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\textsuperscript{1}Low-temperature cycling (LTC) of magnetic remanences carried by rocks has become a standard technique in paleomagnetism, rock magnetism, and environmental magnetism as a means of identifying mineralogy and grain size. LTC usually involves measuring low-temperature thermomagnetic curves on cooling through crystallographic transitions, such as magnetite’s Verwey transition. Historically, it has been assumed that remanence carried by single-domain (SD) magnetite grains is not affected by cooling through the cubic/monoclinic Verwey transition, whereas larger multidomain (MD) magnetite grains partially demagnetize. However, it has been recently pointed out that the shape anisotropy even for an infinitely long cylinder is approximately 3 times smaller than the monoclinic magnetocrystalline anisotropy along the hardest axis, i.e., SD remanences are not impervious to LTC. Using a micromagnetic algorithm we simulate LTC curves for assemblages of effectively elongated SD magnetite grains and consider the contribution of magnetostatic interactions. Initially, we assume that the relationship between the cubic and monoclinic symmetry is chosen randomly; however, there are key experimental features, which this model does not explain. A new “controlled switching” model is developed; the orientation of the low-temperature monoclinic axes are not chosen randomly, but instead are controlled by the direction of the magnetic moment on cooling through the Verwey transition. This new model correctly predicts experimentally observed low-temperature trends that the “random” model does not. We therefore propose a new model for the mechanism controlling the behavior of SD grains at the Verwey transition and show that the low-temperature behavior of SD and MD grains can yield ambiguously similar behavior.


1. Introduction

Low-temperature magnetic measurements have become increasingly popular as a means of identifying magnetic minerals, many of which display magnetic anomalies associated with various types of physical transitions. Because of the presence of magnetite in many natural systems, its distinctive Verwey transition, $T_V$ (\textasciitilde 125 K) is of great interest and is commonly used as a method of identifying magnetite’s presence [Nagata et al., 1964]. At the Verwey transition many magnetic, electronic and crystallographic properties change, in particular the crystallographic cubic symmetry changes to monoclinic. This change in symmetry strongly affects the magnetocrystalline anisotropy, which not only changes shape (Figure 1), but in addition is an order of a magnitude greater in intensity than the cubic phase magnetocrystalline anisotropy at room temperature [Bickford et al., 1957; Abe et al., 1976].

In multidomain (MD) magnetite this sharp change in the anisotropy directly influences a wide range of common magnetic properties, e.g., on cooling through $T_V$ the coercive force increases and the susceptibility decreases [Kronmüller et al., 1974; Argyle and Dunlop, 1990; Özdemir et al., 2002]. Similarly, on either heating or cooling through $T_V$ the change in anisotropy causes demagnetization of saturation isothermal remanence (SIRM) induced in a MD grain [Özdemir and Dunlop, 1999].

In contrast, it has been assumed that single domain (SD) grains are relatively unaffected by the Verwey transition. This assumption was based primarily on low-temperature demagnetization (LTD) memory ratios \textasciitilde 1, where the memory ratio (MR) is the ratio of the magnetization at 300 K after cycling to $<T_V$ divided by the initial remanence. It was argued that MR \textasciitilde 1 because most SD grains are controlled by the shape anisotropy at all temperatures, however, Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2002, 2004] pointed out that the maximum shape anisotropy (for an infinitely long cylinder) is approximately 3 times smaller than the monoclinic magnetocrystalline anisotropy along the hardest axis.
That is, the magnetization of every SD grain will to a certain degree be affected on cooling below $T_V$.

[5] Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2004] modeled LTC curves for SIRM simulations in an assemblages of elongated, randomly oriented, noninteracting SD grains with varying uniaxial anisotropies defined in terms of $q$, where $q$ is the ratio of the long axis to the short axis. They considered values of $q$ between 1 (sphere, cube) and as $q \to \infty$ (infinitively long cylinder). In their model they assumed that during zero-field cooling (ZFC), the low-temperature phase orientation is chosen randomly with respect to the cubic anisotropy above $T_V$, i.e., the $c$ axis aligns with one of the cube edges (Figure 1). In their model this gives rise to reversible behavior, i.e., $MR > 1$, with a large decrease in magnetization at $T_V$; the size of the decrease at $T_V$ decreasing with increasing $q$ (Figure 2).

[6] Their model did not include cubic magnetocrystalline anisotropy for temperatures greater than $T_V$. For large values of $q$ this omission is not significant, however, for values of $q \leq 1.15$, the cubic magnetocrystalline anisotropy becomes increasingly important [Geshev et al., 1998]. Because of this omission, near-equidimensional SD magnetite grains will behave differently to their model predictions, in particular with respect to reversibility and predicted magnetic memory ratios. In addition to having a higher initial SIRM/$M_S$ value, where $M_S$ is the saturation magnetization, randomly oriented grains with random elongations of $q \leq 1.15$, are highly unlikely to display reversible behavior on cooling/warming through $T_V$ (Figure 2). This is because on cooling through $T_V$ the magnetic moments will realign to give a net demagnetization, but on warming back through $T_V$, the magnetic moments of near-equidimensional grains will have an eightfold (cubic) choice as to their new preferred direction rather than the twofold choice for uniaxial shape anisotropy. It is highly unlikely for assemblages of noninteracting grains that magnetic moments would all rotate back to their original positions, i.e., $MR < 1$.

[7] In addition, their model fails to predict certain key features that are commonly observed experimentally. For example, consider Figure 3 redrawn from Özdemir et al. [2002], which shows the LTC curves for near-cubic synthetic SD magnetite. On cycling through the $T_V$, the magnetization is seen to partially reversibly increase, rather than decrease. To be consistent with previous studies [e.g., Muxworthy et al., 2003a], we will refer to this anomalous jump on cooling through $T_V$ as $\Delta J$, where $\Delta J$ is the size of the anomalous jump normalized by the initial SIRM at 300 K (Figure 2). For Figure 3, $\Delta J$ is positive. The model of Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2004] does not accommodate $\Delta J > 0$.

[8] In this paper we investigate LTC curves for SD grains using a numerical micromagnetic approach. In the model developed in this paper we include several key features excluded from earlier models: first, we include magne-
crystalline anisotropy in the cubic phase above $T_V$ in addition to a uniaxial anisotropy. Second, we consider the role of intergrain magnetostatic interactions on LTC. Third, we test the assumption made in earlier models that on zero-field cooling (ZFC) through $T_V$ the low-temperature monoclinic $c$ axis aligns randomly with one of the cubic axes (Figure 1); in this paper we consider in addition to the random alignment a second “controlled” alignment hypothesis.

2. Controlled Alignment Hypothesis

The controlled alignment hypothesis assumes that the direction of the magnetic moment influences the choice of orientation of the monoclinic $c$ axis (easy axis) at $T_V$. This hypothesis is driven by the idea that for any rotation of a magnetic moment there will be an associated energy barrier. If we temporarily ignore other sources, which may influence the orientation of the $c$ axis, then on cooling an SIRM (Figure 4a) through $T_V$, rather than randomly aligning with a cubic axis (Figure 4b), the $c$ axis will align along the cubic axis closest to the magnetic moment (Figure 4c), that is the magnetic moment controls the direction of the $c$ axis orientation. This hypothesis is not unreasonable as it is documented that in the presence of relatively small magnetic fields (field cooling, FC) of the same order as the coercivity, i.e., $\sim 30–80$ mT, that the $c$ axis aligns with the direction of the field [Carvallo and Muxworthy, 2006]. The difference in this hypothesis is that for each grain the $c$ axis aligns with direction of the remanence of each individual grain. That is, the resultant distribution of $c$ axis orientations is partially ordered, rather than fully ordered as in the high-field FC case. The degree of ordering will increase with remanence value, so that an SIRM will have a greater degree of order than, say, a thermoremanence.

3. A Numerical Model for SD Low-Temperature Behavior

3.1. Micromagnetic Algorithm

In this study we have implemented a combination micromagnetic algorithm [Muxworthy and Williams, 2004, 2005]. The approach combines both a minimum energy conjugate-gradient (CG) algorithm [e.g., Williams and Dunlop, 1989] and a dynamic algorithm which follows the torque of a magnetic moment according to the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert (LLG) equation [e.g., Suess et al., 2002]. The reasoning behind this approach is that the dynamic algorithm gives the more rigorous solution since the magnetization between stable states must follow a physically reasonable path dictated by the LLG equation of motion; however, it is relatively slow compared to the CG method. In this combination algorithm, we use the CG algorithm to rapidly generate an initial guess for the magnetic structure, which is then put into the dynamic solver. This increases the efficiency of the algorithm by roughly an order of magnitude compared to the dynamic solver alone. We used a finitely damped solver detailed by Brown et al. [1989]. The combined method is more robust than the CG method alone, as it minimizes the torque on each discretized magnetic moment compared to the CG method, which only minimizes the total energy. The dynamic solver produces lower energy states than the CG algorithm alone. We use fast Fourier transforms (FFT) to calculate the demagnetizing energy, which allows the high resolution needed to examine arrays of interacting grains.

In the model each grain is represented by a simple cube, that is, each cube represents the averaged magnetization direction of many hundreds of atomic magnetic dipole moments, or simply each cube is an ideal SD grain. The orientation of the magnetic moment of each grain can vary. The grain assemblage structure is initially calculated with the CG algorithm by minimizing the total magnetic energy, which is the sum of magnetostatic energy and the anisotropy $E_A$ [Brown, 1963].

$E_A$ consisted of a cubic magnetocrystalline anisotropy above $T_V$ and the monoclinic magnetocrystalline anisotropy below $T_V$ in addition to a uniaxial anisotropy related to $g$. Details of the implementation of the crystallographic anisotropies and their temperature dependence have been described previously [Muxworthy and Williams, 1999]. Variations in the low-temperature crystallographic axes were taken from Bickford et al. [1957] and Abe et al. [1976]. These two data sets were chosen in favor over more recent data because they contain the most complete data sets with the highest number of temperature steps; the values correspond well with other published data. In the original study [Muxworthy and Williams, 1999] and this study, we omit the higher-order terms from the monoclinic magnetocrystalline anisotropy for two reasons. First, our model is a first-order approximation. Second, quick analytical calculations show that at all angles the terms selected to represent the monoclinic anisotropy dominate the other higher-order terms for two reasons: first, the absolute size of the intensity of the omitted terms is significantly smaller, and second, the higher-order terms are related to the directional cosines to the fourth power and not as in the lower-order terms, the second.

In order to maintain the computational efficiencies of the FFT used in the algorithm, when generating the uniaxial anisotropy, rather than varying the shape of the particles we added an additional energy term of the form $E_A = K_2 \sin^2 \theta$, where $\theta$ is the angle between the elongation axis and the magnetization and $K_U$ is a parameter related to the...
Figure 4. Schematic cartoon of the LTC SIRM behavior of a moment controlled by a uniaxial anisotropy ($K_u$) at room temperature for both the RA and CA models. This cartoon is for a noninteracting system. After the removal of a saturating field the magnetic moment will align with the nearest easy uniaxial axis, which is orientated at angles $\alpha$, $\beta$, and $\gamma$ with respect to the crystallographic axes (Figure 4a). From the same initial starting state (Figure 4a), the RA model switching behavior is shown in Figure 4b and for the CA model in Figure 4c. The resultant final state at room temperature after LTC is identical (Figure 4d). In CA model the moment switches to the closest (100) on passing through $T_v$. In the RA model the $c$ axis is randomly chosen; that is, this schematic shows only one of six possible orientations of the monoclinic crystallography.
For the highly interacting models there are small differences between repeat simulations, e.g., for the CA and RA cooling curves above the Verwey transition. For the highly interacting models the entire assemblage behaves effectively as one system. This system experiences a wide range of possible states on simulated cooling. On repeating the simulation occasionally different magnetic states are found. Simply increasing the assemblage size for the most interacting systems would not solve the problem.

Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2002, 2004] modeled LTC curves for chains of interacting SD magnetite grains, i.e., an approximation to magnetosome chains found in magnetostatic bacteria. The effect of one-dimensional interactions has been shown to be different to that of interactions in two or three dimensions [Muxworthy and Williams, 2004]; they make magnetic assemblages behave more SD-like than MD-like. In this study we consider three-dimensional interaction fields.

3.2. Incorporation of Controlled Alignment Hypothesis

On simulated low-temperature cycling for SD magnetite, we consider both a random alignment model (RA) of the monoclinic axes and a controlled alignment model (CA) as discussed in section 2. For the CA model, in addition to choosing the c axis closest to the direction of the magnetic moment of each grain, we also align the anisotropy within the c plane, i.e., in addition to controlling the orientation of the c axis, we also orientate the a axis (hardest direction) and the b axis (intermediate direction) in the c plane (Figures 1 and 4c). Because of symmetry there are only six possible orientations of monoclinic axis with respect to the cubic axis. On cooling through $T_V$, all three axes are orientated with respect to the magnetic moment, i.e., there is no random choice of axis orientation as in the RA model.

We make the assumption that no crystallographic twins form within the SD grains. This is based on two considerations: first, the smallest reported low-temperature twin-domain structures are $>20$ μm [Medrano et al., 1999], and second, if the boundary conditions were sufficient to cause twin structures to form in SD grains, i.e., $<0.1$ μm, it is unlikely that the magnetization would control the orientation of the monoclinic phase. The magnetic behavior of the sample shown in Figure 3 is unlikely to have been influenced by its boundary conditions, as it was embedded in CaF$_2$ giving it effectively a free surface.

4. Random Morphology

4.1. Noninteracting SD Assemblages

Initially, we compare the predicted behavior of the RA and CA models with the calculations of Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2004]. We model assemblages of noninteracting, identical SD grains. Both uniaxial and cubic anisotropy are included, where the two anisotropies are randomly orientated with respect to both the field and each other, i.e., the effective elongation is chosen randomly with respect to the crystal morphology. Three different values of $q$ are considered; $q = 1.01$ (cubic magnetocrystalline dominates at room temperature), $q = 1.1$ (cubic magnetocrystalline is twice that of the uniaxial anisotropy at room temperature) and $q = 1.5$ (uniaxial anisotropy dominates at room temperature). A value of $q = 1.01$ was chosen over $q =$
1.0, for two reasons. First, because of the absence of thermal fluctuations in the model as the cubic anisotropy passes through an isotropic point at $\sim 130$ K [Bickford et al., 1957], in the absence of the small uniaxial anisotropy and intergrain magnetostatic interactions, the SD moments will not rotate even though there is no energy barrier preventing them. Second, it is highly unlikely in reality that grains will have neither a small shape nor a stress-induced anisotropy, i.e., it is unlikely that an SD grain will be truly magnetically isotropic. For the three randomly orientated regimes, the initial SIRM/$M_S$ ratios at 300 K were 0.86, 0.58 and 0.49 for $q = 1.01, 1.1$ and 1.5 respectively. For a randomly orientated assemblage, negative cubic anisotropy has an analytical SIRM/$M_S$ value of 0.866, and uniaxial anisotropy that of 0.5 [Kneller, 1969]. Mixing cubic and uniaxial anisotropy changes these values, and for certain combinations SIRM/$M_S < 0.5$ [Geshev et al., 1998]. The values calculated in this paper are in agreement with published numerical mixed-anisotropy calculations [Geshev et al., 1998].

For high values of $q$, the RA model SIRM LTC curves (Figure 5a) are identical to that predicted by Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2004] in Figure 2. On cooling to $T_V$ the remanence signal increases as $M_S$ increases. The LTC curve for $q = 1.5$ displays a large reversible decrease in the
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magnetization at $T_V$, i.e., $\Delta_j < 0$, and the resulting memory ratio is slightly less than 1. This corresponds to the switching sequence shown through Figures 4a, 4b, and 4d. As $q$ decreases, the influence of cubic magnetocrystalline anisotropy not included in the Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2004] calculations is seen. For $q = 1.01$, on simulated cooling to above $T_V$ the remanence, which is controlled by the magnetocrystalline cubic anisotropy, demagnetizes as the cubic anisotropy decreases to zero at its isotropic point at $\sim 130$ K. On cooling through $T_V$ the remanence displays a small decrease in demagnetization, i.e., small negative $\Delta_j$. On increasing to 300 K, the curves are not reversible and $MR < 1$. This is similar to the behavior observed for MD material [Muxworthy and McClelland, 2000], and in contrast to Figure 2 where even as $q \rightarrow 1$, $MR = 1$. For $q = 1.1$, the LTC behavior falls between the other two cases, noticeably $MR < 1$.

[21] Results for the CA model are similar to the RA model (Figure 5), though for higher values of $q$, $\Delta_j$ is considerably reduced. This corresponds to the sequence shown in Figures 4a, 4c, and 4d; the starting and end states are the same, but due to the controlled switching mechanism at $T_V$, $\Delta_j$ is relatively smaller as the c axis aligns with the closest $\langle 100 \rangle$ axis (Figure 9c), whereas in the RA model it switches to a former $\langle 100 \rangle$ axis which lies at a greater angle from the original SIRM field direction (Figure 9b). On warming up to room temperature, in the CA mode the moment returns approximately to its original position subject to variations in the interaction field (Figure 9e), whereas in the RA model, the moment reverses aligning with the uniaxial anisotropy in the other direction, leading to an effective demagnetization (Figure 9d).

**4.2. Effect of Magnetostatic Interactions**

[22] The effect of varying the interaction spacing ($d/r$) between the grains is considered for the RA and CA models (Figure 6), where $d/r$ is the ratio of the grain size divided by the separation measured from the grain center, e.g., for touching grains $d/r = 1$, and as grains become further apart $d/r \rightarrow 0$. Certain key features are true for both the models; the degree of demagnetization increases on cooling between 300 K and to just above $T_V$, as $d/r$ increases, i.e., increasing interactions (Figure 6). This demagnetization is quantified in Figure 7, by comparing the magnetization at 300 K with that just above $T_V$, allowing for the variation in $M_S(T)$. For $q = 1.01$, the degree of demagnetization is highest for intermediate values of $d/r$, decreasing slightly as $d/r \rightarrow 1$. Even for $q = 1.5$, the decrease in the cubic magnetocrystalline anisotropy on cooling is sufficient to cause a small degree of demagnetization, which increases with interactions (Figure 7). In addition for $q = 1.5$, as $d/r$ increases, $MR$ decreases (Figure 8). The influence of interactions is more pronounced in the RA model results than the CA simulations. For example, for $q = 1.5$ and $d/r = 0.17$, $MR \sim 0.9$ for the CA model, but 0.5 for the RA model (Figure 8). The reason for this is demonstrated in the schematic cartoon for possible switching sequences in the RA and CA models with the same initial starting state shown in Figure 9. On cooling through $T_V$, in the CA model the moment switches to the closest $\langle 100 \rangle$ axis (Figure 9c), whereas in the RA model it switches to a former $\langle 100 \rangle$ axis which lies at a greater angle from the original SIRM field direction (Figure 9b). On warming up to room temperature, in the CA mode the moment returns approximately to its original position subject to variations in the interaction field (Figure 9e), whereas in the RA model, the moment reverses aligning with the uniaxial anisotropy in the other direction, leading to an effective demagnetization (Figure 9d).

![Figure 7](image1.png)

**Figure 7.** Quantification of the demagnetization on simulated cooling from 300 K to just above $T_V$. The demagnetization is normalized by the initial magnetization at 300 K, and the variation in $M_S(T)$ is accommodated for. As the demagnetization occurs on cooling to above $T_V$, these curves are the same for both the RA and CA models. The uniaxial anisotropy is chosen randomly with respect to the crystal morphology.

![Figure 8](image2.png)

**Figure 8.** Magnetic memory ratio (MR) versus $d/r$ for (a) the RA model and (b) the CA model for three effective elongations, i.e., $q = 1.01, 1.1$ and 1.5. As $d/r$ increases the spacing between grains decreases. The uniaxial anisotropy is chosen randomly compared to the crystal morphology.
Figure 9. Schematic cartoon of the LTC SIRM behavior of a moment controlled by a uniaxial anisotropy at room temperature for both the RA and CA models in the presence of local magnetostatic interaction fields. From the same initial SIRM starting state (Figure 9a), the RA model switching behavior is shown in Figures 9b and 9d and for the CA model in Figures 9c and 9e. Because of the interaction field, the moment in Figure 9a does not align with the uniaxial anisotropy ($K_U$) but finds an equilibrium state dependent on the uniaxial anisotropy and the interaction field. In CA model the moment switches to the closest $100\overline{1}$ on passing through $T_V$. In the RA model the c-axis is randomly chosen. On warming back through $T_V$ the moment in the RA model (Figure 9d) moves toward the closest $K_U$ direction, which is in the opposite direction to Figure 9a and finds a new equilibrium position in the new interaction field. In the CA model the moment returns to approximately the same position as in Figure 9a subject to small variations in the interaction field.
for all $h$ (Figures 3, 5, and 6), values (Figure 2) which are not observed values (Figures 11b).

In contrast, for the CA model, $q = 1.1$ and 1.5 and for small $d/r$, direction the LTC curves are compared to the crystal morphology.

Numerical behavior (Figures 11a, 11c, and 13).

The size and sign of $\Delta_j$ are strongly influenced by interactions (Figure 10). The model results for $\Delta_j$ become increasingly noisy as $d/r$ is increased; this is likely due to the complex behavior of highly interacting systems. For the RA model for $q = 1.1$ and 1.5 and for small $d/r$, $\Delta_j$ is $< 0$, but increases as $d/r \to 1$. In contrast, for the CA model, $\Delta_j$ for all three values of $q$, is generally $> -0.2$, except when $d/r \to 1$ $\Delta_j$ displays greater variation.

5. Discussion

The inclusion of the magnetocrystalline anisotropy and magnetostatic interactions in our RA model produces LTC behavior which is closer to the observed behavior than that predicted by Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2004]; in particular, the large negative $\Delta_j$ values (Figure 2) which are not observed experimentally are greatly reduced. However, there still appears to be some discrepancies between the RA model results and experimental results. Primarily, the model predicts significant demagnetization during LTC for equidimensional crystals, i.e., small $q$, which is not observed experimentally for SD near-cubic crystals (Figure 3). The effect of introducing the CA model is to increase MR for grains with small shape anisotropies (Figure 8). In addition, the CA model further reduces the large negative values of $\Delta_j$ compared to the RA model (Figure 10), suggesting that the CA model is a physically realistic mechanism for low-temperature monoclinic axis switching behavior. Positive $\Delta_j$ values observed experimentally are not found in the models except for large values of $d/r$, but simulated LTC curves with positive $\Delta_j$ values do not exhibit the same overall behavior as the experimental curves with positive $\Delta_j$ (Figures 3, 5, and 6), e.g., when $d/r \to 1$ the LTC curves become less smooth and more erratic, in contrast to the experimental results.

Both the CA and RA models in this paper for assemblages of randomly elongated SD grains predict behavior closer to the observed behavior than the simplified RA model of Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2004], and the CA model predicts behavior closer to that observed than the RA model. Yet even the CA model does not predict all the experimental behavior (Figure 3), i.e., reversible LTC curves with positive $\Delta_j$ and high memory ratios.

In the initial simulations in this paper the uniaxial anisotropy was chosen randomly with respect to the cubic anisotropy. This assumption may be invalid for two reasons; first, there maybe a preferred direction of crystal growth, and secondly, by modeling only ideal single domain grains we have ignored the contribution of configurational anisotropy (W. Williams et al., Configurational anisotropy in single-domain and pseudo-single-domain grains of magnetite, submitted to Journal of Geophysical Research, 2006, hereinafter referred to as Williams et al., submitted manuscript, 2006). The configurational anisotropy is a term coined to describe the energy barrier associated with intermediate states in nonuniform SD or flower-state structures in symmetrical nonspherical grains, e.g., a cube, octahedron etc. For example, in a cubic grain with significant flowering it is energetically favorable for the magnetic structure to align with the axes of the cube, rather than through the corners. The energy associated with coherent rotation from one axis to another is the configurational anisotropy (W. Williams et al., submitted manuscript, 2006). Only a sphere will have no configurational anisotropy. Configurational anisotropy will always exist in cubic structures, but will often be masked by magnetocrystalline anisotropy or another anisotropy created by applied fields.

5.1. Nonrandom Orientations

We now consider grains where the orientation of the shape/uniaxial anisotropy with respect to the crystal orientation is identical for each grain within the assemblage. We consider the two extreme cases, i.e., with the elongation in the $\langle 100 \rangle$ direction and the $\langle 111 \rangle$ direction. Numerical SIRM LTC simulations for $q = 1.1$ and 1.5 are shown in Figure 11 for both the RA and CA models. In Figures 12 and 13, MR and $\Delta_j$ are plotted as a function of $d/r$.

In the RA model, for weakly interacting grains elongated along the $\langle 111 \rangle$ direction the LTC curves are reversible with large negative $\Delta_j$ values (Figures 11b and 11d). As the interactions increase the LTC curves becoming less reversible and MR decreases (Figure 12). In the RA model with grains elongated along the $\langle 100 \rangle$ direction, the LTC curves are nonreversible, with MR relatively independent of $d/r$ (Figure 12) and large partially reversible negative-$\Delta_j$ behavior (Figures 11a, 11c, and 13).

For weakly interacting grains elongated in the $\langle 111 \rangle$ direction with high values of $q$, the CA and RA models are
Simulated SIRM LTC curves for assemblages of nonrandomly orientated noninteracting SD grains with two effective elongations, i.e., $q = 1.1$ and 1.5, aligned along both (a), (c), (e) and (g) the $\{100\}$ and (b), (d), (f) and (h) the $\{111\}$ directions and two magnetostatic interaction spacings. Figures 11a–11d are for the RA model, and Figures 11e–11h for the CA model.
essentially the same. In the RA model, due to the relation-
ship between the cubic and monoclinic crystallographic
symmetries, the magnetic moment of each grain becomes
“trapped” in one hemisphere of the uniaxial anisotropy
ellipsoid, and the random choice of the low-temperature
c axis in the RA model is the same as the CA model. The
choice of the second axis will not be same, giving rise to the
slight differences between the CA and RA models for
\( q = 1.1 \) and 1.5 in Figures 11, 12, and 13. As d/r increases local
magnetostatic interaction fields begin to dominate over the
uniaxial anisotropy, and the similarity between the models
breaks down. \( D_J \) is negative at all times in the
\( h_{111} \) models.

[30] In contrast, for grains elongated along the \( h_{100} \)
direction the difference in behavior between the CA and
RA models is significant. The SIRM LTC curves become
more reversible and MR is seen to increase for the CA
compared to the RA model (Figures 11 and 12). On cooling
though \( T_V \). \( \Delta_J > 0 \); for \( q = 1.5 \) \( \Delta_J \) increases steadily from d/r = 0 to 0.91, it then decreases slightly for d/r = 1 (Figures 11g
and 13). For \( q = 1.1 \), \( \Delta_J \) peaks at d/r \( \sim 0.7 \).

[31] On inducing an SIRM in these aligned assemblages
of noninteracting grains elongated along the \( h_{100} \) axis, the
moments of the grains will align along the elongated \( h_{100} \)
axis at room temperature. As the degree of interactions
increases, the grain moments deviate from the \( h_{100} \) axis. If
the degree of interactions is significant then SIRM/M_S will
be reduced. On cooling through \( T_V \) if the degree of
interactions is moderate, the moments rotate to the closest
c axis, which for the CA model corresponds the elongated
(100) axis/easy uniaxial axis. On average this will give rise
to an increase in the magnetization. If, however, the degree
of interactions is very large, then some moments will have
rotated so far away from easy uniaxial anisotropy direction
that the chosen c axis will not coincide with the uniaxial
anisotropy, and the magnetization will decrease. This is why
\( \Delta_J \) decreases slightly as d/r \( \to 1 \). This decrease with
increasing d/r is more pronounced in the \( q = 1.1 \), \( h_{100} \)
model as the uniaxial anisotropy field is weaker. This effect
is not seen in the \( (111) \) models as the monoclinic easy axis,
i.e., the c axis, does not correspond to an easy uniaxial
anisotropy direction. Positive \( \Delta_J \) behavior will exist for
other orientations of elongation, becoming more pro-
nounced as the direction of uniaxial anisotropy becomes
closer to a \( h_{100} \) direction.

[32] Such positive \( \Delta_J \) behavior has been predicted by
models of multidomain LTC behavior [Muxworthy and
Williams, 1999]. In these models it was found that the
removal of closure-domain-like structures near the surface
of the grain was the cause of the increase in magnetization
on cooling through \( T_V \). Highly interacting SD assemblages
behave in many respects in a similar manner to MD
assemblages, e.g., highly interacting SD assemblages have

Figure 12. MR versus d/r for (a) the RA model and (b) the
CA model for two effective elongations, i.e., \( q = 1.1 \) and 1.5
aligned along both the \( h_{100} \) and the \( h_{111} \) directions.

Figure 13. \( \Delta_J \) versus d/r for (a) the RA model and (b)
model for two effective elongations, i.e., \( q = 1.1 \) and 1.5
aligned along both the \( h_{100} \) and the \( h_{111} \) directions.
5.2. Comparison With Experimental Data

[33] Compared to the experimental data (Figure 3), the simulated SIRM LTC curves are less smooth and display more abrupt features, in particular at the Verwey transition temperature. The exact Verwey temperature for “perfect magnetite” is thought to be 125 K [Walz, 2002]; however, this temperature is easily suppressed by small deviations from stoichiometry and low levels of residual stress. In real samples each grain is likely to have a slightly different Verwey transition temperature leading to a distribution of transition temperatures (~120–125 K) in an assemblage of grains, “smoothing” the observed Verwey transition. In addition there are other differences between the model and the actual experimental samples, which will contribute to their LTC behavior; unlike the model, real samples will have distributions of grain spacing and coercivity. While these distributions can be included in the model, it is the purpose of the model to try to understand and interpret the main features of the experimental data; this is done by isolating key parameters.

[34] The positive $\Delta_1$ values in the near-cubic magnetite samples of Özdemir et al. [2002] (Figure 3), can be explained by the CA model with some magnetostatic interactions if the magnetization on average aligns with the $\langle 100 \rangle$ directions, either due to preferred direction of crystal elongation, configurational anisotropy or a combination of the two. That the grains are interacting is supported by the SIRM/MR ratio which is ~0.28 [Özdemir et al., 2002]. For SD magnetite controlled by the cubic magnetocrystalline anisotropy alone, this indicates a spacing of $d/r \sim 0.45$ [Muxworthy et al., 2003b]. The SIRM LTC behavior and the relatively high MR for this SD sample (Figure 3), suggests that a uniaxial anisotropy dominates the behavior and the effective elongation $q$ is $> 1.3$.

6. Conclusions

[35] The introduction of the cubic magnetocrystalline anisotropy and magnetostatic interactions to the model of Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2004] (Figure 2) is seen to significantly alter the LTC behavior (Figures 5, 6, and 10), producing nonreversible behavior, i.e., MR $< 1$, with partial demagnetization on cooling from room temperature to above $T_V$. The random alignment model of Carter-Stiglitz et al. [2004], does not accommodate all the experimentally observed features, in particular, increases in the magnetization on cooling through $T_V$, i.e., $\Delta_1 > 0$. A new “controlled switching” model is developed, which predicts positive $\Delta_1$ behavior that the “random” model does not. In this model the orientation of the low-temperature monoclinic axes are not chosen randomly, but instead are controlled by the direction of the magnetic moment on cooling through the Verwey transition. Positive $\Delta_1$ behavior is only observed for grains with a uniaxial anisotropy aligned with or near to the $\langle 100 \rangle$ directions; uniaxial anisotropy aligned along the $\langle 111 \rangle$ axes produces negative $\Delta_1$ behavior. Thus for assemblages of SD magnetite whose LTC behavior is shown in Figure 3, this suggests that there is a preference for the magnetic moments to align along the $\langle 100 \rangle$ directions, i.e., the hard cubic magnetocrystalline anisotropy direction. This could be due to a preferred growth direction or configurational anisotropy (W. Williams et al., submitted manuscript, 2006).

[36] This proposed CA model is likely to only apply to grains of magnetite that have unconstrained surfaces free from stress. If the surfaces of a grain are not free, then it is likely that the monoclinic crystallographic axes will orientate in response to these boundary conditions, and not the internal magnetic structure of the grain. That is, only in stoichiometric magnetite will monoclinic axes orientation be controlled by the magnetic moment of the grain, and in nonstoichiometric magnetite the monoclinic axes will orientate in response to the stress fields within the grain. At no time will the monoclinic axes be chosen at random.

[37] The LTC curves for SD magnetite controlled by magnetocrystalline anisotropy (Figures 6a–6d) and/or subject to intergrain magnetostatic interactions (Figure 11), display LTC behavior more commonly associated with MD grains. Noninteracting SD magnetite grains dominated by cubic magnetocrystalline anisotropy can carry geologically stable remanences, however, if LTC curves were measured for such grains, then they would be incorrectly identified as MD grains which normally carry soft remanences. Therefore LTD procedures commonly used in paleointensity studies [e.g., McClelland and Briden, 1996; Yamamoto and Tsunakawa, 2005] can also remove stable SD remanences in addition to relatively unstable MD remanences.

[38] What are required now are a series of controlled experimental on well-characterized, stoichiometric SD magnetite grains with known or controlled interaction spacings, to test the models proposed in this studies.
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