

Spin dynamics of the spin-Peierls compound CuGeO_3 under magnetic fieldD. Poilblanc¹, J. Riera², C. A. Hayward¹, C. Berthier^{3,4} & M. Horvatic³¹Laboratoire de Physique Quantique, Université Paul Sabatier, 31062 Toulouse, France²Instituto de Física Rosario, Universidad Nacional de Rosario, Bv. 27 de Febrero 210 bis - 2000 Rosario, Argentina³Grenoble High Magnetic Field Laboratory, Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung and Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, BP 166, 38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France⁴Laboratoire de Spectrométrie Physique, Unité Mixte de Recherche No. 5588 du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Université Joseph Fourier Grenoble I, BP 87, 38402 St-Martin d'Hères Cedex, France
(December 96)

The magnetic field-driven transition in the spin-Peierls system CuGeO_3 associated with the closing of the spin gap is investigated numerically. The field dependence of the spin dynamical structure factor (seen by inelastic neutron scattering) and of the momentum dependent static susceptibility are calculated. In the dimerized phase ($H < H_c$), we suggest that the strong field dependence of the transverse susceptibility could be experimentally seen from the low temperature spin-echo relaxation rate $1/T_{2G}$ or the second moment of the NMR spectrum. Above H_c low energy spin excitations appear at incommensurate wave vectors where the longitudinal susceptibility $\chi_{zz}(q)$ peaks.

PACS numbers: 74.72.-h, 71.27.+a, 71.55.-i

Low dimensional quantum magnets have drawn great attention in recent years. It is believed that the inorganic compound CuGeO_3 is a good realisation of quasi-one dimensional (1D) weakly coupled spin-1/2 antiferromagnetic chains. At low temperature, a Spin-Peierls (SP) transition was experimentally established from a rapid drop of the spin susceptibility¹. Simultaneously with the opening of a spin gap, the lattice undergoes a structural change characterised by a small distortion along the chains direction (X-axis) as seen by x-rays diffraction studies².

The Peierls instability in $S=1/2$ Heisenberg chains has, on the theoretical side, been a long standing problem³ first connected to experiments on organic quasi-1D systems such as $(\text{TTF})\text{CuS}_4\text{C}_4(\text{CF}_3)_4$ (Ref. 4) where TTF stands for tetrathiafulvalene. The new CuGeO_3 compound is the first inorganic quasi-1D SP system with a critical temperature $T_{SP} \approx 14\text{K}$.

To describe a single Cu^{2+} spin-1/2 chain of CuGeO_3 we start with the following effective hamiltonian⁵,

$$H = \sum_i J(i) S_i \cdot S_{i+1} + J^0 \sum_i S_i \cdot S_{i+2}; \quad (1)$$

where i is a site index ($i=1, \dots, L$) and S_i is an electron spin operator. A small dimerisation of the nearest neighbor (NN) exchange coupling is due to the lattice distortion and mimics the effect of the phonons, $J(i) = J(1 + \delta(i)^2)$.

Simple quantum chemistry arguments⁶ suggest that, due to side groups and in contrast to the usual case, the (almost) 90° Cu-O-Cu superexchange path is antiferromagnetic (i.e. $J > 0$) with $J \approx 140\text{K}$ (11.6 meV). In addition, the second nearest neighbor exchange coupling

J^0 is also antiferromagnetic and hence leads to frustration. A sizeable ratio $\delta = J^0/J$ is suggested by the magnetic susceptibility measurements¹ above T_{SP} ($\delta = 0$) which can be well fitted by parameters like $\delta = 0.24$ and $J = 150\text{K}$ (Ref. 7) or $\delta = 0.36$ and $J = 160\text{K}$ (Ref. 8).

In the dimer (D) or Spin-Peierls phase, for temperatures below $T_{SP} \approx 14\text{K}$, the chains become dimerized with an alternation of somewhat shorter and longer Cu-Cu bonds along the X-axis. Physically, this corresponds to the formation of singlet dimers on the stronger bonds⁹. In the simple ($\delta = 0$) J - J^0 Heisenberg chain the transition towards a gapped disordered ground state (GS) occurs at $\delta_c \approx 0.241$ ¹⁰. The parameters proposed by Castilla et al.⁷ hence correspond almost exactly to the critical point and, at low temperature, an extra coupling to the lattice must be advocated to give the correct zero temperature finite spin gap seen in neutron inelastic scattering¹¹. This is taken care of by an ad hoc dimerisation $\delta = 0.03$ ⁷. In addition to the value of the spin gap such parameters seem also to reproduce satisfactorily the whole dynamical spin structure factor¹². However, it should be noted that a similar agreement on the gap value can also be achieved using the set of parameters of Ref. 8 provided a smaller $\delta = 0.014$ is used³. In any case, it is clear that both magnetic frustration and spin-phonon interactions conspire to the formation of the SP phase¹⁴. In the following, we shall use both sets of parameters.

The small value of the spin gap ($\delta_s \approx 2.1\text{meV}$) makes the magnetic field properties of CuGeO_3 particularly interesting. The Zeeman energy $g_B S_z$ leads, for $T < T_{SP}$ and for increasing magnetic field ($H_c \approx 12.5\text{T}$ at low temperature), to a phase transition to an incommensurate

measure or solitonic phase^{15,17}. This transition is directly connected to closing of the spin gap by the magnetic field¹⁸. An accurate theoretical description of the full spin dynamics under magnetic field is still missing and is necessary for the interpretation of neutron inelastic scattering experiments under magnetic field or the NMR experiments. In the following, we investigate the magnetic field behavior of the dynamical spin structure factor and of the static q -dependent magnetic susceptibility which can be indirectly studied in NMR experiments. Dynamical correlations are calculated on finite clusters by standard exact diagonalisation methods¹⁹.




FIG. 1. (a) Dynamical spectral function $S_{zz}(q; !)$ calculated at momenta $q = n\frac{\pi}{L}$ ($L = 28$) in the $S_z = 1$ ground state. From bottom to top, n goes from 1 to $L/2$ ($= 14$) and the parameters are indicated on the plot. (b) Momentum dependence of the various structures appearing in $S_{zz}(q; !)$ for the same parameters as in (a). Results for both 20- and 28-sites clusters are shown. The open triangles and diamonds are experimental data taken from Ref. 11.

In the D phase the transverse and longitudinal dynamical spin structure factor are given by

$$S_{+}(q; !; H) = \sum_n \langle j_n \mathcal{P}_q^+ j_0 \mathcal{P}_q \rangle (! - E_n + H - E_0);$$

$$S_{zz}(q; !; H) - S_{zz}(q; !) = \frac{1}{2} S_{+}(q; !; 0); \quad (2)$$

where $!_0$ is the $S_z = 0$ ground state and the sum over n is, in fact, restricted to the $S_z = 1$ components of the excited triplet states. Hereafter, the units of the magnetic field H are such that $g_B = 1$. The longitudinal part is field independent while the field dependence of the transverse part is simply due to the Zeeman splitting of the $S = 1$ multiplet producing a shift of the poles of the $! -$ function.




FIG. 2. (a) Dynamical spectral functions $S_{zz}(q; !; H)$, calculated at momenta $q = 2n\frac{\pi}{L}$ ($L = 20$) in the $S_z = 1$ ground state (for $H > H_c$). (b) Momentum dependence of the two main structures with lower energy in $S_{zz}(q; !)$ and upper bound of the continuum for the same parameters as in (a).

Before discussing in more details the role of the magnetic field, we briefly summarize our main results on the field independent longitudinal structure factor. The results for $S_{zz}(q; !)$ calculated on a 28-sites chain are shown in Fig. 1 (a). A sharp low energy feature is seen which has been interpreted as a magnon branch or, equivalently as a spinon-spinon bound state. A lot of weight is also seen above this band. It is interesting to notice that a second sharp peak exists above the magnon branch and might a

priori be interpreted as a second bound state below the continuum²⁰. The excitation energy of the three lowest triplet states as a function of momentum q is shown, for two different chain lengths, in Fig. 1(b) together with the upper limit of the continuum of excitations. It is clear that, in contrast to the two first triplet states, the excitation energy of the third one (open symbols) is strongly size dependent and, very likely, converges to the value of the second excitation energy. This means that the second and third excited states belong to a continuum of states. We conclude that, for these parameters, there is only a single magnon branch separated from the continuum by a gap as seen experimentally²¹. For completeness, we also show a comparison of the magnon dispersion with the available experimental data of Regnault et al.¹¹. The agreement is excellent, even slightly better than the one obtained by Haas et al.¹² for the parameters proposed in Ref. 7. Note that, although finite size effects are negligible around $q = \pi/2$, a careful finite size scaling of the gap at $q = \pi$ (see Ref. 13) is necessary and, in fact, gives a gap very close to the experimental value.




FIG. 3. Momentum dependence of static susceptibilities. (a) χ_+ for several values of the reduced field $h = H/H_c$. (b) χ_{zz} for several values of the magnetisation m_z . Parameters are indicated on the graph.

We now turn to the discussion of the effect of the magnetic field H . For $H < H_c$ ($H_c = g\mu_B$), the transverse part S_+ is simply obtained by a global shift of H of the spectral weight of Fig. 1(a) towards low energies. At H_c the GS acquires a finite magnetisation S_z and the lattice modulation becomes incommensurate. In the following, we shall use a sinusoidal modulation $J(i) = J(1 + \cos(Ki))$ of momentum $K = \frac{2}{L}(L - S_z)$ which minimizes the total energy. However, we stress that the effects directly connected to the change of the lattice modulation are very weak²². In the GS carrying a finite magnetisation the longitudinal dynamical spin structure factor becomes

$$S_{zz}(q; H) = \sum_n \left| \sum_j \mathcal{P}_q^z j_0(S_z) \right|^2 \delta(E_n - E_0); \quad (3)$$

where the field dependence enters in the GS $j_0(S_z)$. Results are shown in Fig. 2(a-b) for $S_z = 1$. The low energy spectral weight appears now away from momentum $q = \pi/2$ at a momentum $q_{\text{min}}(H)$. Its position (see Fig. 2(b)) in q -space shifts continuously with the field H according to $q_{\text{min}}(H) = \pi(1 - 2m_z)$ where $m_z = S_z/L$ is the magnetization. This is consistent with the mapping of the XY model on the non-interacting tight-binding fermion model, the change of the magnetic field being related, in the fermion picture, to a change of the chemical potential and hence of the Fermi momentum k_F (Ref. 3).

Besides inelastic neutron scattering, Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) is a very efficient technique to probe the spin dynamics²³, and in particular, the static (zero frequency) susceptibility tensor $\chi(q)$. The dominant component of the interaction between nuclear spins of copper in CuGeO_3 is namely the one mediated by the fluctuation of electronic spins, i.e., by the non-local electron spin susceptibility. Neglecting the direct nuclear dipole-dipole interaction, the second moment (M_2) of the NMR lineshape obtained in the standard spin-echo experiment²⁴ will in general²⁵ depend on both χ_{zz} and χ_{\perp} susceptibilities. However, taking advantage of the strong anisotropy of the copper nuclear spin hyperfine coupling $(A_{zz} = A_{\perp})^2 \sim 100$, (where Z is the principal axis perpendicular to the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbital of copper spin),²⁶ we can select only one dominant contribution to M_2 by applying the magnetic field in the appropriate direction. For $H \parallel Z$ or $H \parallel$ to the chain axis, we thus measure $M_{2;zz}$ or $M_{2;\perp}$, respectively, where

$$M_{2;+} = C \int \frac{1}{L} \sum_q A_{zz}^4(q)^2 \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_q A_{zz}^2(q) \right]^2 g; \quad (4)$$

with $+ = zz$ or \perp , $C_{zz} = 0.69(\gamma_n g_B)^4 \approx 8 \times 10^{-12}$, $C_{\perp} = p C_{zz}$ for the $(-1/2, 1/2)$ transition and $C_{\perp} = 9p C_{zz} = 16$ for $(3/2, 1/2)$ transitions, where $p \approx 1$ is the proportion of "like" nuclear spins participating in spin-exchange interaction²⁵. The q -dependence, $A_{zz} = A_{zz}(q)$, of the A_{zz} coupling was found to be essentially negligible (10%) with $A_{zz}(q = \pi) \approx 440 \text{ kOe}$.²⁶

The static susceptibilities can be easily obtained from the knowledge of the dynamical structure factors,

$$\chi(q;H) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \frac{S(\mathbf{q};H)}{|\mathbf{r}|} \quad (5)$$

Results obtained on a 20-sites cluster are shown in Fig. 3(a-b). In the D-phase ($h < 1$, $m_z = 0$) $\chi_{zz}(q)$ and $\chi_{+}(q)$ are peaked at momentum $q = \pi$. For increasing field, $\chi_{zz}(q)$ remains constant ($\chi_{zz}(q;H) = \frac{1}{2} + \chi_{+}(q;H = 0)$) while a strong singularity develops at $q = \pi$ in $\chi_{+}(q;H)$ when $h \rightarrow 1$. Above the critical point ($h > 1$), the longitudinal part $\chi_{zz}(q;H)$ becomes field dependent with a maximum at the momentum q_m corresponding to the appearance of spectral weight at low energies in the dynamical spin structure factor.




FIG. 4. Second moment $M_{2,+}$ vs reduced field $H = H_c$. To avoid spurious divergences when $h \rightarrow 1$, the momentum $q = \pi$ is not included in the corresponding sum of Eq. 4.

The field dependence of the susceptibilities are expected to be directly reflected in the copper NMR data in CuGeO_3 . The $M_{2;zz}$ value is thus predicted to be field independent, while $M_{2,+}$ should strongly grow as we increase $h \rightarrow 1$. (The increase of $M_{2,+}(h)$ is plotted in Fig. 4 in reduced units, i.e., with $C = 1 = A_{zz}(q)$, as the value of μ is not known). Indeed, NMR spectra in the D-phase, i.e., the width of NMR lines (at 4.2 K) reported in Ref. 26, seem to confirm this behavior. These results have to be corroborated by further systematic investigations.

In conclusion, we have shown that the strong magnetic field dependence of the spin fluctuations could lead to new experimentally observable effects. In particular, it is suggested that the behavior of the transverse spin susceptibility can be experimentally extracted from the second moment of the NMR spectrum.

We thank IDRIS (Orsay) for allocation of CPU time on the C 94 and C 98 CRAY supercomputers.

- ¹ M. Hase, I. Terasaki and K. Uchinokura, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 3651 (1993).
- ² J. P. Pouget et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 4037 (1994).
- ³ M. C. Cross and Daniel S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 19, 402 (1979); see also an earlier approach by E. Pytte, Phys. Rev. B 10, 4637 (1974).
- ⁴ I. S. Jacobs et al., Phys. Rev. B 14, 3036 (1976).
- ⁵ The weak interchain coupling ($J_z = J < 0.1$) is neglected here.
- ⁶ Wiebe Geertsma and D. Khomskii, Phys. Rev. B 54, 3011 (1996).
- ⁷ G. Castilla, S. Chakravarty and V. J. Emery, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1823 (1995).
- ⁸ Jose Riera and Ariel Dobry, Phys. Rev. B 51, 16 098 (1995); further experimental evidences for large competing intrachain interactions can be found e.g. in B. Buchner et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 1624 (1996).
- ⁹ C. K. Majumdar and D. K. Ghosh, J. Math. Phys. 10, 1388 (1969).
- ¹⁰ K. Okamoto and K. Nomura, Phys. Lett. A 169, 433 (1992); For a more accurate determination see S. Eggert, preprint cond-mat/9602026 (1996).
- ¹¹ L. P. Regnault, M. A. N. B. Hennen, G. Dhalenne and A. Revcolevschi, Phys. Rev. B 53, 5579 (1996).
- ¹² Stephan Haas and Emilio Dagotto, Phys. Rev. B 52, R14396 (1995).
- ¹³ Jose Riera and Sergio Koval, Phys. Rev. B 53, 770 (1996).
- ¹⁴ Recent Density Matrix Renormalisation Group studies of the model of Eq. 1 can be found in R. Chitra, Swapam Pati, H. R. Krishnamurthy, Diptim Sen and S. Ramasesha, Phys. Rev. B 52, 6581 (1995).
- ¹⁵ V. K. Iyukhin and B. Keimer, Phys. Rev. B 52, R740 (1995); V. K. Iyukhin, B. Keimer, J. P. Hill and A. Vignante, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4608 (1996).
- ¹⁶ Y. Fagot-Reverat et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 1861 (1996).
- ¹⁷ P. H. M. van Loosdrecht et al., preprint cond-mat/9606056.
- ¹⁸ M. C. Cross, Phys. Rev. B 20, 4606 (1979).
- ¹⁹ For a review on numerical methods based on the Lanczos algorithm see e.g. "Exact diagonalisation methods for models of strongly correlated fermions", D. Poilblanc in "Numerical methods for strongly correlated systems", Ed. D. J. Scalapino, Frontiers in Physics (1997).
- ²⁰ Gotz S. Uhrig and H. J. Schulz, preprint (1996).
- ²¹ M. A. N. et al., preprint (1996).
- ²² We have checked that a $K = \pi$ modulation or a soliton-antisoliton pattern (see e.g. T. Nakano and H. Fukuyama, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 49, 1679 (1980); M. Fujita and K. Machida, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 53, 4395 (1984)) give almost indistinguishable results at least for the physical quantities computed.
- ²³ For recent calculations using the Luttinger Liquid approach see R. Chitra and T. Giamarchi, Phys. Rev. B, in press.
- ²⁴ For Gaussian relaxation, i.e., for $\exp(-t^2/2T_{2G}^2)$, $M_2 = T_{2G}^{-2}$.
- ²⁵ J. A. G. Iijet et al., Physica C 235-240, 1667 (1994) and references found therein.
- ²⁶ Y. Fagot-Reverat et al., Phys. Rev. B 55, (1997), to be published in No. 5.