

Geometric frustration and Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interactions in a quantum star lattice hybrid copper sulfate

Hajime Ishikawa,^{*} Yuto Ishii, Takeshi Yajima, Yasuhiro H. Matsuda, and Koichi Kindo
Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba, 277-8581, Japan

Yusei Shimizu
Institute for Materials Research, Tohoku University, Oarai, Ibaraki 311-1313, Japan

Ioannis Rousochatzakis
Department of Physics, Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, UK

Ulrich K. Röbler and Oleg Janson[†]
Institute for Theoretical Solid State Physics, Leibniz IFW Dresden, 01069 Dresden, Germany
(Dated: April 11, 2024)

We study the magnetism of a layered, spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ organic-inorganic copper sulfate, which is a close realization of the star lattice antiferromagnet, one of the playgrounds of geometric frustration and resonating valence bond physics in two spatial dimensions. Our thermodynamic measurements show no ordering down to 0.1 K and a characteristic field-induced entropic shift, revealing the presence of an infinite number of competing states down to very low energy scales. The response to external magnetic fields shows, in addition, a peculiar anisotropy, reflected in the formation of a $1/3$ magnetization plateau (stable up to full saturation around 105 T) and a paramagnetic, Curie-like susceptibility for one direction of the field ($\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$), and a completely different response in other field directions. Our first-principles density functional theory calculations and exact diagonalizations show that these experimental puzzles are distinctive signatures of a strong interplay between geometric frustration and sizable Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interactions, and the emergence of a continuous $U(1)$ symmetry at low energy scales.

Introduction. The problem of tiling a plane with regular convex polygons fascinated architects since ancient times, engendering a rich cross-cultural heritage. In modern condensed matter physics, the very same patterns appear in a different context: antiferromagnetically coupled localized spins arranged on the vertices of a tiling are at heart of frustrated magnetism [1, 2] and high-temperature superconductivity [3]. The emergent spin lattices split into two classes. Bipartite lattices, such as the square or the honeycomb lattice, feature the classical Néel ground state (GS), which is globally compatible with all antiferromagnetic (AFM) bonds. Such compatibility is fundamentally impossible in geometrically frustrated lattices, where only local constraints can be satisfied. For instance, in the kagome lattice (Fig. 1 a), the local constraint imposes a 120° -spin structure within a each triangle. Since infinitely many *global* configurations satisfy this *local* constraint, the classical GS manifold is infinitely degenerate. In the case of spin- $\frac{1}{2}$, quantum fluctuations may stabilize exotic GSs such as quantum spin liquids [4–6] and valence bond phases [7–9].

The spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ star lattice antiferromagnet (Fig. 1 a) is one of the paradigmatic models of geometrically frustrated magnetism in two spatial dimensions [1, 2, 10]. As in the kagome, the triangle-based structure leads to an infinite ground state degeneracy at the classical level [11], and

an array of unconventional ground states (GSs) in the spin $S = 1/2$ limit, including valence bond solids [11–13], resonating valence bond states [14], chiral spin liquids [15], as well as magnetic field-induced phase transitions [11, 13]. Unlike the kagome, the star lattice features two inequivalent nearest-neighbour (NN) bonds. The respective Heisenberg exchange interactions are often called J_T and J_D , as the spins on these bonds are part of a triangle and a dimer, respectively. The lattice can also be viewed as a (decorated) honeycomb lattice made of triangles.

Layered sulfates often provide peculiar spin lattices such as kagome lattice in natural minerals [16, 17] and organic-inorganic materials [18, 19]. In 2020, Sorolla *et al.* reported $[(\text{CH}_3)_2(\text{NH}_2)]_3\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{SO}_4)_4 \cdot 0.24 \text{H}_2\text{O}$, (Dimethylammonium Copper Sulfate, called DiMACuS hereafter), which is the first realization of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ star lattice made of Cu^{2+} ($3d^9$) ions [20]. The crystal structure features inorganic $[\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{SO}_4)_4]^{3-}$ layers separated by dimethylammonium cations and crystal water molecules. In addition to J_T and J_D , the next nearest neighbor interaction called J_H here (Fig. 1 b), which form the hexagon, may be present due to the rotation of the triangles. Similarly modified next nearest neighbor interactions are found in a classical kagome AFM and their effect on the GS has been examined previously [21]. Sorolla *et al.* observed paramagnetic behavior down to 1.8 K in spite of AFM Weiss temperature of 41 K and proposed DiMACuS as a quantum spin liquid candidate [20].

In this Letter, we report the successful synthesis of

^{*} hishikawa@issp.u-tokyo.ac.jp

[†] o.janson@ifw-dresden.de




FIG. 1. (a) Kagome and star lattices. Close to the isolated-triangle limit ($J_T \gg J_D$), the star lattice can be described as honeycomb lattice made of spin triangles. (b) Isotropic exchange interactions in DiMACuS (top): the $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ frame shown refers to the hexagonal unit cell. Local crystal structure (bottom) described by CuO_5 pyramid and SO_4 tetrahedra, as plotted using VESTA [22]. A picture of a single crystal is also shown. (c) Observed and calculated powder XRD patterns.

millimeter-size single crystals of DiMACuS as well as pure powder suitable for detailed magnetic characterizations. We performed magnetization measurements on single crystals down to 0.1 K, and measured the entire magnetization process of the powder sample in pulsed magnetic fields up to 120 T. We also measured the specific heat with and without magnetic fields. Two remarkable experimental results are the absence of magnetic ordering down to 0.1 K and a peculiar magnetization anisotropy, with a $1/3$ plateau visible only in $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$. By combining first-principles calculations with analytical and numerical model simulations, we show that DiMACuS is a quantum star lattice magnet with $J_T \gg J_D$ and substantial chiral Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya (DM) interactions within the spin triangles.

Synthesis. The sample was prepared by reacting 0.4 g of $\text{CuSO}_4 \cdot 5\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 0.5 ml of sulfuric acid and 5 ml of N,N-dimethylformamide in a glass vial at 80°C for a few days. Aggregation of bright green crystals including hexagonal plates of a few millimeter size is formed (Fig. 1 b). The aggregation is recovered by decantation and washed by N,N-dimethylformamide. The sample is immediately vacuum dried and stored inside an argon-filled glove box as the crystal is hygroscopic. The crystal is covered by Apiezon-N grease or sealed inside a plastic tube when handling in air for measurements. Powder x-ray diffraction measurement is performed on the crushed crystals by a diffractometer with $\text{Cu-K}\alpha_1$ radiation (Smart Lab, Rigaku). The observed pattern matches well with the calculated pattern of DiMACuS with the space group $R\bar{3}$ and lattice constants $a = 12.7222(2)$ and $c = 26.0836(4)$ Å, indicating the successful synthesis: the pattern calculation is performed by Fullprof software [23] including the effect of preferred orientation along c -axis.

Low-field magnetization measurements. The magnetization of a single crystal was measured by a SQUID magnetometer (MPMS-XL, Quantum Design) in the T -range 1.8–300 K and magnetic fields of up to 5 T. We made a Curie-Weiss fit to the magnetic susceptibility χ using the expression $\chi(T) = \chi_0 + C/(T + \Theta)$, where C and Θ are the Curie constant and Weiss temperature, respectively, and χ_0 is the T -independent term. Above 150 K, we obtain $C = 0.469(8)$ emu/mol-Cu·K ($\mu_{\text{eff}} = 1.94 \mu_B$), $\Theta = 43(2)$ K, and $\chi_0 = -3.0(1) \times 10^{-4}$ emu/mol-Cu for $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$. The same fit for the data in $\mathbf{H} \parallel [120]$, parallel to the edge of the hexagonal crystal, yields a similar result with slightly larger Curie constant: $C = 0.498(8)$ emu/mol-Cu·K ($\mu_{\text{eff}} = 1.99 \mu_B$), $\Theta = 43(2)$ K and $\chi_0 = -3.0(1) \times 10^{-4}$ emu/mol-Cu. Note that no clear anisotropy was observed in $\chi(T)$ in $\mathbf{H} \parallel [120]$ and $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{a}$ above 1.8 K. The linear behavior of the inverse susceptibility $(\chi - \chi_0)^{-1}$ justifies the fits (Fig. 2 a). The enhancement of μ_{eff} with respect to the spin-only value ($1.73 \mu_B$) is typical for Cu^{2+} compounds and shows a slight anisotropy in the g factor ($g_{\parallel} \simeq 2.24$ vs $g_{\perp} \simeq 2.30$).

Below ~ 50 K, the susceptibility starts to deviate from the Curie-Weiss behavior (Fig. 2 a). In accord with a previous study [20], neither anomalies indicative of magnetic ordering nor signatures of a spin gap formation were observed down to 1.8 K. To obtain more information on the low- T regime, we measured magnetization of the single crystal samples down to 0.1 K by the capacitive Faraday method [24]. Again, the results do not show any sign of magnetic ordering, despite the relatively large Θ value (Fig. 2 b). This is one of the key experimental results. Furthermore, the low- T susceptibility is highly anisotropic and is significantly suppressed in $\mathbf{H} \parallel [120]$ than in $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$. More importantly, at the lowest field measured (0.1 T), $\chi_{\parallel}$ exhibits paramagnetic behaviour ($\chi_{\parallel} \propto 1/T$) down to 0.1 K, whereas $\chi_{\perp}$ appears to saturate at low T . So the longitudinal and transverse responses are *qualitatively* different. This is another key experimental result, which suggests the presence of anisotropic interactions.

High-field magnetization measurements. In a magnetic field, the star lattice models can feature exotic behavior with a cascade of phases [11, 13]. To study the emergence of field-induced phases in DiMACuS, we performed magnetization measurements in a pulsed high magnetic field. Measurements at 4.2 K up to 65 T were performed by the induction method in a magnetic field with the pulse length of 4 milliseconds (Fig. 2 c). As in the magnetic susceptibility, M is much larger in $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$ than in $\mathbf{H} \parallel [120]$, with the powder data taking intermediate values. While the magnetization increases rapidly below 20 T, its slope $\frac{\partial M}{\partial H}$ first decreases as the field increases, but then saturates around 30 T, which is reminiscent of a magnetization plateau.

This feature is examined in more detail by measuring the magnetization process at 0.13 K (Fig. 2 d, inset). In $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$, the magnetization increases steeply and becomes essentially flat above 2.5 T (with $\frac{\partial M}{\partial H}$ exhibiting a satu-




FIG. 2. (a) T -dependence of inverse susceptibility at 1 T and the Curie-Weiss fits. (b) Magnetic susceptibility at 0.1 and 1 T below 2 K. (c) Magnetization curves of the single crystal and powder sample at 4.2 K and up to 65 T. The magnetic field derivative for powder data is also shown. (d) Magnetization curve of the single crystal at 0.13 K. (e) Magnetization curve of the powder sample up to 120 T measured at $T_{\text{initial}} = 4.2$ K and its field derivative. (f) Specific heat divided by T at 0 and 9 T below 20 K and magnetic entropy estimated as in the main text.

rating behaviour already at 1 T), at around $0.37 \mu_B/\text{Cu}$. With $g_{\parallel} \simeq 2.24$ (estimated from the Curie-Weiss fit) this is close to $\frac{1}{3}$ of the full moment. Therefore, we conclude that DiMACuS exhibits a $\frac{1}{3}$ magnetization plateau in $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$. On the other hand, the magnetization in $\mathbf{H} \parallel [120]$ gradually increases without a clear flat region. The presence of a clear $\frac{1}{3}$ plateau for $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$ despite the presence of anisotropic interactions is the third key experimental result.

The end of the plateau-like regime is signalled by the increase of $\frac{\partial M}{\partial H}$ which becomes noticeable around 40 T at 4.2 K. A more evident increase of magnetization is observed in $\mathbf{H} \parallel [120]$, where magnetization is suppressed at low magnetic fields. The extrapolated (dashed) lines (Fig. 2 c) cross at 53 T, which may be considered as the onset of the jump to saturation for $\mathbf{H} \perp \mathbf{c}$. To study the behavior in higher fields, we performed magnetization measurements by the induction method up to around 120 T (Fig. 2 e) generated by the destructive sin-

gle turn coil method with the pulse length of 7 microseconds [25]. Powder sample was used due to the small sample space. $\frac{\partial M}{\partial H}$ exhibits a minimum at around 30 T and a maximum at around 65 T, which are consistent with the data obtained in the measurements up to 65 T, albeit with large noise caused by the magnetic field generation. The field derivative becomes small and almost constant above 105 T, indicating that the fully polarized state is reached. Indeed, the magnetization at 105 T is approximately three times larger than the value at 30 T in the $\frac{1}{3}$ plateau-like region.

Specific heat measurements. The specific heat C_p of the single crystal was measured by the relaxation method using a commercial apparatus (PPMS, Quantum Design). At zero field, C_p/T shows a low- T upturn (Fig. 2 f), which may indicate long-range ordering below 0.1 K (the lowest T in χ measurements). Measurements in 9 T applied along the c -axis reveal a considerable enhancement of C_p/T above 2 K. While we do not have data below 2 K at 9 T, the system is already in the $\frac{1}{3}$ plateau phase (Fig. 2 d), and the remaining magnetic entropy should be small. Hence, the field-induced enhancement of C_p/T above 2 K gives strong evidence for the existence of low-lying magnetic excitations residing below 2 K in zero field and which are propelled to higher energies by the field. This behaviour is a hallmark of isolated or weakly-interacting spin- S degrees of freedom emerging at low-energy scales. To shed further light on this, we estimate the entropy content of the low-lying excitations by integrating the difference of C_p/T between 9 and 0 T from 2 K up to 20 K. The obtained entropy is approximately $1.8 \text{ J/K mol-Cu}^{-1}$ at 20 K, very close to $\frac{1}{3} R \ln 2$. This value is associated with *one* doublet degree of freedom per Cu triangle. This is the fourth key experimental finding.

Microscopic modeling. We now set out to develop a microscopic description that accounts for all experimental findings. Based on the crystal structure of DiMACuS, we can identify three inequivalent exchange paths between neighbouring spins, J_T , J_D , and J_H (Fig. 1 b), which can be estimated by first-principles density-functional-theory (DFT) calculations. To this end, we employed the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) [26] as implemented in the full-potential code FPLO version 21 [27]. Following [20], we keep only $\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{SO}_4)_4$ magnetic layers and discard the organic cations. A uniform background charge was used to retain electroneutrality. Since the experimental structure features the unusually short hydroxyl bond length of about $0.82 \text{ \AA}$, we calculated the optimal hydrogen position ($z/c = 0.370053$) with respect to the GGA total energy. Next, we performed magnetic supercell calculations using the GGA+ U functional with the Coulomb repulsion U_d of $8.5 \pm 1 \text{ eV}$ and Hund's exchange J_d of 1 eV , respectively, and the fully localized limit as the double counting correction. Magnetic exchange integrals were estimated by mapping the GGA+ U energies of eight different magnetic configurations onto a classical Heisenberg model;

the resulting redundant linear problem was solved by the least-squares method. For $U_d = 9.5$ eV, we found $J_T = 81.5$ K, $J_D = 5.4$ K, and $J_H = 0.3$ K (practically negligible) [28]. This choice of U_d is justified by the excellent agreement between the calculated Weiss temperature $\Theta = \frac{1}{2}J_T + \frac{1}{4}J_D + \frac{1}{2}J_H = 42.2$ K and its experimental value.

The J_T - J_D model in the strong-coupling limit $J_T \gg J_D$ suggests an effective description in terms of isolated $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg triangles. Indeed, the isolated triangle model with $J_T = 58.5$ K and $g = 2.205$ accounts for the experimental $\chi(T)$ measured in $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$ [28] and reproduces the $\frac{1}{3}$ plateau, which corresponds to each triangle being in the $S_z = \frac{1}{2}$ member of the Zeeman-split doublet (a similar situation is observed in the frustrated cuprate volborthite featuring magnetic trimers [29, 30]).

However, the isotropic model fails to describe the observed anisotropy. Moreover, an isolated $S = 1/2$ AFM Heisenberg triangle has two doublet GSs and not one [28], and therefore does not capture the $\frac{1}{3}R \ln 2$ entropy content of the low-lying excitations deduced from the C_p data. To determine the relevant anisotropies, we performed full relativistic noncollinear DFT+ U total energy calculations and compute the bilinear exchange matrix $J_{\alpha\beta}^{\alpha\beta}$ using the energy mapping method [31]. Total energies were calculated with the projector-augmented wave code VASP version 5.4.4 [32] using standard pseudopotentials [33] and the energy cutoff of 400 eV. These calculations were done on a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ k -mesh; for the interaction parameters, we used U_d and J_d of 9.5 and 1 eV, respectively. In this way, we found that [28]: i) the symmetric and traceless part of the exchange anisotropy is extremely weak and can be safely disregarded, and ii) the dominant Heisenberg exchange in DiMACuS is accompanied by a sizable DM anisotropy on the J_T bonds (the DM anisotropy on the J_D bonds vanishes due to inversion symmetry). The $\mathbf{D}_T$ vectors are perpendicular to the respective bonds and form acute angles of $\sim 50^\circ$ to each other, with $D_T^{\parallel}/J_T = 0.274$, $D_T^{\perp}/J_T = 0.493$, and $|\mathbf{D}_T|/J_T = 0.56$ [28]. The latter ratio is remarkably large, yet not unprecedented for cuprates [34, 35]. The sizable DM is supported by the simulated susceptibility showing excellent agreement for both field directions down to ~ 10 K (Fig. 3 a). It allows us to further refine the magnetic exchanges: $J_T = 57$ K and $|\mathbf{D}_T|/J_T = 0.42$.

The DM interactions have a drastic impact on the physics of weakly coupled triangles. The leading contribution stems from $D_T^{\parallel}$, while the influence of in-plane DM components is zero to first order in $D_T^{\perp}/J_T$ [28]. Our numerical simulations (Fig. 3 and [28]), which include all DM components, confirm this explicitly. So, to a good approximation, $D_T^{\perp}$ can be safely disregarded, and the system effectively features two emergent (i.e., approximate) symmetries at low energies: $U(1)$ spin rotation and a threefold spatial rotation, both around the $\mathbf{c}$ axis.

Hence, for $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$, the states of the system have well defined total moment S_z along $\mathbf{c}$ and chirality ℓ (irreps of threefold spatial rotation). Now, in the absence of




FIG. 3. (a) Magnetic susceptibility at 1 T for different field directions (symbols) and fits (lines) with the anisotropic triangle Heisenberg model with $|\mathbf{D}|/J = 0.42$ ($J = 56.5$ K, $g = 2.249$, and $\chi_0 = -2.82 \times 10^{-4}$ emu/mol Cu for $\mathbf{H} \perp \mathbf{c}$ and $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$). (b) Spectra of a Heisenberg triangle and a triangle with $D_T^{\parallel}$. (c) Magnetization curve simulated for the parameters from (a). (d) Simulated specific heat for an isolated triangle ($J_D = 0$) at 0 and 9 T, and for two triangles coupled with $J_D = 4$ K. (e) Powder-averaged magnetization isotherm of an isolated triangle with $|\mathbf{D}|/J = 0.42$ (solid line, obtained by averaging over a Fibonacci sphere of 500 points), in comparison with the isotropic triangle (dashed lines) and the experiment (circles). Matplotlib [36] was used for plotting (a) and (c)-(e). For plotting scripts and numerical data, see Ref. [37].

$D_T^{\parallel}$, each triangle has two doublet GSs, separated by the $S = 3/2$ quartet by a gap of $3J_T/2 \simeq 85$ K (Fig. 3 b, left). At lower temperatures, the J_T scale disappears from the problem, and we are left with two doublets of opposite chirality ℓ (irreps of threefold rotation symmetry). $D_T^{\parallel}$ lifts the degeneracy of the two doublets and introduces a new energy scale, the gap $\Delta = \sqrt{3}|D_T^{\parallel}| \simeq 35$ K, (Fig. 3 b, right). At lower T , this scale also disappears from the problem, and we are left with one doublet per triangle, in agreement with the C_p data (see Fig. 3 d, which also demonstrates the characteristic field-induced entropic shift seen experimentally, at the level of two coupled triangles).

The peculiar anisotropy of DiMACuS is governed by the emergent $U(1)$ symmetry: unaffected by a field along $\mathbf{c}$, but broken for fields perpendicular to $\mathbf{c}$. This is manifest as follows [28]. $D_T^{\parallel}$ gives rise to a characteristic locking between S_z and ℓ : the $S_z = \pm 1/2$ members of one doublet have $\ell = \pm 1$, whereas for the other doublet

$\ell = \mp 1$. Hence, a field along $\mathbf{c}$ does not couple the two doublets; instead, it gives rise to a Zeeman splitting for each doublet, the Curie-like susceptibility $\chi_{\parallel} \propto 1/(4T)$ at temperatures sufficiently below Δ , and the flat 1/3 magnetization plateau (Fig. 3c), independent of $D_{\text{T}}^{\parallel}$. By contrast, an in-plane field breaks the U(1) symmetry explicitly and thus couples the two doublets, leading to a standard level repulsion, with each doublet retaining its twofold degeneracy. At low- T , $\chi_{\perp}$ approaches a finite value (Fig. 3a), inversely proportional to $D_{\text{T}}^{\parallel}$, and the magnetization behaves as $h/\sqrt{h^2 + 3(D_{\text{T}}^{\parallel})^2}$ (where $h = g_{\perp}\mu_B H$): linear at low fields (Fig. 3c), and asymptotically approaching the 1/3 value, without developing a flat plateau. Precisely this behavior is observed experimentally in Fig. 2 (c,d).

Next, we consider the high-field magnetization of the isolated-triangle model. On exiting the 1/3 plateau, the magnetization shows an almost abrupt jump to full saturation at H^* equal to $3/2J_{\text{T}}$ in the isotropic case. D_{T} propels the saturation to higher fields, but only for $\mathbf{H} \parallel \mathbf{c}$. By using the above refined values of J_{T} and D_{T} in analytical expressions for H^* [28], we obtain $H_{\parallel}^* \simeq 64$ T and $H_{\perp}^* \simeq 56$ T. The latter is in satisfactory agreement with the endpoint of the plateau-like region for $\mathbf{H} \perp \mathbf{c}$ (Fig. 2c). The difference between $H_{\parallel}^*$ and $H_{\perp}^*$ is further corroborated by numerical simulations of the powder-averaged magnetization (Fig. 3, e). We note finally that, in the powder measurements, the value of H^* is distributed between $H_{\parallel}^*$ and $H_{\perp}^*$, effectively destroying the magnetization jumps predicted for both field directions.

The isolated triangle model does not fully account for the specific heat data: the expected gapped zero-field spectrum (Fig. 3d) is in sharp contrast with the divergence observed below 0.5 K (Fig. 2f). The root cause of this discrepancy are interactions between the triangles: for a minimal model of two triangles coupled with J_{D} , such a peak readily appears at a temperature very close to the experimentally observed (Fig. 3d). Obviously, the actual connectivity of triangles in DiMACuS follows a honeycomb lattice, and its realistic simulation requires a much larger number of spins. The interactions between the triangles can be described by an effective model, in which each spin triangle is treated as a rigid entity. While a full analysis of this model is beyond our scope, we note that the rescaling of effective spin lengths also reduces the dominant exchange scale from J_{D} to $J_{\text{D}}/9$, which may explain the lack of ordering down to 0.1 K.

Finally, we comment on the disorder in the dimethylammonium molecule and defect in the crystal water intercalated between the inorganic layers. A slight orien-

tational disorder of the dimethylammonium molecule is reported [20]. On the organic molecular Mott insulator, there is an argument that random freezing of the electric polarization of the molecules causes magnetic bond randomness, that can result in a gapless spin liquid behavior [38]. In contrast to the organic Mott insulator where the molecule itself carries the spin, the dimethylammonium and H_2O molecules in DiMACuS are non-magnetic and not involved in the magnetism in the $\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{SO}_4)_4$ layer. Indeed, no structural disorder is reported in the $\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{SO}_4)_4$ layer [20]. While we anticipate the effects of disorder on the magnetism to be weak, this may still hinder the ordering at very low T .

Summary and outlook. We demonstrate DiMACuS as a realization of a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ star lattice antiferromagnet, one of the paradigms for geometric frustration and resonating valence bond physics. The main experimental puzzles, including the absence of magnetic ordering down to very low temperatures, the characteristic field-induced entropic shift seen in the specific heat data, and the peculiar anisotropy in the magnetic response, can all be accounted for by the strong frustration in the Cu triangles and the sizable Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya anisotropy. Further studies are needed to clarify if DiMACuS orders magnetically at a very low temperature and investigate the possible role of disorder.

Star lattice magnets are known to exhibit chiral spin liquid state in the presence of Kitaev-type anisotropic interaction [15]. Substituting Cu with divalent Co may substantially enhance the exchange anisotropy and give rise to bond-dependent interactions that underlie the Kitaev physics. As demonstrated in a kagome system, cobaltate analogs of cuprates exist in nature [39] and can be synthesized [40]. Synthesis of relative materials with different magnetic cations will pave the way to explore the star lattice magnetism from the extreme quantum case to the classical large- S limit.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Dr. D. Nishio-Hamane for taking the optical image of the crystal. We thank Prof. Z. Hiroi for fruitful discussions and U. Nitzsche for technical assistance. HI was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grants No. JP22H04467 and No. JP 22K13996. OJ was supported by the Leibniz Association through the Leibniz Competition and the German Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through SFB 1143 (project-id 247310070). IR acknowledges the support by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, Grant No. EP/V038281/1.

[1] C. Lacroix, P. Mendels, and F. Mila, *Introduction to frustrated magnetism: materials, experiments, theory*, Vol. 164

in Springer Series in Solid-State Sciences (Springer, Berlin, 2011).

- [2] J. Richter, J. Schulenburg, and A. Honecker, Quantum magnetism in two dimensions: from semi-classical Néel order to magnetic disorder, in *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Vol. 645, edited by U. Schollwöck, J. Richter, D. Farnell, and R. Bishop (Springer Berlin/Heidelberg, 2004) pp. 85–153.
- [3] P. W. Anderson, The resonating valence bond state in La_2CuO_4 and superconductivity, *Science* **235**, 1196 (1987).
- [4] A. Kitaev, Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond, *Ann. Phys.* **321**, 2 (2006).
- [5] S. Yan, D. A. Huse, and S. R. White, Spin-liquid ground state of the $S = 1/2$ kagome Heisenberg antiferromagnet, *Science* **332**, 1173 (2011).
- [6] S. Depenbrock, I. P. McCulloch, and U. Schollwöck, Nature of the spin-liquid ground state of the $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg model on the kagome lattice, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 067201 (2012).
- [7] R. R. Singh and D. A. Huse, Ground state of the spin-1/2 kagome-lattice Heisenberg antiferromagnet, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 180407 (2007).
- [8] S. Capponi, V. R. Chandra, A. Auerbach, and M. Weinstein, p6 chiral resonating valence bonds in the kagome antiferromagnet, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 161118 (2013).
- [9] A. Ralko, F. Mila, and I. Rousochatzakis, Microscopic theory of the nearest-neighbor valence bond sector of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ kagome antiferromagnet, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 104401 (2018).
- [10] D. J. Farnell, O. Götze, J. Richter, R. Bishop, and P. Li, Quantum $s = 1/2$ antiferromagnets on archimedean lattices: The route from semiclassical magnetic order to non-magnetic quantum states, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 184407 (2014).
- [11] J. Richter, J. Schulenburg, A. Honecker, and D. Schmalzfuß, Absence of magnetic order for the spin-half Heisenberg antiferromagnet on the star lattice, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 174454 (2004).
- [12] B.-J. Yang, A. Paramekanti, and Y. B. Kim, Competing quantum paramagnetic ground states of the Heisenberg antiferromagnet on the star lattice, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 134418 (2010).
- [13] S.-J. Ran, W. Li, S.-S. Gong, A. Weichselbaum, J. von Delft, and G. Su, Emergent spin-1 trimerized valence bond crystal in the spin-1/2 Heisenberg model on the star lattice, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 075146 (2018).
- [14] S. S. Jahromi and R. Orús, Spin-1/2 Heisenberg antiferromagnet on the star lattice: Competing valence-bond-solid phases studied by means of tensor networks, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 155108 (2018).
- [15] H. Yao and S. A. Kivelson, Exact chiral spin liquid with non-abelian anyons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 247203 (2007).
- [16] M. Townsend, G. Longworth, and E. Roudaut, Triangular-spin, kagome plane in jarosites, *Phys. Rev. B* **33**, 4919 (1986).
- [17] H. Ishikawa, Y. Okamoto, and Z. Hiroi, Magnetic properties of the spin-1/2 deformed kagome antiferromagnet edwardsite, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **82**, 063710 (2013).
- [18] S. K. Pati and C. Rao, Kagome network compounds and their novel magnetic properties, *Chem. Commun.*, 4683 (2008).
- [19] A. V. Powell, P. Leyva-Bailen, P. Vaqueiro, and R. D. Sanchez, $\text{Co}_3(\text{SO}_4)_3(\text{OH})_2[\text{enH}_2]$: A new $S = 3/2$ kagome-type layered sulfate with a unique connectivity, *Chem. Mater.* **21**, 4102 (2009).
- [20] M. Sorolla, X. Wang, H.-J. Koo, M.-H. Whangbo, and A. J. Jacobson, Synthesis of the elusive $S = 1/2$ star structure: A possible quantum spin liquid candidate, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **142**, 5013 (2020).
- [21] H. Ishikawa, T. Okubo, Y. Okamoto, and Z. Hiroi, Kagome-triangular lattice antiferromagnet $\text{NaBa}_2\text{Mn}_3\text{F}_{11}$, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **83**, 043703 (2014).
- [22] K. Momma and F. Izumi, Vesta3 for three-dimensional visualization of crystal, volumetric and morphology data, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **44**, 1272 (2011).
- [23] J. Rodríguez-Carvajal, Recent advances in magnetic structure determination by neutron powder diffraction, *Physica B* **192**, 55 (1993).
- [24] Y. Shimizu, Y. Kono, T. Sugiyama, S. Kittaka, Y. Shimura, A. Miyake, D. Aoki, and T. Sakakibara, Development of high-resolution capacitive faraday magnetometers for sub-kelvin region, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **92**, 123908 (2021).
- [25] S. Takeyama, R. Sakakura, Y. H. Matsuda, A. Miyata, and M. Tokunaga, Precise magnetization measurements by parallel self-compensated induction coils in a vertical single-turn coil up to 103 t, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **81**, 014702 (2011).
- [26] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, Generalized gradient approximation made simple, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- [27] K. Koepnick and H. Eschrig, Full-potential nonorthogonal local-orbital minimum-basis band-structure scheme, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 1743 (1999).
- [28] See Supplemental Material on page 8 for i) details of the first-principles calculations of microscopic interactions, ii) the quantum-mechanical problem of a single spin-1/2 triangle with DM interactions, and iii) simulations of the magnetic susceptibility of this model and fits to the experimental $\chi(T)$ of DiMACuS .
- [29] H. Ishikawa, M. Yoshida, K. Nawa, M. Jeong, S. Krämer, M. Horvatić, C. Berthier, M. Takigawa, M. Akaki, A. Miyake, *et al.*, One-third magnetization plateau with a preceding novel phase in volborthite, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 227202 (2015).
- [30] O. Janson, S. Furukawa, T. Momoi, P. Sindzingre, J. Richter, and K. Held, Magnetic behavior of volborthite $\text{Cu}_3\text{V}_2\text{O}_7(\text{OH})_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ determined by coupled trimers rather than frustrated chains, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 037206 (2016).
- [31] H. Xiang, C. Lee, H.-J. Koo, X. Gong, and M.-H. Whangbo, Magnetic properties and energy-mapping analysis, *Dalton Trans.* **42**, 823 (2013).
- [32] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Efficient iterative schemes for *ab initio* total-energy calculations using a plane-wave basis set, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 11169 (1996); Efficiency of *ab-initio* total energy calculations for metals and semiconductors using a plane-wave basis set, *Comput. Mater. Sci.* **6**, 15 (1996).
- [33] G. Kresse and D. Joubert, From ultrasoft pseudopotentials to the projector augmented-wave method, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 1758 (1999).
- [34] O. Janson, I. Rousochatzakis, A. A. Tsirlin, M. Belesi, A. A. Leonov, U. K. Rößler, J. van den Brink, and H. Rosner, The quantum origins of skyrmions and half-skyrmions in Cu_2OSeO_3 , *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 5376 (2014).
- [35] A. Panther, A. A. Tsirlin, and I. Rousochatzakis, Frustration relief and reorientation transition in the kagome-like dolerophanite Cu_2OSO_4 , *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 224410 (2023).

- [36] J. D. Hunter, Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment, *Comput. Sci. Eng.* **9(3)**, 90 (2007).
 - [37] Source code for generating Fig. 3 and ancillary numerical data can be accessed through a figshare repository at doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.24504163.
 - [38] K. Watanabe, H. Kawamura, H. Nakano, and T. Sakai, Quantum spin-liquid behavior in the spin-1/2 random Heisenberg antiferromagnet on the triangular lattice, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **83**, 034714 (2014).
 - [39] A. V. Kasatkin, J. Plasil, I. V. Pekov, D. I. Belakovskiy, F. Nestola, J. Cejka, M. F. Vidasina, F. Zorzi, and B. Thorne, Karpenkoite, $\text{Co}_3(\text{V}_2\text{O}_7)(\text{OH})_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$, a cobalt analogue of martyite from the little eva mine, grand county, utah, usa, *J. Geosci.* **60**, 251 (2015).
 - [40] Y. Haraguchi, T. Ohnoda, A. Matsuo, K. Kindo, and H. A. Katori, Perfect kagome-lattice antiferromagnets with $J_{eff} = 1/2$: The Co^{2+} analogs of the copper minerals volborthite and vesignieite, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 214421 (2022).
-

Supplemental Material:
**Geometric frustration and Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interactions
in a quantum star lattice hybrid copper sulfate**

Hajime Ishikawa, Yuto Ishii, Takeshi Yajima, Yasuhiro H. Matsuda, Koichi Kindo, Yusei Shimizu,
Ioannis Rousochatzakis, Ulrich K. Rößler, and Oleg Janson

In this supplementary material we provide technical derivations and auxiliary information for: i) the first-principles calculations of the isotropic (Heisenberg) and anisotropic, in particular Dzyaloshinskii–Moriya (DM), interactions in DiMACuS (Sec. I), ii) the quantum-mechanical problem of a single spin-1/2 triangle with antiferromagnetic (AF) exchange J and DM interactions (Sec. II), and iii) simulations of the magnetic susceptibility of this model and fits to the experimental magnetic susceptibility of DiMACuS that facilitate an accurate estimation of the exchange parameters (Sec. III).

I. ESTIMATION OF THE EXCHANGE INTEGRALS

A. Isotropic (Heisenberg) exchanges

In DFT calculations, we consider the experimental crystal structure of DiMACuS [1], remove the organic cation, add a uniform background charge to ensure the electroneutrality, and use the GGA-optimized position for H atoms. All calculations are done using the rhombohedral unit cell, whose volume is three times smaller than that of the hexagonal cell depicted in Fig. S1 (left). Estimates for the three leading exchanges as a function of the Coulomb repulsion U_d are provided in Table S1. The value of $U_d = 9.5$ eV gives an excellent agreement with the experimental Weiss temperature.




FIG. S1. Left: Crystal structure of the magnetic $\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{SO}_4)_4$ layers in DiMACuS, featuring distorted CuO_4 plaquettes (blue) and SO_4 tetrahedra (orange). The unit cell parameters are $a = b = 12.7222 \text{ \AA}$, $c = 26.0836 \text{ \AA}$, $\alpha = \beta = 90^\circ$, $\gamma = 120^\circ$ (hexagonal axes) or $a = b = c = 11.31263 \text{ \AA}$, $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 68.435^\circ$ (rhombohedral axes). All calculations are done for the rhombohedral cell. The hexagonal unit cell is plotted with gray lines. Right: Crystalline environments facilitating the three leading in-plane exchange couplings J_T , J_D , and J_H . The crystal structure was plotted using *vesta* [2].

B. Anisotropic components of J_T

The experimentally observed anisotropy of the magnetic susceptibility despite the similarity of the Weiss temperature for both field directions hints at possible relevance of the antisymmetric DM exchange $\mathbf{D}_T$. To estimate this

TABLE S1. Exchange integrals J_T , J_D , J_H and the Weiss temperature θ (all in K) estimated from GGA+ U ($U_d = 9.5$ eV, $J_d = 1$ eV) total energies for 8 magnetic configurations.

exchange	bonds per spin	$d_{\text{Cu}\dots\text{Cu}}$ (Å)	J (K)			
			$U_d = 7.5$	FPLO $U_d = 8.5$	$U_d = 9.5$	vasp $U_d = 9.5$
J_T	1	3.2797	124.5	101.3	81.5	77.1
J_D	1/2	4.4387	8.5	6.8	5.4	4.1
J_H	1	6.0010	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4
θ			64.5	52.5	42.2	39.8

TABLE S2. Positions of selected atoms in the unit cell in the crystallographic (Cartesian) frame (Fig. S2).

site	X (Å)	Y (Å)	Z (Å)	site	X (Å)	Y (Å)	Z (Å)
Cu(1)	1.571222	3.828742	7.097030	Cu(3)	4.579598	2.909116	6.169293
Cu(2)	3.265568	5.665752	4.973043	S(7)	2.196772	2.893669	4.255106

exchange numerically, we determine all elements of the respective bilinear exchange matrix $\mathbf{M}_T$ by using the energy mapping method [3], and then decomposing this matrix as

$$\mathbf{M}_T = J_T \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{\Sigma}_T + \mathbf{A}_T, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the 3×3 identity matrix and

$$J_T = \frac{1}{3} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{M}_T] \quad (2)$$

is the Heisenberg coupling,

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_T = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{M}_T + \mathbf{M}_T^\top) - \frac{1}{3} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{M}_T] \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_T^\top \quad (3)$$

is the symmetric and traceless part of $\mathbf{M}_T$ ($\mathbf{M}_T^\top$ is the transpose matrix of $\mathbf{M}_T$), and

$$\mathbf{A}_T = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{M}_T - \mathbf{M}_T^\top) = -\mathbf{A}_T^\top \quad (4)$$

is the anti-symmetric part of $\mathbf{M}_T$, which is related to the components of $\mathbf{D}_T$ as $A_T^{\alpha\beta} = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} D_T^\gamma$, or, more explicitly,

$$\mathbf{A}_T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D_T^Z & -D_T^Y \\ -D_T^Z & 0 & D_T^X \\ D_T^Y & -D_T^X & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where X, Y, Z refer to the crystallographic (Cartesian) axes.

The crystal structure of DiMACuS imposes no symmetry constraints on the DM vector $\mathbf{D}_T$, but all vectors on different bonds in the cell are connected by symmetry elements. In particular, the three vectors belonging to the same triangle are connected by C_3 symmetry. In the triangle formed by the atoms Cu(1), Cu(2), and Cu(3) (Table S2), we consider the first interatomic vector $\mathbf{r}_{\text{Cu}(1)\text{-Cu}(3)}$. After performing 36 full-relativistic DFT+ U total energy calculations, we obtain the following bilinear exchange matrix:

$$\mathbf{M}_T^{\text{Cu}(1)\text{-Cu}(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} 66.0 & -35.9 & 3.1 \\ 35.9 & 65.5 & -11.3 \\ -1.6 & 11.6 & 69.1 \end{pmatrix} \text{K}, \quad (6)$$

from which we get

$$J_T = 66.9 \text{ K}, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_T^{\text{Cu}(1)\text{-Cu}(3)} = (-11.5, -2.3, -35.9) \text{ K}, \quad (8)$$

and

$$\Sigma_{\text{T}}^{\text{Cu(1)-Cu(3)}} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.9 & 0 & 0.8 \\ 0 & -1.3 & 0.2 \\ 0.8 & 0.2 & 2.2 \end{pmatrix} \text{K}, \quad (9)$$

in the (X, Y, Z) frame. So the elements of the symmetric and traceless part of the exchange anisotropy are extremely weak compared to the antisymmetric part, and can therefore be disregarded.

In the following, it is more convenient to resort to a different coordinate system, denoted by (x, y, z) in Fig. S2, with the midpoint of Cu(1)-Cu(2)-Cu(3) triangle at the origin and the z axis coinciding with the C_3 axis which crosses the midpoint and the neighboring S(7) atom. Importantly, there are two such frames, one for the Cu triangles with the S(7) atom above the Cu plane, and another for the Cu triangles with S(7) atoms below the Cu plane. The two frames are related by the inversion center in the middle of the J_D bond that connects the two types of triangles. In the following, we shall use the (x, y, z) frame of the Cu triangles with S(7) above the Cu plane as our global frame. The directions of the DM vectors on the Cu triangles with S(7) atoms below the Cu plane can be obtained by applying inversion symmetry (see site-labelling convention indicated by red arrows in Fig. S3).

The crystallographic (Cartesian) coordinates are transformed into this new coordinate system by the following matrix:

$$\mathbf{R}_{\Delta} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.35633105 & -0.84786434 & 0.39262481 \\ -0.84786434 & -0.11683799 & 0.51717980 \\ -0.39262481 & -0.51717980 & -0.76050695 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

By shifting the origin and applying this rotation matrix to the atomic coordinates from Table S2, we obtain the coordinates in the (x, y, z) frame:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}_1 &= (0.1001, 1.8909, 0) \text{ \AA}, & \mathbf{r}_{13} &\equiv \mathbf{r}_3 - \mathbf{r}_1 = (1.4874, -2.9231, 0) \text{ \AA}, \\ \mathbf{r}_2 &= \mathbf{R}_z(2\pi/3) \cdot \mathbf{r}_1 = (-1.6876, -0.8588, 0) \text{ \AA}, & \mathbf{r}_{32} &\equiv \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3 = (1.7877, 2.7497, 0) \text{ \AA}, \\ \mathbf{r}_3 &= \mathbf{R}_z(-2\pi/3) \cdot \mathbf{r}_1 = (1.5875, -1.0321, 0) \text{ \AA}, & \mathbf{r}_{21} &\equiv \mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2 = (-3.2752, 0.1734, 0) \text{ \AA}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{R}_z(\theta)$ describes the rotation around the new z axis by the angle θ . Here, we replaced Cu(1), Cu(2), and Cu(3) superscripts with 1, 2, and 3 to emphasize that we work in the new coordinate system associated with a single triangle.




FIG. S2. Local structure of the Cu(1)-Cu(2)-Cu(3) triangles, with the S(7)O4 tetrahedron (shaded orange) above the plane of the spins. The red arrows show the orientations of the DM vectors on the nearest-neighbour bonds around the triangle. We also show three different frames: i) The crystallographic (a, b, c) frame corresponding to the rhobohedral unit cell. This frame differs from the $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ frame of the main text, which corresponds to the hexagonal unit cell. ii) The Cartesian (X, Y, Z) frame pertains to the crystallographic coordinate system (same as in Table S2). iii) The coordinate system (x, y, z) of a single triangle, with the S(7)O4 tetrahedron sitting above the plane of the spins. The transformation $(X, Y, Z) \rightarrow (x, y, z)$ is described by R_{Δ} in Eq. (10). The structural elements were plotted using vesta [2].




FIG. S3. Lattice structure of Cu atoms in DiMACuS, showing the most relevant Heisenberg couplings. Red arrows indicate our site-labelling convention $i \rightarrow j$ associated with the DM coupling term $\mathbf{D}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{S}_i \times \mathbf{S}_j$ between spin sites i and j . For the actual directions of these vectors see Fig. S2 and Eqs. (12)-(14).

By applying $\mathbf{R}_\Delta$ from Eq. (10) to the DM vector in Eq. (8), we obtain the DM vectors in the (x, y, z) frame:

$$\mathbf{R}_\Delta \cdot \mathbf{D}_T^{\text{Cu}(1)\text{-Cu}(3)} = \mathbf{D}_T^{13} = -\mathbf{D}_T^{31} = (-16.2, -8.6, 33.0) \text{ K}. \quad (12)$$

The symmetrically equivalent DM vectors on other bonds of the triangle are:

$$\mathbf{D}_T^{21} = -\mathbf{D}_T^{12} = \mathbf{R}_z(\frac{2}{3}\pi) \cdot \mathbf{D}_T^{13} = (15.5, -9.7, 33.0) \text{ K}, \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_T^{32} = -\mathbf{D}_T^{23} = \mathbf{R}_z(-\frac{2}{3}\pi) \cdot \mathbf{D}_T^{13} = (0.7, 18.3, 33.0) \text{ K}. \quad (14)$$

The orientation of $\mathbf{D}_T$ vectors with respect to the constituents of the crystal structure is shown in Fig. S2. The vectors are perpendicular to the respective bonds and form 60° angle with the line connecting the midpoint of the respective bond and the third Cu atom. For instance, for $\mathbf{D}_T^{13}$, this line connects the midpoint of $\mathbf{r}_{13}$ and Cu(2). The angle between each two of the three DM vectors is close to 50° .

Finally, it is convenient to express $\mathbf{D}_T$ in units of $J_T \equiv \frac{1}{3} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{M}_T]$ and decompose them into components perpendicular and parallel to the z axis of a triangle, which coincides with the c axis of the hexagonal unit cell in Fig. S1. We obtain:

$$D_T^\parallel / J_T = 0.493, \quad D_T^\perp / J_T = 0.274, \quad D_T^\perp / D_T^\parallel \simeq 1/\sqrt{3}. \quad (15)$$

II. THE PROBLEM OF A SINGLE ANTIFERROMAGNETIC SPIN-1/2 TRIANGLE WITH DM INTERACTIONS

We consider the problem of a single spin-1/2 triangle in the presence of AF exchange J , DM interactions and an external field $\mathbf{H}$. As in DiMACuS, the triangle features a threefold rotational axis along z (perpendicular to the plane of the triangle), going through the center of the triangle. This transformation maps the individual spin operators as follows

$$\begin{aligned} (S_1^x, S_1^y, S_1^z) &\mapsto (-\frac{1}{2}S_2^x + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}S_2^y, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}S_2^x - \frac{1}{2}S_2^y, S_2^z) \\ (S_2^x, S_2^y, S_2^z) &\mapsto (-\frac{1}{2}S_3^x + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}S_3^y, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}S_3^x - \frac{1}{2}S_3^y, S_3^z) \\ (S_3^x, S_3^y, S_3^z) &\mapsto (-\frac{1}{2}S_1^x + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}S_1^y, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}S_1^x - \frac{1}{2}S_1^y, S_1^z) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

A. Hamiltonian

This problem is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM}} + \mathcal{H}_Z, \quad (17)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_J$ comprises the Heisenberg interactions, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM}}$ the DM interactions, and $\mathcal{H}_Z$ the Zeeman coupling to the external field. The latter takes the usual form

$$\mathcal{H}_Z = g\mu_B \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{H}, \quad (18)$$

where we have assumed an isotropic g factor. The Heisenberg terms take the form

$$\mathcal{H}_J = J(\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2 + \mathbf{S}_2 \cdot \mathbf{S}_3 + \mathbf{S}_3 \cdot \mathbf{S}_1) = \frac{J}{2} \mathbf{S}^2 - \frac{9}{8} J, \quad (19)$$

where $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_2 + \mathbf{S}_3$ is the total spin. The DM terms take the form

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM}} = \mathbf{D}_{12} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2) + \mathbf{D}_{23} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_2 \times \mathbf{S}_3) + \mathbf{D}_{31} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_3 \times \mathbf{S}_1), \quad (20)$$

where the DM vectors $\mathbf{D}_{12}$, $\mathbf{D}_{23}$ and $\mathbf{D}_{31}$ are related to each other via the threefold rotational symmetry, namely

$$\mathbf{D}_{23} = \mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{D}_{12}, \quad \mathbf{D}_{31} = \mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{D}_{23}, \quad (21)$$

where

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

More explicitly, denoting the three components of $\mathbf{D}_{12}$ by a , b and c , we have

$$\mathbf{D}_{12} = (a, b, c), \quad \mathbf{D}_{23} = \left(-\frac{1}{2}a - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}b, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}a - \frac{1}{2}b, c \right), \quad \mathbf{D}_{31} = \left(-\frac{1}{2}a + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}b, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}a - \frac{1}{2}b, c \right). \quad (23)$$

For later purposes, let us denote the terms arising from the out-of-plane components of the DM vectors by $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z}$ and the terms arising from the in-plane components by $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},xy}$, namely

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},xy}. \quad (24)$$

The first term, which takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z} &= c(S_1^x S_2^y - S_1^y S_2^x + S_2^x S_3^y - S_2^y S_3^x + S_3^x S_1^y - S_3^y S_1^x) \\ &= -\frac{c}{2i} (S_1^+ S_2^- - S_1^- S_2^+ + S_2^+ S_3^- - S_2^- S_3^+ + S_3^+ S_1^- - S_3^- S_1^+), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

plays a dominant role in DiMACuS, as we discuss in the main text.

B. Convenient set of basis states and matrix representation of $\mathcal{H}$

A convenient set $\mathcal{B}_1$ of basis states which diagonalizes $\mathcal{H}_J$. This set is labeled as $\{|S_{23}, S, M\rangle\}$, where S_{23} is the spin quantum number associated with $\mathbf{S}_{23} = \mathbf{S}_2 + \mathbf{S}_3$, S is the total spin quantum number (associated with $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_{23}$), and M is its projection along the z axis. The addition of three spins-1/2 gives two doublets and one quartet:

$$\frac{1}{2} \otimes \frac{1}{2} \otimes \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \otimes (0 \oplus 1) = \frac{1}{2} \oplus \frac{1}{2} \oplus \frac{3}{2}. \quad (26)$$

More explicitly, the quantum number S_{23} can be either 0 or 1. For $S_{23} = 0$, we get the $S = 1/2$ doublet

$$|0, 1/2, 1/2\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle), \quad |0, 1/2, -1/2\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (|\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle). \quad (27)$$

For $S_{23} = 1$, the total spin can be either $1/2$ or $3/2$. The former consists of the states

$$|1, 1/2, 1/2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (2|\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle - |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle - |\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle), \quad |1, 1/2, -1/2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (2|\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle), \quad (28)$$

whereas the $S = 3/2$ quartet consists of

$$\begin{aligned} |1, 3/2, 3/2\rangle &= |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle \\ |1, 3/2, 1/2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (|\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle + |\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle) \\ |1, 3/2, -1/2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (|\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle), \\ |1, 3/2, -3/2\rangle &= |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

According to Eq. (19), the $\{|S_{23}, S, M\rangle\}$ basis is an eigenbasis of $\mathcal{H}_J$, with

$$\mathcal{H}_J |S_{23}, S, M\rangle = \left(\frac{J}{2} S(S+1) - \frac{9}{8} J \right) |S_{23}, S, M\rangle. \quad (30)$$

The two doublets are degenerate with energy $-3J/4$ and the quartet has energy $3J/4$.

Now, let us examine the symmetry of these states under the threefold rotation which maps the spin indices (123) to (312). In general, the eigenvalues of C_3 can be labeled as $e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}\ell}$, where $\ell = 0, 1$ and -1 . The quartet belongs to the sector $\ell = 0$, since $C_3 |1, 3/2, M\rangle = |1, 3/2, M\rangle$ for any M . The two doublets are not eigenstates of C_3 but we can form linear combinations which are. These combinations can be labeled as $|\ell, \sigma\rangle$ with $\ell = \pm 1$ and $\sigma = \pm 1/2$ (or $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$), and are given by:

$$|\ell, \sigma\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(|-\sigma, \sigma, \sigma\rangle + e^{-i\frac{2\pi}{3}\ell} |\sigma, -\sigma, \sigma\rangle + e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}\ell} |\sigma, \sigma, -\sigma\rangle \right), \quad (31)$$

with

$$C_3 |\ell, \sigma\rangle = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}\ell} |\ell, \sigma\rangle. \quad (32)$$

Note that the $M = \pm 1/2$ members of the quartet [second and third line of (29)] are also of the form of Eq. (31), but with $\ell = 0$. Altogether, we have the following new set $\mathcal{B}_2$ of basis states:

$$\mathcal{B}_2 = \{|\ell=1, \uparrow\rangle, |\ell=-1, \downarrow\rangle, |\ell=-1, \uparrow\rangle, |\ell=1, \downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle, |\ell=0, \uparrow\rangle, |\ell=0, \downarrow\rangle, |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\}. \quad (33)$$

In this basis, the Hamiltonian in the presence of a field

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{h}/(g\mu_B), \quad \mathbf{h} = h_\perp (\cos\phi \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \sin\phi \hat{\mathbf{y}}) + h_z \hat{\mathbf{z}}, \quad (34)$$

takes the form

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{3J}{2} - \sqrt{3}c + h_z & 0 & 0 & -h_\perp e^{-i\phi} & 0 & 0 & \gamma^* & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{3J}{2} - \sqrt{3}c - h_z & -h_\perp e^{i\phi} & 0 & 0 & -\gamma & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -h_\perp e^{-i\phi} & -\frac{3J}{2} + \sqrt{3}c + h_z & 0 & \sqrt{3}\gamma & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -h_\perp e^{i\phi} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{3J}{2} + \sqrt{3}c - h_z & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{3}\gamma^* \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3}\gamma^* & 0 & \frac{3J}{2} + 3h_z & \sqrt{3}h_\perp e^{-i\phi} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\gamma^* & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3}h_\perp e^{i\phi} & \frac{3J}{2} + h_z & 2h_\perp e^{-i\phi} & 0 \\ \gamma & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2h_\perp e^{i\phi} & \frac{3J}{2} - h_z & \sqrt{3}h_\perp e^{-i\phi} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\sqrt{3}\gamma & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3}h_\perp e^{i\phi} & \frac{3J}{2} - 3h_z \end{pmatrix}_{\mathcal{B}_2}. \quad (35)$$

where $\gamma \equiv \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} e^{i2\pi/3} (a + ib)$.

C. Energy spectrum

The field dependence of the energy spectrum is shown in Fig. S4 for $\mathbf{h} \parallel \mathbf{z}$ (panel a) and $\mathbf{h} \parallel \mathbf{x}$ -axis (panel b), for a representative set of DM parameters ($c, d_\perp \equiv \sqrt{a^2 + b^2} = (0.2J, 0)$ (solid lines) and $(0.2J, 0.2J)$ (dotted lines). The main features of Fig. S4 can be understood by examining the general structure of the matrix of Eq. (35):




FIG. S4. Evolution of the energy spectrum of $\mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM}} + \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{S}$, where $\mathbf{h} = g\mu_B \mathbf{H}$, for $\mathbf{h} \parallel \mathbf{z}$ (a) and $\mathbf{h} \parallel \mathbf{x}$ -axis (b). The DM parameters c and $d_\perp \equiv \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$ are $(c, d_\perp) = (0.2J, 0)$ for the blue solid lines, and $(0.2J, 0.2J)$ for the red dotted lines. The number labels give the degeneracy of each energy level.

- $\mathcal{B}_2$ is an eigenbasis of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z}$. This is because $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z}$ is invariant under: i) C_3 and thus does not couple states with different ℓ ; ii) $U(1)$ rotations around the z axis in spin space and thus does not couple states with different S_z .
- At zero field, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z}$ lifts the degeneracy of the two doublet states of $\mathcal{H}_J$ and gives rise to one Kramers doublet $\{|\ell = 1, \uparrow\rangle, |\ell = -1, \downarrow\rangle\}$ with $E = -3J/4 - \sqrt{3}c/2$ and a second Kramers doublet $\{|\ell = -1, \uparrow\rangle, |\ell = 1, \downarrow\rangle\}$ with $E = -3J/4 + \sqrt{3}c/2$. Essentially, c locks the quantum number ℓ to the value of σ .
- Unlike $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z}$, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},xy}$ [matrix elements highlighted in blue color in Eq. (35)] is not diagonal in the $\mathcal{B}_2$ basis. More importantly, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},xy}$ does not couple the two doublets, but only connects the doublets with the high-energy quartet. As a result, the leading correction to the energy eigenvalues from the transverse DM components a and b is second order in $d_\perp/J$, where $d_\perp \equiv \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$. In other words, the transverse DM components have little influence on the spectrum (see difference between solid and dotted lines in Fig. S4), and are therefore not as significant as the z components. In particular, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},xy}$ does not influence the quartet, as long as we are away from level anticrossings.
- $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z}$ does not affect the quartet. So, in the absence of $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},xy}$, the quartet will show the usual Zeeman splitting for any field direction, see solid lines in Fig. S4. A nonzero $d_\perp$ gives rise to an excited level anticrossing at high fields, see dotted lines in Fig. S4.
- For a magnetic field along the z -axis, the Zeeman coupling is diagonal in the basis $\mathcal{B}_2$ because it conserves S_z and ℓ (the Zeeman term is invariant under C_3). Hence, a field along z gives rise to the usual Zeeman splitting of each separate multiplet, see Fig. S4 (a).
- By contrast, for in-plane fields, the Zeeman coupling [matrix elements highlighted in red color in Eq. (35)] connects states with the same ℓ and $\Delta S_z = \pm 1$. As a result, the in-plane magnetic field gives rise to: i) a level-repulsion of the two doublets of $\mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z}$, without lifting the two-fold degeneracy of each doublet, and, ii) the usual Zeeman splitting of the quartet. Figure S4 (b) illustrates these aspects.

We can also deduce the following analytical results for the energy spectrum in special cases:

- For fields along the z -axis and $d_\perp = 0$, the energies are given by the diagonal elements of the matrix of Eq. (35), namely

$$\text{spectrum of } \mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z} + h_z S^z : \left[-\frac{3J}{4} - \frac{\sqrt{3}|c|}{2} \pm \frac{h_z}{2}, -\frac{3J}{4} + \frac{\sqrt{3}|c|}{2} \pm \frac{h_z}{2}, \frac{3J}{4} \pm \frac{3h_z}{2}, \frac{3J}{4} \pm \frac{h_z}{2} \right], \quad (36)$$

- For fields along the z -axis and $d_\perp \neq 0$, the energies are given by

$$\text{spectrum of } \mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM}} + h_z S^z : \left[-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}c + \frac{\zeta_1}{4} \sqrt{3d_\perp^2 + (\sqrt{3}c + 3J + \zeta_2 2h_z)^2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}c + h_z + \frac{\zeta_1}{4} \sqrt{9d_\perp^2 + (\sqrt{3}c - 3J + \zeta_2 2h_z)^2} \right], \quad (37)$$

where $\zeta_1 = \pm 1$ and $\zeta_2 = \pm 1$.

- For fields along the x -axis (the results are the same for any direction in the xy -plane) and $d_\perp = 0$, the energies are given by

$$\text{spectrum of } \mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z} + h_x S^x : \left[-\frac{3J}{4} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2} \text{ (each two-fold)}, \frac{3J}{4} \pm \frac{3h_x}{2}, \frac{3J}{4} \pm \frac{h_x}{2} \right]. \quad (38)$$

- For fields along the x -axis and $d_\perp \neq 0$, we can obtain the energies up to second order in $d_\perp$ using perturbation theory (valid away from level-anticrossings). We find

$$\text{spectrum of } \mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM}} + h_x S^x : \left[-\frac{3J}{4} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2} + \delta E_\pm^{(2)} \text{ (each two-fold)}, \frac{3J}{4} \pm \frac{3h_x}{2}, \frac{3J}{4} \pm \frac{h_x}{2} \right]. \quad (39)$$

where

$$\delta E_+^{(2)} = -\frac{|\gamma|^2}{32} \frac{(3\sqrt{3}c + h_x + 3\sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2})^2}{(3c^2 + h_x^2 + \sqrt{3}c\sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2})(3J + h_x - \sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2})}, \quad \delta E_-^{(2)} = \frac{|\gamma|^2}{16} \frac{4\sqrt{3}c + 3h_x - 5\sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2}}{\sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2}(3J + h_x + \sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2})}. \quad (40)$$

It follows that, to leading order in $d_\perp$: i) the zero-field energy of the quartet is unaffected by $d_\perp$, and, ii) the zero-field splitting between the two lowest doublets becomes

$$\Delta = \sqrt{3}|c| + \frac{J}{32} \left(\frac{d_\perp}{J} \right)^2 \frac{12 + 5\sqrt{3}\frac{c}{J}}{3 - \left(\frac{c}{J}\right)^2}. \quad (41)$$

D. Magnetization process for $d_\perp = 0$

In the following we shall disregard the in-plane components of the DM vectors. The magnetization can be obtained using the expression

$$\mathbf{m} = -\sum_n P_n \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial \mathbf{H}}, \quad (42)$$

where $\{E_n, n = 1 - 8\}$ are the energy eigenvalues, $P_n = e^{-\beta E_n}/Z$ are the corresponding Boltzmann probabilities, $\beta = \frac{1}{k_B T}$ and $Z = \sum_n e^{-\beta E_n}$ is the partition function. We find:

- **Magnetization process for $\mathbf{h} \parallel \mathbf{z}$:** Using Eqs. (36) and (42) leads to the analytical expression

$$\frac{m_z}{g\mu_B} = \frac{1}{2} \tanh\left(\frac{\beta h_z}{2}\right) \left[1 + 4 \frac{\cosh^2(\beta h_z/2)}{\cosh(\beta h_z) + e^{3\beta J/2} \cosh(\sqrt{3}\beta|c|/2)} \right]. \quad (43)$$

The evolution of m_z with h_z/J for $k_B T/J = 0.005$ and $|c|/J = 0$ (black), 0.1 (blue) and 0.2 (red) is shown in Fig. S5 (a). First of all, the results show a clear 1/2 magnetization plateau. Second, the magnetization shows very little dependence on c (invisible in the graph) up to the saturation field h_z^* , whose value seems to be the only aspect that changes with c . Specifically, h_z^* appears to increase linearly with c . Analytically, we find (at $T = 0$)

$$h_z^* = 3J/2 + \sqrt{3}|c|/2. \quad (44)$$

- **Magnetization process for $\mathbf{h} \perp \mathbf{z}$:** Similarly, we can obtain the magnetization m_x for $\mathbf{h} \perp \mathbf{z}$ and $d_\perp = 0$ using Eqs. (38) and (42), but the resulting analytical expression for m_x is too lengthy to write down explicitly. However, we can obtain a simpler formula for the zero-temperature magnetization, where Eq. (42) reduces to

$$T = 0 : \quad \frac{m_x}{g\mu_B} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial h_x} E_1, \quad (45)$$

where E_1 is the ground state energy,

$$E_1 = \begin{cases} -\frac{3J}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2}, & \text{if } |h_x| \leq h_x^* \\ +\frac{3J}{4} - \frac{3}{2} h_x, & \text{if } |h_x| \geq h_x^* \end{cases} \quad (46)$$




FIG. S5. Low- T magnetization process of a spin-1/2 triangle described by $\mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z} + \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{S}$, for $\mathbf{h} \parallel \mathbf{z}$ (a) and $\mathbf{h} \parallel \mathbf{x}$ -axis (b). Here $k_B T = 0.005J$, $\mathbf{h} = g\mu_B \mathbf{H}$ and the three curves correspond to $|c|/J = 0$ (black), 0.1 (blue) and 0.2 (red).

and h_x^* is the saturation field. We find:

$$\frac{m_x}{g\mu_B} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \frac{h_x}{\sqrt{3c^2 + h_x^2}}, & \text{if } 0 \leq h_x \leq h_x^* \\ \frac{3}{2}, & \text{if } h_x \geq h_x^* \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad h_x^* = \frac{1}{8} \left(9J + \sqrt{9J^2 + 24c^2} \right) = J \left[\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(c/J)^2 + \mathcal{O}(c/J)^4 \right]. \quad (47)$$

Note that the saturation field h_x^* scales quadratically with c for small c/J , and therefore is not influenced from c as strongly as h_z^* . This is also demonstrated in Fig. S5.

strongly on c quadratically quaThe size of the magnetization jump at h_x^* is given by

$$\frac{\delta m_x}{g\mu_B} = \frac{3}{2} - \frac{9 + \sqrt{9 + 244(c/J)^2}}{16\sqrt{3(c/J)^2 + \frac{1}{64}(9 + \sqrt{9 + 244(c/J)^2})^2}} = 1 + \frac{(c/J)^2}{3} + \mathcal{O}((c/J)^4). \quad (48)$$

The low- T magnetization process for a field applied along the x axis is shown in Fig. S5 (b) for $|c|/J = 0, 0.1$ and 0.2 . The response is qualitatively different from Fig. S5 (a). Most importantly, the flat plateau disappears for nonzero c . Second, it is the low-field regime of m_x which is affected by c , and not the high-field regime, which is opposite to what happens in Fig. S5 (a). Third, the slope of m_x at low fields does not diverge (as for the case of $c=0$ or for fields along z) and decreases with increasing c , see next subsection.

E. Magnetic susceptibility for $d_\perp = 0$

We can find an analytical expression for the susceptibility using the Van Vleck formula

$$\chi_{\alpha\alpha'} = \lim_{H \rightarrow 0} \sum_n P_n \left(\beta \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial H_\alpha} \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial H_{\alpha'}} - \frac{\partial^2 E_n}{\partial H_\alpha \partial H_{\alpha'}} \right), \quad (49)$$

where α and α' are Cartesian components and $\chi_{\alpha\alpha'} = \lim_{H \rightarrow 0} \frac{M_\alpha}{H_{\alpha'}}$. Due to symmetry, the susceptibility tensor is diagonal and, furthermore, $\chi_{xx} = \chi_{yy}$. In particular, we find (disregarding again the in-plane components of the DM vectors):

- **Longitudinal susceptibility:** Using Eq. (49) and the expressions for the energy eigenvalues given in Eq. (36), gives

$$\frac{\chi_{zz}}{(g\mu_B)^2} = \beta J \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{1 + e^{3\beta J/2} \cosh(\sqrt{3}\beta|c|/2)} \right). \quad (50)$$

The evolution of χ_{zz} with $k_B T/J$ for $|c|/J = 0.1$ and 0.2 is shown in Fig. S6 (a). The curves fall almost on top of each other (they start to deviate slightly at high T for larger values of $|c|/J$). So, χ_{zz} is essentially unaffected by

c , which is consistent with the agreement between the three curves of Fig. S5 (a) at low fields. Moreover, at low temperatures,

$$\boxed{\text{low } T : \quad \frac{\chi_{zz}}{(g\mu_B)^2} \rightarrow \frac{\beta J}{4}}, \quad (51)$$

which is the same expression with that of a spin-1/2 object (Curie's law). At high temperatures,

$$\boxed{\text{high } T : \quad \frac{\chi_{zz}}{(g\mu_B)^2} \rightarrow \frac{3}{4}(\beta J) - \frac{3}{8}(\beta J)^2 - \frac{3}{32}\beta^3 J c^2 + \mathcal{O}(\beta^4)}, \quad (52)$$

So, the two leading terms of the high- T expansion of χ_{zz} are unaffected by the DM interactions. These leading terms give a Curie-Weiss temperature $k_B\Theta = -J/2$, the same as in the case without DM interactions. This is a general result that is related to the fact that the DM interactions are antisymmetric (see, e.g., appendix of Ref. [4]).

- **Transverse susceptibility:** In a similar way, using Eq. (49) and the energy expressions given in Eq. (38), gives

$$\boxed{\frac{\chi_{xx}}{(g\mu_B)^2} = \frac{J}{2\sqrt{3}|c|} \frac{1 - e^{-\sqrt{3}\beta|c|}}{1 + 2e^{-3\beta J/2}e^{-\sqrt{3}\beta|c|/2} + e^{-\sqrt{3}\beta|c|}} + \frac{5\beta J}{4} \frac{1}{1 + e^{3\beta J/2} \cosh(\beta\sqrt{3}|c|/2)}}. \quad (53)$$

The evolution of χ_{xx} with $k_B T/J$ for $|c|/J = 0, 0.1$ and 0.2 is shown in Fig. S6 (b). The results show a qualitatively different behaviour from the curves shown in Fig. S6 (a), which stems from the corresponding difference in the low-field magnetization process shown in the two panels of Fig. S5. Unlike χ_{zz} , χ_{xx} does not diverge as $1/T$ at low T , but saturates to a T -independent value that is inversely proportional to the z component of the DM vectors. Specifically,

$$\boxed{\text{low } T : \quad \frac{\chi_{xx}}{(g\mu_B)^2} \rightarrow \frac{J}{2\sqrt{3}|c|}}. \quad (54)$$

At high temperatures,

$$\boxed{\text{high } T : \quad \frac{\chi_{xx}}{(g\mu_B)^2} \rightarrow \frac{3}{4}(\beta J) - \frac{3}{8}(\beta J)^2 - \frac{1}{8}\beta^3 J c^2 + \mathcal{O}(\beta^4)}, \quad (55)$$

The two leading terms are again unaffected by the DM interactions, and, moreover, coincide with the two leading terms of the high- T expansion of χ_{zz} , see Eq. (52). The third term in the expansion differs by that of Eq. (52) by a factor of $4/3$, which reflects the general trend of the χ_{xx} curves (corresponding to $c \neq 0$) to lie below the χ_{zz} curve, see Fig. S6.

III. ESTIMATION OF THE DM PARAMETERS BY FITTING THE EXPERIMENTAL $\chi(T)$

Here, we search for the set of parameters – the Heisenberg exchange J and the DM exchanges $D_{\parallel}$ and $D_{\perp}$ – of the isolated triangle model that provide an optimal description of the experimental magnetic susceptibility for both field directions. To this end, we use two complementary approaches. In Sec. III A, we apply the analytical expressions from Eqs. (50) and (53), which are valid for $D_{\parallel} = 0$. In Sec. III B, we calculate the reduced magnetic susceptibilities numerically for different values of $|D|/J$ by keeping the $D_{\perp}/D_{\parallel}$ ratio fixed to $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}$ [Eq. (15)]. In both cases, the minimal fitting temperature $T_{\min}$ is used as a free parameter.

A. Analytical expressions

Analytical expressions in Eqs. (50) and (53), supplemented with a temperature-independent contribution χ_0 , account for the experimental susceptibility down to approximately 15 K (Fig. S7); at lower temperatures the discrepancies become manifest (Fig. S8, right). In the broad $T_{\min}$ range between 12 and 20 K, the fitted J and $D_{\parallel}$ are nearly constant (Fig. S8, left and middle) and amount to 60 K and 22 K, respectively ($D_{\parallel}/J = 0.365$).




FIG. S6. T -dependence of the susceptibilities $\chi_{zz} = \lim_{H_z \rightarrow 0} \frac{m_z}{H_z}$ (a) and $\chi_{xx} = \lim_{H_x \rightarrow 0} \frac{m_x}{H_x}$ (b), for a spin-1/2 triangle described by $\mathcal{H}_J + \mathcal{H}_{\text{DM},z} + \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{S}$, where $\mathbf{h} = g\mu_B \mathbf{H}$. The curves shown correspond to $|c|/J = 0$ (black), 0.1 (blue) and 0.2 (red).

B. Numerical evaluation

Here we include all the components of the DM vectors and calculate the magnetization and the magnetic susceptibility of a $S = \frac{1}{2}$ spin triangle [Eq. (17)] numerically. We work in energy units of $J = 1$ and vary $|\mathbf{D}|/J$ between 0.2 and 0.6, while keeping the ratio $D_\perp/D_\parallel$ fixed to $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}$. The magnetic susceptibility is obtained by choosing the direction α (x or z) of the reduced magnetic field $h^* = g\mu_B H/J$, calculating the reduced magnetization M_α^* and taking its zero-field derivative w.r.t. h_α^* :

$$M_\alpha^*(t^*, h^*) = -\frac{\text{Tr}(S^\alpha e^{-\mathcal{H}(h^*)/t^*})}{\text{Tr}(e^{-\mathcal{H}(h^*)/t^*})}, \quad \chi_{\alpha\alpha}^*(t^*) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial h_\alpha^*} M_\alpha^*(t^*, h^*) \right)_{h_\alpha^* \rightarrow 0}, \quad (56)$$

where S^α is the operator for the α -th component of the spin, $M_\alpha^* = \frac{M_\alpha}{g\mu_B}$, $\chi_{\alpha\alpha}^* = \frac{\chi_{\alpha\alpha}}{(g\mu_B)^2/J}$, and the reduced temperature $t^* = \frac{k_B T}{J}$ is taken on a mesh of 299 points between 0.04 and 6. The reduced susceptibilities $\chi_{xx}^*(t^*)$ and $\chi_{zz}^*(t^*)$ calculated on this t^* mesh are approximated by a polynomial $\sum_i c_{\alpha,i} (1/t^*)^i$, where the coefficients $c_{\alpha,i}$ are determined numerically. The resulting polynomials are continuous functions of t^* and can be fitted to the experiment using the following expression for the susceptibility of N_A non-interacting spin triangles:

$$\chi_{\alpha\alpha}(T) = \chi_0 + \frac{N_A (g\mu_B)^2}{J} \sum_i c_{\alpha,i} (1/t^*)^i, \quad (57)$$

where J , g , and χ_0 are the fitting parameters that are determined independently for $\alpha = x$ and $\alpha = z$. In this way, we find that $\chi_\parallel$ is largely independent of $|\mathbf{D}|/J$ (Fig. S9, right). In contrast, $\chi_\perp$ is sensitive to $|\mathbf{D}|/J$ (Fig. S9, left), with the optimal $|\mathbf{D}|/J \simeq 0.42$, and hence $D_\parallel/J = 0.364$ and $D_\perp/J = 0.21$. These values are 25 % smaller than the estimates from first-principles calculations (Sec. I). At the same time, $D_\parallel/J$ is in remarkable agreement with the value obtained in the analytical fits (Sec. III A), showing once again, that the effect of the in-plane components of the DM vectors is weak, see Sec. II.

C. Comparison with the isotropic model

Finally, we compare the optimal solution of the anisotropic model with the isotropic Heisenberg model. While the out-of-plane susceptibilities can be fitted by either model equally well (Fig. S10, middle panels), only the anisotropic model can account for the in-plane susceptibility (Fig. S10, top panels), which becomes evident if we inspect the absolute difference (Fig. S10, bottom panels).

-
- [1] M. Sorolla, X. Wang, H.-J. Koo, M.-H. Whangbo, and A. J. Jacobson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **142**, 5013 (2020).
 [2] K. Momma and F. Izumi, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **44**, 1272 (2011).




FIG. S7. Top: Least-square fits to the experimental (circles) susceptibility (measured in 1 T field) as function of temperature. Fitting is done for temperatures above $T_{\min} = 15$ K. Bottom: difference plots for the same quantities. The plotting was made using matplotlib [5].

- [3] H. Xiang, C. Lee, H.-J. Koo, X. Gong, and M.-H. Whangbo, Dalton Trans. **42**, 823 (2013).
- [4] A. Panther, A. A. Tsirlin, and I. Rousochatzakis, Phys. Rev. B **108**, 224410 (2023).
- [5] J. D. Hunter, Comput. Sci. Eng. **9(3)**, 90 (2007).


Fits of the susceptibility of an isolated $(J + D_{\parallel})$ triangle to $\chi_{\perp}$ and $\chi_{\parallel}$ of DiMACuS

FIG. S8. The fitted J (left) and $D_{\parallel}/J$ (middle) as a function of the minimal fitting temperature $T_{\min}$. Right: the normalized sum (over all fitted temperature and both field directions) of squared differences between the experimental and fitted $\chi(T)$ as a function of the minimal fitting temperature $T_{\min}$. The plotting was made using matplotlib [5].




FIG. S9. Normalized squared differences between the calculated and experimental (measured 1 T) magnetic susceptibilities $\chi_{\perp}$ (left) and $\chi_{\parallel}$ (right) as a function of $|D_{\parallel}|/J$ for various minimal fitting temperatures $T_{\min}$. The plotting was made using matplotlib [5].




FIG. S10. Fits to the experimental magnetic susceptibility with the isolated Heisenberg triangle model (left) in comparison with the $|\mathbf{D}|/J = 0.42$, $D_{\perp}/D_{\parallel} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}$ solution (Sec. III B) of the anisotropic model (right). Top and middle panels show in-plane and out-of-plane susceptibilities, bottom panels show the absolute difference between the fit and the experiment. The minimal fitting temperature $T_{\text{min}} = 15$ K is denoted with a dashed line. The plotting was made using matplotlib [5].