

Spin Accumulation and Longitudinal Spin Diffusion of Magnets

Wayne M. Saslow,^{1,*} Chen Sun,^{2,†} and Shenglong Xu^{1,‡}

¹Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 77843, U.S.A.

²School of Physics and Electronics, Hunan University, Changsha 410082, China

(Dated: December 3, 2021)

Following spintronics we argue that a magnet near equilibrium can be described by two magnetic variables. One is the usual magnetization \vec{M} , which represents equilibrium in some preparation field and temperature \vec{H}_p and T_p that may differ from the actual field and temperature \vec{H} and T . The other is the non-equilibrium quantity \vec{m} , called the spin accumulation, by which the non-equilibrium spin current can be transported. \vec{M} represents a correlated distribution of a very large number of degrees of freedom, as expressed in some equilibrium distribution function for the excitations; we therefore argue that \vec{M} should have a negligible diffusion rate, but should be subject to decay. On the other hand, we argue that \vec{m} should be subject to both diffusion and decay. We therefore argue that diffusion from a given region occurs by decay of \vec{M} to \vec{m} , then by diffusion of \vec{m} , and finally by decay of \vec{m} to \vec{M} in another region. Restricting ourselves to the longitudinal variables M and m with equilibrium properties $M_{eq} = M_0 + \chi_M H$ and $m_{eq} = 0$, we argue that the effective energy density must include a new, thermodynamically required exchange constant $\lambda_M = -1/\chi_M$. We then develop the appropriate macroscopic equations by applying Onsager's irreversible thermodynamics, and use the resulting equations to study the space and time response. At fixed real frequency ω there is a single pair of complex wavevectors $\pm k$ with an unusual dependence on ω . At fixed real wavevector, there are two decay constants. We believe this work has implications for other systems with highly correlated order, such as superconductors.

I. INTRODUCTION

The technologically important field of spintronics uses spin currents to make magnets receive (read) or send (write) information. Associated with this is the major theoretical advancement that, when out of equilibrium, a magnet has a second magnetic variable, called the spin accumulation. The term *accumulation of spin* appeared in the 1970 work of Dyakonov and Perel on what are now known as the spin Hall effect (an electric current produces a magnetization in a non-magnetic spin-active material) and the inverse spin Hall effect.^{1,2}

Transverse spin currents (relative to the magnetization \vec{M}) were implicit in the early work of Monod *et al.*,³ and were explicit in the 1979 work of Silsbee *et al.*,⁴ both of which involved magnetization deviations transverse to the equilibrium magnetization. The latter work invoked an exchange interaction between two posited types of magnetic electrons (s and d were spin-polarized but only s could conduct – i.e., diffuse).⁵ Longitudinal spin currents were studied theoretically by Johnson and Silsbee.^{6,7} The 1993 theory of Valet and Fert considered longitudinal spin currents and introduced the term *spin accumulation*.⁸

In 2002 Zhang, Levy and Fert employed an s - d model with exchange to study (transverse) spin transfer torque.⁹ It was followed in 2004 by a non- s - d model that effectively used Fermi liquid theory for the spin-polarized conducting electrons producing (in our notation) \vec{m} ; it used an exchange constant to couple to a magnetization \vec{M} associated with core electrons and described by the classic theory of Landau and Lifshitz.¹⁰ Both Refs. 9 and 10 emphasized the transverse components of \vec{M} and \vec{m} , which are the magnetic variables used in the area of spintronics.

Using irreversible thermodynamics we have examined the full equations of motion for this model.¹¹ Unlike the present work, it assumed a single longitudinal type of magnetization. More recently we have studied the coupled transverse modes of \vec{M} and \vec{m} , as can be generated in an ac spin transfer torque or spin pumping experiment.¹²

It is well-known in electrical and thermal conduction that it is the non-equilibrium part of the statistical distribution function that gives rise to the diffusive processes leading to the electric current and the heat current. By analogy we argue that for a magnet it is the non-equilibrium part of the statistical distribution function that, in addition to \vec{m} , also gives rise to the diffusive pro-

cesses leading to the spin current.

In addition, we argue that because the equilibrium magnetization M represents a distribution of a macroscopically large number of degrees of freedom, it therefore cannot diffuse; it can only grow or decay. Thus only the spin accumulation m , due to the non-equilibrium part of the statistical distribution function, can diffuse. On the other hand, because \vec{m} must have a source, such as a local fluctuation of \vec{M} , by reciprocity \vec{m} must also be able to provide a source for \vec{M} , and thus \vec{m} can both decay and diffuse.

As a consequence a non-uniform magnetic system can be thought to relax in the following way. Imagine that everywhere \vec{M} takes on a uniform value, except for a small region A where it takes a larger uniform value. For equilibration between the regions to occur, in region A \vec{M} must decay to \vec{m} , which in turn can diffuse out of region A. After \vec{m} has diffused to region B it can decay to \vec{M} , thus transferring the excess in A to region B. Such a process is illustrated in Fig. 1.




FIG. 1. Fluctuation-diffusion-fluctuation process for total magnetization $\mathcal{M} = M + m$ as a function of position, with a higher value to the left. Initially the distribution is a step function. In the high density region, and within a mean free path of the interface, there is a downward decay fluctuation, which then diffuses across the interface and within a mean free path of the interface undergoes an upward decay fluctuation.

In what follows we establish the near-equilibrium thermodynamics of this system (Sect. II), we apply Onsager's irreversible thermodynamics to obtain the equations of motion for M and m (Sect. III), where we study their coupled response to oscillating space variations

e^{ikx} for real k and to oscillating time variations $e^{-i\omega t}$ for real ω . We then provide a brief summary (Sect. IV), and point out the implications for diffusion in other ordered systems, such as superconductors (Sect. V).

II. NEAR EQUILIBRIUM THERMODYNAMICS: LONGITUDINAL VARIABLES

For simplicity we consider only \vec{M} along \vec{H} , with $\vec{H} \cdot \hat{M} = H$. Note that a paramagnet has the same symmetry as a ferromagnet, so the present considerations also apply to paramagnets in a field.

Consider a collinear magnet in a field \vec{H} with remanence M_0 and magnetic susceptibility χ_M , and an effective exchange interaction between M and m . Then any macroscopic effective energy, when minimized, must give the equilibrium values

$$M_{eq} = M_0 + \chi_M H, \quad m_{eq} = 0. \quad (1)$$

Further, the minimization conditions for both M and m must be consistent with one another. This constrains the effective energy, and leads to an exchange term that has not been considered previously.

With μ_0 the permeability of free space, in SI units where fields and magnetization are in units of A/m, we take the system to have an effective energy density whose dependence on M and m is given by

$$\varepsilon = -\mu_0(M + m)H + \frac{\mu_0}{2} \left[\frac{(M - M_0)^2}{\chi_M} + \frac{m^2}{\chi_m} \right] - \mu_0 \lambda_M (M - M_0)m. \quad (2)$$

Here χ_M and χ_m are dimensionless susceptibilities, M_0 is the spontaneous magnetization, and λ_M is a dimensionless mean-field coefficient whose value is determined by the equilibrium condition $m_{eq} = 0$.

We define effective fields H^* and h^*

$$H^* \equiv -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial M} = H + \lambda_M m - \frac{M - M_0}{\chi_M}$$

$$\equiv -\frac{\delta M}{\chi_M}, \quad (3)$$

$$h^* \equiv -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial m} = H + \lambda_M(M - M_0) - \frac{m}{\chi_m} \\ \equiv -\frac{\delta m}{\chi_m}. \quad (4)$$

In equilibrium we want the parameters of the theory to ensure that $H^* = 0$ and $h^* = 0$.

Eq. (3) satisfies the local equilibrium condition (1) for any λ_M . However, Eq. (4) does *not* satisfy and $h^* = 0$ for any λ_M . We ensure that Eq. (4) also satisfies $h^* = 0$ by requiring that [see eq. (10) of Ref. 11]

$$\lambda_M = -\frac{1}{\chi_M}. \quad (5)$$

This value $\lambda_M = -\frac{1}{\chi_M}$ is thermodynamically required. It may be thought of as part of a “preparation” term $-\lambda_M(M - M_0)m$ within the thermodynamic distribution function that specifies the statistical state.

We now define

$$\Delta m \equiv m - m_{eq} = m, \quad \Delta M \equiv M - M_{eq}. \quad (6)$$

When the differences are differentials we may replace $(\Delta M, \Delta m)$ by (dM, dm) .

With the definition

$$\xi \equiv \frac{\chi_m}{\chi_M} \quad (7)$$

we have

$$\delta M \equiv -\chi_M H^* \\ = (M - M_0 - \chi_M H) + m \\ \equiv \Delta M + \Delta m, \quad (8)$$

$$\delta m \equiv -\chi_m h^* \\ = m + \frac{\chi_m}{\chi_M} (M - M_0 - \chi_M H) \\ = \Delta m + \xi \Delta M. \quad (9)$$

On employing (5) in (2), and studying small fluctuations of m and M , we find that thermodynamic stability requires that $\zeta \leq 0$, or $\chi_m \leq \chi_M$.

III. LONGITUDINAL DYNAMICS

We now derive the equations of motion for the longitudinal magnetic response of M

and m . We employ Onsager’s irreversible thermodynamics.^{16,17}

In the thermodynamic relation for the differential of the energy density $d\varepsilon$ we employ H^* and h^* to write

$$d\varepsilon = Tds - \mu_0 H^* dM - \mu_0 h^* dm. \quad (10)$$

Since in equilibrium $H^* = 0$ and $h^* = 0$, ε is minimized on varying M and m .

As already noted, because M characterizes a distribution function for a macroscopic number of excitations, we consider that it cannot diffuse; a structure with 10^{23} variables is not expected to diffuse. That is not true of the excitations, which yield m . With this in mind, we now write down the “conservation laws” for ε , s , M , and m .

With unknown source terms R and flux terms j as appropriate, we take the “conservation laws” to be

$$\partial_t \varepsilon + \partial_i j_i^\varepsilon = 0. \quad (11)$$

$$\partial_t s + \partial_i j_i^s = R_s \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

$$\partial_t M = R_M. \quad (13)$$

$$\partial_t m + \partial_i j_i^m = R_m. \quad (14)$$

Using these equations we find that the time-derivative of (10) can be rewritten as

$$0 \leq TR_s = T\partial_t s + T\partial_i j_i^s \\ = \partial_t \varepsilon + \mu_0 H^* \partial_t M + \mu_0 h^* \partial_t m + T\partial_i j_i^s \\ = -\partial_i (j_i^\varepsilon - Tj_i^s + \mu_0 h^* j_i^m) \\ - j_i^s \partial_i T + \mu_0 j_i^m \partial_i h^* \\ + \mu_0 R_M H^* + \mu_0 R_m h^*. \quad (15)$$

Using the principle of non-negative rate of entropy production, or $R_s \geq 0$, and observing the space and time properties of the R ’s and j ’s, we obtain linear relations between the unknown fluxes and the unknown sources:

$$j_i^s = -\frac{\kappa}{T} \partial_i T, \quad (16)$$

$$j_i^m = C_m \partial_i h^* = -D_m \partial_i (\delta m), \quad (17)$$

$$R_M = L_{MM} H^* + L_{Mm} h^*, \quad (18)$$

$$R_m = L_{mm} h^* + L_{mM} H^*. \quad (19)$$

There is an Onsager relation that

$$L_{mM} = L_{Mm} \equiv -L, \quad (20)$$

so there are only three independent constants associated with the sources. (The minus sign is

expected for cross-decay.) We also neglect the thermomagnetic Onsager constants that relate entropy flux j_i^s to $\partial_i h^*$, and spin accumulation flux j_i^m to $\partial_i T$.

R_M and R_m may be rewritten in a more transparent way by introducing four (related) relaxation times. Thus we may rewrite R_M and R_m as

$$R_M \approx -\delta M \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{Mm}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{ML}} \right) + \frac{\delta m}{\tau_{mM}}, \quad (21)$$

$$R_m \approx -\delta m \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{mM}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{mL}} \right) + \frac{\delta M}{\tau_{Mm}}. \quad (22)$$

Using Eqs. (3) and (4), Eqs. (18) and (19) can be written as:

$$R_M = -\delta M \frac{L_{MM}}{\chi_M} - \delta m \frac{L_{Mm}}{\chi_m}, \quad (23)$$

$$R_m = -\delta m \frac{L_{mm}}{\chi_m} - \delta M \frac{L_{mM}}{\chi_M}. \quad (24)$$

Comparing with Eqs. (21) and (22), we have

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{Mm}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{ML}} = \frac{L_{MM}}{\chi_M}, \quad -\frac{L_{Mm}}{\chi_m} = \frac{1}{\tau_{mM}}, \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{mM}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{mL}} = \frac{L_{mm}}{\chi_m}, \quad -\frac{L_{mM}}{\chi_M} = \frac{1}{\tau_{Mm}}. \quad (26)$$

The Onsager constant of (20) takes the form

$$L \equiv \frac{\chi_m}{\tau_{mM}} = \frac{\chi_M}{\tau_{Mm}}. \quad (27)$$

A. Linearized Equations of Motion

By (13) and (21) we have

$$\frac{\partial M}{\partial t} = R_M = -\delta M \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{Mm}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{ML}} \right) + \frac{\delta m}{\tau_{mM}}. \quad (28)$$

By (14), (17), and (22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial m}{\partial t} - D_m \nabla^2 \delta m &= R_m \\ &= -\delta m \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{mM}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{mL}} \right) + \frac{\delta M}{\tau_{Mm}}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We now introduce the difference in inverse susceptibilities $\tilde{\chi}^{-1}$

$$\tilde{\chi}^{-1} \equiv (\chi_m^{-1} - \chi_M^{-1}), \quad (30)$$

where by $\xi = \chi_m/\chi_M \leq 1$ we have $\tilde{\chi} \geq 0$.

There are a natural exchange-driven rate r (between M and m) and a natural wavevector k_M given by

$$r \equiv \frac{L}{\tilde{\chi}} = \frac{1}{\tau_{mM}} - \frac{1}{\tau_{Mm}}, \quad k_M^2 \equiv \frac{r}{D_m}. \quad (31)$$

Since $L \geq 0$ and $\tilde{\chi} > 0$, we have $r \geq 0$. Thus m decays to M more rapidly than M decays to m ($\tau_{mM} \leq \tau_{Mm}$). Such decay is expected to be due to the microscopic exchange interaction, and is likely to be the fastest of the decay times in the system.

In the next sections we will use (28) and (29) obtain the time-response of an otherwise uniform system subject to a spatially-oscillating disturbance, and the spatial-response of an otherwise uniform system subject to a time-oscillating disturbance.

B. Temporal Response

Consider small deviations from equilibrium dM and dm . Then (8) and (9) give $\delta M = dM + dm$ and $\delta m = dm + \xi dM$, so eqs. (28) and (29) can be put in the form of the eigen-equations

$$\partial_t \begin{pmatrix} dM \\ dm \end{pmatrix} = \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} dM \\ dm \end{pmatrix}. \quad (32)$$

We now introduce an inverse decay rate γ (not the gyromagnetic ratio) and wavevector \vec{k} , where the latter is real. For space and time variation of dm and dM given by $\exp(-\gamma t + i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{r})$, the matrix Γ is given by

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} -\tau_{ML}^{-1} & -\tau_{ML}^{-1} + r \\ -\xi(\tau_{mL}^{-1} + D_m k^2) & -r - (\tau_{mL}^{-1} + D_m k^2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

When $\tau_{ML} \rightarrow \infty$ and $\tau_{mL} \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. the magnetizations do not decay to the lattice, we have $\partial_t(M+m) = 0$ when $k=0$, a result of conservation of magnetization. Expanded, the equations of motion can be written as

$$\left(-\gamma + \frac{1}{\tau_{ML}} \right) dM$$

$$= \left(-\frac{1}{\tau_{ML}} + r\right)dm, \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(-\gamma + \frac{1}{\tau_{mL}} + D_m k^2 + r\right)dm \\ & = -\xi \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{mL}} + D_m k^2\right)dM. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

If the wavevector \vec{k} is known, then the unknown decay rate $\gamma(k)$ as a function of wavevector k can be obtained by diagonalizing the matrix Γ .

1. Slow Lattice Decay

We first work in the limit that $\tau_{ML}, \tau_{mL} \rightarrow \infty$. This is appropriate to spin-aligned nuclear systems, with small magnetic moments and therefore weak interactions with the lattice, if $|\gamma^{-1}|$ is longer than these times. Then the eigenrates are

$$\gamma^\pm = \frac{r}{2} \left[\left(1 + \frac{k^2}{k_M^2}\right) \pm \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{k^2}{k_M^2}\right)^2 - 4\frac{k^2\xi}{k_M^2}} \right]. \quad (36)$$

For each mode, by substituting each decay rate in either of the mode equations we can determine that mode's ratio of dm to dM . The initial conditions on dm and dM then determine the amplitude of each mode.

$$\gamma = \frac{r}{2} \left(\left(\frac{w_m}{r} + \frac{w_M}{r} + \frac{k^2}{k_M^2} + 1 \right) \pm \left[\left(\frac{w_m}{r} - \frac{w_M}{r} + \frac{k^2}{k_M^2} + 1 \right)^2 - 4\xi \left(1 - \frac{w_M}{r} \right) \left(\frac{k^2}{k_M^2} + \frac{w_m}{r} \right) \right]^{1/2} \right). \quad (39)$$

Note that as $w_m, w_M \rightarrow 0$, (39) goes to (36).

We believe it is a realistic simplification is to take the lattice decay rate relatively small compared to the exchange driven cross-decay between M and m . Using this approximation and taking $\tau_{mL}/r = 0.05$, we present results for $\xi = 0.1$ in Figure 2 and for $\xi = 0.9$ in Figure 3. The curve for $\xi = 0.3$ (not shown) is very similar to that for $\xi = 0.1$. When lattice decay is included the lower mode for small k is no longer purely diffusive.

When there is only a single degree of freedom (normally taken to be M), with relaxation time τ and diffusion constant D , the single decay rate

Let γ^+ and γ^- be the decay rates for the fast and slow decay modes. In the long wavelength limit, we have

$$\gamma^+ = r, \quad \gamma^- = \xi D_m k^2. \quad (37)$$

The fast decay mode is basically that of M alone, with $dM^+ \approx -dm^+$. The slow decay mode is a diffusion mode with $dM^- \approx -\xi dm^-$, with effective diffusion constant the m -only diffusion constant multiplied by the factor $\xi = \chi_m/\chi_M$.

Figure 1 presents γ/r for no decay to the lattice, as a function of k^2/k_M^2 , for $\xi = 0.1, 0.3, 0.9$. The upper values are γ^+ and the lower values are γ^- .

2. Significant Lattice Decay

With lattice decay included, the results are a simple quadratic with complicated coefficients. To display it, we employ the rates

$$w_m = \frac{1}{\tau_{mL}}, \quad w_M = \frac{1}{\tau_{ML}}, \quad (38)$$

where $w_m, w_M \rightarrow 0$ as the lattice decay rates go to zero. Then

γ is

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\tau} + Dk^2. \quad (40)$$

This is to be contrasted with the predicted behavior with both M and m .

C. Spatial Response

Now consider that the system is subject to oscillation at a known real frequency ω , so $dM, dm \sim e^{-i\omega t}$. This can be done, e.g., by injecting an ac spin current into the system. The spatial response of dM and dm can be obtained




FIG. 2. Eigenrates γ relative to exchange-driven rate r , versus wavevector ratio $(k/k_M)^2$, for three susceptibility ratios ξ . Lattice decay rates w_m and w_M are neglected. For r and ξ see (7); for wavevector k_M see (31). The respective upper and lower values are γ^+ and γ^- .




FIG. 3. Eigenrates γ relative to exchange-driven rate r , versus wavevector ratio $(k/k_M)^2$, for three $M \rightarrow L$ lattice decay rates w_M relative to r . We take susceptibility ratio $\xi = 0.01$ and $m \rightarrow L$ lattice decay rate w_m relative to r of $w_m/r = 0.05$. For rate r and ξ see (7); for wavevector k_M see (31). The respective upper and lower values are γ^+ and γ^- .

by inverting the dispersion relation with γ replaced by $i\omega$. In general there will be a pair of complex values $k^+ = k_-$, with a simple dependence on ω but with complicated coefficients.




FIG. 4. Eigenrates γ relative to exchange-driven rate r , versus wavevector ratio $(k/k_M)^2$, for three $M \rightarrow L$ lattice decay rates w_M relative to r . We take susceptibility ratio $\xi = 0.09$ and $m \rightarrow L$ lattice decay rate w_m relative to r of $w_m/r = 0.05$. For rate r and ξ see (7); for wavevector k_M see (31). The respective upper and lower values are γ^+ and γ^- .

1. Slow Lattice Decay

For $\tau_{ML}, \tau_{mL} \rightarrow \infty$ we get

$$\frac{k^2}{k_M^2} = i \frac{\omega}{r} \frac{\omega + ir}{\omega + i\xi r}. \quad (41)$$

This is a pair of complex values $\pm k$, one exponentially growing and one exponentially decaying, with associated oscillations. Simple as this is, it is more complex than for a single degree of freedom, given in (37).

For $\omega \ll \xi r$ we have

$$\frac{k^2}{k_M^2} \rightarrow \frac{i\omega}{\xi r}, \quad (42)$$

and for $\omega \gg r$ we have

$$\frac{k^2}{k_M^2} \rightarrow \frac{i\omega}{r}, \quad (43)$$

Once the eigenvalues are found, the eigenmodes, which give the relative amounts of dm and dM , can be determined. As usual, the physics is in the eigenmodes.

2. Significant Lattice Decay

For completeness we present k^2 when lattice decay is included, where w_m and w_M are defined in (38). Other than the dimensionless ξ , all symbols are rates:

$$\frac{k^2}{k_M^2} = -\frac{w_m}{r} - \frac{(i\omega + r)(i\omega + w_M)}{r(i\omega - \xi w_M + w_M + \xi r)}. \quad (44)$$

Figure 4 presents the wavevector k ; the solid line is the real part (oscillation) and the dashed line is the imaginary part (decay).




FIG. 5. Wavevector k : real part is solid line and imaginary part is dashed line. We take $m \rightarrow L$ lattice decay rate w_m relative to r of $w_m/r = 0.05$. We take three $M \rightarrow L$ lattice decay rates relative to r , or w_M/r .

IV. SUMMARY

We have argued that a ferromagnet has two longitudinal variables: the usual magnetization M — due to a statistical equilibrium distribution that cannot diffuse; and the spin accumulation m — due to a statistical non-equilibrium distribution that can diffuse.

By requiring that the phenomenological energy density be minimized for $M_{eq} = M_0 + \chi_M H$ and $m_{eq} = 0$, we find a new phenomenological

exchange term between M and m , of the form $-\lambda_M(M - M_0)m$, that satisfies $\lambda_M = -\chi_M^{-1}$.

Using the methods of Onsager's irreversible thermodynamics, we have found the equations of motion for M and m , and have related the spin current to gradients of the deviation from local equilibrium δm .

We then studied the time decay for this system subject to an imposed real wavevector k , finding two rather than one decay mode; and the spatial decay of such a system subject to an imposed real frequency ω , finding a single modes (as for a single one magnetic variable), but with a more complex frequency dependence than for simple diffusion. The single degree of freedom theory has only one time-decay mode γ , and a space-decay mode with a simpler dependence on frequency.

It would be of great interest to have experimental studies of these predictions.

V. IMPLICATIONS

Other ordered systems may have this property. For example, a superconductor has a non-zero pair order parameter Δ ; we argue that it can decay (as is known) but cannot diffuse; but the non-equilibrium pair order parameter δ can both decay and diffuse. Of course there are strong non-dissipative restoring forces acting when Δ is out of equilibrium, and these will tend to mask the effect analogous to what we have studied for M and m .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the organizers of the 7th Front Range Advanced Magnetism Symposium for the opportunity to present an early version of this work. C. S. is supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities from China.

* wsaslow@tamu.edu

† chensun@hnu.edu.cn

‡ slxu@tamu.edu

- ¹ M. I. Dyakonov and V. I. Perel, Sov. Phys. JETP Lett. 13, 467 (1971), “Possibility of Orienting Electron Spins with Current.”
- ² M. I. Dyakonov and V. I. Perel, Phys. Lett. A 35, 459 (1971), “Current-induced Spin Orientation of Electrons in Semiconductors.”
- ³ P. Monod, H. Hurdequint, and A. Janossy, J. Obert, and J. Chaumont, Phys. Rev. Lett. 29, 1327 (1972), “Giant Electron Spin-Resonance Transmission in Cu Ion Implanted with Mn.”
- ⁴ R. H. Silsbee, A. Janossy, and P. Monod, Phys. Rev. B 19, 4382 (1979), “Coupling between ferromagnetic and conduction-spin-resonance modes at a ferromagnetic-normal-metal interface.” This work may mark the first appearance of the exchange term involving itinerant and localized spins in a single material. However, it is based on an *s-d* model rather than a band model, which is more suitable to Fermi liquid theory. Ref. 5 gives an earlier, related model for alloys.
- ⁵ H. Hasegawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. 21, 483 (1959). “Dynamical Properties of *s-d* Interaction”. This gives an *s-d* model with conduction *s* electrons attributed to the Cu host and localized *d* electrons attributed to the Mn impurity. Only uniform electron spin resonance was considered, so conduction was not an issue
- ⁶ M. Johnson and R. H. Silsbee, Phys. Rev. B 35, 4959-4972 (1987), “Coupling of electronic charge and spin at a ferromagnetic-paramagnetic metal interface”. Their Appendix B analyzes a spin injection experiment assuming only a single longitudinal magnetic variable, with spin-current continuity boundary condition.
- ⁷ M. Johnson and R. H. Silsbee, Phys. Rev. B 37, 5312-5325 (1988), “Thermodynamic analysis of interfacial transport and of the thermomagnetolectric system.”
- ⁸ T. Valet and A. Fert, Phys. Rev. B 48, 7099 (1993), “Theory of the perpendicular magnetoresistance in magnetic multilayers.”
- ⁹ S. Zhang, P. M. Levy, and A. Fert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 236601 (2002), “Mechanisms of Spin-Polarized Current-Driven Magnetization Switching”.
- ¹⁰ J. Zhang, P. M. Levy, S. Zhang, and V. Antropov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 256602 (2004), “Identification of Transverse Spin Currents in Noncollinear Magnetic Structures.”
- ¹¹ W. M. Saslow, Phys. Rev. B 95, 184407 (2017), “Irreversible thermodynamics of uniform ferromagnets with spin accumulation: Bulk and interface dynamics.”
- ¹² C. Sun and W. M. Saslow, Phys. Rev. B 99, 104435 (2019), “Transverse surface modes in ferromagnets: Coupled \vec{M} and \vec{m} .”
- ¹³ As the size of the system decreases, the possibility of diffusion increases. We nevertheless think that even for nanometer sized systems, where other and unforeseen statistical effects may become important, diffusion is unlikely.
- ¹⁴ A. J. Leggett, J. Phys. C 3, 448 (1970), “Spin diffusion and spin echoes in liquid ^3He at low temperature”.
- ¹⁵ W. M. Saslow, C. Sun, S. Xu, “Transverse Response of Itinerant Magnets: Kinetic Theory”, in preparation.
- ¹⁶ L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. 37, 405 (1931), “Reciprocal Relations in Irreversible Processes I.”
- ¹⁷ L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. 38, 2265 (1931), “Reciprocal Relations in Irreversible Processes II.”