

## Mean-field magnetization relaxation in conducting ferromagnets

Yaroslav Tserkovnyak, Gregory A. Fiete, and Bertrand I. Halperin

Lyman Laboratory of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA

(Dated: March 22, 2004)

Collective ferromagnetic motion in a conducting medium is damped by the transfer of the magnetic moment and energy to the itinerant carriers. We present a calculation of the corresponding magnetization relaxation as a linear-response problem for the carrier dynamics in the effective exchange field of the ferromagnet. In electron systems with little intrinsic spin-orbit interaction, a uniform magnetization motion can be formally eliminated by going into the rotating frame of reference for the spin dynamics. The ferromagnetic damping in this case grows linearly with the spin- $\uparrow$  rate when the latter is smaller than the exchange field and is inversely proportional to the spin- $\uparrow$  rate in the opposite limit. These two regimes are analogous to the "spin-pumping" and the "breathing Fermi-surface" damping mechanisms, respectively. In diluted ferromagnetic semiconductors, the hole-mediated magnetization can be efficiently relaxed to the itinerant-carrier degrees of freedom due to the strong spin-orbit interaction in the valence bands.

PACS numbers: 76.50.+g, 75.45.+j, 85.75.-d

Relaxation of the ferromagnetic magnetization dynamics is well understood phenomenologically, being often accounted for by a single dimensionless parameter, the so-called Gilbert damping.<sup>1</sup> The equation of motion conserving the magnetization magnitude is written for the local magnetization-direction unit vector  $\mathbf{m}$  as

$$\dot{\mathbf{m}} = \gamma \mathbf{m} \times \mathbf{H}_e + \alpha \mathbf{m} \times \dot{\mathbf{m}}; \quad (1)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the (minus) gyromagnetic ratio. The first term on the right-hand side describes the motion of the magnetization,  $\mathbf{M} = M_s \mathbf{m}$ , in the effective field  $\mathbf{H}_e = \gamma^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{m}}$ , which preserves the magnetic energy  $E_M$  in the presence of applied, crystal, exchange, and demagnetization fields.<sup>2</sup> The second term characterizes the dissipation of the magnetic energy due to coupling with other degrees of freedom. In the case of small-angle motion near an equilibrium rotational-symmetry axis, Eq. (1) describes a damped circular precession with frequency  $\omega = \gamma H_e$ . In the presence of anisotropies, both  $\gamma$  and  $\alpha$  become tensor quantities, and the trajectories elliptic. For the purpose of our discussion, it is sufficient to treat the simple case of circular precession with a scalar damping.

Despite decades of experimental and theoretical studies of itinerant ferromagnetism in metals and, more recently, in semiconductors, the microscopic origin of  $\alpha$  is still not fully understood. One possible proposed mechanism involves a transfer of the angular momentum (and energy) of a nonequilibrium ferromagnetic configuration to the itinerant electrons via the exchange interaction, with a subsequent spin-orbit relaxation to the lattice. Such a process has been studied extensively within the standard model, see, e.g., Refs. 3,4, although its implied applicability to the itinerant transition-metal ferromagnetism has not been demonstrated. The standard picture was resurrected recently<sup>5</sup> to address the question of magnetization relaxation in the ferromagnetic semiconductor (GaMn)As, where the ferromagnetism originates in the hole-mediated exchange interaction between the substiti-

tutional (paramagnetic) spin-5/2 Mn atoms.<sup>6</sup> This letter puts forward a description of the magnetization damping due to the exchange interaction between the localized magnetic orbitals and the itinerant carriers in ferromagnetic metals and semiconductors, by reducing the problem to treating the carrier dynamics in a time-dependent uniform exchange field.

There is at least one Gilbert-damping mechanism which can be identified and measured separately from the others in metallic ultrathin films. Its origin is nonlocal: The motion of a small ferromagnet with a large surface-to-volume ratio pumps spins into adjacent conductors, which can then be damped by spin- $\uparrow$  scattering outside of the ferromagnet, leading to the Gilbert form of relaxation with an  $\alpha$  which can dominate the intrinsic damping<sup>7</sup>. This process was thoroughly studied experimentally in ultrathin films<sup>8,9</sup> giving remarkable agreement with the parameters obtained by first-principles band-structure calculations.<sup>10</sup> Bolstered by the success in understanding the enhanced damping of thin films by using a picture of the ferromagnetic relaxation via time-dependent exchange interaction with itinerant carriers, we apply related ideas to formulate a framework for studying intrinsic relaxation of conducting ferromagnets.

Consider an sp<sup>2</sup> model of a conducting ferromagnet, where the spins  $\mathbf{J}$  of the itinerant s or p orbitals (either electrons or holes) are polarized by an exchange field along the magnetization direction  $\mathbf{m}$  of localized d orbitals.<sup>11</sup>

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{m}(t) \times \mathbf{J}; \quad (2)$$

Here  $\mathbf{H}$  is a (time-independent) Hamiltonian which depends on the host band structure. The exchange field can be induced by the localized paramagnetic impurities, such as substitutional Mn atoms in (GaMn)As. Although such exchange can be highly nonuniform on the atomic scales, we are making a simplifying assumption in Eq. (2) of a uniform field whose magnetization direction  $\mathbf{m}$  is treated classically in the mean-field approximation.

In particular, the magnetization is taken to be spatially uniform on the relevant length scales of the carrier dynamics. We choose as a concrete example for some of our discussions the spherical Luttinger Hamiltonian for the spin-3/2 holes in the valence bands of a dilute p-doped semiconductor (e.g., GaAs, Si, or Ge):

$$H = (2m_e)^{-1} [1 + (5/2)\beta^2 - 2\beta(J=3/2)] ; \quad (3)$$

where  $m_e$  is the free-electron mass and the  $\beta_i$  are the so-called Luttinger parameters.<sup>12</sup> The spin-orbit term couples the hole momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  with its spin  $\mathbf{J}$ . For the validity of the four-band model (3), the carrier density must be low enough that the Fermi energy is smaller than the intrinsic host spin-orbit interaction energy. For the discussion of spin-1/2 electron systems, we set  $\beta_2 = 0$ . Suppose the magnetization of the localized orbitals varies slowly in time (being uniform at all times), so that the time-dependent  $\mathbf{m}$  modulates the Hamiltonian (2) adiabatically. This means that the system equilibrates on time scales faster than the motion of  $\mathbf{m}$  and all the quantities parameterizing the carrier Hamiltonian stay constant. Many-magnon scattering<sup>13</sup> is disregarded. Such a time-dependent long-range ferromagnetic order can be achieved in ferromagnetic resonance (FMR) experiments on thin films of transition metals<sup>14</sup> and semiconductors.<sup>15</sup>

Consider the small-angle dynamics of the unit vector  $\mathbf{m}(t)$  in Eq. (2) near the  $z$  axis. Suppose the equilibrium value of the average spin is collinear with the magnetization. The variation  $\mathbf{m}(t) = m(t)\hat{z}$  will induce the uniform spin density  $\hat{\mathbf{j}}_j(!) = j_x j_x(!)\hat{x} + j_y j_y(!)\hat{y}$  along the  $x$  axis, and similarly along the  $y$  axis, where  $j_j$  is the spin-spin response function at a finite  $\omega$  (that is we are developing a perturbation theory for small variations in the direction of the exchange field, not assuming the smallness of its magnitude). For a system which is spin-rotationally invariant around the  $z$  axis,  $j_x j_x = j_y j_y$ , which will be assumed in the following. The spin density  $\mathbf{j}$ , in turn, corresponds to the effective field  $\mathbf{H}_e = (\mathbf{M}_s)\mathbf{j}$  which gives a contribution to the magnetization equation of motion (1). In the low-frequency limit, it translates into the damping coefficient

$$= (\mathbf{M}_s)^2 \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \text{Im } j_x j_x(!) = : \quad (4)$$

The susceptibility  $j_x j_y$  renormalizes the local-spin gyromagnetic ratio if the carrier-spin density is comparable to the local-spin density. Eq. (4) can also be obtained by equating the energy dissipated into the itinerant degrees of freedom by the moving magnetization and the work done by an rf magnetic field applied against the viscous Gilbert term in Eq. (1), at a steady magnetic precession. Eq. (4) is the most basic equation in this paper and may be taken as the definition of  $\alpha$ . In the following, we formally evaluate  $\alpha$  for electron and hole systems and discuss its dependence on the disorder composition.

In the absence of spin-orbit interaction in the band structure,  $\beta_2 = 0$ , the average spin density moves in the




FIG. 1: Gilbert damping, Eq. (6), in units of  $\alpha_{\max} = j_0 = (2M_s)$  as a function of the normalized spin-1/2 rate. Inset: Geometry of the model.

exchange field as

$$\partial_t \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j} \times \mathbf{m}(t) - [\mathbf{j} \cdot \partial_t \mathbf{m}(t)] \mathbf{T}_2 ; \quad (5)$$

where the last term is a phenomenological relaxation due to impurities, characterized by the transverse spin-1/2 time  $T_2$ . We assume here that  $\mathbf{m}(t)$  undergoes a slow motion (on the scales set by frequencies  $\omega$  and  $T_2^{-1}$ ). It is convenient to transform Eq. (5) into the frame of reference (for spin variables) moving together with  $\mathbf{m}(t)$ : If, for example,  $\mathbf{m}$  is instantaneously rotating with frequency  $\omega$  around the  $y$  axis in the laboratory frame, see Fig. 1 inset, it is stationary in the rotating frame and there is a new (Larmor) term  $\omega \hat{y} \times \mathbf{j}$  on the right-hand side of Eq. (5), which tries to polarize spins along the  $y$  axis. Because the motion is slow, we can solve for  $\mathbf{j}$  as the (instantaneous) stationary state in the moving frame of reference. We then find the torque that  $\mathbf{j}$  exerts on  $\mathbf{m}$  to get

$$= \sim j_x j_y \mathbf{M}_s = T_2^{-1} [1 + (\omega T_2)^2]^{-1} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{M}_s ; \quad (6)$$

where  $\sim j_x j_y$  is the stationary (real-valued) response function in the rotating frame, for  $\mathbf{m}$  pointing along the  $z$  axis. We have thus reduced the calculation of the time-dependent response in the laboratory frame, Eq. (4), to the static response in the rotating frame. Such a transformation can be done in general for a spin-rotationally invariant Hamiltonian with no spin-orbit interaction in the band structure. We plot Eq. (6) in Fig. 1. The equilibrium spin density  $j_0$  can be calculated from the specific form of the Hamiltonian.  $\alpha$  vanishes at both small and large spin-1/2 rates.

The damping parameter (6) scales differently with the spin-1/2 rate depending on how it compares with the exchange energy. The low spin-1/2 rate regime,  $\omega / T_2^{-1}$ , is completely analogous to the "spin-pumping" damping<sup>7</sup> of thin films in contact with a "spin-sink" conductor: The moving magnetization pumps spins into the itinerant carriers at a constant rate, which are then relaxed with a probability  $\omega / T_2^{-1}$  before exchanging spins with the ferromagnet. The difference is that now the spins are "pumped" into the ferromagnet's own delocalized states. The other limit,  $\omega / T_2^{-1}$ , is simple to understand since

$j(t) = j(t) - T_2 \partial_t j(t)$ , in the laboratory frame when the relaxation rate dominates the dynamics of  $j(t)$ .  $\partial_t j(t) / T_2$  then follows from the torque  $\partial_t j(t) = m$ . This is analogous to the "breathing Fermi surface" mechanism<sup>16</sup> of the itinerant carriers, which try to accommodate the changing magnetization direction but are lagging behind with a delay time of  $T_2$ . In the presence of an anisotropic spin-orbit interaction in the crystal field of a metallic ferromagnet, the breathing Fermi surface gives an additional contribution to damping, which scales linearly with the band-structure relaxation time.<sup>16</sup>

It is interesting to note that Eq. (6) reduces to the random-phase approximation result for the long-wavelength magnon lifetime due to the  $s-d$  interaction with spin-1=2 conduction electrons, which was obtained in Ref. 4 using a fully quantum-mechanical description:

$$= T_2 [1 + (\gamma T_2)^2]^{-1} m k_F = (4 \pi^2 \gamma / M_s); \quad (7)$$

where  $m$  is the band-structure mass and  $k_F$  is the Fermi wave vector, and it was assumed that  $\gamma \approx E_F$  (the Fermi energy). The quantity in the second square brackets is just the total carrier spin density. Eq. (7) was used in Ref. 9 to explain the measured damping in thin permalloy films, which scaled linearly with the film resistivity, as expected due to the  $T_2^{-1}$  prefactor in the relevant limit of a large exchange energy,  $E_F \gg T_2^{-1}$ , in the transition-metal ferromagnets. Unlike the case of the ferromagnetic semiconductors, the direct application of the  $s-d$  model result is however questionable in the case of itinerant ferromagnetism in the transition metals where the separation between the magnetic and conducting orbitals is unphysical.

We now turn to a discussion of the application of these results to magnetization relaxation in hole-doped magnetic semiconductors (Ga,Mn)As. Let us first make a rough estimate of the damping coefficient using Eq. (6): The largest achievable value of  $\gamma_{\max} = \dot{j} = (2M_s)$  occurs when the holes are fully polarized giving  $\gamma_{\max} \approx 0.1-0.3$ , roughly one third the ratio of the hole to the substitutional Mn concentrations. For realistic samples with a spin polarization of the order of unity, therefore,  $\gamma_{\max} \approx 0.1$ . The damping is further suppressed by the factor  $\gamma_{\max} = 2 T_2 [1 + (\gamma T_2)^2]^{-1} < 1$ . For clean bulk samples of GaAs, the spin- $\uparrow$ ip relaxation time is  $\approx 100$  fs.<sup>7</sup> For approximately 5% Mn doping,  $\gamma \approx 0.1$  eV<sup>18</sup>, so that  $T_2 \approx 10$ , puts one in the  $\gamma / T_2^{-1}$  regime with  $\gamma_{\max} \approx 0.1$ . Shorter spin- $\uparrow$ ip times would thus result in larger damping. Experimentally, the impurity scattering is likely to be the easiest parameter to vary in order to "engineer" a desired  $\gamma$ . For a bulk sample, the strong spin-orbit coupling  $\gamma_2$ , however, makes the validity of the phenomenological equation (5), and thus result (6), questionable. Besides, the crystal anisotropy would require a further refinement of the analysis. We thus have to return to Eq. (4) in order to derive a reliable result. Evaluating

the response function for a noninteracting Hamiltonian yields

$$= \frac{2}{M_s V} \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\omega} \sum_{ij} j_i j_x j_j j^2 [f(i) - f(j)] (\sim i + j); \quad (8)$$

where  $f(i)$  is the Fermi-Dirac distribution and  $i, j$  label one-particle eigenstates in the sample of volume  $V$ . If the lattice vector  $k$  is conserved,  $j_i j_x j_j = V \sum_{ab} d^3 k = (2\pi)^3$ , where  $a, b$  label spin states. For a perfect crystal, therefore,  $\gamma$  vanishes, as expected (unless there is a finite measure Fermi surface area with a spin degeneracy). The role of the relaxation on lattice defects was formally introduced in Ref. 5 by broadened one-particle spectral functions,  $A_{ka}(\omega) = [(\omega - \epsilon_{ka})^2 + \gamma^2/4]^{-1}$ , as follows:

$$= \frac{2}{M_s} \lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\omega} \sum_{ab} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} j_{ka} j_x j_{kb} j^2 \frac{d}{d\omega} \frac{1}{(\omega - \epsilon_{ka})^2 + \gamma^2/4} [f(i) - f(i + \sim i)]; \quad (9)$$

which was obtained by evaluating the local-spin susceptibility after integrating out the itinerant-carrier degrees of freedom. They<sup>5</sup> find a nonmonotonic behavior of  $\gamma$  as a function of the phenomenological scattering rate for a realistic (Ga,Mn)As band structure:  $\gamma / T_2^{-1}$  as  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  (after taking the  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  limit first) and, after passing through a minimum,  $\gamma$  increases monotonically with large  $\gamma$ . Eq. (9) however appears to have a problem for the large momentum-scattering rate,  $\gamma$ , asymptotic: When  $\gamma \gg T_2^{-1}$ , the Dyakonov-Pere<sup>19</sup> spin-relaxation rate for Hamiltonian (3) scales as  $\gamma^2$ ; the spin-spin response corresponding to Eq. (9), on the other hand, has a  $1/\omega$  cutoff in the time domain, resulting in a spin-relaxation rate growing linearly with  $\gamma$ .

In our discussion, we have assumed that the ferromagnetic magnetization is moving without specifying the exact mechanism of how the motion is initiated. Doing this by, e.g., applying an external magnetic field (with a large dc and small rf components) will of course affect the form of the Hamiltonian (2) for the itinerant carriers. Our results for the Gilbert damping will stay unaffected, however, as long as the exchange energy  $\gamma$  is much larger than the carrier Zeeman splitting in the applied field, and the ferromagnetic magnetization is mostly supplied by the localized orbitals (otherwise one has to take into account the energy pumped by the rf field into the carrier-magnetization dynamics).

We are grateful to G. E. W. Bauer, A. B. Rataas, and B. Heinrich for stimulating discussions. This work is supported in part by the Harvard Society of Fellows, the DARPA award No. MDA-972-01-1-0024, and NSF Grants PHY-01-17795 and DMR-02-33773.

Present address: Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics,  
UC Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA

- <sup>1</sup> T. L. Gilbert, Phys. Rev. 100, 1243 (1955).
- <sup>2</sup> L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz, and L. P. Pitaevski, Statistical physics, part 2 (Pergamon, Oxford, 1980), 3rd ed.
- <sup>3</sup> A. H. Mitchell, Phys. Rev. 105, 1439 (1957).
- <sup>4</sup> B. Heinrich, D. Fraaije, and V. Kambarsky, Phys. Status Solidi 23, 501 (1967).
- <sup>5</sup> J. Sinova, T. Jungwirth, X. Liu, Y. Sasaki, J. K. Furdyna, W. A. Atkinson, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B 69, 085209 (2004).
- <sup>6</sup> H. Ohno, J. Magn. Mater. 200, 110 (1999).
- <sup>7</sup> Y. Tserkovnyak, A. Brataas, and G. E. W. Bauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 117601 (2002); Phys. Rev. B 66, 224403 (2002).
- <sup>8</sup> S. Mizukami, Y. Ando, and T. Miyazaki, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. 40, 580 (2001); Phys. Rev. B 66, 104413 (2002); R. Urban, G. Woltersdorf, and B. Heinrich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 217204 (2001); B. Heinrich, Y. Tserkovnyak, G. Woltersdorf, A. Brataas, R. Urban, and G. E. Bauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 187601 (2003).
- <sup>9</sup> S. Ingvarsson, L. Ritchie, X. Y. Liu, G. Xiao, J. C. Slonczewski, P. L. Trouilloud, and R. H. Koch, Phys. Rev. B 66, 214416 (2002).
- <sup>10</sup> M. Zwierzycki, Y. Tserkovnyak, P. J. Kelly, A. Brataas, and G. E. W. Bauer, cond-mat/0402088 (unpublished).
- <sup>11</sup> There is actually a small degree of microscopic non-collinearity in the magnetism of ferromagnetic semiconductors: G. Fiete, G. Zarand and K. Damle, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 097202 (2003) and J. Schliemann, Phys. Rev. B, 67 915 (2003).
- <sup>12</sup> J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. 102, 1030 (1956).
- <sup>13</sup> R. Arias and D. L. Mills, Phys. Rev. B 60, 7395 (1999); A. Y. Dobin and R. H. Victora, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 167203 (2003).
- <sup>14</sup> B. Heinrich and J. F. Cochran, Adv. Phys. 42, 523 (1993).
- <sup>15</sup> S. T. B. Goennenwein, T. Graf, T. W. Assner, M. S. Brandt, M. Stutzmann, J. B. Philipp, R. Gross, M. Krieger, K. Zum, P. Ziemann, A. Koeder, S. Frank, W. Schoch, A. Waag, Appl. Phys. Lett. 82, 730 (2003); T. G. Rapoport, P. Redlinski, X. Liu, G. Zarand, J. K. Furdyna, and B. Janko, Phys. Rev. B 69, 125213 (2004).
- <sup>16</sup> J. Kunes and V. Kambarsky, Phys. Rev. B 65, 212411 (2002).
- <sup>17</sup> D. J. Hilton and C. L. Tang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 146601 (2003).
- <sup>18</sup> T. Dietl, H. Ohno, and F. Matsukura, Phys. Rev. B 63, 195205 (2001).
- <sup>19</sup> M. I. Dyakonov and V. I. Perel, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 60, 1954 (1971) [Sov. Phys. JETP 33, 1053 (1971)].