

Exploring dynamical magnetism with time-dependent density-functional theory: from spin fluctuations to Gilbert damping

Klaus Capelle

Instituto de Química de São Carlos
Departamento de Química e Física Molecular
Universidade de São Paulo, Caixa Postal 780
13560-970 São Carlos, SP, Brazil

Balázs L. Györffy

H. H. Wills Physics Laboratory
University of Bristol, Tyndall Av.
Bristol BS8 1TL, U.K.

December 25, 2021

PACS: 71.15Mb, 75.10Lp

Abstract

We use time-dependent spin-density-functional theory to study dynamical magnetic phenomena. First, we recall that the local-spin-density approximation (LSDA) fails to account correctly for magnetic fluctuations in the paramagnetic state of iron and other itinerant ferromagnets. Next, we construct a gradient-dependent density functional that does not suffer from this problem of the LSDA. This functional is then used to derive, for the first time, the phenomenological Gilbert equation of micromagnetics directly from time-dependent density-functional theory. Limitations and extensions of Gilbert damping are discussed on this basis, and some comparisons with phenomenological theories and experiments are made.

The collective behaviour of spins of mobile, correlated electrons that gives rise to metallic magnetism is still only imperfectly understood. The problem arising in micromagnetics [1] or spintronics [2], to mention but two subjects of current technological interest that involve itinerant magnetism, are therefore often dealt with within the framework of the frankly phenomenological Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equations, or semi-phenomenological models whose foundation in material-specific microscopic theory remains incomplete. On the other hand, first-principles spin-density-functional theory (SDFT), which gives a more or less adequate account of the ground state, fails even to address directly the issue of time dependence of the magnetization. Clearly, under these circumstances it is worthwhile to inquire what physical insight may be gained by approaching the problem from the novel point of view afforded by time-dependent SDFT (TD-SDFT) [3, 4]. Our aim here is to explore the potential benefits and difficulties of such enterprise.

In the present paper we thus (i) explain why the popular local-spin-density approximation (LSDA), on its own, cannot account for the magnetic fluctuations at and above the Curie temperature, not even when combined with TD-SDFT; (ii) construct a new gradient-dependent density-functional that does not suffer from this problem of the LSDA; and (iii) use this functional to give a microscopic derivation of the phenomenological Gilbert equation of micromagnetics. This equation has recently been invoked for the phenomenological interpretation of experiments on magnetic nanolayers [5], but has never before been derived microscopically from density-functional theory.

Let us first consider fluctuations in the paramagnetic phase. Among the low-lying excitations of a ferromagnet above the Curie temperature are spin fluctuations. Temporarily, in the neighbourhood of an atom, these fluctuations give rise to magnetic moments that average to zero on a sufficiently long time scale. A convenient way to describe this is by introducing the average magnetization

$$\bar{m}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau dt m(\mathbf{r}; t); \quad (1)$$

where $m(\mathbf{r}; t)$ is the space and time-dependent magnetization density obtained, in principle, from solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation for the many-electron problem, and τ is the averaging time.

Consider now the behaviour of this average magnetization as a function of τ . Right after a magnetic fluctuation has given rise to a magnetic moment on a given site, the average $\bar{m}(\mathbf{r})$ will be different from zero. Moreover, this moment certainly persists until τ is of the order of the hopping time to the

nearest neighbour, T_h , which can be estimated by the inverse band width, $\hbar=W$. On the other hand, for times much longer than the one characteristic for thermal fluctuations of the magnetic moment, T_{fluc} , the average over all configurations of $m(r;t)$ is zero. These two regimes, one with short-term local moments the other with no magnetic moments, exist in any ferromagnet above the Curie temperature. Depending on the values of band width and Curie temperature there may also be a third regime, characterized by averaging times satisfying $\hbar=W \ll \tau \ll T_{fluc}$. In this case electrons hop from site to site, but maintain sufficiently strong correlations to prevent immediate destruction of the local magnetic moments by thermal fluctuations. This latter regime has been addressed by the disordered-local moment picture [6] in which the electronic hopping is treated with DFT, and the much slower behaviour of the local moments is dealt with by using statistical mechanics.

We now ask whether the above, widely accepted physical picture can be recovered within TD-SDFT. On a formal level there is no reason to expect otherwise, since TD-SDFT is an exact transcription of the time-dependent many-body problem, subject only to quite weak v -representability conditions [7], but the situation is different when one considers the approximations for the density-functional that are necessary to perform an actual calculation. The simplest time-dependent density functional is the adiabatic LSDA, or ALSDA [3]. This functional is a straightforward generalization of the conventional LSDA of ground-state DFT, from which it can be obtained by simply substituting the time-dependent densities $n(r;t)$ and $m(r;t)$ for the ground-state densities $n(r)$ and $m(r)$.

The first objective of this paper is to point out that a treatment of magnetic fluctuations within the ALSDA can never correctly account for the observed magnetic fluctuations. To understand why, we only have to consider the TD-SDFT equation of motion for the spin degrees of freedom. Neglecting spin currents, this equation takes the form [4]

$$\frac{\partial m(r;t)}{\partial t} = -\gamma m(r;t) [B_{ext}(r;t) + B_{xc}(r;t)]; \quad (2)$$

where B_{ext} is the externally applied magnetic field, γ the gyromagnetic ratio, and $B_{xc}(r;t)$ is the exchange-correlation (xc) magnetic field of TD-SDFT. Within the ALSDA this field is calculated as

$$B_{xc}^{ALSDA}(r;t) = -\frac{E^{LSDA}[n(r);m(r)]}{m(r)}; \quad (3)$$

where E^{LSDA} is the LSDA functional of static SDFT. Within the LSDA B_{xc} is locally parallel to m and hence drops out of equation (2). In the absence of an externally applied magnetic field this equation then predicts a time-independent magnetization density $m(r;t) = \text{const.}$ Within the LSDA the average magnetization $m(r)$ is thus independent of the averaging time, and the LSDA is seen to be unable to account for the three different regimes described above. The LSDA thus does not capture the dynamics of magnetic fluctuations.

This does of course not imply that previous LSDA-based calculations of spin fluctuations [6, 8], which have had considerable empirical success, are wrong. Such calculations typically avoid the problem by bringing in concepts from outside of that framework, such as external constraining fields that are not recalculated selfconsistently, adiabaticity assumptions for the spin dynamics, fitting to model Hamiltonians, identification of Kohn-Sham energies with excitation energies and the Kohn-Sham susceptibility with the many-body one, etc. However, it would clearly be desirable to have an approach that is exclusively based on TD-SDFT, without the need for additional approximations and assumptions. This observation provides the motivation for the development, in the present paper, of a prototype density functional that is designed to avoid the problems of LSDA.

To this end, note first that the problem is an intrinsic deficiency of the adiabatic LSDA, which persists even if the functional is formulated in a non-collinear way, i.e., in terms of the full magnetization vector $m(r;t)$ instead of the more common variables $n_{\uparrow}(r;t)$ and $n_{\downarrow}(r;t)$. In Ref. [4] we found that the simplest way to graft a nontrivial spin dynamics onto the functional is to include gradient terms. However, not any gradients will do the job. First of all, the gradients must involve all components of the magnetization vector. This discards all standard GGA-type functionals, which are explicitly formulated for the z -component only and can therefore not account for directional fluctuations of the magnetic moments. Second, the functional must satisfy the zero-torque theorem (ZTT), which states that the net torque exerted by B_{xc} on the system as a whole must vanish [4]:

$$\int d^3r m(r;t) \cdot B_{xc}(r;t) = 0: \quad (4)$$

Guided by these considerations we now construct a simple model for a B_{xc} functional that avoids the problems of the LSDA. Our starting point is

the following (still completely general) representation of B_{xc} as

$$B_{xc}(\mathbf{r};t) = \int_1^Z d^3\mathbf{r}^0 \int_t^{Z_t} dt^0 \hat{K}[\mathbf{n};\mathbf{m}](\mathbf{r};\mathbf{r}^0;t;t^0) m(\mathbf{r}^0;t^0); \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{K}[\mathbf{n};\mathbf{m}](\mathbf{r};\mathbf{r}^0;t;t^0)$ is an, as yet undetermined, tensorial kernel, characteristic for the spin-spin interactions. To make contact with the phenomenological theories discussed below we now assume that \hat{K} is a short-ranged isotropic function of the form $\hat{K}(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}^0;t-t^0)$. This isotropy assumption is reasonable if B_{xc} and \mathbf{m} , and therefore also \hat{K} , are interpreted as averages over intraatomic distances, as is the case in the phenomenological theories [9]. Due to the short-rangedness of \hat{K} we can then expand the vector $m(\mathbf{r}^0;t^0)$ under the integral in Eq. (5) about the point \mathbf{r} and the time t ,

$$m(\mathbf{r}^0;t^0) = m(\mathbf{r};t) + (\mathbf{r}^0 - \mathbf{r}) \cdot \nabla m(\mathbf{r};t) + \frac{1}{2} [(\mathbf{r}^0 - \mathbf{r}) \cdot \nabla]^2 m(\mathbf{r};t) + (t^0 - t) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} m(\mathbf{r};t) + \dots; \quad (6)$$

where we have kept first-order terms in the temporal variation, $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} m(\mathbf{r};t) = \dot{m}(\mathbf{r};t)$, and second-order terms in the spatial one. As will become apparent later, it is these orders that are required to make contact with phenomenological theories. Based on experience with similar expansions in static SDFT, nonlinear terms in \mathbf{m} (which would correspond to cubic or higher-order terms in E_{xc}) are not included in this expansion. B_{xc} then becomes

$$B_{xc}(\mathbf{r};t) = \hat{K}_0(t) m(\mathbf{r};t) + \hat{K}_2(t) r^2 m(\mathbf{r};t) + \hat{\Lambda}(t) \dot{m}(\mathbf{r};t); \quad (7)$$

with

$$\hat{K}_0(t) = 4 \int_1^Z dt^0 \int_1^{Z_1} d\mathbf{x} x^2 \hat{K}(\mathbf{x};t-t^0) \quad (8)$$

$$\hat{K}_2(t) = 2 \int_1^Z dt^0 \int_1^{Z_1} d\mathbf{x} x^4 \hat{K}(\mathbf{x};t-t^0) \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{\Lambda}(t) = 4 \int_1^Z dt^0 \int_1^{Z_1} d\mathbf{x} x^2 (t-t^0) \hat{K}(\mathbf{x};t-t^0); \quad (10)$$

and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0$. Substituting this in the equation of motion (2) we obtain

$$\frac{h}{m(\mathbf{r};t)} \nabla \cdot \nabla m(\mathbf{r};t) = \mathbb{B}_{ext}(\mathbf{r};t) + B_{xc}(\mathbf{r};t) = \hat{K}_0(t) m(\mathbf{r};t) + \hat{K}_2(t) r^2 m(\mathbf{r};t) + \hat{\Lambda}(t) \dot{m}(\mathbf{r};t); \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) constitutes a tensorial generalization of the Gilbert equation of micromagnetics [1, 5]. That equation is usually written as

$$\dot{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{r};t) = \gamma \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{r};t) \times \mathbf{B}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r};t) + \frac{\gamma}{M_s} \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{r};t) \times \dot{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{r};t); \quad (12)$$

where \mathbf{B}_{eff} is a phenomenological effective field comprising external and exchange fields, M_s is the saturation magnetization, and γ is the so called Gilbert damping constant [1, 5]. We see that our equation (11) reduces to an equation of the form (12) if the kernels we assumed for generality to be tensors are taken to be scalars, and their intrinsic time-dependence is neglected.

Interestingly, after the reduction of tensors to scalars the first two terms (containing K_0 and K_2) in \mathbf{B}_{xc} satisfy the ZTT identically. On the other hand, the Gilbert damping term on its own is not guaranteed to satisfy the ZTT. Since the latter is an exact constraint that must be obeyed by any effective field to be used in the equation of motion (2), this must be considered a deficiency of the simple form of the Gilbert damping or, equivalently, the linearization of the expression (5) for $\mathbf{B}_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r};t)$. Another limitation of Gilbert theory that becomes apparent from our derivation is that in general the coefficients in Eq. (11) are time dependent, while those in Eq. (12) are not. This time-dependence can give rise to additional dynamics and damping that is not described by the Gilbert term. Below we will show that there is a simple model within which one can rationalize this lack of intrinsic time dependence of the coefficients.

Carrying on, momentarily, with time-independent scalars K_0 and K_2 instead of time-dependent tensors, we can write the \mathbf{B}_{xc} functional as

$$\mathbf{B}_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r};t) = K_0 \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{r};t) + K_2 r^2 \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{r};t) + \dot{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{r};t); \quad (13)$$

where K_0 , K_2 , and γ are numbers that characterize the spin-spin interaction kernel. The correspondence between the phenomenological and the microscopic equations, found above, shows one way in which these numbers can be obtained, since the parameters entering the Gilbert equation can be extracted from experiment or simulations [1]: The first term in Eq. (13) is of the form obtained in the LSDA, i.e., parallel to \mathbf{m} . (This observation implies that one can, in principle, determine K_0 from the LSDA.) Interestingly, the derivative terms in the expression (13) imply that the resulting \mathbf{B}_{xc} is not parallel to \mathbf{m} even when the coefficients are reduced from tensors to scalars. As a consequence they give, unlike the LSDA, rise to nontrivial spin dynamics

and spin fluctuations when substituted back into the equation of motion. To show why we expect the resulting spin dynamics to be essentially correct, in spite of the approximations made in the argument so far, let us, temporarily, neglect the damping term, and write $B_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r};t) = B_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r};t) + K_2 r^2 m(\mathbf{r};t)$ (the term containing K_0 does not contribute to the equations of motion in the scalar approximation). This is precisely of the form of the effective field entering the phenomenological Landau-Lifshitz equation [10], which is known to correctly account for the observed spin dynamics in ferromagnets. In this context K_2 is usually replaced by the spin wave stiffness D , which is related to our K_2 by $D = \hbar M_s K_2$ and can be obtained from experiment or independent calculations (see, e.g., Ref. [11] and references therein).

One way to completely fix the parameters in our functional is thus to determine K_0 from the LSDA, K_2 from the spin stiffness, and α from the Gilbert damping constant. Clearly, this empiricism diminishes the predictive power of the functional, and we will propose below a slightly less empirical strategy in its place. As it stands, the main virtue of the construction leading to Eqs. (11) and (13) is rather in its conceptual consequences: (i) it gives some degree of microscopic justification to the phenomenological approaches, and (ii) it shows what the term missing in the LSDA treatment of spin dynamics and spin fluctuations is, and how a simple prototype B_{xc} functional that has this term might look like.

The simple functional (13) is already sufficient to recover the two basic regimes for spin fluctuations above the Curie temperature, discussed in the introduction. To show this we substitute Eq. (13) into (11) and linearize by setting $m(\mathbf{r};t) = M_0 + n(\mathbf{r};t)$, where n describes small fluctuations about the equilibrium magnetization M_0 . The resulting set of coupled differential equations for n is readily identified as describing damped oscillations with frequency

$$\omega(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{\hbar}{2} \sqrt{h(\mathbf{q})^2 - \frac{k(\mathbf{q})^2}{4} + i \frac{k(\mathbf{q})}{2}}; \quad (14)$$

where $h(\mathbf{q}) = \hbar (B + q^2 M_s K_2) = (1 + \alpha^2) \omega_0 = (g_0 B + D q^2) = (1 + \alpha^2) \omega_0$, $B = \beta B_{\text{ext}}$, and $k(\mathbf{q}) = 2 \hbar \omega_0 \alpha^2 (1 + \alpha^2)$. Below the Curie temperature M_0 is the dominating contribution to $m(\mathbf{r};t)$ and to the average m of Eq. (1). Above this temperature $M_0 = 0$, and the time-averaged magnetic moment is entirely due to the damped spin fluctuations described by $n(\mathbf{r};t)$. As a consequence of the damping, the average magnetic moment is zero for sufficiently large α . On a time scale shorter than that set by the damping constant α , however,

the contribution of $n(r;t)$ to m does not vanish, and one obtains a transient magnetic moment. This fundamental separation of time scales is not obtained from the LDA, within which $\gamma = 0$ and there is no damping. Furthermore, in the absence of the external field B_{ext} the spin dynamics continues to be driven by the gradient term $\nabla \cdot K_2$, whereas in the LDA $K_2 = 0$ and there is no intrinsic spin dynamics at all (LDA $\gamma = 0$).

We now proceed to give a somewhat more microscopic characterization of the coefficients K_0 , K_2 and γ . To this end we recall that according to Eqs. (8) to (10) these coefficients are all defined as certain integrals over the spin-spin interaction kernel $K(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0; t - t^0)$. A simple, but not unrealistic, model for the space and time dependence of this kernel is

$$K(\mathbf{x};t) = K e^{-x/\lambda} e^{-t/T}; \quad (15)$$

which amounts to assuming that spin-spin interactions decay exponentially both in space and time. The amplitude K in Eq. (15) is a measure for the strength of the spin-spin interaction, while λ measures its spatial range and T its temporal range, i.e., its memory. With this model for the spin-spin kernel the integrals (8) to (10) can be evaluated analytically, and one finds $K_0 = 8 K T^{-3}$, $K_2 = 48 K T^{-5} = 6^2 K_0$, and $\gamma = 8 K^{-1} T^2 = T K_0$. These relations have several interesting consequences. First of all, they replace the coefficients K_0 , K_2 and γ , which had been introduced above in a purely mathematical way, by the physically meaningful quantities K , λ and T . Second, although the kernel $K(\mathbf{x};t)$ in Eq. (15) has an explicit time dependence, the coefficients calculated with it depend only on the memory time T , and not on t itself. Within this model we can thus justify the replacement of time-dependent coefficients by static ones, made by the phenomenological theories [cf. our discussion of the limitations of conventional Gilbert damping, below Eq. (12)]. On the other hand, recent experiments report enhanced Gilbert damping in Fe-Au nanolayers [5]. In layered systems the isotropic exponential model (15) for K is, of course, unrealistic, and its main conclusion, the time-independence of K_0 , K_2 and γ , does not hold. The microscopic equation (11) then retains a time-dependence in its coefficients, and attempts to recast it in the form of the traditional Gilbert equation (with a time independent $\nabla \cdot K$) must result in the appearance of additional damping terms. Interestingly, additional damping has indeed been found necessary in various proposals [5] for explaining the experimental results.

Returning now to the model (15), we note that the expressions obtained from it for K_0 , K_2 , and γ can be used, together with the above connection

of these coefficients with the phenomenological parameters in the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equations, to deduce relations between the latter and the microscopic parameters K , γ , and T . An interesting example is

$$\gamma = \frac{\gamma_s}{6\hbar} \frac{TD}{M_s K_0} = \frac{\gamma_s}{6\hbar M_s K_0} D; \quad (16)$$

which shows how the microscopic quantities γ_s and T (characterizing the spatial range and memory of the spin-spin interaction kernel) are related to the macroscopic parameters γ (Gilbert damping), M_s (saturation magnetization) and D (spin stiffness). To test the consistency of these relations we now connect them to another semi-phenomenological approach, namely Stoner theory. Recall that in that theory there are no gradient-dependent terms, since it can be interpreted as a linearized LSDA. If we use it to evaluate γ_s we thus expect that the gradient-dependent terms in our functional disappear. This is indeed the case: In Stoner theory the proportionality factor between the effective magnetic field and the local magnetization is just $1=2\mu_B$ times the Stoner parameter I . Hence $K_0 = I = (2\mu_B)^{-1}$. Plugging this into the preceding equation and using for I , D , and M_s the experimental values for iron, we find that $\gamma_s = 0.18 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}$. This value, which is much shorter than the lattice constant in iron ($2.7 \times 10^{-10} \text{m}$), shows that Stoner theory is indeed a local theory, in which spin-spin interactions decay very rapidly. It also shows, through the relation $K_2 = 6\mu_B^2 K_0$, that the gradient-dependent terms in our functional are strongly suppressed when one uses Stoner theory to evaluate them, as expected.

Finally, we point out that the time average of our expression for B_{xc} , Eq. (13), can also be interpreted as a magnetic equation of state [12], and used to extract the equilibrium magnetization. Naturally, in the paramagnetic state the time-dependence of $B_{xc}(r;t)$ is due to fluctuations only, and the long-time average of $B_{xc}(r;t)$ is zero. In the ferromagnetic state, on the other hand, this average remains finite. Upon including a cubic term in m in the expansion and calculating the average according to Eq. (1), we indeed recover the usual equations of spin-fluctuation theory [12], determining the equilibrium magnetization and the Curie temperature. Here, however, they are obtained by invoking the ergodic theorem, characterizing equilibrium via temporal averaging instead of by thermal averages.

The main results of this work are as follows: We have shown that the LSDA fails to account for spin fluctuations near the Curie temperature, even

when it is made time-dependent (ALSDA) and fully noncollinear. We next identified certain gradient-dependent terms as the key missing ingredient in the ALSDA, and constructed a very simple prototype functional that contains these gradients. Although simple, this functional gives rise to a still quite general equation of motion for the spin degrees of freedom, which can be identified as a microscopic version of the equations of motion of Landau-Lifshitz and of Gilbert. This identification provides microscopic support for these phenomenological theories and opens up a way for the empirical determination of the parameters in the functional. However, it also brings to light some shortcomings of the phenomenological approaches, which may be relevant for recent experiments. In summary, we have presented evidence that time-dependent SDFT may be a novel and useful alternative to constrained SDFT as a first-principles description of itinerant magnetism in metals.

Acknowledgments KC acknowledges useful discussions with J. Quintanilla and financial support from FAPESP. BLG is pleased to acknowledge a Röntgen Professorship at the University of Würzburg, during the tenure of which some of the above work was done.

References

- [1] W. F. Brown, *Micromagnetics* (Krieger, Melbourne, 1978). T. Schreier et al., *Adv. in Solid State Phys.* 41, 623 (2001).
- [2] S. A. Wolf et al., *Science* 294, 1488 (2001). G. A. Prinz, *Science* 282, 1660 (1998).
- [3] E. Runge and E. K. U. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 52, 997 (1984). E. K. U. Gross, J. F. Dobson, and M. Petersilka in *Topics in Current Chemistry* 181, R. Nalewajski ed., (Springer, Berlin, 1996).
- [4] K. Capelle, G. Vignale, and B. L. Gyorffy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 206403 (2001).
- [5] Y. Tserkovnyak, A. Brataas, and G. W. Bauer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88, 117601 (2002). R. Urban, G. Woltersdorf, and B. Heinrich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 217204 (2001).
- [6] B. L. Gyorffy, A. J. Pindor, J. B. Staunton, G. M. Stocks, and H. Winter, *J. Phys. F* 13, 1337 (1985).

- [7] R. van Leeuwen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 3863 (1999).
- [8] S. V. Halilov, et al., Phys. Rev. B 58, 293 (1998). R. Gebauer and S. Baroni, Phys. Rev. B 61, 6459 (2000). S. Y. Savrasov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2570 (1998). V. P. Antropov et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 729 (1995). D. M. Edwards, J. Magn. Mater. 45, 151 (1984). Q. Niu and L. Kleinman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2205 (1998).
- [9] A more microscopic justification is that on physical grounds one expects the spatial range of the spin-spin interactions to be at most a few interparticle distances. For systems in which the magnetization does not vary too rapidly in space compared with the range of \hat{K} (e.g., the low q regime of spin waves, or the variation of $m(r)$ across a domain wall) it is reasonable to assume that \hat{K} depends only on the distance between r and r^0 . Similarly, in equilibrium \hat{K} depends on time only through $t - t^0$ and the corresponding temporal range of the kernel (its memory) is expected to be short compared to the inverse spin wave frequency.
- [10] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, Statistical Physics Part II, Vol. 9 of E. M. Lifshitz and L. D. Landau Course of Theoretical Physics (Reed Publishing, Oxford, 1980).
- [11] J. Schwittalla and B. L. Gyory, Phys. Rev. B 63, 104423 (2001).
- [12] T. Moriya, Prog. Theor. Phys. 16, 23 (1965). K. K. Murata and S. Doniach, Phys. Rev. Lett. 29, 285 (1972). G. G. Lonzarich and L. Taillefer, J. Phys. C 18, 4339 (1985). P. Mohn and E. P. Wohlfarth, J. Phys. F 17, 2421 (1986).