

# M agnetic m odel for $\text{Ba}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{4-x}$

J.R ichter, A .Voigt, J.Schulenburg, N .B .Ivanov and R .Hayn

Institut fur T heoretische P hysik, O tto-von-G uericke-U niversitat M agdeburg, P ostfach 4120, 39106

M agdeburg, G erm any

G eorgi Nadjakov Institute for Solid State P hysics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 72

T zarigradsko chaussee blvd., 1784 S o fia, Bulgaria

Fachbereich P hysik, T U D resden, G erm any

(April 15, 2024)

## A bstract

$\text{Ba}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{4-x}$  consists of two types of copper atom s,  $\text{Cu}(\text{A})$  and  $\text{Cu}(\text{B})$ .  
W e study the corresponding H eisenberg m odel with three antiferrom agnetic  
couplings,  $J_{\text{AA}}$ ,  $J_{\text{BB}}$  and  $J_{\text{AB}}$ . W e find interesting frustration e ffects due to  
the coupling  $J_{\text{AB}}$ .

**Keywords:** antiferrom agnetism , quantum f luctuations, frustration, phase transition

## I. I N T R O D U C T I O N

The exciting collective m agnetic properties of layered cuprates have attracted much attention over the last decade. Recent experiments on  $\text{Ba}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{4-x}$  [1] show m agnetic properties of this quasi 2d quantum antiferrom agnet which differ from the well studied antiferrom agnetism of the parent cuprates like  $\text{La}_2\text{CuO}_4$ . M ost interesting is the observation of two m agnetic critical temperatures ( $T_{\text{A}}^{\text{c}} \approx 330\text{K}$ ,  $T_{\text{B}}^{\text{c}} \approx 40\text{K}$ ) and of a weak ferrom agnetic m oment [1], where a simple explanation of the ferrom agnetic m oment by a D zyaloshinsky-M oriya exchange can be ruled out [2].

The im portant difference between the parent cuprates and  $\text{Ba}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{4-x}$  is the existence of additional  $\text{Cu}(\text{B})$  atom s located at the centre of every second  $\text{Cu}(\text{A})$  square. The coupling

between the A spins  $J_{AA}$  is strongly antiferromagnetic. The observation of a smaller second critical temperature  $T_B^c$  [1] indicates a weaker antiferromagnetic coupling  $J_{BB}$  between the B spins. Additionally, there is a competing coupling  $J_{AB}$  between A and B spins giving rise for interesting frustration effects.

## II. THE MODEL

We consider the classical and the quantum (spin 1=2) version of the Heisenberg model

$$H = J_{AA} \sum_{\langle i2A ; j2A \rangle} S_i S_j + J_{BB} \sum_{\langle i2B ; j2B \rangle} S_i S_j + J_{AB} \sum_{\langle i2A ; j2B \rangle} S_i S_j \quad (1)$$

where the sums run over nearest neighbour bonds of type A-A, B-B, A-B. Tight binding calculations [3] and the large  $T_A^c$  indicate a strong antiferromagnetic  $J_{AA}$ . Because the couplings  $J_{BB}$  and  $J_{AB}$  are of higher order of the hopping integrals [3] they can be assumed as (much) smaller than  $J_{AA}$ . In this paper we focus our interest on antiferromagnetic  $J_{BB}$ ,  $J_{AB} < J_{AA}$  and discuss the magnetic properties in dependence on  $J_{AB}$  and  $J_{BB}$  for fixed  $J_{AA} = 1$ . Since the copper spin is 1=2 the quantum nature of the spins is of great importance. To take into account full quantum fluctuations we use an exact diagonalization algorithm to calculate data for two finite lattices of  $N = 12$  sites (8 A spins and 4 B spins)  $N = 24$  sites (16 A spins and 8 B spins). For comparison we present also some data for the corresponding classical systems.

## III. RESULTS

The ground state results for small  $J_{BB}$  and  $J_{AB}$  are as follows:

- Classical model: Starting from the point  $J_{AB} = 0$  we have Neel ordering in the subsystems A and B. These two Neel states are decoupled and can rotate freely with respect to each other, i.e. the ground state is highly degenerated.

Increasing the frustrating  $J_{AB}$  there is a first order transition to a non-planar canted state at  $J_{AB}^c = 2^p \overline{J_{AA} J_{BB}}$  (see Fig.1). In this non-planar state the A spins form a slightly tilted

Neel state, where the sublattice magnetization  $M_{sA}$  is lowered to about 90% for  $J_{AB} > J_{AB}^c$  and decreases with increasing  $J_{AB}$ . In the B subsystem the angle between neighbouring spins is  $\pi/2$  and the spins build a planar state perpendicular to the sublattice magnetization axis of the A subsystem. However, due to the canting of A spins there is a correlation between A and B spins. There is no ferromagnetic moment in the non-planar canted state. However, an almost degenerated classical planar state exists with a weak ferromagnetic moment which increases with  $J_{AB}$ . Quantum fluctuations may change this situation and could select a planar state instead of a non-planar ground state. For larger  $J_{AB}$  further transitions to other ground states take place, which are not considered here.

- Quantum model: We focus our consideration on the lattice with  $N = 24$  sites. The results for  $N = 12$  are comparable supposing a relation of  $J_{BB}^{12} = 2J_{BB}^{24}$ . (Notice, that for  $N = 12$  the B-spins have only two nearest B neighbors instead of four.) First we consider the antiferromagnetic ground state ordering for small  $J_{AB}$ , where the two subsystems order in a quantum Neel state. In contrast to the classical case the quantum fluctuations cause a typical 'order from disorder' effect and lift the classical degeneracy by selecting a state with a collinear structure of two sublattice magnetizations. This is accompanied by the development of a magnetic coupling between A and B subsystems. A similar 'order from disorder' phenomenon is well-known from the  $J_1 - J_2$  antiferromagnet on square lattice for  $J_2 = J_1/0.65$  [4]. The stability of the Neel state is supported by quantum fluctuations (Fig.1). The transition line to a canted state lies well above the classical instability line and for small  $J_{BB} < 0.07J_{AA}$  the line follows approximately the relation  $J_{AB}^c = 2.7^{1/p} \sqrt{J_{AA} J_{BB}}$ . A detailed analysis of the canted state gives indications for planar structure which is, however, slightly different from that classical planar state which is almost degenerated with the non-planar classical ground state. The ground state order parameters for the  $N = 24$  site lattice are shown in Fig.2 for  $J_{BB} = 0.1J_{AA}$  which corresponds to the relation of critical temperatures. Obviously, both systems are antiferromagnetically ordered. However, the antiferromagnetic order in the B system is weakened by  $J_{AB}$  and drops down dramatically

at the critical line. This is accompanied by an increase of the square of the total magnetic moments  $M_B^2, M_A^2$  indicating the possibility of a weak ferromagnetic moment in the quantum system.

Let us finally present the temperature dependence of the specific heat  $c(T)$  for the quantum case (Fig.3). The exact calculation of  $c(T)$  needs the complete diagonalization of the Hamiltonian and is restricted to very small system, i.e. to  $N = 12$  in our case. We find two peaks in  $c(T)$  indicating the two transition temperatures. The peak positions  $T_A$  and  $T_B$  correspond to the coupling strengths  $J_{AA}$  and  $J_{BB}$ . The frustrating coupling  $J_{AB}$  causes a decrease of  $T_A$  and  $T_B$ . For the parameters used in Fig.3 we have  $T_A(J_{AB} = 0.5) = T_A(J_{AB} = 0) = 0.99$  and  $T_B(J_{AB} = 0.5) = T_B(J_{AB} = 0) = 0.87$ .

#### IV. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Project No. Ri 615/1-2) and the Bulgarian Science Foundation (Grant F412/94).

## REFERENCES

- [1] S Noro et al, Mater.SciEng. B 25 (1994), 167; K Yamada et al. Physica B 213-214 (1995), 191.
- [2] F C Chou et al. PhysRev Let. 78 (1997), 535.
- [3] H Rosner and R Hayn, Physica B (1997), to be published.
- [4] K Kubo, T Kishi, J Phys.Soc.Jap. 60 (1991), 567; J Richter, PhysRev B 47 (1993), 5794.

## FIGURES

FIG .1. Transition line between the Neel phase and the canted phase (see text) for small  $J_{AB}$  and  $J_{BB}$  ( $N = 24$ ). Notice that for larger  $J_{AB}$  several other phases appear which are not considered here.

FIG .2. Square of magnetic order parameters versus  $J_{AB}$  for  $J_{BB} = 0.1$  ( $N = 24$ ).  $M_{sA}^2$  ( $M_{sB}^2$ ) - staggered magnetic moment of subsystem A (B),  $M_A^2$  ( $M_B^2$ ) - total magnetic moment of subsystem A (B)

FIG .3. Specific heat versus temperature for  $J_{BB} = 0.25$  ( $N = 12$ ) and two different  $J_{AB}$ .




Fig.1, J. Richter *et al.*, Magnetic model ...




Fig.2, J. Richter *et al.*, Magnetic model ...






Fig.3, J. Richter *et al.*, Magnetic model ...