


Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung Stuttgart



für Festkörperforschung

2008





MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR FESTKÖRPERFORSCHUNG
STUTT GART

ANNUAL REPORT

JANUARY 1st – DECEMBER 31st, 2008

Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung
Heisenbergstraße 1, D-70569 Stuttgart
Postfach: 80 06 65, D-70506 Stuttgart
Telefon: (0711) 6 89 – 0
Telefax: (0711) 6 89 – 10 10

Contents

General information on Abteilungen, Junior Research Groups, and Scientific Service Groups . . .	1
Selected research reports	13
Publications	105
Habilitation, PhD, Master, and Diploma theses	131
Invention reports & patent applications	133
Organization & budget	135
Colloquia	143
Guest scientists	147
PhD, Master, and Diploma students	153
Staff scientists	159

rate $k_{\text{non-rad}}$ increases even more. Our experiment is biased, as one has to find the dots in the luminescence map to measure them.

In summary, we were able to show that self-assembled semiconductor quantum dots couple reproducibly to the plasmonic nanoantennas. The antenna modifies the radiative rate of the quantum dot exciton that is polarized perpendicularly to the wire. The analysis of the relative change in the radiative rate makes it independent from experimental uncertainties such as the detection efficiency and variations in the non-radiative rate. However, the influence of the latter is found in the clipped distribution of radiative-rate differences. In future experi-

ments, we plan to measure the distance of the dot to the antenna in a direct way, so that we do not have to resort to histograms over many single quantum dots. The coupling of epitaxially grown dots to nanoantennas opens up the way for steering the directed emission of a single photon source towards, e.g., an optical fiber for long distance communication, or for coupling a dot to a plasmonic nanowire for sub-wavelength optics.

-
- [1] Rastelli, A., S. Stuffer, A. Schliwa, R. Songmuang, C. Manzano, G. Costantini, K. Kern, A. Zrenner, D. Bimberg and O.G. Schmidt. *Physical Review Letters* **92**, 166104 (2004).
- [2] Courtois, J.-Y., J.-M. Courty and J.C. Mertz. *Physical Review A* **53**, 1862–1878 (1996).

Coulomb-enhanced spin-orbit splitting: The missing piece in the Sr_2RhO_4 puzzle

G.-Q. Liu, V.N. Antonov, M.W. Haverkort, O. Jepsen and O.K. Andersen

Since the discoveries of high-temperature superconductivity and colossal magnetoresistance in Mott insulators made metallic by hole-doping, $3d$ transition metal oxides have remained at the forefront of research. Their many lattice and electronic (orbital, charge, and spin) degrees of freedom are coupled by effective interactions (electron-phonon, hopping, t , Coulomb repulsion, U , and Hund's rule coupling, J), and when some of these are of similar magnitude, competing phases may exist in the region of controllable compositions, fields, and temperatures. The interactions tend to remove low-energy degrees of freedom, e.g., to reduce the metallicity. This rarely happens by merely shifting spectral weight from a quasiparticle band into incoherent Hubbard bands, as in the U/t -driven metal-insulator transition for the single-band Hubbard model, but is usually

assisted by lattice distortions which break the degeneracy of low-energy orbitals and split the corresponding quasiparticle – or partly incoherent – bands away from the chemical potential.

When going from $3d$ to $4d$ transition metal oxides, the larger extent of the $4d$ orbitals cause the hopping, t , and the coupling to the lattice to increase, and U and J to decrease. It was therefore hardly surprising that the Fermi surface (FS) of Sr_2RuO_4 measured by various techniques like dHvA and ARPES was in good agreement with LDA calculations, in which strong electronic correlations are only moderately represented. It was, however, surprising that substituting Rh for Ru, e.g. adding one electron and one nuclear charge and roughly keeping the crystal structure, lead to strong disagreement between experiments and LDA theory [1].

In both the ruthenates and the rhodenates the Fermi level crosses the t_{2g} manifold, but in the latter, the interaction between the xy and the x^2-y^2 orbitals due to the rotation of the RhO_6 octahedra around the z -axes is such as to gap those two bands at the Fermi level. As a consequence, only the equivalent 1D xz - and yz -bands, which hardly hybridize with the other d -bands nor with each other, remain at the Fermi level, with the single t_{2g} hole distributed equally between them. However, also the LDA FS calculated for the proper structure deviates substantially from the experimental FS [1,2]. This discrepancy clearly seen in Fig. 79 (LDA) is disturbing because there is no experimental indication of any further distortion. Hence, Coulomb-enhanced crystal-field splitting can not be the solution to this puzzle.




Figure 79: Comparison of Sr_2RhO_4 FS for DFT and ARPES experiment. Blue: ARPES [1,2]. Red: DFT using different approximations.

In order to resolve this puzzle we first fitted the Fermi surface to a tight binding model consisting of the xz - and yz -orbitals on a 2D square lattice, e.g., neglecting the rotation of the RhO_6 octahedra and the hopping in the z -direction [3]. The resulting bands and Fermi surfaces with and without spin-orbit (SO) coupling are shown in Figs. 80 and 81 respectively. The perfect fit was obtained with the parameters in the figure caption.




Figure 80: The unfolded 2D tight-binding band structure of Sr_2RhO_4 . The tight-binding parameters are $\varepsilon_F = 0.26$ eV, $t_\pi = 0.185$ eV and $t_\delta = 0.039$ eV. The SO coupling constant ζ used in the (TB+SO') calculation is 0.28 eV.

We then performed *ab initio* LDA calculations including the SO coupling [3,4] and later also the on-site Coulomb effects in the LDA+ U approximation. The results are shown in Fig. 79. As may be seen in Fig. 79 (LDA+SO), the agreement with ARPES is less good for the *ab initio* relativistic LDA FS: the SO splitting along $\overline{\Gamma M}$ is too small. In fact, fitting the LDA+SO FS to our tight-binding model, yields essentially the same values for t_π/ε_F and t_δ/ε_F , but the SO-parameter ζ/ε_F is smaller than $\zeta_{\text{ARPES}}/\varepsilon_F$ by the *large factor* of 2.15. The LDA+SO calculation yields: $\zeta = 0.13$ eV, a value which is smaller than the 0.16 eV obtained for elemental fcc Rh due to the $O p_z$ tails of the rhodate Wannier orbitals. The TB results in Figs. 80 and 81 are obtained with $\zeta = 0$.




Figure 81: Comparison of the FS for the tight-binding model in the unfolded BZ using the parameters in Fig. 80 with ARPES experiment for Sr_2RhO_4 . Blue: ARPES [1,2]. Red: tight-binding.

In order to enhance the SO splitting we performed relativistic LDA+ U calculations with $U-J$ adjusted such as to give the best agreement with the ARPES FS. As is obvious from Fig. 79 (LDA+ U +SO), this agreement is even more perfect than for TB+SO'.




Figure 82: Band structure of Sr_2RhO_4 by DFT using different approximations.

The LDA+U+SO bands in Fig. 82 are well reproduced in the range from 0.15 eV below to 0.5 eV above the Fermi level by the TB+SO bands folded into the BZ/2 with corners at \bar{X} . Features not reproduced are the tiny splittings due to in-plane xz - xy hopping and out-of-plane hoppings neglected in our TB model. The agreement between the TB and the LDA calculation is less satisfactory, first of all because without SO-quenching the in-plane xz - xy hopping produces a splitting along $\bar{\Gamma}\bar{M}$, and secondly because the rotation-induced xy - $(x^2 - y^2)$

gapping is not complete without SO coupling. In fact, it takes the LDA+U+SO to push the lower edges of the xy - $(x^2 - y^2)$ gap to -0.16 eV along $\bar{\Gamma}\bar{M}$, and even deeper along $\bar{\Gamma}\bar{X}$, locations close to those observed with ARPES [2]. Note finally, that the LDA+U alone, without SO coupling, brings little improvement compared with the LDA.

In conclusion, resolution of the Sr_2RhO_4 puzzle has taught us that although usually neglected in 4d-oxides, the spin-orbit coupling belongs to the list of competing interactions which cause the rich physics of these materials.

-
- [1] Baumberger, F.F., N.J.C. Ingle, W. Meevasana, K.M. Shen, D.H. Lu, R.S. Perry, A.P. Mackenzie, Z. Hussain, D.J. Singh and Z.-X. Shen. *Physical Review Letters* **96**, 246402 (2006); Kim, B.J., J. Yu, H. Koh, I. Nagai, S.I. Ikeda, S.-J. Oh and C. Kim. *Physical Review Letters* **97**, 106401 (2006).
 - [2] Perry, R.S., F. Baumberger, L. Balicas, N. Kikugawa, N.J.C. Ingle, A. Rost, J.F. Mercure, Y. Maeno, Z.X. Shen and A.P. Mackenzie. *New Journal of Physics* **8**, 175 (2006).
 - [3] Liu, G.-Q., V.N. Antonov, O. Jepsen and O.K. Andersen. *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 026408 (2008).
 - [4] Haverkort, M.W., I.S. Elfimov, L.H. Tjeng, G.A. Sawatzky and A. Damascelli. *Physical Review Letters* **101**, 026406 (2008).