

Crystal Field Effects in CeIrIn₅

A.D. Christianson¹, J.M. Lawrence¹, P.S. Riseborough², N.O. Moreno³, P.G. Pagliuso³, E.D. Bauer³, J.L. Sarrao³, W. Bao³, E.A. Goremychkin⁴, S. Kern⁵, F.R. Trouw³, and M.P. Hehlen³

¹University of California, Irvine, California 92697

²Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

³Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

⁴Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439

⁵Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523

Mailing Address: Los Alamos National Laboratory, MS K764, Los Alamos, NM 87545
USA

Fax: 505-665-7652

Email: achristianson@lanl.gov

In this work, we study crystalline electric field effects in the heavy fermion superconductor CeIrIn₅. We observe two regions of broad magnetic response in the inelastic neutron scattering spectra at 10 K. The first corresponds to the transition between the Γ_7 groundstate doublet and the first excited state doublet at 4 meV interwoven with a broad quasielastic contribution. The second region corresponds to the transition between the ground state and the second excited state doublet at 28 meV. The large Lorentzian half-widths of the peaks (~ 10 meV) calls into question calculations for the specific heat and magnetic susceptibility that assume sharp crystal field levels. Consequently, we have calculated the inelastic neutron scattering spectra and magnetic susceptibility using the Anderson impurity model within the non-crossing approximation (NCA) including the effects of crystal field level splitting.

Keywords: inelastic neutron scattering, heavy fermions, Kondo effect, superconductivity, crystal field splitting

The discovery of the CeMIn₅ (M = Co, Rh, Ir)^{1,2,3} series of heavy fermion superconductors offers the opportunity to systematically explore heavy fermion superconductivity in closely related materials. Despite numerous attempts, the origin of superconductivity in the CeMIn₅ series has yet to be established unambiguously. There have been several proposals put forth, based on both experimental and theoretical considerations, suggesting that crystal field (CF) splitting may play a crucial role in the heavy fermion superconductivity observed in the CeMIn₅ series^{4,5,6}. Additionally, from the point of view of bulk measurements such as specific heat, magnetic susceptibility, and thermal expansion, there is disagreement about the particular CF parameters in these materials. Therefore a direct measurement of the CF level splitting is desirable. In this work we focus on CF effects in the heavy fermion superconductor CeIrIn₅.

Crystal Field level splittings in heavy fermion systems are typically observed as broadened peaks in an inelastic neutron scattering (INS) spectrum. The broadening of the peaks in the INS is due to hybridization between the localized f-electrons and the conduction electrons. The hybridization has the added effect of renormalizing the energy splitting of the CF levels. In the case of CeIrIn₅, the CF Hamiltonian is that of Ce³⁺ in a tetragonal environment and may be written as

$$H_{CF} = B_2^0 O_2^0 + B_4^0 O_4^0 + B_4^4 O_4^4 \quad (1)$$

where the B_i^m are the CF parameters and the O_i^m are the Stevens operator equivalents.

Diagonalization of this Hamiltonian yields the following wave functions.

$$\Gamma_7^1 = \alpha \left| \pm \frac{5}{2} \right\rangle - \beta \left| \mp \frac{3}{2} \right\rangle \quad \Gamma_7^2 = \beta \left| \pm \frac{5}{2} \right\rangle + \alpha \left| \mp \frac{3}{2} \right\rangle \quad \Gamma_6 = \left| \pm \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle \quad (2)$$

The form of the wave functions are determined by symmetry considerations alone, while the mixing parameters (α and β) and the energy splitting can be determined by fitting to experiment.

The experiments described here were performed on two inelastic chopper spectrometers: PHAROS at the Manuel Lujan Neutron Science Center (Los Alamos National Laboratory) and LRMECS at the Intense Pulsed Neutron Source (Argonne National Laboratory). Approximately 50 g of CeIrIn₅ and 40 g of LaIrIn₅ single crystals were produced by growth in indium flux and powdered for these investigations. Data were collected at incident energies (E_i) of 30 and 60 meV at 10 K and at elevated temperatures (not shown). The counting time for each incident energy at each temperature was approximately two days. The effect of the strong neutron absorption of In and Ir was minimized by performing the experiments in a uniform flat plate sample geometry, which not only maximized the amount of sample in the beam while keeping the neutron path length as short as possible, but also allowed for an accurate absorption correction. The magnetic portion of the INS spectrum has been determined by $S_{\text{mag}} = S(\text{CeIrIn}_5) - f S(\text{LaIrIn}_5)$, where $f = 0.83$ is the ratio of the total scattering cross sections of CeIrIn₅ and LaIrIn₅. Other methods of subtraction of the nonmagnetic scattering give similar results. The dependence of S_{mag} on the magnetic form factor has been removed in the INS spectra shown below.

Figure 1(a) and (b) displays S_{mag} determined from data recorded on LRMECS at 10 K with an $E_i = 30$ meV and 60 meV respectively. Figure 1(c) displays similar data from PHAROS at 18 K with $E_i = 30.2$ meV. The most prominent feature of these data is that the CF levels are extremely broad. The CF peaks are broadened to such a degree that

we are unable to resolve the quasielastic scattering, despite performing higher resolution experiments on PHAROS with a FWHM at the elastic line of 1.4 meV (Figure 1(c)). Figure 1(a-c) also display fits to the INS spectra. The fits contain an overall scale factor for each dataset, the CF parameters and a single Lorentzian half-width Γ_{IE} of the CF excitations at each temperature. To prevent proliferation of fitting parameters the quasielastic width Γ_{QE} has been constrained to be $1/4 \Gamma_{IE}$. For CeRhIn₅⁷ and CeCoIn₅⁸ this gives values of Γ_{QE} that are in good agreement with estimates from NMR experiments⁹. The resulting crystal field parameters for CeIrIn₅ are $B_2^0 = -1.21$ meV, $B_4^0 = 0.063$ meV, and $B_4^4 = 0.075$ meV. This implies that the groundstate (Γ_7^1) - first excited state (Γ_7^2) splitting is $E_1 = 4$ meV¹⁰, while the ground state - second excited state (Γ_6) splitting is $E_2 = 28$ meV. Furthermore, the admixture of the $J_z = 5/2$ and $3/2$ states is nearly equal with $\beta = 0.76$. Finally, the half-width of the inelastic excitations is indeed large and is found to be $\Gamma_{IE} = 10$ meV, indicating large f-conduction electron hybridization.

Such large hybridization suggests that Kondo physics is important in CeIrIn₅. Figure 2(a) shows calculations for the INS spectra of an Anderson impurity subject to crystal field splitting within the non-crossing approximation (NCA) assuming the hybridization (V) = 470 meV and figure 2(b) shows the corresponding calculation of the magnetic susceptibility. Since $\Gamma_{IE} > E_1$, the theoretical result is insensitive to E_1 and we obtain good fits by assuming a ground state quartet; the degeneracy of the ground state is, in effect, larger than 2 in CeIrIn₅ due to the f-conduction electron hybridization. We assume a bare crystal field level at 22.6 meV and an equal admixture of the $J_z = 5/2$ and $3/2$ states ($\alpha^2 = \beta^2 = 0.5$). The NCA calculations reproduce the magnetic susceptibility

reasonably well, with some deficiencies at lower temperatures, which may be in part due to the onset of magnetic correlations.

It is instructive to compare these results to those for two other ambient pressure heavy fermion superconductors. The separation E_1 between the ground state and the excited states is 30 meV in CeCu_2Si_2 ¹¹ and 8.6 meV in CeCoIn_5 ⁸ but is 6.9 meV in antiferromagnetic CeRhIn_5 ⁷. The inelastic width Γ_{IE} is 6.5 meV in CeCoIn_5 ⁸, 10 meV in CeCu_2Si_2 ¹¹ but is only 2.3 meV in CeRhIn_5 ⁷. Hence while there is no correlation between superconductivity and E_1 , it does appear that moderately large hybridization widths Γ_{IE} are necessary for superconductivity. More detailed comparisons among the members of CeMIn_5 will be given in a forthcoming publication¹².

In summary, we have determined the CF level scheme of CeIrIn_5 by least squares fitting to a CF model. The CF excitations are quite broad. The resulting crystal field parameters were then used as input to Anderson impurity calculations which reproduce the INS spectra and the magnetic susceptibility. The moderately large width of the CF excitations is related to the f-conduction electron hybridization, which appears to be a condition for superconductivity in this heavy Fermion compound.

References

- ¹H. Hegger, C. Petrovic, E. G. Moshopoulou, M. F. Hundley, J. L. Sarrao, Z. Fisk, and J. D. Thompson, Pressure-Induced Superconductivity in Quasi-2D CeRhIn₅, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4986 (2000).
- ²C. Petrovic, R. Movshovich, M. Jaime, P. G. Pagliuso, M. F. Hundley, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, and Z. Fisk, A New Heavy-Fermion superconductor CeIrIn₅: A Relative of the Cuprates, Europhys. Lett., **84**, 354 (2001).
- ³C. Petrovic, P. G. Pagliuso, M. F. Hundley, R. Movshovich, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, and Z. Fisk, Heavy-fermion Superconductivity in CeCoIn₅ at 2.3 K, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **13**, L337 (2001)
- ⁴P. G. Pagliuso, N. J. Curro, N. O. Moreno, M. F. Hundley, J. D. Thompson, J. L. Sarrao, Z. Fisk, Structurally tuned superconductivity in heavy-fermion CeMIn₅, Physica B **320**, 370 (2002).
- ⁵T. Takimoto, T. Hotta, T. Maehira, and K. Ueda, Spin-fluctuation-induced superconductivity controlled by orbital fluctuation, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **14**, L369 (2002).
- ⁶T. Hotta and K. Ueda, Construction of a microscopic model for f-electron systems on the basis of a j-j coupling scheme, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 104518 (2003).
- ⁷A.D. Christianson, J.M. Lawrence, P.G. Pagliuso, N.O. Moreno, J.L. Sarrao, J.D. Thompson, P.S. Riseborough, S. Kern, E.A. Goremychkin, and A.H. Lacerda, Neutron scattering study of crystal fields in CeRhIn₅, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 193102 (2002)
- ⁸E. D. Bauer, *et al.* submitted to J. Appl. Phys.
- ⁹N. J. Curro, J. L. Sarrao, J. D. Thompson, Low-Frequency Spin Dynamics in the CeMIn₅ Materials, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227202 (2003).
- ¹⁰Although neutron scattering (or magnetic susceptibility) cannot distinguish between Γ_7^1 or Γ_7^2 (changing the sign of B_4^1), we argue that the crystal field schemes in the CeMIn₅ materials should not be that different from CeIn₃ and therefore the ground state should be Γ_7^1 .
- ¹¹E. A. Goremychkin and R. Osborn, Crystal-field excitations in CeCu₂Si₂, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 14280 (1993).
- ¹²A.D. Christianson *et al.* in preparation.

Figure Captions:

Figure 1. (a) and (b) symbols are S_{mag} determined from data collected on LRMECS as described in the text for $E_i = 30$ and 60 meV respectively at $T = 10$ K. In (c) the symbols are S_{mag} determined from data collected on PHAROS with $E_i = 30.2$ meV at 18 K. The solid line in (a-c) is a least squares fit as described in the text.

Figure 2. (a) The symbols are the data from figure 1(a) and (b). The solid line is a NCA calculation with the hybridization $V = 470$ meV. (b) Shows the corresponding NCA calculation (solid line) for the magnetic susceptibility compared to the experimental results (symbols).




Figure 1: A.D. Christianson *et al.*




Figure 2 : A.D. Christianson *et al.*