



LAWRENCE
LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

Computational modeling of actinide materials and complexes

P. Soderlind, G. Kotliar, R. Haule, P. Oppeneer,
D. Guillaumont

May 3, 2010

MRS Bulletin

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Computational modeling of actinide materials and complexes

Per Söderlind

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550

G. Kotliar and R. Haule

Department of Physics and Astro., Rutgers University,
Piscataway, New Jersey 08854-80195

P. M. Oppeneer

Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Uppsala University, Box 516, SE-751 20 Uppsala, Sweden

D. Guillaumont

Department of Radiochemistry and Processes, CEA Marcoule, France

ABSTRACT

In spite of being rare, actinide elements provide the building blocks for many fascinating condensed-matter systems, both from an experimental and theoretical perspective. Experimental observations of actinide materials are difficult because of rarity, toxicity, radioactivity, even safety and security. Theory, on the other hand, has its own challenges. Complex crystal and electronic structures are often encountered in actinide materials, as well as pronounced electron correlation effects. Consequently, theoretical modeling of actinide materials and their 5f electronic states is very difficult. Here, we review recent theoretical efforts to describe and sometimes predict the behavior of actinide materials and complexes, include density-functional theory (DFT), DFT in conjunction with Coulomb corrections (DFT+U), and dynamical mean-field theory (DFT+DMFT).

INTRODUCTION

The work horse for most condensed-matter calculations is density-functional theory [1]. While the theory can be exactly formulated for a homogenous electron gas, it can be applied to any 'real-world' material for approximation of the electron exchange and correlation energy (Exc). In view of its humble beginnings, it is remarkably successful in describing the chemical bonding in many elements, compounds, and alloys throughout the periodic table. For example, equilibrium lattice constants are often within 1% of measured values. The local density approximation (LDA) of the Exc is reasonable for systems with more slowly varying electron densities such as *d*-transition metals [2] while the more recent generalized gradient approximation (GGA) was shown to give much better description [3] of the actinides. Apparently, no GGA can simultaneously be accurate for all atomic properties without sacrificing precision for solids with slowly varying electron densities [2]. This illustrates the difficulty in devising a completely

general assumption of the Exc that is applicable for solids with strongly different electron densities.

The atomic volumes of the actinide metals can be used to highlight the difficulties of DFT. In Fig. 1 the measured atomic volumes for the actinide metals are shown with a black line, the $5d$ -transition metal series with a brown line), and the $4f$ rare-earth series with a green line. We find that the first part of the actinide series shows great similarity to the d -transition metal series with a parabolic decrease as a function of atomic number while the second part more resembles that of the rare-earth series. The reason is that the $5f$ electrons are participating in bonding up to Pu, then abruptly withdraw from bonding from Am on, leading to a dramatic volume expansion.

These very distinct trends can roughly be modeled by two extremes, one in which the $5f$ electrons are weakly correlated and forming valence band states and the other with the $5f$ electrons together with the atomic-like core electrons with no inter-atomic bonding. In Fig. 1 we show results from calculations that models the band (blue solid circles) and atomic (red squares) limits of the $5f$ electron behavior. The blue solid circles (" $5f$ fully bonding") are obtained from electronic-structure calculations with $5f$ electrons treated as weakly correlated and part of the valence band with no other electron interactions than that of the GGA. Notice how well this model reproduces the experimental situation for the early actinides (Th-Np) while for Pu there is no upturn, as shown experimentally, a fact that is partly due to the lack of spin-orbit coupling in the model [4].

The red squares are results from calculations identical to the solid blue circles except with the $5f$ electrons confined to core states. This latter extreme in the $5f$ electron behavior gives rise to rather good agreement with the heavier actinides from Am and on while failing for the early actinides. Ideally, of course, one prefers to have an approximation to the Exc which can handle both the band and atomic limits of the $5f$ -electron manner on an equal footing, but current DFT formulations of approximate Exc tend to favor one over the other [2]. In practical DFT calculations for Am, the localized (atomic-like) state of the $5f$ electrons are relatively well modeled by a fully spin polarized solution where the spin up (down) manifolds are essentially full (empty) thus removing most of the attractive $5f$ bonding.

DFT RESULTS

At one time, the similarity of the light actinides to the d -transition series suggested to researchers that the actinides were part of a $6d$ transition series and not a $5f$ transition series [5]. However, our calculations in Fig. 1 show clearly that there is an f band, with a total of 14 electrons. With this in mind, we display carefully calculated atomic volumes compared with experimental data in Fig. 2 [4]. Notice the rather good agreement between the two sets, suggesting that DFT is a reasonable model for bonding in the actinide metals. The atomic volume reflects an integration of bonding and anti-bonding states and not necessarily an accurate detailed picture of the electronic structure. For instance, these calculations predict the non-magnetic Am to be magnetic. This is the best DFT solution within the restrictions implied by the GGA for the Exc.

A more sensitive test for the theory is the crystal structure. It depends strongly on details of the electronic structure, particularly close to the Fermi level. Thus, if DFT can reproduce the non-trivial crystal structures in the early actinides (cubic, tetragonal,

orthorhombic, and monoclinic) it suggests an accurate DFT electronic structure. About a decade ago, DFT was shown to accomplish this for the early actinides Th-Pu [6, 7]. The occurrence of such exotic phases, such as monoclinic, is due to narrow $5f$ bands close to the Fermi level that give rise to a Peierls-like distortion that stabilizes low symmetry crystal geometries [8]. During hydrostatic compression these narrow bands broaden and the efficiency of the Peierls distortion is diminished while electrostatic inter-atomic forces of the Madelung type favors higher symmetry atomic arrangements and one therefore observes pressure-induced phase transitions in the actinides. For example, DFT predicted a high-pressure orthorhombic phase of protactinium metal [6] 5 years before it was confirmed experimentally [9].

Details of the crystal structures of actinides under compression can be measured using diamond anvil cell techniques. Such findings provide great opportunities to compare models with real data and in Fig. 3 we show the c/a axial ratio for Ce-Th alloys [10] with data for uranium [11] in the inset. DFT (open symbols) compares rather well with measured data (filled symbols) suggesting the relevancy of the DFT approach. Another interesting feature of uranium are the low-temperature charge density waves, and DFT calculations by Fast *et al.* [12] reproduced these waves and their concomitant distortions.

As a function of temperature, Pu metal transforms through six allotropic phases: α , β , γ , δ , δ' , and ϵ , as shown in the inset of Fig 4. Spin-polarized DFT with spin-orbit coupling and orbital polarization captures well this most complex and non-trivial phase diagram, as shown in Fig. 4 [13]. Even though the energies are consistent with the phase diagram, questions remain regarding the electron correlations and particularity magnetism [14].

Beyond Pu, the structural behavior of both Am and Cm has been studied by experimental methods [15-17] and DFT calculations [16-18] and both agree well implying a robustness of the DFT approach for the heavier actinides. The applicability of DFT for some actinide metals has also been verified by comparisons with experimental data for elastic properties. This has been done for Th [19, 20], U [21, 22], and Pu [23].

Although DFT correctly reproduces many properties of the actinides the magnetic properties of Pu may be questionable. Clearly, for americium, the magnetic prediction is incorrect and due to the failure of DFT to accurately represent the atomic non-magnetic $5f$ -electron states. DMFT and DFT+U are suitable to deal with the complete $5f$ -electron localization that occurs for Am in its non-magnetic ground state. An important failure of DFT is the lack of a proper description of the high-temperature body-centered-cubic (bcc) phase that all actinides adopt prior to melt. Standard DFT treatments rely on the Born-Oppenheimer approximation i.e., frozen atoms corresponding to zero temperature (and no zero-point motion). For the high-temperature bcc phase the zero temperature DFT approach predicts mechanical instabilities rendering DFT problematic for these phases.

For actinide molecular compounds, DFT has become the method of choice in the recent years to compute molecular properties especially when the systems are too large to be handled by other more computationally demanding *ab initio* approaches. To expand the molecular electron density, basis sets of local functions can be employed. Relativistic effects can be included when all-electron basis sets are replaced by relativistic effective core potentials (RECPs) [24] or approximations such as the zeroth-order regular approximation (ZORA) [25] are used. A good test for the theoretical approaches is the correct reproduction of bond distances obtained from crystal structures. Recent work has

shown that DFT can provide a very good agreement between optimized DFT and crystal structures [26, 27].

The involvement of $5f$ orbitals in bonding has been the subject of much debate and has been largely investigated through DFT calculations. Most of the recent investigations indicate that $5f$ and $6d$ orbitals are both involved in the chemistry of the actinide elements. However, while the $5f$ involvement in the bonding is especially important for uranium, the $5f$ participation in the bonding decreases when moving across the series. Thus, for plutonium, americium, or curium in their trivalent oxidation state, DFT calculations give mostly electronic donation into vacant $6d$ orbitals from atoms present in the actinide environment [28,29]. For actinide molecular compounds, the main limitations of DFT are to describe properly excited-properties and energy changes when open-shell actinide systems are involved.

DFT+U RESULTS

Photoemission spectroscopy (PES) experiments are sensitive to the f states through the energy-dependent cross-section and reveal that in most light-actinide materials the $5f$ states are a few eV wide and located near or just below the Fermi level (E_F). Energy positions of $5f$ electrons near or a few eV below E_F imply that the DFT+U approach may be used to describe the materials electronic structure. In this approach, an additional on-site Coulomb interaction, expressed by two parameters U and J , is added for the f electrons; a subtraction of a double counting part avoids the double counting of a mean-field electron interaction already contained in the standard DFT. The Coulomb U parameter may vary from 0 eV for delocalized f -systems to about 5 eV for rather localized materials such as actinide oxides and the late actinides. Calculations of the U parameter have provided values of 2-10 for actinide atoms [30]; fits of the Coulomb U , e.g. for UO_2 , to available experimental data gave $U = 4.5$ eV [31]. The exchange J parameter is less well established for actinides; it may vary from $J = 0$ eV to 0.7 eV (see, e.g., [32]). Both the U and J are related to the Slater integrals $F_2\kappa$ that describe the full two-electron Coulomb interaction, with $U = F_0$ but $J = J(F_2; F_4; F_6)$. The DFT+U approach has been applied to a large number of actinide compounds (e.g., [33-41]).

In some cases simplified implementations either of the +U functional (e.g., [35]) or by neglecting simply the SO interaction (e.g., [42,43]) have been used. Other implementations treat the +U part and SO on an equal footing [36]. Obviously, the neglect of the SO is rarely justified for actinides, as it is responsible for a splitting of about 1 eV of the $5f_{5/2}$ and $5f_{7/2}$ states.

DFT+U calculations capture the correlated nature of the open $5f$ shell and produce a different magnetic solution than conventional DFT. For example, for light actinide systems the +U approach tends to enhance the orbital moment, which is often too small in the LSDA+DFT. This occurs because the +U scheme has an orbital dependent potential. The improvement is large for insulating actinide oxides, as UO_2 , where the removal of $5f$ weight from the Fermi level leads to an insulating state [39].

DFT+U calculations, treating the SO interaction and +U part on an equal footing, have predicted a behavior distinct from the DFT. Specifically, LSDA+U calculations (using the around-mean field double counting term) predict a completely non-magnetic state for δ -Pu as well as Pu-Am alloys [44,45]. Fig. 5 shows the calculated spin (MS),

orbital (ML), and total (MJ) moment as a function of the Coulomb U parameter. For reasonable values $U = 3-4$ eV, LSDA+ U calculations [44] self-consistently converge to a non-magnetic ground state for δ -Pu. Relativistic LSDA+ U calculations for other Pu-compounds have also given non-magnetic ground states. One example is the heavy-fermion superconductor PuCoGa₅ [46]. Fig. 6 shows the LSDA+ U computed energy dispersions of PuCoGa₅ [47]. The separation of the $5f$ manifold is clearly seen. In spite of the used U of 3 eV, the bands near E_F are still hybridized, dispersive $5f$ bands. Hence, the Fermi surface of PuCoGa₅ has an appreciable amount of $5f$ character, and, in addition, it is rather two-dimensional on account of the HoCoGa₅ tetragonal structure (see [41, 47]). The most-recent neutron measurements reveal PuCoGa₅ to be non-magnetic [48]. This is in agreement with LSDA+ U calculations, but it is a surprising result from the viewpoint that spin-fluctuations were believed to be responsible for the unusually high critical temperature in PuCoGa₅ [49, 50]. The reason that the LSDA+ U scheme tends to predict non-magnetic ground states for Pu and Am compounds has been analyzed [41, 44]. The DFT+ U method favors an atomic coupling closer to the jj coupling, whereas plain DFT calculations are normally closer to LS coupling. This difference becomes important particularly for Pu and Am, i.e. close to a filled $j = 5/2$ subshell.

DMFT RESULTS

DMFT has had numerous successes in the field of actinides [51-65]. For example, theoretical prediction of the phonon spectra of δ -Pu [52] were shown to be surprisingly accurate by later inelastic X-ray scattering measurements [66], both reproduced in Fig. 6. Considering the approximations involved in the calculations and the fact that δ -Pu is stabilized by small amounts of Ga impurities, the agreement between theory and experiment is good. The photoemission spectra of δ -Pu, is also in good agreement with the experimental results, as shown in Fig. 7 [53, 58]. Notice the presence of coherent and incoherent spectral weight present in both theory and experiment. Plutonium and its compounds display the phenomena of quasiparticle multiplets (additional structure in the low energy quasiparticle peaks), which are fingerprint of Pu mixed-valence character. The quasiparticle multiplets are labeled by arrows in Fig. 7. The physical origin of these quasiparticle multiplets and their relation to mixed valence of Pu compounds have been elucidated in Ref. [55].

At ambient pressure, DMFT accounts for the non-magnetic state of Am and δ -Pu and the magnetic state of Cm [53]. The boundary of the localization-delocalization transition in elemental Pu was recently explored in Ref. [58]. The results reveal that a 25 percent volume expansion frees the f moment of δ -Pu, in agreement with experimental studies of plutonium hydrides. Alloying Pu with Am does not free the plutonium moment, because the volume expansion is compensated by charge transfer effects (hybridization and level shifts) [59]. Further advances in computational facilities and algorithms would allow the extension of these calculations to map the electronic phase diagrams of actinides, its alloys, and oxides that are involved in advanced nuclear fuel cycles.

DMFT forms a basis for a theoretical spectroscopy, supplementing advanced experimental techniques, to yield new insights in the field of actinides. For example, recent study addressed the ratio of the two white lines (transitions between the $4d$ to $5f$ states), which are measured in electron energy-loss and x-ray absorption spectroscopy,

across the actinide series [57]. The results are reproduced in Fig. 9, which are in agreement with experimental results [67,68]. Experimentally only one quantity is measured, the branching ratio B . This quantity is determined by two parameters, the f -occupancy and the strength of the spin-orbit coupling. These two parameters are separately accessible in LDA+DMFT, and can be used to determine the value of the branching ratio. These studies were crucial in elucidating Pu valence, which is mixed valent, hence non-integer, but close to $5f^6$. The DMFT technique is currently applied to actinide materials by many groups around the world. These works are too numerous to cite and we can only provide a partial list of references [51-65] and to recent review [69,70].

This work performed under the auspices of the U.S. DOE by LLNL under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.

References:

- [1] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. 136, B864 (1964); W. Kohn and L. Sham, Phys. Rev. 140, A1133 (1965).
- [2] J. P. Perdew *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 136406 (2008).
- [3] P. Söderlind, O. Eriksson, B. Johansson, and J. M. Wills, Phys. Rev. B 50, 7291 (1994).
- [4] P. Söderlind and C. S. Nash in *Advances in Plutonium Chemistry 1967-2000* edited by D. Hoffman (American Nuclear Society, La Grange Park, 2002), p. 14.
- [5] W. H. Zachariasen, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem. 35, 3487 (1973).
- [6] P. Söderlind, Adv. Phys. 47, 959 (1998).
- [7] M. Penicaud, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 12 5819 (2000).
- [8] P. Söderlind *et al.*, Nature 374, 524 (1995).
- [9] R. G. Haire, S. Heathman, M. Iridi, T. Le Bihan, A. Lindbaum, and J. Rebizant, Phys. Rev. B 67, 134101 (2003).
- [10] P. Söderlind and O. Eriksson, Phys. Rev. B 60, 9372 (1999).
- [11] J. Akella, S. Weir, J. M. Wills, and P. Söderlind, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 9, L549 (1997).
- [12] L. Fast, O. Eriksson, B. Johansson, J. M. Wills, G. Straub, H. Roeder, and L. Nordström, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2978 (1998).
- [13] P. Söderlind, Europhys. Lett. 55, 525 (2001); P. Söderlind and B. Sadigh, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 185702 (2004).
- [14] J. C. Lashley, A. Lawson, R. J. McQueeney, and G. H. Lander, Phys. Rev. B 72, 054416 (2005).
- [15] S. Heathman *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 2961 (2000); A. Lindbaum, *et al.* Phys. Rev. B 63, 214101 (2001).
- [16] S. Heathman *et al.*, Science 309, 110 (2005).
- [17] K. T. Moore *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 236402 (2007).
- [18] P. Söderlind and A. Landa, Phys. Rev. B 72, 024109 (2005).
- [19] P. Söderlind, O. Eriksson, J. M. Wills, and A. M. Boring, Phys. Rev. B 48, 9306 (1993).
- [20] J. Bouchet, F. Jollet, G. Zerah, Phys. Rev. B 74, 134304 (2006).

- [21] P. Söderlind, Phys. Rev. B 66, 085113 (2002).
- [22] J. Bouchet, Phys. Rev. B 77, 024113 (2008); C.D. Taylor, Phys. Rev. B 77, 094119 (2008).
- [23] P. Söderlind and J. E. Klepeis, Phys. Rev. B 79 104110 (2009); P. Söderlind, *et al.* (to be published).
- [24] P. J. Hay and R. L. Martin, J. Chem. Phys. 109 3875 (1998).
- [25] E. van Lenthe, E.J. Baerends, and J.G. Snijders, J. Chem. Phys. 99 4597 (1993).
- [26] E. J. Schelter et al. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 129 5139 (2007).
- [27] I. Charushnikova, E. Bosse, D. Guillaumont and P. Moisy, Inorg. Chem. 49 2077 (2010).
- [28] K. I. M. Ingram, M. J. Tassell, A. J. Gaunt and N. Kaltsoyannis, Inorg. Chem. 47 7824 (2008).
- [29] D. Guillaumont, J. Phys. Chem. A 108 6893 (2004).
- [30] J. F. Herbst, R. E. Watson, and I. Lindgren, Phys. Rev. B 14, 3265 (1976).
- [31] S. L. Dudarev, D. Nguyen Manh, and A. P. Sutton, Phil. Mag. B 75, 613 (1997).
- [32] D. van der Marel and J. Sawatzky, Phys. Rev. B 37, 10674 (1988).
- [33] P. M. Oppeneer, A. N. Yaresko, A. Y. Perlov, V. N. Antonov, and H. Eschrig, Phys. Rev. B 54, R3706 (1996).
- [34] P. M. Oppeneer *et al.*, Physica B 230{232, 544 (1997).
- [35] S. L. Dudarev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B 57, 1505 (1998).
- [36] A. B. Shick, A. I. Liechtenstein, and W. E. Pickett, Phys. Rev. B 60, 10763 (1999).
- [37] S. Y. Savrasov and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 3670 (2000).
- [38] A. B. Shick and W. E. Pickett, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 300 (2001).
- [39] R. Laskowski, G. K. H. Madsen, P. Blaha, and K. Schwarz, Phys. Rev. B 69, 140408(R) (2004).
- [40] D. B. Ghosh, S. K. De, P. M. Oppeneer, and M. S. S. Brooks, Phys. Rev. B 72, 115123 (2005).
- [41] A. B. Shick, V. Janis, and P. M. Oppeneer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 016401 (2005).
- [42] I. D. Prodan, G. E. Scuseria, and R. L. Martin, Phys. Rev. B 76, 033101 (2007).
- [43] B. -T. Wang, H. Shi, W. Li, and P. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 81, 045119 (2010).
- [44] A. B. Shick, V. Drchal, and L. Havela, Europhys. Lett. 69, 588 (2005).
- [45] A. B. Shick, L. Havela, J. Kolorenc, V. Drchal, T. Gouder, and P. M. Oppeneer, Phys. Rev. B 73, 104415 (2006).
- [46] J. L. Sarrao *et al.*, Nature 420, 297 (2002).
- [47] P. M. Oppeneer, A. B. Shick, J. Ruzs, S. Lebegue, and O. Eriksson, J. Alloys. Compd. 444-445, 109 (2007).
- [48] A. Hiess *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 076403 (2008).
- [49] I. Opahle and P. M. Oppeneer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 157001 (2003).
- [50] E. D. Bauer et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 147005 (2004).
- [51] S. Savrasov, G. Kotliar, and E. Abrahams, Nature 410, 793 (2001).
- [52] X. Dai, S. Y. Savrasov, G. Kotliar, A. Migliori, H. Ledbetter, and E. Abrahams, Science 300, 953-955 (2003).
- [53] J. H. Shim, K. Haule, and G. Kotliar, Nature 446, 513-516 (2007).
- [54] J. H. Shim, K. Haule, S. Savrasov, G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 101, 126403 (2008).
- [55] Chuck-Hou Yee, Gabriel Kotliar, and Kristjan Haule, Phys. Rev. B 81, 035105 (2010).

- [56] Kristjan Haule and Gabriel Kotliar, *Nature Physics* 5, 796 (2009).
- [57] J. H. Shim, K. Haule, G. Kotliar, *Europhys. Lett.* 85, 17007, (2009).
- [58] C. A. Marianetti, K. Haule, G. Kotliar, and M. J. Fluss, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 101, 056403 (2008).
- [59] S. Y. Savrasov, K. Haule, and G. Kotliar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 96, 036404 (2006).
- [60] M. J. Han, X. Wan, and S. Y. Savrasov, *Phys. Rev. B* 78, 060401 (2008).
- [61] L. V. Pourovskii *et al.*, *Europhys. Lett.* 74, 479 (2006).
- [62] L. V. Pourovskii, M. I. Katsnelson, and A. I. Lichtenstein, *Phys. Rev. B* 72, 115106 (2005).
- [63] M. -T. Suzuki and P. M. Oppeneer, *Phys. Rev. B* 80, 161103 (2009).
- [64] L. V. Pourovskii, M. I. Katsnelson, and A. I. Lichtenstein, *Phys. Rev. B* 73, 060506 (2006).
- [65] J. -X. Zhu *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* 76, 245118 (2007).
- [66] J. Wong, M. Krisch, D.L. Farber, F. Occelli, A.J. Schwartz, T.-C. Chiang, M. Wall, C. Boro, and R. Q. Xu, 2003, *Science* 301, 1078.
- [67] K. T. Moore, G. van der Laan, M. A. Wall, A. J. Schwartz, and R. G. Haire, *Phys. Rev. B* 76, 073105 (2007).
- [68] K.T. Moore and G. van der Laan, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 235 (2009).
- [69] G. Kotliar and D. Vollhardt, *Physics Today* 57, 53 (2004).
- [70] G. Kotliar *et al.*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 78, 865 (2006).

FIGURES

FIG. 1: Experimental atomic volumes of the $5d$ transition metals (brown), the lanthanides ($4f$, green), and actinides ($5f$). The red " $5f$ nonbonding" and blue " $5f$ fully bonding" curves show results from model calculations, assuming the face-centered-cubic structure, where the $5f$ electrons are treated as part of the valence band and localized to nonbonding core states, respectively.

FIG. 2: DFT atomic volumes for the actinide metals in the body-centered-cubic and observed crystal structures. The theory is corrected by (experimental) thermal expansion to 300 K except for δ -Pu. Spin-orbit coupling is included for all metals and spin and orbital polarization for δ -Pu, Am, and Cm [4].

FIG. 3: Axial c/a ratio as a function of pressure for tetragonal Ce-Th alloys (redrawn from Ref. [10]). In the inset, we show the c/a axial ratio as a function of compression for α -U [11]. Open symbols are DFT results and filled symbols show measured data.

FIG. 4: Total energies for Pu. Taken from [13]. The inset shows the experimental volume-temperature phase diagram of Pu metal.

FIG. 5: A set of DFT+U calculations. (a) Computed spin moment (MS), orbital moment (ML) and total moment (MJ) of δ -Pu as a function of the Coulomb U parameter in around-mean field LDA+U calculations [44]. (b) Computed energy band dispersions of PuCoGa_5 , using the around-mean field LDA+U approach (with $U = 3$ eV, $J = 0.6$ eV) [47]. The size of the circles denotes the amount of $5f$ character in a band.

FIG. 6: Predicted zero temperature theoretical phonon spectrum of δ -Pu (red) calculated using DMFT compared with experimental values (solid squares) measured at room temperature. The dispersion curves plotted here map the vibrational frequencies of the atoms in momentum space. The frequencies vary with the wave vectors and are evident in the branches as one moves in a particular Brillouin zone direction [69].

FIG. 7: Photoemission spectra of δ -Pu a LDA+DMFT theory and b experiment (from [71]). Notice the presence of the hubbard bands at high energies, and the coherent quasiparticle multiplets at low energy, indicated by arrows [53, 58].

FIG. 8: The LDA+DMFT expectation value of the angular part of the spin-orbit interaction. The LDA+DMFT results are denoted by circles and rectangles for actinide elements and oxides, respectively [57].













