

The Herbertsmithite Hamiltonian: μ SR measurements on single crystals

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2011 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 23 164207

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0953-8984/23/16/164207>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 132.68.74.3

The article was downloaded on 11/06/2013 at 12:28

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

The Herbertsmithite Hamiltonian: μ SR measurements on single crystals

Oren Ofer¹, Amit Keren², Jess H Brewer³, Tianheng H Han⁴ and Young S Lee⁴

¹ TRIUMF, 4004 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, BC, V6T2A3, Canada

² Department of Physics, Technion, Haifa 32000, Israel

³ Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, V6T1Z1, Canada

⁴ Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

E-mail: oren@triumf.ca

Received 29 October 2010, in final form 16 December 2010

Published 6 April 2011

Online at stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/23/164207

Abstract

We present transverse field muon spin rotation/relaxation measurements on single crystals of the spin-1/2 kagome antiferromagnet Herbertsmithite. We find that the spins are more easily polarized when the field is perpendicular to the kagome plane. We demonstrate that the difference in magnetization between the different directions cannot be accounted for by Dzyaloshinskii–Moriya-type interactions alone and that anisotropic axial interaction is present.

(Some figures in this article are in colour only in the electronic version)

After many years of searching for a good model compound for the spin-1/2 antiferromagnetic kagome magnet, it seems that the community is converging on Herbertsmithite, $\text{ZnCu}_3(\text{OH})_6\text{Cl}_2$, as the system closest to the ideal. Recently, a major skepticism was removed when it was shown that the Zn ions in single crystals do not reside in the kagome plane [1]. However, it is not yet clear what exactly is the Hamiltonian controlling the behavior of this system. Are the interactions isotropic or not? Is the Dzyaloshinskii–Moriya (DM) interaction [2] relevant?

To address these questions the research must proceed to single crystals. These are available, but their size is still small, limiting the experiments available for them. The high transverse field muon spin rotation (μ SR) technique is capable of overcoming this size problem, since the high field helps focus the muon beam onto the small crystals. Here we report such measurements. We find that the magnetic response of Herbertsmithite is very anisotropic. We then analyze the magnetization data and show that a non-isotropic diagonal interaction must be present in $\text{ZnCu}_3(\text{OH})_6\text{Cl}_2$.

Pioneering measurements on Herbertsmithite indicated a Curie–Weiss (CW) temperature $\theta = -314$ K and a broad deviation from the high temperature CW behavior starting at $T \approx 75$ K. The nearest-neighbor super-exchange interaction leads to a coupling of $J \approx 190$ K [3]. Extensive measurements on powder samples have found no evidence for long-range

magnetic ordering or spin freezing down to 20 mK [4, 5] or a gap to excitations [6, 7]. A recent Raman spectroscopic study on single crystals gives further evidence for a gapless spin liquid state [8]. Analysis of electron spin resonance spectra using DM interactions only suggests a sizable DM vector of $D_z = 15$ K [9]. Nuclear magnetic resonance spectra, analyzed again using DM interactions only, but with the addition of defects arising from site exchange, claimed $11 \leq D \leq 19$ K [10]. However, magnetization measurements on oriented powders discovered a dramatic difference in the magnetization between different directions [11] and demonstrated that DM is not the only perturbation to the Heisenberg Hamiltonian. The measurements performed here on single crystals are a clear improvement on the experiments with oriented powders.

The single crystals were measured by x-ray diffraction using a Bruker D8 AXS single-crystal diffractometer in order to reveal their crystallographic axes. Subsequently a mosaic of six single crystals was created. In the mosaic, the \hat{c} axis was off by a few degrees between crystals, and we did not manage to keep a particular orientation of the a – b plane. One face of a crystal is shown in the inset of figure 1. In general, all faces had similar sizes and the crystal's shape is closer to a cube rather than a slab or a needle. The dark lines seen on the crystal are likely cracks or uneven steps: however, x-ray refinement does find a single phase. The \hat{c} axis of the crystal is the direction perpendicular to the kagome plane.




Figure 1. The temperature dependence of (a) the muon frequency shift K (errors are smaller than the symbol) and (b) relaxation rate $1/T_2^*$ for two orientations of the crystals (filled symbols for $\vec{H} \parallel \hat{c}$ and hollow for $\vec{H} \perp \hat{c}$). The solid line represent a Curie-Weiss-type law. The inset shows a typical crystal.

The mosaic, held by a thin Mylar tape, was placed onto a low-background sample holder in the M15 surface muon channel at TRIUMF, Canada. Transverse field (TF) μ SR spectra, where the field is applied perpendicular to the muon spin direction, were gathered in the T range between 2 and 250 K in a constant field of $\mu_0 H = 4$ T. Thereafter, the mosaic was rotated by 90° to probe the second orientation of the crystals. A TF μ SR experiment is a sensitive probe of the magnetization M of the specimen through the precession frequency of the muon spin. The frequency shift $K^{\alpha\alpha}(T)$ for a field in the α direction is proportional to M^α/H^α , defined here as $\chi^{\alpha\alpha}(T)$. However, it should be noted that the ratio of shifts in different directions is not the same as the ratio of susceptibilities in those directions, since the shift is also determined by the muon spin to electronic spin coupling. This coupling has a significant dipolar character.

Figure 2 depicts the Fourier transforms of the μ SR data obtained at $T \leq 40$ K. At the highest T (not shown) a symmetric peak at 542.1 MHz is seen for both field orientations. Below 150 K the peak becomes asymmetric (not shown). Below 40 K, two clear peaks show up in the $\vec{H} \parallel \hat{c}$ measurement (panel (a)). This happens only at 20 K in the $\vec{H} \perp \hat{c}$ measurement (panel (b)). In both cases, the emerging lower intensity peak appears below 542.1 MHz. As the temperature is lowered, the low intensity peak in the $\vec{H} \parallel \hat{c}$ spectrum shifts to even lower frequencies and broadens. In contrast, the low intensity peak for $\vec{H} \perp \hat{c}$ smears out quickly, and is unseen at




Figure 2. The temperature dependence of the Fourier transform of the μ SR asymmetry data in a field of 4 T. (a) The spectra obtained when the field \vec{H} is parallel to the \hat{c} axis, which is normal to the mosaic (and thus to the kagome plane). (b) The spectra obtained when the field \vec{H} is perpendicular to the \hat{c} axis.

2 K. The high intensity peak does not shift in either case. The solid vertical lines help assess the shift. The low frequency peaks can be assigned to muons that are influenced by the magnetic kagome planes, since such a wipe out of the signal is typical of the slowing down of spin fluctuations, which is expected as T decreases.

Raw data in the time domain for $T = 2$ and 250 K are shown in figure 3. These data are presented in a rotating reference frame of 539 MHz. The vertical line indicates that in the $\vec{H} \perp \hat{c}$ case (panel (a)) no change in the rotation frequency is detected and only an increase in the relaxation is observed. In the $\vec{H} \parallel \hat{c}$ case (panel (b)) the frequency does shift and the relaxation increases. The reason for the apparent increase in the frequency in figure 3(b) is that in the time domain one sees the mean frequency. In the $\vec{H} \parallel \hat{c}$ case the mean frequency shifts upward since the low frequency peak diminishes faster than the high frequency peak. This is not the case for $\vec{H} \perp \hat{c}$. In light of the Fourier transform the function

$$A_{TF}(t) = A_{\parallel,\perp} \exp\left(-\sqrt{t/T_{2,\perp}^*}\right) \cos(\omega_{\parallel,\perp} t + \varphi_{\parallel,\perp}) + A_2 \exp(-(\sigma t)^2/2) \cos(\omega_2 t + \varphi_2) \quad (1)$$

is fitted to these data globally. The fit is also shown in figure 3 using solid lines. The two terms represent an oscillating signal relaxing as a root exponential, originating from the kagome planes, and a Gaussian-relaxing signal stemming from a paramagnetic site. A , T_2^* , σ and ω are the corresponding




Figure 3. μ SR data in the time domain using a rotating reference frame of 539 MHz, for the two different field directions and two different temperatures: 250 and 2 K. (a) $\vec{H} \perp \hat{c}$; no shift is detected between the two temperatures, but an increase in relaxation is observed. (b) $\vec{H} \parallel \hat{c}$; a shift in the frequency and increase in relaxation are observed. The solid lines are fits of equation (1) to the data. The solid vertical line shows when a shift is present and when it is not.

asymmetry, relaxation times, relaxation rate and frequencies for each peak in each geometry, respectively. The total asymmetry is a common parameter in the global fit. The ratio $A_{\parallel,\perp}/A_2 = 3(1)$ indicates that most muons sense the kagome planes. The very fast relaxation at early times makes the data in the time domain look as if some asymmetry is lost. This translates to a reduced Fourier amplitude in figure 2 upon cooling. A fit in the time domain with a fixed $A_{TF}(0)$ for all temperatures overcomes this problem.

In figure 1(a) we plot the frequency shift, $K_{\parallel,\perp} = (\omega_2 - \omega_{\parallel,\perp})/\omega_2$, versus temperature. The shifts K_{\parallel} and K_{\perp} behave very differently with decreasing temperature. K_{\parallel} increases rapidly with decreasing T below 100 K and reaches 800 ppm at 2 K. In contrast, K_{\perp} fluctuates and is very small. The behavior of K_{\perp} is not understood at the moment; however, the temperature average $\overline{K_{\perp}(T)} = -30(50)$ ppm hints that these might be muon site fluctuations. K_{\parallel} is an order of magnitude larger than the macroscopic susceptibility χ at the same applied field as measured by a SQUID [12]. The fact that $K_{\parallel} \sim 4\pi\chi$ is, *a priori*, a cause for concern. It might indicate that the muons are working as a magnetometer and that the difference between K_{\parallel} and K_{\perp} is due to differences in the sample's demagnetization factor D in different directions. However, the two lines, clearly resolved at 20 K for each direction, indicate that the muons in the site with a shift are sensing the local susceptibility. If the muons were only experiencing $D\chi$, we would not see different behavior at different sites. Moreover, we do not expect differences in D for different directions due to the crystal's shape. Thus, the behavior of K_{\perp} and K_{\parallel} indicates a very small spin response when the field is in the kagome plane compared to a field perpendicular to this plane.

Since the temperature dependence of the shift is proportional to the local susceptibility these results indicate

that Herbertsmithite has an easy axis. We fit $K_{\parallel}(T)$ to a CW-type law and find $\theta_{cw} = -35$ K. We also fit our $K_{\parallel}(T)$ data to a CW law with an offset. We examined a free offset and an offset set by the K_{\perp} data. We found that θ_{cw} either does not change or becomes more negative. We will continue our discussion using the minimal $|\theta_{cw}|$ since it is sufficient for the conclusions of this paper. This θ_{cw} is different from the one obtained by a superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID) on powders. However, in Herbertsmithite different probes gave different behavior [6, 7, 9, 11, 13] upon cooling, so having a new CW is not so surprising.

Finally, in figure 1(b) we present the relaxation rate $1/T_{2\parallel,\perp}^*$. The relaxation in both directions is flat and small down to 70 K and then it increases. However, at low T , the relaxation is very different for the two directions. Since $1/T_2^*$ is also proportional to the susceptibility [14] the relaxation measurement indicates, again, that the system is anisotropic.

In order to understand this behavior we turn to an anisotropic Heisenberg Hamiltonian with a DM interaction which we write as

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_i g\mu_B \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{H} - \sum_{j \neq i} J_{\perp} \vec{S}_i^{\perp} \cdot \vec{S}_j^{\perp} + J_z S_i^z S_j^z + \vec{D}_{ij} \cdot (\vec{S}_j \times \vec{S}_i), \quad (2)$$

where \vec{D}_{ij} are the DM vectors and the second sum is over neighboring spins (not bonds). This Hamiltonian can be written as $\mathcal{H} = g\mu_B \sum_i \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{H}_i^{\text{eff}}$, where the effective field is

$$\vec{H}_i^{\text{eff}} = \vec{H} - \frac{1}{g\mu_B} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \vec{J} \vec{S}_j + \vec{D}_{ij} \times \vec{S}_j \right) \quad (3)$$

and the anisotropic diagonal coupling is given by

$$\vec{J} = \begin{pmatrix} J_{\perp} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & J_{\perp} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & J_z \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

When expressing \vec{H}_i^{eff} one has to be careful about the convention of \vec{D}_{ij} [2]. We continue with the mean-field approximation ($\vec{S} \rightarrow -\vec{M}/g\mu_B$). In principle the kagome unit cell has three different atoms and we should allow a different \vec{M} for each site. However, we are interested in the high temperature limit where it is reasonable to assume that the magnetization of all ions is the same. We will check this assumption at the end of the calculation. Thus

$$\vec{H}_i^{\text{eff}} = \vec{H} + \frac{Z}{(g\mu_B)^2} (\vec{J}\vec{M} + \vec{D}_i \times \vec{M}), \quad (5)$$

where $\vec{D}_i = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_j \vec{D}_{ij}$ and Z is the number of near neighbors. The magnetization is given by a self-consistent solution of the equation $\vec{M}_i = \frac{C}{T} \vec{H}_i^{\text{eff}}$ where $C = (g\mu_B)^2 S(S+1)/(3k_B)$ is the Curie constant. The solution is given by

$$\chi_i^{\perp\perp} = C \frac{(T - \theta_{\perp})(T - \theta_z) + D_i^{\perp/2}}{(T - \theta_z)(T - \theta_{\perp})^2 + T\vec{D}_i^2 - \vec{D}_i^{\perp/2}\theta_{\perp} - D_i^{z/2}\theta_z},$$

$$\chi_i^{zz} = C \frac{(T - \theta_{\perp})^2 + D_i^{z/2}}{(T - \theta_z)(T - \theta_{\perp})^2 + T\vec{D}_i^2 - \vec{D}_i^{\perp/2}\theta_{\perp} - D_i^{z/2}\theta_z}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\vec{\mathbf{D}}^{z,\perp'} = \frac{CZ}{(g\mu_B)^2} \vec{\mathbf{D}}^{z,\perp}.$$

Here $\vec{\mathbf{D}}^{z,\perp}$ are the DM components in the z direction and in the kagome plane, respectively.

It is simple to see that there are three different $\vec{\mathbf{D}}_i$ in the lattice. Therefore, χ_i^{zz} and $\chi_i^{\perp\perp}$ or $\vec{\mathbf{M}}_i$ must be site-dependent, unless we are in the limit of high temperatures, $(T - \theta)^2 \gg (\mathbf{D}_i^{z,\perp'})^2$, where

$$\chi^{zz} = \frac{C}{(T - \theta_z)} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi^{\perp\perp} = \frac{C}{T - \theta_{\perp}}. \quad (7)$$

In this case the DM interaction does not affect the CW temperatures which are determined from the high T data. In our experiment at $T = 65$ K, $T - \theta_{\text{cw}} = 100$ K and \mathbf{D}_{ij} is estimated to be of the order of 10 K [9]. Therefore, $(T - \theta_{\text{cw}})^2$ is two orders of magnitude larger than $(\mathbf{D}_i^{z,\perp'})^2$, and the high temperature limit is valid. Since the shifts, and hence the susceptibilities, in the two directions are different at $T = 65$ K we conclude that $\theta_z \neq \theta_{\perp}$, that J must have axial anisotropy, and that the DM interaction cannot explain the anisotropy in the measurements. This does not mean that the DM interaction, which is allowed by the symmetry of the kagome lattice, is not present in addition to the axial anisotropy [15].

In conclusion, μ SR measurements were performed on single crystals of Herbertsmithite. We find no clear signature of a magnetic transition down to $T < 10^{-2}J$, as was found for powders (down to $10^{-4}J$). Anisotropic spin susceptibility with an easy axis is revealed. By mean-field approximations, we show that this phenomenon cannot be due to DM interactions alone, and an anisotropic super-exchange J is needed. Our data calls for more work on larger crystals where one can avoid using a mosaic of crystal and the anisotropy can be measured more accurately. Such crystals are becoming available. It will also be useful to have theoretical work on the high temperature behavior of the magnetization in different directions, using equation (2) and more accurate methods than mean field.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the staff of the TRIUMF CMMS Facility for assistance with the μ^+ SR experiments. We are also grateful to P Mendels for helpful discussions. AK and YSL would like to thank the Israel–US Binational Science Foundation for funding this work. JHB is supported at UBC by NSERC of Canada and (through TRIUMF) by NRC of Canada.

References

- [1] Freedman D E, Han T H, Prodi A, Muller P, Huang Q-Z, Chen Y-S, Webb S M, Lee Y S, McQueen T M and Nocera D G 2010 *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **132** 16185
- [2] Rigol M and Singh R R P 2007 *Phys. Rev. B* **76** 184403
- [3] Helton J S *et al* 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** 107204
- [4] Mendels P, Bert F, de Vries M A, Olariu A, Harrison A, Duc F, Trombe J C, Lord J S, Amato A and Baines C 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** 077204
- [5] Bert F, Nakamae S, Ladiou F, L'Hute D, Bonville P, Duc F, Trombe J C and Mendels P 2007 *Phys. Rev. B* **76** 132411
- [6] Ofer O, Keren A, Nytko E A, Shores M P, Bartlett B M, Nocera D G, Baines C and Amato A 2006 arXiv:cond-mat/0610540
- [7] Olariu A, Mendels P, Bert F, Duc F, Trombe J C, de Vries M A and Harrison A 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** 087202
- [8] Wulferding D, Lemmens P, Scheib P, Roder J, Mendels P, Chu S, Han T and Lee Y S 2010 *Phys. Rev. B* **82** 144412
- [9] Zorko A, Nellutla S, van Tol J, Brunel L C, Bert F, Duc F, Trombe J C, de Vries M A, Harrison A and Mendels P 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** 026405
- [10] Rousochatzakis I, Manmana S R, Luchli A M, Normand B and Mila F 2009 *Phys. Rev. B* **79** 214415
- [11] Ofer O and Keren A 2009 *Phys. Rev. B* **79** 134424
- [12] Han T and Lee Y S 2011 in preparation
- [13] Imai T, Nytko E A, Bartlett B M, Shores M P and Nocera D G 2008 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** 077203
- [14] Kalvius G M, Noakes D R and Hartmann O 2001 *Handbook on the Physics and Chemistry of Rare Earths* vol 32 (Amsterdam: North-Holland)
Brewer J H 1994 *Encyclopedia of Applied Physics* vol 11 (New York: VCH) pp 23–53
- [15] Elhajal M, Canals B and Lacroix C 2002 *Phys. Rev. B* **66** 014422