

Quantum magnets: a brief overview

Indrani Bose

November 26, 2024

Department of Physics
Bose Institute
93/1, A. P. C. Road
Calcutta-700009

Abstract

Quantum magnetism is one of the most active areas of research in condensed matter physics. There is significant research interest specially in low-dimensional quantum spin systems. Such systems have a large number of experimental realizations and exhibit a variety of phenomena the origin of which can be attributed to quantum effects and low dimensions. In this review, an overview of some aspects of quantum magnetism in low dimensions is given. The emphasis is on key concepts, theorems and rigorous results as well as models of spin chains, ladders and frustrated magnetic systems.

1 Introduction

Quantum magnets are spin systems in which the spins interact via the well-known exchange interaction. The interaction is purely quantum mechanical in nature and the form of the interaction was derived simultaneously by Heisenberg and Dirac in 1926 [1]. The most well-known model of interacting spins in an insulating solid is the Heisenberg model with the Hamiltonian

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

\vec{S}_i is the spin operator located at the lattice site i and J_{ij} denotes the strength of the exchange interaction. The spin $|\vec{S}_i|$ can have a magnitude $1/2, 1, 3/2, 2, \dots$ etc. The lattice, at the sites of which the spins are located, is d -dimensional. Examples are a linear chain ($d = 1$), the square lattice ($d = 2$) and the cubic lattice ($d = 3$). Ladders have structures interpolating between the chain and the square lattice. An n -chain ladder consists of n chains ($n = 2, 3, 4, \dots$ etc.) coupled by rungs. Real magnetic solids are three-dimensional (3d) but can be effectively considered as low-dimensional systems if the exchange interactions have different

strengths in different directions. To give an example, a magnetic solid may consist of chains of spins. The solid may be considered as a linear chain (d=1) compound if the intra-chain exchange interactions are much stronger than the inter-chain ones. In a planar (d=2) magnetic system, the dominant exchange interactions are intra-planar. Several examples of low-dimensional magnetic systems are given in [2].

The strength of the exchange interaction J_{ij} in Eq.(1) falls down rapidly as the distance between interacting spins increases. For many solids, the sites i and j are nearest-neighbours (n.n.s) on the lattice and J_{ij} 's have the same magnitude J for all the n.n. interactions. The Hamiltonian in (1) then becomes

$$H = J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \quad (2)$$

There are, however, examples of magnetic systems in which the strengths of the exchange interactions between successive pairs of spins are not the same. Also, the interaction Hamiltonian (1) may include n.n. as well as further-neighbour interactions. The well-known Majumdar-Ghosh chain [3] is described by the Hamiltonian

$$H_{MG} = J \sum_{i=1}^N \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_{i+1} + \frac{J}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_{i+2} \quad (3)$$

and includes n.n. as well as next-nearest-neighbour (n.n.n.) interactions. The Haldane-Shastry model [4] has a Hamiltonian of the form

$$H = J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \frac{1}{|i-j|^2} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \quad (4)$$

and includes long-ranged interactions. Real materials are characterised by various types of anisotropy. The fully anisotropic n.n. Heisenberg Hamiltonian in 1d is given by

$$H_{XYZ} = \sum_{i=1}^N [J_x S_i^x S_{i+1}^x + J_y S_i^y S_{i+1}^y + J_z S_i^z S_{i+1}^z] \quad (5)$$

The special cases of this Hamiltonian are: the Ising ($J_x = J_y = 0$), the XY ($J_z = 0$), the XXX or isotropic Heisenberg ($J_x = J_y = J_z$) and the XXZ or anisotropic Heisenberg ($J_x = J_y \neq J_z$) models. There is a huge literature on these models some of which are summarised in Refs. [1, 2, 5, 6, 7]. Other anisotropy terms may be present in the full spin Hamiltonian besides the basic exchange interaction terms.

Consider the isotropic Heisenberg Hamiltonian in (2) where $\langle ij \rangle$ denotes a n.n. pair of spins. The sign of the exchange interaction determines the favourable alignment of the n.n. spins. $J > 0$ ($J < 0$) corresponds to anti-ferromagnetic (ferromagnetic) exchange interaction. To see how exchange interaction leads to magnetic order, treat the spins as classical vectors. Each n.n.

spin pair has an interaction energy $JS^2\cos\theta$ where θ is the angle between n.n. spin orientations. When J is < 0 , the lowest energy is achieved when $\theta = 0$, i.e., the interacting spins are parallel. The ferromagnetic (FM) ground state has all the spins parallel and the ground state energy $E_g = -J\frac{NzS^2}{2}$ where z is the coordination number of the lattice. When J is > 0 , the lowest energy is achieved for $\theta = \pi$, i.e., the n.n. spins are antiparallel. The antiferromagnetic (AFM) ground state is the Néel state in which n.n. spins are antiparallel to each other. The ground state energy $E_g = -\frac{JNzS^2}{2}$.

Magnetism, however, is a purely quantum phenomenon and the Hamiltonian (2) is to be treated quantum mechanically rather than classically. For simplicity, consider a chain of spins of magnitude $\frac{1}{2}$. Periodic boundary condition is assumed, i.e., $\vec{S}_{N+1} = \vec{S}_1$. The Hamiltonian (2) can be written as

$$H = J \sum_{i=1}^N [S_i^z S_{i+1}^z + \frac{1}{2}(S_i^+ S_{i+1}^- + S_i^- S_{i+1}^+)] \quad (6)$$

where

$$S_i^\pm = S_i^x \pm iS_i^y \quad (7)$$

are the raising and lowering operators. It is easy to check that in the case of a FM, the classical ground state is still the quantum mechanical ground state with the same ground state energy. However, the classical AFM ground state (the Néel state) is not the quantum mechanical ground state. The determination of the exact AFM ground state is a tough many body problem and the solution can be obtained with the help of the Bethe Ansatz technique (Section 2).

For a spin-1/2 system, the number of eigenstates of the Hamiltonian is 2^N where N is the number of spins. In a real solid N is $\sim 10^{23}$ and exact determination of all the eigenvalues and the eigenfunctions of the system is impossible. There are some classes of AFM spin models for which the ground state and in a few cases the low-lying excitation spectrum are known exactly (Section 2). In the majority of cases, however, the ground state and the low-lying excited states are determined in an approximate manner. Knowledge of the low-lying excitation spectrum enables one to determine the low-temperature thermodynamics and the response to weak external fields. The usual thermodynamic quantities of a magnetic system are magnetisation, specific heat and susceptibility. Exchange interaction can give rise to magnetic order below a critical temperature. However, for some spin systems, the ground state is disordered, i.e., there is no magnetic order even at $T = 0$. Long range order (LRO) of the Néel-type exists in the magnetic system if

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \langle \vec{S}(0) \cdot \vec{S}(\vec{R}) \rangle \neq 0 \quad (8)$$

where \vec{R} denotes the spatial location of the spin. At $T = 0$, the expectation value is in the ground state and at $T \neq 0$, the expectation value is the usual thermodynamic average. The dynamical properties of a magnetic system

are governed by the time-dependent pair correlation functions or their Fourier transforms. Quantities of experimental interest include the dynamical correlation functions in neutron scattering experiments, the NMR spin-lattice relaxation rate, various relaxation functions and associated lineshapes as well as the dynamical response of the magnetic system to various spectroscopic probes [8]. Knowledge of the ground and low-lying states and the corresponding energy eigenvalues is essential to determine the thermodynamic and dynamic properties of a magnetic system.

The discovery of high-temperature cuprate superconductors in 1987 has given a tremendous boost to research activity in magnetism. The dominant electronic and magnetic properties of the cuprate systems are associated with the copper-oxide (CuO_2) planes. The Cu^{2+} ions carry spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ and the spins interact via the Heisenberg AFM exchange interaction Hamiltonian. This fact has given rise to a large number of studies on 2d antiferromagnets. The cuprates exhibit a variety of novel phenomena in their insulating, metallic and superconducting phases some of which at least have links to quantum magnetism. The subject of magnetism has, as a result, expanded significantly in scope and content. A rich interplay between theory and experiments has led to the discovery of materials exhibiting hitherto unknown phenomena, formulation of new theoretical ideas, solution of old puzzles and opening up of new research possibilities. In this review, a brief overview of some of the important developments in quantum magnetism will be given. The focus is on quantum antiferromagnets and insulating solids.

2 Theorems and rigorous results

(i) Theorems :

A. Lieb-Mattis theorem [9]

For general spin and for all dimensions and also for a bipartite lattice, the entire eigenvalue spectrum satisfies the inequality

$$E_0(S) \leq E_0(S + 1) \tag{9}$$

where $E_0(S)$ is the minimum energy corresponding to total spin S . The weak inequality becomes a strict inequality for a FM exchange coupling between spins of the same sublattice. The theorem is valid for any range of exchange coupling and the proof does not require PBC. The ground state of the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg AFM with an even number N of spins is a singlet according to the Lieb-Mattis theorem.

B. Marshall's sign rule [10]

The rule specifies the structure of the ground state of a n.n. $S = \frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg Hamiltonian defined on a bipartite lattice. The rule can be generalised to spin S , n.n.n. FM interaction but not to n.n.n. AFM interaction. A bipartite lattice is a lattice which can be divided into two sublattices A and B such that the n.n. spins of a spin belonging to the A sublattice are located in the B sublattice and vice versa. Examples of such lattices are the linear chain, the square

and the cubic lattices. According to the sign rule, the ground state ψ has the form

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{\mu} C_{\mu} |\mu\rangle \quad (10)$$

where $|\mu\rangle$ is an Ising basis state. The coefficient C_{μ} has the form

$$C_{\mu} = (-)^{p_{\mu}} a_{\mu} \quad (11)$$

with a_{μ} real and ≥ 0 and p_{μ} is the number of up-spins in the A sublattice.

C. Lieb, Schultz and Mattis (LSM) theorem [11]:

A half-integer S spin chain described by a reasonably local Hamiltonian respecting translational and rotational symmetry either has gapless excitation spectrum or has degenerate ground states, corresponding to spontaneously broken translational symmetry.

In the case of a gapless excitation spectrum, there is at least one momentum wave vector for which the excitation energy is zero. For a spectrum with gap, the lowest excitation is separated from the ground state by an energy gap Δ . The temperature dependence of thermodynamic quantities is determined by the nature of the excitation spectrum (with or without gap). The LSM theorem does not hold true for integer spin chains. For such chains, Haldane made a conjecture that the spin excitation spectrum is gapped [12]. This conjecture has been verified both theoretically and experimentally [13].

D. Oshikawa, Yamanaka and Affleck theorem [14]

This theorem extends the LSM theorem to the case of an applied magnetic field. The content of the theorem is : translationally invariant spin chains in an applied field can have a gapped excitation spectrum, without breaking translational symmetry, only when the magnetization per site m ($m = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N S_i^z$, N is the total number of spins in the system) obeys the relation

$$S - m = \text{integer} \quad (12)$$

where S is the magnitude of the spin. The proof is an easy extension of that of the LSM theorem. The gapped phases correspond to magnetization plateaux in the m vs. H curve at the quantized values of m which satisfy (12). Whenever there is a gap in the spin excitation spectrum, it is obvious that the magnetization cannot change in changing external field. Fractional quantization can also occur, if accompanied by (explicit or spontaneous) breaking of the translational symmetry. In this case, the plateau condition is given by

$$n(S - m) = \text{integer} \quad (13)$$

where n is the period of the ground state. Hida [15] has considered a $S = \frac{1}{2}$ HAFM chain with period 3 exchange coupling. A plateau in the magnetization curve occurs at $m = \frac{1}{6}$ ($\frac{1}{3}$ of full magnetization). In this case, $n = 3$, $S = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m = \frac{1}{6}$ and the quantization condition in (13) is obeyed. Ref. [16] gives a review of magnetization plateaux in interacting spin systems. Magnetization plateaux

have been observed in the magnetic compound NH_4CuCl_3 at $m = \frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ [17]. Possible extensions of the LSM theorem to higher dimensions have been suggested [18]. The compound $SrCu_2(BO_3)_2$ is the first AFM compound in 2d in which magnetization plateaux have been observed experimentally [19]. Like the quantum Hall effect, the phenomenon of magnetization plateaux is another striking example of the quantization of a physically measurable quantity as a function of the magnetic field.

E. Mermin-Wagner's theorem [20]

There cannot be any AFM LRO at finite T in dimensions $d = 1$ and 2 . The LRO can, however, exist in the ground state of spin models in $d = 2$. LRO exists in the ground state of the 3d HAFM model for spin $S \geq \frac{1}{2}$ [21]. At finite T, the LRO persists upto a critical temperature T_c . For square [22] and hexagonal [23] lattices, LRO exists in the ground state for $S \geq 1$. The above results are based on rigorous proofs. No such proof exists as yet for $S = \frac{1}{2}$, $d = 2$ (this case is of interest because the CuO_2 plane of the high- T_c cuprate systems is a $S = \frac{1}{2}$ 2d AFM).

(ii) Exact Results :

A. the Bethe Ansatz [24]

The Bethe Ansatz (BA) was formulated by Bethe in 1931 and describes a wave function with a particular kind of structure. Bethe considered the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg linear chain in which only n.n. spins interact. In the case of the FM chain, the exact ground state is simple with all spins aligned in the same direction, say, pointing up. An excitation is created in the system by deviating a spin from its ground state arrangement, i.e., replacing an up-spin by a down-spin. Due to the exchange interaction, the deviated spin does not stay localised at a particular site but travels along the chain of spins. This excitation is the so-called spin wave or magnon. For the isotropic FM Heisenberg Hamiltonian, the exact one-magnon eigenstate is given by

$$\psi = \sum_{m=1}^N e^{ikm} S_m^- |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow \dots\rangle \quad (14)$$

where m denotes the site at which the down-spin is located and the summation over m runs from the first to the last site in the chain. The k 's are the "momenta" which from periodic boundary conditions have N allowed values

$$k = \frac{2\pi}{N}\lambda, \lambda = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1 \quad (15)$$

The excitation energy ϵ_k , measured w.r.t. the ground state energy and in units of J , is

$$\epsilon_k = (1 - \cos k) \quad (16)$$

In the case of r spin deviations (magnons), the eigenfunction can be written as

$$\psi^{(r)} = \sum_{m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_r} a(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_r) S_{m_1}^- S_{m_2}^- \dots S_{m_r}^- |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow \dots\rangle \quad (17)$$

The amplitudes are given by the BA

$$a(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_r) = \sum_P e^{i \sum_j k_{Pj} m_j + \frac{1}{2} i \sum_{j < l}^{1,r} \phi_{Pj, Pl}} \quad (18)$$

where P stands for a permutation of the set $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ and Pj is the image of j under permutation. The sum is over all the $r!$ permutations. Each term in (18) describes r plane waves. The scattering of a pair of waves introduces the phase shift ϕ_{jl} . The symmetric sum over permutations is in accordance with the bosonic nature of the waves, the spin waves, propagating along the chain. The energy of the state $\psi^{(r)}$ is

$$\epsilon^{(r)} = \sum_{i=1}^r (1 - \cos k_i) \quad (19)$$

The k 's are determined as before by applying the periodic boundary conditions which leads to the r equations

$$Nk_i = 2\pi\lambda_i + \sum_j \phi_{ij} \quad (20)$$

where λ_i 's are r integers. One further imposes the condition that a spin at a particular site cannot be deviated more than once leading to the relations

$$2\cot \frac{1}{2} \phi_{ij} = \cot \frac{k_i}{2} - \cot \frac{k_j}{2} \quad (21)$$

Since $\phi_{ij} = -\phi_{ji}$, Eqs. (21) are $\frac{r(r-1)}{2}$ in number, i.e., there are as many distinct ϕ 's. Eqs. (20) are r in number. Together, the total number is $\frac{r(r+1)}{2}$ equations in as many unknowns. Bethe thus established that the set of equations could be expected to have solutions.

The momenta k_i 's can be real or complex. In the first case, the spin waves or magnons scatter against each other giving rise to a continuum of scattering states. In the second case, the magnons form bound states, i.e., the reversed spins tend to be located at n.n. lattice positions. For r magnons, the r -magnon bound state energy is given by

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{r} (1 - \cos K) \quad (22)$$

where $K = \sum_{i=1}^r k_i$ is the total centre of mass momentum of r magnons. The results can be generalised to the XXZ Heisenberg Hamiltonian. The multimagnon bound states were first detected in the quasi-one-dimensional magnetic system $CoCl_2 \cdot 2H_2O$ at pumped helium temperatures and in high magnetic fields by far infrared spectroscopy [25]. Later improvements [26] made use of infrared HCN/DCN lasers, the high intensity of which made possible observation of even 14 magnon bound states.

The exact ground state energy of the isotropic Heisenberg Hamiltonian (Eq.(2)) can be determined using the BA. The BA equations are the same

as in the FM case but the sign of the exchange integral changes from $-J$ to J ($J > 0$). The total spin of the AFM ground state is $S = 0$ according to the Lieb-Mattis theorem. In the ground state, $\frac{N}{2}$ spins are up and $\frac{N}{2}$ spins down ($r = \frac{N}{2}$). The ground state is non-degenerate and there is a unique choice of the λ_i 's as

$$\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 3, \lambda_3 = 5, \dots, \lambda_{\frac{N}{2}} = N - 1 \quad (23)$$

The ground state is also spin disordered, i.e., has no AFM LRO. The exact ground state energy E_g is

$$E_g = \frac{NJ}{4} - JN \ln 2 \quad (24)$$

The low-lying excitation spectrum has been calculated by des Cloizeaux and Pearson (dCP) [27] by making appropriate changes in the distribution of λ_i 's in the ground state. The spectrum is given by

$$\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{2} |\sin k|, \quad -\pi \leq k \leq \pi \quad (25)$$

for spin 1 states. The wave vector k is measured w.r.t. that of the ground state. A more rigorous calculation of the low-lying excitation spectrum has been given by Faddeev and Takhtajan [28]. There are $S = 1$ as well as $S = 0$ states. We give a qualitative description of the excitation spectrum, for details Ref. [28] should be consulted. The energy of the low-lying excited states can be written as $E(k_1, k_2) = \epsilon(k_1) + \epsilon(k_2)$ with $\epsilon(k_i) = \frac{\pi}{2} \sin k_i$ and total momentum $k = k_1 + k_2$. At a fixed total momentum k , one gets a continuum of scattering states. The lower boundary of the continuum is given by the dCP spectrum (one of the k_i 's = 0). The upper boundary is obtained for $k_1 = k_2 = \frac{k}{2}$ and

$$\epsilon_k^U = \pi \left| \sin \frac{k}{2} \right| \quad (26)$$

The energy-momentum relations suggest that the low-lying spectrum is actually a combination of two elementary excitations known as spinons. The energies and the momenta of the spinons just add up, showing that they do not interact. A spinon is a $S = \frac{1}{2}$ object, so on combination they give rise to both $S = 1$ and $S = 0$ states. In the Heisenberg model, the spinons are only noninteracting in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. For an even number N of sites, the total spin is always an integer, so that the spins are always excited in pairs. The spinons can be visualised as kinks in the AFM order parameter. Due to the exchange interaction, the individual spinons get delocalised into plane wave states. Inelastic neutron scattering study of the linear chain $S = \frac{1}{2}$ HAFM compound $KCuF_3$ has confirmed the existence of unbound spinon pair excitations [29]. The Haldane-Shastry model [4] is another spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ model in 1d for which the ground state and low-lying excitation spectrum are known exactly. The ground state has the same functional form as the fractional quantum Hall ground state and is spin-disordered. The elementary excitations are spinons which are non-interacting even away from the thermodynamic limit, i.e., in finite systems.

The individual spinons behave as semions, i.e., have statistical properties intermediate between fermions and bosons. In the case of integer spin chains, the spinons are bound and the excitation spectrum consists of spin-wave-like modes exhibiting the Haldane gap. The BA technique described in this Section is the one originally proposed by Bethe. There is an algebraic version of the BA which is in wide use and which gives the same final results as the earlier technique. For an introduction to the algebraic BA method, see the Refs. [30, 31]. A tutorial review of the BA is given in Ref. [32]. The BA was originally proposed for the Heisenberg model in magnetism. Later, the method was applied to other interacting many body systems in 1d such as the Fermi and Bose gas models in which particles on a line interact through delta function potentials [33], the Hubbard model in 1d [34], 1d plasma which crystallizes as a Wigner solid [35], the Lai-Sutherland model [36] which includes the Hubbard model and a dilute magnetic model as special cases, the Kondo model in 1d [37], the single impurity Anderson model in 1d [38], the supersymmetric t-J model ($J = 2t$) [39] etc. In the case of quantum models, the BA method is applicable only to 1d models. The BA method has also been applied to derive exact results for classical lattice statistical models in 2d.

B. The Majumdar-Ghosh chain [3, 7]

The Hamiltonian is given in Eq. (3). The exact ground state of H_{MG} is doubly degenerate and the states are

$$\phi_1 \equiv [12][34] \dots [N-1N], \phi_2 \equiv [23][45] \dots [N1] \quad (27)$$

where $[lm]$ denotes a singlet spin configuration for spins located at the sites l and m . Also, PBC is assumed. One finds that translational symmetry is broken in the ground state. The proof that ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are the exact ground states can be obtained by the method of ‘divide and conquer’. One can verify that ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are exact eigenstates of H_{MG} by applying the spin identity $\vec{S}_n \cdot (\vec{S}_l + \vec{S}_m)[lm] = 0$. Let E_1 be the energy of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 . Let E_g be the exact ground state energy. Then $E_g \leq E_1$. One divides the Hamiltonian H into sub-Hamiltonians, H_i ’s, such that $H = \sum_i H_i$. H_i can be exactly diagonalised and let E_{i0} be the ground state energy. Let ψ_g be the exact ground state wave function. By variational theory,

$$E_g = \langle \psi_g | H | \psi_g \rangle = \sum_i \langle \psi_g | H_i | \psi_g \rangle \geq \sum_i E_{i0} \quad (28)$$

One thus gets,

$$\sum_i E_{i0} \leq E_g \leq E_1 \quad (29)$$

If one can show that $\sum_i E_{i0} = E_1$, then E_1 is the exact ground state energy. For the MG-chain, the sub-Hamiltonian H_i is

$$H_i = \frac{J}{2} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_{i+1} + \vec{S}_{i+1} \cdot \vec{S}_{i+2} + \vec{S}_{i+2} \cdot \vec{S}_i) \quad (30)$$

There are N such sub-Hamiltonians. One can easily verify that $E_{i0} = -\frac{3J}{8}$ and $E_1 = -\frac{3J}{4}\frac{N}{2}$ ($-\frac{3J}{4}$ is the energy of a singlet and there are $\frac{N}{2}$ VBs in ϕ_1 and ϕ_2). From (29), one finds that the lower and upper bounds of E_g are equal and hence ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are the exact ground states with energy $E_1 = -\frac{3JN}{8}$. There is no LRO in the two-spin correlation function in the ground state:

$$K^2(i, j) = \langle S_i^z S_j^z \rangle = \frac{1}{4}\delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{8}\delta_{|i-j|,1} \quad (31)$$

The four-spin correlation function has off-diagonal LRO.

$$\begin{aligned} K^4(ij, lm) &= \langle S_i^x S_j^x S_l^y S_m^y \rangle \\ &= K^2(ij)K^2(lm) \\ &+ \frac{1}{64}\delta_{|i-j|,1}\delta_{|l-m|,1}\exp(i\pi(\frac{i+j}{2} - \frac{l+m}{2})) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Let T be the translation operator for unit displacement. Then

$$T\phi_1 = \phi_2, T\phi_2 = \phi_1 \quad (33)$$

The states

$$\phi^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\phi_1 + \phi_2), \phi^- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\phi_1 - \phi_2) \quad (34)$$

correspond to momentum wave vectors $k = 0$ and $k = \pi$. The excitation spectrum is not exactly known. Shastry and Sutherland [40] have derived the excitation spectrum in the basis of ‘defect’ states. A defect state has the wave function

$$\psi(p, m) = \dots[2p-3, 2p-2]\alpha_{2p-1}[2p, 2p+1]\dots[2m-2, 2m-1]\alpha_{2m}[2m+1, 2m+2]\dots \quad (35)$$

where the defects (α_{2p-1} and α_{2m}) separate two ground states. The two defects are up-spins and the total spin of the state is 1. Similarly, the defect spins can be in a singlet spin configuration so that the total spin of the state is 0. Because of PBC, the defects occur in pairs. A variational state can be constructed by taking a linear combination of the defect states. The excitation spectrum consists of a continuum with a lower edge at $J(\frac{5}{2} - 2|\cos k|)$. A bound state of the two defects can occur in a restricted region of momentum wave vectors. The MG chain has been studied for general values αJ of the n.n.n. interaction [41]. The ground state is known exactly only at the MG point $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$. The excitation spectrum is gapless for $0 < \alpha < \alpha_{cr} (\simeq 0.2411)$. Generalizations of the MG model to two dimensions exist [42, 43]. The Shastry-Sutherland model [42] is defined on a square lattice and includes diagonal interactions as shown in Figure 1. The n.n. and diagonal exchange interactions are of strength J_1 and J_2 respectively. For $\frac{J_1}{J_2}$ below a critical value ~ 0.7 , the exact ground state consists of singlets along the diagonals. At the critical point, the ground state

changes from the gapful disordered state to the AFM ordered gapless state. The compound $SrCu_2(BO_3)_2$ is well-described by the Shastry-Sutherland model [19]. Bose and Mitra [43] have constructed a $J_1 - J_2 - J_3 - J_4 - J_5$ spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ model on the square lattice. J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4 and J_5 are the strengths of the n.n., diagonal, n.n.n., knight's-move-distance-away and further-neighbour-diagonal exchange interactions (Figure 2). The four columnar dimer states (Figure 3) have been found to be the exact eigenstates of the spin Hamiltonian for the ratio of interaction strengths

$$J_1 : J_2 : J_3 : J_4 : J_5 = 1 : 1 : \frac{1}{2} : \frac{1}{2} : \frac{1}{4} \quad (36)$$

It has not been possible as yet to prove that the four columnar dimer states are also the ground states. Using the method of 'divide and conquer', one can only prove that a single dimer state is the exact ground state with the dimer bonds of strength $7J$. The strengths of the other exchange interactions are as specified in (36). For a 4×4 lattice with PBC, one can trivially show that the four CD states are the exact ground states.

C. The Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki (AKLT) model [44]

We have already discussed the LSM theorem, the proof of which fails for integer spin chains. Haldane [12, 13] in 1983 made the conjecture, based on a mapping of the HAFM Hamiltonian, in the long wavelength limit, onto the nonlinear σ model, that integer-spin HAFM chains have a gap in the excitation spectrum. The conjecture has now been verified both theoretically and experimentally [45]. In 1987, AKLT constructed a spin-1 model in 1d for which the ground state could be determined exactly [44]. Consider a 1d lattice, each site of which is occupied by a spin-1. Each such spin can be considered to be a symmetric combination of two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$'s. Thus, one can write down

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{++} &= |++\rangle, S^z = +1 \\ \psi_{--} &= |--\rangle, S^z = -1 \\ \psi_{+-} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|+-\rangle + |-+\rangle), S^z = 0 \\ \psi_{-+} &= \psi_{+-} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where '+' ('-') denotes an up (down) spin.

AKLT constructed a valence bond solid (VBS) state in the following manner. In this state, each spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ component of a spin-1 forms a singlet (valence bond) with a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ at a neighbouring site. Let $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}$ ($\alpha, \beta = +$ or $-$) be the antisymmetric tensor:

$$\epsilon^{++} = \epsilon^{--} = 0, \epsilon^{+-} = -\epsilon^{-+} = 1 \quad (38)$$

A singlet spin configuration can be expressed as $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta} |\alpha\beta\rangle$, summation over repeated indices being implied. The VBS wave function (with PBC) can be written as

$$|\psi_{VBS}\rangle = 2^{-\frac{N}{2}} \psi_{\alpha_1\beta_1} \epsilon^{\beta_1\alpha_2} \psi_{\alpha_2\beta_2} \epsilon^{\beta_2\alpha_3} \dots \psi_{\alpha_i\beta_i} \epsilon^{\beta_i\alpha_{i+1}} \psi_{\alpha_N\beta_N} \epsilon^{\beta_N\alpha_1} \quad (39)$$

$|\psi_{VBS}\rangle$ is a linear superposition of all configurations in which each $S^z = +1$ is followed by a $S^z = -1$ with an arbitrary number of $S^z = 0$ spins in between and vice versa. If one leaves out the zero's, one gets a Néel-type of order. One can define a non-local string operator

$$\sigma_{ij}^\alpha = -S_i^\alpha \exp(i\pi \sum_{l=i+1}^{j-1} S_l^\alpha) S_j^\alpha, (\alpha = x, y, z) \quad (40)$$

and the order parameter

$$O_{string}^\alpha = \lim_{|i-j| \rightarrow \infty} \langle \sigma_{ij}^\alpha \rangle \quad (41)$$

The VBS state has no conventional LRO but is characterised by a non-zero value $\frac{4}{9}$ of O_{string}^α . After constructing the VBS state, AKLT determined the Hamiltonian for which the VBS state is the exact ground state. The Hamiltonian is

$$H_{AKLT} = \sum_i P_2(\vec{S}_i + \vec{S}_{i+1}) \quad (42)$$

where P_2 is the projection operator onto spin 2 for a pair of n.n. spins. The presence of a VB between each neighbouring pair implies that the total spin of each pair cannot be 2 (after two of the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ variables form a singlet, the remaining $S = \frac{1}{2}$'s could form either a triplet or a singlet). Thus, H_{AKLT} acting on $|\psi_{VBS}\rangle$ gives zero. Since H_{AKLT} is a sum over projection operators, the lowest possible eigenvalue is zero. Hence, $|\psi_{VBS}\rangle$ is the ground state of H_{AKLT} with eigenvalue zero. The AKLT ground state (the VBS state) is spin-disordered and the two-spin correlation function has an exponential decay. The total spin of two spin-1's is 2, 1, 0. The projection operator onto spin j for a pair of n.n. spins has the general form

$$P_j(\vec{S}_i + \vec{S}_{i+1}) = \prod_{l \neq j} \frac{[l(l+1) - \vec{S}^2]}{[l(l+1) - j(j+1)]} \quad (43)$$

where $\vec{S} = \vec{S}_i + \vec{S}_{i+1}$. For the AKLT model, $j = 2$ and $l = 1, 0$. From (42) and (43),

$$H_{AKLT} = \sum_i \left[\frac{1}{2} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_{i+1}) + \frac{1}{6} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_{i+1})^2 + \frac{1}{3} \right] \quad (44)$$

The method of construction of the AKLT Hamiltonian can be extended to higher spins and to dimensions $d > 1$. The MG Hamiltonian (apart from a numerical prefactor and a constant term) can be written as

$$H = \sum_i P_{\frac{3}{2}}(\vec{S}_i + \vec{S}_{i+1} + \vec{S}_{i+2}) \quad (45)$$

The $S = 1$ HAFM and the AKLT chains are in the same Haldane phase, characterised by a gap in the excitation spectrum. The physical picture provided by the VBS ground state of the AKLT Hamiltonian holds true for real systems [46]. The excitation spectrum of H_{AKLT} cannot be determined exactly. Arovav et al. [47] have proposed a trial wave function

$$|k\rangle = N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^N e^{ikj} S_j^\mu |\psi_{VBS}\rangle, \mu = z, +, - \quad (46)$$

and obtained

$$\epsilon(k) = \frac{\langle k | H_{VBS} | k \rangle}{\langle k | k \rangle} = \frac{25 + 15\cos(k)}{27} \quad (47)$$

The gap in the excitation spectrum $\Delta = \frac{10}{27}$ at $k = \pi$. Another equivalent way of creating excitations is to replace a singlet by a triplet spin configuration [48].

3 Spin Ladders

A. Undoped ladders

In the last Section, we discussed some exact results for interacting spin systems. The powerful technique of BA was described. The BA cannot provide knowledge of correlation functions. There is another powerful technique for 1d many body systems known as bosonization [49] which enables one to calculate various correlation functions for 1d systems. After the discovery of high- T_c cuprate systems, the study of 2d AFMs acquired considerable importance. There are, however, not many rigorous results available for 2d spin systems. Ladder systems interpolate between a single chain (1d) and the square lattice (2d) and are ideally suited for the study of the crossover from 1d to 2d. Consider a two-chain spin ladder (Figure 4) described by the AFM Heisenberg exchange interaction Hamiltonian

$$H_{J-J_R} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \quad (48)$$

The n.n. intra-chain and the rung exchange interactions are of strength J and J_R respectively. When $J_R = 0$, one obtains two decoupled AFM spin chains for which the excitation spectrum is known to be gapless. Dagotto et al. [50] derived the interesting result that the lowest excitation spectrum is separated by an energy gap from the ground state. The result is easy to understand in the simple limit in which the exchange coupling J_R along the rungs is much stronger than the exchange coupling J along the chains. The intra-chain coupling may thus be treated as perturbation. When $J = 0$, the exact ground state consists of singlets

along the rungs, each singlet having the spin configuration $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle]$. The ground state energy is $-\frac{3J_R N}{4}$, where N is the number of rungs in the ladder. In first order perturbation theory, the correction to the ground state energy is zero. The ground state has total spin $S = 0$. A $S = 1$ excitation may be created by promoting one of the rung singlets to a $S = 1$ triplet. A triplet has the spin configuration $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ ($S^z = +1$), $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\uparrow\downarrow + \downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ ($S^z = 0$) and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ ($S^z = -1$). A triplet costs an exchange energy equal to J_R . The weak coupling along the chains gives rise to a band of propagating $S = 1$ magnons with the dispersion relation

$$\omega(k) = J_R + J \cos k \quad (49)$$

in first order perturbation theory (k is the wave vector). The spin gap, defined as the minimum excitation energy is given by

$$\Delta_{SG} = \omega(\pi) \simeq (J_R - J) \quad (50)$$

The two-spin correlations decay exponentially along the chains showing that the ground state is a quantum spin liquid (QSL). As the rung exchange coupling J_R decreases, one expects that the spin gap will also decrease and ultimately become zero at a critical value of J_R . Barnes et al. [51], however, put forward the conjecture that $\Delta_{SG} > 0$ for all $\frac{J_R}{J} > 0$, including the isotropic limit $J_R = J$. A variety of numerical techniques like exact diagonalization of finite-sized ladders [50], Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) simulations [52] and density-matrix renormalization group (DMRG) [53] have verified the conjecture. We now consider the case of an n -chain ladder. A surprising fact emerging out of several theoretical studies [54, 55] is: the excitation spectrum has spin gap (is gapless) when n is even (odd). In the first (second) case, the two-spin correlation function has an exponential (power-law) decay. For odd n , the ladder has properties similar to those of a single chain. The strong coupling limit ($J_R \gg J$) again provides a physical picture as to why this is true. When n is even, the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ spins along a rung continue to form a singlet ground state. Hence the creation of a $S = 1$ excitation requires a finite amount of energy as in the case of the two-chain ladder. The gap should decrease as n increases so that the gapless square lattice limit is reached for large n . When n is odd, each rung consists of an odd number of spins, each of magnitude $\frac{1}{2}$. The inter-rung (intra-chain) coupling J generates an effective interaction between the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ rung states, which because of rotational invariance, should be of the Heisenberg form with an effective coupling J_{eff} setting the energy scale. The equivalence of an odd-chain ladder to the single Heisenberg chain leads to a gapless excitation spectrum. Rojo [56] has given a rigorous proof of the gaplessness of the excitation spectrum when n is odd. Khveshchenko [57] has shown that for odd-chain ladders, a topological term governing the dynamics at long wavelengths appears in the effective action, whereas, it exactly cancels for even-chain ladders. The topological term has similarity to the one that causes the difference between integer and half-odd integer spin chains. In the first case, the spin excitation spectrum has the

well-known Haldane gap. In the latter case, the LSM theorem shows that the excitation spectrum is gapless. Ghosh and Bose [58] have constructed an n -chain spin ladder model for which the exact ground state can be determined for all values of n . For n even (odd), the excitation spectrum has a gap (is gapless). This is true even for large n , thus the square lattice limit cannot be reached in the model. Thermodynamic properties of the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ two-chain ladder have been first studied by Troyer et al. [59]. Using a quantum transfer matrix method, they obtained reliable results down to temperature $T \sim 0.2J$. The AFM correlation length ξ_{AFM} has been found to be 3-4 lattice spacings. The magnetic susceptibility $\chi(T)$ shows a crossover from a Curie-weiss form, $\chi(T) = \frac{C}{T+\theta}$ at high temperature to an exponential fall-off, $\chi(T) \sim \frac{e^{-\frac{\Delta_{SG}}{T}}}{\sqrt{T}}$ as $T \rightarrow 0$. The fall-off is a signature of a finite spin gap Δ_{SG} . Frischmuth et al. [60], using a powerful loop algorithm, have calculated the magnetic susceptibility and found evidence for the gapped (gapless) excitation spectrum in the case of an even (odd)-chain ladder.

A major interest in the study of ladder systems arises from the fact that there is a large number of experimental realizations of ladder systems. A comprehensive review of major experimental systems is that by Dagotto [61]. We discuss here only a few interesting ladder systems. Hiroi et al. [62] were the first to synthesize the family of layer compounds $Sr_{n-1}Cu_{n+1}O_{2n}$. Rice et al. [54] subsequently recognized that these compounds contained weakly-coupled ladders of $\frac{n+1}{2}$ chains. For $n=3$ and 5 , respectively, one gets the two-chain and three-chain ladder compounds. Azuma et al. [63] have determined the temperature dependence of the magnetic susceptibility in these ladder compounds experimentally. A spin gap is indicated by the sharp fall of $\chi(T)$ for $T < 300K$ in the two-chain ladder compound $SrCu_2O_3$. The magnitude of the spin gap is $\Delta_{SG} \sim 420K$. This is approximately in agreement with the theoretical result of $\Delta_{SG} \simeq \frac{J}{2}$, if an exchange coupling $J \sim 1200K$ is assumed. For the three-chain ladder compound $Sr_2Cu_3O_5$, Azuma et al. found that $\chi(T)$ approaches a constant as $T \rightarrow 0$, as expected for the 1d Heisenberg AFM chain. Muon spin relaxation measurements by Kojima et al. [64] shows the existence of a long range ordered state with Néel temperature $T_N = 52$ K, brought about by the interlayer coupling. No sign of long range ordering was found in the two-chain ladder compound, confirming the difference between odd and even chain ladders. The compound $LaCuO_{2.5}$ is formed by an array of weakly interacting two-chain ladders [65]. The evidence of spin-liquid formation at intermediate temperatures (confirmed by the existence of a spin gap) and an ordered Néel state at low temperatures, shows that the spin singlet state is in close competition with a Néel state. Spin ladders, belonging to the organic family of materials, have also been synthesized. A recent example is the compound $(C_5H_{12}N)_2CuBr_4$ [66]. This compound is a good example of a strongly coupled ($\frac{J_F}{J} \simeq 3.5$) ladder system. The phase diagram of the AFM spin ladder in the presence of an external magnetic field is particularly interesting. In the absence of the magnetic field and at $T = 0$, the ground state is a quantum spin liquid with a gap in the excitation spectrum. At a field H_{c1} , there is a transition to a gapless Luttinger

liquid phase ($g\mu_B H_{c_1} = \Delta_{SG}$, the spin gap, μ_B is the Bohr magneton and g the Landé splitting factor). There is another transition at an upper critical field H_{c_2} to a fully polarised FM state. Both H_{c_1} and H_{c_2} are quantum critical points. The phase transitions that occur at these points are quantum phase transitions as they occur at $T = 0$. At a quantum critical point, the system switches from one ground state to another. The transition is brought about by changing a parameter (magnetic field in the present example) other than temperature. At small temperatures, the behaviour of the system is determined by the crossover between two types of critical behaviour: quantum critical behaviour at $T = 0$ and classical critical behaviour at $T \neq 0$. Quantum effects are persistent in the crossover region at small finite temperature and such effects can be probed experimentally. Refs. [67, 68, 69] give extensive reviews of quantum critical phenomena. In the case of the ladder system $(C_5H_{12}N)_2CuBr_4$, the magnetization data, obtained experimentally, exhibit universal scaling behaviour in the vicinity of the critical fields, H_{c_1} and H_{c_2} . We remember that in the vicinity of critical points, physical quantities of a system exhibit scaling behaviour. Quantum spin systems provide several examples of quantum phase transitions and organic spin ladders are systems which provide experimental testing grounds of theories of such transitions. For inorganic spin ladder systems, the value of H_{c_1} is too high to be experimentally accessible.

B. Frustrated spin ladders

Bose and Gayen [70] have studied a two-chain spin ladder model with frustrated diagonal couplings (Figure 5, frustrated spin systems are defined in Section 4). The intra-chain and diagonal spin-spin interactions are of equal strength J . The exchange interactions along the rungs are of strength J_R . It is easy to show that for $J_R \geq 2J$, the exact ground state consists of singlets along the rungs with the energy $E_g = -\frac{3J_R N}{4}$ where N is the number of rungs. Xian [71] pointed out that the Hamiltonian of the frustrated ladder model can be written as

$$H = J_R \sum_i \vec{S}_{1i} \cdot \vec{S}_{2i} + J \sum_i \vec{P}_i \cdot \vec{P}_{i+1} \quad (51)$$

where, $\vec{P}_i = \vec{S}_{1i} + \vec{S}_{2i}$, represents a composite operator at the i -th rung and ‘1’ and ‘2’ refer to the lower and upper chains respectively. Due to the commutativity of the rung interaction part of the Hamiltonian with the second part, the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian can be described in terms of the total spins of individual rungs. The energy eigenvalue for the state with singlets on all the rungs is $E_g^s = -\frac{3J_R N}{4}$. The second term in the Hamiltonian (Eq.(51)) does not contribute in this case. If the two rung spins form a triplet, the second term is equivalent to the Hamiltonian of a spin-1 Heisenberg chain with a one-to-one correspondence between a rung of the ladder and a site of the $S = 1$ chain. Because the two parts of H commute, the eigenvalue, when the rung spins form a triplet is

$$E_g^T = (Je_0 + \frac{J_R}{4})N \quad (52)$$

where $e_0 = -1.40148403897(4)$ is the ground state energy/site of the spin 1 Heisenberg chain. Comparing the energy E_g^T with the energy E_g^s of the rung singlet state, one finds that as long as $\frac{J_R}{J} > (\frac{J_R}{J})_c = e_0$, the latter state is the exact ground state. At the critical value $(\frac{J_R}{J})_c$, there is a first order transition from the rung singlet state to the Haldane phase of the $S = 1$ chain. The lowest spin excitation in the rung singlet state can be created by replacing a rung singlet ($S = 0$) by a triplet ($S = 1$). The triplet excitation spectrum has no dynamics. In a more general parameter regime, i.e., when the intra-chain exchange interaction is not equal in strength to the diagonal exchange interaction, the ground and the excited states can no longer be determined exactly. In this case, one takes recourse to approximate analytical and numerical methods. Kolezhuk and Mikeska [72] have constructed a class of generalised $S = \frac{1}{2}$ two-chain ladder models for which the ground state can be determined exactly. The Hamiltonian H is a sum over plaquette Hamiltonians and each plaquette Hamiltonian contains various two-spin as well as four-spin interaction terms. They have further introduced a toy model, the Generalised Bose-Gayen (GBG) model which has a rich phase diagram in which the phase boundaries can be determined exactly. Recently, some integrable spin ladder models with tunable interaction parameters have been introduced [73, 74, 75]. The integrable models, in general, contain multi-spin interaction terms besides two-spin terms.

C. Doped spin ladders

A major reason for the strong research interest in ladders is that doped ladder models are toy models of strongly correlated systems. The most well-known examples of the latter are the high- T_c cuprate systems. As already mentioned in the Introduction, these systems exhibit a rich phase diagram as a function of the dopant concentration. Doping effectively replaces the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$'s associated with the Cu^{2+} ions in the CuO_2 planes by holes. The holes are mobile in a background of antiferromagnetically interacting Cu spins. Also, due to strong Coulomb correlations, the double occupancy of a site by two electrons, one with spin up and the other with spin down, is prohibited. This is a non-trivial many body problem because it involves a competition between two processes: hole delocalization and exchange energy minimization. A hole moving in an antiferromagnetically ordered spin background, say, the Néel state, gives rise to parallel spin pairs which raise the exchange interaction energy of the system. The questions of interest are: whether a coherent motion of the holes is possible, whether two holes can form a bound state (in the superconducting (SC) phase of the doped cuprates, charge transport occurs through the motion of bound pairs of holes), the development of SC correlations, the possibility of phase separation of holes etc. For the cuprates, a full understanding of many of these issues is as yet lacking (see [76] for a recent review of high- T_c superconductivity). The doped ladders are simple model systems in which the consequences of strong correlation can be studied with greater rigour than in the case of the structurally more complex cuprate systems. Recent experimental evidence [61] suggests that some phenomena are common to ladder and cuprate systems. The study of ladder systems is expected to provide insight on the

common origin of these phenomena. Some ladder compounds can be doped with holes. Much excitement was created in 1996 when the ladder compound $Sr_{14-x}Ca_xCu_{24}O_{41}$ was found to become SC under pressure at $x = 13.6$. The transition temperature $T_c \sim 12K$ at a pressure of 3 GPa. As in the case of SC cuprate systems, holes form bound pairs in the SC phase of ladder systems. The possibility of binding of hole pairs in a two-chain ladder system was first pointed out by Dagotto et al. [50]. The strongly correlated doped ladder system is described by the t-J Hamiltonian

$$H_{t-J} = - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle, \sigma} t_{ij} (\tilde{C}_{i\sigma}^+ \tilde{C}_{j\sigma} + H.C.) + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} (\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j - \frac{1}{4} n_i n_j) \quad (53)$$

The $\tilde{C}_{i\sigma}^+$ and $\tilde{C}_{i\sigma}$ are the electron creation and annihilation operators which act in the reduced Hilbert space (no double occupancy of sites).

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_{i\sigma}^+ &= C_{i\sigma}^+ (1 - n_{i-\sigma}) \\ \tilde{C}_{i\sigma} &= C_{i\sigma} (1 - n_{i-\sigma}) \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

σ is the spin index and n_i, n_j are the occupation numbers of the i-th and j-th sites respectively. The term proportional to $n_i n_j$ is often dropped. The first term in Eq.(53) describes the motion of holes with hopping integrals t_R and t for motion along the rung and chain respectively. In the conventional $t - J$ ladder model, i and j are n.n. sites. The second term (minus the $-\frac{1}{4}n_i n_j$ term) is the usual AFM Heisenberg exchange interaction Hamiltonian. The $t - J$ model thus describes the motion of holes in a background of antiferromagnetically interacting spins. In the undoped limit, each site of the ladder is occupied by a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ and the $t - J$ Hamiltonian reduces to the AFM Heisenberg Hamiltonian. Removal of a spin creates an empty site, i.e., a hole. A large number of studies have been carried out on $t - J$ ladder models. These are reviewed in Refs. [61, 77, 78]. We describe briefly some of the major results. A hole-doped single AFM chain is an example of a Luttinger Liquid (LL) which is different from a Fermi liquid. The latter describes interacting electron systems in higher dimensions and at low temperatures. A novel characteristic of a LL is spin-charge separation due to which the charge and spin parts of an electron (or hole) move with different velocities and thus become separated in space. The undoped two-chain ladder has a spin gap. This gap remains finite but changes discontinuously on doping. This is because there are now two distinct triplet excitations (remember that the spin gap is the difference in energies of the lowest triplet excitation and the ground state). One triplet excitation is obtained by exciting a rung singlet to a rung triplet as in the undoped case. A new type of triplet excitation is obtained in the presence of two holes. A clear physical picture is obtained in the limit $J_R \gg J$. In this case, the ground state predominantly consists of singlets along the rungs. On the introduction of a hole, a singlet spin pair is broken and the hole exists with a free spin- $\frac{1}{2}$. In the presence of two holes on two separate rungs, the two free spin- $\frac{1}{2}$'s combine to

give rise to an excited triplet state. The ground state is a singlet and consists of a bound pair of holes. The binding of holes can be understood in a simple manner. Two holes located on two different rungs break two rung singlets and the exchange interaction energy associated with two rungs is lost in the process. If the holes are located on the same rung, the exchange interaction energy of only one rung is lost. If J_R is much greater than the other parameters of the system, the holes preferentially occupy rungs in pairs. As J_R decreases in strength, the hole bound pair has a greater spatial extent. The lightly doped ladder system is not in the LL phase, i.e., no spin-charge separation occurs. The system is in the so-called Luther-Emery phase with gapless charge excitations and gapped spin excitations. A variety of numerical studies show that the hole pairs and the spin gap are present even in the isotropic limit $J_R = J$. Also, the relative state of hole pairs has approximate “d-wave” symmetry with the pairing amplitude having opposite signs along the rungs and the chains. The d-wave symmetry is a feature of strong correlation and is considered to be the symmetry of the pairing state in the case of cuprate systems.

Bose and Gayen [70, 79, 80] have constructed a two-chain $t - J$ ladder model with frustrated diagonal couplings. The intra-chain n.n. and the diagonal hopping integrals have the same strength t . The other parameters have been defined earlier. The special structure of the model enables one to determine the exact ground and excited states in the cases of one and two holes. The most significant result is an exact, analytic solution of the eigenvalue problem associated with two holes in the infinite $t - J$ ladder. The binding of holes has been explicitly demonstrated and the existence of the Luther-Emery phase established. For conventional $t - J$ ladders (the diagonal bonds are missing), the only exact results that have been obtained are through numerical diagonalization of finite-sized ladders. Derivation of exact, analytical results in this case has not been possible so far. The reason for this is that as a hole moves in the antiferromagnetically interacting spin background, spin excitations in the form of parallel spin pairs are generated. Proliferation of states with spin excitations makes the solution of the eigenvalue problem extremely difficult. In the case of the frustrated $t - J$ ladder model, there is an exact cancellation of the terms containing parallel spin pairs [80]. Thus the hole has a perfect coherent motion through the spin background. Frahm and Kundu [81] has constructed an integrable $t - J$ ladder model and obtained the phase diagram. The model contains terms describing correlated hole hopping in chains which may not be realizable in real systems. Several studies have been carried out on the two-chain Hubbard ladder as well as on multi-chain Hubbard and $t - J$ ladders. References of some of the studies may be obtained from [61].

4 Frustrated spin models in 2d

In Sections 2 and 3 we have discussed quasi-1d interacting spin systems, namely, spin chains and ladders. As already mentioned in the Introduction, the CuO_2 plane of the undoped cuprate systems is a 2d AFM. The undoped cuprates

exhibit AFM LRO below a Néel temperature T_N . On the introduction of a few percent of holes, the AFM LRO is rapidly destroyed leaving behind spin-disordered states in the CuO_2 planes. This fact has triggered lots of interest in the study of spin systems with spin disordered states as ground states. Frustrated spin models are ideal candidates for such systems. To understand the origin of frustration, consider the AFM Ising model on the triangular lattice. An elementary plaquette of the lattice is a triangle. The Ising spin variables have two possible values, ± 1 , corresponding to up and down spin orientations. An antiparallel spin pair has the lowest interaction energy $-J$. A parallel spin pair has the energy $+J$. In an elementary triangular plaquette, there are three interacting spin pairs. Due to the topology of the plaquette, all the three pairs cannot be simultaneously antiparallel. There is bound to be at least one parallel spin pair. The parallel spin pair may be located along any one of the three bonds in the plaquette and so the ground state is triply degenerate. The Ising model on the full triangular lattice has a highly degenerate ground state such that the entropy/spin is a finite quantity. As a result, the system never orders including at $T = 0$. Frustration occurs in the system since all the spin pair interaction energies cannot be simultaneously minimised. On the other hand, consider the AFM Ising model on the square lattice. All the four spin pairs in an elementary square plaquette can be made antiparallel and so there is no frustration. The system exhibits magnetic order below a critical temperature. If one of the spin pair interactions in each elementary square plaquette is FM and the rest AFM, frustration occurs in the square lattice spin system. A spin system with mixed FM and AFM interactions is frustrated if the sign of the product of exchange interactions around an elementary plaquette is negative. In the case of a purely AFM model, frustration occurs if the number of bonds in an elementary plaquette of the lattice is odd. Examples of such lattices in 2d are the triangular and kagomé lattices. In 3d, the pyrochlore lattice, the elementary plaquette of which is a tetrahedron provides an example. A spin system is also frustrated due to the presence of both n.n. as well as further-neighbour interactions. Consider AFM n.n. as well as n.n.n. interactions between a row of three Ising spins. Again, all the three spin pairs cannot simultaneously be made antiparallel.

Let us now treat the spins as classical vectors ($S \rightarrow \infty$). For AFM spin-spin interaction, the lowest energy is achieved for an antiparallel spin configuration. In the classical limit, the spins on a bipartite lattice are ordered in the AFM Néel state. On a non-bipartite lattice, such as the triangular lattice, the classical ground state represents a compromise between competing requirements. In the ground state, the spins form an ordered three-sublattice structure with 120° between n.n. spins on different sublattices. The ground state of the classical Heisenberg model on the kagomé lattice is, however, highly degenerate and disordered. We now consider the full quantum mechanical spin Hamiltonian and ask the question how the classical ground states are modified when quantum fluctuations are taken into account. In the case of the triangular lattice, it is now believed that the quantum mechanical ground state of the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ HAFM model has AFM LRO of the Néel-type, i.e., quantum fluctuations do not destroy the

three-sublattice order of the classical ground state. In the second scenario, when the classical ground state is highly degenerate and disordered, thermal/quantum fluctuations select a subset of states which tend to incorporate some degree of long range order. This is the phenomenon of ‘order from disorder’ which is counterintuitive since order is brought about by fluctuations which normally have disordering effects. The classical kagomé lattice HAFM ground states include both coplanar as well as noncoplanar spin arrangements and fluctuations lead to the selection of coplanar order. This kind of ordering is particularly true for large values of the spin S . As the magnitude of the spin is decreased towards $S = \frac{1}{2}$, the quantum fluctuations increase in strength. These fluctuations often destroy the ordered structure obtained for large S . The quantum mechanical ground states of the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ HAFM on the kagomé and pyrochlore lattices have been found to be spin disordered. Some recent references of frustrated magnetic systems are [82, 83]. The triangular lattice $S = \frac{1}{2}$ HAFM is the first example of a spin model in which frustration occurs due to lattice topology [84]. The $S = \frac{1}{2}$ HAFM model has also been studied on a partially frustrated pentagonal lattice [?] and a parameter region identified in which the ground state has AFM LRO of the Néel-type.

Two well-known examples of spin-disordered states are the quantum spin liquid (QSL) and dimer or valence bond (VB) states. A QSL state is a spin singlet with total spin $S = 0$ and has both spin rotational and translational symmetry. In a VB state, spin rotational symmetry is present but translational symmetry is broken. In such states pairs of spins form singlets which are called VBs or dimers with the VBs being frozen in space. A well-known example of a QSL state is the resonating-valence-bond (RVB) state [84] which is a coherent linear superposition of VB states (Figure 6). The RVB state is the starting point for the well-known RVB theory of high- T_c SC. Spin-disordered (no AFM LRO as defined in Eq. (8)) states with novel order parameters are:

(a) Chiral states

In these states, the spins are arranged in configurations characterised by the order parameter

$$\Delta_i = \left\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot (\vec{S}_{i+\hat{x}} \times \vec{S}_{i+\hat{y}}) \right\rangle \quad (55)$$

with the three spins belonging to one plaquette of the square lattice and \hat{x}, \hat{y} denoting unit vectors in the x and y directions respectively. The chiral state breaks time reversal symmetry or a reflection about an axis (parity).

(b) Dimer states

These are the VB states in which the VBs are frozen in space. A well-known example of such states is the columnar dimer (CD) states. In such states, the VBs are arranged in columns. On the square lattice, four such states are possible. The order parameter of CD states is

$$D_l = \left\langle \eta(l) \vec{S}_l \cdot (\vec{S}_{l+\hat{x}} + i \vec{S}_{l+\hat{y}} - \vec{S}_{l-\hat{x}} - i \vec{S}_{l-\hat{y}}) \right\rangle \quad (56)$$

where the l-sites are even and $\eta(l) = +1(-1)$ if both l_x and l_y are even (odd). The order parameter takes the values $1, i, -1, -i$ for the four CD states shown

in Figure 3.

(c) Twisted states:

At the classical level ($S \rightarrow \infty$), the spins in the twisted state are arranged in incommensurate structures. These configurations can be visualised as spins lying in a plane and with a twist angle in some direction. It is possible that such states survive the inclusion of quantum fluctuations. The order parameter is vectorial in nature and is given by

$$T_l = \left\langle \vec{S}_l \times (\vec{S}_{l+\hat{x}} + \vec{S}_{l+\hat{y}}) \right\rangle \quad (57)$$

These states are called spin nematics and are different from helimagnets in which both T_l and the spin-spin correlation functions show LRO.

(d) Strip or Collinear States

In a classical picture, the spins are ferromagnetically ordered in the x direction and antiferromagnetically ordered in the y direction. The configuration obtained by rotating the previous one by $\frac{\pi}{2}$ is also possible. The order parameter is given by

$$C_l = \left\langle \vec{S}_l \cdot (\vec{S}_{l+\hat{x}} - \vec{S}_{l+\hat{y}} + \vec{S}_{l-\hat{x}} - \vec{S}_{l-\hat{y}}) \right\rangle \quad (58)$$

C_l takes the values $1, -1$ in the two different strip configurations.

The spin-disordered states described above are quantum-coherent states and are characterised by novel order parameters. The term ‘quantum paramagnet’ is often used to describe such states.

Examples of real frustrated systems are many [82, 83]. The best studied experimental kagomé system is the magnetoplumbite, $SrCr_{8-x}Ga_{4+x}O_{19}$. The system consists of dense kagomé layers of $S = \frac{3}{2}$ Cr ions, separated by dilute triangular layers of Cr. In a mean-field theory of the HAFM, the high temperature susceptibility is given by

$$\chi = \frac{C}{T + \theta_{cw}}, T \gg T_N \quad (59)$$

Here, the Curie constant $C = \frac{\mu_B^2 p^2}{3k_B}$, where μ_B is the Bohr magneton and, $p = g[s(s+1)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$, g being the Landé splitting factor governing the splitting of the spin multiplet in a magnetic field. Also, θ_{cw} is the Curie-Weiss temperature. The Néel ordering temperature T_N is defined experimentally using bulk probes. One looks for singularities in either the specific heat $C(T)$ or the temperature derivative of the susceptibility $\chi(T)$. In the case of non-frustrated systems, $T_N \sim \theta_{cw}$ and in the second case, $T_N \ll \theta_{cw}$. Since a frustrated system may not order at all in a conventional sense, the hallmark of such a system is $T_c \ll \theta_{cw}$ where T_c is the temperature below which new types of spin order set in. The Curie-weiss temperature θ_{cw} is an experimentally measurable quantity. One defines an empirical measure of frustration by the quantity

$$f = -\frac{\theta_{cw}}{T_c} \quad (60)$$

Frustration corresponds to $f > 1$. For the kagomé AFM $SrCr_8Ga_4O_{19}$, f is as high as 150.

$SrCrGaO$ displays unconventional low-T behaviour [86]. One of these is the insensitivity of the specific heat $C(T)$ to applied magnetic fields H as large as twice the temperature. Susceptibility measurements show the existence of a gap Δ_{SG} in the triplet spin excitation spectrum. For $T < \Delta_{SG}$, $\chi \sim e^{-\frac{\Delta_{SG}}{k_B T}}$. The specific heat, however, does not decrease exponentially for $T < \Delta_{SG}$, i.e., does not have a thermally activated behaviour. It has a T^2 dependence. This fact along with the experimental observation of insensitivity of $C(T)$ to external magnetic field have been explained by suggesting that a large number of singlet excitations fall within the triplet gap [86]. Numerical evidence of such excitations has been obtained in the case of the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ HAFM on the kagomé lattice [87]. The number of such excitations has been found to be $\sim (1.15)^N$ where N is the number of spins in the lattice. Mambrini and Mila [88] have recently established that a subset of short-range RVB states captures the specific low energy physics of the kagomé lattice HAFM and the number of singlet states in the singlet-triplet gap is $(1.15)^N$ in agreement with the numerical results. The appearance of singlet states in the singlet-triplet gap could be a generic feature of strongly frustrated magnets. Other examples of such systems are: the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ frustrated HAFM on the $\frac{1}{5}$ -depleted square lattice describing the 2d AFM compound CaV_4O_9 [89, 90], the HAFM on the 3d pyrochlore lattice and a 1d system of coupled tetrahedra [91]. Bose and Ghosh [90] have constructed a frustrated $S = \frac{1}{2}$ AFM model on the $\frac{1}{5}$ -depleted square lattice and have shown that in different parameter regimes the plaquette RVB (PRVB) and the dimer states are the exact ground states. In the PRVB state, the four-spin plaquettes (Figure 7) are in a RVB spin configuration which is a linear superposition of two VB states. In one such state, the VBs (spin singlets) are horizontal and in the other state the VBs are vertical. In the dimer state, VBs or dimers form along the bonds joining the four-spin plaquettes. Both the PRVB and the dimer states are spin disordered states. The state intermediate between the PRVB and the dimer states has AFM LRO. Both the PRVB and dimer phases are characterised by spin gaps in the excitation spectrum. For the unfrustrated HAFM model on the $\frac{1}{5}$ -depleted square lattice, Troyer et al. [92] have carried out a detailed study of the quantum phase transition from an ordered to a disordered phase. In the ordered phase, the excitation spectrum is gapless. The spin gap Δ_{SG} continuously goes to zero in a power-law fashion at the quantum critical point separating a gapped disordered phase from a gapless ordered phase. Chung et al. [93] have carried out an extensive study on the possible paramagnetic phases of the Shastry-Sutherland model [19]. In addition to the usual dimer phase, they find the existence of a phase with plaquette order and also a topologically ordered phase with deconfined $S = \frac{1}{2}$ spinons and helical spin correlations. Takushima et al. [94] have studied the ground state phase diagram of a frustrated $S = \frac{1}{2}$ quantum spin model on the square lattice. This model includes both the Shastry-Sutherland model as well as the spin model on the $\frac{1}{5}$ -depleted square lattice as special cases. The nature of quantum phase

transitions among the various spin gap phases and the magnetically ordered phases has been clarified.

Lieb and Schupp [95] have derived some exact results for the fully frustrated HAFM on a pyrochlore checkerboard lattice in 2d. This lattice is a 2d version of the 3d pyrochlore lattice. The ground states have been rigorously proved to be singlets. The Lieb-Mattis theorem is applicable only for bipartite lattices. Hence, the proof for the pyrochlore checkerboard lattice is a new result. Lieb and Schupp have further proved that the magnetization in zero external field vanishes separately for each frustrated tetrahedral unit. Also, the upper bound on the susceptibility is $\frac{1}{8}$ in natural units for both $T = 0$ and $T \neq 0$. Frustration can also occur from a competition between exchange anisotropy and the transverse field terms as in the case of the transverse Ising model. Moessner et al. [96] have shown that the transverse Ising model on the triangular (kagomé) lattice has an ordered (disordered) ground state.

Frustrated AFMs with short-range dimer or RVB states as ground states have a gap in the spin excitation spectrum and the two-spin correlation function has an exponential decay as a function of the distance separating the spins. A single branch describes the $S = 1$ triplet excitation spectrum. In Section 2 we pointed out that in the case of the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ HAFM chain, a pair of spinons (each spinon has spin $S = \frac{1}{2}$) are the fundamental excitations. The lowest excitation spectrum is thus not a single branch of $S = 1$ magnon excitations but a continuum of scattering states with well-defined lower and upper boundaries. AFM compounds in 2d, in general, have excitation spectra described by $S = 1$ magnons. Anderson [84] suggested that a RVB state may support pairs of spinons as excitations which are deconfined via a rearrangement of the VBs. In this case, an extended and highly dispersive continuum of excitations is expected. Recently, Coldea et al. [97] have investigated the ground state ordering and dynamics of the 2d $S = \frac{1}{2}$ frustrated AFM Cs_2CuCl_4 using neutron scattering in high magnetic fields. The dynamic correlations exhibit a highly dispersive continuum of excited states which are characteristic of the RVB state and arise from pairs of $S = \frac{1}{2}$ spinons. A recent paper ‘RVB Revisited’ by P.W.Anderson [98] focuses on the relevance of the RVB state to describe the normal state of the CuO_2 planes in the high- T_c cuprate superconductors.

5 Concluding remarks

In Sections 1-4, a brief overview of low-dimensional quantum magnets, specially, antiferromagnets has been given. The subject of quantum magnetism has witnessed an unprecedented growth in research activity in the last decade. This is one of the few research areas in which rigorous theories can be worked out and experimental realizations are not difficult to find. Coordination chemists and material scientists have prepared novel materials and constructed new application devices. Experimentalists have employed experimental probes of all kinds to refine old data and uncover new phenomena. Theorists have taken recourse to a variety of analytical and numerical techniques to explain the experimen-

tally observed properties as well as to make new predictions. Powerful theorems have been proposed and exact results obtained. This trend is still continuing and will lead to further breakthroughs in materials, phenomena and techniques in the coming years. The study of doped magnetic materials which include cuprates, ladders and spin chains has acquired considerable importance in recent times. The dopants can be magnetic and nonmagnetic impurities as well as holes. To give one example, it has been possible to dope the spin-1 Haldane-gap AFM compound Y_2BaNiO_5 with holes. Neutron scattering experiments reveal the existence of midgap states and an incommensurate double-peaked structure factor [99]. Several new experimental results on the Haldane-gap AFMs have been obtained in the last few years [100] which add to the richness of phenomena observed in magnetic systems. In this overview, only a few of the aspects of quantum magnetism have been highlighted. Conventional 2d and 3d magnets have not been discussed at all as a good understanding of these materials already exists. We have not discussed recent advances in material applications which include materials exhibiting colossal magnetoresistance, molecular magnets, nanocrystalline magnetic materials, magnetoelectronic devices (the study of which constitutes the new subject of spintronics) etc. A report on some of these developments as well as some recent issues in quantum magnetism may be obtained from Ref. [101].

References

- [1] D. C. Mattis, The Theory of Magnetism I (Springer-Verlag 1981)
- [2] L. J. de Jongh and A. R. Miedema, Adv. Phys. 23, 1 (1974)
- [3] C. K. Majumdar and D. K. Ghosh, J. Math. Phys. 10, 1388 (1969)
- [4] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 635 (1988); B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 639 (1988)
- [5] I. Bose, S. Chatterjee and C. K. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. B 29, 2741 (1984)
- [6] D. C. Mattis, The Theory of Magnetism II (Springer-Verlag 1985)
- [7] The Many-body Problem: An Encyclopedia of Exactly Solved Models in One Dimension ed. by D. C. Mattis (World Scientific 1993)
- [8] M. Steiner, J. Villain and C. G. Windsor, Adv. Phys. 25, 87 (1976)
- [9] E. H. Lieb and D. C. Mattis, J. Math. Phys. 3, 749 (1962)
- [10] W. Marshall, Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A 232, 48 (1955)
- [11] E. H. Lieb, T. D. Schultz and D. C. Mattis, Ann. Phys. 16, 407 (1961)
- [12] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 1153 (1983); Phys. Lett. A 93, 464 (1983)

- [13] I. Affleck, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 1, 3047 (1989)
- [14] M. Oshikawa, M. Yamanaka and I. Affleck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78, 1984 (1997)
- [15] K. Hida, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* 63, 2359 (1994)
- [16] D. C. Cabra, M. D. Grynberg, A. Honecker and P. Pujol, *cond-mat/0010376*
- [17] W. Shiramura et al., *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* 67, 1548 (1998)
- [18] I. Affleck, *Phys. Rev. B* 37, 5186 (1988); G. Misguich and C. Lhuillier, *cond-mat/0002170*
- [19] H. Kageyama et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 3168 (1999); H. Kageyama et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84, 5876 (2000)
- [20] N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 22, 1133 (1966)
- [21] F. Dyson, E. H. Lieb and B. Simon, *J. Stat. Phys.* 18, 335 (1978); T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb and B. S. Shastry, *J. Stat. Phys.* 53, 1019 (1988)
- [22] E. J. Neves and J. F. Perez, *Phys. Lett.* 114 A, 331 (1986)
- [23] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb and H. Tasaki, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 115, 447 (1988)
- [24] H. Bethe, *Z. Physik* 71, 205 (1931); see also [7] for an English translation of Bethe's paper
- [25] J. B. Torrance and M. Tinkham, *Phys. Rev.* 187, 59 (1969)
- [26] D. F. Nicoli and M. Tinkham, *Phys. Rev. B* 9, 3126 (1974)
- [27] J. des Cloizeaux and J. J. Pearson, *Phys. Rev.* 128, 2131 (1962)
- [28] L. D. Faddeev and L. A. Takhtajan, *Phys. Lett.* 85A, 375 (1981); see also C. K. Majumdar in *Exactly Solvable Problems in Condensed Matter and Relativistic Field Theory* ed. by B. S. Shastry, S. S. Jha and V. Singh (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg 1985)
- [29] D. A. Tennant, T. G. Perring, R. A. Cowley and S. E. Nagler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 70, 4003 (1993)
- [30] L. A. Takhtajan in *Exactly Solvable Problems in Condensed Matter and Relativistic Field Theory* ed. by B. S. Shastry, S. S. jha and V. Singh (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg 1985)
- [31] I. Bose in *Models and Techniques of Statistical Physics* ed. by S. M. Bhat-tacharjee (Narosa, New Delhi India 1997), p. 156
- [32] I. Bose, *cond-mat/0011262*

- [33] E. H. Lieb and W. Liniger, Phys. Rev. 130, 1605 (1963); E. H. Lieb, Phys. Rev. 130, 1616 (1963); M. Gaudin, Phys. Letters 24A, 55 (1967); C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 1312 (1967); C. N. Yang and C. P. Yang, J. Math. Phys. 10, 1115 (1969)
- [34] E. H. Lieb and F. Y. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 20, 1445 (1968)
- [35] B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34, 1083 (1975); *ibid* 35, 185 (1975)
- [36] B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. B 12, 3795 (1975)
- [37] N. Andrei, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 379 (1980)
- [38] P. B. Wiegmann, J. Phys. C 14, 1463 (1981); V. M. Filyov, A. M. Tselvik and P. G. Wiegmann, Phys. Lett. 81 A, 175 (1981)
- [39] P. A. Bares and G. Blatter, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 2567 (1990)
- [40] B. S. Shastry and B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 964 (1981)
- [41] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. B 25, 4925 (1982); K. Okamoto and K. Nomura, Phys. Lett. A 169, 433 (1992)
- [42] B. S. Shastry and B. Sutherland, Physica B 108, 1069 (1981)
- [43] I. Bose and P. Mitra, Phys. Rev. B 44, 443 (1991); see also U. Bhaumik and I. Bose, Phys. Rev. B 52, 12484 (1995)
- [44] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb and H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 799 (1987)
- [45] J. P. Renard et al., Europhys. Lett. 3, 945 (1987); M. Date and K. Kindo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 1659 (1991)
- [46] M. Hagiwara et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 3181 (1990)
- [47] D. P. Arovas, A. Auerbach and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 531 (1988)
- [48] G. Fáth and J. Sólyom, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 5, 8983 (1993)
- [49] J. von Delft and H. Schoeller, Ann. der Physik 4, 225 (1998)
- [50] E. Dagotto, J. Riera and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B 45, 5744 (1992)
- [51] T. Barnes, E. Dagotto, J. Riera and E. Swanson, Phys. Rev. B 47, 3196 (1993)
- [52] M. Greven, R. J. Birgeneau and U.-J. Wiese, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 1865 (1996)
- [53] S. R. white, R. M. Noack and D. J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 886 (1994)

- [54] T. M. Rice, S. Gopalan and M. Sigrist, *Europhys. Lett.* **23**, 445 (1993)
- [55] S. Gopalan, T. M. Rice and M. Sigrist, *Phys. Rev. B* **49**, 8901 (1994)
- [56] A. Rojo, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 9172 (1996)
- [57] D. V. Khveschenko, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 380 (1994)
- [58] A. Ghosh and I. Bose, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 3613 (1997)
- [59] M. Troyer, H. Tsunetsugu and D. Würtz, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 13515 (1994)
- [60] B. Frischmuth, B. Ammon and M. Troyer, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, R3714 (1996)
- [61] E. Dagotto, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **62**, 1525 (1999)
- [62] Z. Hiroi, M. Azuma, M. Takano and Y. Bando, *J. Solid State Chem.* **95**, 230 (1991)
- [63] M. Azuma, Z. Hiroi, M. Takano, K. Ishida and Y. Kitaoka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 3463 (1994)
- [64] K. Kojima et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 2812 (1995)
- [65] Z. Hiroi and M. Takano, *Nature* **377**, 41 (1995); Z. Hiroi, *J. Solid State Chem.* **123**, 223 (1996)
- [66] B. C. Watson et al., *cond-mat/0011052*
- [67] S. L. Sondhi, S. M. Girvin, J. P. Carini and D. Shahar, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **69**, 315 (1997)
- [68] A. Dutta and B. K. Chakrabarti, *Indian J. Phys.* **72B**, 301 (1998)
- [69] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999)
- [70] I. Bose and S. Gayen, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 10653 (1993)
- [71] Y. Xian, *Phys. Rev. B* **52**, 12485 (1995)
- [72] A. K. Kolezhuk and H. J. Mikeska, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **12**, 2325 (1998)
- [73] S. Albeverio, S.-M. Fei and Y. Wang, *Europhys. Lett.* **47**, 364 (1999)
- [74] Y. Wang, *cond-mat/9901168*
- [75] M. T. Batchelor and M. Maslen, *cond-mat/9907486*
- [76] J. Orenstein and A. J. Millis, *Science* **288**, 468 (2000)
- [77] E. Dagotto and T. M. Rice, *Science* **271**, 618 (1996)
- [78] T. M. Rice, *Z. Phys. B* **103**, 165 (1997)

- [79] I. Bose and S. Gayen, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 6, L405 (1994)
- [80] I. Bose and S. Gayen, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 11, 6427 (1999)
- [81] H. Frahm and A. Kundu, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* 11, L557 (1999)
- [82] A. P. Ramirez, *Ann. Rev. Mater. Sci.* 24, 453 (1994)
- [83] R. Moessner, *cond-mat/0010301*
- [84] P. W. Anderson, *Mater. Res. Bull.* 8, 153 (1973); P. Fazekas and P. W. Anderson, *Phil. Mag.* 30, 432 (1974)
- [85] U. Bhaumik and I. Bose, *Phys. Rev. B* 58, 73 (1998)
- [86] P. Sindzingre et al., *cond-mat/9907220*
- [87] C. Waldtmann et al., *Eur. Phys. J. B* 2, 501 (1991)
- [88] F. Mila, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 81, 2356 (1998); M. Mambrini and F. Mila, *cond-mat/0003080*
- [89] M. Albrecht, F. Mila and D. Poilblanc, *Phys. Rev.* 54, 5856 (1996)
- [90] I. Bose and A. Ghosh, *Phys. Rev. B* 56, 3154 (1997)
- [91] M. Mambrini, J. Trébosch and F. Mila, *Phys. Rev. B* 59, 13806 (1999); B. Canals and C. Lacroix, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 80, 2933 (1998)
- [92] M. Troyer and M. Imada, *cond-mat/9703049*
- [93] C. H. Chung, J. B. Marston and S. Sachdev, *cond-mat/0102222*
- [94] Y. Takushima, A. Koga and N. Kawakami, *cond-mat/0103264*
- [95] E. H. Lieb and P. Schupp, *math-ph/9908019*
- [96] R. Moessner, S. L. Sondhi and P. Chandra, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84, 4457 (2000)
- [97] R. Coldea, D. A. Tennant, A. M. Tsvetlik and Z. Tylczynski, *cond-mat/0007172*
- [98] P. W. Anderson, *cond-mat/0104332*
- [99] G. Xu et al., *Science* 289, 419 (2000); see also I. Bose and E. Chattopadhyay, *cond-mat/0012006*
- [100] A. Zheludev et al., *cond-mat/0006350*; see also I. Bose and E. Chattopadhyay, *Phys. Rev. B* 60, 12138 (1999); A. Zheludev et al., *cond-mat/0104311*
- [101] R. R. P. Singh, W. E. Pickett, D. W. Hone and D. J. Scalapino, *cond-mat/0007086*

Figure Captions

Figure 1. The Shastry-Sutherland model

Figure 2. Five types of interaction in the $J_1 - J_2 - J_3 - J_4 - J_5$ model

Figure 3. Four columnar dimer states

Figure 4. A two-chain spin ladder

Figure 5. The two-chain frustrated spin ladder model

Figure 6. An example of a RVB state

Figure 7. The $\frac{1}{5}$ -depleted square lattice.















