

# The quantum $J_1-J'_1-J_2$ spin-1 Heisenberg model: Influence of the interchain coupling on the ground-state magnetic ordering in 2D

R. F. BISHOP<sup>1,2</sup>, P. H. Y. LI<sup>1,2</sup>, R. DARRADI<sup>3</sup> and J. RICHTER<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *School of Physics & Astronomy, Schuster Building, The University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK*

<sup>2</sup> *School of Physics & Astronomy, University of Minnesota, 116 Church St. SE, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, USA*

<sup>3</sup> *Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Magdeburg, 39016 Magdeburg, Germany*

PACS 75.10.Jm – Quantised spin models

PACS 75.30.Gw – Magnetic anisotropy

PACS 75.50.Ee – Antiferromagnetics

**Abstract.** - We study the phase diagram of the isotropic  $J_1-J'_1-J_2$  Heisenberg model for spin-1 particles on an anisotropic square lattice, using the coupled cluster method. We find no evidence for an intermediate phase between the Néel and stripe states, as compared with all previous results for the corresponding spin-1/2 case. However, we find a quantum tricritical point at  $J'_1/J_1 \approx 0.66 \pm 0.03$ ,  $J_2/J_1 \approx 0.35 \pm 0.02$ , where a line of second-order phase transitions between the quasi-classical Néel and stripe-ordered phases (for  $J'_1/J_1 \lesssim 0.66$ ) meets a line of first-order phase transitions between the same two states (for  $J'_1/J_1 \gtrsim 0.66$ ).

Over the last 20 years or so much theoretical effort [1–8] has been expended on the  $J_1-J_2$  model in which the spins situated on the sites of a two-dimensional (2D) square lattice interact via competing isotropic Heisenberg interactions between the nearest-neighbour ( $J_1$ ) and next-nearest-neighbour ( $J_2$ ) pairs. The exchange bonds  $J_1 > 0$  promote antiferromagnetic order, while the  $J_2 > 0$  bonds act to frustrate or compete with this order. Such frustrated quantum magnets continue to be of interest because of the possible spin-liquid and other such novel phases that they can exhibit (see, e.g., Ref. [9]).

The syntheses of compounds that can be closely described by the spin-1/2 version of the model, such as  $\text{Li}_2\text{VO}(\text{Si},\text{Ge})\text{O}_4$  [10] and  $\text{VOMoO}_4$  [11] have further fuelled theoretical interest. It is now widely accepted that the spin-1/2  $J_1-J_2$  model on the 2D square lattice has a ground-state phase diagram showing two phases with quasi-classical long-range order (LRO) (viz., a Néel-ordered phase at small values of  $J_2/J_1$  and a collinear stripe-ordered phase at large values of  $J_2/J_1$ ), separated by an intermediate quantum paramagnetic phase without magnetic LRO in the parameter regime  $\alpha_c^1 < \alpha < \alpha_c^2$ , where  $\alpha \equiv J_2/J_1$  and  $\alpha_c^1 \approx 0.4$ ,  $\alpha_c^2 \approx 0.6$ . Furthermore, it has been argued recently that the quantum phase transition between the quasi-classical Néel phase and the quantum paramagnetic phase present in the 2D  $J_1-J_2$  model is not described by a Ginzburg-Landau type critical the-

ory, but rather may exhibit a deconfined quantum critical point [12]. Other authors [13] have argued that the transition is not of this second-order type due to the deconfinement of the fractionally-charged spinons, but is rather a (weakly) first-order transition between the Néel phase and a valence-bond solid phase with columnar dimerisation.

Such frustrated quantum magnets often have ground states that are macroscopically degenerate. This feature leads naturally to an increased sensitivity of the underlying Hamiltonian to the presence of small perturbations. In particular, the presence of anisotropies in real systems that are well characterised by the  $J_1-J_2$  model, either in spin space or in real space, naturally raises the issue of how robust are the properties of the  $J_1-J_2$  model against any such perturbations. There have been several recent studies addressing this question. For example, in the case of spin anisotropies, generalizations of the  $J_1-J_2$  model have been studied for the spin-1/2 case, in which either the frustrating next-nearest-neighbour interaction or the nearest-neighbour interaction is anisotropic [14, 15].

In the alternative case of real-space anisotropies, for example, a recent study [16] investigated the effects of including an interlayer coupling ( $J_\perp$ ) for the spin-half  $J_1-J_2$  model on a stacked square lattice. In a previous paper of our own [17] we moved instead in the direction of one-dimensionality by investigating a spin-half spatially inhomogeneous  $J_1-J'_1-J_2$  model in which the nearest-

neighbour bonds on the square lattice differ for the intrachain ( $J_1$ ) and interchain ( $J'_1$ ) cases. The model can thus be viewed as parallel ( $J_1$ ) chains, coupled by nearest-neighbour ( $J'_1$ ) and next-nearest-neighbour ( $J_2$ ) interactions that frustrate each other. We found the surprising and novel result that for the spin-1/2 case there exists a quantum triple point below which there is a second-order phase transition between the quasi-classical Néel and stripe-ordered phases with magnetic LRO, whereas only above this point are these two phases separated by the intermediate magnetically disordered liquid-like phase seen in the pure spin-1/2  $J_1$ - $J_2$  model (i.e., at  $J'_1 = J_1$ ). The quantum triple point was found to occur at  $J'_1/J_1 \approx 0.60 \pm 0.03$ ,  $J_2/J_1 \approx 0.33 \pm 0.02$ .

In the present work we extend the study of the  $J_1$ - $J'_1$ - $J_2$  model to consider the spin-1 case, which is computationally more challenging than the previous spin-1/2 case. As in the previous case we again use the much-studied coupled cluster method (CCM). Our main rationale for the present study is that one knows in general that the spin quantum number can play an important and highly non-trivial role in these strongly correlated magnetic-lattice systems, which often exhibit rich and interesting phase scenarios due to the interplay between the quantum fluctuations and the competing interactions present. The strength of the quantum fluctuations can be tuned either by introducing spin-anisotropy terms in the Hamiltonian [18] or by varying the spin quantum number  $s$  [19].

While the general trend is that as  $s$  is increased the effects of quantum fluctuations reduce, one also knows that there can be significant deviations from it. A particularly well-known example is the since-confirmed prediction of Haldane that integer-spin systems on the linear chain would have a nonzero excitation energy gap, whereas half-odd-integer spin systems would be gapless [20]. Indeed, such deviations from general trends provide one of the main reasons why quantum spin-lattice problems still maintain such an important role in the general investigation of quantum phase transitions.

In this context we note that the recent discovery of superconductivity with a transition temperature at  $T_c \approx 26$  K in the layered iron-based compound LaOFeAs, when doped by partial substitution of the oxygen atoms by fluorine atoms [21], has been followed by the rapid discovery of superconductivity at even higher values of  $T_c$  ( $\gtrsim 50$  K) in a broad class of similar quaternary compounds. Enormous interest has thereby been engendered in this class of materials. Of particular relevance to the present work are the very recent first-principles calculations [22] showing that the undoped parent precursor material LaOFeAs is well described by the spin-1  $J_1$ - $J_2$  model on the square lattice with  $J_1 > 0$ ,  $J_2 > 0$ , and  $J_2/J_1 \approx 2$ .

Returning to our present system, we note that while the  $s = 1/2$  version of the  $J_1$ - $J'_1$ - $J_2$  model under discussion has been studied by various groups [17, 23–26], very few calculations have been performed on the  $s = 1$  case up till now. An exception is the two-step density-matrix

renormalisation group study of Moukouri [26, 27] that we discuss later in our concluding remarks. It has also been observed that quantum fluctuations can destabilize the ordered classical ground state (GS), even for values  $s > 1/2$ , for large enough values of the frustration [1, 28].

The model itself comprises a set of  $N \rightarrow \infty$  spin-1 particles on a spatially anisotropic square lattice interacting via isotropic Heisenberg couplings, but with three kinds of exchange bonds. Its Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = J_1 \sum_{i,l} \mathbf{s}_{i,l} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{i+1,l} + J'_1 \sum_{i,l} \mathbf{s}_{i,l} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{i,l+1} + J_2 \sum_{i,l} (\mathbf{s}_{i,l} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{i+1,l+1} + \mathbf{s}_{i+1,l} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{i,l+1}), \quad (1)$$

where the index  $(i, l)$  labels the  $x$  (row) and  $y$  (column) components of the lattice sites. The exchange constant  $J_1$  (which we henceforth set to 1) measures the intrachain bond strength along the row direction, while  $J'_1$  and  $J_2$  are the transverse (column) and diagonal interchain couplings respectively. The model retains the basic physics of the  $J_1$ - $J_2$  model (that is recovered when  $J'_1 = J_1$ ), and has two types of classical GS, namely, the Néel  $(\pi, \pi)$  state and stripe states (columnar stripe  $(\pi, 0)$  and row stripe  $(0, \pi)$ ). There is clearly a symmetry under the interchange of rows and columns,  $J_1 \rightleftharpoons J'_1$ , which implies that we need only consider the range of parameters with  $J'_1 < J_1$ . The (first-order) classical phase transition occurs at the point of maximal frustration,  $J'_1 = J_1/2$ ,  $\forall J_1 > J'_1$ .

The CCM (see, e.g., Refs. [29–31] and references cited therein) employed here is one of the most powerful and most versatile modern techniques in quantum many-body theory. It has been successfully applied to various quantum magnets (see Refs. [16, 31–35] and references cited therein). The CCM is particularly appropriate for studying frustrated systems, for which the main alternative methods are often only of limited usefulness. For example, quantum Monte Carlo techniques are particularly plagued by the sign problem for such systems, and the exact diagonalisation method is restricted in practice, particularly for  $s > 1/2$ , to such small lattices that it is often insensitive to the details of any subtle phase order present.

We now briefly describe the CCM means to solve the ground-state (gs) Schrödinger ket and bra equations,  $H|\Psi\rangle = E|\Psi\rangle$  and  $\langle\tilde{\Psi}|H = E\langle\tilde{\Psi}|$  respectively (and see Refs. [29–34] for further details). The first step in implementing the CCM is always to choose a model state  $|\Phi\rangle$  on top of which to incorporate later in a systematic fashion the multispin correlations contained in the exact ground states  $|\Psi\rangle$  and  $\langle\tilde{\Psi}|$ . More specifically, the CCM employs the exponential ansatz,  $|\Psi\rangle = e^S|\Phi\rangle$  and  $\langle\tilde{\Psi}| = \langle\Phi|\tilde{S}e^{-S}$ . The correlation operator  $S$  is expressed as  $S = \sum_{I \neq 0} S_I C_I^+$  and its counterpart is  $\tilde{S} = 1 + \sum_{I \neq 0} \tilde{S}_I C_I^-$ . The operators  $C_I^+ \equiv (C_I^-)^\dagger$ , with  $C_0^+ \equiv 1$ , have the property that  $\langle\Phi|C_I^+ = 0; \forall I \neq 0$ . They form a complete set of multispin creation operators with respect to the model state  $|\Phi\rangle$ . The ket- and bra-state correlation co-

efficients ( $\mathcal{S}_I, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_I$ ) are calculated by requiring the gs energy expectation value  $\bar{H} \equiv \langle \tilde{\Psi} | H | \Psi \rangle$  to be a minimum with respect to each of them. This immediately yields the coupled set of equations  $\langle \Phi | C_I^- e^{-S} H e^S | \Phi \rangle = 0$  and  $\langle \Phi | \tilde{S} (e^{-S} H e^S - E) C_I^+ | \Phi \rangle = 0; \forall I \neq 0$ , which we solve in practice for the correlation coefficients ( $\mathcal{S}_I, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_I$ ) within specific truncation schemes described below, by making use of parallel computing routines [36].

In order to treat each lattice site on an equal footing we perform a mathematical rotation of the local spin axes on each lattice site such that every spin of the model state aligns along its negative  $z$ -axis. Henceforth our description of the spins is given wholly in terms of these locally defined spin coordinate frames. In particular, the multispin creation operators may be written as  $C_I^+ \equiv s_{i_1}^+ s_{i_2}^+ \cdots s_{i_n}^+$ , in terms of the locally defined spin-raising operators  $s_i^+ \equiv s_i^x + s_i^y$  on lattice sites  $i$ . Having solved for the multispin cluster correlation coefficients ( $\mathcal{S}_I, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_I$ ) as described above, we may then calculate the gs energy  $E$  from the relation  $E = \langle \Phi | e^{-S} H e^S | \Phi \rangle$ , and the gs staggered magnetisation  $M$  from the relation  $M \equiv -\frac{1}{N} \langle \tilde{\Psi} | \sum_{i=1}^N s_i^z | \Psi \rangle$  which holds in the rotated spin coordinates.

Although the CCM formalism is clearly exact if a complete set of multispin configurations  $\{I\}$  with respect to the model state  $|\Phi\rangle$  is included in the calculation of the correlation operators  $S$  and  $\tilde{S}$ , in practice it is necessary to use systematic approximation schemes to truncate them to some finite subset. In our earlier paper on the  $s = 1/2$  version of the present model [17], we employed, as in our previous work [16, 31–34], the localised LSUB $n$  scheme in which all possible multi-spin-flip correlations over different locales on the lattice defined by  $n$  or fewer contiguous lattice sites are retained.

However, we note that the number of fundamental LSUB $n$  configurations for  $s = 1$  becomes appreciably higher than for  $s = 1/2$ , since each spin on each site  $i$  can now be flipped twice by the spin-raising operator  $s_i^+$ . Thus, for the  $s = 1$  model it is more practical, but equally systematic, to use the alternative SUB $n$ - $m$  scheme, in which all correlations involving up to  $n$  spin flips spanning a range of no more than  $m$  adjacent lattice sites are retained [31, 37]. We then set  $m = n$ , and hence employ the so-called SUB $n$ - $n$  scheme. More generally, the LSUB $m$  scheme is thus equivalent to the SUB $n$ - $m$  scheme for  $n = 2sm$  for particles of spin  $s$ . For  $s = 1/2$ , LSUB $n \equiv$  SUB $n$ - $n$ ; whereas for  $s = 1$ , LSUB $n \equiv$  SUB $2n$ - $n$ . The numbers of such fundamental configurations (viz., those that are distinct under the symmetries of the Hamiltonian and of the model state  $|\Phi\rangle$ ) that are retained for the Néel and stripe states of the current  $s = 1$  model at various SUB $n$ - $n$  levels are shown in Table 1.

Although we never need to perform any finite-size scaling, since all CCM approximations are automatically performed from the outset in the  $N \rightarrow \infty$  limit, we do need as a last step to extrapolate to the  $n \rightarrow \infty$  limit in the truncation index  $n$ . We use the same well-tested scaling

Table 1: Number of fundamental configurations (# f.c) for the SUB $n$ - $n$  ( $n = \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ ) scheme for the Néel and stripe columnar states, for the spin-1  $J_1$ - $J'_1$ - $J_2$  model.

Method	# f.c	
	Néel	stripe
SUB2-2	2	1
SUB4-4	28	21
SUB6-6	744	585
SUB8-8	35629	29411




Fig. 1: Extrapolated CCM SUB $n$ - $n$  results for the gs energy per spin,  $E/N$ , of the spin-1  $J_1$ - $J'_1$ - $J_2$  model (with  $J_1 = 1$ ), for  $J'_1 = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 1.0$ . The SUB $n$ - $n$  results are extrapolated in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$  using the set  $n = \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ .

laws as for the  $s = 1/2$  model for the gs energy per spin  $E/N$  and the gs staggered magnetisation  $M$ ,

$$E/N = a_0 + a_1 n^{-2} + a_2 n^{-4}, \quad (2)$$

$$M = b_0 + n^{-0.5} (b_1 + b_2 n^{-1}). \quad (3)$$

We report below on two separate sets of CCM calculations for this model, for given parameters ( $J_1 \equiv 1, J'_1, J_2$ ), based respectively on the Néel state and the stripe state as the model state  $|\Phi\rangle$ . In each case we have 4 calculated data points to fit the 3 unknown parameters in eqs. (2) and (3). Thus, we present below our final results  $a_0$  for  $E/N$  and  $b_0$  for  $M$ , from fitting to the above schemes with the SUB $n$ - $n$  solutions for  $n = \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$  as input. We note that for the corresponding  $s = 1/2$  model we could perform LSUB $n \equiv$  SUB $n$ - $n$  approximation calculations for  $n = \{2, 4, 6, 8, 10\}$ . This enabled us to perform extrapolations using the sets  $n = \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$  and  $n = \{2, 4, 6, 8, 10\}$  as well as the preferred set  $n = \{4, 6, 8, 10\}$ . Gratifyingly, all sets yielded very similar extrapolated results, even near phase boundaries and the quantum triple point, which gave us great confidence in the accuracy and robustness of our extrapolation scheme.

Figure 1 shows the gs energy per spin as a function of  $J_2$  for various values of  $J'_1$ , extrapolated from the raw CCM data as discussed above. The raw SUB $n$ - $n$  data terminate at some particular values. This occurs for the CCM curves based on both the Néel state and the stripe state as the model state  $|\Phi\rangle$ . Such a termination point arises due to the solutions of the CCM equations becoming complex at this point, beyond which there exist two branches of complex-conjugate solutions [31]. In the region where the solution reflecting the true physical situation is real, there actually also exists another real solution. However, only the (shown) upper branch of these two solutions reflects the true physical situation, whereas the lower branch does not. The physical branch is easily identified in practice as the one which becomes exact in some known (e.g., perturbative) limit. This physical branch then meets the corresponding unphysical branch at some termination point beyond which no real solutions exist. The termination points shown in fig. 1 are the extrapolated  $n \rightarrow \infty$  termination points and are evaluated using data only up to the highest level of the CCM approximation schemes used here, namely SUB8-8 for the  $s = 1$  model. The SUB $n$ - $n$  termination points are also reflections of phase transitions in the real system, as we discuss more fully below.

The maxima of the extrapolated gs energy curves are close to the corresponding classical transition points at  $J_2^c = 0.5J'_1$ . The extrapolated gs energy curves of the Néel and stripe states meet smoothly with the same slope for  $J'_1 \lesssim 0.66 \pm 0.03$ . This behaviour is indicative of a second-order phase transition. By contrast, for  $J'_1 \gtrsim 0.66 \pm 0.03$  the behaviour is typical of a first-order phase transition where the curves cross with a discontinuity in the slope. A comparison of fig. 1 for the present  $s = 1$  model with fig. 2 of Ref. [17] for the  $s = 1/2$  model clearly shows the distinct differences between the two cases. Thus, for the  $s = 1/2$  case each gs energy curve for the Néel state for values  $J'_1 \gtrsim 0.60$  terminates before it can reach the corresponding gs energy curve for the stripe state within the region that reflects the true physical situation (*viz.*, where the calculated staggered magnetisation is positive), indicating the opening up of an intermediate quantum phase between the Néel and stripe phases. By contrast, for the  $s = 1$  case, the gs energy curves of the Néel state for all values of  $J'_1$  cross or meet the gs energy curves of the stripe state within the same physical region described above.

Figure 2 shows our corresponding extrapolated results for the gs staggered magnetisation  $M$ . The quantum phase transition or critical point ( $M_{\Delta_c}$ ) marking the end of either the quantum Néel state or the quantum stripe state for a given value of  $J'_1$  is first determined by calculating the order parameter  $M$  to obtain the value of  $J_2$  where  $M$  vanishes. However, as seen in fig. 2, there also occur cases where the order parameters curves for the two states cross before their respective vanishing points. In such cases we take the crossing point to indicate the phase boundary between the quantum Néel and quantum stripe states. Thus, our definition of the quantum critical point




Fig. 2: Extrapolated CCM SUB $n$ - $n$  results for the gs staggered magnetisation,  $M$ , of the spin-1  $J_1$ - $J'_1$ - $J_2$  model (with  $J_1 = 1$ ), for  $J'_1 = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 1.0$ . The SUB $n$ - $n$  results are extrapolated in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$  using the set  $n = \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ .

is the point where there is an apparent first-order phase transition between the two states or where the order parameter vanishes, whichever occurs first. A fuller discussion of this former criterion and its relation to the stricter energy crossing criterion is given elsewhere [16].

We note particularly the result for this  $s = 1$  model that the order parameter  $M$  curves for both the quantum Néel and stripe phases with the same value of  $J'_1$  go to zero smoothly at the same point, for all values of  $J'_1 \lesssim 0.66 \pm 0.03$ . We emphasize that this cannot be accidental since it occurs for a large number of essentially independent calculations over a wide parameter range. We also take this as further strong evidence for the accuracy and robustness of our extrapolation scheme. Thus, in this regime we have behaviour typical of a second-order phase transition between the quantum Néel and stripe phases. Furthermore, the transition occurs at a value of  $J_2$  very close to the classical transition point at  $J_2^c = 0.5J'_1$ . Conversely, for values of  $J'_1 \gtrsim 0.66 \pm 0.03$ , the order parameters  $M$  of the two states meet at a finite value, as is typical of a first-order transition.

Figure 3 shows the zero-temperature phase diagram of the spin-1  $J_1$ - $J'_1$ - $J_2$  model on the square lattice, as obtained from our extrapolated results for both the gs energy and the gs order parameter  $M$ . Unlike the spin-1/2 case there is no sign at all of any intermediate disordered phase for any values of the parameters  $J'_1$  or  $J_2$  (for  $J_1 = 1$ ). Hence, in this respect it is just like the classical case. However, unlike the classical case, there now appears to be a quantum tricritical point (QTCP) at  $J'_1 \approx 0.66 \pm 0.03$ ,  $J_2 \approx 0.35 \pm 0.02$ , where a line of second-order phase transitions between the quasi-classical Néel and stripe-ordered phases (for  $J'_1 \lesssim 0.66$ ) meets a line of first-order phase transitions between the same two states (for  $J'_1 \gtrsim 0.66$ ). We note that the behaviour of both the order parameter (which goes to zero smoothly at the same point for both Néel and stripe phases below the QTCP, but which goes




Fig. 3: Extrapolated CCM SUB $n$ - $n$  results for the gs phase diagram of the spin-1  $J_1$ - $J_1'$ - $J_2$  model (with  $J_1 = 1$ ), showing a quantum tricritical point (QTCP). The SUB $n$ - $n$  results are extrapolated in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$  using the set  $n = \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ .

to a nonzero value above it) and of the gs energy curves for the two phases (which meet smoothly with the same slope below the QTCP, but which cross with a discontinuity in slope above it) tell exactly the same story, as observed in other similar cases [16].

Thus, there is no evidence from our work for an intermediate phase (for larger values of  $J_1'/J_1$ ) for the  $s = 1$  case, by contrast with the  $s = 1/2$  case from our own previous results [17] (from which we found an intermediate phase without magnetic LRO for  $J_1'/J_1 \gtrsim 0.60 \pm 0.03$ ) and those of other groups [24–26]. For the spin-1/2 case this intermediate magnetically disordered phase was shown by us [17] to exist for the pure  $J_1$ - $J_2$  model (i.e., with  $J_1' = J_1$ ) in the parameter range  $\alpha_c^1 < \alpha < \alpha_c^2$  for  $\alpha \equiv J_2/J_1$ , where  $\alpha_c^1 \approx 0.44 \pm 0.01$ ,  $\alpha_c^2 \approx 0.59 \pm 0.01$ , in full agreement with the accepted values. By contrast, for the  $s = 1$  model presented here we find instead a QTCP at  $J_1'/J_1 \approx 0.66 \pm 0.03$ ,  $J_2/J_1 \approx 0.35 \pm 0.02$ .

For the case of the isotropic  $J_1$ - $J_2$  model lowest-order (or linear) spin-wave theory (LSWT) [1] predicts that quantum fluctuations can destabilize the classical GS with LRO even at large values of the spin quantum number  $s$ , for values of  $\alpha \equiv J_2/J_1$  around 0.5. For the spin-1/2 case the range of values  $\alpha_c^1 < \alpha < \alpha_c^2$ , for which a magnetically-disordered phase occurs is predicted by LSWT to be given by  $\alpha_c^1 \approx 0.38$ ,  $\alpha_c^2 \approx 0.52$ . For the corresponding spin-1 case LSWT predicts a much narrower, but still non-vanishing, strip of disordered intermediate phase with  $\alpha_c^1 \approx 0.47$ ,  $\alpha_c^2 \approx 0.501$ . However, in an important paper, Igarashi [38] has shown explicitly for the spin-1 case, by going to higher-order terms in the  $1/s$  power expansion of spin-wave theory (SWT), that no predictions based on LSWT (or SWT more generally) can be relied upon for values  $J_2/J_1 \gtrsim 0.4$  since the series seems to diverge in this region, with second-order terms becoming exceptionally

large. Igarashi also showed that the higher-order correction terms to LSWT act to make the Néel-ordered phase more stable than LSWT would predict. We note too that Read and Sachdev [39], using a large- $N$  expansion technique based on symplectic  $\text{Sp}(N)$  symmetry, which can itself be regarded as akin to a  $1/s$  expansion, have also found for the isotropic  $J_1$ - $J_2$  model an intermediate phase (with valence-bond solid order) for smaller values of  $s$ , which disappears for larger values of  $s$  where they find instead a first-order transition between the Néel and stripe phases. All of these results for the pure  $J_1$ - $J_2$  model are in accord with ours.

Naturally, one can also validly argue that what we have observed as a continuous (second-order) transition below the QTCP (i.e., for  $J_1'/J_1 \lesssim 0.66$ ) might actually be a very weak first-order transition, which would thereby still comply with the Landau symmetry criterion of the standard Ginzburg-Landau theory of phase transitions and critical phenomena. Our completely independent sets of CCM calculations based on the two quasi-classical phases can never entirely exclude this possibility. However, our results from figs. 1 and 2 show clearly that the data below the QTCP are really only consistent with a transition which, if it is not second-order is at best very weakly first-order for all values of  $J_1'/J_1$  below the QTCP. In this context it is relevant to mention again that it has also been argued by others [12] that for the equivalent spin-1/2 model the phase transition between the Néel state and the intermediate paramagnetic state (which has been argued by those authors to be a valence-bond solid state) is also second-order and hence not described by standard Ginzburg-Landau critical theory. Again, for the spin-1/2 pure  $J_1$ - $J_2$  model the standard view is that the quantum phase transition between the striped and magnetically disordered intermediate phases is first-order, and there is no discussion in the literature of deconfined quantum criticality for this transition. One might argue, on similar grounds, that for our  $s = 1$  model a first-order transition for the stripe phase might be more likely than for the Néel phase. We stress again, however, that our own results do indicate a direct second-order transition between these two phases below the QTCP.

In a similar vein one might wonder too whether for the present spin-1  $J_1$ - $J_1'$ - $J_2$  model there might exist a narrow strip of some intermediate phase, which could perhaps also act to reconcile our results with standard Ginzburg-Landau theory. Again, such a possibility cannot be ruled out with complete certainty by any numerical calculation such as ours. However, we have shown that our own extrapolation schemes are sufficiently robust and show sufficient internal consistency to rule out any but a very narrow strip of an intermediate phase for  $0 < J_1'/J_1 \lesssim 0.66$ . We estimate that the width of such a strip cannot exceed by more than a factor of three or so that shown in fig. 3 from the data used in the present extrapolation. However, we note that in the limiting case of the spin-1 1D chain (where  $J_1' \rightarrow 0$ ,  $J_2 \rightarrow 0$ ) the actual GS is the

Haldane gapped state [20]. Presumably this state should persist for small enough perturbations corresponding to small nonzero values of  $J'_1$  and  $J_2$ . The only other numerical study of the spin-1  $J_1$ - $J'_1$ - $J_2$  model of which we are aware [26, 27] focused particular attention on this regime, and did indeed observe the continuation of the Haldane phase in a narrow strip in this regime. Our own results are not inconsistent with these observations, but our interest here lies more in the case of stronger interchain couplings where  $J'_1/J_1$  and  $J_2/J_1$  are not confined to be small. However, we note that other CCM calculations aimed specifically at this regime do, indeed, detect the Haldane gap. Thus, Zinke *et al.* [35] investigate the magnetic LRO of weakly coupled (quasi-1D) Heisenberg antiferromagnetic chains for both the spin-1/2 and spin-1 cases, using the CCM to calculate the staggered magnetisation and its dependence on the interchain coupling strength ( $J_\perp$ ). They find that for the  $s = 1/2$  case an infinitesimally small  $J_\perp$  suffices to stabilize magnetic LRO, whereas for the  $s = 1$  case a nonzero (albeit small)  $J_\perp$  is needed to establish LRO, in agreement with the results from other methods.

Finally, in reaching our conclusions we have relied on two of the unique strengths of the CCM, namely its ability to deal with highly frustrated systems as easily as unfrustrated ones, and its use from the outset of infinite lattices. There is no doubt that the many-body system studied here is highly non-trivial, and one cannot perhaps expect any single analysis or method to solve it completely. However, we present for the first time new and interesting results using a method for which much previous work has shown its ability to describe quantum phase transitions reliably.

## REFERENCES

- [1] CHANDRA P. and DOUCOT B., *Phys. Rev. B*, **38** (1988) 9335.
- [2] DAGOTTO E. and MOREO A., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **63** (1989) 2148.
- [3] RICHTER J., *Phys. Rev. B*, **47** (1993) 5794; RICHTER J., IVANOV N. B., and RETZLAFF K., *Europhys. Lett.*, **25** (1994) 545.
- [4] SCHULZ H. J. and ZIMAN T. A. L., *Europhys. Lett.*, **18** (1992) 355; SCHULZ H. J., ZIMAN T. A. L. and POILBLANC D., *J. Phys. I*, **6** (1996) 675.
- [5] BISHOP R. F., FARNELL D. J. J. and PARKINSON J. B., *Phys. Rev. B*, **58** (1998) 6394.
- [6] CAPRIOTTI L., BECCA F., PAROLA A. and SORELLA S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **87** (2001) 097201
- [7] SIURAKSHINA L., IHLE D. and HAYN R., *Phys. Rev. B*, **64** (2001) 104406.
- [8] SINGH R. R. P., WEIHONG Z., OITMAA J., SUSHKOV O. P. and HAMER C. J., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **91**, (2003) 017201.
- [9] LEVI B G, *Phys. Today*, **60(2)** (2007) 16.
- [10] MELZI R., CARRETTA P., LASCIALFARI A., MAMBRINI M., TROYER M., MILLET P. and MILA F., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **85** (2000) 1318.
- [11] CARRETTA P., PAPINUTTO N., AZZONI C. B., MOZZATI M. C., PAVARINI E., GONTHIER S. and MILLET P., *Phys. Rev. B*, **66** (2002) 094420.
- [12] SENTHIL T., VISHWANATH A., BALENTS L., SACHDEV S. and FISHER M. P. A., *Science*, **303** (2004) 1490; SENTHIL T., BALENTS L., SACHDEV S., VISHWANATH A. and FISHER M. P. A., *Phys. Rev. B*, **70** (2004) 144407.
- [13] SIRKER J., WEIHONG Z., SUSHKOV O. P. and OITMAA J., *Phys. Rev. B*, **73** (2006) 184420.
- [14] ROSCILDE T., FEIGUIN A., CHERNYSHEV A.L., LIU S. and HAAS S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **93** (2004) 017203.
- [15] VIANA J. R. and DE SOUSA J. R., *Phys. Rev. B*, **75** (2007) 052403.
- [16] SCHMALFUSZ D., DARRADI R., RICHTER J., SCHULENBURG J. and IHLE D., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **97** (2006) 157201.
- [17] BISHOP R. F., LI P. H. Y., DARRADI R. and RICHTER J., *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, **20** (2008) 255251.
- [18] DARRADI R., RICHTER J. and KRÜGER S. E., *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, **16** (2004) 2681.
- [19] DARRADI R., RICHTER J., and FARNELL D. J. J., *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, **17** (2005) 341.
- [20] HALDANE F. D. M., *Phys. Lett. A*, **93** (1983) 464; *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **50** (1983) 1153.
- [21] KAMIHARA Y., WATANABE T., HIRANO M. and HOSONO H., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **130** (2008) 3296.
- [22] MA F., LU Z.-Y. and XIANG T., arXiv:0804.3370v2 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci].
- [23] NERSESYAN A. A. and TSVELIK A. M., *Phys. Rev. B*, **67** (2003) 024422.
- [24] SINDZINGRE P., *Phys. Rev. B*, **69** (2004) 094418.
- [25] STARYKH O. A. and BALENTS L., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **93** (2004) 127202.
- [26] MOUKOURI S., *J. Stat. Mech.*, P02002 (2006).
- [27] MOUKOURI S., *Phys. Lett. A*, **352** (2006) 256.
- [28] KRÜGER F. and SCHEIDL S., *Europhys. Lett.*, **74** (2006) 896.
- [29] BISHOP R. F., *Theor. Chim. Acta*, **80** (1991) 95.
- [30] BISHOP R. F., in *Microscopic Quantum Many-Body Theories and Their Applications*, edited by NAVARRO J. and POLLS A., Vol. **510** of *Lecture Notes in Physics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin) 1998, p.1.
- [31] FARNELL D. J. J. and BISHOP R. F., in *Quantum Magnetism*, edited by SCHOLLWÖCK U., RICHTER J., FARNELL D. J. J. and BISHOP R. F., Vol. **645** of *Lecture Notes in Physics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin) 2004, p.307.
- [32] ZENG C., FARNELL D. J. J. and BISHOP R. F., *J. Stat. Phys.*, **90** (1998) 327.
- [33] FARNELL D. J. J., BISHOP R. F. and GERNOTH K. A., *J. Stat. Phys.*, **108** (2002) 401.
- [34] KRÜGER S. E., RICHTER J., SCHULENBURG J., FARNELL D. J. J. and BISHOP R. F., *Phys. Rev. B*, **61** (2000) 14607.
- [35] ZINKE R., SCHULENBURG J. and RICHTER J., *Eur. Phys. J. B*, **61** (2008) 147.
- [36] We use the program package CCCM of FARNELL D. J. J. and SCHULENBURG J., see <http://www-e.uni-magdeburg.de/jschulen/ccm/index.html>.
- [37] FARNELL D. J. J., GERNOTH K. A. and BISHOP R. F., *Phys. Rev. B*, **64** (2001) 172409.
- [38] IGARASHI J., *J. Phys. Soc. Japan*, **62** (1993) 4449.
- [39] READ N. and SACHDEV S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **66** (1991) 1773.