

# Subharmonics and Aperiodicity in Hysteresis Loops

Joshua M. Deutsch and Onuttom Narayan

Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064.

(Dated: March 22, 2022)

We show that it is possible to have hysteretic behavior for magnets that does not form simple closed loops in steady state, but must cycle multiple times before returning to its initial state. We show this by studying the zero-temperature dynamics of the 3d Edwards Anderson spin glass. The specific multiple varies from system to system and is often quite large and increases with system size. The last result suggests that the magnetization could be aperiodic in the large system limit for some realizations of randomness. It should be possible to observe this phenomena in low-temperature experiments.

PACS numbers: PACS numbers: 05.40.-a, 44.10.+i, 05.70.Ln, 45.70.-n

Hysteresis in magnetic systems[1] is the prototype for understanding history dependent behavior in all complex systems.[2, 3, 4] Although the usual example of this is for ferromagnets, it can exist in other magnetic systems such as anti-ferromagnets[5] or spin glasses.[6, 7]

For magnetic systems, when one cycles adiabatically between a *large* positive and negative field  $H$ , the magnetization  $M$  forms a closed loop in the  $H - M$  plane because of saturation. There is an implicit expectation that even if the field were cycled repeatedly between two *moderate* values, the magnetization would settle down to a steady state closed loop, after some initial transient response. In this letter, we show that this expectation is often *wrong*. Many cycles of the external field are necessary to bring the magnetization back to its initial value, and that as the system size grows, so does the number of cycles needed.

We do this for Ising spin glass models: both short range and long range models violate the usual assumption of simple closed loops. Even in steady state, the magnetization returns to its initial value only after multiple cycles of the field. Another way of looking at this phenomenon, probably more relevant to real experiments, is that with a steady state oscillatory field the magnetization shows a subharmonic component. The number of cycles it takes for the magnetization to return varies from system to system, depending on the realization of the randomness, and can be very large. Our estimates suggest that this effect should be observable in nano-particles of spin glass material at very low temperatures.

This result might appear to be rather surprising as there are many cases when the strong result of “return point memory”[8, 9] can be shown: if a system starts at a field  $H_1$  and ends at a field  $H_2$ , its final state is independent of the time dependence of  $H$  as long as  $H$  is never outside the interval  $[H_1, H_2]$ . In the case above this would imply at most one transient cycle before the steady state closed loop was reached. An example of such a system is a random field Ising ferromagnet where an elegant proof of return point memory was given.[8] However the proof does not apply to cases where antiferromagnetic interactions are also present, such as a spin glass. We show below that in this case there is a much richer class

of memory effects.

Earlier work has reported subharmonic response in the magnetization of ferromagnetic materials subjected to oscillating magnetic fields. [10] It is a specific example of the general phenomenon of ferroresonance. However, this occurs when the magnetic material is part of an electrical circuit (e.g. as the core of an inductor) that is driven at finite frequency. Furthermore the intrinsic response of the ferromagnetic material is expected to show return point memory. From a dynamical systems viewpoint, this is simply the observation that a driven nonlinear oscillator can respond at a frequency different from the driving frequency, possibly depending on the initial conditions of the system. There has also been theoretical work on finite frequency hysteresis loops in ferromagnets.[11, 12, 13] In contrast, we only consider  $H$  fields that vary sufficiently slowly to be adiabatic and our non-return point effect is intrinsic to the material.

We consider the standard Edwards-Anderson spin glass Hamiltonian[14, 15] with Ising spins and nearest neighbor interactions in three dimensions,

$$\mathcal{H} = - \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{i,j} S_i S_j - H \sum_i S_i. \quad (1)$$

The coupling strengths  $J_{i,j}$  are chosen to be uniform random numbers between  $-1$  and  $1$ . The Ising spin variables  $S_i$  take values  $\pm 1$ . Because we expect to apply this model to granular materials, we employ free boundary conditions. Other boundary conditions have been verified to yield similar results. We use single spin-flip dynamics at zero temperature, and vary the magnetic field  $H$  adiabatically. Thus as the magnetic field is changed, a spin only flips if it is energetically favorable for it to do so. Once a spin flips, it can render other spins unstable. If more than one spin is unstable, it is important to have an algorithm that chooses the order that spins flip in a deterministic manner, to avoid introducing randomness into the system through the dynamics. Accordingly we flip the spin that lowers the energy the most. This process is repeated until all the spins are stable, after which the magnetic field can be further varied.[16]

We start the system at large  $H$  with all the spins positive and lower  $H$  to  $H_{min}$  adiabatically. The field is




FIG. 1: Steady-state magnetization as a function of magnetic field for a spin-glass with  $8^3$  spins. It can be seen that two cycles of the magnetic field are needed for the magnetization (and in fact the full spin configuration of the system) to return to its initial value.

then raised to  $H_{max}$ . Thereafter, the field is cycled repeatedly between these two extremal values. After an initial transient period, the system reaches steady state. In this steady state we determine the number of cycles of  $H$  that are required for the system to repeat its configuration. This varies randomly, depending on the coupling strengths  $J_{i,j}$ .

Clearly if  $H_{min}$  and  $H_{max}$  are too large in magnitude, the magnetization will saturate at the extremal points of the  $H$  cycles and the behavior seen is trivial. On the other hand, if the range of  $H$  is too small, hysteretic effects are minimal and behavior of the kind above will be hard to observe. By trying various values of the extremal fields, we find that it is best to choose them to be about half of the saturation field. Consequently we work with  $H_{max} = -H_{min} = -1.4$ .

Figure 1 shows an example of a system with linear dimension  $L = 8$ , *i.e.* with  $8^3$  spins, where the steady state behavior is a two-cycle, *i.e.* two cycles of the magnetic field correspond to one cycle in the magnetization. Even though the gap between the two halves of the magnetization loop is much smaller than the width of the loop itself, with an oscillatory magnetic field, it would be straightforward to detect the subharmonic response. Although more complicated cycles are often found, they are not shown in the figure for the sake of clarity.

More generally,  $m$  cycles of the magnetic field can be required for the (steady state) magnetization to return to its initial value. The distribution of  $m$  for systems of different sizes is shown in Table I. One observes that the larger the system size, the more likely it is to find long cycles. In fact for our largest size, with  $16^3$  spins, for about 1% of the systems we were unable to detect any periodicity even when checking for  $m$  up to 128. The fact that for the remaining systems, where periodicity was seen, the biggest value of  $m$  detected was 42, suggests

$m$	$L=4$	$L=8$	$L=16$
1	0.9343	0.68	0.052
2	0.0241	0.2342	0.503
3	0.0359	0.0481	0.044
4	0.0005	0.0179	0.109
5	0.0044	0.0056	0.006
6	0	0.0086	0.206
7	0.0006	0.0021	0
8	0	0.0010	0.007
9	0.0002	0.0011	0.002
10	0	0.0005	0.025
$> 10$	0	0.0009	0.046

TABLE I: Probability that  $m$  cycles of the magnetic field are required for the magnetization to return to its initial value, for systems of sizes  $4^3$ ,  $8^3$  and  $16^3$ . The number of systems considered for the three different sizes was  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  respectively. As  $L$  is increased, there is a greater probability of larger values of  $m$ .

the existence of truly aperiodic behavior[17].

Although Table I shows an increase in typical cycle size as the system is made larger, to some extent this is not caused by the dynamics becoming more complex, but because of the way that the cycle length is defined. For instance if the system were divisible into two independent halves, with a 6 and 7 cycle respectively, the full system would need 42 cycles to return to its original configuration. As the system is made larger, the number of such subsystems could proliferate, driving up the apparent cycle length. To eliminate this kind of behavior, it is useful to examine the power spectrum of these systems. One measures the magnetization at  $H_{min}$  and  $H_{max}$ , the extrema of the cycles of  $H$ . If the magnetization goes through an  $m$ -cycle, these measurements will have a periodicity of  $2m$ , while corresponding measurements of  $H$  would oscillate between  $H_{min}$  and  $H_{max}$ , exhibiting a periodicity of 2. The discrete Fourier transform of the magnetization measurements is taken and the power spectrum is calculated. In the case above, the spectrum will show peaks only at multiples of  $f = 1/6$  and  $f = 1/7$ , where  $f = 1$  is the frequency of the  $H$  field, whereas if the system were truly indivisible, peaks at multiples of  $f = 1/42$  would be observed. In addition, the power spectrum is crucial to detecting these effects experimentally, as we have discussed in connection with figure 1. Although in an experimental situation, one would measure the power spectrum for the full time dependent magnetization  $M(t)$  instead of considering only its values at the extrema of  $H$ , the discrete Fourier transform computed here should be a good indicator of the experimental results.

Figure 2 shows the power spectrum for  $L = 16$ . This is an average of the spectra for all the different  $m$ -cycles, weighted according to their probabilities (given in Table I. Sharp peaks are seen at discrete frequencies, with




FIG. 2: Average power spectrum for systems of  $8^3$  spins. The peaks at  $f = 1$  and  $f = 0$ , whose heights are approximately  $3 \times 10^4$ , have been suppressed. The power is concentrated at  $f = 1/2$ , with smaller peaks at other fractions.




FIG. 3: Low frequency average power spectrum for systems of  $4^3$  and  $16^3$  spins. (To avoid confusion with peaks, no tick marks are shown on the  $x$  axis.) There is substantially more power at low frequencies for  $16^3$  spins, and the spectrum extends down to  $1/f \approx 40$ , *i.e.* a 40-cycle that is indivisible.

the dominant peak at  $f = 1/2$ . Figure 3 is an enlarged plot of the power spectrum at low frequencies for  $L = 4$  and  $L = 16$ . Although small, the low frequency power is clearly greater for  $L = 16$ . In addition, the peaks go down to lower frequencies, demonstrating that the dynamics get more complex as  $L$  is increased in addition to the trivial growth in cycle length discussed in the previous paragraph.

In Figure 2 we have not plotted the two trivial peaks,

at  $f = 0$  and  $1$ . These are approximately  $10^5$  times the strength of the peak at  $f = 1/2$ . As one would expect from Table. I, the corresponding power spectrum for  $L = 4$  has much fewer peaks. However, the strength of the peaks is larger: the peak at  $f = 1/2$  is approximately  $10^{-4}$  times the strength of the peaks at  $f = 0$  and  $1$ . More generally, as  $L$  is varied, the strength of the trivial peaks will be proportional to the number of spins, *i.e.*  $L^3$ . Although the limited range of  $L$  that we have been able to simulate does not allow us to determine the dependence on  $L$  of the other peaks, for large  $L$  we might expect any system to behave as a collection of reasonably independent regions, and the strength of the low frequency peaks to be proportional to  $L^{3/2}$ . However, this argument is hazardous, since even a small coupling between different regions of the system might affect subtle details of the dynamics. On the basis of our numerics, we make the more conservative claim, that the strength of the low frequency peaks increases with  $L$ , while their relative strength (compared to the peaks at  $f = 0$  and  $1$ ) decreases with  $L$ . In a phase-locked experimental setup, the absolute rather than the relative strength of these peaks is important.

We now turn to experimental considerations. Nanoparticles of spin glass material, such as CuMn, with of order  $16^3$  separate spins would have a linear dimension of a few nanometers, which could be readily manufactured. In fact it should also be possible to reduce the grain size somewhat, although as discussed in the previous paragraph the subharmonic content is reduced. In order to eliminate possible problems from interaction between the grains, it would be advisable to coat or embed the grains in a neutral material to isolate them sufficiently from each other. With  $N_g$  independent grains, the strength of the signal would be proportional to  $\sqrt{N_g}$ .

As discussed earlier, the field should be varied over a range of order half the saturation field, which would be  $\sim 1T$ . The time dependence of the magnetic field should be sufficiently slow so as to evolve the spins adiabatically, and to prevent any significant eddy current heating. For the small grains that we consider, a frequency of the order of  $10Hz$  should be adequate.

The critical temperature  $T_c$  of *CuMn* is of order  $1K$ ; in order to see the effects that we have discussed, which are very small compared to the overall hysteresis loop, it is necessary to essentially eliminate thermal noise over the time scales we are interested in. With activated dynamics, it should be possible to achieve this if the temperature is of order  $10mK$ .

It should be possible to satisfy all these conditions in an experiment without too much difficulty. We note that recent work has found super spin glass behavior in nanoparticle multilayer composites [18] and in frozen ferrofluids [19], where the effective individual spins are large and  $T_c$  is correspondingly high. While this would render the phenomena we wish to observe accessible at higher temperatures, one should be careful because the satura-

tion field increases with  $T_c$ .

From a theoretical perspective, it is of interest to ask whether the results we have found here are generic for systems with hysteresis. As mentioned earlier in this paper, there are strong constraints on many ferromagnetic models that force them to have return point memory, precluding the possibility of multi-cycle hysteresis loops. Even with the spin glass model that we have considered in this paper, we find numerically that in one dimensional systems, when  $H$  is cycled repeatedly, the hysteresis loop always settles down to a one-cycle. However, steady state multi-cycles are seen in two dimensions, at rates comparable to those for three dimensional systems.

From a dynamical systems approach, it would be natural to expect a system with many interacting degrees of freedom to exhibit complex dynamical behavior, possibly even chaos. In order to verify whether this is indeed the source of the results reported here, we have carried out similar numerical simulations on the Sherrington Kirkpatrick model [20] for spin glasses, as an example of a coupled non-linear system with several degrees of freedom (the spins). We find that one needs a minimum of 5 spins to find multi-cycle steady state magnetization. In this case, one finds only three cycles and no others aside from the trivial closed loop case. The fraction of systems showing three cycles for 5 spins is low, approximately  $3 \times 10^{-4}$ . However this fraction rises steeply with the number of spins. One has to be careful in ap-

plying general results from dynamical systems, since the dynamics we consider here are of a special kind, being driven by energy minimization. For instance, with a time-independent magnetic field and any initial configuration, the system must evolve towards a fixed point. Further work in this direction may explain the essential ingredients necessary to see the behavior reported in this paper.

Our results for the SK model suggest that systems which are described by a Landau theory with five or more components to the order parameter might, in the correct parameter regime, show multi-cycle hysteresis behavior. This would have the advantage that the effect would show up in intensive quantities. As discussed earlier in this paper, for the spin-glass system we have considered here the non-return point effects for the average magnetization per spin should vanish in the large size limit. [6]

In conclusion, we have shown in this paper that hysteresis loops have much richer behavior than commonly assumed. For Ising spin glass models with zero temperature dynamics, a slowly varying cyclical magnetic field produces a subharmonic response in the magnetization. Our estimates indicate that this effect should be observable in low temperature experiments. Broader implications for other systems have been discussed.

We thank David Belanger, Peter Young and Steve Ford for useful discussions.

- 
- [1] C.P. Steinmetz, Trans. Am. Inst. Electr. Eng. **9**, 3 (1892); H. Barkhausen, Z. Phys. **20**, 401 (1919); F. Preisach, Z. Phys. **94**, 277 (1935).
  - [2] J. Katz, J. Phys. (Colloid) Chem. **53**, 1166 (1949); P.H. Emmett and M. Cines, J. Phys. (Colloid) Chem. **51**, 1248 (1947).
  - [3] Z.Z. Wang and N.P. Ong, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 5967 (1986).
  - [4] J. Ortin and L. Delaey, Intl. J. Non-linear Mech. **37**, 1275 (2002) and references therein; J. Ortin, J. Appl. Phys. **71**, 1454 (1992).
  - [5] P. Shukla, R. Roy and E. Ray, Physica A **275**, 380 (2000); Physica A **276**, 365 (2000).
  - [6] F. Pazmandi, G. Zarand and G.T. Zimanyi, Physica B **275**, 207 (2000).
  - [7] H.G. Katzgraber, F. Pazmandi, C.R. Pike, K. Liu, R.T. Scalettar, K.L. Verosub and G.T. Zimanyi, cond-mat/0205275.
  - [8] J.P. Sethna, K. Dahmen, S. Kartha, J.A. Krumhansl, B.W. Roberts and J.D. Shore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3347 (1993).
  - [9] J.A. Barker, D.E. Schreiber, B.G. Huth and D.H. Everett, Proc. R. Soc. London A **386**, 251 (1983); J. Ortin, J. Appl. Phys. **71**, 1454 (1992).
  - [10] H. Lamba, M. Grinfeld, S. McKee and R. Simpson, IEEE Trans. on Magn. **33**, 2495 (1997).
  - [11] I.F. Lyuksyutov, T. Nattermann and V. Pokrovsky, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 4260 (1999).
  - [12] D. Dhar and P.B. Thomas, J. Phys. A **25**, 4967 (1992); *ibid* **26**, 3973 (1993).
  - [13] S.W. Sides, R.A. Ramos, P.A. Rikvold and M.A. Novotny, J. Appl. Phys. **79**, 6482 (1996); *ibid* **81**, 5597 (1997).
  - [14] S.F. Edwards and P.W. Anderson, J. Phys. F **5**, 965 (1975).
  - [15] K.H. Fischer and J.A. Hertz, *Spin Glasses* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991) and references therein.
  - [16] The dynamics are the same as those of Ref.[7], but in that paper it is not specified what procedure is adopted when several spins become unstable.
  - [17] Although for any finite system it is inevitable that it will eventually become periodic.
  - [18] W. Kleemann, O. Petravic, Ch. Binek, G.N. Kakazei, Yu. G. Pogorelov, J.B. Sousa, S. Cardoso and P.P. Freitas, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 134423 (2001).
  - [19] T. Jonsson, J. Mattsson, C. Djurberg, F.A. Khan, P. Nordblad and P. Svedlindh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4138 (1995).
  - [20] D. Sherrington and S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 1972 (1975).