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Abstract
Powder x-ray diffraction patterns of the doped compounds Gd₅Si₂Ge₁.₉M₀.₁ (M = Ga, Cu) show the same crystal structure, orthorhombic Gd₅Si₂-type, in the ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases. This is different from Gd₅Si₂Ge₂, whose paramagnetic phase is monoclinic. The magnetic structure at low temperature, solved from diffraction experiments with hot neutrons, is the same in all the three compounds, collinear ferromagnetic with moments along the crystal b-axis, or F₉F₂₇₈ according to Bertaut’s notation. These results, combined with those of heat capacity and magnetocaloric effect, indicate, similarly to Gd₅Si₂, a second-order, purely magnetic, transition in the doped compounds explaining the absence of hysteresis.

(Some figures in this article are in colour only in the electronic version)

1. Introduction
Since the discovery of the ‘giant magnetocaloric effect’ (GMCE) in 1997 by Pecharsky and Gschneidner [1], many families of compounds have been studied, with respect to their potential technical applications in magnetic refrigeration near room temperature. For studies until 2003 we refer the reader to the monograph by Tishin and Spichkin [2]. A review on the Mn based GMCE compounds has been published by Brück et al [3]. The first family discovered, Gd₅(Si₁₋ₓGeₓ)₄ (0.2 < x < 0.5), is by far the most studied one and remains among the most efficient GMCE materials. More than one hundred papers about it have been published in the last decade. In these compounds, the GMCE is due to the simultaneous magnetic and structural first-order transition from an orthorhombic ferromagnetic phase O(I) (Gd₅Si₂-type) to a monoclinic paramagnetic phase, M. Figure 1 shows a temperature/composition phase diagram at zero field. The transition temperature Tc can be tuned between 140 and 270 K by selecting the Si/Ge ratio. At higher temperatures and zero field the O(I) structure is recovered, now in paramagnetic state [4]. Si-rich compositions (i.e. x > 0.5) have only a magnetic transition with Tc increasing slowly from 295 K for x → 0.5 to 335 K for x = 1. On the opposite end of the composition–temperature phase diagram, for x < 0.2 the ferromagnetic O(I) phase transforms first into an antiferromagnetic Sm₃Ge₄-type structure, O(II), and this undergoes a magnetic transition to paramagnetic near 125 K. The O(I) and O(II) phases have the same space group, Pnma, and similar cell constants, but quite different atomic positions, so they are usually considered as different structure types. The main qualitative difference between the O(I) and O(II) phases is the distance between Si or Ge atoms on 8d sites, which changes from ca 3.5 Å in O(II) to ca 2.6 Å in O(I) [7], allowing the formation of dimers in this last phase. In the M phase, one half of the dimers are broken. These structural changes modify the exchange interactions and therefore determine the different magnetic structures and ordering temperatures.

In spite of the many works published on Gd₅(Si,Ge)₄, the magnetic structure has not been directly determined. Usually, considerations about it have been extrapolated from results in other rare earth compounds, like Tb₅(Si,Ge)₄ [8], or Er₅(Si,Ge)₄ [9]. However, the Gd atom has zero orbital angular momentum and the magnetic properties are not affected by the crystal field in the same way as in other rare earth atoms. The difficulty for a magnetic structure determination via neutron diffraction lies in the huge cross section, σa, of the natural Gd for the absorption of thermal neutrons. For a typical powder neutron diffraction experiment with wavelength λ = 1.8 Å, σa = 48.8 × 10³ barn [10], which
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paramagnetic state. Between the M and O(II) phases there is a Dashed lines: borders of different crystal structures in the lines: first-order transitions. Dotted lines: second-order transitions. ferromagnetic (FM) O(I) phase on cooling. Solid circles: transition transition at measurements [16]. These results suggest a second-order study the crystal structures and the low temperature magnetic with non-magnetic Ga and Cu. The aim of this work is to solved using hot neutron powder diffraction. gives a penetration depth \( L = 8.2 \, \mu m \) in solid \( \text{Gd}_5(\text{Si}, \text{Ge})_4 \). Using hot neutrons the absorption can be reduced to still high but tolerable values. Using by instance, \( \lambda = 0.5 \, \text{Å} \), gives \( \sigma_a = 760 \, \text{barn} \) [11] and \( L = 0.53 \, \text{mm} \). On the contrary, the resolution is not always enough to get single Bragg peaks in a powder neutron diffraction experiment with this short wavelength. Nevertheless, even complex magnetic structures in, e.g., \( \text{GdNi}_2\text{Si}_2, \text{GdCu}_2\text{Si}_2 \) [12] and \( \text{GdCu} \) [13] have been solved using hot neutron powder diffraction.

Regarding applications in magnetic refrigeration, the main drawback of \( \text{Gd}_5\text{Si}_2\text{Ge}_2 \) is the large hysteresis, which imposes a minimum initial applied field near 2 T to achieve a complete isothermal ferromagnetic to paramagnetic transition, even at the most favourable temperature. Recently it has been reported that replacing (doping) a small amount of Ge by some other metal (Fe, Co, Cu, Ga, Mn, Al) reduces or even eliminates the hysteresis, keeping or increasing the net refrigeration capacity [14, 15]. We have chosen to study the effect of doping with non-magnetic Ga and Cu. The aim of this work is to study the crystal structures and the low temperature magnetic structures of the title compounds.

2. X-ray diffraction

The samples used in this study were the same as used previously for SEM, magnetic [15] and thermal measurements [16]. These results suggest a second-order transition at \( T_C = 293.6 \, \text{K} \) for the Ga-doped compound. For the Cu-doped compound our heat capacity experiments show a very similar behaviour with \( T_C = 294 \, \text{K} \). In addition to previous experimental work, the samples were analysed by x-ray fluorescence and diffraction (XRD) between 200 and 350 K. XRD patterns were collected in a rotating anode RU 300, operated at 80 mA. The data collection was performed every 0.03° using a goniometer Rigaku/MaxSystem. Figure 2 (left) shows the XRD pattern of \( \text{Gd}_5\text{Si}_2\text{Ge}_1.9\text{Ga}_{0.1} \) at 250 and 350 K. In addition to the main phase there is 3.7% in mass of \( \text{Gd(Si, Ge)}_1 \) (1:1 alloy) and 14.4% of \( \text{Gd}_5(\text{Si, Ge})_5 \) (5:3 alloy). The same phases were found in the Cu-doped and in the non-doped compounds, with similar proportions. These proportions are consistent with the global analysis performed by x-ray fluorescence and with previous analysis. The structural data were taken from the literature for the nearest compositions [4, 18–20]. The \( \text{Gd}_5\text{Si}_2\text{Ge}_3 \) patterns were compatible with the M phase at room temperature and at 350 K. At 250 K the structure is O(I) type. For the doped compounds, a previous analysis of the structure at RT (i.e. some undetermined temperature between 290 and 300 K) was not conclusive to assess whether the paramagnetic phase is M or O(I) type, because of the proximity of the magnetic transition. Rietveld analysis was carried out for patterns at several temperatures, in ferromagnetic and paramagnetic phases (figure 2). The doped compounds have the O(I) structure for temperatures below 350 K. This is similar to the Si-rich alloys in \( \text{Gd}_5(\text{Si}, \text{Ge})_x \) with \( x > 0.5 \). In the Cu-doped compound, the only difference between the 350 K pattern and the 200 K one is the appearance of two small peaks at \( 2\theta = 31.2° \) and 32.6°. They correspond to the (231), (132) (very closely spaced) and (231) reflections, among the most intense for the M phase. That would indicate some inhomogeneity in composition, the proportion of Cu being too low to avoid the first-order O(I)–M transition and/or the Ge proportion being higher than the nominal value in some small parts of the sample.

3. Neutron diffraction

The neutron diffraction (ND) experiment was carried out on the D4 diffractometer [17] at the Institut Laue-Langevin, Grenoble (France). This instrument uses a hot neutron source and a Cu-(220) monochromator providing neutrons of wavelength \( \lambda = 0.4964 \, \text{Å} \). The scattered intensity is collected by a bank of nine multi-detectors of 64 3He cells in steps of 0.3° each, with gaps of 7° between two adjacent multi-detectors. Every full pattern was collected by positioning the bank (position of the first cell of the first multi-detector) at 0°, 4°, 8° and 12°. The background radiation coming from parts of the cryostat lying out of the focusing centre is shadowed by the collimators for some detector cells, depending on the position of the bank, which produces some jumps in the experimental diffraction pattern. To correct for this effect, taking into account the absorption by the sample, a pattern was collected on an empty sample holder and another one with a sample of pure boron, considered as completely absorbent. The corrected intensity at a given angle \( 2\theta \) is approximated by \( y_{\text{corr}} = y_{\text{exp}} - \eta y_h + (1 - \eta) y_B \), where \( y_{\text{exp}} \) is the experimental intensity, properly weighted over the positions of the bank and efficiency of every cell. \( y_h \) and \( y_B \) are the intensities for the empty holder and for boron, respectively. \( \eta \) is a fitting parameter between 0 and 1. The geometry of the sample is not exactly the same as that of boron, therefore some jumps appear in the patterns (for instance at \( 2\theta = 4.625° \) even with the best choice of \( \eta \)). These jumps are not related to any property of the sample but, as mentioned, to the different shadowing of the ambient neutron radiation by the collimators, for different detectors.
Figure 2. X-ray diffraction patterns of Gd$_5$Si$_2$Ge$_1$$_\text{Ga}_{0.1}$ at 250 K and at 350 K, and Gd$_5$Si$_2$Ge$_1$$_\text{Cu}_{0.1}$ at 200 K and at 350 K. Symbols: observed patterns. Black lines: calculated for the O(I) structure. Green ticks: positions of the Bragg reflections for three phases: main O(I) phase, Gd(Si,Ge)$_1$ and Gd(Si,Ge)$_3$. Green line: calculated for the M phase, according to structural data given in [7]. Arrows indicate some characteristic reflections for the O(I) and M structures.

Figure 3. Left, symbols: observed neutron diffraction patterns of Gd$_5$Si$_2$Ge$_2$ at 310 K (A), 240 K (B) and 20 K (C). Ticks: positions of the Bragg peaks for the nuclear and magnetic scattering. Lines: calculated with structural parameters taken from XRD, for the ferromagnetic mode $F_y$ (group $Pnma$), with moments of 7 $\mu_B$ (black). Arrows indicate the bumps ascribed to the possible modulated structure of the 5:3 phase. Right: magnified portion of the 20 K pattern, indicating some key reflections. Lines: calculated for the three ferromagnetic modes.

The sample was distributed over a hollow cylinder of 9 mm diameter and 0.5 mm thickness, suitable for an average absorption length of $L = 0.53$ mm corresponding to a solid Gd$_5$Si$_2$Ge$_2$ sample. The resolution, ca 0.2°, does not allow us to observe the individual reflections. Therefore the magnetic mode will be deduced by trial and error, comparing the observed pattern with the calculated one for every possible magnetic mode. The patterns (figure 3) were collected for all samples in the paramagnetic phase (above 300 K), a few kelvin below the transition (240 K) and at 20 K. The scattering length of natural Gd for $\lambda = 0.4964$ Å was interpolated between the nearest values in table 1 of [11], giving $b = (1.067 - i0.042) \times 10^{-12}$ cm. For Si, Ge, Ga and Cu, the usual values were taken, ($0.4149, 0.8185, 0.7288, 0.7718$) $\times 10^{-12}$ cm, as well as for the magnetic form factor of Gd.

The paramagnetic phase patterns are consistent with the structure derived from XRD, that is, M-type structure for Gd$_5$Si$_2$Ge$_2$ and O(I)-type for the doped alloys. In the non-doped sample the monoclinic distortion is not so evident as in the case of XRD because of the poorer resolution in the ND experiment, but in any case the Rietveld refinement gave acceptable reliability indices only for the M-type structure ($R_p = 0.014$, $R_{wp} = 0.018$, $\chi^2 = 1.19$, $R_{Bragg} = 0.015$, over raw data, not corrected for background). The 20 K pattern clearly shows an increase of the already present nuclear reflections. The most evident cases are the (121) at $2\theta = 6.15^\circ$ (a rare case of a well separated reflection) and a group of eight reflections between $2\theta = 8.20^\circ$ and $8.60^\circ$. The difference in the background is also evident and consistent with the incoherent paramagnetic scattering at 310 K. Two small bumps near 1.48° and 3.55° are supposed to correspond to the low temperature magnetic diffraction of the 5:3 phase, below 110 K [21]. From magnetic measurements the magnetic structure of the hexagonal Gd$_5$Si$_3$ at low temperature was supposed to be helical [22]. Recent single crystal ND experiments [23] showed a modulated structure with wavevector $k = (0, 0, 0.40)$, therefore we can expect a peak at $2\theta = 1.8^\circ$, but actually the 5:3 phase is composed of both Ge and Si and the propagation vector is not necessarily the same as in Gd$_5$Ge$_3$ (if the magnetic structures were the same). As additional tips to ascribe these bumps to the 5:3 phase we can notice that: (a) the bumps do not exist at 240 K, when the main phase is magnetically ordered (but not the 5:3 phase), and the heat capacity [16] does not reveal any other transition between 20 and 240 K. (b) The position of the bump at 1.48° does not correspond to any possible Bragg
The magnetic irreducible representations for the 4c and 8d sites are given in table 1, based on Bertaut’s theory and corresponding to the nuclear space group Pnma. That makes 32 possible magnetically inequivalent moments at the 8d sites. Table 1 shows the patterns of the three compounds studied within the crystallographic space group Pnma. Within a given magnetic group and for a collinear structure, we can choose the sign of one moment for instance for R = Gd, the x or z components were included (refining the moments in spherical coordinates while maintaining the magnetic group) but the best fit corresponds to a non-collinear structure, within the standard deviation. If there is some canting, it should be very small and well below the experimental sensitivity. Therefore, the magnetic structure corresponds simply to a collinear ferromagnet.

At 240 K the magnetic structure is the same, with smaller magnetic moments. The average microscopic magnetization can be determined from magnetic measurements by extrapolation of the isothermal magnetization curve to zero field. From figure 2 of [1], in GdSi$_5$Ge$_4$, the magnetization value is about 130 A m$^2$ kg$^{-1}$ at 242.2 K, which corresponds to an average moment of 4.6 $\mu_B$/atom, in good agreement with the ND result of 4.0(3) $\mu_B$ (table 2).

The doped compounds have the same magnetic structure as Gd$_5$Si$_2$Ge$_2$ with slightly different parameters. Figure 4, right, shows the patterns of the three compounds studied at 20 K and table 2 contains the final Rietveld fitting parameters. In some cases, refining individual magnetic moments in different sites led to divergence; therefore they were constrained to be equal. As in the non-doped compound, components perpendicular to the b axis are below 1 $\mu_B$ and below the sensitivity of the experiment. In summary, the magnetic structure is quite similar to that of Er$_5$Si$_4$ at 3 K, that is, ferromagnetic with moments along b, but the crystal structure of the last compound is M-type [9]. The composition–temperature phase diagram of Gd$_5$(Si, Ge)$_4$ (figure 1) is similar to the one observed for Tb(Si, Ge)$_4$, but the magnetic structure is completely different, the moments being near the ac plane, non-collinear and undergoing a spin reorientation at low temperature for the Tb compound [8].

The monoclinic phase of Pr$_5$Si$_2$Ge$_2$ is also different since the moments lie along the a direction [28].
Figure 4. Left, symbols: observed ND pattern of Gd₅Si₂Ge₂ at 20 K. Lines: calculated after a Rietveld refinement with the parameters given in table 2 (black), and the difference (blue). Ticks: positions of the Bragg peaks for the nuclear and magnetic scattering. Right: observed ND patterns at 20 K for Gd₅Si₂Ge₂ and the doped compounds.

Table 2. Parameters of the Rietveld refinement of the ND patterns of Gd₅Si₂Ge₁₉M₀₁ (M = Ge means non-doped). Standard deviations in brackets, in units of the last digit. Tₙ = Si, Ge, Ga or Cu. Magnetic moments in Bohr magnetons. For M = Cu the coordinates were not refined. Nₚₑᵣ is the number of refined parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M, T</th>
<th>Ge, 20 K</th>
<th>Ge, 240 K</th>
<th>Ga, 20 K</th>
<th>Cu, 20 K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gd₁(4c)</td>
<td>0.355(3)</td>
<td>0.352(3)</td>
<td>0.380(3)</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gd₂(8d)</td>
<td>0.092(6)</td>
<td>0.092(7)</td>
<td>0.0963(10)</td>
<td>0.0963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gd₃(8d)</td>
<td>0.119(8)</td>
<td>0.121(9)</td>
<td>0.1217(12)</td>
<td>0.1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₁(4c)</td>
<td>0.983(5)</td>
<td>0.984(5)</td>
<td>0.991(7)</td>
<td>0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₂(4c)</td>
<td>0.265(5)</td>
<td>0.275(5)</td>
<td>0.269(9)</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₃(8d)</td>
<td>0.185(2)</td>
<td>0.185(2)</td>
<td>0.228(5)</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.537(3)</td>
<td>0.538(3)</td>
<td>0.544(5)</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ(Gd₁)</td>
<td>5.8(4)</td>
<td>3.2(4)</td>
<td>6.4(2)</td>
<td>7.3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ(Gd₂)</td>
<td>6.4(3)</td>
<td>5.1(3)</td>
<td>6.4(2)</td>
<td>7.3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ(Gd₃)</td>
<td>6.9(2)</td>
<td>3.4(3)</td>
<td>6.4(2)</td>
<td>7.3(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (Å)</td>
<td>7.586(6)</td>
<td>7.603(7)</td>
<td>7.572(9)</td>
<td>7.64(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (Å)</td>
<td>14.873(14)</td>
<td>14.895(15)</td>
<td>14.822(20)</td>
<td>14.77(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (Å)</td>
<td>7.874(6)</td>
<td>7.894(8)</td>
<td>7.839(10)</td>
<td>7.87(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (Å³)</td>
<td>888.4(13)</td>
<td>894.0(15)</td>
<td>880.0(20)</td>
<td>887(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_p/R_w (°)</td>
<td>1.7/2.1</td>
<td>1.4/1.8</td>
<td>3.2/4.1</td>
<td>2.2/2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_bragg/R_mag (%)</td>
<td>2.2/3.2</td>
<td>2.1/3.2</td>
<td>4.9/5.4</td>
<td>11/8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_pₑᵣ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Conclusions

Previous heat capacity and direct magnetocaloric determinations [16] in Gd₅Si₂Ge₁₉₉Gaₙ₀₁ have shown a substantially different behaviour compared to that of Gd₅Si₂Ge₂. In the doped compound there is no first-order transition but a usual second-order magnetic transition with similar Tₐ to the one of Gd₅Si₄. The heat capacity and the isothermal entropy increment are similar to the values for pure Gd, with a proper scaling due to the relative fraction of Gd atoms in the sample, and decreasing according to the MCE with respect to that of pure Gd. The high and low temperature XRD patterns support those results as they show the well known O(I) to M transition in Gd₅Si₂Ge₂ but not in the doped compounds, which remain in the O(I) phase across the magnetic transition. These conclusions agree with those given in [29] for Gd₅Si₂₋₉Geₓ₋₉Ga₂ₓ with y ≥ 0.05 from DSC and magnetization data. The lower y value corresponds to the Ga amount of our compound, but in this case both Si and Ge are replaced by Ga.
The magnetic structure of Gd₅Si₂Ge₂ below $T_C$ is the same as that of the doped compounds Gd₅Si₂Ge₁₋ₓMₓ (M = Ga, Cu), collinear ferromagnetic $F_P F_{B_3}$, with the magnetic moments in the $b$ direction of the $Pnma$ space group. This is different and much simpler than for compounds with other rare earths (Er, Tb, Yb) substituting Gd. At 20 K the average magnetic moment, 6.5(3) $\mu_B$/atom, lies slightly below the value derived from magnetization measurements (between 7.2 and 7.5 $\mu_B$/atom, taken from the literature) which can be due to the low precision of the ND experiment or to the magnetic polarization of the conduction electrons.

For Gd₅Si₂Ge₂ at 240 K, just below the magnetostructural transition, the magnetic moment is considerably lower than the saturation value of 7 $\mu_B$/atom. This is not surprising, although it has strong consequences for the MCE since the magnetic entropy in the ferromagnetic phase is already quite high at this temperature. Therefore the magnetic entropy jump per atom at the transition is well below the theoretical limit of $k_B \ln(2S + 1)$. This imposes severe limitations for applications of these compounds in magnetic refrigeration. Mn or Fe compounds with a strong electronic contribution to the entropy jump at the transition have higher MCE than Gd₅Si₂Ge₂ in spite of their lower magnetic moments.
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