## 4.6 General solution of LCAO

## 1) The quantum mechanical point of view

- The formerly stable atomic states are disturbed by the lattice potential, leading to a mix of atomic states.
- Since the atomic states are only disturbed slightly, the mixture of atomic states is small as well.
- Only states with nearly the same energy will mix; otherwise these mixed states would relaxate very quickly.
- For the calculation we only must take into account atomic states with energies near the Fermi level.
- Since the crystal lattice continuously disturbs the atomic states, the mixture of this states is stable.
- The calculation of the coefficients is nothing but the unitary transformation into the new Eigenvectorsystem of the Hamiltonian of the solid.
- This demonstrate that the unitary transformation will consist of only a few non diagonal elements.
- The mathematical effort is minimized by this approach.

## Hint: the above considerations hold for all perturbation approaches in quantum mechanics.

We multiply the Schrödinger equation of the solid

$$
H\psi(r) = (H_{at} + \Delta U(r))\psi(r) = \epsilon(k)\psi(r)
$$
\n(4.36)

with the atomic wave function  $\psi_m^*(r)$ , integrate over the complete space by taking into account

$$
\int \psi_m^*(r) H_{at}\psi(r) dV = E_m \int \psi_m^*(r) \psi(r) dV \tag{4.37}
$$

Thus we find

$$
(\epsilon(k) - E_m) \int \psi_m^*(r) \psi(r) dV = \int \psi_m^*(r) \Delta U(r) \psi(r) dV \qquad . \tag{4.38}
$$

Including Eq. (4.35) and using the orthogonal relation

$$
\int \psi_m^*(r)\psi_n(r)dV = \delta_{mn} \tag{4.39}
$$

<span id="page-0-0"></span>we get the Eigenvalue equation for the calculation of the coefficients  $b_n(k)$  and the band energies  $\epsilon(k)$ :

$$
(\epsilon(k) - E_m)b_m = -(\epsilon(k) - E_m) \sum_n \left( \sum_{R \neq 0} \int \psi_m^*(r) \psi_n(r - R) e^{ikR} dV \right) b_n
$$
  
+ 
$$
\sum_n \left( \int \psi_m^*(r) \Delta U(r) \psi_n(r) dV \right) b_n
$$
  
+ 
$$
\sum_n \left( \sum_{R \neq 0} \int \psi_m^*(r) \Delta U(r) \psi_n(r - R) e^{ikR} dV \right) b_n
$$
 (4.40)

## 2) The quantum mechanical point of view

- The integration corresponds to the scalar product.
- We therefore calculate the matrix element which belong to the (disturbed) solid state Hamiltonian.
- Without any perturbation the right hand side of Eq.  $(4.40)$  is zero and the Eigenvalue equation is trivial.
- Including the lattice perturbation and following the above considerations only a few Eigenvectors are needed for the diagonalization.

Let us estimate the right hand side of Eq.  $(4.40)$ :

The first term:

<span id="page-1-0"></span>
$$
\left\| \int \psi_m^*(r) \psi_n(r - R) e^{ikR} dV \right\| \le \int \left| \psi_m^*(r) \psi_n(r - R) \right| dV \tag{4.41}
$$

Fig. 4.1 demonstrates that for well localized states the right hand side of Eq. [\(4.41\)](#page-1-0) should be quite small, since atomic wave functions of different lattice points are multiplied.

The second term:

<span id="page-1-1"></span>
$$
\int \psi_m^*(r) \Delta U(r) \psi_n(r) dV \tag{4.42}
$$

Since we assume a small perturbation for the atomic wave function, we find an anticorrelation between the regions where the wave function is large and the regions where  $\Delta U(r)$  is large. Thus the term of Eq. [\(4.42\)](#page-1-1) is small as well.

This considerations hold again for the third term.

Consequently the right hand side of Eq.  $(4.40)$  is small, i.e.

<span id="page-1-2"></span>for 
$$
b_m \gg 0
$$
 we find  $(\epsilon(k) - E_m) \approx 0$  (4.43)

- Thus only those atomic wave functions add strongly to the state of a solid whose atomic energies are nearly the same and show values near the band energy (Fermi energy).
- This verifies the former results which followed directly from general quantum mechanical considerations.
- If Eq.  $(4.43)$  would hold absolutely, i.e. if we describe the atomic limit, all states would again be independent of  $k$ .

We take benefit from the above considerations in Eq.  $(4.41)$  -  $(4.43)$  to get a good approximation for the band energies  $\epsilon(k)$  by

- 1. taking into account only atomic levels  $n$  which have energies close to the Fermi energy,
- 2. taking into account only neighboring lattice sites when summing up lattice vectors,
- 3. using the integrals of the form [\(4.41\)](#page-1-0) partly as fit parameters.

This approximations simplify the numerical and analytical effort in several ways:

- The system of linear equations for the calculation of the coefficients  $b_n$  has a small dimension.
- Only very few integrals have to be calculated.
- We have only a small number of fit parameters which have to be adapted to experimental data.

Examples:

- For a one atomic basis of atoms with s-electrons which are not degenerated, we do not need to solve a set of linear equations at all.
- For a one atomic basis of p-states we have to calculate a 3x3 Eigenvalue-problem in addition to the integrals.
- For a one atomic basis of d-states we have to calculate a 5x5 Eigenvalue-problem; e.g. for many transition metals the d-states and the s-state of the next orbital are almost degenerated; so we have to solve a 6x6- Eigenvalue equation.

This are the typical sizes of LCAO-approximations; if more states are necessary for a good description of the system, normally the overlap between the states is so large that an expansion into plane waves is more appropriate.