Electronic and magnetic properties of the RuX₃ (X = Cl, Br, I) family: two siblings—and a cousin?
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Motivated by reports of metallic behavior in the recently synthesized RuI₃, in contrast to the Mott-insulating nature of the actively discussed α-RuCl₃ as well as RuBr₃, we present a detailed comparative analysis of the electronic and magnetic properties of this family of trihalides. Using a combination of first-principles calculations and effective-model considerations, we conclude that RuI₃, similarly to the other two members, is most probably on the verge of a Mott insulator, but with much smaller magnetic moments and strong magnetic frustration. We predict the ideal pristine crystal of RuI₃ to have a nearly vanishing conventional nearest-neighbor Heisenberg interaction and to be a quantum spin liquid candidate of a possibly different kind than the Kitaev spin liquid. In order to understand the apparent contradiction to the reported resistivity ρ, we analyze the experimental evidence for all three compounds and propose a scenario for the observed metallicity in existing samples of RuI₃. Furthermore, for the Mott insulator RuBr₃, we obtain a magnetic Hamiltonian of a similar form to that in the much-discussed α-RuCl₃ and show that this Hamiltonian is in agreement with experimental evidence in RuBr₃.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comparative analysis of experiments

In the following, we analyze the reported electrical resistivity, specific heat, and magnetic susceptibility data for RuX₃ (X = Cl, Br, I) and Roser Valentí.

INTRODUCTION

RuI₃ and RuBr₃ are recent additions to the RuX₃ family (X = Cl, Br, I) of layered Ru-based trihalides (Fig. 1a). The first member, α-RuCl₃ (in the following ‘RuCl₃’') has attracted considerable attention in recent years as a candidate material for the Kitaev honeycomb model. RuCl₃ is a spin-orbit-assisted Mott insulator whose magnetic low-energy degrees of freedom can be described in terms of 1/2 moments that interact through strongly anisotropic exchange. While the material enters a so-called zigzag antiferromagnetic order (Fig. 1b) at low temperatures $T_N \approx 7$ K, various experiments at finite temperature or at finite magnetic field have been interpreted as hallmarks of Kitaev physics, a subject which is presently under intensive debate.

Recently, a sister compound with a heavier halogen, X = Br, was synthesized. Analogous to RuCl₃, it is insulating and shows zigzag magnetic order, albeit with higher Néel temperature $T_N = 34$ K. In contrast to RuCl₃, the authors of ref. reported a Weiss constant with dominant antiferromagnetic interactions and a direction of the zigzag-ordered moment different from RuCl₃ and argued that this deviation suggests closer proximity to the pure Kitaev model.

To complete the RuX₃ family, two independent groups have now synthesized RuI₃ with the even heavier halogen iodine. In contrast to the two ‘sibling’ compounds, a quasi-metallic behavior was observed in RuI₃, questioning the description in terms of localized 1/2 moments. Even though the dc resistivities measured in RuI₃ are orders of magnitude smaller than those of RuCl₃ or RuBr₃, the reported values of $10^{-3}$–$10^{-2}$Ω cm are uncharacteristically large for metals or even typical bad metals and practically temperature-independent. While neither of the groups found clear signatures of magnetic ordering, they reported different behaviors of the magnetic susceptibility, which is either found to be temperature-independent or with a strong upturn at low temperatures, suggesting that sample quality plays a crucial role.

In order to understand the apparently distinct behavior of this family of trihalide materials, in this work, we analyze the available experimental data and perform a detailed comparative study of the electronic and magnetic properties of the systems via first-principles calculations and extracted low-energy models. We find that: (i) The behavior of RuI₃ is not that far from RuCl₃ and RuBr₃ and the variations across the series are more quantitative than qualitative. (ii) Pristine samples of RuI₃ should be insulating with highly anisotropic magnetic exchange and nearly vanishing conventional Heisenberg interaction. We argue that the reported metallic behavior in RuI₃ could have its origin in sample quality. (iii) The magnetism in the Mott insulator RuBr₃ has predominantly ferromagnetic interactions, in contrast to what is suggested by the Curie–Weiss analysis of ref. We show that such interactions are consistent with experiment when taking into account spin-orbit coupling effects in the Curie–Weiss behavior.

Our study derives model parameters and magnetic Hamiltonians for the whole RuX₃ family from ab-initio, which will be useful for future theoretical studies of these systems. In contrast to the usual model derivations that only include local spin–orbit coupling (SOC) on the magnetic ion, our approach includes all SOC effects in the crystal. In fact, we show that SOC from the ligands leads to significant deviations from the Ruthenium-only SOC picture in the case of RuBr₃ and RuI₃.
In Fig. 1c we summarize the temperature dependence of the experimental resistivity data\textsuperscript{10,25–27} in all three compounds. In RuI\textsubscript{3}, the resistivity has a weak\textsuperscript{27} or almost no\textsuperscript{26} temperature dependence (Fig. 1c). Traditionally, metals are classified as materials where the resistivity \( \rho \) increases with temperature, distinguishing conventional metals (e.g., Cu) as those where in clean samples at temperatures roughly 300–600 K, \( \rho ~10^{-6} \) to \( ~10^{-10} \) cm, and bad metals as those with resistivities of \( ~1–10 \) m\( \Omega \) cm. This range is shown as a background shading in Fig. 1c. The reported resistivities for RuI\textsubscript{3} (\( \rho ~40 \) m\( \Omega \) cm\textsuperscript{27} and \( \rho ~4 \) m\( \Omega \) cm\textsuperscript{27}) are high even for bad metals, surpassing the loff\–Regel limit by more than an order of magnitude. Even more relevant, the lower-resistivity set of data\textsuperscript{26} shows no discernible temperature dependence at all, while the data in ref.\textsuperscript{27} show a very weak positive derivative d\( \rho /dT \), but the absolute value is above anything traditionally considered metallic.

Seemingly, as also pointed out in ref.\textsuperscript{27}, electron transport in existing RuI\textsubscript{3} samples may be contaminated by grain boundaries. One possibility to interpret the measurements is that the pristine material is metallic, but insulating grain boundaries prevent percolation. Then, the in-grain resistivity can be neglected and what is measured is the resistivity of the insulating grain boundaries. In that case, however, thermal activation of carriers in the boundaries should give a positive temperature gradient of the resistivity, which is not observed. The opposite scenario is that of an insulating behavior in the bulk and (possibly bad) metallic one between the grains. In that case, the large resistivity reflects the small relative volume of metallic boundaries, where the transport is dominated by the residual resistivity. This scenario is compatible with the observations. Morphology of the grain boundaries can vary wildly depending on the growth conditions, including but not limited to vacancies, twins, dislocation, and plain chemical dirt. Grain boundaries in semiconductors are often observed to be metallic. Apart from grain boundaries contaminating resistivity measurements, disorder (in form of vacancies, stacking faults, etc.\textsuperscript{26,27}) could promote the bulk metallic phase over the Mott-insulating one, as has been shown for example for the Mott insulator \( \kappa \text{-BEDT-TTF})_2\text{Cu(NCN})_2\text{Cl}_3\text{.}\) Indeed, in our first-principles calculations discussed below, we find the ideal RuI\textsubscript{3} to already be quite close to a Mott–metal transition.

Turning to the tuning compounds RuCl\textsubscript{3} and RuBr\textsubscript{3}, the resistivity (Fig. 1c) decreases with temperature, as expected for Mott insulators, and both systems show an approximate exponential activation gap behavior, \( E_{\text{act}}(T) = -k_B T \ln \rho(T) \), although with a significant blue-shift of the gap with increasing temperatures.

Considering specific heat data in the compounds, the specific heat for RuCl\textsubscript{3} displays a well-defined peak at \( T_N \approx 7 \) K denoting the onset of the zigzag order, while the onset of long-range magnetic order in RuBr\textsubscript{3} is observed by a kink at \( T_N = 34 \) K\textsuperscript{26}. None of this is observed for RuI\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{26,27}. In Table 1 we summarize specific heat parameters reported experimentally\textsuperscript{25–27,31}, where \( \gamma (\beta) \) is the coefficient of the \( T \)-linear (\( T^2 \)) contribution and given in units of \( \text{mK}^{-2}\text{mol}^{-1} \) (\( \text{mK}^{-4}\text{mol}^{-1} \)). Debye temperature \( \Theta_D = \left( \frac{3 \pi^2 \beta} {4 \gamma \beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \) is given in Kelvin and \( \Theta_D M_{\text{RuX}}^{1/2} \) as a ratio to the value for RuCl\textsubscript{3} (first row), where \( M_{\text{RuX}} \) is the harmonic average of the RuX\textsubscript{3} mass.

*Note that the values given for RuCl\textsubscript{3} correspond to the asymptotic field-polarized limit extracted by Tanaka et al.\textsuperscript{31}, as otherwise at zero field the low-temperature specific heat behavior is dominated by vicinity to the Néel temperature of RuCl\textsubscript{3}, causing large magnetic contributions to \( \beta \).

Table 1. Overview of reported specific heat parameters.

| Sample     | \( \gamma \) | \( \beta \) | \( T_D \) | \( T_D M_{\text{RuX}}^{1/2} \)
|------------|--------------|-------------|----------|------------------|
| RuCl\textsuperscript{3,31} | 1.22 | 185 | 1 |
| RuBr\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{25} | 1.93 | 159 | 1.21 |
| RuI\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{27} | 29.3 | 4.72 | 118 | 1.07 |
| RuI\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{26} | 17.7 | 3.66 | 129 | 1.17 |

In RuI\textsubscript{3}, the \( T \)-linear contribution, even though contaminated by an extrinsic raise at small temperatures in ref.\textsuperscript{25} attributed to the nuclear quadrupole moment of Ru, yields \( \gamma \approx 15–30 \) m\( \text{K}^{-2}\text{mol}^{-1} \). From our electronic structure calculations of RuI\textsubscript{3} shown below, we find that the unrenormalized metallic (i.e., nonmagnetic, not density of states corresponds to \( \gamma \approx 3 \) m\( \text{K}^{-2}\text{mol}^{-1} \), suggesting a mass renormalization (if this \( \gamma \) is intrinsic) of a factor of 7–12. In the scenario where the metallic grain boundaries take up a sizeable fraction of the sample volume, this renormalization shall be even stronger, encroaching into the heavy fermions domain. This suggests that the origin of the anomalously large residual heat capacity may not be related to intrinsic metallicity. It is worth noting that the \( T^3 \) term of \( \gamma /T \), on the other hand, is rather reasonable for the three systems and scales roughly as the harmonic average \( M_{\text{RuX}} \) of the atomic masses (last column in Table 1).

We now turn our attention to magnetic susceptibility measurements. Figure 2a summarizes the powder-averaged measured magnetic susceptibilities \( \chi(T) \) as reported in refs.\textsuperscript{25–27,32} at low temperatures, the RuCl\textsubscript{3} data\textsuperscript{32} shows a clear signature of a transition to the ordered magnetic phase at 7 K. For RuBr\textsubscript{3}, the Néel transition \( T_N = 34 \) K is less apparent from the susceptibility, but the maximum in \( d\chi/dT \) is consistent with the distinct transition seen in NMR relaxation measurements\textsuperscript{25}. The experimental report on powder samples of RuBr\textsubscript{3} utilized a standard Curie–Weiss (CW) fit, yielding an average Curie–Weiss temperature \( \Theta_{\text{CW}} = -58 \) K, indicating predominantly AFM interactions. However, as we have recently shown\textsuperscript{31}, the Weiss constants obtained with such a standard CW fit may not anymore reflect the intrinsic exchange couplings in the case of significant SOC in the material, as is the
case for the Ru-based trihalides. With SOC, temperature-dependent van-Vleck contributions can arise, which can be effectively captured in a temperature-dependent magnetic moment \( \mu_{\text{eff}}(T, \Delta) \), as shown for \( \Delta = 0.018 \text{ eV} \) in Fig. 2b, where \( \Delta \) can be directly associated to the crystal field splitting resulting from the distorted octahedral environment of Ru. In fact, for the sister compound RuCl\(_3\), a standard CW fit would lead to \( \Theta_{\text{std}} = -20 \text{ K} \), whereas an improved CW fit taking into account such van-Vleck-like contributions\(^{33}\) provides CW constants \( \Theta^{\text{avg}} = 55 \text{ K} \) for the magnetic field in the honeycomb plane and \( \Theta^{\parallel} = 33 \text{ K} \) for the out-of-plane field, revealing an average CW constant, \( \Theta^{\text{avg}} = 20^{\parallel} + 30^{\perp} \), of \( -48 \text{ K} \). This indicates predominant ferromagnetic (FM) interactions, as they have become established for the magnetic Hamiltonian in RuCl\(_3\)\(^{34-37}\).

Considering a similar strategy (see the "Methods" section), we fit the average susceptibility \( \chi^{\text{avg}} \) of RuBr\(_3\).\(^{25}\) However, since the crystal-field parameter \( \Delta \) primarily controls the in-plane vs. out-of-plane anisotropy, and for RuBr\(_3\) only powder-averaged data are available, we do not aim at extracting \( \Delta \) by fitting. Instead, we first fix \( \Delta \) using our first-principles calculations, enforcing \( \mu_{\text{eff}}(T = 0 \text{ K}) \propto g_{\parallel}/g_{\perp} \), where \( g_{\parallel}/g_{\perp} \) are taken from quantum chemistry calculations (see Fig. 5a, discussed below). This leads to \( \Delta = 0.018 \text{ eV} \). The best CW fit accounting for the implied \( \mu_{\text{eff}}(T, \Delta = 0.018 \text{ eV}) \) (shown in Fig. 2c) yields Weiss constants \( \Theta_{\parallel} = 5 \text{ K} \), \( \Theta^{\perp} = 17 \text{ K} \) and \( \Theta^{\text{avg}} = 9 \text{ K} \), which are positive, indicating predominately ferromagnetic interactions for RuBr\(_3\), as seen before in RuCl\(_3\). In Fig. 2d we further analyze how the best-fit Weiss constants evolve for other choices of \( \Delta \). Indeed, for a wide range of reasonable \( \Delta \) around the first-principles value (indicated by the dashed vertical line), the average Weiss constant \( \Theta^{\text{avg}} \) remains positive.

Importantly, for both materials, a standard residual ‘background’ term has to be included in the fitting, which in our case, depending on the material (RuBr\(_3\) or RuCl\(_3\)) ranges from \( -3.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ emu/mol} \) up to \( 1.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ emu/mol} \). This is of the same order of magnitude as the corresponding term in RuI\(_3\) (\( -3.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ emu/mol} \)). Since in the former cases an intrinsic Pauli origin can be excluded, this observation also casts doubts on a metallic interpretation of this term in RuI\(_3\). Actually, the two available susceptibility measurements on RuI\(_3\) display different behaviors, one nearly temperature-independent\(^{26}\), and the other\(^{27}\) showing a Curie-like rise at low temperatures, where a standard CW fit yields \( \mu_{\text{eff}} = 0.53 \mu_{B} \) and \( \Theta^{\text{CW}} = -3 \text{ K} \). These differences are consistent with our hypothesis that the measured samples consist of magnetic insulating grains surrounded by metallic boundaries. Then, the samples with larger resistivity data\(^{27}\) hint at larger insulating grains, hence less metallic boundaries are present, leading to the low-temperature Curie-like upturn in the susceptibility, compared to the samples in ref. \(^{26}\).

Electronic and magnetic calculations

In the following, we present a comparison of the electronic and magnetic properties of the trihalide RuX\(_3\) family obtained from a combination of density functional theory (DFT) and exact diagonalization of ab-initio-derived low-energy models. Details of the calculations are given in the “Methods” section.

Past experience with first-principles calculations for the Ru-based trihalides\(^{35,38-40}\) indicates that the magnetic order and, to a considerably lesser extent, metallicity is very fragile, with several closely competing different magnetic phases. The ground states may vary depending on small changes in the crystal structure, on the way in which strong correlations are accounted for, and even on tiny details of the computational protocol. With this in mind, it is imperative to compare the calculated properties across the series, using the exact same computational setup.

For the electronic structure calculations, we consider the experimentally reported C2/m\(^{49}\) and R\(^{341}\) structures for RuCl\(_3\), and the suggested R\(^3\) structures for RuBr\(_3\)\(^{25}\) and RuI\(_3\).\(^{27}\) Structural details of the four models are summarized in the Supplementary Information. For RuCl\(_3\), the R\(^3\) results are shown in Supplementary Information due to very similar results to the C2/m ones.

Figure 3 shows the relativistic density of states (DOS) obtained within GGA + SOC + U as implemented in Wien2k, where a zigzag magnetic configuration with magnetic moments polarized perpendicular to the ab plane was considered. For the choice of \( U_{\text{eff}} = U - J \) we take as a reference the ab initio estimates for the orbitally-averaged Hubbard on-site \( (U_{\text{avg}}) \) and Hund’s coupling \( (U_{\text{avg}}) \) as obtained from constrained random-phase approximation (cRPA) calculations (see the "Methods" section for calculation details). In contrast to previous cRPA estimates for RuCl\(_3\), our estimates incorporate all five d orbitals and extend to the complete Ru-based trihalide family. As shown in Fig. 4a, the effective Hubbard interaction parameters decrease with increasing ligand atomic number from Cl to I, which can be attributed to the more delocalized nature of the Ru d orbitals in RuI\(_3\) compared to RuCl\(_3\) when hybridizing with I instead of Cl.

For RuCl\(_3\) a \( U_{\text{eff}} = 2.7 \text{ eV} \) yields both the fundamental and direct gap to be \( \approx 1 \text{ eV} \) (Fig. 3a) in agreement with the reported optical gap, apart from the presence of multiplets at \( 200 \text{ meV} \).\(^{42}\) We systematically reduced \( U_{\text{eff}} \) to 2.1 eV for RuBr\(_3\) and 1.4 eV for RuI\(_3\) following the trend given by the cRPA results. With these values, RuBr\(_3\) shows a gap of 0.56 eV (Fig. 3b), while RuI\(_3\) shows a small gap of 0.1 eV (Fig. 3c). The gap closes in RuI\(_3\) when \( U_{\text{eff}} \) is further reduced to 1 eV. These results indicate a spin–orbit assisted Mott insulating state in disorder-free RuI\(_3\) samples, which is on the verge of a metal–insulator transition. Possibly, as discussed above, a disorder in the experimental samples could act as effective pressure, and bring the samples closer to or over the Mott transition as seen in other Mott insulators.\(^{36}\) Note that these results hold regardless of the assumed magnetic pattern in the calculations.
Suggested to be closer to the pure Kitaev limit than in RuCl₃. Correspondingly, in our effective pseudospin model of RuCl₃, Eₑₑ and Eₚₑ are energetically almost degenerate, the ferromagnetic state is very close. All orders show very small and varying magnetic moments. These results hint at a magnetic frustration. We proceed with the derivation of magnetic exchange models.

In order to analyze the magnetic structure of the RuX₃ compounds, we first consider spin-polarized total energy calculations with VASP in the GGA + SOC + U approximation (see also the "Methods" section). Detailed results are listed in the Supplementary Information. For RuCl₃, the calculated energy of the ferromagnetic state Eᵣᵣ is very competitive with the energy of the experimentally observed zigzag ordered state Eᵣᵣ\( \approx \) 2 meV/Ru. This observation is consistent with the evidence for a metastable ferromagnetic state in RuCl₃. Correspondingly, in our effective pseudospin model of RuCl₃ discussed below, classically, the energy of the ferromagnet is below that of zigzag, and only by including quantum fluctuations the zigzag ground state is recovered (as in, e.g., ref. 37). For RuBr₃, we find an energy minimum for the zigzag ordering in agreement with the experiment. Interestingly, for RuI₃, Néel and zigzag orders are energetically almost degenerate Eᵣᵣ\( \approx \) 1 meV/Ru, with the rest of magnetic orders we scanned being energetically rather close. All orders show very small and varying magnetic moments for Ru. These results hint at a magnetic frustration.

We proceed with the derivation of magnetic exchange models. In the first place, the magnetic Hamiltonian of RuBr₃ has been suggested to be closer to the pure Kitaev limit than in RuCl₃, and, secondly, with our proposed scenario of a Mott insulating state for RuI₃, the question of its magnetic properties is open.

To investigate these issues from the first principles, we derive via the ab-initio projED method the pseudospin models \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \sum_j S_j \cdot J_j \cdot S_j \) of the three RuX₃ compounds. Here, \( S \) stands for the relativistic pseudospin \( J_{\text{eff}} = 1/2 \) moment.

In the conventional parametrization of Kitaev materials, the exchange matrix \( J_j \) in R₄ symmetry on a nearest-neighbor 𝑍₁ bond (defined in Fig. 1) follows the form

\[
J_j = \begin{pmatrix}
J_1 + \nu_1 & \Gamma_1 & \Gamma_1 + \eta_1 \\
\Gamma_1 & J_1 - \nu_1 & \Gamma_1 - \eta_1 \\
\Gamma_1 + \eta_1 & \Gamma_1 - \eta_1 & J_1 + K_1
\end{pmatrix},
\]

with the isotropic Heisenberg exchange \( J_1 \), the bond-dependent anisotropic Kitaev exchange \( K_1 \), the bond-dependent off-diagonal exchange terms \( \Gamma_1 \) and \( \Gamma_1 \), and correction terms \( \eta_1 \) and \( \nu_1 \). The latter correction terms are found to be small in our calculated Hamiltonians, and are neglected in what follows. The exchange matrices on X- and Y-bonds follow by respective C₃ rotations about the out-of-plane axis (I₁₁₁) in pseudospin coordinates. Analogously follow the definitions for second and third neighbor exchange terms (or see, e.g., ref. 9).

Using \( U_{\text{avg}} \) and \( J_{\text{avg}} \) from cRPA (Fig. 4a), the complex hopping parameters extracted from full-relativistic DFT (magnitudes shown in Fig. 4b–d) and the projED method, we extracted the exchange constants shown in Fig. 5b–d.

Evaluating the magnetic interactions of the complete RuX₃ family, we find a nearest-neighbor ferromagnetic Kitaev interaction \( K_1 \) to be the dominant in all three compounds. Additionally, a subdominant ferromagnetic nearest-neighbor Heisenberg exchange \( J_1 \) is present, which is, however, almost vanishing for the iodine case. The symmetric off-diagonal \( \Gamma_1 \) interaction is of similar magnitude as \( J_1 \), changing sign going from Cl and Br to I. \( \Gamma_0 \), often neglected in the RuCl₃ analysis, may become rather important, particularly for RuBr₃. Further-neighbor interactions are generally smaller than their nearest-neighbor counterparts for all three systems, but increase for larger ligand atomic number and may play, especially in RuI₃, an important role.

That the anisotropic interactions do not monotonically increase with stronger spin-orbit coupling of halogen elements can be related to the SOC source. In the original Jackeli-Khalilullin mechanism, the heavy magnetic ions are solely responsible for SOC effects, which can be well described within the SOC atomic limit. In the case of RuBr₃ and RuI₃, however, ligand SOC starts to play an important role. To evaluate the interplay of these two SOC sources, we extracted ab initio values for the RuX₃ materials and compared them to the SOC atomic limit (see Supplementary Information). We find that these compounds SOC effects from magnetic ions and ligands do not enhance each other, but do compete. This leads to the observed inhomogeneous behavior of the magnetic anisotropic terms in Fig. 5 as a function of ligand atomic number. Another consequence of this breakdown of the SOC atomic limit is that the established analytic perturbation theory expression becomes unjustified in Kitaev materials where SOC arises from both the metal and the ligand elements.

Along the halogen series Cl–Br–I we observe a decrease for nearest-neighbor couplings (Fig. 5b) and an overall increase in magnitude for second and third neighbors (Fig. 5c, d). This can be understood by consideration of the ligand–metal (p–d) hybridization. We quantify the hybridization strength by integrating the DFT(GGA) density of states (DOS) with Ru 4d orbital character in the energy window dominated by the ligand p orbitals (between −7 and −1.05 eV). In spite of respective larger Ru–Ru distances, this can be related to the magnetic exchange by consideration of the ab initio hopping parameters between Wannier d orbitals.
The model presented here in Fig. 5, derived from the analysis of the experimental magnetic susceptibilities of RuCl3 and RuBr3 family from

\[
\text{RuX}_3 \text{ above (Fig. 2). While in RuCl}_3 \text{ and RuBr}_3 \text{ a large FM}
\]

ferromagnetic exchange interactions. This is in line with our
discussion of the experimental magnetic susceptibilities of RuCl3 and RuBr3, leading to a smaller Weiss constant. Furthermore, the small J1 in Ru3 renders the nearest-neighbor interactions to be extremely anisotropic, with a dominant Kitaev interaction K1. While at first glance this might suggest a spin-liquid ground state in Ru3, the increased strength of the further-neighbor interactions in Ru3 (see, e.g., J2, K2 in Fig. 5c) also needs to be considered. To find the magnetic ground state properties, we perform exact diagonalization (ED) calculations of the derived \( J_{\text{eff}} \) models on the 24-site cluster shown in Fig. 6a. In Table 2 and Fig. 6b we summarize the encountered ground states, i.e. zigzag for RuCl3 and RuBr3, and possibly a quantum spin liquid (QSL) in RuI3. This is discussed in detail below.

For RuCl3, the model in Fig. 5 (as well as the \( R^3 \) model discussed in the Supplementary Information) yields zigzag AFM order, identifiable by a maximum at \( k = M \) in the static spin structure factor, shown in Fig. 6b. The computed ordered magnetic moment direction (see the “Methods” section), parametrized by \( \theta \) and \( \phi \) in Table 2 (compare Fig. 1b), is found to be tilted by \( \theta_M = 34^\circ \) out of the plane, in excellent agreement with the recent experiment,

| \( \Theta_{\text{CW}}^\text{avg} \) | \( \Theta_{\text{CW}}^\text{projED} \) | GS | \( \psi_M \) | \( \theta_M \) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| -39.1 K | -35.6 K | 15.4 K | 90° | 34.4° |
| +35.6 K | +35.6 K | QSL? | 90° | 32.4° |

\( \Theta_{\text{CW}}^\text{avg} \) is the powder-averaged Weiss temperature of each model. ‘GS’ refers to the ground state computed by exact diagonalization, and the angles of the magnetic moment \( \theta_M, \phi_M \) are defined according to Fig. 1b.

As also pointed out in ref. 39 in spite of the stronger hybridization the nearest-neighbor hopping parameters are reduced for heavier ligands, illustrated in Fig. 4b. This is reflected in the magnetic exchange parameters (Fig. 5b) in an overall reduced magnitude in the nearest-neighbor parameters. In contrast, the second and third neighbors show a very different dependence on the halogen element. From the dominant further-nearest hoppings (Fig. 4c, d), the hoppings show an overall tendency to increase, with few exceptions. Certain further-nearest magnetic exchange parameters, depending on their relation to the individual hopping parameters, become therefore increasingly important for RuBr3 and especially for the magnetic properties of RuI3.

Finally, we also computed the gyromagnetic \( g \)-tensor for the \( \text{RuX}_3 \) family from first principles, in order to relate the pseudospin \( \text{S} \) of the effective Hamiltonian to the magnetic moment \( \text{M} \). The \( g \)-tensor can be approximately characterized by two components, the value parallel to the honeycomb plane, \( g_{\parallel} \), and the one perpendicular to it, \( g_{\perp} \), which are shown in Fig. 5a. We consistently find \( g_{\parallel} > g_{\perp} \) for the whole family, promoting a stronger Zeeman term for in-plane fields.

We now discuss the ramifications of the derived magnetic models for the magnetism in these materials. For RuCl3, we can compare our result to a vast available literature of models that have been shown to reproduce various experimental observations. Indeed, the model presented here in Fig. 5, derived completely from first principles without adjustments or external parameters, is remarkably close to some well-benchmarked recent models19,37,38, and is therefore expected to also describe the material quite well. As we apply the same ab-initio setup for the new members of the RuX3 family, we expect our models to be reliable for them too.

The direction-averaged Weiss constant (\( \Theta_{\text{CW}}^\text{avg} \) in Table 2) is predicted to be positive across the RuX3 family, characteristic of ferromagnetic exchange interactions. This is in line with our analysis of the experimental magnetic susceptibilities of RuCl3 and RuBr3 above (Fig. 2). While in RuCl3 and RuBr3 a large FM contribution to the Weiss constant comes from a significant FM nearest-neighbor Heisenberg interaction \( J_1 \), this interaction nearly vanishes for RuI3 (Fig. 5b), leading to a smaller Weiss constant. Furthermore, the small \( J_1 \) in Ru3 renders the nearest-neighbor interactions to be extremely anisotropic, with a dominant Kitaev interaction \( K_1 \). While at first glance this might suggest a spin-liquid ground state in Ru3, the increased strength of the further-neighbor interactions in Ru3 (see, e.g., \( J_2, K_2 \) in Fig. 5c) also needs to be considered. To find the magnetic ground state properties, we perform exact diagonalization (ED) calculations of the derived \( J_{\text{eff}} = 1/2 \) models on the 24-site cluster shown in Fig. 6a. In Table 2 and Fig. 6b we summarize the encountered ground states, i.e. zigzag for RuCl3 and RuBr3, and possibly a quantum spin liquid (QSL) in RuI3. This is discussed in detail below.

For RuCl3, the model in Fig. 5 (as well as the \( R^3 \) model discussed in the Supplementary Information) yields zigzag AFM order, identifiable by a maximum at \( k = M \) in the static spin structure factor, shown in Fig. 6b. The computed ordered magnetic moment direction (see the “Methods” section), parametrized by \( \theta \) and \( \phi \) in Table 2 (compare Fig. 1b), is found to be tilted by \( \theta_M = 34^\circ \) out of the plane, in excellent agreement with the recent experiment,
where $\theta_M = 32 \pm 3^\circ$ was reported. Interestingly, on the classical level, the ferromagnetic state is lower in energy than the zigzag state, meaning that the latter only becomes the ground state through quantum fluctuations, as discussed also in ref. 37.

We will now focus on the recently synthesized compounds, starting with RuBr$_3$. The static spin structure factor for the RuBr$_3$ model of Fig. 5 is shown in Fig. 6b, indicating also a zigzag AFM order ($k = M$ and $C_6$-rotated vectors), in agreement with experiment. However, the calculated tilt angle of the magnetic moment, $\theta_M = 32^\circ$, is more in line with RuCl$_3$ than with the reported measured $\theta_M = 64^\circ$ of RuBr$_3$. The authors of ref. 25 argued that this anomalously large tilt angle indicates an exceptionally strong relative Kitaev coupling, i.e., larger $|K_1/J_1|$ and $|K_1/J_1|$ compared to RuCl$_3$. To investigate to what extent closer proximity to the pure Kitaev model could produce such high tilt angles, we take our RuBr$_3$ Hamiltonian of Fig. 5 as a starting point and tune it towards the pure Kitaev model, where $K_1$ is the only non-zero coupling. This is done by multiplying every exchange coupling except $K_1$ by $(1 - f)$ and sweeping $f$ from 0 to 1. As shown in Fig. 6c, the moment indeed rotates further away from the honeycomb plane upon moving towards the pure Kitaev model, however even right before the transition to the Kitaev spin liquid (indicated by the vertical dashed line), $\theta_M$ does not exceed $46^\circ$. $\theta_M = \arccos \left( \frac{\cos \theta_\delta}{\sqrt{g_i \cos \theta_\delta \cos \theta_\delta}} \right)$, which is to be compared to the neutron diffraction experiment, is even smaller due to the anisotropy $g_i > g_s$ in our calculated g-tensor (Fig. 5a). A reconciliation with the reported $\theta_M = 64^\circ$ would therefore require quite drastic changes to the g-tensor anisotropy and/or the exchange parameters. While in the whole $J_1 - K_1 - \Gamma_1$ parameter space with $\Gamma_1 > 0$, no angles of $\theta_M$ beyond $40^\circ$ are expected in the zigzag phase, significant negative $\Gamma_1 < 0$ can in principle lead to $\theta_M$ beyond $60^\circ$. However such terms seem incompatible with the ab-initio results and would likely need strong distortions from the present considered RuBr$_3$ crystal structure to be realized.

More distinct from the other two compounds are our results for RuI$_3$. As discussed above, in our GGA + SOC + U calculations we find a very flat energy landscape of competitive magnetic configurations, indicative of strong magnetic frustration. Fittingly, the ground state from the exact diagonalization of the present exchange model does not show a dominant ordering wave vector in the spin structure factor (see Fig. 6b). Although this is a signature generally associated with quantum spin liquid (QSL) states, we note that in the present model, the Kitaev $Z_2$ flux operator yields $\langle W_p \rangle = 2^8 \langle S_1^+ S_2^+ S_3^+ S_4^+ S_5^+ S_6^+ S_7^+ S_8^+ \rangle \approx 0.29$ (site indices refer to Fig. 6a). While this is clearly elevated compared to classical collinear states, where $\langle W_p \rangle$ is restricted to $|\langle W_p \rangle| \leq 1/2 < 0.04$, it is still significantly below the value of the pure unperturbed Kitaev spin liquid, where $\langle W_p \rangle = 1$. Hence, if the ground state constitutes a QSL state, it is presumably not the $Z_2$ Kitaev spin liquid.

The precise nature of the encountered magnetically disordered state might be interesting for future studies. It appears to be stabilized by the further-neighbor interactions, as we find a clear ferromagnetic ground state when omitting the second- and third-neighbor interactions in the present model. While a QSL scenario for our full RuI$_3$ model is compelling, we note that finite-size effects in our calculation could play a role. In particular, the finite-size cluster could be incompatible with the supposed correct ordering wave vector of the model, e.g. in the case of an incommensurate ordering vector.

To summarize, we have presented a comparative analysis of the electronic and magnetic properties of the Ru-based trihalide family, including the recently synthesized RuBr$_3$ and RuI$_3$, by combining state-of-the-art ab initio microscopic modeling with analysis of reported resistivity, specific heat, and magnetic susceptibility data. The evolution of the magnetic order and Mott–Hubbard correlations along the halogen series, as well as the possible role of disorder, have been a central part of our study.

We conclude that:

1. All three ideal compounds are spin–orbit-assisted Mott insulators, but their fundamental gap decreases with higher ligand atomic number, Cl → Br → I, with RuI$_3$ coming rather close to a metal–insulator transition.
2. From DFT total-energy calculations, in ideal, pristine crystals the zigzag magnetic order is even more stable in RuBr$_3$ than in RuCl$_3$, while RuI$_3$ shows significant magnetic frustration. Our ab-initio extracted low-energy models predict RuI$_3$ to feature either an incommensurate magnetic ordered state or a quantum spin liquid, which, interestingly, is possibly of a different kind to the $Z_2$ Kitaev spin liquid.
3. A number of reported experimental observations seem to be adversely affected by the sample quality, in particular by dirty grain boundaries. In fact, most of the observations in RuI$_3$ can be reconciled with theory by assuming insulating grains surrounded by (bad) metallic boundaries. The experimental evidence is consistent with a ‘dirty’ insulator, or a bad metal. Disorder would favor either of these.
4. In all three systems the dominant nearest-neighbor interaction is FM Kitaev $K_1$, with a subdominant FM Heisenberg Interaction $J_1$, that nearly vanishes for RuI$_3$. We observe a non-monotonous behavior of the magnetic anisotropies as a function of ligand atomic number that we trace back to a competition of the SOC effects from magnetic ions and ligands.
5. RuBr$_3$ has predominantly ferromagnetic interactions, in contrast to what is suggested by standard Curie–Weiss analysis. Such interactions are consistent with the experimental susceptibility when taking into account high-temperature SOC effects. Our ab-initio magnetic model predicts zigzag order in agreement with the

![Fig. 6](image-url) Exact diagonalization of RuX$_3$ pseudospin models. a) Employed periodic cluster. Labeled sites 1,...,6 define the Kitaev plaquette generator $W_p = 2^8 S_1^+ S_2^+ S_3^+ S_4^+ S_5^+ S_6^+ S_7^+ S_8^+$, b) Static spin structure factor in reciprocal space. Inner (outer) hexagon mark the edge of the honeycomb plane upon moving towards the pure Kitaev model. c) Out-of-plane angle $\theta_M (\theta)$ of the pseudospin (magnetic moment) within the zigzag phase when tuning from the RuBr$_3$ model ($f = 0$) towards the pure Kitaev model ($f = 1$). Dashed vertical line indicates phase transition to the Kitaev spin liquid, identified by a peak in $-\partial^2 E/\partial f^2$. 
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experiment, with a tilting angle of $\theta_m = 32^\circ$ for the magnetic moments, similar to RuCl$_3$, but in contradiction to the reported $\theta_m = 64^\circ$. We showed that such a large angle cannot be simply explained by proximity to the pure Kitaev model, but would require quite drastic changes in the exchange parameters, such as sizeable negative $\Gamma_1 < 0$. Those would necessitate strong distortions on the reported RuBr$_3$ crystal structures.

Answering the question posed in the title, our results and analysis strongly suggest that the ideal RuCl$_3$, RuBr$_3$, and RuI$_3$ compounds constitute a family of three Mott-insulating siblings. The challenging task of getting better samples will hopefully help resolve the open issues.

METHODS

Modified Curie–Weiss fit of RuBr$_3$

We fit the experimental average susceptibility of ref. 25 with four fitting parameters $\chi_0$, $\chi_1$, $\Theta^\ominus$, $\Theta^\oplus$ using the modified Curie–Weiss formula

$$\chi^{ex}(T) \approx \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{\chi_0 + C^\ominus(T)}{T - \Theta^\ominus} \right) + \frac{1}{3} \left( \chi_0 + C^\oplus(T) \right),$$

(2)

where $\Theta^\ominus$, $\Theta^\oplus$ are the Weiss constants and $C^\ominus(T) \propto \mu^2(T, \Delta)\delta$ is determined through $\Delta$ as described in ref. 33. Superscripts $\parallel$ and $\perp$ indicate the in- and out-of-honeycomb-plane direction, respectively. The susceptibility is fitted over the temperature range 150–300 K and SOC strength $\lambda = 0.15$ eV is taken.

DFT calculations

To make sure that the calculated features within density functional theory are robust with respect to the choice of the basis set, we have tested the results using two different methods: the projector augmented wave method50,51 as implemented in the VASP code52,53, and the full potential linearized augmented plane-wave (LAPW) basis as implemented in Wien2k. Throughout the paper, we have used the generalized gradient approximation (GGA)54 for the exchange-correlation functional. Hubbard correlation effects were included on a mean-field level in the rotationally invariant implementation of the GGA + U method55. All calculations included spin–orbit coupling (SOC) effects. For VASP we used the Ru $p_v$ pseudopotential, treating Ru $p$ states as valence, and the standard pseudopotentials for the halogens. The Γ-centered $8 \times 8 \times 8$ mesh in the nonmagnetic rhombohedral Brillouin zone was used, or the correspondingly scaled meshes for other structures. The energy cut-off was 350 eV, and the energy convergence criterion $1 \times 10^{-4}$ eV. For each type of magnetic order, a number of collinear starting configurations with randomly selected Néel vectors were used, and the lowest-energy result was selected as the ground state. Individual results can be found in the Supplementary Information. For Wien2k we chose the plane-wave cutoff $K_{\text{max}}$ corresponding to $K_{\text{max}}$ = 8 and a $k$ mesh of $8 \times 8 \times 2$ for the R$^3$ structure in the hexagonal Brillouin zone and $8 \times 4 \times 6$ in the first Brillouin zone of the conventional unit cell for the C$2/m$ structure. The density of states are calculated using a $k$ mesh of $12 \times 12 \times 3$ for the R$^3$ structure and $12 \times 6 \times 9$ for the C$2/m$ structure. The zigzag configurations are constructed using a conventional cell of the C$2/m$ structure for RuCl$_3$ while a $1 \times 2 \times 1$ supercell of the R$^3$ structures for RuBr$_3$ and RuI$_3$.

cRPA calculations

In order to obtain ab-initio estimates for the effective Coulomb interaction for the Ru-trihalide family, we employed the constrained random-phase approximation (cRPA)56,57, as implemented in the FHI-gap code58 based on the Wien2K electronic structure. The low-energy limit of the screened interaction was projected on the five Ru $d$ orbitals, where screening processes in the same window were excluded. Convergence with respect to the discretization of the Brillouin zone and energy cutoff was ensured.

DFT-based derivation of magnetic models

To derive bilinear exchange parameters for each material, we employed the proJED method59, which consists of two steps. First, complex ab-initio hopping parameters between the ruthenium ions are estimated with projective Wannier functions60 applied on full relativistic FPLO61 calculations on a $12 \times 12 \times 12k$ mesh. This allows constructing an effective electronic model $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{hoop}} + \mathcal{H}_d$, where the complex ab-initio hopping parameters enter the kinetic term $\mathcal{H}_{\text{hoop}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{Q}, \sigma} G_{ij}^{\sigma} c^\dagger_{\sigma, \mathbf{k}} c_{\sigma, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q}}$ and the cRPA effective Coulomb interaction parameters enter the two-particle term $\mathcal{H}_d = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{Q}, \sigma, \sigma'} G_{ij}^{\sigma, \sigma'} c^\dagger_{\sigma, \mathbf{k}} c_{\sigma', \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{Q}}$. Second, the effective spin Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}$ is extracted from the electronic model via exact diagonalization (ED) and projection of the resulting energy spectrum onto the low-energy subspace, mapped onto pseudo-spin operator representation in the $\mathbf{J}$-representation picture with the projection operator $P = P^\mathcal{H}_d P = \sum_{\mathbf{J}} P_{\mathbf{J}}$. Note that for RuCl$_3$ the exchange constants slightly differ from previously calculated values by some of the authors. The reason for this lies in the following details of the calculation setup: (i) first principles input parameters $U_{\text{avg}}$ and $J_{\text{avg}}$ from cRPA in contrast to previous choices, (ii) consideration of all five 4d ruthenium orbitals with the cost of restriction onto two-site clusters, (iii) SOC effects from both Ru$^\text{III}$ and ligands considered through complex hopping parameters in contrast to the atomic limit, and (iv) consideration of the experimental crystal structure in contrast to relaxed ambient pressure structure as it was done in ref. 38.

For the calculation of the gyromagnetic $g$-tensor, we considered $[\text{RuX}_3]^+$ molecules within the quantum chemistry ORCA 3.03 package62,63 with the functional TPSSh, basis set def2-TZVP and complete active space for the $d$ orbitals CAS(5,5).

Exact diagonalization

Exact diagonalization calculations of the $\mathcal{J}_{\text{eff}} = 1/2$ models were performed on the 24-site cluster shown in Fig. 6a. To identify possible magnetic ordering, we analyze the static spin structure factor $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} S_{\mathbf{k}} S_{\mathbf{k}}$ for the ordered moment direction, we compute the eigenvector with the maximal eigenvalue of the correlation matrix $\langle (S_{\mathbf{k}} S_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{ij}} \rangle$ at the ordering wave vector $\mathbf{k} \sim \mathbf{Q}$. This eigenvector then represents the ordered pseudospin direction $\mathcal{S}$, which relates to the magnetic moment direction $\mathcal{M} \propto \mathcal{G} \mathcal{S}$, as measured by neutron diffraction, via the anisotropic g-tensor $\mathcal{G}$.
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