

### Comment on "Spectroscopic Evidence for Localized and Extended $f$ -Symmetry States in CeO<sub>2</sub>"

In a recent Letter, Wuilloud, Delley, Schneider, and Baer (WDSB)<sup>1</sup> presented combined x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy and bremsstrahlung isochromat spectroscopy (BIS) studies of CeO<sub>2</sub> focusing on the possibility of valence mixing in this insulating compound, which has been a controversial issue for recent years.<sup>2-4</sup> They concluded that in CeO<sub>2</sub>  $f$ -symmetry states exist as extended states as calculated by band theory<sup>5</sup> and that valence mixing as proposed by the cluster model of Fujimori with configuration mixing<sup>4</sup> is definitely excluded. They argued that, whereas the valence band contains an admixture of  $f$  symmetry ( $n_f^h \neq 0$ ), the occupancy of localized  $4f$  states  $n_f^l$  is zero.

In this Comment, I would like to point out that their results are consistent with the valence mixing of Ref. 4 rather than excluding it. I note that the cluster model<sup>4</sup> and the band model<sup>5</sup> have given quite similar physical pictures in spite of the very different approaches as far as the ground state is concerned. While the band model considers the Ce  $4f$ -O  $2p$  hybridization in a one-electron picture, the cluster model considers it in a configuration-mixing framework.<sup>6</sup> In both cases,  $4f$  electrons are delocalized in the sense that they lose localized magnetic moments and participate in chemical bonding. In fact, their "extended  $f$ -symmetry states" can be regarded as linear combinations of O  $2p$  and Ce  $4f$  atomic orbitals as can be seen from the shape of the wave function in Ref. 5. Therefore, the conclusion of WDSB that  $n_f^h \neq 0$  and  $n_f^l = 0$  is fully consistent with the cluster-model results: The result of Ref. 4 that CeO<sub>2</sub> is mixed valent with  $n_f \sim 0.6$  corresponds well to  $n_f^h \sim 0.5$  used by WDSB in their model calculations.<sup>1</sup>

Then, which is a more relevant definition for the  $4f$  occupancy,  $n_f = n_f^l + n_f^h$  or  $n_f^l$ ? Core-level<sup>7</sup> and valence-band<sup>8</sup> photoemission measures  $n_f$  rather than  $n_f^l$ . So-called tetravalent compounds such as CeRh<sub>3</sub> and CeRu<sub>2</sub>, for which  $n_f^l \sim 0$ , have been assigned the  $4f$  number of  $\sim 0.8$ .<sup>7</sup> The  $4f$  occupancy measured by Compton scattering<sup>9</sup> also corresponds to  $n_f$ , as this experiment measures spatial electron distribution and does not distinguish localized, magnetic  $4f$  electrons, and  $4f$  electrons hybridized with conduction electrons. Generally it is not possible to separate unambiguously  $n_f$  into  $n_f^l$  and  $n_f^h$  in metallic Ce systems both experimentally and theoretically. Therefore we believe that  $n_f$  is a parameter more relevant to recent arguments on the  $4f$

occupancy than  $n_f^l$ , and in this sense CeO<sub>2</sub> should be regarded as mixed valent, although the chemical term "valence" might be confusing.

Finally, the BIS spectrum of CeO<sub>2</sub> has shown an intense  $4f^1$  peak and no clear  $4f^2$  peak, which WDSB considered to be a strong indication of unoccupied localized  $4f$  states. WDSB used a large  $4f$  valence (conduction) band hybridization parameter in their Gunnarsson-Schönhammer (GS)<sup>10</sup> model calculations ( $N_f\Delta = 5.6$  eV as compared to  $V$  or  $N_f\Delta = 0.5$ - $2.5$  eV used in the cluster calculations<sup>4</sup> and previous GS model calculations<sup>7,10</sup>). As a result of the large hybridization the intense BIS peak is an admixture of  $4f^1$  and  $4f^2$  configurations with comparable weight rather than pure  $4f^1$ , and cannot be assigned to localized  $4f^1$  states. Alternatively, the intense " $4f^1$ " peak might be explained by a formation of  $4f$  band in the BIS final state,<sup>11</sup> which cannot be described by single-Ce-ion theories such as the GS and cluster models. In any case, unoccupied  $4f$  states are fairly extended rather than localized.

I would like to thank Professor J. H. Weaver for encouragement and the National Science Foundation for support through Grant No. DMR 82-16489.

Atsushi Fujimori<sup>(a)</sup>

Department of Chemical Engineering and  
Materials Science  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Received 27 August 1984

PACS numbers: 71.70.Ms, 79.20.Kz, 79.60.Eg

<sup>(a)</sup>Permanent address: National Institute for Research in Inorganic Materials, Sakura-mura, Niihari-gun, Ibaraki 305, Japan.

<sup>1</sup>E. Wuilloud *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 202 (1984).

<sup>2</sup>K. R. Bauchspiess *et al.*, in *Valence Fluctuations in Solids*, edited by L. M. Falicov, W. Hanke, and M. B. Maple (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981), p. 147.

<sup>3</sup>P. Wachter, in *Valence Instabilities*, edited by P. Wachter and H. Boppert (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982), p. 145.

<sup>4</sup>A. Fujimori, Phys. Rev. B **28**, 2281, 4489 (1983).

<sup>5</sup>D. D. Koelling *et al.*, Solid State Commun. **47**, 227 (1983).

<sup>6</sup>J. H. Hubbard *et al.*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London **88**, 13 (1960).

<sup>7</sup>J. C. Fuggle *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 7330 (1983).

<sup>8</sup>D. J. Peterman *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 808 (1983).

<sup>9</sup>U. Kornstädt *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 1898 (1980).

<sup>10</sup>O. Gunnarsson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **28**, 4315 (1983).

<sup>11</sup>J. W. Allen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **28**, 5327 (1983).