Skyrmion on Magnetic Tunnel Junction: Interweaving Quantum Transport with Micro-magnetism

Aashish Chahal and Abhishek Sharma^{*}

Department of Electrical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Ropar(Punjab, India)

(Dated: April 18, 2024)

Over the last two decades, non-trivial magnetic textures, especially the magnetic skyrmion family, have been extensively explored out of fundamental interest, and diverse possible applications. Given the possible technological and scientific ramifications of skyrmion-texture on magnetic tunnel junction (ST-MTJ), in this work, we present non-equilibrium Green's function (NEGF) based description of ST-MTJs both for Néel and Bloch textures, to capture the spin/charge current across different voltages, temperatures, and sizes. We predict the emergence of a textured spin current from the uniform layer of the ST-MTJs, along with a radially varying, asymmetrical voltage dependence of spin torque. We delineate the voltage-induced rotation of the spin current texture, coupled with the appearance of helicity in spin current, particularly in the case of Néel skyrmions on MTJs. We describe the TMR roll-off in ST-MTJ with lower cross-sectional area and higher temperature based on transmission spectra analysis. We also introduce a computationally efficient coupled spatioeigen framework of NEGF to address the 3D-NEGF requirement of the ST-MTJs. With analytical underpinning, we establish the generic nature of the spatio-eigen framework of NEGF, alleviating the sine-qua-non of the 3D-NEGF for systems that lack transnational invariance and simultaneous eigen-basis in the transverse directions.

I. INTRODUCTION

The rise of topological magnetic textures such as merons, skyrmions, bimerons, antiskyrmions, skyrmioniums, hopfions, chiral bobbers to name a few[1], at the nano-scale has sparked a cascade of opportunities-from fundamental exploration to a myriad of practical applications. The magnetic skyrmions [2–6], particularly notable for their stable vortex-like spin textures and nontrivial topology [7], have garnered significant attention for their technologically relevance. These micromagnetic structures manifest particle-like attributes attributed to their topological stability and nanometer-scale dimensions [8]. The combination of these characteristics, coupled with a low depinning current density, [9] and the capability for electrical manipulation and detection [10], positions magnetic skyrmions as highly auspicious candidates for the development of next-generation memory and processing devices. Consequently, many skyrmion based applications have been proposed such as nano-oscillators [11], racetrack memories [12], logic gates [13, 14], neuromorphic computing [15, 16], and transistors [17]. Recent works [18, 19] based on the quantization of the helicity have delineated the potential of skyrmions, merons [20] and domain-walls[21] for quantum computing. From a technological perspective, the electrical detection of skyrmions or magnetic textures via the tunnel magnetoresistance (TMR) in the magnetic tunnel junctions (MTJs) holds significant importance. The successful demonstration of nucleation and electrical detection of magnetic skyrmions in MTJs at room temperature [22– 26] marks a significant milestone in unlocking the potential of skyrmions. A uniform-textured (UT) MTJ comprises two ferromagnets (FMs) with uniform magnetization separated by an insulator (MgO) [27], as depicted in Fig. 1(a). UT-MTJs have garnered significant attention primarily due to their notable TMR and spin transfer torque effect. Moreover, the early theoretical predictions unveiling the non-trivial voltage dependence of the spin current in UT-MTJs [28, 29] further elevated their importance. These revelations laid the groundwork for subsequent experimental validations [30, 31], sparking thorough investigations into device behavior. Moreover, these phenomena have not only inspired comprehensive studies but have also significantly influenced the design of various applications relying on UT-MTJs[32–36]. For the device like UT-MTJ, the Non-equilibrium Green's Function (NEGF) based quantum transport [37], coupled with the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert (LLG) equation [38], provides a robust framework for comprehending the dynamic interplay between charge/spin transport and magnetization dynamics of nano-magnet [33, 39].

Given the substantial technological implications associated with the skyrmion texture on the magnetic tunnel junctions (ST-MTJs), in this work, we present quantum transport interwoven with micromagnetic textures to capture the non-equilibrium dynamics of spin/charge current of ST-MTJs (Fig. 1(b)). Our work predicts the emergence of a textured spin current from the uniform top layer of ST-MTJs, accompanied by an asymmetrical voltage dependence. Additionally, we demonstrate a voltage-induced rotation of the spin current texture, coupled with the emergence of helicity, particularly observed in the case of Néel skyrmions.

To address the formidable task of solving the 3D-NEGF for the ST-MTJ, we introduce 'spatio-eigen' approach of the NEGF. The necessity for solving the 3D NEGF for the ST-MTJ arises due to the absence of

^{*} abhishek@iitrpr.ac.in

translations symmetry and the lack of a simultaneous eigen basis of the contacts and channel along the transverse direction to the transport (refer to the methodology section). The computationally efficient spatio-eigen approach of NEGF is not limited to MTJ-like devices with skyrmions but is generic in nature, alleviating the need for 3D NEGF. This approach remains agnostic about the transnational symmetry and commutativity of the device Hamiltonian along the transverse direction.

II. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we detail the non-equilibrium Green's function (NEGF) based quantum transport along with micro-magnetism. We present two devices: the uniform magnetic textured magnetic tunnel junction (UT-MTJ) device, consisting of an insulating channel (MgO) sandwiched between two ferromagnetic (FM) layers with spatially uniform magnetization texture, and the magnetic skyrmion textured magnetic tunnel junction (ST-MTJ), in which one FM layer exhibits uniform magnetization, and the other layer features a magnetic Skyrmion, as depicted in Fig. 1.

The model tight-binding Hamiltonian for the system of Fig. 1 is,

$$H = \sum_{i} c_{i}^{\dagger} \epsilon_{i} c_{i} + \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (c_{i}^{\dagger} t_{0} c_{j} + \text{H.c.}) - \delta \sum_{i} c_{i}^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{i} c_{i}, \quad (1)$$

Here i, j are the site indices, and $\langle i, j \rangle$ indicates a sum over all nearest neighbors, $c_i = [c_{i,\uparrow} c_{i,\downarrow}]^{\mathrm{T}}$ is the spinor annihilation operator, \mathbf{m}_i is the localized spin, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i$ is the electron spin and ϵ_i is an on-site energy term at site i, δ is the spin coupling and t_0 is the nearest neighbor hopping term. The Non-equilibrium Green's function (NEGF) can be utilized to calculate the spin/charge current of the devices (Fig. 1) with retarded Green's function and transmission are given by:

$$G_{B}(E) = [E - H - \Sigma_{T}(E) - \Sigma_{B}(E)]^{-1}$$
(2)

$$T_{\sigma,\sigma_0}(E) = \operatorname{trace} \left\{ \Gamma_T^{\sigma,\sigma} G_B^{\sigma,\sigma_0} \Gamma_B^{\sigma_0,\sigma_0} G_A^{\sigma_0,\sigma} \right\}$$
(3)

where, $\Sigma_{T/B}$ represents self-energies of top/bottom FM contacts with $G_A = G_R^{\dagger}$ and $\Gamma_{T/B} = -2 \text{Im} \Sigma_{T/B}$. The translation symmetry in the UT-MTJs like devices, along the transverse direction (i.e orthogonal to the transport) is generally utilized through Bloch expansion [40, 41] to manage the computational complexity of the NEGF method. But, the absence of such symmetry in ST-MTJs disrupts the notion of crystal momentum as a good quantum number, making Bloch expansion inapplicable. To address the heavily computational demand of 3D NEGF for ST-MJTs like devices, we proposed coupled spacio-eigen method of NEGF which leverage on the finite bandwidth of incoming electron excitation to significantly reduce the computationally complexity while retaining the same physical description. The spatio-eigen approach for NEGF can be applied in both cases, regardless of whether the system exhibits orthogonal translation symmetry along the direction perpendicular to the transport. In this approach of the NEGF decomposes, the Hamiltonian of the device is described in spatial basis (e.g., tight-binding or LCAO [41]) along the transport direction and in the eigen basis along the orthogonal direction to the transport. We delineate both the decoupled and coupled spatio-eigen approaches of NEGF. Additionally, we provide analytical groundwork to illustrate that these approaches yield identical physics to that of the more computationally intensive full 3D-NEGF method



FIG. 1. Schematics of (a) UT-MTJ with uniform magnetization of top/bottom FMs and (b) ST-MTJ hosting skyrmion in bottom FM.

We utilized the finite difference tight-binding model for the device Hamiltonian with first nearest neighbor interaction [42]. The device consists of N lattice points in the direction of transport (\hat{z}) , which includes the channel/insulator region (N-4 points), with one layer from both the ferromagnetic layers (2 points), and one layer representing the interaction between the ferromagnetic and insulator interface for both the ferromagnetic layers (2 points). Both ferromagnetic contacts have been described using the Stoner model of ferromagnetism with ferromagnetic exchange energy (δ) [43], effective mass (m_{FM}^*) , and Fermi energy (E_f) . To facilitate numerical implementation, we rewrite Eq.1 using the notation adopted in [37]. In this notation, the Hamiltonian (H_0) is represented as a block matrix of size $N \times N$, where each block has dimensions of $P \times P$. Here, P = 2LM, with L and M denoting the number of points along the \hat{x} and \hat{y} directions, respectively. Additionally, a factor of 2

is included to accommodate the spin degree of freedom.

$$[H_0] = \begin{pmatrix} H_B^{FM} & \tau_B^{FM} & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \tau_B^{\dagger FM} & H_I^{B \to C} & \tau_C & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & \tau_C^{\dagger} & H^C & \tau_C & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 0 & \tau_C^{\dagger} & H^C & \tau_C & 0 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & \tau_C^{\dagger} & H_I^{C \to T} & \tau_T^{FM} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & \tau_T^{\dagger FM} & H_T^{FM} & , \end{cases}$$
(4)

Here, H_B^{FM} and H_T^{FM} are onsite energy matrices in the transverse directions $(\hat{x} \text{ and } \hat{y})$ for the ferromagnetic bottom and top contacts, respectively, and can be written as:

$$H_{B/T}^{FM} = (H_t^{FM} + 2\operatorname{t_m} \mathbf{I}_x \otimes \mathbf{I}_y) \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 + \Delta_{B/T} \qquad (5a)$$

$$H_t^{FM} = H_x^{FM} \otimes \mathbf{I}_y + \mathbf{I}_x \otimes H_y^{FM}$$
(5b)

 \mathbf{I}_x , \mathbf{I}_y , and \mathbf{I}_2 are identity matrices of order $L \times L$, $M \times M$, and 2×2 , respectively. $H_{x/y}$ is the tight-binding Hamiltonian of order $L/M \times L/M$ along the \hat{x}/\hat{y} direction, given by:

$$[H_{x/y}^{FM}]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 2t_m, & i = j, \\ -t_m, & i = j \pm 1, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$
(6)

Where $t_m = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_{\rm FM}^* a^2}$, \hbar is the reduced Planck constant, $m_{\rm FM}^*$ is the effective mass of the ferromagnetic material, and a is the lattice spacing or discretization step. The spin-dependent exchange energy $\Delta_{B/T}$ of the bottom/top ferromagnetic layer with magnetization texture is given by:

$$\Delta_{B/T} = \delta \frac{\mathbf{I}_x \otimes \mathbf{I}_y \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 - M_{B/T}}{2} \tag{7}$$

Where δ is the ferromagnetic exchange energy, and $M_{B/T}$ is a diagonal matrix of order $P \times P$, describing the spatial variation of the magnetization of the bottom/top contact, given by:

$$[M_{B/T}]_{ij}^{ij} = \hat{m}(x_i, y_j, z_{B/T}).\sigma$$
(8)

Where $[MT]^{ij}ij$ is a 2 × 2 matrix, $\vec{\sigma}$ represents Pauli's matrices, and $\hat{m}(x_i, y_j, z_{B/T})$ is the spatially varying unit vector of magnetization of the bottom/top ferromagnetic layer. The $\tau_{B/T}^{FM}$ is the spin-dependent coupling matrix of the bottom/top ferromagnetic layer, given by:

$$\tau_{B/T}^{FM} = -t_m(\mathbf{I}_x \otimes \mathbf{I}_y \otimes \mathbf{I}_2).$$
(9)

Similarly, H^C is the onsite energy matrix in the transverse direction of the channel and is given by:

$$H^C = (H_t^C + 2\operatorname{t_c} \mathbf{I}_x \otimes \mathbf{I}_y) \otimes \mathbf{I}_2$$
(10a)

$$H_t^C = H_x^C \otimes \mathbf{I}_y + \mathbf{I}_x \otimes H_y^C \tag{10b}$$

 $t_c = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_c^*a^2}$ represents the site-to-site hopping energy of the channel with an effective mass m_c^* . The spin-dependent coupling matrix of the channel region is given by:

$$\tau_C = -t_c(\mathbf{I}_x \otimes \mathbf{I}_y \otimes \mathbf{I}_2). \tag{11}$$

 $H_I^{B\to C}$ and $H_I^{C\to T}$ are the spin-dependent on-site energy matrices of the interface between the channel and the ferromagnetic material, given by:

$$H_I^{B \to C/C \to T} = \left[H_t^I + (t_c + t_m) \mathbf{I}_x \otimes \mathbf{I}_y \right] \otimes \mathbf{I}_2 \quad (12a)$$

$$H_t^I = H_x^I \otimes \mathbf{I}_y + \mathbf{I}_x \otimes H_y^I \tag{12b}$$

 $H_{x/y}^{I}$ is the tight-binding Hamiltonian of order $L/M \times L/M$ along the \hat{x}/\hat{y} direction at the interface, given by:

$$[H_{x/y}^{I}]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} t_m + t_c, & i = j, \\ -(t_m + t_c)/2, & i = j \pm 1, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$
(13)

The self-energy matrix within the 3D-NEGF framework for the device, with its Hamiltonian defined by Eq. 4, can be articulated as

$$\Sigma_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \Sigma_B, & i = j = 1, \\ \Sigma_T, & i = j = N, \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$
(14)

Here, Σ and $\Sigma_{B/T}$ matrices of order $NP \times NP$ and $P \times P$, respectively. The broadening matrices corresponding to both the FMs can be expressed using self energy matrix as

$$\Gamma_{B/T} = i(\Sigma_{B/T} - \Sigma_{B/T}^{\dagger}) \tag{15}$$

The spin and charge current of device can be calculated using transmission operator T_{op} given by

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{op}(E) = (\Gamma_T \otimes E_{NN})G(\Gamma_B \otimes E_{11})G^{\dagger} \qquad (16)$$

where, E_{11} & E_{NN} are the matrix unit, matrices of order $N \times N$.

The charge current and spin current are calculated by integrating the trace of the transmission operator over the energy.

$$I = \frac{q^2}{\hbar} \int dE \operatorname{Re}\left[\operatorname{Tr}\left(\hat{T}_{op}\right)\right] (f_T(E) - f_B(E)), \quad (17)$$

$$I_{S\sigma} = \frac{q^2}{\hbar} \int dE \operatorname{Re} \left[\operatorname{Tr} \left(\sigma \cdot \hat{T}_{op} \right) \right] (f_T(E) - f_B(E)), \quad (18)$$

Where $f_B(E)$ and $f_T(E)$ are the Fermi–Dirac distributions of the bottom/free ferromagnetic (FM) and top/fixed FM contacts, respectively.

A. Uniform Magnetization and Decoupled Spacio-Eigen Approach of NEGF

We first outline the decoupled spatio-eigen approach of NEGF to address the formidable computational demands of solving large 3D systems such as UT-MTJs. If both the FMs have uniform magnetization, then their exchange energy matrix can be written as:

$$\Delta_{B/T} = \mathbf{I}_x \otimes \ \mathbf{I}_y \otimes \left[\delta \left(\frac{\mathbf{I}_2 - \hat{m}_{B/T} . \sigma}{2} \right) \right]$$
(19)

 $\hat{m}_{B/T}$ is the directions of magnetization of bottom/top contact and δ is exchange splitting energy. In the case of uniform magnetization, the Hamiltonian in transverse direction H_B^{FM} & H_T^{FM} (see Eq. 5) can be simultaneously block-diagonalized up to spin-dependent block. The Hamiltonian components independent of the spinsplitting terms H_t^{FM} , H_t^C , and H_t^I in Eqs.5, 10, and 12 can be simultaneously diagonalized with their eigenvalues denoted as ϵ_i^{FM} , ϵ_i^C , and ϵ_i^I , respectively.



FIG. 2. Transformation of UT-MTJ from real space basis to spatio-eigen basis

The off-diagonal elements in the tight-binding Hamiltonian (Eq. 6) along the transverse directions represent connections between two lattice points in the transverse direction. Through the simultaneous diagonalization of the transverse Hamiltonian matrices, i.e., H_t^{FM} , H_t^C , H_t^I , our device (UT-MTJ) is effectively partitioned into multiple decoupled spin-dependent 1-D channels, each corresponding to different eigenvalues along the transverse direction. This enables us to formulate NEGF equations

in a decoupled spatio-eigen basis for each 1-D channel independently (2).

In this context, the Hamiltonian for each of these eigenmodes (i) is represented by:

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_0^i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_B^{FM} & \beta_B^{FM} & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \beta_B^{\dagger FM} & \alpha_I^{B \to C} & \beta_C & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & \beta_C^{\dagger} & \alpha_C & \beta_C & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & 0 & \beta_C^{\dagger} & \alpha_C & \beta_C & 0 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & 0 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & 0 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & \beta_C^{\dagger} & \alpha_I^{C \to T} & \beta_T^{FM} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 0 & \beta_T^{\dagger FM} & \alpha_T^{FM} \end{pmatrix}$$
(20)

where α_B^{FM} , $\alpha_I^{B\to C}$, α^C , $\alpha_I^{C\to T}$, and α_T^{FM} are spindependent on-site energy matrices of the bottom FM, interface between the bottom FM and the channel region, channel, interface between the channel and the top FM contact, respectively, given by:

$$\alpha_{B/T}^{FM} = \left(2t_m + \epsilon_i^{FM}\right)\mathbf{I}_2 + \Delta_{B/T}^{2\times 2} \tag{21a}$$

$$\alpha_I^{B \to C/C \to T} = \left(t_c + t_m + \epsilon_i^I \right) \mathbf{I}_2 \tag{21b}$$

$$\alpha^C = \left(2t_c + \epsilon_i^C\right) \mathbf{I}_2 \tag{21c}$$

Where the spin-splitting energy matrix for these spatio-eigen modes is given by $\Delta_{B/T}^{2\times 2} = \delta \frac{\mathbf{I}_2 - \hat{m}_{B/T} . \sigma}{2}$, as shown in Eq. 19. The matrices $\beta_{B/T}^{FM}$ and β^C are the spin-dependent coupling matrices of the bottom/top FM contact and channel, respectively, given by:

$$\beta_{B/T}^{FM} = -t_m \mathbf{I}_2 \tag{22a}$$

$$\beta^C = -t_c \mathbf{I}_2. \tag{22b}$$

Now, this recasting of the Hamiltonian (H_0) allows one to solve NEGF for each eigen (i) 1D-channel independently. The non-equilibrium Green's function of each channel (i)can be written as:

$$[G^{i}(E)] = [E\mathbf{I} - (H_{0}^{i} + U) - \Sigma^{i}]^{-1}, \qquad (23)$$

where, the self energy matrix Σ^i sigma is give by

$$\Sigma_{mn}^{i} = \begin{cases} \Sigma_{B}^{i}, & m = n = 1, \\ \Sigma_{T}^{i}, & m = n = N, \\ 0_{2,2}, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$
(24)

Assuming the reflection-less contact with an openboundary condition, each term of the self-energy can be written as:

5

$$\Sigma_{B/T}^{i} = -t_m R_{B/T} \begin{bmatrix} \exp\left(ik_{B/T}^{\uparrow,i}a\right) & 0\\ 0 & \exp\left(ik_{B/T}^{\downarrow,i}a\right) \end{bmatrix} R_{B/T}^{\dagger}$$
(25)

where $R_{B/T}$ is a spinor rotation matrix that rotates self-energy matrices from \hat{z} to along the direction of magnetization of the bottom/top contactf. The $k_{B/T}^{\uparrow\downarrow,i}$ are related to the spin-dependent E - k relation inside the FM as:

$$E = \epsilon_i^{FM} + u_{B/T} + 2t_m \left(1 - \cos k_{B/T}^{\uparrow,i} a \right), \qquad (26a)$$

$$E = \epsilon_i^{FM} + \delta + u_{B/T} + 2t_m \left(1 - \cos k_{B/T}^{\downarrow,i} a\right) \quad (26b)$$

Where $u_{B/T}$ is the potential at the bottom/top contact. The charge and spin current can be calculated by adding the current of each individual mode as:

$$I = \frac{q^2}{\hbar} \int dE \sum_i \operatorname{Re} \left[\operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{T}_{op}^i \right) \right] (f_T(E) - f_B(E)), \quad (27)$$

The major computational advantage of the spatio-eigen approach emerges from the fact that we need not solve NEGF for all eigen (i) 1D-channels to capture current. It can be deduced from Eq. 26 that for a specific energy (E), if:

$$|1 - \frac{E - \delta - \epsilon_i^{FM} - u_{B/T}}{2t_m}| > 1$$
(28)

Then, $k_{B/T}^{\uparrow\downarrow,i}$ becomes purely imaginary, resulting in the reduction of $[\Gamma_T^i]$ and $[\Gamma_B^i]$ to zero. It leads to the disappearance of current flow (Eq. 27) from the contact to the channel. Consequently, the higher eigen (*i*) 1D-channel does not contribute to the current flow, allowing for the restriction of any NEGF calculation beyond a certain eigenvalue.

The decrease in current at higher eigen-energy levels can be explained by the eigenvalues associated with specific eigenbasis/mode represent the electron's energy in the transverse direction. As a result, when the transverse energy exceeds E, the contribution to the current from each mode rapidly diminishes. This understanding drives the development of a more efficient approach, focusing exclusively on contributions from lower energy levels to enhance computational efficiency.

B. Micromagnetic Texture and Coupled Spacio-Eigen Approach of NEGF

The NEGF's decoupled spacio-eigen approach encounter difficulties in cases involving an MTJ with ferromagnetic contacts featuring micromagnetic textures, like magnetic skyrmions etc [1]. The challenge arises because

the transverse Hamiltonian of the contacts, denoted as ${\cal H}_B^{FM}$ and ${\cal H}_T^{FM},$ can no longer be block-diagonalized simultaneously to a smaller order matrix (see Eq.5). This results in the breakdown of the decoupled spatio-eigen approach of NEGF. However, the central argument from the above section-namely, the vanishing contribution of higher modes in current—can still be leveraged for the efficient NEGF calculation of MTJs with non-uniform magnetization textures. It can be noted that the earlier effort to combine quantum transport with micromagnetism by P. Flauger et al. [44], overlooked the simultaneous diagonalization of the transverse Hamiltonian. This oversight limits the applicability of their formalism to large micromagnetic structures at best. Whereas, the methodology described in this section can be applied to any transverse Hamiltonian of the contacts that does not preserve translational symmetry in the transverse directions. The spin/charge current is calculated by taking the trace of the transmission matrix, hence the part of transmission operator which is involved in the trace (see Eq. 15 & 16), reduces to

$$T_{\rm op}\left(E\right) = \left(\Gamma_T\right)\left(G_{N,1}\right)\left(\Gamma_B\right)\left(G_{N,1}^{\dagger}\right) \tag{29}$$

Here, $G_{N,1}$ represents the element (a sub-matrix of order $P \times P$) at the Nth row (last row) and 1st column of the NEGF's matrix. Note that the transverse Hamiltonian for the bottom (H_B^{FM}) and top (H_T^{FM}) contacts are not simultaneously diagonalizable. However, the transverse Hamiltonian of the channel (H^C) and the top contact (H_T^{FM}) can be simultaneously diagonalized. In the coupled spatio-eigen approach of NEGF, we choose the simultaneous eigen vectors of H_T^{FM} & H^C as the transverse eigen-basis $(|\epsilon_i\rangle)$ to re-cast the device (contacts+channel) transverse Hamiltonians and the coupling matrices (see Eqs. 9 & 11). In the transverse eigen-basis, H_T^{FM} and H^C are transformed to their respective eigen matrices ϵ_T^{FM} and ϵ^C , while the coupling matrices remain intact. Whereas, the non-commutative nature between the transverse Hamiltonians of the bottom contact $({\cal H}^{FM}_{\cal B})$ and the top contact $({\cal H}^{FM}_{\cal T})$ results in ${\cal H}^{FM}_{\cal B}$ transformation to a non-diagonal matrix in the transverse eigen-basis(3)

$$H_B^{FM} = \mathbf{U}^{\dagger} \epsilon_B^{FM} \mathbf{U} \tag{30}$$

$$\mathbf{U}_{i,j} = \langle \epsilon_i' | \epsilon_j \rangle \tag{31}$$

where, $|\epsilon'_i\rangle$ and $|\epsilon_i\rangle$ are the eigen-basis set of the bottom contact and the transverse eigen-basis set, respectively.

Since the coupling matrices remain intact in the trasverse eigen-basis, the device in the spacio-eigen approach of NEGF can be envision as shown in the Fig. 3. The self-energy matrix for the top contact in the transverse eigen-basis take diagonal form, articulated as

$$\Sigma_{T(i,j)} = \begin{cases} -t_m \exp\left(ik_T^i a\right), & i = j, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$
(32)



FIG. 3. Transformation of ST-MTJ from real space basis to spatio-eigen basis

$$E = \epsilon_{T,i}^{FM} + u_T + 2t_m \left(1 - \cos k_T^i a\right).$$
(33)

Here, $\epsilon_{T,i}^{FM}$ represents the transverse eigenvalue of the top contact. The broadening matrix $[\Gamma_T]i, i = [\Sigma_T]i, i - [\Sigma^{\dagger}T]_{i,i}$ also takes on a diagonal form. In the context of a decoupled scenario, In the context of a decoupled scenario, it is observed that the expression $e^{ik_T a}$ transforms into a fully real value beyond a specific transverse eigenvalue. As a result, the associated entries for these transverse energies in the broadening matrix become zero. This leads to two distinct sets of eigenvalues: the 'relevant' set, actively contributing to transmission, and the 'irrelevant' set, which does not play a role in conduction. Consequently, the transverse eigen matrices of the top FM can be neatly organized into block matrices of size 2×2

$$\epsilon_T^{FM} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_{rev}^T & 0\\ 0 & \epsilon_{irr}^T \end{pmatrix} \tag{34}$$

In this context, ϵ_{rev}^T encompasses all the eigenvalues of the top contact below a threshold energy, beyond which both $e^{ik_T a}$ and $e^{ik_B a}$ become purely real. The remaining eigenvalues are included in ϵ_{irr}^T . A similar partition is applied to the eigenvalues of the bottom contact. With this separation, the broadening matrix of the top contact is simplified to:

$$\Gamma_T = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{rel}^T & 0\\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{35}$$

The self-energy matrix for the bottom contact can be obtained by transforming the self-energy (Σ'_B) to the trans-

verse eigen basis using the unitary transformation as described by the Eq. 31.

$$\Sigma_B = \mathbf{U}^{\dagger} \Sigma_B^{\prime} \mathbf{U} \tag{36}$$

where, Σ'_B is self energy of the bottom contact in $|\epsilon'_i\rangle$ eigen basis, given by

$$\Sigma'_{B(i,j)} = \begin{cases} -t_m \exp\left(ik_B^i a\right), & i = j, \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$
(37)

$$E = \epsilon_{B,i}^{FM} + u_B + 2t_m \left(1 - \cos k_B^i a \right).$$
 (38)

where, $\epsilon_{B,i}^{FM}$ is transverse eigen value of the bottom contact. Employing the same rationale as presented in the equation in Eig. 35, the broadening matrix of the bottom contact in the traverse eigen-basis can be written as

$$\Gamma_B = \mathbf{U}^{\dagger} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{rev}^{'B} & 0\\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}.$$
 (39)

If we partition the matrix **U** into block matrices akin to Γ and Σ , the aforementioned equation can be expressed as

$$\Gamma_B = \begin{pmatrix} U_{11}^+ & U_{21}^+ \\ U_{12}^+ & U_{22}^+ \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{rel}^{'B} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U_{11} & U_{12} \\ U_{21} & U_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$
(40)

which, simplifies to

$$\Gamma_B = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{11} & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{21} & \Gamma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$
(41)

Similarly, the matrix $G_{N,1}$ can be represented in a 2×2 block matrix as

$$G_{N,1} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{11} & g_{21} \\ g_{12} & g_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (42)

Using Eq. 35, 41 & 42, the transmission in Eq. 29 can be written as

$$T_{\rm op} (E) = \left(\Gamma_{rel}^{T}\right) (g_{11}) (\Gamma_{11}) \left(g_{11}^{\dagger}\right) + \left(\Gamma_{rel}^{T}\right) (g_{12}) (\Gamma_{21}) \left(g_{11}^{\dagger}\right) + \left(\Gamma_{rel}^{T}\right) (g_{11}) (\Gamma_{11}) \left(g_{12}^{\dagger}\right) + \left(\Gamma_{rel}^{T}\right) (g_{12}) (\Gamma_{21}) \left(g_{12}^{\dagger}\right)$$

$$(43)$$

The entries of unitary transformation \mathbf{U} from bottom contact to transverse eigen basis described by Eq. 31, represent the overlap of the eigenbases of the bottom and top contacts. Thus, we expect that eigenbases with similar wavelengths will exhibit higher overlap. As we move to lower/higher transverse energy eigenvectors (while keeping one eigenvalue constant in Eq. 31), we should observe a decrease in overlap. This decrease corresponds to the decrease/increase in wavelength for a given eigenvector. We expect \mathbf{U} to feature a region of high overlap near the diagonal (as the eigenvalues of both contacts are of the same order). Therefore, if we further divide U_{12} and U_{21} in block of 2×2 matrices, they are expected to have the

$$U_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0\\ u & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{44a}$$

$$U_{21} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u^{\dagger} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
(44b)

The equation suggests that the primary overlap occurs between the higher energy eigenvectors of the relevant set and the lower energy eigenvectors of the irrelevant set. This overlap can result in minor conduction within the irrelevant set. To mitigate this effect, we can ensure that certain additional relevant eigenvectors, which overlap with the irrelevant set, do not contribute to conduction themselves. This can be achieved by increasing the threshold for relevant eigenvalues. As a result, specific diagonal entries of the relevant broadening matrix $\Gamma^{B/T} rev$ are set to zero. This condition can be expressed as follows:

following form

$$\Gamma_{rev}^{'B/T} = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma & 0\\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (45)

Here, $\Gamma_{rev}^{'B/T}$ is also partitioned into block matrices, similar to U_{12} and U_{21} for the sake of clarity. Now, if we substitute the expressions from Eq. 45 and Eq. 44 into Eq. 41, it simplifies to:

$$\Gamma_B = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{11} & 0\\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{46a}$$

$$\Gamma_{11} = \mathbf{U}_{11}^{\dagger} \Gamma_{rel}^B \mathbf{U}_{11} \tag{46b}$$

Hence, the contributing expression of transmission is reduced to:

$$T_{\rm op}\left(E\right) = \left(\Gamma_{rel}^{T}\right)\left(g_{11}\right)\left(\Gamma_{11}\right)\left(g_{11}^{\dagger}\right). \tag{47}$$

We re-caste device Hamiltonian in spatio-eigen basis i.e transverse Hamiltonians and coupling matrices being in the simultaneous transverse eigen-basis of the top contact & channel. The inverse of the Green function can be represented as a 2×2 block matrix.

$$E\mathbf{I} - H - \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$$
(48)

$$A = E\mathbf{I} - H_B^{FM} - \Sigma_B' \tag{49a}$$

$$B = [t_m \mathbf{I} \mathbf{0} \dots \mathbf{0}] \tag{49b}$$

$$C = B^{\dagger} \tag{49c}$$

Where, D represents the rest of the matrix, which can be viewed as a block matrix of dimensions $N - 1 \times N - 1$, with each block having a dimension of $P \times P$, consistent with matrix A. Then, the matrix G_{1N} simplifies to (refer to the Appendices):

$$G_{1N} = -t_m (D_{N-1,1}^{-1}) (A - t_m^2 (D_{1,1})^{-1})^{-1}$$
(50)

As all blocks of D are diagonal matrices, both $(D^{-1})_{11}$ and $(D^{-1})_{N-1,1}$ are also diagonal matrices. Therefore, these matrices, along with matrices A, will be expressed in terms of relevant and irrelevant blocks as::

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{21} \\ a_{12} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix} \tag{51a}$$

$$D_{1,1}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0\\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix}$$
(51b)

$$D_{N-1,1}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & 0\\ 0 & e_2 \end{pmatrix}$$
(51c)

Since we are interested in g_{11} (see Eq. 42), we can expand the $G_{N,1}$ matrix into 2×2 blocks and replace A, $(D^{-1})_{11}$, and $(D^{-1})_{N-1,1}$ using Eq. 51. This allows us to obtain g_{11} using the inverse of a 2×2 block matrix (refer to the Appendix).

$$g_{11} = -t_m(e_1)(a_{11} - t_m^2 d_1 - a_{12}(a_{22} - d_2)a_{21})^{-1} \quad (52)$$

Expanding the expressions of a's using Eq. 49.a, we obtain:

$$g_{11} = -t_m(e_1)(U_{11}^{\dagger}(E\mathbf{I} - \epsilon_B^T - \Gamma_{rel}^B)U_{11} - \tau_m^2 d_1 + O(u^2))^{-1}$$
(53)

As evident from the analysis, the formula for g_{11} (and consequently, the transmission expression) has been simplified to matrices associated only with relevant eigenvalues. However, a factor contingent on the order of squares and beyond, dependent on matrix u, remains. As previously explained, matrix u characterizes the coupling between the higher relevant eigenbasis and the lower irrelevant basis. This factor diminishes as we elevate the relevance threshold, thereby minimizing its impact. Consequently, the transmission expression can be constructed solely from the relevant terms with appropriate eigen threshold. The spacio-eigen framework of the NEGF, presented, eliminates the necessity of solving the 3D NEGF, while preserving the system's physics under non-equilibrium conditions. The substantial reduction in computational requirements stems from the ability to fully construct the transmission operator using a set of



FIG. 4. (a) Current-Voltage characteristics in the PC and APC, (b) TMR variation with voltage, (c) TMR roll-off with temperature for both the ST-MTJ and UT-MTJ. (d) Transmission of the ST-MTJ in the PC (T_P) and APC (T_{AP}) along with the transmission difference $(T_D = T_P - T_{AP})$

'relevant' transverse eigen states of the system. It is noteworthy that the spacio-eigen framework of the NEGF is generic and capable of handling translationally 'variant' system provided that the system's Hamiltonian can be derived from the tensor sum of Hamiltonian (see Eq. 5).

III. MODELLING

Using the proposed framework of NEGF, we present spin/charge current in ST-MTJs with Bloch-type and Néel-type skyrmions. We have considered an MTJ diameter of 20 nm, with MgO of 1 nm thickness. We use a skyrmion with diameter is of 10 nm stabilized on material having saturation magnetization Ms = 580e3, exchange stiffness A = 15 pJ/m, the interfacial DMI constant D = 3.5 mJ/m², anisotropy constant $K_u = 1$ MJ/m³. During the scaling of the MTJ, we have proportional reduce the skyrmion size to understand the scaling effect, which may be potentially achieved via increased anisotropy/DMI [10]. We have used 0.8 m_e , 0.18 m_e , 2.25 eV, 2.15 eV as effective mass of electrons in MgO, FMs, Fermi energy and exchange splitting [39] of FMs, respectively.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We begin our analysis by examining the currentvoltage (IV) characteristics(Fig.4(a)) of the ST-MTJ in both the parallel (PC) and anti-parallel (APC) configurations. The PC/APC configuration refers to the relative orientation of the top uniform (U)-FM with respect to the



FIG. 5. Charge current density (A/m^2) profiles of the ST-MTJ with the UFM oriented in the (i) PC, (ii) APC and (iii) orthogonal to the core of the skyrmion for (a) Neel and (b) Bloch-type skyrmion, at 10 mV.

skyrmion core (Fig.1). Bloch and Néel-type skyrmions in the ST-MTJ exhibit identical I-V characteristics due to the equivalent azimuthal projections of the skyrmion texture onto the UFM in both the PC and APC. The higher current observed in the APC compared to the PC is attributed to a more positively projected skyrmion texture onto the UFM in the ST-MTJ. Spin texture-dependent tunneling in the ST-MTJ leads to higher resistance in the PC and lower resistance in the APC, as quantified by TMR.

$$TMR = \frac{R_P - R_{AP}}{R_{AP}} \times 100 \tag{54}$$

here, $R_{P/AP}$ represents the resistances in the PC/APC. Conventionally, in UT-MTJs, $TMR = (R_{AP} - R_P) \times 100/R_P$, as the resistance is higher in the APC than in the PC. The zero-voltage TMR is approximately 70%, notably less than half of the TMR offered by the UT-MTJ (Fig. 4(b)).

Figure 4(c) shows monotonic reduction ($\sim 11\%/19\%$) in the TMR of the ST/UT-MTJ with temperature (0-450K). The TMR in terms of the transmission coefficient can be expressed as:

$$TMR = \frac{\int T_D(E)(f_T - f_B)dE}{\int T_{AP}(E)(f_T - f_B)dE} \times 100$$
 (55)

where, $f_{T/B}$ is the Fermi function of the top/bottom contact. Initially, with an increase in temperature, the contribution to the numerator of Eq. 55 remains almost constant, as the Fermi window ($FW = f_T - f_B$) below/above the Fermi energy engulfs an increasing/decreasing transmission difference ($T_D = T_{AP} - T_P$), resulting in a slow roll-off in the TMR (see Fig. 4(c)&(d)). At higher temperatures as the FW crosses the energy point (2.13eV)



FIG. 6. Spin current density (A/m^2) (i) I_x , (ii) I_y , (iii) I_z at (a) zero volt bias and at (b)10mV bias for Neel-type skyrmion on the ST-MTJ.



FIG. 7. Spin current density (A/m^2) (i) I_x , (ii) I_y , (iii) I_z at (a) zero volt bias ,and at (b)10mV bias for Bloch-type skyrmion on the ST-MTJ.

corresponding to the $T_D(E)$ peak, the additional transmission difference contribution from broader FW starts to decrease with temperature, leading to a more pronounced TMR roll-off effect. The TMR roll-off with temperature in UT-MTJs can also be rationalized in the similar manner without invoking magnon scattering to the first order in contrast to the earlier works[45–47].

The charge current density depends on the azimuthal projection of the skyrmion texture on the UFM. Hence, the ST-MTJ with both Néel and Bloch-type skyrmions exhibit identical current density profiles (Fig. 5(a.i,a.ii) & (b.i,b.ii)). In the PC, the highest current density occurs at the center ($\approx 8 \times 10^9 A/m^2$), gradually decreasing radially outward. Conversely, in the APC, the central current is significantly lower ($\approx 2 \times 10^9 A/m^2$), increasing radially outward, peaking at $\approx 8 \times 10^9 A/m^2$,



FIG. 8. Spin current (A/m^2) I_x emerging from the UFM when textured layer have (i) Neel (ii) right-handed Bloch and (iii) left-handed Bloch type skyrmion at a bias of a)0.1V, b) 0V and c) -0.1V

before reducing to zero at the edges. The circular symmetry emerges in the charge current density distribution in both the PC and APC, associated with the inherent circular symmetry of the skyrmions and UFM. However, when the UFM is not co-linear with the skyrmion core, circular symmetry in the current density profile disappears and Néel and Bloch-type skyrmions demonstrate different charge current profile as shown in Fig. 5(a.iii) & 5(b.iii).Thus, distinguishing between Néel-type and Bloch-type skyrmions can be accomplished through local current measurements.

The spin current emerging from the UFM in the ST-MTJ exhibits a textured profile. We illustrate in Fig. 6(a.i,a.ii) and Fig. 7(a.i,a.ii) the emergence of spatially dependent exchange coupling [28], also referred to as dissipation-less spin current (part of $I_x \& I_y$) at zero bias in the ST-MTJ. At non-zero bias, the spin current density along the z-axis (I_z) remains identical for Néel and Bloch-type skyrmions in the ST-MTJ (Fig. 6(b.iii) and Fig. 7(b.iii)). However, the spin current density I_x and I_y are rotated by $\frac{\pi}{2}$ in Neel and Bloch type ST-MTJs as shown in (Fig. 6(b.i,b.ii) & Fig. 7(b.i,b.ii)). The spin current texture emerging from the UFM in the ST-MTJ demonstrates circular symmetry in both the PC and APC configurations, while exhibiting helicity in the case of Neel-type skyrmions. As shown in Fig. 8, a rotation pattern emerges as we sweep the voltage from -0.1V to 0.1V, and the rotation direction and angle of the texture depend on the UFM configuration, micromag-



FIG. 9. Damping-like torque (T_S in a.u) with spatial variation at 20 mV for (a.i) PC, (a.ii) APC and (a.iii) orthogonal configuration. (b) Voltage variation of T_S at different radial distances and c) radial variation of T_S at different voltages.



FIG. 10. Field-like torque (T_h in a.u) with spatial variation at 20 mV for (a.i) PC, (a.ii) APC and (a.iii) orthogonal configuration. (b) Voltage variation of T_h at different radial distances and c) radial variation of T_h at different voltages.

netic texture, etc. Hence, distinguishing between different types of skyrmions and their characteristics such as helicity in the case of Bloch-type skyrmions can be determined by conducting local spin measurements at various voltages.

The spin transfer torque on the skyrmion exerted by textured spin current from the UFM in the ST-MTJ can be quantified by the following term (τ) of the Lan-



FIG. 11. (a) Variation of charge current and (b) TMR with the cross-section area of the ST-MTJ. Radial Variation of charge current in the ST-MTJ with cross-sectional diameter of 12nm and 6nm, in the (c) APC and (d) PC at 10mV

dau-Lifshitz-Gilbert-Slonczewski (LLGS) equation:

$$\tau = -\frac{\gamma h}{2qM_S V} \left(\hat{m} \times \left(\hat{m} \times \vec{I}_S \right) \right) \tag{56}$$

here, $\hat{m}(\vec{r})$ represents the magnetization of the skyrmion layer. The component of torque along the unit vector in the direction of $-\hat{m} \times (\hat{m} \times \hat{M})$ and $\hat{m} \times \hat{M}$ are referred as damping/anti-damping/Slonczewski torque (T_s) and field-like torque (T_h) , respectively, where \hat{M} is the magnetization direction of the UFM.

As depicted in Fig. 9(a) & (d), the T_s term that indicates damping/anti-damping impressed by the UFM on the skyrmion textured layer exhibits radial variation along with circular symmetry in the PC/APC. Consequently, different regions of the skyrmion shall experience distinct torques which can have significant influence on various skyrmion based applications ranging from skyrmion switching on MTJ [48] to skyrmion based quantum gate operations [19]. The circular symmetry of T_s can be lifted in ST-MTJs with an in-plane magnetized UFM (Fig. 9(a,iii)). As shown in Fig. 9(c), T_S exhibits asymmetrical voltage profile with voltage polarities. The bias-dependent asymmetry and profile radial variation is combined effect of skyrmion micro-magnetic orientations and boundary condition. In the similar manner, the field-like torque as shown in Fig. 10, have circularly symmetric pattern in the PC/APC. However, unlike the damping/anti-damping torque, this field-like torque does not exhibit asymmetry between positive and negative voltages.

Lastly, we delineate the effect of cross-sectional area reduction on the characteristics of the ST-MTJ and contrasted with the UT-MTJ[49, 50]. As expected, at larger sizes, the current density is constant with the area (Fig. 11(a)). However, at smaller scales, the pronounced discretization of traverse energy levels result in the reduction of charge current density. The cross-sectional area dependence of the TMR in the ST-MTJ device is contrary to the UT-MTJ's TMR dependence as shown in Fig. 11(b). The reduction in the ST-MJT's TMR becomes more pronounced as the device diameter shrinks below 10 nm, suggesting a strong interference between the different nano-domains of the skyrmion on ST-MTJ. To understand the TMR decrease with reduced area in the ST-MTJ, we refer the current density at 12 nm and 6 nm diameters in the APC (fig. 11(c)). The maximum value of the current density not only decreases ($\approx 18\%$) but also accompanied by a horizontal shift. The reduction in current density in the lower diameter can be attributed to the dominance of boundary effects at smaller sizes. But, the horizontal shift in the maxima point of current density along with an increase ($\approx 30\%$) in the current density at origin for 6 nm ST-MTJ, can only be rationalized by the interference between different nanodomains of the skyrmion texture. The coupled eigen channels of the traverse Hamiltonians of the ST-MTJ translates interference between different nano-domains as a coupling between regions of higher and lower conduction and allowing the lower conduction pathway to tunnel through alternative routes, thereby enhancing overall conductance. Consequently, this interference reduces the disparity in transmission between PC and APC configurations, ultimately leading to the decreased TMR at lower areas along with boundary conditions.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we delineated the charge/spin characteristics of the ST-MTJ with both Bloch and Néel type textures across various voltages, temperatures, and sizes. We detailed the appearance of a textured spin current originating from the uniform layer of ST-MTJs and outline a radially varying asymmetrical voltage dependence of spin torque. We described the voltage-induced rotation of the spin current texture, coupled with the emergence of helicity in the spin current, especially evident in the case of Néel skyrmions on MTJ under nonequilibrium conditions. We identify the temperature rolloff in the TMR of ST-MTJ and UT-MTJ, attributing it to ballistic transmission spectra, abating the need for magnons to the first order. Finally, we describe the effect of scaling on ST-MTJ from a technological standpoint. The work presented in this letter offer a generic and computationally manageable approach to integrate micromagnetic and quantum transport, enabling the exploration of a diverse range of topological non-trivial magnetic phases on MTJs[1]. The predicted emergence of a textured spin current holds the potential to induce non-trivial magnetization dynamics [19], offering diverse fundamental and technological ramifications.



FIG. 12. (a) Charge current in the Spatio-Eigen basis (as a percentage of the charge current in the real basis), varying with the number of eigenbases. (b) Error in the charge current in the Spatio-Eigen basis compared to the real basis.

Appendix A: Toy Model

We demonstrate the effectiveness of spacio-eigen approach of NEGF using a toy model of a 2D nanosheet. In our model, we consider a 2D magnetic tunnel junction (MTJ)-like structure, where a 2D insulating channel is positioned between two 2D FM contacts. One contact exhibits uniform magnetization, while the other features a non-uniform texture, where the in-plane angle of magnetization varies according to a Gaussian distribution. In our simulations, we utilize real-space 2D nonequilibrium Green's function (NEGF) methods to calculate the charge current. Additionally, parallel calculations are conducted using spatio-eigen approch of NEGF method, which employs a smaller set of relevant eigenvalues. As depicted in Fig. 12, we observe that the charge current obtained from using the spacio-eigen approach converges to the charge current obtained from real-space NEGF as the size of the eigenvalue set increases. This comparison provides insights into the accuracy and efficiency of our computational approach.

When the simulation considers 30 eigenvalues, our method yields remarkably accurate results, displaying an error of only 0.04%. The error decreases further to below $3 \times 10^{-3}\%$ with just 50 eigenvalues. We also observe an error of less than 0.05% in the spin current for a set of 30 eigenvalue. A similar trend is observed for different device characteristics and non-uniform contacts. Hence, this toy model demonstrates that the argument we presented in the methodology section, regarding the reduction of the effects of conduction and interference from the irrelevant set of eigen states, diminishes as we increase the threshold of the relevant set. The toy model numerically demonstrate that we can capture all the physics of quantum transport using spatio-eigen approaches of NEGF while utilizing only a fraction of computational resources compared to full 3D-NEGF.

Appendix B: Inverse of matrix in terms of 2×2 block

If we have a matrix divided into 2×2 matrix, then block wise inverse of such matrix is given by expression

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}^{-1}$$
(B1a)

- B. Gobel, I. Mertig, and O. A. Tretiakov, Physics Reports 895, 1 (2021).
- [2] S. Muhlbauer, B. Binz, F. Jonietz, C. Pfleiderer, A. Rosch, A. Neubauer, R. Georgii, and P. Boni, Science **323**, 915 (2009).
- [3] F. Jonietz, S. Mühlbauer, C. Pfleiderer, A. Neubauer, W. Münzer, A. Bauer, T. Adams, R. Georgii, P. Boni, R. A. Duine, K. Everschor, M. Garst, and A. Rosch, Science **330**, 1648 (2010).
- [4] X. Z. Yu, Y. Onose, N. Kanazawa, J. H. Park, J. H. Han, Y. Matsui, N. Nagaosa, and Y. Tokura, Nature 465, 901 (2010).
- [5] S. Heinze, K. von Bergmann, M. Menzel, J. Brede, A. Kubetzka, R. Wiesendanger, G. Bihlmayer, and S. Blügel, Nature Physics 7, 713 (2011).
- [6] A. Hrabec, J. Sampaio, M. Belmeguenai, I. Gross, R. Weil, S. M. Chérif, A. Stashkevich, V. Jacques, A. Thiaville, and S. Rohart, Nature Communications 8, 15765 (2017).
- [7] N. Nagaosa and Y. Tokura, Nature Nanotechnology 8, 899 (2013).
- [8] X. Wang, H. Yuan, and X. Wang, Communications Physics 1, 1 (2018).
- [9] N. Romming, C. Hanneken, M. Menzel, J. E. Bickel, B. Wolter, K. von Bergmann, A. Kubetzka, and R. Wiesendanger, Science **341**, 636 (2013).
- [10] J. Sampaio, V. Cros, S. Rohart, A. Thiaville, and A. Fert, Nature Nanotechnology 8, 839 (2013).
- [11] F. Garcia-Sanchez, J. Sampaio, N. Reyren, V. Cros, and J.-V. Kim, New Journal of Physics 18, 075011 (2016).
- [12] R. Tomasello, E. Martinez, R. Zivieri, L. Torres, M. Carpentieri, and G. Finocchio, Sci Rep 4, 6784 (2014).
- [13] S. Luo, M. Song, X. Li, Y. Zhang, J. Hong, X. Yang, X. Zou, N. Xu, and L. You, Nano Letters 18, 1180 (2018), pMID: 29350935.
- [14] X. Zhang, M. Ezawa, and Y. Zhou, Sci Rep 5, 9400 (2015).
- [15] Y. Huang, W. Kang, X. Zhang, Y. Zhou, and W. Zhao, Nanotechnology 28, 08LT02 (2017).
- [16] T. Bhattacharya, S. Li, Y. Huang, W. Kang, W. Zhao, and M. Suri, IEEE Access 7, 5034 (2019).
- [17] X. Zhang, Y. Zhou, M. Ezawa, G. P. Zhao, and W. Zhao, Sci Rep 5, 11369 (2015).
- [18] C. Psaroudaki and C. Panagopoulos, Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 067201 (2021).

$$a = (A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1}$$
 (B1b)

$$c = D^{-1}Ca \tag{B1c}$$

$$d = (D - CA^{-1}B)^{-1}$$
 (B1d)

$$b = A^{-1}Bd \tag{B1e}$$

- [19] C. Psaroudaki, E. Peraticos, and C. Panagopoulos, Applied Physics Letters 123, 260501 (2023).
- [20] J. Xia, X. Zhang, X. Liu, Y. Zhou, and M. Ezawa, Communications Materials 3, 88 (2022).
- [21] J. Zou, S. Bosco, B. Pal, S. S. P. Parkin, J. Klinovaja, and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. Res. 5, 033166 (2023).
- [22] N. E. Penthorn, X. Hao, Z. Wang, Y. Huai, and H. W. Jiang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 257201 (2019).
- [23] B. He, Y. Hu, C. Zhao, J. Wei, J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, C. Cheng, J. Li, Z. Nie, Y. Luo, Y. Zhou, S. Zhang, Z. Zeng, Y. Peng, J. M. D. Coey, X. Han, and G. Yu, Advanced Electronic Materials **9** (2023), 10.1002/aelm.202201240, in press, Article ID: 2201240.
- [24] S. Li, A. Du, Y. Wang, X. Wang, X. Zhang, H. Cheng, W. Cai, S. Lu, K. Cao, B. Pan, N. Lei, W. Kang, J. Liu, A. Fert, Z. Hou, and W. Zhao, Science Bulletin **67**, 691 (2022).
- [25] S. Kasai, S. Sugimoto, Y. Nakatani, R. Ishikawa, and Y. K. Takahashi, Appl. Phys. Express 12, 083001 (2019).
- [26] Y. Guang, L. Zhang, J. Zhang, Y. Wang, Y. Zhao, R. Tomasello, S. Zhang, B. He, J. Li, Y. Liu, J. Feng, H. Wei, M. Carpentieri, Z. Hou, J. Liu, Y. Peng, Z. Zeng, G. Finocchio, X. Zhang, J. M. D. Coey, X. Han, and G. Yu, Advanced Electronic Materials **9** (2023), 10.1002/aelm.202200570, in press, Article ID: 2200570.
- [27] W. H. Butler, X.-G. Zhang, T. C. Schulthess, and J. M. MacLaren, Phys. Rev. B 63, 054416 (2001).
- [28] J. C. Slonczewski, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 6995 (1989).
- [29] I. Theodonis, N. Kioussis, A. Kalitsov, M. Chshiev, and W. Butler, Physical review letters 97, 237205 (2007).
- [30] T. A. Gosavi, S. Manipatruni, S. V. Aradhya, G. E. Rowlands, D. Nikonov, I. A. Young, and S. A. Bhave, IEEE Transactions on Magnetics 53, 1 (2017).
- [31] J. Sun and D. Ralph, Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials 320, 1227 (2008).
- [32] J. V. Kim, Solid State Physics—Advances in Research and Applications, 1st ed., Vol. 63 (Elsevier Inc., 2012) pp. 217–294.
- [33] A. Sharma, A. A. Tulapurkar, and B. Muralidharan, Phys. Rev. Appl. 8, 064014 (2017).
- [34] E. Kultursay, M. Kandemir, A. Sivasubramaniam, and O. Mutlu (2013) p. 256.
- [35] S. van Dijken and J. M. D. Coey, Applied Physics Letters 87, 022504 (2005).
- [36] A. Sharma, A. Tulapurkar, and B. Muralidharan, IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices 63, 4527 (2016).

- [37] S. Datta, *Electronic Transport in Mesoscopic Systems* (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- [38] J. Slonczewski, Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials 159, L1 (1996).
- [39] S. Salahuddin and S. Datta, Applied Physics Letters 89, 153504 (2006).
- [40] N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, Solid State Physics (Holt-Saunders, 1976).
- [41] N. Papior, N. Lorente, T. Frederiksen, A. García, and M. Brandbyge, Computer Physics Communications 212, 8 (2017).
- [42] A. Sharma, A. A. Tulapurkar, and B. Muralidharan, Journal of Applied Physics 129, 233901 (2021).
- [43] D. Ralph and M. Stiles, Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials **320**, 1190 (2008).
- [44] P. Flauger, C. Abert, and D. Suess, Phys. Rev. B 105, 134407 (2022).

- [45] S. Chakraborti and A. Sharma, Nanotechnology 34, 185206 (2023).
- [46] D. Zhao, Y. Wang, J. Shao, Y. Chen, Z. Fu, Q. Xia, S. Wang, X. Li, G. Dong, M. Zhou, and D. Zhu, AIP Advances 12, 055114 (2022).
- [47] X. Kou, J. Schmalhorst, A. Thomas, and G. Reiss, Applied Physics Letters 88, 212115 (2006).
- [48] S. Chen, J. Lourembam, P. Ho, A. K. J. Toh, J. Huang, X. Chen, H. K. Tan, S. L. K. Yap, R. J. J. Lim, H. R. Tan, T. S. Suraj, M. I. Sim, Y. T. Toh, I. Lim, N. C. B. Lim, J. Zhou, H. J. Chung, S. T. Lim, and A. Soumyanarayanan, Nature **627**, 522 (2024).
- [49] K. Watanabe, B. Jinnai, S. Fukami, H. Sato, and H. Ohno, Nature Communications 9, 663 (2018).
- [50] N. Perrissin, S. Lequeux, N. Strelkov, L. Vila, L. Buda-Prejbeanu, S. Auffret, R. Sousa, I. Prejbeanu, and B. Dieny, in 2018 International Conference on IC Design & Technology (ICICDT) (2018) pp. 125–128.