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Role of nonlocality in exchange correlation for magnetic two-dimensional van der Waals materials

Abstract
To obtain accurate independent-particle descriptions for ferromagnetic two-dimensional van der Waals materials, we apply the quasiparticle self-consistent GW (QSGW) method to VI3, CrI3, CrGeTe3, and Fe3GeTe2. QSGW provides a description of the nonlocal exchange-correlation term in the one-particle Hamiltonian. The nonlocal term is important not only as the U of density functional theory (DFT) + U but also for differentiating occupied and unoccupied states in semiconductors. We show the limitations of DFT + U in mimicking QSGW.
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To obtain accurate independent-particle descriptions for ferromagnetic two-dimensional van der Waals materials, we apply the quasiparticle self-consistent $GW$ (QSGW) method to $VI_3$, $CrI_3$, $CrGeTe_3$, and $Fe_2GeTe_2$. QSGW provides a description of the nonlocal exchange-correlation term in the one-particle Hamiltonian. The nonlocal term is important not only as the $U$ of density functional theory (DFT) + $U$ but also for differentiating occupied and unoccupied states in semiconductors. We show the limitations of DFT + $U$ in mimicking QSGW.
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Introduction. The recent experimental realization of magnetic two-dimensional (2D) van der Waals (vdW) materials has generated great interest for exploiting novel 2D magnetism and for applications such as energy-efficient ultracom- pact spin-based electronics [1]. Long-range ferromagnetic ordering in the atomically thin systems was first demonstrated in the $CrGeTe_3$ bilayer [2] and $CrI_3$ monolayer [3], albeit only at very low temperatures. Later, Deng et al. [4] showed that an electric field could drastically increase the Curie temperature $T_C$ of a $Fe_2GeTe_2$ monolayer up to room temperature. Recently, $VI_3$ has been identified as the first vdW hard ferromagnet with a large coercivity [5–7]. Spurred by these experiments, many theoretical efforts have been published treating magnetic 2D vdW materials (m2Dv) [8–15].

We are also witnessing the recent revolutionary development of materials informatics (MI). For example, Mounet et al. [16] have employed a computational MI to search for 2D exfoliable materials by multilevel screening from the databases of experimentally known compounds. The quality of such work largely depends on the choice of the first-principles method used for the final screening. In the future, such an MI procedure may be applied to m2Dv. Then the first-principles method used in MI should be as reliable as possible and with no adjustable parameters for each material.

At present, m2Dv has been theoretically treated mostly within density functional theory (DFT) + $U$, with a single Hubbard $U$ applied on the cation-3$d$ orbitals, as in Refs. [17–20]. Phenomenological theories, such as DFT + $U$ and dynamical mean-field theory, are very useful for various material systems. However, it is not clear that one can use DFT + $U$ for the above-mentioned MI, because of the limitation of the single parameter $U$, as we illustrate in the following.

First, the cation-3$d$ bands in m2Dv contain more degrees of freedom than a single $U$ parameter can describe. Although DFT + $U$ may adjust overall splitting between occupied and unoccupied 3$d$ bands for each spin, it ignores the $k$ dependence and frequency dependence of effective interactions and thus the interaction anisotropy regarding in-plane and out-of-plane 3$d$ orbitals in m2Dv cannot be adequately treated. An idea using many parameters for the $U$ term would be hard to implement because of the difficulty in determining the unique parameters.

Second, the relative positions of cation-3$d$ and anion-$p$ bands are not directly controlled by on-site $U$. For example, even in nonmagnetic CdO where we expect no $U$ effect because Cd-$4d$ states are fully occupied, we see the center of occupied 4$d$ states can be pushed down about 2 eV (see Fig. A1 in Ref. [21]) in comparison with DFT. Note that the relative positions of and hybridizations between cation-3$d$ and anion-$p$ can be important to determine the superexchange coupling in m2Dv.

In this Rapid Communication, we apply the quasiparticle self-consistent $GW$ (QSGW) method [21–23] to m2Dv, including $VI_3$, $CrI_3$, $CrGeTe_3$, and $Fe_2GeTe_2$. QSGW has been applied to a wide range of materials and shown to be the most reliable method available to determine the one-particle Hamiltonian $H_0$, which defines the independent-particle picture of a particular material. For each material, an accurate $H_0$ is the key to evaluate all of its physical quantities theoretically.

We will show that QSGW reasonably describes electronic structures consistent with experiments for all m2Dv treated here. Then we will examine whether DFT + $U$ can mimic the band structures obtained in QSGW. We will demonstrate the serious limitations of DFT in treating m2Dv, corresponding to the two reasons discussed above.

Methods. First, let us recall the GW approximation (GWA) [24,25]. GWA can be applied to any one-particle Hamiltonian $H_0$, for example, to the Kohn-Sham Hamiltonian of DFT. In GWA, we calculate the self-energy $\Sigma(r, r', \omega) = \Sigma(1, 2) = iG_0(1, 2)W(1+, 2)$. Here, $G_0 = 1/(\omega - H_0)$ is the Green’s function of $H_0$; $W$ is the dynamically screened Coulomb interaction calculated using $G_0$, usually in the random phase approximation (RPA). Then we can determine the quasiparticle energies with $\Sigma(r, r', \omega)$ in the place of the...
exchange-correlation (xc) potential. The reliability of this one-shot method, so-called $G_0W_0$, depends on the reliability of $H_0$.

Thus, the main theoretical problem of $G_0W_0$ is how to determine $H_0$ to which we apply GWA. For this purpose, various self-consistent schemes have been developed. In practice, a partial self-consistency is often employed due to the demanding nature of computation or the intrinsic problems of the methods [26]. In the so-called energy-only self-consistent GW method [27,28], the eigenfunctions are fixed while only the one-particle energies are iterated to reach consistency. In a $G_0W_0$ method [28], one may calculate $W$ using DFT $G_0$, but iterate $G$ until convergence.

QSGW [22,23,29] is given as a self-consistent perturbation method based on the quasiparticle picture within GWA. The full many-body Hamiltonian $H$ is divided into $H = H_0 + (H - H_0)$, then $(H - H_0)$ is treated as a perturbation in GWA. The self-consistent perturbation requires that we should determine $H_0$ so that the term generated in GWA due to $(H - H_0)$ gives virtually zero.

Based on this idea, we generate the QSGW xc potential $V_{ \text{QSGW}}^{xc}$ from the self-energy $\Sigma(r, r', \omega)$ obtained in GWA as

$$V_{ \text{QSGW}}^{xc} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} |\psi_i| [\text{Re}(\Sigma(e_i))]_{ij} + \text{Re}(\Sigma(e_j))]_{ij} \langle \psi_j |.$$

(1)

Here, $e_i$ and $|\psi_i\rangle$ are eigenvalues and eigenfunctions, respectively, of Hamiltonian $H_0$. $\text{Re}$ denotes the Hermitian part. $\Sigma(e_i)(\omega) = \langle \psi_i| \Sigma(\omega)|\psi_j\rangle = \int d^3r \int d^3r' \psi_i^*(r) \Sigma(r, r', \omega) \psi_j(r')$. With Eq. (1), we have a mapping to generate a new $H_0$, $H_0^{(i)} = H_0^{(i+1)}$. This is repeated until $H_0$ is converged. Note that $G_0W_0$ applied to this self-consistent $H_0$ does not cause corrections of the quasiparticle energies because of this self-consistency.

QSGW, as it is, tends to systematically overestimate exchange effects, especially for band gaps [21,22,30]. This can be due to the underestimation of the screening effect in RPA, which neglects electron-hole correlations in the proper polarization function [28,30], and/or the neglect of the screening effect of phonons [31]. Shishkin et al. [28] performed calculations that include the correlation via the vertex correction for $W$ and demonstrated very reliable predictions of band gaps by recovering the screening underestimation. However, their methods are too computationally demanding to apply to the materials treated here. Based on the observation that the underestimations are rather systematic in various systems [32], we here use a hybrid QSGW method, QSGW80 [21,33], which uses an empirical mixing of $V_{ \text{QSGW}}^{xc} = 0.8V_{ \text{QSGW}}^{xc} + 0.2V_{ \text{LDA}}$. QSGW80 is taken to be a substitution of the method by Shishkin et al. to remedy the underestimation quickly and efficiently. Unless specified, all QSGW calculations in this work are carried out in QSGW80, referred to hereafter as QSGW, for simplicity.

The nonlocality of $V_{ \text{QSGW}}^{xc}$ provides a natural description of the correct independent-particle picture. Generally speaking, we can classify this nonlocality into two parts: on-site and off site. The on-site nonlocality, which can differentiate five $3d$ orbitals, can be approximated, to a certain extent, by the Hubbard $U$ in DFT $+ U$. The off-site nonlocality is critical to generate band gaps in semiconductors. To illustrate this, let us consider a hydrogen dimer $H_2$. To lower the highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) energy without changing the shape of eigenfunctions, one needs to introduce a projector of HOMO. The corresponding projector is naturally represented by a nonlocal potential, and the screened exchange contribution in $V_{ \text{QSGW}}^{xc}$ works exactly as such a projector.

Furthermore, in contrast to the hybrid functional methods, the electron screening effects on the exchange is calculated explicitly in QSGW. The screened Coulomb interaction $W$, which determines the screened exchange, is spatially dependent and self-consistently determined without any system-dependent parameters. On the other hand, in the hybrid functional methods such as Heyd-Scuseria-Ernzerhof (HSE), the xc functional is obtained by mixing the DFT xc with the Hartree-Fock (HF) exchange, which is calculated using the bare Coulomb interaction kernel. The mixing parameter solely mimics the screening effect. This limits the universality of the hybrid functional methods because the screening effects vary significantly between metals and semiconductors, and their spatial dependence could be important in anisotropic systems, which can be hard to be mimicked by one single parameter. In fact, He and Franchini [34] showed that the mixing could be very material dependent. Thus, the explicit treatment of screened exchange allows QSGW to treat complex subjects such as metal/insulator interfaces, and also m2Dv, which contain both features of semiconductor and anisotropic magnetic materials.

Computational details. We use the QSGW method from the ecalj package [23], which is implemented with a mixed basis and allows automatic interpolation of self-energy in the whole Brillouin zone without resorting to the wannier90 techniques [35,36]. The spin-orbit coupling (SOC) is included as a perturbation [21] after we attain the self-consistency of QSGW. We employed the experimental lattice parameters [5,37–39] for calculations. As for DFT $+ U$, we use both fully-localized-limit (PLL) [40] and around-the-mean-field (AMF) [41] double-counting schemes to investigate the dependence of band structures on the correlation parameter $U$, which is applied on the cation-3d orbitals. All DFT and DFT $+ U$ calculations are carried out within the generalized gradient approximation using the functional of Perdew, Burke, and Ernzerhof (PBE) [42].

Results. $Fe_2GeTe_2$ is a metallic m2Dv and has a higher $T_c$ than its semiconducting counterparts [4]. Figure 1 shows the total density of states (DOS) and partial density of states (PDOS) calculated in QSGW. DOS obtained by DFT is also shown for comparison. Both QSGW and DFT suggest that $Fe_2GeTe_2$ is a metal, as found in experiments. DOS are dominated by Fe-$3d$ states in this energy window. The Fermi level $E_F$ is located at a pseudogap of $Fe_1$-$3d$ states in the minority-spin channel. QSGW gives slightly narrower $3d$ bands than DFT, suggesting a somewhat stronger localization of electron states in QSGW. Indeed, such $3d$-band narrowing is rather general in QSGW as shown in Refs. [43,44]. Considering the fact that QSGW describes metals such as bcc Fe and also transition-metal oxides such as NiO very well, our result supports the applicability of DFT to $Fe_2GeTe_2$. For a band structure comparison between DFT and QSGW, see the Supplemental Material [45].
Note the difficulty of hybrid functionals such as HSE applied to m2Dv without a choice of material-dependent parameters. For example, one usually uses a mixing parameter $a = 0.25$ for semiconductors. However, it was found that $a = 0.15$ [46] is optimum for transition-metal oxides. Furthermore, $a = 0$ is apparently good for bcc Fe while HSE06 gives a magnetic moment of 2.89 $\mu_B$/Fe [47]. Since semiconducting and metallic features coexist with transition metals in m2Dv, we can hardly expect HSE to work well for m2Dv. We think that QSGW is the optimal choice to describe electronic structures of m2Dv along the line of MI.

Table I summarizes the experimental and our calculated $E_g$ values in m2Dv. Unlike DFT, QSGW correctly predicts VI3 as a semiconductor. It is worth noting that $G_0W_0$ applied to DFT does not open the gap in VI3, as it does in VO2, demonstrating the necessity of self-consistency of GW calculations as in QSGW. For CrGeTe3, QSGW gives $E_g = 0.66$ eV, within the range of reported experimental values of 0.20–0.74 eV, while DFT gives a much smaller value of $E_g = 0.19$ eV. On the other hand, in CrI3, QSGW gives $E_g = 1.68$ eV, 35% larger than the only reported experimental value of 1.2 eV. This difference is somewhat larger than expected, considering that QSGW produces $E_g$ within $\sim$10% difference for a wide range of materials [21].

SOC reduces the calculated $E_g$ in all three semiconducting compounds, as shown in Table I, especially with QSGW. The strong SOC effects on $E_g$ are due to the heavy anion atoms in the compounds. I- and Te-5p orbitals have rather large SOC constants, $\xi_p = 0.9–1.0$ eV, while V- and Cr-3d orbitals have $\xi_d = 20–30$ meV. The contribution of SOC to $E_g$ of CrI3 in QSGW (0.55 eV) is about twice as large as in DFT (0.29 eV).

CrI3. Figures 2(a) and 2(b) show the PDOS of CrI3 calculated in DFT and QSGW, respectively, without SOC. QSGW shifts up the unoccupied states in both spin channels, resulting in a larger $E_g$ than the one we obtain in DFT. In the majority spin, the valence cation-3d states are pushed down relative to the anion-5p states, and the top of valence bands at $\Gamma$ becomes more dominated by anion-p states.

Figure 2(c) compares the QSGW band structures of CrI3 calculated with and without SOC. It clearly shows that SOC pushes up the valence bands along the $\Gamma$ point, resulting in a smaller $E_g$. Within QSGW, the top of majority-spin valence bands become more pure anion-p-like after 3d states are pushed down. As a result, SOC has a stronger effect on decreasing $E_g$ in QSGW than in DFT. Similar SOC effects are also found in VI3 and CrGeTe3.

VI3. QSGW predicts that VI3 is a semiconductor while DFT incorrectly predicts it as a half metal. $E_g$ obtained in QSGW is within the range of experimental values. Figure 3 shows the PDOS of VI3 calculated within DFT, DFT + $U$, and QSGW. VI3 has one less electron than CrI3 in the formula unit. Within DFT, the Fermi level intersects the majority-spin $t_{2g}$ states, resulting in a metallic state. The $t_{2g}$ states consist of five roughly equally occupied 3d orbitals. In contrast, remarkably, QSGW splits the $d_z$ states out of the occupied $t_{2g}$ states and shifts them above $E_g$. Correspondingly, the remaining $t_{2g}$ states become more occupied, and a band gap forms between the $d_z$ states and the other $t_{2g}$ states in the majority spin. Other unoccupied 3d states also shift upward for both spins within QSGW.

By adjusting $U$, DFT + $U$ can reproduce QSGW $E_g$ in VI3. However, as shown in Fig. 3, a $U = 2.7$ eV may give similar positions of V-3d DOS as in QSGW in the majority spin, but not in the minority one. Moreover, the shapes of occupied majority-spin DOS change significantly in DFT + $U$, comparing those in QSGW and in DFT.

DFT + $U$. Figure 4 shows $E_g$ values calculated using two DFT + $U$ schemes, FLL and AMF, as a function of $U$, with and without SOC. FLL and AMF give different $U$ dependences of $E_g$. Within FLL, $E_g$ values of CrI3 and CrGeTe3 decrease with increasing $U$, deviating further from experiments. In VI3, DFT + $U$ is not able to produce the experimental semiconducting state, especially with SOC, unless a sufficiently large $U$ is applied, e.g., 2–3 eV in AMF and 3–4 eV in FLL, respectively. Within AMF, $E_g$ values reach the maximum values with $U = 2.7$ and 6.8 eV in CrI3 and VI3, respectively, and then decrease. In contrast to VI3 and CrI3, $E_g$ of CrGeTe3 decreases with the increasing of $U$ value in both schemes. Hence, DFT + $U$ is unable to increase $E_g$ in CrGeTe3.

TABLE I. Band gaps $E_g$(eV) calculated in DFT and QSGW, with and without SOC. Experimental values are listed to compare. The reported theoretical $E_g$ are in the range of 0.74–1.6, 0–0.43, and 0–1.0 eV for bulk CrI3 [10,48], CrGeTe3 [9,13], and VI3 [6,20], respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>DFT</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>QSGW</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>DFT</th>
<th>QSGW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI3</td>
<td>0.32–0.67$^a$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrI3</td>
<td>1.2$^b$</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrGeTe3</td>
<td>0.20–0.74$^c$</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Resistivity measurement: 0.32 eV [20]; optical reflectance: 0.6 eV [7]; optical transmittance: 0.67 eV [20].

$^b$Optical transition measurement [49].

$^c$Angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) measurements: 0.38 eV [50] and 0.2 eV [51]; resistivity measurement: 0.2 eV [52]; scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) measurement: 0.74 eV [18].
To understand the behavior of $E_g$ dependence on $U$, we examine how electronic structures evolve with the increasing of $U$ in AMF. Figure 5 shows the $U$ dependence of the valence band maximum (VBM), the conduction band minimum (CBM), and the band centers of valence and conduction cation-3$d$ states in both spin channels, comparing with QSGW results. For all three compounds, applying $U$ increases the gap and the distance between the centers of occupied and unoccupied 3$d$ bands in the majority-spin but not the minority-spin channel. This is clearly shown in Fig. 3 for the case of VI$_3$ with $U = 2.7$ eV. In CrI$_3$ and CrGeTe$_3$, a large $U$ pushes up the unoccupied 3$d$ bands in the majority spin but lowers them in the minority spin. When $U$ is sufficiently large, the unoccupied 3$d$ states in the minority spin are shifted below those in the majority spin, and $E_g$ is determined by the exchange splitting instead of crystal-field splitting. A similar trend is also observed in VI$_3$, but it occurs at a much larger $U$. DOS calculated within DFT, DFT + $U$, and QSGW can be found in the Supplemental Material [45].

Can we mimic QSGW DOS by applying $U$ on cation-d orbitals? Now we compare DFT + $U$ with QSGW DOS. As shown in Fig. 5, QSGW separates further, in comparison to DFT, the occupied and unoccupied states in both spin channels, while DFT + $U$ only separates them in one spin channel. Hence, within DFT + $U$, a single $U$ parameter is not able to mimic the QSGW 3$d$ band centers simultaneously in both spin

FIG. 3. The partial density of states projected on the V 3$d$ states in VI$_3$ within DFT (green shaded), DFT + $U$, and QSGW. DFT + $U$ calculation is performed using the AMF scheme. $U = 2.7$ eV is used so that the majority-spin V 3$d$ states peak at similar positions as in QSGW. SOC is not included.

FIG. 4. $E_g$ as a function of $U$ in CrI$_3$, VI$_3$, and CrGeTe$_3$, calculated using the (a) fully-localized-limit scheme (FLL) and (b) around-the-mean-field (AMF) scheme. The lower bound (open circles) and upper bound (open squares) of the shaded areas correspond to calculations with and without SOC, respectively. QSGW + SOC results are included to compare.

FIG. 2. The partial density of states projected on Cr-3$d$ and I-5$p$ states in CrI$_3$ calculated within (a) DFT and (b) QSGW. (c) QSGW band structures of CrI$_3$ calculated with (red) and without (blue) SOC.
CBM and VBM are denoted by open circles (DFT $U = 0$, 1.4, and 4.1 eV). The small, medium, and large circles represent different exchange couplings calculated in two methods, considering QSGW’s profound effects on electronic structures. The anion-$5p$ weights at the top of valence bands are very different within two methods, suggesting that the corresponding superexchange couplings should differ as well.

Finally, QSGW is much more computational demanding in comparison with DFT. Its efficiency needs to be improved for application to large-scale high-throughput calculations. Recently, progress has been made in this direction. For example, self-consistent GW calculations using large unit cells with more than 50 atoms has become feasible [54]. By optimizing algorithms for the polarizability and the self-energy, Kutepov [54] has shown the scaling of computational time is between linear and quadratic with respect to the system size, demonstrating the promising potential of its application on high-throughput computations.

Conclusions. We investigated the effects of the nonlocal exchange-correlation on the electronic structures of magnetic 2D van der Waals materials using the QSGW method. QSGW correctly predicts the semiconducting states of VI$_3$ while DFT and $G_0W_0$ fail. The calculated values are within the range of reported experimental values for CrGeTe$_3$ and VI$_3$, but larger than the experimental $E_g$ for CrI$_3$. We also demonstrated that the simplistic DFT $+ U$ method could not mimic the effects introduced by QSGW, suggesting the importance of a more elaborate treatment of electron correlations in these systems. Furthermore, considering the limitation of the DFT $+ U$ method, the parameter-free and more universal QSGW method is more suitable to work as an engine in MI, providing a good independent-particle picture for high-throughput computations to search for new m2Dv.
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