

## CHCRUS

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

## Chemical Pressure Effects on Pyrochlore Spin Ice

H. D. Zhou, J. G. Cheng, A. M. Hallas, C. R. Wiebe, G. Li, L. Balicas, J. S. Zhou, J. B. Goodenough, J. S. Gardner, and E. S. Choi
Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 207206 — Published 18 May 2012
DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.207206

## Chemical pressure effects on pyrochlore spin ice

H. D. Zhou,<sup>1,\*</sup> J. G. Cheng,<sup>2</sup> A. M. Hallas,<sup>3</sup> C. R. Wiebe,<sup>1,3,4</sup> G. Li,<sup>1</sup>

L. Balicas,<sup>1</sup> J. S. Zhou,<sup>2</sup> J. B. Goodenough,<sup>2</sup> J. S. Gardner,<sup>5,6</sup> and E. S. Choi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-4005, USA

<sup>2</sup>Texas Materials Institute, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Chemistry, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2 Canada

<sup>4</sup>Department of Chemistry, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg, MB, R3B 2E9 Canada

<sup>5</sup>NIST Center for Neutron Research, Gaithersburg, Maryland, 20899-6102, USA

<sup>6</sup>Indiana University, 2401 Milo B. Sampson Lane, Bloomington, Indiana 47408, USA

(Dated: April 13, 2012)

A comparison among the two sets of studied pyrochlore spin ices:  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7$ ,  $Ho_2Ti_2O_7$ , and  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7$  with  $Ho^{3+}$  spins, and  $Dy_2Sn_2O_7$ ,  $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$ , and  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$  with  $Dy^{3+}$  spins, shows that the application of chemical pressure through each set drives the system toward the antiferromagnetic phase boundary from the spin ice region, which agrees with the prediction of the "dipolar spin ice" model of den Hertog and Gingras. Among all the studied pyrochlore spin ices,  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$  has the smallest ratio of  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} = -0.73$ .

PACS numbers: 75.30.Kz, 75.30.Cr, 75.40.Cx, 75.50.Lk

The pyrochlores, denoted by the formula  $A_2B_2O_7$ , belong to a special class of geometrically frustrated materials that have provided a fascinating and diverse set of low temperature magnetic states, from spin liquid to spin glass through spin ice behavior<sup>1</sup>. Spin ice is a very special case, in which the magnetic rare earth ions (A) are situated on the vertices of a lattice of corner sharing tetrahedra. Due to the local crystalline field, the magnetic ground states of these ions are Ising-like, pointing along the <111> axis that joins the centers of two neighboring tetrahedra. The balance between the dipolar and exchange interactions between spins results in a shortrange ordered ground state for each magnetic tetrahedron with two spins pointing in and two pointing out. This has a direct analogy to the two-short, two-long proton bond disorder about each oxygen atom in water ice. In fact, the calculation of the low temperature entropy in spin ice can be mapped onto the water ice problem to yield  $S = R(\ln 2 - \ln 2)$  $1/2\ln(3/2)$ ). This gives a zero point entropy  $1/2R\ln(3/2)$ . which is same as the entropy Pauling predicted for water ice<sup>2</sup>. In the literatures, four pyrochlores:  $Ho_2Ti_2O_7^{3,4}$ ,  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7^{5-7}$ ,  $Dy_2Ti_2O_7^{8-11}$ , and  $Dy_2Sn_2O_7^{12,13}$ , have been confirmed as spin ices. The search for new spin ices is still an active field of condensed matter physics, made more intriguing by the observation of emergent monopole excitations that has captured the attention of the broader scientific community<sup>14–19</sup>.

The low temperature magnetic properties of a pyrochlore spin ice are controlled by the magnetic exchange  $(J_{nn})$  and dipolar interaction  $(D_{nn})$  of the nearestneighbor spins. The theoretical phase diagram for spin ices, first elucidated by den Hertog and Gingras using the so called "dipolar spin ice" model  $(DSIM)^{20}$ , indicated that there is a critical range of values over which a spin ice is stable:  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} > -0.91$ . For  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} < -0.91$ , the system undergoes a transition to a low temperature Q = 0 antiferromagnetically ordered state. To verify this phase diagram, it would be ideal to have the ability to vary  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  to induce a long-range magnetic ordering from the spin ice state. Until now, there have been very few studies which emphasize this approach. Mirebeau and Goncharenko<sup>21</sup> completed neutron scattering studies with an actual applied pressure of 6.0 GPa on Ho<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> which should change the  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  ratio. A long-ranged magnetic ordering phase transition was not observed. An alternative method to efficiently change the  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  ratio is to apply chemical pressure or change the lattice parameter. For the pyrochlore lattice, the dipolar interaction can be calculated as  $D_{nn} = 5/3(\mu_0/4\pi)\mu^2/r_{nn}^3$ (where  $r_{nn}$  is the nearest-neighbor rare earth spin distance). Meanwhile,  $J_{nn}$  is expected to be more sensitive to changes in the lattice parameter, or the distance between the rare earth spins.

With this approach in mind, we have undertaken a high temperature high pressure method to synthesize germanate pyrochlores which have considerably smaller lattice parameters than the stanates and titanates. Prepared with conventional solid state reactions under ambient pressure, Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> and Dv<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> are pvrogermanates with a tetragonal structure<sup>22</sup>. Although their spin relaxation behaviours are analogous to that of the pyrochlore spin ice, they undergo a transition to a longranged magnetic ordering at 1.6 K for  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7^{23}$  and 2.2 K for  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7^{24}$ . Shannon and Sleight reported that the cubic pyrochlore phase prepared under high pressure has a lattice parameter of 9.9  $Å^{25}$ , which is smaller than other canonical spin ices (typically a > 10.0Å). Recently we have successfully prepared pyrochlore Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> and Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> under 7 GPa and 1000 °C by using a high temperature and high-pressure (HTHP) technique<sup>26</sup>. We also reported both of them to be spin  $ices^{27,28}$ . In this letter, by comparing two sets of the studied pyrochlore spin ices: Ho<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, Ho<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, and  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7$  with  $Ho^{3+}$  spins, and  $Dy_2Sn_2O_7$ ,  $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$ , and  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$  with  $Dy^{3+}$  spins, we found that the application of chemical pressure through each set drives



FIG. 1: (a) The variances of the lattice parameter for  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7$ ,  $Ho_2Ti_2O_7$ , and  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7$  with the radius of  $Sn^{4+}$ ,  $Ti^{4+}$ , and  $Ge^{4+}$  ions. Inset: the (222) peak from XRD patterns for  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7$ ,  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7$ , and  $Ho_2Ti_2O_7$ . The line is just a guide for the eye.

the system toward the antiferromagnetic (AFM) phase boundary from the spin ice region, which agrees with the prediction of DSIM.  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$  clearly lies on the phase boundary, and put the germanate pyrochlores into context with the rest of the known spin ices with respect to the approach of the first order antiferromagnetic zone boundary and possible quantum critical point.

The lattice parameters of the pyrochlore Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> and Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> prepared by the HTHP method are a =9.9026(6) Å and a = 9.9290(5) Å, respectively. In order of Ho<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, Ho<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, and Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, the (222) peak from the room temperature x-ray diffraction pattern (XRD) shifts tward a higher  $2\theta$  (Inset of Fig. 1(a)), implying a decrease in the lattice parameter. Indeed, due to the decreasing radius from Sn<sup>4+</sup> to Ti<sup>4+</sup> and to Ge<sup>4+</sup> ions, the lattice parameter for Ho<sup>3+</sup>-spin ices decreases respectively (Fig. 1). There is a same trend for the lattice parameters for Dy<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, Dy<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, and Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> samples. With this decrease in the lattice parameter, the chemical pressure imposed by the chemical substitution of the B site ions increases.

In order to study the effect of chemical pressure on two sets of studied pyrochlore spin ices:  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7$ ,  $Ho_2Ti_2O_7$ , and  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7$  with  $Ho^{3+}$  spins, and  $Dy_2Sn_2O_7$ ,  $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$ , and  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$  with  $Dy^{3+}$  spins, the specific heat data for all six samples are shown in Fig. 2. Their lattice parameters and selected magnetic parameters are also listed in Table I. The specific heat for the germanates were measured in a Physical Property Measurement System(PPMS) and the measurement uncertainty is around 2%. The magnetic specific heat  $C_{mag}(T)$ is obtained by the subtraction of the non-magnetic lattice contribution ( $C_P(T)$  of  $Lu_2Ti_2O_7$  with no magnetic ions). For  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7$ , a low temperature nuclear Schottky anomaly of Holmium was also subtracted, following the same method used for  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7^{-6}$  and  $Ho_2Ti_2O_7^{-4}$ , (see



FIG. 2: (Color online) The magnetic specific heat,  $C_{mag}$  for all six pyrochlore spin ices. The data for Ho<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> is from Ref<sup>6</sup>, for Ho<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> is from Ref<sup>4</sup>, and for Dy<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> is from Ref<sup>8</sup>.

TABLE I: The lattice parameters and selected magnetic parameters for all six pyrochlore spin ices

|  | a     | $\theta_{\rm CW}$ | $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{nn}}$ | $C_{peak}$             | $T_{\rm peak}$ | $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$ | $J_{\rm eff}$ |
|--|-------|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
|  | Å     | Κ                 | Κ                          | $J/mol_{\rm Ho,\ Dy}K$ | Κ              |                 | Κ             |
| $\mathrm{Ho_2Sn_2O_7}$                         | 10.37 | 1.8               | 2.17                       | 2.41                   | 1.65           | -0.26           | 1.61          |
| $\mathrm{Ho_{2}Ti_{2}O_{7}}$                   | 10.10 | 1.9               | 2.35                       | 2.61                   | 1.75           | -0.27           | 1.72          |
| ${\rm Ho_2Ge_2O_7}$                            | 9.90  | 0.06              | 2.50                       | 3.04                   | 1.70           | -0.35           | 1.63          |
| $\mathrm{Dy}_2\mathrm{Sn}_2\mathrm{O}_7$       | 10.40 | 1.7               | 2.15                       | 2.65                   | 1.20           | -0.46           | 1.16          |
| $\mathrm{Dy}_{2}\mathrm{Ti}_{2}\mathrm{O}_{7}$ | 10.10 | 0.5               | 2.35                       | 2.72                   | 1.25           | -0.49           | 1.20          |
| $\mathrm{D}y_2\mathrm{Ge}_2\mathrm{O}_7$       | 9.93  | 0.0               | 2.47                       | 3.17                   | 0.828          | -0.73           | 0.67          |

supplementary materials for detail)<sup>29</sup>. From Ho<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> to Ho<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> (or from Dy<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> to Dy<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>), the increasing chemical pressure due to the shrinkage of the lattice gives a 8% increase of D<sub>nn</sub>. The values for both  $\theta_{\rm CW}$  (Curie temperature) and specific heat peak, C<sub>peak</sub>, are similar between these two Ho (or Dy) samples. From Ho<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> to Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> (or from Dy<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> to Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>), the increasing chemical pressure gives a 15% increase of D<sub>nn</sub>. The  $\theta_{\rm CW} = 0.06$  K for Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> or  $\theta_{\rm CW} = 0.0$  K for Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> is much smaller than that of Ho<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> or Dy<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>. In addition, C<sub>peak</sub> increases from 2.41 J/mol<sub>Ho</sub>-K for Ho<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub><sup>6</sup> to 3.04 J/mol<sub>Ho</sub>-K for Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> to 3.17 J/mol<sub>Dv</sub>-K for Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>.



FIG. 3: (Color online) Dependencies of the specific heat peak position  $T_{\text{peak}}/D_{nn}$  on  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  ratio. The open symbols are experimental results and the solid lines are the theoretical calculations from "dipolar spin ice" model, Ref<sup>20</sup>

For a pyrochlore spin ice, as DSIM proposed,  $\theta_{\rm CW}$ should be on the same energy scale as the effective exchange interaction  $J_{eff} = J_{nn} + D_{nn}$  due to the comparable energy scale between  $J_{nn}$  and  $D_{nn}$ . With similar  $D_{nn}$ , the smaller  $\theta_{CW}$  indicates a more negative value of  $J_{nn}$ , and a more negative value for  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$ . In order to extract the  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  values for all six samples, we compared the experimental values of  $T_{\text{peak}}$  to the theoretical calculation of  $T_{\text{peak}}/D_{nn} \sim J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  curve (Fig. 3) from DSIM. The analysis gives a  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} = -0.35$ for  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7$  which is more negative than -0.22 and -0.14 for  $Ho_2Ti_2O_7$  and  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7$ , respectively. The same trend is also found for  $Dy^{3+}$ -spin ices:  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$ = -0.73 for Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> which is more negative than -0.49 and -0.46 for  $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$  and  $Dy_2Sn_2O_7$ , respectively. These values of  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  are consistent with the experimental results that  $\theta_{\rm CW}$  is smaller for Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> and  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$ . The analysis also shows that the pyrochlore spin ices are driven toward the antiferromagnetic phase boundary with the increasing chemical pressure, as shown in Fig. 3. The DSIM predicted that as the spin ice/antiferromagnetism phase boundary is approached from the spin ice side, the specific heat peak becomes narrower and the peak height begins to increase in magnitude<sup>30</sup>, which are also consistent with the experimental specific data. The sharp increase of  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} =$ -0.73 for  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$  actually reflects the sharp increase of  $C_{\text{peak}}$  calculated from DSIM as the spin ice system approaches  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} < -0.5^{30}$ . With the  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  obtained here, the calculated  $J_{eff}$  for  $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$  and  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$  are 1.20 K and 0.67 K respectively. These values are close to the values obtained by fitting the specific heat with a Debye-Hückel theory<sup>27</sup>, which are 1.1 K for  $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$ and 0.62 K for  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$ .

For pyrochlore spin ices,  $J_{nn}$  is more sensitive to the application of chemical pressure than that of  $D_{nn}$ . Calcultaed for the  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  ratio, the absolute value of  $J_{nn}$ 

increases 55% (or 82%) from  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7$  to  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7$ (or from  $Dy_2Sn_2O_7$  to  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$ ), which is larger than the increase of  $D_{nn}$ , 15%, between them. Obviously, the effect of chemical pressure on the spin ice state is not linear. The increasing chemical pressure does not result in a large difference between  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7(Dy_2Sn_2O_7)$ and  $Ho_2Ti_2O_7(Dy_2Ti_2O_7)$ , but increases  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  ratio dramatically between  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7(Dy_2Sn_2O_7)$  and  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7(Dv_2Ge_2O_7)$ . We can compare the effect of chemical pressure to that of physically applied pressure across the series of pyrochlores. We cannot find structure studies under pressure for Ho and Dy pyrochlores, but studies of XRD under pressure for Tb<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> show that 25 GPa pressure roughly leads to a 10% volume decrease<sup>31</sup>. Changing the lattice from  $Ho_2Sn_2O_7(Dy_2Sn_2O_7)$  to  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7(Dy_2Ge_2O_7)$ , the chemical pressure leads to a 13% volume decrease. This is larger than the effect of 25 GPa pressure on  $Tb_2Ti_2O_7$ . Under so high chemical pressure,  $Ho_2Ge_2O_7$ and  $Dy_2Ge_2O_7$  are still spin ices although they move toward the spin ice/antiferromagnetism phase boundary significantly. It is not surprising that 6 GPa pressure on  $Ho_2Ti_2O_7$  can not induce a magnetic ordering. The robustness of the pyrochlore spin ice is mainly due to the  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  ratio, which sufficiently puts the system far away from the phase boundary. As soon as the  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$ ratio approaches the phase boundary, the system should be more sensitive to pressure or chemical pressure. For example, 6 GPa of pressure successfully induces a magnetic ordering from the spin liquid state of pyrochlore  $\text{Tb}_2\text{Ti}_2\text{O}_7^{32}$ , in which the estimated  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} \sim -1.0$ , which is in the vicinity of the phase  $boundary^{20}$ . However, low-lying crystal fields add an addition perturbation to the system which is not considered in the DSIM phase  $diagram^{33}$ .

So far no pyrochlore systems with  $Ho^{3+}$  or  $Dy^{3+}$  have been found to exhibit the Q = 0 antiferromagnetically ordered state with  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} < -0.91$ , which was proposed by DSIM. Here we discuss two experimental possibilities to probe this quantum critical point: (i) Following the chemical pressure route to synthesize pyrochlore systems with even smaller lattice parameters than those of germanates. One natural thought is to synthesize pyrochlore  $Ho_2Si_2O_7$  or  $Dy_2Si_2O_7$  since the radius of  $Si^{4+}$  (R = 0.4 Å) ion is smaller than that of  $Ge^{4+}$  (R = 0.53 Å) ion. The structural stability limits for pyrochlore phases  $(A_2B_2O_7)$ can be defined by the ionic radius ratios,  $R_{A^{3+}}/R_{B^{4+}}$ , which extends in the range of  $1.36 < R_{A^{3+}}/R_{B^{4+}} < 1.71$ at ambient pressure for most pyrochlores. This is the reason why germanates prepared under ambient pressure are tetragonal, since  $R_{Ho^{3+}}/R_{Ge^{4+}} = 1.92$  and  $R_{Dv^{3+}}/R_{Ge^{4+}}$ = 1.94. The size mismatch between  $Ho^{3+}(Dy^{3+})$  and  $\mathrm{Ge}^{4+}$  is too large to stabilize a pyrochlore structure. For silicates with  $R_{Ho^{3+}}/R_{Si^{4+}} = 2.54$  and  $R_{Dv^{3+}}/R_{Si^{4+}} =$ 2.57, even larger size mismatch, under ambient pressure the structure is triclinic  $P\overline{1}$ . Studies have shown that under 10 GPa and 1600  $\sim$  1700 °C, Dy<sub>2</sub>Si<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> still maintains a triclinic structure although its lattice parameter

decreases<sup>34</sup>. Therefore, the synthesis of pyrochlore silicates under extremely high pressure is a challenge for future studies. (ii) Adding pressure on Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>. As we discussed above, when  $J_{nn}/D_{nn}$  ratio is close to the phase boundary, the system should be more sensitive to pressure. For Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>,  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} = -0.73$  is reasonably close to the critical value - 0.91. There is a higher probability for high pressure to induce a magnetic ordering state in Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, compared to other pyrochlore spin ices. The pressure needed is expected to be higher than 6 GPa, which is the pressure needed to induce magnetic ordering in Tb<sub>2</sub>Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> with smaller  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} = -1.0$ . Future studies such as low temperature susceptibility and neutron scattering measurements under high pressures are needed.

In summary, increasing the chemical pressure through the pyrochlore spin ice series significantly affects  $J_{nn}$ , which drives the system toward the spin ice/antiferromagnetism phase boundary. For Dy<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>,  $J_{nn}/D_{nn} = -0.73$  is the smallest known ratio in the series. Future studies on this new system, will help to elucidate the critical spin behaviour of a spin ice approaching the edge of the phase boundary, and may lead to newly discovered Higgs phases in this limit.<sup>35</sup> Within this regime, the density of monopoles at low temperatures is expected to be high, and new physics involving Bjerrum pairing may become relevant<sup>27</sup>.

## Acknowledgments

This work utilized facilities supported in part by the NSF through the Cooperative Agreement No. DMR-0654118 and the State of Florida. C.R.W acknowledges support through NSERC, CFI, and the ACS Petroleum Fund. J.S.Z. and J.B.G. are grateful for financial support from NSF DMR-0904282, DMR-1122603 and Robert A Welch Foundation (No. F-1066). L.B. is supported by DOE-BES through award DE-SC0002613.

- \* Electronic address: zhou@magnet.fsu.edu
- <sup>1</sup> J. S. Gardner, M. J. P. Gingras, and John E. Greedan, Rev. Mod. Phys. 82, 53 (2010).
- <sup>2</sup> S. T. Bramwell and M. J. P. Gingras, Science **294**, 1495 (2001).
- <sup>3</sup> M. J. Harris, S. T. Bramwell, D. F. McMorrow, T. Zeiske, and K. W. Godfrey, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2554 (1997).
- <sup>4</sup> S. T. Bramwell, M. J. Harris, B. C. den Hertog, M. J. P. Gingras, J. S. Gardner, D. F. McMorrow, A. R. Wildes, A. L. Cornelius, J. D. M. Champion, R. G. Melko, and T. Fennell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 047205 (2001).
- <sup>5</sup> H. Kadowaki, Y. Ishii, K. Matsuhira and Y. Hinatsu, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 144421 (2002).
- <sup>6</sup> G. Prando, P. Carretta, S. R. Giblin, J. Lago, S. Pin, and P. Ghigna, J. Phys:Conference Series **145**, 012033 (2009).
- <sup>7</sup> K. Matsuhira, Y.Hinatsu, K. Tenya, and T. Sakakibara, J. Phys: Condens. Matter **12**, L649 (2000).
- <sup>8</sup> A. P. Ramirez, A. Hayashi, R. J. Cava, R. Siddharthan, and B. S. Shastry, Nature **399**, 333 (1999).
- <sup>9</sup> T. Fennell, O. A. Petrenko, B. Fåk, S. T. Bramwell, M. Enjalran, T. Yavorskii, M. J. P. Gingras, R. G. Melko, and, G. Balakrishnan, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 134408 (2004).
- <sup>10</sup> K. Matsuhira, Y.Hinatsu, and T. Sakakibara, *et al.*, J. Phys: Condens. Matter **13**, L737 (2001).
- <sup>11</sup> J. Snyder, B. G. Ueland, J. S. Slusky, H. Karunadasa, R. J. Cava, Ari Mizel, and P. Schiffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 107201 (2003).
- <sup>12</sup> K. Matsuhira, Y. Hinatsu, K. Tenya, H. Amitsuka, and T. Sakakibara, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **71**, 1576 (2002).
- <sup>13</sup> X. Ke, B. G. Ueland, D. V. West, M. L. Dahlberg, R. J. Cava, and P. Schiffer, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 214413 (2007).
- <sup>14</sup> C. Castelnovo, R. Moessner, and S. L. Sondhi, Nature 451, 42 (2008).
- <sup>15</sup> S. T. Bramwell, S. R. Giblin, S. Calder, R. Aldus, D. Prabhakaran, and T. Fennell, Nature 461, 956 (2009).
- <sup>16</sup> L. D. C. Jaubert and P. C. W. Holdsworth, Nature Physics 5, 258 (2009).
- <sup>17</sup> D. J. P. Morris, D. A. Tennant, S. A. Grigera, B. Klemke, C. Castelnovo, R. Moessner, C. Czternasty, M. Meissner, K. C. Rule, J. U. hoffmann, K. kiefer, S. Gerischer., D. Slobinsky, and R. S. Perry, Science **326**, 411 (2009).

- <sup>18</sup> T. Fennell, P. P. Deen, A. R. Wildes, K. Schmalzl, D. Prabhakaran, A. T. Boothroyd, R. J. Aldus, D. F. McMorrow, and S. T. Bramwell, Science **326**, 415 (2009).
- <sup>19</sup> S. R. Giblin, S. T. Bramwell, P. C. W. Holdsworth, D. Prabhakaran and I. Terry, Nature Physics 7, 252 (2011).
- <sup>20</sup> B. C. den Hertog and M. J. P. Gingras, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 3430 (2000).
- <sup>21</sup> I. Mirebeau and I. N. Goncharenko, Physica B **350**, 250 (2004).
- <sup>22</sup> R. Saez-Puche, M. Bijkerk, F. Fernndez, E. J. Baran, and I. L. Botto, J. Alloys Compd. **184**, 25 (1992).
- <sup>23</sup> E. Morosan, J. A. Fleitman, Q. Huang, J. W. Lynn, Y. Chen, X. Ke, M. L. Dahlberg, P. Schiffer, C. R. Craley, and R. J. Cava, Phys. Rev. B 77, 224423 (2008).
- <sup>24</sup> X. Ke, M. L. Dahlberg, E. Morosan, J. A. Fleitman, R. J. Cava, and P. Schiffer, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 104411 (2008).
- <sup>25</sup> R. D. Shannon and A. W. Sleight, Inorg. Chem. 7, 1649 (1968).
- <sup>26</sup> J. G. Cheng, J. S. Zhou, and J. B. Goodenough, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 134412 (2010).
- <sup>27</sup> H. D. Zhou, S. T. Bramwell, J. G. Cheng, C. R. Wiebe, G. Li, L. Balicas, J. A. Bloxsom, H. T. Silverstein, J. S. Zhou, J. B. Goodenough, and J. S. Gardner, Nature Communications 2, 478 (2011).
- $^{28}$  A paper about detailed characterizations of Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> is under preparation.
- <sup>29</sup> Supplementary materials: specific heat for Ho<sub>2</sub>Ge<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub>.
- <sup>30</sup> R. G. Melko and M. J. P. Gingras, J. Phys: Condens. Matter **16**, R1277 (2004).
- <sup>31</sup> R. S. Kumar, Andrew L. Cornelius, M. Somayazulu, D. Errandonea, M. F. Nicol, and J. S. Gardner Phys. Stat. Sol. (b), **244**, 266 (2007).
- <sup>32</sup> I. Mirebeau, I. N. Goncharenko, P. Cadavez-Peres, S. T. Bramwell, M. J. P. Gingras, and J. S. Gardner, Nature **420**, 54 (2002).
- <sup>33</sup> H. R. Molavian, M. J. P. Gingras, and B. Canals, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 157204 (2007).
- <sup>34</sup> X. Liu and Michael E. Fleet, J. Phys: Condens. Matter 14, 11223 (2002).
- <sup>35</sup> S. Powell, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 094437 (2011).