

Geometry dependence on the energy of vortices on surfaces with negative and variable Gaussian curvature

Vagson L. Carvalho-Santos*

Instituto Federal de Educação,

Ciência e Tecnologia Baiano - Campus Senhor do Bonfim

48970-000 Senhor do Bonfim, Bahia, Brazil

Felipe A. Apolonio

Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Viçosa

36570-000 Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brazil

We have applied the Anisotropic Heisenberg Model on the surfaces of the catenoid and hyperboloid, which present negative and variable Gaussian curvature. Two kinds of topological excitations were considered. The first one is given when we take $\lambda = 0$ (isotropic model), which leads to the sine-Gordon equation and a π -soliton-like solution is obtained. This corresponds to the first class of the second homotopy group of the spin sphere mapping. The second one is given by $\lambda = -1$, that consists of the XY model, whose solution can be a vortex turning around the surfaces. The results show that the vortex energy depends of the length scale of the underlying geometry and, for small central radius (CR), the hyperboloid presents lower vortex energy than that on a catenoid, which, as well as the cylinder case, has its vortex energy varying with the characteristic length $1/\rho$. We have also shown that for any CR value, the lowest value of the vortex energy occurs on the polar hyperboloid surface.

I. INTRODUCTION

Geometrical and topological concepts and tools are important in many branches of natural sciences, particularly, in Physics. For instance, the idea of symmetry, which is intimately associated with geometry, is a keystone for studying a number of fundamental properties of several physical systems, e.g., the Noether theorem asserts that there is a conserved quantity to each continuous symmetry of the associated action. Topology, in turn, is crucial for classifying and for giving stability to certain excitations, such as solitons, extending objects having finite energy, and vortices, presenting a nonvanishing vorticity around a given singular point or a topological obstruction. In addition, the observed vortex-pair dissociation is the mechanism behind the topological phase transition¹.

Vortices and solitons are particle-like excitations and their behavior in different geometries has remained largely unexplored experimentally and is of growing theoretical interest². These and others have been observed in a number of systems, such as superconductors, superfluids, and magnetic materials^{3,4}. In nanomagnets, depending on the length and thickness of micro-sized disks, a vortex can appear in their centers⁵ and the dynamic behavior of the vortices is affected by structural defects that appear during the nanoparticles fabrication. For instance, it is observed that the interaction of the out-of-plane component of vortices with curved defects in nanomagnets must cause a chiral symmetry breaking in the vortex girtropic motion due to the thin-film roughness⁶ and still, in-plane vortices on a two-dimensional space interact not only with each other, but also with the curvature of the substrate⁷. Besides, the energy of these excitations, as well as their stability, depends on the shape of the nanoparticle⁸. In this context, small curved hills and valleys in magnetic nanodots can be modeled by point-like defects, the mathematical representation of which can be given by the Dirac delta function⁹. Kravchuk *et al* showed that the easy-surface Heisenberg model in spherical shells leads to a coupling between the localized out-of-surface component of the vortex with its delocalized in-surface structure¹⁷, what is associated with the curvature of the underlying surface.

In addition, vortices can appear like solutions of the continuous Heisenberg Model in two-dimensional systems^{10–15}. In these works, the authors analyse the dynamic and static properties of vortices and the results show that the energy of these excitations is closely linked to the characteristic length of the considered geometry and still, for holeless surfaces, the energy presents a divergence, which can be controlled by the development of an out-of-plane component in the vortex core, so called the vortex polarity. Soliton-like solutions also have been considered in the above cited works and it is shown that its characteristic length depends on the length scale of the surface. For finite surfaces, half-soliton solutions are found^{12,16}.

From the viewpoint of fundamental physics, the curvature of a surface can induce a quantum potential in the Schrödinger equation, which alters the form of the groundstate and excited-state wavefunctions¹⁸. Thus, an important task would be to control the shape of membranes, what can be done, for example, by the knowledge of their magnetic properties. This way, Saxena *et al.* have considered the exchange and Zeeman terms in the magnetic energy calculations for cylindrical surfaces, and showed that the interaction of an external magnetic field with a cylindrical magnetoelastic membrane has a 2π soliton-like solution, what induces a deformation (pinch) at the point where the spins are pointing in the opposite direction to the magnetic field¹⁹. The response to an external field also can be used to deformate of magnetoelastic metamaterial, what is achieved by providing a mechanical degree of freedom so that the electromagnetic interaction in the metamaterial lattice is coupled to elastic interaction²⁰. Lastly, it is shown that the curvature of graphene bubbles can be controlled by applying an electric field²¹.

In this paper, we propose the study of the anisotropic Heisenberg Model on the catenoid and hyperboloid, which are surfaces with variable and negative Gaussian curvature and present cylindrical symmetry. To our knowledge, the isotropic Heisenberg Model was previously applied on the surfaces of the catenoid and hyperboloid²⁴. In that work, the authors have also considered the helicoid and the single-sheet paraboloid surfaces, obtaining and discussing the properties of skyrmion-like solutions on that surfaces. Here, we extended their analysis by studying both soliton-like ($\lambda = 0$ case) and vortex-like ($\lambda = -1$ case) solutions. Our main objective is to study a class of topological excitations on these surfaces, as well as the influence of a characteristic length, associated with each geometry, on the vortex energy. The answers for these questions may be relevant for future researches in nanomagnetism, once they can improve the understanding of curvature effects in the static and dynamic behavior of vortices in curved ferromagnetic nanoparticles. In fact, the possibility of miniaturization of magnetic devices is an attractive proposition, since circular nanomagnets with vortex as the magnetization groundstate have been considered as candidates in the composition of data storage devices²² and nanoparticles for cancer therapy²³.

The results obtained show that, for small central radius (CR), the energy of a vortex on a hyperboloid is lower than that on a catenoid, however unlike what was observed on other geometries (cylinder, torus and catenoid, for example), the vortex energy on the hyperboloid surface does not vanish when CR tends to infinity. Indeed, we have shown that the vortex energy tends asymptotically to $2\pi \ln(1+h^2)$, where $2h$ is the height of the hyperboloid. Furthermore, the polar hyperboloid presents the lowest energy when compared with the catenoid and the cylinder. This fact can, at first sight, indicate that circular nanomagnets with polar hyperboloid shape could sustain a vortex as the magnetization groundstate to smaller radius than those appearing in cylindrical magnetic nanorings. However, to

confirm this hypothesis, the magnetostatic and exchange energies must be taken into account for different magnetization configurations and the volume of the nanomagnet must be considered.

To proceed our analysis, this work is organized as follows: in Section II we present the continuous anisotropic Heisenberg Model and apply it to the surfaces of the catenoid and hyperboloid. The Section III brings the results and discussions, and compare our results with that obtained for the surface of a cylinder. Finally, in the Section IV, we present our conclusions and prospects for future works.

II. CONTINUUM HEISENBERG MODEL AND CONSIDERED SURFACES

The anisotropic exchange Heisenberg model, for nearest neighbor interacting spins on a two-dimensional lattice, is given by the Hamiltonian below:

$$H_{\text{latt}} = -J' \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} [m_i^x m_j^x + m_i^y m_j^y + (1 + \lambda) m_i^z m_j^z], \quad (1)$$

where J' denotes the coupling between neighboring spins, and according to $J' < 0$ or $J' > 0$, the Hamiltonian describes a ferro or antiferromagnetic system, respectively. $\vec{m}_i = (m_i^x, m_i^y, m_i^z)$ is the spin operator at site i and the parameter λ accounts for the anisotropy interaction amongst spins: for $\lambda > 0$, spins tend to align along the internal Z axis (easy-axis regime); for $\lambda = 0$, one gets the isotropic case; for $-1 < \lambda < 0$, we have the easy-plane regime, while the $\lambda = -1$ case yields to the so-called XY model, which has been recently considered in curved surfaces²⁵. If we focus on a two-component spin, imposing $m_z \equiv 0$, so that $\vec{m}_{RPM} = (m_x, m_y)$, we get the planar rotator model (PRM).

In the continuum approach of spatial and spin variables, valid at sufficiently large wavelength and low temperature, the model given by (1) may be written as follows ($J \equiv J'/2$):

$$H = J \iint \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \sum_{a,b=1}^3 g^{ij} h_{ab} (1 + \delta_{a3} \lambda) \left(\frac{\partial m^a}{\partial \eta_i} \right) \left(\frac{\partial m^b}{\partial \eta_j} \right) \sqrt{|g|} d\eta_1 d\eta_2 \quad (2)$$

where the surface has curvilinear coordinates η_1 and η_2 , $\sqrt{|g|} = \sqrt{|\det[g_{ij}]|}$, g^{ij} and h_{ab} are the surface and spin space metrics, respectively (as usual, $g^{ij} g_{jk} = \delta_k^i$). Now, $\vec{m} = (m_x, m_y, m_z) \equiv (\sin \Theta \cos \Phi, \sin \Theta \sin \Phi, \cos \Theta)$ is the classical spin vector field valued on a unity sphere (internal space), so that $\Theta = \Theta(\eta_1, \eta_2)$ and $\Phi = \Phi(\eta_1, \eta_2)$. With this, the Cartesian parametrization for \vec{m} yields to $h_{ab} = \delta_{ab}$. The Hamiltonian (2) may be also viewed as the anisotropic non-linear σ model (NL σ M), which lies on an arbitrary two-dimensional geometry.

Our interest is to study the above model on surfaces with negative and variable Gaussian curvature. In this way, we are considering two geometries with cylindrical symmetry, the catenoid and the hyperboloid. For our purposes, initially we will describe the mathematical properties and will apply the continuous anisotropic Heisenberg model on these surfaces. After, we will obtain the Euler-Lagrange equations derived from the Hamiltonians associated to each one of them.

1. Catenoid

The first geometry to be considered is that of the catenoid, which is a nonplanar minimal surface. The catenoid has mean curvature everywhere zero and has the fascinating property that it can be deformed into a helicoid in such a way that every surface along the way is a minimal surface, which is locally isometric to the helicoid. This surface appears in many physical systems, e. g., a soap film formed between two coaxial rings takes on this shape²⁶. Catenoid-like surfaces also appears in membrane fissions, where the characteristic of the neck shape is determined by the relationship between the neck radius and the monolayer thickness²⁷.

For describing our theoretical model in the geometry of the catenoid, we have parameterized this surface as follows:

$$x = \rho \cosh\left(\frac{z}{\rho}\right) \cos \varphi, \quad y = \rho \cosh\left(\frac{z}{\rho}\right) \sin \varphi, \quad (3)$$

where $\varphi \in [0, 2\pi]$, $z \in (-\infty, \infty)$ and ρ is the radius of the circle in the $z = 0$ plane. This parametrization gives a negative Gaussian curvature for the catenoid, and it is given by $G_{\text{cat}} = -\frac{1}{\rho^2} \text{sech}^4 \frac{z}{\rho}$.

From now on, we will adopt cylindrical symmetry to the spin coordinate system, that is, $\Theta \equiv \Theta(z)$ and $\Phi \equiv \Phi(\varphi)$. Thus, from Eq. (2), we have that $(\partial_\nu \Psi \equiv \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \nu})$:

$$H_{\text{cat}} = J \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{z_1}^{z_2} \left[\rho(1 + \lambda \sin^2 \Theta) (\partial_z \Theta)^2 + \frac{1}{\rho} \sin^2 \Theta (\partial_\varphi \Phi)^2 \right] dz d\varphi. \quad (4)$$

From the above Hamiltonian, the Euler-Lagrange equations are evaluated to give:

$$2(1 + \lambda \sin^2 \Theta) \rho \partial_z (\rho \partial_z \Theta) = \sin 2\Theta [(\partial_\varphi \Phi)^2 - \lambda (\rho \partial_z \Theta)^2] \quad (5)$$

and

$$\partial_\varphi^2 \Phi = 0 \longrightarrow \Phi = Q\varphi + \varphi_0 \quad (6)$$

where $Q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and φ_0 is a constant parameter that does not influence in the energy calculations.

2. Hyperboloid

The hyperboloid is a quadratic surface that may be one- or two-sheeted. The one-sheeted hyperboloid is a surface of revolution obtained by rotating a hyperbola about the perpendicular bisector to the line between the foci, that is, about the z axis, while the two-sheeted hyperboloid is a surface of revolution obtained by rotating a hyperbola about the line joining the foci.

When oriented along the z -axis, the one-sheeted circular hyperboloid with skirt radius ϱ has its parametrization given by:

$$x = \varrho \sqrt{1 + \eta^2} \cos \varphi, \quad y = \varrho \sqrt{1 + \eta^2} \sin \varphi \quad \text{and} \quad z = b\eta. \quad (7)$$

This parametrization yield a shape similar to the catenoid, however the last one has mean curvature null everywhere, while the mean curvature of the hyperboloid is given by²⁸:

$$K_{\text{hyp}} = \frac{b^2[\varrho^2(\eta^2 - 1) + b^2(1 + \eta^2)]}{2\varrho[\varrho^2 + b^2(1 + \eta^2)]^{(3/2)}}, \quad (8)$$

and the Gaussian curvature, which is also negative, is:

$$G_{\text{hyp}} = -\frac{b^2}{b^2 + (b^2 + \varrho^2)\eta^2}. \quad (9)$$

So, unlike the catenoid, the hyperboloid is not a minimal surface. Besides it, there are substantial differences in their (x, y) coordinates away from the plane $z = 0$, as well as in their geometrical properties.

For using the parametric equations (7), the anisotropic Heisenberg Hamiltonian (2) can be written as:

$$H_{\text{hyp}} = J \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{\eta_1}^{\eta_2} \left[\frac{1}{\chi'(\eta)} (1 + \lambda \sin^2 \Theta) (\partial_\eta \Theta)^2 + \chi'(\eta) \sin^2 \Theta (\partial_\varphi \Phi)^2 \right] d\eta d\varphi \quad (10)$$

where

$$\chi'(\eta) = \frac{\sqrt{b^2(1 + \eta^2) + \varrho^2\eta^2}}{\varrho(1 + \eta^2)}. \quad (11)$$

The general parametrization given in Eq. (7) leads to hard integrals to be calculated, so that, when necessary, they will be computed numerically. A particular and interesting kind of hyperboloid is given by the polar hyperbolic coordinate system (biharmonic coordinates), which can be obtained if we do $b = \varrho$ in the Eq. (7). This particular coordinate system was recently used to develop the pseudospherical functions on an one-sheeted polar hyperboloid²⁹. These functions may be important if we consider problems where the solution of the Laplace Equation in systems with hyperbolic symmetry is demanded. For example, they can be used to calculate the magnetostatic energy of magnets with hyperbolic shape or still, to calculate the electric/magnetic field inside a solenoids with this geometry, when

traversed by an electric current. The characteristic length of a hyperboloid described by the biharmonic coordinate system is given by:

$$\chi'_{b=e}(\eta) \equiv \chi(\eta) = \frac{\sqrt{1+2\eta^2}}{1+\eta^2}. \quad (12)$$

Lastly, the Euler-Lagrange equation related to Eq. (10) is evaluated to give:

$$2(1 + \lambda \sin^2 \Theta) \frac{1}{\chi'(\eta)} \partial_\eta \left(\frac{1}{\chi'(\eta)} \partial_\eta \Theta \right) = \sin 2\Theta \left[(\partial_\varphi \Phi)^2 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{\chi'(\eta)} \partial_\eta \Theta \right)^2 \right]. \quad (13)$$

The Eq. (6) also is obtained to the hyperboloid surface and we have omitted it here.

III. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

From the equations derived for both surfaces, one can see that (5) and (13) can be written in the below general form:

$$2(1 + \lambda \sin^2 \Theta) \partial_\zeta^2 \Theta = \sin 2\Theta \left[(\partial_\varphi \Phi)^2 - \lambda (\partial_\zeta \Theta)^2 \right], \quad (14)$$

and the Hamiltonians (4) and (10) are rewritten as:

$$H_{\text{general}} = J \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{\zeta_1}^{\zeta_2} [(1 + \lambda \sin^2 \Theta) (\partial_\zeta \Theta)^2 + \sin^2 \Theta (\partial_\varphi \Phi)^2] d\zeta d\varphi, \quad (15)$$

where ζ is a parameter that depends of the characteristic length of each surface, that is:

$$\zeta_{\text{cat}} = \int \frac{1}{\rho} dz = \frac{z}{\rho} + \kappa_1 \quad (16)$$

and

$$\zeta_{\text{phyp}} = \int \chi(\eta) d\eta = \sqrt{2} \operatorname{arcsinh}(\sqrt{2}\eta) + \frac{1}{4} \ln \left(\frac{1 + 3\eta^2 - 2\eta\sqrt{1+2\eta^2}}{1 + 3\eta^2 + 2\eta\sqrt{1+2\eta^2}} \right) + \kappa_2, \quad (17)$$

where κ_i ($i = 1, 2$) is an integration constant, ζ_{cat} and ζ_{phyp} are the parameters for the catenoid and polar hyperboloid, respectively. The integral associated to the ζ parameter for a general hyperboloid ($b \neq \varrho$) has not a simple solution, so, when necessary, it will be calculated numerically.

As expected, the anisotropic Heisenberg model is described by nonlinear differential equations and suitable nontrivial solutions can be obtained provided that some conditions are imposed, so that special solutions, for the most general Eq. (14), will be obtained for solving it for two particular values of λ . Initially, we consider the isotropic case, where $\lambda = 0$ and after, we take $\lambda = -1$ to study the XY model, whose simplest solution is a vortex. At this point, one can note that the equations above resemble in form those counterparts for the planar, cylindrical¹⁴, spherical¹³, pseudospherical¹² and toroidal¹⁰ surfaces. Indeed, whenever ζ is identified with $\int \frac{s}{\mathcal{R} + s \sin \theta}$, $\int \frac{1}{\mathcal{S} \sin \theta}$, or $\int \frac{1}{R\tau}$, while φ keeps its role as the azimuth-like angle, the equations above recover their toroidal, spherical or pseudospherical analogs. Above, \mathcal{R} and s are the rotating and axial radius of the torus, respectively, \mathcal{S} is the sphere radius and $R\tau$ accounts for the distance measured along pseudospherical geodesic, say, a hyperbole.

A. The $\lambda = 0$ case

In the model adopted in this work, when we take $\lambda = 0$, one get the isotropic Heisenberg model, which has been previously studied on the surfaces considered²⁴. In that work, skyrmion-like solutions were obtained, and half-skyrmions were found on the paraboloid surface. Here, we show that these appear like solutions to the model and have energy corresponding to the first class of the second homotopy group if we consider an infinity surface. However, these excitations have not topological stability for a finite catenoid/hyperboloid. From now on, without lost of generality, we will take $\mathcal{Q} = 1$, thus the Eq. (14) is rewritten as:

$$2\partial_\zeta^2 \Theta = \sin 2\Theta, \quad (18)$$




FIG. 1. [Color online] Vortex pattern with winding number $\mathcal{Q} = 1$ on the surfaces of the catenoid, hyperboloid and cylinder. In these cases, the spins turn around the surface in a closed way. In spite of they have different shape, the characteristic length associated to the cylinder and catenoid are equal. Besides it, one can see that the shape of the catenoid and hyperboloid surfaces are similar, however, they have different characteristic length and the mean curvature of the catenoid is null, while the mean curvature of the hyperboloid is nonzero. See discussion on the text.

that is the sine-Gordon equation, whose solution can be given by³⁰:

$$\Theta(\zeta) = 2 \arctan(e^\zeta). \quad (19)$$

From (15), the energy associated to (19) is evaluated to give:

$$E_s = 2\pi J \int [(\partial_\zeta \Theta)^2 + \sin^2 \Theta] d\zeta = -\frac{8\pi J}{e^{2\zeta} + 1}, \quad (20)$$

from where one can see that, if we consider a finite surface, the energy associated to the Eq. (19) is lower than $8\pi J$, such that it does not represent an integer π soliton. Indeed, it represents a half-soliton solution, which has not topological stability on the considered geometries. However, when we take this solution on an infinity surface, one get an integer soliton, with energy $E_s = 8\pi J$, so belonging to the first class of the second homotopy group, as predicted from the Bogomol'nyi inequality³¹. The soliton energy on an infinity catenoid (hyperboloid) can be obtained for taking $z_1(\eta_1) = -\infty$ and $z_2(\eta_2) = \infty$ in the Hamiltonians (4) and (10), respectively. Periodic soliton solutions also can be obtained for the surfaces considered here^{14,24} and the differences among these particle-like excitations in these and other geometries are associated with their characteristic length, which are closely related to the curvature of the surface²⁴.

B. The $\lambda = -1$ case

A vortex-like excitation could be obtained from the isotropic Heisenberg Hamiltonian, however, we have chosen to work with the XY model, that can be given for taking $\lambda = -1$ in the model adopted here. This choice is justified by the fact that it inserts constraints in the solutions for Θ . In fact, it stays confined in the xy -plane. In this case, the Eq. (14) is simplified to:

$$2 \cos^2 \Theta \partial_\zeta^2 \Theta = \sin 2\Theta [1 + (\partial_\zeta \Theta)^2], \quad (21)$$

for which the simplest solution is $\Theta = \pi/2$ and, from Eq. (6), we obtain a vortex with winding number $\mathcal{Q} = 1$. The pattern of these vortices, for the studied surfaces and for the cylinder, can be viewed in the Fig. 1.

The vortex energy for each surface considered is determined from Eq. (15), and it is evaluated to give:

$$E_{\text{vortex}} = 2\pi J \zeta \Big|_{\zeta_1}^{\zeta_2} \quad (22)$$

where ζ is given by the Eqs. (16) and (17), ζ_1 and ζ_2 are the lower and upper bounds of the integrals.

The energy of the vortex on a catenoid with height $2h$ and CR ρ is given for taking $\zeta_1 = -\frac{h}{\rho}$ and $\zeta_2 = \frac{h}{\rho}$. In this way, the Eq. 22 is evaluated to give:

$$E_{\text{vortex}}^{\text{cat}} = \frac{4\pi J h}{\rho}, \quad (23)$$

that is the same energy obtained for a vortex on surface of a cylinder with height $2h$ and radius ρ . This is an interesting result, since the area of the catenoid is greater than that of the cylinder. This fact can be explained because these surfaces have the same characteristic length $1/\rho$, what can be noted by the development of the Hamiltonian 15 for the cylinder. Besides from the analysis of the Fig. 1, it can be noted that, in the $z = 0$ plane, the neighbor spins on the catenoid must have the angle equal to that of the spins on the cylinder, however, when $z \neq 0$, the neighbor spins that turning around the catenoid surface have a lower deviation one to another, when compared with that of the cylinder, diminishing the exchange energy (given by the Heisenberg model) in this plane, compensating the largest area. Saying that on another way, if the circle situated in the plane $z = h$, for each surface, is divided in points with a distance Δx one to another, we have that the circle on the cylinder is divided in $n' = \frac{2\pi\rho}{\Delta x}$ points, while the circle on the catenoid is divided in $n = \frac{2\pi\rho \cosh(h/\rho)}{\Delta x}$. In this way, we have that $n = n' \cosh \frac{h}{\rho}$. On the other hand, the circle can be divided in arcs of angles $\theta = \frac{2\pi}{n}$ and $\theta' = \frac{2\pi}{n'}$ for the catenoid and cylinder, respectively. It is immediate to note that $\theta = \frac{\theta'}{\cosh(h/\rho)}$. A closed spin texture on these circles can be given by associate a spin for each point, in such way that the angle between two neighbor spins is θ (θ') for the catenoid (cylinder). The energy for a this vortex-like structure in the circle on the catenoid is $E_{\text{cat}} = \sum_{i,j} \cos \theta_{ij} = n \cos \theta$, where the subscripts i and j indicate neighbor spins. The energy for the circle on the cylinder is $E_{\text{cyl}} = n' \cos \theta'$. Finally, E_{cat} and E_{cyl} are related by:

$$E_{\text{cat}} = \frac{n \cos \frac{2\pi}{n}}{n' \cos \frac{2\pi}{n'}} E_{\text{cyl}}. \quad (24)$$

For $n \gg 1$, we have that $E_{\text{cat}} = E_{\text{cyl}} \cosh \frac{h}{\rho}$. Now, the cylinder and catenoid heights can be divided in m' and m circles, respectively. The total energy of the vortex on the surfaces are given by:

$$E_{\text{tcyl}} = m' E_{\text{cyl}} \quad \text{and} \quad E_{\text{tcat}} = m E_{\text{cat}} = m E_{\text{cyl}} \cosh \frac{h}{\rho}. \quad (25)$$

Since $m = m' \frac{\rho}{h} \sinh \frac{h}{\rho}$, we obtain:

$$E_{\text{tcat}} = \left(\frac{\rho}{2h} \sinh \frac{2h}{\rho} \right) E_{\text{tcyl}}. \quad (26)$$

If $\frac{2h}{\rho} \ll 1 \rightarrow \sinh \frac{2h}{\rho} \approx \frac{2h}{\rho}$, thus $E_{\text{tcat}} = E_{\text{tcyl}}$, as we wanted to show. This discrete analysis is not valid for large $2h/\rho$ values, once in this limit, the approximation of the surfaces by points does not represent the continuum approach to the Heisenberg Hamiltonian and the results obtained for the catenoid does not agree with that found in the Eq. (23).

In the case of the hyperboloid, the characteristic length is given by $\chi'(\eta)$ and analytical calculations will be done only for the biharmonic coordinates. In this case, to obtain and analyse the vortex energy on a hyperboloid with height $2h$, we will take the limits $\eta_1 = -h/\varrho$ and $\eta_2 = h/\varrho$ in the Hamiltonian (10). Thus, the vortex energy is given by:

$$E_{\text{vortex}}^{\text{hyp}} = 4\pi J \left[\sqrt{2} \operatorname{arcsinh} \left(\sqrt{2} \frac{h}{\varrho} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \ln \left(\frac{1 + 3 \left(\frac{h}{\varrho} \right)^2 - 2 \frac{h}{\varrho} \sqrt{1 + 2 \left(\frac{h}{\varrho} \right)^2}}{1 + 3 \left(\frac{h}{\varrho} \right)^2 + 2 \frac{h}{\varrho} \sqrt{1 + 2 \left(\frac{h}{\varrho} \right)^2}} \right) \right]. \quad (27)$$

Despite of the polar hyperbolic coordinates give us an analytical solution to the vortex energy, it also will be interesting to calculate numerically the vortex energy for the most general hyperboloid ($b \neq \varrho$) and analyse its behavior with the radius ϱ . The numerical integration was done for using the Simpsons rule with a Fortran code, and the results can be viewed in Fig. 2.

For continuing our analysis, it will be useful to define upper radius (UR), that is the value of the radius of the surfaces in the plane $z = \pm h$. The cylinder, the catenoid and the hyperboloid have their CR and UR related by:

$$R_{\text{Upper}}^{\text{cyl}} = r, \quad R_{\text{Upper}}^{\text{cat}} = \rho \cosh \left(\frac{h}{\rho} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad R_{\text{Upper}}^{\text{hyp}} = \varrho \sqrt{1 + h^2}, \quad (28)$$

where r , ρ and ϱ are the CR of the cylinder, catenoid and hyperboloid ($b = 1$), respectively.

From the Fig. 2, one can note that, for small values of ϱ , the vortex on a hyperboloid has lower energy than that on a catenoid. However, when ϱ increases, this behavior changes, and the energy of a vortex on the hyperboloid becomes greater than that on the catenoid. The value of ϱ for the transition point in which the vortex energy on the hyperboloid




FIG. 2. [Color online] Vortex energy on the catenoid (black line) and the hyperboloid (red dashed line). Here, we have did $J = 1$, $b = 1$ and ϱ is evaluated in the interval from 0.01 to 20. Four values of h are considered, $h = 1.5$ (top left), $h = 2.5$ (top right), $h = 5$ (bottom left) and $h = 10$ (bottom right). One can see that, for small values of CR (central radius), the energy of a vortex on the hyperboloid is lower than that of the vortex on a catenoid. However, for large values of CR, the vortex energy on a catenoid vanishes, while that of the hyperboloid tends to $2\pi \ln(1+h^2)$. The energy of a vortex on the polar hyperboloid (magenta dots) is always lower than that on a catenoid and, unlike the general hyperboloid ($b \neq \varrho$), it vanishes when $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$.

and on the catenoid intersect themselves depends on h , and varies from $\varrho \approx 2$ for $h = 1.5$ to $\varrho \approx 4$ for $h = 10$. This fact can be explained from the differences of the properties of the geometries of the catenoid and hyperboloid when $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$ and the height h is maintained constant. While the catenoid has its UR related with the height by $\cosh(h/\rho)$, the UR of the hyperboloid grows with $\sqrt{1+h^2}$, what implies that for $\rho \gg h$, we have $R_{\text{Upper}}^{\text{cat}} \rightarrow R_{\text{Upper}}^{\text{cyl}}$ and $R_{\text{Upper}}^{\text{hyp}} \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, for $\rho \gg h$, the catenoid surface looks like a cylinder, while the hyperboloid has the topology and geometry of a plane with a hole. The analysis of the Fig. 2 shows still that when $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$, $E_{\text{vortex}}^{\text{hyp}} \rightarrow 2\pi \ln(1+h^2)$. This is the second time that an hyperbolic surface presents an asymptotical finite and nonzero energy when the radius of the surface tends to infinity¹². This can be explained because, unlike the catenoid case, the characteristic length of the hyperboloid does not tend to zero when $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$. In fact:

$$\chi'(\eta)_{\varrho \rightarrow 0} = \frac{\eta}{1+\eta^2} \Rightarrow \zeta_{\text{hyp}}^{\varrho \rightarrow \infty} = \ln(1+\eta^2). \quad (29)$$

Finally, the case where $b \neq 1$ does not lead to qualitative changes on the vortex energy behavior on a hyperboloid. In this case, the curve that characterizes the vortex energy is moved upwardly, however, as well as the $b = 1$ case, it tends to $2\pi \ln(1+h^2)$. It happens because the b value does not affect the asymptotic behavior of ζ_{hyp} when $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$, see Eq. (11).

Another interesting result is the fact of the vortex energy on the polar hyperboloid is always lower than that on the catenoid. As expected, for small CR ($\varrho \approx b = 1$), the vortex energy on the biharmonic coordinates is the approximately that obtained for the general hyperboloid. In addition, it can be observed that $E_{\text{phyp}} \rightarrow 0$ when $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$ (See Fig. 2). This fact can be explained because in this limit, the polar hyperboloid looks like a catenoid and

its characteristic length is given by:

$$\chi'(\eta)_{\varrho \rightarrow \infty} = 1 \Rightarrow \zeta_{\text{phys}}^{\varrho \rightarrow \infty} = z/\rho = \zeta_{\text{cat}}. \quad (30)$$

The fact that the lowest value found for the vortex energy occurs on the polar hyperboloid indicates that, at first sight, among the geometries considered here, a nanomagnet with this shape could support a vortex-like magnetization with more stability than the other ones. However, to ensure this statement, one must calculate the magnetostatic energy for other possible magnetization states and consider the volume of the magnet.

If we consider the case where the UR of the three surfaces are equal, one can note immediately that the catenoid has lower energy than that of the cylinder, since the vortex energy for both surfaces is inversely proportional to the CR. However, there are not qualitative changes when we think in the hyperboloid case. Here, as well as the previous analysis, the vortex energy on the three surfaces diminishes with the increasing of the UR, tending to zero when $r \rightarrow \infty$ (cylinder, catenoid and polar hyperboloid).

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS

We have applied the anisotropic Heisenberg model to study topological spin excitations on the surfaces of the catenoid and hyperboloid, that have negative and variable Gaussian curvature. For considering the isotropic case ($\lambda = 0$), we obtained soliton-like solutions. For $\lambda = -1$, one obtains the XY model, whose simplest solution is a vortex with winding number $Q = 1$. The energy associated to the vortices, for each surface, was compared with that presented for a vortex on the cylinder. It was observed that for small CR, the general hyperboloid ($b \neq \varrho$) presents a vortex energy lower than that for the cylinder and catenoid, however, for $\varrho \rightarrow \infty$, unlike the catenoid case, the vortex energy on a hyperboloid does not vanish.

The lowest value for the vortex energy is given for the polar hyperboloid what can indicate, at first sight, that this geometry is the best one to support a vortex-like excitation in magnetic systems. However, when we think in nanomagnetism applications, this fact does not ensure that nanomagnets with this geometry could support a vortex magnetization configuration with more stability than cylindrical nanorings. To state that, one must consider the volume of a hyperbolic nanoring and take into account the magnetostatic energy to calculate the magnetic energy associated to other magnetization configurations. So, if we think in miniaturization of magnetic elements, the results of this work can help to understand the influence of the curvature in magnetic properties of nanostructures and give a way to diminish the radius of nanoparticles maintaining the stability of the vortex.

The results obtained here also can be interesting on the magnetoelastic membrane manipulation subject, once vortex configuration could be used to deform the geometry of magnetoelastic surfaces to obtain a particular shape. In this way, it must be an important task to study the vortex energy behavior on surfaces with positive gaussian curvature and include the elastic energy term on that analysis. In addition, it would be relevant to study the influence of an external magnetic field on the energy calculations of magnetoelastic materials presenting a vortex-like configuration.

Acknowledgements

We thank to the Brazilian agency CNPq (project number 562867/2010-4), for financial support. We also are grateful to E. S. Palitot, J. S. Santos, W. A. Moura-Melo and A. R. Pereira for fruitful discussions.

* vagson.santos@ufv.br

¹ J. M. Kosterlitz, and D. J. Thouless, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **6**, 1181 (1973).

² W. T. M. Irvine, V. Vitelli, and P. M. Chaikin, *Nature* **468**, 947 (2010).

³ S.-B. Choe, Y. Acremann, A. Schöll, A. Bauer, A. Doran, J. Stohr, and H. A. Padmore, *Science* **304**, 420 (2004); A. Wachowiak, J. Wiebe, M. Bode, O. Pietzsch, M. Morgenstern, and R. Wiesendanger, *Science* **298**, 577 (2002); V. Novosad, K. Yu. Guslienko, H. Shima, Y. Otani, K. Fukamichi, N. Kikuchi, O. Kitakami, and Y. Shimada, *IEEE Trans. on Magnetics*, **37**, (2001).

⁴ X. Z. Yu, Y. Onose, N. Kanazawa, J. H. Park, J. H. Han, Y. Matsui, N. Nagaosa, and Y. Tokura, *Nature* **465**, 901 (2010); K.-S. Lee, M.-W. Yoo, Y.-S. Choi, and S.-K. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 147201 (2011).

⁵ R. P. Cowburn, D. K. Koltsov, A. O. Adeyeye, M. E. Welland, and D. M. Tricker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1042 (1999).

⁶ A. Vansteenkiste, M. Weigand, M. Curcic, H. Stoll, G. Schütz, and B. Van Waeyenbergh, *New Journal of Physics* **11**, 063006 (2009).

⁷ V. Vitelli, and A. M. Turner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 215301 (2004).

⁸ V. L. Carvalho-Santos, W. A. Moura-Melo, and A. R. Pereira, *J. Appl. Phys.* **108**, 094310 (2010).

- ⁹ F. A. Apolonio, W. A. Moura-Melo, F. P. Crisafuli, A. R. Pereira, and R. L. Silva, *J. Appl. Phys.* **106**, 084320 (2009).
- ¹⁰ V. L. Carvalho-Santos, A. R. Moura, W. A. Moura Melo, and A. R. Pereira, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 134450 (2008).
- ¹¹ J. Benoit, and R. Dandoloff, *Phys. Lett. A* **248**, 439 (1998); A. Saxena, R. Dandoloff, and T. Lookman, *Physica A* **261**, 13 (1998);
- ¹² L. R. A. Belo, N. M. Oliveira-Neto, W. A. Moura-Melo, A. R. Pereira, and E. Ercolessi, *Phys. Lett. A* **365**, 463 (2007).
- ¹³ G. S. Milagre, and W. A. Moura-Melo, *Phys. Lett. A* **368**, 155 (2007).
- ¹⁴ S. Villain-Guillot, R. Dandoloff, A. Saxena, and A. R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, 6712 (1995); L. A. N. de Paula, *Bras. Journ. of Phys.* **39**, 711 (2009).
- ¹⁵ W. A. Freitas, W. A. Moura-Melo, and A. R. Pereira, *Phys. Lett. A* **336**, 412 (2005); W. A. Moura-Melo, A. R. Pereira, L. A. S. Mól, and A. S. T. Pires, *Phys. Lett. A* **360**, 472 (2007).
- ¹⁶ A. Saxena, and R. Dandoloff, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 104414 (2002).
- ¹⁷ V. P. Kravchuk, D. D. Sheka, R. Streubel, D. Makarov, O. G. Schmidt, and Y. Gaididei, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 144433 (2012).
- ¹⁸ J. Gravesen, and M. Willatzen, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 032108 (2005); V. Atanasov, and R. Dandoloff, *Phys. Lett. A* **371**, 118 (2007); V. Atanasov, and R. Dandoloff, *Phys. Lett. A* **372**, 6141 (2008); Bjørn Jensen, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 022101 (2009); V. Atanasov, R. Dandoloff, and A. Saxena, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 033404 (2009).
- ¹⁹ A. Saxena, and R. Dandoloff, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, R563 (1998).
- ²⁰ M. Lapine, I. V. Shadrivov, D. A. Powell, and Y. S. Kivshar, *Nature Materials* **11**, (2012) 30.
- ²¹ T. Georgiou, L. Britnell, P. Blake, R. V. Gorbachev, A. Gholinia, A. K. Geim, C. Casiraghi, and K. S. Novoselov, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **99**, 093103 (2011).
- ²² J.-G. Dai, Y. Zheng, and G. A. Prinz, *J. Appl. Phys.* **87**, 6668 (2000); G. A. Prinz, *J. Magn. Mag. Mat.* **200**, 57 (1999); S. H. Sun, C. B. Murray, D. Weller, L. Folks, and A. Moser, *Science* **287**, 1989 (2000); G. A. Prinz, *Science* **282**, 1660 (1998).
- ²³ D.-H. Kim, E. Rozhkova, I. Ulasov, S. Bader, T. Rajh, M. Lesniak, and V. Novosad, *Nature Matter.*, DOI: 10.1038/NMAT2591 (2009); E.A. Rozhkova, V. Novosad, D.-H. Kim, J. Pearson, R. Divan, T. Rajh, and S. D. Bader, *J. Appl. Phys.* **105**, 07B306 (2009); E.A. Rozhkova, I. Ulasov, B. Lai, N. M. Dimitrijevic, M. S. Lesniak, and T. Rajh, *Nano Lett.* **9**, 3337 (2009).
- ²⁴ R. Dandoloff, and A. Saxena, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44**, 045203 (2011).
- ²⁵ R. Dandoloff, and A. Saxena, *Phys. Lett. A* **358**, 421 (2006); X. Peng, S. Wu, J. Li, D. Suter, and J. Du, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 240405 (2010); Y. Komura, and Y. Okabe, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.:* **44**, 015002 (2011).
- ²⁶ T. R. Powers, G. Huber, and R. E. Goldstein, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 041901 (2002).
- ²⁷ Y. Kozlovsky, and M. M. Kozlov, *Biophys. J.* **85**, 85 (2003).
- ²⁸ E. W. Weisstein, "Hyperboloid." From MathWorld - A Wolfram Web Resource. <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/Hyperboloid.html>
- ²⁹ K. Kowalski, J. Rembieliński, and A. Szcześniak, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.:* **44**, 085302 (2011).
- ³⁰ R. Rajaraman, *Solitons and Instantons: An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984).
- ³¹ E. B. Bogomolnyi, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **26**, (1976) 449.