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Two recent theoretical hysteresis models (Jiles-Atherton model and energetic model) are examined with respect to their capability to describe the dependence of the magnetization on magnetic field, microstructure, and anisotropy. It is shown that the classical Rayleigh law for the behavior of magnetization at low fields and the Stoner-Wohlfarth theory of domain magnetization rotation in noninteracting magnetic single domain particles can be considered as limiting cases of a more general theoretical treatment of hysteresis in ferromagnetism. © 2007 American Institute of Physics. [DOI: 10.1063/1.2802556]

The theoretical description of nonlinear, hysteretic processes in general, and ferromagnetic hysteresis in particular, is known to be a difficult problem. In the case of ferromagnetism, this is due to the multiplicity of processes, both reversible and irreversible, that take place simultaneously within a ferromagnet under the action of a magnetic field. Successful descriptions of the behavior of magnetic materials under the influence of the applied field and its history by hysteresis modeling have great impact on the field of magnetism. In addition, it would be very useful to predict the changes of the magnetic properties due to other physical effects, such as applied and residual stresses, fatigue, temperature, or irradiation. Moreover, applications require integration of the model into system design software with sufficient simplicity that will allow fast computation and efficient parameter identification strategies.

In this work two recent hysteresis models, Jiles-Atherton model (JAM) and energetic model (EM) by Hauser, were studied in order to relate their model parameters to the microstructure and anisotropy, as well as to study these models in some limiting cases. The detailed descriptions of these two models can be found elsewhere. For both models, we used simplified anhysteretic functions: either a linear or hyperbolic tangent, which is well known in situations where the magnetic moments are constrained to lie along a single axis (“spin up” or “spin down”). This is referred to as the one dimensional case. Also, working with two and three dimensional cases is possible: the former leading to a series solution for the anhysteretic function, the latter leading to the Langevin function. The indices J and H are to distinguish between the k coefficients in the JAM and EM, respectively.

The law of Lord Rayleigh describes the magnetization curve at low fields up to coercivity \( H_c \) as a parabolic function:

\[
M = \chi_0 H + \nu_R H^2,
\]

where \( \chi_0 = dM/dH \) at \( M = H = 0 \) is the initial susceptibility and \( \nu_R \) is the Rayleigh constant. If we use a second order Taylor series of the initial magnetization of the JAM and EM, we can find the relationship between Rayleigh coefficients \( \chi_0 \) and \( \nu_R \) and the coefficients of the JAM and EM.

In case of the JAM, these coefficients are found to be

\[
\chi_0 = \frac{c M_s}{a - c a M_s},
\]

\[
\nu_R = \frac{a^2 M_s (1 - c)}{2 k_J (a - c a M_s)^3},
\]

where \( M_s \) is the spontaneous magnetization, \( c \) is the reversibility coefficient, \( k_j \) is the loss coefficient, \( a \) represents the domain coupling, and the geometric demagnetizing factor \( N_d \) is neglected. In the following considerations, we use a linear approximation of an anhysteretic function which is valid for one dimensional case (a hyperbolic tangent) at the origin.

The EM model with linear anhysteretic magnetization gives the following expressions for the Rayleigh coefficients:

\[
\chi_0 = \frac{\mu_0 M_s^2}{k_H q + \mu_0 M_s^2 N_i},
\]

\[
\nu_R = \frac{\mu_0^2 M_s^2 k_H q^2}{2 (k_H q + \mu_0 M_s N_i)^3},
\]

where \( N_i \) is the inner demagnetizing factor (the geometrical demagnetizing factor \( N_d \) is neglected), \( k_h \) is the loss coefficient, and \( q \) is a coefficient in the probability function of irreversible domain wall displacements.

To consider the correlation of these results with micromagnetics, we recall that in a statistical theory of a domain wall pinning by Kronmüller, the relationships between defect density \( N \) and the geometry of domains and domain walls are established, resulting in \( H_c \propto \sqrt{N}, \chi_0 \propto 1/\sqrt{N}, \) and \( \nu_R \propto 1/N. \)

Assuming that \( N \approx p_d + p_c \), it is possible to find the initial defect density \( p_d \) if we have \( H_c, \chi_0, \) or \( \nu_R \) for at least two measurements for different amounts of induced defects \( p_c \), due to external influence, such as that caused by irradiation or fatigue:
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TABLE I. JAM and EM coefficients of Fe–C series (Ref. 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wt % C</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.24</th>
<th>0.47</th>
<th>0.74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M_r$ (MA/m)</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>1.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$ (kA/m)</td>
<td>2.623</td>
<td>2.427</td>
<td>2.306</td>
<td>1.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$ (10⁻⁴)</td>
<td>4.280</td>
<td>3.901</td>
<td>3.447</td>
<td>1.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c$ (10⁻⁴)</td>
<td>2.002</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_f$ (A/m)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_f$ (/m³)</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q(1)$</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_0$ (10⁻⁴)</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$H_{c,2} = \frac{V_{r,1}}{V_{r,2}} = \frac{\chi_{0,1}}{\chi_{0,2}} = \sqrt{\frac{p_0 + p_{C,2}}{p_0 + p_{C,1}}},$  

where the indices 1 and 2 stand for different amounts of induced defects.

As an example, let us consider the recently studied case of low carbon Fe–C steel samples with different percentages of carbon, which were analyzed by both models.¹¹ The model coefficients are summarized in Table I. Evaluating Eq. (6) for $\chi_0$ and $\nu_a$ for different wt % C and averaging them over all combinations of $p_{C}$, we find that $p_0=0.0269\%$ for the EM and $p_0=0.0388\%$ for the JAM. Figures 1 and 2 compare functions of $1/N = \sqrt{p_0 + p_{C}}$ with the normalized $H_{c,1}/H_{c,0}$ and $\sqrt{1/n_r}$ for the EM and JAM, respectively. The values of $H_{c}$ of the major loop, which were computed using the expressions $H_{c,1}=k_f/\mu_0M_s$ and $H_{c,2}=k_f(1-c)$ for both EM and JAM,¹¹ show the best agreement with $\sqrt{N}$. However, due to the fact that $\chi_0$ is not directly comparable between JAM and EM,¹¹ we cannot use $\chi_0$ reliably in this case. All these considerations indicate that both models are capable in predicting the initial percentage of impurities or defects in magnetic materials, if measurements with different densities (e.g., caused by fatigue or irradiation) are known.

Another consideration is to relate the coefficients of the JAM and EM to the well-known approach of Stoner and Wohlfarth (SW) of coherent rotation.¹² In order to achieve the directional dependence we use the uniaxial anisotropy energy density

$$w_k = K_u \sin^2 \varphi,$$

where $\varphi$ is the angle between $M$ and the easy axis. The ideal SW behavior is characterized by a rectangular loop in the

$\varphi=0$ direction and $M=M_s H/H_k$ in the $\varphi=\pi/2$ direction.¹²

In order to identify the values of the JAM parameters, which will be used to describe an equivalent Stoner-Wohlfarth system, we consider their linear anisotropy dependence as proposed earlier:¹³

$$a = a_c + c_a \frac{2K_u}{\mu_0 M_s} \sin^2 \varphi,$$

$$\alpha = a_c + c_a \frac{2K_u}{\mu_0 M_s^2} \sin^2 \varphi,$$

$$N_0 = \frac{2K_u}{\mu_0 M_s^2} \sin^2 \varphi,$$

with $N_0 = a/M_s - \alpha$, and where $a_c$ and $\alpha_c$ are the corresponding values of $a$ and $\alpha$ at $\varphi=0$. If the normalized magnetization $m=m_1-\delta$ with $0<\delta\leq1$ at $H=H_k$, for both $\varphi=0$ and $\varphi=\pi/2$, then we can identify

$$a_c = \frac{H_k}{\arctanh m_1 - m_1},$$

$$\alpha_c = \frac{H_k}{M_c(\arctanh m_1 - m_1)},$$

$$c_a = \frac{H_k - (a_c + H_k) \arctanh m_1 + \alpha_c M_c m_1}{H_k(\arctanh m_1 - m_1)},$$

$$c_a = 1 + c_a.$$

For the case of $\varphi=0$, we have to set $c=0$ (which means irreversible switching processes only) and $k_f=H_k$, which leads to $H_c=H_k$. For the case $\varphi=\pi/2$, we have to set $c=1$ (which corresponds to reversible processes only) and $k_f=0$, $H_c=0$. The SW behavior is then found when $\delta \rightarrow 0$, but this may cause numerical problems because of the large numbers involved. Lower $m_1$ at $H_k$ will result in a smooth transition into saturation, as often observed in real materials. Figure 3 shows the JAM results for $\mu_0 M_s=1$ T and $H=10$ kA/m. Both simulations $\varphi=0$ and $\varphi=\pi/2$ behave as expected. In the case of $\varphi=0$, the modeled coercivity was slightly larger than expected $H_c=1.15H_k$. 

FIG. 1. Normalized dependences of $1/\nu_0$, $\sqrt{1/\nu_0}$, $H_c$ calculated from EM and $\sqrt{N}=\nu_0 + \nu_{C}$ as a function of wt % C of Fe-C series steels.

FIG. 2. Normalized dependences of $1/\chi_0$, $\sqrt{1/\nu_0}$, $H_c$ calculated from JAM and $\sqrt{N}=\nu_0 + \nu_{C}$ as a function of wt % C of Fe-C series steels.
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FIG. 3. SW-JAM hysteresis simulations of \( \varphi = 0 \) (with \( M_s = 800 \text{ kA/m} \),
\( a = 6 \text{ kA/m} \), \( k_f = 10 \text{ kA/m} \), \( \alpha = 0.02 \), \( c = 0 \), and \( N_f = 0 \)) and \( \varphi = \pi / 2 \) (with
\( M_s = 800 \text{ kA/m} \), \( a = 6 \text{ kA/m} \), \( k_f = 0.01 \text{ A/m} \), \( \alpha = 0.0 \), \( c = 1 \), and \( N_f = 0 \)) with
\( H_k = 10 \text{ kA/m} \).

Similar considerations can be made for the EM. Here,
\( k_H = \mu_0 M_s H_k \) and a variation of \( q \) will be considered: \( q = 0 \) in
the \( \varphi = \pi / 2 \) direction and \( q \gg 1 \) in the \( \varphi = 0 \) direction. In order
to obtain the SW behavior, we set

\[
N_f = \frac{2K_u \sin^2 \varphi}{\mu_0 M_s^2},
\]

(15)

\[
2q h = \frac{2K_u}{\mu_0 M_s^2}.
\]

(16)

This results in \( H_c = H_k \) both in the \( \varphi = 0 \) and \( \varphi = \pi / 2 \)
directions. Figure 4 shows the EM result for
\( \mu_0 M_s = 1 \text{ T} \), \( H_k = 10 \text{ kA/m} \), \( g = 120 \), \( h = 10^{-33} \), \( k_H = 10 \text{ kJ/m}^3 \),
and \( q_H = 60 \).

The results of this investigation have shown that the Rayleigh law at low fields and Stoner-Wohlfarth coherent
rotation can both be described as limiting cases of a more
general hysteresis model which encompasses both low and
high field behaviors. Through the more general hysteresis
model it is possible to include additional features, for ex-
ample, a smooth approach to saturation at \( \varphi = 0 \) and
\( \varphi = \pi / 2 \), \( H_c > 0 \) in the hard axis direction, \( H_c < H_k \) in the easy
axis direction, etc. Furthermore, a comparison with micro-
magnetic modeling showed the dependence of the model co-
efficients on the defect density and thus the ability to de-
scribe the effects of degradation by hysteresis measurements.
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FIG. 4. SW-EM hysteresis simulations of \( \varphi = 0 \) (with \( M_s = 800 \text{ kA/m} \),
\( g = 120 \), \( h = 10^{-33} \), \( k_H = 10 \text{ kJ/m}^3 \), and \( q_H = 1 \)) and \( \varphi = \pi / 2 \) (with
\( M_s = 800 \text{ kA/m} \), \( g = 120 \), \( h = 10^{-33} \), \( k_H = 10 \text{ kJ/m}^3 \), and
\( q = 0 \)) with \( H_k = 10 \text{ kA/m} \).
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