Electronic Structure and Fermiology of PuCoGa$_5$

Takahiro Maehira$^1$, Takashi Hotta$^1$, Kazuo Ueda$^{2,1}$, and Akira Hasegawa$^3$

$^1$Advanced Science Research Center, Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute, Tokai, Ibaraki 319-1195, Japan
$^2$Institute for Solid State Physics, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8581, Japan
$^3$Niigata University, Niigata, Niigata 950-2181, Japan

(Dated: October 27, 2018)

PACS numbers: 74.25.Jb, 74.70.Tx, 71.18.+y, 71.15.Rf

By using a relativistic linear augmented-plane-wave method, we clarify energy band structures and Fermi surfaces of recently discovered plutonium-based superconductor PuCoGa$_5$. We find several cylindrical sheets of Fermi surfaces with large volume, very similar to CeMIn$_5$ (M=Ir and Co) isostuctural with PuCoGa$_5$, in spite of different $f$-electron numbers between Ce$^{3+}$ and Pu$^{3+}$ ions. The similarity is understood by a concept of electron-hole conversion in a tight binding model constructed based on the $j$-$j$ coupling scheme. Based on the present results, we provide a possible scenario to explain why a transition temperature is so high as 18.5K in PuCoGa$_5$.

Recently it has been discovered that PuCoGa$_5$ exhibits superconductivity [1]. Surprisingly its superconducting transition temperature $T_c$ is 18.5K, which is the highest among those yet observed $f$-electron materials and high enough even compared with other well-known intermetallic compounds. It has been also found that PuRhGa$_5$ becomes superconducting with $T_c$=8.6K [4]. These plutonium intermetallic compounds PuMGa$_5$ have the same HoCoGa$_5$-type tetragonal structure as CeMIn$_5$, a family of cerium-based heavy fermion superconductors [6]. Note, however, that superconductivity occurs for M=Ir ( $T_c$=0.4K) and Co (2.3K) in CeMIn$_5$, while antiferromagnetic (AFM) phase has been found for M=Rh at ambient pressure. Another isostructural material including uranium is UMGa$_5$ [11], but superconductivity has not been found yet. These HoCoGa$_5$-type compounds are frequently referred to as “115”.

Regarding superconducting mechanism in the 115 compounds, first let us consider Ce-115. It has been widely considered that it is unconventional d-wave superconductor induced by AFM spin fluctuations. In fact, there are some evidences such as $T^3$ behavior in nuclear relaxation rate [8] and node structure measured by thermal conductivity [2]. For the phase diagram of Ce(Co,Rh,Ir)In$_5$ [9], AFM phase is found to exist in adjacent to the superconducting phase. Those experimental facts remind us of high-$T_c$ cuprates, but a clear difference from cuprates should be remarked. Namely, high-$T_c$ superconductivity in cuprates occurs by hole doping into AFM insulators, while in Ce-115, no hole doping is needed. To understand the appearance of superconductivity induced by AFM spin fluctuations without hole doping, a crucial role of orbital degree of freedom has been pointed out by Takimoto et al. [3].

Concerning Pu-115, it is still premature to draw a definitive conclusion about the mechanism of superconductivity, but we notice that some normal-state properties in PuMGa$_5$ seem to be dominated by AFM spin fluctuations, e.g., the Curie-Weiss behavior in magnetic susceptibility and electric resistivity in proportion to $T^{1.35}$ [14]. Thus, it may be natural to consider that superconductivity in Pu-based compounds is also induced by AFM fluctuations. However, several problems still exist, even if d-wave superconductivity is confirmed in both Ce-115 and Pu-115 materials. One question is, of course, why $T_c$ is so high in Pu-115. As is well known, due to difference in spatial extension of wavefunctions, 5$f$ electrons have intermediate nature between localized 4$f$ and itinerant 3$d$ electrons. Namely, energy scale of 5$f$-electrons should be larger than that of 4$f$-electrons, leading to higher $T_c$ in 5$f$ electron systems if we assume the same electronic mechanism for superconductivity. However, this cannot be the whole story and the situation is not so simple, since Pu$^{3+}$ ion includes five $f$-electrons, in contrast to one $f$-electron in Ce$^{3+}$ ion. Furthermore one has to address the question why U-115 does not exhibit superconductivity. If we follow the above scenario about energy scale, U-115 can be superconducting with relatively high $T_c$, but that is not the case. Thus, it is not sufficient to consider Pu-115 and U-115 as simple analogues to Ce-115 with large energy scale, based only on difference in itinerant nature between 4$f$- and 5$f$-electrons.

In this Letter, in order to clarify those points, we calculate energy band structures and Fermi surfaces for PuCoGa$_5$ by applying a relativistic linear augmented-plane-wave (RLAPW) method. It is found that several sheets with large volume form cylindrical Fermi surfaces, quite similar to CeMIn$_5$ (M=Ir and Co) [10]. The whole energy scale in the band structure of PuCoGa$_5$ is larger than that of CeMIn$_5$, as naively expected. On the other hand, for UCoGa$_5$, we have found only several small pocket Fermi surfaces to show semi-metal like behavior [12], consistent with the fact that UMGa$_5$ is not superconducting. The similarity between Ce-115 and Pu-115 is understood by a simple tight-binding model constructed based on the $j$-$j$ coupling scheme [12]. A remarkable fact is that Pu-115 can be regarded as a hole version of Ce-115. Thus, we can conclude that both Ce-115 and Pu-115 have the same electronic origin for superconductivity, suggesting that Pu-115 has higher $T_c$ due to the combination of the electron-hole conversion concept and the energy-scale discussion.
First let us briefly explain the RLAPW method. Readers interested in the formalism can consult with Refs. [13]. When we calculate the electronic energy band structure of $4f$ and $5f$ compounds, in general, relativistic effects should be included, since electrons near the heavy nucleus must move with a high speed to keep their stationary motion. In order to take into account major relativistic effects such as the relativistic energy shifts, the relativistic screening effects, and the spin-orbit interaction, Loucks derived a relativistic augmented-plane-wave method based on the Dirac one-electron wave equation [14]. Several problems in his method have been improved by Hasegawa and co-workers [13]. The local density approximation is used for the exchange and correlation potential and spatial shape of one-electron potential is determined in the muffin-tin approximation. Self-consistent calculations are performed by using the lattice constants determined experimentally [1].

In Fig. 1, we show the energy band structure for PuCoGa$_5$ along the symmetry axes in the Brillouin zone in the range from $-0.5\text{Ryd.}$ to $1.0\text{Ryd.}$, where Ryd. indicates Rydberg and $1\text{Ryd.}=13.6\text{eV}$. First note that in the vicinity of the Fermi level $E_F$ located at $0.446\text{Ryd.}$, there occurs hybridization between Pu $5f$ and Ga $4p$ states. Above $E_F$ near the M point, the flat $5f$ bands split into two groups, corresponding to the total angular momentum $j=5/2$ (lower bands) and $7/2$ (upper bands). The magnitude of the splitting $\Delta$ between the two groups is estimated as $\Delta(\text{Pu})=1\text{eV}$, which is almost equal to the spin-orbit splitting in the atomic $5f$ state of Pu. Note that each Pu APW sphere contains about 5.2 electrons in the $f$ state, suggesting that valence of plutonium ion is Pu$^{3+}$, consistent with experimental result [1].

By using the total density of states at $E_F$, evaluated as $N(E_F)=97.3\text{states}/\text{Ryd.cell}$, the theoretical specific heat coefficient $\gamma_{\text{band}}$ is estimated as $16.9\text{mJ/K}^2\cdot\text{mol}$, while the experimental electronic specific heat coefficient $\gamma_{\text{exp}}$ is $77\text{mJ/K}^2\cdot\text{mol}$ [1]. If we define the enhancement factor for the electronic specific heat coefficient as $\lambda=\gamma_{\text{exp}}/\gamma_{\text{band}}-1$, we obtain $\lambda=3.6$, which is smaller than $\lambda=10$ for CeCoIn$_5$ [10]. Note that the enhancement of $\lambda$ from unity is a measure of electron correlation effect. The moderate $\lambda$ in Pu-115 suggests that the correlation effect in Pu-115 should be weak compared with Ce-115. Since localized nature is stronger in $4f$ electrons, the correlation effect is more significant in Ce-115.

Now we discuss the Fermi surfaces of PuCoGa$_5$. In Fig. 1, the lowest fourteen bands are fully occupied. The next four bands are partially occupied, while higher bands are empty. Then, as shown in Figs. 2(a)-(d), 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th bands crossing the Fermi level construct the hole or electron sheets of the Fermi surfaces, summarized as follows: (a) The Fermi surface from the 15th band includes one small hole sheet centered at the $\Gamma$ point. (b) The 16th band constructs a large cylindrical hole sheet centered at the $\Gamma$ point, while two equivalent small hole sheets are centered at X points. Depending on the energy resolution in the calculation, it is subtle whether those two hole sheets touch each other or not, but in any case, the quasi two-dimensional large hole sheet centered at the $\Gamma$ point gives the main contribu-
Around the A-point, admixture is large, while mixture. As for the Fermi surface constructed from 18th band centered at the M point. (d) The 18th band provides another cylindrical electron sheet centered at the M point.

Let us consider the main Fermi surfaces from the viewpoints of the Fermi-surface volume and f-electron admixture. As for the Fermi surface constructed from 18th band, f-electrons are not uniformly distributed on it, as expressed in color scale. Around the A-point, f-electron admixture is large, while p-electron gives a large contribution around the M-point. If we ignore three dimensionality and small-volume Fermi surfaces, the main contributors are the hole sheet from the 16th band centered at the Γ point and the electron sheet from the 17th band centered at the M point.

In order to gain deeper insight into electronic structure of Pu-115, it is instructive to compare with the results for Ce-115 [10] and U-115 [11]. In Figs. 3 (a)-(c), we show the energy band structures around $E_F$ for CeCoIn$_5$, UCoGa$_5$, and PuCoGa$_5$, respectively, in each panel, red and blue curves indicate the upper and lower bands to construct the Fermi surface with large volume, we observe in common the large hole sheet centered at the Γ point and the large cylindrical electron sheet centered at the M point. On the other hand, U-115 has small-pocket Fermi surfaces, as deduced from Fig. 2(b) [11]. Namely, U-115 is considered as a semi-metal, which seems to be closely related to the reason why U-115 does not exhibit superconductivity. The origin of the semi-metallic behavior may be traced back to slight overlap among the $j=$5/2 f-bands strongly hybridized with the p-states from Ga ions.

In order to understand the similarity in energy band structures and Fermi surfaces between Ce-115 and Pu-115, it is convenient to reanalyze the tight-binding model obtained based on the j-j coupling scheme [12]. To consider the 115 systems, we include only f- and p-electrons in the two-dimensional network composed of Ce and In (Pu and Ga) ions [11]. Due to the lack of space, we skip the details of the model for $j=$5/2 sextet [10,12], but the Hamiltonian $H$ is written as $H=H_1+H_p+H_{fp}$, where $H_1$, $H_p$, and $H_{fp}$ are, respectively, f-electron hopping, p-electron hopping, and f-p hybridization terms, which are characterized by the Slater integrals $(ff\sigma), (pp\sigma)$, and $(fp\sigma)$, respectively. Note that crystalline electric field terms are simply ignored, since those are much smaller than the energies considered here.

As expected, we obtain $\Delta(Ce)<\Delta(U)\lesssim\Delta(Pu)$. As shown in the figure caption, the number to label red and blue curves increase one by one in the order of CeCoIn$_5$, UCoGa$_5$, and PuCoGa$_5$, corresponding to the increase in f-electron number by two per site. Note that shapes of red and blue curves among three 115 compounds are similar to one another, since overall band structure around the Fermi level is always determined by hybridization between broad p-bands and narrow f-bands for 115 compounds. The center of gravity of the $j=$5/2 states in CeCoIn$_5$ is about 0.4eV above $E_F$, while the center of those in PuCoGa$_5$ is slightly lower than $E_F$. Concerning UCoGa$_5$, the $j=$5/2 states seem to be just at the Fermi energy. This trend is consistent with the number of f-electrons in each compounds. The width of $j=$7/2 and 5/2 bands around at the M- or A-points becomes broad in the order of CeCoIn$_5$, UCoGa$_5$, and PuCoGa$_5$, consistent with the difference in 4f- and 5f-electron wavefunctions.

Here we emphasize that Ce-115 and Pu-115 exhibit large Fermi surfaces, as shown in Figs. 2 and 4(d). In particular, we see a clear similarity between main Fermi surfaces of CeCoIn$_5$ and PuCoGa$_5$, except for fine structures. Considering only f-electron dominant Fermi surface with large volume, we observe in common the large hole sheet centered at the Γ point and the large cylindrical electron sheet centered at the M point. On the other hand, U-115 has small-pocket Fermi surfaces, as deduced from Fig. 2(b) [11]. Namely, U-115 is considered as a semi-metal, which seems to be closely related to the reason why U-115 does not exhibit superconductivity. The origin of the semi-metallic behavior may be traced back to slight overlap among the $j=$5/2 f-bands strongly hybridized with the p-states from Ga ions.

In order to understand the similarity in energy band structures and Fermi surfaces between Ce-115 and Pu-115, it is convenient to reanalyze the tight-binding model obtained based on the j-j coupling scheme [12]. To consider the 115 systems, we include only f- and p-electrons in the two-dimensional network composed of Ce and In (Pu and Ga) ions [11]. Due to the lack of space, we skip the details of the model for $j=$5/2 sextet [10,12], but the Hamiltonian $H$ is written as $H=H_1+H_p+H_{fp}$, where $H_1$, $H_p$, and $H_{fp}$ are, respectively, f-electron hopping, p-electron hopping, and f-p hybridization terms, which are characterized by the Slater integrals $(ff\sigma), (pp\sigma)$, and $(fp\sigma)$, respectively. Note that crystalline electric field terms are simply ignored, since those are much smaller than the energies considered here.

In Fig. 4(a), we show the direct comparison between the RAPW and tight-binding results for $(ff\sigma)=4500K$, $(pp\sigma)=6000K$, and $(fp\sigma)=18630K$. Top and bottom of the tight-binding bands are determined by comparison with the RAPW ones with significant amount of Ga 4p states. The Fermi level for $H$ is determined so as to include five f electrons. First, overall features of the bands in the vicinity of $E_F$ are well reproduced by the mixture of broad p- and narrow f-bands. Second, magnitude of parameters for PuCoGa$_5$ are large compared
conclude that 5

FIG. 4: (a)Energy band structures for PuCoGa$_5$ for the tight-binding model (solid curves) and the RLAPW results (dashed curves). Fermi-surface lines discussed here are (b)16th band hole sheets, (c)17th band electron sheets, and (d)18th band electron sheets. Note that solid and broken curves denote the tight-binding and RLAPW Fermi surfaces, respectively. (e) Configurations for f-electrons accommodated in three Kramers doublets. Up and down arrows denote pseudo-spin up and down, respectively.

with those for CeCoIn$_5$, $(ff\sigma) = 4400$K, $(f\pi\sigma) = 5360$K, and $(pp\pi\sigma) = 5730$K [13]. Note that the difference in $(pp\pi\sigma)$ between PuCoGa$_5$ and CeCoIn$_5$ is mainly due to the difference of Ga 4$p$ and In 5$p$ electronic states. Then, we conclude that 5$f$ electrons are more itinerant than 4$f$ ones from the present results for tight-binding fitting. As shown in Figs. 4(b)-(d), the main Fermi surfaces are well reproduced by the tight-binding model. Good agreements between RLAPW and tight-binding results indicate the validity of the $j$-$j$ coupling scheme for PuCoGa$_5$.

In the tight-binding model constructed based on the $j$-$j$ coupling scheme, we are allowed to consider the $f^n$ configuration with $n>2$ by accommodating $n$ electrons among three Kramers doublets. In Fig. 4(e), we show several $f$-electron configurations. First of all, we note the electron-hole conversion relation between Ce$^{3+}$ and Pu$^{3+}$ ions [12]. Thus, Pu-115 can be considered as a hole version of Ce-115 and this is the very reason why common Fermi surfaces are observed.

Note that UMGa$_5$ has been found to be AFM metal for M=Ni, Pd, and Pt, while Pauli paramagnetic for M=Fe, Co, and Rh [4]. Thus, the present band-structure calculation assuming the paramagnetic phase is consistent with the experimental result for UCoGa$_5$. On the other hand, a hint to understand AFM metallic behavior for M=Fe, Pd, and Pt may be found in the local spin structure. Although it is difficult to determine the exact valence of uranium ion, it should be between U$^{4+}$ and U$^{3+}$. As shown in Fig. 4(e), for U$^{4+}$ (U$^{3+}$) ion, local spin $S=1$ ($3/2$) may be formed due to the Hund’s rule coupling and thus, the AFM phase will be favored. However, it is still an open problem to explain the metallic behavior in the AFM phase as well as the difference in the AFM spin structure between UPtGa$_5$ and UNiGa$_5$ [4].

Finally, we provide one short comment on Np-115. For Np$^{3+}$ ion, as shown in Fig. 4(e), we can regard it as a hole version of U$^{4+}$ and thus, Np-115 may not exhibit superconductivity, but antiferromagnetism or paramagnetism, as an analogue of U-115.

In summary, we have performed the band-structure calculation for PuCoGa$_5$ and obtained the Fermi surfaces similar to Ce-115 materials. This similarity can be understood by the electron-hole conversion picture based on the $j$-$j$ coupling scheme. We believe that high $T_c$ in PuCoGa$_5$ can be understood by combining our electron-hole picture with the energy-scale difference in 4$f$- and 5$f$-electrons.
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