

../../../../images/

Hartree-Fock Stability of the Electron Gas

Evan Curtin

October 19, 2017

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Table of contents

Background Information

Levels of Hartree-Fock Theory

| Method | Spinorbital | DoF | Eigenfunction of |
|--------------|--|-----|------------------------|
| Restricted | $\chi_j^\alpha(\vec{r}, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_{ij} \phi_i(\vec{r}) \alpha(\sigma)$ $\chi_j^\beta(\vec{r}, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_{ij} \phi_i(\vec{r}) \beta(\sigma)$ | N/2 | \hat{S}^2, \hat{S}_z |
| Unrestricted | $\chi_j^\alpha(\vec{r}, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_{ij}^\alpha \phi_i(\vec{r}) \alpha(\sigma)$ $\chi_j^\beta(\vec{r}, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_{ij}^\beta \phi_i(\vec{r}) \beta(\sigma)$ | N | \hat{S}_z |
| General | $\chi_j(\vec{r}, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^N [c_{ij}^\alpha \phi_i(\vec{r}) \alpha(\sigma) + c_{ij}^\beta \phi_i(\vec{r}) \beta(\sigma)]$ | 2N | Neither |

Restricted Minimization

- Hartree-Fock SCF guarantees only stationary energy w.r.t. change in orbitals
- The solution may be a maximum, minimum or saddle point



`../../images/1d_extrema.pdf`

Restricted Minimization

- Hartree-Fock SCF guarantees only stationary energy w.r.t. change in orbitals
- The solution may be a maximum, minimum or saddle point

Within the Constrained Space



`../../../../images/1d_extrema.pdf`

Restricted Minimization

- Restricted minima may correspond to minima in another dimension

```
../../../../images/const_opt_globalmi
```

Restricted Minimization

- Restricted minima may correspond to minima in another dimension
- Restricted minima may correspond to maxima in another dimension

[../..images/const_opt_saddle.j](#)

Restricted Minimization

- Restricted minima may correspond to minima in another dimension
- Restricted minima may correspond to maxima in another dimension
- Restricted minima may be nonstationary

../../../../images/const_opt_nonstati

Hartree-Fock Stability

Hartree-Fock Stability

- Solving the HF equations guarantees only that the energy is **stationary**. The first order variation is therefore 0.

Hartree-Fock Stability

- Solving the HF equations guarantees only that the energy is **stationary**. The first order variation is therefore 0.
- We need to know if this is indeed a minimum.

Hartree-Fock Stability

- Solving the HF equations guarantees only that the energy is **stationary**. The first order variation is therefore 0.
- We need to know if this is indeed a minimum.
- We can determine this if we inspect the **second order variation** in the energy.

Hartree-Fock Stability

- Solving the HF equations guarantees only that the energy is **stationary**. The first order variation is therefore 0.
- We need to know if this is indeed a minimum.
- We can determine this if we inspect the **second order variation** in the energy.
- Thouless¹ showed a physically motivated derivation using Time-Dependent Hartree-Fock theory (TDHF).

Hartree-Fock Stability Conditions

- The RPA frequencies represent electronic oscillations about the ground state

Hartree-Fock Stability Conditions

- The RPA frequencies represent electronic oscillations about the ground state
- Real frequencies are stable, imaginary frequencies are unstable

Hartree-Fock Stability Conditions

- The RPA frequencies represent electronic oscillations about the ground state
- Real frequencies are stable, imaginary frequencies are unstable
- The RPA frequencies are imaginary when the **Orbital Hessian** (aka stability matrix, electronic Hessian) eigenvalues are **negative**

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B}^* & \mathbf{A}^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{Y} \end{bmatrix} = \omega \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{Y} \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

Hartree-Fock Stability Conditions

- The RPA frequencies represent electronic oscillations about the ground state
- Real frequencies are stable, imaginary frequencies are unstable
- The RPA frequencies are imaginary when the **Orbital Hessian** (aka stability matrix, electronic Hessian) eigenvalues are **negative**

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B}^* & \mathbf{A}^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{Y} \end{bmatrix} = \omega \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{Y} \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

- Where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ia,jb} &= \langle i^a | H - E_0 | j^b \rangle = (\epsilon_a - \epsilon_i) \delta_{ij} \delta_{ab} + \langle aj || ib \rangle \\ B_{ia,jb} &= \langle ij^a | H - E_0 | 0 \rangle = \langle ab || ij \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Hartree-Fock Stability Conditions

The Matrix Equation Factorizes

| Solution Type | Space Type | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Real RHF | Complex RHF | Real UHF | Complex UHF | Real GHF | Complex GHF |
| Real RHF | ${}^1\mathbf{A}' + {}^1\mathbf{B}'$ | ${}^1\mathbf{A}' - {}^1\mathbf{B}'$ | ${}^3\mathbf{A}' + {}^3\mathbf{B}'$ | ${}^3\mathbf{A}' - {}^3\mathbf{B}'$ | ${}^3\mathbf{A}' + {}^3\mathbf{B}'$ | ${}^3\mathbf{A}' - {}^3\mathbf{B}'$ |
| Complex RHF | - | ${}^1\mathbf{H}'$ | - | ${}^3\mathbf{H}'$ | - | ${}^3\mathbf{H}'$ |
| Real UHF | - | - | $\mathbf{A}' + \mathbf{B}'$ | $\mathbf{A}' - \mathbf{B}'$ | $\mathbf{A}'' + \mathbf{B}''$ | $\mathbf{A}'' - \mathbf{B}''$ |
| Complex UHF | - | - | - | \mathbf{H}' | - | \mathbf{H}' |
| Real GHF | - | - | - | - | $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$ |
| Complex GHF | - | - | - | - | - | \mathbf{H} |

Table reproduced from Seeger & Pople¹

Homogeneous Electron Gas

Brief Overview

- Homogeneous Electron Gas (HEG) model, also known as Uniform Electron Gas or Jellium Model.
- Electrons in a box with "smeared" nuclei \rightarrow uniform positive background charge
- The total charge is constrained to be neutral,

$$V_{bg}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_i \frac{-Ze^2}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_i|} \rightarrow -e^2 \int \frac{d\mathbf{r}'}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}, \quad (3)$$

- and the background and coulomb terms cancel exactly,

$$V_{ee} = e^2 \int \frac{d\mathbf{r}'}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}. \quad (4)$$

Brief Overview

- The discretized solutions are given by,

$$\epsilon_{\vec{k}} = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - \sum_{\vec{k}'}^{|\vec{k}'| < k_f} \langle \vec{k}, \vec{k}' | \vec{k}', \vec{k} \rangle \quad (5)$$

- Where the two electron integral is given by

$$\langle \vec{k}, \vec{k}' | \vec{k}'', \vec{k}''' \rangle \stackrel{2D, 3D}{=} \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{V} \frac{2^{D-1}}{|\vec{k} - \vec{k}''|^{D-1}} & \vec{k}''' = \vec{k} + \vec{k}' - \vec{k}'' \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$
$$\langle k, k' | k'', k''' \rangle \stackrel{1D}{=} \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{V} e^{|k-k''|^2 a^2} \text{Ei}(-|k-k''|^2 a^2) ; & k''' = k + k' - k'' \\ 0 ; & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

QMC Energies for various phases

../../../../images/Ceperley_PhaseDiag.png

Project Goal

- Can we use the HF-Stability analysis to determine where the HEG is unstable?

Project Goal

- Can we use the HF-Stability analysis to determine where the HEG is unstable?
- Will this predict the known tendency of crystallization at low density?

Project Goal

- Can we use the HF-Stability analysis to determine where the HEG is unstable?
- Will this predict the known tendency of crystallization at low density?
- It is known that the GHF solution persists at all densities for the HEG¹.

Project Goal

- Can we use the HF-Stability analysis to determine where the HEG is unstable?
- Will this predict the known tendency of crystallization at low density?
- It is known that the GHF solution persists at all densities for the HEG¹.
- Can we show this numerically?

Project Goal

- Can we use the HF-Stability analysis to determine where the HEG is unstable?
- Will this predict the known tendency of crystallization at low density?
- It is known that the GHF solution persists at all densities for the HEG¹.
- Can we show this numerically?
- (Future) Can we combine this with to improve the efficacy of correlation theories (CC, MBPT)?

Results

First Brillouin Zone

- Excite Only in one direction
- Consider only First BZ due to $\vec{k}' = \vec{k} + \vec{G}$

../../../../images/1stBZ-eps-converted-to.p

Orbital Energies

- 57 grid points per dimension reproduces the orbital energies reasonably well
- Worst towards Γ , better for higher $|\vec{k}|$


../../../../images/energycompare-eps-conver

Convergence of Stability Curves

../../../../images/singlet_onset-eps-converted-to.pdf

Dependence on r_s

Previously reported transition in 2d: $r_s \approx 0.8$



../../images/Bernu_2dEnergyGain.pdf

Final Stability Curves

../../../../images/stability.pdf

Concluding Remarks

- Numerical studies likely support Overhauser's theorem in 1D
- Stability corresponds with direct phase calculations in 2D
- In 3D, predicts transition at higher density than is currently known via other methods.

Next Steps

- Directly calculate more exotic spin phases of HEG within HF theory
- Use those as starting points for CC, MBPT theories
- Apply a similar approach to finite molecular systems

Questions?

Iterative Subspace Eigenvalue Methods

Davidson's Algorithm

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| $\mathbf{Ax} = \lambda \mathbf{x}$ | Eigenvalue Problem |
| $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_M]$ | Guess vectors |
| $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{V}^\dagger \mathbf{A} \mathbf{V}$ | Transform into subspace |
| $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\lambda} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ | Solve the subspace problem |
| $\mathbf{x}_i \approx \mathbf{x}_i^R = \mathbf{V} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i$ | Approximate eigenvectors |
| $\lambda_i \approx \lambda_i^R = \tilde{\lambda}_i$ | Approximate eigenvalues |
| $\mathbf{r}_i = (\mathbf{A} - \lambda_i \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{x}_i^R$ | Calculate the residue |
| $\delta_i = c_i \mathbf{r}_i$ | Correction vectors |
| $c_i = \frac{1}{\lambda_i \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}}$ | Diagonal Precondition |
| $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_M, \delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_I]$ | Append to guess and restart |
| $\mathbf{V} = \textit{orthonormalized}(\mathbf{V})$ | Ensure orthonormal projection |

1. Saad, Y. Numerical Methods for Large Eigenvalue Problems; SIAM, 2011.
2. Davidson, E. R. J. Comput. Phys. 1975, 17 (1), 8794.

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:

1. Saad, Y. Numerical Methods for Large Eigenvalue Problems; SIAM, 2011.
2. Li, R.-C.; Zhang, L.-H. Convergence of Block Lanczos Method for Eigenvalue Clusters; 2013.

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:
 - Number of eigenvalues requested

1. Saad, Y. Numerical Methods for Large Eigenvalue Problems; SIAM, 2011.
2. Li, R.-C.; Zhang, L.-H. Convergence of Block Lanczos Method for Eigenvalue Clusters; 2013.

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:
 - Number of eigenvalues requested
 - The block size of the algorithm

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:
 - Number of eigenvalues requested
 - The block size of the algorithm
 - The density of the eigenvalue spectrum

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:
 - Number of eigenvalues requested
 - The block size of the algorithm
 - The density of the eigenvalue spectrum
 - The initial guess eigenvectors

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:
 - Number of eigenvalues requested
 - The block size of the algorithm
 - The density of the eigenvalue spectrum
 - The initial guess eigenvectors
 - The preconditioner (Davidson only)

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:
 - Number of eigenvalues requested
 - The block size of the algorithm
 - The density of the eigenvalue spectrum
 - The initial guess eigenvectors
 - The preconditioner (Davidson only)
- They can have convergence issues if:

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:
 - Number of eigenvalues requested
 - The block size of the algorithm
 - The density of the eigenvalue spectrum
 - The initial guess eigenvectors
 - The preconditioner (Davidson only)
- They can have convergence issues if:
 - The block size is too small compared to degeneracy

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:
 - Number of eigenvalues requested
 - The block size of the algorithm
 - The density of the eigenvalue spectrum
 - The initial guess eigenvectors
 - The preconditioner (Davidson only)
- They can have convergence issues if:
 - The block size is too small compared to degeneracy
 - The approximate eigenvectors become non-orthogonal

Convergence Properties

- The convergence of these subspace algorithms depends on:
 - Number of eigenvalues requested
 - The block size of the algorithm
 - The density of the eigenvalue spectrum
 - The initial guess eigenvectors
 - The preconditioner (Davidson only)
- They can have convergence issues if:
 - The block size is too small compared to degeneracy
 - The approximate eigenvectors become non-orthogonal
- My recommendation for guess eigenvectors is

$$v_j^{(i)} = \textit{normalize} \left(\frac{1}{|A_{ii} - A_{jj}| + 1} \right). \quad (7)$$

Davidson Scaling

- Davidson is Asymptotically quadratic.
- Full diagonalization is almost cubic.
- Matrix multiplication is order¹ $\log_2(7) \approx 2.807$



../../../../images/dav_vs_exact_scaling-eps

1) <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/StrassenFormulas.html>

Efficacy of Davidson's Algorithm

- Reproduces Exact result to machine precision in all test cases.
- Odd spikes are due to approximating circle by squares



../../../../images/dav_vs_exact-eps-convert

Orthogonalization

- The condition number, κ , is bound from below by

$$\kappa \geq \frac{\text{Max}(A_{ii})}{\text{Min}(A_{jj})} \quad (8)$$

- The Gram-Schmidt procedure has numerical issues,

$$\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{Q}\| \leq \frac{\alpha \kappa^2}{1 - \beta \kappa^2}. \quad (9)$$

- Modified Gram-Schmidt is better, but not perfect,

$$\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{Q}\| \leq \frac{\gamma \kappa}{1 - \eta \kappa} \quad (10)$$

- May need multiple orthogonalization steps