The interface between a magnetic thin film and a ferroelectric material is the subject of several recent investigations [1–19]. The major part of these studies is devoted to Fe/ferroelectric interfaces [2, 4–7, 10, 12, 14–18], since ferromagnetic iron is supposed to be a good candidate as a ferromagnetic electrode in two-component multiferroics. Although it was shown, that a ferroelectric film can be grown on an iron substrate and a functional heterojunction can be fabricated [14, 15], the multiferroic effects by polarization switching were found to be not strong enough, since the main changes of the functional properties occur only in the vicinity of the interface [2, 6, 15]. Another impediment is non-ideal compatibility between an iron and an oxide surface. Until now it was not shown that junctions with symmetric interfaces, a highly desirable condition for coherent electronic transport [20], can be grown. Accordingly, ferromagnetic oxides La$_{1-x}$Sr$_x$MnO$_3$ and SrRuO$_3$ were used as electrodes in multiferroic junctions [3, 8, 9, 11, 19]. Such interfaces can be almost ideally grown, but the Curie temperature of these oxides is too low for functional devices. Therefore, search for an appropriate ferromagnetic/ferroelectric interface is still in progress.

Among the above cited studies only few investigations deal with ultrathin ferromagnetic films on a ferroelectric substrate [6, 7, 12, 16]. In particular, it was shown that two monolayer
thick Fe films on the BaTiO$_3$(0 0 1) surface might not be ferromagnetic because of the film geometry and magneto-elastic properties of iron [6]. Additionally, a substantial charge and spin moment transfer was found at the interface by altering the polarization direction [6].

Thus, ultrathin films of Fe on a BaTiO$_3$(0 0 1) single crystal are magnetically unstable [6], but cobalt exhibits usually stable ferromagnetic characteristics in many nanostructures. Therefore, we continue our work on ultrathin metallic films on ferroelectric single crystals and suggest in this paper to use Co as the ferromagnetic material on BaTiO$_3$(0 0 1).

Despite the comprehensive review about the progress in this field given by Vaz et al [21] there are only few informations about the interface of Co and perovskites like BaTiO$_3$ [21], there are only few informations about the interface of Co and perovskites like BaTiO$_3$ [21], there are only few informations about the interface of Co and perovskites like BaTiO$_3$ [21].

In the framework of spin-polarized DFT calculations, as implemented in the Vienna ab initio Simulation Package (VASP), multiferroic tunnel junctions of Co/BTO/Co were investigated by Cao et al [13]. They showed that a critical thickness of BTO unit cells is necessary for the appearance of ferroelectricity, which is inhibited by a depolarizing electrostatic field, caused by dipoles at the ferroelectric-metal interfaces [22]. In the work of Oleinik et al [23], first-principles calculations were applied on Co/STO/Co(0 0 1) magnetic tunnel junctions, where a strong covalent bond between Co and O and an induced magnetic moment of $|m_s| = 0.25 \mu_B$ at the Ti atom was observed. This is similar to the case of Fe/BTO/Fe tunnel junctions. In another work, Polisetti et al [24] applied piezoelectrically controlled strain for electric tuning of exchange-bias fields of BTO/Co/CoO heterostructures.

In our first-principles study, we investigated systematically the crystalline structure of ultrathin Co films on BTO and their electronic and magnetic properties in dependence on the film thickness and the polarization of BTO. The calculations were performed using a so-called multi-code approach, in which atomic positions were obtained using a pseudo-potential code, VASP [25, 26]. This information serves as input for electronic and magnetic structure calculations with different multiple-scattering Green function methods [27–29].

In addition, we simulated x-ray absorption spectra (XAS) and the related x-ray magnetic circular dichroism (XMCD), which is the method of choice to prove experimentally the change of the magnetic structure. The x-ray linear dichroism (XLD) is discussed in respect of the occupation of $d$ orbitals. These methods are local and site-sensitive and offer the opportunity to investigate both the magnetic and structural properties as a function of layer thickness [16]. So, we traced the dependence of XAS of Co $L_{2,3}$ edges as a function of the Co film thickness and the polarization direction of BTO. All results were compared with the previous results for Fe thin films on BTO [6, 16].

Our paper is organized as follows. Our multi-code approach and computational details are presented in the next section 1. Then, in sections 2 and 3, we discuss structural, electronic, and magnetic properties of ultrathin Co films on BTO. Sections 4 and 5 deal with computational simulations of XAS, XMCD, and XLD spectra. Conclusion is offered in section 6.
3. Electronic and magnetic structure calculations

The relaxed geometry was used for further first-principles calculations using the Korringa–Kohn–Rostoker Green function method (KKR) [33, 34] called HUTSEPOt. HUTSEPOt is developed by Ernst et al. at the Max Planck Institute of Microstructure Physics, Germany. Some of its basic features are described in [27].

We took within the atomic sphere approximation to the crystal potential an angular momentum cutoff of $l_{\text{max}} = 3$ for the Green function, a $k$-point mesh of $24 \times 24 \times 12$ for the BZ integration and 24 Gaussian quadrature points for complex energy contour integration. With the Green function $G(E)$ of the system, all quantities of interest follow in a straightforward way. In particular, we are interested in ground state properties like the density of states (DOS) and the local magnetic moments [35] in dependence on Co film thickness $L$ and ferroelectric polarization direction $P$ of BTO.

To describe magnetic properties of Co/BTO(0 0 1), we calculated interatomic exchange coupling constants $J_{ij}$ using the magnetic force theorem implemented within the Green function method [36]. The exchange coupling constants $J_{ij}$ can be used to obtain spin-wave spectra by the diagonalization of the Heisenberg Hamiltonian

$$H = - \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_i E_{\text{MAE}} (\sigma_i)^2,$$

where $i$ and $j$ label magnetic atoms, $\sigma_i$ is a unit vector in the direction of the magnetic moment of the $i$th atom and $E_{\text{MAE}}$ is the magnetic anisotropy energy (MAE), which is positive (negative) for the case of the easy-axis (easy-plane) anisotropy type. It can be calculated directly with the KKR method by using again the magnetic force theorem [37].

The critical temperatures were estimated using a Monte Carlo (MC) simulation with the model Hamiltonian in (1). For the simulation, two-dimensional supercells, which repeat the unit cell (see figure 1) $60 \times 60, 80 \times 80,$ and $100 \times 100$ times in $x$ and $y$ direction were constructed. In those directions, we considered also periodic boundary conditions and restricted the calculation only to the magnetic atoms of the unit cell (2 Co atoms for $L = 1$, 4 Co atoms for $L = 2$, and 6 Co atoms for $L = 3$). Within the supercell, the magnetic moment at lattice site $i$ interacts with its neighbors at the site $j$ via the first-principles $J_{ij}$. During a MC run, a lattice site $j$ with the magnetic moment vector $\sigma_j$ was chosen and a new random direction $\sigma'_{ij}$ was created. The energy of the system determines whether $\sigma'_{ij}$ or $\sigma_j$ was kept. Performing this procedure $N$ times on a lattice of $N$ sites is defined as one MC step. The starting point was a high-temperature disordered state above the critical temperature $T_C$. In the course of the simulations, the temperature was stepwise reduced until magnetic ordering was reached. For each temperature $T$, the thermal equilibrium was assumed to be reached after 20 000 MC steps. The thermal averages were determined over 20 000 additional MC steps. $T_C$ was then obtained from the temperature dependency of the magnetic susceptibility. With respect to fitting procedures and finite temperature sampling, all three supercells yielded the same critical temperature within an uncertainty range of $\pm 5$ K. More details of our MC scheme can be found in [38–40].

### Table 1. Relaxed interatomic distances (in Å) of (Co)$_2$/BTO(0 0 1) ($L \leq 3$ and $P = P_1, P_2$).

| $L$ | $d_{01}$ | $d_{12}$ | $d_{12}$ | $d_{12}$ |
|-----|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| $L = 1$ | 1.778  | 1.784 | 1.774 | 1.781 |
| $L = 2$ | 1.856  | 1.853 | 1.857 | 1.855 |
| $L = 3$ | 1.827  | 1.829 | 1.843 | 1.849 |

Note: For each $L$, the distances between Co ML $i$ and $j$ are denoted by $d_{ij}$, while the $z$-separation from interfacial O (Ti) to Co of the first (second) ML is shown by $d_{01}$ ($d_{12}$). For comparison, also nearest neighbor Co distances in bulk (hcp) [45] and distances for Fe/BTO(0 0 1) are shown.

1.3. X-ray absorption spectra simulations

Using the self-consistent potentials of HUTSEPOt, the calculations were extended to a spin-resolved fully relativistic KKR code (SPR-KKR) [29]. This Green function method [29] allows the calculation of $x$-ray absorption coefficients $\mu_x(E)$ in dependence on the energy $E$ and the polarization $\lambda$ of the x-rays [42–44]. For SPR-KKR calculations of magnetic moments, XAS and DOS, we have taken 144, 578 and 225 $k$-points in the irreducible part of the Brillouin zone, respectively. The calculation of the structure constants were done using the Ewald method with parameter 2.0 and 4.0 in real space and reciprocal space, respectively. For the Ewald parameter connecting the summation in real and reciprocal space a value of 0.8 was used, making the summation in the real space converge faster. These parameters were applied for all considered Co/BTO systems.

2. Crystalline structure of ultrathin Co films on BTO

For the ultrathin Co films deposited on BTO(0 0 1), the optimized interatomic distances are collected in table 1, in comparison with the corresponding structure of Fe/BTO(0 0 1) [6, 16]. The definition of our distances are given in figure 1. Below in the text, the interface TiO$_2$ layer is denoted as I for all films. The Co layers towards the surface are labeled with I + 1, I + 2, and I + 3.

Structural relaxation, with the in-plane degrees of freedom for the layers starting with I + 2, energetically favors the structure with the Co sites in layer I + 1 on top of the O sites in layer I. In the case of 1 ML Co ($L = 1$), the structure is similar to that of Fe/BTO(0 0 1) [6, 16]. For both multiferroic
systems, the polarization state \( P_l \) results in a slightly shorter distance, \( d_{O1} \), between Co (Fe) and interfacial O.

When the Co film thickness increases to \( L = 2 \) and 3, a distorted bodycentered tetragonal (bct) lattice is formed, although it is not typical for Co [21]. We found that the polarization reversal affects mainly the positions of interfacial Ti (I) and consequently those of the Co (I + 2) atoms, labeled as Co\(_{Ba}\) and Co\(_{Ti}\), respectively (see figure 1). This is important concerning the magnetic properties of the films.

### 3. Electronic and magnetic properties of ultrathin Co films on BTO

In order to determine the magnetic ground state for the three film thicknesses, we calculated the total energy for the ferromagnetic (FM) and antiferromagnetic (AFM) configurations of the magnetic moments of the Co atoms. In all cases, the FM solution was preferable, independent of thickness or polarization. So, the thin cobalt films are strong ferromagnets and show a lower sensitivity to structural transformations than the iron layers, which showed a considerable change in the magnetic order for different layer thicknesses. For the 2 ML Fe film on BTO, the \( m_{Fe} \) in layer \( I + 1 \) were almost quenched while the sizable moments in the surface layer \( I + 2 \) are ordered antiparallel. This results in a total magnetic moment of \( m \rightarrow 0 \). Deposition of a third Fe monolayer restored the ferromagnetic order of the 1 ML Fe film.

#### 3.1. Magnetic moments and density of states

The calculated spin moments (see table 2) for the Co atoms show a strong dependence on the geometry of the films and the hybridization of Co 3\(d\) states with the electronic bands of the substrate. The different environment of e.g. Co\(_{Ba}\) and Co\(_{Ti}\), in particular, the atomic volumes and the band hybridization, influences also these moments.

In the case of \( L = 1 \) and \( L = 2 \), the spin moments for Co atoms at the surface, are larger then for the Co bulk (hcp) because of the symmetry reduction and an enhanced volume per Co atom. The Co magnetic moments in layer \( I + 1 \) for \( L = 2 \) approach their bulk value. For \( L = 3 \), the spin moments of Co\(_{B}(I + 1)\) and Co\(_{Ti}(I + 2)\) are smaller in comparison to \( L = 2 \), because of slightly elongated distances \( d_{12} \) and \( d_{23} \), respectively. In the case of \( L = 3 \), we observe for all three layers a quenching of the spin moment in comparison to Co bulk (hcp), which results from a strong reduction of the volume per Co atom.

Besides, we also observe induced magnetic moments at the Ti and O atoms at the interface (see table 2). For the Ti atoms, these induced magnetic moments are antiparallel oriented to the direction of the magnetic moments of the Co atoms and are originated, similar to the case of Fe/BTO(0 0 1), from the hybridization of Ti and Co 3\(d\) states (see figure 2). The strong interaction between the host and the Co films widens the DOS of the layers at the interface, while the 3\(d\) states of Co become very narrow towards the surface, which results from the reduced coordination number of Co atoms at the surface (in comparison to Co bulk). The impact of the crystalline environment is very strong on the DOS and the magnetic moments of the Co atoms. As a result, the magnetic moments on Co\(_{Ti}\) are smaller by 0.08 \( \mu_{Fe} \)–0.15 \( \mu_{B} \) then on Co\(_{Ba}(I + 2)\) due to the strong interaction between the Co\(_{Ti}\) and the Ti states. A short distance between Co\(_{I}(I + 3)\) and Co\(_{I}(I + 2)\) and a strong Co-Co hybridization in the case

#### Table 2. SPR-KKR results of magnetic spin moments \( m_s (\mu_B/\text{atom}) \) for (Co)\(_{B}/\text{BTO}(0 0 1)\) in dependence on the Co film thickness \( L \) and the direction of ferroelectric polarization \( P (\mathbf{M} || [0 0 1]) \).

| \( L \) | \( P_l \) | \( P_l \) | \( P_l \) | \( P_l \) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| \( L = 1 \) | \( L = 2 \) | \( L = 3 \) |
| Co | Co | Co | Co | Co |
| \( I + 3 \) | 1.39 | 1.42 | \( | \) | \( | \) |
| Co\(_{Ba}\) | 2.00 | 2.03 | 1.60 | 1.64 |
| Co\(_{Ti}\) | 1.89 | 1.93 | 1.45 | 1.47 |
| Co | 1.71 | 1.71 | 1.62 | 1.62 |
| O | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Ti | -0.11 | -0.18 | -0.12 | -0.16 |
| Co bulk | 1.62 | | | |

Note: The Co labels follow from figure 1. In \( I + 1 \) and \( I + 3 \) the Co atoms are equivalent.

#### Table 3. SPR-KKR results of magnetic orbital moments \( m_{o} (\mu_B/\text{atom}) \) for (Co)\(_{B}/\text{BTO}(0 0 1)\) in dependence on the Co film thickness \( L \) and the direction of ferroelectric polarization \( P (\mathbf{M} || [0 0 1]) \).

| \( L \) | \( P_l \) | \( P_l \) | \( P_l \) | \( P_l \) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| \( L = 1 \) | \( L = 2 \) | \( L = 3 \) |
| Co | Co | Co | Co | Co |
| \( I + 3 \) | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Co\(_{Ba}\) | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Co\(_{Ti}\) | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Co | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| Co bulk | 0.06 | | | |

Note: The Co labels follow from figure 1. In \( I + 1 \) and \( I + 3 \) the Co atoms are equivalent.
of \( L = 3 \) leads to a substantial reduction of the magnetic moments in the surface Co layer.

We have calculated the orbital moment of Co atoms along \( M \parallel [0 \ 0 \ 1] \) (see table 3) and along \( M \parallel [1 \ 0 \ 0] \) (see table 4). In the last case, the two Co atoms in each layer are nonequivalent. In the surface layer the atoms show a strong dependence on the electric polarization of the substrate. For \( M \parallel [0 \ 0 \ 1] \) the influence of the polarization is weak and is as large as for the Fe/BTO system [16].

Duan et al [46] predicted that the magnetic anisotropy of thin magnetic films may be affected by the polarization of the ferroelectric substrate. His calculations done for 1 ML Fe/BTO gave differences for the orbital magnetic moment \( \Delta m_o = m_o[0 \ 0 \ 1] - m_o[1 \ 0 \ 0] \) of 0.035 \( \mu_B \) and 0.021 \( \mu_B \) for \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \), respectively. In our former work of 1 ML Fe/BTO, we found also an averaged anisotropy of the orbital magnetic moment \( \Delta m_o = 0.04 \mu_B \) (note that there are two Fe atoms in the unit cell of 1 ML Fe) [16]. In case of 1 ML Co/BTO, we get the averaged \( \Delta m_o = 0.04 \mu_B \) for the polarization \( P_1 \), which is similar to 1 ML Fe/BTO. There was no strong dependence on the polarization on the BTO substrate in our calculations. The anisotropies for the orbital moment will influence the preference of the easy axis of the magnetization as discussed in the next section.

| \( L = 1 \) | \( L = 2 \) | \( L = 3 \) |
|---|---|---|
| \( P_1 \) | \( P_2 \) | \( P_1 \) | \( P_2 \) | \( P_1 \) | \( P_2 \) |
| Co6 | 1 | + | 1.12 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.07 |
| Co5 | 1 | + | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| Co4 | 1 | + | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| Co3 | 1 | + | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| Co2 | 1 | + | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Co1 | 1 | + | 0.13 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |

Note: The Co labels follow from figure 1. In this field direction the Co atoms are nonequivalent.

### 3.2. Magnetic interactions and Curie temperatures

To study the magnetic interactions in ultrathin Co films on BTO(0 0 1), we computed the exchange constants, which enter the Heisenberg model (1). The most significant magnetic exchange interactions for Co/BTO(0 0 1) are shown in figures 3–5 for \( L = 1, 2, 3 \) ML, respectively, while for the sake of completeness all calculated coupling constants are presented in the supplementary material stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/27/426003/mmedia. They are always separated in interlayer and intralayer contributions.

On the other hand, for thicker Co films, the electronic structure can be strongly affected by a Schottky barrier, which develops at a semiconductor-metal interface and can lead to a spurious charge transfer across the interface [47]. However, in very thin metallic films on a semiconductor, the Schottky barrier is not significant and can not substantially modify their electronic and magnetic structure.

![Figure 3](image-url)  
**Figure 3.** Calculated intralayer exchange constants (in meV) for layer \( I \) + 1 in 1 ML Co/BTO(0 0 1) and \( P_1 \), viewed from the \( z \) direction. Atoms in lighter colors are below those in darker colors. The numbers of the Co atoms correspond to those used in figure 1(a).

![Figure 4](image-url)  
**Figure 4.** Calculated exchange constants (in meV) for 2 ML Co/ BTO(0 0 1) and \( P_1 \). The notation is the same as in figure 3 and the numbers of the Co atoms correspond to those used in figure 1(b). Intralayer interactions in layers \( I \) + 1 and \( I \) + 2 are separated from the interlayer interactions shown in the side view. The dashed lines in the two upper panels indicate the Co atoms shown in the side view. For symmetric interactions only one number is given.
is 2.79 Å). In this case, the electronic density is mainly distributed within the \(xy\)-plane and the exchange integrals represent an overlap between the electronic wave functions. Hence, comparing with Co bulk (hcp) the magnetic coupling in 1 ML remains stronger despite the larger nearest neighbor distance (in Co bulk (hcp) the nearest neighbor magnetic coupling is \(\approx 13\) meV).

In contrast, for the films with an out-of-plane component (2 ML, 3 ML), the distances towards the Co atoms in the next layer are shorter (2.23 Å). Therefore, the nearest neighbor coupling is now between those layers and the wave function overlap is even stronger. It leads to a strong magnetic interaction between 32 meV–42 meV for 2 ML (see figure 4). In the case of 3 ML, the electronic density redistributes in all directions and, therefore, the strength of the interlayer exchange interactions with respect to those of 2 ML is reduced to 13 meV–20 meV (see figure 5). Comparing these results with the exchange constants in Co bulk, we found in general a strong asymmetry between in-plane and out-of-plane components. The latter are larger while the in-plane directions are strongly reduced (see figures 4 and 5).

Furthermore, we obtain a partial mediation of the magnetic coupling by the BTO host. The exchange interaction between e.g. the second nearest neighbor Co atoms depends on the underlying atoms, either \(\approx -3.3\) meV or \(\approx 0.4\) meV with mediating Ba or Ti, respectively (see figure 3). This fact can also be observed for 2 and 3 ML (see figures 4 and 5) and is evident from the comparison of the calculated \(J_{ij}\) for supported and unsupported thin Co films, shown in the supplementary material stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/27/426003/mmedia.

While using the same geometry for the Co films, we removed the BTO substrate in the calculations. Immediately, the symmetry of \(x\) and \(y\) directions returns and some exchange interaction values differ more than 10 meV.

For the Monte Carlo simulations with the classical Heisenberg Hamiltonian (1), we have also computed the magneto-crystalline anisotropy energy (MAE) \(E_{\text{MAE}} = E_{\parallel 001} - E_{\parallel 100}\) for various Co thicknesses and polarizations (see table 5). We found an out-of-plane magnetization direction for the cases of 1 and 3 ML Co/BTO(0 0 1), while in the case of 2 ML Co/BTO(0 0 1), the magnetization direction is in-plane. The change in the MAE with the polarization switch can reach up to 25%–30%. It is remarkable, that in the 2 ML Co case, the magnetization direction is lying within the \(xy\)-plane, which can be explained by the small interlayer distance (see table 1).

These MAE values were then used together with the calculated \(J_{ij}\) parameters to determine the critical temperatures \(T_C\) in dependence on the layer thickness \(L\) and polarization \(P\). In general, the thin (Co)/BTO films are ferromagnetic at room temperature for \(L \geq 2\) (see table 5). However, as expected from the large variations of the magnetic coupling parameters, the \(T_C\) increase not monotonically with the thickness. The main contributions in the magnetic exchange originate from the strong interlayer coupling. The different polarization directions have only a small influence to the value of \(T_C\), which follows from the similar \(J_{ij}\) parameters for \(P_\uparrow\) or \(P_\downarrow\) (for all values see the supplementary material stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/27/426003/mmedia).
As expected, a value for MAE \( E_{\text{MAE}} \) increases the Curie temperature (see table 5).

### Table 5. Magnetic anisotropy energy and critical temperature for \((\text{Co})_L/\text{BTO}(0 0 1)\) in dependence on the Co film thickness \( L \) and the direction of ferroelectric polarization \( P \).

| \( L \) | \( P \uparrow \) | \( P \downarrow \) | \( E_{\text{MAE}} \) (meV) | \( T_C \) (K) |
|-------|-------|-------|---------------|--------|
| 1     | −1.847 | −1.483 | 360 (307)     | 298 (250) |
| 2     | 0.680  | 0.958  | 844 (820)     | 818 (780) |
| 3     | −0.270 | −0.438 | 567 (550)     | 580 (550) |

*Note: \( T_C \) in brackets is for \( E_{\text{MAE}} = 0 \) meV.*
layer-resolved XMCD calculations. This dependence on layer thickness should show up in corresponding experiments.

5. X(M)LD

X-ray absorption linear dichroism can be applied in different modes [48]. In nonmagnetic materials with cubic symmetry the x-ray absorption intensity is independent of the orientation of the polarization vector of light ($\mathbf{u}$) relative to the sample. As the symmetry is lowered (like in a film), the intensity is directly proportional to the number of empty valence states in the direction of $\mathbf{u}$. The vector $\mathbf{u}$ acts like a search light for the direction of maximum and minimum empty valence states [48]. In case of a magnetic sample with cubic symmetry, the spin–orbit coupling leads to magnetic linear dichroism, where the x-ray absorption intensity is different for $\mathbf{u}$ aligned parallel and perpendicular to the spin direction [43]. This kind of dichroism is often considered in the discussion of magneto-crystalline effects (e.g. [49]).

In our magnetic ultrathin Co films on BTO, we have both natural and magnetic linear dichroism effects. First, we present results for a fixed direction of magnetization $\mathbf{M}||[001]$ and linearly polarized light with polarization along $[001]$ ($\mu^+$) and $[100]$ ($\mu^-$), respectively. The difference $\text{XLD} = \mu^-(E) - \mu^+(E)$ between both x-ray absorption spectra is shown in figure 8.

The strong dependence of the XLD on the film thickness can be related to the occupation of $d$ orbitals. A detailed analysis is possible concerning the single ($p_j$,$m$) contributions of the initial $p_{3/2}$ ($p_{1/2}$) state to the $p \rightarrow d$ transitions of the different Co absorbers in the film. In the 1 ML case, we get the main positive contribution from the transition of $m_f = -1/2$ into $d_{\pm 1/2}$ states. The contributions of $d_3$ and $d_2$ are small because of the strong interaction between Co and Ti atoms at the interface. The XLD of 2 ML reflects the change of occupancy between in-plane and out-of-plane orbitals. In the 3 ML case, we found that the behavior is similar to the Co bulk, but with much more fine structures. These fine structures are related to the lifting of degeneracy in the final $d$ state in the thin film.

Besides, we found that the XLD is much more sensitive concerning the dependence on the polarization of the BTO substrate as the XMCD. This emphasize how the reversal of polarization $\mathbf{P}$ changes the occupation of $d$ states.

We have also investigated x-ray absorption in dependence on the magnetization direction $\mathbf{M}$ for fixed vector $\mathbf{u}||[001]$ but spin–orbit interaction and crystal field are both to weak to eliminate magneto-crystalline anisotropy.

6. Conclusion

In this first-principles study of structural, electronic, and magnetic properties of ultrathin Co layers on the BaTiO$_3$(0 0 1) substrate, we showed, that the crystalline structure of (Co)$_x$/BTO(0 0 1) ($L = 1, 2, 3$) interfaces is very similar to the one of (Fe)$_y$/BTO(0 0 1) films presented in our previous study [6]. Additionally, we found also for the Co layers only a small dependence on the polarization direction of the substrate for all investigated properties. However, in contrary to the Fe/BTO(0 0 1) case, Co films on BTO(0 0 1) exhibit a stable ferromagnetic ordering at room temperature, which depends strongly on the layer thickness and is the strongest for $L = 2$. The magnetic interaction is mainly featured by the coupling between the nearest neighbors. For $L \geq 2$ cases, the strongest interactions arise between the adjacent layers, while the intra-layer magnetic coupling was found to be rather weak. This results from short interlayer distances leading to a strong hybridization between Co 3$d$ electrons of adjacent layers. Surprisingly, the easy axis turns for 2 ML from a out-of-plane magnetization (in $L = 1$ and 3) to a in-plane magnetization, which was obtained from the direct calculation of the MAE or the calculated orbital moments.

For a comparison to possible experimental measurements, we simulated x-ray absorption spectra and related x-ray magnetic circular and (magnetic) linear dichroism to trace the change of the spectra under the polarization switching in the BTO substrate. While the XMCD depends only weakly on the substrate polarization, similar to our previous study for Fe/BTO(0 0 1) films [16], the XLD shows indeed significant changes under polarization switching, which can probably be observed experimentally.
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