

# Multiplet effects in the electronic structure of $\alpha$ -Pu, Am and their compounds

Alexander Shick<sup>1</sup>, Jindrich Kolorenc<sup>1,2</sup>, Ladislav Havela<sup>3</sup>, Vaclav Drchal<sup>1</sup>, and Thomas Gouder<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Physics, ASCR, Na Slovance 2, CZ-18221 Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>2</sup> Department of Physics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695

<sup>2</sup> Department of Condensed Matter Physics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University, Ke Karlovu 5, CZ-12116 Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>3</sup> European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Institute for Transuranium Elements, Postfach 2340, 76 125 Karlsruhe, Germany

PACS.71.20.Gj { Electronic structure of other crystalline metals and alloys.

PACS.71.27.+a { Strongly correlated electron systems; heavy fermions.

PACS.79.60.-i { Photoemission and photoelectron spectra.

**Abstract.** { We propose a straightforward and efficient procedure to perform dynamical mean-field (DMFT) calculations on the top of the static mean-field LDA+U approximation. Starting from self-consistent LDA+U ground state we included multiplet transitions using the Hubbard-I approximation, which yields a very good agreement with experimental photoelectron spectra of  $\alpha$ -Pu, Am, and their selected compounds.

**Introduction.** { Electronic, magnetic and superconducting properties of actinide elements recently attracted significant interest and attention in the condensed matter physics. Most intriguing are the phenomena at the localization threshold of the 5f series, which is crossed between Pu and Am, where the electron-electron correlations play a prominent role [1,2].

During last few years, electronic structure calculations of Pu and Am based on the conventional band theoretical methods (the local density or generalized gradient expansion approximations LDA/GGA to the density functional theory) could not explain essential experimental data. While, the LDA/GGA band structure calculations predict a local magnetic moment (ordered or disordered) to form on the Pu [3] and Am [4] atoms, none of them were seen in the experiment [5]. Also, the same papers attempted to evaluate the photoemission spectra (PES) and electronic specific heat in Pu and Am making use of single-particle LDA/GGA densities of states (DOS), incorrectly assuming weak electron correlation character of 5f systems at the borderline between the localized, nonbonding, behaviour and the bonding situation of electronic bands.

It was shown recently that the around-mean-field (AMF)-LSDA+U correlated band theory gives non-magnetic ground state for Pu [6] and Am [7]. Also, the equilibrium volumes and bulk moduli for  $\alpha$ -Pu and fcc-Am are calculated in a good agreement with experiment. However, there is a clear disagreement between the AMF-LDA+U calculated DOS and PES, questioning the validity of this approximation. The DMFT calculations [8] using the (AMF)-LSDA+U form of interacting Hamiltonian demonstrated that experimental PES and high coefficient of the electronic specific heat in  $\alpha$ -Pu and its selected compounds [9,10] originate from the excitations, and not from the ground state DOS alone. While accounting for dynamical

uctuations, the DMFT of Ref. [8] does not take into account atom ic-like excitations which can play an important role in Pu and Am.

In this Letter, we develop a DMFT based computational scheme based on multi-orbital Hubbard-I approximation (HIA) [11-13] including the spin-orbit coupling (SOC) which explicitly accounts for the atom ic-like multiplet transition excitations in Pu, Am and their compounds. Starting from the non-magnetic ground state calculated with the static mean-field AMF-LSDA+U approximation, we obtain excitation spectra of Pu and Am in surprisingly good agreement with PES, in support of the atom ic-like origin of the electronic excitations in these materials.

**Methodology.** We start with the multi-band Hubbard Hamiltonian [11]  $H = H^0 + H^{\text{int}}$ , where

$$H^0 = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\sigma} H_{i,j}^0 c_{i,\sigma}^\dagger c_j = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \sum_{\sigma} H^0(\mathbf{k}) c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}; \quad (1)$$

is the one-particle Hamiltonian found from ab initio electronic structure calculations for a periodic crystal. The indices  $i,j$  label the lattice sites,  $\sigma = (\mathbf{m})$  denote the spinorbitals, and  $\mathbf{k}$  is the  $\mathbf{k}$ -vector from the first Brillouin zone. It is assumed that the electron-electron correlations between  $s$ ,  $p$ , and  $d$  electrons are well described within the density functional theory, while the correlations between the  $f$  electrons have to be considered separately by introducing the interaction Hamiltonian

$$H^{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4} \sum_{\sigma} V_{i,m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4}^{\text{ee}} c_{i,m_1,\sigma}^\dagger c_{i,m_2,\sigma}^\dagger c_{i,m_3,\sigma} c_{i,m_4,\sigma}; \quad (2)$$

The  $V^{\text{ee}}$  is an effective on-site Coulomb interaction [11] expressed in terms of the Slater integrals  $F_k$  and the spherical harmonic  $Y_{lm}$ . The corresponding one-particle Green function

$$G(\mathbf{k};z) = \frac{1}{z + H^0(\mathbf{k}) - \Sigma(\mathbf{k};z)} \quad (3)$$

is expressed via  $H^0$  and the one-particle selfenergy  $\Sigma(\mathbf{k};z)$  which contains the electron-electron correlations, where  $z$  is a (complex) energy with respect to the chemical potential. The interactions (2) act only in the subspace of  $f$ -states. Consequently, the selfenergy  $\Sigma(\mathbf{k};z)$  is nonzero only in the subspace of the  $f$ -states.

The simplest mean-field approximation (often called L(S)DA+U) [14] neglects the  $\mathbf{k}$ - and energy-dependence of  $\Sigma$  replacing it by the on-site potential  $V_{+U}$ . For a given set of spin-orbitals  $\mathbf{jn}$  the potential reads:

$$V_{+U} \mathbf{jn} = \sum_{p,q} V_{\mathbf{jn},\mathbf{pq}}^{\text{ee}} n_{\mathbf{pq}}^0; \quad (4)$$

where  $n_{\mathbf{mn}}^0$  is the local orbital occupation matrix of the orbitals  $\mathbf{jn}$ . It was shown in Ref. [15] that the Kohn-Sham equation with the potential Eq.(4) can be obtained by making use of variational minimization of the LDA+U total energy functional (i.e. of the expectation value of the multi-band Hubbard Hamiltonian) in a way similar to the conventional density functional theory [16].

In what follows we use the local approximation for the selfenergy, i.e., we assume that it is site-diagonal and therefore independent of  $\mathbf{k}$ . Then we can employ the "in purity" method of

Ref. [11]. We first obtain a local Green function integrating  $G(\mathbf{k}; z)$ , Eq.(3), over the Brillouin zone

$$G(z) = \frac{1}{V_{BZ}} \int_{BZ} d\mathbf{k} z + H^0(\mathbf{k})^{-1}(z) \quad (5)$$

and define a "bath" Green function (the so-called Weiss field)  $G_0(z)$

$$G_0(z) = G^{-1}(z) + \langle z \rangle^{-1} : \quad (6)$$

All  $G_0$ ,  $G$ , and  $\langle z \rangle$  in Eqs. (5, 6) are matrices in the subspace of the  $j_m$  orbitals.

The DMFT self-consistency condition is now formulated by equating  $G(z)$ , Eq.(5), to the Green function  $\tilde{G}(z)$  of a single-impurity Anderson model (SIAM) [17]

$$\tilde{G}(z) = z + \langle z \rangle_0^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}(z) \tilde{G}(z)^{-1} \quad (7)$$

where  $\tilde{\Sigma}(z)$  is the effective hybridization function and  $\tilde{\Sigma}(z)$  is the SIAM selfenergy. We write the Eq.(7) in the form of the Eq.(6)

$$z + \langle z \rangle_0^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}(z)^{-1} = G_0(z) = G^{-1}(z) + \langle z \rangle^{-1} \quad (8)$$

from which it follows that  $G_0(z)$  has the meaning of the SIAM "bath" Green function. The iterative procedure to solve the periodic lattice problem in the DMFT approximation is now formulated in a usual way [11]: starting with single particle Hamiltonian  $H^0(\mathbf{k})$  and a guess for local  $\langle z \rangle$ , the local Green function is calculated using the Eq.(5) and the "bath" Green function is calculated from Eq.(6); the SIAM is solved for this "bath" and a new local  $\langle z \rangle$  is calculated from Eq.(7), which is inserted back into Eq.(5).

The LDA+U procedure can be viewed in the same way. There is no need to apply the full DMFT iterative procedure described above and to solve the SIAM with the "bath" from Eq.(6). The selfenergy  $\Sigma(z)$  is now approximated by a static potential  $V_{+U}$  from Eq.(4), and the well-known relation between the Green function, Eq.(6), and the local orbital occupation matrix  $n_{mm'} = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \text{Im} \int dE G(E)_{mm'}$  is used. In addition, the charge- and spin-densities needed to construct the single-particle Hamiltonian  $H^0(\mathbf{k})$  in Eq.(5) are calculated self-consistently. We emphasize that LDA+U approximation is generically connected with the LDA+DMFT procedure.

Hubbard-I approximation. { Here we attempt to build a computational scheme based on self-consistent static mean-field LDA+U ground state that will allow us to access the correlated electron excitations. We specially choose the around-mean-field version of LSDA+U (AMF-LDA+U) which was shown to describe correctly the non-magnetic ground state properties of Pu [6], fcc-Am, Pu-Am alloys [7], and selected Pu-compounds [9]. We extend our previous works [6,7] towards the DMFT to account for the multiplet transitions which are necessary for a correct description of PE excitation spectra. We use the multiorbital HIA which is suitable for incorporating the multiplet transitions in the electronic structure, as it is explicitly based on the exact diagonalization of an isolated atomic-like f-shell.

Further, we restrict our formulation to the paramagnetic phase, and we closely follow the procedure described in [11]. We construct the atomic Hamiltonian including the spin-orbit coupling (SOC):

$$H^{\text{at}} = \sum_{m_1 m_2} X_{m_1 m_2}^0 (1 - \delta_{m_1 m_2}) C_{m_1}^y C_{m_2}^y + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m_1 :: m_4} X_{m_1 m_2}^0 \gamma_{m_1 m_2}^{\text{ee}} \gamma_{m_3 m_4}^{\text{ic}} C_{m_1}^y C_{m_2}^y C_{m_4}^0 C_{m_3}^0 ; \quad (9)$$

and perform exact diagonalization of  $H^{\text{at}} |j\rangle = E |j\rangle$  to obtain all possible eigenvalues  $E$  and eigenvectors  $|j\rangle$ .

The HIA "chemical potential"  $\mu_H$  is then calculated as

$$\mu_H = \frac{1}{Z} \text{Tr} N \exp(-\beta H^{\text{at}}) \quad (10)$$

for a given number of particles  $n_H$ . Here,  $\beta$  is the inverse temperature and  $Z$  is the partition function.

Finally, the atomic Green function is calculated as follows:

$$G^{\text{at}}(z)_{m_1 m_2} = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{j,i} \frac{\langle j | c_{m_1}^\dagger | i \rangle \langle i | c_{m_2}^\dagger | j \rangle}{z + (E_H - E_j) + i0} \quad (11)$$

and the atomic self-energy is evaluated as:

$$[\Sigma_H(z)]_{m_1 m_2} = \sum_{m_1 m_2} \langle m_1 | \Sigma_H(z) | m_2 \rangle \quad (12)$$

Assuming that the self-consistent LDA+U calculations are performed, the LDA+U Green function is evaluated as

$$G_{+U}(z) = \frac{1}{V_{BZ}} \int_{BZ} dk \frac{1}{z + \epsilon_0(k) + V_{+U}} \quad (13)$$

In Eq.(13) we took into account the presence of SOC for both  $H_0(k)$  and  $\hat{V}_{+U}$  as described in Ref. [6]. We used LDA+U eigenvalues and eigenfunctions calculated in the full-potential LAPW basis [6,15] to construct the on-site spin-orbital Green function matrix, Eq.(13).

We evaluate the static "bath"  $G_0(z)$  from Eq.(6) and find the hybridization function  $\Gamma(z)$  together with  $\epsilon_0$  which determines the energy of "impurity" level with respect to the solid potential:

$$z + \epsilon_0 + V_{+U} = \epsilon_0 + V_{+U} + \Sigma_H(z) \quad (14)$$

Here we added the SOC explicitly and assumed the paramagnetic case.

We point out a difference in a physical meaning of  $\epsilon_0$  in the original STAM and in the auxiliary STAM used in LDA+DMFT (LDA+U): in the former, it labels the position of the non-interacting f(d)-level so that the chemical potential is determined self-consistently for a given  $\Gamma(z)$ ; in the latter, the chemical potential is determined by a periodical crystal - basically by the Green function of Eq.(5) - so that the auxiliary  $\epsilon_0$  accommodates all the electrostatic shifts between correlated electrons and the potential of the solid.

Now we can formulate a simple approximate procedure to solve the DMFT Eqs.(5,6,7) with Hubbard-I self-energy, Eq.(12). We assume that the self-consistent static mean-field LDA+U already gives a correct number of particles and hybridization. Using the LDA+U Green function, Eq.(9), and the potential, Eq.(4), we evaluate the Weiss field  $G_{+U}^0(z)$ . Then we insert the HIA self-energy, calculated for the same number of correlated electrons as given by LDA+U, into this "bath", and calculate the new Green function

$$G(z) = [G_{+U}^0(z)]^{-1} + (\Sigma_H)_{H_H}(z)^{-1}; \quad (15)$$

where  $(\Sigma_H)_{H_H}$  is chosen so as to ensure that  $n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE \text{Tr}[G(E)]$  is equal to a given number of correlated electrons [19].

Valence band photoemission spectra. { Starting from self-consistent AMF-LDA+U ground state solutions for  $\alpha$ -Pu [6], and fcc-Am [7], and making use of the corresponding eigenvalues and eigenfunctions we evaluate the  $G_{+U}(z)$  Green function given by Eq.(13) and the  $G_0^{+U}(z)$  "bare" Green Function (Eq.(14)) [20]. In HIA calculations Eq.(9–12) we used the commonly accepted values of SOC constants  $\lambda = 0.3$  eV (Pu) and 0.34 eV (Am). To find  $\eta$  in Eq.(10), we choose the AMF-LDA+U values of  $\hbar\omega_i$ , namely,  $n_f = 6.0$  for Am and  $n_f = 5.4$  for Pu [21]. The self-energy Eq.(12) was calculated along the real axis for  $z = E - E_F + i\eta$ , where  $\eta = 63$  meV [18], and  $\eta$  was varied from 100 to 1000 eV<sup>-1</sup>. We found no sizeable effect due to the variation of  $\eta$  for a given  $\hbar\omega_i$  in the resulting spectral density Eq.(15).

In Fig.1a we show the f-projected DOS ( $\rho_{\text{DOS}}$ ) from AMF-LDA+U together with spectral density calculated from Eq.(15). For fcc-Am, the well-localised  $\rho_{\text{DOS}}$  peak at -4 eV transforms to the multiplet of excited state transitions  $f^6 \rightarrow f^5$  below the Fermi energy, and  $\rho_{\text{DOS}}$ -manifold around +2 eV to  $f^6 \rightarrow f^7$  multiplet transitions. Although there is no doubt that the 5f multiplets must dominate the experimental valence-band spectra of Am-based systems, individual lines are not resolved (except for partly resolved features in the spectrum of Am metal), and the position of the 5f intensity in the energy spectrum is the main indicator of the agreement with calculations. In this sense, the calculated Am spectral density is in a good agreement with PES [22]. It also agrees with similar calculations [18] [23]. Furthermore, we performed the calculations of AmN and AmSb using the same fU/Jg set of values as for elemental Am. The AMF-LDA+U yields AmN as an indirect gap semiconductor and AmSb as a semimetal. The HIA spectral densities for Am f-manifolds in AmN and AmSb are shown in Fig.1b,c and are in good agreement with PES experiments [22].

Experimental valence-band spectra of  $\alpha$ -Pu and several other Pu systems exhibit three narrow features within 1 eV below  $E_F$ , the most distinct one very close to  $E_F$  being accompanied by a weaker feature at 0.5 eV and another one at 0.8–0.9 eV. Their general occurrence and invariability of characteristic energies practically excludes any relation to individual features in density of electronic states. Instead, a relation to  $5f$  atomic state multiplets has been suggested [24,25] among other possible explanations. Similar to Am, the link to atomic multiplet is corroborated by the present calculations also for Pu. For  $\alpha$ -Pu shown in Fig.2a, the AMF-LDA+U  $\rho_{\text{DOS}}$  manifold at around -1 eV transforms into a set of multiplet transitions with high value of spectral density at  $E_F$ . Similarly to the Pu metal, the PES exhibits the three most intense peaks for a broad class of Pu compounds. The calculations performed for PuTe (see Fig. 2b) indeed demonstrate the three-peak pattern similar to Pu, in agreement with experiment [26]. Also we point out a good agreement between our calculations and recent DMFT calculations of Ref. [8], as well as those of Svane for PuSe [18]. One should note that the high spectral intensity at the Fermi level is explaining enhanced values of the  $\gamma$ -coefficient of electronic specific heat, observed in  $\alpha$ -Pu and other Pu systems.

As a conclusion, we have shown that the three narrow features observed in the valence band spectra of Pu and majority of Pu compounds can be identified with the most intense atomic excitations (multiplets), calculated using the LDA+U and the multi-orbital HIA calculations. The calculations explain that the atomic excitations can be observed even if the 5f states are not fully localized as in  $\alpha$ -Pu, and the atomic character fixes the characteristic energies (not intensities) such that similar features are found in spectra of diverse Pu systems. A reasonable agreement with experiment is found also for Am and its compounds calculated on the same footing.

The research was carried out as a part of research program sAVO Z10100520 of the Academy of Sciences, MSM 0021620834 of the Ministry of Education of Czech Republic. Financial support was provided by the Grant Agency of the Academy of Sciences (Project A100100530), the Grant Agency of Czech Republic (Projects 202/04/1005 and 202/04/1103), and by the action

COST P16 (Project OC144, financed by the Czech Ministry of Education). We gratefully acknowledge valuable discussions with V. Janis, P. Oppeneer, and A. Lichtenstein.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S.Y. Savrasov, G. Kotliar and E. Abrahams, *Nature* 410 (London), 793 (2001).
- [2] J.-C. Griveau, J. Rebizant, G.H. Lander, and G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 94, 097002 (2005).
- [3] P. Soderlind and B. Sadigh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92, 185702 (2004) and references therein.
- [4] P. Soderlind and A. Landa, *Phys. Rev. B* 72, 024109 (2005) and references therein.
- [5] Lashley J.C., Lawson A., McQueeney R.J., and Lander G.H., *Phys. Rev. B* 72, 054416 (2005). Also, it is well established experimentally that the ground state of Am is a  $f^6 J = 0$  singlet.
- [6] A.B. Shick, V.D. Rchal, and L.H. Avela, *Europhys. Lett.* 69, 588 (2005).
- [7] A.B. Shick, L.H. Avela, J. Kolorenc, T. Gouder, and P. Oppeneer, *Phys. Rev. B* 73, 104415 (2006).
- [8] L.V. Pourovskii, M.I. Katsnelson, A.I. Lichtenstein, L.H. Avela, T. Gouder, F.W. Astin, A.B. Shick, V.D. Rchal, and G.H. Lander, *Europhys. Lett.* 75, 479 (2006).
- [9] L.V. Pourovskii, A.I. Lichtenstein, and M.I. Katsnelson, *Phys. Rev. B* 72, 115106 (2005);
- [10] L.V. Pourovskii, M.I. Katsnelson, and A.I. Lichtenstein, *Phys. Rev. B* 73, 060506 (2005).
- [11] A.I. Lichtenstein, M.I. Katsnelson, *Phys. Rev. B* 57, 6884 (1998).
- [12] X. Dai, S. Savrasov, G. Kotliar et al., *Science* 300, 953 (2003).
- [13] X. Dai, K. Haule, and G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. B* 72, 045111 (2005).
- [14] A.I. Lichtenstein, V.I. Anisimov, and J. Zaanen, *Phys. Rev. B* 52, R5467 (1995) and references therein.
- [15] A.B. Shick, A.I. Lichtenstein, and W.E. Pickett, *Phys. Rev. B* 60, 10763 (1999). When SOC is taken into account, the spin is no longer a good quantum number, and the electron-electron interaction potential Eq.(4) has to be modified to include contributions from spin-off-diagonal elements of the occupation matrix as given e.g. in [I. Yang, S. Savrasov, and G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87, 216405 (2001); A.B. Shick, V. Janis, V.D. Rchal, and W.E. Pickett, *Phys. Rev. B* 70, 134506 (2004)].
- [16] J.P. Perdew and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. B* 23, 5048 (1981).
- [17] M. Pottho, T. Wegner, and W. Nolting, *Phys. Rev. B* 55, 16132 (1997).
- [18] A. Svane, arXiv:cond-mat/0508311.
- [19] The  $(\epsilon_{\text{H}} - \epsilon_{\text{H}}^{\text{shift}})$  "shift" serves as an analogon of the difference between the "local" impurity and the lattice chemical potentials [H. Kajueter and G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77, 131 (1996), and Ref. [11]].
- [20] Also, we used the experimental values of  $-Pu$  and fcc-Am lattice constants. The Am atom Coulomb  $U = 4$  eV, and the intra-atomic exchange parameter  $J = 0.75$  eV (corresponding Slater integrals  $F_0 = 4.0$  eV,  $F_2 = 8.93967$  eV,  $F_4 = 5.97302$  eV, and  $F_6 = 4.41907$  eV), and for the Pu atom  $U = 4$  eV,  $J = 0.7$  eV corresponding Slater integrals  $F_0 = 4.0$  eV,  $F_2 = 8.34369$  eV,  $F_4 = 5.57482$  eV, and  $F_6 = 4.12446$  eV) were used.
- [21] We found that the Eq.(10) gives practically the same values for  $\epsilon_{\text{H}}$  for inverse temperature  $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$  in the range of 30–50 eV<sup>-1</sup> as the procedure of Ref. [11] based on the summation over Matsubara frequencies (see Eq.(11) of Ref. [11]).
- [22] T. Gouder et al., *Phys. Rev. B* 72, 115122 (2005).
- [23] There is only a semi-qualitative agreement of our and Ref [18] results with those of [S.Y. Savrasov, K. Haule, and G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96, 036404 (2006)] for a reason which is unclear at the moment.
- [24] T. Gouder, F.W. Astin, J. Rebizant, L.H. Avela, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84, 3378 (2000).
- [25] L.H. Avela et al., *Phys. Rev. B* 65, 235118 (2002); L.H. Avela et al., *Phys. Rev. B* 68, 235118 (2003).
- [26] T. Durakiewicz et al., *Phys. Rev. B* 70, 205103 (2004).
- [27] The experimental spectra were shifted upwards for clarity.




Fig. 1 { Color-on-line. The  $f$ DOS (AMF-LDA+U) and SpectralDensity (HIA) for fcc-Am (top-a), AmN (middle-b), AmSb (bottom-c) calculated along  $z = E - E_F + i\eta$  where  $\eta = 63$  meV is used. Experimental PES (arb. units) from Ref. [22] are shown [27].

Fig. 2 { Color-on-line. The  $f$ DOS (AMF-LDA+U) and SpectralDensity (HIA) for  $\alpha$ -Pu (top-a) and