

Strain and screening: Optical properties of a small-diameter carbon nanotube from first principles

Wagner, C.; Schuster, J.; Schleife, A.;

Originally published:

February 2019

Physical Review B 99(2019), 075140

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.99.075140>

Perma-Link to Publication Repository of HZDR:

<https://www.hzdr.de/publications/Publ-27762>

Release of the secondary publication
on the basis of the German Copyright Law § 38 Section 4.

Strain and screening: Optical properties of a small-diameter carbon nanotube from first principles

Christian Wagner*

*Technische Universität Chemnitz, Center for Microtechnologies,
Reichenhainer Straße 70, 09126 Chemnitz, Germany*

Department of Materials Science and Engineering,

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA and

now at Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, Bautzner Landstrasse 400, 01328 Dresden, Germany

Jörg Schuster

Fraunhofer Institute for Electronic Nano Systems (ENAS),

Technologiecampus 3, 09126 Chemnitz, Germany

André Schleife†

Department of Materials Science and Engineering,

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

Frederick Seitz Materials Research Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA and

National Center for Supercomputing Applications,

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

(Dated: January 25, 2019)

Carbon nanotubes (CNTs) are a one-dimensional material system with intriguing physical properties that lead to emerging applications. While CNTs are unusually strain resistant compared to bulk materials, their optical-absorption spectrum is highly strain dependent. It is an open question, as to what extent this is attributed to strain-dependent (i) electronic single-particle transitions, (ii) dielectric screening, or (iii) atomic geometries including CNT radii. We use cutting-edge theoretical spectroscopy to explain strain-dependent electronic structure and optical properties of an (8,0) CNT. Quasiparticle effects are taken into account using Hedin's *GW* approximation and excitonic effects are described by solving a Bethe-Salpeter-equation for the optical polarization function. This accurate first-principles approach allows us to identify an influence of strain on screening of the Coulomb electron-electron interaction and to quantify the impact on electronic structure and optical absorption of one-dimensional systems. We interpret our thoroughly converged results using an existing scaling relation and extend the use of this relation to strained CNTs: We show that it captures optical absorption with satisfactory accuracy, as long as screening, quasiparticle gap, and effective electron and hole masses of the strained CNT are known.

Keywords: carbon nanotubes, optical properties, excitons, strain, first-principles calculations, density functional theory, many-body perturbation theory, screening

I. INTRODUCTION

Carbon nanotubes (CNTs) possess interesting material properties: Their mechanical behavior is dominated by high stiffness and large rupture strain,¹⁻⁵ they are chemically very stable,^{6,7} and show a sizable shift of electronic energy levels as a function of axial strain.⁸⁻¹² This shift renders *optical* transitions sensitive to strain, as has been observed experimentally¹³⁻¹⁶ and explained theoretically.¹⁷ For this reason, CNTs are excellent candidates for electronic and optical strain sensing and optical strain characterization, which is a promising technique due to the practical ease of optical readout and the higher precision compared to alternative approaches such as indirect electronic characterization. In particular, optical strain sensors with extremely high, mechanically tunable sensitivity can be built in combined CNT/micro-opto-electro-mechanical systems (MOEMS).^{14,18-20}

Unfortunately, there is no simple, quantitative picture of the explicit strain behavior of optical transitions, since their dependence on the single-particle band gap of the

CNT is not straightforward.¹⁷ This can partly be attributed to strong many-body effects: In low-dimensional systems such as quasi-one dimensional (1D) CNTs, there is less surrounding material than in bulk systems, leading to weak dielectric screening of the electron-electron and electron-hole interaction. As a consequence, quasiparticle (QP) shifts can be as large as 1.2 eV and excitonic effects can be equally strong.^{17,21-25} However, in order to achieve precise strain sensing based on CNTs, a thorough understanding of electronic and optical properties, as well as their strain dependence, needs to be developed. Quantitative insight is essential for the development of MOEMS, such as strain-tunable emitters based on CNTs or tunable optical sensors.

On a more fundamental level, CNTs are a well-suited test bed for obtaining deeper insight into the physics of the strain dependence of screening and, hence, the screened Coulomb electron-electron interaction W . Understanding this is important for modern many-body perturbation theory, since in *GW* approximation (*GW*) and Bethe-Salpeter equation (BSE) calculations, W plays a

crucial role for the renormalization of electronic QP energies and optical transition energies. Large deformations are possible in CNTs before rupture, which allows exploring a much larger strain range than in bulk materials.

This understanding is also needed since difficulties arise during the interpretation of experiments, e.g. for exciton binding energies: While in (homogeneous) bulk material, a spatial average is a good approximation that describes dielectric screening using a dielectric constant ϵ , this cannot *a priori* be assumed for CNTs. The spatially resolved dielectric function $\epsilon(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is needed because the material response, i.e. screening, is restricted to the actual electron density of the CNT²⁴ and is, thus, strongly direction dependent. In reciprocal space, spatial resolution corresponds to a dependence on $\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}'$, which means that $\epsilon(\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')$ must be considered instead of a constant ϵ . Dynamical screening is captured by the frequency-dependent dielectric function $\epsilon(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$, which is required when energy-dependent integrals occur.

Furthermore, as 1D materials, CNTs show negligible optical response perpendicular to the CNT axis, i.e. along the z direction. Hence, screening $\epsilon(q_z=k-k')$ with $\mathbf{q}=q_z\mathbf{e}_z$ and Brillouin zone (BZ) sampling are effectively 1D. This needs to be taken into account when using analytical model functions to describe dielectric screening since usually their \mathbf{q} -dependence is fitted to three dimensional (3D) semiconductors with a dielectric constant as low- q limit.²⁶ However, in CNTs the low- q (large distance) limit is vacuum screening.^{24,27} Therefore, the q -dependence of ϵ and the emerging local-field effects must be calculated accordingly. Nevertheless, in many studies only the dielectric constant ϵ is used as a screening model for the description of excitons in CNTs, since it is a much simpler quantity.^{22,28,29} This neglect of local fields for the description of screening and the scaling of excitons in CNTs with respect to their radius, as proposed by Perebeinos *et al.*,²⁹ is an approximation that requires careful revision.

In this work we use first-principles electronic-structure calculations to provide a deeper understanding of these questions. We use DFT^{30,31} to compute ground-state geometries and total energies of a small-diameter (8,0)-CNT in equilibrium and under axial strain. Hedin's *GW* approximation³² is used to account for QP effects on electronic energy levels. Using the G_0W_0 approximation, we derive strain-induced shifts of valence- and conduction band energies and compare to results from a computationally cheaper hybrid exchange-correlation functional. Finally, by solving the BSE for the optical polarization function³³ we account for excitonic effects in optical absorption spectra. We study the influence of Coulomb truncation, a scheme used to mitigate finite-size effects in supercell calculations for low-dimensional systems, on resulting optical spectra of the CNT under axial strain.

These detailed calculations of optical transitions allow us to disentangle the influence of strain on QP energies and on excitonic effects. Using our data we explore whether the scaling relation by Perebeinos *et al.*²⁹ for

the exciton binding energy in different CNTs also holds for strain in a CNT. Finally, the relation between exciton binding energy, reduced effective mass, and dielectric constant is explored. The resulting strain dependencies of exciton binding energies and optical transitions are essential ingredients for design and layout of MOEMS.

The remainder of this work is structured as follows: Section II summarizes technical aspects of DFT, *GW*, and BSE calculations. In Sec. III we use these techniques to discuss the strain-dependent electronic structure based on G_0W_0 and hybrid-functional calculations. The solution of the BSE is shown and exciton binding energies are analyzed. We then revisit the scaling relation of Ref. 29 and explore its applicability for the Coulomb-truncated case of a strained CNT. Finally, Sec. IV summarizes and concludes our work.

II. THEORETICAL APPROACH AND COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

A. Ground-state properties

We use DFT^{30,31} to compute total energies and, via minimization of Hellman-Feynman forces, optimized ground-state geometries of a (8,0)-CNT in equilibrium as well as under axial strain. For these calculations the local-density approximation (LDA) is used to describe exchange and correlation³⁴ and the electron-ion interaction is described using norm-conserving pseudopotentials based on the parametrization by von Barth and Car.³⁵ Wave functions are expanded into a plane-wave basis up to a cutoff energy of 550 eV (40 Ry). To ensure accuracy, we also tested a plane-wave cutoff of 1100 eV (80 Ry), for which total energies are converged up to 9 meV/electron (36 meV/atom). In both cases, the resulting DFT as well as QP gaps agree within 20 meV, which we include in our error bars for QP energy calculations (see below). All DFT calculations are carried out using the Quantum Espresso code.³⁶

We construct a simulation cell that contains the (8,0)-CNT, oriented along the z axis and surrounded by vacuum in the other two directions. We choose a supercell size of $19.5 \times 19.5 \times 4.26 \text{ \AA}^3$, such that two periodic images of CNTs are separated by 13.2 \AA . This is by far enough vacuum to obtain converged results and to suppress finite-size effects in DFT calculations for the neutral CNT. The geometry optimization is performed using a $1 \times 1 \times 20$ Monkhorst-Pack (MP)³⁷ \mathbf{k} -point grid and all atoms are relaxed until the remaining forces are smaller than 0.01 eV/ \AA . All our results for relaxed atomic geometries can be found in the supplemental material at [URL will be inserted by publisher].

We then compare to calculations within the Vienna *Ab-initio* Simulation Package.^{38,39} For these we use the generalized-gradient approximation by Perdew, Burke, and Ernzerhof⁴⁰ and the projector-augmented wave method.⁴¹ The calculations are carried out using

a plane-wave cutoff energy of 400 eV and the same \mathbf{k} -point grid discussed above. Relaxed atomic geometries from both approaches differ only very slightly (GGA introduces about 0.2 % strain, see supplemental material at [URL will be inserted by publisher]), which is reassuring for the comparison of excited-state properties below.

B. GW calculations

In order to describe QP effects on electronic single-particle energies, we use Hedin's GW approximation for the electronic self energy.³² We use the Yambo package⁴² to compute QP energies within one step of perturbation theory, i.e. without updating G or W , which is known as G_0W_0 approach. The fully frequency-dependent dielectric response function $\epsilon(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$, that enters W , is computed within random phase approximation (RPA) using real-axis integration. Local-field effects play an important role and are converged for a \mathbf{G} -vector cutoff of 35 eV (≈ 2.4 Ry), which results in less than 0.5 % change of the dielectric function at several \mathbf{q} -points with respect to the extrapolated value or less than 20 meV change in the G_0W_0 gap (see Fig. 2 in the supplemental material at [URL will be inserted by publisher]). Converged calculations require a $1 \times 1 \times 40$ MP \mathbf{k} -point grid ($1 \times 1 \times 60$ MP \mathbf{k} points in case of Coulomb truncation due to the sharper profile of $\epsilon(q_z)$, see Ref. 21) and at least 256 bands, which is four times the number of occupied states. Thus, the default parameter set is 256 bands and 60 \mathbf{k} -points for GW calculations, unless other values are explicitly given. In addition, the singularity of the Coulomb integral in \mathbf{k} space has to be circumvented, which is achieved using the random-integration method (RIM) described by Marini *et al.*⁴² for GW calculations.

While the vacuum size in our supercell calculations is sufficiently large to achieve convergence in DFT, a thorough unit cell convergence is not feasible for the screened Coulomb interaction W , due to its long-range character. The slow decay of the Coulomb interaction with distance renders it impossible to eliminate artificial interactions between periodic images.^{43–46} This can be compensated, e.g. when calculating defect-formation energies, by subtracting the electrostatic contribution of all repeating cells.⁴⁴ For converged calculations of W , Coulomb truncation schemes were developed,^{21,43} the Yambo implementation of which is used in this work and described in Ref. 43. Using this scheme renders a lateral unit cell size of 19.5 Å and a truncation cylinder for the Coulomb interaction (radius 9.75 Å) sufficient. All details on convergence tests for \mathbf{k} points, number of bands, cell size and Coulomb truncation, including the non-trivial convergence studies with Yambo, are described in detail in the supplemental material at [URL will be inserted by publisher].

C. Bethe-Salpeter calculations

Excitonic effects are taken into account in the description of optical absorption by solving a BSE for the optical polarization function.³³ For BSE calculations, the screened electron-hole interaction W is computed using the static limit of the response function and the same local-field effects as for GW calculations.^{42,47} Ten valence and ten conduction bands are included for the solution of the BSE. Convergence with respect to \mathbf{k} points is achieved using a $2 \times 2 \times 80$ MP grid and the same lateral unit cell size of 19.5 Å is found to be sufficient. These convergence tests are discussed in detail in the supplemental material at [URL will be inserted by publisher]. The Yambo package (version 3.4.2) is used for all GW and BSE calculations.

In order to better understand the influence of dielectric screening, we compare Yambo results to BSE calculations from a recent VASP-based implementation.^{48,49} These are carried out using the same parameters as for Yambo: $2 \times 2 \times 80$ MP \mathbf{k} points, ten valence and ten conduction bands, as well as the same simulation cell size. Local-field effects are included up to 35 eV \mathbf{G} -vector cutoff, as discussed above for GW calculations. This allows calculating exciton binding energies that are converged to within about 1 % with respect to the dielectric \mathbf{G} -vector cutoff. This error estimate stems from the extrapolation of the estimated error of the dielectric function (see Fig. 2 in the supplemental material at [URL will be inserted by publisher]). An accurate extrapolation scheme is used to circumvent the Coulomb singularity.⁴⁹ This BSE implementation currently does not support Coulomb truncation to remove the interaction between super cells, which is discussed in Sec. III E. In order to study the influence of the screened interaction W , we compare the results using a dielectric constant to an analytical model dielectric function⁵⁰ for screening. This comparison allows us to quantitatively discuss the interplay between Coulomb truncation, screening, and strain effects.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Electronic structure of the unstrained (8,0)-CNT

In Fig. 1 band structures computed using DFT (scissor-shifted to 1.84 eV) and G_0W_0 are compared. Our G_0W_0 gap of 1.84 ± 0.02 eV (1.81 ± 0.02 eV when extrapolated to an infinite number of bands and \mathbf{k} -points, see supplemental information [URL will be inserted by publisher]) agrees very well with early work by Spataru *et al.*, who reported 1.75 eV,²¹ and later work by Lanzillo *et al.*, who reported 1.81 eV.⁵¹ The small difference to Spataru *et al.*²¹ can be explained by slightly different computational parameters: They used a plasmon-pole approximation to describe the ω -dependence of the dielectric function and a slightly smaller 16 Å unit cell with




FIG. 1. (Color online.) G_0W_0 band structure (red dashed) is compared to scissor-shifted DFT results (black solid). Besides the scissor shift, the inset shows a linear dependence of QP shifts on KS eigenvalues. The fit shows that the GW valence band is stretched by about 1.15 and the GW conduction band by about 1.06 with respect to corresponding KS bands. The Fermi level of the GW band structure is chosen to be at zero energy.




FIG. 2. (Color online.) Left: Band gaps of DFT, G_0W_0 , and modified HSE06 calculations (66% HF exact exchange) for the (8,0)-CNT under strain ϵ . Right: Band stretching parameters $\beta_{CB,VB}$ of G_0W_0 and unmodified HSE06 calculations under strain (256 bands and $1 \times 1 \times 60$ k points). The blue dashed line indicates the DFT-LDA reference.

Coulomb truncation beyond 7 Å cylinder radius.

The inset of Fig. 1 shows that G_0W_0 QP shifts depend approximately linearly on DFT Kohn-Sham (KS) eigenvalues: In addition to the scissor shift that opens up the gap, band stretching parameters β describe the linear slope. We find that valence band (VB) and conduction band (CB) are stretched by $\beta_{vb}=1.15$ and $\beta_{cb}=1.06$. This implies a small correction of effective masses, $m^{GW} = \sqrt{\beta} m^{DFT}$, and needs to be taken into account when solving the BSE with much finer \mathbf{k} -point sampling.

In order to calculate effective masses of the π bands, we use a hyperbolic fit that resembles the G_0W_0 bands as closely as possible.¹² The expression stems from the tight binding (TB) zone folding approach together with the Dirac cone approximation⁵³ for describing CNT band structures. The fit to DFT data yields effective masses of $m_{cb}^{DFT}=0.422 m_0$ for the conduction and $m_{vb}^{DFT}=0.310 m_0$ for the valence band. The effective masses of the respective G_0W_0 bands are $m_{cb}=0.418 m_0$ and $m_{vb}=0.278 m_0$ in quantitative agreement with band stretching.

B. Hybrid functional for approximate QP energies

The QP correction of the DFT gap within the G_0W_0 approach is sizable: The extrapolated shift is 1.21 ± 0.02 eV, compared to a DFT gap of 0.60 eV. This large shift is attributed to weak dielectric screening in the 1D CNT, clearly indicating the need for using a QP correction scheme. Unfortunately, the G_0W_0 approach is computationally expensive and becomes unaffordable, e.g. when a large number of CNTs or many different strained configurations are studied. For these cases, an approximate description of QP corrections is beneficial and using a hybrid

exchange-correlation functional, such as the one by Heyd, Scuseria, and Ernzerhof (HSE06)^{55–57} has proven successful. It comes at much reduced computational cost, since no Coulomb truncation or expensive convergence with respect to empty states is needed. For the (8,0)-CNT, the reduction of cost is about a factor of 6.

The HSE06 functional contains 25% of Hartree-Fock (HF) exact exchange and leads to a band gap of 1.06 eV for the (8,0)-CNT. Increasing the fraction of HF exchange to 66% reproduces the G_0W_0 band gap (see details in the supplemental material at [URL will be inserted by publisher]). Such a large fraction of HF exact exchange is not unusual for low-dimensional systems since screening is much weaker than in bulk materials, revealing almost bare electron-electron interaction. Clearly, using a hybrid exchange-correlation functional *without* adjusting the mixing parameter does not give correct band gaps for CNTs. As an example, the work of Matsuda *et al.* publishes a band gap of about 1.28 eV for the (8,0)-CNT, using the B3LYP functional without adapting the mixing parameter.⁵⁸ Next, we investigate whether the same fixed fraction of HF exchange results in sufficiently precise strain-dependent band gaps for the (8,0)-CNT, compared to G_0W_0 results.

C. Electronic structure of the strained (8,0)-CNT

To investigate the strain dependence of the electronic structure, Fig. 2 shows fundamental gaps computed using DFT, modified HSE06, and G_0W_0 , and band stretching parameters for several relative axial strains up to 6%. This illustrates the strong dependence of the fundamental gap on strain, which is significantly enhanced when QP effects are included, as seen from the different slopes of blue and green curves in the left panel of Fig. 2.

This effect can be understood by invoking strain-

359 dependent dielectric screening, in addition to strain-
 360 dependent shifts of KS eigenvalues computed in DFT
 361 (blue curve in Fig. 2): The smaller the band gap of the
 362 strained CNT, the stronger the dielectric screening, and,
 363 thus, the weaker is the electron-electron repulsion. Since
 364 QP shifts are small in a material with strong dielectric
 365 screening, the G_0W_0 gap of the CNT with the largest
 366 axial strain (smallest gap) is closer to the DFT gap than
 367 for less strained CNTs.

368 Figure 2 also illustrates that the band gap computed
 369 using the modified HSE06 functional with 66 % exact ex-
 370 change is very similar to the one computed using the
 371 G_0W_0 approach for all strains investigated here. The re-
 372 maining difference is less than 0.1 eV, showing that axial
 373 strains up to $\approx 6\%$ have no influence on the required
 374 amount of HF exchange.

375 We also note that while band stretching β differs be-
 376 tween CB and VB, it only slightly changes with strain:
 377 β_{cb} is reduced from 1.06 to 1.00 at 6 % strain and β_{cb}
 378 remains at a constant value of 1.15. The strain dependence
 379 of QP corrections modifies the strain-dependent effective
 380 mass of the CB by less than 3%. The VB is stretched
 381 by 15% (7% change of the effective mass), independent
 382 of the strain value. Overall, this means that the ratio
 383 of DFT and GW corrected effective mass is close to 1.0
 384 and, thus, barely strain dependent. However, the absolute
 385 value of the effective mass (either from GW or from
 386 DFT) is strongly strain dependent as discussed in Sec.
 387 III F (see Fig. 6).

388 D. Optical properties of the strained (8,0)-CNT

389 We now discuss the strain dependence of the optical
 390 spectrum via strain-induced shifts of the transitions E_{11} ,
 391 E_{22} , E_{33} , and E'_{11} as depicted in Fig. 3, where the index
 392 nn indicates transition from the n^{th} π -VB to
 393 the n^{th} π -CB.⁵⁹ The unprimed transitions denote first-
 394 order excitons, whereas the primed transition E'_{11} is a
 395 second-order exciton ($n=2$) that originates from the same
 396 electronic bands as E_{11} . This assignment relies on the
 397 numerical diagonalization of the exciton Hamiltonian,
 398 whose eigenstates are superpositions of non-interacting
 399 KS states. We analyzed these contributions for the dif-
 400 ferent strained cases (see details in the supplemental
 401 material at [URL will be inserted by publisher]) and
 402 our assignment agrees with Spataru *et al.* for the un-
 403 strained case.²¹ In the following, results with and with-
 404 out Coulomb truncation are discussed and the origin of
 405 the exciton binding energy is investigated. The visual-
 406 ization of strain-dependent optical transitions in Fig. 4
 407 shows that the first and second optical transition shift
 408 in opposite directions under strain. This is consistent
 409 with the most simple TB calculation of the CNT elec-
 410 tronic bands with the zone-folding method applied to
 411 (strained) graphene,⁸ which predicts a downshift of
 412 bands with strain for odd transitions ($n=1, 3, \dots$) and
 413 upshifts of even CNT bands ($n=2, 4, \dots$).⁴²⁷




FIG. 3. (Color online.) Strain-dependent optical spectra of the (8,0)-CNT computed using the BSE approach with Coulomb truncation. The E_{11} and E'_{11} transitions shift to lower energies, whereas E_{22} and E_{33} shift to higher energies. E'_{11} denotes a higher-order exciton ($n=2$). Black lines are guides to the eye to highlight the shift of transitions.




FIG. 4. (Color online.) Optical transition energies for the strained (8,0)-CNT with (BSE, blue solid) and without (GW, black dashed) excitonic effects, that shift strongly with applied axial strain, covering the visible spectral range.

In contrast to this TB picture, we observe an upshift for the third optical transition that we attribute to σ - π -hybridization. Since the curvature of the (8,0)-CNT is large, σ - and π -bands hybridize and the respective band energies are lowered. This effect becomes stronger for higher bands and leads to reordering of the $n=3$ and $n=4$ states. As a consequence, the third optical transition shifts in the direction opposite to what is predicted by the zone-folding model, which does not include an effect of a curved CNT surface.

For the (8,0)-CNT, the first optical transition E_{11} , which is often observed in photo- or electroluminescence, appears in the infrared and shifts towards lower energies. For the unstrained CNT we observe E_{11} at 1.51 ± 0.03 eV,




FIG. 5. (Color online.) The first three optical transitions computed with Yambo using RIM and homogeneous screening (“Yambo RIM”) for the 19.5 Å unit cell. For comparison, the result with Coulomb truncation is included (“Yambo trunc”).

which is nearly identical to 1.55 eV reported by Spataru *et al.*²¹ We explain the small difference with the slightly different gaps, the use of RPA instead of plasmon-pole approximation (PPA), and the slightly smaller unit cell.

Under strain, the $GW+BSE$ result for the E_{11} transition shows a downshift to 1.02 eV at 6% tensile strain. Qualitatively, this trend follows the GW results, but the exciton binding energy E_B , defined as difference between GW (dashed black line in Fig. 4) and $GW+BSE$ transition (blue line with markers in Fig. 4), significantly reduces with strain. We explain this via the strain-induced increase of the dielectric constant, i.e. screening (see Fig. 6 and discussion in Sec. III F), that leads to a reduction of the exciton-binding energy.

The E_{22} and higher transitions are observed in optical absorption, photoluminescence (PL),^{15,59,60} Rayleigh scattering,^{61,62} and via photocurrents due to absorption.^{63–65} Figure 3 illustrates that E_{22} and E_{33} each consist of a series of peaks. Their intensity-weighted average, depicted in Fig. 4, shows that E_{22} and E_{33} shift approximately linearly in energy with strain by a large value of about 200 meV/%. For larger strained armchair CNTs, such as (11,0) and (17,0), that show a reduced σ - π -hybridization, this value is only about 150 meV/%.¹⁷ Since these CNTs should possess about the same strain dependence within the TB model with the zone folding scheme, it appears that the σ - π -hybridization itself is strain dependent. This leads to an enhanced strain-sensitivity of electronic bands and corresponding optical transitions of the (8,0)-CNT.

E. Exciton binding energies and long-range Coulomb interaction

In order to understand the physics of screening in strained CNTs, we compare BSE results with and without the Coulomb truncation scheme used for eliminating

artificial Coulomb interactions of CNTs in adjacent super cells. We use Yambo and the RIM to solve the BSE for the untruncated case and compare to the truncated case in Fig. 5. We also compare to the VASP-BSE implementation, which uses a different solver⁴⁹ and find that both codes agree almost perfectly, as documented in the supplemental material [URL will be inserted by the publisher].

Figure 5 shows that optical transitions appear at lower energies when the Coulomb interaction is truncated, which means that corresponding exciton binding energies are larger. While in the untruncated case the electron-hole interaction is (artificially) affected by periodic images over long distances, in the truncated case, no periodic images are present and only the much smaller vacuum screening contributes. Thus, the truncation affects the low- q_z behavior of $\epsilon(q_z)$, which determines the screening of the electron-hole interaction in the long-range limit. The reduction of screening for low q_z due to Coulomb truncation explains the *enhancement* of exciton binding energies. Next, we establish detailed, quantitative insight into the scaling of exciton-binding energies with strain.

F. Scaling of the exciton binding energy with strain

Figure 5 also illustrates that the energies of optical transitions for untruncated and truncated cases depend on strain and approach each other for large strain. The reason is that the band gap is reduced with increasing strain, leading to increased screening that even becomes metallic for about 9% strain. In the metallic case, the truncation has almost no effect on the, then very large, screening.²¹

This effect of strain-dependent screening on exciton binding energy and GW gap does not just occur in 1D materials such as CNTs: The exciton binding energy in bulk ZnO decreases from approximately 70 meV to 55 meV between +2% and -2% strain due to different screening, see Ref. 66. The effect is smaller in bulk, compared to low-dimensional systems, since screening is much stronger in 3D. For various 2D materials with band gaps less than about 2 eV, where screening effects are almost as strong as in CNTs, Zhang *et al.* showed that there is a simple, almost linear dependence of the exciton binding energy on the fundamental band gap.⁶⁷ They also showed that the absolute exciton binding energy is about 50% of the band gap and reported that it changes as the band gap changes, e.g. due to strain.

Next, we interpret the strain dependence of the exciton-binding energy via a scaling relation: Perebeinos *et al.* derived this for CNTs, using a TB Hamiltonian together with an Ohno potential in order to solve the BSE.²⁹ By introducing a single parameter α , they extended the well-known exciton scaling relation in homo-




FIG. 6. (Color online.) Strain-dependent reduced effective mass, dielectric constant (for the 19.5 Å unit cell), and CNT radius. These parameters enter the scaling relation for the exciton binding energy, Eq. (1).

geneous, isotropic materials,⁶⁸ $E_B \sim \mu_{\text{eff}} \epsilon^{-2}$, to

$$E_B \approx A_B \mu^{\alpha-1} \epsilon^{-\alpha} r_{\text{CNT}}^{\alpha-2}, \quad (1)$$

where A_B is the exciton-binding energy in a reference state, r_{CNT} is the CNT radius, μ the reduced mass of electron and hole, and ϵ is the dielectric constant. Perebeinos *et al.* found a value of $\alpha=1.40$ for $\epsilon > 4$ for CNTs. An independent confirmation of the parameter is given by Pedersen, who predicted a scaling of $E_B \sim r_{\text{CNT}}^{-0.6}$ using a variational approach for wave functions on a cylinder surface and homogeneous, background dielectric screening.^{22,28} This result corresponds to the same value of $\alpha=1.4$ and $\sim r_{\text{CNT}}^{\alpha-2}$. While the above relations were developed for a background dielectric screening, we now show that this screening (i.e. no Coulomb truncation) and local fields (i.e. with Coulomb truncation) are related.

To analyze the validity of this scaling relation for CNTs under strain, we depict our first-principles results for the three materials parameters that enter Eq. (1) in Fig. 6. The dielectric constant is obtained from RPA calculations using Yambo and the reduced effective mass results from our G_0W_0 data. This figure shows that the CNT radius depends only weakly on strain; the Poisson ratio of about 0.2 leads to a shift in the exciton binding energy of about 0.7% at 6% tensile strain. Conversely, the electronic structure is much more sensitive, leading to significant changes of effective masses and, via the fundamental gap, of the dielectric constant.^{8,9,11,12} The two parameters μ and ϵ , thus, determine the influence of strain on the exciton binding energy via Eq. (1).

In order to compare this to our BSE results, we depict the strain-dependent exciton-binding energy of the E_{11} transition in Fig. 7. This data is computed using strain-dependent dielectric function $\epsilon(q_z)$ for screening of the electron-hole interaction and we compare results based on Coulomb truncation (see Fig. 8) to those computed without the truncation scheme. As expected, resulting exciton binding energies differ in magnitude,




FIG. 7. (Color online.) Scaling of the strain-dependent exciton binding energy E_B of the E_{11} transition with (“Yambo trunc”) and without Coulomb truncation (“Yambo RIM”). Symbols represent BSE results and dashed lines represent the scaling relation, Eq. (1), with different values of α . The value of 1.40 given by Perebeinos *et al.*²⁹ is compared to a fit to BSE data. Inset: Data for the Coulomb-truncated case as a function of the scaling parameter $\mu^{\alpha-1} \epsilon^{-\alpha} r^{\alpha-2}$.

since the underlying screening models deviate between truncated and non-truncated case, especially for low q_z (see supplemental material [URL will be inserted by publisher]).

More importantly, Fig. 7 illustrates that the scaling relation, Eq. (1), holds: Fitting to results without Coulomb truncation yields a value of $\alpha \approx 1.29 \pm 0.03$ and shows almost perfect agreement with our data, despite the fact that BSE calculations take local-field effects into account, whereas Eq. (1) was derived under the assumption of a constant, homogeneous dielectric screening. Since there may be a significant influence from strong σ - π hybridization due to CNT curvature, it is not surprising that the value of α slightly differs from 1.40 given by Perebeinos.²⁹ We note that the data in Fig. 7 was computed using Yambo; VASP data is shown in the supplemental material at [URL will be inserted by publisher].

Fitting to data with Coulomb truncation, yields a slightly different value of $\alpha \approx 1.21 \pm 0.03$, since local-field effects with Coulomb truncation are not captured by the static, homogeneous screening entering the TB models used by Pedersen^{22,28} or Perebeinos.²⁹ While this difference in α is, thus, not a surprise, it is remarkable that the scaling relation also holds in the Coulomb-truncated case, and we explore this in more detail in the next section. We point out that for this fit, we used the dielectric constant from the untruncated case (see Fig. 6) to mimic background screening, since Coulomb truncation would imply $\epsilon = 1.0$. This is also addressed in the next section, where we introduce a geometry-dependent parameter C_1 to substitute ϵ in the scaling relation. It characterizes the inhomogeneity and describes screening for confined carriers in the truncated geometry.




FIG. 8. (Color online.) In (a) the real part of the dielectric loss function $\epsilon^{-1}(q)$ is shown versus strain. Squares represent first-principles data with Coulomb truncation and lines represent the model fit using Eq. (2). The figures (b) and (c) show the fit coefficients C_1 and C_2' as a function of ϵ and E_{11} , respectively.

G. Inhomogeneous dielectric screening and scaling relation

For a single CNT, as a localized, spatially inhomogeneous system, the wave-vector dependence of $\epsilon(q_z)$ is crucial when describing screening.^{21,24,45,70} In order to incorporate this into the scaling relation, we use the analytic expression for the dielectric function of an infinite 1D cylinder, derived by Deslippe *et al.*²⁴ using the Penn model:⁷¹

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{1D}^{-1}(q_z) &= 1 + \chi(q_z) v_{\text{trunc}}(q_z) \\ &\approx 1 - C_2 \frac{R}{E_{11}} \frac{C_1 q_z^2}{1 + C_1 q_z^2} [2 I_0(q_z R) K_0(q_z R)] \\ &= 1 - C_2' R \frac{C_1 q_z^2}{1 + C_1 q_z^2} [2 I_0(q_z R) K_0(q_z R)] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here, C_1 , C_2 , and $C_2' = C_2/E_{11}$ are constants and R is the CNT radius. I_0 and K_0 are modified Bessel functions of the first and second kind, respectively. We fit this expression to our first-principles data for $\epsilon(q_z)$ in Fig. 8 and observe very good agreement. This means that the model of the 1D cylinder mimics screening in a CNT, once the influence of the supercell is removed via Coulomb truncation.

As shown in Fig. 8, the resulting fit parameter C_1 early depends on the strain-dependent dielectric constant ϵ ; C_2' is strain independent. Therefore, C_1 carries the strain dependence of the screening function that was described by ϵ before Coulomb truncation was applied. The relation between C_1 and ϵ is almost linear, which explains

why the scaling relation, Eq. (1), also holds in the case of Coulomb truncation. We can, therefore, rewrite Eq. (1) using C_1 instead of ϵ :

$$E_B = A_B r_{\text{CNT}}^{\alpha-2} \mu^{\alpha-1} C_1^{-\alpha} \quad (3)$$

Hybrid DFT calculations can then yield effective masses and, after adjusting the fraction of exact exchange, strain-dependent corrected gaps. In combination with the RPA, these calculations also yield the inhomogeneous screening as a function of strain and, thus, the parameter C_1 . This shows that for an isolated, strained CNT, the exciton-binding energy can be related to that of the unstrained state by means of a scaling relation, Eq. (3).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We use first-principles electronic-structure calculations, based on the *GW*+*BSE* approach, to compute strong, strain-related shifts of peaks E_{nn} in the optical-absorption spectrum of an (8,0)-CNT, consistent with earlier literature. We find that the exciton binding energy in strained CNTs is a function of the band gap and our work leads to the important conclusion that this arises directly from strain-dependent inhomogeneous dielectric screening. This shows that deformation potentials of electronic eigenvalues *and* exciton binding energies need to be considered explicitly, in order to predict strain-dependent optical spectra of CNTs.

While this implies that the effect of many-body physics on optical spectra in strained CNTs is crucial, we then show that a more simple scaling relation for the exciton binding energy is applicable also to strained CNTs. This scaling relation allows us to extrapolate the shift of optical transitions from the unstrained state to the strained state, based on the strain-induced shift of electronic energy levels and the strain dependence of $\epsilon(q)$ and μ . We then showed that the modified HSE06 hybrid functional, with a fraction of 66% exact exchange, mimics QP corrections for the unstrained CNT quite well, allowing us to avoid expensive *GW* calculations of strained CNTs to determine these parameters.

Finally, we provide detailed understanding of why the scaling relation works for strained CNTs, even though it relies on the dielectric constant as a parameter and neglects the influence of local-field effects. To this end, we demonstrate that in low-dimensional materials, a wave-vector dependent screening function $\epsilon(q_z)$ must be used. In addition, in first-principles excited-state calculations the Coulomb interaction must be truncated in order to obtain supercell convergence, which influences the long-range, low- q_z part of the screening function. We show that a suitable screening function $\epsilon(q_z)$ for CNTs can be obtained from a 1D Penn model of a charge on an infinitely long, hollow cylinder and connect the parameters of this model to our first-principles data, leading to an excellent fit. We envision that this significantly advances the study of optical transitions in strained CNTs and

638 enables broader applications of this interesting material⁶⁴³
 639 system.

port by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft DFG re-
 search unit 1713 and funding of the German academic
 exchange service (DAAD) is gratefully acknowledged.
 We thank the Yambo developers, who gave important
 feedback concerning technical issues during some calcu-
 lations.

640 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

641 Part of this work was supported by the National Sci-
 642 ence Foundation under Grant No. DMR-1555153. Sup-

-
- 649 * christian.wagner@zfm.tu-chemnitz.de 699
 650 † schleife@illinois.edu 700
 651 ¹ Q. Lu and B. Bhattacharya, *Nanotechnology* **16**, 555–566⁷⁰¹
 652 (2005). 702
 653 ² Y. Wu, M. Huang, F. Wang, X. M. H. Huang, S. Rosen-⁷⁰³
 654 blatt, L. Huang, H. Yan, S. P. O’Brien, J. Hone, and T. F.⁷⁰⁴
 655 Heinz, *Nano Lett.* **8**, 4158 (2008). 705
 656 ³ Z. Q. Zhang, B. Liu, Y. L. Chen, H. Jiang, K. C. Hwang,⁷⁰⁶
 657 and Y. Huang, *Nanotechnology* **19**, 395702 (2008). 707
 658 ⁴ J.-Y. Park, in *Carbon Nanotube Electronics*, Integrated⁷⁰⁸
 659 Circuits and Systems, edited by J. Kong and A. Javey⁷⁰⁹
 660 (Springer US, 2009) pp. 1–42. 710
 661 ⁵ C. Pozrikidis, *Archive of Applied Mechanics* **79**, 113⁷¹¹
 662 (2009). 712
 663 ⁶ A. Hirsch, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **41**, 1853 (2002). 713
 664 ⁷ A. Förster, C. Wagner, S. Gemming, and J. Schuster,⁷¹⁴
 665 *Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B* **33**, 052203⁷¹⁵
 666 (2015). 716
 667 ⁸ L. Yang and J. Han, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 154 (2000). 717
 668 ⁹ A. Kleiner and S. Eggert, *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 073408 (2001).⁷¹⁸
 669 ¹⁰ E. D. Minot, Y. Yaish, V. Sazonova, J.-Y. Park, M. Brink,⁷¹⁹
 670 and P. L. McEuen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 156401 (2003). 720
 671 ¹¹ C. Wagner, S. Hartmann, B. Wunderle, J. Schuster,⁷²¹
 672 S. Schulz, and T. Gessner, in *Systems, Signals and De-*⁷²²
 673 *vices (SSD), 2012 9th International Multi-Conference on*⁷²³
 674 *(2012)* p. 1. 724
 675 ¹² C. Wagner, J. Schuster, and T. Gessner, *J. Comput. Elec-*⁷²⁵
 676 *tron.* **15**, 881 (2016). 726
 677 ¹³ P. Gopinath, A. Mohite, H. Shah, J.-T. Lin, and B. W.⁷²⁷
 678 Alphenaar, *Nano Lett.* **7**, 3092 (2007). 728
 679 ¹⁴ H. Maki, T. Sato, and K. Ishibashi, *Nano Lett.* **7**, 890⁷²⁹
 680 (2007). 730
 681 ¹⁵ T. K. Leeuw, D. A. Tsyboulski, P. N. Nikolaev, S. M.⁷³¹
 682 Bachilo, S. Arepalli, and R. B. Weisman, *Nano Lett.* **8**,⁷³²
 683 826 (2008). 733
 684 ¹⁶ M. Huang, Y. Wu, B. Chandra, H. Yan, Y. Shan, T. F.⁷³⁴
 685 Heinz, and J. Hone, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 136803 (2008).⁷³⁵
 686 ¹⁷ C. D. Spataru and F. Léonard, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 045404⁷³⁶
 687 (2013). 737
 688 ¹⁸ C. Hierold, T. Helbling, C. Roman, L. Durrer, A. Jungen,⁷³⁸
 689 and C. Stampfer, *Advances in Science and Technology* **54**,⁷³⁹
 690 343 (2008). 740
 691 ¹⁹ B. R. Burg, T. Helbling, C. Hierold, and D. Poulidakos,⁷⁴¹
 692 *J. Appl. Phys.* **109**, 064310 (2011). 742
 693 ²⁰ T. Helbling, C. Roman, L. Durrer, C. Stampfer, and C. Hi-⁷⁴³
 694 erold, *IEEE Trans. Electron Devices* **58**, 4053 (2011). 744
 695 ²¹ C. D. Spataru, S. Ismail-Beigi, L. X. Benedict, and S. G.⁷⁴⁵
 696 Louie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 077402 (2004). 746
 697 ²² T. G. Pedersen, *Carbon* **42**, 1007 (2004), european Ma-⁷⁴⁷
 698 terials Research Society 2003, Symposium B: Advanced⁷⁴⁸
 Multifunctional Nanocarbon Materials and Nanosystems.
²³ G. L. Zhao, D. Bagayoko, and L. Yang, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**,
 245416 (2004).
²⁴ J. Deslippe, M. Dipoppa, D. Prendergast, M. V. O.
 Moutinho, R. B. Capaz, and S. G. Louie, *Nano Lett.* **9**,
 1330 (2009).
²⁵ E. Malic, J. Maultzsch, S. Reich, and A. Knorr, *Phys.*
Rev. B **82**, 035433 (2010).
²⁶ G. Cappellini, R. DelSole, L. Reining, and F. Bechstedt,
Phys. Rev. B **47**, 9892 (1993).
²⁷ J. Jiang, R. Saito, G. G. Samsonidze, A. Jorio, S. G. Chou,
 G. Dresselhaus, and M. S. Dresselhaus, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**,
 035407 (2007).
²⁸ T. G. Pedersen, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 073401 (2003).
²⁹ V. Perebeinos, J. Tersoff, and P. Avouris, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*
92, 257402 (2004).
³⁰ P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev.* **136**, 864 (1964).
³¹ W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, *Phys. Rev.* **140**, A1133 (1965).
³² L. Hedin, *Phys. Rev.* **139**, A796 (1965).
³³ G. Onida, L. Reining, and A. Rubio, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**,
 601 (2002).
³⁴ J. P. Perdew and A. Zunger, *Phys. Rev. B* **23**, 5048 (1981).
³⁵ A. Dal Corso, S. Baroni, R. Resta, and S. de Gironcoli,
Phys. Rev. B **47**, 3588 (1993).
³⁶ P. Giannozzi, S. Baroni, N. Bonini, M. Calandra, R. Car,
 C. Cavazzoni, D. Ceresoli, G. L. Chiarotti, M. Cococ-
 cioni, I. Dabo, A. Dal Corso, S. de Gironcoli, S. Fab-
 ris, G. Fratesi, R. Gebauer, U. Gerstmann, C. Gougous-
 sis, A. Kokalj, M. Lazzeri, L. Martin-Samos, N. Marzari,
 F. Mauri, R. Mazzarello, S. Paolini, A. Pasquarello,
 L. Paulatto, C. Sbraccia, S. Scandolo, G. Sclauzero, A. P.
 Seitsonen, A. Smogunov, P. Umari, and R. M. Wentzcov-
 itch, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **21**, 395502 (2009).
³⁷ H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 5188
 (1976).
³⁸ G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 1758 (1999).
³⁹ G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 11169
 (1996).
⁴⁰ J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev.*
Lett. **77**, 3865 (1996).
⁴¹ P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 17953 (1994).
⁴² A. Marini, C. Hogan, M. Grüning, and D. Varsano, *Com-*
put. Phys. Commun. **180**, 1392 (2009).
⁴³ C. A. Rozzi, D. Varsano, A. Marini, E. K. U. Gross, and
 A. Rubio, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 205119 (2006).
⁴⁴ C. Freysoldt, P. Eggert, P. Rinke, A. Schindlmayr, and
 M. Scheffler, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 235428 (2008).
⁴⁵ F. Hüser, T. Olsen, and K. S. Thygesen, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**,
 245309 (2013).
⁴⁶ D. Y. Qiu, F. H. da Jornada, and S. G. Louie, *Phys. Rev.*

- 749 **B 93**, 235435 (2016). 775
- 750 47 M. Rohlfing and S. G. Louie, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 4927 (2000). 776
- 751 48 C. Rödl, F. Fuchs, J. Furthmüller, and F. Bechstedt, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 184408 (2008). 778
- 752 49 F. Fuchs, C. Rödl, A. Schleife, and F. Bechstedt, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 085103 (2008). 780
- 753 50 F. Bechstedt, R. D. Sole, G. Cappellini, and L. Reining, *Solid State Commun.* **84**, 765 (1992). 782
- 754 51 N. A. Lanzillo, N. Khariche, and S. K. Nayak, *Scientific Reports* **4**, 3609 (2014). 784
- 755 52 Only the π bands are optically active and their effective 785
756 masses play an important role when comparing to results 786
757 from BSE calculations. 787
- 758 53 M. P. Anantram and F. Léonard, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **69**, 507 (2006). 788
- 759 54 The prefactors β determined above yield the relation 790
760 $m^{\text{GW}} = \sqrt{\beta} m^{\text{DFT}}$. 791
- 761 55 J. Heyd, G. E. Scuseria, and M. Ernzerhof, *J. Chem. Phys.* **118**, 8207 (2003). 793
- 762 56 J. Heyd, G. E. Scuseria, and M. Ernzerhof, *J. Chem. Phys.* **124**, 219906 (2006). 795
- 763 57 A. V. Krukau, O. A. Vydrov, A. F. Izmaylov, and G. E. Scuseria, *J. Chem. Phys.* **125**, 224106 (2006). 797
- 764 58 Y. Matsuda, J. Tahir-Kheli, and W. A. Goddard, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **1**, 2946 (2010). 799
- 765 59 S. M. Bachilo, M. S. Strano, C. Kittrell, R. H. Hauge, R. E. Smalley, and R. B. Weisman, *Science* **298**, 2361 (2002). 800
801
- 60 Y. Ohno, S. Iwasaki, Y. Murakami, S. Kishimoto, S. Maruyama, and T. Mizutani, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 235427 (2006).
- 61 M. Wang, L.-M. Peng, J. Y. Wang, and Q. Chen, *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **16**, 1462 (2006).
- 62 K. Liu, J. Deslippe, F. Xiao, R. B. Capaz, X. Hong, S. Aloni, A. Zettl, W. Wang, X. Bai, S. G. Louie, E. Wang, and F. Wang, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **7**, 325 (2012).
- 63 M. Freitag, Y. Martin, J. A. Misewich, R. Martel, and P. Avouris, *Nano Lett.* **3**, 1067 (2003).
- 64 N. M. Gabor, Z. Zhong, K. Bosnick, and P. L. McEuen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 087404 (2012).
- 65 N. Rauhut, M. Engel, M. Steiner, R. Krupke, P. Avouris, and A. Hartschuh, *ACS Nano* **6**, 6416 (2012).
- 66 A. Schleife, C. Rödl, F. Fuchs, J. Furthmüller, and F. Bechstedt, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **91**, 241915 (2007).
- 67 M. Zhang, L.-Y. Huang, X. Zhang, and G. Lu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 209701 (2017).
- 68 H. Haug and S. W. Koch, *Quantum theory of the optical and electronic properties of semiconductors*, 5th ed. (World Scientific, 2009).
- 69 The Poisson ratio of about 0.2 leads to a shift in the binding energy of about 0.7% at 6% strain.
- 70 F. A. Rasmussen, P. S. Schmidt, K. T. Winther, and K. S. Thygesen, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 155406 (2016).
- 71 D. R. Penn, *Phys. Rev.* **128**, 2093 (1962).