

Critical Properties of Condensation of Field-Induced Triplet Quasiparticles

Naoki KAWASHIMA *

*Department of Physics, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-0357, Japan;
Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8581, Japan*

A review on the field-induced magnetic ordering is given, together with some results of a quantum Monte Carlo simulation focused on the critical behavior near the quantum critical point.

KEYWORDS: quantum spin system, Heisenberg model, quantum Monte Carlo, XY model, XXZ model, cluster algorithm, loop algorithm, worm algorithm, directed-loop algorithm

1. Introduction

In this article we discuss phenomena observed in systems with a singlet ground state with triplet excitations separated by a finite spin gap. The focus of researchers' attention has been on the magnetic phase transition induced by a magnetic field and/or a pressure. While the field- (or pressure-) induced magnetic ordering were observed in various materials, the character of the phase transition, in particular the one at the quantum critical point (QCP) seems to be insensitive to the the nature of the ground state and to the origin of the gap. In one class of materials, localized magnetic spins are bound strongly in pairs to form singlet dimers, and the inter-dimer interaction is not strong enough to induce any long-range magnetic ordering. In these materials, the excited states consist of excitations of quasiparticles, recently often referred to as *tripletons* or *triplons*. They originate from the triplet states at each site. The magnetic ordering in the dimer systems with a sufficiently strong magnetic field was suggested based on a mean-field theory.^{1,2} Later, two possibilities were suggested³ depending on the relative strength of the repulsive interaction among the quasiparticles and their kinetic energy. If the kinetic term dominates, the system may undergo a condensation transition as suggested by the mean-field theory^{1,2} and later also by the Hartree-Fock (HF) theory with the bosonic representation.⁴ On the other hand, when the repulsive force dominates, the ordered state is the super lattice where the quasiparticles are located periodically to form a lattice with a larger unit cell than that of the original lattice, which gives rise to magnetization plateaus in the magnetization-field curve. This scenario is realized in materials for which the effective dimer-dimer couplings vanish due to the cancellation among the exchange couplings and higher order interactions play essential roles.⁵ A well-known example is SrCu₂(BO₃)₂.⁶⁻⁸ In the rest of the present article, however, we only discuss the first case, i.e., the case where the kinetic-term is dominant.

2. Early Experiments and Mean-Field Theory

A long lasting flow of publications on the field-induced magnetic ordering was initiated by a theoretical work,^{1,2} which was inspired by experiments^{9,10} on a quasi one-dimensional magnetic compound Cu(NO₃)₂ · 2.5 H₂O.

The zero-field susceptibility measurement¹¹ had been suggesting that the system's main magnetic structure consisting of isolated dimers. Heat capacity measurements¹² and magnetization measurements¹³ in the presence of a magnetic field were also carried out. However, no clear indication of a phase transition was observed. In retrospect, this was simply because the temperature was not low enough or the magnetic field was not strong enough to bring the system into an ordered state. Later, an unusual magnetocaloric behavior was observed,⁹ which seemed to indicate some sort of phase transition. Subsequently, the existence of the transition was confirmed by an anomaly in the adiabatic magnetization curve¹⁰ at 3-4 T below 1 K.

In order to understand this phenomena, a model system that consists of dimers of spins was considered.^{1,2} The building block of the model is a pair of $S = 1/2$ spins coupled to each other antiferromagnetically. When a magnetic field is applied to the system, the degeneracy among the triplet states is lifted and the lowest branch comes down to meet the singlet state. To be concrete, the spin Hamiltonian considered was

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_i \hat{J} \mathbf{s}_{i1} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{i2} + \sum_{(ij)} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \hat{J}'_{i\alpha, j\beta} \mathbf{s}_{i\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{s}_{j\beta} - \sum_{i\alpha} \hat{H} s_{i\alpha}^z. \quad (1)$$

Here $\hat{J} > 0$ is the antiferromagnetic coupling constant that binds a pair of spins, i and j the indices of dimers, and α and β the specifiers of individual spins in a dimer. The symbol $\mathbf{s}_{i\alpha}$ stands for an $S = 1/2$ spin operator. The dominant couplings are the intra-dimer couplings represented by \hat{J} . While the compound Cu(NO₃)₂ · 2.5 H₂O seemed to have a quasi-one-dimensional lattice structure,¹⁴ any specific structure was assumed in the mean-field theory because it is not relevant in the approximation. In fact, as long as the lattice is three dimensional, its structure does not affect asymptotic behaviors near the criticality even in more elaborate treatments. Therefore, in most of the following discussion we only assume that the lattice is three dimensional.

The above Hamiltonian can be further simplified, taking into account the fact that we can neglect local high energy levels, when the inter-dimer couplings are sufficiently small and can be treated as a perturbation. Only two lower levels, the singlet state and one of the triplet states are retained. These two levels can be regarded as

*E-mail address: kawashima@issp.u-tokyo.ac.jp

the up and down states of an effective $S = 1/2$ spin. Then we have the following effective Hamiltonian:¹

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{(ij)} \tilde{J}_{ij} \left(S_i^x S_j^x + S_i^y S_j^y + \frac{1}{2} S_i^z S_j^z \right) - \sum_i \tilde{H}_i S_i^z \quad (2)$$

where S_i^μ is an operator representing the effective spin. The coupling \tilde{J}_{ij} and \tilde{H}_i can be expressed as simple linear combinations of \hat{J} , \hat{H} and $\hat{J}'_{\alpha,\beta}$.

We here consider the case where the effective Hamiltonian is translation invariant and non-frustrated. The former is the case with most of materials unless impurities affect the observations. The latter assumption does not strictly hold. However, in many important cases, the frustration is weak, at least not strong enough to alter the phase diagram structure or the critical behavior qualitatively. With these assumptions, we obtain an $S = 1/2$ XXZ model with easy plane anisotropy. The mean-field approximation was applied to this model, yielding¹ $\mathcal{H}_{\text{mf}} = \sum_{(ij)} \tilde{J}_{ij} (S_i^x m^x + \frac{1}{2} S_i^z m^z) - \sum_i \tilde{H}_i m^z$. By solving the self-consistent equation in terms of m^x and m^z , a symmetry-breaking solution was obtained, from which the presence of a field-induced magnetic ordering in real materials was suggested.

However, in subsequent works it was found that the anomalous behavior observed in the adiabatic magnetization curve¹⁰ of $\text{Cu}(\text{NO}_3)_2 \cdot 2.5 \text{H}_2\text{O}$ should be attributed to the development of a short-range order along the chain, not a true long-range order. By using the exact solution^{15,16} to the $S = 1/2$ XY model in one dimension, it was shown^{17,18} that a purely one-dimensional model can produce the adiabatic magnetization curve similar to the one observed in the experiments. Later, this result was confirmed by a more extensive investigation.¹⁹ An observation of the genuine long-range magnetic ordering had to wait till the NMR experiment,²⁰ which revealed that the emergence of the long range order takes place in two stages; first the development of a short range order along the chain at an intermediate temperature and then the three-dimensional long range order at a lower temperature. The heat capacity measurement²¹ showed these characteristics more clearly in the form of two peaks; a broad heat capacity peak at a high temperature and a sharper one at a low temperature. The low-temperature one is identified as the transition discussed in the preceding theoretical works^{1,2} based on the mean-field theory. Subsequently, the magnetic structure in the ordered phase was determined through a neutron diffraction experiment²² and an NMR experiment;²³ weakly coupled magnetic chains with each chain having alternating coupling constants.

It should be pointed out here that the field-induced magnetic ordering itself is a rather generic phenomenon and not restricted to the dimer systems. For example, a theoretical result similar to the one mentioned above was obtained for an $S = 1$ (not necessarily dimer) spin system with an uniaxial spin anisotropy.²⁴ Due to the anisotropy, the single-site ground state is the $S_z = 0$ state whereas the $S_z = \pm 1$ states are degenerate excited states. The mechanism of the magnetic ordering induced by a magnetic field is quite analogous to that

in the dimer system. A heat capacity measurement was carried out²⁵ on this type of material. The compound was $\text{Ni}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5\text{NO})_6(\text{ClO}_4)_2$, in which each Ni^{2+} ion carries an $S = 1$ spin. The spins are influenced by the uniaxial spin anisotropy of which the magnitude is greater than the spin-spin exchange couplings. A cusp-like peak was observed in the temperature dependence of the heat capacity, and the parabolic phase diagram in the H - T plane was drawn. There are several other reports on Ni based compounds. A magnetization measurement²⁶ was performed for $\text{NiCl}_2 \cdot \text{SC}(\text{NH}_2)_2$. Later, heat capacity measurements on $\text{Ni}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_4\text{N}_2)_2\text{N}_3(\text{ClO}_4)$ ²⁷ and $\text{Ni}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_4\text{N}_2)_2\text{N}_3(\text{PF}_6)$ ²⁸ clearly showed a lambda peak in the heat capacity. Compounds with more complicated spin anisotropies were discussed within the mean-field theory²⁹ and the spin-wave theory.³⁰ Recently, the rare-earth compound $\text{PrOs}_4\text{Sb}_{12}$ was studied through the heat capacity measurement,³¹ and the neutron diffraction.³² The level crossing scheme of this material was theoretically clarified.³³

The Cr-based compound $\text{Cs}_3\text{Cr}_2\text{Br}_9$ may belong to another category of materials that show a field-induced magnetic ordering. This is a dimer system in which spins are bound pairwise antiferromagnetically to form dimers. The Cr^{3+} ions carry $S = 3/2$ spins. What makes this compound unique is the fact that the ions form frustrated triangular lattices stacked on top of each other. Due to the frustration, the magnetic ordering in this compound seems to be more complicated than a mere Néel state. A cusp in the temperature dependence of the susceptibility was observed^{34,35} in this compound although the nature of the ordered phase was not clarified. Corresponding to the four possible values of dimer angular momentum, $S = 0, 1, 2, 3$, four plateaus were observed in the field dependence of magnetization at low temperatures.³⁶ Quite recently elastic and inelastic neutron scattering experiments³⁷ suggested that the gap does not close between two subsequent plateaus, in contrast to the other materials mentioned above. Theoretical investigations have not been done yet on this material.

3. Recent Experiments and Bose Gas Representation

After a relatively dormant period of mid-90's, active researches of the field-induced ordering were restarted on copper based dimer compounds. The compound $\text{Cu}_2(\text{C}_5\text{H}_4\text{N}_2)_2\text{Cl}_4$, in which Cu^{2+} ions form weakly-coupled ladders, was investigated by various measurements; the magnetization,³⁸ the ac susceptibility,³⁹ the heat capacity³⁹ and the inelastic neutron scattering.³⁹ The heat capacity measurement at higher magnetic field was performed later.⁴⁰ The sharp cusp was observed at the transition temperature and a parabolic curve of the critical temperature as a function of the magnetic field was drawn.

Several other materials were also investigated. A heat capacity measurement showed a clear anomaly in $(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{CHNH}_3\text{CuCl}_3$.⁴¹ An $S = 1$ dimer compound $\text{Ba}_3\text{Mn}_2\text{O}_8$, in which Mn^{5+} ions carry $S = 1$ spins and form singlet dimers, was studied⁴² to reveal two step magnetization curve, corresponding to the three possi-

ble values of the dimer magnetization.

Even more thoroughly investigated was the family of compounds XCuCl_3 where $X = \text{K}, \text{Tl}, \text{NH}_4$, etc. From susceptibility measurements⁴³ the broad peak temperature T_p was obtained for KCuCl_3 and TlCuCl_3 at zero field. For these two compounds, the magnetization process was investigated at finite external field,⁴⁴ which yielded estimates of the critical magnetic field and the gap. An inelastic neutron scattering was carried out for KCuCl_3 ⁴⁵ and later for TlCuCl_3 ,⁴⁶ which showed a three-line structure in the magnon excitation spectrum corresponding to the three triplet excitations.⁴⁵ By comparing the experimentally determined dispersion with the RPA approximation results, the exchange couplings were also estimated.⁴⁵

The experimental evidences were accumulated and it was realized that, apart from the correct critical exponents for the phase transition, there are several additional qualitative features that could not be accounted for by the mean field theory;^{1,2} (i) the upward convex curvature in the adiabatic magnetization curve, (ii) the upward convex curvature in the magnetization curve as a function of the temperature with fixed magnetic field, and (iii) the asymptotic behavior of the critical magnetic field as a function of the temperature that seems more like an algebraic dependence than an exponential dependence.

The upward convex curvature in the adiabatic magnetization had been known from the very early period of the study.¹⁰ The temperature dependence of the magnetization was studied for TlCuCl_3 ⁴⁷ and, at sufficiently strong fixed magnetic fields, revealed an upward convex curvature and a dip at a temperature slightly higher than the transition point. The critical magnetic field $H_{c1}(T)$ was estimated for various temperature and the fitting to

$$H_{c1}(T) - H_{c1}(0) \propto T^\phi \quad (3)$$

yielded $\phi = 1.7(1)$.⁴⁷ For the estimate of ϕ , there are variations: $\phi = 2.2(1)$,⁴ $\phi = 2.0(1)$,⁴⁸ $\phi = 2.3(1)$ ⁴⁹ and $\phi = 1.67(7)$ ⁵⁰ for TlCuCl_3 ; and $\phi = 2.6(2)$ ^{51,52} for $\text{NiCl}_2 \cdot 4\text{SC}(\text{NH}_2)_2$. It is notable that all the estimates so far are higher than the mean-field prediction $\phi = 3/2$ as discussed below.

The algebraic dependence (3) is in contrast to the mean-field theory which indicate an essential singular behavior near zero temperature: $H_{c1}(T) - H_{c1}(0) \propto \exp(-T_0/T)$ with T_0 being a constant. At least this inconsistency can be removed by introducing a mean-field theory (the HF approximation) based on the bosonic representation⁴ of the Hamiltonian. More importantly perhaps, it provides a simple picture for the mechanism of the field-induced magnetic ordering; the BEC of triplet quasiparticles. This theory is equivalent to the spin wave theory with the $M_z = 0$ state taken as the vacuum state. A similar spin wave theory was considered in an early study.¹⁷ It was found that the spin wave theory yields properties closer to the experimental observations than the mean-field theory in the spin representation. For example, the spin wave theory correctly yields the upward convex adiabatic magnetization curve in the ordered region, whereas the mean-field theory yields a flat

straight line. Another important feature that the spin wave theory predicted¹⁷ was the linear dispersion of the magnon in the ordered state. However, the critical behavior was not discussed extensively in early studies. The HF approximation with the bosonic representation predicts that the phase boundary in the $T-H$ plane has an algebraic singularity near zero temperature with the exponent $\phi = 3/2$, in contrast to the experimental estimates. It was reported⁵³ that by assuming a relativistic form for the dispersion relation of magnons the phase boundary can be made closer to those estimated experimentally in an intermediate temperature region, while the asymptotic behavior in the zero-temperature limit remains the same. A similar observation was made in an improved HF calculation⁵⁴ based on a realistic dispersion relation determined by experiments.

The BEC mechanism was confirmed by an inelastic neutron scattering experiment.⁵⁵ A linear dispersion of magnons (i.e., tripletons) was observed in the ordered phase, as predicted by the spin wave theory¹⁷ and later also by bond-operator formalism.⁵⁶ This was the first experimental observation of the magnon dispersion in the ordered phase, while a similar preceding experiment⁴⁵ was carried out in the disordered phase. In the language of Boson problems, the linear dispersion can be interpreted as a Goldstone mode characteristic to the BEC. This piece of evidence was taken as a clear indication of the BEC nature of the phase transition.

a first-order phase transition at the condensation point in contrast to the standard scenario expected for the BEC. The reason for this apparent disagreement has not been clarified.

Even without the magnetic field, the BEC phenomena can be seen when a sufficiently strong pressure is imposed. An elastic neutron scattering experiment⁵⁷ demonstrated the existence of the pressure-induced magnetic ordering. The essential mechanism seems to be the same as that of the field-induced transition; the competition between the gap and the inter-dimer interaction. Therefore it is expected that the resulting $H-p$ phase diagram at $T = 0$ is simple and consists of two phases; the disordered phase including the origin $H = p = 0$ and the ordered phase surrounding the ordered region. However, the phase diagram obtained by the magnetization measurement⁵⁸ seems to consist of three phases, though the very existence of the extra phase or its identity has not been established yet.

While most of the compounds studied in conjunction with the field-induced magnetic ordering are quasi one-dimensional systems, the compounds $\text{BaCuSi}_2\text{O}_6$ offers an example of a quasi two-dimensional system. An inelastic neutron scattering experiment was carried out⁵⁹ to reveal the two-dimensional nature in the magnon dispersion. Recent heat capacity and magnetization measurements⁶⁰ clearly showed the lambda peak in the heat capacity.

The effect of disorder is certainly an interesting subject to explore. It has been already studied through the magnetization measurement^{50,61} of the compound $(\text{Tl}_{1-x}\text{K}_x)\text{CuCl}_3$. At a finite temperature, the presence of the disorder showed only a quantitative effect, namely,

reduction of the transition temperature⁶¹ and did not alter the nature of the phase transition in a qualitative way. Qualitative differences could be observed, however, as the temperature was lowered. For instance, the asymptotic behavior of the critical magnetic field seemed to deviate from that of the homogeneous case. Namely, the value of the exponent ϕ appeared to change when the disorder was introduced, as suggested in the scaling theory.⁶²

Another type of disorder, namely non-magnetic impurities, was studied for $\text{Ti}(\text{Cu}_{1-x}\text{Mg}_x)\text{Cl}_3$.^{63,64} Upon Mg doping, a magnetic phase transition is induced even at zero magnetic field due to the presence of uncoupled magnetic ions. It was found that this impurity-induced magnetic ordering does not affect the dispersion of the magnons at zero magnetic field. However, experiments in the magnetic field are yet to be performed in order to observe the effect upon the critical phenomena at the QCP.

4. Scaling and Numerical Results

As stated above, the bosonic theory explains most of the characteristics observed in experiments. However, it still has a short-coming, i.e., it is destined to produce wrong critical properties for the phase transition at finite temperature and there is no systematic way of amending the flaw. For example, it results in a discontinuous drop in the magnetization at the critical point as we increase the temperature, whereas we only see a dip in experiments.⁴⁷ Another apparent disagreement is of the estimate of the exponent ϕ . Experiments seemed to indicate a larger value for the exponent ϕ for the QCP than the HF theory does. Since the incorrectness of the mean-field type theory concerning the critical exponent is well-known, the disagreement seems trivial at a first glance. However, it is not trivial and in fact the HF theory may be correct concerning the QCP as we see below.

The first quantum Monte Carlo simulation for clarifying the critical properties⁶⁵ was performed for the model Hamiltonian (1) representing weakly coupled ladders. The estimates of the critical exponent ϕ differed from the HF value; $\phi = 1.8(2)$ for the upper critical field and $\phi = 3.1(2)$ for the lower critical field. Another Monte Carlo simulation was carried out⁶⁶ for a similar system. A temperature-dependent effective exponent $\phi(T)$ was defined so that it characterizes the $H_c - T$ curve in a finite temperature-range centered at T . Again, $\phi(T)$ turned out to be greater than $3/2$. However, it decreases as the temperature is lowered, and it was concluded that the trend is consistent with the HF value.

Recently, we carried out another Monte Carlo simulation⁶⁷ to further clarify the problem concerning the critical properties at QCP. Since the critical properties of the effective Hamiltonian (2) derived with the Tachiki and Yamada's mapping is expected to be the same as those of the original Hamiltonian (1), we chose to work on the effective Hamiltonian for simplicity. The effective spin Hamiltonian is a uniform $S = 1/2$ XXZ model in three dimensions with a spatial anisotropy and with the easy-plane spin anisotropy. Since the spatial anisotropy and the $S^z - S^z$ couplings should not affect the critical properties, we can drop them without changing critical

properties. Therefore, we arrive at the XY model Hamiltonian.

$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{(ij)} (S_i^x S_j^x + S_i^y S_j^y) - H \sum_i S_i^z. \quad (4)$$

The simulation method employed is based on the directed-loop algorithm,⁶⁸ for which a review can be found in a recent article.⁶⁹ The magnetization at zero temperature was computed as a function of the magnetic field. It was found that in the thermodynamic limit the deviation of the magnetization from the saturation value depends linearly on the deviation of the magnetic field from the critical value: $1/2 - \langle S_i^z \rangle \propto H_{c1} - H$ where $H < H_{c1}$. This is consistent with the HF prediction and also with the experiments.

For the susceptibility of the perpendicular components of spins, $\chi \equiv \sum_{\mathbf{r}} \int_0^\beta d\tau \langle S^x(\mathbf{r}, \tau) S^x(\mathbf{0}, 0) \rangle$, the result suggested that the system size dependence at the critical point $H = 3J$ was characterized by $\chi(\beta/L^2, H = H_c) \propto L^{2.5}$. As we see below, this is also consistent with the scaling theory that produces the mean-field type scaling properties.

The temperature dependent critical field $H_c(T)$ was also computed. A set of values of temperature were chosen and for each temperature the susceptibility was computed as a function of the magnetic field. We then carried out the finite-size scaling analysis with a fixed temperature to obtain the critical field at the temperature. The finite size scaling plot worked nicely with the critical exponents estimated for the classical XY model, namely, $\nu = 0.67155(27)$ and $\eta = 0.0380(4)$.⁷⁰ In this fashion, we estimated the critical field at various temperatures. A remark may be useful here concerning the critical properties at a finite temperature. There has been a confusion about the critical behavior of the specific heat, which was considered to be divergent in some early articles. In fact, the specific heat exponent $\alpha = -0.0146(8)$ ⁷⁰ is negative, i.e., it has a sharp cusp but finite even at the critical point.

In Fig. 1, two curves are plotted for comparison. The solid curve represents the mean-field critical exponent, $\phi = 1.5$, whereas the dashed curve the previous estimate $\phi = 2.0$ ⁴⁸ based on an experiment on TiCuCl_3 . At a first glance, it seems that the curve with $\phi = 2.0$ fits the data better than $\phi = 1.5$. However, when the logarithmic scale is used, as we do in the inset of Fig. 1, it is rather clear that $\phi = 2.0$ explains only a transient behavior, and the correct asymptotic value of the exponent is $\phi = 1.5$.

Now, let us see why the mean-field type scaling should hold for the QCP in the present system. To this end, we first derive the bosonic Hamiltonian from (4) by using the mapping $S_i^+ = b_i^\dagger$, $S_i^- = b_i$, and $S_i^z = \hat{n}_i - \frac{1}{2}$ with the constraint

$$\hat{n}_i \equiv b_i^\dagger b_i = 0, 1. \quad (5)$$

Then we obtain

$$\mathcal{H} = -t \sum_{(ij)} (b_i^\dagger b_j + b_j^\dagger b_i) - \mu \sum_i \hat{n}_i + \Lambda \sum_i \hat{n}_i (\hat{n}_i - 1), \quad (6)$$




Fig. 1. Critical field as a function of temperature. The solid curve corresponds to $\phi = 1.5$ whereas the dashed one $\phi = 2.0$. The inset is the same data plotted in the logarithmic scale. While in the intermediate temperature region $\phi = 2.0$ seem to fit the data well, in the low-temperature region, the correct slope $\phi = 1.5$ yields a better fitting.

with new parameters t and μ corresponding to the old ones as $t \sim J/2$ and $\mu \sim H$. The Λ -term imposes the condition (5), approximately. However, we believe this approximation does not affect the critical properties since the difference between the hard (original) constraint and the soft one is significant only when more than double occupancies occur frequently, for which the average occupation number needs to be large. As we approach the QCP, however, we have smaller particle density and in the end we have zero density at the QCP. Therefore, we expect the softening of the constraint has no effect on the critical properties.

The rest of the argument is essentially based on the results obtained earlier^{62,71} for diluted bose gas. Similar results can be found also in textbooks.⁷² However, the connection to the present model has not been very transparent, which we can see in the fact that those early scaling theories have been seldom mentioned in conjunction with the field-induced ordering in dimer systems. Therefore we reproduce the scaling results here, and it would be useful to have explicit formulas in the form directly comparable with the Monte Carlo results. (In particular, explicit formulas for the system-size dependence are hardly found in the literature.) First, the continuous field theory for the model (6) is characterized by the action

$$S = \int dx \int d\tau \left(\psi^* \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tau} + |\nabla \psi|^2 - h \operatorname{Re} \psi - r |\psi|^2 + u |\psi|^4 \right). \quad (7)$$

Obviously, the fixed point is given by $h = r = u = 0$. A simple dimensional analysis suffices to obtain the scaling dimensions at this fixed point. The effect of the scale transformation around the fixed point up to the scale b is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &\rightarrow \tilde{\beta} \equiv \beta b^{-2}, \quad L \rightarrow \tilde{L} \equiv L b^{-1}, \quad \psi \rightarrow \tilde{\psi} \equiv \psi b^{\frac{d}{2}}, \\ h &\rightarrow \tilde{h} \equiv h b^{2+\frac{d}{2}}, \quad r \rightarrow \tilde{r} \equiv r b^2, \quad u \rightarrow \tilde{u} \equiv u b^{2-d}, \end{aligned}$$

where L is the system size. Note that the non-linearity represented by parameter u diminishes as we renormalize for $d > 2$. Hence, the upper critical dimension $d_c = 2$,⁷¹ and the critical properties controlled by the $u = 0$ fixed point when $d > 2$. For three dimensions, therefore, we should expect a mean-field type scaling. To be more concrete, let us derive the scaling properties for the magnetization, $m \sim \langle |\psi| \rangle \sim \langle S_i^x \rangle$. We assume that a scaling property holds for the singular part of $\Phi \equiv -\log Z(h, r, u, \beta, L)$, namely, $\Phi(h, r, u, \beta, L) = \Phi(\tilde{h}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{L})$ for an arbitrary b .

In order to obtain the asymptotic behavior of the critical magnetic field, we note that we can make \tilde{u} small by choosing large b so that the perturbation theory in \tilde{u} is nearly exact for the renormalized system. The perturbation theory yields that Φ for the renormalized system has a singularity when the condition⁷² $\tilde{r} = \tilde{r}_c \equiv A \tilde{u} / \tilde{\beta}^{d/2}$ is satisfied with A being some numerical constant. It means that in terms of the bare coupling constants the singularity occurs when⁷¹

$$H_c(T) - H_c(0) \propto T^{d/2}.$$

This is also confirmed by the simulation.

5. Summary

We have presented a brief review of the field-induced magnetic ordering. From the early stage of the research, the existence of the ordering was established, which was also supported by the mean-field theory. The other mean-field theory, i.e., the HF theory was later constructed based on the bosonic representation and described various features observed in the experiments more precisely. Many of recent experimental results, however, seemed to contradict even the HF theory in one important point, i.e., the critical property at the QCP. There could be some possible sources of this discrepancy, such as a presence of Dzyaloshinsky-Moria interactions, a staggered component of the g -tensor giving rise to an effective staggered field, or a crystal field that reduces the symmetry. However, the recent Monte Carlo simulation results present an explanation, though not the unique possibility, that the true asymptotic behavior is consistent with the scaling theory while the transient behavior is hard to get rid of.

Interesting remaining problems concerning the field-induced magnetic ordering are (i) experimental and numerical investigation of the complete phase diagram of a disordered magnet that has a finite gap in the pure case, and the critical phenomena at the bose-glass to superfluid transition, and (ii) the effect of a symmetry lowered by the other kinds of interactions (crystal fields, effective staggered field, etc) or, in case where the gap is caused by the easy-plane axial anisotropy, by a transverse field tangent to the easy plane.

The author thanks M. Oshikawa and H. Otsuka for helpful comments. The present work was supported by the grant-in-aid (Program No. 14540361) from Monka-sho, Japan. Our computation presented in this article was performed using the computers at Supercomputer Center, Institute of Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo.

- 1) M. Tachiki and T. Yamada: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **28** (1970) 1413.
- 2) M. Tachiki and T. Yamada: Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **46** (1970) 291.
- 3) T. M. Rice: Science **298** (2002) 760.
- 4) T. Nikuni, M. Oshikawa, A. Oosawa and H. Tanaka: Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** (2000) 5868.
- 5) Y. Fukumoto: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., **70** (2001) 1397.
- 6) H. Kageyama, K. Yoshimura, R. Stern, N. V. Mushnikov, K. Onizuka, M. Kato, K. Kosuge, C. P. Slichter, T. Goto and Y. Ueda: Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 3168.
- 7) S. Miyahara and K. Ueda: Phys. Rev. B **61** (2000) 3417.
- 8) K. Kodama, M. Takigawa, M. Horvatić, C. Berthier, H. Kageyama, Y. Ueda, S. Miyahara, F. Becca and F. Mila: Science **298** (2002) 395.
- 9) K. Amaya, Y. Tokunaga, R. Yamada, Y. Ajiro and T. Haseda: Phys. Lett. **28A** (1969) 732.
- 10) T. Haseda, Y. Tokunaga, R. Yamada, Y. Kuramitsu, S. Sakatsume and K. Amaya: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Low Temperature Physics (LT12), Kyoto (1970) 685.
- 11) L. Berger, S. A. Friedberg and J. T. Schriempf: Phys. Rev. **132** (1963) 1057.
- 12) S. A. Friedberg and C. A. Raquet: J. App. Phys. **39** (1968) 1132.
- 13) B. E. Myers, L. Berger and S. A. Friedberg: J. App. Phys. **40** (1969) 1149.
- 14) J. C. Bonner, S. A. Friedberg, H. Kobayashi and B. E. Myers: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Low Temperature Physics (LT12), Kyoto (1970) 691.
- 15) S. Katsura: Phys. Rev. **127** (1962) 1508.
- 16) S. Katsura: Phys. Rev. **129** (1963) 2835.
- 17) M. Tachiki, T. Yamada and S. Maekawa: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **29** (1970) 656.
- 18) M. Tachiki, T. Yamada and S. Maekawa: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **29** (1970) 663.
- 19) BonnerFKMB1983 J. C. Bonner, S. A. Friedberg, H. Kobayashi, D. L. Meier and H. W. J. Blöte: Phys. Rev. B **27** (1983) 248.
- 20) M. W. van Tol, L. S. J. Henkens and N. J. Poulis: Phys. Rev. Lett. **27** (1971) 739.
- 21) M. W. van Tol, K. M. Diederix and N. J. Poulis: Physica **64** (1973) 363.
- 22) J. Eckert, D. E. Cox, G. Shirane, S. A. Friedberg and H. Kobayashi: Phys. Rev. B **20** (1979) 4596.
- 23) K. M. Diederix, J. P. Groen, L. S. J. M. Henkens, T. O. Klaassen and N. J. Poulis: Physica **94B** (1978) 9.
- 24) T. Tsuneto and T. Murao: Physica **51** (1971) 186.
- 25) H. A. Algra J. Bartolomé, K. M. Diederix and L. J. de Jongh: Physica **85B** (1977) 323.
- 26) A. Paduan-Filho, R. D. Chirico, K. O. Joung and R. L. Carlin: J. Chem. Phys. **74** (1981) 4103.
- 27) Z. Honda, K. Katsumata, H. Aruga-Katori, K. Yamada and T. Ohishi: J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **9** (1997) L83.
- 28) Z. Honda, H. Asakawa and K. Katsumata: Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 2566.
- 29) H. Ishii and S. Aoyama: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59** (1990) 2216.
- 30) S. Aoyama and H. Ishii: Physica B **177** (1992) 233.
- 31) Y. Aoki, T. Namiki, S. Ohsaki, S. R. Saha, H. Sugawara and H. Sato: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **71** (2002) 2098.
- 32) M. Kohgi, K. Iwasa, M. Nakajima, N. Metoki, S. Araki, N. Bernhoeft, J.-M. Mignot, A. Gukasov, H. Sato, Y. Aoki and H. Sugawara: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **72** (2003) 1002.
- 33) R. Shiina and Y. Aoki: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **73** (2004) 541.
- 34) B. Leuenberger, H. U. Güdel, R. Horne and A. J. van Duynveldt: J. Mag. Mag. Mater. **49** (1985) 131.
- 35) B. Leuenberger, H. U. Güdel, R. Horne and A. J. van Duynveldt: Phys. Rev. B **31** (1985) 597.
- 36) Y. Ajiro, H. Kikuchi, T. Inami, T. Sakakibara and T. Goto: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **58** (1989) 1021.
- 37) B. Greiner, Y. Inagaki, L. P. Regnault, A. Wildes, T. Asano, Y. Ajiro, E. Lhotel, C. Paulsen, T. Ziman and J. P. Boucher: Phys. Rev. Lett. **92** (2004) 177202.
- 38) G. Chaboussant, P. A. Crowell, L. P. Lévy, O. Piovesana, A. Madouri and D. Maily: Phys. Rev. B **55** (1997) 3046.
- 39) P. Hammer, D. H. Reich, C. Broholm and F. Trouw: Phys. Rev. B **57** (1998) 7846.
- 40) M. Hagiwara, H. A. Katori, U. Schollwöck and H.-J. Mikeska: Phys. Rev. B **62** (2000) 1051.
- 41) H. Manaka, I. Yamada, Z. Honda, H. A. Katori and K. Katsumata: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **67** (1998) 3913.
- 42) M. Uchida, H. Tanaka, M. I. Bartashevich and T. Goto: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **70** (2001) 1790.
- 43) K. Takatsu, W. Shiramura and H. Tanaka: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **66** (1997) 1161.
- 44) W. Shiramura, K. Takatsu, H. Tanaka, K. Kamishima, M. Takahashi, H. Mitamura and T. Goto: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **66** (1997) 1900.
- 45) N. Cavadini, W. Henggeler, A. Furrer, H.-U. Güdel, K. Krämer and H. Mutka: Eur. Phys. J. B **7** (1999) 519.
- 46) A. Oosawa, T. Kato, H. Tanaka, K. Kakurai, M. Müller and H.-J. Mikeska: Phys. Rev. B **65** (2002) 094426.
- 47) A. Oosawa, M. Ishii and H. Tanaka: J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **11** (1999) 265.
- 48) H. Tanaka, A. Oosawa, T. Kato, H. Uekusa, Y. Ohashi, K. Kakurai and A. Hoser: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **70** (2001) 939.
- 49) A. Oosawa, T. Takamasu, K. Tatani, H. Abe, N. Tsujii, O. Suzuki, H. Tanaka, G. Kido and K. Kindo: Phys. Rev. B **66** (2002) 104405.
- 50) Y. Shindo and H. Tanaka: preprint (cond-mat/0310691).
- 51) A. Paduan-Filho, X. Gratens and N. F. Oliveira, Jr.: Phys. Rev. B **69** (2004) 020405.
- 52) A. Paduan-Filho, X. Gratens and N. F. Oliveira, Jr.: J. App. Phys. **95** (2004) 7537.
- 53) E. Ya. Sherman, P. Lemmens, B. Busse, A. Oosawa and H. Tanaka: Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** (2003) 057201.
- 54) G. Misguich and M. Oshikawa: preprint (cond-mat/0405422).
- 55) Ch. Rüegg, N. Cavadini, A. Furrer, H.-U. Güdel, K. Krämer, H. Mutka, A. Wildes, K. Habicht and P. Vorderwisch: Nature **423** (2003) 62.
- 56) M. Mastumoto, B. Normand, T. M. Rice and M. Sigrist: Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 077203.
- 57) A. Oosawa, M. Fujisawa, T. Osakabe, K. Kakurai and H. Tanaka: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **72** (2003) 1026.
- 58) H. Tanaka, K. Goto, M. Fujisawa, T. Ono and Y. Uwatoko: Physica B **329-333** (2003) 697.
- 59) Y. Sasago, K. Uchinokura, A. Zheludev and G. Shirane: Phys. Rev. B **55** (1997) 8357.
- 60) M. Jaime, V. F. Correa, N. Harrison, C. D. Batista, N. Kawashima, Y. Kazuma, G. Jorge, R. Stern, I. Heinmaa, S. A. Zvyagin, Y. Sasago and K. Uchinokura: Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 087203.
- 61) A. Oosawa and H. Tanaka: Phys. Rev. B **65** (2002) 184437.
- 62) M. P. A. Fisher, P. B. Weighman, G. Grinstein and D. S. Fisher: Phys. Rev. B **40** 546.
- 63) A. Oosawa, T. Ono and H. Tanaka: Phys. Rev. B **66** (2002) 020405.
- 64) A. Oosawa, M. Fujisawa, K. Kakurai and H. Tanaka: Phys. Rev. B **67** (2003) 184424.
- 65) S. Wessel, M. Olshanii and Stephan Haas, Phys. Rev. B **87** (2001) 206407.
- 66) O. Nohadani, S. Wessel, B. Normand and S. Haas: Phys. Rev. B **69** (2004) 220402.
- 67) N. Kawashima: preprint (cond-mat/0408649).
- 68) O. F. Syljuåsen and A. W. Sandvik: Phys. Rev. E **66** (2002) 046701.
- 69) N. Kawashima and K. Harada: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **73** (2004) 1379.
- 70) M. Campostrini, M. Hasenbusch, A. Pelissetto, P. Rossi and E. Vicari: Phys. Rev. B **63** (2001) 214503.
- 71) D. I. Uzunov: Physics Letters **87A** (1981) 11.
- 72) See, for example, S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York 1999).