

Anomalous scaling behavior of the dynamical spin susceptibility of $\text{Ce}_{0.925}\text{La}_{0.075}\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$

W. Knafo,¹ S. Raymond,¹ J. Flouquet,¹ B. Fåk,¹ M. A. Adams,² P. Haen,³ F. Lapiere,³ S. Yates,³ and P. Lejay³

¹Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique–Grenoble, Direction des Sciences de la Matière/Département de Recherche Fondamentale sur la Matière Condensée/Service de Physique Statistique, de Magnétisme et de Supraconductivité, 38054 Grenoble Cedex 9, France

²ISIS Facility, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0QX, United Kingdom

³Centre des Recherches sur le Très Basses Températures, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, B.P. 166, 38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France

(Received 6 April 2004; revised manuscript received 6 July 2004; published 3 November 2004)

Inelastic neutron scattering measurements have been performed on single crystals of the heavy-fermion compound $\text{Ce}_{0.925}\text{La}_{0.075}\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$ in broad energy [0.1, 9.5 meV] and temperature [40 mK, 294 K] ranges in order to address the question of scaling behavior of the dynamical spin susceptibility at the quantum critical point of an itinerant magnetic system. For two wave vectors \mathbf{Q} corresponding to uncorrelated and antiferromagnetically correlated spin fluctuations, it is found that the dynamical spin susceptibility $\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ is independent of temperature below a cutoff temperature T_Q : the spin fluctuation amplitude saturates at low temperatures contrarily to its expected divergence at a quantum critical point. Above T_Q , a \mathbf{Q} -dependent scaling behavior of the form $T\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T) = C_{\mathbf{Q}}[E/(a_{\mathbf{Q}}T^{\beta_{\mathbf{Q}}})]$ with $\beta_{\mathbf{Q}} < 1$ is obtained. This scaling does not enter the general framework of quantum phase transition theories, since it is obtained in a high-temperature range, where Kondo spin fluctuations depend strongly on temperature.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevB.70.174401

PACS number(s): 75.40.Gb, 71.27.+a, 78.70.Nx, 89.75.Da

I. INTRODUCTION

In many heavy-fermion systems (HFS) a quantum phase transition (QPT) separates a nonmagnetic from a magnetic ground state at $T=0$ K. Such a transition is governed by the competition between Kondo screening of localized moments and Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuya-Yosida (RKKY)-like intersite interactions. It can be tuned by applying an external pressure, a magnetic field, or by chemical substitution. In the vicinity of a QPT, the critical fluctuations have a quantum feature characterized by an effective dimension $d^* = d + z$, d being the spatial dimension and z the dynamical exponent.¹⁻⁴ The extra dimension z is related to the imaginary time direction ($z=2$ for antiferromagnetic fluctuations). When T is increased, a crossover regime [also called quantum classical (QC)] sets up when the fluctuations lose their quantum features and become controlled by T . The dimension is then reduced from d^* to d . In a simple picture this can be seen as a finite-size scaling,⁵ where the “finite size” $\tau_T \sim 1/T$ of the system in the time dimension is decreased when T is increased:⁶ the time dimension is then progressively suppressed. If τ is the relaxation time of quantum fluctuations, the quantum regime is the low T regime for which $\tau_T > \tau$, where the dynamical properties behave as functions of $\omega\tau$ and do not depend on T . The crossover regime is then expected for $\tau_T < \tau$, its dynamical properties behaving as functions of ω/T .

Inelastic neutron scattering (INS) is a unique tool for studying dynamic magnetic properties. Enhancements of spin fluctuations (SF) have already been reported by INS around the QPT of HFS (see, for example, Refs. 7–9). The T dependence of those low-energy excitations is believed to be related to the low-temperature non-Fermi-liquid behavior observed by bulk measurements near the quantum critical point (QCP) of such systems.¹⁰ That is why it is necessary for understanding QPT to study precisely how SF evolve with T

and to search for scaling laws specific to the QC regime. Several INS studies report ω/T scaling of the dynamical spin susceptibility in HFS or high- T_C superconductors.¹¹⁻¹⁵ In particular, some insight was given by the detailed study of Schröder *et al.* at the QCP of $\text{CeCu}_{6-x}\text{Au}_x$.¹¹ They obtained a collapse of the dynamical spin susceptibility on a single curve when plotted as $T^{0.75}\chi''(\omega, T) = g(\omega/T)$. A general form of this law was found to work with the same T exponents for each vector of the reciprocal lattice and down to the smallest accessible temperatures. This \mathbf{Q} dependence became the starting point of a local description of quantum criticality.^{16,17} Such a description is opposed to itinerant scenarios where the QPT is only driven by fluctuations at some critical wave vectors.^{1,2,18,19}

We have chosen here to search for a scaling behavior at the QCP of $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$, a HFS that has been extensively studied for about 20 years.²⁰⁻²⁴ This three-dimensional (3D) Ising system has a QCP at $x_c \simeq 7.5\%$ that separates a paramagnetic ground state for $x < x_c$ from an antiferromagnetic ground state with the incommensurate propagation vector $\mathbf{k}_1 = (0.31, 0, 0)$ for $x > x_c$. Although the occurrence of small magnetic moments has been reported for $x \leq x_c$ [$0.02\mu_B$ at $\mathbf{k}_1 = (0.31, 0, 0)$ below 2 K for $x = x_c$ (Ref. 7) and $0.001\mu_B$ also below 2 K for $x = 0$ (Ref. 25)], a long range magnetic order with diverging correlation length is only obtained for $x > x_c$. Large single crystals are available, which makes it possible to investigate precisely the reciprocal space via INS. In this system, the observed excitation spectra consist in short range magnetic correlations enhanced at the wave vectors \mathbf{k}_1 , $\mathbf{k}_2 = (0.31, 0.31, 0)$ and $\mathbf{k}_3 = (0, 0, 0.35)$, while uncorrelated SF are obtained away from these wave vectors and cover most of the Brillouin zone (see Ref. 26 for a detailed survey of the SF repartition in the reciprocal space of this system). Previous neutron measurements have shown the continuous behavior of the SF through the QCP^{23,24} and

several tests led to a rather good accordance between Moriya's itinerant theory and experimental data.^{7,18,21,26} $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$ constitutes consequently an opportunity to study quantum criticality in a case for which the itinerancy of the $4f$ electrons is established. For this purpose, we present here new measurements at the critical concentration x_c that were made not only to benefit from much better statistics but also to measure a broader range of temperatures (between 40 mK and 294 K) and energies (between 0.1 and 9.5 meV). Such extended data are required for a precise determination of the temperature dependence of the SF. In this paper we report an anomalous scaling behavior of the dynamical spin susceptibility at the QCP of $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$: instead of ω/T , ω/T^{β_Q} scalings with $\beta_Q < 1$ are obtained. Contrary to the other cases reported in the literature, the laws found here depend on the wave vector, and each wave vector is characterized by a different low-temperature cutoff below which a nearly T -independent quantum regime is obtained.

II. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

The single crystals of $\text{Ce}_{0.925}\text{La}_{0.075}\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$ studied here have been grown by the Czochralsky method. They crystallize in the body centered tetragonal $I4/mmm$ space group with the lattice parameters $a=b=4.197 \text{ \AA}$ and $c=9.797 \text{ \AA}$. A single crystal of 250 mm^3 was used for the INS measurements and a smaller one of 3 mm^3 for the dc susceptibility measurements. INS measurements were carried out on the cold and thermal triple-axis spectrometers IN12 and IN22 at the ILL (Grenoble, France). The (001) plane was investigated. 60° -open-open and open-open-open setup were used on IN12 and IN22, respectively. A beryllium filter on IN12 and a pyrolytic graphite (PG) filter on IN22 were added to eliminate higher-order contaminations. In both cases PG was used for the vertically focusing monochromator and for the horizontally focusing analyzer. The final neutron energy was fixed to 4.65 meV on IN12 and to 14.7 meV on IN22 with the resulting energy resolutions of about 0.17 meV on IN12 and 1 meV on IN22 [full width at half maximum (FWHM) of the incoherent signal]. For temperatures between 2.5 and 80 K the high-energy points obtained on IN22 were combined with the ones obtained on IN12, with an appropriate scale factor chosen for the collapse of the data in their common range 1.9–2.5 meV. A complementary neutron experiment was carried out on the inverted-geometry time-of-flight spectrometer IRIS at ISIS (Didcot, U.K.) using a fixed final neutron energy of 1.84 meV (PG analyzer), resulting in $18 \mu\text{eV}$ resolution FWHM. The susceptibility measurements were performed both in a commercial SQUID dc magnetometer for temperatures between 5 and 300 K and in a dilution refrigerator SQUID dc magnetometer for temperatures between 250 mK and 5 K, with the magnetic field along the [001] easy axis in both cases.

III. TEMPERATURE DEPENDENCE OF SPIN FLUCTUATIONS

The data presented here consist in energy scans obtained by INS at two wave vectors: the antiferromagnetic momen-




FIG. 1. INS spectra obtained at $T=5, 24$, and 80 K for the momentum transfers \mathbf{Q}_1 and \mathbf{Q}_0 . A constant background deduced from the scattering at low temperature and negative energy transfers has been subtracted. The scattering at $E=0$ corresponds to the incoherent elastic signal. The lines are fits to the data.

tum transfer $\mathbf{Q}_1=(0.69, 1, 0)=\tau-\mathbf{k}_1$, where $\tau=(1, 1, 0)$ is a reciprocal-lattice vector, and the wave vector $\mathbf{Q}_0=(0.44, 1, 0)$, which is sufficiently far from \mathbf{k}_1 , \mathbf{k}_2 , and \mathbf{k}_3 , so that no spatial correlations are observed. In Fig. 1 the excitations spectra obtained at those two vectors are plotted for three representative temperatures: their shape is characteristic of a relaxation process. At $T=5 \text{ K}$, antiferromagnetic fluctuations are enhanced in comparison with the ones obtained at \mathbf{Q}_0 . When the temperature is raised the difference between the two signals is attenuated and above the correlation temperature $T_{corr} \approx 80 \text{ K}$ they are almost identical; the system has lost its antiferromagnetic correlations. We can also notice that the two signals are identical for $E > 4 \text{ meV}$ at all temperatures. The observed intensity is proportional to the scattering function $S(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ (where $E=\hbar\omega$), from which the imaginary part of the dynamical susceptibility $\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ is deduced using

$$S(\mathbf{Q}, E, T) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 - e^{-E/k_B T}} \chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T). \quad (1)$$

For the two wave vectors the dynamical susceptibility is well fitted by a single quasielastic Lorentzian shape of the form²⁷

$$\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T) = \frac{A(\mathbf{Q}, T)}{\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T)} \frac{E/\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T)}{1 + [E/\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T)]^2} \quad (2)$$

that corresponds to the simplest approximation that can be made to treat the spin fluctuations. The general form of the dynamical susceptibility is the Fourier transform of a single exponential decay of relaxation rate $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T)$. It can be expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\mathbf{Q}, E, T) &= \chi'(\mathbf{Q}, E, T) + i\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T) \\ &= \frac{A(\mathbf{Q}, T)}{\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T) - iE}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In such a case, the static susceptibility is given by the Kramers-Kronig relation:




FIG. 2. Scattering function $S(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ (a) at \mathbf{Q}_1 (b) at \mathbf{Q}_0 and dynamical susceptibility $\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ (c) at \mathbf{Q}_1 (d) at \mathbf{Q}_0 for $2.5 < T < 80$ K. The lines are fits to the data.

$$\begin{aligned}\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T) &= \chi'(\mathbf{Q}, E=0, T) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)}{E} dE \\ &= \frac{A(\mathbf{Q}, T)}{\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T)}.\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

However, in a previous thermal INS experiment on CeRu_2Si_2 , Adroja and Rainford observed a broad crystal field (CF) excitation at about 30 meV that dominates the excitation spectra for $E > 10$ meV, its half width at half maximum (HWHM) being about 15 meV.²⁸ Bulk susceptibility measurements also indicate that the CF scheme do not change very much with concentration x in $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$.²⁰ It is thus reasonable to consider that in $\text{Ce}_{0.925}\text{La}_{0.075}\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$, as well as in CeRu_2Si_2 , the CF excitations dominate the low-energy SF for $E > 10$ meV. Instead of Eq. (4) it is finally better to approximate the static susceptibility of the low-energy SF by introducing an energy cutoff of 10 meV such as

$$\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{10} \frac{\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)}{E} dE. \quad (5)$$

$S(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ and its fits using Eq. (2) are plotted for the two wave vectors and $2.5 < T < 80$ K in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b). $S(\mathbf{Q}_1, E, T)$, which corresponds to antiferromagnetic SF, is shown in Fig. 2(a): it is found to decrease in intensity and to broaden when T is increased. For uncorrelated SF, the scattering intensity $S(\mathbf{Q}_0, E, T)$, which is plotted in Fig. 2(b), is characterized by the collapse of the data on a single curve for positive energy transfers and $T > 5$ K. The negative energy points are strongly T dependent because of the detailed bal-




FIG. 3. Temperature dependence of $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$ and $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$. The full and dashed lines correspond to the high-temperature fits of the relaxation rate $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_1, T) = 1.1T^{0.8}$ and of the static susceptibility $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T) = 3550/T$, respectively.

ance condition $S(\mathbf{Q}, -E, T) = \exp(-E/k_B T)S(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$. Such a behavior was also reported for the polycrystalline compounds UCu_4Pd and $\text{CeRh}_{0.8}\text{Pd}_2\text{Sb}$, where the scattering is temperature independent for positive energy transfers.^{12,13} For $T = 2.5$ and 5 K the uncorrelated signal $S(\mathbf{Q}_0, E, T)$ moves to higher energies. Although better fits are obtained using an inelastic symmetrized Lorentzian instead of the quasielastic Lorentzian shape (2), it is difficult to conclude about their inelasticity, since the widths of these peaks are too important. For both \mathbf{Q}_1 and \mathbf{Q}_0 , a strong T dependence of the dynamical susceptibility $\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ deduced from (1) [and its fits using Eq. (2)] is shown in Figs. 2(c) and 2(d). Contrary to $S(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$, $\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ has a decreasing intensity for both wave vectors and is strongly broadened when T is raised. Finally, for each spectrum, the relaxation rate $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ and the static susceptibility $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ are extracted using Eqs. (2) and (5). In the next two subsections, the results of the fits of low-energy SF are separately analyzed for the momentum transfers \mathbf{Q}_1 and \mathbf{Q}_0 .

A. Antiferromagnetic spin fluctuations

The analysis of the antiferromagnetic SF at the momentum transfer \mathbf{Q}_1 is only made below $T_{\text{corr}} \approx 80$ K. The variations with T of the relaxation rate $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$ and the static susceptibility $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$ for antiferromagnetic SF are plotted in Fig. 3. As seen, there are clearly two different regimes: a nearly T -independent low-temperature and a strongly T -dependent high-temperature regimes.

Below a characteristic temperature of $T_1 \approx 3$ K, $\chi''(\mathbf{Q}_1, E, T)$ does not depend on T . Moreover, the relaxation rate is found to have the value $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_1, T) \approx k_B T_1$ in this regime: this is thus the low-temperature regime for which $\tau < \tau_T$, with $\tau = 1/\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_1, T=0) \sim 1/T_1$ and $\tau_T \sim 1/T$, as presented using a simple picture of scaling in the Introduction. The saturation of antiferromagnetic SF corresponds thus to their quantum regime. Because of the limited resolution on IN12 and IN22, a complementary experiment was made on the time-of-flight backscattering spectrometer IRIS. Mea-




FIG. 4. Scaling behavior of the low-energy antiferromagnetic SF obtained for $3 < T < 80$ K at \mathbf{Q}_1 . The dynamical susceptibility follows the scaling law $T\chi''(\mathbf{Q}_1, E, T) = C_1 f[E/(a_1 T^{0.8})]$ with $f(x) = x/(1+x^2)$.

measurements were carried out at 100 mK and 2 K with a resolution of $18 \mu\text{eV}$. $\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ was found to be independent of T for $\mathbf{Q} \approx \mathbf{Q}_1$, which confirms the saturation of antiferromagnetic SF at temperatures below T_1 .

At higher temperatures, $T_1 < T < T_{corr}$, the antiferromagnetic SF become controlled by T such that T power laws can be extracted for $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$ and $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$:

$$\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T) = C_1/T^{\alpha_1} \text{ and } \Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_1, T) = a_1 T^{\beta_1} \quad (6)$$

with

$$\alpha_1 = 1 \pm 0.05, \quad C_1 = 3550 \pm 100 \text{ arb. unit},$$

$$\beta_1 = 0.8 \pm 0.05, \quad \text{and } a_1 = 1.1 \pm 0.05 \text{ SI unit}.$$

To be more precise, the characteristic temperature T_1 has been defined by the intercept of the two asymptotic regimes obtained at low and high temperatures, the same intercept being given for $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$ and $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$. Finally, the neutron data can be plotted as $T\chi''(\mathbf{Q}_1, E, T) = C_1 f(E/(a_1 T^{0.8}))$ such that all the points measured for $T_1 < T < T_{corr}$ at the antiferromagnetic wave vector collapse on the single curve $C_1 f(x) = C_1 x/(1+x^2)$ with $x = E/(a_1 T^{0.8})$ (see Fig. 4). In the discussion, we will focus on the anomalous form of this scaling law obtained for the antiferromagnetic low-energy SF.

B. Uncorrelated spin fluctuations

The temperature dependence of the relaxation rate $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$ and the static susceptibility $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$ of uncorrelated SF are plotted in Fig. 5. As for the antiferromagnetic SF, we can define a characteristic temperature $T_0 \approx 17$ K at the intercept of the asymptotic low and high-temperature regimes. Below T_0 , $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, E, T)$ does not depend on T , and $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_0, T) \approx k_B T_0$. For T larger than T_0 , T power laws can be extracted; the fits made on $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$ for $T \geq 80$ K and on $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$ for $T \geq 20$ K give




FIG. 5. Temperature dependence of $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$ and $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$. The full and dashed lines correspond to the high-temperature fits of the relaxation rate $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_0, T) = 3.17T^{0.6}$ and of the static susceptibility $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T) = 2740/T$, respectively.

$$\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T) = C_0 T^{\alpha_0} \text{ and } \Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_0, T) = a_0 T^{\beta_0} \quad (7)$$

with

$$\alpha_0 = 1 \pm 0.1, \quad C_0 = 2740 \pm 200 \text{ arb. unit},$$

$$\beta_0 = 0.6 \pm 0.2, \quad \text{and } a_0 = 3.1 \pm 0.5 \text{ SI unit}.$$

However, higher-energy scales and smaller intensities make the study of uncorrelated SF more difficult than for the antiferromagnetic case. Indeed, the corresponding quantum regime differs from the antiferromagnetic one in its energy scale $k_B T_0$ that is 5 times larger than the antiferromagnetic energy scale $k_B T_1$. Then, the T -dependent regime must be analyzed at temperatures sufficiently higher than T_0 . For those temperatures, the ground-state SF and the CF excitations are no longer completely separate entities in the magnetic excitation spectrum. This affects the determination of α_0 and β_0 and makes their uncertainties larger than in the antiferromagnetic case. Part of the uncertainty is removed by introducing a cutoff when determining the susceptibility with Eq. (5). This procedure is justified *a posteriori* by the recovery of a Curie-like behavior of $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$ at high temperature in good agreement with the bulk susceptibility (see Sec. IV A). Since the susceptibility $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$ estimated from Eq. (5) is notably different from the one estimated with $A(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)/\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$, a scaling plot for the uncorrelated fluctuations at \mathbf{Q}_0 , as done in Fig. 4 for \mathbf{Q}_1 , is not meaningful using the raw neutron data. However, the analysis of each individual spectrum that leads to Eq. (7) implies that $T\chi''(\mathbf{Q}_0, E, T) = C_0 f(E/(a_0 T^{\beta_0}))$.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Comparison with bulk susceptibility

The bulk susceptibility χ_{bulk} , measured along the c axis, is compared in Fig. 6 with the microscopic static susceptibilities $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$ and $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$. For $T > 100$ K, $\chi_{bulk}(T)$ follows a Curie-Weiss law with a Curie temperature $\theta \approx 20$ K, i.e., $\chi_{bulk}(T) = C/(T - \theta)$. For $T > 100$ K, the static susceptibilities




FIG. 6. Temperature dependence of $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$ and $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$ in comparison with $\chi_{bulk}(T)$.

$\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ deduced from INS have also been fitted by Curie-like laws that are undistinguishable from Curie-Weiss laws, within the uncertainty in $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$. From the CF scheme of $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$,^{29,30} it is known that the Van Vleck term is negligible in the bulk c -axis susceptibility.³¹ Since the high-energy CF excitation is not taken into account in the integrated susceptibilities from INS, both macroscopic and microscopic susceptibilities $\chi_{bulk}(T)$ and $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ correspond only to low-energy SF. With bulk susceptibility being a measure at the wave vector $\mathbf{Q}=\mathbf{0}$, we have $\chi_{bulk}(T)=\chi'(\mathbf{Q}=\mathbf{0}, T)$ when $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ is obtained using Eq. (5). For $T > T_{corr}$, there are no more magnetic correlations and $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ does not depend on \mathbf{Q} . It is thus adequate to adjust $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ to $\chi_{bulk}(T)$ at high temperatures, as shown in Fig. 6.

As for $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$ and $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$, we can define for $\chi_{bulk}(T)$ a characteristic temperature $T^* \approx 16$ K at the intercept of the two asymptotic low- and high-temperature regimes. For $T < T_{corr}$, the fluctuations are spatially correlated, and the hierarchy $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, 0) < \chi_{bulk}(0) \ll \chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, 0)$ is obtained in the low-temperature quantum regime. This means that low-energy SF are slightly more important at $\mathbf{Q}=\mathbf{0}$ than at \mathbf{Q}_0 , both being much smaller than the antiferromagnetic SF. The slight enhancement of the SF at $\mathbf{Q}=\mathbf{0}$ is most likely due to weak ferromagnetic correlations and is linked to the metamagnetic transition of the system $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$: the application of a magnetic field induces an increase of ferromagnetic SF that are maximal at the metamagnetic field H_m .^{20,32-35}

At low temperatures, we can also express $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, T)$ and $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, T)$ in CGS units, which gives

$$T_1 \chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, 0) = 1.00 \pm 0.1 \text{ K emu mol}^{-1},$$

$$T_0 \chi'(\mathbf{Q}_0, 0) = 0.97 \pm 0.1 \text{ K emu mol}^{-1},$$

$$T^* \chi_{bulk}(0) = 1.09 \pm 0.1 \text{ K emu mol}^{-1}.$$

If T_Q is the characteristic temperature of the SF at the wave vector \mathbf{Q} , we have thus $T_Q \chi'(\mathbf{Q}, 0)$ independent of \mathbf{Q} , within the error bars. Since $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_1, 0) \approx k_B T_1$ and $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}_0, 0) \approx k_B T_0$, we can assume $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}=\mathbf{0}, 0) \approx k_B T^*$, so that the product $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, 0) \chi'(\mathbf{Q}, 0)$ is independent of \mathbf{Q} . Hence, the low-temperature

magnetic properties are in good agreement with a Fermi-liquid description of a correlated system governed by an antiferromagnetic instability, for which $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T) \chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ is expected to be constant.^{18,36,37} This Fermi-liquid picture is broken when, at high temperatures, $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T) \chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ drops because of the different T behaviors of $\Gamma(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ and $1/\chi'(\mathbf{Q}, T)$.

B. Theoretical scenarios

Contrary to the simple picture of scaling presented in the Introduction⁶ and also to the different cases of scaling reported in the literature,¹¹⁻¹⁵ we obtain ω/T^{β_Q} instead of ω/T scalings of the dynamical spin susceptibility of low-energy SF. We have showed that the low-energy SF of $\text{Ce}_{0.925}\text{La}_{0.075}\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$ obey scaling laws that depend on the wave vector \mathbf{Q} , each one being characterized by a different low-temperature cutoff T_Q , below which a T -independent Fermi-liquid-like quantum regime is obtained. While a local description of quantum criticality was proposed to explain the behavior of $\text{CeCu}_{6-x}\text{Au}_x$,^{11,16,17} the itinerant character of our system is a key element to understand its behavior,^{7,21,23,24} and a scenario for which the QPT is driven by itinerant magnetism should be preferred. However, our system does not enter the framework of existing itinerant theories for QPT:^{1,2,18,19} two main discrepancies are obtained between theoretical and experimental features.

A first disagreement comes from the saturation below a finite temperature $T_1 \approx 3$ K of $\chi'(\mathbf{Q}_1, E, T)$: we do not observe any divergence of the dynamical spin susceptibility at the QPT of $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$ and a low-temperature cutoff has to be taken into account. The saturation of antiferromagnetic SF at the QPT of this system was already reported for both cases of tuning by concentration or pressure.^{23,24} The origin of this cutoff is not yet well understood. It could be linked to the appearance of a tiny magnetic moment below $T_m = 2$ K $\approx T_1$.⁷ The saturation of the dynamical spin susceptibility is in marked contrast with its expected divergence at a quantum critical point.

The second discrepancy comes from that, in the QC regime, itinerant SF theories^{1,2,18,19} predict for 3D antiferromagnetic SF a ω/T^β scaling law with $\beta=3/2$ instead of our experimental $\beta_1=0.8$; more generally, a value of β smaller than 1 cannot be obtained in the theories of QPT.^{3,4} In SF theories,¹⁸ a mean-field picture is used to build a \mathbf{Q} -dependent dynamical susceptibility $\chi(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$ from a bare susceptibility $\chi_0(E, T)$:

$$1/\chi(\mathbf{Q}, E, T) = 1/\chi_0(E, T) - J(\mathbf{Q}, T), \quad (9)$$

where $J(\mathbf{Q}, T)$ is the exchange interaction. In $\text{Ce}_{0.925}\text{La}_{0.075}\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$, the correlated signal corresponds only to a small part of the Brillouin zone.²⁶ This fact together with the saturation of the corresponding signal imply that the correlated response has a small spectral weight (of about 10%) when integrating the dynamical spin susceptibility over the Brillouin zone. The bare susceptibility can thus be approximated by the susceptibility measured at \mathbf{Q}_0 . The principle mechanism of relaxation of $4f$ electrons contributing to the bare susceptibility is the Kondo effect. The Kondo tempera-

ture, T_K , is then usually estimated by the low-temperature neutron linewidth. This will lead here to $T_K = T_0 \approx 17$ K. This estimation of T_K is in very good agreement with the values deduced from thermodynamic and thermoelectric power measurements^{29,38} and the approximation of considering the susceptibility at \mathbf{Q}_0 for the bare susceptibility is thus reasonable. In SF theories, the bare susceptibility is supposed to be weakly temperature dependent. This corresponds to a low-temperature regime below the Kondo temperature where the $4f$ moments on cerium sites are screened by conduction electrons and where the renormalized Fermi surface is fully formed. On the contrary, we experimentally found a scaling in a temperature range where the bare susceptibility has a strong temperature dependence. This is certainly the main reason why unexpected exponents are found. Since antiferromagnetic SF saturate below $T_1 \approx 3$ K, a search for the $\beta = 3/2$ scaling predicted by SF theories can consequently only be done in the range $T_1 < T < T_0$, which is experimentally very difficult to verify because of the closeness of T_1 and T_0 . The antiferromagnetic SF being built from the bare one, these two quantities are not independent. A theory including the temperature variation of the bare Kondo susceptibility is thus needed to explain the anomalous scaling law we obtain for the susceptibility at the antiferromagnetic wave vector \mathbf{Q}_1 for $T > T_1$. An impurity Kondo model seems to be a good starting point to describe the bare susceptibility measured at \mathbf{Q}_0 , since it leads, for T sufficiently higher than $T_K (=T_0)$, to the Curie-Weiss static susceptibility and to the $T^{1/2}$ -like behavior of the relaxation rate.^{39–43} Indeed, we experimentally obtained at high temperature for the wave vector \mathbf{Q}_0 a Curie susceptibility and a value of β_0 quite close to 0.5.

C. Comparison with other compounds

In the present study, we have determined the energy and temperature dependence of the SF at the QCP of $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$. The use of single crystals on triple-axis spectrometers allowed us to obtain information on the SF at two wave vectors \mathbf{Q} , where different scaling behaviors have been obtained. In earlier works on the scaling properties of the dynamical spin susceptibility near the QPT of other HFS, such as $\text{UCu}_{5-x}\text{Pd}_x$, $\text{Ce}(\text{Ru}_{1-x}\text{Fe}_x)_2\text{Ge}_2$, and $\text{CeRh}_{1-x}\text{Pd}_x\text{Sb}$,^{12–14} the use of polycrystalline samples on time-of-flight spectrometers made it more difficult to establish with precision any \mathbf{Q} dependence of the SF.

In the case of the QCP of the HFS $\text{CeCu}_{6-x}\text{Au}_x$ (obtained for $x_c = 0.1$), Schröder *et al.* benefited from the use of a single crystal and from the combination of triple-axis and time-of-flight techniques.^{11,44} The first study, using a triple-axis spectrometer, established a scaling law of the form $T^{0.75}\chi''(\omega, T) = g(\omega/T)$ at an antiferromagnetic wave vector.⁴⁴ However, the extension of this law to other parts of the reciprocal lattice was done using a time-of-flight spectrometer,¹¹ which limits the information that can be obtained concerning the \mathbf{Q} dependence. Nevertheless, they found a single general form of scaling for every \mathbf{Q} of the reciprocal lattice. They also found their scaling law to work down to $T = 0$ K, as theoretically expected for critical SF at a QCP. In Table I are reported the main physical quantities that

TABLE I. Comparison of characteristic physical quantities of CeCu_6 and CeRu_2Si_2 (Refs. 21, 23, 24, and 45–48).

	CeCu_6	CeRu_2Si_2
γ^a	1.5 J K ⁻² mol ⁻¹	360 mJ K ⁻² mol ⁻¹
T_γ^{*a}	0.2 K	3 K
T_ρ^{*b}	0.1 K	0.3 K
T_0	5 K	23 K
T_1	2 K	10 K
T_{corr}	4 K	40 K
P_c^c	-4 kbar	-3 kbar

^a $C(T)/T = \gamma$ for $T < T_\gamma^*$

^b $\rho(T) = \rho(0) + AT^2$ for $T < T_\rho^*$

^cCorresponding pressures of the QCP of $\text{CeCu}_{6-x}\text{Au}_x$ and $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$.

characterize the paramagnetic heavy-fermion compounds CeCu_6 and CeRu_2Si_2 at low temperatures. For those two compounds, a Fermi-liquid regime is obtained at low temperatures and characterizes their strong-coupling renormalized state: the linear coefficient γ of the specific heat is found to be constant and highly renormalized for temperatures $T < T_\gamma^*$,²¹ and the resistivity behaves as $\rho(0) + AT^2$ for $T < T_\rho^*$.^{21,45} The temperatures T_1 , T_0 , and T_{corr} have been obtained by INS,^{46,47} as in the present study. As seen in Table I, the characteristic temperatures of CeCu_6 are about 5–10 times smaller than the corresponding ones of CeRu_2Si_2 . Moreover, the QCP of $\text{CeCu}_{6-x}\text{Au}_x$ and $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$ are separated from their parent compounds CeCu_6 and CeRu_2Si_2 by the respective equivalent pressures of -4 kbar and -3 kbar.^{23,24,48} Because of these similar pressures, we believe that for $\text{CeCu}_{5.9}\text{Au}_{0.1}$, the characteristic temperatures are finally also about 5–10 times smaller than those of $\text{Ce}_{0.925}\text{La}_{0.075}\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$. As well as the cutoff temperature, $T_1 \approx 3$ K is found to characterize the critical SF at the QCP of $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$; the QCP of $\text{CeCu}_{6-x}\text{Au}_x$ could thus have a cutoff temperature for its critical SF of order 0.3–0.6 K. Because of smaller characteristic temperatures and energies, in $\text{CeCu}_{5.9}\text{Au}_{0.1}$ the quantum regime of the critical SF is thus much more difficult to distinguish from the classical scaling regime, and no saturation of SF at low temperatures has been yet established by INS.

Finally, our results are quite similar to those of a recent work made by Bao *et al.*¹⁵ They measured by INS the antiferromagnetic fluctuations of a single crystal of $\text{La}_2\text{Cu}_{0.94}\text{Li}_{0.06}\text{O}_4$, using a triple-axis spectrometer. Contrary to the former systems, this system is not a HFS and is located in the Fermi-liquid ground state region in the vicinity of a QCP. However, as in the present work, Bao *et al.* obtained a low-temperature quantum regime for which the dynamical susceptibility is found not to depend on T , and a high-temperature regime for which a scaling behavior is obtained, the relaxation rate $\Gamma(T)$ being in this case proportional to T and the static susceptibility $\chi(T)$, deduced from INS, following a Curie law.

V. CONCLUSION

A detailed study of the T dependence of SF in $\text{Ce}_{0.925}\text{La}_{0.075}\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$ has been carried out in this work. For

each of the two wave vectors \mathbf{Q}_1 and \mathbf{Q}_0 , which correspond to antiferromagnetically correlated and to uncorrelated SF, respectively, a cutoff temperature T_Q delimits a low-temperature T -independent Fermi-liquid-like quantum regime from a high-temperature scaling regime governed by T . The cutoff temperatures $T_1 \simeq 3$ K and $T_0 \simeq 17$ K are obtained at \mathbf{Q}_1 and \mathbf{Q}_0 , respectively. Several discrepancies with itinerant theories of QCP have been established: (i) at low temperatures, while antiferromagnetic SF are enhanced in comparison with the uncorrelated ones, they saturate below T_1 and thus do not diverge when T tends to zero. (ii) For each wave vector, high-temperature T power laws can be extracted for the static susceptibility and the relaxation rate, so that the dynamical spin susceptibility is found to follow an anomalous scaling of the form $T\chi''(\mathbf{Q}, E, T)$

$= C_Q f(E/(a_Q T^{\beta_Q}))$ above T_Q . Anomalous exponents $\beta_Q < 1$ are observed, which is incompatible with QPT theories. This is probably because these scaling laws are obtained in a T range where Kondo SF are temperature dependent. Even at the QCP of an itinerant heavy fermion system, a Kondo impurity scaling should thus be taken into account as a starting point to understand the antiferromagnetic scaling.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank D. T. Adroja and B. D. Rainford for sending us unpublished results on CF measurements in CeRu_2Si_2 , and M. A. Continentino, M. Lavagna, C. Pépin, B. Coqblin, C. Lacroix, S. Burdin, Y. Sidis, A. Murani, N. Bernhoeft, and L. P. Regnault for very useful discussions.

- ¹J. A. Hertz, *Phys. Rev. B* **14**, 1165 (1976).
- ²A. J. Millis, *Phys. Rev. B* **48**, 7183 (1993).
- ³M. A. Continentino, *Quantum Scaling in Many Body Systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001).
- ⁴S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).
- ⁵M. Plischke and B. Bergersen, *Equilibrium Statistical Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994).
- ⁶S. L. Sondhi, S. M. Girvin, J. P. Carini, and D. Shahar, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **69**, 315 (1997).
- ⁷S. Raymond, L. P. Regnault, S. Kambe, J. M. Mignot, P. Lejay, and J. Flouquet, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **109**, 205 (1997).
- ⁸H. Kadowaki, B. Fåk, T. Fukuhara, K. Maezawa, K. Nakajima, M. A. Adams, S. Raymond, and J. Flouquet, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 140402 (2003).
- ⁹O. Stockert, H. v. Löhneysen, A. Rosch, N. Pyka, and M. Loewenhaupt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5627 (1998).
- ¹⁰G. R. Stewart, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 797 (2001).
- ¹¹A. Schröder, G. Aeppli, R. Coldea, M. A. Adams, O. Stockert, H. v. Löhneysen, E. Bucher, R. Ramazashvili, and P. Coleman, *Nature (London)* **407**, 351 (2000).
- ¹²M. C. Aronson, R. Osborn, R. A. Robinson, J. W. Lynn, R. Chau, C. L. Seaman, and M. B. Maple, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 725 (1995).
- ¹³J. G. Park, D. T. Adroja, K. A. McEwen, and A. P. Murani, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **14**, 3865 (2002).
- ¹⁴W. Montfrooij, M. C. Aronson, B. D. Rainford, J. A. Mydosh, A. P. Murani, P. Haen, and T. Fukuhara, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 087202 (2003).
- ¹⁵W. Bao, Y. Chen, Y. Qiu, and J. L. Sarrao, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 127005 (2003).
- ¹⁶P. Coleman and C. Pépin, *Physica B* **312–313**, 383 (2002).
- ¹⁷Q. Si, S. Rabello, K. Ingersent, and J. L. Smith, *Nature (London)* **413**, 804 (2001).
- ¹⁸T. Moriya and T. Takimoto, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **64**, 960 (1995).
- ¹⁹M. Lavagna and C. Pépin, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 6450 (2000).
- ²⁰R. A. Fisher, C. Marcenat, N. E. Phillips, P. Haen, F. Lapierre, P. Lejay, J. Flouquet, and J. Voiron, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **84**, 49 (1991).
- ²¹S. Kambe, S. Raymond, L. P. Regnault, J. Flouquet, P. Lejay, and P. Haen, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **65**, 3294 (1996).
- ²²L. P. Regnault, W. A.C. Erkelens, J. Rossat-Mignod, P. Lejay, and J. Flouquet, *Phys. Rev. B* **38**, 4481 (1988).
- ²³S. Raymond, L. P. Regnault, J. Flouquet, A. Wildes, and P. Lejay, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **13**, 8303 (2001).
- ²⁴S. Raymond, W. Knafo, L. P. Regnault, J. Flouquet, A. Wildes, and P. Lejay, *Physica B* **312–313**, 431 (2002).
- ²⁵A. Amato, R. Feyerherm, F. N. Gygax, A. Schenck, J. Flouquet, and P. Lejay, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 619 (1994).
- ²⁶H. Kadowaki, M. Sato, and S. Kawarazaki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 097204 (2004).
- ²⁷The present data analysis describes the signal measured at a given wave vector as a single Lorentzian as done, e.g., in Ref. 26. This is quite different from previous studies of the system $\text{Ce}_{1-x}\text{La}_x\text{Ru}_2\text{Si}_2$ (Refs. 7, 23, and 24) where the signal was fitted using two contributions: a single site term present at each \mathbf{Q} , and an additional intersite term at the antiferromagnetic wave vectors. Comparative discussion of the two methods of data analysis is given in Ref. 7.
- ²⁸D. T. Adroja and B. D. Rainford (unpublished).
- ²⁹P. Lehmann, Ph.D. thesis, Université Louis Pasteur, Strasbourg, 1987.
- ³⁰A. Lacerda, A. deVisser, P. Haen, P. Lejay, and J. Flouquet, *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 8759 (1989).
- ³¹J. H. Van Vleck, *The Theory of Electric and Magnetic Susceptibilities* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1932).
- ³²S. Raymond, L. P. Regnault, S. Kambe, J. Flouquet, and P. Lejay, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **10**, 2363 (1998).
- ³³P. Haen, J. Flouquet, F. Lapierre, P. Lejay, and G. Remenyi, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **67**, 391 (1987).
- ³⁴J. Flouquet, S. Kambe, L. P. Regnault, P. Haen, J. P. Brison, F. Lapierre, and P. Lejay, *Physica B* **215**, 77 (1995).
- ³⁵J. Flouquet, P. Haen, S. Raymond, D. Aoki, and G. Knebel, *Physica B* **319**, 251 (2002).
- ³⁶Y. Kuramoto, *Solid State Commun.* **63**, 467 (1987).
- ³⁷Y. Kuramoto, *Physica B* **156–157**, 789 (1989).
- ³⁸A. Amato, D. Jaccard, J. Sierro, P. Haen, P. Lejay, and J. Flouquet, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **77**, 195 (1989).
- ³⁹N. E. Bickers, D. L. Cox, and J. W. Wilkins, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 230 (1985).

- ⁴⁰Y. Kuroda, Y. Ōno, K. Miura, B. Jin, H. Jichu, D. S. Hirashima, and T. Matsuura, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **108**, 173 (1992).
- ⁴¹L. C. Lopes, Y. Lassailly, R. Julien, and B. Coqblin, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **31-34**, 251 (1983).
- ⁴²A. Loidl, G. Knopp, H. Spille, F. Steglich, and A. P. Murani, *Physica B* **76-77**, 376 (1988).
- ⁴³A. C. Hewson, *The Kondo Problem to Heavy Fermions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- ⁴⁴A. Schröder, G. Aeppli, E. Bucher, R. Ramazashvili, and P. Coleman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5623 (1998).
- ⁴⁵A. Amato, D. Jaccard, E. Walker, and J. Flouquet, *Solid State Commun.* **55**, 1131 (1985).
- ⁴⁶L. P. Regnault, J. L. Jacoud, J. M. Mignot, J. Rossat-Mignot, C. Vettier, P. Lejay, and J. Flouquet, *Physica B* **163**, 606 (1990).
- ⁴⁷J. Rossat-Mignot, L. P. Regnault, J. L. Jacoud, C. Vettier, P. Lejay, J. Flouquet, E. Walker, D. Jaccard, and A. Amato, *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* **38**, 4481 (1988).
- ⁴⁸H. Wilhelm, S. Raymond, D. Jaccard, O. Stockert, H. v. Löhneysen, and A. Rosch, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **13**, 329L (2001).