

Decoupling of orbital and spin degrees of freedom in $\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{Na}_x\text{NiO}_2$

M. Holzapfel¹, S. de Brion¹, C. Darie², P. Bordet², E. Chappell¹,
G. Chouteau¹, P. Strobel², A. Sulpice³ and M. D. Nunez-Regueiro⁴

¹Grenoble High Field Magnetic Laboratory,
CNRS and MPI-FKF, BP 166, 38042 Grenoble, France

²Laboratoire de Cristallographie, CNRS,
BP 166, 38042 Grenoble, France

³Centre de Recherche sur les Très Basses Températures,
CNRS, BP 166, 38042 Grenoble, France

⁴Laboratoire de Physique des Solides, Bâtiment 510,
Université Paris-Sud, 91405 Orsay, France

present address: Paul-Scherrer-Institut CH-5232 Villigen PSI, Switzerland

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

In the $\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{Na}_x\text{NiO}_2$ solid solutions three different single phase regions exist: for $x = 0.9$, for $x = 0.7$ and for $x = 0.3$. Although the intermediate compound does not show the cooperative Jahn-Teller transition of NaNiO_2 , its magnetic properties remain very similar with, in particular, the low temperature 3D magnetic ordering. Therefore, the strong coupling between orbital and spin degrees of freedom, characteristic of other oxides like perovskites, and usually invoked to explain the absence of both long-range orbital and magnetic ordering in LiNiO_2 , does not take place in these layered compounds with 90° super-exchange bonds. We also discuss the relevance of the O crystal field splitting induced by the trigonal distortion, in generating AFM in-plane Ni-Ni interactions.

PACS numbers: 71.27.+a, 75.30.Et, 71.70.-d, 61.10.Nz, 75.40.Cx

The interplay between orbital and spin degrees of freedom in transition metal (TM) oxides can yield peculiar magnetic structures and so is a subject under active research [1]. In this context, the absence of both long-range magnetic and orbital ordering in layered LiNiO_2 , indeed clearly observed in isomorphous and isoelectronic NaNiO_2 [2, 3, 4], is especially puzzling. Recently there have been attempts to explain these curious different behaviours, but the situation is still unsettled. Most models [5, 6, 7, 8, 9] assume an important coupling between the spin and orbital states, considering that frustration or the particular orbital ordering in the triangular lattice of LiNiO_2 inhibits the stabilization of a 3D magnetic ordering. Here, our synthesis and study of intermediate $\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{Na}_x\text{NiO}_2$ compounds shows that the macroscopic Jahn-Teller (JT) transition observed in NaNiO_2 can be killed by a small amount of Li replacing Na ions. Paradoxically, the magnetic properties exhibited by Li-doped NaNiO_2 remain very close to those displayed by the pure NaNiO_2 . Our experimental observations support previous analysis [10] and recent theoretical calculations [11] showing that, in the 90° TM-O-TM systems, orbitals and spins are essentially decoupled. Departure from the ideal 90° angle, contribution from extra overlappings [9] or crystal field splitting effects [12] have been invoked to strengthen the coupling between spins and orbitals in these systems, but the results reported here indicate that those hypothesis are not appropriate in the case of LiNiO_2 .

The NaFeO_2 structure of LiNiO_2 has planes of Ni magnetic ions arranged in a triangular network. No

long range magnetic ordering has been reported for this compound. The Ni^{3+} ions are in the low spin configuration ($t_{2g}^6 e_g^1$) with $S = 1/2$ on the doubly degenerate e_g level. The Goodenough-Kanamori-Anderson rules yield ferromagnetic (FM) spin exchange couplings between nearest-neighbour Ni ions in the same plane. The measured Curie-Weiss temperature indicates the predominance of FM interactions. Interestingly, it has been recently pointed out [12] that the trigonal crystal field splitting of the O_{2p} orbitals could induce also antiferromagnetic (AFM) exchange integrals in the Ni planes. That would give a microscopic foundation for the coexistence of intra-layer FM and AFM couplings in LiNiO_2 , as considered by some authors [9, 13]. Concerning the orbital occupation, no JT transition is observed.

On the other hand, NaNiO_2 undergoes a cooperative JT ordering of the Ni^{3+} ions at 480K reducing its symmetry from rhombohedral to monoclinic. It presents a long range AFM order below 20K [2, 3]. It has been then speculated that a different oxygen crystal field splitting would inhibit these AFM in-plane Ni-Ni interactions in NaNiO_2 , yielding its different magnetic properties [12].

We perform here a crystallographic and magnetic study of LiNiO_2 , NaNiO_2 and the new $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ [14]. Our main point is that samples with this intermediate composition do not undergo the JT transition of NaNiO_2 , but keep a rhombohedral structure like LiNiO_2 even at low temperature. In spite of this fact, they achieve the long range magnetic ordering of NaNiO_2 . This shows the decoupling between orbital and spins for these oxides with 90° bonds. Furthermore, the quan-




FIG. 1: the trigonal distorted NiO_6 octahedra in LiNiO_2 with O-O distances.

tification of the trigonal distortion in these 3 compounds also allow us to discuss its relevance in generating in-plane AFM interactions in LiNiO_2 , conjectured to suppress the magnetic ordering [12].

The products were obtained by classical high-temperature solid-state reaction. They were synthesized from Na_2O_2 , NiO and $\text{LiOH} \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$ powders. The starting materials were mixed in an argon atmosphere with a 10% excess of (Na+Li) to account for volatilization losses. The mixture was heated under flowing oxygen at 680 °C for 24h. Twelve samples with compositions $(\text{Li}_x\text{Na}_{1-x})\text{NiO}_2$ with $0 \leq x \leq 1$ (x denotes the nominal Na content) were prepared. Their cationic compositions were analyzed by atomic absorption spectroscopy. The crystal structure was studied by x-ray powder diffraction (XPD). In order to detect possible magnetic ordering, neutron powder diffraction (NPD) data were collected down to 1.5K on the CRG-D1B instrument of the ILL. The x-ray and neutron diffraction patterns were refined by Rietveld technique using the Fullprof software [15].




FIG. 2: x-ray diffraction patterns as a function of the nominal composition $\text{Li}_x\text{Na}_{1-x}\text{NiO}_2$.

TABLE I: room temperature crystallographic and low temperature magnetic parameters for the three phases.

	LiNiO_2	$\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$	NaNiO_2
space group	R3m	R3m	C2/m
cell param.	a= 2.8727 (3) c= 14.184 (2)	a= 2.9410 (1) c= 15.4082 (1)	a= 5.3208 (3) b= 2.8440 (2) c= 5.5818 (4) = 110.49 (1)
Na content	0.009 (3)	0.698 (4)	1.0
positional	x(O) = 0.24248 (8)	x(O) = 0.2324 (2)	x(O) = 0.282 (2)
parameters			z(O) = 0.799 (2)
R_{wp}, R_{Bragg}	3.91, 7.28	3.24, 6.6	3.78, 8.11
Ni-O (Å)	6x1.977	6x1.977	4x1.93, 2x2.17
O-O (Å)	6x2.716 6x2.873	6x2.644 6x2.941	4x3.02, 2x2.84 4x2.78, 2x2.60
O-Ni-O (°)	6x93.2 6x86.8	6x96.1 6x83.9	4x94.8, 2x95.1 4x85.2, 2x84.9
T_{CW}	+ 26K	+ 40K	+ 36K
T_N or T_{SG}	9K	25K	20K
H_{CO} at 4K		0.05T	1.8T
H_{C1}		5T	7T
H_{sat}	> 23T	19T	13T
H_E		9.5T	6.5T
H_A		0.2m T	250m T

It is not possible to synthesize single phase samples for arbitrary Li/Na ratio. As shown in Fig.2 and reported by Matsumura et al.[14], the $\text{LiNiO}_2/\text{NaNiO}_2$ phase diagram contains 3 different single phase solid solution regions, in between which, two phase mixtures are observed. For $x \leq 0.3$, the R3m NaFeO_2 structure type of LiNiO_2 is found (R11 phase), where Li, Ni and O atoms occupy the 3a (0 0 0), 3b (0 0 1/2) and 6c (0 0 z 0.24) positions, respectively. For $x \geq 0.9$, the monoclinic C2/m phase of NaNiO_2 is observed, with substitution of Li^+ for Na^+ ions. In this phase, the Na, Ni and O atoms occupy the 2d (0 1/2 1/2), 2a (0 0 0) and 4i (x 0.28 0 z 0.8) positions. In a small concentration range about $x \approx 0.8$, a new rhombohedral phase (R1 phase) is obtained, which has the same structural arrangement as LiNiO_2 , but quite different cell parameters: the c/a ratio is 5.24 instead of 4.94 for LiNiO_2 . The exact cationic composition of this phase found both by Rietveld refinement of the x-ray data and atomic absorption is $\text{Li}_{0.30(1)}\text{Na}_{0.70(1)}$. No structural phase transition could be detected by NPD for $(\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7})\text{NiO}_2$ down to 1.5K. Therefore, this phase remains rhombohedral in this temperature range and does not undergo a cooperative JT ordering. In this respect, it behaves like LiNiO_2 and not like NaNiO_2 .

To better understand the magnetism of these compounds, it is interesting to compare the structural arrangements of the NiO_2 octahedral layers (Table I). The R3m LiNiO_2 structure can be described by starting from the F-centered cubic NiO structure and replacing every

other Ni plane perpendicular to one of the 3-fold axes by a Li plane, forming NiO_2 edge-shared octahedral layers separated by Li^+ cations planes. This is accompanied by a trigonal distortion of the NiO_6 octahedra brought about by the difference of charge and size between Li^+ and Ni^{3+} cations. These octahedra are compressed along the c axis as shown in Fig.1. The six Ni-O distances remain equal (1.98Å), but the six O-O distances linking oxygen anions from the plane above and below the Ni cation, called $d(\text{O-O})_c$, become shorter (2.72Å) than those in the ab plane, $d(\text{O-O})_{ab}$ (2.87Å). At the same time, the O-Ni-O angles between oxygen anions from the same plane above or below the Ni cation opens to 93.2° , while the ones between oxygen anions from the two planes close down to 86.8° . This distortion can be characterized by the ratio $\eta = d(\text{O-O})_c/d(\text{O-O})_{ab}$, and is 0.945 for LiNiO_2 .

Although the structural arrangement is the same for $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$, the interatomic distances and angles are markedly modified because of the steric effect due to the large size difference between Na^+ and Li^+ cations (ionic radius = 1.02Å and 0.76Å). Due to charge balance, the 6 Ni-O distances are almost unchanged (1.98Å), but the 2 O-O distances and angles defined above become 2.94Å, 2.64Å, 96.1° and 83.9° , respectively. $\eta = 0.899$, indicates a much stronger trigonal distortion than for LiNiO_2 .

Very similar Ni-O and O-O distances and O-Ni-O angles can be calculated in the isostructural high temperature form of NaNiO_2 from the NPD data of Chappel et al. [4] (at 565K: Ni-O : $6 \times 1.98\text{Å}$; O-O : $6 \times 2.96\text{Å}$, $6 \times 2.63\text{Å}$, $\eta = 0.899$; O-Ni-O : $6 \times 96.8^\circ$, $6 \times 83.2^\circ$). At room temperature, in the monoclinic phase, the NiO_6 octahedra become JT distorted: 4 Ni-O distances become shorter (1.93Å) and 2 longer (2.17Å). The average O-O distances become $d(\text{O-O})_c = 2.72(0.1)\text{Å}$, and $d(\text{O-O})_{ab} = 2.96(0.1)\text{Å}$, and the average O-Ni-O angles 95° and 85° . The same ratio can still be used to evaluate the trigonal distortion: $\eta = 0.919$. By comparing these values with those of $(\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7})\text{NiO}_2$, one can conclude that in monoclinic NaNiO_2 , the JT distortion is superimposed on the trigonal one without markedly changing the amplitude of the latter.

Having in mind that NaNiO_2 undergoes a collective JT transition, while LiNiO_2 as well as $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ do not, we perform now a comparative study of their magnetic properties. The positive Curie-Weiss temperature for all of them (Fig.3 and Table I) reflects the predominance of FM interactions. The effective moment in all the high temperature orbitally disordered phases is nearly the same ($2.1 \mu_B$) while it is smaller in the orbitally ordered phase of NaNiO_2 ($1.85 \mu_B$). Deviation from the free electron value ($1.75 \mu_B$) is enhanced in the orbital ordered phase reflecting the importance of the orbital contribution to the Ni^{3+} magnetic moment.

The 3 compounds show a maximum in the susceptibility at low temperature: 20K for NaNiO_2 , 25K for $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ and 9K for LiNiO_2 . In fact, LiNiO_2 is never stoichiometric: the exact formula be-

ing $\text{Li}_{1-x}\text{Ni}_{1+x}\text{O}_2$ with extra Ni ions in the Li plane. This gives rise to frustrated magnetic interactions between the Ni planes and prevents any long range magnetic order yielding instead spin glass behaviour [16]. In NaNiO_2 and $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ which are stoichiometric (no Ni ions are present in the Na/Li planes), the field dependence of the magnetization at 4K indicates long range magnetic order for both compositions (Figs.4a and b). NaNiO_2 is considered as an A type antiferromagnet with FM Ni layers coupled AF below $T_N = 20\text{K}$ [2, 3, 4]. However our NPD measurements failed to detect such a simple magnetic structure, in spite of the adequate sensitivity of the D1B spectrometer. A careful analysis of the magnetization data reveals indeed a more complex ordering: when taking its derivative as a function of the applied magnetic field (Fig.4b), clearly 3 characteristic fields are present: H_{c0} , H_{c1} and H_{sat} instead of 2 expected for an A type antiferromagnet (H_{c0} , and H_{sat}) [17]. The same behaviour is observed in $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$, with H_{c0} , H_{c1} lowered and H_{sat} enhanced (Table I). Similarly no magnetic diffraction peak was detected by NPD. So, we can conclude that both NaNiO_2 and $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ undergo the same long range magnetic transition, this is the relevant point for our discussion concerning the decoupling of the orbital and spin degrees of freedom in these systems.

In a first approach, this common magnetic structure can still be described as an AF stacking of FM planes as previously proposed [2, 3, 4]. Then only H_{sat} and H_{c0} are relevant and we can estimate $H_{\text{sat}} = 2H_E$ and $H_{c0} = H_{\text{sf}} = \frac{1}{2}H_E H_A$, where H_E is the AF exchange field (between the Ni layers) and H_A the anisotropy field which aligns the magnetic moment in a given direction [17]. Table I yields all these measured and calculated quantities. Note the significant decrease of H_A : while NaNiO_2 is an easy plane antiferromagnet, $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ is more isotropic. This can be well explained by the presence or absence of orbital order in these compounds: the magneto-crystalline anisotropy




FIG. 3: inverse of the susceptibility vs temperature, showing the Curie-Weiss behaviour.




FIG. 4: field dependence (top) and field derivative of the magnetization (bottom) at 4K, showing the 3 characteristic fields. Inset: blow up of the low field results for $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$.

arises from spin-orbit coupling; in NaNiO_2 orbital order insures the presence of preferred orientations for the magnetic moment, whereas in $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ the disordered orbital occupancy gives rise to isotropic probability for the spins orientation. From H_E we deduce the AF interaction J_{AF} : -1.3K for NaNiO_2 and -1.9K for $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$. Using also the Curie-Weiss temperature, we calculate the FM interaction J_F : $+13.3\text{K}$ for the

former, $+15.2\text{K}$ for the latter. Both interactions increase slightly from NaNiO_2 to $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$. J_{AF} arises from super-super-exchange Ni-O-Ni bonds across the Ni planes, and J_F from 90 Ni-O-Ni in-plane bonds explained before.

To summarize, while $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ and NaNiO_2 have very different orbital ground state, they present a similar magnetic ground state with similar exchange energies. The orbital contribution can only be seen in the value of the magnetic moment and the anisotropy field associated with Ni^{3+} ions. Although we cannot conclude about the orbital occupation in the Li containing compounds, NaNiO_2 can most probably be the spin model for the magnetic ground state of pure LiNiO_2 [16]. The exact magnetic structure of NaNiO_2 , most likely a modulated one derived from the A-type antiferromagnet, remains to be determined but this is out of the scope of this paper. In the calculation of D'are et al. [12] a large enough trigonal distortion can generate AFM interactions in the Ni planes in addition to the FM interactions. This parameter has been quantified in our structural analysis: LiNiO_2 has the lowest trigonal distortion ($\tau = 0.945$) compared to $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ (0.899) and to NaNiO_2 (0.89 for the high temperature orthorhombic phase, 0.92 for the monoclinic phase). Then this mechanism should lead to a stronger AF contribution in NaNiO_2 and $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ than in LiNiO_2 while the opposite occurs according to the measured Curie-Weiss temperatures (Table I).

In conclusion, this crystallographic and magnetic study shows that the intermediate compound $\text{Li}_{0.3}\text{Na}_{0.7}\text{NiO}_2$ has the same magnetic behaviour as NaNiO_2 while its orbital behaviour is different: like LiNiO_2 it does not undergo a collective Jahn-Teller transition. So, these experimental results establish that the orbital and spin degrees of freedom are decoupled in these systems.

We thank A.M. D'are, M.V. Mostovoy and D.I. Khomskii for discussions and O. Isnard for NPD data collected on the CRG-D1B diffractometer at ILL. The GHMFL is "laboratoire associé à l'Université J. Fourier-Grenoble".

-
- [1] Y. Tokura, and N. Nagaosa, *Science* 5465, 462 (2000).
 - [2] P. F. Bongers, and U. Enz, *Solid State Comm.* 4, 153 (1966).
 - [3] E. Chappel, M. D. Nunez-Regueiro, F. Dupont, G. Chouteau, C. D'are, and A. Sulpice, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 17, 609 (2000).
 - [4] E. Chappel, M. D. Nunez-Regueiro, G. Chouteau, O. Isnard, and C. D'are, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 17, 615 (2000).
 - [5] Y. Kitaoka, T. Kobayashi, A. Koda, H. Wakabayashi, Y. Niino, H. Yamakage, S. Taguchi, K. Amaya, K. Yamaura, M. Takano, A. Hirano, and R. Kanno, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* 67, 3703 (1998).
 - [6] L. F. Feiner, A. M. Oles, and J. Zaanen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78, 2799 (1997); and *Phys. Rev. B* 61, 6257 (2000).
 - [7] Y. Q. Li, M. Ma, D. N. Shi, and F. C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81, 3527 (1998).
 - [8] M. van der Bossche, F. C. Zhang, and F. Mila, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 17, 367 (2000); M. van der Bossche, P. Azaria, P. Lecheminant, F. Mila, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86, 4124 (2001).
 - [9] F. Vemay, K. Penc, P. Fazekas, F. Mila, *cond-mat/0401122*
 - [10] M. D. Nunez-Regueiro, E. Chappel, G. Chouteau, and C. Delmas, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 16, 37 (2000).
 - [11] M. V. Mostovoy and D. I. Khomskii, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 227203 (2002).

- [12] A. M. Dare, R. Hayn, and J.-L. Richard, *Europhys. Lett.* **61**, 803 (2003).
- [13] F. Reynaud, D. Mertz, F. Celestini, J.-M. Debierre, A. M. Ghorayeb, P. Simon, A. Stepanov, J. Voiron, and C. Delmas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3638 (2001).
- [14] T. Matsumura, R. Kanno, R. Gover, Y. Kawamoto, T. Kamiyama, B. J. Mitchell, *Solid State Ionics* **152**, 303 (2002).
- [15] J. Rodriguez-Carvajal, *Physica B* **192**, 55 (1993).
- [16] E. Chappel, M. D. Nunez-Regueiro, S. de Brion, and G. Chouteau, V. Bianchi, D. Caurant, and N. Barber, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 132412 (2002).
- [17] A. Herpin, *Theorie du Magnetisme* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1968)

