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We describe a new experimental technique to investigate coupling effects between different layers or modes in ferromagnetic resonance (FMR). Dual FMR frequencies are excited (2-8 GHz) simultaneously and detected selectively in a broadband RF circuit, using lock-in amplifier detection at separate modulation frequencies.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ferromagnetic resonance (FMR) precession of ferromagnetic alloys and heterostructures is technologically important since it determines the GHz dynamics of spin electronic devices. Recently, novel long-ranged dynamic coupling mechanisms between layers in heterostructures, through the transient excitation of spin currents, have been observed experimentally. Some of these processes could be elucidated if motions of individual layers can be excited independently, allowing the effects of higher amplitude motion at one layer to be characterized in the resonance at an opposite layer.

Experiments on driven FMR modes in ferromagnetic multilayers so far have typically focused on the situation with single drive excitation. Dual-drive excitations cannot be found in the literature except in a few studies of nonlinear interactions between magnetostatic waves in yttrium-iron-garnet films. We have developed a dual-frequency FMR technique to study interactions between FMR modes. Through the adjustment of pumping power at mode 1 (excited at \(f_1\)), we can examine effects on FMR line intensity, width, or shape at mode 2 (excited at \(f_2\)).

In this article, we describe the apparatus for dual-frequency FMR measurements. FMR is excited at two frequencies using dual RF sources, combined at a power divider, and delivered to the ferromagnetic sample using a broadband coplanar waveguide (CPW). The response of individual FMR modes is detected by modulating each RF source at a separate low modulation frequency and locking in to these two frequencies with separate lock-in amplifiers. The technique is validated with a Ni\(_81\)Fe\(_{19}\) thin film sample, where dual-frequency FMR is proved to be selective of resonance frequency. With this technique, investigations have been made in a Ni\(_81\)Fe\(_{19}\)/Cu/Co\(_{93}\)Zr\(_7\) multilayer, where some influence of pumped Ni\(_81\)Fe\(_{19}\) precession on the Co\(_{93}\)Zr\(_7\) resonance may be seen.

II. APPARATUS

The block diagram of the experimental setup of dual-frequency FMR is shown in Fig. 1, where broadband (2-8 GHz) swept-field ferromagnetic resonance (FMR) is measured. Lock-in amplifier detection through frequency modulation is used in our FMR measurements. Apart from the dual frequency capability, our measurements are similar to conventional FMR cavity measurements, although network analyzers are often used instead of lock-in amplifier for phase-sensitive detection in conventional broadband FMR spectrometers.

The microwave sources consist of two independently controllable frequency sweepers: RF source 1 and RF source 2. RF source 1 is a home-built, fixed-frequency source at 2.3 GHz (\(f_1\)), variable in output from -50 to 22 dBm. We used a filtered amplified higher harmonic of a 88 MHz signal from a Wavetek 3000 signal with FM capability. RF source 2 is a Wiltron 6668B sweep generator operated in cw mode, with tunable frequency (\(f_2\)) in the range of 0-40 GHz, variable output from -50 to 15 dBm, and FM capability. The dual microwave generators are used to generate dual rf signals (\(f_1, f_2\)) simultaneously. The two independent rf sources modulated at separate frequencies (\(f_{\text{mod}}^1, f_{\text{mod}}^2\)) are combined with an Anaren 42020 broadband power combiner/divider (2-8 GHz), which attenuates each input by 3 dB in transmission, and then delivered to the ferromagnetic thin film sample through a lithographic coplanar waveguide (CPW) with a 100 \(\mu m\) center conductor width. The RF field delivery configuration here is similar to that used in PIMM (pulsed inductive microwave magnetometer) measurements, substituting cw microwave sources for the pulse generator.

The thin film sample is placed film-side down onto the top of the CPW, with a thin layer of photore sist spin-coated onto the film to prevent it from shorting the CPW. The CPW, used to pump the thin film sample with combined microwave (2-8 GHz) excitations from two synthesized microwave generators, is constructed by standard lithographic techniques and placed inside a Fe core electromagnet. The electromagnet has a gap of \(\sim 2\) cm and a maximum field of \(\sim 1.0\) Tesla at 40 Ampere, controlled by parallel KEPCO-BOP-20/20M current sources. The Fe core electromagnet provides applied magnetic bias field along the center conductor of CPW, which is measured directly using a transverse hall probe monitored by a Lakeshore 421 Gaussmeter.

Transmitted rf signals through the magnetic thin film sample are detected at a microwave diode (0-18 GHz), the output of which is sent to the A inputs of two lock-in amplifiers (lock-in 1 of SR810, and lock-in 2 of SR830).
The *sine* outputs of the lock-in amplifiers provide the modulation to the transmitted rf signals at separate modulation frequencies: $f_{\text{mod}}^1$ (≈ 120 Hz) for $f_1$, and $f_{\text{mod}}^2$ (≈ 540 Hz) for $f_2$. A microcomputer equipped with a GPIB bus communicates with the SR810/830 and the Wiltron 6668B: analog inputs (±10 V) at the SR830 read the corrected output of the Lakeshore 421 Gaussmeter, and parallel analog outputs (±5 V) control the Kepco power supplies. All these features allow the system to be fully automated.

In operation, the dual-frequency FMR measurement can sweep frequencies at $f_2$ and fields $H_B$, while monitoring the diode signals at $f_{\text{mod}}^1$ ($f_1$) and $f_{\text{mod}}^2$ ($f_2$). Power levels at $f_1$ are set manually through a variable attenuator. A high-precision (Keithley 2000) DMM, also under GPIB control, was available to monitor the DC diode signals in the same measurements.

![Block diagram of the experimental setup of dual-frequency FMR.](image)

**III. EXPERIMENT**

A single layer sample of Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ (25 nm) and a trilayer structure of Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ (25 nm)/Cu (20 nm)/Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ (25 nm), were grown by UHV magnetron sputtering from alloy targets at a base pressure of 4 × 10^{-3} torr onto Si/SiO$_2$ substrates. A 20 Oe deposition field was applied to induce unidirectional anisotropy in the film plane. More details on deposition conditions can be found in our previous work.[2]

Conventional broadband FMR measurements (RF source 1 is off, and RF source 2 is on) were made on both Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ and Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$/Cu/Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ thin film samples at several selected frequencies (from 0 to 5 GHz) to determine the Kittel relation[8] between microwave frequency ($\omega_p/2\pi$) and resonance field ($H_{\text{res}}$). For in-plane magnetization in a thin film, the Kittel relation can be expressed as[8]:

$$\omega_p^2 \approx \mu_0^2 \gamma^2 M_s (H_{\text{res}} + H_k),$$

where $H_k$ is an effective field due to anisotropy.

The Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ thin film sample was then measured using dual-frequency FMR, where two different FMR modes were excited independently, using separate resonance frequencies ($f_1 = 2.3$ GHz, $f_2 = 4.5$ GHz) at fixed field. In the Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$/Cu/Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ trilayer sample, both the Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ layer and the Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ layer were excited near resonance simultaneously, choosing $H_{\text{res}}$ for $f_1 = 2.3$ GHz, through the adjustment of $f_2$ (to 3.8 GHz). The effects of variable power at $f_1$ on the Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ resonance at $f_2$ were investigated.

**IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The results of conventional broadband FMR measurements on both Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ and Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$/Cu/Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ thin film samples are presented in Fig. 2. We show ($\omega_p/2\pi$)$^2$ as a function of $H_{\text{res}}$. $f_1$ and $f_2$ denote the selected frequencies of excited FMR modes in dual-frequency FMR measurements on the same samples (shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4). Solid lines are linear fits based on Eq. (1). Two branches were observed for the Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$/Cu/Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ thin film sample, corresponding mostly to the separate resonances of the Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ layer and the Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ layer, with some weak ferromagnetic coupling (~5 Oe).

Validation of frequency selectivity in dual-frequency FMR is shown in Fig. 3. Two different FMR modes were excited in the Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ thin film sample at two selective resonance frequencies ($f_1 = 2.3$ GHz, $f_2 = 4.5$ GHz) and then detected selectively using dual lock-in amplifiers (lock-in 1, lock-in 2), respectively. Two absorption peaks were observed for the total transmitted signal, where the positions and widths of the two absorption peaks correspond closely with those found selectively at $f_1$ and $f_2$.

Dual-frequency FMR measurement on the Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$/Cu/Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ trilayer thin film sample is presented in Fig. 4, where the effects of pumped Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ precession at $f_1 = 2.3$ GHz were investigated on the Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ resonance at $f_2 = 3.8$ GHz. This frequency ($f_1$) sets the Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$ layer into FMR at $H_B = 72.5$ Oe. With rf power of RF source 2 fixed at a low value (-5 dBm), we varied the pumping power of RF source 1, from -20 dBm to +10 dBm, measured at the diode. As shown in Fig. 4, two separate FMR modes were observed for each value of the pumping power of RF source 1, where the mode at the low-field side corresponded primarily to the resonance of the Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ layer. Some variations can be seen in both the line intensity and the symmetry of the Co$_{93}$Zr$_7$ FMR modes as a function of power pumped into the Ni$_81$Fe$_{19}$
resonance. It is also evident that the high power excited at $f_1$ has no discernible influence on the Ni$_{81}$Fe$_{19}$ resonance measured at $f_2$, as expected. However, a quantitative estimate of any dynamic coupling between Ni$_{81}$Fe$_{19}$ and Co$_{93}$Zr$_{7}$ layers could not be made, as the residual influence of the static ($\sim$ 5 Oe) coupling could not be excluded. It is additionally important to drive the Ni$_{81}$Fe$_{19}$ resonance symmetrically over the low-field region, which requires a second variable frequency source at $f_1$.

By using dual-frequency FMR technique, we can selectively excite several different FMR modes in a ferromagnetic alloy and heterostructures, and the nature of coupling interactions between multiple FMR modes could thus be probed. We remark that the technique presented could be extended to fixed-field, swept-frequency measurement, or to track the Kittel resonance at $f_1$ as field $H_{res}$ is swept. With much higher power amplification and some cooling capability, nonlinear interactions between magnetostatic spin-wave modes (MSSW) could be studied as well. Finally, the frequency range can be extended to 20 GHz, or even to 40 GHz, through the use of different power dividers.

V. CONCLUSION

A new experimental technique, dual-frequency ferromagnetic resonance (FMR), has been developed to investigate coupling effects between different FMR modes. This new technique is able to excite different FMR modes simultaneously and independently, while separating the properties of each.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was partially supported by the Army Research Office with Grant No. ARO-43986-MS-YIP, and the National Science Foundation with Grant No. NSF-DMR-02-39724. This work has used the shared experimental facilities that are supported primarily by the MR-SEC(Columbia) program of the National Science Foundation under Contract No. NSF-DMR-0213574.

References

[1] Y. Tserkovnyak, A. Brataas, G. E. W. Bauer, and B. I. Halperin, Rev. Mod. Phys. 77, 1375 (2005).
[2] D. J. Mar, T. L. Carroll, L. M. Pecora, J. F. Heagy, and F. J. Rachford, J. Appl. Phys. 80, 1878 (1996).
[3] D. J. Mar, T. L. Carroll, L. M. Pecora, and F. J. Rachford, J. Appl. Phys. 81, 5734 (1997).
[4] B. Heinrich, Ultrathin Magnetic Structures II, edited by B. Heinrich and J. A. C. Bland (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994).
[5] V. P. Denisenkov and A. M. Grishin, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 74, 3400 (2003).
[6] A. Kos, T. Silva, and P. Kabos, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 73, 3563 (2002).
[7] Y. Guan, Z. Dios, D. A. Arena, L. Cheng, and W. E. Bailey, J. Appl. Phys. 97, 10A719 (2005).
[8] Charles Kittel, Introduction to Solid State Physics (Wiley, 2005)