Effects of Transverse Magnetic Anisotropy on Current-Induced Spin Switching

Maciej Misiorny¹, 2, 3, 4 and Józef Barnaś³, 4

¹Peter Grünberg Institut PGI-2, Forschungszentrum Jülich, 52425 Jülich, Germany
²JARA—Fundamentals of Future Information Technology, 52425 Jülich, Germany
³Faculty of Physics, Adam Mickiewicz University, Umultowska 85, 61-614 Poznań, Poland
⁴Institute of Molecular Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Smoluchowskiego 17, 60-179 Poznań, Poland

Spin-polarized transport through bistable magnetic adatoms or single-molecule magnets (SMMs), which exhibit both uniaxial and transverse magnetic anisotropy, is considered theoretically. The main focus is on the impact of transverse anisotropy on transport characteristics and the adatom’s/SMM’s spin. In particular, we analyze the role of quantum tunneling of magnetization (QTM) in the mechanism of the current-induced spin switching, and show that the QTM phenomenon becomes revealed as resonant peaks in the average values of the molecule’s spin and in the charge current. These features appear at some resonant fields and are observable when at least one of the electrodes is ferromagnetic. We also show that the conductance generally depends on the relative orientation of the average adatom’s/SMM’s spin and electrode’s magnetic moment. This spin-valve like magnetoresistance effect can be used to control spin switching of the adatom’s/SMM’s spin.

Experiments on electronic transport through individual atoms/molecules are at the forefront of the search for novel nanoelectronics and information processing technologies. In this context, very prospective are magnetic atoms [1–3] and single-molecule magnets (SMMs) [4–8] with a large spin $S > \frac{1}{2}$. If properly deposited onto a substrate, these quantum systems can acquire (in the case of atoms) [9] or retain (in the case of SMMs) [10] their intrinsic magnetic anisotropy – a property responsible for magnetic bistability. Especially attracting is the idea of incorporating magnetic adatoms/SMMs into spintronic devices [11], with the objective to use spin-polarized currents for manipulation of their magnetic moments [12, 13]. Actually, the feasibility of this concept has already been experimentally proven for Mn adatoms [3]. One of the key conditions for successful applications is a sufficiently large uniaxial magnetic anisotropy constant $D$. Therefore, some efforts have been undertaken in order to synthesize new molecules with large $D$ or to find other ways of anisotropy enhancement. It has been also demonstrated that magnetic anisotropy of an adatom/SMM can be systematically tuned, albeit in a limited range, e.g., by the environment adjustment [14], an external electric field [15], or mechanical stretching of a molecule [16].

Apart from the uniaxial magnetic anisotropy underlying the magnetic bistability, adatoms and SMMs usually possess also the transverse component of the anisotropy [4]. If the latter component is sufficiently large, it may lead to additional quantum effects, like oscillations due to the geometric Berry phase [15] or quantum tunneling of magnetization (QTM) [16, 17]. Although the role of QTM in electronic transport has been studied extensively for normal electrodes [18, 20], much less is known how it affects the spin-polarized transport [21]. Since QTM allows for the underbarrier transitions between the states on the opposite sides of the energy barrier, it may serve as an additional dephasing mechanism, and thus impede the control of spin state by spin-polarized currents.

In this Letter we address the mechanism of current-induced spin switching in the presence of transverse anisotropy. We show that the conductance reveals peaks at voltages where the thermal transition rates directly between degenerate states of lowest energy are equal to the rate of transitions to the first excited state. Moreover, the transverse anisotropy significantly modifies the current-induced spin switching at some resonant fields, where the QTM phenomenon leads to resonant peaks in the field dependence of the average value of spin and charge current. These resonances are well pronounced in the field dependence of the derivative of current with respect to the magnetic field, and appear only when at least one electrode is ferromagnetic. We also show that the conductance generally depends on the relative orientation of the magnetic moments of the electrode and adatom/SMM. This effect follows from the interference of direct and indirect spin-conserving tunneling processes. In addition, a significant bias reversal asymmetry appears then in the transport characteristics.

Model.—Key features of magnetic adatoms and SMMs are captured by the giant-spin Hamiltonian [4],

$$\mathcal{H}_S = -DS_z^2 + \frac{E}{2}(S^2_x + S^2_z) + \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{B},$$

(1)

where the first and second terms stand for the uniaxial and transverse magnetic anisotropy, respectively, while the last term represents the Zeeman interaction, with $\mathbf{B} = (B_z, B_y, B_z)$ denoting an external magnetic field measured in energy units. Since we are interested here in systems with an energy barrier for spin switching, we assume $D > 0$. Without losing generality, we also assume positive perpendicular anisotropy constant, $E > 0$, and $0 \leq E/D \leq \frac{1}{3}$ [4]. When $E \neq 0$, each of the $2S + 1$ eigenstates $|\chi\rangle$ of the Hamiltonian (1), $\mathcal{H}_S |\chi\rangle = E_{\chi} |\chi\rangle$, is a linear combination of the eigenstates $|m\rangle$ of the $S_z$ component. We label the states $|\chi\rangle$ with a subscript $m$, $|\chi\rangle \to |\chi_m\rangle$, which as well as the numbers...
in Fig. 1(c) corresponds to the S\textsubscript{z} component of highest weight in the state \(|\chi_m\rangle\), i.e., \(|\chi_m\rangle \equiv |m\rangle\) for \(E \to 0\). When \(\mathbf{B} = (0, 0, B \hat{z})\), the eigenstates \(|\chi_m\rangle\) can be written as \(|\chi_m\rangle = \sum_{k=0,\pm \pm k}^\infty (m+k)|\chi_m\rangle|k+m\rangle\) for \(m = -S, \ldots, S\), where \(|m\rangle\) is the amplitude of the state \(|m\rangle\) in the eigenstate \(|\chi_m\rangle\). Thus, the transverse anisotropy leads to mixing of the states \(|m\rangle\), and therefore enables the QTM [17]. In the following, the index \(m\) shall be used only when necessary to avoid any confusion.

We consider an experimental configuration including the tip of the scanning tunneling microscope (STM), and a substrate [which plays the role of second electrode] at which the adatom/SMM is deposited, see Fig. 1(a). Both, STM tip and substrate are characterized by noninteracting itinerant electrons, \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{el}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \sigma} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^\sigma c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\langle (q = t\) for the STM tip, and \(q = s\) for the substrate), with the energy dispersion \(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^\sigma\) and \(a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^\dagger(a_{\mathbf{k}\sigma})^\langle\langle\) being the relevant creation (annihilation) operators (\(\mathbf{k}\) is a wave vector, and \(\sigma\) is the electron spin index). In general, both electrodes can be magnetic, with spin-dependent density of states (DOS) \(\rho_\sigma\) at the Fermi level. By introducing the spin polarization coefficient, \(P_\sigma = (\rho_- - \rho_+)/(\rho_- + \rho_+)\), the DOS can be parameterized as: \(\rho_\sigma^{t(+) = \frac{\rho_\sigma}{2}(1 \pm P_\sigma)}\) with \(\rho^- = \rho_+^\prime + \rho_-^\prime\).

Electron tunneling processes in the STM geometry are modeled by the Appelbaum Hamiltonian [12, 18, 22, 23],

\[
\mathcal{H}_T = \sum_{q, \kappa \kappa', \alpha} T_{\alpha} a_{q \kappa \alpha}^q a_{q' \kappa' \alpha}^\dagger + \sum_{q' / q} J_{qq'} \sigma_{\alpha \beta} \cdot \mathbf{S} a_{q \kappa \alpha}^q a_{q' \kappa' \beta}^\dagger, \tag{2}
\]

with \(\bar{q}\) to be understood as \(\bar{s} \equiv t\) and \(\bar{t} \equiv s\). Electrons can tunnel either directly between the two electrodes [the first term Eq. (2)], or during the tunneling event they can interact with the adatom/SMM via exchange coupling [the second term in Eq. (2)]. The former processes are described by the tunneling parameter \(T_{\alpha}\), whereas the latter ones by the exchange parameter \(J_{qq'}\), see Fig. 1(b). Both \(T_{\alpha}\) and \(J_{qq'}\) are assumed to be real, isotropic, and independent of energy and the electrodes’ spin-polarization. In the following discussion, we write \(J_{qq'} = J_{\eta q} \eta q'\), with \(\eta q\) denoting the dimensionless scaling factor of the coupling between the adatom/SMM and the \(q\)th electrode (we fix \(\eta_s = 1\). We also relate the parameters \(J\) and \(T_{\alpha}\) as \(J \equiv \alpha T_{\alpha}\). Thus, \(T_{\alpha}\) will serve as the key, experimentally relevant parameter [23], and \(\alpha\) describes relation between the direct tunneling processes and those involving spin scattering of conduction electrons. For simplicity, electrodes’ magnetic moments are assumed to be collinear with the easy axis of the adatom/SMM.

Method. —In the weak coupling regime, transport characteristics can be derived using the approach based on a master equation. The charge current \((e > 0)\) flowing between the STM tip and the substrate is then given by \(I = e \sum_{\chi'} \rho_{\chi'\chi} \gamma_{\chi'\chi}^\langle\rangle\), where \(\rho_{\chi'\chi} = |\langle \chi | \chi' \rangle|^2\) for the transition rate between the states \(|\chi\rangle\) and \(|\chi'\rangle\) associated with electron tunneling between the electrodes \(q\) and \(q'\).

For the sake of analytical clarity, we decompose the total current into two parts, \(I = I_{\text{el}} + I_{\text{in}}\), where \(I_{\text{el}}\) represents the contribution due to elastic electron tunneling processes [the spin state \(|\chi\rangle\) remains unchanged] and \(I_{\text{in}}\) is the inelastic term [with transitions between different states \(|\chi\rangle\) and \(|\chi'\rangle\)]. In the second order approximation with respect to the electrode-SMM/atom coupling, these two current components take the form

\[
\frac{I_{\text{el}}}{G_0} = \left\{1 + P_1 P_2 + 2\bar{\alpha}(S_{2\chi})(P_2 + P_\alpha)\right\}V + \sum_{\chi} \rho_{\chi'\chi}\chi\chi, \tag{3}
\]

\[
\frac{I_{\text{in}}}{G_0} = \sum_{\chi} \sum_{\chi' \neq \chi} \rho_{\chi'\chi}\chi\chi, \tag{4}
\]

where

\[
\rho_{\chi'\chi} = \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2} \left\{ \left[|\langle S_{2\chi}^\chi\chi |^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=\pm} |S_{2\chi}^\kappa\chi |^2 Z_k(D_{\chi'\chi}) \right]ight\} + P_1 P_2 \left[|\langle S_{2\chi}^\chi\chi |^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=\pm} |S_{2\chi}^\kappa\chi |^2 Z_k(-D_{\chi'\chi}) \right],
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{2} \left(P_2 - P_\alpha\right) \sum_{k=\pm} \kappa|S_{2\chi}^\kappa\chi |^2 Z_k(D_{\chi'\chi}) \right\}. \tag{5}
\]
In the equations above, $G_0 = \frac{e^2}{h} \rho^2 |T_{dd}|^2$, $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha n \eta_s$, and $S_{\chi}^\nu = \langle \chi | S_{\chi} | \chi \rangle$ for $\kappa = z, \pm$. Accordingly, $(S_{\chi}) = \sum_{\kappa} P_{\chi} S_{\chi}$. In addition, $\Delta_{\chi}^\nu = E_{\chi} - E_{\chi'} + eV$, where $eV = \mu_t - \mu_s$ stands for the difference in electrochemical potentials of the tip ($\mu_t$) and substrate ($\mu_s$), while $Z_{\chi} = <(\Delta_{\chi}^\nu) > \pm <(\Delta_{\chi'}^\nu) >$ with $<(\cdot) > = x/\{1 - \exp(-x/k_0 T)\}$ and $T$ denoting temperature.

In order to evaluate the current from Eqs. (3) and (4), we need the probabilities $P_{\chi}$. These can be obtained from the set of stationary master equations, $\forall \chi$: $\sum_{\chi'}\{P_{\chi'} \gamma_{\chi'\chi} - P_{\chi} \gamma_{\chi\chi'}\} = 0$, where the golden rule transition rates $\gamma_{\chi\chi'} = \sum_{q\nu} \gamma_{\chi\chi'}^{q\nu}$, for $\chi \neq \chi'$ are given by

$$\gamma_{\chi\chi'}^{q\nu} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar}|T_{dd}|^2 (\alpha_{q\nu} \eta_{q\nu})^2 \zeta (\Delta_{\chi\chi'}^q) \times \left[ \sum_{\sigma} \rho_{\sigma}^q \rho_{\sigma'}^{q\nu} \left| \langle S_{\chi} | \sigma \rangle \right|^2 + \rho_{\sigma}^q \rho_{\sigma'}^{q\nu} \left| \langle S_{\chi'} | \sigma \rangle \right|^2 \right]. \tag{6}$$

Nonmagnetic electrodes.—Consider a model system of spin $S=5/2$, connected to nonmagnetic tip and substrate, and characterized by typical parameters observed in experiments, see the caption of Fig. [1]. For vanishingly small transverse magnetic anisotropy ($E = 0$) and $|B| = 0$, the Hamiltonian $H$ is diagonal in the basis of the eigenstates of $S_z$. As a result, Eqs. (3) and (4) simplify significantly $\{ I_{el}^{E=0}/G_0 = \{1 + \alpha^2 \langle S_z \rangle^2 \} V \}$ and $I_{el}^{E=0}/G_0 = \frac{\alpha^2}{4\epsilon} \sum_{m} \rho_{m}\sum_{m=\pm 1} \left[ A_\chi(m) \right]^2 Z.(\Delta_{\chi m}\lambda^\nu)$ with $A_\chi(m) = [S(S+1) - m(m+\lambda)]^{1/2}$. For $D > 0$ and low $T$, the system occupies then with equal probabilities each of the metastable ground states $|z\pm\rangle$. When bias voltage $|V|$ increases, initially only the elastic tunneling processes contribute to transport, i.e. $I_{el}^{E=0} \neq 0$ and $I_{el}^{E=0} \approx 0$. When $|V|$ becomes of the order of the threshold value $V_{thr} = D(2S - 1) = 4D$ (for $S = 5/2$), see Fig. [1]c, the inelastic processes become activated and $I_{el}^{E=0} \approx 0$, which appears as a characteristic step in the differential conductance, Fig. [1]d,e. This feature is typical of the systems exhibiting easy-axis magnetic anisotropy [2, 3].

For $E > 0$ and a half-integer spin $S$, the eigenstates $|\chi_{m}\rangle$ are twofold degenerate (Kramers’ doublets) and form two uncoupled sets $\{ |\chi_{m} \pm \rangle \}_{m=0,1,\ldots,5/2}$, schematically distinguished by different colors in Fig. [1]c). Mixing of the states corresponding to different values of $m$ is also revealed in the expressions for current, $I_{el}^{E=0}/G_0 = \{1 + \alpha^2 \sum_{m} \rho_{m} |\langle m|\chi_{m}\rangle|^2 \} V \}$ and $I_{el}^{E=0}/G_0 = \frac{\alpha^2}{4\epsilon} \sum_{m} \sum_{m'=\pm 1} \left[ m|m|\chi_{m}\rangle A_{m}(m) \right]^2 Z.(\Delta_{\chi m}\lambda^\nu)$.

The transverse anisotropy manifests as several new features in transport characteristics. First, for $|V| \lesssim V_{thr}$ it leads to reduction of $I_{el}$ [cf. the second terms of $I_{el}^{E=0}$ and $I_{el}^{E=0}$ given above], which appears as a decreased value of $dI/dV$, Fig. [1]e). Second, the transverse anisotropy effectively gives rise to a small reduction of $V_{thr}$. Actually, at equilibrium, $V \approx 0$, the spin can directly oscillate between the two ground states $|\chi_{\pm S}\rangle$ as $\gamma_{\chi_{-}\chi_{S}} = \gamma_{\chi_{\pm S}} \propto k_0 T$ [23], which is in contrast to $\gamma_{\chi_{\pm S}} \propto k_0 T = 0$ for $E = 0$. Such ‘underbarrier’ oscillations will dominate until they are surpassed by transitions to the first excited spin doublet, which occurs at $|V| \approx V_{thr}(E)$. It’s worth emphasizing that the effect stems entirely from thermal fluctuations, so that the Kramers’ degeneracy is not affected. Finally, for significantly large transverse magnetic anisotropy the second step in the differential conductance appears at $V_{thr}^* \approx 4D(S-1) = 6D$ (for $S = 5/2$), when direct spin excitations to the second excited Kramers’ doublet become possible, Fig. [1]c). We note, however, that these features are clearly distinguishable only if $E \gg T$. Current induced magnetic switching.—In order to control the adatom/SMM’s spin state by a spin-polarized current, at least one of the electrodes has to be magnetic [12, 13]. Here, we choose it to be the tip, $P_t \neq 0$ and $P_s = 0$. Consider first the case of $E = 0$. When $|V| < T$, the system’s spin can still fluctuate indirectly between the states $|\pm S\rangle$ as a result of stepwise ‘overbarrier’ transitions. However, due to imbalance of the spin-up and spin-down electron tunneling processes, the system’s spin becomes locked in one of the ground states $|\pm S\rangle$ [depending on the bias polarization] for $|V| \gtrsim T$, Fig. [2]d). In consequence, the conductance is determined in the GMR-fashion by the relative orientation of the tip’s magnetiza-
tion and the adatom’s/SMM’s spin, \(dI/dV \propto 2\gamma P_t \langle S_z \rangle\), Fig. 2(c). This behavior stems from interference of direct tunneling and spin conserving part of tunneling associated with exchange interaction between tunneling electrons and magnetic core of an adatom/SMM, and also leads to the asymmetry in conductance with respect to bias reversal, see Fig. 2(c). Inelastic transport processes activated at \(|V| \approx V_{th}\) enhance conductance [see the curve for \(E/D = 0\) in Fig. 2(c)], but slightly reduce the absolute value of the average spin \(S_z\) component [see the curve for \(E/D = 0\) in Fig. 2(d)].

The situation changes qualitatively for \(E \neq 0\). For low voltages, the spin oscillates between \(|\chi_{\pm s}\rangle\), like in the nonmagnetic case. However, due to the spin-dependence of tunneling processes \(\gamma_{\chi_{+-s}} \neq \gamma_{\chi_{s-s}}\), and the spin generally resides longer in one of the two ground states [21]. At some voltage, transition rate to the excited state surpasses the transition rate between the two ground states and the spin becomes locked in one of the two states \(|\chi_{\pm s}\rangle\). This results in an additional peak in \(dI/dV\), Fig. 2(c). Since the transition rate \(\gamma_{\chi_{+-s}}\) increases with \(E\), position of this peak moves towards larger voltage with augmenting \(E\). Further rise in voltage leads to saturation of the conductance, and the saturated value only weakly depends on \(E\). It’s worth of note, however, that the strong mixing of spin states for large transverse anisotropy prevents the system’s spin from aligning along the easy axis. Surprisingly, in the case of spin-polarized transport, the interplay of the underbarrier relaxation process introduced by the transverse magnetic anisotropy imposes the voltage barrier for switching the system’s spin. Such a behavior doesn’t take place in systems exhibiting purely uniaxial magnetic anisotropy.

When an external magnetic field is applied, one can achieve degeneration of different states belonging to either of the two decoupled manifolds, see the right side of Fig. 1(c). This degeneration, though, is not complete due to level repulsion, as shown in Fig. 3(c). Anyway, at the fields corresponding to the dashed lines in Fig. 3(c), quantum tunneling of magnetization takes place, which results in transitions between the two degenerate states. These transitions are clearly seen as resonant peaks in the average values of the molecules’ spin, Fig. 3(a,c,d), and current, Fig. 3(b). The resonant character of QTM is even more evident in the field dependence of \(dI/dB_z\), see Fig. 3(d). Interestingly, the resonances due to QTM can be observed only when (at least) one of the electrodes is ferromagnetic, as follows from Fig. 3(d).

Conclusions.— In this Letter we have considered the influence of transverse magnetic anisotropy on spin polarized transport through magnetic adatoms/molecules, and in particular on the current-induced spin switching. First, we have demonstrated that mixing of states by transverse anisotropy leads to a decrease in conductance in the elastic transport regime (low voltage regime) and to appearing of the peaks at voltages where the system’s spin becomes locked in one of the two ground states. When an external magnetic field is applied, the phenomenon of quantum tunneling of magnetization, which occurs at some resonant values of the magnetic field, results in resonant peaks in the average value of the molecule’s spin and in the charge current. It is worth emphasizing, however, that these effects can be observed only when the tip (and/or substrate) is ferromagnetic. Thus, spin-polarized transport spectroscopy may prove a useful experimental tool for studying the phenomenon of QTM.

It has been also shown that the conductance generally depends on the relative orientation of the average adatom’s/SMM’s spin and electrode’s magnetic moment. This dependence stems from the interference of direct tunneling and spin conserving tunneling connected with exchange interaction between the electrons and adatom/SMM spin, and resembles the giant magnetoresistance effect in magnetic multilayers. It is also responsible for a significant asymmetry of transport characteristics with respect to the bias reversal and can be used to control spin switching of the adatom’s/SMM’s spin.
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