

Why spin ice obeys the ice rules

S. V. Isakov,¹ R. Moessner,² and S. L. Sondhi³

¹*Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A7*

²*Laboratoire de Physique Théorique de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, CNRS-UMR8549, Paris, France and*

³*Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA*

The low temperature entropy of the the spin ice compounds, such as $\text{Ho}_2\text{Ti}_2\text{O}_7$ and $\text{Dy}_2\text{Ti}_2\text{O}_7$, is well described by the nearest-neighbor antiferromagnetic Ising model on the pyrochlore lattice, i.e. by the “ice rules”. This is surprising since the dominant coupling between the spins is the long ranged dipole-dipole interaction. We show that this arises rather elegantly: the ice rules by themselves give rise to dipolar correlations between the spins. The mathematical implementation of this insight allows a detailed, essentially analytic, reproduction of numerical work by Gingras and coworkers.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Hk, 75.50.Ee, 75.40.Cx

Introduction: In 1956, Anderson [1] observed that an Ising antiferromagnet on the pyrochlore lattice would exhibit a macroscopic ground state entropy equivalent to that of water ice [2]. Almost four decades later, in 1997, such “spin ice” behavior was experimentally discovered. Harris *et al.* noticed that the pyrochlore compound $\text{Ho}_2\text{Ti}_2\text{O}_7$, where only the Holmium ions are magnetic, failed to display any signs of ordering down to below the ferromagnetic Curie temperature deduced from its high temperature susceptibility. They proposed that this was due to the presence of an easy-axis anisotropy, which leads to the ferromagnet effectively becoming an Ising pseudospin antiferromagnet at temperatures well below the anisotropy strength [3]. This interpretation was confirmed by a remarkable experiment, in which Ramirez *et al.* showed that the related compound $\text{Dy}_2\text{Ti}_2\text{O}_7$ displayed a residual entropy, \mathcal{S}_0 , at low temperatures, which was in excellent agreement with the Pauling estimate for water ice, $\mathcal{S}_0 \approx (1/2) \ln(3/2)$ [4].

More microscopically, the origin of the ferromagnetic coupling was traced to the strong dipolar interaction between the large moments on Ho^{3+} and Dy^{3+} , $\mu \approx 10\mu_B$, where μ_B is the Bohr magneton [5, 6]. This dipolar interaction is thus crucial to spin ice behavior, the nearest-neighbor superexchange interactions in the spin ice compounds are antiferromagnetic [6, 7] and only the sum of the dipolar interaction and antiferromagnetic exchange interaction makes the nearest-neighbor interaction ferromagnetic.

This, however, led to a puzzle. The dipole interaction is long ranged, decaying with separation, r , as $1/r^3$. Why is the entropy of the nearest-neighbor model stable to the inclusion of the rest of this interaction?

That it *is* so also within the model has been checked by explicit simulation. Further, two qualitative observations have been made in the literature. First, it was observed that the anisotropic nature of the dipole interaction precluded any obvious ordering instability stemming from its long range. It is probably fair to say that it is now agreed that instead, it leads to a weak ordering insta-

bility away from $\mathbf{q} = 0$ [5, 6, 7, 8], albeit one which is not observed [9]. Second, explicit evaluation of the Fourier transform of the easy-axis projected dipolar interaction to large (and, using Ewald summation, infinite) yielded a surprise: the infinite distance result resembled the nearest-neighbor interaction more than an interaction truncated at, say, 10 or so nearest neighbors; this ‘self-screening’ indicated that there is something special about the dipolar interactions [10, 11].

In this paper we provide an essentially analytic theory of these observations which also provides a satisfying qualitative resolution of the dipole puzzle. This builds on recent progress in understanding the correlations dictated by the ice rule [12, 13, 14, 15]. The crucial observation is that the low temperature correlations of the nearest-neighbor model are perfectly compatible with the long-distance part of the dipolar correlations: these two quantities are *proportional* to each other. They thus turn out to produce identically the same low-energy physics. To turn this observation into an analytic demonstration we recast the Ising partition function as a soft spin functional integral. The ground state degeneracy of the nearest-neighbor antiferromagnet now shows up as a pair of flat bands. We show next that a model dipole interaction, which possesses the correct long distance form, leads to exactly the same pair of flat bands and thus the same ground state manifold, even with arbitrary (as long as not overwhelmingly antiferromagnetic) admixture of the nearest-neighbor interaction. Finally we show that the deviation of the model interaction from the real dipolar one vanishes as an integrable r^{-5} , and accounts for the weak residual dispersion. Our analysis also makes clear that the finite temperature correlations can be used to distinguish the consequences of the ice rules from those of the long ranged part of the dipolar interaction. We close by discussing how this phenomenon can be generalised.

Hamiltonian: The Hamiltonian of the dipolar spin ice

model reads

$$H = -\frac{3}{2} \sum_{(i,\alpha),(j,\beta)} \mathcal{J}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{S}_j^\beta \quad (1)$$

$$+ Dr_{\text{nn}}^3 \sum_{\substack{(i>j) \\ \alpha,\beta}} \left[\frac{\mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{S}_j^\beta}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}|^3} - \frac{3(\mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})(\mathbf{S}_j^\beta \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}|^5} \right],$$

where $\mathbf{S}_i^\alpha = S_i^\alpha \mathbf{e}_\alpha$ (no sum over α) are unit length spins pointing along the easy axis of the pyrochlore lattice, S_i^α are Ising pseudospins, \mathbf{e}_α are vectors that define the easy axes ($\mathbf{e}_1 = (-1, -1, -1)/\sqrt{3}$, $\mathbf{e}_2 = (1, -1, 1)/\sqrt{3}$, $\mathbf{e}_3 = (1, 1, -1)/\sqrt{3}$, $\mathbf{e}_4 = (-1, 1, 1)/\sqrt{3}$), i is a unit cell index, and α is a sublattice index. The pyrochlore lattice consists of corner-sharing tetrahedra. It can be thought of a Bravais (face-centered cubic) lattice with a four site basis. The first term in (1) is the nearest-neighbor exchange interaction with \mathcal{J} being the adjacency matrix (we add a constant to the Hamiltonian in such a way that the ground state energy is equal to zero), the second is the dipolar interaction, which is summed over *all* pairs of sites, $D = \mu_0 \mu^2 / (4\pi r_{\text{nn}}^3)$, μ is the magnetic moment of the spins, r_{nn} is the nearest-neighbor distance, and $\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ is the vector separating spins \mathbf{S}_i^α and \mathbf{S}_j^β . The ground state of \mathcal{J} , or equivalently the ice rules, impose the constraint that the total pseudospin of each tetrahedron vanish.

Using the fact that, for nearest neighbors, $\mathbf{S}_i^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{S}_j^\beta = -1/3$, we can rewrite Eq. (1) in terms of Ising pseudospins S_i^α :

$$H = \sum_{\substack{(i>j) \\ \alpha,\beta}} S_i^\alpha \left[\mathcal{J}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} + Dr_{\text{nn}}^3 \mathcal{D}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \right] S_j^\beta, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\mathbf{e}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{e}_\beta}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}|^3} - \frac{3(\mathbf{e}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})(\mathbf{e}_\beta \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta})}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}|^5} \quad (3)$$

The partition function for the problem can be recast as a soft-spin functional integral: $Z = \int \mathcal{D}S \mathcal{D}\lambda \exp[-\mathcal{L}(S, \lambda)]$, with the action defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(S, \lambda) = \sum_{(i,\alpha),(j,\beta)} \frac{1}{2} S_i^\alpha A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} S_j^\beta + i \frac{\lambda_i}{2} \delta_{i,j} \delta_{\alpha,\beta} (S_i^\alpha S_i^\alpha - 1), \quad (4)$$

where $A_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \times T = \mathcal{J}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} + Dr_{\text{nn}}^3 \mathcal{D}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ and the Lagrange multiplier field λ enforces the correct spin length.

Saddle point treatment: We now consider a saddle point treatment of the functional integral (4), which is equivalent to a large N treatment of the corresponding $O(N)$ model [16, 17]. Together with K. Gregor [12], we have shown previously that this self-consistent Gaussian theory provides a *quantitatively* accurate description of the correlations of the nearest-neighbor model without

the dipolar interactions; in particular, it is perturbatively stable to fluctuations, as discussed below.

Here we review the central result of this analysis, which is that the nearest-neighbor model gives spin correlations, denoted by the matrix G , which are asymptotically proportional to the dipolar matrix \mathcal{D} . This is a consequence of an emergent gauge structure at low temperature in this class of models, as discussed in Refs. 12, 13, 14, 15.

Using this insight, we demonstrate that an approximate diagonalization of the dipolar Lagrangian leads to identically the same ground-state manifold as that of the nearest-neighbor interactions; this we then supplement by the full diagonalization.




FIG. 1: (color online). Mode spectrum of the nearest-neighbor interaction matrix, \mathcal{J} , in the $[hhl]$ plane [16], \mathbf{q} is in units of 2π . Note that here and on the following plots we plot the eigenvalues, ν_i , with minus sign.

The spectrum of the adjacency matrix $\mathcal{J}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ has a pair of degenerate flat bands and two dispersive bands (one of them is gapless at zero wavevector), see Fig. 1. In the saddle point evaluation, the spin correlation function is the inverse of the above quadratic form:

$$G_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} = \left(\frac{\mathcal{J}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}}{T} + \lambda \right)^{-1}. \quad (5)$$

The diagonalizing transformation necessary for carrying out the matrix inversion is given in Ref. 12. The transformation itself is independent of temperature. In addition, in the limit of $T \rightarrow 0$, a simplification in Eq. 5 occurs: only the flat bands (and the gapless point of the third band) contribute to the correlation function. Thus, the matrix G simply becomes proportional to the projector onto the flat bands (ground state manifold) of the nearest-neighbor exchange.

Carrying out the $T = 0$ calculation explicitly yields the following central long-distance result:

$$G_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \approx -\frac{3}{4\pi} \mathcal{D}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (6)$$

We have demonstrated that the functional form of G holds to all orders in fluctuations about the saddle point

[12]. In addition, from analyticity and symmetry considerations, it follows that corrections to this equation decay as $|\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}|^{-5}$, two powers of $|\mathbf{r}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}|$ faster than the leading terms. Denoting the corrections by the matrix Δ , we can express the dipolar matrix \mathcal{D} through the saddle point correlation function:

$$\mathcal{D}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} = -\frac{4\pi}{3}G_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} + \Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}, \quad (7)$$

With this in hand, we can reproduce all the important features of the spectrum of \mathcal{D} , several of them entirely analytically, without specifically needing to treat the conditional convergence of the dipolar sums. So, let us now consider the case with \mathcal{D} only, ignoring any additional superexchange for the time being.

First, let us ignore the corrections by setting $\Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} = 0$ —this is our model dipole interaction. As G is the inverse of \mathcal{J} , it is diagonalized by the same matrix (they have the same eigenvectors), and its spectrum is that of a projector onto the ground state manifold (Fig. 2), with two pairs of flat bands. The spikes are genuine delta functions arising from the gapless point at the zone centre.

Next, we add the nearest-neighbor part from $\Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$, which are by far the largest elements of Δ . While G is related to the inverse of \mathcal{J} , this operation adds \mathcal{J} itself, leaving one pair of flat bands flat, and endowing the other pair with the same dispersion as \mathcal{J} itself—however, the gap, bridged by the spike, remains unchanged. We can now add back in the supplementary nearest-neighbor superexchange present in the model, which will only modify the amplitude of the correction, leaving the qualitative physics unchanged as long as it is not strongly antiferromagnetic. At this point we have dealt with most of the interactions in the model, especially its truly long distance parts, without affecting the flat bands and hence the ground state manifold and the ground state correlations.

Crucially, $\Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ is small beyond the nearest-neighbor distance. Thus $\Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ does not modify the gross features significantly, preserving a spectrum similar to that of the nearest-neighbor model. Indeed, adding $\Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ beyond the nearest-neighbor distance weakly splits the remaining pair of flat bands, which acquire a small dispersion; the other pair of bands is barely modified on the scale of their dispersion; this is shown in the figure's bottom panel.

Inclusion of the full Δ was carried out numerically. Our numerics bear out that $\Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ decays as $1/r^5$. Since $\Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ is small and decays fast, the Fourier transform is now quickly and absolutely convergent; we have checked that the results are essentially independent of the truncation distance for $r_c \geq 6r_{nn}$. We would like to stress that this truncation is not equivalent to the truncation of the long-range dipolar interaction since in our case the main long distance part of the dipolar interaction is already contained in G .




FIG. 2: (color online). Mode spectrum of the dipolar interaction (the eigenvalues, ν_i , of the $Dr_{nn}^3\mathcal{D}_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ matrix in the $[hhl]$ plane, \mathbf{q} is in units of 2π). Top: Correlation function G only. There are two degenerate pairs of flat bands. Middle: Correlation function plus nearest-neighbor correction. Two bands remain degenerate and flat. The other two become dispersive. Adding a nearest-neighbor superexchange can enhance/suppress this change. Bottom: Correlation function plus $\Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$ truncated at $r_c = 8r_{nn}$. The two remaining flat bands become weakly dispersive. The middle and bottom plots are almost identical on this scale.

The numerical procedure is as follows. We calculate the Fourier transform of an innocuously truncated Δ and add the Fourier transform of the correlation matrix G . Finally, we diagonalize the resulting matrix in Fourier space and obtain the four eigenvalues.

In Fig. 3, we show the band of maximal eigenvalues of the dipolar matrix. It is weakly dispersive because $\Delta_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}$




FIG. 3: (color online). Maximum eigenvalue, ν_{\max} , of the dipolar matrix in the $[hhl]$ plane, \mathbf{q} is in units of 2π , $r_c = 8r_{\text{nn}}$.

is small. Our results are in quantitative agreement with the Ewald summation results [11].

Fluctuations: For the model dipole interaction, the proof of the persistence of dipolar correlations to all orders in the fluctuations, sketched in Ref. 12, indicates that our saddle point considerations are robust. We have not examined the effect of the fluctuations on the weak ordering tendency present in the saddle point treatment of the full model taking the numerical simulations as proof that this does not change matters much.

At nonzero temperature, it is possible to distinguish between the different interactions. For the nearest-neighbor Ising model, the cost of creating a defect, in units of the nearest-neighbor exchange, is 2, which leads to an exponentially diverging correlation length $\xi \sim \exp(2J/3T)$. The saddle-point treatment does not reproduce this, as its soft spins enjoy the possibility of gapless excitations near $\mathbf{q} = 0$. Due to their quadratic dispersion the algebraic dipolar correlations cross over to exponential ones on a lengthscale $\xi \sim 1/\sqrt{T}$. The model dipolar interaction with flat bands only (Fig. 2, top panel) asymptotically exhibits algebraic dipolar correlations at any temperature. Their amplitude, normalised to zero temperature, is given by $f = 1/(1+Tx)$, where the separation between the two pairs of flat bands set the energy scale, and x is the positive solution of $2/T = 1/x + 1/(1+x)$. The qualitative behavior $1-f \propto T$ ($f \propto 1/T$) at low (high) T holds for any interaction without the gapless point of the nearest-neighbor model.

The dipolar interactions thus go along with dipolar correlations at all temperatures. The functional dependence of their amplitude on T given above from the soft-spin theory holds for Ising spins at high, but probably not at low, temperature. In addition, on the temperature scale set by the dispersion of the almost flat band, a phase transition to the ordered state will take place, with precursor short-range correlations developing already at higher temperatures [8, 9].

The phenomenon of self-screening (a longer-range model described by \mathcal{D} mimicking a nearest-neighbor one,

\mathcal{J} , at $T = 0$) is quite general. In the above framework, such models are constructed as follows. In the limit $T \rightarrow 0$ correlators, G , always take on the form of a projector (Eq. 5). $\mathcal{D} \propto -G$ will then lead to the same correlations as \mathcal{J} . The interactions encoded by \mathcal{D} will in general contain further-neighbor terms, although exponential and algebraic decay with distance (or even infinite-range interactions) are possible.

For an experimental realization, it is thus necessary to have a long-range interaction that takes the form of a projector onto the ground state of a nearest-neighbor model. Thus, we can rephrase our central result in different terms. The constraint to the ice-rule manifold takes on the form of a transverse projector, as captured in a gauge theory [12, 13, 14, 15]. The fact that, thanks to the symmetry-enforced orientation of the Ising axes, this projector is identical to that defining the dipolar interaction, is the amazing feature of spin ice.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Matt Enjalran and Michel Gingras for generously sharing their partially published Ewald summation results with us. We are also grateful to D. Huse, K. Gregor and W. Krauth for collaboration on closely related work. We thank the above, Chris Henley, and Oleg Tchernyshyov for useful discussions. This work was in part supported by the Ministère de la Recherche et des Nouvelles Technologies, by the NSF with grant 0213706, PHY99-07949 (at KITP) and by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

-
- [1] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **102**, 1008 (1956).
 - [2] L. Pauling, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **57**, 2680 (1935); L. Pauling, *The Nature of the Chemical Bond*, (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 1965).
 - [3] M. J. Harris, S. T. Bramwell, D. F. McMorrow, T. Zeiske, and K. W. Godfrey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2554 (1997).
 - [4] A. P. Ramirez, A. Hayashi, R. J. Cava, R. Siddharthan, and B. S. Shastry, Nature **399**, 333 (1999).
 - [5] R. Siddharthan, B. S. Shastry, A. P. Ramirez, A. Hayashi, R. J. Cava, and S. Rosenkranz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1854 (1999); S. Rosenkranz, A. P. Ramirez, A. Hayashi, R. J. Cava, R. Siddharthan, and B. S. Shastry, J. Appl. Phys. **87**, 5014 (2000); R. Siddharthan, B. S. Shastry, and A. P. Ramirez, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 184412 (2001); B. S. Shastry, Physica B **329-333**, 1024 (2003).
 - [6] B. C. den Hertog and M. J. P. Gingras, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3430 (2000).
 - [7] S. T. Bramwell, M. J. Harris, B. C. den Hertog, M. J. P. Gingras, J. S. Gardner, D. F. McMorrow, A. R. Wildes, A. L. Cornelius, J. D. M. Champion, R. G. Melko, and T. Fennell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 047205 (2001).
 - [8] R.G. Melko, B. C. den Hertog, and M. J. P. Gingras, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 067203 (2001).
 - [9] The predicted ordering has never been experimentally observed, apparently because it occurs at a temperature where the system is unable to reach its equilibrium state [J. Snyder, J. S. Slusky, R. J. Cava, and P. Schiffer, Na-

- ture **413**, 48 (2001); K. Matsuhira, Y. Hinatsu, and T. Sakakibara, *J. Phys.: Cond. Mat.* **13**, L737 (2001)].
- [10] M. J. P. Gingras and B. C. den Hertog, *Can. J. Phys.* **79**, 1339 (2001).
- [11] M. Enjalran and M. J. P. Gingras, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 174426 (2004); R.G. Melko and M. J. P. Gingras, *J. Phys.: Cond. Mat.* **16**, R1277 (2004).
- [12] S. V. Isakov, K. Gregor, R. Moessner, and S. L. Sondhi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 167204 (2004).
- [13] D. A. Huse, W. Krauth, R. Moessner, and S. L. Sondhi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 167004 (2003); R. Moessner and S. L. Sondhi, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 184512 (2003).
- [14] M. Hermele, M. P. A. Fisher, and L. Balents, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 064404 (2004).
- [15] C. L. Henley, cond-mat/0407005 (unpublished).
- [16] D. A. Garanin and B. Canals, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 443 (1999); B. Canals and D. A. Garanin, *Can. J. Phys.* **79**, 1323 (2001).
- [17] Our treatment follows the introduction to large- N by M. Moshe and J. Zinn-Justin, *Phys. Rep.* **385**, 69 (2003).