

'Hole-digging' in ensembles of tunneling molecular magnets

I. S. Tupitsyn^{1,2}, P. C. E. Stamp¹ and N. V. Prokof'ev^{2,3}¹ Physics Department,
and Canadian Institute for Advanced Research,
University of British Columbia, 6224 Agricultural Rd.,
Vancouver BC, Canada V6T 1Z1.² Russian Research Center "Kurchatov Institute",
Kurchatov Sq.1, Moscow 123182, Russia.³ Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts,
Amherst, MA 01003, USA

The nuclear spin-mediated quantum relaxation of ensembles of tunneling magnetic molecules causes a 'hole' to appear in the distribution of internal fields in the system. The form of this hole, and its time evolution, are studied using Monte Carlo simulations. It is shown that the line-shape of the tunneling hole in a weakly polarised sample must have a Lorentzian lineshape—the short-time halfwidth ω_0 in all experiments done so far should be E_0 , the halfwidth of the nuclear spin multiplet. After a time τ_0 , the single molecule tunneling relaxation time, the hole width begins to increase rapidly. In initially polarised samples the disintegration of resonant tunneling surfaces is found to be very fast.

PACS numbers:

In the last few years many experiments have been done on the tunneling relaxation of magnetic molecules [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. These couple to each other, via dipole and weak exchange interactions, and also to phonon [7] and nuclear [8] environments. The most complete results have appeared on the Fe-8 system, where measurements of the relaxation [1, 3, 9, 10, 11] were interpreted using a theory in which the tunneling dynamics was controlled by dynamic hyperfine and dipolar fields [12]. A key connection between theory and experiment is the existence of 'hole-digging' in the distribution $M(\epsilon; t)$ of magnetisation M over longitudinal bias energy ϵ in the low T regime where the molecules behave as 2-level systems and phonons are unimportant [3, 10, 12, 13]. The hole appears because a molecule can then only tunnel when in resonance. Without nuclear spins resonance only occurs if the local energy bias $\epsilon_j < \epsilon_0$. However the nuclear spins mediate inelastic tunneling over a much larger range $\epsilon_j < \epsilon_0$; in Fe-8 at low fields, $\epsilon_0 = 0.10$. The theory thus predicted an initial hole width ω_0 , provided ϵ_0 the range of energy bias caused by the dipolar field distribution. The experimental halfwidth ω_0 of the hole at short times, in initially strongly annealed samples, was interpreted [3, 10] to be the total halfwidth E_0 of the multiplet of nuclear spin states coupled to the molecule—this latter can be calculated if the hyperfine couplings are known [8]. Support for this interpretation came when isotopes were varied [11]; ω_0 agreed both with approximate calculations of E_0 , for different sets of nuclear isotopes, and with values of ω_0 extracted from independent measurements of the sample relaxation rate τ_0^{-1} .

It is important to understand this hole-digging, not only to evaluate the claim that it demonstrates the role of nuclear spins in controlling the molecular dynamics

(and the use of the holes as diagnostic tools), but also because the physics of the hole formation turns out to be rather interesting. There are 4 obvious questions which one may ask:

(i) Why is $\omega_0 = E_0 = \omega_0$ in the Fe-8 experiments, when $M(0)$ is small?

(ii) The experimental hole width $w(t)$ varies in time (with $w(t) \rightarrow \omega_0$ at short times) – how and why?

(iii) $w(t)$ also depends very strongly on the initial polarisation $M(t=0)$ in the system ($M(t) = \langle dM(\epsilon; t) \rangle$), but ω_0 is apparently independent of $M(0)$ for small $M(0) = M_s$; is this expected theoretically?

(iv) Why is the experimental lineshape Lorentzian?

In fact most published experiments are on partially annealed samples, where $M(0) = M_s < 1$ (M_s being the saturated magnetisation of a fully polarised sample—henceforth we measure $M(t)$ in units of M_s). In the theory [8, 12, 13] the quantity ω_0 was not necessarily the same as E_0 ; and neither the hole lineshape, nor the dependence of $w(t)$ on $M(0)$ or t , were given. Moreover the theory only deals with weakly or strongly polarised samples, whereas almost all experiments are on partially annealed samples, with intermediate polarisation—these are beyond the reach of analytic work.

To address these 4 questions, we present here numerical results for the hole lineshape, and the hole width $w(t)$ as a function of t and initial annealing. We also calculate results for the Fe-8 system, to provide predictions which can be compared with experiment.

1. Short-time hole width: The experimental interpretation, that at short times $\omega_0 = E_0$, appears to be based on the assumption (made explicitly in ref. [14]) that the nuclear bias potential behaves as a noise, fluctuating

rapidly over the whole nuclear multiplet (halfwidth E_0). Actually this assumption is unnecessary— in many cases [15] the hole width depends on the energy exchanged between nuclear spins and the molecules during inelastic tunneling [13]. If the strength of the hyperfine interactions between the molecular spin S and the k -th nuclear spin I_k is $!_k^k$, then $E_0^2 = \sum_k (!_k^k)^2 (I_k + 1) I_k = 3$. However energy is exchanged over a range ω_0 , where $\omega_0 = N^{-1} \sum_k !_k^{jj}$ is the mean hyperfine coupling to the N nuclear spins in the molecule. In low fields $2 = \sum_k (!_k^k)^2$, where $!_k^k = g_k^N N H_0$ is the Zeeman coupling to a field H_0 . In experiments with zero applied field, H_0 is just the strength of the local dipolar field from the other molecules— its root mean square in nearly annealed Fe-8 molecules is 0.05 T. If $\omega_0 > \frac{1}{N}$, then [13] $\omega_0 \approx E_0$.




FIG. 1: The variation of (H_\perp^2) with transverse field H_\perp^2 , calculated for a single Fe-8 molecule at low fields, for various isotopic mixtures. The hyperfine interactions were assumed to be dipolar, except for the core polarisation coupling to ^{57}Fe , which was taken from experiment.

Evaluation of ω_0 at low fields is simple for Fe-8 if we assume that all hyperfine couplings are dipolar except those to ^{57}Fe nuclei [11], since all nuclear positions and moments are known [17]. The couplings $f!_k^k g$, $f!_k^k g$ can then be computed [18]. Fig. 1 shows the results, for different isotopic concentrations in Fe-8. We see that if it were not for the strong intermolecular dipolar fields, ω_0 would be much less than E_0 ; however, in fields 0.05 T, they will be very close to each other.

2. Time dependence of holewidth: To find the time dependence of $w(t)$ we perform Monte Carlo simulations for the time evolution of $M(\xi; t)$ on a simple cubic lattice, averaging over several hundred random initial spin configurations consistent with the initial $M(\xi; t=0)$ (for previous MC simulations see refs. [12, 21] (polarised systems) and [14] (strongly annealed systems)). Individual spins, modelled as point dipoles oriented along

\hat{z} , relax incoherently in a local bias field at a rate $\frac{1}{N}(\xi; t) = \frac{1}{N} e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_0}}$, where $\tau_0^2 = \frac{1}{N}$, with τ_0 the tunneling matrix element and N a nuclear spin dimension rate [12]. The dipolar fields at each site, calculated numerically, are updated at time intervals τ_0 (typically $\tau_0 = 10^{-3}$ at the beginning of the decay) by flipping individual spins with probability $1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_0}}$. We define in the usual way the magnetisation distribution $M(\xi; t) = \int d^3r P(\xi; r; t) P_\#(\xi; r; t)$ for the sample, where $P(\xi; r; t)$ is the probability that a molecule at position r with spin orientation ξ will be in bias field at time t . A typical result is shown in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2: The tunneling hole dynamics, obtained by Monte Carlo simulations, performed on a model cubic lattice of 40^3 point dipoles (E_D is the strength of the nearest neighbour dipolar interaction, and $E_D = 0$ here). The main graph shows the time evolution of $M(\xi; t)$, defined in the text, for a sample in external field $H_z = 30$ at $M(0) = 0.25$ (for which $M(\xi; 0)$ is nearly Gaussian, with a halfwidth $W_D = 4.4 E_D$ for this cubic lattice). The two upper insets are (i) at left, the magnetization curve $M(t)$ vs the time t and (ii) at right, the tunneling hole halfwidth $w(t)$ as a function of time. The inset at the bottom right enlarges the region around $\xi = 0$ to show the hole dynamics. Note that time t is shown in units of τ_0 and bias ξ in units of ω_0 .

A number of important general features of these results are as follows. If and only if the Gaussian halfwidth W_D of $M(\xi; t=0)$ satisfies $W_D \approx \omega_0$, we find:

- (i) for $t < \tau_0$ the hole halfwidth $w(t) \approx w_0$, and $w_0 = \omega_0$ identically. Given the result above, that $\omega_0 \approx E_0$, this means the short-time holewidth w_0 is indeed measuring E_0 , as previously assumed [10, 11, 20].
- (ii) When $t > \tau_0$ the hole rapidly broadens. The sharp rise in $w(t)$ when $t \approx \tau_0$ appears not to be an artifact of the simulation. We have not yet been able to establish the asymptotic form of $w(t)$ for $t \gg \tau_0$, but for $1 < t/\tau_0 < 5$, $w(t)$ grows slower than $t^{0.4}$.

- (iii) For $t > \tau_0$ a square root relaxation (ie., $M(t) \propto t^{-1/2}$) is always found, for any $M(0)$. This

is obeyed until the fractional change in $M(t) - M(0)$ is 0.1 to 0.15.

3. Hole lineshape: When $M(0) < 0.5$, we find the hole lineshape is Lorentzian. If $M(0) > 0.5$, deviations begin to appear; when $M(0) \rightarrow 1$ the lineshape is not Lorentzian at all.

It is important to understand the origin of this Lorentzian lineshape. In a strongly annealed sample the dipolar field fluctuates very rapidly from one molecule to another, but on a coarse-grained scale the sample should look homogeneous. We can therefore define the average time $\tau_{de}(\xi)$ for a molecule with initial bias ξ to come to resonance. The total magnetization is then given by the homogeneous ensemble average:

$$M(t) = M_{eq} + (M(0) - M_{eq}) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dN(\xi) e^{-t/\tau_{de}(\xi)}; \quad (1)$$

where $M_{eq} = M(t \rightarrow \infty)$ and $N(\xi) = \int d^3r P_{\#}(\mathbf{r}; 0) + P_{\#}(\mathbf{r}; 0)$ is the total dipolar field distribution. The Lorentzian hole lineshape results directly from a Lorentzian form for $\tau_{de}^{-1}(\xi)$. We demonstrate this by calculating $\tau_{de}^{-1}(\xi)$ using the Monte Carlo procedure.




FIG. 3: The average decay rate $\tau_{de}^{-1}(\xi)$ obtained by the MC simulations in a cubic sample of 40^3 molecules (diamonds). By solid line we plot the fitting Lorentzian curve with the half width ξ_0 . Three insets are: (i) the magnetization relaxation curve $M(t)$ vs the t ; (ii) the average decay time $\tau_{de}(\xi)$ vs the ξ^2 (diamonds); and (iii) the set of points in space, where for $M(0) = 0.15$ at $t = 0$ molecules are in resonance.

At $t = 0$ all molecules were split into different bias groups of width $\xi_0 = 2$. When some molecule flipped, the number of molecules in its group was reduced by one. The time taken for each bias group to decrease its initial number of molecules by a factor e is assumed to be the decay time τ_{de} for this group. Fig.3 shows the results for $M(0) = 0.15$; one has a Lorentzian line-shape with half-width ξ_0 .

Note one simple implication of this result: when $t = \xi_0 > 1$, the dominant contribution to the integral (1) comes

from $\xi > 0$ where $\tau_{de}(\xi) \propto \xi^{-2}$; by making the integral in (1) dimensionless, we see the magnetisation must decay like $M(t) - M(0) \propto t^{-1}$. Thus the Lorentzian lineshape of the hole in $M(\xi)$, in strongly annealed samples, is directly connected to the square root relaxation, arising from the dipolar form of the intermolecular interactions. Notice, incidentally, that the distribution of molecules in the sample found to be in resonance for these strong annealings is indeed almost homogeneous (Fig.3, inset bottom left).

4. Application to Fe-8 system: Instead of point dipoles we now have 8 spin-5/2 Fe^{+3} ions correctly positioned and oriented inside each molecular unit cell, arranged in a triclinic lattice array. The lattice parameters, easy and hard axis orientations, were taken from standard sources [16, 17]. As an example we show in Fig. 4 results for $M(t)$ and $\tau_{de}^{-1}(\xi)$, for an initial magnetisation $M(0) = 0.2$.




FIG. 4: Plot of $\tau_{de}^{-1}(\xi)$, as in Fig. 3, but now for a crystal of Fe-8 molecules (with 40^3 molecules arranged in a triclinic lattice). The inset above shows the decay of $M(t)$ with t for a partially annealed sample (initial polarisation $M(0) = 0.2$). The lattice parameters for the Fe-8 triclinic lattice ($a = 10.522(7)\text{\AA}$, $b = 14.05(1)\text{\AA}$, $c = 15.1(1)\text{\AA}$, with angles $\alpha = 89.90(6)^\circ$; $\beta = 109.65(5)^\circ$; $\gamma = 109.27(6)^\circ$, in degrees), and the positions of the 8 spin-5/2 ions in each unit cell, were taken from ref. [17]. The bias energy is now given in Kelvin units, and the value $\xi_0 = 6\text{ mK}$ is that appropriate to natural isotopic concentration [11].

Our basic conclusion here is that none of the results found for simple cubic lattices with point dipoles is essentially altered by going to a magnetisation distributed over the 8 Fe ions, or by the change of lattice structure — one still has a Lorentzian lineshape for $\tau_{de}^{-1}(\xi)$, and the $t = \xi_0$ relaxation form for $M(t)$, for $M(0) < 0.5$, for the simulations we have done [22].

5. Nearly polarised samples: Finally we examine the opposite limit of strong initial polarisation, which has already been discussed both analytically and numerically [12, 21]. In a sample of generic shape, the molecules that

can tunnel inelastically (ie., those satisfying the 'resonance' condition $j_j < \omega_0$) form well-defined 'resonance surfaces' in space if the sample is nearly polarised, and $\omega_0 \ll E_D$ [21, 23]. This is because now the dipolar field is dominated not by short-range fluctuations in space, but by the smoothly varying demagnetisation field. These resonance surfaces can be visualised by plotting those molecules satisfying the resonance condition at time t , during a Monte Carlo simulation. The spatial variation of the longitudinal component of the dipolar field can then be described by a slowly-varying demagnetisation field $E(r; t)$, plus a smaller rapidly varying fluctuation $\delta E(r; t)$, having Lorentzian distribution [12, 25] over values of ξ , and $h(\xi; t) = 0$.




FIG. 5: The main figure shows the time evolution of the distribution $M(\xi; t)$ of magnetisation caused by dipolar fields, in an initially polarized sample ($M(t=0) = 1$); the same cubic sample of Fig. 2 was used. The 3 insets show: (i) the resonance surface at $t = 0$, showing all molecules in the sample satisfying the resonance condition in the text; (ii) the same result at $t = 4.0$, where we see that the molecules satisfying the resonance condition have now spread in space (iii) the relaxation of the normalized magnetization $M(t)$ vs \sqrt{t} for the same sample (with the square root form shown as a thin line).

It then becomes interesting to ask how these surfaces evolve in time. Again we must resort to Monte Carlo simulations. Fig. 5 shows a typical example— for all sample geometries we have studied the surfaces break up rapidly once the fraction $(1 - M(t))$ is 0.07–0.11, corresponding closely with the onset of deviations from the square root scaling. This is intriguing because it indicates the deviations may be caused not only by higher correlations between the molecules, as previously assumed [12]; this result needs further investigation. Notice that the hole lineshape is now irrelevant to the square root form of the relaxation dynamics, which comes instead from the Lorentzian distribution of $\delta E(r; t)$ [12, 25]. The hole lineshape is now controlled by the sample shape.

Our essential conclusion in this paper is that one can

use Monte Carlo methods to investigate the relaxation characteristics in regimes inaccessible to analytic theory. This allows one to understand the lineshape, width and time evolution of the hole that appears in $M(\xi; t)$.

We thank NSERC and the CIAR in Canada, and grant number NS-1767/2003.2 in Russia, for support.

-
- [1] A. Caneschi et al., J. Mag. & Magnetic Mat. 200, 182 (1999)
 - [2] B. Barbara et al., J. Mag. & Magnetic Mat. 200, 167 (1999)
 - [3] W. Wemsdorfer, Adv. Chem. Phys. 118, 99–190 (2001).
 - [4] E. del Barco, A.D. Kent, E.M. Rumberger, D.N. Hendrickson, G. Christou, Europhys. Lett. 60, 768 (2002)
 - [5] L. Bokacheva, A.D. Kent, M.A. Walters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 4803 (2000)
 - [6] I. Chiorescu et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 4807 (2000)
 - [7] P. Politi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 537 (1995)
 - [8] N.V. Prokof'ev, P.C.E. Stamp, J. Low Temp. Phys. 104, 143 (1996)
 - [9] T. Ohm, C. Sangregorio, and C. Paulsen, Eur. Phys. J. B 6, 195 (1998).
 - [10] W. Wemsdorfer, T. Ohm, C. Sangregorio, R. Sessoli, D. Mailly, C. Paulsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 3903 (1999).
 - [11] W. Wemsdorfer et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2965 (2000).
 - [12] N.V. Prokof'ev and P.C.E. Stamp, Phys. Rev. Lett., 80, 5794 (1998).
 - [13] N.V. Prokof'ev and P.C.E. Stamp, Rep. Prog. Phys. 63, 669 (2000).
 - [14] J.J. Alonso and J.F. Fernandez, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 097205 (2001).
 - [15] The measured nuclear T_1 in systems like Fe-8 or Mn-12 is typically 10–100 secs [19], longer than the time it takes the hole to develop.
 - [16] A.L. Barra, D. Gatteschi and R. Sessoli, Chem. Eur. J. 6, 1608 (2000).
 - [17] Cambridge Data base: www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk.
 - [18] A more detailed description of the method is in G. Rose, PhD thesis (UBC, 2000). The numbers derived therein have been corrected here to take account of the real crystal structure in Fe-8.
 - [19] Y. Furukawa et al., Phys. Rev. B 64, 094439 (2001); Y. Furukawa et al., Phys. Rev. B 67, 064426 (2003); A. Morello et al., Polyhedron 22, 1745 (2003).
 - [20] W. Wemsdorfer, R. Sessoli, and D. Gatteschi, Europhys. Lett. 47 (2), 254 (1999); cond-mat/9904450.
 - [21] A. Cucchioli, A. Fort, A. Rettori, E. Adam, and J. Villain, Europ. Phys. J B 12, 39 (1999).
 - [22] We found that size effects are non-negligible for samples smaller than 40^3 (and they apparently depend strongly on lattice symmetry).
 - [23] P.C.E. Stamp, pp. 101–197 in "Tunneling in Complex Systems", ed. S. Tomovic (World Scientific, 1998)
 - [24] L. Thomas, A. Caneschi, and B. Barbara, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 2398 (1999).
 - [25] P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. 82, 342 (1951); D.V. Berkov, Phys. Rev. B 53, 731, (1996).