

FYS4480 ORAL EXAM, MIDTERM ONE AND TWO
HELIUM AND BERYLLIUM USING CIS AND HARTREE-FOCK, PAIRING MODEL

Håkon Kvernmoen

University of Oslo

December 19, 2022

SETUP

Represent states using creation a_p^\dagger and annihilation a_q operators (occupation representation/second quantization), obeying

$$\{a_p^\dagger, a_q\} = \delta_{pq}, \quad \{a_p^\dagger, a_q^\dagger\} = \{a_p, a_q\} = 0$$

p and q are sets of relevant quantum numbers. We need to pick a single particle (SP) computational basis, having n possible single particle states.

$$\text{3D HO:} \quad p = \{n_r, l, m_l, s, m_s\}, \quad a_p^\dagger |0\rangle = |p\rangle \longrightarrow \psi_p(\mathbf{x}) = \psi_{n_r l m}(r, \theta, \phi) = \dots$$

Need a Hamiltonian to solve $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}$, with \hat{H}_0 representing single particle energy contributions, and \hat{V} interactions.

Often start with an N -particle ground state ansatz $|\Phi_0\rangle = a_1^\dagger \dots a_N^\dagger |0\rangle$.

And consider excitations of this

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{1p1h} & |\Phi_i^a\rangle = a_a^\dagger a_i |\Phi_0\rangle \\ \text{2p2h} & |\Phi_{ij}^{ab}\rangle = a_a^\dagger a_b^\dagger a_j a_i |\Phi_0\rangle \\ \text{NpNh} & |\Phi_{ij\dots}^{ab\dots}\rangle = a_a^\dagger a_b^\dagger \dots a_j a_i |\Phi_0\rangle \end{array}$$

FULL CONFIGURATION INTERACTION (FCI)

Start with N particle ground state ansatz $|\Phi_0\rangle$.

Not an eigenstate of \hat{V} and therefore not the true ground state of the system.

By considering every possible N particle state in our system (using $\{a_1^\dagger, \dots, a_N^\dagger, \dots, a_n^\dagger\}$), we can construct our ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ as a linear combination of excited states.

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = C_0 |\Phi_0\rangle + \sum_{ai} C_i^a |\Phi_i^a\rangle + \sum_{abij} C_{ij}^{ab} |\Phi_{ij}^{ab}\rangle + \dots$$

Normally solved by considering the Hamiltonian in matrix representation, with elements $H_{XY} = \langle \Phi_X | \hat{H} | \Phi_Y \rangle$, with $X, Y \in \{0p0h, 1p1h \dots NpNh\}$, giving the eigenvalue problem

$$H\mathbf{c} = E\mathbf{c}$$

When solved, the smallest eigenvalue $E^{(0)}$ will yield the ground state energy, and $|\Psi_0\rangle$ can be found by considering the eigenvectors $\mathbf{c}^{(0)} = (C_0, C_i^a \dots C_{ij}^{ab} \dots C_{ij\dots}^{ab\dots})$. Excited states can also be found by considering the other eigenvalues and vectors $E^{(i)}, \mathbf{c}^{(i)}$.

FCI

Example, pairing interaction: \hat{V} only works between spin-paired states at the same energy level. We let $p = 1, 2, 3, 4$ denote energy levels, with SP states also having a spin $\sigma = \pm$, a total of $n = 8$ SP states.


$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}, \quad \hat{H}_0 = \sum_{p\sigma} (p - 1) a_{p\sigma}^\dagger a_{p\sigma}, \quad \hat{V} = -\frac{1}{2} g \sum_{pq} a_{p+}^\dagger a_{p-}^\dagger a_{q-} a_{q+}$$

Diagonal SP Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 and two body interaction \hat{V} . Consider $N = 4$ particles with total spin $S = 0$, writing $|PQ\rangle = |p + p - q + q -\rangle$ we have a total of six different many body states.

$$\begin{array}{ll} 0p0h & |12\rangle \\ 2p2h & |13\rangle, |14\rangle, |23\rangle, |24\rangle \\ 4p4h & |34\rangle \end{array}$$

By setting up the matrix $\langle KL | \hat{H} | RS \rangle$, we get a small eigenvalue problem of a 6×6 matrix.

FCI



But there is a problem...

For all but very simple problems, this approach is unfeasible. In general, we have to consider

$$\binom{n}{N} = \frac{n!}{N!(n-N)!}$$

many body states. Taking our pairing model example, lifting the $S = 0$ restriction yields 70 different states. This is still possible, but increasing both n and N results in disaster

$N \downarrow / n \rightarrow$	8	32	64	128
4	70	10^4	10^5	10^7
8		10^7	10^9	10^{12}
16		10^8	10^{14}	10^{19}
32			10^{18}	10^{30}

Table. NB: Order of magnitude values

FCI

Pros:

- ▶ Provides exact solutions within a truncated basis set
- ▶ Understandable and relatively easy to set up
- ▶ Excited states thrown into the bargain

Cons:

- ▶ Computational complexity, bad scaling
- ▶ Only possible for tiny systems, with few states and particles.
- ▶ Practically only a benchmarking tool

CONFIGURATION INTERACTION (CI)

Follows the same methodology as FCI, but due to its large computational time, the many body states are also truncated.



Different truncation levels can be chosen, for instance only include (in addition to $|\Phi_0\rangle$) 1p1h excitations (CIS) or 2p2h excitations (CID).

Truncation relies on an a priori ranking of the importance of different excited states, which contributions to include might not be obvious.

Considering our pairing model example, we can exclude the 4p4h ($|34\rangle$) contributions from $\langle KL | \hat{H} | RS \rangle$, giving only the ground state ansatz and 2p2h excitations.

This reduces the matrix $6 \times 6 \rightarrow 5 \times 5$, showing how truncation is beneficial from a computational point of view.

CI



CI

Pros:

- ▶ Understandable and relatively easy to set up
- ▶ Excited states thrown into the bargain
- ▶ Reduces the problem of FCI
- ▶ When adding contributions, we approach the exact energy (FCI).

Cons:

- ▶ Still quite computationally expensive
- ▶ Bad scaling for higher contributions
- ▶ What contributions to include might not be obvious
- ▶ Not size extensive

HARTREE-FOCK (HF)

Hartree-Fock methods approximate two body interactions as a mean field potential. This can be done by performing a unitary transformation on the orthonormal basis set $\{|\alpha\rangle\}$. The ground state ansatz energy is:

$$\langle \Phi_0 | \hat{H} | \Phi_0 \rangle = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \langle \alpha | \hat{h}_0 | \alpha \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha\beta=1}^N \langle \alpha\beta | \hat{v} | \alpha\beta \rangle_{AS}$$

We aim to express this in a new (Hartree-Fock) basis $\{|i\rangle\}$.

$$\langle \Phi_0^{\text{HF}} | \hat{H} | \Phi_0^{\text{HF}} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle i | \hat{h}_0 | i \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij=1}^N \langle ij | \hat{v} | ij \rangle_{AS}$$

Of course we do not know this new basis a priori, but they are related by a unitary transformation U where $U^\dagger = U^{-1}$.

$$|i\rangle = U |\alpha\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} C_{i\alpha} |\alpha\rangle$$

Since we have a unitary transformation, together with $\{|\alpha\rangle\}$ being orthonormal, the transformed basis $\{|i\rangle\}$ should also be orthonormal.

HF

The new SP states must obey.

$$\sum_{ij=1}^N \langle i|j \rangle - \delta_{ij} = 0$$

We formulate this as a minimization problem of the Hartree-Fock energy

$$\langle \Phi_0^{\text{HF}} | \hat{H} | \Phi_0^{\text{HF}} \rangle = E[\Phi^{\text{HF}}] = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\alpha\beta=1}^n C_{i\alpha}^* C_{i\beta} \langle \alpha | \hat{h}_0 | \beta \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij=1}^N \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta=1}^n C_{i\alpha}^* C_{j\beta}^* C_{i\gamma} C_{j\delta} \langle \alpha\beta | \hat{v} | \gamma\delta \rangle_{\text{AS}}$$

With the constraint

$$G = \sum_{ij=1}^N \epsilon_{ij} \left(\sum_{\alpha\beta=1}^n C_{i\alpha}^* C_{j\beta} \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle - \delta_{ij} \right) = 0$$

Then by taking the derivative w.r.t. the coefficients $C_{i\alpha}^*$ (minimizing w.r.t. C or C^* is arbitrary).

$$L[\Phi^{\text{HF}}] = E[\Phi^{\text{HF}}] - G$$

On obtains the eigenvalue problem (assuming we chose $\{|\alpha\rangle\}$ to be eigenstates of \hat{h}_0)

$$\sum_{\beta=1}^n h_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{HF}} C_{i\beta} = \epsilon_i C_{i\alpha}, \quad h_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{HF}} = \epsilon_\alpha \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\gamma\delta=1}^n C_{j\gamma}^* C_{j\delta} \langle \alpha\gamma | \hat{v} | \beta\delta \rangle_{\text{AS}}$$

This is often solved iteratively, until a stopping criterion is reached.

HF

Taking note of the interaction piece of $h_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{HF}}$, this is nothing more than

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{\gamma\delta=1}^n C_{j\gamma}^* C_{j\delta} \langle \alpha\gamma | \hat{v} | \beta\delta \rangle_{\text{AS}} = \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \alpha j | \hat{v} | \beta j \rangle_{\text{AS}} = \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \alpha j | \hat{v} | \beta j \rangle - \langle \alpha j | \hat{v} | j \beta \rangle$$

often called the direct and exchange terms. The different states are affected by a mean field set up by all occupied states.

As an example, consider a basis set of three different hydrogen like s-orbitals, giving six total states when counting spin. Constructing Helium (2e) and Beryllium (4e) $S = 0$ states, we can calculate the ground state energies and compare with CIS.

Atom	E_0	E_{CI}	E_1^{HF}	E_c^{HF}	E
Helium	-2.7500	-2.8385	-2.8291	-2.8311	-2.9037
Beryllium	-13.7160	-14.3621	-14.4998	-14.5083	-14.6674

Table. Showing the naive ground state energy expectation value E_0 , the configuration interaction calculation E_{CI} , Hartree-Fock after 1 iteration and after convergence E_1^{HF} , E_c^{HF} and the exact ground state energy using our Hamiltonian E .

HF

Pros:

- ▶ Computationally cheap
- ▶ Variational
- ▶ Serves as a building block for other methods, changing to a HF basis can make another calculations simpler (i.e. perturbation theory)

Cons:

- ▶ If correlations are important, the mean field might not be a good approximation
- ▶ Possibility for not converging if the starting guess is not in a convex region around the minima

MANY BODY PERTURBATION THEORY (MBPT)

Again, the exact ground state of the system is assumed to be an expansion of the ground state ansatz $|\Phi_0\rangle$ and excitations of this (1p1h, 2p2h...)

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = |\Phi_0\rangle + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} C_m |\Phi_m\rangle$$

With m going over all $|\Phi_0\rangle$ excitations. There is no coefficient for $|\Phi_0\rangle$, since we have chosen intermediate normalization $\langle\Phi_0|\Psi_0\rangle = 1$. $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is an eigenstate of the full Hamiltonian and we subtract the Schrödinger equation from an arbitrary energy variable ω .

$$(\hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}) |\Psi_0\rangle = E |\Psi_0\rangle$$

$$(\omega - \hat{H}_0) |\Psi_0\rangle = (\omega - E + V) |\Psi_0\rangle$$

Defining two hermitian idempotent operators, for model space (P) and complimentary space (Q).

$$P = |\Phi_0\rangle \langle\Phi_0|, \quad Q = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\Phi_m\rangle \langle\Phi_m|, \quad P^2 = P, Q^2 = Q, \quad [P, Q] = [\hat{H}_0, P] = [\hat{H}_0, Q] = 0$$

Together they form the identity in the complete Hilbert space $P + Q = I$, which is useful since

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = (P + Q) |\Psi_0\rangle = |\Phi_0\rangle + Q |\Psi_0\rangle$$

$$Q |\Psi_0\rangle = |\Psi_0\rangle - |\Phi_0\rangle$$

MBPT

When applying Q from the left, the rewritten Schrödinger equation becomes

$$Q |\Psi_0\rangle = \hat{R}_0(\omega)(\omega - E + V) |\Psi_0\rangle, \quad \hat{R}_0(\omega) = \frac{Q}{\omega - \hat{H}_0}$$
$$|\Psi_0\rangle = |\Phi_0\rangle + \hat{R}_0(\omega)(\omega - E + V) |\Psi_0\rangle$$

This is solved iteratively, often starting with the guess $|\Psi_0^{(0)}\rangle = |\Phi_0\rangle$. The final state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ can then be expressed as.

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\hat{R}_0(\omega)(\hat{V} - E + \omega) \right)^i |\Phi_0\rangle$$

With an energy:

$$E = \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V} | \Psi_0 \rangle = E^{(0)} + \Delta E = E^{(0)} + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \left(\hat{R}_0(\omega)(\hat{V} - E + \omega) \right)^i | \Phi_0 \rangle$$

Taking just the correlation energy ΔE , we define the PT order by where we truncate this contribution

$$\Delta E = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \Delta E^{(i)}, \quad \Delta E^{(i)} = \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \left(\hat{R}_0(\omega)(\hat{V} - E + \omega) \right)^i | \Phi_0 \rangle$$

DIFFERENT APPROACHES, RAYLEIGH-SCHRÖDINGER (RS)

Different choices of ω can now be made in order to obtain different types of PT expansions.

Setting $\omega = E$ removes E from $(\hat{V} - E + \omega)$, but it is still present in $\hat{R}_0(\omega = E)$, giving an implicit equation. This approach is called Brillouin-Wigner (BW) PT.

Setting $\omega = E^{(0)}$, we do not have the E dependence problem for \hat{R}_0 , and by setting $\Delta E = E - E^{(0)}$ we obtain.

$$\Delta E = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \Delta E^{(i)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \left(\hat{R}_0(\omega) (\hat{V} - \Delta E) \right)^i | \Phi_0 \rangle$$

This does not seem to bring any improvement, since we still have an implicit equation. However, since \hat{R}_0 contains Q and ΔE is just a scalar, $\hat{R}_0 \Delta E |\Psi_0\rangle = \Delta E \hat{R}_0 |\Psi_0\rangle = 0$, a pretty neat perturbative expansion can be formed when gathering terms of the same interaction order.

Explicitly, we expand ΔE

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta E &= \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 (\hat{V} - \Delta E) | \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 (\hat{V} - \Delta E) \hat{R}_0 (\hat{V} - \Delta E) | \Phi_0 \rangle + \dots \\
 &= \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 (\hat{V} - \Delta E) \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle + \dots \\
 &= E^{(1)} + E^{(2)} + \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle - \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 \Delta E \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle + \dots
 \end{aligned}$$

And by inserting recursively for ΔE , we get *two* terms with three \hat{V} s, giving $E^{(3)}$. Higher orders of \hat{V} will be given to $E^{(4)}, E^{(5)}, \dots$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle - \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 (E^{(1)} + E^{(2)} + \dots) \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle + \dots \\
 &= \left(\langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle - E^{(1)} \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0^2 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle \right) - E^{(2)} \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0^2 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle + \dots \\
 &= E^{(3)} - E^{(2)} \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0^2 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle + \dots
 \end{aligned}$$

We can now use this as a normal perturbative series that can be truncated at a specific interaction order (RS2, RS3 and so on).



In contrast to CI/Hartree-Fock, this is not a variational approach. There is no guarantee for convergence and results across different orders can vary.

If the SP energies are very close (\hat{H}_0), convergence might be a problem since the denominator of \hat{R}_0 can explode.

$$E^{(2)} = \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \hat{R}_0 \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle = \sum'_m \langle \Phi_0 | \hat{V} \frac{|\Phi_m\rangle \langle \Phi_m|}{E^{(0)} - \hat{H}_0} \hat{V} | \Phi_0 \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ijab} \frac{|\langle ij | \hat{v} | ab \rangle|^2}{\epsilon_i + \epsilon_j - \epsilon_a - \epsilon_b}$$

If the interaction is parametrized by a coupling constant, the coupling/SP energy ratio is crucial.

RS



PT

Pros:

- ▶ Cheap compared with CI methods
- ▶ Still capable of high accuracy
- ▶ Incorporate high order excitations, even at low order
- ▶ Size extensive

Cons:

- ▶ No guaranty for convergence
- ▶ Nonvariational, we have no energy bounds
- ▶ Degeneracy (at least this formulation)