

Heavy fermion behavior of itinerant frustrated systems: β -Mn, Y(Sc)Mn₂ and LiV₂O₄

C. Lacroix

Laboratoire Louis Néel, CNRS, BP 166, 38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France

(Dated: October 25, 2018)

These three metallic systems do not exhibit any magnetic ordering despite experiments show the existence of localized moments with large antiferromagnetic exchange: this is a consequence of the strong geometric frustration (Y(Sc)Mn₂ and LiV₂O₄ have the Pyrochlore structure, while β -Mn has a more complicated frustrated structure) Another common feature is their very large specific heat coefficient $\gamma = C/T$ (420 mJ mole⁻¹ K⁻² for LiV₂O₄) Several explanations have been proposed for this "3d heavy fermion behavior", including a 3d-Kondo effect. However the similarities between the three compounds indicate that frustration plays a big role. We propose a new model which takes into account the existence of two types of 3d-electrons (localized and itinerant) and a frustrated antiferromagnetic exchange between the localized 3d electrons.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the recent years, there has been a great interest in the study of localized frustrated systems, but much less work whas been devoted to itinerant frustrated systems. In this paper we describe three metallic systems, Y(Sc)Mn₂, β -Mn and LiV₂O₄, in which the absence of any ordered magnetic phase at low temperature is related to their frustrated cristallographic structure. These three compounds exhibit many similarities, the most spectacular being their heavy Fermion behavior, wichh is quite unusual for 3d-electron systems. Table 1 summarizes some properties of these compounds: two of them (Y(Sc)Mn₂ and LiV₂O₄), (ref 1, 2) are similar to pyrochlore systems, while β -Mn has a more complicated structure made of corner-sharing triangles (ref 3,4) for which we have shown that the mean-field ground state is disordered (ref 4). The values of the specific heat coefficient $\gamma = C/T$ (see 2nd line of table 1) are the largest ones observed for 3d-metallic systems (ref 3, 5 and 6), while the values of γ estimated from band structure calculations is at least one order of magnitude smaller (3th line of table 1). In all these compounds the exchange is antiferromagnetic, but in Y(Sc)Mn₂, Θ_p is too high to be measured (line 4 of table 1); another common feature is the finite relaxation rate observed at low temperature in neutron or NMR experiments, similar to 4f heavy fermions (ref 3, 7, 8), from which a characteristic spin-fluctuation temperature can be estimated (last line of table 1). Thus, the same physical picture can be applied to these three systems: strong frustration due to the cristallographic structure prevents any antiferromagnetic ordered ground state and large spin fluctuations are present up to very low temperatures; we propose here that the heavy fermion behavior is a consequence of the peculiar properties of the ground state: due to frustration, a large spin disorder entropy is expected ta low temperature, giving rise to a large cobtribution to the specific heat.

Several models have been proposed for explaining these unusual properties of LiV₂O₄:

- the density of states has been calculated by several

groups (9, 10, 11). In a pyrochlore lattice, flat bands can be obtained within tight binding approximation for s-bands. With d-bands, some bands are almost dispersionless, but all these band calculations, the density at the Fermi level is at lesat 20 times too small to explain the large γ -value. However some interesting features can be deduced from these calculations: the valence of V ions in LiV₂O₄ is 3,5, which indicates that half of the V ions are V⁴⁺ (spin 1/2) and half are V³⁺ (spin 1). The 3d-electrons occupy t_{2g} states: 1 electron is in A_{1g} almost localized orbital, while 0.5 electrons partially fill a twicely degenerate E_g band.

- Fujiwara et al (ref 12) proposed that LiV₂O₄ is close to a para-ferromagnetic instability; the large γ -value would be in this case due to paramagnons. However the exchange interactions are clearly negative in the three systems.

- The possibility of a usual Kondo effect has been discussed by Anisimov et al (ref 13): it was proposed that there is a negative exchange between the localized A_{1g} electron and the itinerant E_g electrons, but since there is a large positive intra-atomic exchange (Hund's coupling), it is then necessary to invoke a quite large intersite negative Kondo coupling to overcome.

It should be mentionned that only very few papers (see e.g. 14) consider the effect of lattice frustration in an itinerant model (Hubbard, t-J, or Kondo lattice model). In this paper we study a double exchange model appropriate for LiV₂O₄, taking explicitly into account the disorder due to frustration.

II. A MODEL FOR LIV₂O₄

As explained above, the band structure calculations indicate that the 3d-electrons are distributed between two types of electronic states:

- 1 electron per site is localized and will be described as a localized spin 1/2, \vec{S}_i . Nearest neighbor localized spins interact through superexchange interaction described by the hamiltonian:

$$H_I = - \sum_{i,j} I_{ij} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \quad (I_{ij} < 0) \quad (1)$$

- 0.5 electrons per site are itinerant. They will be described in tight binding approximation by:

$$H_B = - \sum_{i,j,\sigma} t_{ij} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} \quad (2)$$

we neglect here the degeneracy of the conduction band and the intra-atomic Coulomb interactions between conduction electrons. In the following we do not take into account the real crystallographic structure and we suppose a simple band structure with one atom per unit cell.

- Finally, we take into account the ferromagnetic intra-atomic coupling between conduction and localized electrons due to Hund's rule:

$$H_J = -J_0 \sum_i \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_i \quad (J_0 > 0) \quad (3)$$

Similar models are used in the literature to describe double exchange systems like Manganites. However in our case the main difference comes from the frustrated superexchange interaction H_I : if this interaction is larger than double exchange, magnetic ordering cannot be stabilized due to frustration. On the contrary, if double exchange is large, ferromagnetism should occur.

Thus, we consider in the following the case where the localized spins \vec{S}_i are in a spin liquid state which we describe by two conditions: (i) there is no local magnetization: $\langle \vec{S}_i \rangle = 0$; (ii) short range spin-spin correlations play an important role: $\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle \neq 0$ for neighboring sites i and j .

III. SLAVE BOSON MEAN FIELD APPROXIMATION

We treat both interaction terms H_I and H_J using a slave boson mean field approximation similar to what was used in ref 15 for the Kondo lattice model (which is similar except the fact that J_0 is negative in the Kondo model):

- for the intersite term H_I , we introduce fermions creation and annihilation operators, $d_{i\sigma}^\dagger$ $d_{i\sigma}$ instead of the spin operator \vec{S}_i and we introduce the mean field parameter $\Gamma_{ij} = \langle d_{i\sigma}^\dagger d_{j\sigma} \rangle$, as in ref 15. Then, restricting to nearest neighbor exchange, H_I is replaced by:

$$\widetilde{H}_I = \sum_{i,\delta,\sigma} I_{i,i+\delta} \Gamma_{i,i+\delta} d_{i\sigma}^\dagger d_{i+\delta\sigma} - \sum_{i,\delta} I_{i,i+\delta} (\Gamma_{i,i+\delta})^2 \quad (4)$$

where δ connects neighboring sites in the lattice. This approximation is equivalent to a pseudo hopping hamiltonian for the localized d-electrons; the nearest neighbor spin-spin correlation is then negative and given by:

$$\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \rangle = -\frac{3}{2} (\Gamma_{ij})^2 \quad (5)$$

- For the intrasite correlation term, H_J , the mean field approximation of ref. 15 is not appropriate since in the present case J_0 is positive. Instead, we introduce here a pseudo-hybridization between opposite spin directions: $u_i = \langle c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger d_{i\downarrow} \rangle$, which leads to the following effective hamiltonian:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{H}_J = & - \frac{J_0}{4} \sum_i u_i (d_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow} + d_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i\uparrow}) + u_i^* (c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger d_{i\downarrow} + c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger d_{i\uparrow}) \\ & + \frac{J_0}{2} \sum_i u_i^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The local spin-spin correlations are then positive, as expected in the case of positive intra-atomic exchange:

$$\langle \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_i \rangle = u_i^2 \quad (7)$$

- Other parameters have to be introduced to satisfy the charge conservation conditions: on each site the d-electron number should be equal to 1; this can be satisfied by introducing a Lagrange multiplier λ_i . As a consequence of this charge conservation, the d-states will be pinned at the Fermi level, and this will be the origin of the large specific heat coefficient. Finally the Fermi level E_F is determined by fixing the number of conduction electrons (0.5 in LiV_2O_4).

Since we have not taken into account the real crystallographic structure, both conduction and localized electrons are described by one tight binding band, respectively ε_c and ε_d , which are related by: $\varepsilon_d(k) = I\Gamma\varepsilon_c(k) - \lambda$. This relation allows simple analytic calculations.

We restrict to uniform solutions: $\Gamma_{ij} = \Gamma$, $u_i = u$, $\lambda_i = \lambda$. In this case, the picture is that of two hybridized bands, one of them (the d-electron band) has a temperature width $W_d \approx 2z\Gamma I$ and it is pinned at the Fermi level through the parameter λ . The hybridization, $V_{cd} = J_0 u/4$ is also temperature dependent and it produces a strong renormalization of the density of states at the Fermi level, similar to the Kondo lattice. If V_{cd} is large enough, it can open a gap in the density of states, but since the system is far from half-filling, the Fermi level will not be in the gap, but it will be located in the peak of density of states.

The temperature-dependence of Γ , u and λ can also be calculated, as in ref 15: it will define two characteristic temperatures: u vanishes at T_{HF} which can be considered as the characteristic temperature below which Heavy-fermion behavior occurs ($\approx 20^\circ\text{K}$ in LiV_2O_4 as indicated

by experiments); Γ vanishes at T_{mag} which is found to be higher than T_{HF} ; T_{mag} is related to the paramagnetic Curie temperature Θ_p ($\approx 60^\circ K$ in LiV_2O_4). As usual in the mean field slave boson methods, a phase transition occurs at these characteristic temperatures but these transitions are destroyed if fluctuations beyond mean-field are considered; thus, T_{HF} and T_{mag} should be considered as cross-over temperatures, rather than transition temperatures.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have proposed a new picture of the origin of the 3d-heavy heavy fermion behavior, based on a microscopic model suitable for LiV_2O_4 . We have shown that a resonance may occur near the Fermi level due to the coupling of localized and itinerant electrons in a spin liquid background: the itinerant spins "follow" the localized ones through the intra-atomic coupling J_0 and this results in a strongly renormalized density of states for the quasiparticles. There is a main difference with the Kondo case: the origin of the Kondo resonance is in the formation of a collective singlet state due to the Kondo interaction between one localized spin and conduction electrons. Here,

the singlet state is a frustration of intersite frustration.

We have shown two different energy scales are present in this model: T_{HF} and T_{mag} . These temperatures, as well as the value of γ , can be related to the microscopic parameters t_{ij} , I_{ij} and J_0 ; this will be done in the near future for LiV_2O_4 ; estimation of these parameters can be obtained from the band structure calculations: the conduction band width W_c is of the order of 2eV, J_0 is usually taken between 0.5 eV and 1 eV. Estimation of the superexchange interaction I_{ij} is more difficult since the value of the paramagnetic Curie temperature ($\approx 60^\circ K$) reflects both antiferromagnetic superexchange and ferromagnetic double exchange. A crude field calculation gives: $\Theta_p = \frac{S(S+1)}{3}(zI + 2(J_0)^2\chi_0)$, where χ_0 is the susceptibility of itinerant electrons. A quantitative description of LiV_2O_4 requires also to take into account the tight binding band structure in the spinel lattice, which contains almost flat bands already in the absence of any correlations.

Finally, in the introduction we have pointed out the similarities of the three compounds, $\text{Y}(\text{Sc})\text{Mn}_2$, $\beta\text{-Mn}$ and LiV_2O_4 , and possible application of this model to $\text{Y}(\text{Sc})\text{Mn}_2$ and $\beta\text{-Mn}$ requires to identify two types of electrons: localized and itinerant.

5] 1- R. Ballou, E. Lelièvre-Berna, B. Fak, PRL 76 (1996) 2125 2- D.C. Johnston, C.A Swenson, S. Kondo, PRB 59 (1999) 2627 3- H. Nakamura et al, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 9 (1997) 4701 4- B. Canals and C. Lacroix, PRB 61 (2000) 11251 5- H. Wada et al, J. Magn. Mater. 70 (1987) 17 6- S. Kondo et al, PRL 78 (1997) 3729 7- A. Krimmel et al, PRL 82 (1999) 2919 8- M. Shiga, J. Magn. Mater. 129 (1994) 17 9- J. Matsuno et al, PRB 60 (1999) 1607 10- D.J. Singh et al, PRB 60 (1999)

16359 11- V. Eyert et al, Europhys Lett. 46 (1999) 7621 12- N. Fujiwara, H. Yasuoka and Y. Ueda, Phys.Rev. B 57 (1998) 3539 13- V.I. Anisimov, M.A. Korotin, M. Zöfl, T. Pruschke, K. Le Hur and T.M. Rice, PRL 83 (1999) 364 14- M. Isoda and S. Mori, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn 69 (2000) 1509 15- J.R. Iglesias, C. Lacroix and B. Coqblin, Phys. Rev. B 56 (1997) 11820

	Y(Sc)Mn ₂	β -Mn	LiV ₂ O ₄
structure	cubic Laves Phase	cubic A13	spinel
γ (exp.) mJ.mole ⁻¹ K ⁻²	180	70	420
γ (th.) mJ.mole ⁻¹ K ⁻²	13	8	17
Θ_p (K)	?	-50	-63
Γ (meV)	8	20	0.5
T_{sf} (K)	160	400	10

TABLE I: The three frustrated 3d-heavy fermion systems