

Anomalous Hall Effect in non-commutative mechanics

P. A. Horvathy

Laboratoire de Mathématiques et de Physique Théorique
Université de Tours
Parc de Grandmont
F-37200 TOURS (France)

April 15, 2024

Abstract

The anomalous velocity term in the semiclassical model of a Bloch electron deviates the trajectory from the conventional one. When the Berry curvature (alias noncommutative parameter) is a monopole in momentum space, as found recently in some ferromagnetic crystals while observing the anomalous Hall effect, we get a transverse shift, similar to that in the optical Hall effect.

cond-mat/0606472

1 Introduction

The Anomalous Hall Effect (AHE), characterized by the absence of a magnetic field, is observed in some ferromagnetic crystals. While this has been well established experimentally, its explanation is still controversial. One, put forward by Karplus and Luttinger [1] fifty years ago, suggests that the effect is due to an anomalous current.

Many years later, it has been argued [2] that the semiclassical dynamics of a Bloch electron in a crystal should involve a Berry curvature term, .

e-mail: horvathy@lmpt.univ-tours.fr.

In the n^{th} band the equations of motion read, in an electromagnetic field,

$$\underline{r} = \frac{\partial \epsilon_n(\mathbf{k})}{\partial \mathbf{k}} - \mathbf{k} \times \underline{r}; \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{k} = e\mathbf{E} + e\underline{r} \times \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}); \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{r} = (x^i)$ and $\mathbf{k} = (k_j)$ denote the electron's intracell position and quasimomentum, respectively; $\epsilon_n(\mathbf{k})$ is the band energy. The relation (1) exhibits an anomalous velocity term, $-\mathbf{k} \times \underline{r}$, which is the mechanical counterpart of the anomalous current.

The model is distinguished by the non-commutativity of the position coordinates: in the absence of a magnetic field, $[x^i, x^j] = i\hbar \epsilon^{ijn} \partial/\partial k_n$ [3, 4]. In the free noncommutative model in 3 space dimensions, ϵ^{ijn} can only be momentum-dependent such that $\partial/\partial k_i \epsilon^{ijn} = 0$ [3].

A remarkable discovery concerns the AHE in the metallic ferromagnet SrRuO_3 . Fang et al. [5] found in fact that the experimental data are consistent with taking the form of a monopole in momentum space,

$$\epsilon^{ijn} = \frac{k^i k^j k^n}{k^3}; \quad (3)$$

$k \neq 0$. (3) is, furthermore, the only possibility consistent with rotational symmetry [3].

Here we propose to study the AHE in the semiclassical framework (as advocated in [6]), with non-commutative parameter (3). For $\mathbf{B} = 0$ and a constant electric field, $\mathbf{E} = \text{const.}$ and assuming a parabolic profile $\epsilon_n(\mathbf{k}) = k^2/2$, eqn. (2), $\mathbf{k} = e\mathbf{E}t + \mathbf{k}_0$: The velocity relation (1) becomes in turn

$$\underline{r} = \mathbf{k}_0 + e\mathbf{E}t + \frac{eE\mathbf{k}_0}{k^3} \mathbf{h}; \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{k}_0 \times \hat{\mathbf{E}}$ [hats" denote vectors normalized to unit length]. The component of \mathbf{k}_0 parallel to \mathbf{E} has no interest; we can assume therefore that \mathbf{k}_0 is perpendicular to the electric field. Writing $\mathbf{r}(t) = x(t)\hat{\mathbf{k}}_0 + y(t)\hat{\mathbf{E}} + z(t)\mathbf{h}$, eqn. (4) yields that the component parallel to \mathbf{k}_0 moves uniformly, $x(t) = k_0 t$, and its component parallel to the electric field is uniformly accelerating, $y(t) = \frac{1}{2}eEt^2$. (Our choices correspond to choosing time so that the turning point is at $t = 0$.) However, owing to the anomalous term in (1), the particle is also deviated perpendicularly to \mathbf{k}_0 and \mathbf{E} , namely by

$$z(t) = \frac{eEt}{k_0} \mp \frac{eEt}{k_0^2 + e^2 E^2 t^2}; \quad (5)$$




Figure 1: The anomalous velocity term deviates the trajectory from the plane.

It follows that the trajectory leaves its initial the plane and suffers, between $t = -1$ to $t = 1$, a finite transverse shift, namely

$$z = \frac{2}{k_0}; \quad (6)$$

Most contribution to the shift comes when the momentum is small, i.e., "near the k -monopole."

becomes a half-integer upon quantization, $N = 2$, and hence (6) is indeed $N = k_0$. The constant $k_0 \neq 0$, the minimal possible value of momentum, plays the role of an impact parameter. Let us observe that while (6) does not depend on the field E or the electric charge e , the limit $eE \rightarrow 0$ is singular. For $eE = 0$, the motion is uniform along a straight line.

The transverse shift is reminiscent of the recently discovered optical Hall effect [7] and can also be derived, just like in the optical case, using the angular momentum. The free expression [3], $J = r \times k$; is plainly broken by the electric field to its component parallel to E ,

$$J = J_y = z(t)k_0 \quad \propto \frac{eE t}{k_0^2 + e^2 E^2 t^2}; \quad (7)$$

whose conservation yields once again the shift (6).

How can the same argument work for a Bloch electron and for light? The answer relies, for both problems, on having the same " \mathbf{k} -monopole" contribution, \mathbf{k} in the angular momentum.

Our model is plainly not realistic: what we described is, rather, the deviation of a freely falling non-commutative particle from the classical parabola found by Galileo. Particles in a metal are not free, though, and their uniform acceleration in the direction of \mathbf{E} should be damped by some mechanism. It is nevertheless remarkable that we obtain qualitative information from such a toy model.

Note added. I am indebted to Dr. S. Murakami for calling my attention to similar work in the context of the spin Hall effect in semiconductors [8]. I would also like to thank Dr. Y. Kats for informing me about the experimental status of the AHE, see [9].

References

- [1] R. Karplus and J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. 95, 1154 (1954).
- [2] M. C. Chang and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1348 (1995).
- [3] A. Berard and H. Mohrbach, Phys. Rev. D 69, 127701 (2004) [hep-th/0310167].
- [4] C. Duval et al. Mod. Phys. Lett. B 20, 373 (2006) [cond-mat/0506051].
- [5] Fang et al. Science 302, 92 (2003) [cond-mat/030232].
- [6] T. Jungwirth, Q. Niu, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 207208 (2002).
- [7] M. Onoda, S. Murakami, N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 083901 (2004); K. Yu. Bliokh and Yu. P. Bliokh, Phys. Lett. A 333, 181 (2004) [physics/0402110]; A. Berard and H. Mohrbach, Phys. Lett. A 352, 190; [hep-th/0404165]; C. Duval, Z. Horvath, P. A. Horvathy, [math-ph/0509031], to appear in Journ. Geom. Phys.
- [8] S. Murakami, N. Nagaosa, and S.-C. Zhang, Science 301, 1348 (2003) [cond-mat/0308167]
- [9] Y. Kats et al., Phys. Rev. B 70, 180407(R) (2004).