



CHORUS

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

Phenomenological theory of magnetoelectric coupling in granular multiferroics

O. G. Udalov, N. M. Chtchelkatchev, and I. S. Beloborodov

Phys. Rev. B **92**, 045406 — Published 6 July 2015

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.92.045406](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.92.045406)

Phenomenological theory of magneto-electric coupling in granular multiferroics

O. G. Udalov,^{1,2} N. M. Chtchelkatchev,^{1,3,4} and I. S. Beloborodov¹

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, California State University Northridge, Northridge, CA 91330, USA*

²*Institute for Physics of Microstructures, Russian Academy of Science, Nizhny Novgorod, 603950, Russia*

³*L.D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 117940 Moscow, Russia*

⁴*Department of Theoretical Physics, Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, 141700 Moscow, Russia*

(Dated: June 22, 2015)

We study coupling between the ferroelectric polarization and magnetization of granular ferromagnetic film using a phenomenological model of combined multiferroic system consisting of granular ferromagnetic film placed above the ferroelectric (FE) layer. The coupling is due to screening of Coulomb interaction in the granular film by the FE layer. Below the FE Curie temperature the magnetization has hysteresis as a function of electric field. Below the magnetic ordering temperature the polarization has hysteresis as a function of magnetic field. We study the magneto-electric coupling for weak and strong spatial dispersion of the FE layer. The effect of mutual influence decreases with increasing the spatial dispersion of the FE layer. For weak dispersion the strongest coupling occurs in the vicinity of the ferroelectric-paraelectric phase transition. For strong dispersion the situation is the opposite. We study the magneto-electric coupling as a function of distance between the FE layer and the granular film. For large distances the coupling decays exponentially due to the exponential decrease of electric field produced by the oscillating charges in the granular ferromagnetic film.

PACS numbers: 75.70.-i 68.65.-k 77.55.-g 77.55.Nv

I. INTRODUCTION

Currently the field of multiferroics and materials possessing magneto-electric effect is a very active area of research.¹⁻¹¹ It promises numerous applications, but provides much more fundamental challenges. Vast variety of different multiferroic materials are currently studied by many groups who are looking for strong magneto-electric (ME) coupling. Among them are single crystals possessing intrinsic ME coupling,^{12,13} and composite multiferroics consisting of ferroelectric (FE) and ferromagnetic (FM) layers.¹⁴⁻²³

There are several "classical" mechanisms of ME coupling. In a single crystal multiferroics the intrinsic ME coupling appears due to spin-orbit interaction which couples magnetic moments with orbital motions of electrons.^{12,13} Another mechanism involves the electrostriction effect combined with dependence of exchange interaction on the interatomic distance, the so-called "exchange striction".^{24,25} A different type of ME effect appears in crystals with magnetic spiral structures. In composite multiferroics consisting of two different materials: magnetic and ferroelectric, the ME coupling appears at the interface of the FE and FM phases.¹ Usually, the coupling is due to a combination of electro-striction and magneto-striction effects. The ME coupling also appears at the metal ferromagnet and insulator interface. In this system the electric field can induce a charge accumulation at the FM interface modifying the magnetic anisotropy at the surface.^{20,21} This effect also involves the spin-orbit interaction. Another type of combined multiferroics includes layer of multiferroic with antiferromagnetic ordering and ferromagnetic layer.^{7,8} In these materials the exchange bias is controlled by electric field.




FIG. 1. (Color online) Composite multiferroic - material consisting of granular ferromagnetic film placed at distance d above the FE layer (FE) of thickness h . Ferromagnetic film consists of ferromagnetic metallic particles (blue spheres) with finite magnetic moments (red arrows) embedded into an insulating matrix (I). FE layer has a polarization P along the z -axis.

Typical example of two component multiferroics is the granular multiferroics - materials consisting of magnetic particles embedded into FE matrix.²⁶⁻³¹ Recently, novel mechanism of ME coupling involving the interplay of the Coulomb blockade effects, intergrain exchange interaction and ferroelectric dielectric response was proposed for these materials^{32,33}. In contrast to the above "classical" ME coupling mechanisms this mechanism does not involve the spin-orbit interaction. Similar to the "exchange+striction" mechanism the influence of electric subsystem on the magnetic subsystem occurs through the control of the exchange interaction. However, the control

of the exchange interaction has nothing to do with striction and occurs due to Coulomb blockade which governs the overlap of electron wave functions.

This mechanism was studied using the microscopic theory. In particular, it was shown that the magnetization of granular multiferroics strongly depends on the FE state leading to the appearance of an additional magnetic phase transition in the vicinity of the FE Curie point and to the possibility of controlling the magnetic state of the system by an electric field.

In this paper we study the ME coupling mechanism in combined granular multiferroic - material consisting of granular ferromagnetic film (GFM) placed above the FE layer at distance d , see Fig. 1. In contrast to the previous works, here we use a phenomenological approach. This approach allows to account for i) the spatial dispersion of the FE layer and ii) the influence of magnetic subsystem on the FE polarization. Both these effects were not discussed before.

According to Ref. 32 the coupling between the GFM film and the FE layer occurs due to screening of Coulomb interaction in the GFM film by the FE layer. The screening was discussed assuming that the FE layer is a dielectric with a local response. In this case the ME effect has a peak in the vicinity of the FE Curie temperature. However, real FEs have domain walls of finite thickness increasing with approaching the paraelectric-ferroelectric phase transition. The FE layer can not effectively screen the electric field with characteristic spatial length being smaller than the thickness of the FE domain wall. The characteristic scale for the electric field produced by the GFM film is defined by the intergrain distance. For FE domain wall thickness exceeding this scale the coupling between the FE and the GFM layers is suppressed. This leads to the decrease of the ME effect in the vicinity of the paraelectric-ferroelectric phase transition, contrary to the local response case. Such a behavior was not discussed before since the ME effect in the GMF film was studied assuming the local response of the FE layer. In this paper we study the influence of the FE spatial dispersion on coupling between the FE layer and the GFM film.

We use a phenomenological approach to study the system with spatial dispersion. Usually the ME coupling effects are treated using terms proportional to the product of polarization and magnetization, $\sim \alpha_{me} P^n M^n$.²⁴ We describe our system using three phenomenological parameters: 1) the FE polarization, 2) the GFM film magnetization, and 3) the spatial oscillations of charge in the GFM. The later parameter is crucial for granular materials since these materials have complicated morphology leading to the inevitable formation of charge oscillations. We use the local quadrupole moment to describe the system since the average polarization and the average charge in the granular film is zero. The microscopic theory of ME coupling in GMF shows that the charge oscillations are responsible for this coupling, thus supporting the use of these three parameters.

Phenomenologically the influence of the FE subsystem on the magnetic subsystem is described by the term involving both polarization and magnetization in the total energy of the system.²⁴ This contribution leads to the inverse effect - the influence of magnetic subsystem on the FE subsystem. This effect will be discussed in the present paper.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we discuss the model for combined granular multiferroic system. Using this model we consider two cases of weak and strong spatial dispersion of the FE layer in Secs. III and IV, respectively. In Sec. V we discuss the phenomenological and microscopic approaches. Finally, we consider the validity of our approach in Sec. VI

II. THE MODEL

A. Discussion of ferroelectric substrate state

A uniformly polarized FE layer without domains can be observed between the metallic electrodes with applied bias. These electrodes screen the electric field — this is a well known paradigm verified in numerous experiments.

In our consideration the FE substrate is placed between the metallic electrode (below the FE substrate) and the granular film (above the FE layer). We assume that the granular film has small but finite conductivity leading to the equilibration of potential in the film. A certain potential U is maintained between the bottom electrode and the granular film. Therefore charges can flow from the bottom electrode to the granular film. The metal electrode and the granular film create an external electric field E_{ext} . In addition, the bound charges appear at the FE surface. These charges create a depolarizing field E_{dep} . The total field acting on the FE due to all these charges is $E_0 = E_{ext} + E_{dep}$. The charges on the bottom electrode and the granular film allow to screen the depolarizing field of the FE substrate surface charges. Thus, ferroelectricity with uniform polarization P_0 locally perpendicular to the film surface exists in the system. We will discuss the domain formation below.

In Ref. 34 it was shown that a granular film effectively screens the depolarizing field of the FE surface charges preventing the suppression of ferroelectricity. As demonstrated in Ref. 34 the Curie temperature of the FE layer decreases slightly in comparison with bulk FE. This may be related to the imperfect screening by the granular film. In Refs. 35 and 36 it was shown that even one layer of metallic grains effectively screens the electric field.

Here we note that besides the uniform charge distribution due to potential applied to the granular film there exist a random distribution of charges among the grains. These charges appear due to impurities and defects inevitably existing in granular system. Such charges produce random electric field acting on the FE substrate. This field, however can hardly be strong enough to induce the formation of FE domains. In equilibrium the

excess charge of the grain related to impurities or defects can hardly be larger than one elementary charge. The field produced by these charges is not strong enough to produce domains in the FE. Often, even ten elementary charges on a typical grain is hardly enough to overcome the typical FE switching field except the very special cases when, for example, the FE is somehow “diluted”.^{37,38}

Here we mostly consider the case with all grains having the same charge leading to uniformly polarized FE. In this case the average FE polarization is defined by the applied voltage and there are no domains in the FE substrate. However, our results can be also obtained under more general conditions, when in addition to the external field there is a random field of granular film acting on the FE. In this case our results remain qualitatively the same until the characteristic length of the random field exceeds the intergrain distance. We will discuss the influence of domains in the next subsection.

The electric charges in the granular film also appear in the vicinity of the grain boundaries. These charges appear due to extension of conduction electron wave functions beyond the grain boundaries. We consider these charges as a “regular” charges. On one hand, these charges provide the exchange interaction between grains, and on the another, they interact with FE substrate via Coulomb interaction. Namely, these charges are responsible for ME coupling in our consideration, see Figs. 2 and 3(b). Since the field of these “regular” charges plays the key role in coupling between the FE layer and the granular film we use letters E (field intensity) and D (field induction) to describe it. The total field in FE layer E_{tot} and D_{tot} can be written as follows $E_{\text{tot}} = E_0 + E$ and $D_{\text{tot}} = D_0 + D$. The field of “regular” charges is not strong enough to produce domains in the FE, but it leads to a weak variation of polarization in the substrate which can be considered as a linear perturbation on the uniform (polarization) background. This polarization correction is defined as $P^{(1)}$, therefore the local polarization at each point can be written as $P = P_0 + P^{(1)}$.

B. Importance of spatial dispersion

In contrast to previous consideration of the ME coupling in composite FE we take into account the spatial dispersion, when $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) = \int \chi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}'$. It plays a crucial role for the ME coupling in the system. The interaction between the granular film and the FE layer is due to Coulomb interaction. An inhomogeneous spatial distribution of “regular” charges in the granular film produces an inhomogeneous electric field inside the FE layer. This field has a zero average.

Figure 2 shows metallic grains producing an electric field $\mathbf{E}(z)$ inside the FE layer. This field is not strong enough to create domains in the FE (the field amplitude is essentially less than the FE switching field) and can

be considered as perturbation. The characteristic length scale of this field is the intergrain distance L . When the spatial dispersion is weak and the characteristic scale of the spatial dispersion l_{SD} (which is related to the FE domain wall thickness as $l_{\text{DW}} \sim l_{\text{SD}} \sqrt{\chi}$) is less than the intergrain distance, the polarization locally follows the electric field. Thus, the susceptibility of the FE substrate $\chi(k) \approx \chi(k=0) = \chi_0$ and for polarization one has

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{k}} \sim \chi_0 \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad (1)$$

see the second stripe (“No SP”). Here $P_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $E_{\mathbf{k}}$ are the spatial Fourier harmonics of the polarization and the electric field, respectively. Thus, in the absence of random electric field due to random impurities and defects the susceptibility depends only on the average polarization defined by the bias voltage. In this case χ is the same over the FE substrate. To summarize: In the absence of spatial dispersion the FE response is large and the interaction between the GFM and the substrate is strong.

A strong spatial dispersion, $l_{\text{SD}} \gg L$ ($|\mathbf{k}|l_{\text{SD}} \gg 1$), leads to the suppression of the FE response on the small scale variation of the electric field produced by grains. In this case one can not neglect the k -dependence of the susceptibility, $\chi(k)$. For large k , $k \rightarrow \infty$, the susceptibility $\chi(k) \rightarrow 0$. The leading contribution is quadratic in k due to symmetry reasons

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{k}} \sim \chi(k) \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad \chi(k) \sim \frac{\chi_0}{\mathbf{k}^2 l_{\text{DW}}^2}. \quad (2)$$

(third stripe in Fig. 2, “average SD”) This contribution leads to the suppression of interaction between the grains and the FE layer and thus to the suppression of the ME coupling. Finally, the response disappears for very strong dispersion (forth stripe in Fig. 2, “strong SD”).

The degree of spatial dispersion in the FE can be different. It depends on the ferroelectric material, temperature and other parameters. Below we investigate how the spatial dispersion influences the magneto-electric coupling in general case considering the limits of weak and strong spatial dispersions and justify the validity of Eq. (2).

We mention that above estimates are valid for random electric field, produced by the random charges and defects, being zero. For finite random field the dielectric susceptibility $\chi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ of the FE film depends slowly on the coordinate $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}')/2$. Thus, in Fourier space we have $\chi = \chi(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{R})$. This dependence appears since the local susceptibility depends on the local electric field acting on the FE. In this case we use an effective dielectric susceptibility averaged over the random field distribution. This effect changes the ME coupling dependence on the bias voltage, however it does not suppress it until the characteristic spatial scale of the random electric field exceeds the intergrain distance.




FIG. 2. (Color online) Metallic grains above the FE layer. Due to complicated morphology the inhomogeneous spatial charge distribution occurs in the array of grains. This charge distribution produces an electric field in the FE layer ($E(z)$). The FE response to this field strongly depends on the spatial dispersion strength in the FE. In the case of weak dispersion, when domain wall is less than the characteristic field scale, the response is strong (second stripe marked as “No SP”). In the opposite case, the response is suppressed (third stripe marked as “SP”).

C. System parameters

In this section we discuss the model of composite multiferroics — materials consisting of two thin layers: i) ferroelectric (FE) layer and ii) granular ferromagnetic film (GFM) made of ferromagnetic grains embedded into an insulating matrix, see Fig. 1. The grains have average radius a of few nm with the distance between grains being $1 - 2$ nm. The distance between the neighbouring grain centres is L_g . Each grain is characterized by large Curie temperature, much larger than all other characteristic energy scales in the problem. Therefore, each particle is in the FM state. Due to the interaction between particles the macroscopic FM state may occur in the GFM film for temperatures $T < T_C^{\text{FM}}$, where T_C^{FM} is the ferromagnetic ordering temperature.

There are three phenomenological parameters characterizing the system: 1) the coordinate dependent electric polarization of the FE layer, \mathbf{P} ; 2) the average magnetization of the GFM layer, \mathbf{M} ; 3) the spatial oscillations of electric charge in the GFM film appearing due to inhomogeneous distribution of metallic inclusions in the granular film, see Fig. 3.

A spatial charge distribution in the granular film has two components: 1) a uniform component. We assume that a voltage difference is maintained between a metal electrode at the bottom of the FE substrate and the granular film. The film has low but finite conductance, leading to the equilibration of potential in the film. A surface charge of the FE substrate is screened by the charges uniformly distributed among grains.

2) The second component of the spatial charge distribution is the inhomogeneous component. Below we will concentrate on this component since it is responsible for




FIG. 3. (Color online) (a) Lattice of metallic grains. The interparticle spacing has a small negative and grains have small positive charges due to electron tunneling between grains leading to the formation of quadrupole moments in the regions between grains. There are two types of quadrupoles, \hat{Q}_1 and \hat{Q}_2 . (b) Two magnetic grains. Electron wave functions (Ψ_1 and Ψ_2) extend beyond the grains and overlap in the region between the grains. ξ is the decay length of the electron wave functions. Quadrupole moment appears due to presence of electrons outside the grains. Exchange interaction between grains appears due to the overlap of electron wave functions.

coupling between magnetic moment of granular film and the FE layer. The electron wave functions extend beyond the metallic grains leading to the appearance of a non-zero local electric dipole moment. Opposite dipole moments of two neighbouring grains form a quadrupole moment between each pair of grains. Therefore the system is described by the ensemble of quadrupoles with moments \hat{Q}_i , see Fig. 3.

We mention that the importance of electron wave function extension beyond the metallic grains was understood in optics early. This is so-called “spill-out” effect. For example, due to this effect the plasmon frequency of the nanograin becomes sensitive to the spilled fraction of electrons: $\omega_{\text{pl}} = \omega_{\text{pl}}^{(0)}(1 - \delta N_e/2N_e)$, where δN_e is the spilled electron fraction, N_e is the number of electrons in the nanograin and $\omega_{\text{pl}}^{(0)}$ is the bulk material plasma frequency, see, e.g., Ref. 39.

Our system is characterized by several length scales.

The domain wall thickness L_p in the FE away from the transition point can be comparable with interatomic distance. In this case L_p is smaller than the intergrain distance L_g . Close to the transition point the situation is the opposite, $L_p > L_g$. The magnetic domain wall thickness L_m in the GFM film is much larger than the intergrain distance, $L_m > L_g$.

D. Free energy

The total free energy of the system consists of three contributions: 1) the energy of the FE layer, W^{FE} , 2) the energy of the GFM film, W^{GFM} , and 3) the interaction energy between two subsystems, W^{I} . Below we discuss each energy contribution in details.

1. Energy of granular ferromagnetic film, W^{GFM}

The free energy of GFM film, W^{GFM} has two contributions

$$W^{\text{GFM}} = W_m^{\text{GFM}} + W_c^{\text{GFM}}, \quad (3)$$

where W_m^{GFM} is the energy of magnetic subsystem⁴⁰

$$W_m^{\text{GFM}} = \alpha_M M^2 + \beta_M M^4 - (\mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{B}) + \delta_M (\nabla \mathbf{M})^2. \quad (4)$$

Here α_M , β_M , δ_M are some phenomenological constants and \mathbf{B} is the external magnetic field.

The second contribution, W_c^{GFM} in Eq. (3) is due to spatial charge oscillations. The simplest model of regular rectangular array of identical grains with the lattice parameter L_g is characterized by the regular array of quadrupoles \hat{Q}^i which can be characterized by magnitude $Q^i = Q_{xx}^i + Q_{yy}^i$. Below we consider a uniform spatial distribution of quadrupole moments and introduce a single parameter describing the system of quadrupoles, Q ($Q^i = Q$). There are two types of quadrupoles, \hat{Q}^1 and \hat{Q}^2 , see Fig. 3. These quadrupoles are transformable one into another using the rotation $\pi/2$ ($Q_{xx}^1 = Q_{yy}^2$, $Q_{yy}^1 = Q_{xx}^2$). Both quadrupoles have the same magnitude Q , however the electric field produced by these quadrupoles is different.

We define the electrical induction of electric field produced by quadrupole with unit moment ($Q = 1$) as $\mathbf{D}_i^q(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_i)$, where index i stands for quadrupole i , \mathbf{r}_i denotes the quadrupole position, and \mathbf{r} defines the observer position. Below we will omit vectors \mathbf{r}_i for simplicity keeping the index i only. There are two different spatial distributions of electric field \mathbf{D}_i^q corresponding to two types of quadrupoles. The total electric field produced by quadrupoles is $\mathbf{D} = Q \sum_i \mathbf{D}_i^q$.

The phenomenological parameter \hat{Q}_i is different from the polarization \mathbf{P} and magnetization \mathbf{M} since quadrupoles appear due to complex morphology and not due to a phase transition. In the absence of magnetization and ferroelectricity the quadrupoles are described by

the following free energy $W_c^0 = \alpha_Q (Q - Q_0)^2$, where Q_0 is the equilibrium magnitude of quadrupoles at a given temperature T and parameter α_Q depends on temperature.

Quadrupoles interact with each other via electric field. The energy density of this field is

$$W^{\text{E}} = \frac{Q^2}{8\pi\Omega_{\text{GFM}}} \sum_{i,j} \int d^3r \mathbf{D}_i^q(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{D}_j^q(\mathbf{r}), \quad (5)$$

where Ω_{GFM} is the volume of the GFM film. Without loss of generality we assume that beside the FE layer dielectric permittivity of all over space is approximately 1. The average electric field produced by the ensemble of quadrupoles is zero. Therefore the interference of the field \mathbf{E}_0 and the quadrupole field is negligible, $\int d^3r \mathbf{E}_0 \cdot \sum_i \mathbf{D}_i^q = 0$.

The spatial charge oscillations produce an additional contribution to the system Coulomb energy W^{GFM} . This contribution defines the coupling between quadrupoles and magnetic subsystem. The exchange interaction is the short range interaction. Thus we use the local coupling between parameter Q and magnetization M . Since Q is invariant with respect to the spatial inversion it enters linearly into the coupling term. Finally, we obtain the following result for the energy of quadrupoles

$$W_c^{\text{GFM}} = W_c^0 + W^{\text{E}} + \gamma(Q - Q_0)M^2, \quad (6)$$

where γ is a phenomenological parameter. The higher order terms, $\sigma^4 M^2$, $\sigma^2 M^4$, and $\sigma^4 M^4$ can be taken into account as well. For simplicity we consider only the lowest order coupling term between Q and M . The microscopic origin of this coupling is discussed in Sec. V.

2. Energy of ferroelectric layer, W^{FE}

We consider the case of isotropic FE. The typical example of isotropic FEs are organic ferroelectrics. Our theory can be easily generalized for anisotropic FE. We discuss this point in the Sec. VI. The free energy of the FE layer has the form,⁴¹⁻⁴⁴

$$W^{\text{FE}} = \alpha_P P^2 + \beta_P P^4 + \delta_P (\nabla \mathbf{P})^2 - (\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{E}_0). \quad (7)$$

Here α_P , δ_P and β_P are phenomenological constants and \mathbf{E}_0 is the homogeneous electric field produced by the bound FE charges, granular film and the bottom electrode. It is directed perpendicular to the FE layer (z -axis).

We notice that the charges inside the granular film responsible for the field \mathbf{E}_0 and quadrupoles in the GFM film have a different origin: the charges outside the GFM film are created by the voltage source leading to the fixed electric field \mathbf{E}_0 but not to the fixed electric induction \mathbf{D}_0 while the quadrupoles appear due to complex morphology producing a finite electric field induction \mathbf{D} rather than the electric field \mathbf{E} .

3. Interaction energy between two subsystems, W^I

The coupling between the FE layer and the GFM film occurs due to the interaction of electric field produced by quadrupoles in the GFM film with the FE layer

$$W^I = -\frac{Q}{2\Omega_{\text{GFM}}} \sum_i \int d^3r \mathbf{D}_i^q(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (8)$$

where the FE polarization has the form

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_0 + \mathbf{P}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{P}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (9)$$

Here \mathbf{P}_0 is the spontaneous (or external field induced) uniform polarization of the FE layer. It depends on the external field below and above the transition temperature T_{C}^{FE} . We assume that the electric field created by quadrupoles in the FE layer is weak. The terms $\mathbf{P}^{(1,2)}(\mathbf{r})$ in Eq. (9) are the linear and quadratic responses of the FE to the quadrupoles field \mathbf{D}

$$\mathbf{P}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = Q \sum_i \int_{\Omega_{\text{FE}}} d^3r' \hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \mathbf{D}_i^q(\mathbf{r}'), \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the linear response function of the FE layer to the electric induction. In general, $\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is a tensor depending on the polarization \mathbf{P}_0 , temperature, and electric field \mathbf{E}_0 . Inside the FE layer $\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ depends on both coordinates \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}' due to boundary conditions. In the bulk the susceptibility depends only on the coordinate difference $(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$.

The quadratic response in Eq. (9) has the form

$$\mathbf{P}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}) = Q^2 \sum_{i,j} \int_{\Omega_{\text{FE}}} d^3r' d^3r'' \hat{\chi}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}'') \mathbf{D}_i^q(\mathbf{r}') \mathbf{D}_j^q(\mathbf{r}''), \quad (11)$$

where $\hat{\chi}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}'')$ is the contribution to the susceptibility quadratic in the electric induction. Introducing Eq. (10) into Eq. (8) we find for the interaction energy

$$W^I = -\frac{Q^2}{2\Omega_{\text{GFM}}} \sum_{i,j} \int d^3r d^3r' \mathbf{D}_i^q(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \mathbf{D}_j^q(\mathbf{r}'). \quad (12)$$

The quadratic polarization $\mathbf{P}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r})$ does not contribute to the interaction energy W^I since it produces an odd-degree oscillating electric field \mathbf{D} .

4. Total energy of electric field

The total energy of electric field is given by the following expression

$$W^E + W^I = Q^2 R, \quad (13)$$

where we introduce the notation

$$R = \sum_{i,j} \int d^3r d^3r' \mathbf{D}_i^q(\mathbf{r}) \left(\frac{\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')}{8\pi\Omega_{\text{GFM}}} - \frac{\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')}{2\Omega_{\text{GFM}}} \right) \mathbf{D}_j^q(\mathbf{r}'). \quad (14)$$

The coefficient R depends on temperature T and the electric field \mathbf{E}_0 through the susceptibility $\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. In addition, the coefficient R also depends on the distance between the GFM film and the FE layer and on the FE thickness.

E. Variational procedure

Minimizing the total energy of the system in parameter Q we obtain the equation describing the magnitude of quadrupole

$$2\alpha_Q(Q - Q_0) + 2RQ + \gamma M^2 = 0. \quad (15)$$

This equation has the solution

$$Q = \frac{\alpha_Q Q_0 - \gamma M^2 / 2}{\alpha_Q + R}. \quad (16)$$

We notice that Q depends on both subsystems - the GFM film magnetization and the FE layer polarization through coefficient R leading to the coupling between the FE polarization P and the GFM magnetization M .

The equation describing the magnetization behaviour (up to linear in parameter γ terms) has the form

$$2\tilde{\alpha}_M \mathbf{M} + 4\beta_M M^2 \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{B}, \quad (17)$$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_M = \alpha_M - \gamma \frac{RQ_0}{\alpha_Q + R}.$$

The magnetization \mathbf{M} is parallel to the plane of the GFM film. The magnetic field existing at the film edges is negligible due to large area of the film. We assume that the magnetization \mathbf{M} in Eq. (17) is uniform because the domain wall thickness in the GFM film is much larger than the intergrain distance and the film thickness.

The coefficient $\tilde{\alpha}_M$ depends on the FE state through coefficient R and have some peculiarities in the vicinity of the FE Curie point due to singularities in the susceptibility $\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. Since the coefficient R depends on the field \mathbf{E}_0 one can control the magnetic state of the GFM film by the electric field. The influence of the GFM film on the FE layer is finite due to electric field created by quadrupoles.

III. FE WITHOUT SPATIAL DISPERSION

In the absence of spatial dispersion the FE susceptibility has the form

$$\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \hat{\chi} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'). \quad (18)$$

Substituting this result into Eq. (14) we find the following result for coefficient R

$$\begin{aligned}
R &= R_0 - \chi_{||} R_{||} - \chi_{\perp} R_{\perp}, \\
R_0 &= \frac{1}{8\pi\Omega_{\text{GFM}}} \sum_{i,j} \int d^3r \mathbf{D}_i^q(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{D}_j^q(\mathbf{r}), \\
R_{||} &= \frac{1}{2\Omega_{\text{GFM}}} \sum_{i,j} \int_{\Omega_{\text{FE}}} d^3r D_{i(\\|)}^q(\mathbf{r}) D_{j(\\|)}^q(\mathbf{r}), \\
R_{\perp} &= \frac{1}{2\Omega_{\text{GFM}}} \sum_{i,j} \int_{\Omega_{\text{FE}}} d^3r \mathbf{D}_{i(\perp)}^q(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{D}_{j(\perp)}^q(\mathbf{r}).
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

We assume that the FE layer has the anisotropy axis perpendicular to the layer surface. The quantities $\chi_{||}$ and χ_{\perp} describe the longitudinal and perpendicular susceptibility, respectively. The subscripts $||$ and \perp define the longitudinal and perpendicular components of electric induction.

To find the susceptibility in the absence of spatial dispersion we need to solve the following equation

$$2\alpha_P \mathbf{P} + 4\beta_P P^2 \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{E}_0 + \mathbf{E}, \tag{20}$$

which has the solution

$$\mathbf{P}^{(1)} = \hat{\chi} \mathbf{D}, \tag{21}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{||} &= (2(\alpha_P + 2\pi) + 12\beta_P P_0^2)^{-1}, \\
\chi_{\perp} &= (2(\alpha_P + 2\pi) + 4\beta_P P_0^2)^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

It follows from Eq. (22) that for zero field \mathbf{E}_0 the susceptibility $\hat{\chi} < 1/(4\pi)$.

A. Influence of FE layer on the GFM film

In this subsection we investigate the influence of FE layer on the magnetic subsystem. In the absence of spatial dispersion of the FE, Eq. (17) has the form

$$2(\alpha_M^* + \gamma_{\perp} \chi_{\perp} + \gamma_{||} \chi_{||}) \mathbf{M} + 4\beta_M M^2 \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{B}, \tag{23}$$

with the following coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_M^* &= \alpha_M - \gamma R_0 Q_0 / \alpha_Q, \\
\gamma_{\perp} &= \gamma R_{\perp} Q_0 / \alpha_Q, \\
\gamma_{||} &= \gamma R_{||} Q_0 / \alpha_Q.
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Equation (24) is valid for $R \ll \alpha_Q$ meaning that the interaction of the GFM with the FE layer leads to the renormalization of the constant α_M . Changing the FE susceptibility $\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ by the electric field one can change the FM ordering temperature. Since the susceptibility of FE has some peculiarity in the vicinity of the FE Curie point, the magnetic properties of the GFM film should also exhibit some peculiarities in the vicinity of the FE Curie point.




FIG. 4. (Color online) Magnetization M and magnetic susceptibility χ_M vs. temperature at zero magnetic and electric fields. Solid (blue) line corresponds to the absence of the FE layer. Dashed (red) line corresponds to negative parameter γ . Dash dotted (green) line corresponds to positive γ . T_C^{FE} and T_C^{FM} are the ordering temperatures of the FE layer and the GFM film in the absence of mutual interaction, respectively. (a) Limit of $T_C^{\text{FE}} < T_C^{\text{FM}}$. This limit corresponds to colemanite FE substrate and 45% of Ni granular film. (b) Limit of $T_C^{\text{FE}} > T_C^{\text{FM}}$. This limit corresponds to TTF-CA ferroelectric substrate and 48% of Ni granular film. The interaction of FE and GFM layers leads to the appearance of peculiarities of magnetization M (panel (a)) and susceptibility χ_M in the vicinity of the FE phase transition.

We assume that the coefficient $\alpha_M^* = \bar{\alpha}^{\text{FM}}(T - T_C^{\text{FM}})$ in Eq. (24) defines the position of superparamagnetic-ferromagnetic (SPM - FM) phase transition in the GFM film in the absence of the FE layer.

The temperature dependence of magnetization and magnetic susceptibility of GFM film at zero external magnetic field is shown in Fig. 4. Both limits of $T_C^{\text{FE}} > T_C^{\text{FM}}$ and $T_C^{\text{FE}} < T_C^{\text{FM}}$ are relevant since the ordering temperature of GFM can be rather large reaching the room temperature,^{45,46} and because the FE's with the Curie point below and above the room temperature exist,⁴⁷⁻⁵¹.

Figure 4(a) shows the case $T_C^{\text{FE}} < T_C^{\text{FM}}$, for substrate we choose a colemanite film^{50,51}. In contrast to BaTiO₂ ferroelectric, the colemanite has a rather small dielectric permittivity which is important for granular system since it prevents the total suppression of the Coulomb gap in the granular film. The behavior of colemanite thin films

is well described using Landau-Ginzburg-Devonshire theory. The FE Curie temperature is about $T_C^{\text{FE}} = 267$ K. We use experimental data of Ref. 51 on the temperature dependence of dielectric permittivity to estimate parameters $\tilde{\alpha}_P = 0.031 \text{ K}^{-1}$ ($\alpha_P = \tilde{\alpha}_P(T - T_C^{\text{FE}})$). To calculate $\tilde{\alpha}_P$ we estimate the slope of the FE inverse susceptibility.

For magnetic film we use *Ni* granular film.⁴⁵ At certain concentration of *Ni* (about 45%) the ordering temperature of this film is about $T_C^{\text{FM}} = 100$ K. Using the data of Ref. 45 we can estimate parameter $\alpha_M^* = 0.02 \cdot (T - T_C^{\text{FM}}) \text{ erg}/(\text{Oe}^{-2}\text{cm}^3)$. The parameter $\beta_M = 4 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ erg}/(\text{Oe}^{-4}\text{cm}^3)$ is not given in Ref. 45. We take this parameter assuming that the magnetization of granular film is several times smaller than magnetization of the bulk *Ni*; the parameter β_M does not influence the behavior of magnetization and susceptibility qualitatively.

Similarly Co-SiO₂ film can be used. It has similar magnetic parameters but at different metallic concentration.⁴⁶ In case of 23% Co-SiO₂ film $\alpha_M^* = 0.03 \cdot (T - T_C^{\text{FM}})$ with $T_C^{\text{FM}} = 93$ K. The parameter can be estimated using the data on magnetic susceptibility of Co-SiO₂ film.

To estimate the parameter γ we use an approach discuss in Sec. V. Figure 4(a) shows the case $\gamma_{||} = -24$ and $\gamma_{\perp} = -1.6$. We note that the large values of γ lead to small perturbation of magnetic properties since the function $\chi_{||,\perp}$ depends on the small parameter $1/(16\pi^2\chi_0^{\text{FE}})$, where χ_0^{FE} is the dielectric permittivity of the FE with respect to the electric field. It is related to the susceptibility χ with respect to the electric induction in the following way, $\chi = 1/(4\pi)(1 - 1/(4\pi\chi_0^{\text{FE}}))$. An estimate of parameter γ for particular FE and GFM gives negative coupling constant. We also show the case of positive $\gamma_{||,\perp}$ in Fig. 4(a) (dashed line). According to Sec. V, the constant γ may have values larger than it was used here. In this section we decrease parameter γ increasing the distance between the FE and GFM film.

Figure 4(b) shows the case $T_C^{\text{FM}} > T_C^{\text{FE}}$. This limit can be realized with TTF-CA ferroelectric, with a phase transition temperature $T_C^{\text{FE}} = 81$ K.⁵² This FE has a broader peak of dielectric permittivity in the vicinity of the FE phase transition leading to low parameter $\tilde{\alpha}_P = 0.001$. The parameter is estimated using the slope of the inverse susceptibility curve provided in Ref. 52. A large Curie constant leads to the disappearance of peculiarity in the magnetization versus temperature in the vicinity of T_C^{FE} , however it still leads to an essential shift of the magnetic ordering temperature. In this case we use *Ni* granular film with *Ni* concentration of 49%, leading to $T_C^{\text{FM}} = 200$ K. The parameters $\gamma_{||,\perp}$ are equal to -4 and -0.8 , respectively.

The interaction of FE and GFM layers leads to two effects: 1) The shift of the GFM film ordering temperature which can be estimated as follows

$$\Delta T = -\frac{\gamma_{||}\chi_{||} + \gamma_{\perp}\chi_{\perp}}{\tilde{\alpha}_{\text{FM}}}, \quad (25)$$

where $\chi_{||,\perp}$ is taken in the vicinity of the transition temperature T_C^{FM} . The shift direction depends on the sign of interaction.




FIG. 5. (Color online) Magnetization M (solid blue line) and magnetic susceptibility χ_M (dashed red line) vs temperature at zero magnetic and electric fields and strong coupling between charge fluctuations and magnetization. Here $T_C^{\text{FE}} < T_C^{\text{FM}}$, this limit corresponds to colemanite FE substrate and 45% of *Ni* granular film. Two additional phase transitions occur in the vicinity of the FE phase transition.

2) The peculiarity of magnetization and magnetic susceptibility in the vicinity of the FE phase transition. The maximum deviation of magnetic susceptibility occurs at the FE phase transition point. For $T_C^{\text{FE}} > T_C^{\text{FM}}$ it has the form

$$\Delta\chi_M = -\frac{\gamma_{||}\chi_{||} + \gamma_{\perp}\chi_{\perp}}{2(\tilde{\alpha}_{\text{FM}}(T_C^{\text{FE}} - T_C^{\text{FM}}))^2}. \quad (26)$$

For temperatures $T_C^{\text{FM}} < T_C^{\text{FE}}$ the correction is twice smaller. The change of magnetization at the FE Curie point is

$$\Delta(M^2) = -\frac{\gamma_{||}\chi_{||} + \gamma_{\perp}\chi_{\perp}}{2\beta_M^*}. \quad (27)$$

We notice that even at the point of the FE-paraelectric phase transition the susceptibility $\hat{\chi}$ is finite supporting the assumption of weak spatial dispersion.

For large values of parameters γ and $R_{||,\perp}$ the additional phase transitions may occur in the vicinity of the FE phase transition, see Fig. 5. The curves in Fig. 5 show the ME effect discussed in Ref. 32 and 33 using the microscopic theory. These curves are plotted for the same parameters as in Fig. 4(a), except $\gamma_{||} = -41$ and $\gamma_{\perp} = -2$.

The dielectric susceptibility $\hat{\chi}$ depends on the electric field E_0 . Therefore magnetic properties of the GFM film also depend on the electric field. Figure 6 shows the GFM magnetization vs. electric field E_0 at zero applied magnetic field. Figures 6(a) and (b) correspond to the different strength of magneto-electric coupling. Both figures are plotted for 47% *Ni* GFM placed above the colemanite FE substrate. The upper panel shows the case of weak interaction with parameters $\gamma_{||} = -24$ and $\gamma_{\perp} = -1.6$ and temperature $T = 80$ K. At this temperature the GFM film is in the ferromagnetic state. Applying electric field we change the dielectric permittivity of the FE substrate




FIG. 6. (Color online)(a) Magnetization M vs electric field E_0 at zero magnetic field for colemanite FE and 47% of Ni GFM ($T_C^{\text{FE}} > T_C^{\text{FM}}$). Solid (blue) and dashed (blue) lines show magnetization at finite interaction between the FE layer and the GFM film. Dotted (red) line describes the non-interacting case. Figure (a) corresponds to the case of weak magneto-electric coupling with parameters $\gamma_{||,\perp}$ being -24 and -1.6, respectively. Temperature $T = 80$ K. Inset: dependence of χ_{\perp} and $\chi_{||}$ on electric field E_0 . E_s is the FE polarization switching field. (b) The case of strong coupling with $\gamma_{||} = -41$, $\gamma_{\perp} = -1$, $T = 150$ K. Right inset: dependence of χ_{\perp} and $\chi_{||}$ on electric field E_0 . E_s is the FE polarization switching field, E_m is the electric field at which the magnetic phase transition occurs in the system. Left inset: magnetic susceptibility vs. electrical field.

leading to the strong dependence of magnetization on the electric field. The dependence shows a hysteresis behavior similar to the dielectric permittivity field dependence.

Figures 6(b) shows the case of strong interaction, here parameters $\gamma_{||} = -41$, $\gamma_{\perp} = -1$ and temperature $T = 150$ K. In this case the magnetic phase transition is induced when a strong electric field $E_0 = \pm E_m$ is applied.

B. Influence of GFM film on the FE layer

In this subsection we investigate the influence of magnetic subsystem on the FE layer. The correction to the polarization P quadratic in the electric induction \mathbf{D} has the form

$$\mathbf{P}^{(2)} = -4\beta_P((\hat{\chi}\mathbf{D})^2\hat{\chi}\mathbf{P}_0 + 2(\mathbf{P}_0\hat{\chi}\mathbf{D})\hat{\chi}\hat{\chi}\mathbf{D}). \quad (28)$$

The correction $\mathbf{P}^{(2)}$ averaged over the FE volume is parallel to the polarization \mathbf{P}_0

$$\langle \mathbf{P}^{(2)} \rangle = 4Q^2\beta_P\mathbf{P}_0\chi_{\perp}(3(\chi_{\perp})^2R_{\perp}^* + (\chi_{||})^2R_{||}^*), \quad (29)$$

where $R_{\perp,||}^* = \Omega_{\text{GFM}}R_{\perp,||}/\Omega_{\text{FE}}$. Using Eq. (16) for parameter Q we find

$$\langle \mathbf{P}^{(2)} \rangle = \frac{4}{h} \left(Q_0^2 - \frac{\gamma M^2}{\alpha_Q} \right) \beta_P \mathbf{P}_0 \chi_{\perp} (3\chi_{\perp}^2 R_{\perp}^* + \chi_{||}^2 R_{||}^*). \quad (30)$$

For temperatures $T > T_C^{\text{FM}}$ the correction $\mathbf{P}^{(2)}$ in the presence of external magnetic field behaves as $\mathbf{P}^{(2)} \sim \chi_M^2 B_{\text{ext}}^2$, while for temperatures $T < T_C^{\text{FM}}$ it has a hysteresis dependence on the magnetic field, B_{ext} . As it is shown in Sec. V the correction to the polarization due to the influence of magnetic subsystem can be of the order of $10^{-3} - 10^{-2}$.

C. Dependence of Magneto-Electric coupling on the system parameters

We use the Ewald approach to calculate the electric field of two dimensional periodic lattice of quadrupoles.⁵³ The field produce by this lattice is periodic in the (x,y)-plane and decays along the z direction. The spatial Fourier harmonics of the field are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_{x,y}(\mathbf{k}_{\perp}, z) &= i\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} \frac{\pi}{L_g^2} (k_{x,y}) k_{\perp} E^{-k_{\perp}z} \times \\ &\times \left(\frac{2 \cos(2\phi_{\perp})}{\sqrt{6}} [Q_2^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_2^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_{\perp}\mathbf{s}}] + Q_0^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_0^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_{\perp}\mathbf{s}} \right), \\ E_z(\mathbf{k}_{\perp}, z) &= -\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} \frac{\pi}{L_g^2} k_{\perp}^2 E^{-k_{\perp}z} \times \\ &\times \left(\frac{2 \cos(2\phi_{\perp})}{\sqrt{6}} [Q_2^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_2^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_{\perp}\mathbf{s}}] + Q_0^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_0^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_{\perp}\mathbf{s}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $\mathbf{k}_{\perp} = (k_x, k_y, 0)$, $\phi_{\perp} = \arctan(k_x/k_y)$. The wave vector \mathbf{k}_{\perp} has the discrete values $\mathbf{k}_{\perp}^{n,m} = (2\pi n/L_g, 2\pi m/L_g, 0)$. There are two quadrupoles, \hat{Q}^1 and \hat{Q}^2 , in a unit cell. The vector \mathbf{s} defines the shift of these dipoles, $\mathbf{s} = (\pi/L_g, \pi/L_g, 0)$. The parameters $Q_i^{(2)}$ and $\tilde{Q}_i^{(2)}$ are related to Q as follows $Q_0^{(2)} = -Q$, $\tilde{Q}_0^{(2)} = -Q$, $Q_2^{(2)} = -3Q/(2\sqrt{6})$, $\tilde{Q}_2^{(2)} = 3Q/(2\sqrt{6})$.

The magnitude of spatial Fourier harmonic in Eq. (31) decreases exponentially with increasing the vector k_{\perp} . Therefore even for $z = L_g$ we can neglect all harmonics except the four harmonics nearest to zero, $(\pm 2\pi/L_g, 0, 0)$

and $(0, \pm 2\pi/L_g, 0)$. Using Eq. (31) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
E_x(\pm 2\pi/L_g, 0, z) &= \pm i \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} \frac{4\pi^3}{L_g^4} e^{-2\pi z/L_g} \times \\
&\times \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} \left[Q_2^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_2^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{s}} \right] + Q_0^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_0^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{s}} \right), \\
E_y(\pm 2\pi/L_g, 0, z) &= 0, \\
E_z(\pm 2\pi/L_g, 0, z) &= -\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} \frac{4\pi^3}{L_g^4} e^{-2\pi z/L_g} \times \\
&\times \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} \left[Q_2^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_2^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{s}} \right] + Q_0^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_0^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{s}} \right), \\
E_x(0, \pm 2\pi/L_g, z) &= 0, \\
E_y(0, \pm 2\pi/L_g, z) &= \pm i \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} \frac{4\pi^3}{L_g^4} e^{-2\pi z/L_g} \times \\
&\times \left(-\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} \left[Q_2^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_2^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{s}} \right] + Q_0^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_0^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{s}} \right), \\
E_z(0, \pm 2\pi/L_g, z) &= -\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{5}} \frac{4\pi^3}{L_g^4} e^{-2\pi z/L_g} \times \\
&\times \left(-\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} \left[Q_2^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_2^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{s}} \right] + Q_0^{(2)} + \tilde{Q}_0^{(2)} e^{i\mathbf{k}_\perp \cdot \mathbf{s}} \right). \tag{32}
\end{aligned}$$

The amplitude of electric field oscillations decays with distance as $e^{-2\pi z/L_g}$. The parameter R is averaged over the volume of the FE ($d < z < h + d$). Using Eq. (32) we find

$$R_{||,\perp} \sim e^{-4\pi d/L_g} \left(1 - e^{-4\pi h/L_g} \right). \tag{33}$$

The magneto-electric coupling exponentially decays with increasing the distance between the GFM film and the FE layer with the characteristic decay length being the intergrain distance, L_g .

The coefficients R saturates with increasing the FE thickness h due to the exponential decay of the electric field with distance d . The saturation occurs for thickness's h larger than the intergrain distance L_g leading to the weak influence of the GFM film on the FE layer.

IV. FE WITH STRONG SPATIAL DISPERSION

A. Influence of FE layer on the GFM film

The coupling between the FE layer and the GFM film depends on the parameter R , see Eq. (14). Above we discussed the case of FE without spatial dispersion meaning that the FE response $\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is local. In the opposite case, of strong spatial dispersion we can consider $\hat{\chi}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \text{const}$ being independent of coordinates. In

this case Eq. (14) has the form

$$R = R_0 - \left(\sum_i \int \mathbf{D}_i^q(\mathbf{r}) d^3r \right) \frac{\hat{\chi}}{2\Omega_{\text{GFM}}} \left(\sum_j \int \mathbf{D}_j^q(\mathbf{r}) d^3r \right). \tag{34}$$

The average field created by the ensemble of quadrupoles is zero. Therefore, for strong spatial dispersion the FE layer and the GFM film are decoupled since the parameter $R \rightarrow R_0$. Thus, below we consider the quantity R with large but finite spatial dispersion.

The linear response of the FE layer is described by the following equation

$$-\delta_{\text{P}} \Delta \mathbf{P}^{(1)} + \hat{\chi}^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{(1)} = \mathbf{D}. \tag{35}$$

This equation differs from Eq. (20) by the term with spatial derivatives responsible for dispersion. We use the following boundary condition for polarization, $(P^{(1)})'_z = 0|_{z=h, h+d}$, with h and $h + d$ being the boundary position of the FE layer,^{43,54,55}

It was shown in Sec. III C that the electric field \mathbf{D} produced by the lattice of quadrupoles is periodic in the (x, y) plane and decays in the z -direction. For distances $|z| > L_g$ away from the GFM film the field has (x, y) spatial Fourier harmonics with only $|\mathbf{k}_\perp| = 2\pi/L_g$ and the decay length $k_d = 2\pi/L_g$. Such a field can be considered as a wave with zero wavevector $|\mathbf{k}|^2 = |\mathbf{k}_\perp|^2 - k_d^2 = 0$. Therefore the partial solution of Eq. (35) has the form

$$\mathbf{P}_p^{(1)} = \hat{\chi} \mathbf{D}. \tag{36}$$

And the uniform solution has the form

$$\mathbf{P}_u^{(1)} = \mathbf{C}_1 e^{-\hat{\kappa} z} + \mathbf{C}_2 e^{\hat{\kappa} z}, \tag{37}$$

where the vectors \mathbf{C}_1 and \mathbf{C}_2 depend on the x and y coordinates similar to the electric field \mathbf{D} .

$$\hat{\kappa} = \sqrt{\mathbf{k}_\perp^2 + \hat{\chi}^{-1}/\delta_{\text{P}}}. \tag{38}$$

$\hat{\kappa}$ is the tensor. The appropriate components of tensor $\hat{\chi}^{-1}$ should be used for each vector component $\mathbf{C}_{1,2}$. Using the boundary conditions we find the coefficients $\mathbf{C}_{1,2}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{C}_1 &= \frac{k_\perp \hat{\chi} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}}{\hat{\kappa} (e^{\hat{\kappa} h} - e^{-\hat{\kappa} h})} e^{-k_\perp d - \hat{\kappa} d} (e^{-k_\perp h} - e^{-\hat{\kappa} h}), \\
\mathbf{C}_2 &= \frac{k_\perp \hat{\chi} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}}{\hat{\kappa} (e^{\hat{\kappa} h} - e^{-\hat{\kappa} h})} e^{-k_\perp d + \hat{\kappa} d} (e^{-k_\perp h} - e^{\hat{\kappa} h}).
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Here $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ is the part of vector \mathbf{D} which depends on the coordinates x and y only, $\tilde{\mathbf{D}} = e^{k_\perp z} \mathbf{D}$. For strong spatial dispersion and thick FE layer the linear polarization has the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}^{(1)} &= \mathbf{P}_p^{(1)} + \mathbf{P}_u^{(1)} = \frac{\mathbf{D}}{2\delta_{\text{P}} k_\perp^2} \times \\
&\times \left((z - d) k_\perp + 1 - \frac{3 + 3(z - d) k_\perp + (z - d)^2 k_\perp^2}{4\chi \delta_{\text{P}} k_\perp^2} \right). \tag{40}
\end{aligned}$$

The characteristic length scale for coefficients $R_{||,\perp}$ is the distance between two centres of neighbouring grains L_g since the electric induction \mathbf{D} in the FE layer decays exponentially. For estimates we use $z - d \approx L_g$ and $(z - d)k_{\perp} \approx 1$. Thus, we find for polarization

$$\mathbf{P}^{(1)} \approx \frac{\mathbf{D}}{\delta_P k_{\perp}^2} \left(1 - \frac{7}{8\hat{\chi}\delta_P k_{\perp}^2} \right). \quad (41)$$

Using Eq. (41) we calculate the coefficient R

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \tilde{R}_0 - \frac{\tilde{R}_{||}}{\chi_{||}} - \frac{\tilde{R}_{\perp}}{\chi_{\perp}}, \\ \tilde{R}_0 &= R_0 \left(1 + \frac{L_g^2}{\delta_P 4\pi^2} \right), \\ \tilde{R}_{||} &= -\frac{7L_g^4 R_{||}}{8\delta_P^2 (4\pi^2)^2}, \\ \tilde{R}_{\perp} &= -\frac{7L_g^4 R_{\perp}}{8\delta_P^2 (4\pi^2)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The coefficient $R_{||,\perp}$ is calculated using Eq. (19) with electric field given by Eq. (32). It follows that the influence of the FE layer on the GFM film is suppressed for strong spatial dispersion by the factor $1/(\delta_P(2\pi/L_g)^2)$. The coefficient $\tilde{R}_{||,\perp}$ have the opposite sign to the coefficient $R_{||,\perp}$.

The equation for magnetization has the form

$$2 \left(\tilde{\alpha}_M^* + \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_{\perp}}{\chi_{\perp}} + \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_{||}}{\chi_{||}} \right) \mathbf{M} + 4\tilde{\beta}_M M^2 \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{B}, \quad (43)$$

with the following coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\alpha}_M^* &= \alpha_M - \gamma \tilde{R}_0 Q_0 / \alpha_Q, \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{\perp} &= \gamma \tilde{R}_{\perp} Q_0 / \alpha_Q, \\ \tilde{\gamma}_{||} &= \gamma \tilde{R}_{||} Q_0 / \alpha_Q. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

In contrast to the weak dispersion case, here the susceptibility χ is present in the denominator leading to a different dependence of magnetization on temperature and electric field.

Figure 7 shows the magnetization M behavior in the vicinity of the critical temperature T_C^{FE} for strong spatial dispersion. All parameters for GFM film are the same as before and we used the colemanite FE. According to Eq. 42 the magneto-electric coupling coefficient $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the same as in the case of weak dispersion, however it is multiplied by the small (in the case of strong spatial dispersion) parameter $(L^2/\delta_P * 4\pi^2)$. Figure 7 demonstrates two different cases with $\delta_P = 2 \text{ nm}^2$ and $\delta_P = 10 \text{ nm}^2$. The first value of δ_P corresponds to the case when the domain wall thickness in the FE $l_{\text{DW}} \sim \sqrt{\chi\delta_P}$ is slightly larger than the intergrain distance L_g . The second case corresponds to $l_{\text{DW}} \gg L_g$, where the intergrain distance is $L_g = 7 \text{ nm}$.

In general, increasing the difference $|T - T_C^{\text{FE}}|$ one can study the crossover from strong to weak dispersion.




FIG. 7. (Color online) Magnetization M (solid lines) and magnetic susceptibility χ_M (dash-dotted lines) vs temperature T for strong spatial dispersion and zero external magnetic and electric fields. Blue lines show the non-interacting case while the red and green lines correspond to the finite interaction of the FE layer with the GFM film. Red line is for $\delta_P = 10 \text{ nm}^2$. Green line is for $\delta_P = 2 \text{ nm}^2$.




FIG. 8. (Color online) Magnetization M vs electric field E_0 for strong spatial dispersion and zero external magnetic field. Blue lines show two branches of magnetization for the case of finite interaction of the FE (colemanite) layer with GFM film. Dashed red line corresponds to the non-interacting case. The plots are shown for the following sets of parameters: $T = 245 \text{ K}$, $\delta_P = 2 \text{ nm}^2$. Inset: Magnetic susceptibility χ_M vs electric field E_0 .

Thus, the dependence of magnetization on temperature can be considered as a combination of Fig. 4 and Fig. 7. The crossover temperature between two regimes depends on the system parameters.

The magnetization M vs. electric field E_0 is shown in Fig. 8 for $T_C^{\text{FM}} < T_C^{\text{FE}}$ and fixed temperature $T = 245 \text{ K}$. For FE substrate we used the colemanite. The behavior is shown for small constant $\delta_P = 2 \text{ nm}^2$. In this limit the domain wall thickness $l_{\text{DW}} \sim \sqrt{\chi\delta_P}$ is not too big in comparison with the intergrain distance, L_g . Similar to the case of weak dispersion the FE substrate essentially influences the GFM magnetic state. Applying the electric field E_m one can induce the magnetic phase transition.

For thin FE layer the polarization is given by

$$\mathbf{P}^{(1)} = \mathbf{P}_p^{(1)} + \mathbf{P}_u^{(1)} = \frac{\mathbf{D}}{\delta_P k_\perp^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\hat{\chi} \delta_P k_\perp^2} \right). \quad (45)$$

This polarization produces similar behavior of magnetization as a function of temperature and electric field with slightly modified coefficients. For thin FE film the coefficients $\tilde{R}_{\perp,||}$ are linearly depend on the FE thickness, h .

B. Influence of GFM film on the FE layer

In this subsection we investigate the influence of GFM film on the FE layer in the case of strong dispersion. The equation describing the part of polarization quadratic in the electric induction has the form

$$-\delta_P \Delta \mathbf{P}^{(2)} + (\hat{\chi})^{-1} \mathbf{P}^{(2)} = -4\beta_P (2(\mathbf{P}_0 \mathbf{P}^{(1)}) \mathbf{P}^{(1)} + (\mathbf{P}^{(1)})^2 \mathbf{P}_0). \quad (46)$$

To solve Eq. (46) we use the same boundary conditions as we used before for $\mathbf{P}^{(1)}$. We are interested in average polarization $\mathbf{P}^{(2)}$ appearing due to nonlinear response. Only the average z-component of $\mathbf{P}^{(2)}$ is non-zero. $P_z^{(2)}$ has a contribution with $\mathbf{k}_\perp = 0$. For this component we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_P \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} P_z^{(2)} - (\hat{\chi})^{-1} P_z^{(2)} &= \\ &= \frac{4\beta_P P_0}{(\delta_P k_\perp^2)^2} (3\langle D_z^2 \rangle_{x,y} + \langle \mathbf{D}_\perp^2 \rangle_{x,y}). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Here the notation $\langle \rangle_{x,y}$ stands for averaging over the (x,y) plane. The field \mathbf{D}^2 decays with distance as $e^{-2k_\perp z}$, where $k_\perp = 2\pi/L_g$. Therefore the partial solution of Eq. (47) has the form

$$P_{z(p)}^{(2)} = \frac{\beta_P P_0}{(\delta_P k_\perp^2)^3} (3\langle D_z^2 \rangle_{x,y} + \langle \mathbf{D}_\perp^2 \rangle_{x,y}). \quad (48)$$

We neglect the term with the susceptibility $(\hat{\chi})^{-1}$ in Eq. (47). The uniform solution for $k_\perp = 0$ has the form

$$P_{z(u)}^{(2)} = C_1^z e^{\kappa^* z} + C_2^z e^{-\kappa^* z}, \quad (49)$$

where $\kappa^* = \sqrt{1/(\chi_{||} \delta_P)}$.

Using the boundary condition we find that $C_i^z \sim 1/(\delta_P k_\perp^2)^{5/2}$ with $k_\perp = 2\pi/L_g$. Therefore the average polarization $P_z^{(2)}$ decays with increasing the spatial dispersion as $(\delta_P k_\perp^2)^{-5/2}$. For strong dispersion the correction $P_z^{(2)}$ is also quadratic in parameter Q leading to the same behavior of average polarization on the magnetic field as in the case of weak dispersion. However, the influence of the GFM film on the FE layer is suppressed due to spatial dispersion.

V. MICROSCOPIC MODEL OF MAGNETO-ELECTRIC COUPLING IN COMBINED GFM SYSTEM

A. Direct effect: Influence of FE substrate on the GFM film

In Ref. 32 we developed the model describing the coupling between electric and magnetic degrees of freedom in the GMF. The coupling mechanism is based on the interplay of intergrain exchange coupling, Coulomb blockade and screening of electric field by the FE polarization. In this model the exchange interaction of two neighbouring grains appears due to the overlap of electron wave functions in the space between the grains, see Fig. 3(b)

$$J \propto \sum \int \Psi_1^*(\mathbf{r}_2) \Psi_2^*(\mathbf{r}_1) U_c(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \Psi_1(\mathbf{r}_1) \Psi_2(\mathbf{r}_2) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2. \quad (50)$$

Here $\Psi_{1,2}$ is the spatial part of the electron wave function located in the first (second) grain; U_c is the Coulomb interaction of electrons located in different grains. Summation is over the different electron pairs in the grains.

$$\Psi_{1,2}(\mathbf{r}) = A \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{r}{\lambda}}, & |\mathbf{r} \pm \mathbf{L}_g/2| < a, \\ e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{r} \pm \mathbf{L}_g/2|}{\lambda}}, & |\mathbf{r} \pm \mathbf{L}_g/2| > a. \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

Here A is the normalization constant and L_g is the distance between two grain centres. λ is the electron localization length. It depends on the dielectric permittivity of the FE leading to the strong influence of the FE state on the intergrain exchange interaction and consequently on the magnetic state of granular film,³²

In the simplest case, with small localization length, $\lambda < \min(a, L_g)$, the exchange interaction has the form $J \sim \lambda^2 e^{-\kappa L_g/\lambda}$, where κ is a positive number of order one. At equilibrium, without FE, this expression can be linearized in ξ around ξ_0 , $J = J_0 + (\lambda - \lambda_0)\tilde{\gamma}$, where ξ_0 is the localization length in the absence of FE layer. Changing the localization length ξ one can control the exchange interaction and thus the magnetic state of granular film.

For small localization length, $\lambda \ll a$, one can calculate the quadrupole moment of two electrons between the grains, $Q_{xx} \sim \lambda a e$, $Q_{yy} = Q_{zz} = -1/2 Q_{xx}$, $Q = Q_{xx} + Q_{yy} = 1/2 Q_{xx}$. Calculating Q_{xx} we assumed that positively charged ions are located inside the grains and we averaged over the region between the centres of two grains, $-L_g/2 < z < L_g/2$, see Fig. 3(b). Thus, the quadrupole moment Q is a linear function of localization length ξ and therefore the exchange interaction can be written as $J = J_0 + (Q - Q_0)\gamma$.

B. Estimate of parameter γ

The coupling between electrical and magnetic subsystems appears due to the influence of FE response on the

intergrain exchange constant J and therefore on the ordering temperature of magnetic subsystem $T_C^{\text{FM}} = z_c J/3$, where z_c is the coordination number. We use $z_c = 4$. To estimate the constant γ we use a microscopic theory of Ref. 33, in particular Eq. (5) of Ref. 33. We assume the following parameters: grain radius is 3 nm, the intergrain distance (the distance between grains centres) is 7 nm, the distance between grain centres and the FE substrate surface is 4 nm. We assume that $\epsilon^{\text{FE}} \gg \epsilon_{\text{eff}}$, where ϵ_{eff} is the effective dielectric permittivity of the medium outside the FE substrate. The effective dielectric constant can be estimated as $\epsilon_{\text{eff}} = 5$. For large ϵ^{FE} one can expand Eq. (5) of Ref. 33 in small parameter $\epsilon_{\text{eff}}/\chi_0^{\text{FE}}$. Using above parameters we find for exchange constant $J \approx J_0(1 + \epsilon_{\text{eff}}/\epsilon^{\text{FE}})$. Matching this expression with Eq. (23) one can find $\gamma \approx \tilde{\alpha}^{\text{FM}} T_C^{\text{FM}} 16\pi^2 \epsilon_{\text{eff}}$. This estimate is done for rather small distance between the FE substrate and the magnetic film. Increasing the distance exponentially reduces the coupling constant γ .

C. Inverse effect: Influence of GFM film on the FE substrate

In this subsection we discuss the influence of GFM film on the FE substrate and estimate phenomenological constants α_Q and R . We assume that formation of inhomogeneous charge distribution is related to the fact that conduction electrons penetrate beyond the grain boundaries. Three factors influence the penetration depth: 1) the kinetic energy of electrons inside a grain E_{kin} , 2) the potential energy of electrons outside the grain U_{pot} , 3) and electron Coulomb interaction. The penetration of electrons outside a grain decreases the kinetic energy, but increases the potential U_{pot} and the Coulomb E_{Coul} energies. First, we neglect the influence of intergrain exchange interaction, the last term in Eq. (15).

The kinetic energy has the form

$$E_{\text{kin}} = \frac{\hbar^2(6\pi^2 N)^{5/3}}{20m_e(a')^2}, \quad (52)$$

where N is the number of electrons in the grain, m_e is the electron mass, $a' = a + \lambda_e$ is the effective grain radius. The effective grain radius accounts for the fact that electrons penetrate outside the grain by the distance λ_e which is the electron localization length.

The potential energy has the form

$$E_{\text{pot}} = \frac{U(6\pi^2 N)^{5/3} \lambda_e^3}{10\pi^2(a')^3}, \quad (53)$$

where U is the height of the potential barrier produced by the insulator between the grains. It accounts for: small penetration length λ_e and small penetration probability which is proportional to λ^2 .

The Coulomb interaction contribute to the total energy since the charge distribution is non-uniform.

$$E_{\text{Coul}} = \frac{9e^2 \lambda_e^2 N^2}{5(a')^3}. \quad (54)$$

This expression has a transparent meaning: each electron produces the charge $e\lambda_e/a$ outside the grain. The charge of the same magnitude but of the opposite sign appears inside the grain. The characteristic size of the system is a .

Minimizing the total energy, $W_{Qt} = E_{\text{kin}} + E_{\text{pot}} + E_{\text{Coul}}$, we estimate the equilibrium penetration depth (λ_0) and "stiffness" of quadrupole system, $2(\alpha_Q + R)$.

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{\frac{18}{5}(eN)^2 + \sqrt{\left(\frac{18e^2 N^2}{5}\right)^2 + \frac{3\hbar^2 6\pi^2 N^{10/3} U}{25\pi^2 m_e}}}{(3/5\pi^2)U(6\pi^2 N)^{5/3}}. \quad (55)$$

For potential barrier larger than the Coulomb interaction this expression can be simplified leading to $\lambda_0 \rightarrow \sqrt{\pi^2 \hbar^2 / (3m_e U)}$. For estimate we use $E_F = 5$ eV with $k_F = 12 \text{ nm}^{-1}$, particle diameter $2a = 5$ nm. For such grain the number of electrons is $N = 4 \cdot 10^3$. We use $U = 6$ eV for potential energy of an insulator. For above parameters the equilibrium penetration length is $\lambda_0 = 0.05$ nm. We note that the Coulomb and potential energies are of the same order for such particles. For bigger particles the contribution of Coulomb energy will be stronger leading to stronger suppression of the penetration length. Thus, the non-uniformity of electric charges increases with decreasing the grain size.

We estimate the equilibrium quadrupole moment Q_0 for cubic grains with size $2a$ with positively charged centre ($-a < x, y, z < a$) and negatively charge region around the grain. This region has the size λ_0 . We calculate the quadrupole moment over the cubic region between two centres of neighbouring grains. For small λ_0 we find

$$Q_0 = -2ea\lambda_0 \left(\frac{(L-a)^2}{2a^2} + \frac{L^3 - (L-a)^3}{12a^3} - \frac{11}{18} \right). \quad (56)$$

The estimate gives $Q_0 = 2 \cdot 10^{-38} \text{ C}\cdot\text{m}^2$. Such a quadrupole produces a rather strong electric field inside the FE substrate. Using Eq. (31) for 6nm distance between the granular film and the FE substrate we find $|E| \approx 3 \cdot 10^4 \text{ V/m}$.

The stiffness constant is defined by the second derivative of the total energy, $\partial^2 W_{Qt} / \partial \lambda^2 \approx 10^5 \text{ J/m}^2$. The stiffness constant is rather large in the current model. If exchange interaction is about 100 K it can not essentially influence the quadrupole system. A relative correction to λ due to magnetic subsystem can be of the order of 10^{-3} - 10^{-2} . Thus, the relative change of polarization from disordered to ordered state by applying external magnetic field is less than 10^{-3} - 10^{-2} .

It is important to mention here that above estimate of λ_0 is the lowest estimate. Since we did not take into account the fact that λ depends on the electron energy. In particular, $\lambda > 0.1$ nm at the Fermi level. Electron transport measurements show that the penetration length at the Fermi level is about 0.5-1 nm meaning that electrons near the Fermi surface are responsible for exchange coupling between the grains.

To summarize, the "direct" and "inverse" effects are strongly asymmetric. The direct effect can be rather strong while the inverse effect is very weak. This is the consequence of the fact that the exchange interaction is weaker than the direct Coulomb interaction between quadrupoles in the GFM film with FE layer.

VI. DISCUSSION

In this section we discuss the validity of our model. The real granular films can not be described by the regular lattice since materials have always some degree of disorder. The quadrupole moments fluctuate in space, magnitude, and orientation due to this randomness. However, the presence of disorder does not change qualitatively our main results. In particular, the electric field produced by the GFM film decays exponentially with distance leading to the same results. The coupling between the GFM film and the FE layer decreases with increasing the spatial dispersion of the FE layer. This effect is suppressed for FEs with domain wall thickness exceeding the average intergrain distance. For strongly disordered films one can use a continuous spatial distribution of quadrupole moments.

For multilayer system of grains only the nearest layer to the FE substrate will interact with the FE due to the exponential decay of coupling with distance.

In our consideration we used a certain type of boundary conditions for FE polarization, with polarization derivatives being zero at the interface. In general, one can use the following combination for boundary conditions, $\zeta_1 P + \zeta_2 (P)'_z = 0$. It does not change qualitatively our results.

In this work we discussed the case of intrinsically isotropic dielectric which is typical for some organic components (such as TTF-CA). The only source of anisotropy in our consideration was the external electric field applied to the FE layer producing different susceptibilities - parallel $\chi_{||}$ and perpendicular χ_{\perp} to the layer surface. However, our consideration can be generalized for intrinsically anisotropic FE. In this case the final equations for magnetization (see, for example Eq. (23)) will be modified in the following way: Instead of susceptibilities $\chi_{||}$ and χ_{\perp} defined in Eq. (22) one has to introduce the dielectric susceptibilities $\tilde{\chi}_{||}$ and $\tilde{\chi}_{\perp}$ which account for intrinsic anisotropy.

VII. CONCLUSION

We described the coupling between the FE polarization and magnetization of GFM film using a phenomenologi-

cal model of combined multiferroic system consisting of granular ferromagnet film placed above the FE layer. We showed that the coupling is due to the presence of oscillating in space electric charges in the GFM film. On one hand these charges interact with the FE layer via Coulomb interaction. On the other hand they are coupled with the magnetization leading to the mutual influence of the FE polarization and the GFM film magnetization even for space separated FE layer and the GFM film. This model allows to study the importance of spatial dispersion of FE polarization and to understand the influence of GFM film on the FE polarization.

We studied the temperature and electric field dependence of magnetization and magnetic susceptibility of GFM film for weak and strong spatial dispersion of the FE layer. We calculated the electric polarization as a function of temperature and magnetic field and investigated the influence of the FE state on the magnetization and magnetic susceptibility and vice versa. The effect of mutual influence decreases with increasing the spatial dispersion of the FE layer. For weak dispersion the strongest coupling occurs in the vicinity of the FE-PE phase transition. For strong dispersion the situation is the opposite. We showed that for temperatures $T < T_C^{FE}$ the magnetization has hysteresis as a function of electric field. For strong coupling the interaction of the FE layer and the GFM film leads to the appearance of an additional magnetic phase transition. Below the ordering temperature of GFM film the FE polarization has hysteresis as a function of magnetic field.

We studied the behavior of magneto-electric coupling as a function of distance between the FE layer and the GFM film. We showed that for large distances the coupling decays exponentially due to the exponential decrease of electric field produced by the oscillating charges in the GFM film.

We showed that magneto-electric coupling depends on the thickness of the FE layer. For thin layers it grows linearly and saturates for thickness's exceeding some critical value.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I. B. was supported by NSF under Cooperative Agreement Award EEC-1160504, NSF Award DMR-1158666, and NSF PREM Award.

¹ W. Eerenstein, N. D. Mathur, and J. F. Scott, Nature **442**, 759 (2006).

² R. Ramesh and N. A. Spaldin, Nature Mat. **6**, 21 (2007).

- ³ M. Bibes and A. Barthelemy, *Nature Mat.* **7**, 425 (2008).
- ⁴ R. Ramesh, *Nature* **461**, 1218 (2009).
- ⁵ J. T. Heron, J. L. Bosse, Q. He, Y. Gao, M. Trassin, L. Ye, J. D. Clarkson, C. Wang, J. Liu, S. Salahuddin, D. C. Ralph, D. G. Schlom, J. Inigues, B. D. Huey, and R. Ramesh, *Nature* **516**, 370 (2014).
- ⁶ S.-W. Cheong and M. Mostovoy, *Nature Materials* **6**, 13 (2007).
- ⁷ S. M. Wu, S. A. Cybart, D. Yi, J. M. Parker, R. Ramesh, and R. C. Dynes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 067202 (2013).
- ⁸ V. 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).
- ⁹ H. Ohno, D. Chiba, F. Matsukura, T. Omiya, E. Abe, T. Dietl, Y. Ohno, and K. Ohtani, *Nature (London)* **408**, 944 (2000).
- ¹⁰ D. Chiba, M. Sawicki, Y. Nishitani, Y. Nakatani, F. Matsukura, and H. Ohno, *Nature (London)* **455**, 515 (2008).
- ¹¹ D. Chiba, M. Yamanouchi, F. Matsukura, and H. Ohno, *Science* **301**, 943 (2003).
- ¹² H. Katsura, N. Nagaosa, and A. V. Balatsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **95**, 057205 (2005).
- ¹³ I. A. Sergienko and E. Dagotto, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 094434 (2006).
- ¹⁴ C.-W. Nan, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 6082 (1994).
- ¹⁵ C. Thiele, K. Dorr, O. Bilani, J. Rodel, and L. Schultz, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 054408 (2007).
- ¹⁶ S. Geprags, A. Brandlmaier, M. Opel, R. Gross, and S. T. B. Goennenwein, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **96**, 142509 (2010).
- ¹⁷ M. Weisheit, S. Fahler, A. Marty, Y. Souche, C. Poinignon, and D. Givord, *Science* **315**, 349 (2007).
- ¹⁸ M. Tsujikawa and T. Oda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 247203 (2009).
- ¹⁹ C.-G. Duan, J. P. Velev, R. F. Sabirianov, Z. Zhu, J. Chu, S. S. Jaswal, and E. Y. Tsymbal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 137201 (2008).
- ²⁰ M. Y. Zhuravlev, S. Maekawa, and E. Y. Tsymbal, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 104419 (2010).
- ²¹ V. Garcia, M. Bibes, L. Bocher, S. Valencia, F. Kronast, A. Crassous, X. Moya, S. Enouz-Vedrenne, A. Gloter, D. Imhoff, C. Deranlot, N. D. Mathur, S. Fusil, K. Bouzehouane, and A. Barthelemy, *Science* **327**, 1106 (2010).
- ²² C. Jia and J. Berakdar, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 014432 (2009).
- ²³ C. Jia and J. Berakdar, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 045309 (2011).
- ²⁴ G. A. Smolenskii and I. E. Chupis, *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **25**, 475 (1982).
- ²⁵ Y. J. Choi, H. T. Yi, S. Lee, Q. Huang, V. Kiryukhin, and S.-W. Cheong, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 047601 (2008).
- ²⁶ J. H. Park, H. H. Shin, and H. M. Jang, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 212409 (2008).
- ²⁷ M. Liu, X. Li, J. Lou, S. Zheng, K. Du, and N. X. Sun, *J. Appl. Phys.* **102**, 083911 (2007).
- ²⁸ H. Ryu, P. Murugavel, J. H. Lee, S. C. Chae, T. W. Noh, Y. S. Oh, H. J. Kim, K. H. Kim, J. H. Jang, M. Kim, C. Bae, and J.-G. Park, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **89**, 102907 (2006).
- ²⁹ J. G. Wan, X. W. Wang, Y. J. Wu, M. Zeng, Y. Wang, H. Jiang, W. Q. Zhou, G. H. Wang, and J.-M. Liu, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **86**, 122501 (2005).
- ³⁰ T. D. Thanh, P. T. Phong, D. H. Manh, N. V. Khien, L. V. Hong, T. L. Phan, and S. C. Yu, *J. Mater. Sci.: Mater. Electron* **24**, 1389 (2013).
- ³¹ X. L. Zhong, J. B. Wang, M. Liao, G. J. Huang, S. H. Xie, Y. C. Zhou, Y. Qiao, and J. P. He, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **90**, 152903 (2007).
- ³² O. G. Udalov, N. M. Chtchelkatchev, and I. S. Beloborodov, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 174203 (2014).
- ³³ O. G. Udalov, N. M. Chtchelkatchev, and I. S. Beloborodov, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 054201 (2014).
- ³⁴ M. Huth, A. Rippert, R. Sachser, and L. Keller, *Mater. Res. Expr.* **1**, 046303 (2014).
- ³⁵ O. G. Udalov, N. M. Chtchelkatchev, and I. S. Beloborodov, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **27**, 186001 (2014).
- ³⁶ K. V. Reich, T. Chen, and B. I. Shklovskii, (2014), arXiv:1403.4154 [cond-mat].
- ³⁷ S. A. Fedorov, A. E. Korolkov, N. M. Chtchelkatchev, O. G. Udalov, and I. S. Beloborodov, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 155410 (2014).
- ³⁸ S. A. Fedorov, A. E. Korolkov, N. M. Chtchelkatchev, O. G. Udalov, and I. S. Beloborodov, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 195111 (2014).
- ³⁹ L. G. Gerchikov, C. Guet, and A. N. Ipatov, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 053202 (2002).
- ⁴⁰ L. D. Landau and E. Lifshitz, *Course of Theoretical Physics: Vol.: 8: Electrodynamics of Continuous Media* (Pergamon Press, 1960).
- ⁴¹ A. F. Devonshire, *Philosophical Magazine* **40**, 1040 (1949).
- ⁴² B. A. Strukov and A. P. Levanyuk, *Ferroelectric Phenomena in Crystals* (Springer, Geidelberg, 1998, 1998).
- ⁴³ L.-H. Ong, J. Osman, and D. R. Tilley, *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 144109 (2001).
- ⁴⁴ P. Chandra and P. B. Littlewood, in *Physics of Ferroelectrics* (Springer, 2007) pp. 69–116.
- ⁴⁵ J. I. Gittleman, Y. Goldstein, and S. Bozowski, *Phys. Rev. B* **5**, 3609 (1972).
- ⁴⁶ S. Barzilai, Y. Goldstein, I. Balberg, and J. S. Helman, *Phys. Rev. B* **23**, 1809 (1981).
- ⁴⁷ K. Kimura and H. Ohigashi, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **43**, 834 (1983).
- ⁴⁸ T. Yamada and T. Kitayama, *J. Appl. Phys.* **52**, 6859 (1981).
- ⁴⁹ J. B. Torrance, J. E. Vazquez, J. J. Mayerle, and V. Y. Lee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46**, 253 (1981).
- ⁵⁰ E. Fatuzzo, *J. Appl. Phys.* **31**, 1029 (1960).
- ⁵¹ H. H. Wieder, *J. Appl. Phys.* **30**, 1010 (1959).
- ⁵² K. Kobayashi, S. Horiuchi, R. Kumai, F. Kagawa, Y. Murakami, and Y. Tokura, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 237601 (2012).
- ⁵³ T. H. M. V. D. Berg and A. V. D. Avoird, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **160**, 223 (1989).
- ⁵⁴ V. M. Fridkin, *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **49**, 193 (2006).
- ⁵⁵ V. M. Fridkin, R. V. Gaynutdinov, and S. Ducharme, *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **53**, 199 (2010).