

Numerical simulation projects in micromagnetics with Jupyter

Martin Lonsky,^{1,2,*} Martin Lang,^{3,4} Samuel Holt,^{4,3} Swapneel Amit Pathak,^{4,3} Robin Klause,¹ Tzu-Hsiang Lo,¹ Marijan Beg,⁵ Axel Hoffmann,¹ and Hans Fangohr^{3,4,6,†}

¹*Materials Research Laboratory and Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA*

²*Institute of Physics, Goethe University Frankfurt, 60438 Frankfurt, Germany*

³*Max Planck Institute for the Structure and Dynamics of Matter, 22761 Hamburg, Germany*

⁴*Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom*

⁵*Department of Earth Science and Engineering, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*

⁶*Center for Free-Electron Laser Science, 22761 Hamburg, Germany*

(Dated: July 18, 2024)

We report a case study where an existing materials science course was modified to include numerical simulation projects on the micromagnetic behavior of materials. The Ubermag micromagnetic simulation software package is used in order to solve problems computationally. The simulation software is controlled through Python code in Jupyter notebooks. Our experience is that the self-paced problem-solving nature of the project work can facilitate a better in-depth exploration of the course contents. We discuss which aspects of the Ubermag and the project Jupyter ecosystem have been beneficial for the students' learning experience and which could be transferred to similar teaching activities in other subject areas.

I. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, science curricula at the university level consist of theory-focused classes and experimental courses. However, not only in the natural sciences, but also within the engineering community, computation has emerged as a third fundamental methodology [1]. Both experimentalists and theorists make use of computational techniques in their activities. Oftentimes, a system of interest is too complex to be solved analytically or certain experiments cannot be carried out in a laboratory. In such cases, numerical studies can help to improve our understanding.

In STEM education, computational modeling has an important role [2], and it is widely argued that more computational content in curricula would be desirable [*e.g.*, 3]. Anecdotal evidence on undergraduate programs at numerous universities worldwide suggests that computational contents remain severely underrepresented in the respective curricula [3, 4], despite recent studies presenting evidence that computational methods education in undergraduate coursework may lead to the development of multiple essential skills [5, 6]. For example, the American Association of Physics Teachers (AAPT) has identified competency in computation to be vital for success at the workplace or PhD research activities for physicists [7, 8]. Computational modeling and numerical simulations appear crucial for obtaining a complete picture of the modern STEM disciplines, and therefore adequate ways need to be found to embed this branch into teaching curricula.

We can distinguish between at least two approaches

toward incorporating computational methods in a curriculum [9]: Firstly, there are courses which solely focus on programming, numerical methods, modeling, and simulations. Secondly, computational content can also be introduced by embedding it in existing courses. The latter approach is at the core of this case study.

Here we report on the introduction and implementation of numerical simulation group projects in an elective course within the materials science and engineering curriculum of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). The course is also available to students in other fields, such as electrical and computer engineering or physics, and requires basic knowledge in condensed matter physics. The students set up and perform micromagnetic simulations by using the open computational environment¹ Ubermag [11]. In this article, we describe our experiences using Ubermag and related computational software packages in STEM instruction. We discuss our insights from the teaching delivery, student evaluations and personal interview surveys.

The paper is structured as follows. Section II contains a description of the course on magnetic materials and applications at UIUC, a brief introduction to computational micromagnetics, and a detailed presentation of the Ubermag software and its application in the classroom. Based on the students' feedback and our own experience, we give recommendations for the implementation of computational projects in other courses in Sec. III. We provide supplementary material along with this article, including a general overview on the incorporation of computational

* lonskymartin@gmail.com

† hans.fangohr@mpsd.mpg.de

¹ Open computational environments allow students to directly see and control the underlying algorithm of the computational model, while closed computational environments such as simulation applets are considered as a black box with no or little information about the exact model [10].

contents into STEM programs, a description of simulation projects and the corresponding problem sheets, additional practical considerations, and a thematic analysis of the feedback from students and the teaching staff.

II. MICROMAGNETIC SIMULATION PROJECTS IN A MATERIALS SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING COURSE

There exist many approaches to integrating computational contents into undergraduate or graduate STEM degree curricula (see Sec. I of supplementary material). Here, we present a case study that we conducted within the framework of a class on “Magnetic Materials and Applications”. We utilized the software package Ubermag [11], developed at the University of Southampton, United Kingdom, and the Max Planck Institute for the Structure and Dynamics of Matter, Germany, which provides a Python interface to existing micromagnetic simulation packages.

We introduced group projects that make use of the Ubermag software package. Ubermag offers an easy-to-learn approach to create, control and run simulation scripts that solve the underlying partial differential equation that describes the temporal evolution of the magnetic field in a specified materials system.

In Subsec. II A, we begin with a detailed description of the Magnetic Materials and Applications course in which we have conducted our case study. This is followed by an introduction to (analytical) micromagnetic theory in Subsec. II B and the numerical computation of solutions in Subsec. II C. Finally, Subsec II D introduces the Ubermag software.

A. The Elective Course on Magnetic Materials and Applications

The Magnetic Materials and Applications class (MSE 598/498/464) at UIUC is an elective course aimed at both undergraduate and graduate students at the Department of Materials Science and Engineering, but other students from the physics, chemical engineering and electrical engineering departments have also attended this class. The total enrollment ranges from 7 to 15 students per semester.

The lecture introduces the fundamental concepts with regard to the practical use of magnetic materials. The course objectives are:

- Understand how different magnetic interactions determine static and dynamic magnetic properties.
- Quantify essential magnetic materials properties.
- Design components of magnetism-based devices.
- Use basic micromagnetic simulations.

The class is held over the span of about 16 weeks and it is recommended that students dedicate 6-8 hours per week to working on the course. Aside from the live lectures, online discussions are encouraged via Canvas (an online course and learning management system), weekly homework is assigned, literature review presentations are delivered by the students, and a micromagnetic simulation project has to be completed successfully.

We have designed five distinct simulation projects. Students are asked to work in groups of two to four, since each project is divided into several subprojects, that are mostly independent of each other, but do have a certain overlap such that it is beneficial for the students to interact with their peers and discuss their solutions. More detailed information about the contents of the projects and problem sheets can be found in Sec. II of the supplementary material. A sample timeline of the projects is illustrated in Fig. 1. Before the problems are handed out to the students, we give a brief introduction (about 30 minutes) to Ubermag as part of a standard 90-minute class that focuses on micromagnetic simulations. Furthermore, we provide them with additional material such as video tutorials by the Ubermag developers and the accompanying software documentation, which is very comprehensive and includes numerous examples of Jupyter notebooks that enable to run Ubermag. Due to the students’ diverse backgrounds, their exposure to programming in general and Python in particular prior to working on the computational micromagnetics projects has been vastly different. For instance, the Department of Materials Science and Engineering at UIUC has computational methods embedded in several core classes of the curriculum [12–16], while students from other majors who attend our course may never have written their own code. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume a discrepancy in the average computational literacy between undergraduate and graduate students in the class.

Project reports are due around two months after the projects have been assigned. It is prudent to set up meetings between students and the instructor together with a teaching assistant halfway through the duration of the computational project. Firstly, this provides preliminary feedback to the students and helps to prevent them from getting lost in details. Furthermore, it also enables students to ask questions about the subject matter, programming in general, and the instructor’s expectation with regard to their report and presentation. Lastly, it may be perceived as an intermediate deadline and thereby encourages students to get started with the projects as early as possible. We also ensure that students always have the possibility of reaching out to the teaching assistants via email as well as on a Canvas discussion forum. A few weeks after the intermediate discussions, students are required to present their results to the class and then hand in a project report a few days later. After each presentation, we aim to stimulate a technical discussion and then solicit feedback from the audience on the presentation content and style.




FIG. 1. Example timeline for the computational micromagnetics projects.

B. Introduction to Micromagnetics

Micromagnetics is concerned with magnetization processes on length scales large enough to overlook atomic structure details of a material but small enough to resolve magnetic textures like domain walls. Examples of relevant applications include magnetic data storage devices and nanoparticles for medical purposes. The basis of time-dependent micromagnetics is the equation of motion of the magnetization vector field (Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert, LLG equation) [17]:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{m}}{dt} = -|\gamma_0|\mathbf{m} \times \mathbf{H}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{m}) + \alpha\mathbf{m} \times \frac{d\mathbf{m}}{dt}. \quad (1)$$

Here, γ_0 denotes the gyromagnetic constant, and α is the Gilbert damping constant. The entity of interest is the magnetization vector field $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{r}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ defined as a function of position $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and time $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For a time-dependent problem, one generally knows an initial magnetization vector field $\mathbf{m}_0 = \mathbf{m}(t_0)$ at time t_0 and wants to compute $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ for $t > t_0$.

A significant part of the complexity originates from the effective field, \mathbf{H}_{eff} , which is itself a function of the magnetization vector field. The effective field can be computed from the energy E of the system:

$$\mathbf{H}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \frac{\delta E}{\delta \mathbf{m}}. \quad (2)$$

Different phenomena of material physics can be described by including different contributions to the energy E , for example

$$E(\mathbf{m}) = E_{\text{Ex}}(\mathbf{m}) + E_{\text{Z}}(\mathbf{m}) + E_{\text{Dem}}(\mathbf{m}) + E_{\text{Anis}}(\mathbf{m}) + E_{\text{DMI}}(\mathbf{m}), \quad (3)$$

where E_{Ex} denotes the exchange energy, E_{Z} the Zeeman energy, E_{Dem} the demagnetization energy, E_{Anis} the

anisotropy energy, and E_{DMI} the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction (DMI). All energy terms involve integrals over the volume, some involve vector analysis operators, and the demagnetization term contains a double integral over the volume due to the long-range nature of demagnetization effects.

In summary, the micromagnetic problem — summarized through Eqs. (1) and (3) — is complex. Mathematically, this is reflected in Eq. (1) being a non-linear integro-partial differential equation. A rich variety of phenomena are described by this model, ranging from dynamic effects such as ferromagnetic resonance and spin-wave propagation [18–20] to static equilibrium configurations of the magnetization field such as magnetic domains and vortices. It is this complexity and richness that makes the model a fruitful ground for advanced materials physics education.

C. Introduction to Computational Micromagnetics

The micromagnetic model can only be solved analytically for a small number of cases (often in geometries with particular symmetries). In general, a numerical approach is required to obtain a solution. A typical numerical approach toward the solution of the LLG equation (1) is given by discretizing it in space using finite elements or finite differences. The time-dependent problem then becomes numerically tractable by solving the spatial partial differential equation for a time t , then advancing the solution from t to $t + \Delta t$ through solving a set of ordinary differential equations. We note that this iterative solution over steps in time is algorithmically similar to the time integration method that is frequently used in VPython simulations.

There are at least two widely used software pack-

ages that solve the complex computational micromagnetics problem using finite differences and relying on the same physical model: the Object Oriented Micro-Magnetic Framework (OOMMF) [21] and mumax³ [22]. The OOMMF software operates on the computer’s CPU, whereas mumax³ is GPU-accelerated and requires an Nvidia GPU card to be installed. OOMMF is written in C++ and Tcl, mumax³ is based on the programming languages Go and CUDA. The input scripts for the simulations need to be defined by the user in Tcl and a Go-like scripting language, respectively. The learning curve for either package is long; while clearly acceptable in professional research activities, it is a challenge for occasional users such as students in an educational setting. In the remainder of this article, we will demonstrate that the Ubermag software has a significantly shorter learning curve, making it more suitable for educational use. Ubermag has been developed to offer a Python interface [23] to OOMMF with the goal of providing an improved environment for researchers to support computational science investigations of magnetic materials and devices. Later, Ubermag was extended to also interface with mumax³ [24]. In what follows, we will provide more detailed information on Ubermag and how it can be used for teaching activities.

D. The Ubermag Software and its Utilization in the Classroom

The Python packages provided by Ubermag allow the user to specify micromagnetic models, run simulations, and analyze and visualize data in interactive Jupyter notebooks, see Fig. 1 of the supplementary material. Only the computational solving of micromagnetic problems is delegated to the *micromagnetic calculators* (*i.e.*, OOMMF or mumax³), while all other steps are independent from these simulation packages.

The Ubermag Python packages (Sec. III C 1) are structured to mirror the computational modelling concepts: define a physics model (`micromagneticmodel`), discretise space (`discretisedfield`), compute the numerical solution (`oommf` and `mumax3c`).

Students can control and run their Ubermag simulations via browser-based interactive Jupyter notebooks. The modular structure of Jupyter notebooks allows running blocks of code (so called “cells”) individually instead of running the entire simulation script. Students can obtain an in-depth understanding of the underlying physics by iteratively modifying and exploring the system (Sec. III B 1).

The installation of software for teaching purposes can be challenging: The university’s or the students’ personal laptops may be running a variety of operating systems (typically Windows, MacOS or Linux) with different versions. More complex simulation software environments may need multiple libraries of compatible versions to be installed simultaneously. For the Ubermag soft-

ware, there are fortunately multiple ways to install it: Using conda-forge the three main operating systems are supported. An installation using Python’s standard installation tool pip is also possible, but requires the user to manually install a micromagnetic calculator (such as OOMMF or mumax³).

All simulation projects in our course are carefully designed such that each calculation runs for a reasonably short period of time, *i.e.*, seconds to minutes. For computational problems that can be computed within a few minutes on a single-core CPU, there is another *zero-install* way of using Ubermag through a service called MyBinder available at `mybinder.org`. In short: Ubermag can be executed in the cloud and controlled from any browser; no installation on the computer is necessary. This has been very popular with students (see Sec. III B 2 for more details).

We discuss the value of using open source software in education in Sec. III of the supplementary material. Furthermore, we present a qualitative thematic analysis of the learning experience from the student and teacher perspective in Sec. IV of the supplementary material. In the following section, we offer suggestions for embedding computational projects into other courses based on the feedback and our experience.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMPUTATIONAL PROJECTS

The feedback we have obtained from students and teachers suggests that computational problem solving can improve the learning experience. In this section, we discuss the teaching setup with the objective to extract insights that could be useful in other subjects (*i.e.*, outside micromagnetics and materials physics more generally). We want to comment on three points here: the choice of programming language (III A), the opportunities from the Jupyter Notebook for use in education (III B), and aspects of the Ubermag design that are beneficial for teaching (III C).

A. Choice of Programming Language

The use of Python as the language to both drive the simulation and to carry out the analysis of the data extracted from the simulations appears to be a good choice. Python is easy to learn yet very powerful [25]. Of particular relevance is the wide set of Python libraries available for science and engineering — including sophisticated data analysis and data visualization tools.

B. Project Jupyter Tools for Education

The Jupyter notebook [26] emerged from the Interactive Python (IPython) [27] environment. A recent re-

view [28] by the original authors makes the observation that the notebook has been designed to help scientists think. As such, it is perhaps not surprising that the Jupyter notebook has become the standard in data science [29], and is increasingly used in science for data exploration and analysis [30]. Students can benefit in similar ways as data scientists and scientists from the Jupyter notebook, which is increasingly used in educational settings [31, 32].

1. Jupyter Notebook

The combination of computer code (as input) and the output from the execution (be it textual, or visualizations, for example), together with equations typeset in LaTeX and free-text in one document helps the thinking process. The notebook captures exactly the protocol that was used (*i.e.*, order of commands for simulation and analysis) to achieve a certain result [33]. The ability to re-execute a command or simulation easily (because the relevant commands are readily available in the document) encourages exploration and verification, and thus supports a learning process that is driven by experimentation and exploration [28] of the behavior of a complex system.

While we have not seen this done by our students, it is also possible to author a project report within the Jupyter notebook. It is thus possible to transition gradually from a set of instructions for the simulation to run and data to be plotted to a report that puts those activities and results in context. We hypothesize that this may lower the barrier towards starting the report writing. Moreover, as demonstrated in previous reports [34], Jupyter notebooks represent a platform that supports and fosters students' epistemic agency as well as reproducibility of the result [33].

2. Zero-install software provision with Binder

In our study, we have made use of the publicly accessible and free Binder software [35], which is part of Project Jupyter². The Binder software takes the URL of a data repository³, scans the repository for files that specify which software is required, installs this software — together with a Jupyter notebook server — in a (Docker) container image, starts the container, and connects the notebook server from the container with the user's browser. None of the technical steps described above are visible to the user: After selecting the appro-

priate URL⁴, it takes a couple of minutes until the desired notebooks session appears in the browser. The major benefit for our teaching experience is that students can connect to a Binder session from their desktop, laptop or mobile device, and access the computational environment in which to experiment (numerically) from their browser, which helps lowering the usability barrier.

The public MyBinder service, which hosts the hardware on which the container is executed, comes with some limitations: For example a notebook session that is idle (*i.e.*, no computation and no user activity) for 10 minutes will be stopped from the MyBinder site and all changes will be lost. The notebook and other files can be downloaded before the session is stopped (and later uploaded if a continuation of the work is desired). The computing hardware offered by MyBinder is relatively weak (for example at most two CPU cores).

Despite these limitations, MyBinder has been very useful for our teaching experience in providing a zero-install computational environment: Most students have carried out all of their simulation computation on the MyBinder service. The reason the MyBinder service works well for our projects is that the computation required for the student exercises is relatively modest and can be completed within minutes to hours on single-core CPUs. If one wanted to offer the same no-install computational environment for projects that have more substantial computational demands, the university could host and run their own Binder service: the BinderHub [35] is designed for this⁵. However, the skills required to set this up exceed those of most academics, and help from the local computing or IT team is likely to be required.

A local install of Ubermag on the student's computer is also possible, and some students have chosen to follow this path. Once the installation is completed, this is more convenient for ongoing and extended studies.

3. Zero-install and zero-hosting with JupyterLite

Looking ahead, the just emerging JupyterLite project⁶ circumvents the shortcomings of the MyBinder service. JupyterLite makes it possible to execute Jupyter Notebooks and many Python packages in the user's browser (using WebAssembly) and holds great potential for use of software in the classroom in the future: (i) like Binder, JupyterLite is a zero-install approach, and (ii) the

² URL: <https://mybinder.org/>

³ Ubermag repository <https://github.com/ubermag/tutorials> on Github

⁴ Ubermag on mybinder.org: <https://mybinder.org/v2/gh/ubermag/tutorials/latest>

⁵ We note that JupyterHub is the part of BinderHub responsible for running the server (after BinderHub builds the image), and that—given appropriate skill sets—it can be configured to have additional functionality, such as required user authentication, persistent storage, or control of one or more software environments that can be launched.

⁶ <https://jupyterlite.readthedocs.io>, accessed 5/5/2023

JupyterLite approach does not need other centralized computing resources (*i.e.*, it is a zero-hosting approach).

In the JupyterLite set up, the complete and pre-configured software environment is provided for the learners on a (static) web page. Once the webpage is opened by the learner, the software environment is executed in the browser of the learner’s own device (computer, laptop, chromebook, ...) which provides the computing power. Such consumer devices are generally powerful enough, have no limit in run-time, and there is no dependency on cloud-hosted or other compute resources. (At the moment, the micromagnetic simulation software is not available as WebAssembly.)

C. User interface design for simulation software in education

Our hypothesis is that the use of simulation packages in advanced STEM classes can have educational value. We had a positive experience using the Ubermag software. In this section, we describe two important aspects of the user interface design.

1. Expose concepts of computational modelling

When a computer simulation is used to study a science or engineering problem, there are multiple layers of decision making and simplifications of the problem taking place (we assume that the model equations include differential equations):

1. Decide on the model to be used, and express the model in equations.
2. Discretize the model in some form (on grid).
3. Solve the discretized equation.

Many simulation packages are written for a particular model description and provide all the steps 1 to 3. In particular, the separation between these different aspects is not visible to the user. In Ubermag, this separation of concerns is more clearly exposed and accessible, and thus the meaning of the individual steps is easier for the learner to understand:

1. Decide on physics approximations and the model to be used: Within the Ubermag framework, the user selects the relevant physics through the terms that contribute to the energy and dynamics of the system from the `micromagneticmodel` Python package. This creates a *machine-readable definition*⁷ of a micromagnetic problem. Computer scientists would express this so that the

`micromagneticmodel` Python package provides a *Domain Specific Language* for micromagnetic models of the real world [11].

2. Discretize the model in some form: This requires splitting space into smaller parts such as cuboidal cells for finite difference discretization and a wider choice of geometrical objects for finite elements. Within the Ubermag framework, the `discretisedfield` package is used to define a (finite difference) discretization of space, and scalar and vector fields defined on that discretized space.
3. Using the micromagnetic model definition together with the discretization, the problem can be solved numerically. Ubermag translates the information from the micromagnetic model and the discretized field into a configuration file that is understood by one of the micromagnetic calculators that it supports. Using the OOMMF Calculator (`oommf`) or the mumax³ Calculator (`mumax3c`) Python package, Ubermag then delegates the actual numerical solution to OOMMF or mumax³.

Through the use of different packages — with clearly defined and orthogonal concerns — the concepts of computational science become easier to grasp than if all of those aspects are grouped together in the black-box simulation software.

2. Focus on physics, not the package-specific syntax

A potential user of the software needs to learn and understand what physics model choice and discretization is implemented in the software, and needs to learn how to instruct the software (often through a configuration file) to use the right model, and to combine this with the required geometry, material and other parameters, initial configuration, time-dependent or spatially-resolved external effects, etc. Generally, the required configuration file syntax is simulation package dependent: A scientist (or student) thus needs to learn this syntax for every new simulation package they want to use, which contributes to the *usability barrier*.

The Ubermag framework provides an abstraction from the specific simulation package configuration file syntax in the domain of micromagnetics. The `micromagneticmodel` package provides the machine readable definition of the problem using a syntax that scientists perceive as somewhat intuitive, and Ubermag

(or researcher, educator or learner) can read it and extract all needed information to fully define the physics problem of interest. For the learning context, the machine-readability ensures completeness of information. In a research and industry context, machine-readability is a pre-requisite for increasing automation of simulation-based work. It also supports reproducibility.

⁷ The machine-readable problem definition means that a computer

can automatically translate this into the package-specific configuration file syntax. It is thus much easier to define a micromagnetic problem with Ubermag than it would be if the packages OOMMF and mumax³ were used directly. We believe this reduction in complexity (of specifying a problem in a particular syntax) makes it possible to explore a much wider set of topics within the teaching module and the computational projects. This idea — to provide more “user-friendly” high-level interface to existing simulation software — is certainly transferable to other domains. Examples include the atomic simulation environment (ASE) [36], and the material science workflow tool AiiDA [37].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have introduced computer simulation into a materials science class, and describe approaches we found beneficial for the learning experience. It would be interesting to evaluate these in the context of different subject areas and educational settings:

- Choice of Python as one language for simulation and analysis, with broad library support.
- Design and use of user interfaces that focus on the learner’s interest: expose modelling concepts and hide peculiarities and complexity of underlying simulation engines.
- Use of Jupyter Notebooks to encourage interactive exploration of the (simulated) system under study.
- Binder capabilities of project Jupyter which make it possible to execute simulations in the cloud rather than on the students’ computers. This overcomes the (sometimes significant) challenge of installing the software locally.

Extensions of work described here include combinations of Jupyter based simulation teaching with computational essays [34, 38], the “nbgrader” tool supporting

the grading in Jupyter notebooks [32], and the opportunities for the JupyterLite (Sec. III B 3) based zero-install zero-hosting provisioning of software at scale.

V. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Please click on this link to access the supplementary material, which includes a detailed overview of five simulation projects, the problem sheets, a general overview of computational methods in education, a thematic analysis of student and teacher feedback on the computational projects, and additional practical considerations. Print readers can see the supplementary material at [DOI to be inserted by AIPP].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Thomas Wilhelm (Goethe University Frankfurt) for fruitful discussions on numerical methods in higher education, and Min Ragan-Kelley for helpful discussions on project Jupyter. MLo acknowledges the financial support by the German Science Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) through the research fellowship LO 2584/1-1 for the development of the simulation projects 1 and 2, the implementation of student interviews and questionnaires, as well as the manuscript preparation. SH, SP and HF were supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council’s United Kingdom Skyrmion Programme Grant (EP/N032128/1). The development of the MSE 598/498/464 course and specifically the simulation projects 3 and 4, as well as the efforts from RK and AH were partially supported by the NSF through the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign Materials Research Science and Engineering Center Grant No. DMR-1720633. The development of the simulation project 5 by T-HL was supported by the US Department of Energy, Office of Science, Materials Science and Engineering Division, under Contract No. DE-SC0022060. The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

-
- [1] B. Skuse, The third pillar, *Physics World* **32**, 40 (2019).
- [2] J. Weber and T. Wilhelm, The benefit of computational modelling in physics teaching: a historical overview, *European Journal of Physics* **41**, 034003 (2020).
- [3] M. D. Caballero and L. Merner, Prevalence and nature of computational instruction in undergraduate physics programs across the United States, *Physical Review Physics Education Research* **14**, 020129 (2018).
- [4] G. Kortemeyer, Incorporating computational exercises into introductory physics courses, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **1512**, 012025 (2020).
- [5] A. L. Graves and A. D. Light, Hitting the ground running: Computational physics education to prepare students for computational physics research, *Computing in Science and Engineering* **22**, 50 (2020).
- [6] D. M. Cook, Computation in undergraduate physics: The lawrence approach, *American Journal of Physics* **76**, 321 (2008).
- [7] L. McNeil and P. Heron, Preparing physics students for 21st-century careers, *Physics Today* **70**, 38 (2017).
- [8] AAPT Undergraduate Curriculum Task Force, AAPT Recommendations for Computational Physics in the Undergraduate Physics Curriculum (2016).
- [9] N. Chonacky and D. Winch, Integrating computation into the undergraduate curriculum: A vision and guidelines for future developments, *American Journal of Physics* **76**, 327 (2008).

- [10] M. D. Caballero, M. A. Kohlmyer, and M. F. Schatz, Implementing and assessing computational modeling in introductory mechanics, *Physical Review Special Topics - Physics Education Research* **8**, 020106 (2012).
- [11] M. Beg, M. Lang, and H. Fangohr, Ubermag: Toward more effective micromagnetic workflows, *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **58**, 1 (2022).
- [12] A. Kononov, P. Bellon, T. Bretl, A. Ferguson, G. Herman, K. Kilian, J. Krogstad, C. Leal, R. Maass, A. Schleife, J. Shang, D. Trinkle, and M. West, Computational curriculum for MatSE undergraduates, 2017 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Proceedings 10.18260/1-2-28060 (2017).
- [13] R. Mansbach, A. Ferguson, K. Kilian, J. Krogstad, C. Leal, A. Schleife, D. Trinkle, M. West, and G. Herman, Reforming an undergraduate materials science curriculum with computational modules, *Journal of Materials Education* **38**, 161 (2016).
- [14] R. Mansbach, G. Herman, M. West, D. Trinkle, A. Ferguson, and A. Schleife, WORK IN PROGRESS: Computational modules for the MatSE undergraduate curriculum, 2016 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Proceedings 10.18260/p.27214 (2016).
- [15] X. Zhang, A. Schleife, A. Ferguson, P. Bellon, T. Bretl, G. Herman, J. Krogstad, R. Maass, C. Leal, D. Trinkle, J. Shang, and M. West, Computational curriculum for MatSE undergraduates and the influence on senior classes, 2018 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Proceedings 10.18260/1-2-30213 (2018).
- [16] C.-W. Lee, A. Schleife, D. Trinkle, J. Krogstad, R. Maass, P. Bellon, J. Shang, C. Leal, M. West, T. Bretl, G. Herman, and S. Tang, Impact of Computational Curricular Reform on Non-participating Undergraduate Courses: Student and Faculty Perspective, 2019 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Proceedings 10.18260/1-2-32926 (2019).
- [17] T. Gilbert, Classics in magnetism: a phenomenological theory of damping in ferromagnetic materials, *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **40**, 3443 (2004).
- [18] M. Lonsky and A. Hoffmann, Dynamic excitations of chiral magnetic textures, *APL Materials* **8**, 100903 (2020).
- [19] M. Lonsky and A. Hoffmann, Coupled skyrmion breathing modes in synthetic ferri- and antiferromagnets, *Physical Review B* **102**, 104403 (2020).
- [20] M. Lonsky and A. Hoffmann, Dynamic fingerprints of synthetic antiferromagnet nanostructures with interfacial Dzyaloshinskii–Moriya interaction, *Journal of Applied Physics* **132**, 043903 (2022).
- [21] M. J. Donahue and D. G. Porter, OOMMF User’s Guide, Version 1.0, Interagency Report NISTIR 6376, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD (1999).
- [22] A. Vansteenkiste, J. Leliaert, M. Dvornik, M. Helsen, F. Garcia-Sanchez, and B. V. Waeyenberge, The design and verification of MuMax3, *AIP Advances* **4**, 107133 (2014).
- [23] M. Beg, R. A. Pepper, and H. Fangohr, User interfaces for computational science: A domain specific language for OOMMF embedded in Python, *AIP Advances* **7**, 056025 (2017).
- [24] H. Fangohr, M. Lang, S. J. R. Holt, S. A. Pathak, K. Zulfqar, and M. Beg, Vision for unified micromagnetic modeling (UMM) with Ubermag, *AIP Advances* **14**, 015138 (2024).
- [25] H. Fangohr, A Comparison of C, MATLAB, and Python as Teaching Languages in Engineering, *Computational Science - ICCS 2004*, 1210 (2004).
- [26] T. Kluyver, B. Ragan-Kelley, F. Pérez, B. Granger, M. Bussonnier, J. Frederic, K. Kelley, J. Hamrick, J. Grout, S. Corlay, P. Ivanov, D. Avila, S. Abdalla, and C. Willing, Jupyter notebooks – a publishing format for reproducible computational workflows, in *Positioning and Power in Academic Publishing: Players, Agents and Agendas*, edited by F. Loizides and B. Schmidt (IOS Press, 2016) pp. 87 – 90.
- [27] F. Perez and B. E. Granger, IPython: A system for interactive scientific computing, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **9**, 21 (2007).
- [28] B. E. Granger and F. Perez, Jupyter: Thinking and storytelling with code and data, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **23**, 7 (2021).
- [29] J. M. Perkel, Why Jupyter is data scientists’ computational notebook of choice, *Nature* **563**, 145 (2018).
- [30] H. Fangohr, M. Beg, M. Bergemann, V. Bondar, S. Brockhauser, A. Campbell, C. Carinan, R. Costa, F. Dall’Antonia, C. Danilevski, J. E. W. Ehsan, S. Esenov, R. Fabbri, S. Fangohr, E. F. del Castillo, G. Flucke, C. Fortmann-Grote, D. F. Marsa, G. Giovanetti, D. Goeries, A. Götz, J. Hall, S. Hauf, D. Hickin, T. H. Rod, T. Jarosiewicz, E. Kamil, M. Karnevskiy, J. Kieffer, Y. Kirienko, A. Klimovskaia, T. Kluyver, M. Kuster, L. L. Guyader, A. Madsen, L. Maia, D. Mamchych, L. Mercadier, T. Michelat, I. Mohacsi, J. Möller, A. Parenti, E. Pellegrini, J. Perrin, M. Reiser, J. Reppin, R. Rosca, D. Rück, T. Rüter, H. Santos, R. Schaffer, A. Scherz, F. Schlünzen, M. Scholz, M. Schuh, J. Selknaes, A. Silenzi, G. Sipoš, M. Spitzewski, J. Szuk, J. Szuba, J. Taylor, S. Trojanowski, K. Wrona, A. Yaroslavtsev, and J. Zhu, Data Exploration and Analysis with Jupyter Notebooks, in *Proc. ICALEPCS’19*, International Conference on Accelerator and Large Experimental Physics Control Systems No. 17 (JACoW Publishing, Geneva, Switzerland, 2020) pp. 799–806.
- [31] L. A. Barba, L. J. Barker, D. S. Blank, J. Brown, A. Downey, T. George, L. J. Heagy, K. Mandli, J. K. Moore, D. Lippert, K. Niemeyer, R. Watkins, R. West, E. Wickes, C. Willing, and M. Zingale, Teaching and learning with Jupyter, Figshare 10.6084/m9.figshare.19608801.v1 (2022).
- [32] P. Jupyter, D. Blank, D. Bourgin, A. Brown, M. Bussonnier, J. Frederic, B. Granger, T. Griffiths, J. Hamrick, K. Kelley, M. Pacer, L. Page, F. Perez, B. Ragan-Kelley, J. Suchow, and C. Willing, nbgrader: A tool for creating and grading assignments in the Jupyter notebook, *Journal of Open Source Education* **2**, 32 (2019).
- [33] M. Beg, J. Taka, T. Kluyver, A. Konovalov, M. Ragan-Kelley, N. M. Thiery, and H. Fangohr, Using Jupyter for reproducible scientific workflows, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **23**, 36 (2021).
- [34] T. O. B. Odden, D. W. Silvia, and A. Malthe-Sørensen, Using computational essays to foster disciplinary epistemic agency in undergraduate science, *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* **60**, 937 (2022).
- [35] Project Jupyter, Matthias Bussonnier, Jessica Forde, Jeremy Freeman, Brian Granger, Tim Head, Chris Holdgraf, Kyle Kelley, Gladys Nalvarte, Andrew Osheroff, M. Pacer, Yuvi Panda, Fernando Perez, Benjamin Ragan Kelley, and Carol Willing, Binder 2.0 - Reproducible,

- interactive, sharable environments for science at scale, in *Proceedings of the 17th Python in Science Conference*, edited by Fatih Akici, David Lippa, Dillon Niederhut, and M. Pacer (2018) pp. 113 – 120.
- [36] A. H. Larsen, J. J. Mortensen, J. Blomqvist, I. E. Castelli, R. Christensen, M. Dułak, J. Friis, M. N. Groves, B. Hammer, C. Hargus, E. D. Hermes, P. C. Jennings, P. B. Jensen, J. Kermode, J. R. Kitchin, E. L. Kolsbjerg, J. Kubal, K. Kaasbjerg, S. Lysgaard, J. B. Maronsson, T. Maxson, T. Olsen, L. Pastewka, A. Peterson, C. Rostgaard, J. Schiøtz, O. Schütt, M. Strange, K. S. Thygesen, T. Vegge, L. Vilhelmsen, M. Walter, Z. Zeng, and K. W. Jacobsen, The atomic simulation environment—a Python library for working with atoms, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **29**, 273002 (2017).
- [37] S. P. Huber, S. Zoupanos, M. Uhrin, L. Talirz, L. Kahle, R. Häuselmann, D. Gresch, T. Müller, A. V. Yakutovich, C. W. Andersen, F. F. Ramirez, C. S. Adorf, F. Gargiulo, S. Kumbhar, E. Passaro, C. Johnston, A. Merkys, A. Cepellotti, N. Mounet, N. Marzari, B. Kozinsky, and G. Pizzi, Aiida 1.0, a scalable computational infrastructure for automated reproducible workflows and data provenance, *Scientific Data* **7**, 10.1038/s41597-020-00638-4 (2020).
- [38] A. diSessa, *Changing Minds – Computers, Learning, and Literacy* (MITPress, Cambridge, MA, 2000).

Supplementary material for “Numerical simulation projects in micromagnetics with Jupyter”

Martin Lonsky,^{1,2,*} Martin Lang,^{3,4} Samuel Holt,^{4,3} Swapneel Amit Pathak,^{4,3} Robin Klause,¹ Tzu-Hsiang Lo,¹ Marijan Beg,⁵ Axel Hoffmann,¹ and Hans Fangohr^{3,4,6,†}

¹*Materials Research Laboratory and Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA*

²*Institute of Physics, Goethe University Frankfurt, 60438 Frankfurt, Germany*

³*Max Planck Institute for the Structure and Dynamics of Matter, 22761 Hamburg, Germany*

⁴*Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom*

⁵*Department of Earth Science and Engineering, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*

⁶*Center for Free-Electron Laser Science, 22761 Hamburg, Germany*

(Dated: July 18, 2024)

The present document contains supplementary information for the article “Numerical simulation projects in micromagnetics with Jupyter.” This involves a general overview of computational methods in education (Sec. I), a detailed description of five simulation projects (Sec. II), additional practical considerations (Sec. III), student and teacher feedback on the learning experience (Sec. IV), and the computational problem sheets (Appendix).

CONTENTS

	3. Modern topics and alignment with lecture	7
	References	7
I. Incorporation of Computational Methods into STEM Programs	1	
II. Description of Simulation Projects	2	
Project 1: Static and dynamic properties of a magnetic vortex	2	
Project 2: Synthetic antiferromagnets	3	
Project 3: Static and dynamic properties of domain walls	3	
Project 4: Static and dynamic properties of vortices in an elliptical geometry	3	
Project 5: Ferromagnetic resonance of a Pt/Co nanodisk	3	
III. Additional practical considerations	3	
1. Open source software	4	
2. Fostering the link between micromagnetic simulations and experiments	5	
IV. Feedback on Learning Experience	5	
A. Research Questions	5	
B. Methodology	5	
C. Feedback from Students	5	
1. Physical intuition and epistemic agency	5	
2. Easy accessibility of simulations	6	
3. Effective feedback loops and communication	6	
4. Relevance for academia and industry	6	
5. Varying levels of experience and skills	6	
6. Technical details and limitations	7	
D. Feedback from Teaching Staff	7	
1. Project development and work load	7	
2. Communication and guidance	7	
	I. INCORPORATION OF COMPUTATIONAL METHODS INTO STEM PROGRAMS	

In this section, we review the current status of teaching computational modeling and numerical simulations at university level. This involves several examples of already existing classes and tools, as well as suggestions for further applications in undergraduate courses.

There are various ways how computational methods can be embedded into traditional courses that form an existing undergraduate or graduate curriculum. In general, this may be done in the form of computational assignments, computational lectures, computational laboratories, and computational research projects [1]. In the case of physics, an excellent platform for relevant course materials, teaching approaches, workshops, and interaction with fellow teachers has been established by the Partnership for Integration of Computation into Undergraduate Physics (PICUP) organization [2]. A further comprehensive compilation of useful resources on computational physics can be found in Ref. [3]. In the remainder of this section, we will give several examples of how to embed computational methods into STEM programs.

Computational activities can be incorporated as exercises into introductory courses, see for example Ref. [4]. In laboratory courses, experiments can be combined with computer simulations, for example by using Visual Python (VPython) [5], Mathematica [6] or Microsoft Excel [7]. VPython is a visual extension of Python that can be utilized for simulating and visualizing simple experiments with only a few lines of code [8]. For instance, VPython has been used in the aerospace engineering program at the University of Southampton,

* lonskymartin@gmail.com

† hans.fangohr@mpsd.mpg.de

where second-year students were assigned computational projects related to three-dimensional real time visualization [9]. In physics, VPython is particularly useful for classical mechanics classes and can nowadays also be run in Jupyter Notebooks and in browsers by using Web VPython. VPython can also be presented with an introduction to programming if students have no prior programming experience [9]. In terms of closed computational environments, Physlets [10] and the Physics Education Technology (PhET) Interactive Simulations project at the University of Colorado Boulder [11] are noteworthy products for introductory physics courses.

A major portion of open computational environments is focused on more advanced and specialized topics, such as the interactive molecular dynamics simulation code developed at Weber State University [12], and the nanoHUB platform [13] developed at Purdue University. The latter offers various accessible simulation software packages for semiconductor and nanotechnology applications. At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), instructors have started using some of the resources for various undergraduate courses [1, 14–17]. This involves several homework assignments where students have to solve problems using computational methods. For instance, in the “Electronic Properties of Materials” (MSE 304) course, students use density functional theory (DFT) to investigate properties such as the density of states, band structure and effective masses of electrons and holes in different materials by utilizing the Quantum ESPRESSO computer code [18, 19] on nanoHUB. In another assignment, students are asked to use ABACUS (Assembly of Basic Applications for the Coordinated Understanding of Semiconductors) [20] to obtain a qualitative and quantitative understanding of a semiconducting diode. Aside from the nanoHUB toolset, a comprehensive overview of relevant methods in the context of teaching computational materials science and engineering can be found in Ref. [21].

The inclusion of computational methods in existing courses will also benefit from simulation environments such as Ubermag [22] and the Atomistic Simulation Environment (ASE) [23]. ASE is a software package for atomistic simulations provided by the Technical University of Denmark. Ubermag is described in more detail in Sec. II of the main article. Both Ubermag and ASE provide a high-level (i.e., simplified and accessible) interface to multiple simulation packages: Controlling these simulation packages directly would require more specialized skills than using the high-level interface. Both ASE and Ubermag use a Python interface and are supported by an extensive documentation, which includes tutorials, frequently asked questions, and contents of workshops. These simulation environments offer a *lowering of the usability barrier* which is essential for educational processes. Students can change the simulations inputs and understand how the outputs change in response without having to learn the fine details of the syntax. This is more efficient if the changes of the input are concise

and cognitively not too demanding. Other examples of software with high-level interfaces and thus good potential for teaching include COMSOL Multiphysics [24] and the Einstein Toolkit which offers computational tools for relativistic astrophysics and gravitational physics applications [25].

A further interesting method to embed computational contents into the curriculum is given by so-called computational essays [26]. Originally proposed in a work by diSessa [27], computational essays consist of a combination of text, executable code, interactive diagrams and other computational tools. As pointed out by Odden *et al.*, computational essays can help students to develop epistemic agency, i.e., a greater control over their own learning process [26]. For the realization of such essays, interactive Jupyter notebooks [28] represent an ideal tool.

Following this overview of previous efforts on incorporating computation into STEM curricula, we now turn to the detailed description of simulation projects that we used in our course on magnetic materials and applications.

II. DESCRIPTION OF SIMULATION PROJECTS

This section includes a description of the micromagnetic simulation projects that we developed at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, which may be particularly useful for instructors in the field of magnetism, but it can also serve as an inspiration for teachers in other domains. Note that the complete problem sheets are appended at the end of this document.

Project 1: Static and dynamic properties of a magnetic vortex

Ferromagnetic disks with lateral sizes in the micrometer or submicrometer range exhibit under certain conditions a configuration that is termed magnetic vortex [29]. In the first subproject, the students are asked to determine the minimized energy state of a well-defined nanodisk geometry, which corresponds to such a vortex state. Subsequently, the students play around with various parameters in order to discuss the chirality and polarity of magnetic vortices, the dependence on the magnetic anisotropy of the material, and the changes as a function of external magnetic field. The second subproject appears significantly shorter, but in reality it is more complex and challenging – a fact that is unambiguously stated on the problem sheet for the sake of transparency. In other words, by offering tasks with varying degrees of difficulty we can cater to a broad spectrum of students with different backgrounds.

In this case, the students are asked to simulate the nucleation and annihilation of a magnetic vortex by sweeping the magnetic field and thus determining the magnetic

hysteresis curve. Moreover, they have to obtain snapshots of the magnetization such that they are able to understand the different mechanisms (e.g., domain wall motion, rotation of magnetization, etc.) that are responsible for certain features in the hysteresis loop. Finally, in the third subproject, the students investigate gyrotropic dynamics of the magnetic vortex by applying a magnetic field pulse which leads to a periodic motion of the spin texture. This task involves the calculation of a fast Fourier transform in order to obtain the power spectrum and thus the resonance peak at a specific frequency.

A screenshot of a Jupyter notebook containing calculations that are related to this subproject is depicted in Fig. 1. This particular notebook contains Python code, Markdown text, an image to visualize the magnetic configuration of a nanodisk with a diameter $d = 100$ nm, and a plot of the time-dependence of the (spatially averaged) magnetization components m_x , m_y and m_z after excitation by a magnetic field pulse. All simulation projects in our course are carefully designed such that each calculation runs for a reasonably short period of time, i.e., seconds to minutes.

Project 2: Synthetic antiferromagnets

Synthetic antiferromagnets [30] are typically composed of two ferromagnetic layers that are antiferromagnetically coupled via the so-called Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuya-Yosida (RKKY) interaction [31] through a nonmagnetic spacer. More specifically, the antiferromagnetic interlayer exchange interaction is mediated by the conduction electrons in the spacer layer. In the first subtask, students explore the role of different micromagnetic energy terms with regard to the minimized energy state of the synthetic antiferromagnet. For instance, the dipolar interactions (demagnetization energy term) are neglected initially and the system is relaxed from an initial random magnetization state. Subsequently, dipolar interactions are added to the Hamiltonian of the system and the result is compared to the previous simulations. In the next step, the influence of perpendicular anisotropy and Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction (DMI) is investigated. In the second subproject, skyrmions in a synthetic antiferromagnet with DMI are studied. To this end, the students have to create a skyrmion in the simulated geometry and then study its properties as a function of varying micromagnetic energy terms. Students should also explore the possibility of creating multiple skyrmions in the nanostructure. In the third subproject, the magnetization reversal of a synthetic antiferromagnet with around 20 layers is studied. This is the most challenging part, since a hysteresis loop of a complex magnetic structure needs to be simulated. Eventually, students can observe the switching behavior in the individual layers of the structure by looking at snapshots.

Project 3: Static and dynamic properties of domain walls

Domain walls are present in ferromagnetic materials in order to reduce the magnetostatic energy of the system. Their nucleation and propagation is one of the magnetization reversal mechanisms. This project allows the students to study domain wall initialization in systems with different energy configurations, the motion of domain walls across a magnetic strip, the Walker breakdown [32], and the pinning of a domain wall to a notch in a magnetic strip. While the first subproject revolves around the static properties of a domain wall in a magnetic strip, the second subproject focuses on the domain wall Walker breakdown.

Project 4: Static and dynamic properties of vortices in an elliptical geometry

This is a further project on magnetic vortices, however, it is centered around the role of sample geometry. In particular, an elliptical sample is considered, whereby the major and minor axis lengths are varied in order to study the changes in the magnetic configuration accordingly.

Project 5: Ferromagnetic resonance of a Pt/Co nanodisk

Ferromagnetic resonance is an excitation of a magnetic material during which all moments exhibit an in-phase precession. It represents a unique spectroscopic technique [33] to investigate the dynamic properties of a system and to extract essential quantities such as the Gilbert damping. In this project, the dynamic properties of a well-defined Pt/Co nanodisk are investigated by the students. This implies the simulation of the ferromagnetic resonance as a function of different external magnetic fields and the calculation of the corresponding resonance frequencies in the first subproject. Furthermore, the role of the Gilbert damping is also studied. In the second subproject, students investigate the impact of the size of the system and the direction of the external magnetic field on the dynamic properties.

III. ADDITIONAL PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the following, we provide additional practical considerations about open source software and an additional Ubermag package that connects micromagnetic simulations with experimental results.




FIG. 1. Screenshot of a Jupyter notebook containing Ubermag-based micromagnetic simulations used in a web browser via Binder. This excerpt contains Python code, Markdown text and two diagrams. See main text for details.

1. Open source software

Ubermag and the software from Project Jupyter (such as the Jupyter Notebook and Binder) are freely and openly available as open-source software. In contrast to commercial simulation packages such as COMSOL Multiphysics [24, 34] and other, Ubermag and Python-based Jupyter notebooks offer enhanced value, transparency and unlimited accessibility for students, instructors, and

departments [35]. There is also no tie-in to a particular vendor: Should the university dislike the way the Ubermag package develops in the future, it could take the current Ubermag version and either keep using it as is, or modify it to suit its own needs best.

The ideal scenario is of course that users of the package feed back any requests for improvements (or actual code changes that implement these improvements) to the open source team. There are well established protocols for

such contributions, although it may need skills beyond those of the average academic. Increasingly, universities employ research software engineers who can provide such skills [36].

2. *Fostering the link between micromagnetic simulations and experiments*

A relatively new package termed `mag2exp` of `Ubermag` [37] allows to simulate physical quantities identical to those obtained from experimental techniques that are used to study magnetism, such as Lorentz transmission electron microscopy or small angle neutron scattering. While we have not implemented this in our simulation projects yet, this approach is expected to further reduce the gap between experiments and numerical modeling and thus represents a possible extension of the existing exercises.

IV. FEEDBACK ON LEARNING EXPERIENCE

A. Research Questions

We collected feedback on the learning experience from both students and the teaching staff with the aim of addressing the following two research questions.

(RQ1) What are the critical factors and key challenges to consider for a successful and effective incorporation of computational methods into an existing course?

(RQ2) What are the benefits and challenges perceived by students in regard to computational projects in a science or engineering class?

Prior to a discussion of the feedback, we describe the methodology of our work. This involves a specification of participants, the instruments for data collection as well as the data analysis procedures.

B. Methodology

Personal interview surveys were carried out in October 2022 with six students of the 2020 and 2021 classes in order to assess their experience with the simulation projects¹. All of them were Master or PhD students at the time of attending the course and had differing levels of experience in computational methods and programming. The conversations lasted about 30 minutes per student. During the personal interview survey we asked open-ended questions regarding the following points:

- Overall experience with simulation projects, suggestions for improvements.
- Difficulty of projects, taking into account students' proficiency in programming and their prior experience in the field of magnetism.
- Assessment of the importance of computational methods for research and whether micromagnetic simulation projects changed students' attitude.
- Communication and collaboration within the student groups as well as the communication between the students and the instructional staff.

In addition, we also collected feedback from three teaching assistants (two PhD students and one post-doc) and from the main instructor (full professor) of the class through personal interviews. In the 2020 and 2021 courses, there were two teaching assistants responsible for supervising the projects. Although a single teaching assistant could have managed the workload, we chose to increase the staff to provide more personalized attention for the students. After completing data collection, we performed a thematic analysis by following the scheme recommended by Braun and Clarke [38]. In the following, we present our analysis which is divided into two parts, taking into account feedback from students as well as instructors.

C. Feedback from Students

In the context of student feedback, we have identified six themes that are relevant to the above-mentioned research questions, which we classify into positive and negative themes. An overview of the themes along with a brief definition of each theme is provided in Table I.

1. *Physical intuition and epistemic agency*

In the personal interviews, four out of six students explicitly stated that varying the different micromagnetic energy terms and visualizing the magnetization states has led to a better understanding of the topic in comparison to problem sheets or demonstrations in the lecture. We observed that students develop epistemic agency through self-paced working. Such an in-depth exploration of the complex relationships in micromagnetics cannot be conveyed easily in a conventional lecture format with limitations such as time constraints. One student stated that their physical intuition for magnetism has significantly improved by working on these projects. As shown in Subsec. II B of the main article, it is the complexity of multiple competing energy terms in micromagnetics that makes the simulations a rich and instructive playground. We emphasize that some students even explored topics that were beyond the scope of the required tasks.

¹ Prior to the interviews, we had reached out to 20 former students whose email addresses were still known and received a response by six individuals.

TABLE I. Themes from students' response provided in personal interviews and questionnaires.

Themes	Definition
<i>Positive themes</i>	
Physical intuition and epistemic agency	Freedom to explore by varying micromagnetic energy terms; better understanding through immediate visualization; self-paced learning.
Easy accessibility of simulations	Using Ubermag in the cloud, no installation required; obtain experimentalist's view on magnetism without need for expensive infrastructure.
Effective feedback loops and communication	Intermediate discussions with teaching staff can lead to better results; mostly good communication within student groups using different media.
Relevance for academia and industry	Understand importance of computation in modern research and industry; programming with Python is a valuable skill and experience with numerical simulations can be beneficial for future career.
<i>Negative themes</i>	
Varying levels of experience and skills	Challenges originating from diverse background of undergraduate and graduate students; especially programming skills vary strongly.
Technical details and limitations	Artifacts in simulations, validity of numerical methods and geometric constraints (e.g., edge effects) should be discussed in more detail.

2. *Easy accessibility of simulations*

Two of the interviewed students noted that the simulations offered an experimentalist's perspective on magnetism without the need of being in a laboratory environment. Even though this does not imply that computational methods should replace experimental lab courses, they certainly represent a valuable and accessible addition that does not require extensive resources. In the context of accessibility, we also highlight the positive feedback on the Ubermag software as a well-suited teaching tool in comparison to related packages such as OOMMF and mumax³. Its intuitive handling and straightforward visualization capabilities were particularly appreciated by students with limited background in computational methods. Moreover, the fact that Ubermag can be executed in the cloud free of charge and without installation on the students' personal computer enhanced the accessibility. More details along with practical recommendations for computational projects can be found in Sec. III of the main article.

3. *Effective feedback loops and communication*

The communication within the project groups was typically perceived as positive and took place in the form of virtual meetings, emails or text messages. The collaboration was viewed as fruitful and effective in a majority of groups, since students reportedly exchanged ideas, comments and concerns about the different subtasks. The communication between the students and the teaching staff was also assessed positively. It was pointed out by several students that the intermediate discussions were particularly valuable to them because of important preliminary feedback and help with potential issues.

4. *Relevance for academia and industry*

Each of the six interviewed students recognized that computational methods are important in today's research landscape. One student shared that they had been intimidated by computational methods prior to taking the course, but that the simulation projects resulted in a more positive mindset and a better understanding of the underlying concepts. Some students have learned to recognize the importance of computational methods in science after working on the projects, while others viewed the simulations as relatively limited in terms of their scope and duration, and thus their attitude has not changed significantly. We note that the Department of Materials Science and Engineering at UIUC has already incorporated computational methods into several core classes of the undergraduate curriculum and therefore students in this program likely have a clearer picture with regard to the importance of computational methods in research than students at other institutions. Consequently, working on the micromagnetic simulation projects may not have significantly impacted the attitude of those students who completed their undergraduate degree at the same institution, compared to those who came to UIUC after attending college elsewhere. Students also demonstrated a clear understanding of the relevance of computational methods with respect to their future professional career. Interestingly, the simulation projects as well as the gained experience in programming with Python became a central topic in one student's job interview and appeared to be assessed as positive by the interviewers.

5. *Varying levels of experience and skills*

Prior to working on the simulation projects, most students indicated that they were only barely or somewhat familiar with numerical methods, but on average reasonably comfortable with programming, especially with

Python. Although the limited experience with numerical methods seems contradictory to the department's strong focus on computational methods in undergraduate education, this can be explained by the fact that most graduate students in our course came from external institutions with potentially weaker backgrounds in computation. A majority of students claimed to have a very limited experience with magnetism. The fact that the course is attended by both undergraduate and graduate students poses a challenge for the instructor to guarantee an effective learning experience for everybody. However, despite their different background knowledge, nearly all students stated that the difficulty of the projects was appropriate. The extensive Ubermag documentation and collection of example notebooks have been very beneficial to address the variety of existing skills. A majority of students pointed out that the projects were more enjoyable than regular problem sheets assigned in the class.

6. *Technical details and limitations*

The student feedback suggests that a more comprehensive introduction to Ubermag going beyond the brief presentation and materials that we provided will be beneficial in the future. In particular, an additional session with short exercises prior to the assignment of projects could be offered by teaching assistants in future courses. Moreover, the capabilities, validity and limitations of computational methods could be discussed in more detail. One example is the role of possible artifacts that are caused by an inappropriately-chosen mesh shape or size.

D. **Feedback from Teaching Staff**

Based on the feedback from teaching staff members, we have identified three themes. We present these themes together with a brief definition in Table II.

1. *Project development and work load*

Initially, the design of the computational projects from scratch was laborious and time-consuming for the teaching assistants, especially due to the required careful testing of example solutions. However, the problem sheets and solutions could be reused in the subsequent semesters while gradually fixing issues that were discovered. Apart

from designing the projects, leading intermediate discussions and moderating the session with the students' final presentations, the feedback from the teaching staff indicates that their work load was not exceedingly high compared to other courses.

2. *Communication and guidance*

Discussions and intermediate meetings with students were helpful for the teaching staff to identify mistakes and ambiguities in the problem definition that had caused students to obtain erroneous simulation results or get lost in irrelevant details. Despite the challenging circumstances in the fall 2020 and 2021 semesters due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the communication between the instructional team and students as well as within the student groups was clearly more intensive than in courses without computational group projects. Students were encouraged to actively discuss about the subject matter and ask questions to their peers as well as to instructors.

3. *Modern topics and alignment with lecture*

Overall the simulation projects were designed to relate directly to current research topics, as well as to distinct topics of the regular lectures. For example, synthetic antiferromagnets are integral components of modern spintronics devices to minimize complications from stray fields. Similarly, the complex gyrotropic nature of magnetization dynamics gives rise to phenomena such as Walker breakdown for moving domain walls, or distinct chiralities in the motion of topological solitons such as skyrmions. Unfortunately, given the extended timeframe of the micromagnetic simulation projects, it was not always possible to align the projects well with the discussion of these concepts. We consider the use of small example notebooks and shorter homework problems to achieve that alignment in the future. For instance, at the moment, the projects do not include any current-driven dynamics, since spin transfer torques are only discussed in class after the conclusion of the projects. Assigning multiple short projects at different points throughout the semester instead of a single comprehensive project would allow for more flexibility and better alignment with the syllabus.

We note that the Ubermag numerical simulations fit perfectly into the syllabus, since micromagnetic modeling has been discussed in our course prior to the introduction of the simulation projects and is also typically presented in magnetism courses at other universities.

[1] A. Kononov, P. Bellon, T. Bretl, A. Ferguson, G. Herman, K. Kilian, J. Krogstad, C. Leal, R. Maass, A. Schleife, J. Shang, D. Trinkle, and M. West, Computational curriculum for MatSE undergraduates, 2017

ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Proceedings 10.18260/1-2-28060 (2017).

[2] M. D. Caballero, N. Chonacky, L. Engelhardt, R. C. Hilborn, M. L. del Puerto, and K. R. Roos, PICUP: A

TABLE II. Themes from teaching staff's response provided in personal interviews.

Themes	Connection to research question
Project development and work load	Time-consuming at first, but projects can be reused each year.
Communication and guidance	Good communication between students and teachers even during pandemic.
Modern topics and alignment with lecture	Selecting appropriate topics for projects allows students to work on modern research questions. Difficult to achieve alignment with rest of the class.

- community of teachers integrating computation into undergraduate physics courses, *The Physics Teacher* **57**, 397 (2019).
- [3] T. J. Atherton, Resource Letter CP-3: Computational physics, *American Journal of Physics* **91**, 7 (2023).
- [4] G. Kortemeyer and A. F. Kortemeyer, The nature of collaborations on programming assignments in introductory physics courses: a case study, *European Journal of Physics* **39**, 055705 (2018).
- [5] M. D. Caballero, M. A. Kohlmyer, and M. F. Schatz, Implementing and assessing computational modeling in introductory mechanics, *Physical Review Special Topics - Physics Education Research* **8**, 020106 (2012).
- [6] S. V. Samsonau, Computer simulations combined with experiments for a calculus-based physics laboratory course, *Physics Education* **53**, 055013 (2018).
- [7] D. Sachmpazidi, M. Bautista, Z. Chajewski, C. Mendoza, and C. Henderson, Integrating numerical modeling into an introductory physics laboratory, *American Journal of Physics* **89**, 713 (2021).
- [8] G. Kortemeyer, Incorporating computational exercises into introductory physics courses, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **1512**, 012025 (2020).
- [9] H. Fangohr, Exploiting real-time 3d visualisation to enthuse students: A case study of using visual python in engineering, in *Computational Science - ICCS 2006*, edited by V. N. Alexandrov, G. D. van Albada, P. M. A. Sloot, and J. Dongarra (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006) pp. 139–146.
- [10] W. Christian and A. Titus, Developing web-based curricula using java physlets, *Computers in Physics* **12**, 227 (1998).
- [11] K. Perkins, W. Adams, M. Dubson, N. Finkelstein, S. Reid, C. Wieman, and R. LeMaster, PhET: Interactive simulations for teaching and learning physics, *The Physics Teacher* **44**, 18 (2006).
- [12] D. V. Schroeder, Interactive molecular dynamics, *American Journal of Physics* **83**, 210 (2015).
- [13] K. Madhavan, L. Zentner, V. Farnsworth, S. Shivarajapura, M. Zentner, N. Denny, and G. Klimeck, nanohub.org: cloud-based services for nanoscale modeling, simulation, and education, *Nanotechnology Reviews* **2**, 107 (2013).
- [14] R. Mansbach, A. Ferguson, K. Kilian, J. Krogstad, C. Leal, A. Schleife, D. Trinkle, M. West, and G. Herman, Reforming an undergraduate materials science curriculum with computational modules, *Journal of Materials Education* **38**, 161 (2016).
- [15] R. Mansbach, G. Herman, M. West, D. Trinkle, A. Ferguson, and A. Schleife, WORK IN PROGRESS: Computational modules for the MatSE undergraduate curriculum, 2016 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Proceedings 10.18260/p.27214 (2016).
- [16] X. Zhang, A. Schleife, A. Ferguson, P. Bellon, T. Bretl, G. Herman, J. Krogstad, R. Maass, C. Leal, D. Trinkle, J. Shang, and M. West, Computational curriculum for MatSE undergraduates and the influence on senior classes, 2018 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Proceedings 10.18260/1-2-30213 (2018).
- [17] C.-W. Lee, A. Schleife, D. Trinkle, J. Krogstad, R. Maass, P. Bellon, J. Shang, C. Leal, M. West, T. Bretl, G. Herman, and S. Tang, Impact of Computational Curricular Reform on Non-participating Undergraduate Courses: Student and Faculty Perspective, 2019 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition Proceedings 10.18260/1-2-32926 (2019).
- [18] P. Giannozzi, S. Baroni, N. Bonini, M. Calandra, R. Car, C. Cavazzoni, D. Ceresoli, G. L. Chiarotti, M. Cococcioni, I. Dabo, A. D. Corso, S. de Gironcoli, S. Fabris, G. Fratesi, R. Gebauer, U. Gerstmann, C. Gougoussis, A. Kokalj, M. Lazzeri, L. Martin-Samos, N. Marzari, F. Mauri, R. Mazzarello, S. Paolini, A. Pasquarello, L. Paulatto, C. Sbraccia, S. Scandolo, G. Sclauzero, A. P. Seitsonen, A. Smogunov, P. Umari, and R. M. Wentzcovitch, QUANTUM ESPRESSO: a modular and open-source software project for quantum simulations of materials, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **21**, 395502 (2009).
- [19] P. Giannozzi, O. Andreussi, T. Brumme, O. Bunau, M. B. Nardelli, M. Calandra, R. Car, C. Cavazzoni, D. Ceresoli, M. Cococcioni, N. Colonna, I. Carnimeo, A. D. Corso, S. de Gironcoli, P. Delugas, R. A. DiStasio, A. Ferretti, A. Floris, G. Fratesi, G. Fugallo, R. Gebauer, U. Gerstmann, F. Giustino, T. Gorni, J. Jia, M. Kawamura, H.-Y. Ko, A. Kokalj, E. Küçükbenli, M. Lazzeri, M. Marsili, N. Marzari, F. Mauri, N. L. Nguyen, H.-V. Nguyen, A. O. de-la Roza, L. Paulatto, S. Poncé, D. Rocca, R. Sabatini, B. Santra, M. Schlipf, A. P. Seitsonen, A. Smogunov, I. Timrov, T. Thonhauser, P. Umari, N. Vast, X. Wu, and S. Baroni, Advanced capabilities for materials modelling with quantum ESPRESSO, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **29**, 465901 (2017).
- [20] G. Klimeck and D. Vasileska, ABACUS and AQME: Semiconductor device and quantum mechanics education on nanoHUB.org, 2009 13th International Workshop on Computational Electronics , 1 (2009).
- [21] K. Thornton, S. Nola, R. E. Garcia, M. Asta, and G. B. Olson, Computational materials science and engineering education: A survey of trends and needs, *JOM* **61**, 12 (2009).
- [22] M. Beg, M. Lang, and H. Fangohr, Ubermag: Toward more effective micromagnetic workflows, *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **58**, 1 (2022).
- [23] A. H. Larsen, J. J. Mortensen, J. Blomqvist, I. E. Castelli, R. Christensen, M. Dulák, J. Friis, M. N. Groves, B. Hammer, C. Hargus, E. D. Hermes, P. C. Jennings, P. B. Jensen, J. Kermode, J. R. Kitchin, E. L. Kolsbjerg, J. Kubal, K. Kaasbjerg, S. Lysgaard, J. B.

- Maronsson, T. Maxson, T. Olsen, L. Pastewka, A. Petersen, C. Rostgaard, J. Schiøtz, O. Schütt, M. Strange, K. S. Thygesen, T. Vegge, L. Vilhelmsen, M. Walter, Z. Zeng, and K. W. Jacobsen, The atomic simulation environment—a Python library for working with atoms, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **29**, 273002 (2017).
- [24] M. Pieper and S. Schulz, Teaching Simulation Methods with COMSOL Multiphysics, in *Proceedings of the 2014 COMSOL Conference* (Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2014).
- [25] F. Löffler, J. Faber, E. Bentivegna, T. Bode, P. Diener, R. Haas, I. Hinder, B. C. Mundim, C. D. Ott, E. Schnetter, G. Allen, M. Campanelli, and P. Laguna, The einstein toolkit: a community computational infrastructure for relativistic astrophysics, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **29**, 115001 (2012).
- [26] T. O. B. Odden, D. W. Silvia, and A. Malthe-Sørensen, Using computational essays to foster disciplinary epistemic agency in undergraduate science, *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* **60**, 937 (2022).
- [27] A. diSessa, *Changing Minds – Computers, Learning, and Literacy* (MITPress, Cambridge, MA, 2000).
- [28] B. E. Granger and F. Perez, Jupyter: Thinking and storytelling with code and data, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **23**, 7 (2021).
- [29] T. Shinjo, T. Okuno, R. Hassdorf, K. Shigeto, and T. Ono, Magnetic vortex core observation in circular dots of permalloy, *Science* **289**, 930 (2000).
- [30] R. A. Duine, K.-J. Lee, S. S. P. Parkin, and M. D. Stiles, Synthetic antiferromagnetic spintronics, *Nature Physics* **14**, 217 (2018).
- [31] S. S. P. Parkin, R. Bhadra, and K. P. Roche, Oscillatory magnetic exchange coupling through thin copper layers, *Physical Review Letters* **66**, 2152 (1991).
- [32] N. L. Schryer and L. R. Walker, The motion of 180° domain walls in uniform dc magnetic fields, *Journal of Applied Physics* **45**, 5406 (1974).
- [33] T. Mewes and C. K. A. Mewes, Ferromagnetic resonance, in *Magnetic Measurement Techniques for Materials Characterization*, edited by V. Franco and B. Dorrill (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2021) pp. 431–452.
- [34] J. Dedulle, Pedagogic using of COMSOL Multiphysics for learning Numerical Method and Numerical Modelling, in *Conférence COMSOL Multiphysics* (Paris, France, 2007).
- [35] Ubermag source code at <https://github.com/ubermag>.
- [36] J. Cohen, D. S. Katz, M. Barker, N. C. Hong, R. Haines, and C. Jay, The four pillars of research software engineering, *IEEE Software* **38**, 97 (2021).
- [37] S. J. R. Holt, M. Lang, J. C. Loudon, T. J. Hicken, D. Cortés-Ortuño, S. A. Pathak, M. Beg, and H. Fangohr, Virtual experiments in computational magnetism: `mag2exp`, In preparation for submission (2023).
- [38] V. Braun and V. Clarke, Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research in Psychology* **3**, 77 (2006).

Project 1: Static and Dynamic Properties of Magnetic Vortices

Introduction. Ferromagnetic disks with diameters in the micrometer or submicrometer range under certain conditions exhibit a ground state configuration which is termed *magnetic vortex*.

In order to reduce the dipolar energy, it is favorable for the magnetization vectors to be oriented tangential to the disk boundary, while the lowest exchange energy would be achieved in a uniformly magnetized state. Depending on the details of these (and possibly also other) micromagnetic energy terms as well as on the considered disk aspect ratio, for zero external magnetic field the ground state can be a magnetic vortex. In this case, besides a circularly symmetric in-plane magnetization tangential to the disk boundary, the magnetization will be oriented out-of-plane at the core of the disk.

In this project, the static and dynamic properties of magnetic vortices will be investigated by means of micromagnetic simulations using Ubermag: <https://ubermag.github.io/>. The project is divided into three subproblems.

I. Static Properties of a Magnetic Vortex in a Nanodisk. We consider a thin magnetic nanodisk with radius $r = 50$ nm and thickness $t = 10$ nm. For the micromagnetic simulations, we set the size of a discretization cell to $d_x = d_y = d_z = 5$ nm. The following material parameters are chosen to be similar to permalloy: The saturation magnetization is $M_s = 8 \times 10^5$ A/m and the exchange energy constant is $A = 1.3 \times 10^{-11}$ J/m. Aside from the exchange interaction, we also assume the presence of dipolar interactions (demagnetization energy).

(a) Initially, we further assume that no external magnetic field is applied and we neglect any possible magnetic anisotropy. Define the initial magnetization such that $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}/M_s = \mathbf{f}/|\mathbf{f}|$ where $\mathbf{f}(x, y, z) = (-y, x, 10 \text{ nm})$. Minimize the energy and plot the magnetization for $z = 0$. What are the characteristics of the ground state of the system?

(b) The ground state from (a) has a certain chirality. What do you need to change to obtain as a ground state a magnetic vortex with different chirality? Furthermore, how can you obtain a magnetic vortex with opposite polarity of the core as a ground state?

(c) In the next step, assume a uniaxial out-of-plane anisotropy $K_u = 2.2 \times 10^5$ J/m³ along the z-direction in addition to the parameters used in (a) before calculating the ground state. How does this additional energy term affect the ground state? At which approximate value of K_u does the ground state collapse into a different state?

(d) What happens when – instead of the previously considered out-of-plane anisotropy – an in-plane anisotropy along the x-axis is assumed? Discuss the ground states for $K_u = 1 \times 10^5$ J/m³, 2.5×10^5 J/m³ and $K_u = 8 \times 10^5$ J/m³.

(e) We now consider the effect of an out-of-plane magnetic field. Suppose that we start with the ground state obtained in part (a), that is, without any anisotropy or external field. Now switch the external field from (0, 0, 0) to (0, 0, -2×10^5 A/m). What happens to the magnetic state of the disk? Is this effect reversible?

(f) Discuss and simulate how a magnetic vortex could be stabilized such that its core is not located at the center of the disk. Also, discuss the dependence of the vortex state on the newly introduced parameter. When does the vortex collapse?

II. Nucleation and Annihilation of a Magnetic Vortex – Magnetic Hysteresis. Note: While this project may appear shorter than the others, it is more complex and challenging. We consider a magnetic nanodisk with radius $r = 60$ nm and thickness $t = 70$ nm. For the micromagnetic simulations, we set the size of a discretization cell to $d_x = d_y = d_z = 5$ nm. The following material parameters are chosen to be similar to permalloy: The saturation magnetization is $M_s = 8 \times 10^5$ A/m and the exchange energy constant is $A = 1.3 \times 10^{-11}$ J/m. Aside from the exchange interaction, we also assume the presence of dipolar interactions (demagnetization energy) and a Zeeman energy term in the Hamiltonian.

(a) Simulate the magnetization reversal of the given system. The external magnetic field should be applied along the y -axis and range from -1.8×10^5 A/m to 1.8×10^5 A/m. Plot the hysteresis for the x - and y -components of the magnetization. In order to do so, you will need to simulate both sweep directions (positive to negative, and negative to positive fields). Use $N = 60$ different magnetic fields for one sweep direction (i.e., your final hysteresis will consist of 120 data points).

(b) Discuss characteristic features of the obtained hysteresis. It may be helpful to plot the magnetization configuration for different magnetic fields. As you will see a vortex being nucleated/annihilated at specific fields, please discuss if you observe any intermediate states between the fully magnetized state of the disk and the magnetic vortex state.

(c) Simulate the hysteresis for two other thicknesses of the nanodisk, namely 65 nm and 75 nm. Discuss your results. Furthermore, feel free to vary other simulation parameters and then discuss your results.

III. Gyrotropic Dynamics of a Magnetic Vortex. We consider a thin magnetic nanodisk with radius $r = 50$ nm and thickness $t = 10$ nm. For the micromagnetic simulations, we set the size of a discretization cell to $d_x = d_y = d_z = 5$ nm. The following material parameters are chosen to be similar to permalloy: The saturation magnetization is $M_s = 8 \times 10^5$ A/m and the exchange energy constant is $A = 1.3 \times 10^{-11}$ J/m. Aside from the exchange interaction, we also assume the presence of dipolar interactions (demagnetization energy).

(a) Initially, we further assume that no external magnetic field is applied and we neglect any possible magnetic anisotropy. Define the initial magnetization such that $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}/M_s = \mathbf{f}/|\mathbf{f}|$ where $\mathbf{f}(x, y, z) = (-y, x, 10 \text{ nm})$. Minimize the energy and plot the magnetization for $z = 0$. What are the characteristics of the ground state of the system?

(b) Assume that an external field along the y -direction is applied, $\mathbf{H} = (0, 3.4 \times 10^4 \text{ A/m}, 0)$, and neglect any possible magnetic anisotropy. Minimize the energy. What is the ground state now?

(c) Remove the external magnetic field. Calculate the time evolution assuming a Gilbert damping of $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\gamma_0 = 2.211 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m A}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. The simulation time should be $t = 20$ ns and the number of recorded points $n = 500$. Plot the magnetization for $z = 0$. What is the achieved state?

(d) Plot the spatially-averaged components m_x , m_y and m_z as a function of time in one diagram. What do you observe? How can you explain this observation? It may be helpful to look at snapshots of the magnetic states simulated in (c) during the course of time.

(e) How does the value of α effect the simulation/results? Study the dynamics for at least two more values of α .

(f) Calculate a fast Fourier transform (FFT) of $m_x(t)$ and $m_y(t)$. Plot the FFT power against the frequency. You should obtain a peak at a specific frequency. How do you interpret these results? Discuss how you possibly could change the position of the peak.

(g) Repeat the simulations of the vortex dynamics for the presence of a uniaxial in-plane anisotropy along the x-axis ($K_u = 1 \times 10^5 \text{ J/m}^3$)? Discuss the differences compared to the case without anisotropy. What happens for higher values (e.g., $K_u = 1.5 \times 10^5 \text{ J/m}^3$)?

Project 2: Synthetic Antiferromagnet

Introduction. *Synthetic antiferromagnets* (SAFs) have attracted considerable attention in the scientific community over the past years due to the tunable magnetic interaction strengths, reduced stray fields and fast magnetization dynamics. Here, we will consider a SAF trilayer structure consisting of two ferromagnetic layers that are separated by a nonmagnetic spacer.

In detail, the two ferromagnetic layers are antiferromagnetically coupled via the so-called Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuya-Yosida (RKKY) interaction through the nonmagnetic spacer. The antiferromagnetic interlayer exchange interaction is mediated by the conduction electrons in the metallic spacer layer. A typical material utilized for the spacer layer is ruthenium.

In this project, the properties of various SAF structures will be investigated by means of micromagnetic simulations using Ubermag: <https://ubermag.github.io/>. The project is divided into three subproblems.

I. SAF Trilayer – Role of Different Micromagnetic Energy Terms. We consider a SAF trilayer with the following parameters: The two ferromagnetic layers have a thickness of $d = 10$ nm and lateral size 60×60 nm each. The spacer layer has a thickness of 2 nm only and the same lateral size as the ferromagnetic layers (60×60 nm). For the micromagnetic simulations, we set the size of a discretization cell to $3 \times 3 \times 2$ nm. The following material parameters are assumed: The saturation magnetization is $M_s = 7.0 \times 10^5$ A/m, the intralayer exchange energy constant is $A = 1.0 \times 10^{-11}$ J/m, the uniaxial anisotropy constant is $K_u = 1.0 \times 10^5$ J/m³ with $u = (1, 0, 0)$, and the interlayer antiferromagnetic coupling strength is given by $\sigma = -1.0 \times 10^{-4}$ J/m².

(a) Initially, we assume that no external magnetic field is applied. Furthermore, at first we neglect the presence of dipolar interactions (demagnetization energy term). To define a random initial magnetization state (i.e., the magnitude and direction of the magnetization in every simulation cell is supposed to be random), we import and use the ‘random’ class of Python. It is recommended to use the pseudo-random (deterministic) function termed ‘random.seed()’. Plot the initial magnetization state, minimize the energy and plot the magnetization for $y = 0$ (view of the SAF from the side). What is the ground state of the system? Repeat the simulation a few times starting with other random initial states. Discuss the reproducibility of your results.

(b) In the next step, add a demagnetization energy term to the Hamiltonian. How does this affect the relaxed magnetization state? Can you comment on the simulation time compared to (a), where demagnetization effects were neglected? Again, repeat the simulation a few times starting with other random initial states and discuss the reproducibility of your results.

(c) As in (a), we neglect the presence of dipolar interactions and start with a random initial magnetization state. We now assume an out-of-plane anisotropy with $K_u = 1.0 \times 10^5$ J/m³ and $u = (0, 0, 1)$. Discuss the ground state of the system and the reproducibility of your simulation.

(d) Add the demagnetization energy term to your Hamiltonian from (c) and discuss your results.

(e) Increase the perpendicular anisotropy from $K_u = 1.0 \times 10^5 \text{ J/m}^3$ to $K_u = 3.0 \times 10^6 \text{ J/m}^3$. Discuss your results. Discuss the role of the competing micromagnetic energy terms. In addition, plot the magnetization in the xy-plane at $z = 20 \text{ nm}$ (and for other values of z if you like). What do you observe?

(f) In which way does the magnetization state change for an even higher perpendicular anisotropy $K_u = 6.0 \times 10^6 \text{ J/m}^3$?

(g) Finally, we will introduce a further energy term to the Hamiltonian. Namely, we add the so-called Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction (DMI). In detail, we assume that the DMI constant is $D = 5 \text{ mJ/m}^2$ in the top as well as the bottom layer. Set `crystalclass = 'Cnv'` for the DMI. How does the additional DMI impact the resulting magnetization state in comparison to the results obtained in (e) and (f)?

II. SAF Trilayer – Magnetic Skyrmions in Nanodisk Geometry. We consider a SAF trilayer with the following parameters: The two circular-shaped ferromagnetic layers have a thickness of $d = 1 \text{ nm}$ and a diameter of $d = 100 \text{ nm}$ each. The spacer layer has a thickness of 1 nm and the same lateral size as the ferromagnetic layers. For the micromagnetic simulations, we set the size of a discretization cell to $1.5625 \times 1.5625 \times 1 \text{ nm}$. The following material parameters are assumed: The saturation magnetization is $M_s = 1.0 \times 10^6 \text{ A/m}$, the intralayer exchange energy constant is $A = 1.5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ J/m}$, the uniaxial anisotropy constant is $K_u = 1.0 \times 10^6 \text{ J/m}^3$ with $u = (0, 0, 1)$, and the interlayer antiferromagnetic coupling strength is given by $\sigma = -1.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ J/m}^2$. Furthermore, we add the so-called Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction (DMI) to the Hamiltonian. In detail, we assume that the DMI constant is $D = 3 \text{ mJ/m}^2$ in the top as well as the bottom layer. Set `crystalclass = 'Cnv'` for the DMI.

(a) Start with the following initial magnetization: For the top layer, the magnetization should point along $(0, 0, 1)$ within a radius of 20 nm , otherwise along $(0, 0, -1)$. Conversely, for the bottom layer it should point along $(0, 0, -1)$ within a radius of 20 nm , while it points along $(0, 0, 1)$ outside of this radius. Plot the initial magnetization state for both ferromagnetic layers.

(b) Minimize the energy and plot the magnetization for both layers. Discuss the ground state of the system (hint: magnetic skyrmion). Plot the magnetization in the x-y plane for both the top and the bottom layer.

(c) Plot the z-component of the magnetization along the diameter of the nanodisk (for both the top and the bottom layer). How could you define a diameter of the skyrmion (core)?

(d) How does the magnetization behave at the edges of the nanodisks?

(e) Reduce the interlayer (RKKY) exchange coupling by one order of magnitude to $\sigma = -1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ J/m}^2$. Do you observe any differences for the calculated ground state?

(f) Apply a magnetic field of 50 mT along the positive z-direction. Calculate the ground state for the two different interlayer coupling strengths $\sigma = -1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ J/m}^2$ and $\sigma = -1.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ J/m}^2$. Discuss your results.

(g) Can you create a ground state with more than one skyrmion in each of the ferromagnetic layers? Discuss your results in detail.

III. Magnetization Reversal of a SAF. Note: Even though it appears rather short, this is the most challenging subproject of this problem sheet. Here, we consider an uncompensated SAF with $N = 21$ individual layers and the following parameters: The individual layers have a thickness of $d = 4 \text{ nm}$ and lateral size $100 \times 100 \text{ nm}$ each. In contrast to the previous subprojects, we do not assume the presence of

nonmagnetic spacer layers that provide RKKY-coupling. Instead, we assume a positive exchange constant of $A = 5.0 \times 10^{-12}$ J/m for the ferromagnetic coupling within the layer, while a negative exchange constant $A = -8.0 \times 10^{-12}$ J/m describes the interlayer (antiferromagnetic) exchange coupling. For the micromagnetic simulations, we set the size of a discretization cell to $5 \times 5 \times 4$ nm. The saturation magnetization is $M_s = 8.0 \times 10^5$ A/m. We also consider the demagnetization term for the simulations.

(a) Simulate the magnetization reversal of such a SAF with $N = 21$ layers for an out-of-plane uniaxial anisotropy with $K_u = 6.0 \times 10^5$ J/m³ and $u = (0, 0, 1)$. Sweep the magnetic field between -12 T and 12 T. Utilize at least 61 magnetic field values for each sweep. Plot the hysteresis curve and discuss your results in detail, including the different magnetization states. For this purpose, it will be helpful to plot snapshots of the magnetization state for different magnetic field values.

(b) Discuss the dependence of the hysteresis on the following parameters: magnetic anisotropy, antiferromagnetic exchange coupling strength, number of layers. In other words, you can play around with the different energy terms of the Hamiltonian and study how these changes affect the magnetization reversal.

(c) Remove the demagnetization term from the Hamiltonian and try to simulate the magnetization reversal again. Discuss what you observe.

Project 3: Static and Dynamic Properties of Domain Walls

Introduction. Domain wall nucleation and propagation is one of the magnetization reversal mechanisms. Domain walls are seen everywhere in magnetic materials because they can reduce the magnetostatics energy and are therefore the most energetically favorable magnetic configuration. In this project you will investigate domain wall initialization in systems with different energy configurations, move a domain wall across a magnetic strip and observe the Walker Breakdown, and pin a domain wall to a notch in a magnetic strip.

In this project, the static and dynamic properties of magnetic domain walls will be investigated by means of micromagnetic simulations using Ubermag: <https://ubermag.github.io/>. The project is divided into three subproblems.

I. Static Properties of a Domain Wall in a Magnetic Strip. We consider a magnetic strip with length $l = 500$ nm, width $w = 20$ nm and thickness $t = 2.5$ nm. We use a discretization cell size of 2.5 nm in all three dimensions. We use the following material parameters: the saturation magnetization $M_s = 5.8 \times 10^5$ A/m and the exchange energy constant is $A = 13 \times 10^{-12}$ J/m.

(a) Initially, we only consider exchange interactions and dipolar interactions (demagnetization energy), and do not include a magnetic field or anisotropy. We want to create two domains: one pointing in the +x-direction and the other pointing in the -y-direction with a domain wall in between. Initialize the magnetization so that the moments in the first 250 nm point in the +x-direction and in the second 250 nm points in the -x-direction. Minimize the energy to see if you get the desired domain configuration with a coherent rotation of moments in the domain wall region.

(b) Notice that the moments rotate incoherently in the domain wall region. Add a third 10nm wide domain in the y-direction at the center of the strip when you initialize the magnetization. Do you now get coherent rotation of moments?

(c) Add uniaxial anisotropy energy with an anisotropy constant of $K_u = 0.5 \times 10^6$ J/m³ in the x-direction. Initialize the magnetization as before and minimize the energy. What effect does the anisotropy have on the domain wall size?

(d) Now create two domains: one pointing in the +y-direction and the other in the -y-direction. Do you need to add anisotropy in the y-direction to achieve this? Why? Use $K_u = 0.5 \times 10^6$ J/m³. Do you need a third domain again to get coherent rotation of moments in the domain wall region once you minimize the energy?

(e) Decrease the anisotropy to $K_u = 0.1 \times 10^6$ J/m³. What effect does an increased or decreased anisotropy constant have on the domain wall size?

(f) We now want to look at out-of-plane magnetizations. We want to create a structure with one domain in the +z- and the other in the -z-direction. Why do you need to add anisotropy do achieve this? Use $K_u = 0.5 \times 10^6$ J/m³, create the initial magnetization with a third domain, minimize the energy and observe the wall that has formed. What is the difference in the domain wall when you initialize the magnetization with a third domain in either the x- or y-direction?

(g) Another way to create a domain wall without having to use a third domain in the initial magnetization configuration is to use Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interactions. Add a DMI constant of $D = 3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ J/m}^2$ and create the same out-of-plane configuration as in (f) without using a third domain in the initial magnetization configuration. Use C_{nv_z} for the crystal class. What kind of domain wall do you get (Neel or Bloch)?

(h) Can you initialize the domain wall somewhere that is not in the center of the strip? What energy term do you need to remove to create a domain wall that is not in the center? Compare the time it takes for the simulation to run with and without that energy term.

II. Domain Wall Motion. We consider a magnetic strip with length $l = 500 \text{ nm}$, width $w = 20 \text{ nm}$ and thickness $t = 2.5 \text{ nm}$. We use a discretization cell size of 2.5 nm in all three dimensions. We use the following material parameters: the saturation magnetization $M_s = 5.8 \times 10^5 \text{ A/m}$, exchange energy constant $A = 13 \times 10^{-12} \text{ J/m}$, Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya energy constant $D = 3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ J/m}^2$, and uniaxial anisotropy constant $K_u = 0.5 \times 10^6 \text{ J/m}^3$ in the z -direction. For the dynamics, we use a gyromagnetic ratio of $\gamma_0 = 2.211 \times 10^5 \text{ m/As}$ and a Gilbert damping of $\alpha = 0.3$.

(a) We consider exchange energy, uniaxial anisotropy energy and Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction energy. Initialize the magnetization to form a domain wall pair with the magnetization pointing in the positive z -direction between $x = 20 \text{ nm}$ and $x = 40 \text{ nm}$ and in the negative z -direction in the rest of the film. Then minimize the energy. (look at problem I (g) if you are struggling to create a domain wall)

(b) Add a Zeeman energy term with a magnetic field of 10000 A/m in the negative z -direction. Drive the system for 5 ns . Did the domain wall pair move across the film?

(c) Remove the Zeeman term and initialize the magnetization the same way as in (a). Now drive the domain wall pair using spin torques. Use the Slonczewski precession term with a current density of $J = 1 \times 10^{12} \text{ A/m}^2$, $m_p = (0, 1, 0)$, $\text{Pol} = 0.4$, and $\text{Lambda} = 2$. Drive the system for 0.5 ns and compare the domain wall pair movement to (b).

(d) Now try (b) and (c), but with a single domain wall. Initialize the magnetization to form a domain in the positive z -direction for $x < 20 \text{ nm}$ and negative z -direction for the rest of the film. Drive the system with a magnetic field and a spin torque and compare the two driving mechanisms.

(e) We now want to observe the Walker breakdown of a domain wall when moving the domain wall using a magnetic field. Use the following reference for system dimensions and material parameters: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2887918>. Initialize the magnetization and minimize the energy to get a magnetization configuration similar to that of Fig. 1 C of the reference. (look at problem I (b) if you are struggling to create a domain wall)

(f) Use different magnetic fields applied in the $+x$ -direction to drive the domain wall across the strip. Look at the x -component of the magnetization vs. time to calculate a domain wall velocity for each field. Create a magnetic field vs. domain wall velocity graph around the Walker breakdown field to see the drop in velocity around the Walker breakdown.

(g) Beyond the walker field, the domain wall motion has higher and lower velocity regimes, i.e., the velocity oscillates. Look at the magnetization in those regimes and describe how the domain wall propagates

III. Domain Wall Pinning. We consider a magnetic strip with length $l = 500$ nm, width $w = 50$ nm and thickness $t = 2.5$ nm. We use a discretization cell size of 2.5 nm in all three dimensions. We use the following material parameters: The saturation magnetization $M_s = 5.8 \times 10^5$ A/m, the exchange energy constant $A = 13 \times 10^{-12}$ J/m, Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya energy constant $D = 3 \times 10^{-3}$ J/m², and uniaxial anisotropy constant $K_u = 0.5 \times 10^6$ J/m³ in the z-direction. For the dynamics, we use a gyromagnetic ration of $\gamma_0 = 2.211 \times 10^5$ m/As and a Gilbert damping of $\alpha = 0.3$.

(a) We want to first create two notches in our magnetic strip that are 20 nm long and 5 nm deep in the center of the magnetic strip, such that there is a constriction that is 40 nm wide in the center.

(b) Now create two domains. One domain pointing in the +z-direction in the first 50 nm of the strip and one pointing in the -z-direction for the rest of the strip. Minimize the energy to see if you get the desired magnetization configuration. [look at problem I (g) if you are struggling to create a domain wall]

(c) Add an external magnetic field in the z-direction to drive the domain wall across the film. Find the lowest field required to drive the wall across the film without pinning it to the notch.

(d) Now, use a smaller field to pin the domain wall to the notch. Can you now unpin the domain wall using the magnetic field from (c) or do you need a higher field? Find the lowest field necessary to unpin the domain wall from the notch.

(e) Repeat (c) and (d) using notch depth of 10, 15, and 20 nm. How do the magnetic fields change as a function of notch size?

Project 4: Static and Dynamic Properties of Vortices in an Elliptical Geometry

Introduction. Ferromagnetic disks with diameters in the micrometer or submicrometer range under certain conditions exhibit a ground state configuration which is termed *magnetic vortex*. In order to reduce the dipolar energy, it is favorable for the magnetization vectors to be oriented tangential to the disk boundary, while the lowest exchange energy would be achieved in a uniformly magnetized state. Depending on the details of these (and possibly also other) micromagnetic energy terms as well as on the considered disk aspect ratio, for zero external magnetic field the ground state can be a magnetic vortex. Magnetic vortices can also occur in elliptical geometries where it is possible to get one or two vortices depending on the initial magnetization configuration.

In this project, the static and dynamic properties of magnetic domain walls will be investigated by means of micromagnetic simulations using Ubermag: <https://ubermag.github.io/>. The project is divided into three subproblems.

I. Formation and Manipulation of Vortices. We consider a magnetic ellipse with length major axis $a = 100$ nm, minor axis $b = 50$ nm and thickness $t = 50$ nm. We use a discretization cell size of 5 nm in all three dimensions. We use material parameters similar to those of permalloy: The saturation magnetization $M_s = 8 \times 10^5$ A/m and the exchange energy constant is $A = 13 \times 10^{-12}$ J/m.

(a) The first step is to define a simulations region with dimensions $2a \times 2b \times t$. Next, define the system's energy, which includes exchange, dipolar (demagnetization), and Zeeman energy terms. Now, define the initial magnetization to form the elliptical geometry with an initial magnetization along the minor axis, and an initial external magnetic field of $H = (0, 1.8 \times 10^5$ A/m, 1×10^3 A/m) (along the minor axis and out of plane).

(b) Minimize the energy, then remove the external magnetic field completely and minimize the energy again. You should now have two vortices. Describe their position, chirality, and core polarity.

(c) Now change the magnetic field to be along the minor axis direction with a field strength of 5×10^4 A/m. What do you expect to happen to the vortex cores? Now change the magnetic field direction by 180° and describe what happens to the cores.

(d) Similarly, apply a magnetic field of 8×10^3 A/m parallel and antiparallel to the major axis and describe what you observe. What do you expect to be different if the vortices had the same chirality?

(e) We now want to create vortices with opposing core polarities. Initialize the magnetization as before with a magnetic field of 1.8×10^5 A/m along the minor axis direction. How can you achieve a configuration where the two vortex cores have opposite polarity? (Hint: create two different regions in your mesh) Describe this configuration. Do you notice any difference in the z-component of the magnetization outside of the vortex core between this polarity configuration and that in (b).

(f) Lastly, initialize the magnetization along the major axis and apply a magnetic field of $H = (0, 1.8 \times 10^5$ A/m, 1×10^3 A/m) (along the major axis and out-of-plane). Create a state with only one vortex at the center of the ellipse after minimizing the energy. (Hint: you will need to add another energy term to make this work)

II. Dynamics of Magnetic Vortices. We consider a magnetic ellipse with length major axis $a = 100$ nm, minor axis $b = 50$ nm and thickness $t = 50$ nm. We use a discretization cell size of 5 nm in all three dimensions. We use material parameters similar to those of permalloy: The saturation magnetization $M_s = 8 \times 10^5$ A/m and the exchange energy constant is $A = 13 \times 10^{-12}$ J/m. For the dynamics, we use a gyromagnetic ratio of $\gamma_0 = 2.211 \times 10^5$ m/As and a Gilbert damping of $\alpha = 0.01$.

(a) The first step is to define a simulation region with dimensions $2a \times 2b \times t$. Next, define the system's energy, which includes exchange, dipolar (demagnetization), and Zeeman energy terms. Now, define the initial magnetization to form the elliptical geometry with an initial magnetization along the minor axis, and an initial external magnetic field of $H = (0, 1.8 \times 10^5 \text{ A/m}, 1 \times 10^3 \text{ A/m})$ (along the minor axis and out of plane). Minimize the energy, remove the magnetic field and minimize the energy again. This is two vortex state we want to look at.

(b) Now instead of minimizing the energy after removing the field, drive the system for 3 ns after minimizing the energy with the magnetic field applied, and look at the magnetization configuration every ~ 0.1 ns and describe where and how the vortices form and how they move to their final location.

(c) Now use the same initialization conditions as in (a). After getting the two vortices, apply a magnetic field of 5×10^4 A/m along the minor axis so the vortices move away from each other. Now remove the magnetic field and drive the system for 3 ns, looking at the magnetic configuration again every ~ 0.1 ns. Describe how the vortices move back to their original position. Also create a plot of the three magnetization components as a function of time to describe the vortex motion.

(d) Repeat (c) for vortices with opposite core polarity. [Look at I. (e) for some details on how to create this configuration.] What do you notice about the vortex motion with respect to its chirality? If the vortices had the same chirality how would their motion differ?

III. Vortices in Varying Geometry. We consider a magnetic ellipse with length major axis $a = 100$ nm, minor axis $b = 50$ nm and thickness $t = 50$ nm. We use a discretization cell size of 5 nm in all three dimensions. We use material parameters similar to those of permalloy: The saturation magnetization $M_s = 8 \times 10^5$ A/m and the exchange energy constant is $A = 13 \times 10^{-12}$ J/m.

(a) The first step is to define a simulation region with dimensions $2a \times 2b \times t$. Next, define the system's energy, which includes exchange, dipolar (demagnetization), and Zeeman energy terms. Now, define the initial magnetization to form the elliptical geometry with an initial magnetization along the minor axis, and an initial external magnetic field of $H = (0, 1.8 \times 10^5 \text{ A/m}, 1 \times 10^3 \text{ A/m})$ (along the minor axis and out of plane). Minimize the energy, remove the magnetic field and minimize the energy again.

(b) Reduce the minor axis dimensions and find the smallest minor axis length that still yields two vortices.

(c) Increase the minor axis dimensions and find the largest minor axis length that still yields two vortices.

(d) What vortex state do you get when you increase the minor axis dimension more?

(e) Double the geometric dimensions and repeat (b)-(d). Is the smallest/largest ellipticity to get two vortices different with different overall dimensions?

(f) Another geometry where you can get vortices is a rectangle. What is the domain state in a rectangle that minimizes the magnetostatic energy? Based on that where do you expect the vortex or vortices to be

located? Simulate a rectangle with a width to length ratio of $\frac{1}{2}$. Use the same initial magnetization and magnetic field as before. What kind of vortex configuration do you get? Is this what you expected? Increase the width until you get a different vortex configuration.

Project 5: Ferromagnetic Resonance of a Pt/Co Nanodisk

Introduction. Ferromagnetic resonance (FMR), the excitation during which all magnetic moments have in-phase precession, is a unique spectroscopic technique used to investigate magnetization dynamics of magnetic systems. The FMR in a material provides us with information about the dynamic properties of the material, e.g., the damping constant.

We use the ringdown method to get the fundamental FMR mode: the system is perturbed from its equilibrium state by applying a short-lived and sufficiently weak excitation, followed by simulation and recording of the magnetization dynamics. Resonance frequencies are extracted by fast Fourier transforming (FFT) the recorded data.

In this project, the static and dynamic properties of Pt/Co nanodisks with different sizes will be investigated by means of micromagnetic simulations using Ubermag: <https://ubermag.github.io/>. The project is divided into two subproblems.

I. Static Properties of a Pt/Co Nanodisk. We consider a magnetic nanodisk with radius $r = 50$ nm and thickness $t = 10$ nm. We set the size of a discretization cell to $d_x = d_y = d_z = 5$ nm. The following parameters are material parameters of Pt/Co. The saturation magnetization is $M_s = 3.5 \times 10^5$ A/m, the gyromagnetic ratio $\gamma_0 = 2.211 \times 10^5$ m A⁻¹ s⁻¹ and the exchange energy constant is $A = 1.0 \times 10^{-11}$ J/m. In addition to the exchange interaction, we also assume the presence of the dipolar interactions (demagnetization energy).

(a) Initially, we assume that no external magnetic field is applied, and we neglect any possible magnetic anisotropy. Define the initial magnetization such that $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}/M_s = \mathbf{f}/|\mathbf{f}|$ where $\mathbf{f}(x, y, z) = (1, 0, 0)$. Minimize the energy and plot the magnetization for $z = 0$. What are the characteristics of the ground state of the system?

(b) In the next step, assume a uniaxial out-of-plane anisotropy $K_u = 9.4 \times 10^4$ J/m³ along the z-direction in addition to the parameters used in (a) before calculating the ground state. How does this additional energy term affect the ground state? Why?

(c) Following (b), what happens if we increase K_u to 5×10^5 J/m³, 1×10^6 J/m³, and 5×10^6 J/m³, respectively?

(d) Alternatively, if we redefine the initial magnetization such that $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}/M_s = \mathbf{f}/|\mathbf{f}|$ where $\mathbf{f}(x, y, z) = (0, 0, 1)$. Consider only the dipolar interaction and exchange interaction. Minimize the energy and plot the magnetization for $z = 0$. What are the characteristics of the ground state of the system?

(e) Following (d), assume a uniaxial out-of-plane anisotropy $K_u = 9.4 \times 10^4$ J/m³ along the z-direction in addition to the parameters used in (d) before calculating the ground state. How does this additional energy term affect the ground state?

(f) Following (e), we want to experimentally mimic a SQUID VSM measurement, where we can get a hysteresis loop for ferromagnetic materials. Assume that we sweep the field in the **x-direction**. Plot the magnetization as a function of the field. What would be the minimum field that we apply to get the saturation magnetization? What are the coercive field and the anisotropy field?

(g) On the other hand, we are going to do the same measurement, but we sweep the field in the **z-direction** in this case. Plot the magnetization as a function of the field. What would be the difference? How do you interpret the result?

II. Dynamic Properties of a Pt/Co Nanodisk. We consider a magnetic nanodisk with radius $r = 50$ nm and thickness $t = 10$ nm. For the micromagnetic simulations, we set the size of a discretization cell to $d_x = d_y = d_z = 5$ nm. The saturation magnetization is $M_s = 3.5 \times 10^5$ A/m, uniaxial anisotropy constant $K_u = 9.4 \times 10^4$ A/m along the z-axis, the Gilbert damping constant $\alpha = 0.02$, the gyromagnetic ratio $\gamma_0 = 2.211 \times 10^5$ m A⁻¹ s⁻¹ and the exchange energy constant is $A = 1.0 \times 10^{-11}$ J/m. In addition to the exchange interaction, we also assume the presence of dipolar interactions (demagnetization energy) and Zeeman energy in the Hamiltonian.

(a) Initially, assume that no external magnetic field is applied. Define the initial magnetization such that $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}/M_s = (0, 0, 1)$. Minimize the energy and discuss the characteristics of the ground state.

(b) Following (a), in order to excite the magnetization of the system, we apply a 100 GHz ac-magnetic field along the y-axis, with amplitude $\mathbf{H}_0 = (0, 79770 \text{ A/m}, 0)$, for 1 picosecond. We then turn off the ac-field and plot the time evolution of the average magnetization $m_x(t)$, $m_y(t)$, and $m_z(t)$ for 10 nanoseconds.

(c) Following (b), calculate the FFT $m_x(t)$. Plot the FFT intensity (absolute value) as a function of frequency. You should obtain a few peaks along the frequency axis. How do you interpret these results? Mark the position of the peaks and discuss how you could possibly change the position of the peaks.

(d) Following (a), assume we apply an external (constant) magnetic field, $\mathbf{H}_{\text{ext}} = (0, 0, H_z)$, along the z-axis during the whole simulation process. Repeat the excitation procedure for the following three field values: **39885, 199425, 398850 A/m**. Calculate the FFT of $m_x(t)$ and plot the FFT intensity as a function of frequency. How does the resonance frequency evolve as a function of the external magnetic field?

(e) Following (a), assume we apply an external (constant) magnetic field, $\mathbf{H}_{\text{ext}} = (0, 0, H_z)$, along the z-axis during the whole simulation process. Repeat the excitation procedure for the following value: **-39885 A/m**. Calculate the FFT of $m_x(t)$ and plot the FFT intensity as a function of frequency. How does the resonance frequency evolve as a function of the external magnetic field?

(f) Plot the FFT of $m_x(t)$ as a function of frequency if the Gilbert damping constant $\alpha = 0.08$ and **0.2**. Compare the results and discuss how the Gilbert damping constant affects the linewidth of a peak.

III. Size-Dependence and Angular-Dependence of a Pt/Co Nanodisk. We consider the same magnetic system and the same magnetic parameters as in Part II. In this Part, a magnetic field will be in the x-z plane. We define the out-of-plane direction as 0 degree and the in-plane direction as 90 degrees.

(a) Initially, we consider a *larger* magnetic nanodisk with radius $r = 150$ nm and thickness $t = 20$ nm. Assume that no external magnetic field is applied. Define the initial magnetization such that $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}/M_s = (0, 0, 1)$. Minimize the energy and discuss the characteristics of the ground state.

(b) Following (a), in order to excite the magnetization of the system, we apply a 100 GHz ac-magnetic field along the y-axis, with amplitude $\mathbf{H}_0 = (0, 79770 \text{ A/m}, 0)$, for the duration of 1 picosecond. We then turn off the AC field and plot the time evolution of the average magnetization $m_x(t)$, $m_y(t)$, and $m_z(t)$ for 10 nanoseconds.

(c) Following (b), calculate the FFT $m_x(t)$. Plot the FFT intensity (absolute value) as a function of frequency. What do you get? Discuss within your group and compare the result to that of Part I (c), where a smaller disk is considered. Does size play a role in the obtained FMR frequency?

(d) Consider the same magnetic system as in Part I), i.e., simulate a smaller nanodisk with $r = 50$ nm and $t = 10$ nm. We apply a constant external magnetic field with a magnitude of $H_0 = 39885 \text{ A/m}$ at 0, 15, 30, 45, 60, 75, and 90 degrees. Repeat the excitation procedure. Calculate the FFT of $m_x(t)$ and plot the FFT intensity as a function of frequency.

(e) Following (d), mark the peak frequency with the largest intensity in each case. Plot the frequency as a function of field angle. Do you observe any trend as the magnetic field angle is increased?