

On a dual model for 5f electrons

D.V. Efremov, N. Hasselmann, E. Runge, P. Fulde

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik komplexer Systeme, Nothnitzer Str. 38, 01187 Dresden, Germany

G. Zwicknagl

Institut für Mathematische Physik, Technische Universität Braunschweig, Mendelssohnstr. 3, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany
(April 14, 2024)

We study the effect of intra-atomic correlations on anisotropies of hopping of 5f electrons. It is shown that they may considerably enhance these anisotropies to the extent that electrons in some of the 5f orbitals remain localized. This provides a microscopic basis for a previously made assumption that some of the 5f electrons must be partially localized when Fermi surfaces and effective masses of the component are calculated. Calculations are performed on two- and three-sites clusters. They include phase diagrams in the presence and absence of an external magnetic field as function of anisotropic hopping.

I. INTRODUCTION

Systems with strongly correlated electrons are a subject of considerable research efforts. Among those are the ones with 5f electrons, i.e., involving actinide ions of particular interest. While 4f electrons, because of their closeness to the nuclei, are correlated as strongly as possible on an atom, the 5f electrons have a larger spatial extent and tend more towards delocalization. The degree of delocalization is even more pronounced when 3d electrons are considered. By continuing this line of arguments one finds that s electrons are the least correlated ones on an atom and have the largest tendency to delocalize.

Returning to 5f electrons, the question arises under which circumstances localized features dominate delocalized ones or vice versa. In particular we want to follow up the suggestion which has been made previously [1] that 5f electrons have a dual character in the sense that some of the 5f orbitals lead to delocalization when occupied by electrons while others result in localization. It was demonstrated that a division of 5f orbitals into delocalized and localized ones is able to explain the heavy quasiparticles observed in UPt_3 and UPd_2Al_3 including their mass anisotropies [1,2]. However, the question remained unanswered as regards the microscopic origin of this division of orbitals. Apparently, strong intra-atomic correlations seem to enhance anisotropies in the kinetic energy matrix elements which reflect anisotropies in the hybridization with the chemical environment.

The purpose of the present work is to clarify the physical origin of the dual character of 5f electrons. For that purpose clusters of two and three sites are considered. Because of the large spin-orbit coupling each 5f electron is characterized by its total angular momentum $j = 5/2$ and azimuthal quantum number j_z . We do not include $j = 7/2$ states in our analysis since their energy is higher

by approximately 1eV [3]. We shall treat clusters where the average number of 5f electrons per site is either 2.5 or 2.67, values which are close to the 5f occupancy of U ions in compounds like UPt_3 [3], UPd_2Al_3 or UGe_2 [4,5].

Depending on j_z different hopping matrix elements are assumed for the f electrons in the cluster. The key result of the present investigation is to demonstrate that indeed anisotropies in the hopping are strongly enhanced by intra-atomic correlations.

The paper is organized as follows. After defining the model Hamiltonian a two-site and a three-site cluster are investigated. Various properties are calculated, like the ground-state energy and magnetization as well as the density of states and its magnetic field dependence. This is done for different ratios, of hopping. Partial localization is the subject of the subsequent Section V. A discussion and the conclusions are found in Sect. VI. The Appendices are devoted to perturbation theory, the atomic limit of vanishing inter-atomic electron transfer and to a more detailed analysis of the ground state's composition.

II. MODEL HAMILTONIAN

We investigate a microscopic model of 5f electrons which includes local Coulomb interactions and hopping terms between nearest neighbor sites. The model Hamiltonian is

$$H = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sum_{j_z} t_{j_z} c_{j_z}^\dagger(i) c_{j_z}(j) + \sum_n \sum_{j_z} \epsilon_{j_z} c_{j_z}^\dagger(n) c_{j_z}(n) + H_{\text{Coul}} \quad (1)$$

where the first sum is over neighboring sites i, j . Furthermore $c_{j_z}^\dagger(n) (c_{j_z}(n))$, creates (annihilates) an electron at site n in the 5f $j = 5/2$ state with $j_z = -5/2; \dots; 5/2$.

We will consider two and three site models. The effective hopping between sites results from the hybridization of the $5f$ states with the orbitals of the ligands and depends generally on the crystal structure. Rather than trying to exhaust all possible different lattice symmetries, we shall concentrate here on the special case that hopping conserves j_z . While this is certainly an idealization, it allows us to concentrate on our main interest, i.e., a study of the influence of atomic correlations on the renormalization of hybridization matrix elements. The parameters t_{j_z} ($= t_{j_z}$) are chosen in accordance with density-functional calculations for bulk material which use jj_z basis states. We also include local magnetic fields $h(n)$ to account for the influence of ferromagnetic (FM) or antiferromagnetic (AFM) internal fields. The local Coulomb interactions can be written in the form

$$H_{\text{Coul}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n, j_{z1}, \dots, j_{z4}} \sum_{j_{z1}, j_{z2}, j_{z3}, j_{z4}} C_{j_{z1}}^Y(n) C_{j_{z2}}^Y(n) C_{j_{z3}}(n) C_{j_{z4}}(n) \quad (2)$$

with Coulomb matrix elements

$$\sum_J U_{j_{z1} j_{z2}, j_{z3} j_{z4}} = j_{z1} + j_{z2}, j_{z3} + j_{z4} \quad h_2^{\frac{5}{2}} \frac{5}{2} j_{z1} j_{z2} j J_{J_z} i U_J h J_{J_z} \frac{5}{2} \frac{5}{2} j_{z3} j_{z4} i: \quad (3)$$

Here J denotes the total angular momentum of two electrons and $J_z = j_{z1} + j_{z2} = j_{z3} + j_{z4}$. The sum is restricted by the antisymmetry of the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients $h_2^{\frac{5}{2}} \frac{5}{2} j_{z1} j_{z2} j J_{J_z} i$ to even values $J = 0, 2, 4$. We use in the actual calculations U_J values which are determined from LDA wavefunctions for UPt_3 [1], i.e., $U_{J=4} = 17.21 \text{ eV}$, $U_{J=2} = 18.28 \text{ eV}$, and $U_{J=0} = 21.00 \text{ eV}$. We expect $U_{J=4} < U_{J=2} < U_{J=0}$ to always hold for Coulomb interactions, independently of the chemical environment. In contrast, the relative order of the hopping matrix elements will vary strongly from one compound to the next.

The average Coulomb repulsion of about 20 eV is irrelevant for the low-energy physics of the model. It simply restricts the relevant configurations to states so that the sites are occupied either by 2 or 3 electrons. The low-energy sector is solely determined by the differences of the U_J values, which are of the order of 1 eV and thus slightly larger than typical bare f bandwidths. The latter are obtained, e.g., from LDA calculations for metallic uranium compounds like UPt_3 . Note that restricting the model to f^2 and f^3 configurations is equivalent to let the different $U_J \neq 1$ while their differences remain finite.

To mimic the situation in the U -based heavy-fermion compounds we consider the intermediate valence regime. Note that in the absence of a magnetic field all states of the two-site model with 5 electrons will be at least doubly degenerate because of Kramer's degeneracy.

The Hamiltonian Eq. (1) conserves $J_z = \sum_n J_z(n)$ where J_z is the z -component of the total angular mo-

mentum of the system and the $J_z(n)$ refer to angular momentum projections on individual sites. We shall therefore characterize the eigenstates by their J_z value. For isotropic hopping $t_{j_z} = t = \text{const}$ the system is rotationally invariant. Then J^2 provides an additional good quantum number.

III. TWO SITE MODEL

As mentioned before it should suffice to limit ourselves to the subspace of f^2 and f^3 configurations, because of the large values of U_J . To assess the validity of this simplification we shall compare the predicted ground states for the f^2 - f^3 restricted model with those obtained by diagonalizing the Hamiltonian Eq. (1) in the full space. The rationale for the restriction to f^2 - f^3 is not the reduction of the numerical diagonalization effort by a factor of about two, but the conceptual simplicity gained for the interpretation and presentation of the results for, e.g., local spin configurations and orbital occupations. In the full model, interactions of the order of $t^2 = U$ are present which arise from virtual f^2 - $f^3 \rightarrow f^1$ - f^4 transitions (t and U are representative values of t_{j_z} and U_J , respectively.) The restricted model ceases to be a good approximation when these interactions become comparable to the bare parameters of the model.

For most of the calculations below we shall assume $t_{5=2} = t_{1=2}$ and $t_{3=2}$ as independent parameters, a choice motivated by LDA calculations for UPt_3 [1] where $t_{3=2} > t_{1=2}, t_{5=2}$. However, partial localization, which we will discuss in Section V, is also found for other parameter choices, e.g., by choosing $t_{5=2} = t_{3=2}$ and $t_{1=2}$ as independent parameters. The origin is qualitatively identical for both choices, as we will demonstrate later. The results presented below are obtained from numerical studies of the Hamiltonian (1).

A. Ground-state energy

Figure 1a shows the variation of the ground-state energy E_G as a function of the hopping parameters $t_{3=2}$ and $t_{5=2} = t_{1=2}$. This energy is smooth except for a kink along the isotropic line $t_{1=2} = t_{3=2} = t_{5=2}$.




FIG. 1. (a) Total ground-state energy as a function of $t_{3/2}$ and $t_{5/2} = t_{1/2}$. (b) Expectation value of the Coulomb interaction $\langle H_{\text{Coul}} \rangle_{\text{gs}}$ in the ground state gs vs. hopping parameters $t_{3/2}$ and $t_{5/2} = t_{1/2}$.

Level crossings are apparent from discontinuous jumps of the expectation value E_C of the Coulomb interaction with respect to the ground state, see Fig. 1b. The ground-state energy at vanishing hopping is 69.53 eV which is the sum of the Coulomb energy of the $J = 4$ f^2 configuration and the $J = 9/2$ f^3 configuration,

$$\begin{aligned} E_G (ft_{j_z} = 0) &= E_C (f^2; J = 4) + E_C (f^3; J = 9/2) \\ &= 3 + \frac{5}{14} U_{J=4} + \frac{9}{14} U_{J=2} : \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

In general, the ground-state energy decreases with increasing hopping due to a lowering of the kinetic energy. This is however partially compensated for by an increase in the interaction energy. The jumps indicate quantum phase transitions, which result from the competition between Coulomb interactions and anisotropic hopping or hybridization.

B. Magnetization

In order to characterize the ground state of the two-site cluster for different choices of the hopping matrix elements t_{j_z} we study the total magnetization characterized by J_z in the presence of a vanishingly small field. Results are shown in Fig. 2. The different ground states are separated by solid lines when we allow for f^2 and f^3 configurations only. Dashed lines show the ground-state boundaries when this restriction is lifted. The later

are obtained from diagonalization of H in the full space of 5-electron states. Because of the small differences we shall limit ourselves to f^2 - f^3 configurations only. Five different phases are visible in Fig. 2, i.e., two "high-spin" phases ($J_z = 15/2, J_z = 11/2$) and three "low-spin" phases ($J_z = 5/2, 3/2, 1/2$). In the "high-spin" phases which prevail for $t_{3/2} = t_{1/2} = t_{5/2}$ the two sites are ferromagnetically correlated, $J(a) = J(b) > 0$, while in the low-spin phases the correlations are antiferromagnetic (AFM), $J(a) = J(b) < 0$. Here and below we denote the two different sites by a and b.




FIG. 2. Phase diagram in the $t_{1/2} (= t_{5/2})$ vs. $t_{3/2}$ plane derived from the total magnetization J_z of the ground state. Solid lines: for the f^2 - f^3 model. Dashed lines: with no restriction on the occupancy.

A special case is $t_{1/2} = t_{3/2} = t_{5/2} = t$ (isotropic case). Here the ground state is always six-fold degenerate with $J = 5/2$. This is plausible in the limit of large values of t : all electrons will occupy orbitals with different j_z in order to maximize the kinetic energy. With a total of five electrons one of the j_z orbitals will remain empty, implying a six-fold degenerate ground state.

Even when $U_J \neq 1$, implying the f^2 - f^3 model, but with a difference $|U_J|$ of any pair of U_J values much larger than t , i.e., $|U_J| \gg t \neq 0$, one can see that $J = 5/2$. In that case the six-fold degenerate ground states can be explicitly written in the form

$$\lim_{|U_J| \gg t \neq 0} |j_{j_z} i\rangle = \frac{q}{5} \hat{P}_{f^2-f^3} \sum_{j_z^0 \in j_z} \frac{c_{j_z^0}^y(a) + c_{j_z^0}^y(b)}{2} |i\rangle; \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{P}_{f^2-f^3}$ is the projector allowing only for atomic f^2 and f^3 configurations. One implication is that the kinetic energy is only $3t$ instead of $5t$ as for free electrons, because at most three out of five electrons find free places to hop onto. Note that $j_z \neq j_z^0$ in Eq. (5). While for finite values of $t = |U_J|$ the ground-state wavefunctions become vastly more complex, they remain eigenfunctions of $J = 5/2$. Simple results are found again in the limit $t \neq 0$, see Appendix A.

As one moves away from the isotropic line with $J = 5=2$ the degeneracy of different J_z states is lifted. Depending on $t_{3=2}$ and $t_{1=2} = t_{5=2}$ one of them becomes the ground state while J is no longer preserved (see Fig. 2).

The phase with $J_z = 15=2$ appears when $t_{3=2} = t_{1=2} (= t_{5=2})$. It corresponds to a very simple eigenstate in which all occupied orbitals have $j_z > 0$. One finds

$$|j_{15=2}\rangle = \frac{c_{3=2}^y(a) + c_{3=2}^y(b)}{2} c_{5=2}^y(a) c_{1=2}^y(a) c_{5=2}^y(b) c_{1=2}^y(b) |j_i\rangle \quad (6)$$

with kinetic energy $t_{5=2}$. The $j_z = 5/2$ and $j_z = 1/2$ orbitals are occupied on both sites while $j_z = 3=2$ is occupied with probability $1=2$ on each of the two sites. Note that $|j_{15=2}\rangle$ is separately an eigenstate of the Coulomb as well as the kinetic energy terms. While the Coulomb energy is at its absolute minimum, there are no energy contributions resulting from $t_{1=2}$ and $t_{3=2}$ due to the limitation to f^2 and f^3 configurations. This can be considered as an extreme case of partial localization: the $j_z = 5/2$ and $j_z = 1/2$ states are fully localized and the $j_z = 3/2$ state is maximally delocalized. When the hopping matrix elements increase, a discontinuous jump takes place into a state with $J_z = 5=2$. The corresponding increase in Coulomb energy is seen in Fig. 1b.

The variation of the ground-state energy along the line $t_{1=2} = t_{5=2} = 0$ can be qualitatively understood from the following argument: For sufficiently small hopping matrix elements $t_{3=2}$ the high spin $J_z = 15=2$ state is lowest in energy because it minimizes the Coulomb energy. With increasing values of $t_{3=2}$ it becomes more favorable to partially break up the local Hund correlations in order to gain kinetic energy by partially populating both $j_z = 3=2$ and the $j_z = 3=2$ orbitals. In the limit of large hopping, their angular momentum components cancel and J_z is given by the j_z components of the remaining electrons, i.e., by $(\frac{5}{2} + \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{5}{2}$ resulting in $J_z = 11=2$ or $1/2$. For intermediate hopping the total angular momentum of states where both $3=2$ and $1=2$ are occupied is given by the remaining $5=2$ orbitals. For more details on the occupation of the individual j_z orbitals in the ground state see Appendix B.




FIG. 3. Total momentum as defined by Eq. (7) for sites with local f^3 (upper panel) and f^2 configurations (lower panel), respectively. Note the scale and the smallness of the deviation from the values $24.75 = ((9=2) + 1) (9=2)$ and $20 = (4 + 1) 4$ corresponding to fully polarized f^3 and f^2 configurations.

While the total angular momentum J depends strongly on the anisotropy, the local angular momenta change very little. Fig. 3 shows for different anisotropies the local spins defined in terms of projectors onto configurations with given local f -occupation as

$$J_{e;=2(3)}^2 = \sum_{n=a;b} J(n)^2 \hat{P}_{=2(3)}(n) : \quad (7)$$

The projector \hat{P} selects atomic configurations with electrons. The small range of $J_{e;=2(3)}^2$ variation in Fig. 3 is remarkable. Hopping elements up to 0.5 eV reduce the local momenta by less than 5% relative to their maximal values 24.75 and 20 for f^2 and f^3 configurations, respectively. One observes a reduction of the local spin expectation values at large hopping for both the f^2 and the f^3 site. A decrease of $J_{e;=2(3)}^2$ implies for $U_{J=4} < U_{J=0,2}$, an increase of the Coulomb energy. Thus, Figure 3 demonstrates the competition between Coulomb interaction and hopping.

In the absence of any hopping, i.e., for $t_{3=2} = t_{1=2} = t_{5=2} = 0$, the ground state is 180-fold degenerate (see Appendix A). At finite isotropic hopping this degeneracy is only partially lifted. Then J (a) and J (b) are no longer separately conserved, but the total J still is.




FIG. 4. Energy levels and their degeneracies for isotropic hopping, $t_{1=2} = t_{5=2} = t_{3=2} = t = 0.1$ eV. Inset: Anisotropic hopping $t = t_{3=2} - t_{1=2}$ lifts the high degeneracies.

Thus, along the isotropic line, spherical symmetry still leads to rather highly degenerate states. As seen in Fig. 4, these states are grouped by Hund's rule coupling, i.e., by the energy difference of the values U_J . The different clusters of energy levels are separated by well-defined gaps of about 1 eV.

When spherical symmetry is broken the J_z degeneracy is lifted. This is seen from the inset of Fig. 4. It shows the evolution of the lowest 66 eigenstates as a function of the symmetry breaking parameter $t = t_{3=2} - t_{1=2}$. The value of $t_{3=2} + t_{1=2} = 0.2$ is thereby kept fixed. Five different groups of levels are noticed which for $t = 0$ correspond to the values (ordered by increasing energy) $J_z = 5=2, 3=2, 7=2, 13=2$ and a 34 fold degenerate level consisting of $J_z = 15=2$ and $17=2$ states. When $t \neq 0$ the J_z degenerate states split into doublets. For $t > 0.06$ one state from the originally 34-fold degenerate states becomes lowest in energy. This marks the transition to the "high-spin" state with $J_z = 15=2$.

In the following we want to discuss the effect of an internal or molecular field on the phase diagram. Fig. 5 shows the changes in the phase diagram caused by a ferromagnetic field of three different magnitudes. One notices the appearance of new "high-spin" as well as "intermediate spin" phases [6]. Now the phases with low J_z values require larger hopping matrix elements in order to be realized. The regions of "high-spin" states grow with increasing field and for small values of $t_{3=2}$ a new phase with $J_z = 17=2$ appears. This state is similar to the $J_z = 15=2$ state and has the form

$$|j_1 j_2\rangle = \frac{c_{1=2}^y(a) + c_{1=2}^y(b)}{\sqrt{2}} c_{5=2}^y(a) c_{3=2}^y(a) c_{5=2}^y(b) c_{3=2}^y(b) |j_1 j_2\rangle \quad (8)$$




FIG. 5. Phase diagram of the two-site cluster in the presence of a magnetic field: from top to bottom $h = 0.005, 0.01$, and 0.05 eV, respectively.

IV . THREE SITES

In this section, we extend our analysis to a 3-site cluster. In order to approach the valency $f^{2.7}$ present in

Up to t_3 , we choose a cluster with eight electrons (average f valency 2.67). This choice also avoids the Kramers degeneracy which was present in the 2-site cluster and which would again be present in the 3-site model with 7 electrons, i.e., the other possible electron number with mixed valency. We put the sites on a ring order to work with a model in which all sites are equivalent. As a consequence, AFM correlations are subject to frustration. Furthermore the sign of the matrix elements t_{j_z} 's is now relevant: the eigenstates of the kinetic energy term in the Hamiltonian consist of a doublet with energy t_{j_z} and a singlet state with energy $-2t_{j_z}$. Thus, for $t_{j_z} < 0$ occupancy of j_z orbitals two of the three sites is favored whereas for $t_{j_z} > 0$ a single occupancy is. Below, we consider both negative and positive hopping parameters, assuming the same sign for all t_{j_z} . All calculations are done in the subspace of only atomic f^2 and f^3 configurations.

1. The case $t_{j_z} < 0$.

The left side of Fig. 6 shows the value of the total angular momentum J_z of the three-site cluster as a function of negative $t_{1=2} = t_{5=2}$ and $t_{3=2}$. As for the two-site cluster, a ferromagnetic high-spin phase appears in the region $t_{1=2}=t_{3=2} > 1$. This phase has $J_z = 12$ and can be understood as a straightforward generalization of the $J_z = 15/2$ phase of the two-site model. It is an eigenstate of both the Coulomb and the kinetic terms. Only orbitals with $j_z > 0$ are occupied. The $j_z = +5/2$ and $+1/2$ orbitals are filled with one electron per site and the remaining two electrons occupy $j_z = 3/2$ orbitals. In contrast to this simple ferromagnetic state, all other phases in Fig. 6a have a more complicated structure. Along the isotropic line of the phase diagram, $t_{j_z} = t$, the ground state has $J = 6$ for all finite values of t .

The phases differ also in their magnetic correlations. Two of them have well pronounced correlations. The $J_z = 1$ phase has antiferromagnetic correlations ($\langle \sum_{nm} J(n) J(m) \rangle < 0$), whereas the $J_z = 7$ and 12 phases have ferromagnetic correlations. Correlations within the $J_z = 6$ phase are by about a factor 5 smaller than those of the $J_z = 12$ phase. The other two phases, $J_z = 4, 6$ have generally small magnetic correlations, which can be either ferro- or antiferromagnetic, depending on $t_{1=2}$ and $t_{3=2}$.




FIG. 6. Phase diagram for three sites for negative (left panel) and positive hopping (right panel).

2. The case $t_{j_z} > 0$.

We now turn to the case with positive hopping matrix elements. The ground state along the isotropic line has $J = 4$ for all finite values of t . Away from the isotropic line one finds $J_z = 0$ for $t_{1=2} = t_{5=2} > t_{3=2}$ and $J_z = 3$ for $t_{1=2} = t_{5=2} < t_{3=2}$, see Fig. 6b.

As the kinetic energy penalizes states in which two or more electrons on different sites occupy the same j_z orbital, the ferromagnetic state which was found for $t_{j_z} < 0$ is no longer favorable. Most of the phase diagram is dominated by AFM correlations. However, for large anisotropies $t_{3=2}=t_{1=2} \gg 1$ these correlations weaken continuously with increasing ratio $t_{3=2}=t_{1=2}$ and vanish near $t_{1=2} = 0$.

V. PARTIAL LOCALIZATION

In the following we want to demonstrate that strong on-site correlations result in a considerable enhancement of anisotropies in the bare hopping matrix elements. This can lead to a localization of electrons in orbitals with relatively weak hybridization. The latter is effectively reduced to zero in those cases.

In order to quantify the degree of localization or, alternatively, of the reduction of hopping of a given j_z orbital by local correlations, we calculate the ratio of the j_z projected kinetic energy T_{j_z} and the bare matrix element t_{j_z} , i.e.,

$$\frac{T_{j_z}}{t_{j_z}} = \frac{\langle \sum_{nm} j_z c_{j_z}^\dagger(n) c_{j_z}(m) + h.c. \rangle}{\sum_{nm} j_z} \quad (9)$$

The ground-state wavefunction $|j_{gs}\rangle$ contains the strong on-site correlations. A small ratio of $T_{j_z}=t_{j_z}$ indicates

partial suppression of hopping for electrons in the j_z orbitals. Two kinds of correlations may contribute to that process. The first one is based on the reduction of charge fluctuations to atomic f^2 and f^3 configurations. This is a result for large values of U_J and can be studied by setting all U_J equal to a value much larger than the different t_{j_z} . The second one is due to differences in the U_J values, i.e., $U_{J=4} < U_{J=2} < U_{J=0}$. The differences in the U_J values are the basis of Hund's rules. Hopping counteracts Hund's rule correlations and vice versa. What we want to stress is the fact that those correlations can lead to a complete suppression of hopping channels except for the dominant one which is influenced only little.

A. Two-sites cluster

Results for the ratios $T_{j_z} = t_{j_z}$ are shown in Fig. 7. For a better understanding one should consider that figure in parallel with Fig. 2. The parameter range in Fig. 7 corresponds to a straight line in Fig. 2 intersecting the abscissa at $t_{3/2} = 0.1$ eV and the ordinate at $t_{1/2} = t_{5/2} = 0.1$ eV. This line crosses three different phases with $J_z = 15/2, 5/2$ and $3/2$, labeled I, II and III respectively. One notices that in region I only the dominant hybridization of the $j_z = 1/2$ and $j_z = 5/2$ orbitals is completely suppressed. In regions II and III the correlation effects on different orbitals are not so extremely different. In a forthcoming paper we show how the effects of the correlations on the ratios $T_{j_z} = t_{j_z}$ are changed when all U_J values are assumed to be equal.

To understand the suppression of the T_{j_z} in the limit of very small t_{j_z} it is sufficient to treat the hopping perturbatively, this is discussed in Appendix A.




FIG. 7. Values $T_{j_z} = t_{j_z}$ for the two-site cluster along the line connecting linearly the points written below the figure. Phases with $J_z = 15/2, 5/2$ and $3/2$, are labeled with I, II and III respectively.

B. Three sites

In the case of a three-sites cluster the sign of the matrix elements t_{j_z} matters because of the respective degeneracy of the ground state. We begin with $t_{j_z} < 0$.

Shown in Fig. 8 are results for different parameter choices. Again, for a better understanding, one should consider in parallel the phase diagram in the left hand side of Fig. 6. Again, three different phases are involved and they are labeled as before by I, II and III in Fig. 8. Altogether, the figure looks similar to Fig. 7. There is again a regime of total suppression of the $t_{1/2}$ and $t_{5/2}$ matrix elements (region I) and also in region III the smaller of the t_{j_z} , i.e., $t_{3/2}$ is strongly reduced to an effective $T_{3/2}$. The case of equal Coulomb integrals U_J , i.e., $U_J = 0$ is discussed in an extended version of this paper.

Next we turn to the case of positive $t_{j_z} > 0$. Corresponding results are shown in Fig. 9 which should be considered in connection with the right hand side of Fig. 6. There it is seen that two different phases with $J_z = 3$ and 0 are involved with the chosen parameters t_{j_z} . In distinction to Figs. 7 and 8 there is no regime of total suppression of hopping matrix elements. But a strong enhancement of anisotropies by the correlations is noticeable also here. Again, the overall features are very similar to those in Figs. 7 and 8 except that the intermediate regime is missing here. This is of little surprise, since we are dealing with local correlations so that the effects should be insensitive to the precise form of the chemical environment.




FIG. 8. Values $T_{j_z} = t_{j_z}$ of the three-sites model with $t_{j_z} < 0$ along the line connecting linearly the t_{j_z} values indicated in the figure.




FIG. 9. Values $T_{j_z} = t_{j_z}$ of the three-sites model with $t_{j_z} > 0$ along the line connecting the t_{j_z} values written below the figures.

It is instructive to take a closer look at the ground state. For $t_{1=2}=t_{3=2} < 1$, the ground state is twofold degenerate with $J_z = 3$ (see Fig. 6). When $t_{1=2} = t_{5=2}$ are small, $t_{1=2}=t_{3=2} \rightarrow 1$, the f^2 configurations are strongly dominated by ones in which the orbitals $j_z = 1=2$ and $j_z = 5=2$ are occupied with a ferromagnetic alignment of the electrons. The admixture of other states is less than 1.5 % of the norm for $t_{3=2} = 0.5$ and $t_{1=2} = t_{5=2} = 0.05$. Furthermore, the wavefunction is strongly dominated, in fact to 87 %, by configurations in which the $j_z = 1=2, 5=2$ orbitals form an Ising-like frustrated AFM background for mobile $j_z = 3=2$ orbitals. We describe this AFM background by states

$$|j \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle = c_{5=2}^y (a) c_{1=2}^y (a) \quad (10)$$

$$c_{1=2}^y (b) c_{5=2}^y (b) \quad c_{1=2}^y (c) c_{5=2}^y (c) \quad 0i$$

($|j \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle$ and $|j \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle$ are defined analogously).

We further introduce operators C^y for itinerant electrons in the $3=2$ orbitals

$$C_{3=2}^y = \frac{c_{3=2}^y (a) + c_{3=2}^y (b) + c_{3=2}^y (c)}{2 + \sqrt{2}} \quad (11)$$

with a number of order 1 taking into account that due to the background not all three sites are equivalent. The ground-state wavefunction (with $J_z = 3$) is then of the approximate form

$$|j_{J_z=3} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (|j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle + |j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle + |j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$$

where

$$|j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{20}} \hat{P}_{f^2 f^3} C_{+3=2}^y C_{3=2}^y |j \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle \quad (12)$$

The projector $\hat{P}_{f^2 f^3}$ projects onto local f^2 and f^3 configurations. Furthermore $|j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle, |j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle$ are obtained from $|j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle$ via cyclic permutation of sites. Note that the kinetic energy contributions $T_{1=2}$ and $T_{5=2}$ calculated with the wavefunction (12) vanishes exactly.

As the ground state can be written approximately as a sum of simple products of itinerant $j_z = 3=2$ particles and a magnetic background, one expects to find a similar form for the lowest excited state. This is indeed the case: The first excited state has again $J_z = 3$ but with a fourfold rather than twofold degeneracy. The excited states can be very well approximated by a difference of any two of the three states $|j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle, |j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle, |j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle$, e. g. $(|j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle - |j_0 \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. For fixed $J_z = 3$ or $J_z = 3$ these states span a subspace of dimension two. We may view the first excited state as an excitation of the frustrated AFM background which is dominated by the $j_z = 5=2, 1=2$ orbitals, while the electrons/holes in the $j_z = 3=2$ orbitals simply adjust to the slow dynamical changes of the magnetic background.

The magnetic correlations of the ground state are also interesting. The overall magnetic correlations in $j_{J_z=3} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow$ are weakly ferromagnetic, i. e., $\langle j_{J_z=3} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow | \sum_{\langle m n \rangle} J(m) J(n) j_{J_z=3} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \rangle = 3$. But because of $\langle j_{J_z=3} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow | \sum_{\langle m n \rangle} J(m) J(n) j_{J_z=3} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \rangle = 3$ one can construct states $|j_{J_z=3} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle - |j_{J_z=3} \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle$ which have no magnetic correlations. Thus, we have a situation with a localization mechanism akin to a Mott transition, but without the magnetic correlations which are usually present in Mott systems.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND SUMMARY.

In this investigation we have studied the effects of strong intra-atomic correlations on anisotropies in the hybridization of different 5f orbitals with the environment. For that purpose we considered two-site and three-site clusters which allow for a complete numerical diagonalization of the corresponding Hamiltonian. We demonstrated that in particular Hund's rule correlations enhanced strongly anisotropies in the hybridizations. For a certain range of parameters this may result in a complete suppression of the effective hybridization except for the largest one, which remains almost unaffected. This provides for a microscopic picture of partial localization of 5f electrons, a phenomena, observed in a number of experiments on U compounds. In fact, previous work on the de Haas-van Alphen frequencies and anisotropic effective masses in UPt_3 and UPt_2Al_3 could explain the experimental data very well by assuming, that two of the 5f electrons of the U ions remain localized while a third one is itinerant [1,2]. The latter is in an orbital with $j_z = 3=2$ in both cases, and a j-j coupling scheme is used. Previous work on the molecule uranocene $U(C_8H_8)_2$ gave a hint on partial localization [7], but the present work provides a

detailed justification for such a feature. By including an external field we obtained a rich magnetic phase diagram. We plan to investigate its relevance to compounds such as UGe_2 . We note that intra-atomic excitations within the system of two localized 5f electrons might provide the required bosonic excitations for itinerant electron attraction and Cooper-pair formation [8,10]. One may also speculate about the application of the present findings to multiband Hubbard models. They are used to describe correlations in transition metal compounds [11]. This problem is left for a future investigation as well as the one of a U impurity embedded in a weakly correlated chemical environment. Also a molecular-field description of the effects found here, e.g., by introducing auxiliary fields to model the correlation effects is an interesting subject of future research. In an extended version of this paper we plan to discuss also the phenomenon of charge disproportionation, which may occur in clusters of the type investigated here.

APPENDIX A: PERTURBATION THEORY

In the limit $t_{j_z} \rightarrow 0$, the 180 states of products of local f^2 configurations $|j_z; J_z^0\rangle$ and local f^3 configurations $|j_z; J_z^1\rangle$ are degenerate. The corresponding states are direct products of maximal local J states, i.e., three-particle states with $J(a) = J(b) = 9/2$ and two-particle states with $J(b) = J(a) = 4$.

Finite hopping splits the manifold in first order degenerate perturbation theory. The transition matrix element for hopping with initial product state $|f^3; \frac{9}{2}; J_z^0\rangle |f^2; 4; J_z^1\rangle$ and final state $|f^2; 4; J_z^0\rangle |f^3; \frac{9}{2}; J_z + j_z\rangle$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j_z} t_{j_z} \langle f^3; \frac{9}{2}; J_z + j_z | \sum_{j_z} C_{j_z}^X | f^2; 4; J_z \rangle \\ & = \frac{33}{14} \sum_{j_z} \langle f^2; 4; J_z^0 | j_z j_z | f^3; \frac{9}{2}; J_z^0 \rangle \\ & \quad \times \sum_{j_z} C_{5=2; j_z; 4; J_z}^{9=2; J_z + j_z} (C_{5=2; j_z; 4; J_z^0}^{9=2; J_z^0}) \end{aligned} \quad (A1)$$

where the $C_{c;d}^{a;b}$ are Clebsch-Gordan coefficients.

In the plane spanned by $t_{3=2}$ and $t_{1=2} = t_{5=2}$, for small t_{j_z} transitions occur near $t_{1=2} = t_{3=2} \approx 0.35$ and at the isotropic line, see Fig. 2. These transitions are reproduced with the perturbative treatment. Furthermore, the perturbative analysis also describes the degeneracies of the ground states correctly.

Of particular interest is the behavior along the isotropic line $t_{5=2} = t_{3=2} = t_{1=2} = t$ where the lifting of degeneracy can be solved in closed form. In this limit J^2 provides an additional good quantum number. We therefore consider basis states which are eigenstates of J^2 , i.e., $|j_z; J_z^1\rangle$ and $|j_z; J_z^0\rangle$. They are obtained as linear combinations of the above-mentioned product states $|f^3; 9/2; J_z - j_z\rangle |f^2; 4; J_z + j_z\rangle$ and $|f^2; 4; J_z - j_z\rangle$

$|f^3; 9/2; J_z + j_z\rangle$. In this basis, the hopping matrix elements depend only upon J and can be expressed in terms of the 6j symbols

$$\langle f^3; \frac{9}{2}; J_z + j_z | \sum_{j_z} C_{j_z}^X | f^2; 4; J_z \rangle = \frac{33}{14} t(J) \quad (A2)$$

where

$$t(J) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & J & 10 \\ 4 & \frac{5}{2} & \frac{9}{2} \\ 4 & J & \frac{9}{2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (A3)$$

accounts for the variation with J of the hopping matrix element.

This result allows for a simple interpretation. In the $f^2 - f^3$ model, the total angular momentum J of the 5-electron states $|j_z; J_z^1\rangle$ and $|j_z; J_z^0\rangle$ arises from the coupling of three angular momenta. They characterize f^2 configurations at the two sites a and b with angular momenta 4 and an additional electron which can sit at either site. The angular momentum $j_z = 5/2$ of this electron couples with that of the corresponding f^2 -configurations yielding the angular momentum $J(a) = 9/2$ or $J(b) = 9/2$ of the f^3 -configurations at site a or b, respectively. Technically speaking, the states $|j_z; J_z^1\rangle$ and $|j_z; J_z^0\rangle$ arise from applying different coupling schemes to the three above-mentioned angular momenta. Hopping between the two sites connects the two types of states. As a consequence, the hopping matrix elements can be expressed in terms of the 6j-symbols which transform between the two different coupling schemes.

The variation with J of the hopping matrix elements is easily evaluated yielding

$$t(J) = (1 + 2J) \frac{183681 - 8424J - 8344J^2 + 160J^3 + 80J^4}{1064448} \quad (A4)$$

Here J is restricted to half-integer values $1/2 \leq J \leq 17/2$. The variation with J of $t(J)$ is displayed in Fig. 10. The maximum value for $t(J)$ is obtained for $J = 5/2$ corresponding to a sixfold degenerate ground state in the isotropic case.




FIG. 10. Variation of τ_z with J in the isotropic case.

APPENDIX B: ANALYSIS OF GROUND STATES

At the phase boundaries in Fig. 2 the jumps of the z component of the total magnetization of a two-site cluster coincide with changes of the orbital-resolved occupation number $n_{j_z}(m)$ in the ground-state wavefunction. There are shown as gray-scale plots in Fig. 11. They confirm the scenario developed in the body of the text and allow for some additional observations. The figure corresponds to the $t_{3=2} - t_{1=2}$ phase diagram shown in Fig. 2 in an infinitesimal ferromagnetic field. For weak hopping with $t_{3=2} = t_{1=2} = t_{5=2}$, the $j_z = +5=2$ and the $j_z = +1=2$ orbitals are fully occupied on both sites, whereas $j_z = +3=2$ is half-occupied, allowing for a maximal kinetic energy gain. The corresponding total angular momentum component $J_z = 2 \cdot \frac{5}{2} + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2} = 15=2$. Similarly for large $t_{3=2}$ values the $J_z = 11=2$ phase is formed in which one of the $j_z = +1=2$ electrons is promoted to $j_z = +3=2$.

In all other phases, the average occupations of all orbitals are close to one half or zero. Occupations near one half could indicate frequent hopping. Such a 'paramagnetic' interpretation is appropriate only if t is much larger than the energy differences U_J resulting in Hund's rule. The three phases to be discussed are best classified by looking at the particular j_z orbital which remains unoccupied (light-colored areas in the figure). Obviously, for the case $t_{3=2} < t_{1=2} = t_{5=2}$, the loss of hopping energy gain is minimal if $j_z = +3=2$ remains empty, yielding $J_z = 3=2$. In the case $t_{3=2} > t_{1=2} = t_{5=2}$, either the orbital $j_z = +1=2$ or $j_z = +5=2$ is unoccupied, leading to $J_z = +1=2$ and $J_z = +5=2$, respectively. It should be kept in mind that the Coulomb interaction mixes various j_z orbitals. The concept of 'occupying' j_z states is therefore only approximate. This is reflected in small changes of the occupation within each phase.




FIG. 11. Gray-scale plot of orbital occupations as function of hopping matrix elements for $j_z = +\frac{5}{2}; \dots; -\frac{5}{2}$ in the presence of an infinitesimal ferromagnetic field. Black: fully occupied; white: empty.

- [1] G. Zwicknagl, A. N. Yaresko, and P. Fulde, Phys. Rev. B 65, 081103 (2002)
- [2] G. Zwicknagl and P. Fulde, cond-mat/0211706
- [3] R. C. Albers, A. M. Boring, and N. E. Christensen, Phys. Rev. B 33, 8116 (1986)
- [4] N. Kemavanois, B. Genier, A. Huxley, E. Ressouche, J. P. Sanchez, and J. Flouquet, Phys. Rev. B 64, 174509 (2001)
- [5] H. Yamagami and A. Hasegawa, Physica B 186-188, 182 (1993); see also A. B. Shick and W. E. Pickett, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 300 (2001)
- [6] K. O. K. Lepp and W. Bronger, Z. anorg. allg. Chem. 532, 23 (1986); P. Müller and W. Bronger, Z. Naturforsch. 34b, 1264 (1979); W. Bronger, U. Ruschewitz, and P. Müller, J. Alloys Compounds 187, 95 (1992); H. H. Schmidtke, R. Packro, W. Bronger, and P. Müller, Chem. Phys. Lett. 150, 129 (1988);
- [7] M. Koga, W. Liu, M. Doly and P. Fulde, Phys. Rev. B 57, 10648 (1998)
- [8] P. Fulde, L. L. Hirst and A. Luther, Z. Phys. 230, 155 (1970), see also P. Fulde, Handbook on the Physics and Chemistry of Rare Earth, Chapt. 17, Vol. 2, ed. by K. A. G. Schneider and L. Eyring (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979)
- [9] N. K. Sato, N. Aso, K. Miyake, R. Shina, P. Thalmeier, G. Varelogiannis, C. Geibel, F. Steglich, P. Fulde, and T. Komatsubara, Nature 410, 240, (2001)
- [10] T. Hotta and K. Ueda, cond-mat/0211706
- [11] see, e.g., Chap. 11 of: P. Fulde, Electron Correlations in Molecules and Solids 3rd ed. (Springer, Heidelberg 1995)