

# LDA++ approach to electronic structure of magnets: correlation effects in iron.

M. I. Katsnelson<sup>1</sup> and A. I. Lichtenstein<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Metal Physics, 620219 Ekaterinburg, Russia

<sup>2</sup> Forschungszentrum Jülich, 52425 Jülich, Germany

## Abstract

A novel approach to investigation of correlation effects in the electronic structure of magnetic crystals which takes into account a frequency dependence of the self energy (so called "LDA++ approach") is developed. The fluctuation exchange approximation is generalized to the spin-polarized multiband case and its local version is proposed. As an example, we calculate the electronic quasiparticle spectrum of ferromagnetic iron. It is shown that the Fermi liquid description of the bands near the Fermi level is reasonable, while the quasiparticle states beyond approximately 1 eV range are strongly damped, in agreement with photoemission data. The result of the spin-polarized thermomission experiment is explained satisfactorily. The problem of satellite structure is discussed.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The description of correlation effects in electronic structure and magnetism of iron-group metals is still far from the final picture and attracts continuous interest (see, e.g., [1,4] and Refs therein). Despite many attempts, the situation is still unclear both theoretically and experimentally. For example, there is no agreement on the presence of 5 eV satellite in photoemission spectrum of iron [5,6], and on the existence of local spin splitting above

Curie temperature of nickel [7]. The experimental data on the absence of spin-polarization in the thermomission from cesiated iron [8] are still not understood completely [9]. From the theoretical point of view, different approaches such as the second-order perturbation theory [10,3], the three-body Faddeev approximation [11], and the moment expansion method [12] were used. Unfortunately, the conditions of applicability of these schemes are not clear. Recently we investigated different approximations to the LDA-based correlated electronic structure of crystals with a local self-energy [13] (so called "LDA++" approach) and argued that for moderately strong correlations (the case of iron-group metals) one of the most efficient approaches would be the fluctuation-exchange (FLEX) approximation of Bickers and Scalapino [14]. Here we generalize LDA++ approach [13] to the spin-polarized case and present some results for the quasiparticle spectrum of ferromagnetic iron.

## II. SPIN-POLARIZED MULTI-BAND FLEX APPROXIMATION

Let us start with the general many-body Hamiltonian for crystal in LDA+U scheme [15]:

$$\begin{aligned}
 H &= H_t + H_U \\
 H_t &= \sum_i t_{i0} c_i^\dagger c_0 \\
 H_U &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{f \neq g} \sum_{i,j} h_{ij} c_{i1}^\dagger c_{j1}^\dagger c_{i2} c_{j2} c_{i3} c_{j3} c_{i4} c_{j4} ;
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $i = im$  are the site number ( $i$ ) and orbital ( $m$ ) quantum numbers;  $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$  is the spin projection;  $c^\dagger, c$  are the Fermi creation and annihilation operators;  $H_t$  is the effective single particle Hamiltonian from LDA, corrected for double-counting of average interactions among correlated electrons [15,13], and the Coulomb matrix elements are defined in the standard way

$$h_{ijkl} = \int d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \psi_i(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j(\mathbf{r}') v(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi_k(\mathbf{r}) \psi_l(\mathbf{r}'); \tag{2}$$

where we define for brevity  $\psi_1 = 1$  etc. Following Bickers and Scalapino [14] we introduce the pairwise operators corresponding to different channels, namely, particle-hole density:

$$d_{12} = \frac{1}{2} (c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#} + c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#}) ;$$

particle-hole magnetic channel:

$$m_{12}^0 = \frac{1}{2} (c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#} - c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#})$$

$$m_{12}^+ = c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#}$$

$$m_{12}^- = c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#} ;$$

particle-particle singlet channel:

$$s_{12} = \frac{1}{2} (c_{1\#} c_{2\#} - c_{1\#} c_{2\#})$$

$$\bar{s}_{12} = \frac{1}{2} (c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#}^\dagger - c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#}^\dagger) ;$$

and particle-particle triplet channel:

$$t_{12}^0 = \frac{1}{2} (c_{1\#} c_{2\#} + c_{1\#} c_{2\#})$$

$$\bar{t}_{12}^0 = \frac{1}{2} (c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#}^\dagger + c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#}^\dagger)$$

$$t_{12}^+ = c_{1\#} c_{2\#}$$

$$\bar{t}_{12}^+ = c_{1\#}^\dagger c_{2\#}^\dagger ;$$

The bare vertex matrices corresponding to the different channels are defined as:

$$U_{12;34}^d = 2h_{13} \delta_{j24i} - h_{13} \delta_{j42i} \quad (3)$$

$$U_{12;34}^m = h_{13} \delta_{j42i}$$

$$U_{12;34}^s = \frac{1}{2} [h_{12} \delta_{j34i} + h_{12} \delta_{j43i}]$$

$$U_{12;34}^t = \frac{1}{2} [h_{12} \delta_{j34i} - h_{12} \delta_{j43i}] ;$$

Now we can rewrite the interaction part of Hamiltonian in Eq.(1) in two equivalent forms,

corresponding to the particle-hole and the particle-particle channels:

$$H_U = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \sum_{i,j} d_i^\dagger U^d_{ij} d_j + \sum_{i,j} m_i^\dagger U^m_{ij} m_j \right] ;$$

$$H_U = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \sum_{i,j} \bar{s}_i U^s_{ij} s_j + \sum_{i,j} \bar{t}_i U^t_{ij} t_j \right] ;$$

where ( ) means matrix product, e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} U^d d_{12} &= \sum_{34} U_{12;34}^d d_{34} \\ d_{12} U^d &= \sum_{34} d_{34} U_{34;12}^d : \end{aligned}$$

Then we may repeat the usual derivation of FLEX equations for single band [14] and multiband [13,16] cases, taking into account the spin-dependence of the Green function  $G_0$ :

$$G_{12}(\omega) = \frac{D}{T} c_1(\omega) c_2^\dagger(0) : \quad E$$

For the finite temperature ( $T > 0$ ) FLEX equations has a "local form" in the Matsubara frequency ( $i!_n$ ) or imaginary time ( $\tau$ ) space (where  $!_n = (2n+1)T$ ;  $n = 0; 1; \dots$ ) and it is very efficient to use the fast-Fourier transforms (FFT) with periodic boundary condition [14,13]. Time-frequency spaces are connected by

$$\begin{aligned} G_0(i!_n) &= \int_0^{\beta} e^{i!_n \tau} G_0(\tau) d\tau \\ G_0(\tau) &= T \sum_{!_n} e^{-i!_n \tau} G_0(i!_n); \end{aligned}$$

and we will try to keep this dual ( $i!$ ) ( $\tau$ ) notation to stress the numerical implementation of this LDA++ scheme.

An unusual feature of the spin-polarized multiband FLEX scheme is mixing of  $m^0$  and  $d$ -channels (as well as  $s$  and  $t^0$ -channels) which related with non-zero value of such correlator, for example:

$$d_{12} m_{34}^0 \quad EE_c = \frac{1}{2} \quad DD_c \quad c_1^+ c_2 + c_{1\#}^+ c_{2\#} \quad c_3^+ c_4 + c_{3\#}^+ c_{4\#} \quad EE_c = \frac{1}{2} \quad G_{23}'' G_{41}'' \quad G_{23}^\# G_{41}^\# ; \quad (4)$$

where  $''$  denotes a connected part of the correlator (cf. [14]). As a result, we have the following expression for effective transverse susceptibility matrix:

$$\chi^+(i!) = \frac{\hbar}{1 + U^m} \quad \chi^\#(i!)^{i-1} \quad \chi^\#(i!); \quad (5)$$

where

$$\overset{0}{\chi}_{12;34}(\omega) = G_{23}(\omega) G_{41}^0(\omega) \quad (6)$$

is an "empty loop" and  $\chi(i\omega)$  is its Fourier transform. The corresponding longitudinal susceptibility matrix has a more complicated form:

$$\chi^k(i\omega) = \frac{h}{1 + U_{ph}^k} \chi_0^k(i\omega)^{i-1} \chi_0^k(i\omega); \quad (7)$$

where we introduce the supermatrix of p-h interactions:

$$U_{ph}^k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \frac{B}{\omega} U^d & 0 \\ \frac{B}{\omega} & 0 \\ 0 & U^m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix};$$

and the matrix of bare longitudinal susceptibility:

$$\chi_0^k = \frac{1}{2} \frac{B}{\omega} \begin{pmatrix} "" & "" & "" \\ "" & "" & "" \\ "" & "" & "" \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} "" & "" \\ "" & "" \\ "" & "" \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad (8)$$

in the dd-, dm<sup>0</sup>-, m<sup>0</sup>d-, and m<sup>0</sup>m<sup>0</sup>-channels (d; m<sup>0</sup> = 1; 2 in the supermatrix indices).

Similarly for the p-p channel we have:

$$\begin{aligned} R^k(i\omega) &= \frac{h}{1 + U^t} R_0^k(i\omega)^{i-1} R_0^k(i\omega) \\ R^k(i\omega) &= \frac{h}{1 + U_{pp}^k} R_0^k(i\omega)^{i-1} R_0^k(i\omega); \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the supermatrix of p-p interactions is defined as:

$$U_{pp}^k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \frac{B}{\omega} U^s & 0 \\ \frac{B}{\omega} & 0 \\ 0 & U^t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix};$$

and the bare p-p susceptibilities are

$$\overset{h}{R}_0^i(\omega)_{12;34} = \frac{1}{2} \overset{h}{G}_{14}^{",\#}(\omega) \overset{h}{G}_{23}^{",\#}(\omega) \overset{h}{G}_{13}^{",\#}(\omega) \overset{h}{G}_{24}^{",\#}(\omega); \quad (10)$$

$$R_0^k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \frac{B}{\omega} R_0^{ss} & R_0^{st} \\ \frac{B}{\omega} & R_0^{ts} \\ R_0^{tt} & R_0^{tt} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix};$$

$$\overset{0}{\chi}_{12;34}(\omega) = G_{23}(\omega) G_{14}^0(\omega); \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{0,12;34}^{ss} &= \frac{1}{4} \left( h_{12;34}'' + h_{21;34}'' + h_{21;34}'' + h_{12;34}'' \right) \\
R_{0,12;34}^{st} &= \frac{1}{4} \left( h_{12;34}'' + h_{21;34}'' + h_{21;34}'' + h_{12;34}'' \right) \\
R_{0,12;34}^{ts} &= \frac{1}{4} \left( h_{12;34}'' + h_{21;34}'' + h_{21;34}'' + h_{12;34}'' \right) \\
R_{0,12;34}^{tt} &= \frac{1}{4} \left( h_{12;34}'' + h_{21;34}'' + h_{21;34}'' + h_{12;34}'' \right)
\end{aligned}$$

In the FLEX approximation we can calculate the electronic self-energy in terms of effective interactions in various channels:

$$= H F + (2) + (ph) + (pp); \quad (12)$$

where the Hartree-Fock contribution is equal to:

$$H F_{12;} = \sum_{34} h_{13} j_{ij} j_{24} i \sum_{0} n_{34}^0 h_{13} j_{ij} j_{42} i n_{34}^0; \quad (13)$$

with the occupation matrix  $n_{12} = G_{21}(\omega)$ ; this contribution to  $\Sigma$  is equivalent to spin-polarized "rotationally-invariant" LDA+U method [17].

The second-order contribution in the spin-polarized case reads:

$$(2)_{12;}(\omega) = \sum_{f3,8g} h_{13} j_{ij} j_{74} i G_{78}(\omega) h_{55} j_{ij} j_{26} i \sum_{0} G_{63}^0(\omega) G_{45}^0(\omega) h_{55} j_{ij} j_{62} i G_{63}(\omega) G_{45}(\omega); \quad (14)$$

and the higher-order particle-hole contribution

$$(ph)_{12;}(\omega) = \sum_{34;0} W_{13;42}^0(\omega) G_{34}^0(\omega); \quad (15)$$

with p-h fluctuation potential matrix:

$$W_{ij}^0(\omega) = \frac{6}{4} W_{ij}'''(\omega) W_{ij}''(\omega) \frac{7}{5}; \quad (16)$$

where the spin-dependent effective potentials are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{ij}''' &= \frac{1}{2} f U^d h_{dd} \sum_{0}^{dd} U^d + U^m \left[ \sum_{0}^{mm} \sum_{0}^{mm} \right] U^m \\
&+ U^d h_{dm} \sum_{0}^{dm} U^m + U^m h_{md} \sum_{0}^{md} U^d g
\end{aligned}$$

$$W^{hh} = \frac{1}{2} f U^d \begin{matrix} h \\ dd \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} dd \\ 0 \end{matrix}^i U^d + U^m \begin{bmatrix} mm & mm \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} U^m \\ U^d \begin{matrix} h \\ dm \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} dm \\ 0 \end{matrix}^i U^m U^m \begin{matrix} h \\ md \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} md \\ 0 \end{matrix}^i U^d g$$

$$W^{hh} = U^m \begin{matrix} h \\ dd \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} dd \\ 0 \end{matrix}^i U^m$$

$$W^{hh} = U^m \begin{matrix} h \\ dd \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} dd \\ 0 \end{matrix}^i U^m :$$

Finally the higher-order particle-particle contribution corresponds to:

$$T_{12;34}^{(pp)}(i) = \sum_{0} T_{13;42}^0(i) G_{43}^0(i);$$

with p-p fluctuation potential matrix:

$$T_{12;34}^0(i) = \begin{matrix} 2 \\ 6 \\ 4 \end{matrix} T_{13;42}^{hh}(i) T_{43;12}^{hh}(i) \begin{matrix} 3 \\ 7 \\ 5 \end{matrix}; \quad (17)$$

defined in terms of the spin-dependent p-p effective potentials:

$$T^{hh} = U^s [R^{ss} R_0^{ss}] U^s + U^t \begin{matrix} h \\ tt \end{matrix} R_0^{tt} U^t \\ + U^s \begin{matrix} h \\ st \end{matrix} R_0^{st} U^t + U^t \begin{matrix} h \\ ts \end{matrix} R_0^{ts} U^s;$$

$$T^{hh} = U^s [R^{ss} R_0^{ss}] U^s + U^t \begin{matrix} h \\ tt \end{matrix} R_0^{tt} U^t \\ U^s \begin{matrix} h \\ st \end{matrix} R_0^{st} U^t + U^t \begin{matrix} h \\ ts \end{matrix} R_0^{ts} U^s;$$

$$T^{hh} = U^t \begin{matrix} h \\ tt \end{matrix} R_0^{tt} U^t;$$

$$T^{hh} = U^t \begin{matrix} h \\ tt \end{matrix} R_0^{tt} U^t:$$

Note that for both p-h and p-p channels the effective interactions, according to Eqs.(16,17), are non-diagonal matrices in spin space, in contrast with any mean-field approximation like LSDA.

### III. LOCAL APPROXIMATION

The consideration of full non-local FLEX self-energy  $\Sigma_{ij}(i!)$  (or momentum dependent Fourier transform  $\Sigma(k; i!)$ ) in the framework of realistic multiband calculations is faced with significant computational difficulties [16]. On the other hand, the best local approximation which corresponds to the so called dynamical mean field theory (DMFT) [19] appeared to be very effective for the calculation of electron spectra of strongly correlated systems. Therefore it is reasonable to combine the FLEX approximation with DMFT rather than just neglecting momentum dependence in FLEX equations. In this respect we will take into account only on-site (Hubbard) interactions so all the bare vertices (Eq. (3)) are diagonal in the site index  $i$  but are matrices in orbital indices  $\alpha$ . We believe that this self-consistent local FLEX-approximation partly accounts for "vertex corrections" (due to the difference of  $G$  and  $G_0$  see below) which are absent in usual FLEX method. Moreover, it is known that even simple second-order approximation for self-energy combined with DMFT give rather good results for the description of correlated systems namely, Hubbard splitting, "Kondo resonances" etc. [19].

The DMFT procedure on the lattice is as follows: one needs to find a self-consistent solution of functional equations

$$\begin{aligned} G_0^{-1}(i!) &= G^{-1}(i!) + \Sigma(i!) \\ &= [G_0]^{-1}; \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where

$$G(i!) = \sum_k^X [i! + t(k) - \Sigma(i!)]^{-1} \quad (19)$$

is the matrix (in orbital and spin indices) of the local Green function and  $\Sigma$  (Eq.(12)) is our spin-polarized multiband FLEX solution which depends on the effective media Green function  $G_0$ .

We could further reduce the computational procedure by neglecting dynamical interaction in the  $p$ - $p$  channel since the most important fluctuations in itinerant electron magnets

are spin-fluctuations in the p-h channel. We take into account static (of T-matrix type) renormalization of effective interactions replacing the bare matrix  $U_{12;34} = \hbar^2 \langle j^j \rangle^2$  in Eqs. (14,15) with the corresponding scattering T-matrix averaged over spins

$$\bar{U} = [1 + U_0(i! = 0)]^{-1} U$$

where  $U_0(i!)$  is the Fourier transform of

$$U_{12;34}^0(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\mathbf{r}_0} G_{13}(\mathbf{r}) G_{24}^0(\mathbf{r})$$

In the case of the single-band Hubbard model this approximation was found to be very reliable [18]. The effects of the spin-dependence of the effective interaction matrix  $\bar{U}$  will be considered elsewhere [20].

#### IV. COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS

We have started from the spin-polarized LSDA band structure of ferromagnetic iron within the TB-LMTO method [21] in the minimal s;p;d basis set and used numerical orthogonalization to find the  $H_t$  part of our starting Hamiltonian. We take into account Coulomb interactions only between d-states. The correct parameterization of the  $H_U$  part is indeed a serious problem. For example, first-principle estimations of average Coulomb interactions ( $U$ ) [22,3] lead to unreasonably large value of order of 5-6 eV in comparison with experimental values of the  $U$ -parameter in the range of 1-2 eV for iron [3]. Semiempirical analysis of the appropriate interaction value [23] gives  $U \approx 2.3$  eV. The difficulties with choosing the correct value of  $U$  are connected with complicated screening problems, definitions of orthogonal orbitals in the crystal, and contributions of the intersite interactions. In the quasiatomic (spherical) approximation the full  $U$ -matrix for the d-shell is determined by the three parameters  $U$ ;  $J$  and  $-J$  [13]. Note that the value of intra-atomic (Hund) exchange interaction  $J$  is not sensitive to the screening and approximately equals to 0.9 eV in different estimations [22]. We use the simplest way of estimating  $J$  keeping the ratio

$J=J$  equal to its atomic value [24]. For the most important parameter  $U$ , which defines the bare vertex matrix (Eq. (3)), we use the value  $U = 2.3$  eV for most of our calculations and discuss the dependences of the density of states (DOS) as functions of  $U$ . To calculate the spectral functions

$$A(\mathbf{k}; E) = -\frac{1}{T} \text{Tr}_L G(\mathbf{k}; E + i0)$$

and DOS as their sum over the Brillouin zone we first made analytical continuation for the matrix self-energy from Matsubara frequencies to the real axis using the Padé approximation [25], and then numerically inverted the Green-function matrix as in Eq. (19) for each  $\mathbf{k}$ -point. In the self-consistent solution of the FLEX equations we used 1024 Matsubara frequencies and the FFT-scheme with the energy cut-off at 100 eV. The sum over irreducible Brillouin zone have been made with 72  $\mathbf{k}$ -points for SCF-iterations and with 1661  $\mathbf{k}$ -points for the final total density of states.

First we analyze the  $U$ -dependence of electronic structure (Fig.1). Keeping  $J; J$  fixed as described above we vary the average  $U$  parameter in the range from 2 to 6 eV. For computational simplicity a relatively high temperature value  $T = 1500$  K was used. Note that the temperature in this approach is defined in terms of Matsubara frequencies. In contrast to the standard LDA calculations at the finite temperatures [26] we take into account the temperature dependence of the Bose degrees of freedom through the  $p$ - $h$  susceptibilities. It is known [27] that this source of temperature dependence is the most important for itinerant electron magnets. Although  $T$  is above  $T_C^{\text{exp}}$  (where  $T_C^{\text{exp}} = 1043$  K is the experimental value of the Curie temperature of iron) all DOS ( $N_{\uparrow}(E); N_{\downarrow}(E)$ ) curves in the Fig.1 show the spin splitting. In principle, one could calculate  $T_C$  using the temperature dependence of the uniform spin susceptibility [19] but we have not done it yet. Nevertheless, we believe that this splitting in DMFT is a manifestation of the existence of local magnetic moment above  $T_C$  and is not connected with long-range magnetic order. This spin splitting is a characteristic feature of local approximations and reflects the Hubbard splitting in the one-band model [18]. The local spin splitting above Curie temperature in iron is definitely observed in

in many experiments, e.g. optics, photoemission etc. (see, e.g. [27,4] and references therein).

First of all, we see that the value of the total magnetic moment is weakly dependent on  $U$  and is of order of  $2 \mu_B$  for this temperature. The positions of the main peaks with respect to the Fermi energy roughly coincides with those in LSDA up to  $U = 2$  eV. Starting from  $U = 3$  eV satellites at  $E' = 5$  eV appears as well as additional many-body structure at  $E' = 4$  eV. Note that a weak satellite-like feature at  $E' = 5$  eV was observed experimentally in [5] although it was not found in [6]. For  $U' = 1$  eV which is considered to be "experimental" value for iron [3] there are no any noticeable manifestations of this satellite. The boundary values of  $U$  of order of 2 eV with weak shoulder probably corresponds to the experimental situation in the best way. For  $U' = 5 - 6$  eV an essential part of the spectral density related to the many-particle peaks corresponding to the upper and lower Hubbard bands, which is unrealistic for such moderately correlated substances as iron. At  $U' = 6$  eV the empty quasiparticle minority-spin peak goes below the Fermi level which decreases the magnetic moment.

The depolarization of states near the Fermi level is another important correlation effect. The decrease of the ratio  $P = [N_{\uparrow}(E_F) - N_{\downarrow}(E_F)] / [N_{\uparrow}(E_F) + N_{\downarrow}(E_F)]$  is a typical sign of spin-polaron effects [4,28]. In our approach this effects are taken into account through the  $W_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(ph)}$  terms in the effective spin-polarized LDA++ potential.

The energy dependence of self-energy in Fig 2 shows characteristic features of moderately correlated systems. At low energies  $|E| < 1$  eV we see a typical Fermi-liquid behavior  $\text{Im} \Sigma(E) \propto E^2$ ;  $\partial \text{Re} \Sigma(E) / \partial E < 0$ : At the same time, for the states beyond this interval within the d-bands the damping is rather large (of the order of 1 eV) so these states corresponds to ill-defined quasiparticles, especially for occupied states. This is probably one of the most important conclusions of our calculations. Qualitatively it was already pointed out in Ref. [10] on the basis of a model second-order perturbation theory calculations. We have shown that this is the case of realistic quasiparticle structure of iron with the reasonable value of Coulomb interaction parameter.

Due to noticeable broadening of quasiparticle states the description of the computational

results in terms of effective band structure (determined, for example, from the maximum of spectral density) would be incomplete. We present on the Fig.3 the full spectral density  $A(k;E)$  including both coherent and incoherent parts as a function of  $k$  and  $E$ . We see that in general the maxima of the spectral density (dark regions) coincide with the experimentally obtained band structure. However, for occupied majority spin states at about  $-3$  eV the distribution of the spectral density is rather broad and the description of this states in terms of the quasiparticle dispersion is problematic. This conclusion is in complete quantitative agreement with raw experimental data on angle-resolved spin-polarized photoemission [29] with the broad non-dispersive second peak in the spin-up spectral function around  $-3$  eV.

#### V. APPLICATIONS TO SPIN-POLARIZED THERMOEMISSION

One of the most unexpected results concerning electronic structure of iron was obtained by spin-polarized thermoemission for cesiated iron [8]. In this case the thermal current is determined by the states with the energy  $W = 1.37$  eV above Fermi level which are in the region of quasiparticle DOS peak for minority spin. One could expect a strong negative spin polarization of the current (polarization ratio  $P$  as estimated from LSDA DOS is about  $-85\%$ ). More accurate estimation which takes into account group velocities [9] results in  $P = -34\%$  for the polarization ratio. Experimentally it found to be zero within the experimental error.

To clarify the situation, we considered this effect on the basis of our LDA++ calculations. The current through the surface  $x = 0$  in the spectral representation is

$$j_x = \sum_k \text{Tr}_L \left[ \frac{\partial t(k)}{\partial k_x} D_{c_k^+ c_k}^{E^\#} \right] = \sum_k \text{Tr}_L \left[ \frac{\partial t(k)}{\partial k_x} \right] \int_{-1}^1 dE f(E) A(k;E)^5; \quad (20)$$

where  $\partial t(k) = \partial k = V_k$  is the group velocity operator (the matrix in orbital indices),  $f(E)$  is the Fermi distribution function. Taking into account only electrons moving towards the surface ( $k_x > 0$ ) and with the energy ( $E$ ) above the barrier ( $W$ ) the thermoemission current (cf. Ref [9] for the case of noninteracting electrons) could be expressed as:

$$j_x^T = \sum_{k(k_x > 0)} \int_{-W}^W dE f(E) T_{r_L} \left( \frac{\partial t(k)}{\partial k_x} A(k; E) \right) \quad (21)$$

Taking into account that  $T \ll W$  and averaging over the surface orientations (experiments [8] were carried out for polycrystalline samples), we found the following approximate formula for the polarization

$$P = \frac{I_{\parallel} - I_{\perp}}{I_{\parallel} + I_{\perp}}; \quad (22)$$

$$I = \sum_{i=x,y,z} \sum_k T_{r_L} \left( \frac{\partial t(k)}{\partial k_i} A(k; W) \right)$$

This was calculated using numerical differentiation of  $t(k)$  matrix and summing up over 1661  $k$  points in the irreducible part of the Brillouin zone. We obtained  $P = -12\%$  which is to compare with the value of  $-34\%$  from LSDA calculations [9]. The decrease of  $P$  is not a pure effect of damping of the quasiparticle states, but is the result of rather complicated cancellations of  $s;p;d$ -electron contributions. Therefore, one may conclude that there is no drastic discrepancy between experimental results [8] and theoretical description of the electronic structure of iron, inspite of the approximate character of our treatment of the thermomission problem. For more accurate description one needs to consider, for example, an influence of the cesium layer and surface effects on the electronic structure of iron according to the experimental conditions.

## V I. C O N C L U S I O N S

We have proposed a general scheme for investigation of the correlation effects in the quasiparticle band structure calculations for itinerant-electron magnets. This approach is based on the combination of the dynamical mean-field theory and the fluctuating exchange approximation. Application of LDA++ method gives an adequate description of the quasiparticle electronic structure for ferromagnetic iron. The main correlation effects in the electron energy spectrum are strong damping of the occupied states below 1 eV from the Fermi level  $E_F$  and essential depolarization of the states in the vicinity of  $E_F$ . We obtained

a reasonable agreement with different experimental spectral data (spin-polarized photo- and thermoemission). The method is rather universal and can be applied for other magnetic systems, both ferro- and antiferromagnets.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Part of this work was carried out during the visit of one of the author (M.K.) to Max Planck Institute of Physics for Complex Systems (Dresden). The work was also partially supported by Russian Basic Research Foundation under grant 96-02-16000. We are grateful to O.K. Andersen, C. Carbone, P. Fulde, O. Gunnarsson, G. Kotliar and A. Georges for helpful discussions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Liebch A , 1979 Phys. Rev. Lett. 43 1431
- [2] Staunton J, Gyory B L, Pindor A J, Stocks G M , and Winter H 1985 J. Phys. F 15 1387
- [3] Steiner M M , Albers R C , and Sham L J 1992 Phys. Rev. B 45 13272
- [4] Irkhin V Yu, Katsnelson M I , and Trelov A V 1993 J. Phys. : Condensed Matter 5 8763; Vonsovsky S V , Katsnelson M I, and Trelov A V 1993 Phys. Metals Metallurgy 76 247, 343
- [5] Chanderis D , Lecante J, and Petro Y 1983 Phys. Rev. B 27 2630; Gutierrez A and Lopez M F 1997 Phys. Rev. B 56 1111
- [6] Kirby R E, Kisker B, King F K , and Garwin E L 1985 Solid State Commun 56 425
- [7] Greber T, Kreutz T J, and Osterwalder J 1997 Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 4465; Sinkovich B , Tjeng L H , Brooks N B, Goedkoop J B, Hesper R, Pellegrin E, de Groot F M F, Altieri S, Hulbert S L, Shekel E, and Sawatzky G A 1997 Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 3510
- [8] Vaterlaus A, Milani F, and Meier F 1990 Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 3041
- [9] Monnier R, Steiner M M , and Sham L J 1991 Phys. Rev. B 44 13678
- [10] Treglia G , Ducastelle F, and Spanjaard D 1982 J. Phys. (Paris) 43 341
- [11] Igarashi J 1983 J. Phys. Soc. Japan 52 2827; Manghi F, Bellini V, and Arcangeli C 1997 Phys. Rev. B 56 7149;
- [12] Nolting W , Rex S and MathiJaya S 1987 J. Phys. : Condensed Matter 9 1301
- [13] Lichtenstein A I and Katsnelson M I 1998 Phys. Rev. B 57 6884
- [14] Bickers N E and Scalapino D J 1989 Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 193 206

- [15] Anisimov V I, Aryasetiawan F and Lichtenstein A I 1997 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 9 767
- [16] Esirgen G and Bickers N E 1998 Phys. Rev. B 57 5376
- [17] Lichtenstein A I, Anisimov V I, and Zaanen J 1995 Phys. Rev. B 52 R5467
- [18] Fleck M, Lichtenstein A I, Oles A M, Hedin L, and Anisimov V I 1998 Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 2393
- [19] Georges A, Kotliar G, Krauth W, and Rozenberg M 1996 Rev. Mod. Phys. 68 13
- [20] Katsnelson M I and Lichtenstein A I to be published
- [21] Andersen O K 1975 Phys. Rev. B 12 3060; Krier G, Jepsen O, Burkhardt A, and Andersen O K 1994 The TB-LMTO-ASA Program Preprint of Max Planck Institute of Solid State Research (Stuttgart)
- [22] Anisimov V I and Gunnarsson O 1991 Phys. Rev. B 43 7570
- [23] Oles A M and Stohr G 1984 Phys. Rev. B 29 314
- [24] Anisimov V I, Solov'ev I V, Korotin M A, Czyzyk M T, and Sawatzky G A 1993 Phys. Rev. B 48 16929
- [25] Vidberg H J and Serene J W 1977 J. Low Temp. Phys. 29 179
- [26] Jarlborg T 1997 Rep. Prog. Phys. 60 1305
- [27] Moriya T 1985 Spin Fluctuations in Itinerant Electron Magnetism (Springer, Berlin etc)
- [28] Irkhin V Yu and Katsnelson M I 1994 Physics-Uspokhi 37 659
- [29] Kisker E, Schroeder K, Gudat T, and Campagna M 1985 Phys. Rev. B 31 329

# FIGURES




FIG .1. Density of d-states and magnetic moments for ferromagnetic iron in the LSDA and the LDA++ calculations for different average Coulomb interactions with  $J=0.9$  eV and temperature  $T=1500$  K .




FIG. 2. Total density of states and d-part of self-energy for ferromagnetic iron with  $U = 2.3$  eV and  $J = 0.9$  eV for the temperature  $T = 750$  K. Two different self-energies for  $t_{2g}$  and  $e_g$  d-states in the cubic crystal field symmetry are presented and four different lines corresponds to imaginary part spin-up (full line) and spin-down (dashed line) as well as real part spin-up (dashed-dot line) and spin-down (dashed-double-dot line).




FIG. 3. Spectral function of ferromagnetic iron for spin-up (a) and spin-down (b) and the two k-directions in the Brillouin zone compared with the experimental angle resolved photoemission and de Haas-van Alphen (at the  $E_F = 0$ ) points (from Ref. 3).