

Coherent radiation by molecular magnets

V. I. Yukalov^{1,2} and E. P. Yukalova^{1,3}

¹Institut für Theoretische Physik,
Freie Universität Berlin, Am Müllers 14, D-14195 Berlin, Germany

²Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia

³Department of Computational Physics, Laboratory of Information Technologies,
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia

Abstract

The possibility of coherent radiation by molecular magnets is investigated. It is shown that to realize the coherent radiation, it is necessary to couple the considered sample to a resonant electric circuit. A theory for describing this phenomenon is developed, based on a realistic microscopic Hamiltonian, including the Zeeman terms, single-site anisotropy, and dipole interactions. The role of hyperfine interactions between molecular and nuclear spins is studied. Numerical solutions of the spin evolution equations are presented.

PACS:

07.57.Hm – Infrared, microwave, and radiowave sources

75.50.Xx – Molecular magnets

76.20.+q – General theory of magnetic resonances and relaxation

Molecular magnets is a relatively new class of materials possessing several interesting properties (see e.g. reviews [1{3]). One of the important features is that the molecules, forming the magnet, can have rather different values of spin, between 1/2 and more than 10. At low temperatures, the molecular magnets are bistable and exhibit hysteresis [4] and tunneling between up and down orientations [5,6]. Their potential use for quantum computation has been proposed [7], and experiments with millimeter-wave radiation have been carried out showing that the relaxation rate for magnetization reversal and the energy-level populations can be controlled [8{12]. The magnetization reversal, caused by a linearly varying in time external magnetic field, with a fast magnetization avalanche [4], is due to the Landau-Zener tunneling [13{16]. The latter is a quantum effect, involving no coherence between different molecules. An attempt has been made [17] to check if the quantum tunneling can be accompanied by coherent electromagnetic radiation. However, the most recent and accurate experiment [18] detected no significant radiation.

In the present paper, we suggest a principally different setup for realizing coherent radiation from molecular magnets. The key difference is that a magnet has to be coupled to a resonant electric circuit. Such a setup has proved to be effective in achieving coherent radiation by nuclear spins, which was described theoretically [19{21] as well as performed experimentally (see reviews [22{24]). Molecular magnets, however, have several properties essentially distinguishing them from nuclear magnets. The most important distinctions are the possibility of possessing a high spin, the existence of level splitting, the presence of a single-site anisotropy that can be rather large, and the necessity of taking account of the line-width narrowing effect due to a strong spin polarization. The aim of this letter is to present a generalized theory of coherent spin radiation, including these principal features, typical of molecular magnets, and to give numerical solutions of the derived generalized equations.

Our consideration is based on the macroscopic Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \sum_i \hat{H}_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \hat{H}_{ij}; \quad (1)$$

describing N molecules, each having spin S . The first term in Eq. (1) contains the single-spin Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_i = \gamma_0 B \hat{S}_i + D (\hat{S}_i^z)^2; \quad (2)$$

in which $\gamma_0 = \hbar \gamma$, with γ being the gyromagnetic ratio, B is the total magnetic field acting on spin S_i , and D is the anisotropy parameter. The total magnetic field

$$B = B_0 e_z + (h_0 + h_1 \cos \omega t + H) e_x \quad (3)$$

consists of a longitudinal magnetic field B_0 , transverse constant field h_0 , modelling the level splitting, an alternating field $h_1 \cos \omega t$, and the resonator field H . The latter is defined by the Kirchhoff equation

$$\frac{dH}{dt} + 2\gamma H + \omega^2 \int_0^t H(t') dt' = e_f - 4 \frac{dm_x}{dt}; \quad (4)$$

in which γ is the circuit damping, ω is the circuit natural frequency, $e_f = \hbar \gamma \cos \omega t$ is an electromotive force, γ is a filling factor, and $m_x = \langle \sum_i S_i^x \rangle / V$ is the average transverse

magnetization. The coupling of a molecular magnet to a resonant electric circuit through the Kirchhoff equation (4) is the fundamental point in the proposed setup. The second term in Hamiltonian (1) corresponds to dipole spin interactions, with

$$\hat{H}_{ij} = \sum D_{ij} S_i S_j ; \quad (5)$$

where D_{ij} is the dipolar tensor.

The necessary conditions for the occurrence of coherent spin motion are the existence of a well-defined frequency of their rotation ω_s and the formation of spin packets of a characteristic size L_s , such that $kL_s \gg 1$, where $k = \omega_s/c$. Then the arising coherent radiation happens at the frequency ω_s . If the radiation wavelength is larger than the system linear size L , then the spin-packet length L_s , just coincides with L . This, however, is not compulsory, and L_s can be much shorter than L . But the condition $kL_s \gg 1$ is necessary for spin packets to be formed. Writing down the Heisenberg equations of motion for the spin operators, we shall average them over the spin degrees of freedom, aiming at obtaining the evolution equations for the following averages: The transition function

$$u = \frac{1}{SN_s} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \langle S_i^x \rangle ; \quad (6)$$

the coherence intensity

$$w = \frac{1}{S^2 N_s (N_s - 1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \langle S_i^+ S_j^- \rangle ; \quad (7)$$

and the spin polarization

$$s = \frac{1}{SN_s} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \langle S_i^z \rangle ; \quad (8)$$

where $N_s = I_s^3$ is the number of spins in a spin packet, $N = V$ is the average spin density, and $S_i^\pm$ are the ladder spin operators.

In each spin system, there are dipole spin interactions, represented by Eq. (5). These interactions must be taken into account when considering any collective properties of the spin system. The dipole interactions is the major cause for the appearance of the transverse relaxation rate. A peculiarity of molecular magnets is the possibility of having very high longitudinal spin polarizations. This requires to include in the effective transverse relaxation the effect of line-width narrowing [25], which results in the effective relaxation rate

$$\gamma_2 = (1 - \langle S^2 \rangle) \gamma_2 + \gamma_2 ; \quad (9)$$

where $\gamma_2 = n_0 \frac{2}{S(S+1)} \hbar$ is the spin dephasing rate, with n_0 being the number of nearest neighbours, and γ_2 is an inhomogeneous broadening [25,26].

From the evolution equations for the spin variables (6) to (8), it follows that the frequency of spin rotation is

$$\omega_s = \omega_0 - \omega_D s ; \quad (10)$$

in which $\omega_0 = \gamma_0 B_0 = \hbar$ is the Zeeman frequency and $\omega_D = (2S - 1)D = \hbar$ is the anisotropy frequency. The second term in Eq. (10) depends on time through $s = s(t)$. Therefore to keep

the spin frequency (10) in resonance with the resonator natural frequency ω , one has to apply a sufficiently strong external magnetic field B_0 , such that $\omega_0 = \omega_D \approx 1$, and the resonance condition $\omega = \omega_D \approx 1$, ($\omega = \omega_D \approx 1$) could be realized. In some molecular magnets, the single-site anisotropy is rather strong, so that ω_D can reach the values of 10^{12} s^{-1} . Then, to make ω_0 much larger than ω_D , one has to invoke magnetic fields $B_0 \approx 10 - 100 \text{ T}$. Fortunately, many molecular magnets possess much weaker anisotropies, for which $B_0 \approx 1 \text{ T}$ would be quite sufficient. In addition, achieving nowadays very high magnetic fields is not an insuperable obstacle. Among available sources [27], there are those allowing to reach the stationary magnetic fields of 45 T (National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, USA) and the pulsed fields up to 600 T (University of Tokyo, Japan). The pulsed fields can be supported during the time 10^{-2} s up to several seconds, which is perfectly sufficient for realizing coherent radiation in a molecular magnet.

In what follows, we assume that there is an external constant magnetic field B_0 , for which the resonance condition $\omega = \omega_D \approx 1$ is valid, that is the resonant circuit can be tuned to the resonance with the spin frequency (10). As is mentioned above, to achieve coherent radiation, one has to have a well-defined frequency ω_s , which requires that the magnitude of the latter be much larger than any attenuation rate. If so, the system possesses two different time scales, which allows us to employ the scale-separation approach [19{23], whose mathematical foundation is based on the averaging techniques [28]. The transverse function (6) is fast, as compared to the slow variables (7) and (8). The latter are to be treated as quasi-invariants, when solving the equation for function (6).

To represent the final formulas in a nice way, we need to introduce several notations. The spin-resonator coupling is characterized by the dimensionless coupling parameter

$$g = \frac{\omega_s}{\omega_D (1 + \omega_D^2)}; \quad (11)$$

in which $\omega_0 = \omega_D S = \hbar$ is the natural spin width. The action of the resonator feedback field comes through the temporal coupling function

$$g_2 = 1 - e^{-t} : \quad (12)$$

The effective transverse attenuation is given by the collective width

$$\omega_2 + \omega_3 = S; \quad (13)$$

in which ω_3 is the inhomogeneous dynamic broadening due to local dipole fluctuations [19{23].

For the transverse function (6), we find

$$u = \frac{\omega_s}{\omega_s - i} + \frac{(1 + \omega_D^2)S}{\omega_s + i} e^{-i\omega_s t} + u_0 + \frac{\omega_s}{\omega_s - i} \frac{(1 + \omega_D^2)S}{\omega_s + i} e^{-(i\omega_s + \omega_2)t};$$

where $\omega_0 = \omega_D h_0 = \hbar$, $\omega_1 = \omega_D h_1 = 2\hbar$, $\omega_2 = \omega_D h_2 = 2\hbar$, and the function $(\omega_2 = 2)(1 - e^{-t})$ describes the action of an electromotive force, if any.

Let us define the effective attenuation

$$\omega_3 = \omega_2 + \frac{\omega_0^2}{\omega_s^2 + \omega_2^2} = \frac{\omega_0 (1 + \omega_D^2)}{\omega_s^2 + \omega_2^2} e^{-t} + \frac{(1 + \omega_D^2)^2}{\omega_s^2 + \omega_2^2} (1 - e^{-t}) : \quad (14)$$

Then the slow evolution equations for the slow functions (7) and (8) can be represented in the form

$$\frac{dw}{dt} = -2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1 s)w + 2\gamma_3 s^2; \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = -\gamma_1 w - \gamma_3 s - \gamma_1(s - s_0); \quad (15)$$

in which s_0 is a stationary spin polarization and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1 + \gamma_1$ is the sum of the spin-lattice attenuation γ_1 and a pumping rate γ_1 , if the sample is subject to a nonresonant pumping procedure.

The evolution equations (15) include all important attenuation rates that can influence spin dynamics. In general, there exists also one more relaxation parameter, the radiation rate $\gamma_r = 2\gamma_0^2 S k^3 N_s / 3h$ due to spin interactions through the common radiation field. However this rate, as has been noticed yet by Bloembergen [29], does not influence the dynamics of a macroscopic spin sample. This is evident from the ratio $\gamma_r / \gamma_2 = 0.1 (kL_s)^3 \ll 1$, which shows that γ_r is negligible as compared to the line width formed by the dipole interactions. Such a situation is drastically different from atomic systems [22], in which both the dephasing rate γ_2 as well as the collective radiation rate γ_r are caused by the same reason, by atomic interactions through the photon exchange, so that $\gamma_r = \gamma_2 / N_c \ll 1$, with N_c being the number of correlated atoms in a wave packet. But in spin systems, γ_r and γ_2 are due to different origins. As is thoroughly explained in review [24], in resonatorless spin systems interacting through dipole forces, the effect of pure spin superradiance is principally inachievable. This is why, for organizing coherent radiation by a magnet, one has to couple the latter to a resonant circuit.

Let us investigate the spin dynamics, described by Eqs. (15), for a molecular magnet, such as Mn_{12} or Fe_8 , whose molecules possess spin $S = 10$. Then $\gamma_0 \approx 10^{12} s^{-1}$. At low temperatures, below the blocking temperature of about 1 K, the sample can be polarized, keeping its polarization for rather long times of order $T_1 \approx 10^5 - 10^7 s$, hence $\gamma_1 \approx T_1^{-1}$ is very small, $\gamma_1 \approx 10^{-7} - 10^{-5} s^{-1}$. The density of molecules in a magnet is $\approx 10^{20} cm^{-3}$. Dipole interactions are quite strong, yielding $\gamma_2 \approx 10^{10} s^{-1}$. The tunnel splitting is small, with $\gamma_0 \approx 10^4 s^{-1}$, which is much smaller than γ_0 .

Assume that the sample is polarized, with the spin polarization up, $s_0 = s(0) > 0$. Then it is placed in an external magnetic field B_0 , such that the Zeeman frequency be positive, $\gamma_0 > 0$, hence $\gamma_0 B_0 < 0$. Since $\gamma_0 = 2\gamma_B$, where γ_B is the Bohr magneton, we have $\gamma_B B_0 > 0$. This means that the magnetic field is directed up, which implies that the magnet is prepared in a nonequilibrium state. The relaxation from this state is governed by Eqs. (15). We have analysed these equations numerically for a wide range of parameters. Our main concern has been to study collective effects without imposing transverse fields. So, we present here the results of our calculations, when $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1 = 0$, as a consequence of which $\gamma_3 = \gamma_3$. We assume that there is no pumping, so that $\gamma_1 = 0$, and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1 - \gamma_2$. The coupling parameter (11) is of the order of the resonator quality factor, $g \approx Q$. We have investigated the behaviour of the solutions to Eqs. (15) for the parameters $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma$, and g varied in a very wide diapason, up to three orders of magnitude, and for different initial conditions w_0 and s_0 . For a strong spin-resonator coupling $g \approx 1$, all solutions, under fixed initial conditions, are qualitatively the same. Therefore, it is sufficient to demonstrate typical classes of solutions for a fixed set of the parameters $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma$, and g , but for distinct initial conditions. It is possible to distinguish three such qualitatively different classes of solutions, for each of which the relaxation time is much shorter than $T_2 \approx 1/\gamma_2$.

Figure 1 demonstrates the pure spin superradiance, starting from a high initial spin polarization $s_0 = 1$, and without any initial coherence imposed on the sample, when $w_0 = 0$. This means that superradiance develops as a purely self-organized process. Figure 2 shows the process of triggered spin superradiance, when the initial spin polarization $s_0 = 0.7$ is yet high, an essential self-organization is present, but the relaxation is triggered by an initially induced coherence $w_0 = 0.51$. And Fig. 3 presents the effect of collective spin induction, in which the initial spin polarization $s_0 = 0.1$ is low, playing not so important role, while the relaxation is induced by a high initial coherence $w_0 = 0.99$. In all the cases, the relaxation time, much shorter than T_2 , is due to collective effects caused by the resonator feedback field, with a strong spin-resonator coupling $g \gg 1$. If the latter is weak, $g \ll 1$, then collective coherent effects do not develop, and the relaxation time is of the order of T_2 . Recall that the initial coherence function $w_0 = \langle j_{0y}^2 \rangle$ is nothing but the amplitude of the transverse spin squared. Therefore to create a nonzero w_0 it is sufficient to get a nonzero transverse spin polarization u_0 , which can be obtained by imposing at the initial time a sufficiently large transverse pulsed field.

In molecular magnets, in addition to dipolar fields, there also exist hyperfine fields due to interactions between molecular and nuclear spins. The influence of the latter can be taken into account by generalizing the Hamiltonian (1) to the form $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_I + \hat{H}_{IS}$, in which $\hat{H}_S$ is the same Hamiltonian (1) due to S-spins, the second term is the Hamiltonian of nuclear spins I,

$$\hat{H}_I = \sum_i B_i \mathbb{I}_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} D_{ijI} \mathbb{I}_i \mathbb{I}_j ;$$

where D_{ijI} is a dipolar tensor for nuclear spin interactions, and the hyperfine interactions are described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{IS} = \sum_i A S_i \mathbb{I}_i + \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij} S_i \mathbb{I}_j ;$$

where A is the intensity of single-site hyperfine interactions and A_{ij} is the dipolar tensor of hyperfine interactions at different sites. The following consideration can be done in the same way as earlier, by employing the scale separation approach [19{23]. Hyperfine interactions result in the appearance of an additional line broadening of the order of $10^7 - 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1}$, which is much smaller than the dipolar line width $\gamma \approx 10^{10} \text{ s}^{-1}$.

The most nontrivial effect caused by the presence of the hyperfine interactions is that the ensemble of nuclear spins, being also coupled to an electric circuit, serves as an additional resonator for molecular spins. This changes the effective coupling of molecular spins with the resonator circuit from Eq. (11) to the value

$$g = \frac{\omega_S}{\gamma(\gamma^2 + \omega_S^2)} \left(1 + \frac{\omega_I A S_I \mathbb{I}}{\hbar \omega_I} \right) ;$$

where $\omega_S = \omega_0 + \omega_D S + (A/\hbar) S_I S$ and $\omega_I = \omega_{0I} + (A/\hbar) S_I$, with $\omega_{0I} = \gamma B_0/\hbar$ being the nuclear Zeeman frequency, and S_I is an average nuclear spin polarization defined analogously to Eq. (8). Estimates show that the change in the coupling parameter g , owing to the presence of nuclear spins, is very small, of the order of 10^{-5} . Thus, hyperfine interactions do not much influence the collective effects of molecular spins.

The intensity of radiation from each spin packet is $I(t) = (2=3c^3) \frac{2}{0} S^2!^4 N_s^2 w(t)$, which, depending on the parameters, can reach very high values of many Watts. This microwave radiation can be used for creating spin masers [3]. It is also feasible to organize the regime of punctuated spin superradiance [30], which can be employed for information processing.

Acknowledgments

Financial support from the German Research Foundation (grant Be 142/72-1) is appreciated. One of the authors (V.I.Y.) is grateful to the German Research Foundation for the Mercator Professorship.

References

- [1] Barbara B. et al., J. Magn. Magn. Mat. 200, 167 (1999).
- [2] Caneschi A. et al., J. Magn. Magn. Mat. 200, 182 (1999).
- [3] Yukalov V. I., Laser Phys. 12, 1089 (2002).
- [4] Paulsen C. et al., J. Magn. Magn. Mat. 140, 1891 (1995).
- [5] Thomas L. et al., Nature 383, 145 (1996).
- [6] Sangregorio S. et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 4645 (1997).
- [7] Wernsdorfer W. and Sessoli R., Science 284, 133 (1999).
- [8] Amigo R., Hernandez J.M., Garcia-Santiago A., and Tejada J., Phys. Rev. B 67, 220402 (2003).
- [9] Sorace L. et al., Phys. Rev. B 68, 220407 (2003).
- [10] Wernsdorfer W., Muller A., Mailly D., and Barbara B., Europhys. Lett. 66, 861 (2004).
- [11] BalM. et al., cond-mat/0404448 (2004).
- [12] delBarco E., Kent A.D., Yang E.C., and Hendrickson D.N., cond-mat/0405331 (2004).
- [13] Dobrovitski V.V. and Zvezdin A.K., Europhys. Lett. 38, 377 (1997).
- [14] L. Gunther L., Europhys. Lett. 39, 1 (1997).
- [15] De Raedt H. et al., Phys. Rev. B 56, 11761 (1997).
- [16] Wernsdorfer W. et al., Europhys. Lett. 50, 552 (2000).
- [17] Hernandez-Minguez A. et al., cond-mat/0406389 (2004).
- [18] BalM. et al., Phys. Rev. B 70, 140403 (2004).

- [19] Yukalov V .I., Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 3000 (1995).
- [20] Yukalov V .I., Laser Phys. 5, 970 (1995).
- [21] Yukalov V .I., Phys. Rev. B 53, 9232 (1996).
- [22] Yukalov V .I. and Yukalova E .P ., Phys. Part. Nucl. 31, 561 (2000).
- [23] Yukalov V .I., in Encyclopedia of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance, edited by D .M . Grant and R .K . Harris (Wiley, Chichester, 2002), Vol. 9, p. 697.
- [24] Yukalov V .I. and Yukalova E .P ., Phys. Part. Nucl. 35, 348 (2004).
- [25] Abragam A . and Goldman M ., Nuclear Magnetism : Order and Disorder (Clarendon, Oxford, 1982).
- [26] Abragam A ., Nuclear Magnetism (Clarendon, Oxford, 1961).
- [27] Motokawa M ., Rep. Prog. Phys. 67, 1995 (2004).
- [28] Bogolubov N .N . and Mitropolsky Y .A ., Asymptotic Methods in the Theory of Nonlinear Oscillations (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1961).
- [29] Bloembergen N ., Nuclear Magnetic Relaxation (Benjamin, New York, 1961).
- [30] Yukalov V .I. and Yukalova E .P ., Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 257601 (2002).




Figure 1: Pure spin superradiance. Typical behaviour of the coherence intensity $w(t)$ (solid line) and of the spin polarization $s(t)$ (dashed line) as functions of time (in units of T_2) for the following attenuation parameters (in units of γ_2): $\gamma_2 = 1$, $\gamma_3 = 0.1$, and $\gamma_4 = 10$. The spin-resonator coupling is $g = 100$. The initial conditions are $w_0 = 0$ and $s_0 = 1$.




Figure 2: Triggered spin superradiance. The coherence intensity $w(t)$ (solid line) and spin polarization $s(t)$ (dashed line) versus time (in units of T_2) for the same parameters as in Fig. 1, but for the initial conditions $w_0 = 0.51$ and $s_0 = 0.7$




Figure 3: Collective spin induction. The coherence intensity $w(t)$ (solid line) and spin polarization $s(t)$ (dashed line) as functions of time (in units of T_2) for the same parameters as in Fig. 1, but for the initial conditions $w_0 = 0.99$ and $s_0 = 0.1$