

# Effects of Impurities in Quasi-One-Dimensional $S = 1$ Antiferromagnets

Munehisa Matsumoto<sup>1</sup> and Hajime Takayama<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8578

<sup>2</sup>Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa 277-8581

For the weakly coupled  $S = 1$  antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chains on a simple cubic lattice, the effects of magnetic impurities are investigated by the quantum Monte Carlo method with the continuous-time loop algorithm. The transition temperatures of the impurity-induced phase transitions for magnetic impurities with  $S = 1=2, 3=2$ , and  $2$  are determined and compared with the transition temperature induced by the non-magnetic impurities. Implications on the experimental results are discussed.

## x1. Impurity-Induced Phase Transitions

There have been extensive studies on the phase transitions caused by magnetic fields and/or impurities in the low-dimensional quantum gapped magnets, which do not show phase transitions down to zero temperature. Among them, the non-magnetic-impurity-induced phase transitions in the spin-Peierls material  $\text{CuGeO}_3$ <sup>1)</sup> and the Haldane material  $\text{PbNi}_2\text{V}_2\text{O}_8$ <sup>2)</sup> have been experimentally investigated and the temperature-dependence of the impurity-induced transition temperature has been determined.

Recently in the experiment on  $\text{PbNi}_2\text{V}_2\text{O}_8$ , the transition temperature induced by magnetic impurities were also reported and it was found that the impurity-induced transition temperature shows strange non-monotonic dependence on the magnitude of the impurity spin.<sup>3)</sup> Specifically, the transition temperature caused by  $S = 1=2$   $\text{Cu}^{2+}$  ions is very low compared with that by  $S = 0$  impurity  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$  ions. Furthermore,  $S = 3=2$   $\text{Co}^{2+}$  ions induce by far the highest transition temperature and the transition temperature induced by  $S = 5=2$   $\text{Mn}^{2+}$  impurities is again lower than that induced by  $S = 0$   $\text{Mg}^{2+}$  impurities. Motivated by these interesting experimental results, we study the magnetic-impurity-induced phase transition and determine the impurity-induced transition temperature in the quasi-one-dimensional  $S = 1$  antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model by the quantum Monte Carlo simulations. Based on the simulation results, we discuss the picture for the impurity-induced ordered state hoping to understand the experimental results.

## x2. Model

As a simple model to describe the physics of static impurities in the Haldane-gapped state, we take the weakly coupled  $S = 1$  antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chains on a simple cubic lattice with the host  $S = 1$  spins randomly replaced by impurities

with spin  $S \in 1$ . The Hamiltonian is written as follows.

$$H = J \sum_{x,y,z} S_{x,y,z} S_{x+1,y,z} + J^0 \sum_{x,y,z} S_{x,y,z} S_{x,y,z+1} + J^1 \sum_{x,y,z} S_{x,y,z} S_{x,y,z+1} \quad (2.1)$$

Here the strength of the intrachain coupling is  $J$  and this parameter is used as a unit to measure the energy and the temperature. The strength of the interchain coupling is  $J^0$  and we set the  $x$ -axis parallel to the coupled chains.

The model parameters and simulation conditions are as follows. It is known that the one-dimensional Haldane gap at  $J^0 = 0$  survives even under the presence of a three-dimensional interchain coupling if its strength  $J^0$  is small enough,<sup>4)</sup> and we set  $J^0 = 0.01J$  with which the ground-state system is known to be in the Haldane gapped phase.<sup>4),5)</sup> The critical value  $J_c^0$  between the Haldane gapped phase and the antiferromagnetic phase is estimated to be 0.013 by the mean-field theory on the interchain coupling,<sup>4)</sup> which is expected to give the lower bound of  $J_c^0$ , and the value determined by the series-expansion method is  $J_c^0 = 0.026 - 0.001$ .<sup>5)</sup> Practically it is not sufficient just to satisfy  $J^0 < J_c^0$ , but we should also take care to keep the gap of the pure system small for the observation of the impurity-induced phase transition at a reasonably high temperature. That is why we set  $J^0 = 0.01$  and not, say,  $J^0 = 0.001$ . We will explain this point in more detail in Sec. 4.

For the system with  $J^0 = 0.01$ , we study the finite-temperature phase transition induced by doped impurity spins with  $S = 1/2, 3/2$ , and  $2$ , randomly replacing the host spins that have  $S = 1$ . We utilize the quantum Monte Carlo method with the continuous-time loop algorithm<sup>6)</sup> and the subspin symmetrization technique<sup>7)</sup> for the efficient simulation of systems with general spin magnitude. The sizes of the systems we simulated are  $(L_x; L_y; L_z) = (8; 8; 8)$ ,  $(16; 16; 16)$ , and  $(32; 32; 32)$ , where the  $L_x$ ,  $L_y$ , and  $L_z$  are the number of sites along the  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  axes, respectively. For each system size and temperature, we took average over 50 random samples.

In the present study, we fix the concentration of impurities at 10% and determine the magnetic-impurity-induced transition Neel temperature and compare them with the non-magnetic-impurity-induced Neel temperature.

### 3. Results

We show the way how we determine the impurity-induced transition temperature and its dependence on the spin magnitude of the impurities. By the analogy with the standard finite-size scaling analysis, we plot the ratio of the correlation length to the linear system size  $L$  with respect to temperature varying the system size and observe the crossing point in  $\propto L$  to determine the transition temperature. Here the antiferromagnetic correlation length is calculated by the second moment method<sup>8)</sup> using the dynamic staggered correlation function. The analysis for the  $S = 2$  impurities is shown in Fig. 1. The impurity-induced Neel temperature is determined to be  $T_N = 0.12 - 0.01$ . Thus determined impurity-induced transition temperatures are plotted against the spin magnitude of the impurities in Fig. 2. This figure includes the results for the non-magnetic impurities. As we can see, the  $S = 1/2$  impurities

give higher transition temperature than the non-magnetic impurities. Further, as we increase the spin magnitude of the impurities, the transition temperatures increase monotonically in contrast to the experimental results.




Fig. 1. The determination of the transition temperature by the crossing point of the ratio of the correlation length  $\xi_x$  to the linear system size for system sizes  $L_x = 8, 16$ , and  $32$ , where  $\xi_x$  and  $L_x$  are the correlation length and the number of sites, respectively, along the  $x$  axis. Here plotted are the data for the model doped with 10%  $S = 2$  impurities.




Fig. 2. Impurity-induced transition temperature plotted against the magnitude of the impurity spin. The concentration of the impurities is fixed to be 10%.

#### 4. Discussions I: Interpretation of the Simulation Results

To discuss the impurity-spin dependence of the impurity-induced transition temperature for our simple model, let us begin with the picture for the non-magnetic-impurity-induced long-range ordered phase<sup>9),10),11)</sup> which is schematically shown in Fig. 3. The ground state of the pure system is basically understood as the valence-




Fig. 3. Schematic figure of the site-dilution-induced antiferromagnetic state. The superexchange interaction strength along the chain is set to be unity and that along the interchain direction is  $J'$ . In this figure, only the cross section on the  $xy$  plane is shown. The coupled chains are parallel to the  $x$ -axis. The empty circle denotes the diluted site and the filled one does the  $S = 1$  spins. The arrows denote the effective  $S = 1/2$  spins that appear on both of the nearest-neighbor sites next to the diluted site along the chain. The interaction between them is ferromagnetic along the shortest path that is indicated as 'F' in the figure.

bond solid (VBS)<sup>12)</sup>-like state. Non-magnetic impurities in this state act as cuts in the Haldane chain and the doped state can be regarded as a set of finite-length  $S = 1$  Haldane chains with the open boundary condition. On both edges of the finite length chain, there appear effective spin degrees of freedom with magnitude  $S = 1/2$ .<sup>12),13)</sup> Thus on both neighboring sites of the diluted site,  $S = 1/2$  effective spins appear and the interaction between them along the shortest path is ferromagnetic as shown in Fig. 3. The long-range staggered correlation between the effective spins is supported by all of the interactions and thus the non-magnetic impurities induce the antiferromagnetic long-range order.

The typical energy of the interaction between the effective spins decays exponentially with respect to the distance between them with the decay constant proportional to the gap of the pure system.<sup>9),10),11)</sup> For the observation of the impurity-induced transition at a reasonably high temperature, we need the gap of the pure system to be sufficiently small to make large the length scale of the correlation between the effective spins that contribute to the long-range order. So in the Haldane phase we choose a point near the phase boundary as described in Sec. 2, where the gap is almost collapsing approaching the quantum critical point of the pure system.

This VBS-like picture reveals several subtle aspects when we consider the effects of  $S = 1/2$  magnetic impurities. At first glance, it might be expected that the  $S = 0$  impurities induce higher transition temperature than  $S = 1/2$  impurities do if we focus on the point that an effective  $S = 1/2$  spin per  $S = 1/2$  impurity contribute to the bulk long-range order while an effective  $S = 1$  spin per  $S = 0$  impurity do. Here we imagine that the  $S = 1/2$  spin in the position of the diluted site in Fig. 3 forms a singlet pair with one of the effective spins. On the other hand, it is thought that the opposite situation may well be realized if we consider the paths of the interaction of the effective spins that contribute to the bulk long-range order. The  $S = 0$  spins cut the strong intrachain couplings and only the extremely weak interchain couplings mediate the interaction between the effective spins. Oppositely, the magnetic impurities keep the strong intrachain coupling by definition of the present model and the strength of the interaction between the local effective spins around the impurities is much larger. Furthermore, the VBS structure might be broken around the  $S = 1/2$  impurity spins and three  $S = 1/2$  spins per  $S = 1/2$  impurity spin might contribute to the bulk antiferromagnetic order. The simulation results showed that indeed the latter scenario is more plausible for the impurity effects in the present simple models. We should refine the naive VBS-like picture by investigating the magnetic structure near the impurity sites. This is the next problem now being studied.

## x5. Discussions II: Toward the Understanding of the Experimental Results

Obviously our model is too simple to describe the real materials. One of the features we have not taken into account is the anisotropy effects specific to each magnetic impurity spins which might be playing a significant role in determining the real impurity-induced transition temperature.<sup>3)</sup> For example, possible strong

Ising-type anisotropy in  $S = 3/2$   $\text{Co}^{2+}$  impurities could induce higher transition temperature than the others do.<sup>3)</sup> Another property we have missed is the next-nearest ferromagnetic coupling that is known to be strong for  $\text{PbNi}_{1/2}\text{V}_2\text{O}_8$ <sup>3),14)</sup> and we should include this to give them more qualitatively precise results. According to the discussions in the previous section, the effects of next-nearest ferromagnetic coupling must be strong as it enables the effective spins interact strongly even in the case of  $S = 0$  impurities. Luckily we can do the quantum Monte Carlo simulations without suffering from the sign problem<sup>15)</sup> of the models with the next-nearest ferromagnetic coupling as these additional interactions do not introduce frustration. These are the next problems and now under investigation.

#### Acknowledgements

One of the authors (M.) would like to thank Prof. S. Todo and Prof. T. Sakai for valuable discussions and Prof. K. Uchinokura and Prof. T. Masuda for useful comments. The loop algorithm codes for the present calculations are based on the library "LOOPER version 2" developed by Prof. S. Todo and Dr. K. Kato and the codes for parallel simulations are based on the library "PARAPACK version 2" developed by Prof. S. Todo. The numerical calculations for the present work were done on the SG I 2800 at the Supercomputer center in the Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo.

#### References

- 1) M. Hase, I. Terasaki, Y. Sasago, K. Uchinokura, and H. Obara, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993), 4059.
- 2) Y. Uchiyama, Y. Sasago, I. Tsukada, K. Uchinokura, A. Zheludev, T. Hayashi, N. Miura, and P. Boni, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83 (1999), 632.
- 3) S. Imai, T. Masuda, T. Matsuo, and K. Uchinokura, unpublished (cond-mat/0402595).
- 4) T. Sakai and M. Takahashi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 58 (1989), 3131.
- 5) A. Koga and N. Kawakami, Phys. Rev. B 61 (2000), 6133.
- 6) H. G. Evertz, G. Lana, and M. Marcu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993), 875; B. B. Beard and U.-J. Wiese, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996), 5130; A review has been published in N. Kawashima and K. Harada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 73 (2004), 1379.
- 7) S. Todo and K. Kato, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87 (2001), 047203.
- 8) F. Cooper, B. Freedman, and D. Preston, Nucl. Phys. B 210 [FS6] (1982), 210.
- 9) M. Sigrist and A. Furusaki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 65 (1996), 2385.
- 10) N. Nagaosa, M. Sigrist, A. Furusaki, and H. Fukuyama, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 65 (1996), 3724.
- 11) C. Yasuda, S. Todo, M. Matsumoto, and H. Takayama, Phys. Rev. B 64 (2001), 092405.
- 12) I. A. A. Eck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59 (1987), 799; Commun. Math. Phys. 115 (1988), 477.
- 13) S. Miyashita and S. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. B 48 (1993), 913.
- 14) T. Masuda, K. Uchinokura, T. Hayashi, and N. Miura, Phys. Rev. B 66 (2002), 174416.
- 15) M. Troyer and U.-J. Wiese, unpublished (cond-mat/0408370).