

# ELECTRON SPECTROSCOPY AND DENSITY-FUNCTIONAL STUDY OF “FERRIC WHEEL” MOLECULES

A.V. Postnikov,<sup>a,\*</sup> S.G. Chiuzbăian,<sup>a</sup> M. Neumann,<sup>a</sup>  
S. Blügel<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *University of Osnabrück – Department of Physics, D-49069 Osnabrück,  
Germany*

<sup>b</sup> *Institut für Festkörperforschung, Forschungszentrum Jülich, D-52425 Jülich,  
Germany*

---

## Abstract

The Li-centered “ferric wheel” molecules with six oxo-bridged iron atoms form molecular crystals. We probed their electronic structure by X-ray photoelectron (XPS) and soft X-ray emission spectroscopy (XES), having calculated in parallel the electronic structure of a single “ferric wheel” molecule from first-principles by tools of the density-functional theory, using, specifically, the SIESTA method. The Fe local moments were found to be  $4 \mu_B$ , irrespective of their mutual orientation. Neighbouring atoms, primarily oxygen, exhibit a noticeable magnetic polarization, yielding effective spin  $S=5/2$  per iron atom, that can get inverted as a “rigid” one in magnetic transitions. Corresponding energy preferences can be mapped onto the Heisenberg model with effective exchange parameter  $J$  of about  $-80$  K.

*Key words:* Magnetic molecules, exchange interactions, ab initio calculations, X-ray spectroscopy

---

## 1 Introduction

A family of ring-form metal-organic complexes of iron [1] has attracted an appreciable interest due to their natural beauty and high symmetry, favourable for building theoretical models.

---

\* Corresponding Author: Tel. +49-541-9692377; Fax +49-541-9692351; E-mail: [apostnik@uos.de](mailto:apostnik@uos.de)

<sup>1</sup> Permanent address: Institute of Metal Physics, 620219 Yekaterinburg, Russia

Waldmann *et al.* [2] analyzed the data of magnetic susceptibility measurements, torque magnetometry and inelastic neutron scattering, yielding a satisfactory mapping onto the spin Hamiltonian

$$H = -J \left( \sum_{i=1}^5 \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i+1} + \mathbf{S}_6 \cdot \mathbf{S}_1 \right) + (\text{anisotropy term}) + (\text{Zeeman term}).$$

with  $J \sim 18 - 20$  K (depending on sample and method) for  $\{\text{Li} \subset \text{Fe}_6[\text{N}(\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{O})_3]_6\}\text{Cl}$ , the system of our present study. The ground state was found to be antiferromagnetic; the charge state of iron in such materials is routinely referred to as Fe(III), that implies individual spins  $S=5/2$  in the above equation. While there is recently a consensus reached in interpreting magnetic bulk measurements in terms of the Heisenberg spin model [3,4,5], the microscopic information on the electronic subsystem is much less known. We undertook a number of X-ray spectroscopy measurements, of which we report now the photoelectron valence band spectrum and the Fe  $L_3$  X-ray emission spectrum. These results are compared with, and discussed on the basis of, first-principles electronic structure calculations carried out in the framework of the density-functional theory (DFT). This gives an additional insight in the site-resolved magnetization, chemical bonding, and energetics of magnetic transitions in “ferric wheels”.

## 2 X-ray photoelectron and emission spectra

The XPS measurements were performed using a PHI Model 5600ci MultiTechnique system and employing monochromatized Al  $K_\alpha$  radiation. The pressure in the vacuum chamber during the measurements was below  $5 \cdot 10^{-9}$  mbar; the charge neutrality on the surface was achieved by a low energy electron flood gun. The energy resolution as determined at the Fermi level of a gold foil was 0.3–0.4 eV. Powder samples of  $\{\text{Li} \subset \text{Fe}_6[\text{N}(\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{O})_3]_6\}\text{Cl}$ , obtained by drying the crystals in vacuum and thus removing the  $\text{CHCl}_3$  molecules, were measured in a small gold crucible. The structure of the hexagonal unit cells is preserved upon drying, but the lattice parameters  $a$  and  $b$  are reduced by about 30% [2]. The calibration of the XPS spectra was performed assuming two non-equivalent positions of C in the molecule and 0.8 eV difference between the corresponding C1s peaks, as suggested by the similar surrounded C atoms in PTMG and PEI polymers (see Ref. [6]). With this procedure the maximum of the C1s XPS spectrum was found at 286 eV. The XES measurements were performed at Beamline 8.0.1 at the Advanced Light Source of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. The spectra were taken employing the University of Tennessee at Knoxville soft X-ray fluorescence endstation [7]. The Fe  $L_{3,2}$  emission was measured with incident photon energies ranging between 702.2 and 738.7 eV and an energy resolution of about 0.8 eV. The spectra were calibrated using a pure Fe sample as reference. In this report only the spectrum corresponding to the Fe  $L_3$  emission is listed.

### 3 Electronic structure calculations

The calculations of electronic structure from first-principles have been done within the DFT, using the SIESTA method [8]. The features of this method are an efficient construction of localized numerical atom-centered basis functions and the use of norm-conserving pseudopotentials. The independence on crystal symmetry makes the method particularly useful for structure optimizations and molecular dynamics. In the present case, however, because the calculations on such large system are quite time-consuming, we performed them so far only for nominal (fixed) structures.

“Ferric wheels” crystallize along with some amount of solvent molecules; due to the fact that intermolecular distances are large, we included in the present simulation only a single molecule of 140 atoms – without solvent, but including a chlorine atom (actually present in molecular crystal) as a counter-ion to lithium, for correct charge compensation. The molecule was treated in a box with dimensions  $22 \times 22 \times 18$  Å, on which the real-space grid of  $180 \times 180 \times 150$  divisions (corresponding to the cutoff energy of 180 Ry) was imposed for solving the Poisson equation by the fast Fourier transform. The basis set included double- $\zeta$  functions with polarization orbitals on O and Fe and double- $\zeta$  functions on all other atoms (according to the specifications used by the tight-binding community; see for details Ref. [8] and references therein).

The calculations have been performed using the generalized gradient approximation of Perdew, Burke and Ernzerhof [9]. Although non-collinear magnetization density can be treated by SIESTA, for a large system as the present one this slows down calculations considerably. As the ground state of our “ferric wheel” is believed to be antiferromagnetic (AFM), it is simulated as an alternating sequence of up and down spin moments on the ring. Other spin arrangements – fully ferromagnetic (FM), or with one or two spins inverted – have also been tried, and found stable. The energy relations between these solutions are discussed in the next section.

### 4 Results and discussion

The photoelectron spectrum of the valence band reveals separated features which can be easily attributed to O, N and C  $2s$  states, and a roughly structureless peak around the binding energy of  $\sim 5$  eV, that can be tentatively attributed to Fe $3d$  states, hybridizing with the O $2p$  band (see Fig. 1). A comparison with electronic structure results confirms this assignment. The Fe  $L_3$  X-ray emission spectrum probes occupied Fe $3d4s$  states; it reveals an overall shape in good agreement with calculated partial density of Fe $3d4s$  states. The latter turns out to be very similar irrespective of the actual mutual orientation of spins, FM or antiferromagnetic AFM, and exhibits in all cases a crystal-field splitting (of about 4 eV) into  $t_{2g}$ -like and  $e_g$ -like states in the majority-spin channel. The calculated partial DOS at




Fig. 1. Measured XPS spectrum of the valence band and Fe  $L_3$  X-ray emission spectrum, obtained with the excitation energy 707.8 eV.

the Fe site, along with some its neighbours, is shown in Fig. 2.

These results reveal a complicated pattern of hybridization between Fe, O and N atoms, a detailed discussion of which will be given elsewhere. One notes a pronounced  $Fe3d-O2p$  chemical bonding, which gives rise to magnetic polarization in oxygen  $2p$  shells. Moreover, more distant carbon and nitrogen atoms, whose  $2p$  states are moreover quite separated in energy from the  $Fe3d$ , exhibit a small but not vanishing polarization.

It is noteworthy that the  $3d$ -shell of Fe, although strongly polarized, does not yet develop a spin configuration  $S=5/2$ , contrary to what is routinely assumed in the literature. Instead, the local magnetic moment is close to  $4 \mu_B$ , in relative independence of its precise definition (choice of functions for the population analysis, etc.). While the majority-spin states are fully occupied, the minority-spin band still contains about one electron, because of the above mentioned  $Fe3d-O2p$  hybridization. The presence of one minority-spin electron on the Fe site implies the  $Fe^{2+}$  configuration and not  $Fe^{3+}$  as would seem compatible with  $S=5/2$ . The peculiarity of the situation is that an extra majority-spin electron is delocalized over the organic fragment hosting the Fe atom. This recovers spin  $S=5/2$  per Fe atom in the




Fig. 2. Partial DOS at the Fe atom and its several neighbours in the “ferric wheel” molecule (as labeled in the inset). The Fermi energy is indicated by a dashed vertical line.




Fig. 3. Total energy per Fe atom (left panel) and energy gap in two spin channels (right panel; shaded area – majority-spin, thick lines – minority-spin) from fixed spin moment calculations.

molecule, consistently with macroscopic measurements.

The partial DOS shown in Fig. 2 corresponds to some artificial broadening of discrete energy levels of the molecule, for better visibility. Such broadening is legitimate, as long as it remains small enough not to smear out the band gap and to maintain a clear separation between groups of energy levels split in the ligand field. Actually, an artificial broadening is a useful tool for speeding up the convergence of calculation, that (due to the presence of many nearly degenerate levels near the Fermi energy) is otherwise quite instable even at mixing parameters of about  $10^{-4}$ , demanding for many thousands of iterations. The problem is that such smearing does affect calculated total energies quite dramatically, to the point that a reliable comparison of spin-flip energetics, used to estimate exchange interactions of the order of tens of K, becomes impossible. A very useful technique in this relation is the fixed spin moment (FSM) scheme [10]. In our case, imposing an (integer) spin moment per molecule fixes the number of electrons in both spin channels and thus removes the major reason of instability in the course of calculations. As a consequence, the broadening parameter can be safely reduced to the values which permit a reliable extrapolation to zero level width. The results conveniently converge for FSM values of 30  $\mu_B$  (FM case), 20 and 10  $\mu_B$  (one and two spins inverted, correspondingly); 0 (alternate-spin AFM case). The calculated total energy values are shown in Fig. 3.

Typically, comparison of total energies obtained in the FSM scheme needs to take into

account the “Zeeman term” due to the Fermi energies – now possibly different in two spin channels – moving apart, as if in a fictitiously imposed magnetic field. In our case, however, no additional terms to the total energy must be included, because – as is seen in the right panel of Fig. 3 – there is a common energy gap in both spin channels throughout the whole range of FSM values we studied. A linear change of the total energy while inverting one and then two spins from the FM configuration implies the validity of the Heisenberg model, as we seemingly deal with “rigid” magnetic moments. An additional argumentation comes from the fact that the magnitudes of local magnetic moments always remain close (within several per cent) to  $4 \mu_B$ , and the partial DOS on Fe sites remains largely unaffected by the actual magnetic ordering. Keeping this in mind, and assuming Heisenberg-model spin Hamiltonian as in Section 1 with the  $S$  value of  $5/2$  (i.e., for the total spin which gets inverted), we arrive at the estimate for  $-J$  of around 80 K (over both  $30 \rightarrow 20$  and  $20 \rightarrow 10 \mu_B$  flips). This is qualitatively correct (i.e. indicates preferentially AFM coupling) and even of correct order of magnitude. However, two observations can be done. First, the “true” AFM configuration (with half of magnetic moments inverted on the ring) does not follow the linear trend (see Fig. 3) and lies actually higher in energy than the configuration with two spins inverted. The origin of this is not yet clear to us at the moment. From one side, the zero-FSM configuration is – technically – the most difficult to converge, so some numerical instability can still play a role. From the other side, the true AFM ground-state configuration is apparently not collinear, the fact which does not follow from the simplest (nearest-neighbours) version of the Heisenberg model and probably manifests its shortcomings. The second observation concerns the magnitude of exchange parameter  $J$  and the fact that it is probably overestimated by a factor of  $\sim 4$  in our calculation. The origin of this lies most probably in on-site correlations, which, if treated accurately beyond the standard schemes of the DFT, would primarily affect localized Fe3d states, shifting the bulk of occupied states downwards in energy, the bulk of unoccupied states upwards, expanding the energy gap, and – whatever scheme to use for estimating exchange parameters – substantially reducing their magnitude. This has been recently shown for another molecular magnet ( $\text{Mn}_{12}$ ) by Boukhvalov *et al.* [11].<sup>2</sup>

Summarizing our analysis of the electronic structure of a Li-based “ferric wheel”, the combined use of spectroscopy techniques and first-principles calculations leads to the following conclusions: This system develops strong local magnetic moments on Fe sites, but their magnitude is close to  $4 \mu_B$  and not  $5 \mu_B$  as is often assumed. The value of  $5 \mu_B$  can still be attributed to a Fe atom *in a molecule*, with considerable part of this magnetization distributed over (mostly) oxygen and other atoms. Correspondingly, iron atoms are not ionized to  $+3$ , but instead acquire a configuration close to  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ , with a substantial covalent part in the Fe–O bonding. With respect to its magnetic interactions, this system can be mapped reasonably well onto the Heisenberg model; hence we deal with *rigid* magnetic moments which are nevertheless *delocalized* – an interesting counter-example to a common belief that the Heisenberg model primarily applies to localized spins.

---

<sup>2</sup> We note, that the LDA+ $U$  formalism [12] is a possible scheme of choice for such a simulation. It may help to adjust the situation in a physically reasonable way, but does not necessarily help to make quantitative *predictions*.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for financial support (Priority Program “Molecular Magnetism”). A.V.P. acknowledges useful discussion with Jens Kortus and Jürgen Schnack. The samples for measurements and crystal structure data have been kindly provided by the group of Prof. Dr. R. W. Saalfrank from the Institute for Organic Chemistry of the University Erlangen-Nürnberg. The work in the Advanced Light Source at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy (Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098).

## References

- [1] R. W. Saalfrank, I. Bernt, E. Uller, F. Hampel, *Angewandte Chemie – International Edition* 36 (1997) 2482.
- [2] O. Waldmann, J. Schülein, R. Koch, P. Müller, I. Bernt, R. W. Saalfrank, H. P. Andres, H. U. Güdel, P. Allenspach, *Inorganic Chemistry* 38 (1999) 5879.
- [3] O. Waldmann, R. Koch, S. Schromm, P. Müller, I. Bernt, R. W. Saalfrank, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89 (2002) 246401.
- [4] M. Affronte, J. C. Lasjaunias, A. Cornia, A. Caneschi, *Phys. Rev. B* 60 (1999) 1162.
- [5] O. Waldmann, R. Koch, S. Schromm, J. Schulein, P. Muller, I. Bernt, R. W. Saalfrank, F. Hampel, E. Balthes, *Inorg. Chem.* 40 (2001) 2986.
- [6] G. Beamson, D. Briggs, *High Resolution XPS of Organic Polymers: the Scienta ESCA300 Database*, Wiley, Chichester, 1992.
- [7] J. J. Jia, T. A. Callcott, J. Yurkas, A. W. Ellis, F. J. Himpsel, J. Samant, M. G. Stohr, D. L. Edered, J. A. Carlisle, E. A. Hudson, L. J. Terminello, D. K. Shuh, R. C. C. Perera, *Rev. Sci. Instruments* 66 (1995) 1394.
- [8] J. M. Soler, E. Artacho, J. D. Gale, A. García, J. Junquera, P. Ordejón, D. Sánchez-Portal, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 14 (2002) 2745.
- [9] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77 (1996) 3865.
- [10] K. Schwarz, P. Mohn, *J. Phys. F: Metal Phys.* 14 (1984) L129.
- [11] D. W. Boukhvalov, A. I. Lichtenstein, V. V. Dobrovitski, M. I. Katsnelson, B. N. Harmon, V. V. Mazurenko, V. I. Anisimov, *Phys. Rev. B* 65 (2002) 184435.
- [12] V. I. Anisimov, F. Aryasetiawan, A. I. Lichtenstein, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 9 (1997) 767.