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The discovery of bacteria that precipitate greigite within intracellular organelles (magnetoosomes) offers new evidence about the origin of greigite in natural environments. Unlike magnetite, only scarce information is available about the magnetic characteristics of greigite. For this reason, and the present inability to grow these microorganisms in pure culture, it is not known whether or not the magnetoosomes in the newly discovered greigite-precipitating bacteria are of single-domain (SD) size, as are the magnetoosomes from magnetite-precipitating bacteria. The hypothesis of natural selection for magnetocrystalline behavior predicts that the greigite-bearing magnetoosomes should also be single magnetic domains. Using previously reported magnetic properties and crystallographic features for greigite, we have calculated the size and shape boundaries required for SD and superparamagnetic (SPM) behavior in this mineral. For further characterization of the greigite crystals, we analyzed the domain state at various length/width ratios assuming crystal shapes of parallelepipeds and prolate spheroids. Magnetite was used as control for the current theories supporting these calculations. We also present a simple algorithm to calculate the upper size limit of single-domain grains. Our results show that the crystals of bacterial greigite characterized so far are located in the region close to the single-domain superparamagnetic boundary and should have relatively low coercivity. If these crystals contribute to the magnetization of sediments, remanence produced by bacterial greigite could be mistaken for large, multidomain magnetite in alternating field demagnetization studies.

INTRODUCTION

Until recently, the mineral greigite was thought to form naturally by reduction of iron in H₂S rich sedimentary deposits where the low oxygen or redox potentials were the dominant environmental conditions [Spender et al., 1972; Demirrack, 1985; Bazyliński et al., 1988; Rosev et al., 1960; Hilchen, 1990; Tric et al., 1991]. Since Menn et al. [1990] and Rodgers et al. [1990] reported the discovery of several new types of microorganisms that precipitate greigite-bearing magnetoosomes, interest in the magnetic characterization of the bacterial greigite has been renewed because of its implications for paleomagnetism and bacterial evolution.

A related question of importance involves the selection advantage of bacterial magnetotaxis. Kirschvink and Lovewson [1979] first predicted that bacterial magnetosomes would fall within the single-domain size and shape boundaries calculated by Butler and Banerjee [1975]. Natural selection should gradually weed out strains producing small superparamagnetic crystals or larger multidomain particles, both of which would be less efficient at using geomagnetic navigation. All subsequent analyses of Fe₃O₄-bearing bacterial magnetosomes with transmission electron microscopy (TEM) have confirmed this prediction (reviewed by Chang and Kirschvink [1989]). The discovery of greigite-precipitating magnetotactic bacteria offers the potential to test this hypothesis on yet another ferrimagnetic mineral.

Although literature about greigite is scarce, Spender et al. [1972] measured important magnetic parameters of synthetic greigite samples, and these constitute the basis for our attempts to calculate the single-domain stability parameters for various crystal sizes. Evans and McElhinny [1969] and Butler and Banerjee [1975] have discussed the magnetic properties of small ferromagnetic particles (sulphide spheroids and parallelepipeds, respectively), and although a close relationship among size, shape, and coercivity can be observed with both approaches, significant differences reveal a strong dependence on the crystal morphology. Also, while Evans and McElhinny [1969] and Morris and Yu [1955] before them did not consider magnetocrystalline anisotropy, Butler and Banerjee [1975] developed a more detailed theoretical description of single-domain particles which was based on the calculations of the demagnetizing energies of rectangular blocks done by Rhodes and Rowlands [1954] and Amar [1958].

Since bacterial greigite (and magnetite) shows certain polymorphism from parallelepiped-like crystals [Heywood, 1990] to cubo-octahedral or irregular shapes [Rodgers et al., 1990], we have calculated the stability domain diagram of greigite for both the prolate spheroid and square-cross section parallelepiped shapes. Furthermore, the accompanying amorphous material that was always observed in bacterial [Menn et al., 1990; Rodgers et al., 1990] and synthetic greigite [Spender et al., 1972] makes it difficult to decide whether these crystals are bound by well-formed faces. We therefore tested the measured crystal dimensions against calculations for both shape types. We also used values of shape, size, and coercivity of needle-like grains of greigite reported recently by Snowball [1991] for adjusting the diagram to experimental data. The latter was also used as the main criterion to determine whether the coercivity of greigite is dominated by shape or magnetocrystalline anisotropy. Since there is no experimental measurement reported so far about the real value of K₁ for greigite, we used the value 10⁴ erg/cm² which agrees with the high magnetocrystalline anisotropy expected for greigite and fits experimental values of size, shape, and coercivity reported in the literature [Snowball and Thompson, 1988; 1990; Snowball, 1991]. Although the latter assumption disagrees with the value suggested by Spender et al. [1972] (10⁶ erg/cm²), it describes more accurately the magnetic properties of single-domain grains of greigite found in sediments.

CALCULATION OF THE SINGLE-DOMAIN
TO SUPERPARAMAGNETIC BOUNDARY

The calculation of the threshold size between superparamagnetic (SPM) and single-domain (SD) particles (the SD-SPM boundary, SDB) was carried out according to the approach of Butler and
Banerjee [1975]. It has been demonstrated [Néel, 1955] that the lower size limit of a stable single-domain can be calculated using the relaxation equation that shows the volume dependence of \( \tau \),

\[
\tau = \frac{1}{f_0} e^{\frac{v H_{Jc}}{2kT}}
\]

where \( \tau \) is the relaxation time, \( f_0 \) is the frequency factor (assumed to be \( 10^9 \text{s}^{-1} \)), \( v \) is the crystal volume, \( H_{Jc} \) the coercive force, \( k \) the Boltzman constant (\( 1.38 \times 10^{-23} \text{erg} \text{K}^{-1} \)), and \( J_s \) the saturation magnetization. Assuming that the main contribution to the coercive force comes from shape anisotropy for small grain sizes (<40 nm [Evans and McElhinny, 1969]), the coercive force due to shape anisotropy can be calculated by

\[
H_{Jc} = \alpha N \cdot J_s
\]

where \( \alpha \) is the difference between the demagnetization factor along the major \( (N_a) \) and minor axis \( (N_b) \).

\[
\Delta N = N_b - N_a
\]

Since the expressions of \( N_a \) and \( N_b \) depend on the geometry of the particle, the calculation of \( \Delta N \) will depend on whether the particles are prolate spheroids or parallelepipeds. For the prolate spheroids, \( N_a \) and \( N_b \) were calculated according to the analysis of Osbourn [1945], whereas for parallelepipeds the evaluation of the demagnetizing factors was based on Rhodes and Rolands [1954] and Amar [1958] (see Appendix 1). Defining \( \delta \) as the ratio between length and width \( (a/b) \) of a prismatic grain (or the major/minor axis of a prolate spheroid), the length of a particle can be expressed as a function of \( a \). By substituting (2) in (1) and after some rearrangement we obtain the expression

\[
S' = \left( \frac{12q^2 N}{\pi f_s^2 \cdot \Delta N} \right)^{1/2}
\]

where \( \Delta N = 2s - 6g (1, q) \)

We used (4) to estimate the superparamagnetic threshold of prolate spheroids with \( 3 \) substituting \( \Delta N \) and volume of the grain \( v = \pi a^2 b^2 q^2/6 \). For parallelepipeds, the volume of the particle was replaced by \( a^2 b^2 q^2 \) and \( \Delta N \) by (5) (typographical errors in the original paper of Butler and Banerjee [1975] were corrected) which was derived assuming \( 2N_b = 4a \cdot N_a \) with \( N_a(q) \) as shown in Appendix 1, and replacing into (3). The SD-SPM boundary was calculated at \( T = 290^\circ \text{K} \), with \( \tau = 100 \text{s} \), and \( J_s = 123 \text{emu/cm}^3 \) for greigite [Spender et al., 1972] and 480 emu/cm\(^3\) for magnetite [Butler and Banerjee, 1975].

### Calculation of the Single-Domain to Two-Domain Boundary

For prolate spheroids of greigite, the energetically stable upper size limit for the single-domain to two-domain (SD-2D) transition was calculated by equating the exchange energy involved in a circular spin configuration to the magnetostatic energy of a single-domain grain [Murrich and Yu, 1955]. Although this approach ignores magnetocrystalline anisotropy and assumes a circular spin configuration in the SD grains, it estimates adequately the magnetic properties of particles with axial ratios \( (q) \) less than 7 [Evans, 1972].

The expression used was

\[
\frac{a^2}{\ln \left[ 2.3 \cdot \ln^2 \frac{a}{q} - 1 \right]} = 24.72 \times 10^{-12} \cdot \frac{q^2}{N_a(q)}
\]

where \( q \) and \( a \) are referred to the ratio and major axis, respectively. The demagnetization factor \( N_a(q) \) was calculated for various values of \( q \) using (17) (see Appendix 1). In Figures 1 and 3 we indicate in solid lines the corresponding lines of SDB for greigite and magnetite at \( T = 290^\circ \text{K} \) and \( \tau = 100 \text{s} \).

The calculation of the SD-2D boundary line for square-cross section parallelepipeds was carried out following the method of Butler and Banerjee [1975]. This treatment assumes a negligible contribution of the magnetocrystalline anisotropy on the calculation of the total magnetic energy of a grain (i.e., \( 2\pi J_s^2 K_1 \geq 10 \)) and takes into account the magnetostatic energy of fully magnetized domains separated by a single-domain 180° boundary walls. For wall width \( \delta \) and the magnetostatic energy of the domain wall \( \sigma \), the dependence of the domain wall energy \( \sigma \) on the wall width \( \delta \) is

\[
\sigma = \frac{\sigma_0}{2} \left( \frac{\delta}{\delta_0} \right)^{1/2}
\]

where \( \sigma_0 \) and \( \delta_0 \) are the wall energy and wall width per unit of area of the extended medium [Amar, 1958].

If \( A \) is the exchange energy constant (in ergs per centimeter) and \( K_1 \) the first-order magnetocrystalline anisotropy constant (in ergs per cubic centimeter), the energy of a single-domain wall is

\[
\sigma_0 = 1.83 \sqrt{AK_1}
\]

For greigite, \( K_1 \) was assumed to be \( 10^5 \text{erg/cm}^3 \), compared to the accepted value of 1.3 \( 10^6 \text{erg/cm}^3 \) for magnetite [Banerjee and Moskowitz, 1953]. Estimates of \( A \) were made according to Galt [1952]. We used \( A \) equal to 1.0 \( 10^5 \) and 1.5 \( 10^5 \) for greigite and magnetite, respectively. The wall energy of greigite per unit of area, \( \sigma_0 \), is 0.17 erg/cm\(^2\). The values of \( A \) and \( K_1 \) for greigite were used for the calculation of the wall width \( \delta \), according to Butler and Banerjee [1975], where \( \delta_0 \) was 4.1 \( 10^3 \) for greigite and magnetite, respectively.

If we define \( \eta \) as the fraction of the grain width that corresponds to the wall width \( \delta = \eta \delta_0 \) and substitute in (7), the reduced wall energy per unit of volume [Amar, 1958]

\[
\eta = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_0} = \frac{\sigma_0}{2} \left( \frac{\delta}{\delta_0} \right)^{1/2}
\]

The reduced magnetostatic energy \( (\varepsilon_m) \) of a two-domain grain bearing a single-domain wall was calculated with Amar's [1958] \( g(p,q) \) function and Rhodes and Rolland's [1954] function \( f(p,q) \) (see Appendix 1). Accordingly, \( \varepsilon_m \) for square-cross-section parallelepiped grains as a function of \( \eta \) and \( q \) is

\[
\varepsilon_m = q \left[ (1+\eta) \frac{1+\eta}{2} + (1-\eta) \frac{1-\eta}{2} \right]
\]

\[
+ 4g \left[ \frac{1}{\eta^2} - 1 \cdot g\eta q - g(1,q) \right]
\]

Also, Rhodes and Rolland's [1954] have calculated the reduced energy of a fully magnetized parallelepiped \( \varepsilon_{SD} \) by using the function \( g(p,q) \) as follows

\[
\varepsilon_{SD} = \eta \cdot \frac{g(1,q)}{(1,q)}
\]

Using the expressions of \( \varepsilon_m, \varepsilon_{SD}, \) and \( g(p,q) \) as functions of \( \eta, q, \) and \( a \), we have determined the minimum reduced energy at various \( ab \) ratios of SD grains of greigite and magnetite by calculating the point at which \( \varepsilon_m + \varepsilon_w \) equals to \( \varepsilon_{SD} \) when \( \varepsilon_m + \varepsilon_w < \varepsilon_{SD} \) the two-domain configuration of the grain prevails.

Butler and Banerjee [1975] have proposed a scheme for the calculation of the SDB which consists in the successive evaluation of the minima values of the total energy associated with the particles of different widths, and equating with the energy of an identical fully magnetized grain. The resulting particle size gives the critical particle size attainable before becoming a two-domain grain. Although this method provides a reliable procedure for the calculation of the
SD-2D boundary, it is extremely tedious. For this reason we propose an alternative method which is much easier, faster, and entirely consistent with the Butler and Banerjee [1975] proposal.

The changes we suggest consist in a simple mathematical strategy that evaluates the length of the particle under a double constraint, namely, at the minimum value of the total reduced energy of a two-domain grain $e = e_m + e_w$ and at the value of $q$ that makes

$$e_{SD} = e_m + e_w$$

As the length of the particle $(a)$ is a variable only in the expression of $e_w$ (equation (9)), it allows us to calculate the minimum particle sizes attainable for different wall widths (evaluated through $\eta$) at the values of $q$ that satisfy (12). The latter condition is met by evaluating the minima of the partial derivative of (13) respect to $\eta$, as $q$ constant

$$a = \left(\frac{\sigma_0 \delta \eta^3}{n \ell \delta r^2 - (\ell \delta r^2) \cdot 2 \sigma_0 \eta^2}\right)^{1/2}$$

After some mathematical manipulations we come up with (14) which is ultimately only a function of $\eta$ and $q$.

$$4q \delta_r J_2^2 \cdot g(\eta,q) = 2\eta \psi \frac{j_1}{j_1} \cdot \Delta t$$

where

$$\Delta t(\eta,q) = \left[\frac{\Delta e_m(\eta,q)}{\Delta \eta}\right]_q$$

From (14) we calculate the wall widths when the minimum length is established for various $q$, and the minimum lengths are recalculated with (13) using the corresponding values of $\eta$ and $q$. Further details of this calculation are given in Appendix 2.

CALCULATION OF THE COERCIVITIES FOR DIFFERENT GRAIN SIZE

The calculation of the bulk coercivity ($H_B$) of particles of greigite of different sizes was conducted according to Evans and McElhinny [1969]. Equation (16) was evaluated for different values of $a$ and $q$, and the expression of volume $(v)$ was also changed depending on whether the grain under consideration was a prolate spheroid $(a^2/l^2 q)$ or a square cross-section parallelepiped $(a^2/l^2 q)$.

$$H_B = H_C \left(\frac{2kT}{h} + \frac{Q}{s} \right)^{1/2}$$

where $H_B$ is the coercivity required to unblock the magnetic dipole of a grain, $H_C$ is the theoretical or microscopic coercivity, and $Q$ a numerical value equal to 22 [Evans and McElhinny, 1969]. Also, the values used for $H_C$ were calculated according to (2) and (3) taking into account the shape of the grains.

RESULTS

Figures 1 and 2 show the stability diagrams of single-domain crystals of greigite for prolate spheroids and rectangular parallelepipeds, respectively. Within the diagrams we have located the position of biogenic greigite crystals, reported by Heywood et al. [1990]. Figure 1 shows that, if the bacterial greigite grains are prolate spheroids, they would be superparamagnetic and would not have a magnetic moment locked in any particular orientation. The superparamagnetic grains would have relaxation times ($\tau$) of the order of nanoseconds (Figure 1). However, if the same bacterial greigite grain were prismatic in shape, Figure 2 implies that they would fall into the SD region with an estimated bulk coercivity of 4 mT, though close to the SD-SFM boundary. Also, we have included in the diagram presented in Figure 2, the location of SD needle-like grains of greigite (10-100 mm long) that showed coercivities higher than 50 mT reported by Snowball [1991].

Because we used an iterative computational method for calculating all the lines presented in Figures 1 and 2, we tested the algorithms for magnetite, comparing to previous calculations as a control. In Figures 3 and 4 we present our results for prolate spheroids and
worthwhile to include them on Figure 4 here. Note that the SD field for the prolate spheroids (Figure 3) occurs at larger crystal dimensions than for the parallelepipeds (Figure 4). It could be explained simply because a parallelepiped has nearly twice (6x) the volume of a square spheroid of the same dimensions, or by the effect of the magnetic circular spin configuration assumed in this model. If a magnetic circular spin array takes place, it will contribute to a higher stabilization of the SD grain, so a larger crystal would be needed to develop a boundary wall. However, a circular spin structure is energetically unfavorable in greedite and magnetite because of their high magnetocrystalline anisotropies [McElhinny, 1979].

From Figures 1-4 we conclude that the magnetic characteristics of SD particles of biogenic greedite and magnetite are more consistent with prismatic than with ellipsoidal particles. We have accordingly estimated the maximum size of a cubic SD particle (dₚ) and have calculated the bulk coercivity (Hₛ) of bacterial greedite assuming that they are indeed square cross-section parallelepipeds. From Figures 2 and 4 we estimate the maximum SD size of a cubic grain at the SD-2D boundary (dₚ) to be 0.25 and 0.082 μm for greedite and magnetite respectively. While we have no previous estimates of dₚ for greedite for comparison, the value of dₚ for magnetite agrees fairly well with previous reports [Worm et al., 1991] that suggest 0.076 μm [Butler and Banerjee, 1975] and 0.096 μm [Wyn and Dunlop, 1989]. The values of dₚ estimated when the particles were considered prolate ellipsoids are 0.23 μm and 0.21 μm for greedite and magnetite, respectively (Figures 1 and 3).

In Figure 5 we show in greater detail the lower-right hand corner of Figure 2, with the locations of crystals of greedite reported by Rodgers et al. [1990] and Heywood et al. [1990]. The crystals fall

---

**Fig. 3.** Single-domain stability diagram for different shapes of prolate spheroid grains of magnetite. SD-PM boundary (SPB) and SD-2D boundary (SDB) were calculated using Jₑ = 480 emu/cm³, τ = 100 s, and T = 290°K. Coercivities (Hₛ) are expressed in milliteslas. The shaded oval represents the location of a single-domain crystal of magnetite assuming a minor/major axis ratio (1/μ) equal to 0.8 and length a = 0.05 μm [Mann et al., 1987b]. Neglecting the magnetocrystalline anisotropy and for a spherical grain (1/μ = 1), aₚ is 0.21 μm. The dashed line represents the SPB line that contains the grain of magnetite and corresponds to either T = 290°K and τ = 10⁻⁶ s or T = 1,20°K and τ = 10³ s.

**Fig. 4.** Single-domain stability diagram for magnetite prisms. SD-PM boundary (SPB) and SD-2D boundary (SDB) were calculated using Jₑ = 123 emu/cm³, τ = 100 s, and T = 290°K. Coercivities (Hₛ) are expressed in milliteslas. The square represents the location of an average single-domain crystal of magnetite assuming an axial ratio (1/μ) equal to 0.8, length a = 0.05 μm [Mann et al., 1987b], and bulk coercivity Hₛ = 30 mT [Mann et al., 1987a]. Assuming values of σₓ and δₓ as mentioned above, for a cubic grain, aₚ is 0.082 μm.

**Fig. 5.** Detailed single-domain stability diagram of greedite parallelepipeds. Coercivities (Hₛ) from 10 to 2 milliteslas were calculated for various shapes and sizes of greedite grains. Single-domain to superparamagnetic boundary (SPB) lines were calculated using Jₑ = 123 emu/cm³, τ = 100 s, and T = 290°K (solid line) and T = 77°K (dashed line). Square a represents the location of a well-defined grain of greedite with axial ratio (1/μ) equal to 0.70 and length a = 0.07 μm [Heywood et al., 1990]. The bulk coercivity corresponding to the grain (square a) is Hₛ = 4 mT. Square b depicts a well-defined cuboidal crystal found in other type of bacteria with 1/μ = 0.95 and a = 0.067 μm [Heywood et al., 1990]. Square c represents the location of a less well defined grain of greedite observed within magnetosomes of other bacteria with axial ratio about 1/μ = 0.94 and length a = 0.09 μm (includes the crystalline plus the amorphous material) [Rodgers et al., 1990]. Square d depicts the location of only the crystalline structure observed in the latter greedite magnetosomes, with 1/μ = 0.95 and a = 0.045 μm [Rodgers et al., 1990].
in two different regions depending on the shape of the grains. The cubic crystalline (we assumed $1/q = 0.95$ for better illustration) fall in the superparamagnetic field (square b), whereas the more elongate particles are in the region of single-domain particles (square a). For cubicoidal grains located on the SD-SPM boundary, measurements of coercivity would fail at room temperature (290°-300°K), whereas measurements of the coercivity would be possible at the lower temperatures used by Spender et al. [1972] as a consequence of the downward shift of the SD-SPM transition. Figure 5 also shows the location of the less defined greigite crystal observed by Rodgers et al. [1990] in the “many-cellled prokaryote” (square d in Figure 5). This “mulberry-like prokaryote” presents magnetosomes loaded with crystalline (~45 nm) and amorphous phases (20 nm width), both identified as greigite. While the whole magnetosome (crystalline plus amorphous phases, 85-90 nm) could be located close to the S region (square c) (assuming $1/q = 0.93$), the crystalline structure (square d) that would truly contribute to the magnetic coercivity falls below the SBP calculated at 77°K (Figure 5). For the latter (square d), measurements of coercivity would need temperatures below 50°K.

In Figure 6, we show the influence of the shape and size of greigite and magnetite grains on the width ($\tau_1$) of the single-domain 180° boundary walls. Although the values of $J_2$ and $K_1$ for greigite and magnetite are significantly different, the widths of the walls show identical behavior for different size and shape of the grains. For values of $\sigma_o$ and $\delta_o$ corresponding to higher $K_1$ the wall boundary width decreases (results not shown). We also show in Figure 6 that for greigite and magnetite the largest boundary wall is developed in cubic particles with a maximum width of 55-57% of the grain width.

As we mentioned above, we have used estimates of the exchange energy ($A$) and magnetocrystalline anisotropy ($K_1$) constants for the calculation of $\delta_o$ and $\sigma_o$ (equations (7) and (8)) because of the lack of any experimental values. For this reason we used the routine described here to study the influence of $\delta_o$ and $\sigma_o$ on the position of the SD 2D boundary. In this way to see how sensitive the boundary is to these parameters. In Figure 7 we present the effect of varying $\sigma_o$ on this boundary and in Figure 8 the influence of various values of $\delta_o$ on it. From both figures we see that the influence of $\sigma_o$ and $\delta_o$ is exerted only for larger crystals of greigite, which would corre-

![Fig. 7. Single-domain to two-domain boundary (SDB) of prismatic greigite grains as function of the axial ratio (width/length) and for different values of the wall energy $\sigma_o$. For the calculation we used the parameter values indicated in Figure 2, $\delta_o = 4.1 \times 10^4$ cm$^{-1}$, and $\sigma_o$ equal to 0.17, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0 from lower to upper line, respectively.](image)

![Fig. 8. Single-domain to two-domain boundary (SDB) of prismatic greigite grains as function of the axial ratio (width/length) and for different values of the wall width of the extended medium $\delta_o$. For the calculation we used the parameter values indicated in Figure 2, $\sigma_o = 0.17$ erg/cm$^2$, and $\delta_o$ equal to 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, and $4.0 \times 10^{-5}$ cm from lower to upper line, respectively.](image)

**DISCUSSION**

Although the influence of the shape of the particles (prolate spheroids or square-cross section prisms) is relatively small for magnetite (Figures 3 and 4), it affects significantly the stability diagram of greigite regardless the particular values of $\sigma_o$ and $\sigma_o$. Hence the surface morphology of a greigite crystal is important, since the magnetic properties change a great amount. Also, Figures 1 and 3 show that the circular spin configuration assumed for calculating the
SD-2D boundary in prolate spheroids [Morrish and Yu, 1955] is inappropriate for these materials that have very high values of magnetocristalline anisotropy (K₁) [McElhinny, 1979]. Although Moon and Merrill [1988] have applied a more accurate approach for the calculation of the total reduced magnetic energy for a prolate spheroid without the incorporation of a circular spin configuration, we concluded that the bulk coercivity of bacterial greigite could be better estimated if we assume the particles are parallelepipeds. We have estimated a Hcₘ = 4.0 ± 0.5 mT for the longer particles, whereas the rounded or cubic grains fell into the superparamagnetic region close to the SD-SPM boundary showing a relaxation time τ = 10⁻³ s.

The high value of K₁ of greigite assumed by Spender [1972] of 10⁶ erg/cm² is incompatible with more recent experimental data of Hcₘ of greigite. If K₁ were of the order of 10⁶, the values of σₐ, σₜ, coercivity, and SD-SPM boundaries would all be different. The changes would suggest that the phenomenon of magnetization will be totally dominated by magnetocristalline anisotropy (2πK₁/2K₁ ≈ 0.1) and the formation of two-domain particles will be a highly unfavorable process even for very large crystals. Furthermore, it would be possible to observe at room temperature SD particles as small as 10 nm; this is rather unlikely and in fact contradicts the observation of Uda [1968] when he was unable to determine the coercivity of synthetic greigites of sizes ranging from 30 to 50 nm. Although the degree of uncertainty incorporated by the assumption of K₁ and the estimates of σₐ and σₜ, modify the values of dₖ and the precision location of the SD-2D line (SDB), it will not alter our conclusions concerning the location of bacterial greigite grains within the lower part of the domain diagram.

Our results allow us to explain the unsuccessful attempts to measure the coercivity of synthetic greigite [Uda, 1968], the increasing of coercivities at lower temperatures [Spender et al., 1972] and the lower remanent magnetization observed in bacterial enrichments [Mann et al., 1990, Rodgers et al., 1990] that did not form a packed pellete close to a magnetic bar, as it is usually observed in other strongly magnetite organisms (magnetite precipitating bacteria) [Blakemore, 1975; Moench and Konetska, 1978].

The slight discrepancy between our result of dₖ (0.082 μm) for magnetite and the value reported by Butler and Banerjee [1975] (0.076 μm) is not easy to explain because the routine we used is based largely on their analysis. Our procedure, however, does not involve a graphical minimization, and this may explain this minor difference.

Finally, for paleomagnetic studies our results suggest that alternating field demagnetization may be one of the simplest ways of removing a greigite magnetic component from a sample with several magnetic minerals present.

APPENDIX 1

The expressions used for the calculation of demagnetizing factor of prolate spheroids were obtained from Osborn [1945].

\[
Na(q) = \frac{1}{4} \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{q}{\sqrt{q^2 - 1}} \right) \ln \frac{q + \sqrt{q^2 - 1}}{q - \sqrt{q^2 - 1}} \right]
\]

\[
Nb(q) = \frac{q}{2(q^2 - 1)} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{q + \sqrt{q^2 - 1}}{q - \sqrt{q^2 - 1}} \right]
\]

The demagnetizing factors of parallelepipeds were calculated according to Butler and Banerjee [1975],

\[
N(\eta) = 4 \cdot g \cdot (1, q)
\]

where, from Amar [1958],

\[
g(p, q) = \frac{F(p, 0) - F(p, q)}{p q}
\]

and, from Rhodes and Rowlands [1954],

\[
F(p, q) = q^2 \sinh^{-1} \left[ \frac{p}{\sqrt{p^2 + q^2}} \right] + p(1 - q^2) \cosh^{-1} \left[ \frac{p}{\sqrt{1 + q^2}} \right] + \frac{p q^2}{q} \sinh^{-1} \left[ \frac{q}{p} \right] + \frac{q^2}{q} \sinh^{-1} \left[ \frac{q}{p} \right] + 2 \mu_0 \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{q}{p} \sqrt{1 + q^2} \right] + \left( \frac{1}{3} p^2 - 2 q^2 \right) \sqrt{1 + p^2 + q^2} + \left( \frac{1}{3} p^2 - 2 q^2 \right) \sqrt{1 + q^2} + \left( \frac{1}{3} q^2 - 2 p^2 \right) \sqrt{q^2 + p^2} - \pi d_a \left( \frac{2}{5} q^3 \right)
\]

\[
(21)
\]

APPENDIX 2

The expression of the total reduced energy of a grain eₘ + eₜ satisfying one of the boundary conditions can be written as

\[
F(\eta, q, a) - \epsilon_m(\eta, q) + \epsilon_t(\eta, q, a) = \eta
\]

and according to (13), a can be written as

\[
a = G(\eta, q)
\]

Therefore, applying the second boundary condition, we get

\[
\left[ \frac{\partial a}{\partial \eta} \right]_q = \left[ \frac{\partial G(\eta, q)}{\partial \eta} \right]_q = 0
\]

After some manipulation we obtained (14) mentioned above,

\[
\left[ \frac{\partial \epsilon_m(\eta, q)}{\partial \eta} \right]_q = q \cdot g \left[ \frac{\eta}{q} \right] + \eta \cdot E - g \left[ \frac{1 - \eta}{2} \right] \cdot (1 - \eta) \cdot D + g \left[ \frac{1 + \eta}{2} \right] \cdot (1 + \eta) \cdot C - g(\eta, q) \cdot \eta \cdot B
\]

and

\[
B = \left[ \frac{\partial G(\eta, q)}{\partial \eta} \right]_q
\]

\[
C = \left[ \frac{\partial \epsilon_t(\eta, q, a)}{\partial \eta} \right]_q
\]

\[
D = \left[ \frac{\partial \epsilon_m(\eta, q)}{\partial \eta} \right]_q
\]

\[
E = \left[ \frac{\partial \epsilon_t(\eta, q, a)}{\partial \eta} \right]_q
\]

The evaluation of the coefficients B · E implies the evaluation of (30) for p and q taking the corresponding expression shown in (26)-(29).

\[
\left[ \frac{\partial F(p, q)}{\partial \eta} \right]_q
\]

(30)

Because the derivations for the coefficients B · E are too cumbersome, they are not presented here. These derivations, as well as IBM-based MATHCAD routines, are available upon request.
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