

Work in progress

by

Alfred Alocias Mariadason

THESIS

for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE



Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences
University of Oslo

May 2018

TODO: write creative commons licence

Abstract

Work in progress

Acknowledgements

Work in progress

Contents

1		9
1	Introduction	9
1.1	bleh	9
2		11
1	Variational Principle	11
2	Lagrange Multiplier Method	11
3	Gaussian Type Orbitals	11
3		13
1	Hartree-Fock Theory	13
1.1	Assumptions	13
1.2	Energy Functional	13
1.3	Hartree-Fock Equations	15
1.4	Restricted Hartree-Fock	17
2	Quantum Monte Carlo	17
2.1	The Variational Principle and Expectation Value of Energy	18
2.2	The Trial Wave Function	18
2.3	Use Diffusion Theory and the PDF	18
2.4	Metropolis-Hastings Algorithm	18
2.5	Importance Sampling	19

Symbols List

Work in progress make for $w_{i \rightarrow j} \equiv w(i|j)$

Source Code

Work in progress

Chapter 1

1 Introduction

1.1 bleh

Chapter 2

In this chapter we will list general theory regarding functions used in the methods mentioned in chapter 3 and show important properties used in later derivations.

1 Variational Principle

The Variational principle states that for any normalized function ψ in Hilbert Space » REF HILBERT « with a Hermitian operator H the minimum eigenvalue E_0 for H has an upper-bound given by the expectation value of H in the function ψ . That is

$$E_0 \leq \langle H \rangle = \langle \psi | H | \psi \rangle = \int \psi^* H \psi dr \quad (2.1)$$

See [1] for proof and more.

2 Lagrange Multiplier Method

See [2, 3]. The optimization method of Lagrange multipliers maximizes(or minimizes) a function $f : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with a constraint $g : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ We assume that f and g have continuous first derivatives in all variables(continuous first partial derivatives).

Given the above we can define a so-called Lagrangian \mathcal{L}

$$\mathcal{L}[x_1, \dots, x_N, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M] = f(x_1, \dots, x_N) - \lambda g(x_1, \dots, x_N) \quad (2.2)$$

where the λ is called a Lagrange-multiplier. We now state that if $f(x_1^0, \dots, x_N^0)$ is a maxima of $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ then there exists a Lagrange-multiplier λ_0 such that $(x_1^0, \dots, x_N^0, \lambda_0)$ is a stationary point for the Lagrangian. This then yields the $N + 1$ Lagrange-equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda} = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

to be solved for x_1, \dots, x_N and λ .

3 Gaussian Type Orbitals

Gaussian Type Orbitals or GTO's are functions of the following form » REF GTO here «

$$G_i^\alpha(x, A) \equiv (x - A)^i e^{-\alpha(x-A)^2} \quad (2.4)$$

We call α for the scaling parameter and i for the order of the GTO. The variable A is where the function is centered. These are in many literatures referred to as *primitive gaussians*.

Chapter 3

In this chapter we will address » LIST METHODS « regarding computational quantum mechanics and further deepen into Hartree-Fock methods and Variational Monte Carlo method. Optimization of calculation is also given while structure of program is given in » REF TO PROGRAM STRUCTURE CHAPTER «. General statistical theory used is given in » REF TO STATISTICS CHAPTER «

1 Hartree-Fock Theory

Hartree-Fock theory method is a method for approximating the wavefunction of a stationary many-body quantum state and thereby also obtain an estimate for the energy in this state. In this section we will derive the Hartree-Fock equations from scratch, following closely » REF SOMETHING HERE « by » REF AUTHOR « and find the so-called Roothaan-Hall equations known as *Unrestricted Hartree-Fock* method, which is also the method used for obtaining the results given in » REF RESULTS CHAPTER «.

1.1 Assumptions

Hartree-Fock method makes the following assumptions of the system

- The Born-Oppenheimer approximation, see » REF BO «.
- All relativistic effects are negligible.
- The wavefunction can be described by a single Slater determinant » REF SLATER « or permanent in case of bosons(former is for fermions).
- The Mean Field Approximation holds.

With these inherent approximations the last one is the most important to take into account as it can cause large deviations from test solutions (analytic solutions, experimental data etc.) since the electron correlations is in reality, for many cases, not negligible. There exists many methods that try to fix this problem » LIST METHODS «. The *Variational Monte Carlo* (or VMC) is the method for deeper explorations in this Thesis, see section 2 for more details.

1.2 Energy Functional

The general expression (for a general system) for the energy is given in section 1, we restate it

$$E[\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha})] = \frac{\langle \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) | H | \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \rangle}{\langle \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) | \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \rangle} \quad (3.1)$$

The denominator is just the normalization factor.

Before we can obtain the Hartree-Fock equations we need an expression for the expectation value of the energy, an *energy functional* (functional in the sense that it is dependant on the wavefunction).

With the mentioned Born-Oppenheimer approximation we set up the Schrödinger equation » REF SL « with the following Hamiltonian » REF HAMILTONIAN «

$$H \equiv H_0 + H_I \quad (3.2)$$

where H_0 is the Hamiltonian of some a system with analytic solutions to the wavefunction(i.e harmonic oscillator) meaning

$$H_0 = V(\mathbf{R}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \nabla_i^2 \quad (3.3)$$

where $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N$ (the positions of the particles) and V is the expression for the potential of the system. The second part of equation 3.2 will be referred to as the *Interaction Hamiltonian* and is assumed to be a function of the inter-particle distances $\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j$ meaning

$$H_I = \sum_{i < j} f(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) \quad (3.4)$$

with f being the function describing the interaction between two particles labeled i and j (for instance the Coloumb interaction due to the charge of particles).

As a summary and later reference the full Hamiltonian of the system is

$$H = V(\mathbf{R}) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \nabla_i^2 + \sum_{i < j} f(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) \quad (3.5)$$

which, when inserted into equation 3.1, gives

$$E[\Psi_T] = \langle \Psi_T | V | \Psi_T \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \langle \Psi_T | \nabla_i^2 | \Psi_T \rangle + \sum_{i < j} \langle \Psi_T | f | \Psi_T \rangle \quad (3.6)$$

where we have omitted the normalization factor and argument variables. We start with the part involving H_0 giving

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_T | H_0 | \Psi_T \rangle &= \sum_i \langle \Psi_T | h_i | \Psi_T \rangle \\ &= \sum_i \langle \psi_{ii} | h_i | \psi_{ii} \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

with h_i being the single-particle Hamiltonian (for a particle i). The final result here is due to the fact that h_i only acts on particle i and that the ψ 's are orthogonal.

Before we go any further with H_I let us introduce the so-called permutation operator P which interchanges the labels of particles meaning we can define

$$A \equiv \frac{1}{N!} \sum_p (-1)^p P \quad (3.8)$$

the so-called *antisymmetrization* operator. This operator has the following traits

- The Hamiltonian H and A commute since the Hamiltonian is invariant under permutation.
- A applied on itself (that is A^2) is equal to itself since permuting a permuted state reproduces the state.

We can now express out Slater Ψ_T in terms of A as

$$\Psi_T = \sqrt{N!} A \prod_{i,j} \psi_{ij} \quad (3.9)$$

where $\psi_{ij} = \psi_j(\mathbf{r}_i)$ is element i, j of the Slater matrix (the matrix associated with the Slater determinant Ψ_T).

The interaction part of H is then

$$\langle \Psi_T | H_I | \Psi_T \rangle = N! \prod_{i,j} \langle \psi_{ij} | A H_I A | \psi_{ij} \rangle \quad (3.10)$$

The interaction H_I and A commute since A commutes with H giving

$$A H_I A | \psi_{ij} \rangle = \frac{1}{N!^2} \sum_{i < j} \sum_p (-1)^{2p} f_{ij} P | \psi_{ij} \rangle \quad (3.11)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N!^2} \sum_{i < j} f_{ij} (1 - P_{ij}) | \psi_{ij} \rangle \quad (3.12)$$

The factor $1 - P_{ij}$ comes from the fact that contributions with $i \neq j$ vanishes due to orthogonality when P is applied. The final expression for the interaction term is thus

$$\langle \Psi_T | H_I | \Psi_T \rangle = \sum_{i < j} \prod_{k,l} [\langle \psi_{kl} | f_{ij} | \psi_{kl} \rangle - \langle \psi_{kl} | f_{ij} | \psi_{lk} \rangle] \quad (3.13)$$

Writing out the product and realizing the double summation over pairs of states we end up with

$$\langle \Psi_T | H_I | \Psi_T \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} [\langle \psi_{ij} \psi_{ji} | f_{ij} | \psi_{ij} \psi_{ji} \rangle - \langle \psi_{ij} \psi_{ji} | f_{ij} | \psi_{ji} \psi_{ij} \rangle] \quad (3.14)$$

Relabeling the indices in terms of just one index p and q to represent just a state (the integration label does not matter) we get the following energy functional

$$E[\Psi_T] = \sum_p \langle \psi_p | h | \psi_p \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q} \langle \psi_p \psi_q | H_I | \psi_p \psi_q \rangle_{AS} \quad (3.15)$$

We drop the index in h since the integration label does not matter. We have also introduced the notation

$$\langle pq | v | rs \rangle_{AS} = \langle pq | v | rs \rangle - \langle pq | v | sr \rangle \quad (3.16)$$

referred to as the *antisymmetric part* with v being some hermitian operator.

The expression given in equation 3.15 is the functional form in its general form (since we haven't given any special form for the basis spanned by the ψ 's). In the next section we will derive the Hartree-Fock equations using equation 3.15.

1.3 Hartree-Fock Equations

In order to obtain the Hartree-Fock equations we start by expanding the wavefunction as a linear combination of some *known orthonormal basis* $\{\phi_\lambda(\mathbf{r})\}$ meaning

$$\Psi_p^{\text{HF}} = \sum_\lambda C_{p\lambda} \phi_\lambda(\mathbf{r}) \quad (3.17)$$

This expanded basis is obviously also orthonormal. The energy functional (equation 3.15) is then with equation 3.17 inserted

$$E[\Psi^{\text{HF}}] = \sum_i \sum_{\alpha\beta} C_{i\alpha}^* C_{j\beta} \langle \alpha | h | \beta \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} C_{i\alpha}^* C_{j\beta}^* C_{i\gamma} C_{j\delta} \langle \alpha | H_I | \beta \rangle_{AS} \quad (3.18)$$

Introducing the Lagrange multiplier and minimizing according to section 2 and using the orthogonality of the states we get the following constraint

$$\langle p | q \rangle = \sum_\alpha C_{p\alpha}^* C_{q\alpha} \quad (3.19)$$

giving the functional (Lagrangian)

$$\mathcal{L}[\Psi^{\text{HF}}] = E[\Psi^{\text{HF}}] - \sum_{i\alpha} \varepsilon_i C_{p\alpha}^* C_{p\alpha} \quad (3.20)$$

where ε_i is the Lagrange multiplier which we give units energy for the dimensionality of the equations to match. The Euler-Lagrange equations is then obtained by minimization

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial C_{p\alpha}^*} \left[E[\Psi^{\text{HF}}] - \sum_{j\alpha} \varepsilon_j C_{p\alpha}^* C_{p\alpha} \right] = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \varepsilon_p} \quad (3.21)$$

Since the constraints are leveled functions, meaning they only scale the energy functional, we can effectively ignore the equation regarding ε_p ¹ meaning the right hand of equation 3.21 equals 0. We solve the individual

¹the analogy to this is basically that one can always choose the ground-point of a potential.

parts starting with $E[\Psi^{\text{HF}}]$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial C_{p\alpha}^*} \left[\sum_i \sum_{\alpha\beta} C_{i\alpha}^* C_{i\beta} \langle \alpha | h | \beta \rangle \right] &= \sum_{\beta} C_{p\beta} \langle \alpha | h | \beta \rangle \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial C_{p\alpha}^*} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} C_{i\alpha}^* C_{j\beta}^* C_{i\gamma} C_{j\delta} \langle \alpha\beta | H_I | \gamma\delta \rangle_{AS} \right] &= \sum_{ij} \sum_{\beta\gamma\delta} C_{p\beta}^* C_{i\gamma} C_{j\delta} \langle \alpha\beta | H_I | \gamma\delta \rangle_{AS} \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

The latter part of equation 3.22 uses the product rule for differentiation. The second term in equation 3.21 is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial C_{p\alpha}^*} \left[- \sum_{j\alpha} \epsilon_j C_{j\alpha}^* C_{j\alpha} \right] = -\epsilon_p C_{p\alpha} \quad (3.23)$$

Gathering equations 3.22 and 3.23 yields in what is known as the *Hartree-Fock equations*

$$\sum_{\beta} C_{p\beta} \langle \alpha | h | \beta \rangle + \sum_{j\beta\gamma\delta} C_{j\beta}^* C_{j\delta} C_{p\gamma} \langle \alpha\beta | H_I | \gamma\delta \rangle_{AS} = \epsilon_p^{\text{HF}} C_{p\alpha} \quad (3.24)$$

We rewrite this by pulling out the sum over β and defining the so-called *Hartree-Fock matrix* $h_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{HF}}$ with elements

$$h_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{HF}} \equiv \langle \alpha | h_0 | \beta \rangle + \sum_{j\gamma\delta} C_{j\gamma}^* C_{j\delta} \langle \alpha\gamma | H_I | \beta\delta \rangle_{AS} \quad (3.25)$$

equation 3.24 can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{\gamma} h_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{HF}} C_{p\beta} = \epsilon_p^{\text{HF}} C_{p\alpha} \quad (3.26)$$

This is the eigenvalue problem to be solved with the columns of C being the orthogonal eigenvectors of h^{HF} and ϵ^{HF} 's the eigenvalues which represent the single-particle energies.

Density Matrix

If we take a closer look at equation 3.26 one notices that one of the paired sums(greek letters) can be pre-calculated and tabulated in a matrix. We call this matrix the *density matrix* and define its elements to be

$$\rho_{\gamma\delta} \equiv \sum_i C_{i\gamma}^* C_{i\delta} \quad (3.27)$$

the Hartree-Fock matrix elements can thus be rewritten to

$$h_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{HF}} = \langle \alpha | h | \beta \rangle + \sum_{\gamma\delta} \rho_{\gamma\delta} \langle \alpha\gamma | H_I | \beta\delta \rangle_{AS} \quad (3.28)$$

Rewriting the Ground State Energy

One of the goals of the Hartree-Fock method is to find an estimate for the ground state energy, equation 3.15. We can reduce the sum by adding and subtracting the so-called Hartree-Fock potential defined as

$$U^{\text{HF}} \equiv \sum_{\mu\nu} \langle \mu | \langle \mu\nu | H_I | \mu\nu \rangle_{AS} | \nu \rangle \quad (3.29)$$

The result is

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\text{HF}} &= \sum_i \epsilon_i^{\text{HF}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} C_{i\alpha}^* C_{j\beta}^* C_{i\gamma} C_{j\delta} \langle \alpha\beta | H_I | \gamma\delta \rangle_{AS} \\ &= \sum_i \epsilon_i^{\text{HF}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \rho_{\alpha\gamma} \rho_{\beta\delta} \langle \alpha\beta | H_I | \gamma\delta \rangle_{AS} \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

where we have inserting in the definition of the density matrix in the last step.

Convergence

The convergence criteria for the iterative eigenvalue problem is given by a simple brute-force difference defined as

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left| \varepsilon_i^{\text{HF,new}} - \varepsilon_i^{\text{HF,old}} \right| \leq \theta \quad (3.31)$$

with θ being a small number as threshold. » LIST DIFFERENCE CONVERGENCE THINGS «

Algorithm and Summary

Before we setup the algorithm we give a brief summary of the final equations obtained in this section

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\gamma} h_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{HF}} C_{p\gamma} &= \varepsilon_p^{\text{HF}} C_{p\alpha} \\ h_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{HF}} &= \langle \alpha | h | \beta \rangle + \sum_{\gamma\delta} \rho_{\gamma\delta} \langle \alpha\gamma | H_I | \beta\delta \rangle_{AS} \\ \rho_{\gamma\delta} &= \sum_i C_{i\gamma}^* C_{i\delta} \\ E^{\text{HF}} &= \sum_i \varepsilon_i^{\text{HF}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \rho_{\alpha\gamma} \rho_{\beta\delta} \langle \alpha\beta | H_I | \gamma\delta \rangle_{AS} \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

The algorithm is as follows

Algorithm 1 Hartree-Fock algorithm

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1: assemble interaction elements | ▷ $\langle pq H_I rs \rangle_{AS}$ |
| 2: Set density matrix | ▷ Use equation 3.27 |
| 3: while count < maxiteration & difference > λ do | |
| 4: Calculate Hartree-Fock matrix | ▷ As given in equation 3.28 |
| 5: Find eigenvalues and eigenvectors of Hartree-Fock matrix | ▷ Energies and coefficients |
| 6: Calculate new density matrix | |
| 7: Calculate difference | ▷ Given in equation 3.31 |
| 8: increment count | |
| 9: end while | |
| 10: Calculate ground state energy | ▷ With equation 3.30 |
-

1.4 Restricted Hartree-Fock

Restricted Hartree-Fock, or abbreviated to RHF, we assume a closed-shell system. This means that for a given system the all possible states for a given energy-level is filled. We can achieve this by grouping spin-orbitals with same spatial part, but opposite spin.

2 Quantum Monte Carlo

Quantum Monte Carlo, or QMC is a method for solving Schrödinger's equation by a statistical approach using so-called *Markov Chain* simulations (also called random walk). The nature of the wave function at hand is fundamentally a statistical model defined on a large configuration space with small areas of densities. The Monte Carlo method is perfect for solving such a system because of the non-homogeneous distribution of calculation across the space. An standard approach with equal distribution of calculation would then yield a rather poor result with respect to computation cost.

We will in this chapter address the Metropolis algorithm which is used to create a Markov chain and derive the equations used in the variational method.

The chapter will use *Dirac Notation* [1] and all equations stated assume atomic units ($\hbar = m_e = e = 4\pi\varepsilon_0$) » REF HERE ATOMIC UNITS «.

2.1 The Variational Principle and Expectation Value of Energy

Given a Hamiltonian \hat{H} and a trial wave function $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha})$, the variational principle [1, 7] states that the expectation value of \hat{H}

$$E[\psi_T] = \langle \hat{H} \rangle = \frac{\langle \psi_T | \hat{H} | \psi_T \rangle}{\langle \Psi_T | \Psi_T \rangle} \quad (3.33)$$

is an upper bound to the ground state energy

$$E_0 \leq \langle \hat{H} \rangle \quad (3.34)$$

Now we can define our PDF as(see section 2.3 for a more detailed reasoning)

$$P(\mathbf{R}) \equiv \frac{|\psi_T|^2}{\langle \Psi_T | \Psi_T \rangle} \quad (3.35)$$

and with a new quantity

$$E_L(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \equiv \frac{1}{\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha})} \hat{H} \Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \quad (3.36)$$

the so-called local energy, we can rewrite equation 3.33 as

$$E[\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha})] = \langle E_L \rangle \quad (3.37)$$

The idea now is to find the lowest possible energy by varying a set of parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. The expectation value itself is found with the Metropolis algorithm, see section 2.4.

2.2 The Trial Wave Function

The trial wave function is generally an arbitrary choice specific for the problem at hand, however it is in most cases favorable to expand the wave function in the eigenbasis (eigenstates) of the Hamiltonian since they form a complete set. This can be expressed as

$$\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_i C_i \psi_i(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \quad (3.38)$$

with the ψ_i 's are the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian.

2.3 Use Diffusion Theory and the PDF

The statistics describing the expectation value states that any distribution may be applied in calculation, however if we take a close look at the local energy(equation 3.36) we see that for all distributions the local energy is not defined at the zeros of $\Psi_T(\mathbf{R}; \boldsymbol{\alpha})$. This means that an arbitrary PDF does not guarantee generation of points which makes $\psi_T = 0$. This can be overcome by introducing the square of the wave function to be defined as the distribution function as given in equation 3.35.

Because of the inherent statistical property of the wave function Quantum Mechanics can be modelled as a diffusion process, or more specifically, an *Isotropic Diffusion Process* which is essentially just a random walk model. Such a process is described by the Langevin equation with the corresponding Fokker-Planck equation describing the motion of the walkers(particles). See [12] for details.

2.4 Metropolis-Hastings Algorithm

The Metropolis algorithm bases itself on moves (also called transitions) as given in a Markov process. » REF THIS HERE «. This process is given by

$$w_i(t + \varepsilon) = \sum_j w_{i \rightarrow j} w_j(t) \quad (3.39)$$

where $w(j \rightarrow i)$ is just a transition from state j to state i . In order for the transition chain to reach a desired convergence while reversibility is kept, the well known condition for detailed balance must be fulfilled » REF HERE DETAILED BALANCE «. If detailed balance is true, then the following relations is true

$$w_i T_{i \rightarrow j} A_{i \rightarrow j} = w_j T_{j \rightarrow i} A_{j \rightarrow i} \Rightarrow \frac{w_i}{w_j} = \frac{T_{j \rightarrow i} A_{j \rightarrow i}}{T_{i \rightarrow j} A_{i \rightarrow j}} \quad (3.40)$$

We have here introduced two scenarios, the transition from configuration i to configuration j and the reverse process j to i . Solving the acceptance A for the two cases where the ratio in 3.40 is either 1 (in which case the proposed state j is accepted and transitions is made) and when the ratio is less than 1. The Metropolis algorithm would in this case not automatically reject the latter case, but rather reject it with a proposed uniform probability. Introducing now a probability distribution function (PDF) P the acceptance A can be expressed as

$$A_{i \rightarrow j} = \min \left(\frac{P_{i \rightarrow j} T_{i \rightarrow j}}{P_{j \rightarrow i} T_{j \rightarrow i}}, 1 \right) \quad (3.41)$$

The so-called selection probability T is defined specifically for each problem. For our case the PDF in question is the absolute square of the wave function and the selection T is a Green's function derived in section 2.5. The algorithm itself would then be

- (i) Pick initial state i at random.
- (ii) Pick proposed state at random in accordance to $T_{j \rightarrow i}$.
- (iii) Accept state according to $A_{j \rightarrow i}$.
- (iv) Jump to step (ii) until a specified number of states have been generated.
- (v) Save the state i and jump to step (ii).

2.5 Importance Sampling

Using the selection probability mentioned in section 2.4 in the Metropolis algorithm is called an *Importance sampling* because it essentially makes the sampling more concentrated around areas where the PDF has large values.

In order to derive the form of this equation we use the statements presented in section 2.3. With

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial t} = DF(r(t)) + \eta \quad (3.42)$$

the *Langevin equation* »REF HERE LANGEVIN« and apply Euler's method (Euler-Maryama »REF«) and obtain the new positions

$$r^{\text{new}} = r^{\text{old}} + DF^{\text{old}} \Delta t + \xi \quad (3.43)$$

with the r 's being the new and old positions in the Markov chain respectively and $F^{\text{old}} = F(r^{\text{old}})$. The quantity D is a diffusion term equal to $1/2$ due to the kinetic energy (remind of natural units) and ξ is a Gaussian distributed random number with 0 mean and $\sqrt{\Delta t}$ variance.

As mentioned a particle is described by the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \sum_i D \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} - F_i \right) P \quad (3.44)$$

With P being the PDF (in current case the selection probability) and F being the drift term. In order to achieve convergence, that is a stationary probability density, we need the left hand side to be zero in equation 3.44 giving the following equation

$$\frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial x_i^2} = P \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_i} + F_i \frac{\partial P}{\partial x_i} \quad (3.45)$$

with the drift-term being on the form $F = g(x) \partial P / \partial x$ we finally have that

$$F = \frac{2}{\psi_T} \nabla \psi_T \quad (3.46)$$

This is the so-called *Quantum Force* which pushes the walkers towards regions where the wave function is large.

Bibliography

- [1] David J. Griffiths, *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics Second Edition*, Pearson, 2005, ISBN 0-13-111892-7.
- [2] Bernard Dacorogna, Chapters 2 and 6, *Introduction to the Calculus of Variations (3rd Edition)*, World Scientific, 2014, ISBN 978-1-78326-551-0.
- [3] Bruce Van Brunt, *The Calculus of Variations*, Springer, 2004, ISBN 0-387-40247-0.
- [4] Morten Hjort-Jensen, *Computational Physics: Hartree-Fock methods and introduction to Many-Body Theory*.
<https://www.github.com/CompPhysics/ComputationalPhysics2/blob/gh-pages/doc/pub/basicMB/pdf>, 2017
- [5] Morten Hjort-Jensen, *Computational Physics: Variational Monte Carlo methods*.
<https://www.github.com/CompPhysics/ComputationalPhysics2/blob/gh-pages/doc/pub/vmc/pdf>, 2017
- [6] M. Taut, *Two Electrons in an External Oscillator Potential; Particular analytic solutions of a Coulomb Correlation Problem*, Physical Review A 48, 3561, 1993.
- [7] Negele and Orland, *Quantum Many-Particle Systems*, Addison-Wesley.
- [8] Fetter and Walecka, *Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems*, Mcgraw-Hill, 1971.
- [9] Dickhoss and Van Neck, *Many-Body Theory Exposed*, World Scientific, 2006
- [10] Jack Sherman and Winifred J. Morrison, *Adjustment of an Inverse Matrix Corresponding to a Change in One Element of a Given Matrix*.
Annals of Mathematical Statistics 21, 1950. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729893>.
- [11] David C. Lay Chapter 3, *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, Pearson, 2011, ISBN 978-0321835144.
- [12] Peter E. Kloeden and Eckhard Platen, *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations*, Springer, 1992, ISBN 978-3-662-12616-5.
- [13] J.P. Sethna, *Statistical Mechanics: Entropy, Order Parameters and Complexity*, <http://pages.physics.cornell.edu/sethna/StatMech/EntropyOrderParametersComplexity.pdf>.