INELASTIC NEUTRON SCATTERING IN FERROMAGNETIC METALS*

E. D. Thompson[†]

Solid State Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (Received 14 July 1967)

The relative magnetic inelastic neutron scattering from spin waves and the continuum spin-flip band in a ferromagnetic metal is shown to depend upon the wave vector \mathbf{q} . In particular, the scattering from the continuum band vanishes as $q \rightarrow 0$, and the scattering from the spin waves vanishes as $q \rightarrow q_{\max}$, the cutoff vector for spin waves.

The magnetic, inelastic neutron scattering from a ferromagnetic metal has contributions arising from both spin-wave excitations and the continuum band of spin-flip excitations. The former of these has been calculated in the long wavelength limit by Izuyama, Kim, and Kubo,¹ while the latter has been calculated by Elliott² in the molecular field or Stoner approximation. It is the purpose of this Letter to show that the relative contributions to the scattering depend upon the wave vector \vec{q} . In particular, as $q \rightarrow 0$, the magnetic scattering arises solely from spin-wave excitations with no contribution from the continuum band. On the other hand, as $q - q_{\max}$, where q_{\max} is the cut-off momentum for spin waves,³ the spin-wave scattering vanishes and we are left with only scattering due to the continuum spin-flip band. This result also means that the magnitude of the scattering from spin waves has a q dependence in addition to that arising from the form factor $F(\bar{k})$ and the thermal factor $(1-e^{-\beta E})^{-1}$.

The differential cross section for magnetic, inelastic neutron scattering with the scattering vector \vec{k} parallel to the magnetization is given by the relationship

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\Omega dE} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\frac{g\gamma e^2}{2mc^2}\right)^2 \frac{|F(\vec{k})|^2}{1 - \exp(-\beta E)} \left(\frac{k'}{k}\right) \chi_i^{-+}(\vec{q}, E), \quad (1)$$

where E is the neutron energy loss, χ_i^{-+} is the imaginary part of the atomic susceptibility at the wave vector \mathbf{q} and energy E, and $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k}$ $-\mathbf{K}$, where \mathbf{K} is the necessary reciprocal lattice vector to bring \mathbf{q} into the first Brillouin zone. In the random phase approximation,¹

$$\chi^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) = \chi_0^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) [1 - I\chi_0^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E)]^{-1}, \qquad (2)$$

where

$$\chi_{0}^{-+}(\mathbf{\tilde{q}}, E) = \chi_{0r}^{-+}(\mathbf{\tilde{q}}, E) + i\chi_{0i}^{-+}(\mathbf{\tilde{q}}, E)$$
$$= \frac{\Omega}{(2\pi)^{3}} \int d\mathbf{\tilde{k}} \frac{f_{\mathbf{\tilde{k}}\mathbf{\uparrow}} - f_{\mathbf{\tilde{k}}}}{\Delta + \epsilon (\mathbf{\tilde{k}} + \mathbf{\tilde{q}}) - \epsilon (\mathbf{\tilde{k}}) - E} \qquad (3)$$

is the susceptibility in the Stoner approxima-

tion. In this equation, Ω is the atomic volume, $\Delta = nI$ is the band splitting, *n* is the number of Bohr magnetons per atom, and ϵ is the oneelectron band energy.

 $\chi_i^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E)$ appearing in (1) has two contributions, $\chi_{i1}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E)$ and $\chi_{i2}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E)$, which arise from spin-wave and continuum-band excitations, respectively. $\chi_{i1}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E)$ is singular and arises where the conditions $\chi_{0i}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) = 0$ and $I\chi_{0r}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) = 1$ are satisfied simultaneously. This generally restricts $\mathbf{\bar{q}}$ to certain values⁴ which in its simplest form means $q < q_{\text{max}}$. Provided these conditions are satisfied, then

$$\chi_{i1}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) = \frac{n\pi\delta(E(\mathbf{\bar{q}})-E)}{\Delta\{(\partial/\partial E)[I\chi_{0r}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E)]\}_{E=E(\mathbf{\bar{q}})}}.$$
 (4)

Equation (4) has been given by Izuyama, Kim, and Kubo¹ in the limit as \overline{q} approaches zero for which the derivative in (4) approaches $1/\Delta$. The derivative depends on \overline{q} and, in fact, becomes infinitely large as $q \rightarrow q_{\max}$.³ Hence, $\chi_{i1}^{-+}(q \rightarrow q_{\max}, E) \rightarrow 0$. To show this, we evaluate the derivative appearing in (4) using (3) and an effective-mass approximation. For a strong ferromagnet,

$$\chi_{i1}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) = n\pi (F^2/x^2 F') \delta(E(\mathbf{\bar{q}}) - E), \quad (5)$$

where F' = dF/dx, $F = 0.75\{2x^{-1} + (1-x^{-2})\ln[(1+x)/(1-x)]\}$, and where the auxiliary variable $x = \delta E/(\Delta'-E)$ with $\Delta' = \Delta + \hbar^2 q^2/2m^*$ and $\delta E = \hbar^2 q k_F/m^*$, half the width of the continuum band at q. The dispersion relation is given by $F = \delta E/\Delta$ from which we obtain $q/q_{\text{max}} = \frac{2}{3}F$. Figure 1, a plot of F^2/x^2F' vs q/q_{max} , shows the relative decrease of neutron scattering from spin waves with increasing q, arising from the susceptibility term alone.

The second contribution $\chi_{i2}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E)$ is nonzero in the energy spectrum of the continuum band for which $\chi_{0i}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E)$ is nonzero. Here,

$$\chi_{i2}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) = \chi_{0i}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) / D(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E),$$
 (6)



FIG. 1. Reduction factor F^2/x^2F' , for scattering from spin waves as a function of wave vector \vec{q} normalized to the cutoff wave vector.

with

$$\chi_{0i}^{-+}(\mathbf{\tilde{q}}, E) = 0, \quad |y| > 1,$$
$$= \frac{3}{4}\pi (n/\delta E)(1-y^2), \quad |y| < 1, \quad (7)$$

where $y = (\Delta' - E)/\delta E$ and where we have made the same assumptions in obtaining (7) as we have made in obtaining (5). The denominator $D(\mathbf{\tilde{q}}, E)$ in (6) is given by the relation

$$D(\mathbf{\tilde{q}}, E) = (1 - \Delta G/\delta E)^2 + (\Delta \chi_{0i}^{-+}/n)^2, \qquad (8)$$

where $G = 0.75\{2y + (1-y^2)\ln[(1+y)/(1-y)]\}$. As $\mathbf{\bar{q}} \to 0$, $D(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) \to \infty$ and the neutron scattering from the continuum spin-flip band vanishes. Figure 2 illustrates the effective reduction in this part of the neutron scattering compared with that calculated by Elliott.²

While the detailed nature of these results depends upon the model, the general nature of the results does not. For we know that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_i^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) dE = \frac{1}{2}n, \qquad (9)$$

and hence, that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{i2}^{-+}(\mathbf{\bar{q}}, E) dE = \frac{1}{2}n(1 - F^2/x^2 F').$$
(10)

The limit $F^2/x^2F' \rightarrow 1$ as x and $\bar{q} \rightarrow 0$ is model independent; so χ_{i2}^{-+} must vanish identically in this limit. On the other hand, for those \bar{q}



FIG. 2. The atomic susceptibility per Bohr magneton per unit of energy as a function of energy. The solid curves are calculated using Eqs. (6)-(9) of the text and the dashed curves are calculated using Eqs. (6) and (7) with $D(\vec{q}, E) = 1$. The dashed curves thus represent the susceptibility in the Stoner approximation and give the inelastic neutron scattering calculated by Elliott (Ref. 2). Curves a are calculated for $q/q_{\text{max}}=0.5$ and Curves b for $q/q_{\text{max}} = 1.0$. The broad resonance displayed in b continues as q increases from q_{\max} , the resonance moving slightly away from the bottom of the continuum band, becoming broader, and diminishing in amplitude. This resonance arises from the virtual spin-wave state lying in the continuum band. The band splitting Δ is one unit of energy and the Fermi energy is set equal to Δ for the purposes of this figure.

for which the spin-wave dispersion relation has no solution outside the continuum band, the denominator in (2) never goes to zero, χ_{i1}^{-+} vanishes, and (9) must be satisfied by $\chi_{i2}^{-+}(\mathbf{\tilde{q}}, E)$. The possibility of a discontinuous change of $\chi_{i1}^{-+}(\mathbf{\tilde{q}}, E)$ with $\mathbf{\tilde{q}}$ seems unlikely.

³E. D. Thompson, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) <u>22</u>, 309 (1963).

⁴E. D. Thompson, to be published.

^{*}Research sponsored by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission under contract with Union Carbide Corporation.

[†]Permanent address: Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

¹T. Izuyama, D. J. Kim, and R. Kubo, J. Phys. Soc. Japan <u>18</u>, 1025 (1963).

²R. J. Elliott, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) <u>A235</u>, 289 (1956).