

Systematic derivation of realistic spin-models for beyond-Heisenberg solids from microscopic model

Markus Hoffmann* and Stefan Blügel

Peter Grünberg Institut and Institute for Advanced Simulation, Forschungszentrum Jülich and JARA, 52425 Jülich Germany

(Dated: August 10, 2022)

We present a systematic derivation of effective lattice spin Hamiltonians based on a rotational invariant multi-orbital Hubbard model including a term ensuring Hund's rule coupling. The model is derived down-folding the fermionic degree of freedom of the Hubbard model into the proper low-energy spin sector using Löwdin partitioning, which will be outlined in details for the case of two sites and two orbitals at each site. We show that up to fourth order perturbation of the ground state by hopping electrons, we find for $S \geq 1$ a biquadratic, 3-spin and 4-spin interaction beyond the conventional Heisenberg term. Taking the limit of classical spins, we show that the so far not considered 3-spin interaction explains the puzzling energy spectrum of the magnetic states for a single Fe monolayer on Ru(0001) obtained from density functional theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

Magnetic interactions have captivated several generations of condensed matter physicists because of their variety of physical origins in very different solids, the emergence of a vast spectrum of magnetic structures as a result of their competition and subsequently the many interesting physical phenomena that are arising from those magnetic structures [1–3]. Noncoplanar spin-textures and topological magnetization solitons such as skyrmions are timely examples of complex magnetic structures with a large spectrum of exotic properties, which are interesting for basic research as well as applications in spintronics [4]. Understanding the properties of these novel spin-textures has revitalized the field of magnetic interactions. In this context itinerant magnets play an important role as the itinerant electrons give rise to these complex magnetic structures and in turn the complex magnetic structures give rise to interesting transport phenomena [5–7].

In a materials specific context, the theoretical descriptions of magnetic ground states as well as the dynamical or thermodynamical properties of magnetic systems are often achieved through a multi-scale approach: density functional theory (DFT) calculations are mapped onto a classical lattice spin Hamiltonian, *i.e.* a lattice of classical spins, whose properties are then evaluated carrying out Monte-Carlo or spin-dynamic simulations [8–10]. For many bulk as well as application customized multilayer and heterostructure systems, the well-known spin $S = 1/2$ -Heisenberg model [11] of quantum spins \mathbf{S} is extrapolated to systems with higher quantum spin, $S > 1/2$, or even classical vector spins \mathbf{S} providing a parameterization of an effective spin Hamiltonian successful in describing the required magnetic properties. This holds also true for metallic magnetic materials, in particular those for which the longitudinal spin-fluctuations are unimportant as compared to the transversal ones. These are typically magnets of transition metals with atomic spin moments in the order of $2 \mu_B$ and larger such as for Mn, Fe, Co in their bulk phases, as alloys and multilayers of those that are frequently used in spintronic

devices. In fact, describing typical properties of those magnetic metals one resorts to the classical Heisenberg model of bilinear exchange interactions of the form

$$H_1 = - \sum'_{ij} J_{ij} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \quad (1)$$

between pairs of classical spins \mathbf{S} at different lattice sites i, j with exchange interactions J_{ij} whose signs and strengths depend on details of the electronic structure such as for example of the topology of the Fermi surface. The superscript $'$ of the sum indicates here and throughout the paper that any summations of two equal sites are excluded. The spatial dependence of the exchange interaction follows typically the crystal anisotropy imposed by the crystal lattice and they can be long-ranged, in opposite to insulators, where they are typically short-ranged. A success of this approach is for example the prediction of magnetic structures consistent to experiments [12] or the Curie temperatures of bulk ferromagnets [13, 14]. The minus sign in (1) is a convention we follow for all spin lattice Hamiltonians throughout the paper.

There are, however, well-known cases where the Heisenberg model is insufficient to describe the magnetic structure or magnon excitations correctly. One of the most commonly applied extensions of the bilinear Heisenberg form is the addition of the biquadratic exchange, a term of the form

$$H_2 = - \sum'_{ij} B_{ij} (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j)^2. \quad (2)$$

This term has been motivated by very different microscopic origins, through superexchange [1], magnetoelastic effect [15, 16] or interlayer exchange coupling [17]. According to the algebra of the spin operators, any power of scalar products of pairs of quantum spins of total spin S at sites i, j , can only have $2S$ independent powers up to $(\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j)^{2S}$. Thus, for the biquadratic term to occur requires at least a total spin $S = 1$ at the lattice sites. As we will see below, as the power of $(\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j)$ is related to the order of perturbation theory, the biquadratic term [18–26] is the most essential correction to

the Heisenberg model for spins $S > 1/2$ involving two lattice sites.

Involving more lattice sites, a systematic extension of the bilinear Heisenberg form is the four-spin interaction, which was derived by Takahashi [27] for a spin 1/2-system treating electrons by a single band Hubbard model. It arises in fourth order perturbation theory of electron hopping versus Coulomb interaction [28]. The four-spin interaction consists of four-body operators that appear by permuting all spins in a four-membered ring and can be written in the limit of classical spin as

$$H_4 = - \sum'_{ijkl} K_{ijkl} [(\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j)(\mathbf{S}_k \cdot \mathbf{S}_l) + (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_l)(\mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_k) - (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_k)(\mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_l)], \quad (3)$$

with the sum over all rings of four sites.

A typical signature of the higher-order spin interaction is the occurrence of non-collinear states, *e.g.* canted magnetic states [29] or multi-q states, a superposition of spin-spiral states of symmetry related wave vectors q . A spin-spiral state with a single q-vector [29] is the exact solution of the classical Heisenberg model for a periodic lattice [30]. The higher-order terms couple modes of symmetry equivalent q vectors and can lead to complex magnetic structures of energies lower than the single-q state.

Although the higher-order spin models were mostly applied to magnets with localized electrons such as magnetic insulators, comparing DFT results for itinerant metallic magnets with spin-models reveals their significance also for these systems. Examples are contributions of the biquadratic term to the spin-stiffness of the bulk magnets Fe, Co and Ni [31], the conical spin-spirals [32], or even three-dimensional non-collinear spin structures on a two-dimensional lattice as in Mn/Cu(111) [33] or Fe/Ir(111) [34], where the 4-spin interaction couples spin spirals with different propagation directions and forms a square lattice of chiral magnetic skyrmions of atomic scale size.

Summarizing the spin-models discussed so far we can view the Heisenberg, biquadratic and four-spin model as a two-spin-two-site, four-spin-two-site, and four-spin-four-site interaction, respectively. This 4-spin interaction is motivated from a single-band Hubbard model of a spin $S = 1/2$ system. However, typical magnetic moments at surfaces are in the order of 2 or 3 μ_B equivalent to $S = 1$ or $S = 3/2$. Further, using these classification terms, a four-spin-three-site interaction is missing. Indeed, various partly phenomenological models of three-spin interactions [20, 35–39] had been proposed or derived to explain experiments mostly for insulating magnets. We would like to note that the nomenclature three-spin interactions has recently drawn criticism as the interaction indicates lack of time-inversion symmetry. In the context of this paper we use it synonymously to four-spin-three-site interaction.

In this paper we provide a consistent and systematic derivation of expressions describing the beyond-

Heisenberg higher-order spin interactions resulting from the electron-electron interaction up to the fourth order in the hopping interaction strength of electrons for total spins of size $S \geq 1/2$. This involves all possible sequences of four hopping events of electrons between orbitals at maximal four sites. The spin-orbit interaction is neglected at this point. The starting point is the rotationally invariant multi-orbital Hubbard model assuming half-filling, which will be explained in the next section. The spin-model is derived down-folding the dynamical fermionic degrees of freedom of electrons described by the Hubbard model into the proper low-energy spin sector using Löwdin partitioning [40, 41], which is also known as Schrieffer-Wolf transformation [42, 43]. Löwdin partitioning is briefly sketched for a dimer of $S = 1$ spins described by two electron orbitals at each site. Then, we will present our results for different numbers of sites and orbitals and also for lattices with different space groups like a square lattice as *e.g.* for magnetic atoms on a (001)-surface of a fcc crystal or on a hexagonal lattice like the (111)-surface to adapt the theoretical approach to real systems. Taking the classical spin-limit of the quantum spin-models derived, we reproduce the known spin Hamiltonians plus the missing three-spin interaction

$$H_3 = - \sum'_{ijk} Y_{ijk} [(\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j)(\mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_k) + (\mathbf{S}_k \cdot \mathbf{S}_j)(\mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_i)], \quad (4)$$

where the sum goes over triangles of sites. At the end we will analyze the energy spectrum for different magnetic structures as obtained from density functional theory for a single Fe monolayer on Ru(0001) and subsequently show that the so far puzzling results [44] finally can be understood.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Multi-band Hubbard model

In this section we briefly introduce the Hamiltonian, from which we start our derivations, and define the most important parameters of our model. In the following section we will then focus on mapping the Hamiltonian onto a spin model.

Previous similar investigations [27, 28] typically used the one-band Hubbard model [45–47] as a starting point, as it is the simplest model for the description of interacting electrons on a lattice. For the practical magnetic systems we have in mind with typical magnetic spin moments in the order of 2 or 3 μ_B ($S = 1$ or $S = 3/2$), we extend our investigation to systems with more than one orbital per site (*e.g.* d -orbitals of transition metals). Therefore, we work with a generalized Hubbard Hamiltonian, which not only includes the additional hoppings and Coulomb interactions, but contains also additional terms to ensure Hund's rule coupling. The Hund's terms are included as we are interested in states with a fixed

and stable magnetic moment S per atom or site:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H} = & - \sum_{i < j, \alpha, \sigma} t_{i, \alpha, j, \alpha} \left(c_{i, \alpha, \sigma}^\dagger c_{j, \alpha, \sigma} + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& - \sum_{\substack{i < j, \sigma \\ \alpha \neq \alpha'}} t'_{i, \alpha, j, \alpha'} \left(c_{i, \alpha, \sigma}^\dagger c_{j, \alpha', \sigma} + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& + \sum_{i, \alpha} U_{i, \alpha} \hat{n}_{i, \alpha, \uparrow} \hat{n}_{i, \alpha, \downarrow} \\
& + \sum_{\substack{i, \sigma \\ \alpha < \alpha'}} U'_{i, \alpha, \alpha'} \left(\hat{n}_{i, \alpha, \sigma} \hat{n}_{i, \alpha', \sigma} + \hat{n}_{i, \alpha, \sigma} \hat{n}_{i, \alpha', \bar{\sigma}} \right) \\
& - \sum_{\substack{i, \sigma \\ \alpha < \alpha'}} J_{i, \alpha, \alpha'} \hat{n}_{i, \alpha, \sigma} \hat{n}_{i, \alpha', \sigma} \\
& - \sum_{i, \alpha < \alpha'} J_{i, \alpha, \alpha'} \left(c_{i, \alpha, \uparrow}^\dagger c_{i, \alpha, \downarrow} c_{i, \alpha', \downarrow}^\dagger c_{i, \alpha', \uparrow} + \text{h.c.} \right) \\
& - \sum_{i, \alpha < \alpha'} J'_{i, \alpha, \alpha'} \left(c_{i, \alpha, \uparrow}^\dagger c_{i, \alpha', \uparrow} c_{i, \alpha, \downarrow}^\dagger c_{i, \alpha', \downarrow} + \text{h.c.} \right). \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, i and j represent the atomic sites, α and α' stand for the orbitals and σ is the quantization of the spin projection of the electron (\uparrow or \downarrow). $\hat{n}_{i, \alpha, \sigma} = c_{i, \alpha, \sigma}^\dagger c_{i, \alpha, \sigma}$ defines the number of electrons at site i in orbital α with spin σ . t describes the hopping strength between two different sites of the same orbital types, while t' describes the hopping strength into an other orbital type [48]. The on-site hopping between different orbitals is not considered as we assume the orbitals to be orthogonal with respect to each other ($t'_{i, \alpha, i, \alpha'} = 0$).

Only on-site Coulomb interactions are taken into account throughout the paper. Having a periodic solid in mind with only one atom type, we assume that the Coulomb interaction between electrons is the same for each site and orbital α , $U_{i, \alpha} = U$, as well as for electrons between different orbitals, $U'_{i, \alpha, \alpha'} = U'$. Analogously, $J_{i, \alpha, \alpha'} = J_H$ and $J'_{i, \alpha, \alpha'} = J'_H$ simplifies due to the absence of the site dependency.

This Hamiltonian will now be used to investigate different systems that vary by the number of sites and orbitals and also by the lattice type. To map the electron Hamiltonian (5) onto an effective spin-model we use the so-called Löwdin partitioning [40, 41], which will be described in the next section.

B. Löwdin partitioning

Here we explain briefly how the Löwdin partitioning [40, 41] is used to derive an effective spin Hamiltonian. We take as example the smallest interacting system with more than one orbital per site namely two sites with two orbitals each. Assuming half-filled orbitals, we deal with four electrons, which might be spread over the four available orbitals. Thus, an orbital, $|s\rangle$, can be occupied

by s equal one or two electrons or it can be unoccupied, denoted as $|\cdot\rangle$. The possible states sorted according to the angular momentum quantum number m , representing the z -component of the total spin of the system include the following product states:

$$\begin{aligned}
m = 2 : & |\uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle \\
m = 1 : & |\uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle, \\
& |\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \cdot\rangle, |\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot\rangle, |\uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \cdot\rangle, \\
& |\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot\rangle, |\uparrow, \uparrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, \\
& |\uparrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\cdot, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\cdot, \uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle \\
m = 0 : & |\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, \\
& |\downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \cdot, \downarrow\rangle, \\
& |\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot\rangle, |\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, \\
& |\uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot\rangle, \\
& |\cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\cdot, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \uparrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, \\
& |\cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, \\
& |\cdot, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\cdot, \downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \cdot\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot\rangle, \\
& |\uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot\rangle, |\cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\cdot, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle \\
m = -1 : & |\uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, \\
& |\uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \cdot\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \cdot\rangle, \\
& |\downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \downarrow\rangle, |\cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \cdot\rangle, |\downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, \\
& |\cdot, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \downarrow, \cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \cdot, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\cdot, \downarrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle \\
m = -2 : & |\downarrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $|s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4\rangle = |s_1\rangle |s_2\rangle |s_3\rangle |s_4\rangle$ means that at site 1 the first (second) orbital is occupied by s_1 (s_2) and at site 2 the first (second) orbital is occupied by s_3 (s_4). In general, for a system with n orbitals, the number of states for each value of m is given by $\binom{n}{n/2+m}^2$.

Since the z -component of the angular momentum vector operator \mathcal{S}_z commutes with the Hamiltonian (5), the Hamiltonian block-diagonalizes in separate subspaces of different m , and the matrix representation of (5) can be calculated for each subspace separately. Supporting our goal to map (5) for our model onto an effective spin Hamiltonian it is convenient to change the product basis $|s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4\rangle$ to one, where the total spin at each site is a good quantum number. For example, for $m = 1$ the first 4 states are replaced by the following superpositions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle + |\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle) &= |1, 1\rangle |1, 0\rangle \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle) &= |1, 0\rangle |1, 1\rangle \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle) &= |1, 1\rangle |0, 0\rangle \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow, \uparrow, \uparrow, \uparrow\rangle) &= |0, 0\rangle |1, 1\rangle, \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the notation $|S_1, m_1\rangle |S_2, m_2\rangle$ with S_i being the spin quantum number and m_i being the total z -component at site i .

We are essentially interested in the subspace spanned by the first two states of (7) as we assume magnetic systems, which have constant magnetic moments (here, $S = 1$) at each site. However, there is no direct interaction between these two states, but indirect interactions via states where S is not the same at all sites. These indirect interactions between intermediate states in different subspaces can be downfolded into the sector of interacting spin of constant quantum number at each site using the so called Löwdin partitioning [40, 41]. The Löwdin partitioning can be used since we deal with energetically well separated subspaces of spins with different S due to Hund coupling and on-site Coulomb energies that are large with respect to the hopping parameters as we are discussing here transition metals.

The Löwdin partitioning is a tool to decouple those subspaces perturbatively and to map with increasing order of the perturbation the indirect interaction between two states of the same subspace via states of the other subspaces onto direct interactions between those states. *E.g.*, the indirect interaction $|\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle \xleftrightarrow{\sim t} |\uparrow, \cdot, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle \xleftrightarrow{\sim t} |\uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle$ is mapped on a direct interaction $|\uparrow, \uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow\rangle \xleftrightarrow{\sim t^2/U} |\uparrow, \downarrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\rangle$ if terms up to at least second order are taken into account in the Löwdin partitioning. By going to higher orders also indirect interactions including more than two hoppings are considered. These can then relate to interactions with more than two sites.

Mathematically, this is achieved by splitting the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} in two parts,

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_2, \quad (8)$$

namely a term \mathcal{H}_0 , which contains the on-site contributions, *i.e.* the repulsive Coulomb interaction and the Hund exchange, and a term \mathcal{H}' , which contains the off-diagonal matrix elements due to the electron hopping, which are treated as a perturbation. Here, \mathcal{H}_1 contains the terms whose matrix elements couple within the two subspaces, whereas \mathcal{H}_2 describes the coupling between them. The subspaces are decoupled through a canonical transformation [42, 43]

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = e^{-\hat{S}} \mathcal{H} e^{\hat{S}}, \quad (9)$$

where hermiticity of the Hamiltonian implies $\hat{S}^\dagger = -\hat{S}$ and the generator \hat{S} of the transformation is chosen such that $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ becomes block-diagonal. This is achieved writing Eq. (9) in the form of successive applications of commutator rules

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} [\mathcal{H}, \hat{S}]^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} [\mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1 + \mathcal{H}_2, \hat{S}]^k, \quad (10)$$

with $[A, B]^k = [[\dots [A, B], B] \dots, B], B]$ nested k times. Considering the definitions of \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 [41], this allows then to decouple Eq. (10) into a Hamiltonian term $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_d$, whose matrix representation is block diagonal

and a term $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_o$ with off-block-diagonal matrix elements as shown here:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_d &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k)!} [\mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1, \hat{S}]^{2k} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)!} [\mathcal{H}_2, \hat{S}]^{2k+1} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_o &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)!} [\mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_1, \hat{S}]^{2k+1} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k)!} [\mathcal{H}_2, \hat{S}]^{2k}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The requirement of block diagonalization or $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_o = 0$, respectively, up to a given order k in the perturbation determines the generator \hat{S} and subsequently the effective Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_d$. Due to the block-diagonalization of \mathcal{H} with respect to the basis of \mathcal{S}_z , the Löwdin partitioning can be carried out independently for each angular momentum quantum number m . We work out all spin models for $m = 0$ or $m \pm 1/2$, for systems of integer or half-integer total spin, respectively, since these determine the largest subspaces, and the Löwdin partitioning becomes least degenerate and the functional forms of the spin Hamiltonians become most obviously distinct.

III. RESULTS

A. Derived spin Hamiltonians

Recalling that the spin operators

$$\mathcal{S}_i = (\mathcal{S}_{i,x}, \mathcal{S}_{i,y}, \mathcal{S}_{i,z}) \quad (12)$$

can be expressed via the electron operators $c_{i,\alpha,\sigma}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{i,x} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha} \left(c_{i,\alpha,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i,\alpha,\downarrow} + c_{i,\alpha,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i,\alpha,\uparrow} \right) \\ \mathcal{S}_{i,y} &= -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{\alpha} \left(c_{i,\alpha,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i,\alpha,\downarrow} - c_{i,\alpha,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i,\alpha,\uparrow} \right) \\ \mathcal{S}_{i,z} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha} \left(\hat{n}_{i,\alpha,\uparrow} - \hat{n}_{i,\alpha,\downarrow} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the sum goes over all orbitals α at site i , we show now how spin Hamiltonians are derived from the downfolded Hamiltonian mapping that onto a spin model.

1. Spin $S=1/2$

2 sites, spin $S = 1/2$: To demonstrate the general procedure, at first we discuss a dimer of $S = 1/2$, *i.e.*, two sites and only one orbital per site. For $m = 0$, we have four possible states, $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow, \cdot\rangle, |\cdot, \uparrow, \downarrow\rangle$, from which the first two are the subspace of interest with $S = 1/2$ at both sites. \mathcal{H}_0 gives the same on-site energies for both states, which we consider the origin of our energy scale. Going up to second order in the perturbation (the first order vanishes, because there is no

direct coupling between the states) additional terms occur which couple the states. Those terms are, *e.g.* proportional to $c_{2,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{1,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{1,\uparrow} c_{2,\downarrow} + h.c.$, representing a hopping $|\uparrow, \downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |\downarrow, \uparrow\rangle$. Collecting all those terms and extending the derivation to an infinite lattice of two-site interactions, the resulting Hamiltonian can be written in terms of the spin operators (13) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{2^{\text{nd}}\text{order}} &= \frac{4t^2}{U} \sum'_{ij} c_{i,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i,\downarrow} c_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j,\uparrow} - \hat{n}_{i,\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j,\downarrow} \\ &= \frac{2t^2}{U} \sum'_{ij} \left(\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j - \frac{\hat{n}_i \hat{n}_j}{4} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

with $\hat{n}_i = (\hat{n}_{i,\uparrow} + \hat{n}_{i,\downarrow})$ being the total number operator with expectation value n_i for electrons at site i . As we only consider the low-energy subspace, charge excitations are neglected, and only states with half-filled orbitals giving rise to maximal S are considered. Thus, the last term in Eq. (14) defines a constant energy shift by $n_1 n_2 / 4 = |S_1| \cdot |S_2| = S^2$, which ensures that a ferromagnetic alignment (either all spins up or all spins down) gains no energy in higher-order. This agrees well with the underlying Hubbard model where none of the hopping terms have any effect on those ferromagnetic states as no hopping is possible. Thus, by going just up to second order in the perturbation of the hopping terms we obtain the well-known Heisenberg term (1), if we define the exchange parameter J as $J = -2t^2/U$.

According to what has been said above, $S = 1/2$ models with pair-interaction involving hopping of electrons between two sites can only exhibit a bilinear spin Hamiltonian. This is confirmed by including the 4th order terms in the perturbation (10) (the third order vanishes again), which can be summarized to

$$\mathcal{H}_{4^{\text{th}}\text{order}}^{2\text{ sites}} = -\frac{8t^4}{U^3} \sum'_{ij} \left(\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j - \frac{\hat{n}_i \hat{n}_j}{4} \right). \quad (15)$$

No terms of additional spin-spin interactions show up in fourth order perturbation for two site-interactions. This shows that indeed a system of pair interactions of spin-1/2 sites can be described purely by the Heisenberg interaction (1), although the fourth-order term provides a correction of the Heisenberg exchange parameter

$$J = -\frac{2t^2}{U} + \frac{8t^4}{U^3}. \quad (16)$$

Although discussed only for states with $m = 0$, the same effective Hamiltonian is also able to describe the states with $m = 1$ and $m = -1$, respectively, as the energy of those states is 0 both in the Hubbard Hamiltonian and in the effective spin Hamiltonian.

3 sites, spin $S = 1/2$: Since the fourth-order perturbation term in (11) involves four successive hopping events of electrons, the interaction can involve spins or orbital, respectively, of up to four sites and thus can go beyond the pair interaction typical for the Heisenberg

sites	J	K
2	$-\frac{2t^2}{U} + \frac{8t^4}{U^3}$	0
3	$-\frac{2t^2}{U} + \frac{6t^4}{U^3}$	0
4	$-\frac{2t^2}{U} + \frac{10t^4}{U^3}$	$-\frac{10t^4}{U^3}$
5	$-\frac{2t^2}{U} + \frac{20t^4}{U^3}$	$-\frac{10t^4}{U^3}$
6	$-\frac{2t^2}{U} + \frac{36t^4}{U^3}$	$-\frac{10t^4}{U^3}$
8	$-\frac{2t^2}{U} + \frac{86t^4}{U^3}$	$-\frac{10t^4}{U^3}$

TABLE I. Calculated prefactors of the Heisenberg exchange and the 4-spin interactions for different numbers of sites with $S = 1/2$ obtained by going up to 4th order in the Löwdin partitioning.

model. Considering three sites, the behavior is analogous to the Heisenberg model and the only difference with respect to the system with two sites is a changing prefactor for the Heisenberg exchange parameter (*cf.* Tab. I, for simplicity we assumed the same t for all hopping events. The effect of different hopping elements t_{ij} will be analyzed below). Again, this spin Hamiltonian is capable of describing all the subspaces for different m (here, $m = -3/2, -1/2, +1/2, +3/2$)

4 sites, spin $S = 1/2$: For four sites, the fourth order perturbation produces terms, which can be subsumed to the Heisenberg term, but also additional ones, for example, $c_{4,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{3,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{2,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{1,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{1,\uparrow} c_{2,\uparrow} c_{3,\downarrow} c_{4,\downarrow} + h.c.$, for four sites with $m = 0$. In contrast to the terms above, this term flips four spins instead of two.

Collecting all those fourth order terms and mapping them onto the spin operators we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{4^{\text{th}}\text{order}}^{4\text{ sites}} = \frac{10t^4}{U^3} \sum'_{ijkl} \left(\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j - \frac{n_i n_j}{4} \right) \left(\mathbf{s}_k \cdot \mathbf{s}_l - \frac{n_k n_l}{4} \right), \quad (17)$$

which can be split into a 4-spin term

$$\mathcal{H}_{4\text{-spin}}^{4\text{ sites}} = \frac{10t^4}{U^3} \sum'_{ijkl} (\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j) (\mathbf{s}_k \cdot \mathbf{s}_l), \quad (18)$$

plus a Heisenberg term with the prefactor $J = 10t^4/U^3$, and a constant energy shift of size $15t^4/U^3$. The prefactor in Eq. (18) will be called $-K$ in this paper.

Equation (18) is a simplified version of the more complex four-spin interaction [8, 10, 34] introduced in (3), namely for the case when the hopping parameters between all the atoms are the same. In a real system this is rarely the case as the value of the hopping parameter t depends on the distances between the two involved atoms, the types of orbitals, but also on the environment, for details see also Section: III A 3. Carrying out a more explicit calculation of the fourth-order term with pair-dependent hopping parameter t_{ij} , the prefactor

$k \propto -t^4$ in (17), (18) changes to ring paths of hopping with $K_{ijkl} \propto -t_{ij}t_{jk}t_{kl}t_{li}$ and with spin terms as in (3).

2. Spin $S \geq 1$

The extension to systems with larger spins per site, which becomes possible by more than one half-filled orbital per site, is in principle straightforward, but in practice significantly more complex. The Hilbert space becomes much larger and we have to change from a single-band to a multiband Hubbard model with quite some additional interaction parameters, which at the end adds significant complexity to the prefactors or the exchange parameters of the spin models, respectively (for details see the appendix). To keep the prefactors simple and transparent, we discuss here results for the simplified case, where hopping interactions between equal and different orbitals are identical and orbital independent, $t' = t$, and the Coulomb repulsion and the exchange interaction of electrons at the same site but different orbitals, $U' = 0$ and $J' = 0$, are neglected (see Tab. II), valid assuming that the Coulomb energy is larger if the electrons are not just at the same site but also in the same orbital, *i.e.* for $U' \ll U$ and $J' \ll J$. However, these simplifications do not alter the functional nature of the spin models, just simplify prefactors. The full prefactors can be found in the appendix.

2 sites, spin $S = 1$: Starting again with the simplest model with two sites with two orbitals per site, which is equivalent to $S = 1$, we find in second order perturbation terms where two spins are flipped. This is for $m = 0$ for example $c_{2,2,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{1,1,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{1,1,\uparrow} c_{2,2,\uparrow}$. As it can be seen, there is always one orbital per site involved in those flips. Collecting now all the terms which arise in second order perturbation we again find the Heisenberg term with a prefactor of $J = -2t^2/(U + J_H)$ when we use the definitions in Eq. (12) and Eq. (13). So we see that, due to the presence of the Hund coupling, the prefactor is modified but the occurring interaction stays the same.

However, in fourth order there occur more important differences compared to the system with just one orbital per site. In addition to the previously shown term, there appear additional terms like

$$c_{2,2,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{2,1,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{1,2,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{1,1,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{1,1,\uparrow} c_{1,2,\downarrow} c_{2,1,\downarrow} c_{2,2,\uparrow} \quad (19)$$

where all the electrons are flipped and therefore all orbitals are involved in this interaction. Due to this we can already see that each site is involved two times in this interaction and therefore has to occur two times in the effective spin Hamiltonian. And indeed, by using the spin operators the resulting effective interaction can be written as

$$\mathcal{H} \propto \sum'_{ij} \left(\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j - \frac{\hat{n}_i \hat{n}_j}{4} \right)^2, \quad (20)$$

which is split into the biquadratic interaction (2), a Heisenberg term and a constant shift. The prefactor of

sites	S	J	B	$Y_{3\text{spin}}$	$K_{4\text{spin}}$
2	1	$-\frac{2t^2}{U+J_H}$	$\frac{-20t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	0	0
3	1	$-\frac{2t^2}{U+J_H} + \frac{36t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	$\frac{-20t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	$\frac{-40t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	0
4	1	$-\frac{2t^2}{U+J_H} + \frac{96t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	$\frac{-20t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	$\frac{-40t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	$\frac{-10t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$
2	3/2	$-\frac{2t^2}{U+J_H} + \frac{6t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	$\frac{-20t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	0	0
3	3/2	$-\frac{2t^2}{U+J_H} + \frac{90t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	$\frac{-20t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	$\frac{-40t^4}{(U+J_H)^3}$	0

TABLE II. Calculated prefactors of the Heisenberg exchange, the biquadratic, the 3-spin and the 4-spin interactions for different numbers of sites with $S > 1/2$ obtained by going up to 4th order in the Löwdin partitioning. We set $t' = t$ and U' and J' were set to zero (see text).

the biquadratic exchange interaction is named B in the following. The prefactors with the previously named assumptions for this system and the systems introduced in the following can be found in Tab. II while the complete prefactors are shown in the appendix.

As we can see, this biquadratic term only arises when we have more than one orbital per site and can therefore not be explained based on the normal Heisenberg model. The reason, why this biquadratic interaction does not play a role for the systems with $S = 1/2$ and is also not expected there is due to the fact that the biquadratic interaction in those systems can be written as the sum of a Heisenberg term and a constant shift due to the algebra of the involved spin matrices. The same is true for $(S_1 \cdot S_2)^3$ in systems with $S = 1$ where this term can be transformed into a sum of the biquadratic term, the Heisenberg term and again a constant shift.

3 sites, spin $S = 1$: Now that we confirmed the biquadratic interaction for $S = 1$, we will investigate next, whether new interactions might occur if we do not have just two but more sites. Therefore, the next step is to investigate a system with three sites which have two orbitals each as we want to analyze whether this can again be explained by the same Hamiltonian as the two-atomic system as it was the case for $S = 1/2$ or whether other aspects have to be taken into account.

Starting with the second order in the perturbation we again find the Heisenberg term. Also in the fourth order there are many similar terms compared to the two-atomic system. However, additional terms arise. As previously mentioned for the system out of two sites there occurred terms where the electrons in four orbitals were flipped. In contrast to the smaller system where we have only four orbitals in total this time we have two different possibilities how those four involved orbitals can be spread over the sites. Either they are the four orbitals off just two different sites or they are spread over all three sites whereof one of the sites flips the electron in both orbitals while at the other two sites only one orbital each is involved in the hopping.

The former one results again in a biquadratic interac-

tion. The latter one includes terms like

$$\hat{n}_{3,1,\uparrow}\hat{n}_{1,2,\downarrow}c_{3,2,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{2,2,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{2,1,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{1,1,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{1,1,\uparrow}c_{2,1,\downarrow}c_{2,2,\downarrow}c_{3,2,\uparrow}, \quad (21)$$

where we can clearly see that two orbitals (here, the first orbital at site 3 and the second at site 1) are not affected by this hopping term while the other four change their spin direction. It can be summarized into a term proportional to

$$\sum'_{ijk} \left(\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j - \frac{\hat{n}_i \hat{n}_j}{4} \right) \left(\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_k - \frac{\hat{n}_i \hat{n}_k}{4} \right) \quad (22)$$

which again can be split into three different terms namely a Heisenberg term, a constant shift and a term proportional to

$$\sum'_{ijk} (\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j) (\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_k) . \quad (23)$$

As one can see, we get a 3-spin interaction when we have more than one orbital per site. The exchange constant of the 3-spin interaction will be called $Y_{3\text{spin}}$ henceforth. As we can see from the prefactors (see Tab. II and appendix), the 3-spin constant $Y_{3\text{spin}}$ is in the same order of magnitude and even by a factor of 2 larger than the biquadratic constant B . Therefore, we suppose that this 3-spin interaction might play an important role in systems where other higher order interactions as the biquadratic or the 4-spin interaction are comparable in size to the Heisenberg exchange constants. One system where this might be the case, namely Fe/Ru(0001), will be shown in the next section.

4 sites, spin $S = 1$: Again, the next step is now to go from three to four sites. The behavior within the second order of perturbation is the same as before. However, additional terms compared to the three-atomic system arise within the fourth order. This is due to the fact that the four orbitals which are involved in the interactions of the fourth order perturbation can now either be spread over 2, 3 or 4 sites resulting in the biquadratic, 3-spin and 4-spin interaction, respectively. The prefactors can be seen in Tab. II. So we proofed by this that the 4-spin interaction is not just an effect that arises in $S = 1/2$ systems but also in those with $S = 1$.

To clarify whether the previously shown results are just true for $S = 1$ or can be applied also to systems with larger spins, we also investigated systems with $S = 3/2$ representing a magnetic moment of $3\mu_B$. As we can see in Tab. II the considered systems can all be explained by the interplay of the exchange, biquadratic, 3-spin and 4-spin interaction.

The reason why a possible *bicubic* interaction

$$\mathcal{H}_6 \propto \sum'_{ij} (\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j)^3 \quad (24)$$

does not arise is that such an interaction would need 6 hoppings and therefore can not arise if we only go to




FIG. 1. Investigated geometries: (a) a square arrangement of atoms as it occurs *e.g.* at the (001)-surface of a bcc or fcc crystal and (b) a hexagonal arrangement as it occurs at the (111)-surface of an fcc crystal or the (0001)-surface of an hexagonal lattice. Sketched are the positions of the atoms and two different neighbor distances. t_1 (t_2) represents the hopping between nearest (next-nearest) neighbors.

fourth order. To check whether this *bicubic* interaction arises within higher orders, we went for the system of 2 sites with 3 orbitals up to sixth order in the perturbation and indeed additional terms occur within the sixth order which can be explained based on the bicubic interaction with a prefactor of $\frac{336t^6}{(U+2J_H)^5}$. However, one can assume that this *bicubic* interaction will be small compared to the other interactions as it occurs in even higher order of the perturbation then they do.

3. Spin-models at surfaces due to hopping of electrons beyond nearest neighbor

Up to now, we just presented the results assuming that the hoppings between all the atoms are the same. In a real system this is not necessary the case as the value of the hopping parameter t depends mainly on the distance between the two involved atoms (but also on the environment). By assuming the same hopping parameter t for all pairs of atoms, one describes *e.g.* for four atoms the interactions on a regular tetrahedron. However, we are more interested in different kinds of geometries. For example, we would like to be able to describe different types of surfaces, for example the (001)-surface or the (111)-surface of fcc crystals. While the former one represents a square alignment of the surface atoms, the latter one is a triangular or diamond alignment. Therefore, we will now focus on those two geometries. A sketch of the positions within those two geometries can be seen in Fig. 1.

As we can see in Fig. 1 we have two different distances within both geometries and therefore two different hopping constants t_1 and t_2 between the nearest and next-nearest neighbors, respectively. While there are two pairs of next-nearest neighbors for the square pattern, there is only one pair on the hexagonal one, as one of the diagonals (here the diagonal from atom 1 to atom 3) is also a nearest neighbor pair. We assume the same hopping

t_1 between those two and between those at the edge of the pattern (*e.g.* between atom 1 and 2) even though they have not the same environment. However, we are in general not interested in just one of those patterns but in a periodic lattice and there those two hoppings would indeed be the same.

Going up to second order in the perturbation we find as expected again the Heisenberg exchange but here we get now two different exchange constants namely

$$J_1 = -\frac{2t_1^2}{U} \quad \text{and} \quad J_2 = -\frac{2t_2^2}{U}$$

with J_1 (J_2) being the exchange constant between nearest-neighbors (next-nearest neighbors). This is the same for both geometries.

Of higher interest are now the occurring terms in higher order. Here, we have to differentiate between the square and the diamond pattern as we get different (but similar) results for those two.

For the square lattice, we find terms which are proportional to t_1^4 , t_2^4 and $t_1^2 t_2^2$. The term proportional to t_1^4 is again the normal Heisenberg term for the next-nearest neighbors. The same term occurs proportional to t_1^4 for the nearest neighbors but here we get additional ones. Collecting those terms results indeed in the functional form of Eq. (3) with a prefactor of $K_{4spin} = 20t_1^4/U^3$.

Up to now, we got the terms known from literature. However, the terms proportional to $t_1^2 t_2^2$ were not considered so far. While one part of those results in a correction for J_2 , namely $16t_1^2 t_2^2/U^3$ other terms can not be described by a Heisenberg term or one of the shown 4-spin terms. Instead, we need another 4-spin term:

$$H_{4spin\text{-diag}} = -K_{4spin\text{-diag}} \sum_{\langle i,j,k,l \rangle_{diag}} (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j) \cdot (\mathbf{S}_k \cdot \mathbf{S}_l) \quad (25)$$

Here, $\langle \dots \rangle_{diag}$ indicates that the sum goes over all the terms where i and j (and therefore in this case also k and l) are next-nearest neighbors which means that they are connected by a diagonal of the cell. Therefore, we will call this term *diagonal 4-spin term* in the following. The prefactor of this term is $K_{4spin\text{-diag}} = -40t_1^2 t_2^2/U^3$.

Thus the ratio between the prefactors for the two mentioned 4-spin terms is

$$\frac{K_{4spin\text{-diag}}}{K_{4spin}} = 2 \left(\frac{t_2}{t_1} \right)^2. \quad (26)$$

Depending on the ratio of t_1 and t_2 the diagonal term might be in the same order of magnitude as the conventional 4-spin term or it might even dominate and should therefore not be neglected in Monte-Carlo or spin-dynamic simulations.

Changing the geometry from a square pattern into a diamond pattern results in the change of the hoppings between the diagonally connected atoms. While one of those pairs still is a pair of next-nearest neighbors, the

other pair becomes nearest-neighbors (see Fig. 1). Therefore, the results for this pattern differentiate from those of the square pattern.

Within second order perturbation again the Heisenberg terms arise. Including those terms from fourth order we get the following exchange constants:

$$J_{1,\text{edge}} = -2\frac{t_1^2}{U} - 2\frac{t_1^4}{U^3} - 16\frac{t_1^3 t_2}{U^3} - 2\frac{t_1^2 t_2^2}{U^3} \quad (27)$$

$$J_{1,\text{diag}} = -2\frac{t_1^2}{U} + 16\frac{t_1^4}{U^3} - 36\frac{t_1^3 t_2}{U^3} \quad (28)$$

$$J_2 = -2\frac{t_2^2}{U} + 8\frac{t_2^4}{U} - 16\frac{t_1^3 t_2}{U^3} + 8\frac{t_2^4}{U^3} \quad (29)$$

As one can see, we now get different prefactors for the edges and for the short diagonal even though they have the same distances and we assumed the same hopping. This is due to the different environments.

In addition to those modifications for the exchange constants we find again 4-spin terms by going up to fourth order in the perturbation. Those are quite similar to those shown before for the square pattern but the prefactor of the diagonal 4-spin term changes and becomes $-40t_1^3 t_2/U^3$. Therefore, the ratio

$$\frac{K_{4spin\text{-diag}}}{K_{4spin}} = 2 \left(\frac{t_2}{t_1} \right) \quad (30)$$

makes it even more likely that this term plays an important role and should not be neglected.

Going up to more sites (5,6, and 8) we can show that they can also be explained based on the previously shown terms (Heisenberg plus 4-spin). The calculated prefactors for the case of the same hopping parameter t between all the sites are shown in Tab. I.

B. 3-Spin interaction in Fe/Ru(0001)

Previous investigations by Al-Zubi *et al.* [44] on the system consisting out of a monolayer of iron on the (0001)-surface of a ruthenium crystal (Fe/Ru(0001)) could not be understood based on the commonly assumed spin Hamiltonians. Here, we demonstrate how the newly introduced 3-spin interaction might be the key ingredient for the understanding of the system.

In their work, Al-Zubi *et al.* [44] calculated total energies of different kinds of magnetic structures based on DFT calculations. This were both spin spirals and so called multi-q states which are superpositions of particular spin spirals. Then they mapped those results onto an extended Heisenberg Hamiltonian which included in addition to the Heisenberg interaction also the bi-quadratic and the 4-spin interaction within the nearest-neighbor approximation. The goal was hereby, to determine the parameters of their Hamiltonian and therefore the strength of the different interactions to understand the origin of the occurring *wudd* ground state. However, by doing this, they faced some puzzling results. While

the energy difference of two $uudd$ states with different propagation directions each compared to the related spin spiral (1Q state) should be the same, namely

$$E_{2Q} - E_{1Q} = 4(2K_{4\text{spin}} - B) \quad (31)$$

for both of them, not only the absolute value varied but also the sign.

One attempt to explain this discrepancy from the model was to take the induced magnetic moments of the substrate into account as those are different for those two states. However, with this they just found terms which could not explain the different sign of the two energy distances.

In our opinion the 3-spin interaction might be a good candidate to describe Fe/Ru(0001) more accurately and therefore in addition to the nearest neighbor biquadratic and 4-spin interactions a 3-spin term like (4) should be included in the extended Heisenberg model.

Due to the classical character of the spins in the Heisenberg model Eq. (4) can be simplified:

$$-2 \cdot \sum_{\langle ijk \rangle} Y_{ijk} (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j) (\mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_k) \quad (32)$$

With this additional interaction the energy differences calculated by Al-Zubi *et al.* [44] are modified by the 3-spin term:

$$E_{3Q} - E_{\bar{M}} = \frac{16}{3} (2K_{4\text{spin}} + B - Y_{3\text{spin}}) \quad (33)$$

$$E_{uudd, \frac{\bar{M}}{2}} - E_{\frac{\bar{M}}{2}} = 4(2K_{4\text{spin}} - B - Y_{3\text{spin}}) \quad (34)$$

$$E_{uudd, \frac{3\bar{K}}{4}} - E_{\frac{3\bar{K}}{4}} = 4(2K_{4\text{spin}} - B + Y_{3\text{spin}}) \quad (35)$$

Here, $E_{uudd,q}$ is the energy of the $uudd$ state which results due to the superpositions of q and $-q$.

As one can see, the previously identical energy differences for the two $uudd$ cases are now separated by $8Y_{3\text{spin}}$ due to the 3-spin interaction. Therefore, it should be possible to explain the occurring energy differences in the results from Al-Zubi *et al.*

Taking the energy differences from Al-Zubi *et al.*

$$(33) = 4.6 \text{ meV}$$

$$(34) = -30.3 \text{ meV}$$

$$(35) = 7.5 \text{ meV}$$

we are now able to calculate the prefactors of the three interactions:

$$B = 4.22 \text{ meV} \quad (36)$$

$$Y_{3\text{spin}} = 4.73 \text{ meV} \quad (37)$$

$$K_{4\text{spin}} = 0.68 \text{ meV} \quad (38)$$

As one can see, the 3-spin might explain the occurring energy differences and its value $Y_{3\text{spin}}$ is in the same order of magnitude as the biquadratic interaction but also significant large compared to the nearest neighbor exchange

interaction ($J_1 = -6.4 \text{ meV}$) [49] and should therefore not be neglected.

Based on our investigation we would argue that the previously puzzling results for Fe/Ru(0001) are the result of the interplay between the biquadratic and a strong 3-spin interaction which favors one of the $uudd$ alignments over the other.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we derived consistently and systematically the spin Hamiltonian due to interacting electrons for a maximal spin up to $S = 3/2$ and up to fourth order perturbation theory in the Löwdin partitioning algorithm. As a result we obtain the spin Hamiltonian

$$H = (H_1 + H_4)\{\text{for } S \geq 1/2\} + (H_2 + H_3)\{\text{for } S \geq 1\}, \quad (39)$$

which consists of the Heisenberg Hamiltonian H_1 (1), the biquadratic (four-spin-three-site) H_2 (2), the three-spin (four-spin-three-site) H_3 (4), and the four-spin Hamiltonian (four-spin-four-site) H_4 (3). The Heisenberg term emerges already in second order perturbation, but the fourth-order perturbation term adds to the exchange coupling parameter. Characteristic of the fourth order terms is the hopping of electrons between 4 orbitals that connect maximally four sites. This form remains correct also for higher spins S treated up the fourth order perturbation theory. On the other hand $S = 3/2$ has also 6-order contributions and $S = 2$, would have 6- and 8-order contributions, which we have not calculated. Since the dimension of the matrices H_0 and H_1 in the Löwdin algorithm grows binomially with the number of orbitals as $\binom{n}{n/2}^2$, the algorithm becomes quickly involved and at the same time the exchange coupling parameters are becoming increasingly smaller and the terms less important. The exchange coupling parameters of the different Hamiltonians H_i are summarized in detail in the appendix.

The spin-orbit interaction was neglected. Subject to the spin-orbit interaction, S_z does not commute anymore with the Hamiltonian, thus the Hamiltonian does not block-diagonalizes anymore for different m , and the Löwdin partitioning becomes more involved.

Starting point was the rotationally invariant multi-orbital Hubbard model that described the interacting electrons on a lattice. We showed that Löwdin's downfolding technique is an efficient approach to map the effect of the interacting electrons onto an effective spin model. We showed that our technique is capable of verifying the commonly applied Heisenberg model, as well as the 4-spin and biquadratic interaction, but unraveled in addition the occurrence of the three-spin interaction. The importance of the three-spin interaction was verified for the system of one monolayer Fe on Ru(0001), where *ab initio* calculations [44] showed puzzling results on the magnetic states that now could be consistently explained.

Appendix: Prefactors for the complete model

In the main text we focussed on presenting the prefactors, or exchange parameter, respectively, of the different spin-models for the simplified case of orbital independent hopping interactions ($t_{i,\alpha,j,\alpha} = t'_{i,\alpha,j,\alpha'} = t$) and for the limits $J' = 0$ and $U' = 0$. Here, we show the extension of the results for which the hopping interaction between the same ($t_{i,\alpha,j,\alpha} = t$) and between different orbitals ($t'_{i,\alpha,j,\alpha'} = t'$) are distinct. Analogously the distinction

between intra- and inter-orbital onsite Coulomb repulsion U , and U' , respectively, and exchange interaction, J and J' , respectively, is taken into account. Otherwise, all interaction parameters are kept orbital independent for simplicity and remain site independent assuming a periodic lattice of one atom type.

In the following, we will denote exchange parameters as $X_{s \times o}$ with $X \in (J, B, K_{4\text{spin}}, Y_{3\text{spin}})$ and s and o denoting the number of sites and orbitals, respectively. The prefactors are calculated up to fourth order in the Löwdin partitioning.

$$J_{2 \times 2} = -\frac{t^2 + t'^2}{U + J_H} + \frac{4(t^2 + t'^2)^2}{(U + J_H)^3} - \frac{16t^2 t'^2}{(U + J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2}$$

$$B_{2 \times 2} = -\frac{2(t^2 + t'^2)^2}{(U + J_H)^3} + \frac{(t^2 - t'^2)^2}{2(U + J_H)^2 J_H} + \frac{4(t^2 - t'^2)^2}{(2U + U')(U + J_H)^2} + \frac{t^4 - 14t^2 t'^2 + t'^2}{(U + J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2}$$

$$+ \frac{(t^2 - t'^2)^2}{(U + J_H - U' + J'_H)(U + J_H)^2}$$

$$J_{3 \times 2} = -\frac{t^2 + t'^2}{U + J_H} + \frac{12(t^2 + t'^2)^2}{(U + J_H)^3} - \frac{3(t^4 + 6t^2 t'^2 + t'^4)}{(2U + 2J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2}$$

$$- (t^2 - t'^2)^2 \cdot \left(-\frac{27}{4J_H^2(U + J_H)} + \frac{12}{J_H^2(2U + J_H)} + \frac{3}{4J_H^2(U + 3J_H)} - \frac{3}{2J_H(U + J_H)^2} \right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{3}{(2U + 2J_H - U' + J')(U + J_H)^2} + \frac{3}{(2U + J_H + U')(U + J_H)^2} \right)$$

$$B_{3 \times 2} = - (t^2 + t'^2)^2 \cdot \left(+\frac{2}{(U + J_H)^3} + \frac{3}{(U + J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} \right)$$

$$- (t^2 - t'^2)^2 \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2J_H(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{1}{(U + J_H - U' + J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} \right.$$

$$\left. - \frac{4}{(2U + U')(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{4}{(U + J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} \right)$$

$$Y_{3 \times 2} = -\frac{16t^2 t'^2}{(U + J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} + \frac{2t^4 + 12t^2 t'^2 + 2t'^4}{(2U + 2J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{6t^4 + 20t^2 t'^2 + 6t'^4}{(U + J_H)^3}$$

$$- (t^2 - t'^2)^2 \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2J_H^2(U + 3J_H)} + \frac{1}{J_H(U + J_H)^2} + \frac{9}{2J_H^2(U + J_H)} - \frac{8}{J_H^2(2U + J_H)} \right.$$

$$\left. - \frac{2}{(2U + J_H + U')(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{2}{(2U + 2J_H - U' + J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} \right)$$

$$J_{4 \times 2} = -\frac{t^2 + t'^2}{U + J_H}$$

$$- (t^2 - t'^2)^2 \cdot \left(+\frac{24}{J_H^2(2U + J_H)} - \frac{27}{2J_H^2(U + J_H)} + \frac{3}{2J_H^2(3J_H + U)} - \frac{3}{J_H(U + J_H)^2} \right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{6}{(2U + 2J_H - U' + J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} + \frac{6}{(2U + J_H + U')(U + J_H)^2} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{23t^4 + 58t^2t'^2 + 23t'^4}{(U + J_H)^3} - \frac{6t^4 + 36t^2t'^2 + 6t'^4}{(2U + 2J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} + \frac{16t^2t'^2}{(U + J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2}$$

$$B_{4 \times 2} = - (t^2 - t'^2)^2 \cdot \left(- \frac{1}{2J_H(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{4}{(2U + U')(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{1}{(U + J_H - U' + J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} \right) \\ - \frac{2(t^4 + 2t^2t'^2 + t'^4)}{(U + J_H)^3} + \frac{t^4 - 14t^2t'^2 + t'^4}{(U + J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2}$$

$$Y_{4 \times 2} = - (t^2 - t'^2)^2 \cdot \left(- \frac{2}{(2U + 2J_H - U' + J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{2}{(2U + J_H + U')(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{8}{(2U + J_H)J_H^2} \right) \\ + \frac{9}{2(U + J_H)J_H^2} - \frac{1}{2J_H^2(U + 3J_H)} + \frac{1}{(U + J_H)^2J_H} \\ + \frac{2t^4 + 12t^2t'^2 + 2t'^4}{(2U + 2J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{16t^2t'^2}{(U + J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + J_H)^2} - \frac{6t^4 + 20t^2t'^2 + 6t'^4}{(U + J_H)^3}$$

$$K_{4 \times 2} = - \frac{5(t^4 + 6t^2(t'^2) + t'^4)}{4(U + J_H)^3}$$

$$J_{2 \times 3} = - \frac{2(t^2 + 2t'^2)}{3(U + 2J_H)} - \frac{8t'^2(t - t')^2}{3(U + 5J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} - \frac{(t^2 + 2tt' + 3t'^2)(t - t')^2}{(U + J_H + U')(U + 2J_H)^2} + \frac{4(t^2 + 2t'^2)^2}{(U + 2J_H)^3} \\ - \frac{(t^2 + 2tt' + 3t'^2)(t - t')^2}{2(U + 2J_H - U' + J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} - \frac{3t^4 + 76t^2t'^2 + 76tt'^3 + 25t'^4}{6(U + 2J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} - \frac{(t^2 - t'^2)^2}{9(U + 2J_H)^2J_H}$$

$$B_{2 \times 3} = + \frac{(t^2 + 2tt' + 3t'^2)(t - t')^2}{3(U + 2J_H - U' + J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} + \frac{3t^4 - 52t^2t'^2 - 52tt'^3 - 7t'^4}{9(U + 2J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} \\ + \frac{16t'^2(t - t')^2}{9(U + 5J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} + \frac{2(t^2 + 2tt' + 3t'^2)(t - t')^2}{3(U + J_H + U')(U + 2J_H)^2} \\ + \frac{2(t - t')^2(t + t')^2}{27(U + 2J_H)^2J_H} + \frac{8(t^2 + 2t'^2)^2}{9(U + 2J_H)^3}$$

$$J_{3 \times 3} = - \frac{2(t^2 + 2t'^2)}{3(U + 2J_H)} - \frac{-3t^4 + 20t^2t'^2 + 20tt'^3 - t'^4}{6(U + 2J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} - \frac{-110t^4 - 456t^2t'^2 - 16tt'^3 - 444t'^4}{9(U + 2J_H)^3} \\ - \frac{-10t^4 - 80t^2t'^2 - 40tt'^3 - 50t'^4}{3(2U + 4J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} \\ - (t - t')^2 \cdot \left[+ \frac{t^2 + 2tt' + 3t'^2}{(U + 2J_H)^2} \cdot \left(- \frac{20(U + 2J_H)}{27J_H(5J_H + U)} + \frac{1}{U + J_H + U'} + \frac{20}{3(2U + 3J_H + U')} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{2(U + 2J_H - U' + J'_H)} + \frac{10}{3(2U + 4J_H - U' + J'_H)} \right] \\ + \frac{23t^2 + 46tt' + 63t'^2}{27(U + 2J_H)^2J_H} - \frac{8t'^2}{3(U + 5J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} \Big]$$

$$B_{3 \times 3} = + \frac{(t - t')^2}{(U + 2J_H)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{2t^2 + 4tt' + 6t'^2}{3(U + J_H + U')} + \frac{16t'^2}{9(U + 5J_H - U' - J'_H)} + \frac{t^2 + 2tt' + 3t'^2}{3(U + 2J_H - U' + J'_H)} + \frac{2(t + t')^2}{27J_H} \right) \\ + \frac{3t^4 - 52t^2t'^2 - 52tt'^3 - 7t'^4}{9(U + 2J_H - U' - J'_H)(U + 2J_H)^2} + \frac{8(t^2 + 2t'^2)^2}{9(U + 2J_H)^3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{3 \times 3} = & -(t - t')^2 \cdot (t^2 + 2tt' + 3t'^2) \cdot \left[-\frac{1}{(U + 2J_H)^2} \cdot \left(\frac{16}{9(2U + 3J_H + U')} + \frac{8}{9(2U + 4J_H - U' + J'_H)} + \frac{16}{81J_H} \right) \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{16}{243(U + 2J_H)J_H^2} - \frac{16}{243(5J_H + U)J_H^2} \right] \\
& - \frac{1}{(U + 2J_H)^2} \cdot \left[-\frac{8t^4 + 64t^2t'^2 + 32tt'^3 + 40t'^4}{9(2U + 4J_H - U' - J'_H)} + \frac{16t'^2(t' + 2t)^2}{9(U + 2J_H - U' - J'_H)} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{64t^4 + 384t^2t'^2 + 128tt'^3 + 288t'^4}{27(U + 2J_H)} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

-
- * m.hoffmann@fz-juelich.de
- ¹ P. W. Anderson, *Exchange in Insulators: Superexchange, Direct Exchange, and Double Exchange*, edited by G. Rado and H. Suhl, Vol. 1 (Magnetism Academic, 1963).
- ² H. J. Zeiger and G. W. Pratt, *Magnetic Interactions in Solids*, Monographs on Physics (Oxford University Press, 1973).
- ³ C. de Graaf and R. Broer, *Magnetic Interactions in Solids and Molecules*, Theoretical Chemistry and Computational Modelling (Springer International Publishing, 2015).
- ⁴ A. Fert, N. Reyren, and V. Cros, *Nat. Rev. Mat.* **2**, 17031 (2017).
- ⁵ R. Shindou and N. Nagaosa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 116801 (2001).
- ⁶ T. Schulz, R. Ritz, A. Bauer, M. Halder, M. Wagner, C. Franz, C. Pfleiderer, K. Everschor, G. M., and R. A., *Nat. Phys.* **8**, 301 (2012).
- ⁷ M. dos Santos Dias, J. Bouaziz, M. Bouhassoune, S. Blügel, and L. Samir, *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 13613 (2016).
- ⁸ B. Dupé, M. Hoffmann, C. Paillard, and S. Heinze, *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 4030 (2014).
- ⁹ A. Deák, L. Szunyogh, and B. Ujfalussy, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 224413 (2011).
- ¹⁰ M. Hoffmann, J. Weischenberg, B. Dupé, F. Freimuth, P. Ferriani, Y. Mokrousov, and S. Heinze, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 020401 (2015).
- ¹¹ W. Heisenberg, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **49**, 619 (1928).
- ¹² M. Bode, M. Heide, K. von Bergmann, P. Ferriani, S. Heinze, G. Bihlmayer, A. Kubetzka, O. Pietzsch, S. Blügel, and R. Wiesendanger, *Nature* **447**, 190 (2007).
- ¹³ I. Turek, J. Kudrnovský, V. Drchal, and P. Bruno, *Philos. Mag.* **86**, 1713 (2006).
- ¹⁴ E. Şaşıoğlu, L. M. Sandratskii, P. Bruno, and I. Galanakis, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 184415 (2005).
- ¹⁵ C. Kittel, *Phys. Rev.* **120**, 335 (1960).
- ¹⁶ M. Lines, *Solid State Commun.* **11**, 1615 (1972).
- ¹⁷ P. Bruno, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **121**, 248 (1993), proceedings of the International Symposium on Magnetic Ultrathin Films, Multilayers and Surfaces.
- ¹⁸ A. Aharony, *J. Phys. A* **10**, 389 (1977).
- ¹⁹ J. J. Sudano and P. M. Levy, *Phys. Rev. B* **18**, 5078 (1978).
- ²⁰ N. Uryû and S. A. Friedberg, *Phys. Rev.* **140**, A1803 (1965).
- ²¹ D. S. Rodbell, I. S. Jacobs, J. Owen, and E. A. Harris, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **11**, 10 (1963).
- ²² B. D. Gaulin and M. F. Collins, *Phys. Rev. B* **33**, 6287 (1986).
- ²³ S. Bhattacharjee, V. B. Shenoy, and T. Senthil, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 092406 (2006).
- ²⁴ Y. A. Fridman and D. V. Spirin, *Low Temp. Phys.* **26**, 273 (2000).
- ²⁵ J. Lou, T. Xiang, and Z. Su, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 2380 (2000).
- ²⁶ H. A. Brown, *Phys. Rev. B* **11**, 4725 (1975).
- ²⁷ M. Takahashi, *J. Phys. C Solid State Phys.* **10**, 1289 (1977).
- ²⁸ A. MacDonald, S. Girvin, and D. Yoshioka, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 9753 (1988).
- ²⁹ T. Iwashita and N. Uryû, *Phys. Rev. B* **14**, 3090 (1976).
- ³⁰ P. Ferriani, K. von Bergmann, E. Y. Vedmedenko, S. Heinze, M. Bode, M. Heide, G. Bihlmayer, S. Blügel, and R. Wiesendanger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 027201 (2008).
- ³¹ O. N. Mryasov, A. J. Freeman, and A. I. Liechtenstein, *J. Appl. Phys.* **79**, 4805 (1996).
- ³² Y. Yoshida, S. Schröder, P. Ferriani, D. Serrate, A. Kubetzka, K. von Bergmann, S. Heinze, and R. Wiesendanger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 087205 (2012).
- ³³ P. Kurz, G. Bihlmayer, K. Hirai, and S. Blügel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1106 (2001).
- ³⁴ S. Heinze, K. von Bergmann, M. Menzel, J. Brede, A. Kubetzka, R. Wiesendanger, G. Bihlmayer, and S. Blügel, *Nat. Phys.* **7**, 713 (2011).
- ³⁵ T. Iwashita and N. Uryû, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **36**, 48 (1974).
- ³⁶ T. Iwashita and N. Uryû, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **47**, 786 (1979).
- ³⁷ T. Iwashita and N. Uryû, *Phys. Lett. A* **76**, 64 (1980).
- ³⁸ H. Kobayashi, I. Tsujikawa, and I. Kimura, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **24**, 1169 (1968).
- ³⁹ R. Bastardis, N. Guihéry, and C. de Graaf, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 132412 (2007).
- ⁴⁰ P.-O. Löwdin, *J. Chem. Phys.* **19**, 1396 (1951).
- ⁴¹ R. Winkler, *Spin-orbit coupling effects in two-dimensional electron and hole systems*, Vol. 191 (Springer, 2003).
- ⁴² J. R. Schrieffer and P. A. Wolff, *Phys. Rev.* **149**, 491 (1966).
- ⁴³ S. Bravyi, D. P. DiVincenzo, and D. Loss, *Annals of Physics* **326**, 2793 (2011).
- ⁴⁴ A. Al-Zubi, G. Bihlmayer, and S. Blügel, *Phys. Status Solidi (b)* **248**, 2242 (2011).
- ⁴⁵ J. Hubbard, *Proc. Royal Soc. A* **276**, 238 (1963).
- ⁴⁶ J. Hubbard, *Proc. Royal Soc. A* **277**, 237 (1964).
- ⁴⁷ J. Hubbard, *Proc. Royal Soc. A* **281**, 401 (1964).
- ⁴⁸ We use $t'_{i,\alpha,j,\alpha'}$ instead of only $t_{i,\alpha,j,\alpha'}$ to emphasize the two different types of hoppings. This notation will also be

used later on in the paper..
⁴⁹ B. Hardrat, A. Al-Zubi, P. Ferriani, S. Blügel,

G. Bihlmayer, and S. Heinze, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 094411 (2009).