arXiv:2305.10484v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 17 May 2023

Introducing the monoclinic polymorph of the Kitaev magnet $Na_2Co_2TeO_6^*$

Emilie Dufault*,
1 Faranak Bahrami*,
1 Alenna Streeter, 1

Xiaohan Yao,¹ Enrique Gonzalez,¹ Qiang Zhang,² and Fazel Tafti¹

¹Department of Physics, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA

²Neutron Scattering Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37830, USA

Recent theoretical studies have suggested that the low-energy Hamiltonian of honeycomb cobaltate systems could be dominated by anisotropic Kitaev interactions. Motivated by the theory, a honeycomb layered material Na₂Co₂TeO₆ with a hexagonal unit cell has been studied and found to exhibit antiferromagnetic (AFM) ordering at 27 K with two spin reorientation transitions at 15 and 5 K. Here we report a monoclinic polymorph of Na₂Co₂TeO₆, also with honeycomb layered structure but with a single AFM transition at 9.6 K and without spin reorientation transitions at lower temperatures. Using neutron diffraction, we identify an in-plane zigzag AFM order in the ground-state with the spins canted out of the honeycomb planes and ferromagnetically coupled between them. The zigzag order is suppressed by a magnetic field of 6 T.

I. INTRODUCTION

Establishing a quantum spin-liquid (QSL) phase is highly desired in condensed matter physics, since the non-abelian anyonic excitations of a QSL can be used as qubits for topological quantum computing 1-6. One of the most promising proposals for the QSL phase is the Kitaev model based on anisotropic interactions among spin-1/2particles on a honeycomb lattice⁷. Experimental efforts to materialize the Kitaev model have been largely focused on honeycomb layered structures with heavy transition metals such as α -Li₂IrO₃, Na₂IrO₃, Li₂RhO₃, α -RuCl₃, Cu₂IrO₃, Ag₃LiIr₂O₆, Ag₃LiRh₂O₆, Cu₃LiIr₂O₆, and $H_3LiIr_2O_6^{8-24}$. The choice of 4d and 5d transition metals (Ru, Rh, Ir) is due to their strong spinorbit coupling (SOC) that induces anisotropic interactions among pseudospin-1/2 ($J_{\text{eff}} = 1/2$) spin-orbital states^{25–27}. Such $J_{\text{eff}} = 1/2$ Kramers doublets originate from the low-spin configuration $t_{2g}^5 e_g^0$ of the $(4,5)d^5$ or-bitals of Ru³⁺, Rh⁴⁺, and Ir⁴⁺ subjected to octahedral crystal electric field $(CEF)^{28}$.

Recent theoretical studies have suggested that both the anisotropic exchange interactions and Kramers doublets can also be realized in the high-spin configuration $t_{2g}^5 e_g^2$ of the $3d^7$ orbitals of Co^{2+} and $\text{Ni}^{3+29-32}$. The tantalizing possibility of synthesizing Kitaev QSL candidate materials with earth-abundant elements (Co and Ni) instead of precious metals (Ru, Rh, and Ir) led to a surge of activity on such materials as Na₃Co₂SbO₆ and Na₂Co₂TeO₆³³⁻⁴⁰. In these compounds, anisotropic interactions stem from a sizable Hund's coupling in the e_g manifold and enhanced SOC effect of the ligands due to proximity of oxygen to heavier Sb or Te atoms³¹.

Na₃Co₂SbO₆ crystallizes in the monoclinic space group C2/m similar to the iridates. It shows anti-ferromagnetic (AFM) ordering at $T_{\rm N} = 8.3$ K with a positive Curie-Weiss temperature $\Theta_{\rm CW} = +2.2$ K. The positive $\Theta_{\rm CW}$ and a weak hysteresis in M(H) at 2 K despite AFM ordering suggest a competition between ferromagnetic (FM) and AFM interactions in this material³³⁻³⁵. Na₂Co₂TeO₆ instead crystallizes in the hexag-



FIG. 1. (a) The hexagonal polymorph of Na₂Co₂TeO₆ has considerable sodium deficiency and site disorder between the layers. The yellow and white colors show Na occupancy and vacancy, respectively. (b) Both hexagonal ($P6_322$) and monoclinic (C2/m) space groups have honeycomb layers. (c) The monoclinic polymorph has less inter-layer sodium disorder.

onal space group $P6_322$. It undergoes an AFM transition at 27 K followed by two spin reorientation transitions at 15 and 5 K. The negative $\Theta_{\rm CW} = -8.3$ K in polycrystalline samples confirms dominant AFM interactions, unlike competing FM and AFM interactions found in Na₃Co₂SbO₆³⁷⁻⁴⁰.

Both the monoclinic (C2/m) unit cell of Na₃Co₂SbO₆ and hexagonal (P6₃22) unit cell of Na₂Co₂TeO₆ posses sodium disorder between the honeycomb layers. However, there is more disorder in the hexagonal structure because it allows for three inter-layer Wyckoff sites unlike the monoclinic structure with two inter-layer Wyckoff sites. Such disorder in the inter-layer site occupancy randomizes the position of oxygen atoms and leads to higher levels of bond randomness within the honeycomb layers and stacking faults between them (Fig. 1a).

In this article, we introduce a monoclinic polymorph

of Na₂Co₂TeO₆ in the space group C2/m, which is structurally similar to Na₃Co₂SbO₆. As shown in Fig. 1, the two-layer monoclinic polymorph reported here has a smaller amount of inter-layer sodium disorder than the three-layer hexagonal polymorph^{36,37,39,40}. Unlike the hexagonal Na₂Co₂TeO₆ that has three transitions at 27, 15, and 5 K, the monoclinic polymorph has a single AFM transition at 9.6 K. Also, the large splitting between zerofield-cooled (ZFC) and field-cooled (FC) susceptibility in the hexagonal Na₂Co₂TeO₆, indicative of spin-glass behavior, is absent in the monoclinic polymorph consistent with lower disorder levels.

II. EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

Polycrystalline samples of both hexagonal and monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ were synthesized via a solid-state reaction. The precursor materials sodium carbonate (99.5%), cobalt oxide (99.7%), and tellurium oxide (99.99%) were mixed and reacted according to the following equation.

$$3Na_2CO_3 + 2Co_3O_4 + 3TeO_2 \rightarrow 3Na_2Co_2TeO_6$$
 (1)

The mixture was pressed into a 350 mg pellet, wrapped in a gold foil, and sintered in a capped alumina crucible at 850°C for 24 h. It was then cooled to 550°C and quenched in a dry box. The hexagonal polymorph was obtained by following Eq. 1 strictly, and the monoclinic polymorph was obtained by adding 30% molar excess of Na₂CO₃. Both polymorphs were fairly stable in air and had distinguishable colors of purple (monoclinic) and maroon (hexagonal) as shown in Fig. 2. We also synthesized the non-magnetic analog Na₂Zn₂TeO₆ with a similar approach (using 50% additional Na₂CO₃) to subtract the phonon background from the heat capacity data.

Powder x-ray diffraction (PXRD) measurements were performed using a Bruker D8 ECO instrument with a Cu- $K\alpha$ source. The FullProf suite⁴¹ and VESTA software⁴² were used for the Rietveld refinements and crystal visualizations. Magnetization and heat capacity measurements were performed using a Quantum Design MPMS3 and PPMS Dynacool, respectively. Neutron powder diffraction (NPD) was performed on the time-of-flight (TOF) powder diffractometer POWGEN at the Spallation Neutron Source at Oak Ridge National Laboratory by loading 2.5 g of dried powder into a vanadium sample can and cooling it in an orange cryostat. For optimal nuclear and magnetic refinements, two neutron banks with center wavelengths of 1.500 Å and 2.556 Å were selected, respectively, at 100 K and 1.6 K. The Fullprof k-Search software was used to identify the magnetic propagation vector⁴¹. The Bilbao Crystallographic Server⁴³ was used for the magnetic symmetry analysis, and GSAS-II⁴⁴ was used for the refinements.



FIG. 2. (a) Rietveld refinement of the PXRD pattern of monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆. The inset compares PXRD patterns of the monoclinic (C2/m) and hexagonal $(P6_322)$ polymorphs. (b) Rietveld refinement of the NPD pattern at $T \gg T_N$. The inset compares the colors of the monoclinic (purple) and hexagonal (maroon) polymorphs.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Structural Analysis

Figures 2a,b show the PXRD and NPD patterns of the monoclinic polymorph of $Na_2Co_2TeO_6$ (red empty circles) with Rietveld refinements in the C2/m space group (black solid lines). The crystallographic solution confirmed by both PXRD and NPD is visualized in Figs. 1b.c. and the refinement details are summarized in Appendix A. The inset of Fig. 2a shows visible differences between the PXRD patterns of the monoclinic (C2/m)and hexagonal $(P6_322)$ polymorphs. The first peak for the hexagonal compound is located at a lower angle compared to that of the monoclinic compound suggesting a stronger inter-layer connection and smaller interlayer spacing in the monoclinic polymorph. The inset of Fig. 2b shows that the two polymorphs have different colors. As shown in Fig. 1, the amount of Na-deficiency between the layers of monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ is significantly less than that of the hexagonal polymorph – a direct result of the change of space group. Therefore, structural disorders such as bond randomness within the honeycomb layers and stacking faults between them are fewer in the newly synthesized monoclinic polymorph.



FIG. 3. (a) Magnetic susceptibility per mole Co (black) and inverse susceptibility (red) plotted as a function of temperature. The filled and empty circles correspond to zero-fieldcooled (ZFC) and field-cooled (FC) data, respectively. The solid black line is a Curie-Weiss (CW) fit above 250 K. Inset shows the $d\chi/dT$ curve to identify $T_{\rm N}$ (b) Comparison between $\chi(T)$ in the monoclinic and hexagonal polymorphs of Na₂Co₂TeO₆. (c) $\chi(T)$ (and $d\chi/dT$ in the inset) at several fields values. (d) Magnetization as a function of field at 2 and 150 K. Inset shows a weak hysteresis at small fields.

B. Magnetic Characterization

The monoclinic polymorph of Na₂Co₂TeO₆ has a single AFM transition characterized by one peak in the susceptibility data $\chi(T)$ without ZFC/FC splitting (Fig. 3a). The Néel temperature $T_{\rm N} = 9.6(6)$ K is determined from the peak in $d\chi/dT$ in the inset of Fig. 3a. A comparison between the $\chi(T)$ curves of the monoclinic and hexagonal polymporphs is shown in Fig. 3b. The hexagonal polymorph orders at a higher temperature $T_{\rm N} = 27$ K with two spin reorientation transitions at 15 and 5 K (the peak and trough in the ZFC data), which are absent in the monoclinic polymorph^{37,39,40}. Figure 3b also shows the absence (presence) of ZFC/FC splitting in the monoclinic (hexagonal) polymorph indicating the absence (presence) of spin-glass behavior consistent with less (more) Na disorder. In Appendix B we show that a lower quality sample of the monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ has a lower transition temperature (5.9 K instead of 9.6 K) with an upturn at around 3 K, suggesting that the previously reported spin re-orientation transitions in hexagonal $Na_2Co_2TeO_6^{37-40}$ may be due to an impurity phase of the monoclinic polymorph.

A Curie-Weiss (CW) analysis, $\chi^{-1} = (T - \Theta_{\rm CW})/C$, at T > 250 K in Fig. 3a yields a CW temperature of $\Theta_{\rm CW} = +10.3$ K and an effective moment of $\mu_{\rm eff} = 4.83 \,\mu_{\rm B}$. The

TABLE I. Magnetic properties of $Na_3Co_2SbO_6$ and the hexagonal and monoclinic polymorphs of $Na_2Co_2TeO_6$.

Material	Na ₃ Co ₂ SbO ₆	$Na_2Co_2TeO_6$	$Na_2Co_2TeO_6$
	Monoclinic	Hexagonal	Monoclinic
Space group	C2/m	$P6_{3}22$	C2/m
T_N	8.3 K	$27 \mathrm{K}$	9.6 K
$\Theta_{\rm CW}$	$+2.2 {\rm K}$	$-8.3 \mathrm{K}$	$+10.3 {\rm K}$
$\mu_{ ext{eff}}$	5.22 $\mu_{\rm B}$	$5.34 \ \mu_{\rm B}$	$4.83 \ \mu_{\rm B}$
S_m/Co	$1.47 R \ln(2)$	$0.70 R \ln(2)$	$0.70 R \ln(2)$
Reference	33	37,38	[this work]

positive sign of $\Theta_{\rm CW}$ in the monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ indicates the presence of FM correlations, unlike in the hexagonal Na₂Co₂TeO₆ which has a negative CW temperature ($\Theta_{\rm CW} = -8.3$ K). In this regard, the behavior of monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ is closer to that of Na₃Co₂SbO₆ with $\Theta_{\rm CW} = +2.2$ K and an AFM order at $T_{\rm N} = 8.3$ K. The similar behavior of these two compounds is likely related to having the same monoclinic structure (C2/m). Table I summarizes the magnetic parameters of these materials.

The effective moment of $4.83 \,\mu_{\rm B}$ in the monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ is close to the value $4.73 \,\mu_{\rm B}$ expected from a high-spin $3d^7$ system with S = 3/2 and $L_{\rm eff} = 1$ with unquenched orbital moment (g = 1.6 instead of 2). In contrast, the effective moments of hexagonal Na₂Co₂TeO₆ ($5.34 \,\mu_{\rm B}$) and Na₃Co₂SbO₆ ($5.22 \,\mu_{\rm B}$) listed in Table I are closer to the value $5.92 \,\mu_{\rm B}$ expected from a spin-only state with quenched orbital moment (g = 2)³⁷. Thus, the effect of SOC seems to be stronger in the title compound compared to its counterparts.

Figure 3(c) shows that $T_{\rm N}$, defined as the peak in $d\chi/dT$, is suppressed by an external magnetic field of 6 T. A similar behavior is observed in the hexagonal polymorph, where the suppression of $T_{\rm N}$ happens at 9 T³⁹. Such a behavior is reminiscent of the field-induced quantum paramagnetic phase proposed for α -RuCl₃⁴⁵.

Figure 3(d) shows magnetization curves below and above $T_{\rm N}$ in the monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆. At 2 K, $M(\mu_0 H = 7 \text{ T})$ reaches $1.6\mu_{\rm B}$, which is close to the local moment found in neutron diffraction (see below). The inset of Fig. 3(d) shows a weak hysteresis at 2 K for H < 3 T, evidence of a finite FM component and competing FM/AFM interactions. This is consistent with the observed positive $\Theta_{\rm CW}$ despite AFM ordering (Table I) as well as the c-type zigzag AFM order found by neutron scattering (see below).

C. Heat Capacity

Similar to the magnetic susceptibility data, a single peak is observed at 12 K in the heat capacity of monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ due to AFM ordering (Fig. 4a). The low-temperature spin reorientation transitions found in the hexagonal Na₂Co₂TeO₆ are absent in the monoclonic polymorph according to both magnetic susceptibility and



FIG. 4. (a) Heat capacity divided by temperature (C/T) per mole Co or Zn plotted as a function of temperature for monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ (red) and Na₂Zn₂TeO₆(black). The black data is multiplied by 0.95 to correct for the mass difference between Co and Zn. Inset shows dC/dT at zero field to determine $T_{\rm N}$. (b) Magnetic heat capacity (C_m) and entropy (S_m) of monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ in units of $R \ln(2)$ as a function of temperature. (c) C/T per mole Co as a function of temperature at different magnetic fields. (d) Suppression of $T_{\rm N}$ with increasing field according to $d\chi/dT$ and dC/dT data.

heat capacity data (Figs. 3a and 4a). The peak in dC/dTin the inset of Fig. 4a is used to evaluate $T_{\rm N} = 9.6(6)$ K consistent with the value reported from $d\chi/dT$ in the inset of Fig. 3a. The lower $T_{\rm N}$ in the monoclinic polymorph (9.6 K) compared to hexagonal polymorph (27 K) indicates enhanced magnetic frustration due to the change of crystal symmetry (Fig. 1).

To isolate the magnetic heat capacity, we synthesized monoclinic $Na_2Zn_2TeO_6$ (a non-magnetic analog of the title compound) and measured its purely phononic heat capacity (black data in Fig. 4a). After subtracting the phonon background, the magnetic heat capacity (C_m/T) is plotted in units of $R \ln(2)$ per mole Co in Fig. 4b (black curve). Also, the magnetic entropy is calculated by numerical integration using $S_m = \int (C_m/T) dT$ and plotted in Fig. 4b (red curve). It reaches 70% of $R \ln(2)$, which is the expected molar entropy per Co^{2+} for the theoretically predicted Γ_7 doublet (pseudo-spin 1/2)⁴⁶. Releasing 70% of this amount across the AFM transition could be due to either an incomplete phonon subtraction or considerable fluctuations of the pseudo-spin 1/2 degrees of freedom above $T_{\rm N}$. Table I compares the magnetic entropy of monoclinic $Na_2Co_2TeO_6$ with its hexagonal polymorph and the isostructural system $Na_3Co_2SbO_6$.

Figure 4c shows that the AFM transition is suppressed gradually by applying a magnetic field. Using the peaks



FIG. 5. (a) Neutron powder diffraction (NPD) pattern of the monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ at $T < T_{\rm N}$ modeled by a zigzag magnetic structure visualized in the bottom panels. (b) The spins are predominantly in the *bc* plane with 37° out-of-plane canting. (c) The inter-layer coupling is FM.

in both dC/dT and $d\chi/dT$, a temperature-field phase diagram is constructed in Fig. 4d that shows the suppression of the AFM order at 6 T. The measured C/Tas a function of temperature shows similar behavior to the magnetic susceptibility and displays a suppression of the AFM peak with increasing field. However, in contrast to the complete change of behavior seen in χ at 6 T, the C/T data still shows a residual peak up to 9 T. Similar suppression of the AFM peak has been reported for Na₂Co₂TeO₆³⁸.

D. Neutron Powder Diffraction

To determine the nuclear and magnetic structures, NPD profiles were collected at 100 K (Fig. 2b) and 1.6 K (Fig. 5a). The black and red ticks in Fig. 5a mark the positions of the nuclear and magnetic Bragg peaks, the latter of which appears at $T < T_{\rm N}$. The inset of Fig. 5a compares a temperature independent nuclear Bragg peak at Q = 1.2 Å to a temperature dependent magnetic Bragg peak at Q = 0.7 Å with growing intensity below $T_{\rm N}$.

The magnetic peaks in Fig. 5a are indexed by the commensurate propagation vector $\mathbf{k} = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$. A magnetic symmetry analysis based on the structural space group C2/m gives two magnetic maximal subgroups corresponding to the zigzag and stripy AFM orders within the honeycomb layers with FM coupling between the layers. However, the magnetic refinement for the zigzag order produces a higher quality fit than the stripey configuration (Appendix C). Thus, the magnetic subgroup that best represents the experimental data is $P_s\overline{1}$ (Irrep: mV_{1-}) which describes a zigzag AFM order within the layers and FM coupling between them (Figs. 5b,c). The non-vanishing $\chi(T)$ when $T \to 0$ and positive Θ_{CW} in Fig. 3a are consistent with such a magnetic structure.

A refinement of the moment size in the zigzag structure gives $\mu = (0.48(15), 1.50(15), 1.18(16)) \mu_{\rm B}$ suggesting that the spins lie primarily along the *b* axis with 37° canting out of plane (Figs. 5b,c). The magnetic moment per Co²⁺ from this refinement is 1.83 $\mu_{\rm B}$ which can be understood by considering the high-spin configuration (⁴*F*) of the $3d^7$ orbitals which splits into two triplets and a singlet (⁴*F* $\rightarrow 2^4T + ^4A$) under the octahedral CEF⁴⁷. The lowest energy triplet ⁴*T* has an orbital angular momentum $L = -\frac{3}{2}L_{\rm eff} = -\frac{3}{2} \times 1$ and spin $\frac{3}{2}$ leading to a total moment $\langle m \rangle = 2S + L = 2(\frac{3}{2}) - \frac{3}{2} = \frac{3}{2}$. This is close to but slightly lower than the observed moment of 1.83 $\mu_{\rm B}$. The small difference is likely due to the trigonal distortion which is ignored in the first-order analysis.

IV. CONCLUSION

The results presented here highlight the interplay between the structural symmetry and magnetic properties in Kitaev magnets. Although both polymorphs of Na₂Co₂TeO₆ have identical Co-Te honeycomb layers, the magnetic properties of the monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ are markedly more similar to the isostructural Na₃Co₂SbO₆ in space group C2/m than to its hexagonal polymorph in the space group $P6_322$. Both monoclinic Na₂Co₂TeO₆ and Na₃Co₂SbO₆ have a positive CW temperature and a single AFM transition with evidence of anisotropic interactions and magnetic frustration. These results show the importance of lattice symmetry considerations in the ongoing search for an ideal Kitaev candidate material.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank S. Nagler and Y. Ran for fruitful discussions. The work at Boston College was supported by the National Science Foundation under award number DMR-2203512. A portion of this research used resources at Spallation Neutron Source, a DOE Office of Science User Facility operated by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

TABLE II. Unit cell parameters of $Na_2Co_2TeO_6$ and quality factors of the PXRD Rietveld refinement at room temperature.

Unit cell	parameters	Refinement parameters		
Space Group	C2/m	Parameters	20	
a (Å)	5.33225(6)	$R_{\rm Bragg}$ (%)	6.92	
b (Å)	9.20808(8)	$R_{\rm F}~(\%)$	5.57	
c (Å)	5.80718(8)	$R_{\rm exp}$ (%)	5.38	
β (°)	108.90837(88)	$R_{ m p}~(\%)$	5.72	
V (Å ³)	269.745	$R_{\rm wp}$ (%)	7.69	
Z	2	χ^2	2.04	
$\rho (\mathrm{gr}\mathrm{cm}^{-3})$	4.770	$T(\mathbf{K})$	295	

TABLE III. Atomic coordinates, site occupancies, and isotropic Debye-Waller factors from NPD Rietveld refinement of Na₂Co₂TeO₆ in space group C2/m at 100 K.

atom	site	x	y	z	occ.	$B_{\rm iso}$ (Å ²)
Na1	4h	1/2	0.32818	1/2	0.700	0.014
Na2	2d	0	1/2	1/2	0.600	0.014
Co1	4g	0	0.66923	0	1.000	0.007
Te1	2a	0	0	0	1.000	0.0002
01	8j	0.28060	0.34569	0.80303	1.000	0.006
O2	4i	0.26474	1/2	0.19231	1.000	0.006

Appendix A: Rietveld Refinement

A co-refinement of PXRD and NPD patterns was used to accurately solve the crystal structure of monoclinic $Na_2Co_2TeO_6$. The unit cell parameters from the PXRD Rietveld refinement are summarized in Table II. Since neutron diffraction is more reliable in determining the oxygen positions, the atomic coordinates, Wyckoff-site occupancies, and Debye-Waller factors are reported from the NPD refinement in Table III. Since Na, Co, Te, and O have sufficiently different atomic form factors for neutron diffraction, the chemical composition of $Na_2Co_2TeO_6$ was reliably determined from the NPD refinement.

Appendix B: Good-quality vs. poor-quality sample

The quality of Na₂Co₂TeO₆ samples varies based on the amount of excess Na₂CO₃ and the temperature and duration of the synthesis. A common problem in poorquality samples is cobalt deficiency that is correlated with excess sodium between the layers (to maintain charge neutrality). Figures 6a,b show the results of the PXRD refinements in a good (S1) versus poor (S2) quality sample. The good quality sample (S1) has less sodium between the layers and no cobalt deficiency. The poorquality sample (S2) has more sodium atoms between the layers which strengthen the inter-layer bonds and shorten the *c*-axis. Thus, the first Bragg peak in Fig. 6b is shifted to the right in S2 compared to S1.

Due to cobalt deficiency, $T_{\rm N}$ is shifted to a lower temperature in the poor-quality sample (S2) as seen in Fig. 6c. Note that the $T_{\rm N}$ reduction in S2 is due to disor-



FIG. 6. (a) A good-quality sample (S1) does not have cobalt deficiency unlike poor-quality (S2) sample. (b) PXRD pattern of the poor-quality sample (S2) shows a shift of the first peak to the right indicating a larger *c*-axis due to weaker inter-layer bonding. (c) The magnetic transition is reduced from 9.6 to 5.9 K in the poor-quality sample.

der; it is not an evidence of increasing proximity to the Kitaev spin liquid phase. Also, there is an upturn in $\chi(T)$ of S2 at 3 K similar to the upturn observed in Fig. 3b in the hexagonal polymorph. It is likely that this upturn is due to disorder (Co deficiency) in the monoclinic phase and it shows up in hexagonal samples that are contaminated with a small amount of a parasitic monoclinic phase.

Appendix C: Neutron Diffraction

A symmetry analysis of the $\mathbf{k} = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$ wavevector in the structural space group C2/m of Na₂Co₂TeO₆ gives two magnetic models belonging to the maximal magnetic space group $P_s \overline{1}$. The irreducible representations of these two magnetic models are mV_1^- and mV_1^+ corresponding to the zigzag and stripy orders, respectively. The Rietveld refinement for both magnetic structures are shown in Fig. 7. Whereas the zigzag model produces a good fit quality, the stripy model does not fit the data properly as seen in Fig. 7. For example, the large Bragg peak at Q = 0.7 (Å⁻¹) and the small peaks near 1.8 and 1.9 (Å⁻¹) are fitted poorly in the stripy model. We found a small amount (2% volume fraction) of Co₃O₄ impurity in our samples. The peaks corresponding to this impurity are marked by asterisks in Fig. 7.

It is also possible to refine the NPD pattern in a lower

symmetry space group $P_s 1$ (irrep. mV_1^+) which allows four different Co moment sites, which we constraint to have the same size. The refinement in this model, which also gives a zigzag in-plane ordering but with 26° outof-plane canting, is presented in Fig. 7c. This model



FIG. 7. Comparison between the magnetic Rietveld refinements of the NPD pattern using three different models. (a) Maximal magnetic space group $P_s \bar{1}$ with zigzag order, which gives the best fit and amoment of $1.83 \,\mu_{\rm B}$ per Co²⁺. (b) Maximal magnetic space group $P_s \bar{1}$ with stripy order, which gives the worst fit. (c) Magnetic subgroup $P_s 1$ with zigzag order but in a lower symmetry magnetic structure. The fit quality is worse than in panel (a). The red and blue circles in the insets represent anti-parallel spins. The poor fit quality of the stripy model leads to a larger weighted profile factor $R_{\rm WP}$. The asterisks mark the positions of Co₃O₄ impurity peaks.

produces a lower quality fit than the first zigzag model in Fig. 7a. It also gives a total moment of $2.91 \,\mu_{\rm B}$ which is considerably higher than the expected moment from the doublet ground-state $(1.5 \,\mu_{\rm B})$ and should produce twice the magnetic entropy shown in Fig. 4b. Thus, the model that best describes the behavior of the title compound is the zigzag model presented in Figs. 5 and 7a.

¹ C. Broholm, R. J. Cava, S. A. Kivelson, D. G. Nocera,

^{*} These authors contributed equally to this work.

M. R. Norman, and T. Senthil, Science **367**, eaay0668 (2020).

- ² Y. Motome and J. Nasu, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **89**, 012002 (2020).
- ³ J. Knolle and R. Moessner, Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics **10**, 451 (2019).
- ⁴ L. Savary and L. Balents, Reports on Progress in Physics 80, 016502 (2016).
- ⁵ A. Y. Kitaev, Annals of Physics **303**, 2 (2003).
- ⁶ C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. Das Sarma, Reviews of Modern Physics 80, 1083 (2008).
- ⁷ A. Kitaev, Annals of Physics **321**, 2 (2006), january Special Issue.
- ⁸ Y. Singh, S. Manni, J. Reuther, T. Berlijn, R. Thomale, W. Ku, S. Trebst, and P. Gegenwart, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 127203 (2012).
- ⁹ K. W. Plumb, J. P. Clancy, L. J. Sandilands, V. V. Shankar, Y. F. Hu, K. S. Burch, H.-Y. Kee, and Y.-J. Kim, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 041112 (2014).
- ¹⁰ K. Mehlawat, A. Thamizhavel, and Y. Singh, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 144406 (2017).
- ¹¹ I. I. Mazin, S. Manni, K. Foyevtsova, H. O. Jeschke, P. Gegenwart, and R. Valentí, Phys. Rev. B 88, 035115 (2013).
- ¹² V. Todorova and M. Jansen, Zeitschrift für anorganische und allgemeine Chemie **637**, 37 (2011).
- ¹³ M. Abramchuk, C. Ozsoy-Keskinbora, J. W. Krizan, K. R. Metz, D. C. Bell, and F. Tafti, Journal of the American Chemical Society **139**, 15371 (2017).
- ¹⁴ F. Bahrami, W. Lafargue-Dit-Hauret, O. I. Lebedev, R. Movshovich, H.-Y. Yang, D. Broido, X. Rocquefelte, and F. Tafti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 237203 (2019).
- ¹⁵ F. Bahrami, E. M. Kenney, C. Wang, A. Berlie, O. I. Lebedev, M. J. Graf, and F. Tafti, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 094427 (2021).
- ¹⁶ F. Bahrami, X. Hu, Y. Du, O. I. Lebedev, C. Wang, H. Luetkens, G. Fabbris, M. J. Graf, D. Haskel, Y. Ran, and F. Tafti, Science Advances 8, eabl5671 (2022).
- ¹⁷ J. H. Roudebush, K. Ross, and R. Cava, Dalton Transactions 45, 8783 (2016).
- ¹⁸ K. Kitagawa, T. Takayama, Y. Matsumoto, A. Kato, R. Takano, Y. Kishimoto, S. Bette, R. Dinnebier, G. Jackeli, and H. Takagi, Nature **554**, 341 (2018).
- ¹⁹ E. M. Kenney, C. U. Segre, W. Lafargue-Dit-Hauret, O. I. Lebedev, M. Abramchuk, A. Berlie, S. P. Cottrell, G. Simutis, F. Bahrami, N. E. Mordvinova, G. Fabbris, J. L. McChesney, D. Haskel, X. Rocquefelte, M. J. Graf, and F. Tafti, Phys. Rev. B **100**, 094418 (2019).
- ²⁰ J. Wang, W. Yuan, T. Imai, P. M. Singer, F. Bahrami, and F. Tafti, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 214405 (2021).
- ²¹ A. de la Torre, B. Zager, F. Bahrami, M. DiScala, J. R. Chamorro, M. H. Upton, G. Fabbris, D. Haskel, D. Casa, T. M. McQueen, F. Tafti, and K. W. Plumb, Phys. Rev. B **104**, L100416 (2021).
- ²² G. Fabbris, A. Thorn, W. Bi, M. Abramchuk, F. Bahrami, J. H. Kim, T. Shinmei, T. Irifune, F. Tafti, A. N. Kolmogorov, and D. Haskel, Phys. Rev. B **104**, 014102 (2021).
- ²³ F. Bahrami, M. Abramchuk, O. Lebedev, and F. Tafti,

Molecules **27** (2022), 10.3390/molecules27030871.

- ²⁴ A. de la Torre, B. Zager, F. Bahrami, M. H. Upton, J. Kim, G. Fabbris, G.-H. Lee, W. Yang, D. Haskel, F. Tafti, and K. W. Plumb, "Momentum-independent magnetic excitation continuum in the honeycomb iridate H₃LiIr₂O₆," (2023), arXiv:2302.07907 [cond-mat].
- ²⁵ J. Chaloupka, G. Jackeli, and G. Khaliullin, Physical Review Letters **105**, 027204 (2010).
- ²⁶ H. Takagi, T. Takayama, G. Jackeli, G. Khaliullin, and S. E. Nagler, Nature Reviews Physics 1, 264 (2019).
- ²⁷ W. Witczak-Krempa, G. Chen, Y. B. Kim, and L. Balents, Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics 5, 57 (2014).
- ²⁸ J. G. Rau, E. K.-H. Lee, and H.-Y. Kee, Physical Review Letters **112**, 077204 (2014).
- ²⁹ R. Sano, Y. Kato, and Y. Motome, Phys. Rev. B 97, 014408 (2018).
- ³⁰ H. Liu and G. Khaliullin, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 014407 (2018).
- ³¹ P. P. Stavropoulos, D. Pereira, and H.-Y. Kee, Physical Review Letters **123**, 037203 (2019).
- ³² H. Liu, J. c. v. Chaloupka, and G. Khaliullin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 047201 (2020).
- ³³ C. Wong, M. Avdeev, and C. D. Ling, Journal of Solid State Chemistry 243, 18 (2016).
- ³⁴ L. Viciu, Q. Huang, E. Morosan, H. Zandbergen, N. Greenbaum, T. McQueen, and R. Cava, Journal of Solid State Chemistry **180**, 1060 (2007).
- ³⁵ J.-Q. Yan, S. Okamoto, Y. Wu, Q. Zheng, H. D. Zhou, H. B. Cao, and M. A. McGuire, Physical Review Materials 3, 074405 (2019).
- ³⁶ A. K. Bera, S. M. Yusuf, A. Kumar, and C. Ritter, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 094424 (2017).
- ³⁷ G. Xiao, Z. Xia, W. Zhang, X. Yue, S. Huang, X. Zhang, F. Yang, Y. Song, M. Wei, H. Deng, *et al.*, Crystal Growth & Design **19**, 2658 (2019).
- ³⁸ W. Yao and Y. Li, Phys. Rev. B **101**, 085120 (2020).
- ³⁹ G. Lin, J. Jeong, C. Kim, Y. Wang, Q. Huang, T. Masuda, S. Asai, S. Itoh, G. Günther, M. Russina, *et al.*, Nature communications **12**, 5559 (2021).
- ⁴⁰ S. Mukherjee, G. Manna, P. Saha, S. Majumdar, and S. Giri, Phys. Rev. Mater. 6, 054407 (2022).
- ⁴¹ J. Rodríguez-Carvajal, Physica B: Condensed Matter **192**, 55 (1993).
- ⁴² K. Momma and F. Izumi, Journal of Applied Crystallography 44, 1272 (2011).
- ⁴³ J. Perez-Mato, S. Gallego, E. Tasci, L. Elcoro, G. de la Flor, and M. Aroyo, Annual Review of Materials Research 45, 217 (2015).
- ⁴⁴ B. H. Toby and R. B. Von Dreele, Journal of Applied Crystallography 46, 544 (2013).
- ⁴⁵ A. Banerjee, P. Lampen-Kelley, J. Knolle, C. Balz, A. A. Aczel, B. Winn, Y. Liu, D. Pajerowski, J. Yan, C. A. Bridges, A. T. Savici, B. C. Chakoumakos, M. D. Lumsden, D. A. Tennant, R. Moessner, D. G. Mandrus, and S. E. Nagler, npj Quantum Materials **3**, 1 (2018).
- ⁴⁶ Y. Motome, R. Sano, S. Jang, Y. Sugita, and Y. Kato, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **32**, 404001 (2020).
- ⁴⁷ M. E. Lines, Physical Review **131**, 546 (1963).