TIGHT-BINDING MODEL FOR HEAVY FERMION COMPOUNDS: CONSTRUCTION OF $f-p$ MODEL*
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We discuss electronic properties of CeIrIn$_5$ based on the relativistic band-structure calculation. The obtained energy band-structure is reanalyzed by using a tight-binding $f$-$p$ model, which is found to be a realistic and practical Hamiltonian for CeTIn$_5$ ($T$ = Ir, Rh, and Co).

PACS numbers: 71.27.+a, 71.18.+y, 71.15.-m

Recently Ce-based heavy fermion superconductors CeTIn$_5$ ($T$ = Ir, Rh, and Co) have attracted much attentions in the research field of strongly correlated electron systems [1]. The so-called Ce-115 compound has the HoCoGa$_5$-type tetragonal crystal structure with alternating layers of CeIn$_3$ and TIn$_2$ stacked along the [001] direction, as shown in Fig. 1(a), indicating that two-dimensionality is strong in this material. In fact, the angular dependence of major experimental de Haas–van Alphen frequency branches is well explained by quasi two-dimensional Fermi surfaces [2].

Due to the simple two-dimensionality of the Fermi surfaces and magnetic property, CeIrIn$_5$ is an ideal example for fundamental study of superconductivity and magnetism in rare earth compounds. However, when we attempt to promote such an investigation for CeTIn$_5$ from a microscopic viewpoint, we encounter a problem of absence of an appropriate Hamiltonian for the $f$ electron systems. Thus, we will try to construct a microscopic model by combining the band calculation and the tight-binding method.
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(1023)
In this paper we first discuss electronic properties of CeIrIn₅ from the band calculation within the local density approximation (LDA). Second we reanalyze the energy band structure in comparison with a tight-binding model including Ce 4f and In 5p states. The overall framework of the band structure around the Fermi energy $E_F$ is determined by the broad p band and f–p hybridization, while the fine structure in the vicinity of $E_F$ is sensitive to the narrow f bands and crystalline electric field (CEF) effects.

Let us briefly discuss the energy band structure calculated by using the relativistic linear augmented plane wave (RLAPW) method with the exchange and correlation potential in the LDA. The muffin-tin approximation is adopted for the spatial shape of one-electron potential and self-consistent calculations are carried out for experimental lattice constants. In the calculated energy band structure for CeIrIn₅, as shown in Fig. 1(b), four characteristic features are observed: (i) $E_F = 0.416$ Ryd. in the present unit and 13th-16th bands construct the Fermi surfaces. (ii) Around $E_F$, hybridization between Ce 4f and In 5p states occurs. (iii) Above $E_F$ near the M point, flat 4f bands split into two groups, specified by $j = 5/2$ for lower and 7/2 for upper bands, respectively ($j$ is the total angular momentum). (iv) The magnitude of the splitting in 4f states corresponds to the spin-orbit coupling, estimated as 0.4 eV.

As suggested in the point (iii) above, energy bands around $E_F$ are composed of $j = 5/2$ states. Thus, we take into account only the $j = 5/2$ sextet to construct an effective model for low-energy excitations. Moreover, since the Fermi surfaces exhibit two-dimensionality both in experiments and in the band calculation, we consider the tight-binding model within the $j = 5/2$ sextet on the two-dimensional lattice shown in Fig. 2(a).
Due to the lack of space, we skip detailed explanations for the tight-binding procedure, but here only the result is shown:

\[
H = \sum_{k\mu\sigma} \left[ (\varepsilon^f_{k\mu\sigma} + \Delta^f_{\mu\sigma}) c^\dagger_{k\mu\sigma} f_{k\eta\tau} + (\varepsilon^p_{k\mu\sigma} + \Delta^p_{\mu\sigma}) \tilde{p}^\dagger_{k\eta\tau} P_{k\eta\tau} + V_{k\mu\sigma} (f_{k\eta\tau} P_{k\eta\tau} + \text{h.c.}) \right],
\]

where \( f_{k\eta\tau} \) (\( P_{k\eta\tau} \)) is an annihilation operator for \( f \) (\( p \)) electron with momentum \( k \) and pseudo-spin \( \sigma \) in the \( \mu \) orbital. Note here that \( f_{k\eta\tau} \) is given by the linear combination of the states in the \( j = 5/2 \) sextet, while \( P_{k\eta\tau} \) is composed of the states in the \( j = 1/2 \) doublet and \( j = 3/2 \) quartet. The dispersion energies for \( f \) and \( p \) electrons are given by \( \varepsilon^f_{k\mu\sigma} \) and \( \varepsilon^p_{k\mu\sigma} \), respectively, while \( V_{k\mu\sigma} \) indicates \( f-p \) hybridization. Effects of tetragonal CEF are included in \( \Delta^f_{\mu\sigma} \) and \( \Delta^p_{\mu\sigma} \) for \( f \) and \( p \) electrons, respectively. Parameters in \( H \) are three Slater integrals \([f f \sigma], (p p \sigma), (f p \sigma)\] and several CEF parameters, which are determined so as to be consistent with the band calculation results.

In Fig. 2(b) we show a typical result for comparison between the RLAPW and the tight-binding energy bands. For a given value of \( (f f \sigma) \), we determine \( (p p \sigma) \) and \( (f p \sigma) \) in a manner that energies at the top and bottom of tight-binding bands are just equal to those at the \( \Gamma \) point of the 25th band and at the \( M \) point of the 12th in the RLAPW result, respectively, since these bands...
originates from In 5p states. Then, we obtain \((pp\sigma) = 7010 \text{K}\) and \((fp\sigma) = 11280 \text{K}\) for \((f\sigma) = 2000 \text{K}\) [3]. CEF parameters have been determined in the \(f-f\) model without \(p\) electrons [4]. Details of parameter fitting as well as the derivation of \(H\) will be discussed elsewhere [5].

Here we focus on the three Fermi surfaces constructed from 13th, 14th, and 15th bands in the RLAPW result, since \(f\) and \(p\) components of the 16th-band Fermi surface are quite small. The tight-binding model has several bands crossing \(E_F\) along the \(\Gamma-M\) and \(X-M\) axes, reproducing two large cylindrical sheets corresponding to the 14th- and 15th-band Fermi surfaces in the RLAPW result, as shown in Fig. 2 (d) and (e). We can also reproduce a portion of the small 13th-band Fermi surfaces, as shown in Fig. 2(c), which could not be obtained in the \(f-f\) model [4]. Thus, it is suggested that the Fermi surfaces of the \(f-p\) model agree well with the RLAPW results.

In summary, the energy band and Fermi surface structures of CeIrIn\(_5\) have been discussed by combining the band calculation and the tight-binding \(f-p\) model. The Fermi surface topology in the \(f-p\) model is consistent with the band calculation and experimental results. We believe that the \(f-p\) model may serve as a realistic Hamiltonian to discuss magnetism and superconductivity in CeTmIn\(_5\) by further adding Coulomb interaction terms.
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[3] Although hopping amplitudes estimated from the band calculation are large, these should be reduced by many-body effects which are not fully included here. To improve the band theory for \(f\)-electron compounds on this point, a study based on the optimized effective potential theory is in progress.
