Magnetic oxide nanowires with strain-controlled uniaxial magnetic anisotropy direction
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While magnetic nanowires generally have a preferential magnetization direction along the wire axis to minimize magnetostatic energy, it is shown here for epitaxial magnetic oxide nanowires that substrate-induced strain can be used to tailor the magnetic easy axis in any direction. La$_{0.67}$Sr$_{0.33}$MnO$_3$ (LSMO) nanowires were prepared by pulsed laser deposition of LSMO thin films on NdGaO$_3$ (NGO) substrates of two different orientations [NGO(110)$_o$ and NGO(010)$_o$], followed by patterning into arrays of nanowires by laser interference lithography. The uniaxial compressive strain from the substrate induces a strong uniaxial magnetic anisotropy in the LSMO that dominates the anisotropy. Hence, one obtains LSMO nanowires having a magnetic easy axis that can lie in any direction, including perpendicular to the wire axis. In marked contrast, similar nanowires on SrTiO$_3$(001) substrates without significant uniaxial strain exhibit the usual preferential magnetization direction along the wire axis, as dictated by magnetostatic shape anisotropy. The tunable magnetic anisotropy direction is a useful feature for applications of magnetic nanowires in magnetic memory, sensor, and logic devices.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Magnetic oxides attract considerable interest because of their rich variety of properties, including colossal magnetoresistance, half-metallic ferromagnetism, magnetism in oxide semiconductors with dilute doping, as well as electrically driven reversible resistance switching. The half-metallic character of some magnetic oxides leads to a very high spin-polarization of the conduction electrons, in theory 100%. Indeed, a spin-polarization of 95% was observed for high spin-polarization of the conduction electrons, in theory 100%. Hence, the ability to control and tune the magnetic properties of oxide nanomagnets is an important topic.

In general, a magnetic nanowire has a magnetization that points preferentially along the wire axis, as this reduces the magnetostatic energy. The strength of this so-called magnetic shape anisotropy increases as the aspect ratio of the magnetic element increases, and is therefore often the dominant source of magnetic anisotropy in nanowires. The epitaxial growth of magnetic oxides on various single crystals allows one to introduce an additional source of anisotropy due to substrate-induced strain. This has been demonstrated for thin films of various magnetic oxides, including LSMO, for which the magnetic properties are sensitive to strains imposed by the lattice mismatch between the film and the substrate.

Only a few studies have so far been done on patterned complex magnetic oxides. Submicron LSMO islands of different aspect ratio on LaAlO$_3$ substrate were reported to have characteristic multidomain structure with perpendicular orientation, influenced by the compressive strain from the substrate. Recently, magnetic oxide nanostructures embedded in a paramagnetic matrix prepared by electron beam lithography and ion implantation have been also reported. In this letter, we report the control of the magnetic anisotropy in epitaxial LSMO nanowires on NGO substrates using strain engineering. We show that the uniaxial substrate-induced strain can create a large uniaxial magnetic anisotropy in the LSMO nanowires that is strong enough to overcome the magnetic shape anisotropy and dominates the magnetic anisotropy of the nanowires. Consequently, nanowires are obtained with the magnetic easy axis oriented at any angle with respect to the wire axis, even perpendicular to it.

II. EXPERIMENT

The LSMO is grown using pulsed laser deposition (PLD), which is known as a powerful technique for making thin films with atomically smooth surface and interfaces, atomically regulated thickness, and controlled epitaxial strain caused by the substrate. As substrate we choose NGO of two different orientations, namely, (110)$_o$ and (010)$_o$, for which the LSMO is subjected to strain values that are unequal for the two in-plane crystal directions. The subscript “o” denotes orthorhombic metric. LSMO films were deposited at a substrate temperature of 750 °C from a stoichiometric target in an oxygen background pressure of 0.35 mbar and a laser fluence of 3 J/cm$^2$. The target to substrate distance was fixed at 4 cm. After LSMO deposition, the films were cooled to room temperature with 10 °C/min ramp rate in 1 bar of oxygen gas. The crystal structure of the films was examined using x-ray diffraction (XRD) two-theta scans. The thickness of the films was determined using low-angle XRD while the surface morphology was analyzed by Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM). In order to pattern arrays of LSMO nanowires, the epitaxial LSMO films are spin coated with diluted photoresist (Arch 907 aka Olin) and exposed in a laser interfer-
ence lithography (LIL) setup. Then the sample is etched by argon ion milling, followed by ultrasonic cleaning in acetone to remove the photosist. After optimizing the LIL exposure time and the etching time, LSMO nanowires of different dimensions and periodicity can be obtained. We report here on arrays of wires with a 300 nm width and 600 nm periodicity. The nanowire length is approximately 4.5 mm, with the array of wires covering a surface area of 4.5 by 4.5 mm. Magnetic measurements were done using a vibrating sample magnetometer (VSM) at room temperature, on nanowires as well as on continuous films for comparison. Below we shall first describe the properties of the latter.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Structure

In order to understand the expected strain of the LSMO lattice on NGO substrates of different orientations, we first describe the crystal structure of LSMO and NGO, for which the unit cells are schematically represented in Fig. 1. LSMO has a pseudocubic crystal structure with bulk lattice parameter $a=3.88$ Å. The orthorhombic crystal structure of NGO (with lattice parameters $a=5.426$ Å, $b=5.496$ Å, and $c=7.706$ Å) can also be described in the pseudocubic space group, in which the (100) pseudocubic direction corresponds to the (110) orthorhombic direction, and the average pseudocubic lattice parameter, $a_1$, is related to the orthorhombic unit cell by $a \approx \sqrt{2} a_1$, $b \approx \sqrt{2} a_1$, and $c \approx 2a_1$. The growth orientations of LSMO on NGO(110)$_o$ and (010)$_o$ substrates are different. Figures 2(a)–2(c) shows how LSMO grows on a NGO(110)$_o$ substrate having its surface terminated with the GaO$_2$ crystal plane. Figure 2(a) shows the top view of the GaO$_2$ termination plane and (b) illustrates how the LSMO cubic lattice fits onto it. In Fig. 2(c), the stacking of the LSMO on the substrate is depicted as a side view. Using the LSMO and NGO lattice parameters, the lattice mismatch of the film can be calculated and the expected strain can be obtained for an LSMO film grown in epitaxial mode. We obtain a compressive strain of 0.70% along the in-plane “c” axis ([001] direction) of NGO (110)$_o$, while there is a smaller compressive strain of 0.47% in the in-plane direction perpendicular to it.

Similarly, Figs. 2(d)–2(f) shows how LSMO grows on NGO(010)$_o$ substrates. The most salient feature is that the LSMO grows with its [011] axis perpendicular to the surface.
Film on NGO local space mapping was carried out on a 25 nm thick LSMO annealed at 950 °C for 1 h in oxygen flow of 1 bar in order to get a clean and well-ordered surface with straight terraces. For NGO, to get a clean and well-ordered surface with straight terraces.

5.546 nm LSMO film ing to the surface. The crystal structure of the LSMO films was analyzed by XRD (Fig. 3). The two-theta XRD scan of a representative LSMO film of 15 nm thickness on a NGO(110), substrate shows only the peaks corresponding to the (00l) orientations of the film, confirming its crystallinity. Similarly, LSMO grown on NGO(010), shows reflections corresponding to the (hkl) orientations, which confirms the crystallinity, but also the rotated growth orientation as described above and shown in Fig. 2(f). The out of plane lattice parameter deduced from these two-theta XRD measurements is 3.906 ± 0.003 Å for LSMO/NGO(110), and 5.546 ± 0.004 Å for LSMO/NGO(010), corresponding to an out of plane tensile strain 0.67% and 1.1%, respectively.

To determine the in-plane lattice parameters, XRD reciprocal space mapping was carried out on a 25 nm thick LSMO film on NGO(110), see Fig. 4. The h,l scan and k,l scan were measured, respectively, around the (204),pc and (024),pc reflections, and show two separate peaks associated with the NGO substrate and the LSMO film due to their different out-of-plane lattice parameters (l direction or Q(110),). In addition, the h,l scan provides selective information about one in-plane lattice parameter [h direction or Q(001),], which is seen to be identical for LSMO film and NGO substrate. The k,l scan provides selective information about the other, orthogonal in-plane lattice parameter [k direction or Q(110),], which is also found to be identical for LSMO film and NGO substrate. Hence, we conclude that the in-plane lattice of the LSMO film matches the in-plane lattice of the substrate, implying epitaxial growth and hence the expected uniaxial strain.

B. Magnetic anisotropy of LSMO thin films on NGO

From magnetization curves taken with the field \( H \) applied in different directions, we find that all films have in-plane magnetization direction, i.e., the direction perpendicular to the film is a magnetic hard axis. In order to study in detail the magnetic anisotropy in the plane of the films, hysteresis loops were taken at different in-plane field directions with intervals of 5°, from which we also obtain the magnetic remanence (i.e., the remanent magnetization at \( H=0 \)). Figure 5(a) shows representative data for a 18 nm LSMO film on NGO(110),. The curve taken in the [110] direction of the NGO substrate shows typical easy axis behavior with sharp magnetization switching at small fields and large remanence, while for the field applied in the [001] in-plane direction the film shows very little remanence and much larger saturation field typical for a magnetic hard axis. Figure 5(b) shows the
extracted magnetic remanence plotted against the in-plane field angle ($\theta$), measured from one edge of the sample as defined in the AFM image shown in Fig. 5(c). The remanence is found to oscillate with a periodicity of 180°, which implies a uniaxial magnetic anisotropy. The highest remanence value occurs around $\theta=58^\circ$ corresponding to the in-plane [110] direction. The lowest remanence is at $\theta=148^\circ$ (in-plane [001] direction). We thus find that the magnetic easy and hard axis lie along the [110] and [001] in-plane crystal directions, respectively.

The same result is obtained for LSMO on NGO(010)$_0$ substrates, for which a similar set of data is presented in Figs. 5(d)–5(f) for a 50 nm thick LSMO film. Here $\theta$ is defined as the angle between the applied field direction and the [001] NGO crystal direction. Again there is a pronounced oscillation of the magnetic remanence with periodicity of 180°, with the highest remanence at $\theta=0^\circ$ (in-plane [001] direction) and the lowest remanence at $\theta=90^\circ$ (in-plane [100] direction). Thus, also for this substrate orientation there is a uniaxial magnetic anisotropy, in this case with easy axis along [001] and hard axis along the [100] in-plane direction. As outlined above, the compressive strain induced in the LSMO by both of these NGO substrates is different in the two in-plane directions. This modifies the magnetocrystalline anisotropy and results in a uniaxial magnetic anisotropy. Compared to LSMO films on STO substrates, for LSMO on NGO we obtain a much larger amplitude of the oscillation of the remanence, which almost reaches zero for the magnetic hard axis direction. We also note that the in-plane magnetic easy axis does not coincide with the orientation of the steps and terraces on the film surface [see AFM images in Figs. 5(c) and 5(f)]. Therefore, the step-induced uniaxial anisotropy, previously observed for LSMO on vicinal STO substrates, is weak compared to the strong strain-induced anisotropy.

C. Magnetic anisotropy of LSMO nanowires on NGO

Next, we exploit the strain-induced magnetic anisotropy to manipulate the magnetization direction of magnetic nanowires. Figure 6 shows data obtained on a representative LSMO nanowire sample on a NGO(110)$_0$ substrate. The nanowires have a width of 300 nm, length of 4.5 mm, height (film thickness) of 20 nm, and a periodicity of 600 nm, while the axis of the wires lies along one edge of the substrate [i.e., along $\theta=90^\circ$, as can be seen in the AFM image of Fig. 6(c)]. The magnetic hysteresis loop [Fig. 6(a)] taken for $\theta=60^\circ$ ([110] direction) shows typical easy axis behavior with relatively sharp magnetization switching and large remanence, while for the field applied at $\theta=150^\circ$ ([001] direction) the nanowires show smaller remanence and hysteresis. Figure 6(b) shows that the remanence oscillates with the in-plane field angle $\theta$ with a periodicity of 180°, implying a uniaxial magnetic anisotropy. However, the most salient feature is that the highest remanence value occurs around $\theta=58^\circ$, i.e., when the magnetic field is applied at an angle of about 30°.
with respect to the long axis of the nanowires. Similarly, the magnetic hard axis is not perpendicular to the nanowires, as it would be if magnetic shape anisotropy would dominate. Rather, the hard axis is at $\theta \approx 148^\circ$, which is about 60° away from the nanowire axis. In fact, the magnetic easy and hard axes of the nanowires coincide with the in-plane crystal directions, [110] and [001], respectively. We thus find that the LSMO nanowires have a uniaxial magnetic anisotropy direction that is determined by the strain induced by the substrate, and not by the magnetic shape anisotropy of the wires. Obviously, the large uniaxial magnetic anisotropy induced by the strain is essential.

Given that the magnetic anisotropy of the nanowires is determined by the in-plane crystal orientation, it becomes possible to create nanowires with a magnetic easy axis at any angle with the nanowire axis. We demonstrate this for the extreme case of nanowires having a magnetic easy axis perpendicular to the wire axis. For that purpose, LSMO films on NGO(010)$_x$ substrates were patterned into nanowires oriented along the [100] in-plane crystal direction [see AFM image in Fig. 7(c)]. The wires have a width of 300 nm, length of 4.5 mm, height of 25 nm, and a periodicity of 600 nm. Figures 7(a) and 7(b) shows the in-plane hysteresis loops and extracted remanence versus in-plane field angle, from which we can see that the magnetic easy axis lies along the [001] direction ($\theta = 0^\circ$). Indeed, this is perpendicular to the axis of the nanowires. The wires also exhibit a uniaxial anisotropy with the magnetic hard axis in the [100] in-plane crystal direction ($\theta \approx 90^\circ$), which is along the nanowire axis.

D. Magnetic anisotropy of LSMO nanowires on STO

For comparison we have also prepared LSMO nanowires with similar dimensions on SrTiO$_3$ (STO) substrates, using the same fabrication method. On STO(001), the epitaxial LSMO films have equal in-plane tensile strain of 0.64% in both the orthogonal in-plane directions. Thus, in this case the LSMO lacks strain-induced magnetocrystalline anisotropy in the film plane. Therefore, the magnetic easy axis of nanowires on STO is expected to be along the long axis of the wires, as dictated by the magnetostatic shape anisotropy. This conventional behavior is indeed observed [see Fig. 8], showing that a significant magnetostatic shape anisotropy is indeed present in such LSMO nanowires (we note that the observed uniaxial behavior is not due to the (weak) step-induced uniaxial anisotropy previously observed in LSMO films on vicinal STO at room temperature,\(^1\) since the nanowires were patterned at an angle with the surface steps, which for the sample of Fig. 8 were oriented along the [110] direction).
where constants in the wires isotropy, is then given by \( 27 \) for the given dimensions of the nanowires. For the latter, we approximate the Young's modulus, and strain induced by the NGO substrate is then obtained as the energy of the nanowires. For the latter, we approximate the anisotropy constant, \( K_{\text{static}} \), corresponding to the in-plane anisotropy, is then given by \( 27 \) for the given dimensions of the nanowires \((a=420 \text{ nm}, b=26 \text{ nm}, \text{ and } c=4.5 \text{ mm})\), yielding \( N_a=0.08 \) and \( N_c=6.6 \times 10^{-6} \). This gives \( K_{\text{static}}=6.51 \times 10^3 \text{ J/m}^3 \), which is sufficient to force the magnetic easy axis of the nanowires on STO along the wire axis.

For the strain-induced anisotropy, we start from the general expression for the magnetoelastic energy due to strain in cubic materials, given by \( 28,29 \)

\[
E = -(3/2)\lambda_{100}\sigma(\alpha_1^2\gamma_1^2 + \alpha_2^2\gamma_2^2 + \alpha_3^2\gamma_3^2) \]

\[ - 3\lambda_{111}\sigma(\alpha_1\alpha_2\gamma_1\gamma_2 + \alpha_2\alpha_3\gamma_2\gamma_3 + \alpha_3\alpha_1\gamma_3\gamma_1). \]

(1)

Here, \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \text{ and } \alpha_3 \) are the direction cosines of the magnetization and \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \text{ and } \gamma_3 \) are direction cosines of the tension \( (\sigma) \) in the ferromagnetic body \((\sigma=Y\varepsilon, \text{ with } Y \text{ the young’s modulus, and } \varepsilon \text{ the strain vector } (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3) \text{ with magnitude } |\varepsilon|)\), and \( \lambda_{100} \) and \( \lambda_{111} \) are the magnetostriiction constants in the \([100]\) and \([111]\) directions, respectively. The magnetoelastic anisotropy energy \( K_{\text{static}} \) associated with the strain induced by the NGO substrate is then obtained as the energy difference between magnetization along the in-plane axis 1 \((\alpha_1=1, \alpha_2=0, \alpha_3=0)\) and the orthogonal in-plane axis 2 \((\alpha_1=0, \alpha_2=1, \alpha_3=0)\), which gives \( K_{\text{static}}=-(3/2)\lambda_{100}\sigma(\gamma_1^2 - \gamma_2^2) \) or equivalently \( K_{\text{static}}=-(3/2)\lambda_{100}Y|\varepsilon| (\varepsilon_1^2-\varepsilon_2^2)/|\varepsilon|^2 \). We consider the case of the LSMO on NGO(110), with in-plane strain parameters \( \varepsilon_1=-0.7\% \), \( \varepsilon_2 = -0.47\% \) and out-of-plane strain \( \varepsilon_3=+0.67\% \), as determined from the XRD results. A value of \( Y=4.5 \times 10^{11} \text{ J/m}^3 \) was used for the Young’s modulus. \( 30,31 \) The magnetostriiction constant \( \lambda_{100} \) was reported \( 30 \) to be between \( 2.2 \times 10^{-5} \) and \( (7-10) \times 10^{-5} \). Using the lowest value \( (2.2 \times 10^{-5}) \), we obtain a lower bound for \( K_{\text{static}} \) of \( 3.7 \times 10^4 \text{ J/m}^3 \). This is about an order of magnitude larger than the magnetostatic anisotropy energy of the nanowires, consistent with the observation that strain controls the magnetic anisotropy of the LSMO nanowires on NGO substrates.

IV. CONCLUSION

Thus for nanowires on NGO substrates, the magnetic anisotropy due to the substrate-induced lattice strain is strong enough to dominate over the shape anisotropy, and allows the magnetic easy axis of the nanowires to lie in any direction, even perpendicular to the wires. Strain engineering in epitaxial oxide nanowires via a suitable choice of substrate is therefore a viable approach to manipulate and tune the magnetic properties of nanowires and create a uniaxial magnetic anisotropy in any direction. This is a very useful feature for applications of magnetic nanowires in magnetic memory, sensor and logic devices.
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