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A highly correlated CuO_2 cluster model is utilized to interpret the core level Auger and X-ray emission decay spectra for YBa_2Cu_3O_7 and CuO. The evidence indicates that the initial-state shakeup states fall to states of the same symmetry before the core level decay, provided they have a shakeup excitation energy much greater than the core level width.
Previously reported [1,2] core level Auger (AES) and x-ray emission (XES) data are interpreted within a highly correlated CuO₆ cluster model for the high-temperature superconductors (HTSC's), YBa₂Cu₃O₇₋ₓ and La-Ba-CuO₄ (herein referred as 123 and La). The LaMnV Auger lineshape is reported here for the first time and is interpreted consistently with the LuVV lineshape and XES data. This work clearly indicates, contrary to previous reports [1,3], that the initial-core shake-up (ICSU) states do not directly decay, but rather relax to the primary core-state before decay. The XES data dramatically reveal the change of character of the valence band (VB) states between CuO and 123.

The basic electronic structure of the HTSC's can be described by an extended Hubbard model, characterized by the transfer or hopping integral t, the Cu and O orbital energies e₄ and e₇, the core polarization energy Qₓ, the intra-site Coulomb repulsion energies U₈ and U₉, and the inter-site repulsion energies U₆ and U₇ (i.e. between neighboring Cu–O and O–O atoms). The extended Hubbard model is most appropriate when the U's are large relative to the band widths [3], i.e. when correlation effects dominate covalent or hybridization effects. A CuO₆(2₉₋₁)– cluster model, which is also reasonably valid when U >> t, simplifies the model [3]. Both La and CuO contain CuO₆ groups [4], having 4 short and 2 long Cu–O bonds. The 123 HTSC contains CuO₆ and planar CuO₄ groups [4]. The different n may alter the relative intensities of various features, but similar features are present in each case. The different bond lengths may increase the widths of the spectral features, but little else since correlation dominates.

The CuO₆(2₉₋₁)– cluster has one hole shared between the Cu 3d and O 2p shells in the ground state, which we term the v (valence) states. The spectroscopic final states reflect multi-hole states, e.g. v², cv (c = core) etc.
We indicate the location of the $v$ holes by $d$ (Cu 3d) or $p$ (O 2p). In the case of two holes on the oxygens, we distinguish two holes on the same O ($p^1$), on ortho neighboring O atoms ($pp'$), or on para O atoms ($pp'$) of the cluster. Furthermore, neighboring $pp'$ holes can dimerize [5], so we distinguish between two holes in bonded ($pp'$) and antibonded ($pp'$) O pairs. Most of the O atoms actually participate in two CuO$_4$ clusters. Consistent with previous work [6], we account for this by defining the effective parameter, $\varepsilon_p = \varepsilon_p' + U_p$, where $U_p$ includes the interaction of a hole in an O $p$ orbital with its environment. In general $U_p$ will be less than $U_p'$ due to polarization.

The $v$ states, as reflected by the theoretical DOS [7], can be described as having the Cu-O bonding ($+b$) and antibonding ($-b$) orbitals centered at 4 and 0 eV and the nonbonding Cu and O orbitals at 2 eV. The O features each have a width $2\Gamma = 4$ eV due to the O-O bonding and antibonding character and the Cu-O dispersion. The $+b$ and $-b$ wavefunctions can be expressed as

$\psi_b = d \cos \phi_1 - p \sin \phi_1$

$\psi_a = d \sin \phi_1 + p \cos \phi_1$

where $\phi_1 = 0.5 \tan^{-1}(2t/\Delta)$. We also define the Cu-O hybridization shift $\delta_1 = 0.5 \sqrt{\Delta^2 + 4t^2} - \Delta/2$, which is utilized in Table 1 to give the energies. In this picture, the ground state of an average CuO$_4$ cluster is located at 1 eV having the energy $\varepsilon_e - \delta_1/2 = \varepsilon_e - 1$, which we use as a reference energy for the excited $v_1$, $v_2$, and $v_3$ states reflected in the core level spectra. In CuO, the hybridization shift $\Gamma$ is smaller, and we shall see below that $\delta_{Cu} - \delta_{Cu}$ has increased to 1 eV.

Recently [8] we consistently interpreted the VB photoelectron spectra (UPS and XPS). Most of the features in the UPS and XPS are also reflected
in the AES and XES, so that we review these assignments here. In 123, the states were assigned as indicated in Table 1 [8,10]. Calculated photoemission intensities, their variation with $\Delta$, and photon energy dependencies confirm these assignments [8]. In CuO [9], we have previously assigned a feature at 5.5 eV to $pp^\pi$ and $pp^\sigma$ and at 3 eV to $dp$. The character switch of state 1 from mostly $dp$ to $pp^\pi$ and vice versa for state 2 between CuO and 123 arises because $\Delta$ decreases from 1 eV in CuO to 0 eV in 123. The reduction in $\Delta$ as indicated by the UPS data is consistent with the Cu 2p XPS data and with the XES data to be discussed below.

The "shakeup" or "many-particle" features at 9.5, 12.5, and 16 eV have also been assigned as indicated in Table 1 [8]. The $pp^\sigma$ state has been assigned to the "mystery" feature at 9.5 eV. Such a feature also appears for CuO [9,11] so that this feature is not unique to the HTSC's. This feature cannot arise from the $p^2$ final state because $U_\pi$ is around 12-13 eV, much too large to cause a feature at 9.5 eV. In fact we have found evidence [8] for the existence of the $p^2$ feature around 16 eV in 123. Finally the $d^2$ state is known to cause the 12.5 eV feature [12].

Cu 2p and O 1s core level XPS. In order to understand the XES and AES data, we first characterize the initial state, which is reflected directly in the Cu 2p and O 1s XPS data. The primary and satellite features seen in the Cu 2p XPS spectrum for CuO [13] and 123 or La [1,14] are known to arise from the $cp$ and $cd$ states, respectively [3], having the energies given in Table 1. The relative satellite intensity, $I(cp)/I(cd)$ decreases from 0.55 in CuO to 0.37 in 123 as determined from the experimental data [1]. The energy separation, $E(cd) - E(cp)$ increases from 8.7 eV in CuO to 9.2 eV in 123 [1].

The primary ($cp$) and satellite ($cd$) wavefunctions can be written similar to eq. (1), with hybridization angle $\phi_c = 0.5 \tan^{-1}(2t/(\Delta-Q))$ [3]. In the
sudden approximation, the intensities are proportional to the overlap between
the ground state wavefunction, \( \varphi_0 \), and the final states, so that \( I(dp) = \cos^2(\Delta \theta_0) \) and \( I(cd) = \sin^2(\Delta \theta_0) \) [3]. Thus the satellite intensity increases
with change in the hybridization angles between the \( v \) and \( cv \) states. In the
ground \( v \) state, the hole is shared equally in the \( p \) and \( d \) orbitals since \( \theta_1 \approx 45^\circ \), in the primary \( cv \) state it is mostly in the \( p \) orbital since \( \theta_c \approx 78^\circ \). The
changes between \( CuO \) and \( 123 \) noted above are just that expected for a
decrease in \( \Delta \) and reflect an increased covalency in 123 [15].

The large width of the primary \( cp \) peak is believed to arise from the
mixing with the \( cd \) state [3,15]. The \( cd \) state has a large width due to the
large core-hole, valence-hole interaction, indeed, the satellite actually reveals
the \( cd \) multiplet structure. Evidence that the primary \( cp \) peak width arises
from the \( cd \) interaction comes from the \( Cu \) halide data [3], which show a direct
correlation of the primary \( cp \) peak width with the satellite \( cd \) peak intensity.
We do not believe that the primary peak width arises from the \( O \) \( p \) band width
as proposed by others [16].

The \( O 1s \) spectra have been reported by many authors; however, it is
seriously altered by impurities such as \( O^{2-} \) and \( CO^{2-} \) on the sample surface
[17]. Recent data [18] from single crystal samples of the \( La \) material cleaved
in-situ are expected to be reasonably free of impurity effects. The \( cp^\ast \) and
\( cp^{\ast\prime} \) states listed in Table 1 are believed to account for the tailing off of the
spectra seen in these spectra (this will be positively identified upon
examination of the XES data). Consistent with the sudden approximation, the
\( cp \) state is not seen in the \( O 1s \) XPS because now both the \( v \) and \( cv \) states
have similar hybridization angles, i.e. the valence hole is mostly in the \( d \)
orbital in both cases.
We will find below that the ISSU process, which is responsible for the satellites in the XPS noted above, does not produce satellites in the AES or XES data, because the ISSU states generally "relax" to the primary states of the same symmetry before the core level decay. Such a relaxation is expected when the ISSU excitation energy is larger than the core level width [19].

Previously, vanderLaan et al. [3] suggested the intensity of these ISSU states in the XPS should be quantitatively reflected in the intensity of the Auger satellites found in the LuVV lineshapes for the Cu halides. The data do not indicate this however. While \( I(\text{cd})/I(\text{cp}) \) increases from 0.45 for CuBr₂ to 0.8 for CuF₂, the Auger satellites do not increase [3]. We previously [1] indicated that a fraction of these ISSU states probably resulted in Auger satellites for the HTSC's, and that this fraction increased with the increasing covalency of the HTSC material. Evidence presented here indicates rather that the ISSU states relax before the core level decay to states of the same symmetry, provided they have a ISSU excitation energy much greater than the core level width. We believe this to be a general result, at least in the Cu* materials.

The Cu L₃ and O K XES data. The O K XES data [2] in Figure 1a confirms our assignment of the O XPS, and clearly shows the dependency of the ISSU state relaxation on the excitation energy and symmetry. The principal XPS peak arises from the cd state, and it decays to the dp state since the x-ray emission process is intra-atomic in nature. Therefore the principal O XES peak aligns with the dp feature in the UPS as shown in Fig. 1. The cp* state does not mix with the primary cd state; therefore, it does not relax before the decay, but decays directly to the pp* (and perhaps a little also to the pp*) state. This accounts for the feature around 6.5 eV in the XES, just 3 eV above the pp* feature in the UPS. The shift of 3 eV matches the energy
difference between the cp^± and cd core hole states. The cp^± state can mix with the cd state, therefore it can relax to the cd state, but it does this slowly because of the small excitation energy of 0.5 eV. Therefore, the cp^± state decays either directly to the pp^± state, or relaxes to the cd state, which then decays to the dp state. This explains the photon energy dependence seen [2] in the data of Fig. 1a. At high photon energy, the sudden approximation is more valid, creating a larger intensity for the cp^± state, and consequently a larger pp^± contribution around 2.5 eV in the XES.

The Cu L_3 XES data [2,20] shown in Figure 1b dramatically reveals the switch in character of the 1 and 2 v\^2 states between CuO and 123. Again, the satellite cd initial state relaxes to the cp state before the decay so that the XES reflects primarily the dp DOS. In CuO the XES spectrum peaks at 3 eV, in 123 it falls around 4.2 eV, very near where we indicated the dp states fall in the UPS data. The large intensity in the CuO XES extending above the Fermi level is believed to be an experimental artifact [20].

The Cu L_3VV and LaM_2V Auger data. Comparison of the L_3VV data for CuO [11] and 123 [1] are shown in Fig. 2. The data reveal features at 7 (the two-center feature), 15, and 19 eV, which we previously [1] attributed to dp, d^1, and d^3 final states, utilizing a v^3 final state model. The d^3 states were attributed to a combination of 3 different processes; 1) initial state shakeoff (ISSO) followed by Auger decay (g.s. + hv \rightarrow L_v \rightarrow d^1), 2) Coster-Kronig (CK) decay followed by Auger decay (g.s. + hv \rightarrow L_s \rightarrow L_v \rightarrow d^1), and 3) ISSU followed by Auger decay (g.s. + hv \rightarrow L_v \rightarrow L_v \rightarrow d^1, where e denotes the excited electron). The ISSO and CK processes accounted for all of the d^3 component in CuO, and the ISSU process was believed, as mentioned above, to account for the increasing d^3 component in La and 123 [1].

We report and interpret here, for the first time, the LaM_2VV Auger
lineshapes for the 123 SC. The sample preparation, treatment, and instrument utilized were described previously [1]. Fig. 2 compares the \( \text{La}_{\text{M}_{\text{III}}V} \) spectra for CuO [124] and 123, and identifies the various features. The \( \text{La}_{\text{M}_{\text{III}}V} \) lineshapes reflect the \( cv^1 \) DOS, the main features arising from the cdp final state, and the satellite from the cdp state apparently resulting from the similar ISSO, CK, and ISSU processes defined above. However, Fig. 2 reveals a most interesting point; although 123 shows an increased satellite in the \( \text{La}_{\text{L}_{\text{III}}V} \) relative to CuO, it is not increased in the \( \text{La}_{\text{M}_{\text{III}}V} \). This indicates strongly that the ISSU process is not responsible for the increased satellite in the \( \text{La}_{\text{L}_{\text{III}}V} \), because then it should increase the satellite in both 123 lineshapes.

Since only the primary cp core-hole state Auger decays, and this process is also known to be strictly intra-atomic, the \( \text{La}_{\text{L}_{\text{III}}V} \) lineshape in our current \( v^1 \) final state model, reflects the \( d^1p \) DOS, as it is distributed among the \( v^1 \) states listed in Table 1. Thus the features at 7, 15, and 19 eV arise naturally from the \( d^1p^*, d^1p, \) and \( d^1p^5 \) final states. The ISSO and CK processes also contribute to the "satellite" contribution at 19 eV just as in CuO. The \( d^1p^* \) state does not appear in the \( \text{La}_{\text{L}_{\text{III}}V} \) lineshape because it does not have the same symmetry possessed by all the other \( v^1 \) final states and the \( cv \) initial state. The increased "satellite" feature at 19 eV in the HTSC's arises apparently because of increased configuration mixing between the \( d^1p \) and \( d^1p^5 \) states. Its intensity is increased in 123 relative to CuO because the energy separation (before hybridization) between \( d^1p \) and \( d^1p^5 \) has decreased from 3.8 eV in CuO to 2.5 eV in 123. We have indicated this mixing in Table 1 by adding the hybridization shifts \( \delta \) to the energy expressions for these two states.

The \( \text{La}_{\text{M}_{\text{III}}V} \) lineshape reflects the cdp DOS. The mixing of the other states (\( cd^1, cpp^5, cpp^5, \) and \( cpp^5; \) the latter three are not listed in Table 1)
with the cdp state is small because of the large energy separations involved. The cp state is close to cdp; however, it falls in between the 3L and 4L multiplets of the cdp state. Although it may have some intensity, it surely does not contribute to the CK + SU satellite around 25 eV in either CuO or 123. The exchange splitting (2K) between the 3p and d holes is known to be very large [3], so we include it explicitly in Table 1 to account for the $\pm 4$L multiplets.

The 0 KVV lineshape is severely altered by impurities on the sample surfaces, and no single crystal lineshape data have been reported. The 0 KVV lineshapes for CuO and Cu$_2$O have been reported [11], and they have the primary dp or pt features, respectively, around 19 eV. A very small satellite appears around 7 eV in Cu$_2$O which we attribute to the pp state. A much larger and broader satellite around 7 to 14 eV in CuO appears, which we attribute to the dp state around 14 eV as well as a smaller amount to the dpp state around 7 eV. Thus the dp and dp states appear in both the Cu L$_{2,3}$VV and O Auger lineshapes for Cu oxides, except their primary and satellite roles are reversed.

In summary, we have interpreted XES and AES data utilizing a highly correlated CuO cluster model. Both the XES data and the previously interpreted UPS data reveal the reversal in character of the VB states between CuO and the HTSC's. We have also shown that the initial-state shake-up states evident in core level XPS, do not generally produce satellites in the core emission spectra, because they relax to the primary core states of the same symmetry, provided the ISSU excitation energy is greater than the core level width.
TABLE I

Summary of hole states revealed in the spectroscopic data, and estimated energies using the following optimal values for the Hubbard parameters in eV:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\delta_1 = 2$</th>
<th>$\delta_2 = 0.5, 0.8$</th>
<th>$\alpha = 1, 0.5$</th>
<th>$\Delta = 0, 1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$e_v = 2$</td>
<td>$e_v = 2, 3$</td>
<td>$Q_0 = 9$, $10.2$</td>
<td>$E = 4$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Energy expression</th>
<th>Calc. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Exp. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.S. and IPRS, $\psi$</td>
<td>$d$ $e_v - \delta_1 \neq \Gamma$</td>
<td>0 $\neq$ 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>heavily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$ $e_v + \delta_1 \neq \Gamma$</td>
<td>4 $\neq$ 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS and XES, $\psi^*$</td>
<td>$1^d$ pp $e_v + \Delta - \delta_1 + \alpha$</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>heavily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2^d$ dp $e_v + U_{pp} + \delta_1 + \alpha$</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3^d$ pp$^*$ $e_v + \Delta + U_{pp} + \delta_1 + \alpha$</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4^d$ pp$^*$ $e_v + \Delta + U_{pp} + \delta_1 + \alpha$</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5^d$ $d^2$ $e_v + U_d + \alpha$</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Cu sat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6^d$ $p^2$ $e_v + \Delta + U_d + \alpha$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cu 2p XPS, $\psi^*$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Energy expression</th>
<th>Calc. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Exp. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$cp$</td>
<td>$e_v + \Delta + \alpha$</td>
<td>$e_v + 1$</td>
<td>$E_{sp}$</td>
<td>main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cd$</td>
<td>$e_v + Q_0 + \alpha$</td>
<td>$e_v + 10$</td>
<td>$E_{sp} + 9.2$</td>
<td>sat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O 1s XPS, $\psi^*$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Energy expression</th>
<th>Calc. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Exp. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$cd$</td>
<td>$e_v + \alpha$</td>
<td>$e_v + 1$</td>
<td>$E_{sp}$</td>
<td>main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cp$</td>
<td>$e_v + \Delta + \alpha$</td>
<td>$e_v + 1$</td>
<td>$E_{sp}$</td>
<td>main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cp^*$</td>
<td>$e_v + \Delta + U_{pp} + \alpha$</td>
<td>$e_v + 3$</td>
<td>$E_{sp} + 2$</td>
<td>tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cp</td>
<td>$e_v + \Delta + Q_0 + \alpha$</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>not obs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cu L$_{VV}$ ABS, $\psi^*$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Energy expression</th>
<th>Calc. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Exp. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$dpp^*$</td>
<td>$2e_v + 2U_{pp} + \alpha$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 cent. feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$dpp^*$</td>
<td>$2e_v + U_{pp} + 2U_{pp} + \alpha$</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no mixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$dp$</td>
<td>$e_v + e_v + U_{pp} + 2U_{pp} + \delta_1 + \alpha$</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>main feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$dp^*$</td>
<td>$2e_v + U_{pp} + 2U_{pp} + \delta_1 + \alpha$</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>sat. feature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cu L$_{MM}$ V ABS, $\psi^*$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Energy expression</th>
<th>Calc. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Exp. E. (eV)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$cdp^*$</td>
<td>$e_v + U_{pp} + e_v + U_{pp} + \delta_1 + \alpha$</td>
<td>$e_v + 9$</td>
<td>$E_{sp} + 10$</td>
<td>main, 1L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cp^*$</td>
<td>$e_v + e_v + U_{pp} + \alpha$</td>
<td>$e_v + 17$</td>
<td>$E_{sp} + 18$</td>
<td>main, 1L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$cd$</td>
<td>$e_v + e_v + U_{pp} + 2Q_0 + \alpha$</td>
<td>$e_v + 30.5$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>not observed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^*$Parameters for 123 indicated first, those for CuO second.

$^a$The dominant character in the hybridized states is given.

$^b$The calculated E is defined relative to the ground state $\psi^*$ energy $e_v$.

$^c$The calculated E is defined relative to the ground $\psi^*$ (d) state energy $e_v$.

$^d$The dominant character switches as described in the text, and thus the sign in front of $\delta_1$ is the opposite for CuO.
Figure Captions

1a) Comparison of O K XES data for 123 taken at the indicated photon excitation energies (from Ref. 2).

1b) Comparison of Cu L23 XES data for 123 (Ref. 2) and CuO (Ref. 20).

1c) UPS data for 123 (hv = 74 eV from Ref. 10).

Fig. 2) Comparison of Auger data for the materials indicated. Cu L_{33}VV data for CuO and 123 from refs. 25 and 1. Cu L_{32}M_{34}V data for CuO from ref. 24 and for 123, this work.

The L_{33}VV data is on a 2-hole binding energy scale = E_{L3} - E_{L3}, and the L_{32}M_{34}V on a 1-hole scale = E_{L3} - E_{M3} - E_{M3}, where E_{L3} = 933.4 and E_{M3} = 77.3 eV (9,11).
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