Magnetization dynamics of two interacting spins in an external magnetic field

Sergey V. Titov,^a Hamid Kachkachi,^b Yuri P. Kalmykov,^c and William T. Coffey^d

^aInstitute of Radio Engineering and Electronics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Fryazino, Moscow Region, 141190, Russian Federation

^b Laboratoire de Magntetisme et d'Optique, Universitte de Versailles St. Quentin 45 av. des Etats-Unis, 78035 Versailles Cedex, France

^c Groupe de Physique Moléculaire, MEPS, Université de Perpignan, 52 Avenue Paul Alduy, 66860 Perpignan Cedex, France

^d Department of Electronic and Electrical Engineering, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland

Abstract

The longitudinal relaxation time of the magnetization of a system of two exchange coupled spins subjected to a strong magnetic field is calculated exactly by averaging the stochastic Gilbert-Landau-Lifshitz equation for the magnetization, i.e., the Langevin equation of the process, over its realizations so reducing the problem to a system of linear differential-recurrence relations for the statistical moments (averaged spherical harmonics). The system is solved in the frequency domain by matrix continued fractions yielding the complete solution of the two spin problem in external fields for all values of the damping and barrier height parameters. The magnetization relaxation time extracted from the exact solution is compared with the inverse relaxation rate from Langer's theory of the decay of metastable states [J. S. Langer, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **54**, 258 (1969)], which yields in the high barrier and intermediate-to-high damping limits the asymptotic behavior of the greatest relaxation time.

PACS number(s): 75.50.Tt, 76.20.+q, 05.40.Jc

I. INTRODUCTION

Fine single-domain ferromagnetic particles are characterized by thermal instability of their magnetization due to thermal agitation.¹ Thermal fluctuations and relaxation of the magnetization of single domain particles are important in information storage and rock magnetism, as well as in magnetization reversal (that is the slowest magnetization decay mode which is characterized by the greatest relaxation time) in isolated ferromagnetic nanoparticles and nanowires. The effect of thermal fluctuations on the magnetization reversal of an assembly of single domain ferromagnetic particles (that is single coherent spins) is described by the Néel-Brown model.¹⁻³ This model, based on the classical theory of the Brownian motion (by taking as Langevin equation the Gilbert-Landau-Lifshitz equation for the motion of the magnetization augmented by a random field) and the one-spin approximation, has been used to interpret many experiments (see, for example, Ref. 4). Nevertheless, systems of (both metallic and ferrite) particles exist, where deviations in behavior from that predicted by the one-spin approximation have been recently observed.⁵⁻⁸ An understanding of these effects requires microscopic theories of the magnetization dynamics, capable of distinguishing and accounting for the various crystallographic local environments inside a nanoparticle and on its surface. In formulating such theories one is invariably faced with complex N-body problems. Thus before one can calculate the magnetization relaxation time of many interacting spins, one needs to understand the effect of interactions on the magnetization relaxation time of the simplest interacting system, conceived of as a pair of spins coupled via exchange interaction, including the usual magneto-crystalline anisotropy and Zeeman terms. This will be referred to as the two-spin problem (TSP). This apparently simple problem presents, in the course of its general formulation, the usual difficulties related with analyzing the energyscape (location of the minima, maxima, and saddle points of the potential energy) in a system with many degrees of freedom, which is a crucial step in the calculation of the relaxation time whatever the context. At first sight, one may remark that the TSP appears to be an overtly trivial problem, solely of academic interest. Nevertheless, it still has interesting technological applications, such as to the Magnetic Random Access Memory (MRAM) with magnetic tunnel junction comprised of two ferromagnetic layers separated by a thin insulating barrier,⁹ and interacting via an effective interfacial exchange coupling depending on the mutual orientation of the moments of the two ferromagnets.¹⁰ The solution of the TSP is also of interest in the study of the dielectric relaxation of polar molecules containing rotating polar groups interacting by means of dipole-dipole coupling as formulated by Budó¹¹ and which has been reviewed in detail in Ref. 12.

The Néel-Brown model is based on the concept of three-dimensional coherent rotational diffusion of the magnetization in an external potential comprising the potentials of the magnetocrystalline anisotropy and external fields. The theoretical treatment of the model is usually given by means of the Fokker-Planck equation for the distribution function *W* of the orientations of the magnetic spins on the surface of unit sphere.^{3,13-16} This Fokker-Planck equation also known as Brown's equation can be solved by expanding *W* in spherical harmonics so yielding an infinite hierarchy of differential-recurrence relations for the statistical moments (averaged spherical harmonics). The same hierarchy of moment equations can also be obtained without appealing to the Fokker-Planck equation¹⁷ by directly averaging the Gilbert-Landau-Lifshitz equation of motion of the magnetization augmented by a random field over its realizations. The hierarchy can be solved either by calculating the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the system matrix (e.g., Refs. 18-20) or in the frequency domain using a matrix continued fraction method.^{21,22} The solution allows one to calculate the magnetization relaxation time as well as other physical parameters (spectra of the relaxation functions, the complex susceptibility, etc.).

We remark that the effect of interactions between magnetic moments on the magnetization relaxation time τ has been approximately treated in several papers. For example, Lyberatos *et al.*²³ used a Monte-Carlo method to study the dynamics of an assembly of interacting magnetic moments. In Ref. 24, a pair of coupled dipoles was treated using numerical

Langevin dynamics simulations. Hinzke and Nowak²⁵ compared calculations of thermally activated magnetization reversal in systems of interacting classical magnetic moments both by a Monte-Carlo method and Langevin dynamics simulations. Denisov and Trohidou²⁶ by solving the Fokker-Planck equation for the distribution function of two-dimensional ensembles of ferromagnetic nanoparticles, derived an evolution equation for magnetization and found its solution in certain limiting cases. Approximate analytic equations for τ were obtained under particular conditions for assemblies of magnetic moments in Refs. 27-29. Rodé et al.³⁰ numerically solved the Fokker-Planck equation for a system of two interacting particles and calculated the time decay of the magnetization. Chen *et al.*³¹ presented an analytic solution for τ for two identical interacting single domain particles and obtained good agreement with the numerical results using the Fokker-Planck equation. The relaxation time has also been approximately evaluated by Kachkachi³² using Langer's general theory of the decay of metastable states³³ comprising *inter alia* the generalization of Kramers calculation of the intermediate-to-high damping (IHD) escape rate for a single degree of freedom system with a separable and additive Hamiltonian to multidegree of freedom systems with non separable Hamiltonians as obtain in magnetic systems. He considered a system of two spins in the special situation, where the easy axes of the two spins are parallel to each other and to the applied field. He then used Langer's general reaction rate equation to obtain analytical expressions for the relaxation time (a detailed description of the application of Langer's theory of the decay of metastable states to superparamagnetism and its relation to the Kramers escape rate is given in Refs. 14,22,33, and 34). Apparently a "critical" value of the exchange coupling, $j_c=1-h^2$ (h being the reduced applied field) exists separating two regimes with distinct reversal mechanisms. More precisely, for strong coupling $(i > i_c)$ the two spins reverse their direction coherently through the only available saddle point. On the other hand, for weak coupling two saddle points exist so that reversal of the two spins is a two-step process. Moreover, near j_c it was shown that the relaxation rate diverges due to flattening of the saddle points implying that Langer's general

calculation of the IHD relaxation rate which is formulated by means of a quadratic expansion of the potential energy about the saddle point, is not applicable in this coupling range, thus leaving the two ranges unconnected as far as asymptotic calculations are concerned.

The purpose of the present work is to present the exact solution of the TSP (a system with more than two degrees of freedom). This will be accomplished by (i) deriving an exact system of equations for statistical moments by directly averaging the Gilbert-Landau-Lifshitz equations for the motion of the magnetization augmented by a random field due to the heat bath over its realizations; (ii) solving the resulting hierarchy of moment equations by the matrix-continued fraction (MCF) method,²² which will allow one (iii) to investigate the time decay of the magnetization both in the critical region of exchange coupling alluded to above and also in all other ranges of the damping, anisotropy and applied field parameters. In the IHD regime, the energy loss per cycle of the almost periodic motion of a spin having the saddle point energy much greater than the thermal energy, asymptotic formulas for the greatest relaxation time [32] based on Langer's method are naturally expected to apply. In this regime the results for the relaxation time obtained from the Langevin equation using the exact MCF method are compared with those of Ref. 32 in order to establish a range of validity for asymptotic calculations of the IHD relaxation time.

II. SOLUTION OF THE LANGEVIN EQUATIONS FOR TWO INTERACTING SPINS

We first demonstrate how the hierarchy of differential-recurrence relations for the appropriate relaxation functions arise naturally from the coupled vector Langevin equations for the two-spin system defined as Stratonovich stochastic equations,^{22,35} thus bypassing the problem of constructing and solving the Fokker-Planck equation entirely. Consider a system of two exchange-coupled spins $S_i(t)$, *i*=1,2,

$$\mathbf{S}_{i} = S\mathbf{s}_{i}, \, \mathbf{s}_{i} = \mathbf{i}\sin\vartheta_{i}\cos\varphi_{i} + \mathbf{j}\sin\vartheta_{i}\sin\varphi_{i} + \mathbf{k}\cos\vartheta_{i}, \qquad (1)$$

where ϑ_i and φ_i are the respective polar and azimuthal angles, \mathbf{s}_i the unit vectors along \mathbf{S}_i , and S the nominal value of the spin. The two easy axes are taken parallel to each other and to the

applied field, which is parallel to the reference (Z) axis. Next, we assume that the magnitude of an external applied (spatially) uniform dc magnetic field is suddenly altered at time t = 0 from $\mathbf{H}_Z^{\mathrm{I}}$ to $\mathbf{H}_Z^{\mathrm{II}}$. We are then interested in the relaxation of this system starting from an equilibrium state I with the distribution function W_{I} ($t \leq 0$) to another equilibrium state II with the distribution function W_{II} ($t \rightarrow \infty$). The initial distribution function in equilibrium state I is the Boltzmann distribution,

$$W_{\rm I} = Z_{\rm I}^{-1} e^{-\beta V_{\rm I}} \ . \tag{2}$$

Likewise, a long time after the alteration of the field the distribution function in the new equilibrium state II will also be given by the Boltzmann distribution,

$$W_{\rm II} = Z_{\rm II}^{-1} e^{-\beta V_{\rm II}} , \qquad (3)$$

where V_N is the free energy, $\beta = 1/kT$ and Z_N (N = I, II) are the partition functions. The dynamics of the spin $\mathbf{S}_i(t)$ immediately following the alteration of the field may be described using the normalized relaxation function

$$f_{i}(t) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{s}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{Z} \rangle(t) - \langle \mathbf{s}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{Z} \rangle_{\mathrm{II}}}{\langle \mathbf{s}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{Z} \rangle_{\mathrm{I}} - \langle \mathbf{s}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{Z} \rangle_{\mathrm{II}}},$$
(4)

where \mathbf{e}_{Z} is the unit vector along the Z axis, the angular brackets $\langle \mathbf{s}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{Z} \rangle(t)$ are the time dependent ensemble averages, and the brackets $\langle \mathbf{s}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{Z} \rangle_{N}$ designate the *equilibrium* ensemble average in the initial I and final II states with weighting function W_{N} ,

$$\left\langle \mathbf{s}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{Z} \right\rangle_{N} = \int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{\pi} \int_{0}^{\pi} (\mathbf{s}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{Z}) W_{N} \sin \vartheta_{2} \sin \vartheta_{1} d\vartheta_{2} d\vartheta_{1} d\varphi_{2} d\varphi_{1} d\varphi_{1} d\varphi_{2} d\varphi_{1}.$$
(5)

Note that the transient response so formulated is truly nonlinear because the change in amplitude $H_{\rm I} - H_{\rm II}$ of the external dc magnetic field is arbitrary.

The spin dynamics is governed by a Langevin equation which is the stochastic Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equation, i.e., the deterministic Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equation augmented by a random field $\mathbf{h}^{i}(t)$,^{3,22}

$$\dot{\mathbf{s}}_{i}(t) = \left[\mathbf{s}_{i}(t) \times \left[\gamma \mathbf{H}_{i}(t) + \gamma \mathbf{h}^{(i)}(t) - \alpha \dot{\mathbf{s}}_{i}(t)\right]\right],\tag{6}$$

where γ is the gyromagnetic ratio and α is the dimensionless damping parameter representing the dissipative coupling to the heat bath. The effective magnetic field $\mathbf{H}_i(t)$ acting on the spin *i* consists of the externally applied magnetic fields, the crystalline anisotropy field, and the molecular (or exchange) field produced by the other spin. It may be written as

$$\mathbf{H}_{i} = \frac{1}{\mu} \left(0, -\frac{\partial V}{\partial \vartheta_{i}}, -\frac{1}{\sin \vartheta_{i}} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \varphi_{i}} \right), \tag{7}$$

where $\mu = \mu_B S$ is the magnetic moment associated with the spin and μ_B being the Bohr magneton. The reduced free energy V of the two spin system in the dc magnetic field \mathbf{H}_Z^N may be written as [32]

$$\beta V = -\beta J S^{2}(\mathbf{s}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{2}) - \beta \sum_{i=1,2} \left[\mu H_{Z}^{N}(\mathbf{e}_{Z} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{i}) + K(\mathbf{e}_{Z} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{i})^{2} \right].$$
(8)

where *K* and *J* are the anisotropy and ferromagnetic exchange coupling constants, respectively. The random Gaussian field $\mathbf{h}^{i}(t)$ has the white noise properties

$$\overline{h_{\vartheta_i}(t)} = \overline{h_{\varphi_i}(t)} = 0, \quad \overline{h_{\vartheta_i}(t)h_{\vartheta_i}(t')} = \overline{h_{\varphi_i}(t)h_{\varphi_i}(t')} = 2\alpha(\gamma\mu\beta S)^{-1}\delta(t-t'), \quad (9)$$

where the overbar stands for statistical averaging over an ensemble of spins which have all started with the same (sharp) values of $\mathbf{s}_i(t) = \mathbf{s}_i$. The random white noise field takes into account the thermal fluctuations of the spin via the fluctuation-dissipation theorem. Equation (6) may be rearranged in the Landau-Lifshitz form³⁶

$$\dot{\mathbf{s}}_{i}(t) = bS\left(\alpha^{-1}\left[\mathbf{s}_{i}(t)\times\left(\mathbf{H}_{i}(t)+\mathbf{h}_{i}(t)\right)\right] - \left[\mathbf{s}_{i}(t)\times\left[\mathbf{s}_{i}(t)\times\left(\mathbf{H}_{i}(t)+\mathbf{h}_{i}(t)\right)\right]\right]\right),$$
(10)

where $b = \beta \mu / (2\tau_N)$ and

$$\tau_N = \beta \mu S (1 + \alpha^2) / (2\gamma \alpha) \tag{11}$$

is a characteristic (free diffusion) time. The vector stochastic differential equation (10) written in spherical polar coordinates leads to the system of two coupled scalar stochastic differential equations

$$\dot{\vartheta}_{i}(t) = bS \Big[h_{\vartheta}^{(i)}(t) - \alpha^{-1} h_{\varphi}^{(i)}(t) \Big] - b \Big[\frac{\partial}{\partial \vartheta_{i}} V(t) - \frac{1}{\alpha \sin \vartheta_{i}(t)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi_{i}} V(t) \Big],$$
(12)

$$\dot{\varphi}_{i}(t) = \frac{bS}{\sin\vartheta_{i}(t)} \Big[h_{\varphi}^{(i)}(t) + \alpha^{-1} h_{\vartheta}^{(i)}(t) \Big] -b \Big[\frac{1}{\sin^{2}\vartheta_{i}(t)} \frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi_{i}} V(t) + \frac{1}{\alpha\sin\vartheta_{i}(t)} \frac{\partial}{\partial\vartheta_{i}} V(t) \Big].$$
(13)

In applications to the spin reorientational dynamics, the relevant quantities are averages involving the spherical harmonics $Y_{l,m}(\vartheta, \varphi)$, which are defined as³⁷

$$Y_{l,m}(\vartheta,\varphi) = (-1)^m \sqrt{\frac{(2l+1)(l-m)!}{4\pi(l+m)!}} e^{im\varphi} P_l^m(\cos\vartheta),$$

where $P_l^m(x)$ are the associated Legendre functions. We now introduce the functions

$$M_{l_1, l_2, m}(t) = Y_{l_1, m}[\vartheta_1(t), \varphi_1(t)] Y_{l_2, -m}[\vartheta_2(t), \varphi_2(t)],$$
(14)

satisfying the orthogonality relation

$$\int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{\pi} \int_{0}^{\pi} \int_{0}^{\pi} M_{l_1,l_2,m} M_{l_1',l_2',m'} \sin \vartheta_1 \sin \vartheta_2 d\vartheta_1 d\vartheta_2 d\varphi_1 d\varphi_2 \sim \delta_{l_1,l_1'} \delta_{l_2,l_2'} \delta_{m,m'},$$

which form a complete set of functions characterizing the dynamics of the two exchange-coupled spins. Thus we can obtain from Eqs. (12)-(14) the stochastic equations of motion (Langevin equations) for the functions $M_{l_1,l_2,m}(t)$

$$\frac{d}{dt}M_{l_{1},l_{2},m}(t) = \sum_{i=1,2} \dot{\vartheta_{i}}(t)\frac{\partial M_{l_{1},l_{2},m}}{\partial \vartheta_{i}} + \dot{\varphi_{i}}(t)\frac{\partial M_{l_{1},l_{2},m}}{\partial \varphi_{i}}$$
$$= b\sum_{i=1,2} S\left[\left(h_{\vartheta}^{(i)}(t) - \alpha^{-1}h_{\varphi}^{(i)}(t)\right)\frac{\partial M_{l_{1},l_{2},m}}{\partial \vartheta_{i}} + \frac{1}{\sin\vartheta_{i}(t)}\left(h_{\varphi}^{(i)}(t) + \alpha^{-1}h_{\vartheta}^{(i)}(t)\right)\frac{\partial M_{l_{1},l_{2},m}}{\partial \varphi_{i}}\right] \quad (15)$$
$$-\left[\left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial \vartheta_{i}} - \frac{1}{\alpha\sin\vartheta_{i}(t)}\frac{\partial V}{\partial \varphi_{i}}\right)\frac{\partial M_{l_{1},l_{2},m}}{\partial \vartheta_{i}} + \frac{1}{\sin\vartheta_{i}(t)}\left(\frac{1}{\sin\vartheta_{i}(t)}\frac{\partial V}{\partial \varphi_{i}} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\frac{\partial V}{\partial \vartheta_{i}}\right)\frac{\partial M_{l_{1},l_{2},m}}{\partial \varphi_{i}}\right]$$

Upon averaging the stochastic differential Eq. (15) over its realizations (see details in [22]), we obtain

$$2\tau_N \dot{M}_{l_1, l_2, m} = \sum_{i=1, 2} \Delta_i M_{l_1, l_2, m} - \beta \Big(\nabla_i V + \alpha^{-1} [\mathbf{s}_i \times \nabla_i V] \Big) \cdot \nabla_i M_{l_1, l_2, m},$$
(16)

where ∇_i and Δ_i are the orientation space gradient and Laplacian operators on the surface of the unit sphere defined as²²

$$\nabla_{i} = \mathbf{s}_{i} \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{s}_{i}} = \left(0, -\frac{1}{\sin \vartheta_{i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi_{i}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \vartheta_{i}}, \right),$$
$$\Delta_{i} = \frac{1}{\sin \vartheta_{i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \vartheta_{i}} \left(\sin \vartheta_{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \vartheta_{i}}\right) + \frac{1}{\sin^{2} \vartheta_{i}} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \varphi_{i}^{2}}.$$

The free energy V from Eq. (8) may be expressed in terms of spherical harmonics as

$$\beta V = -\frac{4\pi}{3} \varsigma \Big[Y_{1,0}(\vartheta_1, \varphi_1) Y_{1,0}(\vartheta_2, \varphi_2) - Y_{1,-1}(\vartheta_1, \varphi_1) Y_{1,1}(\vartheta_2, \varphi_2) - Y_{1,1}(\vartheta_1, \varphi_1) Y_{1,-1}(\vartheta_2, \varphi_2) \Big] - \sum_{i=1,2} \left[\xi_N \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{3}} Y_{1,0}(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i) + \sigma \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{5}} Y_{2,0}(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i) \right] + \text{Const},$$
(17)

where we have introduced the dimensionless field, anisotropy, and interaction parameters, viz.,

$$\xi_N = \beta \mu S H_Z^N, \quad \sigma = \beta K, \quad \varsigma = \beta J S^2.$$
⁽¹⁸⁾

The form of Eq. (14) suggests that one should express the right-hand side of Eq.(16) in terms of the orbital angular momentum $operators^{37}$

$$L^{2} = -\Delta, \quad L_{Z} = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}, \quad L_{\pm} = e^{\pm i\varphi} \left(\pm \frac{\partial}{\partial\vartheta} + i\cot\vartheta\frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi}\right). \tag{19}$$

One may now radically simplify the problem by using the theory of angular momentum,³⁷ where the angular momentum operators act on $Y_{l,m}$ as follows

$$L^{2}Y_{l,m} = l(l+1)Y_{l,m}, \quad L_{Z}Y_{l,m} = mY_{l,m}, \quad L_{\pm}Y_{l,m} = \sqrt{l(l+1) - m(m\pm 1)}Y_{l,m\pm 1}.$$
 (20)

Hence, we obtain from Eqs. (16) and (20)

$$2\tau_{N}\dot{M}_{l_{1},l_{2},m} = \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{\beta}{2} \left[\left(L^{(i)} \right)^{2} \left(VM_{l_{1},l_{2},m} \right) - V \left(L^{(i)} \right)^{2} M_{l_{1},l_{2},m} - M_{l_{1},l_{2},m} \left(L^{(i)} \right)^{2} V \right] - \sum_{i=1,2} \left(L^{(i)} \right)^{2} M_{l_{1},l_{2},m} - \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{i\beta}{2\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2\pi}} \left\{ \left(Y_{1,1}^{(i)} \right)^{-1} \left[\left(L_{Z}^{(i)} V_{+}^{(i)} \right) \left(L_{+}^{(i)} M_{l_{1},l_{2},m} \right) - \left(L_{+}^{(i)} V_{+}^{(i)} \right) \left(L_{Z}^{(i)} M_{l_{1},l_{2},m} \right) \right] \right]$$

$$+ \left(Y_{1,-1}^{(i)} \right)^{-1} \left[\left(L_{Z}^{(i)} V_{-}^{(i)} \right) \left(L_{-}^{(i)} M_{l_{1},l_{2},m} \right) - \left(L_{-}^{(i)} V_{-}^{(i)} \right) \left(L_{Z}^{(i)} M_{l_{1},l_{2},m} \right) \right] \right],$$

where we have used the following representation for the expansion of V in terms of spherical harmonics

$$V = V_{+}^{(i)} + V_{-}^{(i)}, \qquad V_{+}^{(i)} = \sum_{R=1}^{2} \sum_{S=0}^{1} v_{R,S}^{(i)} Y_{R,S}^{(i)}, \qquad V_{-}^{(i)} = v_{1,-1}^{(i)} Y_{1,-1}^{(i)}.$$
(22)

Furthermore, $Y_{l,\pm 1}$, $Y_{l,0}$ and $Y_{l,\pm 1}^{-1}$ may also be considered as (ladder) operators acting on $Y_{l,m}$ in accordance with the rules²²

$$\sqrt{\frac{8\pi}{3}}Y_{l,\pm 1}Y_{l,m} = \sqrt{\frac{(l\pm m+1)(l\pm m+2)}{(2l+1)(2l+3)}}Y_{l+1,m\pm 1} - \sqrt{\frac{(l\mp m-1)(l\mp m)}{(2l-1)(2l+1)}}Y_{l-1,m\pm 1},$$
(23)

$$\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{3}}Y_{l,0}Y_{l,m} = \sqrt{\frac{(l+m+1)(l-m+1)}{(2l+1)(2l+3)}}Y_{l+1,m} + \sqrt{\frac{(l-m)(l+m)}{(2l-1)(2l+1)}}Y_{l-1,m},$$
(24)

$$Y_{1,\pm 1}^{-1}Y_{l,\pm m} = \sqrt{\frac{8\pi(2l+1)(l-m)!}{3(l+m)!}} \sum_{L=m-\varepsilon_{l,m}}^{l-1} \sqrt{\frac{(2L+1)(L+m-1)!}{(L-m+1)!}} Y_{L,\pm(m-1)},$$
(25)

where $\Delta L = 2$ and $\varepsilon_{l,m} = 1$, if the indices *l* and *m* are of the same order of evenness, and $\varepsilon_{l,m} = 0$ otherwise.

Thus we can transform Eq. (21) to the moment system:

$$\tau_N \dot{M}_{l_1, l_2, m} = \sum_{i, j=-2}^{2} \sum_{k=-1}^{1} d_{l_1 + i, l_2 + j, m+k}^{l_1, l_2, m} M_{l_1 + i, l_2 + j, m+k} , \qquad (26)$$

where the coefficients $d_{l_1,l_2,m}^{l_1,l_2,m}$ are given in Appendix A. We now have from Eq. (26) (taking the ensemble averages over the sharp values of ϑ_i and φ_i [22]) the set of recurrence relations for the relaxation functions (i.e., the observables) $c_{l_1,l_2,m}(t) = \langle M_{l_1,l_2,m} \rangle(t) - \langle M_{l_1,l_2,m} \rangle_{\rm H}$,

$$\tau_N \dot{c}_{l_1, l_2, m} = \sum_{i, j=-2}^2 \sum_{k=-1}^1 d_{l_1 + i, l_2 + j, m+k}^{l_1, l_2, m} c_{l_1 + i, l_2 + j, m+k} \,.$$
(27)

This system of differential recurrence relations for the observables must be solved subject to the initial conditions

$$c_{l_1,l_2,m}(0) = \left\langle M_{l_1,l_2,m} \right\rangle_{\mathrm{I}} - \left\langle M_{l_1,l_2,m} \right\rangle_{\mathrm{II}}.$$
(28)

In order to derive Eq. (27), one should note that the equilibrium averages $\langle M_{l_1,l_2,m} \rangle_N$ (N= I, II)

satisfy the recurrence relation:

$$\sum_{i,j=-2}^{2} \sum_{k=-1}^{1} d_{l_{1}+i,l_{2}+j,m+k}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} \left\langle M_{l_{1}+i,l_{2}+j,m+k} \right\rangle_{N} = 0, \quad (N = I, II).$$
⁽²⁹⁾

The equilibrium averages $\langle M_{l_1,l_2,m} \rangle_N$ can also be evaluated directly using Eq. (5).

III. MATRIX CONTINUED FRACTION SOLUTION

To proceed we first introduce the vectors

$$\mathbf{C}_{n}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{c}_{2n-1,0}(t) \\ \mathbf{c}_{2n-2,1}(t) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{c}_{0,2n-1}(t) \\ \mathbf{c}_{2n,0}(t) \\ \mathbf{c}_{2n-1,1}(t) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{c}_{0,2n}(t) \end{pmatrix}_{4n^{2}+2n+1}, \quad \mathbf{c}_{n,m}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} c_{n,m,-r}(t) \\ c_{n,m,-r+1}(t) \\ \vdots \\ c_{n,m,r}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad r = \min[n,m], \quad (30)$$

Thus Eq. (26) can be transformed into a tridiagonal vector recurrence relation of the form

$$\tau_N \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{C}_n(t) = \mathbf{Q}_n^{-} \mathbf{C}_{n-1}(t) + \mathbf{Q}_n \mathbf{C}_n(t) + \mathbf{Q}_n^{+} \mathbf{C}_{n+1}(t) \quad (n \ge 1),$$
(31)

with $\mathbf{C}_0(t) = \mathbf{0}$. The matrices $\mathbf{Q}_n, \mathbf{Q}_n^+, \mathbf{Q}_n^-$ are given in Appendix A. By using the general method for solving matrix recursion Eq. (31),²² we have the exact solution for the spectrum $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \tau_{N} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{1}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \left\{ \mathbf{C}_{1}(0) + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(\prod_{k=2}^{n} \mathbf{Q}_{k-1}^{+} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{k}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \right) \mathbf{C}_{n}(0) \right\},$$
(32)

11

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{n}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \frac{\mathbf{I}}{i\boldsymbol{\omega}\tau_{N}\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{n} - \mathbf{Q}_{n}^{+}} \frac{\mathbf{I}}{i\boldsymbol{\omega}\tau_{N}\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{n+1} - \mathbf{Q}_{n+1}^{+}} \frac{\mathbf{I}}{i\boldsymbol{\omega}\tau_{N}\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}_{n+2}} \mathbf{Q}_{n+1}^{-}}$$
(33)

is a matrix continued fraction. The tilde denotes the one-sided Fourier transform

$$\tilde{F}(\omega) = \int_{0}^{\infty} F(t) e^{-i\omega t} dt$$

The initial vector $\mathbf{C}_n(0)$ in Eq. (32) can also be calculated in terms of matrix continued fractions (see Appendix A).

The relaxation time, which is easiest to calculate using the MCF method is the *integral* relaxation time τ of the orientation relaxation function $f_i(t) = c_{1,0,0}(t)/c_{1,0,0}(0)$. This time is the area under the curve of $f_i(t)$ which₂ in the present problem for values of the external applied field less than a certain critical field (see below) yields₂ a close approximation to the greatest relaxation time. Thus the integral relaxation time is given by the zero frequency limit of $\tilde{c}_{1,0,0}(\omega)/c_{1,0,0}(0)$,

$$\tau = \int_{0}^{\infty} f_{i}(t)dt = \tilde{f}_{1}(0) = \tilde{f}_{2}(0) = \tilde{c}_{1,0,0}(0) / c_{1,0,0}(0) .$$
(34)

This time may equivalently be posed in terms of the eigenvalues (λ_k) of the Fokker-Planck operator L_{FP} as defined by the Fokker-Planck equation underlying Eq. (15), viz.

$$\dot{W} = L_{FP}W, \qquad (35)$$

for the distribution function $W(\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, t)$ of the orientations of the spins. The latter definition follows because the function $f_i(t)$ may formally be written as the discrete set of relaxation modes

$$f_i(t) = \sum_k c_k e^{-\lambda_k t} , \qquad (36)$$

where $\sum_{k} c_k = 1$, so that from Eqs. (34)-(36)

$$\tau = \sum_{k} c_k / \lambda_k . \tag{37}$$

Equation (37) emphasizes that the integral relaxation time τ contains contributions from *all* the eigenvalues λ_k . The smallest nonvanishing eigenvalue λ_1 is associated with the slowest overbarrier or interwell relaxation mode and so with the long-time behavior of $f_i(t)$; the other eigenvalues λ_k characterize high-frequency "intrawell" modes. In general, in order to evaluate τ numerically from Eq. (37), all λ_k and c_k are required. However, in the low temperature (high barrier) limit, $\lambda_1 \ll |\lambda_k|$ and $c_1 \approx 1 \gg c_k$ ($k \neq 1$) provided the wells of the potential remain approximately equivalent (as is true for a small external field) so that

$$\tau \approx 1/\lambda_1. \tag{38}$$

In other words, the integral relaxation time τ for nearly equivalent potential wells in the low temperature limit closely approximates the inverse of the smallest nonvanishing eigenvalue, that is the greatest relaxation time of the magnetization. The practical advantage of Eq. (38) is that it is usually far easier to calculate the integral relaxation time rather than λ_1 directly.

The approach we have developed here also allows us to evaluate the *linear response* of a two-spin system to infinitesimally small changes in the strength of the strong dc field $\mathbf{H}_{Z}^{\mathrm{I}}$, i.e., for $h_{\mathrm{II}}=h_{\mathrm{I}}-\kappa$ as $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ ($h_{N}=\xi_{N}/(2\sigma)$). Here the relaxation function $f_{i}(t)$ from Eq. (4) coincides with the normalized longitudinal dipole equilibrium correlation function $C_{\parallel}(t)$, that is

$$\lim_{\kappa \to 0} f_i(t) = C_{\parallel}(t) = \frac{\left\langle \cos \vartheta_i(0) \cos \vartheta_i(t) \right\rangle_{\mathrm{I}} - \left\langle \cos \vartheta_i(0) \right\rangle_{\mathrm{I}}^2}{\left\langle \cos^2 \vartheta_i(0) \right\rangle_{\mathrm{I}} - \left\langle \cos \vartheta_i(0) \right\rangle_{\mathrm{I}}^2}$$

Having determined the one-sided Fourier transform of $C_{\parallel}(t)$, one can calculate the integral relaxation time in the linear response approximation that is the correlation time $\tau = \tilde{C}_{\parallel}(0)$ and the spectrum of the equilibrium correlation function $\tilde{C}_{\parallel}(\omega)$.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The exact solution in terms of MCF [Eqs. (32) and (33)] is well suited to numerical calculations. All MCF and the associated [Eq. (32)] series converge very rapidly, so that 10-30 downward iterations for the computation of these matrix fractions and 10-20 terms in the series [Eq. (32)] are sufficient for an accuracy of at least 4 significant figures in most cases.

The greatest relaxation time τ rendered as the integral relaxation time is calculated numerically by the MCF method for the two-spin system in the IHD regime where α is expected to be $\geq 1^{38}$ corresponding physically to the situation where the energy loss per cycle of the almost periodic motion of a spin having the saddle point energy is >> kT. The linear response where $\Delta h = h_{\rm I} - h_{\rm II}$ is maintained at small constant value 0.001 is displayed in Fig. 1 for small anisotropy σ , as a function of the interaction (exchange coupling) parameter ζ . In that figure, curve 1 represents the behavior of the relaxation time as a function of the exchange parameter for zero reduced bias field $h_{\rm II}$, curves 2 and 3 represent the behavior of the relaxation time in linear response for finite values of the reduced bias field $h_{\rm II}$. Here it is apparent that the effect of increasing exchange coupling is to increase the relaxation time. The foregoing result pertains to very small anisotropy, which in the absence of exchange coupling is always treated by perturbation theory as described by Brown.^{2,3} Fig. 2 on the other hand essentially displays the effect of the exchange coupling for zero reduced bias field on the behavior of the relaxation time for all values of σ . We remark that for $\sigma \ge 2$ in the absence of exchange coupling the relaxation time is exponential in nature and is given by the inverse Kramers escape rate as described by Brown.^{2,3} It is apparent that the effect of increasing exchange coupling in the zero bias field situation in linear response is again to increase the relaxation time which is entirely in accord with curve 1 of Fig.1. Fig. 3 displays the behavior of the relaxation time as a function of the exchange coupling for three reasonably large values of the anisotropy parameter σ and a small bias field with Δh still maintained very small so that we are again considering the linear response in the presence of a small bias field. As before the effect of increasing exchange coupling is to increase the relaxation time, that is, to raise the potential barrier height. In addition a comparison of the exact integral relaxation time with the asymptotes obtained in Ref. 32 for the IHD situation typified by $\alpha = 1$ by means of Langer's theory, and summarized in Appendix B, is given in Figs. 2 and 3. First of all, these plots show overall good agreement between the asymptotic calculation and those rendered by the MCF method, excluding the low barrier region characterized by small σ and exchange coupling values as exemplified by curve 1 in Fig.3. The deviation between the exact and asymptotic solutions for the relaxation time for small σ , or equivalently, low anisotropy energy barriers, is as expected because Langer's theory on which the asymptotic solution is based assumes high energy barriers and thus well-defined saddle points and meta-stable states. On examination of Fig. 3, one notices the striking result that the apparent discontinuity in the asymptotic expression for the relaxation time as a function of the exchange coupling (region between the dots and triangles) observed in Ref. 32 is not reproduced by the exact numerical MCF solution. Thus the discontinuity reported there is just an artifact of the approximation used in the asymptotic calculation, that is, the quadratic expansion of the potential energy near the saddle point, as discussed in Ref. 32. The discrepancy between the exact and asymptotic solutions manifests itself in the vicinity of the critical exchange coupling where the saddle points become rather flat so that Taylor series expansion of the potential energy near the saddle point is no longer valid. Therefore, the exact MCF solution indicates (although a critical exchange coupling marking a fundamental change in the energy scape and therefore in the reversal mechanism, which changes from a two-step into a one-step process exists), that no corresponding singularity in the relaxation time as a function of that coupling appears.

Thus in Figs. 2 and 3 the reasons for seeking the exact solution for the relaxation time become apparent because the exact solution based on the MCF method yields the behavior of the relaxation time both in the region where the magnetic anisotropy energy is comparable to the thermal energy kT and in the critical exchange coupling region where the saddle points flatten so allowing one to accurately delineate the regions in which the asymptotic solution is no longer

applicable. In other words, just as in the absence of exchange coupling, it is now possible to give a range of validity for the asymptotic formula. Another advantage of the MCF solution is that it is valid for all values of α unlike the asymptotic solution based on Langer's method, which applies to intermediate-to-high damping only.

Figs 2 and 3 also indicate that for small $h_{\rm II}$, the dependence of τ on the anisotropy parameter σ has an activation character. This leads to an *exponential growth* of the relaxation time τ as the height of the potential barrier σ increases as is predicted by transition state theory. However, as the constant bias field increases, so that, taking zero exchange coupling described by bistable potential as an example, the wells of the potential become markedly non equivalent the integral relaxation time τ can decrease with increasing σ (see Fig. 4) and may deviate considerably from the inverse Kramers rate. This effect, first reported in Ref. 20 and explained qualitatively in Ref. 39 in an analysis of the linear response of an assembly of noninteracting uniaxial particles in the low temperature limit, is due to the depletion of the population of the upper shallow potential well consequent on their escape from that well and subsequent descent to the deeper well from which it is very difficult to escape due to the high energy barrier. In particular, the depletion effect is typified by the fact that for values of the parameters $h_{\rm I} \cong h_{\rm II}$ above a certain critical level $h_c \approx 0.17$, the integral relaxation time τ has no longer an activation character and so can no longer provide an accurate approximation to the reversal time of the magnetization. In other words in this situation the integral relaxation time τ decreases as the height of the potential barrier increases. The depletion effect also occurs in the presence of exchange interaction and is indeed reinforced by that interaction as shown in Fig.4 so that again the integral relaxation time *exponentially diverges* from the greatest relaxation time or inverse many body IHD Kramers escape rate yielded by Langer's method for values of the field in excess of the critical value.

To summarize in this paper we have presented a general method for the calculation of the relaxation time τ of the linear and nonlinear transient response functions of two interacting

spins due to a sudden change of a *strong* external dc magnetic field using the matrix continued fraction technique for all values of the nonlinearity, anisotropy and interaction parameters. It appears that including the ferromagnetic exchange interaction always tends to increase the effective barrier height that is to increase the greatest relaxation time. Moreover, it appears that the depletion effect where the integral relaxation time may diverge exponentially from the inverse Kramers rate consequent on the application of a strong bias field is enhanced by the exchange interaction. The calculations we have presented also allow one to pinpoint the critical exchange coupling regions where calculations based on Langer's method become invalid. In particular, we have proved that the discontinuity which appears in the relaxation time in a certain critical region of the exchange coupling predicted by the asymptotic solution is simply an artifact of that solution. We emphasize that the asymptotic solution based on Langer's method is valid for the IHD region only where the energy loss per cycle of a spin with the capability to cross a barrier is much greater than kT. No such restriction of course applies to the exact solution which in turn suggests that the asymptotic solution should be generalized to include all values of α and then tested against the exact solution. Such a generalization has been made for non interacting spins in Ref. 38, where a single asymptotic formula for the greatest relaxation time including the low damping, Kramers turnover and IHD regions has been given by generalizing the Mel'nikov-Meshkov solution of the Kramers turnover problem for particles to spins which could be extended to include the effect of exchange coupling. Finally we remark that although the present results are based on a two body interaction they at least allow one to understand qualitatively the role played by exchange interaction which is in general to increase the relaxation time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The support of this work by INTAS (project 01-2341) and HEA Ireland (Programme for Research in Third Level Institutions, Nanomaterials Initiative) is gratefully acknowledged. S.V.T. thanks the University of Versailles for the award of a Visiting Professorship.

APPENDIX A. MATRICES $\mathbf{Q}_n, \mathbf{Q}_n^+, \mathbf{Q}_n^-$ AND INITIAL VALUE VECTORS $\mathbf{C}_n(0)$

The matrices $\mathbf{Q}_n, \mathbf{Q}_n^+, \mathbf{Q}_n^-$ have the form

$$\mathbf{Q}_{n}^{-} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_{2n-1} & \mathbf{R}_{2n-1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{V}_{2n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{Q}_{n} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}_{2n-1} & \mathbf{S}_{2n-1} \\ \mathbf{R}_{2n} & \mathbf{P}_{2n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{Q}_{n}^{+} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}_{2n-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{S}_{2n} & \mathbf{U}_{2n} \end{pmatrix}$$
(A1)

where

$$\mathbf{P}_{m} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{m,0} & \mathbf{p}_{0,m}^{*} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{p}_{m-1,1}^{*} & \mathbf{p}_{m-1,1} & \ddots & \ddots \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \mathbf{p}_{m-1,1}^{*} \\ \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{p}_{0,m}^{*} & \mathbf{p}_{0,m} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{R}_{m} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{r}_{0,m}^{*} & \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{r}_{m-1,1} & \mathbf{r}_{1,m-1}^{*} & \ddots & \ddots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{r}_{m-2,2} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \mathbf{r}_{m-1,1}^{*} \\ \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{r}_{0,m} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{S}_{m} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}_{m,0} & \mathbf{s}_{0,m}^{*} & \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{s}_{m-1,1} & \mathbf{s}_{1,m-1}^{*} & \ddots & \ddots \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{s}_{0,m} & \mathbf{s}_{m,0}^{*} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{V}_{m} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v}_{0,m}^{*} & \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{s}_{0,m} & \mathbf{s}_{m,0}^{*} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{V}_{m} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v}_{0,m}^{*} & \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{s}_{0,m} & \mathbf{s}_{m,0}^{*} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{U}_{m} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}_{m,0}^{*} & \mathbf{u}_{m,0} & \mathbf{u}_{0,m}^{*} & \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{v}_{m-3,3} & \ddots & \mathbf{v}_{m-2,2} \\ \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \mathbf{v} & \mathbf{v}_{1,m-1} \\ \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{v}_{0,m}^{*} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{U}_{m} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}_{m,0}^{*} & \mathbf{u}_{m,0} & \mathbf{u}_{0,m}^{*} & \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{u}_{m-1,1}^{*} & \mathbf{u}_{m-1,1}^{*} & \mathbf{u}_{1,m-1}^{*} & \ddots & \ddots \\ \mathbf{0} & \ddots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{v}_{0,m}^{*} & \mathbf{u}_{m,0}^{*} & \mathbf{u}_{m,0}^{*} \end{pmatrix}$$

The matrices $\mathbf{p}_{n,m}$, $\mathbf{s}_{n,m}$, $\mathbf{u}_{n,m}^*$, $\mathbf{v}_{n,m}^*$ have the form

|.

$$\mathbf{x}_{n,m} = \begin{pmatrix} \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0\\ \ddots & x_{n,m,-1} & 0 & \ddots & \ddots \\ \ddots & 0 & x_{n,m,0} & 0 & \ddots \\ \ddots & \ddots & 0 & x_{n,m,1} & \ddots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \end{pmatrix}_{(2r+1)\times(2r_x+1)}$$

The matrices $\mathbf{p}_{n,m}^*$, $\mathbf{r}_{n,m}$, $\mathbf{u}_{n,m}$, $\mathbf{v}_{n,m}$ are given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{n,m} = \begin{pmatrix} \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \ddots & x_{n,m,-1} & x_{n,m,-1}^{+} & 0 & \ddots \\ \ddots & x_{n,m,0}^{-} & x_{n,m,0} & x_{n,m,0}^{+} & \ddots \\ \ddots & 0 & x_{n,m,1}^{-} & x_{n,m,1} & \ddots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}_{(2r+1)\times(2r_{x}+1)}$$

Here **x** designates one of the submatrices $\mathbf{p}_{n,m}$, $\mathbf{p}_{n,m}^*$, $\mathbf{r}_{n,m}$, $\mathbf{s}_{n,m}$, $\mathbf{u}_{n,m}$, $\mathbf{v}_{n,m}^*$, $\mathbf{v}_{n,m}$. All the submatrices has the same number of rows, namely, 2r + 1, where $r = \min[n,m]$. The number of columns also can be found as $2r_x + 1$, but now each submatrix has its own number r_x , namely

$$r_{p} = \min[n,m], \quad r_{p^{*}} = \min[n+1,m-1], \quad r_{s} = \min[n+1,m], \quad r_{r} = \min[n,m-1],$$
$$r_{v} = \min[n-1,m-1], \quad r_{u} = \min[n+1,m+1], \quad r_{v^{*}} = \min[n,m-2], \quad r_{u^{*}} = \min[n+2,m].$$

The corresponding matrix elements are

$$\begin{split} p_{l_{1},l_{2},m} &= d_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = -\sum_{l=l_{1},l_{2}} \left(\frac{1}{2} l(l+1) - \sigma \frac{l(l+1) - 3m^{2}}{(2l-1)(2l+3)} \right), \\ p_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{*} &= d_{l_{1}+l_{2}-1,m}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = \frac{1}{2} \varsigma(l_{2}-l_{1}+1) \sqrt{\frac{((l_{1}+1)^{2}-m^{2})(l_{2}^{2}-m^{2})}{(2l_{1}+1)(2l_{1}+3)(2l_{2}-1)(2l_{2}+1)}}, \\ p_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{*\pm} &= d_{l_{1}+l_{2}-1,m\pm 1}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = \frac{1}{4} \varsigma(l_{2}-l_{1}+1) \sqrt{\frac{(l_{1}\pm m+1)(l_{1}\pm m+2)(l_{2}\mp m-1)(l_{2}\mp m)}{(2l_{1}+1)(2l_{1}+3)(2l_{2}-1)(2l_{2}+1)}}, \\ s_{l_{1},l_{2},m} &= d_{l_{1}+l_{2},m}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = -\left(\frac{\xi_{\Pi}}{2} l_{1} + \frac{i(2\sigma-\varsigma)}{2\alpha} m\right) \sqrt{\frac{(l_{1}+1)^{2}-m^{2}}{4(l_{1}+1)^{2}-1}}, \\ s_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{*} &= d_{l_{1}+l_{2},m\pm 1}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = \pm \frac{i\varsigma}{4\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{(l_{1}\pm m+1)(l_{1}\pm m+2)(l_{2}\pm m+1)(l_{2}\mp m)}{(2l_{1}+1)(2l_{1}+3)}}, \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} r_{l_{1},l_{2},m} &= d_{l_{1},l_{2}-l,m}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = \left(\frac{\xi_{\mathrm{II}}}{2}(l_{2}+1) + \frac{i(2\sigma-\varsigma)}{2\alpha}m\right)\sqrt{\frac{l_{2}^{2}-m^{2}}{4l_{2}^{2}-1}}, \\ r_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{*} &= d_{l_{1},l_{2}-l,m\pm 1}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = \pm \frac{i\varsigma}{4\alpha}\sqrt{\frac{(l_{1}\pm m+1)(l_{1}\mp m)(l_{2}\mp m-1)(l_{2}\mp m)}{(2l_{2}-1)(2l_{2}+1)}}, \\ u_{l_{1},l_{2},m} &= d_{l_{1}+l_{2}+l,m}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = -\frac{1}{2}\varsigma(l_{1}+l_{2})\sqrt{\frac{((l_{1}\pm m+1)(l_{1}\pm m+2)(l_{2}\pm m-1)(l_{2}\pm m)}{(2l_{1}+1)(2l_{1}+3)(2l_{2}+1)(2l_{2}+3)}}, \\ u_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{\pm} &= d_{l_{1}+l_{2}+l,m\pm 1}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = -\frac{1}{2}\varsigma(l_{1}+l_{2})\sqrt{\frac{(l_{1}\pm m+1)(l_{1}\pm m+2)(l_{2}\pm m+1)(l_{2}\pm m+2)}{(2l_{1}+1)(2l_{1}+3)(2l_{2}+1)(2l_{2}+3)}}, \\ u_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{*} &= d_{l_{1}+l_{2}+l,m\pm 1}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = -\sigma\frac{l_{1}}{2l_{1}+3}\sqrt{\frac{((l_{1}\pm m+1)(l_{1}\pm m+2)(l_{2}\pm m+1)(l_{2}\pm m+2)}{(2l_{1}+1)(2l_{1}+3)(2l_{2}+1)(2l_{2}+3)}}, \\ v_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{*} &= d_{l_{1}-l_{2}-l,m}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = -\sigma\frac{l_{1}}{2l_{1}+3}\sqrt{\frac{((l_{1}\pm m+1)(l_{1}\pm m+2)(l_{2}\pm m+1)(l_{2}\pm m+2)}{(2l_{1}+1)(2l_{1}+3)(2l_{2}+1)(2l_{2}+3)}}, \\ v_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{*} &= d_{l_{1}-l_{2}-l,m}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = \frac{1}{2}\varsigma(l_{1}+l_{2}+2)\sqrt{\frac{(l_{1}\pm m+1)(l_{1}\pm m+2)(l_{2}\pm m-1)(l_{2}\pm m-1)(l_{2}\pm m)}{(2l_{1}-1)(2l_{1}+1)(2l_{2}-1)(2l_{2}+1)}}, \\ v_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{*} &= d_{l_{1}-l_{2}-l,m\pm 1}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = -\frac{1}{4}\varsigma(l_{1}+l_{2}+2)\sqrt{\frac{(l_{1}\pm m-1)(l_{1}\pm m)(l_{2}\pm m-1)(l_{2}\pm m-1)(l_{2}\pm m)}{(2l_{1}-1)(2l_{1}+1)(2l_{2}-1)(2l_{2}+1)}}, \\ v_{l_{1},l_{2},m}^{*} &= d_{l_{1}-l_{2}-l,m\pm 1}^{l_{1},l_{2},m} = \sigma\frac{l_{2}+1}{2l_{2}-1}\sqrt{\frac{(l_{2}^{2}-m^{2})((l_{2}-1)^{2}-m^{2})}{(2l_{2}+1)(2l_{2}-3)}}, \end{split}$$

and

$$d_{l_i+x,l_j+y,m\pm 1}^{l_i,l_j,m} = \left(d_{l_j+y,l_i+x,m\pm 1}^{l_j,l_i,m}\right)^*.$$

The initial value vectors $\mathbf{C}_n(0)$ in Eq. (32) are calculated in the following manner. We introduce the vector

$$\mathbf{F}_{n}^{N} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}_{2n-1,0}^{N} \\ \mathbf{f}_{2n-2,1}^{N} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{f}_{0,2n-1}^{N} \\ \mathbf{f}_{2n,0}^{N} \\ \mathbf{f}_{2n-1,1}^{N} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{f}_{0,2n}^{N} \end{pmatrix}_{4n^{2}+2n+1}} \qquad \mathbf{f}_{n,m}^{N} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{n,m,-r}^{N} \\ M_{n,m,-r+1}^{N} \\ \vdots \\ M_{n,m,r}^{N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad r = \min[n,m]$$

where the index N = I, II corresponds to the fields \mathbf{H}_{Z}^{I} and \mathbf{H}_{Z}^{II} . Next, we transform Eq. (29) to the matrix recursion formula

$$\mathbf{Q}_{n}^{-}\mathbf{F}_{n-1}^{N} + \mathbf{Q}_{n}\mathbf{F}_{n}^{N} + \mathbf{Q}_{n}^{+}\mathbf{F}_{n+1}^{N} = 0 \quad (n \ge 1).$$

The solution of this equation has the form

$$\mathbf{F}_{n}^{N} = \Delta_{n}^{N}(0)\mathbf{Q}_{n}^{-}\mathbf{F}_{n-1}^{N} = \frac{1}{4\pi}\Delta_{n}^{N}(0)\mathbf{Q}_{n}^{-}\Delta_{n-1}^{N}(0)\mathbf{Q}_{n}^{-}\dots\Delta_{1}^{N}(0)\mathbf{Q}_{1}^{-}...$$

Here, we have noted that $\mathbf{F}_0^N = \frac{1}{4\pi}$. Thus we can write the initial value vector as

$$\mathbf{C}_{n}(0) = \mathbf{F}_{n}^{\mathrm{I}} - \mathbf{F}_{n}^{\mathrm{II}}.$$

APPENDIX B. ESCAPE RATE OF A SYSTEM OF TWO INTERACTING SPINS

The relaxation rate of a system of two interacting spins in the IHD limit ($\alpha \ge 1$) where Langer's calculations are expected to hold is given by [32]

$$\Gamma = \begin{cases} 2\Gamma^{+}\Gamma^{-}/(\Gamma^{+} + \Gamma^{-}) & \varsigma < \sigma(1 - h^{2}) \\ \Gamma_{2s} & \varsigma > \sigma(1 - h^{2}) \end{cases}.$$
(B1)

where

$$\begin{split} \Gamma_{2s} &= \frac{\sigma^{3/2} (1-h^2) (1-h) [\varsigma + \sigma(1-h)]}{\sqrt{\pi \varsigma} [\varsigma - \sigma(1-h^2)]} e^{-2\sigma(1-h)^2}, \\ \Gamma^{\pm} &= \frac{\sigma^{3/2} \left| \kappa^{\pm} \right| D^{\pm} P^{\pm}}{\sqrt{\pi j \left| 2R_1^{\pm} R_2^{\pm} + j W^{\pm} (R_1^{\pm} + R_2^{\pm}) \right|}} e^{-\beta \Delta V^{\pm}}, \end{split}$$

$$P^{\pm} = [(1 - \cos^{2} \vartheta_{1}^{\pm})(1 - \cos^{2} \vartheta_{2}^{\pm})]^{1/4},$$

$$R_{1,2}^{\pm} = \cos \vartheta_{1,2}^{\pm}(2\cos \vartheta_{1,2}^{\pm} + h) - 1,$$

$$W^{\pm} = P^{\pm} - j/2 \pm h\sqrt{1 + (j/2)^{2}/(1 - j)},$$

$$\beta \Delta V^{\pm} = -\sigma \left\{ j\sqrt{\left[1 \pm h\sqrt{1 + (j/2)^{2}/(1 - j)} - j/2\right]^{2} - \left(h \pm \sqrt{1 - j}\right)^{2}} + j\left[1 \pm h\sqrt{1 + (j/2)^{2}/(1 - j)} - j/2\right] - \left[h^{2} + j - 1 \pm 2h\sqrt{1 + (j/2)^{2}/(1 - j)}\right] - 2 + 2h \pm (2h - j) \right\},$$

$$D^+ = (1-h)(j+1-h), D^- = 1-h^2-j,$$

 $\cos \vartheta_{1,2}^{\pm}$ corresponds to the position of the saddle points (two saddle points for each spin) which can be found from the equations

$$\frac{\beta \partial V(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, 0)}{\partial \vartheta_1} = \zeta \sin(\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2) + 2\sigma \sin \vartheta_1 (h + \cos \vartheta_1) = 0,$$
$$\frac{\beta \partial V(\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, 0)}{\partial \vartheta_2} = -\zeta \sin(\vartheta_1 - \vartheta_2) + 2\sigma \sin \vartheta_2 (h + \cos \vartheta_2) = 0,$$

so that

$$\cos \vartheta_{1}^{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \bigg(-h \mp \sqrt{1-j} + \sqrt{\left(h \pm \sqrt{1-j}\right)^{2} + 2j \mp 4h\sqrt{1+(j/2)^{2}/(1-j)}} \bigg),$$
$$\cos \vartheta_{2}^{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \bigg(-h \mp \sqrt{1-j} - \sqrt{\left(h \pm \sqrt{1-j}\right)^{2} + 2j \mp 4h\sqrt{1+(j/2)^{2}/(1-j)}} \bigg),$$

 $j = \zeta / \sigma$, and $h = \xi / (2\sigma)$. The attempt frequencies κ^{\pm} are computed numerically.³² The relaxation rate for the two-spin system contains two unconnected branches corresponding to the two regimes, $j < j_c = (1 - h^2)$ and $j > j_c$;³² these branches are plotted in Figs. 2 and 3 by filled circles and triangles, respectively.

The longest relaxation time can be estimated in terms of the relaxation rate Γ as

$$\tau/\tau_N \simeq \left[\Gamma(h) + \Gamma(-h)\right]^{-1}.$$
(B2)

REFERENCES

- ¹ L. Néel, Ann. Géophys. **5**, 99 (1949).
- ² W. F. Brown, Jr., Phys. Rev. **130**, 1677 (1963).
- ³ W. F. Brown, Jr., IEEE Trans. Mag. **15**, 1196 (1979).
- ⁴ W. Wernsdorfer, Adv. Chem. Phys. **118**, 99 (2001).
- ⁵ J. P. Chen, C. M. Sorensen, K. J. Klabunde, and G. C. Hadjipanayis, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 11527 (1995).
- ⁶ M. Respaud, J. M. Broto, H. Rakoto, A. R. Fert, L. Thomas, et al., Phys. Rev. B **57**, 2925 (1998).
- ⁷ R. H. Kodama and A. E. Berkowitz, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 6321 (1999).
- ⁸ J. T. Richardson, D. I. Yiagas, B. Turk, and J. Forster, J. Appl. Phys. **70**, 6977 (1991).
- ⁹ S. S. P. Parkin, K. P. Roche, M. G. Samant, P. M. Rice, R. B. Beyers, et al., J. Appl. Phys. 85, 5828 (1999); D. C. Worledge, Appl. Phys. Lett. 84 4559 (2004).
- ¹⁰ J. C. Slonczewski, Phys. Rev. B 39 (1989) 6995.
- ¹¹ A.J. Budó, Chem. Phys. **17**, 686 (1949).
- ¹² W. Coffey, M. Evans, and P. Grigolini, *Molecular diffusion and spectra* (Wiley, New York, 1984).
- ¹³ Yu. L. Raikher and M. I. Shliomis, Adv. Chem. Phys. **87**, 595 (1994).
- ¹⁴ H. B. Braun, J. Appl. Phys. **76**, 6310 (1994).
- ¹⁵ L. J. Geoghegan, W. T. Coffey, and B. Mulligan, Adv. Chem. Phys. **100**, 475 (1997).
- ¹⁶ J. L. Garcia-Palacios, Adv. Chem. Phys. **112**, 1 (2000).
- ¹⁷ Yu. P. Kalmykov and S. V. Titov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2967 (1999).
- ¹⁸ A. Aharoni, Phys. Rev. **177**, 793 (1969).
- ¹⁹ I. Eisenstein and A. Aharoni, Phys. Rev. B **16**, 1278 (1977); *ibid.* **16**, 1285 (1977).
- ²⁰ W. T. Coffey, D. S. F. Crothers, Yu. P. Kalmykov, E. S. Massawe, and J. T. Waldron, Phys. Rev. E 49, 1869 (1994).
- ²¹ H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation*, 2nd Edition (Springer, Berlin, 1989).

- ²² W. T. Coffey, Yu. P. Kalmykov, and J. T. Waldron, *The Langevin Equation*, 2nd Ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 2004).
- ²³ A. Liberatos, E. P. Wohlfarth, and R. W. Chantrell, IEEE Trans. Magn. MAG-21, 1277 (1985).
- ²⁴ A. Liberatos and R. W. Chantrell, J. Appl. Phys. **73**, 6501 (1993).
- ²⁵ D. Hinzke and U. Nowak, Phys. Rev. B 61, 6734 (2000); J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 221, 365 (2000).
- ²⁶ S. I. Denisov and K. N. Trohidou, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 184433 (2001).
- ²⁷ J. L. Dormann, L. Bessais, and D. Fiorani, J. Phys. C **21**, 2015 (1988).
- ²⁸ S. Morup and E. Tronc, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3278 (1994).
- ²⁹ P. E. Jonsson and J. L. Garcia-Palacios, Europhys. Lett. **55**, 418 (2001).
- ³⁰ D. Rodé, H. N. Bertram, and D. R. Fradkin, IEEE Trans. Magn. **MAG-23**, 2224 (1987).
- ³¹ W. Chen, S. Zhang, and H. N. Bertram, J. Appl. Phys. **71**, 5579 (1992).
- ³² H. Kachkachi, Europhys. Lett. **62** (5), 650 (2003).
- ³³ J. S. Langer, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **54**, 258 (1969).
- ³⁴ W. T. Coffey, D. A. Garanin, and D. J. McCarthy, Adv. Chem. Phys. **117**, 528 (2001).
- ³⁵ R. L. Stratonovich, *Conditional Markov Processes and Their Application to the Theory of Optimal Control* (Elsevier, New York, 1968).
- ³⁶ L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, Phys. Z. Sowjetunion **8**, 153 (1935).
- ³⁷ D. A. Varshalovich, A. N. Moskalev, and V. K. Khersonskii, *Quantum Theory of Angular Momentum* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998).
- ³⁸ Yu. P. Kalmykov, W. T. Coffey, and S. V. Titov, Fizika Tverdogo Tela **47**, 260 (2005)
 [Phys. Solid State, **47**, 272 (2005)].
- ³⁹ D. A. Garanin, Phys. Rev. E **54**, 3250 (1996).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- Figure 1. Relaxation time τ/τ_N vs. ζ for $\sigma = 1$, $\alpha = 1$, and various values of $h_{\rm II}$ in the linear response condition $h_{\rm I} h_{\rm II} = 0.001$.
- **Figure 2.** Relaxation time τ/τ_N vs. σ for $\alpha = 1$, $h_I = 0.001$, $h_{II} = 0$ and various values of ς . Exact matrix continued fraction solution for the relaxation time τ/τ_N [solid lines: Eq.(34))] is compared with the inverse reaction rate rendered by Langer's theory of the decay of metastable states [filled circles and triangles: Eqs. (B1) and (B2)].
- **Figure 3.** Relaxation time τ/τ_N vs. ζ for $\alpha = 0.5$, $h_I = 0.101$, $h_{II} = 0.1$, and various values of σ . Exact solution [solid lines: Eq.(34)] is compared with the inverse reaction rate rendered by Langer's theory of the decay of metastable states [filled circles and triangles: Eq. (B1) and (B2)].

Figure 4. Relaxation time τ/τ_N vs. σ for $\alpha = 1$, $h_I = 3.001$, $h_{II} = 3.0$, and various values of ζ .





(Titov et al.)



Fig. 2

(Titov et al.)



Fig. 3

(Titov et al.)



Fig.4 (Titov et al.)