

## Phase diagram of the Kitaev-Heisenberg model using various finite-size clusters

Masahiro Kadosawa<sup>1\*</sup>, Masaaki Nakamura<sup>2</sup>, Yukinori Ohta<sup>1</sup>, and Satoshi Nishimoto<sup>3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Chiba University, Chiba 263-8522, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, Ehime University, Ehime 790-8577, Japan

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics, Technical University Dresden, 01069 Dresden, Germany

<sup>4</sup>Institute for Theoretical Solid State Physics, IFW Dresden, 01171 Dresden, Germany


We estimate phase boundaries of four ordered and two spin-liquid phases for the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  Kitaev-Heisenberg (KH) model using four kinds of relatively-small clusters, based on the second derivative of ground-state energy. The estimated values are compared between the clusters as well as the previous iPEPS results. We thus find that the boundaries can be accurately estimated within limited-size clusters. The used clusters may appropriate to study higher- $S$  KH models having less fluctuations.

The Kitaev model<sup>1)</sup> consists of Ising bond-direction dependent interactions on a honeycomb lattice. The ground state is exactly known to be a quantum spin liquid, the so-called ‘‘Kitaev spin liquid (KSL)’’. Since the microscopic origin of such Kitaev-type interactions in the  $d^5$  transition metal compounds with a strong spin-orbit coupling was worked out,<sup>2)</sup> there has been a growing number of researches on the Kitaev materials.<sup>3)</sup> Nonetheless, a more realistic spin model to describe the magnetic properties of real materials is the Kitaev-Heisenberg (KH) model that accounts for the residual Heisenberg-type couplings, although further neighbor interactions and/or off-diagonal  $\Gamma$  interactions may play important roles in some materials. Initially, an exact-diagonalization study using 24-site periodic cluster (24PBC) claimed that the ground-state phase diagram of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  KH model is composed of four magnetically ordered phases, namely Néel, zigzag, ferromagnetic, and stripy as well as two KSL phases, depending on the ratio between Kitaev and Heisenberg interactions.<sup>4)</sup> A small size-dependence of their critical points has been also confirmed by large-scale simulations.<sup>5,6)</sup> In recent years, researches on higher- $S$  Kitaev materials are increasing to seek for new physics. However, when we study the corresponding spin models numerically, the cluster size would be strongly limited. Thus, it is useful to verify how accurately the phase boundaries are evaluated with limited-size clusters for the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  KH model where quantum fluctuations are largest.

In this short note, we estimate the phase boundaries with four kinds of finite-size clusters using exact diagonalization and density-matrix renormalization group (DMRG) methods. By comparing them with referring to the previous iPEPS results,<sup>6)</sup> we suggest a few clusters suitable for study of the higher- $S$  KH models. The Hamiltonian of the KH model reads as

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \gamma} 2K^\gamma S_i^\gamma S_j^\gamma + J \sum_{\langle i, j \rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \quad (1)$$

where  $K^\gamma$  is the Kitaev interaction of nearest neighbor spins




**Fig. 1.** (a) 2D honeycomb lattice with  $L = 3$ , where the region framed by black line is the original cluster. (b) 1D representation of (a) using SBC. An open chain is created by cutting  $L + 1$  bonds between two sites (dotted line). (c) Spatially-isotropic hexagonal-shaped 24-site cluster. The periodic and open clusters are denoted as 24PBC and 24OBC, respectively. (d) 1D representation of magnetically ordered states for the KH model.

on three different bonds  $\gamma = x, y, z$  and  $J_{ij}$  is the nearest-neighbor Heisenberg interaction. Assuming  $K^x = K^y = K^z = K$ , we parameterize the interactions as  $K = \sin \varphi$  and  $J = \cos \varphi$  ( $\sqrt{K^2 + J^2} = 1$  is the energy unit). The ground state is controlled by  $\varphi$ . The critical values are estimated from the peak positions in the second derivative of the ground-state energy  $E$  as a function of  $\varphi$ , i.e.,  $-\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial \varphi^2}$ .

Four kinds of clusters are employed here. First, the results for 24PBC cluster [Fig. 1(c)] are used as reference data. The second is 24-site cluster with open boundary conditions (24OBC), which is a hexagonal-shaped cluster as 24PBC but outer sites are not connected to those in the opposite side. Ideally, it is deemed desirable to use a spatially-isotropic cluster. To cite a case, if a spatially-anisotropic cluster is used, the estimation of critical points could be biased due to the lift of three-fold degeneracy in the zigzag and stripy states.<sup>8)</sup> Also, it is not easy to set up such a cluster consistent with all the ordered states. Regarding this point, the 24PBC and 24OBC clusters are preferable.

Nevertheless, when we need to use a spatially-anisotropic cluster, it would be good to apply spiral boundary conditions (SBC). The SBC enable us to flexibly control the periodicity of cluster.<sup>7)</sup> As illustrated in Fig. 1(a,b) a 2D honeycomb lattice with  $L \times L$  unit cells can be mapped onto a periodic chain with nearest- and  $(2L - 1)$ th-neighbor couplings by ap-

\*afna1728@chiba-u.jp



**Fig. 2.** Ground-state energy and its second derivative as a function of  $\varphi$ , where the phase boundaries are indicated by peaks in the second derivative. The state of each period is denoted on the top.

plying SBC. We note that the SBC-projected chain can be also represented as a cylinder where finite-size effects due to the short circumference are minimized.<sup>9)</sup> We now employ an SBC-projected 32-site chain ( $L = 4$ ), which is consistent with all the magnetically ordered states seen in the KH model. The structural unit cell of the mapped 1D chain contains two spins as in the original 2D lattice. The 1D representations of magnetic structures of Néel, zigzag, and stripy states are illustrated in Fig. 1(d). The Néel state possesses a staggered arrangement of spins. From a topological point of view, it is interesting that both of the zigzag and stripy states have a two-site periodicity but their phases are different just by one site. In the Kitaev limits  $\varphi = \frac{\pi}{2}$  and  $\varphi = \frac{3}{2}\pi$ , the KSL feature can be reproduced. Namely, the spin-spin correlations are finite only between Ising-coupled spins and zero for the others. We study periodic (32SBC-P) and open (32SBC-O) chains.

In Fig. 2 the ground-state energy and its second derivative are plotted as a function of  $\varphi$ . For all of the four clusters, we find that the energy behaves similarly and six peaks appear at similar positions in the second derivative. [For 32SBC-O cluster, an additional peak appears at  $\varphi = \pi$  (explained below).] We can thus identify four ordered and two KSL phases. It is worth noting that the second-derivative peaks indicating the boundaries between FM KSL and its neighboring phases are even more obvious in the use of SBC clusters.

The estimated critical  $\varphi$  values for each of the clusters

**Table I.** Phase boundaries for the KH model, parameterized by the angle  $\varphi$  (in units of  $\pi$ ), using various clusters. The iPEPS results<sup>6)</sup> are also shown.

| boundary    | 24PBC | 24OBC | 32SBC-P | 32SBC-O | iPEPS |
|-------------|-------|-------|---------|---------|-------|
| Néel/KSL    | 0.489 | 0.487 | 0.486   | 0.491   | 0.489 |
| KSL/zigzag  | 0.511 | 0.513 | 0.516   | 0.510   | 0.511 |
| zigzag/FM   | 0.913 | 0.898 | 0.896   | 0.889   | 0.894 |
| FM/KSL      | 1.407 | 1.399 | 1.410   | 1.449   | 1.433 |
| KSL/stripy  | 1.577 | 1.577 | 1.570   | 1.552   | 1.556 |
| stripy/Néel | 1.802 | 1.812 | 1.812   | 1.805   | 1.817 |

are summarized in Table I. For comparison, the results obtained by iPEPS<sup>6)</sup> are also listed. Overall, the critical values for 24OBC and 32SBC-P clusters agree to those for 24PBC cluster very well. A largest deviation is found in the zigzag and FM boundary;  $\varphi_{\text{zigzag-FM}} = 0.913\pi$  for 24PBC cluster and  $\varphi_{\text{zigzag-FM}} = 0.896\pi$  for 32SBC-P cluster, which corresponds to an error of  $\sim 17\%$  in  $K/J$ . However, this  $\varphi_{\text{zigzag-FM}}$  value for 32SBC-P is rather closer to that obtained by iPEPS, i.e.,  $\varphi_{\text{zigzag-FM}} = 0.894\pi$ . Possibly, since 24OBC and 32SBC-P clusters do not have short periodic loops of bonds, their finite-size effects may be smaller than those of 24PBC in some cases. The critical values for 32SBC-O cluster are also in good agreement with those for 24PBC cluster. However, the region of FM KSL seems to be a little underestimated. This is because a spin-rotation anisotropy is induced by cutting 1  $x$ -bond (or  $y$ -bond) and 4  $z$ -bonds when OBC is applied [see Fig. 1(b)]. This effect is also revealed as a second-derivative peak at  $\varphi = \pi$ , where the polarization direction changes between  $xy$ -plane and  $z$ -axis.

In summary, we examined the quantitiveness of six critical values for the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  KH model using four kinds of clusters. We confirmed that the phase boundaries of commensurate orders and KSL can be accurately estimated even within limited-size clusters, based on the second derivative of ground-state energy. Since a certain level of accuracy for the energy is required to perform this analysis, cluster size may be strongly limited when a larger- $S$  KH model is studied by DMRG. Practically, either 24OBC or 32SBC-P clusters would be a good choice for that purpose.

**Acknowledgment** We thank Ulrike Nitzsche for technical support. This work was supported by the SFB 1143 of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research from JSPS (Projects No. JP20H01849, No. JP20K03769, and No. JP21J20604). M. K. acknowledges support from the JSPS Research Fellowship for Young Scientists.

- 1) A. Kitaev, Ann. Phys. **321**, 2 (2006).
- 2) G. Jackeli and G. Khaliullin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 017205 (2009).
- 3) S. Trebst and C. Hickey, Phys. Rep. **950**, 1 (2022).
- 4) J. Chaloupka, G. Jackeli, and G. Khaliullin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 027204 (2010).
- 5) H.-C. Jiang, Z.-C. Gu, X.-L. Qi, and S. Trebst, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 245104 (2011).
- 6) J.O. Iregui, P. Corboz, and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 195102 (2014).
- 7) M. Kadosawa, M. Nakamura, Y. Ohta, and S. Nishimoto, Phys. Rev. B **107**, L081104 (2023).
- 8) R. Yadav, S. Reja, R. Ray, J. van den Brink, S. Nishimoto, and O.V. Yazyev, Phys. Rev. Research **4**, 033025 (2022).
- 9) M. Nakamura, S. Masuda, and S. Nishimoto, Phys. Rev. B **104**, L121114 (2021).