

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO  
COMPUTATIONAL PHYSICS

---

**Project 2**

---



UiO : **University of Oslo**

---

Authors:

Birgitte Madsen

Magnus Isaksen

Soumya Chalakkal

---

Autumn 2015





**UiO : University of Oslo**

**Department of Physics**

**University of Oslo**

Sem Sælands vei 24

0371 Oslo, Norway

+47 22 85 64 28

<http://www.mn.uio.no/fysikk/english/>

**Course:**

Computational Physics

**Project number:**

2

**Link to GitHub folder:**

<https://??>

**Hand-in deadline:**

Monday, October 5, 2015

**Project Members:**

Birgitte Madsen

Magnus Isaksen

Soumya Chalakkal

**Copies:** 1

**Page count:** ??

**Appendices:** 0

**Completed:** ??

*The content of the report is freely available, but publication (with source) may only be made with the agreement of the authors.*





---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Nature of the problem . . . . .	3
2.2	Description of the Algorithm . . . . .	4
2.2.1	Change in Matrix Elements after Iterations and Choice of $\theta$ . . . . .	4
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Interpretation of Results . . . . .	7
3.1.1	Dependence of $\rho_{max}$ and $n$ on Eigenvalue . . . . .	7
3.1.2	Dependence of $n$ on Number of Iterations . . . . .	9
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>MatLab code for smt....</b>	<b>15</b>



---

# INTRODUCTION

Bla bla bla

The codes written in this project and the results gained from the codes, can be found by following the link: <https://?> to the GitHub repository. <sup>1</sup>

We can ref. to sections etc. using "secref"-command like: Sec. 2

Vectors can be written using "v"-command like: **v**

.... and a lot of other cool stuff!

---

<sup>1</sup>FiXme Note: correct the these lines





Intro to chapter

The source code itself can be found in the GitHub folder <https://??>.<sup>1</sup>

## 2.1 Nature of the problem

First part of the project is aimed at solving Schrodingers equations for one electron. The radial part of the Schrodingers equation is considered which is as follows

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left( \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{d}{dr} r^2 \frac{d}{dr} - \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \right) R(r) + V(r)R(r) = ER(r). \quad (2.1)$$

In order to solve this equation numerically, it is rewritten after a series of transformation and substitution as

$$-\frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} u(\rho) + \rho^2 u(\rho) = \lambda u(\rho) \quad (2.2)$$

<sup>2</sup> is discretized by assuming the second derivative of u

$$u'' = \frac{u(\rho+h) - 2u(\rho) + u(\rho-h)}{h^2} + O(h^2) \quad (2.3)$$

In <sup>3</sup> h is the step length,  $\rho_{max}$  and  $\rho_{min}$  are the maximum and minimum values of the variable . For a given number of n step , h is given by

$$h = \frac{\rho_{max} - \rho_{min}}{n_{step}} \quad (2.4)$$

Inorder to solve equation (3) it is transformed into a matrix eigenvalue problem

CONTINUE.....

---

<sup>1</sup>FiXme Note: correct the above lines

<sup>2</sup>FiXme Note: eq-ref

<sup>3</sup>FiXme Note: eq-ref

## 2.2 Description of the Algorithm

About the algorithm.....

This is how we write c++ code in the report:

---

```
// I am a comment

double please define me;

for (int i=1 ; i<n ; i++)
{
    I do this for a lot of i's;
}
```

---

### 2.2.1 Change in Matrix Elements after Iterations and Choice of $\theta$

The algorithm for solving the eigenvalue problem given in <sup>4</sup> contains of multiply similarity transformations of the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , in which we assume  $a_{kl}$  to be the largest off-diagonal element. The matrix  $\mathbf{B}$  constructed by the similarity transformation is given by

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{S}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{S} \quad (2.5)$$

in which  $\mathbf{S}$  is an orthogonal transformation matrix with its non-zero matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{kk} &= s_{ll} = \cos \theta \\ s_{kl} &= -s_{lk} = -\sin \theta \\ s_{ii} &= 1, \quad i \neq k, i \neq l \end{aligned}$$

After matrix multiplication with the orthogonal transformation matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  and its transverse (as in (2.5)) the entrances of  $\mathbf{B}$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} b_{ii} &= a_{ii}, \quad i \neq k, i \neq l \\ b_{ik} &= a_{ik} \cos \theta - a_{il} \sin \theta, \quad i \neq k, i \neq l \\ b_{il} &= a_{il} \cos \theta + a_{ik} \sin \theta, \quad i \neq k, i \neq l \\ b_{kk} &= a_{kk} \cos^2 \theta - 2a_{kl} \cos \theta \sin \theta + a_{ll} \sin^2 \theta \\ b_{ll} &= a_{ll} \cos^2 \theta + 2a_{kl} \cos \theta \sin \theta + a_{kk} \sin^2 \theta \\ b_{kl} &= (a_{kk} - a_{ll}) \cos \theta \sin \theta + a_{kl} (\cos^2 \theta - \sin^2 \theta) \end{aligned}$$

Due to the symmetry in (2.5) with  $\mathbf{A}$  being a tridiagonal symmetric matrix,  $b_{lk} = b_{kl}$ ,  $b_{ki} = b_{ik}$ , and  $b_{li} = b_{il}$ . <sup>5</sup> Since  $\theta$  can be chosen arbitrarily, we choose  $\theta$  to be the angle at which  $b_{kl}$ , and hence  $b_{lk}$ , becomes zero. In this way, the largest element of  $\mathbf{A}$  is eliminated, and it can be shown that this choice of  $\theta$  reduces the norm of the off-diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{A}$ , which ensures that the algorithm terminates towards the eigenvalues. <sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>FiXme Note: eqref

<sup>5</sup>FiXme Note: check that this is actually correct

<sup>6</sup>FiXme Note: this, I can write, right??

This yields the equation

$$0 = (a_{kk} - a_{ll}) \cos \theta \sin \theta + a_{kl} (\cos^2 \theta - \sin^2 \theta) \quad (2.6)$$

By introducing  $\tan \theta = \sin \theta / \cos \theta$  and the quantity

$$\tau = \frac{a_{ll} - a_{kk}}{2a_{kl}} \quad (2.7)$$

(2.6) can be rewritten as the quadratic equation in  $\tan \theta$

$$\tan^2 \theta + 2\tau \tan \theta - 1 = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

which has the solutions

$$\tan \theta = -\tau \pm \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \quad (2.9)$$

From the solutions for  $\tan \theta$  given in (2.11),  $\cos \theta$  and  $\sin \theta$  can be found using the formulas

$$\cos \theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \tan^2 \theta}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sin \theta = \tan \theta \cos \theta$$

If  $\tau < 0$ ,  $\tan \theta$  is chosen to be

$$\tan \theta = -\tau - \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \quad (2.10)$$

whilst if  $\tau \geq 0$ ,  $\tan \theta$  is calculated as

$$\tan \theta = -\tau + \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \quad (2.11)$$

This choice is made to always make  $\tan \theta$  the smaller of the two roots given in (2.11). Furthermore, this choice ensures that  $|\tan \theta| \leq 1$ , yielding that  $|\theta| \leq \pi/4$ .

This is true since  $|\tau| \leq 1$ , because  $|a_{kl}| \geq |a_{ij}|$  for all  $i, j$ , from which it follows that

$$|\tan \theta| = \left| -\tau - \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \right| \leq 1, \quad \text{for } \tau < 0 \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$|\tan \theta| = \left| -\tau + \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \right| \leq 1, \quad \text{for } \tau \geq 0 \quad (2.13)$$

since  $\sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \leq \sqrt{2}$ .

The fact that  $|\theta| \leq \pi/4$  ensures that  $\cos \theta \geq 0$  which ultimately ensures that the difference between  $\mathbf{A}$  and the new matrix  $\mathbf{B}$  is minimized, since

$$\|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}\|_F^2 = 4(1 - c) \sum_{i=1, i \neq k, l}^n (a_{ik}^2 + a_{il}^2) + \frac{2a_{kl}^2}{c^2}. \quad (2.14)$$

### Off-diagonal norm

Similarity transformations are used to reduce the off-diagonal norm. The norm found by Eq. (2.15), is wanted as small as possible and smaller than a given test value  $\varepsilon$ . Ideally the norm should get to zero, but that is difficult because when the elements get small there can be problems with round-off errors. The value  $\varepsilon$  is therefore set so that it gives the smallest values possible without problems round-off errors, typically set around  $10^{-8}$ .

$$off(\mathbf{A}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n a_{ij}^2} \quad (2.15)$$

This norm is compared after each transformation so that the new matrix  $\mathbf{B}$  is as close to a diagonal matrix as possible. But this is a very time consuming approach and requires many calculations. So instead Eq. (2.16) is used as it is less time consuming.

$$\max(a_{kl}^2) > \varepsilon \quad (2.16)$$

This is possible because if the biggest element squared is smaller than  $\varepsilon$  then all other values will be equally small or smaller. Which means that they are so small that the possibility for round-off errors is big. As it is not possible to get ensure that the process further gives correct values the transformation loop should stop.

# RESULTS

When running the code presented in Chap. 2.... blah blah blah.... Let's have an intro to this chapter...

The results from running the code ... can be found in the GitHub folder <https://??>.<sup>1</sup>

## 3.1 Interpretation of Results

WOW, an awesome interpretation of the results :D

### 3.1.1 Dependence of $\rho_{max}$ and $n$ on Eigenvalue

<sup>2</sup> For a single electron moving in a three-dimensional harmonic oscillator potential, the analytical solution for first three eigenvalues to the rewritten Schrödinger's equation <sup>3</sup> is  $\lambda_0 = 3$ ,  $\lambda_1 = 7$ , and  $\lambda_2 = 11$ , for  $l = 0$ .  
<sup>4</sup>

In the code given in ?? the two parameters  $\rho_{max}$  and  $n$  can be modified to give a more or less accurate numerical solution to the problem. If not considering the computational time, limit in memory, and round-off errors, the obvious <sup>5</sup> choice of  $\rho_{max}$  and  $n$  would be to make both numbers infinite. This is, however, not a realistic possibility, and this sections is therefore dedicated to find (discuss) on the optimal choices for  $\rho_{max}$  and  $n$  to obtain acceptable values for the eigenvalues of <sup>6</sup>.

Changing  $\rho_{max}$  causes the interval  $[\rho_{min}, \rho_{max}]$ , in which the wave function is considered, to change. Since the wave function goes to zero as the distance goes to infinity, it is acceptable to neglect the contribution from some  $\rho_{max}$ . It is a <sup>7</sup> to decrease  $\rho_{max}$  and hence making the interval smaller, in the sense that a smaller  $n$  then is needed to create a sufficient step length and ultimately a good enough "resolution". However, if this  $\rho_{max}$  is too close to  $\rho_{min}$  the neglected part can actually not be neglected, if an acceptable result is wished for.

<sup>1</sup>FiXme Note: correct the above lines

<sup>2</sup>FiXme Note: include e.g. a section called "1 electron case" or smt similar

<sup>3</sup>FiXme Note: eq. ref to nature eq


<sup>4</sup>FiXme Note: ref. to project description

<sup>5</sup>FiXme Note: mest fordelagte

<sup>6</sup>FiXme Note: eqref

<sup>7</sup>FiXme Note: fordel

In the figure below, the dependence of different integer valued  $\rho_{max}$  on the three first eigenvalues gained by the algorithm described in <sup>8</sup> is plotted for  $n = 100$ . <sup>9</sup>



**Figure 3.1.** Awesome caption

From the figure that if  $\rho_{max} < 3$  the eigenvalues are varying dramatically. This happens due to neglection ?? of strongly contributing parts of the eigenfunction. <sup>10</sup> <sup>11</sup> The  $\rho_{max}$  that, with  $n = 100$ , gives the most accurate result for all three of the first eigenvalues is  $\rho_{max} = 5$ . Since this  $\rho_{max}$  gives the most accurate result for a relatively small  $n$ , this is chosen as the optimal  $\rho_{max}$  in this and the following sections for this specific problem.

With this  $\rho_{max}$ , we wish to find the number of  $n$  that gives the first three eigenvalues with four leading digits. This optimal  $n$  is found by steady increment of  $n$ , as seen in <sup>12</sup>.


<sup>8</sup>FiXme Note: sec ref

<sup>9</sup>FiXme Note: comment on, why we only have integer  $\rho_{max}$

<sup>10</sup>FiXme Note: is this ok??

<sup>11</sup>FiXme Note: comment on the flat part!!

<sup>12</sup>FiXme Note: figref below



**Figure 3.2.** Awesome caption

The eigenvalue of the first excited state is seen to be asymptotic to the analytical solution  $\lambda_1 = 7$ , and at a matrix size of  $n = 200$ , the eigenvalue of the first excited state has the numerical solution 6.99904. This yields an accuracy up to four leading digits, which is also found to be the case for the ground state and the third eigenstate. Hence, the optimal  $\rho_{max}$  and  $n$  is 5 and 200, respectively.

### 3.1.2 Dependence of $n$ on Number of Iterations

In here I want to put the last two figures side by side, but I'm tired now :P

### Coulumb potential

13

First considering the value of  $\rho_{max}$ . Finding a value of  $\rho_{max}$  so that the eigenvalues are stable. Stable is chosen so that the values doesn't change to much. This is in the area of  $\rho_{max} = 10$  and the change is about 0.2 between the surrounding steps. Also the change between 10 and 10.1 is about 0.02 so small changes in  $\rho_{max}$  doesn't give big changes. Also the relation between  $\rho_{max}$  and  $n$  is kept constant so that <sup>14</sup> is constant. Running for different values of  $\rho_{max}$  with the ratio gives Tab. 3.1, which shows that when  $\rho_{max}$  is 10 the results are stable for the 3rd eigenvalue. The reason for choosing the 3rd eigenvalue is that it is more sensitive for change of  $\rho_{max}$  and it's the last printed eigenvalue in the program <sup>15</sup>.

**Table 3.1.** hei hei

$\rho_{max}$	N	3rd eigenvalue
1	10	83.5237
2	20	21.8365
3	30	9.79411
4	40	5.5277
⋮	⋮	⋮
9	90	1.0983
10	100	0.890899
10.1	101	0.873488
11	110	0.737631

<sup>13</sup>FiXme Note: Introduce Coulumb

<sup>14</sup>FiXme Note: ref h

<sup>15</sup>FiXme Note: reference pogram





---

## CONCLUSION

Conclude.... conclude.... conclude....





---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY



**A**

---

# MATLAB CODE FOR SMT....

This is how, we write MatLab code in the report

---

```
close all
clear all
clc
%I am a comment

filename = 'Results.xlsx';
sheet = 4;
xlRange = 'B3:C12';

[v,T,vT] = xlsread(filename, sheet, xlRange);
x10=v(:,1);y10=v(:,2);

figure
plot(??)
legend(??)

xlim(??)
ylim(??)

title(??)
xlabel('x')
ylabel('y')
```

---