Journal of Physics: Conference Series 200 (2010) 012057

Uranium compounds prepared by sputter deposition: UFe_{2+x}

A Adamska¹, L Havela¹, S Daniš¹, J Pešička¹, J Macl¹, K Uhlířová¹, T Gouder², R Eloirdi², F Huber², N-T H Kim-Ngan³, A G Balogh⁴

¹ Charles University, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Ke Karlovu 5, Prague 2, CZ-12116 The Czech Republic

² European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Institute for Transuranium Elements, Postfach 2340, D-75125 Karlsruhe, Germany

³ Institute of Physics, Pedagogical University, Podchorazych 2, 30-084 Kraków, Poland

⁴ Institute of Material Science, Darmstadt University of Technology, Petersenstrasse 23, D-64287 Darmstadt, Germany

E-mail: havela@mag.mff.cuni.cz

Abstract. UFe₂ is one of rare examples of combination of 3*d* and 5*f* magnetism in a compound with relatively high $T_{\rm C} = 162$ K. U-excess is known to reduce the $T_{\rm C}$ value markedly. To prepare the Laves phase with an Fe excess is much more difficult. It can be achieved by sputter deposition, but the structure becomes amorphous. $T_{\rm C}$ can increase at least to 240 K (for UFe₄), but the segregation of α -Fe cannot be avoided for very high Fe concentrations.

1. Introduction

Uranium cubic Laves phase UFe₂ was the first known actinide compound exhibiting ferromagnetism [1]. Its Curie temperature $T_{\rm C}$ reported by various authors was typically between 160-170 K [2]. Although both U and Fe carry magnetic moments [3], the Fe sublattice can be taken responsible for relatively high $T_{\rm C}$. The fact that U moments are small (0.01 $\mu_{\rm B}$) is, besides the cancellation of spin and orbital part, undoubtedly connected with the small U-U spacing. The strong 5*d*-3*d* hybridisation leads to Fe moments (0.60 $\mu_{\rm B}$) [3] greatly reduced with respect to those in Fe metal or REFe₂ Laves phases [4]. That is why the potential of a combination of the 5*f* and 3*d* magnetism in one material is not materialized in UFe₂.

Studies on off-stoichiometric UFe_x compounds prepared by quenching [2] showed that the reduction of the Fe concentration leads to a suppression of T_C from 162 K in UFe₂ to 112 K in UFe_{1.7}. The opposite deviation from the ideal 1:2 stoichiometry, i.e. stabilizing the Fe excess, could not be realized by a simple quenching. However, an increase of T_C to more than 200 K was achieved by a ball milling with excessive Fe, despite the concomitant amorphisation [5]. This finding was in contrast with results of reference [6], reporting on amorphous UFe_{2.7} prepared by sputtering, which exhibits only weak ferromagnetism with spin-glass features at low temperatures (below 32 K). More detailed study on splat-cooled UFe_{2+x} [7] indicated that incorporating additional 0.3 Fe atoms into the Laves phase structure leads to increase of T_C to about 230 K. In this case, Fe occupies the U sites, and such antistructure Fe atoms can have substantially higher magnetic moments. The structure remains crystalline, approaching nanocrystallinity. A larger Fe excess led to a segregation of α -Fe

Journal of Physics: Conference Series 200 (2010) 012057

The aim of the present study is to use sputter deposition to test if even more Fe can be incorporated into the U-Fe phase, leading possibly to additional $T_{\rm C}$ increase. It is particularly intriguing to determine whether possible amorphisation would not affect the ferromagnetism in a negative way, as shown before for magnetic systems of purely 5*f* type.

2. Thin-film synthesis and structure

UFe_{2+x} films were obtained by sputter deposition in a UHV chamber (base pressure 10^{-11} mbar) from U and Fe targets on Si (111) and fused silica (SiO₂) as substrates, kept at the room temperature. The co-sputtering from two targets allows the stoichiometry control. In-situ XPS was used for the primary diagnostics. We succeeded to prepare films with *x* varying between 0.3 and 8, with typical thickness of 500 nm. Approximate sputtering time was 4 hours. After the XPS analysis, the films were exposed to atmosphere.

The composition and thickness of the films were studied by means of Rutherford Backscattering Spectroscopy (RBS). As an example, figure 1 shows the depth profile for the film UFe_x (the stoichiometry 1U-4Fe was estimated from XPS and electron microprobe analysis and confirmed by RBS) deposited on Si (111). Moreover, RBS indicated the presence of very thin (65 nm) surface layer of UO₂ mixed with the U-Fe phase. At the interface, an U-Fe-Si intermixing region (≈ 60 nm) could be detected. A small amount of Fe (2%) diffused into the Si substrate. This Fe can be possibly in the form of α -Fe, which is not easily detected by XRD due to the overlap with diffraction lines of USi₃.



Figure 1. Concentration depth profile derived from the RBS areal density using the mass density of the "bulk" stoichiometric UFe₂. The analysis for the UFe₄ deposited on Si (111). The plot shows both the elemental profiles as well as the tentative composed profile of the UFe₄ phase.

A similar structure pattern was found for the U-Fe film deposited on fused silica under the same conditions. The main slab of approx. UFe₄ composition contains in this case also small amount of uranium oxide. Much more uranium oxides occur at the interface in this case, pointing to the effect of the oxygen originating from the silica substrate and reacting with highly reactive uranium. Moreover, the surface oxidized layer was thicker than in the previous case. The results suggest that the surface film is not only due to post-deposition oxidation, but small amount of oxygen may segregate at the surface during the deposition already.

The film prepared with a larger Fe excess (approx. UFe_8) exhibited a large amount of crystalline α -Fe.



Figure 2.

XRD patterns for UFe₄ (the same as in figure 1) obtained in the glancing angle XRD using Cu-K α radiation with a variable angle of incidence (given in the figure), increasing from 1° (bottom) to 15° (top). For small angles of incidence, the diffracted beam originates from the film only. For higher angles the interface and the substrate are included into the effective information depth.

3.Magnetic properties

Magnetic properties were studied in the temperature range 2-300 K by means of a vibrating sample magnetometer and *ac* susceptibility magnetometer in the Quantum Design PPMS system. The diamagnetic signal of the substrates can be neglected in weak magnetic field. Therefore no correction was applied. Figure 3 shows the total magnetization in magnetic field of 0.1 T. Its temperature dependence indeed exhibits a ferromagnetic transition, which is not very far from critical temperature assumed for UFe₂. The film deposited on Si exhibits T_C approx. 180 K, while T_C for the SiO₂ substrate is higher, approx. 240 K. The sample with larger Fe concentration (not shown here) exhibits a ferromagnetic behaviour throughout the whole temperature range. This is undoubtedly due to the dominance of α -Fe, but also the present U-Fe phase is likely to have the T_C value exceeding 300 K.



Figure 3.

Temperature dependence of the magnetization for the UFe₄ films deposited on Si and SiO₂, respectively, measured in magnetic field 0.1 T. The arrows indicate the respective Curie temperatures.

The small amount of α -Fe as ferromagnetic impurity is the reason for the relatively higher magnetization of the UFe₄ sample on Si at 300 K, ie. nominally in the paramagnetic state. The weakly paramagnetic USi₃ and low-temperature antiferromagnetic UO₂ cannot influence the data significantly.

The respective Curie temperatures are better seen from the figure 4, exhibiting the *ac* magnetization data (*ac* field 1 mT). For the real part, a broad plateau is observed below $T_{\rm C}$, which is unusual in U-based ferromagnets with typically strong magnetocrystalline anisotropy and consequent pinning of narrow domain walls. The anisotropy of UFe₂ is relatively very weak and the *ac* magnetization forms such a plateau instead of a sharp peak even in a crystalline material.



250

300

200

T (K)

IOP Publishing doi:10.1088/1742-6596/200/1/012057

Figure 4. Temperature dependence of *ac* magnetization in the *ac* field of 1 mT for UFe₄ in Si(111) and SiO₂. The real part M'(T) is in the upper panel, the imaginary part M''(T) in the lower panel. Reader should note that the real part is higher by a factor of 100. Although the main slab has nominally the main composition UFe₄ in both cases, the film in SiO₂ has somewhat less free α -Fe (seen in Figure 3) and more oxides, which can both amount in more Fe-rich U-Fe, increasing the actual $T_{\rm C}$ value.

4. Discussion and conclusions

100

150

50

0.0 -0.2

0

The $T_{\rm C}$ value of UFe₂ can increase if an excessive Fe can be embedded in the same phase. The fact that the sputter deposited material is amorphous apparently does not strongly affect the $T_{\rm C}$ value, which points to the dominance of the Fe-3*d* magnetism as the 5*f* magnetism was found much more easily suppressed with increasing disorder [9,10]. The issue remains what is the highest achievable Fe concentration at various deposition conditions (mainly the substrate temperature and deposition rates should play a role). In this preliminary work we were not able to identify what is the main reason that the significant $T_{\rm C}$ increase was recorded for the UFe₄ film deposited on fused silica. One can speculate that the higher oxidation leading to uranium oxides can stimulate the U depletion in the U-Fe phase. A deeper insight could be provided by a microscopic method as XMCD, which could reveal magnetic moments of individual components. The results apparently strongly contradict to [6].

350

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Grant Agency of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic under the grant number IAA100100912 and by the Czech Research and Development project KAN101630651. N.-T.H.K-N and A.G.B. acknowledge the financial support from German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)-project D/08/07991.

References

- [1] Gordon P, 1949, Thesis, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- [2] Aldred A T 1979 J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 10 42
- [3] Lebech B, Wulff M, Lander G H, Rebizant J, Spirlet J C and Delapalme A 1989 J. Phys. Cond. Matter 1 10229
- [4] Hilscher G 1982 J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 25 229
- [5] Timko M, Szlafarek A, Zentko A and Kováč J 1999 J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 655 196
- [6] Freitas P P, Plaskett T S and McGuire T R 1988, J. Appl. Phys. 63 3746
- [7] Havela L, Miliyanchuk K, Pešička J, Gonçalves A P, Waerenborgh J C, Pereira L C J, Šantavá E, Šebek J 2008 *acta phys.polonica a* **113** 247
- [8] Roy S B, Williams G and Coles B R 1989 J. Phys. France **50** 2773
- [9] Rafaja D, Havela L., Kuzel R., Wastin F, Colineau E and Gouder T 2005 J. Alloys Comp. 386 87
- [10] Havela L, Miliyanchuk K, Rafaja D, Gouder T and Wastin F 2006 J. Alloys Comp. 408-412 1320