

Geometrical frustration and incommensurate magnetic order in Na_3RuO_4 with two triangular motifs

Vera P. Bader,^{1,*} Clemens Ritter,² Elias Papke,¹ Philipp Gegenwart,¹ and Alexander A. Tsirlin^{1,3,†}

¹*Experimental Physics VI, Center for Electronic Correlations and Magnetism,
University of Augsburg, 86159 Augsburg, Germany*

²*Institut Laue-Langevin, 38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France*

³*Felix Bloch Institute for Solid-State Physics, University of Leipzig, 04103 Leipzig, Germany*

(Dated: August 10, 2023)

Incommensurate magnetic order in the spin-3/2 antiferromagnet Na_3RuO_4 is uncovered by neutron diffraction combined with *ab initio* calculations. The crystal structure of Na_3RuO_4 contains two triangular motifs on different length scales. The magnetic Ru^{5+} ions form a lozenge (diamond) configuration, with tetramers composed of two isosceles triangles. These tetramers are further arranged in layers, such that an effective triangular lattice is formed. The tetramers are nearly antiferromagnetic but frustration between them leads to an incommensurately modulated magnetic structure described by the propagation vector $\vec{k} = (0.242(1), 0, 0.313(1))$. We show that the long-range Ru–O–O–Ru couplings between the tetramers play a major role in Na_3RuO_4 and suggest an effective description in terms of the spatially anisotropic triangular lattice if the tetramers are treated as single sites.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ru^{4+} compounds show a plethora of interesting properties like superconductivity in Sr_2RuO_4 [2], ferromagnetism in SrRuO_3 [3], Pauli paramagnetism in BaRuO_3 [4], and the $J = 0$ electronic state that may serve as a platform for excitonic magnetism [5]. Other oxidation states of Ru can be peculiar too. Strong electronic correlations render Ru^{4+} -based $\text{Pr}_2\text{Ru}_2\text{O}_7$ an antiferromagnetic Mott insulator, whereas Ru^{5+} -based $\text{Ca}_2\text{Ru}_2\text{O}_7$ is a paramagnetic metal [6]. Ruthenium compounds are also instrumental in studying quantum and frustrated magnets with different values of the local spin [7–13].

In the present case, we concentrate on a Ru^{5+} ($4d^3$) system in which the magnetic atoms carry a spin of $S = 3/2$ with the quenched orbital moment. The layered Ru^{5+} compound Na_3RuO_4 hosts a number of different actors, including frustration, low-dimensionality, and Ru–O covalency. Na_3RuO_4 first synthesized by Darriet *et al.* [14] crystallizes in the space group $C2/m$ (no. 12), which was later confirmed through powder neutron diffraction [15]. The structure is illustrated in Fig. 1. The Ru^{5+}O_6 octahedra form tetramers that are composed of two isosceles Ru triangles. The tetramers themselves are arranged on a second triangular lattice and form layers, which are stacked along the crystallographic c axis. The triangular geometry, the simplest motif for geometrical frustration, is thus found on two different length scales of the crystal lattice.

The tetramers in the planes and the tetramers in adjacent layers are separated by Na. At first glance, the large spatial separation between the tetramers suggests that they should be almost decoupled. This scenario was put forward by Drillon *et al.* [16] who was able to describe magnetic susceptibility data using only two isotropic intratetramer exchange couplings. At low temperatures, the individual tetramers should approach their

singlet ground state without long-range magnetic order. Later, however, Mössbauer spectroscopy [17] and neutron diffraction [15, 18] detected the formation of magnetic order in Na_3RuO_4 below 28 – 30 K with the concomitant magnetic excitations that were observed in inelastic neutron scattering and attributed to acoustic and optical spin waves. Their damping with temperature indicates an intertetramer coupling [18]. Additionally, heat capacity data revealed two successive phase transitions at 25 and 28 K, respectively [18]. These transitions either do not appear or could not be resolved in the previous magnetization data that showed one transition only [15, 18].

The nature of the ordered state in Na_3RuO_4 remains unknown. It was shown over time that the tetramers are not decoupled, but how exactly does the magnetic structure look like, and what is the nature of intertetramer couplings? In this work, we seek to address these questions. Using powder neutron diffraction (NPD) and *ab initio* calculations, we determine the magnetic structure of Na_3RuO_4 and underlying exchange couplings. We uncover the incommensurate nature of the magnetic order and show how this incommensurability arises from the two length scales of the magnetic frustration. Triangular structural motifs play crucial role in stabilizing the incommensurate order and prevail over the intuitively anticipated tetramer physics.

II. METHODS

Powder samples of Na_3RuO_4 were synthesized similar to the procedure described in Ref. [15]. NaOH and pre-dried RuO_2 (2 h at 700 °C) were mixed in a molar ratio 3.1:1 and ground in an Ar glovebox. Here, a small excess of NaOH was used to avoid RuO_2 impurities, which are difficult to remove afterwards. The resulting powder was filled in an alumina combustion boat and placed in a hor-




FIG. 1. Crystal structure of Na_3RuO_4 at 300 K. (a) View along the b axis. The magnetic layers containing ruthenium are separated by non-magnetic sodium layers. (b) View along the c axis. The RuO_6 octahedra form tetramers, which are composed of two isosceles triangles (drawn in green). The tetramers themselves are arranged on a triangular lattice (shown by the black dotted lines). Na and O were omitted for clarity. The structures were drawn with VESTA [1].

horizontal tube furnace. The sample was heated to 500°C in 2 h in an O_2 flow (20 sccm) and kept at this temperature for 18 h. After an intermediate grinding step, the sample was again loaded into the tube furnace. The second annealing was done in the mixed Ar and O_2 flow (3:1, 20 sccm) with the heating to 650°C in 2 h and the subsequent dwelling time of 18 h. The resulting black powder was again ground in the glovebox.

All experiments were done on powder samples. Sample quality was checked by powder x-ray diffraction (PXRD) performed in Bragg-Brentano geometry with $\text{CuK}\alpha$ radiation using the diffractometer EMPYREAN from Panalytical. No impurity phases were detected. For heat capacity measurements a pellet was pressed and tempered. The tempering was conducted in the same atmosphere as used in the second annealing step. The sample was heated to 650°C in two days, kept at this temperature for three days, and slowly cooled to room temperature in three days. For neutron diffraction measurements the tempered powder from seven different batches with the total mass of 3.45 g was ground together in an Ar glovebox. Because the compound is hygroscopic, the sample was loaded into a vanadium container and sealed inside the glovebox.

For VSM magnetization measurements in the MPMS3 from Quantum Design, a 7.34 mg powder sample was filled into a plastic capsule mounted on a brass sample holder. The magnetization was measured at 1, 3, and 7 T in the temperature window between 2 and 300 K. The field-dependent magnetization was measured in the field window between 0 and 7 T for different temperatures.

The heat capacity was measured in the PPMS from Quantum Design with the relaxation method. Before the measurement, the addenda of the platform and low-

temperature grease was measured in zero magnetic field and at 7 T. A 5.41 mg piece of the tempered pellet was then measured in 0 and 7 T between 2 and 50 K.

NPD data were collected on the high-resolution diffractometer D2B and on the high-intensity diffractometer D20 of the ILL (Grenoble, France) with the wavelengths 1.594 \AA and 2.415 \AA , respectively. The D2B measurements were performed at several temperatures between 1.5 and 300 K to detect possible structural changes, whereas the D20 measurements were performed in order to reveal a larger number of magnetic reflections. Crystal and magnetic structures of Na_3RuO_4 were refined in Jana2006 [19] and FullProf [20], respectively.

Ab initio band-structure calculations were performed in the framework of density functional theory (DFT) with the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof type of the exchange-correlation potential [21]. The magnetic structure of Na_3RuO_4 was modeled using an effective spin Hamiltonian,

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_j \quad (1)$$

where the summation is over bonds $\langle ij \rangle$ and $S = \frac{3}{2}$. Exchange couplings J_{ij} were evaluated by a mapping procedure [22, 23]. Total energies for different spin configurations were obtained on the relativistic DFT+ U +SO level in VASP [24, 25] with the mean-field correction for the correlation effects in the Ru 4d shell using the on-site Coulomb repulsion $U_d = 3 \text{ eV}$ and Hund's coupling $J_d = 0.5 \text{ eV}$ [26, 27].




FIG. 2. Thermodynamic properties of Na_3RuO_4 . (a) Heat capacity data in zero field and at 7 T. Two successive phase transitions at 26 K and 29 K are visible. The lower-temperature transition is also visible in Fisher's heat capacity, $d(\chi T)/dT$, indicated in gray. (b) Temperature dependent magnetic susceptibility data for three different fields. An antiferromagnetic phase transition is observed at around 30 K. The high temperature data are described accurately by the Curie-Weiss fit shown in magenta. The inset shows linear field dependence of the magnetization at several temperatures.




FIG. 3. Structural refinement with the Rietveld method for the NPD data collected at 300 K.

III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Thermodynamic Measurements

The temperature-dependent heat capacity between 2 K and 50 K in zero magnetic field and at 7 T is shown in Fig. 2(a). Clearly visible are two adjacent phase transitions at 26 K and 29 K. The transitions are field independent up to at least 7 T. Our findings agree well with the

data from Ref. [18]. We want to mention that in Ref. [28] the same double peak of the heat capacity was observed too, but assigned to Na_2RuO_3 . Here we join the opinion of Veiga *et al.* that the data were miscategorized [29]. Na_3RuO_4 forms easily as side product if traces of oxygen are present during the synthesis.

Both transitions are visible in the magnetic susceptibility as well. While the upper one appears as a maximum in $\chi(T)$ with the Néel temperature $T_N \approx 30$ K [see Fig. 2(b)], the lower one is seen as a maximum in Fisher's heat capacity, $d(\chi T)/dT$ [see Fig. 2(a)], corresponding to the inflection point of the magnetic susceptibility [30]. The Curie-Weiss fit, $\chi = \chi_0 + C/(T - \theta)$, in the temperature range of 150 to 300 K describes the data accurately and returns the Curie-Weiss temperature θ of $-161.5(5)$ K for the data collected at 1 T and an effective moment of $4.07(2) \mu_B$, which is close to the spin-only value $3.87 \mu_B$ expected for a $S = 3/2$ ion. The fit parameters for the data at higher fields differ by less than 2%. To account for the diamagnetic contribution from the sample $\chi_{\text{dia}} \approx -9 \cdot 10^{-5}$ emu/mol (Pascal's constants taken from Ref. [31] and assuming similar constants for the different oxidation states of Ru) and the sample holder, a temperature independent constant χ_0 was added to the Curie-Weiss fit ($\chi_0 = 4.97(8) \cdot 10^{-4}$ emu/mol).

The ratio $\theta/T_N \approx 5.4$ indicates a suppression of the magnetic order and may be a fingerprint of the underlying magnetic frustration, although a weak coupling between the tetramers could lead to the reduction of T_N as well. We will discuss this further while analyzing the magnetic structure. The magnetization versus field, intertwined with the magnetization versus temperature, is




FIG. 4. NPD data collected at the high-resolution instrument D2B. (a) NPD pattern at low angles for the temperatures of 1.5, 27, and 40 K. Magnetic peaks visible at 1.5 K and partly at 27 K are marked with arrows. The nuclear peak positions are marked with ticks. The inset shows the data at high angles. No structural phase transition is observed. (b) Temperature-dependent lattice parameters scaled to their values at 300 K. The error bars are smaller than the symbol size. The lines are guides for the eye.

shown in the inset of Fig. 2(b). Due to the antiferromagnetic nature of the transition, the slope of the $M(H)$ curves first increases with increasing temperature from 2 to 30 K and decreases after the compound enters the paramagnetic regime.

B. Neutron Diffraction

1. Crystal Structure

The lattice parameters obtained from the Rietveld refinement with the space group $C2/m$ (no. 12) using the NPD data collected at 300 K (Fig. 3) are $a = 11.0280(3)$ Å, $b = 12.8141(3)$ Å, $c = 5.7047(2)$ Å, and $\beta = 109.906(2)^\circ$ in a perfect agreement with Ref. [15]. We also find the same atomic positions as in the previous studies [32].

The data obtained at the high-resolution instrument D2B at low temperatures are shown in Fig. 4. Neutron diffraction data were collected above the transition temperatures at 40 K, in the transition region at 27 K, and at the base temperature of 1.5 K. At 1.5 K, in the magnetically ordered state, no additional peaks and no peak splitting are visible in the data at high angles and hence any changes in the structural symmetry can be ruled out [see the inset in Fig. 4(a)]. We can thus exclude a structural phase transition within the resolution of our measurement and suggest that both transitions must have predominantly magnetic character. Indeed, temperature-dependent lattice parameters given in Fig. 4(b) do not show any significant anomalies but de-

cline monotonically with decreasing temperature. Only the a parameter shows a slight upturn below 50 K, indicative of the weak magnetoelastic coupling, which is typical for transition-metal compounds [33, 34]. Already in this setup magnetic Bragg peaks are visible. They are indicated by arrows in Fig. 4(a). One magnetic peak at 15.5° develops at 27 K. At the lowest temperature four peaks are perceptible.

2. Magnetic Structure

To further explore the magnetic structure, we use the data collected at the high-intensity instrument D20. The thermo-diffractogram showing the magnetic contribution after subtracting the nuclear background from the data is pictured in Fig. 5. Upon cooling, magnetic Bragg peaks start to appear at 29 K, which fits perfectly to the upper phase transitions observed in the heat capacity data. At around 26 K, a second set of magnetic peaks emerges and parallels the second phase transition in the heat capacity data. Upon further cooling no other peaks appear but the magnetic peaks shift in position. This already indicates an incommensurately modulated magnetic structure.

To capture the magnetic structure quantitatively, measurements at fixed temperatures were recorded and will be analyzed next. Fig. 6(a) shows in black the pattern collected at 1.5 K after the nuclear background was subtracted. To determine the propagation vector $\vec{k} = (k_x, k_y, k_z)$, the procedure was as follows. The lattice parameters as determined from the refinement for the high-resolution D2B data taken at 40 K were fixed for the




FIG. 5. NPD data collected at the high-intensity instrument D20 while ramping the temperature. Only the magnetic contribution is shown. The paramagnetic data at 40 K were used to subtract the nuclear contribution.

refinement for the 40 K data from D20, which allowed to determine precisely the wavelength and zero shift. The zero-shift corrected positions of the magnetic peaks visible in the 1.5 K data were used to determine the possible propagation vectors with help of the program **k-SEARCH**, which is part of the **FullProf** suite of programs. LeBail refinements for the difference data 1.5 K – 40 K that contain only the magnetic scattering were then done using the different propagation vectors found by **k-SEARCH**. The best solution returned $\vec{k} = (0.242(1), 0, 0.313(1))$ and the magnetic structure was refined as a spin-density wave with magnetic moments directed along c . The corresponding irrep splits the Ru2 site into two, resulting in three nonequivalent Ru sites in the magnetic structure (see Fig. 7). The magnetic Rietveld refinement is shown in Fig. 6(a) as the red line and describes the data accurately with the magnetic R-factor of 4.79.

The x and z components of the propagation vector as a function of temperature are depicted in Fig. 6(b). These components are almost temperature-independent at low temperatures and start changing above 15 K. Whereas k_x increases on heating, k_z decreases. This correlation reflects the same microscopic origin of the incommensurability along a and c , as we discuss in more detail below. Between 26 and 29 K, only a fraction of the magnetic reflections could be observed, and a refinement of the magnetic structure was not possible. However, magnetic peaks remain at incommensurate positions, suggesting that the intermediate ordered phase may be related to the low-temperature one.

At low temperatures, the ordered magnetic moments are $2.23(3) \mu_B$ for the Ru atom on site 1 and $3.04(3) \mu_B$ for both Ru atoms on the former site 2. (Without loss of the fit quality, the magnetic moments of the split positions were restricted to be equal.) The determined mo-

TABLE I. Exchange couplings in Na_3RuO_4 obtained from *ab initio* calculations: Ru–Ru distances d , angles φ (Ru–O–Ru and dihedral Ru–O–O–Ru depending on the coupling), and the coupling strength J . The labels are introduced in Fig. 8. The couplings not listed in the Table are below 1 K.

bond	label	d (Å)	φ (deg)	J (K)
within the tetramer				
Ru1–Ru1	$J1$	3.210	98.2	−4.9
Ru1–Ru2	$J2$	3.210	97.5/103.3	30.2
Ru2–Ru2	$J3$	5.559	0	2.0
between the tetramers, <i>ab</i> plane				
Ru2–Ru2	$J4$	5.477	0	34.7
Ru1–Ru2	$J5$	5.531	1.6	23.4
Ru1–Ru1	$J6$	6.376	28.2	7.1
Ru2–Ru2	$J7$	6.413	19.7	2.0
between the <i>ab</i> planes				
Ru1–Ru1	$J8$	5.703	74.7	6.1
Ru2–Ru2	$J9$	6.262	0	20.9

ments are generally consistent with the theoretically expected local moment of $3 \mu_B$ for $S = 3/2$. The temperature dependence of the magnetic moments is shown in Fig. 6(c). Below 10 K, the magnetic moments stay constant within experimental error and then start to decrease monotonically until at 25 K the moments on Ru1 and Ru2 reach 60% and 70% of the 1.5 K value, respectively.

The magnetic structure at 1.5 K is shown in Fig. 7. The Ru1 and Ru2_a/Ru2_b moments are antiparallel within one tetramer. Additionally, a small phase shift of $\phi = 0.092(3)$ was found between Ru2_a and Ru2_b, but to a first approximation individual tetramers show an almost compensated antiferromagnetic order. The incommensurability arises from the couplings between the tetramers. Below, we show that these intertetramer couplings play the dominant role in the Na_3RuO_4 magnetism.

3. Microscopic Magnetic Model

Magnetic couplings in Na_3RuO_4 can be divided into three groups, as shown in Table I. The couplings of the first group are within the tetramer. Two of them involve Ru–O–Ru bridges and show a drastically different coupling strength, $J1$ ferromagnetic and $J2$ antiferromagnetic, despite essentially the same Ru–Ru distances. This difference can be traced back to the Ru–O–Ru angles. The coupling $J1$ is closer to the 90° regime and, therefore, ferromagnetic according to Goodenough-Kanamori-Anderson rules. The coupling $J3$ is weak and involves a Ru–O...O–Ru bridge with the O...O distance of 2.78 Å.

The couplings between the tetramers also involve the Ru–O...O–Ru bridges but with the longer O...O distances of 3.35 – 3.65 Å. Some of these couplings are as strong as $J1$ and $J2$. The relative strength of these




FIG. 6. Data collected at the high-intensity instrument D20. (a) Magnetic refinement with the Rietveld method for the magnetic contribution of the data (black dots) collected at 1.5 K. The Rietveld fit is depicted in red, the difference between experiment and fit is depicted in blue, and the magnetic peak positions are marked with the black ticks. [(b) and (c)] Evolution of the components of \vec{k} and the magnetic moments for Ru1 and Ru 2_a /Ru 2_b with temperature. The error bars are smaller than the symbol size. The lines are guides for the eye.




FIG. 7. Magnetic structure of Na₃RuO₄ obtained from magnetic Rietveld refinement. Due to frustrated intertetramer couplings the spin density wave is incommensurately modulated along a and c . The magnetic structure was drawn with FPStudio.

long-range couplings is controlled by the respective dihedral angles, see Table I. The strongest coupling occurs when two Ru atoms and two O atoms all lie in the same plane, similar to long-range superexchange interactions in Cu compounds [35]. The only exception is J_3 where the shorter O...O distance gives rise to a more curved pathway, which is less suitable for superexchange [36].

It is worth noting that magnetic interactions in other ruthenium compounds are typically restricted to nearest neighbors with Ru–O–Ru pathways [11]. Na₃RuO₄ with its strong long-range couplings stands as an exception to this trend.

To determine magnetic order stabilized by the couplings $J_1 - J_9$, we performed an energy minimiza-




FIG. 8. Exchange couplings between the Ru atoms. Intratetramer couplings are drawn in red, intertetramer couplings in green, and interlayer couplings in orange. The thickness of the lines shows the strength of the couplings. Exchange couplings not indicated are insignificant. The structures were drawn in VESTA [1].

tion against three components of the propagation vector (k_x , k_y , and k_z) as well as phase shifts between the magnetic moments within the tetramer (α_1 , α_2 , and α_3). This minimization results in $k_x = 0.250$ and $k_z = 0.350$ in a good agreement with the experimental $\vec{k} = (0.242(1), 0, 0.313(1))$ at 1.5 K. Moreover, we find $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0.5107$ for the phase shift between Ru1 and Ru2_a as well as $\alpha_3 = 0.0215$ for the phase shift between Ru2_a and Ru2_b. These values also compare favorably with 0.5 and 0.092(3) found experimentally. The good match between the experimental and calculated magnetic structures serves as a verification of our microscopic magnetic model.

For a further comparison we calculated effective Curie-Weiss temperatures on both Ru sites as

$$\theta = -\frac{S(S+1)}{3} \sum_i J_i$$

where $S = \frac{3}{2}$ and the summation is over all couplings that the given Ru site is involved in. This procedure returns the values of $\theta = -161$ K for Ru1 and -246 K for Ru2 that compare favorably to the experimental Curie-Weiss temperature of $-161.5(5)$ K. Moreover, the weaker exchange field on Ru1 explains the lower ordered moment on this site [Fig. 6(c)].

IV. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

Our microscopic magnetic model shows that individual tetramers in Na₃RuO₄ are only weakly frustrated. Both, the ferromagnetic J_1 and the antiferromagnetic J_2 , favor the antiferromagnetic order with opposite magnetic moments on Ru1 and Ru2, whereas J_3 is too weak to modify this order significantly.

The incommensurate order is a consequence of frustrated couplings between the tetramers. Indeed, the two leading intertetramer interactions J_4 and J_5 are similar in magnitude and compete. A smaller value of J_4 would prevent the formation of an incommensurate order. If all the exchange couplings are kept constant and J_4 is reduced to 26.2 K or lower, the propagation vector becomes $\vec{k} = (0, 0, 1/2)$, which corresponds to the picture of antiferromagnetic tetramers that tile up the ab plane. The same applies if J_5 is raised above 31.9 K. It turns out that J_4 and J_5 in Na₃RuO₄ are fine-tuned to stabilize incommensurate order. A useful perspective on this frustration mechanism is given by an effective model where each tetramer is reduced to a single site of an anisotropic triangular lattice, as shown by the black dotted lines in Fig. 1(b). For this picture we introduce the effective couplings $J_{4\text{eff}} = J_4$ and $J_{5\text{eff}} = -2 \cdot J_5 + J_6 + J_7$ for the interactions along a and $a \pm b$, respectively (see Fig. 8). The minus sign in front of J_5 is due to the fact that this coupling connects Ru1 and Ru2 atoms with antiparallel spins. Since $k_y = 0$ in our case, the expression $\cos(\pi \cdot k_x) = -J_{5\text{eff}}/2J_{4\text{eff}}$ ensues. The experimental value of $k_x = 0.242$ can be reproduced with $J_{5\text{eff}}/J_{4\text{eff}} = -1.45$, suggesting a moderate spatial anisotropy of this effective triangular lattice.

After elucidating the incommensurability in the ab plane we will now consider the origin of incommensurability along the c direction. Geometric frustration between J_4 , J_8 , and J_9 alone would not cause this effect because J_8 is too weak. This can be seen by ignoring other sources of geometric frustration, leaving J_4 as the only intertetramer interaction in the ab plane. Doing so would result in a commensurate $\vec{k} = (1/2, 0, 0)$ since the neighboring tetramers along \vec{a} would have opposite spin arrangements and the dominant interaction between the ab planes J_9 creates an opposite spin arrangement of neighboring tetramers along $\vec{a} + \vec{c}$. Given $J_8 \ll J_9$, one can set $J_8 = 0$ and write the k_z contribution to the total energy as $E_{J_8=0}(k_z) = J_9 \cos(2\pi(k_x + k_z + \phi))$. Because J_9 is oblique to the c axis, k_x and k_z get linked and the magnetic structure is incommensurately modulated along c as a result of the incommensurability in the ab plane. This link is further supported by the correlation between k_x and k_z as a function of temperature [Fig. 6(b)]. The almost symmetric changes in k_x and k_z further support the fact that the incommensurability of k_z is merely a consequence of the oblique coupling J_9 .

Finally, we comment on the nature of two consecutive phase transitions. We have shown that both transitions are magnetic in nature without any detectable structural component. Our data collected between 26 and 29 K are unfortunately insufficient to resolve the magnetic structure in this temperature range. However, Fig. 5 clearly shows that many of the magnetic peaks persist above 26 K up to 29 K, and the magnetic structure remains incommensurate. In this context, an effective description of Na₃RuO₄ in terms of the anisotropic triangular lattice may be useful because triangular antiferromagnets often

show two magnetic transitions [37–39] with magnetic ordering at T_N followed by spin reorientation. Interestingly, neither of the transitions showed any dependence on the magnetic field up to at least 7 T [Fig. 2(a)]. This may be due to the quite high energy scale of magnetic interactions and the large local moment ($S = \frac{3}{2}$).

In summary, we have determined the magnetic ground state of Na_3RuO_4 using NPD. Magnetic structure of this material is incommensurate with the propagation vector $\vec{k} = (0.242(1), 0, 0.313(1))$ at 1.5 K. We showed that structural tetramers play only a minor role in the physics because long-range couplings between the tetramers are as strong as the nearest-neighbor coupling within the tetramers. Frustration of the intertetramer couplings renders magnetic structure incommensurate in the ab plane and, consequently, also along the c direction because of the oblique nature of the leading coupling between the planes. This peculiar magnetic model has

several ramifications. It puts Na_3RuO_4 into the category of triangular antiferromagnets rather than molecular (tetramer) magnets, contrary to the previous studies. Moreover, it highlights the importance of long-range Ru–O...O–Ru couplings that are typically disregarded in ruthenates. The role of these couplings in other Ru-based magnets, including the honeycomb and pyrochlore systems, remains an interesting avenue for future studies.

Experimental and computational data associated with this study can be found in Refs. [40, 41].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge ILL for providing beamtime for this project. This work was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – TRR 360 – 492547816.

* vera.bader@uni-a.de

† altsirlin@gmail.com

- [1] K. Momma and F. Izumi, *VESTA3* for three-dimensional visualization of crystal, volumetric and morphology data, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **44**, 1272 (2011).
- [2] Y. Maeno, H. Hashimoto, K. Yoshida, S. Nishizaki, T. Fujita, J. Bednorz, and F. Lichtenberg, Superconductivity in a layered perovskite without copper, *Nature* **372**, 532 (1994).
- [3] A. Kanbayasi, Magnetic properties of SrRuO_3 Single Crystal, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **41**, 1876 (1976).
- [4] C.-Q. Jin, J.-S. Zhou, J. B. Goodenough, Q. Q. Liu, J. G. Zhao, L. X. Yang, Y. Yu, R. C. Yu, T. Katsura, A. Shatskiy, and E. Ito, High-pressure synthesis of the cubic perovskite BaRuO_3 and evolution of ferromagnetism in ARuO_3 ($A = \text{Ca, Sr, Ba}$) ruthenates, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 7115 (2008).
- [5] J. Chaloupka and G. Khaliullin, Highly frustrated magnetism in relativistic d^4 Mott insulators: Bosonic analog of the Kitaev honeycomb model, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 224413 (2019).
- [6] R. Kaneko, K. Ueda, S. Sakai, Y. Nomura, M.-T. Huebsch, R. Arita, and Y. Tokura, Fully filling-controlled pyrochlore ruthenates: Emergent ferromagnetic-metal state and geometrical Hall effect, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, L201111 (2021).
- [7] C. A. Marjerrison, C. Mauws, A. Z. Sharma, C. R. Wiebe, S. Derakhshan, C. Boyer, B. D. Gaulin, and J. E. Greedan, Structure and Magnetic Properties of KRuO_4 , *Inorg. Chem.* **55**, 12897 (2016).
- [8] B. E. Prasad, S. Sadhukhan, T. C. Hansen, C. Felser, S. Kanungo, and M. Jansen, Synthesis, crystal and magnetic structure of the spin-chain compound Ag_2RuO_4 , *Phys. Rev. Materials* **4**, 024418 (2020).
- [9] W. Schnelle, B. E. Prasad, C. Felser, M. Jansen, E. V. Komleva, S. V. Streltsov, I. I. Mazin, D. Khalyavin, P. Manuel, S. Pal, D. V. S. Muthu, A. K. Sood, E. S. Klyushina, B. Lake, J.-C. Orain, and H. Luetkens, Magnetic and electronic ordering phenomena in the Ru_2O_6 -layer honeycomb lattice compound AgRuO_3 , *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 214413 (2021).
- [10] C. I. Hiley, M. R. Lees, J. M. Fisher, D. Thompson, S. Agrestini, R. I. Smith, and R. I. Walton, Ruthenium(V) Oxides from Low-Temperature Hydrothermal Synthesis, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **53**, 4423 (2014).
- [11] H. Suzuki, H. Gretarsson, H. Ishikawa, K. Ueda, Z. Yang, H. Liu, H. Kim, D. Kukusta, A. Yaresko, M. Minola, J. A. Sears, S. Francoual, H.-C. Wille, J. Nuss, H. Takagi, B. J. Kim, G. Khaliullin, H. Yavaş, and B. Keimer, Spin waves and spin-state transitions in a ruthenate high-temperature antiferromagnet, *Nature Mater.* **18**, 563 (2019).
- [12] R. Kumar, T. Dey, P. M. Ette, K. Ramesha, A. Chakraborty, I. Dasgupta, J. C. Orain, C. Baines, S. Tóth, A. Shahee, S. Kundu, M. Prinz-Zwick, A. A. Gippius, N. Büttgen, P. Gegenwart, and A. V. Mahajan, Unconventional magnetism in the $4d^4$ -based $S = 1$ honeycomb system $\text{Ag}_3\text{LiRu}_2\text{O}_6$, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 054417 (2019).
- [13] B. R. Ortiz, P. M. Sarte, A. H. Avidor, A. Hay, E. Kenney, A. I. Kolesnikov, D. M. Pajerowski, A. A. Aczel, K. M. Taddei, C. M. Brown, C. Wang, M. J. Graf, R. Seshadri, L. Balents, and S. D. Wilson, Quantum disordered ground state in the triangular-lattice magnet NaRuO_2 , *Nat. Phys.* **19**, 943 (2023).
- [14] J. Darriet and J. Galy, Sur les composés Na_3TO_4 ($T = \text{Nb, Ta et Ru}$). Structure cristalline de Na_3NbO_4 , *Bull. Minéral.* **97**, 3 (1974).
- [15] K. Regan, Q. Huang, and R. Cava, Isolated spin 3/2 plaquettes in Na_3RuO_4 , *J. Solid State Chem.* **178**, 2104 (2005).
- [16] M. Drillon, J. Darriet, and R. Georges, Etude des propriétés thermodynamiques d'un groupement tetranucléaire: Application au composé Na_3RuO_4 , *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **38**, 411 (1977).
- [17] T. C. Gibb, R. Greatrex, and N. N. Greenwood, A novel case of magnetic relaxation in the ^{99}Ru Mössbauer spectrum of Na_3RuO_4 , *J. Solid State Chem.* **31**, 153 (1980).
- [18] J. T. Haraldsen, M. B. Stone, M. D. Lumsden, T. Barnes, R. Jin, J. W. Taylor, and F. Fernandez-Alonso, Spin-

- lozenge thermodynamics and magnetic excitations in Na_3RuO_4 , *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **21**, 506003 (2009).
- [19] V. Petříček, M. Dušek, and L. Palatinus, Crystallographic Computing System JANA2006: General features, *Z. Krist.* **229**, 345 (2014).
- [20] J. Rodríguez-Carvajal, Recent advances in magnetic structure determination by neutron powder diffraction, *Physica B* **192**, 55 (1993).
- [21] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, Generalized Gradient Approximation Made Simple, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- [22] H. J. Xiang, E. J. Kan, S.-H. Wei, M.-H. Whangbo, and X. G. Gong, Predicting the spin-lattice order of frustrated systems from first principles, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 224429 (2011).
- [23] A. A. Tsirlin, Spin-chain magnetism and uniform Dzyaloshinsky-Moriya anisotropy in BaV_3O_8 , *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 014405 (2014).
- [24] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Efficiency of *ab-initio* total energy calculations for metals and semiconductors using a plane-wave basis set, *Computational Materials Science* **6**, 15 (1996).
- [25] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Efficient iterative schemes for *ab initio* total-energy calculations using a plane-wave basis set, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 11169 (1996).
- [26] O. Grånäs, I. Di Marco, O. Eriksson, L. Nordström, and C. Etz, Electronic structure, cohesive properties, and magnetism of SrRuO_3 , *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 165130 (2014).
- [27] A. Hariki, A. Hausoel, G. Sangiovanni, and J. Kuneš, DFT+DMFT study on soft moment magnetism and covalent bonding in SrRu_2O_6 , *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 155135 (2017).
- [28] J. C. Wang, J. Terzic, T. F. Qi, F. Ye, S. J. Yuan, S. Aswartham, S. V. Streltsov, D. I. Khomskii, R. K. Kaul, and G. Cao, Lattice-tuned magnetism of Ru^{4+} ($4d^4$) ions in single crystals of the layered honeycomb ruthenates Li_2RuO_3 and Na_2RuO_3 , *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 161110 (2014).
- [29] L. S. I. Veiga, M. Etter, E. Cappelli, H. Jacobsen, J. G. Vale, C. D. Dashwood, D. Le, F. Baumberger, D. F. McMorrow, and R. S. Perry, Correlated electron metal properties of the honeycomb ruthenate Na_2RuO_3 , *Phys. Rev. Mater.* **4**, 094202 (2020).
- [30] M. E. Fisher, Relation between the specific heat and susceptibility of an antiferromagnet, *Philos. Mag.* **7**, 1731 (1962).
- [31] G. A. Bain and J. F. Berry, Diamagnetic Corrections and Pascal's Constants, *J. Chem. Educ.* **85**, 532 (2008).
- [32] The table of atomic positions in Ref. [15] contains two typos. $x = 0.2421$, $y = 0.1254$, $z = 0.5$ for Na3 and $x = 0.1528$, $y = 0.5$, $z = 0.1969$ for O3. This was also pointed out in Ref. [18].
- [33] M. S. Senn, A. M. Arevalo-Lopez, T. Saito, Y. Shimakawa, and J. P. Attfield, Nonmagnetic spin-singlet dimer formation and coupling to the lattice in the 6H perovskite $\text{Ba}_3\text{CaRu}_2\text{O}_9$, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **25**, 496008 (2013).
- [34] S. Reschke, A. A. Tsirlin, N. Khan, L. Prodan, V. Tsurkan, I. Kézsmárki, and J. Deisenhofer, Structure, phonons, and orbital degrees of freedom in $\text{Fe}_2\text{Mo}_3\text{O}_8$, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 094307 (2020).
- [35] D. O. Nekrasova, A. A. Tsirlin, M. Colmont, O. Siidra, H. Vezin, and O. Mentré, Magnetic hexamers interacting in layers in the $(\text{Na,K})_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}(\text{SO}_4)_3$ minerals, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 184405 (2020).
- [36] P. Bag, N. Ahmed, V. Singh, M. Sahoo, A. A. Tsirlin, and R. Nath, Low-dimensional magnetism of $\text{BaCuTe}_2\text{O}_6$, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 134410 (2021).
- [37] M. Lee, J. Hwang, E. S. Choi, J. Ma, C. R. Dela Cruz, M. Zhu, X. Ke, Z. L. Dun, and H. D. Zhou, Series of phase transitions and multiferroicity in the quasi-two-dimensional spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ triangular-lattice antiferromagnet $\text{Ba}_3\text{CoNb}_2\text{O}_9$, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 104420 (2014).
- [38] M. Lee, E. S. Choi, X. Huang, J. Ma, C. R. Dela Cruz, M. Matsuda, W. Tian, Z. L. Dun, S. Dong, and H. D. Zhou, Magnetic phase diagram and multiferroicity of $\text{Ba}_3\text{MnNb}_2\text{O}_9$: A spin-5/2 triangular lattice antiferromagnet with weak easy-axis anisotropy, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 224402 (2014).
- [39] K. M. Ranjith, R. Nath, M. Majumder, D. Kasinathan, M. Skoulatos, L. Keller, Y. Skourski, M. Baenitz, and A. A. Tsirlin, Commensurate and incommensurate magnetic order in spin-1 chains stacked on the triangular lattice in $\text{Li}_2\text{NiW}_2\text{O}_8$, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 014415 (2016).
- [40] V. Bader, C. Ritter, and A. A. Tsirlin, Investigation of the Two Consecutive Phase Transitions in the Ruthenate Na_3RuO_4 , 10.5291/ILL-DATA.5-31-2641 (2019).
- [41] V. Bader, C. Ritter, E. Papke, P. Gegenwart, and A. A. Tsirlin, Geometrical frustration and incommensurate magnetic order in Na_3RuO_4 with two triangular motifs, 10.5281/zenodo.8226430 (2023).