O rbital contribution to the magnetic properties of nanow ires: Is the orbital polarization ansatz justi ed?

M.C.Desipnqueres, C.Barreteau, G.Autes, D.Spanjaard^y

CEA Saclay, DSM /DRECAM /SPCSI, Bâtim ent 462, F-91191 G if sur Yvette, France and ^YLaboratoire de Physique des Solides, Universite Paris Sud, Bâtim ent 510, F-91405 Orsay, France

(D ated: M arch 23, 2024)

We show that considerable orbital magnetic moments and magneto-crystalline anisotropy energies are obtained for a Fe monatom ic wire described in a tight-binding method with intra-atom ic electronic interactions treated in a full H artree Fock (HF) decoupling scheme. Even-though the use of the orbital polarization ansatz with simplied H am iltonians leads to fairly good results when the spin magnetization is saturated this is not the case of unsaturated systems. We conclude that the full HF scheme is necessary to investigate low dimensional systems.

PACS num bers:

In the bulk of ferrom agnetic transition metals it is well known that the orbital magnetic moment L is quenched and that the magneto-crystalline anisotropy energy (MAE) is very smallas a result of strong electron delocalization and crystal eld e ects com pared with those of intra-atom ic Coulomb interactions. In nanoobjects the dimensionality or coordination is reduced so that the in uence of these interactions, responsible for Hund's rules in the free atom, becomes more and more important and both the spin and orbital magnetic mom ents increase dram atically. This is seen in experim ents on chains of Co atom s at step edges of Pt (997) [1] and Co single atom s or nanoparticles deposited on Pt(111) in which orbital moments as large as 1.1 $_{\rm B}$ per atom have been measured [2], associated with a considerable enhancem ent of the MAE.

On the theoretical side, in the Local Spin Density Approximation (LSDA) or in simplied tight-binding (TB) Hartree-Fock (HF) schemes the intra-atom ic Coulomb interactions are treated in an average manner so that the distribution of electrons between the orbital states of opposite magnetic quantum num bersm is poorly described, especially in low dimensional systems. As a result these approximations yield underestimated values of L, even though these values increase when the dimensionality is low ered. Eriksson et al.[3] have proposed to correct for this e ect by adding a term proportional to $B^2=2$ in the H am iltonian, treated in m ean-eld, w hich w ill be referred to as Orbital Polarization Ansatz (OPA) in the following. The e ect of this term is obviously to increase < 2 > . A more rigorous way of obtaining both the spin and orbitalm om ents is to solve the HF equations by taking into account all intra-atom ic term s in the decoupling with all matrix elements of the Coulomb interaction U $_{1 2 3 4} = h_{1}(r); _{2}(r^{0}) j_{jr} \frac{e^{2}}{r^{0}j} j_{3}(r); _{4}(r^{0}) i_{j}$ where i are atom ic orbitals, expressed in terms of the three Racah parameters A; B and C, for d electrons[4] and a system of hom onuclear atom s. Starting from this Ham iltonian Solovyev et al.[5] have shown, in an elegant work, that the OPA cannot be derived analytically from

the HF Ham iltonian except in some very special cases and that, even in the latter, the proportionality factor is not B as usually assumed but 3B = 2. Very recently N icolas et al.[6] have discussed the e ect of orbital polarization, using either a Stoner-like TB Ham iltonian with the OPA or an HF Ham iltonian in which the one and two orbital matrix elements of the Coulomb interaction are treated exactly in the spherical harm onics (SH) basis but three and four orbital terms are neglected. These latter terms depend both on B and C in the SH basis which results in a symmetry breaking that they claim to overcom e by averaging over di erent orbital basis. O n the opposite, a recent work by X iangang W an et al.[7] is based on a complete HF decoupling. However their effective intra-atom ic potential (see Eq.4 of their work) is the same as in LSDA + U while the TB part of their total Ham iltonian is not spin polarized. As a result when the approxim ations leading to the Stoner m odel are carried out in their Eq.4, it does not lead to the correct Stoner param eter.

It is thus of fundam ental importance to investigate the ability of the full HF scheme to predict large L and MAE in nano-objects, and to check whether the OPA can account for these e ects. In this paper we com pare, on the simple model of a monatom ic wire, the results given by the full HF decoupling and two currently used sim pli ed H am iltonians corrected or not by the OPA term . We use a TB model in a minim alorthogonalbasis set of d valence orbitals ji; ; i = ji; i ji, ofspin and orbital centered at site i. In the following will either denote cubic harmonics (CH) (== d_{xy} ; d_{yz} ; d_{zx} ; d_{x^2} , d_{x^2} ; d_{3z^2} , d_{z^2}) or spherical harm on ics (= m = 2; 1;0;1;2). Our Ham iltonian H can be expressed as the sum of a standard one-body TB Ham iltonian H $_0$ (determ ined by the bare d level " $_0$, and hopping integrals) and an electron-electron interaction Ham iltonian H int in which only on-site electron-electron interactions are considered. The standard Hartree Fock decoupling leads to the one-electron H am iltonian (denoted as HF1) which, in the second quantization form alism can be w ritten

$$H_{int}^{HF1} = X \qquad U_{4 2 3 1} hc_{i_{4}}^{y} c_{i_{3}} ic_{i_{2}}^{y} c_{i_{1}} \circ$$
$$U_{4 2 1 3} hc_{i_{4}}^{y} c_{i_{3}} ic_{i_{2}}^{y} c_{i_{1}} \circ$$
$$U_{4 2 1 3} hc_{i_{4}}^{y} c_{i_{3}} oic_{i_{2}}^{y} c_{i_{1}} (1)$$

The expressions of the matrix elements U $_{1 2 3 4}$ obviously depend on the atom ic basis, but the resolution of the full Hartree-Fock Ham iltonian (namely without any approximation) must lead to the same results whatever the basis. However, the use of CH is quite attractive for discussing the OPA since in this basis the three and four orbital matrix elements of the electron-electron interaction are proportional to the R acah parameter B only [4]. Moreover in CH the dierent values of the two orbital and U matrix elements U (€) only differ by terms proportional to B. The average values: and (1=4), 5 U ; ∈ U (1=4)are independent of and are given by U = AB + C and J = 5B = 2 + C [8] while the one orbital term s U are all equal to U + 2J. This leads us to de ne (U; J; B) as a new set of parameters. The two orbital terms U (resp.U) can then be expressed in terms of U and B (resp. J and B) while the three and four orbital term s

B (resp. J and B) while the three and four orbital term s are proportional to B only. As already stated, this is no longer true in the SH basis.

When B is neglected in the above Ham iltonian HF1, we recover the model (hereafter referred to as HF2) that has been used in our previous studies[9] (U = U and U = J for any pair of di erent orbitals and and no three and four orbital terms) in which spin- ip terms were om itted since the spin-orbit coupling interaction was not taken into account. Starting from this Ham iltonian, keeping only the diagonal term s and replacing each orbital population of a given spin by its average value, leads to a Stoner-like Ham iltonian (called HF3) that we have also investigated since it has widely been used in the literature [10]:

$$H_{int}^{HF3} = \bigvee_{i;}^{V} (U_e N_i \quad IM_i=2)C_i^{V} C_i : (2)$$

In this ham iltonian I = (U + 6J)=5 is the Stoner param – eter while N_i and M_i are, respectively, the total charge and m om ent on site i. U_e is equal to $(9U \quad 2J)=10$ if one derives HF3 from HF2 as explained above. Since here we are interested in systems with geom etrically equivalent atom s (i.e., N_i = N; M_i = M) we can choose the energy zero in allham iltonians as " $_0+U_e$ N so that the rst term in Eq.(3) disappears from the total ham iltonian HF3.

The spin m agnetism is governed by the Stoner param – eter I that will be kept constant in all our calculations and determ ined so that it reproduces the experimental value in the bulk bcc phase. From the above discussion it is clear that HF2 di ers from HF1 by term sproportional to B, this is also true for HF3 as far as this ham iltonian is justi ed. Eriksson et al.[3] have proposed to introduce an OPA term to account for this di eregce. This term is written in mean eld E $_{OP} = \frac{1}{2}B_{i}hL_{i}i^{2}$ which reduces to $\frac{1}{2}B_{i}hL_{iz}i^{2}$ when the spin and orbitalm om ents have the sam e quantization axis z (which is strictly veri ed along high symmetry directions). The corresponding H am iltonian is then:

$$H_{OP} = BhL_{zi} [L_{z}] \circ C_{i}^{y} C_{i} \circ$$
(3)

where $[L_z] \circ$ are the matrix elements of the local orbital moment operator L_{iz} . $[L_z] \circ$ is spin independent and diagonal in the SH basis when the orbital momentum quantization axis of the SH orbitals is rotated so that it coincides with the spin quantization axis. This is no longer true if the SH orbital momentum axis is along a crystallographic axis which is not parallel to the spin quantization axis, or when $[L_z] \circ$ is expressed in the CH basis. Finally the last term of our H am iltonian takes into account the intra-atom ic spin-orbit interactions determ ined by the spin-orbit coupling parameter .

A monatom ic wire of a transition metal is a handy system to compare the results given by the various models described above. The param eters of the model are chosen to m im ic Fe which is assumed to have N = 7 valence delectrons per atom in the bulk as well as in the wire. The hopping integrals dd, dd and dd are chosen proportional to (-6, 4, -1) and decrease with the interatom ic distance according to a R 5 law . The num erical value of dd is tted to the bulk d band width of Fe $(W_d = 6eV)$ which leads to dd = 0.749eV at the bulk nearest neighbor distance (d= 4.7a.u.). First and second nearest neighbor hopping integrals have been taken into account. The Stoner parameter is I = 0.67 eV. The spinorbit coupling parameter is taken from a previous work (= 0.06eV) [11]. It is well known that the parameter U is strongly screened in metals. In particular in a recent paper Solovyev [12] has shown that this param eter is alm ost independent of the bare interaction. From Fig.1 of this reference it can be deduced that U $\,{}^{\prime}\,$ J in Fe[13]. In that case I = 7J=5 so that U = J = 0.48 eV, a num erical value in good agreem ent with that given by Solovyev. Finally, as in previous works [12], we have taken B = 0:14J[8].

W hen applied to bulk Fe, the complete HF decoupling yields $h2S_z i = 2.12_B$ and $hL_z i = 0.08_B$ when B = 0 (HF2 model), and $h2S_z i = 2.11_B$ and $hL_z i = 0.12_B$ when B is taken into account (HF1 model). Then, we have compared the results derived from the vem odels (HF1, HF2 and HF3 with and without H_{OP}) for the spin and orbitalm on ents with m agnetizations along the wire (= 0) and perpendicular to it (= =2) and the corresponding m agnetocrystalline anisotropy energy (MAE)

	HF1	HF2	HF2	НFЗ	НFЗ
			OPA		ΟΡΑ
d = 4:7a.u.					
h2S _z (0)i	3	3	3	3	3
h2S _z (=2)i	3	3	3	3	3
hL _z (0)i	1.45	0.37	1.31	0.37	1.31
$h \mathbb{L}_{\rm z}$ (=2)i	0.49	0.25	0.61	0.25	0.60
MAE	23.4	0.7	22.3	0.6	22.3
$d = 425a \mu$.					
h2S _z (0)i	1.51	1,24	1.23	0.94	0.78
h2S _z (=2)i	1.51	1,23	1,24	0.93	0.94
hL _z (0)i	0.33	0.19	0.39	0.24	1.07
hL _z (=2)i	0,21	0.10	0.18	0.08	0.15
MAE	-0.7	-0.3	1.5	0.0	62

TABLE I: The spin $(h2S_z i)$ and orbital $(hL_z i)$ m agnetic moments (in $_B$ per atom) for a monatom ic Fe w ire and two magnetization orientations (parallel (= 0) and perpendicular (= =2) to the w ire) and the corresponding m agnetocrystalline anisotropy MAE (E_{tot} (=2)) E_{tot} (0)) in meV per atom for two interatom ic distances.

 $E = E_{tot} (= = 2)$ $E_{tot} (= 0)$ where E_{tot} is the total energy per atom of the system. Two interatom ic distances have been considered: the bulk interatom ic distance at which the spin m agnetization is saturated and a shorter distance (4.25a.u.) corresponding to unsaturated spin m om ents. The results are given in Table 1.

Let us rst discuss the wire at the bulk interatom ic distance. All models agree to predict saturated spin magnetization, i.e., the spin magnetic moment is 3 $_{\rm B}$ to less than a few 10 3 $_{\rm B}$. As a consequence the e ective atom ic orbital levels with down spin are identical in HF2 and HF3 models since U = J. This is no longer true for the up spin orbitals for which the atom ic levels are orbital dependent with HF2 and not with HF3. However the average atom ic level is the same in both m odels. Therefore the orbitalm om ent, which arises only from the spin down band, the spin up band being lled, is alm ost identical in both m odels sim ilarly to the total energy (see Table 1). As expected the orbitalm om ents for both magnetization orientations and the associated MAE, even though reinforced com pared to the bulk ones, are largely underestim ated by the HF2 and HF3 m odels with B = 0 compared to those predicted by the complete HF decoupling (HF1). W hen the OPA term is added to the HF2 and HF3 ham iltonians, the results given by the latter models become in fair agreement with those obtained from HF1 for the orbitalm om ent while the MAE is well reproduced.

The above trends completely change when the interatom ic distance is shortened to 4.25a.u.. It is rst seen that the spin m om ent depends on the m odel. In this respect the HF2 m odel is much better than the HF3 one. M oreover, taking into account the OPA term leads to an increase of the orbital m on ents for both m agnetization orientations which are rather close to the HF1 results for HF2 but not for HF3.



FIG.1: hL_z i and MAE as a function of B=J from HF1 and HF2 (HF3 results are undistinguishable from the HF2 ones) for a magnetic Fe m onatom ic wire (d = 4.7a u.).

To summarize this discussion we can state that the OPA is rather good for saturated spin magnetization while for the unsaturated case it leads to results depending critically on the approxim ations made concerning the electron-electron interaction ham iltonian. In order to verify that the good perform ance of the OPA for the saturated spin magnetization is not due to the particular value of B, we have studied the variation of hLzi = 0 and = =2 and the associated MAE as a at function of the ratio B = J. The results (Fig.1) show that the OPA gives the right trends on the full dom ain of B = J values that we have investigated. In particular an abrupt variation of hL_z i at = 0 occurs around a critical value of B = J' 0.09 above which the upper band (the corresponding eigenfunctions being mostly linear com binations of SH with jm j = 2) of m inority spin becomes em pty.

Even if the OPA works reasonably in the saturated spin m agnetization case for determ ining hL_z i and the MAE, this does not m ean that it reproduces the band structure correctly. Let us rst note that for = 0, the eigenfunctions have a largely dom inating single SH character while at = = 2 they are alm ost pure single CH orbitals. The band structures corresponding to HF1 and HF2 are drawn in Fig 2 (the band structure of HF3 is close to that ofHF2). At rst sight they look quite sim ilar. How ever a closer examination reveals som e di erences. Let us rst comment on the majority spin bands at = 0. W hile the splittings of the jn j = 2 () and jn j = 1 () bands are respectively given by 2 and with the HF1 m odel, they become 2 4B hLzi and $2B hL_z i w ith both the$ HF2 and HF3 models, respectively. In addition the m character of the bands is reversed, i.e., the m = 2(1) band



FIG. 2: HF1 (top) and HF2 (bottom) band structure (referred to the Ferm i level) for a magnetic Ferm onatom ic wire (d = 4.7au) with a magnetization parallel (= 0) and perpendicular (= -2) to the wire. All results are obtained for U=J = 1 and B = 0.14J save for the dotted band structure of the the top right panel obtained for U=J = 1.34 and B = 0.14J.

is above the m = -2(-1) band in the HF1 while it is the opposite with the HF2 and HF3 m odels. This inversion does not occur in the m inority spin bands and the splittings of the and bands are not exactly the same with the HF2 and HF3 as with the HF1 m odels. At = -2 allm odels agree that for U = J there are alm ost no band splittings and that the rem ovals of degeneracy around the m idpoint between and X are more pronounced in the m inority bands than in the m a prity ones.

Finally it is interesting to study the variation of hL_zi and of the MAE with the HF1 m odel when the ratio U=J is varied by keeping the Stoner parameter xed. Indeed this ratio is not perfectly known. The results are shown in Fig.3. A brupt variations of hL_zi are observed at U=J ' 1:34 when = =2 and U=J ' 3:25 when = 0. They correspond respectively to the occurrence of a splitting of the bands (see Fig.2) and to the complete lling of the lowest band of minority spin. These abrupt changes of hL_zi are associated with a change of sign of the variation of the MAE as a function of U=J.

In conclusion we have studied orbital polarization effects for a Fem onatom ic wire with various HF H am ilto-



FIG.3: hL_z i and MAE as a function of U=J from HF1 for a magnetic Fe m onatom ic wire (d = 4.7au).

nians in a tight-binding scheme: a full HF Ham iltonian (HF1) including all the Coulom b interaction matrix elements, a simplied one (HF2) neglecting the Racah param eter B, and nally a Stoner-like H am iltonian (HF3). OPA has then been reintroduced in HF2 and HF3 as proposed by Eriksson et al[3]. W ith HF1 we predict that very large values of L and MAE are possible in agreement with existing experiments. The same trends are obtained by adding the OPA to simplied Ham iltonians when the spin m om ent is saturated, how ever noticeable di erences appear in the band structure since som e splitting and band characters are wrongly reproduced. This fair agreem ent strongly deteriorates when dealing with an unsaturated system, especially with the Stoner-like model. It is thus of prime importance to use the HF1 model for the study of systems with much more com plex geom etnies (surfaces, clusters, break junctions), in a realistics, p and d basis set, or to implement it in abinitio codes. Indeed from our results giant anisotropy of m agneto-resistance in low dimensional systems such as break junctions is expected [14].

- [1] P.G am bardella et al, N ature 416, 301 (2002).
- [2] P.Gam bardella et al, Science 300, 1130 (2003).
- [3] O .E riksson, M S.S.B rooks and B.Johansson, Phys.Rev. B 41, 9087 (1990).
- [4] J.S. Grith, The theory of transition-metal ions, Cambridge University Press, London (1961).
- [5] I.V. Solovyev, A. J. Liechtenstein and K. Terakura, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 5758 (1998).
- [6] G.Nicolas, J.Dorantes-Davila and G.M. Pastor, Comp. Mat.Sci. 35, 292 (2006).
- [7] X iangang W an et al, Phys. Rev. B 69, 174414 (2004).
- [8] N ote that our de nition of the average C oulom b and exchange interactions di ers from the one chosen by A nisim ov (U_A, J_A) (V I. A nisim ov et al., Phys. Rev. B 48, 16929 (1993)). The relations between U, J and U_A , J_A are: $U_A = U + 2J=5$; $J_A = 7J=5$

- [9] C.Barreteau et al, Phys.Rev.B 61, 7781 (2000).
- $[10]\ {\rm F}$. A guilera-G ran ja, JM . M onte jano-C arrizalez and R A . Guirado-Lopez, Phys. Rev. B 73, 115422 (2006).
- [11] G.Autes et al, J.Phys.: Condens.M atter 18, 1 (2006).
- [12] I.V. Solovyev, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 267205 (2005).
- and thus [13] Note that in Solovyev work U denotes U corresponds to U + 2J with our de nition of U and J.
- [14] M.Viret et al., Eur. Phys. J B 51, 1 (2006).