

Unified bulk semiclassical theory for intrinsic thermal transport and magnetization currents

Cong Xiao and Qian Niu

Department of Physics, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA

We reveal the unexpected role of the material inhomogeneity in unifying the formulation of intrinsic thermal and thermoelectric transport as well as magnetization currents. The smooth inhomogeneity leads to the position dependent local band dispersion and *phase-space* Berry curvature, enabling a general and rapid access to transport and magnetization currents displaying the *momentum-space* Berry curvature physics. Our theory does not invoke the boundary current, the thermodynamic approach to magnetization or any mechanical counterpart of statistical forces. By introducing a fictitious inhomogeneity, it applies to homogeneous samples as well, promoting the inhomogeneity to be a basic trick in semiclassical transport theories. Such a trick works regardless of the driving force of transport, e.g., temperature gradient, in contrast to the trick of fictitious gravitational field in quantum transport theories. We thus include more general mechanical driving forces and establish the Mott relation between the resulting transport thermal and electric currents, whereas this relation for these two currents was previously only known when an electric field is the driving force.

I. INTRODUCTION

Momentum-space Berry curvature effects in various nonequilibrium phenomena in crystalline solids driven by statistical forces, namely the gradients of temperature and chemical potential (∇T and $\nabla\mu$), have been extensively studied in recent years. Prominent examples include the anomalous and spin Nernst effects [1–4] and the thermal Hall effect [5–15]. A basic issue in these phenomena is that the transport current of experimental interest differs from the local one by the magnetization current, which cannot be measured in standard transport experiments [1, 16]. An efficient, intuitive and systematic approach to subtracting the magnetization current from the local one is thus vital for understanding the anomalous thermoelectric and thermal transport.

Quantum theories have been formulated to address the aforementioned phenomena. For this purpose, a fictitious gravitational potential [6–10, 17–19] or a thermal vector potential [20] has to be introduced as the mechanical counterpart of the temperature gradient. Alternatively the gauge theory of gravity (Cartan geometry) combined with the Keldysh perturbation formalism is employed, describing the magnetization of the thermal current thermodynamically as a torsional response [21]. Nevertheless, such approaches are usually technically complicated and less intuitive compared to the semiclassical ones.

Semiclassical theories, based on the Berry-curvature-modified semiclassical equations of motion of the carrier wave-packets, are intuitive and thus found many applications in the intrinsic anomalous thermoelectric and thermal Hall effects [1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 13–15]. However, when the thermal current response is considered, a thorough and systematic understanding of its transport and magnetization parts from the semiclassical theory is still lacking. On one hand, the existing semiclassical theory on the basis of bulk considerations [1] can only deal with the thermal current induced by the electric field \mathbf{E} , but cannot accommodate that induced by statistical forces. On

the other hand, the semiclassical theory based on the boundary-current picture [6, 7] cannot include the effect of a uniform electric field. And how to distinguish the transport and magnetization currents in this approach is not apparent. Besides, these theories assume no bulk material inhomogeneity, which may not be true in realistic samples [16]. For instance, in ferromagnets where the anomalous and thermal Hall effects appear, the magnetization order parameter field, at the mean-field level, may change slowly in space [22].

Moreover, even in homogeneous samples there are subtleties in the physical interpretation of existing semiclassical theories [1, 6, 7]. Noticeably, in the bulk semiclassical theory the intrinsic (i.e., determined solely by band structures) transport electric current induced by $(\nabla\mu, \nabla T)$ comes solely from the orbital magnetization current [1], seeming to conflict with the basic concept that the magnetization current does not contribute to transport [16]. On the other hand, in the boundary-current theory the obtained current takes the form of a curl [6, 7], resembling the magnetization current [16] instead.

In this paper, based on pure bulk considerations we formulate a semiclassical theory for the thermal and electric current responses in the presence of $(\mathbf{E}, \nabla\mu, \nabla T)$ as well as material inhomogeneity. Assumed to be smooth in the spread of a wave-packet, the inhomogeneity fits naturally into the semiclassical theory due to the locality of wave-packet [23], but this advantage has not been fully exploited in previous considerations on thermal transport. Notably, we show that introducing the smooth inhomogeneity serves as a general and rapid access to transport and magnetization currents displaying the momentum-space Berry curvature physics. As a result, this theory does not need to appeal to the boundary-current picture, the thermodynamic and electrodynamic approaches to various (orbital, particle, energy and thermal) magnetizations [1, 21, 25] or any mechanical counterpart of statistical forces.

Our theory also applies conveniently to homogeneous

samples by introducing an fictitious inhomogeneity, thus providing a unified treatment for thermal transport in both inhomogeneous and homogeneous systems. Such a treatment avoids aforementioned subtleties in the physical interpretation of the widely referred semiclassical theories in homogeneous samples [1, 6, 7].

Our finding promotes the (fictitious) smooth inhomogeneity to be a basic and generic trick in the semiclassical transport theory. Unlike the trick of the fictitious gravitational field [9, 17–19] which mimics the temperature gradient in quantum transport theories, the trick of inhomogeneity is not proposed to mimic any driving force of transport, thus is not limited to the transport induced by $(\mathbf{E}, \nabla\mu, \nabla T)$. To show this generality, we work out the linear electric and thermal transport driven by the first-order spatial gradient of any gauge-invariant static vector field \mathbf{F} that perturbs the single-particle Hamiltonian in the form of $\hat{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r})$. Here $\hat{\theta}$ is the observable coupled to the \mathbf{F} field, and is assumed to be well-defined in the Bloch representation. A particular example covered is the thermoelectric transport driven by the gradient of an external Zeeman field. To study transport we need to subtract the orbital and thermal magnetization currents in the presence of the aforementioned perturbation, which have not been addressed in previous theories. We establish the Mott relation between the transport thermal and electric currents induced by the generic driving forces, whereas, for these two kinds of current, textbooks [26, 27] and previous studies only proved the Mott relation when an electric field is the driving force.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II is devoted to the preliminaries of the magnetization current and the semiclassical wave-packet dynamics under nonuniform circumstances. In Sec. III we set forth the theory for obtaining the magnetization current in the absence of driving forces. The theory is then extended to involve both the magnetization and transport currents in the presence of statistical forces and the electric field in Sec. IV. We show that this approach applies to homogeneous samples as well in Sec. V. Finally, we include more general driving forces into our theory in Sec. VI, and conclude the paper in Sec. VII.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Local current and magnetization current

The local thermal current density is given by

$$\mathbf{j}^h(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \mathbf{j}^E(\mathbf{r}) - \mu(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{j}^N(\mathbf{r}), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{j}^E(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathbf{j}^N(\mathbf{r})$ are the local energy current and local particle current densities, respectively. Since \mathbf{j}^E and \mathbf{j}^N are conserved currents, there can be a circulating component that is a curl of some bulk quantity and cannot be measured in transport experiments [16]. If the quasi-particle number is not conserved, \mathbf{j}^N is not well defined

but $\mu = 0$, thus $\mathbf{j}^h(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \mathbf{j}^E(\mathbf{r})$. For carriers with a conserved charge, say, electrons with charge e , the particle current implies a charge one $\mathbf{j}^e(\mathbf{r}) = e\mathbf{j}^N(\mathbf{r})$, whose circulating component is the orbital magnetization current $\mathbf{j}^{e,\text{mag}} = \nabla \times \mathbf{M}^e$ according to electromagnetism, with \mathbf{M}^e being the orbital magnetization. Given this convention, the circulating energy and particle currents can be termed as magnetization currents $\mathbf{j}^{E,\text{mag}} = \nabla \times \mathbf{M}^E$ and $\mathbf{j}^{N,\text{mag}} = \nabla \times \mathbf{M}^N$, with \mathbf{M}^E and \mathbf{M}^N being respectively the energy magnetization and particle magnetization, albeit the thermodynamic definitions of these magnetizations are not apparent. The local current density is thus composed of the transport and magnetization parts: $\mathbf{j}^{E(N)}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{j}^{E(N),\text{tr}}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{j}^{E(N),\text{mag}}(\mathbf{r})$, and then

$$\mathbf{j}^h(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{j}^{h,\text{tr}}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{j}^{h,\text{mag}}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (2)$$

Here the thermal magnetization current density $\mathbf{j}^{h,\text{mag}} \equiv \mathbf{j}^{E,\text{mag}} - \mu\mathbf{j}^{N,\text{mag}}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{j}^{h,\text{mag}} = \nabla \times (\mathbf{M}^E - \mu\mathbf{M}^N) + \nabla\mu \times \mathbf{M}^N, \quad (3)$$

which is not simply a curl of some thermal magnetization in the presence of statistical inhomogeneity.

Before proceeding, we outline the strategy of our theory for acquiring the magnetization and transport currents. The semiclassical wave-packet theory introduced shortly allows for acquiring the local current densities, which reduce to the magnetization ones in the absence of any statistical and mechanical driving forces. Hence we will first obtain the magnetization current in this case, based on which we can go further to identify the magnetization current in the presence of the statistical and mechanical driving forces. The transport current are thus reached by subtracting the magnetization current from the local one.

B. Semiclassical description in nonuniform bulk

In the semiclassical theory [24, 27], a Bloch electron is physically identified as a wave-packet $|\Phi(\mathbf{q}_c, \mathbf{r}_c, t)\rangle$ that is constructed from the Bloch states in a particular nondegenerate band (throughout this paper the band index n is usually omitted for simplicity, unless otherwise noted) and is localized around a central position \mathbf{r}_c and a mean crystal momentum \mathbf{q}_c . Assuming all the inhomogeneous fields are static and vary slowly on the spread of the wave-packet, a local Hamiltonian description for an electron wave-packet emerges, from which the semiclassical equations of motion are derived [23] (we set $\hbar = 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{r}}_c &= \partial_{\mathbf{q}_c} [\varepsilon + e\phi(\mathbf{r}_c)] - \Omega_{\mathbf{q}_c\mathbf{r}_c} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{r}}_c - \Omega_{\mathbf{q}_c\mathbf{q}_c} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{q}}_c, \\ \dot{\mathbf{q}}_c &= -\partial_{\mathbf{r}_c} [\varepsilon + e\phi(\mathbf{r}_c)] + \Omega_{\mathbf{r}_c\mathbf{r}_c} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{r}}_c + \Omega_{\mathbf{r}_c\mathbf{q}_c} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{q}}_c. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here $(\Omega_{\lambda\lambda})_{ij} = 2 \text{Im}\langle \partial_{\lambda_j} u | \partial_{\lambda_i} u \rangle$ are the Berry curvatures derived from the periodic part $|u(\mathbf{q}_c, \mathbf{r}_c)\rangle$ of the local Bloch wave function, where i and j are Cartesian indices, and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \mathbf{r}_c, \mathbf{q}_c$.

To study the magnetization current which only manifests itself in the presence of inhomogeneity, we introduce a slowly-varying nonuniform field $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{r})$ to represent the material inhomogeneity. Hence the spatial derivative $\partial_{\mathbf{r}_c}$ in the equations of motion acts through $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{r}_c)$. This is a route to manifest the magnetization current in bulk even in the global equilibrium without position dependent temperature or chemical potential, outside of the scope of previous semiclassical theories [1, 6, 7, 11]. The \mathbf{w} field can exist indeed in the system, representing the realistic material inhomogeneity, or just be an auxiliary tool in a homogeneous sample. In the former case, a specific realization is the slowly-varying spin texture in ferromagnets with an inhomogeneous equilibrium magnetization order parameter field [22]. In the latter case the fictitious \mathbf{w} field will be dropped after identifying the magnetization current. In both cases the specific content of \mathbf{w} field is not needed in our theory. It can be a scalar, vector or tensor field. When it is a scalar field, the local band energy is shifted but the local Bloch wave-function is not affected, hence $\Omega_{\mathbf{q}_c \mathbf{r}_c} = \Omega_{\mathbf{r}_c \mathbf{r}_c} = 0$, simplifying the analysis. However, as mentioned above, the material inhomogeneity may appear as a nonuniform vector field. Therefore, in what follows we assume \mathbf{w} field is not a scalar one for the sake of generality.

In the equations of motion, $\varepsilon + e\phi(\mathbf{r}_c)$ is the wave-packet energy, where $\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_c, \mathbf{r}_c) = \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_c, \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{r}_c))$ is the local band dispersion without the coupling to driving fields that do not equilibrate with the system, such as the electrostatic potential $e\phi(\mathbf{r}_c)$. The dipole moment correction from the gradient of $\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{r}_c)$ to the wave-packet energy [23] is not essential for the present topic, as can be easily verified.

Within the validity of the uncertainty principle, the phase-space occupation function $f(\mathbf{q}_c, \mathbf{r}_c)$ of a grand canonical ensemble of dynamically independent semiclassical Bloch electrons can be defined, and the phase-space measure $D(\mathbf{q}_c, \mathbf{r}_c)$ has to be introduced. Because of the non-canonical structure of the equations of motion (4) shaped by the Berry curvatures [28], $D \neq 1$ and reads

$$D(\mathbf{q}_c, \mathbf{r}_c) = 1 + (\Omega_{\mathbf{q}_c \mathbf{r}_c})_{ii} \quad (5)$$

up to the first order of spatial gradient. Summation over repeated Cartesian indices is implied henceforth. The number of states within a small phase-space volume is hence given by $Df d\mathbf{r}_c d\mathbf{q}_c / (2\pi)^d$, with d as the spatial dimensionality. In this paper we do not consider the off equilibrium distribution function, as the pertinent transport contributions can be described by the Boltzmann equation [27]. Therefore, in the following f is just the equilibrium occupation function, which is given by the Fermi-Dirac distribution function $f(\varepsilon) \equiv f_{DF}(\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_c, \mathbf{r}_c))$ in the case of Bloch electrons.

III. MAGNETIZATION CURRENT AT GLOBAL EQUILIBRIUM

First we look at the case of global equilibrium without any statistical or mechanical force driving nonequilibrium states. As is pointed out above, in the presence of material inhomogeneity represented by a nonuniform \mathbf{w} field, $\mathbf{j}^E = \mathbf{j}^{E, \text{mag}} \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{j}^N = \mathbf{j}^{N, \text{mag}} \neq 0$ in the bulk. Thus

$$\mathbf{j}^h = \mathbf{j}^{h, \text{mag}} = \nabla \times \mathbf{M}^h, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{M}^h = \mathbf{M}^E - \mu \mathbf{M}^N$ is the thermal magnetization in the absence of electric fields, and μ is a constant.

In the semiclassical theory the local energy current density reads

$$\mathbf{j}_i^E(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \int [d\mathbf{q}_c] d\mathbf{r}_c Df(\varepsilon) \varepsilon \langle \Phi | \hat{v}_i \delta(\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{r}) | \Phi \rangle, \quad (7)$$

and the local particle current density is

$$\mathbf{j}_i^N(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \int [d\mathbf{q}_c] d\mathbf{r}_c Df(\varepsilon) \langle \Phi | \hat{v}_i \delta(\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{r}) | \Phi \rangle. \quad (8)$$

Here $[d\mathbf{q}_c]$ is shorthand for $\sum_n d\mathbf{q}_c / (2\pi)^d$, and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ are respectively the velocity and position operators. Expanding the δ function to first order of $\hat{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{r}_c$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j}_i^h(\mathbf{r}) = & \int Df(\varepsilon) (\varepsilon - \mu) \langle \Phi | \hat{v}_i | \Phi \rangle |_{\mathbf{r}_c = \mathbf{r}} \\ & - \partial_{r_j} \int f(\varepsilon) (\varepsilon - \mu) \langle \Phi | \hat{v}_i (\hat{r}_j - r_j) | \Phi \rangle |_{\mathbf{r}_c = \mathbf{r}}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Henceforth we omit the center position label c , unless otherwise noted, and the notation \int without integral variable is shorthand for $\int [d\mathbf{q}_c]$. We are limited to the first order of spatial gradients, thus it is sufficient to set $D = 1$ in the second term in the above expansion.

To proceed, we introduce two functions $g(\varepsilon, \mu, T)$ and $h(\varepsilon, \mu, T)$ which satisfy

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial \varepsilon} = f(\varepsilon), \quad \frac{\partial h}{\partial \varepsilon} = f(\varepsilon) (\varepsilon - \mu). \quad (10)$$

In fact $g(\varepsilon) = -k_B T \ln[1 + e^{-(\varepsilon - \mu)/k_B T}]$ is the grand potential density contributed by a particular state, whereas $h = -\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} d\eta f(\eta) (\eta - \mu)$. Then the local thermal (particle) current density reads [1, 11]

$$\mathbf{j}^{h(N)} = \int D \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \varepsilon} \dot{\mathbf{r}} + \nabla \times \int \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \varepsilon} \mathbf{m}^N \quad \text{for } \Lambda = h(g). \quad (11)$$

The first and second terms come from the motion of the wave-packet center with velocity $\dot{\mathbf{r}} = \langle \Phi | \hat{\mathbf{v}} | \Phi \rangle$ and the wave-packet self-rotation, respectively. \mathbf{m}^N is the particle magnetic moment, which is the vector form of the antisymmetric tensor $m_{ji}^N = \langle \Phi | \hat{v}_i (\hat{r}_j - r_j) | \Phi \rangle$ (symmetrization between operators is implied) [24]. For \mathbf{j}^h the second term reads alternatively $\nabla \times \int f \mathbf{m}^h$, with $\mathbf{m}^h = (\varepsilon - \mu) \mathbf{m}^N$ being the so-called thermal magnetic moment [11].

Above expressions for the local current are well known. However, now we are in a position to acquire the thermal magnetization current from a pure bulk consideration, outside of the scope of the previous bulk semiclassical theory [1]. In fact, in the latter the local currents vanish $\mathbf{j}^{\text{h(N)}} = 0$ in the present case without statistical and mechanical driving forces.

Plugging the equations of motion (4) in the first order of spatial gradients and the phase-space measure (5) into the first term of (11) and making use of $\nabla\Lambda = \partial_\varepsilon\Lambda\nabla\varepsilon$, we arrive at

$$\int D\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial\varepsilon}\dot{\mathbf{r}} = \nabla \times \int \Lambda(\varepsilon)\Omega_{\mathbf{q}}, \quad (\Lambda = g, h), \quad (12)$$

with $(\Omega_{\mathbf{q}})_k = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}(\Omega_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}})_{ij}$ being the vector form of the momentum-space Berry curvature. This is one of the pivotal results of our approach. Since $\dot{\mathbf{r}}$ represents the motion of the wave-packet center, it may not be very apparent to envision that $\int D\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial\varepsilon}\dot{\mathbf{r}}$ can be totally a part of the magnetization current. According to the above two equations we get

$$\mathbf{j}^{\text{h(N)}} = \nabla \times \int \left(\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial\varepsilon}\mathbf{m}^{\text{N}} + \Lambda\Omega_{\mathbf{q}} \right) \quad \text{for } \Lambda = h(g). \quad (13)$$

Since they are just the magnetization currents, we identify $\mathbf{M}^{\text{h(N)}} = \int \left(\frac{\partial\Lambda}{\partial\varepsilon}\mathbf{m}^{\text{N}} + \Lambda\Omega_{\mathbf{q}} \right)$ for $\Lambda = h(g)$ as the thermal (particle) magnetization up to a gradient. Our result for \mathbf{M}^{N} is consistent with the thermodynamic one [1, 25], and the obtained \mathbf{M}^{h} coincides with that obtained using the gauge theory of gravity [21], where the thermal magnetization is thermodynamically defined as the derivative of the grand potential with respect to the torsional magnetic field, further confirming the validity of our theory.

IV. TRANSPORT AND MAGNETIZATION CURRENTS IN THE PRESENCE OF DRIVING FORCES

In the presence of statistical forces, the local current density consists of both the magnetization and transport parts. Manipulations similar to Eq. (9) lead to the local thermal current density

$$\mathbf{j}^{\text{h}} = \int D\frac{\partial h}{\partial\varepsilon}\dot{\mathbf{r}} + \nabla \times \int \frac{\partial h}{\partial\varepsilon}\mathbf{m}^{\text{N}} + \nabla\mu \times \int f\mathbf{m}^{\text{N}}. \quad (14)$$

Taking some technical steps similar to those of Eq. (12) and noticing that $\nabla h = \frac{\partial h}{\partial\varepsilon}\nabla\varepsilon + \frac{\partial h}{\partial T}\nabla T + \frac{\partial h}{\partial\mu}\nabla\mu$ in the present case, we get

$$\int D\frac{\partial h}{\partial\varepsilon}\dot{\mathbf{r}} = -\left(\nabla\mu \times \frac{\partial}{\partial\mu} + \nabla T \times \frac{\partial}{\partial T}\right) \int h\Omega_{\mathbf{q}} + \nabla \times \int h\Omega_{\mathbf{q}}, \quad (15)$$

which is another pivotal result of our approach. It is of interest because, as long as the material inhomogeneity is absent one would only get $\int D\frac{\partial h}{\partial\varepsilon}\dot{\mathbf{r}} = 0$, even in the

presence of statistical forces. However, introducing the material inhomogeneity enables us to show that the motion of the wave-packet center in bulk can contribute to both the transport and magnetization currents.

Then the local thermal current density is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j}^{\text{h}} &= \nabla\mu \times \int \Omega_{\mathbf{q}}s(\varepsilon)T - \nabla T \times \int \frac{\partial h}{\partial T}\Omega_{\mathbf{q}} \\ &+ \nabla \times \mathbf{M}^{\text{h}} + \nabla\mu \times \mathbf{M}^{\text{N}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here \mathbf{M}^{h} and \mathbf{M}^{N} take the same expressions as those at global equilibrium, with the only difference that μ and T are now position dependent at local equilibrium. The second line of Eq. (16) is thus the zero-electric-field thermal magnetization current (3). The first line of Eq. (16) is then identified as the transport thermal current according to Eq. (2). Here $s(\varepsilon) = [(\varepsilon - \mu)f(\varepsilon) - g(\varepsilon)]/T$ is the entropy density for a particular state.

In the presence of an electric field as well as statistical forces, the local energy current density is still given by Eq. (7), but with the difference that the transported carrier energy changes to be $\varepsilon + e\phi(\mathbf{r}_c)$, as shown in the dynamic equations (4). Note that the electric field does not equilibrate with the electron system thus the equilibrium phase-space distribution function remains as $f(\varepsilon)$. Manipulations similar to what have been done yield the local thermal current density as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{j}^{\text{h}} &= (e\mathbf{E} - \nabla\mu) \times T \int \frac{\partial g}{\partial T}\Omega_{\mathbf{q}} - \nabla T \times \int \frac{\partial h}{\partial T}\Omega_{\mathbf{q}} \\ &+ \nabla \times [\mathbf{M}^{\text{h}} + e\phi\mathbf{M}^{\text{N}}] + \nabla\mu \times \mathbf{M}^{\text{N}}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here \mathbf{M}^{h} is the zero-electric-field thermal magnetization, and we have used the relation $s = -\partial g/\partial T$.

The presence of the $e\phi\mathbf{M}^{\text{N}}$ term just reflects the result in the quantum mechanical linear response theories that the energy magnetization becomes $\mathbf{M}^{\text{E}} + e\phi\mathbf{M}^{\text{N}}$ in the presence of the electrostatic potential [16]. Here \mathbf{M}^{E} stands for the zero-electric-field energy magnetization. The general form of the bulk thermal magnetization current given by the second line of (17) in the presence of not only $(\phi, \nabla\mu, \nabla T)$ but also the material inhomogeneity is consistent with the full quantum theory (Eqs. (76) and (77) in Ref. [16]). This achievement has not been reached in previous semiclassical theories. The potential field ϕ is introduced to produce the electric field $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla\phi$, and after achieving this one can always set $\phi(\mathbf{r}_c) = 0$. Therefore the thermal magnetization current can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{j}^{\text{h,mag}} = \nabla \times \mathbf{M}^{\text{h}} - (e\mathbf{E} - \nabla\mu) \times \mathbf{M}^{\text{N}}. \quad (18)$$

In the absence of the material inhomogeneity (\mathbf{w} field) and statistical forces, \mathbf{M}^{h} is a constant in bulk. Then $\mathbf{j}^{\text{h,mag}} = -\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{M}^{\text{e}}$, reducing to the result in the previous bulk semiclassical theory [1]. There this magnetization current is obtained on the basis of a physical argument of the material dependent part of the Poynting vector, while here such an argument is not needed.

The transport thermal current, according to Eq. (2), is just given by the first line of Eq. (17). Noticing that $\mathbf{M}^{e,B} = e \int g \Omega_{\mathbf{q}}$ and $\mathbf{M}^{h,B} = \int h \Omega_{\mathbf{q}}$ are respectively the Berry-curvature parts of the orbital magnetization ($\mathbf{M}^e = e\mathbf{M}^N$) and thermal magnetization, we have

$$\mathbf{j}^{h, \text{tr}} = (\mathbf{E} - \frac{1}{e} \nabla \mu) \times T \frac{\partial \mathbf{M}^{e,B}}{\partial T} - \nabla T \times \frac{\partial \mathbf{M}^{h,B}}{\partial T}. \quad (19)$$

Similarly, the transport electric current reads

$$\mathbf{j}^{e, \text{tr}} = (e\mathbf{E} - \nabla \mu) \times \frac{\partial \mathbf{M}^{e,B}}{\partial \mu} - \nabla T \times \frac{\partial \mathbf{M}^{e,B}}{\partial T}, \quad (20)$$

thus one immediately verifies the Einstein relation, the Onsager relation and the Wiedemann-Franz law, in the presence of material inhomogeneity. In insulators $\mathbf{M}^{e,B}$ ($\mathbf{M}^{h,B}$) can be replaced by \mathbf{M}^e (\mathbf{M}^h) in Eqs. (19) and (20), recovering the Streda formulas [11, 29, 30] which link the transport coefficients to the derivatives of magnetizations with respect to μ or T .

V. APPLICATION TO HOMOGENEOUS SAMPLES

The obtained transport and magnetization currents [Eqs. (18) to (20)] are also valid in the absence of material inhomogeneity. In fact, in homogeneous samples, which all previous semiclassical thermoelectric and thermal transport theories [1, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13] are designed for, one can introduce a fictitious nonuniform \mathbf{w} field that is removed at the last of the calculation to reach the above results. Our approach thus unifies the treatment and understanding of the intrinsic thermal transport in both homogeneous and inhomogeneous samples.

In the following we make a comparison of semiclassical thermoelectric transport theories in the present and previous papers. In the previous bulk semiclassical thermoelectric transport theory [1], the orbital magnetization is acquired separately by thermodynamics as the derivative of the grand potential density with respect to magnetic field, and then the magnetization current is obtained. This route poses the basic requirement for a thermodynamic definition of the thermal magnetization, which is not evident in the familiar context of condensed matter physics. Therefore, the thermal Hall transport was not touched in Ref. [1]. The particle magnetization current of neutral quasi-particles that do not couple to the magnetic field by the Lorentz force [4] suffers from the same situation. In contrast, in the present transport approach, the thermal magnetization and particle magnetization currents emerge naturally.

With the identified thermal magnetization current (18), the result of the boundary-current approach [6, 7], which applies to the case with merely statistical forces, can be derived from the present bulk theory. In this situation the \mathbf{w} field is absent, thus $\nabla = \nabla \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \nabla T \frac{\partial}{\partial T}$, and all the spatial gradients in the equations of motion vanish,

implying $\dot{\mathbf{r}} = \partial_{\mathbf{q}} \varepsilon$ and $D = 1$. The local thermal current density then reduces to $\mathbf{j}^h = \nabla \times \int f \mathbf{m}^h + \nabla \mu \times \int f \mathbf{m}^N$. Subtracting the magnetization current (18) yields

$$\mathbf{j}^{h, \text{tr}} = -\nabla \times \mathbf{M}^{E,B} + \mu \nabla \times \mathbf{M}^{N,B},$$

with $\mathbf{M}^{E,B} = \int (h + \mu g) \Omega_{\mathbf{q}}$ the Berry-curvature part of the energy magnetization. Concurrently, we prove in the same way $\mathbf{j}^{E, \text{tr}} = -\nabla \times \mathbf{M}^{E,B}$ and $\mathbf{j}^{N, \text{tr}} = -\nabla \times \mathbf{M}^{N,B}$. These are just the pivotal results of the boundary-current approach (Eqs. (14) and (15) in Ref. [7]). However, the transport-current nature of $\mathbf{j}^{E, \text{tr}}$ and $\mathbf{j}^{N, \text{tr}}$ is not evident in the boundary-current approach, since they take the form of a curl, resembling the magnetization current instead. A straightforward way to clarify this is to introduce a fictitious material inhomogeneity (i.e., a nonuniform \mathbf{w} field) and apply our theory, which shows that the intrinsic transport electric current, for instance, is not essentially a total spatial-derivative, contrary to the orbital magnetization current, but is always given by Eq. (20).

In Table I we compare the capabilities of our theory and previous semiclassical transport theories in homogeneous samples. The driving forces are not limited to $(\mathbf{E}, \nabla \mu, \nabla T)$, but include also the spatial gradient of a vector mechanical field \mathbf{F} , which is detailed in the next section.

VI. MORE GENERAL MECHANICAL DRIVING FORCES

Above our theory has promoted the material inhomogeneity to be a basic trick in the unified semiclassical theory of the intrinsic linear electric and thermal transport induced by the driving forces $(\mathbf{E}, \nabla \mu, \nabla T)$. Recall that in the quantum thermal and thermoelectric transport theories it is the fictitious gravitational field [6, 7, 17–19] which serves as a vital trick to mimic the temperature gradient. However, unlike the gravitational field, the trick of (fictitious) inhomogeneity has nothing to do with the driving force of transport, thus is not limited to the transport induced by $(\mathbf{E}, \nabla \mu, \nabla T)$.

In this section we generalize our theory to the linear electric and thermal transport driven by the spatial gradient of any gauge-invariant vector field \mathbf{F} that perturbs the single-particle Hamiltonian in the form of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \cdot \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r})$. The genuine or fictitious material inhomogeneity is still represented by the nonuniform \mathbf{w} field. Here $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is the physical observable operator coupled to the \mathbf{F} field, and is assumed to be well-defined in the Bloch representation. A specific example of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \cdot \mathbf{F}$ is the Zeeman coupling $\hat{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{r})$, where $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ is the carrier spin operator, and $\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{r})$ is an external Zeeman field. This field does not equilibrate with the electron system and its spatial gradient drives transport. In fact, both $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ and \mathbf{F} can be tensors in general, and the product denotes the contraction between them. Thus $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \cdot \mathbf{F}$ also includes the specific case where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = e$ is the carrier charge and $\mathbf{F} = \phi$ is the electrostatic

TABLE I. The capabilities of our theory and previous representative semiclassical transport theories of Bloch electrons in homogeneous samples. $\mathbf{j}^{\text{e,tr}}$ and $\mathbf{j}^{\text{h,tr}}$ are the electric and thermal transport currents, respectively. The driving forces include not only $(\mathbf{E}, \nabla\mu, \nabla T)$, but also the spatial gradient of a vector mechanical field \mathbf{F} , which is detailed in the Sec. VI.

semiclassical theories	$\mathbf{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{j}^{\text{h,tr}}$	$\nabla\mu, \nabla T \rightarrow \mathbf{j}^{\text{e,tr}}$	$\nabla\mu, \nabla T \rightarrow \mathbf{j}^{\text{h,tr}}$	$\nabla\mathbf{F} \rightarrow \mathbf{j}^{\text{e,tr}}$	$\nabla\mathbf{F} \rightarrow \mathbf{j}^{\text{h,tr}}$
previous bulk theory [1]	✓	✓		✓	
boundary-current theory [6, 7]		✓	✓		
present bulk theory	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

potential and hence the transport is driven by the electric field. Only the spatial gradients of $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r})$ matter and are assumed to be uniform, and one can always choose $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}_c) = 0$ at the last of the linear response calculation.

The local electric current density is given by $\mathbf{j}^{\text{e}} = e\mathbf{j}^{\text{N}}$ and Eq. (11). The perturbed wave-packet energy needed in the calculation reads $\varepsilon + \boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r}_c) + \delta\varepsilon$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \langle \Phi | \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} | \Phi \rangle$, and $(\partial_i \equiv \partial_{r_i})$

$$\delta\varepsilon = d_{ij}^\theta \partial_i F_j \quad (21)$$

is the energy correction induced by the dipole moment of operator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ on a finite-size wave-packet [24]. This dipole moment takes the explicit form of

$$d_{ij}^\theta = \text{Im} \sum_{n' \neq n} \frac{\langle u_n | \hat{v}_i | u_{n'} \rangle \langle u_{n'} | \hat{\theta}_j | u_n \rangle}{\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n'}}, \quad (22)$$

where n is the index of the band we are considering, and n' denotes other bands in the system. In the case where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = e$ is the carrier charge and $\mathbf{F} = \phi$ is the electrostatic potential, we have $\delta\varepsilon = 0$ since the electric dipole moment of a wave-packet is zero, and the perturbed wave-packet energy reduces to that used in Eq. (4). In the present more general case, up to the first order of spatial gradients we obtain

$$\int Df(\varepsilon) \dot{r}_i = \int f(\varepsilon) [\partial_{q_i}(\varepsilon + \delta\varepsilon) + \Omega_{q_i r_j} \partial_{q_j} \varepsilon + \Omega_{q_i q_j} (\partial_j \varepsilon + \theta_l^0 \partial_j F_l) - \Omega_{q_i r_j} \partial_{q_j} \varepsilon],$$

where $\theta_l^0 = \langle u_n | \hat{\theta}_l | u_n \rangle$. Since the driving \mathbf{F} field does not equilibrate with the electron system, the argument of the equilibrium distribution function remains as ε . Some manipulations similar to those leading to Eq. (12) give rise to $\mathbf{j}^{\text{e}} = \mathbf{j}^{\text{e,tr}} + \nabla \times \mathbf{M}^{\text{N}}$, with the transport electric current reading

$$j_i^{\text{e,tr}} = e \int f(\varepsilon) [\partial_{q_i} d_{jl}^\theta + \Omega_{q_i q_j} \theta_l^0] \partial_j F_l. \quad (23)$$

In the case of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = e$ and $\mathbf{F} = \phi$, $\mathbf{j}^{\text{e,tr}}$ reduces to the intrinsic anomalous Hall current $j_i^{\text{e,tr}} = -e^2 \int f(\varepsilon) \Omega_{q_i q_j} E_j$. When $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is not a conserved quantity, its dipole moment contributes to the transport current driven by the \mathbf{F} -field gradient.

After some similar manipulations, the local thermal current density up to the first order of spatial gradients

is obtained as

$$\mathbf{j}^{\text{h}} = \int s(\varepsilon) T \left[\partial_{\mathbf{q}} \delta\varepsilon + \theta_i^0 \nabla F_i \times \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathbf{q}} \right] + \nabla \times \left[\mathbf{M}^{\text{h}} + \int \theta_i^0 F_i (f m^{\text{N}} + g \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\mathbf{q}}) \right], \quad (24)$$

where the second line is the thermal magnetization current density in the presence of the perturbation $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \cdot \mathbf{F}$. In the case that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = e$ and $\mathbf{F} = \phi$, the above \mathbf{j}^{h} reduces to Eq. (17) in the absence of statistical forces. The transport thermal current is then identified as the first line of the above equation, namely

$$j_i^{\text{h,tr}} = \int s(\varepsilon) T \left[\partial_{q_i} d_{jl}^\theta + \Omega_{q_i q_j} \theta_l^0 \right] \partial_j F_l. \quad (25)$$

As the entropy density $s(\varepsilon)$ goes to zero at the zero-temperature limit, the above transport thermal current behaves well in this limit.

One could then ask if there is the Mott relation linking the transport thermal and electric currents when they are driven by the first-order spatial gradient of the \mathbf{F} field. For these two kinds of current, textbooks and previous studies only proved the Mott relation in the case that an electric field is the driving force. Here the present theory enables us to extend the regime of validity of the Mott relation to the case where the \mathbf{F} -field gradient serves as the driving force. In fact, when the temperature is much less than the distances between the chemical potential and band edges, the Sommerfeld expansion can be used [31], yielding the entropy density $s(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{3} \pi^2 k_B^2 T \delta(\mu - \varepsilon)$. Then we arrive at the Mott relation

$$\frac{j^{\text{h,tr}}}{T} = \frac{\pi^2 k_B^2 T}{3e} \frac{\partial j^{\text{e,tr}}(\varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=\mu}, \quad (26)$$

where $j^{\text{e,tr}}(\varepsilon)$ is the zero-temperature transport electric current with Fermi energy ε .

VII. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In conclusion, we have provided a semiclassical description for the linear thermal transport induced by the electric field and the gradients of chemical potential and temperature in the presence of material inhomogeneity, based on pure bulk considerations. In our method, applying simply the semiclassical equations of motion in

the presence of material inhomogeneity leads to a systematic and efficient approach to both the magnetization and transport currents. The results that previously can only be obtained in different theories even in the absence of material inhomogeneity now emerge in a unified theory. As long as the Berry-curvature-modified semiclassical equations of motion hold for the considered quasiparticles, the linear intrinsic thermal transport falls into the present framework, irrespective of the specific content of Berry curvatures in different physical contexts [1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 13, 14].

By introducing a fictitious inhomogeneity, this theory also applies to homogeneous samples. Therefore, our theory promotes the material inhomogeneity to be a basic and generic trick in the unified semiclassical theory of the intrinsic linear thermoelectric and thermal transport. The trick of inhomogeneity is independent of the driving force of transport, thus we have included more generic mechanical driving forces other than the electric field, and established the Mott relation between the resultant transport thermal and electric currents.

Our theory can be extended further in several interesting directions. An example is the thermal Hall effect mediated by Bogoliubov quasi-particles, i.e., bogolons, in superconductors with time-reversal broken pairing like $d + id$ [2]. As a momentum-dependent composition of electrons and holes, the bogolon does not possess a definite charge, but has a definite spin. Thus the scalar potential perturbation in the electronic Hamiltonian is endowed with a spin structure in Nambu space, where the bogolons live in [32]. Therefore, the usual scalar potential felt by electrons in superconductors is no longer a scalar one for bogolons. As a consequence, the application of the boundary-current theory, where the quasiparticle wave-packet is assumed to feel the gradient of the scalar potential provided by the boundary, becomes very subtle for bogolon wave-packets. On the other hand, in our theory the spin structure of the fictitious \mathbf{w} field, which can be a scalar, vector or tensor field, is arbitrary. Thereby, to apply our theory to the intrinsic thermal transport of bogolons is appealing. To do this, one should derive the equations of motion (4) for bogolons, which has

not been done up to now. Since this subject would involve much more derivations and notations arising from the characteristics of superconductors, it deserves a separate elaborate study.

Another issue of current interest is the electric and thermal current responses to the gradient of an external electric field [33, 34], where the orbital and thermal magnetization currents, under the perturbation of the \mathbf{E} -field gradient, should be discounted to acquire the transport currents. While the orbital magnetization current can be accounted for along the approach of Ref. [1], as was done recently [33], the thermal magnetization current cannot. We can show that our theory by using a fictitious inhomogeneity can be generalized to obtain both the thermal and orbital magnetization current in this case, and the resulting transport thermal current at the order of $\nabla \mathbf{E}$ still obeys the Mott relation with the transport electric current. However, such a generalization needs much more theoretical input from the nonlinear semiclassical theory ($\nabla \mathbf{E}$ is the second-order gradient of the electrostatic potential), which goes beyond the scope of the present linear-response one and thus will be presented in a separate work.

In addition, the nonlinear generalization of our theory also allows for attaining the linear thermoelectric responses of the orbital magnetization in two-dimensional metallic systems with reduced symmetry [35]. This potential for thermoelectric generation and control of magnetization via the orbital degree of freedom would be of current great interest in low-symmetry two-dimensional antiferromagnets.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Liang Dong, Bangguo Xiong, Yinhan Zhang and Yang Gao for insightful discussions. Q.N. is supported by DOE (DE-FG03-02ER45958, Division of Materials Science and Engineering) on the geometric formulation in this work.

-
- [1] D. Xiao, Y. Yao, Z. Fang, and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 026603 (2006).
 - [2] C. Zhang, S. Tewari, V. M. Yakovenko, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 174508 (2008).
 - [3] X.-Q. Yu, Z.-G. Zhu, G. Su, and A.-P. Jauho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 246601 (2015).
 - [4] R. Cheng, S. Okamoto, and D. Xiao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 217202 (2016).
 - [5] L. Zhang, J. Ren, J.-S. Wang, and B. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 225901 (2010).
 - [6] R. Matsumoto and S. Murakami, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 197202 (2011).
 - [7] R. Matsumoto and S. Murakami, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 184406 (2011).
 - [8] T. Qin, J. Zhou, and J. Shi, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 104305 (2012).
 - [9] R. Matsumoto, R. Shindou, and S. Murakami, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 054420 (2014).
 - [10] H. Lee, J. H. Han, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 125413 (2015).
 - [11] L. Zhang, New J. Phys. **18**, 103039 (2016).
 - [12] T. Saito, K. Misaki, H. Ishizuka, and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 255901 (2019).
 - [13] X. Zhang, Y. Zhang, S. Okamoto, and D. Xiao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 167202 (2019).
 - [14] S. Park and B.-J. Yang, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 174435 (2019).

- [15] G. Go, S. K. Kim, and K.-J. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 237207 (2019).
- [16] N. R. Cooper, B. I. Halperin, and I. M. Ruzin, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 2344 (1997).
- [17] J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. **135**, A1505 (1964).
- [18] L. Smrčka and P. Středa, J. Phys. C **10**, 2153 (1977).
- [19] T. Qin, Q. Niu, and J. Shi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 236601 (2011).
- [20] G. Tatara, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 196601 (2015).
- [21] A. Shitade, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2014**, 123I01 (2014).
- [22] D. Xiao, J. Shi, D. P. Clougherty, and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 087602 (2009).
- [23] G. Sundaram and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 14915 (1999).
- [24] D. Xiao, M.-C. Chang, and Q. Niu, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 1959 (2010).
- [25] J. Shi, G. Vignale, D. Xiao, and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 197202 (2007).
- [26] J. M. Ziman, Principles of the Theory of Solids (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1972).
- [27] N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, Solid State Physics (Saunders, Philadelphia, 1976).
- [28] D. Xiao, J. Shi, and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 137204 (2005).
- [29] P. Středa and L. Smrčka, J. Phys. C **16**, L895 (1983).
- [30] K. Nomura, S. Ryu, A. Furusaki, and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 026802 (2012).
- [31] C. Xiao, D. Li, and Z. Ma, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 075150 (2016).
- [32] L. Liang, S. Peotta, A. Harju, and P. Torma, Phys. Rev. B **96**, 064511 (2017).
- [33] Y. Gao and D. Xiao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 227402 (2019).
- [34] M. F. Lapa and T. L. Hughes, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 121111(R) (2019).
- [35] C. Xiao and Q. Niu, arXiv:2002.01637