

First-principle study of surface structure estimation in $L1_0$ -FePd(001)/graphene heterojunction

Ryusuke Endo

Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Graduate School of Engineering, Kobe University, 1-1 Rokkodai-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe 651-8501, Japan

Naohiro Matsumoto

Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Graduate School of Engineering, Kobe University, 1-1 Rokkodai-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe 651-8501, Japan

Samuel Vergara

Graduate School of Engineering, Tohoku University, 6-6-05, Aoba, Aramaki, Aoba-ku, Sendai, 980-8579 Japan and ENS Paris-Saclay, 4 Av. des Sciences, Gif-sur-Yvette, 91190, France

Masaki Kobayashi

Center for Spintronics Research Network (CSRN), The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan and Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Systems (EEIS), The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan

Hikari Shinya

Center for Spintronics Research Network (CSRN), The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan and Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Systems (EEIS), The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan

Center for Science and Innovation in Spintronics (CSIS), Tohoku University, 2-1-1 Katahira, Aoba-ku, Sendai, Japan and

Center for Spintronics Research Network (CSRN), The University of Osaka, 1-3 Machikaneyama, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-8531, Japan

Hiroshi Naganuma

*Center for Innovative Integrated Electronic System (CIES),
Tohoku University, 468-1 Aramaki Aza Aoba, Aoba-ku, Sendai,
Japan*

*Center for Science and Innovation in Spintronics (CSIS), Tohoku University,
2-1-1 Katahira, Aoba-ku, Sendai, Japan*

*Institute for Advanced Study (IAS), Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya,
464-8601, Japan and*

*Institute of Materials and Systems for Sustainability (IMaSS),
Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, 464-8601,
Japan*

Tomoya Ono

*Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Graduate School of Engineering,
Kobe University, 1-1 Rokkodai-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe 651-8501,
Japan*

Mitsuharu Uemoto

*Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Graduate School of Engineering,
Kobe University, 1-1 Rokkodai-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe 651-8501,
Japan*

(*Electronic mail: uemoto@eedept.kobe-u.ac.jp)

(Dated: 4 February 2025)

In this study, we present a theoretical and computational investigation of the atomic-scale structure of the heterointerface formed between the (001) surface of $L1_0$ -ordered iron palladium (FePd) alloy and graphene (Gr), namely, $L1_0$ -FePd(001)/Gr. Using the density functional theory (DFT) calculations, we demonstrate that the topmost surface layer consisting of Pd (Pd-terminated surface) becomes more energetically stable than Fe, and Pd-terminated surfaces are not conducive to Gr adsorption. On the other hand, under oxygen atmosphere conditions, our calculation suggests the presence of Fe-terminated surfaces with Gr-covered structures reproducing recent experimental observations; besides, the presence of Fe-O bonds by the surface oxidization is also consistent with X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy. These findings are crucial for understanding the fabrication processes of interfaces in Fe-based $L1_0$ alloy materials.

Keywords: Spintronics, First-principles, Graphene

I. INTRODUCTION

Iron palladium (FePd)¹⁻⁶ has tetragonal $L1_0$ -ordered crystal structures and exhibits anisotropic ferromagnetism. FePd and similar binary alloys, such as FePt, FeIr, etc. are known to have presence of large perpendicular magnetic anisotropy (PMA)⁷⁻¹² suggests their potential for use in spintronics applications such as magnetic storage devices, including spin-transfer torque magnetoresistive random-access memory (STT-MRAM)¹³⁻¹⁵.

For decades, hetero-interfaces between such ferromagnetic alloys and two-dimensional materials, such as graphene (Gr), have been investigated as the magnetic tunnel junctions (MTJs)^{16,17}, which is an essential component of STT-MRAMs. Previously, the authors have reported the experimental synthesis of hetero-interfaces between FePd and graphene (FePd/Gr) using chemical vapor deposition (CVD) techniques². Scanning transmission electron microscopy (STEM) observations indicate the existence of atomically flat and uniform coverage³. First-principles calculations have also been performed to study the atomic structure, electronic, magnetic states⁵, as well as spin transport characteristics that represent magnetic resistance (MR) performances⁶. The sandwich junction structure composed of FePd and multilayer graphene, referred to as "FePd/m-Gr/FePd," demonstrates a significant MR ratio, reaching the order of 10^2 %. However, the atomic composition of the bare or Gr-covered FePd surface remains inadequately understood. Usually, the iron-based $L1_0$ -ordered binary alloy consist of alternately stacked Fe and another metal along the [001] axis; the composition of the topmost surface layer significantly affects the interfacial magnetic anisotropy¹⁸, which is also essential on MRAM applications. Our recent experimental and theoretical investigations indicate that the topmost layer of the Gr-covered FePd surface is primarily consists of Fe atoms²⁻⁶, despite some reports suggesting the instability of Fe-terminated surfaces in similar $L1_0$ alloys without Gr. For example, in the case of $L1_0$ FePt, Taniguchi *et al.* have theoretically found that Pt termination is more stable than that of Fe¹⁹. Besides, Dannenberg *et al.* have found similarly for the stability of Pt-terminated surfaces in $L1_0$ and $L1_1$ phases of CoPt and MnPt²⁰. On the other hand, theoretical calculations have also reported that at the FePt/MgO heterointerface, Fe-terminated atoms are energetically more stable¹⁹. We consider that the origin of these discrepancies lies in the chemical bonding energy between the topmost metallic atoms and covering 2D material or oxygen in atomsphere. In this work, we carry out first-principles calculations to clarify the atomic scale structures of the FePd/Gr heterointerface. We prepare slab supercell models for both the bare surfaces and the heterointerfaces and determined the formation

energies of Fe- or Pd-terminated FePd surfaces and their interactions with Gr coverage. Additionally, we analyze the oxidation effects on the formation energies of Fe- or Pd-terminated surfaces in an oxygen-rich atmosphere. The above results indicate that the Pd-terminated surface is stable for the bare surface in a vacuum, which is consistent with the behavior observed in other $L1_0$ alloys. Analysis of the surface region interactions suggests that the proximity between Fe and C contributes to energetic stability. Additionally, in an oxygen atmosphere, the strong chemical bonding between Fe and O stabilizes the Fe-terminated surface. Based on these results, we hypothesize that the FePd/Gr surface observed in the experiment can be explained as follows: the Pd-rich surface of pure FePd is transformed into an Fe-terminated surface through exposure to atmospheric oxygen and thermal annealing during the formation of the Gr layer via CVD in a reducing atmosphere. We believe that these findings will contribute to improving the fabrication quality of $L1_0$ -alloy and 2D material heterointerfaces, paving the way for advanced spintronics applications.

II. METHOD

We perform first-principles calculations to investigate the stabilities of bare $L1_0$ -FePd(001) surfaces and FePd/Gr heterointerfaces and analyze the influence on structural configurations of surface metallic atoms. Figure 1 illustrates our computational model. The crystal structure of bulk $L1_0$ -FePd is shown in Fig. 1(a), and the equilibrium lattice constants (a and c) are obtained from structural optimization. In this work, we employ slab supercells that incorporate both vacuum and substrate regions. Figure 1(b) provides an overview of the slab supercell structure, which dimensions are $13.35 \text{ \AA} \times 2.67 \text{ \AA} \times 26.28 \text{ \AA}$. The atomic structure consists of five periodic FePd units along the horizontal (x -) direction. In the vertical (z -) direction, the slab consists of seven atomic layers with a total thickness of approximately 11.13 \AA . Each layer consists of either Fe or Pd atoms, denoted as \textcircled{a} , \textcircled{b} , \textcircled{s} , and $\textcircled{\bar{s}}$, representing atoms in the topmost surface layer, the second layer, the odd-numbered substrate layers, and the even-numbered substrate layers, respectively. Notably, we assume that Fe and Pd layers are alternately stacked below the third layer, with $\textcircled{\bar{s}}$ chosen to complement \textcircled{s} . We consider several structural models with different surface metal compositions; for convenience, these models are labeled as " \textcircled{a} - \textcircled{b} - \textcircled{s} " (representing the elements in the first, second and third layers, respectively). Figure 1(c) illustrates the examples of several surface structures. In addition, we analyze a heterointerface structure in which Gr is adsorbed onto the bare FePd(001) surface; the structure shown in Fig. 2(a) has been proposed in




FIG. 1. Schematic illustration of the crystal structure and computational models. (a) Bulk $L1_0$ -ordered FePd crystal cell under equilibrium conditions. (b) Slab supercell model of the pristine $L1_0$ -FePd(001) surface labeled as $\text{\textcircled{a}}-\text{\textcircled{b}}-\text{\textcircled{s}}-\text{\textcircled{s}'}$, where $\text{\textcircled{a}}$, $\text{\textcircled{b}}$, $\text{\textcircled{s}}$, and $\text{\textcircled{s}'}$ denote the Fe or Pd atoms in the topmost surface layer, the second layer, the odd-numbered substrate layers, and the even-numbered substrate layers, respectively. (c) Surface models with various atomic compositions.

our previous work with further details provided in Ref. 5.




FIG. 2. (a) Schematic illustration of Gr-covered FePd surface. (b) Bare FePd surface model without the topmost atomic layer. (c) FePd surface model including the topmost atomic layer. (d) FePd surface model covered with the Gr layer.

For computation, we use Vienna *ab initio* simulation package (VASP) code, which provides the first-principles electronic-structure calculation based on the density functional theory (DFT)²¹. We use generalized gradient approximation (GGA) as exchange-correlation functionals²² and the projector augmented wave (PAW) method for electron-ion interaction²³. Only collinear spin polarization is considered in this calculation and the effects of spin-orbit coupling are ignored. Besides, To account for van der Waals (vdW) interactions, we apply two widely used empirical functionals: Grimme’s DFT-D2²⁴ and Kliměš’ optB86b-vdW²⁵; the comparison of the results obtained with these functionals demonstrates the robustness of our calculations with respect to the choice of vdW functional. We use Γ -centered Monkhorst–Pack k -point mesh with a $2 \times 10 \times 1$ grid or its equivalent, a plane wave cutoff energy of 500 eV. The convergence threshold for structural optimizations using the conjugate gradient method is set to be less than 10^{-3} eV, while the threshold for the self-consistent field iterations for the electronic system is set to be less than 10^{-4} eV.

In addition, by modifying the slab supercell model described above, we also construct Gr-covered and oxidized metal surface models; the details are provided in a later section.

III. RESULTS

A. Stability of alloy surface with graphene

The formation energy to stack an additional single atomic layer on the surface is crucial for predicting stable structures. Here, we calculate the formation energies for the topmost layer of FePd $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$ which is expressed as:

$$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}} = \left(E_{\text{slab}}^{\text{w/}\textcircled{a}} - E_{\text{slab}}^{\text{w/o}\textcircled{a}} - \mu_{\text{Fe}} N_{\text{Fe}}^{\textcircled{a}} - \mu_{\text{Pd}} N_{\text{Pd}}^{\textcircled{a}} \right) / N, \quad (1)$$

where $E_{\text{slab}}^{\text{w/}\textcircled{a}}$ ($E_{\text{slab}}^{\text{w/o}\textcircled{a}}$) represent the total energies of the bared FePd surface model with (without) topmost \textcircled{a} layer [see Figs. 2(b) and 2(c)]. $N_{\text{Fe}}^{\textcircled{a}}$ and $N_{\text{Pd}}^{\textcircled{a}}$ denote the number of Fe and Pd atoms in the topmost layer, respectively, and $N = N_{\text{Fe}}^{\textcircled{a}} + N_{\text{Pd}}^{\textcircled{a}}$. Besides, μ_{Fe} and μ_{Pd} represent the chemical potentials of Fe and Pd, respectively. Generally, chemical potentials depend on external conditions, such as material concentrations. Since the experimental growth conditions reported to be Pd-rich^{2,3}, according to the phase diagram of the Fe–Pd alloy²⁶, we assume the coexistence of FePd and FePd₃ (or FePd and Pd) under Pd-rich conditions. Within this environment, μ_{Fe} ranges from -8.63 to -8.75 eV, while μ_{Pd} is from -5.99 to -5.87 eV (DFT-D2); for further details, refer to Supplementary Information S. 1.

Figure 3 indicates the formation energy $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$, calculated using Eq. (1), for four different surface models: Fe-Fe-Pd, Fe-Pd-Fe, Pd-Fe-Pd, and Pd-Pd-Fe. The black and gray dashed lines represent the chemical potentials of bulk FePd₃ and Pd, respectively. Under these conditions, the results reveal the following order of stability for Pd-Fe-Pd < Fe-Fe-Pd ~ Pd-Pd-Fe < Fe-Pd-Fe; the most stable structure indicates Pd as the topmost layer, it is consistent with theoretical studies on other Fe-based $L1_0$ binary alloys^{19,20}.

For simplicity, our analysis is limited to configurations where the atoms in the second and third layers are of different types. Additional configurations for the model shown in Fig. 1(c) are summarized in Supplementary Information S2.

For the surface with the adsorbed graphene, we define the formation energy $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$ as follows:

$$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}} = \left(E_{\text{slab}}^{\text{w/Gr}} - E_{\text{slab}}^{\text{w/oGr}} - \mu_{\text{C}} N_{\text{C}} \right) / N, \quad (2)$$

where $E_{\text{slab}}^{\text{w/oGr}}$ and $E_{\text{slab}}^{\text{w/Gr}}$ represent the total energies of the slab surfaces without and with the graphene layer, respectively [see Fig. 2(c) and 2(d)]. μ_{C} is the chemical potential of isolated pristine graphene, which is assumed to be $\mu_{\text{C}} \approx -9.28$ eV (DFT-D2).




FIG. 3. Formation energy $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$ from Eq. (1) for various surface models: Fe-Fe-Pd, Fe-Pd-Fe, Pd-Fe-Pd, and Pd-Pd-Fe. The black and gray dashed lines represent the chemical potentials of bulk FePd_3 and Pd, respectively. The calculations are performed by DFT-D2 vdW functional.

In Table I, we summarize the calculated formation energies for four surface structures considered in Fig. 3. The values for μ_{Fe} and μ_{Pd} are taken from the black line in Fig. 3 (FePd_3). Besides, for comparison, the results obtained using the DFT-D2 and optB86b functionals are provided (the values for optB86b are shown in parentheses). According to $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$ values, in most cases, Pd-terminated surfaces are more stable than Fe-terminated surfaces. For instance, stacking Fe layers on a Pd-Fe-Pd structure would result in an Fe-Pd-Fe surface. However, the formation energy indicates that the Pd-Pd-Fe is more stable. Additionally, while Fe-terminated surfaces are energetically unstable (refer $E_{\text{FePd}}^{\text{form}}$ for Fe-Pd-Fe), it can be stabilized by capped with Pd layer (refer $E_{\text{FePd}}^{\text{form}}$ Pd-Fe-Pd) and be resulting in the formation of the Pd-Fe-Pd structure.

As shown in Table I, the formation energy $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$ follows the order $\text{Fe-Pd-Fe} < \text{Fe-Fe-Pd} < \text{Pd-Fe-Pd} < \text{Pd-Pd-Fe}$, indicating that the bonding between Fe and Gr is significantly stronger than that between Pd and Gr. In other words, the bare Fe-terminated surface, which is originally unstable, can be stabilized by capping with a Gr layer (or other metallic layers). However, the gain in $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$ is smaller in magnitude compared to $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$. For the total formation energy, $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}} + E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$ is $\text{Pd-Fe-Pd} < \text{Fe-Fe-Pd} < \text{Fe-Pd-Fe} \approx \text{Pd-Pd-Fe}$; the Pd-terminated surface with graphene adsorption is still the most stable. This result contrasts with recent observations reported in Ref. 3, which indicates the existence of the Fe-terminated surface with graphene; the attractive chemical interaction between Fe and C is insufficient to explain this discrepancy.

TABLE I. Calculated formation energy of bared FePd surface $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$, $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$ for various different surface structure models in Fig. 1. For comparison, the results using the DFT-D2 and optB86b functionals are provided (the values for optB86b are shown in parentheses).

	$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$ [eV/atom]	$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$ [eV/atom]	$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}} + E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$ [eV/atom]
Fe-Fe-Pd	+0.00	-0.04	-0.05
	(+0.03)	(-0.02)	(+0.01)
Fe-Pd-Fe	+0.60	-0.21	+0.39
	(+0.59)	(-0.15)	(+0.44)
Pd-Fe-Pd	-0.61	+0.24	-0.37
	(-0.59)	(+0.32)	(-0.28)
Pd-Pd-Fe	+0.22	+0.15	+0.37
	(+0.21)	(+0.24)	(+0.45)

B. Effect of surface oxidation

Section III A discusses the stability FePd/Gr in a vacuum, and suggests that the formation of Fe-terminated surfaces is unlikely under such conditions. Next, we additionally explore the effect of surface oxidation as a potential mechanism for forming Fe-terminated surfaces. Under the experiment condition, FePd samples are fabricated using the sputtering method^{2,3}, and the surface is exposed to an oxygen atmosphere before the deposition of graphene by CVD. To investigate the effect of oxygen, we perform XPS (X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy) measurements on FePd samples. XPS spectra are obtained using a Mg- $K\alpha$ X-ray source ($h\nu = 1253.6$ eV), for which photoelectrons are collected using a Gammatdata Scienta SES-100 hemispherical analyzer in transmission mode. The measurements are conducted at room temperature at a base pressure of approximately 1.0×10^{-7} Pa.

Figure 4 presents the schematic illustration of the experimental setup and results of XPS measurement at Fe $2p$ and Pd $3d$ peaks. We compare the spectra of samples immediately after fabrication (labeled "As-grown") and after one week of oxidation in the air (labeled "Oxidized"). The latter condition closely resembles samples used in prior FePd/Gr fabrication^{2,3}. In Fig. 4(b), the Fe $2p$ core-level spectra indicates the increase of FeO_x peak in the oxidized sample; it represents




FIG. 4. Schematic illustration of the experimental conditions (a) and spectra at the Fe $2p$ (b) and Pd $3d$ (c) core-levels. Spectra are shown for samples immediately after fabrication (yellow) and after one-week of oxidation in the air (light blue).

the existence of bonding between Fe and O, In Fig. 4(c), it can be observed that Pd atoms are less susceptible to oxidation under the same conditions compared to Fe atoms.




FIG. 5. Computational models of oxidized FePd surfaces. Two types of adsorption sites are considered: top (a) and hollow (b). Various oxygen coverage ratios and configurations are illustrated in (c).

Next, we perform the first-principles calculation to evaluate the effect of oxidization of surface metal atoms on the formation energy; we construct a model that includes O atoms, as illustrated in Fig. 5. The atomic-scale arrangement and concentration of O atoms on the FePd(001) surface are not well understood. Therefore, we propose several initial structural models inspired by the well-known crystals of FeO and PdO (with a rocksalt structure). In our study, we consider two adsorption sites (referred to as "top" and "hollow") and four different coverage rates: 25 %, 50 %, 75 %, and 100 %.

75 %, and 100 %, where 100 % indicates a completely oxidized surface (the ratio of topmost metal to oxygen is 1:1). To determine the most realistic formation energy among these proposed structural models, we perform structural optimization. The stability of the structure is evaluated by the formation energy ($E_{\text{form}}^{\text{O}}$) expressed as below:

$$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd/O}} = E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}} + E_{\text{form}}^{\text{O}} \quad (3)$$

with

$$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{O}} = (E_{\text{surf}}^{\text{w/O}} - E_{\text{surf}}^{\text{w/o O}} - N_{\text{O}}\mu_{\text{O}})/N, \quad (4)$$

where $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$ is the formation energy of the topmost metallic layer as defined in Eq. (1). $E_{\text{surf}}^{\text{w/O}}$ represents the energy of the oxidized FePd slab r , while $E_{\text{surf}}^{\text{w/o O}}$ corresponds to the energy of the bare surface. N is the number of atoms in the topmost layer. N_{O} is the number of O atom, and μ_{O} is the chemical potential of oxygen. μ_{O} of diatomic oxygen molecule O_2 in atmosphere is given as below:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\text{O}}(p_{\text{O}_2}, T) = & \frac{1}{2} \left[E_{\text{O}_2} + k_{\text{B}}T \log \left(\frac{p_{\text{O}_2}}{p^\circ} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \Delta_{\text{f}}G_{\text{O}_2}(p^\circ, T) - \Delta_{\text{f}}G_{\text{O}_2}(p^\circ, 0) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where E_{O_2} is the energy of an isolated O_2 molecule. Here, p_{O_2}/p° represents the relative partial pressure of O_2 gas, and $\Delta_{\text{f}}G_{\text{O}_2}$ is the Gibbs free energy for a single molecule²⁷.

As a result, in the case of Fe-terminated surfaces, the formation energy of oxidation ($E_{\text{form}}^{\text{O}}$) is minimized at a hollow site with a coverage rate of 100 %, which reaches $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{O}} \approx 2.85$ eV/atom). This energy gain is significantly larger than the formation energy of the bare surface ($E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$); then, the total formation energy $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd/O}} \approx -2.25$ eV/atom (see the supplementary material S. 3 for details). This negative formation energy indicates a favorable thermodynamic tendency towards the realization and stability of the Fe-terminated surfaces.

We perform similar calculations for Pd-terminated surface models. Figure 6 illustrates the calculated formation energy $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd/O}}$ as a function of the oxygen coverage ratio. The minimum $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd/O}}$ of the Fe-terminated surface models is approximately 1.3 eV lower than that of the Pd-terminated surface models. In contrast to the analysis presented in Section III A, these results suggest that Fe surfaces are enhanced in samples exposed to an oxygen atmosphere. This finding is consistent with XPS measurements in Fig. 4 and reproduces the prior characterization of FePd/Gr interface by STEM³.




FIG. 6. Calculated formation energy $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd/O}}$ as defined in Eq. (3) plotted as a function of the oxygen coverage ratio for Fe-terminated (red) and Pd-terminated surface models shown in Fig. 5. The solid line indicates the minimal $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd/O}}$ (convex hull) at each ratio.

C. Formation mechanism

In the analysis presented in Sec. III A, we investigated the stability of the FePd surface in a vacuum. We obtained that Pd-terminated surfaces would be energetically more favorable than Fe. Besides, the adsorption of graphene is unstable in the case of Pd-terminated surface (stable only in Fe-terminated surface); the most energetically favorable configuration becomes the Pd surface without graphene, prior experimental observations of graphene-adsorbed Fe surfaces. In the analysis provided in Sec. III A, we have established that, in an oxygen atmosphere, the formation of oxidized iron on the FePd surface exhibits enhanced thermodynamic stability. This finding is in agreement with the results obtained from XPS measurements. Based on the findings above, we propose a formation mechanism for the experimentally observed FePd/Gr heterointerface, as summarized in Fig. 7.

In the experimental fabrication process, L1₀-FePd is grown by radio frequency (RF) magnetron sputtering using a FePd target with a 46:54 atomic ratio, resulting in a FePd film with a 50:50 atomic ratio. The FePd films are annealed at high temperatures and temporarily exposed to the atmosphere before being transferred to the CVD chamber. During the CVD process, the sample is annealed under a reducing gas atmosphere (H₂) to remove the surface oxidation layer, and graphene is deposited on the surface using C₂H₂ gas (the detail is given in Ref. 3).




FIG. 7. Proposed formation mechanism of FePd/Gr

As illustrated in Fig. 7, we hypothesize that the initially Pd-rich surface of the sample becomes covered with FeO due to oxidation. In the subsequent stage, the hydrogen-reduced Fe surface provides favorable sites for carbon adsorption. This process likely enables the formation of a macroscale graphene-covered Fe-terminated surface. Additionally, we consider the above does not forbid the existence of the energetically stable bare (uncovered) Pd-terminated surface; under specific growth conditions, samples with a higher proportion of Pd-terminated surfaces could also be obtained.

IV. SUMMARY

This study presents a first-principles analysis of the van der Waals heterointerface between two-dimensional (2D) materials and ferromagnetic alloys, specifically FePd. Our calculations explain the atomic-scale structures of the FePd/Graphene (Gr) heterointerface, revealing key stability characteristics. We find that Pd-terminated surfaces of bare FePd are stable under vacuum conditions. While Gr coverage promotes Fe-terminated surfaces due to the attractive Fe-C chemical bonding, Fe-terminated surfaces remain less stable than Pd-terminated ones. In the presence of oxygen, stability shifts towards Fe termination as Fe-O bonds form, significantly influencing surface composition during chemical vapor deposition (CVD) processes³. Our theoretical and experimental findings enhance the fabrication strategies for L1₀-alloy and 2D material heterointerfaces, offering valuable insights into their stability and magnetic properties, essential for advancing future spintronics technologies.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Additional details and results are included in the supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is partly supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Core-to-Core Program (No. JPJSCCA20230005), by Cooperative Research Project from CSRN, and by the cross-appointment project (H.N, P.S., and J.R.) and QST-Tohoku University matching foundation. In addition, this work is also partially financially supported by MEXT as part of the “Program for Promoting Researches on the Supercomputer Fugaku” (Quantum-Theory-Based Multiscale Simulations toward the Development of Next-Generation Energy-Saving Semiconductor Devices, JPMXP1020200205), JSPS KAKENHI (JP22H05463), JST CREST(JPMJCR22B4), Kurata Grants, and the Iwatani Naoji Foundation. This work was partially supported by the Spintronics Research Network of Japan (Spin-RNJ). The numerical calculations were carried out using the computer facilities of the Institute for Solid State Physics at The University of Tokyo, the Center for Computational Sciences at the University of Tsukuba (Multidisciplinary Cooperative Research Program), and the supercomputer Fugaku provided by the RIKEN Center for Computational Science (Project ID: hp210170, hp230175). The visualization is performed by VESTA code²⁸.

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest

The author has no conflicts to disclose.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Author Contributions

R. Endo: Conceptualization (equal); Data curation (lead); Formal analysis (lead); Software (lead); Investigation (equal); Validation (equal); Visualization (equal) Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal). **N. Matsumoto:** Conceptualization (supporting);

Investigation (supporting); Software (supporting); Writing – review & editing (supporting). **S. Vergara**: Conceptualization (supporting); Investigation (supporting); Writing – review & editing (supporting). **M. Kobayashi**: Conceptualization (supporting); Investigation (equal); Writing – review & editing (supporting). **H. Shinya**: Conceptualization (supporting); Investigation (supporting); Software (supporting); Writing – review & editing (supporting). **H. Naganuma**: Conceptualization (equal); Investigation (equal); Project administration (equal); Supervision (equal); Funding acquisition (equal); Writing – original draft (supporting); Writing – review & editing (supporting). **T. Ono**: Conceptualization (equal); Investigation (equal); Formal analysis (supporting); Project administration (equal); Software (supporting); Supervision (equal); Funding acquisition (equal); Writing – original draft (supporting); Writing – review & editing (supporting). **M. Uemoto**: Conceptualization (equal); Investigation (equal); Formal analysis (supporting); Software (supporting); Supervision (equal); Visualization (equal) Validation (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal).

REFERENCES

- ¹H. Naganuma, G. Kim, Y. Kawada, N. Inami, K. Hatakeyama, S. Iihama, K. M. Nazrul Islam, M. Oogane, S. Mizukami, and Y. Ando, “Electrical detection of millimeter-waves by magnetic tunnel junctions using perpendicular magnetized $L1_0$ -FePd free layer,” *Nano Lett.* **15**, 623–628 (2015).
- ²H. Naganuma, V. Zlatko, M. Galbiati, F. Godel, A. Sander, C. Carrétero, O. Bezencenet, N. Reyren, M.-B. Martin, B. Dlubak, and P. Seneor, “A perpendicular graphene/ferromagnet electrode for spintronics,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **116**, 173101 (2020).
- ³H. Naganuma, M. Nishijima, H. Adachi, M. Uemoto, H. Shinya, S. Yasui, H. Morioka, A. Hirata, F. Godel, M.-B. Martin, B. Dlubak, P. Seneor, and K. Amemiya, “Unveiling a chemisorbed crystallographically heterogeneous graphene/ $L1_0$ -FePd interface with a robust and perpendicular orbital moment,” *ACS nano* **16**, 4139–4151 (2022).
- ⁴H. Naganuma, M. Uemoto, H. Adachi, H. Shinya, I. Mochizuki, M. Kobayashi, A. Hirata, B. Dlubak, T. Ono, P. Seneor, J. Robertson, and K. Amemiya, “Twist pz orbital and spin moment of the wavy-graphene/ $L1_0$ -fepd moiré interface,” *J. Phys. Chem. C* **127**, 11481–11489 (2023).
- ⁵M. Uemoto, H. Adachi, H. Naganuma, and T. Ono, “Density functional study of twisted graphene $L1_0$ -FePd heterogeneous interface,” *J. Appl. Phys.* **132**, 095301 (2022).

- ⁶H. Adachi, R. Endo, H. Shinya, H. Naganuma, T. Ono, and M. Uemoto, “First-principle study of spin transport property in $L1_0$ -fepd(001)/graphene heterojunction,” *J. Appl. Phys.* **135** (2024), 10.1063/5.0175047.
- ⁷A. Itabashi, M. Ohtake, S. Ouchi, F. Kirino, and M. Futamoto, “Preparation of $L1_0$ ordered FePd, FePt, and CoPt thin films with flat surfaces on MgO (001) single-crystal substrates,” in *EPJ Web of Conferences*, Vol. 40 (EDP Sciences, 2013) p. 07001.
- ⁸H. Shima, K. Oikawa, A. Fujita, K. Fukamichi, K. Ishida, and A. Sakuma, “Lattice axial ratio and large uniaxial magnetocrystalline anisotropy in $L1_0$ -type FePd single crystals prepared under compressive stress,” *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 224408 (2004).
- ⁹T. Klemmer, D. Hoydick, H. Okumura, B. Zhang, and W. Soffa, “Magnetic hardening and coercivity mechanisms in $L1_0$ ordered FePd ferromagnets,” *Scr. Mater.* **33**, 1793–1805 (1995).
- ¹⁰S. Iihama, A. Sakuma, H. Naganuma, M. Oogane, T. Miyazaki, S. Mizukami, and Y. Ando, “Low precessional damping observed for $L1_0$ -ordered FePd epitaxial thin films with large perpendicular magnetic anisotropy,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **105**, 142403 (2014).
- ¹¹T. Kawai, A. Itabashi, M. Ohtake, S. Takeda, and M. Futamoto, “Gilbert damping constant of FePd alloy thin films estimated by broadband ferromagnetic resonance,” in *EPJ Web of Conferences*, Vol. 75 (EDP Sciences, 2014) p. 02002.
- ¹²D.-L. Zhang, K. B. Schliep, R. J. Wu, P. Quarterman, D. Reifsnnyder Hickey, Y. Lv, X. Chao, H. Li, J.-Y. Chen, Z. Zhao, M. Jamali, A. K. Mkhoya, and J.-P. Wang, “Enhancement of tunneling magnetoresistance by inserting a diffusion barrier in $L1_0$ -FePd perpendicular magnetic tunnel junctions,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **112**, 152401 (2018).
- ¹³H. Naganuma, “Spintronics memory using magnetic tunnel junction for X nm-generation,” *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* **62**, SG0811 (2023).
- ¹⁴T. Endoh, H. Honjo, K. Nishioka, and S. Ikeda, “Recent progresses in STT-MRAM and SOT-MRAM for next generation MRAM,” in *2020 IEEE Symposium on VLSI Technology* (IEEE, 2020) pp. 1–2.
- ¹⁵S. Bhatti, R. Sbiaa, A. Hirohata, H. Ohno, S. Fukami, and S. Piramanayagam, “Spintronics based random access memory: a review,” *Mater. Today* **20**, 530–548 (2017).
- ¹⁶A. Hashmi, K. Nakanishi, and T. Ono, “Graphene-based symmetric and non-symmetric magnetoresistive junctions,” *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **89**, 034708 (2020).
- ¹⁷J. Robertson, H. Naganuma, and H. Lu, “Comparing h-BN and MgO tunnel barriers for scaled magnetic tunnel junctions,” *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* **62**, SC0804 (2023).

- ¹⁸K. Hammar, Y. Labaye, L. Messad, and A. Ziane, “Theoretical estimation of surface magnetic anisotropy on 110-fept thin films: Case of perfect and defect surfaces.” *Surface Science* **717**, 121999 (2022).
- ¹⁹Y. Taniguchi, Y. Miura, K. Abe, and M. Shirai, “Theoretical studies on spin-dependent conductance in fept/mgo/fept (001) magnetic tunnel junctions,” *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **44**, 2585–2588 (2008).
- ²⁰A. Dannenberg, M. E. Gruner, A. Hucht, and P. Entel, “Surface energies of stoichiometric fept and copt alloys and their implications for nanoparticle morphologies,” *Physical review B* **80**, 245438 (2009).
- ²¹G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, “Efficiency of ab-initio total energy calculations for metals and semiconductors using a plane-wave basis set,” *Computational materials science* **6**, 15–50 (1996).
- ²²J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, “Generalized gradient approximation made simple,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865–3868 (1996).
- ²³P. E. Blöchl, “Projector augmented-wave method,” *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 17953 (1994).
- ²⁴S. Grimme, “Semiempirical GGA-type density functional constructed with a long-range dispersion correction,” *J. Comp. Chem.* **27**, 1787–1799 (2006).
- ²⁵J. c. v. Klimeš, D. R. Bowler, and A. Michaelides, “Van der waals density functionals applied to solids,” *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 195131 (2011).
- ²⁶E. Burzo, P. Vlaic, *et al.*, “Magnetic properties of iron-palladium solid solutions and compounds,” *Journal of optoelectronics and advanced materials* **12**, 1869 (2010).
- ²⁷M. Chase, *NIST-JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 4th Edition* (American Institute of Physics, 1998).
- ²⁸K. Momma and F. Izumi, “VESTA: a three-dimensional visualization system for electronic and structural analysis,” *J. Appl. Cryst.* **41**, 653–658 (2008).

Appendix A: Interaction between inhomogeneous graphene and metal surfaces

Understanding the stability and atomic arrangement of FePd surfaces partially covered with graphene is crucial for applications in catalysis and electronics. The behaviors of uniformly constructed surfaces and interfaces, as discussed in Sec. III A, are also applicable to macroscopic-scale surfaces, including graphene-deficient regions and local compositional variations in the alloy surface spanning tens of atoms or more. We evaluate similar behavior observed in atomic-scale structural defects to extend these findings.




FIG. 8. Computational models of graphene with a gap and a partially substituted metal surface: single-atom substitution model (a) and multiple atom subsection model (b).

Here, we consider a model consisting of graphene with a gap and a partially substituted metal surface, as illustrated in Fig. 4. In this model, based on the graphene-covered Fe-terminated surface, a single Fe atom in the topmost layer is replaced by a Pd atom, referred to as the single-atom

substitution model [see Fig. 4(a)]. Several modified configurations are represented by the parameter m , where m denotes the position of the substituted atom. The calculated formation energies for each configuration are listed in Table II. The results indicate that the total energy decreases as the Pd atom moves closer to the graphene gap. In other words, this suggests instability observed in homogeneous graphene on Pd-terminated surfaces, as discussed in Sec. III A, and demonstrates that similar effects occur at the atomic scale in defect structures.

Additionally, we consider a multiple-atom substitution model [see Fig. 8(b)], in which n Pd atoms are substituted in the topmost layer. Our calculations show that increasing the number of Pd atoms beneath the graphene-covered area tends to destabilize graphene adsorption [see Table III].

These findings suggest that the most stable structure for FePd/Gr with a graphene gap consists of Fe atoms at the graphene-covered regions and Pd atoms at the gap.

TABLE II. Change of formation energy as the function of relative Pd atom position of topmost layer m :

$$\Delta E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}(m) = E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}(m) - E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}(m=0)$$

Position of Pd atom m	Formation energy $\Delta E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}(m)$ [eV/atom]
1	0.15 (0.15)
2	0.15 (0.15)
3	0.03 (0.04)
4	0.16 (0.15)
5	0.14 (0.14)

TABLE III. Change of formation energy as a function of the number of partially substituted Pd atoms (n)

in the topmost layer: $\Delta E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}(n) = E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}(n) - E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}(n=0)$

Number of Pd atom n	Formation energy $\Delta E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}(m)$ [eV/atom]
2	0.22 (0.22)
3	0.56 (0.43)
4	0.50 (0.42)

Supporting information of
**First-principle study of surface structure estimation
in $L1_0$ -FePd(001)/graphene heterojunction**

Ryusuke Endo¹, Hikari Shinya^{2,3,4,5}, Hiroshi Naganuma^{6,7,8,9},
Tomoya Ono¹ and Mitsuharu Uemoto¹

February 4, 2025

¹Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Graduate School of Engineering, Kobe University, 1-1 Rokkodai-cho, Nada-ku, Kobe 651-8501, Japan

²Center for Spintronics Research Network (CSRN), University of Tokyo, 7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan

³Institute for Chemical Research, Kyoto University, Gokasho, Uji, Kyoto 611-0011, Japan

⁴Center for Science and Innovation in Spintronics (CSIS), Tohoku University, 2-1-1, Katahira, Aoba-ku, Miyagi 980-8577, Japan

⁵Center for Spintronics Research Network (CSRN), Osaka University, 1-3, Machikaneyama, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-8531, Japan

⁶Center for Innovative Integrated Electronics Systems (CIES), Tohoku University, 468-1 Aramaki Aza Aoba, Aoba, Sendai, Miyagi, 980-8572, Japan

⁷Center for Spintronics Integrated Systems (CSIS), Tohoku University, 2-2-1 Katahira Aoba, Sendai, Miyagi 980-8577 Japan

⁸Center for Spintronics Research Network (CSRN), Tohoku University, 2-1-1 Katahira, Aoba, Sendai, Miyagi 980-8577 Japan

⁹Graduate School of Engineering, Tohoku University, 6-6-05, Aoba, Aoba-ku, Sendai, Miyagi, 980-8579, Japan

S.1 Chemical potentials of Fe and Pd atoms

The chemical potential of iron and paradium μ_{Fe} and μ_{Pd} is indeed depends on environmental properties such as the compotion of the alloy. During the experimental synthesis of FePd in Pd-rich growth condition, based on the phase diagram of Fe–Pd system, the coexistence of multiple phases, such as FePd and FePd₃ and Pd, can be achieved.

For two alloys in equilibrium (Alloy A and Alloy B), the chemical potential of a metallic components must be equal in both alloys. Then we have:

$$\mu_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{A}} = \mu_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{B}} \quad (\text{S.1})$$

$$\mu_{\text{Pd}}^{\text{A}} = \mu_{\text{Pd}}^{\text{B}} . \quad (\text{S.2})$$

The density functional theory (DFT) calculation provides the total energy E ; which is related to chemical potential by the following equation:

$$E(\text{A}) = N_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{A}} \mu_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{A}} + N_{\text{Pd}}^{\text{A}} \mu_{\text{Pd}}^{\text{A}} , \quad (\text{S.3})$$

where N_{Fe}^{A} and N_{Pd}^{A} are the numbers of Fe and Pd atoms in Alloy A, respectively. Besides, a similar relationship can be hold for the case of alloy B:

$$E(\text{B}) = N_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{B}} \mu_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{B}} + N_{\text{Pd}}^{\text{B}} \mu_{\text{Pd}}^{\text{B}} . \quad (\text{S.4})$$

Then, Eqs. (S.1)-(S.4) lead to system of equations which provides the chemical potentials.




Figure S.1: Crystal structures of (a) Fe, (b) Pd, (c) FePd, (d) FePd₃.

Here, we consider the a few reference materials: FePd, FePd₃, Pd (and Fe, for comparison), whose crystal structure are illustrated in Fig. S.1. The number of atoms in unit cell and corresponding total energies are listed in Table. S.1. The calculated μ_{Fe} and μ_{Pd} for each of the two alloys systems are also provides in Table. S.3. μ_{Fe} and μ_{Pd} are distributing in a narrow range of 0.3 eV regardress of the material system .

Additionally, for comparison, we employ two types of empirical van der Waals (vdW) functionals: DFT-D2 and optB86b-vdW.

Table S.1: Crystal structures, number of atoms per unit cell, and calculated total energies for the considered reference materials obtained by two vdW functionals: DFT-D2 and optB86b-vdW.

Material		Number of atoms [1/cell]		Total energy [eV/cell]	
Name	Structure	N_{Fe}	N_{Pd}	DFT-D2	optB86b-vdW
Fe	bcc	2	0	-17.35	-11.91
Pd	fcc	0	4	-23.47	-9.84
FePd	tetragonal($L1_0$)	1	1	-14.63	-8.46
FePd3	cubic	1	3	-26.60	-13.61

Table S.2: Calculated chemical potential μ_{Fe} and μ_{Pd} from various materials.

Material		Chemical potentials [eV]			
		DFT-D2 results		optB86b-vdw results	
A	B	μ_{Fe}	μ_{Pd}	μ_{Fe}	μ_{Pd}
Fe	Pd	-8.67	-5.87	-5.96	-2.46
Fe	FePd	-8.67	-5.95	-5.96	-2.51
Fe	FePd ₃	-8.67	-5.98	-5.96	-2.55
Pd	FePd	-8.76	-5.87	-6.00	-2.46
Pd	FePd ₃	-8.99	-5.87	-6.23	-2.46
FePd	FePd ₃	-8.64	-5.99	-5.89	-2.57

S.2 Formation energies of bare and Gr-covered surfaces

Table S.3: Formation energies of bare FePd surface $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$ and the adsorption of Gr layer $E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$, which are defined in Sec. 2 of the manuscript.

Model	Formation energy [eV]					
	DFT-D2 results			OptB86b-vdw results		
	$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$	$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$	$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}} + E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$	$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}}$	$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$	$E_{\text{form}}^{\text{FePd}} + E_{\text{form}}^{\text{Gr}}$
Fe-Fe-Fe	-0.03	-0.03	-0.06	-0.03	-0.01	-0.04
Fe-Fe-Pd	0.00	-0.04	-0.05	0.03	-0.02	0.01
Fe-Pd-Fe	0.60	-0.21	0.39	0.59	-0.15	0.44
Fe-Pd-Pd	0.36	-0.23	0.12	0.35	-0.17	0.18
Pd-Fe-Fe	-0.43	0.24	-0.20	-0.47	0.32	-0.15
Pd-Fe-Pd	-0.61	0.24	-0.37	-0.59	0.32	-0.28
Pd-Pd-Fe	0.22	0.15	0.37	0.21	0.24	0.45
Pd-Pd-Pd	0.13	0.11	0.24	0.12	0.21	0.33