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Abstract

MAELAS is a computer program for the calculation of magnetocrystalline anisotropy energy, anisotropic magnetostrictive coefficients and magnetoelastic constants in an automated way. The method originally implemented in version 1.0 of MAELAS was based on the length optimization of the unit cell, proposed by Wu and Freeman, to calculate the anisotropic magnetostrictive coefficients. We present here a revised and updated version (v2.0) of MAELAS, where we added a new methodology to compute anisotropic magnetoelastic constants from a linear fitting of the energy versus applied strain. We analyze and compare the accuracy of both methods showing that the new approach is more reliable and robust than the one implemented in version 1.0, especially for non-cubic crystal symmetries. In this new version, we also fix some issues related to trigonal crystal symmetry found in version 1.0.
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Does the new version supersede the previous version?: Yes

Reasons for the new version: To implement a more accurate methodology to compute magnetoelastic constants and magnetostrictive coefficients, and fix some issues related to trigonal crystal symmetry.

Summary of revisions:

- New method to calculate magnetoelastic constants and magnetostrictive coefficients derived from the magnetoelastic energy.
- Correction of the trigonal crystal symmetry.

Nature of problem: To calculate anisotropic magnetostrictive coefficients and magnetoelastic constants in an automated way based on Density Functional Theory methods.

Solution method: In the first stage, the unit cell is relaxed through a spin-polarized calculation without spin-orbit coupling (SOC). Next, after a crystal symmetry analysis, a set of deformed lattice and spin configurations are generated using the pymatgen library [1]. The energy of these states is calculated by the Vienna Ab-initio Simulation Package (VASP) [2], including SOC. The anisotropic magnetoelastic constants are derived from the fitting of these energies to a linear polynomial. Finally, if the elastic tensor is provided [3], then the magnetostrictive coefficients are also calculated from the theoretical relations between elastic and magnetoelastic constants.

Additional comments including restrictions and unusual features: This version supports the following crystal systems: Cubic (point groups 432, 43m, m3m), Hexagonal (6mm, 622, 6/mmm), Trigonal (32, 3m, 3m), Tetragonal (4mm, 422, 42m, 4/mmm) and Orthorhombic (222, 2mm, mmm).
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1. Introduction

MAELAS aims to provide an efficient and reliable computational program for the study of magnetostriction by automated first-principles calculations. The version 1.0 of MAELAS was originally published in Ref. [1], where we implemented and generalized the length optimization method proposed by Wu and Freeman to calculate the magnetostrictive coefficients ($\lambda$) [2]. In version 1.0, we also proposed to compute the magnetoelastic constants ($b$) indirectly from the theoretical relations between the elastic constants ($C_{ij}$) and magnetostrictive coefficients using the calculated values of these quantities. The present release of the MAELAS program (version 2.0) aims to add a more robust, rigorous and accurate alternative methodology to calculate the magnetoelastic constants with respect to the previous version. This is accomplished by implementing cell deformations and spin directions theoretically derived from the magnetoelastic energy for each crystal symmetry. In this new approach, the magnetoelastic constants are directly obtained from a linear fitting of the energy versus strain data.

A quantitative analysis of the accuracy of these methods can be very useful to know their reliability and to optimize them. In every calculation with MAELAS we can identify two main sources of errors. The first source of errors comes from the methodology used to compute the magnetostrictive coefficients and magnetoelastic constants, while the second source is the evaluation of the total energies performed with Density Functional Theory (DFT) itself. For instance, in some cases DFT gives energy values that can not fitted well to the polynomial used in these methods, due to numerical or physical reasons. Frequently, the lack of available experimental data makes it difficult to estimate the reliability and precision of these calculations. Aiming to overcome these limitations, we propose here to analyze the systematic error coming from the methodologies implemented in MAELAS by evaluating the exact energy from the theory of magnetostriction. This strategy allows us to compare the accuracy between the length optimization method (originally implemented in version 1.0) and the new approach (added in version 2.0). It also helps us to identify some issues with the trigonal crystal symmetry in the previous version of MAELAS, which is fixed in the present version and discussed here. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the main updates in the new version, while the accuracy of MAELAS is analyzed in Section 3. The new implemented method is benchmarked in Section 4. The paper ends with a summary of the main conclusions and future perspectives (Section 5).
2. Main updates in new version

In this section, we explain in detail two major updates implemented in the new version of MAELAS. An introduction to the theory of magnetostriction and overview of the theoretical background were already provided in the publication of version 1.0 of MAELAS [1]. Here, we use the same notation, definitions and conventions as in Ref. [1].

2.1. New method for direct calculation of anisotropic magnetoelastic constants

We have added an alternative method to compute anisotropic magnetoelastic constants in version 2.0. This approach is derived from the total energy ($E$) including elastic ($E_{el}$), magnetoelastic ($E_{me}$) and unstrained magnetocrystalline anisotropy ($E_{0K}$) terms

\[ E(\varepsilon, \alpha) = E_{el}(\varepsilon) + E_{me}(\varepsilon, \alpha) + E_{0K}(\alpha), \]  

(1)

where $\varepsilon$ is the strain tensor and $\alpha$ is the normalized magnetization ($|\alpha| = 1$). The basic idea of this method is to subtract the total energy of two magnetization directions $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ for a deformed unit cell in such a way that we can get the $i$-th anisotropic magnetoelastic constant $b_i$ from a linear fitting of the energy versus strain data

\[ \frac{1}{V_0} \left[ E(e^i(s), \alpha^i_1) - E(e^i(s), \alpha^i_2) \right] = \Gamma_i b_i s + \Phi_i(K_1, K_2), \]  

(2)

where $V_0$ is the equilibrium volume, $\Gamma_i$ is real numbers, $\Phi_i$ can depend on the magnetocrystalline anisotropy constants $K_1$ and $K_2$, and $s$ is the parameter used to parameterize the strain tensor $e^i(s)$. In practice, Eq. (2) is fitted to a linear polynomial

\[ f(s) = As + B, \]  

(3)

where $A$ and $B$ are fitting parameters, so that the $i$-th anisotropic magnetoelastic constant $b_i$ is given by

\[ b_i = \frac{A}{\Gamma_i}. \]  

(4)

Additionally, we note that in some cases from the fitting parameter $B$ is possible to estimate the magnetocrystalline anisotropy constants since $B = \Phi_i(K_1, K_2)$. In Appendix A we describe the procedure to generate the deformations for each magnetoelastic constant, while in Table 1 we show the selected set of $\alpha^i_1$ and $\alpha^i_2$. 


Table 1: Selected magnetization directions ($\mathbf{a}_1$, $\mathbf{a}_2$) in the new method implemented in MAELAS version 2.0 to calculate the anisotropic magnetoelastic constants. The first column shows the crystal system and the corresponding lattice convention set in MAELAS based on the IEEE format [3]. In the fifth and sixth columns we show the values of the parameters $\Gamma$ and $\Phi$ that are defined in Eq. 2. Last column presents the equation of the deformation gradient $F_{ij}$ that we used in Eq. 2 for the calculation of each magnetoelastic constant. The symbols $a, b, c$ correspond to the lattice parameters of the relaxed (not distorted) unit cell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crystal system</th>
<th>Magnetoelastic constant</th>
<th>$\mathbf{a}_1$</th>
<th>$\mathbf{a}_2$</th>
<th>$\Gamma$</th>
<th>$\Phi$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cubic (I)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>$-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}$</td>
<td>Eq. A.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Eq. A.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexagonal (I)</td>
<td>$b_{21}$</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$-K_1 - K_2$</td>
<td>Eq. A.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a</td>
<td></td>
<td>\hat{x}, b</td>
<td></td>
<td>\hat{y}, c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$ = $\left(-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0\right)$</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a = b \neq c$</td>
<td>$b_4$</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>$\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigonal (I)</td>
<td>$b_{21}$</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$-K_1 - K_2$</td>
<td>Eq. A.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a</td>
<td></td>
<td>\hat{x}, b</td>
<td></td>
<td>\hat{y}, c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$ = $\left(-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0\right)$</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a = b \neq c$</td>
<td>$b_4$</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>$\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$b_{14}$</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>$\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$b_{34}$</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>$\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetragonal (I)</td>
<td>$b_{21}$</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$-K_1 - K_2$</td>
<td>Eq. A.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a</td>
<td></td>
<td>\hat{x}, b</td>
<td></td>
<td>\hat{y}, c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a = b \neq c$</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$b_4$</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>$\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$b_3'$</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>$\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthorhombic</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$K_1$</td>
<td>Eq. A.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c &lt; a &lt; b$</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$K_2$</td>
<td>Eq. A.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$K_1$</td>
<td>Eq. A.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b_4$</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$K_2$</td>
<td>Eq. A.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b_5$</td>
<td>(1, 0, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$K_1$</td>
<td>Eq. A.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b_6$</td>
<td>(0, 1, 0)</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$K_2$</td>
<td>Eq. A.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b_7$</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0\right)$</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\frac{K_1}{2} + \frac{K_2}{2}$</td>
<td>Eq. A.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b_8$</td>
<td>$\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\frac{K_1}{2}$</td>
<td>Eq. A.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b_9$</td>
<td>$\left(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)$</td>
<td>(0, 0, 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\frac{K_2}{2}$</td>
<td>Eq. A.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the corresponding value of $\Gamma_i$ that fulfills Eq. 2. We implemented this method for all supported crystal symmetries in version 1.0 [1].

To illustrate this method, let’s apply it for the calculation of $b_1$ of cubic symmetry since it is easy to handle. For cubic (I) systems (point groups 432, 43m, m3m) the energy terms in Eq. 1 read [1]

\[
\frac{1}{V_0}E_{el}(\mathbf{\varepsilon}) = \frac{C_{11}}{2}(\varepsilon_{xx}^2 + \varepsilon_{yy}^2 + \varepsilon_{zz}^2) + C_{12}(\varepsilon_{xx}\varepsilon_{yy} + \varepsilon_{xx}\varepsilon_{zz} + \varepsilon_{yy}\varepsilon_{zz})
\]

\[
+ 2C_{44}(\varepsilon_{xy}^2 + \varepsilon_{yz}^2 + \varepsilon_{xz}^2),
\]

\[
\frac{1}{V_0}E_{me}^{cub(I)}(\mathbf{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{\alpha}) = b_0(\varepsilon_{xx} + \varepsilon_{yy} + \varepsilon_{zz}) + b_1(\alpha_x^2\varepsilon_{xx} + \alpha_y^2\varepsilon_{yy} + \alpha_z^2\varepsilon_{zz})
\]

\[
+ 2b_2(\alpha_x\alpha_y\varepsilon_{xy} + \alpha_x\alpha_z\varepsilon_{xz} + \alpha_y\alpha_z\varepsilon_{yz}),
\]

\[
\frac{1}{V_0}E_{K}^{cub}(\mathbf{\alpha}) = K_0 + K_1(\alpha_x^2\alpha_y^2 + \alpha_y^2\alpha_z^2 + \alpha_z^2\alpha_x^2) + K_2\alpha_x^2\alpha_y^2\alpha_z^2,
\]

where $C_{11} = C_{11}$, $C_{12} = C_{12}$ and $C_{44} = C_{44}$ are the elastic constants, $b_0$, $b_1$ and $b_2$ are the magnetoelastic constants, and $K_0$, $K_1$ and $K_2$ are the magnetocrystalline anisotropy constants. In Table [1] we see that the deformation gradient $F$ to calculate $b_1$ is given by Eq. [A.4], which leads to the following strain tensor through Eq. [A.3]

\[
\mathbf{\varepsilon}^{h_1}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
\varepsilon_{xx} & \varepsilon_{xy} & \varepsilon_{xz} \\
\varepsilon_{yx} & \varepsilon_{yy} & \varepsilon_{yz} \\
\varepsilon_{zx} & \varepsilon_{zy} & \varepsilon_{zz}
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
s & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(6)

We also see in Table [1] that the two magnetization directions to calculate $b_1$ are $\mathbf{\alpha}_1 = (1, 0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{\alpha}_2 = (1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2}, 0)$. Hence, Eq. 2 becomes

\[
\frac{1}{V_0} \left[ E(\mathbf{\varepsilon}^{h_1}(s), 1, 0, 0) - E(\mathbf{\varepsilon}^{h_1}(s), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0) \right] = \frac{1}{2}b_1s - \frac{1}{4}K_1,
\]

(7)

where we recover $\Gamma = 1/2$, as shown in Table [1]. Therefore, $b_1$ can be estimated from the fitting parameter $A$ of the linear polynomial (Eq. [4]) as $b_1 = A/\Gamma = 2A$. We also observe that $\Phi = -K_1/4$, so the first magnetocrystalline anisotropy constant $K_1$ for the unstrained cubic state can be estimated as well from the fitting parameter $B$ of the linear polynomial ($K_1 = -4B$), see Eq. [3].

The corresponding workflow for this new methodology is depicted in Fig. [1]. It contains the same steps as the workflow for the method implemented in version 1.0 for direct calculation of anisotropic magnetostrictive coefficients [1]. However, here the generated deformations and spin configurations for the Vienna Ab
initio Simulation Package (VASP) [4–6] in step 3 corresponds to the new method. In step 5, after processing VASP output data, MAELAS v2.0 will calculate directly the magnetoelastic constants. Additionally, if the elastic constants are also provided in AELAS format [3], then it will also calculate the anisotropic magnetostrictive coefficients ($\lambda$) from the theoretical equations $\lambda(b^k, C_{ij})$ given in Ref. [1]. The calculated magnetostrictive coefficients can be analyzed and visualized with the online tool MAELASviewer [7]. This new method is executed by using tag -mode 2 in the command line. The length optimization method [2] originally implemented in version 1.0 for direct calculation of anisotropic magnetostrictive coefficients [1] can also be executed in version 2.0 by using tag -mode 1, see Fig. 2.

2.2. Revision of the trigonal (I) symmetry

The analysis of the accuracy of MAELAS that is presented in Section 3 helped us to identify some issues in version 1.0 [1] related to the implementation of the length optimization method (originally proposed by Wu and Freeman [2]) for the trigonal (I) symmetry. First of all, we point out a misprint in the publication of version 1.0 [1] in the elastic energy that should read

$$E_{\text{trig}}(I)_{\text{el}} - E_0 = \frac{1}{2} c_{xxxx}(\varepsilon_{xx}^2 + \varepsilon_{yy}^2) + c_{xyxy}\varepsilon_{xx}\varepsilon_{yy} + c_{xzzz}(\varepsilon_{xx} + \varepsilon_{yy})\varepsilon_{zz} + \frac{1}{2} c_{zzzz}\varepsilon_{zz}^2$$

$$+ 2c_{yzyz}(\varepsilon_{xz}^2 + \varepsilon_{yz}^2) + (c_{xxxx} - c_{xyxy})\varepsilon_{xy}^2$$

$$+ c_{xxyz}(4\varepsilon_{xy}\varepsilon_{xz} + 2\varepsilon_{xx}\varepsilon_{yz} - 2\varepsilon_{yy}\varepsilon_{yz}).$$

(8)

where $c_{xxxx} = C_{11}$, $c_{xyxy} = C_{12}$, $c_{xzzz} = C_{13}$, $c_{xyyz} = C_{14}$, $c_{zzzz} = C_{33}$, and $c_{yzyz} = C_{44}$. Secondly, the correct theoretical relations between the magnetostrictive coefficients $\lambda_1^y$, $\lambda_2^y$, and $\lambda_{21}$, and the elastic and magnetoelastic constants are

$$\lambda_1^y = \frac{1}{2} C_{14} b_{14} - \frac{1}{2} C_{44} b_3$$

$$\lambda_2^y = \frac{1}{2} C_{44} (C_{11} - C_{12}) - C_{14}^2$$

$$\lambda_{21} = \frac{1}{2} C_{44} (C_{11} - C_{12}) + C_{33}^2.$$

(9)

Lastly, based on the equation of the relative length change $\Delta l/l_0$, for the calculation $\lambda_{12}$ in version 1.0 we proposed to compute the cell length in the direction
Figure 1: Workflow of the new methodology for direct calculation of anisotropic magnetoelastic constants implemented in MAELAS v2.0. This new method is executed by tag -mode 2. The method originally implemented in version 1.0 for direct calculation of anisotropic magnetostrictive coefficients based on the length optimization can also be executed in version 2.0 by using tag -mode 1.

\[
\mathbf{\beta} = \left( \frac{a}{\sqrt{a^2 + c^2}}, 0, \frac{c}{\sqrt{a^2 + c^2}} \right)
\]

using the deformation gradient $\mathbf{F}$.

\[
\mathbf{F} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \frac{sc}{2a} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{sa}{2c} & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
\]  

where $\Omega = \sqrt[3]{4/(4-s^2)}$, $a$ and $c$ are the lattice parameters of the relaxed (not deformed) unit cell. However, this choice leads to the same theoretical total energy for the selected magnetization directions $\mathbf{\alpha}_1 = (0, 1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2})$ and $\mathbf{\alpha}_2 = (0, 1/\sqrt{2}, -1/\sqrt{2})$, that is, $E(\mathbf{e}^{\lambda_{12}}, \mathbf{\alpha}_1) = E(\mathbf{e}^{\lambda_{12}}, \mathbf{\alpha}_2)$. Consequently, in practice
Figure 2: Diagram showing the two methods available in MAELAS v2.0 to calculate anisotropic magnetostrictive coefficients ($\lambda$) and magnetoelastic constants ($b$). The method -mode 1 corresponds to the approach originally implemented in version 1.0 [1] based on the length optimization [2], while -mode 2 is the new method added in version 2.0 (Section 2.1).

This would always give a negligible magnetostrictive coefficient $\lambda_{12}$ ($\lambda_{12} \approx 0$), which is obviously not correct. To fix this problem in version 2.0, we use the same magnetization directions $\alpha_1 = (0,1/\sqrt{2},1/\sqrt{2})$ and $\alpha_2 = (0,1/\sqrt{2},-1/\sqrt{2})$, and replace the measuring length direction by $\beta = (1,0,0)$, and deformation gradient by

$$F_{\beta=(1,0,0)}^{\lambda_{12} \text{ (version 2.0)}}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + s & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+s}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+s}} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

In this case, we have

$$\lambda_{12} = \frac{2(l_1 - l_2)}{\rho(l_1 + l_2)} = \frac{4(l_1 - l_2)}{(l_1 + l_2)}, \tag{12}$$

where $\rho = 1/2$, and $l_1$ and $l_2$ are the equilibrium cell length along $\beta = (1,0,0)$ when the magnetization points to $\alpha_1 = (0,1/\sqrt{2},1/\sqrt{2})$ and $\alpha_2 = (0,1/\sqrt{2},-1/\sqrt{2})$, respectively.

### 3. Analysis of the accuracy of the methods implemented in MAELAS

There are two main sources of errors in any calculation with MAELAS, (i) one coming from the used methodology to compute the magnetostrictive coefficients and magnetoelastic constants and other from (ii) the DFT calculation of the total energy for each deformed state. Unfortunately, the lack of available experimental data for some crystal symmetries makes it difficult to estimate the reliability and
precision of these calculations. In this Section, we try to estimate the systematic error coming from the methodologies implemented in MAELAS by evaluating the exact energy of each deformed state from the theory of magnetostriction. In this way, we can get rid of possible errors from DFT, and reveal the accuracy of the implemented methods, as well as possible issues. To do so, we first consider a theoretical material for each supported crystal symmetry in MAELAS that is characterized by an imposed set of elastic ($C_{ij}^{\text{exact}}$) and magnetoelastic ($b_k^{\text{exact}}$) constants. The imposed values for these quantities are shown in the third and fifth columns of Table [2]. Next, using these elastic and magnetoelastic constants, we calculate the exact magnetostrictive coefficients (shown in the seventh column of Table [2]) from the theoretical relations between these quantities $\lambda_{i}^{\text{exact}}(b_k^{\text{exact}}, C_{ij}^{\text{exact}})$ [1]. Finally, we also use these elastic and magnetoelastic constants to evaluate the exact elastic and magnetoelastic energies $E_{\text{exact}}(\varepsilon, \alpha) = E_{\text{el}}^{\text{exact}}(\varepsilon) + E_{\text{me}}^{\text{exact}}(\varepsilon, \alpha)$, (13)

for each deformed state and magnetization direction generated by the two implemented methods in MAELAS. Then these exact energies are used as inputs for MAELAS to compute the magnetoelastic constants and magnetostrictive coefficients. The exact expression of the elastic and magnetoelastic energies for cubic (I) symmetry are given in Eq. [5] while the corresponding equations for the other supported symmetries can be found in Ref. [1]. By comparing the exact values and MAELAS results for $b$ and $\lambda$, we can estimate the relative error of the calculation of MAELAS as

$$b_i^{\text{Rel. Error}}(\%) = \frac{b_i^{\text{exact}} - b_i^{\MAELAS}}{b_i^{\text{exact}}} \times 100,$$  (14)

$$\lambda_i^{\text{Rel. Error}}(\%) = \frac{\lambda_i^{\text{exact}} - \lambda_i^{\MAELAS}}{\lambda_i^{\text{exact}}} \times 100.$$  (15)

The estimated relative errors are shown in Table [2] for -mode 1 (method originally implemented in version 1.0 based on the length optimization [1, 2], including the corrections of the trigonal (I) symmetry given in Section [2.2]) and -mode 2 (new method implemented in version 2.0 that is described in Section [2.1]). We observe that the new methodology (-mode 2) improves significantly the accuracy of the calculations for all magnetoelastic constants and magnetostrictive coefficients exhibiting relative errors lower than $10^{-4}\%$. The -mode 1 gives good results for cubic symmetry, but for lower symmetries the relative error is significantly large in some cases ($>10\%$), due to the deformation gradients implemented in version
1.0 for the cell length optimization [1]. In Appendix B, we analyze this problem in more detail and discuss possible ways to improve the accuracy of -mode 1. Based on these results, we recommend to use -mode 2 instead of -mode 1, especially for non-cubic crystals. The -mode 2 is set as the default method in version 2.0. We note that performing the calculations with these two independent methods and comparing their results can also be useful to confirm the correct execution of the program.

4. Tests for the new method

In this section, we perform some calculations with the new method described in Section 2.1 (mode 2). Here, MAELAS is interfaced with VASP [4–6] to compute the energies of each deformed state. For a fair comparison with the method implemented in version 1.0 (mode 1), we consider the same materials (BCC Fe, FCC Ni, HCP Co, Fe2Si space group (SG) 164, L10 FePd and YCo SG 63) as in the publication of version 1.0 [1], and use the same relaxed unit cells, VASP settings (energy cut-off, pseudopotentials, exchange correlation,...) and elastic constants calculated with AELAS [1, 3]. A summary of the results is presented in Table 3.

4.1. FCC Ni

The new method implemented in MAELAS v2.0 (mode 2) gives very similar results to -mode 1 for FCC Ni (cubic (I) crystal symmetry), see Table 3. The analysis of the calculated magnetoelastic constants with -mode 2 as a function of the k-points in the Brillouin zone is shown in Fig. 3. We see that both $b_1$ and $b_2$ converge well above $4 \times 10^4$ k-points and are in fairly good agreement with experiment. In Fig. 3 we also plot the linear fitting of the energy versus strain ($\varepsilon_{xx}$) data to compute $b_1$.

4.2. BCC Fe

The results given by -mode 2 for BCC Fe (cubic (I) crystal symmetry) are also very similar to -mode 1, see Table 3. The analysis of the calculated magnetoelastic constants with -mode 2 as a function of the k-points in the Brillouin zone is shown in Fig. 4. We see that both $b_1$ and $b_2$ converge well above $5 \times 10^4$ k-points. While $b_1$ is in good agreement with experiment, $b_2$ has the opposite sign to experiment due to a possible failure of DFT [11, 12]. In Fig. 4 we also plot the linear fitting of the energy versus strain ($\varepsilon_{xy}$) data to compute $b_2$. Since the slope of the fitted linear polynomial is negative, then the calculation gives $b_2 < 0$. 
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Table 2: Summary of the analysis of the accuracy of the methods implemented in MAELAS. The relative error for the magnetoelastic constants ($b_{\text{Rel. Error}}$) and magnetostrictive coefficients ($\lambda_{\text{Rel. Error}}$) is computed using Eqs. [14] and [15] respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crystal system</th>
<th>$C_{ij}$</th>
<th>$C_{ij}^\text{exact}$ (GPa)</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$b_{\text{Rel. Error}}^\text{exact}$ (MPa)</th>
<th>$\lambda^\text{exact}$ ($\times 10^{-6}$)</th>
<th>-mode 1 $b_{\text{Rel. Error}}$ (%)</th>
<th>-mode 1 $\lambda_{\text{Rel. Error}}$ (%)</th>
<th>-mode 2 $b_{\text{Rel. Error}}$ (%)</th>
<th>-mode 2 $\lambda_{\text{Rel. Error}}$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cubic (I)</td>
<td>$a = 2.8293\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 423</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 423</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 423</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 423</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 423</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 423</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 423</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a = 2.4561\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 138</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 138</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 138</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 138</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 138</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 138</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 138</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c = 3.9821\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 122</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 122</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 122</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 122</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 122</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 122</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 122</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexagonal (I)</td>
<td>$a = 2.4561\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 307</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 307</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 307</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 307</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 307</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 307</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 307</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c = 3.9821\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 103</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 103</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 103</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 103</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 103</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 103</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 103</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a = 3.9249\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 164</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 164</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 164</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 164</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 164</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 164</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 164</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c = 4.8311\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 428</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 428</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 428</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 428</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 428</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 428</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 428</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigonal (I)</td>
<td>$a = 3.9249\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 133</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 133</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 133</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 133</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 133</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 133</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 133</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c = 4.8311\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 434</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 434</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 434</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 434</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 434</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 434</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 434</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a = 2.6973\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 118</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 118</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 118</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 118</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 118</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 118</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 118</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c = 3.7593\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 264</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 264</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 264</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 264</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 264</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 264</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 264</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetragonal (I)</td>
<td>$a = 2.6973\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 324</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 324</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 324</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 324</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 324</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 324</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 324</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c = 3.7593\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 267</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 267</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 267</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 267</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 267</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 267</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 267</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthonormal</td>
<td>$a = 4.0686\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 176</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 176</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 176</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 176</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 176</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 176</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 176</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b = 10.3157\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 45</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 45</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 45</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 45</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 45</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 45</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 45</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c = 3.8956\text{Å}$</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 48</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 48</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 48</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 48</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 48</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 48</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 48</td>
<td>$b_{11}$ 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Anisotropic magnetostrictive coefficients and magnetoelastic constants calculated with the two methods (-mode 1 and -mode 2) available in MAELAS v2.0. In parenthesis we show the magnetostrictive coefficients with Mason’s definitions [1, 8]. These data correspond to the simulations with the same VASP settings, relaxed unit cell and elastic constants as in Ref. [1]. For Fe2Si we repeated the calculations with -mode 1 as implemented in version 2.0 [v2.0], that is, including the corrections described in Section 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Crystal system</th>
<th>DFT Exchange Correlation</th>
<th>Magnetostrictive coefficient MAELAS-mode 1 (× 10⁻⁵)</th>
<th>Magnetoelastic constant MAELAS-mode 1 (MPa)</th>
<th>Expt. (× 10⁻⁵)</th>
<th>Expt. (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCC Ni</td>
<td>Cubic (I)</td>
<td>GGA</td>
<td>λ_{111} -5.5, 0.7</td>
<td>b₁ = 18.4 ± 1.5</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Fe</td>
<td>Cubic (I)</td>
<td>GGA</td>
<td>λ_{111} -4.3, 0.5</td>
<td>b₂ = 19.4 ± 1.5</td>
<td>4.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP Co</td>
<td>Hexagonal (I)</td>
<td>LSDA+U</td>
<td>λ_{111} -3.0, 0.1</td>
<td>b₃ = 10.5 ± 1.5</td>
<td>5.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>10.9 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe₂Si</td>
<td>Trigonal (I)</td>
<td>GGA</td>
<td>λ_{111} -2.0, 0.2</td>
<td>b₄ = 11.5 ± 1.5</td>
<td>4.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1₀ FePd</td>
<td>Tetragonal (I)</td>
<td>GGA</td>
<td>λ_{111} -1.5, 0.1</td>
<td>b₅ = 12.5 ± 1.5</td>
<td>5.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>10.9 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCo</td>
<td>Orthorhombic</td>
<td>LSDA+U</td>
<td>λ_{111} -0.5, 0.1</td>
<td>b₆ = 13.5 ± 1.5</td>
<td>4.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. HCP Co

The results of both methods for HCP Co (hexagonal (I) crystal symmetry) follow the experiment, except for b₄ and its corresponding magnetostrictive coefficient λ₅,2 which are clearly underestimated. Hence, the new method confirms the issue with b₄ and λ₅,2 that was already identified with -mode 1 in the publication of version 1.0 [v1.0]. Calculated magnetoelastic constants for HCP Co with the new method implemented in MAELAS v2.0 (-mode 2) for different values of the Hubbard U parameter is shown in Fig. 5. In this figure we also plot the linear...
Figure 3: (Left) Calculated magnetoelastic constants for FCC Ni with the new method implemented in MAELAS v2.0 (-mode 2). (Right) Calculation of \(b_1\) for FCC Ni through a linear fitting of the energy difference between magnetization directions \(\alpha_1 = (1, 0, 0)\) and \(\alpha_2 = (1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2}, 0)\) versus strain (\(\varepsilon_{xx}\)) data.

Figure 4: (Left) Calculated magnetoelastic constants for BCC Fe with the new method implemented in MAELAS v2.0 (-mode 2). (Right) Calculation of \(b_2\) for BCC Fe through a linear fitting of the energy difference between magnetization directions \(\alpha_1 = (1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2}, 0)\) and \(\alpha_2 = (-1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2}, 0)\) versus strain (\(\varepsilon_{xy}\)) data.

fitting of the energy versus strain data to compute \(b_4\). We see that the linear fitting is quite good (R-squared=0.9989), so that the low value of \(b_4\) is not related to a possible failure in the fitting procedure.

4.4. Fe\(_2\)Si

For Fe\(_2\)Si (SG 164, trigonal (I) symmetry) we first recalculated the magnetostrictive coefficients and magnetoelastic constants with -mode 1 including the corrections implemented in version 2.0 for trigonal (I) symmetry that were described in Section 2.2. The corrected deformation gradient for \(\lambda_{12}\) (Eq. 11)
in -mode 1 gives $\lambda_{12} = -11 \times 10^{-6}$, while the old deformation gradient (Eq. 10) implemented in version 1.0 provides a negligible magnetostriction ($\lambda_{12} = -3 \times 10^{-6}$), as expected from the discussion about this issue in Section 2.2. Additionally, the corrections of the theoretical relations for $\lambda_{1,1}^\gamma$, $\lambda_{2,1}^\gamma$ and $\lambda_{2,1}$ given by Eq. 9 fix the issue with the sign of $b_4$, $b_{14}$ and $b_{34}$ found in the calculations with version 1.0. In Fig. 6 we show the calculation of $b_{22}$ and $b_4$ through a linear fitting of the energy versus strain data generated with -mode 2.

4.5. $L1_0$ FePd

In the case of $L1_0$ FePd (tetragonal (I) symmetry), -mode 2 gives magnetoelastic constants similar to -mode 1, except for $b_{21}$ that has opposite sign due to the
deviation obtained in $\lambda^{\alpha_{1,2}} (b_{21} = -(C_{11} + C_{12}) \lambda^{\alpha_{1,2}} - C_{13} \lambda^{\alpha_{2,2}})$. Both methods also lead to similar magnetostrictive coefficients, where the largest deviation is found in $\lambda^{\alpha_{1,2}}$. In Fig. [7] we show the linear fitting of the energy versus strain ($\varepsilon_{xy}$) data to compute $b_3$ and $b'_3$ using -mode 2.

Figure 7: Calculation of (left) $b_3$ and (right) $b'_3$ for L1$_0$ FePd through a linear fitting of the energy versus strain data.

4.6. YCo

In YCo (SG 63, orthorhombic), we observe larger discrepancies between -mode 1 and -mode 2 than in the previous examples, especially in the results for the magnetoelastic constants. This fact is partially due to the lower accuracy of -mode 1 with respect -mode 2, as discussed in Section 3. Fig. [8] presents the linear fitting of the energy versus strain ($\varepsilon_{xy}$) data to compute $b_3$ and $b_8$ using -mode 2.

Figure 8: Calculation of (left) $b_3$ and (right) $b_8$ for YCo through a linear fitting of the energy versus strain data.
5. Conclusions

In summary, version 2.0 of MAELAS includes an alternative method (-mode 2) to compute directly the anisotropic magnetoelastic constants from a linear fitting of the energy versus strain data, which is derived from the magnetoelastic energy of each crystal symmetry. The analysis of the accuracy of MAELAS reveals that this new method is more precise and convenient than the method originally implemented in version 1.0, especially for non-cubic symmetries. The fact that these two independent methods give similar results can also be a useful way of confirming the correct execution of the calculations. For instance, this analysis helped us to identify some issues in version 1.0 for the trigonal (I) symmetry, which has been fixed in version 2.0.
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Appendix A. Generation of the deformed unit cells in the new method to calculate magnetoelastic constants

In this appendix we present the procedure to generate the deformed unit cells in the new methodology (-mode 2) of MAELAS 2.0 to calculate anisotropic magnetoelastic constants that is described in Section 2.1. The deformed unit cells are generated by multiplying the lattice vectors of the initial unit cell \( \mathbf{a} = (a_x, a_y, a_z), \mathbf{b} = (b_x, b_y, b_z), \mathbf{c} = (c_x, c_y, c_z) \) by the deformation gradient \( F_{ij} \) \[\begin{pmatrix} a'_x & a'_y & a'_z \\ b'_x & b'_y & b'_z \\ c'_x & c'_y & c'_z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} F_{xx} & F_{xy} & F_{xz} \\ F_{yx} & F_{yy} & F_{yz} \\ F_{zx} & F_{zy} & F_{zz} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a_x & b_x & c_x \\ a_y & b_y & c_y \\ a_z & b_z & c_z \end{pmatrix} \] (A.1)
where $a'_i$, $b'_i$, and $c'_i$ ($i = x, y, z$) are the components of the lattice vectors of the deformed cell. In the infinitesimal strain theory, the deformation gradient is related to the displacement gradient ($\partial u_i / \partial r_j$) as $F_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \partial u_i / \partial r_j$, where $\delta_{ij}$ is the Kronecker delta. Since the strain tensor ($\varepsilon_{ij}$) can be expressed in terms of the displacement vector $u$ as

$$
\varepsilon_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial r_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial r_i} \right), \quad i, j = x, y, z \tag{A.2}
$$

then the strain tensor $\varepsilon_{ij}$ can be written in terms of the deformation gradient as

$$
\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix}
\varepsilon_{xx} & \varepsilon_{xy} & \varepsilon_{xz} \\
\varepsilon_{yx} & \varepsilon_{yy} & \varepsilon_{yz} \\
\varepsilon_{zx} & \varepsilon_{zy} & \varepsilon_{zz}
\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix}
2(F_{xx} - 1) & F_{xy} + F_{yx} & F_{xz} + F_{zx} \\
F_{xy} + F_{yx} & 2(F_{yy} - 1) & F_{yz} + F_{zy} \\
F_{xz} + F_{zx} & F_{yz} + F_{zy} & 2(F_{zz} - 1)
\end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.3}
$$

We see, that the strain tensor is symmetric ($\varepsilon_{ij} = \varepsilon_{ji}$, $i \neq j$), but the deformation gradient is not necessarily symmetric. For the new methodology implemented in MAELAS 2.0 we consider deformation gradients that fulfill Eq.2 with the magnetization directions $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ given by Table [I]. For the sake of simplicity in implementing this new approach, we use deformations that don’t preserve the volume of the unit cells (non-isochoric deformation), so that the determinant of the deformation gradients is not equal to one ($det(F) \neq 1$).

**Appendix A.1. Cubic (I) system**

For cubic (I) systems the new method (-mode 2) generates two set of deformed unit cells using the following deformation gradients

$$
F^{b_1}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 + s & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{A.4}
$$

$$
F^{b_2}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & s & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.5}
$$

The parameter $s$ controls the applied deformation, and its maximum value can be specified through the command line of the program MAELAS using tag $-s$. The total number of deformed cells can be chosen with tag $-n$. 
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Appendix A.2. Hexagonal (I) system

In the case of hexagonal (I), the new method (-mode 2) generates 4 sets of deformed cells using the following deformation gradients

\[
F^{b_21}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 + \frac{s}{2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 + \frac{s}{2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (A.6)
\]

\[
F^{b_22}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 + s
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (A.7)
\]

\[
F^{b_3}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 + \frac{s}{2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 - \frac{s}{2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (A.8)
\]

\[
F^{b_4}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & s \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
s & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (A.9)
\]

Appendix A.3. Trigonal (I) system

In the case of trigonal (I), the new method (-mode 2) generates 6 sets of deformed unit cells. The deformation gradients for \(b_{12}, b_{22}, b_3\) and \(b_4\) are the same as in the hexagonal (I) case, (Eqs. A.6, A.7, A.8 and A.9), while for \(b_{14}\) and \(b_{34}\) the deformation gradients are

\[
F^{b_{14}}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & s \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
s & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (A.10)
\]

\[
F^{b_{34}}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & s & 0 \\
s & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (A.11)
\]

Appendix A.4. Tetragonal (I) system

In the case of tetragonal (I), the new method (-mode 2) generates 5 sets of deformed unit cells. The deformation gradients for \(b_{12}, b_{22}, b_3\) and \(b_4\) are the same as in the hexagonal (I) case, (Eqs. A.6, A.7, A.8 and A.9), while for \(b_3'\) the deformation gradient is

\[
F^{b_3'}(s) = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & s & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (A.12)
\]
Appendix A.5. Orthorhombic system

For orthorhombic crystals the new method (-mode 2) generates 9 sets of deformed cells using the following deformation gradients

\[
F^{b_1}(s) = F^{b_2}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + s & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A.13)
\]

\[
F^{b_3}(s) = F^{b_4}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A.14)
\]

\[
F^{b_5}(s) = F^{b_6}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 + s \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A.15)
\]

\[
F^{b_7}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s & 0 \\ s & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A.16)
\]

\[
F^{b_8}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & s \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ s & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A.17)
\]

\[
F^{b_9}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & s \\ 0 & s & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (A.18)
\]

Appendix B. Analysis of the accuracy of the length optimization method

In Section 3 we found that the length optimization method (-mode 1) leads to some significantly large relative errors in the calculation of some magnetostrictive coefficients. In this appendix we study this issue in more detail for \(\lambda^{\alpha_2,2}\) of the Hexagonal (I) symmetry. A similar analysis can be used for the other magnetostrictive coefficients and symmetries. The deformation gradients \(F(s)\) implemented in -mode 1 are parameterized using only a single parameter \(s\) based on the measuring length direction \(\beta\) [1]. For instance, the calculation of \(\lambda^{\alpha_2,2}\) in -mode 1 is performed using the following deformation gradient for the length optimization along \(\beta = (0,0,1)\) of both magnetization directions \(\alpha_1 = (0,0,1)\) and
$\alpha_2 = (1, 0, 0)$

$$F_{\alpha \beta}^{\alpha_2, 2}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+s}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+s}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 + s \end{pmatrix}.$$ (B.1)

This deformation gradient generates a set of deformed cells that do not contain the exact equilibrium state when the magnetization is constrained along the direction $\alpha$. Consequently, it gives approximated values of the equilibrium lengths $l_1$ and $l_2$ along the direction $\beta$ when magnetization points to direction $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$, respectively. This situation is illustrated in Fig. B.9.

Figure B.9: Scheme showing the equilibrium energy obtained using deformation gradients parameterized with one and two parameters.

One needs to make use of the equilibrium magnetoelastic strain tensor $\varepsilon_{eq}(\alpha)$ in order to find the parameterized deformation gradient that contains the exact equilibrium state when the magnetization is constrained along the direction $\alpha$. According to the workflow of MAELAS (see Fig.1), in the step 1 a spin-polarized cell relaxation without SOC takes place, so the isotropic part of magnetostriction is already taken into account before the generation of the distorted cells in step 3. Hence, we only need to consider the anisotropic magnetostriction. The anisotropic
part of the equilibrium strain tensor for Hexagonal (I) systems reads \([1, 15]\)

\[
\varepsilon^{eq}(\alpha) = \left( \begin{array}{ccc}
\lambda^{\alpha 1.2} (\alpha_z^2 - \frac{1}{3}) + \frac{\lambda^{\gamma 2}}{2} (\alpha_x^2 - \alpha_y^2) & \lambda^{\gamma 2} \alpha_x \alpha_y & \lambda^{e 2} \alpha_x \alpha_z \\
\lambda^{\gamma 2} \alpha_y \alpha_x & \lambda^{\alpha 1.2} (\alpha_z^2 - \frac{1}{3}) - \frac{\lambda^{\gamma 2}}{2} (\alpha_x^2 - \alpha_y^2) & \lambda^{e 2} \alpha_y \alpha_z \\
\lambda^{e 2} \alpha_x \alpha_y & \lambda^{e 2} \alpha_y \alpha_z & \lambda^{a 2.2} (\alpha_z^2 - \frac{1}{3}) 
\end{array} \right). 
\]

In -mode 1, for the calculation of \(\lambda^{a 2.2}\) we selected the magnetization directions \(\alpha_1 = (0, 0, 1)\) and \(\alpha_2 = (1, 0, 0)\) \([1]\). Hence, the equilibrium strain tensor becomes

\[
\varepsilon^{eq}(0, 0, 1) = \left( \begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{2}{3} \lambda^{\alpha 1.2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{2}{3} \lambda^{\alpha 1.2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} \lambda^{a 2.2} 
\end{array} \right),
\]

\[
\varepsilon^{eq}(1, 0, 0) = \left( \begin{array}{ccc}
-\frac{1}{3} \lambda^{\alpha 1.2} + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{\gamma 2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -\frac{1}{3} \lambda^{\alpha 1.2} - \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{\gamma 2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{3} \lambda^{a 2.2} 
\end{array} \right). 
\]  

The corresponding deformation gradients that give these equilibrium strain tensors are obtained using Eq. \([A,3]\)

\[
F^{\lambda^{a 2.2}}_{\alpha_1 = (0,0,1)} = \left( \begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{2}{3} \lambda^{\alpha 1.2} + 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{2}{3} \lambda^{\alpha 1.2} + 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3} \lambda^{a 2.2} + 1 
\end{array} \right),
\]

\[
F^{\lambda^{a 2.2}}_{\alpha_2 = (1,0,0)} = \left( \begin{array}{ccc}
-\frac{1}{3} \lambda^{\alpha 1.2} + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{\gamma 2} + 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -\frac{1}{3} \lambda^{\alpha 1.2} - \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{\gamma 2} + 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{3} \lambda^{a 2.2} + 1 
\end{array} \right). 
\]

Therefore, if we parameterize these deformation gradients by setting the magnetostrictive coefficients as free parameters, then they generate a set of deformed cells that contains the exact equilibrium state that corresponds to the particular case when the free parameters are equal to the magnetostrictive coefficients (min-
imum energy). Hence, these deformation gradients should be parameterized as

\[
F_{\alpha_1=(0,0,1)}^{\lambda^{\alpha_2,2}}(s_1,s_2) = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{2}{3}s_1 + 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{2}{3}s_1 + 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{2}{3}s_2 + 1
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
F_{\alpha_2=(1,0,0)}^{\lambda^{\alpha_2,2}}(s_1,s_2,s_3) = \begin{pmatrix}
-\frac{1}{3}s_1 + \frac{1}{2}s_2 + 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -\frac{1}{3}s_1 - \frac{1}{2}s_2 + 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{3}s_3 + 1
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(B.5)

where \(s_1, s_2\) and \(s_3\) are free parameters. At the minimum energy (free parameters are equal to the magnetostrictive coefficients), these parameterized deformation gradients give the equilibrium lengths \(l_1\) and \(l_2\) along the direction \(\boldsymbol{\beta} = (0,0,1)\) (via Eq. [A.1])

\[
l_1 = \left( \frac{2}{3}\lambda^{\alpha_2,2} + 1 \right)c_z,
\]

\[
l_2 = \left( -\frac{1}{3}\lambda^{\alpha_2,2} + 1 \right)c_z,
\]

(B.6)

where \(c_z\) is the \(z\)-component of the relaxed (not deformed) lattice vector \(\mathbf{c} = (0,0,c_z)\). Therefore, the formula used in -mode 1 to compute the magnetostrictive coefficient gives \(\lambda^{\alpha_2,2}\)

\[
\lambda^{\alpha_2,2}_{\text{approx}} = \frac{2(l_1 - l_2)}{\rho(l_1 + l_2)} = \frac{2\lambda^{\alpha_2,2}}{\frac{1}{3}\lambda^{\alpha_2,2} + 2},
\]

(B.7)

where \(\rho = 1\). The relative error using the exact value for \(\lambda^{\alpha_2,2}\) in Table 2 is

\[
\lambda_{\text{Rel.Error}}^{\alpha_2,2} = \frac{\lambda^{\alpha_2,2} - \lambda^{\alpha_2,2}_{\text{approx}}}{\lambda^{\alpha_2,2}} \times 100 = -0.002\%,
\]

(B.8)

which is clearly much smaller than in the example shown in Section 3 using a deformation gradient with a single parameter (\(~ 17\%\)). Hence, deformation gradients with more than one parameter based on the equilibrium strain tensor could improve the accuracy of -mode 1 since they give more accurate values for the equilibrium lengths \(l_1\) and \(l_2\) along the direction \(\boldsymbol{\beta}\) when magnetization points to direction \(\alpha_1\) and \(\alpha_2\), respectively. Unfortunately, they will also increase the number of deformed cells needed to calculate the magnetostrictive coefficients through a fitting to a higher order polynomial, making this approach more computationally demanding. In Section 4 we see that the implemented deformation gradients with a single parameter in -mode 1 still provide reasonable results (similar to -mode 2) in many cases.
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