Plasmonic mass and Johnson–Nyquist noise
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Abstract
The fluctuation-dissipation theorem relates the thermal noise spectrum of a conductor to its linear response properties, with the ohmic resistance arising from the electron scattering being the most notable linear response property. But the linear response also includes the collective inertial acceleration of electrons, which should in principle influence the thermal noise spectrum as well. In practice, this effect would be largely masked by the Planck quantization for traditional conductors with short electron scattering times. But recent advances in nanotechnology have enabled the fabrication of conductors with greatly increased electron scattering times, with which the collective inertial effect can critically affect the thermal noise spectrum. In this paper we highlight this collective inertial effect—that is, the plasmonic effect—on the thermal noise spectrum under the framework of semiclassical electron dynamics, from both fundamental microscopic and practical modeling points of view. In graphene, where non-zero collective inertia arises from zero single-electron effective mass and where both electron and hole bands exist together, the thermal noise spectrum shows rich temperature and frequency dependencies, unseen in traditional conductors.
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1. Introduction
The phenomenon of Johnson–Nyquist noise [1, 2] is not only of great importance for its own sake, but it also offers a prominent example of the fluctuation-dissipation relation [3, 4]. The fluctuation-dissipation theorem dictates that the power spectral density of the Johnson–Nyquist current noise in a conductor is given by [3, 4]

\[ S_f(\omega) = \frac{4k_B T \Re \{Y(\omega)\} \hbar/\omega}{\exp(\hbar/\omega k_B T) - 1}, \]

where \( Y(\omega) \) is the complex admittance that represents the conductor’s linear response. While the primary factor that affects \( Y(\omega) \) is the ohmic resistance \( R \) arising from the electron scattering, \( Y(\omega) \) must be a frequency-dependent, complex quantity, even in the most intrinsic case considering only the pure dynamical effects of electrons (i.e., even after excluding parasitic reactive elements). This is because the current response to an applied voltage entails not only the electron scattering but also the collective inertial acceleration of electrons, which manifests as a kinetic inductance \( L_K \) [5]. For a conductor with an arbitrary single-electron energy dispersion \( \epsilon(k) \), \( L_K \) can be obtained by calculating the ac conductivity or dielectric function within the linear response framework [6–8]. In particular, the semi-classical approximation yields [6, 8]

\[ L_K = \frac{1}{W} \frac{\hbar^2}{ge^2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{\partial^2 \epsilon}{\partial k_z^2}(\epsilon(k)) \left[ \frac{1}{\hbar^2/\omega k_B T} + 1 \right], \]

for a conductor with length \( l \) along the \( x \)-axis—along which \( Y(\omega) \) and \( S_f(\omega) \) are measured—and cross-sectional width or area, \( W \), depending on conductor dimension \( d = 2 \) or \( 3 \). \( g \) accounts for degeneracy (e.g., due to spin and valley), and...
In other words, in the classical regime, the current noise is

\[ f(\omega) = [1 + \exp\{(e - \mu)/(k_B T)\}]^{-1} \]

is the Fermi–Dirac distribution (\(\mu\): chemical potential). Then

\[ Y(\omega) = (R + i\alpha L_K)^{-1}, \]

with \(L_K\) and \(R\) in series. The corresponding circuit model is in figure 1(a). At low frequencies, equation (1) reduces to the familiar \(4k_B T/R\). In the classical regime (\(\hbar \rightarrow 0\)), equation (1) reduces to

\[ S_I(\omega) = 4k_B T Y\{Y(\omega)\}. \]

Integrating equation (4) over the frequency yields

\[ \{\bar{I}^2\} = \int_0^\infty S_I(\omega) \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} = \frac{k_B T}{L_K}. \]

In other words, in the classical regime, the current noise follows the equipartition theorem, storing a mean thermal energy of \(k_B T/2\) into the collective degree of freedom associated with \(L_K\).

So, in principle the collective inertial effect \(L_K\) influences the thermal noise spectrum. But little attention has been paid to this effect, as it is not too conspicuous—if not negligible—in most traditional conductors. To see this, note that the Planck factor in equation (1) rolls off with frequency with a characteristic cutoff \(\omega_q \equiv k_B T/\hbar\), while \(Y\{Y(\omega)\}\) rolls off with a characteristic cutoff \(\omega_p \equiv R/L_K = \tau^{-1}\) (\(\tau\): electron momentum relaxation time), where \(R/L_K = \tau^{-1}\) is from the semiclassical calculation of the ac conductivity [6]. In traditional conductors, \(\omega_q\) tends to be smaller than, or at best comparable to, \(\omega_p\) across a broad temperature range, rendering the \(L_K\) effect masked in the spectrum. But in recently advanced nanoscale or low-dimensional conductors such as graphene, \(\tau\) is large enough that \(\omega_q \ll \omega_p\) is possible [8, 9], in which case the \(L_K\) effect will dominate the spectrum roll-off.

The purpose of this paper is to highlight this collective inertial effect on the thermal noise spectrum from both fundamental microscopic and practical modeling points of view. In section 2, we will delineate the effect from a microscopic standpoint. The collective excitation of electrons, macroscopically represented by \(L_K\), exhibits a well-defined collective mass [5, 8, 10]. Since its acceleration is essential for propagating the plasmonic wave [5, 8, 11–15], we will call this collective mass, normalized to the number of electrons, as the plasmonic mass \(m_p\). We will elucidate that the correct mass to use in describing the microscopic dynamics of thermal fluctuation is not the single-electron effective mass \(m^*\) but the plasmonic mass \(m_p\). In fact, this essential link between \(m_p\) (or \(L_K\)) and thermal noise is subsumed by, and thus a natural consequence of, the linear response theory; i.e., both the fluctuation-dissipation theorem and \(m_p\) are attained from the same linear response framework applied to the collection of electrons [3, 4]. In section 3, we will elaborate on how the plasmonic roll-off can take over the Planck (quantum) roll-off in the noise spectrum for large enough \(\tau\). Section 4 will use graphene as an example conductor and develop its thermal noise model, considering the plasmonic mass effect from both electron and hole bands that co-exist.

2. Collective mode and noise: microscopic view

2.1. Plasmonic mass

We first detail the concept of plasmonic mass [8] that is paramount in this paper. If we collectively displace each electron in a conductor—e.g., by applying an electric field and setting a current—by \(\delta\) in the \(k_x\) direction, the total energy of the electron system is increased. The increase amount is the collective kinetic energy \(E_K\) corresponding to the current; it is given by

\[ E_K = W \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} g(k + \delta \hat{k}_x) f(\epsilon(k)) \]

\[ - W \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} g(k)f(\epsilon(k)), \]

where the integration is over the conduction band—up to section 3, we focus on a conductor with a single conduction band—and \(\hat{k}_x\) is a unit vector along the \(k_x\) axis. For a small enough \(\delta\), which is practically always the case, we can write equation (6) in powers of \(\delta\)

\[ E_K = \delta x W g \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial k_x} f(\epsilon(k)) \]

\[ + \frac{\delta^2}{2} x W g \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2 \epsilon}{\partial k_x^2} f(\epsilon(k)) + ... \]

Figure 1. (a) Circuit model for the Johnson–Nyquist noise, including the kinetic inductance effect. (b) Current noise power spectral density for various \(\tau\) values at \(T = 300\) K.
If we assume inversion symmetry \( \epsilon(k) = \epsilon(-k) \), met by many lattice types, the first term vanishes. But more broadly, since the first term is proportional to the integration of the group velocity, \( v_g(k) = (\hbar/\delta c) \partial \epsilon(k)/\partial k \), weighted by the Fermi–Dirac distribution, if it did not vanish, there would be a spontaneous current; we do not consider such a case here, and set the first term to zero. Now, as \( \delta \) and the collective crystal momentum \( P \) are related by \( P = nWl \times \delta \) —here, \( n = \int (\hbar^2/k^2)df(\epsilon(k)) \) is electron number density per area or volume (\( d = 2 \) or \( 3 \))— equation (7) becomes

\[
E_K = \frac{p^2}{2} \times \frac{\hbar^2n^2Wl}{g} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial k^2}_x f(\epsilon(k)).
\]

(8)

So \( E_K \propto \delta^2 \propto P^2 \) regardless of \( \epsilon(k) \). This quadratic relation is expected, as \( E_K \) is minimum at \( \delta = 0 \) (whether the electrons move to the right or left, \( E_K \) increases). As \( E_K \propto P^2 \), the collective inertia is

\[
M = \frac{p^2}{2E_K} \times \frac{\hbar^2n^2Wl}{g} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial k^2}_x f(\epsilon(k)) .
\]

(9)

Collective mass per electron—plasmonic mass—is then

\[
m_p = \frac{\hbar^2}{g} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial k^2}_x f(\epsilon(k))(\frac{\partial k}{\partial \epsilon})^{-1}.
\]

(10)

which is the harmonic mean of the effective mass tensor component \( \hbar^2[M^{ij}(k)]_{xx} = \partial^2\epsilon/\partial k^2_x \). For later use, we re-express equation (10) after integration by parts:

\[
m_p = \frac{n}{g} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial k^2}_x (\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon})^{-1}.
\]

(11)

We now make a few key observations about \( m_p \).

1. **Plasmonic mass versus effective mass:** For a general \( \epsilon(k) \), \( m_p \) differs from the single-electron effective mass, \( m^* \) = \( [(\hbar^2/\delta c)(\partial^2\epsilon/\partial k^2)]^{-1} \). \( m_p \) is \( k \)-independent, while \( m^* \) is generally \( k \)-dependent. \( m_p \) generally varies with \( T \) and \( n \), for it arises from the collective excitations, while \( m^* \) does not. In the special case of \( \epsilon(k) \propto k^2 \) (\( \epsilon(k) \propto |k|^d \)), \( m^* \) is a well-defined, \( k \)-independent constant, and \( m_p = m_p \), as seen from equation (10) in connection with \( n = \int (d^2k/(2\pi)^2)df(\epsilon(k)) \).

2. **Plasmonic mass versus cyclotron mass:** Consider a 2D conductor at \( T = 0 \) with an isotropic single-electron dispersion, \( \epsilon(k) = \epsilon(k) \). Integrations in equation (10) and

\[
 n = \int (d^2k/4\pi^2)df(\epsilon(k)) \quad \text{for} \quad |k| \leq k_F \quad \text{yield} \quad m_p(T = 0) = h^2k_F/(dk/d\epsilon)_w_{k_F} \quad (k_F; \text{Fermi wavenumber}).
\]

On the other hand, the cyclotron mass for electrons that orbit around the Fermi surface enclosing the \( k \)-space area of \( \epsilon \) is\( m_c = h^2/(2\pi)(d\epsilon/dk)_{w_{k_F}} \) for \( \epsilon(k) \), which, for isotropic 2D conductors, is

\[
m_c = \frac{h^2}{2\pi} [\frac{dk}{d\epsilon} \cdot \frac{d(\pi k^2)}{dk}]_{w_{k_F}} = h^2k_F(\frac{dk}{d\epsilon})_{w_{k_F}} .
\]

Thus, for a 2D isotropic conductor, \( m_p(T = 0) = m_c \). This also applies to three-dimensional (3D) conductors with \( \epsilon(k) = \epsilon(k) \).

3. **Graphene:** While the single-electron energy dispersion \( \epsilon(k) \) for graphene is that of massless Dirac Fermions, \( m_p \neq 0 \). As graphene is isotropic with \( \epsilon(k) = h\gamma k_F \), \( m_p(T = 0) = m_c = \gamma k_F^2/2 \), like the rest mass in relativity (\( \epsilon_F \) and \( v_F \) are Fermi energy and velocity). \( m_c \) was measured from Shubnikov–de Hass oscillations [17, 18]. \( m_p \) is expected, as \( \epsilon(k) \) is a spontaneous current; we do not consider such a case

\[
I = W \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial k^2}_x f(\epsilon(k))(\frac{\partial k}{\partial \epsilon})^{-1}.
\]

(13)

which, to the first order of \( \delta \), is

\[
I = \delta \times \frac{WGe}{h} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial k^2}_x f(\epsilon(k)).
\]

(14)

Thus \( E_K \propto \delta^2 \propto I^2 \), and we identify the constant of proportionality as \( L_K/2 = E_K/I^2 \). Using equations (8) and (14), we have:

\[
L_K = \frac{1}{WGe} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2\epsilon}{\partial k^2}_x f(\epsilon(k)) \].

(15)

This is identical to equation (2) obtained from the semiclassical calculation of the ac conductivity [6]. Finally, from equations (10) and (15), we obtain

\[
L_K = \frac{1}{W} \frac{m_p}{W e^2} .
\]

(16)

This establishes the link between macroscopic \( L_K \) and microscopic \( m_p \). Equation (16) is the generalization of the more familiar expression for \( L_K \) derived from the Drude model for the special case of \( \epsilon(k) \propto k^2 \) and \( m_p = m^* \).

2.2. From macroscopic to microscopic picture

In the introduction, we established the macroscopic energy equipartition in the classical regime, equation (5); the noise current \( I \) stores a thermal energy of \( k_B T/2 \) into \( L_K \). We now convert this macroscopic energy equipartition to a microscopic form applicable to the thermal fluctuation velocity \( v_0 \) —along the \( x \)-axis where noise is measured—for an individual electron. As each electron contributes a fluctuating current of \( v_0 e/\ell \), (17) = \( (v_0^2)^2 \) \( e^2 / (2\pi)^2 \times nWl \). By combining this with equations (5) and (16), we obtain

\[
(v_0^2) = \frac{k_B T}{m_p} .
\]

(17)

which holds for arbitrary \( \epsilon(k) \). While the thermal motions of electrons are not apparently collective, the fluctuating velocity stores a thermal energy of \( k_B T/2 \) into the plasmonic mass \( m_p \)—as opposed to the single-electron effective mass \( m^* \)—with the plasmonic motion being an appropriate degree of freedom.
to apply the energy equipartition at the microscopic level. We emphasize that the energy equipartition does not apply generally to \( m^* \), i.e., \( \langle v_i^2 \rangle \neq k_B T / m^* \), in general. While \( \langle v_i^2 \rangle = k_B T / m^* \) is valid when \( \epsilon(k) \propto k^2 \) and \( m^* = m_p \), it faces a problem for a general, non-parabolic \( \epsilon(k) \), where \( m^* \) is dependent on \( k \). A more dramatic example where \( \langle v_i^2 \rangle = k_B T / m^* \) fails is the case of graphene, where individual electrons act as massless Dirac Fermions. In sum, the proper mass to use in describing thermal noise dynamics is not \( m^* \) but \( m_p \). In the time-domain description, the Langevin equation [3] should use \( m_p \), not \( m^* \).

2.3. From microscopic to macroscopic picture

The foregoing discussion started by integrating the power spectral density of equation (4) into the macroscopic equipartition of equation (5) and subsequently obtained the macroscopic equipartition of equation (17). We may reverse this chain of processes, and derive first the microscopic equipartition by enumerating and averaging the effect of each individual electron, based on the Fermi–Dirac statistics.

To this end, for a \( k \)-state, we define a unitless random variable \( s_k \), which assumes a value of 1 with probability \( f(\epsilon(k)) \) and a value of 0 with probability \( 1 - f(\epsilon(k)) \). That is, \( s_k = 1 \) means that the \( k \)-state is occupied by an electron, while \( s_k = 0 \) signifies the emptiness of the \( k \)-state. Then, the sum of the \( x \)-component group velocities of all electrons in the conductor can be written as

\[
\langle v_{\text{sum}} \rangle = \sum_k v_x(k) s_k,
\]

which itself is a random variable. Its variance, which represents the fluctuation in the velocity sum, must be related to the above-discussed \( \langle v_i^2 \rangle \) by:

\[
n W I \times \langle v_i^2 \rangle = \langle \langle v_{\text{sum}} \rangle^2 \rangle - \langle v_{\text{sum}} \rangle^2.
\]

We evaluate each term on the right-hand side by using equation (18). The first term is

\[
\langle \langle v_{\text{sum}} \rangle^2 \rangle = \left( \sum_k v_x(k) s_k \right)^2 = \sum_k v_x^2(k) s_k^2 + \sum_{k \neq k'} v_x(k) v_x(k') s_k s_{k'} = \sum_k v_x^2(k) f_k + \sum_{k \neq k'} v_x(k) v_x(k') f_k f_{k'}.
\]

By plugging these two results into equation (19), we obtain

\[
\langle v_i^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{n W I} \sum_k v_x^2(k) f_k (1 - f_k).
\]

In the special case where there is inversion symmetry in the single-electron energy dispersion, i.e., \( \epsilon(k) = \epsilon(-k) \) and \( v_x(k) = -v_x(-k) \), equation (20) has a particularly simple interpretation. In this case, if a \( k \)-state and a \(-k \)-state are both occupied, the group velocities of the two occupant electrons cancel each other due to the symmetry, not contributing to the fluctuation. Thus to evaluate \( \langle v_i^2 \rangle \) in this special case, one has to enumerate only those situations where the \( k \)-state is occupied while the \(-k \)-state is not. The corresponding probability is then \( f_k (1 - f_k) \), and hence equation (20). However, in attaining equation (20), we have not imposed any condition on \( \epsilon(k) \)—such as the inversion symmetry—and, hence, equation (20) is generally valid.

Converting equation (18) into an integral and using \( f(\epsilon(k))[1 - f(\epsilon(-k))] = -k_B T (\partial f / \partial \epsilon) \), we obtain

\[
\langle v_i^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{n} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} v_x^2(k) f(\epsilon(k))[1 - f(\epsilon(-k))] = \frac{k_B T}{m_p}.
\]

where we have taken the last step by using equation (11). As seen, the microscopic equipartition with \( m_p \) resurfaces but this time via the \textit{ab initio} calculation, which reaffirms the critical relevance of \( m_p \) to noise dynamics.

Equation (16) with \( \langle I^2 \rangle = \langle v_i^2 \rangle e^2 / l^2 \times n W I \) transforms this microscopic equipartition into the macroscopic equipartition, equation (5). We can subsequently work out the noise power spectral density: As \( (I(0)I(t)) = (I^2)e^{-|t|/\tau} \) [3],

\[
S_I(\omega) = 4 \int_0^\infty dt (I(0)I(t)) \cos(\omega t) = 4 \langle I^2 \rangle \tau (1 + \omega^2 \tau^2);
\]

by using equation (5) and \( \tau = L_K / R \), we obtain the noise power spectral density of equation (4).

The power spectral density derivation above tacitly assumed frequency-independent \( \tau \) and \( R \). But even when \( \tau \) and \( R \) are frequency-dependent, we can still derive the power spectral density from the microscopic equipartition \( \langle v_i^2 \rangle = k_B T / m_p \) by using the generalized Langevin equation of Kubo’s linear response theory [3], where (and importantly) \( m_p \) is to be used instead of \( m^* \).

3. High-frequency behavior of \( S_I(\omega) \)

With \( Y(\omega) = (R + i a L_K)^{-1} \), equation (1) is written out as

\[
S_I(\omega) = \frac{4k_B T}{R^2 + a^2 L_K^2} \frac{\hbar \omega / k_B T}{\exp(\hbar \omega / k_B T) - 1}.
\]

The second factor is \( \Re \{Y(\omega)\} \), and the third Planck factor is due to the radiation quantization. With frequency, the Planck
factor starts rolling off at around the ‘quantum cutoff,’ $a_{B} = k_{B}T/\hbar$; at $T = 300$ K, $a_{B}/(2\pi) \approx 6.25$ THz. On the other hand, $\Re\{Y(\omega)\}$ starts rolling off at around the ‘plasmonic cutoff,’ $a_{p} = R/L_{K} = 1/\tau$. In most typical conductors with $\tau$ between $\sim 10^{-14}$ s and $\sim 10^{-16}$ s, $a_{p}$ tends to be larger than, or, at best, comparable to, $a_{B}$. So the noise spectrum roll-off due to $L_{K}$ (or $m_{P}$) is typically masked (or, at best, blunted) by that due to the Planck factor.

By contrast, recent advances in nanoscale or low-dimensional conductors such as graphene have greatly increased $\tau$ so that $a_{B} \ll a_{p}$ is possible [8, 9], with which $Y(\omega)$ becomes substantially inductive at GHz to THz frequencies and the spectrum roll-off due to $L_{K}$ kicks in before the Planck factor suppresses the spectrum. To show this concretely, figure 1(b) plots equation (22)—noise spectrum versus frequency—for various values of $\tau$. For $\tau = 0$ (black curve), the noise spectrum starts decreasing at around $a_{B}$; this is the noise suppression due purely to the Planck factor. As $\tau$ is increased and $a_{p}$ becomes increasingly smaller than $a_{B}$, the high-frequency suppression of the noise spectrum becomes increasingly dominated by the $L_{K}$ effect; compare the blue, green, and red curves—$\tau$ increasing in that order—against the black curve. For such large $\tau$ values, the $L_{K}$ effect on thermal noise is critical to model in. This effect may also be exploited to infer the optical (plasmonic) properties from the noise spectrum.

To further highlight the critical role of $L_{K}$ in the noise spectrum for large $\tau$, we compute $\langle I^{2} \rangle$ by integrating equation (22) across the entire frequency:

$$
\langle I^{2} \rangle = \frac{k_{B}T}{L_{K}} \times \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{a}{a^{2} + x^{2}} \frac{xdx}{e^{x} - 1} \tag{23}
$$

where $a \equiv a_{B}/a_{p} = R\hbar/(k_{B}TL_{K}) = \hbar/(k_{B}T\tau_{K})$ and $x \equiv \hbar\omega/(k_{B}T)$. This generalizes equation (5) by including the Planck quantization. $\langle I^{2} \rangle$ versus $a$ is in figure 2. For $a \to \infty$ ($\tau \to 0$; $a_{p} \gg a_{B}$), the Planck quantization effect takes precedence over the $L_{K}$ effect, and $\langle I^{2} \rangle \ll k_{B}T/L_{K}$. In fact, in this case, equation (23) is reduced to

$$
\langle I^{2} \rangle = \frac{k_{B}T}{L_{K}} \times \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{x}{a^{2} + x^{2}} \frac{dx}{e^{x} - 1} = \frac{\pi(k_{B}T)^{2}}{3R\hbar} \tag{24}
$$

where $L_{K}$ disappears. In contrast, for $a \to 0$ ($\tau \to \infty$; $a_{p} \ll a_{B}$), we have

$$
\langle I^{2} \rangle = \frac{k_{B}T}{L_{K}} \times \frac{2a}{\pi} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a^{2} + x^{2}} dx = \frac{k_{B}T}{L_{K}}, \tag{25}
$$

recovering the macroscopic equipartition, equation (5); i.e., in this case, the spectrum roll-off is entirely governed by $L_{K}$, with the Planck quantization effect masked.

4. Thermal noise model for graphene

Graphene is an ideal system to apply the foregoing formalism to and to derive a thermal noise model from for a few reasons. First, in high-quality graphene, $\tau \sim 10^{-12}$ s [8, 9], corresponding to the green curve of figure 1(b), and, hence, the effect of $L_{K}$ (or $m_{P}$) dominates over the Planck quantization effect in the noise spectrum. Second, in graphene, individual electrons act as massless Dirac Fermions, yet conduction and valence bands contribute to electronic conduction, $L_{K}$ (or $m_{P}$) from both bands should be considered, which further complicates the noise behaviors.

First consider a fictitious graphene with only a conduction band, held at a constant charge density by a gate bias. With only the electron band, the constant charge density means a constant electron number density $n$. Suppose $\mu(T = 0) = \varepsilon_{F} = 0.1$ eV. With $g = 4$, $n = \int (d^{2}k/\pi^{2})f(\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}))|_{\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{F}, T = 0} = \varepsilon_{F}^{2}/(\pi\hbar^{2}v_{F}^{2})$. As $n$ is $T$-independent in our scenario,

$$
n = \int \frac{d^{2}k}{\pi^{2}} f(\varepsilon(\mathbf{k}))|_{\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{F}} = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\varepsilon_{F}^{2}}{\hbar^{2}v_{F}^{2}}, \tag{26}
$$

from which $\mu(T)$ is determined (figure 3(a), blue curve). Using this $\mu(T)$ in equation (10), we evaluate $m_{P}$. As $n$ is constant, $L_{K} \propto m_{P}$ (equation (16)). Figure 3(b) shows $L_{K}$ and $m_{P}$ as functions of $T$; both increase with $T$. This contrasts the case of a conventional conductor with parabolic dispersion, for which $m_{P}$ (and $L_{K}$ with the fixed $n$ with the gate biasing) is independent of $T$.

A real graphene sample where electron and hole bands co-exist exhibits even richer behaviors. We again assume a constant charge density held by a gate bias and suppose $\mu(T = 0) = \varepsilon_{F} = 0.1$ eV. At $T = 0$, graphene is electron-doped. As $T$ rises, both the electron number density $n_{e}$ and hole number density $n_{h}$—subscript ‘e’ and ‘h’ signify electron and hole bands—can vary (this contrasts the fictitious case where the electron number density is fixed) while the total
charge density \(-en_c + en_h\) is fixed. Formally:

\[
n_e(\mu, T) - n_h(\mu, T) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{e^2}{\hbar^2 v_F^2},
\]

where

\[
n_e(\mu, T) = \int_{\epsilon} \frac{d^2 \mathbf{k}}{\pi^2} f(\epsilon(\mathbf{k}))|_{\mu,T},
\]

\[
n_h(\mu, T) = \int_{h} \frac{d^2 \mathbf{k}}{\pi^2} \left[1 - f(\epsilon(\mathbf{k}))|_{\mu,T}\right].
\]

This leads to a markedly different behavior for \(\mu(T)\), with \(\mu \rightarrow 0\) for \(T \rightarrow \infty\) (figure 3(a), red curve), as compared to the case of the fictitious graphene (figure 3(a), blue curve). Once \(\mu(T)\) is evaluated, \(n_e(T)\) and \(n_h(T)\) follow from equations (28) and (29). Also with \(\mu(T)\), we can evaluate \(m_{p,e}\) and \(m_{p,h}\):

\[
m_{p,e} = \frac{\hbar^2 n_e}{g} \left[ \int_{c} \frac{d^2 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2 \epsilon}{\partial k_i^2} f(\epsilon(\mathbf{k}))|_{\mu,T}\right]^{-1},
\]

\[
m_{p,h} = \frac{\hbar^2 n_h}{g} \left[ \int_{h} \frac{d^2 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\partial^2 \epsilon}{\partial k_i^2} \left[1 - f(\epsilon(\mathbf{k}))|_{\mu,T}\right]\right]^{-1},
\]

which are variations of equation (10). Finally, using the results above in equation (16), we can compute the kinetic inductance \(L_K\) of each band separately.

Figures 3(c) and (d) plot the resulting \(m_p\) and \(L_K\) in each band as functions of \(T\). They again exhibit conspicuous \(T\) dependency, just like in the fictitious case. However, the \(T\)-dependency of \(L_{K,e}\) with a maximum value (figure 3(d)) markedly differs from the monotonically increasing \(T\)-dependency of \(L_{K,e}\) in the fictitious case (figure 3(b)). \(L_{K,e} \sim m_{p,e}/n_e\) (equation (16)) exhibits the maximum value in the real graphene due to competing effects of \(m_{p,e}\) and \(n_e\). For small \(T\), \(n_h \ll n_e \approx \text{const.}\), so \(L_{K,e}\) increases with \(T\) as \(m_{p,e}\) increases with \(T\). This is just like in the fictitious case. In contrast, for large \(T\), \(n_e\) grows as \(T^2\) (as does \(n_h\) to keep the overall charge density constant), which is faster than the growth of \(m_{p,e}\) with \(T\) (compare figure 3(a) inset and figure 3(c)); therefore, \(L_{K,e} \sim m_{p,e}/n_e\) decreases for large \(T\).

The circuit noise model of the real graphene is shown in figure 4(a), where the \(L_K\) effects from both bands is explicitly modeled in. The total power spectral density of the current
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**Figure 3.** (a) \(\mu(T)\) for fictitious graphene (blue curve) and real graphene (red curve), shown with electronic band structures. \(\epsilon_F = 0.1\,\text{eV}\) for both. Inset: \(n_e\) for both systems. (b) \(m_p\) \(L_K\) versus \(T\) for fictitious graphene. \(m_0\) is intrinsic electron mass. (c) \(m_p\) in each band versus \(T\) for real graphene. (d) \(L_K\) in each band versus \(T\) for real graphene. \(L_{K,e}/L_{K,h}\) is also shown.
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**Figure 4.** (a) Circuit noise model for graphene. (b) For \(x = n_0\).
noise is given by

\[ S_f(\omega) = 4k_B T \left( \frac{R_c}{\omega^2 + \omega^2 L_{K,e}^2} + \frac{R_h}{\omega^2 + \omega^2 L_{K,h}^2} \right) \]

\[ \times \frac{\hbar \omega}{k_B T} \exp \left( \frac{\hbar \omega}{k_B T} \right) - 1 \]  

(32)

assuming no correlation between the electron band noise and hole band noise. Due to the dominance of \( L_{K,e} \) and \( L_{K,h} \) in the spectrum roll-off over the Planck quantization effect (in high-quality graphene) and due also to the rich \( T \)-dependencies of \( L_{K,e} \) and \( L_{K,h} \), the noise power spectral density in graphene exhibits very different characteristics from that in traditional conductors in terms of both frequency and temperature dependency. Whether the electron and hole band noise are correlated or not is an open question; such correlation, if extant and conspicuous, would further enrich the noise spectrum. Also note that we have ignored inter-band transitions, because they are minimal at our frequencies of interest (up to THz) for this relatively highly doped sample.

If \( r \) is the same for both bands, i.e., if \( L_{K,e}/R_c = L_{K,h}/R_h \), equation (32) is reduced to

\[ S_f(\omega) = 4k_B T \left( \frac{R_c}{\omega^2 + \omega^2 L_{K,e}^2} + \frac{R_h}{\omega^2 + \omega^2 L_{K,h}^2} \right) \]

\[ \times \frac{\hbar \omega}{k_B T} \exp \left( \frac{\hbar \omega}{k_B T} \right) - 1 \]  

(33)

where

\( R_c \left| R_h \right|^2 = R_c^{-1} + R_h^{-1} \)

and

\( L_{K,e} \left| L_{K,h} \right|^2 L_{K,e}^{-1} + L_{K,h}^{-1} \). That is, the circuit model of figure 4(a) can be reduced to figure 4(b), with the resistors from both bands and the kinetic inductors from both bands each connected in parallel, with \( R_c \left| R_h \right| \) and \( L_{K,e} \left| L_{K,h} \right| \) in series serving as overall resistor and inductor. For the \( T \)-dependency of \( L_{K,e} \left| L_{K,h} \right| \), see figure 3(d).

In general, \( L_{K,e}/R_c \neq L_{K,h}/R_h \), but even in such a case, \( L_{K,e} \left| L_{K,h} \right| \) considered right above is still of great relevance to figure 4(a) with the aforementioned shunt capacitance (to ground) added; here the inductance, resistance, capacitance, and current noise of each segment has to be scaled to its infinitesimal length [8]. The noise spectrum at either terminal of this transmission line then can be evaluated from the noise sources distributed along the lossy plasmonic transmission line [21].

5. Conclusion

Recent advances in low-dimensional materials have blurred the traditional boundary between photonics and electronics. A prominent example is plasmonics in 2D conductors (e.g., graphene), while plasmonic excitation occurs traditionally in the realm of photonics, in 2D materials it can occur at THz and GHz frequencies, reaching into the electronics realm. This paper offered another example that highlights such a merger of photonics—electronics boundaries. Concretely, we investigated how the plasmonic response (traditionally studied in photonics) can significantly alter the Johnson–Nyquist thermal noise dynamics (traditionally studied in electronics). The intrinsic connection between plasmonics and Johnson–Nyquist noise is in fact a natural consequence of the linear response theory: that is, both plasmonic properties and the fluctuation-dissipation relation (of which the Johnson–Nyquist noise is a prominent example) are obtained from the same linear response framework applied to the collection of electrons. But in traditional conductors with short electron scattering times, the Planck quantization effect has masked the plasmonic effect in the noise spectrum. On the other hand, in 2D materials like graphene, where the electron scattering time has been greatly elongated, the plasmonic effect can take precedence over the Planck quantization effect, significantly altering the thermal noise spectrum. We demonstrated that this effect is not only of great importance for practical noise modeling, but it also provides an opportunity to delineate some fundamental concepts, in particular, the critical role that the plasmonic mass (as opposed to the single-electron effective mass) plays in thermal fluctuation dynamics of electrons.

To emphasize the practical relevance of this study, the last section of this paper was dedicated to developing the thermal noise model for graphene, where individual electrons act as massless Dirac Fermions, while the plasmonic mass is non-zero. We demonstrated that in graphene, due to the dominance of the plasmonic mass effect over the Planck quantization effect, the temperature dependence of the
plasmonic mass, and the emergence of the plasmonic mass from both electron and hole bands that co-exist, the thermal noise spectrum shows rich temperature and frequency dependency, unprecedented in traditional conductors.
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