M algorzata W ierzbowska Physics Department, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland

Daniel Sanchez-Portal

Centro Mixto CSIC-UPV/EHU and Donostia International Physics Center (DIPC), Paseo Manuel de Lardizabal 4, 20018 Donostia-San Sebastian, Spain

> Stefano Sanvito Physics Department, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland. (Dated: March 22, 2024)

The mechanism for the ferrom agnetic order of $(Ga_M n)As$ and $(Ga_M n)N$ is extensively studied over a vast range of M n concentrations. We calculate the electronic structures of these materials using density functional theory in both the local spin density approximation and the LDA + U scheme, that we have now implemented in the code SIESTA. For $(Ga_M n)As$, the LDA + U approach leads to a hole mediated picture of the ferrom agnetism, with an exchange constant N = -2.8 eV. This is smaller than that obtained with LSDA, which overestimates the exchange coupling between M n ions and the Asp holes. In contrast, the ferrom agnetism in wurtzite $(Ga_M n)N$ is caused by the double-exchange mechanism, since a hole of strong d character is found at the Ferm i level in both the LSDA and the LDA + U approaches. In this case the coupling between the M n ions decays rapidly with the M n-M n separation. This suggests a two phases picture of the ferrom agnetic order in $(Ga_M n)N$, with a robust ferrom agnetic phase at large M n concentration coexisting with a diluted weak ferrom agnetic phase.

PACS numbers: 71.15.m, 71.15Mb, 71.15Ap, 75.30Et, 71.50Pp

I. IN TRODUCTION

In recent years there was a rapid developm ent in the growth and characterization of diluted magnetic sem iconductors (DMS) [1]. These materials are obtained by doping with transition metals ordinary III-V sem iconductors [2] and recently also transition m etal oxides [3]. The novel aspect of the DMS is the interplay between the electronic functionality of a sem iconductor with m agnetic properties. For example the possibility of tailoring the ferrom agnetic Curie tem perature (T_c) by electron gating has been already dem onstrated [4]. It is then clear that the m easurem ent of a spontaneous m agnetization, although good test for ferrom agnetism , is not a direct proof of a material to be a DMS. Therefore som e other measurements such as the anomalous Halle ect [2] or X-ray magnetic circular dicrohism (XMCD) [5] must be used to demonstrate the interaction between the magnetic and the electronic degrees of freedom . To date only a few materials, including (Ga,Mn)As and (In,Mn)As, have passed convincingly this test [5], but unfortunately none of them present a Tc above room tem perature. This of course is a critical requisite for future devices.

New excitement cames with the synthesis of ferrom agnetic (G a,M n)N [6,7,8,9] with T_c well above room tem – perature. High T_c in thism aterial was somehow expected after the predictions of D ietlet al. [10], who calculated the magnetic properties of various semiconductors incorporating M n, and concluded that wide gap semiconductors might o er better possibility for high T_c . D ietl's calculations are based on the Zener [11] m odel of ferro-

m agnetism, where the localized 5/2 spins of the M n ions are antiferrom agnetically coupled with the spins of the free holes, giving rise to an elective M n-M n ferrom agnetic interaction. Interestingly high T_c (G a,M n)N does not show any evidence for anom alous hole elect, nor for any hysteretic XMCD signal coming from the valence G aN electrons [12]. This seems to suggest, that in the case of (G a,M n)N the agreem ent with the D ietl's theory is som ehow coincidental.

Since the experimental situation is not conclusive, abinitio methods are important for understanding the main features of these novelmaterials, and for establishing the validity of models based on elective Hamiltonians [10, 13]. So far a large number of density functional theory (DFT) calculations for a wide range of DMS have been published (see reference [14] for a review). A lm ost all the calculations to date are based on the local spin density approximation (LSDA) and here we list the main results for (G a M n)As and (G a M n)N:

1) (G a,M n)As is a half-m etal with a magnetic m om ent of 4 $_{\rm B}$ per M n in unit the cell [15, 16, 17, 18].

2) In (G a,M n)As the local magnetic m on ent at the M n site is larger than 4 $_{\rm B}$ and the Ferm i level lies below the top of the majority valence band. This sustains the idea of a hole with spin antiferrom agnetically coupled to that of the M n. In addition an induced magnetic moment antiparallel to that of the M n is found at the As sites neighboring the M n ions.

3) The hole in (G a,M n)As has a rather large d com ponent as the result of a considerable p-d interaction. 4) For (G a,M n)As an estimation of the exchange constant N gives a value of about -4.5 eV [15], which is considerably larger than that given by m ost experimental determinations and the value used in model H am iltonian calculations [10, 13].

5) A lso (G a,M n)N is a half-m etalw ith a m agnetization of 4 $_{\rm B}$ per M n in the cell [19].

6) The valence band of (G a, M n)N is not spin-splitted and the Ferm i level lies in a rather narrow impurity band [19].

7) The magnetic impurity band in $(Ga_M n)N$ has a strong d character and the magnetic moment at the M n sites is consistent with a M n d⁴ con guration [16].

Very recently we have investigated whether some of these comm on features are pathological of the use of the LSDA. In particular, since the LSDA tends to underestim ate electron localization and to overestim ate the p-d hybridization, one may cast som e doubts on its quantitative predictions. W e have carried out electronic structure calculations for both (Ga,Mn)As and (Ga,Mn)N by using the self-interaction corrected LDA method (LDA -SIC) [20, 21]. The main ndings are that, on the one hand the electronic structure of (Ga,Mn)As are rather sim ilar in LSDA and LDA-SIC, although the second predicts a much weaker p-d hybridization at the top of the valence band with consequent reduction of the valence band spin-splitting. This of course means that the exchange constant N is smaller than that predicted by the LSDA.On the other hand, for (Ga,Mn)N LDA-SIC shows a strong orbital ordering with a convincing evidence of a M n d⁴ con guration. A lthough this can be re-interpreted as M n d⁵ plus a localized d hole, it is clear that no holes are left in the GaN valence band and an it inerant free-hole-m ediated picture of ferrom agnetism is not sustainable.

Unfortunately, due to its computational overheads we have not been able yet to investigate the details of the Mn-Mn interaction with the LDA-SIC method. The present paper seeks to 11 this gap. We have implemented the LDA+U scheme in the localized atom is orbitalDFT code SIESTA [22, 23], and we have then used this novel computational capability to investigate the magnetic properties of (G a,Mn)As and (G a,Mn)N. The method, although introduces two phenom enological parameters (the C oulom b U and the exchange J constants), allow s us to perform large scale calculations and therefore to investigate the Mn-Mn interaction over a broad range of Mn concentrations.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we will brie y discuss our computational details and we will justify the values used for the LDA + U phenom enological parameters. Then we will present our results for both ($Ga_{,M} n$)As and ($Ga_{,M} n$)N, and nally we will conclude. Details on the implementation of the LDA + U method in SESTA are described in the appendix.

II. COMPUTATIONALDETAILS

All the calculations of this work are performed with the density functional code SESTA [22, 23]. SESTA has been specially optimized to deal with very large systems. It uses a very e cient localized atom ic orbital basis set [24, 25, 26] and norm conserving pseudopotentials in the separate K leinman-Bylander form [27]. It is therefore ideal to simulate arrangements of hundreds and even thousands of atom s, hence DM S with low M n concentrations [14] and related systems [28].

We use conventional scalar relativistic Troulier-Martins pseudopotentials [29] with nonlinear core cor-The reference electronic con gurarections [30]. tions for the pseudopotentials are: $2s^22p^33d^0$ (N), $4s^{2}4p^{3}3d^{0}$ (As), $4s^{2}4p^{0}3d^{5}4f^{0}$ (Mn), with s/p/d cuto radii: 1.14/1.14/1.14 a.u. (N), 1.9/2.18/2.5 a.u. (As) and s/p/d/f radii for M n 1.98/2.18/1.88/1.88 a.u. W e treat the 4s and 4p electrons of G a as valence electrons and we leave the 3d in the core. Therefore the pseudopotential is constructed for $4s^2 4p^1 3d^0$ with s/p/d cut-o radii 2.1/2.5/2.98 a.u. W e also checked whether or not the inclusion of 3d electrons in the valence changes the relevant properties. In GaAs, although this was shown to be important for the geometry optimization and the high pressure phases [31], it does not seem to be particularly relevant for the physics at the Ferm i level under norm alpressure conditions. In contrast, in GaN the 3d states lie about 3 eV below the N-2s states [32]. LSDA sets erroneously their position within the N-2s band and one may suspect that this will a ect som ehow the physics at the Ferm i level. We x this wrong alignment by applying U corrections to the G a 3d states and nd that, although now the bands have the correct position, the Ferm i sphere is not m odi ed. Therefore we decided not to include G a 3d states in the valence in order to save computational time and memory. Note that the same choice is presently adopted in most of the calculations of this type [19].

As far as the lattice structure is concerned, all the calculations assume the experim ental geom etry for both zincblende G aAs ($a_0 = 5.65$ A) and wurtzite G aN (a = 3.189 A c = 5.185 A and u = 0.377) [33]. We then perform supercell simulations, where the supercells are constructed as integer multiple of either the primitive or in the case of zincblende the cubic cell.

Turning our attention to the basis set it is worth pointing out that SIESTA uses a exible multiple- basis set [34] of num erical atom ic orbitals. Our calculations use double- for the s and p-shells of any element and a triple-

basis set for the M n 3d-shell. Details of the relevant basis cuto radii and their optim ization has been already given elsew here [15].

A lthough SIE STA is a very powerful and exible package, it includes only basic features to tackle magnetic system s. In particular it can only use the LSDA or the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) for the exchange correlation potential. No schemes to deal with strong electron correlations are included. Since we believe that these may play an important rôle in determ ining the magnetic properties of III-V DMS, we decided to implement the LDA+U scheme in SIESTA, using the functional proposed by Anisim ov et al. [35, 36]. Details of the implementations are discussed in the Appendix.

Since the LDA + U method is essentially empirical, in the sense that the values of the Coulomb and exchange constants U and J must be provided, we have explored several choices of these parameters. Our thing criterion was to choose U and J in order to obtain the best energy position of the Mnd band compared with that of available photoem ission data [37]. This t xes U and J respectively to 4.5 eV and 1.0 eV. In addition to the correct positioning of the Mn d band we nd that this set of param eters also reproduces accurately the band structure of (G a,M n)As that we have obtained with the LDA-SIC method [20]. Finally it is worth noting that the results are not strongly dependent on the values of J (within a reasonable range) and that we have assumed that the same set of parameters can be used also for Mn in (Ga,Mn)N. Here we also present som e results for U = 8 eV in order to give a better explanation of the trends.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A schematic Hamiltonian for describing the main interaction in III-V DMS is as follows

$$H = H_0 + N S s; \qquad (1)$$

where H₀ is the H am iltonian for the host sem iconductor and N is the exchange constant between the M n spin S and the spin s of som e type of carriers. When the relevant carriers are holes this H am iltonian leads to two possible scenarios depending on the magnitude of N = where is the valence band bandwidth. In the case of N the M n-M n coupling is mediated by free carriers and can be treated in term of the mean-eld Zener [11] model.

In contrast if N an impurity band forms at the top of the valence band with a strong M n d character and the e ective coupling is double-exchange like [38]. Finally in the case N , when the hole are strongly localized at the M n sites, a magnetic polaron can form and the interaction is expected to be rather short range and described by percolation theory [38]. In addition to this picture, if the Mnd levels lie at midgap with weak coupling with the carriers of either the conduction or valence band of the host sem iconductor, the entire use of the H am iltonian (1) can be questioned and the ferrom agnetism might be described by a Zhang-Rice polaron [39]. One of the aim of this work is to distinguish between these multiple options.

A. (Ga, Mn) As: Electronic Structure

In gure 1 we show the density of the states $(D \circ S)$ for 3.125% (G a,M n)As obtained with the LSDA and the LDA+U schemes respectively. Both methods result in a



FIG.1: DOS for 3.125% (G a,M n)As calculated with both the LSDA (upper panel) and the LDA + U (low er panel) schemes. The solid line represents the total DOS and the dashed area the contribution from the M n d electrons. The values of U and J are respectively 4.5 eV and 1 eV. The vertical line denotes the position of the Fermi level ($E_F = 0 \text{ eV}$).

halfm etalw ith a magnetic moment of 4 $_{\rm B}$ perM n in the cell. The di erence between LSDA and LDA+U is in the position of the M n-derived d DOS and its contribution to the top of the majority spin valence band. LDA+U shifts the center on the majority M n d band to lower energies and now the DOS shows a strong M n-d peak at about 4 eV below Ferm i level ($E_{\rm F}$). This is a feature that agrees perfectly with the photoem ission spectra of reference [37]. M oreover this downshift changes the contribution of the M n d levels to the DOS at $E_{\rm F}$ which is substantial in the LSDA (18 % of the total DOS at $E_{\rm F}$) and small in the LDA+U (7 %). These features

are a consequence of the enhanced localization of the M n d shells in real space. The magnetic moment per M n atom calculated from the M ulliken population analysis [40] is 4.21 $_{\rm B}$ for LSDA and 4.71 $_{\rm B}$ for LDA+U with U = 4.5 eV.LDA+U therefore gives a clear con rm ation of the M n d⁵ con guration.

In addition there is always an induced magnetic moment at the As sites, which is antiparallel to that of the M n ion. In this case the LSDA and LDA+U behaviors are somehow di erent. In LSDA we nd a rapid decay of the induced magnetic moment with the distance between the As and the M n ions. This is 0.068 $_{\rm B}$ for the rst neighbor, 0.011 $_{\rm B}$ for the second, 0.006 $_{\rm B}$ for the third. In contrast LDA+U gives a larger magnetic moment for the rst neighbor (0.106 $_{\rm B}$), but then this becomes almost constant with the distance from the M n ion (0.015 $_{\rm B}$).

F inally it is worth noting that the LDA+U pushes the unoccupied M n d states in the m inority band to higher energies and therefore the m inority conduction band bottom changes from d-like to sp-like. D expite aforem entioned features, it seems that taking into account strong C oulom b interaction in the M n 3d shell, does not change much the qualitative LSDA picture of (G a,M n)As near E_F . In order to appreciate the di erences between the two schemes and distinguish between the di erent scenarios described at the beginning of this section we need to investigate in m ore details the magnetic interaction.

B. (Ga,Mn)As: Magnetic Interaction

We rst decide to evaluate the Mn-d/free-hole exchange constant N . Before starting we would like to note that N is not a physical observable. Therefore it cannot be measured directly but must be inferred from some other quantity. In particular the Ham iltonian (1) solved within the mean eld approximation, leads to the prediction of a linear dependence of the spin-splitting of the valence band E_v upon the Mn concentration x

$$N = \frac{E_v}{x hS_1}; \qquad (2)$$

where hS i is the average spin of the M n site $(5/2 \text{ assum} - \text{ing a M n } d^5 \text{ con guration})$ [15]. This is a quantity that can be easily calculated within our approach. Of course the idea of extracting N from the equation (2) underpins the assumption that DFT and the Ham iltonian H solved in the mean eld approximation lead to the same physics.

In gure 2, we present E $_{v}$ for x equal to 0.021, 0.031, 0.042, 0.063, and 0.125 obtained by substituting one G a atom with M n in supercells containing respectively 96, 64, 48, 32, and 16 atom s. It is easy to note that the slope of the linear dependence of E $_{v}$ upon x decreases when going from LSDA to LDA+U, and furtherm ore it becomes smaller as U gets larger. We also note that only in the case of U = 4.5 eV the linear interpolation presents



FIG.2: Valence band spin splitting E $_v$ for (G a,M n)As at various M n concentrations. Results for LSDA and LDA+U with U=4.5 eV, J=1 eV and at U=8 eV, J=1. The straight lines represent our best t taken over all the concentration range.

the correct lim it E v ! 0 for x ! 0, while this is not found for the LSDA or for other values of U. Although simple multiple scattering corrections which reproduce the appropriate behaviour for x ! 0 can be added to our analysis [15, 41], this is an interesting result in itself. In fact the value of U = 4.5 eV gives also the correct position of the M n d states, and produces band structure that closely agrees with those calculated with our param eter free LDA-SIC method [20]. We therefore conclude that the LDA+U method with U = 4.5 eV and J = 1 eV accurately describes the electronic structures of (G a, M n)As, which in turn is also consistent with the mean eld theory [10]. We then extract the value of N using the equation (2). In doing this we have observed that, although it is possible to t very accurately for either large (x = 0.031,0.042, 0.063 and 0.125) or sm all (x=0.021, 0.031, 0.042, and 0.063) M n concentrations, a good t over the whole concentration range is not satisfactory. This is som ehow expected since for sm all concentrations multiple scattering corrections are relevant and for large the M n ions cannot be considered as a small perturbation to the GaAs electronic structure. We therefore always calculate two values of N corresponding to the two di erent ts.

In this way we nd 3.0 < N < 2.8 eV for LDA+U (U = 4.5 eV), which must be put in relation with the values of 3.25 < N < 3.0 eV and 2.23 < N < 2 eV extracted respectively from the LSDA and from LDA+U with U = 8 eV.

We believe that our value of N -2.8 eV is the appropriate value to use in the H am iltonian (1). Let us point out the exact meaning of our statement. We state that in a perfectly ordered, defect-free (G a, M n)As crystal, where every M n ion occupies a G a site and therefore donates a local spin 5/2 and a hole, the spin splitting of the valence band will be that given in gure 2 for U = 4.5 eV. Then, if we also suppose that E_v can be described by the H am iltonian H of equation (1), the correct \bare" value for N is in the range 3:0 < N< 2:8 eV. In contrast if one wants to extract a value of N from experim entaldata it must be rem em bered that the actual value entering in the de nition of the observables (for instance the band spinsplitting) is not the \bare" one, but an \e ective" value that som ehow takes into account e ects such as disorder, presence of compensating defects and so on. Therefore it should not be surprising that these values do not agree with the \bare" one obtained here, and that the measurem ents of di erent observables give di erent values of . Magnetotransport gives values ranging from 1.5 eV Ν [42] to 3.3 eV [43], exciton splitting gives N = 2.5 eV [44] and core level photoem ission N = -1.2 eV [45].

To further investigate the e ects of strong on-site correlation on the electronic structure of (G a,M n)A swe have analyzed the e ective M n-M n interaction. As usual we consider supercells where we now include two M n ions per cell [46]. We calculate the total energy of the cell either in posing a ferrom agnetic ($E_{\rm FM}$) or antiferrom agnetic ($E_{\rm AF}$) alignment of the magnetization of the M n ions. Then our total energy calculations are tted to a simple H eisenberg model, in which the energy can be written as

$$E = \int_{j>j}^{X} J(\mathbf{r}_{ij}) S_i S_j; \qquad (3)$$

where J (r_{ij}) is the exchange constant as a function of the M n-M n separation $r_{ij} = \mathcal{R}_i$ R_jjand S_i is the M n spin at site \mathcal{R}_i . Here we assume $S_i = hSi = 5=2$ independently on the atom ic position. This is consistent with the magnetic moment per M n obtained from our DFT calculations. M oreover we consider J (r) to be rather short ranged by setting J (r) = 0 for r > 10.0A. O ur results for x = 0.063 for both LSDA and LDA+U with U = 4.5 eV as a function of the M n-M n separation are presented in gure 3.



FIG. 3: Exchange parameter J as a function of the M n-M n separation d for x = 0.063. The results are for LSDA and LDA+U with U = 4.5 eV and J=1.0.

Both LSDA and LDA + U show a decay of the magnetic

coupling strength between two M n ions as their separation increases. In addition we also observe some oscillating behaviour. This is expected when dealing with a carrier-m ediated ferrom agnetism, although our J (r) cannot be tted to an RKKY-like expression due to the lack of antiferrom agnetic interaction (positive J's). It is interesting to note that our results are rather sim ilar to those obtained previously with LSDA [47], which have been interpreted in term of ferrom agnetic paths through As sites. The main di erence between the LSDA and the LDA+U results is a substantial reduction of the M n-M n interaction when strong correlation is included.

A rough estimation of the possible $T_{\rm c}$ can be obtained by using the mean-eld approximation [48]. This involves the sum of the exchange parameters over all the cation sites. From gure 3 it is then clear that LDA+U predicts a $T_{\rm c}$ for ~6%~ (G a,M n)As considerably smaller than that predicted by LSDA .

In conclusion for (G a,M n)As both LSDA and LDA+U give a picture of hole-m ediated ferrom agnetism . However the inclusion of strong on-site repulsion at the M n sites reduces the p-d hybridization at the top of the valence band with a consequent reduction of the elective M n-M n interaction.

C. (Ga,Mn)N: Electronic Structure

The bandstructure and the corresponding DOS for (GaMn)N with a Mn concentration of 3.125% (1 Mn ion in a 64 atom GaN cell) are presented respectively in gures 4 and 5. For both LSDA and LDA+U and in contrast with zincblende (GaMn)As, in the wurtzite (GaMn)N the Mn d-derived states appear in the middle of the GaN gap in the majority spin band. The Fermi level cuts through a triplet with mainly Mn d and N p character and no free holes are left in the valence band, which in turn does not spin split.

From the pictures it is clear that also (Ga,Mn)N is a half-m etal with a total magnetization of the unit cell of 4 B, as in the (G a, M n) As case. However for (G a, M n) N the M ulliken population gives us a m agnetic m om ent per M n ion of 3.74_{B} and 3.86_{B} respectively for LSDA and LDA + U. This is consistent with a M n d⁴ con guration and a Ferm isurface dom inated by d like holes. Going into the details of the bandstructure we note that the triplet state at the Ferm i level is made mainly from Mnd states with xy, x^2 y^2 and z^2 symmetry, while the doublet is primarily made from Mn $d_{\rm x\,z}$ and $d_{\rm y\,z}$ states. The zaxis has been taken here along the c-axis of the wurtzite structure. This can be easily seen from the density of states projected on the M n d shells (gures 6 and 7) and it is a direct consequence of the hexagonal crystal eld splitting.

There are two main di erences when going from LSDA to LDA + U. First with LDA + U the d_{xz} - d_{yz} doublet disappears at the top of the GaN valance band, leaving only the triplet in the bandgap, which shifts closer to the va-



FIG. 4: Bandstructure of 3.125% (G a,M n)N calculated with LSDA (upper panel) and LDA+U (U = 4.5 eV, J = 1.0 eV) (low er panel). The picture on the left (right) is for m a jority (m inority) spins. The horizontal line denotes the position of the Ferm i level (E $_{\rm F}$ = 0 eV).

lence band top. Secondly LDA+U enhances the orbital ordering of the xy, $x^2 y^2$, z^2 triplet. In fact, while with LSDA this is a mixture of all the three orbital components, with the Ferm i level cutting through a peak with strong d_{z²} character, in LDA+U the Ferm i level lies below the d_{z²} peak leaving a strongly localized d_{z²} hole. Secondly in LDA+U there is a general reduction of the M n d component of the DOS at the Ferm i level, with an increase of the N p component. In fact by integrating the orbital resolved DOS over the xy, $x^2 y^2$, z^2 triplet, we calculate that the relative contribution to the DOS com - ing from the M n d shells is 55% and 36% respectively for LSDA and LDA+U.

These features suggest that the main e ects of the Hubbard U corrections are an increase of the localization of the M n d electrons associated with a reduction of both the on-site d hybridization and the M n d-N p coupling.

A similar behaviour has also been found with the LDA-SIC method [20]. However in the LDA-SIC case the orbital ordering in much stronger producing a complete split of the triplet into an occupied doublet and an empty singlet (with mainly d_{z^2} character). We have tried several values of U and J in order to reproduce the LDA-SIC result, without success. The main dimense between the two calculations is that in the case of LDA-SIC all the orbitals, including those of G a and N, are corrected. The resulting band gap of G aN is almost twice as big as that obtained with the simple LSDA. This means that the LDA-SIC and LDA+U calculations start from an host



FIG. 5: DOS of 3.125% (G a,M n)N calculated with LSDA (upper panel) and LDA+U (U = 4.5 eV, J = 1.0 eV) (lower panel). The solid line represents the total DOS and the dashed area the contribution from the M n d electrons. The vertical line denotes the position of the Ferm i level, that we set to 0 eV.

sem iconductor with a rather di erent band gap giving rise to a more pronounced orbital ordering in the LDA-SIC case. In support to this hypothesis it is worth reporting that novelLDA-SIC calculations [49], perform ed by subtracting the self-interaction only from the M n d orbitals, give very sim ilar results than our present LDA+U.

A lso for (G a, M n)N we investigate the presence of an induced magnetic moment at the N sites. In this case the situation is rather di erent from that of (Ga,Mn)As. LSDA calculations show very little magnetic moment at any N sites, including nearest M n neighbors where the induced magnetic moment is only $0.03_{\rm B}$ and parallel to that of the Mn ion. A lso LDA + U gives sm all induced m agnetic m om ents $(0.098_{\rm B}$ for the rst neighbor sites, then smaller than 0.008 $_{\rm B}$ for any other N), however those are antiparallel to that of the M n ions. M ore interestingly the occupation of the four N ions in the M nN_4 tetrahedron is rather sensitive to whether the N ion is placed along the wurtzite c axis (top N) or in the opposite plane (in-plane N). The induced m agnetic m om ent is given solely by the p_z orbital for the N top ion, and only by the p_x and p_y orbitals for the in plane N . However, in contrast with the previous LDA-SIC results [20], in the



FIG. 6: Projected DOS for the Mn d shell of a 3.125% (Ga,Mn)N: LSDA results. The vertical lines denote respectively the position of the Fermi level (solid line) and of the GaN valence band top (dotted line).

present case the induced N m agnetic moment is always antiparallel to that of the M n.

D. (Ga,Mn)N: M agnetic Interaction

From the previous analysis it is clear that the bandstructure does not support a conventionalZener-like picture of the ferrom agnetism, since no free holes are present in the G aN valence band. Therefore a careful investigation of the ferrom agnetic coupling between M n ions is needed. A loo in this case we consider supercells where we include two M n ions at di erent mutual positions, and we investigate the energy di erence between the ferro- and antiferrom agnetic alignment of the M n ions.

We explore several possible geom etrical con gurations, by using both a 32 and a 64 atom unit cell. The rst M n ion is always placed in the corner of the supercell and we allow the second to occupy di erent positions. Those possible con gurations are schem atically presented in gures 8 and 9. Also in this case we have t our DFT energy calculations to the H eisenberg H am iltonian of equation (3). In this case we use hSi = 2 and we have set J (r) = 0 for r > 6:4A. A sum mary of the results for all the M n positions studied here is presented in table I and in gure 10.

From our data it is clear that the LDA + U gives a ferrom agnetic coupling with rather di erent features than that given by the LSDA. In particular when going from



FIG. 7: Projected DOS for the Mn d shell of a 3.125% (Ga,Mn)N:LDA+U (U = 4:5 eV, J = 1:0 eV) results. The vertical lines denote respectively the position of the Fermi level (solid line) and of the GaN valence band top (dotted line).



FIG.8: Position of the M n ions in the (G a M n)N supercell. The large (sm all) spheres represent the possible M n (N) sites. The rst M n ion is in the position M n" and the second occupies one of the sites labeled with a capital letter.

LSDA to LDA+U there is a large enhancement of the J for nearest M n neighbours (case A and B), while all the other J's are either unchanged or reduced. A second interesting aspect is the dependence of J (r) over the M n concentration. A lso in this case LSDA and LDA+U give a rather di erent behaviour. In LSDA all the ex-



FIG.9: Position of the M n ions in the (G a, M n)N supercell: planar view. The large (sm all) circles represent the possible M n (N) sites. The rst M n ion is in the position M n" and the second occupies one of the sites labeled with a capital letter.



FIG.10: Exchange constants J as a function of the M n-M n separation for x = 12.5% and x = 6.25%, obtained with either LSDA or LDA+U. The label indicated the position of the second M n in the cell, according to gures 8 and 9, and table I. The horizontal line denotes J = 0.

change constants increase as the M n concentration becom es sm aller, while the LDA + U gives an increase of the nearest neighbour constants and alm ost no dependence on concentration for all the other constants.

This severe dependence of the J's on the M n-M n distance, with a strong coupling at short M n-M n separation and weak long-range tails, suggests that high T_c can be achieved only at reasonably large M n concentrations, when it is m ore likely to have several M n ions occupying nearest neighbouring positions. This leads us to speculate that the ferrom agnetic state occurs in ferrom agnetic clusters (with wurtzite lattice structure), presenting very large M n concentration. W ithin the clusters the ferrom agnetic state is stabilized by the strong nearest neighbour ferrom agnetic interaction, while the cluster-cluster coupling remains weak. Therefore our LDA + U calculations support the hypothesis of two ferrom agnetic phases in (G a,M n)N [12]: a high T_c phase characterized by large M n concentrations, and a diluted low T_c phase.

To gain more insights into the nature of the ferrom agnetic coupling we have studied in great details the electronic structure of various supercells containing two M n

Pos	sition	d (A)	$J_{0:125}^{\text{LSDA}}$	J _{0:125} ^{LDA+U}	J _{0:0625}	J ^{LD A + U} 0:0625
A	(0)	3.189	5.03	27.00	29.50	42.80
В	(1)	3.179	12.30	32.99	30.00	52.23
С	(2)	5.185	2.50	1.14	5.66	1.52
D	(0)	4.510	2.48	3.87	4.98	3.56
Е	(1)	4.504	2.50	2.90	10.18	1.08
F	(2)	6.088	2.75	3.50	15.83	9.05
G	(0)	6.378	3.88	5.57	6.15	5.73
Н	(1)	5.518	2.04	3.33	6.55	3.16

TABLE I: Sum mary of the results for all the di erent congurations studied. The M n positions correspond to those of gures 8 and 9 and d is the M n-M n distance. In brackets we report the num ber of planes separating the two M n ions along the wurtzite c axis. All the values of J are in meV, and the indexes label the M n concentration x.

ions. Here we focus only on the case of nearest neighbour M n ions, which are the ones presenting the larger exchange constants, and in particular on the case A. In gure 11 we present the DOS for both 64 and 32 atom cellcontaining two M n ions in the position A. The picture shows the results obtained with LSDA (top four panels) and LDA+U (bottom four panels) for both the parallel (right panels) and antiparallel (left panel) alignments of the M n spins.

From the picture it is clear that the ferrom agnetic state becomes more stable when the ferrom agnetic conguration presents a large spin-gap, i.e. when there is little overlap between the two Mn derived spin sub-bands. This is the case of LDA+U for both the concentrations studied, where we nd a spin-gap of the order of 1.5 eV. Moreover in LDA+U this spin-gap appears to be rather insensitive to the Mn concentration (although it clearly increases when going from x=12.5% to x= 6.25%), which re ects the corresponding weak dependence of J.

In contrast in the LSDA case there is a substantial overlap between the majority and the minority Mn d bands, in particular at large Mn concentrations. This is a direct consequence of the broadening of the Mn d states, upon increasing concentration. It is worth noting that in our 32 atom cell each Mn ion has two Mn neighbours separated only by one N site forming a Mn-N chain, whereas in the 64 atom cellMn-N An trimers are separated by two N sites. The large broadening obtained for x=12.5% closes alm ost entirely the spin gap, resulting in a rather weak ferrom agnetic coupling between the Mn.

These ndings can be understood in terms of competition between the super- and double-exchange mechanisms [51]. In absence of any holes the coupling between two M n ions is expected to be antiferrom agnetic due to the super-exchange coupling, as it was recently veri ed [52]. This coupling is extremely short ranged and one has to assume that M n ions separated by more than one N site are magnetically decoupled. Doping such a system will generally produce a distortion of the antiferro-



FIG.11: Density of states for various 64 and 32 atom supercells containing two M n ions in the position A (see gures 8 and 9). The di erent gures correspond to di erent M n concentrations, to either LSDA or LDA+U and to either parallel or antiparallel alignment of the M n ions: (a1) x=12.5% LSDA parallel, (a2) x=12.5% LSDA antiparallel, (b1) x=6.25% LSDA parallel, (b2) x=6.25% LSDA antiparallel, (c1) x=12.5% LDA+U parallel, (c2) x=12.5% LDA+U antiparallel, (d1) x=6.25% LDA+U parallel, (d2) x=6.25% LDA+U antiparallel. The solid lines show the totalDOS and the shadowed regions the contribution from the d orbitals of one M n ion. The horizontal lines denote the position of the Ferm i level (0 eV).

m agnetic coupling, eventually leading to a ferrom agnetic ground state for large enough dopants concentration. The \m elting" of the antiferrom agnetic state is connected with the fact that the additional electrons (or holes) are exchange coupled with the local spin of the transition m etal in purities. In this case the wave-function of such electrons depends on the magnetic con guration of the transition metal ions, and in particular it will be localized when those are aligned along di erent directions. The form ation of a ferrom agnetic state will enhance the delocalization of the additional electrons providing a net gain in band energy. The nal ground state is then the result of the competition between the energy gain due to the electron delocalization and the energy loss due to direct Mn-Mn super-exchange. Therefore in (Ga,Mn)N the ferrom agnetic ground state is directly connected with the presence of a hole in the M n-derived in purity band.

However in the case of sm all spin-splitting of the M n d states, virtual hopping of the holes between antiferrom agnetically oriented M n ions becomes possible and their kinetic energy can be lowered without producing

a ferrom agnetic ground state. This is why the LSDA calculations for large M n doping present a rather sm all ferrom agnetic interaction between the M n ions. In addition this enhanced hopping between antiferrom agnetically aligned M n ions produces a reduction of the M n m agnetic m om ent. For the x=12.5% case LSDA shows a m agnetic m om ent of the M n d shell (obtained from the M ulliken population) of 3.9 $_{\rm B}$ and 3.2 $_{\rm B}$ respectively for the ferrom agnetic and antiferrom agnetic con guration. This is indeed very di erent from the LDA+U case, where the localm agnetic m om ent changes little with the m utual M n alignment.

We have perform ed the sam e analysis over all the congurations studied with very similar conclusions. In the other case of short M n-M n distance (case B) the tiny differences with the case A are due to the di erent e ective M n-M n hopping integral. This is expected since the hopping integral depends on the speci c orbitals form ing the bond and ultimately on the path connecting the two M n ions. This gives rise to a weak anisotropy in the magnetic coupling. Finally for M n ions separated by m ore than one N site the coupling is always rather sm all due to the sm all hopping integral.

IV. SUMMARY

We have investigated extensively the mechanism for the ferrom agnetic coupling in $(G a_{,}M n)A s$ and $(G a_{,}M n)N$, by using density functional theory in both the standard LSDA and our new ly im plem ented LDA+U m ethod.

For (G a,M n)As LDA+U qualitatively does not change the general picture given by LSDA. Both methods conm a strong p-d hybridization leading to a spin-splitting of the valence band of G aAs. In this case a hole mediated Zenerm odel for the ferrom agnetism is appropriate. A fler having xed the C oulom b and exchange constants U and J to values that reproduce accurately both the position of the M n d shell coming from photoem ission data [37] and the spin-splitting of the G aAs valence band coming from the LDA-SIC method [20], we have estimated the Zener mean-eld exchange parameter N to be 2:8 eV.We believe this is the correct value that should be used in model H amiltonian calculations.

Then we moved our attention to (G a, M n)N. In this case the addition of the on-site U corrections result in a very strong, short range, ferrom agnetic coupling between the M n ions. This is rather anisotropic and decays quickly with the M n-M n separation. The strong ferrom agnetic interaction is double-exchange-like and is associated with the creation of a wide M n-d/N-p im purity band at the Ferm i level. These features sustain a picture of the ferrom agnetism where a high T_c ferrom agnetic phase given by regions with large M n concentration, co-exist with a low T_c ferrom agnetic phase given by sm all M n concentration regions.

A cknow ledgm ents

This work is sponsored by Enterprise Ireland under the grant E I-SC / 2002 / 10. Traveling is sponsored by Enterprise Ireland under the International Collaboration program m e E I-IC / 2003 / 47. D SP acknow ledges support by the Basque D epartam ento de E ducacion, the UPV /EHU (G rant. No. 9/UPV 00206215-13639/2001), and the Spanish M CyT (G rant No. M AT 2001-09046).

APPENDIX A:LDA+U IM PLEMENTATION IN THE SIESTA CODE

The LDA+U method combines LSDA density functional theory with the impurity Anderson model. The main idea is to divide the electronic states into two subsystems: localized (generally d or f) and delocalized electrons (generally s and p). In what follows we always refer to the localized orbitals as d orbitals. Then the LDA+U philosophy consists in replacing the averaged (LSDA) C oulom b and exchange interactions acting on the localized shells, by an orbital dependent H artree-Fock-like H am iltonian [35, 36]. The generalized LDA+U functional is de ned as follows:

$$E^{LDA+U}[(x);fng] = E^{LSDA}[(x)] + E^{U}[fng]$$
$$E^{dc}[fng]; \qquad (A1)$$

where E^{LSDA} is the standard LSDA functional, (r) is the charge density for the spin electrons, and fn g is the reduced density matrix corresponding to the orbitals we need to correct. Finally E^U and E^{dc} are respectively the new Hubbard-like functional and the double counting correction. E^{dc} is necessary to eliminate the averaged electron-electron interaction within the d shell, which is already included in E_{LSDA}. Following Anisim ov et al. the total energy of a spin polarized system can be written as

$$E_{LDA+U} = E_{LSDA} + \frac{1}{2} X_{mm^{0}} U_{mm^{0}} n_{m} n_{m^{0}} + \frac{1}{2} X_{mm^{0}} U_{mm^{0}} n_{m^{0}} n_{m^{0}} + \frac{1}{2} (U_{mm^{0}} J_{mm^{0}}) n_{m} n_{m^{0}} + \frac{1}{2} (U_{mm^{0}} J$$

where N " and N $^{\#}$ are total number of, respectively, spin-up and spin-down electrons occupying the d shell, and n_m and n_m are the orbital occupation numbers, which are calculated self-consistently within the LDA+U approach. It is assumed in the spirit of the LDA+U approximation that the total occupations of the d shell N are identical within LSDA and LDA+U. This assumption justices the denition of the double counting term, $E^{\rm dc}$.

The index m runs over the magnetic quantum number. The parameters U and J are respectively the Coulomb and the exchange interaction constants, that in principle can be calculated as the two-electron matrix elements of the atom ic electron-electron interaction potential, V_{ee}

$$J_{m m \circ} = hm^{0}m J_{ee} jm m^{0}i:$$
 (A4)

The elective LDA + U potential in then obtained by taking the functional derivative of the total energy E $_{LDA+U}$ with respect to the orbital density n_m (r). This yields:

$$V_{m} = V_{LSDA} \quad U(N) \quad \frac{1}{2} + J(N) \quad \frac{1}{2} + J($$

In our in plem entation we assum eU and J to be independent from the magnetic quantum numberm, although of course they can be di erent for d and f shells. Hence if $U_{m\ m\ 0} = U$ and $J_{m\ m\ 0} = J$, the equation above becomes

$$V_{m} = V_{LSDA} + U (n_{m} \circ n_{0}) +$$

$$(U \quad J) (n_{m} \circ n_{0}) + (U \quad J) \frac{1}{2} n_{0} (A_{A} 6)$$

with $n_0 \ \mbox{the average orbital occupations of the correlated shell}$

$$n_0 = \frac{1}{2l+1}N$$
; (A7)

and the orbital quantum number.

From the potential of equation (A 6) one can extract an intuitive picture of the e ects of strong correlations on the one-particle energy levels. We have

$$m_{m}^{\text{LDA+U}} = m_{m}^{\text{LSDA}} + (U \quad J) \frac{1}{2} \quad n_{m}$$
; (A8)

where n_m are the LDA+U orbital occupations. In the simple form ula above the single particle energies of the occupied and unoccupied orbitals are shifted respectively by 1=2 (U J) and +1=2 (U J) reproducing qualitatively the correct physics of a M ott-H ubbard insulator.

We turn now our attention to the numerical in plan entation of this method in SESTA. This is quite straightforward since SESTA uses localized atom ic orbital basis set [23, 25]. Let us call these non-orthogonal basis functions f g. The two-center overlap integrals, S , are then given by

$$S = (r R_1) (r R_2)dr;$$
 (A9)

where R $_1$ and R $_2$ are the atom ic centers, and the density matrix in our atom ic functions representation is denoted as D $\,$. The occupation number of a given atom ic orbital m is then de ned as follow s:

$$n_m = S_m D S_m :$$
 (A 10)

The additional potential of equation (A 6) is an operator $\hat{V_m}$ of the form

$$\hat{V}_m = V_m \quad jn \quad ihm \quad j;$$
 (A 11)

where V_m is the scalar de ned in equation (A 6) and in ihm j is the projector on the molecular state m with spin . A ssuming jn ito be one of our basis function the matrix element of the LDA + U potential can be written as

$$(\hat{V}_{m}) = S_{m} V_{m} S_{m}$$
 : (A 12)

- [1] T.Dietl, Sem icond.Sci.Technol. 17, 377 (2002)
- [2] H.Ohno, Science 281, 951 (1998)
- [3] W. Prellier, A. Fouchet, and B. Mercey, J.Phys.Condensed Matter 15, R1583 (2003)
- [4] H. Ohno, D. Chiba, F. Matsukura, T. Omiya, E. Abe, T. Dietl, Y. Ohno and K. Ohtani, 408, Nature (London) 944 (2000)
- [5] K.Ando, T.Hayashi, M. Tanaka and A.Twardowski, J. Appl. Phys., 83 6548, (1998)
- [6] M L.Reed, N A. ElM asry, H H. Stadelm aier, M K.Ritum s, M J.Reed, C A. Parker, J.C. Roberts, and S M. Bedair, Appl. Phys. Lett. 79, 3473 (2001)
- [7] G.T. Thaler, M.E. Overberg, B. Gila, R. Frazier, C.R. Abemathy, S.J. Pearton, J.S. Lee, S.Y. Lee, Y.D. Park, Z.G. Khim, J.Kim, and F.Ren, Appl. Phys. Lett. 80, 3964 (2002)
- [8] S. Sonoda, S. Shimizu, T. Sasaki, Y. Yamamoto, and H.J. Hori, Cryst. Growth 237-239, 1358 (2002)
- [9] S. Sonoda, H. Hori, Y. Yam am oto, T. Sasaki, M. Sato, S. Shim izu, K. Suga, and K. Kindo, IEEE Trans. Magn. 38, 2859 (2002)
- [10] T. Dietl, H. Ohno, F. Matsukura, J. Cibert and D. Ferrand, Science 287, 1019 (2000)
- [11] C.Zener, Phys.Rev.81, 440 (1950); Phys.Rev.83, 299 (1950)
- [12] K.Ando, Appl. Phys. Lett. 82, 100 (2003)
- [13] J. Konig, H.-H. Lin, and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 5628 (2000)
- [14] S. Sanvito, G. Theurich and N A. Hill, Journal of Superconductivity and N ovelM agnetic M aterials 15, 85 (2002)
- [15] S. Sanvito, P.O. rdejon and N.A. Hill, Phys. Rev. B 63, 165206 (2001)
- [16] M .van Schilfgaarde and O N .M yrasov, Phys. Rev. B 63, 233205 (2001)
- [17] M. Jain, L. Kronik, J.R. Chelikowsky, and V.V.Godlevsky, Phys. Rev. B 64, 245205 (2001)
- [18] K. Sato, H. Katayam a-Yoshida, and P.H. Dederichs, Journal of Superconductivity and Novel M agnetic M aterials 16, 31 (2003)
- [19] L.Kronik, M. Jain and J.R. Chelikowsky, Phys. Rev. B 66, 041203 (R) (2002)
- [20] A. Filippetti, N.A. Spaldin, and S. Sanvito, condm at/0302178
- [21] A.Filippettiand N.A.Spaldin, Phys. Rev. B 67, 125109 (2003)
- [22] D. Sanchez-Portal, P. Ordejon, E. Artacho and

In this case we use a multiple- basis set for the localized shell, and we construct the LDA+U projector from one of the . The cut-o radius of this particular basis function is usually much shorter than that of the other basis functions, and in this work we have used projectors with a cut-o radius of 2.2 Bohr.

J.M. Soler, Int. J. of Quantum Chem 65, 453 (1997)

- [23] J. M. Soler, E. Artacho, J. D. Gale, A. Garcia, J. Junquera, P. Ordejon and D. Sanchez-Portal, J. Phys. C ond. M atter 14, 2745 (2002)
- [24] O F. Sankey and D J. N ik lew ski, Phys. Rev. B 40, 3979 (1989)
- [25] J. Junquera, O. Paz, D. Sanchez-Portal and E. Artacho, Phys. Rev. B 64, 235111 (2001)
- [26] E. Anglada, J. M. Soler, J. Junquera and E. Artacho, Phys. Rev. B 66, 205101 (2002)
- [27] L.K leinm an, D M. Bylander, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1425 (1982)
- [28] D. Sanchez-Portal, R. M. Martin, S. M. Kauzlarich, W. E. Pickett, Phys. Rev. B 65, 144414 (2002).
- [29] N. Troullier and J.L. Martins, Phys. Rev. B 43,1993 (1991)
- [30] S.G. Louie, S.Froyen and M.L.Cohen, Phys. Rev. B 26, 1738 (1982)
- [31] A.Garcia and M.L.Cohen, Phys. Rev. B 47, 6751 (1993)
- [32] W R L. Lambrecht, B. Segal, S. Strite, G. Martin, A. Agarwal, H. Morkoc and A. Rockett, Phys. Rev. B 50, 14155 (1994)
- [33] S.J. Pearton, C. R. Abemathy, M. E. Overberg, G. T. Thaler, D. P. Norton, N. Theodoropou, A. F. Hebard, Y. D. Park, F. Ren, J. Kim, and L.A.Boatner, J.Appl.Phys. 93, 1 (2002)
- [34] E. Artacho, D. Sanchez-Portal, P. Ordejon, A. Garcia and J.M. Soler, Phys. Stat. Solidi B, 215, 809 (1999)
- [35] V J.Anisim ov, J.Zaanen, and O K .Andersen, Phys.Rev. B 44, 943 (1991)
- [36] V J. Anisimov, F. Aryasetiawan, and A. I. Lichtenstein, J. Phys.: Condens. M atter 9, 767 (1997)
- [37] J. O kabayashi, A. Kimura, O. Rader, T. Mizokawa, A. Fujim ori, T. Hayashi and M. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. B 64, 125304 (2001)
- [38] S. Das Samma, E. H. Hwang, and A. Kaminski, Phys. Rev. B 67, 155201 (2003)
- [39] T. D ietl, F. M atsukura, and H. Ohno, Phys. Rev. B 66, 033203 (2002).
- [40] R. S. Mulliken, J. Chem. Phys. 23, 1833 (1955); R.S.Mulliken, J.Chem. Phys. 23, 1841 (1955).
- [41] V. Bernoit a la Guillaume, D. Scalbert, and T. Dietl, Phys. Rev. B 46, 9853 (1992)
- [42] T.Omiya, F.M atsukura, T.Dietl, Y.Ohno, T.Sakon, M.M otokawa and H.Ohno, Physica E (Am sterdam) 7, 976 (2000)

- [43] F.M atsukura, H.Ohno, A.Shen and Y.Sugawara, Phys. Rev.B 57, R2037 (1998)
- [44] J.Szczytko, W. Mac, A.Stachow, A.Twardowski, P.Becla and J.Tworzydlo, Solid State Communications 99, 927 (1996)
- [45] J. O kabayashi, A. K im ura, O. Rader, T. M izokawa, A. Fujim ori, T. Hayashi and M. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. B 58, R4211 (1998)
- [46] S. Sanvito and N A. H ill, Appl. Phys. Lett. 78, 3493 (2001)
- [47] LM.Sandratskii and P.Bruno, Phys. Rev.B 67, 214402

(2003)

- [48] S.Sanvito, Phys.Rev.B 68, 054425 (2003)
- [49] A lessio F ilippetti, private com m unication
- [50] M .T .C zyzyk and G A .Saw atzky, Phys.Rev.B 49,14211 (1994)
- [51] D J.Khom ski and G A . Saw atzky, Solid State Commun. 102, 87 (1997)
- [52] L M . Sandratskii, P. Bruno and K. Kudmovsky, condm at/0404163