

Helicoidal ordering in iron perovskites

Maxim Mostovoy

*Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung,
Heisenbergstrasse 1, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany*

(Dated: August 31, 2004)

We consider magnetic ordering in materials with negative charge transfer energy, such as iron perovskite oxides. We show that for a large weight of oxygen holes in conduction bands, the double exchange mechanism favors a helicoidal rather than ferromagnetic spin ordering both in metals, e.g. SrFeO₃ and insulators with a small gap, e.g. CaFeO₃. We discuss the magnetic excitation spectrum and effects of pressure on magnetic ordering in these materials.

PACS numbers: 75.10.-b, 71.30.+h, 75.50.Ee, 75.30.-m

The interaction of itinerant electrons with localized spins couples transport to magnetism and gives rise to many fascinating phenomena, e.g., the heavy fermion and Kondo insulator behavior. In manganese perovskites the strong Hund's rule coupling between the e_g and t_{2g} electrons results in the colossal magnetoresistance near the metal-insulator transition [1]. The transport and magnetic properties of manganites are furthermore strongly influenced by the instability of the partially filled e_g orbitals towards an orbital ordering.

One would expect to find a similar behavior in other transition metal (TM) oxides with partially filled e_g and t_{2g} levels. However, the iron perovskites SrFeO₃ and CaFeO₃ have very different properties. Although the tetravalent iron has the same $t_{2g}^3 e_g^1$ electronic configuration as the Mn³⁺ ion in LaMnO₃, the ferrates, which lie closer to the borderline separating metals and insulators than manganites, exhibit no Jahn-Teller instability: SrFeO₃ is a cubic metal down to lowest temperatures [2], while CaFeO₃ is a charge-ordered insulator below 290K [3]. Both the metallic and insulating ferrates show the helicoidal magnetic (HM) ordering with a small helix wave vector \mathbf{Q} along the body diagonal, which sets in at 134K in SrFeO₃ and at 115K in CaFeO₃ [4, 5, 6]. A further evidence for the decoupling of transport and magnetism in these materials is the absence of a resistivity anomaly at Néel temperature in SrFeO₃ [7].

A possible explanation of the suppression of orbital ordering in Fe⁴⁺ oxides came from photoemission experiments [8], which showed that SrFeO₃ and CaFeO₃ have a large negative charge transfer energy $\Delta \sim -3\text{eV}$ (i.e., the energy necessary to transfer an electron from an oxygen to a TM ion). For large negative Δ , the conduction bands are formed by the strongly hybridized iron e_g and oxygen p_σ orbitals and the nominal d^4 state of the iron ions has a high weight of the d^5 state with holes on oxygen sites. Since the high-spin d^5 configuration is non-degenerate, the orbital ordering is suppressed. Furthermore, for the half filled d -orbital, the charge fluctuations shift from TM sites to Fe-O and O-O bonds, reducing the Coulomb energy cost of the charge ordering.

In this paper we discuss the origin of the helicoidal

magnetism in ferrates. Since magnetism and transport in these materials seem to be largely decoupled, such an ordering cannot result from the spin-density-wave (SDW) or any other Fermi surface instability. The Dzyaloshinskii-Moria interaction [9], responsible for the HM ordering in, e.g., MnSi, is forbidden by symmetry in the cubic SrFeO₃. A non-collinear spin ordering can be a result of the competition between the ferromagnetic (FM) double exchange (DE) [10, 11] and the antiferromagnetic (AFM) superexchange (SE) between the spins of the t_{2g} electrons, as was discussed by de Gennes in Ref. [12]. However, even if we leave aside problems with the phase separation in DE systems [13], the HM state resulting from such a competition, only occurs at low concentrations of charge carriers, for which the kinetic energy of the e_g electrons is comparable with the small superexchange energy of the t_{2g} electrons (the same holds for the spiral state in the tJ -model of doped cuprates [14]). In particular, a non-collinear magnetic ordering in La_{1-x}Sr_xMnO₃ was reported for $x = 0.06 - 0.09$ [15]. Furthermore, the delicate balance between the DE and SE, necessary to stabilize the HM state, is incompatible with the insensitivity of magnetism to transport properties (and vice versa) in SrFeO₃ and CaFeO₃.

Here we establish a relation between the helicoidal ordering and suppression of orbital ordering in ferrates. We show that when the oxygen orbitals are included in the DE model and the density of oxygen holes is high, the kinetic energy of itinerant electrons is minimized for a helicoidal spin ordering. This result holds both for metals and small gap insulators.

The model: We consider an extended version of the DE model, which in addition to itinerant e_g electrons and spins of localized t_{2g} electrons, includes the oxygen σ -orbitals that are strongly hybridized with the TM e_g -orbitals. It is convenient to describe states of the model in terms of holes that can occupy both oxygen and TM sites. By the holes on iron sites we mean the e_g -holes in the high-spin electronic d^5 -configuration (the total spin $S = 5/2$). For infinite Hund's rule coupling, the spin of the e_g hole on the site j is antiparallel to the local spin \mathbf{S}_j . Therefore, these holes can be described by the

spinless operators $d_{j\alpha}$, where the index $\alpha = 1, 2$ denotes, respectively, the $3z^2 - r^2$ and $x^2 - y^2$ orbitals. The holes on oxygen sites can have both spin projections: $p_{j\pm b/2} = \begin{pmatrix} p_{j\pm b/2\uparrow} \\ p_{j\pm b/2\downarrow} \end{pmatrix}$, where $j \pm b/2$ ($b = x, y, z$) are the 6 oxygen sites from the octahedron centered at the TM site j .

The Hamiltonian of the DE dp -model has the form

$$H_{dp} = \sum_{j\alpha b} t_{\alpha b} \left(d_{j\alpha}^\dagger u_j^\dagger P_{jb} + P_{jb}^\dagger u_j d_{j\alpha} \right) + t_{pp} \sum_{j,b\neq c} P_{jb}^\dagger P_{jc} + \Delta \sum_{jb} p_{j+b/2}^\dagger p_{j+b/2}, \quad (1)$$

where the dp - and pp -hopping amplitudes are expressed through the Slater-Koster parameters by $t_1 = (pd\sigma) \left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)$, $t_2 = (pd\sigma) \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, 0\right)$, and $t_{pp} = \frac{1}{2}(pp\sigma) - \frac{1}{2}(pp\pi)$. Since for infinite Hund's rule coupling the hopping on the TM site j is only possible for holes with the spin antiparallel to the local spin $\mathbf{S}_j = S(\sin\theta_j \sin\phi_j, \cos\theta_j \sin\phi_j, \cos\theta_j)$, the oxygen hole operator $P_{jb} = p_{j+b/2} + p_{j-b/2}$ is projected on the spinor

$$u_j = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin\frac{\theta_j}{2} e^{i\phi_j} \\ \cos\frac{\theta_j}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For HM state with the wave vector \mathbf{Q} and spin rotation axis \mathbf{e}_3 the local spin on the site j

$$\mathbf{S}_j = S(\mathbf{e}_1 \cos \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{e}_2 \sin \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}_j), \quad (2)$$

where the unit vectors \mathbf{e}_1 , \mathbf{e}_2 , and \mathbf{e}_3 form an orthogonal basis. Due to the invariance of the tight-binding Hamiltonian (1) under an arbitrary rotation of the spin axes, the energy of the HM state is independent of \mathbf{e}_3 . In Sr(Ca)FeO₃ the spin rotation axis is parallel to the helix wave vector [5, 6] due to the anisotropy of spin interactions, which we neglect here. For $\mathbf{e}_3 = \hat{x}$ and $\mathbf{e}_1 = \hat{z}$, we have $u_j = e^{\frac{i}{2}\sigma_x(\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}_j)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

To obtain the hole energies for the HM state, the transformation to the momentum space has to be combined with the spin rotation:

$$p_{j\pm b/2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{(\mathbf{k} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_x \mathbf{Q})\mathbf{x}_{j\pm b/2}} p_{\mathbf{k}b},$$

where N is the number of Fe ions. The Hamiltonian (1) then reads

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\alpha b} t_{\alpha b} \left(d_{\mathbf{k}\alpha}^\dagger P_{\mathbf{k}b\downarrow} + P_{\mathbf{k}b\downarrow}^\dagger d_{\mathbf{k}\alpha} \right) + t_{pp} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, b\neq c} P_{\mathbf{k}b}^\dagger P_{\mathbf{k}c} + \Delta \sum_{\mathbf{k}b} p_{\mathbf{k}b}^\dagger p_{\mathbf{k}b}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$P_{\mathbf{k}b\sigma} = 2 \left(\cos\frac{Q_b}{4} \cos\frac{k_b}{2} p_{\mathbf{k}b\sigma} - \sin\frac{Q_b}{4} \sin\frac{k_b}{2} p_{\mathbf{k}b,-\sigma} \right)$$




FIG. 1: The mixed dp \downarrow -hole bands (solid lines) and oxygen p \uparrow -hole bands (circles) for ferromagnetically ordered local spins, $(pd\sigma) = 1.7\text{eV}$, $t_{pp} = 0.65\text{eV}$, and $\Delta = -2\text{eV}$. The thin horizontal line indicates the Fermi level for 1 e_g -hole/Fe.

(the lattice constant equals 1).

The hole bands for the FM state are shown in Fig. 1. For local spins oriented up, the spin-down bands (solid lines) are formed by the mixed d - and p -hole states, while the spin-up bands (circles) are purely oxygen-hole bands. To a good approximation the states forming the two lowest bands are Bloch superpositions of the Zhang-Rice states of holes on metal-oxygen octahedra [16] with the symmetry of the $3z^2 - r^2$ and $x^2 - y^2$ orbitals. These are the two bands of the effective dd -model used to describe colossal magnetoresistance manganites [13]. The Hilbert space of this model is reduced to the subspace of the TM orbitals. Even for ferrates with a large negative Δ , the Fermi sea is either completely or predominantly filled by the states from these two bands (in Fig. 1 the Fermi energy ε_F is indicated by the thin horizontal line).

Yet, for negative Δ the dd -model may fail to describe the magnetic ground state. The reason is the high density of low energy spin-flip excitations, created by promoting a hole from the spin-down Fermi sea to one of the two lowest oxygen spin-up bands, which at the Γ -point also have the symmetries of the $3z^2 - r^2$ and $x^2 - y^2$ orbitals (see Fig. 1). In the HM state these bands become mixed with the two lowest dp -bands, which lowers the energies of the occupied states. There is also an energy loss due to the narrowing of bands caused by the relative rotation of local spins (the usual DE mechanism). When the bottom of the oxygen spin-up bands (at $\varepsilon = \Delta - 4t_{pp}$) is close to ε_F , the energy gain exceeds the energy loss, which makes the FM state unstable and stabilizes the HM state.

Although both the instability of the FM state towards the HM ordering and SDW instabilities are driven by the lowering of the energy of occupied states, the former does not require a nested Fermi surface and, in general, does not open a gap, since the crossing of the spin-up and spin-down bands at the Fermi surface only occurs at isolated points. While the energy driving an SDW




FIG. 2: The helical angle ϕ (in radians) between the spins in neighboring [111] layers plotted versus: (a) Δ , for $(pd\sigma) = 1.8\text{eV}$ and $t_{pp} = 0.6\text{eV}$; (b) the hopping amplitude $(pd\sigma)$, for $\Delta = -3\text{eV}$ and $t_{pp} = 0.6\text{eV}$; (c) t_{pp} , for $(pd\sigma) = 1.8\text{eV}$ and $\Delta = -3\text{eV}$. These three curves are re-plotted versus the separation between the Fermi energy and the bottom of the oxygen band in the FM state $\delta = (\varepsilon_F - \Delta + 4t_{pp})/(pd\sigma)$ in panel (d).

transition is gained close to ε_F , in our case the energy gain is distributed over the whole Fermi sea - it is a Fermi sea rather than a Fermi surface instability.

The transition from the FM to HM ground state, induced by varying Δ , $(pd\sigma)$, and t_{pp} , is shown Fig. 2, where we plot the optimal angle ϕ between the spins in neighboring [111] layers ($\phi = 0$ corresponds to the FM state). In general, the helical angle ϕ grows with the weight of oxygen holes in the ground state, which can be achieved by decreasing Δ (see Fig. 2a) or the width of the hybridized dp -bands (see Fig. 2b), or by increasing the width of the oxygen bands (see Fig. 2c). To a good approximation the value of ϕ is controlled by a single parameter $\delta = (\varepsilon_F - \Delta + t_{pp})/(pd\sigma)$, describing the separation between the Fermi energy and the bottom of the oxygen spin-up band in the FM state. When the data shown in Figs. 2 a, b, and c are re-plotted versus δ , they nearly fall on a single curve (see Fig. 2d). The FM state becomes unstable for small negative δ , when the bottom of the oxygen band is slightly above the Fermi energy. The phase diagram of the dp -model Eq.(1) is plotted in Fig. 3a. For large $-\frac{\Delta}{(pd\sigma)}$ and $\frac{t_{pp}}{(pd\sigma)}$, the HM state has a lower energy than the FM one. The ratio of Δ and $(pd\sigma)$ can be decreased by pressure, which widens the conduction bands. Experimentally the switching from HM to FM state was observed in SrFeO_3 at $\sim 13\text{GPa}$ [17].

Effect of superexchange: The AFM superexchange,

$$H_{SE} = J \sum_{ib} (\mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{S}_{i+b}), \quad J > 0, \quad (4)$$

between the spins of the t_{2g} electrons stabilizes a HM




FIG. 3: The phase diagram of the dp -model (a) and the dp -model with the SE interaction (b), for $\frac{3JS^2}{(pd\sigma)} = 0.07$.

state also at large $\frac{\Delta}{(pd\sigma)}$ (see Fig. 3b), since for $\Delta \gg (pd\sigma)$, $H_{dp} + H_{SE}$ reduces to the DE model considered by de Gennes [12]. We believe, however, that the HM state found in SrFeO_3 lies below the FM region rather than above it. The ‘upper’ helicoidal state only appears for very large positive Δ . Furthermore, $\frac{3JS^2}{(pd\sigma)} = 0.07$ used to obtain Fig. 3b, is too large for SrFeO_3 . The applicability of the de Gennes mechanism to SrFeO_3 would require a strong reduction of hopping amplitudes, e.g., due to polaronic or strong correlation effects.

Magnetic ordering in insulators: Since the instability of the FM state towards HM ordering, is a Fermi sea rather than a Fermi surface instability, it can also occur in insulators, such as CaFeO_3 below $T_{CO} = 290\text{K}$. Here we assume that the charge ordering in this material occurs due to a strong electron-lattice coupling, which for one hole/Fe gives rise to a breathing-type lattice distortion (an alternation of large and small oxygen octahedra), observed below T_{CO} [6]. Figure 4 shows the dependence of the gap in the hole spectrum (squares) due to the modulation of the hopping amplitudes in the ordered state: $t_{ab}(i) = (1 + \sigma_i \eta) t_{ab}$ and $t_{pp}(i) = (1 + \sigma_i \eta) t_{pp}$, where $\sigma_i = \pm 1$ for $i \in A/B$ sublattice of the cubic lattice. Since the Fermi surface is not nested, the gap only opens above some critical value of the modulation amplitude η (a finite electron-phonon coupling constant is necessary to stabilize the charge ordered state). The helical angle ϕ (circles) decreases very slowly with η and even the 1eV gap does not have a strong effect on the wave vector of




FIG. 4: The helical angle ϕ (circles), measured in radians, and the gap E_g (squares), measured in eV, versus the modulation amplitude η for $(pd\sigma) = 1.7\text{eV}$, $t_{pp} = 0.65\text{eV}$, and $\Delta = -3\text{eV}$.

the HM ordering.

Magnon dispersion: The magnon spectrum for a HM state, calculated in the leading $1/S$ approximation, is shown in Fig. 5 (details of this calculation will be published elsewhere). The magnon frequency vanishes both at $\mathbf{q} = 0$ and $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{Q}$, corresponding to the two Goldstone modes: the translation of the incommensurate helix along \mathbf{Q} and rotation of the helical axis \mathbf{e}_3 , respectively. Although the HM state is stable, the magnon spectrum for \mathbf{q} varying between 0 and \mathbf{Q} is extremely soft (note the small energy scale in the inset in Fig. 5).

At the transition from HM to FM state, these two points merge, resulting in the vanishing spin stiffness. Thus the transition from HM to FM state at zero temperature, which can be induced by varying Δ , $(pd\sigma)$, or t_{pp} (see Fig. 2), is a quantum critical point, at which both the Curie and Néel temperatures drop to zero due to diverging spin fluctuations. In reality such a quantum critical behavior can be suppressed by the single-ion and exchange anisotropies, neglected in our model, which open a gap in the magnon spectrum at $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{Q}$ and result in a first order transition between the two magnetic states. This may explain, why the magnetic ordering temperature in SrFeO_3 monotonously grows with pressure, even though the HM state is replaced by the FM one at around 13 GPa [17].

In conclusion, we showed that in double exchange systems with a high density of oxygen holes the kinetic energy of the conduction electrons is minimized for a helicoidal spin ordering. This allows us to relate the helicoidal ordering observed in SrFeO_3 and CaFeO_3 to the negative charge transfer energy, inferred for these materials from photoemission experiments. The difference between the magnetism in ferrates and manganites is very similar to the difference between the Mott-Hubbard and charge transfer insulators [18]: the lowest energy spin-flip excitation in ferrates resides mainly on oxygen sites and does not cost much energy. When the holes predomi-




FIG. 5: The magnon spectrum for the helicoidal state with $\mathbf{Q} = 0.93(1, 0, 0)$, which is the ground state for $(pd\sigma) = 1.7\text{eV}$, $t_{pp} = 0.65\text{eV}$, and $\Delta = -2\text{eV}$. The inset shows $\omega_{\mathbf{q}}$ for $\mathbf{q} = q(1, 0, 0)$, where q varies between 0 and $1.2Q$.

nantly occupy TM sites, their kinetic energy is minimized for parallel local spins. On the other hand, the kinetic energy of the oxygen holes is minimal for the unpolarized Fermi sea. When both the transition metal and oxygen sites are occupied with high probability, the compromise is the helicoidal ordering.

I would like to thank B. Keimer, G. Khaliullin, D. Khomskii, O. Sushkov, B. Simons, and C. Ulrich for fruitful discussions.

-
- [1] “Colossal Magnetoresistive Manganites”, ed. Y. Tokura (Gordon and Breach, 2000).
 - [2] J.B. MacChesney *et al.*, J. Chem. Phys. **43**, 1907 (1965).
 - [3] M. Takano *et al.*, Mater. Res. Bull. **12**, 923 (1977).
 - [4] T. Takeda, Y. Yamaguchi, and H. Watanabe, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **33**, 967 (1972).
 - [5] H. Oda, Y. Yamaguchi, H. Takei, and H. Watanabe, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **42**, 101 (1977).
 - [6] P.M. Woodward *et al.* Phys. Rev. B **62**, 844 (2000).
 - [7] A. Lebon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 037202 (2004).
 - [8] A.E. Bocquet *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 3771 (1992).
 - [9] I.E. Dzyaloshinskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **46**, 1420 (1964) [Sov. Phys.-JETP **19**, 960 (1964)].
 - [10] C. Zener, Phys. Rev. **81**, 440 (1951); *ibid* **82**, 403 (1951).
 - [11] P.W. Anderson and H. Hasegawa, Phys. Rev. **100**, 675 (1955).
 - [12] P.-G. de Gennes, Phys. Rev. **118**, 141 (1960).
 - [13] For a review see e.g. E. Dagotto *et al.*, Phys. Rep. **344**, 1 (2001).
 - [14] B. Shraiman and E.D. Siggia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1564 (1989).
 - [15] J. Geck *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B, **64**, 144430 (2001).
 - [16] F.C. Zhang and T.M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 3759 (1988).
 - [17] S. Nasu, T. Kawakami, S. Kawasaki, and M. Takano, Hyp. Interact. **144/145**, 119 (2002).
 - [18] J. Zaanen, G.A. Sawatzky, and J.W. Allen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 418 (1985). J. Zaanen and G.A. Sawatzky, Can.

J. Phys. **65**, 1262 (1987).