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The spin conductance of two-dimensional topological insulators (2D TIs) is not expected to be quantized in the presence of perturbations that break the spin-rotational symmetry. However, the deviation from the pristine-limit quantization has yet to be studied in detail. In this paper, we define the spin current operator for the helical edge modes of a 2D TI and introduce a four-terminal setup to measure spin conductances. Using the developed formalism, we consider the effects of disorder terms that break spin-rotational symmetry or give rise to edge-to-edge coupling. We identify a key role played by spin torque in an out-of-equilibrium edge. We then utilize a tight-binding model of topological monolayer WTe\textsubscript{2} and scattering matrix formalism to numerically study spin transport in a four-terminal 2D TI device. In particular, we calculate the spin conductances and characteristic spin decay length in the presence of magnetic disorder. In addition, we study the effects of inter-edge scattering in a quantum point contact geometry. We find that the spin Hall conductance is surprisingly robust to spin symmetry-breaking perturbations, as long as time-reversal symmetry is preserved and inter-edge scattering is weak.

Electrical control of spins is one of the central objectives in the field of spintronics \cite{1}. Topological insulators (TIs) are materials with strong spin-orbit coupling and host spin-momentum locked gapless modes confined to the boundary of an insulating bulk \cite{2,3}. These helical boundary modes offer new possibilities to generate spin polarization and spin currents with electrical means \cite{4-6}. So far, most studies of topological insulators from spintronics point of view have focused on 3D TIs \cite{7-10}, whose 2D surface hosts a massless helical Dirac fermion.

However, impurity scattering limits the potential of using the 3D TI surface states for spintronics. Even though direct backscattering $k \rightarrow -k$ of the Dirac electrons is forbidden by time-reversal symmetry (since $k$ and $-k$ are oppositely spin-polarized), scattering by any other angle is allowed, which leads to the loss of momentum and spin conservation at a scale set by the elastic mean free path \cite{4}. By the same token, current-induced spin accumulation is similarly limited by the mean free path \cite{11}.

Impurity scattering is much more restricted in 2D TIs whose boundary modes are confined to 1D. These helical modes have only 2 momentum directions, left and right, and time-reversal symmetry (TRS) forbids elastic backscattering between the two. The modes therefore remain ballistic (and retain their spin) at distances below the inelastic mean free path \cite{12-19}. Likewise, current-induced out-of-equilibrium spin polarization of a 2D TI edge is not limited by elastic non-magnetic impurity scattering. Indeed, a bias voltage $V$ (or charge current $e^2V/h$) leads to a spin accumulation per density $\langle S_z \rangle/n = eV/(4E_F)$ on a 2D TI edge, independent of scalar disorder (the opposite edge would have the opposite spin polarization). Here we denote $z$ the spin quantization axis at the Fermi level, assuming it does not vary on the scale $eV$.

Spin transport on the one-dimensional edge states of a 2D TI was first considered in Refs. \cite{20,21} where the spin Hall conductance was calculated in the ideal case with the conservation of spin-$z$ projection. In this case, the spin Hall conductance is found to be quantized to $e/(4\pi)$. Upon breaking the spin conservation, the spin Hall conductance is generally finite but not expected to be quantized \cite{22-24}.

Various spin-rotation symmetry breaking mechanisms on the 2D TI edge have been considered in the context of charge transport \cite{12-17,25-28}. On a clean, translationally invariant edge, the spin rotational symmetry may be broken due to bulk or structural inversion asymmetry which can lead to a momentum space spin rotation of the helical edge modes \cite{14,29}, without breaking time-reversal symmetry. Similarly, the spin quantization axis may rotate in real space in the presence of a random Rashba spin-orbit term \cite{30-32}. These TRS mechanisms do not lead to elastic backscattering but can modify the charge conductance at non-zero temperatures inelastically \cite{12-14,26}. Elastic backscattering becomes possible when TRS is broken \cite{12,13,28}. This can be achieved for example by applying an external magnetic field \cite{33-37} or by doping the sample with polarized magnetic impurities \cite{38,39} which both suppress edge conduction. While spin-non-conserving perturbations have received considerable attention in charge transport, relatively few quantitative studies \cite{23,40-43} have focused on spin transport in 2D TIs.

In this paper we formulate the low-energy scattering theory of spin transport in 2D TI edge states and use numerical simulations to go beyond the effective model. Focusing on the recently discovered monolayer WTe\textsubscript{2} topological insulator \cite{34,35,44-48} as an example, we carry out an extensive numerical study of disorder effects on spin transport. We consider both spin-conserving and explicitly spin-symmetry-breaking terms such as random scalar onsite disorder, spin-non-conserving disorder in the spin-orbit coupling strength, TRS breaking magnetic
impurities, as well as inter-edge scattering in a quantum point contact geometry.

Our analytical theory clarifies how the spin conductance quantization gets broken by spin non-conserving perturbations. We identify a crucial role played by local equilibrium or non-equilibrium on the TI edge. Namely, the non-conservation of edge spin current (and a resulting non-quantized spin conductance) arises from a spin torque generated by the spin non-conserving disorder. As we will show, the spin torque vanishes if the edge is in local equilibrium, and is generally non-zero when the edge is out of equilibrium (and can have a non-zero spin equilibrium, and is generally non-zero when the edge is out of equilibrium (and can have a non-zero \( S_z \)). As a result, when using a 4-terminal measurement of the spin conductances, the bias configuration is of key importance: when the edge has no voltage drop, it can carry a conserved spin current, see Figs. 1–2 and Table I.

The outline of our paper is as follows. We first introduce an effective 1D model for the helical edge modes (Sec. I). We derive the spin current operator and discuss how intra- and inter-edge backscattering perturbations modify the average spin current. In Sec. II, we introduce the spin-resolved Landauer–Büttiker formula to define the spin conductances for a multiterminal setup. In Sec. III, we present our numerical simulations for spin transport in disordered multiterminal systems and in Sec. IV we draw our conclusions.

I. EFFECTIVE DESCRIPTION OF EDGE SPIN TRANSPORT

In this section we develop a low-energy effective Hamiltonian which describes the propagation of the helical edge states in a 2D TI. We then utilize this model to study the effects of localized magnetic disorder and inter-edge scattering on the spin transport properties of the material.

The characteristic feature of a 2D TI is the presence of a pair of helical edge modes and a gapped bulk. On a given edge and at a fixed energy, the helical modes have opposite spin-polarizations and velocities. At low energies, we can approximate the edge spectrum by a linear dispersion and ignore any momentum space spin rotation [29]. Denoting \( \mathbf{z} \) the spin quantization axis of the TI, we obtain the 1D effective Hamiltonian of a single edge,

\[
H_0 = \int dx \bar{\Psi}(\mathbf{z}) \left( -i \hbar \partial_x \sigma_z - \mu \right) \Psi ,
\]

where \( v \) is the velocity of the edge modes, \( \mu \) is the chemical potential, \( \sigma_z \) denotes the spin Pauli matrices, and \( \Psi(x) = (\psi_{\uparrow}, \psi_{\downarrow})^T \) is the electron field operator.

While the effective Hamiltonian (1) does not have full spin-rotational symmetry, it does have a \( U(1) \) spin-rotational symmetry about the \( \mathbf{z} \)-axis; we can therefore define a conserved spin current along this axis. Starting from the spin density \( S_z(x) = \frac{\hbar}{2} \bar{\Psi}^\dagger(x) \sigma_z \Psi(x) \), we obtain the spin-\( z \) current operator by using the continuity equation [49][50, 51]:

\[
\partial_t S_z + \partial_x I_z^s = 0 .
\]

The time derivative in Eq. (2) can be evaluated using the Heisenberg equation of motion: \( \partial_t S_z = \frac{i}{\hbar} [H_0, S_z] \). The commutator can then be expressed in terms of the gradient of the density operator \( \rho(x) = \bar{\Psi}^\dagger(x) \Psi(x) \). Remarkably, the spin current along the conserved axis is thus tied to the local density:

\[
I_z^s = \frac{\hbar v}{2} \rho .
\]

This simple result is a direct consequence of spin-momentum locking: left and right moving electrons carry equal spin currents since they have opposite velocities and spin projections [52].

Importantly, we note that any local perturbation which does not break the \( U(1) \) spin symmetry of Eq. (1) will not modify the spin current. We will see below that the spin current is indeed robust against such perturbations. One might expect even greater robustness of the spin current since \( I_z^s \), Eq. (3), commutes with any particle number conserving operator. This robustness is manifest in the quantization of the spin Hall conductance of a two-edge system, as long as inter-edge scattering (which breaks the conservation of particle number on a given edge) is absent and each edge is at a local equilibrium, see Fig. 1a. However, random spin-orbit coupling or magnetic disorder terms \( \delta H \) in the Hamiltonian can break the \( S_z \) conservation, leading to a spin-torque term to the RHS of Eq. (2):

\[
\mathcal{T} = -i \frac{\hbar}{\mu} [\delta H, S_z] .
\]

In general, this spin torque breaks the conservation of the spin current defined by Eq. (3) [53]. We will see that in an out-of-equilibrium situation the spin torque can be on average non-zero and lead to a deviation of the spin conductance from the quantized value, see Fig. 1b.

To study the effect of \( S_z \)-non-conserving magnetic perturbations, we begin by adding a spatially-dependent disorder term to Eq. (1):

\[
\delta H = \int dx m(x) \bar{\Psi}^\dagger \sigma_x \Psi .
\]

The \( \sigma_x \) operator in Eq. (5) breaks time-reversal (TR) symmetry and the \( U(1) \) spin-symmetry, coupling right- and left-movers and resulting in spin-flipping reflections. We will assume that \( m(x) \) is non-zero only in the region between 0 and \( x_0 \) so that we may treat the system as a scattering problem.

In the presence of the magnetic disorder, the spin torque term, Eq. (4), is non-zero. Thus, the spin current as defined in Eq. (3) is no longer conserved in the
related to the transmission and reflection coefficients by

For our incident right-mover of unit amplitude, the spin current is conserved since each edge is at a local equilibrium and spin torque vanishes. The absence of such perturbations, the spin current is conserved since each edge is at a local equilibrium and spin torque vanishes. Present due to the non-equilibrium distribution on each edge, there is a non-zero spin torque which breaks the conservation of spin current, \( I_{z,R}^s \neq I_{z,L}^s \). The lack of spin current conservation requires the definition of separate incident and transmitted spin conductances given by \( G_{T}^s = I_{z,L}^s/V \) and \( G_{T}^s = I_{z,R}^s/V \), respectively. c) Standard setup used to define the two-terminal charge conductance \( G_{2T} = I_{L}^s/V = I_{R}^s/V \).

Figure 1. a) Voltage setup of a 2D TI nanoribbon with a quantized spin Hall conductance \( G_{TH}^s = I_{z,L}^s/V = I_{z,R}^s/V \). Only perturbations which cause bulk conduction or couple the top and bottom edges will cause a deviation from the quantized conductance value. b) Voltage setup producing non-quantized spin conductances when \( S \), non-conserving disorder is present. Due to the non-equilibrium distribution on each edge, there is a non-zero spin torque which breaks the conservation of spin current, \( I_{z,L}^s \neq I_{z,R}^s \). The lack of spin current conservation requires the definition of separate incident and transmitted spin conductances given by \( G_{T}^s = I_{z,L}^s/V \) and \( G_{T}^s = I_{z,R}^s/V \), respectively. c) Standard setup used to define the two-terminal charge conductance \( G_{2T} = I_{L}^s/V = I_{R}^s/V \).

We note that for large \( \eta_m \), the “transmitted” spin current \( I^s_z(x_0) \) becomes exponentially small, i.e.

\[
I^s_z(x_0) \approx 2\hbar v e^{-x_0/\ell_0},
\]

where \( \ell_0 = x_0/(2\eta_m) \) is a characteristic spin decay length. The transmitted spin current therefore decreases in the same way that transmitted charge current (and conductance) would.

The analysis leading to Eqs. (10) and (11) applied to an incident left-mover from the right shows spin currents with the values of \( I^s_z(0) \) and \( I^s_z(x_0) \) interchanged, i.e., a spin current \( I^s_z(0) \), Eq. (10), on the right of the barrier. Hence, in general spin-flipping reflections lead to an increase in the spin current on the incident side and a decrease of equal magnitude on the transmitted side. In particular, when edge modes are incident with the same amplitude from both sides, the spin current per unit momentum is equal on both sides of the barrier, \( I^s_z(0) = I^s_z(x_0) = \hbar v \), independent of the strength of spin-flip scattering. In this case the spin torque, Eq. (6), vanishes; the magnetic impurities experience no spin torque in equilibrium [54]. This is a key observation that leads to the robustness of the spin Hall conductance in a four-terminal system when the edge is in local equilibrium, as will be discussed below.

Above, we evaluated the spin current carried by a single scattering state on a helical edge. The thermally averaged spin current for a single edge [obtained by averaging Eq. (3)] is not mathematically well-defined (without a UV cutoff) nor physical. In an actual two-terminal device, there are two edges carrying opposite spin currents, which ensures that the total spin current vanishes at equilibrium. The single-edge Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) can be extended to include both edges of a 2D TI ribbon.
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The analysis leading to Eqs. (10) and (11) applied to an incident left-mover from the right shows spin currents with the values of \( I^s_z(0) \) and \( I^s_z(x_0) \) interchanged, i.e., a spin current \( I^s_z(0) \), Eq. (10), on the right of the barrier. Hence, in general spin-flipping reflections lead to an increase in the spin current on the incident side and a decrease of equal magnitude on the transmitted side. In particular, when edge modes are incident with the same amplitude from both sides, the spin current per unit momentum is equal on both sides of the barrier, \( I^s_z(0) = I^s_z(x_0) = \hbar v \), independent of the strength of spin-flip scattering. In this case the spin torque, Eq. (6), vanishes; the magnetic impurities experience no spin torque in equilibrium [54]. This is a key observation that leads to the robustness of the spin Hall conductance in a four-terminal system when the edge is in local equilibrium, as will be discussed below.

Above, we evaluated the spin current carried by a single scattering state on a helical edge. The thermally averaged spin current for a single edge [obtained by averaging Eq. (3)] is not mathematically well-defined (without a UV cutoff) nor physical. In an actual two-terminal device, there are two edges carrying opposite spin currents, which ensures that the total spin current vanishes at equilibrium. The single-edge Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) can be extended to include both edges of a 2D TI ribbon.

disordered region. This leads to a discontinuity in the current due to the perturbation:

\[
I^s_z(x_0) - I^s_z(0) = \int_0^{x_0} dx \, T = - \int_0^{x_0} dx \, m(x) \Psi^\dagger_0 \sigma_y \Psi_0.
\]

This discontinuity can be evaluated explicitly by using the scattering matrix to calculate the spin current in the left and right regions due to, say, an incident right-mover with unit amplitude. The transmission and reflection coefficients \( t \) and \( r \) corresponding to Eq. (5) are given by (see Appendix A)

\[
t = \text{sech} \eta_m ,
\]

\[
r = -i \tanh \eta_m ,
\]

where \( \eta_m = \int_0^{x_0} m(x) \, dx / (\hbar v) \) and we neglect the energy-dependence of the scattering amplitudes (assuming scattering states near the Dirac point). We can then use the scattering matrix \( S \) to relate the coefficients of the incoming modes \( \Psi_{in} \) to the outgoing modes \( \Psi_{out} \) by \( \Psi_{out} = S \Psi_{in} \), where

\[
S = \begin{pmatrix} r & t \\ t & r \end{pmatrix}.
\]

For our incident right-mover of unit amplitude, the spin current in the left \((x < 0)\) and right \((x > x_0)\) regions are related to the transmission and reflection coefficients by

\[
I^s_z(0) = \frac{\hbar v}{2} \left( 1 + |r|^2 \right) = \frac{\hbar v}{2} \left( 1 + \tanh^2 \eta_m \right) ,
\]

\[
I^s_z(x_0) = \frac{\hbar v}{2} |t|^2 = \frac{\hbar v}{2} \left( 1 - \tanh^2 \eta_m \right) .
\]

We see that the jump, or loss, in the spin current is then \( I^s_z(x_0) - I^s_z(0) = -\hbar v \tanh^2 \eta_m \).
by introducing another set of Pauli matrices $\tau_i$ that act on the on-edge degree of freedom. The effective Hamiltonian of two uncoupled edges at the same chemical potential $\mu$ is given by

$$H_0 = \int dx \, \hat{\Psi}^\dagger (-i\hbar v_0 \partial_x \sigma_z \tau_z - \mu) \hat{\Psi},$$

(13)

where $\hat{\Psi} = (\Psi_1, \Psi_2)^T$ denotes the two-edge field operator and $\Psi_i = (\psi_{i\uparrow}, \psi_{i\downarrow})$. The matrix $\tau_z$ in the kinetic energy term ensures that the two edges carry edge modes with opposite helicities. Generalizing Eq. (3) to the two-edge system, we obtain the spin current operator

$$I_z^s = \frac{\hbar v}{2} (\rho_1 - \rho_2),$$

(14)

which consists of counter-propagating spin currents on the two edges 1 and 2.

A spin Hall current can be driven if the two edges of the ribbon are held at different, constant chemical potentials. This can be modeled by setting $\mu \rightarrow \mu + eV/2$ in Eq. (13). Such an inter-edge bias can be achieved, for example, by using four terminals (see Fig. 1a and Sec. II). Since each edge is at a constant potential, each edge carries a spin current $\pm \hbar v$ per momentum, as detailed above. Taking the thermal average of the total spin current in the low-temperature limit gives

$$\langle I_z^s \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \, \frac{\nu_0}{2} \hbar v \left[ f \left( E - \frac{eV}{2} \right) - f \left( E + \frac{eV}{2} \right) \right] = \frac{e}{2\pi} V,$$

(15)

where $f$ is the Fermi function and $\nu_0 = 1/(\pi \hbar v)$ is the edge density of states per length. In this setup with a transverse voltage, we define the spin Hall conductance $G_s^h = \langle I_z^s \rangle / V$. Since each edge is at a constant potential (Fig. 1a), the spin Hall conductance is quantized, $G_s^h = e/(2\pi)$, even in the presence of spin-non-conserving perturbations. This quantization can be traced back to the fact that the spin current operator is determined by the local electron density, which does not change upon intra-edge backscattering at equilibrium.

While the spin Hall conductance is robust against intra-edge backscattering, perturbations that couple modes on separate edges (inter-edge scattering) may result in reflections without a corresponding spin flip. The transfer of charge between the two edges changes the spin current, Eq. (14). Hence, such perturbations will lead to a decrease in the spin Hall conductance. To demonstrate this, we add an inter-edge scattering term to the two-edge Hamiltonian,

$$\delta H = \int dx \, \gamma(x) \hat{\Psi}^\dagger \tau_x \hat{\Psi}.$$  

(16)

This perturbation conserves $S_z$ and therefore does not give rise to spin-torque. Nevertheless, since it does not conserve the number of particles on a given edge, it will lead to a non-quantized spin conductance. As before, in order to define a scattering problem, we will assume that $\gamma(x)$ is non-zero only in the interval $0 < x < x_0$. Since there are four edge modes in the two-edge system, we can promote $r$ and $t$ in the scattering matrix $S$ in Eq. (9) to $2 \times 2$ matrices. In this case, $r_{ij}$ ($t_{ij}$) denote the amplitude of an incoming state from edge $i$ reflecting (transmitting) into an outgoing state on edge $i$. The nonzero components of $r$ and $t$ are

$$r_{12} = r_{21} = -i \tanh \eta_\gamma ,$$

(17)

$$t_{11} = t_{22} = \text{sech} \eta_\gamma ,$$

(18)

where $\eta_\gamma = \int_0^{x_0} \gamma(x) \, dx / (\hbar v)$. The other components, meanwhile, vanish due to the lack of a term coupling states of opposite spin. Noting that the reflected edge modes now carry an opposing spin current to the incident and transmitted modes, we find that

$$I_z^s(0) = \frac{\hbar v}{2} \left( 1 - |r_{12}|^2 \right) = \frac{\hbar v}{2} \left( 1 - \tanh^2 \eta_\gamma \right) ,$$

(19)

$$I_z^s(x_0) = \frac{\hbar v}{2} |t_{11}|^2 = \frac{\hbar v}{2} \left( 1 - \tanh^2 \eta_\gamma \right) .$$

(20)

Hence, unlike intra-edge spin-flip perturbations, inter-edge tunneling without a spin flip conserves the spin current but results in a decrease of its value. As a result, in the spin-Hall setup, Fig. 1a, the spin Hall conductance $G_s^h$ is not robust against inter-edge scattering. As was mentioned above, this result could be expected from the fact that the spin current couples to the difference of the density operators between the two edges, Eq. (14), and the inter-edge scattering does not conserve this difference.

Finally, when an edge is not at constant potential but has a potential drop $V$ along it (left-right bias), the spin current can have a jump in the presence of spin-flip perturbations, as is illustrated by Eqs. (10) and (11). This jump can be thought of as resulting from a non-zero spin torque, Eq. (6), in the non-equilibrium setup. Due to this jump, one must define separate spin conductances, which we call incident ($G_i^s = \langle I_z^s(0) \rangle / V$) and transmitted ($G_t^s = \langle I_z^s(x_0) \rangle / V$), for current flowing on either side of the disordered region (see Fig. 1b). Even without inter-edge scattering, these conductances are not quantized in the presence of magnetic disorder (unlike $G_h^s$); their sum, however, is robust since $G_i^s + G_t^s = G_h^s$, see Eq. (30) below.

The above results that were derived for the simple models of Eq. (5) and Eq. (16) illustrate the generic behavior of the spin conductances. We corroborate the findings by our numerical transport simulation discussed in Sec. III, where we simulate magnetic disorder as well as a quantum point contact (QPC) system to couple the edges (see Fig. 9). Before that, we introduce spin conductances defined in a four-terminal setup, Sec. II.
II. MULTITERMINAL TRANSPORT

We now move from the two-terminal case to a multiterminal system. While a two-terminal TI system requires the use of a proximitizing ferromagnetic heterostructure to drive a net spin current [55], a spin Hall current can be driven purely electrically in a multiterminal setup. In this section we therefore give the relevant expressions for the currents and conductances necessary to study multiterminal charge and spin transport.

Consider a general \( n \)-terminal system with metallic leads attached. The full scattering matrix \( S \) of such a system relates the coefficients of the incoming modes \( \Psi_{in} \) to the outgoing modes \( \Psi_{out} \) by \( \Psi_{out} = S \Psi_{in} \). In particular, the \( ij \)-th block \( S_{ij} \) is the scattering matrix for modes scattering from terminal \( j \) to \( i \). Furthermore, in the case that the leads share a spin-rotational symmetry along a given axis, we may choose a new eigenbasis which conserves this symmetry. In this basis, the scattering matrix takes the form \( S_{\sigma,i,j,\sigma'} \), where the \( \sigma \) indices denote the spins of the incoming and outgoing modes.

The Landauer-Büttiker formula provides the charge current passing through a lead in the low temperature limit in terms of the voltages applied to the leads and the transmission coefficients \( T_{ij} \) (from terminal \( i \) to \( j \)):

\[
I_i = \frac{e^2}{2\pi \hbar} \sum_{j \neq i} (T_{ji} V_j - T_{ij} V_i) .
\]

(21)

In the case of spin-rotational symmetric leads, Eq. (21) may easily be generalized to give the spin-resolved current in a lead by considering each lead spin channel as a separate terminal:

\[
I_{i\sigma} = \frac{e}{2\pi \hbar} \sum_{j \neq i} (T_{j\sigma',i\sigma} V_j - T_{i\sigma,j\sigma'} V_i) ,
\]

(22)

where the spin-resolved current \( I_{i\sigma} \) is the outgoing current in lead \( i \) due to electrons of spin \( \sigma \). The charge and spin currents in each lead can then be related to these spin-resolved currents by

\[
I_i^c = e (I_{i\uparrow} + I_{i\downarrow}) ,
\]

(23)

\[
I_i^s = \frac{\hbar}{2} (I_{i\uparrow} - I_{i\downarrow}) .
\]

(24)

The above equations also suggest that spin current can be measured by using two ferromagnetic terminals fully polarized along the \( z \) and \( -z \) axes. The net current into each terminal will be effectively spin resolved and their difference gives the net spin current. In Fig. 2b, we envision using this technique to measure the spin current into each terminal [56].

In the scattering formalism, the conductance \( G \) of an \( n \)-terminal system is the \( n \times n \) matrix relating the currents in the leads to the applied voltages. Assuming the leads share the same spin-rotational symmetry as the TI in the pristine limit, we define the \( 2n \times n \) spin-resolved conductance matrix \( G^{\sigma} \) by the spin-resolved current response \( I_{i\sigma}^r \) to a small voltage \( V_j \) (setting all other voltages to zero): \( G_{i\sigma,j\sigma'} = I_{i\sigma}^r / V_j \). From this we then define the \( n \times n \) charge and spin conductance matrices \( G^{c,s} \) by:

\[
G_{ij}^c = e (G_{i\uparrow,j\uparrow} + G_{i\downarrow,j\downarrow}) = I_i^c / V_j ,
\]

(25)

\[
G_{ij}^s = \frac{\hbar}{2} (G_{i\uparrow,j\uparrow} - G_{i\downarrow,j\downarrow}) = I_i^s / V_j .
\]

(26)

By inverting the conductance matrices, one could also quantify the inverse Hall effect and the inverse spin Hall effect, where a voltage is generated by a charge or spin current, respectively.

While the conductance matrices in Eqs. (25) and (26) provide the current response resulting from any voltage configuration, it is more illuminating to define conductance values for specific voltage setups such as those depicted in Fig. 1. In Table I we define several such conductance values for the four-terminal device depicted in Fig. 2a: the standard two-terminal charge conductance \( G_{2T}^c \) due a horizontal bias on both sides, and the diagonal spin Hall conductance \( G_{H}^s \) due to a vertical bias on a single side, the spin Hall conductance \( G_{H}^c \) due to a diagonal bias (this was considered in Ref. [20]). We note that in the case of \( G_{D}^s \), there is a potential drop on every edge. This leads to \( G_{D}^s \) being less robustly quantized than \( G_{H}^s \), see Sec. III C.

It is important to recognize that the spin conductances defined in Table I are defined with regards to the spin currents passing through the leads. In a multiterminal system with spin-non-conserving disorder this is not the same as spin currents passing through a cross section of the TI sample. In Fig. 2c we demonstrate this difference in the case of the spin Hall current and conductance. The net spin current into leads 3 and 4 on the right has two components: the spin Hall current from the left leads, \( I_{H}^s \), and the extra spin current between leads 3 and 4, \( \delta I_{H}^s \), generated by the spin torque from spin-non-
Figure 2. a) Schematic depiction of a four-terminal TI device of length $L$, width $W$, and lead width $W_{\text{lead}}$. The dotted region denotes disorder localized between two clean transition regions of length $L_{\text{trans}}$, where $L_{\text{trans}} = 0$ indicates a fully disordered sample. We evaluate the spin conductances from the spin currents entering the terminals, see Eq. (26). b) In order to measure the spin current entering each terminal, we consider the terminals to be composed of two closely spaced ferromagnetic leads with magnetization axes parallel and anti-parallel to the quantized axis of the TI, see Eq. (24). c) Depiction of spin currents in the spin Hall setup, Fig. 1a, with spin-non-conserving disorder between leads 3 and 4. The spin Hall current $I_{\text{SH}}$ passing through a cross section of the TI sample is conserved and equal to the sum of the currents along the top and bottom edges, $I_{\text{SH}} = I_{\text{top}} + I_{\text{bottom}}$. However, spin-non-conserving disorder and a non-equilibrium distribution lead to a spin torque on the edge connecting terminals 3 and 4, see also Fig. 1b. Due to the spin torque, an additional current $\delta I_{\text{SH}} = I_{1} - I_{2}$ is generated and flows to leads 3 and 4, resulting in a total spin current $I_{\text{SH}} + \delta I_{\text{SH}}$ entering the terminals and a non-quantized $G_{\text{SH}}$.

conserving disorder, see Eq. (6). In terms of these, the spin Hall conductance is $G_{\text{SH}} = (I_{\text{SH}} + \delta I_{\text{H}})/V$. In general, $G_{\text{SH}}$ is not equal to the conductance corresponding to just the spin Hall current passing through the sample, $G_{\text{SH}}' = I_{\text{SH}}/V$, especially when the connection between leads 3 and 4 is disordered (see Sec. III C). Importantly, only $G_{\text{SH}}'$ is quantized as predicted in Sec. I when the entire sample is disordered; $G_{\text{SH}}$ is only quantized when the connection between leads 3 and 4 has no spin-symmetry breaking disorder. This picture is confirmed by our numerical study where we compare clean and disordered connection between leads 3 and 4, see Fig. 7.

Using the definitions provided by Table I, we can derive several relations between the four-terminal conductances. In particular, we consider two special cases which will be relevant to the results in Secs. III A and III C. When the disorder does not break the spin-rotational symmetry of the TI, transmission between opposite spins is impossible: $T_{i\sigma,j\sigma'} \propto \delta_{\sigma\sigma'}$. This restriction results in the following relations between the conductances,

$$ G_{H}^{s} = \frac{h}{2e} G_{2T}, $$

$$ G_{I}^{s} = G_{T}^{s} = \frac{1}{2} G_{H}^{s}. $$

The relations in Eqs. (27) and (28) are valid even for conducting bulk states. Meanwhile, if there is no inter-edge scattering then only spin-preserving transmission and spin-flipping reflections are allowed: $T_{i\sigma,j\sigma'} \propto \delta_{ij} - \delta_{\sigma\sigma'}$. The resulting conductance relations are,

$$ G_{T}^{s} = \frac{h}{4e} G_{2T}, $$

$$ G_{H}^{s} = G_{I}^{s} + G_{T}^{s}. $$

Unlike Eqs. (27) and (28), the relations in Eqs. (29) and (30) rely on the localization of the edge states and are not true for conducting bulk states.

III. NUMERICAL STUDIES OF DISORDERED MULTITERMINAL SYSTEMS

To numerically study the transport properties of WTe$_2$, we utilized the Kwant package [57] for Python to implement the tight-binding model introduced in Ref. [48]. Four-terminal systems were created to study the conductances in Table I. Each system is comprised of a sample in the topological phase with four leads of width $W_{\text{lead}} = 12$ nm attached at the corners, as de-
We model the leads with the same WTe$_2$ tight-binding model as the sample, except with spin-orbit coupling set to zero. The Fermi level of the leads is placed within the valence band ($\mu = -400$ meV) to allow for an abundance of conducting bulk modes; the sample Fermi level, meanwhile, is placed near the center of the 56 meV wide bulk gap ($E = 0$ in Fig. 3) to ensure only edge modes are relevant in the pristine, zero-temperature limit. All plots shown utilize a horizontal straight edge termination [58] that has a Dirac point buried within the valence band (see Fig. 3); however, we find similar results for the zigzag termination which has a Dirac point in the bulk gap. We then use Kwant to construct the scattering matrix for the system, which is used with Eqs. (22)-(26) to determine the charge and spin conductances in the zero-temperature limit [59].

In the pristine limit we find the standard [20] quantized values for the two-terminal charge conductance ($G_{\text{TR}}^c = 2e^2/h$) and spin Hall conductance ($G_{\text{TH}}^s = e/(2\pi)$). We also find that $G_{\text{TH}}^s = G_{\text{TR}}^s = e/(4\pi)$ and $G_{\text{D}}^s = e/(4\pi)$ [20] in the pristine limit. In the following subsections we discuss the effects of onsite scalar and magnetic disorder on these results. We also study inter-edge scattering using a QPC system and calculate the characteristic spin decay length in the presence of magnetic disorder.

### A. $S_z$ conserving disorder

Due to the spin-momentum locking of the edge states in a 2D TI, it is expected that any perturbation which neither breaks the spin-symmetry nor couples the edges will not affect current propagation, as long as the perturbation strength is smaller than the gap to bulk excitations. Previous studies [48, 60] have demonstrated this in the context of scalar disorder and charge conductance. Here, we demonstrate that weak spin-symmetric disorder does not affect the charge and spin conductance values of our four-terminal system. We study the effects of both on-site scalar disorder as well as disorder in the spin-orbit coupling (SOC) strength.

In Fig. 4a we add a spatially-dependent on-site potential $u(x)$ drawn from a Gaussian of mean 0 and standard deviation $\sigma$; we then plot the dependence of the conductances defined in Table I on $w$. For small enough values of $w$ ($< 200$ meV), we find that the charge and spin conductances remain quantized at their expected values. This is due to the fact that scalar on-site disorder does not break the TR and spin-rotational symmetries of the TI, nor does it couple the two edges; the transmission amplitudes thus remain unaffected when the disorder is weak. At larger $w$, however, we see a decrease in the charge conductances and an increase in the charge conductance. The increasing charge conductance is attributable to the onset of bulk conduction within the disordered sample, whose size is smaller than the Anderson localization length. For weak disorder, the Fermi level of the sample remains within the bulk gap, ensuring that only the spin-momentum locked edge states effect the low-temperature conductances. Stronger disorder, meanwhile, can shift the bands sufficiently so that they cross the Fermi level, leading to bulk conduction.

The effect of disorder in the SOC strength is similar to spin-symmetric on-site disorder. In Fig. 4b we multiply the SOC strength by a spatially dependent factor $\lambda(x)$ drawn from a Gaussian of mean 1 and standard deviation $\delta\lambda$; we then plot the conductances versus $w = \lambda_{\text{SOC}} \delta\lambda$, where $\lambda_{\text{SOC}} = 472$ meV is the sum of the magnitudes of SOC terms in the WTe$_2$ tight-binding model [48]. Importantly, this “isotropic” modification of the SOC.

---

**Figure 4.** Conductances versus potential disorder strength $w$. The system dimensions are $L = 20$ nm, $W = 30$ nm, $L_{\text{trans}} = 0$, and $W_{\text{lead}} = 12$ nm (see Fig. 2). Each data point represents the average of 100 samples, with the standard error bars attached. Charge conductances are measured in units of $e^2/h$ and spin conductances in units of $e/(4\pi)$. **a)** On-site scalar disorder. **b)** Spin-conserving SOC disorder.
strength does not change the spin quantization axis; for anisotropic SOC disorder, see Sec. III B below. Just as with spin-symmetric on-site disorder, the conductances are robust against weak spin-symmetric SOC disorder; however, this regime appears to be smaller for SOC disorder, with the conductances deviating from their quantized values for \( w > 150 \text{ meV} \).

The conductances are remarkably robust against weak spin-symmetric disorder. In Fig. 5 we plot the transmitted spin conductance \( G_s^T \) versus sample length for \( w = 150 \text{ meV} \) and \( w = 300 \text{ meV} \) on-site scalar disorder. In the weak disorder regime, the conductance remains quantized and does not appear to depend on the length up to \( L = 100 \text{ nm} \) (not shown). Weak length-dependence appears in the very strong disorder regime (\( w > 200 \text{ meV} \) for on-site scalar disorder). These findings are to be contrasted with a diffusive conductor where the conductance is inversely proportional to the length.

**B. Time-reversal symmetric, \( S_z \) non-conserving disorder**

In Sec. III A we saw that the charge and spin conductances remained quantized in the presence of weak on-site and SOC perturbations that do not break the spin-rotational symmetry of the TI. Here, we demonstrate that the conductances are **not** protected against SOC perturbations that break the spin-rotational symmetry, even when TR symmetry remains intact. In particular, we implement a TR-symmetric, \( S_z \) non-conserving disorder term by adding a spatially-dependent \( i\lambda_0(x)\sigma_x \) term to the \( \lambda_0 \) hopping amplitude (see Ref. [48] for details on the WTe\(_2\) tight-binding model), where \( \lambda_0(x) \) is drawn from a Gaussian of mean 0 and standard deviation \( w \). We demonstrate the effects of this term on the conductances in Fig. 6.

For disorder terms weaker than \( w < 300 \text{ meV} \), the conductances slowly deviate from their quantized values. This result suggests that TR symmetry alone is not enough to ensure quantization of the conductances when disorder is added to the SOC hopping amplitudes; rather, it is the combination of TR symmetry and spin-rotational symmetry that leads to this quantization. Of course, this distinction is not relevant when one only considers on-site disorder terms, as in that case spin-rotational symmetry is implied by TR symmetry. At larger \( w \) we see a qualitatively different dependence of conductance on disorder strength, corresponding to the onset of bulk conduction in the disordered sample. While the conductances do not remain quantized in the presence of TR-symmetric, spin-non-conserving disorder, their deviations from their quantized values appears to be much weaker than for disorder that breaks TR symmetry, see Fig. 7b in Sec. III C.

**C. Magnetic disorder breaking time-reversal symmetry and \( S_z \) conservation**

Unlike spin-symmetric on-site disorder and SOC disorder, unaligned magnetic disorder breaks both the TR symmetry and the spin-rotational symmetry of the TI, leading to a large deviation of the conductance from the
that the spin Hall conductance $G_H$ of the same side (der localized such that there is no disorder between leads left and right edges. drastically on whether or not there is disorder along the edges connecting leads of the same side ($L_{trans} = 0$ in Fig. 2). We see that the removal of the clean connection results in a different dependence on the disorder strength. The relations given by Eqs. (29) and (30), which only relied on the lack of bulk conduction and edge-to-edge coupling, still hold for $w < 200$ meV. However, the spin Hall conductance $G_H^s$ is apparently no longer quantized, and the deviations of $G_H^s$ and $G_T^s$ no longer agree with what is predicted by Eqs. (10) and (11). As mentioned in Sec. II, this discrepancy is due to the fact that we define the conductances in the leads, not in the sample. We expect the spin Hall conductance corresponding to the current in the sample to remain quantized even when the sample is strongly disordered.

Meanwhile, in Fig. 7b, we demonstrate the case of a fully-disordered sample with magnetic disorder added along the edges connecting leads of the same side ($L_{trans} = 0$ in Fig. 2). We see that the removal of the clean connection results in a different dependence on the disorder strength. The relations given by Eqs. (29) and (30), which only relied on the lack of bulk conduction and edge-to-edge coupling, still hold for $w < 200$ meV. However, the spin Hall conductance $G_H^s$ is apparently no longer quantized, and the deviations of $G_H^s$ and $G_T^s$ no longer agree with what is predicted by Eqs. (10) and (11). As mentioned in Sec. II, this discrepancy is due to the fact that we define the conductances in the leads, not in the sample. We expect the spin Hall conductance corresponding to the current in the sample to remain quantized even when the sample is strongly disordered.

In addition to studying how the disorder strength affects the conductances, we also study how the transmitted conductance $G_T^s$ varies with the sample length $L$. We plot the dependence of $G_T^s$ on the disorder strength and sample length, as well as a constant $w = 150$ meV slice, in Fig. 8. We find that, for constant $w$, the transmitted spin conductance decays exponentially with the sample length, i.e., $G_T^s \propto e^{-L/\ell_0}$ where $\ell_0$ is a characteristic spin decay length. For $w = 150$ meV, our fit gives $\ell_0 \approx 10$ nm, see inset of Fig. 8. This roughly agrees with an estimate of $\ell_0 = \hbar^2 v^2/(w^2 r_0) \approx 3$ nm if we use the average distance between neighboring lattice sites $r_0 \approx .2$ nm as a disorder correlation radius and $\hbar v \approx 120$ meV · nm estimated from Fig. 3.
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Figure 9. Conductance deviations $\delta G = G_0 - G$ of a four-
terminal QPC system made of a $L = 30$ nm by $W = 30$ nm
rectangular sample cut such that the width smoothly transitions to a narrowed region of length $L_{QPC} = 200$ nm and
varying width $W_{QPC}$. A scalar disorder term with standard deviation $w = 150$ meV is then added to extend the effective
decay length and increase edge-to-edge coupling. Each data point represents the average of 200 samples, with the standard
error bars attached. Charge conductances are measured in units of $e^2/h$ and spin conductances in units of $e/(4\pi)$. The
slopes of the corresponding best fit lines are $-1/(2.1 \text{ nm})$ for $G_{xx}^T$, $-1/(5.8 \text{ nm})$ for $G_{xy}^T$, and $-1/(5.9 \text{ nm})$ for $G_{H}^T$. Inset:
Diagram of the QPC device demonstrating the definitions of
the various dimensions.

**D. Quantum point contact system**

As mentioned in Sec. I, inter-edge tunneling through the bulk of the TI is another mechanism by which the conductances can deviate from their quantized values. For each conductance $G$ we define the deviation $\delta G$ from the quantized value $G_0$ by $\delta G = G_0 - G$. In a QPC system of minimum width $W_{QPC}$, we expect $\delta G \propto e^{-W_{QPC}/W_0}$ for small deviations, where $W_0$ is the effective decay length of the edge modes (not to be confused with the characteristic spin decay length $l_0$ studied in Sec. III C).

To test this relation, we create a four-terminal QPC system where a rectangular sample is smoothly transitioned into a narrowed region of width $W_{QPC}$ and length $L_{QPC}$ (see inset of Fig. 9). We then add a scalar disorder term to extend the effective decay length $W_0$.

In Fig. 9 we plot the resulting conductance deviations against $W_{QPC}$ on a logarithmic scale, along with their linear fits. Using the inverse slopes of the best fit lines, we find that the decay length of the charge conductance is roughly 2 nm. The various spin conductances, including the incident and diagonal conductances which we hide for clarity, have decay lengths of about 6 nm. It is interesting that the effective decay lengths of the spin conductances are larger than that of the charge conductance, suggesting the spin conductance is more robust against

**IV. CONCLUSIONS**

We studied the effects of disorder on spin transport in 2D TIs and established important estimates for the level of disorder strength that starts to hinder spin transport. One of our main findings is that the spin current operator on the 2D TI edge is given by the local density, Eq. (14). For this reason, the spin Hall current generated by a transverse voltage is remarkably robust to even spin-non-conserving perturbations, see Eq. (15), as long as the two edges of the 2D TI are not coupled. However, measuring the spin Hall current in a 4-terminal geometry is difficult due to additional spin currents that flow between the terminals at different potentials, see Fig. 2c. These spin currents are not in general conserved and hinder the measurement of a quantized spin Hall conductance. These findings are confirmed by our numerical simulations, e.g. Fig. 7. Overall, we find that spin conductance is most sensitive to spin-non-conserving disorder such as random spin-orbit coupling (Fig. 6) or magnetic impurities (Figs. 7–8). In the former time-reversal symmetric case, the spin Hall conductance is nevertheless nearly
quantized even with relatively large disorder strength of the order of the bulk band gap.

In WTe₂, recent measurements of the spin quantization axis indicate that spin-orbit disorder is relatively weak. The canting of the edge state spin has been measured in experiments [61, 62] in agreement with theoretical models [36, 43, 48, 63, 64]. These findings indicate that the spin quantization axis, although canted, does not vary strongly in position or momentum space. This gives hope that the spin of the edge carriers can be conserved over long distances.

We focused on low-temperatures at which scattering is dominated by elastic processes. At the same time, we found that time-reversal symmetric disorder has a weak effect on spin transport, see Secs. III A–III B. Therefore, at higher temperatures, inelastic scattering is expected to become the dominant scattering mechanism, leading to temperature-dependent corrections to the spin conductances. Finite-temperature and interaction effects on spin transport constitute an interesting future direction (see also Refs. [65–67] for quantum point contacts).

Finite-temperature and interaction effects on spin transport constitute an interesting future direction. The potential to control spin polarization electrically [72].
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Appendix A: Derivation of transmission and reflection coefficients

Here we derive the transmission \( t \) and reflection \( r \) coefficients given by Eqs. (7) and (8). We first find the eigenstates of Eq. (5) by rearranging the Schrödinger equation \( H(x)\psi = E\psi \) into a more convenient form,

\[
\partial_x \psi = \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ m(x) \sigma_y + i(E + \mu) \sigma_z \right] \psi , \tag{A1}
\]

which can then be solved through the use of a matrix exponential:

\[
\psi(x_0) = \exp \left\{ \eta m \sigma_y + i \frac{\xi}{\chi} \sigma_z \right\} \psi(0) , \tag{A2}
\]

where \( \eta m = \int_0^{x_0} m(x) dx/(\hbar v) \) and \( \xi = (E + \mu) x_0/(\hbar v) \). Thus, by taking \( 0/x_0 \) to be at the left/right edges of the disordered region and expanding the matrix exponential in Eq. (A2), we can calculate how the disorder scatters an incoming mode. Defining \( \chi = \sqrt{\xi^2 - \eta m^2} \), the matrix exponential in Eq. (A2) is equal to the scattering operator

\[
\tilde{S} = \cos \chi + \frac{\eta m \sigma_y + i \frac{\xi}{\chi} \sigma_z}{\chi} \sin \chi . \tag{A3}
\]

To calculate the transmission/reflection coefficient of an incoming right-mover, we apply \( \tilde{S} \) to the state \( \psi(0) = |\uparrow\rangle + r |\downarrow\rangle \), where \( r \) is the reflection amplitude yet to be determined:

\[
\psi(x_0) = \tilde{S} \psi(0) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \chi + i \frac{\xi}{\chi} \sin \chi - i r \frac{\eta m}{\chi} \sin \chi \end{bmatrix} |\uparrow\rangle + \begin{bmatrix} r \cos \chi - i \frac{\xi}{\chi} \sin \chi + i \frac{\eta m}{\chi} \sin \chi \end{bmatrix} |\downarrow\rangle . \tag{A4}
\]

Since the spin-down state on the right side of the barrier is an incoming left-mover, we know its coefficient must
be zero. Hence, solving for $r$ and plugging the result into the spin-up coefficient for $t$ gives

$$t = \frac{\chi^2 \cos \chi + i \xi \chi \sin \chi}{\xi^2 - \eta_m^2 \cos^2 \chi}, \quad \text{(A5)}$$

$$r = \frac{\eta_m \xi \sin^2 \chi - i \eta_m \chi \sin \chi \cos \chi}{\xi^2 - \eta_m^2 \cos^2 \chi}. \quad \text{(A6)}$$

Finally, we note that a similar analysis using an incoming left-mover gives the same coefficients, resulting in a unitary scattering matrix as given by Eq. (9) in the low-energy limit. Furthermore, the square magnitudes $|t|^2$ and $|r|^2$ are (restoring $\chi = \sqrt{\xi^2 - \eta_m^2}$)

$$|t|^2 = \frac{\xi^2 - \eta_m^2}{\xi^2 - \eta_m^2 \cos^2 \sqrt{\xi^2 - \eta_m^2}}, \quad \text{(A7)}$$

$$|r|^2 = \frac{\eta_m^2 \sin^2 \sqrt{\xi^2 - \eta_m^2}}{\xi^2 - \eta_m^2 \cos^2 \sqrt{\xi^2 - \eta_m^2}}. \quad \text{(A8)}$$

Taking the scattering state near the Dirac point, $\xi \ll \eta_m$, these expressions are used in Eqs. (10) and (11) to calculate the spin current on the left and right of the disordered edge segment.