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Geometric-Phase Interference in a Mn_{12} Single-Molecule Magnet with Fourfold Rotational Symmetry


Department of Physics, Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts 01002-5000, USA
Department of Condensed Matter Physics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel
Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1

We study the magnetic relaxation rate $\Gamma$ of the single-molecule magnet Mn$_{12}$-BuAc as a function of the magnetic field component $H_F$ transverse to the molecule’s easy axis. When the spin is near a magnetic quantum tunneling resonance, we find that $\Gamma$ increases abruptly at certain values of $H_F$. These increases are observed just beyond values of $H_F$ at which a geometric-phase interference effect suppresses tunneling between two excited energy levels. The effect is washed out by rotating $H_F$ away from the spin’s hard axis, thereby suppressing the interference effect. Detailed numerical calculations of $\Gamma$ using the known spin Hamiltonian accurately reproduce the observed behavior. These results are the first experimental evidence for geometric-phase interference in a single-molecule magnet with true fourfold symmetry.

Geometric-phase effects are responsible for many fascinating phenomena in classical and quantum physics, from how a cat rights itself while in free fall to the dynamics of charged particles in electromagnetic fields, e.g., the Aharonov-Bohm effect [1]. One formulation of geometric-phase effects involves a path-integral approach in which the interference of paths is modulated by the geometric phase difference between the paths [2–5]. Such interference effects can reveal the underlying symmetries of the system’s Hamiltonian. The dynamics of spins provide a natural way to explore quantum geometric phases for, as Berry showed in his pioneering work [6], it has also been seen in antiferromagnetic molecular wheels [19] and in SMM dimers [20,21]. Such interference effects in the bellwether SMM Mn$_{12}$Ac are complicated by the presence of solvent disorder [22], which breaks the SMM’s nominal fourfold symmetry, resulting in a competition between second-order and fourth-order anisotropies [23,24]. Here we report the observation of a geometric-phase interference effect in [Mn$_{12}$O$_{12}$(O$_2$CCH$_2$-Bu)$_{16}$ (CH$_3$OH)$_4$] · CH$_3$OH (hereafter Mn$_{12}$-BuAc), a variant of Mn$_{12}$Ac that is free of solvent disorder and maintains its fourfold rotational symmetry [25–29]. Unlike previous observations of geometric-phase interference, which involved ground-state tunneling, the interference effect described herein is observed in the thermally assisted tunneling regime where tunneling takes place near the top of the barrier. The interference effect provides a fingerprint that affords an unprecedented ability to clearly identify which levels participate in the thermally assisted process.

In 2002, Park and Garg [30] and, independently, Kim [31], predicted that an interference effect should be observed in SMMs with fourth-order transverse anisotropy, described by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = -D S_z^2 + (C/2)(S_x^4 + S_y^4) - g \mu_B S \cdot H,$$

where $S_z = S_x \pm i S_y$. In zero field, such a spin system has the classical energy landscape shown in the left inset of Fig. 1. Applying a magnetic field $H_F$ along one of the four hard directions ($\pm x$ and $\pm y$ for $C > 0$) preserves reflection symmetry through the z-hard plane, allowing interference between equal-amplitude tunneling paths...
that virtually pass through the saddle points in the landscape. This interference induces oscillations in the tunneling probability as a function of $H_T$. $\text{Mn}_{12}$-BuAc is reasonably well described by the above Hamiltonian with the addition of sixth-order terms consistent with fourfold symmetry [27]:

$$
\mathcal{H} = -DS_z^2 - AS_z^4 - A'S_z^6 + (C/2)(S_z^4 + S_z^4)
+ \left( C'/2 \right) [S_z^2(S_z^4 + S_z^4) + \text{H.c.}]
- \mu_B g_s S_z H_z + g_\perp (S_z \cos \phi + S_y \sin \phi) H_T \right],
$$

(2)

where $D = 0.568 \text{ K}$, $A = 0.69 \text{ mK}$, $A' = 3.3 \mu\text{K}$, $C = 50 \mu\text{K}$, $C' = -0.79 \mu\text{K}$, $g_z = 2.00$, and $g_\perp = 1.93$. $H_z$ is the longitudinal component of the magnetic field, and $\phi$ measures the angle between $H_T$ and the $x$ axis. Much of the system’s dynamics can be understood in terms of the double-well potential shown in the inset of Fig. 2(a), which shows the system’s energy as a function of the angle between the spin vector and the easy axis (z) direction. The spin has $2S + 1$ energy levels, which are approximate eigenstates of $S_z$. $H_z$ tilts the potential and at certain values, levels in opposite wells align, allowing resonant tunneling between wells that results in a marked increase in the magnetic relaxation rate. The fourth and fifth terms in Eq. (2) as well as $H_T$ break the commutation of $\mathcal{H}$ and $S_z$, thereby inducing tunneling. The tunnel splitting between nearly degenerate states is readily calculated by diagonalizing Eq. (2). The solid lines in Fig. 2(b), for $\phi = 0 \ (\text{mod 90}^\circ)$, show that destructive interference between tunneling paths induces a dramatic suppression (“quenching”) of tunneling at discrete values of $H_T$ for each pair of levels [32]. (Here and below, we label each state by $m$, its value of $(S_z)$ in the absence of tunneling.) The interference effect is largely destroyed when $\phi$ is increased towards $45^\circ$ (dashed lines) since $H_T$ then favors one tunneling path over others. The tunneling quenching affects which levels are involved in the magnetic relaxation process, as evidenced by our data.

Crystals of $\text{Mn}_{12}$-BuAc were synthesized according to published procedures [29]. A sample was mounted adjacent to a Hall sensor that was in turn mounted on a rotator probe. A reference sensor on the same chip was used to measure background signals. Signals from the two
sensors were subtracted with an analog circuit. We performed extensive measurements on two samples \( A \) and \( B \). Measurements of sample \( B \) were performed using a modified apparatus (Fig. 1 right inset) in which the orientation of both the sample’s easy and hard axes relative to the field could be adjusted (the latter \( \text{ex situ} \) by \( \pm 35^\circ \)). Measurements were performed as follows. The sample was rotated to align its easy axis with the external magnetic field, magnetizing the sample, i.e., populating one of the wells in the inset of Fig. 2(a). Next, the sample was rotated to an orientation that produced the desired values of \( H_T \) and \( H_r \). The subsequent time dependence of the magnetization was monitored and fit to an exponential decay to extract the relaxation rate, \( \Gamma \). Proceeding this way, we obtained values for \( \Gamma \) as a function of \( H_r \) and \( H_T \) and of temperature \( T \) for relaxation near a tunneling resonance.

Some data from sample \( A \) are shown in Fig. 1, where \( \Gamma \) is plotted as a function of \( H_r \) for several values of \( H_T \) at \( T = 3.10 \, \text{K} \). For each value of \( H_T \), \( \Gamma \) exhibits a roughly Lorentzian dependence on \( H_r \), peaked at \( H_r = 0 \), where tunneling is maximum. \( \Gamma \) generally increases with increasing \( H_T \) as the tunneling rate is enhanced and, in tandem, the effective energy barrier is reduced [33]. We note that for some regions of \( H_T \) and \( H_r \) (green boxes) the data are bunched—the relaxation rate changes very little with increasing \( H_T \). The effect is much more pronounced in the shoulders of the peak than near its center. Figure 2 shows \( \Gamma \) as a function of \( H_T \) for \( H_r = 0 \) (upper four data sets, from peak center in Fig. 1) and \( H_r = -400 \, \text{Oe} \) (lower four data sets, from peak shoulders). All sets show a roughly exponential increase in \( \Gamma \) with \( H_T \). In addition, \( \Gamma \) exhibits steps and plateaus (the latter corresponding to the bunching in Fig. 1). These are far more apparent in the \( H_r = -400 \, \text{Oe} \) data. Each step corresponds to a transition from one dominant pair of tunneling levels (e.g., \( m = \pm 3 \)) to another (e.g., \( m = \pm 4 \)). Interestingly, theoretical calculations of these transitions for \( C = C' = 0 \) predict that the transitions should be independent of \( \phi \) and more pronounced on resonance \( (H_r = 0) \) than away from resonance [34,35], in contrast to our results.

Structure near \( H_r = 0 \), where \( \Gamma \) depends strongly on \( H_r \), may be washed out by inhomogeneous dipole fields. More importantly, the structure observed near \( H_r = -400 \, \text{Oe} \) (where \( \Gamma \) is less sensitive to dipole fields) is much more pronounced than predicted by the simple model. Including the experimentally determined values of \( C \) and \( C' \) in Eq. (2) induces the tunneling suppression shown in Fig. 2(b). These tunnel quenches, in turn, give rise to the steps in \( \Gamma \).

To illustrate this, Fig. 2(b) contains a horizontal dotted line—an empirically determined “tunnel threshold.” When the tunnel splitting for a particular pair of levels approaches this threshold, tunneling for that pair begins to become the dominant relaxation mechanism [33,34,36,37]. For example, at \( H_T \sim 4.2 \, \text{kOe} \) (marked by the red vertical dotted line), the tunnel splitting for \( m = \pm 3 \) reaches the threshold and tunneling between these levels begins to dominate over relaxation through higher levels. This additional relaxation mechanism produces the rapid increase in \( \Gamma \) near this field.

Similar transitions occur when other pairs of levels reach the threshold, marked by the other dotted vertical lines in the figure. The tunneling suppression effect plays a crucial role here: it determines how rapidly the threshold is crossed as \( H_T \) increases. The slope of the tunnel splitting curves in Fig. 2(b) is rather steep in the vicinity of the threshold right after a quench for \( \phi = 0 \). In contrast, when \( \phi = 45^\circ \), the tunnel splitting quenches are absent and the tunnel splittings cross the threshold more gradually, making each transition so broad that it overlaps with others so that its observability is washed out.

This effect is demonstrated in Fig. 3. The inset of the figure shows \( \Gamma \) as a function of \( H_T \) for sample \( B \) in the vicinity of one of the transitions for several values of \( \phi' = \phi + \phi_0 \), where \( \phi' \) is the experimental azimuthal angle of the rotator’s second stage and \( \phi_0 \) is a constant offset representing the orientation of the sample’s hard axis (see Fig. 1 right inset). The data features for sample \( B \) were less distinct than for sample \( A \), possibly because \( B \) was measured more than a year after synthesis. To enhance clarity, we divided the data by \( e^{0.3H_r/KOe} \), where the coefficient 0.3 was chosen empirically. The resulting data are presented in the main figure. For \( \phi' = 2^\circ \) and \( 20^\circ \), the sharp transition at \( \sim 8 \, \text{kOe} \) is apparent while it is clearly suppressed for values of \( \phi' \) outside this range. These results suggest \( \phi_0 \sim 9^\circ \), implying that the hard axes for the \( m = 2-4 \) levels are roughly parallel with the \( a \) and \( b \) crystallographic axes of the cuboid-shaped crystals [38].

We also studied the relaxation rate near the \( n = 1 \) \( (H_r \sim 4.5 \, \text{kOe}) \) resonance. We examined sample \( B \) with \( \phi' = 2^\circ \) with \( H_r \sim 1 \, \text{kOe} \) below the resonance peak. Again we see steps in the relaxation rate as a function of \( H_T \), as shown in Fig. 4(a). (Like in Fig. 3, we have removed an exponential background for clarity.) The steps here also correspond to the transitions between dominant tunneling
interactions. For calculational ease, we used the spin’s Sz horizontal line represents a tunneling threshold while the dotted and than the peak of the resonance. (b) Simulations of relaxation rate (c) Tunnel splitting calculations with \(\Delta\) is the phonon thermal distribution function, \(\rho = 1.356 \times 10^3 \text{ kg/m}^3\) is the mass density [27], and \(c_s\) is the transverse speed of sound. \(\kappa^{(1)} = 1\) and \(\kappa^{(2)}\) is a constant of order unity representing the strength of the associated spin-phonon coupling mechanism [43]. We neglect possible collective spin-phonon interactions [46].

We calculated \(\Gamma\) by finding the slowest nonzero eigenvalue of the rate matrix implicit in Eq. (3). The calculated rates are fit to the data in Fig. 2, allowing \(c_s\), \(\kappa^{(2)}\), \(C\), and \(C'\) to be unconstrained parameters. The remaining Hamiltonian parameters were fixed and we set \(H_z = -400 \text{ Oe and } \phi = 7^\circ\). The results of the fitting are shown by the solid curves in Fig. 2(a). The calculated rates reproduce the data quite well. The fit yields \(c_s = 1122 \text{ m/s and } \kappa^{(2)} = 1.21\). These parameters set the overall scale of the rate and the general slope of the rate versus \(H_T\), respectively. They do not influence the positions of the steps, which are determined by Hamiltonian parameters \(C\) and \(C'\). The fit yields \(C = 55 \mu\text{K and } C' = -0.81 \mu\text{K, in good agreement with the values determined spectroscopi-

Our calculations allow us to precisely determine which pairs of levels dominate the tunneling process as a function of \(H_T\). The inset of Fig. 2(b) shows an example of the probability “currents” (dashed arrows) [37] between some of the relevant states at \(H_T = 4.8 \text{ kOe}\). The state labels indicate the values of \(\langle S_z \rangle\). Diagonal arrows correspond to tunneling transitions in the energy eigenbasis—such transitions would be forbidden in the absence of tunneling. For this example, \(m = \pm 3\) are clearly the dominant tunneling levels. These calculations confirm the interpretation of the steps in the relaxation rate given above, e.g., for \(n = 0\) at \(H_T \sim 4.2 \text{ kOe}\) the dominant tunneling pair switches from \(m = \pm 2\) to \(m = \pm 3\).

In conclusion, our measurements provide the first evidence for a geometric-phase interference effect in a truly fourfold symmetric SMM. The results also demonstrate this effect in the thermally assisted tunneling regime, allowing identification of which levels dominate the tunneling process. It may be possible to observe similar effects in this system in ground-state tunneling. Such experiments would require lower temperatures and higher magnetic fields.
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\[
\frac{dp_i}{dt} = \sum_{i,j} (\gamma^{(1)}_{ij} + \gamma^{(2)}_{ij}) p_i + (\gamma^{(1)}_{ji} + \gamma^{(2)}_{ji}) p_j
\]

The phonon transition rates are given by [34,42]

\[
\gamma^{(a)}_{ij} = \frac{\kappa^{(a)} d^2}{6\pi \rho c_s^2 \hbar^4} |s_{ij}^{(a)}|^2 \Delta_{ij}^3 N(\Delta_{ij}),
\]

where \(s^{(1)}_{ij} = \langle i | [S_x, S_z] | j \rangle\) and \(s^{(2)}_{ij} = \langle i | S_x^2 - S_z^2 | j \rangle\) and \(\Delta_{ij} = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j\), with \(\epsilon_i\) the energy of level \(i\). \(N(\Delta) = (\Delta/k_B T - 1)^{-1}\) is the phonon thermal distribution function, \(\rho = 1.356 \times 10^3 \text{ kg/m}^3\) is the mass density [27], and \(c_s\) is the transverse speed of sound. \(\kappa^{(1)} = 1\) and \(\kappa^{(2)}\) is a constant of order unity representing the strength of the associated spin-phonon coupling mechanism [43]. We neglect possible collective spin-phonon interactions [46].

![FIG. 4 (color online). (a) Relaxation rate (after dividing by an exponential to enhance presentation) as a function of \(H_T\) for \(H_z\) near the \(n = 1\) resonance. Data was taken from sample B with experimental azimuthal angle \(\phi = 7^\circ\) and \(H_z\) set to 1 kOe less than the peak of the resonance. (b) Simulations of relaxation rate as a function of transverse field using Eqs. (2)–(4) with \(\phi = 7^\circ\). The inset shows the double-well potential for the sample. (c) Tunnel splitting calculations with \(\phi = 0^\circ\) for the \(m = -2, 3\) and \(m = -3, 4\) energy-level pairs, as indicated. The dotted horizontal line represents a tunneling threshold while the dotted vertical lines correspond to the transverse fields at which abrupt transitions in relaxation rate occur.](Image)
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[32] Our calculated tunnel splittings differ somewhat from those presented in Ref. [27], even when we use the same Hamiltonian parameters as those reported in that paper.
[38] In contrast, Ref. [27] reports that the hard axes are \( \approx 45^\circ \) from the a and b axes. This apparent discrepancy arises because C and C’ have opposite signs, causing the hard-axis directions to depend on which levels m are probed.
[43] There has been some debate about the magnitude and even the existence of \( \gamma^{(2)} \) [44,45]. However, we find including it necessary to get a reasonable fit to our data.