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We have studied the nearest neighbor Heisenberg model with added Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction using Schwinger boson mean field theory considering in-plane component as well as out-of-plane component. Motivated by experimental result of Vesignieite that the ground state is in \( Q = 0 \) long range order state, we first looked at the classical ground state of the model and consider the mean field ansatz which mimics the classical ground state in the large \( S \) limit. We have obtained the ground state phase diagram of this model and calculated properties of different phases. We have also studied the above model numerically using exact diagonalization up to a system size \( N = 30 \). We have compared the obtained results from these two approaches. Our results are in agreement with the experimental result of the Vesignieite.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm, 75.40.Mg, 75.50.Ee

I. INTRODUCTION

Geometrically frustrated magnets are the potential candidate to host exotic ground states like quantum spin liquids, a state with fractional excitations, high entanglement and without any broken symmetries even at low temperature magnetic structure of this frustrated system may have deep impact on the ground state manifold of the material. The kagome structure due to the presence of disorder, structural distortion, Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction(DMI) or other long range interactions. However, theoretical study reveals that the presence of minute perturbation may have deep impact on the ground state manifold. One of such perturbation which is very sensitive to the low temperature magnetic structure of this frustrated magnets is Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction(DMI). DMI appears in a lattice where there is lack of inversion symmetry between the two magnetic sites, which was first introduced to explain the weak ferromagnetism in \( \alpha \)-Fe\(_2\)O\(_3\)\(^{13}\). The interaction term is of the form \( H_{ij} = \hat{D}_{ij} \cdot (\vec{S}_i \times \vec{S}_j) \) where \( \hat{D}_{ij} \) is the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya (DM) vector, the strength of the coupling and \( i, j \) are the site index. The DM vector \( \hat{D}_{ij} \) lies on a mirror plane bisecting the bond joining the two magnetic sites \( i \) and \( j \).

In the experimental side, several materials were thought to be potential candidates for the kagome antiferromagnet (KAFM) to host a quantum spin liquid ground state like herbertsmithite,\(^{12}\)volborthite,\(^{13}\)and vesignieite.\(^{13}\) Among all these, the mineral Herbertsmithite is found to be a geometrically perfect description of quantum kagome Heisenberg antiferromagnet(QKHF), has been studied intensively\(^{13}\). This material does not show any sign of ordering down to 50 mk which is 3000 times lower than the characteristic exchange energy. Herbertsmithite is strongly suspected to host a quantum spin liquid ground state with spinon excitations.\(^{13,17}\) Form ESR data, the measured value of in-plane component of DMI, comes out as 0.01\(J\) where as the out-of-plane of DMI is much larger 0.06.\(^{13,19}\) Exact diagonal results predicts that there may be quantum critical point \( D_c = 0.1J \), at the one side \( D < D_c \) there is moment free phase and on the other side \( D > D_c \) there is Neel ordered phase.\(^{20}\)

Unlike herbertsmithite, vesignieite shows a magnetic transition to \( Q = 0 \) magnetic order with the in-plane moments on the three sublattices oriented at 120° with each other, at a surprisingly high temperature \( T_N = 9K \).\(^{13,17,18}\) ESR spectra reveals the presence of largeDMI anistropy.\(^{20}\) So, it is expected that large value of DMI may lead to the \( Q = 0 \) magnetic structure i.e the other side of the quantum critical point.\(^{22}\) In contrast to herbertsmithite, the dominant anistropy is the in-plane component of DMI. For vesignieite, the measured value of in-plane component is found to be 0.19\(J\) and out-of-plane component is 0.07\(J\) as indicated by ESR data analysis.

Apart from herbertsmithite, vesignieite, the compound \( \text{Nd}_3\text{Sb}_2\text{Mg}_5\text{O}_{12} \) is also of much interest since it shows large canting angle \( \eta = 30.6° \) indicating the presence of large in-plane DMI, \( D_p = 0.8J \) as predicted by Scheie et. al.\(^{25}\) However Laurell et. al.\(^{29}\) argued that the predicted value should be \( D_p > 1.5 \) to reproduce the such large canting angle. There are also interesting cases with even larger DMI as predicted from first principle calculation.\(^{27}\)

In this work, we study the ground state of nearest neighbor Heisenberg model with added Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction using Schwinger boson mean field theory(SB) framework and numerically using exact diagonalization(ED) method upto cluster size \( N = 30 \). There are several SB studies as well as exact diagonalization studies which only focuses on the out-of-plane component of DMI.\(^{20,23,31}\) In the present study we con...
consider in-plane and out-of-plane component of DMI both to study the ground state phase diagram. We have compared the results obtained from these two different approaches.

The layout of this paper is as following. In sec. II, we discuss the model Hamiltonian and the orientation of the DM vector. In sec. III, we briefly describe the classical ground state of this model. In sec. IV, we present the Schwinger boson formalism. In sec. IV, we present the result obtained from SBMFT approach. In sec. V, we discuss the exact diagonalization results of the proposed model. In sec. VI, we compare the results obtained from these two distinct approaches and discuss its relevance in experiment. Finally in sec. VII, we make the concluding remarks.

II. MODEL HAMILTONIAN

In this work, we have explored the model Hamiltonian of Vesignieite, as obtained in the Ref. For Vesignieite, they found that the strength of symmetric anisotropic exchange (AE) is comparable to the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction term and argued that since DMI results form the first order correction of \( J \) in the spin-orbit coupling whereas AE is the second order correction. Naturally DMI is supposed to be more influential on the low temperature magnetic structure\(^{21}\). So, the effective spin Hamiltonian for Vesignieite is given by

\[
H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} [J_{ij} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j + \mathbf{D}_{ij} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_i \times \mathbf{S}_j)]
\]  

(1)

where the isotropic exchange interaction strength \( J_{ij} = J \) for the nearest-neighbour pairs. The Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya vector, \( \mathbf{D}_{ij} \) has \( D_p \) and \( D_z \) as the strengths of the in-plane and out-of-plane components of DMI. \( \langle ij \rangle \) indicates the interactions are restricted to nearest neighbor only. The order of the cross product between \( i \)-th and \( j \)-th site for given \( \mathbf{D}_{ij} \) are denoted by arrows as shown in the Fig. 1(a). The lattice vectors are \( \mathbf{a} = a(1,0) \) and \( \mathbf{b} = a(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}) \). The DM vector is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{D}_{31} &= D_p \hat{\mathbf{j}} + D_z \hat{\mathbf{k}} \\
\mathbf{D}_{12} &= R(\mathbf{k}, -\frac{2\pi}{3}) \mathbf{D}_{31} \\
\mathbf{D}_{23} &= R(\mathbf{k}, -\frac{4\pi}{3}) \mathbf{D}_{31}
\end{align*}
\]

(2)

where \( R(\mathbf{k}, \theta) \) is the rotation operator that rotates a vector by an angle \( \theta \) about the axis \( \mathbf{k} \). The introduction of DM interaction reduces the symmetries of the isotropic Heisenberg model. When \( \mathbf{D}_{ij} = D_z \mathbf{k} \), that is when \( D_p = 0 \), then the global spin rotation symmetry reduces to \( U(1) \) from \( SU(2) \) but the wallpaper group remains \( p\6m \). When \( D_p \neq 0 \), then there are global spin rotation symmetries and the wallpaper group reduces to \( p3m1 \).

The classical ground state was discussed by Elhajal et al.\(^9\). We introduce their results since it is relevant to the SBMFT used in the later sections. First consider the pure isotropic case i.e the absence of Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction. Based on projective symmetry group (PSG) analysis Messio et al.\(^{32}\) showed that there are eight possible classical magnetic structure\(^{21}\). So, the states are given by (i) Ferromagnetic state (ii) \( Q = 0 \) state (iii) \( \sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3} \) states (iv) octahedral states (v) cuboc1 state (vi) cuboc2 state (vii) \( Q = 0 \) umbrella state and (viii) \( \sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3} \) umbrella states. Classical energies and the structure factor for these states can be found in Ref.\(^{32}\).

Motivated by the experimental result of vesignieite

FIG. 1. (a) The orientation of DM vector, in-plane component \( D_p \) is shown by the blue arrow and the out-of-plane component \( D_z \) is uniform along \( \hat{\mathbf{z}} \). (b) Classical ground state phase diagram for spin-1/2

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\eta > 0 & 0.4 & 0.2 \\
\eta < 0 & -0.2 & -0.4 \\
\eta = 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
D_p & 0.4 & 0.2 \\
D_z & -0.2 & -0.4 \\
\end{array}
\]
that there is strong presence of DMI and the ground state is found to be \( Q = 0 \) long range order (LRO) state. In the following, we discuss the \( Q = 0 \) classical ground state of kagome Heisenberg antiferromagnet with Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction. The classical ground state of kagome Heisenberg antiferromagnet is highly degenerate. All the possible states, where the three spins respects the angle \( 2\pi/3 \) with each other to minimize the ground state energy. With the introduction of the DMI, the symmetry is lowered, though the ground state is non-coplanar \( Q = 0 \) LRO with planar components of the spins making \( 2\pi/3 \) angle with each other.

With lowered symmetries, the spin arrangements can now be classified using the notion of chirality, that is the angle between the spins in a given triangle of Kagome lattice. If \( \vec{S}_1, \vec{S}_2 \) and \( \vec{S}_3 \) are three spins in a given triangle located in counter-clockwise direction, then we define the spin chirality as

\[
\chi_z = [\vec{S}_1 \times \vec{S}_2 + \vec{S}_2 \times \vec{S}_3 + \vec{S}_3 \times \vec{S}_1] \cdot \hat{z}
\]

(3)

In addition, the spins are non-coplanar, all the spins make a canting angle \( \eta \) with the plane of the lattice. The energies for these spin configurations are given by

\[
E_+ = \frac{J}{N} \left[ 1 - 3\cos(2\eta) \right] - \sqrt{3}(D_z \cos^2 \eta + D_p \sin(2\eta) \cos \phi)
\]

(5)

\[
E_- = \frac{J}{N} \left[ 1 - 3\cos(2\eta) \right] + \sqrt{3}D_z \cos^2 \eta
\]

(4)

where \( E_+ (E_-) \) is the energy of the configuration (as shown in the Fig. 2) with positive (negative) chirality, and \( \phi \) is the angle azimuthal angle of \( \vec{S}_1 \).

From the energy expressions, we can describe the ground state spin configuration. In the absence of in-plane component, the Hamiltonian is invariant under rotation around the \( z \) axis. The spins are forced to lie in the lattice plane with positive or negative chirality depending on the sign of \( D_z \). In more interesting case, when both in-plane and out-of-plane are present, there are two phases distinguished by chirality. For large positive \( D_z \), the spins remain coplanar with negative chirality irrespective of the value of \( D_p \). For negative \( D_z \), the spins have positive chirality but make a canting angle

\[
\eta = \frac{1}{2} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{2D_p}{\sqrt{3}J + D_z} \right)
\]

giving rise to weak ferromagnetism.

The complete phase diagram is shown in the Fig. 1(b). The two phases are separated by a first order transition. For negative \( D_z \), the canting angle continues to grow with the value of \( D_p \). In the phase diagram, the canting angle is shown using color map.

### III. SCHWINGER BOSON FORMALISM

One of the advantages of SBMFT formalism is that this approach can address both the long range ordered and the spin liquid state. Unlike fermionic approach long range order appears due to the condensation of the Schwinger bosons and hence the spin liquid states will have gapped bosonic spinons.

The model Hamiltonian Eq. (1) can be mapped to a simpler model with \( U(1) \) symmetry up to terms second order in \( D_p \). This is due to the fact that the vector sum of the in-plane components of DMI is zero in a triangle. So, for small values of in-plane components of DMI, we can rotate the spins in such a way that the \( U(1) \) symmetry is restored. However, when the strength of the in-plane component of DMI is comparable or greater than the strength of out-of-plane component of DMI, then the above rotation will not work. In this case we do the following.

We rotate the spins at \( i \)-th and \( j \)-th site by an angle \( \theta_i \) and \( \theta_j \) with \( \theta_i = -\theta_j \) about an axis \( \vec{d}_{ij} \) i.e along the \( \vec{d}_{ij} \) vector. The rotated spin at site \( i \) and \( j \) is given by \( \vec{S}'_i = R(\theta_i)\vec{S}_i \) and \( \vec{S}'_j = R(\theta_j, -\theta)\vec{S}_j \). Applying
this rotation we can write the above Hamiltonian in the following form

$$H = J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \langle \hat{S}_i \cdot \hat{S}_j \rangle$$

(6)

where $\theta = \sqrt{D_p^2 + D_z^2}/2J$. We have used the assumptions that quadratic terms in $D_p$ and $D_z$ are very small.

In Schwinger boson formalism, the spin operator is represented by two bosonic operators $a$ and $b$, given by

$$S = \Phi^\dagger \cdot \sigma \cdot \Phi$$

(7)

with $\Phi \equiv (a, b)$ be the bosonic spinor and $\sigma$ be the vector of Pauli matrices. The component of spin along an arbitrary direction $\hat{n}$ is given by

$$\langle \hat{S} \cdot \hat{n} \rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \Phi^\dagger \langle \hat{n} \cdot \sigma \rangle \Phi$$

In Schwinger boson formalism there is an emergent $U(1)$ gauge symmetry as $a_i \rightarrow e^{i\phi_i} a_i$ and $b_i \rightarrow e^{i\phi_i} b_i$. The boson operators obeys the typical bosonic commutation relations $[\Phi_{\alpha \beta}, \Phi_{\gamma \delta}^\dagger] = \delta_{\alpha \gamma} \delta_{\beta \delta}$. This representation enlarges the Hilbert space. So, to remain within the physical space, the total number of Schwinger boson at a particular is constrained to be $2S$. In the standard mean field treatment the constraint is implemented by taking the ground state average and a Lagranges multiplier $\lambda$ is introduced which can be thought as chemical potential. Now we define two bond operator in the following way

$$A_{ij} = \frac{i}{2} \Phi^\dagger \sigma_i \Phi_j \quad \text{and} \quad B_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \Phi^\dagger \Phi_j$$

(8)

The bond operator $A_{ij}$ creates a superposition of singlet and triplet at the bond where as $B_{ij}$ helps the Schwinger boson to hop from site $i$ to site $j$. Since the form of Hamiltonian in Eq. (6) is invariant under global spin rotation, we can always decouple the Hamiltonian in terms of two bond operator as given by

$$\langle \hat{S}_i \cdot \hat{S}_j \rangle = \langle \hat{B}_{ij} \cdot \hat{B}_{ij} \rangle + \langle \hat{A}_{ij} \cdot \hat{A}_{ij} \rangle$$

(9)

:: indicates the normal ordered product. The rotated bond operators can be written in terms of unrotated bond operators as following

$$B_{ij}^\dagger = \cos \theta B_{ij} + \sin \theta C_{ij}$$

$$A_{ij}^\dagger = \cos \theta A_{ij} - \sin \theta D_{ij}$$

(10)

with two additional bond operators, given by

$$C_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \Phi^\dagger (\hat{a}_{ij} \cdot \sigma) \Phi_j$$

$$D_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \Phi^\dagger (\sigma_j \hat{d}_{ij} \cdot \sigma) \Phi_j$$

(11)

With this bond operators we can identify two identities

$$\hat{d}_{ij} \cdot (\hat{S}_i \times \hat{S}_j) = \frac{1}{2} (B_{ij}^\dagger B_{ij} + C_{ij}^\dagger C_{ij} + A_{ij}^\dagger A_{ij} + D_{ij}^\dagger D_{ij})$$

$$\langle \hat{d}_{ij} \cdot S_i \rangle \langle \hat{d}_{ij} \cdot S_j \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (C_{ij}^\dagger C_{ij} - D_{ij}^\dagger D_{ij})$$

The model Hamiltonian in terms of bond operators can be cast in the following way

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \langle \hat{B}_{ij}^\dagger \hat{B}_{ij} - \hat{A}_{ij}^\dagger \hat{A}_{ij} \rangle$$

(12)

We can decouple the quadratic field Hamiltonian in terms of bilinear operators using standard mean field decoupling scheme. The form of the mean field Hamiltonian is as following

$$H_{MF} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \langle \hat{B}_{ij}^\dagger \hat{B}_{ij} + \hat{A}_{ij}^\dagger \hat{A}_{ij} \rangle + \langle \lambda_i \hat{n}_i \rangle + \epsilon_0$$

(13)

with the mean fields corresponding to the bond operators is given by

$$\langle \hat{B}_{ij} \rangle = B_{ij}^0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \hat{A}_{ij} \rangle = A_{ij}^0$$

with $\epsilon_0$ is constant which depends on the mean fields and $\lambda$ given by $\lambda = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \langle \hat{B}_{ij}^\dagger \hat{B}_{ij} \rangle + 2S \sum_i \lambda_i$. Let $\delta$ be the neighbor vectors, then the mean field Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_{MF} = \sum_{\langle \langle i j \rangle \rangle} \left[ \cos \theta \hat{B}_{i,i+\delta}^\dagger \hat{B}_{i,i+\delta} + \sin \theta \hat{C}_{i,i+\delta}^\dagger \hat{C}_{i,i+\delta} + \sin \theta \hat{D}_{i,i+\delta}^\dagger \hat{D}_{i,i+\delta} \right] + \epsilon_0$$

with $\theta = \sqrt{D_p^2 + D_z^2}/2J$. We have, the bosonic spinor $\Phi_i = (a_i, b_i)$ and define the Fourier transformation $\Phi_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_k e^{-i k \cdot \xi} \psi_{k,\mu} \xi_{k,\mu}$ where $\xi_{k,\mu} = (\alpha_{k,\mu}, \beta_{k,\mu})$ with sublattice index $\mu$, and $N$ be the total number of sites. Then above mean field Hamiltonian reduces to a compact form, given by

$$H_{MF} = \sum_{k>0} \psi_k^\dagger D_k \psi_k + \epsilon_0$$

(14)

We define $\Psi^T_k = (\xi_{k,1}, \xi_{k,2}, \xi_{k,3})$ and the $D_k$ matrix is given by

$$D_k = \begin{pmatrix}
\alpha_{k,1} & \beta_{k,1} & 0 \\
-\beta_{k,1} & \alpha_{k,1} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \alpha_{k,3} + \beta_{k,3}
\end{pmatrix}$$
\[ D_k = \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda & 0 & Y_{12}(k) & X_{12}(k) & Y_{31}(k) & X_{31}(k) \\ 0 & -\lambda & X_{12}(-k)^T & Y_{12}(-k)^T & X_{31}(-k)^T & Y_{31}(-k)^T \\ Y_{12}(k)^\dagger & X_{12}(-k)^T & -\lambda & 0 & Y_{23}(k)^\dagger & X_{23}(k)^\dagger \\ X_{12}(k)^\dagger & Y_{12}(-k)^T & 0 & -\lambda & X_{23}(-k)^T & Y_{23}(-k)^T \\ Y_{31}(k) & X_{31}(-k) & Y_{23}(k)^\dagger & X_{23}(k)^\dagger & -\lambda & 0 \\ X_{31}(-k)^T & Y_{31}(-k)^T & Y_{23}(-k)^T & X_{23}(-k)^T & 0 & -\lambda \end{pmatrix} \]

where \( X_{ij}(k) \) and \( Y_{ij}(k) \) are \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix, given by

\[ X_{ij}(k) = \frac{i}{2} \left( A_{ij} e^{-ikr_{ij}} + A'_{ij} e^{-ikr_{ij+3}} e^{-i\pi/3} \right) \sigma_y \left( \cos \theta - i \sin \theta d_{ij} \cdot \right) \]

\[ Y_{ij}(k) = \frac{1}{2} \left( B_{ij} e^{-ikr_{ij}} + B'_{ij} e^{-ikr_{ij+3}} e^{-i\pi/3} \right) \left( \cos \theta + i \sin \theta d_{ij} \cdot \right) \]

The structure of the \( D_k \) matrix is slightly different at the special points \( \Gamma, M, \) and \( K \). Using the standard Bogoliubov transformation we can diagonalize the mean field Hamiltonian \( \psi_k = M \bar{\psi}_k \) where \( M \) is the Bogoliubov matrix of the form \( M = \begin{pmatrix} U & V \\ X & Y \end{pmatrix} \) and \( \bar{\psi}_k = \left( \xi_{k,1}, \xi_{k,2}, \xi_{k,3}, \xi_{k,4} \right) \) and \( \xi_K = \left( \tilde{\alpha}_k, \tilde{\beta}_k \right) \)

The mean field energy is given by

\[ E_{MF} = \sum_{\mu,k>0} \left[ \omega_{k\mu} (\tilde{\alpha}_{k\mu} \tilde{\alpha}_{k\mu} + \tilde{\beta}_{k\mu} \tilde{\beta}_{k\mu}) + (2S + 1)N\lambda \right] + 2(A^2 - B^2) \]  

where \( \omega_{k\mu} \) is the dispersion relation of the \( \mu = 1, \ldots, 2m \) spin modes with \( m \) be the number sites within the unit cell. The ground state \( |0\rangle \) is the vacuum of the Bogoliubov bosons.

**Choice of mean fields:** In the large \( S \) limit the SBMFT result should mimic the classical ground state i.e the \( Q = 0 \) umbrella state. In the classical limit we define

\[ \langle a \rangle = r_1 e^{i\theta_1} \]
\[ \langle b \rangle = r_2 e^{i\theta_2} \]

where \( r_1, r_2 \) is the modulus and \( \theta_1, \theta_2 \) be the argument of the average values of two flavors of bosonic operator \( a \) and \( b \) in the classical limit. To obtain the \( Q = 0 \) spin configuration, we must have

\[ \langle a_i \rangle = \sqrt{2S} \cos \left( \frac{\xi}{2} \right) \]
\[ \langle b_i \rangle = \sqrt{2S} \sin \left( \frac{\xi}{2} \right) e^{i\beta_i} \]

where \( \beta_1 = \frac{\pi}{6}, \beta_2 = \frac{\pi}{2}, \) and \( \beta_3 = -\frac{\pi}{6} \) and \( \xi = \pi/2 - \eta \). The mean fields we obtain using these are summarized in table below

One can immediately notice that a gauge transformation by angles \( \{ \frac{\pi}{6}, -\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{6} \} \) at three sublattices will make both \( A \) and \( D \) fields real. At the same time \( B \) and \( C \) fields will acquire a constant phase of \( 4\pi/3 \). Thus, in the final calculation we can take \( A' \) as a real number and \( B' \) as a complex number. However, the optimization of the mean field parameters shows that for the symmetry of the spiral order we must have \( B' = 0 \). Basically we are left to optimize \( A' \) field and \( \lambda \).

The mean field parameters can be obtained by extremizing the mean field energy with respect to the mean field parameters which is equivalent to the solve the self-consistency equations.

\[ \frac{\partial E}{\partial A'} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial E}{\partial \lambda} = 0 \]  

Few optimized values of the mean field parameters and energies are given in the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>( D_p )</th>
<th>( D_z )</th>
<th>( A' )</th>
<th>( \lambda )</th>
<th>Energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26429</td>
<td>-0.46458</td>
<td>-0.13970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.52736</td>
<td>-0.92482</td>
<td>-0.55622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. SBMFT RESULTS

We have computed the zero temperature ground state phase diagram for this model in the parameter space of $0 \leq D_p \leq 0.5$ and $-0.5 \leq D_z \leq 0.5$ based on chirality, the $ZZ$ correlation at $\Gamma$ point and also the gap in the thermodynamic limit for various values of $S$. Our proposed ground state phase diagram for $S = 0.5$ is quite similar to the classical phase diagram and is as shown in the Fig. 3(a). In the phase diagram for $S = 0.5$, we found $Q = 0$ structure with two chiralities. The boundary between two phases obtained from the chirality is shown by a black line. The boundary obtained from SBMFT is not exactly same as obtained from the classical case but the qualitative features remains the same as shown in the Fig. 3(a). The boundary line is curved into the first quadrant of the phase diagram, that is the chirality changes at positive values of $D_z$ for a given larger $D_p$ as shown in Fig. 3. This is a result of the fact that the chirality selected by these two components is not same and hence there is a competition between these two. In the negative chirality phase, the spins are forced to lie in the kagome plane, resulting $S^z = 0$ where as for the positive chirality the spins are canted and the canting angle is shown by the color gradient. If we change the sign the in-plane component, the effect of $D_p$ is to change the canting angle from positive to negative.

As the value of $S$ is lowered, a gapped spin liquid phase opens up at the boundary line at a critical value of $S$ which is very close to 0.2 and the spin liquid phase becomes wider with decreasing value of $S$. The ground state phase diagram for $S = 0.2$ is shown in the Fig. 3(b). At this value of $S$, the gapped spin liquid phase is sandwiched between two $Q = 0$ LRO phases with two different chirality. The boundary between the QSL and the LRO is obtained from the extrapolation of the gap data. Gap as a function of $D_p$ and $D_z$ is shown in the density plot in Fig. 3(c).

Fig. 4 shows the quasi particle dispersion relations along the high symmetry line $\Gamma - M - K - \Gamma$. In Fig. 4(a) the spinon spectrum is shown at $S = 0.05$ with $D_p = 0.05$ and $D_z = 0.5$. The spectrum is gapped indicating the ground state is in the spin liquid state. The spectrum for $S = 0.2$ with $D_p = 0.2$ and $D_z = 0.05$ is as shown in the
1.0 0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0

which is defined as magnetic order, we calculate the static structure factor state has acquired LRO. To investigate the long range and $D_z$ the spinon spectrum is shown for Fig. 4(b) where the spectrum is still gapped. In Fig. 4(c) $D_z$ the static structure factor is presented in the Fig. 7(a). The ground state is in the ferromagnetic component along the $z$ direction which is result of the spins tilting away from xy plane. The canting angle can also be estimated from this data.

\[ S_{\alpha \beta}(Q) = \frac{3}{4N} \sum_{ij} e^{i(Q \cdot (R_i - R_j))} |0\rangle S_{\alpha}^{i} S_{\beta}^{j} |0\rangle \]  

(22)

where $R_i$ and $R_j$ is the site index and $\alpha, \beta \in \{x, y, z\}$. A magnetic long order state produces a sharp discrete Bragg peaks where as QSL produces a continuous, diffusive scattering spectra. Here, we have calculated both the transverse component and ZZ component of static structure factor for different points in the parameter space to examine the magnetic structure.

![FIG. 5. (a)XX-component of SSF at $S = 0.2$ with $D_p = 0.05$ and $D_z = 0.05$ (b) XX-component of SSF at $S = 0.5$ with $D_p = 0.5$ and $D_z = 0$ (c) ZZ-component of SSF at $S = 0.5$ with $D_p = 0.5$ and $D_z = 0$](image)

The XX-component of static structure factor for $S = 0.20$ at $D_p = 0.05$ and $D_z = 0.05$ is shown in the Fig. 5(a). This is a representative point in QSL region of the phase diagram. There is a broad peak at $M_z$ supports the conclusion that the ground state is in spin liquid state. To illustrate the canting of the spins, we show the static structure factor for $S = 0.5$ with $D_z = 0$ and $D_p = 0.5$ in Fig. 5(b). Sharp peaks appear at the $M_z$ point, indicating magnetic LRO of $Q = 0$ type. From Fig. 5(c), we see a peak at $\Gamma$ point. This suggests that there is a ferromagnetic component along the $z$ direction which is result of the spins tilting away from xy plane. The canting angle can also be estimated from this data.

V. EXACT DIAGONALIZATION STUDY

To verify the results obtained using the SBMFT, we have computed numerical results by employing the exact diagonalization method up to 30 sites. We have computed various physical quantities to examine the magnetic structure of this model. This method is exact and widely used to study the ground state of different frustrated magnets though it is limited by small system size due to the huge computational requirement. In addition, the absence of the global spin rotation symmetry, due to the presence of DM interaction, the Hilbert space could not be decomposed into the invariant subspaces, restricting the size of the system to 30. In our computation, We have used the package PARPACK to diagonalize the sparse Hamiltonian matrix with total number of spins $N$ is $12$, $15$, $18$, $21$, $24$, $27$, $30$ for different shapes. We have applied periodic boundary condition to reduce the finite size effect. We have obtained the ground state phase diagram of the model only for the positive $D_p$. We must mention that the conclusion are made by looking at the trends of data points and extrapolation, so the accurate location of the critical point largely depends on the extrapolation function as well as cluster size and shape.

The ground state phase diagram of the present model is presented in the Fig. 7(a). The ground state is in the long range order through out the parameter space. For $D_p = 0$ case is discussed by Cepas et al.\cite{12} and they give evidence for spin liquid below $D_z = 0.1 J$ using the idea of tower of states. However, as soon as $D_p$ is added, the global $U(1)$ symmetry vanishes and hence the same.
idea cannot be used to determine existence of spin liquid. Away from the isotropic point, the ground state is in $Q = 0$ LRO. The ground state is planar with negative chirality when $D_z > 0$. With $D_z < 0$, the state is an umbrella state with positive chirality. In this case, the canting angle varies from zero to $62.2^\circ$ as $D_p$ changes from zero to $J$ as shown in the Fig. 8. These results are in agreement with the SBMFT results presented earlier.

For Vesignieite, the measured value of in-plane component $D_p = 0.19J$ and the out-of-plane component $D_z = 0.07J$ which are the two dominant term compared to other anisotropies like isotropic exchange anisotropy. The ground state is expected to be influenced by both in-plane as well as out-of-plane component of DMI. In the classical limit any small amount of $D_z$ will force the spin to lie in the kagome plane. In the absence of in-plane component, the critical value $D_z = 0.1J$ predicted by ED result, there is a disordered state at one side and ordered state on the other. So, we expect that the presence of in-plane component $D_p$ will effect this critical value. The presence of in-plane component of DMI is re-

VI. DISCUSSION
sponsible for tilting of the spins towards the z-axis. The measured value of canting angle for Vesignieite is found to be $3^\circ < \phi < 9^\circ$, as obtained from NMR data analysis.

In our phase diagram, for spin-1/2 case, the ground state is in magnetic LRO state. For negative values of $D_z$ we get the canted magnetic structure and the canting angle increases with the increase of $D_p$. For $D_p = 0.2$ and $D_z = -0.1$ the estimated value of canting angle is $6.98^\circ$ which is very close to the canting angle measured in Vesignieite as reported by Zorko et. al \cite{2016}.

Since, in the previous SBMFT studies, it was argued that lower values of spin ($S = 0.366$) is found to be better description of spin-1/2 case due to the fact that the constraint $n_z = 2S$ is not implemented exactly rather implemented as an average. However, even at $S = 0.366$, the ground state is also in magnetic LRO region for all values of $D_p$ and $D_z$. It seems the canted LRO nature of the ground state of Vesignieite is dictated by the presence of DM interaction with dominant component in the kagome plane.

VII. CONCLUSION

We have studied the effect of in-plane and out-of-plane component of Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction on the ground state of spin-1/2 kagome antiferromagnet using Schwinger Boson Mean field theory as well as numerically using exact diagonalization method up to system size $N = 30$. We found two chiralities of $q = 0$ structure in the phase diagram for spin-1/2 case in both the approaches. In case of SBMFT, for the lower values of $S$, the spin liquid phase is sandwiched between the above two chiralities. We also found that this spin liquid region shrinks to the phase boundary between the two chiralities in the large $S$ limit. In the classical limit, our SBMFT result is in agreement with the result obtained from classical phase diagram, as well as exact diagonalization results.
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\caption{(a) XX component of static structure factor (b) ZZ component of static structure factor for $D_z = D_p = 1$}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure10}
\caption{(a) XX component of static structure factor (b) ZZ component of static structure factor for $D_z = -1$ and $D_p = 1$}
\end{figure}
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