## First-principles approach to Non-Collinear M agnetism : towards Spin D ynam ics

S. Sharm a<sup>1;2;5</sup>, J.K. Dew hurst<sup>2;3</sup>, C. Am brosch-Drax 1<sup>2;4</sup>, S.Kurth<sup>5</sup>, N.

1 Fritz Haber Institute of the Max Planck Society, Faradayweg 4-6, D-14195 Berlin, Germany.

2 Institut fur Physik, Karl{Franzens{Universitat G raz, Universitatsplatz 5, A {8010 G raz, Austria.

3 School of Chemistry, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH 9 3JJ

4 D epartm ent M aterials Physics, University of Leoben, Erzherzog Johann - Strasse 3, A -8700 Leoben

5 Institut fur Theoretische Physik, Freie Universitat Berlin, Amim allee 14, D-14195 Berlin, Germany.

6 Departm ent of Physics, Technical University of Denmark DK-2800 Lyngby, Denmark. and

7 Department of Physics, Uppsala University, Box 530, 751 21 Uppsala, Sweden.

(D ated: January 28, 2022)

A description of non-collinear magnetism in the framework of spin-density functional theory is presented for the exact exchange energy functional which depends explicitly on two-component spinor orbitals. The equations for the elective Kohn-Sham scalar potential and magnetic eld are derived within the optimized elective potential (OEP) framework. W ith the example of a magnetically frustrated Crmonolayer it is shown that the resulting magnetization density exhibits much more non-collinear structure than standard calculations. Furthermore, a time-dependent generalization of the non-collinear OEP method is well suited for an ab-initio description of spin dynamics. We also show that the magnetic moments of solids Fe, Co and N i are well reproduced.

PACS num bers: 71.15 M b,71.10.-w,71.22.+i

The extension of the original density functional theory (DFT) Hohenberg-Kohn-Sham approach to the case of spin polarized systems was given, under the name spin DFT (SDFT) more than three decades ago [1]. While this form ulation was for arbitrary directions of the magnetization vector eld, even today most applications are based on a restricted collinear version. This has the advantage of computational simplicity: one then works with two separate KS equations, one yielding the spin-up orbitals the other the spin-down orbitals, whereas the general form ulation involves Pauli spinors. N evertheless, there exists a wealth of non-collinearity in nature. To give only a few examples it is widely seen in molecular magnets, exchange frustrated solids (-Fe, spin glasses), and all magnets at nite temperatures.

C rucial for practical calculations using SD FT is the approximation made for the exchange-correlation (xc) energy functional. The Local Spin Density Approximation (LSDA) and the Generalized Gradient Approximations (GGAs) are currently the most popular ones. These have been developed for collinear magnetism, and their use in non-collinear situations relies on the magnetization, m (r), and exchange correlation magnetic eld,  $B_{xc}(r)$ , being made collinear in a local reference frame at each point in space [2]. This is only possible with purely bcal functionals like LSDA [3, 4], though it has been used under additional approximations for gradient functionals as well [5]. Such approximations (that lead to bcally collinearm agnetization and xcm agnetic eld) cause m (r)  $B_{xc}(r)$  to vanish everywhere in space. As noted recently, this fact renders the adiabatic tim e dependent extension of these functionals in proper [6] for the study

of spin dynam ics, because in the absence of external magnetic elds and within adiabatic approximation, the local torque on the spins (m (r;t)  $B_{\rm xc}$  (r;t)) vanishes [7]. This is a serious limitation since the dynam ics of the spin degree of freedom is responsible for a number of important phenomena such as spin injection, the dynam ics of B loch walls, spin wave excitations [8], and spin litering, mechanisms crucial for recent developments in spintronics [9]. The search for approximate xc functionals which depend on all three components of the spin magnetization m beyond the form of the locally collinear LSDA has remained a major challenge in the description of non-collinearm agnetism.

In recent years, an alternative route to the construction of approxim ate xc functionals has enjoyed increasing interest. These involve functionals depending explicitly on the single-particle KS orbitals which, through the KS single-particle equation, are implicit functionals of the density [10]. Technically, one needs to employ the Optimized E ective Potential (OEP) [11] m ethod to compute the local xc potential. The simplest orbital-dependent approximation to the xc energy is the EX act eX change (EXX) functional which is the Fock exchange energy but evaluated with KS orbitals (i.e. orbitals coming from a local potential). A number of successful EXX calculations have been reported for sem iconductors [12, 13, 14] and m agneticm etals [15]. How ever, form agnetic system s again the collinear form alism has been employed.

In this Letter we extend the OEP form alism for SDFT to non-collinearm agnetic system s. M ost importantly, we do not rely on a condition of local collinearity and treat the wavefunctions as Pauli spinors for high lying and

Helbig<sup>1;5</sup>, S. Pittalis<sup>5</sup>, S. Shallcross<sup>6</sup>, L. Nordstrom<sup>7</sup>, and E. K. U. Gross<sup>5</sup>

D irac spinors for deep lying (3 H a below the Ferm i level) electrons. Using the EXX functional, we demonstrate with the example of an unsupported Cr(111) m onolayer, that (i) the m agnetization and  $B_{xc}$  are generally not b-cally parallel in contrast to what has been assumed in all calculations to date and (ii) that the non-collinearity is much more pronounced than found with the LSDA functional. Against popular belief [16], we nd that this non-collinearity is not restricted to just the interstitial region but spreads all the way to the atom center. W ith the exam ples of bulk Fe, Co and N iwe further show that our form alism can also be electively used for collinear magnets.

To derive the OEP equations in the general noncollinear case, we start with the Kohn-Sham (KS) equation for two-component spinors  $_i$ , which has the form of a Pauli equation. For non-interacting electrons moving in an electric scalar potential  $v_s$  and a magnetic vector eld B  $_s$  it reads as (atom ic units are used throughout)

$$\frac{1}{2}r^{2} + v_{s}(r) + B_{s}(r) = "i i(r): (1)$$

This equation can be derived by minimizing the total energy which, in SDFT, is given as a functional of the density  $(r) = \int_{i}^{occ} y(r) i(r) = (r)$  and the magnetization density m $(r) = B_{i} \int_{i}^{occ} y(r) i(r) i(r)$ . For a given external scalar potential  $v_{ext}$  and magnetic eld  $B_{ext}$  this total energy reads

 $E [;m] = T_{s}[;m] + (r)v_{ext}(r)dr + m(r) B_{ext}(r)dr + U[] + E_{xc}[;m]$ (2)  $= \frac{X^{cc}}{i} (r)v_{xc}(r)dr m(r) B_{kc}(r)dr U[] + E_{xc}[;m];$ 

where U [] =  $1=2^{RR}$  (r) (r<sup>0</sup>)=jr r<sup>0</sup>jdr dr<sup>0</sup> is the H artree energy. The xc potential and xc m agnetic eld are given by

$$v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{E_{xc}[;m]}{(\mathbf{r})} \text{ and } B_{xc}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{E_{xc}[;m]}{m(\mathbf{r})}; \quad (3)$$

respectively. The exact functional form of  $E_{xc}$  [;m ] is unknown and has to be approximated in practice.

A ssum ing that the densities (;m) are non-interacting (v;B)-representable one m ay, equivalently, m in in ize the total-energy functional (2) over the e ective scalar potential and m agnetic eld. Thus the conditions

$$\frac{\mathrm{E}[;m]}{\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{r})}_{\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{s}}} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\mathrm{E}[;m]}{\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{r})}_{\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{s}}} = 0 \quad (4)$$

must be satis ed.

If the functional derivatives in Eq. 4 are evaluated for an xc functional that depends explicitly on the KS spinors, one obtains the natural extension of the OEP equations to non-collinear magnetism. By the usage of spinor valued wavefunctions we can stay within a single global reference fram e, in contrast to the case where functionals originally designed for collinear magnetism are used in a non-collinear context by introducing a local reference fram e at each point in space. The most com m only used orbital functional is the EXX energy given by

$$E_{x}^{EXX}[f_{i}g] = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum Z X^{cc}}{\sum_{i,j} \frac{y(r)_{j}(r)_{j}(r^{0})_{i}(r^{0})}{jr r^{0}j} dr dr^{0}$$
(5)

where the label occ indicates that the sum mation runs only over occupied states. In the following we restrict ourselves to an exchange-only treatment although generalization to other orbital functionals is straightforward.

For the energy functional Eq.(2) using the EXX approximation to  $E_{\rm xc}$  one obtains the following coupled integral equations for the exchange potential and magnetic eld

$$R_{v}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{r}]}{v_{s}(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^{cc} \mathbf{X}^{n}}{\sum_{i j = 1}^{ij} \frac{ij(\mathbf{r})}{\mathbf{r}_{i} - \mathbf{r}_{j}} + c\mathbf{r} = 0 \quad (6)$$

and

$$R_{B}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{r}]}{\mathbf{B}_{s}(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{\mathbf{X}^{cc} \mathbf{X}^{n}}{\underset{i j}{\overset{i j}{\mathbf{m}_{i}} \frac{\mathbf{m}_{ij}(\mathbf{r})}{\mathbf{m}_{i}} + c\mathbf{r}} + c\mathbf{r}; = 0; \quad (7)$$

where  $_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{y}{i}(\mathbf{r})_{j}(\mathbf{r}), m_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) = B_{i} \frac{y}{i}(\mathbf{r})_{j}(\mathbf{r})$ and j runs only over the unoccupied states. The matrix is given by

where

$$V_{ij}^{NL} = \sum_{k}^{X^{CC}} \frac{Z Z}{i} \frac{Y_{i}(r)_{k}(r) \frac{Y}{k}(r^{0})_{j}(r^{0})}{jr r^{0}j} dr dr^{0}; \quad (9)$$

are the non-local matrix elements of the Coulom b interaction between states i and j.

To ensure that our num erical analysis be as accurate as possible, we use the full-potential linearized augmented plane wave (FP-LAPW) method [17] in plane ented within the EXCITING code [18]. Here the single electron potential is calculated exactly without any shape approximation and the space is divided into mun-tin (MT) regions, where atom ic orbitals are used as a basis and interstitial region, where plane waves are used as a basis. The deep lying core states (3 Ha below the Ferm i level) are treated as D irac spinors and valence states as Pauli spinors. M ore in portantly them agnetization density and xcm agnetic eld are both treated as unconstrained vector elds throughout space. In our in plem entation of the OEP method the exchange elds are iteratively updated by subtracting the residue functions R  $_{\rm v}$  and R  $_{\rm B}$  from the exchange elds. In other words, if i is the iteration num ber then

$$v_{x}^{i}(r) = v_{x}^{i \ 1}(r) \qquad R_{v}^{i}(r);$$
  
$$B_{x}^{i}(r) = B_{x}^{i \ 1}(r) \qquad R_{B}^{i}(r) \qquad (10)$$

is repeated until convergence is reached, with  $R_v^i$  and  $R_B^i$  calculated by inserting  $v_x^{i\ 1}$  and  $B_x^{i\ 1}$  into Eqs. (6) and (7). is the mixing chosen in such a manner as to achieve a speedy convergence. In the collinear case this m ethod is similar to the one previously suggested in the Ref. 19.

In order to explore the impact of treating non-collinear magnetism in the way outlined above we compare our approach with the standard LSDA functional using the example of an unsupported Cr (111) monolayer. W e set the lattice parameter of the Cr-m onolayer to that of the Aq (111) surface. The result is a topologically frustrated anti-ferrom agnet, known from LSDA calculations to exist as a non-collinear N eel state with the net m agnetization direction of the three non-equivalent atom s pointing at 120 to each other. In Fig. 1 we show the magnetization density and B eld for both the LSDA and EXX functionals. Both nd, as they must, the non-collinear Neelstate, and in fact the EXX and LSDA MT averaged m om ents are sim ilar, being 2.60  $_{\rm B}$  and 2.0  $_{\rm B}$  , respectively. The details of the xc density and eld how ever are very di erent with the EXX functional producing a lot m ore structure, in contrast to its fairly hom ogeneous LSDA counterpart. In the past, the LSDA results (of



FIG.1: Fully non-collinear magnetization density and B eld obtained using the LSDA and exchange-only EXX functionals for an unsupported Crm onolayer in Neel state. A rrows indicate the direction and information about the magnitude (in atom ic units) is given in the colour bar.

the kind shown in Fig. 1), which show almost no noncollinearity in the MT region, led to the conclusion that it is su cient to treat only the interstitial region as noncollinear [16]. The present work shows that orbital functionals such as EXX are more sensitive to the atom ic shell structure and this sensitivity also manifests itself in the magnetization density and exchange B eld. This is clear from the ower petal like structure visible in the magnitude of EXX density and B eld. The Neel walls are also much narrower in the EXX case. Adding LSD A correlations to the EXX functional does not signi cantly change these results. A striking feature of the EXX B eld is that, unlike its LSD A counterpart, it is not locally parallel to the magnetization density.



FIG.2: m (r)  $B_x$  (r) for an unsupported Cr-m onolayer, in the same plane as Fig. 1, obtained using the EXX functional. A rrows indicate the direction and inform ation about the magnitude (in atom ic units) is given in the colour bar.

Another appealing property of the EXX functional

that could have consequences in future time-dependent extensions is the non-vanishing cross product of the m agnetization density and EXX B  $_{\rm X}$  eld. This is interesting because the equation of motion for the spin m agnetization reads

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{m} (\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{t})}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{t}} = \mathbf{m} (\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{t}) \quad \left[ \mathbb{B}_{\mathrm{xc}} (\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{t}) + \mathbb{B}_{\mathrm{ext}} (\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{t}) \right] \quad \mathbf{r} \quad \mathcal{J}$$
(11)

where  $J_s$  is the spin current and the gyrom agetic ratio. In the time-independent LSDA and conventionalGGA, m (r) and  $B_{xc}$  (r) are locally collinear, as is clear from F ig. 1, and therefore m (r)  $B_{xc}(r)$  vanishes. This also holds true in the adiabatic approximation of time dependent SDFT which, by Eq.(11), im plies that these functionals cannot properly describe the dynam ics of the spin m agnetization. In contrast, already at the static level, for the EXX functionalm (r)  $B_x$  (r) does not vanish (see Fig. 2) In fact, in the ground state of a non-collinear ferromagnet without external magnetic eld, m (r)  $B_{xc}(r)$ exactly cancels the divergence of the spin current, r J, i.e. these terms are equally important, and it is essential to have a proper description of  $m(r) = B_{xc}(r)$ . These results indicate that a tim e-dependent generalization of our m ethod could open the way to an ab-initio description of spin dynam ics. How well this functional really perform s in describing the spin dynamics remains a question for future investigations.

W e now turn to the question of the calculation of m agneticm om ents of collinear solids with the present form alism using the EXX functional. For the collinear magnets Fe, Co, and Niwe nd moments of 2.71  $_{\rm B}$  (2.12  $_{\rm B}$  ), 1.77  $_{\rm B}$  (1.71  $_{\rm B}$  ), and 0.50  $_{\rm B}$  (0.55  $_{\rm B}$  ) respectively, where the LSDA results are indicated in brackets. Surprisingly, a previous OEP calculations [15, 20] found much largerm om ents of  $3.40_{\rm B}$ ,  $2.25_{\rm B}$  and 0.68B respectively. This discrepancy may be attributed to the following facts: rst, the previous calculations used the atom ic sphere approxim ation for the scalar potential and the atom ic m om ent approximation for the magnetization. In our work there is no shape approximation for the scalar potential and the magnetization is treated as an unconstrained vector eld. Second, and more im portant, in the present work a coupled set of equations is solved to num erically invert the response function. This has the advantage of autom atically including the response of the system to a constant magnetic eld which is important for spin-unsaturated systems. This response needs additional treatment in the case where a decoupled set of equations is used and the response is inverted in a constant-free basis, as done in all past calculations [15, 20]. We suspect that this is the major reason for the present discrepancy.

To conclude we have presented a generalization of the widely used OEP equations for non-collinear magnetic

system s. The resulting method does not need any assumption of local collinearity for m (r) and B  $_{\rm xc}$  (r), and therefore extends ab-initio approaches to non-collinear magnetism substantially beyond the LSDA. In particular, a time-dependent extension of the non-collinear OEP method naturally leads to a new and promising ab-initio approach to describe spin dynamics.

Finally, we note that since the form alism presented here treats KS wavefunctions as spinors, it can be used in conjunction with spin-orbit coupling. In particular, in f-electron systems both spin-orbit coupling and the exchange eld are of crucial in portance, where the latter is well known to be poorly treated by LSDA/GGA. Hence, the present work opens new interesting routes for future extensions.

We acknowledge the Austrian Science Fund (project P16227), the EXCITING network funded by the EU (Contract HPRN-CT-2002-00317), NoE NANOQUANTA Network (Contract NMP4-CT-2004-50019), Deutsche Forschungsgem einschaft and Swedish Research Council for nancial support.

E lectronic address: sangeeta sharm a@ uni-graz.at

- [1] U.von Barth and L.Hedin, J.Phys.C 5, 1629 (1972).
- [2] J. Kubler, K. H. Hock, J. Sticht, and A. R. W illiam s, J. Phys. F 18, 469 (1988).
- [3] L.Nordstrom and D.J.Singh, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4420 (1996).
- [4] T.Oda, A. Pasquarello, and R.Car, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 3622 (1998).
- [5] E.Sjostedt and L.Nordstrom, Phys. Rev. B 66, 14447 (2002).
- [6] K. Capelle, G. Vignale, and B. L. Gyor y, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 206403 (2001).
- [7] K. Capelle and B. L. Gyor y, Europhys. Lett. 61, 354 (2003).
- [8] R.Gebauer and S.Baroni, Phys.Rev.B 61, 6459 (2000),
   N.M.Rosengaard and B.Johansson, Phys.Rev.B 55, 14975 (1997), S.V.Halibv, A.Y.Perlov, P.M.Oppeneer, and H.Eschrig, Euro-phys Lett. 39, 91 (1997), S.
   Y.Savrasov, Phys.Rev.Lett. 81, 2570 (1998).
- [9] S.A.W olf et al, Science 294, 1488 (2001).
- [10] M. Gruning, A. Marini, and A. Rubio, J. Chem. Phys. 124, 154108 (2006).
- [11] J.D. Talm an and W .F. Shadwick, Phys. Rev. A 14, 36 (1976).
- [12] M. Stadele, M. Moukara, J. A. Majewski, P. Vogl, and A. Gorling, Phys. Rev. B 59, 10031 (1999).
- [13] R.J.Magyar, A.Fleszar, and E.K.U.Gross, Phys. Rev. B 69, 045111 (2004).
- [14] S. Sharma, J. K. Dewhurst, and C. Ambrosch-Draxl, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 136402 (2005).
- [15] T.Kotani, J.Phys.Condens.Matter 10, 9241 (1998).
- [16] P.Kurz, F.Forster, L.Nordstrom, G.Bihlmayer, and S.Blugel, Phys. Rev. B 69, 024415 (2004).
- [17] D. J. Singh, Planew aves P seudopotentials and the LAPW M ethod, K luwer A cadem ic Publishers, Boston (1994).

(2003).

- [18] J. K. Dewhurst, S. Sharm a, and C. Ambrosch-Draxl (2004), URL http://exciting.sourceforge.net.
- [19] S.Kummeland J.P.Perdew, Phys.Rev.B 68, 035103

[20] T.Kotaniand H.Akai, Physica B 237, 332 (1997).