Refining magnetic interactions from the magnetic field dependence of spin-wave excitations in magnetoelectric LiFePO$_4$
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We investigated the spin excitations of magnetoelectric LiFePO$_4$ by THz absorption spectroscopy in magnetic fields up to 33 T. By studying their selection rules, we found not only magnetic-dipole, but also electric-dipole active (electromagnons) and magnetoelectric resonances. The magnetic field dependence of four strong low-energy modes is reproduced well by our four-sublattice spin model for fields applied along the three orthorhombic axes. From the fit, we refined the exchange couplings, single-ion anisotropies, and the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction parameters. Additional spin excitations not described by the mean-field model are observed at higher frequencies. Some of them shows a strong shift with magnetic field, up to 4 cm$^{-1}$/T, when the field is applied along the easy axis. Based on this field dependence, we attribute these high frequency resonances to excitation of higher spin multipoles and of two magnons, which become THz-active due to the low symmetry of the magnetically ordered state.

1. INTRODUCTION

Recent optical studies of multiferroic materials have revealed non-reciprocal directional dicroism, which is the light absorption difference for unpolarized counterpropagating beams [1–25]. This unusual phenomenon is the finite-frequency manifestation of the magnetoelectric (ME) effect, which emerges at simultaneously electric- and magnetic-dipole allowed excitations, that we term as ME resonance. Since the relative orientation of the electric and magnetic fields is different for counterpropagating beams ME coupling generates an absorption difference between the two beams and may even lead to one-way transparency [7]. This non-reciprocal absorption may gain applications in photonics and spintronics [3, 13]. For example, materials with ME resonances can be used as optical diodes where the direction of transparency for the THz radiation can be switched by magnetic fields [3–5, 7–9, 17], electric fields [20, 24, 28], or both [13]. From the fundamental science point of view, the spectroscopy of the ME excitations promotes the understanding of the static ME response which is linked to the non-reciprocal directional dichroism spectrum via the Kramers-Kronig relations [16, 29]. Moreover, a THz absorption study, combined with magnetization, inelastic neutron scattering measurements [30–32], and theoretical modeling [33–36] can resolve realistic spin Hamiltonians of ME compounds.

The relativistic spin-orbit coupling plays an essential role for ME spin excitations. It establishes a coupling between spins and electric dipoles and also introduces single-ion anisotropy for $S > 1/2$. The single-ion anisotropy expands the frequency scale of spin excitations as it separates the $\pm m_s$ doublets from each other in zero field, where $m_s$ is the spin quantum number. In addition to conventional spin waves, spin-quadrupolar excitations corresponding to $\Delta m_s = \pm 2$ may appear in systems with strong single-ion anisotropy and spin $S > 1/2$ [37–41], broadening the frequency range for possible applications of ME materials. In general, if there are $N$ spins in the magnetic unit cell we expect $2NS$ spin excitations, which can be described by the multi-boson spin-wave...
theory [13, 37, 38, 42] or by single-ion spin Hamiltonian with added molecular field to take into account spin-spin interactions [32, 43, 44].

The LiMPO$_4$ (M = Mn, Co, Fe, Ni) orthophosphate compounds become ME as their magnetic order breaks the inversion symmetry [45]. This, together with their large single-ion anisotropy [31, 32, 46], makes them appealing candidates to explore unconventional spin excitations. Among these compounds, LiFePO$_4$ has the highest Néel temperature, $T_N = 50$ K below which an antiferromagnetic (AFM) order develops, as depicted in Fig. 1. The spins of the four magnetic ions of the unit cell are nearly parallel to the $y$ axis [47]. Detailed neutron diffraction experiments showed that the spins are slightly rotated in the $xy$ plane and canted toward the $z$ axis [31]. LiFePO$_4$ has one of the largest spins in the orthophosphate family but the number of spin-wave modes detected in the magnetically ordered phase has been substantially less than $2NS = 16$, allowed for a $S = 2$ spin system. In zero-field inelastic neutron scattering (INS) studies two spin-wave branches [30–32] and a dispersionless mode were observed below 10 meV [32]. Whereas, a recent high-frequency electron spin resonance study detected two modes in the vicinity of the spin-flop field, 32 T [46]. Therefore, further experimental data is needed to understand better the spin dynamics and spin Hamiltonian of LiFePO$_4$.

In this work, we studied the magnetic field dependence of the spin excitations using THz absorption spectroscopy in the low temperature AFM phase of LiFePO$_4$. The spectral range of our experiments extending up to 175 cm$^{-1}$ (22 meV) covers two and five times larger energy window compared to former INS [30–32] and electron spin resonance studies [46, 48], respectively. The broader spectral range allowed us to observe 17 spin excitations and to determine their selection rules. The absorption spectra were measured with magnetic field applied along all three principal crystallographic axes up to 33 T in the Faraday configuration (light propagates along the field, $\mathbf{k} \parallel \mathbf{H}$) and up to 17 T in Voigt geometry (light propagates perpendicular to the field, $\mathbf{k} \perp \mathbf{H}$). Beside THz spectroscopy, we measured high-field magnetization up to 120 T along the easy-axis from which we determined the spin-flop and the saturation fields. Finally, we successfully employed a mean-field model to describe the field dependence of the magnetization and the resonance frequencies of the four strongest low-frequency spin-wave modes in the AFM state. By fitting the magnetic field dependence of four magnons we have refined the values of the exchange couplings, the single-ion anisotropies, and the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction.

2. EXPERIMENTAL

The LiFePO$_4$ single crystals were grown by the floating zone method [49]. The quality of the crystals was verified by powder diffraction and Laue XRD, which confirmed the orthorhombic structure with the same lattice constants as reported in Ref. [50].

The low field magnetization measurements were done using a 14 T PPMS with VSM option (Quantum Design). High-field magnetization measurements were carried out up to 120 T using ultra-high semidestructive pulses at the Laboratoire National des Champs Magnétiques Intenses in Toulouse [51, 52]. The maximum field of a semidestructive pulse was reached in $\sim 2.5 \mu s$.

For THz spectroscopy studies the single crystal was cut into three 1 mm thick slabs each with a large face normal to one of the three principal crystallographic directions. The slabs were wedged by two degrees to suppress the fringes in the spectra produced by the internal reflections in the crystal.

The THz measurements up to 17 T were performed with a polarizing Martin-Puplett interferometer and a 0.3 K silicon bolometer in Tallinn. High field spectra from 17 T up to 33 T were measured using a Bruker IFS 113v spectrometer and a 1.6 K silicon bolometer in High Field Magnet Laboratory in Nijmegen. The experiments above 17 T were done in Faraday configuration, while below 17 T both Faraday and Voigt configuration experiments were performed. All spectra were measured with an apodized spectral resolution of 0.3 or 0.5 cm$^{-1}$. The polarizer angle with respect to the crystal axes was determined by evaluating the intensity change of the strongest modes in the THz absorption spectra as the function of rotation angle of the polarizer. This information was also used to mount the polarizer in the high field experiments in Nijmegen where the in situ polarizer rotation was not possible. Absorption was determined by using a reference spectrum of an open hole, sample spectrum in the paramagnetic phase or by statistically calculating the baseline from the magnetic field dependence of sample spectra. In the first method, the absorption was calculated as

$$\alpha = -d^{-1} \ln(I/I_r),$$

where $I_r$ is the intensity through the reference hole with the area equal to the sample hole area and $d$ is the sample thickness. In the second method, the absorption difference was calculated,

$$\Delta \alpha(H, T) = \alpha(H, T) - \alpha(0 \, \text{T}, 55 \, \text{K}) = -d^{-1} \ln \left[ I(H, T)/I(0 \, \text{T}, 55 \, \text{K}) \right],$$

where $I(0 \, \text{T}, 55 \, \text{K})$ is the intensity through the sample measured at 0 T and 55 K in the paramagnetic phase. In the third method, the statistically calculated baseline, $\alpha(0 \, \text{T})$, was found as a minimum of differential absorption,

$$\Delta \alpha_H(H_i) = \alpha(H_i) - \alpha(0 \, \text{T}) = -d^{-1} \ln \left[ I(H_i)/I(0 \, \text{T}) \right],$$

at each frequency over several magnetic field values $H_i$. By adding $\alpha(0 \, \text{T})$ to the differential absorption we get
FIG. 1. The ground state spin configuration of LiFePO$_4$ in zero magnetic field. There are four Fe$^{2+}$ spins, $S = 2$, in the magnetic unit cell drawn as a box. $S_1$ is in the corner, $S_2$ is on the face and $S_3$ and $S_4$ are inside the unit cell. The spins are rotated towards the $x$ axis and canted towards the $z$ axis away from the $y$ axis [31]. The numbering of spins and the labeling of exchange interactions corresponds to the spin Hamiltonian described by Eq. (4).

the dependence of absorption spectra on magnetic field. This method was used to obtain the spectra measured above 17 T.

3. MEAN-FIELD MODEL

The mean-field theory of localized magnetic moments is a widely applied tool to interpret the static and dynamic magnetic properties of systems with periodic magnetic structures [53], e.g. ferro- [54], ferri- [34] and antiferromagnetic- [33] insulators. Particularly, the microscopic spin Hamiltonian of LiFePO$_4$ has been discussed by several papers [30-32, 46, 55, 56].

Here we aim to describe the static magnetism and the infrared-active optical magnetic resonances of LiFePO$_4$. Thus, we use a simplified Hamiltonian where the exchange coupling terms $J_y$ and $J_z$ have been omitted as they connect spins at crystallographically equivalent sites, see Fig. 1. While the one-magnon THz spectrum is insensitive to the same energy shift of all states at the $\Gamma$ point of the Brillouin zone produced by $J_y$ and $J_z$, these couplings are relevant when describing the dispersion of the magnon modes [31]. The Hamiltonian of our study is

\[
H = 4[J_{xz}(S_1 \cdot S_2 + S_3 \cdot S_4) + J_{xy}(S_1 \cdot S_3 + S_2 \cdot S_4) + J_{yz}(S_1 \cdot S_4 + S_2 \cdot S_3) + D_{14}(S_1^yS_2^y - S_3^yS_4^y + S_3^yS_2^z - S_4^yS_3^z)] + \sum_{i=1}^{4} \left[\Lambda_x(S_i^x)^2 + \Lambda_z(S_i^z)^2 + \Lambda_{xy}(S_i^xS_i^y) - \mu_B\mu_0(g_xH_xS_i^x + g_yH_yS_i^y + g_zH_zS_i^z)\right],
\]

where the terms, exchange interactions, Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya term, single-ion anisotropy terms, and the Zeeman energy, have been considered in the earlier works of LiFePO$_4$ summarized in Table I. The model is based on four Fe$^{2+}$ spins, here represented by classical vectors of $S = 2$ length, that occupy crystallographically non-equivalent positions of the unit cell. As shown in Fig.1, the spins are coupled by three different exchange couplings with parameters $J_{xz}$, $J_{xy}$ and $J_{yz}$. There are two single-site hard-axis anisotropies, $\Lambda_x$ and $\Lambda_z$, that effectively produce the easy axis along $y$. The spins are slightly rotated away from the $y$ axis towards the $x$ axis as observed by neutron scattering [31]. Extending previous studies to reproduce this small deviation of the magnetic structure from the collinear antiferromagnetic...
order we introduced an additional single-site anisotropy term $\Lambda_{yz} S^x S^y$. The Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction is $D = \{D_{14}, 0, 0\}$. Since the spins are predominantly along the $y$ direction, $D_{14}$ cant spins towards the $z$ direction. The last term in Eq. (4) is the interaction of the electron spin with the applied magnetic field taking into account the $g$-factor anisotropy.

We model the spin dynamics using the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equation, Ref. [57], as used in Ref. [58], by assuming that the spins are oscillating about their equilibrium orientations without changing their lengths. The equilibrium orientation of the spins is found by minimizing the energy described in the Hamiltonian of Eq. (4), with respect to the spin orientations. The magnetic-dipole absorption of light by spin-waves is calculated assuming that the magnetic field $H^\omega$ of radiation couples to the total magnetic moment of the spins [58]. Dielectric permittivity in the absorption coefficient formula, Eq. (10) in Ref. [58], was assumed to be real and frequency-independent with components $\epsilon_x = 8.1$, $\epsilon_y = 7.3$ and $\epsilon_z = 7.6$ [59].

4. RESULTS

4.1. Magnetization

We characterized LiFePO$_4$ samples by measuring the magnetization at 2.4 K along the principal axes up to 14 T. Along $H \parallel y$, the measurement is extended up to 120 T at 5 K using pulsed fields, see Fig. 2. The $y$-axis magnetization determined from the pulsed-field measurements was normalized to the value of static field measurements in the range from 4 to 14 T, neglecting a small hysteresis of magnetization between 0 and 4 T. In the AFM state the spins are predominantly aligned along the easy axis, the $y$ axis in LiFePO$_4$. The magnetization grows approximately linearly in increasing field for $H \parallel x$ and $H \parallel z$. When $H \parallel y$ is applied, the spins maintain easy-axis alignment up to the spin-flop field marked by a jump in the magnetization at 32±3 T. As the field further increases the magnetization grows linearly and reaches saturation at 56±3 T. In the field-polarized state, the saturation magnetization is estimated to 4.4 $\mu_B$ per iron. The spin-flop field deduced from our measurements is in agreement with former high-field magnetization measurements [46].
TABLE I. The parameters of the mean-field model used to describe the static magnetic properties and spin-waves in LiFePO$_4$: exchange couplings $J_{ii}$ and $J_{ij}$, single-ion anisotropies $A_{ii}$ and $A_{ij}$, Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya coupling $D_{14}$, and anisotropic $g$-factor $g_{i}$. All parameters are in units of meV except the dimensionless $g_{i}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$J_{xx}$</th>
<th>$J_{xy}$</th>
<th>$J_{yy}$</th>
<th>$A_{x}$</th>
<th>$A_{y}$</th>
<th>$A_{xy}$</th>
<th>$D_{14}$</th>
<th>$g$</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>$g_x = 2.04$</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$g_y = 2.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$g_z = 2.1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.038b</td>
<td>$g_x = 2.24$</td>
<td>[46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$g_y = 2.31$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$g_z = 1.99$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $a$ This work
- $b$ The Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya parameter $D_{14} = J_{DM}/4$ where $J_{DM}$ is from Ref. [46].

4.2. THz absorption spectra in zero field

The zero-field THz absorption spectra of LiFePO$_4$ are presented in Fig. 3 and the mode parameters are collected in Table II, while Fig. 3(b) features absorption spectra in the AFM phase, relative to the paramagnetic phase.

The spectra in the paramagnetic phase show a broad but weak magnetic-dipole active peak $F_{os}$ at around $\sim 55$ cm$^{-1}$, Fig. 3(a). The magnetic on-site excitation $F_{os}$ is $H_x^z$ active as it is seen in two polarization configurations, $\{E_y^z, H_z^x\}$ and $\{E_z^y, H_z^x\}$. The frequency and the selection rules of $F_{os}$ are reproduced by exact diagonalization of a four-spin cluster, see Fig. S6 in the Supplementary Material. Other features in the paramagnetic phase spectra are $E_x^z$-active phonon at 140 cm$^{-1}$, with a strong absorption exceeding the detection limit, and absorption rising towards higher frequencies due to the phonons with resonance frequencies above 175 cm$^{-1}$.

To better resolve spectral features emerging in the magnetically ordered phase we plot the difference spectra, $\alpha(3.5 \text{ K}) - \alpha(55 \text{ K})$, Fig. 3(b). We observe a diminished absorption at the tails of phonons at low $T$ appearing as negative features in the difference spectra between 140 and 175 cm$^{-1}$. The change of the 140 cm$^{-1}$ phonon mode is obscured by the strong absorption and therefore the $E_y^z$-spectra, green and red solid lines, are discontinued where the 140 cm$^{-1}$ phonon peaks. The broad peak $F_{os}$ from the high-$T$ paramagnetic phase appears as a negative feature in the difference spectra in $H_z^x$ polarization.

All sharp modes, labeled $F_1, \ldots, F_{17}$, are absent above $T_N$ and we assign them to spin excitations. The seven excitations, $F_3, F_4, F_5, F_6, F_8, F_9$ and $F_{11}$, are identified as magnetic-dipole active modes. Six modes, $F_{10}, F_{12}, F_{13}, F_{15}, F_{16}$ and $F_{17}$, are identified as electric-dipole active resonances. The mode $F_{13}$ has a shoulder, thus, it was fitted with two Gaussian lines with maxima at 124.4 cm$^{-1}$ and 127.6 cm$^{-1}$. Two modes, $F_7$ at 71.4 cm$^{-1}$ and $F_{14}$ at 137.1 cm$^{-1}$, are both electric- and magnetic-dipole allowed, therefore, we identified them as ME resonances. $F_7$ is the strongest in $\{E_y^z, H_z^x\}$ polarization, red dashed line in Fig. 3(b), and its intensity is halved if only one of the components, $E_y^z$ or $H_z^x$, is present. Thus, $F_7$ is an example of a ME resonance which couples equally to the magnetic and electric components of radiation. We detected $F_{14}$ in the same three polarization configuration, thus, we also assigned it to a ME resonance with the same selection rule as mode $F_7$, $\{E_y^z, H_z^x\}$.

The three strongest magnetic-dipole active modes $F_4$, $F_6$, and $F_{11}$ show only weak absorption in polarizations orthogonal to their main magnetic dipole component. The weak absorption in other polarizations could be explained by the imperfections of the polarizer. However, we can not completely rule out that some of these modes are ME resonances with a weak electric-dipole component which can be tested by further measurements of the non-reciprocal directional dichroism on magneto-electrically poled samples [13, 16]. We can not identify the selection rules for modes $F_1$ and $F_2$ as they are too weak.

4.3. Magnetic field dependence of spin-waves

The magnetic field dependence of mode frequencies and intensities between 0 and 17 T is shown in Fig. 4 for Faraday, panels (a)-(c), and Voigt configuration, (d) and (e). The modes mostly stay at constant frequency when the magnetic field is applied along the hard axes, $H \parallel x$, Fig. 4(a) and $H \parallel z$, Fig. 4(c, e). However, most of the resonances shift with the magnetic field for $H \parallel y$. We assigned a slope, $b_1 = \Delta E/\Delta B$, calculated between 15 and 17 T in units cm$^{-1}$T$^{-1}$, to each of the modes and collected them in Table II. If the mode was not visible in this range, a lower magnetic field range was used. One mode, $F_{17}$, has zero slope and $F_9$, $F_{13}$, and $F_{16}$ have a moderate value, $|b_1| < 0.3$. Modes $F_{14}$ and $F_{15}$ have the largest $|b_1|$ for $H \parallel y$ but also a substantial $|b_1|$ for $H \parallel z$.

Assuming $g \approx 2$ we estimated from the slopes the change of the spin projection quantum number, $\Delta m_s$, upon the excitations. The results are listed in Table II. The spin-waves below 80 cm$^{-1}$ (zero-field frequency) have $|\Delta m_s| = 1$ while above 100 cm$^{-1}$ $|\Delta m_s|$ is 2, 3 or 4. $|\Delta m_s|$ was not assigned to $F_1$ and $F_2$ where $b_1 \approx 1.5$ cm$^{-1}$T$^{-1}$ below 8 T, which is between $\Delta m_s = 1$ and 2. We note that $b_1$ of $F_1$ changes with field. It is 0.9 cm$^{-1}$T$^{-1}$ above 8 T. This change of slope could be due to the anti-crossing with $F_1$ but we do not have evidence for that because the mode was too weak to be detected in the high-field magnet set-up above 17 T.

The absorption spectra in high magnetic field $H \parallel y$ up to 31.6 T are presented in Fig. 5. The spin-wave excitations, $F_6$ and $F_7$, start softening before reaching
the spin-flop transition at 32 T, in accordance with the mean-field calculation. Also, $F_{13}$ at about 125 cm$^{-1}$ shows softening close to 30 T. Spectra in other two field directions, $H \parallel x$ and $H \parallel z$, above 17 T are shown in Supplementary Material, Figs. S1 and S3.

### 4.4. Mean-field model results

The mean-field model parameters of Table I were obtained by fitting the magnetic field dependence of frequencies of the spin-wave modes $F_4$, $F_5$, $F_6$, and $F_7$. The magnetic field dependence of these modes below 17 T is reproduced remarkably well by the model for all three magnetic field directions, Fig. 5 and Fig. 4. The isotropic $g$-factor was not sufficient to quantitatively describe the magnetic field dependence of mode frequencies. The anisotropic $g$-factor values improved not only the magnetic field dependence of spin-wave frequencies, but also reproduce the value of the spin-flop field and the saturation field, Fig. 2. In addition, the calculated magnetization as a function of $H_z$ and $H_y$ follows the measured $M(H)$ below 15 T, inset to Fig. 2.

The equilibrium spin configuration deviates in two ways from the perfect collinear arrangement of spins along the $y$ axis. With the parameters from Table I we get the canting away from the $y$ axis towards the $z$ axis by 0.86 degrees, driven by the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction $D_{14}$. The rotation of spins, driven by $\Lambda_{xy}$, away from the $y$ axis towards the $x$ axis is 0.95 degrees. Using the spin length $S = 2$, the out-of-easy-axis magnetic moments per spin are $|m_z| = 0.063 \mu_B$ and $|m_x| = 0.067 \mu_B$ reproducing the experimentally determined deviations, $m_z = 0.063(5) \mu_B$ and $m_x = 0.067(5) \mu_B$ [31].

The saturation value of the magnetization for $H \parallel y$ calculated from the mean-field model is 4.5% higher than the experimentally observed, Fig. 2 (a). Reason for the failure to reproduce the saturation magnetization and the spin-flop field with the same set of magnetic-field independent parameters could be magnetostriction [56]. Magnetostriction, as was proposed in Ref. [46], could also be the reason why the mean-field model does not reproduce the frequency of $F_4$ close to the spin-flop field, 32 T in Fig. 5.

### 5. DISCUSSION

#### 5.1. Spin-wave excitations from the mean-field model

We found that the the mean-field model quantitatively describes the magnetic field dependence of the frequencies of spin-waves $F_4$, $F_5$, $F_6$, and $F_7$, Fig. 4. The modes $F_4$, $F_5$, $F_6$, and $F_7$ have a linear field dependence with the slope close to $\pm 1 cm^{-1}T^{-1}$ when the field is along the easy axis $y$. This slope corresponds to a spin-wave excitation with $\Delta m_s = \pm 1$, assuming $g \approx 2$. Other studies also found a $g$-factor close to 2 [46]. Other candidates for the $\Delta m_s = \pm 1$ spin-wave excitations are $F_3$ and $F_8$. However, both of these modes have two branches degenerate in zero field. The magnetization measurements, inset of Fig. 2(a), indicate bi-axial magnetic anisotropy in LiFePO$_4$ which lifts the degeneracy of magnetic resonances in zero field. Therefore, $F_3$ and $F_8$ cannot be consistently included into the mean-field description.

The spin-waves of the mean-field model have oscillating spin components, $\delta S_i = S_i - \bar{S}_i$, perpendicular to the equilibrium direction of the $i$-th spin, $\bar{S}_i$. The spin-wave couples to the magnetic field of radiation if the oscillating spin component of the whole magnetic unit cell is finite, $H \delta \omega \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^{4} \delta S_i \right)$. The equilibrium direction of the spins is aligned to the easy axis $y$ within few degrees in LiFePO$_4$. The selection rules, Table II, show that $F_4$ and $F_5$ are excited by the $H_y^z$ component of radiation and modes $F_6$ and $F_7$ by the $H_x^z$ component, which both are perpendicular to $\bar{S}_i$. The magnetic field dependence of intensities of the strongest modes $F_4$ and $F_6$ is well described by the mean-field model. Firstly, $F_4$ is $H_x^z$-active and $F_6$ is $H_y^z$-active in zero field, Table II. Secondly, as $H_y$ increases, $F_4$ becomes $H_y^z$-active and $F_6$ becomes $H_x^z$-active, Fig. S4 in the Supplementary Material. Thus, for modes $F_4$ and $F_6$ the agreement between theory and experiment is good.

The experimental and theoretical selection rules of magnetic dipole transition for $F_5$ agree, it is $H_z^z$-active. For the spin-wave $F_7$ the theory predicts $H_y^z$-activity, although it is $H_x^z$-active in the experiment, see Fig. S4 in the Supplementary Material. Overall, theory underestimates $F_5$ and $F_7$ magnetic dipole transition intensity by two orders of magnitude. It is not surprising as the modes $F_5$ and $F_7$ are relatively weak as compared to $F_4$ and $F_6$ and therefore they are sensitive to the composition of the spin-wave state. If the mean-field model, as an approximation, does not give the true spin-wave state, the weak intensities could be seriously affected. As observed experimentally, Fig. 3, $F_5$ is electric-dipole active in addition. The coupling of spins to the electric field was not included in the mean-field model.

Similar to the quantum-mechanical formulas of the magnon dispersion relation of former studies [30, 31, 60], the classical expressions for the zero-field resonance frequencies of the magnon modes can be derived. For the two strongest spin-waves $F_4$ and $F_6$

$$\nu_{4/6} \approx 2S \sqrt{\Lambda_{x/z} \left(4(J_{yz} + J_{xy}) + \Lambda_{z/x}\right)},$$

(5)
TABLE II. The excitation configurations and field dependence of LiFePO$_4$ modes in the AFM phase. The selection rules were found by measuring polarization dependence of spin excitations in three principal directions without magnetic field. The absorption line energy and area in zero field were obtained from the fit to Gaussian lineshape, except $F_1$, where the sum of two Gaussians was used. The slopes of the modes were estimated from the linear field dependence between 15 and 17 T; if mode was not visible in this field range, the lower field range was used. From the slopes the $|\Delta m_s|$ values are proposed assuming $g \approx 2$. Modes $F_1$ to $F_7$ were observed by INS spectroscopy [31, 32] and are fitted to the mean-field model in this work.

| Mode | Energy at 0 T (cm$^{-1}$) | Area at 0 T (cm$^{-2}$) | Selection rules at 0 T | Magnetic field direction | Slope $b_1$ (cm$^{-1}$T$^{-1}$) | $|\Delta m_s|$ |
|------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| $F_1$ | 18.3                    | 4                      | $z$                    | $+$1.4                 |                                |                  |
| $F_2$ | 24.7                    | 2                      | $z$                    | $+$1.5                 |                                |                  |
| $F_3$ | 30.8                    | 2                      | $H^z$                  | $y$                    | $-0.9, +0.9$                    | 1                |
| $F_4$ | 46.2 (5.7 meV)          | $>$100                 | $H^z$                  | $y$                    | $-1.1$                         | 1                |
| $F_5$ | 58.0 (7.2 meV)          | 6                      | $H^y$                  | $y$                    | $-1.1$                         | 1                |
| $F_6$ | 67.9 (8.4 meV)          | $>$200                 | $H^y$                  | $y$                    | $+0.9$                         | 1                |
| $F_7$ | 71.4 (8.9 meV)          | 37                     | $H^x, H^y$             | $y$                    | $+1.0$                         | 1                |
| $F_8$ | 76.2                    | 9                      | $H^x$                  | $y$                    | $-0.8, +1.0$                    | 1                |
| $F_9$ | 90.8                    | 2                      | $H^x$                  | $x$                    | $+0.1$                         |                  |
| $F_{10}$ | 102.2                  | 57                     | $E^x$                  | $y$                    | $-3.3$                         | 3                |
| $F_{11}$ | 109.0                  | 74                     | $H^y$                  | $y$                    | $+1.8$                         | 2                |
| $F_{12}$ | 120.8                  | 50                     | $E^y$                  | $y$                    | $-1.9$                         | 2                |
| $F_{13}$ | 124.4, 127.6           | 185                    | $E^x$                  | $y$                    | $-0.3$                         |                  |
| $F_{14}$ | 137.1                  | 17                     | $H^x, E^y$             | $y$                    | $-3.0, +2.8$                    | 3                |
| $F_{15}$ | 146.3                  | 30                     | $E^x$                  | $y$                    | $-3.7, +3.8$                    | 4                |
| $F_{16}$ | 163.7                  | 2                      | $E^x$                  | $x$                    | $-0.3$                         |                  |
| $F_{17}$ | 164.8                  | 4                      | $E^x$                  | $y$                    | $0.0$                          |                  |

while the zero-field frequencies of the weaker $F_5$ and $F_7$
are

$$
\nu_{5/7} \approx 2S \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda_{x/z}}{1 - \sqrt{J_{xy}/\Lambda_{x/z}}} - J_{xx}} \left(4J_{yz} + \Lambda_{z/x}\right),
$$

(6)

where we neglected the weak Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction and the single-ion anisotropy $\Lambda_{xy}$ terms. While these two terms are necessary to give finite magnetic dipole activity to the weak $F_5$ and $F_7$ resonances by breaking the equivalence of $S_1$ and $S_2$ ($S_3$ and $S_4$, respectively) sublattices, they do not change the resonance frequencies significantly.

As follows from Eq. (5) and Eq. (6), if $J_{xy} = J_{xz} = 0$, $F_4$ and $F_5$ are degenerate in zero field, $\nu_4 = \nu_5$, and also $\nu_6 = \nu_7$. In this case the nearest-neighbor (100) planes of the $\{S_1,S_4\}$ and $\{S_2,S_3\}$ sub-lattices, separated by $a/2$, are decoupled from each other, thus, their in-phase and out-of-phase excitations with respect to each other are degenerate. Consequently, $F_4$ and $F_6$ can be considered as the in-phase while $F_5$ and $F_7$ as the out-of-phase resonances of the nearest-neighbor (100) planes. Without Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction and $\Lambda_{zz}$ anisotropy the total oscillating magnetic dipole moment of the unit cell produced by $F_5$ and $F_7$ is zero. This explains the weak intensity of $F_5$ and $F_7$ compared to $F_4$ and F$_6$ in the THz absorption spectrum. Furthermore, the correspondence between the INS magnon dispersion interpreted in the two-spin unit cell scheme [30–32] and our $\Gamma$-point optical experiments can also be formulated based on the mean-field results. Namely, $F_4$ and $F_6$ correspond to the spin-waves observed in the zone center, $Q = (0, 2, 0)$ [31] or $Q = (0, 0, 2)$ [32] while $F_5$ and $F_7$ are zone-boundary excitations of the two-spin unit cell, seen at $Q = (0, 0, 1)$ [32], $Q = (1, 1, 0)$ [30, 31] and $Q = (0, 1, 1)$ [31] in the INS experiments [30–32].
FIG. 4. Magnetic field dependence of the spin-wave resonance frequencies and absorption line areas at $T = 3.5$ K in LiFePO$_4$. Panels (a), (b), and (c) correspond to measurements in the Faraday ($k \parallel H$), while panels (d) and (e) correspond to experiments in the Voigt ($k \perp H$) configuration. The direction of the magnetic field is (a) – $H \parallel x$, (b), (d) – $H \parallel y$, and (c), (e) – $H \parallel z$. The symbols correspond to six combinations of linear light polarization {$E_\omega^{x}, H_\omega^{x}$} as indicated at bottom left of the figure. The symbol height is proportional to the square root of experimental absorption line area with the same scaling as wavenumber axis. To simplify the figure the larger symbols are not shown for every measured field. The error bars (vertical green lines) from fitting the line positions in most cases are too small to be seen in the figure. The black lines are the results of the mean-field model calculations, modes $F_4$, $F_5$, $F_6$, and $F_7$. Comparison of experimental and calculated intensities is in the Supplementary Material.

5.2. Spin excitations beyond the mean-field model

Out of 17 lines appearing below $T_N$ in the THz absorption spectrum only four can be described by the classical four-spin mean-field model. The rest can be (i) spin-stretching excitations captured only by multi-boson spin-wave theory or alternatively by crystal-field schemes including exchange fields, (ii) two-magnon excitations (two spin waves with nearly opposite $k$ vectors), or can even be (iii) excitations from impurity spins. Assuming
that the spins are aligned along the $y$-axis the magnetic symmetry reduces to $Pnma^*$ [30]. Since all spatial
symmetries of the paramagnetic state remain in the
AFM phase, at least in combination with time-reversal
operation, we do not expect new optical phonon modes
to emerge below $T_N$.

We assign absorption lines $F_1$, $F_2$ and $F_3$ to impurities
because these very weak modes are located below the
lowest magnon mode $F_4$. In addition, the frequencies of
$F_1$ and $F_2$ increase linearly in magnetic field $H \parallel z$,
not coinciding with easy-axis direction $y$. Previous works
have found that Fe$^{2+}$ at Li site has zero field splitting
7.3 cm$^{-1}$ (220 GHz) [48]. The lowest impurity absorption
line in our spectrum is 18 cm$^{-1}$ in zero field. This
suggests that we are observing different impurities than
reported in Ref. [48].

The mean-field model does not describe spin excitations $F_4$–$F_7$. Several of them are electric-dipole active
and have a steep magnetic field dependence of frequency,
suggesting $|\Delta m_s| > 1$ change of a spin projection
quantum number. This is unusual for a spin-wave
excitation but can be explained by a large single-ion
anisotropy ($A$) which is comparable or stronger than the
exchange coupling ($J$) [37], see Table I. In that case
a suitable approach is a multi-boson spin-wave theory,
which describes more than four spin-wave excitations in
a four-sublattice magnet. Out from the ortho-phosphate
compounds, the multi-boson spin-wave theory has been
only applied to LiCoPO$_4$, a $S = 3/2$ spin system [13].
Developing a multi-boson spin-wave theory for LiFePO$_4$
is a tedious calculation, therefore, it is out of the scope
of this paper.

Some of the observed features can be explained qualita-
tively in the limit of zero exchange and Dzyaloshinskii-
Moriya coupling. Assuming rotational symmetry about
the $y$ axis in Eq. (4), $\Delta_y = \Lambda_y$, the spins are parallel
to the quantization axis $y$, and the energy levels $E_{m_s}$
of spin $S = 2$ are $E_0$, $E_{\pm1}$ and $E_{\pm2}$. When the $H \parallel y$
field is applied, the energy difference $E_{+2} - E_{-2}$ increases
approximately at a rate 4 cm$^{-1}$T$^{-1}$, as observed for the
spin-wave excitation $F_{15}$. The electric dipole activity
comes from the on-site spin-induced polarization which
in the lowest order of spin operators is $P \propto S_\alpha S_\beta$ ($\alpha, \beta = x, y, z$) [13]. Although $P \propto S_y^2$ and $S_z^2$ (quantization axis
is $y$) couple states different by $\Delta m_s = \pm 2$ it does not
explain the $|\Delta m_s| \geq 3$ transitions, $F_9$, $F_{14}$ and $F_{15}$.
However, in LiFePO$_4$ the single ion anisotropies are not
equal, $\Lambda_z \neq \Lambda_y$ and mix $E_0$ into $E_{\pm2}$ states, see Table I
in Ref. [32]. Therefore, the selection rule for the electric-
dipole transition, $\Delta m_s = 2$, and mixing of states gives

FIG. 5. THz absorption spectra of spin-wave excitations in magnetic field $H \parallel k \parallel y$ at $T = 3.5$ K in two orthogonal
polarizations, (a) $\{H_x^\prime, E_z^\prime\}$ and (b) $\{H_y^\prime, E_y^\prime\}$. The broad stripes are the results of the mean-field calculation, $F_4$, $F_5$, $F_6$
and $F_7$, in order of increasing frequency; the width of the line is proportional to the square root of the line area with the
same scale as wavenumber axis and calculated in the magnetic dipole approximation. The zero field 55 K spectrum was used
as a reference below 17 T and the low temperature zero-field spectrum above 17 T. Filled circles are the spin-wave excitation
energies reproduced from Ref. 46.
finite electric-dipole moment to the $\Delta m_s = 4$ transition. In a similar manner, $P \propto \hat{S}_x \hat{S}_y$ and $\hat{S}_y \hat{S}_z$ could give rise to $\Delta m_s = \pm 1$ transitions and if the mixing of states is taken into account, then to the electric-dipole allowed $\Delta m_s = \pm 3$ transitions.

Two spin-waves, $\omega_1(\mathbf{q}_1)$ and $\omega_2(\mathbf{q}_2)$, can be excited by THz radiation of frequency $\omega = \omega_1 + \omega_2$ if $\mathbf{q}_1 = -\mathbf{q}_2$, which is termed as two-magnon excitation. The exact frequency dependence of this absorption depends on the coupling mechanism between the radiation and the spin-wave and on the density of spin-wave states [61–66]. This leads to broad absorption bands with peaks at the highest density of spin-wave states [58, 61–64, 67, 68], mostly with spin-waves from the edge of the Brillouin zone. Since the product of the two spin operators has the same time-reversal parity as the electric dipole moment, the simultaneous excitation of two spin-waves by the electric field is allowed and this mechanism usually dominates over the magnetic-dipole active absorption [69]. A relatively broad electric-dipole active absorption line is $F_{13}$. If $\omega_1(\mathbf{q}_1) = \omega_2(\mathbf{q}_2)$, the spin-wave frequency should be $\omega \approx 60 \text{ cm}^{-1} = 7.4 \text{ meV}$. At about the same energy two dispersion curves cross in the $[0,1.5,0]$ Brillouin zone point of the two-spin unit cell [31, 32]. The $[0,0.5,0]$ point, equivalent to $[0,1.5,0]$, is the Brillouin zone boundary of the four-spin unit cell and therefore we expect anti-crossing of two dispersion curves which leads to increase in the density of magnon states at this point. Thus, considering the linewidths, energy scale, and the electric-dipole activity, $F_{13}$ could be a two-magnon excitation. Another candidate for a two-magnon excitation is the electric dipole active $F_{12}$. Although it is relatively broad in zero field, it has a complicated field dependence in $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{y}$, see Fig. S5 in the Supplementary Material, what can not be explained within a simple model of two-magnon excitation.

6. SUMMARY

We studied the magnetic ground state and the spin excitations of the magnetoelectric antiferromagnet LiFePO$_4$ by magnetization measurements in magnetic fields up to 120 T and by THz absorption spectroscopy up to 33 T. Magnetization measurements revealed a spin-flop transition at 32 T before reaching the saturation at 50 T. We found 17 absorption lines below $175 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ (5.25 THz) appearing in the magnetically ordered phase. Based on the magnetic field dependence of the resonance frequencies and the intensities, we assigned four of them to magnon modes ($F_1$-$F_7$), eight to multiboson spin-wave excitations ($F_8$-$F_{11}$, $F_{14}$-$F_{17}$), two to two-magnon excitations ($F_{12}$, $F_{13}$) and the rest to the absorption by impurity spins ($F_1$-$F_3$). We applied a mean-field model, which describes well the four magnon modes ($F_1$-$F_7$). We attribute the other spin-wave modes to excitations with $|\Delta m_s| > 1$ arising due to the large, $S = 2$, spin of octahedrally coordinated Fe$^{2+}$ ions. Such excitations may become electric-dipole active due to symmetry allowed coupling between spin-quadrupolar fluctuations and electric polarization. Two modes, $F_7$ and $F_{14}$, are magneto-electric resonances with significant coupling to both, electric and magnetic field component of radiation. Additional experiments on magneto-electrically poled samples are needed to clarify if these two resonances show non-reciprocal directional dichroism [13, 16].

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the valuable discussions with Karlo Penc and thank Kirill Amelin and Jakub Vit for fruitful discussions and for the help with the THz spectroscopy measurements. This project was supported by the Estonian Research Council grant PRG736, institutional research funding IUT23-3 of the Estonian Ministry of Education and Research, the European Regional Development Fund project TK134, by the bilateral program of the Estonian and Hungarian Academies of Sciences under Contract No. NMK2018-47, by the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office—NKFIH Grants No. FK 135003. The high magnetic field magnetization experiments were supported by LNCMI-CNRS and HFML-RU/NWO-I, members of the European Magnetic Field Laboratory (EMFL). D. S. acknowledges the FWF Austrian Science Fund I 2816-N27 and TAI 334-N. The cooperation of Austrian and Hungarian partners was supported by Austrian Agency for International Cooperation in Education Research Grant No. WTZ HU 08/2020 and by the Hungarian NKFIH Grant No. 2019.2.1.11-TÉT-2019-00029. V. K. was supported by the RIKEN Incentive Research Project and B.B. acknowledges the support by the European Research Council (Grant Agreement No.835279-Catch-22). The data handling, calculations and figures were done in Python programming language using libraries NumPy [70], Matplotlib [71], SciPy [72] and Pandas [73].

L.P., V.K., and D.S. contributed equally to this work.


Refining magnetic interactions from the magnetic field dependence of spin-wave excitations in magnetoelectric LiFePO$_4$


1 National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Akadeemia tee 23, 12618 Tallinn, Estonia
2 RIKEN Center for Emergent Matter Science (CEMS), Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan
3 Institute of Solid State Physics, TU Wien, 1040 Vienna, Austria
4 Department of Physics, Institute of Physics, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Műegyetem rkp. 3., H-1111 Budapest, Hungary
5 Experimental Physics 5, Center for Electronic Correlations and Magnetism, Institute of Physics, University of Augsburg, 86159 Augsburg, Germany
6 High Field Magnet Laboratory (HFML-EMFL), Radboud University, Toernooiveld 7, 6525 ED Nijmegen, The Netherlands
7 Laboratoire National des Champs Magnétiques Intenses (LNCMI-EMFL), CNRS-UGA-UT3-INS, 143 Avenue de Rangueil, 31400 Toulouse, France
8 Department of Advanced Materials Science, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa 277-8561, Japan
9 Department of Applied Physics, University of Tokyo, Hongo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan

(Dated: April 28, 2022)

1. THZ ABSORPTION SPECTRA OF LiFePO$_4$ IN MAGNETIC FIELD

Fig.S1, S2 and S3 show the THz absorption spectra measured for three applied magnetic field directions.

2. MAGNETIC DIPOLE ACTIVE TRANSITIONS OF THE MEAN-FIELD MODEL SPIN-WAVES

The experimental magnetic field dependence of modes $F_4$, $F_5$, $F_6$ and $F_7$ frequencies and intensities in comparison with the mean-field model results are shown in Fig.S4. Note that the data is displayed in the limited frequency range from 30 to 85 cm$^{-1}$. Each column of figure panels corresponds to one direction of the applied magnetic field and the row corresponds to one direction of the oscillating magnetic field. The oscillating electric field component of experimental data can be found from the table at top left of Fig. S4. The model intensities, shown as colored lines, describe well the intensities of the strongest modes $F_4$ and $F_6$. For the weak absorption line $F_5$ the theory under-estimates intensities, see Table I. The mode $F_7$ is a ME resonance and therefore there is disagreement between experimental line intensities and intensities predicted in the magnetic-dipole approximation by the mean-field model, see Table II.

3. $F_{12}$ IN $H \parallel Y$

The mode $F_{12}$ has slope $-1.9$ cm$^{-1}$T$^{-1}$ in $H_y$, seen only in Voigt configuration, Fig. 5(d). Such behavior is more clearly seen in Fig. S5. As this figure shows, the intensity of $F_{12}$ vanishes to zero above 6 T. Additional $E_ω$-active absorption line appears on the higher frequency side of $F_{12}$ what is labeled $F^*_12$. Close to $F_{12}$ there is $F_{13}$, but it is $E_ω$-active instead. One can also see from Fig.S2 that $F^*_12$ and $F_{13}$ are different modes because they appear at different frequency. Thus there is an additional spin-wave excitation between $F_{12}$ and $F_{13}$ with zero intensity in zero magnetic field. It becomes $E_y$-active above few tesla in magnetic field $H \parallel y$. 
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FIG. S1. LiFePO₄ THz absorption spectra of spin-wave excitations in magnetic field $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{x}$ at $T = 3.5$ K in two orthogonal polarizations, $\{H_x^\omega, E_y^\omega\}$ and $\{H_y^\omega, E_x^\omega\}$. The spectra are shifted to zero between 73 to 85 cm$^{-1}$ and an offset proportional to the magnitude of the magnetic field is added. The spectra up to 17 T are calculated with the reference spectra from 55 K. The spectra above 17 T are calculated with statistically found baseline and the absorption represents the changes relative to the 0 T spectra.
FIG. S2. LiFePO₄ THz absorption spectra of spin-wave excitations in magnetic field \( \mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{y} \) below 4 K. The colors correspond to different polarization configurations \( \{ H_y, E_y \} \) indicated at the top of figure. The spectra below 17.5 T are shifted to zero between 20 to 30 cm\(^{-1}\) and above 17.5 T are shifted to zero between 60 to 65 cm\(^{-1}\), additionally an offset proportional to the magnitude of magnetic field is added. The spectra up to 17 T are calculated with the reference spectra from 55 K. The spectra above 17 T are calculated with statistically found baseline and the absorption represents the changes relative to the 0 T spectra.
FIG. S3. LiFePO$_4$ THz absorption spectra of spin-wave excitations in magnetic field $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{z}$ below 4 K. The colors correspond to different polarization configurations $\{H^x, E^y\}$ indicated at the top of figure. The spectra is shifted to zero between 80 to 90 cm$^{-1}$ and an offset proportional to the magnitude of magnetic field is added. The spectra up to 17 T are calculated with the reference spectra from 55 K. The spectra above 17 T are calculated with statistically found baseline and the absorption represents the changes relative to the 0 T spectra.
4. EXACT DIAGONALIZATION OF A SPIN CLUSTER HAMILTONIAN

Exact numerical diagonalization (ED) of the same Hamiltonian as in the mean-field approach, Eq. (1), was performed on a four-spin cluster. The basis has 625 states $|m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4\rangle$ where $m_i$ is the $i$-th spin projection quantum number on the $z$ axis, $S_i^z |m_i\rangle = m_i |m_i\rangle$ and $m_i \in \{-2, -1, 0, 1, 2\}$. The spectra of magnetic-dipole active transitions were calculated at $T = 55\,K$ and are shown in Fig. S6. The frequency and the selection rule of $F_{os}$ are reproduced.
TABLE I. Experimental $S_{\text{exp}}$ and theoretical $S_{\text{theor}}$ (from the mean-field model) absorption line area of $F_5$ in different polarization configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$E^\omega$</th>
<th>$H^\omega$</th>
<th>$S_{\text{exp}}$</th>
<th>$S_{\text{theor}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S3B B3B</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>1.05±0.13</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B2C</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>5.74±0.22</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B2C</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>5.6±0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B5</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>5.6±0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B2C</td>
<td>$y$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>5.1±0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. $F_7$ intensity comparison with theory in different polarization configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$E^\omega$</th>
<th>$H^\omega$</th>
<th>$S_{\text{exp}}$ (cm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$S_{\text{theor}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S3B B5</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>20.9±0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B3B</td>
<td>$y$</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>37.09±0.27</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B3B</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>$y$</td>
<td>0.32±0.16</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B2C</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>$y$</td>
<td>0.06±0.28</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B2C</td>
<td>$y$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>14.31±0.16</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B2C</td>
<td>$y$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>14.3±0.3</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B2C</td>
<td>$y$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>14.23±0.19</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3B B5</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>0.31±0.17</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. MAGNETIZATION NORMALIZATION

The semi-destructive pulses magnetization values were normalized by DC magnetization measurement. The normalization was done by linearly fitting the DC measurements in range 4-14 T and pulsed field measurements in range 4-20 T, and by multiplying the pulsed field measurement each values with the ratio of the slopes obtained from linear fits. The 0-4 T range was neglected from fitting as there exists small hysteresis in $H \parallel y$, see Fig.S7. The pulsed field range for fitting was extended up to 20 T for minimizing the effect of noise, that was detected in range 8-14 T, see Fig.S8.
FIG. S5. The THz spectra of LiFePO$_4$ mode $F_{12}$ in magnetic field $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{y}$ at 3.5 K. Polarization of THz radiation is $\{E_\omega \mathbf{y}, H_\omega \mathbf{z}\}$. In $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{y}$ below $F_{12}$ there appears a narrow line $F^*_{12}$ that is almost constant in magnetic field. This figure helps to understand the complicated magnetic field dependence of $F_{12}$.

FIG. S6. THz absorption spectra from the exact diagonalization of a 4-spin cluster at 55 K in zero applied magnetic field. The black, red and green spectra correspond to the transitions induced by oscillating magnetic fields components $H_\omega \mathbf{x}$, $H_\omega \mathbf{y}$ and $H_\omega \mathbf{z}$, respectively. The spectra are the sum of individual transitions described by the Gaussian line shape with FWHM = 5 cm$^{-1}$. 
FIG. S7. The DC magnetic field magnetization of LiFePO₄ at 3.5 K. The magnetic field directions are \( H \parallel x \) (black), \( H \parallel y \) (red) and \( H \parallel z \) (green). Along the easy axis direction, \( H \parallel y \), LiFePO₄ shows hysteretic behaviour in low magnetic fields.

FIG. S8. The normalized semi-destructive low magnetic field upsweep magnetization of LiFePO₄ at 4.2 K. The magnetic field direction is \( H \parallel y \). The slopes of magnetization was normalized in range of 4 to 20 T with the DC magnetization in range of 4 to 14 T. Steep increase from linear magnetization starts at 22 T. From 8 to 14 T there exists oscillation of magnetization because of it the slope determination was extended to 20 T.