

Home Search Collections Journals About Contact us My IOPscience

Electronic structure calculations for layered LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article. 2001 J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 13 9231 (http://iopscience.iop.org/0953-8984/13/41/313)

View the table of contents for this issue, or go to the journal homepage for more

Download details: IP Address: 171.66.16.226 The article was downloaded on 16/05/2010 at 14:58

Please note that terms and conditions apply.

J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 13 (2001) 9231-9244

PII: S0953-8984(01)21598-7

# Electronic structure calculations for layered LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>

## **Key Taeck Park**

Department of Physics, Kookmin University, Seoul 136-702, Korea

Received 1 February 2001, in final form 17 April 2001 Published 28 September 2001 Online at stacks.iop.org/JPhysCM/13/9231

### Abstract

The electronic structures and magnetic properties of layered perovskite LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> have been determined using the full-potential linearized augmented-plane-wave method within the local spin-density approximation (LSDA) and the LDA + U approach (LDA standing for local density approximation). The results of LSDA and LDA + U total-energy calculations show that the antiferromagnetic state of these materials is stable compared with the ferromagnetic and paramagnetic states. The LDA + U calculation results show that Jahn–Teller distortion of Mn–O and Ru–O octahedra produces an energy gap, and  $3z^2 - r^2$  and xy orbital ordering for LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>, respectively. However, the LSDA calculation is not sufficient for describing the orbital ordering and fails to produce the band gap. The Jahn–Teller distortion stabilizes a two-dimensional planar antiferromagnetic state.

## 1. Introduction

Recently, Mn and Ru oxide compounds have been extensively studied, since these compounds with the perovskite structure show a variety of physical properties (superconductivity, colossal magnetoresistance (CMR), magnetic phase transitions etc) [1].

It is well known that the mother material of CMR manganites, LaMnO<sub>3</sub>, presents A-type antiferromagnetic (AF) insulating behaviour and the  $Mn^{3+}$  ( $t_{2g}^3 e_g^1$  occupation) causes Jahn–Teller distortion. Similarly, LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> with two-dimensional layered structure also shows AF insulating behaviour and Jahn–Teller distortion. However, the Mn–O plane of LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> exhibits AF structure, while three-dimensional LaMnO<sub>3</sub> shows in-plane ferromagnetic (FM) structure. The difference in magnetic structure is closely related to the Jahn–Teller distortion of the two structures.

In the 4d ruthenate case, several magnetic behaviours are presented. SrRuO<sub>3</sub> and CaRuO<sub>3</sub>, which have the same 4d-electron occupations (Ru<sup>4+</sup>), are three-dimensional FM metals ( $T_c = 160$  K) and paramagnetic (PM) metals, respectively. Two-dimensional Sr<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>

with the  $K_2NiF_4$  structure is superconducting below 1.5 K [2]. However, two-dimensional  $Ca_2RuO_4$  with a small degree of Ca-ion substitution is an AF insulator [3, 4]. The magnetism of 4d ruthenate strongly depends on the cation size and dimensionality [4, 5].

It is well known that Jahn–Teller distortion is closely related to the orbital ordering and magnetic ordering. The strength of hybridization and exchange splitting between 3d transition metal and oxide atoms are quite different from those between 4d transition metal and oxide atoms. This leads to there being some differences in orbital ordering, magnetic structure and Jahn–Teller distortion between LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>.

In this paper, we focus on the following questions.

- (1) The LSDA seems to be sufficient for describing the opening of a band gap in threedimensional LaMnO<sub>3</sub> if the cooperative Jahn–Teller distortion is taken into account. Is it appropriate to expect this for two-dimensional LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>?
- (2) What are the differences in electronic and magnetic structure between two-dimensional and three-dimensional materials?
- (3) Why do 3d (LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>) and 4d oxides (Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>) show different types of Jahn–Teller distortion?
- (4) What kinds of orbital ordering exist for LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>?

In order to answer the above questions, we performed first-principles LSDA and LDA + U electronic structure calculations for the 3d oxide LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and the 4d oxide Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>, which have the same d-band occupations (d<sup>4</sup>). We investigated the electronic structure and magnetic structure of both materials and compared our findings with results for three-dimensional materials (LaMnO<sub>3</sub> and SrRuO<sub>3</sub>). Using total-energy calculations for each magnetic configuration (ferromagnetic, antiferromagnetic and paramagnetic states), we studied the magnetic stability.

## 2. Method

#### 2.1. Crystal structure

LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> has the K<sub>2</sub>NiF<sub>4</sub>-type body-centred-tetragonal structure (group *I4/mmm*) if spin is not taken into consideration. The K<sub>2</sub>NiF<sub>4</sub> crystal structure is shown figure1. Its lattice constants *a* and *c* are 3.794 and 13.09 Å, respectively [15]. The spin structure is planar AF and it leads to a doubling of the K<sub>2</sub>NiF<sub>4</sub> unit cell ( $\sqrt{2a}, \sqrt{2b}, c$ ), while LaMnO<sub>3</sub> has the A-type AF structure with an orthorhombic unit cell. The Mn–O–Mn angle is 180° (160° in LaMnO<sub>3</sub>). The Mn–O octahedron is elongated in the *c*-direction because of the Jahn–Teller distortion caused by the Mn<sup>3+</sup> ion. The in-plane distance between Mn and O<sub>1</sub> (1.897 Å) is shorter than the inter-plane Mn–O<sub>2</sub> distance (2.285 Å). This Jahn–Teller distortion is different for three-dimensional LaMnO<sub>3</sub>, which has Mn–O distances 1.91 and 2.06 Å (the in-plane Mn–O<sub>1</sub> distances) and 1.96 Å (the inter-plane Mn–O<sub>2</sub> distance). These findings are summarized in table 1.

Table 1. The crystal and magnetic structure of Mn and Ru oxides. M is the Mn or Ru atom.

|                      | LaSrMnO <sub>4</sub> | LaMnO <sub>3</sub> Ca <sub>2</sub> RuO <sub>4</sub> |              |
|----------------------|----------------------|---|--------------|
| Structure            | Tetragonal           | Orthorhombic  | Orthorhombic |
| Phase                | AF                   | AF (A-type)   | AF           |
| M–O <sub>2</sub> (Å) | 2.285                | 2.18  | 2.015, 2.018 |
| M–O <sub>1</sub> (Å) | 1.897                | 1.91, 1.96  | 1.972        |



Figure 1. The crystal structure of LaSrMnO4. The black, grey and white spheres represent La or Sr, Mn and O atoms, respectively.

Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> has the same K<sub>2</sub>NiF<sub>4</sub>-type structure as LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>. However, the different types of distortion and rotation of the Ru–O octahedron lead to it having orthorhombic structure with *P bca* symmetry [6]. The flattening of RuO<sub>6</sub> octahedron along the *c*-axis is associated with a Jahn–Teller distortion (2.015 and 2.018 Å in-plane Ru–O<sub>1</sub> distances and 1.972 Å inter-plane Ru–O<sub>2</sub> distance). However, the other Ru oxides, Sr<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>, CaRuO<sub>3</sub> and SrRuO<sub>3</sub>, do not show Jahn–Teller distortion. According to experimental observation, Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> is an in-plane AF insulator and Sr<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> is a paramagnetic insulator.

#### 2.2. Calculation

For the band-structure and total-energy calculations, we used the self-consistent full-potential linearized augmented-plane-wave (FLAPW) method [14] based on density functional theory [13] within the local spin-density approximation (LSDA) and the LDA + U approach. Since non-spherical components are employed for both the potential and the charge density, it is possible to calculate the strong anisotropic interaction in layered materials.

Application of the LSDA approach to transition metal oxide perovskites is quite successful as regards describing the electronic structure for LaMnO<sub>3</sub> and Sr<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> systems. However, LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> are categorized as Mott insulators. The LSDA approach is not sufficient for describing the insulating behaviour and the orbital ordering. Thus, we employed the LDA + U approach. In these calculations, we assumed that  $U_{eff} = U - J$  is set to 2.0 eV



**Figure 2.** The total density of states and muffin-tin projected partial density of states of LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> obtained by LSDA calculation. Solid and dotted lines in the second and fourth panels represent projected densities of states for up and down spins, respectively.

for Mn 3d and Ru 4d, since we could not find appropriate values of the parameters U and J from experiments.

We treated the 2s and 2p states of O, 3d states of Mn, 4d states of Ru and 5p, 5d and 6s states of La as valence states. The core eigenstates were recomputed in each iteration fully relativistically (i.e. no frozen-core approximation was made). The calculations were made using the Hedin–Lundqvist form of the exchange–correlation potential and the maximum angular momentum quantum number was taken to be l = 8 in the expansion of the wave function and in that of the potential. The plane-wave expansion outside the muffin-tin sphere was continued up to  $R_{MT}K_{max} = 7.04$ . In the self-consistent iterations, 80 tetrahedron *k*-points are used. Increasing the number of plane waves and mesh *k*-points did not change the total energy by more than 0.1 mRyd. The muffin-tin radii were chosen to be 3.0 au for La and Ca, 2.0 au for Mn and 1.5 au for O.

In the calculation for LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>, we used the virtual-crystal approximation (VCA) for the La and Ba atoms. This approximation does not affect the result, since the La and Sr levels



**Figure 3.** The energy band structure of LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> obtained by LSDA calculation.  $\Gamma$ , X, M, Y and Z represent (0, 0, 0), (1/2, 0, 0), (1/2, 1/2, 0), (0, 1/2, 0), (0, 0, 1) *k*-points in the simple tetragonal Brillouin zone, respectively. The dotted line at 0 eV represents the Fermi level.

are located far from the Fermi level and the La and Sr atoms are not arranged periodically in the experiment.

#### 3. Results and discussion

## 3.1. LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>

Figure 2 shows the calculated total density of states (TDOS) and partial density of states (PDOS) inside muffin-tin spheres for antiferromagnetic LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> based on the LSDA. Because of the high-spin Mn<sup>3+</sup> ionic states, the up-spin states of  $t_{2g}$  are fully occupied and those of Mn e<sub>g</sub> are half-filled. Unlike the PDOS of O<sub>1</sub>, the PDOS of O<sub>2</sub> represents the localized density of states. The Jahn–Teller distortion (tetragonal distortion of Mn–O octahedra) splits the e<sub>g</sub> orbitals into  $x^2 - y^2$  and  $3z^2 - r^2$  orbitals. The long Mn–O<sub>2</sub> distance



Figure 4. The total density of states and muffin-tin projected partial density of states of LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> obtained by LDA + U calculation. Solid and dotted lines in the second and fourth panels represent projected densities of states for up and down spins, respectively.

and two-dimensionality (non-periodicity along the *c*-direction) give rise to weak hybridization between Mn  $3z^2 - r^2$  and O<sub>2</sub>  $2p_z$  orbitals. Thus, this band locates below the  $x^2 - y^2$  and O<sub>1</sub>  $p_{x,y}$  hybridization band and shows strongly localized character. This band charge density of the (110) plane is shown in figure 3. It represents  $3z^2 - r^2$  orbital ordering. Figure 4 shows the LSDA-calculated band structure for the AF state. However, LSDA calculation fails to describe the insulating behaviour of LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> due to Jahn–Teller distortion. Recently, the LDA + *U* approach to Mott–Hubbard-type insulators has proved quite successful as regards describing the orbital ordering and Jahn–Teller distortion [9, 10]. We employed an LDA + *U* calculation for LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>, which is categorized as a Mott–Hubbard-type strongly electron-correlated material. Figure 5 shows the calculated PDOS and TDOS based on the LDA + *U* approach. The band gap between  $3z^2 - r^2$ - and  $x^2 - y^2$ -related orbitals is about 0.4 eV and this is in good agreement with the optical spectra measurement: 0.55 eV [12]. Figure 6 presents the band structure calculated using the LDA + *U* approach. It shows the insulating gap, since the  $3z^2 - r^2$ -orbital-related band lowers and shows more localized behaviour. Even though LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> shows tetragonal symmetry in its crystal structure, the energy of the  $3z^2 - r^2$ band is slightly different at the X and Y *k*-points, because this band is coupled with the other layer. This indicates that magnetic coupling between layers is not negligible in LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>.



**Figure 5.** The energy band structure of LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> obtained by LDA + U calculation.  $\Gamma$ , X, M, Y and Z represent (0, 0, 0), (1/2, 0, 0), (1/2, 1/2, 0), (0, 1/2, 0), (0, 0, 1) k-points in the simple tetragonal Brillouin zone, respectively. The conduction band minimum energy is chosen as 0 eV.

However, the  $x^2 - y^2$  band (just above 0 eV) is symmetric at these *k*-points, since this orbital does not couple with those of the other layers.

The calculated magnetic moment inside the muffin-tin spheres is 3.08 and 3.30  $\mu_B$  according to the LSDA and LDA + U approaches, respectively. The experimentally observed moment is 0.8  $\mu_B$  [7]. This value is quite small compared with that of LaMnO<sub>3</sub> (3.89 $\mu_B$ ), which also has Mn<sup>3+</sup> ions. The small magnetic moment observed from experiments may arise from canted spin structure or helical spin structure of LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>. Since this material is very sensitive to the oxygen content [7], we need more accurate experiments.

To investigate the AF stability, we calculated the total energy using the experimental crystal structure within the LSDA. The calculated total energy in the AF state is 28 and 1300 meV/cell



**Figure 6.** The total density of states and muffin-tin projected partial density of states of Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> obtained by LSDA calculation. Solid and dotted lines in the second and fourth panels represent projected densities of states for up and down spins, respectively.

lower than those in the FM and PM states, respectively. According to a simple molecular field approximation with nearest-neighbour interactions, the interaction Hamiltonian is

$$H = -\sum_{j=1}^{4} J(\vec{S}_{i} \cdot \vec{S}_{j}).$$
 (1)

From the above equation, the total energy in the FM state is  $E(FM) = -4JS^2$ , while the total energy in the AF state is  $E(AF) = 4JS^2$ . Using the FLAPW-calculated energy, we derived the exchange interaction J = -0.44 meV. The Néel temperature is given by

$$T_N = \frac{2S(S+1)}{3k_B}(-4J).$$
 (2)

The calculated Néel temperature is 82 K, which is similar to the experimental value of 180 K. Generally, the calculated Néel temperature is overestimated in the molecular field approximation. The small energy difference between the AF and FM states comes from using the room temperature crystal structure and from the LSDA-related problem of absence of an energy gap. The total-energy differences calculated using the LDA + U approach are 220 meV



**Figure 7.** The energy band structure of Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> obtained by LSDA calculation.  $\Gamma$ , X, M, Y and Z represent (0, 0, 0), (1/2, 0, 0), (1/2, 1/2, 0), (0, 1/2, 0), (0, 0, 1) *k*-points in the simple orthorhombic Brillouin zone, respectively. The dotted line at 0 eV represents the Fermi level.

bigger than those calculated with the LSDA. The LDA + U calculation gives correct values for LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>.

Three-dimensional LaMnO<sub>3</sub> has A-type AF structure and Jahn–Teller distortion gives  $3x^2 - r^2$  and  $3y^2 - r^2$  orbital ordering. Recently, several theoretical calculations have shown that this orbital ordering is closely related to the in-plane FM state and the interplane AF state [8, 11]. However, two-dimensional LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> has AF in-plane structure. Jahn–Teller distortion with elongation of the apex-oxygen-atom leads to  $3z^2 - r^2$  orbital ordering and stabilizes the AF structure. In three-dimensional systems, this kind of Jahn–Teller distortion cannot occur, since the periodic arrangement of Mn and O atoms along the *c*-direction causes strong hybridization between  $3z^2 - r^2$  orbitals of Mn and p<sub>z</sub> orbitals of O<sub>2</sub> and it has no energy gap between the Mn e<sub>g</sub> orbitals. It favours the FM state.



**Figure 8.** The total density of states and muffin-tin projected partial density of states of  $Ca_2RuO_4$  obtained by LDA + U calculation. Solid and dotted lines in the second, third and fourth panels represent projected densities of states for up and down spins, respectively.

## 3.2. Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>

Figure 7 and figure 8 show the LSDA-calculated total and partial densities of states and band structure, respectively Near the Fermi level, there are two  $t_{2g}$  levels (six bands) with up-spin and down-spin characters. In LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>, the exchange-splitting energy mJ (3 eV) is bigger than the crystal-field-splitting energy 10 Dq (1 eV). In Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>, 10 Dq (3 eV) is bigger than mJ (0.8 eV) because of the difference between 3d and 4d orbital characters. The up-spin  $t_{2g}$  bands are fully occupied and the down-spin band is partially occupied. These  $t_{2g}$  levels are split into xy, yz, xz orbitals by the orthorhombic Jahn–Teller distortion of the Ru–O octahedron. The xz- and yz-related bands above the Fermi level are quite flat, because of the two-dimensional character (absence of *c*-direction Ru–O–Ru periodicity). Only the *xy*-related band is occupied and shows the orbital ordering nature. The charge-density plot of this band is shown in figure 9. However, LSDA calculation is not sufficient for describing the insulating nature, as for LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>. Ru oxide is also categorized as a strongly electron-correlated material. Figures 10 and 11 show the density of states and band structure calculated using the LDA + U method, respectively. These figures show the insulating gap and the orbital ordering nature.



**Figure 9.** The energy band structure of Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> obtained by LDA + U calculation.  $\Gamma$ , X, M, Y and Z represent (0, 0, 0), (1/2, 0, 0), (1/2, 1/2, 0), (0, 1/2, 0), (0, 0, 1) *k*-points in the simple orthorhombic Brillouin zone, respectively. The conduction band minimum energy is chosen as 0 eV.

The LSDA-calculated total energy of the AF state is lower than those of the FM and PM states by 250 and 400 meV/cell, respectively. These energy differences are bigger than those for LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub>. The Néel temperature calculated using equations (1) and (2) is 966 K. Although the calculated value is bigger than the experimentally observed value,  $T_N = 110$  K, the temperature calculated in the molecular field approximation is close to the experimental value. The total energy difference calculated using the LDA + U approach is 160 meV bigger than the LSDA result.

The calculated magnetic moments inside the muffin-tin spheres are listed in table 2. The magnetic moments observed in experiments are dependent on the sample preparation, and vary from 0.4 to 1.3  $\mu_B$  [6, 17]. The value calculated using the LDA + U method, 1.32  $\mu_B$ , is quite similar to one experimental value.

 $Sr_2RuO_4$  presents paramagnetic and superconducting behaviour. Since the  $Sr^{2+}$  ion is bigger than the  $Ca^{2+}$  ion, the Ru–O octahedron of  $Sr2RuO_4$  shows a small tilt and rotation.



Figure 10. The charge-density plot in the (110) plane for LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> near the Fermi level ( $0 \le E \le -0.5 \text{ eV}$ ).

**Table 2.** The magnetic moments ( $\mu_B$ ) and total energy (meV/cell).  $\delta E$  is the total-energy difference between the AF and FM energies ( $E_{AF} - E_{FM}$ ).

|                                  | Magnetic moment |             |                                     | $\delta E$ |         |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------|---------|
|                                  | AF (LSDA)       | AF(LDA + U) | Experiment                          | LSDA       | LDA + U |
| LaSrMnO <sub>4</sub>             | 3.08            | 3.30        | 0.8 <sup>a</sup>                    | -28        | -248    |
| LaMnO3 <sup>b</sup>              | 3.3             | 3.8         | 3.89                                | 19.4       |         |
| Ca <sub>2</sub> RuO <sub>4</sub> | 1.06            | 1.36        | 0.4 <sup>c</sup> , 1.3 <sup>d</sup> | -250       | -410    |

<sup>a</sup> Reference [7].

<sup>b</sup> Reference [10].

<sup>c</sup> Reference [6].

<sup>d</sup> Reference [17].

This gives strong hybridization between Ru and O atoms in Sr<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> and increases the Ru bandwidth *W*. This prevents Sr<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> from having an insulating nature. So, Sr<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> favours paramagnetism and does not show Jahn–Teller distortion. Three-dimensional CaRuO<sub>3</sub> has a PM state and does not show Jahn–Teller distortion, even though it has small Ca<sup>2+</sup> ions. There are two reasons for this. First, if CaRuO<sub>3</sub> has the same Jahn–Teller distortion as Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> (short Ru–O<sub>2</sub> and long Ru–O<sub>1</sub> distances), the bands related to Ru *xz*, *yz* orbitals are strongly



9243

Figure 11. The charge-density plot in the (001) plane for Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> near the Fermi level ( $0 \le E \le -0.5 \text{ eV}$ ).

dispersive, because there is a periodic arrangement of Ru and O atoms along the *c*-direction (three-dimensionality). It does not show an insulating nature and the Jahn–Teller distortion is also unstable. Second, if it has LaMnO<sub>3</sub>-type Jahn–Teller distortion (this gives  $3x^2 - r^2$  and  $3y^2 - r^2$  orbital ordering), CaRuO<sub>3</sub> does not show an insulating orbital ordering nature because the bands near the Fermi level are of  $t_{2g}$  character.

## 4. Conclusions

We performed first-principles electronic structure calculations for the 3d oxide LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and the 4d oxide Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub> with layered perovskite structure. We investigated the electronic structures and magnetic structures using the LSDA and LDA + U methods. LSDA calculation for these materials is not sufficient for describing the insulating gap due to the Jahn–Teller distortion. In LDA + U calculations, the Jahn–Teller distortion and two-dimensional structure give an insulating gap, and  $3z^2 - r^2$  and xy orbital ordering in LaSrMnO<sub>4</sub> and Ca<sub>2</sub>RuO<sub>4</sub>, respectively. The total-energy calculations show that the AF state is stable compared with the PM and FM states of these materials.

### Acknowledgment

This work was accomplished with the aid of a Research Fund provided by the Korea Research Foundation, Support for Faculty Research Abroad.

# References

- [1] Moritomo Y, Asamitsu A, Kuwahara H and Tokura Y 1996 Nature 380 141
- [2] Maeno Y et al 1994 Nature **372** 532
- [3] Nakatsuji S, Ikeda S and Maeno Y 1997 J. Phys. Soc. Japan 66 1868
- [4] Nakatsuji S and Maeno Y 2000 Phys. Rev. Lett 84 2666
- [5] Mazin I I and Singh D J 1997 Phys. Rev. B 56 2556
- [6] Braden M, Andre G, Nakatsuji S and Maeno Y 1998 Phys. Rev. B 58 847
- [7] Kawano S, Achiwa N, Kamegashira N and Aoki M 1988 J. Physique Coll. C8 829
- [8] Solovyev I V and Terakura K 1998 J Korean Phys. Soc. 33 375
- [9] Liechtenstein A I, Anisimov V I and Zaanen J 1995 Phys. Rev. B 52 R5467
- [10] Sawada H and Terakura K 1998 Phys. Rev. B 58 6831
- [11] Sawada H, Morikawa Y, Terakura K and Hamada N 1997 Phys. Rev. B 56 12154
- [12] Moritomo Y, Arima T and Tokura Y 1995 J. Phys. Soc. Japan 64 4117
- [13] Hohenberg P and Kohn W 1964 Phys. Rev. 136 B864
- [14] Weinert M, Wimmer E and Freeman A J 1981 Phys. Rev. B 26 4571
- [15] Bouloux J, Soubeyroux J, Daoudi A and Flem G Le 1981 Mater. Res. Bull. 16 855
- [16] Moritomo Y et al 1995 Phys. Rev. B 51 3297
- [17] Cao G, McCall S, Shepard M, Crow J E and Guertin R P 1997 Phys. Rev. B 56 R2916