Optimal magnetization switching via spin-orbit torque on the surface of a topological insulator

Grzegorz J. Kwiatkowski,¹ Ivan P. Miranda,^{2,3} Cecilia M. Holmqvist,³ Carlo M. Canali,³ Igor S.

Lobanov,⁴ Valery M. Uzdin,⁴ Andrei Manolescu,⁵ Pavel F. Bessarab,^{1,3,*} and Sigurður I. Erlingsson⁵

¹Science Institute, University of Iceland, 107 Reykjavík, Iceland

²Department of Physics and Astronomy, Uppsala University, SE-75120 Uppsala, Sweden

³Department of Physics and Electrical Engineering, Linnaeus University, SE-39231 Kalmar, Sweden

⁵Department of Engineering, Reykjavík University, 102 Reykjavík, Iceland

(Dated: June 14, 2024)

An optimal protocol for the current-induced switching of a perpendicularly magnetized nanoelement placed on the surface of a topological insulator is presented. The time dependence of both in-plane components of the surface current that induces the magnetization reversal via Dirac spinorbit torque with minimal Joule heating is derived analytically as a function of the required switching time and material properties. It is demonstrated that a particularly energy-efficient switching is realized for vanishing dampinglike torque. The optimal reversal time providing a tradeoff between the switching speed and energy efficiency is derived. The obtained switching protocol is contrasted with the one realized in heavy-metal systems. Topological insulators provide a highly tunable platform for the realization of energy-efficient magnetization switching.

I. INTRODUCTION

Spin-orbit torque (SOT)[1], a torque relying on the conversion of charge current to spin via spin-orbit interaction, provides an efficient mechanism for electrical control of magnetization [1–4]. Magnetization switching is one important application of the SOT [5, 6] as it can be assigned to represent logical operations in nonvolatile information technologies. The challenge is to minimize the energy cost of the switching. A SOT-induced magnetization reversal can be realized by applying an inplane current in a heavy-metal (HM) layer on which a switchable ferromagnetic (FM) element is placed. In this case, the SOT originates from the inverse spin galvanic effect [7-9] and the spin Hall effect [10-14] in the HM, both giving rise to fieldlike (FL) and dampinglike (DL) torques [1]. Conventional switching protocols rely only on the DL SOT and involve a unidirectional current [15, 16], but switching with much lower current densities can be achieved by using both in-plane components of the current [17]. Analysis based on the optimal control theory has previously revealed a theoretical limit for the minimum energy cost of the SOT-induced magnetization reversal in the FM/HM system, identified the corresponding optimal switching current pulse as a function of the reversal time and relevant material properties, and uncovered a sweet-spot ratio of the FL and DL torques which permits for a particularly efficient switching by a down-chirped rotating current pulse [18]. Optimization of magnetization switching protocols is both fundamentally interesting and technologically important as it enables identification of the right combination of materials properties for energy-efficient applications.

Topological insulators (TIs) [19–22], i.e., materials characterized by an insulating bulk but conducting surface states, represent a promising alternative to HM systems in the context of electrical control of magnetization [23]. The spin-momentum locking of the Dirac electrons at the surface of a TI results in a large chargespin conversion, thereby enabling a significant SOT on an adjacent FM [23]. Remarkably, such Dirac SOT has a different geometrical form compared to the SOT found in HM systems [24], affecting the magnetization dynamics. It is therefore interesting to explore how much Dirac SOT-induced magnetization dynamics can be optimized and whether using TI systems offers benefits for achieving energy-efficient magnetization switching.

In this article, we present a complete analytical solution to the problem of energy-efficient magnetization switching in a nanoelement with perpendicular magnetic anisotropy (PMA) by means of Dirac SOT realized in TI systems. We show that the optimal switching protocol, i.e. the protocol that minimizes the energy cost associated with Joule heating, involves both in-plane components of the surface current whose time dependence is determined by the materials properties and the switching time. We obtain noteworthy exact dependencies concerning the optimal switching and compare them with the results obtained earlier for the HM systems [18]. We demonstrate that the best scenario for magnetization switching is realized for vanishing dampinglike Dirac SOT. Finally, we discuss various possibilities to tune the SOT coefficients to achieve the most efficient switching. We conclude that TI systems offer a convenient platform for energy-efficient magnetization control, providing several advantages over other systems.

⁴Department of Physics, ITMO University, 197101 St. Petersburg, Russia

^{*} Corresponding author: pavel.bessarab@lnu.se



Figure 1. Energy-efficient switching of a PMA nanoelement (cylinder) by a Dirac spin-orbit torque induced by an optimal 2D electric current pulse \vec{j}_m flowing at the surface of a topological insulator substrate. The calculated optimal control path for the switching for $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\xi_D = \xi_F$ and $T = 50\tau_0$ is shown with the green line. The direction of the normalized magnetic moment \vec{s} of the element (optimal current \vec{j}_m) is shown with the blue (red) arrow.

II. MODEL

Figure 1 shows the simulated PMA nanoelement placed on the surface of a TI. The magnetic moment of the nanoelement is reversed by a surface current via Dirac SOT. The nanoelement is assumed small enough to be treated essentially as a single-domain particle at any time of the reversal process. The energy E of the system is defined by the anisotropy along the z axis which is perpendicular to the surface of the TI (see Fig. 1),

$$E = -Ks_z^2, \tag{1}$$

where s_z is a z component of the normalized magnetic moment \vec{s} and K > 0 is the anisotropy constant. The task is to identify the optimal current pulse that reverses the magnetic moment from $s_z = 1$ at t = 0 to $s_z = -1$ at t = T, with T being the switching time. Both the amplitude and the direction of the current \vec{j} at the surface of the TI are allowed to vary in time. The efficiency of the reversal is naturally defined by the amount of Joule heating generated in the resistive circuit during the switching process [25]. In particular, the optimal reversal is achieved when the cost functional

$$\Phi = \int_0^T |\vec{j}|^2 dt, \qquad (2)$$

is minimized. This optimal control problem is subject to a constraint imposed by the zero-temperature Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert (LLG) equation describing the dynamics of the magnetic moment induced by the Dirac SOT [24]:

$$\dot{\vec{s}} = - \gamma \vec{s} \times \vec{b} + \alpha \vec{s} \times \dot{\vec{s}} + \gamma \xi_F \vec{s} \times (\vec{j} \times \vec{e}_z) + \gamma \xi_D s_z (\vec{s} \times \vec{j}).$$
(3)

Here, γ is the gyromagnetic ratio, α is the damping parameter, \vec{e}_z is the unit vector along the z axis, and \vec{b} is the anisotropy field: $\vec{b} \equiv -\mu^{-1}\partial E/\partial \vec{s}$, with μ being the magnitude of the magnetic moment. The third and the fourth terms on the rhs of Eq. (3) represent FL and DL components of the SOT, respectively. The coefficients ξ_F and ξ_D can be written in terms of microscopic system parameters [1, 24]. We will assume that both ξ_D and ξ_F are independent of \vec{s} , which is valid for $J_{\rm xc}/\varepsilon_F \ll 1$ [24], where $J_{\rm xc}$ is the exchange coupling and ε_F is the Fermi energy, see Section III C for details.

In what follows, we will focus on how the ratio of the SOT coefficients affects the switching cost. For this we introduce the following notation:

$$\xi_F = \xi \cos \beta, \qquad \xi_D = \xi \sin \beta \tag{4}$$

where $\xi = \sqrt{\xi_F^2 + \xi_D^2}$ is the magnitude of spin-orbit torque and β is a parameter characterizing the proportion between its components.

III. RESULTS

To find the optimal switching current $\vec{j}_m(t)$ that makes Φ minimum, we first express the energy cost in terms of the switching trajectory and then minimize it so as to find the optimal control path (OCP) $\vec{s}_m(t)$ for the switching process; after that, the optimal switching pulse $\vec{j}_m(t)$ is derived from the OCPs. Similar procedure was applied earlier in the context of magnetization switching induced by applied magnetic field [26] and SOT in HM systems [18]. Here, we only sketch briefly the derivations, but a complete analytical solution will be published elsewhere.

A. Optimal magnetization switching

We first notice that the direction ψ of the current can be optimized relative to the azimuthal angle φ of the magnetic moment (see Fig.1) before the OCP is actually known. This gives us:

$$\psi = \varphi - \arctan\left[\frac{\cos\theta\left(\alpha\cos\beta + \sin\beta\right)}{\cos\beta - \alpha\cos^2\theta\sin\beta}\right],\qquad(5)$$

where θ is the polar angle of the magnetic moment \vec{s} . It follows from Eqs. (3) and (5) that the amplitude of the current is given by the following equation:

$$j = \frac{2K}{\mu} \frac{\left(1 + \alpha^2\right) \tau_0 \dot{\theta} + \alpha \sin \theta \cos \theta}{2\xi \sqrt{\left(1 + \alpha^2 \cos^2 \theta\right) \left(1 - \sin^2 \theta \sin^2 \beta\right)}}, \qquad (6)$$

where $\tau_0 = \mu (2K\gamma)^{-1}$ defines the timescale. It is seen from Eq. (6) that the current amplitude is the lowest for $\beta = 0$ and $\beta = \pi$ leading to most energy-efficient switching. On the other hand, for $\beta = \pi/2$ and $\beta = 3\pi/2$ the switching is impossible as the current amplitude is infinite at the top of the energy barrier ($\theta = \pi/2$). This is a consequence of the geometrical form of the Dirac SOT, for which the dampinglike (DL) torque vanishes for an in-plane orientation of the magnetic moment. It is also of note that the current amplitude does not depend on the azimuthal angle ϕ , so the cost functional Φ is only dependent on the polar angle θ , which makes the minimization problem straightforward.

We are interested in minimizing the cost functional Φ defined in Eq. (2) with the boundary conditions of $\theta(0) = 0$, $\theta(T) = \pi$. The solution to the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation for $\theta(t)$ is expressed in terms of Jacobi elliptic functions [27]. Subsequently, current amplitude j is obtained from Eq. (6). After that, $\varphi_m(t)$ is calculated via direct integration of the equation of motion and $\psi_m(t)$ is obtained using Eq. (5). Regardless of the system parameters, the OCP always crosses the energy barrier $\theta = \pi/2$ at t = T/2 which is a result of a more general symmetry $\theta_m(T/2 + t') = \pi - \theta_m(T/2 - t')$, $0 \le t' \le T/2$.

According to Eq. (5), the current rotates following the magnetic moment as it precesses around the anisotropy axis, gradually changing its frequency. The exact expressions for the frequency and amplitude are rather complex, but an analytic expression for the average current can be obtained:

$$\langle j_m \rangle = \frac{2\left(1+\alpha^2\right)\mathcal{K}\left[\sin^2\beta + \alpha^2\cos^2\beta\right]}{\xi\gamma T},\qquad(7)$$

where $\mathcal{K}[\ldots]$ is the complete elliptic integral of the first kind. Noteworthy, the average current is independent of K, although $\vec{j}_m(t)$ does depend on the strength of the anisotropy field. Similarly to the results we obtained earlier for the average current [18] and magnetic field [26], this is connected to the fact that the contribution of relaxation due to internal magnetic field to the switching process cancels out: it hinders the switching for $\theta < \pi/2$ but it helps the system reach the final state for $\theta > \pi/2$. In that sense, it is instructive to analyze both limiting cases of K. For a large anisotropy, the current pulse tends to be large and localized in time, while in the weak anisotropy regime, it becomes extended in time, characterized by an almost constant value. For $\alpha = 0$, Eq. (7) coincides exactly with the one obtained in [18] for the Slonczewski-like SOT, while for non-zero damping the average optimal current for the Dirac SOT is slightly larger.

Figure 2 shows the optimal switching current as a function of time for the optimal ratio of the SOT coefficients $(\beta = 0)$ and various values of the switching time T and damping parameter α .

B. Minimum energy cost of magnetization switching

Figure 3 shows the minimum energy cost as a function of inverse switching time for various parameter values. As in the previously studied cases [18, 26], Φ_m monotonically decreases with T and demonstrates two distinct asymptotic behaviours. For short switching times, $T \ll (\alpha + 1/\alpha) \tau_0$, the contribution from internal dynamics becomes insignificant and the solution approaches that of a free magnetic moment resulting in

$$\Phi_0 = \frac{4(1+\alpha^2)^2 \mathcal{K}^2 [1-(1+\alpha^2)\cos^2\beta]}{\xi^2 \gamma^2 T}$$
(8)

On the other hand, for $T \to \infty$ the energy cost approaches a lower limit of

$$\Phi_{\infty} = \frac{4\alpha K (1+\alpha^2) \ln \left[(1+\alpha^2) \cos^2(\beta) \right]}{\gamma \mu \xi^2 \left[(1+\alpha^2) \cos^2(\beta) - 1 \right]} \tag{9}$$

The intersection of those asymptotics gives an optimal switching time T_{opt} for which a balance between switching speed and energy efficiency is obtained.

In a scenario where the system parameters (i.e., ξ, K) are the same, the energy efficiencies of switching protocols based on the Dirac SOT and Slonczewski-like SOT are found to be very close to each other. Physically, this can be understood by the fact that the optimal switching relies mostly on the FL torque in both cases and its form is the same for the Dirac and Slonczewski-like SOT. Furthermore, typical values of the Gilbert damping parameter for 3d transition metals, when in contact with TI substrates, are greatly enhanced due to the strong spin-orbit coupling of the TI, but generally predicted to be of the order of 10^{-1} or less [28]. For these values of α and in the assumption of same model parameters the difference in switching cost between the Dirac and Slonczewski-like SOTs is less than $\sim 1\%$. At the same time, topological insulators have the advantage of channeling the whole current through the surface instead of the bulk increasing the efficiency of spin-orbit coupling.

 Φ_m depends strongly on the β parameter as shown in Fig. 4. As predicted from Eq. (6), we obtain the lowest energy cost for $\beta = 0, \pi$, while for $\beta = \pi/2, 3\pi/2$ the cost diverges to infinity indicating that switching is not possible using just the spin-orbit torques (no-switching regime). The main difference from the Slonczewski-like SOT case is that both the optimal value of β as well as the one that prevents switching to occur do not depend on α .



Figure 2. (Color online) (a-c) Optimal current magnitude $j_m(t)$ as a function of the time for several values of the damping parameter and switching time, as indicated in the legend; (d) Magnitude and in-plane components of the optimal switching current as functions of time for T = 10 and $\alpha = 0.4$. In all cases, $\beta = 0$ which corresponds to the lowest energy cost of switching.



Figure 3. (Color online) Minimum energy cost Φ_m of the magnetization switching induced by the Dirac-SOT as a function of $\frac{1}{T}$ for various values of the damping parameter as indicated in the legend. Dotted and dashed lines show the long and short switching time asymptotics, respectively. *Inset:* comparison of Φ_m for the Dirac and Slonczewski-like spinorbit torques, considering $\alpha = 0.4$ and same model parameters (ξ, K). In all cases, β is chosen to represent the lowest cost functional Φ_m , i.e., $\beta = 0$ for the Dirac SOT and $\beta = -\arctan \alpha$ for the Slonczewski-like SOT.



Figure 4. (Color online) Minimum energy cost of magnetization switching Φ_m as a function of β for T = 10 (black lines) and $T \to \infty$ (blue lines), considering two different spin-orbit torques: Dirac (solid lines), and Slonczewski-like (dashed lines), for $\alpha = 0.3$ and same model parameters (ξ, K). The red dotted line represents the damping-like and field-like parameters ratio in which no switching occurs in the Slonczewski-like spin-orbit torque.

C. Tunability of spin-orbit torque coefficients

Having identified the optimal ratio of the Dirac SOT coefficients, $\beta = 0$, we now link β to the physical parameters of an FM/TI system and explore their potential tunability.

The coefficients of the SOT acting on a magnet when due to current flowing at the surface of a TI are given by [24]

$$\xi_F = e\rho \frac{J_{xc} \tau \varepsilon_F}{\pi \hbar^2 v_F \gamma}, \text{ and } \xi_D = -e\rho \frac{2J_{xc}^2}{\pi \hbar v_F \varepsilon_F \gamma}, \qquad (10)$$

where e > 0 is the elementary charge, \hbar the reduced Planck constant, J_{xc} the exchange coupling in the TI, τ the relaxation time, and ε_F and v_F are the Fermi energy and velocity, respectively. Here we assume that $\vec{E} = \rho \vec{j}$, where ρ is some relevant resistivity. It is interesting to note that for a normal 2D semiconductor with Rashba spin-orbit interactions in the limit $J_{xc} \ll \alpha_R k_F$, the SOT coefficients take the same form as in Eq. (10) [29]. The parameter in front of the two terms, field-like and damping-like, are of course different but accounting for the differences in the density of states for the 2D Rashba system and the 2D Dirac system – they can be matched perfectly.

The angle β can be related to the microscopic model parameters via

$$\tan(\beta) = \frac{-2J_{xc}\hbar}{\varepsilon_F^2 \tau},\tag{11}$$

and the magnitude of the total SOT is

$$\xi = \left| \frac{J_{xc}}{\pi \hbar v_F} \frac{e\rho}{\gamma} \right| \sqrt{\left(\frac{\varepsilon_F \tau}{\hbar}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{2J_{xc}}{\varepsilon_F}\right)^2}.$$
 (12)

The angle β does not explicitly depend on v_F , but ξ is, however, inversely proportional to v_F . By applying strain [30], or external gate voltages [31] the value of the Fermi velocity can be modified, and in some cases made asymmetric [30]. The torque coefficients in Eq. (10) only contain surface contribution, relevant when the Fermi energy is in the gap. For ε_F closer to bulk bands additional terms appear due to e.g. hexagonal warping [32, 33], and spin-transfer torque due to bulk states [33– 35], but these are beyond the scope of the present paper.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We investigated the energy-efficient switching process in a single macrospin controlled by external currents when subject to the so-called *Dirac* SOT, that is predicted to arise in ferromagnet/topological insulator systems [24]. With this aim, we used the optimal control theory to study the energy limits of the Dirac SOTinduced magnetization switching in a PMA nanoelement at zero applied magnetic field, deriving the optimal timedependent current pulse. We established that the FL component of the Dirac SOT is the only responsible for switching and the energy cost is the lowest for vanishing DL torque. This represents a fundamental difference to the Slonczewski-like SOT [1, 18], arising typically in FM/HM systems, in which the DL torque may compensate for the relaxation and reduce the overall energy cost of the switching.

The obtained minimal switching cost is comparable to that obtained for Slonczewski-like SOT. Results for respective types of SOTs coincide in the undamped case and the difference between them increases with larger Gilbert damping. For damping constant values expected in the PMA nanoelement on a TI substrate, the energy cost difference is estimated to be less than $\approx 1\%$ under the assumption of the same model parameters and respective optimal ratio of torque coefficients for both SOT models. This shows that magnetic systems exhibiting Dirac SOT are a viable candidate for memory elements.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank T. Sigurjónsdóttir for helpful discussions and useful comments. This work was supported by the Icelandic Research Fund (Grant No. 217750 and No. 217813), the University of Iceland Research Fund (Grant No. 15673), the Faculty of Technology and the Department of Physics and Electrical Engineering at Linnaeus University (Sweden), the Swedish Research Council (Grants No. 2020-05110 and No. 2021-046229), the Russian Science Foundation (Grant no. 23-72-10028), and Carl Tryggers Stiftelsen (CTS20:71).

- A. Manchon, J. Železný, I. M. Miron, T. Jungwirth, J. Sinova, A. Thiaville, K. Garello, and P. Gambardella, Current-induced spin-orbit torques in ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic systems, Rev. Mod. Phys. **91**, 035004 (2019).
- [2] P. Gambardella and I. M. Miron, Current-induced spinorbit torques, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal

Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **369**, 3175 (2011).

^[3] I. M. Miron, K. Garello, G. Gaudin, P.-J. Zermatten, M. V. Costache, S. Auffret, S. Bandiera, B. Rodmacq, A. Schuhl, and P. Gambardella, Perpendicular switching of a single ferromagnetic layer induced by in-plane current injection, Nature 476, 189 (2011).

- [4] L. Liu, C.-F. Pai, Y. Li, H. W. Tseng, D. C. Ralph, and R. A. Buhrman, Spin-torque switching with the giant spin hall effect of tantalum, Science 336, 555 (2012).
- [5] S. V. Aradhya, G. E. Rowlands, J. Oh, D. C. Ralph, and R. A. Buhrman, Nanosecond-timescale low energy switching of in-plane magnetic tunnel junctions through dynamic oersted-field-assisted spin hall effect, Nano Letters 16, 5987 (2016).
- [6] K. Garello, C. O. Avci, I. M. Miron, M. Baumgartner, A. Ghosh, S. Auffret, O. Boulle, G. Gaudin, and P. Gambardella, Ultrafast magnetization switching by spin-orbit torques, Applied Physics Letters 105, 212402 (2014).
- [7] V. Edelstein, Spin polarization of conduction electrons induced by electric current in two-dimensional asymmetric electron systems, Solid State Communications 73, 233 (1990).
- [8] V. V. Bel'kov and S. D. Ganichev, Magneto-gyrotropic effects in semiconductor quantum wells, Semiconductor Science and Technology 23, 114003 (2008).
- [9] A. Manchon and S. Zhang, Theory of nonequilibrium intrinsic spin torque in a single nanomagnet, Phys. Rev. B 78, 212405 (2008).
- [10] M. Dyakonov and V. Perel, Current-induced spin orientation of electrons in semiconductors, Physics Letters A 35, 459 (1971).
- [11] J. E. Hirsch, Spin hall effect, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1834 (1999).
- [12] K. Ando, S. Takahashi, K. Harii, K. Sasage, J. Ieda, S. Maekawa, and E. Saitoh, Electric manipulation of spin relaxation using the spin hall effect, Phys. Rev. Lett. 101, 036601 (2008).
- [13] L. Liu, T. Moriyama, D. C. Ralph, and R. A. Buhrman, Spin-torque ferromagnetic resonance induced by the spin hall effect, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 036601 (2011).
- [14] J. Sinova, S. O. Valenzuela, J. Wunderlich, C. H. Back, and T. Jungwirth, Spin hall effects, Rev. Mod. Phys. 87, 1213 (2015).
- [15] K.-S. Lee, S.-W. Lee, B.-C. Min, and K.-J. Lee, Threshold current for switching of a perpendicular magnetic layer induced by spin Hall effect, Applied Physics Letters 102, 112410 (2013).
- [16] S. Fukami, T. Anekawa, C. Zhang, and H. Ohno, A spinorbit torque switching scheme with collinear magnetic easy axis and current configuration, Nature Nanotechnology 11, 621 (2016).
- [17] Y. Zhang, H. Y. Yuan, X. S. Wang, and X. R. Wang, Breaking the current density threshold in spin-orbittorque magnetic random access memory, Phys. Rev. B 97, 144416 (2018).
- [18] S. M. Vlasov, G. J. Kwiatkowski, I. S. Lobanov, V. M. Uzdin, and P. F. Bessarab, Optimal protocol for spinorbit torque switching of a perpendicular nanomagnet, Phys. Rev. B 105, 134404 (2022).
- [19] M. Z. Hasan and C. L. Kane, *Colloquium* : Topological insulators, Rev. Mod. Phys. 82, 3045 (2010).
- [20] X.-L. Qi and S.-C. Zhang, Topological insulators and su-

perconductors, Rev. Mod. Phys. 83, 1057 (2011).

- [21] Y. Ando, Topological insulator materials, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 82, 102001 (2013).
- [22] A. Bansil, H. Lin, and T. Das, Colloquium: Topological band theory, Rev. Mod. Phys. 88, 021004 (2016).
- [23] A. R. Mellnik, J. S. Lee, A. Richardella, J. L. Grab, P. J. Mintun, M. H. Fischer, A. Vaezi, A. Manchon, E.-A. Kim, N. Samarth, and D. C. Ralph, Spin-transfer torque generated by a topological insulator, Nature **511**, 449 (2014).
- [24] P. B. Ndiaye, C. A. Akosa, M. H. Fischer, A. Vaezi, E.-A. Kim, and A. Manchon, Dirac spin-orbit torques and charge pumping at the surface of topological insulators, Phys. Rev. B 96, 014408 (2017).
- [25] O. A. Tretiakov, Y. Liu, and A. Abanov, Minimization of ohmic losses for domain wall motion in a ferromagnetic nanowire, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 217203 (2010).
- [26] G. J. Kwiatkowski, M. H. A. Badarneh, D. V. Berkov, and P. F. Bessarab, Optimal control of magnetization reversal in a monodomain particle by means of applied magnetic field, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 177206 (2021).
- [27] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables, Vol. 55 (US Government printing office, 1948).
- [28] Y. Hou and R. Wu, Strongly enhanced gilbert damping in 3d transition-metal ferromagnet monolayers in contact with the topological insulator bi₂se₃, Phys. Rev. Appl. 11, 054032 (2019).
- [29] H. Li, H. Gao, L. P. Zârbo, K. Výborný, X. Wang, I. Garate, F. Doğan, A. Čejchan, J. Sinova, T. Jungwirth, and A. Manchon, Intraband and interband spinorbit torques in noncentrosymmetric ferromagnets, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 134402 (2015).
- [30] H. Aramberri and M. C. Muñoz, Strain effects in topological insulators: Topological order and the emergence of switchable topological interface states in sb₂te₃/bi₂te₃ heterojunctions, Physical Review B 95, 205422 (2017).
- [31] A. Díaz-Fernández, L. Chico, J. W. González, and F. Domínguez-Adame, Tuning the fermi velocity in dirac materials with an electric field, Scientific Reports 7, 10.1038/s41598-017-08188-3 (2017).
- [32] L. Fu, Hexagonal warping effects in the surface states of the topological insulator Bi₂Te₃, Physical Review Letters 103, 266801 (2009).
- [33] M. Farokhnezhad, J. H. Cullen, and D. Culcer, Spin-orbit torques due to topological insulator surface states: an in-plane magnetization as a probe of extrinsic spin-orbit scattering, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter 36, 315004 (2024).
- [34] S. Ghosh and A. Manchon, Spin-orbit torque in a three-dimensional topological insulator–ferromagnet heterostructure: Crossover between bulk and surface transport, Physical Review B 97, 134402 (2018).
- [35] J. H. Cullen, R. B. Atencia, and D. Culcer, Spin transfer torques due to the bulk states of topological insulators, Nanoscale 15, 8437 (2023).