arXiv:cond-mat/0201455v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 25 Jan 2002

MAGNETIC ORDER IN TRANSITION METAL OXIDES WITH ORBITAL DEGREES OF FREEDOM

Andrzej M. Oleś

Institute of Physics, Jagellonian University,
Reymonta 4, PL-30059 Kraków, Poland
e-mail: amoles@if.uj.edu.pl

(Received 21 June 2001)

We investigate the frustrated magnetic interactions in cubic transition metal oxides with orbital degeneracy. The e_g orbitals order easier and their ordering explains the A-type antiferromagnetic phase in $KCuF_3$ and $LaMnO_3$. In t_{2g} systems the magnetic order changes at a transition from an orbital liquid to orbital ordered states. The fluctuations of t_{2g} orbitals play a prominent role in $LaVO_3$ and YVO_3, where they compete with the Jahn-Teller effect and trigger the C-type antiferromagnetic order.

1. Spin-orbital physics in transition metal oxides

Large on-site Coulomb interactions $\propto U$ in transition metal oxides suppress charge fluctuations and lead to the (partial) localization of d electrons which interact by the effective superexchange interactions. When such localized electrons occupy degenerate orbital states, one has to consider orbital degrees of freedom at equal footing with electron spins [1]. The importance of the orbital degrees of freedom in such systems has been emphasized long ago for cuprates [2] and for V_2O_3 [3], when it was also realized that ferromagnetic (FM) superexchange could be induced by the Hund's exchange interaction $\propto J_H$ [4], but only recently it has been fully appreciated that *the orbital physics* leads to several novel and interesting phenomena.

The superexchange which involves the orbital degrees of freedom is described by the so-called spin-orbital models [5], and is typically *highly frustrated* even on a cubic lattice [6]. Although this frustration might even lead to the collapse of magnetic (or orbital) long-range order in the limit of weak $\propto J_H$, in real e_g systems it is largely suppressed by $J_H/U \simeq 0.12$ [7], where U is the intraorbital interaction, and structural phase transitions stabilize a particular ordering of occupied orbitals, supporting the A-type antiferromagnetic (AF) order. Here we show that this happens even in the absence

of the Jahn-Teller (JT) effect in the e_g systems with degenerate orbitals filled either by one hole ($KCuF_3$) [8], or by one electron ($LaMnO_3$) [9].

The transition metal oxides with partly filled t_{2g} orbitals are even more fascinating. The quantum phenomena are here more important and stabilize the *coherent orbital liquid* ground state in the spin $S = 1/2$ Mott-insulator $LaTiO_3$ [10], which preserves the cubic symmetry and explains the observed isotropic G-type AF order [11]. In vanadium compounds rather involved spin-orbital models, which describe coexisting AF and FM interaction, were recently introduced for $LiVO_2$ [12] and V_2O_3 [13]. The superexchange is again frustrated in cubic systems, and C-type of AF order, observed both in $LaVO_3$ and $T = 0$ [14] and in YVO_3 $77 < T < 114$ K [15], can be explained as supported by quantum one-dimensional (Q1D) orbital fluctuations [16].

2. Magnetic and orbital order in cuprates and manganites

Conceptually the simplest realistic spin-orbital model can be derived for d^9 ions interacting on a cubic lattice, as in $KCuF_3$. The charge excitations $d_i^9 d_j^9 \rightleftharpoons d_i^8 d_j^{10}$ lead to: one high spin $^3A_2$ state, and two low-spin ^1E and $^1A_1$ states [8]. The energy spectrum in Fig. 1(a) is obtained from the model Hamiltonian which includes the on-site U and J_H interactions for degenerate d orbitals [17], and reproduces the exact spectrum [18]. The superexchange is $\propto J_e = t_\sigma^2/U$, where t_σ is the largest hopping element between two $3z^2 - r^2$ orbitals along the c axis (note that this is a natural unit for the anisotropic hopping between e_g orbitals [5]), and is given by

$$\mathcal{H}(d^9) = J \sum_\gamma \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \| \gamma} \Big[(\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + S^2) \hat{J}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^9) + \hat{K}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^9) \Big], \tag{1}$$

where $\vec{S}_i$ are spin $S = 1/2$ operators. The operator expressions:

$$\hat{J}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^9) = (2 + \eta p_2 - \eta p_3) \mathcal{P}_{\langle ij \rangle}^{\zeta\zeta} - \eta (3p_1 - p_2) \mathcal{P}_{\langle ij \rangle}^{\zeta\xi}, \tag{2}$$

$$\hat{K}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^9) = -[1 + \eta(3p_1 + p_2)/2] \mathcal{P}_{\langle ij \rangle}^{\zeta\xi} - [1 + \eta(p_2 - p_3)/2] \mathcal{P}_{\langle ij \rangle}^{\zeta\zeta}, \tag{3}$$

describe spins and orbital superexchange, with $\eta = J_H/U$, $p_1 = 1/(1 - 3\eta)$, $p_2 = 1/(1 - \eta)$, and $p_3 = 1/(1 + \eta)$. They depend on orbital operators:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\langle ij \rangle}^{\zeta\xi} = (1/2 + \tau_i^\gamma)(1/2 - \tau_j^\gamma) + (1/2 - \tau_i^\gamma)(1/2 + \tau_j^\gamma), \tag{4}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\langle ij \rangle}^{\zeta\zeta} = 2(1/2 - \tau_i^\gamma)(1/2 - \tau_j^\gamma), \tag{5}$$

which project on the orbital states, being either parallel to the bond $\langle ij \rangle$ direction on one site ($P_{i\zeta} = 1/2 - \tau_i^\gamma$) and perpendicular on the other ($P_{j\xi} =$

$1/2 + \tau_j^\gamma$), or parallel on both sites. They are represented by the orbital operators τ_i^α associated with the three cubic axes ($\gamma = a$, b, or c),

$$\tau_i^{a(b)} = (-\sigma_i^z \pm \sqrt{3}\sigma_i^x)/4, \qquad \tau_i^c = \sigma_i^z/2, \tag{6}$$

where the σ's are Pauli matrices acting on: $|x\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $|z\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, which transform as $|x\rangle \propto x^2 - y^2$ and $|z\rangle \propto (3z^2 - r^2)/\sqrt{3}$.

The superexchange in $LaMnO_3$ couples *total spins* $S = 2$ at the d^4 Mn^{3+} ions and originates from the charge excitations, $d_i^4 d_j^4 \rightleftharpoons d_i^3 d_j^5$ [9]. The e_g part, following from $d_i^4 d_j^4 \rightleftharpoons d_i^3(t_{2g}^3) d_j^5(t_{2g}^3 e_g^2)$ processes, involves FM terms due to the high-spin ${}^6A_1$ state, and AF terms due to the low-spin states: ${}^4A_1$, ${}^4E$, and ${}^4A_2$ [Fig. 1(a)], is orbital dependent. By contrast, the t_{2g} part $\propto j_t \simeq 0.09$, which follows from $d_i^4 d_j^4 \rightleftharpoons d_i^3(t_{2g}^3) d_j^5(t_{2g}^4 e_g)$ excitations, is purely AF and orbital independent. Both terms give

$$\mathcal{H}(d^4) = J_e \sum_\gamma \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \| \gamma} \Big[(\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + 4) \hat{J}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^4) + \hat{K}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^4) \Big], \tag{7}$$

where the exchange interactions depend on the multiplet structure,

$$\hat{J}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^4) = 2\Big[1 - \frac{4}{3}\eta(q_3 + 2q_4)\Big] \mathcal{P}_{\langle ij \rangle}^{\zeta\zeta} - \frac{2}{15}\eta\Big(36q_1 + 9q_2 + 20q_3\Big) \mathcal{P}_{\langle ij \rangle}^{\zeta\xi} + j_t, \tag{8}$$

with $q_1 = 1/(1 - 3\eta)$, $q_2 = 1/(1 + 2\eta)$, $q_3 \simeq 1/(1 + 8\eta/3)$, and $q_4 \simeq 1/(1 + 16\eta/3)$ [18]. The orbital part $\hat{K}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^4)$ is given in Ref. [9].

Both d^9 model and d^4 model at $j_t = 0$ describe strongly frustrated superexchange in the limit of $J_H \to 0$, which takes a universal form,

$$\mathcal{H}_e^{(0)} = J_e \sum_\gamma \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \| \gamma} \Big[(\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j / S^2 + 1)(1/2 - \tau_i^\gamma)(1/2 - \tau_j^\gamma) - 1 \Big]. \tag{9}$$

Several classical phases have the same energy of $-3J_e$ per site at this point [6]: the G-AF phases with arbitrary occupation of orbitals, and A-AF phases with $\langle (1/2 - \tau_i^\gamma)(1/2 - \tau_j^\gamma) \rangle = 0$, as obtained for staggerred planar orbitals, e.g. for $x^2 - y^2 / y^2 - z^2$. The model (9) is qualitatively different from the idealized SU(4)-symmetric case [19] due to the directionality of e_g orbitals.

At finite J_H the degeneracy of classical phases is removed, and the A-AF phase is stable, with two-sublattice alternating orbital order in both cuprate (1) and manganite (7) model, $|i\mu\sigma\rangle = \cos\theta_i |iz\sigma\rangle \pm \sin\theta_i |ix\sigma\rangle$, where $\pm$ refers to $i \in A(B)$ sublattice. In the cuprates the orbital order given by $\cos 2\theta = (1 - \eta/2)/(2 + 3\eta)$, induces FM interactions J_{ab} within the (a, b) planes, and AF interactions J_c between them [5]. The AF interactions decrease with

increasing J_H/U [Fig. 2(a)], but still dominate at realistic $J_H/U \simeq 0.12$ [7], explaining why the excitation spectra of $KCuF_3$ are dominated by Q1D spin excitations of $S = 1/2$ spin chains [20].

Although the orbital order found in the manganite model (7) at $J_H/U = 0$ is again $x^2 - z^2/y^2 - z^2$, and the A-AF phase is stable, the situation is here *qualitatively* different as J_{ab} and J_c change much faster with increasing J_H/U [Fig. 2(b)], and have similar values in $LaMnO_3$ ($J_H/U \simeq 0.117$ [7]), demonstrating the proximity to ferromagnetism which is indeed observed in doped manganites [1, 5]. Including the (smaller) t_{2g} interactions one finds a somewhat enhanced tendency towards antiferromagnetism, with the G-AF (A-AF) phase stable for $J_H/U < 0.05$ ($J_H/U > 0.05$). In order to explain quantitatively the experimental ratio $J_c/J_{ab} \simeq 0.7$ in $LaMnO_3$, one has to include also the JT effect which stabilizes the orbital order closer to $(|x\rangle+|z\rangle)/(|x\rangle-|z\rangle)$ alternation [9]. This modification of the orbital ordering changes not only the effective magnetic interactions, but also considerably reduces the scattering of a hole on spin excitations in $LaMnO_3$ [21].

3. Orbital fluctuations in t_{2g} systems

As in the d^9 case, the excitation spectra of d^2 and d^3 ions in the t_{2g} subspace [18], shown in Fig. 1(b), may be faithfully reproduced with a model Hamiltonian [17] containing only two parameters: U and J_H, with J_H standing now for the Hund's element between two t_{2g} orbitals. As usually, the excitation energy to high-spin ($^3A_2$ and $^4A_2$) states is $U - 3J_H$, while the energy of the next (low-spin) excited states is either $U - J_H$ for d^2 ions ($^1T_2$, ^1E), or U for d^3 ions ($^2T_1$, ^2E), respectively. The highest excitation energy of $U + 2J_H$ is the same for d^2 ($^1T_1$) and d^3 ($^2T_2$) ions.

Each t_{2g} orbital is orthogonal to one of the cubic axes, so we label them as a, b , and c (for instance, xy orbitals are labelled as c). The superexchange interactions $\propto J = 4t^2/U$ follow from the hopping between two orbitals *active along a given direction* γ, for instance between the pairs of a and b orbitals along the c axis. Therefore, it is convenient to define pseudospin operators, $\vec{\tau}_i = \{\tau_i^x, \tau_i^y, \tau_i^z\}$, which act in the subspace spanned by two active orbital flavors [10, 16]. For instance, for a bond $\langle ij\rangle \parallel c$, these operators are: $\tau_i^+ = a_i^\dagger b_i$, $\tau_i^- = b_i^\dagger a_i$, $\tau_i^z = \frac{1}{2}(n_{ia} - n_{ib})$, and $n_i^{(c)} = n_{ia} + n_{ib}$, where $\{a_i^\dagger, b_i^\dagger\}$ are Schwinger bosons for a and b orbitals.

The model for titanates follows from the $d_i^1 d_j^1 \rightleftharpoons d_i^0 d_j^2$ processes,

$$\mathcal{H}(d^1) = J \sum_\gamma \sum_{\langle ij\rangle \parallel \gamma} \Big[(\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + S^2) \hat{J}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^1) + \hat{K}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^1) \Big], \qquad (10)$$

with the exchange constants between $S = 1/2$ spins,

$$\hat{J}_{ij}^{(\gamma)} = 2(\vec{\tau}_i\cdot\vec{\tau}_j+n_in_j/4)+\eta[(-3r_1+r_2)(n_{ia}n_{jb}+n_{ib}n_{ja}+n_{ic}+n_{jc}-n_{ic}n_{jc}) + (3r_1+r_2)(\tau_i^+\tau_j^-+\tau_i^-\tau_j^+)+4(r_2-r_3)(n_{ia}n_{ja}+n_{ib}n_{jb})/3]/2, \quad (11)$$

depending on: $r_1 = 1-3\eta$, $r_2 = 1-\eta$, $r_3 = 1+2\eta$, while $\hat{K}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^1)$ stands for purely orbital interactions. *A priori,* the magnetic interactions are anisotropic, and may be either AF or FM, depending on the orbital correlations. In the limit of $J_H/U = 0$ the Hamiltonian (10) takes the form,

$$\mathcal{H}^{(0)} = (J/2)\sum_{\gamma}\sum_{\langle ij\rangle\parallel\gamma}[(\vec{S}_i\cdot\vec{S}_j/S^2+1)(\vec{\tau}_i\cdot\vec{\tau}_j+n_in_j/4)-4S/3], \quad (12)$$

and shows again a strong frustration of superexchange interactions [10]. Although formally it resembles the SU(4)-symmetric spin-orbital models [19] even more than Eq. (9), the pseudospin operators $\vec{\tau}_i$ have here a different meaning and refer to different orbital flavors for each cubic direction γ. One may also notice a certain analogy with the models of valence bond solids [22], but this analogy is again only partial, as the formation of orbital singlets in all directions simultaneously is impossible.

In the mean field approach (MFA) the G-AF phase is degenerate with FM phases, if $\langle\vec{\tau}_i\cdot\vec{\tau}_j+\frac{1}{4}n_in_j\rangle = 0$, as realized for alternating orbitals (e.g. for staggered a/b orbitals). Such FM states, with anisotropic exchange constants: J_{Fa} and J_{Fc} along a (b) and c axis [Fig. 3(a)], respectively, would be favored classically at finite J_H. On the contrary, the quantum fluctuations take over, remove the anisotropy, and stabilize the *orbital liquid* state, if the JT interactions are weak [10]. Indeed, the spin wave spectrum of $LaTiO_3$ is nearly isotropic [11], showing that the orbital moments of t_{2g} ions are fully quanched [10]. Increasing J_H almost does not change the exchange constants J_{AF} evaluated using the MFA in this state [Fig. 3(a)].

The superexchange interactions between $S = 1$ spins in $LaVO_3$ [16],

$$\mathcal{H}(d^2) = J\sum_{\gamma}\sum_{\langle ij\rangle\parallel\gamma}\Big[(\vec{S}_i\cdot\vec{S}_j+1)\hat{J}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^2)+\hat{K}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}(d^2)\Big], \quad (13)$$

follow from the $d_i^2d_j^2 \rightleftharpoons d_i^1d_j^3$ processes active on the bonds, with

$$\hat{J}_{ij}^{(\gamma)} = \frac{1}{2}\left[(1+2\eta R)\Big(\vec{\tau}_i\cdot\vec{\tau}_j+\frac{1}{4}n_in_j\Big)-\eta r\Big(\tau_i^z\tau_j^z+\frac{1}{4}n_in_j\Big)-\frac{1}{2}\eta R(n_i+n_j)\right]^{(\gamma)}, \quad (14)$$

and the orbital term $\hat{K}_{ij}^{(\gamma)}$ given in Ref. [16]. The coefficients $R = 1/(1-3\eta)$ and $r = 1/(1+2\eta)$ follow from the multiplet structure of d^3 ions [Fig. 1(b)].

In the limit of $J_H \to 0$ one finds again the frustrated superexchange (12). While the orbital liquid cannot stabilize in this case, orbital singlets may form along the c direction when c orbitals have condensed ($n_{ic} = 1$) and the a and b orbitals fluctuate. This gives a *novel mechanism of ferromagnetic interactions* which operates already in the limit of $J_H = 0$ [16].

The exchange constants within (a, b) planes (J_{ab}) and along c axis (J_c):

$$J_{ab} = [1 - \eta(R+r) + (1 + 2\eta R - \eta r)\langle n_{ia} n_{ja}\rangle^{(b)}]/4, \quad (15)$$

$$J_c = [(1+2\eta R)\langle \vec{\tau}_i \cdot \vec{\tau}_j + 1/4\rangle^{(c)} - \eta r \langle \tau_i^z \tau_j^z + 1/4\rangle^{(c)} - \eta R]/2, \quad (16)$$

are given by orbital correlations. Their values at $\eta = 0$ were obtained from the Bethe ansatz for a Q1D Heisenberg chain, while the orbital wave spectrum, $\omega_k^{\rm C} = [\Delta^2 + R^2(1 - \cos^2 k)]^{1/2}$, with a gap $\Delta = \{\eta(R + r)[2R + \eta(R + r)]\}^{1/2}$, was used at finite J_H. As a result, one finds increasing FM (J_c) and decreasing AF (J_{ab}) exchange constants with increasing J_H [Fig. 3(b)], and both interactions have similar values at $J_H/U \simeq 0.15$ [7].

While the cubic structure of $LaVO_3$ is almost undistorted [14], YVO_3 has a distorted structure, and a and b orbitals stagger in (a, b) planes and repeated themselves along c axis [15]. Such ordering can be promoted by the JT effect term which lowers the energy by $-2V$ on the bonds along the c axis when a (b) orbitals are repeated in C-type orbital ordered state [16]. Finite $V > 0$ lowers the energy of the G-phase, but the entropy $\mathcal{S}$ determined by orbital excitations increases faster in the C-phase, and thus induces a transition from G-AF to C-AF order around $T^* \simeq 0.8J$ (Fig. 4), reproducing qualitatively the first order transition observed in YVO_3 [15].

4. Summary and open problems

In summary, the transition metal oxides with orbital degrees of freedom show a very fascinating behavior, with various types of magnetic and *orbital order*. While e_g orbitals usually order and explain A-AF phases, further stabilized by the JT effect, the t_{2g} orbitals have a generic tendency towards disorder, which leads to the orbital liquid in the isotropic G-AF phase in $LaTiO_3$. In cubic vanadates the JT interactions compete with the *orbital disorder*, and the Q1D orbital fluctuations stabilize the C-AF phase in $LaVO_3$, and also in YVO_3 at finite temperatures. A better understanding of these fluctuations is required to explain quantitatively the observed phase transitions and the strong reduction of the magnetic order parameter in $LaVO_3$ and YVO_3. This problem is as urgent as the theoretical understanding of the colossal magnetoresistance in the manganites.

It is a pleasure to thank Lou-Fe' Feiner, Peter Horsch, Giniyat Khaliullin, and Jan Zaanen for a friendly collaboration on this subject and for numerous

stimulating discussions. This work was supported by the Committee of Scientific Research (KBN) of Poland, Project No. 2 P03B 055 20.

REFERENCES

[1] Y. Tokura, N. Nagaosa, Science **288**, 462 (2000).

[2] K.I. Kugel, D.I. Khomskii, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **136**, 621 (1982) [Sov. Phys. Usp. **25**, 231 (1982)].

[3] C. Castellani, C.R. Natoli, J. Ranninger, *Phys. Rev.* **B18**, 4945 (1978); **B18**, 4967 (1978); **B18**, 5001 (1978).

[4] M. Cyrot, C. Lyon-Caen, *J. Phys.* **36**, 253 (1975); S. Inagaki, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **39**, 596 (1975); J. Spałek, K.A. Chao, *J. Phys. C* **13**, 5241 (1980).

[5] A.M. Oleś, M. Cuoco, N.B. Perkins, in: *Lectures on the Physics of Highly Correlated Electron Systems IV*, edited by F. Mancini, AIP Conference Proceedings Vol. **527** (New York, 2000), p. 226.

[6] L.F. Feiner, A.M. Oleś, J. Zaanen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2799 (1997).

[7] T. Mizokawa, A. Fujimori, *Phys. Rev.* **B54**, 5368 (1996).

[8] A.M. Oleś, L.F. Feiner, J. Zaanen, *Phys. Rev.* **B61**, 6257 (2000).

[9] L.F. Feiner, A.M. Oleś, *Phys. Rev.* **B59**, 3295 (1999).

[10] G. Khaliullin, S. Maekawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3950 (2000).

[11] B. Keimer, D. Casa, A. Ivanov, J.W. Lynn, M.v. Zimmermann, J.P. Hill, D. Gibbs, Y. Taguchi, Y. Tokura, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3946 (2000).

[12] H.F. Pen, J. van den Brink, D.I. Khomskii, G.A. Sawatzky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 1323 (1997).

[13] R. Shiina, F. Mila, F.-C. Zhang, T.M. Rice, *Phys. Rev.* **B63**, 144422 (2001); S. Di Matteo, N.B. Perkins, C.R. Natoli, cond-mat/0107026 (unpublished).

[14] S. Miyasaka, T. Okuda, Y. Tokura, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 5388 (2000).

[15] Y. Ren, T.T.M. Palstra, D.I. Khomskii, A.A. Nugroho, A.A. Menovsky, G.A. Sawatzky, *Phys. Rev.* **B62**, 6577 (2000).

[16] G. Khaliullin, P. Horsch, A.M. Oleś, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3879 (2001).

[17] A.M. Oleś, *Phys. Rev.* **B28**, 327 (1983).

[18] J.S. Griffith, *The Theory of Transition Metal Ions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1971).

[19] Y.Q. Li, M. Ma, D.N. Shi, F.C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3527 (1998); B. Frischmuth, F. Mila, M. Troyer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 835 (1999).

[20] B. Lake, D.A. Tennant, S.E. Nagler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 832 (2000).

[21] J. Bała, G.A. Sawatzky, A.M. Oleś, A. Macridin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 067204 (2001).


[22] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E.H. Lieb, H. Tasaki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 799 (1987).


Fig. 1. Excitation spectra in cubic transition metal oxides for: (a) e_g systems: Cu^{3+} (d^8) and Mn^{2+} (d^5) ions; (b) t_{2g} systems: Ti^{2+} (d^2) and V^{2+} (d^3) ions.


Fig. 2. Exchange constants FM J_{ab} (solid lines) and AF J_c (dashed lines) in A-AF phase of e_g systems as functions of J_H/U for: (a) cuprates ($KCuF_3$); (b) manganites ($LaMnO_3$), for: $j_t = 0$ (thin lines) and $j_t = 0.09$ (heavy lines).


Fig. 3. Exchange constants as functions of J_H/U for t_{2g} systems: (a) G-AF (J_{AF}, dashed line) and FM (J_{Fa} and J_{Fc}, solid lines) phase in titanates; (b) AF J_{ab} (dashed line) and FM J_c (solid line) C-AF phase in vanadates ($LaVO_3$).

Fig. 4. Free energies $F(T) = \langle \mathcal{H}(d^2) \rangle - T\mathcal{S}$ (in units of J) of: G-AF phase obtained with the JT interaction $V = 0.65J$ (solid line), and C-AF phase for $\eta = 0.05$, 0.10 and 0.15 (dashed lines), as functions of temperature T/J (after Ref. [16]).


(a)
U+5J H
U+2J H
U-J H
U-3J H
1A1
1E
3A2
4A2
4E
4A1
6A1
d8
d5
(b)
1A1
2T2
U+2J H
2T1,2E
U
1T2,1E
U-J H
3A2
4A2
U-3J H
d2
d3


(a)
J_{ab}, J_c (J_e)
2.4
1.8
1.2
0.6
0.0
J_c
J_{ab}
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20
J_H/U
(b)
J_{ab}, J_c (J_e/10)
1.6
1.2
0.8
0.4
0.0
J_c
J_{ab}
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15
J_H/U


(a)
J_{AF}
J_{Fc}
J_{Fa}
J_{AF}, J_F (J)
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20
J_H/U
(b)
J_{ab}
J_c
J_{ab}, J_c (J)
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4
0.00 0.05 0.10 0.15 0.20
J_H/U


0.8
0.4
0.0
−0.4
−0.8
F(T)
0.0
0.5
1.0
1.5
2.0
T/J
η= 0.05
0.10
0.15
C−AF
G−AF