

Quantum description of spin tunneling in magnetic molecules: a new view

D. Galetti
Instituto de Física Teórica
São Paulo State University - UNESP
Rua Pamplona 145
01405 - 900 São Paulo, SP, Brazil

Abstract

Starting from a phenomenological Hamiltonian originally written in terms of angular momentum operators we derive a new quantum angle-based Hamiltonian that allows for a discussion on the quantum spin tunneling. The study of the applicability of the present approach, carried out in calculations with a soluble quasi-spin model, shows that we are allowed to use our method in the description of physical systems such as the Mn12-acetate molecule, as well as the octanuclear iron cluster, Fe8, in a reliable way. With the present description the interpretation of the spin tunneling is seen to be direct, the spectra and energy barriers of those systems are obtained, and it is shown that they agree with the experimental ones.

PACS: 75.45+j, 75.60Jp

Keywords: Spin tunneling, Lipkin model, Mn12-acetate, Fe8 cluster

Corresponding author
D. Galetti
Instituto de Física Teórica - UNESP
Phone: (011) 3177 9001
Fax: (011) 3177 9080
e-mail: galetti@ift.unesp.br

1 Introduction

Besides the well-known examples of tunneling processes that permeate the literature in molecular and nuclear physics [1, 2, 3], in recent years it has been shown that quantum tunneling also appears in as broad physical situations as magnetic moments in spin glass systems, single magnetic impurities in a crystal field, a single domain, a ferromagnetic, or antiferromagnetic, domain wall, and also in spin tunneling in molecules [4, 5, 6], emphasizing the importance of the angle/angular momentum degree of freedom in these cases. This quantum effect occurring in such mesoscopic, and even in macroscopic systems points to the necessity of a discussion on how such tunneling can be realized and controlled [7].

In what concerns the case of spin tunneling, or the quantum tunneling of magnetization, QTM, the theoretical approaches have pointed to some different ways of treating this problem. In particular, the spin tunneling was first treated by van Hemmen and Sütö [8], and by Enz and Schilling [9]. From different perspectives, various approaches were introduced: by using a generalization of the usual WKB method adapted to spin systems [10, 11, 12], or by using Feynman's path integral treatment of quantum mechanics [13], and also by using coherent states [14]. On the other hand, from the experimental point of view, great advances have been made since the synthesis of the Mn12-acetate molecule in 1980 [15]. Among the properties of this molecule it emerged an indication of spin tunneling that has strongly motivated great efforts in characterizing and elucidating the pure quantum contribution to that phenomenon [16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. The discovery of the same indications of spin tunneling in the octanuclear iron cluster, Fe8 [21, 22], has thus reinforced the proposed idea of pure quantum spin tunneling, and formal treatments involving phenomenological Hamiltonians were then widely proposed and discussed [23].

In any case, the angular momentum operators obeying the standard commutation relations

$$[J_i, J_j] = i\varepsilon_{ijk}J_k$$

constitute the fundamental blocks from which the starting Hamiltonian describing the spin system is constructed. In general, a Hamiltonian is proposed based on experimental considerations on the symmetries of the physical system, and also under the assumption of low temperature such that the pure quantum effects dominate. In this sense, a general Hamiltonian encompass-

ing the molecule symmetries plus possible parallel and transverse magnetic fields may be written as

$$H = H_0 + C_1 J_z + C_2 J_x, \quad (1)$$

being H_0 the molecule Hamiltonian, and the constants C_i measure the intensity of the additional external magnetic fields. This description clearly separates and takes into account the molecule total angular momentum degree of freedom as the dominant one and, as far as no other degree of freedom is directly and explicitly involved, it is considered a sound description of the system. As such, all of its kinematical content can be described in terms of combinations of the set of $2j+1$ states generated by all the projections of the total angular momentum operator J , which obeys the eigenvalue equation

$$J^2|jm\rangle = \hbar^2 j(j+1)|jm\rangle.$$

It is then clear that those Hamiltonians can then be diagonalized within the state space defined by $\{|jm\rangle\}$ whose dimension is given by the total angular momentum J . At the same time, as it is well known, since the Hamiltonian is written in terms of the generators of that algebra, it commutes with the Casimir operator thus giving at least one more constant of the motion - besides the energy; in fact, all the symmetries present in the Hamiltonian must also play a precise role, giving rise to characteristic features in the energy spectrum.

In this paper we want to extend the content of previous publications [24, 25] that proposed to construct and present the main features of a potential function, described in terms of an angle variable, which can be used to picture in a more intuitive way the spin tunneling. In those works, we have shown how to obtain such a potential and how pure quantum tunneling shows up as a transmission through an energy barrier. In the present contribution we show how to extract a new Hamiltonian which also includes a kinetic term - not only a potential energy function - also described in terms of an angle variable, from a phenomenological Hamiltonian, Eq.(1), that can be used to study the spin tunneling.

To construct such a Hamiltonian, as for the kinematics, we use the $su(2)$ coherent states [26], since they constitute an overcomplete basis of states, and also because they present the desired properties for the study of the systems of interest in the semiclassical limit. At the same time they also include quantum effects such as zero point energies associated with the corresponding

angle and angular momentum variables. We also use the Generator Coordinate Method (GCM) of wide use in nuclear and molecular physics[27, 28] mainly because it has been shown to be a useful tool when one deals with collective behavior in many-body systems, that is the case in the spin systems of interest where the tunneling degree of freedom has a suggested collective character.

From the operational point of view, the GCM is used so that an energy surface is generated that embodies off-diagonal matrix elements that account for the quantum corrections to the diagonal contribution which, by its turn, is basically dominated by the semiclassical contribution. The present approach proposes to take into account those off-diagonal contributions by calculating the moments of that energy distribution; the zeroth-order moment is associated with the potential function, while the second-order moment is associated with an inertia function: together they constitute our approximate Hamiltonian. It is clear that the higher order terms can also be obtained so that the complete series gives rise to a new representation of the starting phenomenological Hamiltonian. A truncated series up to the second term is then an approximate description of the system, and its validity must necessarily be discussed. It is precisely the use of the $su(2)$ coherent states that makes this study feasible since our moment expansion of the energy surface is then akin to the $1/N$ expansion discussed in the literature [29], which also makes explicit use of the coherent states. In the present context, it is the total spin of the molecule, j , the quantum number that determines how many terms we must keep in the moment expansion series in order to get a reliable Hamiltonian.

It is worth noticing that the present approach is based on quantum grounds from the beginning in such a way that it does not need to be quantized in any form. Therefore, it has a different perspective from the approaches that start from a classical Hamiltonian and then quantize it. Furthermore, what is important to keep in mind in the present context is that the associated pair of quantum operators related to the rotation degree of freedom must be treated properly[30, 31, 32].

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II we introduce the $su(2)$ coherent states in the discussion of the semiclassical approach for a general phenomenological Hamiltonian, and show how some preliminary results are obtained which suggest that quantum corrections may be important in some cases. The GCM is presented in Section III where we show how the energy and overlap kernels of the method are obtained for the general phenomenolog-

ical Hamiltonian, and the new general angle-based Hamiltonian is obtained. In this section we also carry out the calculations for the soluble Lipkin quasi-spin model [33, 34] since it is a valuable testing ground for systems of the kind we are interested in, and also for establishing a reliable truncation criterion for the moment series in terms of the value of the spin. The result that we obtain guarantees the application, in section IV, of the second-order approximate Hamiltonian to the description of two interesting molecules studied in the literature, namely, the Mn12-acetate, and the Fe8 cluster, and we show that we reproduce the experimental results to a good degree of accuracy. The spin tunneling phenomenon occurring in these molecules is qualitatively discussed in this context, and the main aspects of the potential barrier are discussed. The role of the effective inertia function in the tunneling process is also stressed. Finally the conclusions are presented in section V.

2 A semiclassical approach

As a starting point to get a semiclassical approach for describing spin systems we may consider the $su(2)$ coherent states defined in a general form as [26]

$$|jz\rangle = (1 + |z|^2)^{-j} e^{zJ_+} |j, -j\rangle,$$

or also as

$$|jz\rangle = (1 + |z|^2)^{-j} \sum_{m=-j}^j \binom{2j}{j+m} z^{j+m} |jm\rangle,$$

where z is a complex variable given by

$$z = \tan \frac{\alpha}{2} e^{-i\xi},$$

and j characterizes the angular momentum state multiplet. These states are nonorthogonal and normalized, and furthermore satisfy an overcompleteness relation

$$\int |jz\rangle \langle jz| d\mu(z) = 1,$$

which allows us to use them as an useful state basis.

Moreover, these states are a very interesting starting point when semiclassical aspects of the physical system must be discussed, as has been already discussed in the literature [29].

Let us consider now a spin Hamiltonian of the type that, for simplicity, does not include transversal magnetic fields

$$H = AJ_z + BJ_z^2 + G(J_+^2 + J_-^2) \quad (2)$$

written in terms of the basic operators obeying the $su(2)$ algebra

$$[J_z, J_\pm] = \pm J_\pm$$

and

$$[J_+, J_-] = 2J_z.$$

It is clearly seen that by properly choosing the parameters of that Hamiltonian we end up with particular expressions associated with physical systems we may want to study, for instance if we choose $B = 0$ we have the Lipkin quasi-spin solvable model [33]

$$H_L = AJ_z + G(J_+^2 + J_-^2) .$$

By choosing $G = 0$ we get the Mn-12 acetate model, where a paralel magnetic fields is present [4], namely

$$H_{Ac} = AJ_z + BJ_z^2 ,$$

and we also see that by choosing $A = 0$ we have a model Hamiltonian for the octanuclear iron cluster, $[\text{Fe}_8\text{O}_2(\text{OH})_{12}(\text{tacn})_6]^{8+}$, or just Fe8 [21, 22], in the absence of external magnetic fields

$$H_{Fe} = BJ_z^2 + G(J_+^2 + J_-^2) .$$

We then recall that a description based on an angle representation of these models, out of that general Hamiltonian, can be obtained by directly calculating its respective normalized matrix elements with the proposed coherent states. To this end, we collect the basic results

$$\frac{\langle jz | J_z | jz \rangle}{\langle jz | jz \rangle} = -j \cos \alpha ,$$

$$\frac{\langle jz | J_z^2 | jz \rangle}{\langle jz | jz \rangle} = j^2 - j \left(j - \frac{1}{2} \right) \sin^2 \alpha ,$$

$$\frac{\langle jz|J_+^2|jz\rangle}{\langle jz|jz\rangle} = 2j(2j-1)\sin^2\frac{\alpha}{2}\cos^2\frac{\alpha}{2}e^{2i\xi},$$

and

$$\frac{\langle jz|J_-^2|jz\rangle}{\langle jz|jz\rangle} = \left[\frac{\langle jz|J_+^2|jz\rangle}{\langle jz|jz\rangle} \right]^\dagger.$$

Using these results we get the energy surface associated with the Hamiltonian, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\alpha, \xi) = & -Aj\cos\alpha + B\left[j^2 - j\left(j - \frac{1}{2}\right)\sin^2\alpha\right] + \\ & 2G2j(2j-1)\sin^2\frac{\alpha}{2}\cos^2\frac{\alpha}{2}\cos 2\xi. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

At this point, we see that we can determine the value of ξ that minimizes the energy surface, leading to an energy curve in the variable α .

Let us analyse this expression in a particular case. It is evident that, if we choose the parameters so that we describe the Mn12-acetate molecule in the absence of paralel and transverse magnetic fields, i.e., $A = G = 0$ (the energy surface in this case is ξ -independent), the energy curve

$$\mathcal{H}(\alpha) = B\left[j^2 - j\left(j - \frac{1}{2}\right)\sin^2\alpha\right]$$

presents minima at $\alpha = 0, \pi$ for $B < 0$. For the values $B/k_B = -0.6 K$, where k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and $j = S = 10$, as found in the literature [16], we obtain the energy minima at $E_{\min} = -60.0 K$. This is, however, precisely the ground state energy value obtained by diagonalizing the Hamiltonian associated with the corresponding model, Eq.(2), within the $|j(=S)m\rangle$ states basis. This result thus indicates that such a semiclassical approach does not embody quantum content enough to describe such system because, as we see, the bottom of the energy curve coincides with the ground state energy. This fact shows that the quantum correlations related to the rotation degree of freedom may be important and, furthermore, it is not taken into account in this approach.

3 Formalism

Let us now go one step further in order to construct an energy surface that describes the spin system and at the same time that encompasses more quantum

correlations than the previous procedure does. In this sense the Generator Coordinate Method (GCM) [27] extends that approach because it also embodies off-diagonal elements, i.e., if we start from the $su(2)$ coherent states we have to calculate the so-called energy and overlap kernels, as already discussed[24, 25]

$$K(\alpha, \alpha'; \xi) = \langle jz' | H | jz \rangle = \langle j\alpha' \xi | H | j\alpha \xi \rangle = \langle \alpha' | H | \alpha \rangle$$

$$N(\alpha, \alpha') = \langle jz' | jz \rangle = \langle j\alpha' \xi | j\alpha \xi \rangle = \langle \alpha' | \alpha \rangle,$$

respectively. It must be observed that hereafter we will only consider α as our generator coordinate. The variable ξ will be properly chosen at the beginning in each case so as to minimize the energy surface as pointed out before.

In the same way as we did in the last section, the basic matrix elements of the operators are collected

$$\langle jz' | J_z | jz \rangle = -j \cos^{2j-1} \left(\frac{\alpha' - \alpha}{2} \right) \cos \left(\frac{\alpha' + \alpha}{2} \right),$$

$$\langle jz' | J_z^2 | jz \rangle = \frac{j}{2} \cos^{2j} \left(\frac{\alpha' - \alpha}{2} \right) + \frac{j}{2} (2j-1) \cos^{2j-2} \left(\frac{\alpha' - \alpha}{2} \right) \cos^2 \left(\frac{\alpha' + \alpha}{2} \right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle jz' | J_+^2 + J_-^2 | jz \rangle &= 2j(2j-1) \cos^{2j-2} \left(\frac{\alpha' - \alpha}{2} \right) \times \\ &\left(e^{2i\xi} \sin^2 \frac{\alpha'}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2} + e^{-2i\xi} \sin^2 \frac{\alpha}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\alpha'}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the GCM energy and overlap kernels for the general spin Hamiltonian are respectively

$$\begin{aligned} K(\alpha, \alpha'; \xi) &= -Aj \cos^{2j-1} \left(\frac{\alpha' - \alpha}{2} \right) \cos \left(\frac{\alpha' + \alpha}{2} \right) + B \frac{j}{2} \cos^{2j} \left(\frac{\alpha' - \alpha}{2} \right) + \\ &B \frac{j}{2} (2j-1) \cos^{2j-2} \left(\frac{\alpha' - \alpha}{2} \right) \cos^2 \left(\frac{\alpha' + \alpha}{2} \right) + \\ &2Gj(2j-1) \cos^{2j-2} \left(\frac{\alpha' - \alpha}{2} \right) \left(e^{2i\xi} \sin^2 \frac{\alpha'}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2} + e^{-2i\xi} \sin^2 \frac{\alpha}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\alpha'}{2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and

$$N(\alpha, \alpha') = \cos^{2j} \left(\frac{\alpha' - \alpha}{2} \right). \quad (5)$$

The contribution of the off-diagonal matrix elements is immediately recognized in these expressions, and it can be easily verified that they are less and less important as j increases, and that the semiclassical results are thus reobtained for $\alpha' = \alpha$, or when $j \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, the off-diagonal contributions may play an essential role in the description of spin systems with small and medium values of j since they carry additional quantum information when compared with the semiclassical approach.

Instead of solving the GCM integral equation with these kernels, as usually is done[27], we will show in what follows how a spin Hamiltonian – written in terms of an angle variable – can be extracted from the GCM kernels.

Once we have the GCM overlap and energy kernels, we will use a new representation for describing the spin system[35]. Following the scheme already presented before[24, 25], which makes use of Fourier transforms, we get the new matrix representation for the spin system

$$\begin{aligned} H_{nn'} = & -\frac{A}{2} \frac{S(j, n, n')}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2j+1}{2} + \frac{n+n'}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2j+1}{2} - \frac{n+n'}{2}\right)} (\delta_{n', n+1} + \delta_{n', n-1}) + \\ & B \frac{j}{2} \frac{S(j, n, n')}{\Gamma\left(j + \frac{n+n'}{2} + 1\right) \Gamma\left(j - \frac{n+n'}{2} + 1\right)} \delta_{n', n} + \\ & \frac{B}{4} \frac{S(j, n, n')}{\Gamma\left(j + \frac{n+n'}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(j - \frac{n+n'}{2}\right)} [2\delta_{n', n} + (\delta_{n', n+2} + \delta_{n', n-2})] + \\ & \frac{G}{2} \frac{S(j, n, n')}{\Gamma\left(j + \frac{n+n'}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(j - \frac{n+n'}{2}\right)} [6\delta_{n', n} - (\delta_{n', n+2} + \delta_{n', n-2})] + \\ & G j (2j - 1) \frac{S(j, n, n')}{\Gamma\left(j + \frac{n+n'}{2} + 1\right) \Gamma\left(j - \frac{n+n'}{2} + 1\right)} \delta_{n', n}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where

$$S(j, n, n') = \sqrt{\Gamma(j + n + 1) \Gamma(j - n + 1) \Gamma(j + n' + 1) \Gamma(j - n' + 1)}.$$

The diagonalization of this Hamiltonian matrix clearly gives the same results as those obtained by directly diagonalizing the matrix generated by the starting Hamiltonian, Eq.(2), using the angular momentum $|jm\rangle$ states

basis. This result is expected because this new representation is obtained by the use of unitary transformations acting on the original one. This also assures us that this new representation totally preserves the content of the original representation and that it is not an approximate version of the energy surface.

This new representation has also the virtue of allowing a further manipulation that is an essential step in order to write a Hamiltonian in terms of an angle variable for the spin system. Namely, to this end we perform new Fourier transformations, followed by a discrete version of the continuous Weyl-Wigner transformation [36]. Again, using the results of Refs. [24, 25], we can get an expression for the energy surface - from the GCM energy kernel - in terms of a new pair of angle variables, namely β and β' . In fact, we introduce the new variables $\varphi = \frac{\alpha+\alpha'}{2}$, $\theta = \alpha' - \alpha$, $u = \beta - \beta'$ and $\phi = \frac{\beta+\beta'}{2}$, and also $l = n + n'$ and $k = n - n'$ in order to transform the GCM energy kernel into the new energy surface. The summations over l that appear are restricted so that they run over even/odd values if k is even/odd.

Since we already have the GCM energy kernel, Eq.(4), we will consider hereafter the particular case of no transverse magnetic field, $C = 0$, for simplicity, and therefore we rewrite it as

$$H^{(GCM)}(\theta, \varphi) = \langle \varphi + \frac{\theta}{2} | H | \varphi - \frac{\theta}{2} \rangle =$$

$$\left[B \frac{j}{2} + |G| j (2j - 1) \right] \cos^{2j} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) - 2 |G| j (2j - 1) \cos^{2j-2} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) -$$

$$A j \cos^{2j-1} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \cos \varphi + j (2j - 1) \left(\frac{B}{2} + |G| \right) \cos^2 \varphi,$$

where the choices for the variable ξ were already carried out. After a direct but tedious calculation we obtain the general expression,

$$H(u, \phi) = \frac{[B \frac{j}{2} + |G| j (2j - 1)]}{2\pi} \sum_{l=-2j}^{2j} e^{i \frac{l}{2} u} + \frac{\frac{B}{2} - 3 |G|}{2\pi} \sum_{l=-2j}^{2j} e^{i \frac{l}{2} u} \left(j^2 - \frac{l^2}{4} \right) -$$

$$\frac{A}{2\pi} \cos \phi \sum_{l=-2j}^{2j} e^{i \frac{l}{2} u} \sqrt{\left(j + \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(j - \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)} +$$

$$\frac{\frac{B}{2} + |G|}{2\pi} \sum_{l=-2j}^{2j} e^{i\frac{l}{2}u} \cos 2\phi \sqrt{\left(j + \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(j + \frac{l}{2}\right) \left(j - \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(j - \frac{l}{2}\right)}. \quad (7)$$

So far no approximation has been made and the above expression contains exactly the same physical content as the original phenomenological Hamiltonian.

3.1 Discussion

Before carrying out the calculations in order to obtain the moments of the above shown energy surface, we must recall some aspects of the Weyl-Wigner transformation techniques developed for continuous degrees of freedom [37]. It can be readily recognized that the power series expansion in the momentum p that appears in the defining expression of the Weyl-Wigner transform

$$H(q, p) = \int e^{ip(x-x')} H\left(\frac{x+x'}{2}, x-x'\right) d(x-x'),$$

where $\frac{x+x'}{2} = q$, and $H(q, p)$ is the quantum phase space representative of the Hamiltonian operator, can be rewritten in such a form that the new coefficients are the moments of the energy surface with respect to the difference of the original variables, namely

$$M_n\left(\frac{x+x'}{2}\right) = \int H\left(\frac{x+x'}{2}, x-x'\right) (x-x')^n d(x-x'), \quad n = 0, 2, 4, \dots$$

is the n -th moment of the energy surface in the variable $x - x'$. Obviously we expect that only the even moments do not vanish because otherwise the system would violate time reversal symmetry, or, in other words, terms would appear in the Hamiltonian that would be proportional to odd powers of the momentum. In fact, it is the even parity of the GCM kernels that warrants us a time reversal invariant Hamiltonian.

In the continuous case, by using this procedure one ends up with a series the first two terms of which are dependent on the coordinate variable only, and proportional to the squared momentum respectively. In some cases, the proportionality coefficient in the second term may result in a function

of the coordinate variable or, in other words, an effective mass may come out. Therefore, these first two terms can be seen as the potential and kinetic energy terms of an associated effective Hamiltonian. When these two terms dominate the series expansion, i.e., higher order moments can be neglected – they may even be completely absent in certain cases – then the approximate two-terms effective Hamiltonian can be useful to describe the physical system we started with.

Now, the same can be seen to be valid in the present case of spin degrees of freedom if we consider the proper angular function in respect to which the moments of the energy surface must be taken. Since the angle is not the direct variable to be used here since it does not obey a standard commutation relation with the angular momentum operator [30, 31, 32] – in contrast with the canonical case of ordinary coordinate and momentum discussed above – the moments of the energy surface must be calculated with a periodic function of the angle. Thus, we perform the calculation with respect to $\sin(u)$ [31], where $u = \beta - \beta'$, as already defined. The zeroth order moment will give us the potential function in terms of the angle variable, as has been already presented in the past [24, 25]. Since the zeroth order is given by

$$V(\phi) = \sum_{u=-\frac{2j}{2j+1}\pi}^{\frac{2j}{2j+1}\pi} H(u, \phi) \Delta u,$$

where $\Delta u = \frac{2\pi}{2j+1}$, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} V(\phi) = & \frac{j[B + 2|G|(2j-1)]}{2} + \frac{B - 6|G|}{2}j^2 - \\ & \frac{A \cos \phi}{2j+1} \sqrt{j(j+1)} \sum_{n,k=-j}^j e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N}} e^{i\pi \frac{k}{N}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{n(n+1)}{j(j+1)}} + \\ & \frac{B + 2|G|}{2}j(j+1) \cos 2\phi, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $N = 2j + 1$ is the angular momentum state space dimension.

By its turn, the second moment will give us the expression associated with the inertia function. In other words,

$$I(\phi) = \sum_{u=-\frac{2j}{2j+1}\pi}^{\frac{2j}{2j+1}\pi} H(u, \phi) \sin^2 u \Delta u$$

leads to

$$I(\phi) = (B - 6|G|) + \frac{A \cos \phi}{4j(j+1)} \sqrt{j(j+1)} \times$$

$$\sum_{n,k=-j}^j e^{i\pi \frac{k}{N}} \left[e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}(n+2)} + e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}(n-2)} - 2e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}n} \right] \sqrt{1 - \frac{n(n+1)}{j(j+1)}} -$$

$$\frac{B + 2|G|}{4} j(j+1) \cos 2\phi \left[\sqrt{1 - \frac{6}{j(j+1)}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{2}{j(j+1)}} - 1 \right].$$

It is then a direct matter to see that

$$I(\phi) = -\frac{1}{M(\phi)},$$

where $M(\phi)$ is the corresponding effective "mass" function associated with the spin system.

We now propose that these first two moments must suffice to write a Hamiltonian that can, to an acceptable degree of accuracy, describe systems consisting of a suitably great number of spins. In this form, in this approximation the Hamiltonian is written as

$$H(\phi) = -\frac{d}{d\phi} \left(\frac{1}{2M(\phi)} \frac{d}{d\phi} \right) + V(\phi),$$

and we straightforwardly get the eigenvalues E_k as well as the eigenfunctions $\psi_k(\phi)$ by solving the Schrödinger equation

$$H(\phi) \psi_k(\phi) = E_k \psi_k(\phi)$$

by a Fourier analysis. As such, the spin number for which the validity of this proposal is assured can be estimated by introducing a model Hamiltonian and comparing the results obtained from this Schrödinger equation with the exact ones, obtained from a direct diagonalization of that model Hamiltonian in a $|jm\rangle$ basis, for a great range of values of the spin quantum number j . In what follows we will discuss the validity of that approximation using the Lipkin model[33].

As already pointed out before, the Lipkin quasi-spin model is singled out by assuming the parameters: $A = \varepsilon$, $B = 0$, and $G = \frac{V}{2} = -\frac{\varepsilon\chi}{2(N_s-1)}$, where $N_s = 2j$, so that the GCM kernels read

$$\frac{H_L(\theta, \varphi)}{\varepsilon} = -\frac{N_s}{2} \left\{ \cos^{N_s-1} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \cos \varphi + \frac{\chi}{2} \cos^{N_s-2} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \times \right.$$

$$\left[(1 + \sin^2 \varphi) - \cos^2 \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \right] \},$$

and

$$N_L(\theta, \varphi) = \cos^{N_s} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right)$$

respectively, if we measure energy in unities of ε .

We obtain the potential function directly from Eq.(8), which gives

$$V_L(\phi) = -\frac{\chi j(j+1)}{2j-1} \sin^2 \phi - \frac{\sqrt{j(j+1)}}{N} \cos \phi \times \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{n,k=-j}^j e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}(n+\frac{1}{2})} \sqrt{1 - \frac{n(n+1)}{j(j+1)}}.$$

In the same form we get the expression related to the inertia function

$$I_L(\phi) = -\frac{3\chi}{2j-1} + \frac{\sqrt{j(j+1)}}{4N} \cos \phi \times$$

$$\sum_{n,k=-j}^j e^{i\pi \frac{k}{N}} \left[e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}(n+2)} + e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}(n-2)} - 2e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}n} \right] \sqrt{1 - \frac{n(n+1)}{j(j+1)}} -$$

$$\frac{\chi j(j+1)}{4(2j-1)} \cos 2\phi \left[\sqrt{1 - \frac{6}{j(j+1)}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{2}{j(j+1)}} - 1 \right]. \quad (10)$$

With these expressions we can discuss now the approximations proposed before. First, if the number of quasi-spins is such that $N_s \gg 1$, the summations over k can be substituted by integrals and we obtain the expressions

$$V_L(\phi) = -\frac{\chi(N_s+3)}{4} \sin^2 \phi - \sqrt{j(j+1)} \cos \phi \frac{2}{\pi} \sum_{n=-j}^j \frac{(-1)^n}{2n+1} \sqrt{1 - \frac{n(n+1)}{j(j+1)}},$$

and

$$I_L(\phi) = -\frac{2\chi}{N_s-1} (1 + \sin^2 \phi) +$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{j(j+1)} \cos \phi \sum_{n=-j}^j (-1)^n \left(\frac{1}{2n+5} + \frac{1}{2n-3} - \frac{2}{2n+1} \right) \sqrt{1 - \frac{n(n+1)}{j(j+1)}}$$

respectively. Furthermore, the remaining summations can be seen to have well defined limits for $N_s \gg 1$, so that we get

$$V_L(\phi) \simeq -\frac{N_s + 1}{2} \cos \phi - \frac{\chi(N_s + 3)}{4} \sin^2 \phi, \quad (11)$$

and

$$I_L(\phi) \simeq -\frac{2}{N_s - 1} \cos \phi - \frac{2\chi}{N_s - 1} (1 + \sin^2 \phi) \quad (12)$$

respectively. These expressions are closely related to those obtained from an Adiabatic Time Dependent Hartree-Fock (ATDHF) approach to this model [38]. In fact, the expression that gives the inertia function, Eq.(12), almost coincides with the one obtained from that approach (N_s instead of our $N_s - 1$) while the expression associated with the potential, namely

$$V_L^{ATDHF}(\phi) = -\frac{N_s}{2} \left(\cos \phi + \frac{\chi}{2} \sin^2 \phi \right),$$

shows that the ATDHF mean field approximation does not include the term $-\frac{1}{2} \cos \phi - \frac{3\chi}{4} \sin^2 \phi$ that appears in our approximation. This difference is due to the initial GCM ansatz used in our approach which deals with linear superpositions of Slater determinants as the starting quasi-spin wavefunctions instead of pure determinants as it is the case with ATDHF. A similar discussion using the GCM has been also presented in Ref. [38].

Figure 1 depicts the potential functions obtained from expressions (9) and (11), while Figure 2 shows the functions given by (10) and (12), with the changed signal, for $\chi = 1.5$ and $N_s = 2, 6, 10$ and 20 , respectively. From these figures it can be verified that the curves tend to superpose as N_s increases being that they are almost indistinguishable already for $N_s = 20$, i.e., $j = 10$.

With these results we can now check the validity of our approach and its limiting version when $N_s \gg 1$. To compare the two approaches we first obtain the exact results by diagonalizing the energy matrix $H_{n,n'}$, Eq.(6), and, on the other hand, by solving the Schrödinger equation

$$\left[-\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\phi} \left(\frac{1}{M(\phi)} \frac{d}{d\phi} \right) + V(\phi) \right] \psi(\phi) = E \psi(\phi) \quad (13)$$

using the expressions for $V(\phi)$, Eq.(11), and $M(\phi)$, obtained from Eq.(12), respectively. From the outset it is clear that the second order moment truncation proposed here will not suffice to describe the quasi-spin system for small

N_s since in these cases higher order terms are also important. Thus the requirement of large N_s imposed so that a reliable two-terms Hamiltonian can be obtained also results in the approximate expressions, Eqs.(11) and (12) respectively. In this form, from a direct inspection of Figures 1 and 2, we know beforehand that our approach must be acceptable for $N_s = 2j \gtrsim 10$. This guides us to study the spectra of systems with those quasi-spin number directly using expressions (11) and (12) as our starting point. Therefore, the solutions thus obtained give an way of testing the quality of our approximate expressions for the potential and inertia functions.

A comparison between the approximate and exact energies can be seen in Figures 3 and 4. A check of our description is shown in Figure 3 where the exact ground state eigenvalues of the quasi-spin systems, with $N_s = 10, 20$ and 40 , are compared with those obtained from Eq.(13), using Eqs.(11) and (12), as a function of the strength parameter χ . In Figure 4 we show the energy errors in the ground state eigenvalues as a function of the quasi-spin number N_s for a fixed value of the strength parameter, namely, $\chi = 1.0$. The results are almost the same for other values of χ . It is clear from Figure 4 that an error as low as 1% is achieved already for a system with $N_s = 8$ ($j = 4$) thus confirming our previous assumption, and therefore establishing a suitable working limit for the number of quasi-spins of the system when we use the present approach. This also means that the truncation of the series of moments of the energy surface up to the second term can, already for $2j = N_s \gtrsim 8$, account for the dominant part of the dynamical content of the quasi-spin system.

Two interesting features of the Lipkin model can be directly discussed in this approach. First, it is immediate to see, observing the expression describing the potential function, Eq.(11), that the strength parameter, namely χ , assumes its critical value χ_c – the minimum at $\phi = 0$ turns into a maximum – when $\chi = \chi_c = (N_s + 1) / (N_s + 3)$. This shows that only when $N_s \rightarrow \infty$ we get $\chi_c \rightarrow 1$, as expected [29]. Clearly for values $\chi > \chi_c$ ($N_s < \infty$) a barrier appears at the origin and tunneling can occur under certain conditions [25]. Second, the possibility of tunneling through the barrier, when it is the case, can be blocked if the effective mass presents a divergent behaviour at or near the classical turning points, i.e., if $I_L(\phi)$ exhibits zeroes there. In this form, not only the potential barrier governs the tunneling process, but the inertia function also plays an essential role in this matter. Due to the behaviour of the inertia some regions in the angle domain may not be accessible; this can also be seen as a localization of the spin orientation when this singular

behaviour occurs: when it turns out to be impossible for the spin to change its orientation - when the effective mass diverges - it cannot tunnel. Considering $I_L(\phi)$ for the Lipkin model we see that its zeroes occur at $\phi_0 = \pm \frac{\pi}{2}$ for $\chi = 0$, and that they are pushed to the borders of the angle interval as χ increases to 1, i.e., $\phi_0 = \pm \pi$ for $\chi = 1$. For $\chi > 1$ there will be no zeroes at all. This result shows us that whenever a barrier is present in the potential function – and this occurs for $\chi > \chi_c$ – there will always be a nonvanishing tunneling probability. As a consequence, there will always be tunneling in the Lipkin model when a barrier is present.

4 Applications

4.1 Mn-12 Acetate molecule

If we choose now the parameters of the phenomenological Hamiltonian such that $A = g\mu_B H_{\parallel}$, $B = -D$ ($D > 0$), and $G = 0$ we have the already proposed Mn12-acetate molecule Hamiltonian model [4, 23]. Starting from that Hamiltonian, and using the general expression, Eq.(7), we end up with the corresponding energy surface

$$\begin{aligned} H_{Ac}(u, \phi) = & -\frac{Dj}{4\pi} \sum_{l=-j}^j e^{i\frac{l}{2}u} - \frac{D}{4\pi} \sum_{l=-j}^j e^{i\frac{l}{2}u} \left(j^2 - \frac{l^2}{4} \right) - \\ & \frac{g\mu_B}{2\pi} H_{\parallel} \cos \phi \sum_{l=-j}^j e^{i\frac{l}{2}u} \sqrt{\left(j + \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(j - \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right)} - \\ & \frac{D}{4\pi} \cos 2\phi \sum_{l=-j}^j e^{i\frac{l}{2}u} \sqrt{\left(j + \frac{l}{2} + 1 \right) \left(j + \frac{l}{2} \right) \left(j - \frac{l}{2} + 1 \right) \left(j - \frac{l}{2} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

We can now obtain the expressions for the potential and inertia functions,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{Ac}(\phi) = & -Dj(j+1) \cos^2 \phi - \\ & \frac{g\mu_B H_{\parallel}}{2j+1} \cos \phi \sqrt{j(j+1)} \sum_{n,k=-j}^j e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N} (n+\frac{1}{2})} \sqrt{1 - \frac{n(n+1)}{j(j+1)}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{ac}(\phi) = & -\frac{1}{M(\phi)} = -D + \frac{g\mu_B H_{\parallel}}{4(2j+1)} \cos \phi \sqrt{j(j+1)} \sum_{n,k=-j}^j e^{i\pi \frac{k}{N}} \times \\
& \left[e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}(n+2)} + e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}(n-2)} - 2e^{2\pi i \frac{k}{N}n} \right] \sqrt{1 - \frac{n(n+1)}{j(j+1)}} + \\
& \frac{D}{4} \cos 2\phi j(j+1) \left[\sqrt{1 - \frac{6}{j(j+1)}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{2}{j(j+1)}} - 1 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

respectively. Since in this case $j = S = 10$, and all the summations can be directly calculated, we are allowed by the estimates of the previous section to directly use here the already discussed approximations such that these expressions reduce respectively to

$$V_{Ac}(\phi) = -S(S+1)D \cos^2 \phi - \gamma g\mu_B H_{\parallel} \cos \phi \quad (14)$$

and

$$I_{Ac}(\phi) = -D - \xi g\mu_B H_{\parallel} \cos \phi - \beta D \cos 2\phi, \quad (15)$$

where $\gamma \cong \sqrt{S(S+1)}$ (to within 1.4%), $\xi \cong 1/S$ (to within 0.1%), and $\beta \cong 1.0$ (to within 0.47%). Figures 5 and 6 depict $V_{Ac}(\phi)$ and $I_{Ac}(\phi)$ for some values of H_{\parallel} where we have adopted the angle domain $(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2})$ for the sake of clarity. In Figure 5 we see that the potential for the Mn12-acetate molecule presents two minima whose energy depths depend on the applied field. At the same time the expressions for $I_{Ac}(\phi)$ shown in Figure 6 present a similar behaviour. As it is shown, as the paralel field increases, one of the minima gets shallower while the other deepens as expected from phenomenological considerations [19].

If we solve the Schrödinger equation with the obtained expressions for the potential and inertia function, we obtain $E_{gs} = -60.278 \text{ K}$ for the ground state energy when $H_{\parallel} = 0$ with $D/k_B = 0.6 \text{ K}$. This result shows that the calculated ground state energy is only 0.46% below the exact energy result (-60.0 K), obtained by diagonalizing the corresponding $H_{n,n'}$ matrix. When $H_{\parallel} \neq 0$ the errors are of the same order of magnitude as that. These results confirm our previous considerations, and thus allow us to further discuss the Mn12-acetate molecule properties using our approach. However, instead of

extracting results from numerical calculations based on the new Hamiltonian, we will discuss some basic properties of this molecule by analysing the potential and inertia function analytic expressions.

Observing that we can consider $\xi = 1/S$, and that we can introduce the field at which the magnetization of the Mn12-acetate molecule attains saturation [4], i.e.,

$$H_a = \frac{2SD}{g\mu_B},$$

we can further rewrite expressions (14) and (15) as

$$V_{Ac}(\phi) = -S(S+1)D \cos^2 \phi - \frac{2D}{H_a} S \sqrt{S(S+1)} H_{\parallel} \cos \phi \quad (16)$$

$$I_{Ac}(\phi) = -2D \cos^2 \phi - \frac{2D}{H_a} H_{\parallel} \cos \phi. \quad (17)$$

It can be immediately seen that while $V_{Ac}(\phi) \propto S^2$, $I_{Ac}(\phi) \propto S^0$, thus showing the relative dominance of the potential energy term in the approximate Hamiltonian.

Now, let us analyse the expressions for the potential and inertia functions. First of all let us extract the essential features of the potential function. It is direct to see that since the treatment is of quantum nature, it embodies the inherent quantum correlations, and as such, even in the absence of paralel magnetic fields, the potential minima are -66.0 K , instead of the semiclassical value -60.0 K obtained with $D/k_B = 0.6\text{ K}$. In fact, in our calculation, it is the ground state energy that occurs at -60.278 K , meaning that this is the energy height of the ground state barrier in this description, and furthermore that the ground state energy does not coincide with the bottom of the potential, due to the uncertainty principle, as it must be. This also points to the fact that the quantum correction related to the uncertainty principle amounts to about 10% of the potential barrier height. In the particular case of no paralel field, the minima occur at $\phi_{\min} = 0, \pi$, while the maxima occur at $\phi_{\max} = \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2} (= -\frac{\pi}{2})$.

The introduction of a paralel magnetic field, H_{\parallel} , only shifts the maxima, the minima being kept unaltered, viz.,

$$\phi_{\max} = \arccos \left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{S(S+1)}} \frac{H_{\parallel}}{H_a} \right).$$

In what refers to the inertia function let us study first of all its expression by looking for the extrema. Let us consider the equation

$$\frac{dI_{Ac}(\phi)}{d\phi} = \cos \phi \sin \phi + \frac{1}{2} \frac{H_{\parallel}}{H_a} \sin \phi = 0.$$

As before, when there is no magnetic field, $H_{\parallel} = 0$, the maxima occur at $\phi_{\max} = \pm \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}$ respectively, while the minima occur at $\phi_{\min} = 0, \pi$.

Now, it is important to see that the search for the zeroes of the inertia function gives us the possibility of characterizing, at least qualitatively, the conditions under which tunneling can occur. Thus, starting from Eq.(17), we verify that the zeroes of

$$\cos^2 \phi + \frac{1}{H_a} H_{\parallel} \cos \phi = 0$$

will determine the situations for which tunneling will not occur since then the effective mass goes to infinity, and the spin will be trapped in the angular region around the minima of the potential. It is then direct to see that the roots of that equation will be $\phi = \pm \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}$, and $\phi = \arccos\left(-\frac{H_{\parallel}}{H_a}\right)$. The existence of these zeroes directly imply that tunneling cannot occur; obviously this conclusion is verified by the exact diagonalization of the model Hamiltonian for the molecule, i.e., the existence of zeroes in $I(\phi)$ is the way through which the present description reflects the diagonal behaviour of the phenomenological Hamiltonian in the $|Sm\rangle$ basis. In other words, the spectrum then presents a collection of doubly-degenerate energy levels.

4.2 Fe8 cluster

By choosing now $B = -D$ and $G = E/2$, with $A = 0$, we have the proposed Hamiltonian for the Fe8 cluster [21, 22, 23] in the absence of external magnetic fields. Thus, by taking into account that, again, $j = S = 10$, we can use all the approximations discussed before so that we obtain

$$V_{Fe}(\phi) = -(D - E)S(S + 1) \cos^2 \phi - ES(S + 1), \quad (18)$$

and

$$I_{Fe}(\phi) = -\frac{1}{M(\phi)} = -2(D - E) \cos^2 \phi - 4E, \quad (19)$$

respectively. In the same way as in the Mn12-acetate, we also have $V_{Fe}(\phi) \propto S^2$, and $I_{Fe}(\phi) \propto S^0$ thus also showing the relative dominance of the potential energy contribution to the approximate Hamiltonian. In Figure (7) we depict the potential and the effective mass functions for $D/k_B = 0.275 \text{ K}$ and $E/k_B = 0.046 \text{ K}$.

The numerical solutions of the Schrödinger equation written with those expressions and constants also give results that agree quite well with the ones obtained from the diagonalization of the corresponding original model Hamiltonian. The errors are less than 1% for the energy values in the lower part of the spectrum.

As in the Mn12-acetate molecule without parallel magnetic fields, the minima of the potential occur at $\phi = 0, \pi$, while the maxima occur at $\phi = \pm\pi/2, 3\pi/2$. As such, the energy height defined by

$$V_{Fe}^{\max}(\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}) - V_{Fe}^{\min}(\phi = 0) = (D - E)S(S + 1)$$

is obviously only dependent on the internal parameters of the molecule.

It is now possible to evaluate the energy barrier height associated with the lowest energy level. If we consider the energy of the ground state (but not the bottom of the potential well) then,

$$h_b = -ES(S + 1) - E_{gs};$$

using $E_{gs} \cong -27.645 \text{ K}$, obtained from the Schrödinger equation, we get $h_b \cong 22.58 \text{ K}$, which is only 1.7% higher than the experimental result, 22.2 K , presented in [21].

In addition, it is important to observe that the top of the potential barrier lies in the negative energy domain so that there appear some energy levels – all those above the barrier – that seem not to be associated with tunneling processes. In fact there are some pairs of levels that are almost degenerate although this is not due to tunneling, as is also the case in the Lipkin model when $\chi > \chi_c$. This effect is due to the particular form of the Fe8 Hamiltonian which embodies a subtle interplay between the J_z^2 term, which tends to produce degenerate doublets, and the $(J_x^2 - J_y^2) = \frac{1}{2}(J_+^2 + J_-^2)$ term which tends to symmetrize the energy spectrum about zero.

In what concerns the expression that gives the inertia function, Eq.(19), it is immediately seen that it presents its minima precisely at the same angles as the potential function does. Furthermore, for the specific values of the

Fe8 cluster parameters, the mass function does not exhibit infinities so that tunneling is always possible, even in the absence of an external transverse magnetic field. In fact, the tunneling probability rate is strongly dependent on the behavior of the effective mass function in the barrier region

5 Conclusions

In this contribution we have shown that a Hamiltonian written in terms of an angle variable can be constructed that can describe spin systems in a consistent way. The construction scheme starts from a Hamiltonian given in terms of the operators obeying the angular momentum commutation relations and that is, in general, introduced from phenomenological considerations. The quantum Hamiltonian here proposed extends a previous description, that only took into account a potential energy term, by also introducing a kinetic energy term in which an effective mass associated with the spin system is present. Although this Hamiltonian has been obtained in a general form, the validity of the basic hypothesis supporting the assumed dominance of the first two terms of a moment expansion of the associated matrix energy distribution has been tested. Using the soluble Lipkin quasi-spin model as a testing ground, we have then shown that a criterion for the obtained two-terms Hamiltonian to be a good description of the system can be established. From this study it is clear that for systems with $j = S \geq 5$ the energy spectrum - then obtained from a Schrödinger equation - is a very good approximation to the one obtained from the diagonalization of the starting model Hamiltonian. It is then important to verify that some recently produced molecules are physical systems of interest that have global angular momentum values in the range that allow us to use the present approach. In this perspective, in what concerns the energy spectra and barriers, we have shown that a consistent description were obtained for the Mn12-acetate as well as for the Fe8 cluster molecules. Being of quantum nature, this approach extends the semiclassical estimates and introduce essential corrections that would not be present.

In what concerns the possibility of spin tunneling, we have shown that in the present description the potential energy function clearly exhibits energy barriers whose heights are in agreement with the experimental results. At the same time we have emphasized the essential role played by the effective mass function in the discussion of tunneling in the sense that its values in

the barrier region are a measure of how easy it is for the system to change its angular orientation. The presence of infinities in the effective mass function is an unequivocal feature indicating that tunneling is then forbidden. In the case of the Mn12-acetate molecule the divergences always occur if only a parallel magnetic field is present, as it should be. The expression for the effective mass then shows the way through which the final effective Hamiltonian embodies that well-known basic quantum mechanical result. The same is not true for the Fe8 cluster when tunneling can occur, even in the absence of a transverse magnetic field. The phenomenological Hamiltonian reflects the symmetries of the molecule, and it is precisely its particular form, with its coefficients obtained from the experiments, which gives rise to an effective mass function that is nowhere divergent.

In the present paper we have carried out a qualitative discussion pointing to the main aspects of our approach that can be used to describe the spin tunneling process. In a forthcoming contribution we intend to present quantitative estimates of the energy levels splitting associated with the spin tunneling.

Acknowledgement 1 *The author is grateful to Prof. M.A. Novak from Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, A.F.R. de Toledo Piza from Universidade de São Paulo, and B.M. Pimentel from Instituto de Física Teórica-UNESP for valuable suggestions. The author was partially supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico, CNPq, Brazil.*

References

- [1] G. Gamow, Z. Phys. **51** (1928) 204.
- [2] R.W. Gurney and E.U. Condon, Nature **122** (1928) 439.
- [3] R.P. Bell, The Tunnel Effect in Chemistry, Chapman and Hall, London, UK, 1980.
- [4] E.M. Chudnovsky and J. Tejada, Macroscopic Quantum Tunneling of the Magnetic Moment, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1998.
- [5] E.M. Chudnovsky and L. Gunther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60** (1988) 661.

- [6] P.C.E. Stamp and E.M. Chudnovsky, *Int. Jour. Mod. Phys.* **B6** (1992) 1355.
- [7] S. Takagi, *Macroscopic Quantum Tunneling*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2002.
- [8] J.L. van Hemmen and A. Süto, *Europhys. Lett.* **1** (1986) 481; J.L. van Hemmen and A. Süto, *Physica* **141B** (1986) 37.
- [9] M. Enz and R. Schilling, *J. Phys.* **C19** (1986) 1765; M. Enz and R. Schilling, *J. Phys.* **C19** (1986) L711.
- [10] G. Scharf, W.F. Wreszinski, and J.L. van Hemmen, *J. Phys.* **A20** (1987) 4309.
- [11] O.B. Zaslavskii, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **1** (1989) 6311; O.B. Zaslavskii, *Phys. Lett.* **A145** (1990) 471.
- [12] J.L. van Hemmen and W.F. Wreszinski, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **119** (1988) 213.
- [13] R. Schilling, in: *Proceedings of the NATO Workshop on Quantum Tunneling of Magnetization, QTM'94*, Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht, 1995.
- [14] V.V. Ulyanov and O.B. Zaslavskii, *Phys. Rep.* **216C** (1992) 179.
- [15] T. Lis, *Acta Crystallog.* **B36** (1980) 2042.
- [16] R. Sessoli, D. Gatteschi, A. Caneschi, and M.A. Novak, *Nature (London)* **365** (1993) 141.
- [17] M.A. Novak, R. Sessoli, A. Caneschi, and D. Gatteschi, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **146** (1995) 211.
- [18] C. Paulsen, J.-G. Park, B. Barbara, R. Sessoli, and A. Caneschi, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **140-144** (1995) 379, 1891.
- [19] J.R. Friedman, M.P. Sarachik, J. Tejada, and R. Ziolo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76** (1996) 3830.
- [20] L. Thomas, F. Lioni, R. Ballou, D. Gatteschi, R. Sessoli, and B. Barbara, *Lett. Nature*, vol. **383**, Sept. (1996) 145.

- [21] A.-L. Barra, P. Debrunner, D. Gatteschi, Ch.E. Schulz, and R. Sessoli, Europhys. Lett. **35** (1996) 133.
- [22] C. Sangregorio, T. Ohm, C. Paulsen, R. Sessoli, and D. Gatteschi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 4645.
- [23] A. Caneschi, D. Gatteschi, C. Sangregorio, R. Sessoli, L. Sorace, A. Cornia, M.A. Novak, C. Paulsen, and W. Wernsdorfer, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **200** (1999) 182.
- [24] D. Galetti and M. Ruzzi, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33** (2000) 2799.
- [25] D. Galetti, B.M. Pimentel, and C. L. Lima, Physica **A351** (2005) 315.
- [26] A. Perelomov, Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1986.
- [27] J.J. Griffin and J.A. Wheeler, Phys. Rev. **108** (1957) 311.
- [28] C.W. Wong, Phys. Rep. **15C** (1975) 283.
- [29] L.G. Yaffe, Rev. Mod. Phys. **54** (1982) 407.
- [30] L. Susskind and J. Glogower, Physics **1** (1964) 49.
- [31] P. Carruthers and M. M. Nieto, Rev. Mod. Phys. **40** (1968) 411.
- [32] R. Lynch, Phys. Rep. **256C** (1995) 367.
- [33] H. Lipkin, N. Meshkov, and A. J. Glick, Nucl. Phys. **62** (1965) 188.
- [34] A. Klein and E.R. Marshalek, Rev. Mod. Phys. **63** (1991) 375.
- [35] A.F.R. de Toledo Piza, E.J.V. de Passos, D.Galetti, M.C. Nemes, and M.M. Watanabe Phys. Rev. **C15** (1977) 1477; A.F.R. de Toledo Piza and E.J.V. de Passos, Il Nuovo Cimento 45B (1978) 1.
- [36] B. Leaf, J. Math. Phys. **9** (1968) 65, 769.
- [37] D. Galetti and S.S. Mizrahi, Phys. Rev. **C25** (1982) 2795.
- [38] G. Holzwarth, Nucl. Phys. **A207** (1973) 545.

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Comparison between the large N_s potential function (continuous line) and the full expression, Eq.(8), (dashed line) for the Lipkin model for different values of N_s . The interaction strength is $\chi = 1.5$ in all cases.

Figure 2: Comparison between the large N_s function $-I(\phi)$ (continuous line) and the full expression, Eq.(9), (dashed line) for the Lipkin model for different values of N_s . The interaction strength is $\chi = 1.5$ in all cases.

Figure 3: Relative error in the ground state energies obtained from Eq.(13) for the Lipkin model when compared with the exact results, as a function of the interaction strength χ . The continuous curve is associated with $j = 5$ ($N_s = 10$), the dashed curve with $j = 10$ ($N_s = 20$), and the dot-dashed curve with $j = 20$ ($N_s = 40$). The lines only guide the eyes.

Figure 4: Relative error in the ground state energies obtained from Eq.(13) for the Lipkin model, when compared with the exact results, as a function of the number of spins, N_s ($= 2j$), for $\chi = 1.0$. For systems with $N_s > 10$ the deviation lies below 1%. The line only guides the eyes.

Figure 5: Curves representing the potential energy of the Mn12-acetate for some different values of the paralel magnetic field.

Figure 6: Curves representing the function $I(\phi)$ of the Mn12-acetate for some different values of the paralel magnetic field.

Figure 7: Potential and effective mass functions associated with the Fe8 cluster.

This figure "fig1.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0603183v1>

This figure "fig2.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0603183v1>

This figure "fig3.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0603183v1>

This figure "fig4.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0603183v1>

This figure "fig5.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0603183v1>

This figure "fig6.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0603183v1>

This figure "fig7.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/quant-ph/0603183v1>