

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS, the article has been published as:

Drude Weight, Cyclotron Resonance, and the Dicke Model of Graphene Cavity QED

Luca Chirolli, Marco Polini, Vittorio Giovannetti, and Allan H. MacDonald

Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 267404 — Published 27 December 2012

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.267404](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.267404)

Drude weight, cyclotron resonance, and the Dicke model of graphene cavity QED

Luca Chirolli,¹ Marco Polini,² Vittorio Giovannetti,¹ and Allan H. MacDonald³

¹*NEST, Scuola Normale Superiore and Istituto Nanoscienze-CNR, I-56126 Pisa, Italy*

²*NEST, Istituto Nanoscienze-CNR and Scuola Normale Superiore, I-56126 Pisa, Italy*

³*Department of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA*

The unique optoelectronic properties of graphene make this two-dimensional (2D) material an ideal platform for fundamental studies of cavity quantum electrodynamics (QED) in the strong-coupling regime. The celebrated Dicke model of cavity QED can be approximately realized in this material when the cyclotron transition of its 2D massless Dirac fermion carriers is nearly resonant with a cavity photon mode. We develop the theory of strong matter-photon coupling in this circumstance, emphasizing the essential role of a dynamically generated matter energy term that is quadratic in the photon field and absent in graphene's low-energy Dirac model.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Pq, 73.43.-f, 78.67.Wj

Introduction—Graphene, a 2D honeycomb crystal of Carbon atoms [1], is emerging as an ideal platform to study light-matter interactions for both fundamental and applied purposes [2–5]. Recent experimental advances have made it possible to monolithically integrate graphene with optical microcavities [6, 7], paving the way for cavity QED [8] at the nanometer scale with graphene as an active medium. Graphene cavity QED offers a plethora of unique advantages. First, graphene is a highly-tunable active medium [6] since its electrical and heat transport properties can be easily controlled by employing gates. Second, graphene offers many pathways to achieve the so-called strong-coupling regime of cavity QED [8]. These include [4, 5] the exploitation of intrinsic Dirac plasmons or the combination of graphene with other plasmonic nanostructures. Finally, the active medium can be enriched by embedding inside planar cavities 2D vertical heterostructures [9] comprising graphene as well as other 2D crystals [10] such as MoS₂, h-BN, etc.

A central role in cavity QED is played by the Dicke model [11], which describes a non-dissipative closed system of identical two-level subsystems interacting with a single-mode radiation field. For a sufficiently strong light-matter coupling constant, the thermodynamic limit of the Dicke model exhibits a second-order quantum phase transition to a super-radiant ground state (SPT) [12] with macroscopic photon occupation and coherent atomic polarization. Wide interest in these SPTs has emerged recently in the context of circuit QED [13–16] and ultracold atom gases in optical cavities [17, 18]. When an external magnetic field is applied to a 2D electron system, transitions between states in full and empty Landau levels (LLs) are dispersionless, mimicking atomic transitions and enabling a condensed matter realization of the Dicke model. In particular, recent pioneering work [19, 20] has shown that these systems can be driven toward the ultrastrong coupling [21] limit by tuning the cyclotron transition energy of an ordinary parabolic-band 2D electron gas to resonance with the photonic modes of a terahertz metamaterial. The main scope of this work is

to lay down a theory of the Dicke model of graphene cavity QED. This is not only a fundamental building block of cavity QED but it also offers a number of intriguing twists when it is realized on a graphene platform.

The light-matter interaction in the Dicke Hamiltonian is linear in the vector potential \mathbf{A}_{em} of the cavity. For condensed matter states described by parabolic band models, a quadratic \mathbf{A}_{em}^2 term whose strength is related to the system's Drude weight [22] and f-sum rule [23], also emerges naturally from minimal coupling. It has long been understood [24] that the Dicke model's SPT is suppressed when the quadratic terms are retained. Demonstrations of this property are often referred to as *no-go* theorems. (Standard *no-go* theorems do not apply [25] to ultracold atoms which are driven by an external pump field and subject to significant cavity losses.) Electronic states near the neutrality point of a graphene sheet are described at low energies by a 2D massless Dirac fermion (MDF) Hamiltonian [1], which is *linear* in momentum \mathbf{p} . One of the twists offered by the Dicke model of graphene cavity QED is therefore the following [26]: minimal coupling applied to the MDF Hamiltonian does *not* generate a term proportional to \mathbf{A}_{em}^2 . Cyclotron resonance in this material, which has been extensively investigated experimentally and theoretically over the past decade [27], seems therefore to provide an example of an active medium which could enable a SPT [26] when the graphene sheet is embedded in a cavity. In this work we demonstrate however that in the strong coupling regime the Dicke model for graphene cavity cyclotron resonance must be supplemented by a quadratic term that is dynamically generated by inter-band transitions and again implies a *no-go* theorem.

Gauge invariance and SPTs—We consider an electronic system in D spatial dimensions coupled to an electromagnetic (e.m.) field with a single privileged mode described by a vector potential $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}, t)$. We argue below that the *no-go* theorem for the SPT requires only unbroken gauge symmetry. Our ideas are most clearly spelled out when \mathbf{A} is treated classically. Quantization of the

e.m. field can be easily carried out in the final step. Light-matter interactions are described by minimal coupling: $\mathbf{p}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{p}_i + e\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}_i, t)/c$, where \mathbf{p}_i is the canonical momentum of the i -th electron and $-e$ is the electron charge. The Hamiltonian of a light-matter system can always be written as $\hat{\mathcal{H}}[\mathbf{A}] = \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{mat}}[\mathbf{A}] + \mathcal{H}_{\text{em}}[\mathbf{A}]$, where $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{mat}}[\mathbf{A}]$ contains all the electronic degrees of freedom treated quantum mechanically, while $\mathcal{H}_{\text{em}}[\mathbf{A}]$ is the classical energy density of the e.m. field. The spontaneous coherent photon state is the ground state when the total energy is lowered by introducing a finite static vector potential. Since $\mathcal{H}_{\text{em}}[\mathbf{A}]$ is a positive-definite quadratic form of \mathbf{A} , the instability can occur only if the second derivative of the matter energy with respect to \mathbf{A} is negative for static \mathbf{A} .

We therefore consider the variation of the matter energy $\Delta E_{\text{mat}} \equiv E_{\text{mat}}[\delta\mathbf{A}] - E_{\text{mat}}[\mathbf{0}]$ due to an infinitesimal variation of the static vector potential:

$$\Delta E_{\text{mat}} = \int d^D \mathbf{r} \, \delta \mathbf{A} \cdot \langle \delta \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{mat}}[\mathbf{A}] / \delta \mathbf{A} \rangle. \quad (1)$$

The quantity $\delta \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{mat}}[\mathbf{A}] / \delta \mathbf{A}$ is [28] the physical current operator, $\hat{\mathbf{J}}_{\text{phys}}(\mathbf{r})$. It is convenient to split the current into paramagnetic and diamagnetic contributions, which can be defined by the expansion of $\hat{\mathbf{J}}_{\text{phys}}(\mathbf{r})$ in powers of $\delta \mathbf{A}$. For the μ -th Cartesian component of the current operator this expansion reads

$$\hat{J}_{\text{phys}}^{(\mu)}(\mathbf{r}) = \hat{J}_{\text{p}}^{(\mu)}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{e}{c} \int d^D \mathbf{r}' \hat{K}^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \delta A_{\nu}(\mathbf{r}'), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{J}_{\text{p}}^{(\mu)}(\mathbf{r}) = \delta \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{mat}}[\mathbf{A}] / \delta A_{\mu}(\mathbf{r})|_{\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{0}}$ is the paramagnetic current-density operator, $\hat{K}^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = (c/e)\delta^2 \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{mat}}[\mathbf{A}] / \delta A_{\mu}(\mathbf{r}) \delta A_{\nu}(\mathbf{r}')|_{\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{0}}$, and the sum over repeated Greek indices is intended. The second term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (2) is the diamagnetic contribution to the current-density operator.

We now evaluate the expectation value of $\hat{J}_{\text{phys}}^{(\mu)}(\mathbf{r})$ to first order in $\delta \mathbf{A}$: i) the expectation value of the paramagnetic current-density operator, $J_{\text{p}}^{\mu}(\mathbf{r})$, can be calculated using linear response theory [22, 23]: we find $J_{\text{p}}^{\mu}(\mathbf{r}) = V^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} J_{\text{p}}^{\mu}(\mathbf{q}) e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} + \text{c.c.}$ with $V = L^D$ the D -dimensional volume and $J_{\text{p}}^{\mu}(\mathbf{q}) = (e/c)\chi^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q})\delta A_{\nu}(\mathbf{q})$, where the tensor $\chi^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q})$ is the *static* paramagnetic current-current response function. This current corresponds to the linear term in energy that is retained in the Dicke model. The diamagnetic current operator in Eq. (2) corresponds to the quadratic term neglected in the Dicke model. It already contains one power of $\delta \mathbf{A}$. Its contribution to the linear response current can therefore be obtained by evaluating its expectation value, $K^{\mu\nu}(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|) \equiv \langle \hat{K}^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rangle$, where $\langle \dots \rangle$ refers now to the ground state of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{mat}}$ at $\delta \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0}$ (see Sect. I in Ref. [29]).

Using these results, we find that $\langle \hat{J}_{\text{phys}}^{(\mu)}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle = (e/c)V^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \Xi^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q})\delta A_{\nu}(\mathbf{q})e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} + \text{c.c.}$, where we have in-




FIG. 1: (color online) Left panel: Dipole allowed transitions in a neutral graphene sheet in the presence of an external magnetic field. The horizontal lines denote the unevenly-spaced Landau levels of massless Dirac fermions. The filled valence band levels ($\lambda = -1$) and the empty conduction band levels ($\lambda = +1$) are indicated by filled (empty) circles. The zero-energy ($n = 0$) Landau level is formed partly from the valence band and partly from the conduction band and is half filled in a neutral system. Right panel: In a doped graphene sheet with a Fermi level ε_F placed between the conduction band $n = M$ and the $n = M + 1$ Landau levels, there is an allowed cyclotron transition within the conduction band (magenta line) while some of the lower energy inter-band transitions, indicated by dashed lines, are Pauli-blocked. There is a clear energetic separation between the lowest energy (unblocked) intra-band transition and the (unblocked) inter-band transitions.

roduced $\Xi^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \chi^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q}) + K^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q})$, $K^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q})$ being the Fourier transform of $K^{\mu\nu}(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)$. The corresponding change in matter energy up to second order in $\delta \mathbf{A}$ is $\Delta E_{\text{mat}} \propto V^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \Xi^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q})\delta A_{\mu}(\mathbf{q})\delta A_{\nu}(-\mathbf{q})$. The key point now is to realize [22, 23] that, if gauge invariance is unbroken, there cannot be a current response to a static uniform potential (see Sect. II in Ref. [29]). The diamagnetic contribution to the current-current response is crucial to cancel the paramagnetic contribution and can *never* be neglected:

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 0} K^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q}) = - \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \chi^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{q}). \quad (3)$$

This implies that, in the absence of broken gauge invariance, the change in matter energy due to a static and quasi-homogeneous vector potential must vanish (for explicit examples see Sect. III in Ref. [29]). SPTs therefore cannot occur unless gauge invariance is broken, as it happens for superconductors.

Cavity cyclotron resonance in graphene—We now focus on a 2D electron gas in a graphene sheet exposed to a strong quantizing magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = B\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ [30]. When Zeeman coupling is neglected, the LLs of graphene have two-fold spin and valley degeneracies and therefore over-

all degeneracy $N_f = 4$ [27]. The single-spin single-valley MDF Hamiltonian reads $\mathcal{H}_0 = v_D \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Pi}(\mathbf{r})$, where $v_D \approx 10^6$ m/s is the Dirac velocity, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma^x, \sigma^y)$ is a 2D vector of Pauli matrices, $\boldsymbol{\Pi}(\mathbf{r}) = -i\hbar \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} + e\mathbf{A}_0(\mathbf{r})/c$ is the gauge-invariant dynamical momentum, and $\mathbf{A}_0(\mathbf{r})$ is the static vector potential that describes the quantizing magnetic field. We work in the Landau gauge $\mathbf{A}_0(\mathbf{r}) = (-By, 0, 0)$. A complete set of eigenfunctions is provided by the two-component pseudospinors [27]

$$\langle \mathbf{r} | \lambda, n, k \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{\lambda, n, k}^{(A)}(\mathbf{r}) \\ \psi_{\lambda, n, k}^{(B)}(\mathbf{r}) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{e^{ikx}}{\sqrt{L}} \begin{pmatrix} C_n^- \varphi_{n-1, k}(y) \\ \lambda C_n^+ \varphi_{n, k}(y) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where $\lambda = +1$ (-1) for conduction (valence) band levels, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is the intra-band LL index, and k is the eigenvalue of the magnetic translation operator in the \hat{x} direction. In Eq. (4) $C_n^\pm = \sqrt{(1 \pm \delta_{n,0})/2}$ and $\varphi_{n, k}(y)$ are the normalized eigenfunctions of the parabolic-band Landau problem [23]. The form of the coefficients C_n^\pm guarantees that the pseudospinor corresponding to the $n = 0$ LL has weight only on one sublattice. Each LL has a degeneracy $\mathcal{N} = N_f S / (2\pi \ell_B^2)$, where $S = L^2$ is the sample area. The pseudospinor (4) is an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_0 with eigenvalue [27] $\varepsilon_{\lambda, n}^{(0)} = \lambda \hbar \omega_c \sqrt{n}$, where we have introduced the MDF cyclotron frequency $\omega_c = v_D \sqrt{2}/\ell_B$ and the magnetic length $\ell_B = [\hbar c / (eB)]^{1/2}$.

The Hamiltonian which describes coupling between MDFs and light in the cavity does not contain a quadratic term: $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = v_D (e/c) \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{\text{em}}(\mathbf{r})$. For future purposes we introduce the notations $\sigma^\pm = (\sigma^x \pm i\sigma^y)/2$ and $A_{\text{em}}^\pm(\mathbf{r}) = A_{\text{em}}^x(\mathbf{r}) \pm iA_{\text{em}}^y(\mathbf{r})$. In what follows we neglect [26] the spatial variation of the e.m. field in the cavity, $A_{\text{em}}^\pm(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow A_{\text{em}}^\pm$, since the photon wavelength is normally much larger than other length scales in the problem. In this quasi-uniform approximation we can easily evaluate the matrix elements of \mathcal{H}_{int} between the unperturbed pseudospinors (4):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \lambda', n', k' | \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} | \lambda, n, k \rangle &= \frac{ev_D}{c} \delta_{k, k'} (\lambda C_{n'}^- C_n^+ \delta_{n', n+1} A_{\text{em}}^- \\ &+ \lambda' C_{n'}^+ C_n^- \delta_{n', n-1} A_{\text{em}}^+) . \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The strong coupling limit is most easily obtained when the Fermi energy ε_F lies within one of the bands; we consider the case in which it lies in the conduction band ($\lambda = +1$) between the LL with index $n = M$, which is fully occupied, and the LL with index $n = M+1$, which is at least partially empty. (See Fig. 1.) The Dicke model of cavity cyclotron resonance includes only the intra-band $n = M$ to $n = M+1$ transition and acts in the $2^\mathcal{N}$ -fold subspace spanned by $\{|+, M, k\rangle, |+, M+1, k\rangle, k = 1 \dots \mathcal{N}\}$, neglecting inter-band transitions [26]. Using Eq. (5) and introducing a set of Pauli matrices $\{\mathbb{1}_k, \tau_k^z, \tau_k^\pm, k = 1 \dots \mathcal{N}\}$ which act in this two-level-system subspace leads to the

following pseudospin Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \left(\mathcal{E}_M \mathbb{1}_k - \frac{\Omega_M}{2} \tau_k^z + \epsilon_{\text{em}} \tau_k^+ + \epsilon_{\text{em}}^* \tau_k^- \right), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_M = \hbar \omega_c (\sqrt{M} + \sqrt{M+1})/2$, $\Omega_M = \hbar \omega_c (\sqrt{M+1} - \sqrt{M})$, and $\epsilon_{\text{em}} = ev_D A_{\text{em}}^- / (2c)$. In this model the occupied conduction-band LL shifts down in energy by

$$\Delta E_M^{(\text{intra})} = -\mathcal{N} \left(\frac{ev_D}{2c} \right)^2 \frac{A_{\text{em}}^2}{\hbar \omega_c} (\sqrt{M+1} + \sqrt{M}) \quad (7)$$

in the limit of a static vector potential, in violation of gauge invariance as explained in the previous section. This is the origin of the SPT found in Ref. [26]. The correct effective matter Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_{mat} for graphene cavity cyclotron resonance must repair this defect.

The Dicke model misses a diamagnetic contribution to \mathcal{H}_{mat} , which, according to (3), must precisely cancel the spurious energy shift (7). To derive this term we first recognize the intrinsic two-band nature of graphene (see Fig. 1). A generic valence band state $|-, n, k\rangle$ is coupled by the e.m. field to two states in conduction band: $|+, n+1, k\rangle$ and $|+, n-1, k\rangle$. We first consider the undoped limit in which all valence band states $|-, n, k\rangle$ are occupied. Because the Dirac model applies over a large but finite energy region we must apply a cut-off by occupying valence band levels with $0 \leq n \leq \nu_{\text{max}}$. Treating the e.m. field again by second-order perturbation theory, we find the following change in matter energy for an undoped graphene sheet in a quantizing magnetic field:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E_{\text{undoped}} &= \sum_{k=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{n=0}^{\nu_{\text{max}}} \left[p_n \frac{|\langle +, n+1, k | \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} | -, n, k \rangle|^2}{\varepsilon_{-, n}^{(0)} - \varepsilon_{+, n+1}^{(0)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + p_{n-1} \frac{|\langle +, n-1, k | \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} | -, n, k \rangle|^2}{\varepsilon_{-, n}^{(0)} - \varepsilon_{+, n-1}^{(0)}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $p_n = 1 - \delta_{n,0}/2$. (The factor p_n takes care of transitions involving the $n = 0$ LL, which is half filled.) Using Eq. (5) for the matrix elements we can write Eq. (8) more explicitly:

$$\Delta E_{\text{undoped}} = -\mathcal{N} \left(\frac{ev_D}{2c} \right)^2 \frac{A_{\text{em}}^2}{\hbar \omega_c} [1 + F(\nu_{\text{max}})], \quad (9)$$

with $F(\nu) \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{\nu} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n} + \sqrt{n+1}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n} + \sqrt{n-1}} \right)$. Once again, this large negative contribution to the change in matter energy is spurious. It is present because the Dirac model with a rigid ultraviolet cut-off ν_{max} breaks gauge invariance [31]. When a model that is correct at atomic length scales, for example a π -band tight-binding model, is used instead, a static vector potential merely reassigns momentum labels within the full valence band. We compensate exactly for this deficiency of the Dirac model at

its ultraviolet cut-off scale by adding the positive quantity $-\Delta E_{\text{undoped}}$ to the change in matter energy.

We now reconsider the situation analyzed earlier in which the Fermi energy ε_F lies in conduction band ($\lambda = +1$) between LLs with indices $n = M$ and $n = M + 1$, but account for inter-band transitions. The *inter-band* correction to the energy shift $\Delta E_M^{(\text{intra})}$ in Eq. (7), can be calculated using an expression which is equivalent to Eq. (8) but accounts for *Pauli blocking* of transitions to occupied conduction-band states. The final result for the inter-band contribution is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E_M^{(\text{inter})} &= -\Delta E_{\text{undoped}} - \mathcal{N} \left(\frac{ev_D}{2c} \right)^2 \frac{\mathcal{A}_{\text{em}}^2}{\hbar\omega_c} \\ &\times [F(\nu_{\text{max}}) - F(M)] , \\ &= \mathcal{N} \left(\frac{ev_D}{2c} \right)^2 \frac{\mathcal{A}_{\text{em}}^2}{\hbar\omega_c} [1 + F(M)] , \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the term $-\Delta E_{\text{undoped}}$ takes care of the Dirac model regularization and Eq. (9) has been used in the last equality. After noticing that $1 + F(M) = \sqrt{M+1} + \sqrt{M}$, we finally obtain

$$\Delta E_M^{(\text{inter})} = \mathcal{N} \left(\frac{ev_D}{2c} \right)^2 \frac{\mathcal{A}_{\text{em}}^2}{\hbar\omega_c} (\sqrt{M+1} + \sqrt{M}) . \quad (11)$$

The quantity $\Delta E_M^{(\text{inter})}$ is a dynamically-generated inter-band diamagnetic contribution to the effective Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_{eff} , which: i) is independent of cut-off ν_{max} and ii) satisfies $\Delta E_{\text{mat}} = \Delta E_M^{(\text{intra})} + \Delta E_M^{(\text{inter})} = 0$, *i.e.* in the limit of a static vector potential, it precisely cancels the spurious shift (7) responsible for the Dicke model SPT.

Because intra-band transition energies are much lower than inter-band transitions in the weak-field limit relevant to the strong coupling limit of cavity cyclotron resonance, we can neglect the frequency dependence of the dynamically generated quadratic term. This energy must be added to the effective matter Hamiltonian (6) for graphene cavity cyclotron resonance:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} + S \frac{\mathcal{D}_M}{2\pi c^2} \mathcal{A}_{\text{em}}^2 , \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{D}_M = 4\mathcal{E}_M\sigma_{\text{uni}}/\hbar$ is the Drude weight [29, 31] expressed in terms of the function \mathcal{E}_M introduced right after Eq. (6). This Hamiltonian is the starting point of the cavity QED theory of graphene cyclotron resonance. The $\mathcal{A}_{\text{em}}^2$ quadratic supplement to the Dicke model is always critical in the strong coupling limit. Eq. (12) is the most important result of this work.

Quantum Theory—We can quantize the e.m. field by promoting the positive and negative Fourier amplitudes of \mathcal{A}_{em} to photon annihilation a and creation a^\dagger operators: $\mathcal{A}_{\text{em}} = \mathcal{A}\epsilon(a + a^\dagger)$, where ϵ is unit vector describing the polarization of the e.m. field and $\mathcal{A} = \sqrt{2\pi\hbar c^2/(\varepsilon\omega V)}$ with $V = SL_z$ the volume of the cavity ($L_z \ll L$ is the height of the cavity in the direction perpendicular to

graphene) and ε its dielectric constant. When a cavity model with frequency ω is nearly resonant with the cyclotron transition frequency Ω_M , the total Hamiltonian (12) yields a Dicke model supplemented by an $\mathcal{A}_{\text{em}}^2$ term:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{Dicke}} &= \hbar\omega a^\dagger a - \frac{\Omega_M}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \tau_k^z + \frac{g}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}}} \sum_{k=1}^{\mathcal{N}} \tau_k^x (a + a^\dagger) \\ &+ \kappa(a + a^\dagger)^2 , \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $g = \hbar\omega_c\sqrt{2\sigma_{\text{uni}}/(\varepsilon\omega L_z)}$ and $\kappa = \hbar\mathcal{D}_M/(\varepsilon\omega L_z)$. In writing Eq. (13) we have assumed a specific polarization of the e.m. field, *i.e.* $\epsilon = \hat{x}$. In the thermodynamic $\mathcal{N} \rightarrow \infty$ limit the model (13) undergoes a SPT if the condition $\omega\Omega_M(1 + 4\kappa/\omega)/(4g^2) < 1$ is satisfied [16, 24]. In our case, however, a SPT is forbidden because the following identity holds true:

$$g^2 = \kappa\Omega_M , \quad (14)$$

which specifically establishes a *no-go* theorem for the occurrence of a SPT in the graphene cyclotron resonance cavity QED. It is not a coincidence, and instead follows directly from the cancellation between paramagnetic and diamagnetic currents discussed in the first part of this work. The paramagnetic response of the Hamiltonian (13) to a static and quasi-homogeneous e.m. field is, indeed, $(g^2/\mathcal{N}) \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \langle \tau_{\text{tot}}^x; \tau_{\text{tot}}^x \rangle_\omega = -2g^2/\Omega_M$, where $\tau_{\text{tot}}^x = \sum_k \tau_k^x$ and $\langle \tau_{\text{tot}}^x; \tau_{\text{tot}}^x \rangle_\omega = 2\mathcal{N}\Omega_M/(\omega^2 - \Omega_M^2)$ [32]. According to Eq. (3), this paramagnetic contribution must be equal in magnitude and opposite in sign to the diamagnetic response of (13), which is simply 2κ : *i.e.* it must satisfy $\kappa = g^2/\Omega_M$, which coincides with Eq. (14). *Summary and discussion*—We have derived a microscopic effective Hamiltonian - Eq. (12) - for graphene cavity cyclotron resonance, highlighting in particular the role of gauge invariance and Drude weight. From the point of view of graphene fundamental physics and quantum optics, Eq. (12) is a key result that can be used to address a number of subtle issues. First of all, it goes without saying that Eq. (12) is the proper theoretical tool to analyze graphene cavity cyclotron resonance physics which, even in the absence of super-radiant phases, retains all its appeal due to the gate-tunability and versatility of the active material [2, 4–7, 9]. Useful applications of Eq. (12) can also be foreseen in studies of the poorly understood [27] electron-electron interaction corrections to cyclotron resonance transition energies in graphene and other Dirac materials. Finally, it is worth mentioning that our work does not touch upon the interesting possibility of realizing super-radiant phases when massless Dirac fermions are driven away from equilibrium.

Acknowledgements—We thank R. Fazio for fruitful discussions. This work was supported by MIUR-FIRB grants RBID08B3FM and RBFR10M5BT, Welch Foundation grant TBF1473, and by DOE Division of Materials Sciences and Engineering grant DE-FG03-02ER45958.

-
- [1] M.I. Katsnelson, *Graphene: Carbon in Two Dimensions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012).
- [2] F. Bonaccorso, Z. Sun, T. Hasan, and A.C. Ferrari, *Nature Photon.* **4**, 611 (2010).
- [3] N.M.R. Peres, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 2673 (2010).
- [4] F.H.L. Koppens, D.E. Chang, and F.J. García de Abajo, *Nano Lett.* **11**, 3370 (2011).
- [5] A.N. Grigorenko, M. Polini, and K.S. Novoselov, *Nature Photon.*, to appear (2012).
- [6] M. Engel, M. Steiner, A. Lombardo, A.C. Ferrari, H. v. Loehneysen, P. Avouris, and R. Krupke, *Nature Commun.* **3**, 906 (2012).
- [7] M. Furchi, A. Urich, A. Pospischil, G. Lilley, K. Unterrainer, H. Detz, P. Klang, A.M. Andrews, W. Schrenk, G. Strasser, and T. Mueller, *Nano Lett.* **12**, 2773 (2012).
- [8] J.M. Raimond, M. Brune, and S. Haroche, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 565 (2001); H. Mabuchi and A.C. Doherty, *Science* **298**, 1372 (2002); H. Walther, B.T.H. Varcoe, B.-G. Englert, and T. Becker, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **69**, 1325 (2006).
- [9] K.S. Novoselov, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 837 (2011).
- [10] K.S. Novoselov, D. Jiang, F. Schedin, T.J. Booth, V.V. Khotkevich, S.V. Morozov, and A.K. Geim, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. (USA)* **102**, 10451 (2005).
- [11] R.H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- [12] K. Hepp and E.H. Lieb, *Ann. Phys.* **76**, 360 (1973); Y.K. Wang and F.T. Hioe, *Phys. Rev. A* **7**, 831 (1973); K. Hepp and E.H. Lieb, *ibid.* **8**, 2517 (1973).
- [13] For a recent review on circuit QED see *e.g.* M. Devoret, S. Girvin, and R. Schoelkopf, *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **16**, 767 (2007).
- [14] P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 023601 (2010).
- [15] P. Nataf and C. Ciuti, *Nature Commun.* **1**, 72 (2010).
- [16] O. Viehmann, J. von Delft, and F. Marquardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 113602 (2011).
- [17] F. Brennecke, T. Donner, S. Ritter, T. Bourdel, M. Köhl, and T. Esslinger, *Nature* **450**, 268 (2007).
- [18] K. Baumann, C. Guerlin, F. Brennecke, and T. Esslinger, *Nature* **464**, 1301 (2010).
- [19] D. Hagenmüller, S. De Liberato, and C. Ciuti, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 235303 (2010).
- [20] G. Scalari, C. Maissen, D. Turčinková, D. Hagenmüller, S. De Liberato, C. Ciuti, C. Reichl, D. Schuh, W. Wegscheider, M. Beck, and J. Faist, *Science* **335**, 1323 (2012).
- [21] In the ultrastrong limit the strength of the radiation-induced coupling between two consecutive LLs is of the same order as the bare cyclotron transition energy.
- [22] D. Pines and P. Nozières, *The Theory of Quantum Liquids* (W.A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1966).
- [23] G.F. Giuliani and G. Vignale, *Quantum Theory of the Electron Liquid* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005).
- [24] K. Rzażewski, K. Wódkiewicz, and W. Żakowicz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 432 (1975); I. Białynicki-Birula and K. Rzażewski, *Phys. Rev. A* **19**, 30103 (1979); K. Gawędzki, K. Rzażewski, *ibid.* **23**, 2134 (1981).
- [25] J. Keeling, M.J. Bhaseen, and B.D. Simons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 043001 (2010); V.M. Bastidas, C. Emary, B. Regler, and T. Brandes, *ibid.* **108**, 043003 (2012).
- [26] D. Hagenmüller and C. Ciuti, arXiv:1111.3550.
- [27] See *e.g.* M.O. Goerbig, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 1193 (2011).
- [28] Strictly speaking this derivative yields the current operator Fourier component with wavevector \mathbf{q} equal to the lateral wavevector of the privileged photon mode. In practice $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}$.
- [29] Supplemental Material File.
- [30] Although it is clear that the gauge invariance condition (3) is valid in the presence of electron-electron interactions, for simplicity in this Section we restrict the analysis to a non-interacting gas of MDFs. At equilibrium, the impact of electron-electron interactions on the graphene cavity cyclotron resonance theory is merely quantitative.
- [31] S.H. Abedinpour, G. Vignale, A. Principi, M. Polini, W.-K. Tse, and A.H. MacDonald, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 045429 (2011).
- [32] See *e.g.* S.H. Abedinpour, M. Polini, A.H. MacDonald, B. Tanatar, M.P. Tosi, and G. Vignale, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 206802 (2007).