

Surface magnetic canting in a ferromagnet

P. Betti¹, M. G. Pini^{2,*} and A. Rettori^{1†}

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Firenze and Istituto Nazionale per la Fisica della Materia, Unità di Firenze, Via G. Sansone 1, I-50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Italy*

²*Istituto di Fisica Applicata “Nello Carrara”, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Via Panciatichi 56/30, I-50127 Firenze, Italy*

(Dated: January 9, 2022)

The surface magnetic canting (SMC) of a semi-infinite film with ferromagnetic exchange interaction and competing bulk and surface anisotropies is investigated via a nonlinear mapping formulation of mean-field theory previously developed by our group [L. Trallori *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **10**, 1935-1988 (1996)], and extended to the case where an external magnetic field is applied to the system. When the field H_{\parallel} is parallel to the film plane, the condition for SMC is found to be the same as that recently reported by Popov and Pappas [Phys. Rev. B **64**, 184401 (2001)]. The case of a field H_{\perp} applied perpendicularly to the film plane is also investigated. In both cases, the zero-temperature equilibrium configuration is easily determined by our theoretical approach.

PACS numbers: 75.70.Rf, 75.70.-i, 75.30.Kz

Recently Popov and Pappas¹ - motivated by their previous valuable experimental work² on the magnetic properties of an ultrathin (1.5 monolayers-thick) Fe film grown on the surface of a 15nm-thick Gd(0001) film - determined the zero-temperature phase diagram of a semi-infinite Heisenberg ferromagnet, with exchange constant $J > 0$, subject to a surface anisotropy, K_S , competitive with the bulk one, K_B . In the mean-field approximation, since the system is inhomogeneous only along one direction (*i.e.*, the normal to the surface), the problem is reduced to consider the energy of the one-dimensional model¹

$$E = -J \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \cos(\theta_n - \theta_{n+1}) + K_S \sin^2 \theta_1 + K_B \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sin^2 \theta_n - g\mu_B H_{\parallel} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \cos \theta_n \quad (1)$$

where θ_n is the angle formed by the classical vector moment of the n -th layer with the film plane. To fix ideas, in the following we will assume $K_B > 0$ (*i.e.*, the bulk anisotropy favours the alignment of the vector moments along the film plane, $\theta = 0$) and $K_S < 0$ (*i.e.*, the surface anisotropy favours the alignment along the film normal, $\theta = \pi/2$). H_{\parallel} denotes an external magnetic field applied parallel to the film plane.

Expanding the energy in Eq. (1) to second order for each θ_n , $E \approx E_0 + \theta^T A \theta$, and performing a stability analysis, Popov and Pappas¹ showed that it is possible to have surface magnetic canting (SMC) provided that

$$k_S + 1 + h_{\parallel} < \frac{1}{k_B - (k_S - 1)} \quad (2)$$

where $k_S = 2K_S/J$, $k_B = 2K_B/J$ and $h_{\parallel} = g\mu_B H_{\parallel}/J$. Hence it follows that for $k_S < -1 - h_{\parallel}$, the surface is always canted whatever the value of the in-plane bulk anisotropy; otherwise there is SMC for $|K_S|$ exceeding a threshold value which depends on K_B , J and H_{\parallel} .

Surely, the theoretical analysis of Popov and Pappas¹ is quite original and valuable. However, it is worth noting that, in the special case $H_{\parallel} = 0$, a condition for surface magnetic canting analogous to Eq. (2) was obtained by our group some years ago³ using a rather different method: *i.e.*, a nonlinear mapping formulation of mean-field theory.^{4,5,6,7,8,9} Within this framework, the properties of a magnetic film are formulated as a problem in nonlinear dynamics, in terms of an area-preserving map, where the surfaces are introduced as appropriate boundary conditions. In this Brief Report, using the method developed in Refs. 4,5,6,7,8,9, not only we obtain the condition for surface magnetic canting, but also we calculate the zero-temperature magnetization profile of the film, both in the case of the model, Eq. (1), considered by Popov and Pappas¹, and in the case that a magnetic field is applied perpendicularly to the film plane, see Eq. (16) below.¹⁰

Let us summarize our method. The equilibrium configurations of the semi-infinite ($n \geq 1$) film are obtained from Eq. (1) by θ_n -derivation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial E}{\partial \theta_n} &= J \sin(\theta_n - \theta_{n+1}) - J \sin(\theta_{n-1} - \theta_n)(1 - \delta_{n,1}) \\ &+ K_S \sin(2\theta_n)\delta_{n,1} + K_B \sin(2\theta_n)(1 - \delta_{n,1}) \\ &+ g\mu_B H_{\parallel} \sin \theta_n = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Introducing the variables $s_n = \sin(\theta_n - \theta_{n-1})$, in the bulk ($n \geq 2$) we obtain the nonlinear mapping

$$\begin{aligned} Js_{n+1} &= Js_n + K_B \sin(2\theta_n) + g\mu_B H_{\parallel} \sin \theta_n \\ \theta_{n+1} &= \theta_n + \sin^{-1}(s_{n+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

while on the surface plane $n = 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} Js_2 &= K_S \sin(2\theta_1) + g\mu_B H_{\parallel} \sin \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 &= \theta_1 + \sin^{-1}(s_2) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The map, Eq. (4), is area-preserving because its Jacobian determinant is 1

$$\det \hat{J} = \det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial s_{n+1}}{\partial s_n} & \frac{\partial s_{n+1}}{\partial \theta_n} \\ \frac{\partial \theta_{n+1}}{\partial s_n} & \frac{\partial \theta_{n+1}}{\partial \theta_n} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathcal{S}(\theta_n) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-s_{n+1}^2}} & 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-s_{n+1}^2}} \mathcal{S}(\theta_n) \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{S}(\theta_n) = \frac{2K_B}{J} \cos(2\theta_n) + \frac{g\mu_B H_{\parallel}}{J} \cos \theta_n$. The trajectories in (θ, s) space are associated with equilibrium configurations, while the fixed points of the map correspond to uniform ground states of the bulk system. For $K_S < 0$ and $K_B > 0$, the hyperbolic fixed point: $(\theta_{\infty}, s_{\infty}) = (0, 0)$ represents the energetically stable bulk configuration, while the elliptic fixed point: $(\theta_{\infty}, s_{\infty}) = (\pi/2, 0)$ represents an unstable bulk configuration.

Now we observe that, by introducing a fictitious plane $n = 0$, characterized by the angle θ_0 and the variable $s_1 = \sin(\theta_1 - \theta_0)$, the nonlinear mapping Eq. (4), valid in the bulk ($n \geq 2$), can be assumed to hold even for $n = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} J s_2 &= J s_1 + K_B \sin(2\theta_1) + g\mu_B H_{\parallel} \sin \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 &= \theta_1 + \sin^{-1}(s_2) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

provided that the following boundary condition is satisfied

$$s_1 = \frac{K_S - K_B}{J} \sin(2\theta_1). \quad (8)$$

Thus, among all trajectories in (θ, s) space obtained from Eqs. (4)(7), only those which satisfy Eq. (8) represent equilibrium configurations for the semi-infinite ferromagnet.

By linearizing the map in the neighborhood of a fixed point,¹¹ one is led to solve the eigenvalue equation

$$\lambda^2 - \text{Tr} \hat{J} \lambda + \det \hat{J} = 0 \quad (9)$$

Near the hyperbolic fixed point $(\theta_{\infty}, s_{\infty}) = (0, 0)$, one obtains two real eigenvalues ($\lambda_1 < 1$, $\lambda_2 > 1$)

$$\lambda_{1,2} = 1 + \frac{\mathcal{S}(\theta_{\infty})}{2} \mp \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{S}(\theta_{\infty})}{2} \left[2 + \frac{\mathcal{S}(\theta_{\infty})}{2} \right]} \quad (10)$$

and the slopes, in the (θ, s) phase space, of the orbit inflowing to ("1") and outflowing from ("2") the hyperbolic fixed point are, respectively

$$m_{1,2} = \left. \frac{\frac{\partial s_{n+1}}{\partial \theta_n}}{\lambda_{1,2} - \frac{\partial s_{n+1}}{\partial s_n}} \right|_{(0,0)} \quad (11)$$

Within this theoretical framework, the condition for surface magnetic canting is that m_s , the (negative) slope of the boundary condition curve Eq. (8), calculated in the hyperbolic fixed point

$$m_s = \left. \frac{ds_1}{d\theta_1} \right|_{(0,0)} = \frac{2(K_S - K_B)}{J} \quad (12)$$

should be smaller than m_1 , the (negative) slope of the trajectory inflowing to the hyperbolic fixed point, see

FIG. 1: Map phase portraits calculated from Eqs. (4)(7) using Hamiltonian parameters $J = 1$, $K_B = 0.1$, $K_S = -0.3$ for different values of a magnetic field H_{\parallel} applied parallel to the film plane: (a) $g\mu_B H_{\parallel} = 0$; (b) 0.05; (c) 0.155 (threshold value, see Eq. (15)); (d) 0.3. The dashed curve represents the boundary condition at the surface, Eq. (8). Arrows denote inflowing and outflowing trajectories associated with hyperbolic fixed points.

Eq. (11). Thus, the condition for surface magnetic canting turns out to be

$$\frac{2(K_S - K_B)}{J} < \frac{\mathcal{S}(\theta_{\infty})}{\frac{\mathcal{S}(\theta_{\infty})}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{S}(\theta_{\infty})}{2} \left[2 + \frac{\mathcal{S}(\theta_{\infty})}{2} \right]}} \quad (13)$$

Taking into account that $K_S < 0$ and $K_B > 0$, this equation can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|K_S|}{J} &> \frac{2K_B + g\mu_B H_{\parallel}}{4J} \sqrt{1 + \frac{4J}{2K_B + g\mu_B H_{\parallel}}} \\ &- \frac{2K_B - g\mu_B H_{\parallel}}{4J} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which is readily seen to be completely equivalent to Eq. (2). Thus, in the case of external magnetic field parallel to the film plane, for sufficiently high surface anisotropy (*i.e.*, $2|K_S| > J + g\mu_B H_{\parallel}$), the surface is always canted whatever the value of K_B . Otherwise, there is SMC for $|K_S|$ exceeding a threshold value which depends on K_B , J and H_{\parallel} : see Eq. (14).

In Fig. 1 we report the different map phase portraits obtained from Eqs. (4)(7) for different, increasing values of H_{\parallel} . The boundary condition curve - which does not depend on the value of H_{\parallel} , see Eq. (8) - is also reported (dashed line). In zero field, $H_{\parallel} = 0$ (see Fig. 1a), for the chosen values of the parameters, the condition, Eq. (13), for the slopes m_s and m_1 calculated in the hyperbolic fixed point, is satisfied: thus, the configuration with surface magnetic canting is the ground state. As H_{\parallel} is increased, the slope m_1 of the trajectory inflowing to $(\theta_{\infty}, s_{\infty}) = (0, 0)$ becomes more negative and θ_1 decreases (see Fig. 1b). Finally, for $H_{\parallel} \geq H_{C\parallel}$, where $H_{C\parallel}$ is a threshold value given by

$$g\mu_B H_{C\parallel} = \frac{[2(K_B - K_S)]^2}{J + 2(K_B - K_S)} - 2K_B, \quad (15)$$

the boundary condition curve is no more intersected: thus, the uniform configuration with all spins parallel to the film plane becomes energetically favoured (see Figs. 1c,d).

Let us now consider a semi-infinite ferromagnetic film ($J > 0$) with competing surface and bulk anisotropies ($K_S < 0$, $K_B > 0$) and with an external magnetic field applied perpendicularly to the film plane.¹⁰ The energy

FIG. 2: Map phase portraits calculated from Eq. (17) using Hamiltonian parameters $J = 1$, $K_B = 0.1$, $K_S = -0.3$ for different values of a magnetic field H_\perp applied perpendicularly to the film plane: (a) $g\mu_B H_\perp = 0$; (b) 0.10; (c) 0.20 (threshold value, $g\mu_B H_{C\perp} = 2K_B$); (d) 0.3. The dashed curve represents the boundary condition at the surface, Eq. (8). Arrows denote inflowing and outflowing trajectories associated with hyperbolic fixed points.

is

$$E = -J \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \cos(\theta_n - \theta_{n+1}) + K_S \sin^2 \theta_1 + K_B \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sin^2 \theta_n - g\mu_B H_\perp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sin \theta_n \quad (16)$$

The map equations are now ($n \geq 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} Js_{n+1} &= Js_n + K_B \sin(2\theta_n) - g\mu_B H_\perp \cos \theta_n \\ \theta_{n+1} &= \theta_n + \sin^{-1}(s_{n+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

while the boundary condition at the surface plane turns out to be the same as in the case of in-plane magnetic field, Eq. (8). The Jacobian determinant takes the same form as in Eq. (6): the only difference is that now $\mathcal{S}(\theta_n) = \frac{2K_B}{J} \cos(2\theta_n) + \frac{g\mu_B H_\perp}{J} \sin \theta_n$. In contrast with the case of in-plane field, now the hyperbolic fixed point $(\theta_\infty, s_\infty)$ is characterized by an angle, θ_∞ , which depends on the field intensity

$$\theta_\infty = \begin{cases} \sin^{-1} \left[\frac{g\mu_B H_\perp}{2K_B} \right] & , \text{ for } g\mu_B H_\perp < 2K_B, \\ \frac{\pi}{2} & , \text{ for } g\mu_B H_\perp \geq 2K_B \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

and $s_\infty = 0$. In Fig. 2 we report different map phase portraits, obtained from Eq. (17) calculated for different, increasing values of H_\perp . The boundary condition curve Eq. (8), independent of the value of H_\perp , is also reported (dashed line). It is apparent from the map topology (see Figs. 2a,b) that for $0 < H_\perp < H_{C\perp}$, where $g\mu_B H_{C\perp} = 2K_B$ is a threshold field value, one does have surface magnetic canting even in the case that SMC is absent for zero field. In contrast, for $H_\perp \geq H_{C\perp}$ (see Figs. 2c,d), no intersection is possible between the boundary condition curve and the trajectory inflowing in the hyperbolic fixed point $(\theta_\infty, s_\infty) = (\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)$: thus, the uniform configuration with all spins perpendicular to the film plane becomes the ground state.

In Fig. 3a,b we report the zero-temperature equilibrium configurations of the semi-infinite film obtained via the map method for different values of the intensity of an external magnetic field, applied in-plane or perpendicularly to the plane, respectively. In both cases we have chosen Hamiltonian parameters which, in zero field, give rise to surface magnetic canting. We observe that as the in-plane field H_\parallel is increased (see Fig. 3a from top to bottom), the surface angle θ_1 decreases until, for $H_\parallel \geq H_{C\parallel}$, a uniform configuration with all spin in-plane

FIG. 3: (a) Equilibrium configurations of the semi-infinite film with Hamiltonian parameters $J = 1$, $K_B = 0.1$, $K_S = -0.3$, as calculated from the map equations Eqs. (4)(7) and boundary condition at the surface Eq. (8). The different curves refer to selected values of $g\mu_B H_\parallel = 0, 0.10, 0.15$, and $H_\parallel > H_{C\parallel}$, see Eq. (15), with the field increasing from top to bottom. The lines are guides to the eye. (b) The same as in (a), but for magnetic field applied perpendicularly to the film plane. The different curves refer to selected values of $g\mu_B H_\perp = 0, 0.10, 0.15, 0.19$, and $H_\perp \geq H_{C\perp}$ (where $g\mu_B H_{C\perp} = 2K_B = 0.2$), with the field increasing from bottom to top.

is obtained. In contrast, in the case of increasing perpendicular field (see Fig. 3b from bottom to top), the surface angle θ_1 increases and so does the bulk angle θ_∞ , defined in Eq. (18). As $g\mu_B H_\perp$ reaches the threshold value $2K_B$, a uniform configurations with all spins perpendicular to the film plane is obtained.

It is worth noting that by the map method it is possible to calculate, with any desired accuracy, the equilibrium configuration even in the case of a film with a finite number N of spins, provided that the boundary condition on the second surface,^{6,8} $s_N = -\frac{K_S - K_B}{J} \sin(2\theta_N)$, is taken into account, in addition to Eq. (8).¹²

Finally, we observe that the approach described here can be used to investigate the zero-temperature magnetic properties of the Fe/Gd film,² provided that the model (1) is modified in order to account for the anti-ferromagnetic coupling between the Fe surface plane and the Gd underlying one.¹³ However, owing to the absence of frustration effects, only qualitative modifications to the results obtained here are expected. Moreover, it is worth noting that the non-uniform ground state is not affected by a surface enhancement of the exchange constant (which is present in the Fe/Gd film, since the 1.5 monolayers of Fe order at a Curie temperature substantially higher than Gd). In fact, since at $T = 0$ the magnetization of each plane takes the saturation value, the surface exchange only keeps the spins on the surface parallel to each other, without modifying their orientation with respect to the spins on the underlying plane: *i.e.*, at $T = 0$ the possibility of a non-uniform ground state only arises from the competition between surface and bulk anisotropies.⁸ In contrast, the interpretation of the quite interesting finite temperature properties of Fe/Gd films, like the two-step reorientation transition experimentally observed by Arnold *et al.*,² would require not only an improvement of model (1) but also a much more refined analysis. In fact, at $T \neq 0$ both the modulus and the orientation of the magnetization vary with the plane index, so that the dimensionality of the map increases and the equilibrium configuration of the film cannot generally be calculated without resorting to some approximation.⁷

In conclusion, a mean-field theoretical method, where the equilibrium properties of a magnetic film are formulated in terms of an area-preserving map and the sur-

faces are introduced as appropriate boundary conditions, was exploited in this paper. In particular, the model of a semi-infinite Heisenberg ferromagnet with competing bulk and surface anisotropies was investigated when an external magnetic field is applied parallel or perpendicular to the film surface. In both cases, the condition for surface magnetic canting as well as the zero-temperature equilibrium configuration were easily determined by such

a theoretical approach.

Acknowledgments

This paper is dedicated to our colleague and friend Matteo Amato.

* Electronic address: mgpini@ifac.cnr.it

† Electronic address: rettori@fi.infn.it

¹ A.P. Popov and D.P. Pappas, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 184401 (2001).

² C. S. Arnold, D. P. Pappas and A. P. Popov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3305 (1999); J. Appl. Phys. **87**, 5478 (2000).

³ See Eq. (10) of Ref. 7 or Eq. (53) of Ref. 8. (Actually, this equation was firstly reported - with a misprint - in Ref. 6.) In these papers, SMC was denoted as "surface magnetic reconstruction". It should be noted that these equations differ slightly from Eq. (2) or, equivalently, from Eq. (14) of the present Brief Report just because, in Refs. 7 and 8, the bulk anisotropy was assumed to be present also on the $n = 1$ plane, in addition to the surface anisotropy.

⁴ L. Trallori, P. Politi, A. Rettori, M.G. Pini and J. Villain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1925 (1994).

⁵ L. Trallori, P. Politi, A. Rettori, M.G. Pini and J. Villain, J. Phys.: Cond. Matt. **7** L451 (1995).

⁶ A. Rettori, L. Trallori, P. Politi, M.G. Pini and M. Macciò, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **140-144**, 639 (1995).

⁷ M. Macciò, M.G. Pini, L. Trallori, P. Politi and A. Rettori, Phys. Lett. **A205**, 327 (1995).

⁸ L. Trallori, M.G. Pini, A. Rettori, M. Macciò and P. Politi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **10**, 1935-1988 (1996).

⁹ M. Amato, M.G. Pini, and A. Rettori, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 3414 (1999).

¹⁰ Such a model was not considered by the authors in Ref. 1.

¹¹ In practice, such a linearization procedure is equivalent to the second order θ_n -expansion of the energy in Eq. (1), performed by Popov and Pappas.¹

¹² In the finite film case, the non-uniform ground state configuration is found to be associated with elliptic trajectories.^{6,8}

¹³ S.L. Gnatchenko, A.B. Chizhik, D.N. Merenkov, V.V. Ere-
menko, H. Szymczak, R. Szymczak, K. Fronc, and R. Zu-
berek, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **186**, 139 (1998).





