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Overlap between neighboring atomic wavefunctions is a central feature of conducting solids. In heavy fermion materials, f-electron orbitals in the lattice lie on the boundary between fully localized and hybridized in an energy band. This dichotomy gives rise to a range of behaviors including antiferromagnetism, unconventional superconductivity, and the ability to tune from one ground state to the other continuously. Measuring the degree of this hybridization by traditional methods is challenging and indirect. We utilize a new approach using NMR to determine the magnetic couplings between the f-electrons and neighboring nuclear spins in a series of CeRh$_{1-x}$Ir$_x$In$_5$ crystals, and find that the hybridization is strongly directional dependent in this important class of superconducting heavy fermion materials. Our results demonstrate that hyperfine coupling measurements provide a quantitative measure of orbital anisotropy.

I. INTRODUCTION

Heavy fermion metals are characterized by strong electron-electron interactions that can be tuned across a quantum phase transition between localized f-electron magnetism and itinerant heavy-mass Fermi liquid behavior [1–3]. The crossover between these two extremes is controlled by the degree to which the f-electron orbitals hybridize with neighboring atoms to form dispersive bands [4–7]. Theoretical models typically assume that variables such as pressure or doping ('chemical pressure') indirectly modify the small wavefunction overlap between the Ce 4f electrons and itinerant conduction electron bands, which consequently alter the low energy degrees of freedom [8–11]. Detailed information about this hybridization has required complex quantum chemistry calculations [12], or indirect analysis of experiments [13–15].

The tetragonal CeMIn$_5$ (M = Co, Rh, Ir) materials (see Fig. 1) are prototypical heavy fermion systems, exhibiting quantum criticality, antiferromagnetism and unconventional superconductivity across a phase diagram that can be tuned with pressure, magnetic field, or substitution at the transition metal site [16–19]. One of the outstanding mysteries in these materials is how the transition metal M changes the 4f hybridization, and hence the ground state. Similar physics is at play in the actinide PuMGa$_5$ (M=Co, Rh) materials, where the superconducting transition temperature is an order of magnitude larger [20–22]. For parts of the phase diagram where the ground state is superconducting, $T_c$ appears to correlate with the lattice anisotropy at ambient pressure [23, 24]. However, this relationship breaks down when the ground state evolves towards antiferromagnetism.

Recently, an X-ray absorption spectroscopy (XAS) study probed the nature of the Ce 4f crystalline electric field (CEF) ground state wavefunctions for several different CeRh$_{1-x}$Ir$_x$In$_5$ crystals [14]. These studies revealed a change in the shape of the wavefunction, lending support to the idea that the hybridization of the 4f electrons is strongly momentum-dependent [12, 13].

Electronic structure calculations indicated that the momentum dependence affects the hybridization with the in-plane In(1) and out-of-plane In(2) 5p electrons differently, leading to multiple hybridization gaps at low temperature. Surprisingly, the In(2) appear to be more strongly coupled to the 4f moments, suggesting that substitution at the M site may affect this coupling and hence the nature of the ground state.

In order to investigate the nature of this hybridization in more detail, we have measured the nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) Knight shift in CeRh$_{1-x}$Ir$_x$In$_5$ for both In(1) and In(2) sites. The In nuclear spins ($I = 9/2$) experience a transferred hyperfine field that reflects the hybridization to the 4f electrons [25, 26]. The hyperfine coupling between a nuclear spin $I$ at $r = 0$ and an

FIG. 1. Crystal structure of the CeMIn$_5$ system. Grey corresponds to the Ce sites, orange to the In(1), green and blue to the In(2), and black to the M site. Note that $a = b$ in this tetragonal system, but the In(2) sites exhibit different Knight shifts for field along $a$ versus $b$.
the surface. Powder x-ray diffraction measurements in
selected manually and polished to remove In flux from
nuke [32, 33]. Single crystals of tetragonal shape were
multiple values of $x$.

where $\gamma$ is the nuclear gyromagnetic ratio and $\mu_B$ is the
Bohr magneton. The first term is the Fermi contact term
relevant for s-orbitals, and the second and third terms
constitute a dipolar interaction with the electron spin.
Typically both contact and dipolar terms are present,
as well as multiple electron spins, leading to an effective
hyperfine coupling tensor that in practice is determined
empirically and contains both Fermi-contact and dipolar
components. Often the magnitude of the dipolar com-
ponent exceeds the direct dipolar field for a localized spin
by at least an order of magnitude - e.g. in this case the
dipolar field of a moment located at the origin of the
Ce atom. This enhancement is due to hybridization of
the orbitals of the unpaired electron spin with the rel-
levant orbitals surrounding the nucleus. These so-called
transferred hyperfine couplings depend sensitively on the
electronic wavefunction [27].

In heavy fermions, there are two sets of electronic
spins: those associated with the itinerant conduction
electrons, $S_c$, and with the $4f$ orbitals, $S_f$. There are
different hyperfine coupling tensors to these two degrees
of freedom: $\mathcal{H}_{\text{hyp}} = g\mu_B\gamma h \mathbf{I} \cdot \left( \frac{8\pi}{3} \delta(r) \mathbf{S} + 3 \frac{\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{S}}{r^5} - \frac{\mathbf{S}}{r^3} \right)$, where $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to an on-site coupling to the con-
duction electron spins [28], and $\mathbf{B}_i$ are the transferred
couplings to the nearest neighbor $4f$ spins. The trans-
ferred couplings can be determined by comparing the
Knight shift and bulk susceptibility as a function of tem-
perature and field direction, and have been well docu-
mented for the stoichiometric CeMIn$_5$ materials [15, 28–
30]. Surprisingly, the transferred coupling $B_{cc}(1)$ for the
In(1) site decreases by a factor of three between $M=$Rh
and M=Co, whereas $B_{cc}(2)$ for the In(2) site increases
by the same factor. A similar evolution of $B_{cc}(1)$ has been
observed in CeRhIn$_5$ under modest hydrostatic pressure
as the ground state evolves from antiferromagnetic to
superconducting [31]. Such a large variability in trans-
ferred hyperfine couplings constants has not been observed in
other strongly correlated superconductors, such as the
cuprates, iron pnictides or chalcogenides. We posit that
in the CeMIn$_5$ materials the transferred hyperfine cou-
plings arises due to the hybridization between the Ce
$4f$ ground state orbital and the In $5p$ states, and that the
variations in coupling constant reflect changes to the
shape of the ground state $4f$ orbital.

II. METHODS

High-quality single crystals of CeRh$_x$Ir$_{1-x}$In$_5$ with
multiple values of $x$ were grown via the flux method tech-
nique [32, 33]. Single crystals of tetragonal shape were
selected manually and polished to remove In flux from
the surface. Powder x-ray diffraction measurements in
a Bruker Phaser D2 diffractometer with Cu K$_\alpha$ radia-
tion ($\lambda = 1.5418$ Å) using a silicon plate with zero back-
ground confirmed the expected tetragonal phase without
evidence of spurious phases.

Magnetic susceptibility experiments, were carried out on
a commercial Quantum Design PPMS-14T, with a in-
sert for VSM magnetization measurements in the range
$3 < T < 300$ K, in a magnetic field of 8 T. NMR ex-
periments were carried out in a high-homogeneity fixed-
field magnet with field $H_0 = 11.7294$ T for a range of
temperatures down to 5 K. Samples were mounted with
$H_0 \parallel c$, and radiofrequency pulses of varying duration
(1.9 -2.2 $\mu$s) were used. Spectra at multiple frequencies
were acquired and summed over a broad range to identify
multiple satellites of each In site.

III. RESULTS

A. Magnetic Susceptibility

Figure 2 shows the bulk magnetic susceptibility, $\chi$, of
a series of single crystals of CeRh$_x$Ir$_{1-x}$In$_5$ between 4
and 300 K. $\chi$ varies strongly between 4 and 300 K, ref-
lecting the localized nature of the Ce $4f$ electrons. For
$T > 50$ K, $\chi$ is well-described by local moments in a
tetragonal crystal field, with an effective exchange inter-
action, as discussed in [35]. This behavior is modified
at low temperature due to the crystal field splitting, the
Kondo interaction, and the exchange interaction among
the Ce orbitals, all of which depend on the doping, $x$. As
$x$ increases the ground state evolves from antiferromag-
netic below the Neel temperature $T_N = 3.8$ K ($x = 0$
 to superconducting below $T_c = 0.4$ K ($x = 1$), with a
possible quantum phase transition near $x = 0.3$ [36], de
Haas-van Alphen measurements and band structure cal-
culations indicate that the $4f$ electrons become more itin-
erant, and this trend is reflected in the overall decrease
in the magnitude of $\chi$ over this range [37, 38].

The behavior of an isolated Ce 4f electron spin in a
tetragonal environment is given by $\mathcal{H}_{\text{CEF}} = B_0^0 \hat{O}_0^0 + B_0^2 \hat{O}_2^0 + B_4^0 \hat{O}_4^0$, where $\hat{O}_n$ are the Stevens operators and
$B_n^0$ are parameters that characterize the crystal field.
The $J = 5/2$ multiplet is split into three Kramers’ dou-
bles: $\Gamma_7^{(1)}$, $\Gamma_7^{(2)}$, and $\Gamma_6$. The ground state $\Gamma_7^{(1)}$
wavefunctions can be expressed as:

$$|\psi(\Gamma_7^{(1)})\rangle = \alpha \left| \pm \frac{5}{2} \right> + \sqrt{1-\alpha^2} \left| \pm \frac{3}{2} \right>, \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha$ characterizes the degree of mixing between the
$J_z$ manifolds and controls the degree of spatial anisotropy
of the orbital, $\alpha^2 = 1/6$ for cubic symmetry ($B_4^0 = 4B_0^0$
 and $B_2^0 = 0$), $\alpha^2$ increases as the CEF potential becomes
more tetragonal, and the orbital shape becomes more
two-dimensional.

The magnetic susceptibility of the $f$ moments is given
by $\chi_{ff}^{-1} = \chi_{f0}^{-1} + \lambda$, where $\lambda$ is a mean-field parame-
TABLE I. EFG, Hyperfine, and CEF Parameters for CeRh$_{1-x}$Ir$_x$In$_5$ and CeCoIn$_5$. Values for $x = 0$, $x = 1$, and CeCoIn$_5$ are reproduced from [28], [29], and [34]. Hyperfine couplings are given in units of kOe/µ$_B$.

| $x$ | $\nu_{zz}(1)$ (MHz) | $\nu_{zz}(2)$ (MHz) | $\eta(2)$ | $B_{xx}(1)$ | $B_{xx}(2)$ | $B_{yy}^0$ (meV) | $B_{zz}^0$ (meV) | $|B_{zz}^1|$ (meV) | $\alpha^2$ |
|-----|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| 0   | 6.78                | 16.665              | 0.445     | 21.4        | 4.1         | $-0.928$       | $0.052$        | $0.128$        | 0.407 |
| 0.20| 6.4(5)              | 17.3(8)             | 0.45      | 20.0(2.0)   | $-0.961$    | $0.057$        | $0.118$        | 0.37           |
| 0.50| 6.3(5)              | 16.5(8)             | 0.45      | 16.7(4)     | $-0.996$    | $0.061$        | $0.107$        | 0.28           |
| 0.75| 6.0(5)              | 17.3(8)             | 0.45      | 15.0(4.0)   | $-1.154$    | $0.068$        | 0.86           | 0.26           |
| 1   | 6.07                | 18.17               | 0.46      | 13.8        | 15.9        | $-1.197$       | $0.069$        | $0.088$        | 0.250 |
| CeCoIn$_5$ | 8.173 | 15.489 | 0.386 | 8.9 | 28.1 | $-0.856$ | $0.063$ | $0.089$ | 0.129 |

FIG. 2. Bulk susceptibility along the $c$ axis of CeRh$_{1-x}$Ir$_x$In$_5$ versus temperature. The solid lines are fits to the high-temperature data, as described in the text. The curves have been offset vertically for clarity with values -0.001, -0.006, -0.007, and -0.009 emu/mol for $x = 0.2$, 0.5, 0.75 and 1, respectively.

FIG. 3 shows $^{115}$In NMR spectra of CeRh$_{1-x}$Ir$_x$In$_5$ for several different values of $x$ at 5 K. In ($I = 9/2$) has nine transitions for each site, and all transitions are split by the quadrupolar interaction [31]. The In sites were identified by fitting the spectra using the nuclear spin Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H} = \gamma h (1 + K) \cdot H_0 + \frac{h \nu_{zz}}{6} \left[ 3I_z^2 - I^2 + \eta \left( I_x^2 - I_y^2 \right) \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $\gamma = 0.93295$ kHz/G is the gyromagnetic ratio, $I_\alpha$ are the nuclear spin operators, $K$ is the Knight shift tensor, $\nu_{zz}$ is the largest eigenvalue of the electric field gradient (EFG) tensor, and $\eta$ is the asymmetry parameter. The $(x, y, z)$ coordinates are defined in the usual manner such that $|\nu_{zz}| > |\nu_{xx}| > |\nu_{yy}|$. For the In(1), $z$ corresponds to the $c$ axis, and for the In(2), $z$ corresponds to the direction normal to unit cell face containing the In(2) atom, whereas $x$ corresponds to the other in-plane direction perpendicular to $c$. The resonance frequencies of the In(1) depend on $K$, the field orientation, and $\nu_{cc}$. The In(2) resonances are more complex due to the non-zero EFG asymmetry parameter, $\eta = |\nu_{xx}| - |\nu_{yy}|/|\nu_{zz}|$, and misorientations from $H_0 || c$ split the In(2) resonances giving rise to double peaks. Furthermore, local disorder and mixing of the Rh and Ir in the substitutional samples are responsible for multiple In(2) sites and create complex NMR spectra.

To fit the spectra, we assume the direction of $H_0$ is described by the spherical polar angles ($\theta, \phi$) with respect to the $c$ axis, and perform an exact diagonalization of Eq. 3. The peaks in Fig. 3 are fit to Voigt functions. The EFG values agree with previous measurements [36]. Although we are able to fit the full In(1) spectra, one peak at 104 MHz peak is not apparent in the experimental data for $x = 0.5$. The reason for this discrepancy is unclear, but may be related to poor tuning conditions of the probe. There are also several peaks that are not fully identified, which are likely due to In(2) sites associated with local disorder due to the non-stoichiometry of Rh and Ir. Note that when $\theta \neq 0^\circ$ the In(2) sites split into two peaks. Moreover, because the In(2) has non-axial symmetry, the resonance frequencies are strong functions of the relative orientation between $H_0$ and the EFG tensor. Local disorder at an In(2) site can affect both the magnitude of the EFG tensor components and the orientation of the principal EFG axes. Nevertheless, these sites are not relevant for understanding the behavior of the hyperfine coupling and we focus our analysis solely on the sites that have been clearly identified. Fig. 4 shows the temperature dependence of specific well-defined resonances. There are clear shifts of the resonance frequencies with increasing temperature. We assume that the EFG remains temperature independent and that the temperature dependence arises solely from the Knight shift.
FIG. 3. NMR spectrum for CeRh$_{1-x}$Ir$_x$In$_5$ with $x = 0.20$ (top), $x = 0.50$ (middle), and $x = 0.75$ (lower). Fits to the In(1) sites are shown in blue and those for the In(2) sites are shown in red. The fit parameters for $x = 0.20$ are: $\theta = 4 \pm 3^\circ$, $\phi = 8 \pm 3^\circ$, $K_c(1) = 7.8 \pm 0.1\%$, $K_c(2) = 2.5 \pm 0.1\%$, $\nu_{zz}(1) = 6.41 \pm 0.5$ MHz, $\nu_{zz}(2) = 17.3 \pm 0.5$ MHz, and $\eta(2) = 0.45 \pm 0.02$. The fit parameters for $x = 0.50$ are: $\theta = 8.3 \pm 3^\circ$, $\phi = 11 \pm 3^\circ$, $K_c(1) = 6.2 \pm 0.2\%$, $K_c(2) = 2.8 \pm 0.5\%$, $\nu_{zz}(1) = 6.32 \pm 0.2$ MHz, $\nu_{zz}(2) = 16.57 \pm 0.5$ MHz, and $\eta(2) = 0.45 \pm 0.02$. The fit parameters for $x = 0.75$ are: $\theta = 6 \pm 3^\circ$, $\phi = 0^\circ$, $K_c(1) = 7.3 \pm 0.2\%$, $K_c(2) = 5.4 \pm 0.8\%$, $\nu_{zz}(1) = 6.0$ MHz, $\nu_{zz}(2) = 17.28 \pm 0.5$ MHz, and $\eta(2) = 0.45 \pm 0.02$.

C. Knight shift

The Knight shift of the In(1), $K_1$, is shown in Fig. 5 as a function of temperature and Ir substitution, $x$, for field aligned along the $c$-direction. $K_1$ decreases with $x$, similar to $\chi$, although there are small deviations at low temperature. For the hyperfine interaction in heavy fermions, the Knight shift is given by $K = A\chi_{cc} + (A + B)\chi_{cf} + B\chi_{ff}$, where $\chi_{cc}$, $\chi_{cf}$, and $\chi_{ff}$ are contributions from the conduction electrons, the $f$-moments, and their interaction, respectively [25]. Here we write $B = nB_{cc}$, where $n$ is the number of nearest neighbor $f$ sites ($n = 4$ for In(1) and 2 for In(2)), and $B_{cc}$ corresponds to the $c$-axis component of the tensor $B$. The total susceptibility is $\chi = \chi_{cc} + 2\chi_{cf} + \chi_{ff}$. For sufficiently high temperatures $T > T^*$ the first two contributions to the shift can be ignored and $K \approx B\chi$. A plot of $K_1$ versus $T$ yields a straight line for $T > T^*$ with slope $B_1$, as shown in Fig. 6. Fig. 7 shows the Knight shift for the In(2) for $x = 0.75$. We are unable to reliably extract the In(2) Knight shift for the other substitutions due to misalignments and spectral overlap with other sites.

There are two important trends evident in Fig. 6.

FIG. 4. Spectra of CeRh$_{1-x}$Ir$_x$In$_5$ for $x = 0.20$, $x = 0.50$ and $x = 0.75$ for several different temperatures for $H_0 = 11.7$ T along the $c$ direction. Blue indicates In(1) and red indicates In(2). Slight misalignments cause the In(2) spectra to split. Details of the spectral fitting are provided in the supplemental information.

FIG. 5. In(1) Knight shift versus temperature. Data for the $x = 0$ and $x = 1$ are reproduced from [28].
First, the slope decreases with increasing $x$, and gets even smaller in CeCoIn$_5$. Secondly, there is a breakdown in the linear relationship below a temperature $T^*$. This deviation signals the onset of coherence at low temperatures, where $\chi_{cc}$ and $\chi_{ef}$ can no longer be ignored. As $x$ increases from 0 to 1, the deviation evolves from curving upwards (pure CeRhIn$_5$) to downwards (undoped CeIrIn$_5$), and becomes more pronounced for CeCoIn$_5$. For intermediate values of $x \approx 0.5$, there is no clear evidence of such a deviation in the data. This behavior reflects changes in the relative size of the on-site $A$ coupling to the transferred $B$ coupling, as well as the growth of heavy fermion coherence, as discussed below.

### IV. DISCUSSION

We can now examine how the hyperfine coupling correlates with the CEF ground state orbital shape. Fig. 8 shows the $B_1$ and $B_2$ transferred hyperfine couplings to In(1) and In(2), respectively, versus $\alpha^2$, using the parameters extracted from the fits to the Knight shift and susceptibility. The lines in Fig. 8 are linear fits to the data, including the value for CeCoIn$_5$ [40]. As $\alpha^2$ increases, the orbitals become more oblate, the lobes pointing along the In(1) directions become more extended, and the transferred hyperfine coupling to the In(1) nucleus increases.

In order to understand this behavior quantitatively, we consider a simple model in which the transferred coupling is directly proportional to the magnitude squared of the Ce $4f$ wavefunction along the Ce-In(1) bond direction. The angular dependence of this probability is given by the function $f_\alpha(\theta, \phi) = \sum_{m_L} |\langle \theta, \phi, m_s | \psi(1) \rangle|^2$, shown as insets in Fig. 8 for various values of $\alpha$. The wavefunction is given by Eq. 2, where

$$|J_z\rangle = \sum_{m_L} \sum_{m_S} C_{m_L,m_S,J_z} |L, m_L\rangle |S, m_S\rangle$$

and $C_{m_L,m_S,J_z}$ are the appropriate Clebsch-Gordan coefficients for $L = 3$, $S = 1/2$ and $J = 5/2$. Along the Ce-In(1) bond direction $f_\alpha(\theta = \pi/2, \phi = \pi/4) \sim 1 + 4\alpha^2 + 2\sqrt{5}\alpha^2 / (1 - \alpha^2)$. This function grows over the range $0.2 \lesssim \alpha^2 \lesssim 0.8$, in agreement with our observation that the hyperfine coupling increases with $\alpha^2$.

Direct measurements of the In(2) hyperfine coupling are challenging in the doped materials. However, it is insightful to consider the values for the pure CeRhIn$_5$, CeIrIn$_5$ and CeCoIn$_5$ versus $\alpha^2$ [28], as well as for the $x = 0.75$ sample. In contrast to the In(1), $B_2$ is largest when the orbital lobes extend out of the plane and decreases with increasing $\alpha^2$. The exact value of $\theta$ to use for $f_\alpha(\theta, \phi)$ depends on the position of the In(2) within the unit cell, however it can be well-approximated as $f_\alpha(\theta \approx \pi/2, \phi = 0) \sim 61 - 6\alpha(6\alpha + \sqrt{5} - 5\alpha^2)$. This quantity decreases as $\alpha^2$ increases, which again agrees with the behavior observed in Fig. 8. These results reveal directly how the hybridizations to the in-plane In(1) and out-of-plane In(2) sites evolve as the ground state orbital anisotropy changes.

Similar changes in the transferred hyperfine couplings were observed in CeRhIn$_5$ under hydrostatic pressure [31]. In this case, $B_1$ decreases from 25.6 to 5.2 kOe/µB between ambient pressure and ~2 GPa, which is close to the value observed in pure CeCoIn$_5$. Using the linear relationship between $B_1$ and $\alpha^2$ we observe under ambient pressure in Fig. 8, we infer the pressure dependence of $\alpha^2$ in Fig. 9(a). These results imply that pressure...
changes the CEF parameters so that the Ce 4f wavefunction lobes extend more out of the plane, becoming more cubic-like. This observation is consistent with the fact that at this pressure, CeRhIn$_5$ becomes superconducting with $T_c$ similar to CeCoIn$_5$, and develops a large Fermi surface [17, 37]. On the other hand, the data imply that the $\alpha^2$ becomes smaller than $\alpha_c = 1/6$ which may be unphysical. It should be noted, however, the values for $B_1$ in [31] were determined based on the assumption that the In(2) hyperfine coupling did not change under pressure. Because there is no independent susceptibility data under pressure, it was only possible to directly extract the ratio of $B_1(P)$ to $B_2(P)$, rather than their independent values. Nevertheless, the trend under hydrostatic pressure is similar to that observed with ‘chemical pressure’. A possible explanation for the behavior of the In(2) hyperfine coupling is that under pressure the wavefunction acquires an admixture of the $\Gamma^{(2)}_7$ excited states due to the Kondo coupling, similar to recent observations in CeCoIn$_5$ [42]. Because the $\Gamma^{(2)}_7$ state is rotated 45 degrees relative to the $\Gamma^{(1)}_7$, any admixture would dramatically affect the hyperfine couplings $B_1$ and possibly $B_2$. Future measurements of the In(2) Knight shift for in-plane fields in CeRhIn$_5$ will be necessary to check this scenario.

The Knight shift anomaly observed in Fig. 6 reflects the growth of $K_{HF}(T)$ below $T^*$, where $K_{HF}(T) \propto (A - B)(1 - T/T^*)^{3/2}[1 + \ln(T^*/T)]$ [28]. As $B_1$ increases with $\alpha^2$, the sign of $K_{HF}(T)$ changes from positive to negative, and vanishes when the transferred coupling equals the on-site coupling, $A$. Previously, $A \approx 14$ kOe/$\mu_B$ was estimated in CeCoIn$_5$ [29]. Since this quantity reflects a combination of a Fermi-contact interaction plus core-polarization from the Indium 5p orbitals, it should only weakly depend on doping or transition metal element. Thus, the observation that the Knight shift anomaly is small or absent in CeRh$_{1-x}$Ir$_x$In$_5$ for $x \approx 0.5$ in Fig. 6 likely reflects the fact that $B_1 \approx A$ in this range. On the other hand, there is a clear growth of both the magnitude of $K_{HF}$ and the onset temperature, $T^*$, as $\alpha^2$ decreases in CeIrIn$_5$ and CeCoIn$_5$. $T^*$ is approximately the temperature where the entropy reaches $R$$\ln2$, and has been shown empirically related to the Kondo coupling, $J$, as $T^* = 0.45J^2\rho$, where $\rho$ is the density of conduction electron states [19]. Since the Kondo coupling arises due to hybridization of the 4f orbital, it is natural to expect that $J \propto \alpha^2$, and thus $T^* \sim B_2^2$, as demonstrated in Fig. 9(b). This observation supports previous dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT) calculations of CeIrIn$_5$ that indicated the hybridization gap for

![FIG. 8. The transferred hyperfine coupling to the In(1) and In(2) as a function of $\alpha^2$. The lines are fits to $B_{1,2}(\alpha^2) = B_{1,2}(0) + \kappa_1 \alpha^2$, where $B_1(0) = 3.3(8)$ kOe/$\mu_B$, $B_2(0) = 32(1)$ kOe/$\mu_B$, $\kappa_1 = 44(2)$ kOe/$\mu_B$ and $\kappa_2 = -59(2)$ kOe/$\mu_B$. The open black circles represent CeRhIn$_5$ under pressure and are taken from Ref. [31] and inferring the $\alpha^2$ values using the fit to the ambient-pressure data (shown in Fig. 9). The open green circle represents CeRhIn$_5$ at high fields above 31 T, taken from Ref. [41]. The insets at the bottom show how the spatial form of the Ce 4f wavefunction evolves as $\alpha^2$ changes.

![FIG. 9. (a) $\alpha^2$ inferred from the pressure dependence of $B_1$ in [31] using the relationship measured at ambient pressure in Fig. 8. The solid line is a guide to the eye. (b) The coherence temperature $T^*$ versus $B_2^2$. The solid line is given by $T^* = 16.3(2) + 0.039(3)B_2^2$.](image-url)
the Ce-In(2) band dominates that for the in-plane Ce-In(1) band [12]. The Kondo hybridization, which drives the low temperature correlated behavior, is thus directly controlled by the shape of the Ce 4f orbitals.

V. SUMMARY

We have measured the Knight shift and magnetic susceptibilities for several single crystals of CeRh1–xIrxIn5, and found that the transferred hyperfine couplings to the In(1) and In(2) vary linearly with $\alpha^2$, where $\alpha$ describes the admixture between the $|J_z = -\frac{3}{2}\rangle$ and $|J_z = +\frac{3}{2}\rangle$ states of the Ce 4f ground state wavefunction. The hyperfine coupling to the In(1) is enhanced as $\alpha^2$ grows and the wavefunction extends out of the plane. The coupling to the In(2), on the other hand, decreases as $\alpha^2$ increases. These results provide direct proof that the hybridization between the 4f wavefunction and the In 5p orbitals is controlled by the orbital anisotropy. This observation also offers an explanation for the abrupt decrease in the In(1) Knight shift at 30 T, where the magnetic field induces changes to the crystal field ground state orbital [41], and for the pressure-dependence of the coupling to the In(1). A detail that has not been considered in our analysis is that it is possible that the Kondo coupling to the excited state $\Gamma_7^{(2)}$ manifold alters the shape of the 4f orbital, which may play a role in the pressure dependence of the ratio $B_1/B_2$ under pressure [31]. Further experiments exploring all components of the hyperfine coupling tensor will be important to better characterize this hybridization, especially under pressure. This study establishes transferred hyperfine interactions as an important probe of hybridization anisotropy in heavy fermion materials, and may provide a more straightforward approach to determine the crystal field parameters.
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