

This is a repository copy of *Rotation of the pinning direction in the exchange bias training effect in polycrystalline NiFe/FeMn bilayers*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/4865/>

Version: Submitted Version

---

**Article:**

Qiu, X.P, Yang, D.Z, Zhou, S.M et al. (6 more authors) (2008) Rotation of the pinning direction in the exchange bias training effect in polycrystalline NiFe/FeMn bilayers. Physical Review Letters. 147207. pp. 1-4. ISSN: 1079-7114

<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.147207>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



**Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York**  
**<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>**

---

This is an author produced version of a paper, subsequently published in the **PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS**. (This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.)

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
**<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/4865>**

---

**Published paper**

Qiu, X. P, Yang, D. Z, Zhou, S. M, Chantrell, R, O'Grady, K, Nowak, U, Du, J, Bai, X. J, Sun, L.

*Rotation of the pinning direction in the exchange bias training effect in polycrystalline NiFe/FeMn bilayers*

**PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS** 101 14 (147207)

---

# Rotation of the pinning direction in the exchange bias training effect in polycrystalline NiFe/FeMn bilayers

X. P. Qiu, D. Z. Yang, and S. M. Zhou

*Applied Surface Physics Laboratory (State Key Laboratory) and The State Key Lab for Advanced Photonic Materials Devices and Department of Physics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

R. Chantrell, K. O'Grady, and U. Nowak

*Physics Department, The University of York, York, YO10 5 DD, UK*

J. Du and X. J. Bai

*National Laboratory of Solid State Microstructures, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China*

L. Sun

*Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204*

(Dated: July 29, 2008)

## Abstract

For polycrystalline NiFe/FeMn bilayers, we have observed and quantified the rotation of the pinning direction in the exchange bias training and recovery effects. During consecutive hysteresis loops, the rotation of the pinning direction strongly depends on the magnetization reversal mechanism of the ferromagnet layer. The interfacial uncompensated magnetic moment of antiferromagnetic grains may be irreversibly switched and rotated when the magnetization reversal process of the ferromagnet layer is accompanied by domain wall motion and domain rotation, respectively.

PACS numbers: 75.30.Et; 75.30.Gw; 75.60.Jk

Exchange bias (EB) in ferromagnet (FM) /antiferromagnet (AFM) bilayers has attracted much attention because of its importance in developing magneto-electronic devices [1, 2]. In the EB training effect, the exchange field  $H_E$  and the coercivity  $H_C$  decrease during consecutive measurements of hysteresis loops [3]. Since its first discovery, the training effect has been extensively studied, both experimentally and theoretically [3–11]. Very recently, the training effect and the hysteresis loop asymmetry have been found to be correlated to each other after the first magnetization reversal of the FM layer [9]. To explain the training effect, various theoretical models have been proposed [3, 4, 6, 7]. In an early approach [3], AFM spins are assumed to undergo thermally activated transitions during the magnetization reversal process of the FM layer. To account for the athermal training effect, characterized by a large irreversible change between the first and second hysteresis loops which occurs even at low temperatures, AFM spins are proposed to spin-flop between easy axes [6]. Currently it is generally believed that the AFM spins play a crucial role in the EB training effect [12, 13]. However, a complete picture of the motion of AFM spins behind the phenomenon still remains unclear.

The lack of detailed understanding of the motion of the AFM spins arises for a number of reasons. Principally, it is difficult to probe experimentally the rearrangement of AFM spins during the magnetization reversal process of the FM layer due to the zero net magnetization of the AFM layer. Secondly, in the studies of the training effect, hysteresis loops are often measured only along the cooling field [3, 9]. In particular, most attention has been focused on the reduction in magnitude of  $H_E$  and  $H_C$  with the number of cycles  $n$ . The orientation change of the pinning direction (PD) has been ignored. Actually, the PD in FM/AFM bilayers can be directly measured using reversible anisotropic magnetoresistance to demonstrate the motion of the AFM spins [14, 15]. In this Letter, *we have for the first time directly observed and quantified the PD rotation in the EB training effect.* Both the orientation change of the PD and the behavior of the AFM spins are demonstrated to depend on the magnetization reversal mechanism of the FM layer.

A bilayer of  $\text{Ni}_{80}\text{Fe}_{20}(\text{NiFe})(3 \text{ nm})/\text{Fe}_{50}\text{Mn}_{50}(\text{FeMn})$  was sputtered on a  $1 \text{ cm} \times 5 \text{ cm}$  glass substrate at ambient temperature. With a wedge shape across the distance of 5 cm, the FeMn layer thickness  $t_{\text{AFM}}$  is a linear function of the sampling location. A uniform bilayer of  $\text{NiFe}(3 \text{ nm})/\text{FeMn}(2.4 \text{ nm})$  was also prepared. A 15 nm Cu buffer layer was used to stimulate the fcc (111) preferred growth of FeMn and to enhance EB [16]. The EB

was established by a magnetic field applied in the film plane during deposition. Detailed fabrication procedures were given elsewhere [17].

X-ray diffraction shows that the constituent layers are polycrystalline with fcc (111) and fcc (200) peaks. Before magnetic measurements, the large specimen was cut into small pieces along the wedge direction. With a vector vibrating sample magnetometer (VVSM),  $m_x$  and  $m_y$  were measured simultaneously, as components of the magnetic moment parallel and perpendicular to the in-plane external magnetic field  $H$ . The two components are parallel to the film plane. The curve of  $m_x$  versus  $H$  corresponds to the conventional hysteresis loop. In order to determine the PD of the FM layer,  $m_y$  was measured as a function of the orientation of the sample under a fixed  $H$  [18]. All measurements were performed at room temperature.

In experiments, we found that for the NiFe/FeMn bilayers,  $m_y$  is always zero when the hysteresis loop is measured along the deposition field. Therefore, the principal axes of the uniaxial and unidirectional anisotropies are collinear [19]. This is because the intrinsic uniaxial anisotropy of the magnetically soft NiFe layer is negligible and thus the uniaxial anisotropy in the NiFe/FeMn bilayer is purely induced by the EB. Accordingly, we can define the deposition field direction as the initial PD along which the exchange bias initially acts. Any changes in the orientation of the PD can be monitored from the rotational variation of  $m_y$  in zero magnetic field; the PD can be identified as the angular position with  $m_y = 0$  and a positive maximal  $m_x$ . The schematic picture for magnetic measurements is shown in the inset of Fig. 1, where  $\theta_{PD}$  and  $\theta_{H-Loop}$  represent respectively the orientations of the PD and  $H$  for measurements of hysteresis loops with respect to that of the initial PD.  $\theta_{Rtn}$  is the angular variable for the rotational variation of  $m_y$  in zero magnetic field. For each sample, the initial PD was first identified from the rotational variation of  $m_y$  in zero magnetic field *before the application of any external magnetic field*. At a specific  $\theta_{H-Loop}$ , the hysteresis loop was measured and  $H_E$  and  $H_C$  were determined at  $n = 1$ . Afterwards,  $\theta_{PD}$  was determined at  $n = 1$  using the rotational variation of  $m_y$  in zero magnetic field. The above procedures were then repeated so that the variations of  $H_E$ ,  $H_C$ , and  $\theta_{PD}$  with  $n$  were acquired.

Figure 1(a) shows that for the uniform NiFe(3 nm)/FeMn(2.4 nm) bilayer at  $\theta_{H-Loop} = -12$  degrees, the coercive field of the descending branch decreases significantly with increasing  $n$  while that of the ascending branch changes little. As shown in Fig. 1(b),  $m_y$  at the




FIG. 1: Hysteresis loops  $m_x$  (a) and  $m_y$  (b) with  $\theta_{H-Loop} = -12$  degrees, and the curves of  $m_y$  versus  $\theta_{Rtn}$  in  $H = 0$  (c) for uniform NiFe(3 nm)/FeMn (2.4 nm) bilayers. In (a) and (b)  $n=1$  (black, solid line), 20 (red, dashed line). In (c)  $n=0$  (black, solid line), 20 (red, dashed line). The inset shows the schematic picture of magnetic measurements.

descending branch is increased after subsequent measurements and the asymmetry of the hysteresis loop becomes weak. Figure 1(c) shows that  $\theta_{PD}$  is shifted towards high angles after subsequent measurements. Apparently, the PD rotation has *for the first time been probed directly during consecutive hysteresis loops*. It is noted that similar phenomenon has been observed in FM/AFM bilayers in rotating magnetic fields [15]. As a new physical quantity, the quantitative estimation of the PD rotation is of crucial importance to the investigations of the EB training effect.

Figure 2 shows the variations of  $H_E(n)$ ,  $H_C(n)$ , and  $\theta_{PD}(n)$  with  $n$  at  $\theta_{H-Loop} = -12$  degrees. It is interesting to note that the initial sharp decrease of  $H_E(n)$  and  $H_C(n)$  and a sharp increase of  $\theta_{PD}(n)$  occur simultaneously. With increasing  $n$ ,  $H_E(n)$  and  $H_C(n)$  decrease while  $\theta_{PD}(n)$  increases. Alternatively, we can interpret the data as follows. As the angle between  $H$  and the rotated PD, i.e.,  $\theta_{PD}(n) - \theta_{H-Loop}$  increases,  $H_E(n)$  and  $H_C(n)$  decrease, which is consistent with the conventional angular dependence of the EB [20]. The

rotation of the PD is at least one important contribution to the reductions of  $H_E(n)$  and  $H_C(n)$  in the training effect. Thus, in addition to the magnitude reduction of the exchange anisotropy [7], the PD rotation should also be considered in explanations of the EB training effect. For all non-zero values of  $\theta_{H-Loop}$  we obtain similar results to those in Figs. 1& 2.

Here, we use  $\frac{\Delta H_{E/C}}{H_{E/C}(n=1)}$  and  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  to express respectively the relative changes of  $H_E$  and  $H_C$  and the orientation change of the PD, where  $\Delta H_{E/C} = H_{E/C}(n=1) - H_{E/C}(n=20)$  and  $\Delta\theta_{PD} = \theta_{PD}(n=20) - \theta_{PD}(n=0)$ . Figures 3(a) & 3(b) show the angular dependence of  $\frac{\Delta H_{E/C}}{H_{E/C}(n=1)}$  and  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  for the uniform NiFe(3 nm)/FeMn(2.4 nm) bilayer. At  $\theta_{H-Loop} = 0$ ,  $\Delta\theta_{PD} = 0$  while  $\frac{\Delta H_E}{H_E(n=1)}$  and  $\frac{\Delta H_C}{H_C(n=1)}$  still exist. At small negative  $\theta_{H-Loop}$ ,  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  increases sharply and reaches a maximum while  $\frac{\Delta H_E}{H_E(n=1)}$  and  $\frac{\Delta H_C}{H_C(n=1)}$  change little. At large negative  $\theta_{H-Loop}$ ,  $\frac{\Delta H_E}{H_E(n=1)}$ ,  $\frac{\Delta H_C}{H_C(n=1)}$ , and  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  all decrease. Finally, near  $\theta_{H-Loop} = -90$  degrees,  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  and  $\frac{\Delta H_C}{H_C(n=1)}$  are close to zero. However,  $\frac{\Delta H_E}{H_E(n=1)}$  increases because the denominator  $H_E(n=1)$  is close to zero.

For the present NiFe/FeMn bilayer, the hysteresis loop asymmetry is similar in the angular dependence to  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$ . For simplicity, consider the  $n=1$  hysteresis loop as an example. In experiments, we found that at  $\theta_{H-Loop} = 0$ ,  $m_y$  at the coercive field of either branch always equals zero and the asymmetry disappears. At small negative  $\theta_{H-Loop}$ ,  $m_y$  is non-zero and the asymmetry is prominent [6, 10, 11, 21–23], as shown in Fig. 1(b). At large negative  $\theta_{H-Loop}$ , the asymmetry approaches zero again. In general, non-zero values of  $m_y$  indicate the presence of a component of rotation in the magnetization reversal mechanism;  $m_y = 0$  corresponds to dominant domain wall motion. Apparently,  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$ , the asymmetry, and the magnetization reversal mechanism are correlated. The dramatic angular dependence of  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  is important evidence relating the PD rotation to the magnetization reversal mechanism of the FM layer.

The variation of  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  with  $\theta_{H-Loop}$  can be understood using the thermal activation model [17, 24]. For the interfacial uncompensated magnetic moment of an individual AFM grain,  $m_{AFM}$ , which is controlled by the interfacial roughness and is parallel to spins of one sublattice, the motion mode depends on the magnetization reversal mechanism of the FM layer due to the exchange field from the FM layer [25]. With domain rotation,  $m_{AFM}$  is irreversibly rotated by the rotating exchange field whereas it can only switch by 180 degrees due to switching of the exchange field with domain wall motion. Meanwhile, the probability of rotation or switching of  $m_{AFM}$  is controlled by both the thermal energy and the energy




FIG. 2: Dependence of  $H_E$  and  $H_C$  (a), and  $\theta_{PD}$  (b) on  $n$  for the uniform NiFe(3 nm)/FeMn (2.4 nm) bilayer, where consecutive hysteresis loops were measured at  $\theta_{H-Loop} = -12$  degrees.

barrier. For the average uncompensated magnetic moment per unit area,  $m_{AFM-AVE}$ , both the magnitude [26] and the orientation might change. Since the PD orientation is determined by that of  $m_{AFM-AVE}$  [27], the PD may be rotated during the EB training. Apparently, at  $\theta_{H-Loop} = 0$ , with domain wall motion the orientation of  $m_{AFM-AVE}$  is still aligned along that of the initial PD, resulting in  $\Delta\theta_{PD} = 0$  as shown in Fig. 3(b). At small negative  $\theta_{H-Loop}$ , the fraction of the domain rotation is different for two branches of the hysteresis loop, as revealed by the prominent asymmetry in Fig. 1(b). Hence, the change in the orientation of  $m_{AFM-AVE}$  is different for the two branches, resulting in a large  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$ . At large negative  $\theta_{H-Loop}$ , the fraction of the domain rotation is similar for the two branches, as demonstrated by a weak asymmetry [21]. In this case, the irreversible rotations of  $m_{AFM-AVE}$  in two branches tend to cancel so that  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  is reduced. Hence, the non-monotonic variation of  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  with  $\theta_{H-Loop}$  indicates that the motion of  $m_{AFM-AVE}$  in the EB training effect depends on the magnetization reversal mechanism of the FM layer.

Figures 3(c) & 3(d) show the dependence of  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  and  $\frac{\Delta H_{E/C}}{H_{E/C}(n=1)}$  on  $t_{AFM}$  for NiFe (3 nm)/FeMn bilayers at  $\theta_{H-Loop} = -12$  degrees.  $\frac{\Delta H_E}{H_E(n=1)}$ ,  $\frac{\Delta H_C}{H_C(n=1)}$ , and  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  are equal to






FIG. 3: Dependence of  $\frac{\Delta H_E}{H_E(n=1)}$  and  $\frac{\Delta H_C}{H_C(n=1)}$  (a, c) and  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  (b, d) on  $\theta_{H-Loop}$  for the uniform NiFe(3 nm)/FeMn (2.4 nm) bilayer (a, b) and on  $t_{AFM}$  at  $\theta_{H-Loop} = -12$  degrees for NiFe(3 nm)/wedged-FeMn (0-6 nm) bilayers (c, d).

zero at small  $t_{AFM}$  and then increase to reach maxima with increasing  $t_{AFM}$ . Finally, they decrease with further increasing  $t_{AFM}$ . These results can also be explained in terms of the thermal activation model [24]. The transition probability of AFM spins and  $m_{AFM}$  is assumed to be governed by the competition between the thermal energy and the energy barrier. The latter one is proportional to  $t_{AFM}$ , assuming the lateral area of grains is fixed. With small  $t_{AFM}$ , AFM spins in most grains are "superparamagnetic" and thus the training effect and the PD deviation vanish [17, 24]. With increasing  $t_{AFM}$ , AFM spins in most of AFM grains are thermally stable [28]. Since AFM spins can be rotated irreversibly, the PD deviation reaches a maximum, so does the training effect. As  $t_{AFM}$  is further increased, the volume of AFM grains and accordingly the anisotropy energy barrier increase, resulting in a reduction in probability of thermally activated transitions. The PD deviation and the training effect are suppressed.

Although the EB recovery has been studied more recently [9], direct observation of the PD can further elucidate the nature of this phenomenon. Here, we study the EB recovery




FIG. 4: Hysteresis loops at  $\theta_{H-\text{Loop}} = -12$  degrees (a, c) and angular dependence of  $m_y$  under  $H = 0$  (b, d) using the first (a, b) and the second (c, d) recovery methods for uniform NiFe(3 nm)/FeMn (2.4 nm) bilayer.

in the uniform NiFe(3 nm)/FeMn (2.4 nm) bilayer. Initially,  $n = 20$  hysteresis cycles were measured at  $\theta_{H-\text{Loop}} = -12$  degrees. Afterwards, the EB recovery was performed by one of the following two methods. In the first approach, one hysteresis loop was measured at  $\theta_{H-\text{Loop}} = 78$  degrees [9]. In the second approach,  $H$  was set to zero for a designated period. Finally, the rotational variation of  $m_y$  in zero magnetic field and the hysteresis loop at  $\theta_{H-\text{Loop}} = -12$  degrees were recorded in turn. Figures 4(a) & 4(c) show that with either approach,  $H_E$  and  $H_C$  are increased after the recovery procedure, compared with those of  $n = 20$ . Meanwhile, the PD approaches the initial one, as shown in Figs. 4(b) & 4(d). Therefore, the variation of  $\theta_{PD}$  *directly* verifies the theoretical prediction that  $m_{\text{AFM-AVE}}$  and AFM spins are also rotated during the EB recovery [9].

In summary, the PD in polycrystalline FM/AFM bilayers has been found to deviate from and approach the initial PD in the EB training and recovery effects, respectively. The non-monotonic variation of  $\Delta\theta_{PD}$  with  $\theta_{H-\text{Loop}}$  suggests that the orientation change of  $m_{\text{AFM-AVE}}$  depends on the magnetization reversal mechanism of the FM layer.  $m_{\text{AFM}}$  may

acquire 180-degree switching and rotation in the cases of domain wall motion and domain rotation in the FM layer, respectively.  $\Delta\theta_{\text{PD}}$  also depends on  $t_{\text{AFM}}$ . These results can be explained in terms of the thermal activation model. The present work uncovers the general picture of the motion of AFM spins in the EB training effect [12, 13].

**Acknowledgement** This work was supported by the National Science Foundation of China under grant Nos. 50625102, 10574026, and 60490290, the National Basic Research Program of China under grant no. 2007CB925104, 973-project under grant no. 2006CB921300, Shanghai Science and Technology Committee under grant No. 06DJ14007, and Shanghai Leading Academic Discipline Project under grant B113.

- 
- [1] *see, e. g.*, J. Nogués and I. K. Schuller, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **192**, 203(1999).
  - [2] A. E. Berkowitz and K. Takano, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **200**, 552(1999)
  - [3] K. Zhang *et al*, J. Appl. Phys. **89**, 6910(2001)
  - [4] D. Suess *et al*, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 054419(2003)
  - [5] F. Radu *et al*, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 134409(2003)
  - [6] A. Hoffmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 097203(2004)
  - [7] C. Binek, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 014421(2005)
  - [8] T. Hauet *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 067207(2006)
  - [9] S. Brems *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 157202(2005); *ibid* **99**, 067201(2007)
  - [10] E. Pina *et al*, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 052402(2004)
  - [11] T. Gredig *et al*, Phys. Rev. **B74**, 094431(2006)
  - [12] H. W. Xi *et al*, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 184416(2001)
  - [13] S. Polisetty *et al*, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 184423(2007)
  - [14] B. H. Miller and E. Dan Dahlberg, Appl. Phys. Lett. **69**, 3932(1996)
  - [15] T. Gredig *et al*, J. Appl. Phys. **87**, 6418(2000)
  - [16] R. Nakatani, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **33**, 133(1994)
  - [17] T. R. Gao *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 057201(2007)
  - [18] L. Benito *et al*, Rev. Sci. Instru. **77**, 025101(2006)
  - [19] T. Pokhil *et al*, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **272**, E849(2004)

- [20] H. Sang, Y. W. Du, and C. L. Chien, J. Appl. Phys. **85**, 4931(1999)
- [21] J. Camarero *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 057204(2005)
- [22] D. Spenato *et al*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **91**, 062515(2007)
- [23] M. S. Lund and C. Leighton, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 104433(2007)
- [24] D. Choo *et al*, J. Appl. Phys. **101**, 09E521(2007)
- [25] B. Beckmann *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 187201(2003)
- [26] A. Hochstrat *et al*, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 092409(2002)
- [27] H. W. Xi *et al*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **74**, 2687(1999)
- [28] M. D. Stiles and R. D. McMichael, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 3722(1999)