# Stability and electronic structure in hexagonal $A \downarrow M n_3 Siand ' A \downarrow_0 M n_3 crystals$

Guy Trambly de Laissardiere

Laboratoire de Physique Theorique et M odelisation, CNRS {Universite de Cergy-Pontoise (ESA 8089), 5 m ail Gay-Lussac, Neuville sur Oise, 95031 Cergy-Pontoise, France

E-m ail: guy.trambly@ptm.u-cergy.fr

A bstract. The electronic structures of hexagonal  $A \downarrow M n_3 Si$  and '  $A \downarrow_0 M n_3$  are investigated through self-consistent calculations carried out using the LM TO m ethod. This ab initio approach is combined with an analysis of a simplied ham iltonian m odel for A l based alloys containing transition m etal atom s. Results show a strong e ect on an atom ic structure stabilisation by an indirect M n-M n interaction m ediated by conduction electrons over m edium range distances (5A and m ore). Both the role and position of Si atom s are explained as well as the origin of large vacancies which characterises these atom ic structures. As and ' phases are related to A l based quasicrystals and related approxim ant structures, it yields arguments on the stabilisation of such complex phases.

PACS num bers: 61.50 Lt, Crystalbinding; cohesive energy 61.44 Br, Quasicrystals 71.20 Lp, Interm etallic com pounds 71.23 Ft, Quasicrystals

Submitted to: J. Phys.: Condens. Matter

2002/7/5

#### 1. Introduction

The almost isomorphic stable  $A \downarrow M n_3 Si [1]$  and metastable '  $A \downarrow_{10} M n_3$  [2] phases are often present in alloys containing quasicrystals in A l(Si)-M n systems. A lthough their diraction features are direct from those of quasicrystals, several correlations with quasiperiodic atom ic structure have been shown. For instance, there is a strong resemblance of these phases with parts of the complex structures of  $A \downarrow_{4:12} M n$  [3] and

A  $l_4$ M n [4] which are related to quasicrystals. and ' are also alm ost isom orphic with A  $l_5$ C  $o_2$  [5] which is an approxim ant of decagonal quasicrystal with the shortest periodic stacking sequence along the tenfold axis [6].

M eta-stable icosahedral (i-) and decagonal (d-) quasicrystals have been found in the A HM n system [7, 8, 9]. W ith the addition of few per cent of Si atoms, new stable phases are obtained: i-A HM n-Si [8], approximant A  $l_0M n_2$ Si [10, 11, 12] and A  $l_0M n_3$ Si...The occurrence of stable complex structure in A HM n and A HM n-Si is a m a pr question in the understanding of the stability of quasicrystals. For instance, the role of Si in stabilising the i-phase, is not yet understood. In this direction, investigations on relations between isomorphic stable A  $l_0M n_3$ Si and m eta-stable ' A  $l_{10}M n_3$  phases represent a great interest. O n another hand, these phases give a good example to analyse the e ect of the position of transition m etal (TM) atoms in stabilising complex structure related to quasiperiodicity.

In this paper, a rst-principles (ab initio) study of the electronic structure in  $A \downarrow_{M} n_{3}Si$  and '  $A \downarrow_{10} M n_{3}$  phases is combined with a model approach in order to describe the interplay between the medium range order and the electronic structure. Results are compared between , ',  $A \downarrow_{C} O_{2}$ ,  $A \downarrow_{4:12} M n$ , and  $A \downarrow_{4} M n$  phases. The stabilising role of Si and the origin of a large hole (vacancy) in both and ' phases are justiled. The origin of a pseudogap is analysed in the frame of the Hum e-R othery stabilisation rule for sp-d electron phases [13, 14]. Besides, a real space approach in term of a realistic TM -TM pair interaction allows to understand the elect of M n position. A s these phases are related to quasiperiodic phases, such a study yields arguments to discuss the interplay between electronic structure and stability in quasicrystals.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2, is presented a short review on Hum e-Rothery mechanism in Al(rich)-TM phases that has often been proposed for the stabilisation of crystals and quasicrystals. The structures of ' and are presented in section 3 with a discussion on their relations with quasicrystals. First-principles (ab initio) study of the electronic structure is presented in section 4. Then the e ect of the sp-d hybridisation is analysed in details through ab initio calculations for hypothetical structures. In section 5, these results are understood in term of a Friedel-Anderson sp-d ham iltonian that allows to nd the \e ective Bragg potential" for sp-d Hum e-Rothery alloys. In section 6, a real space approach of the Hum e-Rothery mechanism shows the strong e ect of a medium range M n-M n pair interaction (up to 5A and more). Magnetism is studied in section 7 and a short conclusion is given in section 8.

#### 2.1. Near contact between Ferm i sphere and pseudo-Brilbuin zone

Since the 1950s, A l(rich)-TM crystals are considered by m any authors as H um e-R othery alloys [15] (for instance see R efs [16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 1, 2]). In these phases, the important parameter is the average number of electrons per atom, e=a. The valence of A land Siare xed without ambiguity (+3 and +4, respectively). Following classical theory [19, 20], a negative valence is assigned to TM atom (typically, 3 for M n, 2 for Fe, 1 for Co and 0 for N i). For ' A  $l_{10}$ M n<sub>3</sub>, A  $l_{9}$ M n<sub>3</sub>Si and A  $l_{5}$ Co<sub>2</sub>, e=a is equal to 1.61, 1.69 and 1.86, respectively. The occurrence of di erent compounds with similar structures is therefore to be explained by the fact that they are electron compounds with similar e/a ratio in spite of di erent atom ic concentrations [1]. Indeed, for these phases a band energy m inimisation occurs when the Ferm i sphere touches a pseudo-B rillouin zone (prom inent B rillouin zone), constructed by B ragg vectors K p corresponding to intense peaks in the experimental di raction pattern. The H um e-R othery condition for alloying is then  $2k_F$  ' K p. A ssum ing a free electron valence band, the Ferm im omentum,  $k_F$ , is calculated from e=a.

Soon after the discovery of quasicrystals, it has been pointed out that their stoechiom etry appears to be governed by a Hum e-Rothery rule (see for instance [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]). Indeed the e-a ratio has been used for a long time to distinguish between Frank-K asper type quasicrystals (sp quasicrystals) and M ackay type quasicrystals (sp-d quasicrystals) [25]. Friedel and D enoyer [21] have determ ined the pseudo-B rillouin zone in contact with the Ferm i sphere for i-A H\_i-Cu. G ratias et al. [29] have shown that the A l-Cu-Fe icosahedral dom ain is located along a line in the phase diagram de ned by the equation e-a ' 1.86. Besides, A l-Cu-Fe alloys along an e-a-constant line have sim ilar local electronic properties and local atom ic order [30]. Recently, a pseudo-B rillouin zone that touches the Ferm i Sphere in 1/1A + Cu-Ru-Siand A l-M g-Zn approxim ants has been identi ed [31, 32]. W ith the discovery of decagonal d-A l-Cu-C o and d-A l-N i-C o by T saiet al. [33], these authors [25] have determ ined that the value of e-a ratio is about 1.7 in spite of wide com position range for quasicrystals in these system s. The importance of e-a value in quasicrystals and their properties suggests that Hum e-R othery m echanism plays a signi cant role in their stabilisation.

### 2.2. P seudogap in the density of states

The density of states (DOS) in sp Hum e-Rothery alloys is well described by the Jones theory (for review see Refs [34, 35, 36]). The valence band (sp states) are nearly-free electrons, and the Ferm i-sphere/pseudo-Brillouin zone interaction creates a depletion in the DOS, called \pseudogap", near the Ferm i energy,  $E_F$ . This pseudogap has been found both experimentally and from rst-principles calculations in classical Hum e-Rothery alloys (see for instance the recent theoretical study of archetypal system Cu-Zn [35]). It has also been found experimentally and theoretically in sp quasicrystals

and related phases (for instance in A H\_i-Cu [8, 26] and A H g-Zn [27, 31]). But, the treatment of Al(rich) alloys containing transition metal elements requires a new theory. Indeed, the d states of TM are not nearly-free states in spite of strong spd hybridisation. Thus a model for sp-d electron phases which combined the e ect of the di raction by Bragg planes with the sp-d hybridisation has been developped [13, 14]. It is shown that negative valence of TM atom results from particular e ects of the sp-d hybridisation in Hume-Rothery alloys [22, 37, 13, 14]. Besides the TM DOS (mainly d states) depends strongly on TM atom s positions. For particular TM positions, one obtains a pseudogap near  $E_F$  in total DOS and partial d DOS. This has been con med by ab initio calculations in a series of Al(rich)-TM crystals including  $A \downarrow Co_2$  [14], which is isomorphic with  $A \downarrow M n_3$ Si and 'A  $\downarrow_0 M n_3$ . The presence of a pseudogap in A  $l_{5}Co_{2}$  D O S has also been con m ed by photoem ission spectroscopy [38]. For icosahedral sp-d quasicrystals and their approximants, a wide pseudogap at  $E_F$  has been found experimentally [8, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44] and from ab initio calculations 24, 45, 46, 47, 32]. For instance in i-A l-Cu-Fe, i-A l-Pd-Mn and A l-Mn-Si, the DOS at  $E_F$  is reduced by 1=3 with respect to pure Al (c.f.c.) DOS [8].

However, there are contradictory results about DOS in decagonal quasicrystals. Photoem ission spectroscopy measurements in the photon-energy range 35-120 eV do not show any pseudogap [48] in d-A  $l_{55}Co_{15}Cu_{20}$  and d-A  $l_{70}Co_{15}Ni_{15}$ , whereas ultrahigh resolution ultraviolet photoem ission shows a depletion of the DOS at  $E_F$  for the same compositions [49]. From soft X-ray spectroscopy, DOS in d-A  $l_{55}Co_{20}Cu_{15}$  and d-A  $l_{70}Co_{15}Ni_{15}$ , exhibits also a pseudogap in the A l-3p band [50]. Recently a pseudogap, enhanced by sp-d hybridisation, has been found in the A l-p band of d-A l-P d-M n [44]. There are also ab initio calculations performed for several atom ic model approximants of d-A l-C o [51, 52], d-A l-C o-N i [53] and d-A l-P d-M n [54]. The results show that an existence of pseudogap depends on the position of the TM atom s. Indeed, some TM atom s may \ llup" the pseudogap, via the sp-d hybridisation; whereas other TM positions enhance the pseudogap.

In sum mary, the importance of Hume-Rothery mechanism is now established for many A Hoased quasicrystals with and without TM elements although the presence of a pseudogap near  $E_F$  is still discussed for decagonal phases. Nevertheless, one can not ignore the possible Hume-Rothery stabilising e ect on the origin of the quasiperiodicity. This is the reason why in this article ab initio results are analysed in the frame work of Hume-Rothery mechanism in order to test the importance of this mechanism.

#### 3. Structures and relations with quasicrystals

## 3.1. General aspects

The unit cell dimensions of  $A \downarrow M n_3 Si [1]$  and '  $A \downarrow_{10} M n_3 [2]$  are similar, with a same space group  $P 6_3 = m m c$ . A tom ic environment and interatom ic distances are gathered in tables 1 and 2.

Lattice	A LM n <sub>3</sub> Si [1]		′A 40M n3 [2]		Al₅Co <sub>2</sub> [5]	
param eters						
a (A)	7.513		7.543		7.656	
с(А)	7.745		7.898		7.593	
W ycko						
Sites						
(2a):0,0,0	(A 1,Si)(0)		Al(0)		Al(0)	
(6h) :x,2x, <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	(A 1,Si) (1)	x = :4579	Al(1)	x = <b>:</b> 4550	Al(1)	x = :4702
(12k) :x,2x,z	(Al,Si)(2)	x = 2006	Al(2)	x = :1995	Al(2)	x = :1946
		z= <b>:</b> 0682		z= <b>:</b> 0630		z= <b>:</b> 0580
(6h) :x,2x, <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	M n	x = :1192	Мп	x = :1215	Co(1)	x = :1268
(2d) : $\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}$	Va		Va		C o (0)	

Table 2. Interatom ic distances in  $A \downarrow M n_3 Si' A \downarrow_0 M n_3$  and  $A \downarrow_5 Co_2$ . TM is either M n or Co(1). X corresponds to the vacancy in and ' phases and to Co(0) in  $A \downarrow_5 Co_2$ .

Atom	W ycko	Neighbours	Distances (A)			
	site		A ♭M n₃Si	'A 40M n3	ALCO2	
Al,Si(0)	(2a)	6A1(2)	2.66	2.65	2.62	
		6 TM (1)	2.48	2.53	2.53	
Al(1)	(6h)	2 A l(1)	2.81	2.75	3.14	
		4 A 1(2)	2.77	2.84	2.74	
		4 A 1(2)	2.98	2.99	2.97	
		2 TM (1)	2.42	2.41	2.41	
		1 X	2.72	2.77	2.61	
A1(2)	(12k)	1 A l <b>,</b> Si(0)	2.66	2.65	2.62	
		2 A l(1)	2.77	2.84	2.74	
		2 A l(1)	2.98	2.99	2.97	
		2 A 1(2)	2.81	2.79	2.73	
		1 A 1(2)	2.82	2.95	2.92	
		2 A 1(2)	2.99	3.03	3.19	
		1 TM (1)	2.68	2.67	2.51	
		2 TM (1)	2.68	2.71	2.70	
		1 X	2.23	2,29	2.35	
TM (1)	(6h)	2 A l <b>,</b> Si(O)	2.48	2.53	2.54	
		2 A l(1)	2.42	2.41	2.41	
		2 A 1(2)	2.68	2.67	2.51	
		4 A 1(2)	2.68	2.71	2.70	
		2 TM (1)	2.69	2.75	2.91	
Х	(2d)	3 A 1(1)	2.72	2.77	2.61	
		6A1(2)	2.23	2.29	2.35	
		6 TM (1)	3.81	3.82	3.86	

X and TM (1) are not rst-neighbour.



Figure 1. Crystal structure of A  $\[mbox{bm}]M$  n<sub>3</sub>Siphase described in terms of icosahedral clusters centered on the atom s. Siatom s are on W ycko site (2a). Squares show the sites of the vacancy Va (site (2d)). Top and side views of both layers at  $z = \frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}$  are shown. The icosahedral environment of each Siatom is also shown on the right low part of the gure.

First atom neighbours of the Mn site correspond to 10 Al/Si + 2 Mn atom s situated at vertices of a distorted icosahedron. Such an icosahedron is considered in the structural representation of Al<sub>9</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub>Si (gure 1). The small Al(0)-TM, Al(1)-TM and Al(2)-TM distances suggest a strong e ect of the sp-d hybridisation. Each Mn has two Mn nst neighbours in Mn-triplet. Between Mn-triplets, Mn-Mn distances are about 4:17A. Sim ilar Mn-triplets exist also in Al<sub>4:12</sub>Mn (hexagonal, P6<sub>3</sub>=mmc, 563 atom s/unit cell) [3]. Al<sub>9</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub>Si and 'Al<sub>40</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub> have signi cant relations with the complex structures Al<sub>4:12</sub>Mn and Al<sub>4</sub>Mn (hexagonal, P6<sub>3</sub>=m, 568 atom s/unit cell) [4] that are related to quasicrystals. For instance, in gure 1 of Ref. [3], the outline of the repeated unit of ' phase on several parts of structure is shown. K reiner and Franzen [55, 4] showed that the I3-cluster, a structure unit of three vertex connected icosahedra, is the basic building block of a large num ber of interm etallic phases related to i-Al-Mn-Sisuch as Al<sub>9</sub>Mn<sub>2</sub>Si, Al<sub>4:12</sub>Mn and Al<sub>4</sub>Mn.Note that the environm ent of Mn are also close to those found in Al-Mn-Siapproxim ant [10, 11, 12].

## 3.2. Vacancies

The hexagonal structure of  $A \downarrow_5 Co_2$  [5] is almost isomorphic with and ' where Co replace M n and Va sites (table 1). These phases have similar atom ic sites and rstneighbours distances (table 2). However, a major di erence is that the site (2d) is empty (Va) in and ' whereas it is occupied by cobalt (Co(0)) in  $A \downarrow_5 Co_2$ . It is thus interesting to understand why this vacancy is maintained in and ' crystals? As rstneighbour distances around M n in ' and are similar to those around Co in  $A \downarrow_5 Co_2$ , and that Va-Aldistances in and ' are very close of Co(0)-Aldistances a vacancy can not be explained from steric encumbering. The environment of Va forms a Tri-capped trigonal prism (3 Al(1) and 6 Al(2)).

The same environment is also found in  $Al_{4:12}Mn$  [3] and  $Al_4Mn$  [4]. But in and , this site is occupied by a Mn atom (Mn(1) in (2b) in  $Al_{4:12}Mn$  and Mn(1) in (2d) in  $Al_4Mn$ ). In and , the rst-neighbour distances Mn(1)-Alare 2.35 2.48 A, which are similar to Va-Al rst-neighbour distances in and '.

In the following, it is shown that the presence (or not) of such a vacancy in and ' can be explained on account of the medium range atom ic order because of strong M n-M n pair interaction up to medium range distances (m ore than 5A).

## 3.3. Role and position of Siatom s

The role of Si in Al based quasicrystals and related phases is known to have an important e ect. Unstable quasicrystals are obtained in AlM n system, whereas stable quasicrystals are formed when a small proportion of Si is added [8]. Sim ilar stabilising e ects occurs for i-Al-Cu-Cr-Si [56] and for approximants Al-Mn-Si [8], 1/1Al-Cu-Fe-Si [57, 58], Al-Re-Si [59]. The number of valence electrons are 3 (4) per Al (Si) atom. With respect to a Hum e-Rothery condition for alloying ( $2k_F$  ' K<sub>p</sub>), it is possible that a substitution of a small quantity of Si increases the e-a ratio in better agreement with  $2k_F$  ' K<sub>p</sub>.

Experimentally Al and Si atoms have not been distinguished in  $A \lg M n_3 Si$ . However, Robinson [1] has proposed to consider Si in (2a) because the interatom ic distances between an atom on sites (2a) and its six neighbouring Alatoms is less than between any other pairs of Alatoms in structure (table 2). But, from a comparison of

and ', Taylor [2] has suggested that Siatom s should be preferentially in (12k) with A latom s instead of (2a).

In section 4.2, we give arguments form ab initio calculations to understand the e ect of Sion the Hum e-R othery stabilisation and to conclude that Siare likely in (2a).

4. First-principles calculations of the electronic structure

4.1. LM TO procedure, treatment of Si

E lectronic structure determ inations were perform ed in the fram e-work of the local spindensity approximation (LSDA) [60] by using the ab initio Linear Mu n T in Orbital m ethod (LM TO) in an Atom ic Sphere Approximation (ASA) [61, 62]. The space is divided into atom ic spheres and interstitial region where the potential is spherically symmetric and at, respectively. Sphere radii were chosen so that the total volume of spheres equals that of the solid. For vacancies (Va) empty spheres were introduced in (2d). The sphere radii are  $R_{Si=A1(0)} = 1.37A$ ,  $R_{A1(1)} = R_{A1(2)} = 1.53A$ ,  $R_{Mn} = 1.34A$ ,  $R_{Va} = 1.04A$  for phase, and  $R_{A1(0)} = 1.38A$ ,  $R_{A1(1)} = R_{A1(2)} = 1.55A$ ,  $R_{Mn} = 1.35A$ ,  $R_{Va} = 1.05A$  for ' phase. As these structures are metallic and rather compacts, it was found that a small change of the sphere radii does not modify signi cantly the results.

N eglecting the spin-orbit coupling, a scalar relativistic LM TO -A SA code, was used with combined corrections for A SA [61, 62]. The k integration in a reduced B rillouin zone was performed according to the tetrahedron method [63] in order to calculate the electronic density of states (DOS). The nal step of the self-consistent procedure and the DOS calculation were performed with 4416 k points in the reduced B rillouin zone. With an energy mesh equals to E = 0.09 eV, calculated DOSs do not exhibit signi cant di erences when the number of k points increases from 2160 to 4416. Thus, the structure in the DOS larger than 0.09 eV are not artefacts in calculations. Except in section 7, the LM TO DOSs calculations were performed w ithout polarised spin (param agnetic state).

The LM TO -A SA basis includes all angular moments up to l = 2 and the valence states are Al (3s, 3p, 3d), Mn (4s, 4p, 3d), Co (4s, 4p, 3d), Si (3s, 3p, 3d) and Va (1s, 2p, 3d) z. In order to analyse the position of Si atoms in the phase, we performed calculations for (Al;Si)<sub>10</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub> where the Si atoms occupied random ly the Al sites. In this case an average atom named (Al,Si) was considered (virtual crystal approximation). In the LM TO -A SA procedure this atom is simulated with nuclear charge  $Z = (1 - c)Z_{A1} + cZ_{Si}$ , where c is the proportion of Si atoms, and  $Z_{A1} = 13$ ,  $Z_{Si} = 14$  are the nuclear charge of Al, Si, respectively. Such a calculation can be justiled as the main difference between Al and Si is the number of valence electrons. It was checked that the LM TO -A SA total energy of pure Al and pure Si are alm ost equal to this calculated with the average (Al,Si) atom with c = 0.01 and c = 0.99, respectively. Three possibilities were considered for the phase: (i) the phase named A bM n<sub>3</sub>Si where Si are on site (2a) and A b on site (6h) and site (12k); (ii) the phase

 $I-(A l;Si)_{10}M n_3$  where Siatom s substitute for som e A l (on sites (2a), (6h) and (12k)); (iii) the phase II-(A l;Si)\_{10}M n\_3 where Siatom s substitute for som e A l(2) (site (12k)). Sam e sphere radii for these three cases were input.

### 4.2. General aspects of the density of states (DOS)

Total energy self-consistent calculations were performed for dierent volumes, with isotropic volume changes i.e. the ratio c=a is constant and equal to the experimental value (table 1). The atom ic positions were not relaxed. M inim a of energy were obtained for a lattice parameter a equal to 7.41A for AlpM n<sub>3</sub>Si, 7.41A for I-(Al;Si)<sub>10</sub>M n<sub>3</sub>,

z In ASA approximation, orbitals are introduced in vacancies in order to yield a good expansion of the LM TO orbitals out of atom ic spheres.



Figure 2. Total density of states (DOS) calculated by LMTO-ASA method in (a) 'Al<sub>10</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub>, (b) Al<sub>2</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub>Si, and (c) I-(Al;Si)<sub>10</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub>. Details of the total DOSs around  $E_F$  are given in inserts.  $E_F = 0$ . The DOS in II-(Al;Si)<sub>10</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub> is almost the same as that in I-(Al;Si)<sub>10</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub>.



Figure 3. LocalDOS performed by LM TO -ASA method in A hM n<sub>3</sub>Siphase. Siare in (2a). The localM n DOS calculated without sp-d hybridisation is also drawn (see text).  $E_F = 0$ .

7.42A for  $II-(A l;Si)_{10}M n_3$ , and 7.43A for 'A  $l_{10}M n_3$ . These values correspond within 1.5% to experimental values. Similar results have also been found in LM TO-ASA calculations for A LTM alloys with small concentration of TM elements [14].

The totalDOSs in and ' phases (gure 2), are very similar. LocalDOSs in are also shown in gure 3. Except for low energies (less than 10 eV), the totalDOS in

does not depend on the Siposition. The parabola due to the Alnearly-free states is clearly seen. The large d band from 2 up to 2 eV is due to a strong sp-d hybridisation in agreem ent with experim ental results [38, 39, 40, 64] and with rst-principles calculations on A LTM crystals and quasicrystals [14, 24, 47].

The sum of local DOSs on Al and Si atoms, shown in gure 4(a), is mainly sp DOS. As expected for a Hum e-R othery stabilisation, it exhibits a wide pseudogap near  $E_F$  due to electron scattering by Bragg planes of a predominant pseudo-Brillouin zone (i.e. the pseudo-Brillouin zone close to the Ferm i surface). Its width of about 1 eV is of the same order of magnitude to this found in A HM n icosahedral approximants [14, 24, 45, 47]. The large pseudogap in fA l+ Sig DOS is meanly characteristic of a p-band at this energy, but the pseudogap in the total DOS is narrower. Therefore, the d states of M n atom s must llup partially the pseudogap. N evertheless, as it is shown in the following that the pseudogap in fA l+ Sig DOS results from M n sub-lattice e ect.

Spiky total DOS where obtained for the studied phases as it has been found in



Figure 4. local fAl + Sig DOS performed by LMTO-ASA method in AlM n<sub>3</sub>Si phase: (a) calculated including sp-d hybridisation, (b) calculated without sp-d hybridisation. (c) local fAl + Sig DOS in hypothetical Al<sub>A</sub>Al<sub>b</sub>Si and (d) in hypothetical Al<sub>A</sub>M n<sub>4</sub>Si E<sub>F</sub> = 0.

LM TO DOS of icosahedral sm all approximants (for instance A LM n-Si [24], 1/1A L Cu-Fe [45], 1/1A HPd-M n [46]). In fact this is a consequence of a sm all electron velocity ( at dispersion relations) which contributes to anom abus electronic transport properties [24, 45, 65]. Such properties are not speci c of quasicrystals as they are also observed in m any crystal related to quasicrystals, therefore it does not only come from the long range quasiperiodicity. They are also associated with local and medium range atom ic order that are related to quasiperiodicity. Indeed, it has been shown [66] that ne peaks in the DOS could come from electron con nement in atom ic clusters characteristic [67] of the quasiperiodicity. This is not in contradiction with a Hume-Rothery mechanism because this tendency to localisation has a smalle ect on the band energy [66]. W hether spiky DOSs exist in quasicrystals or not is how ever much debated experimentally [49, 68, 43] and theoretically (R ef [69] and references therein) and the present calculation does not give answer to this question for the case of quasicrystals. But, in case of and ' crystals, we checked that structures in the DOS with an energy scale larger than 0.09eV are not artifacts in calculation as they do not depend on the non-physical parameters in the LM TO procedure (number of k points, see section 4.1).

# 4.3. Analysis of Sie ect

From LM TO band energy calculated with xed atom ic positions and composition, the lowest band energy is obtain when Siatom s are in (2a) in A LM  $n_3$ Si. The di erence in band energy between A LM  $n_3$ Si and I-(A l;Si)<sub>10</sub>M  $n_3$  is + 5 eV / unit cell. The same order of magnitude is obtained between A LM  $n_3$ Si and II-(A l;Si)<sub>10</sub>M  $n_3$ . These ab

initio results shows that Si are in (2a) and not mixed with Al. A comparison between the band energy of and ' phases cannot be made because their compositions are dierent.

In the vicinity of  $E_F$ , the total DOSs in and ' are very similar except  $E_F$  positions (gure 2). At  $E_F$ , the DOS is 5:6 states=eV cell in , 16:0 states=eV cell in '. The small amount of Si increases the average valence e=a in . In a rigid band like model, this  $E_F$  shifts up to the minimum of the pseudogap, and in Hum e-Rothery mechanism, the band energy is minimised. This di erence allows one to understand why  $A \ hmumber M \ n_3$ Si phase is stable whereas '  $A \ hmumber M \ n_3$  phase is metastable.

D i erences between (A l;Si)<sub>10</sub>M n<sub>3</sub> where Siatom s are m ixed with A latom s, and A l<sub>2</sub>M n<sub>3</sub>Si where Si atom s are in (2a) can also be understood from LM TO DOSs. Indeed, two bonding peaks are present at low energies (11.5 eV and 10.3 eV, gure 3) in the local Si DOS of A l<sub>2</sub>M n<sub>3</sub>Si, which is no m ore nearly-free states (each Si atom has 6 A l(2) and 6 M n rst neighbours (table 2)). The close proximity between Si and M n and the presence of a bonding peak in the partial M n DOS suggest that the Si M n bond is rather covalent and thus increases the stability of phase when Si is on site (2a).

## 4.4. E ects of the d state of the transition-m etal (TM) atom s

In this part the origin of the pseudogap is analysed from LMTO calculations for hypothetical phases derived from  $A \downarrow_M n_3 Si$ . Three points are successively considered (i) the strong e ect of the sp-d hybridisation on the pseudogap, (ii) the role of the M n position which explains the origin of the vacancy (Va) in and ', (iii) and the great e ect of M n-M n m edium range interaction up to 5 A.

### (i) Role of the sp-d hybridisation on the pseudogap

Self-consistent LM TO calculation where perform ed without sp-d hybridisation by setting to zero the corresponding term s of the ham iltonian matrix [70]. Such a calculation is physically meaningful because the d TM states are mainly localised in the TM sphere and the sp Al states are delocalised. In gure 3, local M n DOS (mainly d states), is drawn for two cases: with sp-d hybridisation and without sp-d hybridisation. The comparison between these local DOSs shows that the sp-d hybridisation increases the width of d band. This con rm s a strong sp-d hybridisation. The local fAl+ Sig DOS (mainly sp DOS) is also strongly a ected by a sp-d hybridisation. A s a matter of fact the pseudogap disappears in the calculation without sp-d hybridisation (gure 4(b)).

For Hum e-Rothery alloys containing TM elements, a stabilisation mechanism is more complex than in sp alloys because of a strong sp-d hybridisation in the vicinity of  $E_F$ . A l and Si atom s, which have a weak potential, scatter sp electrons by a potential  $V_B$  almost energy independent. This leads to the so-called di raction of electrons by Bragg planes in sp alloys. But the potential of M n atom s depends on the energy. It is strong for energies around  $E_d$ , and creates a d resonance of the wave function that scatters also sp states. The e ect is analysed in detail from a model ham iltonian in section 5. LM TO calculation was performed on hypothetical A bA bSi constructed by putting Al in place of Mn in A bM n<sub>3</sub>Si in order to con rm (or not) the previous analysis. The resulting total DOS (mainly sp DOS) of the hypothetical phase has no pronounced pseudogap (gure 4(c)). But there are many sm all depletions that might come from di ractions by B ragg planes. It shows that classical di ractions by B ragg planes by a weak potential V<sub>B</sub> can not explain a pseudogap close to  $E_F$  in A bA bSi and 'A  $l_{10}$ M n<sub>3</sub>.

### (ii) E ect of the M n position, origin of the vacancy

As explained in section 3, a particularity of and ' structures is a vacancy in (2d). This is the main di erence with the A  $l_5$ C  $o_2$  structure (table 1). The origin of a vacancy can not be explained from too short near-neighbour distances (section 3.2). Therefore, a LM TO calculation was performed including a new M n atom, named M n (0), on site (2d) in A  $l_4$ M n<sub>3</sub>Siphase using atom ic sites and lattice parameters of A  $l_4$ M n<sub>3</sub>Si (table 1). This hypothetical phase is named A  $l_4$ M n<sub>4</sub>Si and its total and fA l+ Sig DOSs are shown in gures 5 and 4 (d), respectively. The absence of pseudogap in the total DOS results of a the great e ect of M n (0). In fA l+ Sig DOS the pseudogap created by the scattering of sp electrons by the sub-lattice of M n in (6h) is still present. But a large peak at  $E_F$  lls up partially the pseudogap. Consequently,  $E_F$  is located in a peak due to sp (A l)-d (M n (0)) hybridisation. This is in fact a good example where a sp-d hybridisation does not induce a pseudogap. A similar result was obtained with an hypothetical ' A  $l_{10}$ M n<sub>4</sub>, built by putting a M n atom in place of the vacancy in (2d).

Total and local DOSs of hypothetical A lpM  $n_4$ Si and A lpC  $o_2$  [14, 38] are compared in gure 5. In spite of the near isom orphism between these structures, their DOSs are very dierent. As there is pseudogap in A lpC  $o_2$  and not in A lpM  $n_4$ Si, it indicates that C o (0) and M n (0) act dierently, thus justifying the existence of a vacancy in both A lpM  $n_3$ Si and 'A lpM  $n_3$  phases and not in A lpC  $o_2$ .

Therefore, the sim ilar W ycko sites lead to both anti-bonding or bonding peaks depending on the nature of the atom on the W ycko site (2d), either M n (0) or  $C \circ (0)$  respectively. Since there is a great e ect of the nature of the TM element, a further analysis is proposed in section 6, where cohesive energies are compared using realistic TM -TM pair interaction.

## (iii) E ect of Mn-Mn medium range interaction

The M n-M n distances in  $A \downarrow_M n_3$ Si are reported in table 3. M n are grouped together to form M n-triplets (section 3.1). In order to determ ine the e ect of a possible M n-M n medium range interaction on a pseudogap, a LM TO calculation was performed on a modiled phase containing only one M n-triplet per unit cell instead of two. In this



Figure 5. Total DOS and local TM DOSs performed by LM TO-ASA method in  $A \downarrow C o_2$  and hypothetical  $A \downarrow M n_4 Si$ . The  $A \downarrow M n_4 Si$  phase is built from  $A \downarrow M n_3 Si$  (table 1) by replacing the vacancy in (2d) by M n atom (M n (0)). Other M n are in (6h).  $E_F = 0$ .

Table 3. Mn-Mn distances in AlpMn\_3Si and hypothetical AlpMn\_1:5Cu\_1:5Si (see text).

M n-M n distance (A )	NumberofM A ♭M n₃Si	n-M n pairs A LM n <sub>1:5</sub> C u <sub>1:5</sub> Si
2.69	2	2
4.17	4	
4.83	2	2
4.96	2	
6.38	4	
6.59	4	4
7.33	8	
7.51	6	6



Figure 6. LM TO-ASA DOSs performed by LM TO-ASA method in hypothetical A  $hM n_{1:5}Cu_{1:5}Si$ : (a) totalDOS, (b) fAl+ Sig boalDOS, (c) M n boalDOS, (d) Cu boalDOS. The hypothetical A  $hM n_{1:5}Cu_{1:5}Si$  is built by placing 1 M n-triplet by 1 Cu-triplet in each unit cell of A  $hM n_3Si$ .  $E_F = 0$ .

case, A  $\[mu]M$  n<sub>3</sub>Siwas transform ed into A  $\[mu]M$  n<sub>1.5</sub>C u<sub>1.5</sub>Siby rem placing a M n-triplet by a Cu-triplet. M n environments remain identical up to 4:17A (table 3).

As results, the local Cu DOS (mainly d states, gure 6(d)) at  $E_F$  is very small; Cu having almost the same number of sp electrons as Mn, it has a minor e ect near  $E_F$ . For the local Mn DOS the pseudogap disappears completely (gure 6(c)). For the total DOS, a small depletion below  $E_F$  is still remaining (gure 6(a)), and for the local fAl+ Sig DOS there is a pseudogap below  $E_F$  (gure 6(b)), but less pronounced than for  $A \lg M n_3 Si$  (gure 4(a)). Therefore, such a disappearence of pseudogap proves the e ect of Mn-Mn interactions over medium distances equal to 4.17, 4.96, 6.38 A... (table 3).

### 5. E ective B ragg potential for sp states

### 5.1. Exitence of e ective sp ham iltonian

As electrons are nearly-free electrons in Hum e-Rothery sp crystals without TM atoms the ham iltonian writes [34],

$$H_{\rm sp} = \frac{h^2 k^2}{2m} + V_{\rm B} :$$
 (1)

 $V_{B}$  is a weak potential (Bragg potential), and does not depend on an energy,

$$V_{\rm B}(r) = \int_{K}^{X} V_{\rm B}(K) e^{iK r};$$
 (2)

where the vectors K belong to the reciprocal lattice. However, for alloys containing TM atom s, the strong scattering of sp electrons by TM atom s can not be described from a

weak potential. In this case, a generalised Friedel-Anderson ham iltonian [71] has been considered. In a non-magnetic case:

$$H = H_{sp} + H_{d} + H_{sp-d};$$
(3)

where sp states are delocalised nearly-free states (equation (1)) and d states are localised on d orbitals of TM atom s.  $H_d$  is the energy of d states. The term  $H_{sp-d}$  represents a spd coupling which is essential in this context. The eigenstates of H can be decom posed in two term s:

$$ji = j_{sp}i + j_{d}i;$$
(4)

where  $_{sp}$  and  $_{d}$  are each linear combinations of sp states and linear combinations of d orbitals of all TM atoms. The classical tight-binding approximation h  $_{sp}j_{d}i = 0$  is made.

An  $\$  ective Bragg potential" for sp states, including e ects of d orbitals of TM atom s, is calculated in order to analyse the e ect of TM atom s. A projection of the Schrodinger equation, (H E) j i = 0, on the sub-space generated by sp states allow s one to write the e ective ham iltonian for sp states:

$$H_{eff(sp)} = \frac{h^2 k^2}{2m} + V_{B,eff} \quad w \pm h \quad V_{B,eff} = V_{B} + H_{sp-d} \frac{1}{E - H_{d}} H_{sp-d}; \quad (5)$$

and where  $V_B$  is as given by equation (2). The second term of  $V_{B;eff}$  depends on energy. In crystals and quasicrystals,  $V_{B;eff}$  is an elective Bragg potential that takes into account the scattering of sp states by the strong potential of TM atom s.

#### 5.2. Characteristic of e ective Bragg potential

For the phases presently considered, there are a few pairs of M n atom s that are nearneighbours. Indeed each M n is surrounded by 10 A l (Si) and 2 M n (section 3). Therefore, a direct hoping between two d orbitals can be neglected. Thus:

$$H_{d} = \int_{d;i}^{A} E_{di} j d; i j d; i j d; j j;$$
(6)

where i is a TM site index and d the ved orbitals of each TM atom. Assuming that all TM atoms are equivalent, one has  $E_{di} = E_d$ . The Fourier coe cients of the elective Bragg potential  $V_{\text{B},\text{eff}}$  are calculated from  $H_{\text{eff}(\text{sp})}$  using the formula  $V_{\text{B},\text{eff}}$  (K) = hk  $H_{\text{eff}(\text{sp})}$  k K i. One obtains:

$$V_{B,eff}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{K}^{X} V_{B}(K) + \frac{\mathbf{j}_{K,K} \mathbf{j}}{E E_{d}} e^{iK \mathbf{r}_{i}} e^{iK \mathbf{r}_{i}} ;$$
(7)

where 
$$\mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{k};\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{j} = \int_{d=1}^{X^{5}} \mathbf{h} \mathbf{k} \mathbf{j}_{sp-d} \mathbf{j}_{0} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{h}_{0} \mathbf{j}_{1}_{sp-d} \mathbf{j}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{i};$$
 (8)

where  $r_i$  is the position of TM (i) atom s. By convention a TM atom with orbital  $d_0$  is on a site at  $r_0 = 0$ .  $t_{k,K}$  is a matrix element that couples sp states k and k K ivia sp-d hybridisation. The expression (7) is exact providing that a direct d-d coupling is neglected.

The potential of TM atom s is strong and creates d resonance of the wave function  $E_d +$ , where 2 is the width of the d resonance. In in an energy range E<sub>d</sub> Ε this energy range, the second term of equation (7) is essential as it does represent the ie<sup>iK</sup> r<sub>di</sub> di raction of the sp electrons by a network of d orbitals, i.e. the factor corresponding to the structure factor of the TM atom s sub-lattice. As the d band of M n is almost half lled,  $E_F ' E_d$ , this factor is in portant for energy close to  $E_F$ . Note that the Bragg planes associated with the second term of equation (7) correspond to B ragg planes determ ined by diraction. For phase, it can be concluded that  $V_B$  has no e ect on a pseudogap and on a phase stabilisation because of absences of pseudogap for DOS calculated for A hM n<sub>3</sub>Siw ithout sp-d hybridisation (gure 4(b)) and A hA hSi without M n atom s (qure 4 (c)). Let us note how ever that the H um e-R othery m echanism for alloying stillm in in izes the sp band energy due to a strong scattering of sp states by the M n sub-lattice.

In sum m ary, an analyse in term of e ective B ragg potential allows one to interpret LM TO results as hybridisation-induced pseudogap in total and sp DOSs which comes from a di raction of sp states by the sub-lattice of M n atom s via the sp-d hybridisation. In this context the medium range distance between TM atom s might have important role.

# 6. Role of indirect M n-M n pair interaction

#### 6.1. Medium range TM-TM interaction in Albased albys

As a Hume-Rothery stabilisation is a consequence of oscillations of charge density of valence electrons with energy close to  $E_F$  [72, 34, 73, 74, 36], a most stable atom ic structure is obtained when distances between atom s are multiples of the wavelength  $_F$  of electrons with energy close to  $E_F$ . Since the scattering of valence sp states by the M n sub-lattice is strong, the Friedel oscillations of charge of sp electrons around M n m ust have a strong e ect on a stabilisation. Taking into account that stabilisation occurs for a speci c M n-M n distance of 4.7 A [75]. A Hum e-Rothery mechanism in Al(rich)-TM compounds might be analysed in term of an indirect medium range TM -TM pair interaction resulting from a strong sp-d hybridisation. Zou and Carlsson [75, 76] have calculated this interaction from an Anderson model ham iltonian with two in purities, using a G reen's function method. A calculation of an indirect TM -TM pair interaction,

 $_{\rm TM} -_{\rm TM}$ , within a multiple scattering approach [66] yields a result in good agreement with this given in Ref. [75] (gure 7). M n-M n [75, 76] and Co-Co [77, 78] interactions have been used successfully form olecular-dynamics studies [79, 80] of A HM n and A HC o systems near the composition of quasicrystals.

As interaction magnitudes are larger for TM-TM than for A HTM and A HA l,  $_{\text{TM}}$   $_{\text{TM}}$  has a major e ect on the electronic energy. Because of the sharp Ferm isurface of A l, it asymptotic form at large TM-TM distance (r) is of the form :

$$_{\text{TM}}$$
  $_{\text{TM}}$  (r) /  $\frac{\cos(2k_{\text{F}} r)}{r^{3}}$ : (9)



Figure 7. Indirect (solid lines) M n-M n pair interaction  $M_{n-M,n}$  and (dashed line) Co-Co pair interaction  $C_{O-CO}$ . This interaction does not include the short range repulsive term between two TM atoms. TM atoms are non-magnetic.

The phase shift depends on the nature of the TM atom and varies from 2 to 0 as the d band lls. M agnitude of the m edium range interaction is larger for M n-M n than for other transition m etal (Cr, Fe, Co, Ni, Cu), because the number of d electrons close to  $E_F$  is the largest for M n, and the m ost delocalised electrons are electrons with Ferm i energy. From the gure 7 and equation (9), it is clear that distances corresponding to m inim a of TM -TM depend also on the nature of TM atom.

## 6.2. Contribution of the medium range Mn-Mn interaction to total energy

The \structural energy", E, of TM sub-lattice in Al(Si) host is de ned as the energy needed to built the TM sub-lattice in the metallic host that simulates Aland Siatom s from isolated TM atoms in the metallic host. E per unit cell is:

$$E = \sum_{\substack{i;j \ (j \in j)}}^{X} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{TM \to TM} (r_{ij}) e^{\frac{r_{ij}}{L}};$$
(10)

where i and j are index of TM atom and  $r_{ij}$ , TM (i)-TM (j) distances. L is the mean-free path of electrons due to scattering by static disorder or phonons [81]. L depends on the structural quality and temperature and can only be estimated to be larger than 10A. Note that a similar exponential damping factor was introduced originaly in the treatment of RKKY interaction [82, 72]. In the following, the elects of TM-TM pairs over distances larger than rst-neighbour distances is analysed. Therefore, an energy  $E^0$  is calculated from equation (10) without including rst-neighbour TM-TM terms in the sum .  $E^0$  is the part of the structural energy of TM sub-lattice that only com es from medium range distances.

Structural energies,  $E^0$ , of the Mn sub-lattice are shown for ALM n<sub>3</sub>Si and 'Al<sub>10</sub>Mn<sub>3</sub> structures in gure 8, where they are compared to those of oAl<sub>6</sub>Mn [83] and ALM n-Si approximants [11, 12].  $E^0$  are always negative with magnitudes less



Figure 8. Structural energy  $E^0$  of the Mn sub-lattice in (line) A  $hMn_3Si$ , (4) 'A  $h_0Mn_3$ , () o A  $hMn_4$ , () A  $hMn_5i$ , and () hypothetical A  $h_9Mn_{1:5}Su_{1:5}Si_{1:5}$ .

than 0.1 eV = TM atom, but strong enough to give a signi cant contribution to the band energy.

This result is in good agreement with an elect of M n sub-lattice on the pseudogap as shown previously (sections 4.4 and 5). A coording to a Humle-Rothery mechanism, one expects that a pseudogap is well pronounced for a large value of  $\pm^{0}$ j. Such a correlation is veried for the hypothetical A l\_M n<sub>1.5</sub>C u<sub>1.5</sub>Si (section 4.4) where the diminution of pseudogap in A l\_M n<sub>1.5</sub>C u<sub>1.5</sub>Si sp DOS (gure 6(b)) with respect to A l\_M n<sub>3</sub>Si sp DOS (gure 4(a)), corresponds to reduction of ( $\pm^{0}$ j) (gure 8).

# 6.3. Origin of the Vacancy

For structures containing serveral M n W ycko sites, the TM -TM pair interaction mediated by conduction states allows one to compare the relative stability of TM atoms on di erent W ycko sites. Considering a phase with a structural energy of the TM sub-lattice equal to E, the variation,  $E_{i}$ , of E is determined when one TM (i) atom is removed from the structure:

$$E_{i} = \sum_{\substack{\text{TM} - \text{TM} \\ i \text{ (if i)}}}^{X} (r_{ij}) e^{\frac{r_{ij}}{L}} :$$
(11)

TM atom s on di erent W ycko sites have di erent E <sub>i</sub> values that can be compared. The most stable M n sites correspond to highest E<sub>i</sub> values. Moreover, the energy reference is a TM imputity in the Al(Si) matrix which does not depend on the structure. Therefore, it is possible to compare E<sub>i</sub> calculated for di erent structures. A spreviously, the energy  $E_i^0$  is calculated from equation (11) without the rst-neighbour TM -TM contributions in order to analyse e ects at medium range order.

Considering the hypothetical  $A \downarrow M n_4$ Sibuilted from  $A \downarrow M n_3$ Si in which a M natom (M n (0)) replaces a vacancy (Va) in (2d), it appears that  $E_{M n (1)}^0 > E_{M n (0)}^0$  (gure 9). M n (0) in (2d) is therefore less stable than M n in (6h) for hypothetical  $A \downarrow M n_4$ Si,



Figure 9. Variation of the structural energy  $E_{i}^{0}$  due to Mn-Mn interaction for (simple line) Mn(0) in (2d) in the hypothetical Al<sub>2</sub>Mn<sub>4</sub>Si; for (4) Mn in (6h) in the hypothetical Al<sub>2</sub>Mn<sub>4</sub>Si; for () Mn(1) in (2b) in Al<sub>4:12</sub>Mn [3]; and for () Mn(1) in (2d) in Al<sub>4</sub>Mn [4]. Mn(1) in Al<sub>4:12</sub>Mn and Al<sub>4</sub>Mn have similar local environment as Mn(0) in hypothetical Al<sub>2</sub>Mn<sub>4</sub>Si.



Figure 10. Variation of the structural energy  $E_{i}^{0}$  due to Co-Co interaction in A  $l_{5}$ Co<sub>2</sub>.  $E_{i}^{0}$  is calculated for the two CoW ycko sites: (sim ple dashed line) Co(0) in (2d); (4) Co(1) in (6h).

thus justifying that a vacancy exists in  $\;$  phase. A similar result was obtained for ' A  $l_{10}M\;n_3$  .

On opposite, for complex crystals  $A l_{4:12}M n [\beta]$  and  $A l_4M n [4]$  containing a M n site (M n (1) in Refs [3, 4]) with similar local environment as Va (or M n (0)) in structure (section 3.2), the corresponding  $E_i^0$  values diers strongly from those of M n (0) in hypothetical  $A l_6M n_4$ Si. Thus M n (1) in and are more stable than an additional M n atom replacing the vacancy in and '. Moreover, both  $E_{Mn(1)}^0$  in and have the same order of magnitude as the  $E_i^0$  calculated for other M n (i) atoms in and ( and phases contain 10 and 15 M n W ycko sites respectively [3, 4]). Thus M n (1) in and is stable. Such a dierence between ,' and , can be interpreted in terms of

m edium range M n-M n distances with respect to the curve of gure 7: In ,' phases, environment of Va contains two M n at distance 3.8A (table 2), whereas the smallest M n (1)-M n distance is 4.8A in and phases. 3.8A corresponds to an unstable M n-M n distance whereas 4.8A corresponds to a stable one (gure 7).

For  $A \downarrow_{c} C \circ_{2}$  phase alm ost isom orphic of and ' phases, there is a C  $\circ$  site (C  $\circ$  (0)) corresponding to the vacancy of and ' (table 1). In this case  $E_{C \circ (0)}^{0}$ , calculated with a C  $\circ$ -C  $\circ$  pair interaction, is alm ost equal to  $E_{C \circ (1)}^{0}$  (gure 10). A  $\circ$  C  $\circ$  (0) in (2d) is as stable as C  $\circ$  (1) in (6h), it justi es why any vacancy does not exist in A  $\downarrow_{c} C \circ_{2}$ .

The present analysis on the origin of the vacancy in terms of TM-TM medium range interactions con ms the LMTO results (section 4.4). It shows the importance of TM-TM medium range indirect interaction on the atom ic structure.

#### 7. M agnetic properties

The presence of localised magnetic moments in quasicrystals and related phases containing M n is much debated [13, 47, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93]. Vacancies, M n pairs, triplets, quadruplets, quintuplets, variation of rst-neighbour distances around M n are often invoked to explain magnetic moments [94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 47, 92]. But in previous work [84, 99], it has been shown that an extrem e sensitivity of magnetic properties also comes from an e ect of an indirect M n-M n interaction mediated by sp states. Consequently an analysis limited to rst-neighbour environments is not su cient to interpret magnetic properties.

The unit cell of and ' phases contains two M n-triplets distant each other from from about 5A, and experimental measurements indicate that M n-triplets are nonmagnetic [89]. LM TO electronic structures calculated with polarised spin conmesthat M n triplets are non-magnetic in A  $l_{\rm M}$  M n<sub>3</sub>Si and ' A  $l_{\rm 10}$ M n. But from polarised spin LM TO calculation, performed on A  $l_{\rm M}$  N n<sub>15</sub>C u<sub>15</sub>Si phase where a Cu-triplet replaces one M n-triplet in each cell (section 4.4 (iii) and table 3), a magnetic moment equal to 1 <sub>B</sub> was found on each M n in A  $l_{\rm M}$  N n<sub>15</sub>C u<sub>15</sub>Si (i.e. 3 M n in M n-triplet are almost equivalent with a ferrom agnetic spin orientation). The energy of formation of magnetic moments in A  $l_{\rm M}$  N n<sub>15</sub>C u<sub>15</sub>Si is 0.046 eV per triplet. The Cu has no long range interaction as its d orbitals are full. Thus a medium range M n-M n interaction holds M ntriplets in non-magnetic state of a M n atom is very sensitive to surrounding M n atom s at a medium range distance up to 4.17A (table 3). The model of the spin polarised M n-M n interaction presented in Ref. [84] is in agreement with this LM TO result.

As explain in the literature [13, 86, 47, 90, 99], the occurrence of magnetic M n can be related to a reduction of pseudogap in the local M n paramagnetic DOS in A  $l_{\rm M}$  n<sub>1:5</sub>Cu<sub>1:5</sub>Si (gure 6(c)) by comparison with the local M n DOS in A  $l_{\rm M}$  n<sub>3</sub>Si (gure 3). However, the present study shows that a pseudogap in paramagnetic M n DOS does not only depend on the local environment of M n as it is also very sensitive to M n-M n medium range interaction (sections 4.4 (iii), 5.2 and 6.2).

# 8. Conclusion

From rst-principles calculations combined with a model ham iltonian approach, it is shown that a detailed analysis of the electronic structure allows one to explain the following features of  $A \lg M n_3 Si and ' A \lg M n_3$  structures:

The small amount of Siin A  $Mn_3$ Sistabilises its structure due to a shift of the Ferm i energy toward the minimum of the pseudogap in the DOS. An ab initio study shows that, at 0 K elvin, Siatom s are on a W ycko site dierent of those for A latom s.

A JM  $n_3$ Si and 'A  $l_{10}M$   $n_3$  are sp-d Hum e-Rothery phases. The transition m etal (TM) elements have a crucial e ect as sp electrons are scattered by an e ective B ragg potential dominated by the e ect of the Mn sub-lattice. Such a B ragg potential relates to an indirect Mn-Mn interaction which has a strong magnitude up to 5A and more.

An analysis in terms of medium range TM-TM interactions gives theoretical arguments to understand the origin of a large vacancy existing in A  $hMn_3Si$  and 'A  $h_0Mn_3$ , whereas similar sites are occupied by Mn in A  $l_{4:12}Mn$  and A  $l_4Mn$ , and by Co in A  $h_5Co_2$ .

Finally, in A  $\lg M$  n<sub>3</sub>Si and 'A  $\lg_0 M$  n<sub>3</sub>, the Hume-Rothery minimization of band energy leads to a \frustration" mechanism which favours a complex atom ic structure. The M n sub-lattice appears to be the skeleton of the stucture via a medium range indirect interactions between M n atom s in the Almatrix. As and 'structures are related to those of quasicrystals, it suggests that Hume-Rothery stabilisation, expressed in term s of M n-M n interactions, is intrinsically linked to the emergence of quasiperiodic structures in A 1(Si)-M n system s.

#### A cknow ledgm ents

I am very grateful to D.M ayou with whom m any ideas of this work have been developed. I thank also F.H ippert, D.N guyen-M anh, R.Bellissent, V.Sim onet and J.J.P rejean for fruitful discussions. M y thanks to M.Audier from stimulating discussions and carefull reading of this paper.

#### References

Robinson K 1952 Acta Cryst. 5 397
 Taylor M A 1959 Acta Cryst. 12 393
 Shoem aker C B, Keszler D A, Shoem aker D P 1989 Acta Cryst. 45 13
 Kreinier G, Franzen H F 1997 J. Albys Comp. 261 83
 New kirk J B, B lack P J, D am janovic A 1961 Acta Cryst. 14 532
 Song S, Ryba E R 1992 Phil. M ag. Lett. 65 85

[7] Shechtm an D, Blech I, Gratias D, Cahn JW 1984 Phys. Rev. Lett. 53 1951

- [8] Berger C 1994 Lecture on Quasicrystals ed F H ippert and D G ratias (Les U lis: Les Editions de Physique) p 463
- [9] Hamerlin M, Maâmar S, Fries S, Lukas H L 1984 Z. Metallkd. 85 814
- [10] Cooper M, Robinson K 1966 Acta Cryst. 20 614
- [11] Guyot P, Audier M 1985 Philos. Mag. B 52 L15
- [12] ElserV, Henley C L 1985 Phys. Rev. Lett. 55 2883
- [13] Tram bly de Laissardiere G, Nguyen M anh D, M ayou D 1993 Europhys. Lett. 21 25
- [14] Tram bly de Laissardiere G, Nguyen M anh D, M agaud L, Julien J P, Cyrot-Lackm ann F, M ayou D 1995 Phys. Rev. B 52 7920 (1995)
- [15] Hum e-Rothery W , Raynor G V 1954 The Structure of M etals and Albys (London: Institute of M etals)
- [16] Raynor G V, Waldron M B 1949 Phil. Mag. 40 198
- [17] Douglas A M B 1950 Acta Cryst. 3 19
- [18] NicolA D I 1953 Acta Crys. 6 285
- [19] Raynor G V 1949 Progr. Met. Phys. 1 1
- [20] Hum e-Rothery W , Coles B R 1954 Adv. Phys. 3 149
- [21] Friedel J, Denoyer F 1987, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. II 305 171
- [22] Friedel J 1988 Helv. Phys. Acta 61 538
- [23] Sm ith A P, Ashcroft N W 1987 Phys. Rev. Lett. 59 1365
- [24] Fujiwara T 1989 Phys. Rev. B 40 942;
   Fujiwara T, Yam am oto S, Tram bly de Laissardiere G 1993 Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 4166
- [25] TsaiA P, Inoue A, M asum oto T 1991 Sci. Rep. Ritu. A 36 99
- [26] Fujiwara T, Yokokawa T 1991 Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 333
- [27] Hafner J, Krajc M 1992 Europhys. Lett. 17 145
- [28] M ayou D 1994 Lecture on Quasicrystals ed F H ippert and D G ratias (Les U lis: Les E ditions de Physique) p 417
- [29] Gratias D, Calvayrac Y, Devaud-Rzepski J, Faudot F, Harmelin M, Quivy A, Bancel PA 1993 J. Non Cryst. Solid 153-154 482
- [30] Hippert F, Brand R A, Pelloth J, Calvayrac Y 1994 J. Phys.: Condens. M atter 6 11189
- [31] Sato H, TakeuchiT, M izutaniU 2001 Phys. Rev. B 64 094207
- [32] M izutaniU, TakeuchiT, Banno E, Fourmee V, Takata M, Sato H 2001 Q uasicrystals ed Belin-Ferre E, ThielPA, TsaiAP and Urban K (W arrendale: M aterials Research Society) M ater. Res. Soc. Sym p. Proc. Vol. 643 p K 13.1
- [33] T saiA P, Inoue A, M asum oto T 1989 M ater. Trans. JIM 30 300; 30 463
- [34] MassalskiT B, MizutaniU 1978 Prog. Mater. Sci. 22 151
- [35] Paxton A T, M ethfesselM, Pettifor D G 1997 Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 453 1493
- [36] Pettifor D G 2000 The Science of Alloys for the 21st Century. A Hume-Rothery Symposium ed P E A Turchi, R D Shull and A Gonis, TM S, 121
- [37] Friedel J 1992 Philos. M ag. B 65 1125
- [38] Belin-Ferre, Tram bly de Laissardiere G, Pêcheur P, Sadoc A, Dubois JM 1997 J. Phys.: Condens. M atter 9 9585
- [39] M oriM , M atsuo S, Ishim asa T, M atsuura T, K am iya K, InokuchiH, M atsukawa T 1991 J. Phys.: C ondens. M atter 3 767
- [40] Belin E, Kojnok J, Sadoc A, Traverse A, Hannelin M, Berger C, Dubois JM 1992 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 4 1057
- [41] Belin E, Dankhazi Z, Sadoc A, Dubois JM, Calvayrac Y 1994 Europhys. Lett. 26 677
- [42] Belin E, Dankhazi Z, Sadoc A, Dubois JM 1994 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 6 8771
- [43] Stadnik Z M, Purdie D, Baer Y, Lograsso T A 2001 Phys. Rev. B 64 214202
- [44] Fournee V, Belin-Ferre E, Pécheur P, Tobala J, Dankhazi Z, Sadoc A, Muller H 2002 J Phys.: Condens. M atter 14 87
- [45] Tram bly de Laissardiere G, Fujiwara T 1994 Phys. Rev. B 50 5999

- [46] Krajc M, Windisch M, Hafner J, Kresse G, Mihalkovic M 1995 Phys. Rev. B 51 17355
- [47] Hafner J, Krajc M 1998 Phys. Rev. B 57 2849
- [48] Stadnik Z M, Zhang G W, TsaiA P, Inoue A 1995 Phys. Rev. B 51 11358; Phys. Lett. A 198 237
- [49] Stadnik Z M, Purdie D, Garnier M, Baer Y, Tsai A P, Inoue A, Edagawa K, Takeuchi S, Buschow K H J 1997 Phys. Rev. B 55 10938
- [50] Belin-Ferre E, Dankhazi Z, Fournee V, Sadoc A, Berger C, Muller H, Kirchmayr H 1996 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 8 6213
- [51] Tram bly de Laissardiere G, Fujiwara T 1994 Phys. Rev. B 50 9843; Mat. Sci. Eng. A 181-182 722
- [52] Sabiryanov RF, Bose Sk, Burkov SE 1995 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 7 5437
- [53] Krajc M, Hafner J, Mihalkovic M 1997 Phys. Rev. B 62 243
- [54] Krajc M, Hafner J, Mihalkovic M 1997 Phys. Rev. B 55 843
- [55] Kreiner G, Franzen H F 1995 J. Albys Comp. 221 15
- [56] Khare V, Tiwari R S, Srivastava O N 2001 Mat. Sci. Eng. 304-306 839
- [57] Quivy A, Quiquandon M, Calvayrac, Faudot F, Gratias D, Berger C, Brand R A, Sim onet V, H ippert F 1996 J. Phys.: Condens. M atter 8 4223
- [58] TakeuchiT, Yam ada H, Takata M, Nakata T, Tanaka N, M izutaniU 2000 M at. Sci. Eng. 294-296 340
- [59] Tamura R, Asao T, Takeuchi S 2001 Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 3104
- [60] von Barth U , Hedin L 1972 J. Phys. C 5 1629
- [61] Andersen O K 1975 Phys. Rev. B 12 3060; Andersen O K, Jepsen O, G botzel 1985 Highlights of Condensed M atter Theory ed F Bassani, F Fum i and M P Tosi (New York: North-Holland)
- [62] Skriver H L 1984 The LM TO Method (New York: Springer)
- [63] Jepsen O, Andersen O K 1971 Solid State Commun. 9 1763
- [64] Dankhazi Z, Tram bly de Laissardiere G, Nguyen-M anh D, Belin E, M ayou D 1993 J. Phys.: Condens. M atter 9 3339
- [65] M ayou D 2000 Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 1290
- [66] Tram bly de Laissardiere G, M ayou M 1997 Phys. Rev. B 55 2890
- [67] Gratias D, Puyrain ond F, Quiquandon M, Katz A 2000 Phys. Rev. B 63 24202
- [68] Dolinsek J, K lanjæk M, Apih T, Smontara A, Lasjaunias JC, Dubois JM, Poon S J 2000 Phys. Rev. B 62 8862
- [69] Zijlstra E S, Janssen T 2000 Europhys. Lett. 52 578
- [70] Nguyen M anh D, Tram bly de Laissardiere G, Julien JP, M ayou D, Cyrot-Lackm ann F 1992 Solid State Commun. 82 329
- [71] Anderson P W 1961 Phys. Rev. 124 41
- [72] B landin A 1963 A lbying B ehaviour and E ects of C ondentrated Solid Solutions ed T B M assalski
   (N ew York: G ordon and B reach);
  - Blandin A 1967 Phase Stability in Metals and Alloys ed P S Rudman, J Stringer, R I Ja ee (New York: MoG raw-Hill);
  - Blandin A 1980 Physics-Bulletin 31 93
- [73] Hafner J, von Heim endahll 1979 Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 386
- [74] Hafner J 1987 From Ham iltonians to Phase D iagrams (Berlin: Springer Verlag)
- [75] Zou J, Carlsson A E 1993 Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 3748
- [76] Zou J, Carlsson A E 1994 Phys. Rev. B 50 99
- [77] Phillips R, Zou J, Carlsson A E, W idom M 1994 Phys. Rev. B 49 9322
- [78] Moriarty JA, Widom M 1997 Phys. Rev. B 56 7905
- [79] M ihalkovic M, Zhu W J, Henley C L, Phillips R 1996 phys. Rev. B 53 9021
- [80] M ihalkovic M, Elhor H, Suck J B 2001 Phys. Rev. B 63 214301
- [81] Babic E, Krsnik R, Leontic B, Vucic Z, Zoric I, Rizzuto C 1971 Phys. Rev. Lett. 27 805
- [82] de Gennes P G 1962 J. Phys. Radium 23 630
- [83] Villars P, Calvert L D 1991 Pearson's Handbook of Crystallographic Data for interm etallic Phases

(American Society of Metals, Materials Park, OH) Vol1

- [84] Tram bly de Laissardiere G, M ayou D 2000 Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 3273
- [85] Berger C, Prejean J J 1990 Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 1769;
  - Chemikov M A, Bemasconi A, Beeli C, Schilling A, Ott H R 1993 Phys. Rev. B 48 3058; Lasjaunias JC, Sulpice A, Keller N, Prejean JJ 1995 Phys. Rev. B 52 886
- [86] Bratkovsky A M, Smirnov A V, Nguyen-M anh D, Pasturel A 1995 Phys. Rev. B 52 3056
- [87] Bahadur D 1997 Prog. CrystalG rowth and Charact. 34 287
- [88] Hippert F, Audier M, Klein H, Bellissent R, Boursier D 1996, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76 54
- [89] Sim onet V, Hippert F, Audier M, Tram bly de Laissardiere G 1998 Phys. Rev. B 58 8865 (R)
- [90] Krajc M, Hafner J 1998 Phys. Rev. 58 14110
- [91] Sim onet V, Hippert F, Klein H, Audier M, Bellissent R, Fischer H, Murani A P, Boursier D 1998 Phys Rev. B 58 6273
- [92] Hippert F, Sim onet V, Tram bly de Laissardiere G, Audier M, Y. Calvayrac Y 1999 J. Phys.: Cond. M at. 11 10419
- [93] Prejean JJ, Berger C, Sulpice A, Calvayrac Y 2002 Phys. Rev. B 65 140203 (R)
- [94] CooperJR, Miljak M 1976 J. Phys. F 6 2151
- [95] Hoshino T, Zeller R, Dederichs P H, W einert M 1993 Europhys. Lett. 24 495;
   Hoshino T, Zeller R, Dederichs P H, A sada T 1996 J. Magn. Magn. Mater 156–158 717
- [96] Guenzburger D, Ellis D E 1991 Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 3832
- [97] Guenzburger D, Ellis D E 1994 Phys. Rev. B 49 6004
- [98] Sche er M, Suck J B 2000 M at. Sci. Eng. A 294-296 629
- [99] Tram bly de Laissardiere G, M ayou D 2000 M at. Sci. Eng. A 294-296 621