

Multiferroic Tunnel Junctions: The Future of Spintronic Devices?

Dr. Sushree Ipsita^{*1}, Sunil Ku. Nayak², Prof. P.K. Mahapatra³

^{*1}Dept. of Basic Science and Humanities, Raajdhani Engineering College, Bhubaneswar, pin-751017

^{2,3}Dept. of Physics, Siksha 'O' Anusandhan (Deemed to be) University, Bhubaneswar, pin-751030

^{*}Corresponding author- Dr. Sushree Ipsita

Abstract: As the scaling limits of conventional CMOS technologies become increasingly evident due to issues like power dissipation and quantum effects, spintronic devices are emerging as viable alternatives for next-generation electronics. Among these, multiferroic tunnel junctions (MFTJs) have gained significant attention for their potential to realize high-density, energy-efficient, and non-volatile memory and logic systems. MFTJs integrate a ferroelectric barrier between two ferromagnetic electrodes, combining the tunneling magnetoresistance (TMR) of magnetic tunnel junctions (MTJs) with the tunnelingelectroresistance (TER) of ferroelectric tunnel junctions (FTJs). This dual functionality enables four non-volatile resistance states, controllable by electric and magnetic fields. Beyond this binary extension, strong magnetoelectric coupling at the ferromagnet/ferroelectric interface—driven by mechanisms such as spin-dependent screening and interfacial charge redistribution—offers voltage-based control of magnetic and spintronic properties. This review surveys the fundamental operating principles, experimental breakthroughs, and material systems enabling TMR, TER, and tunnelingelectromagnetoresistance (TEMR) in MFTJs. Emphasis is placed on interface engineering strategies and the performance metrics of various device architectures, including room-temperature-operable systems. The continuing development of MFTJs holds promise for multifunctional device applications in memory, logic, and neuromorphic computing.

Date of Submission: 15-05-2025

Date of Acceptance: 26-05-2025

I. Introduction

As the need for faster, more compact, and non-volatile electronic devices grows, existing technologies are encountering significant barriers to further miniaturization, mainly due to power dissipation, quantum mechanical limitations, and other constraints. Spintronics—particularly those leveraging multiferroic and magnetoelectric effects—has emerged as a promising alternative to address these challenges. This approach capitalizes on the electron's spin, in addition to its charge, for processing and storing information [1–7].

Among the innovative device concepts, multiferroic tunnel junctions (MFTJs) stand out as particularly promising. These devices incorporate a ferroelectric barrier sandwiched between two ferromagnetic electrodes, offering a path toward energy-efficient, high-density, non-volatile, and multifunctional memory and logic systems [8–12]. The MFTJ concept merges two ideas: the magnetic tunnel junction (MTJ), which consists of two ferromagnetic layers [13,14], and ferroelectric tunneling, which uses a ferroelectric rather than a conventional dielectric barrier [15–17].

In an MTJ, the spin-dependent tunneling current varies with the alignment of the magnetizations of the two electrodes, resulting in the tunneling magnetoresistance (TMR) effect. According to Julliere's model [13], the TMR ratio between parallel and antiparallel magnetic alignments is given by:

$$TMR = (R_{AP} - R_P)/R_P = 2P_1 P_2 / (1 - P_1 P_2), \quad (1)$$

where R_P and R_{AP} are the resistances in the parallel and antiparallel states, and P_1 and P_2 represent the spin polarizations at the two interfaces.

Conversely, in a ferroelectric tunnel junction (FTJ), the tunneling current is influenced by the direction of the ferroelectric polarization in the barrier, giving rise to the tunnelingelectroresistance (TER) effect under specific conditions [15–17]. The TER ratio is expressed as:

$$TER = |R_\uparrow - R_\downarrow| / \min(R_\uparrow, R_\downarrow), \quad (2)$$

where R_\uparrow and R_\downarrow correspond to the resistances of the ferroelectric polarization states pointing up and down, respectively.

In MFTJs, the coexistence of TMR and TER effects enables four distinct, non-volatile resistance states. These states can be controlled via external electric and magnetic fields, offering a novel and efficient way to realize high-density memory technologies.

Beyond simply offering more resistance states, multiferroic tunnel junctions (MFTJs) provide capabilities that go well beyond a simple combination of magnetic tunnel junctions (MTJs) and ferroelectric tunnel junctions (FTJs). Alongside the ability to regulate spin and charge tunneling currents through ferromagnetic and ferroelectric polarization, the interface between the ferromagnetic and ferroelectric layers can induce strong magnetoelectric coupling effects. These effects can stem from phenomena such as spin-dependent screening at the interface [18,19], modifications in bonding strength [20], or shifts in ionic oxidation states influenced by the ferroelectric polarization [21,22].

If this interfacial coupling is sufficiently strong, reversing the ferroelectric polarization can significantly impact magnetic properties, including magnetic anisotropy, coercivity, and even the magnetic structure at the interface. This strong magnetoelectric interaction opens up a low-power method to control magnetization through voltage—offering an alternative to traditional techniques like spin-transfer torque [23] or electric-field-tuned interfacial perpendicular magnetic anisotropy in MTJs [24,25].

Furthermore, this interfacial coupling could allow the electrical control of spin polarization, which is a highly sought-after feature in spintronics. Since the tunneling magnetoresistance (TMR) is directly related to the spin polarization at the electrode/barrier interfaces (as defined by Eq. 1), Garcia et al. introduced the concept of tunneling electromagnetoresistance (TEMR) [26] to quantify how ferroelectric polarization reversal can influence spin polarization:

$$\text{TEMR} = |\text{TMR}_{\uparrow} - \text{TMR}_{\downarrow}| / |\min(\text{TMR}_{\uparrow}, \text{TMR}_{\downarrow})|,$$

where TMR_{\uparrow} and TMR_{\downarrow} refer to the TMR ratios for upward and downward ferroelectric polarization states, respectively.

In 2007, Gajek et al. [27] observed the TER effect in a $\text{La}_{2/3}\text{Sr}_{1/3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{La}_{0.1}\text{Bi}_{0.9}\text{MnO}_3/\text{Au}$ spin filter junction utilizing a naturally multiferroic $\text{La}_{0.1}\text{Bi}_{0.9}\text{MnO}_3$ barrier, achieving TMR of ~81% and TER of ~20%. Then, in 2010, Garcia et al. [26] provided the first experimental evidence for ferroelectric control of spin polarization in a Fe-indented $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{BaTiO}_3$ MFTJ, reporting TMR values of ~45% and ~19% for opposite polarization states, along with TER ~37% and a striking TEMR of ~450%.

Subsequent studies showed that the sign of the TMR could be reversed by switching the ferroelectric polarization in MFTJs that used 3d ferromagnetic metals (e.g., Co, NiFe) as top electrodes. Examples include $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{PbZr}_{0.2}\text{Ti}_{0.8}\text{O}_3/\text{Co}$ [28,29] and $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{BaTiO}_3/\text{NiFe}$ junctions [30]. $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ is often chosen as the bottom electrode due to its good lattice compatibility with oxide ferroelectrics and its half-metallic nature [31]. The use of 3d ferromagnetic metals for the top electrode is largely driven by their ease of integration into nanoscale structures.

However, MFTJs using 3d metals typically display relatively low TMR values—often under 20% for one or both polarization states—mainly because of the low spin polarization of these metals and potential interdiffusion at the interface. As a result, such devices seldom exhibit the well-defined switching behavior typical of MTJ-based memory and are not yet ready for practical device applications.

Higher TMR values and more well-defined resistance (R) versus magnetic field (H) switching loops have been achieved in MFTJs that utilize two half-metallic perovskite electrodes. Examples include:

- $\text{La}_{0.67}\text{Sr}_{0.33}\text{MnO}_3/\text{BiFeO}_3/\text{La}_{0.67}\text{Sr}_{0.33}\text{MnO}_3$ (TMR ~ 69%, TER ~ 40%) [32],
- $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Ca}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{Ba}_{0.5}\text{Sr}_{0.5}\text{TiO}_3/\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Ca}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ (TMR ~ 300%, TER ~ 160%) [33],
- $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{BaTiO}_3/\text{La}_{0.5}\text{Ca}_{0.5}\text{MnO}_3/\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ (TMR ~ 100%, TER ~ 104%) [34],
- $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{BaTiO}_3/\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ (TMR ~ 65%, TER ~ 125%) [21,35,36],
- $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{SrTiO}_3/\text{BaTiO}_3/\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{Mn}_{0.8}\text{Ru}_{0.2}\text{O}_3$ (TMR ~ 30%, TER ~ 128%) [37],
- $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{Pb}(\text{Zr}_{0.3}\text{Ti}_{0.7})\text{O}_3/\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ (TMR ~ 50%, TER ~ 100%) [22],
- $\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{BaTiO}_3/\text{La}_{0.84}\text{Sr}_{0.16}\text{CuO}_{3-x}/\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ (TMR ~ 125%, TER ~ 104%) [38],
- and $\text{LaNiO}_3/\text{Pr}_{0.8}\text{Ca}_{0.2}\text{MnO}_3/\text{BaTiO}_3/\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ spin filter MFTJ (TMR ~ 24%, TER ~ 100%) [39].

| Year | Substrate | Bottom electrode | Tunnellingbarrier | To electrode | Max(TMR, TER, TEMR) | T_c TMR |
|--------------|------------------|--|--|--------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| 2007 [27] | SrTiO_3 | $\text{La}_{2/3}\text{Sr}_{1/3}\text{MnO}_3$ | $\text{La}_{0.1}\text{Bi}_{0.9}\text{MnO}_3(1.2\text{nm})$ | Au | (81%, 20%, n/a) at 3K | 60 K |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|--------|
| 2010 [26] | NdGaO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (1.2nm) | Fe | (-45%,37%, 450%) at4.2K | >4.2 K |
| 2010 [32] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.67} Sr _{0.33} MnO ₃ | BiFeO ₃ (3nm) | La _{0.67} Sr _{0.33} MnO ₃ | (69%,40%,13%) at80K | >80 K |
| 2011 [33,40] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | Ba _{0.95} Sr _{0.05} TiO ₃ (2nm) | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | (1.1%,2%,8.5%) atRT | >RT |
| 2011 [41] | NdGaO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (1.2nm) | Co | (-20%,80%,82%) at4K | >4K |
| 2012 [28] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | PbZr _{0.2} Ti _{0.8} O ₃ (3.2nm) | Co | (7.5%,700%, 250%)at10K | 250K |
| 2013 [34,42] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (3 nm)/ La _{0.5} Ca _{0.5} MnO ₃ (1-5 uc) | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | (180%, 104%, 450%) at 80 K | 180 K |
| 2014 [43] | LSAT | La _{0.6} Sr _{0.4} MnO ₃ | BiFeO ₃ (10 nm) | La _{0.6} Sr _{0.4} MnO ₃ | (6.6%, 15.5%, 18%) at 10 K | 100 K |
| 2014 [44] | LSAT | La _{0.67} Sr _{0.33} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (2.8 nm) | Co | (20%, 104%, 100%) at 10 K | > 10 K |
| 2015 [29] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | PbTiO ₃ (3.2 nm) | Co | (30%, 350%, 15%) at 5 K | 140 K |
| 2015 [30] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (5 nm) | Ni _{0.81} Fe _{0.19} | (0.3%, 1500%, 300%) at 8 K | > 8 K |
| 2015 [21,35] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (3 nm) | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | (82%, 125%, 127%) at 80 K | 160 K |
| 2015 [37] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (6 uc)/SrTiO ₃ (4 uc) | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} Mn _{0.8} Ru _{0.2} O ₃ | (30%, 128%, 100%) at 10 K | > 10 K |
| 2016 [38] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (6 nm)/La _{0.84} Sr _{0.16} CuO _{3-x} nm) | (2) La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | (125%,104%, n/a) | n/a |
| 2016 [22] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | PbZr _{0.3} Ti _{0.7} O ₃ (4 nm) | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | (40%, 100%, 170%) at 80 K | > 80 K |
| 2016 [45] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.6} Sr _{0.4} MnO ₃ | PVDF (26 nm) | Co | (15%, 75%, 288%) at 10 K | 120 K |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------|--------|
| 2016 [39] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.6} Sr _{0.4} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (5 uc)/ Pr _{0.8} Ca _{0.2} MnO ₃ (9 uc) | LaNiO ₃ | (24%, 100%, 167%) at 10 K | > 10 K |
| 2017 [36] | SrTiO ₃ | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | BaTiO ₃ (4.4 nm) | La _{0.7} Sr _{0.3} MnO ₃ | (20%, 103%, n/a) at 14 K | > 14 K |
| 2017 [46] | Si | Ni _{50.3} Mn _{36.9} Sb _{12.8} | SrTiO ₃ (2 nm)/PbZr _{0.52} Ti _{0.48} O ₃ (3 nm) | Ni ₅₀ Mn ₃₅ In ₁₅ | (39%, 487%, 224%) at RT | >RT |
| 2017 [47] | Si | Ni _{50.3} Mn _{36.9} Sb _{12.8} | BiFeO ₃ (4 nm) | Ni _{50.3} Mn _{36.9} Sb _{12.8} | (13%, 33%, 17%) at RT | >RT |

All these experimental studies on engineered multiferroic tunnel junctions exhibiting both TER and TMR effects are summarized in Table 1. This table also includes the peak values for TMR, TER, and TEMR, the temperature above which TMR and the four-state memory effect vanish ($T_c _{TMR}$), and notes on the availability of data (n/a indicating missing information). Room temperature results are marked as RT, and entries are sorted chronologically by publication date.

For comprehensive reviews on MFTJs, readers can refer to previously published works [8–12].

References

- [1]. ŽutićI.,FabianJ.&DasSarmaS.Spintronics:Fundamentalsandapplications. RevModPhys2004;76:323-410.
- [2]. MatsukuraF.,TokuraY.&OhnoH.Controlofmagnetismbyelectricfields. NatureNanotech2015;10:209-220.
- [3]. Fusil S., Garcia V., Barthelemy A. &Bibes M. in Annual Review Of Materials Research,Vol44Vol.44AnnualReviewofMaterialsResearch(edD.R.Clarke) 91-116 (Annual Reviews, 2014).
- [4]. FiebigM.,LottermoserT.,MeierD.&TrassinM.Theevolutionofmultiferroics. NatureReviewsMaterials2016;1:16046.
- [5]. Ma J., Hu J., Li Z. & Nan C. W. Recent progress in multiferroic magnetoelectric composites: from bulk to thin films. Adv Mater 2011; 23: 1062-1087.
- [6]. Song C., Cui B., Li F., Zhou X. & Pan F. Recent progress in voltage control of magnetism: Materials, mechanisms, and performance. Progress in Materials Science 2017; 87: 33-82.
- [7]. Hu J.-M., Duan C.-G., Nan C.-W. & Chen L.-Q. Understanding and designing magnetoelectric heterostructuresguidedby computation:progresses,remaining questions, andperspectives.npjComputationalMaterials2017;3:18.
- [8]. Tsymbal E. Y. & Kohlstedt H. Tunneling across a ferroelectric. Science 2006; 313: 181-183.
- [9]. Tsymbal E. Y., Gruverman A., Garcia V., Bibes M. & Barthelemy A. Ferroelectricandmultiferroictunneljunctions.MRSBULLETIN2012;37: 138-143.
- [10]. Garcia V. &Bibes M. Ferroelectric tunnel junctions for information storage and processing. Nature Commun 2014; 5: 4289.
- [11]. HuangW.,YangS.&LiX.Multiferrocheterostructuresandtunnelingjunctions. JournalofMateromics2015;1:263-284.
- [12]. VelevJ.P.,BurtonJ.D.,ZhuravlevM.Y.&TsymbalE.Y.Predictivemodelling of ferroelectric tunnel junctions. npj Computational Materials 2016; 2: 16009.
- [13]. JulliereM.TunnelingBetweenFerromagneticFilms.PhysicsLettersA1975;54: 225-226.
- [14]. TsymbalE.Y.Spin-dependenttunnelinginmagnetictunneljunctions.Journalof Physics: Condensed Matter 2003; 15: R109–R142.
- [15]. Zhuravlev M. Y., Sabirianov R. F., Jaswal S. S. & Tsymbal E. Y. Giant electroresistance in ferroelectric tunnel junctions. Phys Rev Lett 2005; 94: 246802.
- [16]. KohlstedtH.,PertsevN.A.,ContrerasJ.R.&WaserR.Theoretical current-voltagecharacteristics offerroelectric tunnel junctions.Phys Rev B2005; 72: 125341.
- [17]. Velev J. P., Duan C. G., Burton J. D., Smogunov A., Niranjan M. K., Tosatti E., Jaswal S. S. & Tsymbal E. Y. Magnetic Tunnel Junctions with Ferroelectric Barriers: Prediction of Four Resistance States from First Principles. Nano Lett 2009; 9: 427-432.
- [18]. VazC.A.F.,HoffmanJ.,SegalY.,ReinerJ.W.,GroberR.D.,ZhangZ.,AhnC. H. & Walker F. J. Origin of the Magnetoelectric Coupling Effect in Pb_{(Zr_{0.2}Ti_{0.8})O₃}/La_{0.8}Sr_{0.2}MnO₃ Multiferroic Heterostructures. Phys Rev Lett 2010; 104: 127202.
- [19]. Burton J. D. & Tsymbal E. Y. Prediction of electrically induced magnetic reconstruction at the manganite/ferroelectric interface. Phys Rev B 2009; 80: 174406.
- [20]. Duan C. G., Jaswal S. S. & Tsymbal E. Y. Predicted magnetoelectric effect in Fe/BaTiO₃ multilayers: Ferroelectric control of magnetism. Phys Rev Lett 2006; 97: 047201.
- [21]. HuangW.C.,LinY.,YinY.W.,FengL.,ZhangD.L.,ZhaoW.B.,LiQ.&LiX. G. Interfacial Ion Intermixing Effect on Four-Resistance States in La_{0.7}Sr_{0.3}MnO₃/BaTiO₃/La_{0.7}Sr_{0.3}MnO₃MultiferroicTunnelJunctions.ACSAppl Mater &Interf 2016; 8: 10422-10429.
- [22]. Soni R., Petraru A., Nair H. S., Vavra O., Ziegler M., Kim S. K., Jeong D. S. & Kohlstedt H. Polarit tunable spin transport in all-oxide multiferroic tunnel junctions. Nanoscale 2016; 8: 10799-10805.
- [23]. RalphD.C.&StilesM.D.Spintransfertorques.JournalofMagnetismand MagneticMaterials2008;320:1190-1216.
- [24]. ShiotaY.,NozakiT.,BonellF.,MurakamiS.,ShinjoT.&SuzukiY.Inductionof coherent magnetization switching in a few atomic layers of FeCo using voltage pulses. Nat Mater 2012; 11: 39-43.
- [25]. Wang W. G., Li M., Hageman S. & Chien C. L. Electric-field-assisted switching in magnetic tunnel junctions. Nat Mater 2011; 11: 64-68.
- [26]. Garcia V., Bibes M., Bocher L., Valencia S., Kronast F., Crassous A., Moya X., Enouz-Vedrenne S., Gloter A., Imhoff D., Deranlot C., Mathur N. D., Fusil S., Bouzehouane K. & Barthelemy A. Ferroelectric control of spin polarization. Science 2010; 327: 1106-1110.

- [27]. Gajek M., Bibes M., Fusil S., Bouzehouane K., Fontcuberta J., Barthelemy A. & Fert A. Tunnel junctions with multiferroic barriers. *Nature Materials* 2007; 6: 296-302.
- [28]. Pantel D., Goetze S., Hesse D. & Alexe M. Reversible electrical switching of spin polarization in multiferroic tunnel junctions. *Nature Materials* 2012; 11:289-293.
- [29]. Quindeau A., Fina I., Marti X., Apachitei G., Ferrer P., Nicklin C., Pippel E., Hesse D. & Alexe M. Four-state ferroelectric spin-valve. *Sci Rep* 2015; 5: 9749.
- [30]. YauH.M.,YanZ.B.,ChanN.Y.,AuK.,WongC.M.,LeungC.W.,ZhangF.Y., Gao X. S. & Dai J. Y. Low-field Switching Four-state Nonvolatile Memory Based on Multiferroic Tunnel Junctions. *Sci Rep* 2015; 5: 12826.
- [31]. ParkJ. H., Vescovo E., KimH. J., KwonC., Ramesh R. & VenkatesanT. Direct evidence for a half-metallic ferromagnet. *Nature* 1998;392:794-796.
- [32]. Hambe M., Petrucci A., Pertsev N. A., Munroe P., Nagarajan V. & Kohlstedt H. Crossing an Interface: Ferroelectric Control of Tunnel Currents in Magnetic Complex Oxide Heterostructures. *Adv Funct Mater* 2010; 20: 2436-2441.
- [33]. YinY.-W.,RajuM.,HuW.-J.,WengX.-J.,ZouK.,ZhuJ.,LiX.-G.,ZhangZ.-D. & LiQ. Multiferroic tunnel junctions. *Front Phys* 2012; 7:380-385.
- [34]. Yin Y. W., Burton J. D., Kim Y. M., Borisevich A. Y., Pennycook S. J., Yang S. M., Noh T. W., Gruverman A., Li X. G., Tsymbal E. Y. & Li Q. Enhanced tunnelling electroresistance effect due to a ferroelectrically induced phase transition at a magnetic complex oxide interface. *Nature Materials* 2013; 12:397-402.
- [35]. YinY.-W.,HuangW.-C.,LiuY.-K.,YangS.-W.,DongS.-N.,TaoJ.,ZhuY.-M., Li Q. & Li X.-G. Octonary Resistance States in $\text{La}_{0.5}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/\text{BaTiO}_3/\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ Multiferroic Tunnel Junctions. *Adv Electron Mater* 2015; 1: 1500183.
- [36]. Sanchez-SantolinoG.,Tornos J.,Hernandez-MartinD.,BeltranJ. I.,MunueraC., Cabero M., Perez-Munoz A., Ricote J., Mompean F., Garcia-Hernandez M., Sefrioui Z., Leon C., Pennycook S. J., Munoz M. C., Varela M. & Santamaria J. Resonant electron tunnelling assisted by charged domain walls in multiferroic tunnel junctions. *Nat Nanotechnol* 2017.
- [37]. Ruan J., Qiu X., Yuan Z., Ji D., Wang P., Li A. & Wu D. Improved memory functions in multiferroic tunnel junctions with dielectric/ferroelectric composite barrier. *Appl Phys Lett* 2015; 107:232902.
- [38]. CaberoM.,Perez-MuñozA.,HernándezD.,SefriouiZ.,AbrudanR.,ValenciaS., Pennycook S. J., León C., Varela M. & Santamaría J. in European Microscopy Congress 2016: Proceedings 1104-1105 (Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, 2016).
- [39]. RuanJ.,LiC.,YuanZ.,WangP.,LiA.&WuD. Four-state non-volatile memory in a multiferroic spin filter tunnel junction. *Appl Phys Lett* 2016; 109: 252903.
- [40]. Yin Y. W., Raju M., Hu W. J., Weng X. J., Li X. G. & Li Q. Coexistence of tunneling magnetoresistance and electroresistance at room temperature in $\text{La}_{0.5}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3/(\text{Ba},\text{Sr})\text{TiO}_3/\text{La}_{0.7}\text{Sr}_{0.3}\text{MnO}_3$ multiferroic tunnel junctions. *J Appl Phys* 2011; 109: 07D915.
- [41]. ValenciaS.,CrassousA.,BocherL.,GarciaV.,MoyaX.,CherifiR.O.,Deranlot C., Bouzehouane K., Fusil S., Zobelli A., Gloter A., Mathur N. D., Gaupp A., AbrudanR., RaduF., BarthelemyA. & BibesM. Interface-induced room-temperature multiferroicity in BaTiO_3 . *Nature materials* 2011; 10:753-758.
- [42]. Yin Y. W., Raju M., Hu W. J., Burton J. D., Kim Y. M., Borisevich A. Y., Pennycook S. J., Yang S. M., Noh T. W., Gruverman A., Li X. G., Zhang Z. D., Tsymbal E. Y. & Li Q. Multiferroic tunnel junctions and ferroelectric control of magnetic state at interface (invited). *J Appl Phys* 2015; 117: 172601.
- [43]. LiuY.K.,YinY.W.,DongS.N.,YangS.W.,JiangT.&LiX.G.Coexistenceof four resistance states and exchange bias in $\text{La}_{0.6}\text{Sr}_{0.4}\text{MnO}_3/\text{BiFeO}_3/\text{La}_{0.6}\text{Sr}_{0.4}\text{MnO}_3$ multiferroic tunnel junction. *Appl Phys Lett* 2014;104:043507.
- [44]. MaoH.J.,MiaoP.X.,CongJ.Z.,SongC.,CuiB.,PengJ.J.,Li F.,WangG.Y., Zhao Y. G.,SunY., Xiao L. R. & Pan F. Interface-modification-enhanced tunnel electroresistance in multiferroic tunnel junctions. *J Appl Phys* 2014; 116:053703.
- [45]. Liang S., Yang H., Yang H., Tao B., Djeffal A., Chshiev M., Huang W., Li X., Ferri A., Desfeux R., Mangin S., Lacour D., Hehn M., Copie O., Dumesnil K. & Lu Y. Ferroelectric Control of Organic/Ferromagnetic Spin interface. *Adv Mater* 2016; 28: 10204-10210.
- [46]. Singh K. & Kaur D. Four logic states of tunneling magnetoresistance in ferromagnetic shape memory alloy based multiferroic tunnel junctions. *Appl Phys Lett* 2017; 111: 022902.
- [47]. Barman R. & Kaur D. Influence of Barrier Thickness on Ni50.3Mn36.9Sb12.8/BiFeO₃/Ni50.3Mn36.9Sb12.8 Multiferroic Tunnel Junctions. *Ceramics International* 2017.