Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Nanoscale Advances. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2020

Supplementary information

for

Exchange-bias via nanosegregation in novel $Fe_{2-x}Mn_{1+x}Al$ (x = -0.25, 0, 0.25) Heusler

films

S. Kurdi^{1,*}, M. Ghidini^{2,3,1,‡}, G. Divitini¹, B. Nair¹, A. Kursumovic¹, P. Tiberto⁴, S.S. Dhesi³, Z.H. Barber¹

¹ Department of Materials Science and Metallurgy, University of Cambridge, CB3 0FS Cambridge, United Kingdom.

² Department of Physics, Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Parma, 43130 Parma, Italy.

³ Diamond Light Source, Chilton, Didcot, OX11 0DE Oxfordshire, United Kingdom

⁴ The National Institute for Metrological Research (INRIM), 10135 Torino, Italy.

* sk862@cantab.ac.uk

‡ massimo.ghidini@unipr.it

Contents

Note1 As-deposited Film Characterization

Note 2 Exchange-Bias at *T* = 2 K for the Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al film

Note 3 Mn and Fe XAS

Note 4 Morphology and Surface Roughness

Note 5 Curie temperatures from ZFC/FC curves

As-deposited Film Characterization

XRD of the as-deposited Fe_{2-x}**Mn**_{1+x}**Al films.** Fig. S1 shows only principal reflections (of the type (h+k+1)/2 = 2n). The absence of superlattice reflections shows that the films possess the disordered A2 Heusler structure. Peaks are broad, which suggests that the as-deposited films have a very small crystallite size, as confirmed by STEM (Fig. S2), which shows homogenous microstructure with grain size ~10 nm or smaller.



Figure S1. XRD of the as deposited $Fe_{2-x}Mn_{1+x}Al$ films (x = -0.25, 0, 0.25). XRD patterns for compositions $Fe_{2.25}Mn_{0.75}Al$ (blue), Fe_2MnAl (red) and $Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al$ (black). The vertical black lines represent the expected positions of the fundamental peaks.



Figure S2. High-angle annular dark-field STEM image of the as deposited Fe₂MnAl film. **Supplementary Note 2**

Exchange-Bias at T = 2 K for the Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al film

For all the samples discussed in this paper, the highest value of 36 ± 0.05 mT for the exchange-bias field, was measured at T = 2 K after field cooling in a 600 mT field (Fig. S3).



Figure S3. Zooms of the hysteresis loops for the Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al film measured at T = 2 K after cooling in zero applied magnetic field (thick black line) and in a 600 mT applied magnetic field (thin orange line). Both hysteresis loops were measured sweeping the magnetic field in the range ± 7 T.

Mn and Fe XAS

For all film compositions, here we present typical XAS scans measured in total electron yield at T = 1.6 K and in a 6 T applied magnetic field. Multiplet peaks are present in the Mn scans for the Fe₂MnAl and Fe_{2.25}Mn_{0.75}Al (as shown by arrows) indicating the presence of some degree of surface oxidation. For this reason, as explained in the main text, it has not been possible to apply XMCD sum rules to these samples. However, these spurious peaks are absent in the corresponding data for the Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al film and the high quality of the XAS spectra has allowed the quantitative XMCD analysis that we presented in the main paper (Fig. 4).



Figure S4. (a) Mn and (b) Fe raw XAS scans (with photon helicity parallel to magnetic field, I⁺) measured at T = 1.6 K in a 6 T field for Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al (black), Fe₂MnAl (red) and Fe_{2.25}Mn_{0.75}Al (blue). Black arrows point to spurious oxide peaks in the Mn XAS scans for Fe₂MnAl and Fe_{2.25}Mn_{0.75}Al.

Morphology and Surface Roughness

Here we present AFM scans for all film compositions (Fig. S5). Root-mean-square squareness $R_{\rm rms}$ (as determined from the three 1×1 µm² scans below) is 1.07 ± 0.02 nm, 3.56 ± 0.1 nm and 4.10 ± 0.04 nm for Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al, Fe₂MnAl and Fe_{2.25}Mn_{0.75}Al respectively. The Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al films show the lowest peak-to-peak roughness: 10.5 ± 0.5 nm compared to 25.5 ± 1.0 nm for Fe₂MnAl and 26.5 ± 0.8 nm for Fe_{2.25}Mn_{0.75}Al. The increase of Fe (decrease in Mn) content shows a surface microstructure with finer grain size.



Figure S5. Surface morphology for the Fe_{2-x}Mn_{1+x}Al films. Roughness (R_{rms}) was determined from three 1 x 1 μ m² scans.

Curie temperatures from ZFC/FC curves



Figure S6. Thermal dependence of the magnetization as measured after cooling in zero-field (dashed lines) and while cooling in a field $\mu_0 H = 5$ mT (solid lines), for the films with nominal composition Fe_{2.25}Mn_{0.75}Al (blue), Fe₂MnAl (red) and Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al (black).

The T_c values were extracted from Fig. S6 using the two-tangent method¹, and are summarized in Table S1 below for all film compositions.

Table S1. The Curie temperature (T_c) of the Fe_{2.25}Mn_{0.75}Al, Fe₂MnAl and Fe_{1.75}Mn_{1.25}Al films.

Film	$T_{\rm c}[{\rm K}]$
Fe _{2.25} Mn _{0.75} Al	268
Fe ₂ MnAl	150
Fe _{1.75} Mn _{1.25} Al	83

As in previous studies^{2,3} we observe that T_c decreases with decreasing Fe concentration (mirroring as expected the observed decrease in magnetic moment). This behaviour has been attributed to the ferromagnetic nature of the dominant Fe-Fe interactions. For the Fe₂MnAl sample we observe $T_c \sim 150$ K which is lower than the values reported for bulk samples in some studies^{4,5}, but comparable to another study². This large spread in the reported T_c values is not surprising in Heusler alloys and is likely related to the role of chemical disorder⁶, but more specifically in nanocrystalline films T_c is also affected by extrinsic factors such as strain and size effects.

The suppression of ferromagnetism at room temperature could in principle be due to superparamagnetism, but we can rule this out in view of our STEM data, showing that the sample with the smallest average grain size also displays the highest T_c .

References

- 1 K. Fabian, V. P. Shcherbakov and S. A. McEnroe, *Geochem. Geophys.*, 2013, **14**, 947–961.
- 2 Z. Liu, X. Ma, F. Meng and G. Wu, J. Alloys Compd., 2011, 509, 3219–3222.
- 3 H. Bremers, J. Hesse, H. Ahlers, J. Sievert and D. Zachmann, *J. Alloys Compd.*, 2004, **366**, 67–75.
- C. Paduani, A. Migliavacca, W. E. Pöttker, J. Schaf, J. C. Krause, J. D. Ardisson, C. A. Samudio Pérez, A. Y. Takeuchi and M. I. Yoshida, *Phys. B Condens. Matter*, 2007, 398, 60–64.
- 5 K. H. J. Buschow, P. Engen and P. G. van Engen, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.*, 1981, **25**, 90–96.
- J. Karel, J. E. Fischer, S. Fabbrici, E. Pippel, P. Werner, M. Vinicius Castergnaro, P.
 Adler, S. Ouardi, B. Balke, G. H. Fecher, J. Morais, F. Albertini, S. S. P. Parkin and C.
 Felser, J. Mater. Chem. C, 2017, 5, 4388–4392.