M agnetization process of spin ice in a [111] m agnetic eld

S.V. Isakov, ¹ K.S. Ram an, ² R.M oessner³ and S.L. Sondhi²

¹D epartm ent of Physics, A lbaN ova, Stockholm University, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden

²Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA and

³Laboratoire de Physique Theorique de l'Ecole Norm ale Superieure, CNRS-UMR8549, Paris, France

(D ated: A pril 14, 2024)

Spin ice in a magnetic eld in the [111] direction displays two magnetization plateaux, one at saturation and an intermediate one with nite entropy. We study the crossovers between the di erent regimes from a point of view of (entropically) interacting defects. We develop an analytical theory for the nearest-neighbor spin ice model, which covers most of the magnetization curve. We nd that the entropy is non-monotonic, exhibiting a giant spike between the two plateaux. This regime is described by a monom er-dimermodel with tunable fugacities. At low elds, we develop an RG treatment for the extended string defects, and we compare our results to extensive M onte C and simulations. We address the implications of our results for cooling by adiabatic (de)m agnetization.

I. IN TRODUCTION

Recent experiments on the spin ice compounds^{1,2} Ho₂Ti₂O₇ and Dy₂Ti₂O₇ have uncovered an intriguing set of phenomena when unicrystalline samples are placed in an external magnetic eld in the [111] direction.^{3,4,5,6} For a review on spin ice, see Ref. 7.

The discovery of a plateau in the magnetization below saturation, rst predicted theoretically⁸ and explored in M onte C arlo simulations,^{8,9} has been particularly remarkable as it was found to retain a fraction of the zeroekd spin ice entropy.^{4,10,11} In this regime, the system is well described by a two-dimensional Ising model on a kagome lattice in a longitudinal ekd, which is in turn equivalent to a hexagonal lattice dimermodel.^{10,11,12}.

Recently, two of the present authors have studied the therm odynam ics and correlations of the [111] plateau.¹¹ This work has led to the identi cation of mechanisms s which term inate the plateau. At the high-eld end, the term ination occurs via the proliferation of monom er defects in the underlying dimerm odel. At low elds, a more exotic extended string defect restores three dimensionality. The asymptotic density of both kinds of defects was estim ated in Ref. 11.

In this paper, we consider in detail the full magnetization curve from zero-eld to saturation. A brief synopsis of the exotic therm odynam ic properties of spin ice is in a [111] eld is sketched in Fig. 1. The aim of this paper is to identify the di erent regimes of the magnetization curves, to provide analytical theories for them, and to test them against M onte C arlo simulations, and nally against experiment.

N ear zero eld, we use the accurate self-consistent H artree approximation¹³ to provide an analytical approximation for the linear response regime. At the low eld end of the plateau, we develop mean eld and renormalization group treatments for the extended string defects, which we use to analyze the in-plane and out-of-plane correlations. We compare these with M onte C arlo simulations using an e cient cluster algorithm, which allows us to obtain accurate data from the linear response regime to the beginning of the [111] plateau. We nd

that the mean eld treatment is accurate at the lowest elds, where the string density would be relatively high. The renormalization group treatment compares well with simulation in the dilute string limit. A teven higher elds, the plateau is approached and the suppression of the entropic activation of strings becomes apparent as a nitesize eldt.

At the high-eld term ination of the plateau, we observe a giant peak in the entropy, which even exceeds the zero eld Pauling value, despite the fact that a quarter of all spins are pinned. We model this phenom enon by a monom er-dim er model on the honeycom b lattice with varying fugacities. (At the point where the all fugacities equal 1, this model turns out to be one of hard bow-ties' on the kagom e lattice.) We analyze this model within a Bethe approximation and also by using results from a high-order series expansion.¹⁴

We show that the entropy peak is due to the crossing of an extensive number of energy levels which have m acroscopic entropies. Comparing this theory with M onte Carlo simulations of the appropriate m onom er-dimer m odel, we nd that the simple Bethe approximation is accurate for m oderate to large m onom er densities.

W e point out that this theory predicts to a crossing point in the plots of magnetisation versus eld at di erent tem peratures. In addition, there is a further crossing point at lower elds, where the corrections to the magnetisation due to monom er and string defects alm ost cancel one another.

W e then address the connection of these results to experiment, in particular pointing out the presence of (at least a vestige) of the entropy peak in existing experimental data.

We then discuss the implications of the entropy peak for magnetocaloric manipulations. In particular, we argue that it arises in a more general set of models. It can, in principle, be used to e ect cooling in a eld, both by adiabatic dem agnetization, and by adiabatic magnetization. Finally, we close with some concluding remarks.



FIG.1: Properties of spin-ice as the [111] magnetic eld is varied. These curves are for illustration and do not show actual numerical or experimental data. We have indicated the regions where various analytic approaches discussed in the text apply.

II. MODELAND NOTATION

A general model of spin ice includes the single-ion anisotropy, the exchange interaction, and the dipolar interaction. In this work we use a simpli ed model¹ in which the long-range dipolar interaction is truncated beyond the nearest-neighbor spins. W hile the exchange interaction in spin ice compounds is antiferrom agnetic, the e ective interaction (exchange plus nearest-neighbor dipolar) is ferrom agnetic. The Ham iltonian for unitlength spins S_i may be written as

$$H = J_{0}^{Q} S_{i} S_{i} S_{i} C_{i} S_{i} S_$$

where J_e^0 is an elective exchange coupling. The second term is the easy axis anisotropy of strength E < 0,



FIG.2: The pyrochlore lattice of corner-sharing tetrahedra.



FIG.3: A single tetrahedron inscribed in a cube. The easy axes of the pyrochlore lattice (or hl111 axes), \hat{d} , are indicated by the short-dashed lines.

 $f = j^{>} 50K$, which is much larger than the exchange and dipolar interaction strengths. The unit vectors $\hat{d}_{(i)}$ are the local easy axes of the pyrochlore lattice (see Fig. 2 and Fig. 3). The third term is the interaction with a magnetic eld of strength B, g _B J being the magnetic moment of the spins. Both experiment and theory indicate that this simpli ed model is a good description of spin ice at moderate temperatures.

In our analysis, we take the single ion anisotropy to be in nite so the spins are constrained to lie along their local easy axes. In this limit, it is convenient to describe the system by the Ising pseudospins i, where $S_i = i\hat{d}_{(i)}$. The pseudospin i = +1(-1) if the physical spin points into (out of) its associated up-pointing tetrahedron. We may write an elective H am iltonian for the pseudospins:

$$H = J_e \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} X & X \\ i j & g_B J & B & \hat{d}_{(i)} & i \end{array}$$
(2.2)

where $J_e = J_e^0 = 3 > 0$.

At zero magnetic eld and zero temperature, the ferromagnetic interaction gives rise to an \ice rule" constraint: the pseudospins on each tetrahedron must sum to zero, j = 0. In terms of the physical spins, on each tetrahedron two will point inwards (towards the center) and two will point outwards (away from the center). The set of con gurations satisfying the ice rule com prises the zero-eld spin ice ground state manifold. At low magnetic elds (and low temperatures), the system will continue to obey the ice rule, though the magnetic eld will favor certain states am ong those in the zero- eld ground state manifold.

W e have perform ed extensive M onte C arlo sim ulations of the low eld regime, from zero-eld up till the low eld plateau term ination, using a loop algorithm, which is discussed in Appendix A.Our algorithm probes only spin ice ground states (two spins in and two out on each tetrahedron) and is thus applicable at low temperatures J_{e} and low magnetic elds, where the density of Т m onom er defects, w hich are responsible for the high eld plateau term ination, is low. The simulation is written in terms of a pyrochlore lattice with the conventional 16 site cubic unit cell (which contains four tetrahedra of each kind). The simulations have been done for system swith 16, 128, 432, 1024, 2000, 3456, 5488, 8192, and 16000 sites. For a system with 16000 sites, we perform 2:5 10° loop ips for equilibration and 5 10^7 for averaging. For other system sizes, we we perform 1 10[°] loop ips for equilibration and 2 10° for averaging. The simulated m agnetization as a function of the m agnetic eld strength is shown in Fig. 4. The magnetization attains the plateau value at elds much larger than the tem perature.



FIG. 4: The magnetization from M onte Carlo simulations.

A. The linear response regime

We may calculate the ground state entropy of spin ice at zero eld by numerically integrating the rst law of therm odynam ics

$$dS = \frac{dU}{T} + \frac{m}{T}dh: \qquad (3.1)$$

Noting that the magnetization is constant and equal to

g $_{\rm B}$ J=3 per spin on the plateau and is zero at zero ekd, and that the value of the entropy on the plateau is S=k_B = 0.080765^{10,11}, we obtain for the entropy of spin ice, S=k_B = 0.2051 0.0001. Our value is very close to Pauling's estimate S=k_B = 0.202733 and is consistent with the most accurate current theoretical estimate S=k_B = 0.20501 0.00005^{15}

At zero eld, we use the self-consistent H artree approximation, which is known to give a quantitatively accurate approximation to the ground state correlations of spin ice.¹³ This gives $= 2 (g_B J)^2 = 3k_B T$ for spin ice. This compares well with our M onte Carlo result, = $(0.66735 \quad 0.0003) (g_B J)^2 = k_B T$ for a system with 16000 sites.

B. String defects and their interactions

1. General description

Figure 2 presents the underlying pyrochlore lattice of spin ice and g. 3 shows the [111] direction. It is convenient to visualize the pyrochlore lattice as a stack of alternating kagom e and triangular planes, the [111] direction being the direction in which the planes are stacked. E ach spin lies on a comer shared by an up-pointing and down-pointing tetrahedron.

If the [111] m agnetic eld is large enough, the spins in the triangular planes align with the eld; the kagom e planes decouple from one another; and the system is well described by a two-dimensional model. This describes spin ice on the plateau. At elds slightly lower than the plateau, excitations called string defects,¹¹ restore three-dimensionality and are responsible for the low eld term ination of the plateau.

To describe these defects, we consider the entropic bene t of relaxing the condition that the triangular planes are polarized. Suppose we ip a spin in some triangular layer. Then, by the ice rule constraint, we must also ip a spin in each of the two neighboring kagom e layers (on the two tetrahedra that are sharing the rst ipped spin). Flipping these kagom e spins requires ipping spins in each of the two neighboring triangular layers, which requires ipping spins in the two next-nearest kagom e layers and so on. The resulting \string defect" is an excitation that extends through the system . The energy cost, per kagom e-triangle bilayer, of creating the string is $E_{s} = 8q_{B} JB = 3$. To estim ate the entropy, we note that creating a string actually involves creating a pair of defects in each kagom e plane. A \positive" defect connects the kagom e plane to the kagom e plane directly above it via a ipped spin in the intermediate triangular plane. Sim ilarly, a \negative" defect connects the kagom e plane

(spin-wave) and \m onom er" (vortex) contributions. A standard calculation¹⁸ gives the entropy of the m onom er

piece:

$$S_{m} = \frac{9K}{4} \begin{bmatrix} Z & Z \\ d^{2}rd^{2}r^{0} & (r) & (r^{0}) \end{bmatrix} \ln \frac{jr \quad \hat{r}^{0}j}{\prod \frac{jr \quad \hat{r}^{0}j}{2}}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} Z & Z \\ d^{2}rd^{2}r^{0} & (r) & (r^{0}) \end{bmatrix} \ln \frac{jr \quad \hat{r}^{0}j}{\prod \frac{jr \quad \hat{r}^{0}j}{2}}$$
(3.4)

is a hard-core radius com parable where = 1=2 and to the lattice spacing. This shows that the entropic interaction between two defects separated by distance r is given by $p_1 p_2 V$ ($j_{r_1} p_2 i$) where p_i is +1 (-1) for a positive (negative) defect and V (\mathbb{R}) = $\ln(R =)$.

3. Mean eld calculation

If the num ber of defects is fairly large, we may expect the interaction to be su ciently screened to justify the use of variational mean eld theory.¹⁹ W e will investigate the in-plane and out-of-plane correlations for the defects.

We consider a layered system of two-dimensional planes (indexed by the label k which ranges from Κ to K) where each plane contains N positive and N negative defects (which we refer to as charges) that interact logarithm ically. The string constraint requires that each positive charge in layer k is rigidly connected to a negative charge in the layer k + 1. We impose a periodic boundary condition to connect the positive charges in the K th layer to the negative charges in the K th layer.

We formally impose the constraint by writing the \Ham iltonian" in terms of positive charges alone. The planes are stacked in the z-direction. Let x_i^k be the inplane position of the ith positive charge in the kth layer. In absence of external elds, the entropy of a particular con guration of N defects is given by:

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} X^{K} & X^{N} & X^{k} \\ & (V (\mathbf{j} \mathbf{x}_{\perp}^{k} & \mathbf{x}_{j}^{k} \mathbf{j}) & V (\mathbf{j} \mathbf{x}_{\perp}^{k} & \mathbf{x}_{j}^{k+1} \mathbf{j}) \end{pmatrix} (3.5)$$

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} X^{K} & X^{K} & X^{K+1} \\ & X^{K} & X^{K+1} & X^{K+1} \end{pmatrix} (3.5)$$

 $\ln (R =)$, where is a hard-core radius H ere V (R) =de ning the minimum separation between two charges and = 1=2. The rst term corresponds to the repulsion of positive charges within the same layer. The absence of a factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ in front of this term is due to the string constraint: bringing two positive charges in the sam e plane close together also involves bringing together their negative partners in the plane above. In terms of our positive charge form ulation, this means the repulsion is twice as large. The second term is the interlayer interaction. Physically, a positive charge in layer k has a negative partner in the layer k+1 which attracts the posit ive charges in layer k+1. In term sofour positive charge form ulation, charges repel charges in the sam e plane but attract charges in nearest neighbor planes.

to the kagom e plane directly below it. These two defects may be separated by ipping pairs of spins pointing in di erent directions on neighboring triangles of the kagom e plane. The entropy in the kagom e plane depends on this separation, which is the basis for the interaction between defects discussed below. Ignoring this correction, the positive defect m ay be placed anywhere in the plane (which xes the position of the negative defect in the layer above). This im plies that the entropy per bilnA, where A is the area of a layer. This layer is S shows that for a given magnetic eld, string defects are favored in a su ciently large system. For a given system size, strings are favored at su ciently low magnetic elds.

2. Interactions

Form agnetic elds in the plateau region, the triangular spins are xed while each kagom e plane contains two up pseudospins (= 1) and one down pseudospin (= 1). This Ising model on the kagom e lattice may be mapped onto the dimer model on the hexagonal lattice^{10,11,12}, where a down pseudospin corresponds to a dimer on the hexagonal lattice. In this language, a string defect appears as a pair of oppositely charged m onom ers.

As discussed in Ref. 11, a monom er-dim er covering may be described by assigning a height variable h_i to each site i of the triangular lattice dual to the hexagonal lattice on which the dimers lie. The heights are assigned as follows. Moving from a site to a nearest neighbor site by moving clockwise around an up- (down-) triangle will increase (decrease) the height by +2 (-2) if a dimer is crossed. If a dim er is not crossed, then the height will decrease (increase) by -1 (+1). A coording to these rules, traversing a closed loop in the dual lattice will result in a height di erence of + 3 (-3) if a positive (negative) m onom er is enclosed and 0 otherwise. W e note that the overall sign of the height assignments is a matter of convention and we may as well have chosen the h_i so that traversing a closed loop containing a positive (negative) m onom er gave a height di erence of -3.

In a coarse-grained description, the h_i are replaced by a real, continuum eld h (r) and as discussed in R ef. 11, the entropy associated with a height eld $h(\mathbf{r})$ is given to low est order ingredients by:

$$S = d^2 r \frac{K}{2} \dot{r} h f \qquad (3.2)$$

where $K = \frac{1}{9}$ for the honeycomb lattice.¹⁶ The height eld has the property:

$$I \qquad Z \qquad rh \quad dr = 3 d^2 r (r) \qquad (3.3)$$

where (r) is the monom er charge density and S is the region enclosed by the loop C.W em ay proceed by analogy with the 2d XY model¹⁷ and divide h into \dim er"

W eassume a variationalmean eld density of the form :

$$(\mathbf{x}_{1}^{K} ; ...; \mathbf{x}_{i}^{k}; ...; \mathbf{x}_{N}^{K}) = \frac{\mathbf{\hat{Y}}^{K} \mathbf{\hat{Y}}^{N}}{\sum_{k=K}^{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\mathbf{\hat{x}}_{i}^{k}}{N}}$$
(3.6)

which asserts that all particles in a given layer k have the same probability density k (x)=N , but the density may vary from layer to layer. We also need the norm alizing condition: $$^{\rm Z}$$

$$d^{2}x^{k}(x) = N$$
 (3.7)

This trial function implies a variational entropy functional:

$$S_{jN} = \frac{X}{k} \frac{1}{2} \frac{Z}{d^{2}xd^{2}x^{0}} (x (x) + 1 (x))$$

$$= \frac{(x (x^{0}) + 1 (x^{0}))V}{Z} (x (x) + 1 (x^{0}))V (x (x^{0}))$$

$$= \frac{Z}{d^{2}x (x) \ln(\frac{x (x)}{N})} (3.8)$$

This functional ism axim ized when the density is uniform ${}^{k}(x) = \frac{N}{A}$ which gives S_N = (2K + 1)N hA. To investigate the linear response of the system, we may apply a perturbing potential to the objects in the k = 0 plane. In particular, we consider the e ect on the density of placing a positive charge at the origin of the plane. The details are given in Ref. 18 but we may quote the result:

$$\frac{x}{k};k) = \frac{1}{4^{2} \frac{2}{k}}$$

$$\frac{z}{d^{2}s s^{2}(s^{2}+2)} e^{is(\frac{x}{k})}$$

$$\frac{1}{1+s^{2}+2} \frac{p}{s^{2}(s^{2}+2)} \frac{in}{1+s^{2}+p} \frac{p}{s^{2}(s^{2}+2)}$$
(3.9)

where the in-plane length scale is given by $_{k} = \frac{A}{4} \frac{1+2}{N}$. We note 1st that this expression diverges at small x for k = 0, which is not surprising because the assumption of a linear response would be not be valid so close to the perturbing charge. The expression would be valid at larger k and an interesting feature is that when $x = _{k}$, the decay in the z-direction does not depend on any physical parameters, i.e. there is no length scale in the z direction. We will return to this point in the next section.

To connect with our physical problem, we note that at a given temperature, we will have an expected value of defects which may be calculated from the partition function:

$$Z = e^{A} = \frac{X}{N} \frac{Y^{(2K+1)N}}{(N!)^{2K+1}} e^{S_{N}}$$
(3.10)

where S_N is the entropy of having N defects and $y = e^{E_{-s}=k_B T}$ is the fugacity of a positive defect (y^{2K+1} is the

fugacity of $\string"$). In m ean $edd, we may replace <math display="inline">S_N$ by S $_{;N}$ = (2K + 1)N $ln\,A$. From this, we may show 18 that < N > $\,$ yA and using our earlier expression, we nd that:

$${}^{2}_{k,M F} = \exp(8g_{B}JB = 3k_{B}T)$$
 (3.11)

4. RG calculation

W hen the gas of defects is fairly dilute, we may expect that the screening is not e ective enough to justify a mean eld treatment. In this section, we account for uctuations by making a real space renormalization group calculation using methods similar to the K osterlitz treatment of the 2d C oulom b gas.^{17,20}

The dynam ical objects described by H am iltonian 3.5 are dipoles of length 1. W e need to generalize this model in order to do an RG calculation. The generalization that we consider is allowing for dipoles of arbitrary length. An $\label{eq:linear}$ is an object where the negative charge lies directly lplanes above its positive partner. W hile the original problem involved just the coupling of nearest neighbor planes, our generalized model involves all possible couplings. A ssociated with each 1-dipole is a fugacity $y_1=2$ (the 2 is for convenience). The grand partition function for the system may be written as:

$$Z = \frac{X Y}{f_{N_{k};1}g_{k}} \frac{(y_{1}=2)^{N_{j1}}}{(N_{k};1)!} Z [f_{N_{k};1}g]$$
(3.12)

where N_{k;1} denotes the num ber of 1-dipoles in layerk; N_{;1} is the number of 1-dipoles in the system; and N_k is the number of dipoles (of any length) that have their positive ends in layer k. The sum is over all particle number con gurations fN_{k;1}g that satisfy the charge neutrality constraint in each plane: N_k = ${}_1$ N_k 1;1. The canonical partition function corresponding to a given dipole distribution fN_{k;1}g is:

$$Z [fN_{k;l}g] = \begin{bmatrix} Z & Y & \frac{d^2 x_{k;l}^{(1)}}{2} \frac{d^2 x_{k;l}^{(2)}}{2} & \frac{x_{k;l}^{(1)} & x_{k;l}^{(2)}}{2} \\ & h^{k;l} & i \\ exp & H (fN_{k;l}g) & (3.13) \end{bmatrix}$$

H (fN $_{k,l}g$) is the Ham iltonian (actually an entropy) corresponding to the dipole distribution fN $_{k,l}g$. The coordinate $x_{k,i}^{(1)}$ is the planar coordinate of the ith positive charge of layer k and $x_{k,i}^{(2)}$ is the planar coordinate of its negative partner which lives in layer k + 1(i), 1(i) being the length of the dipole being described. The string constraint is in posed by the delta function, where we use the normalization $\frac{R^2}{R^2} \stackrel{d^2x}{(2)} \in) = 1$. The product is over all positive charges in all layers. The integration is over the space . This is de ned to be the set of all possible spatial con gurations of the dipole distribution fN $_{k,i}g$

that respect the hard-core constraint: no two charges in a given plane ${\tt m}$ ay be closer than distance $% {\tt n}$.

O ur procedure is an extension of the treatment in Refs.17,20. The rst part of an RG procedure norm ally involves integrating over the high momentum modes of the system. In our problem, these correspond to those con gurations where in some plane, we have a pair of charges separated by a distance between and +d. We assume a dilute system so only oppositely charged pairs are considered and also the distance between the mem – bers of a pair is taken to be much smaller than the distance from the pair to another charge. The basic coarse-graining step in our RG transform ation is illustrated in g. 5.



FIG.5: The basic coarse-graining step in our RG transform ation.

Suppose a particular state involves pairing the negative end of an l_1 -dipole in layer k with the positive end of an l_2 -dipole in layer k + l_1 . Viewed at long length scales, we e ectively have an $(l_1 + l_2)$ -dipole in layer k. We will nd that integrating over all possible pairings gives a zeroeth order term (which just involves replacing with $+_d$) and a number of correction terms of order d where two short dipoles were destroyed and replaced by a longer dipole. Since the procedure respects the charge neutrality constraint, these correction terms will com bine with other terms in the grand partition sum. The second step involves rescaling lengths so that the high momentum cuto , in the new variable, is the same as before. The aim is to see how the fugacities and couplings change as we run this procedure.

Details of the calculation are given in Appendix B. Here we give the resulting ow equations:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}y_1}{\mathrm{d}t} = (2) \qquad y \qquad (3.14)$$

$$\frac{dy_1}{dt} = (2) y_1 + y_m y_{1m}$$
(3.15)

$$\frac{d}{dt} = 0 \tag{3.16}$$

where $t = \ln \cdot 0$ ne notable feature is that the coupling does not change with the ow, in contrast with the 2d

C oulom b gas where the coupling does vary (albeit at second order in the fugacity). This indicates that strings are sti er objects than charges. A nother observation is that for the initial conditions of our physical problem, namely that $y_1(0) = y_0 = 2 e^{E_{g} = k_b T}$ and $y_1(0) = 0$ for l > 1, the ow equations have an exact solution:

$$y_1 = y_0^2 \frac{h}{2} \frac{y_0}{2} (2 1)^{i_{11}}$$
 (3.17)

O urRG is valid as long as the corrections to the fugacities are sm all, meaning that the derivatives dy_1 =dt should be bounded. If we look at the above result, Eq. 3.17, we see that when the term in brackets is greater than 1, y_1 diverges with 1. Therefore, a critical length, which we interpret as an in-plane correlation length, is de ned by when the term in brackets equals 1:

$$\frac{Y_0}{2} \left(\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ k_{;RG} \end{array} \right) = 1 \tag{3.18}$$

Substituting earlier expressions and noting that for our system , = 1=2, we nd that:

$$\ln {}^{2}_{k;RG} = \frac{32g_{B}JB}{9k_{B}T} 1 + \frac{\ln (e^{E_{s}=k_{B}T} + 2)}{E_{s}=k_{B}T}$$

$$^{2}_{k;RG} \exp (32g_{B}JB = 9k_{B}T)$$
(3.19)

for the elds and tem peratures of interest. This value is the same as that predicted in Ref. 11 using a free energy argument. For $<_{k;RG}$, y_1 decreases with l which m eans that states with long dipoles are less probable than states with short dipoles. If $>_{k;RG}$, y_1 diverges with l which suggests that longer dipoles are favored, but, as m entioned above, the RG procedure is no longer valid in this regime. We note that when $=_{k;RG}$, y_1 is independent of 1 so that, as in the mean eld calculation discussed above, there is no discernible length scale in the z direction.

If $<_{k;RG}$, then we may consider an out-of-plane length scale, which we de ne nom inally as the value of l = 1 for which $y_1=y_1 = 1=e$.

$$1 = 1 + \frac{1}{\ln \frac{\frac{3-2}{k,R \in 1}}{\frac{k,R \in 1}{3-2}}}$$
(3.20)

We may interpret 1 as the typical length of a string segment that is captured by a tube of diameter (where a tube need not be straight).

5. Comparison with simulation

In Fig. 6, we show the magnetization as a function of the magnetic eld strength on a log-log scale. Our algorithm allows us to simulate spin ice in a [111] magnetic eld with very high accuracy.

The magnetization should scale with the average density of defects, which in turn should scale like the inverse



FIG.6: The crossover between exponents.

square of the in-plane correlation length. As shown in this gure, the data at low elds are well t by the exponent 8/3 obtained in the m ean eld calculation discussed earlier. At som ewhat higher elds, the data are well t by the exponent 32/9, obtained by the RG calculation discussed earlier and also in Ref. 11 by looking at the entropic contribution to the free energy. At high elds, the exponent of 8L=3 (= 16 for L= 6 (sites), as was the case in the simulations) characterizes a regime where nite-size e ects are important, as discussed below.

The low eld crossover makes qualitative sense in that at low elds, there will be many defects which screen one another which suggests that a mean eld treatment may be reasonably accurate. At higher elds, the gas of defects is more dilute so an RG treatment would be required.

The high eld crossover is a nite-size e ect since the position of a crossover between exponents is system size dependent and the corresponding exponent is also system size dependent, getting steeper with increasing system size. The nite-size behavior may be explained as follows. At high magnetic elds, there are a small number of string defects in the system. The magnetization and the energy of one string defect in a system of size L are

 $4Lg_B J=3$ and $4Lg_B JB=3$ respectively. The energy cost grows linearly with system size and, as mentioned above, the defects are favored solely due to their entropic contribution to the free energy. At su ciently high m agnetic elds, a given system will be too sm all to provide the entropy to balance the energy cost of a string. This will occur when the magnetization per spin reaches the magnetization of a system with one string defect:

$$m = 1=3 \quad 2(4L=3)=(16L^3) g_B J$$
$$= 1=3 \quad 1=(6L^2) g_B J: \qquad (3.21)$$

In this case, the statistical weight of a single string defect will be a Boltzmann factor $\exp(8Lg_BJB=3k_BT)$ and the magnetization will equal [L=3 C exp($8Lg_BJB=3k_BT$)]g $_BJ$, where C is some constant. The crossover between di erent regimes occurs when the magnetization reaches (3.21). We have good agreement with the 8L=3 behavior for a variety of system sizes, including L = 6 which is shown in gure 6.

IV. THE HIGH FIELD REGIME

On the plateau, the magnetization of the triangular sublattice is saturated and we may consider each kagom e plane separately. Thus, the 3-dimensionalmodelm ay be mapped onto a 2-dimensional one. Whereas the spins in the triangular sublattice are xed, the physics in the kagom e planes remains non-trivial. Each triangle on the kagom e plane contains two up pseudospins (=1) and one down pseudospin (=1). This Ising model on the kagom e lattice may be mapped onto the dimermodel on the hexagonal lattice,^{10,11,12} in which a down pseudospin corresponds to a dimer on the hexagonal lattice. The model retains an extensive ground state entropy, S=k_B = 0.080765.

If we ip a down (pseudo)spin it violates the ice rule. This corresponds to breaking a dimerinto twom onom ers. A swith string defects, these monom ersmay be separated and move freely on the lattice. The energy cost for creating two monom ers is $2E = 4J_e \qquad 2g_B JB = 3$. This energy vanishes at a critical eld $B_c = 6J_e = (g_B J)$. At higher elds the monom ers proliferate leading to com – plete saturation and an ordered state with zero entropy.

The physics near the transition m ay be described by the following H am iltonian which acts on the kagom e lattice:

$$\frac{H}{T} = \begin{pmatrix} X & X \\ K_{ij}s_is_j & h & s_i; \\ h_{iji} & i \end{pmatrix}$$
(4.1)

where the sum is over all nearest neighbors; s_i are classical Ising spins taking values + 1 and 1; h is the strength of a ctitious magnetic eld; and $K_{++} = 0$, $K_{+} = K_{+} = K = [g_B JB = 6 J_e] = T$, and K = 1. The coupling constants in ply that each triangle of the kagom e lattice contains at m ost one down pseudospin and that down spins cost energy (positive or negative dependent on the magnetic eld strength).



FIG. 7: The magnetization (top) and the entropy (bottom) around the transition between the plateaux. The simple Bethe approximation is compared to the M onte C arlo results. The exact result for the entropy at zero m onom er density and P auling's estimate for the entropy at zero magnetic eld are shown for reference. The series expansion contains the results from R ef. 14 on the m onom er-dimermodel.

W e m ay calculate the m agnetization and entropy using the simple Bethe approximation. Details are given in Refs. 14,21 but we may quote the results:

$$m = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 + x^2}$$
(4.2)

$$S = \frac{3xz \ln z}{2 + 6xz} + \frac{1}{4} \ln \frac{2z^3}{x^2 (3z \ x)}; \qquad (4.3)$$

where $x = 2z = (1 + p + 8z^2)$ and z = exp(2K).

In Fig.7, we compare these expressions with a M onte C arlo simulation. The simulation is of a kagom e lattice with 16x16 up-triangles (768 total spins). The standard single spin- ip M etropolis algorithm was used, which m ay explain the inaccuracy in the simulated entropy at low elds, where a m ore clever scheme m ay be needed to sample the degenerate m anifold. The entropy was computed, for a given eld, by integrating from high temperatures (where S=k_B = (3=4) ln 2 per atom) to low temperatures.

We nd that the simple Bethe approximation is accurate for moderate and high monomer densities (higher elds) but does not work so well at low monomer density (lower elds). As the Bethe approximation does not account for long cycles on the lattice, the approximation should indeed break down when the correlation length is large (monomer density is small). We note that the correlation length is in nite at zero monomer density since the dimermodel on the hexagonal lattice is critical.

In a higher-order series expansion, one m ay account for some corrections to the Bethe approximation.¹⁴ As seen in the gure, the corrections are almost indiscernible for the magnetization. For the entropy, the corrections give better agreement at the low monomer density and are negligible at high monomer densities.

There is a giant peak in the entropy at the transition point, $S=k_B=1=4\ln(16=5)$ 0.291, which exceeds even the zero eld entropy. The peak is due to the crossing of an extensive number of energy levels which have m acroscopic entropies. For $B=B_c$, the energies of states corresponding to di erent numbers of m onom er defects are equal since the m onom er and dim er weights are, by de nition, equal at the critical eld. There are an extensive number of states corresponding to a given number of m onom ers (below saturation). The highly degenerate ground state m anifold explains the large spike in the entropy.

V. CROSSING POINTS

The theory described in the previous section in plies that the curves of magnetisation versus eld, plotted for di erent tem peratures, will display a crossing point. This arises simply because the partition function depends on magnetic eld and tem perature e ectively only through the combination (B B_c)=T. Thus, when plotted as a function of B B_c , the curves coincide only at the point B = B_c . At this point, the Bethe approximation gives a value for the magnetisation of m = 0:4g $_B$ J, see Eq.42.

In addition, we expect a crossing point at low elds, due the interplay of string and m onom er defects. Indeed, where the plateau is well-form ed, the string density is $n_s \exp(32g_B JB = 9k_bT)$ and the m onom er density is $n_m \exp(8E = 7k_BT)$, where $E = g_B J(B_c B) = 3$ is the energy of creating one m onom er. The crossing point occurs when $n_s = n_b$. W ith logarithm ic accuracy, we can

w rite

$$\frac{32g_{B}JB}{9k_{b}T} = \frac{8g_{B}J(B_{C})}{21k_{B}T} : (5.1)$$

Thus the crossing point lies at B[?] = $3B_c=31$.

VI. RELATION TO EXPERIMENT AND OTHER THEORIES

O ur m odel gives a description of the high eld transition that is qualitatively consistent with experiment for a range of tem peratures⁴. In particular, a peak in the entropy has been observed close to the high-eld term ination of the plateau (Fig. 9 in Ref. 4). As this feature was taken to be an experimental artefact, it was not analyzed in detail in that work. However, it appears that its height is rather sm aller than the one we nd here, although the num ber of data points is not enough to determ ine the center of the peak or its height.

However, recent experiments²² on the spin ice compound $D\,y_2\,T\,i_2O_7$ have indicated that at low temperatures, the high eld transition becomes rst order. In Ref. 22, the onset of rst order behavior was found to occur for temperatures low er than a critical temperature of T_c 0:36K ($0.327\,J_{f\,f;D\,Y}=k_B$). Figure 7 shows that our predicted curves remain continuous even at temperatures below this observed T_c .

A likely reason for the discrepancy is the long range nature of the dipolar interaction, which we approximated as a nearest neighbor Ising model. The simplest way to account for these interactions is to model the ignored interaction terms as giving rise to a magnetic eld proportional to the magnetization. By assuming the magnetization M, as a function of the eld B + M, has the same functional form as given in gure 7, we may self-consistently determine M for a given B. U sing as a free parameter, we nd that this simplem odel predicts the onset of rst order behavior, at the experimentally observed critical eld B_c, only for temperatures in the millikelvin range. To obtain a higher numerical T_c requires a larger , which causes a lower numerical B_c. To get the numerical T_c to match experiment requires an

so large that our num erical B_c is \negative" (in the sense of arti cially extending the M = 1=3 line of gure 7 for the purpose of a spline t). It seems that a more careful treatm ent of the dipolar interaction is required in order to explain the recent experim ental results. A lso, we have not considered the impact of the slow down of the dynam ics which is observed at low tem perature.²³

As for the crossing points mentioned above, the higheld one does indeed appear to be present in the experimental data^{3,22} in the appropriate temperature range. The experimental value of the magnetization at the crossing point is about m = 0.38 g _B J, reasonably close to the theoretical value m = 0.4 g _B J. By contrast, a crossing point at small elds is harder to make out, and an approximate estimate of its location gives B² = 0.35B_c, in disagreem ent with the theoretical B[?] = $3B_c=31$.

Fig. 7 shows a stark contrast between the behavior of magnetization and entropy as the eld strength is increased. W hereas the magnetization increases monotonically going from one plateau to the other, the entropy displays a strong (but smooth) non-monotonicity.

One question which naturally arises is whether such an entropy peak exists m ore generally between two m agnetization plateaus { what is the crucial ingredient for the existence of the spike? The sectors with di erent m agnetizations are degenerate because not only do the m onom er defects not cost any energy at the degeneracy point, but they also do not interact. Such a situation has in fact been observed already in a much more fam iliar frustrated m odel, nam ely the triangular Ising antiferrom agnet in a longitudinal eld. Here, there is a (non-degenerate) low - eld plateau with m agnetization of 1/3, in addition to the usual saturated high-eld plateau. These two are separated by a degeneracy point where up-up-up' and up-up-down' triangles are degenerate.24 The statistical mechanics of that point is described by the hard-hexagon m odel,²⁵ the entropy of which is extensive. A similar phenomenon { a magnetization plateau bounded by two entropy spikes { also appears in the case of an e ectively 1d helim agnet.²⁶

In classical Ising models, such a degeneracy seem s not so surprising as the allowed energies are naturally discrete. However, a similar situation can arise even in bona- de Heisenberg models. This follows from the result by Richteret al.²⁷ who demonstrated that near saturation, on a range of frustrated lattices (including the kagome), localized spin-1/2 excitations exist. As one sweeps the magnetic eld from saturation downwards, one would therefore also expect an entropy spike in those models. A num erical study testing this assertion is in progress.²⁸

Cooling by adiabatic (de)m agnetization

At low tem peratures, near the degeneracy point, the partition function depends on magnetic eld and tem – perature e ectively only through the combination (B B_c)=T. O nem ay thus argue that the spike m ay be used to e ect cooling by adiabatic dem agnetization²⁹ in exactly the same way onem ay use param agnets { analogous constraints lim it the application in either case.

There are two features which may be worth pointing out at this point. Both follow from the fact that { unlike in the case of a param agnet { $B_c \in 0$. Firstly, maximal cooling occurs at a nite eld, namely around B_c . This phenom enon may therefore be useful to e ect cooling for a magnet in a eld, with the restriction that B_c , for a

given spin ice com pound, is not tunable. Secondly, if B approaches B_c from below, one can in fact obtain \cooling by adiabatic m agnetization", as entropy and m agnetization grow together in this regime.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have analyzed in detail the m agnetization curve of nearest-neighbor spin ice in a [111] m agnetic eld. The basic ingredient which m akes this system particularly interesting is that a uniform eld can be used to couple to the Ising pseudospins as a staggered eld.^{30,31} This amounts to the possibility of applying elds which would have appeared to be rather unnatural in the form ulation of a sim ple Ising m odel (w ithout the detour via spin ice) on the pyrochlore lattice.

As a result, one observes an attractively rich behavior. Perhaps the most salient is the dimensional reduction from pyrochlore to kagome under the application of an external eld. The restoration of threedimensionality upon weakening the eld goes along with the one-dimensional string defects. We hope that the extension developed here of Kosterlitz's RG treatment to such extended defects m ight be of more general use.

A particularly attractive feature of the monom erdim er model we have obtained here lies in the fact that the relative monom er and dim er fugacities in the low – tem perature (T $_{\rm Je}$) regime are given by simple Boltzm an weights of Zeem an energies. They are thus straightforwardly tunable by changing the strength of the applied ekd. In particular, anisotropic fugacities can be obtained by tilting the ekd, and they therefore do not require an actual manipulation (such as an application of anisotropic stress) of the two-dimensional layer.

As discussed previously in Ref. 11 the price for our ability to analyze the model in such detail has been the om ission of the long-range nature of the dipolar interaction. A truncation of the interaction at only the nearest-neighbor distance would seem a rather drastic step; an expectation of quantitative agreem ent between experiment and the nearest-neighborm odel will in general likely be m isplaced. However, as we argue in a different context, it turns out that, in an interm ediate tem perature regime, this is not entirely unreasonable.¹³ This observation m ight lie at the basis of the fact that the m easured dipolar ice entropy agrees so well with Pauling's estimate. Our 'prediction' of the entropy peak between the intermediate and saturated plateaux bears witness to the promise of our approach to unearth at least som e qualitative features of interest.

A cknow ledgem ents

W ewould like to thank M ichelG ingras, H ans H ansson, R yu ji H igashinaka, P eter H oldsworth, Johannes R ichter, A nders K arlhede, Satoru N akatsu ji for useful discussion. This work was in part supported by the M inistere de la Recherche et des N ouvelles Technologies with an ACI grant. SLS would like to acknow ledge support by the NSF (DMR-0213706) and the D avid and Lucile Packard Foundation.

APPENDIX A: THE CLUSTER ALGORITHM

We use a loop algorithm to simulate spin ice at low elds. The algorithm probes only the spin ice ground state manifold and therefore can work only at low tem peratures and low magnetic elds. All attempted loop ips are accepted in our algorithm.

The algorithm works as follows. To construct a loop, we, rst, pick at random a tetrahedron of xed orientation (and mark it as a rst tetrahedron in a loop), then we pick with probability 1=2 a spin direction (in or out of a tetrahedron) and pick a rst spin in a loop using the following rules. If both spins with the chosen direction are on the kagom e sublattice then we pick the spin with a probability 1=2, which is independent of the spin orientation. If one spin is on the triangular sublattice and another is on the kagom e sublattice then we pick the spin with probability that depends on the spin orientation. N am ely, if the spin on the triangular sublattice is out of the tetrahedron (along the magnetic eld), we pick the spin on the kagom e or triangular sublattices with respective probabilities

$$p_1 = \frac{1}{1+g};$$
 (A1)

and

$$p_2 = \frac{g}{1+g} \tag{A2}$$

where g will be xed by the detailed balance condition, see below, and $p_1 + p_2 = 1$. If the spin on the triangular sublattice points into the tetrahedron, we pick the spin on the kagom e or triangular sublattices with probabilities p_2 and p_1 respectively. Then we ip the chosen spin thus introducing two defects in the tetrahedra that share the spin.

A fier choosing the rst spin, we move to the neighboring tetrahedron with a defect. The next tetrahedron has two spins with the opposite orientation. We ip one of these two spins adding it to the loop using the same prescription as we used to pick the rst spin. Thus we move the defect to another tetrahedron. Then we repeat this procedure iteratively moving one of the two defects through the lattice until we encounter the other defect in the rst tetrahedron { the two defects will annihilate and the loop will be closed. Since we add spins to the loop with alternating signs { two spins with opposite orientation from each tetrahedron we traverse, the ice rule is not violated.

The algorithm is ergodic since any pair of di erent congurations di er by spins on cloæd loops on ly. They can always be connected by ipping these loops. Let us sketch the proof of the detailed balance condition. Suppose that we have ipped some bop. In order to prove detailed balance, the rst site in a bop that returns us to the original con guration must be the rst site in the original bop and the reversed bop must be constructed in the reverse direction. We can prove the detailed balance condition locally, i.e. for all short sequences of the bop, see Fig. 8 and Fig. 9. It is easy to check that most of these sequences are trivial, i.e. they have equal energies before and after spin ip and equal probabilities to go from one to another con quration. An



FIG. 8: Con gurations A and B. Tetrahedra are shown on top of each other. Sm all arrows indicate a short sequence of a loop. Up and down spins are denoted by black and grey dots.

example of such a simple sequence is shown in Fig. 8. The probability of going from con guration A to con guration B is equal to the probability of going from B to A (equal to 1=2). In order to prove the detailed balance condition, we only need to consider the energies of single spins that are the second spins in the sequences (the energies of the rst spins in the sequences are taken into account in the previous step). These spins have the sam e energies. Thus the detailed balance condition is satis ed trivially. An example of a nontrivial sequence is shown in Fig. 9. The energies of con gurations A and B⁰ are di erent there. We have to prove the detailed balance



FIG. 9: Con gurations A and B 0 . Tetrahedra are shown on top of each other. Sm all arrows indicate a short sequence of a loop. Up and down spins are denoted by black and grey dots.

condition

$$P(A ! B) = P(A B^{\circ}) = P(B^{\circ}) = P(A)$$
 (A3)

The right hand side in (A 3) is just a ratio of Boltzm ann weights and is equal to exp(8h=3), where h =g _B JB = k_B T, since the energy of con guration A (the energy of the second and third spins in the sequence) is $4hk_B$ T=3, and the energy of con guration B⁰ (the energy of the second and third spins in the sequence) is

 $4hk_B T=3$. A coording to our algorithm, the probability of going from con guration A to con guration B 0 is

P (A ! B⁰) = p_1 =2 and the reverse probability of going from B⁰ to A is P (A B⁰) = p_2 =2. We have from (A 3)

$$g = \frac{p_2}{p_1} = \exp(8h=3)$$
: (A 4)

Therefore if we choose p_1 and p_2 as

$$p_1 = \frac{1}{1 + e^{8h=3}};$$
 (A 5)

and

$$p_2 = \frac{e^{8h=3}}{1+e^{8h=3}}$$
 (A 6)

then the detailed balance condition is ful lled.

APPENDIX B:RG CALCULATION

W e introduce the abbreviation:

$$d = \frac{Y}{{}_{k;i2 I_{k}}} \frac{d^{2} x_{k;i}^{(1)}}{2} \frac{d^{2} x_{k;i}^{(2)}}{2} - \frac{x_{k;i}^{(1)} x_{k;i}^{(2)}}{2}$$
(B1)

in terms of which the canonical partition function for a given dipolar distribution fN $_{\rm k,l}g$ may be written: Z (fN $_{\rm k,l}g$;) = d exp(H). Our RG calculation has two steps. The rst step is integrating over short length scales, i.e. those states where at least one pair of charges is separated by a distance between and + d. The second step is to rescale variables to restore the short distance cuto . W hen we carry out the rst step, the result is a zeroth order term and a correction of orderd :

$$Z (fN_{k;l}g;) = d exp(H) + I_{klm;ij}$$

$$d exp(H) + I_{klm;ij}$$

$$(B2)$$

where $I_{k\,lm\ ij}$ is the contribution of the conguration that has the negative end of the ith m-dipole of layer k paired with the positive end of the jth (l m)-dipole of layer k + m. The sum over k is over all planes; the sum over l is over all dipole lengths up to the number of planes; and the sum over m is from 1 to l 1. The form of this term is given by:

$$L_{k \, \text{Im } ij} = \int_{\substack{0 \\ +d}}^{Z} d^{0} e^{H_{0} 0} \frac{d^{2} x_{i}^{(2)}}{2} \frac{x_{i}^{(1)} x_{i}^{(2)}}{2}$$

$$Z_{d(x_{i}^{(2)};)} \frac{d^{2} x_{j}^{(1)}}{2} \frac{x_{j}^{(1)} x_{j}^{(2)}}{2} e^{H_{0}(x_{i}^{(2)}; x_{j}^{(1)})}$$
(B 3)

The region of integration of the positive charge $x_j^{(1)}$ is an annulus of radius and thickness d centered on the negative charge $x_i^{(2)}$. This region is denoted by $d(x_i^{(2)};)$. The position of this negative charge (and hence the pair) is integrated over the entire area A. Strictly speaking,

 $\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(2)}$ would have to avoid the hard cores of all of the other charges but this introduces an error of order (d \hat{f} . \hat{f}_{+d} is the space of con gurations of the rest of the charges in which the charges are separated from each other by a distance of at least $+ d \cdot H(\mathbf{x}_{1}^{(2)}; \mathbf{x}_{j}^{(1)})$ refers to the piece of the H am iltonian which involves charges $\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(2)}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{j}^{(1)}$ and the rest of the H am iltonian is denoted by H 0 .

The $\mathbf{x}_{j}^{(1)}$ integration amounts to making the substitution $\mathbf{x}_{j}^{(1)} = \mathbf{x}_{i}^{(2)} + \sim$; $d\mathbf{\hat{x}}_{j}^{(1)} = d d$; and integrating over angles. If we denote the latter two of integrals of equation B3 by I, then:

$$I = \frac{d}{a} \frac{\sum_{A}^{Z} \frac{d^{2} \mathbf{x}_{i}^{(2)}}{2}}{\sum_{A}^{Z}} d e^{H (\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(2)} + \mathbf{x}_{i}^{(2)} + \cdots)} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_{i}^{(2)}}{2} \frac{\mathbf{x}_{i}^{(2)} \mathbf{x}_{i}^{(2)} + \cdots}{2}$$
(B4)

We assume that our gas of defects is su ciently dilute that the following distances are much greater than the pair separation : (1) the distance of a particle in plane k+m from our pair, (2) the distance of a particle in plane k from the positive charge $x_i^{(1)}$, and (3) the distance of a particle in plane k + l from the negative charge $x_j^{(2)}$. In this dilute limit, we may make the approximation:

$$\frac{\mathbf{x}_{\perp}^{(1)} \quad \mathbf{x}_{\perp}^{(2)}}{A} = \frac{\mathbf{x}_{\perp}^{(2)} \quad \mathbf{x}_{j}^{(2)} + \sim}{A} = \frac{2}{A} = \frac{\mathbf{x}_{\perp}^{(1)} \quad \mathbf{x}_{j}^{(2)}}{A}$$
(B 5)

We also have that H $(x_i^{(2)}; x_j^{(1)})$ is small in this limit, which allows us to expand the exponential and to leading order, the integralm ay be done exactly¹⁷. The result is:

$$I = \frac{d}{2} \frac{x_{i}^{(1)} x_{j}^{(2)}}{2} 2 \frac{(2)^{2}}{A} \frac{X_{a \in b}}{a \in b} e_{a} e_{b} \ln \frac{r_{ab}}{a \in b}$$

$$2 \frac{d}{A} \frac{x_{i}^{(1)} x_{j}^{(2)}}{2}$$
(B 6)

In the penultim ate line, the sum refers to a sum over all charges, positive and negative, residing in the plane k + m. This sum term m ay be neglected in the large A lim it, which is why, in contrast to the K osterlitz calculation²⁰, the coupling strength does not vary during our RG ow (see equation 3.14). The delta function in plies that the m-dipole and (l m)-dipole have been combined into a larger l-dipole. Returning to our correction term :

$$I_{k \text{lm ij}} \quad 2 \stackrel{\texttt{"Z}}{\longrightarrow} d^{k;lm} \exp(H)$$

where the space $^{k;lm}_{+d}$ is analogous to $_{+d}$, except that there is one less m-dipole in layer k; one less (l m)dipole in layer k + m; and one more l-dipole in layer k. W hat we are actually interested in is the grand partition function (equation 3.12). Because our RG procedure is consistent with the charge neutrality constraint, the various fI_k m ijg m ay be combined with di erent terms in the grand partition function. W hen we substitute into equation 3.12 and arrange term s, we nd that:

$$Z = \frac{X}{Q} \frac{1}{(N; 9)!} h^{Z} d exp(H)$$

$$= \frac{Y}{Y} \frac{Y}{2} N;$$

$$+ \frac{X}{k;l_{fm}} i \frac{Y}{2} \frac{Y}{2} N; \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{(2)^{2}} N_{k;l} \frac{Y_{l}}{2} N_{k;l} \frac{Y_{l}}{2} N_{k;l} \frac{Y_{l}}{2} N_{k;l} \frac{Y_{l}}{2} N_{k;l}$$
(B8)

The prime on the second product means that $y_1^{N_{k+1}}$ has been taken outside the product. If the fugacities are small, then we may write this in a more convenient way:

$$Z = \frac{X \quad hY}{\sum_{\substack{f_{N_{k;1}g \quad k;1}\\ Z}} \frac{(y_{1} + \frac{d}{m} \frac{P_{11}}{m=1} y_{m} y_{1m})^{N_{;1}}}{(2)^{N_{k;1}} (N_{k;1})!}$$

$$d \quad exp(H) \qquad (B9)$$

F inally, we rescale lengths, $x ! x (1 + d =)^1$, and nd (dropping primes):

$$Z = \frac{X \quad h_{Y}}{\int_{M_{k;l}g \quad k;l} \frac{y_{1}^{\circ}}{(N_{k;l})!}} \frac{y_{1}^{\circ}}{(N_{k;l})!} \quad d \quad \exp(H) \quad (B10)$$

where

$$y_1^{\circ} = (y_1 + \frac{d}{m} y_m y_{1m}) (1 + 2\frac{d}{m}) (1 - \frac{d}{m}) (B 11)$$

The ow equations (3.14) follow from this.

² A.P.Ramirez, A.Hayashi, R.J.Cava, R.Siddharthan,

- ³ K. Matsuhira, Z. Hiroi, T. Tayama, S. Takagi, and T. Sakakibara, J. Phys. Cond. M at. 14, L559 (2002).
- ⁴ Z. Hiroi, K. Matsuhira, S. Takagi, T. Tayama, and T. Sakakibara, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 72, 411 (2003).
- ⁵ R.Higashinaka, H.Fukazawa, and Y.Maeno, Phys.Rev. B 68, 014415 (2003).
- ⁶ H.Fukazawa, R.G.Melko, R.Higashinaka, Y.Maeno, and M.J.P.Gingras, Phys. Rev. B 65, 054410 (2002).
- ⁷ S.T.Bramwell, M.J.P.G ingras, Science 294, 1495 (2001).
- ⁸ M.J.Harris, S.T.Bram well, P.C.W.Holdsworth, and J. D.M.Champion, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 4496 (1998).
- ⁹ R.Siddharthan, B.S.Shastry, A.P.R am irez, A.H ayashi, R.J.Cava, and S.Rosenkranz, Phys.Rev.Lett. 83, 1854 (1999); R.Siddharthan, B.S.Shastry, and A.P.R am irez, Phys.Rev.B 63, 184412 (2001).
- ¹⁰ M. U dagawa, M. O gata, and Z. H iroi [J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 71, 2365 (2002)].
- ¹¹ R.M oessner and S.L.Sondhi, Phys.Rev.B 68, 064411 (2003).
- ¹² R.Moessner and S.L.Sondhi, Phys.Rev.B 63, 224401 (2001).
- $^{13}\,$ S.V. Isakov, R.M. oessner, and S.L.Sondhi, in preparation.
- ¹⁴ J.F.Nagle, Phys. Rev. 152, 190 (1966).
- ¹⁵ J.F.Nagle, J.M ath. Phys. 7, 1484 (1966).
- ¹⁶ W e neglect the term proportional to $\cos(2 h)$.

- ¹⁷ S.W .Pierson, Phil.M ag.B 76, 715 (1997).
- ¹⁸ K.S.Raman, PhD thesis, in preparation.
- ¹⁹ P.Chaikin and T.Lubensky, Principles of condensed matter physics, Cambridge University Press (1995).
- ²⁰ J.M. Kosterlitz, J. Phys. C 7, 1046 (1974).
- ²¹ S.V. Isakov, PhD thesis, Stockholm 2004.
- ²² T.Sakakibara, T.Tayama, Z.Hiroi, K, Matsuhira, and S. Takagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 207205 (2003).
- ²³ J. Snyder, J. S. Slusky, R. J. Cava, and P. Schi er, Nature 413, 48 (2001); K. Matsuhira, Y. Hinatsu, and T. Sakakibara, J. Phys. Cond. M at. 13, L737 (2001).
- ²⁴ B.D.M etcalf and C.P.Yang, Phys. Rev. B 18, 2304 (1978).
- ²⁵ R.J.Baxter, J.Phys.A 13, L61 (1980); J.Stat.Phys.26, 427 (1981).
- ²⁶ V. Ravi Chandra, S. Ram assha, and D. Sen, condmat/0403555 (unpuplished).
- ²⁷ J. Richter, J. Schulenburg, A. Honecker, J. Schnack, and H.-J. Schmidt, J. Phys. Cond. M at. 16, S779 (2004).
- $^{\mbox{\tiny 28}}$ O .D erzhko and J.R ichter, work in progress.
- ²⁹ The potential of frustrated m agnets for adiabatic dem agnetization has been m entioned already in M.E.Zhitom irsky, Phys.Rev.B 67, 104421 (2003).
- ³⁰ J.T.Chalker and P.Chandra, private communication.
- ³¹ R.Moessner, Phys.Rev.B 57, R5587 (1998).