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We perform ab initio many-body Green’s function calculations to investigate the quasiparticle energies and optical properties of diamond polytypes that have been predicted to be producible via pressure-induced structural phase transition from carbon nanotube solids. We find, through quasiparticle band-structure calculations within the GW approximation, that the band gaps of two hexagonal (2H- and 4H-type) polytypes of diamond differ significantly from that of cubic diamond as well as from that of the crystalline sp3 carbon phase with the body-centered structure, called bct C4. We also examine the dielectric functions of three polytypes of diamond (cubic, 2H, and 4H) by employing the GW plus Bethe-Salpeter equation (GW-BSE) approach. The calculated optical absorption spectra are found to be distinct from each other. The lattice mismatches of carbon layers of these diamond polytypes are very small and the total-energy differences are also small. Our work opens up the possibility of fabricating diamond superlattices with various electronic and optoelectronic properties by utilizing and controlling the different stacking sequences of carbon layers.

I. INTRODUCTION

Face-centered cubic (fcc) and hexagonal close-packed (hcp) structures both have a close-packed arrangement of atoms. The difference between the fcc and hcp structures is the stacking sequence of close-packed atomic layers along the stacking axis. The period of other stacking sequences is known to be longer in certain materials. The best known example is silicon carbide (SiC).1 The crystal structure of an SiC polytype can be specified by its stacking pattern. For example, a hexagonal SiC polytype, called nH–SiC, repeats its stacking sequence with a periodicity of n, forming a hexagonal unit cell. Similarly, an SiC polytype with zinc blende structure is referred to as 3C–SiC, since it possesses a cubic crystalline lattice and has an ABC stacking along its [111] direction. Owing to the difference in the crystal lattice structure, SiC polytypes exhibit a wide variety of electronic and optical properties, which are not only useful to characterize the polytypes but also potentially advantageous for device applications.1 Because both silicon and carbon atoms have four valence electrons and carbon shows a greater flexibility in its covalent bonding than silicon, tetrahedrally-bonded carbon solid is expected to show polytypism similar to SiC. Indeed, a tetrahedrally-bonded carbon phase with an ABC stacking is nothing but cubic diamond, which exists in nature. The simplest hexagonal counterpart is hexagonal diamond, also named lonsdaleite, which has been suggested to exist in meteorites2,3 and has also been synthesized by room-temperature compression of graphite.4 There is a close equivalence of atomic structures between SiC and diamond polytypes. Thus cubic (hexagonal) diamond can be called as 3C (2H) diamond.

The graphite-to-hexagonal-diamond transition under pressure4 suggests that other sp3-bonded carbon phases can be produced by applying high pressure to other sp2-bonded carbon allotropes, such as fullerene and carbon nanotube. Shock compression experiments combined with rapid cooling technique5,6 have revealed a transformation from C60 fullerene solid into “amorphous diamond,” an sp3-rich phase with no-long-range order. Carbon nanotube solids under moderate pressure have recently been predicted to transform into a variety of diamond phases from constant-pressure molecular-dynamics (MD) simulations.7–9 The resultant phases include two hexagonal (2H and 4H) polytypes of diamond and a fourfold coordinated carbon phase having a body-centered tetragonal (bct) lattice,10 called bct C4. These diamond polytypes are found to be stable not only under pressure but also at zero pressure.9 Like SiC polytypes,11,12 hexagonal polytypes of diamond are expected to have distinct electronic and optical properties in comparison to cubic (3C) diamond. Such novel properties should be of importance in the future device applications of diamond.

In order to clarify the details of the electronic and optical properties of diamond polytypes, we study the quasiparticle energies and optical properties of two hexagonal polytypes of diamond (2H and 4H) that have been predicted to be producible through the constant-pressure MD simulations of carbon nanotubes under pressure, and compare them to those of other diamond polytypes. We adopt the GW approximation (GWA)20–22 to investigate the quasiparticle band structures of 2H and 4H diamond polytypes. We discuss diamond superlattices as a possible application of diamond polytypes. We also examine
the dielectric functions of 2H and 4H diamond polytypes by solving the Bethe-Salpeter equation (BSE) using the \textit{ab initio} GW band structure\cite{26} to take into account the electron-hole interaction, which is crucial to obtain an accurate spectrum.

II. COMPUTATIONAL METHODS

The ground-state total energies, as well as the Kohn-Sham single-particle orbitals and corresponding eigenenergies, are calculated in the framework of the density-functional theory\cite{13} in the local-density approximation (LDA)\cite{14} as implemented in Quantum ESPRESSO package.\cite{15} We employ the parameterized Ceperley-Alder\type{16,17} the Troullier-Martins norm-conserving pseudopotentials,\cite{18,19} and a plane-wave basis set with a cutoff energy of 60 Ry for all LDA calculations.

Quasiparticle energies are evaluated within “one-shot” GW approximation\cite{20–22} where the frequency-dependent (Fourier-transformed) electron self-energy $\Sigma$ is given by a convolution of the one-particle Green’s function $G$ and the dynamically screened Coulomb interaction $W$. The Kohn-Sham orbitals and the corresponding energies are used as input for constructing the Green’s function. The static irreducible polarizability is then calculated within the random-phase approximation with not the Hartree-Fock functional theory but the previous LDA calculations. The latter is shorter than the C–C bond in cubic diamond, respectively. Unlike cubic diamond, all the carbon–carbon (C–C) bonds are no longer equivalent in 2H diamond, where the C–C bond length along the $a$ axis (1.548 Å) is longer than the other ones (1.519 Å). The lattice constants of 2H and 4H diamond polytypes are determined by the LDA calculations: $a = 2.475$ Å, $c = 4.127$ Å for 2H diamond, and $a = 2.482$ Å, $c = 8.189$ Å for 4H diamond. The values obtained for 2H diamond agree with the experimental data\cite{21,22} ($a = 2.52$ Å and $c = 4.12$ Å) as well as the theoretical results.\cite{23,24,25} Our LDA results for 4H diamond are also consistent with the previous LDA calculations.\cite{26,27} The lattice constants of 2H and 4H diamond polytypes are only 0.024 and 0.010 eV/atom higher than that of cubic diamond, respectively. Unlike cubic diamond, all the carbon–carbon (C–C) bonds are no longer equivalent in 2H diamond, where the C–C bond length along the $c$ axis (1.548 Å) is longer than the other ones (1.519 Å). The latter is shorter than the C–C bond in cubic diamond (1.526 Å within the LDA and 1.54 Å in experiment). Similarly, 4H diamond have longer C–C bonds

\begin{equation}
\varepsilon_2(\omega) = \frac{16\pi^2 e^2}{\omega^2} \sum_S \left| \vec{\lambda} \cdot \langle 0|\vec{v}|S \rangle \right|^2 \delta(\omega - \Omega_S).
\end{equation}

Here, $\vec{\lambda}$ is the polarization vector of the light, $\vec{v}$ denotes the velocity operator, and $\langle 0|\vec{v}|S \rangle$ represents the optical transition matrix element from the ground state $|0\rangle$ to the excited state $|S\rangle$ which is given in terms of the quasiparticle free electron-hole pair basis functions by $|S\rangle = \sum_{vc} A^S_{vc}|vc\rangle$. The transition energy $\Omega_S$ and the corresponding amplitude $A^S_{vc}$ are the solutions of the following eigenvalue equation

\begin{equation}
(E_c - E_v)A^S_{vc} + \sum_{v'c'} \langle vc|K^{eh}|v'c'\rangle A^S_{v'c'} = \Omega_S A^S_{vc},
\end{equation}

where $K^{eh}$ is the electron-hole interaction kernel and the summation runs over the valence bands $(v)$ and the conduction bands $(c)$. The $E_v$ and $E_c$ are the GW quasiparticle energies of valence and conduction bands, respectively. For notational simplicity, we have suppressed the explicit $k$ dependence of all the quantities in Eq. 2. For crystals, it is essential to evaluate the $K^{eh}$ on a very fine $k$-point grid, which is a computationally demanding task. Here, we use the interpolation scheme proposed by Rohlfing and Louie\cite{26} that aims to capture not only the energy dependence but also the $k$-point dependence of the self-energy correction. In this scheme, we first calculate the quasiparticle energies and the matrix elements of the kernel on a coarse $k$-point grid, and then interpolate them onto a dense $k$-point grid using the tetrahedron method and a wavefunction-based interpolation. This interpolation scheme greatly reduces the computational cost without losing accuracy.\cite{26} Once the imaginary part $\varepsilon_2(\omega)$ is obtained, the corresponding real part $\varepsilon_1(\omega)$ is calculated by using a Kramers-Kronig transformation.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Quasiparticle band structure

We commence with a quasiparticle energy calculation for cubic diamond. The lattice constant is set to be the experimental one, 3.57 Å. The static dielectric matrix is computed with a cutoff energy of 10 Ry. The self energy is computed with a summation over 20 $k$ points in the irreducible Brillouin zone. The Coulomb-hole contribution to the self-energy converges slowly with respect to the number of empty states included in the calculation.\cite{27} To ensure convergence, we use 300 bands consisting of 4 valence and lowest 296 conduction bands. Within the GW approximation, we obtain a fundamental gap of 5.37 eV and a direct gap of 7.13 eV at the $\Gamma$ point. These results agree well with the experimental values, 5.48 eV and 7.3 eV, respectively, and are also consistent with the previous GW calculations.\cite{21,22} The lattice constants of 2H and 4H diamond polytypes are determined by the LDA calculations: $a = 2.475$ Å, $c = 4.127$ Å for 2H diamond, and $a = 2.482$ Å, $c = 8.189$ Å for 4H diamond. The values obtained for 2H diamond agree with the experimental data\cite{21,22} ($a = 2.52$ Å and $c = 4.12$ Å) as well as the theoretical results.\cite{23,24,25} Our LDA results for 4H diamond are also consistent with the previous LDA calculations.\cite{26,27} The calculated LDA total energies of 2H and 4H diamond polytypes are only 0.024 and 0.010 eV/atom higher than that of cubic diamond, respectively. Unlike cubic diamond, all the carbon–carbon (C–C) bonds are no longer equivalent in 2H diamond, where the C–C bond length along the $c$ axis (1.548 Å) is longer than the other ones (1.519 Å). The latter is shorter than the C–C bond in cubic diamond (1.526 Å within the LDA and 1.54 Å in experiment). Similarly, 4H diamond have longer C–C bonds.
FIG. 1. Electronic band structures of (a) hexagonal (2H) diamond and (b) 4H diamond, calculated with the LDA (black) and the GWA (red). Energy is measured from the top of the valence band.

(1.535 Å) along the c axis and shorter ones (1.522 Å). With the LDA-optimized geometries, the GW calculations are then performed using a dielectric energy cutoff of 10 Ry, 39 k points, and 400 (800) bands for 2H (4H) diamond.

Figure 1(a) shows the electronic band structure of 2H diamond obtained with the LDA and the GWA. The 2H diamond is predicted to be an indirect-gap semiconductor with a band gap of 4.58 eV, which is much smaller than that of cubic diamond (5.37 eV within the GWA) but is significantly larger than that of bct C4 (3.78 eV within the GWA10). The reduction of the band gap is due to the presence of a dispersive conduction band with a minimum at the K point. This state shows a parabolic dispersion around the K point and has a “floating” character. Here “floating” means that the wave function localizes in interstitial regions rather than atomic or bond sites. Similarly, the interlayer (or surface) state in graphite33,34 and the nearly-free-electron (NFE) state in carbon nanotube35,36 have wave functions that are also distributed away from atomic sites. The many-body correction within the GWA pushes down the NFE state relative to the Fermi level in carbon nanotube and graphene,37 while the conduction bands around the Fermi level in 2H diamond, including the state with a “floating” character, are raised up in energy due to the self-energy correction, as can be seen in Fig. 1(a). This observation is evident in Fig. 2, where the difference between the quasiparticle energy $E_{\text{QP}}^{n,k}$ and the LDA energy $E_{\text{LDA}}^{n,k}$, in hexagonal (2H) diamond. The data are plotted as a function of the LDA eigenvalue for the highest 5 occupied and the lowest 6 unoccupied states ($n = 4–14$) at 39 k points including several high-symmetry points. Energy reference for $E_{\text{LDA}}^{n,k}$ is the top of the valence band. The solid lines, fitted to the data, indicate weak linear dependence.

The difference in the GW correction arises from differences in the spatial extent of and the strength of electronic screening to each electronic state. In graphene and carbon nanotube, the NFE states are much more delocalized than the bonding and antibonding states, and they are located in the vacuum region, a few angstroms away from the carbon plane. Due to these two factors, the self-energy correction to an NFE state is smaller. In diamond, the state having floating character is in the interstitial region and hence have a larger self-energy correction. Although the GW self-energy corrections for both occupied states and unoccupied states show weak linear dependence on the LDA eigenvalue, not only their energy but also $k$-point dependences are of crucial importance in computing the absorption spectrum, which requires the quasiparticle energies at a given $k$ point on a fine grid.

Figure 1(b) shows the electronic band structure of 4H diamond calculated by the LDA and the GWA. The quasiparticle band gap of 4H diamond is predicted to be 6.00 eV, which is, in contrast to 2H diamond, sig-
nificantly larger than that of cubic diamond as well as that of bct C\(_4\). The hexagonal unit cell of 4H diamond is approximately twice longer than that of 2H diamond in the direction of the c axis. As a result, a minimum of the low-lying conduction band with parabolic dispersion occurs at the H point. The conduction bands around the K point are moved away from the Fermi level. The absolute bottom of the conduction band is located between Γ and M points. The direct band gap at the Γ point of 4H diamond (7.19 eV within the GWA) is comparable to that of cubic diamond (7.13 eV within the GWA and 7.3 eV in the measurement\(^{38}\)) and is larger than that of 2H diamond (6.80 eV within the GWA). As is the case for 2H diamond, the GW self-energy corrections obtained for 4H diamond show weak linear dependence on the LDA eigenvalue, pushing the valence (conduction) bands to lower (higher) energies.

Diamond polytypes with different band gaps and similar lattice constant are promising as a building block for a diamond superlattice. In their first synthesis of diamond superlattice using a different concept,\(^{39}\) Watanabe and co-workers controlled the isotope composition of carbon layers and achieved a band-gap difference of 17 meV to confine electrons. The band-gap difference in the diamond polytypes, revealed in the present GW study, is much larger than the value measured for isotope-controlled diamond superlattice, making it easier to control carrier confinement. Similar lattice constants of diamond polytypes are also favorable to superlattice structure: (i) Cubic diamond involves an ABC stacking of carbon layers along the [111] direction. This direction is suited for c-axis-oriented growth of either hexagonal (2H) diamond or 4H diamond polytypes. In both cases, the lattice-constant mismatch is less than a few percent. (ii) Combination of 2H and 4H diamond polytypes is highly promising for a superlattice structure. The difference between the LDA lattice constants of carbon layers of these two polytypes is less than 1\%. It is expected that one can create multilayer structures consisting of 2H and 4H diamond polytypes by controlling the stacking sequence along the c axis. (iii) In addition to these diamond polytypes, bct C\(_4\) is another potential candidate. The material consists of AB-stacked carbon layers along the a (or b) axis in the bct unit cell. Its in-plane lattice constant (2.483 Å within the LDA\(^{10}\)) is approximate to those of 2H and 4H diamond (2.475 and 2.482 Å, respectively, within the LDA), offering a possibility to combine bct C\(_4\) with either 2H or 4H diamond polytypes. We note that bct C\(_4\) is predicted to be accompanied by hexagonal diamond in constant-pressure MD simulation of transforming (10,10) carbon nanotube solid under pressure.\(^7\)

Diamond is well-known to exhibit significant band-gap renormalization due to strong electron-phonon interaction.\(^{40,41}\) The diamond polytypes that we study here have similar carbon–carbon bond lengths and are expected to have a similar degree of the electron-phonon coupling, resulting in a similar band-gap renormalization. The difference in the electron-phonon band-gap renormalization is expected to be smaller than the band-gap difference that we predicted for different diamond polytypes. As shown in the literature, incorporation of the electron-phonon interaction is necessary to obtain accurately the temperature dependence of the band gap.

### B. Dielectric functions and optical properties

We focus on cubic diamond to confirm the reliability of the present GW plus BSE calculation. The quasiparticle energies and the matrix elements of the electron-hole interaction kernel are computed on a coarse \(7^3\) \(k\)-point grid, and we then interpolate them onto a fine \(19^3\) grid. To achieve a \(k\)-point sampling dense enough to evaluate accurately the electron-hole interaction kernel, the fine \(19^3\) grid is shifted so that the grid contains 6859 crystallographically different \(k\) points. In solving the BSE, we include highest 3 valence and lowest 4 conduction bands.

In Fig. 3, we plot the dielectric functions calculated for cubic diamond. As seen in previous work,\(^{25,26}\) inclusion of the electron-hole interaction changes the amplitude of the entire spectrum, causing a shift of the dominant features of the spectrum to lower energy. The calculated spectra that include the electron-hole interaction are in very good agreement with the experimental data in a wide range of energy. We note that our spectrum does not exhibit a jagged “ghost” structure that have been found in previous calculations,\(^{43,44}\) indicating that an enough fine \(k\)-point sampling is realized in our calculation. As shown in Fig. 3(a), the BSE spectrum describes the characteristic features of \(\varepsilon_1(\omega)\) quantitatively: a steep, negative slope around 12 eV and a pronounced minimum at about 12.5 eV. The low-energy limit of \(\varepsilon_1(\omega)\) gives the high-frequency dielectric constant. The BSE method yields \(\varepsilon_\infty = 5.59\), which agrees with the experimental value (\(\varepsilon_\infty = 5.7\)).\(^{45}\) As seen in Fig. 3(b), the position of the absorption maximum agrees well with the experiment, although the BSE spectrum has a larger amplitude around 12 eV than the experiment. Such an overestimation of the spectral weight has also been reported in previous calculations.\(^{43,44}\)

In a similar way to cubic diamond, we apply the BSE method to the 2H and 4H polytypes of diamond. A coarse \(k\)-point grid of \(6\times6\times4\) is used for calculating the quasiparticle energies and the electron-hole kernel before they are interpolated onto a fine \(k\)-point grid. In solving the BSE for 2H (4H) diamond, we use a shifted fine grid of \(15\times15\times15\) (\(15\times15\times6\)) and include the highest 5 (8) valence and the lowest 6 (10) conduction bands. Since the dielectric response of an uniaxial semiconductor shows strong differences for the electric vector parallel to the different principal axis, we consider two directions for the polarization of the light (\(\lambda\)): the one perpendicular to the c axis of the hexagonal unit cell, which gives the ordinary spectrum, and the other parallel to the c axis, which yields the extraordinary spectrum.\(^{42}\)

The imaginary part of the macroscopic dielectric func-
FIG. 3. (a) Real part $\varepsilon_1(\omega)$ and (b) imaginary part $\varepsilon_2(\omega)$ of the macroscopic dielectric function of cubic diamond, calculated with (solid curve) and without (dashed curve) the electron-hole interaction. The calculated spectra (which include a Gaussian broadening of 0.25 eV) are compared to the experimental data (dots) taken from Ref. 42.

The calculated spectra (which is related to the optical absorption spectrum) for 2H and 4H diamond, obtained with the BSE method, is shown in Figs. 4(a) and 4(b), respectively, where the BSE spectrum of cubic diamond is also plotted for comparison. The extraordinary spectrum of 2H diamond is quite similar to that of cubic diamond, except for a peak with reduced weight and occurred at slightly lower energy (11.6 eV). The ordinary spectrum of 2H diamond has much less weight at low energies before a sharp rise, reaching a absorption maximum at 11.2 eV. The spectrum also exhibit a shoulder around 12.5 eV, which is not seen in the spectrum of cubic diamond at this energy. The extraordinary spectrum of 4H diamond exhibits a pronounced peak at 11.8 eV, which is a common feature among the spectra of three diamond polytypes. The ordinary spectrum of 4H diamond shows a gradual increase at low energies before it yields broad double peaks (at 11.9 eV and 12.6 eV) that are similar to the peak and the shoulder in the ordinary spectrum of 2H diamond. Above 14 eV, the ordinary and extraordinary spectra of 4H diamond are practically identical.

From the calculated imaginary part of the dielectric function $\varepsilon_2(\omega)$, we carry out the Kramers-Kronig transformation to obtain the corresponding real part $\varepsilon_1(\omega)$, which is shown in Fig. 5. As in the case of SiC polytypes, the ordinary spectra of 2H and 4H diamond polytypes resemble the $\varepsilon_1$ spectrum of the cubic (3C) diamond, except that the ordinary spectra between 12 and 14 eV are suppressed in comparison to that of cubic diamond. In hexagonal (2H) diamond, the extraordinary spectrum exhibits a pronounced maximum at 9.9 eV. In the extraordinary spectrum of 4H diamond, first maximum is shifted to higher energy. Above 14 eV, the ordinary and extraordinary spectra are nearly identical.
We have studied the quasiparticle energies and the optical properties of diamond polytypes using ab initio many-body Green’s function approach. By performing quasiparticle calculations within the GWA, we have shown that the fundamental gap values of hexagonal (2H) and 4H diamond polytypes are significantly different from that of cubic diamond as well as that of bct C\textsubscript{4} phase. We have examined the dielectric functions of three diamond polytypes (cubic (3C), 2H, and 4H) based on the GW plus BSE methodology. The calculated spectra for cubic diamond are in good agreement with experiment, and the spectra calculated for 2H and 4H diamond polytypes are found to be distinct from that of cubic diamond. We have also suggested that these diamond polytypes are promising materials to fabricate diamond superlattices. Small lattice-constant mismatches are favorable to superlattice structure formation. The sizable band-gap difference, shown in the present GW results, is more suitable for electron confinement than the one realized in the isotope-controlled system.

**IV. SUMMARY**

We have studied the quasiparticle energies and the optical properties of diamond polytypes using ab initio many-body Green’s function approach. By performing quasiparticle calculations within the GWA, we have shown that the fundamental gap values of hexagonal (2H) and 4H diamond polytypes are significantly different from that of cubic diamond as well as that of bct C\textsubscript{4} phase. We have examined the dielectric functions of three diamond polytypes (cubic (3C), 2H, and 4H) based on the GW plus BSE methodology. The calculated spectra for cubic diamond are in good agreement with experiment, and the spectra calculated for 2H and 4H diamond polytypes are found to be distinct from that of cubic diamond. We have also suggested that these diamond polytypes are promising materials to fabricate diamond superlattices. Small lattice-constant mismatches are favorable to superlattice structure formation. The sizable band-gap difference, shown in the present GW results, is more suitable for electron confinement than the one realized in the isotope-controlled system.
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