

Dissipationless Spin Current in Anisotropic p-Doped Semiconductors

Bogdan A. Bernevig^y, Jiangping Hu[?], Eran Mukamel^y, Shou-Cheng Zhang^y
^y Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305
[?] Department of Astronomy and Physics, UCLA, Los Angeles, California 90095

Recently, dissipationless spin current has been predicted for the p-doped semiconductors with spin-orbit coupling. Here we investigate the effect of spherical symmetry breaking on the dissipationless spin current, and obtain values of the intrinsic spin Hall conductivity for realistic semiconductor band structures with cubic symmetry.

PACS numbers: 72.10.-d, 72.15.Gd, 73.50.Jt

Spintronics is a new field of science and technology which aims to manipulate the spin of the electron for building functional logic and storage devices [1]. The creation, manipulation and transport of spin currents is a central challenge in this field. Recently, Murakami, Nagaosa and Zhang [2] found a basic law of spintronics, which relates the spin current and the electric field by the response equation

$$j_j^i = s_{ijk} E_k \quad (1)$$

where j_j^i is the current of the i -th component of the spin along the direction j and s_{ijk} is the totally antisymmetric tensor in three dimensions. This effect arises because of the spin-orbit coupling in the valence band of conventional semiconductors such as GaAs and Ge. Sinova et al [3] also found a similar effect in the electron doped conduction band. The transport equation (1) is similar to Ohm's law in electronics. However, unlike the Ohm's law, this new law describes a purely dissipationless spin current, in the sense that Eq. (1) is invariant under the time reversal and the intrinsic part of s does not depend on impurity scattering. These effects have been further discussed in the recent literature [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9].

Fundamental to the proposal of Murakami, Nagaosa and Zhang [2] is the spin-orbit coupling that exists in the Luttinger effective-mass model in the degenerate valence bands:

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \left(\epsilon_1 + \frac{5}{2} \epsilon_2 \right) k^2 - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_2 (k_x^2 - k_y^2) \quad (2)$$

In this "isotropic," or spherically symmetric model, the helicity $\hat{k} \cdot \mathbf{S}$ is a good quantum number of the isotropic Luttinger Hamiltonian above, and it labels the two doubly degenerate Kramers bands corresponding to the heavy holes $\hat{k} \cdot \mathbf{S} = \frac{3}{2}$ and light holes $\hat{k} \cdot \mathbf{S} = \frac{1}{2}$. The spin current effect can be intuitively understood as a consequence of the conservation of total angular momentum: $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{S}$. The spin current flows in such a way that the change of the orbital angular momentum $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{k}$ exactly cancels the change of the spin angular momentum

\mathbf{S} . When an electric field is applied on the arbitrary z axis, the z component of \mathbf{J} is conserved. The topological nature of the spin current is manifest in the gauge field

	1	2	3	
Si	4.22	0.39	1.44	0.248
Ge	13.35	4.25	5.69	0.108
GaAs	4.15	1.01	1.75	0.114
InSb	35.08	15.64	16.91	0.036
InAs	19.67	8.37	9.29	0.047
GaP	4.20	0.98	1.66	0.162

TABLE I: Valence-band parameters for some common materials [10]. Following [11] we define $\epsilon = (\epsilon_3 - \epsilon_2)/\epsilon_1$ as a measure of the anisotropy.

formulation of [5], where the spin conductance is defined in terms of a linear combination of the components of a gauge field, $G_{ij} = (\epsilon^2 - 13/4) \epsilon_{ijk} k_l = k^3$, clearly reflecting a monopole structure in k space. The singularity at $k \rightarrow 0$ exemplifies the confluence of the Kramers doublets at the Γ point where the band becomes 4-fold degenerate, but the flux of the gauge field through a 2-dimensional surface in k space is constant and set by the helicity eigenvalue.

The picture presented above is valid as long as the Hamiltonian is isotropic, that is to say it has spherical symmetry. In the real materials in which the dissipationless spin-current is predicted [2], all of which are characterized by a large anisotropy (see Table I), the angular momentum \mathbf{J} and the helicity $\hat{k} \cdot \mathbf{S}$ are no longer good quantum numbers. It is therefore vital to ask whether the topological spin current is preserved in materials which are not rotationally invariant. In this paper, we investigate the effect of the spherical symmetry breaking on the dissipationless spin current, and calculate the values of the intrinsic spin Hall conductivity for anisotropic band structure parameters.

The most general Hamiltonian which respects time-reversal and cubic symmetries was derived by Luttinger [12]:

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{2m} \left(1 + \frac{5}{2} \right) k^2 - \frac{2}{m} (k_x^2 S_x^2 + k_y^2 S_y^2 + k_z^2 S_z^2) - \frac{2}{m} [fk_x; k_y g f S_x; S_y g + f k_y; k_z g f S_y; S_z g + f k_z; k_x g f S_z; S_x g] \quad (3)$$

where we define $fA;Bg = \frac{1}{2}(AB + BA)$, and $k^2 = k_x^2 + k_y^2 + k_z^2$. The parameters, β_1 ; β_2 ; and β_3 ; are material-dependent. In the special case of $\beta_2 = \beta_3$ (which we call isotropic), the last two terms simply combine to yield $-\frac{2}{m}(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{S})^2$.

In real materials, however, the values of β_2 and β_3 are very different. Table 1 lists the values of these parameters in some important materials. The anisotropy, characterized by the parameter $(\beta_3 - \beta_2) = \beta_1$, is relevant and substantial for all the materials, and especially relevant for Si. In order to understand the dissipationless spin-current generated in these real materials, including its dependence on the orientation of the field and current with respect to the crystal axes, we must consider the full anisotropic Hamiltonian, Eq. 3.

When $\beta_2 \neq \beta_3$, the Hamiltonian is no longer isotropic and the helicity is not a good quantum number. However, the energy spectrum of the Hamiltonian retains the same structure as in the isotropic case, albeit with a different dispersion relation. After diagonalizing the Hamiltonian, we obtain two doubly degenerate energy levels, which we call light and heavy holes in analogy with the isotropic case:

$$E(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2m} \beta_1 k^2 - \frac{3}{m} d(\mathbf{k})$$

$$d^2(\mathbf{k}) = \left(\frac{2}{3} \right)^2 (k_x^4 + k_y^4 + k_z^4) \quad (4)$$

$$+ (3 - \left(\frac{2}{3} \right)^2) (k_y^2 k_x^2 + k_x^2 k_z^2 + k_y^2 k_z^2):$$

Following Ref. [5], we can expand the spin-dependent terms in the anisotropic Luttinger Hamiltonian in terms of a Clifford algebra of Dirac matrices f^a ; $g^b = 2 \beta_{ab} I_4$:

$$H_0 = \beta_1(k) + \frac{3}{m} d_a f^a \quad (5)$$

$$\beta_1(k) = \frac{1}{2m} k^2;$$

$$d_1 = \frac{1}{3} k_z k_y; d_2 = \frac{1}{3} k_x k_z; d_3 = \frac{1}{3} k_x k_y;$$

$$d_4 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{3} (k_x^2 - k_y^2) \right); d_5 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{3} (2k_z^2 - k_x^2 - k_y^2) \right) \quad (6)$$

with $d_a d_a = d^2$. Whereas in the isotropic Luttinger model the matrix used to diagonalize the Hamiltonian belongs to the SO(3) group of rotations in \mathbf{k} space [2], in the anisotropic materials the matrix that diagonalizes the

anisotropic Hamiltonian belongs to the SO(5) rotations in d_a space. The SO(5) Clifford algebra representation of the Hamiltonian (5) naturally unifies both the isotropic and the anisotropic Luttinger model on the same footing. Since this form of the Hamiltonian depends on \mathbf{k} only through the five dimensional vector \mathbf{d} , a large part of the results in [5] is directly applicable to the anisotropic case. In this sense, the SO(5) Clifford algebra formalism shows its full power in the anisotropic case studied here. The projection operators onto the two-dimensional subspace of states of the heavy-hole (HH) and light-hole (LH) bands read:

$$P^L = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \hat{d}_a f^a); P^H = \frac{1}{2} (1 - \hat{d}_a f^a) \quad (7)$$

For finite \mathbf{k} , the Hamiltonian maintains the SO(4) symmetry observed in [5]. This symmetry reflects the degeneracy of the two Kramer's doublets at each value of \mathbf{k} , corresponding to the doubly-degenerate HH and the LH bands. Each of the bands has an SU(2) symmetry, which we may denote by SU(2)_{HH} and SU(2)_{LH}. Therefore, the total symmetry is SU(2)_{HH} × SU(2)_{LH} = SO(4). At the point, $\mathbf{k} = 0$, there is an enhanced SO(5) symmetry.

The symmetry generators read:

$$S^{ab} = S^{ab} + d_b d_c f^{ca} - d_a d_c f^{cb} = P^L S^{ab} P^L + P^H S^{ab} P^H \quad (8)$$

where $S^{ab} = \frac{i}{2} [f^a; f^b]$ and $[S^{ab}; H_0] = 0$ trivially since the Hamiltonian is diagonal in the HH and LH bands. The spin operators S^i are related to the S^{ab} matrices through the tensor \hat{S}_{ab}^i ; whose entries were given in [5]: $S^i = \hat{S}_{ab}^i S^{ab}$. The concept of a conserved spin current is still valid in anisotropic materials, since the projected spin is a constant of motion in virtue of its being a linear combination of the symmetry generators, $S_{(c)}^1 = \frac{1}{ab} S^{ab} = P^L S^1 P^L + P^H S^1 P^H$. We can therefore define the conserved spin-current as $\hat{J}^1 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial H}{\partial k_1} S_{(c)}^1$. Note that the richer anisotropic Luttinger Hamiltonian yields a very similar structure to the isotropic one when cast in SO(4) language.

Although the concept of helicity $= k_i S^i$ is not valid in anisotropic materials, we can define a corresponding conserved helicity, \hat{h}_{new} , as:

$$\hat{h}_{new} = k_i S_{(c)}^i = k_i \left(S^{ab} + d_b d_c f^{ca} - d_a d_c f^{cb} \right) = P^L \hat{h} P^L + P^H \hat{h} P^H \quad (9)$$

Since it is a linear combination of the symmetry generators of H_0 ($\chi_{\text{new}} = k_i S_{(c)}^i = k_i \frac{1}{ab} \epsilon^{ab}$), it is clear that $[H; \chi_{\text{new}}] = 0$. In the isotropic limit, $\chi_{\text{new}} = \chi$, as can be seen using the identities $[\chi; P^L] = [\chi; P^H] = 0$, valid in the isotropic case.

The recent work of Ref.[5] shows that the Kubo formula for the conserved spin current response can be expressed purely in terms of a geometric quantity

$$G_{ij} = G_{ij}^{ab} \epsilon^{ab} = \frac{1}{4d^3} \epsilon^{abcde} d_c \frac{\partial d_d}{\partial k_i} \frac{\partial d_e}{\partial k_j} \epsilon^{ab} \quad (10)$$

which describes the mapping from the 3D k vector space to the 5D d vector space. This results also includes a quantum correction to the semiclassical result of Ref.[2]. We shall apply this formula to the anisotropic case here. However, there is one essential difference. Whereas in the isotropic case, the \mathbf{E} field strength can be brought, through a proper choice of gauge, to the diagonal form $G_{ij} = \delta_{ij} \epsilon^2 \frac{1}{3} k_i k_j$, in the anisotropic case this is impossible. Non-abelian \mathbf{E} field strength are, in general, gauge-variant. However, there is a fundamental difference between \mathbf{E} fields that can be diagonalized through a gauge transformation and \mathbf{E} fields for which this is not possible. The former are ultimately abelian in nature, whereas the latter are truly non-abelian. The non-diagonal gauge \mathbf{E} field which describes evolution in anisotropic materials reflects the richer structure of the anisotropic Luttinger Hamiltonian.

We can express the \mathbf{E} field strength in terms of the (unprojected) spin degrees of freedom if we first note that the ten $SO(5)$ generators ϵ^{ab} decompose into the 3 spin matrices S^i and the seven cubic, symmetric and traceless combinations of the spin operators of the form $S^i S^j S^k$, namely:

$$\begin{aligned} A^1 &= (S_x)^3; A^2 = (S_y)^3; A^3 = (S_z)^3 \\ A^4 &= f S_x; (S_y)^2 - (S_z)^2 g \\ A^5 &= f S_y; (S_z)^2 - (S_x)^2 g \\ A^6 &= f S_z; (S_x)^2 - (S_y)^2 g \\ A^7 &= S_x S_y S_z + S_z S_y S_x \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Then we can write:

$$G_{ij} = \frac{1}{4d^3} \epsilon_{ijl} k_l [V A + U_1 S^l]; \quad l = 1; \dots; 3; \quad = 1; \dots; 7 \quad (12)$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \left[(13 + 28 \frac{2}{3}) k_1^3 + (13 - 28 \frac{2}{3}) k_2^2 k_1 \right] \\ V_1 &= 2 \epsilon^2 \left[(1 + 4 \frac{2}{3}) k_1^3 + (1 - 4 \frac{2}{3}) k_2^2 k_1 \right] \\ V_4 &= 3 \epsilon^2 k_x (k_y^2 - k_z^2) \\ V_5 &= 3 \epsilon^2 k_y (k_x^2 - k_z^2) \\ V_6 &= 3 \epsilon^2 k_z (k_x^2 - k_y^2) \\ V_7 &= 12 k_x k_y k_z \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$l = 1; \dots; 3$$

When cast in the $SO(4)$ language, the expression for the spin conductance in anisotropic materials has the same form as in the spherical model:

$$\frac{1}{ij} = \frac{8e^2 X}{V} \sum_k (n_L(k) - n_H(k)) \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_{ab} G_{ij}^{ab} \quad (14)$$

where $n_L = n_F(\epsilon_L)$ and $n_H = n_F(\epsilon_H)$ are the Fermi functions of the LH and HH bands. This expression can be put into the following elegant form:

$$\frac{1}{3} \epsilon_{ab} G_{ij}^{ab} = \frac{1}{8d^3} \frac{2}{3} \epsilon_{ijm} k_m k_l \left[\left(1 - \frac{2}{3}\right) k_l^2 + \left(1 + \frac{2}{3}\right) k^2 \right] \quad (15)$$

where we see that the first term in brackets vanishes in the isotropic case. The index specifies the direction of the spin orientation, and it is not summed over on the right hand side of Eq. (15). It is now obvious that the only components of $\frac{1}{ij}$ surviving after summing the contributions from the whole Fermi surface, are those for which $i \neq j \neq l$. Indeed, upon integration over k , $\frac{1}{ij}$ becomes proportional to ϵ_{ijk} , just as it should for in crystals with cubic symmetry [13].

Our result for the spin-current can thus be put in the form:

$$s = \frac{e^2}{\hbar} n^{1/3} S(\epsilon_L; \epsilon_H; \epsilon_H); \quad (16)$$

where the material-specific coefficient, S , is independent of the Fermi energy, and is of the order 0.05 for most materials (see Table II). The $s \propto n^{1/3}$ scaling is the hallmark of the dissipationless spin current, and has been proposed as a means to distinguish from other extrinsic effects [2, 4]. To compare the spin-conductance in different materials, we separate the dependence on the total carrier density, which for the anisotropic Luttinger model depends on the band-parameters: $n = (2m \epsilon_F)^{3/2} \frac{1}{3} \left[\frac{1}{(1 - 2/3 d=k^2)^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{(1 + 2/3 d=k^2)^{3/2}} \right] \frac{d^2 k}{(2)^{3/2}}$. Using this relation, we can find ϵ_F as a function of n , and use it to define the anisotropic Fermi distribution functions, $n_{L,H}(k) = (k_F^{L,H} - k)$. We have calculated s for band parameters corresponding to a selection of real materials, as well as for band parameters corresponding to isotropic materials with the same values of ϵ_L and $\frac{6\epsilon_L + 4\epsilon_H}{5}$. The results, listed in Table II, show that the non-zero anisotropy leads to a decrease in the spin-conductivity of as much as 30% (for Si), although the reduction in materials with smaller anisotropy is typically only ~5%.

To illustrate the systematic dependence of spin-conductance on anisotropy, we plot s as a function of $\epsilon = (\epsilon_H - \epsilon_L)/\epsilon_L$ with ϵ_L and $\epsilon_H = (6\epsilon_L + 4\epsilon_H)/5$ held fixed at the values corresponding to Si, GaAs and InSb (Figure 1). The spin-conductance at fixed carrier concentration is maximum at $\epsilon = 0$, whereas all real materials have $\epsilon > 0$. This observation should guide the selection of

	$S(\delta_1; \delta_2; \delta_3)$	$s(\delta) (\text{cm}^{-1})$	$s_{\delta=0} (\text{cm}^{-1})$
Si	0.028	14.60	21.10
Ge	0.063	32.79	34.31
GaAs	0.062	32.64	34.33
InSb	0.083	43.63	44.67
InAs	0.079	41.61	42.55
GaP	0.051	26.50	29.17

TABLE II: We list the material-dependent coefficients of the spin-conductivity for values of $\delta_1; \delta_2; \delta_3$ corresponding to common semiconductors. Also given are the actual spin-conductivities at $n = 10^{19} \text{cm}^{-3}$ for both the real anisotropic materials, and their spherical approximations ($\delta = 0$).




FIG. 1: Spin-conductivity is plotted as a function of the anisotropy, parameterized by $(\delta_2, \delta_3) = \delta$; with $\delta_1 = (\delta_3 + 4\delta_2)/5$ and $n = 10^{19} \text{cm}^{-3}$ held fixed at values corresponding to Si (bottom curve), GaAs and InSb (top curve). The circles indicate the real values of the parameters in Si, GaAs and InSb.

materials with relatively low anisotropy for spin-injection devices and other applications where a strong spin-current is desired. Finally, the variation of σ_s with carrier concentration, n , is shown in Figure 2.

We would like to thank L. Balents, S. Murakami, N. Nagaosa and J. Sinova for the useful conversations. This work is supported by the NSF under grant numbers DMR-9814289 and the US Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences under contract DE-AC03-76SF00515. A. Bernevig acknowledges support from the Stanford Graduate Fellowship and E. Murakami acknowledges

support from the NSF Graduate Fellowship. JP is supported by the funds from the David Saxon chair at UCLA.

- [1] S. A. Wolf, D. D. Awschalom, R. A. Buhrman, J. M. Daughton, S. von Molnar, M. L. Roukes, A. Y. Chtchelkanova, and D. M. Treger, *Science* 294, 1488 (2001).
- [2] S. Murakami, N. Nagaosa, and S. C. Zhang, *Science* 301, 1348 (2003).
- [3] J. Sinova, D. Culcer, Q. Niu, N. A. Sinitsyn, T. Jungwirth, and A. MacDonald, cond-mat/0307663.




FIG. 2: The dependence of spin-conductivity on carrier density, n , is plotted using the band parameters of Si (bottom curve), GaAs and InSb (top curve).

- [4] D. Culcer, J. Sinova, N. A. Sinitsyn, T. Jungwirth, A. H. MacDonald, and Q. Niu, cond-mat/0309475.
- [5] S. Murakami, N. Nagaosa, and S. C. Zhang, cond-mat/0310005.
- [6] J. Hu, B. A. Bernevig, and C. Wu, cond-mat/0310093.
- [7] J. Schliemann and D. Loss, cond-mat/0310108.
- [8] N. A. Sinitsyn, E. M. Hankiewicz, W. Teizer, and J. Sinova, cond-mat/0310315.
- [9] S.-Q. Shen, cond-mat/0310368.
- [10] P. Lawaetz, *Physical Review B* 4, 3460 (1971).
- [11] A. Balderes and N. O. Lipari, *Physical Review B* 8, 2697 (1973).
- [12] J. M. Luttinger, *Physical Review* 102, 1030 (1956).
- [13] M. Lax, *Symmetry Principles in Solid State and Molecular Physics*, Dover Publications, New York, (2001).