

# Basis Sets & Pseudopotentials

*Fawzi Mohamed*

*Humboldt Universität zu Berlin*

# Basis Sets

- ~ To solve in practice one has to use a finite Hilbert space
- ~ goals:
  - ~ efficiency
  - ~ accuracy

# LCAO

- ~ Single atoms can be solved efficiently
- ~ Molecules distort the atoms: orbitals of the unperturbed atom might be used as basis
- ~ Linear Combination of Atomic Orbitals

- ~ works reasonably well, needs only a small number of orbitals
- ~ reference basis 6-31++G(3df,3pd) has 18 AO for H (1 e) and 39 for C (6 e) and 47 for Mg (12 e)
- ~ selection of “natural” orbitals

# H-like

- ~ H like atoms (single electron) can be solved exactly

$$Q_{nl}(Zr) \exp\left(-\frac{Zr}{n}\right) Y_l^m(\theta, \phi)$$

- ~ effective charge  $Z$
- ~ can be used and works well, but is cumbersome

# STO

- ~ simplify H like by setting

$$Q_{nl}(Zr) = r^l$$

- ~ can be accurate
- ~ simpler, but still computational expensive



# Polarization

- ~ first response of atom is probably how it gets deformed when it is in a molecule
- ~ important to describe many effects
- ~ normally use AOs for occupied orbitals (+ maybe some) and add polarization

# Molecularly optimized

- ~ Same approach as polarization, but looking at the perturbation on the atom made by other atoms (in molecules)
- ~ condition number of overlap matrix is also optimized



# Gaussian orbitals (GTO)

$$r^l Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi) \exp(-\alpha r^2)$$

- ~ can be efficiently evaluated: most contributions have simple analytic expression
- ~ product of gaussians  $\rightarrow$  gaussian
- ~ decomposes in x,y,z directions

$$\exp(-\alpha r^2) = \exp(-\alpha x^2) \exp(-\alpha y^2) \exp(-\alpha z^2)$$

- ~ “wrong” asymptotic  $\rightarrow$  use several of them
- ~ Linear combination of gaussians
- ~ approximate AOs, STOs, polarization using them

# Augmentation

- ~ use diffuse functions to recover the correct asymptotic
- ~ important to reduce the error in gas phase

# Numerical AO

- ~ use a finite radial grid to represent AOs
- ~ difficult to get the electrostatic
- ~ normally not as efficient as gaussians
- ~ finite support

# Non Orthogonality

- ~ all previous basis set are atom centered
- ~ non orthogonal between atoms
- ~ overlap  $S_{\mu\nu} = \int \psi_{\mu} \psi_{\nu}$

# BSSE

- ~ Several problems due to this
  - ~ general eigenvalue problem
  - ~ basis depends on atom position
  - ~ approximation is not constant -> BSSE
- ~ gas phase, surfaces, condensed phase less

# Plane Waves

- ~ orthogonal
- ~ uniform  $\exp(i \langle k, r \rangle)$
- ~ can be efficiently handled
- ~ core electrons difficult to represent
- ~ describe empty space



# Mixed Basis Sets

- ~ separate space into regions
- ~ Muffin Tin Approximation
  - ~ close to atom AOS
  - ~ slowly varying outside

# APW

- ~ plane waves for the interstitial region
- ~ GTO for the core region
- ~ KKR spherical waves outside (multiple scattering)

- ~ whole density in gaussians
- ~ put a smooth part on plane waves
- ~ residual density mostly atom centered
- ~ atomic expansion of it
- ~ expand also smooth density in gaussians

~ split the density in a smooth part and a

# RI methods

- ~ expand the density in single gaussian basis to reduce coulomb term calculation

# Pseudo potentials

- ~ active electrons
- ~ try to describe only the valence electrons
- ~ first approximation: frozen core

$$\psi_v = \phi_v + \sum \alpha_{cv} \psi_c$$

~  $\phi_v$  smooth

$$\left[ H + \sum_c (\epsilon_v - \epsilon_c) \psi_c \psi_c^* \right] \phi_v = \epsilon_v \phi_v$$

~ non normalized  $\phi_v$

~ arbitrary projector



# Norm conservation

- ~ scattering approach: reproduce correct

$$\langle q | V | q' \rangle$$

- ~ logarithmic derivative defines it

$$-\frac{1}{2\psi^2(r)} \int_0^r |\psi(t)|^2$$

# Calculating a pseudo

- ~ all electron calculation for a reference state
- ~ for each  $l$  choose a cutoff radius  $r_c^l$
- ~  $\phi$  ground state  $\rightarrow$  nodeless
- ~ invert the Schrödinger equation and get the screened pseudopotential
- ~ unscreening (get the ionic potential)

~ centrifugal barrier for  $l > l_{max}$   
taken from a reference 1

# Semilocal and Separable

- ~ The non local part  $V$  is approximated

as

$$V = \sum_{l,m} \frac{|V_l|Y_{l,m} \rangle \langle Y_{l,m}|V_l|}{\langle Y_{l,m}|\delta V_l|Y_{l,m} \rangle}$$

- ~ sum of projectors  $V = \sum_{l,m} p_{l,m}^* e_{l,m} p_{l,m}$

- ~ matrix element between plane waves is a product

- ~ simple, and has computational advantages
- ~ might introduce “ghost states” (solution with nodes at lower energy)
- ~ there are conditions and recipes to avoid that

# Ultrasoft

- ~ difficult to improve 1s,2p,3d,... where no nuclear repulsion is present
- ~ Vanderbilt
  - ~ remove norm conservation, but introduce more reference states to improve transferability

# NLCC

- ~ xc energy is not linear, so contribution of pseudopotential do not cancel perfectly out
- ~ add a core density to the density on which the xc potential is calculated
- ~ can smooth the cusp at the core, something that makes xc evaluation difficult



# Relativistic corrections

- ~ in the solution of the atomic problem used for the pseudopotential calculation one can easily use scalar relativistic calculations
- ~ as core electrons are the ones that need most correction this is a good way to keep them into account
- ~ needed for heavy elements

# Advantages

- ~ less electrons (cheaper)
- ~ relativistic correction
- ~ reduced BSSE