

Hall conductivity in the presence of spin-orbit interaction and disorder

Louis-François Arsenault*

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019

B. Movaghar†

*Département de Génie Physique and Regroupement Québécois sur les Matériaux de Pointe (RQMP)
École Polytechnique de Montréal, C.P. 6079, Succursale "Centre-Ville", Montréal (Québec), H3C 3A7, Canada*

(Dated: March 22, 2019)

Starting from the Kubo formula, we expand the Hall conductivity using a cumulant approach which converges quickly at high temperatures ($k_B T >$ energy differences of initial and final scattering states) and can be extended to low temperatures. The theory can deal with the sign, the ordinary and the anomalous contributions to the Hall effect. When applied to include the spin-orbit interaction to first order, we recover what is essentially the Karplus-Luttinger result for the anomalous Hall effect. Contact is made to the Chazalviel and Nozières-Lewiner formulae. A side-jump type formula is obtained by using an exact application of linear response. We show that there exists a rigid Hall current which is not a Fermi level property. We introduce a relationship between mass and diffusivity which allows us to generalize the theory to strong disorder and even introduce a mobility edge. The formalism provides a systematic and practical way of analyzing both ordinary and anomalous contributions to the Hall conduction including the changes of sign, and in the presence of serious disorder.

PACS numbers: 72.10.Bg, 72.15.Gd, 75.47.-m, 72.80.Ng, 71.70.Ej

I. INTRODUCTION

The Hall conductivity of materials exhibits a wide and rich variety of behavior. The interpretation is, in general, still very difficult, even though, in principle, the information is contained in the Kubo formula. This is true at least in linear response to the applied electric field. The Kubo formula is therefore the starting point of our analysis of Hall conductivity. We include the spin-orbit interaction and discuss the so called anomalous Hall effect (AHE). Previously, most work was focused on understanding the sign change of the Hall coefficient in ordered and disordered systems¹, localization, and the Quantum Hall effect (QHE)². More recently, the problem has been to understand the effect of magnetism and of many body corrections on the Hall effect. Considerable progress has been made recently by integrating the spin-orbit coupling into the Bloch wavefunction formalism of Kane in crystals, and applying these wavefunctions and other first principle numerical methods³ to study the AHE effect in magnetic materials⁴. In these papers, the emphasis is on order, and disorder is only represented by a uniform lifetime. Most magnetically doped semiconductors and magnetic alloys can, however, not really be considered to be in the weak scattering regime, and therefore, in the present approach, we have inverted this priority. We emphasize the absence of Bloch symmetry rather than its presence⁵⁻¹⁰.

The aim is to develop practical formulae which can deal with disorder, the sign, the side jump Hall effect problem, and the Skew scattering/intrinsic Hall effect problem.

The AHE is now a well established observation in magnets, and a number of explanations have been proposed⁷, and will be discussed here. All explanations are based, in one way or another, on the spin-orbit mechanism. Thus, it is accepted that spin-orbit coupling causes the anomalous Hall conductivity contribution.

Much progress has been made recently on understanding the origin of the AHE and this has generated exciting new physics. Traditionally it was thought that only the spin-orbit *Skew scattering mechanism*^{1,11,12}, gives rise to a magnetism (M_z) dependent Hall coefficient. This process depends on the conductivity relaxation time or relaxation time squared, depending on whether the skew scattering is itself rate determining for conductivity or not. Traditionally, skew scattering is derived as an extrinsic effect, i.e. it is due to impurity scattering, and not to the host spin-orbit interaction. The intrinsic spin-orbit interaction produced by the host crystal potential had been invoked as a source of AHE by Karplus and Luttinger¹⁰ but later rejected by Smit¹³ who claimed that the intrinsic effect is negligible. Earlier, it had been shown by Mott and Massey¹⁴ that electron scattering from Coulomb potentials is asymmetric with respect to spin direction, with spin up going more to one side, and those with spin down more to the other. When the electron gas is magnetized, there is a net transverse Hall current. When the asymmetric scattering is at impurity sites, this process is called skew scattering as mentioned above, and has been discussed by several authors^{11,12}. The important point about skew scattering is that the net spin-orbit coupling at the impurity site, can be strongly enhanced by the

host crystal. This is really what makes this process so important. For a detailed account of the history and progress in understanding the AHE see Ref. 8.

II. THE KUBO FORMULA FOR THE LONGITUDINAL AND TRANSVERSE CONDUCTIVITY

The frequency (ω) dependant conductivity in linear response to an electric field is usually written as^{1,15,16}

$$\sigma_{\mu\nu} = \frac{i\hbar e^2}{\Omega} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \frac{\langle \alpha | v_\mu | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | v_\nu | \alpha \rangle}{\varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_\beta + \hbar\omega + i\delta} \frac{f(\varepsilon_\alpha) - f(\varepsilon_\beta)}{\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha}. \quad (1)$$

This form is general for any exact set of eigenstates $|\alpha\rangle$ and energies ε_α , spin summation is implied. The $f(\varepsilon)$ are the Fermi functions and Ω is the volume. The velocity operators v_μ are given by Heisenberg's equation of motion.

For the general case of a material which need not be periodic, the spin orbit term in the Hamiltonian is

$$H_{so} = \frac{\hbar}{4m^2c^2} (\nabla V(\mathbf{r}) \times \mathbf{p}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad (2)$$

where

$$V(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_n \frac{eZ_n}{4\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon_0|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_n|} - eFx. \quad (3)$$

In Eqs. (2) and (3), m is the bare electron mass, c is the speed of light, \mathbf{p} is the momentum operator and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the Pauli spin operator which is a vector containing the Pauli's matrices i.e. $[\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z]$. In Eq. (3), F is the external applied electric field, e the electric charge, Z_n is the effective local charge, $\varepsilon\varepsilon_0$ is the permittivity, \mathbf{r} and x are positions operators for the charges and \mathbf{R}_n is the position of the fixed ions that make the lattice. The velocity operators can then be written as

$$v_x = v_x^0 + \frac{\hbar}{4m^2c^2} [\nabla_z V(\mathbf{r})\sigma_y - \nabla_y V(\mathbf{r})\sigma_z], \quad (4)$$

$$v_y = v_y^0 - \frac{eB_z x}{m} + \frac{\hbar}{4m^2c^2} [\nabla_x V(\mathbf{r})\sigma_z - \nabla_z V(\mathbf{r})\sigma_x], \quad (5)$$

where we have used the Landau gauge for the vector potential, $\mathbf{A} = (0, B_z x, 0)$. The v_x^0 and v_y^0 are $-\frac{i\hbar}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ and $-\frac{i\hbar}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ respectively. The choice of the minus sign in $-eB_z x/m$ implies that $e = -|e|$ since the kinetic part of the Hamiltonian for a charge q in a field is $T = 1/2m(\mathbf{p} - q\mathbf{A})^2$.

The spin dependent terms in Eqs. (4) and (5) can be important in magnets. We shall consider them explicitly in Section V.

The Hall effect is given by the antisymmetric part of the transverse conductivity^{11,17}. To write the antisymmetric Hall conductivity, we note that for non-zero frequency it is the anti-hermitian part¹¹ $\sigma_{xy}^a = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{xy} - \sigma_{yx}^*)$. In the dc limit we have

$$\sigma_{xy}^a = \frac{\hbar e^2}{\Omega} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} -i \langle \alpha | v_x | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | v_y | \alpha \rangle \frac{f(\varepsilon_\alpha) - f(\varepsilon_\beta)}{(\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha)^2 + \delta^2}. \quad (6)$$

We shall now derive the Hall conductivity in a general way which will include both the skew scattering and the intrinsic contributions.

III. THE HALL EFFECT USING A CUMULANT EXPANSION OF THE KUBO FORMULA

One way to derive the contributions to the Hall effect, with disorder present, is to rewrite the Kubo formula using the Heisenberg equation of motion:

$$\langle \alpha | x | \beta \rangle = -i\hbar \frac{\langle \alpha | v_x | \beta \rangle}{\varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_\beta}, \quad (7)$$

which is true in any finite box (length L) without dissipation. Then Eq. (6) becomes

$$\sigma_{xy}^a = \frac{e^2}{\Omega} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \frac{(f(\varepsilon_\alpha) - f(\varepsilon_\beta)) (\varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_\beta)}{(\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha)^2 + \delta^2} \langle \alpha | x | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | v_y | \alpha \rangle. \quad (8)$$

We drop the a superscript for the Hall conductivity, but it will be implicit that we refer to the antisymmetric part unless otherwise mentioned. In order to demonstrate the cumulant technique, we consider the limits of high temperatures when $(\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha) < k_B T$ and, of small magnetic fields $k_B T \gg \hbar\omega_c$. This is the limit when the matrix elements are dominated by intraband scattering with weak B -field. We expand the function

$$\begin{aligned} f(\varepsilon_\alpha) - f(\varepsilon_\beta) &\approx e^{-\frac{\varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_f}{k_B T}} - e^{-\frac{\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_f}{k_B T}} \\ &= \left(\frac{\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha}{k_B T} \right) e^{-\frac{\varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_f}{k_B T}} - \frac{1}{2!} \left(\frac{\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha}{k_B T} \right)^2 e^{-\frac{\varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_f}{k_B T}} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and substitute Eq. (9) into Eq. (8). This gives us a cumulant expansion of the Hall conductivity in powers of $\frac{1}{k_B T}$ where one can use the operator identity

$$(\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha) A_{\alpha\beta} = \langle \alpha | [A, H] | \beta \rangle, \quad (10)$$

where $[A, H]$ is the commutator of A with the Hamiltonian H and $A_{\alpha\beta} = \langle \alpha | A | \beta \rangle$, to reduce and evaluate the terms generated by the expansion.

The high T expansion is the easiest one to justify as temperature is an external parameter. Moreover, the structure of the Kubo formula itself helps. Indeed, if we look at Eq. (6), we can see that the important contributions to the conductivity come from states that are close in energy i.e. $\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha \approx 0$. Hence, there could exist large number of situations where a more general expansion (for any T) could be correct. In this case we should not expand the high temperature limit of the Fermi function. What we can do is to suppose that ε_β and ε_α are always close and so we can Taylor expand $f(\varepsilon_\beta)$ around ε_α and obtain

$$f(\varepsilon_\alpha) - f(\varepsilon_\beta) = \left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha} \right) (\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha) + \dots \quad (11)$$

This type of expansion is the one that must be used to obtain the low temperature form of an expression and is only justified in certain situations. For each particular problem where we want to use it, we have to be careful, i.e. we must verify that each order gives smaller values than the previous one. But, as discussed above, the structure of the Kubo formula will make the expansion often a good one. Of course, for high T , Eq. (11) gives back Eq. (9). By looking at Eqs. (11) and (9), one can see that, to first order in the cumulant, to go from the high T version of an expression to its low T one, we just have to replace $\frac{1}{k_B T} f(\varepsilon_\alpha)$ by $\left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha} \right)$. Note that the higher order cumulants introduce in effect higher order derivatives of the velocity operator. For an effective mass Hamiltonian with Landau levels, this gives corresponding powers of the cyclotron frequency and we could in principle stop after the linear term. The higher order terms linear in B_z are those that involve the spin-orbit and the disorder potentials. Thus, we can expect these to get progressively less important, except for strong scattering near band edges. We shall see this more explicitly when we consider the higher order cumulants quantitatively.

We should note that if we start from a Hamiltonian with a periodic potential, then it is far easier to work directly with the effective mass Hamiltonian and get rid of the periodic part leaving only the disorder part. In this way, only the disorder and the spin orbit is carried through the cumulant expansion and we have excellent expansion parameter. In some extreme cases, such as an amorphous semiconductor, this may not necessarily be the best starting point and one may wish to switch to the tight binding representation. For most problems of interest in this field however, the effective mass plus disorder approach is the much better starting point. Thus, wherever the bare mass appears in the following text (except when it comes from the spin-orbit Hamiltonian), the reader should note that for this class of problems, we can replace bare mass with the effective mass (m^*) and drop the periodic part of the Hamiltonian in the remaining analysis.

To first order, we obtain with Eqs. (8) and (9)

$$\sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}} = -\frac{e^2}{\Omega} \frac{1}{k_B T} \sum_{\alpha} f(\varepsilon_\alpha) \langle \alpha | x v_y | \alpha \rangle. \quad (12)$$

Let us remember that in the previous equation, $|\varepsilon\rangle$ is a magnetic field dependent exact eigenstate. In order to rewrite the matrix element in a simple way, we show in, Appendix A, that we can write the derivative of the eigenvalue with respect to the magnetic field as

$$\frac{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha(B_z)}{\partial B_z} = -e \langle \alpha | x v_y | \alpha \rangle - \frac{g \mu_B}{2} \left\langle \alpha \left| \sum_i \sigma_z^i \right| \alpha \right\rangle, \quad (13)$$

where v_y does not contains the spin-orbit term (Eq. (5)) contrary to v_y in Eq. (12). The spin-orbit term of v_y will be treated later, in Section V D.

The Hall conductivity only comes from the first term on the RHS of Eq. (13), the orbital term. The way to handle this is to introduce initially two different magnetic fields, one acting on the orbital part B_{orb} and one giving the Zeeman energies B_z . We can thus rewrite Eq. (12) as

$$\sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}} = \frac{e^2}{\Omega} \frac{1}{k_B T} \frac{1}{e} \sum_{\alpha} f(\varepsilon_\alpha) \frac{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha}{\partial B_{orb}}, \quad (14)$$

Only the derivative of the energy eigenvalues with respect to the orbital field B_{orb} gives the Hall conductivity. An advantage of this representation is that the spin-orbit energy can now be treated in first order perturbation theory, as we shall see later.

Within the low T expansion (Eq. (11)), the first order term is given by

$$\sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}} = \frac{e^2}{\Omega} \frac{1}{e} \sum_{\alpha} \left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha} \right) \frac{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha}{\partial B_{orb}}. \quad (15)$$

Before we go further, we shall make a precision concerning possible numerical calculations using the present approach when disorder is present. In either the general conductivity formula (Eq. (1)) and in the formulae obtained using the cumulant approach (Eqs. (14), (15) and equations thereafter), the state $|\alpha\rangle$ is an exact eigenstate of the system for a fixed configuration of disorder. For a numerical calculation, it is implied that this is to be repeated for different configurations. Then, at the end, with the appropriate weighting factor, one should carry an average over all configuration of disorder for the conductivity.

Before examining the higher order terms (Appendices B and C), let us understand the significance of this result and compare with other well known approaches.

IV. COMPARISON TO OTHER THEORIES

A. The Streda result

We can rewrite Eq. (15) in the form

$$\sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}} = -e \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial B_z} \int_{-\infty}^E \rho(E', B_z) dE' \right]_{E=\varepsilon_f}, \quad (16)$$

where $\rho(E', B_z)$ is the density of states with magnetic field.

This expression is the quantum term of the Streda formula¹⁸. This author reduced the Kubo formula to two terms called σ_{xy}^I and σ_{xy}^{II} (Eq. (16) above). The antisymmetric part of the other term, σ_{xy}^{Ia} , should be contained in the remainder of the cumulant expansion. Our term (Eq. (16)) differs from Streda's¹⁸ by a minus sign. The sign problem can be traced in Ref. 18 to one transformation. The transformation $\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \frac{d\delta(\varepsilon-H)}{d\varepsilon} (xv_y - yv_x) = \frac{1}{e} \frac{\partial}{\partial B_z} \text{Tr} \delta(\varepsilon - H)$ used by Streda in Ref 18 should, in reality, be $\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \frac{d\delta(\varepsilon-H)}{d\varepsilon} (xv_y - yv_x) = -\frac{1}{e} \frac{\partial}{\partial B_z} \text{Tr} \delta(\varepsilon - H)$ and thus we both have the same sign.

B. The classical limit

If, instead of Eq. (7), we write as in Ref. 19

$$\langle \alpha | x | \beta \rangle = -i\hbar \frac{\langle \alpha | v_x | \beta \rangle}{\varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_\beta + \frac{i\hbar}{\tau}}, \quad (17)$$

where τ is a lifetime, we can reduce the first term of the cumulant expansion to the classical result. When using this ad-hoc identity, we must be very careful, because it introduces some subtleties. By adding a lifetime, we effectively assume electrons scattering in a band of a solid. Thus, if we carefully do the calculation for the matrix elements in the Bloch states, as Karplus and Luttinger¹⁰ and others did, a transformation of the type of Eq. (17), implicitly introduces an effective mass, i.e. one bare mass m becomes m^* . Also, when one introduce a finite lifetime, then in this weak scattering limit, one no longer has to worry about configuration averages and disorder.

We consider only the term linear in B_z in Eq. (8), the one involving the $eB_z x/m$ part of v_y (see Eq. (5)), which gives the diagonal mass tensor term. Then, Eq. (8) together with Eq. (17) yields the cumulant,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}} &= \frac{e^2}{\Omega m} (eB_z) \sum_{\alpha} \left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon_{\alpha})}{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}} \right) \langle \alpha | x^2 | \alpha \rangle \\ &\approx \frac{e^2}{\Omega m^*} (eB_z) \sum_{\alpha} \left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon_{\alpha})}{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}} \right) \sum_{\beta} \tau^2 |\langle \alpha | v_x | \beta \rangle|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Using the longitudinal conductivity for nearly-free-electron result for isotropic dispersion (see Ref. 19) in Eq. (18), this leads to the very well known classical result

$$\sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}} = \frac{N e^2 \tau}{m^*} \frac{e B_z \tau}{m^*} = \sigma_{xx} \frac{e B_z \tau}{m^*}, \quad (19)$$

where $N = \rho(\varepsilon_f) m^* v_f^2$.

Note from Eq. (17) that we also have $\langle x^2 \rangle_{\varepsilon_f} \sim D\tau = (v_f \tau)^2$ where D is the diffusivity and v_f is the Fermi velocity. The off-diagonal effective mass tensor terms not included in the expression for the longitudinal conductivity are contained in the $\langle \alpha | x v_y^0 | \alpha \rangle$ term of Eq. (8) treated to first order in the cumulant expansion and will arise from the expansion of the wave-functions to first order in B_z .

V. THE INFLUENCE OF THE SPIN ORBIT COUPLING

Spin-orbit coupling introduces a number of new contributions to the Hall current. New terms arise, due to the spin dependent velocities from Eqs. (4) and (5), and from the effect of the spin-orbit interaction on the energy levels. We examine this last effect first.

A. The effect of the spin orbit interaction on the Hall current from the changes in the energy levels and wavefunctions

Consider the first order cumulant result with the zero order velocity operators (including the $-\frac{eB_z x}{m}$ term). The advantage of the cumulant expansion is that it allows us to analyze a very complex phenomenon, the effect of the spin-orbit coupling on the Hall conductivity, via the eigenstates. We write, to first order in perturbation theory,

$$\varepsilon_{\alpha}(B_z) = \varepsilon_{\alpha}^0(B_z) + \langle \alpha | H_{so} | \alpha \rangle. \quad (20)$$

The spin orbit Hamiltonian being dependent upon the Pauli's matrices, we should remember that the state $|\alpha\rangle$ must now be a spinor (two components vector). The action of taking the bracket will leave a scalar and, as we use the same state at this order, only the z component survive.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}(B_z)}{\partial B_{orb}} &= -e \langle \alpha | x v_y | \alpha \rangle \\ &= \frac{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}^0(B_z)}{\partial B_{orb}} + \sigma_z^{\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial B_{orb}} \left\langle \alpha \left| \sum_i \lambda_i l_{i,z} \right| \alpha \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where

$$\lambda_n = \frac{\hbar e Z_n}{4m^2 c^2 (4\pi \varepsilon \varepsilon_0) |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_n|^3}, \quad (22)$$

$\sigma_z^\alpha \equiv \langle \alpha | \sigma_z | \alpha \rangle$ and $l_{i,z}$ is the z component of the orbital angular momentum at site i .

The first term in Eq. (21) is the one we examined above in the classical limit and is intuitively very attractive. The magnitude of the Hall current per eigenstate is related to the sensitivity of the energy level to an external magnetic field. Its sign depends on whether the magnetic field increases or decreases the energy of the eigenstate. In particular, it also follows that the contribution of a localized state is negligible. In reality, localized states should actually give exactly zero. The zero is presumably recovered by summing the remaining contributions in the cumulant series. Keeping only the first cumulant is obviously not exact in the localized limit, with discrete energy levels separated by more than $k_B T$. The result is close to zero however, and therefore a good approximation. See Appendix B and C for the analysis of the higher order cumulants.

For delocalized states, there is more information in the first term of Eq. (21). Normally, for weak scattering, when ε_f is near the top of the band, we have the hole sign, because the magnetic field can only lower the energy near the top of the band. Near the bottom of a band, we have the electron sign because the magnetic field confines the carrier and raises the energy of the electrons. This rule is also true for disordered eigenstates. The effect of the magnetic field on the energy levels can be evaluated in second order perturbation theory in the presence of disorder.

The anomalous term can now be studied by going to first order perturbation theory in B -field with exact eigenstates. The term $-\mu_B \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{B}_{orb}$ generates

$$|\alpha\rangle = |\alpha_0\rangle + \sum_{\beta_0} \langle \beta_0 | -\mu_B \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{B}_{orb} | \alpha_0 \rangle \frac{|\beta_0\rangle}{\varepsilon_{\alpha_0} - \varepsilon_{\beta_0}}. \quad (23)$$

Substituting Eq. (23) in the second term of Eq. (21), keeping only the z -components, we obtain terms in the energy which involve a factor of the type

$$\Delta g_\alpha^{zz} = \sum_{\beta} \frac{\sum_i \lambda_i l_{\alpha\beta}^{i,z} \sum_j l_{\beta\alpha}^{j,z}}{\varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_\beta}. \quad (24)$$

The sign of the anomalous process depends upon the sign of a quantity which is closely related to the electron g -shift and which itself can be electron-like or hole-like. Thus the first order cumulant for high temperatures can be written as

$$\sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}} = \sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}(n)} + \frac{e^2}{\Omega k_B T} \frac{1}{|e|} \sum_{\alpha} f(\varepsilon_\alpha) \mu_B \sigma_z^\alpha \Delta g_\alpha^{zz}, \quad (25)$$

Let us compare the relative magnitude of the two terms of Eq. (25). At very low T (we replace $\frac{1}{k_B T} f$ by $-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon} = \delta(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_f)$) we can rewrite the Hall conductivity (Eq. (25))

and the current is

$$J_y = \sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}(n)} F_x + e^2 \rho(\varepsilon_f) \frac{\hbar}{2m} \langle \sigma_z \rangle_{\varepsilon_f} \Delta g^{zz}(\varepsilon_f) F_x. \quad (26)$$

With $\rho(\varepsilon_f) \sim 10^{45} / \text{m}^3 \text{J}$ and $F_x = 10^4 \text{ V/m}$ we have for the anomalous contribution $J_y^{an} = 10^3 \Delta g \langle \sigma_z \rangle F_x \text{ A/m}^2$, which is the same order of magnitude as the normal process with $N = 10^{26} / \text{m}^3$, giving the normal Hall current $J_y^n = 10^6 \text{ A/m}^2$ or $10^5 (\hbar \omega_c \tau) F_x \text{ A/m}^2$ where $\hbar \omega_c \tau \sim 10^{-3}$. In principle, the normal and anomalous terms can have opposite signs. The results of Eq. (25) and Eq. (26) are very elegant, and by writing $\Delta g = 2 - g^*$ we have essentially recovered the Fermi level version of the Chazalviel²⁰ and Nozières and Lewiner²¹ result. Chazalviel²⁰ computes the single carrier wave packet motion in an electric field without using the Kubo linear response formalism. We also note that in this form, the anomalous term, apparently has no dependence on the relaxation time. Finally, and most importantly, it is essentially also the Karplus and Luttinger¹⁰ result in the limit of high temperature when the Karplus and Luttinger energy gap between the Kane Luttinger subbands is $\Delta \sim k_B T$ and $\Delta g \sim \frac{\lambda_{so}}{\Delta}$.

In the Karplus-Luttinger¹⁰ Bloch wavefunction formalism, the anomalous Hall effect, even though it is intrinsic, is a Fermi level property at low temperatures. In Ref. 10, the spin-orbit interaction is treated in first order perturbation theory using Bloch functions. We have also used first order perturbation, but the Fermi level property, here, is a result of keeping the first order cumulant. An interesting point is that Karplus and Luttinger did not use the Kubo formula. They arrived at a similar expression, except that the matrix elements are always interband matrix elements. The reason is that their starting point is the Bloch function, so that in the absence of an explicit treatment of disorder scattering, only interband matrix elements are left when the matrix elements of position and momentum operators are considered. Note that one way of calculating the g -shift, when we have weak disorder, is to use the Kohn-Luttinger wavefunctions. One can compute the g -shift $\Delta g_{\mathbf{k},\alpha}$ in the exact band states²².

In summary, in this section, we have rederived the Karplus-Luttinger intrinsic AHE¹⁰ and made contact with the Chazalviel²⁰, Nozières and Lewiner²¹ and Sinova^{8,9} results within a simple and unified formalism.

B. The Side Jump Hall current: Background

The new velocity terms generated by the spin-orbit coupling in Eqs. (4) and (5) have been shown by Wölfle and Muttalib²³ to give rise to a term of a form called the side jump Hall effect in the linear response Kubo formula,

which is

$$J_y = -Ne^2 \langle \sigma_z \rangle \frac{\hbar}{4m^2c^2} F_x. \quad (27)$$

However, this result is obtained only after a complex diagrammatic sum of potential scattering events. We shall rederive a similar term from linear response in Section V C. The side jump was first proposed by Berger²⁴ as a scattering shift every time the charge encounters a potential. Using scattering theory, the remarkable feature is that it gives rise, at the end, to a Hall current which is independent of the potential, and therefore, of disorder. Another point to note is that Eq. (27) is not a Fermi level property. It represents a very small and insignificant current if the spin-orbit coupling is not enhanced by the lattice. Eq. (27) gives a finite result, even if the Fermi level is in a region of localized states. All the authors who derived the side jump Hall current assumed that the net lattice spin-orbit coupling is orders of magnitude larger than the bare value. This renormalized spin-orbit coupling was computed for the Rashba coupling by De Andrada *et al.*²⁵ for a confined 2d-gas using the Kane Hamiltonian for semiconductor lattices. The Bloch function enhancement can give up to a staggering factor 10^6 , which makes this otherwise very small effect interesting for experiment²⁴. These enhancement factors, however, do not apply to disordered systems, and it is not clear what happens to them when the system gets more and more disordered. We shall see how to treat this situation using linear response on the external field dependant spin-orbit term. But we note that Eq. (26) is a first order perturbation result, and cannot include the full spin-orbit renormalization properties obtained when Bloch bands are considered.

C. The effect of the spin orbit interaction on the Hall current: Side jump rederived

Here we shall consider the spin orbit energy term caused by the external field. Treated in linear response, this will give a side jump Hall current. We do not use the cumulant approach because it is easy to treat this term exactly.

Consider again that part of the spin-orbit coupling which is itself dependent on the applied external field F_x (see Eqs. (3)). This term is an external-field-dependent contribution to the total energy. As part of the Hamiltonian, this term creates a departure from equilibrium, and must therefore be treated on the same footing as the usual electric potential $eF_x x$. We therefore start from first principles, with the density matrix. When we take all such terms in the Hamiltonian as the perturbation H_{pert} , the change in the density matrix is given by

$$\Delta D_{\alpha\beta} = \langle \alpha | H_{pert} | \beta \rangle \frac{f(\varepsilon_\alpha) - f(\varepsilon_\beta)}{\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha}, \quad (28)$$

where

$$H_{pert} = -eF_x x + \frac{\hbar}{4m^2c^2} (\nabla V_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) \times \mathbf{p}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \quad (29)$$

with

$$V_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) = -eF_x x. \quad (30)$$

The second term of Eq. (29) involves the external applied electric field, and one can use linear response and ask: what Hall current does it produce in the presence of disorder? We can evaluate the thermally averaged velocities in the usual way. We consider the external-field-independent eigenstate, include disorder and the Zeeman splitting. These states can therefore be picked to have either spin up or spin down eigenstates in a chosen direction. Thus the y -current produced by the second term from Eq. (28) and Eq. (29) is given by (spin projection in z -direction and keeping only the y -momentum term)

$$J_y = -\frac{e^2}{\Omega} F_x \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \langle \beta | v_y | \alpha \rangle \left\langle \alpha \left| \frac{\hbar}{4m^2c^2} p_y \right| \beta \right\rangle \frac{f(\varepsilon_\alpha) - f(\varepsilon_\beta)}{\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha} \sigma_z^\alpha. \quad (31)$$

If we now use $mv_y = p_y$ and the sum rule (to be discussed in detail in Section V E)

$$\frac{1}{2m_\alpha} = \sum_{\beta} \frac{|\langle \alpha | v_\mu | \beta \rangle|^2}{\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha}, \quad (32)$$

where $\mu = x$ or y , applied to the y -operator, we have the very simple and elegant result

$$J_y = -\frac{e^2}{\Omega} \left(\frac{\hbar}{4m^2c^2} \right) F_x \sum_{\alpha} f(\varepsilon_\alpha) \frac{m}{m_\alpha} \sigma_z^\alpha, \quad (33)$$

which apparently only depends upon the effective mass. This is true as long as Eq. (32) can be used to define effective mass, i.e. if all incoherence is neglected. The interpretation of this sum rule in the Kubo formula context is not trivial. If we include the entire infinite spectrum in the sum of Eq. (32), then we have the trivial result $m_\alpha = m$, and we again obtain Berger side jump Hall current²⁴. However, in this limit, there is clearly no enhancement and no dependence on the potentials. Note that the spin polarization is now summed over the entire band and is not just the fermi level spin.

In the framework of a finite band model, one can interpret Eq. (32) as the *effective mass*. The spin-orbit terms associated with the lattice can be included in Eq. (32). In the weak disorder limit, one could compute Eq. (32) using the Kane method. One can see that, in the Kane model, Eq. (32) is indeed the effective mass. The effective mass correction in Eq. (33) can, then in principle, increase the current up to two orders of magnitude (InSb for example). But

the side jump (Eq. (33)) is, even with effective mass, for extended states, much smaller than the Karplus-Luttinger contribution. We have $J_y = 10^{-29} \langle \sigma_z \rangle N F_x$ A/m in 2-dimensions. In 3-dimensions, with the same numbers we have $10^{-3} F_x \langle \sigma_z \rangle (m/m^*)$ A/m² compared to $10^3 F_x \langle \sigma_z \rangle \Delta g$ A/m² from Eq. (26). Note that the huge Bloch function enhancement evaluated in various forms by Chazalviel²⁰, Fivaz²⁶ and Berger²⁴ and which make this term important do not appear in Eq. (33). Chazalviel, for example, used the Heisenberg commutator for v_y and Kane wavefunctions to evaluate a similar expression. The present method is more rigorous.

To complete the analysis of Eq. (33) we need a discussion of the sum rule of Eq. (32) and we will defer this to Section V E because a similar term is encountered in the next section.

D. The effect of the spin dependent velocity on the Hall current: The terms which are due to the internal potentials

Let us consider the contributions to the Hall current which results from including the contribution of the remaining spin-orbit velocity terms (Eq. (4) and (5)) in the Kubo formula. These now involve the lattice potentials as sources of *velocity*. For Coulomb potentials, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \alpha | v_x | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | v_y | \alpha \rangle \rightarrow \\ & \left\langle \alpha \left| \sum_n \frac{e Z_n \hbar}{4m^2 c^2 (4\pi \epsilon \epsilon_0)} \frac{y - Y_n}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_n|^3} \sigma_z \right| \beta \right\rangle \langle \beta | v_y | \alpha \rangle \\ & \approx \sum_\eta \left\langle \alpha \left| \sum_n \varsigma \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_n|^3} \right| \eta \right\rangle \langle \eta | y \sigma_z | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | v_y | \alpha \rangle \quad (34) \\ & \approx \left\langle \alpha \left| \sum_n \varsigma \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_n|^3} \right| \alpha \right\rangle \langle \alpha | y \sigma_z | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | v_y | \alpha \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varsigma \equiv \frac{e Z_n \hbar}{4m^2 c^2 (4\pi \epsilon \epsilon_0)}$.

Two approximations were made here. Y_n takes alternatively positive and negative values and the term involving it would be zero if \mathbf{r} were not present. But, even if we include \mathbf{r} , it will always give a smaller contribution compared to the first and we therefore neglect it. Second, $\frac{1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_n|^3}$ is local and therefore cannot couple different sites but, in tight-binding for example, could couple different orbitals at the same sites. We considered that the main contribution comes from the matrix element taken between the same eigenstate and this is why we considered only the $|\eta\rangle = |\alpha\rangle$ term in the previous equation. One has to note that the original integrals in Eq. (34) are convergent but when one breaks them up, then the integral $\langle \alpha | \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_n|^3} | \alpha \rangle$ is strictly speaking not convergent because one has taken one position term $y - Y_n$ out of it. The justification

is that, the orbit radius is never allowed to be smaller than the effective atomic orbit of the valence state so that the cubic singularity does not occur. Of course, in some situations, the approximation can be crude and it should be checked when we use it for a particular problem.

This term gives rise to a contribution in the first cumulant. To obtain it, we start from Eq. (6) instead of Eq. (8). We substitute Eq. (34) in Eq. (6) and use Eq. (7) to transform $\langle \alpha | y | \beta \rangle$ to $\langle \alpha | v_y | \beta \rangle$. The result at low T is

$$\sigma_{xy} = \frac{\hbar^2 e^2}{\Omega} \sum_\alpha \left(-\frac{\partial f(\epsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \epsilon_\alpha} \right) \Gamma_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon_\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{2m_\alpha} \right) \sigma_z^\alpha, \quad (35)$$

where

$$\Gamma_\alpha = \left\langle \alpha \left| \sum_n \frac{e Z_n \hbar}{4m^2 c^2 (4\pi \epsilon \epsilon_0)} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_n|^3} \right| \alpha \right\rangle. \quad (36)$$

Again we have used Eq. (32). Following Datta¹⁹, we will assume that, in a crystal, the sum rule of Eq. (32) is indeed the effective mass. The sum rule (Eq. (32)) will be discussed in detail in Section V E. The high T result is obtained, as usual, by replacing $-\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon}$ with $\frac{1}{k_B T} f$. Note that if we use Eq. (17) with broadening, then an exact result can be obtained by taking the derivative with respect to the broadening $\left(\frac{i\hbar}{\tau}\right)$ instead of the energy in Eq. (35). This relation will be used to derive Eq. (38) for the strong scattering limit.

E. The problem of the sum rule of Eq. (32)

There is a certain arbitrariness in the use of the sum rule of Eq. (32) which we should clarify. We note that, if we use the standard transformation of Eq. (7), then it follows, in principle, that when we sum over the entire real spectrum of the Hamiltonian, we obtain the free electron mass on the LHS. This is simply a consequence of the trivial identity $p_x x - x p_x = -i\hbar$ with $p_x = m v_x$.

However, if we follow Datta¹⁹, and use the linear response density matrix to compute the *acceleration* of a particle in an electric field, then we obtain the effective mass, in the sense of Newton's law, as given by Eq. (32). Consequently, this gives the absurd result that the accelerating particle is always free, irrespective of what its initial state is. In effect, the trivial result signifies that if we wait long enough, then even a strongly bound electron will eventually be free in an electric field. That is, this result (mass is free mass), would represent the very long time behavior, when the history of the particle is irrelevant, and its acceleration in a constant field is truly dominated by what happens when it has reached its final free state. Datta¹⁹ concluded that he should use a finite band in the evaluation of Eq. (32), and then the LHS is indeed the effective mass in the sense of the

tight-binding band structure, for example.

The solution of this dilemma, in general, seems to be that, in a transport situation, where electrons are injected at one end and absorbed at the other, the sum can only run over that part of the spectrum which is accessible to the carrier in its lifetime, i.e. for which $\hbar \sum_{\beta} |\langle \alpha | v_x | \beta \rangle|^2 \delta(\varepsilon_{\beta} - \varepsilon_{\alpha} - \hbar\omega)$ is finite. In weak scattering, the particle *lives* in energy levels near the Fermi level which have an effective mass, because it relaxes and emits energy to the lattice. In a strong scattering situation, the kinetic energy of the carrier can be of the same order as the scattering energy uncertainty $\frac{\hbar}{\tau}$. So here, we can relate the sum on the RHS of Eq. (32) directly to the quantum diffusivity D_{α}^0 (see Appendix D). We propose therefore, in the strong scattering limit, where Bloch's theorem does not apply, to define the effective mass, in the sum rule of Eq. (32) by the relation

$$\frac{1}{m_{\alpha}} = 2c_{\alpha} \frac{D_{\alpha}^0}{\hbar}, \quad (37)$$

where c_{α} is a constant $\sim \left\langle \frac{(\varepsilon_{\alpha} - \varepsilon_{\beta})\tau_{\beta}}{\hbar} \right\rangle_{\beta}$ which carries a sign and is averaged over the band (See Appendix D for a formal representation). It is of order 1 when the energy ε_{α} is near the bottom of the band or in a rapidly changing region of the DOS. We shall henceforth absorb this constant in the definition of an effective diffusivity, D_{α} . Equation (37) is exact (Appendix D).

In the random phase limit, c_{α} is a relatively weak function of energy and can be treated as a constant. The unit of time is the scattering time. Acceleration with strong disorder is therefore drift velocity divided by scattering time. With the same definition, in the semi-classical limit we therefore have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}} \left(\frac{1}{2m_{\alpha}} \right) \sim -\frac{D_{\alpha}\tau}{\hbar^2}. \quad (38)$$

It follows that a localized initial state $|\alpha\rangle$ has no acceleration without phonons, i.e. at zero temperature, its effective mass in the sense of Eq. (32) is infinite. If one evaluates what diffusivity one needs to reproduce the electron mass using Eq. (37), one has $D \sim 1 \text{ cm}^2\text{s}^{-1}$ which is not a small value in a disordered system. We now have a way of interpreting terms involving the effective mass m_{α} . For example, for strong disorder, expressions of the form

$$\sum_{\alpha} \frac{1}{m_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial^2 f(\varepsilon_{\alpha})}{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}^2}, \quad (39)$$

as encountered in Appendix B for the second order cumulant can be written as

$$-\int \frac{D(\varepsilon)\rho(\varepsilon)}{\hbar} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \left[\delta(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_f) \right] = \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{\partial \sigma(\varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon} \Bigg|_{\varepsilon_f}, \quad (40)$$

with $\sigma(\varepsilon) = \rho(\varepsilon)D(\varepsilon)$, where $\sigma(\varepsilon)$ is the energy dependent conductivity with universal scaling properties near mobility edges².

F. The resistance dependence of the anomalous term

Experimentally one is normally interested in the resistance dependence of the AHE and this is the criterion used to discriminate between possible models. For example, the observed resistance independence of the experimental anomalous Hall conductivity in dilute magnetic semiconductors is taken as proof that the AHE is intrinsic. However, it follows from the present analysis, that the apparent scattering-time independence of the anomalous Hall conductivity, as derived here in the form of Eq. (25), and by Karplus and Luttinger¹⁰, and by Jungwirth *et al.*⁷ constitutes a very special limit. The scattering time independence of the g -shift (Eq. (24)) follows when the matrix elements are dominated by interband processes where the energy differences are $\gg \frac{\hbar}{\tau}$, (see Ref. 10 for example). But this implies that the basic band structure is Bloch-like, with well-defined semiconductor bands. This is obviously not always the case, and there can be many situations where disorder and band crossings wash out the Kane subband gaps, and give rise to arbitrarily small energy denominators in which the lifetime directly enters the AHE as well. Thus, the g -shift (Eq. (24)) can very well involve the conductivity scattering time. This is shown in Appendix E, where one can see that in some limits, the g -shift term has the form of a skew-scattering term and involves the conductivity.

The assumption of Bloch functions is made by Jungwirth *et al.*⁷, and the resistance independence of their result also rests on the existence of well defined subbands, and the sums run over all occupied levels. Thus we conclude that for strong spin-orbit scattering and weak disorder scattering, the anomalous Hall conductivity will not depend strongly on the resistance, and this then accounts for some of the experimental observations on the AHE²⁷. In contrast, for weak spin-orbit coupling and strong disorder, the anomalous Hall conductivity can vary as the scattering time τ^n , $0 < n < 2$. The Bloch matrix elements²⁰ are not appropriate in the strong disorder limit, and the present approach, though perturbational, is more appropriate.

VI. DISCUSSION

The Kubo formula was expanded in a cumulant expansion which converges quickly at high temperatures. One can also use a series at lower temperatures, provided one examines the higher order contributions in detail and checks the convergence. This is done in the

Appendices B and C.

The second order cumulant derived in Appendix B, also has a very interesting structure, although normally, one would want to stop at the first order term. It gives terms which scale as the derivative of the density of states at the Fermi level both for the normal and the anomalous contribution. Hall conductivities with this particular form have long been sought, because in disordered systems there is no such thing as an electron or hole effective mass, and there must be another concept which replaces it. This has always been intuitively thought to be the derivative of the density of states²⁸. But it has always proved difficult to demonstrate a simple relationship between the Hall conductivity and the derivative of the density of states. The reason for this is that the derivative of the density of states is indeed only one contribution, or one limit to what is a much more complex formula for the Hall conductivity. In the present theory, one has the very interesting observation that the sign of the normal term scales, in the first term, as the derivative of the energy with respect to B -field, and in the second, as the derivative of the density of states. The two terms have opposite sign which give a really interesting result in strong scattering. Indeed, normally, the first term is dominant except in the limit of very strong scattering where we have near localization. In this case, it may happen that the second term dominates and that we have a sign anomaly as in the band edge of doped amorphous silicon²⁹. In disordered systems, one can use the CPA (Coherent Potential Approximation)³⁰ to describe the disordered band structure for example^{31,32} and get explicit results for the sign of the Hall effect. It turns out that there is no simple rule for the sign of the Hall coefficient in CPA either, but at the band edges, we do indeed have the same behavior as predicted here. This has been discussed in detail in Refs. 1 and 32. In Ref. 1, the case of an impurity band is also considered.

The disadvantage of the cumulant method is that the low temperature limit has to be examined with care for convergence. In situations with Bloch symmetry where the dominant matrix elements are on the same energy shell, this is no problem. But in general, with disorder, there is, in the present formulation, in lowest order in magnetic field B_z , unfortunately, an infinite number of terms. This seems a big problem at first, but then it resolves itself. The resolution of the difficulty is most obvious when we apply the first order term in the limit that the states are localized at ε_f . We obtain a Hall conductivity which is small, but non-zero. This small contribution must be canceled by the remaining linear terms in the series. One can therefore argue that the approximation is still good because it gives us nearly zero. Eqs. (B3) and (C1) have terms which scale as B_z . They are generally smaller than the first order contributions we derived in Section V. However, they involve higher derivatives of the Fermi function and can be dangerous to handle at low T . One may infer that, if the system has a density of states and scattering times which are only weak functions of energy at the Fermi level, these higher order cumulant terms are negligible. If the density of states is a strong function of energy, the expansion will not converge so easily. Indeed, near the band edges, there will be mobility edges and localized levels which must give rise to a null result without phonons, but the null result must be arrived at by cancelation of many, albeit, small contributions.

At high temperatures, the higher order terms cause no problem and can be neglected. At low temperatures, a more thorough analysis has to be done in each application. At any temperature we may conclude that a very good approximation is obtained by keeping only the first and second cumulants. The final approximate formula for the Hall conductivity thus becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{xy} = & \frac{e^2}{\Omega} \sum_{\alpha} \left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon_{\alpha})}{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}} \right) \left[\frac{-1}{|e|} \frac{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}}{\partial B_{orb}} + \frac{\hbar}{2m|e|} \sigma_z^{\alpha} \Delta g_{\alpha}^{zz} \right] + \frac{e^2}{2!\Omega} \sum_{\alpha} \frac{\hbar}{2m_{\alpha}} \frac{\partial^2 f(\varepsilon_{\alpha})}{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}^2} \left[\frac{\hbar|e|B_z}{m} + \hbar\Gamma_{\alpha} \sigma_z^{\alpha} \right] \\ & - \frac{e^2}{\Omega} \frac{\hbar}{4m^2 c^2} \sum_{\alpha} f(\varepsilon_{\alpha}) \frac{m}{m_{\alpha}} \sigma_z^{\alpha} + \frac{e^2 \hbar^2}{\Omega} \sum_{\alpha} \left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon_{\alpha})}{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}} \right) \Gamma_{\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}} \left(\frac{1}{2m_{\alpha}} \right) \sigma_z^{\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

We may call Eq. (41) the weak-to-intermediate scattering Hall conductivity. When we evaluate the cumulants, one can use the effective mass Hamiltonian so that the periodic potential is no longer in the problem. This means that the only terms which contribute above the 2^{nd} order cumulant will be those related to the disorder and spin-orbit Hamiltonian and this makes the

approximation of only keeping up to second order very powerful. Each of the four additive terms of Eq. (41) will now be discussed and a simple interpretation given.

The first expression in the bracket of the first term has been discussed and is easy to interpret, but it is not completely trivial to see that it simply reduces to the

classical result (Eq. (19)) if we used Eq. (17) or Bloch functions in the Kubo formula with a constant lifetime. In the pure quantum limit it gives the Streda result but it is actually the *normal* Hall effect. The way this term should be handled depends on the problem in question. In weak scattering it again gives Eq. (19), with a free electron mass. In the tight-binding representation, one can evaluate it using second order perturbation theory in the magnetic field dependent term in the Hamiltonian.

The second part of the first bracket involves the g -shift of the delocalized levels above the mobility edge. In comparison, the localized g -shift is negligibly small. In the weak scattering limit, the g -shift can be evaluated using the Kane-Luttinger wavefunctions¹⁰. This is given by Roth *et al*²²:

$$\Delta g_\alpha^{zz} = - \left(\frac{m}{m_\alpha} - 1 \right) \frac{\Delta}{3E_g + 2\Delta}. \quad (42)$$

At the bottom of a well defined conduction band, for example, $m_\alpha = m^*$, which is the corresponding effective mass. In an incoherent situation, a disordered system with no Bloch symmetry and strong scattering, we should use $m_\alpha = \frac{\hbar}{D_\alpha}$ as the effective mass.

For the second term, the one involving a second derivative of the Fermi function, one can, using the $m_\alpha = \frac{\hbar}{D_\alpha}$ approximation, obtain integral products of the type $\sigma(\varepsilon) = \rho(\varepsilon)D(\varepsilon)$ as shown in Eq. (40) which are energy dependent conductivities, and which obey well known universal scaling relations near the mobility edges.

The third term was shown to be due to the effect of the external-field-induced spin-orbit energy (Section VC). With $m_\alpha = m^*$, this term reduces exactly to the so called side jump contribution. Our theory shows that it can be enhanced via a small effective mass and even extended to apply to strong scattering via Eq. (37).

Considering the second and third terms, we propose that, to a good approximation, in most situations where Bloch functions cannot be used, we may replace $m_\alpha = \frac{\hbar}{D_\alpha}$, once the sign has been determined via Eq. (32). This accounts for localized states if any are present, because D_α is zero.

At low temperatures, the first term in Eq. (41) is a measure of the orbital and spin magnetism changes at the Fermi level. The second term is proportional to the derivative of the conductance at the Fermi level and scales as the inverse effective mass as defined by Eq. (37). Let us rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{e^2}{2!\Omega} \sum_\alpha \frac{\hbar}{2m_\alpha} \frac{\partial^2 f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha^2} \left[-\frac{\hbar e B_z}{m} + \hbar \Gamma_\alpha \sigma_z^\alpha \right] = \\ & \frac{1}{2!} \frac{e^2}{2} \frac{d\sigma}{d\varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon_f} \left[-\frac{\hbar e B_z}{m} + \hbar \langle \Gamma_\alpha \rangle_{\varepsilon_f} \langle \sigma_z \rangle_{\varepsilon_f} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

in the strong scattering limit. In Eq. (43), we took the spin-orbit and the spin matrix elements to be independent of the energy. The second order contributions become important when $\hbar\omega_c \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \ln(\rho(\varepsilon)) \Big|_{\varepsilon=\varepsilon_f} \geq 1$, and when, for the spin-orbit contribution, we have $\hbar \langle \lambda_{so} \rangle \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \ln(\rho(\varepsilon)) \Big|_{\varepsilon=\varepsilon_f} \geq 1$. When $\sigma = \sigma_0 \left(\frac{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_c} \right)^s$, $s > 0$, the correction is of order $\sim s \frac{\hbar\omega_c}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_c}$, and small, away from the mobility edge. But just above the mobility edge, the correction can be important. The low temperature expansion is justified when we are not too close to the mobility edges. We know from localization theory that the effect of a magnetic field is to shift the mobility edge in such a way as to increase the regime of delocalization. When we are too close to the mobility edge, all the higher order terms (absent from Eq. (41)) are important and they renormalize the conductivity near the mobility edges, $\sigma = \sigma_0 \left(\frac{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_c}{\varepsilon_c} \right)^s$, to^{33,34}

$$\sigma(\varepsilon) = \sigma_0 \left(\frac{\varepsilon - \varepsilon_c \left(1 - \frac{\kappa \hbar \omega_c}{\varepsilon_c} \right)^{1/2}}{\varepsilon_c} \right)^s. \quad (44)$$

The last term in Eq. (41) is due to the spin-orbit contribution to the velocity operators via the internal potentials from Eqs. (4) and (5). This also vanishes for localized states. Above the mobility edge, this contribution is comparable to the second expression in the bracket of the second term. This can be seen using the strong scattering correspondence (Eq. (38)). The last term in Eq. (41) then reduces to a term which resembles the usual skew scattering term¹² provided we interpret the skew scattering rate for Coulomb spherical potentials as

$$\frac{1}{\tau_s^\alpha} = \frac{\hbar e}{4m^2 c^2 (4\pi \varepsilon \varepsilon_0)} \left\langle \alpha \left| \sum_n \frac{Z_n}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_n|^3} \right| \alpha \right\rangle. \quad (45)$$

Thus, for disordered systems, the last term of Eq. (41) term can be written

$$\sigma_{xy}^{skew} = -\frac{\hbar e^2}{\Omega m} \sum_\alpha \left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha} \right) \frac{\tau}{\tau_s^\alpha} \frac{m D_\alpha}{\hbar} \sigma_z^\alpha. \quad (46)$$

Note that the sum runs over all the potentials in the lattice. So the skew scattering and g -shift terms include both extrinsic and intrinsic contributions. Note that very recently, Chudnovsky³⁵, using a different approach, and for spin Hall effect, also obtained a term where all the potentials are included. In the form of Eq. (46), appropriate for disordered systems with no Bloch symmetry, the Bloch enhancement does not appear. If we neglect the host spin-orbit coupling and only include the impurities, then both g -shift and skew term are, by definition, extrinsic contributions, and the mass in Eq. (45) is necessarily the effective mass. It is the effective mass particle which generates the impurity spin-orbit magnetic field. In Appendix E, it is shown

that a term of the form of Eq. (46) can be extracted from the g -shift term by approximating the sum involved.

Let us now re-examine the question of the theoretical resistance dependence of the AHE. From the above analysis we note that this all has to do with the way we treat the matrix elements, and at what stage we introduce incoherence and lifetime. This can already be seen in the first term, which can be treated as a quantum effect, as in Streda¹⁸ or in the semi-classical limit. The same is true for the spin-orbit terms. Thus, if we keep to the notion of effective mass, we have the quantum result. If we use the transformation of Eq. (37), which involves the diffusivity, then we have the connection with conductivity. As an example, we can take the first two, dominant, terms in Eq. (41) and write them in the incoherent limit as (we assume Δ and E_g to still be defined):

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{xy}^{(1)} &= \sigma_{xx} \left(\frac{eB_z\tau}{m^*} \right) + \\ & \frac{e^2}{\Omega} \sum_{\alpha} \left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon_{\alpha})}{\partial \varepsilon_{\alpha}} \right) \frac{\hbar}{m} \sigma_z^{\alpha} \left[- \left(m \frac{D_{\alpha}}{\hbar} - 1 \right) \frac{\Delta}{3E_g + 2\Delta} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Now, we see that what was a pure quantum term with effective mass, has, in this limit, become a term which depends on the diffusivity. Even the sign change found by Nozières and Lewiner²¹ is recovered when $m \frac{D_{\alpha}}{\hbar} < 1$. The AHE Hall coefficient can, it seems, change from scaling as the resistance squared (relaxation time squared) with Eq. (42) or $\frac{D_{\alpha}}{\hbar}$ becomes m_{α}^{-1} , as is observed in diluted magnetic semiconductors²⁷ to linear scaling with resistance using $m_{\alpha}^{-1} = \frac{D_{\alpha}}{\hbar}$. The experimentally observed $R_A \propto \rho_{xx}^2$ dependence implies, therefore, that the effective mass concept remains valid in these systems. The high temperature expansion involves the same terms, but they are now divided by $k_B T$ and the expansion is relatively easy to justify.

We have focused our attention on the anomalous contributions, and how they undergo a transformation, in going from the weak scattering to the strong scattering limit. A similar change must occur for the first term of Eq. (47). Here too, we must replace the Drude σ_{xx} by

$$\sigma_{xx} = e^2 \int d\varepsilon \left(-\frac{\partial f(\varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon} \right) \rho(\varepsilon) D(\varepsilon) \quad (48)$$

and the band mobility term $\frac{e\tau B_z}{m^*}$ by

$$\frac{e\tau B_z}{m^*} = eB_z \frac{D}{\langle \varepsilon \rangle}, \quad (49)$$

at low temperatures. The notation in terms of diffusivity D is valid in the weak scattering limit too, but now one can see what happens as we approach the mobility edge using standard localization theory (Eq. (44)) and

$$\sigma(\varepsilon) = \rho(\varepsilon) D(\varepsilon).$$

We have shown that the AHE Hall coefficient R_A can vary with resistance ρ_{xx}^n with $1 \leq n \leq 2$ depending on the degree of coherence. The essential point seems to be the way one treats the rather ambiguous sum rule given by Eq. (32). This was already a problem for Datta¹⁹ in his analysis of the Hall effect in his 1980 paper. Eq. (32) may be treated as the well known f-sum rule, but it is clearly not realistic to sum over an infinite excited state spectrum, without taking into account the finite lifetime of the states. The question then becomes: when is the sum on the RHS of Eq. (32) $\frac{1}{2m^*}$ and when is it closer to $\frac{D}{\hbar}$ which is the sum evaluated in the semi-classical limit, and also derivable from $\langle \alpha | x^2 | \alpha \rangle \sim D_{\alpha} \tau$? The interesting and important side of this last result, is that it gives the correct null result for transport in localized states, and therefore must be the correct approximation near the mobility edges.

Next we note that the side jump Hall effect derived in the past by various authors^{20,23,24} is also reproduced here. In Berger²⁴ and Lyo and Holstein³⁶, the effect is the result of side jumps each time the particle scatters from a potential. The problem here is that the lengths that are added to give the final result are not really allowed as *measurable lengths* in the sense of the Heisenberg uncertainty relation. The derivation must therefore start directly from the *measurable current* using the Kubo formula. Woelfle and Muttalib²³ did indeed do that, and re-derived the side jump which turned out to be result of the term in the commutator which gives the generalized velocity in the Kubo formula (Eqs. (4) and (5)). The problem with this derivation is that it gives the unrenormalized or unenhanced side-jump result and it is quite apparently a diagrammatic approximation, not related to the Berger²⁴ and Chazalviel²⁰ derivations. We have derived the side-jump-like term almost trivially, using linear response to the spin-orbit interaction which is produced by motion in the external potential. Our result is, in principle, exact, up to the evaluation of the notorious sum rule (Eq. (32)). One extreme, empty lattice limit, of the answer, is the unrenormalized *Berger side-jump* with *mass* = free electron mass. But in a well defined finite band, it can be *mass* = effective mass and thus enhanced if m^* is smaller than m . Finally in the incoherent limit, and specially near mobility edges, we have the relation $m_{\alpha} = \frac{\hbar}{D_{\alpha}}$ which then gives a very sensible result, namely

$$\sigma_{xy}^{sj} = -\frac{e^2}{\Omega} \frac{\hbar}{4m^2 c^2} \sum_{\alpha} f(\varepsilon_{\alpha}) \frac{m D_{\alpha}}{\hbar} \sigma_z^{\alpha} \quad (50)$$

and therefore a vanishing side jump Hall effect contribution from those states in the localized part of the band.

Adding Eqs. (50) and Eq. (47) we have the strong scattering Hall conductivity limit. Note that unlike Eq. (47), the side-jump-like Hall effect is not a Fermi

level property, in agreement with Berger's original result. As in the QHE, every conducting state contributes. However, the full enhancement of the spin-orbit coupling (see Ref. 25 and Ref. 12 for example) does not appear in this expression. This suggests that the true analogue to the Berger-Chazalviel-Nozières result is perhaps not Eq. (50), but rather the g -shift term from the first cumulant. The most interesting aspect of the side-jump-like term (Eq. (50)), is that if the Fermi level is in a region of localized states, say near the top of the band, then this term dominates the Hall current since all other terms are Fermi level terms, and vanish at low temperatures. It would give us (using the free mass) $J_y \sim 10^{-29} N_{del} \langle \sigma_z \rangle F_x$ A/m² (N_{del} = delocalized electrons density) which is, of course, a small but *rigid* current, analogous to the Quantum Hall current.

VII. CONCLUSION

The principal result of the cumulant method developed in this paper is given by Eq. (41). It is an expression for the Hall current which allows for disorder and spin-orbit coupling. For a typical doped semiconductor, we might expect the following contributions to the Hall effect:

1. The normal process (first term of Eq. (47)).
2. The intrinsic AHE side jump like process (Rashba term, Eq.(50)).
3. The intrinsic AHE Karplus-Luttinger process (second term of Eq. (47)).
4. The skew scattering process due to impurities (Eq. (46)). Here, the basic spin-orbit coupling has the effective mass and not the free mass.

The skew term (Eq. (46)) is only relevant if both the enhancement and the basic spin-orbit coupling are large and the concentration of impurities high enough (see Ref. 12 for estimates). The side-jump term is only important if the effective mass is small or the Fermi level is in a region of localized states. In most situations with weak disorder, we expect the Karplus-Luttinger intrinsic term to dominate the AHE. In the limit of strong scattering, when the use of Bloch functions and uniform lifetimes is no longer valid, we may replace the effective mass in Eq. (41) using the concept of quantum diffusivity i.e. put $m_\alpha^{-1} \rightarrow \frac{D_\alpha}{\hbar}$, and use derivatives, as explained in the text.

For magneto-optical, Faraday angle measurements, for example, we need the frequency dependent Hall conductivity. One can show that in weak scattering, where we use the effective mass for Eq. (32), we add a factor $\frac{1}{1+(\omega\tau)^2}$ to the four main Hall conductivity results listed above. In strong scattering, where we use the diffusivity to describe Eq. (32), $D(\varepsilon)$ is replaced by $D(\varepsilon, \omega)$.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Pr. Arthur Yelon for reading and commenting on the manuscript. L.-F. A. acknowledge financial support from Pr. A.-M.S Tremblay during the writing of the manuscript.

APPENDIX A: DERIVATIVE OF THE HAMILTONIAN WITH RESPECT TO THE MAGNETIC FIELD

With $\mathbf{A}_i = (0, B_z x_i)$ and $p_y^0 = mv_y^0$, the kinetic part of the Hamiltonian is

$$T = \sum_i \left[\frac{m(v_i^0)^2}{2} - eB_z x_i v_y^{0,i} + \frac{e^2 B_z^2}{2m} x_i^2 \right]. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Thus, with $H = T + V + H_{so} - \frac{g\mu_B}{2} B_z \sum_i \sigma_z^i$, we can write, remembering that without the spin-orbit term in the velocity operator $v_y^i = v_y^{0,i} - \frac{eB_z}{m} x_i$,

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial B_z} = \sum_i \left[-e x_i v_y^i - \frac{g\mu_B}{2} \sigma_z^i \right]. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Thus,

$$\left\langle \alpha \left| \frac{\partial H}{\partial B_z} \right| \alpha \right\rangle = -e \langle \alpha | x v_y | \alpha \rangle - \frac{g\mu_B}{2} \left\langle \alpha \left| \sum_i \sigma_z^i \right| \alpha \right\rangle. \quad (\text{A3})$$

We now want to transform the LHS of Eq. (A3) to obtain Eq. (13). To do so, we just apply the well known Hellman-Feynman theorem and we obtain $\left\langle \alpha \left| \frac{\partial H}{\partial B_z} \right| \alpha \right\rangle = \frac{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha}{\partial B_z}$ and thus Eq. (13). Remember that v_y in the equation does not contains the spin-orbit term of Eq. (5).

APPENDIX B: THE SECOND ORDER TERMS IN THE CUMULANT EXPANSION

Consider now the second order contribution to the Hall conductivity. This can be written

$$\sigma_{xy}^{\{2\}} = \frac{e^2}{2! \Omega} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \langle \alpha | x | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | H v_y - v_y H | \alpha \rangle \frac{\partial^2 f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha^2} \quad (\text{B1})$$

where, as previously, $v_y = \frac{i\hbar}{m} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - \frac{eB_z x}{m}$, dropping the spin-orbit current operator. After evaluating the commutator we are left with three terms

$$i\hbar \frac{eB_z}{m} v_x^0, \quad \frac{i\hbar}{m} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y}, \quad -\frac{i\hbar}{m} p_x \sum_n \lambda_n \sigma_z. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Only the first and third term give significant contributions in this order. The first term is

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{xy,1}^{\{2\}} &= \frac{e^2}{2!\Omega} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \langle \alpha | x | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | i\hbar \frac{eB_z}{m} v_x^0 | \alpha \rangle \frac{\partial^2 f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha^2} \\ &= \frac{e^2}{2!\Omega} \frac{\hbar^2 e B_z}{m} \sum_{\alpha} \left(-\frac{1}{2m_\alpha} \right) \frac{\partial^2 f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha^2},\end{aligned}\quad (\text{B3})$$

where we have used the sum rule of Eq. (32) restricted to the active energy band. For Bloch states restricted to the 8-Kane bands with spin-orbit coupling, the RHS of Eq. (32) reproduces the 8-bands $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p}$ calculated effective masses. To conclude, we note that the cumulant expansion is a powerful method when the bandwidth is very narrow and $< k_B T$. At low temperatures, when we use $m_\alpha = m^*$, we obtain for Eq. (B3)

$$\sigma_{xy,1}^{\{2\}} = -\frac{e^2}{2!} \frac{\hbar}{m} \left(\frac{\hbar e B_z}{2m^*} \right) \frac{\partial \rho(\varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=\varepsilon_f}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Note that the cumulant expansion is not purely an expansion in powers of B_z . There is a term linear in B_z in almost every order. Using the effective mass method, the linear term in B_z becomes an expansion in powers of the $V_{\text{disorder}}/\varepsilon_f$. The convergence is problematic near band edges where we have localization. We neglect the term given by the second term of Eq. (B2). The spin-orbit term, given by the third term of Eq. (B2), becomes

$$\sigma_{xy,3}^{\{2\}} = \frac{e^2 \hbar^2}{2!\Omega} \sum_{\alpha} \frac{1}{2m_\alpha} \Gamma_\alpha \frac{\partial^2 f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha^2} \sigma_z^\alpha. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Again, at low T (neglecting other energy dependence under the integral), we can use

$$\sum_{\alpha} \frac{\partial^2 f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha^2} = \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=\varepsilon_f}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

If we assume that $\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \varepsilon} \Big|_{\varepsilon=\varepsilon_f} \sim \frac{\rho}{\varepsilon_f}$, again, we have the same structure as before in Eq. (26), this time with $\Delta g = \frac{\hbar \Gamma_\alpha}{\varepsilon_f}$. With the numerator of order 10^{-4} eV, this term corresponds to an effective g -shift of 10^{-4} which is therefore smaller than the first order cumulant of its type. But, we should also remember, that the approximation for the derivative of the DOS can be quite wrong at the band edges for obvious reasons.

APPENDIX C: THIRD ORDER CUMULANT

In the third order cumulant, if we neglect terms of order B_z^2 and λ^2 , we have only the terms

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{xy}^{\{3\}} &= \frac{e^2}{3!\Omega} \sum_{\alpha} \frac{1}{m_\alpha} \frac{\partial^3 f(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\partial \varepsilon_\alpha^3} \\ &\left\langle \alpha \left| x^2 \nabla_y^2 V(\mathbf{r}) \left[\frac{\hbar e B_z}{m} + \sum_n \hbar \lambda_n(\mathbf{r}) \langle \sigma_z \rangle \right] \right| \alpha \right\rangle \frac{\hbar}{m}.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{C1})$$

The terms linear in B_z and spin-orbit coupling always go in pairs, the spin-orbit term acting like an effective magnetic field. The higher order terms form an infinite series with products involving derivatives of the lattice potential. These terms are small at high temperature and renormalize the first order linear terms in B_z and λ_n . For localized states, the renormalization must exactly yield a null result for the Hall conductivity of these levels. The null result can of course also be reproduced immediately by using the argument of Ando² starting from the exact Kubo formula. If the variation of the density of states is small with energy then the third order term which involve second derivatives of the lattice potential is completely negligible even at low temperatures. Note that $\nabla_y^2 V(\mathbf{r}) \propto \frac{r^2 - 3y^2}{r^5}$ and therefore, on its own, averages to zero. Note also that in the effective mass approach, the lattice potential no longer appears in the Hamiltonian so $V(\mathbf{r})$ appearing in Eq. (C1) is due to impurities or disorder.

APPENDIX D: EFFECTIVE MASS AND DIFFUSIVITY IN THE STRONG SCATTERING LIMIT

Since the excited states can decay and must have a finite lifetime, we can write the sum of Eq. (32) as

$$\frac{1}{m(\varepsilon_\alpha)} = 2 \int_{-W}^W d\varepsilon_\beta \rho(\varepsilon_\beta) \frac{|\langle \alpha | v_x | \beta \rangle|^2 (\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha)}{(\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha)^2 + \left(\frac{\hbar}{\tau_\beta} \right)^2}. \quad (\text{D1})$$

The quantum diffusivity is defined as

$$D_\alpha = \hbar \sum_{\beta} |\langle \alpha | v_x | \beta \rangle|^2 \delta(\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha). \quad (\text{D2})$$

Then it follows that we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{m(\varepsilon_\alpha)} &= \\ &2 \int_{-W}^W d\varepsilon_\beta \left\{ \rho(\varepsilon_\beta) \frac{|\langle \alpha | v_x | \beta \rangle|^2 \frac{\hbar}{\tau_\beta}}{(\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha)^2 + \left(\frac{\hbar}{\tau_\beta} \right)^2} \right\} \left\{ \frac{(\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha)}{\frac{\hbar}{\tau_\beta}} \right\} \\ &= \frac{2c_\alpha D(\varepsilon_\alpha)}{\hbar},\end{aligned}\quad (\text{D3})$$

where c_α is a constant, defined by Eq. (D3). Its value and sign depends on the density of states variation. One can also see this by doing an integration by parts using the product of the two functions in brackets. The constant carries a sign (as does the effective mass) which depends on the energy. We can rewrite it as $c_\alpha = \langle (\varepsilon_\beta - \varepsilon_\alpha) \frac{\tau_\beta}{\hbar} \rangle_\beta$, where the average is to be taken with the diffusivity weighting function under the integral as defined by Eq. (D3). This equation is still *exact*. In the random phase approximation, kinetic energies are of the same

order as the energy uncertainty and c_α is ~ -1 or $+1$ depending on whether we are near the top or the bottom of the band.

APPENDIX E: THE INTRINSIC AND SKEW SCATTERING IN THE CUMULANT APPROACH

Let us consider Eq. (21) and write for Coulomb potentials

$$\left[\sum_l \lambda_l (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_l) \times \mathbf{p} \right]_z \sigma_z \sim (xp_y - yp_x) \sigma_z \sum_l \lambda_l \quad (\text{E1})$$

and if we decouple the expectation value as

$$\langle \alpha | (xp_y - yp_x) \sigma_z \sum_l \lambda_l | \alpha \rangle = \langle \alpha | (xp_y - yp_x) | \alpha \rangle \Gamma_\alpha \sigma_z^\alpha, \quad (\text{E2})$$

then from Eq. (14) and $v_y = -\left(\frac{i\hbar}{m}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - \frac{eB_z x}{m}$ we see that the expectation value of the angular momentum is

related to the normal Hall conductivity in the first order cumulant, so that indeed we have

$$\frac{e^2}{k_B T \Omega} \sum_\alpha f(\varepsilon_\alpha) \frac{\partial}{\partial B_{orb}} \left[\langle \alpha | xp_y - yp_x | \alpha \rangle \right] \sigma_z^\alpha \Gamma_\alpha \rightarrow \langle \sigma_z^\alpha \rangle \Gamma_\alpha \frac{mc}{e} \frac{\partial}{\partial B_{orb}} \sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}}(B_z). \quad (\text{E3})$$

With the classical term $\frac{\partial}{\partial B_{orb}} \sigma_{xy}^{\{1\}}(B_z) = \sigma_{xx} \frac{e\tau}{m^*}$, we have a term analogous to the skew scattering rate (Eq. (46)) if this rate is given by Eq. (45) where all the potentials are included, not just the impurities. So it is in fact a truncated part of the intrinsic g -shift term derived as Eq. (24). But, if we use only the impurity potential as perturbation on the energy, then it would indeed be the analogue of the skew scattering Hall current, enhanced (if at all) by the squared ratio of free to effective mass $\left(\frac{m}{m^*}\right)^2$ and not by the factor obtained by Bloch-Kane theory.

-
- * Present address: Département de Physique and RQMP, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, QC, Canada
- † Present address: Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA
- ¹ B. Movaghar, and R. W. Cochrane Phys. Stat. Sol. (b) **166**, 311 (1991).
 - ² T. Ando, A. Fowler, and F. Stern, Rev. Mod. Phys. **54**, 437 (1982).
 - ³ Y. Yao, L. Kleinman, A. H MacDonald, J. Sinova, T. Jungwirth, D.-S. Wang, E. Wang, and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 037204 (2004).
 - ⁴ M. Abolfath, T. Jungwirth, J. Brum, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 054418 (2001).
 - ⁵ T. Jungwirth, Q Niu, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 207208 (2002).
 - ⁶ T. Jungwirth, J. Sinova, K. Y. Wang, K. W. Edmonds R. P. Champion B. L. Gallagher C. T Foxon Qian Niu and A.H. MacDonald, Appl. Phys. Lett. **83**, 320 (2003).
 - ⁷ T. Jungwirth, J. Sinova, J. Masek, J. Kucera and A.H. MacDonald, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 809 (2006).
 - ⁸ J. Sinova, T. Jungwirth and J. Cerne, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **18**, 1083 (2004).
 - ⁹ J. Sinova, D. Culcer, Q. Niu, N. A. Sinitsyn, T. Jungwirth, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 126603 (2004).
 - ¹⁰ R. Karplus, and J.M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. **95**, 1154 (1954).
 - ¹¹ L.E. Ballentine, in *Liquid Metals 1976*, edited by R. Evans and D.A. Greenwood, IOP Conf. Proc. No. 30 (Institute of Physics, London, 1977), Chap. 1, Pt. 2, pp. 188-199
 - ¹² H. A. Engel, B. I. Halperin, and E. I. Rashba, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 166605 (2005).
 - ¹³ J. Smit, Physica **24**, 39 (1958).
 - ¹⁴ N. F. Mott, and H. S. W. Massey, *Theory of Atomic Collisions* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, 1965).
 - ¹⁵ L.M. Roth, in *Liquid Metals 1976*, edited by R. Evans and D.A. Greenwood, IOP Conf. Proc. No. 30 (Institute of Physics, London, 1977), Chap. 1, Pt. 2, pp. 200-206
 - ¹⁶ B. Movaghar, and R. W. Cochrane Z. Phys. B **85**, 217 (1991).
 - ¹⁷ T. Matsubara, and T. Kaneyoshi Prog. Theor. Phys. **40**, 1257 (1968).
 - ¹⁸ P. Streda, J. Phys. C Solid State **15**, L717 (1982).
 - ¹⁹ S. Datta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 828 (1980).
 - ²⁰ J.- N. Chazalviel, Phys. Rev. B **11**, 3918 (1975).
 - ²¹ P. Nozieres, and L. Lewiner J. Physique **34**, 901 (1973).
 - ²² L. M. Roth, B. Lax, and S. Zwerdling, Phys. Rev. **114**, 90 (1959).
 - ²³ P. Wolfle, and K. A. Muttalib Annalen der Physik **15**, 508 (2006).
 - ²⁴ L. Berger, Phys. Rev. B **2**, 4559 (1970).
 - ²⁵ E. A. de Andrada e Silva, G. C. La Rocca, and F. Bassani, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 8523 (1994).
 - ²⁶ R. C. Fivaz, Phys. Rev. **183**, 586 (1969).
 - ²⁷ D. Ruzmetov, J. Scherschligt, D. V. Baxter, T. Wojtowicz, X. Liu, Y. Sasaki, J. K. Furdyna, K. M. Yu, and W. Walukiewicz, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 155207 (2004).
 - ²⁸ G. Bush, and J. J. Guentherodt Solid State Phys. **29**, 335 (1974).
 - ²⁹ H. Overhof, P. Thomas, *Electronic transport in hydrogeneated amorphous semiconductors* (Springer-Verlag Berlin, West Germany, 1989).
 - ³⁰ B. Velicky, S. Kirkpatrick, and H. Ehrenreich, Phys. Rev. **175**, 747 (1968).
 - ³¹ L.-F. Arsenault, B. Movaghar, P. Desjardins, and A. Yelon, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 115211 (2008).
 - ³² L.-F. Arsenault, M.Sc.A. Thesis, Department of engineering physics, École Polytechnique de Montréal, (2006).
 - ³³ D. Khmel'nitskii and A. I. Larkin, Solid State Comm. **39**, 1069 (1981).
 - ³⁴ B. Movaghar and S. Roth, Synthetic Metals **63**, 163 (1994).
 - ³⁵ E. M. Chudnovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 206601 (2007).
 - ³⁶ S. K. Lyo, and T. Holstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **29**, 423 (1972).