M agnetostriction M easurem ents with A tom ic Force M icroscopy:

A NovelApproach

A.C.Papageorgopoulos, H.W ang, C.Guerrero and N.Garcia* Laboratorio de Fisica de Sistem as Pequeros y Nanotechnologia CSIC,

Serrano

144 E-28006 M adrid, Spain

In this study we present a new method of measuring magnetostriction with an atom ic force microscope adapted for the application magnetic elds. The experiment allow sus to visualise, in an elegant and educational way how the lateral magnetoelastic shape changes take place on the sample surface when a magnetic eld is applied. We have, furtherm ore, used this technique to observe magnetically induced strains as small as 5 10 ⁸, and have measured N i, perm alloy and commercial C u wires and Im s, as well as pure C u and P t wires, where results are in agreement with other methods of measurement. The applications are, moreover, relevant to studies of ballistic magnetoresistance, where we can draw conclusions involving the elect of the magnetically induced strains on magnetoresistance measured at the same time as magnetostriction.

PACS:68.37 Ps;75.50.-y;75.80.+ q

Keywords: A tom ic Force M icroscopy; Ferrom agnetic m aterials; m agnetostriction

* corresponding author em ail: nicolas.garcia@ fsp.csic.es Tel: 34-91-561 88 06 Fax: 34-91-563 15 60

Magnetostriction is the phenom enon whereby the shape of a ferrom agnetic specim en changes during the process of magnetization. [1] The deformation 1/1 resulting from this change is usually in the 10 5 to 10 6 range. M agnetostriction can be positive or negative depending if the m aterial expands or contracts along the m easured direction. [2] M any ways exist for measuring this eld-induced deformation, including the strain gauge and capacitance methods. [1 [5] The development of local surface probes (scanning tunnelling microcopy (STM), scanning force microscopy (SFM), magnetic eld microscopy (MFM) and others) [6,7], however, has introduced new ways to visualize the structure and topology of the surfaces with high spatial resolution. These surface characterization techniques can easily visualize variations of the surface structure as well as local surface behaviour such as those resulting from induced strains on the measured specimen. Takata et al, in particular, have reported strain in aging of magnetic recording material. [8] By their de nition, how ever, strain in aging involves detecting strains generated by any modulation including an alternating magnetic eld. In the case of Ref. 8, the strain is driven in the z-direction by the alternating B - edd. Up to now, and according to our know ledge, there have never been applications of local probe techniques to observe and measure lateral changes of the shape of a specim en under an applied magnetic eld without modulation. Given the vast applications of magnetic materials, the need for magnetic characterization methods of greater resolution is param ount. We, therefore, believe that carefully set-up experiments of this nature should provide very valuable inform ation.

On another note, ever since prelim inary experiments showing large ballistic magnetoresistance (BMR) e ects in atom ic nanocontacts have been reproduced in other cases, [9{11] there have been observations of BMR values of 700%, [12] 3000% and practically in nity. [13] The latter are observed when N i contacts of nanom eter size are electrodeposited in the gap region of N i w ires. In addition, BMR values of over 50000% have been observed when using perm alloy $Fe_{21}Ni_{79}$ w ires, and values not as large (a few hundred percent) [14] were m easured in commercial C u w ires. From the above, a very legitim ate question can be posed: W hat is the effect of the magnetostriction deform ation of the nanocontacts on the

BM R? In other words; is the BM R due to the magnetoelastic deform ations?

In this paper we present a new method of measuring magnetostriction with the use of atom ic force m icroscopy (AFM).W ith the AFM we are able to visualize in an illustrative and educational manner the strains of a ferrom agnetic sample's micro and nanostructure under an applied magnetic eld. In our technique, the eld is unidirectional for each application with the intended value applied near-instantly and removed in the same manner after a period of in uence lasting several seconds (and scan lines). There is no eld modulation, and the lateral shift is measured directly from the scan. Lateral strains as sm all as 5 10^{8} have been thus measured, although this resolution could be improved under more stringent scanning conditions. Sample size, however, is not an issue as long as a topographic in age can be attained. Thus, the technique is easily applicable to samples whose length is of the order 100 m as well as larger specimens. The wires measured in this study included Ni, perm alloy, com m ercial and pure Cu as well as Pt. In addition, applications of this m ethod are performed to answer the question posed above by measuring BMR of nanocontacts form ed via electrodeposition on wires. From our results: we do not see a direct relation between magnetostrictive strains and large BMR.

The experiment was conducted with a D imension 3100 Scanning probe M icroscope (SPM), with a Nanoscope IV Controller. Figure 1 (a) shows a diagram of the experimental set-up during measurements. The U-shaped electromagnet (constructed in the laboratory for this purpose) was comprised of a ZnM n ferrite powder core, wrapped with Cu wire on one end. The magnet was, furthermore, supported so the poles could be accurately placed on either side of the sample (without coming into contact with the latter), with the desired stability during scanning. This con guration provided a maximum eld of about 250 O e (measured with a DTM-133 Teslameter at the sample plane) for these measurements. By controlling the current of the 75 W, DC power supply, the magnetic eld strength could be varied to within < 2 O e.

The metal wires used were N i, perm alloy $Fe_{21}Ni_{79}$, Cu (both commercial wire and that of 99.999% purity) and Pt. W ith the exception of N i, with a diameter d = 0.25 mm, all

the m etal wires were of d = 0.5 mm. Fig.1 (b) shows, in diagram m atic form, how the wires were attached to their base (m ade of circuit-board m aterial) for both the cases of free wires and wires in a \T "-con gured contact form ation (upper and lower diagrams of g. 1 (b) respectively). Cyanoacrylic commercial glue was the preferred sample clamping method, used successfully in all cases. The glue was applied to a length 1^2 at one end of the wire, leaving a predeterm ined length 1^1 free. The distances from the glue boundary to the AFM tip for each wire were measured using an OLYMPUS BX 50 optical microscope in combination with the built-in optical microscope camera of the D in ension 3100 SPM.

Figure 1 (c), shows a side-view close-up of the scanning process. Contact mode AFM was always used, with short (100 m) cantilevers with a force constant of 0.58 N/m being preferred. Fig. 1 (c) schem atically depicts the case of a free wire measured under a eld direction parallel to its length. The scan direction was always along the length of the wire, whereupon changes in the length were easily detected as shifts in the x-direction of the scan im age.

N i free wires and \T " configured contacts: 0 ur rst m easurements were conducted on N i, a ferrom agnetic material with well-known magnetoelastic properties. W ires were m easured in two congurations: a) single free wires and b) two wires forming a \T " conguration (g. 1 (b), lower portion). Results are depicted in g. 2. Specifically, the upper portion of g. 2 shows two typical scans of the N i wire surface (left and center) using contact mode AFM, and an optical microscope close-up in age of the measured \T "-congured contact (right). The two scans are both 300 nm in range with the positive x-direction toward the right of each scan. In the case of the far left scan the magnetic eld (H = 80 0 e) was consecutively applied and removed ve times. The scan direction (as indicated by the vertical arrow) was from the bottom to the top of the image, and the rst application of the eld (toward the bottom of the scan), including the direction of strain, is depicted by the black arrow pointing left (indicating contraction). In contrast, the bottom portion of the gure shows the arrow pointing right, which is indicative of the eld being turned o (re-expansion to original length). As can be easily seen in the far left-hand scan of g. 2,

the shift is nearly instantaneous whether the eld is applied or removed, i.e., there are no distortions of the scan in age during magnetic eld transitions. The distance of the shift was easily measurable using available SPM software, and the repeatability of the eld is easily demonstrated by the identical multiple shifts in the scan. Another in portant result is that when the eld is removed the wire returns to precisely its original position as indicated by the topographic continuity observable in the far left in age between eld applications. The contrast between the far left-hand scan and that at the upper middle of Fig. 2, where no eld is applied is obvious, although the scans do not show identical topographic features (scan windows are within 1 m of each other on the surface). Even with in ages with a great degree of noise, the eld soft magnetoelastic strain are easily distinguishable from the form er at least for strains down to 5 10^8 .

The bottom portion of g_2 depicts the results of various measurements of dierent con gurations of Niwires under the in uence of both parallel and transversal elds, where changes in eld intensity reach 2500 e. The upper portion of the graph (g. 2(a)) depicts the changes in length of a 6 mm free wire during the indicated eld application when eld direction is transversal to the length of the wire, while the lower portion (q. 2(b)) shows the magnetostiction of a 6mm free wire when the same eld values are applied in the direction parallel to the wire's length. The extra data points on the right-hand side of both plots represent singular values of wire deform ation m easured under di erent sam ple m ounting and eld direction conditions. The plot (represented with inverted solid triangles) in g2 (b), represents the deformation of the T -con qured N i contact vs. increasing eld strength. First, the plots of the deformation of the free wire vs. eld strength for magnetic eld directions both parallel and transversal to the wire lengths have been presented elsewhere, [15] and are in agreem ent with previous ndings for the magnetoelastic deform ation of N i wires under a eld direction parallel to their length. $[1{3}]$ Second, the question whether the glue itself provides adequate clamping to prevent movement of the wire as a whole when under a magnetic eld, and thus eliminates the strain e ects caused by the total m agnetization of the specim en was addressed by st m easuring the strain on a wire where

the glued portion was vetimes the length of the free (1 mm) wire. We found the deformation to be twice that of a wire with only 25% of its total length glued (such as the wires used in the plots of Fig. 2 (a) and (b)). We then eliminated the strain contribution of the glued portion by measuring the magnetostriction at two points on the free wire, and applying the form ula $(1_2 \quad 1_1) = (l_2 \quad l_1)$, where l_2 and l_1 are the free wire lengths corresponding to the two positions. Results deviated only 5% from the case of the wires glued along 25% of their total length, and could be improved with a smaller percentage of the total wire length glued. For a more detailed explanation see Ref. 15.

Our measurements continued with the magnetostriction of a 6 mm free Niwire (only 2mm glued) in a T -con gured contact formation, with a contact area measured at 30 m. The upper right-hand portion of gure 2 shows a 600 m D in ension 3100 opticalm icroscope picture of the T contact area. The scans were performed 200 m from the contact itself. W ith these measurements along with those on permalloy wire we attempt to shed some light on the relationship between magnetoelastic deformation in T -con gured contacts and BMR. For this reason, the resistance was monitored over the contact throughout all the magnetic eld applications involving T -con gured contacts. The value of this resistance was measured at 1.5 , which represents the elective conductive portion of the contact. From previous studies we have found this particular value to correspond to conducting contact of 30 nm, [14] in contrast with the total contact geometry (30 m diameter area). M ost of the total contact area is actually comprised of non-conductive oxides.

In g. 2(b) the upper curve represents the deform ation values of the T "-contact vs. increasing magnetic eld, up to 250 0 e in a direction parallel to its length. The observed deform ation at 250 0 e is about half the value of the free w ire (-16 nm /m m) when the eld is parallel, and about 2.5 nm /m m when it is transversal to the w ire's length (represented by the hollow upright triangle in g. 2(a)). In the case of the parallel eld direction in particular, it would be expected that a 100 nm contraction (over the 6 m m free length) would break the contact. In fact, the monitored resistance rem ained stable during multiple consecutive eld applications. In other words, magnetoelastic strain does not alter the resistance across the

contact, and more importantly does not automatically imply large magnetoresistance. It is most likely that both wires of the T -conguration in the contact area deform together when the eld is applied. In other words, we must consider the contact connecting the two wires as a single system extending to the second wire.

It is known that 10% of the contact samples exhibit m agnetoresistance in the 100% range and only 2% of the samples show BMR values over 1000% [12{14]. All ferrom agnetic m aterials exhibit some degree of m agnetoelastic deformation, including those exhibiting BMR. A lthough it is evident that m agnetostriction does not necessarily in ply BMR, we can draw no conclusions involving the reverse from the available data on Ni. But there is no evidence that the contacts are modi ed as indicated from our resitance and m agnetostriction data. In other words, based on the above results, we cannot say one way or the other if BMR induces m agnetoelastic strain.

P erm alloy $F e_{21}N i_{79}$ wires: Sin ilar measurements were conducted on perm alloy $Fe_{21}N i_{79}$, although only for the cases of the free wire and "T"-con gured contact both under the in uence of an applied eld parallel to the wire lengths. Figure 3 shows a similar con guration as that of g. 2, this time of the perm alloy T"-con gured contact. The top portion of the gure shows two scans of 450 nm of the wire surface, about 200 m from the contact tip. The left-hand scan involves magnetic eld applications, and the subsequent respective topographic shifts in the im age, while the right-hand scan represents the surface without any magnetic eld applied. Below these in ages is a graph showing the changes in length of a 10 mm perm alloy $Fe_{21}N i_{29}$ wire when increasing eld values are applied in the parallel direction. O urm easured contraction of perm alloy wire with increasing eld strength is approximately equal to that indicated in the literature, [2] where 1/1 approaches -2 nm perm m length of wire at higher eld values (H 800 e). To exam he the case for BM R applications, an additional data point (hollow circle) was added. This represents the measured contraction of the perm alloy wire with not a stable re-

sistance during deform ation. The obtained value for the perm alloy contact was, furtherm ore, practically identical to that of the free perm alloy wire. In the case of perm alloy $Fe_{21}Ni_{79}$, however, the movement is too small to meet resistance from the glue or transversal wire. It is most likely for this reason that we do not observe any decrease in the magnetostriction values of perm alloy when comparing the eld induced strain of the "T"-con gured contact with that of the free wire.

C opper and P latinum wires: W e conducted m easurem ents on three param agnetic wires, each 10 mm long with applied elds in directions parallel to their respective lengths, and have provided some interesting results. Commercial Cu was measured rst, initially as a reference sample to the Ni and perm alloy wires. Despite the fact that Cu is a param agnetic m aterial, there was magnetostrictive strain that increased with increasing magnetic eld strength, although in a more linear manner than Ni and perm alloy. The changes in length m easured in the commercialCu sample, moreover, were of the same order as perm alloy wires under a parallel eld. Figure 4 (top left) shows a case where a eld is applied to commercial Cu with the evident shift (in the sam em anner as the previous ferrom agnetic sam ples under parallel elds). The top right part of the gure depicts the plot of the contraction of the commercial Cuwire with increasing eld strength, as described above. Our commercial sample was analyzed by EDAX where the presence of 3% Co, Ni and Fe in purities was detected. It is evident from this analysis that even minute amounts of impurities cause appreciable changes in the values of magnetoelastic strain in a param agnetic material such as Cu. To compare we have attempted to measure magnetostriction in pure (99,999%) Cu, as well as Pt wires (not shown here), and the scans do not exhibit any observable change under the same applied eld (2500 e). I.e. there is a complete absence of the characteristic topographic displacem ent in the x-scan direction present in measurem ents of ferrom agnetic specimens. It should be noted that pure C u actually exhibits a magnetostriction deformation of 10⁹, which for a 10 mm of Cu wire implies a displacement of 0.01nm (0.1 A) [16]. At the bottom right-hand of the gure is a scanning electron micrograph (SEM) of a Cu Im with a 10 m gap, bridged by electrodeposited perm alloy, where we measured for BMR

and m agnetostriction. W hile close to 100% BMR was m easured here, (repeatable through several hundred trials), there was no observable magnetostriction under applied elds up to 2500 e. The lack of displacement described for the pure Cu and Pt samples is clearly shown in the 200 nm scan of the aforem entioned contact (g.4, bottom left), where repetitive eld applications were perform ed while scanning under the AFM. It is no surprise, regarding the above information, that a pure Cu Im shows no magnetostriction. The perm alloy deposite should, how ever, also be taken into consideration. As we have described, perm alloy $Fe_{21}Ni_{29}$ exhibits a magnetostrictive strain around 10 6 , which implies a strain of 0.01 nm (0.1 A) for a 10 m length of the material. We have attempted to see this displacement with an ex-situ STM, but resolution was in the Angstrom range, and no topographic shifting was detected. It is noteworthy that even a displacement below what is the minimum detectable causes a disturbance in the scan that m anifests as a horizontal line through the im age at the point the eld is applied. Whether, however, this 0.1A displacement of the contact can in uence the BMR response can be understood as follows: 0 ur 1-100 hm contacts correspond to sections of contacts of 10^3 to 10^4 atom s-taking one atom to be one conductance unit for a good conductor (for a bad one the section is larger still). In order to obtain the observed changes of 200% such as those described in the case below, we would need to change the section by a factor of 3. This, according to all simulations regarding the pulling of nanow ires, is not possible for a shift of 0.1 A.

We thought it relevant to conclude this report with a brief description of our most recent magnetostriction data (not shown here), involving the measurement of a contact formed by the electrodeposition of permalloy to bridge the 30 m gap between two pure Cu wires aligned tip-to-tip [17]. The applied eld strength in this case was H = 8500 e, and no shift was observed in the scan upon eld application, meaning that if there was a strain present it was $< 5 \quad 10^8$. As described in the former paragraph, such a strain cannot correspond to the measured BM R of 200% in this system. From the very fact that we did observe BM R in at least these two latter cases, we may conclude that not only does magnetostriction not im ply BM R, but that also the presence of BM R does not mean observable magnetostriction

is present. The two e ects are thus not related to each other.

In this report a new m ethod of m easuring the m agnetostriction of m etallic w ires has been presented, which utilizes atom ic force m icroscopy (AFM), and the (near-instantaneous) application of a magnetic eld at the sample plane. The strains are observed laterally, relative to the sample plane, in the direction of the scan in progress. This technique eliminates the contribution of strains due to magnetization of the total specimen, and the lack of modulation guarantees the absence of electrom agnetic elects due to eddy currents caused by the e ects of the oscillating magnetic eld on the sample. We have measured strains as small $10^8\,$ in sample areas in scan ranges as small as 200 nm . The experiment shows in a as 5 dram atic visual manner how the magnetoelastic strains of the sample take place when the magnetic eld is applied. For wires exhibiting magnetostriction, the shift is instantaneous and is clearly depicted in the scanned in ages presented in this study. Applications of this m ethod have been m ade to wires of N i, perm alloy, com m ercial C u wire, pure C u, and pure Pt, as well as T "-con gured contacts of N i and perm alloy Fe₂₁N i₉. These applications are relevant in exam ining the e ect of magnetoelastic strains on magnetoresistance, measured at the same time as the magnestostriction. From the data presented, there is no evidence that m agnetostriction autom atically in plies m agnetoresitance. W hile large m agnetostriction is seen for all N i sam ples, m agnetoresitance is only seen for the 10% of the sam ples and only 2% for BMR larger than 1000%. This happens for Ni and perm alloy sam ples even if the deform ations of the latter are 30 tim es sm aller than those of the form er. W e speculate, as discussed above, that the contact m oves rigidly with the m agnetoelastic m otion of the wires (as if the contact and second wire are a continuation of the rst). Further m easurem ents on perm alloy contacts deposited on pure Cu In s and wires, which have exhibited up to 200% BMR have shown no observable magnetostriction. We, therefore, conclude that BMR and m agnetostriction are not causally linked, i.e. one e ect does not in ply the other.

A dknow ledgem ents

W e would like to extend our thanks to P rof. A . del M oral for his m ost valuable advice

and discussions, and also to N.D.Nikolic and H.Cheng for their invaluable assistence in performing this experiment. This work has been supported by the DGICyT.

References:

- [1] S. Chikazum i, Physics of Ferrom agnetism, Oxford University Press (1999).
- [2] R.M. Bozorth, "Ferrom agnetism", D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc, New York, NY (1951).
- [3] A.H.Morrish, "The Physical Properties of Magnetism", John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY (1965).
- [4] E.T. De Lachaiserie, in Magnetostriction, CRC Press, Boca Raton USA (1993).
- [5] A. de Moral in Magnetostriction: Basic Principles and Materials, IOP Pub., Bristol, to be published (2003). This is a 900 pages treaty on magnetostriction. It is a work of scholarship, useful as a consulting book.
- [6] Proc. of the International School of Physics "Enrico Ferm i", Ed.M. Allegrini, N.G arcia and
 O.M arti: Nanom eter Scale Science and Technology, IOS press (2001) Am stemdam NL.
- [7] G.Binnig, C.F.Quate, and Ch.Gerber, Atom ic Force M icroscope. Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 930 (1986).
- [8] Keiji Takata and Futoshi Tom iyam a, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. 39, 3090 (2000).
- [9] N.Garcia, M.Mu?oz, and Y-W Zhao, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 2923 (1999).
- [10] J.J.Verluijs, A.M. Bariand J.M. D. Coey, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 26601 (2001).

- [11] S.H.Chung, M.Mu?oz, N.Garcia, W.H.Egelho and R.D.Gom ez, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 287203 (2002).
- [12] N.Garcia, M.Mu?oz, G.G.Qian, H.Rohrer, I.G.Saveliev and Y.-W. Zhao, Appl. Phys. Lett. 79, 4550 (2001).
- [13] H.D.Chopra and S.Z.Hua, Phys.Rev.B 66, 204403 (2002), HaiW ang, Hao Cheng and N. Garcia, arX is condern att/207516v, W.H.Egelho (unpublished).
- [14] N.Garcia, G.G.Qian, and I.G.Saveliev, Appl. Phys. Lett. 80, 1785 (2002).
- [15] A.C. Papageorgopoulos, H.W ang, C.Guerrero and N.Garcia, J.M agn.M agn.M ater. 268, 198-204, (2003).
- [16] E.Fawcett, Phys.Rev.B2, 1604 (1970); Phys.Rev.B2, 3887 (1970).
- [17] N. Garcia, H. Cheng, H. Wang, N. D. Nikolic, C. Guerrero and A. C. Papageorgopoulos, (Invited paper to ICM Conference (2003), Rome, to be published in J. Magn. Magn. Mater.).

F igure C aptions:

Figure 1: Schem atic depicting the experimental set-up with (a) a top-view diagram of the D in ension 3100 SPM with the sam ple holding system placed between the poles of the electrom agnet inserted under the scanner (shown transparent). (b) Top-views of free wire and contact con gurations, and (c) a side-view schem atic of the placem ent of the AFM tip as it scans the wire.

Figure 2: top-left and center: Two scans of the N if free w ine with a magnetic eld, applied multiple times throughout the scan, (left) and without any eld applied (right). In both cases the scan range is 300 nm, while the scan direction is indicated by the red and black arrows in the corresponding gures; (top right): D in ension 3100 optical m icroscope in age of N i "T "-con gured contact after parallel eld applications. Scale is in m. Contact area has been measured at 30 m. (Bottom): G raphs of the measured change in wire length $1/1 \times 10^6$ vs. the strength H (in O e) of the applied eld when (a) the eld direction is transversal and (b), when it is parallel to the wire's length. Upper plot of (b) refers to N i contact and the lower graph to the free wire. A dditional data points m ark cases of magnetostriction for a contact under a transversal eld (upright hollow triangle), and the case of a 1m m free wire under a parallel eld (led circle).

Figure 3: Top: two 450 nm contact AFM scans of perm alloy $Fe_{21}Ni_{9}$ wire in "T"-contact form ation, with free length l = 10mm. Left scan shows the application of a magnetic eld, while right scan depicts the same topography without any eld applied. Bottom : G raph of $l/1x10^{6}$ vs. H with applied parallel eld onto 10 mm free wire. Extra data point at H = 80 0 e (enlarged hollow circle) represents perm alloy "T"-contact deform ation at this eld strength.

Figure 4: Top row (left): 200 nm scan of a commercial Cuwire with a free (unclamped) length of 10 mm with an applied led of H = 250 Oe. Topographic displacement to the left upon eld application is obvious. Top row (right): graph of $1/1 \times 10^{-7}$ vs. H (in Oe),

with various eld strengths applied in the parallel direction. Bottom left: 200 nm scan of perm alloy electrodeposited over a 10 m gap in a pure Cu lm. The scan was taken at a distance of ~200 m from the center of the gap. Even with multiple applications of a 250 O e eld, there was no m agnetostriction evident. Bottom right: SEM photo of the latter surface showing a close-up of the contact area formed by electrodeposited perm alloy. The 5 m scale-bar is placed vertically to the right of the contact. This specimen, while showing no m agnetoelastic response did exhibit a 100% BMR (both were measured at the same time).

This figure "Fig.1.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

This figure "Fig.2.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

This figure "Fig.3.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

This figure "Fig.4.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from: