

# Reply to “Comment on ‘First-principles calculation of the superconducting transition in $\text{MgB}_2$ within the anisotropic Eliashberg formalism’”

Hyoungh Joon Choi,<sup>1</sup> David Roundy,<sup>1,2</sup> Hong Sun,<sup>1</sup> Marvin L. Cohen,<sup>1,2</sup> and Steven G. Louie<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720*

<sup>2</sup>*Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720*

(Dated: October 28, 2018)

The recent preprint by Mazin *et al.* [cond-mat/0212417] contains many inappropriate evaluations and/or criticisms on our published work [Phys. Rev. B **66**, 020513 (2002) and Nature **418**, 758 (2002)]. The preprint [cond-mat/0212417v1] was submitted to Physical Review B as a comment on one of our papers [Phys. Rev. B **66**, 020513 (2002)]. In the reviewing process, Mazin *et al.* have withdrawn many of the statements contained in cond-mat/0212417v1, however two claims remain in their revised manuscript [cond-mat/0212417v3]: (1) the calculated variations of the superconducting energy gap within the  $\sigma$ - or the  $\pi$ -bands are not observable in real samples due to scatterings, and (2) the Coulomb repulsion  $\mu(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}')$  is negligibly small between  $\sigma$ - and  $\pi$ -states and thus should be approximated by a diagonal  $2 \times 2$  matrix in the  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  channels. Here, we point out that the former does not affect the validity of our theoretical work which is for the clean limit, and that the latter is not correct.

Our computational work<sup>1,2</sup> for the superconducting properties of  $\text{MgB}_2$  is an exact implementation of the fully anisotropic Eliashberg formalism which was established more than two decades ago. The momentum dependence and the dynamical behaviors of the electron-phonon interactions are fully considered in this formalism. By solving the anisotropic Eliashberg equations correctly without any assumption on the distribution of the superconducting energy gap on the Fermi surface, we conclusively obtained the theoretical values of the superconducting energy gap in  $\text{MgB}_2$  for the first time<sup>2</sup>.

Recently, Mazin *et al.* incorrectly stated in the original version of their preprint<sup>3</sup> that our work<sup>1,2</sup> represents a computational implementation of ideas proposed by Liu, Mazin, and Kotus<sup>4</sup> and that our treatment of the fully anisotropic Eliashberg equations integrates out all the phononic degrees of freedom. These statements are deleted in the revised version of their preprint<sup>5</sup>. Mazin *et al.* also incorrectly claimed in their preprint<sup>3</sup> that the Coulomb pseudopotential between  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  sheets might have been omitted erroneously in our actual computation. This incorrect claim is also deleted in their revised preprint<sup>5</sup>.

The superconducting energy gap in  $\text{MgB}_2$  is shown to have greatly different average values on the  $\sigma$ - and the  $\pi$ -sheets of the Fermi surface, and it also exhibits some variations within the  $\sigma$ - or the  $\pi$ -sheets<sup>2</sup>. This is the result of *ab initio* calculations of Ref. 2 carried out within the fully  $\mathbf{k}$ -dependent (anisotropic) Eliashberg formalism in the clean limit, and no claim was made in our paper regarding whether the variations within the  $\sigma$ - or the  $\pi$ -sheets would be measurable in particular samples. We agree with the discussion<sup>3,5</sup> that these variations inside the  $\sigma$ - or the  $\pi$ -sheets may be averaged out with sufficient strong scatterings in a sample, as also would eventually be the case for the difference between the  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  gaps. Since this is an impurity effect, the theoretical result in Ref. 2 remains valid for samples in the clean limit. We

hope that perhaps clever experiments in the future may observe these variations in appropriate samples.

Mazin *et al.* also claimed that the anisotropy of the Coulomb repulsion  $\mu(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}')$  on the Fermi surface is large and very important in  $\text{MgB}_2$ <sup>3,5</sup>. They further argued that, when viewed as a  $2 \times 2$  matrix in the  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  channels,  $\mu$  should be taken as a diagonal matrix (i.e., no repulsion between  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  states) as opposed to a uniform matrix in order to obtain physical results. This claim was based on their simplified estimation of  $\mu$  in  $\text{MgB}_2$  by replacing the screened Coulomb interaction with a contact potential  $\delta(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')$ . Their model calculation gives the result of  $\mu_{\sigma\sigma} : \mu_{\pi\pi} : \mu_{\sigma\pi} : \mu_{\pi\sigma} = 3.1 : 2.6 : 1.4 : 1.0$ .

A realistic calculation of  $\mu$  requires knowing the screened Coulomb interaction  $W(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$  which typically has an extent of over a bond length. *Ab initio* calculations of  $\mu$  can be achieved by employing the full dielectric matrix<sup>6</sup>. This approach has been applied to  $\text{MgB}_2$  recently and obtained a result<sup>7</sup> of  $\mu_{\sigma\sigma} : \mu_{\pi\pi} : \mu_{\sigma\pi} : \mu_{\pi\sigma} = 1.75 : 2.04 : 1.61 : 1.00$  following the definition in Ref. 5. These *ab initio* results show that  $\mu$  is much less anisotropic than the model results in Ref. 5. Thus, the anisotropy of  $\mu$  is not as important as claimed in Ref. 5, in particular in view of the fact that the value and anisotropy of  $\lambda$  is an order of magnitude bigger in this system. In a simple modeling of  $\mu$ , it may in fact be more appropriate to take it as a uniform matrix than a diagonal one.

In addition, Figure 1 in Ref. 5 presents an inappropriate reduction of our full  $\mathbf{k}$ -dependent theory<sup>1,2</sup> to a two-band model. It is likely that the claimed discrepancies originate from their incorrect splitting of the  $\mathbf{k}$ -dependent  $\alpha^2 F(\omega)$  into  $\alpha^2 F_{ij}(\omega)$ 's for  $i, j = \sigma, \pi$ . (They used the same frequency dependence for all components –  $\sigma$ - $\sigma$ ,  $\pi$ - $\pi$ , and  $\sigma$ - $\pi$ .) A two-band model properly reduced from our fully  $\mathbf{k}$ -dependent Eliashberg formalism in fact reproduces well the results in Refs. 1 and 2. These 2-band model results will be published elsewhere<sup>8</sup>.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> H. J. Choi, D. Roundy, H. Sun, M. L. Cohen, and S. G. Louie, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 020513 (2002).
- <sup>2</sup> H. J. Choi, D. Roundy, H. Sun, M. L. Cohen, and S. G. Louie, Nature (London) **418**, 758 (2002).
- <sup>3</sup> I. I. Mazin, O. K. Andersen, O. Jepsen, A. A. Golubov, O. V. Dolgov, and J. Kortus, cond-mat/0212417v1 (2002). The 2nd version of the preprint is almost the same as the 1st one.
- <sup>4</sup> A. Y. Liu, I. I. Mazin, and J. Kortus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 087005(2001).
- <sup>5</sup> I. I. Mazin, O. K. Andersen, O. Jepsen, A. A. Golubov, O. V. Dolgov, and J. Kortus, cond-mat/0212417v3 (2003). The 3rd version of the preprint is greatly revised from the previous versions.
- <sup>6</sup> K.-H. Lee, K. J. Chang, and M. L. Cohen, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 1425 (1995); K.-H. Lee and K. J. Chang, *ibid.* **54**, 1419 (1996).
- <sup>7</sup> C.-Y. Moon, Y.-H. Kim, and K. J. Chang, to be published.
- <sup>8</sup> H. J. Choi, M. L. Cohen, and S. G. Louie, to be published.