COMMENTS AND ADDENDA

The Comments and Addenda section is for short communications which are not of such urgency as to justify publication in Physical Review Letters and are not appropriate for regular Articles. It includes only the following types of communications: (1) comments on papers previously published in The Physical Review or Physical Review Letters; (2) addenda to papers previously published in The Physical Review or Physical Review Letters, in which the additional information can be presented without the need for writing a complete article. Manuscripts intended for this section may be accompanied by a brief abstract for information-retrieval purposes. Accepted manuscripts will follow the same publication schedule as articles in this journal, and galleys will be sent to authors.

Concentration dependence of the electron-spin-resonance linewidth in $(CH_3)_4NMn_{1-x}Cu_xCl_3^{\dagger}$

Peter M. Richards Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87115

(Received 11 August 1975)

The electron-spin-resonance linewidth ΔH has been measured in (CH₃)₄NMnCl₃ (TMMC) samples having a fraction x of Cu⁺⁺ substituted for Mn⁺⁺, with x up to 0.22. For the applied field along the chain axis, ΔH increases with x in a manner consistent with predictions of one-dimensional spin dynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION

In a paper¹ referred to as I, we studied electron spin resonance (ESR) in a linear chain cyrstal of $(CH_3)_4$ NMnCl₃ (TMMC) which contained 4-at. % Cu⁺⁺ substituted for Mn⁺⁺. The main result of I was that the linewidth ΔH of TMMC: Cu was greatly enhanced when the field was applied along the chain axis, and this enhancement of 50% could be explained in terms of the Cu⁺⁺ slowing down the rate of spin diffusion along the chain and was consistent with the peculiar features of ESR caused by one-dimensional spin dynamics.² Here we report measurements on a number of

 $(CH_3)_4NMn_{1-x}Cu_xCl_3$ samples with x between 3.4 $\times 10^{-4}$ and 0.22. The results further confirm the basic conclusions presented in I.

II. THEORY

According to the theory in I, the concentration dependence of ΔH is given by

$$\Delta H(x) / \Delta H(0) = (1 - x)^{2/3} [D(0) / D(x)]^{1/3}$$
(1)

for the field applied along the chain axis. The factor $(1-x)^{2/3}$ comes from a reduction of the second moment M_2 due to substitution of Mn^{++} by the much lower moment Cu^{++} . [See Eq. (27) of I and surrounding discussion. The $\frac{2}{3}$ power results because $\Delta H \propto M_2^{2/3}$ for a one-dimensional system.] It produced a negligible effect for the x = 0.04 sample measured in I and thus was not included in Eq. (30) of I. For the larger concentrations

studied here, however, its effect can be significant. The quantity D(x) is the spin-diffusion coefficient of the chain at concentration x, and the $\frac{1}{3}$ power results, once again, from the one-dimensional characteristics of the problem.

A model was employed in I whereby the chain is made up of segments of length 2c (c is the nearest-neighbor intrachain distance) in which the spins diffuse at the rate D' proportional to the Mn-Cu exchange interaction and ones of length l-2c (l = c/x) in which the diffusion coefficient is D(0). From this model we obtain

$$\frac{D(0)}{D(x)} = 1 + 2x \left(\frac{D(0)}{D'} - 1 \right).$$
(2)

Equation (2), which is valid for an arbitrary ratio of D/D', agrees with Eqs. (29) and (35) of I for $D/D' \gg 1$, the conditions under which these equations were derived. Note that (2) correctly gives D(x) = D' at $x = \frac{1}{2}$, which corresponds to an alternating chain of Mn⁺⁺ and Cu⁺⁺ ions. The model clearly breaks down for $x > \frac{1}{2}$ since no account is taken of Cu-Cu interactions. Use of (2) in (1) then gives the predicted concentration dependence

$$[\Delta H(x)/\Delta H(0)]^3 (1-x)^{-2} = 1 + \lambda x, \qquad (3)$$

where λ is a constant.

III. RESULTS

In Fig. 1 we plot $[\Delta H(x)/\Delta H(0)]^3(1-x)^{-2}$ vs x for data at room temperature, a frequency of 9.82 GHz and with the field along the chain axis. The

13

458



FIG. 1. Peak-to-peak linewidth ΔH vs Cu⁺⁺ concentration x, plotted in manner to give straight line according to theory of Eq. (4). Circles are for $\theta = 0$; triangles are for angle at which ΔH is a maximum, in cases where there is a shallow minimum in ΔH at $\theta = 0$.

peak-to-peak width at x=0 is taken to be $\Delta H(0)$ = 960 Oe for normalization purposes. The large error bars at the most concentrated (x=0.22) sample result from imprecision in measuring large linewidths ($\Delta H \approx 2000$ Oe) and from taking the cube of the quantity. The values of x were obtained by chemical analysis at Huffman Laboratories, Wheatridge, Colorado. X-ray diffraction showed that the lattice constants decreased by about 0.7% in going from x=0 to x=0.22.

The angular dependence of ΔH in all samples was similar to that reported in I and thus showed the roughly $3\cos^2\theta - 1$ (θ is the angle of applied field with respect to the chain axis) variation characteristic of linear chain materials. In two of the samples (x = 0.023 and x = 0.22), however, there was a (10-15)% dip in ΔH at $\theta = 0$, the maximum ΔH occurring at $\theta \approx \pm 10^\circ$. The effect was repeatable and just outside the experimental error. Data shown in Fig. 1 for these samples are both for $\theta = 0$ and the maximum observed ΔH .

The peak-to-peak width at 55° $(3\cos^2\theta - 1 = 0)$ increased from 160 to 280 Oe as x varied between nearly zero and 0.22.

IV. DISCUSSION

The dependence of Eq. (3) is seen in Fig. 1 to be reasonably well verified up to at least x = 0.1. The slope of the straight line gives $\lambda = 57$, and this is in good agreement with the result in I based on comparison between x = 0 and x = 0.04, and which may be converted to $\lambda = 62$ in the present notation [comparison of Eq. (3) here and Eq. (36) of I, which approximated $1 - x \approx 1$, shows that $\lambda = 3.7 \times |J/J'|$, and the value |J'/J| = 0.06 was deduced in I]. If the maximum observed ΔH is used for the x = 0.22 sample, then the agreement extends up to the highest concentration.

As noted in I, the linewidth at $\theta = 55^{\circ} \Delta H_{55}$ should be nearly independent of x since it is not affected by the long-time features of spin dynamics in one dimension, whereas we observe a significant increase with x. If the source of broadening were purely dipole dipole, ΔH_{55} should decrease with increasing x, and the observed 0.7% lattice contraction between x = 0 and x = 0.22 should be too small to have any significant effect on ΔH . Two mechanisms for a ΔH_{55} which increases with x are (i) a Δg broadening caused by the difference between Cu^{**} and $Mn^{**} g$ factors and (ii) rapid spinlattice relaxation of the Cu⁺⁺ ion. These are ruled out, however, by the following considerations. The Δg mechanism (i) should be strongly field dependent, but measurements on the x = 0.22 sample gave the same value of ΔH_{55} at 22 GHz as at 9.8 GHz. Mechanism (ii) results in broadening only if the spin-lattice relaxation rate δ is comparable to or larger than the impurity-host exchange frequency. As mentioned in I, this requires $\delta \gtrsim 5 \times 10^{10}$ sec⁻¹, which does not seem reasonable for Cu⁺⁺ ions in TMMC.

A possible explanation of both the variation of ΔH_{55} with x and the anomalous minimum in ΔH at $\theta = 0$ for the highest concentration could be an anisotropic Cu-Mn interaction which does not have a $3\cos^2\theta - 1$ angular dependence. To be specific, consider an interaction of the form

$$\mathcal{H}' = 2GS_i^{z'} S_{i+1}^{z'} \tag{4}$$

between a Mn^{**} spin S and a neighboring Cu^{**} spin \vec{s} . We take the principal axis z' to be in the direction of the g_{\parallel} axis of the Cu^{**} ion, which should lie along one of the Cu-Cl bonds in the Cl₃-Cu-Cl₃ octahedron.³ A tetragonal distortion, common for Cu^{**}, is expected to single out a particular Cu-Cl direction for z'. The direction z' will then be about 63° from the chain axis,³ so that the interaction will be mostly secular at $\theta = 55^{\circ}$ and mostly nonsecular at $\theta = 0$ since the secular component varies as $3\cos^2 \alpha - 1$, where α is the angle between the applied field and the z' direction.⁴

The contribution of \mathcal{K}' to ΔH may be estimated by assuming that ΔH scales as $M_2^{2/3}$, where M_2 is the second moment. Thus we have

$$\frac{\Delta H'}{\Delta H_D} \approx \left(\frac{J'c^3}{\gamma^2 \hbar^2}\right)^{4/3} \left[\frac{s(s+1)}{s(s+1)}\right]^{2/3} \left(\frac{x}{1-x}\right)^{2/3}, \qquad (5)$$

where $\Delta H'$ is the linewidth at 55° due to \mathcal{K}' , ΔH_D is the linewidth at $\theta = 0^\circ$ due to intrachain dipolar

460

coupling, and γ is the Mn^{**} gyromagnetic ratio. One might expect to have an interaction G of the order of $\frac{1}{2}(g-2)|J'|$, where g is the Cu^{**} g factor and J' is the Cu-Mn exchange constant. For $|J'|/k_B \approx 0.4 \,^{\circ}\text{K} (|J'| = 0.06|J|, |J|/k_B \approx 7 \,^{\circ}\text{K}$ for pure TMMC) and a typical value g = 2.2 for Cu^{**}, we thus obtain $\Delta H' \approx 80$ Oe at x = 0.22, which is nearly the amount by which ΔH_{55} increases in going from x = 0 to x = 0.22. Since the dominant secular contribution of \mathcal{K}' to ΔH increases as θ moves away from 0°, the small minimum in ΔH observed when the field is along the chain axis could also be due to this mechanism.

Equation (5) assumes that the effective spin dynamics for the interaction (4) are the same as govern the Mn-Mn dipolar broadening. This is reasonable for the long times of interest where the strongly coupled system decays with the single diffusion coefficient D(x).

- ¹P. M. Richards, Phys. Rev. B <u>10</u>, 805 (1974).
- ²For reviews see D. Hone and P. M. Richards, Ann. Rev. Mater. Sci, <u>4</u>, 337 (1974); P. M. Richards, in Low-Dimensional Cooperative Phenomena, edited by

In conclusion, we have established that the major point made in I about impurities affecting ESR in a Heisenberg linear chain by strongly altering the rate of spin diffusion is correct for a wide range of concentrations. In addition there

wide range of concentrations. In addition there are effects on the linewidth at the "magic angle" $\left[\theta = \cos^{-1}\left(1/\sqrt{3}\right)\right]$ and near $\theta = 0^{\circ}$ which are not yet fully understood and may be worthy of further investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

J. Johnson performed the measurements. The crystals were grown and supplied by Professor S. Holt, University of Wyoming. He and Dr. G. M. Cole, University of Wyoming, also supervised the chemical analysis. We are very grateful to them for these contributions and several helpful discussions. Dr. B. Morosin made the x-ray measurements.

[†]Work was supported by the U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration.

H. J. Keller (Plenum, New York, 1975), p. 147.

³B. Morosin and E. J. Graeber, Acta. Crystallogr. <u>23</u>, 766 (1967).

⁴K. T. McGregor and Z. G. Soos, J. Chem. Phys. (to be published).