

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

A phenomenological model for the spontaneous exchange bias effect

L. Bufaical^{a,*}, L. T. Coutrim^b, E. M. Bittar^c, F. Garcia^c

^a*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal de Goiás, 74001-970, Goiânia, GO, Brazil*

^b*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, 59078-900, Natal, RN, Brazil*

^c*Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rua Dr. Xavier Sigaud 150, 22290-180, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil*

Abstract

In this work we propose an alternative model to explain the spontaneous exchange bias (SEB) effect observed in spin glass (SG)-like systems. As in a previously proposed model [1], it is based on the unconventional dynamics of the SG-like moments at the magnetic hysteresis cycle. However, using a reliable estimate of the amount of SG-spins that are relaxing during the cycle, the new model can correctly describe the changes in the SEB observed for measurements performed at different temperatures and different maximum applied fields.

Keywords: Exchange Bias; Spin-glass; Double-perovskite

1. INTRODUCTION

The exchange bias (EB) effect finds its applicability in magnetic recording read heads and spintronic devices. The phenomena is known since the 1950's, being characterized by a horizontal shift of the magnetic hysteresis loop of heterostructured materials [2]. In general, the exchange unidirectional anisotropy is set at the interface of different magnetic phases after the system is cooled in the presence of an external magnetic field (H) from above its magnetic transition temperature (T). Nonetheless, recently there were discovered some materials manifesting the EB spontaneously, *i.e.* even after being cooled from an unmagnetized state down to low T in zero H [3, 4, 5].

Recently we have shown that the presence of a re-entrant spin glass (RSG) state is necessary for the manifestation of the spontaneous EB (SEB) effect, and proposed a model to explain the phenomenon [1]. The model is based on the pinning of the spin glass (SG)-like moments and on their unusual temporal evolution in magnetization as a function of H [$M(H)$] curves, from which it is obtained accurate predictions of the SEB effect observed in two representative

*Corresponding author

Email address: lbufaical@ufg.br (F. Garcia)

SEB materials, $\text{La}_{1.5}\text{Sr}_{0.5}\text{CoMnO}_6$ [6] (LSCMO) and $\text{La}_{1.5}\text{Ca}_{0.5}\text{CoMnO}_6$ [8, 7] (LCCMO). More specifically, our model considers an asymmetric magnetic relaxation of the SG-like moments at the regions encompassing the positive and negative coercive fields (H_C) in the $M(H)$ cycle of these materials. It is assumed, as an approximation, that for the region close to the positive H_C , half of SG-like spins are relaxing due to the negative H previously applied in the third quadrant of the $M(H)$ cycle, while the other half is pinned toward the positive H direction. However, in spite of the very good agreement between the theoretical and experimental results observed for LSCMO and LCCMO in $M(H)$ loops carried at $T = 5$ K with a maximum applied field (H_m) of 90 kOe, one cannot rely that this assumption is always correct. By measuring at different T and different H_m , the correlation lengths for the SG-like phase can change, resulting in unique magnetic relaxations and consequently in distinctive EB fields (H_{EB}).

Due to its robust SEB effect [1, 6], in this work we chose the LSCMO compound as a representative example of a SEB material to confirm that T and H_m remarkably affect the H_{EB} observed in $M(H)$ loops, complementing the model proposed in Ref. [1]. Here we offer a complementary model, adapted from the previous one, but that is based on a plausible estimate of the SG-like moments pinned toward the positive and negative H directions. This model can capture the evolution of H_{EB} as a function of T and H_m , resulting in theoretical values that are very close to those experimentally observed for LSCMO.

2. EXPERIMENT DETAILS

The polycrystalline LSCMO sample here investigated was prepared as described elsewhere [1]. The $M(H)$ loops were carried out at several T and H_m using a Quantum Design PPMS-VSM magnetometer. The curves were measured at a H sweep rate of 210 Oe/s, after zero field cooling (ZFC) the system. In order to prevent the presence of trapped current on the magnet and ensure a reliable ZFC process, from one measurement to another the sample was warmed up to the paramagnetic state and the coil was demagnetized in the oscillating mode.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Fig. 1(a) shows the $M(H)$ loop at $T = 2$ K and $H_m = 90$ kOe. The shape of the curve is a result of the contribution of three distinct magnetic phases, a ferromagnetic (FM), an antiferromagnetic (AFM) and a SG-like phase [1], producing a closed loop that is asymmetric in respect to the H axis, as evidenced in the inset. In the $M(H)$ cycle the magnetization (M) depends on H , which in turn varies linearly with time (t). Thus, the hysteresis curves can be displayed in the form of M as a function of t [$M(t)$], Fig. 1(b). Since our model is based on the time-evolution of the magnetization of the SG-like phase, this form is suitable for its understanding.




Figure 1: (a) $M(H)$ loop of LSCMO at $T = 2$ K and $H_m = 90$ kOe. Red and green solid lines are the calculated M_1 (Eq. 1) and M_2 (Eq. 2) stretches, respectively. Inset shows zoom in around $M = 0$, evidencing the shift along H -axis. (b) The same hysteresis loop for LSCMO, now displayed in $M(t)$ mode. The blue solid line is the magnetic field as function of time.

The phenomenological model intends to describe the H_{EB} obtained from $M(H)$ curves, herein defined as $H_{EB} = |H^+ + H^-|/2$, where H^+ and H^- are the positive and negative coercive fields, respectively. For that, the M_1 and M_2 stretches of the curve, encompassing respectively the H^- and H^+ [see Figs. 1(a) and (b)], must be calculated. The material's net magnetization results from the contributions of FM, AFM and SG-like phases, leading to the following equation for M_1

$$M_1(t) = \{M_{sp} + M_0 e^{-(t-t_1)/t_p^n}\} - \{A(t-t_1) + B(t-t_1)^r\}, \quad (1)$$

which corresponds precisely to the equation proposed in Ref. [1]. The first pair of braces represents the SG-like phase's relaxation from the previously applied positive H_m . In fact, this corresponds to the stretched exponential equation commonly used to verify the isothermal remnant magnetization (*IRM*) of glassy magnetic systems [9], where M_{sp} represents the spontaneous magnetization of the FM phase, M_0 is the initial magnetization of the SG-like phase at the instant t_1 when $H = 0$ (see Fig. 1), and t_p and n are the time and the time-stretch exponential constants, respectively. The second pair of braces account for the contributions of the AFM and FM phases to M_1 , when under the effect of the immediately applied negative H . The A parameter is related to the linear dependence of the AFM phase with H (and consequently with t), while the B and r parameters account for the non-linear contribution of the FM phase to the magnetization.

To get the parameters of the first pair of braces of Eq. 1, the *IRM*(t) curve must be fitted immediately after H_m is turned on and subsequently turned off in the ZFC sample. Subsequently, by fixing the parameters of the SG-like phase, the M_1 stretch can be fitted with Eq. 1, yielding a very good match, as expected [1]. The main results obtained from the fittings are displayed in Table 1.

For the M_2 stretch, we take into account the unusually slow relaxation of glassy magnetic systems. It is assumed that at M_2 not all spins of the SG-like phase are relaxing due to the negative field previously applied during the $M(H)$ cycle, but it considers that some amount of them are still pinned toward positive direction due to the firstly applied positive H_m . The resulting equation for M_2 becomes

$$M_2(t) = -\{M_{sp} + xM_0 e^{-(t-t_2)/t_p^n}\} + \{(1-x)M_0 e^{-(t-t_1)/t_p^n}\} + \{A(t-t_2) + B(t-t_2)^r\}, \quad (2)$$

where the first pair of braces represents the decay of the SG-like spins that are relaxing from the negative H previously applied, the second pair corresponds to the relaxation from the positive H applied before, and the third pair represents the contributions of the AFM and FM phases that are under the effect of the just applied positive H . This is similar to the equation proposed in Ref. [1], where the decay of the SG moments pointing toward the positive direction starts at t_1 while the decay of those pointing toward the negative direction starts at t_2 . However, there is a remarkable difference here. While for the previous model it was considered that an equal amount of the moments were relaxing in opposite directions, here the amount of SG-spins pointing toward negative (x)




Figure 2: (a) Magnified view of the $M(H)$ loops of LSCMO carried at $H_m = 90$ kOe at different temperatures. (b) H_{EB} as a function of T . (c) and (d) show magnified views of the experimental and calculated M_1 and M_2 stretches of the loop carried at $T = 2$ K. The blue solid line represents the H time dependence.

and positive $(1-x)$ directions can be estimated directly from the experimental curve. To fit M_2 with Eq. 2, all parameters, with the exception of x , are kept fixed at the values obtained from the fit of M_1 .

Although the previous model succeed in predicting the H_{EB} values of $M(H)$ loops carried at $T = 5$ K and $H_m = 90$ kOe, changes in the T and/or the H_m at which the experiments are carried can lead to deviations from the calculated results in relation to the experimentally observed values. Fig. 2(a) shows a magnified view of loops carried with $H_m = 90$ kOe at different temperatures. It is evident that changing T has a greater impact on H^+ , while H^- keeps nearly unchanged. This can be understood in terms of the gain of thermal energy with increasing T , which favors the flipping of spins toward the negative field direction at the third quadrant of the cycle. As T increases the amount x of SG-spins flipped enhances, leading to the increase of H^+ and consequently to the decrease of H_{EB} , as can be seen in Fig. 2(b). Since the previous model assumes a fixed number of SG-spins in each direction, it cannot capture such changes. Fig. 2(d) shows the fittings of the M_2 stretch of the 2 K $M(H)$ curve for both the previous and the alternative model here proposed, and Table 1 displays the H_{EB} obtained from each model. The difference is remarkable.

The alternative model can also capture changes in $M(H)$ curves measured at different H_m . Fig. 3(a) shows that H^- is significantly influenced by changes

Table 1: Main results obtained from the fits of M_1 and M_2 stretches with Eqs. 1 and 2. The H_{EB} results obtained experimentally, the values calculated with Eqs. 1 and 2 and those obtained from the previous model of Ref. [1] are referred respectively as H_{EB}^{exp} , H_{EB}^{new} and H_{EB}^{old} .

H_m (kOe)	70	90	90
T (K)	2	2	5
M_{sp} (μ_B /f.u.)	0.220	0.226	0.231
M_0 (μ_B /f.u.)	0.348	0.363	0.370
t_p (s)	4.882×10^{10}	1.983×10^9	1.961×10^{10}
n	0.130	0.122	0.143
A (μ_B /f.u.)	5.2×10^{-4}	6.1×10^{-4}	9.8×10^{-4}
B (μ_B /f.u.)	0.028	0.026	0.023
r	0.78	0.79	0.74
x	0.47	0.43	0.54
H_{EB}^{exp} (Oe)	3517	3716	3114
H_{EB}^{new} (Oe)	3539	3719	3084
H_{EB}^{old} (Oe)	3049	3085	3172




Figure 3: (a) Magnified view of the $M(H)$ loops of LSCMO carried at $T = 2$ K with different H_m . (b) H_{EB} as a function of H_m . (c) and (d) show magnified views of the experimental and calculated M_1 and M_2 stretches of the loop carried at $H_m = 70$ kOe. The blue solid line represents the H time dependence.

in H_m , while H^+ keeps nearly unchanged. In this case, as larger is H_m greater will be the amount of spins pinned toward positive direction. This is translated in the equations by the decrease of x and by the increase of both M_{sp} and M_0 , as can be seen in Table 1. This leads to the increase of H^- , resulting in the enhancement of H_{EB} . Again, the previous model cannot account for such changes because it considers a fixed number of spins pointed toward opposite directions.

Despite the very good adequacy of the alternative model proposed here, one must stress that it results from approximations and simplifications, most of them concerning the dynamics of the SG-like phase. For instance, the varying H may alter the balance between the distinct magnetic phases present in the system, in a way that in principle several parameters of the equations should be functions of t . To minimize this effect, we fitted M_1 and M_2 for short time-intervals. Another clear approximation comes from the fact that the second brace of Eq. 1 and the third brace of Eq. 2 take into account the influence of the immediately applied H only on the FM and AFM phases, but not on the SG-like one. In principle, a term should be added in the equations to regard it. However, since the two terms in these braces were enough to yield precise fits of M_1 and M_2 , we have disregarded a third term in order to make the model as simple as possible. Despite these simplifications, Eqs. 1 and 2 can successfully reproduce the H_{EB} observed in LSCMO. Since the RSG state is a common feature of all known SEB materials, in principle the model could be applied to any similar compound. Having established that the glassy magnetism is imperative for the manifestation of SEB, the model here proposed can guide the search for new materials presenting robust SEB effect at higher T .

4. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we proposed an alternative phenomenological model to explain the SEB effect observed in RSG systems. It is based on the pinning and on the dynamics of the SG-like moments relaxing during a magnetic hysteresis measurement. Differently of the model previously proposed [1], here we considered a reliable estimate of the amount of SG-like moments pinned toward the positive and negative H directions during the $M(H)$ cycle. We used LSCMO as a representative example of SEB to check the model and show that it allows an accurate calculation of the H_{EB} and a correct description of the changes observed in the SEB effect for $M(H)$ curves measured at different T and H_m .

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) [No. 400134/2016-0], Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (FAPERJ), Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Goiás (FAPEG) and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES).

References

- [1] L. T. Coutrim, E. M. Bittar, F. Garcia, and L. Bufaiçal, Phys. Rev. B **98**, 064426 (2018).
- [2] J. Nogués, J. Sort, V. Langlais, V. Skumryev, S. Suriñach, J. S. Muñoz, and M. D. Baró, Phys. Rep. 422 (2005) 65.
- [3] B. M. Wang, Y. Liu, P. Ren, B. Xia, K. B. Ruan, J. B. Yi, J. Ding, X. G. Li, and L. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106 (2011) 0077203.
- [4] T. Maity, S. Goswami, D. Bhattacharya, and S. Roy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110 (2013) 107201.
- [5] L. T. Coutrim, E. M. Bittar, F. Stavale, F. Garcia, E. Baggio-Saitovitch, M. Abbate, R. J. O. Mossaneck, H. P. Martins, D. Tobia, P. G. Pagliuso, and L. Bufaiçal, Phys. Rev. B 93 (2016) 174406.
- [6] J. Krishna Murthy and A. Venimadhav, Appl. Phys. Lett. 103 (2013) 25410.
- [7] L. T. Coutrim, D. Rigitano, C. Macchiutti, T. J. A. Mori, R. Lora-Serrano, E. Granado, E. Sadrollahi, F. J. Litterst, M. B. Fontes, E. Baggio-Saitovitch, E. M. Bittar, and Bufaiçal, Phys. Rev. B 100 (2019) 054428.
- [8] L. Bufaiçal, R. Finkler, L. T. Coutrim, P. G. Pagliuso, C. Grossi, F. Stavale, E. Baggio-Saitovitch, and E. M. Bittar, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 433 (2017) 271.
- [9] R. V. Chamberlin, G. Mozurkewich, and R. Orbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52 (1984) 10.