

First-principles linear response description of the spin Nernst effect

S. Wimmer, D. Ködderitzsch, K. Chadova and H. Ebert

Department Chemie/Phys. Chemie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Butenandtstrasse 11, 81377 München, Germany

(Dated: June 9, 2021)

A first-principles description of the spin Nernst effect, denoting the occurrence of a transverse spin current due to a temperature gradient, is presented. The approach, based on an extension to the Kubo-Středa equation for spin transport, supplies in particular the formal basis for investigations of diluted as well as concentrated alloys. Results for corresponding applications to the alloy system $\text{Au}_x\text{Cu}_{1-x}$ give the intrinsic and extrinsic contributions to the relevant transport coefficients. Using scaling laws allows in addition splitting the extrinsic contribution into its skew scattering and side-jump parts.

PACS numbers: 71.15.Rf, 72.15.Qm, 72.15.Jf, 72.25.Ba

In recent years, transverse transport phenomena have moved into the focus of many studies, the enormous interest being of twofold origin: first due to their promising potential use in applications; second because of the intriguing underlying physics—the delicate and non-trivial entanglement of the electrons’ spin and orbital degrees of freedom due to relativistic effects. Prominent examples for these are the anomalous Hall effect (AHE) in magnetically ordered solids^{1–3} and the spin Hall effect (SHE) occurring in nonmagnetic solids.^{4–6} While these transverse charge (AHE) and spin (SHE) transport phenomena are connected with an electric field \vec{E} applied to a sample, corresponding phenomena can also be induced by a temperature gradient $\vec{\nabla}T$, giving rise to the anomalous Nernst (ANE)^{7,8} and spin Nernst (SNE)^{9–11} effects.

Spin-orbit interaction is the ultimate origin of all the aforementioned transverse transport phenomena, and different mechanisms giving contributions to the transverse conductivities have been identified. For pure systems they consist of an intrinsic contribution that can be connected to the so-called Berry curvature,^{7,12,13} as has been demonstrated by various first-principles investigations on the AHE^{14–16} as well as the SHE.^{17–19} It has been suggested that for pure systems the intrinsic contribution has to be complemented by a concentration-independent side-jump contribution, which is meant to account for inevitable impurities. Corresponding first-principles work has been done for the AHE¹⁶ and ANE.²⁰ For diluted alloys skew or Mott scattering and the side-jump mechanisms have been identified as additional extrinsic contributions.^{1,2} Recently, model calculations on the basis of Friedel’s impurity model have demonstrated for the SHE of $5d$ -transition metals diluted in Cu that both contributions may be of the same order of magnitude.²¹ Corresponding first-principles work on the SHE²² as well as the SNE^{23,24} has been done using the Boltzmann formalism that gives so far access to the skew scattering contribution only. As an alternative to this, the Kubo-Středa formalism, which is applicable to pure systems as well as diluted and concentrated alloys, has been used to deal with the AHE^{25,26} and the SHE.²⁷ In the case of concentrated alloys, a decomposition into

intrinsic and extrinsic contributions to the transport coefficients has been suggested^{25,27} on the basis of their relation to the so-called vertex corrections^{1,28,29} (which correspond to the scattering-in term of the Boltzmann equation) and the scaling laws connecting transverse and longitudinal transport coefficients.^{1,2} This approach led for diluted alloys to contributions due to the skew scattering mechanism in full agreement with results based on the Boltzmann formalism.²⁷

Among the various transport phenomena, the SNE has so far been considered only by a relatively few authors.^{9–11,23,30–32} Only recently, the first calculations from first-principles for the skew scattering contribution have been performed for diluted alloys.²³ As suggested by previous work,³³ the concept of a spin-projected conductivity has been used for this. As demonstrated in this Rapid Communication, this simplifying concept³⁴ can be avoided by working throughout with the spin current density and its related transport coefficients. This, together with a fully relativistic first-principles band structure scheme, allows us to include all spin-flip transitions.³⁵ Finally, as demonstrated below, the extension of the Kubo-Středa formalism for spin transport leads to a first-principles description of the SNE that accounts for all possible contributions and that can be applied to pure as well as disordered systems. Furthermore, it supplies a proper basis to deal with nonmagnetic solids, as done here, but also to discuss thermally induced spin transport in magnetic solids.

Kubo’s linear response formalism allows to relate the electric and heat current densities, \vec{j}^c and \vec{j}^q , respectively, to the gradients of the electrochemical potential μ and temperature T ^{36,37}. These standard relations may be extended to include an induced spin current density J^s and can formally be written (see, e.g., Ref. 33)

$$\vec{j}^c = -L^{cc}\vec{\nabla}\mu - L^{cq}\vec{\nabla}T/T \quad (1)$$

$$\vec{j}^q = -L^{qc}\vec{\nabla}\mu - L^{qq}\vec{\nabla}T/T \quad (2)$$

$$J^s = -\mathcal{L}^{sc}\vec{\nabla}\mu - \mathcal{L}^{sq}\vec{\nabla}T/T \quad (3)$$

with the gradient of the electrochemical potential $\vec{\nabla}\mu = \vec{\nabla}\mu_c + e\vec{E}$, where μ_c is the chemical potential,³⁸ $e = |e|$

the elementary charge, \vec{E} the electric field, and $\vec{\nabla}T$ denotes the temperature gradient. Here, the L^{ij} and J^s are tensors of second rank and \mathcal{L}^{ij} denote tensors of third rank. In the following we will consider only the response to the vector fields \vec{E} and $\vec{\nabla}T$. All elements of the response tensors will be considered as temperature dependent with the restriction to the electronic temperature T . In addition T which appears in the forces is interpreted as the average sample temperature and not as a microscopic $T(\vec{r})$ due to the temperature gradient, assuming that we are in the regime of linear response. Furthermore only the carrier diffusion contribution to the thermoelectric effects will be considered, collective phenomena such as the phonon-drag effect are not accounted for.

The response tensors appearing in Eqs. (1) and (2) can be calculated from the corresponding conductivities in the athermal limit, as was demonstrated, e.g., by Smrčka and Středa³⁹ or Jonson and Mahan.⁴⁰ Extending existing approaches employing a spin-projection scheme in the spirit of Mott's two-current model and avoiding the use of spin-dependent electrochemical potentials,^{23,33} the present relativistic formulation leads to analogous expressions for the spin response coefficients. In particular, the underlying spin conductivity σ^{sc} ($\equiv -e\mathcal{L}^{sc}$ for $T \rightarrow 0$ K) may be calculated by an expression analogous to the Kubo-Středa formula for σ^{cc} ($\equiv -eL^{cc}$ for $T \rightarrow 0$ K).^{27,41} Numerical checks against the Kubo-Bastin formula⁴² proved this to be justified for the metallic systems considered here. Therefore it is possible to use the concept of an energy-dependent conductivity $\sigma^{sc}(E)$ providing the basis for calculating the response to $\vec{\nabla}T$ following the conventional scheme. For the spin-polarization axis along ξ , the spin current along μ , and the electric field along ν , with $\mu(\nu, \xi) \in \{x, y, z\}$, one obtains

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mu\nu}^{sc,\xi}(T) = -\frac{1}{e} \int dE \sigma_{\mu\nu}^{sc,\xi}(E) D(E, T), \quad (4)$$

with $D(E, T) = \left(-\frac{\partial f(E, T)}{\partial E}\right)$, $f(E, T)$ the Fermi function and the energy-dependent spin conductivity $\sigma_{\mu\nu}^{sc,\xi}(E)$ which is obtained by applying the Kubo-Středa formalism in the framework of KKR-CPA,^{25,27,29,43} using a relativistic spin current density operator.^{27,44}

In analogy to the connection between the transport coefficient $L_{\mu\nu}^{cq}(T)$ and the energy-dependent electrical conductivity $\sigma_{\mu\nu}^{cc}(E)$,⁴⁰ the temperature-dependent spin transport coefficient $\mathcal{L}_{\mu\nu}^{sq,\xi}(T)$ is expressed in terms of the energy-dependent spin conductivity $\sigma_{\mu\nu}^{sc,\xi}(E)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mu\nu}^{sq,\xi}(T) = -\frac{1}{e} \int dE \sigma_{\mu\nu}^{sc,\xi}(E) D(E, T) (E - E_F), \quad (5)$$

with E_F the Fermi energy.

Considering a thermal gradient $\vec{\nabla}T$ without an external electric field \vec{E} , the resulting electric current density \vec{j}^c vanishes when open-circuit conditions are imposed.

Equation (1) implies that an internal electric field

$$\vec{E} = -\frac{1}{eT}(L^{cc})^{-1}L^{cq}\vec{\nabla}T = S\vec{\nabla}T \quad (6)$$

builds up in order to compensate the charge imbalance induced by $\vec{\nabla}T$, where S is the thermo(magneto)electric tensor. Equations (4), (5) and (6) are in their combination sometimes called the generalized Mott formula for the thermopower (e.g. Refs. 20 and 45) and it has been shown by various authors (e.g. Ref. 40) that this expression reduces to the original expression of Mott for $T \rightarrow 0$ K. Using Eq. (3) together with Eq. (6) a spin-polarized current as a response to a temperature gradient is obtained under the aforementioned conditions for the charge current:

$$\begin{aligned} J^s &= \mathcal{L}^{sc}(-e\vec{E}) + \mathcal{L}^{sq}(-\vec{\nabla}T/T) \\ &= \alpha^{scq} \vec{\nabla}T, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with the third-rank tensor

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{scq} &= -e\mathcal{L}^{sc}S - \mathcal{L}^{sq}/T \\ &= \mathcal{L}^{sc}(L^{cc})^{-1}L^{cq}/T - \mathcal{L}^{sq}/T, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with notation chosen to be in line with the conventional symbol $\alpha_{\mu\nu}^{cq} = -L_{\mu\nu}^{cq}/T$ for the Nernst^{20,46,47} (or Peltier⁴⁸) coefficient or conductivity. In the following $\alpha_{\mu\nu}^{sq,\xi} = -\mathcal{L}_{\mu\nu}^{sq,\xi}/T$ will be used accordingly for the spin Nernst conductivity.

Obviously, the properties of the tensors appearing in Eq. (8) allow us to decide in a most general way whether a thermal gradient may give rise to longitudinal and/or transverse spin currents. To investigate the symmetry properties of the tensor \mathcal{L}^{sc} we have extended the symmetry scheme of Kleiner⁴⁹ in an appropriate way and applied it to $\sigma^{sc}(E)$.⁵⁰ For nonmagnetic cubic solids as considered here one obtains for spin-polarization along $\xi = z$

$$\sigma^{sc,z} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_{xy}^z & 0 \\ -\sigma_{xy}^z & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

which by virtue of Eqs. (4) and (5) leads to the same structure for $\mathcal{L}^{sc,\xi}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{sq,\xi}$, respectively. Cyclic permutations of the indices μ , ν , and ξ do not change the value of $\sigma_{\mu\nu}^\xi$, while anticyclic permutations reverse its sign. It should be mentioned that the structure of $\sigma_{\mu\nu}^\xi$ given by Eq. (9) is obtained accounting only for the spatial symmetry operations of the cubic point group. Inclusion of time-reversal symmetry does not give further restriction to the shape of the tensor σ^{sc} but introduces Onsager relations among tensors of response coefficients when response and force are interchanged.

As for the situation considered here (nonmagnetic, cubic) the conductivity tensor σ^{cc} (derived from L^{cc}) is diagonal and isotropic, a temperature gradient cannot create a longitudinal spin current. However, for the transverse components with respect to the polarization axis in

$\xi = z$ one finds for example in the open electrical circuit case the nonvanishing term

$$\alpha_{yx}^{scq,z} = -e\mathcal{L}_{yx}^{sc,z}S_{xx} - \frac{1}{T}\mathcal{L}_{yx}^{sq,z} \quad (10)$$

$$= \alpha_{yx}^{sc,z} + \alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}, \quad (11)$$

consisting of the “electrical” and “thermal” contributions, $\alpha_{yx}^{sc,z}$ and $\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}$, respectively.⁵¹

The second term of Eq. (10) represents the energy dependence of the spin-polarized transverse (spin Hall) conductivity in the vicinity of the Fermi level weighted with the asymmetrical occupation of states due to the temperature gradient [see Eq. (5)]. The first term, which is caused by zero charge current conditions, couples the thermoelectric effect in the direction of the temperature gradient via the generated charge imbalance (or internal electric field) to a transverse spin current. In the linear response regime this can be equivalently interpreted as an additional charge current (balancing the effect of $\vec{\nabla}T$) with a transverse (spin) component at the mean temperature of the sample or the action of the internal field on two heat currents (mediated by electrons) with opposite directions and hence on their off-diagonal spin-dependent components (as described in the second term without the field).

A fully relativistic implementation of the Korringa-Kohn-Rostoker (KKR) band structure method⁵² is used to determine the electronic structure of the various investigated systems self-consistently with disorder in the alloys accounted for by the coherent potential approximation (CPA). In a second step, the transport coefficients L^{cc} , L^{cq} , L^{sc} and L^{sq} are determined using the Kubo-Středa formalism together with Eqs. (4) and (5). For the athermal limit we use Mott’s classical formula for the thermopower to obtain S/T and α/T .

Table I gives for the three diluted alloys $\text{Cu}_{0.99}\text{M}_{0.01}$ with $\text{M} = \text{Ti}, \text{Au},$ and Bi the resulting longitudinal conductivity σ_{xx} that is found in good agreement with experiment⁵³ as well as theoretical data obtained by Tauber *et al.*²³ using the Boltzmann formalism. Also the transverse spin conductivity σ_{yx}^z (for $T = 0$ and 300 K) and spin Nernst conductivity $\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}$ obtained via the Boltzmann²³ and Kubo-Středa formalisms are found in fairly good agreement. Furthermore, the “electrical” contribution to $\alpha_{yx}^{scq,z}$, $\alpha_{yx}^{sc,z}(T) = -e\mathcal{L}_{yx}^{sc,z}(T)S_{xx}(T)$, is given for $T = 300\text{ K}$. The large discrepancy between the Kubo-Středa and Boltzmann result for $\text{M} = \text{Au}$ for this quantity are mostly related to the strong deviations in S_{xx} , which is shown in the table as well. Possible sources for the deviations seen in Tab. I are discussed in the Supplemental Material.⁵⁰

The transverse conductivities given in Table I reflect that these are induced by spin-orbit coupling (SOC) and accordingly most pronounced for the diluted Au- and Bi-systems. In fact, a model study for $\text{Cu}_{0.99}\text{M}_{0.01}$ with M being one of the heavy elements from Lu to At for which the SOC of Cu and the element M has been manipulated, clearly showed that σ_{yx}^z is primarily caused by the SOC of




FIG. 1. (Color online) Longitudinal residual resistivity $\rho = [\sigma_{xx}(E_F)]^{-1}$ in $\text{Au}_x\text{Cu}_{1-x}$ calculated with (VC) and without (NV) vertex corrections for $T = 0\text{ K}$. In addition the resistivity $\rho = [-eL_{xx}^{cc}]^{-1}$ for $T = 5\text{ K}$ obtained by an expression analogous to Eq. (4) is shown.

the element M (see Supplemental Material⁵⁰). However, along the series $\text{M} = \text{Lu}$ to At the electronic structure of M at the Fermi energy E_F is dominated by d states for the transition-metal elements and by p states for the later elements. In addition, the SOC strength of the d electrons showing a maximum at $\text{M} = \text{Tl}$ is weaker than for the p electrons. As a consequence, there is a crossover of the dominance of d - to p -states for σ_{yx}^z around $\text{M} = \text{Pt}$ when going through the periodic table. The spin Hall conductivity is found to be maximal at $\text{M} = \text{Hg}$. As Eq. (5) connects σ_{yx}^z and α_{yx}^z the latter transport quantity could be expected to show a similar behavior along the series. However, as Table I clearly shows there is no strict one-to-one correspondence between σ_{yx}^z and $\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}$ as for $\text{M} = \text{Au}$ and Bi the values for the first quantity are nearly identical while those for the latter differ by two orders of magnitude. The different behavior of σ_{yx}^z and $\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}$ is obviously caused by the fact that the latter is not only determined by the electronic structure at the Fermi energy E_F but by its variation around E_F (see below). A detailed discussion of the deviations between the two theoretical approaches for the spin Nernst conductivity is given in the Supplemental Material.⁵⁰

In contrast to the Boltzmann approach,²² the Kubo-Středa formalism can be applied straightforwardly to concentrated alloys. Figure 1 shows results for the residual resistivity ρ , i.e., the inverse of the longitudinal conductivity σ_{xx} for the energy $E = E_F$. Evaluating the equation with (VC) and without (NV) vertex corrections shows that these give only a minor reduction of ρ of a few percent for this system. Including finite-temperature effects in analogy to the expression in Eq. (4) gives rise to a negligibly small increase of ρ when going from 0 to 5 K. These results are in fairly good agreement with the experimental data for $T = 4\text{ K}$ and show in particular the nearly parabolic concentration dependence.

TABLE I. Longitudinal charge (σ_{xx}) and transverse spin (σ_{yx}^z) conductivities (in $\mu\Omega^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$) at the Fermi energy, longitudinal charge Seebeck coefficient S_{xx} (in $\mu\text{V}/\text{K}$), and both contributions to $\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}$, $\alpha_{yx}^{sc,z} = \sigma_{yx}^z(T)S_{xx}(T)$ and the conventional spin Nernst conductivity $\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}$ (in $\text{AK}^{-1}\text{m}^{-1}$), always for $T = 300 \text{ K}$, for the diluted alloys $\text{Cu}_{0.99}\text{M}_{0.01}$ with $M = \text{Ti, Au, Bi}$. Comparison is made to experimental data for the electrical conductivity⁵³ and for all quantities to the Boltzmann results of Tauber *et al.*²³.

M	$\sigma_{xx}(E_F)$			$\sigma_{yx}^z(E_F)$		$\sigma_{yx}^z(300 \text{ K})$ this work	$S_{xx}(300 \text{ K})$		$\alpha_{yx}^{sc,z}(300 \text{ K})$		$\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}(300 \text{ K})$	
	Exp.	Boltz.	Kubo	Boltz.	Kubo		Boltz.	Kubo	Boltz.	Kubo	Boltz.	Kubo
Ti	0.12	0.09	0.08	3.24×10^{-4}	4.28×10^{-4}	4.29×10^{-4}	5.83	5.72	0.19	0.25	0.43	0.50
Au	1.92	2.64	2.28	2.67×10^{-2}	2.11×10^{-2}	2.11×10^{-2}	0.08	1.41	0.21	2.98	-15.1	-28.4
Bi	0.20	0.23	0.19	2.02×10^{-2}	2.05×10^{-2}	2.05×10^{-2}	-1.49	-1.02	-3.01	-2.10	-2.01	-0.20

As the extrinsic contributions to the transverse spin Hall conductivity σ_{yx}^z can be ascribed to the vertex corrections²⁷ its intrinsic part ($\sigma_{yx}^{z \text{ intr}}$) is obtained by ignoring these within the calculations. As Fig. 2 shows, $\sigma_{yx}^{z \text{ intr}}$ is rather small and increases nearly linearly with concentration when going from Cu to Au, obviously reflecting the increase of the average SOC strength. Including the vertex corrections leads to




FIG. 2. (Color online) Spin Hall conductivity σ_{yx}^z and spin Hall angle $\alpha = \sigma_{yx}^z/\sigma_{xx}$ of $\text{Au}_x\text{Cu}_{1-x}$ calculated with (VC) and without (NV) vertex corrections for $T = 0 \text{ K}$. In both cases σ_{xx} contains the vertex corrections.

strong apparently diverging extrinsic contributions in the low-concentration regimes (x close to 0 or 1, respectively). In contrast to this behavior, the spin Hall ratio $\alpha = \sigma_{yx}^z/\sigma_{xx}$, which is most relevant for applications, shows a rather smooth and simple behavior. Taking only the intrinsic part of the spin Hall conductivity the ratio $\sigma_{yx}^{z \text{ intr}}/\sigma_{xx}$ goes to 0 in the limit $x \rightarrow 0$ and $x \rightarrow 1$, respectively, while the full ratio $\sigma_{yx}^z/\sigma_{xx}$ stays finite also in these limits. Making use of the different scaling behavior^{1,2} of the extrinsic contributions to σ_{yx}^z ($\sigma_{yx}^{z \text{ extr}}$) one finds that the side-jump part of $\sigma_{yx}^{z \text{ extr}}$ is as $\sigma_{yx}^{z \text{ intr}}$ quite small and weakly concentration dependent but opposite in sign. As a consequence, the skew scattering part of $\sigma_{yx}^{z \text{ extr}}$ dominates by far in the low-concentration regimes (see Supplemental Material⁵⁰).

The electrical and thermal contributions to the total spin Nernst conductivity divided by T , $\alpha_{yx}^{sc,z}/T$ and $\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}/T$, respectively, for $\text{Au}_x\text{Cu}_{1-x}$ are shown in Fig. 3. As one notes, the intrinsic contributions obtained by




FIG. 3. (Color online) Components of the total spin Nernst conductivity (for $T \rightarrow 0$) in $\text{Au}_x\text{Cu}_{1-x}$, excluding and including the vertex corrections.

ignoring the vertex corrections (NV) are quite small and vary nearly linearly with concentration for both terms. Including the vertex corrections, the concentration dependence of the electrical contribution $\alpha_{yx}^{sc,z}/T$ is obviously following that of the spin Hall conductivity σ_{yx}^z with a diverging behavior in the low concentration regimes (see Eq. (10) and Fig. 2). The thermal contribution $\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}/T$ also shows a diverging behavior but with opposite sign for $x \rightarrow 0$ and $x \rightarrow 1$. This clearly demonstrates that there is no simple one-to-one correspondence between the spin Hall conductivity σ_{yx}^z and $\alpha_{yx}^{sq,z}/T$ as one can already expect from Eq. (5).

Making again use of the connection of the vertex corrections to the extrinsic contributions to the spin conductivity and of the scaling laws, one finds—similarly to the SHE—only small and linearly varying intrinsic contributions to the SNE. Also the extrinsic contribution, namely once again the skew scattering part, is prevailing in the dilute-concentration regimes of $\text{Au}_x\text{Cu}_{1-x}$ (see Supplemental Material⁵⁰).

In summary, a first-principles description of the spin Nernst effect has been presented that is based on the Kubo-Středa formalism. It is demonstrated that the concept of a spin-projected conductivity can be avoided allowing in particular an unambiguous symmetry analysis for the various transport coefficients involved. Numerical implementation of the scheme using the KKR-CPA method led to satisfying agreement with previous results for diluted alloys obtained using the Boltzmann formalism. In addition, the first application of the approach

presented to diluted and concentrated alloys allowed accessing all contributions to the SNE. For the investigated alloy system $\text{Au}_x\text{Cu}_{1-x}$ the extrinsic skew scattering contribution was found to dominate in the low-concentration regimes of the system.

This work was supported financially by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) via the priority programme SPP 1538 and the SFB 689. Discussions with D. Fedorov, M. Gradhand, K. Tauber, and I. Mertig are gratefully acknowledged.

-
- ¹ A. Crépieux and P. Bruno, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 014416 (2001).
- ² S. Onoda, N. Sugimoto, and N. Nagaosa, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 165103 (2008).
- ³ N. Nagaosa, J. Sinova, S. Onoda, A. H. MacDonald, and N. P. Ong, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 1539 (2010).
- ⁴ M. I. Dyakonov and V. I. Perel, *Phys. Letters A* **35**, 459 (1971).
- ⁵ J. E. Hirsch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1834 (1999).
- ⁶ J. Sinova, D. Culcer, Q. Niu, N. A. Sinitsyn, T. Jungwirth, and A. H. MacDonald, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 126603 (2004).
- ⁷ D. Xiao, Y. Yao, Z. Fang, and Q. Niu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 026603 (2006).
- ⁸ N. A. Sinitsyn, *J. Phys.: Cond. Mat.* **20**, 023201 (2008).
- ⁹ S. G. Cheng, Y. Xing, Q. F. Sun, and X. C. Xie, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 045302 (2008).
- ¹⁰ X. Liu and X. Xie, *Solid State Commun.* **150**, 471 (2010).
- ¹¹ Z. Ma, *Solid State Commun.* **150**, 510 (2010).
- ¹² D. Xiao, J. Shi, and Q. Niu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 137204 (2005).
- ¹³ M. Gradhand, D. V. Fedorov, F. Pientka, P. Zahn, I. Mertig and B. L. Görfly *J. Phys.: Cond. Mat.* **24**, 213202 (2012).
- ¹⁴ X. Wang, D. Vanderbilt, J. R. Yates, and I. Souza, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 195109 (2007).
- ¹⁵ E. Roman, Y. Mokrousov, and I. Souza, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 097203 (2009).
- ¹⁶ J. Weischenberg, F. Freimuth, J. Sinova, S. Blügel, and Y. Mokrousov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 106601 (2011).
- ¹⁷ Y. Yao and Z. Fang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 156601 (2005).
- ¹⁸ G. Y. Guo, S. Murakami, T.-W. Chen, and N. Nagaosa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 096401 (2008).
- ¹⁹ F. Freimuth, S. Blügel, and Y. Mokrousov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 246602 (2010).
- ²⁰ J. Weischenberg, F. Freimuth, S. Blügel, and Y. Mokrousov, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 060406 (2013).
- ²¹ A. Fert and P. M. Levy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 157208 (2011).
- ²² M. Gradhand, D. V. Fedorov, P. Zahn, and I. Mertig, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 186403 (2010).
- ²³ K. Tauber, M. Gradhand, D. V. Fedorov, and I. Mertig, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 026601 (2012).
- ²⁴ K. Tauber, D. V. Fedorov, M. Gradhand, and I. Mertig, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 161114 (2013).
- ²⁵ S. Lowitzer, D. Ködderitzsch, and H. Ebert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 266604 (2010).
- ²⁶ I. Turek, J. Kudrnovský, and V. Drchal, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 014405 (2012).
- ²⁷ S. Lowitzer, M. Gradhand, D. Ködderitzsch, D. V. Fedorov, I. Mertig, and H. Ebert *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 056601 (2011).
- ²⁸ B. Velický, *Phys. Rev.* **184**, 614 (1969).
- ²⁹ W. H. Butler, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 3260 (1985).
- ³⁰ T. Seki, I. Sugai, Y. Hasegawa, S. Mitani, and K. Takanaishi, *Solid State Commun.* **150**, 496 (2010).
- ³¹ A. Dyrdal and J. Barnaś, *J. Phys.: Cond. Mat.* **24**, 275302 (2012).
- ³² H. Akera and H. Suzuura, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 075301 (2013).
- ³³ G. E. W. Bauer, E. Saitoh, and B. J. van Wees, *Nature Mater.* **11**, 391 (2012).
- ³⁴ Which even leads to artificial off-diagonal contributions to the longitudinal Seebeck effect in a nonmagnetic crystal, as in Eq. (8) of Ref. 23.
- ³⁵ S. Lowitzer, D. Ködderitzsch, and H. Ebert, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 140402(R) (2010).
- ³⁶ R. Kubo, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **12**, 570 (1957).
- ³⁷ J. M. Luttinger, *Phys. Rev.* **135**, A1505 (1964).
- ³⁸ Assumed to be constant (Ref. 40).
- ³⁹ L. Smrčka and P. Středa, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **10**, 2153 (1977).
- ⁴⁰ M. Jonson and G. D. Mahan, *Phys. Rev. B* **21**, 4223 (1980).
- ⁴¹ S. Lowitzer, PhD thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, 2010, <http://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/12218/>.
- ⁴² K. Chadova, H. Ebert, and D. Ködderitzsch (unpublished).
- ⁴³ J. Banhart, R. Bernstein, J. Voitländer, and P. Weinberger, *Solid State Commun.* **77**, 107 (1991).
- ⁴⁴ A. Vernes, B. L. Györfly, and P. Weinberger, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 012408 (2007).
- ⁴⁵ Y. M. Zuev, W. Chang, and P. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 096807 (2009).
- ⁴⁶ S. Y. Huang, W. G. Wang, S. F. Lee, J. Kwo, and C. L. Chien, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 216604 (2011).
- ⁴⁷ Y. Pu, D. Chiba, F. Matsukura, H. Ohno, and J. Shi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 117208 (2008).
- ⁴⁸ H. Kontani, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 014408 (2003).
- ⁴⁹ W. H. Kleiner, *Phys. Rev.* **142**, 318 (1966).
- ⁵⁰ See Supplemental Material at arXiv:1311.5047.
- ⁵¹ The two terms in Eq. (10) have been denoted σ_{SN}^E and σ_{SN}^T (Ref. 23) or σ_{TE}^{SH} and σ_{TM}^{SH} (Ref. 11) in previous work. The latter author termed the sum thermo-spin Hall conductivity and its constituents thermoelectric spin Hall and thermal spin Hall conductivity.
- ⁵² H. Ebert, D. Ködderitzsch, and J. Minár, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **74**, 096501 (2011).
- ⁵³ J. Bass, *Electrical Resistivity of Pure Metals and Alloys*, Landolt-Bornstein New Series, Group III, Part (a), Vol. 15, Springer, New York, 1982.