

Bound-magnetic-polaron molecule in diluted magnetic semiconductors

Henryk Bednarski* and Jozef Spałek†

* *Centre of Polymer and Carbon Materials, Polish Academy of Sciences, M. Curie-Skłodowska 34, 41-819 Zabrze, Poland*

† *Marian Smoluchowski Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, Reymonta 4, 30-059 Kraków, Poland*

(Dated: August 14, 2018)

We formulate a complete microscopic theory of a coupled pair of bound magnetic polarons, the bound-magnetic-polaron molecule (BMPM) in a diluted magnetic semiconductor (DMS) by taking into account both a proper two-body nature of the impurity-electron wave function and within the general spin-rotation-invariant approach to the electronic states. We also take into account both the Heisenberg and the antiferromagnetic kinetic-exchange interactions, as well as the ferromagnetic coupling within the common spin BMPM cloud. The thermodynamic fluctuations of the spin cloud within the polaron effective Bohr radius of each polaron are taken as Gaussian.

PACS numbers: 75.10.-b, 75.45.+j, 75.30.Et

I. INTRODUCTION

The bound magnetic polarons, single and molecule, represent the charge carrier quantum states formed when the magnetization fluctuations influence both their binding and a nontrivial thermal behavior. These states have been discussed in novel materials encompassing diluted magnetic semiconductors,¹ ferromagnetic perovskites,² and dilute ferromagnetic oxides.³ For example, the origin of ferromagnetism in diluted magnetic semiconductors (DMS) such as $\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As}$, is intensively discussed in the recent years¹ in view of their potential application in spintronics. The origin of ferromagnetism¹ poses a very nontrivial question in view of the dominant role of antiferromagnetic superexchange in all of those materials when the carrier concentration is very low.⁷ Therefore, it is crucial to describe these interactions accurately in the physically tractable situation. Here we propose a soluble model of two interacting impurity electrons forming a bound magnetic-polaron molecule (BMPM).

Magnetic interaction between a single electron located on a shallow impurity and the localized magnetic moments in diluted magnetic semiconductors (DMS) has been studied intensively for some time.^{8–14} In the first period, the influence of classical fluctuations of magnetization on quantum states of the impurity electron have been analyzed.^{8–14}, thus leading to the concept of bound magnetic polaron (BMP). The main result obtained was to demonstrate that thermodynamic fluctuations suffice to produce a spontaneous spin splitting of the impurity states. A renewed interest in the present decade was stimulated by the possibility of ferromagnetic inter-polaron interaction,^{15–17} which would contribute in a fundamental manner to the origin and properties of ferromagnetic DMS systems and other materials.^{2–3} In Ref. 15 the authors extended the theory of single BMP^{8–14} to the bipolaron case in the limit when the mutual interaction is represented by hopping of electrons between the two spatially separated impurities, that leads among others to the antiferromagnetic kinetic exchange between them.¹⁸ The magnetic cloud is represented then by an effective magnetic field, which is oriented arbitrar-

ily and optimized, but its amplitude is a parameter of the approach.¹⁶ In the later version of the approach,¹⁷ the authors approximate the two-impurity wave function by piecewise constant values. They consider also a detailed thermodynamics of the resultant spin model and optimize the coupling parameters. The explicit solution is discussed in the limit of large inter-polaron distance. Due to complexity of the interacting BMP pair problem existing theories are still incomplete. For instance, the model developed by Angelescu and Bhatt¹⁶ of the system of two nonoverlapping polarons is analyzed via a generalized Hubbard type Hamiltonian with hopping (matrix element t) and Coulomb interaction (energy U) turned on, is thought of as being complementary to the model of overlapping polaron pair of Ref. 15. Other important and still awaiting for solution problems are concerned with the acceptor type interacting BMP's in II-VI and III-V DMS. Recent achievements in understanding the ferromagnetism in these classes of materials clearly show importance of an accurate treating of the non-hydrogeniclike character of the hole wave function and its influence by the central cell corrections.^{19–23}

In this paper we introduce and solve BMP molecule Hamiltonian for the case of two donors. It is shown that our model unifies existing approaches to an interacting polaron pair: The Wolff-Bhatt-Durst (thereafter referred as to WBD) model¹⁷ of overlapping polaron pair and the multiple-level generalized Hubbard model of Angelescu and Bhatt (thereafter referred as to AB) with random fields¹⁶. The WBD model is completed by providing whole microscopic justification of their Hamiltonian parameters. While, the AB model of nonoverlapping, equal-magnitude and large polarons is generalized to the case of overlapping and arbitrary-magnitude interacting polaron pair, the extension is limited here only to the regular Hubbard model (i.e. within one lowest-energy level on each polaron site only). Furthermore, we solve the resulting Hamiltonian within the continuum-medium and the effective-mass approximations for the donor case. In this manner, we extend the BMP model to the microscopic model of BMP molecule. This constitutes an accurate ground for the future analysis concerning acceptor-type

BMP molecules and the polaron lattices.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section II we formulate our model of BMPM. In Section III we diagonalize the effective Hamiltonian for the molecule. In Section IV the thermodynamical properties are considered, whereas Section V contains concluding remarks. The Appendixes A and B provide details of analytic calculations.

II. THE BMP MOLECULE MODEL

We start by considering two interacting BMPs in DMS with a random distribution of localized spins. Within the continuum-medium and the effective-mass approximations, one can write Hamiltonian in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} H &\equiv H_I + H_{II} \equiv -J_c \left[\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{r}_1) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{r}_2) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \right] + H_{II} \\ &= H_I - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^*} (\nabla_1^2 + \nabla_2^2) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$- \frac{e^2}{\varepsilon} \left[\frac{1}{r_{a1}} + \frac{1}{r_{a2}} + \frac{1}{r_{b1}} + \frac{1}{r_{b2}} - \frac{1}{r_{12}} \right],$$

where m^* is the impurity-electron effective mass, a and b label the two-impurity sites, $l = 1, 2$ label the two electrons, $r_{a1}, r_{a2}, r_{b1}, r_{b2}, r_{12}, r_1, r_2$ and R_{ab} are corresponding relative distances appearing in the problem, ε is the static dielectric constant, J_c is the exchange integral of the contact Fermi (s-d) interaction between localized spins $\{\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_i\}$ and those of impurity carriers, $\{\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i\}$. $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{r}_l) = \sum_i \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_i \delta(\mathbf{r}_l - \mathbf{R}_i)$ is the spin-density operator with the sum running over sites occupied by magnetic ions (Mn^{2+}). H_{II} is the hydrogen-molecule part which supplemented with the s-d coupling of electrons to localized spins (H_I).

The solution of BMP-pair problem is complex.^{15–17} From one side, a systematic approach to the BMP lattices and hydrogen molecules can be achieved within the second-quantization formalism,²⁴ but from the other, the spin part of H is dependent on the positions of the localized-moment densities. This fact makes the problem more complex to solve. However, it becomes tractable when one tries to diagonalize H as consisting of the hydrogeniclike molecule Hamiltonian H_{II} influenced by the perturbation H_I . This suggests to approach the solution of BMPM by selecting as trial states the eigenstates of the set of mutually compatible observables $\{\mathbf{s}_{tot}^2, s_{tot}^z\}$, where \mathbf{s}_{tot} is the total spin of the BMPM. In fact, as mobile carriers interact via an isotropic Coulomb repulsion, only rotations of the whole molecule conserve their relative distance, thus leaving their energy unchanged. Moreover, we know that in the Heitler-London approximation the Hamiltonian commutes with both \mathbf{s}_{tot}^2 and s_{tot}^z , it is thus diagonal with three-fold degenerate triplet

states. Such an approach greatly simplifies the problem, as in practice we have solutions for H_{II} within the eigenstates of $\{\mathbf{s}_{tot}^2, s_{tot}^z\}$. Here we consider more general than Heitler-London solution of the hydrogen molecule by including also ionic configurations. In this case, H_{II} is not diagonal in the basis formed from eigenstates of \mathbf{s}_{tot}^2 and s_{tot}^z . Fortunately, for the off-diagonal elements, the hopping couples only the different singlet states.

Next, we express H_I in terms of the creation and annihilation operators. Details of calculations of the matrix representation of H_I within the first quantization formalism are presented in Appendix A. Our methodology bases on an explicit demonstration that the postulated occupation-number representation of the polaronic part of the BMPM Hamiltonian leads to the same expectation values as those obtained within the first quantization scheme. Thus, we assume H_I in the following form:

$$H_I = \frac{1}{2} a_{as}^\dagger (\Delta_a \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})_{ss'} a_{as'} + \frac{1}{2} a_{bs}^\dagger (\Delta_b \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})_{ss'} a_{bs'}, \quad (2)$$

where a_{cs}^\dagger (a_{cs}) is the creation (annihilation) operator for the state on impurity $c = a, b$ with the spin s ($s = \uparrow, \downarrow$) and the polaron exchange fields Δ_c are defined as:

$$\Delta_c \equiv \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} \int w_c^*(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}) w_c(\mathbf{r}) d^3 r, \quad c = a, b, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}) = -g\mu_B N_0 x \langle \chi_S | \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{r}) | \chi_S \rangle$ is the local magnetization per unit volume; $N_0 = n_0/v_0$ is number of atoms per unit volume containing fraction x of magnetic atoms, $w_a(\mathbf{r})$ and $w_b(\mathbf{r})$ are the orthogonal molecular wave functions:

$$w_{a,b}(r) = \beta [\psi_{a,b}(r) - \gamma \psi_{b,a}(r)], \quad (4)$$

which are build from the single-particle atomic wave functions ψ_a and ψ_b , being the solution of the corresponding single-particle hydrogeniclike Schrödinger equation with the effective Bohr radius a_B . β and γ are the mixing coefficients:

$$\beta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\frac{1}{1-S^2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-S^2}} \right]^{1/2}, \quad \gamma = \frac{S}{1 + \sqrt{1-S^2}}, \quad (5)$$

determined by imposing the orthogonality and the normalization conditions, whereas $S = \langle \psi_a(r) | \psi_b(r) \rangle$ is the overlap integral. It is important to note here, that when calculating Δ_c we replaced the spin density operator $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\mathbf{r})$ by its quantum mechanical average, thereby introducing the adiabatic and mean field approximations. This however is acceptable here, because the same approximations are assumed in the single BMP theory and provide good results.⁸ The BMP's exchange fields Δ_a and Δ_b may be oriented in an arbitrary direction and we do not make any a priori restriction for their magnitude. In our model those polaronic exchange fields are overlapping, through the presence of the mixing coefficients in the definition of Δ_a and Δ_b . Next, we introduce the six eigenstates of

the carriers total spin operator $\widehat{\mathbf{S}} = \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_1 + \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_2$: three triplet ($s = 1$) and three singlet ($s = 0$) states.²⁴ The triplet states are:

$$|1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_{a\uparrow}^\dagger a_{b\downarrow}^\dagger + a_{a\downarrow}^\dagger a_{b\uparrow}^\dagger) |0\rangle, \quad (6)$$

$$|2\rangle = a_{a\uparrow}^\dagger a_{b\uparrow}^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad |3\rangle = a_{a\downarrow}^\dagger a_{b\downarrow}^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (7)$$

and the corresponding three singlet states are:

$$|4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_{a\uparrow}^\dagger a_{b\downarrow}^\dagger - a_{a\downarrow}^\dagger a_{b\uparrow}^\dagger) |0\rangle, \quad (8)$$

$$|5\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_{a\uparrow}^\dagger a_{a\downarrow}^\dagger + a_{b\downarrow}^\dagger a_{b\uparrow}^\dagger) |0\rangle, \quad (9)$$

and

$$|6\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_{a\uparrow}^\dagger a_{a\downarrow}^\dagger - a_{b\downarrow}^\dagger a_{b\uparrow}^\dagger) |0\rangle. \quad (10)$$

It is also more convenient to transform the BMP exchange fields Δ_a and Δ_b to Δ^+ and Δ^- according to following prescriptions:

$$\Delta^+ \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a + \Delta_b) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta^- \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a - \Delta_b), \quad (11)$$

which enable us to write the effective polaron fields as:

$$\Delta^\pm[\mathbf{M}] = \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} \int d^3r [|w_a(r)|^2 \pm |w_b(r)|^2] \mathbf{M}(r). \quad (12)$$

This in turn leads to H_I in the form:

$$H_I = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ss'} (a_{as}^\dagger (\Delta^+ \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})_{ss'} a_{as'} + a_{bs}^\dagger (\Delta^+ \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})_{ss'} a'_{bs'}) + a_{as}^\dagger (\Delta^- \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})_{ss'} a_{as'} - a_{bs}^\dagger (\Delta^- \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})_{ss'} a'_{bs'}. \quad (13)$$

Now, we select the direction of the global quantization axis as aligned with Δ^- . This choice leads to the following 6×6 singlet-triplet matrix representation of H_I :

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Delta^+ \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\varphi} & \Delta^+ \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\varphi} & \Delta^- & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^+ \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\varphi} & \Delta^+ \cos\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^+ \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\varphi} & 0 & -\Delta^+ \cos\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^- & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta^- \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta^- & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (14)$$

where θ and φ are respectively, the azimuthal and the polar angles between the exchange field Δ^+ and Δ^- .

For the solution of the BMPM problem, the polaronic part H_I must be completed with the hydrogenlike

molecule part H_{II} , written also in the second quantization form. Such representation of H_{II} is known¹⁸⁻²⁴ so, we can write it directly as:

$$H_{II} = \epsilon_a n_a + \epsilon_b n_b + t \sum_s (a_{as}^\dagger a_{as} + a_{bs}^\dagger a_{bs}) + U_a n_{a\uparrow} n_{a\downarrow} + U_b n_{b\uparrow} n_{b\downarrow} - 2J \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_1 \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_2 + \left(K + \frac{1}{2}J\right) n_a n_b + J(a_{a\uparrow}^\dagger a_{a\downarrow}^\dagger a_{b\downarrow} a_{b\uparrow} + H.c.) + V \sum_s [(n_{as} + n_{as}) \times (\widehat{a}_{as}^\dagger a_{b\bar{s}} + \widehat{a}_{b\bar{s}}^\dagger a_{a\bar{s}})], \quad (15)$$

where, ϵ_c is the atomic level position, t the hopping between the impurity states and U_c the intra-atomic Coulomb interaction. The remaining terms represent respectively, the interatomic (Heisenberg) exchange, the pair hopping, and the so-called correlated hopping. In the singlet-triplet basis, H_{II} has relatively simple form²⁴, so we may write:

$$H_{II} = \begin{pmatrix} L & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & L & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & L & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & L + 2j & T & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & T & L_6 + 2j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & L_6 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

where:

$$L = 2\epsilon + K - j, \quad L_6 = 2\epsilon + U - j, \quad \text{and} \quad T = 2(t + V). \quad (17)$$

For identical impurities both the atomic level positions ϵ_a and ϵ_b and the intra-atomic Coulomb interactions U_a and U_b are equal (i.e. $\epsilon_a = \epsilon_b \equiv \epsilon$ and $U_a = U_b = U$). We note here, that H_{II} is solved in the local coordinate system, with z axis aligned with the direction of the molecular bond, and then Hamiltonian H_{II} is reoriented towards the global quantization axis. This last step is quite trivial due to the rotational invariance of H_{II} .

Having determined the BMP molecule Hamiltonian, we discuss next its relation to the with existing models of Angelescu-Bhatt (AB) and Wolff-Bhatt-Durst (WBD).¹⁵⁻¹⁷ These earlier models of interacting BMP pair, while being significant theoretical achievements, are subject to certain important limitations, clearly stated by their authors. Here, for a purpose of completeness, we enumerate some of them. As in our model each site contributes a single s-type orbital, the AB model appears as more advanced, because it accounts for excited-states transitions from 1s level up to 3d level. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind, that AB model treats BMPs as nonoverlapping, equal and large field within the perturbatoion approach with respect to their mutual interaction, hence neglecting important processes even in the simplest one-level situation. For instance, AB model does not predict ferromagnetic ground state in that case. Their assumption about equal magnitudes of BMPs exchange fields creates a serious problem with




FIG. 1. (Color online) Mixing coefficients γ and γ^2 as a function of interimpurity distance R_{ab} expressed in the units of a_B .




FIG. 2. (Color online) K , γK and $\gamma^2 K$ (in units of α) as a function of interimpurity distance R_{ab} expressed in the units of a_B .

treating them as thermodynamically fluctuating quantities. From the other side, trusting in predictions from WBD model is weakened by not fully microscopic derivation of their Hamiltonian, including their parameters.

Therefore, it is important to recognize consequences of such approximations, even in a relatively simplest case. In this work the model is formulated as applicable beyond those limits namely, our BMPs are overlapping, have arbitrary magnitude of the exchange fields and their mutual interaction is accounted for within molecular formalism. Moreover, we are able to consider also thermodynamics, including thermal fluctuations of BMPs exchange fields.

To demonstrate the generality of our approach more

clearly, we map polaronic part H_I into corresponding parts of the WBD model Hamiltonian (the whole WBD model contains also the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg exchange interaction between carrier spins, which we do not specify explicitly). Namely, we can rewrite H_I in the spin operator form:

$$H_I = \Delta_a \cdot \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \Delta_b \cdot \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2, \quad (18)$$

and take into account the explicit form of the exchange fields Δ_a and Δ_b which yields:

$$\begin{aligned} H_I = & \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} \beta^2 [\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \cdot \int |\psi_a|^2 \mathbf{M} d^3r + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \cdot \int |\psi_b|^2 \mathbf{M} d^3r] \\ & - \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} \beta^2 \gamma (\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2) \cdot \int (\psi_a^* \psi_b + \psi_b^* \psi_a) \mathbf{M} d^3r \\ & + \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} \beta^2 \gamma^2 [\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \cdot \int |\psi_b|^2 \mathbf{M} d^3r + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \cdot \int |\psi_a|^2 \mathbf{M} d^3r]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

This expression should be compared with following polaronic part of the WBD model Hamiltonian:¹⁷

$$H_{WBD} = K[\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2] + K'(\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2) \cdot \mathbf{S}_3, \quad (20)$$

where now K and K' are the WBD model parameters and \mathbf{S}_3 is the total spin of magnetic ions in overlapping region. A direct mapping can be established by introducing the following definitions:

$$\begin{aligned} K \equiv \alpha \beta^2, \quad K' \equiv -\gamma K, \quad \mathbf{S}_{1(2)} \equiv \int |\psi_{a(b)}|^2 \frac{\mathbf{M}}{g\mu_B} d^3r \\ \text{and} \quad \mathbf{S}_3 \equiv \int (\psi_a^* \psi_b + \psi_b^* \psi_a) \frac{\mathbf{M}}{g\mu_B} d^3r, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

which allow to rewrite H_I into the final form:

$$\begin{aligned} H_I = & K[\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2] + K'(\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2) \cdot \mathbf{S}_3 \\ & + \gamma^2 K[\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2 + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \cdot \mathbf{S}_1]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

In Fig. 1 we have plotted γ and γ^2 as a function of inter-polaron distance R_{ab} , where in Fig. 2 we show the same radial dependence for K , γK and $\gamma^2 K$. As can be seen from these plots only K is different from zero at large distances and in this limit is equal to that corresponding to isolated BMPs. In H_I , the parameters γ and γ^2 appear as interaction couplings and the corresponding three terms describe contribution from the zero-, first- and second-order processes, respectively. One can also see, that at large inter-polaron distances, for which $\gamma^2 \rightarrow 0$, H_I can be reduced to the bipolaron part of WBD model Hamiltonian. In this manner, we have provided the microscopic derivation of the WBD model and the microscopic meaning of their parameters. Also, the derived relation of BMP exchange fields Δ_a and Δ_b to the carrier orthogonalized single particle wave functions shows that the magnitude of these quantities depends on the inter-polaron distance R_{ab} , the feature which is completely neglected in the AB model.

III. SOLUTION OF THE BMP MOLECULE HAMILTONIAN

Diagonalization of the BMPM Hamiltonian requires the solution of the eigenequation $HV = EV$, with H

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} L & \Delta^+ \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\varphi} & \Delta^+ \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\varphi} & \Delta^- & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^+ \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\varphi} & L + \Delta^+ \cos\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^+ \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\varphi} & 0 & L - \Delta^+ \cos\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^- & 0 & 0 & L + 2j & T & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & T & L_6 + 2j & \Delta^- \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta^- & L_6 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Its form does not allow for an exact analytical diagonalization. Therefore, before solving it numerically, we discuss first some limiting situations, for which approximate analytical solutions can be obtained.

A. Saturation limit

We first solve BMPM effective Hamiltonian for pair of donors in the saturation limit, i.e. with $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{M}_{sat}$. In this case, the solution is simplified greatly within our approach, because we can write:

$$\Delta_+ = \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} M_{sat} = 5/2\alpha N \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_- = 0, \quad (24)$$

where N is the number of Mn ions within BMPM which contribute to magnetization. Subsequent diagonalization of H leads to following exact solution for the eigenvalues E_i , $i = 1, \dots, 6$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} L \\ L + 5/2\alpha N \\ L - 5/2\alpha N \\ \frac{1}{2}[(L + L_6) + 4j + \sqrt{(L - L_6)^2 + 4T^2}] \\ \frac{1}{2}[(L + L_6) + 4j - \sqrt{(L - L_6)^2 + 4T^2}] \\ L_6 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

The eigenvalues $E_{4,5}$ contain antiferromagnetic kinetic exchange interaction²⁴ in an explicit form, that competes with the direct Heisenberg exchange. Nature of the ground state depend on the sign of the expression $\Delta E \equiv E_5(\Delta_-) - E_3(\Delta_+)$, which determines the dominant exchange interaction aligning individual polaron polarization clouds; for positive value the ground state is ferromagnetic. Note that states belonging to the eigenvalue E_1 , E_2 and E_3 are the triplet states. We plot in Fig. 3 the singlet-triplet splitting ΔE as a function of inter-impurity distance R_{ab} , calculated for the material parameters corresponding to $\text{Cd}_{0.95}\text{Mn}_{0.01}\text{Se}$; $N_0\alpha = 0.28$ eV (line a).⁸ This naturally is only a formal dependence,

given by:




FIG. 3. (Color online) Exchange splitting ΔE dependence on inter-impurity distance R_{ab} for BMPM with effective concentration $\bar{x} = 0.027$ of magnetic ions. Lines a and b are calculated with material parameters corresponding to $\text{Cd}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{Se}$ and $\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{As}$, respectively, within the s-state approximation for the impurity single-particle wave function.

which shows a potential strength of a force stabilizing ferromagnetic state. One sees also that if the two impurities are to close each other, then nonmagnetic hydrogen-molecule spin-singlet ground state becomes dominant. In s-type II-VI DMS, the magnetic susceptibility χ of localized magnetic ions at low temperatures takes the form of the Curie-Weiss law $\chi = C_M/(T + T_0)$, with $T_0 > 0$.⁷ Therefore, the magnetization is certainly not saturated and considered case appears as describing a non-realistic situation. The situation changes for p-type ferromagnetic III-V DMS in which magnetization saturates and presented here model provides a quantitative argument that for certain range of inter-polaron distances the interactions between BMPs can stabilize ferromagnetism.

In Fig. 3. the line (b) was calculated with values of parameters corresponding to p-d exchange $N_0\beta = -1.2$ eV confirming our last sentence. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that the nature of holes wave function in zinc-blende semiconductors is much more complicated, then the used here simple s-type donor wave function. In other words, the acceptor BMPM is not quite correct theory.⁷⁻⁹ We postpone this discussion to a separate publication.

B. Large inter-polaron distance limit

It can be derived by making the transformation $R^{-1}HR$ on the whole 6x6 Hamiltonian matrix, with

R being the rotational matrix which diagonalizes H_{II} . In explicit form R is the sparse matrix, with all elements equal zero, except for $R_{44} = R_{55} = \cos(\delta)$, $R_{45} = -\sin(\delta)$ and $R_{54} = \sin(\delta)$, and the rotation angle δ is defined through:

$$\tan(2\delta) = \frac{4(t+V)}{K-U}. \quad (26)$$

This leads to H in the form:

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} L & \frac{2\sin(\theta)}{\sqrt{2}}e^{i\varphi}\Delta^+ & \frac{2\sin(\theta)}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\varphi}\Delta^+ & \Delta^- \cos(\delta) & -\Delta^- \sin(\delta) & 0 \\ \frac{2\sin(\theta)}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\varphi}\Delta^+ & L + \Delta^+ \cos(\theta) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{2\sin(\theta)}{\sqrt{2}}e^{i\varphi}\Delta^+ & 0 & L - \Delta^+ \cos(\theta) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^- \cos(\delta) & 0 & 0 & L_4 & 0 & \Delta^- \sin(\delta) \\ -\Delta^- \sin(\delta) & 0 & 0 & 0 & L_5 & \Delta^- \cos(\delta) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta^- \sin(\delta) & \Delta^- \cos(\delta) & L_6 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

where the diagonal elements L_4 and L_5 are:

$$L_{4,5} \equiv 2\epsilon_a + 1/2(K+U) + j\pm 1/2[(U-K)^2 + 16(t+V)^2]^{1/2}. \quad (28)$$

In the considered here limit of large inter-polaron distances one can neglect the terms proportional to $\sin(\delta)$. In practice, this limits us to the region with $R_{ab} \gtrsim 3.5 a_B$. In that limit, we can write the resulting sixth-order eigenequation as:

$$\begin{aligned} & (E^2 - E(L_5 + L_6) + L_5L_6 - \Delta^-^2) \\ & \{[(E-L)^2 - \Delta^+^2](E^2 - E(L + L_4) + LL_4 - \Delta^-^2) \\ & \quad - (\Delta^+ \times \Delta^-)^2\} = 0. \quad (29) \end{aligned}$$

The eigenvalues E_5 and E_6 can be easily determined, but presence of the vector product $(\Delta^+ \times \Delta^-)^2$ still complicates calculations of remaining four eigenvalues in simple terms. Formally, this equation can be solved exactly, as in a principle all roots of the four order equation can be found analytically. However, solutions will have complicated analytical form, which precludes further explicit analysis. To overcome this difficulty we regard the expression in $\{\dots\}$ as a function of E , say $F(E)$, and write:

$$F(E, \theta) = G(E) + A(\theta), \quad (30)$$

where

$$A(\theta) = -(\Delta^+)^2(\Delta^-)^2 \sin^2(\theta), \quad (31)$$

the definition of the function $G(E)$ is self-explanatory. Now, it is easy to observe that the quantity $A(\theta)$, which is

independent of the energy E , influences $F(E, \theta)$ through a downward shift of $G(E)$. Thus we need to analyze properly $G(E)$ and at least take into account approximately the presence of $A(\theta)$. Therefore, we can expand $F(E, \theta)$ in terms of Taylor series for each eigenvalue separately around the zeros of $G(E)$:

$$\begin{aligned} F(E, \theta) = A(\theta) + \frac{1}{1!} \frac{\partial G(E)}{\partial E} \Big|_{E=E_{0i}} (E - E_{0i}) \\ + \frac{1}{2!} \frac{\partial^2 G(E)}{\partial E^2} \Big|_{E=E_{0i}} (E - E_{0i})^2 + \dots = 0. \quad (32) \end{aligned}$$

We solve those equations to the first order and obtain:

$$E_i = E_{0i} - \frac{A(\theta)}{\frac{1}{1!} \frac{\partial G(E, \xi)}{\partial E} \Big|_{E=E_{0i}}}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, 4, \quad (33)$$

In effect, we find the following six zero-order eigenvalues E_{0i} :

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1/2(L + L_4 - \sqrt{4(\Delta^-)^2 + (L - L_4)^2}) \\ L + \Delta^+ \\ L - \Delta^+ \\ 1/2(L + L_4 + \sqrt{4(\Delta^-)^2 + (L - L_4)^2}) \\ 1/2(L_6 + L_5 - \sqrt{4(\Delta^-)^2 + (L_6 - L_5)^2}) \\ 1/2(L_6 + L_5 + \sqrt{4(\Delta^-)^2 + (L_6 - L_5)^2}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (34)$$

Analysis of this expression shows that the nature of the ground state is determined by the sign of $\Delta E = E_5 - E_3$ expressing the difference between parallel and antiparallel configuration of the exchange fields. Moreover, for

$\Delta^- = 0$, the eigenvalues have the same functional form as in the exact solution, except that now Δ^+ is not calculated for saturated situation.

1. Asymptotic solution for $R_{ab} \rightarrow \infty$

In the limit $R_{ab} \rightarrow \infty$, we can neglect the terms describing interactions between BMPs and two ionic configurations. Naturally, in resulting expression Δ^+ and Δ^- cannot be neglected. Next, we diagonalize $H_{R_{ab} \rightarrow \infty}$

i.e. write:

$$H_{R_{ab} \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{V} = E \tilde{V}. \quad (35)$$

This equation leads to the related fourth-order equation of the form:

$$[(2E_\infty - E)^2 - (\Delta^+)^2][(2E_\infty - E)^2 - (\Delta^-)^2] - (\Delta^+)^2(\Delta^-)^2 \sin^2(\theta) = 0, \quad (36)$$

where $E_\infty = \epsilon_a = \epsilon_b$. The corresponding four eigenvalues are:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2E_\infty + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{2(\Delta_+^2 + \Delta_-^2) + 2\sqrt{(\Delta_+^2 + \Delta_-^2)^2 - 4\Delta_+^2 \Delta_-^2 \cos^2(\theta)}} \\ 2E_\infty - \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{2(\Delta_+^2 + \Delta_-^2) + 2\sqrt{(\Delta_+^2 + \Delta_-^2)^2 - 4\Delta_+^2 \Delta_-^2 \cos^2(\theta)}} \\ 2E_\infty + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{2(\Delta_+^2 + \Delta_-^2) - 2\sqrt{(\Delta_+^2 + \Delta_-^2)^2 - 4\Delta_+^2 \Delta_-^2 \cos^2(\theta)}} \\ 2E_\infty - \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{2(\Delta_+^2 + \Delta_-^2) - 2\sqrt{(\Delta_+^2 + \Delta_-^2)^2 - 4\Delta_+^2 \Delta_-^2 \cos^2(\theta)}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (37)$$

Our asymptotic solutions still depend formally on the angle θ between Δ^+ and Δ^- , whereas the corresponding solutions for the two isolated BMPs:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2E_\infty - \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a + \Delta_b) \\ 2E_\infty - \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a - \Delta_b) \\ 2E_\infty + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a - \Delta_b) \\ 2E_\infty + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a + \Delta_b) \end{pmatrix} \quad (38)$$

are clearly free of such angular dependence, what reflects an uncorrelated character of the spatial orientation of the polaron fields. In Appendix B we prove the equivalence of our solutions given by Eq. (37), with that for the two isolated polarons. Note, that for finite inter-polaron distances, the limit $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ leads also to a correct solution of the hydrogeniclike molecule.

IV. THERMODYNAMICS

Thermodynamic fluctuations of magnetization may strongly influence behavior of the system. Having determined the eigenvalues, we can construct the free energy of the BMP pair. To determine these properties we extend the previous approach⁸ devised for a single BMP. For the case of single BMP, the thermodynamics has been derived by including the contribution coming from localized magnetic moments starting from the Ginzburg-Landau Hamiltonian:

$$H_S[\mathbf{M}] = \int d^3r \left(\frac{1}{2} \kappa \sum_{j=1}^3 |\nabla M_j(\mathbf{r})|^2 + \frac{1}{2\chi} \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r})^2 \right), \quad (39)$$

where the two phenomenological parameters, κ and χ^{-1} , are the exchange stiffness constant and the inverse static susceptibility, respectively. For this case, the probability distribution of the exchange field has been found in the form:

$$P(\Delta) = \int D\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}) P[\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r})] \delta(\Delta - \Delta[\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r})]), \quad (40)$$

where the probability distribution of $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r})$ is defined as

$$P[\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r})] = C e^{-\beta H_S} e^{-\beta \Delta F}, \quad (41)$$

and C is a normalization constant. The functional integration in Eq. (40) expresses a summation of the contributions coming from all space profiles of magnetization $\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r})\}$ contributing to given value of the exchange field Δ . This necessitates the functional integration over all possible "paths" of $\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r})\}$, with the probability density $P[\mathbf{M}]$.⁸ Generalization of Eqs.(39)-(40) to N -polaron case leads to the following N -component Ginzburg-Landau Hamiltonian:

$$H_S[\mathbf{M}_1, \dots, \mathbf{M}_N] = \sum_{i=1}^N \int d^3r_i \left(\frac{1}{2} \kappa^2 \sum_{j=1}^3 |\nabla_i \mathbf{M}_{ij}(\mathbf{r}_i)|^2 + \frac{1}{2\chi} |\mathbf{M}_i(\mathbf{r}_i)|^2 \right). \quad (42)$$

Next, we define the probability distribution of exchange fields Δ_i , with $i = 1, \dots, N$, in the following form

$$P(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_N) = C' \int \prod_i^N D\mathbf{M}_i e^{-\beta H_{S_i}} \delta(\Delta_i - \Delta[\mathbf{M}_i, w_i]) e^{-\beta \Delta F_T} \quad (43)$$




FIG. 4. (Color online) Interpolaron distance dependence of the functions $f_+(R_{ab})$ and $f_-(R_{ab})$ describing the fluctuating exchange field, as defined in Eq. (47).

where ΔF_T is the electronic part of the total free energy of N polarons system, C' is now the overall normalization factor, and

$$\Delta[\mathbf{M}_i, w_i] = \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} \int \mathbf{M}_i(\mathbf{r}) |w_i(\mathbf{r})|^2 d^3r. \quad (44)$$

Transformation made in Eq. (43) defines our dynamic variables Δ_i and the functional integrations in this equation can be carried out for each $\Delta[\mathbf{M}_i, w_i]$ with the methodology developed in Ref. 8.

When coupling between BMPs is important, our eigenvalues are given by Eq. (33) and the two-isolated BMP problem transforms now to the problem of interacting polarons with Δ^+ and Δ^- .

Thermodynamics of this system can be derived from Eq. (43), which after executing the functional integrations provides the physical free energy:

$$F = k_B T \ln \iint d^3\Delta^+ d^3\Delta^- P(\Delta^+, \Delta^-), \quad (45)$$

where the probability distribution of the exchange fields

Δ^+, Δ^- is:

$$P(\Delta^+, \Delta^-) = C'' \exp \left\{ -\frac{(\Delta^+)^2}{8\varepsilon_+ k_B T} \right\} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(\Delta^-)^2}{8\varepsilon_- k_B T} \right\} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^6 \exp \left(-\frac{E_i}{k_B T} \right) \right\}, \quad (46)$$

and the eigenvalues E_i are the roots of Eq. (29), whereas the two new parameters, ε_+ and ε_- are defined as follows:

$$\varepsilon_{\pm}(R_{ab}) \equiv \frac{1}{4} \frac{\alpha^2 \chi}{(g\mu_B)^2} f_{\pm}(R_{ab}) \equiv \frac{1}{4} \frac{\alpha^2 \chi}{(g\mu_B)^2} \int d^3r [|w_a(r)|^2 \pm |w_b(r)|^2]^2 d^3r. \quad (47)$$

Note that $P(\Delta^-, \Delta^+)$ has a correct asymptotic behavior for the interpolaron distance $R_{ab} \rightarrow \infty$. We stress also, that the parameters ε_+ and ε_- are material dependent (χ is the spin system susceptibility) and correspond to the single-polaron parameter ε_p of DS.⁸ Their R_{ab} dependence is crucial, as it affects the magnitudes of either Δ^+ or Δ^- . In Fig. 4 we plot this dependence. One sees, that for all finite distances $f_+ \geq f_-$, i.e. the field responsible for the triplet configurations of the two impurity electrons is dominant. Note also, that even though the parameter $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ in the limit $R_{ab} \rightarrow 0$, the corresponding functions $f_+(R_{ab})$ and $f_-(R_{ab})$ are finite then (see also below).

The dominating character of ε_+ may result in the ferromagnetic-ground-state appearance of the BMPM. However, to prove that explicitly we have to include also the effect of the exchange fields on the eigenvalues $\{E_i\}$. This can be done by determining the most probable values of the fields Δ^+ and Δ^- . For that purpose, we consider first the lowest-order solution assuming that $E_i \approx E_{0i}$. In analogy to the single-polaron theory, we can now calculate the most probable values $\overline{\Delta^+}$ and $\overline{\Delta^-}$ from the conditions:

$$[\partial P(\Delta^+, \Delta^-) / \partial \Delta^+]_{\overline{\Delta^+}} = [\partial P(\Delta^+, \Delta^-) / \partial \Delta^-]_{\overline{\Delta^-}} = 0, \quad (48)$$

which lead to the following system of two coupled equations:

$$(1 + A + B) \overline{\Delta^-}^3 - 4\varepsilon_- \frac{\overline{\Delta^-}^3}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J^2 + (\overline{\Delta^-})^2}} C \tanh \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J^2 + (\overline{\Delta^-})^2}}{k_B T} \right] - 8(1 + A + B) \overline{\Delta^-} \varepsilon_- k_B T = 0, \quad (49)$$

and

$$(B^{-1} + 1 + AB^{-1}) \overline{\Delta^+}^3 - 4\varepsilon_+ \overline{\Delta^+}^2 \tanh \left[\frac{\overline{\Delta^+}}{k_B T} \right] - 8(1 + B^{-1} + AB^{-1}) \overline{\Delta^+} \varepsilon_+ k_B T = 0, \quad (50)$$

where $A = A(T)$, $B = B(T)$ and $C(T)$ are defined as:

$$A(T) \equiv \cosh \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J_4^2 + (\overline{\Delta}^-)^2}}{k_B T} \right] \exp \left[\frac{\frac{J_6}{2} + L_5 - \frac{J_4}{2} - L}{k_B T} \right] \cosh^{-1} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J^2 + (\overline{\Delta}^-)^2}}{k_B T} \right], \quad (51)$$

$$B(T) \equiv \cosh \left[\frac{\overline{\Delta}^+}{k_B T} \right] \exp \left[\frac{\frac{J}{2} + L_5 - L}{k_B T} \right] \cosh^{-1} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J^2 + (\overline{\Delta}^-)^2}}{k_B T} \right], \quad (52)$$

and

$$C(T) = 1 + \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J^2 + (\overline{\Delta}^-)^2} \sinh \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J_4^2 + (\overline{\Delta}^-)^2}}{k_B T} \right]}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J_4^2 + (\overline{\Delta}^-)^2} \sinh \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J^2 + (\overline{\Delta}^-)^2}}{k_B T} \right]}, \quad (53)$$

with $J = L_6 - L_5$ and $J_4 = L_4 - L$. This system of coupled equations leads to the following three pairs of the solutions at $T = 0$, depending on the sign of $\Delta E = E_5 - E_3$:

$$(i) \quad \overline{\Delta}^{-2} = (2\varepsilon_-)^2 - (J/2)^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Delta}^+ = 2\varepsilon_+, \quad \text{for } \Delta E = 0,$$

$$(ii) \quad \overline{\Delta}^+ = 4\varepsilon_+, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Delta}^- = 0, \quad \text{for } \Delta E > 0, \quad (54)$$

and

$$(iii) \quad \overline{\Delta}^+ = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Delta}^- = \sqrt{(4\varepsilon_-)^2 - (J/2)^2}, \quad \text{for } \Delta E < 0.$$

The condition $\Delta E(R_{ab}) = 0$ defines the critical distance R_c for $R_{ab} > R_c$ the ground state is ferromagnetic. Therefore, the driving interaction which aligns at $T = 0$ individual polaron polarization clouds can be defined at R_c in the form $\Delta E_c \equiv E_5(iii) - E_3(ii)$. Let us then discuss explicitly the limit $T \rightarrow 0$, for which the ground state is determined by the sign of the expression:

$$\left| \frac{J(R_{ab})}{2} + L_5 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}J(R_{ab})^2 + (\overline{\Delta}^-(R_{ab}))^2} \right| - \left| L - \overline{\Delta}^+(R_{ab}) \right| \equiv f(R_{ab}). \quad (55)$$

This expression for negative values yields the ground state belonging to eigenvalue E_5 , i.e. a mixture of two singlet states of impurity electrons, whereas for $f(R_{ab}) > 0$ it leads to ferromagnetic, ($s_{tot}^z = \pm 1$) ground state with the corresponding eigenvalue E_3 . Therefore, the condition $f(R_{ab}) = 0$ defines a critical interpolaron distance

R_c , at which the crossover from magnetic to nonmagnetic ground states occurs. A direct analysis shows that $\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} A(T) = 0$ and $\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} C(T) = 1$, whereas an important role on the character of the ground state is played by the function $B(T)$. This become clearly visible if one determines its value for $T \rightarrow 0$. Namely, $B(T \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow \infty$ for $f(R_{ab}) > 0$, so $B^{-1}(T \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0$. It can be readily seen, that in this case we have:

$$\overline{\Delta}^+ = 4\varepsilon_+, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Delta}^- = 0. \quad (56)$$

In the other case, i.e. for $f(R_{ab}) < 0$, $B(T \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0$ and we find:

$$\overline{\Delta}^- = \sqrt{(4\varepsilon_-)^2 - (J(R_{ab})/2)^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Delta}^+ = 0. \quad (57)$$

Such peculiar behavior of $B(T \rightarrow 0)$ stabilizes the ground state and moreover, makes our analytical solution exact, because $E_i = E_{0i}$ under these circumstances. For completeness, we need to determine still $B(T \rightarrow 0)$ at R_c . It can be shown that $B(T \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 1$, with:

$$\overline{\Delta}^- = \sqrt{(2\varepsilon_-)^2 - (J(R_c)/2)^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\Delta}^+ = 2\varepsilon_+. \quad (58)$$

Even at low nonzero temperature solutions for $\overline{\Delta}^+$ and $\overline{\Delta}^-$ become complicated and temperature dependent. Therefore, considering behavior of the state population probabilities at low T , one can propose an approximate expression for determining R_c :

$$\frac{f_+ - bf_-}{f_-} - \frac{L - bL_5}{2\kappa f_-} + \frac{bJ}{4\kappa f_-} - \frac{b(J/2)^2}{(4\kappa f_-)^2} \equiv w(R_{ab}), \quad (59)$$

where $J_{H_2}(R_{ab}) = J(R_{ab})$ is taken for the hydrogen molecule (i.e. $\varepsilon = 1$ and $m^*/m_e = 1$, m_e being the electron mass), whereas R_c is expressed in units of a_B , and κ is defined as:

$$\kappa \equiv \frac{\alpha^2 \chi}{4(g\mu_B)^2} \frac{\varepsilon^2 m_e}{m^*} \quad (60)$$

and contains all the key material parameters that determine R_c , provided that the parameters L , L_5 , J_{15} and J_{56} are calculated for the H_2 molecule. Note that neglecting




FIG. 5. (Color online) Plot of $w(R_{ab})$, defined in Eq. (59), for three DMS characterized by $\varkappa = k\varkappa_0$, where the value \varkappa_0 corresponds to that for $\text{Cd}_{0.95}\text{Mn}_{0.05}\text{Se}$ and $k > 1$.

the quadratic term in the condition $w(R_{ab}) = 0$ and for $b = 1$ is equivalent to $\Delta E = 0$. Next, we discuss the R_c dependence on material parameters.

In Fig. 5 we plot $w(R_{ab})$ with $b = 1.1$ ($T \simeq 1.1\text{K}$) for DMS characterized by $\varkappa = k\varkappa_0$, with $k = 4, 5$, and 15 , where the value \varkappa_0 corresponds to that for $\text{Cd}_{0.95}\text{Mn}_{0.05}\text{Se}$ ($\varepsilon = 9.4$, $m^*/m_e = 0.13$, $(\bar{\Delta} = 2\varepsilon_p \lesssim 1\text{ meV})$).⁸ One sees from Fig.2 that for $\text{Cd}_{0.95}\text{Mn}_{0.05}\text{Se}$, $w(R_{ab}) < 0$ for all R_{ab} ; then the $s_{tot}^z = 0$ spin configuration of the impurity electrons is always stable.

So far we have treated the magnetic susceptibility χ of localized magnetic ions as a material parameter neglecting its strong temperature dependence. In $\text{Cd}_{0.95}\text{Mn}_{0.05}\text{Se}$ and at low temperature, χ takes the form of Curie-Weiss law $\chi = C_M/(T+T_0)$ with $T_0 = 1.2\text{ K}$. Properties of the system at low temperatures may be deduced from analysis of the averages of Δ^+ and Δ^- , as they reflect properties of the most probable values $\bar{\Delta}^+$ and $\bar{\Delta}^-$ expressed via conditions (i) – (iii). In order to see that within our approach the ferromagnetic configuration of the impurity electron is possible in general, we have displayed in Fig. 5 the numerical average of Δ^+ and Δ^- vs. T for exemplary value of the parameter $\varkappa(T) = k\varkappa_0(T)$, with $k = 25$. Such value of k for n-type DMS is naturally outside of accessible range of material parameter, but for the p-type DMS the p-d exchange is about 4 – 5 times stronger than that for the n-type, then such high value of k is justified. For this value of k one finds $\Delta E_c \approx 0.47\text{ meV}$ (calculated at 2 K, with $T_0 = 1.2\text{ K}$ and for $R_{ab} = 3.65\text{ a}_B$), which allow for a very rough estimation of the Curie temperature T_C , in the mean field approximation for a 3D cubic BMP lattice, would be 22 K.

For completeness, we plot in Fig. 6 temperature dependence of the average values of Δ^+ and Δ^- taking the




FIG. 6. (Color online) Temperature dependence of average exchange fields Δ^+ and Δ^- for DMS characterized by $\varkappa = 25\varkappa_0$.

parameters for $\text{Cd}_{0.95}\text{Mn}_{0.05}\text{Se}$ at $R_{ab} = 2$ and 4.25 a_B . As can see, the numerical results confirm that for this material a nonmagnetic ($s_{tot}^z = 0$) configuration of the impurity electrons is always stable.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have developed the model of BMP molecule (BMPM) consisting of two overlapping polarons, which have arbitrarily oriented in space their polaronic spin clouds of arbitrary magnitude. Their mutual interaction is accounted for within the molecular electronic states. We also succeeded in deriving thermodynamics of these states that allows to analyse their properties at nonzero temperature. These features allow for a better understanding of the earlier results, including the range of their applicability. More directly, an important role of an accurate inclusion of the impurity electron wave functions has been demonstrated. What is also important, the microscopic interpretation of Wolff-Bhatt-Durst model Hamiltonian-parameters¹⁷ has been provided. Simultaneously, the regular case of the many-level generalized Hubbard model with random fields of Angelescu-Bhatt¹⁶ of nonoverlapping, large polarons has been extended to the case of overlapping polarons forming the BMP molecule.

Generally, our model of BMPM in DMS confirms a possibility of the ferromagnetic ground-state appearance for certain DMS materials and appropriate distances between polarons. One of the important and new results of our approach is a direct incorporation of material parameters into the BMP molecule model. Presented here numerical calculation for BMP molecule embodied in $\text{Cd}_{0.95}\text{Mn}_{0.05}\text{Se}$ shows, that for all interpolaron dis-

tances the polaronic molecule ground state spin configuration is $s_{tot}^z = 0$ for the impurity electrons. Then, in this DMS a non-magnetic ground state of BMP molecule is always stable. From the other side, our model predicts a ferromagnetic (spin-triplet) ground state of BMP molecule for material parameters corresponding to p-type DMSs. The nature of the ground state depends on magnitude of the parameter \varkappa , defined by Eq. (60), which is proportional to the magnetic susceptibility of the spin system of host DMS. Therefore, the RKKY interaction responsible for the low temperature ferromagnetic ordering in p-type DMSs enhances ferromagnetic ground state of BMPM when approaching the critical region from the high-temperature side. However, the results for the p-type DMSs must be analyzed within the approach, which accounts correctly for the non-s-type character of BMP carrier wave function, as well as non-Gaussian contributions to the free energy functional. Such formulation of BMPM is under consideration and will be presented separately.

Appendix A: The matrix representation of H_I within first quantization formalism

We assume that the exchange field acting on impurity electrons is relatively weak and that orbital moments can be disregarded. As a consequence, the two-impurity electron wave function may be written as a product of functions, which depend on the spatial and the spin variables separately i.e. it is of the form

$$\Psi_c(\{\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_i\}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \chi_S \{\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_i\} \chi_{\sigma_1\sigma_2} \Psi_c(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\chi \{\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_i\}$ is the wave function of the spins, and $\chi_{\sigma_1\sigma_2}$ is the spin part of that for the carriers, whose spatial wave function is $\Psi_c(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$, where c runs over all pairs (ab, aa, bb). We take the two-electron functions as composed of orthogonal molecular wave functions $w_{a,b}(r_i)$:

$$w_{a,b}(r) = \beta[\psi_{a,b}(r) - \gamma\psi_{b,a}(r)], \quad (\text{A2})$$

contain 1s-hydrogenic-like wave functions ψ_a and ψ_b , with the effective Bohr radius a_B , with β and γ being the mixing coefficients. These orthogonal single-particle wave functions are used to construct the two-particle six-dimensional space. The space part is identical with that for the hydrogeniclike molecule. Therefore, we can write down directly the following six two-electron wave functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{1,4}\chi_{1,4} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[w_a(\mathbf{r}_1)w_b(\mathbf{r}_2) \mp w_a(\mathbf{r}_2)w_b(\mathbf{r}_1)] \\ &\times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\chi_{1/2}(1)\chi_{-1/2}(2) \pm \chi_{-1/2}(1)\chi_{1/2}(2)], \quad (\text{A3}) \end{aligned}$$

for the spin-triplet state with $s_{tot}^z = 0$ and the singlet state respectively and

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{2,3}\chi_{2,3} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[w_a(\mathbf{r}_1)w_b(\mathbf{r}_2) - w_a(\mathbf{r}_2)w_b(\mathbf{r}_1)] \\ &\times [\chi_{\pm 1/2}(1)\chi_{\pm 1/2}(2)], \quad (\text{A4}) \end{aligned}$$

for the remaining triplet states with $s_{tot}^z = \pm 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{5,6}\chi_{5,6} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[w_a(\mathbf{r}_1)w_a(\mathbf{r}_2) \mp w_b(\mathbf{r}_2)w_b(\mathbf{r}_1)] \\ &\times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\chi_{1/2}(1)\chi_{-1/2}(2) \pm \chi_{-1/2}(1)\chi_{1/2}(2)], \quad (\text{A5}) \end{aligned}$$

for the two ionic singlet states.

Next, we find the matrix representation of H_I by averaging over the spatial coordinates, but keeping out the carrier spin still in the operator form:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_n | H_I | \Psi_m \rangle &= \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} [\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \cdot \int \Psi_n^* \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}_1) \Psi_m d^3r_1 d^3r_2 \\ &+ \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \cdot \int \Psi_n^* \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}_2) \Psi_m d^3r_1 d^3r_2]. \quad (\text{A6}) \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the symmetry properties of spatial wave function with respect to the transposition of the carrier coordinates, the matrix elements of H_I can be recast to the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_n | H | \Psi_m \rangle &= \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \cdot \Delta_1[\mathbf{M}, \Psi_n, \Psi_m] + \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_2 \cdot \Delta_2[\mathbf{M}, \Psi_n, \Psi_m] \\ &\equiv (\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \text{sign}(\Psi_n)\text{sign}(\Psi_m)\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_2) \cdot \Delta[\mathbf{M}, \Psi_n, \Psi_m], \quad (\text{A7}) \end{aligned}$$

where the factor $\text{sign}(\dots) = \pm 1$ and expresses the parity of the corresponding wave function. The exchange fields, $\Delta_l[\mathbf{M}, \Psi_n, \Psi_m]$ are thus defined as:

$$\Delta_l[\mathbf{M}, \Psi_n, \Psi_m] \equiv \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} \int \int \Psi_n^* \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}_l) \Psi_m d^3r_1 d^3r_2, \quad (\text{A8})$$

Note that the fields $\Delta_l[\mathbf{M}, \Psi_n, \Psi_m]$ are equal to $\Delta[\mathbf{M}, \Psi_n, \Psi_m]$, except for the sign. An explicit calculation provides a remarkable reduction of the number of the exchange fields. Namely, only the following two appear in the final BMP pair Hamiltonian matrix:

$$\Delta^\pm[\mathbf{M}] = \frac{\alpha}{g\mu_B} \int d^3r [|w_a(r)|^2 \pm |w_b(r)|^2] \mathbf{M}(r). \quad (\text{A9})$$

The labeling of the exchange fields Δ^+ and Δ^- originates from the wave function parities (e.g. "+" corresponds to the triplet-triplet matrix elements and "-" to the singlet-triplet ones).

Here we outline the details of calculations of the matrix elements $\langle \Phi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z} | H_{BMP} | \Phi_{\nu'}^{s_{tot}', s_{tot}'^z} \rangle$ in the singlet-triplet basis. According to the definition given in the

text : $\Phi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z} = \Psi_\tau \chi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z}$, and taking into account that Hamiltonian H_{II} does not contain explicitly the carrier spin variables, one can write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \Phi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z} | H_{BMP} | \Phi_\nu^{s'_{tot}, s'_{tot}^z} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \chi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z} | \langle \Psi_\tau | H_{BMP} | \Psi_\nu \rangle | \chi_\nu^{s'_{tot}, s'_{tot}^z} \right\rangle \\ &= E_\tau \delta_{\tau\nu} + \left\langle \chi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z} | (\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \text{sign}(\tau\nu)\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_2) \cdot \Delta^{\tau\nu} | \chi_\nu^{s'_{tot}, s'_{tot}^z} \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_1 = \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_1 \otimes \mathbf{1}$, $\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_2 = \mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_2$ are the carrier spin operators and the corresponding spinors $\chi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z}$ are explicitly defined below:

$$\chi_+^{0,0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\chi_{1/2}(1) \otimes \chi_{-1/2}(2) - \chi_{-1/2}(1) \otimes \chi_{1/2}(2)], \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$\chi_-^{1,0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\chi_{1/2}(1) \otimes \chi_{-1/2}(2) + \chi_{-1/2}(1) \otimes \chi_{1/2}(2)], \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$\chi_-^{1,1} = \chi_{1/2}(1) \otimes \chi_{1/2}(2), \quad (\text{A13})$$

and

$$\chi_-^{1,-1} = \chi_{-1/2}(1) \otimes \chi_{-1/2}(2). \quad (\text{A14})$$

To short-hand notation of the tensor product symbol are omitted below. We recall that we have fixed the direction of the spin quantization axis as parallel to the local exchange field $\Delta^-[\mathbf{M}]$.

Generally, one can assume that in the selected coordinate system direction of $\Delta^+[\mathbf{M}]$ is described by the angles θ and ϕ . Therefore, evaluation of Eq. (A10) with these exchange fields is the simplest in the appropriately rotated spin basis, namely:

$$\chi_{1/2} = \chi_{\theta\phi} e^{i\frac{\phi}{2}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} - \chi_{\bar{\theta}\bar{\phi}} e^{i\frac{\phi}{2}} \sin \frac{\theta}{2}, \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$\chi_{-1/2} = \chi_{\theta\phi} e^{-i\frac{\phi}{2}} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} + \chi_{\bar{\theta}\bar{\phi}} e^{-i\frac{\phi}{2}} \cos \frac{\theta}{2}, \quad (\text{A16})$$

where the angles $\bar{\theta}$ and $\bar{\phi}$ describe the spin state with an arbitrary direction opposite to that defined by θ and ϕ .

From Eq. (A10), the diagonal matrix elements can be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \chi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z} | H_{BMP} | \chi_\nu^{s'_{tot}, s'_{tot}^z} \right\rangle \\ &= E_\tau + \left\langle \chi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z} | (\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_2) \cdot \Delta^\tau | \chi_\tau^{s_{tot}, s_{tot}^z} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A17})$$

Note that $\langle \chi_+^{0,0} | H_{BMP} | \chi_+^{0,0} \rangle = E_+$ because $\chi_+^{0,0}$ transform as a scalar under rotations, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi_{1/2}(1)\chi_{-1/2}(2) - \chi_{-1/2}(1)\chi_{1/2}(2) \\ &= \chi_{\theta\phi}(1)\chi_{\bar{\theta}\bar{\phi}}(2) - \chi_{\bar{\theta}\bar{\phi}}(1)\chi_{\theta\phi}(2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A18})$$

Also, the matrix element $\langle \chi_-^{1,0} | H_{BMP} | \chi_-^{1,0} \rangle$ can be computed in the following manner

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \chi_-^{1,0} | (\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_2) \cdot \Delta^{--} | \chi_-^{1,0} \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \left\langle \chi_{1/2}(1)\chi_{-1/2}(2) + \chi_{-1/2}(1)\chi_{1/2}(2) | \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i \cdot \Delta^{--} | \chi_{1/2}(1)\chi_{-1/2}(2) + \chi_{-1/2}(1)\chi_{1/2}(2) \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \sum_{\sigma, \sigma'}^{1/2, -1/2} \langle \chi_\sigma(1)\chi_{\sigma'}(2) | \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i \cdot \Delta^{--} | \chi_\sigma(1)\chi_{\sigma'}(2) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \sum_{\sigma}^{1/2, -1/2} \langle \chi_\sigma(i) | \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i \cdot \Delta^{--} | \chi_\sigma(i) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \sum_{\sigma}^{1,2} \sum_{\xi_2, \phi_2, \bar{\xi}_2, \bar{\phi}_2} \langle \chi_\sigma(i) | s_i^{z'} | \chi_\sigma(i) \rangle \Delta^{--} = \frac{1}{4} \Delta^{--} [(\cos^2(\xi) - \sin^2(\xi)) + (\sin^2(\xi) - \cos^2(\xi))] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A19})$$

and thus $\langle \chi_-^{1,0} | H_{BMP} | \chi_-^{1,0} \rangle = E_-$.

The other matrix elements are:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \chi_-^{1,1} | H_{BMP} | \chi_-^{1,1} \right\rangle = \\ & \sum_i \left\langle \chi_{1/2}(i) | \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i \cdot \Delta^+ | \chi_{1/2}(i) \right\rangle = \Delta^+ \cos \theta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A20})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \chi_-^{1,-1} | H_{BMP} | \chi_-^{1,-1} \right\rangle = \\ & \sum_i \left\langle \chi_{-1/2}(i) | \widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i \cdot \Delta^+ | \chi_{-1/2}(i) \right\rangle = -\Delta^+ \cos \theta. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A21})$$

Finally, the non vanishing off-diagonal matrix elements

are:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \chi_+^{0,0} | H_{BMP} | \chi_-^{1,0} \rangle = \\ \Delta^- \langle \chi_+^{0,0} | s_1^z - s_2^z | \chi_-^{1,0} \rangle = \Delta^- \langle \chi_+^{0,0} | \chi_+^{0,0} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A22})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \chi_-^{1,0} | H_{BMP} | \chi_-^{1,1} \rangle &= \langle \chi_-^{1,0} | (\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_2) \cdot \Delta^+ | \chi_-^{1,1} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_j \langle \chi_{-1/2}(j) | \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \cdot \Delta^+ | \chi_{1/2}(j) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Delta^+ e^{i\varphi} \sin \theta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A23})$$

and

$$\langle \chi_-^{1,0} | H_{BMP} | \chi_-^{1,-1} \rangle = \langle \chi_-^{1,0} | H_{BMP} | \chi_-^{1,1} \rangle^*. \quad (\text{A24})$$

Next, we select a convenient direction of the quantization axis for the BMP-pair problem, which is selected as aligned with the field Δ^- . In effect, the matrix representation of H_I in the six dimensional basis of the two-electron wave functions is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Delta^+ \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\varphi} & \Delta^+ \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\varphi} & \Delta^- & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^+ \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\varphi} & \Delta^+ \cos \theta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^+ \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\varphi} & 0 & -\Delta^+ \cos \theta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Delta^- & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta^- \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta^- & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A25})$$

where, φ and θ are respectively, the azimuthal and the polar angles between the exchange field Δ^+ and Δ^- . This form of the Hamiltonian matrix is identical to that taken in Sec. II for a detailed analysis.

Appendix B: Equivalence of Eq. (35) with the solution for two isolated BMPs

In this Appendix we demonstrate that our solution of the asymptotic case for $R_{ab} \rightarrow \infty$ is equivalent to that known for two isolated BMP, hence we prove the equivalence between Eq. (37) and Eq. (38). To do this we need calculate first:

$$2\Delta^+ \Delta^- \cos(\theta) = (\Delta^+ + \Delta^-)^2 - (\Delta^+)^2 - (\Delta^-)^2. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Taking now into account that:

$$(\Delta^+ + \Delta^-)^2 = 4\Delta_a^2, \quad (\text{B2})$$

and

$$(\Delta^+)^2 + (\Delta^-)^2 = 2(\Delta_a^2 + \Delta_b^2), \quad (\text{B3})$$

one can find:

$$\Delta^+ \Delta^- \cos(\theta) = \Delta_a^2 - \Delta_b^2. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Substitution of Eqs.:(B3)-(B4) into Eq.(37) gets finally:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2E_\infty + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a + \Delta_b) \\ 2E_\infty - \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a + \Delta_b) \\ 2E_\infty + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a - \Delta_b) \\ 2E_\infty - \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_a - \Delta_b) \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B5})$$

These eigenvalues can be found also taking independent linear combination of the solutions for the two isolated polarons. This constitutes the equivalence between the two solutions.

* hbednarski@cmpw-pan.edu.pl

† ufspalek@if.uj.edu.pl

¹ T. Jungwirth, J. Sinowa, J. Masek, J. Kucera, and A. H. MacDonald, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 809 (2006); T. Dietl et al., Science **287** 1019 (2000).

² J. M. De Teresa et al., Nature **386**, 256 (1997).

³ J. M. Coey, M. Venkatesan and C. B. Fitzgerald, Nature Materials **4**, 173 (2005).

⁴ K. Kikoin and V. Fleurov, Phys. Rev. B **74** 174407 (2006).

⁵ P.M. Krstajić et al., Phys. Rev. B **70**, 195215 (2004).

⁶ R. Bouzerar, G. Bouzerar, and T. Ziman, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 024411 (2006); G. Bouzerar, T. Ziman, and J. Kudrnovsky, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 125207 (2005).

⁷ J. Spalek, A. Lewicki, Z. Tarnawski, J.K. Furdyna, R.R. Galazka, and Z. Obuszko, Phys.Rev. B **33**, 3407 (1986).

⁸ T. Dietl and J. Spalek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 355 (1982); Phys. Rev. B **28**, 1548 (1983). referred to as DS.

⁹ S.M. Rybachenko and Y.G. Semenov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **84**, 1419 (1983). [Sov. Phys. JETP **57**, 825 (1983)].

¹⁰ D. Heiman, P.A. Wolff and J. Warnock, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 4848 (1983); P. A. Wolff and J. Warnock, J. Appl. Phys. **55**, 2300 (1984).

¹¹ A. Golnik, J. Ginter, and J.A. Gaj, J. Phys. C **16**, 6073 (1983).

¹² T. H. Nhung, R. Planel, C. Benoit a la Guillaume, and A.K. Bhattacharjee, Phys. Rev. B. **31**, 2388 (1985).

¹³ A. Golnik and J. Spalek, J. Magn. Magn. Mat. **54-57**, 1207 (1986).

¹⁴ M. Umehara, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 12209 (2000).

¹⁵ P.A. Wolff, R.N. Bhatt, and A.C. Durst, J. Appl. Phys. **79**, 5196 (1996).

¹⁶ D.E. Angelescu and R. N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 75211 (2002).

¹⁷ A.C. Durst, R.N. Bhatt, and P.A. Wolff, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 235205 (2002).

- ¹⁸ P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B **115**, 2 (1959); K. A. Chao, J. Spalek, and A. M. Oleś, J. Phys. C **10**, L271 (1977).
- ¹⁹ M. Berciu and R.N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 029702 (2003); M. Berciu and R.N. Bhatt, B **69**, 045202 (2004).
- ²⁰ M.P. Kennett, M. Berciu, and R.N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. B **66** 045207 (2002); M.P. Kennett, M. Berciu, and R.N. Bhatt, Phys. Rev. B **65** 115308 (2002); M. Berciu and R.N. Bhatt, *ibid.* **66**, 085207 (2002).
- ²¹ L. Brey and G. Gomez-Santos, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 115206 (2003).
- ²² G. A. Fiete, G. Zarand, K. Damle, and C. P. Moca, Phys. Rev. B **72** 045212 (2005); G. A. Fiete, G. Zarand and K. Damle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** 097202 (2003).
- ²³ A.Kaminski and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** 247202 (2002); J. Priour and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 127201 (2006).
- ²⁴ see e.g. J. Spalek, R. Podsiadły, W. Wójcik and A. Rycerz, Phys. Rev. B **6,1** 15676 (2000).