

Tests of magnetic Hamiltonians for CaV_4O_9

Martin P. Gelfand

Department of Physics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

Rajiv R. P. Singh

Department of Physics, University of California, Davis, California 95616

We study the uniform magnetic susceptibility and spin-gap for recently proposed Heisenberg model Hamiltonians for CaV_4O_9 based on the orbital ordering scenario of Marini and Khomskii and the LDA calculations of Pickett. We argue that the experimentally observed uniform susceptibility data is inconsistent with the weakly coupled dimer picture of Marini and Khomskii. The model proposed by Pickett can, with appropriate choice of parameters, lead to an explanation for the the observed gap and uniform susceptibility. The resulting agreement with experiments is of a similar quality to previously studied models. We argue that this new model is best distinguished from previous ones by neutron or Raman scattering experiments, via the location of the excitation minimum in the Brillouin zone and by the possible existence or non-existence of sharply defined singlet excitations.

The observation of spin gaps in the calcium vanadates, especially in the quasi-2D material CaV_4O_9 , has attracted much attention. A number of theoretical papers have explored the compatibility of the experimental data with various model spin Hamiltonians. Ignoring some out-of-plane distortions, a given layer of these materials forms a one-fifth depleted square lattice with a four-spin unit cell (see Fig. 1). It is by now well established that a uniformly nearest-neighbor coupled, one-fifth depleted square-lattice Heisenberg model has long range magnetic order.¹⁻⁴ Thus the spin gap has been argued to arise either (i) from non-uniform couplings which can lead to weakly coupled plaquettes or (ii) from frustrating second-neighbor interactions, which destabilize the Néel order. Either situation leads to a “plaquette RVB” (PRVB) ground state, and lies in the same $T = 0$ phase as a Hamiltonian which contains only intraplaquette nearest-neighbor interactions. Based on extensive comparison of the experimental susceptibility and spin gap with theoretical models, it was argued by Gelfand *et al.*^{3,5} that the experimental data is best supported by the latter scenario, with the second-neighbor interactions roughly half the nearest-neighbor interactions.

In a recent paper, Marini and Khomskii⁶ suggest that the magnetic properties of the vanadates $\text{CaV}_n\text{O}_{2n+1}$ (with $n = 2, 3, 4$) are determined principally by orbital ordering and associated structural distortions. These considerations lead to rather different spin Hamiltonians than those considered by most authors previously,^{7,8} who neglected the orbital degrees of freedom. To leading

order Marini and Khomskii find the system to be a set of weakly coupled dimers.

In another recent paper, Pickett⁹ has used LDA calculations to study the magnetic properties of CaV_4O_9 . His most interesting conclusion is that the relevant orbitals are $d_{x^2-y^2}$ — different from the ones considered by Marini and Khomskii. Furthermore, he argues that out-of-plane distortions in the arrangement of the vanadium atoms are quite important. The one-fifth depleted square lattice of vanadium atoms is actually made up of two (planar) layers, slightly above and below one ab -plane, and each forming a square lattice of “meta-plaquettes.” These meta-plaquettes are to be distinguished from the plaquettes considered before by Ueda *et al.*⁸ and other authors in the “plaquette RVB” (PRVB) scenario. The plaquettes involve nearest-neighbor spins, two of them lying in the upper layer and two in the lower layer. In this case, a significant second-neighbor interaction is expected within the plaquettes. In contrast, the meta-plaquettes of Pickett lie either entirely in the upper or entirely in the lower layer. Pickett argues that although the spins within a meta-plaquette are further apart than spins between two neighboring meta-plaquettes, various quantum-chemical arguments conspire to make the interactions within meta-plaquettes the strongest. He finds that to leading approximation the magnetic system should be regarded as decoupled meta-plaquettes. One important point to note is that within a meta-plaquette the interactions are expected to be primarily between neighboring spins only.

The aim of this paper is to examine the consistency of the above two scenarios with existing and prospective experimental data on CaV_4O_9 . Neither Marini and Khomskii nor Pickett provide quantitative estimates for all the relevant exchange constants. Within their scenarios one might easily consider a four parameter Hamiltonian in each case. In the interest of simplicity and because our main conclusions are unaffected by the number of parameters, we have considered only a two-parameter Hamiltonian in both cases.

First we consider the proposal of Marini and Khomskii. They suggest that the spins in CaV_4O_9 form antiferromagnetic dimers with exchange interaction J approximately equal to the observed triplet gap, a bit larger than 100 K. If the inter-dimer interactions are neglected then the susceptibility follows $\chi(T) \propto T^{-1}/(e^{J/T} + 3)$. This form is shown as the dashed line in Fig. 2 and compared with the data of Taniguchi *et al.*¹⁰ (solid line). Here we have chosen J and the normalization for the susceptibil-

ity so that the different curves coincide at the maximum. The two curves are clearly inconsistent. Including the “corner” exchange constants (shown by thin solid lines in Fig. 1), suggested to be the second most important by Marini and Khomskii, leads to an alternating spin-chain Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = J \sum_i (\mathbf{S}_{2i} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2i+1} + a \mathbf{S}_{2i+1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2i+2}) . \quad (1)$$

Here $a = 0$ corresponds to the dimer limit. Accurate calculations for this model are possible by finite-size diagonalization.¹¹ Once again we adjust the exchange constants and the g -factors to make the theoretical susceptibility coincide with the experimental data at its peak. As shown in Fig. 2, increasing a to 0.5 still leaves one far from agreement with the data. It should be noted that much better fits are obtained within the PRVB scenario³. One can trace the inconsistency of the alternating chain model with the susceptibility data to the fact that the model’s Curie constant is $J(1+a)/4$, which implies a much larger J value than what is needed to account for the gap.

We now turn to the scenario presented by Pickett. Here the leading exchange constant J couples spins within a meta-plaquette. The second most significant interaction is that between nearest-neighbor vanadium spins. These are the nearest-neighbor plaquette and dimer interactions of Ueda *et al.* (shown by thick solid and dashed lines in Fig. 1), and we take them to be equal to each other. They couple spins on neighboring meta-plaquettes with three terms in the Hamiltonian. Let these interactions be of strength λJ . The spin-gap for this model as a function of λ is calculated via perturbation theory to be

$$\Delta/J = 1 - (2/3)\lambda - 0.25347222\lambda^2 - 0.048747749\lambda^3 - 0.069181496\lambda^4 - 0.030457074\lambda^5 + O(\lambda^6) . \quad (2)$$

Dlog-Padé approximants suggest that this model orders magnetically at $\lambda_c \approx 0.88$, with a gap exponent approximately 0.7, consistent with a $d = 3$ Heisenberg universality class. The Curie-Weiss constant for the model is given by $J(1+3\lambda/2)/2$. Thus the observed gap and Curie-Weiss constant can both be accounted for with $J \approx 220K$ and $\lambda \approx 0.6$. We note that these parameters will change if interactions between second neighbor metaplaquettes (that is, metaplaquettes in the same layer) are considered or if the nearest-neighbor dimer and plaquette interactions are unequal. However, the quality of the agreement with the high temperature susceptibility data is likely to be similar to that obtained within the PRVB scenario. The high temperature susceptibility is determined by the Curie-Weiss constant and the g -factor. Just as in previous fits within the PRVB scenario, g -values smaller than 2 (roughly 1.7) will be needed to fit the data.

The question remains as to whether one can experimentally distinguish a weakly coupled meta-plaquette scenario from a PRVB phase stabilized by frustration

scenario. One approach is to measure the dispersion of triplet elementary excitations. In Pickett’s model, the interactions between neighboring meta-plaquettes are two plaquette couplings and one dimer coupling. Assuming those two types of couplings to have equal strength, as in our derivation of Eq. (2), leads to a spectrum in which the gap minimum occurs at wavevector $(0, 0)$. (Note that this corresponds to incipient two-sublattice order, not incipient ferromagnetism, due to the geometry of the meta-plaquettes.) The dimer couplings would need to be nearly twice as strong as the plaquette couplings in order for the gap minimum to occur elsewhere in the Brillouin zone. In the PRVB scenario considered earlier the gap minimum most likely lies at an incommensurate wavevector, or possibly at (π, π) . Thus inelastic magnetic neutron scattering experiments may help to distinguish between these cases. Frustrating interactions within plaquettes can lead to sharply defined singlet excitations,^{5,13} which are absent in Pickett’s model. Thus Raman scattering can also help distinguish between the two scenarios.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Dr. Daniel Khomskii and Dr. Warren Pickett for communicating their results to us prior to publication. This work is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grants No. DMR-94-57928 (MPG) and DMR-96-16574 (RRPS).

-
- ¹ M. Troyer, H. Kontani, and K. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3822 (1996).
 - ² S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3633 (1996).
 - ³ M. P. Gelfand *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2794 (1996).
 - ⁴ O. A. Starykh *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2558 (1996).
 - ⁵ Z. Weihong, M. P. Gelfand, R. R. P. Singh, J. Oitmaa and C. Hamer, to appear in Phys. Rev. B.
 - ⁶ S. Marini and D. I. Khomskii, cond-mat/9703130.
 - ⁷ K. Sano and K. Takano, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65**, 46 (1996).
 - ⁸ K. Ueda, H. Kontani, M. Sigrist, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1932 (1996).
 - ⁹ W. E. Pickett, cond-mat/9704203.
 - ¹⁰ S. Taniguchi *et al.*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **64**, 2758 (1995).
 - ¹¹ W. Duffy, Jr., and K. P. Barr, Phys. Rev. **165**, 647 (1965).
 - ¹² H. Kodama *et al.*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65**, 1941 (1996).
 - ¹³ M. Albrecht, F. Mila and D. Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 15856 (1996).

FIG. 1. One-fifth depleted square lattice representing vanadium spins associated with one ab -plane of CaV_4O_9 . The shaded circles represent vanadium atoms slightly above the plane and the open circles represent vanadium atoms slightly below the plane. The thick solid lines represent the elementary plaquettes of Ueda *et al.* The thin dashed lines represent the meta-plaquettes of Pickett. In Marini and Khomskii's picture the largest interactions are the "dimer interactions" shown here by thick dashed lines and the second largest ones are the "corner" interactions, shown by thin solid lines. In Pickett's picture the largest interactions are the metaplaquette interactions shown by the thin dashed lines and the second most important interactions are the dimer and plaquette interactions shown by the thick dashed and solid lines respectively.

FIG. 2. Uniform susceptibility for CaV_4O_9 compared with the alternating spin-chain model with $a = 0$ (dimer limit) and $a = 0.5$. The exchange constant and the normalization for the susceptibility are scaled to make the curves coincide at their maxima.



