

# Microscopic theory of multipole ordering in $\text{NpO}_2$

Katsunori Kubo and Takashi Hotta

Advanced Science Research Center, Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute, Tokai, Ibaraki 319-1195, Japan  
(Received 18 February 2005; Published 29 April 2005)

In order to examine the mysterious ordered phase of  $\text{NpO}_2$  from a microscopic viewpoint, we investigate an  $f$ -electron model on an fcc lattice constructed based on a  $j$ - $j$  coupling scheme. First, an effective model with multipole interactions is derived in the strong-coupling limit. Numerical analysis of the model clearly indicates that the interactions for  $4u$  and  $5u$  moments are relevant to the ground state. Then, by applying mean-field theory to the simplified model including only such interactions, we conclude that longitudinal triple- $q$   $5u$  octupole order is realized in  $\text{NpO}_2$  through the combined effects of multipole interactions and anisotropy of the  $5u$  moment.

PACS numbers: 75.30.Et, 71.10.Fd, 75.40.Cx

The magnetism of actinide compounds has been one of the fascinating phenomena in the research field of condensed matter physics, since we have observed various ordered states at low temperatures due to the competition among several kinds of interactions between  $5f$  electrons.<sup>1</sup> Among them, the phase transition in  $\text{NpO}_2$ <sup>2</sup> is peculiar, and the determination of the order parameter has been a long-standing issue for many years. At first, this transition was expected to have a magnetic origin, due to the specific heat behavior similar to that of the antiferromagnet  $\text{UO}_2$ . In fact, a cusp in magnetic susceptibility has been also found at the transition temperature  $T_0 \approx 25 \text{ K}$ , as in an antiferromagnetic transition.<sup>3,4</sup> However, no magnetic reflection has been observed in neutron diffraction experiments<sup>5</sup> and more sensitive probes such as Mossbauer<sup>6,7</sup> and  $\text{SR}^8$  measurements have detected only a very small internal magnetic field. If it is caused by a dipole moment, the magnitude should be of the order of  $0.01 \text{ B}$ .<sup>6</sup> Thus, the transition is not the usual magnetic one, even though time reversal symmetry is broken.

Since the possibility of an ordinary magnetic transition is discarded, it may be natural to consider that the interesting properties of  $\text{NpO}_2$  come from the orbital degeneracy of the  $f$  electrons. However, typical orbital order, i.e., quadrupole order, does not break time reversal symmetry, and thus, we also discard this possibility. Finally, one may consider ordering of higher-order multipoles such as octupoles.<sup>9</sup> In fact, recent results of resonant X-ray scattering experiments are consistent with this scenario.<sup>10,11,12</sup> In order to explain superstructure Bragg peaks below  $T_0$  due to longitudinal triple- $q$   $5g$  quadrupole order, it has been proposed that longitudinal triple- $q$   $5u$  octupole order is realized,<sup>11</sup> since it induces quadrupole order and breaks time reversal symmetry. Very recent experiments on the  $^{17}\text{O}$  NMR also support the triple- $q$  ordered state.<sup>13</sup>

In order to understand such multipole ordering, phenomenological theories have been developed up to now, assuming the existence of triple- $q$  octupole order. These theories have consistently explained the experimental facts, such as a cusp in magnetic susceptibility, broken time reversal symmetry, no distortion from cubic structure,<sup>10</sup> a quadrupole moment observed in the resonant

X-ray scattering, and the structure of  $^{17}\text{O}$ -NMR spectra.<sup>14</sup> However, the origin of octupole order cannot be discussed in phenomenological theories. It was necessary to proceed to a microscopic theory to understand why such higher-order multipole order is realized in  $\text{NpO}_2$ , but it has been a very hard task to study multipole ordering from a microscopic level, since multipole moments originate from the complex combination of spin and orbital degrees of freedom of  $f$  electrons.

In this paper, we attempt to overcome such a difficulty by considering a microscopic model based on a  $j$ - $j$  coupling scheme.<sup>15</sup> Following the procedure to estimate the superexchange interaction in  $d$ -electron systems, we derive an effective multipole interaction model from a Hamiltonian on an fcc lattice corresponding to  $\text{NpO}_2$ . The correlation functions for multipole moments are numerically evaluated, suggesting that the interactions for  $4u$  and  $5u$  moments are relevant to the ground state. Then, we apply a mean-field theory to a simplified model including only such interactions. It is shown that the ground state has the longitudinal triple- $q$   $5u$  octupole order, proposed phenomenologically for the low-temperature phase of  $\text{NpO}_2$ .<sup>11</sup> We also evaluate specific heat and magnetic susceptibility for the triple- $q$  octupole ordered state.

First we briefly explain our approximation to treat the multipole state. In general, Coulomb interaction, symbolically expressed by  $U$ , is larger than the spin-orbit interaction, leading to an LS coupling scheme, but the energy scale of the present problem is  $T_0$ , much smaller than both  $U$  and  $\lambda$ . Since we find that the local ground state does not qualitatively depend on the order to take in the limit of  $\lambda = T_0$  and  $U = T_0$ , we prefer to use a  $j$ - $j$  coupling scheme, in which we accommodate  $f$  electrons among sextet with total angular momentum  $j = 5/2$ . For actinide dioxides, we propose to ignore further two states in the sextet. Due to crystalline electric field (CEF) effect for the  $\text{CaF}_2$  structure, the sextet is split into  $\gamma_8$  quartet and  $\gamma_7$  doublet. In this case, the  $\gamma_7$  state is higher than the  $\gamma_8$  level and the splitting energy is denoted as  $\Delta$ . When we accommodate two, three, and four electrons in the  $\gamma_8$  level, the ground states are  $5$ ,  $8^{(2)}$ , and  $1$ , respectively,<sup>16</sup> consistent with the CEF ground states of

$\text{UO}_2$ ,<sup>17</sup>  $\text{NpO}_2$ ,<sup>18</sup> and  $\text{PuO}_2$ ,<sup>19</sup> respectively. Then, is estimated from the CEF excitation energy in  $\text{PuO}_2$ , experimentally found to be 123 meV.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, the Hund's rule coupling  $J_H$  between  $s$  and  $d$  levels is 1/49 of the original Hund's rule interaction among  $f$  orbitals.<sup>15</sup> Namely,  $J_H$  is as large as a few hundred Kelvins. Thus, we simply ignore the  $d$  states in this paper. As we will see later, this simplification is not appropriate to reproduce experimental results quantitatively, since the ground-state wave-function is not exactly reproduced. However, we believe that our approximation provides a qualitatively correct approach for the complex multipole state from the microscopic viewpoint.

Since the  $s$  quartet consists of two Kramer's doublets, we introduce 'orbital' index ( $= ;$ ) to distinguish the two Kramer's doublets, while a 'spin' index ( $= \uparrow; \downarrow$ ) is defined to distinguish the two states in each Kramer's doublet. In the second-quantized form, annihilation operators for  $s$  electrons are given by  $c_{r\uparrow} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_{r5=2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}a_{r3=2})$  and  $c_{r\downarrow} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_{r5=2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}a_{r3=2})$  for  $-$ orbital electrons, and  $c_{r\uparrow} = a_{r1=2}$  and  $c_{r\downarrow} = a_{r1=2}$  for  $+$ -orbital electrons, where  $a_{rj_z}$  is the annihilation operator for an electron with the  $z$ -component  $j_z$  of the total angular momentum at site  $r$ .

In the tight-binding approximation, we obtain the following Hamiltonian for  $s$  electrons:<sup>15</sup>

$$H = \sum_{r,j;\uparrow,\downarrow} t_{r,j;\uparrow,\downarrow} c_{r+}^\dagger c_r + U \sum_r n_{r\uparrow} n_{r\downarrow} + U^0 \sum_r n_{r\uparrow} n_{r\downarrow} + J \sum_{r,j;\uparrow,\downarrow} c_{r\uparrow}^\dagger c_{r\downarrow}^\dagger c_{r\downarrow} c_{r\uparrow} + J^0 \sum_{r,j;\uparrow,\downarrow} c_{r\uparrow}^\dagger c_{r\downarrow}^\dagger c_{r\downarrow} c_{r\uparrow} \quad (1)$$

where  $n_r = c_{r\uparrow}^\dagger c_{r\uparrow}$ ,  $n_r = c_{r\downarrow}^\dagger c_{r\downarrow}$ , is a vector connecting nearest-neighbor sites, and  $t_{r,j;\uparrow,\downarrow}$  is the hopping integral of an electron with  $(j;\uparrow)$  at site  $r+$  to the  $(j;\downarrow)$  state at  $r$ . The coupling constants  $U$ ,  $U^0$ ,  $J$ , and  $J^0$  denote the intra-orbital Coulomb, inter-orbital Coulomb, exchange, and pair-hopping interactions, respectively.

Concerning the hopping amplitudes, we consider only the overlap integrals of  $f$ -electron wave-functions through the  $\sigma$ -bond ( $ff\sigma$ ).<sup>15,20</sup> For example, the hopping integrals between  $f$ -orbitals at  $(0;0;0)$  and  $(a=2;a=2;0)$  ( $a$  is the lattice constant) are given by

$$t_{\uparrow;\uparrow}^{(a=2;a=2;0)} = t_{\downarrow;\downarrow}^{(a=2;a=2;0)} = \frac{4}{2} \frac{2}{3i} \frac{2}{3i} t; \quad (2)$$

and

$$t_{\uparrow;\downarrow}^{(a=2;a=2;0)} = t_{\downarrow;\uparrow}^{(a=2;a=2;0)} = 0; \quad (3)$$

where  $t = (ff\sigma) = 28$  and  $t_{j;\uparrow,\downarrow} = t_{j;\uparrow,\downarrow}$ . Note that the hopping integrals depend on  $j$  and they are intrinsically complex numbers in the fcc lattice.<sup>21</sup>

In order to discuss multipole ordering, we derive an effective model in the strong-coupling limit using second-

order perturbation theory with respect to  $t$ . We consider the case of one electron per  $f$  ion in the  $s$  orbitals, but the effective model is the same for the one-hole case, which corresponds to  $\text{NpO}_2$ , due to an electron-hole transformation. Among the intermediate  $f^2$ -states in the perturbation theory, we consider only the lowest-energy  $s$  triplet states, in which the two electrons occupy different orbitals, assuming that other excited states are well separated from the  $f^2$  ground states. In fact, the excitation energy from the  $s$  ground state of  $f^2$  in  $\text{UO}_2$  is 150 meV.<sup>17</sup> Note that the CEF excitation energy is considered to be larger than the triplet excitation one, since the Hund's rule interaction is effectively reduced in the  $j-j$  coupling scheme.<sup>15</sup> Thus, it is reasonable to take only the  $s$  states as the intermediate states.

After straightforward, but tedious calculations, we arrive at an effective model in the form of

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \sum_q (H_{1q} + H_{2q} + H_{4u1q} + H_{4u2q}); \quad (4)$$

where  $q$  is the wave vector.  $H_{1q}$  denotes the interactions between quadrupole moments, given by

$$H_{1q} = a_1 (O_{2; q}^0 O_{2; q}^0 c_x c_y + \text{c.p.}) + a_3 (O_{2; q}^0 O_{xy; q} s_x s_y + \text{c.p.}) + a_4 (O_{xy; q} O_{xy; q} c_x c_y + \text{c.p.}); \quad (5)$$

where c.p. denotes cyclic permutations,  $c = \cos(qa=2)$ , and  $s = \sin(qa=2)$  ( $= x, y, \text{ or } z$ ). The definitions of the multipole operators and values of the coupling constants  $a_i$  are given in Tables I and II, respectively. Note that  $O_{2q}^0$  transforms to  $(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3} O_{2q}^2 - O_{2q}^0) = 2$  and  $(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3} O_{2q}^2 - O_{2q}^0) = 2$  under c.p. ( $x; y; z \rightarrow y; z; x$ ) and  $(x; y; z \rightarrow z; x; y)$ , respectively.  $H_{2q}$  and  $H_{4unq}$  ( $n = 1 \text{ or } 2$ ) are the interactions between dipole and octupole moments, given by

$$H_{2q} = b_8 [T_{z; q}^{5u} T_{z; q}^{5u} (c_y c_z + c_z c_x) + \text{c.p.}] + b_9 [T_{x; q}^{5u} T_{y; q}^{5u} s_x s_y + \text{c.p.}] + b_{10} [T_{xyz; q} T_{xyz; q} (c_x c_y + \text{c.p.})]; \quad (6)$$

and

$$H_{4unq} = b_1^{(n)} [J_{z; q}^{4un} J_{z; q}^{4un} c_x c_y + \text{c.p.}] + b_2^{(n)} [J_{z; q}^{4un} J_{z; q}^{4un} (c_y c_z + c_z c_x) + \text{c.p.}] + b_3^{(n)} [J_{x; q}^{4un} J_{y; q}^{4un} s_x s_y + \text{c.p.}] + b_4^{(n)} [T_{xyz; q} (J_{z; q}^{4un} s_x s_y + \text{c.p.})] + b_5^{(n)} [T_{x; q}^{5u} J_{z; q}^{4un} c_z (c_x - c_y) + \text{c.p.}] + b_6^{(n)} [T_{z; q}^{5u} (J_{x; q}^{4un} s_z s_x + J_{y; q}^{4un} s_y s_z) + \text{c.p.}]; \quad (7)$$

where values of the coupling constants  $b_i$  and  $b_i^{(n)}$  are shown in Table II. The above Eqs. (4)-(7) are consistent with the general form of multipole interactions on the fcc

TABLE I: Multipole operators in the  $\gamma_8$  subspace.<sup>22</sup> The multipole operators are represented by pseudospin operators:  $\hat{C}^x = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\sigma}_x + \hat{\sigma}_y)$ ,  $\hat{C}^y = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\sigma}_x - \hat{\sigma}_y)$ , and  $\hat{C}^z = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z$ , where  $\hat{\sigma}_i$  are the Pauli matrices. We use notations  $\hat{C}^x = (\hat{\sigma}_x + \hat{\sigma}_y)/2$  and  $\hat{C}^y = (\hat{\sigma}_x - \hat{\sigma}_y)/2$ . The site label  $r$  is suppressed in this Table for simplicity.

multipole operator X	2u	3gu	3gv	4u1x	4u1y	4u1z	4u2x	4u2y	4u2z	5ux	5uy	5uz	5gx	5gy	5gz
pseudospin representation	$T_{xyz}$	$O_2^0$	$O_2^2$	$J_x^{4u1}$	$J_y^{4u1}$	$J_z^{4u1}$	$J_x^{4u2}$	$J_y^{4u2}$	$J_z^{4u2}$	$T_x^{5u}$	$T_y^{5u}$	$T_z^{5u}$	$O_{yz}$	$O_{zx}$	$O_{xy}$
	$\hat{C}^y$	$\hat{C}^z$	$\hat{C}^x$	$\hat{C}^x$	$\hat{C}^y$	$\hat{C}^z$	$\hat{C}^x$	$\hat{C}^y$	$\hat{C}^z$	$\hat{C}^x$	$\hat{C}^y$	$\hat{C}^z$	$\hat{C}^y$	$\hat{C}^x$	$\hat{C}^z$

TABLE II: Coupling constants in the effective model. The energy unit is  $(1/16)t^2 = (U^0 - J)$ .

$a_1$	$a_3$	$a_4$	$b_8$	$b_9$	$b_{10}$	$b_1^{(1)}$	$b_2^{(1)}$	$b_3^{(1)}$
12	$64/3$	192	195	336	576	196	4	0
$b_4^{(1)}$	$b_5^{(1)}$	$b_6^{(1)}$	$b_1^{(2)}$	$b_2^{(2)}$	$b_3^{(2)}$	$b_4^{(2)}$	$b_5^{(2)}$	$b_6^{(2)}$
$224/3$	0	0	4	193	336	$64/3$	$2/3$	$112/3$




FIG. 1: Correlation functions for the 8-site cluster for  $q = (0;0;0)$  (triangles),  $q = (0;0;1)$  (squares), and  $q = (1;2;1;2;1;2)$  (diamonds) in units of  $2 = a$ . The inset shows the fcc cluster (solid spheres) taken in the calculation.

lattice derived by Sakai et al.<sup>23</sup> We follow the notation in Ref. 23 for convenience.

When we apply a mean-field theory to the effective model, due care should be taken, since in an fcc lattice with geometrical frustration, the effect of fluctuations may be strong enough to destroy the state obtained with mean-field theory. Thus, we first evaluate the correlation function in the ground state using an unbiased method such as exact diagonalization on the  $N$ -site lattice. We set  $N = 8$ , as shown in the inset of Fig. 1. The correlation function of the multipole operators is given by  $\chi_q = (1/N) \sum_{r,r'} e^{iq \cdot (r - r')} \langle X_r X_{r'} \rangle$ ; where  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  denotes the expectation value using the ground-state wavefunction. Figure 1 shows results for the correlation functions. Although the interaction between  $2u$  moments ( $b_{10}$ ) is large, the correlation function of the  $2u$  moment is not enhanced, indicating that the frustration effect is significant for an Ising-like moment such as  $2u$ . Large values of correlation functions are obtained for  $J_z^{4u2}$ ,  $T_z^{5u}$ , and  $O_{xy}$  moments at  $q = (0;0;1)$  in units of  $2 = a$ . We note that there is no term in the effective model which

stabilizes  $O_{xy}$  quadrupole order at  $q = (0;0;1)$ . The enhancement of this correlation function indicates an induced quadrupole moment in  $4u2$  or  $5u$  moment ordered states. Therefore, the relevant interactions are  $b_2^{(2)}$  and  $b_8$ , which stabilize the  $J_z^{4u2}$  and  $T_z^{5u}$  order, respectively, at  $q = (0;0;1)$ . In the following, we consider a simplified model including only  $b_2^{(2)}$  and  $b_8$ .

Next we study the ordered state by applying mean-field theory to our simplified model. The coupling constant  $b_8$  is slightly larger than  $b_2^{(2)}$ , and  $5u$  order has lower energy than  $4u2$  order. The interaction  $b_8$  stabilizes longitudinal ordering of the  $5u$  moments, but their directions are not entirely determined by the form of the interaction. In the  $\gamma_8$  subspace, the  $5u$  moment has an easy axis along  $[111]$ .<sup>24,25</sup> Thus, taking the moment at each site along  $[111]$  or other equivalent directions, we find that a triple- $q$  state is favored, since it gains interaction energy in all the directions. In fact, the ground state has longitudinal triple- $q$   $5u$  octupole order with four sublattices, i.e.,  $(\langle T_{xr}^{5u} \rangle; \langle T_{yr}^{5u} \rangle; \langle T_{zr}^{5u} \rangle) / (\exp[i2\pi x/a]; \exp[i2\pi y/a]; \exp[i2\pi z/a])$ . Note that this triple- $q$  structure does not have frustration even in the fcc lattice. The ground state energy is  $4b_8$  per site, and the transition temperature is given by  $k_B T_0 = 4b_8$ .

Let us evaluate physical quantities in the mean-field theory. Figures 2(a) and (b) show the temperature dependence of the specific heat and magnetic susceptibility, respectively. The calculated results are compatible with experimental ones for  $\text{NpO}_2$ , but we should include higher energy states such as  $\gamma$  for quantitative agreement, as already mentioned. This is one of future problems. Figures 2(c) and (d) show the magnetic field dependence of the magnetization at  $T = 0$  and an  $H$ - $T$  phase diagram, respectively. The magnetization is isotropic as  $H \rightarrow 0$  due to the cubic symmetry, while anisotropy develops under a high magnetic field. Note that under a high magnetic field, sublattice structures change:  $(\langle T_{xr}^{5u} \rangle; \langle T_{yr}^{5u} \rangle; \langle T_{zr}^{5u} \rangle) / (0;0;\exp[i2\pi z/a])$  for  $H \parallel [001]$ , a two-sublattice structure with  $\langle T_{xr}^{5u} \rangle; \langle T_{yr}^{5u} \rangle \neq 0$ , and  $\langle T_{zr}^{5u} \rangle = 0$  for  $H \parallel [110]$ , and  $(\langle T_{xr}^{5u} \rangle; \langle T_{yr}^{5u} \rangle; \langle T_{zr}^{5u} \rangle) / (\sin[2\pi(y-z)/a]; \sin[2\pi(z-x)/a]; \sin[2\pi(x-y)/a])$  for  $H \parallel [111]$ . Note also that the triple- $q$  state is fragile under  $H \parallel [110]$ :  $\langle T_{zr}^{5u} \rangle = 0$  with a four-sublattice structure for  $g_{\gamma} = b_8 H / (k_B T_0) \approx 0.11$ , i.e.,  $H \approx 5$  T at  $T = 0$  (this phase boundary is not shown in Fig. 2(d)).

In order to confirm the octupole ordered state in  $\text{NpO}_2$ , further experimental tests are required. One possibility is a neutron diffraction measurement under uniax-




FIG. 2: Results of the mean-field calculation. (a) Temperature dependence of the specific heat. Solid circles represent the experimental values<sup>26</sup> obtained by subtracting those for  $\text{ThO}_2$ <sup>27</sup> from those for  $\text{NpO}_2$ .<sup>2</sup> (b) Temperature dependence of the magnetic susceptibility. The Lande  $g$ -factor is  $g_J = 6/7$ . Solid circles represent the experimental values for  $\text{NpO}_2$ .<sup>4</sup> (c) Magnetic field dependence of the magnetization. (d)  $H$ - $T$  phase diagram. Solid symbols denote the  $5_u$  octupole transition, while open symbols denote transitions between  $5_u$  octupole ordered states with different sublattice structures. Note that  $k_B T_0 = (g_J \mu_B) = 43$  K for  $\text{NpO}_2$ .

ial pressure. In an octupole ordered state, a magnetic moment will be induced by application of uniaxial pressure.<sup>25,28</sup> For example, a double- $q$  magnetic moment  $(M_x; M_y; M_z) / (\exp[i2\pi x/a]; \exp[i2\pi y/a]; 0)$  is induced by pressure along the  $z$ -direction in the longitudinal triple- $q$   $5_u$  octupole ordered state.

In summary, multipole order in  $f$ -electron systems on the fcc lattice has been studied from a microscopic viewpoint. An effective model has been derived from a microscopic model based on the  $j$ - $j$  coupling scheme. Multipole correlation functions in the ground state of the effective model have been calculated by exact diagonalization. It has been revealed that the interactions for  $4u_2$  and  $5_u$  moments are dominant. Mean-field theory has been applied to the simplified model including only such interactions, and longitudinal triple- $q$   $5_u$  octupole order has been found to be realized.

We thank S. Kambe, N. Metoki, H. Onishi, Y. Tokunaga, K. Ueda, R. E. Walstedt, and H. Yasuoka for discussions. One of the authors (T. H.) is supported by Grant-in-Aids for Scientific Research of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology of Japan.

- <sup>1</sup> P. Santini, R. Lemanski, and P. Erdos, *Adv. Phys.* **48**, 537 (1999).
- <sup>2</sup> E. F. Westrum, Jr., J. B. Hatcher, and D. W. Osborn, *J. Chem. Phys.* **21**, 419 (1953).
- <sup>3</sup> J. W. Ross and D. J. Lam, *J. Appl. Phys.* **38**, 1451 (1967).
- <sup>4</sup> P. Erdos, G. Solt, Z. Zolnieriek, A. Blaise, and J. M. Fournier, *Physica B & C* **102B**, 164 (1980).
- <sup>5</sup> L. Heaton, M. H. Mueller, and J. M. Williams, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **28**, 1651 (1967); D. E. Cox and B. C. Frazer, *ibid.* **28**, 1649 (1967); R. Caciuo, G. H. Lander, J. C. Spirlet, J. M. Fournier, and W. F. Kuhs, *Solid State Commun.* **64**, 149 (1987).
- <sup>6</sup> B. D. Dunlap, G. M. Kalvius, D. J. Lam, and M. B. Brodsky, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* **29**, 1365 (1968).
- <sup>7</sup> J. M. Friedt, F. J. Litterst, and J. Rebizant, *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 257 (1985).
- <sup>8</sup> W. Kopmann, F. J. Litterst, H.-H. Klau, M. Hillberg, W. Wagener, G. M. Kalvius, E. Schreier, F. J. Burghart, J. Rebizant, and G. H. Lander, *J. Alloys Compd.* **271-273**, 463 (1998).
- <sup>9</sup> P. Santini and G. Amoretti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 2188 (2000); *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **71** (Suppl.), 11 (2002).
- <sup>10</sup> D. M. Annix, G. H. Lander, J. Rebizant, R. Caciuo, N. Bernhoeft, E. Lidlstrom, and C. Vettier, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 15187 (1999).
- <sup>11</sup> J. A. Paixao, C. Detlefs, M. J. Longeld, R. Caciuo, P. Santini, N. Bernhoeft, J. Rebizant, and G. H. Lander, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 187202 (2002); R. Caciuo, J. A. Paixao, C. Detlefs, M. J. Longeld, P. Santini, N. Bernhoeft, J. Rebizant, and G. H. Lander, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **15**, S2287 (2003).
- <sup>12</sup> S. W. Lovesey, E. Balcar, C. Detlefs, G. van der Laan, D. S. Sivia, and U. Staub, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **15**, 4511 (2003).
- <sup>13</sup> Y. Tokunaga, Y. Homma, S. Kambe, D. Aoki, H. Sakai, E. Yamamoto, A. Nakamura, Y. Shiokawa, R. E. Walstedt, and H. Yasuoka, to be published in *Physica B*.
- <sup>14</sup> O. Sakai, R. Shiina, and H. Shiba, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **74**, 457 (2005).
- <sup>15</sup> T. Hotta and K. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 104518 (2003).
- <sup>16</sup> T. Hotta, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 054405 (2004).
- <sup>17</sup> S. Kem, C.-K. Loong, and G. H. Lander, *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 3051 (1985); G. Amoretti, A. Blaise, R. Caciuo, J. M. Fournier, M. T. Hutchings, R. Osborn, and A. D. Taylor, *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 1856 (1989).
- <sup>18</sup> J. M. Fournier, A. Blaise, G. Amoretti, R. Caciuo, J. Larroque, M. T. Hutchings, R. Osborn, and A. D. Taylor, *Phys. Rev. B* **43**, 1142 (1991); G. Amoretti, A. Blaise, R. Caciuo, D. DiCola, J. M. Fournier, M. T. Hutchings, G. H. Lander, R. Osborn, A. Severing, and A. D. Taylor, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **4**, 3459 (1992).
- <sup>19</sup> S. Kem, C.-K. Loong, G. L. Goodman, B. Cort, and G. H. Lander, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **2**, 1933 (1990); S. Kem, R. A. Robinson, H. Nakotte, G. H. Lander, B. Cort, P. Watson, and F. A. Vigil, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 104 (1999).
- <sup>20</sup> Even if we include the hopping via oxygen  $p$  orbitals, the hopping matrix is written in the form of Eq. (2).
- <sup>21</sup> It is in sharp contrast to a model on a simple cubic lat-

tice,<sup>15</sup> in which the hopping integrals are real and the same form as for  $e_g$  orbitals of  $d$  electrons. In other words, there is no difference between the  $t_{88}$  model for  $f$  electrons and the  $e_g$  orbital model for  $d$  electrons on the simple cubic lattice in the absence of a magnetic field. For  $e_g$  orbitals, we can always set the hopping integrals to be real, irrespective of the lattice type, by selecting appropriate basis wave-functions, while  $t_{88}$  orbitals on the fcc lattice appear to be complex in nature, specific to  $f$ -electron system with strong spin-orbit coupling.

- <sup>22</sup> R. Shiina, H. Shiba, and P. Thalmeier, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 66, 1741 (1997).  
<sup>23</sup> O. Sakai, R. Shiina, and H. Shiba, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 72, 1534 (2003).

- <sup>24</sup> K. Kubo and Y. Kuramoto, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 72, 1859 (2003); A. Kiss and P. Fazekas, Phys. Rev. B 68, 174425 (2003).  
<sup>25</sup> K. Kubo and Y. Kuramoto, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 73, 216 (2004).  
<sup>26</sup> To subtract specific heat values of  $\text{ThO}_2$ <sup>27</sup> from those of  $\text{NpO}_2$ ,<sup>2</sup> we interpolate the experimental data of  $\text{ThO}_2$  and evaluate the values at temperatures in which specific heat of  $\text{NpO}_2$  have been measured.  
<sup>27</sup> D. W. Osborne and E. F. Westrum, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. 21, 1884 (1953).  
<sup>28</sup> Y. Kuramoto and H. Kusunose, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 69, 671 (2000).