

Universal angular magnetoresistance and spin torque in ferromagnetic/normal metal hybrids

Gerrit E. W. Bauer,¹ Yaroslav Tserkovnyak,² Daniel Huertas-Hernando,¹ and Arne Brataas²

¹*Department of Applied Physics and DIMES,
Delft University of Technology, 2628 CJ Delft, The Netherlands and*

²*Harvard University, Lyman Laboratory of Physics,
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138 USA*

(Dated: March 22, 2002)

Abstract

The electrical resistance of ferromagnetic/normal-metal (F/N) heterostructures depends on the nature of the junctions which may be tunnel barriers, point contacts, or intermetallic interfaces. For all junction types, the resistance of disordered F/N/F perpendicular spin valves as a function of the angle between magnetization vectors is shown to obey a simple universal law. The spin-current induced magnetization torque can be measured by the angular magnetoresistance of these spin valves. The results are generalized to arbitrary magnetoelectronic circuits.

PACS numbers: 72.25.Ba, 75.70.Pa, 75.60.Jk, 75.75.+a

Magnetoelectronics achieves new functionalities by incorporating ferromagnetic materials into electronic circuits. The giant magnetoresistance, *i.e.* the dependence of the electrical resistance on the relative orientation of the magnetizations of two ferromagnets in a ferromagnetic/normal/ferromagnetic (F/N/F) metal structure or “spin valve”, is applied in read heads of high information density magnetic storage systems [1]. Usually, such a device is viewed as a single bit, the magnetizations vectors being either parallel or antiparallel. Early seminal contributions by Slonczewski [2] and Berger [3] revealed fundamentally new physics and technological possibilities of noncollinearity, which triggered a large number of experimental and theoretical research. An important example is the non-equilibrium spin-current induced torque (briefly, spin torque) which one ferromagnet can exert on the magnetization vector of a second magnet through a normal metal. This torque can be large enough to dynamically turn magnetizations [4], which is potentially interesting as a low-power switching mechanism for magnetic random access memories [5]. The spin torque is also essential for novel magnetic devices like the spin-flip transistor [6, 7, 8], detection of spin-precession [9], the Gilbert damping of the magnetization dynamics in thin magnetic films [10], and spin-injection induced by ferromagnetic resonance [11].

Recently, two theoretical approaches have been developed which address charge and spin transport in diffusive noncollinear magnetic hybrid structures. The magnetoelectronic “circuit theory” [6] is based on the division of the system into discrete resistive elements over which the applied potential drops, and low-resistance nodes at quasi-equilibrium (as in Fig. 1(a)). The electrical properties are then governed by generalized Kirchhoff rules in Pauli spin space and can be computed easily. Each resistor is thereby characterized by four material parameters, the spin-up and spin-down conductances $g_{\uparrow(\downarrow)} = \sum_{nm} [\delta_{nm} - |r_{nm}^{\uparrow(\downarrow)}|^2]$ as known from the scattering theory of transport [12], as well as the real and imaginary part of the “mixing conductance” $g^{\uparrow\downarrow} = \sum_{nm} [\delta_{nm} - r_{nm}^{\uparrow}(r_{nm}^{\downarrow})^*]$, where r_{nm}^s is the reflection coefficient between n -th and m -th transverse modes of an electron with spin s in the normal metal at the contact to a ferromagnet. Waintal *et al.* [13] studied the random matrix theory of transport in noncollinear magnetic systems as sketched in Fig. 1(b). Their formalism did not require the assumption of highly resistive elements, but the algebra of the 4×4 scattering matrices in spin space seemed so complex, that analytical results were obtained in limiting cases only.

Both theories are not valid in the limit of intermetallic interfaces in a diffuse enviro-

ment (see Fig. 1c) like the perpendicular spin valves, studied thoroughly by the Michigan State University collaboration [14] and others [15, 16]. These studies provided a large body of evidence for the two-channel (*i.e.* spin-up and spin-down) series resistor model and a wealth of accurate transport parameters like the interface resistances for various material combinations. Transport through transparent interfaces in a diffuse environment has been studied for *collinear* magnetizations by Schep *et al.* [17]. Under the condition of isotropy of scattering by disorder, it was found that the bulk resistances, which are proportional to the layer thicknesses, are in series with interface resistances, for each spin s

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{g}_s} = \frac{1}{g_s} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{N_s^F} + \frac{1}{N_N} \right), \quad (1)$$

where N_s^F and N_N are the number of modes of the bulk materials on both sides of the F/N contact. Physically, in Eq. (1) a spurious Sharvin resistance is subtracted from the result of scattering theory. This correction is large for transparent interfaces and essential to obtain agreement between experimental results and first-principles calculations [17, 18, 19].

In exchange-biased spin valves, it is possible to measure the electric resistance as a function of the angle between magnetizations, which has been analyzed experimentally and theoretically [20, 21, 22]. The present study has been motivated by Pratt's observation that this angular magnetoresistance could accurately be fitted by the form [6]

$$\frac{R(\theta) - R(0)}{R(\pi) - R(0)} = \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{\chi (1 + \cos \theta) + 2} \quad (2)$$

with one free parameter χ that is given by circuit theory

$$\chi = \frac{1}{1 - p^2} \frac{|\eta|^2}{\text{Re}\eta} - 1 \quad (3)$$

in terms of the normalized mixing conductance $\eta = 2g_{\uparrow\downarrow}/g$, the polarization $p = (g_{\uparrow} - g_{\downarrow})/g$, and the average conductance $g = g_{\uparrow} + g_{\downarrow}$. This was surprising, since the circuit theory, as mentioned above, was not designed for metallic multilayers, and, indeed, the numerical value of fitted parameters did not make sense, also after including effects of bulk scattering in the ferromagnetic layers [23].

In the following we develop a theory of transport in disordered magnetoelectronic circuits and devices in the diffuse regime which unifies and extends previous theoretical approaches. We find simple analytical results with parameters that are accessible to realistic electronic-structure calculations. The angular magnetoresistance for perpendicular spin valves agrees

with the universal form [Eq. (2)] in agreement with measurements [22], and is used to determine the mixing conductance and spin torque. The theory is valid under two conditions: (i) the system should be diffusive, *i.e.* the elastic mean free path ℓ (including scattering at interfaces) should be smaller than typical sample scales and (ii) the ferromagnetic elements should have an exchange splitting Δ , which is large enough that the magnetic coherence length $\ell_c = \hbar/\sqrt{2m\Delta} < \min(\ell, d_F)$, where d_F is the thickness of the ferromagnetic layer. These conditions are usually fulfilled in transition-metal systems: Deviations from diffusive behavior, like quantum-size effects and breakdown of the series resistor model, are small or controversial [19, 24], whereas the magnetic coherence length is of the same order as the lattice constant in high- T_c transition-metal ferromagnets [10, 25]. We obtain identical results by two methods: The first one is a combination of the Boltzmann-like method of Schep *et al.* [17] for collinear systems and the random-matrix theory of Waintal *et al.* [13]. The second one is an extension of magnetoelectronic circuit theory [6] to arbitrary resistors.

Let us consider planar spin-valve structures as shown in Fig. 1. We assume the existence of a distribution function at a certain position x in the sample (a “node”), which in spin-polarized systems has 8 elements $f_{ss'}^\pm(x)$. We arrange them into a 4×1 vector $\vec{f}^\pm = (f_{\uparrow\uparrow}^\pm, f_{\uparrow\downarrow}^\pm, f_{\downarrow\uparrow}^\pm, f_{\downarrow\downarrow}^\pm)^T$ as well as into a 2×2 matrix, denoted by a hat:

$$\hat{f}^\pm(x) = \begin{pmatrix} f_{\uparrow\uparrow}^\pm(x) & f_{\uparrow\downarrow}^\pm(x) \\ f_{\downarrow\uparrow}^\pm(x) & f_{\downarrow\downarrow}^\pm(x) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

The superscript denotes that the distribution is in general anisotropic in reciprocal space, + for right-moving – for left moving, indicating that, in contrast to [6, 13], the current density in the nodes is not negligible. The distribution functions at different nodes are matched *via* boundary conditions:

$$\vec{f}^+(x_B) = \check{T}_{A \rightarrow B} \vec{f}^+(x_A) + \check{R}_{B \rightarrow B} \vec{f}^-(x_B) \quad (5a)$$

$$\vec{f}^-(x_A) = \check{R}_{A \rightarrow A} \vec{f}^+(x_A) + \check{T}_{B \rightarrow A} \vec{f}^-(x_B), \quad (5b)$$

where the 4×4 transmission and reflection probability matrices (indicated by the caret) have elements like [13]:

$$[\check{T}_{A \rightarrow B}]_{ij} = \frac{1}{N_i^B} \sum_{nm} (\vec{t}_{nm}^{A \rightarrow B})_i (\vec{t}_{nm}^{A \rightarrow B})_j^\dagger \quad (6)$$

where $N_i^B = N_\uparrow^B (\delta_{i,1} + \delta_{i,2}) + N_\downarrow^B (\delta_{i,3} + \delta_{i,4})$, N_s^B is the number of modes for spin s in B , and $\vec{t}_{nm}^{A \rightarrow B}$ is a vector of the transmission coefficients in spin space.

Let us calculate the electrical charge current in a symmetric two-terminal spin valve with relative magnetization angle θ (Fig. 1). x_L and x_R are within left and right ferromagnets at a distance from the interface equal to the spin diffusion length in the ferromagnet $\ell_{sd}^F \gg \ell_c$, and thus define the magnetically active region. In the coordinate systems defined by the magnetization directions, the transverse components of the spin accumulation in the ferromagnets vanish [6, 25] and the distributions in the magnets depend on the local spin current densities γ_s and (spin-independent) chemical potentials μ only:

$$\vec{f}^\pm(x) = ((\pm\gamma_\uparrow + \mu)(x), 0, 0, (\pm\gamma_\downarrow + \mu)(x)). \quad (7)$$

In symmetric junctions the spin current is symmetric as well, $\gamma_s(x_L) = \gamma_s(x_R)$. The charge current $i_c = (e^2/h) \sum_s N_s^F \gamma_s$ divided by the chemical potential drop equals the electrical conductance $G = i_c/\Delta\mu$. Eqs. (5,7) then lead to:

$$G = \frac{2e^2}{h} \sum_{\substack{i=1,4 \\ j=1,4}} \left\{ N_i^F [\check{1} - \check{T}_{L \rightarrow R} + \check{R}_{R \rightarrow R}]^{-1} \check{T}_{L \rightarrow R} \right\}_{ij}. \quad (8)$$

In principle, the matrices \check{T} and \check{R} do not need to be approximate.

In dirty systems, more nodes may be introduced at convenient locations in the sample and Eqs. (5) implies that total transport probability matrices can be composed in terms of those of individual elements by semiclassical concatenation rules [26]. For instance, the transmission through a F(0)/N/F(θ) double heterojunction as in Fig. 1 (without bulk scattering) takes the form:

$$\check{T}(\theta) \equiv \check{T}_{N \rightarrow F}(\theta) [\check{1} - \check{R}_{N \rightarrow N}(0) \check{R}_{N \rightarrow N}(\theta)]^{-1} \check{T}_{F \rightarrow N}(0). \quad (9)$$

These rules have been derived from the (phase-coherent) scattering theory by averaging over random matrices [13] and found to be valid to leading order in N_N^{-1} , where N_N is the number of transport channels in the normal metal. Bulk impurity scattering can be represented by diagonal matrices [13, 17]

$$(\check{T}_B)_{ss'} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{N_s^B} + \frac{e^2 \rho_s^B d_B}{h A_B} \right)^{-1} \delta_{ss'} \quad (10)$$

where ρ_s^B , d_B , A_B are the bulk resistivities, thickness and cross section of the bulk material B , respectively.

The problem can be simplified by transformations into the coordinate systems defined by the magnetization directions of the ferromagnets. In terms of the spin-rotation

$$\hat{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} & \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

and projection matrices ($s = \pm 1$)

$$\hat{u}_s(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + s \cos \theta & s \sin \theta \\ s \sin \theta & 1 - s \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

the interface scattering matrices (omitting the mode indices for simplicity) are transformed as [6] $t_{ss'}^{F \rightarrow N} = U_{ss'} t_{s'}^{cF}$, $t_{ss'}^{N \rightarrow F} = t_s^{cN} U_{ss'}^\dagger$, $\hat{r}_{N \rightarrow N} = \sum_s \hat{u}_s r_s^{cN}$, and $r_{ss'}^{F \rightarrow F} = r_s^{cF} \delta_{ss'}$, where the superscript c indicates that the matrices should be evaluated in the reference frame of the local magnetization and spin-flip scattering in the contacts has been disregarded.

The angular magnetoresistance can now be evaluated analytically for our spin valve in terms of the three interface conductances g_\uparrow , g_\downarrow , $g_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ defined above, the bulk number of modes N_s^F , N^N , and bulk resistances ρ_s^F , ρ^N , whereas the magnetization angle and layer thicknesses are the variables. Surprisingly, the form Eq. (2) is recovered, but with renormalized parameters. The spin-dependent interfaces conductances are identical to Eq. (1), whereas, including the effect of bulk scattering,

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{g}_{\uparrow\downarrow}} = \frac{1}{g_{\uparrow\downarrow}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\rho_N d_N}{A} - \frac{1}{N_N} \right). \quad (13)$$

By letting $N_s^F \rightarrow \infty$ we are in the regime of [13]. The circuit theory is recovered when, additionally, $N_N \rightarrow \infty$. The bare mixing conductance is bounded not only from below $\text{Re} g_{\uparrow\downarrow} \geq g/2$ [6], but also from above $|g_{\uparrow\downarrow}|^2 / \text{Re} g_{\uparrow\downarrow} \leq 2N_N$. The polarization and relative mixing conductances are also renormalized, with $0 < |\tilde{\eta}| < \infty$.

It is not obvious how these results should be generalized to more complicated circuits and devices and to the presence of spin-flip scattering in the normal metal. The magnetoelectronic circuit theory [6] does not suffer from these drawbacks. In the following we demonstrate that above results can be obtained with less effort, proving that with the renormalization of the transport parameters by subtracting Sharvin resistances, circuit theory remains valid for arbitrary contacts. To this end we construct the fictitious circuit depicted in Fig. 2. Consider a junction which in conventional circuit theory is characterized

by a matrix conductance \hat{g} leading to a matrix current \hat{i} when the normal and ferromagnetic distributions \hat{f}_L and \hat{f}_R are not equal. When the distributions of the nodes are isotropic, we know from circuit theory that:

$$\hat{i} = \sum_{ss'} (\hat{g})_{ss'} \hat{u}_s (\hat{f}_L - \hat{f}_R) \hat{u}_{s'}, \quad (14)$$

where the projection matrices \hat{u}_s are defined in Eq. (12) and $(\hat{g})_{ss} = g_s$, $(\hat{g})_{s,-s} = g_{s,-s}$. Introducing lead conductances, which modify the distributions $\hat{f}_L \rightarrow \hat{f}_1$ and $\hat{f}_2 \leftarrow \hat{f}_R$, respectively, we may define a (renormalized) conductance matrix $\hat{\hat{g}}$, which causes an identical current \hat{i} for the reduced (matrix) potential drop:

$$\hat{i} = \sum_{ss'} (\hat{\hat{g}})_{ss'} \hat{u}_s (\hat{f}_1 - \hat{f}_2) \hat{u}_{s'}. \quad (15)$$

When the lead conductances are now chosen to be one-half of the Sharvin conductances, and using (matrix) current conservation:

$$\hat{i} = 2N_N (\hat{f}_L - \hat{f}_1) \quad (16)$$

$$= \sum_s 2N_s^F \hat{u}_s (\hat{f}_2 - \hat{f}_R) \hat{u}_s, \quad (17)$$

straightforward matrix algebra leads to the result that $\hat{\hat{g}}$ is identical to the renormalized interface conductances found above [Eqs. (1) and, without the bulk term, (13)]. By replacing \hat{g} by $\hat{\hat{g}}$ we not only recover results for the spin valve obtained above, but we can now use the renormalized parameters also for circuits with arbitrary complexity and transparency of the contacts. Also spin-flip scattering in N can be included [6]; it does not affect the form of Eq. (2) either, but only reduces the parameter $\tilde{\chi}$.

Experimental values for the parameters for Cu/Permalloy (Py) spin valves are $\tilde{\chi} = 1.2$ and $\tilde{p} = 0.6$ [22]. Disregarding a very small imaginary component of the mixing conductance [8], using the known values for the bulk resistivities, the theoretical Sharvin resistance for Cu ($0.55 \cdot 10^{15} \Omega^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} / \text{spin}$ [17]), and the spin-flip length of Py as the effective thickness of the ferromagnet ($\ell_{sd}^F = 5 \text{ nm}$ [14]), we arrive at the bare Cu/Py interface mixing conductance $G_{\uparrow\downarrow} = 0.39(3) \cdot 10^{15} \Omega^{-1} \text{m}^{-2}$, which is close to that of Co/Cu [8].

The analytical expression for the spin torque on either ferromagnet, *i.e.* the spin current normal to the magnetization direction, reads

$$L(\theta) = \frac{\tilde{p}\tilde{g}}{2} \frac{\tilde{\eta} \sin \theta}{(\tilde{\eta} - 1) \cos \theta + 1 + \tilde{\eta}} \frac{\Delta\mu}{2\pi}, \quad (18)$$

in terms of parameters which can be measured as well as computed from first principles. Previous results [2, 13] are recovered in the limit that $\tilde{\eta} \rightarrow 2$ and $\tilde{p} \rightarrow 1$. By the generalized circuit theory it is straightforward to compute the torque on the base contact of the spin-flip transistor with antiparallel source-drain magnetizations (three identical contacts) [8]. Interestingly, it is larger and has a symmetric and flatter dependence on the angle of the base magnetization direction θ :

$$L_b(\theta) = \frac{\tilde{p}\tilde{g}\tilde{\eta}\sin\theta}{(1-\tilde{\eta})\cos^2\theta+2+\tilde{\eta}}\frac{\Delta\mu}{2\pi}.$$

This opens the way to engineer materials and device configurations to optimize switching properties of magnetic random access memories.

We would like to thank Bill Pratt for attracting our attention to the problem and sharing unpublished experimental data. We acknowledge discussions with Paul Kelly, Ke Xia, Jack Bass, Bert. I Halperin, Yuli Nazarov, as well as support by FOM, the Schlumberger Foundation, DARPA Award No. MDA 972-01-1-0024, NSF Grant NO. DMR 99-81283 and the NEDO joint research program “Nano-Scale Magnetoelectronics”. G.B. is grateful for the hospitality of Dr. Y. Hirayama and his group at the NTT Basic Research Laboratories.

-
- [1] <http://www.almaden.ibm.com/sst/>
 - [2] J.C. Slonczewski, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **159**, L1 (1996).
 - [3] L. Berger, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 9353 (1996).
 - [4] M. Tsoi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4281 (1998); J.-E. Wegrowe *et al.*, Europhys. Lett. **45**, 626 (1999); J.Z. Sun, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **202**, 157 (1999); E.B. Myers *et al.*, Science **285**, 867(1999); J.A. Katine *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3149 (2000); J. Grollier *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **78**, 3663 (2001).
 - [5] K. Inomata, IEICE Transactions on Electronics **E84-C**, 740 (2001); J.C. Slonczewski, cond-mat/0205055.
 - [6] A. Brataas, Yu.V. Nazarov, and G.E.W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2481 (2000); Eur. Phys. J. B **22**, 99 (2001).
 - [7] G.E.W. Bauer, Yu.V. Nazarov, and A. Brataas, Physica E **74**, 137 (2001).
 - [8] K. Xia, P. J. Kelly, G. E. W. Bauer, A. Brataas, and I. Turek, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 2204XX(R) (2002).

- [9] D.H. Hernando, Yu.V. Nazarov, A. Brataas, and G.E.W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 5700 (2000).
- [10] Y. Tserkovnyak, A. Brataas, G.E.W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 117601 (2002).
- [11] A. Brataas, Y. Tserkovnyak, G.E.W. Bauer, and B. Halperin, cond-mat/0205028.
- [12] S. Datta, *Electronic Transport in Mesoscopic Systems* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).
- [13] X. Waintal, E.B. Myers, P.W. Brouwer, and D.C. Ralph, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 12317 (2000).
- [14] W.P. Pratt, Jr., S.-F. Lee, J.M. Slaughter, R. Loloee, P.A. Schroeder, and J. Bass, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3060 (1991); J. Bass and W.P. Pratt, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **200**, 274 (1999).
- [15] M.A.M. Gijs, S.K.J. Lenczowski, and J.B. Giesbers, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3343 (1993).
- [16] For recent reviews see: M.A.M. Gijs and G.E.W. Bauer, Advances in Physics **46**, 285 (1997); J.-P. Ansermet, J. Phys.-Cond Mat. **10**, 6027 (1998); A. Barthélémy, A. Fert and F. Petroff, in *Handbook of Magnetic Materials*, Vol. 12, edited by K.H.J. Buschow (1999); E. Tsymbal and D. G. Pettifor, Sol. State Phys. **56**, 113 (2001).
- [17] K.M. Schep *et al.* Phys. Rev. B **56**, 10805(1997); G.E.W. Bauer, K.M. Schep, P.J. Kelly, K. Xia, J. Phys. D, in press.
- [18] M. D. Stiles and D. R. Penn, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 3200 (2000).
- [19] K. Xia, P.J. Kelly, G.E.W. Bauer, I. Turek, J. Kudrnovský, and V. Drchal, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 064407 (2001).
- [20] P. Dauguet *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 1083 (1996).
- [21] A. Vedyayev, N. Ryzhanova, B. Dieny, P. Dauguet, P. Gandit, and J. Chaussy Phys. Rev. B **55**, 3728 (1997).
- [22] L. Giacomoni, B. Dieny, W.P. Pratt, Jr., R. Loloee and M. Tsoi, to be published.
- [23] D.H. Hernando, G.E.W. Bauer, Yu.V. Nazarov, J. Mag. Mag. Mat., in press.
- [24] E.Y. Tsymbal, Phys. Rev. B **62**, R3608 (2000); D. Bozec *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1314 (2000); A. Shpiro and P.M. Levy, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 014419 (2001); K. Eid *et al.* Phys. Rev. B **65**, 054424 (2002).
- [25] M.D. Stiles and A. Zangwill, cond-mat/0202397.
- [26] B. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 8256 (1987); M. Cahay, M. McLennan, and S. Datta, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 10125 (1988); A. Brataas and G.E.W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 14684(1994).

FIG. 1: Different realizations of perpendicular spin valves. (a) Highly resistive junctions like point contacts and tunneling barriers limit the conductance. (b) Spin valve in a geometrical constriction amenable to the scattering theory of transport. (c) Magnetic multilayers with transparent interfaces. θ is the angle between magnetization directions.

FIG. 2: Fictitious device which illustrates the generalization of circuit theory to transparent resistors as discussed in the text.



