General Disclaimer

One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.

- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.

- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.

- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.

- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.

Four Particle Exchange in Solid ^{3}He

A. K. McMahan[*] and J. W. Wilkins[†]

Laboratory of Atomic and Solid State Physics
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

Abstract

We report calculations which suggest that there is a physically-important four-atom exchange process in bcc ^{3}He and thus an important four-spin term in the exchange Hamiltonian. A simple, mean-field analysis of this Hamiltonian appears to account for a number of the perplexing properties of bcc ^{3}He. An understanding of other properties may require treatment of the exact four-spin term. It is our hope to stimulate such effort by this Letter.

We report the results of calculations which suggest there is a physically important four-atom exchange process in bcc solid ^{3}He. The process gives rise to a <u>four-spin</u> term in the effective spin or exchange Hamiltonian with an exchange energy comparable to the nearest-neighbor two-spin term. A simple-minded mean-field treatment suggests this four-spin term could lead to a temperature-dependent exchange frequency which offers partial insight to the several perplexing properties of bcc solid ^{3}He.[1]

To facilitate discussion we define the exchange Hamiltonian including pair, triple, and the important cyclic quadruple exchange:[2]

$$H_{ex} = -2 \; [J_1 - 6J_{112} + 3J_{1111,23}] \; \overset{(1)}{\underset{i<j}{\Sigma}} \; \vec{I}_i \cdot \vec{I}_j$$

$$-2 \; [J_2 - 4J_{112} + J_{1111,23}] \; \overset{(2)}{\underset{i<j}{\Sigma}} \; \vec{I}_i \cdot \vec{I}_j \tag{1}$$

$$-4J_{1111,23} \; \underset{i<j<k<\ell}{\Sigma} \left[(\vec{I}_i \cdot \vec{I}_j)(\vec{I}_k \cdot \vec{I}_\ell) + (\vec{I}_j \cdot \vec{I}_k)(\vec{I}_\ell \cdot \vec{I}_i) \right.$$
$$\left. - (\vec{I}_i \cdot \vec{I}_k)(\vec{I}_j \cdot \vec{I}_\ell) \right].$$

The first two-spin term involves nearest-neighbor spins (the "(1)" over the sum), while the second involves next-nearest neighbor spins (the "(2)"). Finally the one four-spin term involves four atoms located at the corners of the rhombus, lying in the (110) plane, whose sides $\overline{ij}$, $\overline{jk}$, $\overline{k\ell}$, $\overline{\ell i}$ are first-neighbor distances (the subscript "1111" in $J_{1111,23}$) and whose diagonals $\overline{ik}$, $\overline{j\ell}$ are second- and third-nearest neighbors (the 23 after the comma).

Later in this letter we will present a summary of the calculations for the various exchange constants. The relative large size of $J_{1111,23}$ appears to arise from the generally larger amplitude of atomic vibrations associated with transverse phonons. Moreover the ratio of $J_{1111,23}/J_1$ is further enhanced by making the atomic wavefunction less localized than is indicated by most calculations.

of the ground state energy, which are relatively insensitive to the degree of localization.

First we want to briefly discuss the anomalies in ^{3}He solid within the context of a mean-field approximation for (1) in which, for simplicity, we ignore the next-nearest-neighbor exchange terms except to indicate those situations where they may play a noticeable role. Then (1) reduces to

$$H = - 2\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1(T) \sum_{i<j}^{(1)} \vec{I}_i \cdot \vec{I}_j \tag{2}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1(T) = J_1 - 6J_{112} + 3J_{1111,23}(1 + 4 \langle \vec{I} \cdot \vec{I} \rangle_1). \tag{3}$$

In (3) the term $\langle \vec{I} \cdot \vec{I} \rangle_1$ corresponds to the thermal expectation value of the scalar product of nearest-neighbor spins. Since we expect ^{3}He solid to become anti-ferromagnetic at low temperatures, then $\langle \vec{I} \cdot \vec{I} \rangle_1$ will change from zero at high temperature to something like $-(3/4)$ in the ordered phase. Taking a simple analytic form for this switching behavior, and using numbers we have calculated, we might approximate (3) above the transition by

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1(T) \approx - 0.65 + 0.4 \tanh (2/T) \tag{4}$$

where $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1$ and T are measured in mK. (The factor 2 in the tanh $(2/T)$ is an estimate of the transition temperature in the absence of $J_{1111,23}$.)

There are several puzzling anomalies in the ^{3}He solid data which we discuss in terms of (2) and (4). We restrict ourselves to a single density, corresponding to a molar volume of 24.0 cc/mole.

High temperature results (T > 20 mK): In this regime, $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1$ is a temperature-independent constant. High temperature susceptibility measurements[3] indicate it is negative (anti-ferromagnetic), with its best value of -0.65 mK coming from the pressure measurements.[4] When the pressure measurements are extended to finite magnetic fields,[5] it appears necessary to assume an additional ferromagnetic next-nearest neighbor interaction of strength $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2/\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1 \sim -0.2$.[6,7]

All of the _high_ temperature data can be reconciled within such a two-parameter model, in which $\tilde{J}_1$ is still approximately -0.65 mK, and $\tilde{J}_2$ is ferromagnetic.[6,7] Ratios in the vicinity of -0.2 have been theoretically calculated.[6,8,1] In the present work we can only specify $+0.03 > \tilde{J}_2/\tilde{J}_1 > -0.2$ because of 10% or so uncertainties in the various exchange frequencies, and large cancellations in $J_2 - 4J_{112} + J_{1111,23}$ (the high temperature value of $\tilde{J}_2(T)$).

Low temperature results (T < 20 mK):

(i) _Transition temperature._ A constant first-neighbor exchange frequency of -0.65 mK corresponds (via $T_N = 2.75|J|$) to an anti-ferromagnetic transition temperature of 1.8 mK (a bit higher if $\tilde{J}_2 > 0$), whereas the first observed transition in the solid is 1.1 mK.[9] Clearly (4) would produce a lower transition temperature.

(ii) _Specific heat._ A high temperature expansion for the specific heat in powers of T^{-1} using an anti-ferromagnetic Heisenberg Hamiltonian results in a T^{-3} term with a positive coefficient (even larger if $\tilde{J}_2 > 0$); whereas the experiments[9,10] indicate a _negative_ one. A temperature-dependent exchange such as (4) can result in a negative coefficient, although our crude argument appears to give too small a coefficient.

Near the transition temperature of the solid the specific heat has a pronounced bump[9,10] near 2 mK prior to the entropy anomaly at 1.1 mK. Our mean field model _cannot_ explain this structure. On the other hand, the original Hamiltonian (1) we propose may be able to explain it. Specifically we propose to the phase transition theory community the following question: does H_{ex} (1) with its four-spin term have the same behavior as a Heisenberg Hamiltonian in the vicinity of the (depressed) transition temperature? Or can it exhibit structure consistent with that observed in bcc ^{3}He?

(iii) _Spin Diffusion._ As additional evidence that something extraordinary is occuring at about 2 mK in the solid, there is the fact that the spin diffusion

coefficient D drops sharply by over 30% for decreasing temperature about 2 mK,[11] leading once again to the idea that the effective J ($\propto$ D) is strongly temperature dependent.

(iv) H-T phase boundary. In terms of a mean-field model, an external magnetic field would favor a positive $\langle \vec{I} \cdot \vec{I} \rangle_1$ in (3) and hence increase $|\mathcal{J}_1|$. Presumably this effect would increase the magnetic field at which the spin-flop to paramagnetic-solid transition occurs over that predicted by a Heisenberg Hamiltonian. Only preliminary experimental data[12] exist for the H-T phase boundary.

Finally we turn to the actual calculation of $J_{1111,23}$ and the other exchange frequencies. There is an extensive literature[13] which underpins our calculation. The exchange frequencies can be written in terms of integrals involving the Jastrow-Gaussian ansatz for the many-body wave function in solid ^{3}He:

$$\psi = \prod_i e^{-\frac{1}{2}A(\vec{r}_i - \vec{R}_i)^2} \prod_{i<j} f(r_{ij}), \tag{5}$$

where $\vec{r}_i$ and $\vec{R}_i$ specify the atom and lattice site positions, respectively.

The scalar coefficient A is proportional to the (Einstein) frequency describing the harmonic motion of an atom about its lattice site. In our calculation we generalize A to a matrix[14] in order to take into account a more realistic description of the atomic motion based on a self-consistent calculation[15] of the phonon frequencies. Accordingly the A_{eff} listed in Table I for the four largest exchange frequencies reflects phonon frequencies which predominate in that exchange process.

The Jastrow function $f(r_{ij})$ is roughly a step function used to describe the short-range correlations, by preventing two atoms from approaching closer than their hard-core diameter. The energy of solid He can be written in terms of integrals involving ψ. Various calculations[16] which in effect minimize the energy with respect to functional form and parameters of (5), yield very similar

Jastrow functions. On the oth r hand the energy is not very sensitive to A. Nevertheless, it now appears on the basis of recent Monte Carlo calculations,[8] that A may be 30% smaller than the range of values previously accepted. We exploit this possibility in our work.

In terms of the wave function (5) the exchange frequency for a given exchange p of atoms is

$$J_p = -\Omega_p \; e^{-A \; d_p^2/4} \; I_p(A, \{f\}). \tag{6}$$

where d_p is a distance in configuration space between the original and exchanged atoms. Values of d_p in units of the nearest neighbor distance R are given for various exchanges in Table I. The attempt frequency for the exchange process, within the Einstein approximation for the atomic motion, is given by

$$\Omega_p = (\hbar/2M) \; d_p \; (A^3/\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The exchange frequencies are dominated by the other two factors in (6).

Gaussian overlap. The exponential factor is a measure of the overlap of the wavefunctions of the original and exchanged atoms. Note that it is a very sensitive function of the frequencies of the exchanging atoms. In Table I A_{eff} for next-nearest-neighbor exchange is smaller than for nearest-neighbor which is a measure of the relative ease of distortions for exchange in (100) as opposed to (111) directions.

Hard-core effects. The final factor I_p corrects for the fact that the Gaussian overlap overestimates the probability for atoms to exchange by not excluding routes of exchange forbidden by the hard-core repulsion of the atoms. This effect is most important for pair exchange where straight-line exchange would have the atoms sitting on top of each other. In this case I_1 includes the dominant factor $\exp\left(-\frac{A}{2} \sigma^2\right) \sim \frac{1}{25}$ where σ is the hard-core radius. This strong

dependence on A does not occur in I_p for three- and four-atom exchange, where the short-range correlation effects are largely geometric in nature.[1] The values for I_p in Table I are extrapolated from the results of Ref. 1 based on Monte Carlo integrations (for the Einstein case), with the exception of the last (and crucial) entry which has been estimated on the basis of the experience gained from three-atom exchange.

In the next to the last column of Table I are the results for J_p. It is clear that $J_{1111,23}$ is too small but so is J_1 by at least a factor of 20, if it is to agree with the high temperature measurements. At this stage we take advantage of the fact that the more accurate Monte Carlo work[8] suggests that the true A values may be 30% or so smaller than those consistent with Ref. 15 on which our work is based. Accordingly we decrease A, or more accurately, rescale downward the phonon frequencies until the value of $(J_1 - 6J_{112} + 3J_{1111,23})$ [see (1)] agrees with the exchange frequency deduced from high temperature measurements.[17] The resulting numbers are shown in the last column. We note that $9|J_{1111,23}|$ is ~.4 mK, the factor used in (4). As a result of these cal-culations we argue that this four-atom exchange (the next largest one is an order of magnitude smaller) must be taken into account in any treatment of the phase transition of bcc ^{3}He.

TABLE I

	$(d_p/2R)^2$	$A_{eff}(\text{Å}^{-2})$	$\Omega_p e^{-A_{eff}d_p^{2}/4}$	I_p	J_p(mK)	scaled J_p(mK)
Pair (1)	1/2	1.350	2.00	.014	−.028	−1.02
(2)	2/3	1.129	.602	.0067	−.0040	− .25
Triple (112)	5/6	1.295	.0104	.086	−.00089	− .085
Quadruple 1111,23	1	1.136	.0042	.09	−.00038	− .045

Table I. Exchange frequencies and related intermediate numbers for bcc ^{3}He (24.0 cc/mole).

References

* Supported in part by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration through grant number NGR-33-010-188. Permanent address: L504, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Livermore, California, 94550.

† Supported in part by the National Science Foundation through grant number DMR74-23494.

1. R. A. Guyer, Phys. Rev. A 9, 1452 (1974) first suggested that a four-spin exchange might explain the anamolous data for bcc ^{3}He. We offer no advance over his mean-field investigation of the effects but do suggest why the exchange frequency could be large.

2. See A. K. McMahan and R. A. Guyer, Phys. Rev. A 7, 1105 (1973) for a discussion of such Hamiltonians and methods for calculating the exchange constants.

3. See review article, S. B. Trickey, W. P. Kirk, and E. D. Adams, Rev. Mod. Phys. 44, 668 (1972), and references therein.

4. M. F. Panczyk and E. D. Adams, Phys. Rev. 187, 321 (1969); A 1, 1356 (1970)

5. W. P. Kirk and E. D. Adams, Phys. Rev. Lett. 27, 392 (1971).

6. L. I. Zane, Phys. Rev. Lett. 28, 420 (1972); J. Low Temp. Phys. 9, 219 (1972).

7. L. Goldstein, Phys. Rev. A 8, 2160 (1973).

8. W. L. Lim and L. H. Nosanow (to be published); W. L. Lim, Doctoral Thesis, University of Minnesota (1973); no. 73-29, 416 University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

9. W. P. Halperin, C. N. Archie, F. B. Rasmussen, R. A. Buhrman, and R. C. Richardson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 927 (1974) plus private communication.

10. J. M. Dundon and J. M. Goodkind, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 1343 (1974).

11. R. T. Johnson, O. G. Symko, and J. C. Wheatley, Phys. Letters 39A, 173 (1972).

12. R. B. Kummer, E. D. Adams, W. P. Kirk, A. S. Greenberg, R. M. Mueller, C. V. Britton and D. M. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 34, 517 (1975).

13. See Refs. 1 and 6 for extensive bibleography.

14. A similar calculation for the nearest-neighbor-pair exchange frequency has been reported by L. H. Nosanow and C. M. Varma, Phys. Rev. **187**, 660 (1969).

15. The self-consistent phonon frequencies that went into our calculation were very kindly provided by Dr. H. R. Glyde. See H. R. Glyde, Can. J. Phys. **49**, 761 (1971).

16. R. A. Guyer and L. I. Zane, Phys. Rev. **188**, 445 (1969); H. Horner, Phys. Rev. A **1**, 1722 (1970); C. Ebner and C. C. Sung, Phys. Rev. A **4**, 1099 (1971).

17. Ref. 8 also reported Einstein exchange calculations of $J_1 - 6J_{112}$ in better than factor of two agreement with the high temperature experiments. Conversely, our procedure of actually fitting the data results in rescaled values of A_1 (A_{eff} for first-neighbor pair exchange) in fairly good agreement with the Einstein A values reported in Ref. 8 at both densities considered there. The agreement becomes excellent when differences in short-range correlation functions are taken into account.