# N eutron spectroscopy and m agnetic relaxation of the M $n_6$ nanom agnets.

S. Carretta<sup>1</sup>, T. Guid<sup>2</sup>, P. Santin<sup>1</sup>, G. Am oretti<sup>1</sup>, O. Pieper<sup>3;4</sup>, B. Lake<sup>3;4</sup>, J. van Slageren<sup>5;6</sup>,

F.ElHallak<sup>5</sup>, W.Wernsdorfer<sup>7</sup>, H.Mutka<sup>8</sup>, M.Russina<sup>3</sup>, C.J.Milios<sup>9</sup> and E.K.Brechin<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>D ipartim ento di Fisica, Universita di Parma, I-43100 Parma, Italy

 $^2$  ISIS Pulsed Neutron Facility, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup> Hahn-Meitner Institut, Glienicker Strasse 100, 14109 Berlin, Germany

<sup>4</sup> Institut fur Festkorperphysik, Technische Universitat Berlin, 10623 Berlin, Germany

<sup>5</sup> 1. Physikalisches Institut, Universitat Stuttgart, D-70550 Stuttgart, Germany

<sup>6</sup> School of Chem istry, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom

<sup>7</sup> Laboratoire Louis Neel-CNRS, F-38042 Grenoble Cedex, France

 $^{8}$  Institute Laue-Langevin, B.P. 156, F-38042 G renoble Cedex, France and

<sup>9</sup> University of Edinburgh, W est M ains Road, Edinburgh, EH 9 3JJ, U.K.

(D ated: February 20, 2024)

Inelastic neutron scattering has been used to determ ine the m icroscopic H am iltonian describing two high-spin variants of the high-anisotropy M  $n_6$  nanom agnet. The energy spectrum of both system s is characterized by the presence of several excited total-spin multiplets partially overlapping the S=12 ground multiplet. This im plies that the relaxation processes of these molecules are di erent from those occurring in prototype giant-spin nanom agnets. In particular, we show that both the height of the energy barrier and resonant tunnelling processes are greatly in uenced by low-lying excited total-spin multiplets.

PACS num bers: 75.50 X x, 75.40 G b, 75.60 Jk, 78.70 N x

Keywords: Molecular magnets, Neutron inelastic scattering, Dynamic properties, Magnetization reversal mechanisms

#### I. IN TRODUCTION

Molecular nanom agnets (MNMs) have recently attracted considerable interest because at low tem perature T they display slow relaxation of the magnetization M of purely molecular origin [1]. The main relaxation mechanism is provided by the interactions of the spin degrees of freedom with phonons, either through modulation of the local crystal elds on individual magnetic ions, or through modulation of two-ion interactions. Typically, the relaxation dynam ics are modelled by restricting the spin Hilbert space to the ground total-spin multiplet only, as resulting from the usually dom inating isotropic exchange interactions. In this fram ework, each N -spins molecule is described as a single giant spin S in an e ective crystal-eld potential. At tem peratures of few K, the reversal of M occurs through a multi-step O rbach process yielding a therm ally activated behavior of the relaxation time,  $= _0 \exp(U = k_B T)$ , where the energy barrier U is set by the e ective axial anisotropy experienced by the giant spin [2].

We show that excited S-multiplets strongly in uence the energy barrier for the relaxation of M in two high-spin (S = 12) variants of the high-anisotropy M n<sub>6</sub> nanom agnet (a record barrier U = 86:4 K, and U = 53:1 K [3, 4]). In fact, inelastic neutron scattering (INS) and Frequency D om ain M agnetic Resonance Spectroscopy (FDMRS) show that the two variants are characterized by a similar anisotropy but have signi cantly di erent exchange interactions. The large di erence in U is mainly due to the presence of relaxation paths passing through excited S multiplets partially nested within the ground one. In addition, because of S-mixing in the wavefunctions, these excited manifolds may lead to resonant inter-multiplet tunnelling processes for elds of a few thousands of G auss. These are associated with additional steps in hysteresis cycles which are absent in the giant spin model.

#### II. SPIN HAM ILTONIAN AND MOLECULAR ENERGY LEVELS

The two Mn<sub>6</sub> molecules have chemical formula  $Mn_6O_2$  (Et-sao)<sub>6</sub> ( $O_2$ CPh (Me)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub> (EtOH)<sub>6</sub> (higher barrier) and  $Mn_6O_2$  (Et-sao)<sub>6</sub> ( $O_2$ CPh)<sub>2</sub> (EtOH)<sub>4</sub> (H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>2</sub> (lower barrier) and are nearly isostructural. The magnetic core comprises six Mn<sup>3+</sup> ions arranged on two triangles bridged by oxygen atoms (Fig. 1). Each Mn<sup>3+</sup> ion has a distorted octahedral cage of ligands, with the Jahn Teller axes all approxim ately perpendicular to the planes of the triangles. The six Mn<sup>3+</sup> ions have spin s = 2 and are coupled by dom inant ferrom agnetic interactions, leading to a high S = 12 total-spin ground state, as can be inferred by magnetization measurements, see Fig. 2 [3, 4].

Each M  $n_6$  m olecule can be described by the following spin H am iltonian [5]

$$H = \begin{array}{c} X & X \\ J_{ij}s(i) & s(j) + \\ i < j \end{array} d_i s_z^2(i) +$$



FIG.1: (color online) Structure of the high-barrier M  $n_6$  m olecule (H om itted for clarity).G reen : M n, red : O, blue : N, dark grey : C).



FIG. 2: (color online) M easured (points) and calculated (lines) T-dependence of the susceptibility for the two M  $n_6$  m olecules. Calculations are made by including exchange interactions only, with the parameters determ ined by IN S.g = 2 has been assumed.

Х	c <sub>i</sub> (35s <sup>4</sup> <sub>z</sub> (i)+ (25	30s (s+ 1))s <sub>z</sub> <sup>2</sup> (і́))+ g <sub>в</sub> В	S+H <sup>0</sup> ;	(1)
i				

where s(i) are spin operators of the ith Mn ion and ; s(i) is the molecule's total spin. The rst term is S = the isotropic exchange, while the second and third term s describe axial local crystal-elds (a z axis perpendicular to the triangles plane is assumed), and B is the external eld [1]. H<sup>0</sup> (neglected in the following) represents additional sm all an isotropic term s. The m in in al set of free param eters is given by three di erent exchange constants  $J_{11^0}$   $J_1$ ,  $J_{12} = J_{23} = J_{13} = J_{1^02^0} = J_{2^03^0} = J_{1^03^0}$ J<sub>2</sub>, and  $J_{13^0} = J_{1^03}$  $J_3$  (Fig.1) and two sets of crystaleld (CF) parameters  $d_1 = d_{1^\circ}$ ,  $c_1 = c_{1^\circ}$ , and  $d_2 = d_{2^\circ}$ ,  $c_2 = c_2 \circ$ . The ligand cages of sites 1 and 3 are rather sim ilar and we assumed the corresponding CF parameters to be equal. Since experimental information is insu cient to x independently the two small c parameters, we have chosen to constrain the ratio  $c_1 = c_2$  to the ratio  $d_1 = d_2$ . The anisotropic terms break rotational invariance and

here lead to a large am ount ofm ixing of di erent S multiplets (S m ixing [6]). In the following we label the states by their leading S-component.

To determ ine the parameters appearing in (1), we



FIG. 3: (color online) INS spectra for the higher barrier m olecule collected on IN 5 with incident wavelength of 3.4 A for T = 2 K (black) and T = 16 K (red). Lines are theoretical calculations with m odel (1).



FIG. 4: (color online) INS spectra for the higher barrier molecule collected on IN 5 with incident wavelength of 6.7 A for T = 2 K (black) and T = 16 K (red). Lines are theoretical calculations with model (1).

have used the time-of-ight neutron spectrom eters NEAT at the Hahn M eitner Institut (Berlin) and IN5 at the Institute Laue Langevin (G renoble). In addition, we have perform ed FDMRS measurements at the U niversity of Stuttgart. Since FDMRS is sensitive to intramultiplet transitions only, its use in conjunction with INS makes easier to assess the character of the di erent observed excitations. Figs. 3 and 4 show exam ples of INS spectra together with theoretical simulations. The analysis of INS and FDMRS data leads to the following parameters for the higher (lower) barrier com pounds :  $J_1 = 0.84$  ( 0.61) m eV ,  $J_2 =$ 0:59( 0:31) m eV,  $J_3 = 0.01 (0.07) m eV$ ,  $d_1 = 0.20 (0.23) m eV$ ,  $d_2 = 0.76(0.97) \text{ m eV}$  and  $c_1 = 0.001(0.0008) \text{ m eV}$ [5]. These parameters are consistent with susceptibility measurements (see Fig. 2). Hence, anisotropy is sim ilar in the two variants whereas the dom inant ferrom agnetic exchange is substantially larger in the higherbarrier compound. Figures 5 and 6 show the energies of the S-multiplets resulting from the exchange part of (1). It is evident from these gures that the exchange splitting between the ground S = 12 m anifold and m any excited multiplets, including low-S ones, is smaller than the energy scale of an isotropic terms in (1). In particular, Fig. 6 shows that in the lower-barrier compound the energy of the lowest-lying S = 0 multiplet is only about 4 meV larger than that of the ground one. Thus, the



FIG.5: Energy of all S-multiplets for the higher barrier com – pound, resulting from the exchange part of (1) with the param eters given in the text.

giant spin m apping com pletely breaks down in these two m olecules, not only for the large S-m ixing in the wave-functions, but even for failing to account for the num ber of states located below the barrier. The presence of a center of inversion (characterizing the structure determined at 150 K) in plies that exchange multiplets can be classi ed according to their parity with respect to the associated spin-permutation operation. For instance, the ground S = 12 states are even, whereas the low est-lying S = 11 states are odd.

## III. RELAXATION OF THE MAGNETIZATION

The main di erence between the two  $Mn_6$  variants is the position of the excited S manifolds, therefore the comparison between the relaxation behavior of these systems o ers the opportunity to study the role played by low-lying excited multiplets. To address this issue, we



FIG.6: Energy of all S-multiplets for the lower barrier com – pound, resulting from the exchange part of (1) with the parameters given in the text.

adopt the well established fram ework presented in [7,8] for the irreversible evolution of the density matrix (t). By focusing on time scales much longer than the typical periods of free evolution of the system, the so-called secular approximation enables the time evolution of the diagonal matrix elements of the density matrix to be decoupled from that of the o-diagonal ones. In particular, the populations of the molecular eigenstates,  $p_1(t)$ , evolve through master equations:

$$\underline{p}_{1}(t) = \bigvee_{m}^{X} W_{lm} p_{m}(t); \qquad (2)$$

where W  $_{\rm im}$  is the lm element of the rate matrix, i.e., the probability per unit time that a transition between levels jn i and jli is induced by the interaction with the phonon heat bath. The latter can be calculated by perturbation theory once magnetolelastic (ME) interactions have been modelled. Experimental information is totally insu - cient to x all the many possible parameters appearing in the ME coupling potential. By assuming that the main contribution to this coupling arises from the modulation of the local rank-2 crystal elds and that quadrupolem o-ments of each individual Mn ion are isotropically coupled to D ebye acoustic phonons, we obtain [9]

$$W_{lm} = {}^{2} {}^{3}_{lm} n ( {}_{lm} ) {}^{k}_{ij;q_1;q_2} hlj {}^{0}_{q_1;q_2} (s_i) j_n i$$

$$\lim_{j} j_{q_1;q_2}(s_j) j l;$$
 (3)

where i and j run over M n ions,  $O_{q_1,q_2}(s_i)$  are the components of the cartesian quadrupole tensor operator,  $n(x) = (e^{hx=k_BT} 1)^{-1}$  and  $l_m = (E_1 E_m)=h$ . The single free parameter is proportional to the M E coupling strength. In spite of the complexity of their energy spectrum, for both variants the resulting relaxation spectrum

at low T is dom inated by a single relaxation time displaying a nearly Arrhenius behavior (T) =  $_0 \exp(U=K_BT)$ , in agreement with experiments [5]. In particular, the elective energy barrier for the magnetization reversal is crucially dependent on the position of low -lying excited S multiplets. Indeed, the large di erence between the barriers of the two molecules mainly results from the variation of the ferrom agnetic exchange constants and not from a variation in anisotropy. It is also worth to note that in the present case U is not set by the energy of the low est-lying M  $_{\rm S}$  = 0 state as one could naively expect.

The existence of several total-spin multiplets partially



FIG. 7: Energy levels of the higher-barrier compound as a function of B, applied along the z axis. The color maps for each state the value of  $S_{\rm eff}$ , where  $< S^2 > = S_{\rm eff} (S_{\rm eff} + 1)$ . E llipses and the square indicate representative examples of level crossings.

overlapping with the ground one in plies that a magnetic eld applied along the molecule's easy axis induces crossings involving states which are absent in a giant spin description. These can be turned into anticrossings (ACs) by the small transverse term s contained in H  $^{0}$ . Figure 7 shows that besides the "traditional" intra-S = 12 crossings at about 0, 0.4 (e.g., the square) and 0.8 T, m any m ore occur for interm ediate values of B. In particular, there are three di erent kinds of "non-traditional" eldinduced crossings, i.e., which are absent in the giant spin description of the molecule. First of all there are crossings involving a pair of states belonging to a single low energy S multiplet di erent from the ground one (for instance the higher-lying ellipsis at 0.3 T in Fig. 7). These crossing may lead to relaxation shortcuts if the dom inant relaxation path passes through them . The other two kinds of crossings (e.g. the other ellipses in Fig. 7) involve pairs of states belonging to di erent S-m anifolds. The distinction arises from the symmetry properties of the two crossing states, i.e., they may have the same par-

ity or not. In the rst case (e.g., the crossings between red and green curves in the two ellipses at about 0.6 and 1 T) H $^{0}$  usually leads to an AC, whereas in the second case (e.g., the ellipse at about 0.3 T) an AC m ay occur to the extent that at low T the inversion center is rem oved by a distortion, leading to term s with low-enough symmetry in H<sup>0</sup>. Even if there are no structural data below 150 K, it is not unlikely for magnetic molecules to undergo a symmetry lowering at low T (see, e.g., [10, 11]). "Nontraditional" ACswith the associated resonant incoherent tunneling, may result in relaxation shortcuts leading to additional steps in hysteresis cycles, absent in a giantspin picture. For instance, Fig. 8 shows an example of derivative of the hysteresis curves m easured at T = 3 Kfor the higher-barrierm olecule [3]. The "traditional" ACS produce m inor features in these curves, and the two m ain peaks are associated with "non-traditional" ACs. The effect of low - eld ACs is more evident at higher T [5]. For instance, there are features at 0.3 T which may a priori originate from both crossings marked on Fig. 7.



FIG. 8: Example of derivative of the hysteresis curves measured for the higher-barrier molecule in  $\beta$ ]. For each value of B, there are two points corresponding to increasing or decreasing B in the hysteresis cycle.

### IV. CONCLUSIONS

By exploiting INS and FDMRS we have determ ined the microscopic H am iltonian of two di erent high-spin variants of the M  $n_6$  nanom agnet. We have found that excited S multiplets overlapping with the ground one strongly a ect the magnetic relaxation process. Moreover, we have demonstrated the existence of tunnelling pathways involving pairs of states belonging to di erent total spin manifolds. Hence, the energy separation between the ground and excited multiplets may be a key ingredient in determ ining the relaxation and tunnelling dynamics of molecular nanom agnets.

- D.G atteschi, R. Sessoli and J.V illain, M olecular N anom agnets, O x ford U niversity P ress (2006).
- J.V illain, F.H artm ann-B outron, R.Sessoli, and A.Rettori, Europhys.Lett.27,159 (1994); A.W urger, J.Phys.: Condens. M atter 10, 10075 (1998); M.N.Leuenberger and D.Loss, Phys.Rev.B 61,1286 (2000); D.Zueco and J.L.G arcia-Palacios, Phys.Rev.B 73,104448 (2006).
- [3] C.J.M ilios, A.V inslava, W.W emsdorfer, S.M oggach, S.Parsons, S.P.Perlepes, G.Christou and E.K.Brechin, J.Am.Chem.Soc.129, 2754 (2007).
- [4] C. J. Milios, A. Vinslava, P. A. Wood, S. Parsons,
  W. Wemsdorfer, G. Christou, S.P. Perlepes and E.K. Brechin, J.Am. Chem. Soc. 129, 8 (2007).
- [5] S.Carretta, T.Guidi, P.Santini, G.Amoretti, O.Pieper, B.Lake, J.van Slageren, F.ElHallak, W. Wernsdorfer, H.Mutka, M.Russina, C.J.Milios and E.K.Brechin, Phys. Rev. Letters 100, 157203 (2008).
- [6] S.Carretta, E.Liviotti, N.Magnani, P.Santini, and G.

Am oretti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 207205 (2004).

- [7] K. Blum, Density Matrix Theory and Applications, Plenum Press, NY (1996).
- [8] P.Santini, S.Carretta, E.Liviotti, G.Amoretti, P.Carretta, M.Filibian, A.Lascialfari and E.Micotti, Phys. Rev.Lett. 94, 077203 (2005).
- [9] S. Carretta, P. Santini, G. Amoretti, M. A ronte, A. Candini, A. Ghirri, I.S. Tidmarsh, R. H. Laye, R. Shaw, and E. J. M cInnes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 207201 (2006).
- [10] S. Carretta, J. van Slageren, T. Guidi, E. Liviotti, C. Mondelli, D. Rovai, A. Comia, A. L. Dearden, F. Carsughi, M. A ronte, C. D. Frost, R. E. W inpenny, D. Gatteschi, G. Amoretti and R. Caciu o, Phys. Rev. B 67, 094405 (2003).
- [11] S.Carretta, P.Santini, G.Amoretti, T.Guidi, R.Caciu o, A.Candini, A.Comia, D.Gatteschi, M.Plazanet, and J.A.Stride, Phys.Rev.B 70, 214403 (2004).