

UDC 541.67:541.49:546.562

STUDIES ON THE *g*-FACTORS OF THE COPPER(II)—OXYGEN COMPOUNDS

G.-L. Li^{1,2}, S.-Y. Wu¹, M.-Q. Kuang¹, X.-F. Hu¹, Y.-Q. Xu¹

¹Department of Applied Physics, School of Physical Electronics, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, P. R. China

E-mail: liquolianglq@163.com (G.L. Li); wushaoysi@uestc.edu.cn (S.Y. Wu)

²School of Physics and Engineering, Xingyi Normal University for Nationalities, Xingyi, P.R. China

Received October, 17, 2015

The *g* factors for Cu²⁺ in meta-zeunerite (Cu(UO₂)₂(AsO₄)₂·3H₂O), kroehnkite (Na₂Cu(SO₄)₂·2H₂O), copper benzoate (Cu(PhCO₂)₂·3H₂O) and diaboleite (Pb₂Cu(OH)₄Cl₂) of the tetragonal phase are uniformly treated by high order perturbation formulas for 3d⁹ ions in tetragonally elongated octahedra. The calculation results are in good agreement with the observed values and systematically analyzed in view of the local structures around Cu²⁺. The *g* anisotropies Δ*g* (= *g*_{||} - *g*_⊥) are largely ascribed to the local tetragonal elongations of the Cu²⁺ sites, characterized by the relative elongation ratios (*R*_{||} - *R*_⊥)/*R̄* ≈ 19 %, 21 %, 27 % and 30 % for meta-zeunertie, kroehnkite, copper benzoate and diaboletie, respectively. The anomalous valley (minimum) of relative *g* anisotropy for copper benzoate is attributed to the modification of the Cu²⁺ electronic states due to the phenyl ring. The ligand orbital contributions are found to be significant due to covalency, and should be taken into account. The present study would be helpful to the unified investigations of structures and properties of the copper oxygen compounds.

DOI: 10.15372/JSC20170408

Ключевые слова: электронная парамагнитная резонанс (EPR), локальные структуры, Cu(UO₂)₂(AsO₄)₂·3H₂O, Na₂Cu(SO₄)₂·2H₂O, Cu(PhCO₂)₂·3H₂O, Pb₂Cu(OH)₄Cl₂.

INTRODUCTION

The copper (II)—oxygen compounds have become a significant theme in the fields of electrochemistry [1—4], spectroscopy [5—8], geochemistry [9], magnetism [10, 11], and crystal structural research [12]. Normally, their behavior and properties are sensitively dependent upon electronic states and local structures of paramagnetic Cu²⁺ and can be efficiently probed by means of electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) technique. For example, EPR experiments were employed for tetragonal Cu(UO₂)₂(AsO₄)₂·3H₂O, Na₂Cu(SO₄)₂·2H₂O, Cu(PhCO₂)₂·3H₂O, and Pb₂Cu(OH)₄Cl₂, and the anisotropic Cu²⁺ *g* factors *g*_{||} and *g*_⊥ were also measured [13]. Unfortunately, these experimental results [13] have not been satisfactorily explained until now, except for the *g* factors which were tentatively analyzed from the simple second-order formulas [13]. Nevertheless, the ligand contributions were neglected, and the local structures of the Cu²⁺ sites were not involved in the analysis [13]. In order to overcome these shortcomings and investigate the *g* factors of these copper oxygen compounds to a better extent, high order perturbation formulas for the *g* factors in tetragonally elongated octahedral 3d⁹ Cu²⁺ are adopted in the present treatment, and the local structures (low-symmetry distortions) of the Cu²⁺ sites are quantitatively included using the superposition model.

THEORETICAL

When a $3d^9$ (Cu^{2+}) ion is in a tetragonally elongated octahedron, the g round 2E_g level splits into two orbital singlets $^2A_{1g}(|z^2\rangle)$ and $^2B_{1g}(|x^2 - y^2\rangle)$, with the latter lying lowest. The excited $^2T_{2g}$ state can be separated, too, into an orbital singlet $^2B_{2g}(|xy\rangle)$ and a doublet $^2E_g(|xy\rangle, |yz\rangle)$ [14]. As mentioned before, simple second-order g formulas were applied in the previous theoretical analysis without involving the local structures of the paramagnetic Cu^{2+} sites. In fact, these copper oxygen compounds may exhibit significant covalency due to relatively short Cu—O bond lengths, and then the ligand orbital contributions should be considered in the EPR analysis. Therefore, high order perturbation g formulas for a tetragonally elongated octahedral $3d^9$ ion containing ligand orbital and spin-orbit coupling contributions should be adopted. Thus, we have [15]

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\parallel} &= g_s + 8k'\zeta'/E_1 + k\zeta'^2/E_2^2 + 4k'\zeta\zeta'/(E_1E_2) + g_s\zeta'^2[1/E_1^2 - 1/(2E_2^2)] - k\zeta\zeta'^2(4/E_1 - 1/E_2)/E_2^2 - \\ &\quad - 2k'\zeta\zeta'^2[2/(E_1E_2) - 1/E_2^2]/E_1 - g_s\zeta\zeta'^2[1/(E_1E_2^2) - 1/(2E_2^3)], \\ g_{\perp} &= g_s + 2k'\zeta'/E_2 - 4k\zeta'^2/(E_1E_2) + k'\zeta\zeta'(2/E_1 - 1/E_2)/E_2 + 2g_s\zeta'^2/E_1^2 + \zeta\zeta'(k\zeta' - k'\zeta)/(E_1E_2^2) - \\ &\quad - \zeta\zeta'(1/E_2 - 2/E_1)(2k\zeta'/E_1 + k'\zeta/E_2)/(2E_2) - g_s\zeta\zeta'^2[1/E_1^2 - 1/(E_1E_2) + 1/E_2^2]/(2E_2). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here g_s (≈ 2.0023) is the pure spin g value. E_1 and E_2 are the energy separations between the excited $^2B_{2g}$ and 2E_g and the ground $^2B_{1g}$ states, which can be expressed in terms of the cubic field parameter Dq and the tetragonal field parameters Ds and Dt : $E_1 \approx 10Dq$ and $E_2 \approx 10Dq + 3Ds - 5Dt$. The spin-orbit coupling coefficients ζ and ζ' and the orbital reduction factors k and k' can be determined from the cluster approach [15]

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &= N_t(\zeta_d^0 + \lambda_t^2\zeta_p^0/2), \quad \zeta' = (N_tN_e)^{1/2}(\zeta_d^0 - \lambda_t\lambda_e\zeta_p^0/2), \\ k &= N_t(1 + \lambda_t^2/2), \quad k' = (N_tN_e)^{1/2}[1 - \lambda_t(\lambda_e + \lambda_s A/2)], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here ζ_d^0 and ζ_p^0 are the spin-orbit coupling coefficients of free $3d^9$ ion and ligand, respectively. A denotes the integral $R\langle n_s |\partial/\partial y| np_y \rangle$ with the reference metal-ligand distance R . N_γ ($\gamma = t$ and e stands for the irreducible representations T_{2g} and E_g of group O_h) and λ_γ (or λ_s) are, respectively, the normalization factors and the orbital admixture coefficients. They are usually obtained from the normalization conditions [15]

$$\begin{aligned} N_t(1 - 2\lambda_t S_{dpt} + \lambda_t^2) &= 1, \\ N_e(1 - 2\lambda_e S_{dpe} - 2\lambda_s S_{ds} + \lambda_e^2 + \lambda_s^2) &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and the approximate relationships [15]

$$\begin{aligned} N^2 &= N_t^2[1 + \lambda_t^2 S_{dpt}^2 - 2\lambda_t S_{dpt}], \\ N^2 &= N_e^2[1 + \lambda_e^2 S_{dpe}^2 + \lambda_s^2 S_{ds}^2 - 2\lambda_e S_{dpe} - 2\lambda_s S_{ds}]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here N is the average covalency factor, characteristic of the covalency of the systems. S_{dpy} (and S_{ds}) are the group overlap integrals. In general, the orbital admixture coefficients increase with increasing group overlap integrals, and one can reasonably apply the proportionality relationship $\lambda_e/S_{dpe} \approx \lambda_s/S_{ds}$ for the same irreducible representation E_g .

This treatment has been applied to the studies of the tetragonal Cu^{2+} sites in $\text{Cu}(\text{UO}_2)_2(\text{AsO}_4)_2 \times 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{Na}_2\text{Cu}(\text{SO}_4)_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{Cu}(\text{PhCO}_2)_2 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$, and $\text{Pb}_2\text{Cu}(\text{OH})_4\text{Cl}_2$. The tetragonal field parameters can be expressed from the superposition model [16] and local geometry as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} D_s &= 4\bar{A}_2(R)[(R/R_{\parallel})^{t_2} - (R/R_{\perp})^{t_2}]/7, \\ D_t &\approx 16\bar{A}_4(R)[(R/R_{\parallel})^{t_4} - (R/R_{\perp})^{t_4}]/21. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here t_2 (≈ 3) and t_4 (≈ 5) are the power-law exponents. $\bar{A}_2(R)$ and $\bar{A}_4(R)$ are the intrinsic parameters, with the reference distance taken as the average Cu—O bond length: $R = \bar{R} = (R_{\parallel} + 2R_{\perp})/3$. For coor-

Table 1

The local parallel and perpendicular copper(II) ligand bond lengths (in Å), covalency factor N , cubic field parameter Dq (in cm⁻¹), the group overlap integrals, the normalization factors, the orbital admixture coefficients, the spin-orbit coupling coefficients (in cm⁻¹) as well as the orbital reduction factors for Cu(UO₂)₂(AsO₄)₂·3H₂O, Na₂Cu(SO₄)₂·2H₂O, Cu(PhCO₂)₂·3H₂O, and Pb₂Cu(OH)₄Cl₂

System	R_{\parallel}	R_{\perp}	\bar{R}	N	Dq	S_{dpt}	S_{dpe}	S_{ds}	A
Cu(UO ₂) ₂ (AsO ₄) ₂ ·3H ₂ O	2.565	2.14	2.282	0.88	1300	0.0032	0.0126	0.0100	1.4855
Na ₂ Cu(SO ₄) ₂ ·2H ₂ O	2.41	1.97	2.117	0.86	1200	0.0061	0.0215	0.0171	1.3781
Cu(PhCO ₂) ₂ ·3H ₂ O	2.51	1.94	2.130	0.84	1260	0.0058	0.0206	0.0164	1.3867
Pb ₂ Cu(OH) ₄ Cl ₂	2.75	2.07	2.297	0.91	1350	0.0030	0.0120	0.0095	1.4953
System	N_t	N_e	λ_t	λ_e	λ_s	ζ	ζ'	k	k'
Cu(UO ₂) ₂ (AsO ₄) ₂ ·3H ₂ O	0.881	0.885	0.371	0.295	0.234	740	725	0.942	0.778
Na ₂ Cu(SO ₄) ₂ ·2H ₂ O	0.862	0.870	0.406	0.325	0.258	725	709	0.933	0.746
Cu(PhCO ₂) ₂ ·3H ₂ O	0.842	0.850	0.439	0.350	0.279	710	692	0.923	0.709
Pb ₂ Cu(OH) ₄ Cl ₂	0.911	0.915	0.316	0.252	0.199	762	751	0.956	0.833

dinated 3dⁿ ions, the relationships $\bar{A}_4(R) \approx (3/4)D_q$ and $\bar{A}_2(R) \approx 10.8\bar{A}_4(R)$ [17—20] are valid for many systems, and are adopted here. Thus, the g factors, especially the anisotropy $\Delta g (= g_{\parallel} - g_{\perp})$, are correlated with the tetragonal field parameters and hence with the local structures (e.g., the relative tetragonal elongation $R_{\parallel} - R_{\perp}$) of the studied systems.

From the optical spectral analysis for Cu²⁺ in the oxides [13, 21], the cubic field parameters Dq and the covalency factors N are extracted for the studied systems. From the distance R and the Slater-type self-consistent field wave functions [24, 25], the group overlap integrals S_{dpt} , S_{dpe} , S_{ds} and the integral A are calculated. Based on the free-ion values $\zeta_d^0 \approx 829$ cm⁻¹ for Cu²⁺ [22] and $\zeta_p^0 \approx 151$ cm⁻¹ [23] for oxygen in H₂O (or OH⁻), the quantities ζ (and ζ') and k (and k') are required. These values are listed in Table 1.

Substituting these values into Eq. (1), the g factors (Cal. ^c) are calculated for the tetragonal Cu²⁺ sites in the copper oxygen compounds and listed in Table 2. In order to clarify the importance of covalency and the ligand contributions, the results (Cal. ^a) based on the simple second-order g formulas [13] and those (Cal. ^b) based on the conventional crystal-field model (i.e., taking $\zeta' = \zeta = N\zeta_d^0$ and $k' = k = N$ in Eq. (1)) are also collected in Table 2.

DISCUSSION

Table 2 indicates that the g factors (Cal. ^c) for the tetragonal Cu²⁺ sites in the copper oxygen compounds show better agreement with the experimental data than those (Cal. ^a) based on simple second-order formulas and those (Cal. ^b) based on the conventional crystal field model. Therefore, the EPR experimental data for these systems are uniformly explained in this work.

1) The results (Cal. ^a) based on simple second-order formulas and those (Cal. ^b) based on the high order perturbation formulas in the absence of the ligand contributions are not as good as those (Cal. ^c) based on the high order perturbation formulas containing the ligand contributions. In particular, the averages of g factors and the g anisotropies Δg (in Cal. ^a and Cal. ^b) are larger than the observed values. This means that high order perturbation formulas with ligand contributions, employed in the present study, are superior to the simple second-order ones (Cal. ^a) and those (Cal. ^b) based on the conventional crystal field model. This point can be further illustrated as the moderate orbital admixture coefficients ($\approx 0.20 - 0.44$) and the significant anisotropies $k/k' - 1$ ($\approx 15 - 30\%$) for the orbital reduction factors based on the present cluster approach calculations, suggesting obvious anisotropic copper(II)-ligand orbital admixtures due to covalency. The significant covalency in the copper oxygen com-

Table 2

The *g* factors and anisotropies $\Delta g (= g_{\parallel} - g_{\perp})$ for $\text{Cu}(\text{UO}_2)_2(\text{AsO}_4)_2 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{Na}_2\text{Cu}(\text{SO}_4)_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{Cu}(\text{PhCO}_2)_2 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$, and $\text{Pb}_2\text{Cu}(\text{OH})_4\text{Cl}_2$

System		g_{\parallel}	g_{\perp}	Δg
$\text{Cu}(\text{UO}_2)_2(\text{AsO}_4)_2 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$	Cal. ^a	2.3951	2.0856	0.3095
	Cal. ^b	2.3996	2.0690	0.3306
	Cal. ^c	2.3508	2.0720	0.2788
	Expt. [13]	2.3554	2.0676	0.2878
$\text{Na}_2\text{Cu}(\text{SO}_4)_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$	Cal. ^a	2.4762	2.0966	0.3797
	Cal. ^b	2.4143	2.0762	0.3381
	Cal. ^c	2.3574	2.0804	0.2770
	Expt. [13]	2.35	2.083	0.267
$\text{Cu}(\text{PhCO}_2)_2 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$	Cal. ^a	2.4034	2.0756	0.3269
	Cal. ^b	2.3779	2.0764	0.3015
	Cal. ^c	2.3168	2.0815	0.2353
	Expt. [13]	2.313	2.084	0.229
$\text{Pb}_2\text{Cu}(\text{OH})_4\text{Cl}_2$	Cal. ^a	2.5038	2.0940	0.4098
	Cal. ^b	2.4104	2.0671	0.3433
	Cal. ^c	2.3745	2.0692	0.3053
	Expt. [13]	2.383	2.064	0.319

^a Calculations based on the simple second-order formulas in the previous work [13].

^b Calculations based on the high order perturbation formulas and omission of the ligand contributions.

^c Calculations based on the high order perturbation formulas and inclusion of the ligand contributions from the cluster approach.

pounds may be attributed to the $\text{Cu}^{2+} 3d_{x^2-y^2} - \text{O}^{2-} 2p/2s$ orbital admixtures under tetragonal elongation distortion. So, the ligand contributions should be taken into account in the EPR analysis of the copper oxygen compounds. This idea about covalency is different from the conventional cases for Cu^{2+} in normal oxides, where covalency and ligand contributions are actually very small and can be regarded as negligible [26—28].

2) The local structures of the Cu^{2+} sites in these systems show evident tetragonal elongation distortions, characterized by the relative elongation ratios $(R_{\parallel} - R_{\perp})/\bar{R} \approx 19\%, 21\%, 27\%$ and 30% for $\text{Cu}(\text{UO}_2)_2(\text{AsO}_4)_2 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{Na}_2\text{Cu}(\text{SO}_4)_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$, $\text{Cu}(\text{PhCO}_2)_2 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$, and $\text{Pb}_2\text{Cu}(\text{OH})_4\text{Cl}_2$. This approximately accounts for the relative anisotropies $(g_{\parallel} - g_{\perp})/\bar{g} \approx 13\%, 12\%, 11\%$ and 15% , respectively. The valley (minimum) of the relative anisotropy for copper benzoate may reveal anomalous values of Dq and N for this system. From Eq. (1), the anisotropy largely depends upon the term $2k'\zeta'(4/E_1 - 1/E_2)$ and hence upon the quantities k' , ζ' , Dq and N , which consequently induce the valley of Δg for copper benzoate. The above anomaly for $\text{Cu}(\text{PhCO}_2)_2 \cdot 3\text{H}_2\text{O}$ may be attributed to the modification of electronic states for Cu^{2+} due to the phenyl ring, as compared with the other three systems. For example, the previous study [3, 11] indicated that strong antiferromagnetic exchange interactions exist in the loop arrays.

3) There are some errors in the present calculations. There are three reasons for this. Firstly, the approximations of the theoretical model and formulas would result in some errors. Secondly, the errors come from the approximation of the relationship $\bar{A}_2(R) \approx 10.8\bar{A}_4(R)$ [17—20] for the superposition model intrinsic parameters, which may affect the tetragonal field parameters and the final results.

If one takes the widely accepted range $\bar{A}_2(R)/\bar{A}_4(R) \approx 9 \sim 12$, the errors for the calculated g factors are estimated to be not more than 3 %. Thirdly, the calculations are based on the local structures of the Cu^{2+} sites in the copper oxygen compounds, while the influence of the Jahn—Teller effect is not taken into account. In fact, the Jahn—Teller effect may induce some modifications of the local bond lengths around the Jahn—Teller ion Cu^{2+} and thus lead to some errors in the resultant g factors.

CONCLUSIONS

The g factors for the tetragonal Cu^{2+} sites in the copper oxygen compounds are theoretically investigated by utilizing high order perturbation formulas based on the cluster approach, and the anisotropies $\Delta g (= g_{||} - g_{\perp})$ are largely illustrated by the relative elongation ratios $(R_{||} - R_{\perp})/\bar{R}$ for these systems. The anomalous valley (minimum) of relative g anisotropy for copper benzoate is attributed to the modification of electronic states for Cu^{2+} due to the phenyl ring. The ligand contributions are found to be significant due to notable covalency and should be taken into account. This idea about covalency is different from the conventional cases for Cu^{2+} in normal oxides where covalency and ligand contributions can be regarded as very small and negligible. The present studies would be helpful to the unified investigations of structures and properties for the copper oxygen compounds.

This work was financially supported by "the Sichuan Province Academic and Technical Leaders Support Fund" (Y02028023601015), "the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities" (ZYGX2014J136) and "the United Science and Technology Foundation of Guizhou Provincial Science and Technology Department and Xingyi Normal University for Nationalities" (LH [2014] 7404).

REFERENCES

1. Repo E., Ahlberg E., Murtomaki L., Kontturi K., Schiffriin D.J., David J. // *Electrochim. Acta*. – 2009. – **54**. – P. 6584 – 6593.
2. Zelenov V.I., Shabanova I.V., Tsokur M.N. // *Russ. J. Gen. Chem.* – 2008. – **78**. – P. 2166.
3. Stamatatos T.C., Vlahopoulou G., Raptopoulou C.P., Psycharis V., Escuer A., Christou G., Perlepes S.P. // *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* – 2012. – **2012**. – P. 3121 – 3131.
4. Peng X., Cui G.H., Li D.J., Liu T.F. // *J. Mol. Struct.* – 2010. – **967**. – P. 54 – 60.
5. Frost R.L. // *Spectrochim. Acta A*. – 2004. – **60**. – P. 1469 – 1480.
6. Frost R.L. // *Neues. Jb. Miner. Monat.* – 2004. – **4**. – P. 145 – 162.
7. Frost R.L., Williams P.A. // *Spectrochim. Acta A*. – 2004. – **60**. – P. 2071 – 2077.
8. Frost R.L., Williams P.A., Martens W. // *Mineral. Mag.* – 2003. – **67**. – P. 103 – 111.
9. Sracek O., Veselovsky F., Kribek B., Malec J., Jehlicka J. // *Appl. Geochem.* – 2010. – **25**. – P. 1815 – 1824.
10. Tsirlin A.A., Janson O., Lebernegg S., Rosner H. // *Phys. Rev. B*. – 2013. – **87**. – P. 064404.
11. Sarkar M., Clerac R., Mathoniere C., Hearns N.G.R., Bertolasi V., Ray D. // *Inorg. Chem.* – 2010. – **49**. – P. 6575 – 6585.
12. Hennig C., Reck G., Reich T., Rossberg A., Kraus W., Sieler J. // *Z. Kristallogr.* – 2003. – **218**. – P. 37 – 45.
13. Billing D.E., Hathaway B.J., Nicholls P. // *J. Chem. Soc. A*. – 1969. – P. 316 – 319.
14. Abragam A., Blenaney B. *Electron Paramagnetic Resonance of Transition Ions*. – London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
15. Wu S.Y., Gao X.Y., Dong H.N. // *J. Magn. Magn. Mater.* – 2006. – **301**. – P. 67 – 73.
16. Newman D.J., Ng B. // *Rep. Prog. Phys.* – 1989. – **52**. – P. 699 – 763.
17. Newman D.J., Pryce D.C., Runciman W.A. // *Am. Mineral.* – 1978. – **63**. – P. 1278 – 1281.
18. Rudowicz C., Gnutek P., Açıkgöz M. // *Opt. Mater.* – 2015. – **46**. – P. 254 – 259.
19. Ding C.C., Wu S.Y., Kuang M.Q., Zhang Z.H., Teng B.H., Wu M.H. // *Phys. Chem. Miner.* – 2014. – **41**. – P. 767 – 774.
20. Wu S.Y., Zhang H.M., Xu P., Zhang S.X. // *Spectrochim. Acta A*. – 2010. – **75**. – P. 230 – 234.
21. Chakravarty A.S. *Introduction to the Magnetic Properties of Solids*. – New York: Wiley-Interscience Publication, 1980.
22. Griffith J.S. *The Theory of Transition-Metal Ions*. – London: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
23. Hodgson E.K., Fridovich I. // *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* – 1973. – **54**. – P. 270 – 274.
24. Clementi E., Raimondi D.L. // *J. Chem. Phys.* – 1963. – **38**. – P. 2686 – 2689.
25. Clementi E., Raimondi D.L., Reinhardt W.P. // *J. Chem. Phys.* – 1967. – **47**. – P. 1300 – 1307.
26. Dong H.N. // *Z. Naturforsch. A*. – 2005. – **60**. – P. 615 – 618.
27. Wu S.Y., Yao J.S., Zhang H.M., Lu G.D. // *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B*. – 2007. – **21**. – P. 3250 – 3253.
28. Huang P., Ping H., Zhao M.G. // *J. Phys. Chem. Solids*. – 2003. – **64**. – P. 523 – 525.