A re light alkalim etals still m etals under high pressure?

Fabio Siringo, Renato Pucci and Giuseppe G N. Angilella

D ipartim ento di Fisica dell'Universita di Catania, 57, Corso Italia, I-95129 Catania, Italy (August 26, 2021)

Abstract

The extended Hubbard Ham iltonian on a bcc lattice is studied at half-lling and for a nite hopping between next-nearest-neighbours, in mean-eld approximation. An ionic insulating broken-symmetry phase is predicted for any hydrogenoid bcc solid in the density range $1.0 < r_s < 2.6$. The occurrence of an ionic phase would explain the failure to achieve hydrogen metallization at high pressures. Moreover, a metal-insulator transition is expected for sodium in the 100 GPa region.

PACS numbers: 71.30.+h, 62.50.+p, 81.30 Bx, 71.20 Dg

Typeset using REVT_EX

A kalimetals crystallize in a bcc phase under ordinary them odynamic conditions. In 1935, W igner and Huntington [1] proposed that even hydrogen should undergo a metalinsulator (M I) transition from a molecular to a monatom ic bcc crystal, under high pressure in analogy to alkalimetals. During the last years new excitement arose after several claims for the reach of hydrogen's metallization [2{5]. However, it is now out of doubt that all the observed phases of hydrogen are still molecular, and there is no evidence of metallization induced by a band overlap mechanism up to 191 GPa [6]. From this point of view, hydrogen seem s to be quite di erent from the halogens, for which M I transitions have been observed [7,8].

The nature of the high pressure A phase of hydrogen still remains unexplained, and several hypotheses have been advanced. The recent proposal by B aranow ski [9] that the hydrogen m olecules m ay develop electric dipole m on ents is challenging for di erent reasons: i) rst of all, such a phase would be per se interesting, being a broken-sym m etry ground state of the sym m etric H_2 m olecular system; ii) in addition, the existence of such an ionic phase could m ove a possible m onatom ic phase further tow ards higher pressures; iii) nally, given the sim ilarity of hydrogen with the alkalim etals, the possible existence of an ionic instability should show up even in lithium or sodium under the proper therm odynam ic conditions.

Provided that such a broken-symmetry ionic crystal does exist, it would be desirable to x the boundaries between the ionic and the monatom ic bcc phases. Approaching the boundary from the bcc phase, we look for an ionic instability of the monatom ic crystal, or, in other words, for a charge density wave (CDW) instability, commensurate with the cubic lattice. The existence of such a CDW has been recently observed in the ground state of sodium and potassium, under ordinary therm odynam ic conditions [10]. Such instabilities of the Ferm igas had been predicted [11] as a consequence of the C oulom b electron-electron (ee) repulsion, but do not give rise to any M I transistion, since the CDW is not commensurate with the lattice. Such very smalle ect does not prevent us from considering the alkalim etals as simple 'free-electron' m etals for m ost aspects. On the other hand, a nearest-neighbour tight-binding m odel on a bipartite bcc lattice gives rise to a perfectly nested cubic Ferm i

2

surface at half-lling, and any small e-e repulsion would drive the system towards a spin density wave (SDW) or towards a CDW commensurate with the lattice.

In this Letter we show that, even without nesting of the Ferm i surface, an hydrogenoid bcc crystal undergoes a M I transition towards a broken-symmetry commensurate CDW phase, for an appropriate bounded range of density values. Such a conclusion em erges from a careful analysis of the mean-eld phase diagram for an extended Hubbard Ham iltonian, m odi ed in order to take in due account the long range C oulom b interactions and the hopping between next-nearest-neighbours. Even for a spherical Ferm i surface, the model predicts the occurrence of a broken-symmetry insulating ground state, provided that the nearestneighbour repulsive interaction V exceeds som e critical value. The latter is a function of the other energy scales and mainly of the on-site Hubbard repulsion U between two electrons sharing the same lattice site. While U is only slightly a ected by any increase in density, V scales as a ¹, being a the cubic lattice spacing. Under high pressure, V may reach its critical value, giving rise to a M I transition, albeit in an interm ediate density range; then, at very high densities, the large increase of the Ferm i energy, scaling as a ², would eventually stabilize the monatom ic phase. In other words, we expect that under high pressure both lithium and sodium should undergo a M I transition from a simplem etal to an ionic insulator. On the other hand, such a high density instability of the bcc crystal would suggest that, in order to stabilize a hydrogen m onatom ic phase, higher densities are required than previously estim ated.

The extended Hubbard Ham iltonian reads as:

$$H = \underset{i}{\overset{X}{\underset{hiji}{\underset{hiji}{\underset{hiji}{\atop{}}}}}} C_{i}^{y} C_{j} \qquad \underset{hijii}{\overset{K}{\underset{hijii}{\atop{}}}} C_{i}^{y} C_{j} \qquad \underset{hijii}{\overset{hijii}{\atop{}}} \qquad \underset{hijii}{\underset{hijii}{\atop{}}} + U \underset{i}{\overset{X}{\underset{n_{i''}}{\atop{}}}} n_{i'''} n_{i'''} + \frac{1}{2} \underset{i \in i}{\overset{X}{\underset{i \in i}{\atop{}}}} V_{ij} n_{i} n_{j} \circ; \qquad (1)$$

where c_i (c_i^y) denote the annihilation (creation) operators for an electron in the W annier state centered on the ith site of a bcc lattice, with spin projection 2 f"; #g $n_i = c_i^y c_i$, t_i , $t_2 > 0$, and hiji, hhijii restricting the sum s over nearest and next-nearest-neighbour couples, respectively.

The H am iltonian, Eq. (1), incorporates two major approximations: i) it neglects all bondbond and bond-ion interactions; ii) it neglects any hopping term other than those between nearest or next-nearest neighbours. Approximating the W annier states by atom ic hydrogen ground state wave functions, for a density corresponding to $r_s = 2.2$, the larger bond-ion interaction term does not exceed the 30% of the corresponding ion-ion interaction. O fcourse, any extrapolation to higher densities would require some caution. Regarding the neglected hopping terms, we must notice that the insertion of such exponentially decreasing terms does not change the shape of the Ferm isurface in a signi cant way. A ratio $t_2=t_1 = 0.6 = 0.7$ allows for an alm ost spherical Ferm i surface, up to a 3% deviation.

The model may be solved in mean-eld (MF) approximation by inserting $h_i i = \frac{1}{2} + i$ and neglecting second order terms in the uctuations $n_i = n_i$ h_{l_i} i. Since we are looking for a commensurate CDW instability, we assume $i = \cos(Q - R_i)$, being $Q = \frac{2}{a}$;0;0 the exact nesting vector of the Ferm i surface when $t_2 = 0$. W orking in the reciprocal lattice, i.e. introducing:

$$c_{i}^{y} = p \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k}^{X} e^{-ik R_{i}} c_{k}^{y};$$
 (2)

with k sum m ed over the N points inside the rst B rillouin zone, and neglecting second order uctuation terms, the H am iltonian Eq. (1) reads (up to a constant) as:

$$H_{MF} = \sum_{k}^{X} (k) c_{k}^{Y} c_{k} + \sum_{k}^{X} c_{k+Q}^{Y} c_{k} N ; \qquad (3)$$

where = $(U \quad 16W)$, $"(k) = "_1(k) + "_2(k)$, and:

$$"_{2}(k) = \pm [\cos(k_{x}a) + \cos(k_{y}a) + \cos(k_{z}a)]:$$
(5)

Here W is a renormalized interaction parameter summing up all the long range C oulom b interactions:

$$W = \frac{1}{8} \sum_{m=1}^{N^{2}} (1)^{m+1} z_{m} V^{(m)};$$
(6)

where, for m = 1;2;:::1, V^(m) denotes the V_{ij} interaction term for nearest-neighbours, next-nearest-neighbours, etc., and z_m is the corresponding coordination number.

The MF Ham iltonian, Eq. (3), is easily diagonalized by a canonical transformation. Let us introduce the spinorial notation $_{k}^{y} = c_{k}^{y}$; c_{k+Q}^{y} , with k restricted inside the cube j_{k} j < =a (=x;y;z), which is exactly half the rst Brillouin zone. A ctually the transformation k ! k + Q maps such reduced zone onto the complementary half-zone. The Ham iltonian Eq. (3) now reads:

$$H_{MF} = \sum_{k}^{Y} h(k) k N ;$$
 (7)

where the 2 2 m atrix h (k) is de ned as:

$$h(k) = \begin{cases} 0 & 1 \\ B & "_{1}(k) + "_{2}(k) & (U & 16W) \\ C & K \\ (U & 16W) & "_{2}(k) & "_{1}(k) \end{cases}$$
(8)

and is promptly diagonalized yielding the spectrum :

E (k) = "₂(k)
$$q = \frac{1}{(k)^2 + 2}$$
: (9)

A gap opens between the two bands, E (k), whenever $> 2t_2$: in such a regime, the system is an insulator, and the total energy E tot is readily evaluated by summing E over the doubly occupied half-zone:

$$E_{tot} = \sum_{k}^{X} ["_{2}(k)] = \frac{q}{["_{1}(k)^{2} + 2]} N :$$
(10)

A gap equation is obtained by di erentiating E $_{\rm tot}$ with respect to the order parameter, $\;$:

$$\frac{1}{16W} = \frac{a^3}{2} \frac{^2}{(2)^3} \frac{d^3k}{(2)^3} \frac{1}{(1)^2 + (1)^2}$$
(11)

A nite always solves the latter condition at any coupling strengths but, for sake of consistency with the above assumption of dealing with an insulating phase, must exceed the critical value, $_{c} = 2t_{2}$. A consistent minimum for the total energy is e.g. found for (16W U)= $t_{2} > 3.84$ if $t_{2}=t_{1} = 0.8$.

In the insulating phase, the C oulom b interaction is not screened by the conduction electrons, and long range contributions cannot be neglected. We should evaluate the parameters $U, V^{(m)}$ as diagonal matrix elements of the bare C oulom b interaction in the W annier representation. If we assume V_{ij} $1=R_i$ R_j ; the renormalized parameter W follows from its de nition, Eq. (6), as W $\frac{1}{8}$ MV, being M the Cs{ClM adelung constant, M = 1:763 [12], and V $V^{(1)}$ the rest term in the expansion, Eq. (6), i.e., the nearest-neighbour repulsive interaction. The problem is thus mapped back onto the standard extended H ubbard m odel with an elective number of nearest-neighbour sites z = M, to be compared with the box value $z_1 = 8$. For the reasonable choice $t_2 = t_1 = 0.8$ [13], the U {V phase diagram for the CDW instability is shown in Fig.1.

The boundary between the metallic and the ionic insulating phases is given by the sim ple linear relation $U = t_1 = +2_M V = t_1$, being them inimum value of the ratio (16W U)= t_1 , as emerging from Eq. (11) for $= c = 2t_2$ (= 3.84 for $t_2 = t_1 = 0.8$). In principle, an ionic metallic phase may exist just over the boundary, since the gap closure is due to band overlap, while a nite order parameter always arises from the gap equation (11). However, in presence of a band overlap, the total energy, Eq. (10), is incorrect, since the energy levels must be sum med up to the Ferm i value inside both the bands E . Thus, Eq. (11) is not correct in the metallic phase and the existence of a stable broken-symmetry ground state is questionable in the metallic regime. Moreover, all the Coulomb interaction terms would be strongly screened by the conduction electrons, so that the symmetric = 0 ground state is expected to be more favoured for the metallic phase. The phase diagram is incomplete, since we have not taken in consideration the possible occurrence of SDW instabilities, which are likely to be present for U V, though irrelevant for the follow ing considerations.

Let us rst discuss the U {V phase diagram in relation with the behaviour of solid hydrogen under pressure. The possible bcc phase of dense hydrogen would be a simple 'freeelectron' m etal, with an almost spherical Ferm isurface and a Ferm ienergy comparable with the free electron value $E_F = 1.84 = r_s^2$ a.u., which also reproduces the observed Ferm ienergies for the alkalim etals. In the m etallic phase, neglecting any interaction term, the m odel Ferm i energy arises from the unperturbed spectrum given by Eqs. (4) and (5) in term softhe parameters t_1 , t_2 as $E_F = "(k_F)$ "(0), where k_F is the Ferm i vector, ak_F (6²)¹⁼³. Comparing the latter with the denition for E_F in the free-electron case yields an estimate of t_1 for any chosen ratio $t_2=t_1$, and for any xed density. If we x $t_2=t_1 = 0.8$, then $t_1 = 0.259=r_s^2$ a.u. Approximating the W annier states by 1s hydrogen wave functions, both U and V follow, in a.u. [14], as $U = \frac{5}{8}$, $V = \frac{1}{R}$ $e^{2R} \frac{1}{R} + \frac{11}{8} + \frac{3}{4}R + \frac{1}{6}R^2$, where the nearest-neighbour distance $R = (\frac{p}{3})^{1=3}r_s$ has been used. For large r_s values, $U=t_1$ r_s^2 , while $V=t_1$ r_s , so that the equation of state for hydrogen in the $U=t_1$ { $V=t_1$ phase diagram of Fig. 1 is just a parabola. Some possible states of dense hydrogen are reported on Fig. 1 At very high density, the equation of state deviates from the parabolic behaviour, since V saturates for r_s ! 0. However, the very high density lim it is questionable, and must be considered as an extrapolation out of the range where the adopted approximations are reasonable.

The phase diagram is not signi catively altered by a change of the ratio $t_2=t_1$, since both the boundary line and the equation of state are shifted in the same direction and their relative changes compensate.

If we rely on the emerging scenario, even in the very high density limit, then we would predict that hydrogen m etallization requires $r_s < 1$, since the boc phase would be unstable towards an insulating ionic phase for $1.0 < r_s < 2.6$. The occurrence of such an ionic phase could explain the failure of all the attempts to reach the monatom ic state at the currently achievable densities. In fact, as discussed by Chen et al. [6] and A shcroft [15], the occurrence of an IR active vibron mode could be justiled by the presence of permanent dipole moments. Besides, the occurrence of any otherm olecular ionic phase cannot be ruled out by our approach, which only prevents the stability of the monatom ic boc structure for a given high density range. However, the high density limit $r_s ' 1$ is only qualitatively correct, as previously discussed, being the approximations out of control in this very high density regime. Therefore, we don't indice the monatom is phase for $r_s = 1.3$. Moreover, that numerical calculation evidenced the equivalence of the monatom is ground state energies in both the fix and in the

bcc phases. Thus the ionic instability, lowering the ground state energy, should be relevant even if an fcc structure were the most stable monatom ic phase.

W hile the lower bound of the ionic phase is only qualitatively determ ined by the present approach, the upper limit $r_s < 2.6$ is much more reliable. Any hydrogenoid bcc solid should undergo a M I transition around that critical density value [17], thus realizing an unexpected broken-symmetry ionic phase. At room pressure, $r_s = 3.94$ for sodium and $r_s = 3.25$ for lithium, so that according to Fig. 1 both the elements are correctly predicted to be stable in the monatom ic boc phase. In order to reach the critical density r_s 2:6, a very high pressure is required [18{20]. Such a pressure could be really prohibitive for K, Rb and Cs. Besides, these heavier alkali elements undergo several pressure induced structural transitions which are believed to be driven by the electronic transfer to upper empty bands [18]. Therefore, our attention should be focused on the lightest alkali, since such transferm echanism is negligible and the required pressure could be reached by modern diam ond anvilcellapparatus. Lithium has been compressed up to r_s 2:8 [19], and a phase transition from bcc to fcc has been observed for P = 6.9 GPa ($r_s = 2.9$). The occurrence of the fcc phase could in principle invalidate our discussion, even if the ground state energies of such cubic monatom ic structures are so close that the ionic instability cannot be ruled out at higher densities. Mostly, the best alkali with which we may compare our prediction is sodium: i) it has an almost spherical Ferm i surface; ii) its 3s orbital is expected to be comparable for extension with the 1s orbital of hydrogen [21]; iii) no structural phase transition has been observed up to r_s 2:9 [20]; iv) the rst empty d band is far from the Ferm ienergy. A structural phase transition has been predicted [22] from boc to hop at the very high density $r_s < 2:5$, which should be reachable in the 100 GPa region [18]. A coording to Fig. 1, a M I transition should occur rst, around $r_s = 2.6$, then the ionic phase could push to higher densities the structural transition.

At this stage, we should reverse our starting question, and we should ask instead: W hy is sodium a metal? In a broken-symmetry ionic phase, the inter-ion C oulomb interactions add a considerable contribution to the total ground state energy. This very same term

8

amounts to the almost entire cohesive energy of any ionic crystal. We cannot neglect such interactions, even at high densities, in comparison with the Fermi energy. On the other hand, the rôle played by the on-site Hubbard U and by the nearest-neighbour e ective interaction W is competitive, as it is evident from Eqs. (10) and (11). The form er favours a SDW instability, whereas the latter is responsible for the onset of a CDW. In sodium, under norm al therm odynam ic conditions, such interaction terms compensate each other, precluding any instability. The ground state is a m etal, the interactions are strongly screened by the Fermi liquid, and give only rise to a sm all renorm alization of the band param eters. In other words, the symmetric metallic phase is based on the equilibrium between competing interactions. Whenever we alter such an equilibrium (e.g. increasing W by compressing the distances) the system falls into a broken-symmetry insulating phase, where the interactions are no longer screened and play an essential rôle. Such a phase is expected for sodium in the 100 GPa region, for r_s 2:6. The ionic phase could explain the failure to reach hydrogen m etallization, and would give a possible interpretation of the anom alous IR active vibron mode observed in the high pressure A phase. A very high density is required in order to reduce the rôle of the interactions in comparison with the kinetic electronic energy, and to restore symmetry. For a perfectly nested Ferm i surface $(t_2 = 0)$, such a density is in nite, since the integral in the gap equation (11) diverges for = 0.0 ut of nesting (t_2 > 0), a m etallic phase arises around the U 2_{M} V region (Fig. 1), which also explains the behaviour of all the alkalim etals.

REFERENCES

- [1] E P.W igner and H P.Huntington, J.Chem. Phys. 3, 764 (1935).
- [2] J.H. Eggert, K.A. Goettel, and I.F. Silvera, Europhys. Lett. 11, 775 (1990), and ibid. 12, 381 (1990).
- [3] H K . M ao and R J. Hem ley, Science 244, 1462 (1989).
- [4] L. Cui, N H. Chen, and IF. Silvera, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 4011 (1995).
- [5] M. Han and, R. J. Hem ley, and H. K. Mao, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 3760 (1993).
- [6] N.H. Chen, E. Sterer, IF. Silvera, preprint (1995).
- [7] R. Pucci and F. Siringo, in Molecular system s under high pressure, R. Pucci, G. Piccitto Eds. (Elsevier Science, 1991).
- [8] H. Fujihisa, Y. Fujii, K. Hase, Y. Ohishi, N. Hamaya, K. Tsuji, K. Takemura, O. Shimomura, H. Takahashi, and T. Nakajima, High Press. Res. 4, 330 (1990).
- [9] B. Baranowski, Polish J. Chem. 66, 1737 (1992).
- [10] T M. Giebultowicz, A W. Overhauser, SA. Werner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 1485 (1986); P.G. Coulter, W. R. Datars, Phys. Rev. B 34, 2963 (1986).
- [11] A W .O verhauser, in Highlights of C ondensed M atter Theory, F.Bassani, F.Fum i, M P. Tosi Eds. (N orth-Holland, Am sterdam, 1985).
- [12] See, e.g., N.W. Ashcroft, N.D. Mermin, Solid State Physics (Saunders College, Philadelphia, 1976).
- [13] A slight change of the ratio $t_2=t_1$ does not a lect too much the phase diagram. In general, a smaller value than 0.8 would be expected, thus giving rise to an enlargement of the ionic region in the phase diagram.
- [14] See, e.g., J.C. Slater, Quantum Theory of Molecules and Solids, (MoGraw-Hill, New

York, 1963).

- [15] N W .A shcroft, Physics W orld July 1995, p. 43; N W .A shcroft, Phys. Rev. B 41, 10963 (1990).
- [16] D. Ceperley, in Simple Molecular System s at Very High Density, A. Polian, P. Loubeyre,
 N. Boccara Eds., NATO ASI Series, B186 (Plenum Press, New York, 1989).
- [17] Notice that for $r_s = 2.6$, V is almost independent of the atom ic size, while U is slightly smaller for larger atom ic orbitals, so that the critical r_s value could be even larger for the other alkalim etals.
- [18] H.Olijnyk, W B.Holzapfel, Phys. Lett. A 99, 381 (1983).
- [19] A W . O linger, JW . Shaner, Science 219, 1071 (1983).
- [20] I.V. A lexandrov, S.M. Stishov, V.N. Kachinsky, and I.M. akarenko, in Proc. of the XX EHPRG Meeting (Stuttgart, 1982).
- [21] From the minimal basis set of E.C lementi and D.L.Raimondi, J.Chem.Phys. 38, 2686 (1963), the elective 3s atom ic radius is $a_0 = 3 = (z_1) a_{11}$, where z = 11 and the shield constant z = 8:4927 for sodium, thus yielding $a_0 = 1:196$, to be compared with $a_0 = 1$ for hydrogen.
- [22] JA.Moriarty, AK.M dM ahan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 809 (1982).

FIGURES

FIG.1. U {V phase diagram for a CDW instability, for $t_2=t_1 = 0.8$. The boundary between norm alm etal (M) and ionic insulator (I) is reported as a solid line. The dashed line represents the equation of state for a light alkali as hydrogen: the squares correspond to $r_s = 0.6$ 2.8.

