

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

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Method	3
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 θ	5
2.3	Tests	7
2.3.1	Test of the <i>find_max</i> function	7
2.3.2	Testing against simple 2×2 case	8
Chapter 3	Results	11
3.1	Interpretation of Results	11
3.1.1	Dependence of ρ_{max} and n on Eigenvalue	11
3.1.2	Computation Time Compared to Alternative Algorithm	13
Chapter 4	Conclusion	17
	Bibliography	19
Appendix A	MatLab code for smt....	21

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. ¹

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!

¹FiXme Note: correct the these lines

Intro to chapter

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

2.1 Nature of the problem

The aim of the first part of the project is to solving Schröingers equations for one electron in a harmonic oscillator potential with angular momentum $l = 0$. The radial part of the Schröingers equation is considered which is as follows

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

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

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

Eq. (2.2) is discretized by writing the second derivative of $u(\rho)$ as

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

In Eq. (2.3) h is the step length, and ρ_{max} and ρ_{min} are the maximum and minimum values of the variable ρ , respectively. For a given number of steps n , the step length is given as

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

In order to solve equation Eq. (2.2), it is transformed into a matrix eigenvalue problem

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} = \lambda \mathbf{u} \quad (2.5)$$

¹FiXme Note: correct the above lines

in which \mathbf{A} is a tridiagonal matrix of the form

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{h^2} + V_1 & -\frac{1}{h^2} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{h^2} & \frac{2}{h^2} + V_2 & -\frac{1}{h^2} & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{h^2} & \frac{2}{h^2} + V_3 & -\frac{1}{h^2} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \frac{2}{h^2} + V_{n-2} & -\frac{1}{h^2} \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & -\frac{1}{h^2} & \frac{2}{h^2} + V_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.6)$$

\mathbf{A} is obtained from Eq. (2.2), with the approximation of the derivative of $u(\rho)$ given in Eq. (2.3) when omitting all later terms, by discretizing ρ by

$$\rho_i = \rho_{min} + ih \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (2.7)$$

This leads to the following Schrödinger equation:

$$-\frac{u(\rho_i + h) - 2u(\rho_i) + u(\rho_i - h)}{h^2} + \rho_i^2 u(\rho_i) = \lambda u(\rho_i) \quad (2.8)$$

which can be rewritten as

$$-\frac{u_{i+1} - 2u_i + u_{i-1}}{h^2} + \rho_i^2 u_i = -\frac{u_{i+1} - 2u_i + u_{i-1}}{h^2} + V_i u_i = \lambda u_i \quad (2.9)$$

in which $V_i = \rho_i^2$ is the harmonic oscillator potential. When comparing this relation with the general eigenvalue problem in Eq. (2.5), it is evident that the diagonal elements of the matrix \mathbf{A} is given by

$$d_i = \frac{2}{h^2} + V_i \quad (2.10)$$

while all off diagonal elements are zero apart from those neighbouring the diagonal, which are all constants with the value

$$e_i = -\frac{1}{h^2} \quad (2.11)$$

This is exactly what is given in Eq. (2.6).

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 θ

The algorithm for solving the eigenvalue problem given in ² 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

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{S}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{S} \quad (2.12)$$

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 (2.12)) 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 (2.12) with \mathbf{A} being a tridiagonal symmetric matrix, $b_{lk} = b_{kl}$, $b_{ki} = b_{ik}$, and $b_{li} = b_{il}$. ³ Since θ can be chosen arbitrarily, we choose θ 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 θ reduces the norm of the off-diagonal elements of \mathbf{A} , which ensures that the algorithm terminates towards the eigenvalues. ⁴

This yields the equation

$$0 = (a_{kk} - a_{ll}) \cos \theta \sin \theta + a_{kl} (\cos^2 \theta - \sin^2 \theta) \quad (2.13)$$

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

$$\tau = \frac{a_{ll} - a_{kk}}{2a_{kl}} \quad (2.14)$$

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

$$\tan^2 \theta + 2\tau \tan \theta - 1 = 0 \quad (2.15)$$

which has the solutions

$$\tan \theta = -\tau \pm \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \quad (2.16)$$

²FiXme Note: eqref

³FiXme Note: check that this is actually correct

⁴FiXme Note: this, I can write, right??

From the solutions for $\tan \theta$ given in (2.18), $\cos \theta$ 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

$$\tan \theta = -\tau - \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \quad (2.17)$$

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

$$\tan \theta = -\tau + \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \quad (2.18)$$

This choice is made to always make $\tan \theta$ the smaller of the two roots given in (2.18). 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

$$|\tan \theta| = \left| -\tau - \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \right| \leq 1, \quad \text{for } \tau < 0 \quad (2.19)$$

and

$$|\tan \theta| = \left| -\tau + \sqrt{1 + \tau^2} \right| \leq 1, \quad \text{for } \tau \geq 0 \quad (2.20)$$

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

$$\|\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}\|_F^2 = 4(1 - c) \sum_{i=1, i \neq k, l}^n (a_{ik}^2 + a_{il}^2) + \frac{2a_{kl}^2}{c^2}. \quad (2.21)$$

5 6

Off-diagonal norm

Similarity transformations is used to reduce the off-diagonal norm. The norm found by Eq. (2.22), is wanted as small as possible and smaller than a given test value ε . Ideally the norm should get to zero, but that is difficult because when the elements gets small there can be problems with round-off errors. The value ε is therefore set so that it gives the smallest values possible without problems round-off errors, typically set around 10^{-8} .

$$off(\mathbf{A}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n a_{ij}^2} \quad (2.22)$$

⁵FiXme Note: and why is this minimization a good thing?? :-P

⁶FiXme Note: inddrag del af kode

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. (2.23) is used as it is less time consuming.

$$\max(a_{kl}^2) > \varepsilon \quad (2.23)$$

This is possible because if the biggest element squared is smaller than ε 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.

2.3 Tests

Several tests... blah blah blah

2.3.1 Test of the *find_max* function

To find the maximum absolute value of the elements of the matrix for which we want to solve the eigenvalue problem using the Jacobi method, the following c++ source code is used.

```
void find_max(mat &A, int &n, int &row_number, int &column_number)
// Set row_number = 0 and column_number = 1, when running the code.
// These are the initial guesses for max(A(i,j))
{
    double max = A(0,1);
    for (int i=0; i<n; i++)
    {
        for (int j=i+1; j<n; j++)
        {
            if (fabs(A(i,j)) > fabs(max))
            {
                max = A(i,j);
                row_number = i;
                column_number = j;
            }
        }
    }
    return;
}
```

The programmed function *find_max* finds the entrance with the maximal absolute value amongst the entrances above the diagonal. The initial guess of the maximum absolute value of the off diagonal elements is set to a_{12} (notice that the first row/column of the matrix in the code is 0, whilst it is 1 in the text). The two for loops then run through all the elements above the diagonal, and if the absolute value of that element is greater than the absolute value of the until then computed maximal value, the new value *max* is set equal

to the value of that entrance. Since the matrix \mathbf{A} for this project is symmetric, it is not necessary to run through the elements below the diagonal.

To check that the *find_max* function runs as expected, a random matrix \mathbf{A} , with the maximum absolute value above the diagonal being $a_{25} = 6$, is considered.

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & -1 & -2 & -3 & -4 \\ 0 & -3 & -6 & -9 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.24)$$

When running the function for the matrix \mathbf{A} in Eq. (2.24) and an initial guess that the greatest absolute value can be found as the element $a_{12} = 2$, the function outputs the maximum value:

max value = 6

row number = 2

column number = 5

which is exactly what was expected when considering the investigated matrix. When running the function for $-\mathbf{A}$ the element with the greatest absolute value is once again found to be a_{25} . In this case the element has a value of $a_{25} = -6$, which was to be expected.

2.3.2 Testing against simple 2×2 case

To check that the Jacobi function runs correctly, consider the case with matrix dimensionality 2×2 case with $\rho_{min} = 0$ and $\rho_{max} = 6$, yielding a step length of

$$h = \frac{\rho_{max} - \rho_{min}}{n + 1} = \frac{6 - 0}{3} = 2$$

With the potential described by ρ^2 , this case gives that the matrix \mathbf{A} , for which the eigenvalue problem is solved, takes the form

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{2^2} + 2^2 & -\frac{1}{2^2} \\ -\frac{1}{2^2} & \frac{2}{2^2} + 4^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 4.5 & -0.25 \\ -0.25 & 16.5 \end{pmatrix}$$

The entrance with the greatest absolute value of the off diagonal element is the $a_{12} = a_{21}$, which means that τ introduced in Eq. (2.14)

$$\tau = -\frac{16.5 - 4.5}{2 \cdot 0.25} = -24$$

and hence

$$\tan \theta = 24 - \sqrt{1 + 24^2} \approx -0.0208$$

which yields that

$$\cos \theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + 48^2}} \approx 0.9998 \quad \text{and} \quad \sin \theta = -0.0208 \cdot 0.9998 \approx -0.0208 \quad (2.25)$$

From the values for $\cos \theta$ and $\sin \theta$, the diagonal elements of the constructed matrix \mathbf{B} after one similarity transformation described in Eq. (2.12) take the form

$$b_{11} \approx 4.5 \cdot 0.9998^2 - 2 \cdot 0.25 \cdot 0.0208 \cdot 0.9998 + 16.5 \cdot 0.0208^2 \approx 4.495$$

$$b_{22} \approx 16.5 \cdot 0.9998^2 + 2 \cdot 0.25 \cdot 0.0208 \cdot 0.9998 + 4.5 \cdot 0.0208^2 \approx 16.51$$

giving

$$\mathbf{B} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 4.495 & 0 \\ 0 & 16.51 \end{pmatrix}$$

Which means that the first and second eigenvalues are 4.495 and 16.51, respectively. When running the computed Jacobi function for this 2×2 example, this is exactly what is gained.⁷

⁷FiXme Note: ref. to result

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://??>.¹

3.1 Interpretation of Results

WOW, an awesome interpretation of the results :D

3.1.1 Dependence of ρ_{max} and n on Eigenvalue

² 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 ³ is $\lambda_0 = 3$, $\lambda_1 = 7$, and $\lambda_2 = 11$, for $l = 0$.
⁴

In the code given in ?? the two parameters ρ_{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 ⁵ choice of ρ_{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 ρ_{max} and n to obtain acceptable values for the eigenvalues of ⁶.

Changing ρ_{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 ρ_{max} . It is a ⁷ to decrease ρ_{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 ρ_{max} is too close to ρ_{min} the neglected part can actually not be neglected, if an acceptable result is wished for.

¹FiXme Note: correct the above lines

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

³FiXme Note: eq. ref to nature eq

⁴FiXme Note: ref. to project description

⁵FiXme Note: mest fordelagtige

⁶FiXme Note: eqref

⁷FiXme Note: fordel

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




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. ¹⁰ ¹¹ The ρ_{max} that, with $n = 100$, gives the most accurate result for all three of the first eigenvalues is $\rho_{max} = 5$. Since this ρ_{max} gives the most accurate result for a relatively small n , this is chosen as the optimal ρ_{max} in this and the following sections for this specific problem.

With this ρ_{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 ¹².

⁸FiXme Note: sec ref

⁹FiXme Note: comment on, why we only have integer ρ_{max}

¹⁰FiXme Note: is this ok??

¹¹FiXme Note: comment on the flat part!!

¹²FiXme 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 ρ_{max} and n is 5 and 200, respectively.

3.1.2 Computation Time Compared to Alternative Algorithm

When calculating the time needed for the Jacobi rotation algorithm described in ¹³ to solve the eigenvalue problem with a matrix \mathbf{A} of dimensionality 200×200 , $\rho_{max} = 5$, and $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ the elapsed time is found to be 17 sec. ¹⁴ This is a much greater value than the elapsed time for solving the same eigenvalue problem using the Armadillo function `eig_sym` for the same $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$, since the Armadillo function has a displayed computational time of 0 sec (the computational time is of course not 0 sec, but the precision of the displayed time is so low that the number is displayed as 0). It is hence clear that the computed Jacobi algorithm consumes more time than the precomputed Armadillo function and as we increase the size of the matrix the elapsed time to get the solution also increases. This makes the Jacobi rotation algorithm less efficient. The slowness of the Jacobi algorithm, furthermore, has the effect that it cannot be run for too large matrices, and hence there is a significant limit for how small the step length h can be made, and ultimately a limit to the precision of the algorithm.

It is, however, evident that the Jacobi method implemented in this project can be improved for solving the specific eigenvalue problem described by Eq. (2.5) and (2.6) by taking into account that the matrix \mathbf{A} is tridiagonal and has constant values in the entrances adjacent to the diagonal. ¹⁵ However, this improvement of the algorithm is not in the scope of this project.

¹³FiXme Note: ref to section

¹⁴FiXme Note: ref to results

¹⁵FiXme Note: reference ??

New potential and repulsive Coulomb interaction

Introducing a new potential $V_\rho = \omega^2 \rho^2 + \frac{1}{\rho}$ where ω is an oscillator frequency and $\frac{1}{\rho}$ is a repulsive Coulomb potential. First considering the value of ρ_{max} in the case without a repulsive Coulomb interaction. Where finding a value of ρ_{max} so that the eigenvalues are stable is the first step.¹⁶ For this to be stable the change should be small, so $\rho_{max} = 10$ 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 ρ_{max} doesn't give big changes. Also the relation between ρ_{max} and n is kept constant so that¹⁸ is constant. Running for different values of ρ_{max} with the ratio gives Tab. 3.1, which shows that when ρ_{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 ρ_{max} and it's the last printed eigenvalue in the program.

Table 3.1. hei hei¹⁷

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

The Eigenvectors are used for determining the wave function, and in this case they are used squared so they show the probability density of the distance ρ between the two electrons. Which gives the most probable distance between the particles, the distance $\rho = (\frac{1}{\alpha})r$ where $\alpha = (\frac{\hbar^2}{mk})^{1/4}$. The reason for this is better described in Sec. 2.1. Plotting the distance as a function of ρ for different values of the frequency ω_r , Fig. 3.3 shows that for a higher frequency ω_r , the distance between the particles are bigger and the spread in area which the particle can be in is also more stretched out.




Figure 3.3. The probability density as a function of distance ρ without repulsive Coulomb interaction. Where

$\rho_{min} = 0, \rho_{max} = 10$ and $n = 200$

¹⁶FiXme Note: rewrite sentence

¹⁸FiXme Note: ref h

When adding a repulsive Coulomb potential $\frac{1}{\rho}$ to the potential $V(\rho)$ in Fig. 3.4 the probability density is pushed to a longer distance, although it might be a bit difficult to see in Fig. 3.4 and Fig. 3.3.




Figure 3.4. The probability density as a function of distance ρ with a repulsive Coulomb interaction. Where $\rho_{min} = 0$, $\rho_{max} = 10$ and $n = 200$

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')
```
