

A Model for the Occurrence of Lock-ins in Holmium in c-axis Magnetic Fields

M.O. Steinitz, D.A. Pink, C.P. Adams^y and D.A. Tindall

PACS numbers: 64.70.Rh, 75.25+z, 75.30Kz, 75.50.Ee

Department of Physics, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, Canada B2G 2W5

Department of Physics, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada B3H 3J5

^ypresent address: Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A7

Abstract. We introduce a novel interpretation of the sequence of commensurate lock-ins of the spiral wave vector, \mathbf{Q} , observed in the helimagnetic phase ofholmium in the presence of c-axis magnetic fields. This is the first successful model for the prediction of these lock-ins. We show that a model which combines a spin-slip model with an assumption concerning the spin structure along the c-axis in finite size "domains", yields excellent predictions when the energetics of this system with an applied c-axis magnetic field are considered.

Introduction

HoInium has been extensively studied for nearly three decades [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] and many types of experiments have been performed to probe its magnetic phases and structures. Despite the wealth of experimental information, no model has yet been proposed that accounts for the observations that, in applied magnetic fields, lock-ins occur at particular (commensurate) wave vectors and are not apparent in the absence of such fields. Recent work addressing this question has been presented by Plumier [10] and Jensen [11]. To account for these observations, we propose a model which combines the spin-slip model [1] [12], involving layers with magnetic orientation organized only into "singlets" and "doublets" (see below), with a key assumption about the magnetic structure of the commensurate phases and which builds upon earlier work of Steinitz et al. [13]. A consequence of these ideas is that finite size effects in the magnetic structure are essential to an understanding of the lock-ins. In this paper we refer to the coherent structures, the (finite) size of which defines the wave vectors accessible to the system, as "domains". We find that when the energetics of the problem are considered, we are able to predict the experimentally observed lock-ins in the presence of applied magnetic fields along the c-axis and can account for the fact that the lock-ins become more pronounced as the field increases, and are not apparent in zero field.

Much work has been done on a general approach to understanding structures in systems with competing interactions in terms of (domain) wall energies and wall-wall interactions [14] [15]. In addition, there have been recent studies on models of rare-earth systems [16] [17]. None of these approaches, however, have considered finite-size "domain" structures as being of possible significance in understanding lock-in effects in HoInium in the presence of applied magnetic fields. Indeed, work on rare-earth models has been confined either to zero field or to a field in the basal plane [18]. Our model is in the spirit of the work of Fisher and Szpilka [14]. It relates energies directly to wave vectors, which, because of the proposed finite-size "domains" to be described below, are isolated in k-space.

HoInium has a hexagonal close-packed crystal structure (hcp). Below its Neel temperature ($T_N = 132$ K) it has a helimagnetic or spiral magnetic structure down to the Curie temperature ($T_C = 20$ K), at which a c-axis component of the moment develops and the wave vector, Q , locks in at a value of $1/6$, i.e. one turn in 6 unit cells or twelve layers. (We will always refer to Q in reciprocal lattice units along c^* , the hexagonal axis.) In the helimagnetic phase, the moments in the basal planes are ferromagnetically aligned, with a temperature dependent angle between the magnetic orientations of adjacent planes, leaving the material antiferromagnetic overall. Generally, this structure appears to be incommensurate with the crystal structure along the c-axis. In zero field it is found that Q varies, apparently continuously, from a value of $1/6$ at T_C to a value which we have found to be $5/18$ just at T_N [9].

In the presence of an applied magnetic field we have found that θ does not vary smoothly as the temperature is changed, but locks in at certain commensurate values, i.e. it tends to stay at certain values for a finite temperature interval before continuing its apparently smooth variation. In a sequence of papers [9] [19] [20] [21] [22] [28], lock-ins were reported at $1/5$, $2/9$, $1/4$, and $5/18$ in addition to the lock-in at $1/6$ at T_C which occurs even in zero field, and one found by Gibbs et al. [6] at $2/11$. A comparison of the field and temperature values where lock-ins occur with the phase boundaries on a phase diagram [8] obtained from magnetization measurements, shows a clear correspondence. We have also reported the observation of anomalous "noise", presumably due to fluctuations, in dilatometric measurements [23]. This noise disappears at T_N and at the $\theta = 1/4$ lock-in in a 3 T c-axis field, leading us to associate it with fluctuations in the spiral turn angle of coherent domains (given the correspondence between thermal expansion and the variation of θ).

Theory

1. Localized-spin Hamiltonian and the Spin-slip Model

A model based on spin-slips has previously been used with great success to describe the observed Fourier components of the magnetic structures ofholmium [12] [24] [25]. The spin-slip model arose from the observation that at the Curie point, where $\theta = 1/6$, there is not, in fact, a constant turn angle between the planes. Instead the magnetization vectors of the planes are bunched up or paired into doublets which lie near the six easy magnetization directions [1] (see Figure 4 of Morrow et al., 1993 for a clear picture of such an arrangement) [26]. As the temperature increases, some of the doublets break up into singlets, or unpaired planes. Each singlet is referred to as a spin-slip. By using various combinations of such spin-slips one can find a spin-slip structure that matches any θ value that is a rational fraction. If a doublet is represented by a "2" and a singlet by a "1" then, for instance, 222221 gives a value of $\theta = 2/11$. (Note that there are two basal plane layers per unit cell along c, so that 1 turn in 11 layers makes 2 turns in 11 cells.) This choice of structure is not unique and there can be several spin-slip structures which yield the same θ .

In previous work [13] it was observed that, upon considering the sequence of rational numbers representing commensurate θ 's, up to some maximum denominator (dictated in real materials by, for example, a finite "domain size" or correlation length), certain numbers are relatively isolated from their neighbors, i.e. they are the only occupants of gaps in the sequence. This is shown schematically in Figure 1, where we have drawn a vertical line at each rational fraction up to an arbitrarily chosen maximum denominator of 60 chosen for an acceptable density for printing purposes. As was pointed out [13], a number of about 150 corresponds to a reasonable estimate of domain size or coherence length from estimates of distances between imperfections such as impurities or dislocations which might

act as pinning sites. It is well-known that the gaps between the fractions close only very slowly as the maximum denominator increases. This pattern arises from the fact that if the rational fractions considered are limited to those with some maximum denominator, the sequence is a Farey series [27] in which the interval between sequential elements with denominators a and b is known to be $1/ab$. Thus the most isolated values are those with small denominators and correspond closely to the observed locked-in values of θ .

This observation does not, however, give any indication as to why some of these fractions with low denominators correspond to observed lock-ins and why some do not. The principal contribution of this work is to propose an answer to this by calculating the energies of spins in zero and non-zero c -axis fields. The calculation of these energies will be based upon the spin-slip model in the temperature regime of interest. In order, then, to develop our model of magnetic-field induced lock-ins, we must establish the validity of the spin-slip model, which we do below, using computer simulation.

The simplest model for localized spins interacting via a Heisenberg exchange interaction is [30]:

$$H = \frac{J_0}{2} \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{S}_{ni} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{nj} + \frac{J_1}{2} \sum_i \mathbf{S}_{ni} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{n+1;i} + \frac{J_2}{2} \sum_i \mathbf{S}_{ni} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{n+2;i} + \sum_{n,i} K_6 (S_{n,i}^z)^2 + 2K_6 \sum_{n,i} (\cos(6\theta_{ni}) + 1) H \sum_{n,i} S_{n,i}^z \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{S}_{ni} is the spin vector at the i -th site of the n -th layer in the basal plane, with the direction of the spin vector given by (θ_{ni}, ϕ_{ni}) . J_0 is the ferromagnetic exchange interaction between nearest neighbour spins in the basal plane, J_1 and J_2 are the interactions between nearest and second nearest neighbor spins on layers n_{m-1} and n_{m-2} respectively.

and K_6 represent crystal field parameters for c -axis and six-fold basal plane anisotropy. In order to verify the validity of the spin-slip model, we carried out Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of classical spin ordering in this system over a wide temperature range using the Metropolis algorithm [31].

We considered a simple hexagonal lattice with the spin system described by the hamiltonian (1). We used periodic boundary conditions in the a - b plane, which was represented by either a 10×10 or 15×15 lattice, and open boundary conditions along the c -axis, where the number of layers possessing six-fold symmetry, n , ranged from 100 to 360. Both the 10×10 and the 15×15 lattices gave the same results. Spins were visited in a sequence which chose the layer and the site within the layer using a pseudo-random number generator. We chose spin magnitude = 1.0, with $J_0 = 1.0$, $J_1 = 1.0$, $J_2 = 1.5$ in order to yield a "classical" turn angle of $\theta = \pi/5$. We chose $\phi = 0.2$ simply in order to drive the spins out of the basal plane with an external field, H , not too large, and $K_0 = 0.5$ so that the depth of the six-fold anisotropy was comparable to the exchange energies. We initialized the system for 1000 MC steps and

performed averages over 5000 MC steps. For values of $n = 140$ we found no difference in the results. The small size of the basal plane lattice had no effect: fluctuations in spin direction within a given basal plane were $\approx 2^\circ$. MC runs greater than 5000 MC steps yielded no change in the results.

Figure 2 shows typical results for the instantaneous turn angles per layer, averaged over all turn angles within a layer, for a non-zero field, H , applied along the c -axis. It can be seen that the distribution is composed predominantly of "singlets" and "doublets", though we did not carry out an analysis to confirm this. It is easily confirmed that the average turn angle, averaged over all layers, is equal to the turn angle per layer, calculated analytically on the assumption that it is a constant from layer to layer. This last observation is correct within the confidence limits of the simulation.

2. A Model of Magnetic-Field-Induced Lock-ins.

In our model, we assumed that a spiral or conical arrangement of classical spins exists which is composed entirely of "systems" of "singlets" and "doublets", labelled as 1 and 2 respectively, in which there are $n_{k,l}$ systems of type k immediately adjacent, along the positive c -axis, to a system of type l ($k, l = 1, 2$). Thus the number of doublets with a singlet adjacent to it along the c -axis is n_{21} . We assume, initially, that all spins are localized along the directions of the local minima of the six-fold basal plane anisotropy energy. With this assumption, when the system is of infinite extent along the c -axis, then the following relations hold:

$$n_{21} = n_{12}, n_{12} + n_{22} = n_2, n_{11} + n_{12} = n_1 \quad (2)$$

where n_1 and n_2 are the total numbers of singlets and doublets respectively. We note that the total number of layers, m , the total number of turns, n , and the average turn angle per layer, θ , are given by

$$m = n_1 + 2n_2, n = \frac{n_1 + n_2}{6}, \theta = 2\pi/n \quad (3)$$

The third of these equations follows from the assumption that in the absence of an applied magnetic field, all spins are located at the local minima of the six-fold basal plane anisotropy energy. From our simulations, however, we know this to be false: the doublets are "split" slightly, while the singlets can be located away from the local minimum. This arises because of the exchange couplings. We shall use this observation in what follows:

We assumed that a doublet is split slightly and calculated the dependence of the energy of a doublet, in the six-fold basal plane anisotropy field (the term in K_6 on the right hand side of equation (1)) only, as a function of the tilt angle θ , away from the c -axis, in a magnetic field, H , applied along the c -axis. We assumed that each spin in the doublet possessed the same value of μ . When $H = 0$, $\theta = \pi/2$. We assumed that the doublet splitting and orientation

projected onto the basal plane did not change with θ and found that this energy $E = 2 \sin^2 \theta$ near the local minimum of the potential. A similar result holds for singlets, if they do not lie precisely at one of the minima of the six-fold anisotropy energy and if they do not change their orientation, projected onto the basal plane, with θ . If the singlets and doublets lie precisely at the minima of the six-fold basal plane anisotropy, then there will be no dependence of the energy as the external field is turned on.

All these assumptions are relatively minor. In the case of the assumption concerning the constancy of the doublet splitting irrespective of the value of θ , we note that the energy will still increase, because a change in splitting, to reduce the six-fold basal plane anisotropy energy, will be balanced by increases in the exchange energies.

Our last assumption, however, is the key to our model: we assume that, for a given average turn angle, θ , the system, composed entirely of singlets and doublets, will minimize its energy by having singlets on the two layers which terminate a complete spiral of $2\pi k$ radians, where k is the smallest integer which can achieve this, and that these two singlets will be located at a local minimum of the six-fold basal plane anisotropy field. Accordingly, when a field, H , is applied, those two singlets do not increase their six-fold basal plane anisotropy energy. This assumption is shown schematically in Figure 3 for $m = 8$, $n = 1$, $n_1 = 4$ and $n_2 = 2$, making the (112112) structure. Note that a doublet could not be at an end of a sequence because the two spins are "split" nearly, or exactly, symmetrically and so will not then lie in a minimum of the basal plane anisotropy. The figure shows one instantaneous configuration, as appears in the simulations (of which an example is shown in Figure 2), where interactions cause the local spins to lie away from the minima of the hexagonal anisotropy field.

In order to see whether such a spin arrangement is stable under a rotation of all the spins of a complete spiral, let us consider the arrangement shown in Figure 3. We shall consider only the energy of the six-fold basal plane anisotropy field. We assume, for simplicity, that every member of a doublet lies at angles $\pm \theta$ on either side of the local minimum, and that half of the singlets are offset from the local minimum by θ_1 and the other half by $-\theta_1$. This last comment does not apply to the two spins at either end which lie at the minimum of the anisotropy field. It is then trivial to show that the system is indeed stable under an infinitesimal rotation of all vectors by $\delta\theta$. This provides some justification for our proposal that such an arrangement is set up in antiferromagnetic holmium.

With this assumption and the results preceding it, the energy per layer, in units of $J_1 S^2$, becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E}{m J_1 S^2} = & \frac{n_2}{m} \frac{6n}{m} (\cos \theta + \cos^2 \theta - \cos \theta \cos^2 \theta) + \frac{n_1 J_2}{m J_1} \\ & \frac{J_2}{J_1} \left(\frac{12n}{m} \cos^2 \theta + \frac{2n_2}{m} \cos \theta + \frac{2n_1}{m} \cos^2 \theta - \frac{2n_2}{m} \cos \theta \cos^2 \theta \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{2n_1}{m} \cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \theta \right) + \frac{H}{J_1 S} \cos \theta \\ & + \frac{K_6}{J_1 S^2 \sin^2 \theta} \left(\frac{n_1}{m} + \frac{n_2}{m} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where S is the spin magnitude and we have omitted the term in J_0 , since this does not change with H . The term in $n_1 - 1$ allows for the two singlets at each "end" of a complete spiral of total turn angle $2\pi k$.

If we minimize $E = m J_1 S^2$ with respect to the turn-angle, θ , we obtain:

$$\frac{J_2}{J_1} = \frac{3n - m}{\frac{n_2}{m} + \frac{2n_1}{m} \cos \theta} \quad (5)$$

If we minimize $E = m J_1 S^2$ with respect to the tilt-angle, θ , away from the c -axis, then we obtain a relationship between H and θ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H}{J_1 S} = & \left(\frac{2K_6}{J_1 S^2 \sin^4 \theta} \left(\frac{n_1}{m} + \frac{n_2}{m} \right) + \frac{2}{J_1} \frac{12n}{m} (1 - \cos \theta) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{2J_2}{J_1} \left(\frac{12n}{m} \cos^2 \theta + \frac{2n_2}{m} \cos \theta + \frac{2n_1}{m} \cos^2 \theta \right) \right) \cos \theta \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We then substitute for H in (4) to give,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E}{m J_1 S^2} = & \frac{n_2}{m} \frac{6n}{m} (\cos \theta + \cos^2 \theta - \cos \theta \cos^2 \theta) + \frac{n_1 J_2}{m J_1} \\ & \frac{J_2}{J_1} \left(\frac{12n}{m} \cos^2 \theta + \frac{2n_2}{m} \cos \theta + \frac{2n_1}{m} \cos^2 \theta + \frac{2n_2}{m} \cos \theta \cos^2 \theta \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{2n_1}{m} \cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \theta \right) + \frac{H}{J_1 S} \cos \theta \\ & + \frac{K_6}{J_1 S^2 \sin^4 \theta} \left(\frac{n_1}{m} + \frac{n_2}{m} \right) (\sin^2 \theta - 2 \cos^2 \theta) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Results

We have plotted this energy, $\frac{E}{m J_1 S^2}$, in Figure 4, as a function of θ (or $\cos \theta$) for two values of H . It should be noted that H depends implicitly upon θ so that spin arrangements with different turn angles have different arrangements of angles with the c -axis in non-zero H . We varied θ by changing the ratio $\frac{J_2}{J_1}$. Experimentally it is known that θ varies with temperature, implying that $\frac{J_2}{J_1}$ varies with temperature. In Figure 4 it can be seen that certain wave vectors having small values of m exhibit local minima, which are shallow in zero field but which become deeper as a c -axis field is applied. Accordingly, the sheets of ferromagnetically-aligned spins in the basal planes should

exhibit some cooperative effects characteristic of "spin-reorientation," and lock-in at those wave vectors with local energy minima. The extent of fluctuations, as the lock-in wave vector is approached, and the stability of the locked-in state itself, will be determined by the depth of the local energy minimum compared to energies of neighbouring wave vectors as well as the density of states as a function of wave vector. The density of states is suggested by Figure 1, where it is seen that some wave vectors are relatively "isolated". It should be noted that, in particular, those wave vectors at $k = 2/11, 1/5, 2/9$ and $1/4$ are the only ones that are isolated in this way, and that these correspond precisely to the set of lock-ins observed in neutron diffraction measurements.

A consequence of this is that in zero magnetic field, measurements will give the appearance of continuously varying incommensurate values within the experimental resolution and within our ability to resolve separate peaks [13]. Based on our ability to detect the presence of a second, coexisting phase [28], we can say that any fluctuation or noise in k due to multiphase behaviour is certainly less than $0.002 c^*$. This is sufficient to hide lock-in effects, at least for higher temperatures. However, the $2/11$ lock-in has been observed even in zero field below 30 K, although this may be due to the effect of local strain mimicking the effect of an applied field in this material, which has an immense spontaneous magnetostriction [3] [10].

The wave vector $5/18$ is marked in Figure 4 because experimentally, this is always the ultimate value of the wave vector at T_N in zero field and in any applied c -axis or b -axis field tried to date. This is a great mystery to us, and we have no explanation whatsoever for it. There is a significantly wider lock-in in a b -axis field [21] (7 or 8 K elvins wide) than any observed in c -axis fields. The absence of any lock-in at $5/18$ in our work on c -axis effects presented here is in accord with experiment.

Conclusions:

The simple model presented here predicts exactly all of the wave vectors of all the c -axis magnetic-field-induced lock-ins observed experimentally in the hcp helimagnet,holmium. The relative probabilities of observing lock-ins can be estimated by assuming that there is some characteristic length, L , along the c -axis into which the lattice distances over which the complete spiral of 2π radians (see above), terminated at each end by singlets, must "fit". Clearly, the number of such 2π -radian "units" will be proportional to $1/m$. These results should be relevant to many other hexagonal antiferromagnets which exhibit helical spin structures [29]. This model assumes (a) that the magnetic structure is sufficiently well-described, for the temperature range of interest, by "singlet-doublet" spin-slip structures, and we have offered the evidence of computer simulations to support this; and (b) we assume that, for a given average turn angle, θ , the system, composed entirely of singlets and doublets, will minimize its

energy by having singlets on the two layers which terminate a complete spiral of $2\pi/k$ radians, where k is the smallest integer which can achieve this, and that those two singlets will be located at a local minimum of the six-fold basal plane anisotropy. As the wave vector changes, lock-ins will occur at those wave vectors for which the energy exhibits a sufficiently deep local minimum. Fluctuations should be observed for wave vectors in the neighbourhoods of those wave vectors for which lock-in behaviour is manifested at the temperatures of interest. The wave vectors can be swept by changing the temperature in a constant c -axis magnetic field. Analogous lock-ins should be observed if the temperature is fixed and the field is swept, so as to sample those values which exhibit sufficiently low local values of energy. The phase boundaries found in magnetization work, however, are quite steep, making some of these field sweeps quite difficult to carry out. We note that the energy term in equation (1), which we have described as a 6-fold basal plane anisotropy field, might be enhanced significantly, because of the large magneto-elastic coupling in these materials, as the crystal is distorted by the application of a c -axis magnetic field.

We are pleased to acknowledge the financial support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada and the Canadian Institute for Neutron Scattering. It is a pleasure to thank Ms. Bonnie Quinn for writing the code to simulate magnetic ordering inholmium, Mr. Brian Segal for preparing the figures, and the staff at the Chalk River Laboratories of AEC L, especially Dr. T. M. Holden, for their invaluable assistance.

-
- [1] W . C . K oehler, J . W . C able, M . K . W ilkinson, and E . O . W ollan . Phys . Rev . 151, 414 (1966) .
- [2] W . C . K oehler, J . W . C able, H . R . C hild, M . K . W ilkinson, and E . O . W ollan . Phys . Rev . 158, 450 (1967) .
- [3] J . J . R hyne, S . L egvold, and E . T . R odine . Phys . Rev . 154, 266 (1967) .
- [4] M . C . L ee, R . A . T reder, and M . L evy . J . Phys . Chem . Solids 36, 1281 (1975) .
- [5] K . D . J ayasuriya, S . J . C ampbell, and A . M . S tewart . J . Phys . F 15, 225 (1985) .
- [6] D . G ibbs, D . E . M oncton, K . L . D 'A m ico, J . B ohr, and B . H . G rier . Phys . Rev . Lett . 55, 234 (1985) .
- [7] S . B ates, C . P atterson, G . J . M cIntyre, S . B . P alm er, A . M ay er, R . A . C ow ley, and R . M elville . J . Phys . C 21, 4125 (1988) .
- [8] F . W illis, N . A li, M . O . S teinitz, M . K ah rizi, and D . A . T indall . J . Appl . Phys . 67, 5277 (1990) .
- [9] D . A . T indall, M . O . S teinitz, and T . M . H olden . J . Appl . Phys . 73, 6543 (1993) .
- [10] M . L . P lum er . Phys . Rev . B 44, 12376 (1991) .
- [11] J . J ensen . Phys . Rev . B 54, 4021 (1996) .
- [12] J . B ohr, D . G ibbs, D . E . M oncton, and K . L . D 'A m ico . Physica 140A , 349 (1986) .
- [13] M . O . S teinitz, D . A . T indall, and C . P . A dam s . J . M agn . M agn . M ater . 140-144, 759 (1995) .
- [14] M . E . F isher and A . M . S zpilka . Phys . Rev . B 36, 644 (1987) .
- [15] W . S elke . "Spatially M odulated Structures in System s with Com peting Interactions," Phase Transitions and Critical Phenom ena (Eds . C . D omb and J . L . L ebow itz), A cadem ic P res s 1992, 1 .
- [16] K . Sasaki . J . Stat . Phys . 68, 1013 (1992) .
- [17] F . S eno, J . M . Y eom ans, R . H arbord and D . Y . K . K o . Phys . Rev . B 49, 6412 (1994) .
- [18] A . B . H arris, E . R astelli and A . T assi, Phys . Rev . B 44, 2624 (1991) .
- [19] D . R . N oakes, D . A . T indall, M . O . S teinitz, and N . A li . J . Appl . Phys . 67, 5274 (1990) .
- [20] D . A . T indall, M . O . S teinitz, and T . M . H olden . Phys . Rev . B 47, 5463 (1993) .

- [21] D . A . T indall, M . O . Steinitz, and T . M . Holden. J. Phys. Cond. Mat. 4, 9927 (1992).
- [22] D . A . T indall, C . P . Adams, M . O . Steinitz, and T . M . Holden. J. Appl. Phys. 76, 6229 (1994).
- [23] M . O . Steinitz, D . A . T indall, and M . Kahrizi. J. Magn. Mater. 104-107, 1531 (1992).
- [24] R . A . Cowley, D . A . Jehan, D . F . M cMorro, and G . J . M cIntyre. Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 1521 (1991).
- [25] J. Jensen and A . R . Mackintosh. Phys. Rev. Letters 64, 2699 (1990)
- [26] D . F . M cMorro, D . A . Jehan, R . A . Cowley, P . P . Swaddling, R . C . C . Ward, M . R . Wells, N . Hagmann, K . N . Clausen. Europhys. Lett. 23, 523 (1993).
- [27] G . H . Hardy and E . M . Wright. An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1938) p. 23.
- [28] D . A . T indall, C . P . Adams, M . O . Steinitz, and T . M . Holden, J. Appl. Phys. 75, 6318 (1994).
- [29] See, for example, "Magnetic Systems with Competing Interactions," edited by H . T . Diep (1994), World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ 07661, U.S.A .
- [30] Elliott, R . J. Phys. Rev. 124, 329 (1961).
- [31] e.g. "Applications of the Monte-Carlo Method to Statistical Physics", ed. K . Binder, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1984).

Figure Captions

Figure 1. The Farey series with denominator up to 60. A vertical line is drawn at each rational fraction with denominator less than 60 in order to illustrate the gaps between the fractions. The gaps fill in very slowly as the maximum denominator increases.

Figure 2. Average angle of spin orientation projected onto the n -th basal plane, $\langle \theta_n \rangle$, as a function of plane, n , obtained from a Monte-Carlo simulation of equation (1). The ratio of $J_2=J_1$ was selected to give an average turn angle of $\theta=5$ per plane as an example. Each basal plane was represented by a (10×10) triangular lattice with periodic boundary conditions and this simulation used 360 planes with open boundary conditions, so that correlations due to c -axis periodicity were not introduced. Here, a c -axis magnetic field was applied and gave values of θ_n , the angle measured from the c -axis, lying between about 61 and 66 degrees. The graph shows planes 0 to 140 so that the effect of the open boundary condition can be seen.

Figure 3. An example of a spin-slip structure (112112) with an average turn angle of $\theta=4$ per layer ($\theta = \frac{1}{4}$) with the spin vectors projected onto the basal plane. Here, $m = 8, n = 1, n_1 = 4$ and $n_2 = 2$. Note that m is the number of spacings between the two singlets (shown as heavy lines because they have the same orientation) which are at either end of the spin structure. Accordingly, one of those end spins is not included in n_1 . The dashed lines indicate the local minima of the six-fold basal plane anisotropy field.

Figure 4. The energy per layer, $\frac{E}{m J_1 S^2}$, calculated from equation (7) as a function of the wave vector, k , in a magnetic field and in zero field for comparison. The parameters used are $\frac{K_6}{J_1} = 2, \frac{K_6}{J_1 S^2} = 2,$ and $\frac{H}{J_1 S} = 0$ and $\frac{H}{J_1 S} = 20$. The Farey series of order 150 was used to generate the wave vectors. Points with denominators, $m < 20$ are circled. The important points to note are the isolation of the low-denominator points (in particular those at $2/11, 1/5, 2/9,$ and $1/4$), the field dependence of the "lock-in" energy, and the difference between the energy of the isolated low-denominator points and that of the adjacent wave vectors. The points for $H = 20$ have been displaced upwards by 10 for display purposes.







