SUMMER SCHOOL ON COMPUTATIONAL MATERIALS SCIENCE

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, June 13-23, 2005

Pseudopotentials and Basis Sets

How to generate and test them

Pseudopotential idea

Atomic Si



Core electrons... highly localized very depth energy ... are chemically inert



Valence wave functions must be orthogonal to the core wave functions



The "atom" program

"pseudopotential generation" label





• Run the shell script (pg.sh)

\$ pg.sh Si.tm2.inp Calculation for Si.tm2 completed. Output in directory Si.tm2

• Check contents of new directory (Si.tm2)

\$ ls Si.tm2								
AECHARGE	AEWFNR3	PSLOGD3	PSPOTR3	PSWFNR3	charge.gplot			
AELOGDO	CHARGE	PSPOTQO	PSWFNQO	RHO	charge.gps			
AELOGD1	INP	PSPOTQ1	PSWFNQ1	SCRPSPOTRO	pots.gplot			
AELOGD2	OUT	PSPOTQ2	PSWFNQ2	SCRPSPOTR1	pots.gps			
AELOGD3	PSCHARGE	PSPOTQ3	PSWFNQ3	SCRPSPOTR2	pseudo.gplot			
AEWFNRO	PSLOGDO	PSPOTRO	PSWFNRO	SCRPSPOTR3	pseudo.gps			
AEWFNR1	PSLOGD1	PSPOTR1	PSWFNR1	VPSFMT	pt.gplot			
AEWFNR2	PSLOGD2	PSPOTR2	PSWFNR2	VPSOUT	pt.gps			

• Plot the pseudo-potentials/orbitals

\$ cd Si.tm2

\$ gnuplot pseudo.gps

==> Postscript output in pseudo.ps

Procedure (II)

Pseudo-wave function



Pseudopotential



Logarithmic derivative

Radial

Fourier-T

Procedure (III)



Radial charge distribution:

• Compare all-electron with pseudo-charge



Pseudopotential testing (I)

The *all-electron* (ae.sh) and *pseudo-test* (pt.sh) scripts:

pt Si Test 3s0 3p3 3d1
Si ca
0.0
3 3
3 0 0.00
3 1 3.00
3 2 1.00

sh ../pt.sh Si.test.inp Si.tm2.vps Output data in directory Si.test-Si.tm2...

Pseudopotential testing (II)

\$ cd Si.te \$ ls [A-Z] AECHARGE AEWFNRO	st-Si.tm2 * AEWFNR1 CHA AEWFNR2 INP	RGE OUT PTCHARGE	PTWFNRO PTWFNR1	PTWFNR2 RHO	VPSIN	
<pre>\$ ## EIGEN \$ \$ grep '&v ATM3 3s 0.0 3p 0.0 3d 0.0</pre>	VALUE TEST ' OUT 11-JUL-02 0.0000 3.0000 1.0000	Si Test 3s -1.14358268 -0.60149474 -0.04725203	0 3p3 3d1 3. 2. 0.	71462770 68964513 46423687	A tra will r energ func	nsferable pseudo reproduce the AE by levels and wave stions in arbitrary environments
ATM3 1s 0.0 2p 0.0 3d 0.0	11-JUL-02 0.0000 3.0000 1.0000	Si Test 3s -1.14353959 -0.59931810 -0.04733135	0 3p3 3d1 0. 0. 0.	56945741 95613808 45664551		

levels and wave

Pseudopotential testing (III)

- Compute the energy of two different configurations
- Compute the difference in energy
- For the pseudopotential to be transferible:

&d	total	energy	differences	s in se	eries	
&d		1	2	3	4	5
&d	1	0.0000			Λ Τ	$\neg AE$
&d	2	0.4308	0.0000		ΔI	
&d	3	0.4961	0.0653	0.000)	-
&d	4	0.9613	0.5305	0.4652	2 0.0000	
&d	5	1.4997	1.0689	1.0030	0.5384	0.0000
&d		1	2	3	4	5
&d	1	0.0000			A 7	$\neg PS$
&d	2	0.4299	0.0000		Δh	
&d	3	0.4993	0.0694	0.000)	
&d	4	0.9635	0.5336	0.4642	2 0.0000	
&d	Б	1 5044	1 0745	1 0051	0 5400	0 0000

ions E_{C1} E_{C2} $\Delta E = E_{C2} - E_{C1}$ $\Delta E^{AE} = \Delta E^{PS}$

 $\begin{array}{l} \rightarrow 3s^2 \ 3p^2 \quad \mbox{(reference)} \\ \rightarrow 3s^2 \ 3p^1 \ 3d^1 \\ \rightarrow 3s^1 \ 3p^3 \\ \rightarrow 3s^1 \ 3p^2 \ 3d^1 \\ \rightarrow 3s^0 \ 3p^3 \ 3d^1 \end{array}$

Large core-valence overlap



Errors due to non-linearity of XC-potential

Non-linear core corrections

Standard pseudopotential unscreening: Valence charge only

$$V^{ps} = V^{ps}_{scr}[\rho_{v}](r) - V_{H}[\rho_{v}](r) - V_{xc}[\rho_{v}](r)$$

However...

$$V_{xc}[\rho_{v} + \rho_{c}](r) \neq V_{xc}[\rho_{v}](r) + V_{xc}[\rho_{c}](r)$$

Keep core charge in pseudopotential generation

$$\widetilde{V}_{xc} = V_{xc}[\rho_{v}] + \{V_{xc}[\rho_{v} + \rho_{c}] - V_{xc}[\rho_{v}]\}$$

$$V^{ps}(r) = V^{ps}_{scr}[\rho_{v} + \rho_{c}](r) - V_{H}[\rho_{v}](r) - V_{xc}[\rho_{v} + \rho_{c}](r)$$

PCC input file

New flag



Pseudo-core & pseudo-valence charge



Smooth Fourier Transform

The real-space grid required fineness depends on how you define the pseudopotential. The *meshcutoff* parameter can be determined from the Fourier Transform.

Cutoff =
$$(q_{\text{max}})^2$$



Basis generation



"Divide and Conquer" W. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 1438 (1992)

$$\phi_{Ilm}(\vec{r}) = R_{Il}(r_I) Y_{lm}(\hat{r}_I) \qquad \vec{r}_I = \vec{r} - \vec{R}_I$$

- <u>Numerical Atomic Orbitals (NAOs)</u>: *Numerical solution of the KS Hamiltonian for the isolated pseudoatom with the same approximations (xc, pseudos) as for the condensed system*
- Very efficient
- Lack of systematic for convergence
- Main features:
 - Size or number of functions
 Range of localization of these functions
 Shape or functional form used.

Basis Size (I)

Depends on the required accuracy and available computational power

Quick and dirty calculations

Highly converged calculations

Minimal basis set (single- ζ ; SZ)

Complete multiple- ζ Polarization

Diffuse orbitals

Basis Size (II): improving

One single radial function per angular momentum shell occupied in the free-atom. Single-ζ (minimal or SZ) Improving the quality?

Radial flexibilization:Add more than one radial functionwithin the same angularmomentum shellMultiple-ζ

Angular flexibilization: Add shells of different angular momentum

Polarization

Examples

Atom	Valence	SZ			DZ	Р		
	configuration							
		# orbital	s symmetry	# orbita	ls symmetry	# orbitals	symmetry	
Si	$3s^2 \ 3p^2$	1	S	2	s	1	d_{xy}	
		1	p_x	2	p_x	1	d_{yz}	
		1	p_y	2	p_y	1	d_{zx}	
		1	p_z	2	p_z	1	$d_{x^2-y^2}$	
						1	$d_{\Im z^2-r^2}$	
	Total	4		8		(DZ+P) 13	1	
Atom	Valence							

Atom	Valence									
	configuration									
		# •	orbitals	symmetry	#	orbitals	symmetry	#	orbitals	symmetry
Fe	$4s^2 \ 3d^6$		1	S		2	S		1	p_x
			1	d_{xy}		2	d_{xy}		1	p_y
			1	d_{yz}		2	d_{yz}		1	p_z
			1	d_{zx}		2	d_{zx}			
			1	$d_{x^2-y^2}$		2	$d_{x^2-y^2}$			
			1	$d_{3z^2-r^2}$		2	$d_{3z^2-r^2}$			
	Total		6			12		(D	Z+P) 15	

Basis Size (III): Polarization

Perturbative polarization

Apply a small E field to the orbital we want to polarize

S

Atomic polarization

Solve Schrödinger equation for higher angular momentum

unbound in the free atom \Rightarrow require short cut offs



E. Artacho et al, Phys. Stat. Sol. (b), 215, 809 (1999)

Basis Size (IV): Convergence Bulk Si

Cohesion curves

PW and NAO convergence



Range (I): How to get sparsity for $O(\tilde{n})$

- Neglecting interactions below a tolerance or beyond some scope of neighbours ⇒ numerical instablilities for high tolerances.
- Strictly localized atomic orbitals (zero beyond a given cutoff radius, r_c)

 Accuracy and computational efficiency depend on the range of the atomic orbitals.

• Way to define all the cutoff radii in a balanced way.

Range (II): Energy Shift

Easy approach to define the cutoff radii for the NAOs:

$$\left[-\frac{1}{2r}\frac{d^2}{dr^2}r + \frac{l(l+1)}{2r^2} + V_l(r)\right]\phi_l(r) = (\varepsilon_l + \delta\varepsilon_l)\phi_l(r)$$

A single parameter for all cutoff radii...

E. Artacho et al. Phys. Stat. Solidi (b) 215, 809 (1999)



Fireballs

O. F. Sankey & D. J. Niklewski, Phys. Rev. B 40, 3979 (1989)

...BUT, a different cutoff radius for each orbital

Range (II): Convergence



Bulk Si

equal s, p orbitals radii

J. Soler et al, J. Phys: Condens. Matter, 14, 2745 (2002)



The radial function shape is mainly determined by the pseudopotential.

Extra parameters can be introduced to add flexibility:

• δQ : extra charge per atomic specie.

• **Confinement** : imposed separately for each angular momentum shell.



Shape (II)

Soft confinement

(J. Junquera et al, Phys. Rev. B 64, 235111 (01))

Shape of the optimal **3***s* orbital of Mg in MgO for different schemes

Corresponding optimal confinement potential

•Better variational basis sets

•Removes the discontinuity of the derivative

PAO.Basis (I)

Add polarization %block PAO.Basis # Define Basis set # Species label, number of I-shells Cu 4sn=4 # n, I, Nzeta, Polarization, NzetaPol 5.200 5.500 Rc 1.000 1.000 2 n=3 2 # n, l, Nzeta 3.541 4.991 Rc 1.000 1.000 nd 🖌 %endblock PAO.Basis

SUMMER SCHOOL ON COMPUTATIONAL MATERIALS SCIENCE University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, June 13-23, 2005 PAO.Basis (II): new generation %block PAO.Basis # Define Basis set 0.10660 Cu 3 5.78489 0.96502 n=4 0 Ε 5.10647 1.00000 0.48813 Ε 2.51950 n=4 1 1 Polarization 4.97570 orbital 1.00000 3.07629 1 4.30968 n=3 2 Ε 4.99958 1.00000 %endblock PAO.Basis

Procedure

- 1. Check the difference in energies involved in your problem
- 2. For semiquantitative results and general trends use SZ
- 3. Improve the basis:
 - Automatic DZP (Split Valence & Perturbative Polarization):
 - High quality for most systems
 - Good valence between well converged results & computational cost
 - 'Standard'
 - Rule of thumb in Quantum Chemistry: *« a basis should always be doubled before being polarized ».*
- 4. Functional optimization of the basis

Pseudos & Basis repository

- Pseudopotentials and basis sets available in the SIESTA web page: www.uam.es/siesta
 - Uploaded by users
 - input files to generate them
 - Plots of the radial functions
 - Documentation of the tests done
 - Author's contact information
 - The PAO is pseudopotential-dependent.

• Check also in the user's mailing list.