This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

# Generation of gauge magnetic fields in a kagome spin liquid candidate using the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction

Byungmin Kang and Patrick A. Lee

Phys. Rev. B **109**, L201104 — Published 3 May 2024

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevB.109.L201104

# Generation of gauge magnetic fields in a kagome spin liquid candidate using the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction.

Byungmin Kang and Patrick A. Lee[1]

[1]*Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA*

The recent discovery of magnetization oscillations in a kagome spin liquid candidate motivates us to examine the origin of the gauge magnetic field term that can give rise to quantum oscillations of fermionic spinons. We find that in the presence of the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction and an average spin polarization, the spin permutation operator around the unit cell acquires an imaginary part, and a net gauge flux is generated through the unit cell of the kagome lattice. This new mechanism of gauge field generation can account for the strength of the gauge magnetic field needed to explain the experiment.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The quantum spin liquid is an exotic state of matter that has generated intense theoretical interests since the proposal by P. W. Anderson in 1973[1], and a great effort has gone into searching for its realization in nature[2]. While the initial proposal was for a system with antiferromagnetic interactions which fails to order due to quantum fluctuations in frustrated lattices, it is now recognized that the spin liquid state is a prime example of the notion of emergence, where new degrees of freedom which are absent in the microscopic Hamiltonian emerge at low energy and low temperature[3,4]. For example, starting with a spin-1/2 Heisenberg model where excitations are $S = 1$ spin flips, spinons which carry spin-1/2 and no charge emerge, together with an internal gauge field coupled with spinons. If the spinons are fermions, it may have a Fermi surface and the gauge field may be an U(1) gauge field. Much focus has been on two dimensional (2D) systems and the U(1) gauge field is a 2D version of the electromagnetic field in our world. The spinons coupled to the gauge magnetic field form Landau levels and may exhibit quantum oscillations. Indeed, a proposal was made by Motrunich[5] that an insulator near the Mott transition may be a spin liquid candidate and there is a linear coupling between the physical magnetic field perpendicular to the plane, $B_c$, and the gauge magnetic field $b$. Near the Mott transition, the ratio $\alpha = b/B_c$ was found to be be of order unity[5].

Recently Zheng et al.[6] reported magnetization oscillations in a kagome spin liquid candidate $YCu_3(OH)_6Br_2[Br_{1-y}(OH)_y]$ (YCOB) which was interpreted as originating from an emergent fermionic spinon coupled to the gauge magnetic field $b$. For a fixed magnetic field, the period of the oscillation is found to be proportional to $\cos(\theta)$ where $\theta$ is the angle between the applied $B$ field and the axis perpendicular to the kagome plane. This demonstrates the orbital origin of the effect. Furthermore, the analysis found that $\alpha$ is of the order of unity or even larger[6]. This large value of $\alpha$ is unexpected because YCOB is a robust insulator with a charge gap of several volts. In a Hubbard model described by hopping $t$ and repulsion $U$, the linear coupling between $b$ and $B_c$ found by Motrunich[5] is of order $t^3/U^2$. The quadratic restoring force is estimated to be of order the exchange energy $J = 4t^2/U$ and we expect $\alpha$ to be of order $t/U$ and small in the large-$U$ limit[6]. This motivates us to search for another mechanism for generating the gauge magnetic field where the Dzyaloshiskii-Moriya (DM) interaction is the source of the gauge field generation. While our study is mainly motivated by the recent experimental observations made in Ref. 6, our results are quite general and can be applied to a general class of materials with spin liquid behavior, whenever the DM interaction exists together with other interactions. Since the gauge flux appears in other spin liquids such as chiral spin liquid, our construction also applies to spin liquid phases beside U(1) spin liquid.

Generally speaking, the orbital signature of the oscillation suggests that spin-orbit coupling may be playing a role. In YCOB, as in the better known kagome system Herbertsmithite, there is a Dzyaloshiskii-Moriya (DM) interaction in addition to the Heisenberg exchange term:

$$H = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \left( J\, \boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_j + \boldsymbol{D}_{i,j} \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_i \times \boldsymbol{S}_j \right), \tag{1}$$

where $J$ is the antiferromagnetic coupling constant and $\boldsymbol{D}_{i,j}$ is the DM vector. The ratio $|\boldsymbol{D}_{i,j}|/J$ is about 0.1 which produces a gauge flux large enough to be consistent with the experimental value[6]. To proceed, let us focus on the $z$ component of the DM vector $\boldsymbol{D}_{i,j}$. The sign of the vector depends on the convention of ordering $i$ and $j$. This is indicated by arrows in Fig. 1 (a), where we choose the convention that the arrows run counter-clockwise around each triangle in the kagome lattice, and we order $i$ and $j$ in Eq. (1) from the tail to the head of the arrow. With this convention, the $z$-component of the $\boldsymbol{D}_{i,j}$ vector, which we denote by $D_z$, are all equal in magnitude and have the same sign[7]. It is convenient for us for work with the Pauli operators $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = 2\boldsymbol{S}$ in the rest of the paper. For each triangle, the scalar chirality operator is defined by

$$\hat{C}_{ijk} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i \cdot (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k), \tag{2}$$

where $i, j, k$ runs counter-clockwise around the triangle. In the presence of the DM interaction, $D_0 = \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k)_z \rangle$ is nonzero. Lee and Nagaosa[8] made use of this fact to

show that fluctuations in $\sigma_z$ couples linearly to fluctuations of the chirality operator, thus providing a way to measure chirality fluctuations through the triangles using neutron scattering.

Gao and Chen[9] took this one step further and argued that in the presence of a finite magnetic field $B_c$ along the c-axis, $\langle\sigma_z\rangle$ is nonzero. Then the average chirality on the triangle $C_{123} = \langle\hat{C}_{123}\rangle \propto D_0\langle\sigma_z\rangle$ is also nonzero. As shown by Wen, Wilzcek, and Zee[10], the gauge magnetic flux through the triangle is proportional to the scalar chirality $C_{123}$. This is a mechanism to produce a gauge flux through the triangles. However, Gao and Chen stated that a negative gauge flux is generated through the hexagon in the kagome lattice which exactly cancels the flux through the triangles. So they concluded that there in no net flux through the unit cell, however this conclusion was reached without providing any details. Here, we give a thorough derivation of the gauge flux through the unit cell. We reach the conclusion that there is finite gauge flux through the kagome unit cell that is proportional to $\langle S_z\rangle$. Hence the DM term can indeed generate the average gauge magnetic field $b$ that is needed to explain the observed magnetization oscillations.





FIG. 1. (a) Convention of the ordering of vertices defining $\boldsymbol{D}_{i,j}$ in Eq. (1). (b) The kagome unit-cell is highlighted in green, together with the counter-clockwise numbering of sites in the unit-cell. An isolated triangle and hexagon in the kagome unit-cell are also highlighted in red and blue, respectively.

## II. SPIN PERMUTATION AND CHIRALITY

For a robust insulator, we would like to restrict ourselves to spin space and ignore any charge fluctuations. We begin by reviewing the various connections between operators in spin space to chirality and gauge flux as described by Wen, Wilzcek and Zee[10]. We introduce the spin permutation operator $\hat{P}_{1\ldots n}$ which maps the state $|s_1,\ldots,s_n\rangle$ to $|s_n,s_1,\ldots,s_{n-1}\rangle$, i.e., shifts the spins forming a periodic array in an anti-clockwise order, where $s_i = \pm 1$ denotes the spin state on site $i$. The permutation operator can be decomposed into a product of pair exchanges $\hat{P}_{i,j}$ which in turn equals $\frac{1}{2}\big(1+\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j\big)$. Thus, we arrive at an expression for the expectation value of the permutation operator

$$\begin{aligned} P_{1\ldots n} &= \langle\hat{P}_{1\ldots n}\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}\big\langle(1+\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2)(1+\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3)\ldots(1+\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{n-1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_n)\big\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Physically, $P_{1\ldots n}$ describes the motion of a spin around a loop. If $P_{1\ldots n}$ has an imaginary part, the motion picks up a Berry's phase which we can associate with the flux through the loop. By writing $P = |P|e^{i\Phi}$, $\Phi$ follows from the real and imaginary parts of $P$. In particular, we show that the imaginary part of $P$ is nonzero for a loop that encloses a unit cell of the kagome lattice. We will identify $\Phi/2\pi$ as the gauge magnetic flux per unit cell seen by the spinon and calculate $\Phi$ to first order in the DM interaction. This calculation will form the core of this paper.

Before presenting the full details, let us mention another method of computing the gauge flux introduced by Wen, Wilczek, and Zee[10]. They introduced a second operator $\hat{\chi}$ to describe the gauge flux, which is given by the product

$$\hat{\chi}_{1\ldots n} = \hat{\chi}_{1,2}\hat{\chi}_{2,3}\cdots\hat{\chi}_{n,1} \tag{4}$$

where

$$\hat{\chi}_{i,j} = f^\dagger_{i,\sigma}f_{j,\sigma} \tag{5}$$

and $f_{j,\sigma}$ is the annihilation operator of a fermion which satisfies the constraint that the occupation number is unity on each site. To get a physical meaning, suppose we create a particle at site 1 with spin $\sigma$ by applying $f^\dagger_{i,\sigma}$ on a spin liquid background. Then $\hat{\chi}_{i,i+1}$ appearing in $\hat{\chi}_{1\ldots n} = \hat{\chi}_{1,2}\hat{\chi}_{2,3}\cdots\hat{\chi}_{n,1}$ successively destroys a particle at site $i+1$ and creates a particle at site $i$ starting from the site 1. This resulting in the particle at site 1 comes back to its original position after traversing the loop formed by sites $1,\ldots,n$. Due to the background gauge field in spin liquid, the particle experiences the gauge flux associated with the loop as a Berry phase. Therefore, the operator $\hat{\chi}_{1\ldots n}$ describes the motion of the fermion around a loop in the restricted subspace and its mean value $\chi_{1\ldots n} = \langle\hat{\chi}_{1\ldots n}\rangle$ can again be used to characterize the gauge flux seen by the spinon. We will return to discuss the second way of determining the gauge flux in Section III.

### A. Permutation operator

To see how the real and imaginary part of the expectation value of the loop operator $P_{1\ldots n}$ Eq. (3) is related to Heisenberg and chirality terms, let us first consider the

simplest example, which is a triangle[10]

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{P}_{123} &= \frac{1}{4}(1+\boldsymbol{\sigma_1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2)(1+\boldsymbol{\sigma_2}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3)\\ &= \frac{1}{4}\big(1+\boldsymbol{\sigma_1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2+\boldsymbol{\sigma_2}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3+(\boldsymbol{\sigma_1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2)(\boldsymbol{\sigma_2}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3)\big)\\ &= \frac{1}{4}\big(1+\boldsymbol{\sigma_1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2+\boldsymbol{\sigma_1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3+\boldsymbol{\sigma_2}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3-i\hat{C}_{123}\big). \quad (6)\end{aligned}$$

The real part of $P_{123}=\langle\hat{P}_{123}\rangle$ is determined by the expectation value of the Heisenberg terms and the imaginary part is determined by the chiralities. Based on this observation, it seems natural to guess the formula for the expectation value of an arbitrary permutation operator as a sum of Heisenberg terms acting on all possible pairs of sites and a sum of chiralities acting on all possible triples of sites. However, such a naive guess fails immediately in the square case:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{P}_{1234} = \frac{1}{8}\Big(1+\sum_{1\le a<b\le 4}\hat{h}_{a,b}+\hat{h}_{1,2}\hat{h}_{3,4}+\hat{h}_{1,4}\hat{h}_{2,3}\\ -\hat{h}_{1,3}\hat{h}_{2,4}-i\big(\hat{C}_{123}+\hat{C}_{124}+\hat{C}_{134}+\hat{C}_{234}\big)\Big), \quad (7)\end{aligned}$$

where we introduced $\hat{h}_{a,b}\equiv\boldsymbol{\sigma}_a\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_b$ to simplify the equations. In the equation, products of Heisenberg terms appear. So for larger $n$, the expression becomes more complicated and we find terms involving higher order in Heisenberg and chiralities in the imaginary part as well.

To find the correct expression for the permutation operator, we first recall the following identities of spin operators, where we defer the derivation to Supplemental Material[11]:

$$(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2)(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3)=\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3-i\hat{C}_{123} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned}i\hat{C}_{123}\,(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_4) = &-(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_4)(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3)\\ &+(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3)(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_4)+i\hat{C}_{124} \quad (9)\end{aligned}$$

Then, let us note that the permutation operator $\hat{P}_{1\dots n}$ acting on $n$ sites is related to $\hat{P}_{1\dots n-1}$ via

$$\hat{P}_{1\dots n}=\hat{P}_{1\dots n-1}\hat{P}_{n-1,n}=\hat{P}_{1\dots n-1}\frac{1+\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{n-1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_n}{2}. \quad (10)$$

Finally, starting from the expression for $\hat{P}_{1\dots n-1}$, the expression for $\hat{P}_{1\dots n}$ can be obtained from Eq. (10) together with Eqs. (8) and (9). The resulting expression of the permutation operator on 6 sites (hexagon) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{P}_{123456} = \frac{1}{32}\Big(1+\sum_{1\le a<b\le 6}\hat{h}_{a,b}+\sum_{\substack{(a,b),(c,d)\\ a<c}}{}'\,\mathrm{sign}(abcd)\hat{h}_{a,b}\hat{h}_{c,d}+\sum_{\substack{(a,b),(c,d),(e,6)\\ b\le 3,\,4\le d<5}}{}'\,\mathrm{sign}(abcde6)\hat{h}_{a,b}\hat{h}_{c,d}\hat{h}_{e,6}\\ -\hat{C}_{123}\hat{C}_{456}-i\sum_{1\le a<b<c\le 6}\hat{C}_{abc}-i\sum_{\substack{(a,b),(c,d,e)\\ b\le 4,\,b<d\\ a>=4,\,a>e}}{}'\,\mathrm{sign}(abcde)\hat{h}_{a,b}\hat{C}_{cde}\Big), \quad (11)\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{h}_{a,b}=\boldsymbol{\sigma}_a\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_b$ as before, $\mathrm{sign}(ab\dots f)$ equals $(-1)$ to the power of the total number of exchanges in order to make the tuple $(a,b,\dots,f)$ into an ascending order and $\sum'_{I_1,\dots,I_k}$ for tuples $I_1=(a_1,\dots,a_i),\dots,I_k=(b_1,\dots,b_j)$ denotes the summation over all possible assignments of $\{1,\dots,n\}$ into tuples $I_1,\dots,I_k$ satisfying the following rules: (1) the element of $\{1,\dots,n\}$ appears at most once, (2) each tuple is in ascending order, and (3) satisfying any one set of the constraints specified in the summation. Each line denotes a different set of constraints to be satisfied and only one set of constraints (appearing in one of the line) needs to be satisfied. For example, $I_1=(1,2), I_2=(3,4,5)$ is a valid assignment in the last summation satisfying the first among two set of constraints in the sum while $I_1=(1,3), I_2=(3,2,4)$ is not since $I_2$ is not ordered and 3 appears twice. Note also for example, $\sum'_{I_1=(a,b,c)}=\sum_{1\le a<b<c\le n}$.

$P_{12345678}$ is given by

$$\hat{P}_{12345678} = \frac{1}{128}\Big(1 + \sum_{(a,b)}{}' \hat{h}_{a,b} + \sum_{\substack{(a,b),(c,d)\\ a<c}}{}' \mathrm{sign}(abcd)\hat{h}_{a,b}\hat{h}_{c,d} + \sum_{\substack{(a,b),(c,d),(e,f)\\ b\le 5,\, b<d<f,\, f\ge 6,\, a+c+e>6}}{}'' \mathrm{sign}(abcdef)\hat{h}_{a,b}\hat{h}_{c,d}\hat{h}_{e,f}$$
$$+ \sum_{\substack{(a,b),(c,d),(e,f),(g,8)\\ b\le 3,\, 4\le d\le 5,\, 6\le f\le 7}}{}' \mathrm{sign}(abcdefg8)\hat{h}_{a,b}\hat{h}_{c,d}\hat{h}_{e,f}\hat{h}_{g,8} - \sum_{\substack{(a,b,c),(d,e,f)\\ c\le 5,\, d\ge 4,\, c<d}}{}' \mathrm{sign}(abcdef)\hat{C}_{abc}\hat{C}_{def}$$
$$- \sum_{\substack{(a,b),(c,d,e),(f,g,h)\\ b\le 3,\, e=5,\, h=8\\ b\le 6,\, e=3,\, h=8\\ a=7,\, e=3}}{}' \mathrm{sign}(abcdefgh)\hat{h}_{a,b}\hat{C}_{cde}\hat{C}_{fgh} - i\sum_{(a,b,c)}{}' \hat{C}_{abc} - i\sum_{\substack{(a,b),(c,d,e)\\ a\ge 4,\, a>e\\ b\le 6,\, b<d}}{}' \mathrm{sign}(abcde)\hat{h}_{a,b}\hat{C}_{cde}$$
$$- i \sum_{\substack{(a,b),(c,d),(e,f,g)\\ b\le 4\le d<f,\, f\ge 6,\, a+c+e>6\\ b\le 4\le f,\, g\le 6\le c\\ a,c\ge 4\ge g,\, b<d}}{}' \mathrm{sign}(abcdefg)\hat{h}_{a,b}\hat{h}_{c,d}\hat{C}_{efg}\Big), \tag{12}$$

where the summation rule is the same as the one used in Eq. (11) except for $\sum''$ in the second line where we impose an additional constraint that when $b = 5$, we consider only the tuples satisfying $b-a+d-c+f-e \le 11$ and $d-c+f-e \le 8$. Among those tuples, when $d-c+f-e \ge 6$, we only include tuples with $(f-8)(b-3) = 0$ (so $f = 8$ or $b = 3$) and $\{a, c, e\} \ne \{2, 3, 4\}$ (as a set) and $d = 7$ when $a = 1$ in the summation. These additional rules in the summation reflects a highly non-trivial combinatorial nature of the loop operator expression. In Supplemental Material[11], we provide an explicit algorithm to get a complete expression for an arbitrary sized plaquette, together with the scaling of the number of terms in the number of sites in the plaquette.

As one can see, the permutation operator is expressed in terms of both linear and higher-order in Heisenberg and chirality terms. Since the expectation value of the Heisenberg term is not small in the spin liquid system, it is important to count higher-order terms properly. In the following, we present the mean-field approximation of the permutation operator expectation value.

### B. Mean-field approximation of permutation operator

Here, we use mean-field approximation to evaluate $\langle \hat{P}_{1\ldots n}\rangle$. Even in the absence of magnetic order, the nearest-neighbor Heisenberg term has a non-zero expectation value related to the ground state energy. We will make the approximation of keeping only the nearest-neighbor terms:

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_j \rangle = \begin{cases} S_0 & \text{if } (i,j) \text{ are nearest-neighbor} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

Similarly, in the presence of the DM term, we keep only the nearest neighbor term

$$\langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_j)_z \rangle = \mathrm{sgn}(i,j) D_0 \tag{14}$$

where $\mathrm{sgn}(i,j) = 1$ if $i,j$ is along the arrow in Fig 1 (a), and $-1$ if it is opposed. Using these mean-field approximation, the expectation value of the chirality term for any mutually distinct sites $i, j, k$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{C}_{ijk} \rangle &= \langle \epsilon_{abc} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i)_a (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j)_b (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k)_c \rangle \\ &= \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i)_z (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k)_z \rangle + \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j)_z (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i)_z \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k)_z (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_j)_z \rangle \\ &\approx \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i)_z \rangle \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k)_z \rangle + \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j)_z \rangle \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i)_z \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k)_z \langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_j)_z . \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

In the first two lines we used operator identities and the last line is a mean field factorization. We set $\langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i)_z \rangle = h$ to be site independent. Note that $i, j, k$ can be any 3 sites, not just the equilateral triangle formed out of nearest neighbor. Only pairs of $j, k$ need to be nearest-neighbor in order for $\langle (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_j \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k)_z \rangle$ to be non-zero to contribute to Eq. (15). To simplify the expression, we introduce $C_0 = D_0 h$ in the following.

So far, our calculation works for an arbitrary cluster with an arbitrary DM vectors. In our case, the DM vectors shown in Fig. 1a respect the lattice translational symmetry, which is also the experimentally relevant situation[6] and we will focus on this case in the following. We note that this is not the case for the hexagonal lattice, which we revisit at the end of the section.

Using the mean-field approximation, the expectation values of the flux operators for an isolated triangle and hexagon in the kagome unit-cell, and the expectation value of the flux operator for the kagome unit-cell described in Fig. 1 (b) are given by

$$P_{123} = \frac{1}{4}\big(1 + 3S_0 - i3C_0\big) \tag{16}$$

$$P_{234678} = \frac{1}{32}\Big[\Big(1 + 6S_0 + 9S_0^2 + 2S_0^3 - 4C_0^2\Big) + i\Big(24C_0 + 23S_0C_0\Big)\Big] \tag{17}$$

$$P_{12345678} = \frac{1}{128}\Big[\Big(1 + 10S_0 + 29S_0^2 + 22S_0^3 + 2S_0^4 + 2S_0C_0^2\Big) + i\big(8C_0 + 22S_0C_0 + 5S_0^2C_0\big)\Big], \tag{18}$$

the numbers appearing in the subscript matches with the lattice site numbering in Fig. 1 (b). As the computation of the numerical coefficients is quite involved, which can be seen from Eqs. (11) and (12), we employed a computer code to get the results[11].





FIG. 2. Mean-field estimate of the real and imaginary part of the loop operator Eq. (18) for the kagome unit-cell shown in Fig. 1 (b) as functions of $S_0$. We have multiplied a prefactor 128 for better readability. We ignore $S_0C_0^2$ term in the real part since it is relatively negligible, and plot the linear coefficient of $C_0$ for the imaginary part. We highlighted the region around $S_0 \approx -0.86$, the estimated value of $S_0$ for the Heisenberg model on the kagome lattice. In this region, the real part $\approx 1.0/128$ and the imaginary part $\approx -(7.2/128)C_0$.

Now we provide an estimate for the parameter $S_0$. For the Heisenberg model on the kagome lattice, the ground state energy is close to $-0.43J$ per site[12]. Since there are two bonds per site, the energy per bond is $J\langle \boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_j\rangle \approx -0.215J$, hence $S_0 \approx -0.86$. Note this value is negative and close to unity in magnitude. Therefore it is necessary to keep higher orders in $S_0$ in our calculation. In fact for the case of the triangle given in Eq. (16), the real part of $P_{123}$ is negative. This reflects the tendency to generating a $\pi$ flux due to frustration in the triangle.

We finally compute the flux of the kagome unit-cell using Eq. (18) and our estimates on $S_0$. As can be seen from Fig. 2, the flux $\Phi_{1\ldots8}$ associated with the kagome unit-cell is given by $\Phi_{1\ldots8} \approx -\tan^{-1}(7.2\,C_0)$, which is non-zero when $C_0 \neq 0$. Since $C_0$ is non-zero whenever the DM term exists, the kagome unit-cell experiences non-zero flux upon introducing the DM term. Estimate of the size of the flux for the specific case of YCOB will be given in section IV.

Let us discuss the results for the triangular and the hexagonal lattices. Since the DM interaction must respect the lattice translational symmetry, a different choice of arrows should be made for the triangular or the hexagonal lattice compared with that shown in Fig. 1a. For the triangular lattice, the imaginary part of the expectation value of the permutation operator $P$ of a unit cell is zero. As the unit cell consists of one upward triangle and one downward triangle, we see that the chirality of the upward triangle exactly cancels the chirality of the downward triangle. For a hexagon in the hexagonal lattice, the DM interaction additionally respect a $\hat{C}_3$-symmetry, with the rotation center being a site. The real part of $P$ for hexagon remains the same as the real part in Eq. (17). In the imaginary part the coefficient of the leading $C_0$ term also vanishes. However, surprisingly, the next term proportional to $S_0C_0$ is not cancelled and the absolute value of the coefficient is 3 (its sign depends on the convention of arrows). So even assuming $S_0 = -1$, the imaginary part of $P$ of the elementary hexagon in the kagome lattice is $47/32$ and that in the hexagonal lattice is $3/32$, i.e., hexagonal lattice has an order-of-magnitude smaller compared to the value from the kagome lattice.

## III. A SECOND ROUTE TO ESTIMATE THE GAUGE FLUX

In this section we comment on the second route to estimating the gauge flux using the $\hat{\chi}$ operators. Let us consider $\chi_{1\ldots n} = \langle \hat{\chi}_{1\ldots n}\rangle$ where $\hat{\chi}_{1\ldots n}$ was defined in Eq. (4). A common approximation is to consider $\chi_{1\ldots n} \approx \chi_{1,2}\chi_{2,3}\cdots\chi_{n,1}$. In the absence of the DM interaction, it is obvious that this product is real when the loop is around a unit cell, because $\chi_{i,j}$ is equal to one that is translated by a lattice vector which appears in the product as complex conjugate, e.g., $\chi_{2,3} = \chi_{6,5} = \chi^*_{5,6}$ in Fig. 1 (b). Working to first order in the DM interaction, the correction terms to $\chi_{i,j}$ are also the same under translation, so that $\chi_{i,j}$ remains equal under translation and the product $\chi_{1\ldots n}$ remains real. To find the imaginary part, we take the next level of approximation by keeping a factor $\chi_2(i,j,k)$ defined as $\langle \hat{\chi}_{i,j}\hat{\chi}_{j,k}\rangle$ and factorizing the rest into products of $\chi_{l,m}$. Then there is no longer any cancellation between pieces that were previously related by translation, e.g., compare $\chi_2(2,3,4)$ and $\chi_2(4,5,6)$ in Fig. 1 (b). These two triangles have different geometry because sites 4 and 6 are nearest neighbors while sites 2 and 4 are not. Therefore the correction due to DM terms which live only on nearest neighbors will be different. Furthermore, the contributions of $\chi_2(4,5,6)$ and $\chi_2(8,1,2)$ which come from the two opposing triangles add because they are related by a 180-degree rotation. Therefore in general $\chi_{1\ldots8}$ will have an imaginary part to leading order in the DM interaction. Within the slave particle mean field theory, it is possible to compute these using diagrammatic Greens function techniques, where we sketch the steps in Supplemental Material[11].

## IV. CONCLUSION

In this letter, we provide a general mechanism for generating gauge flux when the interaction of the material contains the DM term in addition to other interactions. While our framework works for an arbitrary lattice, we provide a detailed analysis for the kagome lattice since it in general shows a larger gauge flux compared to other lattices such as the triangular and the hexagonal lattice and therefore suits well with spin liquid states. In the following, we elaborate more on the application of these results for the case of YCOB[6].

We make some estimate of the gauge flux generated by the DM interaction in the specific case of YCOB. The gauge magnetic flux through the unit cell is given by $\Phi/2\pi$ which is given by the ratio of the imaginary part to the real part of $P_{12345678}$. Using the value $S_0 = -0.86$ obtained earlier, we read from Fig. 2,

$$\Phi \approx -7.2C_0 \approx -7.2\langle(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2 \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_3)_z\rangle\langle\sigma_z\rangle \qquad (19)$$

for small values of $C_0$. Starting from Eq. (1) and treating the spins classically, we estimate the canting angle to be $\approx |D_z|/J$. Hence very roughly, we estimated $\langle(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2 \times \boldsymbol{\sigma}_3)_z\rangle \approx -D_z/J$. Furthermore $|D_z|/J \approx \Delta g/g$ where $\Delta g/g$ is the g factor anisotropy which is roughy 0.1 in YCOB. Zorko et al.[13] found by neutron scattering in a related compound which has anti-ferromagnetic order that the ordering is a 120 degree anti-chiral state, This implies that $\langle(\boldsymbol{S}_2 \times \boldsymbol{S}_3)_z\rangle$ tends to be negative and $D_z > 0$. (Note that our convention for the sign of the DM term is opposite to that used in Refs.[7,13].) Near the 1/9 plateau, $\langle\sigma_z\rangle \approx -1/9$ for field along the c-axis. Taken together we estimate

$$\Phi/2\pi \approx (7.2/2\pi)(D_z/J)\langle\sigma_z\rangle \approx -1.2 \times 10^{-2}. \qquad (20)$$

The spinon couples to this negative gauge flux with a positive gauge charge. It is convenient to express the Berry phase in terms of an effective magnetic field $b$ so that $\Phi = 2\pi\phi/\phi_0$ where $\phi = bA_0$, $A_0$ is the unit cell area and $\phi_0 = h/e$ is the flux quantum. In YCOB, the unit cell area $A_0 = 38.53\mathring{A}^2$ and we find that the effective magnetic field that gives this flux to be $b \approx 10^4(\Phi/2\pi)$T which is about $-120$T. This is larger than the physical magnetic field $B \approx 30$T used in the experiment, so that $\alpha = |b|/B_c \approx 4$. In Ref. 6 $\alpha$ was found to be of order unity, but that estimate has large uncertainly because it depends quadratically on the assumed Dirac velocity which was not well determined. The important point is the flux generated by the DM interaction is large enough to give rise to the observed magnetization oscillations.

Up to now we estimated the DM contribution to the Berry phase assuming that there is no other flux through the unit cell. In the case of YCOB we need to produce an extended unit cell with 9 bands in order to explain the 1/9 plateau. This can either come from breaking of translation symmetry, or by assuming $2\pi/3$ flux per unit cell as was done in Ref. 6. This large flux produces the band structure with 9 bands, and the DM contribution should be considered as a small perturbation on this band structure. In particular, the flux we estimated in Eq. (20) gives an effective uniform gauge magnetic field $b$ which produces Landau levels in the bands near the conduction and valence band edges and is the correct one to use to compare with the experiment. In principle, we should calculate the Berry phase using a tripled unit cell, where the model has a net flux of $2\pi$ and the hopping can be taken as periodic in the absence of DM. In practice we expect that Eq. (20) continues to be a reasonable estimate.

Finally, we note that the mechanism of generating a net gauge magnetic field from the DM term is quite general, and should be present as long as $\langle S_z\rangle$ is finite. For example, this will give rise to a thermal Hall effect even away from the 1/9 plateau if spinons are present. It should also be possible to use thermal Hall effect to probe the existence of spinons in other kagome systems which often have similar DM terms.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

PL acknowledges support by DOE (USA) office of Basic Sciences Grant No. DE-FG02-03ER46076.


[1] P. W. Anderson, Materials Research Bulletin **8**, 153 (1973).
[2] J. Khatua, B. Sana, A. Zorko, M. Gomilšek, K. Sethupathi, M. R. Rao, M. Baenitz, B. Schmidt, and P. Khuntia, Physics Reports **1041**, 1 (2023).
[3] L. Savary and L. Balents, Reports on Progress in Physics **80**, 016502 (2016).
[4] Y. Zhou, K. Kanoda, and T.-K. Ng, Reviews of Modern Physics **89**, 025003 (2017).
[5] O. I. Motrunich, Physical Review B **73**, 155115 (2006).
[6] G. Zheng, Y. Zhu, K.-W. Chen, B. Kang, D. Zhang, K. Jenkins, A. Chan, Z. Zeng, A. Xu, O. A. Valenzuela, et al., arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07989 (2023).
[7] M. Elhajal, B. Canals, and C. Lacroix, Physical Review B **66**, 014422 (2002).
[8] P. A. Lee and N. Nagaosa, Physical Review B **87**, 064423 (2013).
[9] Y. H. Gao and G. Chen, SciPost Physics Core **2**, 004 (2020).
[10] X.-G. Wen, F. Wilczek, and A. Zee, Physical Review B **39**, 11413 (1989).
[11] See Supplemental Material for more details.
[12] Y. Ran, M. Hermele, P. A. Lee, and X.-G. Wen, Physical review letters **98**, 117205 (2007).
[13] A. Zorko, M. Pregelj, M. Gomilšek, M. Klanjšek, O. Zaharko, W. Sun, and J.-X. Mi, Physical Review B **100**,

144420 (2019).