

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

# Exploiting interfacial and size effects to construct oxide superlattices with robust and tunable magnetoelectric properties at room temperature

Yurong Yang, L. Bellaiche, and Jorge Íñiguez

Phys. Rev. B **91**, 075423 — Published 23 February 2015

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.91.075423](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.91.075423)

# Multiferroic BiFeO<sub>3</sub>/BiMnO<sub>3</sub> Superlattices with Robust and Tunable Magnetoelectric Properties at Room-Temperature

Yurong Yang,<sup>1</sup> L. Bellaiche,<sup>1</sup> and Jorge Íñiguez<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Physics Department and Institute for Nanoscience and Engineering,  
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Institut de Ciència de Materials de Barcelona (ICMAB-CSIC), Campus UAB, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain*

<sup>3</sup>*Materials Research and Technology Department,  
Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology,  
5 avenue des Hauts-Fourneaux, L-4362 Esch/Alzette, Luxembourg*

We propose a strategy to create materials displaying robust and tunable magnetoelectric multiferroic properties at room temperature. The key idea is to construct heterostructures that combine two different constituents: (1) Compound BiFeO<sub>3</sub>, which presents strong ferroelectric and anti-ferromagnetic orders well above room temperature, but displays a small magnetic moment. (2) A ferromagnetic insulator (e.g., BiMnO<sub>3</sub>) that is only required to couple magnetically with BiFeO<sub>3</sub>. Our simulations show that it is possible to combine such materials to create superlattices that present (i) a room-temperature multiferroic state with relatively large magnetization (up to 0.3  $\mu_B$  per transition metal atom, with the possibility to improve by finding a suitable replacement for BiMnO<sub>3</sub>), (ii) an amply customizable magnetic behavior, and (iii) a strong magnetoelectric coupling. Thus, the new design strategy successfully addresses the greatest challenge in the area of magnetoelectric multiferroics, exploiting interfacial couplings and size (layer-thickness) effects to produce materials apt for applications.

## I. INTRODUCTION

From an applications perspective, the requirements for an ideal magnetoelectric multiferroic (MEM) material are: large values of the polarization and magnetization at room temperature, a strong coupling between the electric and magnetic orders, and good insulating properties. As regards the all-important family of ABO<sub>3</sub> perovskite oxides, the difficulties to find materials that present all these features simultaneously have been discussed [1–3]. Today, the most robust room-temperature multiferroics are materials like BiFeO<sub>3</sub> (BFO) [4], where magnetism is associated with the Fe<sup>3+</sup> cations located at the B-site of the lattice, while ferroelectricity is driven by the off-centering of the A-site Bi<sup>3+</sup> cations.

The simple ABO<sub>3</sub> perovskites displaying room-temperature multiferroism tend to have an anti-ferromagnetic (AFM) structure; in some cases, the AFM order is modulated, in others it presents a spin canting that gives rise to a small magnetic moment (e.g., about 0.01  $\mu_B$  per Fe cation in AFM thin films of BFO) [5–7]. Large magnetization values are unheard of in this context, for fundamental reasons: MEM perovskite oxides are insulators in which the dominant magnetic interaction is super-exchange. While AFM super-exchange can be very strong (e.g., BFO's Néel temperature is  $T_N = 643$  K) [8], ferromagnetic (FM) super-exchange is rare and relatively weak [9], a fact that explains the paucity of insulators that present large FM moments at room temperature. Among the most promising materials, it is worth noting BiMnO<sub>3</sub> (BMO, with  $T_C = 105$  K) [10] or more complex double perovskites such as La<sub>2</sub>MnNiO<sub>6</sub> ( $T_C = 275$  K) [11, 12]. Interestingly, for some time BMO was believed to be a MEM, although its paraelectric character ( $C2/c$  space group) is now ac-




FIG. 1. Panel (a): Sketch of a superlattice with AFM (red) and FM (blue) layers that couple anti-ferromagnetically across the interface. We indicate the ground state spin configuration, which corresponds to a periodic repetition of the indicated cell provided that the number of planes in the AFM layer  $m$  is odd. Panel (b): Basic 30-atom cell corresponding to the hexagonal representation of BFO's  $R3c$  phase. Note that this cell can be taken as a  $(111)_{pc}$ -oriented unit with 6 atomic planes in it; this structure was the starting point to construct all the superlattices investigated from first-principles in this work.

cepted [13]. La<sub>2</sub>MnNiO<sub>6</sub> is paraelectric as well; nevertheless, a strategy to induce a small (improper) polarization in it, and thus obtain a near-room-temperature MEM, has recently been proposed [14]. Higher Curie temperatures have been predicted for perovskite oxides involving 5d transition metals (e.g.,  $T_C = 360$  K for Bi<sub>2</sub>NiReO<sub>6</sub>) [15], but such an increase is unfortunately accompanied by a deterioration of the insulating character; the increased spread of the  $d$  orbitals results in stronger magnetic couplings, but also closes the gap. Hence, the materials-design challenge remains open.

Here we propose an appealing solution to this problem. As others before us [16–19], we want to take advantage of possibilities provided by artificial heterostructures, introducing a novel design concept that is likely to yield large and robust MEM effects at room temperature. The basic idea is to create heterostructures combining a high- $T_N^{\text{bulk}}$  anti-ferromagnet with a lower- $T_C^{\text{bulk}}$  FM insulator, as sketched in Fig. 1(a) for the case of a superlattice (SL) geometry. By choosing the stacking direction parallel to the  $\mathbf{q}$ -vector characterizing the AFM order, we can construct an artificial material with a well-defined magnetic ground state. As shown in Fig. 1(a), the magnetization will be dominated by the contribution of the FM layers provided they are thick enough. For thick enough AFM layers, we will have a magnetic ordering transition at  $T_t$  close to  $T_N^{\text{bulk}}$ . Due to the exchange interactions across the interface, the FM layers can be expected to be partly ordered above  $T_C^{\text{bulk}}$ ; therefore, we might have a sizable magnetization  $M(T) \neq 0$  for  $T > T_C^{\text{bulk}}$ . (Note that proximity and size effects of this kind are typical of magnetic superlattices and bilayers [20, 21].) Furthermore, ferroelectricity can be effectively induced in a SL structure, e.g. by inserting strongly ferroelectric (FE) layers or by means of epitaxial strain [22, 23]. Hence, as a result, this design concept can potentially lead to large MEM effects at room temperature, as we will indeed show in the following. Here we demonstrate, for BFO:BMO superlattices grown along the pseudo-cubic [111] direction, that this strategy can indeed work. Moreover, the analysis of the results for BFO:BMO naturally indicates that other superlattices combining a high- $T_N^{\text{bulk}}$  anti-ferromagnet and a lower- $T_C^{\text{bulk}}$  FM insulator should give similar behaviors.

## II. METHODS

For the electronic structure calculations, we used density functional theory within the local-density approximation (LDA), as implemented in the VASP simulation package [24, 25] including a Hubbard  $U$  correction [26] for a better treatment of the 3d electrons of the transition metal atoms. More specifically, we used  $U$  values of 3.8 eV and 5.3 eV, respectively, for the Fe and Mn cations; these are standard choices that are known to produce qualitatively and quasi-quantitatively correct results for these compounds [27, 28]. We used the projector augmented method to represent the ionic cores [25, 29], treating explicitly the electrons in the following atomic orbitals: 3p, 3d, and 4s for both Fe and Mn; Bi's 5d, 6s, and 6p; and O's 2s and 2p. We represented the electronic wave functions in a basis of plane waves cut off at 550 eV. We used a basic 30-atom cell defined by the following lattice vectors:  $\mathbf{a} = a(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)$ ,  $\mathbf{b} = a(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_3)$ , and  $\mathbf{c} = 2a(\mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2 + \mathbf{x}_3)$ , where  $a$  is the lattice parameter of the elementary pseudocubic 5-atom perovskite cell and  $\mathbf{x}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_2$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_3$  are unit vectors along the [100]<sub>pc</sub>, [010]<sub>pc</sub>, and [001]<sub>pc</sub> pseudo-cubic directions, respectively.

Note that this is the conventional cell of the  $R3c$  phase of BFO in the hexagonal setting, which is perfectly adapted to describe a (111)<sub>pc</sub>-oriented superlattice with the third lattice vector  $\mathbf{c}$  along the stacking direction  $z$ . In our first-principles simulations, we have always considered either this cell [sketched in Fig. 1(b)] or a multiple of it along  $z$ . The corresponding Brillouin Zone integrals have been computed using a  $5 \times 5 \times 2$   $k$ -point grid. Structural relaxations were stopped when the residual forces went below 0.001 eV/Å.

We computed the electric polarizations within a linear approximation, using the corresponding dynamical charge tensors as obtained from first principles for each of the considered ferroelectric (FE) structures. We quantified the polar distortion by using as reference a centrosymmetric (cubic-like) structure that has the (distorted) cell of the FE configuration. As mentioned in the main text, this procedure tends to underestimate the polarization computed directly from first principles using the Berry's phase formalism; yet, it allows us to obtain qualitatively correct results in a fast and reliable way.

For our statistical investigations of the magnetic properties of the superlattices (SLs), we used the simple spin model described in the main text [see Eq. (1)]. We computed the exchange constants by requesting that the model reproduces the first-principles energies obtained for representative spin configurations (in essence, FM and G-AFM). Then, we solved our spin Hamiltonians by means of standard Metropolis Monte Carlo techniques, using a periodically-repeated supercell that contains  $24 \times 24 \times 24$  elementary perovskite cells. Note that, while this supercell is pseudocubic, it is nevertheless able to capture the (111)<sub>pc</sub>-oriented SLs we want to investigate, provided the chemical layering along the [111]<sub>pc</sub> direction is properly introduced in the simulation. In our Monte Carlo runs, we typically used 40,000 sweeps for thermalization and 60,000 additional sweeps for computing statistical averages.

## III. RESULTS

### A. Basic features and ferroelectricity

As indicated above, we choose BFO (high- $T$  AFM and FE) and BMO (FM) as representative and convenient materials to form our superlattices. Note that BFO thin films present a so-called G-AFM structure with nearest-neighboring spins lying anti-parallel to each other [5, 6]. Such an ordering is characterized by the  $\mathbf{q} = \pi/a(1, 1, 1)$  modulation vector, where  $a$  is the lattice parameter of the 5-atom pseudo-cubic perovskite cell. Hence, we build our SLs along the [111]<sub>pc</sub> pseudo-cubic direction ( $z$  in the following), and use for the simulations the basic cell shown in Fig. 1(b). Interestingly, it should be relatively easy to grow BFO:BMO SLs along [111]<sub>pc</sub>, since (1) a variety of BFO-BMO compounds have already been synthesized [30, 31], likely because BMO layers can adopt a  $R3c$ -like

structure [30] having a small lattice constant mismatch of 0.4% compared to the  $R3c$  state of pure BFO; (2)  $(111)_{pc}$ -oriented BFO thin films have also been successfully grown (on  $SrRuO_3$  substrate) [32, 33]; and (3) substrates different from  $SrRuO_3$  but still providing a moderate epitaxial strain can also stabilize the rhombohedral-like structure in the BFO:BMO SLs.

We first ran structural relaxations to investigate the basic features of these  $(111)_{pc}$ -oriented  $(BFO)_m:(BMO)_n$  SLs. For most of our exploratory simulations we considered  $(BFO)_3:(BMO)_3$  superlattice. In all our optimizations, we took as starting point the structure of BFO's  $R3c$  FE phase which displays a spontaneous polarization  $\mathbf{P}$  along one of the eight  $\langle 111 \rangle_{pc}$  directions. Because of the  $t_{2g}^3 e_g^1$  electronic configuration of  $Mn^{3+}$ , in relaxed SLs the oxygen octahedra containing  $Mn^{3+}$  cations are Jahn-Teller distorted, with a splitting between long, medium, and short O–Mn–O bonding distances that is characteristic of many manganese perovskite oxides. When constructing our SLs, we can choose the polar distortion to be parallel to the stacking direction  $z$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{P} \parallel \pm[111]_{pc}$ ) or to form a  $71^\circ$  (equivalently,  $109^\circ$ ) angle with it (i.e., we have the symmetry-related cases with  $\mathbf{P} \parallel \pm[\bar{1}11]_{pc}$ ,  $\mathbf{P} \parallel \pm[1\bar{1}1]_{pc}$  or  $\mathbf{P} \parallel \pm[11\bar{1}]_{pc}$ ). We considered representative cases for both alternatives, and observed the following common ferroelectric features.

All considered SLs are insulating, with the BMO layers adopting a FE distortion that closely resembles that of BFO. Note that BMO layers could become paraelectric (i.e., adopt a structure similar to the  $C2/c$  space group of bulk BMO) when they are very thick; this is why here we work with relatively thin BMO layers. We can estimate the polarization from the atomic structural distortions and corresponding Born charges. For the SL with  $\mathbf{P} \parallel z$  we got  $0.58 \text{ C/m}^2$ , to be compared with the value of  $0.63 \text{ C/m}^2$  obtained for bulk BFO within the same approximation. (Note that the Berry phase result for BFO is  $0.91 \text{ C/m}^2$ , which suggests that our approximate and computationally convenient scheme to estimate  $\mathbf{P}$  tends to render relatively small values.) We can further estimate the polarization of the different layers. For the  $\mathbf{P} \parallel z$  case we get  $0.61 \text{ C/m}^2$  for BFO and  $0.55 \text{ C/m}^2$  for BMO, which is indicative of a rather homogeneous polar distortion. As regards the SLs with  $\mathbf{P}$  oblique to  $z$ , we get an in-plane polarization of  $0.56 \text{ C/m}^2$  ( $0.59 \text{ C/m}^2$  and  $0.54 \text{ C/m}^2$  for BFO and BMO layers, respectively) and an out-of-plane component of  $0.21 \text{ C/m}^2$  ( $0.20 \text{ C/m}^2$  for BFO and  $0.22 \text{ C/m}^2$  for BMO). Further, for thick enough BFO layers we can expect the BFO:BMO SLs to have a high FE Curie temperature approaching that of BFO.

Our calculations indicate that it is energetically favorable for the polar distortion to have an in-plane component and, thus, form an oblique angle with  $z$ . The computed energy splitting between the oblique-to- $z$  and parallel-to- $z$  cases is  $8.4 \text{ meV}$  per 5-atom cell for the 3:3 SL. Hence, in the following we will give quantitative results for this energetically preferred situation.




FIG. 2. Magnetic exchange constants  $J_{ij}$  as a function of the  $n/m$  ratio for the  $(BFO)_m:(BMO)_n$  and  $(BFO)_{m1}:(BMO)_{n1}:(BFO)_{m2}:(BMO)_{n2}$  (with  $n1 + n2 = n$  and  $m1 + m2 = m$ ) superlattices having an electrical polarization pointing along (a) the  $[11\bar{1}]$  pseudo-cubic direction and (b) the  $[111]$  pseudo-cubic direction. The exchange constant in BFO bulk (in its  $R3c$  ground state) and in BMO bulk (both in the  $C2/c$  and  $Cc$  states) are also displayed by means of solid horizontal lines, for comparison.

## B. Tunable magnetic behavior

To investigate the magnetic interactions in our SLs, we assumed a simple spin Hamiltonian of the form

$$E - E_0 = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j, \quad (1)$$

where  $E_0$  is a reference energy,  $i$  and  $j$  label 5-atom cells, the sum is restricted to first-nearest-neighboring cells, and  $N$  is the number of cells in a periodically repeated supercell. For simplicity, we assume classical spins and take  $|\mathbf{S}_i| = 1$  for the calculation of the exchange constants. [Nominally, the  $Fe^{3+}$  cations have a magnetic moment of 5 Bohr magnetons ( $\mu_B$ ) associated with them, while the  $Mn^{3+}$  cations present  $4 \mu_B$ .] In the SLs, the Mn–Mn interactions within the BMO layers are FM in character. The Fe–Fe interactions within the BFO layers are AFM in character. The Mn–Fe interactions at the interface are AFM in character. By computing the energies of different spin arrangements, using our DFT+U scheme, the exchange constants can be obtained [14].

The computed exchange constants between first-nearest-neighboring magnetic atoms in  $(BFO)_3:(BMO)_3$  SL are  $J_{FeFe} = 44.2 \text{ meV}$ ,  $J_{MnMn} = -20.0 \text{ meV}$ , and  $J_{FeMn} = 20.1 \text{ meV}$ . We computed the analogous magnetic couplings for other  $(BFO)_m:(BMO)_n$  ( $m:n$ ) systems. As shown in Fig. 2,  $J_{FeFe}$ ,  $J_{MnMn}$ , and  $J_{FeMn}$  for different SLs have very similar values. One can see that the  $J_{FeFe}$  exchange constant in the SLs is very close to

the corresponding one in BFO bulk (46.2 meV), while  $J_{MnMn}$  in SLs is slightly higher in magnitude than that in BMO bulk with  $C2c$  symmetry ( $-16$  meV) and  $Cc$  symmetry ( $-16.6$  meV, obtained using a BFO-like structure that is Jahn-Teller distorted). And we also calculated the Mn-Fe coupling in a hypothetical  $\text{Bi}_2\text{FeMnO}_6$  double perovskite with a BFO-like structure, its  $J_{\text{FeMn}}$  8.5 meV. Hence, we will use a fixed set of exchange interactions between first-neighboring pairs to investigate  $(\text{BFO})_m:(\text{BMO})_n$  SLs with arbitrary  $m:n$  stacking in our text. Using magnetic exchange constants  $J_{ij}$  calculated from DFT+ $U$  scheme, we constructed spin Hamiltonians for a set of  $(\text{BFO})_m:(\text{BMO})_n$  SLs with various  $m:n$  thicknesses and solved them by means of Monte Carlo (MC) simulations [34].

Figure 3(a) shows the obtained results of magnetic ordering transition temperature ( $T_t$ ), which evidence two clear trends. First, the thickness of the BFO layers is the main factor controlling  $T_t$ , which ranges from about 350 K for  $m = 3$  to values approaching the transition temperature of bulk BFO (643 K) for large  $m$ . Second, for a given value of  $m$ , the transition temperature increases as the thickness of the BMO layers  $n$  decreases. This is a rather natural result given that the Mn cations have relatively weak exchange couplings associated to them, and their presence results in an effective reduction of the dimensionality of the spin order within the BFO layers. It is worth noticing that  $T_t$  of all the superlattices is largely enhanced with respect to the Curie temperature of BMO bulk ( $T_C = 105$  K). In particular, this transition temperature is above room-temperature for superlattices with  $m > 1$ .

Figure 3(b) shows the magnetization of these SLs,  $M(T)$ , as computed at 200 K, 250 K, and 300 K ( $T_{\text{room}}$ ), one of the key quantities we would like to optimize. As in the case of  $T_t$ , the results are strongly SL dependent, and some general trends can be observed. For example, the largest  $M$  values at the lowest  $T$  shown (200 K) correspond to the SLs with thickest BMO layers (see results for  $n/m > 1.25$ ). In such cases we obtain  $M(200 \text{ K}) \approx 0.4 \mu_B$  per transition metal atom ( $\mu_B/\text{tma}$  in the following), which is about 40 times of BFO thin film; unfortunately, the magnetization decays very rapidly when we approach  $T_{\text{room}}$ , reaching values of about  $0.02 \mu_B/\text{tma}$  that are comparable to the magnitude of the canted moment in BFO thin films [5–7]. In contrast, we find cases in which  $M(T)$  is constant in the  $T$  range considered, presenting sizable values between  $\approx 0.1 \mu_B/\text{tma}$  and  $\approx 0.3 \mu_B/\text{tma}$  at  $T_{\text{room}}$ , which is about one order of magnitude larger than that of BFO films. Interestingly, these are cases in which the BMO layers are very thin, namely with  $n = 1$ . How can we explain these counterintuitive results, with the SLs with smallest fraction of FM material presenting the largest magnetizations at  $T_{\text{room}}$ ?

To get further insight into the magnetic behavior of our SLs, in Fig. 4 we plot the  $T$  dependence of the total magnetization  $M(T)$ , as well as the analogous results for the magnetization  $M_k(T)$  of the  $k$ -th  $(111)_{\text{pc}}$  plane along




FIG. 3. Panel (a): Computed magnetic ordering temperatures for the set of superlattices studied at the level of the spin model in Eq. (1). The results are ordered according to the ratio of  $n/m$  for each  $(\text{BFO})_m:(\text{BMO})_n$  SLs with  $m:n$  shown in the panel. Panel (b): Computed magnetization at three different temperatures, for the same superlattices as shown in panel (a). The horizontal dashed line in Panels (a) and (b) shows the Curie temperature of pure BMO bulk and the magnetization of BFO thin film, respectively, for comparison.

$z$ , for a few representative SLs. Many interesting features are obvious from these results: (1) In some cases, we have a non-monotonic behavior of  $M(T)$ , which becomes non-zero at  $T_t$  and changes sign as we further cool down (see, e.g., the 3:2 case). (2) The alternating positive and negative values of  $M_k$  inside the BFO layers reflect the G-AFM order. (3) The BMO layers present a FM order, with a magnetization that aligns anti-parallel to the magnetization of the boundary planes of the BFO layer. (4) The onset of magnetic order at  $T_t$  is dominated by the planes at the core of the BFO layers; in contrast, the magnetic order in the interfacial BFO planes is comparatively weak (see, e.g., the 5:5 case in Fig. 4d). (5) At  $T_t$ , when the BFO layers order, the interfacial BMO planes present a non-zero magnetization as well. For the SLs with very thin BMO layers (e.g., see the 3:1 and 3:2 cases in Fig. 4), the magnetization of the BMO planes displays a temperature dependence that closely resembles the one observed for the BFO planes, and we can






FIG. 4. Computed temperature dependence of the total (solid line, using the left axis) and plane-resolved (symbols, using the right axis) magnetizations, for a number of representative superlattices. The filled and open symbols refer to BFO and BMO layers, respectively. For each symbol line we indicate the corresponding layer number.

say that the SL transforms at  $T_t$  as a whole. In contrast, for thicker BMO layers (e.g., the 5:5 case in Fig. 4d), the magnetization of the interfacial BMO planes displays a behavior below  $T_t$  that is nearly linear and qualitatively different from that of the BFO planes. This order is merely caused by the interfacial exchange-bias field, and is not accompanied by a transformation in the bulk of the BMO layer. In fact, in such cases we find that the BMO layer undergoes a smooth FM transition (typical of a material under an applied field) at a second critical temperature  $T'_t$  that is about 200 K in the 5:5 case shown in Fig. 4d.

Let us now discuss the behavior of  $M(T)$ . Note that, for our SLs with odd  $m$ , the analytic solution for the ground state magnetization is

$$M(T \rightarrow 0 \text{ K}) = \frac{4n-5}{m+n} \mu_B/\text{tma}. \quad (2)$$

This implies that the low- $T$  magnetization of SLs with relatively thick BMO layers ( $n \geq 3$ ) will be clearly dominated by the contribution from the Mn cations. However,

the situation for such thick-BMO SLs is less clear as  $T$  increases. Note that, because the number of BFO planes  $m$  is odd in our SLs, the BFO layers present a non-zero net magnetization below  $T_t$ , as the G-AFM order is truncated in a way that does not allow for a perfect compensation. [These uncompensated iron spins result in the  $-5$  term in the numerator of Eq. (2).] For  $T$  close to  $T_t$ , when the order in the BFO layers is strong while the thick BMO layers remain essentially disordered, we find that  $M(T)$  is dominated by the BFO contribution. Hence, we naturally obtain the non-monotonic behavior for  $M(T)$  for the 5:5 and 3:3 cases shown in Fig. 4. Accordingly, we expect these SLs with thick BMO layers to present a strong  $T$  dependence of the magnetization; this is indeed what we find in the cases with large  $n/m$  ratio mentioned above in connection with the results in Fig. 3.

In contrast, Eq. (2) tells us that the situation for  $n = 1$  in  $(\text{BFO})_m:(\text{BMO})_n$  is very different, as in this case the ground-state magnetization is dominated by the BFO contribution. Hence, as shown in Fig. 3(a), we get a monotonic behavior for  $M(T)$ , which is weakly  $T$ -dependent except in the neighborhood of  $T_t$ . Note that the best performing SLs shown in Fig. 3(b), which display large  $M(T_{\text{room}})$  and nearly constant magnetization in the interval between 200 K and 300 K, correspond exactly to small  $n/m$  ratios with  $n = 1$ .

## IV. DISCUSSION

### A. Magnetoelectric effects

Because of their reduced symmetry, our SLs will most likely display a linear magnetoelectric (ME) response, of the type that is known to be very large for materials that are electrically or magnetically *soft*, i.e., that display large dielectric or magnetic susceptibilities [35–37]. In this sense, note that our SLs offer the ideal conditions to enhance such a softness, e.g. by changing the  $n/m$  ratio to control the magnetic and FE ordering temperatures.

Furthermore, our BFO:BMO SLs should allow us to obtain a large ME effect associated to the switching between equivalent FE states. As mentioned above, the ground state of our SLs corresponds to having a polarization  $\mathbf{P}$  oblique to the growth direction  $z$ , with six symmetry-equivalent variants being accessible in principle, as shown in Fig. 4a. Moreover,  $\mathbf{P}$  can lie (anti-)parallel to three distinct crystallographic axes, given by  $[\bar{1}11]_{\text{pc}}$ ,  $[1\bar{1}1]_{\text{pc}}$ , and  $[11\bar{1}]_{\text{pc}}$ . From previous studies of BFO's MEM phase, we know that the G-AFM order parameter lies in a plane perpendicular to the polarization direction (see Fig. 4b-d), and such a plane changes when an electric field is used to make  $\mathbf{P}$  switch between equivalent polar states [7, 38, 39]. In our SLs, the polarization should be easily switchable by  $109^\circ$  between the three oblique states associated with orange (or purple) colored arrows in Fig. 4a by *in-plane* electric-fields using planar electrodes as in Ref. [40]. On the other hand, a switch be-




FIG. 5. (a) Schematic representation of the possible polarization orientations for a perovskite superlattice grown along the  $[111]_{pc}$  direction. The oblique polarization directions are colored purple or orange, respectively, depending on whether they point *up* (i.e., positive projection along  $[111]_{pc}$ ) or *down* (i.e., positive projection along  $[\bar{1}\bar{1}\bar{1}]_{pc}$ ). (b), (c), and (d) Schematic diagram of the easy magnetic plane for the state with a polarization oriented along  $\pm[111]_{pc}$ ,  $\pm[\bar{1}\bar{1}\bar{1}]_{pc}$ , and  $\pm[11\bar{1}]_{pc}$ , respectively.

tween any of the three “orange states” to any of the three “purple states”, or *vice-versa*, would likely require the combination of out-of-plane and in-plane electric fields via the use of both perpendicular and planar electrodes. Analogous electric-field-driven switch between oblique- $\mathbf{P}$  states would automatically result in a different orientation of  $M(T)$ , as shown in Figs. 4b-d. Our best SLs would thus provide us with a  $T_{room}$  magnetization of up to  $0.3 \mu_B/tma$  (more than 10 times larger than that of BFO thin films) whose direction is also controllable with an applied electric field.

### B. Connections with prior proposals

Interestingly, our solutions with  $n = 1$  are reminiscent of a decade-old idea to obtain optimum MEM materials, namely, to consider rock salt-ordered double perovskites (like  $Bi_2FeCrO_6$  in the original work of Baettig and Spaldin[16]) in which the AFM interaction between the first-nearest-neighboring magnetic cations (Fe and Cr in Ref. 16) would lead to a *ferrimagnetic* configuration with a sizable magnetic moment. Unfortunately, such double perovskites tend to display relatively weak magnetic interactions, which renders an ordering temperature below  $T_{room}$  and makes them impractical for applications. In our case, our SLs correspond to the double-perovskite order for  $m = n = 1$ , for which we obtain  $T_t = 210$  K. In a sense, the identified optimum SLs with  $n = 1$  can be viewed as displaying a quasi-ferrimagnetic spin arrangement, as incomplete compensation is the origin of their net magnetization. However, in our case, by increasing  $m$  with respect to the  $m = n = 1$  double-perovskite limit, we achieve a transition temperature above  $T_{room}$ .

### C. Possible improvements

Let us now discuss how variations in the behavior of the FM layer, and the interfacial coupling, may affect the performance of our SLs at room temperature. For example, let us artificially increase the  $J_{MnMn}$  exchange constant so that  $T_C^{bulk}$  of the FM layer becomes 275 K. In that case, we obtain an enhanced  $M(T_{room})$  of  $0.50 \mu_B/tma$  for the 3:3 case and  $0.71 \mu_B/tma$  for the 5:5 case. Alternatively, if we vary the  $J_{MnMn}$  exchange constant so that it has the same magnitude as the one computed but the opposite sign (i.e., rendering a FM coupling between layers), we obtain a large  $M(T_{room})$  values of  $1.24 \mu_B/tma$  for the 3:1 case,  $0.93 \mu_B/tma$  for the 3:3 case, and  $0.63 \mu_B/tma$  for the 5:5 case. Hence, we find that suitable replacements for BMO in the considered SLs may dramatically increase the values of  $M(T_{room})$ . Examples of such replacement may be  $La_2MnNiO_6$  ( $T_C = 275$  K)[11, 12], and  $Bi_2NiReO_6$  ( $T_C = 360$  K)[15].

## V. CONCLUSIONS

Our results show that our design concept works: We studied  $BiFeO_3:BiMnO_3$  bicolor superlattices in which, by taking advantage of the strong AFM interactions of  $BiFeO_3$ , we are able to obtain an ideal MEM material that (1) presents robust and large ME effects at room temperature and (2) offers great freedom to tune its properties to address specific needs. Our results also suggest there is room for further improvement. For example, if we were able to replace  $BiMnO_3$  by a compound with a higher Curie temperature, or presenting a FM interfacial interaction with  $BiFeO_3$ , the values of  $M(T_{room})$  might drastically increase. We thus hope our results will encourage experimental work on the investigated superlattices and other nanostructures realizing the same design concept, which appears as a promising path to achieving

technologically-relevant multiferroics.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank ONR Grants No. N00014-11-1-0384 and No. N00014-12-1-1034, and Office of Basic Energy Sci-

ences under contract ER-46612 for personnel support. ARO Grant No. W911NF-12-1-0085 and NSF Grant No. DMR-1066158 are also acknowledged for discussions with scientists sponsored by these grants. J.Í. got financial support from MINECO-Spain (Grants No. MAT2013-40581-P).

- 
- [1] N. A. Hill, J. Phys. Chem. B **104**, 6694 (2000).
  - [2] A. Filippetti and N. A. Hill, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 195120 (2002).
  - [3] S. Bhattacharjee, E. Bousquet, and P. Ghosez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 117602 (2009).
  - [4] G. Catalan and J. F. Scott, Adv. Mater. **21**, 2463 (2009).
  - [5] F. Bai, J. Wang, M. Wuttig, J. Li, N. Wang, A. P. Pyatakov, A. K. Zvezdin, L. E. Cross, and D. Viehland, Appl. Phys. Lett. **86**, 032511 (2005).
  - [6] H. Béa, M. Bibes, A. Barthélémy, K. Bouzehouane, E. Jacquet, A. Khodan, J.-P. Contour, S. Fusil, F. Wyczisk, A. Forget, D. Lebeugle, D. Colson, and M. Viret, Appl. Phys. Lett. **87**, 072508 (2005).
  - [7] D. Albrecht, S. Lisenkov, W. Ren, D. Rahmedov, I. A. Kornev, and L. Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 140401 (2010).
  - [8] I. Sosnowska, T. P. Neumaier, and E. Steichele, J. Phys. C **15**, 4835 (1982).
  - [9] J. Goodenough, *Magnetism and the chemical bond*, Interscience monographs on chemistry: Inorganic chemistry section (Interscience Publishers, 1963).
  - [10] A. M. D. Santos, S. Parashar, A. Raju, Y. Zhao, A. Cheetham, and C. Rao, Solid State Commun. **122**, 49 (2002).
  - [11] N. Y. Vasanthacharya, P. Ganguly, J. B. Goodenough, and C. N. R. Rao, J. Phys. C **17**, 2745 (1984).
  - [12] R. I. Dass, J.-Q. Yan, and J. B. Goodenough, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 064415 (2003).
  - [13] A. A. Belik, S. Iikubo, T. Yokosawa, K. Kodama, N. Igawa, S. Shamoto, M. Azuma, M. Takano, K. Kimoto, Y. Matsui, and E. Takayama-Muromachi, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **129**, 971 (2007).
  - [14] H. J. Zhao, W. Ren, Y. Yang, J. Íñiguez, X. M. Chen, and L. Bellaiche, Nat. Commun. **5**, 4021 (2014).
  - [15] M. Ležaić and N. A. Spaldin, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 024410 (2011).
  - [16] P. Baettig and N. A. Spaldin, Appl. Phys. Lett. **86**, 012505 (2005).
  - [17] V. Laukhin, V. Skumryev, X. Martí, D. Hrabovsky, F. Sánchez, M. V. Garcia-Cuenca, C. Ferrater, M. Varela, U. Lüders, J. F. Bobo, and J. Fontcuberta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 227201 (2006).
  - [18] Y.-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, Nat. Mater. **7**, 478 (2008).
  - [19] S. M. Wu, S. A. Cybart, P. Yu, M. D. Rossell, J. X. Zhang, R. Ramesh, and R. C. Dynes, Nat. Mater. **9**, 756 (2010).
  - [20] U. Gradmann, J. Mag. Mag. Mater. **6**, 173 (1977).
  - [21] K. Lenz, S. Zander, and W. Kuch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 237201 (2007).
  - [22] D. G. Schlom, L.-Q. Chen, C.-B. Eom, K. M. Rabe, S. K. Streiffer, and J.-M. Triscone, Annu. Rev. Mater. Res **37**, 589 (2007).
  - [23] M. Stengel and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 241103 (2009).
  - [24] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 11169 (1996).
  - [25] G. Kresse and D. Joubert, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 1758 (1999).
  - [26] S. L. Dudarev, G. A. Botton, S. Y. Savrasov, C. J. Humphreys, and A. P. Sutton, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 1505 (1998).
  - [27] I. A. Kornev, S. Lisenkov, R. Haumont, B. Dkhil, and L. Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 227602 (2007).
  - [28] L. Pálová, P. Chandra, and K. M. Rabe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 037202 (2010).
  - [29] P. E. Blöchl, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 17953 (1994).
  - [30] L. Pálová, P. Chandra, and K. M. Rabe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 037202 (2010).
  - [31] A. Chen, H. Zhou, Z. Bi, Y. Zhu, Z. Luo, A. Bayraktaroglu, J. Phillips, E.-M. Choi, J. L. MacManus-Driscoll, S. J. Pennycook, J. Narayan, Q. Jia, X. Zhang, and H. Wang, Adv. Mater. **25**, 1028 (2013).
  - [32] S. Kyun Lee, B. Ho Choi, and D. Hesse, Appl. Phys. Lett. **102**, 242906 (2013).
  - [33] K. Ujimoto, T. Yoshimura, A. Ashida, and N. Fujimura, Appl. Phys. Lett. **100**, 102901 (2012).
  - [34] The so-called DFT+*U* scheme used in this work[26] is reliable to describe magnetism in these insulating oxides at a qualitative level, but is also known to produce *J*'s that fail to reproduce the experimental transition temperatures with quantitative accuracy. To remedy this problem, we rescaled the *J*'s mentioned above following an approach that has proved very successful before.[14] Thus, for example, we considered bulk BFO and, by comparing our computed  $T_N$  with the experimental value, deduced a suitable rescaling factor for  $J_{\text{FeFe}}$  (0.82 in this case); by applying such a rescaling factor to the exchange constant computed for our SLs, we got a value of  $J_{\text{FeFe}} = 38$  meV, which we then used in the MC simulations. Analogously, we studied BMO's bulk phase and deduced a rescaling factor (0.385) that leads to the value of  $J_{\text{MnMn}} = -6$  meV used in our MC simulations for the SLs. As for the Mn-Fe coupling, we used an average rescaling factor to obtain  $J_{\text{FeMn}} = 11.4$  meV.
  - [35] J. C. Wojdel and J. Íñiguez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 267205 (2009).
  - [36] J. C. Wojdel and J. Íñiguez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 037208 (2010).
  - [37] S. Prosandeev, I. A. Kornev, and L. Bellaiche, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 020102 (2011).
  - [38] D. Lebeugle, D. Colson, A. Forget, M. Viret, A. M. Bataille, and A. Gukasov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 227602 (2008).



- (2008).
- [39] C. Ederer and N. A. Spaldin, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 060401 (2005).
- [40] Z. Chen, X. Zou, W. Ren, L. You, C. Huang, Y. Yang, P. Yang, J. Wang, T. Sritharan, L. Bellaiche, and L. Chen, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 235125 (2012).