

# Study of the influence of the lattice structure and the surface anisotropy on the behaviour of a small magnetic cluster

Laura Hernández and Claire Pinettes

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Modélisation,

Université de Cergy-Pontoise 5, mail Gay Lussac, Neuville-sur-Oise 95301 Cergy-Pontoise, Cedex, France.

Received: date / Revised version: date

**Abstract.** We have simulated by Monte Carlo method the thermal behaviour of a small ( $N=13$  particles) cluster described by a Heisenberg model including nearest neighbours ferromagnetic interactions and radial surface anisotropy, in an applied magnetic field. We have studied three different lattice structures: hexagonal close packed, face centered cubic and icosahedral. We show that the zero field thermal behaviour depends not only on the anisotropy constant value but on the lattice structure as well. Concerning the behaviour in an applied field, it depends in addition, on the different orientations of the field with respect to the crystalline axes. These facts could be helpful to understand the dispersion observed in the deflection profiles of the Stern-Gerlach experiments. According to the orientation of the applied field with respect to the crystalline axes, hysteresis cycles show step-like character.

**PACS.** 75.75.+a Magnetic Properties of Nanostructures – 75.30.Gw Magnetic Anisotropy – 02.70.Uu Application of Monte Carlo Methods

## 1 Introduction

Magnetic properties of clusters have been studied intensely for about two decades now. Historically a lot of experimental work has been done on ferromagnetic transition metals (TM) clusters such as Fe, Co, and Ni and consequently, the theoretical works were also mainly oriented to these type

of systems. It is now widely accepted to describe them in terms of the superparamagnetic (SP) model [1] in which the individual magnetic moments of the cluster are free to explore all the phase space easily following an applied external field. This model is well adapted to the TM as their crystal anisotropies are very low. The experimental signature of this SP behaviour is found in experiments

where the clusters pass through a zone where a gradient of magnetic field is present, like in a Stern-Gerlach apparatus. The measured deflections are always directed to the high field region with almost no broadening of the beam deflection profile. In addition the relationship among the measured magnetization, the temperature and the applied magnetic field can be fitted by a Langevin law. From this fit the intrinsic magnetic moment of the particle may be obtained and it is found to approach the corresponding bulk value as the number of atoms,  $N$ , increases up to  $N \approx 700$ . This approach is not monotonic and magnetization minima have been observed for clusters with closed geometrical shells [2] [3].

Unlike the TM, rare earth (RE) clusters generally exhibit a quite different behaviour. When passing through a magnetic field gradient the deflection profile is broadened, and some of the clusters have been found to deflect also towards the low field region [4]. The magnetic behaviour is strongly dependent on  $N$ . While some clusters behave superparamagnetically, others show what is called *locked moment behaviour* [1] [4] [5]. In this case the individual spins are tightly coupled to the lattice by the crystal anisotropies, which are bigger than for the 3d-TM, finding it more difficult to follow the applied field. This gives rise to broad deflection profiles. This locked moment behaviour, which hasn't been observed in TM even at very low temperatures, may be observed in RE at much higher  $T$ . When the temperature is raised above a certain blocking temperature,  $T_b$ , the clusters become superparamagnetic. Another striking result is the fact that the magnetic mo-

ment per atom of Gd clusters is lower than the bulk value and in some cases it increases with the temperature [4] [5].

The SP or locked moment behaviour of Gd clusters is still under discussion for some values of  $N$ . In [4] it has been found that  $Gd_{22}$  is SP while the two neighbouring sizes behave in a locked moment way. This is contested by Gerion and coworkers [5] who found that  $Gd_{22}$  keeps a locked moment behaviour for temperatures well above those measured in [4].

The thermal magnetic behaviour of relatively small clusters has been numerically studied considering different hamiltonians [6] [7] [8] [9] [10]. All these models assumed that the anisotropy could be neglected. With this assumption the studied ferromagnetic clusters show a SP behaviour [6] [7].

In [8] an Ising hamiltonian with antiferromagnetic first neighbours interactions was considered on icosahedral, hexagonal closed packed (hcp) and face centered cubic (fcc) lattices structures. The authors find that the magnetization increases with temperature for a wide range of temperatures in an applied magnetic field. A lattice structure dependent behaviour was also observed. This lattice structure dependent behaviour had also been found in [9] where the same model was studied for bigger clusters (up to  $N \approx 500$ ) having icosahedral and cuboctahedral lattices. On the contrary, no peak was found in the magnetization as a function of temperature [9].

Based on theoretical electronic calculations and a Heisenberg hamiltonian with RKKY interactions for  $Gd_{13}$ , a canted spin structure has been proposed as an explana-

tion for the observed magnetic moment reduction [11]. Recently, a simple Heisenberg model on a hcp lattice, including competing ferromagnetic interactions between nearest neighbours and antiferromagnetic interactions between all the other pairs has been considered [10] to allow for the canted structure proposed in [11] for  $Gd_{13}$ . For some values of the ratio between the two competing interactions these authors obtain a peak in the magnetization curves as a function of the temperature.

Finally we can cite studies including different anisotropy terms. They mostly concern large clusters cut with regular shapes (spherical or ellipsoidal) out of simple cubic or spinel lattices. For these systems the difference of behaviour between bulk and surface spins has been shown as well as the contributions of finite size effects and surface effects [12] [13] [14] [15]. The influence of surface effects on the hysteresis cycle has also been shown [16]. In particular Dimitrov and Wysin [17] have studied the zero-temperature behaviour of particles in two cases: ferromagnetically coupled Heisenberg classical spins with either uniaxial random anisotropy or radial surface anisotropy. They have studied the two (three) dimensional simple cubic lattice with the cluster having circular and rectangular (spherical and cubic) geometries. They find a step-like hysteresis cycle which is identified as a surface effect. This is also observed in a zero temperature study of spherical particles cut out a fcc lattice structure [18].

In Stern-Gerlach like experiments the deflection of a cluster beam passing through an inhomogeneous magnetic field is measured. Each cluster is assumed to be free and

its size is well known, so in principle, one can have access to the magnetization of the cluster along the field direction and, in the context of superparamagnetic theory, to the magnetic moment per atom of the cluster. On the contrary, the crystal structure of the cluster as well as the initial orientation of the crystal axes with respect to the field gradient direction remain unknown. In order to understand some of the results of the experiments on very small Gd particles described in [1] [4] [5], we analyse the influence of the radial surface anisotropy and the lattice structure on the behaviour of a  $N=13$  particle in finite temperature and in an applied external field.

The article is organized as follows: in Sect. 2 we describe the studied systems; in Sect. 3, we give the technical details of our calculation, and in Sect. 4 we show the obtained results. Finally, in Sect. 5, we summarize and discuss our results.

## 2 Description of the studied systems

In this article, we studied a simple model of a  $Gd_{13}$  cluster. *Ab initio* calculations indicate an hcp structure for this cluster [11]. Nevertheless numerical simulation results of cluster aggregation starting from  $N=13$  separated particles placed in either a Lennard-Jones or a Gupta potential [19] yield very similar cohesion energies for the hcp, fcc and icosahedral lattices. These energy values are smaller than those of other simple known structures, like simple or body centered cubic.

In these  $N=13$  clusters, 12 atoms are at the surface, each one being at the same distance from the central spin.

It is then reasonable to expect the surface effects to have a dominant effect.

The aim of this work is to understand how the surface anisotropy term may induce a competition with the exchange term according to the different lattice structures and/or to the direction of the applied field.

The magnetism in RE elements arises due to the 4f electrons localized at the ions. It can then be reasonably modeled by the classical Heisenberg hamiltonian. In addition, for clusters, a surface anisotropy term should be considered due to the fact that the coordination number is there different from that of the bulk, inducing a change in the crystal fields [20]. For metallic clusters the existence of a surface anisotropy which is larger than the bulk anisotropy is now experimentally established. This fact has been interpreted as a consequence of the localised character of the 3d electrons at the surface [21]. Although a similar experiment on RE elements doesn't exist yet it is reasonable to expect this anisotropy to be also important for the RE clusters. In addition, studies performed on Gd surfaces [22] show the existence of a magnetic moment perpendicular to the surface.

In this work we have assumed a radial surface anisotropy and we have neglected the bulk anisotropy. Then we study the competing effects of a first nearest neighbour ferromagnetic interaction, radial surface anisotropy and external magnetic field on hcp, fcc and icosahedral (ico) N=13 clusters via the following hamiltonian:


$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{s}_j - K_s \sum_{i=2}^N (\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}_i)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{s}_i \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{s}_i$  is a classical unitary Heisenberg spin,  $\langle i, j \rangle$  denotes the sum over all nearest neighbours pairs,  $\mathbf{n}_i$  is the unitary vector giving the radial direction to the central spin  $s_1$  and  $J > 0$ ,  $K_s > 0$  and  $h$  are the ferromagnetic interaction constant, the radial surface anisotropy constant and the intensity of the applied magnetic field measured in units of  $k_B$  respectively. In this article we fix  $J=1$ .

### 3 Calculation details

We have performed Monte Carlo simulations of the temperature behaviour of the system for the fcc, hcp and icosahedral lattice in zero field (heating and cooling simulations) for different values of the anisotropy constant ranging between  $0 \leq K_s \leq 7$ .

We have also performed heating and cooling cycles of the system in constant field. The different considered orientations of the applied field are depicted in figure 1. For hcp lattice we have studied the cases where the field is oriented parallel and perpendicular to the  $\mathbf{c}$  axis of the crystal. The former is noted  $\mathbf{H}_c = h\mathbf{u}_c$  and the latter  $\mathbf{H}_n = h\mathbf{u}_n$ , where  $\mathbf{u}_n$  is a basis vector of the hexagonal central layer. As the fcc lattice can be seen in a layered way, we used for comparison the same definition of the direction of the applied field as in the hcp structure (see figure 1.b). For the icosahedral structure we have chosen one orientation also called  $\mathbf{u}_c$  along the direction of one of the 5-fold symmetry axes. The complementary  $\mathbf{u}_n$  di-



**Fig. 1.** Studied lattice structures, definition of  $\mathbf{u}_c$  and  $\mathbf{u}_n$  directions of the applied field for the FC and hysteresis simulations. (a) hcp, (b) fcc, (c) icosahedral lattices.

rection is perpendicular to  $\mathbf{u}_c$  and joins the intersection point, noted S, of the 5-fold axis with the perpendicular plane containing the 5 icosahedral sites, with one of these sites (see figure 1.c).

Hysteresis cycles have been simulated at different values of the temperature T, with the magnetic field applied in the predefined directions of each structure.

In all these simulations we have used  $10^6$  MCS/s steps for calculation after having discarded  $10^6$  MCS/s steps for the thermalisation process. Average quantities were calculated taking one configuration every 100 MCS/s to diminish correlations.

We define the average cluster magnetization as

$$m = 1/N \left\langle \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{s}_i \right| \right\rangle \quad (2)$$

and the cluster average surface magnetization,

$$m_s = 1/(N-1) \left\langle \sum_{i=2}^N |\mathbf{s}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}_i| \right\rangle \quad (3)$$

We have also calculated the energy, the specific heat and the averages of the three cartesian components,  $\langle m_x \rangle$ ,  $\langle m_y \rangle$ ,  $\langle m_z \rangle$  as functions of the temperature and/or the magnetic field.


## 4 Results

### – Zero field thermal behaviour

We have performed heating and cooling cycles for the three considered lattices structures in a range of values of the anisotropy constant  $1 \leq K_s \leq 7$ . Figure 2 shows the setting of average magnetization of the particle in a cooling process in zero field for different  $K_s$  values and the three considered lattice structures.

First we observe that the cluster magnetization saturates at  $m_0 \neq 1$  for the three considered geometries due to the surface anisotropy term. The influence of this term on the temperature behaviour of the magnetization clearly depends on the crystal structure.

For  $K_s = 2$  (figure 2(a)) the  $m(T)$  curves increase monotonically for the three structures. The  $m(T)$  curve of the icosahedral lattice being higher than those of the two other structures in all the measured temperature range. For  $K_s = 3$  the curve corresponding to the hcp structure presents an anomalous behaviour. As the temperature is lowered, the magnetization of the cluster sets in but at a value  $T_a$  it stops growing and rapidly falls down. If the cooling process is performed



**Fig. 2.** Magnetic moment as a function of temperature for hcp, fcc and icosahedral lattice structures. Zero-field cooling (ZFC) simulations. Full symbols indicate a slow cooling. (a)  $K_s=2,3$ . Notice the anomalous behaviour observed for the hcp lattice with  $K_s=3$  in the slow cooling process. The magnetization decreases when lowering  $T$  and suddenly increases again to rejoin the fcc curve for the same  $K_s$ . The two low  $T$  states shown have no difference in energy. (b)idem,  $K_s=4$ , the slow cooling process doesn't modify the peak and the saturation value of  $m$  is lower than for finite  $T$ .

very slowly the cluster magnetization increases again and finally reaches the same saturation value than for the fcc structure. The figure shows together this result with the result obtained from a quicker cooling process in which  $m(T)$  doesn't reach its saturation value showing a broad peak instead. Energy curves of the two processes superpose exactly, revealing that at this value of  $K_s=3$  there are states of different magnetization having the same energy.

For  $K_s=4$  the peak actually stays even for slow cooling and as expected, the saturation value of the cluster magnetization is smaller than for the fcc structure (figure 2(b)). Increasing  $K_s$  diminishes the height of the peak till it disappears. This behaviour is a particularity of the hcp structure.

For the other lattice structures the cluster magnetization increases as the temperature is lowered and only for big values of  $K_s$  a plateau is observed.

The fact that the zero temperature value of the magnetization for big enough  $K_s$  values, is  $0.6 < m(0) < 0.8$  shows that the final state is non collinear for the three lattices. This non collinear order is confirmed by the surface average magnetization which saturates near  $m_s(0) \approx 1$

In all the cases the magnetization value at all temperature is ordered (from highest to lowest case) as follows: icosahedral, fcc and hcp. This fact shows that, at fixed  $K_s$ , a different degree of competition appears between the exchange and the surface term according to the considered lattice structure. We will see this fact em-


phasized by the application of an external magnetic field.

As the ground state is not known for  $K_s > 0$ , we used either a ferromagnetic or a random state as starting point at low temperatures. This leads to metastable states in the heating curves at low temperatures as the thermal energy is not enough to allow for the single spin flip over the energy barriers. This situation is not found in the cooling curve in which we start from a random configuration at high temperature and we sequentially lower  $T$ . At low  $T$  the states issued from a cooling process have always a lower energy than the states issued from the corresponding heating process. This also suggests the existence of a ground state which is not collinear (and then very difficult to reach at low  $T$  starting from an arbitrary state). Indeed the ground state magnetization is  $m(0) < 1$  even for low  $K_s$  ( $K_s \approx 2$ ).

#### – Non-zero field thermal behaviour

We have simulated the field cooling of the system with the field applied in directions described in figure 1. We have studied various intensities of the field ranging from  $0 \leq h \leq 1$ .

In figure 3(a) we can see  $m(T)$  for  $K_s=3$  and the two considered orientations of  $\mathbf{H}$ . When  $\mathbf{H}_c = h\mathbf{u}_c$  and ( $h \geq 0.05$ ) the magnetization grows monotonically, as the temperature is decreased and the anomaly observed in zero field disappears. On the contrary for relatively low fields values and when the field is on the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  direction, a peak is observed for the same  $T \approx T_a$



**Fig. 3.** Hcp lattice,  $K_s=3$ . Field cooling (FC) simulations.  $H_c$  and  $H_n$  denote the magnetic field intensities along the directions described in figure 1(a). Full symbols curves, issued from slow FC simulations, show that the peak is stable. (a) Magnetic moment as a function of temperature. (b) Projection of the magnetization along the axis of the corresponding applied field.

where the anomaly is found in the zero field. This peak is confirmed by a very slow cooling process as reported in figure 3(a).


In figure 3(b) we plot  $|\mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{H}| / |\mathbf{H}|$  as a function of  $T$  for different intensities and the two studied orientations of the applied field. It can be seen that when the field is

applied in the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  direction the corresponding projection of the average magnetization, called  $m_n$ , follows the field more easily than does  $m_c$ , the projection on the  $\mathbf{u}_c$  direction, when the field is applied in this latter direction.

Comparing figure 3(a) and (b) one can understand the difference in the magnetic behaviour between the two chosen field directions. When the field is in the  $\mathbf{u}_c$  direction, the magnetization grows monotonically while the  $m_c$  projection reaches its saturation value at finite  $T$ . This means that there is a contribution to the magnetization which is not in the  $\mathbf{u}_c$  direction. On the contrary when the field is in the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  direction, we can see that it is mainly the projection along that direction,  $m_n$ , which is responsible for the peak on the magnetization curve.


For the fcc structure the situation is different. To compare with the hcp lattice we considered the field directions as shown on the figure 1(b).

The  $m(T)$  curves are coincident for both directions of the applied field and no anomaly is observed (see figure 4(a)). This result remains true for all field intensities and for all values of  $K_s$ . On the other hand, as for the hcp lattice, when the field is applied in the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  direction,  $m_n$  follows it more easily than when it is applied in the  $\mathbf{u}_c$  direction (see figure 4(b)). The zero temperature value of  $m_c$  is lower than the corresponding one for  $m_n$  for all  $K_s$ , also in agreement with the hcp case.



**Fig. 4.** Fcc lattice, the intensity of the applied field is  $h=0.2$ . Field cooling (FC) simulations.  $H_c$  and  $H_n$  denote the applied magnetic field parallel to the  $\mathbf{u}_c$  and to the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  axis respectively (see figure 1(b)). (a) The magnetic moment as a function of temperature is not affected by the direction of the applied field for all  $K_s$  values. (b) Projection of the magnetization along the axis of the corresponding applied field. For all  $K_s$  values, the magnetization follows the field more easily when it is applied along the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  axis.

The comparison with the icosahedral lattice is less straightforward. First, the fact that this lattice is, by definition, a globular structure makes it impossible to describe it as a layered one. Hence one cannot directly



**Fig. 5.** Icosahedral lattice, the intensity of the applied field is  $h=0.1$ . Field cooling (FC) simulations.  $H_c$  and  $H_n$  denote the magnetic field applied parallel to the  $\mathbf{u}_c$  and to the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  axis respectively (see figure 1(c)). As  $K_s$  grows, the magnetization saturates at a higher  $T = T_s$  and shows a plateau as  $T$  is lowered. For high values of  $K_s$  ( $K_s > 5$ ) large fluctuations are observed just before the saturation is achieved.

identify the 5-fold symmetry with the  $\mathbf{u}_c$  axis of the other two layered structures. Nevertheless, the results of field cooled simulations show, as for the fcc case, that the orientations of the field has no influence in the  $m(T)$  curves. On the contrary, the orientation of the field affects the projection of the magnetization in the field direction. For this structure it is  $m_c$  which follows more easily the applied field. For  $K_s \geq 3$ ,  $m_c$  reaches its saturation value at a finite value of  $T = T_s$ . This value increases with  $K_s$ , as could be expected (see figure 5). This is also a sign of a non collinear state and is confirmed for the high values of the surface magnetization at zero temperature ( $m_s(0) \geq 0.9$  for  $K_s \geq 6$ ).

In general, observing the behaviour of  $m(T)$  and  $m_s(T)$  curves for each  $K_s$ , one may determine a  $K_s^c$  value where these curves start crossing. This  $K_s^c$  is characteristic of each lattice structure. In spite of the fact that one cannot actually talk of a phase transition, this crossing indicates that the non collinear state where each magnetic moment has a strong component perpendicular to the surface, takes over a state of big global magnetization (collinear state). The crossing temperature  $T_c$ , shifts to low temperatures as the applied field increases for the three structures. With our parameters, we have found  $K_s^c = 4$  for hcp and fcc and  $K_s^c = 5$  for the icosahedral structure. This is the expected lattice dependence of the  $K_s^c$  regarding the number of nearest neighbours at the surface for the different structures. In fact, the sites at the surface of both hcp and fcc lattices have 5 nearest neighbours while the sites of the icosahedral lattice have 6, which leads to a bigger  $K_s^c$  in this latter case so as to counterbalance the ferromagnetic coupling.

#### – Hysteresis loops.

Starting from a zero field cooled state (ZFC) we performed hysteresis loops with the field oriented along the directions described above. We have observed that above the temperature  $T_a$  of the anomaly of the hcp lattice, no hysteresis is found. Then, to allow for comparison, we performed for all the lattices the hysteresis cycles at a  $T \leq 0.1$ , where the hysteresis is found in hcp structure.

For the hcp lattice no hysteresis loop is observed for  $K_s=1$  but it is already present for  $K_s=2$ .


We observe that the field orientation along  $\mathbf{u}_c$  gives a smoother loop than the orientation along  $\mathbf{u}_n$  for all  $K_s$  values. Figure 6(a) shows that the cycle is qualitatively harder, showing small plateaux and jumps and a larger coercive field, when the field is applied along the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  direction.

For  $K_s=3$  these characteristics are kept (see Figure 6(b)).

Hysteresis disappears only in the  $\mathbf{u}_c$  direction for  $K_s=4$  and completely for  $K_s=5$ .

For the fcc lattice the behaviour of the coercive field with the orientation of the applied field is the same as for hcp but the cycle width starts diminishing already at  $K_s=3$ .

For the icosahedral lattice the situation is once again different from that of the layered structures. First the temperature where we have performed the previous field loops is too low for this structure and the MC simulation fails to flip individual spins over the high energy barriers. This different scale of temperature is again due to the higher coordination of the surface sites, which increases the effect of the ferromagnetic coupling with respect to the other lattices. We have then performed the field loops at  $T=0.1$  (the hysteresis disappears for  $K_s=3$  at  $T=0.15$ ). Second, at a given  $T$ , the width of the hysteresis loops increases with  $K_s$ , which indicates that it is more difficult to reverse the magnetization of the system as  $K_s$  increases in contrast with the hcp and fcc cases. This can again be



**Fig. 6.** Hcp lattice, hysteresis cycle,  $T=0.01$ .  $H_c$  denotes the magnetic field applied parallel to the  $\mathbf{u}_c$  axis,  $H_n$  denotes the magnetic field parallel to the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  axis (see figure 1(a)). Projection of the magnetization along the axis of the corresponding applied field. All the cycles have been started from a ZFC state. The lines are only a guide to the eye. (a)  $K_s=2$ , (b)  $K_s=3$ . The cycle width is larger when the field is parallel to the  $\mathbf{u}_n$  axis. In this case the magnetization remains almost unchanged till  $h=0$ , showing intermediate jumps before saturating on the opposite sens. When the field is parallel to  $\mathbf{u}_c$  a monotonous increase of the magnetization with the applied field can be observed. The coercive field seems to diminish when  $K_s$  grows.

understood considering the particularities of this global structure. For a layered case one can see that there is a competition between the field and the anisotropy terms: when the cluster is (almost) completely polarized, let's say, in the up direction, the anisotropy term in the hexagonal layer is far from being optimized (it is globally zero), then when the field is diminished in the reversal process, the anisotropy term "helps" the individual spin transitions. The situation is different for the icosahedral structure in which the radial character of the anisotropy term allows for a configuration which can follow the field without rising too much the anisotropy energy. When the field is reversed, to satisfy again both terms, each individual spin must completely reverse its sense along its radial direction so, the intermediate states concern a jump over the anisotropy barrier which increases with  $K_s$ . This is exactly what we observed, the coercitive field keeps increasing with  $K_s$ .

For the three lattices, the magnetization shows small plateaux as a function of the applied field. Step-like hysteresis cycles have been observed for large clusters in [16] [17] [18] with surface anisotropy and for small antiferromagnetic clusters [8]. They have been explained in terms of the simultaneous reversal of a group of spins. Here we see, in addition, that the location of these plateaux depends not only on the intensity of the field but also on its direction with respect to the crystalline axes of the clusters.

## 5 Conclusions

We have studied the temperature and field behaviour of a cluster of  $N=13$  particles having ferromagnetic interactions and radial surface anisotropy for three different lattice structures which have similar cohesion energies in the context of Lennard-Jones and Gupta potentials. The anomalies seen in the average cluster magnetization curves as a function of the temperature for the hcp lattice show that, even in zero field, the behaviour of the cluster strongly depends on its lattice structure.

Experimental measurements of the magnetic moment per atom of  $Gd_{13}$  cluster [5] give values well below the one predicted by first principles calculations for the ground state of the  $Gd_{13}$  [11]. It has been proposed that a non collinear arrangement of the atomic moments could be responsible for such reduction [5] [11]. Based on the fact that bulk gadolinium is well modeled by RKKY interactions, a simplified hamiltonian model including competing interactions coupling ferromagnetically the nearest neighbours and antiferromagnetically all the other pairs in the cluster was proposed in [11] as a way to obtain these non collinear configurations. In [10], using this model, the authors find a range of values for the competing ratio between ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic interactions where the  $m(T)$  curves in zero field have a peak. The comparison with experimental data gives an antiferromagnetic interaction intensity which is about 36% of the ferromagnetic one. This is around one order of magnitude over the ratio between the intensity of the first and second neighbours in a RKKY interaction, and it is additionally over-estimated

by the fact that all the neighbours but the nearest are coupled antiferromagnetically with the same intensity.

It is clear that many possible hamiltonian including competing interactions can lead to a peak in the  $m(T)$  curves. In this paper, we show that the same qualitative behaviour may be induced by a simple hamiltonian including, in addition to the first neighbours ferromagnetic interaction, a radial surface anisotropy term which is always present due to the relative importance of the surface.

When dealing with small particles almost all the atoms belong to the surface, hence it is reasonable to expect that its effect will become important. Our results show that, for the hcp structure, the one which  $Gd_{13}$  is assumed to have [11], the competition between the two terms leads to a peak in the  $m(T)$  curves for a range of  $K_s$ . For the same range of  $K_s$  the low temperature magnetization is decreased by the setting on of a non-collinear configuration, in qualitative agreement with the experimental results [5].

We have also shown the dependence of the magnetic behaviour of the cluster on the orientation of the applied field with respect to its crystalline axes. In particular the low temperature value of the projection of the magnetization along the field direction is different according to the orientation of the applied field. This projection is exactly what is measured in a Stern-Gerlach experiment, then different relative orientations will lead to different deflections hence broadening the deflection profile [4] [5]. This broadening has been interpreted in terms of clusters having the magnetic moment completely locked to the lat-

tice which are forced to turn as a whole to get aligned with the field [1] [4]. Our results show that in the intermediate case where the individual spins feel an anisotropy term but are still able to explore the phase space, there can be a broad deflection profile due to the different (and experimentally unknown) relative orientation of their crystalline axes and the applied field.

Our results show that the effect of the lattice structure on the magnetic behaviour cannot be neglected. Moreover as the crystalline structure is not known for general  $N$  (first principles results are available only for  $Gd_{13}$ ), it is not excluded that at the temperatures of the experiment different structures could be present for a given  $N$ . And again, the different values of the low temperature magnetization could broaden the deflection profile.

Most of our results are related to the fact that for small clusters the details of their structure become important. It is reasonable to expect that some of the observed effects due to the interplay of the surface anisotropy, the ferromagnetic coupling, the direction of the applied field and the lattice structure on the magnetic behaviour of the cluster could evolve with  $N$ . This study is in progress.

## References

1. J. P. Bucher and L. A. Bloomfield, Int. Journal of Modern Physics B **7** (1993), p1079 and references therein.
2. I. M. L. Billas, A. Châtelain, W. A. de Heer, Science **265** (1994), p1682; I. M. L. Billas, A. Châtelain, W. A. de Heer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993), p4067; Isabelle M. L. Billas,

- A. Châtelain, W. A. de Heer, J. Magn. Mater. **168** (1997), p64.
3. S. E. Apsel, J. W. Emmert, J. Deng and L. A. Bloomfield Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996), p1441.
4. D. C. Douglass, J. P. Bucher and L. A. Bloomfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** (1992), p1774; D. C. Douglass, A. J. Cox, J. P. Bucher and L. A. Bloomfield, Phys. Rev. B **47** (1993), p12874.
5. Danièle Gerion, Armand Hirt, and André Châtelain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999), p532.
6. J. Merikoski, J. Timonen, M. Manninen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991), p938.
7. J. P. Bucher and L. A. Bloomfield, Phys. Rev. B **45** (1992), p2537.
8. E. Viitala, J. Merikoski, M. Manninen, J. Timonen, Phys. Rev. B **55** (1997), p11541; E. Viitala, J. Merikoski, J. Timonen, M. Manninen, Z. Phys. D **40** (1997), p173.
9. B. V. Reddy and S. N. Khanna, Phys. Rev. B **45** (1992), p10103.
10. V. Z. Cerovski, S. D. Mahanti and S. N. Khanna, Eur. Phys. J. D **10** (2000), p119.
11. D. P. Pappas, A. P. Popov, A. N. Anisimov, B. V. Reddy and S. N. Khanna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996), p4332.
12. H. Kachkachi, M. Noguès, E. Tronc and D. A. Garanin, J. Magn. Mater. **221** (2000), p158.
13. H. Kachkachi, A. Ezzir, M. Noguès and E. Tronc, Eur. Phys. J. B **14** (2000), p681.
14. H. Kachkachi and D. A. Garanin, Physica A **30** (2001), p487.
15. Y. Labaye, O. Crisan, L. Berger, J. M. Greneche and J. M. D. Coey, J. of Appl. Phys. **91** (2002), p8715.
16. H. Kachkachi and M. Dimian, Phys. Rev. B **66** (2002), p174419; M. Dimian and H. Kachkachi, J. Appl. Phys. **91** p7625 (2002).
17. D. A. Dimitrov and G. M. Wysin, Phys. Rev. B **50** (1994), p3077.
18. D. A. Dimitrov and G. M. Wysin, Phys. Rev. B **51** (1995), p11947.
19. S. Sugano, *Microcluster Physics*, (Springer Series in Materials Science Vol **20**, ed. by J P Toennies, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1991), Chapter 2 (and references therein).
20. A. Aharoni, *Introduction to the Theory of Ferromagnetism* Second Edition, (Oxford University Press, 2000), Chapter 5.
21. F. Luis, J. M. Torres, L. M. García, J. Bartolomé, J. Stankiewicz, F. Petroff, F. Fettar, J. L. Maurice and A. Vaurès, Phys. Rev. B **65** (2002), p094409.
22. H. Tang, D. Weller, T. G. Walker, J. C. Scott, C. Chappert, H. Hopster, A. W. Pang, D. S. Dessau and D. P. Pappas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993), p444.