## Single Impurity in a Paramagnetic Induced-Moment System\*

Yung-Li Wang

Department of Physics, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306

(Received 2 April 1973)

Using a cluster method it is shown that the local instability observed in the molecular-field calculation and in the Green's-function calculation in the random-phase approximation for a paramagnetic induced-moment system containing a single impurity is spurious.

Recently, the problem of a single impurity in a paramagnetic induced-moment system has been discussed by Fulde and  $Peschel<sup>1</sup>$  using a diagram technique in the molecular-field approximation and by Shiles and Wang<sup>2</sup> using a Green's-function method in the random-phase approximation (RPA). One of the results found was that the energy of a localized mode becomes zero and thus the susceptibility diverges as the exchange interaction between the impurity ion and the host ions exceeds a certain value. This normally indicates an instability of the assumed ground state and a state with local polarization was proposed. To investigate the nature of this instability we have recalculated the susceptibility using a cluster method. We solve the impurity cluster which consists of the impurity and its nearest-neighbor host ions exactly and couple the cluster to the rest of the system in an effective-field approximation. Since the interactions between the impurity ion and its surrounding host ions are treated exactly in the calculation, the method is superior to the previous ones in dealing with systems with strong impurityhost coupling. We show that the instability observed in the previous works was a spurious result due to the use of molecular-field approximation or RPA in the Green's-function calculation. This same question was also raised by Fulde and Pesch $el<sup>3</sup>$  and discussed in a very complicated manner by Villain and Pataud.<sup>4</sup> Here we sketch the cluster theory as follows.

We assume the same simple induced-moment system as described by Refs. 1 and 2. Each ion is represented by a singlet ground state and a singlet excited state. To describe the system we introduce a pseudospin  $S = \frac{1}{2}$  for each ion.<sup>2</sup> The Hamil tonian in the pseudospin variables is then

$$
\mathcal{H} = \Delta \sum_{n} S_{n}^{z} + (\Delta - \Delta_{0}) S_{0}^{z} - 4 \, \mathcal{I} \, \alpha^{2} \sum_{n, \delta} S_{n}^{x} S_{n+\delta}^{x}
$$

$$
- 8(\mathcal{I}_{0} \alpha_{0} - \mathcal{I} \, \alpha) \sum_{\delta} S_{0}^{x} S_{\delta}^{x}, \qquad (1)
$$

where  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta_0$  are energy gaps of the two singlets and  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha_0$  are the matrix elements of the angular momentum operators between the two singlets for the host ions and the impurity ion. We have also

assumed that the exchange interactions are between nearest-neighbor ions only and  $\beta$  and  $\beta_0$  are, respectively, the host-host and host- impurity exchangeinteraction parameters.

The eigenstates of an isolated impurity cluster can be found easily and the local susceptibilities  $\chi_0$  and  $\chi_6$  are then calculated by the standard perturbation technique using

$$
\mathcal{K}' = -2rhS_0^x - 2h\sum_{\delta}\left(1 + 4 s\alpha^2 \sum_{\substack{\delta^{\prime} \\ (\delta^{\prime} + \delta \neq 0)}} \chi_{\delta + s^2}\right) S_{\delta}^x
$$
  

$$
(h = g\mu_B \alpha H, r = g_0 \alpha_0 / g \alpha, \chi_n = \langle S_n^x \rangle / h)
$$
 (2)

as the perturbation potential, where the exchangeenhancement effect due to the neighboring ions of the cluster has been incorporated using an effective-field approximation. It is then clear that both  $\chi_0$  and  $\chi_6$  depend on the quantity  $\chi_2 = \sum_{\alpha} \zeta \chi_{\alpha+\delta}$ , which should be determined self-consistently.

To find the self-consistent condition, we note that in the same approximation we can obtain the following equation which relates the local susceptibilities:

$$
\sum_{n} \mathcal{L}_{mn} \chi_n = \sum_{\kappa} D_{m\kappa} \chi_{\kappa} + \gamma_m, \qquad (3)
$$

where

$$
\mathcal{L}_{mn} = \delta_{mn} - \frac{a}{z} \sum_{\delta} \delta_{m,n+6}, \qquad (4)
$$

$$
D_{\eta\kappa} = -\frac{a}{z} \sum_{\delta_1, \delta_2} \delta_{\eta, \delta_1} \delta_{\kappa, \delta_1 + \delta_2} - \frac{a}{z} \sum_{\delta_1} \delta_{\eta, 0} \delta_{\kappa, \delta_1}, \qquad (5)
$$

$$
\gamma_m = \chi_c + \sum_{\delta} \delta_{m,\delta} (\chi_{\delta} - \chi_c) + \delta_{m,\delta} (\chi_0 - \chi_c) \,. \tag{6}
$$

We have also defined  $a = (4.42 \alpha^2/\Delta) \tanh(\Delta/2kT)$  and  $\chi_c = (1/\Delta)\tanh(\Delta/2kT)$  and z is the number of the nearest neighbors of an ion. Equation (8) enables  $\chi_n$  to be expressed in terms of  $\chi_0$  and  $\chi_6$ . Setting  $n = 0$  we find that

$$
a\chi_2 = \chi_c \left( \frac{a}{1-a} \frac{1}{G-1} - z - \frac{aG}{G-1} \right) + \chi_b \left( z - \frac{a^2 G}{G-1} \right), \tag{7}
$$

where

$$
G = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\kappa} \frac{1}{1 - \gamma_{\kappa}} \quad \text{and} \quad z \gamma_{\kappa} = \sum_{\delta} e^{i\vec{\kappa} \cdot \vec{\delta}}. \tag{8}
$$

8

2365

 $\underline{\mathbf{8}}$ 



FIG. 1. Inverse local susceptibility at the impurity site  $\chi_0^{-1}$  in units of  $\chi_c^{-1}$  (the inverse susceptibility of the pure crystal in the absence of exchange interactions) as a function of  $A_0 \equiv 4.4~\omega_0 \alpha / \Delta$  for  $A \equiv 4.4~\omega^2 / \Delta = 0.5$ ,  $\Delta_0 = \Delta$ , and  $g_0\alpha_0 = g\alpha$  at  $k_BT = 0.1\Delta$ .

- 'Supported by the U. S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Contract No, AF-AFOSR 70-1940.
- 'P. Fulde and I. Peschel, Z. Phys. 241, 82 (1971).

This equation which relates  $\chi_2$  back to  $\chi_6$  is the self-consistent condition for our calculation. In Fig. 1, we compare the result of the present cluster theory (CT) and that of the molecular-field theory (MFT) (Green's-function theory in RPA gives a similar result), for  $A = 4.9 \alpha^2 / \Delta = 0.5$  and  $\Delta_0 = \Delta$  at  $k_B T = 0$ . 1 $\Delta$  for a simple-cubic-latti system. We plot  $(\chi_0/\chi_c)^{-1}$  as function of  $A_0$  $\equiv 4\beta_0\alpha_0\alpha/\Delta$ . We see that they agree very well until the coupling of the impurity and the host ions is so strong that  $A_0 \sim 1$ .  $\chi_0$  of MFT diverges at about  $A_0 = 2.3$ , while  $\chi_0$  of CT remains finite until  $A_0 = 6.3$ . In fact if A is reduced to 0.3,  $\chi_0$  of MFT diverges at  $A_0 = 2.4$ , but  $\chi_0$  of CT will never diverge although it does at a lower temperature. The cause of divergence of  $\chi_0$  of CT at the much higher value of  $A_0$  can also be traced to the use of the effective-field approximation in the coupling of the impurity cluster to the rest of the system. We therefore conclude that the instability is spurious and that the polarization would only be possible if the concentration of the impurity is finite and then the critical condition is expected to be concentration dependent.

- 'E. Shiles and Y. L. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 5, 4505 (1972).
- ${}^{3}P$ . Fulde and I. Peschel, Adv. Phys. 21, 1 (1972).
- 4J, Villain and P. Pataud (unpublished).