arXiv:0905.3213v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 20 May 2009

Multipolar interactions and complex phases in ferromagnetic ultrathin films

Daniel G. Barci[1] and Daniel A. Stariolo[2]

[1]*Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rua São Francisco Xavier 524, 20550-013, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.*[*]

[2]*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul and National Institute of Science and Technology for Complex Systems, CP 15051, 91501-970, Porto Alegre, Brazil*[*]

(Dated: May 19, 2009)

We present a model to describe complex phases observed at mesoscopic scales in ultrathin magnetic films. The model is based on the interaction between dipolar as well as quadrupolar magnetic moments. In the special case of strong perpendicular crystal anisotropy, we show that quadrupolar degrees of freedom associated with orientation of domain walls are essential in order to correctly describe the observed phenomenology of domain formation. A nematic phase characterized by orientational order of domain walls (stripe-like) but without translational order is predicted. This isotropic-nematic transition belongs to the Kosterlitz-Thouless type in the thermodynamic limit. However, we found that in actual experimental scales, the fluctuations of the nematic order parameter are regularized by the sample size, and orientational long range order, as predicted by mean field, should be observable. The transition may be completely characterized experimentally from measurements of the magnetic structure factor as well as from the non-linear in-plane magnetic susceptibility.

PACS numbers: 75.10.-b, 75.60.Ch, 75.70.Ak

The existence of complex inhomogeneous/anisotropic phases in ferromagnetic thin films with perpendicular anisotropy is by now well established. For instance, the observation of stripe phases were reported in multilayer systems like Fe/Ni/Cu(001) and Co/Cu/(Fe/Ni)/Cu(001)[1, 2], measured by means of photoemission electron microscopy and also, in ultrathin Fe films grown on Ag(100) [3] near the reorientation transition. They were also observed and studied in Fe/Cu(100) ultrathin films, using scanning electron microscopy with polarization analysis [4, 5, 6]. The non-homogeneous states are composed by ferromagnetic domains with opposite perpendicular magnetization in the form of stripes, in such a way that the whole state is paramagnetic. These domains may show translational as well as orientational order of domain walls.

At the stem of inhomogeneous/anisotropic phases and domain wall formation there is competition between exchange, dipolar and crystal anisotropy interactions. For quasi two dimensional films, this phenomenology is elementary described by a Heisenberg model plus long ranged dipolar interactions. An uniaxial anisotropy term that privileges the direction perpendicular to the film is also relevant for describing, e.g. the magnetism of Fe/Cu(001) films. This model has been extensively studied in the literature by means of different theoretical approaches, from ground state calculations and mean field treatments, to numerical simulations [7, 8, 9]. A rather complete phase diagram was proposed by Abanov and collaborators [10]. They showed how stripes, which break positional order, appear as a natural mean field solution. The striped state was identified with the smectic phase of liquid crystals due to its symmetry properties and the algebraic decay of correlations.

However, very nice experiments in the last years [1, 5, 6] on different systems suggest a more complex behavior. One intriguing aspect is the appearance of an inverse freezing and melting process[6, 11] where an isotropic phase is found at lower temperatures than the stripe phase. Also, orientational order seems to decouple from the geometry of the substrate. This "floating solid" scenario opens the possibility of new orientational phases like in continuous nematic with quasi-long-range order. Mean field like treatments of the minimal dipolar model fail to describe these facts, related to the emergence of complex phases at mesoscopic scales and finite temperatures. Other degrees of freedom beyond the dipolar approximation must be taken into account. On purely theoretical grounds, we have recently shown [12] that for a generic Landau-Ginzburg model with Ising symmetry and competing interactions, multipole couplings are relevant in a renormalization group sense, and that they are responsible for possible orientational order in the system. In particular, we have shown that a nematic phase associated with orientation of domain walls can be present, and the transition can be described as a condensation of quadrupole moments. Numerical results in Refs. [13, 14] are consistent with this scenario.

In this letter we show that, to describe the physics of pattern formation in ferromagnetic ultrathin films with perpendicular anisotropy, it is necessary to go beyond the competition between exchange and dipolar interactions. It turns out that quadrupolar degrees of freedom, associated with the orientation of domain walls, are also essential in order to correctly describe the phase transitions present in these systems and the whole process of domain formation.

The relevance of multipolar interactions in magnetic systems has recently been reviewed in [15], mainly in connection with nanodot arrays. The existence of quadrupolar exchange and dipole-quadrupole interactions at atomic level was early recognized by Van Vleck [16] for Fe atoms. The limitations of the spin 1/2 Heisenberg model for explaining complex magnetic phases are clear and a matter of currently intense discussion, as more and more precise measurements emerge. The

necessity to consider so called "non-Heisenberg terms", like higher order spin interactions, seems inescapable in many systems [17, 18, 19, 20]. Nevertheless, these are essentially microscopic approaches, in the sense that multipolar interactions are always represented by simple combinations of spin variables. While this reductionist approach may be justified formally, its usefulness is limited to cases in which the departure from the Heisenberg model is minimal. This is not the case, e.g. for explaining orientational order of domain walls at finite temperatures. Instead, we propose here a new model which considers multipolar interactions as independent degrees of freedom from the outset.

While quadrupolar interactions turned to be irrelevant to explain the origin of magnetic anisotropies in the bulk of three dimensional ferromagnets, they may be relevant degrees of freedom in quasi two dimensional films where orientational order may show up, associated with the presence of domain walls. In fact, as shown in [12], all multipolar interactions are, in principle, relevant to describe planar systems with competing interactions at different scales.

To define our model, we consider a coarse grained film. Each grain have a magnetic charge distribution localized in a small volume V_i and is characterized by its magnetic dipolar and quadrupolar moments:

$$S_i^\alpha = \int_{V_i} d\vec{r}\, r_\alpha\, \rho(\vec{r}) \tag{1}$$

$$Q_i^{\alpha\beta} = \int_{V_i} d\vec{r}\, \left(r_\alpha r_\beta - \frac{1}{3} r^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta} \right) \rho(\vec{r}) \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha, \beta = x, y, z$ and i represents a site at the center of domain V_i. The magnetic charge density $\rho(\vec{r}) = \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{M}(\vec{r})$, where $\vec{M}(\vec{r})$ is the local magnetization distributed in each grain V_i. $\vec{S}$ and $\hat{Q}$ are the elementary blocks to build up our model. While the dipole moment is a vector variable, the quadrupolar moment $\hat{Q}$ is a traceless symmetric tensor that can be parameterized by a unit vector quantity called the director, $Q_{\alpha\beta} = n_\alpha n_\beta - \frac{1}{3} n^2 \delta_{\alpha\beta}$. It has the symmetry $\hat{Q}(\vec{n}) = \hat{Q}(-\vec{n})$ which characterizes nematic order.

Now, we consider a model with the general structure:

$$H = H_S + H_Q + H_{SQ} + H_{an} \tag{3}$$

where H_S and H_Q correspond to dipole-dipole and quadrupole-quadrupole interactions respectively, H_{SQ} represents the dipole-quadrupole interactions and H_{an} is an uniaxial anisotropy energy.

For the dipole component we consider exchange and dipolar interactions, $H_S = H_{\rm ex} + H_{\rm dip}$, where

$$H_{\rm ex} = -J \sum_{<ij>} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \tag{4}$$

is the (classical) Heisenberg Hamiltonian, and

$$H_{\rm dip} = g \sum_{ij} \left[\frac{\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j}{|\vec{r}_{ij}|^3} - 3 \frac{(\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{r}_{ij})(\vec{S}_j \cdot \vec{r}_{ij})}{|\vec{r}_{ij}|^5} \right] , \tag{5}$$

is the long range magnetostatic dipolar contribution. Without losing generality, we consider fixed unitary dipolar and quadrupole moments, in such a way that the only dimensional parameters are the coupling constants. In analogy with this picture, we introduce a short ranged quadrupolar interaction:

$$H_Q = -K \sum_{<ij>} {\rm Tr} \left(\hat{Q}_i \hat{Q}_j \right) , \tag{6}$$

where K is a quadrupolar exchange constant. In addition, standard long ranged magnetostatic quadrupole contributions can also be considered. However, they are sub-leading with respect to the quadrupolar exchange term and then we will not consider them here. Instead, we found relevant to consider dipole-quadrupole interactions which take the general form:

$$H_{SQ} = \sum_{ijk} K^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma}_{i-k,j-k} \;\; S_i^\alpha S_j^\beta Q_k^{\gamma\sigma} \; . \tag{7}$$

By construction, $K^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma}_{i-k,j-k}$ is symmetric in the internal degrees of freedom $\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma$ and the labels $i-k$ and $j-k$ guarantee discrete translation and rotation invariance in the lattice.

There are only two possibilities to choose the coupling's structure, depending of the symmetries the interaction preserves. The exchange terms of the Hamiltonian, Eqs. (4) and (6), are invariant under independent spin and quadrupole rotations and under discrete lattice rotations of angle $\pi/2$ (*i. e.* $O_S(3) \otimes O_Q(3) \otimes C_{4,\,L}$). The interaction term necessarily reduces this symmetry. If interactions are isotropic , the lattice structure decouples from the internal degrees of freedom and then:

$$K^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma}_{i-k,j-k} = \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\delta^{\alpha\gamma} \delta^{\beta\sigma} + \delta^{\alpha\sigma} \delta^{\beta\gamma} \right) G_{i-k,j-k}, \tag{8}$$

where G is a simple short ranged function defined on the lattice. This coupling reduce the symmetry from $O_S(3) \otimes O_Q(3) \otimes C_{4,\,L} \rightarrow O_{S+Q}(3) \otimes C_{4,\,L}$. The residual symmetries are simultaneous rotations of dipole and quadrupole components and discrete lattice rotations. The simplest choice for the function G is $G_{i-k,j-k} = \delta_{i,k} \delta_{j,k}$ where, for simplicity, we have considered only short ranged interactions. With this choice, the dipole-quadrupole term reduces to:

$$H_q = \lambda \sum_k Q_k^{\alpha\beta} \left(S_k^\alpha S_k^\beta - \frac{1}{3} \delta^{\alpha\beta} \right) . \tag{9}$$

The last term, proportional to $\delta^{\alpha\beta}$, is automatically zero since $Tr\hat{Q} = 0$. We have added it for symmetry reasons.

Other possibility is to retain the spin rotational symmetry $O_S(3)$ of the original Heisenberg model. In this case, it is not possible to decouple the lattice structure and the coupling turns out to be anisotropic:

$$K^{\alpha\beta\gamma\sigma}_{i-k,j-k} = \mu \; \delta^{\alpha\beta} G^{\gamma\sigma}_{i-k,j-k} . \tag{10}$$

Due to the fact that $Tr\hat{Q} = 0$, the function G necessarily couples the lattice with the internal degrees of freedom. The

simplest choice compatible with all the symmetries is

$$G^{\alpha\beta}_{i-k,j-k} = \frac{1}{2}\left(r^{\alpha}_{i-k}r^{\beta}_{j-k} + r^{\beta}_{i-k}r^{\alpha}_{j-k}\right), \qquad (11)$$

where r^{α}_{i-k} is the α component of a vector joining the lattice sites i and j, $\vec{r}_{i-k} = \vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_k$. The interaction Hamiltonian then reads

$$H_N = \mu \sum_{\langle ijk \rangle} \left(\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j\right) Q^{\alpha\beta}_k r^{\alpha}_{i-k} r^{\beta}_{j-k} \qquad (12)$$

The symmetry is now reduced from $O_S(3)\otimes O_Q(3)\otimes C_{4,\,L} \rightarrow O_S(3)\otimes C_{4,\,L+Q}$. The breaking of discrete lattice rotations is compensated by quadrupole rotations, since the hole Hamiltonian is rotational invariant. If we limit the sum in Eq. (12) to nearest neighbors, the Hamiltonian takes a simpler and transparent form. In this case we can explicitly make the sums over i, j in the following way. Defining the finite difference vector operator $\Delta^{\alpha}\vec{S}_k = \vec{S}_{k+\hat{e}_\alpha} - \vec{S}_{k-\hat{e}_\alpha}$, we can write $\sum_i \vec{S}_i r^{\alpha}_{i-k} = \Delta^{\alpha}\vec{S}_k$. With this notation the Hamiltonian term of Eq. (12) now reads:

$$H_N = \mu \sum_k Q^{\alpha\beta}_k \left(\Delta^{\alpha}\vec{S}_k \cdot \Delta^{\beta}\vec{S}_k - \frac{1}{3}\delta^{\alpha\beta}(\Delta\vec{S}_k)^2\right), \quad (13)$$

where we have added again a null term, proportional to $\delta^{\alpha\beta}$, for symmetry reasons to be justified below. Then, the interacting Hamiltonian can be written as $H_{SQ} = H_q + H_N$, where H_q and H_N are given by the Eqs. (9) and (13) respectively.

The model of Eq. (3) can be completed by introducing an uniaxial anisotropy term that explicitly breaks $O_S(3)$ symmetry and tends to align the magnetic dipoles along the z axis, $H_{an} = -D\sum_i (S^z_i)^2$, with $D > 0$.

Now, we make a general discussion of the possible competing orders that can arise from the quadrupolar terms, and then we focus on the special regime of large perpendicular anisotropy, relevant for some class of ultrathin ferromagnetic films. The dipole part of the Hamiltonian H_S encodes the basic competing interactions responsible for the emergence of domain walls. The scale of the ferromagnetic domains is roughly proportional to J/g.

Let us now analyze the quadrupole interactions. In terms of the director, H_q (Eq. (9)) is proportional to $\lambda\ (\hat{n}\cdot\vec{S})^2$. Then, the director has the tendency to be aligned or perpendicular to the dipole moment depending on whether the sign of λ is negative or positive respectively. If the quadrupole moment acquires a non zero mean value, the system breaks spin and quadrupole rotation invariance, generating spin textures with $\langle Q^{\alpha\beta}\rangle = \langle S^{\alpha}S^{\beta} - \frac{1}{3}\delta^{\alpha\beta}\rangle$. This is a quadrupolar or "spin nematic" order proposed for the interpretation of the magnetic properties of spin 1 systems [18, 19, 21, 22]. Eq. (9) resembles (at mean field) the so called non-Heisenberg Hamiltonians with bi-quadratic spin interactions. In the present model, the non quadratic spin interactions are dynamically generated by means of the quadrupole dynamics.

On the other hand, the interactions described by Eq. (13) have a completely different character. This Hamiltonian is proportional to $\mu(\hat{n}\cdot\vec{r})^2$. In the case of a thin film, $\vec{r}$ is in the plane of the film. Therefore, for positive μ the director tries to point out of plane, while for negative μ the tendency is to project the quadrupolar moment on the plane. It is important to note that this coupling is particularly relevant at domain walls. It is clear from Eq. (13) that a quadrupole at site k is coupled with the difference of the dipole moments at both sides of it ($\vec{S}_{k+\hat{e}_x} - \vec{S}_{k-\hat{e}_x}$ or $\vec{S}_{k+\hat{e}_y} - \vec{S}_{k-\hat{e}_y}$). Therefore, inside a uniform domain this coupling is exactly zero. However, inside a domain wall between two domains, a quadrupole moment interacts with the surrounding dipolar degrees of freedom, in such a way that the director has the tendency to be oriented perpendicular to the domain wall. *For this reason this coupling is essential to describe domain wall dynamics and therefore global domain orientational order in ultrathin films*. Different from the previous case, if $\hat{Q}$ acquires a non zero mean value, the Heisenberg symmetry $O_S(3)$ remains exact. On the other hand, an anisotropic state is developed with $\langle Q^{\alpha\beta}\rangle = \langle \Delta^{\alpha}\vec{S}\cdot\Delta^{\beta}\vec{S} - \frac{1}{3}\delta^{\alpha\beta}(\Delta\vec{S})^2\rangle$ that reduces the lattice symmetry from $C_{4,\,L} \rightarrow C_{2,\,L}$, since the system remains invariant under lattice rotations of π.

For small anisotropies $D \ll 1$ all these orders are simultaneously competing, producing an extremely rich phase diagram depending on the set of parameters $J/g, K, \mu, \lambda, D$ and temperature. We will report on this phase diagram in a future work. In this letter we would like to focus in the special regime of very large perpendicular anisotropy.

In the limit $D \rightarrow \infty$, the Heisenberg symmetry reduces to the Ising one, $O_S(3) \rightarrow Z_2$, and the model takes a still simpler form; the dipole interaction in Eq.(5) becomes isotropic and, since $(S^z_i)^2 = 1$, the quadrupole-dipole interaction of Eq. (9) is irrelevant. Therefore, the only remaining dipole-quadrupole coupling is given by Eq. (13). For sufficiently large negative μ, the dynamics is essentially bidimensional since the director tends to lay in-plane. In terms of the Ising variable S we can rewrite our model in the form $H = H_0 + H_I$, where

$$H_0 = -\sum_{ij} J_{ij}\ S_iS_j - K\sum_{<ij>} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\hat{Q}_i\hat{Q}_j\right) \qquad (14)$$

and

$$H_I = \mu\sum_k Q^{\alpha\beta}_k \left(\Delta^{\alpha}S_k\Delta^{\beta}S_k - \frac{1}{2}\delta^{\alpha\beta}(\Delta S_k)^2\right). \quad (15)$$

In Eq. (14), $J_{ij} = JV_{ij} - gS_iS_j/|\vec{r}_{ij}|^3$ in which V_{ij} limits the sum to nearest neighbors.

Experimentally $J/g \gg 1$, producing ferromagnetic domains and walls of width much larger than the lattice constant. In this conditions, orientational order decouples from the lattice structure. Then, in the regime $D \rightarrow \infty$ and $J/g \gg 1$ a continuous limit can be taken, and the present model can be exactly mapped to the extended Brazovskii model studied in [12, 23]. In that references we have shown in general grounds that the system has an isotropic-nematic phase transition of the Kosterlitz-Thouless universality class, where

the orientation of the domain walls has quasi-long-range order(QLRO). In fact, we have found that at a critical temperature T_{KT}, the system goes through a continuous phase transition with $\langle Q_{\alpha\beta}\rangle = q\ \exp(-W)(n_\alpha n_\beta - 1/2\ \delta_{\alpha\beta})$, where q is the (scalar) mean field orientational order parameter, the Debye-Waller factor $W = T/(4\pi\rho_s)\ln(L/a)$, ρ_s is the temperature dependent stiffness constant, L the linear size of the sample and a is the lattice spacing. Therefore, in the thermodynamic limit $L/a \to \infty$, $\langle Q\rangle \to 0$, and then there is no nematic long range order. However, the slow logarithmic dependence of the Debye-Waller factor implies that there is quasi-long-range order with algebraic decay of correlations $\langle Q(x)Q(x')\rangle \sim |x-x'|^{-\eta}$, with $\eta = T/4\pi\rho_s$. The temperature T_{KT} at which the QLRO disappears is given by $\rho_s(T_{KT})/T_{KT} = 8/\pi$ [24]. Due to the extremely slow variation of the logarithm in the Debye-Waller factor we expect to observe order in the typical scales of actual experiments. Consider for instance the Fe/Cu(100) ultrathin films of ref. [6]. The linear size of the sample is $L \sim 1mm$, while the typical inter-atomic distances are about $a = 0.1nm$. This gives a factor $L/a \sim 10^7$. The Debye-Waller factor at T_{KT} gives $W \sim 7/32$. With this small factor the fluctuations are mild in these scales and the mean field prediction is quite reliable.

Therefore, the model predicts a new phase in ultrathin films with strong perpendicular anisotropy, which is characterized by orientational order of domain walls, decoupled from the lattice structure. The signature for this transition is the presence of a finite quadrupolar moment and the divergence of the in-plane quadrupolar susceptibility. The orientational order parameter can be cast in terms of the wave-vector dependent structure factor of the perpendicular magnetization, which is an experimentally accessible quantity:

$$q = \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2}\ k^2\cos(2\theta)\ < S_z(k)S_z(-k) > . \qquad (16)$$

Another experimental signature for the phase transition is a peak in the in-plane quadrupolar (non linear) susceptibility χ^q. The energy of a magnetic quadrupole in an external field $\vec{H}$ is $\sum_i Q_i^{\alpha\beta}H_i^\alpha H_i^\beta$. The magnetization of the sample is given by $M^\alpha = \partial(\ln Z)/\partial H^\alpha$, where $Z(T,\vec{H})$ is the partition function. Then, the quadrupolar in-plane susceptibility is given by the third derivative of the magnetization with respect to a small external in-plane magnetic field $\vec{H}$, $\chi^q \sim \partial^3 M^\alpha/\partial(H^\alpha)^3$, when $\vec{H} \to 0$.

Summarizing, a new model for describing complex magnetic phases observed at mesoscopic scales in thin films was introduced. The model is based on the interaction of magnetic dipolar as well as quadrupolar moments, which are considered as independent degrees of freedom at the scales of interest. This model has a rich and complex phase diagram. In the limit of strong perpendicular anisotropy we found a regime where orientational order of domain walls decouples from the microscopic lattice. This gives rise to a isotropic-nematic transition which is of the Kosterlitz-Thouless type, i.e. it shows quasi-long-range order of wall orientation correlations. However, we have shown that in actual experiments the fluctuations should be regularized by the sample size, and long range order in the form of stripes is expected, as it is in fact observed. The phase transition can be characterized in experiments measuring the structure factor of the perpendicular component of the magnetization and the non-linear in plane susceptibility.

The nematic phase is only an example of the rich phase diagram which can be described by the model. In particular, we are very confident that the quadrupole interactions described in this letter are at the core of yet unexplained effects, like e.g. the striking reentrant behavior observed in ref. [6]. We expect to report on this issue soon.

We wish to thank Alessandro Vindigni and Antonio Politi for fruitful discussions. We acknowledge the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics where part of this work was developed. The *"Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico CNPq-Brazil"* and the *"Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro"* are acknowledged for the financial support.

* Research Associate of the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics

[1] Y. Z. Wu *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 117205 (2004).
[2] C. Won *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 224429 (2005).
[3] A. Berger and R. P. Erickson, J. Mag. Mag. Mat. **165**, 70 (1997).
[4] R. Allenspach, M. Stamponi, and A. Bischof, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3344 (1990).
[5] A. Vaterlaus, C. Stamm, U. Maier, M. G. Pini, P. Politi, and D. Pescia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2247 (2000).
[6] O. Portmann, A. Vaterlaus, and D. Pescia, Nature **422**, 701 (2003).
[7] I. Booth, A. B. MacIsaac, J. P. Whitehead, and K. De'Bell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 950 (1995).
[8] P. Politi, Comments Cond. Matter Phys. **18**, 191 (1998).
[9] S. A. Cannas, D. A. Stariolo, and F. A. Tamarit, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 092409 (2004).
[10] A. Abanov, V. Kalatsky, V. L. Pokrovsky, and W. M. Saslow, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 1023 (1995).
[11] O. Portmann, A. Vindigni, and D. Pescia, arXiv:0812.3811, (2008).
[12] D. G. Barci and D. A. Stariolo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 200604 (2007).
[13] A. D. Stoycheva and S. J. Singer, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 036706 (2002).
[14] L. Nicolao and D. A. Stariolo, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 054453 (2007).
[15] E. Vedmedenko and N. Mikuszeit, Phys. Chem. **9**, 1222 (2008).
[16] J. H. van Vleck, Phys. Rev. **52**, 1178 (1937).
[17] I. d. P. R. Moreira *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 134430 (2002).
[18] A. Läuchli, F. Mila, and K. Penc, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 087205 (2006).
[19] R. Bastardis, N. Guihéry, and C. de Graaf, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 132412 (2007).
[20] B. Hardrat *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 094411 (2009).
[21] S. Bhattacharjee, V. B. Shenoy, and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 092406 (2006).
[22] J. Lou, T. Xiang, and Z. Su, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2380 (2000).
[23] D. G. Barci and D. A. Stariolo, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 075437 (2009).
[24] J. Toner and D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 316 (1981).