

Electronic Structure of transition metals Fe, Ni and Cu in the GW approximation

Atsushi Yamasaki Takeo Fujiwara^Y

Department of Applied Physics, University of Tokyo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656

(Received October 4, 2002)

The quasiparticle band structures of 3d transition metals, ferromagnetic Fe, Ni and paramagnetic Cu, are calculated by the GW approximation. The width of occupied 3d valence band, which is overestimated in the LSDA, is in good agreement with experimental observation. However the exchange splitting and satellite in spectra are not reproduced and it is required to go beyond the GW approximation. The effects of static screening and dynamical correlation are discussed in detail in comparison with the results of the static COHSEX approximation. The dynamical screening effects are important for band width narrowing.

KEYWORDS: Density functional theory, GW approximation, LMTO, product-basis, transition metal, dynamical screening

1. Introduction

Lattice structure, lattice constants and bulk moduli in 3d transition metal are well described by the local-spin-density approximation (LSDA)^{1,2)} or the generalized gradient approximation (GGA).^{3,4)} However, the occupied 3d band width is too broad, and the exchange splitting is overestimated. The good agreement is essentially related with the property of the ground-state, and the discrepancies are associated with excitation properties.

The GW approximation (GWA) is based on the many-body perturbation theory⁵⁽⁷⁾ and can describe the quasiparticle property. The self-energy of GWA is the first term in a series expansion of dynamical correlation and it is treated by the random-phase approximation (RPA).

The plane wave basis set based on the pseudopotential method is used in many GW calculations. In simple metals and semiconductors, the single plasmon peak is often assumed within the plane wave framework (the plasmon pole approximation).⁸⁾ However the plasmon peak of transition metal cannot be well-defined isolated peak due to interband transition in the same energy region. The transition metal has strong atomic potential for 3d electrons, the 3d orbital is localized and the plane wave formalism cannot be applied. Moreover it is essentially important to include core electrons in many cases. Therefore the plasmon peak approximation is not applicable to the dielectric function of transition metals and all-electron calculation and localized orbital basis set are needed.

In this paper, the GW method based on the linear muffin-tin orbital (LMTO) method⁹⁾ and the product-basis method¹⁰⁾ are applied to the series of transition metal. There is a numerical difficulty in the k-point summation of self-energy with the momentum transfer $q = 0$. This summation is treated by the offset method,¹¹⁾ and test calculation of the exchange energy in the electron gas is performed. The paper is organized as follows. The theoretical framework is described in §2. The numerical

technique and test calculation of electron gas are also given in this section. The results for these systems and detailed discussion are presented in §3. Finally, in §4 we present our summary.

2. Theory

2.1 GW approximation

In the GWA the self-energy is replaced by the lowest order term of the expansion as $\Sigma(1;2) = iG(1;2)W(1;2)$. G is the one particle Green function and the dynamically screened interaction W is defined by

$$W(1;2) = \frac{1}{\epsilon(1;2)} v(1;2) + \frac{1}{\epsilon(1;2)} \int d3 d4 v(1;3) \epsilon^{-1}(3;4) W(4;2); \quad (1)$$

where ϵ^{-1} is the inverse dynamical dielectric function, v is the bare Coulomb potential and ϵ^0 is the irreducible polarization function $\epsilon^0(1;2) = iG(1;2)G(2;1)$. Here we use an abbreviated notation $(1) = (r_1; t_1)$ and $v(1;2) = v(r_1; r_2) \delta(t_1 - t_2)$. Equation (2) is treated by the RPA.

We adopt the LSDA Hamiltonian to be the unperturbed one $H^0 = T + V^H + V_{LSDA}^{xc}$. Here T is the kinetic energy, V^H is the Hartree potential, and V_{LSDA}^{xc} is the exchange-correlation potential in the LSDA. We presume the wavefunctions $\phi_{kn}(r)$ of the LSDA to be a reasonably good starting wavefunctions. Then the self-energy can be written by three terms as $\Sigma = \Sigma^x + \Sigma^c + \Sigma^d$, where $\Sigma^x (= iGv)$ is the exchange part (the Fock term) and $\Sigma^c (= iGW^c)$ is the dynamical correlation part. W^c is the second term in eq.(2). The quasiparticle energy is given as

$$E_{kn} = \epsilon_{kn} + \Sigma_{kn}(k_n); \quad (3)$$

where ϵ_{kn} is the LSDA eigenvalue. The self-energy is $\Sigma_{kn}(k_n) = \langle \phi_{kn} | \Sigma^x + \Sigma^c | \phi_{kn} \rangle$ and the renormalization factor is $Z_{kn} = (1 - \partial \Sigma_{kn}(k_n) / \partial \epsilon_{kn})^{-1}$. The renormalization factor Z_{kn} is a measure of the occupation number and should equal to the discontinuity of occupation number at the Fermi energy. Therefore

Present address: Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany. E-mail: A.Yamasaki@fkf.mpg.de

^Y E-mail address: fujiwara@coral.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp




Fig. 2. The energy bands of Fe, Ni and Cu, calculated by the LSDA (dotted lines) and the GW A (solid lines) along high symmetric lines. The closed circles are the calculated points in the GW A. In Fe and Ni, left side and right side show minority spin and majority spin, respectively. The high symmetric points are $\Gamma = (0;0;0)$, $H = (1;0;0)$, $N = (1/2;1/2;0)$ and $P = (1/2;1/2;1/2)$ in bcc lattice (Fe), and $L = (1/2;1/2;1/2)$, $\Gamma = (0;0;0)$ and $X = (1;0;0)$ in fcc lattice (Ni and Cu). Fermi energy is set to zero. ($E_F = 0$)

The occupied 3d valence band width of transition metals Fe, Ni and Cu in the LSDA is overestimated in comparison with experimental observation, especially in Ni. The valence band width is in reasonably agreement with experiment in the GW A. In Fig. 3, the band narrowing occurs in the occupied valence band of both the majority and the minority spin in Fe and Ni. But the width of unoccupied 3d band of Fe is unchanged in the GW A. The source of band narrowing is the screening for the valence electrons. In the spectral function of the GW A, the plasmon-like excitation appears around 30 eV above and below the Fermi energy and also the long tail extends over wide lower energy region. The intensity of spectrum is totally suppressed by the excitations in wide energy region. The intensity of the GW spectrum is actually reduced by a factor of $Z_{d\downarrow}$ and, in Fig. 3, the reduction factor is $Z_{d\downarrow} = 0.5$ (0.6). In the Hartree Fock (HF) approximation which includes no screening effects, the band width is overestimated. No screening in the HF gives zero density of states at the Fermi level in the electron gas and also gives overestimated band gap in insulators and semiconductors. In the static COHSEX approximation, which includes static screening, the band width is much smaller than the HF results, and is almost the same as the one in the LSDA or still wider. Moreover the 4s state is located too much deep because it exists far from Fermi level. The band width in the GW A is in good agreement with experiment. We can see that the dynamical correlation effect is important for the band width in the transition metals from the comparison between the GW A and the static COHSEX approximation.

The magnetic moment μ_{spin} of Fe and Ni is almost the same as the result of LSDA and is in good agreement with experiment. The difference of the exchange splitting E_{ex} between the LSDA and experiments in Fe (30%) is smaller than that in Ni (50%). E_{ex} of Fe becomes close to the experimental value in the GW A. In Ni, the discrepancy of E_{ex} is not improved by the GW A. In the HF, E_{ex} is overestimated. The screening effects of correlation term Σ^c in the GW A or the static COHSEX approximation reduce E_{ex} of HF. However

the GW A only includes long-range correlation effects, and cannot describe short-range effects such as electron-electron or hole-hole scattering process. Higher order diagrams (e.g. vertex corrections) is needed for electron-electron and hole-hole scattering. Especially two-hole bound states are very important to the exchange splitting and the satellite structure of spectrum if on-site Coulomb interaction between d electrons is large.^{27,28)} The effective Coulomb interaction is obtained from an analysis of Auger spectra, Ni is $U = 4.0$ eV and Fe is $U = 1.0$ eV.²⁹⁾ The discrepancy between experiments and the GW A in Ni is caused by the short-range correlation effects from large U . The clear satellite in Ni can be also explained, and the GW A cannot reproduce it. Since the 3d band is full in Cu, there is no hole-hole correlation and the GW A can work quite well.

The renormalization factor of transition metal 3d states is $Z = 0.52$ (0.58) in Fe, $Z = 0.48$ (0.53) in Ni and $Z = 0.53$ (0.56) in Cu. Z of 4s states is about 0.7 (0.8) in these systems. Those results of the renormalization factor show that the interaction between 3d electrons is large, and the correlation in Ni is strongest, which is consistent with the large Coulomb interaction U .

The static screened d-d Coulomb interaction $h_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}^c$ ($l = 0$) $j_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}$ is calculated to be about 1.4 eV, 1.2 eV and 3.9 eV in Fe, Ni and Cu, respectively. The bare Coulomb interaction $h_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}^0 j_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}$ is actually 23.7 eV, 25.9 eV, and 27.4 eV in Fe, Ni and Cu. This value becomes larger with increasing the number of 3d occupation. Then the correlation term $h_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}^c j_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}$ ($l = 0$) $j_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}$ is 22.3 eV, 24.7 eV and 23.5 eV in Fe, Ni and Cu. Therefore, the correlation effects and the static screening are quite important in transition metals. The screened correlation of Ni is largest and this is consistent with the smallest Z in these systems. We should mention that the d-d Coulomb interaction $h_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}^0 j_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}$ is different from the Hubbard U evaluated from the constrained LSDA, which includes only screening by on-site d electrons. The term $h_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}^0 j_{d\downarrow d\uparrow}$ includes the screening effects by both on-site and off-site electrons.³⁰⁾

In the transition metals, the Hubbard U parameter is




Fig. 3. The spectral function $A(\omega)$ in the transition metals Fe, Ni and Cu by the GWA (bottom), the LSDA (middle) and the static COHSEX approximation (top). In Fe and Ni, the solid lines show majority spin and the dotted lines show minority spin, respectively.

overestimated within the constrained LSDA, for example ~ 6 eV for Fe, due to incomplete metallic screening in the LSDA.³¹⁾ We should mention that our value of Ni with our set method is smaller than the previous estimate ($\hbar\omega_d/\omega(0) = 2.2$ eV).³⁰⁾ The discrepancy may be caused by the absence of the present set method since we also obtained the value without the set method similarly to be previous one.

4. Summary

In this paper the GW approximation is applied to ferromagnetic transition metals Fe and Ni, and paramagnetic Cu. We showed that the occupied 3d band width of transition metal is improved within our GW calculation.

We also investigated the effects of dynamical screening by comparison between the GWA and the static COHSEX approximation and showed the crucial role of the dynamical correlation for band width.

The self-energy is discussed systematically. The renormalization factor Z showed that the interaction between d-electrons in Ni is larger than that in Fe, and this is consistent with the interaction strength from Auger spectra.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank to F. Aryasetiawan for fruitful discussions and suggestions. We also thank to T. Kotani for useful suggestion about the our set method. This work is supported by Grant-in-Aid for COE Research "Spin-Charge-Photon", and Grant-in-Aid from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture. Part of the present calculation has been done by use of the facilities of the Supercomputer Center, Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo.

- 1) P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn: Phys. Rev. 136 (1964) B864.
- 2) W. Kohn and L. J. Sham: Phys. Rev. 140 (1965) A1133.
- 3) J. P. Perdew and Y. Wang: Phys. Rev. B 45 (1992) 13244.
- 4) J. P. Perdew, J. A. Chevary, S. H. Vosko, K. A. Jackson, M. R. Pederson, D. H. Singh and C. Fiolhais: Phys. Rev. B 46 (1992) 6671.
- 5) L. Hedin and S. Lundqvist: Solid State Physics, ed. H. Ehrenreich, F. Seitz, and D. Turnbull (Academic Press, New York, 1969) Vol. 23, P.1.
- 6) L. Hedin: Phys. Rev. 139 (1965) A796.
- 7) F. Aryasetiawan and O. Gunnarsson: Rep. Prog. Phys. 61 (1998) 237.
- 8) M. S. Hybertsen and S. G. Louie: Phys. Rev. B 34 (1986) 5390.
- 9) O. K. Andersen: Phys. Rev. B 12 (1975) 3060.
- 10) F. Aryasetiawan and O. Gunnarsson: Phys. Rev. B 49 (1994) 16214.
- 11) T. Kotani and M. van Schilfegaarde: private communications.
- 12) Recently fully self-consistent GW calculation is applied to K and Si in following paper. [W. D. Schone and A. G. Eguiluz: Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 1662.] It gives wider band width in K or overestimated band gap in Si. This procedure maintain the conservation laws of particle number, energy and momentum. However such treatment cannot guarantee better agreement with experimental results.
- 13) A. Yamasaki and T. Fujiwara: Phys. Rev. B 66 (2002) 245108.
- 14) R. W. G. Wyckoff: Crystal Structures (Wiley, New York, 1963).
- 15) F. Aryasetiawan: Phys. Rev. B 46 (1992) 13051.
- 16) M. B. Stearns: Magnetic Properties in Metals, ed. H. P. J. Wijn and Landolt-Bornstein (Springer, Berlin, 1984) New Series, Vol. III, Pt. 19a.
- 17) D. Bonnenker, K. A. Hempel and H. P. J. Wijn: Magnetic Properties in Metals, ed. H. P. J. Wijn and Landolt-Bornstein (Springer, Berlin, 1984) New Series, Vol. III, Pt. 19a.
- 18) A. M. Turner, A. W. D. Onoho and J. L. Erskine: Phys. Rev. B 29 (1984) 2986.
- 19) A. Santoni and F. J. Himpsel: Phys. Rev. B 43 (1991) 1305.
- 20) D. E. Eastman, F. J. Himpsel and J. A. Knapp: Phys. Rev. Lett. 44 (1980) 95.
- 21) R. Raue and H. Hopster: Z. Phys. B 54 (1984) 121.
- 22) R. E. Kirby, E. Kisker, F. K. King and E. L. Garwin: Solid State Commun. 56 (1985) 425.
- 23) H. Hochst, A. Goldmann and S. Hufner: Z. Phys. B 24 (1976) 245.
- 24) H. Hochst, A. Goldmann and S. Hufner: Phys. Lett. 57A (1976) 265.
- 25) H. Hochst, A. Goldmann and S. Hufner: Z. Phys. B 26 (1977) 133.
- 26) P. Steiner, S. Hufner, A. J. Freeman and D. S. Wang: Solid State Commun. 44 (1982) 619.
- 27) D. R. Penn: Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 921.
- 28) A. Liebsch: Phys. Rev. B 23 (1981) 5203.
- 29) E. Antonides, E. C. Janse and G. A. Sawatzky: Phys. Rev. B 15 (1977) 1669.
- 30) M. Springer and F. Aryasetiawan: Phys. Rev. B 57 (1998) 4364.
- 31) V. I. Anisimov and O. Gunnarsson: Phys. Rev. B 43 (1991) 7570.