

Spin-wave softening and Hund's coupling in ferromagnetic manganites

Sze-Shiang Feng[†], Mogus Mochena

Physics Department, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, FL 32307

(Dated: November 15, 2018)

Using one-orbital model of hole-doped manganites, we show with the help of Holstein-Primakov transformation that finite Hund's coupling is responsible for the spin-wave softening in the ferromagnetic *B*-phase manganites. We obtain an analytical result for the spin-wave spectrum for $J_H \gg t$. In the limit of infinite Hund's coupling, the spectrum is the conventional nearest-neighbor Heisenberg ferromagnetic spin-wave. The $o(t/J_H)$ -order correction is negative and thus accounts for the softening near the zone boundary.

PACS numbers: 75.30.Vn, 71.10.-w

The observations of large magnetoresistance (LMR) in $\text{Nd}_{0.5}\text{Pb}_{0.5}\text{MnO}_3$, giant magnetoresistance (GMR) and colossal magnetoresistance (CMR) in manganites ($\text{R}_{1-x}\text{A}_x\text{MnO}_3$, R is a rare earth element and A a divalent alkaline-earth metal) a decade ago [1] have rekindled much interest in these materials which have been known for half a century [2]. Upon doping, the manganites undergo complicated transitions resulting in various magnetic, charge-ordering and orbital-ordering phases, showing the interplay between relevant spin, charge and orbital degrees of freedom. In particular, magnetism and electronic transport are clearly correlated. So it is widely believed that knowledge of spin dynamics can provide important information of the underlying physics of CMR. Perring *et al* first measured the spin waves in $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Pb}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ for a broad range of q [3]. The magnon spectrum is well defined at low temperatures and can be accounted for by the nearest neighbor Heisenberg model. Subsequent measurements for $\text{Pr}_{0.63}\text{Sr}_{0.37}\text{MnO}_3$ and $\text{Nd}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ [4], $\text{Nd}_{0.7}\text{Ba}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ [5] further showed that the magnon spectrum deviates from the Heisenberg model and becomes softened near the zone boundary. So the behavior seems a universal phenomenon of manganites.

As is well known, a number of interactions such as spin-orbital coupling, Hund's coupling, antiferromagnetic coupling between core spins, Coulomb interaction and dynamic Jahn-Teller effect coexist in manganites. These interactions are supposed to explain the existence of different phases of doped manganites. To explain the spin wave softening, various mechanisms were proposed. The

authors of [4] further showed that the experimental spectrum can be reproduced reasonably well by an extended Heisenberg model. Furukawa [6] argued that the softening seems to be explainable by ferromagnetic Kondo lattice model with bandwidth narrower than the Hund's coupling. Solov'yev *et al* [7] showed that the spin-wave behavior near the zone boundary has a purely magnetic spin origin, and neither the lattice deformation nor the orbital ordering are required to account for the softening. Dai *et al* argued that the observed magnon softening and broadening are due to strong magnetoelastic interactions [8]. And this magnon-phonon coupling was later treated quantitatively in [9]. Using ferromagnetic Kondo lattice model and composite operator method, Mancini *et al* obtained the softening spectrum [10]. Shannon *et al* constructed a theory of spin wave excitations in the bilayer manganite $\text{La}_{1.2}\text{Sr}_{1.8}\text{Mn}_2\text{O}_7$ based on the simplest double exchange model and explained partly the softening behavior [11]. Krivenko *et al* showed that the scattering of spin excitations by low-lying orbital modes may cause the magnon softening [12].

In this paper, we show that in the hole-doped manganites, the softening behavior might be of a purely electronic origin, i.e., a strong but finite Hund's coupling between the e_g electron and the core spin. Since in the hole-doped manganite there is less than one e_g electron per site on average and the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbital energy is significantly higher than that of $d_{3z^2-r^2}$ [13] due to Jahn-Teller splitting, one orbital description is a reasonable approximation. As in [14], we adopt the model Hamiltonian

$$H = t \sum_{\langle \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \rangle} \sum_{\sigma} c_{\mathbf{i}\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{j}\sigma} - J_H \sum_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{i}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{i}} + J_{\text{AF}} \sum_{\langle \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \rangle} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{i}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{j}} - \mu \sum_{\mathbf{i}\sigma} c_{\mathbf{i}\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{\mathbf{i}\sigma} + U \sum_{\mathbf{i}} n_{\mathbf{i}\uparrow} n_{\mathbf{i}\downarrow} \quad (1)$$

where t is the double exchange hopping, $\langle \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \rangle$ are nearest sites, μ is the chemical potential for the fermions, $c_{\mathbf{i}\sigma}$

represents the e_g electrons, J_H is the Hund's coupling between the e_g spin $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{i}} = \frac{1}{2} c_{\mathbf{i}\uparrow}^{\dagger} \boldsymbol{\sigma} c_{\mathbf{i}\uparrow}$ and the the core spin

\mathbf{S}_i . J_{AF} is the antiferromagnetic interaction between the core spins, which is necessary to account for the G -phase parent ($x = 1$) manganites. The last term is the Hubbard Coulomb interaction. We use the Holstein-Primakoff transformation for the core spins ($S = 3/2$); $S_i^+ = (2S - a_i^\dagger a_i)^{1/2} a_i$, $S_i^- = a_i^\dagger (2S - a_i^\dagger a_i)^{1/2}$, $S_i^z = S - a_i^\dagger a_i$ and

take the approximation $(2S - a_i^\dagger a_i)^{1/2} \simeq (2S - \langle a_i^\dagger a_i \rangle)^{1/2}$. Homogeneity implies that $\langle a_i^\dagger a_i \rangle = \langle a^\dagger a \rangle$. Because we consider the low temperature case, we can drop the magnon quadratic term, hence the total Hamiltonian can be written as

$$H = t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sum_{\sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} - \mu \sum_{i\sigma} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} + U \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} J_H A \sum_i (s_i^+ a_i^\dagger + s_i^- a_i) - J_H S \sum_i s_i^z + A^2 J_{AF} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} a_i a_j^\dagger + J_{AF} Z N S^2 - 2Z J_{AF} S \sum_i a_i^\dagger a_i + J_H \sum_i s_i^z a_i^\dagger a_i \quad (2)$$

, where $A^2 = 2S - \langle a^\dagger a \rangle$, $Z = 6$ is the coordination number of the core spins. To use the composite operator

method, we consider the doublet $B(\mathbf{i}) = (a_i, s_i^+)^T$. The equation of motion for $B(\mathbf{i})$ is

$$i\partial_t B(\mathbf{i}) = [B(\mathbf{i}), H] = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} J_H A s_i^+ + A^2 J_{AF} \sum_{\mathbf{e}} a_{i+\mathbf{e}} - 2Z J_{AF} S a_i + J_H s_i^z a_i \\ t \sum_{\mathbf{e}} (c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i+\mathbf{e}\downarrow} - c_{i+\mathbf{e}\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow}) - J_H A s_i^z a_i + J_H S s_i^+ - J_H s_i^+ a_i^\dagger a_i \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

Composite operator method assumes that the right-hand side can be expressed as

$$[B(\mathbf{i}), H] = \sum_{\mathbf{j}} \varepsilon(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) B(\mathbf{j}) \quad (4)$$

with $\varepsilon(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$ determined in the following way,

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) = \sum_{\mathbf{l}} m(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{l}) I^{-1}(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \quad (5)$$

where $I(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) = \langle [B(\mathbf{i}), B^\dagger(\mathbf{j})] \rangle$, $m(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) = \langle [i\partial_t B(\mathbf{i}), B^\dagger(\mathbf{j})] \rangle$, and $\langle \rangle$ represents the expectation value. Thus $\varepsilon(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})$ contains some parameters to be determined self-consistently. This approach was proposed for Hubbard model originally[14] and recent intensive studies[15] show credible agreement with Monte Carlo method. In our case (again due to homogeneity, $\langle s_i^z \rangle = \langle s^z \rangle$)

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) &= \delta_{ij} \cdot \text{diag}(1, 2\langle s^z \rangle) \\ m_{11}(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) &= \delta_{ij} (J_H \langle s^z \rangle - 2Z S J_{AF}) + A^2 J_{AF} \sum_{\mathbf{e}} \delta_{j, i+\mathbf{e}} \\ m_{12}(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) &= \delta_{ij} J_H (-A \langle s^z \rangle - \langle s_i^- a_i \rangle) \\ m_{22}(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}) &= -t p_1 \sum_{\mathbf{e}} (\delta_{ij} - \delta_{j, i+\mathbf{e}}) + J_H A \langle s_i^- a_i \rangle \\ &\quad + 2J_H S \langle s^z \rangle - 2J_H \langle s_i^z a_i^\dagger a_i \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $p_1 = \sum_{\sigma} \langle c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} \rangle$, $p_2 = \langle s_i^- a_i \rangle$, $p_3 = \langle s_i^z a_i^\dagger a_i \rangle$. In the \mathbf{k} -space

$$\begin{aligned} m_{11}(\mathbf{k}) &= (J_H \langle s^z \rangle - 2Z S J_{AF}) + Z A^2 J_{AF} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}} \\ m_{12}(\mathbf{k}) &= J_H (-A \langle s^z \rangle - p_2) \\ m_{22}(\mathbf{k}) &= J_H A p_2 - t Z p_1 (1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}) + 2J_H S \langle s^z \rangle - 2J_H p_3 \end{aligned}$$

We assume that at $T = 0\text{K}$, $\langle a^\dagger a \rangle = 0$, which satisfies self-consistency using the resulting retarded Green's function and spectral theorem. Then condition $\omega|_{\mathbf{k}=0} = 0$ requires that $p_3 = -\frac{1}{2} p_2 (A + \frac{p_2}{\langle s^z \rangle})$. So the ε -matrix is

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{11}(\mathbf{k}) &= J_H \langle s^z \rangle - 2Z S J_{AF} (1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}) \\ \varepsilon_{12}(\mathbf{k}) &= -\frac{J_H}{2\langle s^z \rangle} (A \langle s^z \rangle + p_2) \\ \varepsilon_{21}(\mathbf{k}) &= -J_H (A \langle s^z \rangle + p_2) \\ \varepsilon_{22}(\mathbf{k}) &= J_H S - \frac{t Z p_1}{2\langle s^z \rangle} (1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}) + J_H A \frac{p_2}{\langle s^z \rangle} + J_H \frac{p_2^2}{2\langle s^z \rangle^2} \end{aligned}$$

and the Green's function is

$$\begin{aligned} D_{11}(\omega, \mathbf{k}) &= \frac{\omega - (J_H S - \frac{t Z p_1}{2\langle s^z \rangle} (1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}) + J_H A \frac{p_2}{\langle s^z \rangle} + J_H \frac{p_2^2}{2\langle s^z \rangle^2})}{(\omega - \omega_1(\mathbf{k}))(\omega - \omega_2(\mathbf{k}))} \\ D_{12}(\omega, \mathbf{k}) &= D_{21}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{-J_H (A \langle s^z \rangle + p_2)}{(\omega - \omega_1(\mathbf{k}))(\omega - \omega_2(\mathbf{k}))} \\ D_{22}(\omega, \mathbf{k}) &= \frac{2\langle s^z \rangle [\omega - (J_H \langle s^z \rangle - 2Z S J_{AF} (1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}))]}{(\omega - \omega_1(\mathbf{k}))(\omega - \omega_2(\mathbf{k}))} \end{aligned}$$

where $\omega_{1,2}(\mathbf{k})$ are acoustical and optical branches of the spin excitations. Using

$$p_2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{i}{2\pi} \int d\omega \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{D_{12}(\omega + i\eta, \mathbf{k}) - D_{12}(\omega - i\eta, \mathbf{k})}{e^{\beta\omega} - 1} \quad (6)$$

we have at $T = 0\text{K}$, $p_2 = 0$, therefore, $p_3 = 0$. Accordingly, in this scheme, there are two parameters left: $\langle s^z \rangle, p_1$. The acoustical magnon spectrum can be expanded as a Taylor series which manifests the role of Hund's coupling

$$\omega_1(\mathbf{k}) = t \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{t}{J_H}\right)^n a_n (1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}})^{n+1} \quad (7)$$

where as usual, $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} = Z^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{e}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{e}}$. The first few a_n are

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= -\frac{3(4S^2 \frac{J_{AF}}{t} + p_1)}{\langle s^z \rangle + S} \\ a_1 &= -\frac{9S(4S \frac{J_{AF}}{t} \langle s^z \rangle - p_1)^2}{\langle s^z \rangle (\langle s^z \rangle + S)^3} \\ a_2 &= \frac{27(4S \frac{J_{AF}}{t} \langle s^z \rangle - p_1)^3 S(S - \langle s^z \rangle)}{\langle s^z \rangle^2 (S + \langle s^z \rangle)^5} \\ a_3 &= -\frac{81(S^2 - 3S \langle s^z \rangle + \langle s^z \rangle^2)(4S \frac{J_{AF}}{t} \langle s^z \rangle - p_1)^4 S}{\langle s^z \rangle^3 (S + \langle s^z \rangle)^7} \end{aligned}$$

In the small k limit, $\omega \simeq Dk^2$, $D = -(4S^2 \frac{J_{AF}}{t} + p_1)/(\langle s^z \rangle + S)$. Note that the hopping energy tp_1 is negative and when it overcomes the AF term, the resulting magnon stiffness D is positive. Our numerical results show that this self-consistency is satisfied. Expression (7) suggests that the softening comes from the finite J_H . To fix the parameters $\langle s^z \rangle$, we use spectral theorem and get $\langle s^z \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(1 - x)$, where x is the dopant concentration. To fix p_1 , we need the fermion sector. Using the notations in [10] for the fermion operator $\psi(\mathbf{i}) = (\xi_{\uparrow\mathbf{i}}, \eta_{\uparrow\mathbf{i}}, \xi_{\downarrow\mathbf{i}}, \eta_{\downarrow\mathbf{i}})^T$, where $\xi_{\sigma} = (1 - n_{-\sigma})c_{\sigma}$, $\eta_{\sigma} = n_{-\sigma}c_{\sigma}$ are the Hubbard operators, we obtain the retarded Green's function for ψ in the large- U limit at zero temperature.

$$G^R(\omega, \mathbf{k}) = \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\omega - E_1(\mathbf{k})}, 0, \frac{x}{\omega - E_3(\mathbf{k})}, \frac{1-x}{\omega - E_4(\mathbf{k})}\right) \quad (8)$$

('diag' means diagonal matrix) with $E_1(\mathbf{k}) = -\mu + 6t\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} - \frac{1}{2}SJ_H$, $E_2(\mathbf{k}) = U - \mu + 6tu + 6tv\gamma_{\mathbf{k}}$, $E_3(\mathbf{k}) = [24tx\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} - 2\mu x + SJ_Hx + 12tp_{\downarrow}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} - 12t\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} + 12t\Delta_{\uparrow}]/(2x)$, $E_4(\mathbf{k}) = [-2Ux + 2\mu x - SJ_Hx + 2U + 12tp_{\downarrow}\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} + SJ_H - 2\mu + 12t\Delta_{\uparrow}]/[2(1-x)]$, where Δ is related to the nearest-neighbor correlations of the Hubbard operators: $\Delta_{\sigma} = \langle \xi_{\sigma}(\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{e}) \xi_{\sigma}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{i}) \rangle - \langle \eta_{\sigma}(\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{e}) \eta_{\sigma}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{i}) \rangle$. In this scenario, E_1, E_3 are partially filled and E_2, E_4 are empty. The relevant parameters are $\mu, \Delta_{\uparrow}, p_{\downarrow}$. We have three equations to fix them $1 - x = 2 - C_{11}^F - C_{22}^F - C_{33}^F - C_{44}^F$, $\Delta_{\uparrow} = C_{11}^{F\gamma}$, $C_{11}^F = C_{33}^F$, where $C^F = \langle \psi(\mathbf{i}) \psi^{\dagger}(\mathbf{i}) \rangle$, $C^{F\gamma} = \langle \psi(\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{e}) \psi^{\dagger}(\mathbf{i}) \rangle$. We know that $C_{22}^F = 0$ and $C_{44}^F = 1 - x$.

Thus $C_{11}^F = x = C_{33}^F$, so E_3 is empty, i.e., only E_1 is partially filled. Hence only μ is relevant to our problem and can be fixed by $x = N^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \theta(E_1(\mathbf{k}))$ where $\theta(x)$ is the usual step function. The hopping energy is

$$tp_1 = -tC_{11}^{F\gamma} = \frac{t}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \theta(-E_1(\mathbf{k})) \gamma_{\mathbf{k}} < 0 \quad (9)$$

The other two parameters $\Delta_{\uparrow}, p_{\downarrow}$ can also be determined by $t\Delta_{\uparrow} = -tp_1 > 0$, $24tx + 12t(p_{\downarrow} - 1) = -2\mu x + SJ_Hx + 12t\Delta_{\uparrow}$. Further analysis show that for $J_H > 2.5t$, the whole scheme is self-consistent. Fig.1 shows that two relevant fermion bands for $x = 0.301, t = 1, J_H = 3.0$ (in unit of t).

It is seen from the magnon spectrum (7) that we can estimate the two model parameters t and J_H from measured data. Fig.2 shows the comparison between our calculated result for the prescribed antiferromagnetic coupling $J_{AF} = 0.01$ and the measured result at $T = 10\text{K}$ for $\text{Pr}_{0.63}\text{Sr}_{0.37}\text{MnO}_3$ in [4]. The solid curve in the left panel is the fit to a nearest-neighbor Heisenberg model and gives the value at zone boundary about 34.2 meV. This corresponds to the uppermost curve in the right panel. The comparison gives the hopping energy $t \simeq 0.462\text{eV}$. The circles are the data measured and give the value at zone boundary about 23 meV, corresponding to the point 0.05 in the right panel. This point corresponds to $J_H \simeq 3.2t \simeq 1.48\text{ eV}$. Note that the ratio J_H/t is very close to the values of interaction from a number of references [16][17]. It is worth noting that the nearest-neighbor Heisenberg interaction alone can not account for the Curie temperature. The fitting curve in the left panel corresponds to the nearest-neighbor Heisenberg spectrum $\omega(\mathbf{k}) \simeq 51.3(1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}})\text{ meV}$. In the mean field theory, the Curie temperature T_c corresponding to the spectrum $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = 2ZS^*J(1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}})$ is $k_B T_c = \frac{2}{3}JZS^*(S^* + 1)$ (here $S^* = S + \frac{1}{2}(1 - x)$ is the effective spin). This gives $T_c^{\text{MF}} \simeq 500\text{K}$. Taking into account that in three dimensions for a simple cubic lattice, the real Curie temperature T_C and T_C^{MF} have relation [18]: $T_C = 0.75T_C^{\text{MF}}$, we get $T_c \simeq 375\text{ K}$, higher than the real value 315 K.

To conclude this paper, we present some discussions and comments. In the derivation of the series expression of the magnon spectrum, we have used the approximation $(2S - a_{\mathbf{i}}^{\dagger}a_{\mathbf{i}})^{1/2} \simeq (2S - \langle a_{\mathbf{i}}^{\dagger}a_{\mathbf{i}} \rangle)^{1/2}$ in the Holstein-Primarkov transformation. This can be satisfied at very low temperatures. Further, the quartic term $J_{AF} \sum_{\langle \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \rangle} a_{\mathbf{i}}^{\dagger}a_{\mathbf{i}}a_{\mathbf{j}}^{\dagger}a_{\mathbf{j}}$ is neglected because J_{AF} is very small and the magnon fluctuation at zero temperature is negligible. The series expression (7) of the acoustic magnon dispersion shows alternating behavior; convergence is guaranteed when $J_H S > 3$. The model parameters t, J_H, J_{AF} and the hopping energy p_1 can be estimated by fitting experimental data. There is a simple physical picture for the deviation of the magnon spectrum from that of Heisenberg model. The interaction between core spins is induced by the hopping of e_g -electrons




FIG. 1: The bands for the Hubbard operators at $T = 0\text{K}$.




FIG. 2: The spin wave spectrum along ΓX of B -phase. The left panel (taken from [4]) is the experimental result. The right panel is the calculated spin-wave spectrum (in unit of t) at $T = 0\text{K}$.

and the dominant term is linear in t . If the Hund's coupling J_H is infinite, only the dominant term plays the role. The e_g electron and core spin must add up to a total spin-2 to minimize the energy in the B -phase. So the actual background for spin excitation is just that in the simple Heisenberg model. But for finite J_H , high orders of the mediated interaction between core spins make some difference. Our result (7) agrees with the conclusions from random phase approximation [19], which provides an integral equation for the dispersion relation. The strength of induced ferromagnetic interaction is determined by the hopping energy of the conduction fermions. For the approach presented to be self-consistent, the spin-wave stiffness must be positive. The ferromagnetic order becomes unstable at certain filling when the stiffness vanishes. Though zone boundary spin wave softening can be explained by the spin dynamics in the Kondo lattice model, as shown in this paper. The origin of the

behavior is still an issue of debate. Based on the observed proximity of phonon dispersion and magnon dispersion and the anisotropic spin-wave broadening, Dai et al [8] argue that strong magnon-phonon coupling is needed for a complete understanding of the low temperature spin dynamics of manganites. Quite recently, Endoh et al concluded [20] that the ferromagnetic magnons in $\text{Sm}_{0.55}\text{Sr}_{0.45}\text{MnO}_3$ is of orbital nature since the magnon dispersion shows anisotropy which is mainly determined by the short range correlation of the e_g orbitals. They explained that the anisotropic magnon dispersion are attributed to long range magnetic interactions based on fitting the data to Heisenberg model with long range interactions. We believe that if orbital degrees of freedom are taken into account in our model, the resulting magnon spectrum will be anisotropic since orbital degrees of freedom bring anisotropy into the system. Finally, we remark that as manganites are very complex systems, there might be multiple mechanisms contributing to a single phenomenon. The analysis provided in this paper shows that Hund coupling might be of primary importance.

SSF is grateful to Prof. P. Schlottmann, Prof. Mancini, and Dr. Avella for their helpful discussions. This work is supported in part by the Army High Performance Computing Research Center (AHPCRC) under the auspices of the Department of the Army, Army Research Laboratory (ARL) under Cooperative Agreement number DAAD19-01-2-0014.

[†]Corresponding author, e-mail: shixiang.feng@fam.u.edu

-
- [1] R. M. Kusters, J. Singleton, D. A. Keen, R. McGreevy & W. Hayes, *Physica* (Amsterdam) **155B** (1989):362; R. von Helmolt, J. Wecker, B. Holzapfel, L. Schultz, and K. Samwer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**(1993): 2331; Ken-ichi Chahara, Toshiyuki Ohno, Masahiro Kasai, & Yuzoo Kozono *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **63** (1993):1990; H. L. Ju, C. Kwon, Qi Li, R. L. Greene, & T. Venkatesan, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **65** (1994):2108; S. Jin, T.H. Tiefel, M. McCormack, R.A. Fastnacht, R. Ramesh & L.H.Chen, *Science* **264**:413(1994).
 - [2] M.B. Salamon, M. Jaime *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**:583(2001).
 - [3] T.G. Perring, G. Aeppli, S. M. Hayden, S.A. Carter, J.P. Remeika & S-W Cheong *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**:711(1996).
 - [4] H.Y. Hwang, P. Dai, S-W. Cheong, G. Aeppli, D.A. Tennant & H.A.Mook, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**:1316(1998); J.A. Fernandez-Baca, P. Dai, H.Y. Hwang, C. Kloc & S-W. Cheong *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**:4012(1998).
 - [5] T. Chatterji, L.P. Regnault, & W. Schmidt *Phys. Rev. B* **66** (2002):214408.
 - [6] N. Furukawa, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **65**(1996):1174.
 - [7] I.V. Solovyev & K. Terakura *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**(1999):2959.
 - [8] P. Dai, H.Y. Hwang, J. Zhang, J.A. Fernandez-Baca, S-W. Cheong, C. Kloc, Y. Tomioka & Y. Tokura *Phys. Rev. B* **61**:9553(2000).

- [9] G. Khaliullin, R. Killian, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**:3494(2000);
- [10] F. Mancini, N.B. Perkins & N.M. Plakida *Phys. Lett. A* **284**:286(2001).
- [11] N. Shannon, T. Chatterji, F. Ouchni & P. Thalmeier *Eur. Phys. J B* **27**:287(2002); T. Chatterji *Pramana J. Phys.* **63**:143(2004).
- [12] S. Krivenko, A. Yaresko, G. Khaliullin & H. Fehske *J.Mag.Mag.Mat.* **272-276**:458(2004).
- [13] E. Dagotto *Nanoscale Phase Separation and Colossal Magnetoresistance*, Springer-Verlag,(2002); S. Satpathy, Z.S. Popović & F.R. Vukajlović, *J. Appl. Phys.* **79**:4555 (1996).
- [14] L.M. Roth *Phys. Rev.* **184**:451(1969).
- [15] A. Avella, F. Mancini, D. Villani, L. Siurakshina & V.Yu. Yushankhai *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **12**:81(1998); F. Mancini *Phys. Lett. A* **249**:231(1998).
- [16] S. Ishihara, J. Inoue & S. Maekawa *Phys. Rev. B* **55**:8280(1997). L.F. Feiner, A. M. Oleś, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**:3295(1999).
- [17] S. Satpathy, Z.S. Popović & F.R. Vukajlović, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**:960 (1996);
- [18] N. W. Ashcroft & D.D. Mermin *Solid State Physics* p717, (Brooks/Cole, 1976)
- [19] X. Wang *Phys. Rev. B* **57** (1998):7427.
- [20] Y. Endoh, H. Hiraka, Y. Tomioka, Y. Tokura, N. Nagaosa, and T. Fujiwara *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** (2005):017206.