

¹ INS_IEP: A MATLAB package for fitting Inelastic Neutron Scattering data.

³ **Alban Bloor Riley**  ¹¶, **Marcus Webb**  ¹, and **Michael L. Baker**  ²

⁴ 1 The University of Manchester, Department of Mathematics ² The University of Manchester,
⁵ Department of Chemistry ¶ Corresponding author

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

Software

- [Review](#) ↗
- [Repository](#) ↗
- [Archive](#) ↗

Editor: [Open Journals](#) ↗

Reviewers:

- [@openjournals](#)

Submitted: 01 January 1970

Published: unpublished

License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#)).

⁶ Summary

⁷ Inelastic neutron scattering (INS) is a spectroscopic technique that can be used to measure
⁸ the magnetic excitations in materials with interacting electron spins. For samples composed of
⁹ finite-size clusters of magnetic moment-carrying atoms, such as single ions or molecular-based
¹⁰ magnets, INS experiments yield inelastic excitation with energies that correspond to the
¹¹ eigenvalues of the spin Hamiltonian of the material being studied. Fitting a model spin system
¹² to these experimental eigenvalues can be formulated as an inverse eigenvalue problem (IEP),
¹³ where the matrix formed is the spin Hamiltonian operator of the sample molecule. INS_IEP is
¹⁴ a MATLAB package that uses deflated numerical optimisation methods to systematically find
¹⁵ multiple solutions to this IEP. The package requires and is fully compatible with easyspin
¹⁶ ([Stoll & Schweiger, 2006](#)), a package for solving fitting problems in electron paramagnetic
¹⁷ resonance (EPR).

Statement of need

¹⁹ Neutrons are an excellent bulk probe of material properties since they carry no charge and
²⁰ therefore penetrate deeply into matter. Neutrons also carry a quantum spin of a half, making
²¹ them a sensitive probe of magnetism ([Squires, 2012](#)). Reactors and spallation sources with
²² dedicated high-flux neutron sources serve the international research community with neutron
²³ scattering experiment capabilities for material research. Inelastic neutron scattering (INS) is
²⁴ one such experimental technique that can be used to study magnetism. In an INS experiment,
²⁵ a sample under investigation is irradiated with a beam of neutrons and the scattered neutron
²⁶ energy and momentum transfer are detected. For samples composed of finite-size clusters of
²⁷ magnetic moment-carrying atoms, such as single ions or molecular-based magnets, the detected
²⁸ neutron energy transfer gives direct access to the quantum spin excitations ([M. Baker & Mutka,](#)
²⁹ [2012](#); [Furrer & Waldmann, 2013](#); "Spectroscopy Methods for Molecular Nanomagnets," [2014](#)).

³⁰ The energy of such excitations relates to the energy difference between eigenvalues of the
³¹ Hamiltonian matrix that describes the quantum spin dynamics of the compound in question.
³² Single-ion and molecular-based magnets are studied as prototype components (quantum bits,
³³ sensors) for quantum technologies. INS can therefore provide crucial information concerning
³⁴ the precise quantum properties of such systems. However, to relate the INS experimental
³⁵ results to the Hamiltonian that describes quantum spin dynamics requires parameterisation of
³⁶ matrix elements such that a set of eigenvalues and eigenstates matching the experiment are
³⁷ determined. This situation is known as the inverse eigenvalue problem.

³⁸ To date, this problem is addressed in an iterative process where parameters of the Hamiltonian
³⁹ are varied manually, often one at a time, and the resultant eigenvalues compared to the
⁴⁰ experimental values - each such iteration requires an eigendecomposition of the Hamiltonian
⁴¹ matrix. INS_IEP presents an elegant solution to solving this problem, using algorithms to

⁴² calculate multiple parameter sets that minimise the difference in eigenvalues, reducing the
⁴³ number of Hamiltonian matrix diagonalisations, and providing a more robust method to reliably
⁴⁴ extract an accurate spin Hamiltonian model from INS experimental data.

⁴⁵ Key Concepts

⁴⁶ The Spin Hamiltonian

⁴⁷ The Spin Hamiltonian, H , is an approximation of the Hamiltonian that uses spin coordinates
⁴⁸ instead of orbital coordinates, and is widely used to model data arising from many spectroscopy
⁴⁹ techniques (Launay & Verdaguer, 2014). It can be modeled as a linear combination of
⁵⁰ interaction terms; in this package we will use the zero field interaction, H_{ZFI} , and the
⁵¹ electron-electron interaction, H_{EEI} :

$$H = H_{ZFI} + H_{EEI}.$$

⁵² Both of these terms can themselves be modelled as the linear sum of other basis matrices.
⁵³ The zero field interaction can be written as:

$$H_{ZFI} = \sum_{-k \leq q \leq k} B_k^q O_k^q$$

⁵⁴ where the O_k^q are Stevens Operators (Rudowicz & Chung, 2004), and B_k^q the associated
⁵⁵ parameter. When there are multiple spin centres it is necessary to take Kronecker products of
⁵⁶ the operator with identity matrices of the appropriate for each other spin centre.
⁵⁷ When there are multiple spin centres it is also necessary to include an electron-electron
⁵⁸ interaction term, H_{EEI} . This term will be the sum of interaction terms between each pair of
⁵⁹ spin centres:

$$H_{EEI} = - \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j$$

⁶⁰ where S_i is the vector of spin operators $S_i = [S_x, S_y, S_z]$ for the i -th spin centre, and J_{ij} is
⁶¹ the parameter to be found that represents the strength of interaction between the two spin
⁶² centres. Note that in the isotropic case J can be thought of as a scalar value, but in the
⁶³ anisotropic case will be a matrix where the off diagonals are skew symmetric (often the off
⁶⁴ diagonals are assumed to be zero). While the summation is in theory over all spin centre
⁶⁵ combinations, in practice many of these contributions will be negligible - often only the nearest
⁶⁶ neighbour interactions are significant.

⁶⁷ It is important to mention that these matrix operators can be very large. The size is defined
⁶⁸ by the number of spin centres (n) and the spin (S_i) of each spin centre. The dimension of
⁶⁹ matrices is given by:

$$\prod_i^n (2S_i + 1).$$

⁷⁰ The operators are however highly sparse, this means that it is possible to use eigensolvers that
⁷¹ can take advantage of this sparsity.

⁷² Inverse Eigenvalue Problem

⁷³ The INS experiments provide eigenvalues of the Spin Hamiltonian matrix of the sample, the
⁷⁴ task of calculating the matrix from the eigenvalues is an inverse eigenvalue problem:

⁷⁵ Let $A(x)$ be the affine family of matrices,

$$A(x) = A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i A_i,$$

⁷⁶ where $x \in \mathbb{C}^\ell$ and $A_0, \dots, A_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are linearly independent Hermitian matrices, and denote
⁷⁷ the ordered eigenvalues of $A(x)$ as $\lambda_1(x) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(x)$. Then the least squares inverse
⁷⁸ eigenvalue problem (LSIEP) is to find the parameters $x \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ that minimises

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{2} \|r(x)\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m (\lambda_i(x) - \lambda_i^*)^2$$

⁷⁹ where $\lambda_1^* \leq \dots \leq \lambda_m^*$ are the experimental eigenvalues (Chu & Golub, 2005). In the case of INS
⁸⁰ fitting the A_i basis matrices will be a combination of Stevens operators and electron-electron
⁸¹ exchange terms. The IEP described above is formulated as an least squares problem because
⁸² the number of eigenvalues that can be probed by INS experiments is often a small subset of
⁸³ the full spectrum. Due to the low temperatures that these experiments are performed at (can
⁸⁴ be as low as 1K) it is generally the smallest eigenvalues that are involved. Note also that since
⁸⁵ it is the energy difference between the eigenvalues that is probed we actually have to modify
⁸⁶ the IEP - either by adding an additional parameter (an identity matrix) that shifts the values
⁸⁷ of the eigenvalues, or by changing the above formula for F to directly sum the difference in
⁸⁸ eigenvalues thereby reducing the number of residual equations in $r(x)$ by one.

⁸⁹ As far as we are aware this is the first time that the fitting of INS data has been explicitly
⁹⁰ formulated as an IEP. An advantage of this formulation is that there are explicit formulas for
⁹¹ the derivatives of $r(x)$. The first derivative (Jacobian) is:

$$J_r(x) = \begin{pmatrix} q_1(x)^T A_1 q_1(x) & \dots & q_1(x)^T A_\ell q_1(x) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ q_m(x)^T A_1 q_m(x) & \dots & q_m(x)^T A_\ell q_m(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

⁹² and the second derivative (Hessian) is:

$$(H_r)_{ij} = 2 \sum_{k=1}^m (\lambda_k - \lambda_k^*) \sum_{\substack{t=1 \\ \lambda_t \neq \lambda_k}}^m \frac{(q_t^T A_i q_k)(q_t^T A_j q_k)}{\lambda_k - \lambda_t}.$$

⁹³ Another advantage is the number of constraints to fit is much smaller than fitting the spectrum
⁹⁴ itself, as it corresponds to fitting only the locations of the peaks of the spectrum.

⁹⁵ Methods

⁹⁶ All of the methods used are iterative schemes of the form $x^{k+1} = x^k + p^k$ where the step p^k
⁹⁷ uniquely defines each algorithm:

- ⁹⁸ ■ Newton's method: $p^k = (J_r^T J_r + H_r r) - 1 J_r^T r$ (Nocedal & Wright, 2006)
- ⁹⁹ ■ Gauss-Newton method: $p^k = (J_r^T J_r)^{-1} J_r^T r$ (Nocedal & Wright, 2006)
- ¹⁰⁰ ■ Lift and Projection Method: $p^k = B^{-1} J_r^T r$ (Bloor Riley et al., 2025a)

¹⁰¹ Where the matrix B is the Gram matrix formed from the frobenius inner products of the basis
¹⁰² matrices: $B_{ij} = \langle A_i, A_j \rangle_F$. The Lift and Projection method is a Riemannian Gradient descent
¹⁰³ method (Bloor Riley et al., 2025a), inspired by the Lift and Projection method (Chu & Golub,
¹⁰⁴ 2005), specifically designed for solving IEPs. In (Bloor Riley et al., 2025a) it is proven that the
¹⁰⁵ method is a strictly descending algorithm, that is it reduces the value of the objective function
¹⁰⁶ every step. Both the deflated Gauss-Newton method and the Riemannian Gradient descent

¹⁰⁷ Lift and Projection method are new methods designed for this package ([Bloor Riley et al., 2025a, 2025b](#)).

¹⁰⁹ Deflation

¹¹⁰ The number of eigenvalues that can be probed via INS experiments varies depending on the
¹¹¹ equipment and sample in question, meaning that the fitting problem is often under or even
¹¹² over determined. The IEP is also highly nonlinear and due to the experimental nature of the
¹¹³ data may be ill-posed. One consequence of this is that the solution space may be very ‘bumpy’,
¹¹⁴ that is there may exist many local minimisers to the problem. For example in [Figure 1](#), there
¹¹⁵ are clearly 4 distinct solutions (for more details see Example 1 and the file `Example1_Mn12.m`
¹¹⁶ in the examples folder). We seek to solve the problem of multiple local minima by the use
¹¹⁷ of Deflation, a numerical technique used to find multiple solutions to systems of equations
¹¹⁸ ([Farrell et al., 2015](#)). Fortunately it is cheap to apply deflation for the above methods, it is
¹¹⁹ simply a change to the length of the step - notably this means that the direction of each step
¹²⁰ does not change. It is proven in ([Bloor Riley et al., 2025b](#)) that the deflated methods will not
¹²¹ converge to deflated points. The usual requirements still apply to the convergence of the new
¹²² methods - that the initial guess is close enough to the new minimum, and that the Jacobian is
¹²³ full rank in a neighbourhood around that minimum. The rate of convergence of the deflated
¹²⁴ methods is also more complicated, although the number of iterations required to converge can
¹²⁵ go up with the number of deflations this is not a strict correlation, as can be seen in [Figure 2](#).




Figure 1: Contour plot of how F varies with the two parameters B_2^2 and B_4^4 for the molecule Mn_12 as described in Example 1. There are four locally minimising parameter pairs corresponding to the four blue regions




Figure 2: Comparison of the convergence behaviour for computing each solution in Example 1. The gradient of the lines as the method approaches the solution shows how the methods are quadratically convergent local to a minimum.

126 Examples

127 Example 1 - Mn12

128 The first example we will look at is Manganese-12-acetate. This is a well known example in the
 129 INS and magnetism community, as one of the first molecules that behaves like a nano-sized
 130 magnet with a molecular magnetic coercivity as well as its role in the research of quantum
 131 tunnelling of magnetisation (Friedman et al., 1996; Sessoli et al., 1993).

132 The Spin Hamiltonian of this system, using the giant spin approximation, can be represented
 133 as a 21×21 matrix modelled using 4 Stevens operators (Bircher et al., 2004):

$$H = B_2^0 O_2^0 + B_4^0 O_4^0 + B_2^2 O_2^2 + B_4^4 O_4^4 \in \mathbb{R}^{21 \times 21}$$

134 We utilise the same spin system syntax as easyspin, so to set up the problem we first set up
 135 the model, along with initial guesses for the parameters:

```
%One spin centre (because giant spin approximation)
Sys0.S=10;
%Four Stevens operators
Sys0.B2 = [-100,0,-1000,0,0];
Sys0.B4 = [-1,0,0,0,-1,0,0,0,0];
```

136 Then we input the experimental eigenvalues - these are typically shifted such that the smallest
 137 eigenvalue is zero - and define which parameters to fit. Note that all values given must be in
 138 gigahertz, so it may be useful to use conversions.

```
rcm = 29979.2458;    meV = rcm*8.065; %Conversions values
%Input calculated eigenvalues:
Exp.ev = [0,0,1.24,1.24,2.3,2.3,3.18,3.18,3.91,3.91,4.5,4.5,
4.97,4.97,5.32,5.32,5.54,5.59,5.69,5.75,5.78].*meV;
```

%Note that these eigenvalues are simulated from the parameters given in `[@bircher_trans]`

```
%Vary all non zero parameters (no Fixed parameters):
Vary = Sys0;
```

139 Then all that is required is to call `INS_IEP` with these three inputs:

```
SysOut = INS_IEP(Sys0,Vary,Exp);
```

140 If we wish to find all four solutions as shown in [Figure 1](#) then we use the additional option:

```
Opt.NDeflations = 4;
SysOut = INS_IEP(Sys0,Vary,Exp,Opt);
```

141 In this case `SysOut` will be an array of four spin structures each containing a distinct locally optimal solution. It is possible to access information about the convergence of each deflation by using `SysOut.Output`. For example by utilising the iterates recorded, stored in `SysOut.Output.Iterates` it is possible to plot a graph of convergence, as can be seen in [Figure 2](#). The `Output` structure also contains the value of F at the final point, as well as the number of iterations it took to get there.

147 A full list of options is provided in the help of `INS_IEP`.

148 Example 2 - Chromium(iii) Horseshoes

149 The second example concerns antiferro-magnetically coupled chain of six chromium(III) ions ([M. L. Baker et al., 2011](#)). Because there are multiple spin centres an electron-electron interaction term is required. The spin hamiltonian is a 4096×4096 matrix composed of two Stevens operators and one interaction term, since it is known a priori that each spin centre will have the same value parameters we pin the parameters here, by setting the initial guess as the same value:

```
Sys0.S = [1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5];
Sys0.B2 = [1 0 -1 0 0;
           1 0 -1 0 0;
           1 0 -1 0 0;
           1 0 -1 0 0;
           1 0 -1 0 0;
           1 0 -1 0 0];
Sys0.J = [100,0,0,0,0,100,0,0,0,100,0,0,100,0,0,100];
Vary = Sys0;
Exp.ev = [0,0.355,0.457,0.497,1.576,1.577,1.592,1.629,1.632,
          2.97,2.98,3.002,3.004,3.01,3.038,3.821,3.824,3.827,
          3.837,3.856,3.879,3.888,3.895,3.903].*meV;
```

155 Note that only 24 eigenvalues were found experimentally, so this will form a partial LSIEP. To
156 find the solution system is as simple as:

```
Opt.GradientTolerance = 1e-3; %Use additional stopping criterion.
SysOut= INS_IEP(Sys1,Vary1,Exp,Opt);
```

157 It is possible to find multiple minimising systems even if they do not make any sense physically,
158 however due to the scaling of the problem a change in the default deflation parameters is
159 necessary:

```
Opt = struct('NDeflations',5,'Sigma',1e-7,'StepTolerance',1e-3 );
SysOut= INS_IEP(Sys0,Vary,Exp,Opt);
```

160 The output contains five different spin systems that all have the same eigenvalues as input.
161 Like in example one some of the minima found differ only by a sign change of the B_2^2 parameter,
162 but all minima have the same exchange term.

¹⁶³ Additional examples can be found in the Examples folder.

¹⁶⁴ Note also that using mint ([M. L. Baker, 2022](#)), which is fully compatible with INS_IEP it is
¹⁶⁵ possible to simulate the INS spectrum of any calculated system - which can then be compared
¹⁶⁶ to the experimental spectrum. A description of how to do this can also be found in the
¹⁶⁷ examples folder.

¹⁶⁸ Acknowledgements

¹⁶⁹ ABR thanks the University of Manchester for a Dean's Doctoral Scholarship. MW thanks the
¹⁷⁰ Polish National Science Centre (SONATA-BIS-9), project no. 2019/34/E/ST1/00390, for the
¹⁷¹ funding that supported some of this research.

¹⁷² References

- ¹⁷³ Baker, M. L. (2022). *Mint: Simulate inelastic neutron scattering induced magnetic excitations
for single-ions, molecular-magnets and finite exchange coupled spin-systems*. [https://
mlbakerlab.co.uk/mint/](https://mlbakerlab.co.uk/mint/)
- ¹⁷⁶ Baker, M. L., Bianchi, A., Carretta, S., Collison, D., Docherty, R. J., McInnes, E. J. L.,
¹⁷⁷ McRobbie, A., Muryn, C. A., Mutka, H., Piligkos, S., Rancan, M., Santini, P., Timco, G.
¹⁷⁸ A., Tregenna-Piggott, P. L. W., Tuna, F., Güdel, H. U., & Winpenny, R. E. P. (2011).
¹⁷⁹ Varying spin state composition by the choice of capping ligand in a family of molecular
¹⁸⁰ chains: Detailed analysis of magnetic properties of chromium(iii) horseshoes. *Dalton
Transactions*, 40(12), 2725. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c0dt01243b>
- ¹⁸² Baker, M., & Mutka, H. (2012). Neutron spectroscopy of molecular nanomagnets. *The
European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 213, 53–68. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjst/e2012-01663-6>
- ¹⁸⁵ Bircher, R., Chaboussant, G., Sieber, A., Güdel, H. U., & Mutka, H. (2004). Transverse
¹⁸⁶ magnetic anisotropy in Mn 12 acetate: Direct determination by inelastic neutron scattering.
¹⁸⁷ *Phys. Rev. B*, 70(21), 212413. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.70.212413>
- ¹⁸⁸ Bloor Riley, A., Webb, M., & Baker, M. L. (2025a). *A Riemannian Gradient Descent Method
for the Least Squares Inverse Eigenvalue Problem*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2504.07809>
- ¹⁹¹ Bloor Riley, A., Webb, M., & Baker, M. L. (2025b). *Deflation Techniques for Finding Multiple
Local Minima of a Nonlinear Least Squares Problem*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2409.14438>
- ¹⁹⁴ Chu, M. T.-C., & Golub, G. H. (2005). *Inverse Eigenvalue problems: Theory, algorithms, and
applications*. Oxford University Press. ISBN: 978-0-19-856664-9
- ¹⁹⁶ Farrell, P. E., Á. Birkisson, & Funke, S. W. (2015). Deflation Techniques for Finding
¹⁹⁷ Distinct Solutions of Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comp.*, 37(4),
¹⁹⁸ A2026–A2045. <https://doi.org/10.1137/140984798>
- ¹⁹⁹ Friedman, J. R., Sarachik, M. P., Tejada, J., & Ziolo, R. (1996). Macroscopic Measurement
²⁰⁰ of Resonant Magnetization Tunneling in High-Spin Molecules. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 76(20),
²⁰¹ 3830–3833. <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.76.3830>
- ²⁰² Furrer, A., & Waldmann, O. (2013). Magnetic cluster excitations. *Reviews of Modern Physics*,
²⁰³ 85, 367–420. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.85.367>
- ²⁰⁴ Launay, J.-P., & Verdaguer, M. (2014). *Electrons in molecules: From basic principles to
molecular electronics* (First edition). Oxford University Press. ISBN: 978-0-19-929778-8

- 206 Nocedal, J., & Wright, S. J. (2006). *Numerical optimization* (2nd ed). Springer. ISBN: 978-0-
207 387-30303-1
- 208 Rudowicz, C., & Chung, C. Y. (2004). The generalization of the extended Stevens operators
209 to higher ranks and spins, and a systematic review of the tables of the tensor operators
210 and their matrix elements. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 16(32), 5825–5847.
211 <https://doi.org/10.1088/0953-8984/16/32/018>
- 212 Sessoli, R., Gatteschi, D., Caneschi, A., & Novak, M. A. (1993). Magnetic bistability in a
213 metal-ion cluster. *Nature*, 365(6442), 141–143. <https://doi.org/10.1038/365141a0>
- 214 Spectroscopy Methods for Molecular Nanomagnets. (2014). In *Structure and Bonding* (pp.
215 231–291). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/430_2014_155
- 216 Squires, G. L. (2012). *Introduction to the Theory of Thermal Neutron Scattering* (3rd ed.).
217 Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139107808>
- 218 Stoll, S., & Schweiger, A. (2006). EasySpin, a comprehensive software package for spectral
219 simulation and analysis in EPR. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance*, 178, 42–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmr.2005.08.013>