Intrinsic nonlinear Hall effect in antiferromagnetic tetragonal CuMnAs
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Detecting the orientation of the Néel vector is a major research topic in antiferromagnetic spintronics. Here we recognize the intrinsic nonlinear Hall effect, which is independent of the relaxation time, as a prominent contribution to the time-reversal-odd second order conductivity and can be used to detect the flipping of the Néel vector. In contrast, the Berry-curvature-dipole-induced nonlinear Hall effect depends linear on relaxation time and is time-reversal-even. We study the intrinsic nonlinear Hall effect in an antiferromagnetic metal: tetragonal CuMnAs, and show that its nonlinear Hall conductivity can reach the order of mA/V². The dependence on the chemical potential of such nonlinear Hall conductivity can be qualitatively explained by a tilted massive Dirac model. Moreover, we demonstrate its strong temperature dependence and briefly discuss its competition with the second order Drude conductivity. Finally, a complete survey of magnetic point groups is presented, providing guidelines for finding more antiferromagnetic materials with the intrinsic nonlinear Hall effect.

Introduction.—Electrically detecting the flipping (180° rotation) of the Néel vector is a crucial task in antiferromagnetic spintronics [1, 2]. Since the Néel vector and its flipped image are related by time reversal symmetry, the time-reversal-odd (T-odd) part of the conductivity tensor can be utilized to distinguish them. However, many antiferromagnets respects the combination of spatial and time reversal symmetry (PT), which forbids the T-odd part of the linear conductivity tensor. In contrast, for the second order conductivity tensor, PT symmetry forbids the time-reversal-even (T-even) part and allows the existence of the T-odd part. Therefore, second order conductivity is an ideal quantity to detect the Néel vector flipping in PT-symmetric antiferromagnets. In fact, one pioneering experiment detected the Néel vector flipping by measuring the sign of the second order conductivity in antiferromagnetic tetragonal CuMnAs [3]. Despite the success of the experiment, the underlying microscopic mechanism of this second order conductivity has not been fully recognized.

The second order conductivity tensor is defined as the quadratic current response J to electric field E: \( J^\alpha = \sum_{\beta, \gamma} \sigma^{\alpha \beta} E^\beta E^\gamma \) (\( \alpha, \beta \) and \( \gamma \) are Cartesian indices). \( \sigma \) can be separated into an Ohmic-type part and a Hall-type part [4]. The Ohmic part includes a second-order Drude conductivity, which is T-odd and quadratically dependent on the relaxation time \( \tau \) [5–8]. The Hall part also includes a T-odd contribution which is independent of the relaxation time, and is therefore called the intrinsic nonlinear Hall effect (INHE) [9]. The INHE is different from the more well-known Berry curvature dipole (BCD) contribution [10–14]. The latter is proportional to \( \tau \) and, more importantly, it is a T-even quantity and is forbidden in PT-symmetric antiferromagnets. The INHE and its thermal counterpart, the intrinsic nonlinear Nernst effect, has been studied in model Hamiltonians such as the loop current model [15]. However, little is known about the INHE in realistic materials.

In this Letter, we show that the INHE is a prominent contribution, and sometimes the dominant contribution, to the T-odd second order conductivity. Using density functional theory (DFT) calculations, we show that \( \sigma_{\text{INH}} \) in antiferromagnetic tetragonal CuMnAs can reach the order of mA/V² and is much larger than the Ohmic second order Drude conductivity. We find a large peak accompanied by a sign change of \( \sigma_{\text{INH}} \) as a function of the chemical potential. This behavior can be explained by a tilted massive Dirac fermion model in which the INHE is shown to have a geometric origin arising from the quantum metric dipole. We find that \( \sigma_{\text{INH}} \) in tetragonal CuMnAs has a strong temperature dependence and briefly discuss its competition with second order Drude conductivity. Finally, a complete survey of magnetic point groups is presented, providing guidelines for finding other candidate materials where the INHE can be observed. Our results thus establish the INHE as an important transport phenomena in inversion asymmetric magnetic metals, particularly in the context of probing the Néel vector flipping in antiferromagnets.

Intrinsic nonlinear Hall effect in CuMnAs.—CuMnAs usually crystallizes in an orthorhombic phase. However, with suitable substrate (e.g., GaAs or GaP), a tetragonal phase can be experimentally grown [16], which is the focus of this work. Figure 1(a) presents the atomic structure and important symmetries of tetragonal CuMnAs. Each unit cell contains two Mn planes. The magnetic moment, lying in the Mn plane, is antiferromagnetically ordered between the planes. For magnetic moments lying in different directions within the Mn plane, there is little energy difference. Therefore, the Néel vector \( \mathbf{N} \), defined as the difference of the magnetic moments between Mn₁ and Mn₂ atoms, can be parametrized by the polar angle \( \theta \) [see Fig. 1(a)]. For arbitrary \( \theta \), PT symmetry is respected. Electrical manipulation of \( \theta \) using current pulses has recently been demonstrated [17, 18].

The intrinsic nonlinear Hall conductivity can be expressed in terms of band quantities as [9, 15]

\[
\sigma^{\alpha \beta}_{\text{INH}} = 2e^3 \sum_{n,m} \epsilon_n^2 \epsilon_m \frac{\epsilon_n^2}{2\pi^2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{v_{\alpha} A_{nm} A_{\beta \mu}^*}{\epsilon_n - \epsilon_m} \frac{\partial f(\epsilon_n)}{\partial \epsilon_n} - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta),
\]

where \( v \) is the band velocity, \( \epsilon_n \) is the energy of the \( n \)th Bloch
FIG. 1. (a) The unit cell of tetragonal CuMnAs (left) and its top view (right). Mn1 and Mn2 have opposite magnetic moments, both lying in the x − y plane. Important crystalline symmetries without magnetic order include inversion (inversion center between Mn1 and Mn2 on the left panel), four-fold rotation in the z direction (rotation axis at the Mn atom in the right panel) and four mirror symmetries (mirror planes indicated by dashed gray lines in the right panel). The Néel vector \( \mathbf{N} \) is parameterized by the polar angle \( \theta \) in the x − y plane. (b) The band structure of CuMnAs for \( \theta = 0 \).

The band structure of CuMnAs for \( \theta = 0 \) is shown in Fig. 2(a). When the Néel vector is along the \( \mathbf{X} \) direction, the order of mA/V is on the order of \( 10^{-3} \). (c) Intrinsic nonlinear Hall conductivity \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyy}}(\theta) \) and \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}}(\theta) \) as a function of chemical potential (\( \mu \)) and orientation of the Néel vector \( \theta \). \( \mu = 0 \) is the intrinsic chemical potential. A sketch of the experimental setup to measure \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \). The x and y directions are defined in Fig. 1. (b) \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \) for \( \theta = 0 \) as a function of the chemical potential (c-d) Intrinsic nonlinear Hall conductivity \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyy}}(\theta) \) and \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}}(\theta) \) as a function of chemical potential (\( \mu \)) and orientation of the Néel vector \( \theta \). \( \mu = 0 \) is the intrinsic chemical potential.

state, \( A_{nm} = \langle u_n | i \nabla_k | u_m \rangle \) is the Berry connection with \( | u_n \rangle \) the periodic part of the \( n \)th Bloch state, and \( e \) is the (positive) elementary charge. \( f(\epsilon; T, \mu) \) \( T \) and \( \mu \) are omitted in Eq. (1) is the Fermi-Dirac occupation number for energy \( \epsilon \) at temperature \( T \) and chemical potential \( \mu \). For now we work at \( T = 0 \). We note that \( a^{\alpha \beta}_{\text{INH}} \) is antisymmetric with respect to \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), therefore it describes a Hall-type current [4]. Due to the derivative of \( f \) in Eq. (1), the INHE only depends on quantities around the Fermi surface and is only relevant for metals. As shown in Fig. 1(b), CuMnAs is indeed a metal.

For a general orientation (not along high symmetric directions such as \( \theta = 0 \)) of the Néel vector, the magnetic point group of tetragonal CuMnAs is \( 2' \overline{m} \). The allowed components are \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyy}} = -\sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{yx}} \), \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} = -\sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{yx}} \), \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xzx}} = -\sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{zx}} \) and \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{yyy}} = -\sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{yy}} \). Four-fold rotational symmetry along the z axis \( (C_{4z}) \) demands that \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{yzz}}(\theta) = \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{yzy}}(\theta + \pi/2) \). Therefore, the only independent components are \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \) and \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{yzy}} \).

We first examine the chemical potential (\( \mu \)) dependence of \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \). A sketch of the experimental setup to measure \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \) is presented in Fig. 2(a). When the Néel vector is along the x-axis (\( \theta = 0 \)), \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \) is generally small for hole doping, but develops a peak and then changes sign rapidly and develops another peak for electron doping [Fig. 2(b)]. This behavior signifies a strong variation of Bloch wave function in the band structure, and will be discussed later. As shown in Fig. 2(b), \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \) is on the order of mA/V².

Next, we discuss the strong correlation between \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \) and the orientation of the Néel vector [Fig. 2(c-d)]. In most cases, symmetry arguments can be invoked to explain the correlation. As mentioned in the introduction, time reversal symmetry demands \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyy}}(\theta) = -\sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyy}}(\theta + \pi) \). Additional constraints on specific components can be derived from crystalline symmetries. For example, when the Néel vector is along the \( x \) (y) direction, \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyy}}(\theta) \) is forbidden by mirror symmetry in the \( x \) (y) direction. Therefore, the sign of \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \) can be used to distinguish the Néel vector lying in \( \pm x \) direction [Fig. 2(c)], and the sign of \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyy}} \) can be used to distinguish the Néel vector lying in \( \pm y \) direction [Fig. 2(d)].

Tilted massive Dirac point model.—To gain further insight into the behavior of \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \), we analyze the contribution to \( \sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\text{xyx}} \) from different \( k \) points at the Fermi surface. We find that the dominant contribution of the peak comes from avoided crossings along the \( \Gamma-X-\Gamma \) and \( \Gamma-Y-\Gamma \) lines. Figure 3(a) shows the band structure along the \( \Gamma-Y-\Gamma \) line, where two avoided crossings can be observed. These avoided crossings are common on these high symmetry lines since the little group on these lines has only one allowed representation.

These avoided crossings can be qualitatively modeled by tilted massive Dirac points. Specifically, we introduce the following Hamiltonian

\[
H_{\text{Dirac}} = k_x \tau_1 \sigma_0 + k_y (\tau_2 \sigma_2 - i \tau_0 \sigma_0) + k_z \tau_3 \sigma_0 + m \tau_2 \sigma_3 ,
\]

where \( \tau \) and \( \sigma \) are two sets of Pauli matrices, \( i \) is a parame-
FIG. 3. (a) shows the band structure of tetragonal CuMnAs along the Γ-Y-Γ line, which contains two avoided crossings. (b) shows the intrinsic nonlinear Hall conductivity of a tilted massive Dirac model. (c) and (d) shows the quantum metric tensor dipole at $k_z = 0$ plane for the lower band. $\hbar$ is the reduced Planck constant. Parameters: $\tau = 0.8$ eVÅ, $m = 5$ meV.

FIG. 4. The temperature dependence of intrinsic nonlinear Hall conductivity in tetragonal CuMnAs. Inset: temperature dependence of chemical potential calculated with the assumption of constant electron density.

$$\sigma^\alpha_\nu = \sum_{i,j} \text{Re}[A_v^{i,j} A_v^{\alpha,j}]$$, with $\bar{\nu} \neq \nu$. $v^\nu_\nu^\alpha_\alpha$ can be regarded as the quantum metric tensor dipole. For $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$, the two relevant quantum metric dipoles are $v^\nu_\nu^\alpha_{\nu\alpha}$ and $v^\nu_\nu^\alpha_{\alpha\nu}$, which are plotted for the lower band in Fig. 3(c,d). $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$ is determined by the difference between these two dipoles, and hence nonzero as observed from the figure.

In some antiferromagnets, massless Dirac points can also be realized with certain crystalline symmetries [20–22]. For massless Dirac points with $m \to 0$ in Eq. (2), the expression of $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$ [Eq. (1)] diverges when the chemical potential lies exactly at the Dirac point. Disorder is the most likely source that will regularize the behavior of second order conductivity for band touchings, and further theoretical investigation is needed.

Temperature dependence.—By multiplying Eq. (1) with $\int d\lambda d\delta (\varepsilon_n - \lambda)$, the INHE at finite temperatures can be expressed as a weighted integration of the INHE at zero temperature around the chemical potential $\mu$ as $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}(T, \mu) = \int d\lambda d\delta \sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}(T = 0, \lambda) [\delta \varepsilon_n(\lambda, T, \mu)]/\partial \lambda]$. Finite temperature modifies $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$ in two ways: $T$ directly enters the Fermi-Dirac distribution and $\mu$ has a small dependence on temperature.

Assuming finite electron density, we calculate the dependence of chemical potential on $T$. $\mu$ decreases quadratically with respect to $T$, as expected from the Sommerfeld expansion. At room temperature, $\mu$ drops by 5 meV. Figure 4 shows the behavior of $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$ as a function of $T$, where both $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$ and $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$ have a strong dependence on temperature. Especially, $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$ receives an order of magnitude enhancement near room temperature. We find that this drastic change comes from the broadening of $-\delta f(\lambda, T, \mu)/\partial \lambda$, which can take advantage of the large INHE away from the intrinsic chemical potential; the change of $\mu$ plays a negligible role in the temperature dependence of $\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$.

Second order Drude conductivity.—$\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha}$ is not the only member of $T$-odd second order conductivity. Especially, the Drude conductivity can also be generalized to second order as [5–8]

$$\sigma^{\alpha\beta}_{\nu\alpha} = -\frac{e^2}{\hbar} \sum_{n} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} (\partial_{k_x} \partial_{k_y} \partial_{k_z}) f(\varepsilon_n).$$
TABLE I. Magnetic point groups classified by the existence or absence of INHE, second order Drude conductivity and BCD-induced NHE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnetic point groups</th>
<th>INHE</th>
<th>Drude</th>
<th>BCD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/m′′m′′′m′′′ -6/m′2, 6/m′m′m′</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6, 6/m, -6m2, -6m′2, 6/m′′m′′′m′′, 23, m′′3′, 4/m′32, -43m, -m′3m</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11′, 21′, m′′, 2221′, mm21′, 41′, -41′, 2221′, 4mm1′, -42m1′, 31′, 321′, m′1, 61′, 6221′, 6mm1</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1′, 2/m′, 2/m′, m′m′, m′m′, 4/m′, 4/m′, 4/m′m, 4/m′m′, -3′, -3′m, -3′m′</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422, 4/m′m′, -42m2, 622, 6mm’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6′, 6′22′, 6′mm</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2, 2′, m′, 222, 222′, m22, m′m2′, m′m′2, 4, 4′, -4′, -4′, 4′2′, 4′2′2, 4m, 4/m’m, -42m, -4′2m, -42m′, 3, 32, 32′, 3m, 3m′, 6, 62′2′, 6mm</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For a second order conductivity tensor $\sigma^{\alpha\beta\gamma}_{\text{Drude}}$, only the $\beta \leftrightarrow \gamma$ permutation symmetric part contributes to the current. Therefore, in Table I, we have an extra constraint that such symmetric part does not vanish.
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I. DETAILS OF DFT CALCULATIONS

DFT calculations were carried out to evaluate Eq. (1) in the main text. The VASP package [1, 2] combined with the WANNIERT90 [3] package was used to construct a tight binding Hamiltonian for CuMnAs. Projector augmented wave method [4] and Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof exchange-correlation functional [5] were utilized in the DFT calculations. A 16 × 16 × 10 mesh was used to sample the Brillouin zone and the planewave energy cutoff was 400 eV. A Hubbard $U$ of 1.7 eV [6] was added to account for the electron-electron repulsion on the Mn d orbitals. Experimental lattice constants were used and the internal coordinates of atoms were relaxed until the forces on each atom were smaller than 1 meV/Å.

II. σ^{zzz}_{INH} OF TETRAGONAL CuMnAs

As explained in the main text, the only independent components of $\sigma_{INH}$ are $\sigma^{xxx}_{INH}$ and $\sigma^{zzz}_{INH}$. $\sigma^{xxx}_{INH}$ has been extensively discussed in the main text and we present the DFT result of $\sigma^{zzz}_{INH}$ in Fig. S1.

![Figure S1](image-url)

**FIG. S1.** $\sigma^{zzz}_{INH}$ of tetragonal CuMnAs as a function of chemical potential $\mu$ and orientation of the Néel vector $\theta$.

III. SECOND ORDER DRUDE CONDUCTIVITY IN CuMnAs

The expression of second order Drude conductivity has been provided in Eq. (4) in the main text. Here we extract the $\tau$-independent part of the $\sigma_{Drude}$ and call it second order Drude weight: $\sigma^{ab\beta}_{Drude} = D^{ab\beta} / \eta^2$, with $\eta = \tau / h$. With the calculation method detailed in the main text, we find that the second order Drude weight is on the order of $\mu \text{A} \cdot \text{eV}^2 / \text{V}^2$ (Fig. S2). To estimate the value of $\eta$, we notice that the experimental value of resistivity is roughly $1.6 \times 10^{-4} \Omega \cdot \text{cm}$ at 230 K. Within relaxation approximation, the conductivity is

$$\sigma^{ab}_{Drude} = \frac{D^{ab\beta}}{\eta},$$

(S1)
FIG. S2. Second order Drude weight of CuMnAs. The unit is $\mu$A·eV²/N².

where

$$D^{\alpha\beta} = -e^2 \hbar \sum_n \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial \epsilon_n} v_n^\alpha v_n^\beta,$$

is the (linear) Drude weight. In our DFT calculations we find $D^{xx}$ and $D^{yy}$ are roughly the same, with the value 882 eV·(Ω cm)$^{-1}$. Therefore, $\eta$ is estimated to be 0.16 eV. The largest component of second order Drude weight at intrinsic Fermi energy for $\theta = 0$ is $D^{xy} = 0.75 \mu$A·eV²/N², corresponding to $\sigma_{\text{Drude}}^{xy} = 0.029$ mA/V², which is much smaller than $\sigma_{\text{INH}}^{xy} \approx 0.2$ mA/V² at room temperature (Fig. 4 in the main text).

IV. INTRINSIC NONLINEAR HALL CONDUCTIVITY AND GEOMETRIC TENSOR

The quantum metric tensor measures the distance between neighbouring Bloch state:

$$\text{Tr}(P_{vk}) - \text{Tr}(P_{vk} P_{vk+\delta k}) \approx g_\nu^{\alpha\beta}(k) \delta k^\alpha \delta k^\beta,$$

where repeated Cartesian indices imply summation and $P_{vk}$ is the projection operator

$$P_{vk} = \sum_{n \in \nu} |u_{nk}\rangle \langle u_{nk}|.$$

$\nu$ is the periodic part of the Bloch state. $\nu$ denotes a band set. If a band is nondegenerate, $\nu$ only contains this band. If there are degenerate bands, $\nu$ contains all these bands. Written explicitly,

$$g_\nu^{\alpha\beta}(k) \delta k^\alpha \delta k^\beta = \sum_{n,m \in \nu} \delta_{nm} - \left| \langle u_{nk} | u_{mk+\delta k} \rangle \right|^2.$$

To evaluate $g(k)$, we expand $\delta_{nm} - \left| \langle u_{nk} | u_{mk+\delta k} \rangle \right|^2$, where $n$ and $m$ are band indices. We first expand $\langle u_{nk} | u_{mk+\delta k} \rangle$ to second order as

$$\langle u_{nk} | u_{mk+\delta k} \rangle \approx \langle u_{nk} | \partial_a u_{mk} \rangle \delta k^a + \frac{1}{2} \langle u_{nk} | \partial_a \partial_b u_{mk} \rangle \delta k^a \delta k^b + \delta_{nm},$$

and then collect terms of different orders from $\delta_{nm} - \left| \langle u_{nk} | u_{mk+\delta k} \rangle \right|^2$. The zeroth order term in $\delta k$ is clearly zero. Since $\delta_{nm} - \left| \langle u_{nk} | u_{mk+\delta k} \rangle \right|^2$ reaches maximum or minimum at $\delta k = 0$, the linear term should also be zero. We verify this statement by writing out the linear terms:

$$-\delta_{nm} \delta k^a \left( \langle u_{nk} | \partial_a u_{mk} \rangle + \langle \partial_a u_{mk} | u_{nk} \rangle \right),$$

$$\equiv -\delta_{nm} \delta k^a \partial_a \langle u_{nk} | u_{mk} \rangle,$$

$$= -\delta_{nm} \delta k^a \partial_a \delta_{nm} = 0,$$

where $\partial_a \equiv \partial_{k^a}$. The second order terms are

$$-\left( \langle u_{nk} | \partial_a u_{mk} \rangle \langle \partial_b u_{mk} | u_{nk} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle u_{nk} | \partial_a \partial_b u_{mk} \rangle \delta_{nm} + \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_a \partial_b u_{mk} | u_{nk} \rangle \delta_{nm} \right) \delta k^a \delta k^b.$$
To simplify the expression, we use the following identities

\[
\langle u_{nk} | u_{mk} \rangle = \delta_{nm}, \quad (S12)
\]

\[
\langle u_{nk} | \partial_a u_{mk} \rangle + \langle \partial_a u_{nk} | u_{mk} \rangle = 0, \quad (S13)
\]

\[
\langle \partial_\beta u_{nk} | \partial_{a} u_{mk} \rangle + \langle u_{nk} | \partial_a \partial_\beta u_{mk} \rangle + \langle \partial_a u_{nk} | \partial_\beta u_{mk} \rangle = 0, \quad (S14)
\]

where each identity is the derivative of the previous one. Therefore,

\[
- \left( \langle u_{nk} | \partial_\beta u_{mk} \rangle \langle \partial_\beta u_{nk} | u_{mk} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle u_{nk} | \partial_a \partial_\beta u_{mk} \rangle \delta_{nm} + \frac{1}{2} \langle \partial_a \partial_\beta u_{nk} | u_{mk} \rangle \delta_{nm} \right) \delta k^\alpha \delta k^\beta = 0
\]

\[
\left( -A_{nm}^\alpha A_{nm}^\beta + \frac{1}{2} \sum_l A_{nl}^\alpha A_{ln}^\beta \delta_{nm} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_l A_{nl}^\alpha A_{ln}^\beta \delta_{nm} - A_{nm}^\alpha A_{nm}^\beta \right) \delta k^\alpha \delta k^\beta = 0
\]

\[
\left( -A_{nm}^\alpha A_{nm}^\beta + \frac{1}{2} \sum_l A_{nl}^\alpha A_{ln}^\beta \delta_{nm} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_l A_{nl}^\alpha A_{ln}^\beta \delta_{nm} - A_{nm}^\alpha A_{nm}^\beta \right) \delta k^\alpha \delta k^\beta = 0
\]

where \( A_{nm}^\alpha = i \langle u_{nk} | \partial_a u_{mk} \rangle \) is Berry connection. Therefore

\[
\gamma_{\nu}^{\alpha \beta} = \sum_{n,m \in \nu} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_l A_{nl}^\alpha A_{ln}^\beta \delta_{nm} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_l A_{nl}^\alpha A_{ln}^\beta \delta_{nm} - A_{nm}^\alpha A_{nm}^\beta \right) \delta k^\alpha \delta k^\beta = 0
\]

\[
\gamma_{\nu}^{\alpha \beta} = \sum_{n \in \nu} \text{Re}(A_{n}^\alpha A_{n}^\beta) \quad (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta).
\]

The intrinsic nonlinear Hall conductivity is

\[
\sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\alpha \beta} = 2e^3 \sum_{n,m} \text{Re} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\nu_{n}^\alpha A_{nm}^\beta}{\epsilon_{n} - \epsilon_{m}} \frac{\partial f(\epsilon_{n})}{\partial \epsilon_{n}} - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta).
\]

For a system with two band sets \( \nu \in \{1, 2\} \), where within each band set \( \nu \) there are two degenerate bands \( i \in \{1, 2\} \),

\[
\sigma_{\text{INH}}^{\alpha \beta} = 2e^3 \sum_{\nu} \sum_{i \in \nu} \sum_{j \in \nu} \text{Re} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\nu_{v}^\alpha A_{ij}^\beta A_{ji}^\beta}{\epsilon_{v} - \epsilon_{\tilde{v}}} \frac{\partial f(\epsilon_{v})}{\partial \epsilon_{v}} - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta)
\]

\[
= 2e^3 \sum_{\nu} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\nu_{v}^\alpha A_{ij}^\beta}{\epsilon_{v} - \epsilon_{\tilde{v}}} \frac{\partial f(\epsilon_{v})}{\partial \epsilon_{v}} - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta).
\]

This is Eq. (3) in the main text.