### E lectronic Structure of transition m etals Fe, N i and C u in the G W approxim ation

AtsushiYamasaki Takeo Fujiwara <sup>y</sup>

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

(Received October 4, 2002)

The quasiparticle band structures of 3d transition m etals, ferrom agnetic Fe, N i and param – agnetic 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. How – ever the exchange splitting and satellite in spectra are not reproduced and it is required to go beyond the GW approximation. The elects of static screening and dynamical correlation are discussed in detail in comparison with the results of the static COHSEX approximation. The dynamical screening elects 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 localspin-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 manybody perturbation theory<sup>5(7)</sup> and can describe the quasiparticle property. The self-energy of GWA is the rst 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 sem iconductors, the single plasm on peak is often assumed within the plane wave framework (the plasm on pole approximation).<sup>8)</sup> However the plasm on peak of transition metal cannot be well-de ned isolated peak due to interband transition in the same energy region. The transition metal has strong atom ic potential for 3d electrons, the 3d orbital is localized and the plane wave form alism cannot be applied. Moreover it is essentially important to include core electrons in many cases. Therefore the plasm on 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 mu n-tin orbital (LMTO) method<sup>9)</sup> and the productbasis method<sup>10)</sup> are applied to the series of transition metal. There is a numerical di culty in the k-point sum – mation of self-energy with the momentum transfer q = 0. This summation is treated by the o set method<sup>11)</sup> 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 x 2. The numericaltechnique and test calculation of electron gas are also given in this section. The results for these systems and detailed discussion are presented in x 3. Finally, in x 4 we present our sum m ary.

### 2. Theory

#### 2.1 GW approximation

7.

In the GWA the self-energy is replaced by the lowest order term of the expansion as (1;2) = iG(1;2)W(1;2). G is the one particle G reen function and the dynam ically screened interaction W is de ned by

$$W (1;2) = d(3)^{-1} (1;3)v(3;2)$$
(1)  
Z

$$= v(1;2) + d(34)v(1;3)^{-0}(3;4)W(4;2); (2)$$

where <sup>1</sup> is the inverse dynam ical dielectric function, v is the bare C oulom b potential and <sup>0</sup> is the irreducible polarization function <sup>0</sup>(1;2) = iG (1;2)G (2;1). Here we use an abbreviated notation (1) =  $(r_1; _1; t_1)$  and  $v(1;2) = v(r_1; r_2)$  ( $t_1 = t_2$ ). Equation (2) is treated by the RPA.

We adopt the LSDA Ham iltonian to be the unperturbed one H<sup>0</sup> = T + V<sup>H</sup> + V<sup>xc</sup><sub>LSDA</sub>. Here T is the kinetic energy, V<sup>H</sup> is the Hartree potential, and V<sup>xc</sup><sub>LSDA</sub> is the exchange-correlation potential in the LSDA. We presume the wavefunctions f<sub>kn</sub> (r)g of the LSDA to be a reasonably good starting wavefunctions. Then the self-energy can be written by three term sas = <sup>x</sup> + <sup>c</sup> V<sup>xc</sup><sub>LSDA</sub>; where <sup>x</sup> (= iG v) is the exchange part (the Fock term) and <sup>c</sup> (= iG W<sup>c</sup>) is the dynam ical correlation part. W<sup>c</sup> is the second term in eq.(2). The quasiparticle energy is given as

$$E_{kn} = _{kn} + Z_{kn} _{kn} (_{kn});$$
 (3)

where  $_{kn}$  is the LSDA eigenvalue. The self-energy is  $_{kn}(_{kn}) = h_{kn}j^{x} + {}^{c}(_{kn}) V_{LSDA}^{xc}j_{kn}i$  and the renorm alization factor is  $Z_{kn} = (1 \ @ _{kn}(_{kn})=@!)^{1}$ . The renorm alization factor  $Z_{kn}$  is a measure of the occupation number and should equal to the discontinuity of occupation number at the Ferm i energy. Therefore

Present address: Max-Planck-Institut fur Festkorperforschung,

D -70569 Stuttgart, G erm any. E -m ail: A Yam asaki@ fkfm pg.de <sup>y</sup> E -m ail address: fu jiw ara@ coral.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp




Fig. 1. Exchange energy S (y) of the electron gas as a function of  $y = k = k_F$ . The solid lines for the exact result, the open triangles for the sim ple sum mation and the closed circles for the o set method. The numbers of the mesh points in the Brillouin zone are (a) 64 = (4 4 4) and (b) 512 = (8 8 8).

it should satisfy the condition  $Z_{kn}$  1. In the present work we perform one iteration calculation without self-consistency.<sup>12)</sup>

### 2.2 LM TO m in im al basis set and product-basis

Because the plane wave basis becomes very costly for system s containing 3d electrons, the LM TO method<sup>9)</sup> is more appropriate. We use the LM TO basis set  $_{\rm R\,L}$  (r) within the atom ic sphere approximation (ASA) for the LSDA calculation. Here L is angler momentum L = (l; m). The LM TO can be expanded by the mu n-tin orbital  $_{\rm R\,L}$  (r) and it's energy derivative  $_{-\rm R\,L}$  (r).

The functional space of basis for is spanned as

$$f g = f g = f g = f g + f -g + f -g : (4)$$

In fact the mixing coe cients of -to are less than 0:1 for the most part and the norm of -, h—i, is 0:1 0:3 even in the largest case, so the term s including -can be dropped out. M ore detailed description is shown in ref. 13.

### 2.3 Num erical technique

The C oulom b m atrix v(q) has a singularity at q = 0 as F (q) = 1=jqf. The integration of v(q) over the B rillouin zone does not diverge but special cares are needed not only for the q = 0 term but for small nite q. For a choice of the discrete points near q = 0, we use the o set -point m ethod<sup>11</sup>, where the integration of F (q) over the B rillouin zone can be perform ed analytically and the o setted points Q 's are chosen near q = 0 so as to satisfy a relation

Here k's are the discrete mesh points in the Brillouin zone.

The exchange energy of the electron gas system is given as a function of a wave vector k as (k) =

 $1 + \frac{1 y^2}{2y} \ln \frac{1+y}{1-y}$ ,  $y = \frac{k}{k_{\rm E}}$  $\frac{e^2 k_F}{2}$  S (y), where S (y) = and k<sub>F</sub> is the Ferm i wave vector. The empty lattice calculation is done with spdf orbitals in the LM TO method. W e calculate the exchange energy of the electron gas in a fcc lattice with a lattice constant  $a = 6.824a_0$  which corresponds to the fcc copper and  $a_0$  is the Bohr radius. The corresponding electron gas parameter is  $r_s = 2.6668$ . The calculated S (y), by the sim ple sum m ation, by the o set m ethod and by the exact S (y), are shown in Fig.1. In the simple summation, the diverging term 1=jqf is simply averaged inside a sphere of a volume equal to that of one k-mesh point. The number of k-mesh of the Brillouin-zone in the calculation is (a) 64 points 4) and (b) 512 points (8 8 8). In case of 4 (4 512 points of these structure, eight o setted points Q are  $\frac{2}{2}$  (0:038; 0:038; 0:038). The derivative of S (y) has a logarithm ic singularity at the Ferm ienergy (y = 1). Unphysical gap still remains at the Fermi energy in the simple summation of these examples. A large number of k points is necessary for a convergence in the sim ple summation. But the o set method can reduce the num ber of k point for rapid convergence even in case of sm all num ber of m esh points. The careful treatm ent of the C oulom b m atrix at or near q = 0 is very crucial near the band gap or the Ferm i energy.

### 3. Results and Discussions

In the calculation of LSDA, the lattice structure and constants of Fe, N i and Cu are box and a = 2.87 A, for and 3.52 A, for and 3.61 A, respectively.<sup>14)</sup> The band structures of Fe, N i and Cu, calculated both in the LSDA and the GWA, are shown in Fig.2 along high symm etric lines. The localized 3d orbital has a weak hybridization with the extended 4s, 4p orbitals and is below Ferm i energy.

The magnetic moment, the exchange splitting and the band width of the occupied 3d valence bands in the GWA are summarized in Table I, in comparison with those by the LSDA and the static COHSEX approximation.<sup>6)</sup> Our results of N i are in good agreement with those of the previous GW calculation.<sup>15)</sup> The spectral function A(!) = (1 = ) Im TrG(!) is shown in Fig. 3.

Table I. The M agnetic m om ent  $_{\rm spin}$  ( $_{\rm B}$ ) of Fe and N i, the exchange splitting  $E_{\rm ex}$  (eV) of Fe and N i, the band width of the occupied 3d valence bands W  $_{\rm d/occ}$  (eV) of Fe, N i and C u.

			LSD A	COHSEX	GW	expt.
spin	Fe Ni		2,27 0,54	2.04 0.62	2.31 0.55	2.13 <sup>16,17)</sup> 0.57 <sup>16,17)</sup>
Eex	Fe Ni	25 H <sub>25</sub> P4 L <sub>3</sub> X <sub>2</sub>	2.0 2.3 2.2 0.6 0.6	1.7 2.1 2.5 0.5 0.5	1.9 1.8 2.3 0.7 0.7	$2.1^{18}) 1.8^{19}) 1.5^{20}) 0.3^{20}) 0.2^{21})$
W d;occ	Fe Ni Cu		3.7 4.5 3.3	4.6 5.1 3.7	3.4 3.3 2.9	3.3 <sup>22{24)</sup> 3.2 <sup>25)</sup> 3.0 <sup>26)</sup>

3




Fig. 2. The energy bands of Fe, N i and Cu, calculated by the LSDA (dotted lines) and the GWA (solid lines) along high symmetric lines. The closed circles are the calculated points in the GWA. In Fe and N i, left side and right side show m inority spin and m a prity spin, respectively. The high symmetric points are = (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), = (0;0;0) and X = (1;0;0) in fcc lattice (N i and Cu). Ferm i energy is set to zero. (E F = 0)

The occupied 3d valence band width of transition m etals Fe, Ni and Cu in the LSDA is overestim ated in com parison with experim ental observation, especially in Ni. The valence band width is in reasonably agreem ent with experiment in the GWA. 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 GWA. The source of band narrowing is the screening for the valence electrons. In the spectral function of the GWA, the plasm on-like excitation appears around 30 eV above and below the Ferm i 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  $Z_{kn}$  and, in Fig. 3, the reduction factor is  $Z_d$ 0:5{0.6. In the Hartree Fock (HF) approximation which includes no screening e ects, the band width is overestimated. No screening in the HF gives zero density of states at the Ferm i level in the electron gas and also gives overestim ated band gap in insulators and sem iconductors. 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 Ferm i level. The band width in the GWA is in good agreem entwith experim ent. W e can see that the dynam ical correlation e ect is in portant for the band width in the transition m etals from the comparison between the GWA and the static COHSEX approximation.

The magnetic moment  $_{\rm spin}$  of Fe and Ni is almost the same as the result of LSDA and is in good agreement with experiment. The di erence of the exchange splitting  $E_{\rm ex}$  between the LSDA and experiments in Fe ( 30%) is smaller than that in Ni ( 50%).  $E_{\rm ex}$  of Fe becomes close to the experimental value in the GWA. In Ni, the discrepancy of  $E_{\rm ex}$  is not improved by the GWA. In the HF,  $E_{\rm ex}$  is overestimated. The screening e ects of correlation term <sup>c</sup> in the GWA or the static COHSEX approximation reduce  $E_{\rm ex}$  of HF. However the GWA only includes long-range correlation e ects, and cannot describe short-range e ects such as electronelectron or hole-hole scattering process. Higher order diagram s (e.g. vertex corrections) is needed for electronelectron and hole-hole scattering. Especially two-hole bound states are very in portant to the exchange splitting and the satellite structure of spectrum if on-site Coulomb interaction between d electrons is large.<sup>27,28)</sup> The e ective Coulomb interaction is obtained from an analysis of Auger spectra, Ni is U 4:0 eV and Fe is 1:0 eV.<sup>29)</sup> The discrepancy between experiments U and the GWA in Ni is caused by the short-range correlation e ects from large U. The clear satellite in Nican be also explained, and the GWA cannot reproduce it. Since the 3d band is full in Cu, there is no hole-hole correlation and the GWA can work quite well.

The renormalization factor of transition metal 3d states is  $Z = 0.52\{0.58 \text{ in Fe}, Z = 0.48\{0.53 \text{ in Ni} \text{ and } Z = 0.53\{0.66 \text{ in Cu}. Z \text{ of } 4s \text{ states is about } 0.7\{0.8 \text{ in these system s. Those results of the renormalization factor show that the interaction between 3d electrons is large, and the correlation in Ni is strongest, which is consistent with the large C oulom b interaction U.$ 

The static screened d-d Coulomb interaction h<sub>d</sub> dj W  $(! = 0)j_d$  discalculated to be about 1.4 eV, 1.2 eV and 3.9 eV in Fe, Ni and Cu, respectively. The bare Coulomb interaction h  $_{\rm d}$   $_{\rm d}$  jvj  $_{\rm d}$   $_{\rm d}$  is actually 23:7 eV, 25:9 eV, and 27:4 eV in Fe, Ni and Cu. This values become larger with increasing the number of 3d occupation. Then the correlation term  $h_d d \mathbf{W}^c (! = 0) \mathbf{j}_d d\mathbf{i}$ is 22:3 eV, 24:7 eV and 23:5 eV in Fe, Ni and Cu. Therefore, the correlation e ects and the static screening are quite important in transition metals. The screened correlation of N i is largest and this is consistent with the smallest Z in these systems. We should mention that the d-d C oulomb interaction  $h_d dW$  (0) j d is di erent from the Hubbard U evaluated from the constrained LSDA, which includes only screening by on-site d electrons. The term h  $_{\rm d}$   $_{\rm d}J\!\!\!/$  (0)j  $_{\rm d}$   $_{\rm d}i$  includes the screening e ects by both on-site and o -site electrons<sup>30</sup>.

In the transition m etals, the Hubbard U param eter is




Fig. 3. The spectral function A (!) 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.

overestim ated within the constrained LSDA, for example U 6 eV for Fe, due to incomplete m etallic screening in the LSDA.<sup>31)</sup> W e should mention that our value of N i with o set method is smaller than the previous estimate (h<sub>d</sub> <sub>d</sub> jW (0) j<sub>d</sub> <sub>d</sub> i = 2.2 eV).<sup>30)</sup> The discrepancy may be caused by the absence of the present o set method since we also obtained the value without the o set method similarly to be previous one.

# 4. Sum m ary

In this paper the GW approximation is applied to ferrom agnetic transition metals Fe and N i, and paramagnetic Cu.W e showed that the occupied 3d band width of transition metal is in proved within our GW calculation.

W e also investigated the e ects of dynam ical screening by comparison between the GWA and the static COH-SEX approximation and showed the crucial role of the dynam ical correlation for band width.

The self-energy is discussed system atically. The renormalization factor Z showed that the interaction between d-electrons in N i is larger than that in Fe, and this is consistent with the interaction strength from A uger spectra. A cknow ledgm ents

W e would like to thank to F.A ryasetiawan for fruitful discussions and suggestions. W e also thank to T.K otani for useful suggestion about the o set m ethod. This work is supported by G rant-in-A id for COE Research \Spin-Charge-Photon", and G rant-in-A id from the Japan M inistry of E ducation, Science, Sports and C ulture. Part of the present calculation has been done by use of the facilities of the Supercom puter C enter, Institute for Solid State P hysics, U niversity 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.W ang: Phys.Rev.B 45 (1992) 13244.
- 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 (A cadem ic Press, New York, 1969) Vol.23, P.1.
- 6) L.Hedin: Phys.Rev.139 (1965) A 796.
- 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 Schilfgaarde: private communications.
- 12) R ecently fully self-consistent GW calculation is applied to K and Si in follow ing paper. W .-D . Schone and A .G .E guiluz: Phys.R ev.Lett 81 (1998) 1662.] It gives wider band width in K or overestim ated band gap in Si. This procedure m aintain the conservation laws of particle number, energy and m om entum .H ow ever such treatm ent cannot guarantee better agreem ent with experim ental results.
- 13) A .Yam asakiand T .Fu jiw ara: Phys.Rev.B 66 (2002) 245108.
- 14) R.W.G.Wycko : Crystal Structures (W iley, New York, 1963).
- 15) F.Aryasetiawan: Phys.Rev.B 46 (1992) 13051.
- 16) M.B.Steams: Magnetic Properties in Metals, ed.H.P.J.W in and Landolt-Bornstein (Springer, Berlin, 1984) New Series, Vol. III, Pt. 19a.
- 17) D.Bonnenker, K.A.Hempel and H.P.J.W ijn: Magnetic Properties in Metals, ed.H.P.J.W ijn and Landolt-Bornstein (Springer, Berlin, 1984) New Series, Vol. III, Pt. 19a.
- 18) A.M. Turner, A.W. Donoho and J.L.Erskine: Phys.Rev. B 29 (1984) 2986.
- 19) A.Santoniand F.J.Him psel: Phys. Rev. B 43 (1991) 1305.
- 20) D.E.Eastman, F.J.H im pseland J.A.K napp: Phys.Rev. Lett.44 (1980) 95.
- 21) R.Raue and H.Hopster: Z.Phys.B 54 (1984) 121.
- 22) R.E.Kidoy, E.Kisker, F.K.King and E.L.Garwin: Solid State Commun. 56 (1985) 425.
- 23) H.Hochst, A.Goldm ann 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.Freem an and D.S.W ang: 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.Anisim ov and O.G unnarsson: Phys.Rev.B 43 (1991) 7570.