

# Crossover in the Structure Between Bloch and Linear Domain Walls

Pavel Krotkov\*

*National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32310, USA, and  
L.D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2 Kosygina st., 117334 Moscow Russia  
(Dated: Jan 22, 2004)*

Near the Curie temperature of a ferromagnet the form of a domain wall changes from the Bloch type to (asymptotically) the linear Zhirnov wall. Unlike the simple  $180^\circ$  rotation of the magnetization vector in a Bloch wall, its absolute value diminishes near the center of the wall. This leads to a decrease of the total transverse component of the exchange field inside the wall and to an increase of mistracking of the spins of the electrons traversing the wall. This mechanism may help explain large magnetoresistance of domain walls in thin nanowires, as the Curie temperatures of low-dimensional nanostructures are known to be lower than in bulk ferromagnets while the anisotropy energy stays virtually unchanged.

Strong current interest in magnetoresistance of domain walls in metallic ferromagnets is motivated by possible applications in magnetoelectronics. But at the moment there remains difficulty in reconciling experimental and theoretical results. Different experimental groups reported both positive and negative contribution of a single wall to resistance (see, e.g., the review in [1]). The theory of “mistracking” of the electron spin, e.g. the inability of its precession to track the changing local exchange field as the electron traverses the wall, could explain [2] a small ( $\sim 2\%$ ) increase of the wall resistance [3]. However, various other contributions to resistance of the same order of magnitude that are either negative [4] or can have both signs [5], were proposed, that could instead lead to a decrease in the domain wall resistance [6, 7]. We want to show below that the controversy of the experimental results may be resolved in terms of the wall structure in different experiments.

Magnetoresistance of domain walls in Ni nanocontacts was found to be very large [8, 9]. The theory [10] showed that geometrically constrained domain walls in atomic point contacts become much sharper than in the bulk or thin films, with the width on the scale of the size of the constriction, thus enhancing the mistracking and, consequently, the resistance.

A very large increase (100%-600%) in the resistivity of domain walls was also observed in 35 nm Co nanowires [11]. The authors suggested that the mechanism behind this raise may be similar to the giant magnetoresistance in current perpendicular to the plane geometry (GMR-CPP). I.e., the mistracking of the passing electrons causes spin accumulation at the domain walls which extends on the scale of the spin diffusion length much larger than the domain wall width and gives rise to the large resistance. In a theoretical study [12] it was found that spin accumulation on Bloch domain walls is insufficient to give rise to large magnetoresistance, and was suggested that the

domain wall may be of Zhirnov linear type [13].

In a linear domain wall magnetization remains along the easy axis and is inverted by diminishing the absolute value and passing through zero. The absence of a transverse component of the exchange field in a linear wall eliminates the torque rotating the spin of the traversing electron, and maximizes the mistracking. A linear wall is energetically more favorable than the Bloch one in the bulk of a ferromagnet when the magnetic energy becomes weaker than the anisotropy, e.g. near the Curie temperature in bulk ferromagnets as in Zhirnov’s original paper [13]. Since the Curie temperature of thin films and wires is known to be considerably lower than those of bulk ferromagnets, magnetic energy can become comparable to or even less than the anisotropy in thin nanowires.

In this paper we describe the transition between Bloch and linear domain walls with the relative change of the coefficients of magnetic energy and anisotropy in the Landau functional. We show that the magnetization always rotates in a transition layer of the Bloch wall width, but its absolute value could change. If the magnetic energy is comparable to or less than the anisotropy, another scale, the Zhirnov linear wall width, greater than the Bloch wall width, appears in the problem. The absolute value of magnetization then diminishes from the values in the domains toward the region where the inversion occurs on the scale of Zhirnov linear wall width. So the transverse component of the average magnetic moment in the wall diminishes, which leads to increased electron spin mistracking and higher wall resistance.

Quite generally, equilibrium magnetic domain structure is determined from the minimum of the total energy of a ferromagnet below the Curie temperature including exchange, anisotropy, magnetostatic (stray, or dipole-dipole) and magnetoelastic energies. In the simplest case of uniaxial crystals average magnetic moment along the anisotropy axis (easy-axis)  $\hat{z}$  is oriented oppositely in the neighboring domains. This case corresponds to a positive anisotropy coefficient  $\kappa > 0$  in the Landau expansion of the density of ferromagnetic free energy:

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_0 + AM^2 + BM^4 + \frac{1}{2}\beta(\partial_i\mathbf{M})^2 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa\mathbf{M}_\perp^2. \quad (1)$$

---

\*E-mail: krotkov@magnet.fsu.edu

Here  $\mathbf{M}_\perp = \mathbf{M} - M_z \hat{\mathbf{z}}$  is the in-plane component of the average magnetic moment  $\mathbf{M}$ . For positive  $\kappa$  the minimums  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{const}} = \mathcal{F}_0 - |A|M_s^2/2$  of (1) among the spatially uniform solutions are reached when

$$\mathbf{M} = \pm M_s \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad \text{with} \quad M_s^2 = |A|/2B \quad (2)$$

(in a ferromagnetic state  $A < 0$ ).

Consider a transition layer (a domain wall) between two regions with uniform equilibrium magnetization (2) in the bulk of a ferromagnet. In this case  $\mathbf{M}$  is varying only in the direction  $\hat{\mathbf{l}}$  perpendicular to the plane of the wall. If we introduce the normalized magnetization  $m = M/M_s$  and the polar coordinates  $(\theta, \varphi)$  of  $\mathbf{M}$  with respect to  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ , free energy (1) is rewritten as

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{const}} + \frac{1}{2}M_s^2 [ |A|(1-m^2)^2 + \beta(\dot{m}^2 + m^2\dot{\theta}^2) + (\kappa + \beta\dot{\varphi}^2)m^2 \sin^2 \theta ], \quad (3)$$

where a dot over a symbol implies a derivative over  $l$ . An equilibrium wall structure  $m(l)$ ,  $\theta(l)$ , and  $\varphi(l)$  has to be found from this functional variationally.

The Euler-Lagrange equation  $\delta\mathcal{F}/\delta\varphi = 0$  gives  $\ddot{\varphi} = 0$ , hence  $\dot{\varphi} = \text{const}$ . A minimum of  $\mathcal{F}$  is obtained when  $\dot{\varphi} \equiv 0$ , i.e., the magnetization stays in a plane, which we will choose to be the  $xz$ -plane, so that  $\varphi \equiv 0$ .

Equation  $\delta\mathcal{F}/\delta\theta = 0$  gives  $\beta\dot{\theta} = \kappa \sin\theta \cos\theta$ . Its first integral

$$I = \beta\dot{\theta}^2 - \kappa \sin^2 \theta = \text{const} \quad (4)$$

vanishes in the domains at  $\pm\infty$ , therefore  $I \equiv 0$ . Whence we find that the solution with boundary conditions  $\cos\theta(\pm\infty) = \pm 1$  and the center of the wall at the origin is [14]

$$\cos\theta = \tanh(l/w_{\text{BI}}). \quad (5)$$

The spatial scale  $w_{\text{BI}} = \sqrt{\beta/\kappa}$  is the width of the Bloch wall. It is determined by a competition between the inhomogeneous exchange interaction which tends to increase  $w_{\text{BI}}$  and of the magnetic anisotropy which decreases  $w_{\text{BI}}$ . The direction of magnetization rotates from 0 to  $\pi$  on the scale of  $w_{\text{BI}}$ .

We still have to find the normalized absolute value  $m$  of the magnetization from  $\delta\mathcal{F}/\delta m = 0$ :

$$\beta\ddot{m} = m(\beta\dot{\theta}^2 + \kappa \sin^2 \theta) - 2|A|m(1-m^2). \quad (6)$$

Substituting (5) we arrive at

$$\beta\ddot{m} = 2m \left[ \frac{\kappa}{\cosh^2(l/w_{\text{BI}})} - |A|(1-m^2) \right]. \quad (7)$$

The variation of  $m$  is determined by a competition of the two terms. The first is the anisotropy which acts only in the region  $l \lesssim w_{\text{BI}}$  near the center of the wall, where magnetization deviates from the easy axis. The second




Figure 1: The variation of the absolute value of magnetization through domain walls in a bulk ferromagnetic. The parameter  $w_{\text{zh}}/w_{\text{BI}}$  is 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1, 1.25, 1.5, 2, 3, 5, 10, and 20 for the curves from top to bottom.

term comes from the change in the absolute value of the magnetization. It acts on a scale of the width of Zhirnov wall  $w_{\text{zh}} = \sqrt{\beta/|A|}$  which may be smaller or greater than  $w_{\text{BI}}$  depending on the parameter  $|A|/\kappa$  which gives the relative strength of the magnetic energy and anisotropy.

Deep below the Curie temperature one can neglect the variation of the absolute value of the magnetization  $m$ . In this case the solution, calculated by Landau and Lifshitz [14], is the Bloch wall in which  $m$  remains constant and the angle  $\theta$  inverts on the scale of  $w_{\text{BI}}$ . Indeed, when  $|A| \gg \kappa$ , the first term in (7) may be neglected and the equation

$$\beta\ddot{m} = -2|A|m(1-m^2) \quad (8)$$

has only the trivial solution  $m \equiv 1$  satisfying the boundary conditions  $m(\pm\infty) = 1$ .

Zhirnov [13] considered the domain wall structure near the Curie temperature, when  $A = \alpha(T - T_c)$  is smaller than the anisotropy, and it becomes energetically more favorable to diminish  $m$  rather than to tilt magnetization from the easy axis. Zhirnov linear wall is most easily obtained if we omit the first term in (7) altogether and allow  $m$  to change sign. To pass to the limit of Zhirnov wall in the solution of (7) with the chosen parametrization of  $\mathbf{M}$ , although possible, is not straightforward, and we postpone the discussion of this academic problem until the end of the paper.

For arbitrary ratios  $\kappa/|A|$  the solution for the absolute value of magnetization can only be obtained numerically. The curves  $m(l)$  for several values of the parameter  $w_{\text{zh}}/w_{\text{BI}} = \sqrt{\kappa/|A|}$  are plotted in Fig. 1. The increase in the relative value of the anisotropy  $\kappa/|A|$  describes the transition from the Bloch to linear wall.

We see that for small  $w_{\text{zh}}/w_{\text{BI}}$ , when the anisotropy is relatively weak, the first term in (7) only causes a small




Figure 2: Normalized absolute value of magnetization at the center of the wall  $m(l=0)$  (solid line), the flux width  $w_F$  (9) of the wall (dashed line), and the inverse half-width of the wall (dash-dotted line) as functions of the parameter  $w_{Zh}/w_{BI} = \sqrt{\kappa/|A|}$ .

indentation in  $m$  in the region  $l \lesssim w_{BI}$  near the wall center where the magnetization inverts its direction. A measure of the depth of this indentation is the absolute value of the magnetization in the center of the wall  $m(l=0)$ , which is always  $< 1$  for finite anisotropy  $\kappa/|A|$ .

As  $w_{Zh}$  approaches  $w_{BI}$ ,  $m(l=0)$  goes down. Nevertheless, the width of the indentation remains almost constant and equal to  $w_{BI}$ . At approximately the point when  $w_{Zh}/w_{BI} \approx 2 \div 3$  the second term in (7) takes over the variation of  $m$ . From this point on, the width of the indentation grows approximately linearly with  $w_{Zh}$  and  $m(l=0)$  continues to fall slowly, approaching zero asymptotically as the wall goes to a pure linear limit  $\kappa \gg |A|$ .

Quantitatively, this transition is illustrated in Fig. 2, where the absolute value of the magnetization at the center of the wall  $m(l=0)$  (solid line) and the inverse half-width of the indentation (dash-dotted line) are plotted vs.  $w_{Zh}/w_{BI}$ .

There are clearly two spatial scales in the problem: angle  $\theta$  is inverted in a layer of the width  $w_{BI}$ ; also, if  $w_{Zh} > w_{BI}$ , the absolute value of magnetization changes with the characteristic length of  $w_{Zh}$ . Which of the scales defines the wall width depends on the context, and various definitions were proposed in the literature [15]. All of them, however, are based on the variation of the angle  $\theta(l)$  only and are not particularly suitable for the wall in question. The definition of the wall width based on the total wall flux

$$w_F = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} m(l) \sin \theta(l) dl \quad (9)$$

seems a viable suggestion. It describes contrast in Bitter pattern experiments [15]. And, since (9) gives the inte-

gral of the transverse component of magnetization in a wall, it serves as a qualitative measure of mistracking, and, hence, of the wall resistance.

The flux width of the wall is plotted in units of  $w_{BI}$  as dashed line in Fig. 2. It changes from  $w_{BI}$  for the limiting case of a pure Bloch domain wall to zero for a pure Zhirnov linear wall. Thus with the increase of the anisotropy, as the wall transforms into a linear one, the transverse component of magnetization in the wall diminishes, so the electron spin becomes less able to track the changing local exchange field when it traverses the wall, and the wall resistance increases.

In a finite sample the structure of a domain wall is found from a minimum of the sum of the local free energy (1) and of the non-local dipolar energy depending on the form of the sample. This is a highly non-trivial task even for the simple geometry of cylindrical wires with the easy axis along the wires used in [11]. A rough estimate of the importance of the dipolar energy is given by  $2\pi M_s^2$  multiplied by the wall width compared to the surface tension of the wall. For a Bloch wall this leads to the usual “quality factor” criterion: if  $2\pi M_s^2/\kappa$  is less than unity, the dipolar interaction can be neglected, otherwise not. For a Zhirnov wall the ratio of the dipolar energy of the wall to its tension calculated by neglecting the dipolar contribution is  $2\pi M_s^2/|A|$ . Since in the Zhirnov regime  $|A| \ll \kappa$ , this is a stricter requirement. So, we conclude, the magnetostatic energy does play a role in the form of the domain wall in finite samples in the regime close to the pure linear Zhirnov wall. However, this is a problem of the next level of complexity that has to be studied separately.

To conclude, in an equilibrium domain wall in a bulk ferromagnet the magnetization is flipped on the scale of the Bloch wall width. If the anisotropy is comparable or stronger than the magnetic energy the absolute value of magnetization in the region where it is flipped is less than the value in the domains. The decrease in the absolute value occurs on the scale of the width of Zhirnov linear wall. This decrease diminishes the torque acting on the spin of an electron traversing the wall, impairs the ability of the electron spin to track the changing magnetization, and leads to a greater spin accumulation GMR effect, and thus to a greater wall resistance. This may contribute to the observed large magnetoresistance of domain walls in 35 nm Co nanowires [11]. A quantitative estimate of the effect is hindered by the absence of data on the Curie temperature of nanowires. Encouraging, though, is the absence of large magnetoresistance in slightly thicker wires of 50 nm in diameter [11] which presumably have greater  $T_c$ .

In the end of the paper, we show how a formal passing to the limit of pure Zhirnov wall may be done in the solution of (7). Zhirnov linear wall is realized in the limit  $w_{Zh} > w_{BI}$ . Then outside of the region of the inversion of  $\theta$ ,  $|l| \lesssim w_{BI}$ , the slow variation of  $m$  is still described

by (8). The non-trivial solutions with the boundary conditions  $m(\pm\infty) = 1$  are respectively

$$m(l) = \tanh \frac{l_0 \pm l}{w_{\text{Zh}}}. \quad (10)$$

The first term of (7) is non-zero only closer than  $w_{\text{BI}}$  to the center of the wall. To describe the variation of  $m$  on the scale of  $w_{\text{Zh}}$  it may be substituted by a delta-function:  $\cosh^{-2}(l/w_{\text{BI}}) \rightarrow 2\delta(l/w_{\text{BI}})$ . Thus the two solutions (10) need to be matched at the origin so that the derivative  $\dot{m}(0)$  had a jump

$$\dot{m}(+0) - \dot{m}(-0) = 4m(0). \quad (11)$$

Since for small  $l_0$  Eq. (10) gives  $m(0) \approx l_0/w_{\text{Zh}}$  and  $\dot{m}(0) \approx \pm 1/w_{\text{Zh}}$ , condition (11) corresponds to a choice of  $l_0 = w_{\text{BI}}/2$ . So the solution is given by

$$m(l) = \tanh \frac{w_{\text{BI}}/2 \pm |l|}{w_{\text{Zh}}}. \quad (12)$$

On the scale of  $w_{\text{Zh}}$  one may neglect  $w_{\text{BI}}/2$  compared to  $|l|$ , and we finally have

$$m(l) = \tanh |l|/w_{\text{Zh}}. \quad (13)$$

The law of inversion (5) of the angle  $\theta$  on the scale  $w_{\text{Zh}}$  is

$$\theta(l) = \pi\Theta(l), \quad (14)$$

where  $\Theta(x)$  is the Heaviside function. In a pure Zhirnov wall magnetization never leaves the easy axis and only changes its direction passing through zero. Hence the chosen parametrization of  $\mathbf{M}$  by  $m$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $\varphi$  is not very convenient for such a transition. That's why an indirect procedure above was needed.

We gratefully acknowledge discussions with L. P. Gor'kov. Work was supported from DARPA through the Naval Research Laboratory Grant No. N00173-00-1-6005.

- 
- [1] A. D. Kent, J. Yu, U. Rüdiger and S. S. P. Parkin, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **13**, R461 (2001).
  - [2] P. M. Levy and S. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 5110 (1997).
  - [3] J. F. Gregg, W. Allen, K. Ounadjela, M. Viret, M. Hehn, S. M. Thompson, and J. M. D. Coey, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1580 (1996).
  - [4] G. Tatara and H. Fukuyama, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3773 (1997).
  - [5] R. P. van Gorkom, A. Brataas and G. E. W. Bauer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4401 (1999).
  - [6] K. Hong and N. Giordano, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **13**, L401 (1998).
  - [7] U. Ruediger, J. Yu, S. Zhang, A. D. Kent, and S. S. P. Parkin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5639 (1998).
  - [8] N. Garcia, M. Muñoz, and Y.-W. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2923 (1999).
  - [9] H. D. Chopra and S. Z. Hua, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 020403 (2002).
  - [10] P. Bruno, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 2425 (1999).
  - [11] U. Ebels, A. Radulescu, Y. Henry, L. Piraux, and K. Ounadjela, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 983 (2000).
  - [12] M. Dzero, L. P. Gor'kov, A. K. Zvezdin, and K. A. Zvezdin, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 100402(R) (2003).
  - [13] V. A. Zhirnov, *Zh. Éksp. Teor. Fiz.* **35**, 1175 (1959) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **8**, 822 (1959)].
  - [14] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Phys. Z. Sowjetunion* **8**, 153 (1935).
  - [15] A. Hubert and R. Schäfer, *Magnetic Domains* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998).