Comments

Comments are short papers which comment on papers of other authors previously published in the Physical Review. Each Comment should state clearly to which paper it refers and must be accompanied by a brief abstract. The same publication schedule as for regular articles is followed, and page proofs are sent to authors.

Comment on "Time decay of the saturated remanent magnetization in a metallic spin glass"

J. J. Préjean and J. Souletie

Centre de Recherche sur les Très Basses Températures, Boîte Postale 166X, 38042 Grenoble Cédex, France (Received 16 March 1987)

The data of Granberg *et al.* [Phys. Rev. B 35, 2075 (1987)] are consistent with our previous observation that the saturated remanent of CuMn relaxes like t^{-m} where $m \sim 0.2T/T_g$ up to $T \sim 0.7T_g$

Chamberlin, Mozurkewich, and Orbach¹ were pioneers in promoting the use of the Kohlrausch law to fit magnetization relaxations in spin glasses well below T_g . This law comes from the glass literature where those who use it to fit data over the glass transition are well aware that it contains (i) a specification on the shape of the relaxation $M \sim M_0 \exp(-t/\tau_p)^{1-n}$ and (ii) a specification on the characteristic time $\tau_p = [(1-n)\exp(n\gamma)\omega_c^n \tau_0]^{1/(1-n)}$.² The remarkable efficiency of the formula appeared from the very beginning when it succeeded in providing an excellent fit to the data with a wrong specification on τ_p . Despite that, recent developments tend to restrain the range over which the law allegedly applies.³ The tendency is to use an expression of the form

$$M = M_0 t^{-m} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\tau_p}\right)^{1-m}$$

as was reported, e.g., by Granberg *et al.*⁴ In this particular work the authors were cautious to apply a field large enough to saturate the remanent magnetization, the relaxation of which is subsequently studied. They report that $n \neq 1$ only for 0.98 $T_g < T < T_g$. Skipping those 2% of the total range, it is found therefore that a simple power law t^{-m} suffices to describe the data, in agreement with the simulations of Kinzel.⁵ Previous to these experiments and to these simulations other experiments⁶⁻⁸ and other simulations⁹ made this same conclusion with the focus put at the same time upon other points of interest to the discussion. In our own work^{6,7,10} we stressed that at low enough temperatures ($T < 0.7T_g$) the magnetization⁶ and the energy relaxations⁷ are essentially functions of the variable $X = T/T_g \ln(t/\tau_0)$ where the function f(X) depends on the procedure (field cooling, zero-field cooling, etc.). In the cases where the remanent magnetization is saturated it was found that the function f(X) could well be approximated by an exponential over many decades. We had therefore

$$M \sim M_0 \exp\left[-\alpha \frac{T}{T_g} \ln\left(\frac{t}{\tau_0}\right)\right] = M_0 \left(\frac{t}{\tau_0}\right)^{-\alpha (T/T_g)}$$

This remarkable temperature dependence of the exponent, reminiscent of the XY model, was observed on the magnetization relaxation of several CuMn alloys⁶ and on the energy and the magnetization relaxation of several AuFe alloys.⁷ The results agreed qualitatively with the simulations of Binder and Stauffer.⁹ However, they reported $\alpha = d/4$ with Ising spins when we measured $\alpha = 0.4$ in AuFe (for both the energy and the magnetization) and $\alpha = 0.2$ in CuMn (for the magnetization). The data of Granberg et al. confirm quantitatively this last figure (i.e., $\alpha \simeq 0.2$ in CuMn) as may be seen from Fig. 4 of Ref. 1 up to $T < 0.8T_g$. We believe that this is an important remark as it permits one to introduce some physics in a discussion otherwise limited to fitting considerations with a phenomenological formula. As we stressed in Refs. 6, 7, and 10, the $T\ln(t/\tau_0)$ variable is the natural variable to use in a frozen landscape of potential mountains and valleys [frozen distribution P(W) of energy barriers W] which are populated through an activated process. For this reason the $T\ln(t/\tau_0)$ scaling applies to a wide variety of hysteresis phenomena⁸ largely independent of their microscopic nature: spin glasses, superparamagnetic grains, wall motion in ferromagnets, vortices in type-II superconductors, plasticity of rubbers and polymers,.... The $T\ln(t/\tau_0)$ scaling also applies to corresponding states of the unsaturated remanent magnetization although the relaxation is not given by a power law in this case. 6,7,10

- ¹R. V. Chamberlin, G. Mozurkewich, and R. Orbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 867 (1984).
- ²K. L. Ngai, A. K. Rajagopal, and C. Y. Huang, J. Appl. Phys. 55, 1714 (1984); K. L. Ngai and A. K. Rajagopal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 53, 1024 (1984).
- ³M. Alba, M. Ocio, and J. Hammann, Europhys. Lett. 2, 45 (1986); J. Phys. (Paris) Lett. 46, L101 (1985).
- ⁴P. Granberg, P. Svedlindh, P. Nordblad, L. Lundgren, and H. S. Chen, Phys. Rev. B 35, 2075 (1987).
- ⁵W. Kinzel, Phys. Rev. B 19, 4595 (1979); 33, 5086 (1986).
- ⁶J. J. Prejean, J. Phys. (Paris) Colloq. **39**, C6-907 (1978); J. J. Prejean and J. Souletie, J. Phys. (Paris) **41**, 1335 (1980); R. Omari, J. J. Prejean, and J. Souletie, J. Phys. (Paris) **45**, 1809 (1984); E. Carre, J. J. Prejean, and J. Souletie, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. **54–57**, 205 (1986).
- ⁷A. Berton, J. Chaussy, J. Odin, R. Rammal, J. Souletie, and R. Tournier, J. Phys. (Paris) Lett. 40, L391 (1979); J. J. Prejean, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 15-18, 203 (1980); A. Berton, J. Chaussy, J. Odin, J. Peyrard, J. J. Prejean, and J. Souletie, Solid State Commun. 37, 241 (1981); A. Berton, J. Chaussy, J. Odin, J. Prejean, and R. Rammal, *ibid.* 49, 959 (1984).
- ⁸J. Ferre, J. Rajchenbach, and H. Maletta, J. Appl. Phys. **52**, 1697 (1981).
- ⁹K. Binder and R. Stauffer, Phys. Lett. 57A, 177 (1976).
- ¹⁰J. Souletie, J. Phys. Colloq. **39**, C2-3 (1978); J. Phys. (Paris)
 44, 1095 (1983); Ann. Phys. (Paris) **10**, 69 (1985); R. Rammal and J. Souletie, in *Magnetism of Metals and Alloys*, edited by M. Cyrot (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1982), p. 379.