Strong quantum fluctuations due to competition between magnetic phases in a pyrochlore iridate
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We report neutron diffraction measurements of the magnetic structures in two pyrochlore iridates, Yb2Ir2O7 and Lu2Ir2O7. Both samples exhibit the all-in-all-out magnetic structure on the Ir4+ sites below TN ≃ 150 K, with a low temperature moment of around 0.45 μB/Ir. Below 2 K, the Yb moments in Yb2Ir2O7 begin to order ferromagnetically. However, even at 40 mK the ordered moment is only 0.57(3) μB/Yb, significantly smaller than the saturated moment of 2 μB/Yb deduced from magnetization measurements and from a refined model of the crystal field environment. The reduced moment on Yb is found to be a consequence of enhanced phase competition caused by the coupling to the all-in-all-out magnetic order on the Ir sublattice.

The extended family of pyrochlore oxides A2B2O7 exhibits an enormous range of exotic and interesting magnetic phenomena. This richness of behavior stems from the structure of the A and B sublattices, which form interpenetrating nets of corner-sharing tetrahedra, and from the local anisotropy of the magnetic ions. For example, strong Ising anisotropy leads to classical spin ice behaviour and emergent magnetic monopoles, as found in Dy2Ti2O7 and Ho2Ti2O7 whereas XY anisotropy leads to unconventional ordered states in Yb and Er based compounds.

The magnetic ground state in these materials can be tuned by control parameters such as pressure (mechanical and chemical) and external magnetic field. An alternative approach, however, is to create an effective internal magnetic field at the A site by substitution of a magnetic ion on the B site. It is then possible that the staggered field generated by a magnetic coupling between the two sites can produce competition between their respective preferred ground states.

A system in which such a scenario might occur is the iridate pyrochlore oxides A2Ir2O7, where A is a trivalent lanthanide. The magnetic properties of the iridate pyrochlores have been quite extensively studied, and the Ir sites have been found to develop long-range order at a temperature TN close to the onset of a metal-to-insulator transition, where TN = 115–150 K for A = Sm–Lu, and TN ≃ 33 K for A = Nd. The exception is Pr2Ir2O7, which exhibits no conventional magnetic order down to 70 mK. In the A2Ir2O7 compounds studied so far, the ordered magnetic moments on the Ir sites are small (~ 0.5 μB) and point either all towards the center of the tetrahedron or directly away from it — the so-called all-in-all-out (AlAO) structure, see Fig. 1a.

If the magnetic coupling between the Ir and the A sites is strong then the Ir order will induce AlAO order on the A site, as observed in e.g. Nd2Ir2O7 (Ref. 30) and Tb2Ir2O7 (Ref. 31).

In this work we investigate the effect of the staggered molecular field from Ir in Yb2Ir2O7, using a combination of neutron diffraction, neutron spectroscopy and macroscopic measurements. We find that competition between the planar single-ion anisotropy of Yb3+, the splayed ferromagnetism favored by the Yb–Yb coupling, and the AlAO order favored by coupling to the ordered Ir spins (JIr-Yb), tends to suppress magnetic order of the Yb moments and leads to strong quantum fluctuations down to the lowest temperatures. We show how these results can be understood in terms of competing phases induced by JIr-Yb.

We prepared polycrystalline samples of Yb2Ir2O7 and Lu2Ir2O7 by the conventional solid-state reaction method. Standard characterization measurements between 2 and 300 K were performed, and AC susceptibility measurements between 0.1 and 4.2 K were carried out in a SQUID magnetometer equipped with a dilution fridge developed at the Institut Néel. We observe an anomaly in the magnetization at TN ≃ 150 K in both samples, consistent with magnetic order on the Ir sublattice. The data are presented in the Supplemental Material.

Neutron diffraction measurements were performed at the WISH diffractometer at the ISIS Facility. The data were reduced using MANTID and structural refinements were performed with FullProf. Both samples were found to be > 98% pure, and their structures were refined in the space group Fd3m with lattice constant a = 10.094(1) Å (Lu2Ir2O7) and a = 10.104(1) Å (Yb2Ir2O7) at 1.5 K. The refined oxygen content is 6.97(4), indicating no oxygen deficiency. Details are provided in the Supplemental Material.

Figure 2a) shows diffraction from Lu2Ir2O7 at 1.5 K as a function of scattering vector Q. Data recorded in
Here, $\Gamma_{\text{mag}}$ is the irreducible representation (irrep) which describes the AIAO structure, $\Gamma_6^0$ contains the $\psi_2$ and $\psi_3$ structures, $\Gamma_8^3$ is the Palmer-Chalker state, and $\Gamma_{10,A}^3$ and $\Gamma_{10,B}^3$ are a pure ferromagnet and a non-collinear ferromagnet, respectively. From now on, we omit the suffix which indicates the dimension of the irrep. Only the AIAO structure ($\Gamma_3^0$) is consistent with our data for Lu$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ at 1.5 K. The fit to this magnetic structure is shown in Fig. 2(a) and is in good agreement with the data.

The AIAO structure also gives a very good description of our data on Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ for temperatures down to 20 K [Fig. 2(b)]. We conclude, therefore, that the Ir sublattice in Lu$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ and Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ orders in the same AIAO structure as found in other $A_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ iridates.

To understand the magnitude of the magnetic moment we note that each Ir$^{4+}$ ion is surrounded by a trigonally-distorted octahedron of $O^{2-}$ ions. In perfect octahedral symmetry, the 5$d^5$ configuration of Ir$^{4+}$ combined with spin–orbit coupling forms a $J_{\text{eff}} = 1/2$ ground state with a magnetic moment $\langle \mu \rangle = \frac{1}{2}\mu_B$. The trigonal distortion...
tion leads to a mixing of the $t_{2g}$ and $e_g$ levels so that the $J_{AB} = 1/2$ picture is only approximately correct, leading to a larger observed moment. We have tried including the other ir-

crystal field model refined against neutron spectroscopy data obtained on the MAPS time-of-flight spectrometer at the ISIS facility (see Supplemental Material for details).

The existence of magnetic order over long distances in which only a small fraction of the saturated moment is ordered suggests that there are significant low frequency fluctuations. Evidence in support of this is found in AC susceptibility measurements shown in Fig. 4 for frequencies between 0.11 and 21.1 Hz. There is a broad peak in the real part of the AC susceptibility $\chi'$ at around 350 mK, and the imaginary part $\chi''$ becomes non-zero at about 400 mK. A bifurcation in DC susceptibility is also seen at 350 mK. These observations indicate the onset of magnetic order at this temperature. The peak in $\chi'$ is broader and rounder than what would be expected for a continuous phase transition, and has a slight frequency dependence that may be associated to domain wall dynamics. Our results are quite different from the first-order ferromagnetic transition in Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$, which exhibits a sharp cusp in $\chi'$ and a rapid rise in $\chi''$ at the phase transition. Similar to Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$, we observe a broad anomaly in the heat capacity of Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ around $T \approx 1$ K (see Supplemental Material), which indicates the build up of correlations in agreement with our neutron data.

We now present a mean field analysis of the magnetic phases in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ which provides insight into the observed magnetic order of Yb and the cause of its reduced moment. The appropriate effective spin Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sum_{\mu,\nu} J_{ij}^{\mu\nu} S_i^{\mu} S_j^{\nu} + \sum_{\langle i,m \rangle} J_{Ir-Yb}^i S_i \cdot S_m^i, \quad (2)$$

at 40 mK, much smaller than the estimated saturated moment of $M_s \approx 2.0 \mu_B$ at low temperature from bulk magnetometry. The observed $M_s$ is consistent with the saturated moment of the Kramers doublet ground state of Yb$^{3+}$ in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$, which we have obtained from a crystal field model refined against neutron spectroscopy data obtained at the ISIS facility (see Supplemental Material for details).

We now turn to the Yb sublattice. Figures 2(c) and (d) display neutron diffraction data on Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ at 1.5 K and 40 mK, respectively. At 1.5 K, there is some enhancement of intensity at the positions of the 111 and 400 reflections, both of which grow into strong peaks upon cooling to 40 mK. These peaks indicate ordering of the Yb sublattice in a different structure than the AIAO sublattice assuming only a ferromagnetic component. Data below 1 K were measured in a dilution fridge.

The 220 reflection is absent in the pure Yb sublattice in a different structure than the AIAO sublattice, which we have obtained from a crystal field model refined against neutron spectroscopy data obtained on the MAPS time-of-flight spectrometer at the ISIS facility (see Supplemental Material for details).

FIG. 3. Main panel: Temperature dependence of the refined magnetic moment on Ir in Lu$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ and Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$, assuming only AIAO order. The line is to guide the eye. Insert: Low temperature region showing also the moment on the Yb sublattice assuming only a ferromagnetic component. Data below 1 K were measured in a dilution fridge.

FIG. 4. The real ($\chi'$) and imaginary ($\chi''$) parts of the measured AC susceptibility signal from Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$, showing that spin freezing sets in at $T \approx 0.4$ K.
where $\mathbf{S}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbf{S}_m$ are effective spins on the Yb and Ir sites, respectively. $J^{Ir-Yb}_m$ is the coupling between Ir and Yb sites (assumed isotropic), and $J^{\Gamma}_m$ is the Yb–Yb exchange matrix which has four symmetry-allowed components $J_1 - J_4$ that have been determined by neutron scattering for Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$ with $\mu, \nu = x, y, z$. The summations in Eq. (2) are restricted to nearest-neighbor spin pairs. Taking the values for $J_1 - J_4$ to be the same as those found for Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$, we minimized the mean-field energy to obtain the phase diagram as shown in Fig. 1(c). Details can be found in the Supplemental Material.

There are five phases of interest as a function of increasing $J^{Ir-Yb}$, illustrated in Fig. 1(a). The splayed ferromagnet (Splayed FM) is the ground state of Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$ with a splay angle of 17°. The “3-in-1-out” (3I1O) arrangement has one of the spins pointing along the local [111] direction anti-aligned with the molecular field from Ir. The AIAO+XY state has two spins approximately following the AIAO structure, while the other two are XY-like, pointing perpendicular to the local [111] axis. The Canted AIAO structure has all spins pointing either in or out of the tetrahedra, but at an angle to the local [111] direction. Finally, as $J^{Ir-Yb}$ increases, the ground state is the pure AIAO structure induced from the Ir sublattice. Other states are possible depending on the exact values of $J$ and $J^{Ir-Yb}$.

Each state can be decomposed into a sum of the order parameters $m_k$ for the five irreps. Fig. 1(c) shows $m_k^2$ for each of the five irreps as a function of $J^{Ir-Yb}$.

Our observation of a large (possibly splayed) ferromagnetic component, with up to ~ 10% AIAO component and no other components, is consistent with the Splayed FM and 3I1O phases. The lack of any detectable $\Gamma_0$ component in our neutron diffraction data points to the 3I1O phase, except that this phase requires a $\Gamma_{10,B}$ component that is larger than the upper limit placed on it from our neutron data. This is not a significant concern, however, because the amount of $\Gamma_{10,B}$ component is mainly determined by the magnitude of $J_3$, and $J_3$ could well be smaller in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ than in Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$.

Other pyrochlore iridates fit well within this general phase diagram, although details of their ground states vary. The behavior of the pyrochlore iridates is governed by the relative strength of three interactions: The interaction between (i) the Ir sites (Ir–Ir), (ii) the Ir and the A site (Ir–A) and (iii) the A sites (A–A). The Ir sublattice develops AIAO order at temperatures higher than or equal to the ordering temperature for the A site, indicating that the Ir–Ir interaction is strongest. The Ir–A interaction is typically the second strongest, as evidence by the onset of induced AIAO order on the A sublattice either simultaneously with the Ir order (Nd$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ and Tb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$) or at slightly lower temperatures (Ho$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$, Gd$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$). The A–A interaction is the weakest and only relevant at low temperatures as observed e.g. in Tb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ where the moments cant slightly below 10 K.

In Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$, the Ir spins order at 150 K, while magnetic order of the Yb moments sets in at significantly lower temperatures, between 20 K and 1.5 K. We do not have data between these temperatures, but a µSR study found a change in behavior at $T^* = 20$ K, indicating the onset of Yb magnetic order. This indicates that the Ir–Yb and Yb–Yb interactions are the same order of magnitude in our sample, leading to competition.

We have found that the ordered moment on the Yb sites in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ is 0.57 $\mu_B$, which is only about a half of the ~1$\mu_B$ moment found in Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$ and only a quarter of the saturated moment $M_s \approx 2.0 \mu_B$ of the ground state Kramers doublet. To investigate this reduction we have calculated the ordered moment in the mean-field model as function of $J^{Ir-Yb}$ by linear spin-wave theory, and given the results in Fig. 1(b) as $(S)/S$. The ordered moment is found to be suppressed by up to 40% in this model, with the greatest reductions on the phase boundaries. The small ordered moment in our sample implies that it is close to a phase boundary. Even so, the calculated moment reduction is not as large as we observe in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$, and as the mean-field model is semi-classical this suggests that quantum fluctuations further destabilize the order.

Furthermore, although neutron diffraction detects magnetic order of Yb up to at least 1.5 K, AC susceptibility shows no order above ~ 0.4 K (Fig. 1). These disparate results from the two techniques can be explained by their different time scales. The time scale for AC susceptibility measurements (~ $10^{-1}$ s) is much longer than that of neutron scattering (~ $10^{-12}$ s). The neutron thus sees moments which fluctuate more slowly than ~ $10^{-12}$ s as static. At temperatures between ~ 0.4 and 1.5 K, therefore, the magnetic moments appear static and ferromagnetically correlated over relatively long distances and times to neutrons, but appear dynamic to AC susceptibility. The lack of magnetic hysteresis even at the lowest temperatures is a further indication for the presence of significant spin fluctuations at the lowest temperatures.

The Yb$^{3+}$ ions in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ and Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$ have weak planar single-ion anisotropy from the crystal field. From our analysis of the neutron spectrum of Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ we find that the the $g$ tensor components parallel and perpendicular to the local $<111>$ axes are $g_{||} = 2.3$, and $g_{\perp} = 4.0$ (see Supplemental Material). The anisotropy ratio $g_{||}/g_{\perp} = 1.7$ for Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ is slightly smaller than that for Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$, $g_{||}/g_{\perp} = 2.0$. This anisotropy competes with the exchange interactions between the Yb$^{3+}$ ions in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ which favor a splayed ferromagnetic phase that is very close to several other phase boundaries. The resulting phase competition, which is also evidenced by the anomalously reduced ordered moment, is arguably the key to understanding the properties of this compound.

By replacing the nonmagnetic Ti$^{4+}$ ions in Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$ with Ir$^{4+}$ having AIAO magnetic order in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ we introduce a weak effective field along the local $<111>$ directions on each Yb site which is in direct competition
to the other magnetic interactions already present. The effect of this molecular field, as we have established, is to destabilize order and increase frustration.

In summary, we have found that the Ir sites in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ and Lu$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ order in the AIAO magnetic structure below $T_N \simeq 150$ K with an ordered moment of around 0.45 $\mu_B$. Upon cooling below $\sim 1.5$ K, the Yb moments in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ begin to order with a dominant ferromagnetic component. The ordered moment on Yb at the lowest accessible temperature of 40 mK is only about 25% of that expected for the ground state Kramers doublet of Yb$^{3+}$, and so the majority of the Yb moment remains dynamic. Our analysis suggests that the suppression of Yb magnetic order in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ is the result of competition between different ground states favored by Yb-Yb exchange, single-ion anisotropy, and the staggered field from the Ir magnetic order. This study demonstrates that the introduction of magnetic ions on the $B$ sites in $A_2B_2O_7$ can provide a route to unconventional quantum ground states on the $A$ sites.
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Appendix A: Sample characterisation

Here we present magnetization, resistivity, susceptibility and heat capacity measurements of our polycrystalline samples of Lu$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ and Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$. The samples were prepared by the conventional solid-state reaction method using high purity (99.99%) Yb$_2$O$_3$/Lu$_2$O$_3$ and IrO$_2$ powders. The samples were characterized using a Quantum Design Magnetic Properties Measurement System (MPMS) and a Physical Properties Measurement System (PPMS).

Figure 5(a) shows the magnetization as a function of temperature. A bifurcation between field-cooled and zero-field-cooled magnetization curves as a function of temperature is found at $T_N \approx 150$ K in both samples, indicating the onset of magnetic ordering of the Ir sublattice. In Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ there is a large additional paramagnetic signal from the Yb$^{3+}$ magnetic moments.

In Fig. 5(b), the resistivity is seen to increase monotonically upon cooling, from 12 Ω cm (0.2 Ω cm) at 300 K to more than $10^5$ Ω cm at 25 K (10 K) K for the Lu (Yb) sample, in agreement with previous results.[22] In both samples, a gradual crossover from $\rho \sim T^{-2}$ to $\rho \sim T^{-4}$ takes place upon cooling below $\sim 150$ K, although no clear transition is apparent in neither the resistivity nor its derivative. The resistivity does not change significantly on application of a magnetic field of 10 T.

Figure 6(a) shows the measured susceptibility (calculated as $M/H$) and its inverse for the Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ sample. We show both the raw data, and corrected data after subtraction of the measured susceptibility of Lu$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ as an estimate of the magnetic contribution from iridium. The red line shows the susceptibility calculated from our model for the crystal field detailed in the next section.

$M$ vs $H$ curves for our samples are shown in Fig. 5(b) along with the calculation from our crystal field model. We find good agreement between the data and the model, although our single-ion model slightly underestimates the magnetization. This discrepancy may partly be explained by the exchange interactions that are neglected in the single-ion calculation.

Heat capacity measurements were carried out in a Physical Properties Measurement System for temperatures down to 1 K, see Fig. 7. An anomaly at low temperature indicates the presence of low energy fluctuations as also seen in other rare earth pyrochlores.

Appendix B: Neutron diffraction

Samples of polycrystalline Lu$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ and Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ with masses 3.4 g and 5.0 g, respectively, were loaded into aluminium cans which had the form of a cylindrical annulus with an average radius of 12 mm and radial spacing 1 mm. The cans were installed in a standard helium cryostat for measurements at temperatures down to 1.5 K. Both samples were measured at 1.5 K and 160 K for approximately 4 hours, and the Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ sample was additionally measured at 60 K for 4 hours and in shorter runs ($\sim 30$ min) at several other temperatures between 20 K and 140 K. A second experiment with the sample of Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ now in a copper can of similar annular geometry installed in a dilution fridge was carried out at several temperatures between 40 mK and 900 mK, and at 10 K. The 40 and 900 mK runs were measured for 3 hours, the 10 K run for 1.5 hours, and the intermediate temperatures between 40 mK and 900 mK for 1 hour each. The sample was kept at 40 mK for 24 hours before the experiment started.
FIG. 6. (a) Magnetic susceptibility of Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ as function of temperature in an applied field of $\mu_0 H = 1$ T. We show both the raw data and data corrected for the measured susceptibility of Lu$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ to remove the contribution from Ir. The red line shows the calculated susceptibility based on our single-ion model for Yb$^{3+}$. (b) Magnetization of powdered Lu$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ and Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ at $T = 1.8$ K as a function of applied field, together with the magnetization of Yb$^{3+}$ calculated from our single-ion model for Yb$^{3+}$.

1. Crystal structure refinement

Figure 8 shows diffraction data on Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ recorded at 1.5 K in bank 5 of the Wish diffractometer, along with a Rietveld refinement of the crystal structure. A small amount of parasitic scattering from the aluminium sample container was also included in the refinement. All analysis was performed using the FullProf software package. The magnetic signal from the Ir$^{4+}$ moments is weak and cannot be refined without background subtraction, and has thus been excluded from the refinement. No impurity phases were detected.

We find excellent agreement between our data and the refinement of Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ in space group $Fd\bar{3}m$. The Yb$^{3+}$ ions occupy the 16d Wyckoff positions at 0.5, 0.5, 0.5; the Ir$^{4+}$ ions occupy the 16c Wyckoff positions at 0, 0, 0; and the O$^{2-}$ ions occupy the Wyckoff positions 8b at 0.375, 0.375, 0.375 and 48f at $x$, 0.125, 0.125. At 1.5 K we find $x = 0.340(1)$.

Site-mixing could not be refined due to the large neutron absorption of Ir and the fact that the neutron- and x-ray scattering cross sections for Yb and Ir are quite similar, but as the samples are single-phase and near-stoichiometric in oxygen, any site mixing is likely to be minimal.

2. Magnetic refinement

In order to fit the magnetic signal we have subtracted data recorded in the paramagnetic phase at 160 K from the low temperature data. To improve subtraction we scaled the time of flight of the 160 K data by the ratio of lattice constants at 160 K and the other temperature. For the magnetic refinements we have used bank 2 of the Wish diffractometer.

The large neutron absorption cross-section of Ir is difficult to correct for in our data. We find the fitting routine sometimes compensates for this by giving unphysical values of the isotropic displacement parameters, $B_{iso}$. We therefore choose to fix $B_{iso} = 0.5 \AA^2$ for all atoms. We find that the refined magnetic parameters are virtually insensitive to this constraint.

3. Normalization of dilution fridge data

In the dilution fridge experiment, data could not be measured above the ordering temperature of the Ir sublattice. Moreover, the relatively strong scattering from the Cu sample can used in this experiment meant that...
FIG. 8. Neutron powder diffraction pattern of Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ measured at 1.5 K. The red line through the data is a Rietveld refinement of the crystal structure together with a small signal from the aluminium sample holder. The tick marks shows the peaks positions of these two contributions, and the line underneath is the difference $I_{\text{model}} - I_{\text{obs}}$. The intensity of the magnetic scattering is too weak to include a magnetic structure model in the refinement. The inset shows the refined lattice constant as function of temperature.

we could not simply subtract the high temperature data measured in the orange cryostat from the dilution fridge data. To isolate the magnetic scattering at 40 mK we therefore calculate

$$I_{\text{mag}}^{40 \text{ mK}} \approx S \times \{ I^{(2)}(40 \text{ mK}) - I^{(2)}(10 \text{ K}) \} + \{ I^{(1)}(60 \text{ K}) - I^{(1)}(160 \text{ K}) \},$$

(B1)

where $I^{(1)}$ and $I^{(2)}$ are the intensities measured in the orange cryostat and dilution fridge experiments, respectively, and $S \approx 2.2$ is a scaling factor between the two experiments, calculated from refinements of the nuclear scattering peak intensities. The approximation is valid providing $S \times I^{(2)}(10 \text{ K}) \approx I^{(1)}(60 \text{ K})$, which we will now justify. Figure 3 in the main text shows that the refined Ir magnetic moment is virtually constant over the temperature range 10 to 60 K. To further validate the approximation we look at the integrated intensity of the 111 peak, which has a weak nuclear component at all temperatures and a magnetic component which develops as the temperature is reduced below $\sim 1.5$ K, Fig. 9. The integrated intensity remains constant for temperatures between $\sim 10$ K and 160 K, thus further validating the approximation.

Appendix C: Crystal field excitations in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$

In order to isolate the single-ion magnetic response of Yb we have measured the spectrum of crystal-field excitations within the $^2F_{7/2}$ term of Yb$^{3+}$ ($4f^{13}$) by inelastic neutron scattering. We start with a brief introduction to the theory, then discuss previous results on Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$ as...
a starting point for the presentation of our data.

The crystal field excitations in the pyrochlores can be modeled with the Hamiltonian
\[ H = B_0^2 C_0^{(2)} + B_0^4 C_0^{(4)} + B_3^4 C_3^{(4)} + B_0^6 C_0^{(6)} + B_3^4 C_3^{(6)} + B_6^6 C_6^{(6)}, \]
where \( B_q^k \) are numerical coefficients and \( C_q^{(k)} \) are the Wybourne tensor operators, given by
\[ C_q^{(k)}(\theta, \phi) = \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{2k+1}} Y_{k,q}(\theta, \phi), \]
with \( Y_{k,q} \) the spherical harmonic functions (here we use the Condon-Shortley phase convention). We use the SPECTRE program for all crystal field calculations. We note that unlike the commonly used Stevens formalism, SPECTRE can include all states of the 4\( f^6 \) configuration, which for Yb\(^{3+} \) means both the \( J = 7/2 \) and the \( J = 5/2 \) levels. We ignore the Yb–Yb and Yb–Ir exchange interactions as they are much smaller than the crystal field potential, and have negligible effect on the crystal field spectrum.

Inelastic neutron scattering measurements on Yb\(_2\)Ti\(_2\)O\(_7\) revealed crystal field excitations at 76, 82 and 116 meV. The model used in Ref. 58 uses the Stevens operator formalism and thus includes only the \( J = 7/2 \) manifold of states. Although this is a very good approximation for Yb\(^{3+} \), for a proper comparison with our Yb\(_2\)Ir\(_2\)O\(_7\) data we would like to use the same model for both data sets.

We therefore fitted the data in Ref. 58 using the model (C1). With only five observables (3 peak positions, 2 intensity ratios) we must fix one of the six crystal field parameters. We choose to fix the highest order parameter \( B_6^6 \) to the value found in Ref. 58. We find that with minor adjustments in the remaining parameters we can obtain a model that fits the data equally as well as the simpler model used in Ref. 58. Note that to achieve good agreement with the observed spectrum we needed to include a phonon peak centred near 76 meV. The best-fit parameters are given in Table I.

We now turn to our experiments. We measured the same polycrystalline Yb\(_2\)Ir\(_2\)O\(_7\) sample as used in the neutron diffraction experiments. The experiment was carried out at the ISIS Facility on the MAPS time-of-flight spectrometer. The sample was spread as evenly as possible inside a 4 × 13 cm\(^2\) aluminium sachet which was inserted in an aluminium cylindrical can. The can was then mounted in a closed-cycle refrigerator and cooled to a base temperature of 5.5 K. Spectra were recorded with neutrons of incident energy \( E_i = 200 \text{ meV} \) and \( E_i = 110 \text{ meV} \) for 13.5 and 9 hours, respectively.

A standard vanadium sample was measured to normalize the data from runs with different \( E_i \) and to calibrate the spectra in units of mb sr\(^{-1}\) meV\(^{-1}\) Yb\(^{-1}\). However, an accurate absolute calibration proved not to be possible because of the large neutron absorption cross-section of Ir. With a sample mass of 5.0 g the average thickness of the sample in the aluminium sachet is \( t \simeq 0.08 \text{ mm} \) giving a nominal \( \sim 5\% \) absorption according to Beer’s law. In the analysis detailed below, however, we find all the calculated intensities to be about a factor of 2 times larger than the observed intensities, indicating much stronger absorption than in the ideal case. This is most likely due to the difficulty in spreading the powder evenly in such a thin layer.

The normalized spectra were corrected for sample absorption assuming an evenly loaded sample, and for the magnetic form factor of Yb\(^{3+} \), \( f^2(Q) \), as well as for a small offset on the energy axis.

Figure 10(a) is a color map of the corrected intensity as function of scattering vector, \( Q \), and energy transfer, \( E \). We made a constant-\( Q \) cut through the data, averaging the intensity over \( 3.5 < Q < 4.5 \text{ Å}^{-1} \). These cuts are shown in Figs. 10(b) and (c) for \( E_i = 200 \) and 110 meV, respectively.

We identify two clear peaks from crystal field excitations at 76.6(6) and 113.5(3) meV. The peak at 76.6 meV has shoulders on both sides which can be modelled with peaks centred near 71 and 81 meV. We expect one of these to be a phonon and the other a crystal field excitation. We are able to find satisfactory fits to our data for both of these cases. The best fit is found when we attribute the peak near 81 meV to the crystal field excitation, although we cannot rule out the other possibility with certainty. For this fit, as well as others described below, we used an approximation of the resolution function to describe the crystal field excitations, and Gaussian functions for the phonons.

We find good agreement between the data for Yb\(_2\)Ir\(_2\)O\(_7\) and the model with fixed \( B_6^6 = 35.6 \text{ meV} \), the value found for Yb\(_2\)Ti\(_2\)O\(_7\) in Ref. 58. However, this model underestimates the susceptibility and the saturated magnetization of Yb\(_2\)Ir\(_2\)O\(_7\). We then performed fits with other values of \( B_6^6 \) and found that good fits could be found for a range of values of \( B_6^6 \). Larger values of \( B_6^6 \) were found to give better agreement with the susceptibility. Indeed, a scaling of the crystal field parameters from other heavier lanthanides \( \text{ (Tb}^{3+} \text{ in Tb}_2\text{Ti}_2\text{O}_7, \text{ Ref. 59) } \text{ Ho}^{3+} \text{ in Ho}_2\text{Ti}_2\text{O}_7, \text{ Ref. 60) } \text{ and Er}^{3+} \text{ in Er}_2\text{Ti}_2\text{O}_7, \text{ Ref. 61) } \) to Yb\(^{3+} \) gives \( B_6^6 \) values significantly larger than 36.5 meV.

We therefore repeated our analysis, fixing \( B_6^6 = 82.6 \text{ meV} \), which is obtained by scaling from Tb\(^{3+} \) to Yb\(^{3+} \) using their respective 4\( f \) radial averages plus an additional factor of 1.2 to match the overall crystal splitting in Yb\(_2\)Ir\(_2\)O\(_7\). The fit using this procedure is shown in Figs. 10(b)–(c). We find very good agreement with the data. The susceptibility and magnetization calculated with this model are shown in Fig. 6. The model still slightly underestimates the measurements, but is significantly better than the model with \( B_6^6 = 36.5 \text{ meV} \). The remaining discrepancy could be an effect of the exchange interactions which our single-ion model does not take into account.
TABLE I. Crystal field parameters and components of the \( g \) tensor in different models for Yb\(_2\)Ti\(_2\)O\(_7\) and Yb\(_2\)Ir\(_2\)O\(_7\), as described in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( B^0_2 )</th>
<th>( B^0_4 )</th>
<th>( B^0_6 )</th>
<th>( B^0_8 )</th>
<th>( g_\perp )</th>
<th>( g_\parallel )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yb(_2)Ti(_2)O(_7) (Ref. 58)</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>284.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>-195.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yb(_2)Ti(_2)O(_7) (This work)</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>284.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>-195.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled from Ref. 59</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>292.8</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>-78.5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yb(_2)Ir(_2)O(_7) (This work)</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>258.0</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>-99.8</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, we have fitted our data using four different models: we have used \( B^6_6 = 35.6 \text{ meV} \) and \( B^8_8 = 82.6 \text{ meV} \), and in each case we have performed the fit assuming, first, the 70 meV peak and second, the 81 meV peak is the crystal field excitation. In all models we find \( g_\parallel \approx 2 \) and \( g_\perp \approx 4 \). The best fit is found using the method described in detail above. The parameters for this fit are listed in Table I. In this model we find that the components of the wave function from the \( J = 7/2 \) level are a doublet consisting of

\[
\psi = 0.904|\frac{7}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle \pm 0.413|\frac{7}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle \mp 0.094|\frac{5}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle \pm 0.037|\frac{5}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle \mp 0.03|\frac{5}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\rangle \pm 0.005|\frac{7}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\rangle. \quad (C3)
\]
FIG. 10. Crystal field excitations of Yb$^{3+}$ in Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ measured on MAPS with an incoming energy of 200 meV. The data have been normalised to mbarn/meV/° sr/Yb using a vanadium standard and corrected for the absorption of iridium and the magnetic form factor of Yb$^{3+}$ as described in the text. (a) shows the intensity as function of energy transfer, $E$, and scattering vector, $Q$, with arrows indicating the crystal field excitations. (b) A constant $Q$ cut through the data shown in (a) within the limits shown by the dotted white lines in (a). The red line shows the full fit to the data consisting of the crystal field excitations (dotted blue line), two phonons (solid black line) and a sloping background (not shown). (c) Same as (b) but for $E_i = 110$ meV.
Appendix D: Phase diagram

We here expand on the calculations of the phase diagram. The starting point is the Hamiltonian, Eq. (2). As the magnetic structure has propagation vector $\mathbf{k} = 0$, the Hamiltonian for the Yb sites reduces to a sum over individual tetrahedra. The Ir–Yb exchange interaction can be modelled as an effective field which for Yb site $i$ is given by

$$B_i^{\text{Ir-Yb}} = \sum_j J^{\text{Ir-Yb}} S_i^{\text{Ir}} S_j^{\text{Yb}} = 2 J^{\text{Ir-Yb}} S_i^{\text{Ir}} \hat{z}_i,$$

where $\hat{z}_i$ is a unit vector along the local (111) direction. We have assumed that the Ir sublattice orders in the AIAO magnetic structure, and that the Ir–Yb exchange interaction is isotropic.

The Hamiltonian for a single tetrahedron is

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\mu, \nu} S_i^\mu J_{ij}^{\mu\nu} S_j^\nu + \sum_{i,m} J^{\text{Ir-Yb}} S_i^{\text{Ir}} \cdot S_m^{\text{Yb}}$$

where $J_{ij}$ are order parameters associated with the five different types of ordered phases, as also described in the main text. Their precise definitions can be found in Table I, which is a copy of Table III of Ref. 55. In Ref. 55 the states are named after which point groups they transform under; here we name them using the irrep naming convention used in Refs. 30 and 31. We note that we have merely rewritten the Hamiltonian in a different form; no approximations have been made at this point.

When $B_i^{\text{Ir-Yb}} = 0$, the energy is minimized when one $m_{10} = 1$ and the rest are 0 (except at phase boundaries). This automatically satisfies the physical constraint that the spins must have the same magnitude. When $B_i^{\text{Ir-Yb}} \neq 0$, the different order parameters mix, and it is not trivial to analytically satisfy the constraint that the spins are normalized. We have therefore investigated the phase diagram of Yb$_2$Ir$_2$O$_7$ as function of $J^{\text{Ir-Yb}}$ numerically, keeping the exchange constants between Yb sites fixed to the values found in Yb$_2$Ti$_2$O$_7$. We implemented the calculations independently in MATLAB and SpinW with identical results. The resulting phase diagram as a function of $J^{\text{Ir-Yb}}$ is shown in Fig. 1 in the main paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order parameter</th>
<th>Definition in terms of spin components</th>
<th>Associated ordered phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( m_{\Gamma_3} )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (S_0^x + S_0^y + S_0^z - S_1^x - S_1^y - S_1^z + S_2^x - S_2^y + S_2^z - S_3^x + S_3^y + S_3^z) )</td>
<td>All-in-all-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_{\Gamma_6} )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (-2S_0^x + S_0^y + S_0^z - 2S_1^x - S_1^y - S_1^z + S_2^x + S_2^y - S_2^z + 2S_3^x - S_3^y + S_3^z) \right) )</td>
<td>( \psi_2 ) and ( \psi_3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_{\Gamma_8} )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-S_0^x + S_0^y + S_0^z - S_1^x - S_1^y - S_1^z + S_2^x + S_2^y + S_2^z + S_3^x + S_3^y + S_3^z) \right) )</td>
<td>Palmer-Chalker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_{\Gamma_{10,A}} )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{1}{2} (S_0^x + S_1^x + S_2^x + S_3^x) \right) )</td>
<td>Ferromagnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_{\Gamma_{10,B}} )</td>
<td>( \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (S_0^y + S_1^y + S_2^y + S_3^y) \right) )</td>
<td>Noncollinear ferromagnet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. Definitions of symbols used in Eq. (D3). Each \( m_{\Gamma_k} \) is the order parameter associated with the phase given in the right column. The table is reproduced from Ref. 55.