

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			2	Form Approved OMB NO. 0704-0188	
<p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA, 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</p>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)		2. REPORT TYPE New Reprint		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Electric field control of magnetism using BiFeO ₃ -based heterostructures			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER W911NF-08-2-0032		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 611103		
6. AUTHORS J. T. Heron, D. G. Schlom, R. Ramesh			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAMES AND ADDRESSES Cornell University 373 Pine Tree Road Ithaca, NY 14850 -2820			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS (ES) U.S. Army Research Office P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2211			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) ARO		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) 54227-MS-MUR.47		
12. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.					
14. ABSTRACT Conventional CMOS based logic and magnetic based data storage devices require the shuttling of electrons for data processing and storage. As these devices are scaled to increasingly smaller dimensions in the pursuit of speed and storage density, significant energy dissipation in the form of heat has become a center stage issue for the microelectronics industry. By taking advantage of the strong correlations between ferroic orders in multiferroics, specifically the coupling between ferroelectric and magnetic orders (magnetoelectricity), new device functionalities with ultra-low					
15. SUBJECT TERMS multiferroic					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT		15. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UU	b. ABSTRACT UU	c. THIS PAGE UU	UU		Daniel Ralph
				19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER 607-255-9644	

Report Title

Electric field control of magnetism using BiFeO₃-based heterostructures

ABSTRACT

Conventional CMOS based logic and magnetic based data storage devices require the shuttling of electrons for data processing and storage. As these devices are scaled to increasingly smaller dimensions in the pursuit of speed and storage density, significant energy dissipation in the form of heat has become a center stage issue for the microelectronics industry. By taking advantage of the strong correlations between ferroic orders in multiferroics, specifically the coupling between ferroelectric and magnetic orders (magnetoelectricity), new device functionalities with ultra-low energy consumption can be envisioned. In this article, we review the advances and highlight challenges toward this goal with a particular focus on the room temperature magnetoelectric multiferroic, BiFeO₃, exchange coupled to a ferromagnet. We summarize our understanding of the nature of exchange coupling and the mechanisms of the voltage control of ferromagnetism observed in these heterostructures.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE (SF298)
(Continuation Sheet)

Continuation for Block 13

ARO Report Number 54227.47-MS-MUR
Electric field control of magnetism using BiFeO3..

Block 13: Supplementary Note

© 2014 . Published in APPLIED PHYSICS REVIEWS, Vol. 1 (2) (2014), (1 (2)). DoD Components reserve a royalty-free, nonexclusive and irrevocable right to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use the work for Federal purposes, and to authorize others to do so (DODGARS §32.36). The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other documentation.

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

APPLIED PHYSICS REVIEWS

Electric field control of magnetism using BiFeO₃-based heterostructures

J. T. Heron,^{1,a)} D. G. Schlom,^{1,2} and R. Ramesh^{3,4,5,6}

¹Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA

²Kavli Institute at Cornell for Nanoscale Science, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA

³Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

⁴Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

⁵Materials Science Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

⁶Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, USA

(Received 9 February 2014; accepted 13 March 2014; published online 22 April 2014)

Conventional CMOS based logic and magnetic based data storage devices require the shuttling of electrons for data processing and storage. As these devices are scaled to increasingly smaller dimensions in the pursuit of speed and storage density, significant energy dissipation in the form of heat has become a center stage issue for the microelectronics industry. By taking advantage of the strong correlations between ferroic orders in multiferroics, specifically the coupling between ferroelectric and magnetic orders (magnetoelectricity), new device functionalities with ultra-low energy consumption can be envisioned. In this article, we review the advances and highlight challenges toward this goal with a particular focus on the room temperature magnetoelectric multiferroic, BiFeO₃, exchange coupled to a ferromagnet. We summarize our understanding of the nature of exchange coupling and the mechanisms of the voltage control of ferromagnetism observed in these heterostructures. © 2014 AIP Publishing LLC. [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4870957>]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1	AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS	13
A. BiFeO ₃ : A room temperature single-phase magnetoelectric multiferroic	2	A. Magnetoelectric switching with an out-of-plane electric field	13
II. EXCHANGE COUPLING IN FERROMAGNET/BiFeO ₃ HETEROSTRUCTURES	3	B. Integration with silicon	15
A. Exchange coupling with transition metal ferromagnets (TMFs)	4	C. Electrically controlled magnetic memory or logic element	15
1. Single domain bulk crystals	4	D. Fatigue and reliability	16
2. Multidomain thin films: Effect of domain walls	4	V. SUMMARY	16
3. Multidomain thin films: Effect of domain structure	5		
B. Exchange coupling with oxide ferromagnets	7		
III. ELECTRIC FIELD CONTROL OF MAGNETISM	9		
A. Electric field control of antiferromagnetism	9		
B. Electric field control of exchange bias	10		
C. Electric field control of magnetization direction without exchange bias	11		
D. Electric field control with single domain BiFeO ₃ crystals	11		
E. Electric field control with multidomain BiFeO ₃ thin films	11		
IV. WHAT ARE THE ISSUES?: CHALLENGES			

I. INTRODUCTION

CMOS technology is seeing growing barriers to scaling and increased energy efficiency as the demand for higher density and lower power consumption devices becomes imperative, and thus the search for new technologies to augment or replace CMOS have increased.¹ Spintronics, a field of research that seeks to employ the electron spin in devices in addition to its charge,^{2,3} has emerged with devices poised to improve information processing⁴⁻⁷ and information storage.⁸⁻¹⁰ Many of these new technologies rely on the spin transfer torque (STT), where the injection of a spin-polarized current is used to drive the motion of a magnetic domain wall or change the magnetic state of a magnetic multilayer device.^{11,12} While STT memories provide the historical advantages of magnetic based memories (such as high speed, high density, and high reliability all in a non-volatile technology), it does not sufficiently lower energy dissipation. A large current density of $\sim 10^5$ – 10^6 A/cm² is typically required for STT switching making resistive losses the primary source of power

^{a)}Author to whom correspondence should be addressed. Electronic mail: jth247@cornell.edu

consumption.^{13,14} As an example of the energy consumption of such a device, a state of the art STT device requires a voltage pulse of several hundred millivolts (0.7 V) and 120 ps¹⁴–500 ps¹³ in duration through a 60–70 nm × 180 nm device leading to energy dissipation per unit area per switch of 3–4 mJ/cm². The effort to reduce this energy cost has led to the pursuit of mechanisms by which magnetic anisotropy and magnetization direction can be tailored with an applied electric field, rather than electrical current, where, in an ideal case, the energy dissipation per unit area can be estimated to be at least an order of magnitude smaller.

A revival of interest in materials or heterostructures that possess more than one ferroic parameter has been driven by the interest in studying the correlations between two or more ferroic orders¹⁵ and the possibility of demonstrating next generation devices using these correlations. Materials of this class are deemed multiferroic.^{16,17} Originally, the definition of multiferroics was limited to single-phase materials that simultaneously display one of the four ferroic orders: ferroelectricity, ferromagnetism, ferroelasticity, and ferrotoroidicity.¹⁸ This definition has been broadened to include materials that possess antiferroic order, such as antiferromagnetism, as well. The incorporation of multiferroics in devices should not only enable additional functionality through the multiple controllable order parameters but also through the coupling of the multiple order parameters.^{19,20} Magnetoelectricity or magnetoelectric coupling (the coupling of the ferroelectric and magnetic orders), which can enable the electric field control of magnetism, observed in both single-phase and composite multiferroics have been under intense investigation and summarized in many review articles.^{16,17,21–25} Due to the many reviews on the topic, this review is not written to give the reader a detailed review of multiferroics and all of the pathways to the electric field control of magnetism^{26,27} enabled by this materials class. Rather, we focus on the room temperature single-phase magnetoelectric multiferroic BiFeO₃ (BFO) and its integration into exchange coupled heterostructures where it serves as an electrically controllable pinning layer. The appeal of such a configuration is that it combines the intrinsic magnetoelectric coupling, which couples the ferroelectric order to the magnetic order of BiFeO₃, and the interface exchange coupling with the ferromagnetic layer, thereby coupling the moments of the ferromagnet to the magnetic order of BiFeO₃, giving rise to a pathway of controlling a large ferromagnetic magnetization with solely an applied electric field. As noted previously, electric field control of magnetism is attractive to the spintronics community in that the significant energy dissipation arising from Joule heating can be eliminated. Since the writing/switching of the large magnetization in these BiFeO₃/ferromagnet heterostructure is governed by the ferroelectric switching of the multiferroic, the energy consumption of an ideal device can easily be estimated if parasitic losses (such as leakage) are ignored. Taking the saturation polarization (along [001] ~ 60 μC/cm²) and the switching voltage (1–5 V) of an (001) oriented BiFeO₃ film that is nominally 100–200 nm thick, the estimated energy dissipation per unit area per switch is 120–600 μJ/cm², about an order of magnitude smaller than the consumption of a optimized STT device. The remainder of this review focuses on summarizing the observations of

exchange coupling and the magnetoelectric switching of BiFeO₃/ferromagnet heterostructures. Furthermore, in the case of thin films, this review highlights the challenges and directions toward the advancement of this materials system in applications of low-energy consumption devices.

A. BiFeO₃: A room temperature single-phase magnetoelectric multiferroic

BiFeO₃ has been the most heavily investigated single-phase multiferroic to date largely due to the coexistence of its magnetic order and ferroelectric order at ambient conditions. Interestingly, the research of BiFeO₃ dates to well before the discovery of its thin film stabilization in 2003.^{28,29} Much, as it is now, of early investigations of BiFeO₃ focused on its magnetoelectric coupling; however, these studies investigated bulk crystals rather than thin films, which dominate BiFeO₃ research now.³⁰ At an early stage, BiFeO₃ was determined to crystallize in the *R3c* perovskite structure (i.e., a rhombohedrally distorted perovskite)^{31,32} and display a ferroelectric hysteresis³³ and a G-type antiferromagnetic spin lattice that cants to form a long-range spin cycloid that propagates along the {110} directions.^{34,35} As has now been confirmed in the bulk, the electric polarization of the epitaxially stabilized thin film is ~90 μC/cm². Disparate from the bulk, however, is the breaking of the spin cycloid in thin films, instead favoring a long-range weak canted magnetization that preserves the G-type antiferromagnetic order.³⁶

Figs. 1(a)–1(c) show the rhombohedrally distorted perovskite crystal structure, a G-type antiferromagnetic lattice, and the canting of the BiFeO₃ antiferromagnetic spins in the (111) plane forming the weak magnetization. Since the rhombohedral distortion is small, crystal orientations in the literature (and in this paper) frequently refer to a cubic unit cell. Fig. 1(a) shows the BiFeO₃ crystal structure in the two different bases. The main instability that drives the formation of the ferroelectric polarization is the ordering of Bi lone pairs where the outer Bi 6s electrons are highly polarizable and orient along the direction of the rhombohedral distortion (the [111] direction) below ~1100 K.^{33,37,38} The G-type antiferromagnetic order is driven by the super-exchange interaction between neighboring d⁵ – Fe³⁺ atoms and mediated by the O²⁻ between them. The half-full d-shell of the Fe³⁺ atoms and the occupied O²⁻ p orbitals promotes the configuration where all nearest neighbor spins point (arrows represent Fe³⁺ spins) antiparallel to one another as in Fig. 1(b) making the spins in the (111) plane ferromagnetically aligned. The antiferromagnetic ordering temperature (Néel temperature) was measured to be 643 K,³⁹ significantly lower than the ferroelectric ordering temperature. This difference has significant ramifications on the strength of the magnetoelectric interaction since the magnetoelectric coupling must result as the consequence of a weaker interaction, which is in this case the spin-orbit driven Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya (DM) interaction.^{40–42} These latter two points, naturally, have profound implications on the symmetries that govern the magnetoelectric switching in BiFeO₃.^{36,43,44} Furthermore, the symmetry of the rhombohedrally distorted perovskite and the

rotation of the oxygen octahedral cages permit the formation of a weak magnetic moment through a canting of the antiferromagnetic lattice via the torque provided by the DM interaction: $E = -\frac{1}{2}\bar{D} \cdot (\bar{M}_1 \times \bar{M}_2)$. Here, \bar{D} is the DM vector, which is highly dependent on symmetry. The DM interaction can be rewritten in a form specific to BiFeO₃ to highlight the mutual orthogonality of its macroscopic orders and the expected magnetoelectric switching permissible³⁶

$$E \sim \bar{P} \cdot (\bar{L} \times \bar{M}_c). \quad (1)$$

The ferroelectric polarization can point along any one of the eight degenerate $\langle 111 \rangle$ directions. This degeneracy, along with a consideration of the electrostatic and elastic boundary conditions, permits the possible formation of three “flavors” (i.e., 71°, 109°, and 180°) of domain walls that are distinguished by the angle the polarization rotates across the domain wall (see Figs. 1(d) and 1(e)).⁴⁵ Typically, piezoresponse force microscopy (PFM), a scanning probe technique that employs a conductive tip to apply a localized electric field, is used to determine the flavor of the domain wall by mapping the direction of the polarization in each of the domains. The piezoelectric coefficient of a ferroelectric is dependent on its polarization direction, thus the out-of-plane component of the polarization can be inferred from the phase offset of the PFM tip with respect to the phase of the applied ac voltage and the in-plane (IP) component can be inferred from the shear forces experienced by the tip.⁴⁶ IP and out-of-plane PFM images of two BiFeO₃ films deposited by pulsed laser deposition on SrTiO₃ (STO) substrates at different deposition rates (controlled by the frequency of the laser pulses) are shown in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b) with the film in (b) having the faster rate. A thorough review of the synthesis of BiFeO₃ (and many other oxides) thin films can be found in Ref. 47. The deposition rate influences domain formation and the primary flavor of domain wall to populate the film.⁴⁸ Figs. 2(c) and 2(d) trace out the

domain walls present in the two films. The domain structure in Fig. 2(a), a so called 4-variant film due to the presence of only 4 of the 8 possible polarization directions, is primarily composed of 71° domain walls while the domain structure in Fig. 2(b), referred to as a mosaic or disordered domain structure, is predominantly 109° domain walls.

As is the case with BiFeO₃, multiferroics that support both ferroelectric and magnetic orders are typically insulators with an antiferromagnetic spin arrangement (and possibly a very small magnetization from spin canting). Hence, to achieve electric field control of conductive ferromagnets with large magnetization for device applications, multiferroics are studied in ferromagnet-multiferroic exchange coupled heterostructures. Section II is dedicated to the exchange coupling of transition metal and oxide ferromagnets to BiFeO₃ to highlight the different mechanisms of exchange anisotropy in these structures.

II. EXCHANGE COUPLING IN FERROMAGNET/BiFeO₃ HETEROSTRUCTURES

Despite its relevance to the electric field control of magnetism in an exchange coupled heterostructure, it is surprising that the details of exchange coupling have not received more attention in reviews of the electric field control of magnetism. It is the goal of this section to summarize our knowledge in exchange coupled ferromagnet/BiFeO₃ heterostructures and highlight the experimental knobs that can be tuned to engineer the magnetic properties of the system. We also discuss potential issues that may pose as challenges to future endeavors but leave a detailed discussion for Sec. IV. Finally, we hope that this section promotes exchange coupling as an investigative tool for uncovering magnetic order in multiferroics.

The broad interest in ferromagnetic-antiferromagnetic heterostructures originates from the initial discovery of exchange bias observed by Meiklejohn-Bean in 1956




FIG. 1. (a) Rhombohedral (yellow) and cubic (blue) unit cells of BiFeO₃. (b) Schematic of a G-type antiferromagnet highlighting the ferromagnetic order within the (111) plane. (c) Schematically illustrating that the antiferromagnetic spins in BiFeO₃ lie in the (111) plane and the canting of these spins produces a small magnetization (M) which lies in this plane. (d) Schematic of the cubic unit cell of BiFeO₃ with a polarization (P)—white arrow) along one of the $\langle 111 \rangle$ directions. Black arrows indicate the permissible angles of rotation the polarization can make either due to an applied electric field or across a domain wall. (e) Schematics of the three “flavors” of domain walls permitted in BiFeO₃.




FIG. 2. (a) and (b) IP PFM (and out-of-plane PFM: insets) images of two BiFeO₃ films deposited on SrTiO₃ substrates at different deposition rates. (c) and (d) Line traces of the domain walls present in the two films highlighting that the domain structure and the composition of the domain walls can be tuned with deposition rate. The domain structure in (a) is primarily 71° domain walls while that in (b) is largely 109° domain walls. Reprinted with permission from Martin *et al.*, *Nano Lett.* **8**, 2050 (2008). Copyright 2008 American Chemical Society.

(Ref. 49) and its pervasive use in the magnetic read heads found in hard drives.^{50,51} Exchange bias manifests as a shift (either positive or negative) in the ferromagnetic hysteresis loop of the ferromagnetic-antiferromagnetic heterostructure, breaking the symmetry about zero magnetic field.^{52–57} Typically to observe such an effect, the antiferromagnetic layer must be cooled in a magnetic field below the Néel temperature to align the antiferromagnetic spins, however, when the Néel temperature is high, exchange bias is present when the soft ferromagnetic layer is deposited on the antiferromagnet while under a small magnetic field. In the phenomenological description of exchange bias by Meiklejohn and Bean (a simple Stoner-Wohlfarth model^{58,59}), the spins at the surface of the antiferromagnetic layer are ferromagnetically ordered and ferromagnetically coupled to the surface spins in the ferromagnetic layer. While this picture is quite simple, the origin of the exchange bias effect is still understood to be an interface effect driven by pinned uncompensated spins at the surface of the antiferromagnet. Difficulties typically arise in the quantification of the effect and understanding the source of the uncompensated spins. On compensated surfaces, the uncompensated spins are attributed to extrinsic defects in the antiferromagnet such as surface roughness,^{60–62} vacancies,⁶³ and domain walls.⁶⁴ Exchange bias is not the only manifestation of exchange coupling observable in a magnetic hysteresis loop; the coercive field of the exchange coupled heterostructure will broaden with respect to the coercive field of the uncoupled ferromagnetic layer. The broadening of the hysteresis is attributed to the dragging of unpinned spins in the antiferromagnet due to the rotation of the spins in the ferromagnetic layer in response to an applied magnetic field. In this case the interface coupling energy is larger than the

product of the volume anisotropy energy of the antiferromagnet and its thickness. In many ferromagnet-antiferromagnet heterostructures both coercivity broadening and exchange bias will be present indicating that both pinned and unpinned spins in the antiferromagnet are present at the interface. For excellent reviews on exchange coupling and quasi-static modeling see Refs. 52–57, and 65.

A. Exchange coupling with transition metal ferromagnets (TMFs)

The strong correlations in BiFeO₃ are exemplified by its ferroelectric, ferroelastic, and (anti)ferromagnetic orders and the coupling between them. In such correlated materials, it is expected that at domain boundaries, where there are changes in the electric, magnetic, and elastic states, intriguing behavior, disparate from the bulk, should appear.^{66,67} In BiFeO₃ bulk crystals, the antiferromagnetic structure is cycloidal G-type with a period of $\lambda_{(110)} = 64$ nm (Refs. 34, 35, and 69), while in thin films a weak ferromagnetic moment emerges from the breaking of this cycloid.³⁶ Thus, the nature and strength of the exchange coupling is expected to vary from bulk crystal to thin film and with the domain wall density and flavor (i.e., 71°, 109°, 180°).

1. Single domain bulk crystals

While the exchange coupling between BiFeO₃ multidomain films and monodomain single crystals is significant, the anisotropies of the two systems are remarkably different.^{48,68–70} Additionally, thin film heterostructures have the benefit that the magnetic anisotropy of the system can be engineered with epitaxy.^{71–74} In monodomain single crystals, the exchange coupled TMF acquires a uniaxial anisotropy along the propagation vector of the antiferromagnetic spin cycloid of BiFeO₃ (see Fig. 3).^{68,69} A broadening of the hysteresis is observed while exchange bias is absent indicating that an insignificant density of pinned uncompensated spins lies on the (001) surface of the BiFeO₃ crystal. The Heisenberg exchange energy is minimized when the cycloid moments and the TMF moments are parallel and the demagnetization energy is minimized when the TMF are stacked tip-to-tail. The competition between these two energy states favors a TMF magnetization that “wiggles” in-phase with the oscillation of the spin cycloid and the TMF moments stack nearly tip-to-tail in the direction of the cycloid propagation direction.⁶⁹

2. Multidomain thin films: Effect of domain walls

In thin film based heterostructures, the magnetic anisotropy is dependent on the domain structure, domain wall density, and the flavor of the domain walls. The works of Refs. 48 and 70 have combined PFM and magnetometry measurements to show that a unidirectional anisotropy (exchange bias) scales with the inverse of the ferroelectric domain size of BiFeO₃. In BiFeO₃, the ferroelectric and antiferromagnetic domains are coupled so that the antiferromagnet domain size and structure can be inferred from PFM measurements.⁷⁵ By mapping the length and flavor of domain walls present for both a 4-variant (primarily 71°




FIG. 3. Depiction of the exchange coupling observed in the ferromagnetic permalloy (Py)/(001) BiFeO₃ crystal. (a) and (b) A magnetic hysteresis loop taken along the [010] (a) and [100] (b) directions of the crystal showing a square hysteresis of an easy axis (a) and the large saturation field of the hard axis (b). (c) Schematic of the spin cycloid projected onto the Py/BiFeO₃ interface plane and propagates in the direction of \vec{q} . (d) The Py layer can minimize the Heisenberg exchange and demagnetization energies by “wiggling” in phase with the oscillation of the spin cycloid and ordering the moments along the cycloid propagation direction. (e) A high-energy state when the net magnetization of Py is orthogonal to the spin cycloid propagation direction, indicating a strong uniaxial anisotropy should be observed. Reprinted with permission from Lebeugle *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 257601 (2009). Copyright 2009 American Physical Society.

domain walls) and a mosaic (primarily 109° domain walls) BiFeO₃ film, the magnitude of the exchange bias was found to scale with the length of the 109° domain walls while being independent of the length of the 71° domain walls (Fig. 4). The enhanced coercive field of the exchange coupled Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} layer was independent of the domain wall flavor suggesting a coupling with the bulk of the domain. For both the 4-variant and a mosaic BiFeO₃ films, it was found that the direction of the uniaxial or unidirectional anisotropy is governed by the direction of the applied magnetic field during the growth of the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} layer and did not correlate with the domain structure. While the details of the spin structure in each of the domain walls are still ongoing investigation, it is interesting to note that signatures of magnetic order in the 109° domain wall have emerged in X-ray magnetic circular dichroism (XMCD) and magnetotransport measurements and remain absent for the 71° and 180° domain walls.⁷⁶

3. Multidomain thin films: Effect of domain structure

The domain structure of BiFeO₃ is sensitive to the electrostatic and elastic boundary conditions and the deposition rate. Hence, the magnetic interface exchange coupling will be sensitive to the same conditions. The 4-variant and mosaic films grown on (001) SrTiO₃ (Figs. 4(a) and 4(b)), for example, are grown with different deposition rates but with otherwise similar deposition conditions. By changing the elastic boundary conditions from the isotropic $\sim -1.5\%$ strain imparted by an SrTiO₃ substrate to a small, anisotropic strain of -0.3% from a (110) DyScO₃ substrate a well-ordered, quasi-periodic, 2-variant, striped domain structure with solely 71° or 109° domain walls can be achieved⁷⁷ (see Fig. 5(c) for an IP PFM image the domain structure, no

out-of-plane PFM image for the 71° striped sample is presented since it is a uniform contrast). This was a significant development since the study of the properties of domain walls and multiferroic domains require their formation be controlled.

In an exchange-coupled heterostructure, the anisotropy and domain structure of the anisotropically strained BiFeO₃ layer can be transferred to a TMF through exchange coupling. Figs. 5(a) and 5(b) show the angle dependent magnetic hysteresis loops from Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/BiFeO₃ bilayers where the applied magnetic field during the growth of the TMF was applied (b) parallel and perpendicular (a) to the BiFeO₃ domain walls to test if the applied field or the multiferroic would govern the anisotropy of the system. Recall that in Refs. 48 and 70 the anisotropy direction is set by the applied magnetic field during the growth of the TMF. In Fig. 5, the domain walls are all 71° so that there is a net in-plane component of the ferroelectric polarization ($P_{\text{net IP}}$) that points perpendicular to the domain walls and the out-of-plane component is uniform across domains. Irrespective of the orientation of the growth field, the anisotropy is always uniaxial and along the axis corresponding to the direction of $P_{\text{net IP}}$. This trend was observed regardless of the orientation of the BiFeO₃ growth terraces with respect to the ferroelectric domain walls. These heterostructures show an enhancement of the coercive field, when compared to Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} grown on a DyScO₃ substrate, and negligible unidirectional anisotropy.

The combination of XMCD with photoemission electron microscopy (PEEM) at the Co L₃-edge and PFM images shown in Fig. 5(c) show the strong correlation between the domain structures of the two layers. These images reveal that both layers are composed of a well-ordered array of long, striped domains with two variants of the relevant order parameter. A closer look into the regions outlined by blue




FIG. 4. (a) In-plane PFM image of a 4-variant striped domain BiFeO₃ film containing primarily 71° domain walls. (b) In-plane PFM image of a mosaic domain BiFeO₃ film containing primarily 109° domain walls. (c) Magnitude of the exchange bias field vs. the inverse of the domain size for the 4-variant and mosaic BiFeO₃ films. (d) Magnitude of the exchange bias field vs. the length of the 109° domain walls present in the 4-variant and mosaic BiFeO₃ films. (e) Polar plots illustrating that the applied magnetic field during the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} growth (H_{dep}) governs the direction of the anisotropy. Reprinted with permission from Martin *et al.*, Nano Lett. 8, 2050 (2008). Copyright 2008 American Chemical Society. Reprinted with permission Lebeugle *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B 81, 134411 (2010). Copyright 2010 American Physical Society.

boxes in Figs. 5(c) and 5(d) reveals a nearly one-to-one mapping of the multiferroic domain structure into the TMF, highlighted by the encircled “dislocation” structure. Furthermore, a collinear arrangement is observed between the in-plane projection of each polarization variant and the moment from the corresponding Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} domain (arrows in the figure). One should caveat this conclusion with the following: the coupling is not between the in-plane projection of the polarization and the magnetic moment in the CoFe; instead, the coupling is between the in-plane projection of the canted moment in the BFO (which on this surface projects parallel to the polarization).

Employing the orthogonal relationship between \bar{P} , \bar{L} , and \bar{M}_c ,³⁶ the orientations of these macroscopic order parameters in BiFeO₃ were determined through a combination of magnetometry, XMCD, and scanning probe measurements. With the orientations of these macroscopic order parameters determined, a mechanism of the exchange coupling was inferred. A schematic of the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/2-variant 71° striped BiFeO₃ structure with all of the relevant order parameters is given in Fig. 6. Within a single unit cell of BiFeO₃, with a polarization (\bar{P}) pointing along a $\langle 111 \rangle$ direction, the canted moment (\bar{M}_c) and the antiferromagnetic axis (\bar{L}) lie perpendicular to each other and in the (111) plane.³⁶ The magnetic hysteresis loops of the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/BiFeO₃ heterostructure presented in Figs. 5(a) and 5(b) suggest a strong coupling of the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} moments to the anisotropy of the BiFeO₃. To separate the convolution of a stress induced anisotropy and an exchange

coupling driven anisotropy, a thin (1.5 nm), non-magnetic, and insulating SrTiO₃ layer was inserted between the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} and the BiFeO₃. The spacer acts to prevent any magnetic exchange between the layers since it is an interface driven effect, while the elastic interaction still transfers through the SrTiO₃. Magnetometry and XMCD measurements of the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/(1.5 nm) SrTiO₃/BiFeO₃ heterostructure show that the anisotropy of the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} is now governed by the direction of the applied growth field, the enhanced coercivity is quenched, and no correlation of the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} and BiFeO₃ domains was observed (not shown). These measurements provide the evidence that the coupling observed in the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/BiFeO₃ heterostructure is driven by magnetic interface exchange and not an effect of the elastic conditions. It should also be noted that the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} composition is intentional because of a vanishing magnetostriction coefficient ($\lambda_s \sim 10^{-7}$) observed in Co rich Co-Fe alloys.⁷⁸ X-ray magnetic linear dichroism (XMLD) PEEM measurements of both 4-variant and 2-variant striped BiFeO₃ films independently confirmed the orientation of the antiferromagnetic axis to lie in the (001) plane along a $\langle 110 \rangle$ type direction and perpendicular to the (001) projection of the ferroelectric polarization.⁷⁵ Thus, the one-to-one correlation between the direction of the magnetic moments within each Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} domain and the ferroelectric polarization within each BiFeO₃ domain observed in Refs. 71 and 72, and Fig. 5(c) determine that the correlation is driven by the BiFeO₃ canted moment that points along the $\langle 112 \rangle$ and projects




FIG. 5. Room temperature magnetic hysteresis loops obtained from $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}/2$ -variant BiFeO_3 where the growth field is applied (a) parallel to P_{net} IP and (b) perpendicular to P_{net} IP. In either case, the easy axis is collinear with the direction of P_{net} IP. (c) XMCD-PEEM image taken at the Co edge (black and white image) of the $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}/2$ -variant striped BiFeO_3 heterostructure and an IP PFM image (brown and yellow image) of BiFeO_3 after the $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}$ has been removed. The arrows in the XMCD images correspond to the direction of the net magnetization and the directions of the magnetizations associated with their respective domains. The arrows in the PFM images correspond to the direction of the net IP polarization and the IP direction (both variants have a component pointing into the page) of the polarization associated with their respective domains. Reprinted with permission from Heron *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 217202 (2011). Copyright 2011 American Physical Society.

parallel to the projected polarization on the (001) BiFeO_3 surface (Fig. 6).

The electric field control of magnetism is most easily envisioned through the electric field control of exchange bias since it breaks time reversal symmetry and manifests as an interfacial magnetic field.⁷⁹ Unfortunately, the 109° domain walls are metastable and revert to stable 71° domain walls after an electric field is applied, making a reversible process unlikely.^{80,81} While the highly desirable exchange bias is absent in the films primarily consisting of 71° domain walls, a significant exchange coupling remains. This fact, along with the stability of 71° domain walls after an applied voltage make it a suitable system to study the electric field control of magnetism in exchange coupled multiferroic heterostructures.

B. Exchange coupling with oxide ferromagnets

A coherence of crystallinity across the interface of a BiFeO_3 /crystalline oxide ferromagnet bilayer suggests expected differences in the interface exchange coupling due to ordered bonding. Additionally, there are significant intrinsic differences in the magnetism displayed by the ferromagnetic oxides. Magnetism in oxide ferromagnets emerges as a consequence of super- or double- exchange, display much smaller ordering temperatures and have significant magnetostriction coefficients compared to transition metal ferromagnets, and can display a magnetocrystalline anisotropy. Additionally, the correlations of the oxide ferromagnet give

yet another mechanism by which unique interface phenomena can emerge, creating a platform for exploring the intriguing physics and opening the possibility for engineering functionalities. These points are exemplified in the studies of manganite $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ (LSMO)/ BiFeO_3 interfaces.

LSMO is a popular oxide ferromagnet due to its Curie temperature being near room temperature and the relative ease at which high quality epitaxial thin films can be deposited on other perovskite films and substrates. We note that there have been preliminary studies of exchange coupling between BiFeO_3 and other high Curie temperature oxide ferromagnets (such as the ferrite spinels);⁸² however, we highlight the results obtained from the LSMO/ BiFeO_3 bilayer.

The LSMO/ BiFeO_3 system has been used to demonstrate the electric field control of exchange bias at low temperature,^{79,83} while a room temperature effect has remained a challenge. The root of this problem may lie in the correlated temperature dependence of the observed exchange bias, enhanced BiFeO_3 interface moment, and the interface orbital hybridization. These correlations suggest that an interface ferromagnetic ordering at the surface of BiFeO_3 , and hence the exchange bias, can be attributed to an orbital reconstruction induced by the orbital ordering in the manganite film (see Fig. 7). Fig. 7(a) shows magnetization hysteresis loops of LSMO (red) and LSMO/ BiFeO_3 films (blue and green) taken at 10 K. The LSMO/ BiFeO_3 was cooled from high temperature under +1 T and -1 T to illustrate the negative exchange bias and the presence of pinned uncompensated spins at the




FIG. 6. A schematic illustration of the magnetic interface coupling in the $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}/2$ -variant striped BiFeO_3 heterostructure. Reprinted figure with permission from Heron *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 217202 (2011). Copyright 2011 American Physical Society.

BiFeO_3 interface and ferromagnetically coupled to the LSMO layer. A key feature of the exchange bias observed in the LSMO/ BiFeO_3 system is the independence of the exchange bias on the ferroelectric domains, indicating a completely different mechanism of exchange coupling in this

system than that observed in the TMF/ BiFeO_3 system. Fig. 7(b) compares the Fe XMCD spectra from LSMO/ BiFeO_3 , BiFeO_3 , and other Fe based compounds. A measurable Fe XMCD signal is obtained from the LSMO/ BiFeO_3 bilayer, in stark contrast to the spectra obtained from a bare BiFeO_3 film; this indicates an enhanced interface moment. Figs. 7(c) and 7(d) illustrate the correlation between the enhanced moment measured in the Fe XMCD, the exchange bias, and the orbital reconstruction measured by x-ray absorption spectroscopy (XAS) at the oxygen-K edge. All three of the signals reach a steady state near 100 K.

The exchange bias, enhanced BiFeO_3 surface moment, and the orbital hybridization were described using an electronic hybridization model and the framework provided by the Goodenough-Kanamori-Anderson rules. Fig. 8(a) shows the proposed electronic hybridization at the LSMO/ BiFeO_3 interface. The red shift of the $d_{3z^2-r^2}$ observed in the XAS temperature dependence (Fig. 7(d)) suggests a bonding state and anti-bonding state corresponding to this orbital after hybridization. Using this electronic configuration, the spin order is then inferred. The super-exchange interactions between the Fe^{3+} and Mn^{3+} ($4+$) are ferromagnetic while the super-exchange interaction between the interface Mn and the bulk Mn in the LSMO layer is antiferromagnetic (Fig. 8(b)). Orbital ordering then leads to a competition between bulk




FIG. 7. (a) Magnetic hysteresis loops of LSMO (red) and LSMO/BFO (blue and green) films at 10 K illustrating the broadening of the hysteresis and the negative exchange bias in the LSMO/BFO bilayer. (b) XMCD spectra from a LSMO/BFO bilayer, GaFeO_3 , $\gamma\text{-Fe}_2\text{O}_3$, and single-layer BFO films at 10 K. (c) and (d) Temperature dependent magnetometry and XAS measurements highlight a correlation of the exchange coupling, the ferromagnetic Fe moment, and the orbital reconstruction. The red shift of the $d_{3z^2-r^2}$ orbital ($P2_c$) indicates hybridization between Mn and Fe at the interface. Reprinted with permission from Yu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 027201 (2010). Copyright 2010 American Physical Society.




FIG. 8. (a) Schematic of the interface electronic orbital reconstruction with hybridization. (b) Proposed interface spin configuration and coupling mechanism with $d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbital ordering in the interfacial LSMO. (c) Schematic of the canting of the antiferromagnetic moments at the interface. Reprinted with permission from Yu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 027201 (2010). Copyright 2010 American Physical Society.

antiferromagnetism and surface ferromagnetism in the BiFeO₃ layer. Fig. 8(c) schematically illustrates the significant canting of the BiFeO₃ magnetic structure induced from this competition between the bulk antiferromagnetic order and the induced ferromagnetic order due to the orbital ordering. Later, a more rigorous calculation employing a model Hamiltonian confirmed the experimental results and postulated that the competition of the ferromagnetic interaction and the bulk antiferromagnetic interaction drives the large surface canting.⁸⁴ Interestingly, the calculation of Ref. 84 predicts that the exchange coupling strength and sign (i.e., the canting magnitude and direction at the BiFeO₃ surface) are dependent on the interface charge density.

The exchange coupling in the aforementioned LSMO/BiFeO₃ bilayer is quite clearly driven by a different mechanism than that found for TMF/BiFeO₃ bilayers; however, because epitaxy is preserved in ferromagnetic oxide/BiFeO₃




FIG. 9. (a) MFM image of LSMO/BFO laid over the PFM image of the BiFeO₃ film before LSMO deposition. (b) MFM of the LSMO/STO/BiFeO₃ multilayer and PFM of the BiFeO₃ layer before the deposition of LSMO/STO layers. There is a clear striped, magnetic domain structure in the LSMO correlated to the BiFeO₃ striped domains both with and without the insertion of the non-magnetic STO layer. Reprinted with permission from You *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 184426 (2013). Copyright 2013 American Physical Society.

heterostructures, the system can be engineered to yield similar magnetic properties to those observed in TMF/BiFeO₃ bilayers. Similar to the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/BiFeO₃ heterostructure, a 2-variant, striped BiFeO₃ film can induce a 2-variant, striped magnetic domain structure in the coupled LSMO layer which gives rise to a uniaxial anisotropy in the film. Figs. 9(a) and 9(b) show magnetic FM (MFM) and PFM images of the LSMO/BiFeO₃ and LSMO/SrTiO₃/BiFeO₃ systems, respectively. Even with the insertion of a thin, non-magnetic spacer layer (SrTiO₃), the LSMO layer adapts the 2-variant striped domain structure of the underlying BiFeO₃ film. The insertion of the thin non-magnetic spacer layer eliminates magnetic exchange coupling between the two layers while still allowing strain to transfer from the BiFeO₃ layer to the LSMO layer. Thus, the elongation of the BiFeO₃ unit cell (driven by the polarization) couples to the LSMO unit cell and the large, positive magnetostriction coefficient of LSMO^{85,86} causes the moments to align with the elongation of the lattice. This coupling is fundamentally different from the one-to-one domain correlation observed in the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/BiFeO₃ system, where exchange coupling is the driving mechanism of the correlation.

In this section, we have highlighted some of the distinguishing characteristics of exchange coupling of an oxide ferro(ferri)magnet to multiferroic BiFeO₃. The coupling of the lattice opens pathways for new coupling phenomena that may be driven by correlations in the oxide ferro(ferri)magnet. We note that the results presented in Fig. 9 are not driven by a magnetic exchange with BiFeO₃ and do not require a multiferroic to achieve the 2-variant, striped domain structure. Since the coupling is driven by strain, the intrinsic magnetoelectric effect of BiFeO₃ is likely unnecessary for the electric field control of magnetism in this heterostructure, and, thus, is more akin to a traditional composite multiferroic. Nonetheless, these results highlight the fact that lattice coupling can enable alternate methods of coupling through which new coupling mechanisms maybe found and the magnetic properties of the system may be tailored.

III. ELECTRIC FIELD CONTROL OF MAGNETISM

A. Electric field control of antiferromagnetism

The first milestone in the advancement of the electric field control of magnetism in exchange coupled BiFeO₃ based heterostructures was the experimental observation of the magnetoelectric effect at room temperature in BiFeO₃ films. The 2005 study by Zhao *et al.*, combined PFM and XMLD-PEEM to make several major discoveries.⁷⁵ (1) The antiferromagnetic domain structure and the ferroelectric domain structure were found to be coupled such that information on the size and order of antiferromagnetic domains can be determined through imaging the ferroelectric domain structure both before (Figs. 10(a) and 10(b)) and after (inside yellow dotted squares in Figs. 10(c) and 10(d)) electrical switching with an out-of-plane oriented electric field. (2) It confirmed that BiFeO₃ films are magnetoelectric at room temperature. (3) It was determined that only the 109° ferroelectric switching event underwent a magnetoelectric switching event. (4) The magnetoelectric switching was shown to be stable over long periods, i.e., is non-volatile. These

findings were later confirmed in bulk single crystals by neutron diffraction measurements.^{87–89} The results in Ref. 75 were rationalized with the notion that the projection of the {111} magnetic plane onto the (001) plane only changes when the out-of-plane electric field drives a 109° ferroelectric switching event (see the schematics in Figs. 10(e)–10(h)).

B. Electric field control of exchange bias

The early attempts to establish the electric field control of an exchange-coupled ferromagnet in a multiferroic-based heterostructure were done with the vision of controlling the ferromagnetic layer through the exchange bias. Laukin *et al.* showed the first report of the electric field control of exchange bias at 2 K, in a Py/YMnO₃ heterostructure using a combination magnetometry and anisotropic magnetoresistance (AMR).⁹⁰ Using the temperature dependence of the exchange bias effect in this heterostructure, AMR curves with and without the influence of exchange bias could be taken. Then comparing these curves to AMR curves taken with YMnO₃ under an applied bias revealed a change in the exchange bias driven magnetic anisotropy.

It was not until 2010 that the reversible control and quantification of the modulations to the exchange bias through the applied voltage was demonstrated at 5.5 K.⁷⁹ Wu *et al.* fabricated devices with the LSMO/BiFeO₃ heterostructure where an out-of-plane electric field can be applied to the BiFeO₃ layer and the magnetic anisotropy of the LSMO layer could be monitored through magnetoresistance measurements (see Fig. 11). From the magnetoresistance curves, the magnitude

and the direction of the exchange bias could be quantified. Bipolar voltage pulses were found to reversibly modulate the magnitude of the exchange coupling between two states, one with a near zero exchange field in a non-volatile way but the sign of the exchange bias was not found to reverse. Only recently could the sign of the exchange bias be reversed with an applied, bipolar electric field in this system. In the model of exchange bias at the LSMO/BiFeO₃ interface described in Sec. II B, the BiFeO₃ Fe³⁺ atoms are hybridized with the LSMO Mn^{3+/4+} atoms. This hybridization drives the formation of an enhanced canted moment and the exchange bias. The reversal of the exchange bias is attributed to the shift of the Fe³⁺ and Bi³⁺ ions in BiFeO₃ relative to the oxygen octahedral⁹¹ and the surface when ferroelectric polarization is switched. The shift is proposed to alter the interaction between the surface Fe³⁺ atoms and Mn^{3+/4+} atoms, thereby altering the exchange bias.

Advances toward the reversible electric field control of exchange bias at room temperature in a ferromagnet/BiFeO₃ bilayer have been difficult. The current issues stem from the mechanism of exchange coupling. Either the blocking temperature is much lower than room temperature regardless of the ferromagnet's much higher Curie temperature, as is the case for LSMO/BiFeO₃ ($T_{\text{blocking}} \sim 100$ K (Fig. 7(c)), $T_C \sim 350$ K) or the exchange bias is driven by the metastable 109° domain walls; hence, the exchange bias decreases significantly and irreversibly with every applied voltage pulse.⁸⁰ This issue may be solved if a new mechanism for driving exchange bias is discovered, another ferromagnetic layer with stronger correlations than LSMO is coupled, or if the BiFeO₃ can be engineered to pin or stabilize the 109° domain walls.




FIG. 10. XMLD-PEEM (a) and PFM (b) of a BiFeO₃ film before electrical switching. The yellow dotted box indicates where electrical switching will occur. The double-headed red arrow indicates the axis of polarization for the incoming X-rays. The corresponding XMLD-PEEM (c) and PFM (d) after electrical switching. A 109° ferroelectric switching event occurred at regions 1 and 2 while regions 3 and 4 underwent 71° and 180° ferroelectric switching events. No change in the XMLD contrast is observed for the 71° and 180° ferroelectric switching events. Illustrations of the polarization and magnetic plane are shown for the (f) 180°, (g) 109°, and (h) 71° rotations of the polarization in BiFeO₃ unit cells. Reprinted with permission from Zhao *et al.*, Nature Mater. 5, 823 (2006). Copyright 2006 Zhao *et al.*




FIG. 11. (a) A device schematic of the device used to quantify changes in the electric field induced modulation of exchange bias at the LSMO/BiFeO₃. (b) The voltage pulse sequence, the modulation of exchange bias at 5.5 K with the LSMO magnetization in the negative ($-M_R$) and positive ($+M_R$) remnant states, and examples of the magnetoresistance curves used to quantify the exchange bias field (H_{EB}) and the coercive field (H_C). Reprinted with permission from Wu *et al.*, Nature Mater. **9**, 756 (2010). Copyright 2010 Wu *et al.*

C. Electric field control of magnetization direction without exchange bias

The electric field control of magnetism without the electric field control of exchange bias is not expected to reverse the direction of the coupled magnetization by symmetry. Since both the electric field and the polarization break space inversion symmetry and in the absence of exchange bias, there is no time reversal symmetry-breaking stimulus that can reverse a magnetization. Nonetheless, the magnetic anisotropy and magnetization direction can be controlled via an applied electric field. We have already highlighted the differences in coupling between a TMF to BiFeO₃ single domain bulk crystals and multidomain thin films where exchange coupling is not observed with the distinctions residing in the magnetic state of the canted moment (i.e., a spin cycloid that propagates in the $\langle 110 \rangle$ type directions or a long range moment that projects parallel to the polarization on the (001) surface). In this section, we will discuss the works that demonstrate the electric field control of a TMF in contact with both BiFeO₃ bulk crystals and multidomain thin films with only an applied electric field at room temperature. Furthermore, we note that engineering the domain structure of the films can lead to the situation where a net magnetization can reverse with the applied electric field while the laws of symmetry are obeyed.

D. Electric field control with single domain BiFeO₃ crystals

Lebeugle *et al.* described the exchange coupling of a TMF with BiFeO₃ crystals, as well as the electric field control of these exchange coupled spins.⁶⁹ Using a combination of optical techniques, the ferroelectric domains (it should be noted that BiFeO₃ crystals are not truly single domain, however, due to the very large domain size in crystals the domain wall density is not significant) and ferromagnetic domains could be imaged and magnetic hysteresis loops could be measured. Taking an angular set of magnetic hysteresis loops, the evolution of the systems magnetic anisotropy after the

application of an electric field could be observed (Figs. 12(a) and 12(b)). The regions of the crystal that had experienced a 90° change in the direction of the polarization also experienced a 90° change in the direction of the magnetic anisotropy. The anisotropy remained uniaxial after the electrical switching. While a reversal of the magnetization was not observed, this work highlights that exchange bias is not required for the electric field control of magnetic anisotropy. A correlation between the ferroelectric and ferromagnetic domains persisted after the application of the electric field. The effect was observed to be reversible, however, after just five cycles the domain correlation was broken. They postulate that the correlation breaks down due to the non-uniqueness of the spin cycloid propagation direction for a given polarization. Since each polarization has three possible directions for the spin cycloid to propagate, there exist shared propagation directions among the eight possible polarization directions.^{88,89} Thus, the spin cycloid is not always required to change direction upon switching the polarization; indeed, it can be a detriment.

E. Electric field control with multidomain BiFeO₃ thin films

The observation of the electric field control of the antiferromagnetism in BiFeO₃ thin films⁷⁵ sets the stage for the electric field control of a ferromagnetic layer exchange coupled to the BiFeO₃ film. In the seminal paper by Chu *et al.*, the magnetic anisotropy of small magnetic features ($2 \times 6 \mu\text{m}^2$ Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} dot) were reversibly toggled by an in-plane electric field (see Fig. 13).⁹² This was another demonstration of a new room temperature functionality employing this materials system. Furthermore, these researchers demonstrated that the electric field control can be exchange mediated without exchange bias, was reversible and non-volatile, and, most importantly, showed that the in-plane switching of a polarization by 71° is a magnetoelectric switch. Prior to this only the out-of-plane 109° switch was known to be magnetoelectric.⁷⁵




FIG. 12. (a) and (b) Polar plots illustrating the magnetic anisotropy of the Py/BiFeO₃ bulk crystal before (a) and after (b) the application of an electric field. For the regions of the crystal that experienced a 90° switch of the polarization from the applied electric field, the magnetic anisotropy has also rotated 90°. Ferroelectric (c) and magnetic (d) domain structures after the first application of the electric field. Ferroelectric (e) and magnetic (f) domain structures after the fifth application of the electric field. The domain correlation is broken in these images, as can be seen by the magnetic domain wall in the lower left-hand corner of (f). Orange arrows give the direction of the ferroelectric polarization. Reprinted figure with permission from Lebeugle *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 257601 (2009). Copyright 2009 American Physical Society.

To probe the ability to electrically control the ferromagnetic state of the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} layer, the heterostructures of Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/4-variant BiFeO₃ were grown on pre-patterned substrates with conducting SrRuO₃ (SRO) interdigitated electrodes. The poling structure was carefully designed to ensure the 71° ferroelectric switching event by rotating the electrodes to be 45° from the domain walls (Fig. 13).⁹³ The switching event was found to rotate the domain ferroelectric wall orientation by 90° from switch to switch. Similarly, XMCD images of the exchange coupled Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} layer also show a rotation of the ferromagnetic domain wall orientation from switch to switch, in agreement with the ferroelectric switching and indicating some correlation of domain structure.

The possible domain correlation observed in Fig. 13 using the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/4-variant BiFeO₃ and the successful demonstration of the electric field control of the magnetization at room temperature in this system motivate a similar study with the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/2-variant BiFeO₃ heterostructure. Since only the out-of-plane 109° and the in-plane 71° ferroelectric switches have been found to be magnetoelectric, a careful consideration of the ferroelectric switching in 2-variant BiFeO₃ is needed for the electric field control of magnetism. In 2-variant BiFeO₃, the net in-plane polarization can be reversed with only the in-plane components contributing to the total switching of the polarization.^{71,94,95} A continuity of the domain walls across switched and unswitched regions illustrate that the domain switching is accomplished

by 90° rotation of the in-plane polarization (in-plane 71° switch of the polarization vector) without creating additional domain walls (Figs. 14(a)–14(d)). Consistent with previous phase-field simulations of BiFeO₃,^{96,97} the coercive field of




FIG. 13. In-plane PFM of the BiFeO₃ domain structure (left) and XMCD of a Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} feature (middle) in a device architecture where an in-plane electric field can be applied (blue arrows). BiFeO₃ and the coupled Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10} feature are as-grown (a), 1st switch (b) and 2nd switch (c) states. (b) Schematics illustrating the correlation of XMCD contrast to moment direction and the direction of the total moment (orange arrow). Reprinted with permission from Chu *et al.*, Nature Mater. **7**, 478 (2008). Copyright 2008 Chu *et al.*

the 71° switch is then expected to be significantly lower than the 109° switch (in-plane 180°). Phase-field modeling has confirmed the switching mode as a mode of charge driven domain switching (a case where a large build up of charge at the domain walls drives ferroelectric switching due to only one of the two polarization variants switching under the applied electric field).^{71,98} It was also determined that this mode of polarization switching is dependent on the strength of the applied electric field. If the field is large enough to drive the 109° switch in a domain, both the domain walls, along with the net in-plane polarization, rotate 90° as observed in Refs. 92 and 93. The unique one-to-one coupling of domain structure and collinear alignment of the in-plane polarization and the magnetization observed in the $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}/2$ -variant BiFeO_3 heterostructure (Fig. 5) suggests the reversal of the net in-plane polarization should lead to the reversal of the net $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}$ magnetization.

Researchers had then undertaken the task of demonstrating an electric field induced stable reversal of a net magnetization at 300 K. Devices were designed to meet fundamental compatibility requirements for microelectronics by measuring the state of the device with a resistance measurement rather than a more complex optical measurement (Fig. 14(e)). The AMR of the $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}$ was measured in the as-grown state and after subsequent electrical poling of the BiFeO_3 (Fig. 14(f)). The AMR is taken with an applied magnetic field that is smaller than the coercive field of the device to avoid switching but to allow the magnetization to wiggle about its anisotropy direction allowing the magnetization direction to be determined.^{99,100} The phase of the AMR curves changes by 180° after each subsequent application of an electric field revealing a magnetization reversal and corroborates with the observation of the reversal of the net in-plane polarization after each application of the electric field. While this work demonstrated that anisotropy engineering leads to the unique exchange coupling and ferroelectric switching enables the voltage driven net magnetization reversal, it also highlights several issues that need to be tackled in the pursuit of a “real world” device application. Establishing such a reversal with the electric field applied out-of-plane (through the film thickness ~ 100 nm) could enable single digit switching voltages (200 V were used in Ref. 92 and 70 V in Ref. 71) and bring the energy consumption per unit area per switch below that of STT and into the realm of 100s of $\mu\text{J}/\text{cm}^2$ while simultaneously using an architecture better suited to achieve high device density. In the spirit of achieving higher device density, the devices should be scaled down to the sizes of modern magnetic bits (~ 180 nm \times 70 nm), of course this would put the device within a single multiferroic domain raising a slew of new and old questions and concerns. These are just a few of the challenges that remain open for near future investigations and is the topic for Sec. IV.

IV. WHAT ARE THE ISSUES?: CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Transitioning fundamental discoveries to real products is a monumental challenge. While there is still a long road to travel before a ferromagnetic/multiferroic heterostructure

will impact technology, the works reviewed herein have illustrated the relevant parameters governing the interface coupling and the switching of the multiferroic. It is now time for researchers to use these tools to demonstrate a potential for technological impact. Here we discuss a small list of perhaps the most relevant challenges where future research initiatives must focus before circuit engineers can take a closer look at this materials system.

A. Magnetoelectric switching with an out-of-plane electric field

While the voltage control of a magnetization was shown in bilayers with BiFeO_3 , the voltages required are too large for conventional microelectronics circuitry.^{71,92} This detriment is due to the large in-plane electrode structures used in these early experiments; however, the geometries of these device structures were carefully chosen to drive the magnetoelectric in-plane 71° switching event which is responsible for the electric field induced rotation of the ferromagnetic moment. Naturally, a higher density of devices and lower switching voltages can be reached if a geometry employing an out-of-plane electric field is employed as the separation between electrodes then decreases from ~ 6 μm to ~ 100 nm.

Of more relevance is the magnetoelectric switching that can be controllably accessed with the application of an out-of-plane electric field for the deterministic control of a magnetization. For such an endeavor, it is important to consider the configuration of the system. The magnetization of a transition metal alloy ferromagnet will typically lie in the plane of the film due to the demagnetization energy. Hence, an in-plane rotation of the ferromagnetic moments is expected to occur when the magnetic plane of BiFeO_3 undergoes an in-plane rotation. This point illustrates the motivation to drive the in-plane 71° switching event in the early device structures. The 71° switch drives an in-plane rotation of the magnetic plane (Fig. 15(a)) and can be deterministically switched with an in-plane electrode geometry with the electrodes oriented 45° from the axis of the domain walls (Fig. 13). Now, considering a (001) oriented BiFeO_3 film, a vertically applied electric field must rotate the polarization by 71° , 109° , or 180° with each reversing the vertical component of the polarization (Fig. 15(a)). Of these, only the 109° and 180° rotate the in-plane component of the polarization and only the 109° drives an in-plane rotation of the magnetic plane (Fig. 15(a)). From a symmetry perspective, the DM vector \vec{D} in BiFeO_3 is independent of the sign of the polar distortion (i.e., the polarization), rather it is dependent on the non-polar rotations of the network of oxygen octahedra.⁴³ This invariance can be overcome in the $R3c$ perovskite structure when the magnetic cations are situated on the A-site, which then leads to the DM interaction being induced by the polar distortion.⁴³ Nevertheless, the 180° switch in BiFeO_3 is expected to leave the magnetic plane invariant and, thus, is not magnetoelectric. This latter fact makes finding a mechanism for deterministically reversing a magnetization (the most desired outcome for conventional spintronics applications) by either in-plane or out-of-plane electric fields in this system even more challenging. Zhao *et al.* have demonstrated that an out-of-plane




FIG. 14. (a) In-plane PFM of a 4-variant BiFeO_3 film and schematics illustrating the 4 polarization variants. The out-of-plane image is also included. (b) Partial switching of a pre-switched region of the capacitor. Pre-switching poles the state into a 2-variant film. Continuity of the domain walls is satisfied across the boundary and reveals that each polarization variant rotates 71° (90° in projection). (c) Saturated switching reverses the net in-plane polarization. (d) Reversible switching of the net in-plane polarization switched. (e) A combined image from AFM and PFM images highlighting the features of the magneto-electric device and the configuration of the AMR measurements. The IP electric field is applied to the device via the two outer switching electrodes and the AMR is measured with a current flowing down the centrals leads to a $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}$ dot. The sample is rotated in a small magnetic field ($H_a = 20\text{Oe}$) to make the magnetization wiggle about its anisotropy direction. (f) AMR curves as a function of applied electric field. The phase of the AMR curves changes by 180° with respect to the previous curve after the application of the voltage pulse indicating a net magnetization reversal. (g) PFM of 3 devices in the states corresponding to the states in (f) but after the $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}$ has been removed with a soft Ar ion milling. The net IP polarization reverses under the $\text{Co}_{0.90}\text{Fe}_{0.10}$ dot after every switching event. Reprinted with permission Heron *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 217202 (2011). Copyright 2011 American Physical Society. Reprinted with permission from Appl. Phys. Lett. **97**, 062910 (2010). Copyright 2010 AIP Publishing LLC.

electric field applied to a 4-variant (001) BiFeO_3 film can drives the out-of-plane 71° , 109° , and 180° ferroelectric switching events, however, it is only the out-of-plane 109° rotates the antiferromagnetic axis on the (001) surface.⁷⁵ Further investigation is needed to determine if the out-of-plane 109° switching event can be isolated from the out-of-plane 71° and 180° ferroelectric switching events in a vertical capacitor geometry and if then a coupled magnetization can then be rotated with an applied electric field. Thus, it is clear that a full understanding of the atomistics pathways for polarization switching needs to be understood; how this impacts the canted moment (i.e., the canted moment switches or doesn't) should indeed be explored.

Further consideration of the out-of-plane magnetolectric switching possibilities must examine the activation

barriers for each of the ferroelectric switching events and their dependence on elastic interactions with the underlying substrate and the BiFeO_3 matrix. Baek *et al.* have calculated that a 180° rotation of the polarization may occur through the combination of 71° and 109° rotations driven by the action of the electric field and the elastic interactions with the surrounding unswitched BiFeO_3 matrix.⁹⁶ Such a method of “combinatorial” switching could lead to a reversal of a magnetization circumventing the issue of magnetic invariance. Of course, other surface orientations of BiFeO_3 (such as the (011) and (111)) should be considered and could reveal unique switching pathways and magnetolectric switching events. It is clear that theoretical and experimental investigations of the switching events in an out-of-plane capacitor structure are still needed to determine the feasibility




FIG. 15. (a) Illustrations of the magnetoelectric switching events possible in the BiFeO₃ system. The white arrows give the direction of the $\langle 111 \rangle$ oriented polarization. The (111) oriented magnetic plane is orthogonal to the polarization and is shown in yellow. An externally applied electric field directed in-plane (along the $[110]$ or the $[-110]$) will lead to either a 71° or 109° in-plane switching event. A $[001]$ oriented electric field can induce 71° , 109° , or a 180° out-of-plane switching events. The 180° switching event leaves the (111) magnetic plane invariant. (b) Ferroelectric hysteresis loops of $\text{La}_x\text{Bi}_{1-x}\text{FeO}_3$ (where $x = 0, 10, 15,$ and 20). (c) Cross-sectional TEM image of the SRO/ $\text{La}_{0.10}\text{Bi}_{0.90}\text{FeO}_3$ /SRO/STO/Si multilayer. (d) Schematic of a possible magnetoelectric magnetic multilayer device using BiFeO₃. The state of the device is written with an applied electric field to drive a magnetoelectric switching in the multiferroic, reversing the magnetization of the pinned ferromagnetic layer (P-FM) and keeping the free layer (F-FM) fixed. The reversal of the ferromagnetic layer switches the resistance state of the spin valve or magnetic tunnel junction into either a high or low resistance state depending on the relative orientations of the two ferromagnetic layers. Reprinted with permission from Appl. Phys. Lett. **92**, 102909 (2008). Copyright 2008 AIP Publishing LLC.

of a deterministic and reversible magnetoelectric switching event. It will then be up to researchers to determine if such a magnetoelectric switching occurs and if it can be harnessed in an exchange coupled heterostructure.

Pathways toward reduced energy consumption exist beyond moving to an out-of-plane device geometry. The ferroelectric properties of BiFeO₃ can be tuned, without significant changes in the magnetic properties, through chemical doping of the Bi site. Previous reports have shown that the substitution of 10% La can reduce the switching to below 1 V for a ~ 100 nm thick film.¹⁰¹ There exist, however, fundamental limits to which the thickness of the BiFeO₃ can be scaled for these devices. While the ferroelectricity can exist down to very small scales (2–3 nm),¹⁰² the exchange bias field of a CoFeB/BiFeO₃ heterostructure begins to sharply drop near 30 nm indicating a suppression of the antiferromagnetic Néel temperature.⁷⁰ If even lower energy consumption is required, materials engineering may be required to reduce the switching voltage further.

B. Integration with silicon

To pose a technological impact the next generation devices require compatibility with current CMOS technology. One of the key requisites is the epitaxial integration of BiFeO₃ with silicon. A significant materials advancement was made when SrTiO₃ buffer layers could be grown on silicon.^{103,104} SrTiO₃ has become the workhorse of complex

oxide thin film growth due to its cubic perovskite crystal structure and lattice constant that is relatively well matched to many other perovskites. Thus this discovery enables the integration of the correlated complex oxides that display the multi-functionality desired in next generation devices to be integrated with silicon based technology. Chu *et al.* have demonstrated the successful growth of $\text{La}_x\text{Bi}_{1-x}\text{FeO}_3$ (where $x = 0, 10, 15,$ and 20) on the SrTiO₃-templated silicon and with a conducting bottom electrode (SrRuO₃) for investigating the ferroelectric properties (Fig. 15(c)).¹⁰¹ While the macroscopic ferroelectric properties of the un-doped films remain largely similar to those observed for the mosaic domain structure obtainable on SrTiO₃ substrates there is no report to whether the domain structure can be controlled through deposition conditions or other means. This is quite a significant research direction since the 4-variant and 2-variant stripe-like domain structures are the ones that have enabled the electrically controlled ferromagnetic layer. As we will discuss later, perhaps a single domain film is the most ideal.

C. Electrically controlled magnetic memory or logic element

While the spintronics community has been intrigued with the idea of electric field controlled spintronic devices, there still has yet to be a demonstration of a reversible and deterministic electric field control of such devices at room temperature using exchange-coupled multiferroic

heterostructure. While using current induced magnetic switching allows high memory densities, the present state-of-the-art devices are still energetically costly. We discussed the energy cost of an STT memory element in the introduction. Furthermore, the electric field control of ferromagnetism shown in Fig. 13 had come with a proposal for a magnetoelectric magnetic multilayer device that combines the advantages of ferroelectric (fast, low-power writing/switching) and ferromagnetic (non-volatility, easy readout of device state) memories (Fig. 15(d)). The resistance state of such a device is controlled using the magneto-electrically pinned layer as the active layer rather than the low magnetic anisotropy free layer. The next step is to demonstrate such a device with a reversible switching of the resistance state using a multiferroic-spin valve (BiFeO₃/ferromagnet/Cu/ferromagnet) or multiferroic-tunnel junction (BiFeO₃/ferromagnet/MgO/ferromagnet) device with solely an electric field at room temperature.

When discussing such memory elements, it is important to consider the scale of modern devices. The size of a modern STT memory element is nearly a 60–70 nm × 180 nm, which is then capable of fitting within a single BiFeO₃ domain. Many of the basic questions remain unanswered when we consider the exchange coupling, ferroelectric switching, and magnetoelectric switching at these small scales.

D. Fatigue and reliability

References 69, 71, and 92 are three independent reports of the room temperature electric field control of a large magnetization in a TMF-BiFeO₃ heterostructure, however, these reports have also highlighted a significant lack of switching reliability. For the case of Py/BiFeO₃ single crystals, it was shown that after five cycles, regions where a correlated domain structure was observed were broken and these regions no longer switched under the applied electric field.⁶⁹ The lack of deterministic switching was explained through the degeneracy of the spin cycloid propagation direction with polarization direction. In the case of the Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/BiFeO₃ thin film heterostructures the reliability numbers are even worse. No report has shown more than one complete switching cycle. While neither Ref. 71 nor 92 propose a mechanism of failure, Couet *et al.* have proposed and supported the argument that stems from the issue that has plagued applications with ferroelectrics, such as ferroelectric memories, for decades: the motion of ionic species (such as oxygen vacancies) under the large electric field and their trapping at the ferroelectric/metal electrode interface. Couet *et al.* investigated the interface chemistry and magnetism in Fe/BaTiO₃ and Fe/LiNbO₃ heterostructures as a function of an applied electric field.¹⁰⁵ It was determined that the Fe at the interface would oxidize as a threshold electric field is surpassed, creating a magnetically dead layer and irreversibly altering the magnetoelectric effect initially observed in these systems. They propose that the interdiffusion is largely driven by the amplification of the applied electric field by the large permittivity of the ferroelectric layer.¹⁰⁵ Additionally, they find that for a 300 kV/m electric field, 1.2 nm–2 nm of the Fe has oxidized. As the electric fields applied in Refs. 71 and 92 are on the order of 10 MV/m

and Co is more easily oxidized than Fe, it seems plausible that the oxidation of the interface and breaking of the exchange coupling in Co_{0.90}Fe_{0.10}/BiFeO₃ heterostructures could happen over a few voltage pulses. Perhaps tailoring of the ferroelectric properties, possibly through La doping, to reduce the dielectric constant and reduce the electric field required for switching will improve device reliability.

The solution to polarization fatigue lies in the use of oxide switching electrodes¹⁰⁶ as the mobile ionic species can diffuse beyond the interface. Ultimately, this has led to commercially viable, reliable ferroelectric memory technology. This suggests that the magnetoelectric switching of the heterostructure could be made robust to with an oxide as the ferromagnetic layer. As shown in Fig. 11(b) and Ref. 79, the LSMO/BiFeO₃ devices were shown to have been cycled five times with the claim of up to sixty cycles, however, room temperature functionality in this system has yet to be demonstrated.

V. SUMMARY

In this manuscript, we have reviewed the electric field control of magnetism using the ferromagnet/BiFeO₃ exchange coupled heterostructure. It is our hope that we have captured all of the excitement and nuances that have been used recently in this pursuit. The works presented herein have outlined the complexity of such an undertaking. While globally the route to the electric field control of magnetism in these heterostructures amounts to an understanding or engineering of the exchange coupling between the layers and the magnetoelectric switching of BiFeO₃, it is apparent that this requires an understanding of the chemical and physical changes that can occur at the interface and the relation of these interface energies to volumetric interaction energies. We have presented challenges that currently stand in the way for these advancements to impact technology, highlighting the importance of length scales and materials chemistry. We hope that this review of the achievements and challenges for BiFeO₃ based spintronics will motivate and aid the community to turn these challenges into accomplishments and lead to the adoption of the technology by circuit designers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

J.T.H. acknowledges that this research was made with government support awarded by DOD, Air Force Office of Scientific Research, National Defense Science and Engineering Graduate (NDSEG) Fellowship, 32 CFR 168a. We thank C. M. Brooks and H. Nair for their comments on this manuscript. The authors recognize that this material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation (Nanosystems Engineering Research Center for Translational Applications of Nanoscale Multiferroic Systems) under Grant Number EEC-1160504 and the D.O.D.-A.R.O. M.U.R.I supported by the Army Research Office through Agreement Number W911NF-08-2-0032. R.R. acknowledges the support of the Director, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Science Division of the US Department of Energy under Contract Number

DE-AC02-05CH11231, the NSF MRSEC (DMR-00-80008), the Center for Energy Efficient Electronics Science (NSF Grant Number 0939514), the Western Institute of Nanoelectronics program, the STARnet FAME, as well as significant intellectual and financial support from scientists and engineers at Intel (e.g. Dmitri Nikonov). Finally, we would like to express our appreciation to all of the collaborators and coauthors for the work presented herein, specifically K. Ashraf, Y.-H. Chu, R. Dynes, M. Gajek, Q. He, L. W. Martin, S. Salahuddin, M. Trassin, S. Wu, and P. Yu. Additionally, we would like to express our gratitude to M. Viret and J. Wang for the permissions to reuse their works.

- ¹K. Bernstein, R. K. Calvin III, W. Porod, A. Seabaugh, and J. Welsler, *Proc. IEEE* **98**, 2169 (2010).
- ²S. A. Wolf, D. D. Awschalom, R. A. Buhrman, J. M. Daughton, S. von Molnar, M. L. Roukes, A. Y. Chtchelkanova, and D. M. Treger, *Science* **294**, 1488 (2001).
- ³D. D. Awschalom and M. E. Flatté, *Nat. Phys.* **3**, 153 (2007).
- ⁴A. Imre, G. Csaba, L. Ji, A. Orlov, G. H. Bernstein, and W. Porod, *Science* **311**, 205 (2006).
- ⁵D. Bhowmik, L. You, and S. Salahuddin, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **9**, 59 (2014).
- ⁶B. Behin-Aein, D. Datta, S. Salahuddin, and S. Datta, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **5**, 266 (2010).
- ⁷A. Khitun, D. E. Nikonov, and K. L. Wang, *J. Appl. Phys.* **106**, 123909 (2009).
- ⁸E. B. Myers, D. C. Ralph, J. A. Katine, R. N. Louie, and R. A. Buhrman, *Science* **285**, 867 (1999).
- ⁹Formed in 2002, Grandis (<http://www.grandisinc.com>) worked for several years to commercialize STT-RAM technology. In August 2011, Grandis was acquired by Samsung. D. McGrath, "Samsung buys MRAM developer Grandis" EETimes Aug. 2 2011 (<http://www.eetimes.com/electronics-news/4218434/Samsung-buys-MRAM-developer-Grandis>)
- ¹⁰S. S. P. Parkin, M. Hayashi, and L. Thomas, *Science* **320**, 190 (2008).
- ¹¹D. C. Ralph and M. D. Stiles, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **320**, 1190 (2008).
- ¹²J. C. Slonczewski, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **159**, L1 (1996).
- ¹³H. Liu, D. Bedau, D. Backes, J. A. Katine, J. Langer, and A. D. Kent, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **97**, 242510 (2010).
- ¹⁴G. E. Rowlands, T. Rahman, J. A. Katine, J. Langer, A. Lyle, H. Zhao, J. G. Alzate, A. A. Kovalev, Y. Tserkovnyak, Z. M. Zeng, H. W. Jiang, K. Galatsis, Y. M. Huai, P. Khalili Amiri, K. L. Wang, I. N. Krivorotov, and J.-P. Wang, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **98**, 102509 (2011).
- ¹⁵K. F. Wang, J. M. Liu, and Z. F. Ren, *Adv. Phys.* **58**, 321 (2009).
- ¹⁶R. Ramesh and N. A. Spaldin, *Nature Mater.* **6**, 21 (2007).
- ¹⁷S.-W. Cheong and M. Mostovoy, *Nature Mater.* **6**, 13 (2007).
- ¹⁸H. Schmid, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **20**, 434201 (2008).
- ¹⁹H. Béa, M. Gajek, M. Bibes, and A. Barthélémy, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **20**, 434221 (2008).
- ²⁰C. Binek and B. Doudin, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **17**, L39 (2005).
- ²¹M. Fiebig, *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **38**, R123 (2005).
- ²²W. Eerenstein, N. D. Mathur, and J. F. Scott, *Nature* **442**, 759 (2006).
- ²³A. P. Pyatakov and A. K. Zvezdin, *Phys.-Usp.* **55**, 557 (2012).
- ²⁴D. Khomskii, *Physics* **2**, 20 (2009).
- ²⁵J. Ma, J. Hu, Z. Li, and C. W. Nan, *Adv. Mater.* **23**, 1062 (2011).
- ²⁶N. X. Sun and G. Srinivasan, *SPIN* **2**, 1240004 (2012).
- ²⁷C. A. F. Vaz, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **24**, 333201 (2012).
- ²⁸P. Royen and K. Swars, *Angew. Chem.* **69**, 779 (1957).
- ²⁹J. Wang, J. B. Neaton, H. Zheng, V. Nagarajan, S. B. Ogale, B. Liu, D. Viehland, V. Vaithyanathan, D. G. Schlom, U. V. Waghmare, N. A. Spaldin, K. M. Rabe, M. Wuttig, and R. Ramesh, *Science* **299**, 1719 (2003).
- ³⁰Y. F. Popov, A. K. Zvezdin, G. P. Vorobei, A. M. Kadomtseva, V. A. Murashev, and D. N. Rakov, *JETP Lett.* **57**, 69 (1993).
- ³¹C. Michel, J.-M. Moreau, G. D. Achenbach, R. Gerson, and W. J. James, *Solid State Commun.* **7**, 701 (1969).
- ³²F. Kubel and H. Schmid, *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B: Struct. Sci.* **46**, 698 (1990).
- ³³J. R. Teague, R. Gerson, and W. J. James, *Solid State Commun.* **8**, 1073 (1970).
- ³⁴I. Sosnowska, T. Peterlin-Neumaier, and E. Steichele, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **15**, 4835 (1982).
- ³⁵G. A. Smolenskii, V. M. Yudin, E. S. Sher, and Y. E. Stolypin, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **16**, 622 (1963).
- ³⁶C. Ederer and N. A. Spaldin, *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 060401(R) (2005).
- ³⁷R. Seshadri and N. A. Hill, *Chem. Mater.* **13**, 2892 (2001).
- ³⁸D. Khomskii, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **306**, 1 (2006).
- ³⁹P. Fischer, M. Polomska, I. Sosnowska, and M. Szymanski, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **13**, 1931 (1980).
- ⁴⁰I. E. Dzyaloshinskii, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **4**, 241 (1958).
- ⁴¹I. E. Dzyaloshinskii, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **19**, 960 (1964).
- ⁴²T. Moriya, *Phys. Rev.* **120**, 91 (1960).
- ⁴³C. Ederer and C. J. Fennie, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **20**, 434219 (2008).
- ⁴⁴C. J. Fennie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 167203 (2008).
- ⁴⁵S. K. Streiffer, C. B. Parker, A. E. Romanov, M. J. Lefevre, L. Zhao, J. S. Speck, W. Pompe, C. M. Foster, and G. R. Bai, *J. Appl. Phys.* **83**, 2742 (1998).
- ⁴⁶N. Balke, I. Bdkin, S. V. Kalinin, and A. L. Kholkin, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* **92**, 1629 (2009).
- ⁴⁷L. W. Martin, Y. H. Chu, and R. Ramesh, *Mater. Sci. Eng., R* **68**, 89 (2010).
- ⁴⁸L. W. Martin, Y. H. Chu, M. B. Holcomb, M. Huijben, P. Yu, S.-J. Han, D. Lee, S. X. Wang, and R. Ramesh, *Nano Lett.* **8**, 2050 (2008).
- ⁴⁹W. H. Meiklejohn and C. P. Bean, *Phys. Rev.* **102**, 1413 (1956).
- ⁵⁰J. C. S. Kools, *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **32**, 3165 (1996).
- ⁵¹S. S. P. Parkin, K. P. Roche, M. G. Samant, P. M. Rice, R. B. Beyers, R. E. Scheuerlein, E. J. O'Sullivan, S. L. Brown, J. Bucchigano, D. W. Abraham, Y. Lu, M. Rooks, P. L. Trouilloud, R. A. Wanner, and W. J. Gallagher, *J. Appl. Phys.* **85**, 5828 (1999).
- ⁵²J. Nogués and I. K. Schuller, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **192**, 203 (1999).
- ⁵³A. E. Berkowitz and K. Takano, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **200**, 552 (1999).
- ⁵⁴M. Kiwi, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **234**, 584 (2001).
- ⁵⁵J. Stöhr and H. C. Siegmann, *Magnetism: From Fundamentals to Nanoscale Dynamics* (Springer, New York, 2006).
- ⁵⁶C. Binek, *Ising-Type Antiferromagnets*, Springer Tracts in Modern Physics Vol. 196 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003), p. 55.
- ⁵⁷J. Nogués, J. Sort, V. Langlais, V. Skumryev, S. Surinach, J. S. Muñoz, and M. D. Baró, *Phys. Rep.* **422**, 65 (2005).
- ⁵⁸E. C. Stoner and E. P. Wohlfarth, *Nature* **160**, 650 (1947).
- ⁵⁹E. C. Stoner and E. P. Wohlfarth, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc., A* **240**, 599 (1948).
- ⁶⁰A. P. Malozemoff, *Phys. Rev. B* **35**, 3679 (1987).
- ⁶¹A. P. Malozemoff, *J. Appl. Phys.* **63**, 3874 (1988).
- ⁶²A. P. Malozemoff, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 7673 (1988).
- ⁶³D. Schumacher, A. Steffen, J. Voigt, J. Schubert, and Th. Bruckel, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 144427 (2013).
- ⁶⁴D. Mauri, H. C. Siegmann, P. S. Bagus, and E. Kay, *J. Appl. Phys.* **62**, 3047 (1987).
- ⁶⁵F. Radu and H. Zabel, *Magnetic Heterostructures*, Springer Tracts in Modern Physics Vol. 227, edited by H. Zabel and S. D. Bader (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007), p. 97.
- ⁶⁶M. Daraktchiev, G. Catalan, and J. F. Scott, *Ferroelectrics* **375**, 122 (2008).
- ⁶⁷G. Catalan and J. F. Scott, *Adv. Mater.* **21**, 2463 (2009).
- ⁶⁸D. Lebeugle, A. Mougín, M. Viret, D. Colson, J. Allibe, H. Béa, E. Jacquet, C. Deranlot, M. Bibes, and A. Barthélémy, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 134411 (2010).
- ⁶⁹D. Lebeugle, A. Mougín, M. Viret, D. Colson, and L. Ranno, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 257601 (2009).
- ⁷⁰H. Béa, M. Bibes, F. Ott, B. Dupé, X.-H. Zhu, S. Petit, S. Fusil, C. Deranlot, K. Bouzehouane, and A. Barthélémy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 017204 (2008).
- ⁷¹J. T. Heron, M. Trassin, K. Ashraf, M. Gajek, Q. He, S. Y. Yang, D. E. Nikonov, Y.-H. Chu, S. Salahuddin, and R. Ramesh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 217202 (2011).
- ⁷²M. Trassin, J. D. Clarkson, S. R. Bowden, J. Liu, J. T. Heron, R. J. Paull, E. Arenholz, D. T. Pierce, and J. Unguris, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 134426 (2012).
- ⁷³P. Yu, J.-S. Lee, S. Okamoto, M. D. Rossell, M. Huijben, C.-H. Yang, Q. He, J. X. Zhang, S. Y. Yang, M. J. Lee, Q. M. Ramasse, R. Erni, Y.-H. Chu, D. A. Arena, C.-C. Kao, L. W. Martin, and R. Ramesh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 027201 (2010).
- ⁷⁴L. You, B. Wang, X. Zou, Z.-S. Lim, Y. Zhou, H. Ding, L. Chen, and J. Wang, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 184426 (2013).
- ⁷⁵T. Zhao, A. Scholl, F. Zavaliche, K. Lee, M. Barry, A. Doran, M. P. Cruz, Y. H. Chu, C. Ederer, N. A. Spaldin, R. R. Das, D. M. Kim, S. H. Baek, C. B. Eom, and R. Ramesh, *Nature Mater.* **5**, 823 (2006).

- ⁷⁶Q. He, C.-H. Yeh, J.-C. Yang, G. Singh-Bhalla, C.-W. Liang, P.-W. Chiu, G. Catalan, L. W. Martin, Y.-H. Chu, J. F. Scott, and R. Ramesh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 067203 (2012).
- ⁷⁷Y.-H. Chu, Q. He, C.-H. Yang, P. Yu, L. W. Martin, P. Shafer, and R. Ramesh, *Nano Lett.* **9**, 1726 (2009).
- ⁷⁸R. C. O'Handely, *Solid State Commun.* **21**, 1119 (1977).
- ⁷⁹S. M. Wu, S. A. Cybart, P. Yu, M. D. Rossell, J. X. Zhang, R. Ramesh, and R. C. Dynes, *Nature Mater.* **9**, 756 (2010).
- ⁸⁰J. Allibe, S. Fusil, K. Bouzehouane, C. Daumont, D. Sando, E. Jacquet, C. Deranlot, M. Bibes, and A. Barthélémy, *Nano Lett.* **12**, 1141 (2012).
- ⁸¹M. P. Cruz, Y.-H. Chu, J. X. Zhang, P. L. Yang, F. Zavaliche, Q. He, P. Shafer, L. Q. Chen, and R. Ramesh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 217601 (2007).
- ⁸²T. L. Qu, Y. G. Zhao, P. Yu, H. C. Zhao, S. Zhang, and L. F. Yang, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **100**, 242410 (2012).
- ⁸³S. M. Wu, S. A. Cybart, D. Yi, J. M. Parker, R. Ramesh, and R. C. Dynes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 067202 (2013).
- ⁸⁴M. J. Calderon, S. Liang, R. Yu, J. Salafranca, S. Dong, S. Yunoki, L. Brey, A. Moreo, and E. Dagotto, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 024422 (2011).
- ⁸⁵G. Srinivasan, E. T. Rasmussen, B. J. Levin, and R. Hayes, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 134402 (2002).
- ⁸⁶B. Dabrowski, L. Gladczuk, A. Wisniewski, Z. Bukowski, R. Dybzinski, A. Szewczyk, M. Gutowska, S. Kolesnik, C. W. Kimball, and H. Szymczak, *J. Appl. Phys.* **87**, 3011 (2000).
- ⁸⁷W. Ratcliff II, Z. Yamani, V. Anbusathaiah, T. R. Gao, P. A. Kienzle, H. Cao, and I. Takeuchi, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 140405 (2013).
- ⁸⁸D. Lebeugle, D. Colson, A. Forget, M. Viret, A. M. Bataille, and A. Gukasov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 227602 (2008).
- ⁸⁹S. Lee, W. Ratcliff II, S.-W. Cheong, and V. Kiryukhin, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **92**, 192906 (2008).
- ⁹⁰V. Laukhin, V. Skumryev, X. Marti, D. Hrabovsky, F. Sanchez, M. V. Garcia-Cuenca, C. Ferrater, M. Varela, U. Luders, J. F. Bobo, and J. Fontcuberta, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 227201 (2006).
- ⁹¹J. X. Zhang, Q. He, M. Trassin, W. Luo, D. Yi, M. D. Rossell, P. Yu, L. You, C. H. Wang, C. Y. Kuo, J. T. Heron, Z. Hu, R. J. Zeches, H. J. Lin, A. Tanaka, C. T. Chen, L. H. Tjeng, Y. H. Chu, and R. Ramesh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 147602 (2011).
- ⁹²Y.-H. Chu, L. W. Martin, M. B. Holcomb, M. Gajek, S.-J. Han, Q. He, N. Balke, C.-H. Yang, D. Lee, W. Hu, Q. Zhan, P.-L. Yang, A. Fraile-Rodriguez, A. Scholl, S. X. Wang, and R. Ramesh, *Nature Mater.* **7**, 478 (2008).
- ⁹³P. Shafer, F. Zavaliche, Y.-H. Chu, P.-L. Yang, M. P. Cruz, and R. Ramesh, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **90**, 202909 (2007).
- ⁹⁴L. You, E. Liang, R. Guo, D. Wu, K. Yao, L. Chen, and J. Wang, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **97**, 062910 (2010).
- ⁹⁵F. Johann, A. Morelli, and I. Vrejoiu, *Phys. Status Solidi* **249**, 2278 (2012).
- ⁹⁶S. H. Baek, H. W. Jang, C. M. Folkman, Y. L. Li, B. Winchester, J. X. Zhang, Q. He, Y. H. Chu, C. T. Nelson, M. S. Rzchowski, X. Q. Pan, R. Ramesh, L. Q. Chen, and C. B. Eom, *Nature Mater.* **9**, 309 (2010).
- ⁹⁷N. Balke, S. Choudhury, S. Jesse, M. Huijben, Y. H. Chu, A. P. Baddorf, L. Q. Chen, R. Ramesh, and S. V. Kalinin, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **4**, 868 (2009).
- ⁹⁸K. Ashraf and S. Salahuddin, *J. Appl. Phys.* **112**, 074102 (2012).
- ⁹⁹T. R. McGuire and R. I. Potter, *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **11**, 1018 (1975).
- ¹⁰⁰B. H. Miller and E. Dan Dahlberg, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **69**, 3932 (1996).
- ¹⁰¹Y. H. Chu, Q. Zhan, C.-H. Yang, M. P. Cruz, L. W. Martin, T. Zhao, P. Yu, R. Ramesh, P. T. Joseph, I. N. Lin, W. Tian, and D. G. Schlom, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **92**, 102909 (2008).
- ¹⁰²Y. H. Chu, T. Zhao, M. P. Cruz, Q. Zhan, P. L. Yang, L. W. Martin, M. Huijben, C. H. Yang, F. Zavaliche, H. Zheng, and R. Ramesh, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **90**, 252906 (2007).
- ¹⁰³H. Li, X. Hu, Y. Wei, Z. Yu, X. Zhang, R. Droopad, A. A. Demkov, J. Edwards, K. Moore, W. Ooms, J. Kulik, and P. Fejes, *J. Appl. Phys.* **93**, 4521 (2003).
- ¹⁰⁴M. P. Warusawithana, C. Cen, C. R. Slesman, J. C. Woicik, Y. Li, L. F. Kourkoutis, J. A. Klug, H. Li, P. Ryan, L.-P. Wang, M. Bedzyk, D. A. Muller, L.-Q. Chen, J. Levy, and D. G. Schlom, *Science* **324**, 367–370 (2009).
- ¹⁰⁵S. Couet, M. Bisht, M. Trekels, M. Menghini, C. Petermann, M. J. Van Bael, J.-P. Locquet, R. Rüffer, A. Vantomme, and K. Temst, *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **24**, 71 (2014).
- ¹⁰⁶R. Ramesh, W. K. Chan, B. Wilkens, H. Gilchrist, T. Sands, J. M. Tarascon, and V. G. Keramidis, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **61**, 1537 (1992).