

Extraction of crystal-field parameters for lanthanide ions from quantum-chemical calculations

9 December 2010

L. Hu^{1,2} M. F. Reid^{*2} C. K. Duan³ S. Xia¹ M. Yin¹

¹Department of Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China

²Department of Physics and Astronomy and MacDiarmid Institute for Advanced Materials and Nanotechnology, University of Canterbury, Christchurch 8140, New Zealand

³Institute of Modern Physics, Chongqing University of Post and Telecommunications, Chongqing 400065, China

PACS: 71.70.Ch, 71.15.-m, 71.23.An, 31.15.E-

Keywords: Crystal field; Lanthanides; Rare Earths; Energy levels

Abstract

A simple method for constructing effective Hamiltonians for the $4f^N$ and $4f^{N-1}5d$ energy levels of lanthanide ions in crystals from quantum-chemical calculations is presented. The method is demonstrated by deriving crystal-field and spin-orbit parameters for Ce^{3+} ions doped in $LiYF_4$, Cs_2NaYCl_6 , CaF_2 , KY_3F_{10} and YAG host crystals from quantum chemical calculations based on the DV- $X\alpha$ method. Good agreement between calculated and fitted values of the crystal-field parameters is obtained. The method can be used to calculate parameters even for low-symmetry sites where there are more parameters than energy levels.

Corresponding authors:

* Email: mike.reid@canterbury.ac.nz (MFR);

1. Introduction

The $4f^N$ and $4f^{N-1}5d$ energy levels of trivalent lanthanide ions doped in crystals are important information for optical materials. Since the 1960s the $4f^N$ levels have been analysed by a parametric ‘crystal-field’ model.^[1-5] More recently an extension of this model has been applied to the $4f^{N-1}5d$ levels.^[6-10]

The parameters in the parametric ‘crystal-field’ model give valuable insight into the interactions of the 4f and 5d electrons with each other, with other electrons in the lanthanide ion, and with the crystalline environment.^[5, 11] Furthermore, a key feature that makes parametric ‘crystal field’ calculations useful is that the parameters are found to vary predictably across the lanthanide series.^[10] This means that once parameters have been determined for one or two ions it is relatively easy to extrapolate to other ions. These parametric analyses have not only provided a useful summary of the interactions mentioned above, but have also played a key role in the design of technological materials.^[12]

The ‘atomic’ parameters in the ‘crystal-field’ model may be calculated by atomic many-body techniques^[13] and spectroscopy of the $4f^N$ configuration has been an important test case for such calculations.^[14] The crystal-field parameters may also be calculated, and it has been understood since the 1960s that the “crystal-field” is not just an electrostatic effect, but is the result of the complex interplay of quantum-mechanical effects.^[15,16]

Reasonably accurate *ab initio* calculations of the lanthanide energy levels have become common in recent years.^[17-22] Unfortunately, though quite good agreement can be obtained between *ab initio* calculations and experimental energy levels, most of these calculations do not derive crystal-field parameters. In some cases, particularly in high symmetries such as O_h , it is possible to determine the parameters from *ab initio* calculations by fitting the parameters to the calculated energy levels. However, this is not always possible in low symmetry, especially for Ce^{3+} occupying a site of symmetry lower than O_h , T_d , or D_6 , where there are an equal or greater number of free crystal-field and spin-orbit interaction parameters than energy

level splittings. Parameters can provide a better test of the calculations because they can be compared with experimental parameters from ions other than the ion used in the calculation. So, for example, parameters calculated for Ce^{3+} may be compared with experimental data for Pr^{3+} and Nd^{3+} , as we will discuss below.

In this paper, we demonstrate how *ab initio* calculations may be used to determine parameters of a phenomenological effective Hamiltonian^[23-25] such as the $4f^N$ and $4f^{N-1}5d$ crystal-field Hamiltonian. In this method, eigenvalues and eigenvectors from the *ab initio* calculations are used to construct the effective Hamiltonian. Preliminary results have been reported previously by Reid *et al.*^[26,27] Here we present a detailed study of Ce^{3+} in various host crystals with a variety of site symmetries. The calculated energy levels are compared with experimental measurements, and other quantum chemical calculations. We compare the crystal-field parameters with fitted parameters for Ce^{3+} and/or other ions in the same crystal, such as Pr^{3+} and Nd^{3+} , where the larger number of observable energy levels makes the fitted crystal-field parameters more reliable. Though we intend these calculations as a demonstration of principle, since the *ab initio* method we have used is relatively simple, the agreement between the calculations and experiment is generally good.

2. Parametric crystal-field model

The parametric crystal-field model of the $4f^N$ and $4f^{N-1}5d$ energy levels of trivalent and divalent lanthanide ions consists of an effective Hamiltonian operator H_{eff} , which acts on the multi-electron basis constructed from the single-electron orbitals of the ion under a central-field approximation. In principle, H_{eff} can be as precise as the full H in the sense of obtaining exact energies and projected wave functions in the model space, as long as all the effects are taken as effective interactions in the model space interactions. In practice, however, approximations are usually adopted in constructing H_{eff} .

The model Hamiltonian for the $4f^N$ configuration of a lanthanide ion in a crystal is commonly written as:^[4]

$$H = H_{\text{free-ion}} + H_{\text{CF}}, \quad (1)$$

where $H_{\text{free-ion}}$ includes the spherically-symmetric interactions present in the free lanthanide ion, and H_{CF} describes the additional non-spherical symmetric interactions due to interactions of the lanthanide ion with the environment. The most common choices for $H_{\text{free-ion}}$ and H_{CF} are:

$$H_{\text{free-ion}} = E_{\text{AVG}} + \sum_{k=2,4,6} F^k f_k + \zeta_{4f} A_{\text{SO}} + \alpha L(L+1) + \beta G(G_2) + \gamma G(R_7) + \sum_{i=2,3,4,6,7,8} T^i t_i + \sum_{k=0,2,4} M^k m_k + \sum_{k=2,4,6} P^k p_k, \quad (2)$$

$$H_{\text{CF}} = \sum_{k,q,i} B_q^k C_q^k(i). \quad (3)$$

Here E_{AVG} is a parameter that shifts the energy of the whole $4f^N$ configuration. F^k and f_k are electron repulsion parameters and operators. ζ_{4f} and A_{SO} are the spin-orbit coupling constant and angular part of the spin-orbit interaction. α , β and γ are two-particle configuration interaction parameters which are also known as Trees' parameters. L is the total orbital angular momentum. $G(G_2)$ and $G(R_7)$ are Casimir operators for groups G_2 and R_7 . The T^i and t_i are three-particle parameters and operators. The M^k are Marvin integrals and m_k the associated operators. The P^k is electrostatic correlated spin-orbit interaction parameters and p_k are the operators associated with P^k .

The $4f^N$ model Hamiltonian may be extended to the $4f^{N-1}5d$ configuration by including more interactions,^[6,7] i.e.

$$H_{f^{N-1}d} = E_{\text{AVG}} + \sum_{k=2,4,6} F^k(\text{ff})f_k(\text{ff}) + \zeta_{4f} A_{\text{SO}}(\text{ff}) + \alpha L(L+1) + \beta G(G_2) + \gamma G(R_7) + \sum_{i=2^-,4,6^-8} T^i t_i + \sum_{k=0,2,4} M^k m_k + \sum_{k=2,4,6} P^k p_k + \sum_{k,q} B_q^k(\text{ff})C_q^k(\text{ff}) + \Delta_E \delta_E(\text{fd}) + \sum_{k=2,4} F^k(\text{fd})f_k(\text{fd}) + \sum_{j=1,3,5} G^j(\text{fd})g_j(\text{fd}) + \zeta_{5d} A_{\text{SO}}(\text{dd}) + \sum_{k,q} B_q^k(\text{dd})C_q^k(\text{dd}). \quad (4)$$

The parameters and operators have similar meanings to those in Eq. (2-3). The term $\Delta_E \delta_E(\text{fd})$

represents the difference between the average energy of the $4f^{N-1}5d$ configuration and the $4f^N$ configuration. The operator $\delta_E(fd)$ is diagonal, with unit matrix elements for $4f^{N-1}5d$ and zero matrix elements for $4f^N$. The $F^k(fd)$ and $G^j(fd)$ are direct and exchange Slater parameters for the Coulomb interaction between the 4f and 5d electrons. The ζ_{5d} parameter is associated with the spin-orbit interaction of the 5d electron. The $B_q^k(dd)$ is for the 5d electron affected by crystal-field interaction. More details are given in Refs. [6,7].

As explained in the Introduction, the ‘crystal-field’ interactions are not simply a result of electrostatic interactions between the ligands and the lanthanide ion, but arise from complex quantum-mechanical interactions between the 4f and 5d electrons and other electrons in the host crystal. Fitted crystal-field parameter values will automatically absorb contributions from all of such interactions.^[5, 11, 15, 16]

All calculations in this paper use Ce^{3+} as the lanthanide ion. In this case there is only one valence electron and the 4f and 5d configurations that we consider only involve one-electron operators (i.e., crystal-field and spin-orbit interactions). Consequently, the Hamiltonian simplifies to:

$$H = \zeta(ff)A_{so} + \sum_{k,q} B_q^k(ff)C_q^k(ff) + \Delta_E(fd)\delta_E(fd) + \zeta(dd)A_{so} + \sum_{k,q} B_q^k(dd)C_q^k(dd) . (5)$$

3. DV-X α calculations

To demonstrate our method we make use of the DV-X α computer program. This program was originally developed for quantum chemical calculations of electronic and structural properties on molecular systems by D. E. Ellis and co-workers,^[28] and was further developed by Adachi and co-workers.^[29] The program employs the discrete variational method to a cluster isolated or embedded in microcrystal. α is the parameter for exchange-correlation potential and fixed to be 0.7 in this work. The DV-X α method gains numerical efficiency by replacing the calculation of integrals by summation of data over sampling points that are appropriate for the charge distribution of the system in question. It has been used not only to calculate the

single-electron states of lanthanides,^[30] but also to obtain molecular orbitals used in the calculation of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of many-electron states.^[17] In this work we use a relativistic version, which therefore automatically includes the spin-orbit interaction.

In the relativistic DV-X α method, the one-electron states are obtained by solving the one-electron Dirac equation:

$$H\phi_k(\mathbf{r}) = E_k\phi_k(\mathbf{r}) \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{r} is the position of the electron, and $\Phi_k(\mathbf{r})$ and E_k are the k th molecular orbital and its energy. H represents the one-electron Dirac Hamiltonian, Eq. (2) of Chapter 1 in Ref. [17]. The k th molecular orbital $\Phi_k(\mathbf{r})$ is expressed as a linear combination of atomic orbitals (LCAO), i.e.

$$\phi_k(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_i c_{ik} \varphi_i(\mathbf{r}), \quad (7)$$

where $\varphi_i(\mathbf{r})$ is the i th atomic orbital.

4. Crystal-field parameters from DV-X α calculations

A method for obtaining effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} in a model space from a quantum-chemical *ab initio* / first principle calculations was given by Reid *et al.*^[26] The advantage of this method is that it makes use not only of the energies but also of the model-space projection of the eigenvectors. This allows us to determine the parameters even in cases where there are more parameters (spin-orbit, crystal-field, *etc.*) in the parametric Hamiltonian than the number of energy levels.

To calculate the crystal-field parameters for Ce³⁺ in crystals, all 14 $^2F_{JM}$ (or 10 $^2D_{JM}$) basis functions are used to form the ‘model space’. In the DV-X α calculation the output wave functions $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ in (6) are given as linear combinations of those bases and other orbitals, such as the 6s and 5p orbitals of Ce³⁺ and the orbitals of the ligand atoms.

To construct the effective Hamiltonian for the levels that can be considered as ‘4f’ (or ‘5d’) levels of Ce³⁺, the 14 (or 10) energy levels with the largest 4f (or 5d) components are

chosen. We denote the diagonal matrix constructed with diagonal elements the 14 (or 10) energies as \mathbf{E}_p and the matrix for the eigenvectors projected into the ‘model’ space as \mathbf{V}_p . The method presented in Ref. [26] can then be used to construct the effective Hamiltonian. This can then be used to calculate crystal-field parameters. A brief discussion of the method is given below. Further details may be found in Ref. [26].

The projected eigenvectors are, in general, not orthonormal but can usually be expected to be non-singular. An orthonormal matrix \mathbf{V}_k can be constructed from \mathbf{V}_p as:

$$\mathbf{V}_k = ((\mathbf{V}_p \mathbf{V}_p^\dagger)^{-1})^{1/2} \mathbf{V}_p . \quad (8)$$

Then an Hermitian effective Hamiltonian can be constructed as:

$$\mathbf{H}_{\text{eff}} = \mathbf{V}_k \mathbf{E}_p \mathbf{V}_k^{-1} . \quad (9)$$

It can be seen immediately that the eigenvalues of \mathbf{H}_{eff} are the diagonal elements of \mathbf{E}_p and the eigenvectors of \mathbf{H}_{eff} are \mathbf{V}_k . Following Ref. [26], \mathbf{H}_{eff} can be expanded in terms of a complete set of operators \mathbf{T}_α describing the effective interactions in the model space as:

$$\mathbf{H}_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{\alpha} P_{\alpha} \mathbf{T}_{\alpha} . \quad (10)$$

Here P_{α} are the parameters to describe the strength of the various effective interactions:

$$P_{\alpha} = \sum_{\beta} (\mathbf{A}^{-1})_{\alpha\beta} \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}_{\beta}^{\dagger} \mathbf{H}_{\text{eff}}) , \quad (11)$$

where \mathbf{A} is a matrix with elements:

$$A_{\alpha\beta} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}_{\alpha}^{\dagger} \mathbf{T}_{\beta}) . \quad (12)$$

For some site symmetries not all crystal-field parameters can be chosen to be real. The crystal-field parameters are modified by rotations of the axis system, as described in Ref. [4].

All B_0^k are real due to the hermiticity and time-reversal symmetries of the crystal-field interaction.^[31] Rotating about the z axis by angle ϕ gives the following change in phase for the parameters:

$$B_q^k = B_q^k e^{-iq\phi} . \quad (13)$$

Hence at least one B_q^k ($q \neq 0$) may be chosen to be real, and it has been shown that it is always possible to perform rotations to make all $k=2$ parameters real.^[32]

In practice, most calculations based on parameter fitting have been carried out by assuming that all parameters are real. Where our calculated crystal-field parameters are complex, we take the sign from the real part of our calculated parameters. In this paper this is only an issue for LiYF_4 . In that case, for a suitable choice of axes, the only parameter with an imaginary part is B_4^6 , and the imaginary part is calculated to be small. In several cases we use Eq. (13) to change the phases of parameters to match them to the choice of axes made in our calculation.

In the following calculations we are primarily interested in crystal-field splitting. Therefore the calculated 5d energies are adjusted by shifting all levels by a constant amount so that the average of 5d energies matches the experimental average.

5. Examples

5.1 $\text{LiYF}_4:\text{Ce}^{3+}$

We use $\text{LiYF}_4:\text{Ce}^{3+}$ to illustrate our method. DV-X α calculations for a number of lanthanide ions in LiYF_4 have been reported in Ref. [33], which we can compare our calculations to. Another reason for choosing this system is that Ce^{3+} occupies a low-symmetry S_4 site in LiYF_4 . Consequently, the number of crystal-field and spin-orbit parameters is larger than the number of energy levels and so it is not possible to determine all of the parameters by a parametric fitting of only the experimental or calculated *energies*. However, the method described in Sec. 4 can be used to determine all of the parameters.

In order to investigate the effect of different cluster sizes, calculations were carried out for three different clusters $(\text{CeF}_8)^{5-}$, $(\text{CeLi}_4\text{F}_{12})^{5-}$ and $(\text{CeY}_4\text{Li}_8\text{F}_{12})^{11+}$. All the clusters were embedded in a microcrystal containing about 1300 atoms. The coordinates of atoms were taken from Ref. [34], and differ slightly from those used in Ref. [27].

Table 1 lists experimental energies, energies calculated by Watanabe *et al.* in Chapter 5 of Ref. [17] and energies from our calculations. It can be seen that the calculated 5d splitting for the small $(\text{CeF}_8)^{5-}$ cluster is quite close to those of Refs. [17, 22], which were obtained with the same method but a slightly different choice of basis functions. In the calculation by S. Watanabe all orbitals from 1s to 6p for cerium and from 1s to 2p for fluorine were allowed to vary, while in our calculation only 4f, 5p, 5d and 6s for cerium and 2s, 2p for fluorine were allowed to vary, and inner orbitals were frozen in order to speed up the calculation. This may explain why our calculations tend to underestimate the average energy of the 5d configuration, whereas the calculations of Refs. [17, 22] tend to overestimate it. Table 2 lists the available experimental crystal-field and spin-orbit parameters for Ce^{3+} , Pr^{3+} , and Nd^{3+} in LiYF_4 for the $4f^N$ and $4f^{N-1}5d$ configurations. In the case of Ce^{3+} the 4f parameters are extrapolated from those for Pr^{3+} and Nd^{3+} ions due to the lack of experimental data. For the small cluster the calculated crystal-field and spin-orbit parameters are quite consistent with the experimental parameters. However, for larger clusters the parameters are no longer consistent with those obtained by fitting experimental data. We conclude that the calculations for the large clusters are physically unrealistic. This may be illustrated by analysing the states in terms of atomic orbital percentages. These are plotted in Figure 1 for the largest cluster adopted in our calculations. In this case the lowest 5d state is 73% 5d components, with most other components from orbitals of Y^{3+} , but all the other states contain less than 50% 5d components. While experimental data such as line-widths and photoconductivity^[35] suggest that the higher 5d states should mix with the conduction band (being built primarily from Y^{3+} orbitals) the mixing in our calculation is not physically realistic.

This delocalization has been noted by Pascual *et al.*^[19] In Figure 1 of Ref. [19] it is demonstrated that a simple Madelung embedding (such as the one used here) can lead to an unphysical delocalization of the high-energy electrons. A more robust quantum-mechanical

embedding such as the one implemented in Ref. [19] would be required to treat these states more accurately.

Since our calculations for large clusters give unrealistic results, for other systems we only present results for clusters that explicitly consider only Ce^{3+} and its nearest neighbours. In fact, almost all *ab initio* calculations on lanthanide ions in crystals have used such small clusters.

5.2 $\text{Cs}_2\text{NaYCl}_6$

The space group of $\text{Cs}_2\text{NaYCl}_6$ is Fm3m (SG number 225).^[36] Ce^{3+} substitutes for Y^{3+} on sites of octahedral symmetry. For 4f and 5d states, only two and one crystal-field parameters are required respectively. The crystal-field splitting of 4f and 5d states alone can be used to fully determine the crystal-field parameters, making the method summarized in Sec. 4 unnecessary. Nevertheless, it is useful to test DV- $X\alpha$ calculation in such high symmetry systems. Calculated and experimental energy levels and parameters are listed in Table 3 and Table 4. It can be seen that our calculations are consistent with experimental values and with the calculation of Ref. [37].

Note that for octahedral symmetry the ratios of certain crystal-field parameters are fixed, $B_4^4/B_0^4 = \sqrt{5/14}$ and $B_4^6/B_0^6 = -\sqrt{7/2}$,^[38] so in this case, and for CaF_2 , we only give B_0^4 and B_0^6 parameters.

5.3 CaF_2

The space group of CaF_2 is Fm3m (SG number 225).^[39] We consider the case that Ce^{3+} substitutes for Ca^{2+} and maintains the cubic site symmetry (i.e., the charge compensation ion or vacancy is far away).^[40] Table 5 presents the calculated 4f and 5d energy levels and Table 6 presents calculated and experimental parameters. The calculated splitting of 5d energy levels is smaller than the experimental one. This may be because the substitution of divalent Ca^{2+} with trivalent Ce^{3+} will result in a reduction of the Ce-F distance.

5.4 KY_3F_{10}

The space group of KY_3F_{10} is $Fm\bar{3}m$ (SG number 225).^[41] Ce^{3+} substitutes Y^{3+} in a site of C_{4v} symmetry. In Table 7 we compare our calculated energy levels with those from Chapter 5 of Ref. [17]. Since there are no experimental parameters available for Ce^{3+} in this host, parameters obtained from fitting experimental data for Pr^{3+} and Nd^{3+} are shown in Table 8, together with those calculated here for Ce^{3+} . Considering that the crystal-field parameters for Ce^{3+} are expected to be slightly larger than those for Pr^{3+} and Nd^{3+} ions it can be seen that the agreement between calculated and experimental parameters is quite satisfactory.

5.5 YAG

The space group of YAG is $Ia\bar{3}d$ (SG number 230).^[42] Ce^{3+} replaces Y^{3+} site of D_2 symmetry. Table 9 lists the results of energies and Table 10 lists the parameters. There are six equivalent sets of parameters for D_2 symmetry due to six different choices of coordinate system compatible with D_2 symmetry. Detailed discussion of this point is given by Morrison and Leavitt.^[43] In general, it is not possible to determine the correspondence of the parameter set with coordinate system from parametric fitting, unless there are other information, such as EPR data, available.

In our calculation, once a coordinate system was chosen and the ions positions were given, a unique set of energies and eigenvectors were obtained and hence a unique set of parameters would be obtained. Comparing the six equivalent experimental parameter sets we find that the set 3 of Ref. [43] corresponds to our choice of coordinate system for the calculations. However, we have adjusted signs to match the calculations by rotating the system, as explained in section 4. The agreement with experiment is generally satisfactory for the 5d and 4f parameters, except for some 4f crystal-field parameters with relative small values.

6. Conclusions

We have demonstrated that crystal-field parameters for $4f^N$ and $4f^{N-1}5d$ configurations of lanthanide ions in crystals can be obtained systematically from *ab initio* calculations. The method we have used involves the construction of the effective Hamiltonian making use of both eigenvalues and projected eigenvectors from the *ab-initio* calculation. The use of the eigenvectors means that the method is applicable in cases of low symmetry, where there are more parameters than energy levels.

Our calculation uses a relatively simple DV- $X\alpha$ method, and a simple Madelung embedding. However, the calculated results are quite consistent with the experimental data. They are accurate enough that it should be possible to use the method for the calculations of low-symmetry Ce^{3+} systems for which crystal-field parameters can not be determined from fitting experimental data. This is an important application, as there is considerable interest in phosphors that make use of the $5d \rightarrow 4f$ transitions.^[44, 45]

Since crystal-field parameters are transferable to other ions in the lanthanide series, another application of our approach is to derive parameters from calculations from Ce^{3+} , for which *ab initio* calculations are manageable than for a system with many 4f electrons, and then scale those parameters for crystal-field calculations for other ions.

Applying our method of extracting parameters to more sophisticated calculations or higher accuracy gives the possibility of investigating the physics of the crystal-field interactions in more detail. For example, it would be interesting to examine the dependence of calculated crystal-field parameters across the lanthanide series and compare the trends with experimental data.^[46] It would also be interesting to investigate the dependence of the parameters on bond distances and angles, as has been discussed in Refs. [11, 47]. Such analyses would provide useful tests of both the *ab initio* calculations and the various empirical models that are used to analyse experimental data and predict other spectroscopic properties.^[4,5,11]

Our method can also be expanded to constructing effective operators for other properties of the system. Of particular interest are the electric dipole transition intensities within the $4f^N$ configuration, which is commonly addressed via a parametric ‘Judd-Ofelt’ model.^[48,49] Few attempts of true *ab initio* evaluation of these transition intensities have been attempted,^[50,51] with most theoretical work using simple point-charge and induced-dipole ("dynamic coupling") mechanisms.^[4, 6, 52] The Judd-Ofelt parameters may be determined from effective dipole-moment operators. Such calculations will be the subject of a future study.

Acknowledgements

L. Hu acknowledges financial support from China Scholarship Council that enabled his visit to New Zealand and the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant Nos. 11011120083, 10904139 and 11074315.

S. Xia acknowledges supports of the national science foundation of China under grant Nos. 10874173 and 11074245.

M. Yin acknowledges financial support of the Knowledge Innovation Project of The Chinese Academy of Sciences under grant No. KJCX2-YW-M11, and the Special Foundation for Talents of Anhui Province, China under grant No. 2007Z021.

References

- [1] B. G. Wybourne, *Spectroscopic Properties of Rare Earths* (Interscience, New York, 1965).
- [2] G. H. Dieke, *Spectra and Energy Levels of Rare Earth Ions in Crystals* (Interscience, New York, 1968).
- [3] W. T. Carnall, P. R. Fields, K. Rajnak, *J. Chem. Phys.* **49**, 4424 (1968).
- [4] G. K. Liu, B. Jacquier (Eds.), *Spectroscopic Properties of Rare Earths in Optical Materials* (Springer, New York, 2005).
- [5] D. J. Newman, B. Ng, *Crystal Field Handbook* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [6] G. W. Burdick, M. F. Reid, *Handbook on the physics and chemistry of rare earth*, vol. 37 (Eds: K. A. Gschneidner, Jr., J. –C. G. Bünzli, V. K. Pecharsky), chapter 232, North Holland, Amsterdam, 61 (2007).
- [7] M. F. Reid, L. van Pieterson, R. T. Wegh, A. Meijerink, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 14744 (2000).
- [8] M. Karbowiak, A. Urbanowicz, M. F. Reid, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 115125 (2007).
- [9] C. K. Duan, P. A. Tanner, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **20**, 215228 (2008).
- [10] C. K. Duan, P.A. Tanner, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **114**, 6055 (2010).
- [11] D. J. Newman, B. Ng, *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, **52**, 699 (1989).
- [12] B. Henderson, R. H. Bartram, *Crystal-Field Engineering of Solid-State Laser Materials*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [13] J. C. Morrison, K. Rajnak, *Phys. Rev. A* **4**, 536 (1971).
- [14] E. Eliav, U. Kaldor, Y. Ishikawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 225 (1995).
- [15] M. M. Ellis, D. J. Newman, *Phys. Lett.* **21**, 508 (1966).
- [16] B. Ng, D. J. Newman, *J. Chem. Phys.* **87**, 7110 (1987).
- [17] M. G. Brik, K. Ogasawara, *First-principles Calculations of Spectral Properties of Rare Earth and Transition Metal Ions in Crystals* (Transworld Research Network, Kerala, 2006).
- [18] F. Ruiperez, A. Barandiarán, L. Seijo, *J. Chem. Phys.* **123**, 244703 (2005).
- [19] J. L. Pascual, J. Schamps, Z. Barandiarán, L. Seijo, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 104105 (2006).
- [20] G. Sánchez-Sanz, L. Seijo, Z. Barandiarán, *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 024505 (2009).
- [21] J. Andriesson, E. van der Kolk, P. Dorenbos, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 075124 (2007).
- [22] S. Watanabe, T. Ishii, K. Fujimaru, K. Ogasawara, *J. Solid State Chem.* **179**, 2438 (2006).
- [23] V. Hurtubise, K. F. Freed, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **83**, 465 (1993).
- [24] A. R. Bryson, M. F. Reid, *J. Alloys Comp.* **275-277**, 284 (1998).

- [25] M. J. Lee, M. F. Reid, M. D. Faucher, G. W. Burdick, *J. Alloys Comp.* **323-324**, 636 (2001).
- [26] M. F. Reid, C. K. Duan, H. W. Zhou, *J. Alloys Comp.* **488**, 591 (2009).
- [27] M. F. Reid, L. Hu, S. Frank, C. K. Duan, S. Xia, M. Yin. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **18**, 2649 (2010).
- [28] A. Rosen, D. E. Ellis, *J. Chem. Phys.* **62**, 3039 (1975).
- [29] H. Adachi, M. Tsukada, C. Satoko, *J. Phys. Soc. Japn.* **45**, 875 (1978).
- [30] S. Nomura, T. Takizawa, S. Endo, M. Kai, *Phys. Stat. Sol. (c)* **8**, 2739 (2006).
- [31] D. J. Newman, *Adv. Phys.*, **20**, 197 (1971).
- [32] M. F. Reid, G. W. Burdick, H. J. Kooy, *J. Alloys Comp.* **207-208**, 78 (1994).
- [33] K. Ogasawara, S. Watanabe, H. Toyoshima, T. Ishii, M. G. Brik, H. Ikeno, I. Tanaka, *J. Solid State Chem.* **178**, 412 (2005).
- [34] A. V. Goryunov, A. I. Popov, N. M. Khaidukov, P. P. Fedorov, *Mater. Res. Bull.* **27**, 213 (1992).
- [35] L. van Pieteron, M. F. Reid, R. T. Wegh, S. Soverna, A. Meijerink, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 045113 (2002).
- [36] C. Reber, H. U. Guedel, G. Meyer, T. Schleid, C. A. Daul, *Inorg. Chem.* **28**, 3249 (1989).
- [37] P. A. Tanner, C. S. K. Mak, N. M. Edelstein, K. M. Murdoch, G. Liu, J. Huang, L. Seijo, Z. Barandianrán, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **125**, 13225 (2003).
- [38] C. Görrler-Walrand, K. Binnemans, *Handbook on the Physics and Chemistry of Rare Earths*, vol. 23 (Eds.: K. A. Gschneidner Jr., L. Eyring), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 121, (1996).
- [39] A. K. Cheetham, B. E. F. Fender, M. J. Cooper, *J. Phys. C* **4**, 3107 (1971).
- [40] L. van Pieteron, R. T. Wegh, A. Meijerink, M. F. Reid, *J. Chem. Phys.* **115**, 9382 (2001).
- [41] E. F. Bertaut, Y. Fur, S. Aleonard, *Z. Kristallogr.* **187**, 279 (1989).
- [42] A. Nakatsuka, A. Yoshiasa, T. Yamanaka, *Acta Crystallogr. B* **55**, 266 (1999).
- [43] C. A. Morrison, R. P. Leavitt, *Handbook on the Physics and Chemistry of Rare Earths*, vol. 5 (Eds.: K. A. Gschneidner, L. Eyring), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 461 (1996).
- [44] J. Lü, Y. Huang, Y. Tao, H. J. Seo, *J. Alloys Comp.* **500**, 134 (2010).
- [45] Z. Tian, H. Liang, W. Chen, Q. Su, G. Zhang, G. Yang, *Opt. Express* **17**, 957 (2009).
- [46] W. T. Carnall, G. L. Goodman, K. Rajnak, R. S. Rana, *J. Chem. Phys.* **90**, 3443(1989).
- [47] B. Ng, D. J. Newman, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **19**: L585 (1986).
- [48] B. R. Judd, *Phys. Rev.* **127**, 750 (1962).
- [49] G. S. Ofelt, *J. Chem. Phys.* **37**, 511 (1962).
- [50] M. F. Reid, B. Ng, *Mol. Phys.* **67**, 407 (1989).
- [51] M. Kotzian, T. Fox, N. Rosch, *J. Phys. Chem.* **99**, 600 (1995).

- [52] M. F. Reid, J. J. Dallara, F. S. Richardson, *J. Chem. Phys.* **79**, 5743 (1983).
- [53] G. W. Burdick, F. S. Richardson, *J. Alloys Comp.* **275-277**, 379 (1998).
- [54] J. P. R. Wells, M. Yamaga, T. P. J. Han, H. G. Gallagher, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **12**, 5297 (2000).
- [55] M. Mujaji, J. R. Wells, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **21**, 255402 (2009).
- [56] P. A. Tanner, L. Fu, L. Ning, B. M. Cheng, M. G. Brik, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **19**, 216213 (2007).
- [57] J. Gracia, L. Seijo, Z. Barandiarán, D. Curulla, H. Neimansverdriet, W. van Gennip, *J. Lumin.* **128**, 1248 (2008).
- [58] C. A. Morrison, D. E. Wortman, N. Karayianis, *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.*, **9**, L191 (1976).

Table 1. 4f and 5d energy levels of Ce^{3+} in $LiYF_4$. Units are cm^{-1} . The calculated energies for the 5d states have been shifted by a constant amount so that the average matches the experimental average of 45277 cm^{-1} . Before this correction the calculated averages were 49490 cm^{-1} , 30864 cm^{-1} , 48480 cm^{-1} and 81176 cm^{-1} respectively.

	Experiment ^[a]	Calculation ^[b]	$(CeF_8)^{5-}$	$(CeLi_4F_{12})^{5-}$	$(CeLi_8Y_4F_{12})^{11+}$
4f ¹		0	0	0	0
		129	368	184	556
		492	414	466	1347
		2807	2650	2642	3184
		2896	2777	2657	3506
		3041	3010	3091	4289
		3646	3265	3094	4573
5d ¹	33433	35873	33348	35395	31525
	41101	41760	42179	41781	40807
	48564	47568	48339	47076	49308
	50499	48616	48957	47660	49641
	52790	52568	53564	54475	55102

[a] Experiment energy levels from Ref. [40].

[b] DV- $X\alpha$ calculation from Chapter 5 of Ref. [17].

Table 2. Crystal-field parameters and spin-orbit interaction parameters of Ce^{3+} , Pr^{3+} and Nd^{3+} in LiYF_4 . Units are cm^{-1} .

Parameters		$\text{Ce}^{3+[\text{a}]}$	$\text{Pr}^{3+[\text{b}]}$	$\text{Nd}^{3+[\text{c}]}$	$(\text{CeF}_8)^{5-}$	$(\text{CeLi}_4\text{F}_{12})^{5-}$	$(\text{CeLi}_8\text{Y}_4\text{F}_{12})^{11+}$
4f	$B_0^2(\text{ff})$	481	489	409	618	-819	2404
	$B_0^4(\text{ff})$	-1150	-1043	-1135	-538	-435	1350
	$B_4^4(\text{ff})$	-1228	-1242	-1216	-966	-485	-874
	$B_0^6(\text{ff})$	-89	-42	27	143	466	-345
	$B_4^6(\text{ff})$	-1213	-1213	-1083	-818	-737	-1071
	ζ_{4f}	615	731	871	752	752	910
5d	$B_0^2(\text{dd})$	4673	7290		4075	-612	3339
	$B_0^4(\text{dd})$	-18649	-14900		-14296	-11012	-19136
	$B_4^4(\text{dd})$	-23871	-17743		-25162	-23783	-29128
	ζ_{5d}	1082	906		841	773	365

[a] Extrapolated and fitted parameters from Ref. [40].

[b] Fitted parameters from Ref. [7]. Signs of $B_4^4(\text{ff})$ and $B_4^6(\text{ff})$ and $B_4^4(\text{dd})$ have been changed to match the axis choice of our calculation by rotating $\pi/4$ about z axis.

[c] Fitted parameters from Ref. [38].

Table 3. 4f and 5d energy levels of Ce^{3+} in $\text{Cs}_2\text{NaYCl}_6$ (unit: cm^{-1}). The calculated energies in this work for the 5d states have been shifted by a constant amount so that the average matches the experimental average of 36015 cm^{-1} . Before this correction the calculated average was 13806 cm^{-1} .

	Irrep	Degeneracy	Experiment ^[a]	Calculation ^[b]	Calculation ^[c]
4f ¹	Γ_{7u}	2	0	0	0
	Γ_{8u}	4	597	831	598
	Γ_{7u}	2	2167	2318	2536
	Γ_{8u}	4	2691	3019	3053
	Γ_{6u}	2	3085	3376	3478
5d ¹	Γ_{8g}	4	28196	25510	29244
	Γ_{7g}	2	29435	26716	30312
	Γ_{8g}	4	47125	47263	45638

[a] Experiment energy levels from Ref. [37].

[b] *Ab initio* embedded cluster calculations from Ref. [37].

[c] DV-X α calculated on $(\text{CeCl}_6)^{3-}$ embedded in $\text{Cs}_2\text{NaYCl}_6$ microcrystal in this work.

Table 4. Crystal-field parameters and spin-orbit interaction parameters of Ce^{3+} , Pr^{3+} , and Nd^{3+}

in $\text{Cs}_2\text{NaYCl}_6$. Units are cm^{-1} .

Parameters		$\text{Ce}^{3+[\text{a}]}$	$\text{Pr}^{3+[\text{b}]}$	$\text{Nd}^{3+[\text{c}]}$	Calculation ^[\text{d}]
4f	$B_0^4(\text{ff})$	2208	2279	1966	2230
	$B_0^6(\text{ff})$	250	293	258	310
	ζ_{4f}	624	747	872	732
5d	$B_0^4(\text{dd})$	38709			33530
	ζ_{5d}	793			683

[a] Fitted parameters from Ref. [37].

[b] Fitted parameters from Ref. [53].

[c] Fitted parameters from Ref. [43].

[d] DV-X α calculated on $(\text{CeCl}_6)^{3-}$ embedded in $\text{Cs}_2\text{NaYCl}_6$ microcrystal in this work.

Table 5. 4f and 5d energy levels of Ce^{3+} in CaF_2 (unit: cm^{-1}). The calculated energies for the 5d states have been shifted by a constant amount so that the average matches the experimental average of 44929 cm^{-1} . Before this correction the calculated averages were 48119 cm^{-1} and 54145 cm^{-1} respectively.

	Irrep	Degeneracy	Experiment ^[a]	Calculation ^[b]	Calculation ^[c]
4f ¹	Γ_{8u}	4	0	0	0
	Γ_{7u}	2	430	468	420
	Γ_{8u}	4	2106	2750	2910
	Γ_{6u}	2	2194	2863	2964
	Γ_{7u}	2	2963	4412	3893
5d ¹	Γ_{8g}	4	32267	34960	33428
	Γ_{8g}	4	52857	51091	52156
	Γ_{7g}	2	54395	52543	53476

[a] Experiment from Ref. [40].

[b] DV-X α calculations by S. Watanabe from Ref. [17].

[c] DV-X α calculations on $(\text{CeF}_8)^{5-}$ embedded in CaF_2 microcrystal in this work.

Table 6. Crystal-field parameters and spin-orbit interaction parameters of Ce^{3+} in CaF_2 . Units

are cm^{-1} .

Parameters		Experiment ^[a]	Calculation ^[b]
4f	$B_0^4(\text{ff})$	-1900	-2041
	$B_0^6(\text{ff})$	500	888
	ζ_{4f}	615	838
5d	$B_0^4(\text{dd})$	-44016	-40012
	ζ_{5d}	1082	926

[a] Fitted parameters from Ref. [40].

[b] Calculated parameters in this work.

Table 7. 4f and 5d energy levels of Ce^{3+} in KY_3F_{10} . Units are cm^{-1} . The calculated energies for the 5d states have been shifted by a constant amount so that the average matches with each other. Before this correction the calculated averages were 49038 cm^{-1} and 27794 cm^{-1} .

	Calculation ^[a]	Calculation ^[b]
	0	0
	718	324
	1579	518
4f ¹	2750	2590
	3339	2860
	3992	2866
	4484	3371
	38553	34367
	46215	43567
5d ¹	52184	52994
	53232	56644
	55007	57619

[a] DV-X α calculations from Chapter 5 of Ref. [17].

[b] DV-X α calculations on $(CeF_8)^{5-}$ embedded in KY_3F_{10} microcrystal in this work.

Table 8. Crystal-field parameters and spin-orbit interaction parameters of Pr^{3+} , Nd^{3+} and Ce^{3+}

in KY_3F_{10} . Units are cm^{-1} .

Parameters		$\text{Pr}^{3+[\text{a}]}$	$\text{Nd}^{3+[\text{b}]}$	Calculation ^[\text{c}]
4f	$B_0^2(\text{ff})$	-664	-670	-455
	$B_0^4(\text{ff})$	-1543	-1484	-2084
	$B_4^4(\text{ff})$	343	569	237
	$B_0^6(\text{ff})$	891	698	929
	$B_4^6(\text{ff})$	-30	9	-40
	ζ_{4f}	745	881	738
5d	$B_0^2(\text{dd})$			-5192
	$B_0^4(\text{dd})$			-46002
	$B_4^4(\text{dd})$			-11702
	ζ_{5d}			832

[a] Fitted parameters from Ref. [54].

[b] Fitted parameters from Ref. [55].

[c] Calculated parameters in this work.

Table 9. 4f and 5d energy levels of Ce³⁺ in YAG. Units are cm⁻¹. The calculated energies for the 5d states have been shifted by a constant amount so that the average matches the experimental average of 36570 cm⁻¹. Before this correction the calculated averages were 33622 cm⁻¹ and 24429 cm⁻¹ respectively.

	Experiment ^[a]	Calculation ^[b]	Calculation ^[c]
4f ¹		0	0
			340
			800
			2370
			2550
			2790
			4260
5d ¹	21858	18510	23497
	29438	26130	28823
	38314	42540	40625
	44366	47010	42467
	48876	48660	47439

[a] Experiment from Ref. [56].

[b] Calculation from Ref. [57].

[c] DV-X α calculations on (CeO₈)¹³⁻ embedded in YAG microcrystal in this work.

Table 10. Crystal parameters and spin-orbit interaction parameters of Ce^{3+} in YAG. Units are cm^{-1} .

Parameters		$\text{Ce}^{3+[\text{a}]}$	$\text{Ce}^{3+[\text{b}]}$	Calculation ^[\text{c}]
4f	$B_0^2(\text{ff})$	-465	-380	-275
	$B_2^2(\text{ff})$	96	261	449
	$B_0^4(\text{ff})$	-3739	-3008	-2154
	$B_2^4(\text{ff})$	380	573	-74
	$B_4^4(\text{ff})$	1602	1105	1038
	$B_0^6(\text{ff})$	901	1227	842
	$B_2^6(\text{ff})$	-307	-397	79
	$B_4^6(\text{ff})$	2136	1799	1613
	$B_6^6(\text{ff})$	-246	-3	-740
	ζ_{4f}	647		752
5d	$B_0^2(\text{dd})$	-6099		-736
	$B_2^2(\text{dd})$	1259		4885
	$B_0^4(\text{dd})$	-50042		-48389
	$B_2^4(\text{dd})$	5374		4249
	$B_4^4(\text{dd})$	19626		18077
	ζ_{5d}	991		770

[a] Fitted parameters from Ref. [56]. Signs have been transformed to match our axis choice by rotating $\pi/2$ about z axis.

[b] Parameters estimated by C. A. Morrison, see Ref. [58].

[c] Calculated parameters in this work.

Figure 1. 5d components of calculated energy levels in a $(\text{CeY}_4\text{Li}_8\text{F}_{12})^{11+}$ cluster.

