## Electronic Structure Calculations of Magnetic Exchange Interactions in Europium Monochalcogenides

Xiangang Wan<sup>1</sup>, Jinming Dong<sup>1</sup>, Sergej Y. Savrasov<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Laboratory of Solid State Microstructures and Department of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, University of California, Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, Ca 95616

(Dated: February 23, 2024)

Using a combination of local spin density and Hubbard 1 approximations we study the mechansim of exchange interacion in EuX (X=O, S, Se and Te). We reproduce known experimental results about bulk modulus, critical pressure for structural phase transition, magnetic ordering temperature, spin-wave dispersions as well as momentum- and tempearuture-dependent band shift. Our numerical results show pressure induced competition between the hybirization enhanced exchange interaction and Kondo-like coupling in EuO. Possible ways to enhance  $T_c$  are discussed.

PACS numbers: 75.30.Et, 71.70.Gm, 75.50.Pp, 71.27.+a

Europium monochalcogenides EuX (X=O, S, Se and Te) have been studied extensively since 1961[1]. As the only known examples of Heisenberg ferromagnetism in nature, EuO and EuS have their Curie temperatures (T<sub>c</sub>) of 69.15 K and 16.57 K, respectively. On the other hand, EuSe has a complex magnetic structure at low temperatures, and EuTe is antiferromagnetic[2]. It was found that doping of EuO by electrons results in 100% spin polarization of the conduction electrons[3], and the material has a colossal magnetoresistance effect stronger than famous manganites. Moreover, very recently EuO has been integrated with Si and GaN, making it very attractive for spintronic applications[4], and the interest to these systems has been renewed [5–12].

As finding ways to raise the  $T_c$  up to room temperatures in EuX is of both fundamental and technological importance, many past studies of their magnetic exchange mechanism appeared in the literature. Based on a model calculation, Kasuya [13] proposed that the nearest neighbor exchange coupling  $J_1$  is induced by the indirect exchange between 4f and 5d electrons of Eu while the superexchange between the 4f states of Eu and p electrons of anion can be ignored. Liu and Lee[14] claimed based on their band structure calculation that anion valence band has an important contribution to both  $J_1$ and  $J_2$ . On the other hand, based on density functional calculation and Wannier function analysis, Kuneš et.al<sup>[15]</sup> emphasized the importance of hybridization between the 4f of Eu and 2p of O and the associated superexchange interaction. There have also been other theoretical models [16] to describe magnetic exchange mechanism in EuX including the s-f model[17]. Experimentally, optical spectroscopy finds a considerable 4f-5d mixing and suggests the importance of f-d exchange[18]; the Mössbauer experiment emphasizes the effect of 6s band of Eu and supports the *s*-*f* model[19]; the neutron diffraction stresses the contribution from the anion p shells[20]: the angle resolved photoemission (ARPES) experiment observes a momentum-dependent temperature-induced band shift[8] and contributions from Eu 4f-5d exchange to  $J_1$  and from Eu 4f–O 2p exchange to  $J_2$  while the x– ray absorption spectroscopy[7] claims that the exchange interaction is due to f-d mixing without involvement of the anion p states. It was also found that pressure[7, 20– 25], epitaxial strain[26, 27] and carrier doping[4, 28] can vary the T<sub>c</sub> of EuX significantly although still did not reach the values comparable with the room temperature.

In this work we address the controversial issue of understanding magnetic exchange mechanism in europium monochalcogenites using a recently developed linear response approach[29] which is based on a combination of density functional and dynamical mean field theories [30]. We reproduce major experimental results regarding their spin wave dispersions [31], pressure dependent transition temperatures[20, 24], and temperature dependent band structures [8]. We provide conclusive theoretical insights to various contributions to magnetic exchange interactions.

Our electronic structure calculations with the full potential linearized-muffin-tin-orbital (LMTO) method[32] are done using the local *spin* density approximation (LSDA) for the conduction electrons and atomic Hubbard 1 (Hub1) self-energy to approximate localized nature of the Eu f-electrons[30] with the on-site Coulomb interaction parameters U = 7 eV and J = 1.2 eV[6, 7]. We also check that our results are robust within the reasonable range of U's from 6 to 9 eV. With the electronic structure information, one can evaluate the magnetic interaction J in the Heisenberg Hamiltonian H = $-\sum_{ij} J_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j$ , based on a magnetic force theorem [33] that evaluates linear response due to rotations of magnetic moments [29]. This technique has been used successfully for evaluating magnetic interactions in a series of Mott insulating oxides [29], cuprate [34] and pnictide [35] superconductors.

The ground state properties predicted by our LSDA+Hub1 calculation including magnetic moments and energy gaps are found to be in agreement with experiment. Moreover, the obtained exchange splitting of conduction band is about 0.65 eV, which is close to the experimental value 0.60 eV [3]. Since at ambient pressure EuX compounds crystallize in rock-salt structure, but change to CsCl-type structure at high pressures[22],[23], we perform our calculations for both NaCl and CsCl type

TABLE I: Comparison between calculated using LSDA+Hub1 method and experimental values for the bulk modulus  $B_0$ , its first derivative  $B'_0$  and phase transition pressure  $P_c$  in Europium monochalcogenides. The experimental values are given in parentheses.

	EuO	EuS	EuSe	EuTe			
$B_0(GPa)$	$105 (118^a)$	$61~(61^b)$	$53 (52^b)$	$43 (40^b)$			
$\mathbf{B}'$	$3.2 (2.2^a)$	2.8	2.8	2.8			
$P_c(GPa)$	$48~(47^a)$	$26 (22^b)$	$17 (15^b)$	$14 (11^b)$			
<sup>a</sup> Ref. [23]; <sup>b</sup> Ref. [22].							

structures for a number of different volumes. The total energy vs volume, E(V), curves were fitted by the Murnaghan equation of state (EOS), and the obtained bulk modulus ( $B_0$ ) together with its first derivative ( $B'_0$ ) are listed in Table I. The crystal phase stability is analyzed by evaluating the enthalpy (H = E + PV), and the phase–transition pressure  $P_c$  is evaluated from crossing the H(P) curves. It is found that LSDA alone significantly overestimates the values of  $B_0$  and  $P_c$ . After inclusion of the correlation effects, our LSDA+Hub1 calculation reproduces the experimental values successfully. This is shown in Table I. The parameters of EOS and  $P_c$ are not sensitive to U's in the range 6–9 eV.

Using our LSDA+Hub1 method and the magnetic force theorem, we subsequently evaluate the exchange constants as the integral over the q space using (8,8,8)grid. The magnetic interactions in these materials are usually characterized by two exchange constants,  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ , although there is an argument about longer range interactions [36]. Our linear response approach allows us to evaluate J's in real space, and the numerical results confirm that they are short range with the magnetic coupling further than the second nearest neighbor to be almost equal to zero. As shown in Table II, our  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  are smaller than the values extracted from neutron scattering experiment [31], while quite close to the thermodynamic data[37]. Consistent with the experiment, we obtain that moving from EuO to EuTe, the strength of  $J_1$  decreases, meanwhile  $J_2$  changes from FM to AFMlike. For EuSe, the magnitude of  $J_1$  is smaller than  $J_2$ , but notice that for the rock-salt structure the number of nearest neighbors and of second nearest neighbors is 12 and 6, respectively, so there is a competition resulting in a complex magnetic structure at low temperatures[2]. For EuTe, both  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  become AFM-like and the ground state changes to AFM[2]. Using the mean-field approximation (MFA), we also estimate the magnetic ordering temperature. The agreement between the experimental and calculated  $T_c$  is good, with the expected overestimate of the mean-field value.

Based on the obtained exchange interactions we evaluate the spin-wave dispersions of EuO along major high symmetry directions. This is shown in Fig.1 where for comparison we also plot by symbols the results of neutron scattering measurements[31]. Our numerical data

TABLE II: Calculated and experimental nearest neighbor,  $J_1$ , and second nearest neighbor,  $J_2$ , exchange couplings as well as magnetic transition temperature for EuX (X=O, S, Se and Te) in units of K. The positive/negative signs denote ferro/antiferro magnetic coupling and Curie/Neel temperature.

		EuO	EuS	EuSe	EuTe
Our results	$J_1$	0.60	0.12	0.10	-0.03
	$J_2$	0.03	-0.10	-0.18	-0.24
Thermodynamic [37]	$J_1$	0.67	0.19	0.13	0.02
	$J_2$	-0.06	-0.08	-0.12	-0.16
Neutron Scattering[31]		0.61	0.24		
	$J_2$	0.12	-0.12		
Our results	$T_c$	81.1	19.6	-5.9	-19.8
Experimental data [2]	$T_c$	69.3	16.6	-7.1	-12.0



FIG. 1: Calculated spin–wave dispersions of EuO in comparison with the experiment (circles)[31].

are found in good agreement with the experiment which is done on polycrystalline samples thus accessing direction averaged spin–wave excitations.

One of the controversy about the mechanism of exchange interaction is the superexchange via the p orbital of anion which is believed to be negligible due to its small hybridization with localized 4f orbital[13, 14]. However this viewpoint has been argued due to recent theoretical works[15, 26] and a very recent observation of the momentum-dependent shift of 4f states of Eu and 2p states of O[8]. It has even been suggested that the f-p superexchange is the leading factor which induces change of sign in  $J_2$  when moving from EuO to EuTe[26]. To clarify this effect, we performed the calculation with turned off spin polarization of the conduction band by



FIG. 2: Temperature dependent LSDA+Hub1 band structure of EuO. (a) Temperature is 5 K. The red and black lines denote the majority and minority spin state respectively. (b) temperature is above  $T_c$ . By arrows we show the experimental spin splitting in the 2p O band and the momentum dependent shift for the top of the 4f Eu band.

using LDA instead of LSDA approach. It is interesting that such LDA+Hub1 calculation still gives a considerable spin splitting for the p band of anion, and the magnitude of this splitting is almost the same as we obtain with the LSDA+Hub1 method. Within the LDA+Hub1 framework this spin splitting of the p band can only come from the hybridization with the 4f band of Eu. Thus, we confirm that the f-p overlap is not negligible and the spin polarization in 4f will result in shifting p band as suggested by the recent experimental work[8].

To further understand the effect of the f-p hybridization and in order to make comparisons with recent ARPES data [8] regarding the temperature and momentdependent Eu-4f and O-2p band shifts we perform the LSDA+Hub1 calculation at temperatures below and above  $T_c$ . Agree with the experiment[8], our calculation shows that at low temperature (5 K), O-2p state have considerable spin splitting as shown in Fig.2(a). With increasing temperature the spin splitting decreases and eventually becomes zero when temperature becomes above  $T_c$  as shown in Fig2.(b). We also reproduce the temperature and moment-dependent Eu-4f band shift. As shown in Fig.2, our calculation predict that from low temperature to high temperature, the top of the Eu-4fband at  $\Gamma$  point and X point have the shift of 0.35 and 0.18 eV, respectively. These values are in good agreement with the experimental values of 0.32 and 0.07 eV[8].

Based on these arguments and noticing that EuX has the NaCl-type structure with anion located between two Eu atoms, one can then expect that the 4f-2p-4f superexchange should play an important role in the exchange mechanism. However, our values of  $J_1$  and  $J_2$ extracted from LDA+Hub1 calculation are coming out to be very small (e.g., for EuO, both  $J_1$  and  $J_2 \leq 0.001$  K) as compared to LSDA+Hub1 result shown in Table II. This emphasizes that the major part of the exchange process is going thru virtual excitations to the conduction band. If one does the same test for Mott insulating oxides[29] and cuprates[34] where the 3d-2p-3d superexchange dominates, one finds that the results of the calculations with LDA+Hub1 and LSDA+Hub1 are indeed similar to each other. This clearly indicates that the spin polarization in the conduction band is essential to explain the magnetic behavior of EuX. At the same time one can also conclude that there is considerable f-p hybridization in EuX system as suggested by recent experiment[8] and theory work[15, 26]. However the f-p superexchange being the second order effect can be ignored for those systems.

To see which exactly orbitals are contributing to the exchange process, we additionally made a calculation of J's with an artificial external potential applied to a particular orbital. It turns out that a downshift of 5p orbital for Eu or of s orbitals for anion does not affect the exchange constants. On the other hand, they are extremely sensitive to the position of 5d states of Eu: even a small up-shift here significantly decreases the strength of  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  due to the increase of band separation between 4f and 5d and following 5d-4f dehybridization. Shifting 6s level of Eu affects the  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  as well, although the effect is smaller than for 5d. Since anion atoms are between second nearest neighbor Eu ions, it is natural to expect that  $J_2$  is mediated by the 2p electrons of anion[8, 20] through the d-p and s-p hybridization. As a result the value of  $J_2$  should be sensitive to the position of the 2p band. Our numerical calculation, on the other hand, shows that both  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  are almost insensitive to the shift of the p band of anion. This result is consistent with our previous conclusion on the smallness of 4f-2p-4f superexchange. For example, we upshift the p level of O in EuO by 1.0 eV but  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  are almost unchanged. So, our calculation clearly rules out possible contributions from the d-p and s-p hybridization, and even the second nearest neighbor coupling  $J_2$  is mediated by the 6s and 5d electrons.

We have studied the effect of pressure which does not only enhance the hybridization between the conduction band and the f states, but also increases the crystal-field splitting between  $5d t_{2g}$  and  $e_g$  states of Eu and reduces the energy gap between the  $t_{2g}$  and the 4f states[20]. Consistent with the experiment, our theoretical results show that pressure enhances the exchange constants and  $T_c$  of EuS, while it changes the ground state of EuSe and EuTe from AFM to FM. However, for EuO our numerical data agree with the experiment only at the low pressure region, while for pressures larger than 20 GPa, our calculated Curie temperature still rises but the experimental one decreases [24]. This is illustrated in Fig.3. Our calculation shows that pressure closes the band gap and results in metallic behavior of EuO, but even for pressures as high as 40 GPa, the calculated exchange coupling is still short range. Based on our LSDA+Hub1 calculation, we,



FIG. 3: Pressure dependence of magnetic transition temperature of EuO experimental (triangle)[24], theoretical(circles) as well as Pressure dependence of Kondo coupling  $J_K$ .

on the other hand, estimate the on-site Kondo coupling strength  $J_K$  using a method described by us earlier[38]. As shown in Fig.3,  $J_K$  increases rapidly above 20 GPa, which results in not only the Kondo-like screening but also in an AFM like intersite coupling in the second order perturbation theory with respect to  $J_K$ . Both effects will suppress the  $T_c$  as is seen experimentally[24].

We have finally studied the effect of electron doping on  $T_c$  for EuO using the virtual crystal approximation

- B.T. Matthias, R.M. Bozorth and J.H. Van Vleck, Phys. Rev. Lett. 7, 160 (1961).
- [2] A. Mauger and C. Godart, Phys. Rep. 141, 51 (1986).
- [3] P.G. Steeneken et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 047201 (2002).
- [4] A. Schmehl *et al.*, Nature Materials **6**, 882 (2007).
- [5] M. Arnold and J. Kroha, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 046404 (2008).
- [6] S. Q. Shi et al., Euro. Phys. Lett. 83, 69001 (2008).
- [7] N.M. Souza-Neto, D. Haskel, Y.C. Tseng and G. Lapertot, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 057206 (2009).
- [8] H. Miyazaki et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 227203 (2009).
- [9] P. Larson and W.R.L. Lambrecht, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 18, 11333 (2006); D.B. Ghosh, M. De, and S.K. De, Phys. Rev. B 70, 115211 (2004).
- [10] G. van der Laan et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 067403
  (2008); B. Kaminski et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 057203
  (2009).
- [11] F. Zhao et al., Small 2, 244 (2006); ;
- [12] H. Rho et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 127401 (2002).
- [13] T. Kasuya, IBM J. Res. Dev. 14, 214 (1970).
- [14] V.C. Lee and L. Liu, Phys. Rev. B 30, 2026 (1984).
- [15] J. Kuneš, W. Ku and W.E. Pickett, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 74, 1408 (2005).
- [16] A. N. Kocharyan and D. I. Khomskii, Sov. Phys. Solid State 17, 290 (1975).
- [17] W. Nolting, Phys. Status Solidi B 96, 11 (1979).

(VCA). Our calculation shows that there are two competing factors: since the bottom of the conduction band consists mainly of the majority spin, the doped electron will enter the spin-polarized manifold, and this results in the onset of moment in 5*d* band which will enhance  $T_c$ . On the other hand, free carriers will induce the RKKY interaction which will supress  $T_c$ . We indeed find that our theoretical  $T_c$  first increases as the function of doping , and then goes through a maximum in accord with the experimental trend[28]. So we conclude that a combination of both doping and pressure can be the efficient ways to reach higher  $T_c$  in those systems.

In summary, we have calculated the exchange constants of EuX and reveal contributions from various orbitals relevant to the exchange mechanism. In particular, we showed that the 5d-4f and 6s-4f indirect exchange is dominant while the p electrons of anion has no contribution to it. We also reproduced that bulk modulus, pressure-induced phase transition and magnetic ordering temperatures as well as the spin-wave dispersions agree well with the experiment. We also suggest that the abnormal behavior of pressure dependent  $T_c$  in EuO is due to increase in Kondo-like coupling in the metallic phase.

The work was supported by National Key Project for Basic Research of China (Grant No. 2006CB921802, and 2010CB923404), NSFC under Grant No. 10774067, and 10974082. We also acknowledge the DOE NEUP subcontract #88708 and KITP where part of the work has been performed.

- [18] K. Syassen, Physica (Amsterdam) 139B, 277 (1986).
- [19] U.F. Klein, G. Wortmann and G.M. Kalvius, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 3, 50 (1976).
- [20] I. N. Goncharenko and I. Mirebeau, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1082 (1998).
- [21] D. DiMarzio et al., Phys. Rev. B 35, 8891 (1987).
- [22] A. Jayaraman et al., Phys. Rev. B 9, 2513 (1974).
- [23] S. Heathman et al., J. Alloys Compounds 230, 89 (1995).
- [24] M.M. Abd-Elmeguid and R.D. Taylor, Phys. Rev. B 42, 1048 (1990).
- [25] H.G. Zimmer et al., Phys. Rev. B 29, 2350 (1984).
- [26] N.J.C. Ingle and I.S. Elfimov, Phys. Rev. B 77, 121202 (2008).
- [27] R. T. Lechner et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 157201 (2005),
  R. Sutarto et al., Phys. Rev. B 79, 205318 (2009).
- [28] H. Ott et al., Phys. Rev. B 73, 094407 (2006).
- [29] X. Wan, Q. Yin and S.Y. Savrasov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 146602 (2006).
- [30] For a recent review, see G. Kotliar *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 78, 865 (2006).
- [31] L. Passell, O.W. Dietrich and J. Als-Nielsen, Phys. Rev. B 14, 4897 (1976).
- [32] S. Y. Savrasov, Phys. Rev. B 54 16470 (1996).
- [33] A. I. Liechtenstein et al., J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 67, 65 (1987).
- [34] X. Wan, T.A. Maier and S.Y. Savrasov, Phys. Rev. B

5

**79**, 155114 (2009).

- [35] M. J. Han, Q. Yin, W. E. Pickett, and S. Y. Savrasov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 107003 (2009).
- [36] W. Zinn, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 3, 23 (1976).
- [37] T. Kasuya and A. Yanase, Rev. Mod. Phys. 40, 684

(1968).

[38] M.J. Han, X. Wan and S.Y. Savrasov, Phys. Rev. B 78, 060401 (2008).