

Dzyaloshinskii–Moriya spin-spin interaction from mixed-parity superconductivity

Jabir Ali Ouassou,¹ Takehito Yokoyama,² and Jacob Linder³

¹*Department of Computer Science, Electrical Engineering and Mathematical Sciences, Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, NO-5528 Haugesund, Norway*

²*Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Meguro, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan*

³*Center for Quantum Spintronics, Department of Physics, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway*

Interacting impurity spins adsorbed on surfaces have been suggested as basic components for applications in quantum computation and spintronics. Such spins usually prefer a parallel or antiparallel configuration, but weakly non-collinear alignments are possible due to the Dzyaloshinskii–Moriya interaction (DMI) that arises in the presence of relativistic spin-orbit coupling. Here, we show that an effective DMI can emerge purely from superconducting correlations without any spin-orbit interaction. We give an analytical proof and provide a numerical study which shows that DMI arises in mixed-parity superconductors solely from the superconducting pairing. These results enable a way to engineer spin textures using the superconducting phase transition.

Introduction.—Individual spins placed on the surface of a material as well as magnetic layers separated by a non-magnetic layer can communicate with each other over distance via the electrons in the separating material. This indirect exchange mechanism is known as the Ruderman–Kittel–Kasuya–Yosida (RKKY) [1–3] interaction and can be utilized for a dual purpose. On one hand, it determines the preferred magnetic configuration of two or more spins, which in turn dictates possible “write” operations in a device utilizing such spins. The “read” operation is performed by measuring the spin configuration. On the other hand, the manner in which the spins align gives important information about correlations and interactions in the mediating material itself, acting as a probe for the host environment. Notably, localized spins interacting via exchange has also been shown to be sufficient to implement a universal quantum computer [4, 5], and RKKY interactions could therefore provide a possible architecture for future quantum computers.

The RKKY interaction has been studied in a range of materials, including major classes such as metals [6, 7], topological insulators [8–10], and superconductors [11–15]. In its most basic form, where two spins are coupled via a normal metal, the spins align either parallel (P) or antiparallel (AP) depending on their separation distance. However, spin interactions promoting a non-collinear ground state configuration come into play when adding spin-orbit coupling (SOC). This is manifested through an emergent Dzyaloshinskii–Moriya (DMI) [16, 17] term in the free energy. Such non-collinear spin arrangements are of interest in a number of subfields of condensed matter physics due to their importance in creating chiral magnetic textures such as skyrmions [18] and also because they could facilitate ferroelectric control over such magnetism due to the coupling that exists between DMI and electric polarization [19].

When the DMI term arises due to SOC, it is bound to be limited in magnitude due to the relativistic origin of such interactions. Therefore, an important question is if it is possible to generate strong DMI by other means than conventional SOC. We here predict that this is indeed possible in mixed-parity superconductors with an $s + ip_x$ symmetry [see Fig. 1(a)]. This kind of superconductivity arises both intrinsically in noncentrosymmetric materials [20] and by design in heterostructures




FIG. 1: (a) We consider an $s + ip_x$ superconductor of dimensions $101a \times 101a$ in the xy plane, where a is the lattice constant. Such a superconductor has order parameter contributions Δ_s and Δ_p that are respectively symmetric and antisymmetric in momentum space, as illustrated above. One spin impurity is placed at coordinates $(51a, 51a)$ and another at $(51a + \delta, 51a)$, and their spin orientations couple via an indirect exchange interaction mediated by the superconductor. (b) DMI coefficient D_z describing the interaction between S_1 and S_2 as function of the s -wave singlet gap Δ_s and p -wave triplet gap Δ_p for $\delta = a$. Only when both components are non-zero, corresponding to a mixed-parity superconducting state, do we find a finite DMI term. There is no SOC in our model, so this DMI term arises purely from mixed-parity superconductivity. (c) DMI coefficient as a function of δ for $\Delta_s = \Delta_p = 0.1t$. This shows that the DMI term exhibits the same damped oscillations as the usual RKKY interactions.

consisting of conventional superconductors with ferromagnets [21]. This finding shows that mixed-parity superconductors provide a new material platform for applications that require non-collinear spins in the vicinity of superconductivity, e.g. Kitaev chains constructed from magnetic adatoms on superconductors. For other mixed-parity superconductors, e.g. $s + i(p_x + p_y)$, our

analytical result shows that a DMI will exist for spins displaced along either the x or y axis. It may then be possible to realize e.g. skyrmion ground states in a 2D lattice of magnetic adatoms, stabilized by the superconductivity-induced DMI as opposed to SOC.

Theory.—When two spin impurities \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 are placed on a superconductor, the free energy that describes this perturbation can to leading order in \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 be parametrized as [22]

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_0 + \boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_2) + \mathbf{J} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_1 \circ \mathbf{S}_2) + \mathbf{D} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{F}_0 is independent of the spin directions \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 , $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ describes a magnetic interaction between each spin and a triplet superconducting condensate, $\mathbf{J} = (J_x, J_y, J_z)$ describes a Heisenberg or Ising RKKY interaction, $\mathbf{D} = (D_x, D_y, D_z)$ describes a DMI RKKY interaction, and \circ is a Hadamard product. In Ref. [22], we have previously developed both a numerical and an analytical methodology to determine the RKKY parameters \mathbf{J} and \mathbf{D} for general superconductors. Moreover, we used this to determine the RKKY coefficients for pure s -wave and p -wave superconductors, respectively. One interesting finding was that it was possible to obtain a DMI in non-unitary p -wave superconductors without any SOC in the model. However, that interaction was very weak and only occurred for very specific placements of the spins, since the mechanism behind it depends on proximity to the system's edges.

In this paper, we go beyond our previous work by studying a mixed-parity superconductor with an $s + ip_x$ order parameter. As we will show below, a new DMI contribution arises in this system which (i) does not require proximity to system edges, and (ii) is many orders of magnitude larger than the previously discovered DMI contribution. *In fact, we will show*

that this new DMI term becomes larger than all other RKKY coefficients for some parameter ranges, which is important for both experimental validation and potential applications.

The RKKY interaction energy \mathcal{E} can be analytically obtained via a 2nd-order perturbation expansion in the exchange coupling \mathcal{J} between each spin and the superconductor they are placed on. Such a perturbation expansion allows us to understand the microscopic origin of the terms in Eq. (1). The result of that procedure is the standard equation [7, 22, 23]

$$\mathcal{E} \sim \mathcal{J}^2 \text{Im} \int d\mathbf{p}_1 \int d\mathbf{p}_2 e^{-i(\mathbf{p}_2 - \mathbf{p}_1) \cdot (\mathbf{R}_2 - \mathbf{R}_1)} \int d\omega \tanh(\omega/2T) \times \text{Tr}[(\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \hat{\sigma}) \hat{G}^R(\mathbf{p}_1, \omega) (\mathbf{S}_2 \cdot \hat{\sigma}) \hat{G}^R(\mathbf{p}_2, \omega)], \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{S}_1 and \mathbf{S}_2 are the two spin orientations, \hat{G}^R is the retarded 4×4 Green function in Nambu \otimes Spin space, $\hat{\sigma} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*)$ where $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ is the Pauli vector, $\mathbf{p}_{1,2}$ are momentum variables, ω is the quasiparticle energy, and T is the temperature. We can parametrize a mixed-parity Green function as

$$\hat{G}^R = \begin{pmatrix} (g_s + \mathbf{g}_p \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})\sigma_0 & (f_s + \mathbf{f}_p \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})i\sigma_2 \\ (\tilde{f}_s + \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_p \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*)i\sigma_2 & (\tilde{g}_s + \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_p \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^*)\sigma_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where $\{g_s, \mathbf{g}_p, f_s, \mathbf{f}_p\}$ are all functions of momentum \mathbf{p} and energy ω , σ_0 is the identity matrix, and tilde conjugation is defined as $\tilde{x}(\mathbf{p}, \omega) = x^*(-\mathbf{p}, -\omega)$. Here, g_s and \mathbf{g}_p are related to the spin-independent and spin-dependent density of states, whereas f_s and \mathbf{f}_p can be interpreted as s -wave singlet and p -wave triplet superconducting correlations. Next, we substitute Eq. (3) into Eq. (2) and take the traces. Finally, we extract the parts of $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2)$ that can be written $\mathbf{D} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2)$, and thus find the following result for the DMI coefficient \mathbf{D} :

$$\mathbf{D} \sim \mathcal{J}^2 \int d\mathbf{p}_1 \int d\mathbf{p}_2 \int d\omega \tanh(\omega/2T) \sin[(\mathbf{p}_2 - \mathbf{p}_1) \cdot (\mathbf{R}_2 - \mathbf{R}_1)] \times \left\{ \text{Re}[\mathbf{g}_p(\mathbf{p}_1, \omega) \times \mathbf{g}_p(\mathbf{p}_2, \omega)] + 2 \text{Im}[g_s(\mathbf{p}_1, \omega)\mathbf{g}_p(\mathbf{p}_2, \omega)] - 2 \text{Im}[f_s(\mathbf{p}_1, \omega)\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_p(\mathbf{p}_2, \omega)] \right\}. \quad (4)$$

We have discarded a DMI term proportional to $\mathbf{f}_p \times \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_p$ which vanishes in bulk systems for symmetry reasons. The contributions from \mathbf{g}_p and g_s can arise due to e.g. SOC without any superconductivity [7]. However, and importantly, the $f_s, \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_p$ term can only arise in the presence of both s -wave singlet and p -wave triplet superconductivity with different complex phases, which is intrinsically realized for $s + ip$ superconductors. Motivated by this last term, we from here on focus on an $s + ip_x$ mixed-parity superconductor as a host material for spins.

Numerics.—For most of the simulations presented herein, we considered a $101a \times 101a$ square lattice with open boundary conditions. One spin was placed at the exact center of the system [see Fig. 1(a)] and another spin displaced a distance δ along the positive x axis. By choosing an odd number of lattice

sites and placing one spin at the system center, we completely suppress the small but finite DMI contribution that can arise due to edge effects [22]. The tight-binding Hamiltonian for the system under consideration is written

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 - \mu \sum_{i\sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} - t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{J} \sum_{i\sigma\sigma'} \sum_{p=1,2} \delta_{i,ip} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger (\mathbf{S}_p \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{i\sigma'} - \sum_{ij\sigma\sigma'} \left\{ c_{i\sigma}^\dagger [(\Delta_s \delta_{ij} + \Delta_p \mathbf{d}_{ij} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}) i\sigma_2]_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{j\sigma'} + \text{h.c.} \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Here, \mathcal{H}_0 is a constant that is unimportant for our (non-




FIG. 2: Magnitudes of all finite RKKY coefficients in an $s + ip_x$ superconductor with $\Delta_s = \Delta_p = 0.1t$. The DMI coefficient D_z has similar magnitude to the conventional RKKY coefficients $\{J_x, J_y, J_z\}$, but it dominates strongly for some separation distances δ .

selfconsistent) calculations, and $c_{i\sigma}^\dagger, c_{i\sigma}$ are the usual electronic creation and annihilation operators at lattice site i for spin σ . Except where otherwise stated, we used a nearest-neighbor hopping $t = 1$, chemical potential $\mu = -3t$, exchange interaction $\tilde{J} = 3t$, s -wave singlet gap $\Delta_s = 0.1t$, and p -wave triplet gap $\Delta_p = 0.1t$. The vector \mathbf{d}_{ij} is determined from the d -vector $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}) = ie_z p_x$ of the p -wave order parameter. Finally, the lattice sites i_1 and i_2 correspond to the positions of S_1 and S_2 , respectively. *Note that there is no SOC in this Hamiltonian, which is usually a prerequisite for DMI terms in the RKKY interaction.*

After numerically constructing the Hamiltonian matrix corresponding to Eq. (5), we calculated the free energy of the system for the 36 spin configurations $S_1, S_2 \in \{+e_x, +e_y, +e_z, -e_x, -e_y, -e_z\}$ for each $\delta \in [1a, 20a]$. The free energy is calculated using the equation

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{H}_0 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\epsilon_n > 0} \epsilon_n - T \sum_{\epsilon_n > 0} \log(1 + e^{-\epsilon_n/T}), \quad (6)$$

where $\{\epsilon_n\}$ are the numerically calculated eigenvalues and $T = 0.001t$ is the system temperature. The Python code used to construct the tight-binding model and calculate the free energy is available under a permissive open-source license at github.com/jabirali/bodge. These calculations are sufficient to fit Eq. (1) to the numerical results, and thus obtain the parameters $\{\mu, \mathbf{J}, \mathbf{D}\}$ of the free energy for each value of δ . We found no magnetic interaction between the spins and $s + ip_x$ superconductor in our simulations (i.e. $\mu = 0$), while the RKKY parameters (\mathbf{J} and \mathbf{D}) were generally found to be finite.

Results.—In Fig. 1(b), we show the DMI coefficient D_z as a function of the s -wave and p -wave order parameters. Notably, the DMI vanishes when either $\Delta_s \rightarrow 0$ or $\Delta_p \rightarrow 0$, showing that the mixed-parity order is essential for this contribution to be finite. We have also performed some calculations for $s + p_x$ superconductors without the ‘ i ’ (not shown), and found no DMI in those systems. All of these findings are consistent with the analytical result in Eq. (4) having a term $\mathbf{D} \sim \text{Im}[f_s f_p]$.

In Fig. 1(c), we show the DMI coefficient as a function of the spin–spin separation distance δ for an $s + ip_x$ -wave

superconductor. Strikingly, the resulting DMI coefficient is over two orders of magnitude larger than the edge-induced contribution in non-unitary triplet superconductors identified in Ref. [22] for similar system parameters. The DMI contribution oscillates and decays as a function of δ , which entails that very different spin configurations can be expected as a function of the distance between the spins. As expected from the analytical result in Eq. (4), we find that $\mathbf{D} \sim \text{Im} f_p^* \sim \text{Im} \mathbf{d} \sim e_z$, where we have used that the anomalous Green function f_p points in the same direction as the d -vector $\mathbf{d} \sim ie_z$.

Note that for an $s + ip_x$ superconductor, a finite DMI is only found for spin displacements along the x axis; when spins are displaced purely along the y axis, the DMI coefficient remains zero. This can be understood from Eq. (4). For displacements along the x axis, we have $\mathbf{R}_2 - \mathbf{R}_1 = \delta e_x$. For a general $s + ip_x$ superconductor, we can write $f_s(\mathbf{p}_1, \omega) \tilde{f}_p(\mathbf{p}_2, \omega) = F(|\mathbf{p}_1|, |\mathbf{p}_2|, \omega) p_{2x} e_z$ for some function F . The integrand is therefore proportional to $p_{2x} \sin[\delta(p_{2x} - p_{1x})]$, which remains finite when integrated over all momentum directions. For displacements along the y axis, one similarly obtains $p_{2x} \sin[\delta(p_{2y} - p_{1y})]$, which vanishes when integrated over positive and negative p_{2x} . For more complex order parameters (not shown), e.g. an $s + ip$ superconductor where the p -wave part is described by $\mathbf{d} = (e_x + ie_y)(p_x + ip_y)$, we find DMI coefficients with different orientations for displacements along the x and y axes—consistent with the arguments above.

The DMI we obtain is also consistent with Moriya’s original symmetry arguments [17]. The simulations presented herein correspond to an $s + ip_x$ superconductor, where the superconducting order parameter transforms as described in the supplemental material of Ref. [24]: Under e.g. mirroring through the xz plane, $\Delta(p_x, p_y, p_z) \rightarrow -\sigma_2 \Delta(p_x, -p_y, p_z) \sigma_2^*$, where $\Delta(\mathbf{p})$ is the 2×2 order parameter in spin space

$$\Delta(\mathbf{p}) = [\Delta_s + \Delta_p(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{p}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})] i\sigma_2. \quad (7)$$

Applied to an $s + ip$ superconductor with the d -vector $\mathbf{d} = p_x e_z$, we find that the order parameter is invariant under mirroring through the xy and yz planes. When the spins are displaced along the x axis, then the xy plane becomes a mirror plane that includes both \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 , so Moriya’s 3rd rule requires that $\mathbf{D} \parallel e_z$. Moreover, the yz plane is in this case a mirror plane perpendicular to $\mathbf{R}_2 - \mathbf{R}_1$, so Moriya’s 2nd rule requires that $\mathbf{D} \perp e_x$. The numerical result $\mathbf{D} \sim e_z$ for displacements along the x axis is consistent with both constraints. On the other hand, if the spins are displaced along the y axis, then both the xy and yz planes will be mirror planes that include \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 . Thus, Moriya’s 3rd rule requires that $\mathbf{D} \parallel e_z$ and $\mathbf{D} \parallel e_x$, which is only possible for $\mathbf{D} = 0$. This result for displacements along the y axis is thus required by symmetry.

In Fig. 2, we compare the order of magnitudes of the various non-zero RKKY coefficients for the above system. Since all coefficients oscillate as a function of the spin–spin separation distance δ , which contribution that dominates the RKKY interaction depends on the exact separation distance. For instance, when $\delta = 6a$ or $\delta = 9a$, the DMI contribution is roughly an order of magnitude larger than the Heisenberg contribution.




FIG. 3: Tunability of the DMI interaction in a mixed-parity superconductor. **(a)** Relative change in D_z when the phase winding ν becomes finite. **(b)** D_z as a function of the chemical potential μ , for different δ/a as indicated in the legends above. For this specific plot, we used a $51a \times 51a$ lattice size to make the numerics feasible.

On the other hand, for e.g. $\delta = 5a$ the Heisenberg contribution is roughly two orders of magnitude larger than the DMI interaction. Note that the non-DMI contribution is roughly Heisenberg-like ($J_x = J_y = J_z$) for small separation distances, but acquires an increasing Ising contribution ($J_z \neq J_x = J_y$) as the spins are moved further apart. This shows that an $s + ip_x$ superconductor with spin impurities can provide a rich set of ground-state spin configurations: depending on the precise placements of each spin, the dominant RKKY interaction can be either Heisenberg-like, Ising-like, or DMI-like.

In Fig. 3(a), we compute the influence of a supercurrent flowing through the superconductor on the RKKY interaction [25] to determine if the DMI can be experimentally tuned. To this end, we include a phase winding $\Delta_{s,p} \rightarrow \Delta_{s,p} e^{2\pi i \nu x/L}$, where x is the position along the x axis and L is the length of the system. Thus, $\nu = 0$ corresponds to no phase winding (the case studied so far in this manuscript), while $\nu = 1$ corresponds to a 2π phase winding across the sample. To ensure correct current conservation along the x axis, periodic boundary conditions were used for these specific simulations. We see that the DMI coefficient can be increased by up to 192 % for certain values of δ . The largest modulation is found for $\delta = 5a$ and $\delta = 8a$, corresponding to near-zero values of D_z without phase winding [cf. Fig. 1(c)]. This permits a way to perform *in situ* engineering of the DMI interactions between the spins. Note that the applied current in most cases *enhances* the DMI—only for $\delta = 10a$ do we find a weak reduction of D_z . The same results were obtained whether the current is applied in the positive direction ($\nu = +1$) or negative direction ($\nu = -1$).

In Fig. 3(b), we show the DMI as a function of the chemical potential. Interestingly, the DMI coefficient exhibits an oscillating dependence on μ which is antisymmetric with respect to $\mu = 0$, and decays exponentially for $|\mu| > 4t$. When the spin separation δ increases, the wavelength and amplitude of these oscillations decrease. The main features of this behavior can be understood from Eq. (4). As discussed above, the DMI integrand contains a factor $p_{2x} \sin[\delta(p_{2x} - p_{1x})]$ in $s + ip_x$ superconductors. The momentum factor $p_{2x} - p_{1x}$ is constrained by the Fermi momentum in the system, which in turn

is a function of the Fermi level μ . This sine function thus explains why the DMI oscillates both as a function of δ and μ . The fact that the DMI vanishes for $|\mu| > 4t$ can be understood because the RKKY interaction is mediated by correlations at the Fermi level. When $|\mu| > 4t$, the density of states is shifted so much that no electronic states remain at the Fermi level. In reality, the decay near $|\mu| \approx 4t$ is likely to be more abrupt, since we might expect the superconducting gap itself to vanish in this limit, which is not captured by our non-selfconsistent simulations. The results in Fig. 3(b) suggest an alternative way to tune the DMI coefficient *in situ*: In 2D superconductors, the chemical potential can in principle be tuned via a gate voltage, permitting voltage control over the RKKY DMI term.

Experimentally, one method to directly probe the RKKY interaction is via spin-polarized scanning tunneling microscopy (SP-STM) as demonstrated in Ref. [26]. When spin impurities are placed on a surface as in Fig. 1(a), the electric current that tunnels between each spin impurity and an SP-STM tip depends on the relative spin orientations: The current is maximized when the tip is magnetized in the same direction as the spin, and minimized when they are antiparallel. From the dI/dV curve as a function of applied magnetic field, one can determine to what extent the spins are parallel or antiparallel. In the case of a strong DMI, we would of course expect the ground state configuration to be neither parallel nor antiparallel but rather somewhere in-between. A similar approach was used to study the RKKY DMI specifically in Ref. [27], where the SP-STM results show oscillations as a function of position along an atomic chain. Their system is particularly relevant for a chain of spin impurities placed on an $s + ip_x$ superconductor, as discussed with respect to Kitaev chains earlier in this manuscript.

Concluding remarks.—In this paper, we have shown analytically and numerically that a DMI-like contribution to the RKKY interaction arises specifically in $s + ip$ mixed-parity superconductors. Moreover, we have shown that this DMI coefficient becomes the dominant spin–spin interaction for some parameter ranges, and that its precise magnitude can be tuned *in situ* either via a charge supercurrent or via a gate voltage. Notably, these effects are obtained without any spin-orbit coupling in our model. This suggests mixed-parity superconductors as a promising platform for engineering non-collinear magnetic ground states for artificial spin chains and lattices.

This work was supported by the Research Council of Norway through Grant No. 323766 and its Centres of Excellence funding scheme Grant No. 262633 “QuSpin.” This work was also supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP30578216. The numerical calculations were partially performed on resources provided by Sigma2—the National Infrastructure for High Performance Computing and Data Storage in Norway, project NN9577K. The research presented in this paper has also benefited from the Experimental Infrastructure for Exploration of Exascale Computing (eX3), which is financially supported by the Research Council of Norway under contract 270053.

-
- [1] M. A. Ruderman and C. Kittel, *Phys. Rev.* **96**, 99 (1954).
- [2] T. Kasuya, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **16**, 45 (1956).
- [3] K. Yosida, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 893 (1957).
- [4] D. Loss and D. P. DiVincenzo, *Physical Review A* **57**, 120 (1998).
- [5] D. P. DiVincenzo, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, G. Burkard, and K. B. Whaley, *Nature* **408**, 339 (2000).
- [6] Y. Yafet, *Phys. Rev. B* **36**, 3948 (1987).
- [7] H. Imamura, P. Bruno, and Y. Utsumi, *Physical Review B* **69**, 121303 (2004).
- [8] M. Shiranzaei, H. Cheraghchi, and F. Parhizgar, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 024413 (2017).
- [9] J.-J. Zhu, D.-X. Yao, S.-C. Zhang, and K. Chang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 097201 (2011).
- [10] Q. Liu, C.-X. Liu, C. Xu, X.-L. Qi, and S.-C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 156603 (2009).
- [11] N. E. Alekseevskii, I. A. Garifullin, B. I. Kochelaev, and E. G. Kharakhash'yan, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **72**, 1523 (1977).
- [12] B. Kochelaev, L. Tagirov, and M. Khusainov, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **76**, 578 (1979).
- [13] M. Khusainov, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **109**, 524 (1996).
- [14] D. N. Aristov, S. V. Maleyev, and A. G. Yashenkin, *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter* **102**, 467 (1997).
- [15] A. Di Bernardo, S. Komori, G. Livanas, G. Divitini, P. Gentile, M. Cuoco, and J. W. A. Robinson, *Nature Materials* **18**, 1194 (2019).
- [16] I. Dzyaloshinsky, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **4**, 241 (1958).
- [17] T. Moriya, *Phys. Rev.* **120**, 91 (1960).
- [18] N. Nagaosa and Y. Tokura, *Nature Nanotechnology* **8**, 899 (2013).
- [19] A. Fert, M. Chshiev, A. Thiaville, and H. Yang, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **92**, 081001 (2023).
- [20] M. Smidman, M. B. Salamon, H. Q. Yuan, and D. F. Agterberg, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **80**, 036501 (2017).
- [21] M. Eschrig, T. Löfwander, T. Champel, J. C. Cuevas, J. Kopu, and G. Schön, *J. Low. Temp. Phys.* **147**, 457 (2007).
- [22] J. A. Ouassou, J. Linder, and T. Yokoyama, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 174506 (2024).
- [23] N. F. Schwabe, R. J. Elliott, and N. S. Wingreen, *Physical Review B* **54**, 12953 (1996).
- [24] Y. Ueno, A. Yamakage, Y. Tanaka, and M. Sato, *Physical Review Letters* **111**, 087002 (2013).
- [25] C. Sun and J. Linder, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 214409 (2024).
- [26] L. Zhou, J. Wiebe, S. Lounis, E. Vedmedenko, F. Meier, S. Blügel, P. H. Dederichs, and R. Wiesendanger, *Nature Physics* **6**, 187 (2010).
- [27] M. Schmitt, P. Moras, G. Bihlmayer, R. Cotsakis, M. Vogt, J. Kemmer, A. Belabbes, P. M. Sheverdyaeva, A. K. Kundu, C. Carbone, S. Blügel, and M. Bode, *Nature Communications* **10**, 2610 (2019).