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#### Abstract

Spin ice in a magnetic eld in the [111] direction displays two magnetization plateaux, one at saturation and an interm ediate onewith nite entropy. W e study the crossovers betw een the di erent regim es from a point of view of (entropically) interacting defects. $W$ e develop an analytical theory for the nearest-neighbor spin ice $m$ odel, which covers $m$ ost of the $m$ agnetization curve. $W e n d$ that the entropy is non $m$ onotonic, exhibiting a giant spike betw een the tw o plateaux. This regim e is described by a monom er-din er modelw ith tunable fugacities. At low elds, we develop an RG treatm ent for the extended string defects, and we com pare our results to extensive M onte C arlo sim ulations. W e address the im plications of our results for cooling by adiabatic (de)m agnetization.


## I. IN TRODUCTION

 $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7}$ and $\mathrm{Dy}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7}$ have uncovered an intriguing set of phenom ena when unicrystalline sam ples are plaped in an extemalm agnetic eld in the [111]direction $\mathbf{3}^{1 / 44_{1} 515,616}$ For a review on spin ice, see Ref. $\overline{1}_{1}$.
$T$ he discovery of a plateau in the $m$ agnetization below saturation, rst predicted, theoretically ${ }^{8}$ in and explored in $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations, ${ }^{18014}$ has been particularly re$m$ arkable as it $w$ as found, ton, retain a fraction of the zeroeld spin ice entropy ${ }^{4} 4_{1}^{11} 11$ In this regim $e$, the system is well described by a two-dim ensional Ising model on a kagom e lattioe in a longitudinal eld, which is in tum equivalent to a hexagonal lattioe dim er modell $1^{1,11^{11} 1^{12}}$.

R ecently, tw o of the present authors have studied the therm odynam ics and correlations of the [111] plateau ${ }^{111}$ This work has led to the identi cation of $m$ echanism $s$ which term inate the plateau. At the high-eld end, the term ination occurs via the proliferation ofm onom er defects in the underlying dim erm odel. At low elds, a m ore exotic extended string defect restores three dim ensionality. The asym ptotic density ofboth kinds of defects was estim ated in Ref. '111.

In this paper, we consider in detail the fullm agnetization curve from zero- eld to saturation. A brief synopsis of the exotic them odynam ic properties of spin ice is in a [111] eld is sketched in Fig. ${ }_{1}^{1.1}$. The aim of this paper is to identify the di erent regim es of the $m$ agnetization curves, to provide analytical theories for them, and to test them against $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations, and nally against experim ent.

Near zero eld, we-use the accurate self-consistent H artree approxim ation ${ }^{2}$ ! - to provide an analyticalapproxim ation for the linear response regim e. At the low eld end of the plateau, we develop $m$ ean eld and renorm alization group treatm ents for the extended string defects, which we use to analyze the in-plane and out-ofplane correlations. W e com pare these w ith M onte C arlo sim ulations using an e cient cluster algorithm, which al low s us to obtain accurate data from the linear response regim $e$ to the beginning of the [111] plateau. We nd
that the $m$ ean eld treatm ent is accurate at the low est elds, where the string density w ould be relatively high. $T$ he renorm alization group treatm ent com pares w ellw ith sim ulation in the dihute string lim it. A teven higher elds, the plateau is approached and the suppression of the entropic activation of strings becom es apparent as a nitesize e ect.

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. W e m odel this phenom enon by a m onom er-dim er m odel on the honeycom b lattice with varying fugacities. (At the point where the all fugacities equall, this m odeltums out to be one of hard bow -ties' on the kagom e lattioe.) $W$ e analyze this $m$ odel $w$ thin a Bethe approxim ation and allso by using results from a high-order series expansion ${ }^{144}$

W e show that the entropy peak is due to the crossing of an extensive num ber of energy levels which have $m$ acroscopic entropies. C om paring this theory with M onte C arlo sim ulations of the appropriate $m$ onom er-dim er model, we nd that the sim ple Bethe approxim ation 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 $m$ agnetisation versus eld at di erent tem peratures. In addition, there is a further crossing point at lower elds, where the corrections to the $m$ agnetisation due to $m$ onom er and string defects alm ost cancel one another.

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

W e then discuss the implications of the entropy peak for $m$ agnetocaloric $m$ anipulations. In particular, we argue that it arises in a m ore generalset ofm odels. It can, in principle, be used to e ect cooling in a eld, both by adiabatic dem agnetization, and by adiabatic $m$ agnetization. Finally, we close w th som e concluding rem arks.


F IG . 1: P roperties of spin-ice as the [111] m agnetic eld is varied. These curves are for illustration and do not show actual num erical or experim ental data. W e have indicated the regions where various analytic approaches discussed in the text apply.

## II. M ODELAND 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 modelu in which the long-range dipolar interaction is truncated beyond the nearest-neighbor spins. W hile the exchange interaction in spin ice com pounds is antiferrom agnetic, the e ective interaction (exchange plus nearest-neighbor dipolar) is ferrom agnetic. The H am iltonian for unitlength spins $S_{i} m$ ay be w ritten as

$$
\begin{align*}
& +g_{\text {b }} \text { B } \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{i}} \tag{2.1}
\end{align*}
$$

$w h e r e J_{e}^{0}$ is an e ective exchange coupling. The second term is the easy axis anisotropy of strength $E<0$,


F IG . 2: The pyrochlore lattice of comer-sharing tetrahedra.


FIG. 3: A single tetrahedron inscribed in a cube. The easy axes of the pyroch lore lattice (orh111i 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 lattioe (see Fig. and Fig. (13). The third term is the interaction with a $m$ agnetic eld of strength $B, g{ }_{B} J$ being the $m$ agnetic $m$ om ent of the spins. B oth experim ent and theory indicate that this simpli ed m odel is a good description of spin ice at $m$ oderate tem peratures.

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 lim it, 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 $m$ ay write an e ective $H$ am iltonian for the pseudospins:

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=J_{e}{ }_{<i j>}^{X} \quad i j \quad g_{B} J_{i}^{X} B \quad \hat{d}_{(i)} i ; \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here $J_{e}=J_{e}^{0}=3>0$.

## III. THE LOW FIELD REGIME

At zero $m$ agnetic eld and zero tem perature, the ferro$m$ agnetic interaction gives rise to an \ice rule" constraint: the pseudospins on each tetrahedron $m$ ust sum to zero, $j \quad j=0$. In tem s of the physical spins, on each tetrahedron two w ill point inw ards (tow ards the center) and tw o w illpoint outw ards (aw ay from the center). T he set of con gurations satisfying the ice rule com prises the zero- eld spin ice ground state m anifold. At low m agnetic elds (and low tem peratures), the system will continue to obey the ioe rule, though the $m$ agnetic eld will favor certain states am ong those in the zero- eld ground state $m$ anifold.

W e have perform ed extensive $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations of the low eld regim e, from zero- eld up till the low eld plateau term ination, using a loop algorithm, which is discussed in A ppendix A. O ur algorithm probes only spin ice ground states (tw o spins in and tw o out on each tetrahedron) and is thus applicable at low tem peratures T $J_{e}$ and low magnetic elds, where the density of m onom er defects, which are responsible for the high eld plateau tem ination, is low. The sim ulation is written in term s of a pyrochlore lattice w ith the conventional16 site cubic unit all (w hich contains four tetrahedra ofeach kind ) . T he sim ulations have been done for system $\mathrm{s} w$ ith $16,128,432,1024,2000,3456,5488,8192$, and 16000 sites. For a system w ith 16000 sites, we perform 2:5 $1 \sigma^{6}$ loop ips for equilibration and $5 \quad 10^{7}$ for averaging. For other system sizes, we we perform $1 \quad 10^{\circ}$ loop ips for equilibration and $2 \quad 10^{8}$ for averaging. T he sim ulated $m$ agnetization as a function ofthem agnetic eld strength is show $n$ in $F$ ig. $I_{1}^{1} 1 . T$ hem agnetization attains the plateau value at elds much larger than the tem perature.


FIG. 4: Them agnetization from $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations.
A. The linear response regim e

W e may calculate the ground state entropy of spin ice at zero eld by num erically integrating the rst law of
therm odynam ics

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{dS}=\frac{\mathrm{dU}}{\mathrm{~T}}+\frac{\mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{~T}} \mathrm{dh}: \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$N$ oting that the $m$ agnetization is constant and equal to $g_{\text {в }} J=3$ per spin on the plateau and is zero at zero eld, and that the value of the entropy on the plateau is $S=k_{B}=0: 0807651$ spin ice, $S=k_{B}=0: 2051 \quad 0: 0001$. O ur vahe is very close to Pauling's estim ate $S=k_{B}=0: 202733$ and is consistent $w$ ith the $m$ ost accurate,current theoretical estim ate $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}}=0: 20501 \quad 0: 00005^{15}$

At zero eld, we use the self-consistent $H$ artree approxim ation, which is know n to give a quantitatively accurate appraxim ation to the ground state correlations of spin ice ${ }^{13}$ This gives $=2\left(g g_{B} J\right)^{2}=3 k_{B} T$ for spin ice. This com pares well with our M onte C arlo result,
$=(0: 667350: 0003)\left(g_{B} J\right)^{2}=k_{B} T$ for a system w ith 16000 sites.
B. String defects and their interactions

## 1. G eneral description

Figure $\overline{2}$ presents the underlying pyrochlore lattioe of spin ioe and $g$. $\bar{N}_{1}^{1}$, show $s$ the [111] direction. It is convenient to visualize the pyrochlore lattioe as a stack of altemating kagom e and triangularplanes, the [111] direction being the direction in which the planes are stacked. Each spin lies on a comer shared by an up-pointing and dow $n$-pointing tetrahedron.

If the [111] m agnetic eld is large enough, the spins in the triangular planes align w th the eld; the kagome planes decouple from one another; and the system is well described by a two-dim ensional model. This describes spin ice on the plateau. At elds slightly lawer than the plateau, excitations called string defects $1^{111}$ restore three-dim ensionality and are responsible for the low eld term ination of the plateau.

To describe these defects, we consider the entropic ben$e t$ of relaxing the condition that the triangular planes are polarized. Suppose we ip a spin in som e triangular layer. T hen, by the ice rule constraint, we m ust 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 $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{s}}=8 \mathrm{~g}$ в $\mathrm{JB}=3$. 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 interm ediate triangular plane. Sim ilarly, a \negative" defect connects the kagom e plane
to the kagom e plane directly below it. These two defects $m$ ay be separated by ipping pairs of spins pointing in di erent directions on neighboring triangles of the kagom e plane. $T$ he entropy in the kagom e plane depends on this separation, which is the basis for the interaction betw een defects discussed below. Ignoring this correction, the positive defect $m$ ay be placed anyw here in the plane (which xes the position of the negative defect in the layer above). This im plies that the entropy per bilayer is $S \quad \ln A$, where $A$ is the area of a layer. This show sthat for a given $m$ agnetic 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 triangu lar spins are xed while each kagom e plane contains tw o up pseudospins ( = 1) and one dow n pseudospin ( = 1). $T$ his Ising $m$ odel on the kagom $e$ lattice $m$ ay be $m$ apped onto the dim er model on the hexagonal lattioe $1_{1}^{11122!}$ where a dow $n$ pseudospin corresponds to a dim er on the hexagonal lattice. In this language, a string defect appears as a pair of oppositely charged $m$ onom ers.

As discussed in Ref. $11 \underline{11}$, a m onom er-dim er covering $m$ ay 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 dim ers lie. T he heights are assigned as follow s. M oving from a site to a nearest neighbor site by $m$ oving clockw ise around an up- (dow n-) triangle will increase (decrease) the height by $+2(-2)$ if a dim er is crossed. If a dim er is not crossed, then the height will decrease (increase) by $-1(+1)$. A ccording to these rules, traversing a closed loop in the dual lattice $w$ ill result in a height di erence of $+3(-3)$ if a positive (negative) m onom er is enclosed and 0 otherw ise. W e note that the overall sign of the height assignm ents is a $m$ atter 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 $h(x)$ and as discussed in Ref. '11 1', the entropy associated w ith a height eld $h(x)$ is given to low est order ingredients by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
S=d^{Z} r \frac{K}{2} \dot{r} h \mathcal{J} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $K=\overline{9}$ for the honeycom b lattice ${ }^{-16 \sigma^{\prime}}$ T he height eld has the property:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { I } &  \tag{3.3}\\
\\
& \mathrm{Zh} \\
\mathrm{C}
\end{array}
$$

where ( $x$ ) is the $m$ onom er charge density and $S$ is the region enclosed by the loop_G. . W em ay proceed by analogy w th the 2d XY m odein ${ }^{17}$, and divide $h$ into \dim er"
(spin-wave) and $\backslash \mathrm{m}$ onom er" (vortex) contributions. A standard calculation ${ }^{18}$ gives the entropy of the $m$ onom er piece:

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{m}=\frac{9 K^{Z ~ Z}}{4} d^{2} r d^{2} r^{0}(x) \quad\left(r^{0}\right) \quad \ln \frac{\tilde{r}^{0} j}{} \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \quad d^{2} r d^{2} r^{0} \quad(\underset{\sim}{x}) \quad\left(\mathbb{x}^{0}\right) \quad \ln \frac{\tilde{r}^{0} j}{} \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

where $=1=2$ and is a hard-core radius com parable to the lattioe spacing. This show sthat the entropic interaction betw een two defects separated by distance $r$ is given by $p_{1} p_{2} V$ (jqu $\mathrm{k}_{2} \mathrm{j}$ ) where $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is + $1(-1)$ for a positive (negative) defect and $V(\mathbb{R})=\quad \ln (R=)$.

## 3. M ean eld calculation

If the num ber of defects is fairly large, we m ay expect the interaction to be su ciently scmened to justify the use of variationalm ean eld theory ${ }^{19}$. W ew ill investigate the in-plane and out-of-plane correlations for the defects.

We consider a layered system of two-dim ensional planes (indexed by the label $k$ which ranges from $K$ to $K$ ) where each plane contains $N$ positive and $N$ negative defects (which we refer to as charges) that interact logarithm ically. T he string constraint requires that each positive charge in layer k is rigidly connected to a negative charge in the layer $\mathrm{k}+1$. W e im pose a periodic boundary condition to connect the positive charges in the $K$ th layer to the negative charges in the $K$ th layer.

W e form ally im pose the constraint by writing the \H am ittonian" in term s 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 extemal elds, the entropy of a particular con guration of $N$ defects is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=\sum_{k=k}^{X^{K}} \int_{i \neq j}^{X^{N}} V\left(\dot{x}_{i}^{k} \quad x_{j}^{k}\right){ }_{i ; j}^{X^{N}} V\left(\dot{x}_{i}^{k} \quad X_{j}^{k+1} j\right) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\operatorname{Here} V(\mathbb{R})=\quad \ln (\mathbb{R}=)$, where $\quad$ is a hard-core radius de ning the $m$ inim um separation betw een two charges and $=1=2$. The rst term corresponds to the repulsion of positive charges w ithin the sam e 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 term $s$ of our positive charge form ulation, this $m$ eans the repulsion is tw ige as large. The second term is the interlayer interaction. Physically, a positive charge in layer $k$ has a negative partner in the layerk +1 which attracts the positive charges in layerk+1. In term s ofour positive charge form ulation, charges repel charges in the sam e plane but attract charges in nearest neighbor planes.

W e assum e a variationalm ean eld density of the form :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x_{1}^{K} ;::: ; x_{i}^{k} ;::: ; x_{N}^{K}\right)=Y_{k=K}^{Y} \quad y_{i=1}^{\mathrm{Y}} \frac{{ }^{k}\left(x_{i}^{k}\right)}{N} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

which asserts that allparticles in a given layerk have the sam e probability density ${ }^{k}(x)=N$, but the density $m$ ay vary from layer to layer. W e also need the norm alizing condition:

$$
{ }_{A}^{Z} d^{2} x^{k}(x)=N
$$

$T$ his trial function implies a variational entropy functional:

$$
\begin{align*}
& Z^{\left({ }^{k}\left(x^{0}\right) \quad{ }^{k+1}\left(x^{0}\right)\right) V\left(\begin{array}{ll}
j^{k} & x^{0}
\end{array}\right)} \\
& d^{2} x^{k}(x) \ln \left(\frac{{ }^{k}(x)}{N}\right) \tag{3.8}
\end{align*}
$$

This functional is $m$ axim ized when the density is uniform
${ }^{k}(\mathrm{x})=\frac{\mathrm{N}}{\mathrm{A}}$ which gives $\mathrm{S} ; \mathrm{N}=(2 \mathrm{~K}+1) \mathrm{N} \ln \mathrm{A}$. To investigate the linear response of the system, wem ay apply a perturbing potential to the ob jects in the $\mathrm{k}=0$ plane. In particular, we consider the e ect on the density ofplacing a positive charge at the origin of the plane. The details are given in Ref. 1 d but we $m$ ay quote the result:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \underset{\mathrm{k}}{\mathrm{x}} ; \mathrm{k})=\frac{1}{4^{2}{ }_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}} \\
& Z \quad d^{2} s s^{2}\left(s^{2}+2\right)^{i=2} e^{i s\left(\frac{x}{k}\right)} \\
& h_{1+s^{2}+2^{p}{\overline{s^{2}\left(s^{2}+2\right)}}^{i n} 1+s^{2}+{ }^{p}{\overline{s^{2}\left(s^{2}+2\right)}}^{\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k} 1}}} \tag{3.9}
\end{align*}
$$

where the in-plane length scale is given by $k=$ $\frac{A}{4}^{\mathrm{N}}{ }^{1=2}$. We note rst that this expression diverges at $s m$ all $x$ for $k=0$, which is not surprising because the assum ption 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 param eters, i.e. there is no length scale in the $z$ direction. $W$ e will retum to this point in the next section.

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
z=e^{A}=\int_{N}^{X} \frac{y^{(2 K+1) N}}{(N!)^{2 K+1}} e^{S_{N}} \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S_{N}$ is the entropy of having $N$ defects and $y=$ $e^{E} s_{s}=k_{B} T$ is the fugacity of positive defect ( $y^{2 K+1}$ is the
fugacity ofa \string"). In $m$ ean eld, wem ay replace $S_{T}$, by $S_{; N}=(2 K+1) N \ln A$. From this, we may show ${ }^{181}$ that $\langle N>y y$ and using our earlier expression, we nd that:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underset{k ; M F}{2} \quad \exp \left(8 g_{B} J B=3 k_{B} T\right) \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 4. RG calculation

W hen the gas of defects is fairly dilute, we m ay expect that the screening is not e ective enough to justify a $m$ ean eld treatm ent. In this section, we account for uctuations by $m$ aking a real space renorm alization group calculation using $m$ ethods sin, ilar to the $K$ osterlitz treatm ent of the 2 d C oulom b gas

The dynam ical ob jects described by H am iltonian 13 are dipoles of length $1 . W$ e need to generalize this $m$ odel in order to do an RG calculation. The generalization that we consider is allow ing for dipoles of arbitrary length. A n \l-dipole" is an ob ject where the negative charge lies directly lplanes above its positive partner. W hile the originalproblem involved just the coupling of nearest neighbor planes, our generalized model involves all possible couplings. A ssociated $w$ ith each l-dipole is a fugacity $y_{1}=2$ (the 2 is for convenience). The grand partition function for the system $m$ ay be $w$ ritten as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Z}=\mathrm{XN}_{\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{I}}}^{\mathrm{X}} \underset{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{l}}{\mathrm{Y}} \frac{\left(\mathrm{Y}_{1}=2\right)^{\mathrm{N} ; 1}}{\left(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1}\right)!} \mathrm{Z}\left[\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{l}} \mathrm{G}\right] \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1}$ denotes the num ber ofl-dipoles in layer k ; $\mathrm{N}_{\text {; }}$ is the num ber of l-dipoles in the system; and $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{k}}$ is the num ber of dipoles (of any length) that have their positive ends in layer k. T he sum is over all particle num ber con gurations $\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{l}}$ g that satisfiy the charge neutrality constraint in each plane: $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{k}}={ }_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{k} 1 ; 1}$. The canonical partition function corresponding to a given dipole distribution $\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{I}}$ is:

$$
\begin{align*}
Z\left[\mathrm{IN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{I}} \mathrm{G}\right]= & \mathrm{Z} \quad \mathrm{Y} \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{2} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{i}}^{(1)}}{2} \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{2} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{i}}^{(2)}}{2}  \tag{3.13}\\
\mathrm{~h}^{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{i}} & \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{i}}^{(1)} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{i}}^{(2)}
\end{align*}
$$

H ( $\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{I}}$ ) is the H am iltonian (actually an entropy) corresponding to the dipole distribution $\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{l}} \mathrm{g}$. T he 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 $k+l(i), l(i)$ being the length of the dipole being described. T he string constraint is im posed ${ }_{R}$ by the delta function, where we use the norm alization $R_{R^{2}} \frac{d^{2} x}{2} \quad(\because)=1$. The product is over all positive charges in all layers. T he integration is over the space. . This is de ned to be the set of all possible spatial con gurations of the dipole distribution $\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{I}} \mathrm{g}$
that respect the hard-core constraint: no two charges in a given plane $m$ ay be closer than distance .

O ur procedure is an extension of the treatm ent in Refs. 12 involves integrating over the high m om entum m odes of the system. In our problem, these correspond to those con gurations where in som e plane, we have a pair of charges separated by a distance betw een and $+\mathrm{d} . \mathrm{We}$ assum e a dilute system so only oppositely charged pairs are considered and also the distance betw een the mem bers of a pair is taken to be $m$ uch sm aller than the distance from the pair to another charge. T he basic coarsegraining step in our RG transform ation is ilhustrated in g. $\bar{W}_{1}$.


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 $k$ w ith the positive end of an $l_{2}$-dipole in layer $k+l_{1} . V$ iew ed at long length scales, we e ectively have an ( $l_{1}+l_{2}$ )-dipole in layerk. W ew ill nd that integrating over allpossible pairings gives a zeroeth order term (which just involves replacing with +d) and a num ber of correction term s of orderd where two short dipoles were destroyed and replaced by a longer dipole. Since the procedure respects the charge neutrality constraint, these correction term $\mathrm{s} w$ ill com bine $w$ ith other term $s$ in the grand partition sum. T he second step involves rescaling lengths so that the high m om entum cuto, in the new variable, is the sam e as before. T he aim is to see how the fugacities and couplings change as we run this procedure.

D etails of the calculation are given in A ppendix B. H ere we give the resulting ow equations:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{d y_{1}}{d t}=(2 & ) y \\
\frac{d y_{1}}{d t}=(2 & ) y_{1}+\underbrace{x^{1}}_{m=1} y_{m} Y_{l m} \\
\frac{d}{d t}=0 & \tag{3.16}
\end{array}
$$

$w$ here $t=\ln$. O ne notable feature is that the coupling does not change w ith the ow, in contrast w th the 2 d

C oulom b gas where the coupling does vary (albeit at second order in the fugacity). This indicates that strings are sti er ob jects than charges. A nother observation is that for the intial conditions of our physical problem, nam ely that $y_{1}(0)=y_{0}=2 e^{E}{ }_{s=k_{b} T}$ and $y_{l}(0)=0$ for $l>1$, the ow equations have an exact solution:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{l}}=\mathrm{y}_{0} 2^{\mathrm{h}} \frac{\mathrm{y}_{0}}{2}\left(^{2} \quad 1\right)^{\mathrm{i}_{11}} \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

O urRG is valid as long as the corrections to the fiugacities are $s m a l l, m$ eaning that the derivatives $d y_{1}=d t$ should be bounded. If we look at the above result, Eq. see that when the term in brackets is greater than $1, \mathrm{Y}_{1}$ diverges w ith l. Therefore, a critical length, which we interpret as an in-plane correlation length, is de ned by when the term in brackets equals 1:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{Y_{0}}{2}(\underset{k ; R G}{2} \quad 1)=1 \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{align*}
& \ln {\underset{k ; R G}{ }}_{2}=\frac{32 g{ }_{B} J B}{9 k_{B} T} 1+\frac{\ln \left(e^{E} \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{s}}=\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{~T}\right.}{}+2 \\
& E_{\mathrm{s}}=\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{~T}  \tag{3.19}\\
& \mathrm{k}_{; R G} \quad \exp \left(32 g_{B} J B=9 k_{B} T\right)
\end{align*}
$$

for the elds and tem peratures of interest. This value is the sam e as that predicted in Ref. II using a free energy argum ent. For $<k ; R G, Y_{1}$ decreases with lwhich $m$ eans that states $w$ ith long dipoles are less probable than states with short dipoles. If $>{ }_{k ; R G}, Y_{l}$ diverges $w$ ith 1 which suggests that longer dipoles are favored, but, as $m$ entioned above, the RG procedure is no longer valid in this regim e. We note that when $\quad=k_{k ; R}, y_{1}$ is independent of 1 so that, as in the $m$ ean eld calculation discussed above, there is no discemible length scale in the $z$ direction.

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
l=1+\frac{1}{\ln \frac{\substack{3=2 \\ k ; R G 1 \\ 3=21}}{}} \tag{3,20}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e may interpret $l$ as the typical length of a string segm ent that is captured by a tube of diam eter (w here a tube need not be straight).

## 5. C om parison $w$ ith sim ulation

In $F$ ig. $\overline{1} \bar{G}$, we show the $m$ agnetization as a function of the $m$ agnetic eld strength on a log-log scale. O ur algorithm allows us to sim ulate spin ice in a [111] m agnetic eld with very high accuracy.
$T$ he $m$ agnetization should scale $w$ ith the average density of defects, which in tum should scale like the inverse


FIG. 6: T he crossover betw een exponents.
square of the in-plane correlation length. As shown in this gure, the data at low elds are well tby the exponent $8 / 3$ obtained in the $m$ ean eld calculation discussed earlier. At som ew hat higher elds, the data are well $t$ by the exponent 32/9, obtained by the RG calculation discussed earlier and also in $R$ ef. 11111 by looking at the entropic contribution to the free energy. At high elds, the exponent of $8 \mathrm{~L}=3$ (= 16 for $L=6$ (sites), as $w$ as the case in the sim ulations) characterizes a regim e where nite-size e ects are im portant, as discussed below .

The low eld crossoverm akes qualitative sense in that at low elds, there $w$ ill be many defects which screen
one another which suggests that a m ean eld treatm ent $m$ ay be reasonably accurate. At higher elds, the gas of defects is m ore dilute so an RG treatm ent would be required.

The high eld crossover is a nite-size e ect since the position of a crossover betw een exponents is system size dependent and the corresponding exponent is also system size dependent, getting steeper w ith increasing system size. The nite-size behavior $m$ ay be explained as follow s. At high m agnetic elds, there are a sm all num ber of string defects in the system. The m agnetization and the energy of one string defect in a system of size $L$ are
$4 L g$ в $J=3$ and $4 L g$ в JB $=3$ respectively. T he energy cost grow s linearly $w$ ith system size and, as m entioned above, the defects are favored solely due to their entropic contribution to the free energy. At su ciently high magnetic elds, a given system will be too sm all to provide the entropy to balance the energy cost of a string. This $w$ ill occur $w$ hen the $m$ agnetization per spin reaches the $m$ agnetization of a system $w$ ith one string defect:

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
m & =1=3 & 2(4 L=3)=\left(16 L^{3}\right) g \text { в } Ј \\
& =1=3 & 1=\left(6 L^{2}\right) g \text { в } J: \tag{3.21}
\end{array}
$$

In this case, the statistical weight of a single string defect $w$ ill be a Boltzm ann factor $\exp \left(8 L g_{B} J B=3 k_{B} T\right)$ and the $m$ agnetization $w$ ill equal $\left[1=3 \quad C \exp \left(8 L g_{B} J B=3 k_{B} T\right)\right] g$ $J$, where $C$ is som e constant. The crossover betw een di erent regim es occurs $w$ hen the $m$ agnetization reaches ( $32 \mathbf{I N}_{1}$ ). W e have good agreem ent $w$ ith the $8 \mathrm{~L}=3$ behavior for a variety of system sizes, including $L=6 \mathrm{which}$ is shown in gure ${ }^{1} \mathbf{1}, 1$.

IV . THEHIGHEIELDREGIME

On the plateau, the $m$ agnetization of the triangular sublattioe is saturated and wem ay consider each kagom e plane separately. T hus, the 3-dim ensionalm odelm ay be $m$ apped onto a 2 -dim ensional one. W hereas the spins in the triangular sublattice are xed, the physics in the kagom e planes rem ains non-trivial. E ach triangle on the kagom e plane contains two up pseudospins ( $=1$ ) and one dow $n$ pseudospin $(=1)$. This Ising model on the kagom e lattice $m$ ay be $m$ apped onto the dim er m odel on the hexagonal lattice, 1011112 in which a dow $n$ pseudospin corresponds to a dim er on the hexagonal lattice. The $m$ odel retains an extensive ground state entropy, $S=k_{B}=$ 0:080765.

If we ip a down (pseudo)spin it violates the ice nule. T his corresponds to breaking a dim er into tw o m onom ers. A sw ith string defects, these $m$ onom ensm ay be separated and $m$ ove freely on the lattice. T he energy cost for creating two m onom ens is $2 \mathrm{E}=4 \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{e}} \quad 2 \mathrm{~g}$ в $J B=3$. This energy vanishes at a critical eld $B_{c}=6 J_{e}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}g & \text { в }\end{array}\right)$. At higher elds the $m$ onom ers proliferate leading to com plete saturation and an ordered state w ith zero entropy.

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{H}{T}={ }_{h_{i j i}}^{X} K_{i j} S_{i} S_{j} h_{i}^{X} S_{i} ; \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here the sum is over all nearest neighbors; $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{i}}$ are classical Ising spins taking values +1 and $1 ; h$ is the strength of a ctitious m agnetic eld; and $\mathrm{K}_{++}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{+}=$ $K+=K=\left[g{ }_{\text {в }} J B=6 \quad 屯\right]=T$, and $K=1$. The coupling constants im 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 $m$ agnetic eld strength).


FIG.7: The m agnetization (top) and the entropy (bottom) around the transition betw een the plateaux. T he simple $B$ ethe approxim ation is com pared to the $M$ onte $C$ arlo results. $T$ he exact result for the entropy at zero $m$ onom er density and $P$ auling's estim ate for the entropy at zero $m$ agnetic eld are show $n$ for reference. $T$ he series expansion contains the results from $R$ ef. $1 \underline{14}$ on the $m$ onom er-dim er $m$ odel.

W em ay calculate the $m$ agnetization and entropy using the simple B ethe approxim ation. D etails are given in Refs. 114121.1

$$
\begin{align*}
m & =\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1+x^{2}}  \tag{4.2}\\
S & =\frac{3 x z \ln z}{2+6 x z}+\frac{1}{4} \ln \frac{2 z^{3}}{x^{2}(3 z \quad x)^{\prime}} \tag{4.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $x=2 z=\left(1+p \overline{1+8 z^{2}}\right)$ and $z=\exp (2 K)$.
In F ig. $\underline{1}_{1}^{1}, 1$ we com pare these expressions w th a M onte $C$ arlo sim ulation. The sim ulation is of a kagom e lattioe w ith $16 \times 16$ up-triangles ( 768 total spins). The standard single spin- ip M etropolis algorithm was used, which $m$ ay explain the inaccuracy in the sim ulated entropy at low elds, w here a m ore clever schem e $m$ ay be needed to sam ple the degenerate $m$ anifold. The entropy $w$ as com puted, for a given eld, by integrating from high tem peratures (where $S=k_{B}=(3=4)$ ln 2 per atom ) to low tem peratures.

We nd that the sim ple Bethe approxim ation is accurate for $m$ oderate and high $m$ onom er densities (higher
elds) but does not work so well at low m onom er density (lower elds). A s the B ethe approxim ation does not account for long cycles on the lattioe, the approxim ation should indeed break dow n when the correlation length is large ( $m$ onom er density is $s m a l l)$. W e note that the correlation length is in nite at zero $m$ onom er density since the dim er m odel on the hexagonal lattioe is critical.

In a higher-order series expansion, onem ay acoount for som e corrections to the B ethe approxim ation $1^{14}$ A s seen in the gure, the corrections are alm ost indiscemible for the $m$ agnetization. For the entropy, the corrections give better agreem ent at the low monom er density and are negligible at high $m$ onom er densities.
$T$ here is a giant peak in the entropy at the transition point, $S=k_{B}=1=4 \ln (16=5) \quad 0: 291$, which exceeds even the zero eld entropy. The peak is due to the crossing of an extensive num ber of energy levels which have $m$ acroscopic entropies. For $B=B_{c}$, the energies of states corresponding to di erent num bers of $m$ onom er defects are equal since the $m$ onom er and dim er weights are, by de nition, equalat the critical eld. There are an extensive num ber of states corresponding to a given num ber of $m$ onom ers (below saturation). T he highly degenerate ground state $m$ anifold explains the large spike in the entropy.
V. CROSSING POINTS

The theory described in the previous section im plies that the curves ofm agnetisation versus eld, plotted for di erent tem peratures, w illdisplay a crossing point. This arises sim ply because the partition function depends on $m$ agnetic eld and tem perature e ectively only through the combination $\left(B \quad B_{C}\right)=T$. Thus, when plotted as a function of $B \quad B_{C}$, the curves coincide only at the point $B=B_{c}$. At this point, the $B$ ethe approxim ation gives a value for the $m$ agnetisation ofm $=0: 4 \mathrm{~g}$ в J , see Eq.

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 $n_{s} \quad \exp \left(32 g_{B} J B=9 k_{b} T\right)$ and the $m$ onom er density is $n_{m} \quad \exp \left(\quad 8 \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{f}}=7 \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{T}\right)$, where $\mathrm{E}=\mathrm{g}$ в $J\left(\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{C}} \quad B\right)=3$ 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

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{32 g_{\mathrm{B}} \text { JB }}{9 \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{~T}}=\frac{8 \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{~J}\left(\mathrm{~B} \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{C}}\right)}{21 \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{~T}}: \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus the crossing point lies at $B^{?}=3 B_{c}=31$.

## VI. RELATION TO EXPERIMENTAND

 OTHERTHEORIESO urm odel gives a description of the high eld transition that is qualitatively, consistent $w$ ith experim ent for a range of tem peratures ${ }^{44}$. In particular, a peak in the entropy has been observed close to the high-eld term ination of the plateau ( $F$ ig. 9 in Ref. $\overline{(1 / 4) \text { ). A } s \text { th is feature }}$ was taken to be an experim ental artefact, it w as not analyzed in detail in that work. H ow ever, it appears that its height is rather sm aller than the one we nd here, although the num ber ofdata points is not enough to determ ine the center of the peak or, its height.

H ow ever, recent experim ents ${ }^{2} 2$ on the spin ice com pound $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{~T} \mathrm{i}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7}$ have indicated that at low tem peratures, the high eld transition becom es rst order. In Ref. ${ }^{2} \overline{2}^{\prime}$, the onset of rst order behavior was found to occur for tem peratures low er than a critical tem perature of $T_{C} \quad 0: 36 \mathrm{~K}\left(0: 327 \mathbb{d}_{f f ; D}=k_{B}\right)$. F igure $\bar{T}_{1} \overline{1}$ show $s$ that our predicted curves rem ain continuous even at tem peratures below this observed $T_{c}$.

A likely reason for the discrepancy is the long range nature of the dipolar interaction, which we approxim ated as a nearest neighbor Ising $m$ odel. The sim plest way to account for these interactions is to m odel the ignored interaction tem s as giving rise to a magnetic eld proportionalto the $m$ agnetization. By assum ing the $m$ agnetization $M$, as a function of the ective eld $B+M$, has the sam e functional form as given in gure $\overline{1}, 1$, wem ay self-consistently determ ine $M$ for a given $B$. Ūsing as a free param eter, we nd that this sim ple m odelpredicts the onset of rst order behavior, at the experim entally observed critical eld $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{c}}$, only for tem peratures in the m illikelvin range. To obtain a higher num erical $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}$ requires a larger, which causes a low er num ericalB $c_{c}$. To get the num erical $T_{c}$ to $m$ atch experim ent requires an
so large that our num erical $B_{c}$ is $\backslash n e g a t i v e " ~(i n ~ t h e ~$ sense of arti cially extending the $M=1=3$ line of gure 171 carefiultreatm ent of the dipolar interaction is required in order to explain the recent experim ental results. A lso, we have not considered the im pact of the slow dow $n$, of the dynam ics which is observed at low tem perature! ${ }^{23}$

A $s$ for the crossing points $m$ entioned above, the higheld one does, indeed appear to be present in the experim ental data ${ }^{4142}$ in the appropriate tem perature range. $T$ he experim entalvalue ofthem agnetization at the crossing point is aboutm $=0: 38 \mathrm{~g}$ в $J$, reasonably close to the theoretical value $\mathrm{m}=0: 4 \mathrm{~g}$ в J . By contrast, a crossing point at sm all elds is harder to $m$ ake out, and an approxim ate estim ate of its location gives $B ?=0: 35 B_{c}$, in
disagreem ent w ith the theoretical $B^{?}=3 B_{c}=31$.
VII. ENTROPY SPIKEAND

MAGNETOCALORICS
F ig. $\overline{1}$ I, show s a stark contrast betw een the behavior of $m$ agnetization and entropy as the eld strength is increased. W hereas the $m$ agnetization increases $m$ onotonically going from one plateau to the other, the entropy displays a strong (but sm ooth) non-m onotonicity.

O ne question which naturally arises is whether such an entropy peak exists $m$ ore generally betw een tw o m agnetization plateaus \{ what is the crucial ingredient for the existence of the spike? The sectors $w$ th 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 m ore fa$m$ iliar frustrated $m$ odel, nam ely the triangular Ising antiferrom agnet in a longitudinal eld. H ere, there is a (non-degenerate) low - eld plateau $w$ ith $m$ agnetization of $1 / 3$, in addition to the usualsaturated high-eld plateau. $T$ hese two are separated by a degeneracy point where up-up-up' and up-up-dow $n^{\prime}$ triangles are degenerate $\mathbf{I n}^{41}$ $T$ he statistical $m$ echanics, of that point is described by the hard-hexagon m odell25 the entropy of which is extensive. A sim ilar phenom enon \{ a m agnetization plateau bounded by tw o entropy spikes, $\frac{f}{r}$ also appears in the case of an e ectively 1 d helim agnet $\mathbf{I}^{6}$.

In classical Ising $m$ odels, such a degeneracy seem s not so surprising as the allowed energies are naturally discrete. H ow ever, a sim ilar situation can arise even in bona- de $H$ eisenberq- $m$ odels. This follow $s$ from the result by R ichteret al. ${ }^{271}$ w ho dem onstrated that near saturation, on a range of frustrated lattices (including the kagom e), localized spin-1/2 excitations exist. As one sweeps the $m$ agnetic eld from saturation dow nwards, one would therefore also expect an entropy spike in those models. A, num erical study testing this assertion is in progresst ${ }^{\text {2 }}$.

## Cooling by adiabatic (de)m agnetization

At low tem peratures, near the degeneracy point, the partition function depends on $m$ agnetic eld and tem perature e ectively only through the com bination (B $\left.B_{c}\right)=T$. O ne $m$ ay thus argue that the spike $m$ ay be used to e ect cooling by adiabatic dem agnetizationt. in exactly the sam ew ay onem ay use param agnets \{ analogous constraints lim it the application in either case.
$T$ here are two features which $m$ ay be worth pointing out at this point. B oth follow from the fact that \{ unlike in the case of a param agnet $\left\{B_{c} \in 0\right.$. Firstly, $m$ axim al cooling occurs at a nite eld, nam ely around $B_{c}$. This phenom enon $m$ ay therefore be useful to e ect cooling for a magnet in a eld, w th 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 regim e.

## V III. C O N C LU SIO N S

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 makes this system particularly interesting is that a uniform eld can be used to pouple to the Ising pseudospins as a staggered eld 121311 This am ounts to the possibility of applying eldswhich would have appeared to be rather unnatural in the form ulation of a sim ple Ising $m$ odel (w ithout the detour via spin ioe) on the pyrochlore lattice.

A s a result, one observes an attractively rich behavior. Perhaps the $m$ ost salient is the dim ensional reduction from pyrochlore to kagome under the application of an extemal eld. The restoration of threedim ensionality upon weakening the eld goes along with the one-dim ensionalstring defects. W e hope that the extension developed here of $K$ osterlitz's RG treatm ent to such extended defects $m$ ight be ofm ore general use.

A particularly attractive feature of the m onom erdim er m odel we have obtained here lies in the fact that the relative $m$ onom er and dim er fugacities in the lowtem perature ( $T \quad J_{e}$ ) regim e are given by sim ple B oltz$m$ an weights of Zeem an energies. They are thus straightforw ardly tunable by changing the strength of the applied eld. In particular, anisotropic fugacities can be obtained by tilting the eld, and they therefore do not require an actual manipulation (such as an application of an isotropic stress) of the tw o-dim-ensional layer.

As discussed previously in Refill ${ }^{111}$ 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 betw een experim ent and the nearest-neighbor $m$ odel $w$ ill in general likely be m isplaced. H ow ever, as we argue in a different context, it tums out that, in an interm ediate, tem perature regim $e$, this is not entirely unreasonable $\underline{I}^{131} \mathrm{~T}$ his observation $m$ ight lie at the basis of the fact that the $m$ easured dipolar ioe entropy agrees so well w ith Pauling's estim ate. O ur prediction' of the entropy peak betw een the interm ediate and saturated plateaux bears witness to the prom ise of our approach to unearth at least som e qualitative features of interest.
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## APPENDIX A:THECLUSTERALGORITHM

W e use a loop algorithm to sim ulate spin ice at low elds. T he algorithm probes only the spin ioe ground state $m$ anifold and therefore can work only at low tem peratures and low m agnetic elds. All attem pted loop
ips are accepted in our algorithm.
The algorithm works as follow s. 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 w ith probability $1=2$ a spin direction (in or out of a tetrahedron) and pick a rst spin in a loop using the follow ing rules. If both spins w ith the chosen direction are on the kagom e sublattice then we pick the spin $w$ ith 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 sublattioe then we pick the spin w ith probability that depends on the spin orientation. N am ely, if the spin on the triangular sublattice is out of the tetrahedron (along the $m$ agnetic eld), we pick the spin on the kagom e or triangular sublattices $w$ ith respective probabilities

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{1}=\frac{1}{1+g} \tag{A1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{2}=\frac{g}{1+g} \tag{A2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $g \mathrm{w}$ ill be xed by the detailed balance condition, see below, and $\mathrm{p}_{1}+\mathrm{p}_{2}=1$. If the spin on the triangular sublattice points into the tetrahedron, we pick the spin on the kagom e or triangular sublattioes $w$ ith 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 fter choosing the rst spin, we $m$ ove to the neighboring tetrahedron $w$ ith a defect. The next tetrahedron has tw o spins w ith the opposite orientation. We ip one of these two spins adding it to the loop using the sam e prescription as we used to pick the rst spin. Thus we $m$ ove the defect to another tetrahedron. Then we repeat this procedure teratively $m$ oving one of the tw o defects through the lattice until we encounter the other defect in the rst tetrahedron \{ the two defects $w$ ill annihilate and the loop will be closed. Since we add spins to the loop w ith altemating signs $\{$ tw o spins w ith opposite orientation from each tetrahedron we traverse, the ioe rule is not violated.

The algorithm is ergodic since any pair ofdi erent congurations di er by spins on closed loops only. T hey can alw ays be connected by ipping these loops.

Let us sketch the proof of the detailed balance condition. Suppose that we have ipped some loop. In order to prove detailed balance, the rst site in a loop that retums us to the original con guration $m$ ust be the rst site in the original loop and the reversed loop must be constructed in the reverse direction. W e can prove the detailed balance condition locally, ie. for all short se-
 check that $m$ ost 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 guration. A n


FIG. 8: C on gurations A and B. Tetrahedra are shown on top ofeach other. Sm all arrow sindicate a short sequence of a lop. Up and down spins are denoted by black and grey dots.
exam ple of such a sim ple sequence is shown in $F$ ig. 'q. $T$ he probability of going from con guration $A$ to con $\bar{g}-$ uration $B$ 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). T hese spins have the sam e energies. $T$ hus the detailed balance condition is satis ed trivially. A $n$ exam ple of a nontrivial sequence is show $n$ in $F$ ig. ${ }_{2}^{\prime} \underline{l}_{1}^{\prime}$. The energies of con gurations $A$ and $B{ }^{0}$ are di erent there. W e have to prove the detailed balance


F IG . 9: C on gurations $A$ and $B^{0}$. Tetrahedra are show on top ofeach other. Sm all arrow sindicate a short sequence of a loop. Up and dow $n$ spins are denoted by black and grey dots.
condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
P(A!B)=P\left(A \quad B^{0}\right)=P\left(B^{0}\right)=P(A) \tag{A3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The right hand side in $\left.{ }^{-1} \mathrm{~A}_{-}^{-1}\right)$ is just a ratio of B oltz$m$ ann $w$ eights and is equal to $\exp (8 h=3)$, where $h=$ $g$ в $J B=k_{B} T$, since the energy of con guration $A$ (the energy of the second and third spins in the sequence) is $4 h k_{B} T=3$, and the energy of con guration $B^{0}$ (the energy of the second and third spins in the sequence) is
$4 h k_{B} T=3$. A ccording to our algorithm, the probability of going from con guration $A$ to con guration $B^{0}$ is
$P\left(A!B^{0}\right)=p_{1}=2$ and the reverse probability of going from $B^{0}$ to $A$ is $P\left(\begin{array}{ll}A & B^{0}\end{array}\right)=p_{2}=2$. W e have from ( $A \mathcal{B}_{-1}^{0}$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
g=\frac{p_{2}}{p_{1}}=\exp (\quad 8 h=3): \tag{A4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore if $w e$ choose $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{p}_{1}=\frac{1}{1+\mathrm{e}^{8 \mathrm{~h}=3}} \tag{A5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{2}=\frac{e^{8 h=3}}{1+e^{8 h=3}} \tag{A6}
\end{equation*}
$$

then the detailed balance condition is ful lled.

> APPEND IX B:RG CALCULATION

W e introduce the abbreviation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d}={\underset{k ; i 2}{ } \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}}_{\mathrm{Y}}^{2} \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{2} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k} ; i}^{(1)}}{\mathrm{d}^{2} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{i}}^{(2)}} \frac{\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{i}}^{(1)} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{i}}^{(2)}}{2} \tag{B1}
\end{equation*}
$$

in tem s of which the canonical partition function for a given dipolar ${ }_{R}$ distribution $\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{~g}} \mathrm{~m}$ ay be wrilten: $\mathrm{Z}\left(\mathrm{IN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{I} \mathrm{g}}\right)=\mathrm{d} \exp (\mathrm{H})$. Our RG calculation has two steps. The nst step is integrating over short length scales, i.e. those states w here at least one pair of charges is separated by a distance betw een and $+d$. T he 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 order d :
where $I_{k l m}$ ij is the contribution of the con guration that has the negative end of the ith $m$-dipole of layer $k$ paired $w$ th 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 alldipole lengths up to the num ber ofplanes; and the sum overm is from 1 to 1 . The form of this term is given by:

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 $d\left(x_{i}^{(2)} ;\right)$. $T$ he position of this negative charge (and hence the pair) is integrated over the entire area A. Strictly speaking,
$x_{i}^{(2)}$ would have to avoid the hard cores of allof the other chargesbut th is introduces an erroroforder (d $)^{2} .{ }^{0}+d$ 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 $+\mathrm{d} \cdot \mathrm{H}\left({\underset{\mathrm{x}}{ }(2)}_{(2)}^{\left.\mathrm{x}_{j}^{(1)}\right) \text { refers to the }}\right.$ piece of the $H$ am iltonian which involves charges $x_{i}^{(2)}$ and $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}^{(1)}$ and the rest of the H am iltonian is denoted by $\mathrm{H}^{0}$.
$T$ he $x_{j}^{(1)}$ integration am ounts to $m$ aking the substitution $x_{j}^{(1)}=x_{i}^{(2)}+\sim ; d^{d} x_{j}^{(1)}=d d$; and integrating over angles. If we denote the latter two of integrals of equation ${ }_{3}^{-3} \overline{3}_{1}^{1}$ by $I$, then:

$$
\begin{gather*}
I=\frac{d}{}^{Z} \frac{d^{2} x_{i}^{(2)} Z_{2}^{2}}{2}{ }_{0}^{A} d e^{H\left(x_{i}^{(2)} ; x_{i}^{(2)}+\sim\right)} \\
\underline{x}_{i}^{(1)} x_{i}^{(2)}  \tag{B4}\\
\end{gather*}
$$

W e assum e that our gas of defects is su ciently dilute that the follow ing distances are $m$ uch greater than the pair separation : (1) the distance of a particle in plane $k+m$ from ourpair, (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 lim 斗, we $m$ ay $m$ ake the approxim ation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{x_{i}^{(1)} x_{i}^{(2)}} \quad \frac{x_{i}^{(2)} x_{j}^{(2)}+\sim}{A} \quad \frac{2}{x_{i}^{(1)} x_{j}^{(2)}} \tag{B5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We also have that $\mathrm{H}\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}^{(2)} ; \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}^{(1)}\right)$ is sm all in this lim it, which allow s us to expand the exponential and to leading order, the integralm ay be done exactly $1^{17}$. . T he result is:

$$
\begin{align*}
I= & \frac{d}{x_{i}^{(1)} x_{j}^{(2)}} 2 \frac{\left({ }^{2}\right)^{2}}{A} e_{a \notin b} e_{b} \ln \frac{r_{a b}}{} \\
& 2-\frac{d}{x_{i}^{(1)} x_{j}^{(2)}} \tag{B6}
\end{align*}
$$

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 calculation ${ }^{2}$ :, the coupling strength does not vary during our RG ow (see equation 13.14 ') . The delta function im plies that the m -dipole and ${ }^{-1} \mathrm{~m}$ )-dipole have been com bined into a larger l-dipole. Retuming to our correction term :

$$
I_{k l m} i^{j} \quad 2 \frac{d^{" Z}}{\substack{k ; 1 ; m \\+d}} d^{k ; 1, m} \exp (H)
$$

where the space $\underset{+d}{k ; 1, m}$ is analogous to $+d$, exœept that there is one less m-dipole in layer $k$; one less (l m )dipole in layer $k+m$; and one $m$ ore 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 $w$ th the charge neutrality constraint, the various $f I_{k l m}{ }_{i j} g \mathrm{~m}$ ay be combined $w$ ith di erent term $s$ in the grand partition function. W hen we substitute into equation $\frac{13}{1}-12$ and arrange term $s$, we nd that:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Y } \frac{\mathrm{Y}}{2}^{\mathrm{N} ;} \\
& +X_{k ; l, m} \quad X^{0} Y^{0} Y^{N ;} i^{i} \frac{d}{} \frac{Y_{m} Y_{l m}}{(2)^{2}} N_{k ; 1} \frac{Y_{1}}{2}{ }^{N_{k ; 1} 1} \text { \# } \tag{B8}
\end{align*}
$$

The prim $e$ on the second product $m$ eans that $y_{1}{ }_{k ; 1}{ }^{1}$ has been taken outside the product. If the fugacities are sm all, then we m ay w rite this in a m ore convenient way:

$$
\begin{gather*}
Z=X^{\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1 \mathrm{I}} \mathrm{k} ; 1} \mathrm{hY} \frac{\left(\mathrm{Y}_{1}+\frac{\mathrm{d}}{}_{\mathrm{P}_{11}^{11}}^{\mathrm{m}=1} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{lm}}\right)^{\mathrm{N} ; 1} \mathrm{i}}{(2)^{\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1}\left(\mathbb{N}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1}\right)!}} \\
\mathrm{d} \exp (\mathrm{H}) \tag{B9}
\end{gather*}
$$

Finally, we rescale lengths, $x!x(1+d=)^{1}$, and nd (dropping prim es):

$$
\begin{equation*}
Z=\underbrace{\mathrm{k} ; 1}_{\mathrm{fN}_{\mathrm{k} ; 1} \mathrm{~g}} \mathrm{XY} \frac{{\frac{y_{1}^{0}}{2}}_{\left(N_{k ; 1}\right)!}^{N} i^{Z}}{\left(N_{k}\right.} d \quad \exp (H) \tag{B10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
y_{l}^{0}=\left(y_{1}+\frac{d}{m=1}_{y_{m}^{1} Y_{l m}}\right)\left(1+2 \frac{d}{}\right)\left(1 \quad \frac{d}{}\right)(B 11)
$$

The ow equations ( $(\overline{1}-\overline{1})$ follow from this.
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