

Spin-Hall effect in semiconductor heterostructures with cubic Rashba spin-orbit interaction

O. Bleibaum and S. Wachsmuth

Institute for Theoretical Physics, Otto-von-Guericke University,
PF 4120, 39016 Magdeburg, Germany

Abstract

We study the spin-Hall effect in systems with weak cubic Rashba spin-orbit interaction. To this end we derive particle and spin diffusion equations and explicit expressions for the spin-current tensor in the diffusive regime. We discuss the impact of electric fields on the Green's functions and the diffusion equations and establish a relationship between the spin-current tensor and the spin diffusion equations for the model under scrutiny. We use our results to calculate the edge spin-accumulation in a spin-Hall experiment and show that there is also a new Hall-like contribution to the electric current in such systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

At present there is much interest in investigations of spin-charge coupling effects in non-magnetic semiconductor heterostructures with intrinsic spin-orbit interaction. Particular attention is paid to effects, which permit the electric generation of non-equilibrium magnetizations in such systems, like the spin-Hall effect (see, e.g. Ref.[1]–[11]) or the spin accumulation induced by an external electric field (see, e.g., Ref. [12]–[18]). In the spin-Hall effect a non-homogeneous magnetization is created at the sample boundaries in the presence of electric fields. The spin accumulation, by contrast, is a homogeneous non-equilibrium magnetization, which is induced by a current in the bulk.

While the mechanisms leading to spin accumulations in heterostructures with intrinsic spin-orbit interaction have been understood for decades the spin-Hall effect is still a rather controversial issue. The first papers on spin-Hall effects in heterostructures with intrinsic spin-orbit interaction have focused on investigations of spin-current tensors for electron gases with linear Rashba spin-orbit interaction¹ and for hole gases described by the Luttinger model⁷. The spin-current tensors were defined as the expectation value of the operator (\hat{v}_i –velocity operator, S_k –spin operator, f –Fermi–Dirac distribution function, g –anticommutator)

$$\hat{j}_{ik} = \frac{1}{2} f \langle \hat{v}_i S_k + S_k \hat{v}_i \rangle \quad (1)$$

The investigations have shown that an electric field leads to distortions of the spectrum, which render the spin-Hall current of clean systems finite, even if their Hamiltonian does not explicitly contain S_z (S_z –spin operator for particles with spin in the perpendicular direction). This fact has led the authors of the papers in question to the conclusion that there is a non-vanishing spin-Hall effect of considerable magnitude in such systems. However, none of them has been able to establish a connection between the spin-current tensor and the non-equilibrium magnetization induced at the boundary of a sample. The silent assumption was the spin current tensor enters a diffusion like equation, as discussed, e.g., in Ref.[7].

Further investigations, however, have shown that the results on the spin-current tensor are not robust. In the linear Rashba model the spin-Hall conductivity vanishes already in the presence of weak disorder^{5,16,19}. In p-doped systems, described by Luttinger models, the situation seems to be more favorable. In such systems the spin-Hall conductivity is also finite in the presence of disorder^{8,21}. In spite of this fact most investigations have focused on systems with linear Rashba spin-orbit interaction, which are technically less demanding.

The absence of spin-Hall currents in the linear Rashba model in the presence of weak disorder, however, has not remained the only problem casting doubts on the predictions of spin-Hall effect. More pressing is the question of the relevance of the approach itself^{22,23}. It has already been shown in Ref.[22] that the spin-current tensor in the Rashba model is finite, even in equilibrium. Therefore, it does not characterize macroscopic transport phenomena. Diffusion equations, which take into account also spin-charge coupling effects, have been derived in a number of papers for systems with weak Rashba interaction^{24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31}. However, they do not only contain the divergence of the spin-current tensor but also additional derivative terms. The investigation of these terms leads to the conclusion that the spin-current tensor in the linear Rashba model is not a quantity, which is continuous at boundaries²⁷, as stressed also in Ref.[23]. In fact, the solution to the diffusion equations, which is derived under the assumption that the spin-current tensor vanishes at hard-wall boundaries, is not physical. It violates time reversal symmetry³¹. Responsible for this fact are just those terms, which are also present in equilibrium. Alternative definitions for the

spin-current tensor have been suggested in a number of papers (see, e.g., Refs. [32,33]) to circumvent these problems. However, although the authors have focused on observable quantities they have failed to establish a connection between the non-equilibrium magnetization at the boundary of a sample and their definition. Moreover, their predictions differ rather strongly from those, which have been derived on the basis of Eq.(1). The existence of the spin-Hall effect in clean samples has meanwhile been established experimentally² in spite of these problems. The predictions of Ref.[1] have essentially proven to be correct. The question, however, how to describe this effect theoretically, is still remaining.

Recently, some investigations have been published, which address the question how universal the results to the linear Rashba model are^{9,10,34}. The results of these investigations show that already deviations from the quadratic dispersion relation of the unperturbed band spectrum³⁴ or deviations from the linear dependence of the Rashba spin-orbit interaction^{10,35} lead to a non-vanishing spin-Hall current in the bulk even in the presence of disorder. To obtain the latter result the authors of the Refs.[10] and [35] use a cubic Rashba model. The cubic Rashba model, which describes the heavy holes in III-V semiconductor quantum wells, has been introduced in the Refs. [36,37]. It differs from the linear Rashba model in that the interaction depends cubically on the momentum. Thus, the cubic Rashba model offers the opportunity to study spin-Hall transport in semiconductor heterostructures with intrinsic spin-orbit interaction in a framework, which keeps the simplicity of the original Rashba model. Here we use this opportunity to address the question, how the non-vanishing spin-Hall current manifests themselves in the spin diffusion equations, how these equations differ from those in the linear Rashba model, and whether the spin-current tensor (1) is the appropriate quantity, which has to be considered, or whether alternative definitions for the spin-current tensor are more appropriate, as claimed, e.g., in the Refs.[32,33]. To answer these questions we derive particle diffusion equations, spin diffusion equations and explicit expressions for the spin-current tensor, discuss the impact of external fields on the diffusion process and use our results to calculate the magnitude of the magnetization for systems with weak Rashba spin-orbit interaction. Doing so, we establish an explicit relationship between the spin-current tensor (1), the diffusion equations, and the non-equilibrium magnetization at the boundary in the presence of an electric field. Thus our results show that the spin-current tensor (1) determines indeed the physics in the cubic Rashba model. We would like to mention that a paper has recently been published, in which the spin-Hall effect has been investigated numerically in the cubic Rashba model⁹. The authors of Ref.[9] focus on systems with strong Rashba interaction, in which the energy level splitting at the Fermi surface is large compared to the disorder energy. In contrast to them we present analytical calculations and focus on systems in the opposite regime. While the numerical results of Ref.[9] apply to systems with strong spin-orbit interaction, in which the energy level splitting at the Fermi energy due to the spin-orbit interaction is large compared to the disorder energy, we focus on systems with weak spin-orbit interaction, in which the energy level splitting at the Fermi energy is small compared to the disorder energy.

II. BASIC EQUATIONS

We consider the holes in the lowest heavy-hole subband of a two-dimensional hole gas with Rashba spin-orbit interaction. Their motion is described by the Hamiltonian^{9,35,36,37,38,39}

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + i\frac{N}{2} (p^3_+ - p^3_-) + V(r): \quad (2)$$

Here \mathbf{p} is the momentum operator, m is the effective mass, $\mathbf{p} = p_x \mathbf{e}_x + p_y \mathbf{e}_y$, \mathbf{e}_z is a unit vector perpendicular to the plane. The potential $V(\mathbf{r})$ is a random white noise potential with Gaussian statistics and correlation function

$$\langle V(\mathbf{r})V(\mathbf{r}^0) \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0); \quad (3)$$

where $\rho = m^{-2} \hbar^2$ is the density of states per spin and τ is the scattering time. The vectors \mathbf{e}_x and \mathbf{e}_y are the unit vectors in the two-dimensional plane. \mathbf{e}_z is a unit vector perpendicular to the plane. The indices 1, 2 and 3 replace the indices x, y and z in sums. Double indices have to be summed over in all formulas. Sums over Latin indices run from 1-3, sums over Greek indices from 0-3.

The Hamiltonian (2) describes particles with single particle energies $E(\mathbf{k}) = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \pm \hbar k$, where $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \hbar^2 k^2 / 2m$, $\hbar k$ is the momentum of the particles, and $\hbar k = \hbar^3 k^3$ is the energy level splitting due to the Rashba spin-orbit interaction. The spectrum is unstable at large k , since $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} / k^3$. This instability is an artifact, which results from the fact that the effective Hamiltonian (2) is only derived for systems with small k by means of perturbation theory. Therefore, the Hamiltonian (2) can only be used for low hole densities. From the practical point of view these are also those typical achieved in experiments³⁵. The investigation of transport processes on the basis of the Hamiltonian (2), however, requires also the calculation of integrals with infinite upper bound. To render them finite we assume that $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$ depends only cubically on k in the region of interest, but increases slower than k^3 for $k \rightarrow \infty$. In this case we can use the same methods for the investigation of the system, which have also been used for systems with linear Rashba spin-orbit interaction (see, e.g., Refs. [24, 25, 26, 27, 40]). In particular we can use the self-consistent Born approximation for the description of the single-particle excitations. The retarded Green's function takes the form

$$G^R(\mathbf{k}, E) = g_+^R(\mathbf{k}, E) g_-^R(\mathbf{k}, E) (g_+^{-1}(\mathbf{k}, E) + i \frac{N}{2} (\epsilon_+^3 + \epsilon_-^3)) \quad (4)$$

in this approximation, where

$$g^R(\mathbf{k}, E) = \frac{1}{E - \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} \pm \hbar k}; \quad (5)$$

$\epsilon_0 = 1$ is the unit matrix and $g_{\pm}^R(\mathbf{k}, E) = g_{\pm}^R(\mathbf{k}, E) \mathbf{j}_{\pm} = 0$. The advanced Green's function is obtained from Eq.(4) by hermitian conjugation.

III. SPIN DIFFUSION IN THE ABSENCE OF EXTERNAL FIELDS

A. Particle and spin diffusion equations

To derive particle and spin diffusion equations we use the ladder approximation. The equation of motion for the Fourier-Laplace transform of the particle density $n(\mathbf{r}, s) = S_0(\mathbf{r}, s)$ and the Fourier-Laplace transform of the spin density $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}, s) = S_i(\mathbf{r}, s) \mathbf{e}_i$ takes the form^{24, 26, 27, 40}

$$\left[\frac{\hbar}{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} - \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \text{tr} \left(G^R(\mathbf{k} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r} + i\hbar s) G^A(\mathbf{k} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r}) \right) \right] S(\mathbf{r}, s) = S_0(\mathbf{r}) \quad (6)$$

in this case. Here s is the frequency describing the evolution (it corresponds to a Laplace transformation with respect to time), tr symbolizes the trace, and S_0 ($\in \mathbb{R}$) is the initial condition. To simplify Eq.(6) we use the hydrodynamic expansion, viz we expand the kernel of Eq.(6) with respect to \mathbf{r} , N and s and take into account only contributions, which are at most of second order in \mathbf{r} and of first order in s . In this case we obtain the following diffusion equations for system with weak Rashba spin-orbit interaction after inverse Laplace and Fourier transformation:

$$\partial_t n - D \nabla^2 n = 0; \quad (7)$$

$$\partial_t S + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{S} - D \nabla^2 S = 0; \quad (8)$$

Here $D = E_F / m$ and \mathbf{S} is a symmetrical tensor of second rank with matrix elements $S_{ik} = S_{ik} (1 + \beta_{ij})$, where

$$\beta_{ij} = 16 \frac{N^2 m^3}{\hbar^2} E_F^3; \quad (9)$$

In deriving these equations we have ignored terms of the order $N^2 r^2 S_1$, which yield corrections to the diffusion coefficient. These corrections are small with respect to the ratio $(\beta_{ij})_{k=F} = (\hbar/2)^2$ and thus negligible in systems with weak Rashba spin-orbit interaction.

It is instructive to compare these equations with those, which are obtained for systems with linear Rashba spin-orbit interaction in the same approximation. If we replace the cubic spin-orbit interaction in Eq.(2) by a linear interaction, according to

$$i \frac{N}{2} (p^3 + p_+^3) \rightarrow (N; p); \quad (10)$$

where $N = N e_z$, we obtain the equations^{24,25,26,27,28}

$$\partial_t n - D \nabla^2 n - (\mathbf{r}; N \cdot \nabla) = 0; \quad (11)$$

$$\partial_t S + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{S}_A) - D \nabla^2 S + \beta_s (N \cdot \nabla) \cdot (\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{S}_A) = 0; \quad (12)$$

Here

$$\mathbf{S}_A = N \cdot \mathbf{r} \nabla \quad (13)$$

is the non-equilibrium magnetization induced by a density gradient and β_s is a transport coefficient proportional to D (Note that, although we use the character N to characterize the strength of the Rashba spin-orbit interaction both for systems with linear and cubic Rashba interaction this quantity is different in both systems and possesses different dimension. The structure of the tensor β_{ij} in the linear model agrees with that in the cubic model. The dependence of the quantity β_{ij} on the microscopic details, however, is also different in both models.).

Comparing the Eqs.(7) and (8) with the Eqs.(11) and (12) we note the following. Whereas the spin-orbit coupling gives rise to a coupling between spin and charge in the linear model there is no coupling between spin and charge in the diffusion equations for cubic systems at all. There is neither a spin accumulation ($S_A = 0$) nor a spin-galvanic current. This fact is very surprising, since we would have expected that the structure of the diffusion equations is little affected by a simple change in the power of the momentum in the Rashba spin-orbit interaction. We would like to mention that we have also checked this conclusion by calculating the spin accumulation in the Kubo-formalism. The results of this calculation are in line with those obtained from the diffusion equation and therefore not presented

here. They also show that the dc-spin accumulation is zero in the linear approximation with respect to the electric field for systems with weak cubic Rashba spin-orbit interaction.

The diffusion equations (8) and (12), however, differ not only in the spin-charge coupling terms. Comparing both equations further we also note that there is no term linear in the derivatives in the spin-diffusion equation (12), neither in the linear approximation with respect to N nor in higher order. This fact has far reaching consequences. The coefficient β_s in Eq.(12) leads to a precession of the magnetization around an axis, which is parallel to $N \times F$, if an electric field F is switched on. This precession can be used for the manipulation of the electron spin (see, e.g., Refs. [27,30,40,41,42]). The corresponding effective Zeeman field is linear in F . In the cubic Rashba model by contrast, there is no effective Zeeman field in linear approximation with respect to F .

The huge difference between the structure of the diffusion equations raises the question why the physics of both systems is drastically different. There is no answer to the question yet. On the technical level, however, the difference results from the angle averaging. The cubic Rashba-interaction is proportional to $p^3 = (\hbar k)^3$. The calculation of terms of first order in the derivatives, e.g. of spin-charge coupling terms, reduces to integrals of the type

$$\int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} k k^3 f(k) = 0;$$

which are zero for arbitrary functions $f(k)$.

B. The spin-current tensor

The surprising difference between the structure of the spin diffusion equations for systems with linear Rashba spin-orbit interaction and that for systems with cubic Rashba spin-orbit interaction raises the question, where spin-charge coupling effects manifest themselves. To investigate this question further we investigate the spin-current tensor. The spin-current tensor is defined as the expectation value $J_{ik}(r; E; s)$ of the operator

$$\hat{J}_{ik}(r) = \frac{1}{2} f \hat{j}_{ik}; (\hat{r} - r)g \quad (14)$$

where

$$\hat{j}_{ik} = \frac{1}{2} f_{-i}; \hat{v}_k g; \quad (15)$$

\hat{r} is the position operator and \hat{v}_k is the velocity operator. To calculate the expectation value we restrict the consideration to time scales, which are large compared to the momentum relaxation time. In this case we can use the following relationship between the spin-current tensor and the Green's functions^{25,31}:

$$J_{ik}(r; E; s) = \frac{\hbar}{4} \int dr_1 dr_2 \text{tr}(G^A(r_1 - r_2; E) \hat{J}_{ik}(r) G^R(r_2 - r_1; E)) S(r_1; E; s); \quad (16)$$

Here the Green's functions are those in the position representation. To simplify the integrals we use again the hydrodynamic expansion and obtain the equations

$$J_{ix} = -D r_i S_x; J_{iy} = -D r_i S_y \quad (17)$$

and

$$J_{iz} = -D \partial_i S_z + \frac{3\hbar}{2m} (\mathbf{e}_z \cdot \mathbf{r}) \partial_i n: \quad (18)$$

Eq.(18) generalizes the existing results³⁵ on the spin-Hall current to non-homogeneous systems. To compare Eq.(18) with the result of Ref.[35] for the spin-Hall current of a homogeneous system in the presence of an electric field we use the fact that the impact of the field on the spin-Hall current can be mimicked by means of a concentration gradient in the ohmic approximation²⁵. To mimic the field we use a particle density of the form

$$n(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{F}; s) = n_0 - 2(\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{r}) \quad (19)$$

where $\mathbf{F} = -e\mathbf{E}$ (e is the electric charge and \mathbf{E} is the electric field) and n_0 is a constant density. Doing so, we obtain

$$J_{iz} = -3 \frac{\hbar}{m} (\mathbf{e}_z \cdot \mathbf{F}) \partial_i: \quad (20)$$

This result coincides with that of Ref.[35]. It shows that there is a non-vanishing spin-Hall current in this system. The crucial question is, whether this fact gives also rise to a non-vanishing spin-Hall effect, viz to a non-equilibrium spin accumulation at the boundaries of the sample.

The equations (17) and (18) differ strongly from those obtained for systems with linear Rashba-interaction^{27,31}. The spin-current tensor for such systems is even non-zero in equilibrium (see, e.g. Refs.[22,23]). This fact manifests itself in terms containing the particle density without derivatives^{31,40,43}. Such terms are absent in systems with weak cubic Rashba-interaction. Therefore, the spin-current tensor describes deviations from equilibrium in systems with weak cubic Rashba-interaction and thus characterizes transport phenomena. In contrast to the spin diffusion equation, however, the spin-current tensor couples also spin with charge. The coupling is achieved by the second term on the right hand side (rhs) of Eq.(18). Since such spin-charge coupling terms are absent in the diffusion equation there is the question, whether there is really a connection between the spin diffusion equation and the spin-current tensor. Such a connection has not been established for systems with linear Rashba-interaction yet^{27,31}.

From the phenomenological point of view we expect that the spin diffusion equation can be written in the form⁴⁵

$$\partial_t S_k + \partial_i J_{ik} + \partial_i \tilde{J}_{ik} = 0: \quad (21)$$

Here \tilde{J}_{ik} is a tensor of currents, which we call transport currents. The transport currents determine the boundary conditions needed to find solutions to the diffusion equation. The physical solutions are those with the property that the transport currents are continuous at the boundary in the presence of a boundary⁴⁴. To find the transport currents there is no other way than to read off all terms, which are under the sign of the derivative. However, since Eq.(21) contains only the divergence of the spin-current tensor it is impossible to retrieve terms proportional to a curl unambiguously.

The spin-charge coupling term in Eq.(18) has just the structure of a curl. Due to this fact the relationship

$$\partial_i J_{ik} = -D \partial_k S_i \quad (22)$$

holds, so Eq.(8) can also be written in the form

$$\partial_t S_k + \partial_i J_{ik} + \partial_i \tilde{J}_{ik} = 0: \quad (23)$$

This fact suggests that the spin-current tensor coincides with the tensor of transport currents. Spin-charge coupling effects would enter the diffusion equation via the boundary condition if this assumption were correct.

Close to equilibrium, however, there is no way to assure that the spin-current tensor really coincides with the tensor of transport currents, since the terms proportional to a curl can not be retrieved from the diffusion equation, as mentioned before. Thus, there is no reason to believe that the spin-current tensor really determines the boundary conditions. There is no generally accepted method to avoid this problem. However, in a recent paper²⁷ we have noted the following fact: we can get further insight into the structure of the terms in question by switching on an additional external electric field F . The transport coefficients become position dependent in this case, since they depend on the kinetic energy $\epsilon_r = E(F; r)$ of the particles, which is different for particles with fixed total energy E at different positions r . Due to this fact the derivatives in the diffusion equation have also to act on the transport coefficients and thus, they produce additional terms. If the assumption that the spin-current tensor coincides with the tensor of transport currents is correct, these terms are just those, which result from derivatives of the spin-charge coupling term on the rhs of Eq.(18). Thus, this observation is helping us to identify unambiguously all those terms in the tensor of transport currents, which have the structure

$$! (r) (e_z - r)_i S(r; F; s);$$

where $! (r)$ is an arbitrary transport coefficient. Only terms of the form

$$(e_z - r)_i (! (r) S(r; F; s))$$

can not be retrieved.

IV . SPIN DIFFUSION IN THE PRESENCE OF AN ELECTRIC FIELD

A . Diffusion in the presence of an electric field

To generalize the diffusion equations to the presence of an electric field we use the symmetry properties of the Green's functions. The Green's functions satisfy the property

$$G(r + a; r^0 + a; F) = G(r; r^0; F; a) \quad (24)$$

in the presence of a constant field F , where $G(r; r^0; F)$ is either the retarded or the advanced Green's function in the position representation and a is an arbitrary vector. This fact permits the introduction of a new function g , according to the relationship²⁶

$$G(r; r^0; F) = \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} e^{i(k; r - r^0)} g(k; R); \quad (25)$$

where $R = (r + r^0)/2$. The knowledge of the function g is sufficient to derive the diffusion equation. In the presence of the field it takes the form²⁶

$$[a - (r; s) + \frac{1}{2} f b^i (r); r_i g + \frac{1}{2} r_i c^{ij} (r) r_j] S(r; F; s) = S_0(r; F); \quad (26)$$

where $\{f, g\}$ is the anticommutator. The coefficients a , b and c in this equation are related to the function g by the relationships

$$a(\mathbf{r}; s) = \frac{\hbar}{4} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \text{tr} [g^R(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{r} + i\mathbf{s}) g^A(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{r})]; \quad (27)$$

$$b^j(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\hbar}{4} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \text{tr} [g^R(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{r}) i\mathbf{r}_j g^A(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{r})] \quad (28)$$

and

$$c^{ik}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\hbar}{4} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \text{tr} [g^R(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{r}) i\mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{r}_k g^A(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{r})]; \quad (29)$$

The function g can be calculated perturbatively. It depends only on F^2 in the absence of the spin-orbit interaction and reduces to the equilibrium Green's function in such systems in the ohmic approximation. The coefficients a , b and c are the same in this case as those in the absence of the field. Therefore, the impact of electric fields can be reduced to position dependent shifts of the reference point of the kinetic energy, which can be taken into account by a simple substitution of the type $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \mathbf{r} - F\mathbf{a}$ in the equilibrium diffusion equation, where \mathbf{a} is the kinetic energy.

However, in the presence of the spin-orbit interaction this concept proves to be inadequate. The impact of the field on transport processes can not be reduced to simple shifts of the reference point of the kinetic energy in such systems, as claimed, e.g., in the Refs.[25] and [28]. In such systems the field leads both to a position dependent shift of the reference point of the kinetic energy and to distortions of the particle spectrum. These distortions are responsible for the spin-Hall effect, as discussed in Ref.[1]. To take into account the distortions we restrict the consideration to the ohmic approximation. In this case we can write the function g in the form

$$g(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{E}) = G(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{E}) + g^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{E}); \quad (30)$$

where $g^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{E})$ is the linear contribution to g with respect to F and the function $G(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{E})$ is the equilibrium Green's function. The function $g^{(1)}$ can be calculated perturbatively. For the linear Rashba model we obtain $g^{(1)} / N^2(F; \mathbf{k})$ (see Eq.(10) of Ref.[26]), as expected of the spin-Hall term. The cubic Rashba model yields

$$g^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{E}) = i\frac{3\hbar}{2} \int N^2(g_+(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{E})g_-(\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{E}))^2 (p_+^3 p_+^2 F + p_-^3 p_-^2 F); \quad (31)$$

where $F = F_x - iF_y$. If we take into account this term in calculating the coefficients in Eq.(26) we obtain the equation

$$\partial_t S_k(\mathbf{r}; t) + \mathbf{v}_k(\mathbf{r}) S_i(\mathbf{r}; t) + \mathbf{r}_i J_{ik}(\mathbf{r}; t) = 0 \quad (32)$$

in the ohmic approximation, where $\mathbf{v}_k(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{v}_r$ and the spin-current tensor is given by the Eqs.(17) and (18) with $\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_k(\mathbf{r})$ and $D \rightarrow D(\mathbf{r}) = D_{\mathbf{v}_k = \mathbf{v}_r}$. In Eq.(32) we have also included the variables the densities depend on to stress that the densities are functions of the total energy E , of the particle position \mathbf{r} and of t in the presence of a field. Below we omit the variables again to avoid cluttering the notation.

At this point it is important to note the following: whereas Eq.(8) can only be written in the form (23) due to the identity (22), Eq.(32) contains also derivatives of spin-charge

coupling coefficients, since the equality (22) does not hold in the presence of electric fields. The spin-charge coupling term (second term on the rhs of Eq.(18)) arises naturally in the diffusion equation. It does not reduce to the divergence of a curl. Consequently, we can truly claim that the spin-charge coupling term enters the diffusion equation and thus, that the spin-current tensor coincides with the tensor of transport currents. The second point we would like to draw attention to is the following: the spin-charge coupling term would be absent if we had ignored the distortion of the particle spectrum due to the electric field.

Eq.(32) couples the spin density with the charge density. The diffusion equation for the charge density takes the form

$$\partial_t n(\mathbf{r}; t) + \text{div} \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}; t); \quad (33)$$

where

$$\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}; t) = -D(\epsilon) \nabla n(\mathbf{r}; t) - \frac{3\hbar}{2m} (\epsilon_z - \epsilon) \mathbf{r} S_z(\mathbf{r}; t); \quad (34)$$

Eq.(34) sets the situation again apart from that in the linear Rashba model. Homogeneous non-equilibrium magnetizations in the plane of the 2-d electron gas lead to electric currents in the linear Rashba model in the absence of external fields (the spin-galvanic currents). In the cubic Rashba model, by contrast, non-equilibrium magnetizations can only induce electric currents in the absence of external fields if they are inhomogeneous and perpendicular to the 2-d plane of the 2-d electron gas. A homogeneous non-equilibrium magnetization perpendicular to the 2-d plane can only induce a current in the presence of a field, as discussed further below.

The Eqs.(32)–(34) do not have the structure of conventional diffusion equations yet. The reason for this fact is that these equations are written down for densities, which depend on the total energy of the particles. To obtain conventional diffusion equations we distinguish between the position dependence of the densities, which characterizes the shape of the packet, and the position dependence of the reference point of the kinetic energy, viz we write the densities in the form $n(\mathbf{r}; t) = n(r; \epsilon; t)$, $S(\mathbf{r}; t) = S(r; \epsilon; t)$ and replace ϵ by $\epsilon - F_z$. The position dependence of the density $n(r; \epsilon; t)$ describes the shape of a particle packet of particles with the same kinetic energy ϵ , which is measured from the tilted bottom of the band. Likewise for the density $S(r; \epsilon; t)$. Doing so, we find that the derivatives transform according to the rule $\nabla \rightarrow \nabla - F_z \partial / \partial \epsilon$. Using this method, we obtain

$$\partial_t S_k + \nabla_k(\epsilon) S_i + r_i J_{ik} = -\partial_j j_i; \quad (35)$$

where j_i is the energy relaxation current for spins,

$$J_{ix} = -D(\epsilon) r_i S_x + D(\epsilon) F_i \partial S_x / \partial \epsilon; \quad J_{iy} = -D(\epsilon) r_i S_y + D(\epsilon) F_i \partial S_y / \partial \epsilon; \quad (36)$$

and

$$J_{iz} = -D(\epsilon) r_i S_z + D(\epsilon) F_i \partial S_z / \partial \epsilon + \frac{3\hbar}{2m} (\epsilon_z - \epsilon) \epsilon_i n - \frac{3\hbar}{2m} (\epsilon_z - F_z) \partial n / \partial \epsilon; \quad (37)$$

The second term on the rhs of the Eqs.(36) and (37) might look unfamiliar. However, in looking on these equations one has to take into account that these equations are spectral diffusion equations. To obtain diffusion equations, say for particles at the Fermi surface, one has to integrate these equations with respect to ϵ . In this case the first term on the rhs

of Eq.(35) vanishes and the second term on the rhs of the Eqs.(36) and (37) yields just the mobility times the field, as expected.

The electric current takes the following form

$$\mathbf{j} = -D(\epsilon) \nabla n + D(\epsilon) F \hat{e}_n - \frac{3\hbar}{2m} (\epsilon) \mathbf{e}_z \times \nabla S_z + \frac{3\hbar}{2m} (\epsilon) \mathbf{e}_z \times F \hat{e}_n S_z: \quad (38)$$

and the diffusion equation (33) yields

$$\partial_t n + \text{div} \mathbf{j} = -\partial_j j; \quad (39)$$

where j is the energy relaxation current for particles. Note that, the fourth term on the rhs of Eq.(38) yields also an electric current in an electric field if there is a homogeneous magnetization in z -direction. This current is a Hall current, i.e., it is transverse to F .

B. Spin-Hall effect

To investigate the spin-Hall effect we focus on a system in the half-plane $y > 0$. We assume that the system is translation invariant in x -direction ($d=dx=0$), that the electric field is applied in x -direction and that there is an additional scattering process, which keeps the system in energy equilibrium. Thus, $n(\mathbf{r}; t) = n_0(\epsilon_F)$, where ϵ_F is the Fermi energy and $n_0 = 2$. A glance on the spin diffusion equations (35)–(37) reveals that a non-equilibrium magnetization at the Fermi surface is created in this case. Therefore, we can solve the spin diffusion equation with the ansatz $S(\mathbf{r}; t) = S(y)(\epsilon_F)$. To obtain an equation for $S(y)$ we restrict the consideration to the stationary limit and integrate the spin diffusion equations with respect to x . Doing so, we obtain the equation

$$2(\epsilon_F) S_z - D(\epsilon_F) \frac{d^2}{dy^2} S_z = 0; \quad (40)$$

which has to be solved subjected to the boundary conditions

$$0 = J_{yz}|_{y=0} = -D(\epsilon_F) \frac{d}{dy} S_z + \frac{3\hbar}{2m} (\epsilon_F) F_x n_0 \quad (41)$$

and $S_z = 0$ for $y \rightarrow \infty$. The unique solution is

$$S_z(y) = \frac{3\hbar}{2} \frac{(\epsilon_F) \hbar}{2D(\epsilon_F)m} n_0 F_x \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{2(\epsilon_F)}{D(\epsilon_F)}} y\right): \quad (42)$$

Thus, the spin-Hall current in the bulk leads to a non-equilibrium magnetization at the boundary, as it is also the case in systems with strong Rashba spin-orbit interaction⁹. Since the exponent depends only on the ratio $(\epsilon_F)/D(\epsilon_F)$ the penetration depth of the spin accumulation is independent of disorder in systems with weak spin-orbit interaction. It decreases with increasing particle number. The magnitude of the edge spin-accumulation increases with increasing ϵ_F since $(\epsilon_F)/D(\epsilon_F) \propto \epsilon_F^3$. This sets the situation apart from that in nearly clean systems. There both the magnitude of the edge spin-accumulation and the penetration depth decrease with increasing particle number⁹.

The disorder enters only in the preexponential factor via the relaxation time. This factor leads to a reduction of the magnitude of the magnetization with increasing amount of disorder.

C . Hall-like current

Spin-charge coupling effects manifest themselves also in the electric current in optical experiments. To investigate the magnitude of the Hall-like current, we assume that a constant non-equilibrium magnetization of the type $S(r, j; t) = S_z e_z (\delta n_F)$ is created optically by means of optical orientation. Such a density leads to a Hall-like current of the form

$$j = \frac{3\hbar}{2m} e_z \delta n_F S_z \frac{d(\delta n_F)}{d_F} : \quad (43)$$

Surprisingly this current depends only quadratically on N , as it is also the case for the spin-Hall effect. It shares this property with the Hall current, which has recently been discussed in Ref.[46]. We speculate that the physics is similar.

V . CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the diffusion equations for heavy holes in semiconductor quantum wells with Rashba spin-orbit interaction. The holes are described by a cubic Rashba model. In our investigation we have restricted the consideration to systems with weak Rashba interaction. These systems have the property that the energy level splitting due to the Rashba interaction at the Fermi energy is small compared to the disorder energy $\hbar\omega_c$.

At first glance the cubic Rashba model differs from the conventional linear Rashba model only in that the interaction does not depend linearly but cubically on the momentum. This small difference, however, leads to drastic changes in the structure of the spin diffusion equations. The particle and spin diffusion equations reduce to conventional diffusion equations in the absence of external fields. There are no spin-charge coupling effects in the diffusion equations themselves in the absence of external fields. There is neither a spin-accumulation, which can be induced by concentration gradient, nor a spin-galvanic current in homogeneous non-equilibrium systems. This sets the situation strongly apart from that for systems with linear Rashba-interaction, in which spin-charge coupling terms occur in the particle and spin diffusion equations, which are related to the existence of these phenomena. If we switch on an external field the situation changes. Spin-charge coupling terms occur also explicitly in the diffusion equation, which lead to a non-equilibrium current in the presence of a perpendicular non-equilibrium magnetization and to spin-Hall effect. Our investigation shows that both effects depend only on the magnitude of the Rashba interaction strength. Explicit formulas for the magnitude of the spin-accumulation at the boundary and for the magnitude of the non-equilibrium current under steady state illumination are given in the text.

The investigation of the structure of the spin-diffusion equations has also yield further informations on the physics of spin-diffusion processes in such systems. It has shown that the spin-current tensor coincides with the tensor of transport currents in the diffusion equation (see Eq.(21) for the definition of tensor of transport currents). Therefore, the spin-current tensor determines the boundary conditions needed to find solutions to the spin diffusion equations. Due to this fact spin-charge coupling effects enter the solution to the diffusion equations even in the absence of external fields, although they are absent in the diffusion equations themselves in the absence of fields. This fact is remarkable and sets the situation again strongly apart from that in the linear model. In the linear model there is no relationship between the tensor of transport currents and the spin-current tensor²⁷.

The huge differences between the results for the linear and the cubic model raise the question, why the physics in the cubic Rashba model differs so strongly from that in the linear model. We have no clear answer to the question yet but speculate that the difference is caused by the fact that the linear spin-orbit coupling has nearly the structure of a pure gauge. In fact, to take into account the spin-orbit interaction in the linear model we only have to replace the derivatives by covariant derivatives in the diffusion equations, as long as spin-charge coupling effects are ignored³¹.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to H. Bottger and P. Kleinert for many useful and interesting discussions on the subject.

Electronic address: olaf.bleibaum@physik.uni-magdeburg.de

- ¹ J. Sinova, D. Culcer, Q. Niu, N. A. Sinitsyn, T. Jungwirth, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 126603 (2004).
- ² J. Wunderlich, B. K. Aestner, J. Sinova, T. Jungwirth, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 047204 (2005).
- ³ B. K. Nikolic, L. P. Zabo, and S. Souma, Phys. Rev. B 72, 075361 (2005), Phys. Rev. B 73, 075303 (2006).
- ⁴ B. K. Nikolic and S. Souma, Phys. Rev. B 71, 195328 (2005).
- ⁵ J. Schliemann and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B 69, 165315 (2004).
- ⁶ L. Sheng, D. N. Sheng, and C. S. Ting, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 016602 (2005).
- ⁷ S. Murakami, N. Nagaosa, and S. C. Zhang, Science 301, 1348 (2003) (see also the supporting online material).
- ⁸ B. A. Bernevig, and S. C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 016801 (2005).
- ⁹ K. Nomura, J. Wunderlich, J. Sinova, B. K. Aestner, A. H. MacDonald, and T. Jungwirth, Phys. Rev. B 72, 245330 (2005).
- ¹⁰ K. Nomura, J. Sinova, N. A. Sinitsyn, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B 72, 165316 (2005).
- ¹¹ M. W. Wu and J. Zhou, Phys. Rev. B 72, 115333 (2005).
- ¹² Y. K. Kato, R. C. Myers, A. C. Gossard, and D. D. Awschalom, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 176601 (2004).
- ¹³ A. Yu. Silov, P. A. Blajov, J. H. Woller, R. Hey, K. H. Ploog, and N. S. Averkiev, Appl. Phys. Lett. 85, 5929 (2004).
- ¹⁴ S. D. Ganichev, S. N. Danilov, P. Schneider, V. V. Bel'kov, L. E. Golub, W. Wegscheider, D. Weiss, and W. Prettl, cond-mat/0403641 (unpublished).
- ¹⁵ V. M. Edelstein, Solid State Commun. 73, 233 (1990).
- ¹⁶ J. I. Inoue, G. E. W. Bauer, and L. W. Molenkamp, Phys. Rev. B 67, 033104 (2003).
- ¹⁷ D. Culcer, Y. Yao, A. H. MacDonald, and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. B 72, 045215 (2005).
- ¹⁸ P. Kleinert, V. V. Bryksin and O. Bleibaum, Phys. Rev. B 72, 195311 (2005).
- ¹⁹ R. Raimondi, P. Schwab, Phys. Rev. B 71, 33311 (2005).
- ²⁰ O. Chalaev and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B 71, 245318 (2005).
- ²¹ S. Murakami, Phys. Rev. B 69, 241202(R) (2004).
- ²² E. I. Rashba, Phys. Rev. B 68, 241315(R) (2003), J. Supercond. 18, 137 (2005).

- ²³ S. Zhang and Z. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 066602 (2005).
- ²⁴ A. A. Burkov, A. S. Nunez and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B 70, 155308 (2004).
- ²⁵ E. G. Mishchenko, A. V. Shytov, and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 226602 (2004).
- ²⁶ O. Bleibaum, Phys. Rev. B 71, 195329 (2005).
- ²⁷ O. Bleibaum, Phys. Rev. B 73, 35322 (2006).
- ²⁸ I. Adagideli, G. E. W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 256602 (2005).
- ²⁹ O. Bleibaum, Phys. Rev. B 72, 75366 (2005).
- ³⁰ T. Damker, H. Bottger and V. V. Bryksin, Phys. Rev. B 69 205327 (2004).
- ³¹ O. Bleibaum, cond-mat/0503471 (unpublished) (2005).
- ³² P. Zhang, J. Shi, SiXiao, and Q. Niu, cond-mat/0503505v4 (2005).
- ³³ N. Sugimoto, S. Onoda, S. Murakami and N. Nagaosa, cond-mat/0503475v3 (2006).
- ³⁴ P. L. Krotkov, and S. DasSarma, cond-mat/0510114v1 (2005).
- ³⁵ J. Schliemann and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. B 71, 85308 (2005).
- ³⁶ M. G. Pala, M. G. Overmire, J. König, U. Zülicke, G. Iannaccone, Phys. Rev. B 69, 045304 (2004).
- ³⁷ M. G. Pala, M. G. Overmire, J. König, U. Zülicke, Europhys. Lett. 65, 850 (2004).
- ³⁸ R. Winkler, Phys. Rev. B 62, R4245 (2000).
- ³⁹ R. Winkler, H. Noh, E. Tutuc, and M. Shayegan, Phys. Rev. B 65, 155303 (2002).
- ⁴⁰ O. Bleibaum, Phys. Rev. B 69, 205202 (2004).
- ⁴¹ M. Q. Wang, M. W. Wu, and L. Jiang, Phys. Rev. B 69, 245320 (2004).
- ⁴² Y. K. Kato, R. C. Myers, A. C. Gossard, and D. D. Awschalom, Appl. Phys. Lett. 87, 22503 (2005).
- ⁴³ P. Kleinert and V. V. Bryksin, Phys. Rev. B (in print).
- ⁴⁴ L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifschitz, Lehrbuch der Theoretischen Physik VI Hydrodynamik (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1991).
- ⁴⁵ Note that, since \mathbf{S} is a vector we could as well expect that the diffusion equation can be written in the form
- $$\partial_t S_k + \kappa_i S_i + r_i J_{ik} + (\text{curl} \mathbf{T})_k = 0;$$
- where \mathbf{T} is a vector field, which depends on \mathbf{S} . The choice of the structure (23) is really only based on the observation, that hydrodynamic equations can usually be written in the form (23) (see, e.g., [44]).
- ⁴⁶ P. Zhang and Q. Niu, cond-mat/0406436v1 (2004).