## W hy spin ice obeys the ice rules

S.V. Isakov,<sup>1</sup> R. Moessner,<sup>2</sup> and S. L. Sondhi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Departm ent of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M 5S 1A7

<sup>2</sup>Laboratoire de Physique Theorique de l'Ecole Norm ale Superieure, CNRS-UMR8549, Paris, France and

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

The low temperature entropy of the the spin ice compounds, such as  $H \circ_2 T i_2 \circ_7$  and  $D y_2 T i_2 \circ_7$ , is well described by the nearest-neighbor antiferrom agnetic Ising model on the pyrochlore lattice, i.e. by the \ice nules". This is surprising since the dom inant coupling between the spins is their long ranged dipole interaction. We show that this phenom enon can be understood rather elegantly: one can construct a model dipole interaction, by adding terms of shorter range, which yields precisely the same ground states, and hence T = 0 entropy, as the nearest neighbor interaction. A treatment of the small di erence between the model and true dipole interactions reproduces the num erical work by G ingras et al. in detail. We are also led to a more general concept of projective equivalence between interactions.

PACS num bers: 75.10 H k, 75.50 Ee, 75.40 C x

Introduction: In 1956, Anderson [1] observed that an Ising antiferrom agnet on the pyrochlore lattice would exhibit a macroscopic ground state entropy equivalent to that of water ice [2]. A lm ost four decades later, in 1997, such \spin ice" behavior was experimentally discovered. Harris et al. noticed that the pyrochlore com pound H o<sub>2</sub> T i<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, where only the H olm ium ions are m agnetic, failed to display any signs of ordering down to below the ferrom agnetic Curie tem perature deduced from its high tem perature susceptibility. They proposed that this was due to the presence of an easy-axis anisotropy, which leads to the ferrom agnet e ectively becoming an Ising pseudospin antiferrom agnet at tem peratures well below the anisotropy strength [3]. This interpretation was strongly supported by a remarkable experiment, in which Ram irez et al. showed that the related compound  $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$  displayed a residual entropy,  $S_0$ , at low tem peratures, which was in excellent agreement with the Pauling estim ate for water ice,  $S_0$ (1=2) ln (3=2) [4].

H ow ever, it was quickly pointed out that the dom inant interaction in these com pounds is dipolar due to the large m om ents on H o<sup>3+</sup> and D y<sup>3+</sup>, 10 <sub>B</sub>, where <sub>B</sub> is the B ohr m agneton [5]. Yet, the dipole interaction is long ranged, decaying with separation, r, as  $1=r^3$ . W hy, then, is the entropy of the nearest-neighborm odel stable to the inclusion of the rest of this interaction [5, 6]?

That this is the case has been checked in detail by explicit simulation. Further, two qualitative observations have been made in the literature. First, the anisotropic nature of the dipole interaction precludes any obvious ordering instability stemming from its long range. It is probably fair to say that it is now agreed that instead, it leads to a weak ordering instability away from q = 0 [5, 6, 7, 8], albeit one which is not observed [9]. Second, explicit evaluation of the Fourier transform of the easy-axis projected dipole interaction to large (and, using Ewald summation, in nite) distances yielded a surprise: the in nite distance result resembled the nearest-

neighbor interaction m ore than an interaction truncated at, say, 10 or so nearest neighbors; this 'self-screening' (G ingras) indicates that there is something special about the dipole interaction [10, 11].

In this paper we show what it is that is special about spin ice and dipole interactions. The main insight comes from recent progress in understanding the correlations dictated by the ice nule[12, 13, 14, 15]: it was shown that the pyrochlore Ising model dynam ically acquires a gauge structure at T = 0, which manifests itself in the emergence of dipolar correlations as the ice nules are enforced. The crucial observation is that this gauge structure is (form ally, not in origin) exactly the same as that of brdinary' magnetostatics; this latter, of course, is what determ ines the form of the dipole interactions.

M ost crisply, we use this observation to show that there exists a slightly modi ed \model" dipole interaction, which di ers from the physical interaction by term s that fall o faster and are small in magnitude, whose ground states are identically the same as those of the nearest neighbor interaction. This accounts for their identical low temperature entropy.

The mathematical implementation of this insight revolves around relating two quantities { dipole interactions, and the operator enforcing the ice rules { to the same projector, P. Finally, this leads us to a generalizable equivalence between a long ranged interaction and one of shorter range projected onto its low energy manifold; this we term \projective equivalence".

In the balance of the paper we esh out these statem ents. We begin by recalling the energetics of spin ice. The ground state degeneracy of the nearest-neighbor antiferrom agnet m anifests itself in a pair of at bands. We show next that a model dipole interaction possessing the correct long distance form, leads to exactly the same pair of at bands and thence to the same ground state m anifold, even with arbitrary admixture of the nearestneighbor interaction (as long as not so overwhelm ingly antiferrom agnetic to invert the ordering of the bands). The deviation of the model interaction from the true dipole interaction is seen to vanish as an integrable r<sup>5</sup>. Treating this by elementary means we are able to account for the weak residual dispersion and ordering tendency found in previous work. As a byproduct, this analysis makes clear that at higher temperatures, the correlations arising from the dipole interaction are not the same as those stemming from the ice rules alone. We close with some comments on projective equivalence.

H am iltonian: The dom inant term in the spin ice H am iltonian is a strong easy easy axis anisotropy, which allows us to transform the vector spins S to Ising pseudospins = 1 via  $S_i = _i e$  (no sum over ). e denote the local easy axes of the pyrochlore lattice, which consists of corner-sharing tetrahedra. It can be thought of as a face-centred qubic lattice with a four site basis:  $e_1 = _p (1; 1; 1) = \overline{3}, e_2 = (1; 1; 1) = \overline{3}, e_3 = (1; 1; 1) = \overline{3}, e_4 = (1; 1; 1) = \overline{3}; i is a unit cell index, and is the sublattice index.$ 

The dipolar spin ice model contains two terms. First, a nearest-neighbour exchange, J, of strength J, to which we add a constant so that its ground states have zero energy; these ground states obey the ice rules or equivalently the constraint that the total pseudospin of each tetrahedron vanish. And second, the dipole interaction D, which is summed over all pairs of sites, with  $D = _0^2 = (4 r_{nn}^3)$ , is the magnetic moment of the spins,  $r_{nn}$  is the nearest-neighbor distance, and  $r_{i \ j}$  is the vector separating spins  $S_i$  and  $S_j$ . Dening H  $_{i \ j}$  H  $_{i \ j}$ , the H am iltonian is:

$$H = \sum_{i JJ_{i};j}^{X} + Dr_{nn}^{3}D_{i};j ; (1)$$

$$D_{i;j} = \frac{e e}{\dot{r}_{i;j} \dot{j}} - \frac{3(e r_{;j})(e r_{;j})}{\dot{r}_{i;j} \dot{j}}$$
(2)

Spectrum and eigenvectors of H : In this section, we establish the connection of the ice rules with the dipole interaction; this we do by discussing the spectrum and eigenvectors of the H am iltonian m atrix H . T hese, specifically two dispersionless bands, will form the basis of our discussion of the zero tem perature entropy and zero and nite tem perature correlations below .

First, consider the spectrum of the adjacency matrix  $J_{i}$ ; J. It is well know that this has a pair of degenerate at bands and two dispersive bands (one of them is gapless at zero wavevector), see Fig. 1. The diagonalizing transformation is given in Ref. 12. We can write the

$$J = \begin{cases} X^{4} \\ (q) jy (q) lin (q) j \end{cases}$$
(3)

where for = 1;2, (q) 0.

result as the schem atic decom position,




FIG. 1: (color online). Mode spectrum of the nearestneighbor interaction matrix, J, in the [hhl] plane [16], q is in units of 2. Note that here and on the following plots we plot the eigenvalues, i, with minus sign.

As shown below, at T = 0, the physics is determ ined solely by the modes in the zero-energy at bands; it will therefore be unchanged for a family of interaction matrices with any other choice of  $_{3;4} > 0$  (but keeping the vectors v unchanged). The family member with  $_{3;4}$  1 is then a simple projector  $P = P^2 = \frac{P_{-4}}{=_3} jr$  (q) inv (q) j (Fig. 2).

This is a longitudinal projector; for form aldetails, see Refs. 12, 13, 14, 15, but in a nutshell, what happens is this. The ice nules  $_{i2 \text{ tet} i}$  are equivalent to r = 0. Here, the spins are thought of link variables ('lattice uxes') on the diam ond lattice, which is dual to the pyrochlore, and r is the appropriate lattice divergence. This equation encodes the statem ent that longitudinal modes, those with  $r = S \notin 0$ , cost energy, whereas transverse ones do not. The energetically enforced constraint r = S = 0 is at the origin of the 'em ergent gauge structure' of spin ice, as it can be resolved by transform ing to a gauge eld (vector potential), S = r = A.

W hat are the matrix elements of P in real space? W orking backwards from the form of the spin ice correlations obtained in [12, 13, 14, 15], one can read o that, asymptotically at large distances, D / P. M ore precisly, de ning a correction term through

$$D_{i;j} = \frac{8}{3}P_{i;j} + i;j; \qquad (4)$$

analyticity and symmetry considerations give  ${}_{\rm i}$  ;; 0 (r\_{\rm i}  ${}_{\rm j}^{\rm 5}$  ).

Thus, an interaction P (i) has the same long-distance form as D and (ii) has the same eigenvectors and same ground-state manifold as  $J \cdot W$  ith this in hand, we can now understand all the important qualitative features of the spectrum of H analytically and gain a quantitative understanding with computations that do not require us explicitly to treat the conditional convergence of dipole sum s. (Note that we again add an overall constant to the energy so that the at bands occur at zero energy). Starting with the model dipole interaction P (Fig.2, top panel), it is trivial to add in the superexchange as J and P have the same eigenvectors. The same is true of the nearest-neighbor pieces of  $_{i;j}$ , by far its largest m atrix elements, which are also proportional to J. The net result is that the lower pair of at bands remain at while the upper pair acquire the same dispersion as J | this is illustrated in the middle panel of Fig.2.

Thus far we have shown that  $\much"$  of H is characterized by a pair of low lying at bands. W hat remain, them atrix elements of  $_{i,j}$  beyond the nearest-neighbor distance, are small. Thus their inclusion does not modify the gross features signi cantly, preserving a spectrum similar to that of the nearest-neighbor model. Indeed, adding  $_{ij}$  beyond the nearest-neighbor distance weakly splits the remaining pair of at bands, which acquire a small dispersion; the other pair of bands is barely modied on the scale of their dispersion; this is shown in the gure's bottom panel.

The full was included by adding its numerical Fourier transform to that of J and P obtained analytically, and diagonalising the resulting 4 4 m atrix. W ith i; j sm all and decaying fast, its Fourier transform is quickly and absolutely convergent; we have checked that the results are essentially independent of the truncation distance for  $r_c$   $12r_{nn}$ . We would like to stress that this truncation is not equivalent to the truncation of the long-range dipole interaction since in our case the main long distance part of the dipole interaction is already contained in P.

In Fig. 3, we show the band of maximal eigenvalues of the dipole matrix. It is weakly dispersive because  $_{ij}$  is small. Our results are in quantitative agreement with the Ewald summation results [11].

G round states and entropy: The nearest neighbor interaction by itself gives rise to a macroscopic entropy at T = 0.W enow show that any combination of the nearest neighbour, J and the model dipole, P, interactions leads to precisely the same ground states, and hence entropy.

First, note that the ground states of J have zero energy; an arbitrary ground state, jDi can thus be written as a linear combination of modes in the at zero-energy bands only, as an adm ixture of other bands would lead to a non-zero energy:

$$j_{0i} = \begin{bmatrix} X & X^2 \\ & a & (q) jy & (q)i : \end{bmatrix}$$
 (5)

The hard-spin condition in poses constraints on the am - plitudes a (q), which we do not need to resolve explicitly.

It su ces to note that, having written the ground states of J in term softhe at bands, it follows that they rem ain ground states upon admixing the model dipole interaction, P, as this only a ects the relative position of the excluded positive energy bands = 3;4. Indeed,




FIG.2: (color online). M ode spectrum of the dipole interaction (the eigenvalues, i, of the D  $r_{nn}^{3}D_{ij}$  m atrix). Top: M odel dipole interaction, P only. There are two degenerate pairs of at bands. M iddle: A fler inclusion of nearestneighbor correction. Two bands remain degenerate and at. T he other two become dispersive. A dding a nearest-neighbor superexchange can enhance/suppress this change. Bottom: C orrelation function plus  $_{ij}$ . The remaining at bands become weakly dispersive. The middle and bottom plots are alm ost identical on this scale. (The spikes in the gure have to with the special character of the single point at q = 0 for the conditionally convergent dipole interaction.)

this implies that the set of ground states of J and P are identical.

The addition of will lift this degeneracy but, as we saw, only weakly. Consequently the low temperature entropy of spin ice will be quite close to that of ice before it goes away at the lowest temperatures as the system




FIG.3: (color online). Maximum eigenvalue,  $m_{ax}$ , of the dipole matrix in the [hhl] plane, q is in units of 2,  $r_c = 16r_{nn}$ .

orders[9].

C orrelations: This explains why the similarity of the spectrum is su cient to yield the correct low – tem perature physics: for the model dipole interaction, the ground state correlations are exactly those averaged over the ice rule manifold. How ever, this equivalence between the model dipole and the nearest neighbor antiferrom agnetic Ising model breaks down at nonzero tem peratures. For the nearest-neighbor Ising model, the presence of therm ally activated ice rule violating defects leads to an exponential decay of correlations on a length scale diverging as  $\exp(2J=3T)$  at low T.

By contrast, for the dipole problem the long range of the interaction implies long ranged correlations at any temperature. This is already evidenced by the rst term in the high-temperature expansion of

$$hS_{i} = S_{i} i / H_{i,j} = T O(r_{i,j}^{3}):$$
 (6)

In fact, in a saddle-point treatment for  ${\tt P}$ , one can show that this holds for any tem perature, and to all orders in corrections to the saddle point.

P rojective equivalence: The mathematics underlying our analysis of dipolar spin ice can be generalized. One can construct other exchange matrices  $J^{0}$ which share their low-lying at bands (and its eigenvectors) with interactions  $D^{0}$  of longer range; we should note though, that generically, neither the  $J^{0}$  nor the  $D^{0}$  are of bounded range. In this fashion, we indicate projection to the at bands; this we term \projectively equivalent".

The m iracle of spin ice is hence twofold: rst, that the physical dipole interaction restricted to the site dependent easy axes on the pyrochlore lattice provides one m ember of such a pair; and second, thanks to its em ergent gauge structure, the other m ember of the pair is the classic ice problem dating back to Bernal, Fow ler and Pauling. In short: dipolar spins are ice because ice is dipolar.

A cknow ledgem ents: W e would like to thank M att Enjalran and M ichel G ingras for generously sharing their partially published E wald sum m ation results with us. W e are also gratefulto D avid H use, K arolG regorand W erner K rauth for collaboration on closely related work. W e thank the above, C hris H enley, and O leg T chemyshyov for useful discussions. This work was in part supported by the M inistere de la Recherche et des N ouvelles Technologies, by the N SF [PHY 99-07949 (at K IT P), 0213706] and by the D avid and Lucile Packard Foundation.

- [1] P.W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. 102, 1008 (1956).
- [2] L.Pauling, J.Am. Chem. Soc. 57, 2680 (1935); L.Pauling, The Nature of the Chemical Bond, (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 1965).
- [3] M.J.Harris, S.T.Bram well, D.F.M cMorrow, T.Zeiske, and K.W.Godfrey, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2554 (1997).
- [4] A.P.Ram irez, A.Hayashi, R.J.Cava, R.Siddharthan, and B.S.Shastry, Nature 399, 333 (1999).
- [5] R. Siddharthan, B. S. Shastry, A. P. Ram irez, A. Hayashi, R. J. Cava, and S. Rosenkranz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1854 (1999); S. Rosenkranz, A. P. Ram irez, A. Hayashi, R. J. Cava, R. Siddharthan, and B. S. Shastry, J. Appl. Phys. 87, 5014 (2000); R. Siddharthan, B. S. Shastry, and A. P. Ram irez, Phys. Rev. B 63, 184412 (2001); B. S. Shastry, Physica B 329-333, 1024 (2003).
- [6] B.C. den Hertog and M.J.P.G ingras, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 3430 (2000).
- [7] S.T.Bram well, M.J.Harris, B.C. den Hertog, M.J.P. Gingras, J.S.Gardner, D.F.McMorrow, A.R.W ildes, A.L.Comelius, J.D.M.Champion, R.G.Melko, and T.Fennell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 047205 (2001).
- [8] R.G. Melko, B.C. den Hertog, and M. J. P. G ingras, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 067203 (2001).
- [9] The predicted ordering has never been experimentally observed, apparently because it occurs at a temperature where the system is unable to reach its equilibrium state [J. Snyder, J. S. Shusky, R. J. Cava, and P. Schi er, Nature 413, 48 (2001); K. Matsuhira, Y. Hinatsu, and T. Sakakibara, J. Phys.: Cond. Mat. 13, L737 (2001)].
- [10] M. J. P. G ingras and B. C. den Hertog, Can. J. Phys. 79, 1339 (2001).
- [11] M. Enjalran and M. J. P. Gingras, Phys. Rev. B 70, 174426 (2004); R.G. Melko and M. J. P. Gingras, J. Phys.: Cond. M at. 16, R1277 (2004).
- [12] S.V. Isakov, K.G regor, R.M oessner, and S.L.Sondhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 167204 (2004).
- [13] D.A.Huse, W.Krauth, R.Moessner, and S.L.Sondhi, Phys.Rev.Lett. 91, 167004 (2003); R.Moessner and S. L.Sondhi, Phys.Rev.B 68, 184512 (2003).
- [14] M. Hermele, M. P. A. Fisher, and L. Balents, Phys. Rev. B 69, 064404 (2004).
- [15] C.L.Henley, Phys.Rev.B 71, 014424 (2005).
- [16] D. A. Garanin and B. Canals, Phys. Rev. B 59, 443 (1999); B. Canals and D. A. Garanin, Can. J. Phys. 79, 1323 (2001).
- [17] Our treatment follows the introduction to large-N by M. Moshe and J.Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rep. 385, 69 (2003).