

# Slides for Patryk's Notes

Patryk Kozlowski

December 5, 2025

# Outline

1. Why UEG MP2 poles are bad
2. Implementation of QP MP2
3. Comparison to evGW

1. Why UEG MP2 poles are bad

2. Implementation of QP MP2

3. Comparison to evGW

# Why UEG MP2 poles are bad

The VASP paper by Kresse (2012) proves that QP MP2 consists of terminating the Dyson equation for the  $\chi$  to lowest order, so MP2 self-energy sets

$$\chi(\omega) \approx \chi_0(\omega) \quad (1)$$

# Why UEG MP2 poles are bad

The VASP paper by Kresse (2012) proves that QP MP2 consists of terminating the Dyson equation for the  $\chi$  to lowest order, so MP2 self-energy sets

$$\chi(\omega) \approx \chi_0(\omega) \quad (1)$$

So MP2 self-energy is only reliable if the  $\chi_0(\omega)$  is small, and thus the MP2 pole at  $r_s = 4$  is bad.

# Why UEG MP2 poles are bad

The VASP paper by Kresse (2012) proves that QP MP2 consists of terminating the Dyson equation for the  $\chi$  to lowest order, so MP2 self-energy sets

$$\chi(\omega) \approx \chi_0(\omega) \quad (1)$$

So MP2 self-energy is only reliable if the  $\chi_0(\omega)$  is small, and thus the MP2 pole at  $r_s = 4$  is bad. When we do this large scale study of molecular IP/EAs, we should find a way to quantify the  $\chi_0(\omega)$ , so we can see if this trend gets reproduced.

1. Why UEG MP2 poles are bad
2. Implementation of QP MP2
3. Comparison to evGW

# Algorithm for QP MP2

Likely, we want to do:

- 1 Start with HF reference orbitals and energies.
- 2 Solve QP equation for each orbital using MP2 self-energy of 2.
- 3 Update *some* orbital energies in 2, keeping the numerator fixed.
- 4 Repeat steps 2-3 until convergence in the orbital energies *of interest*.

$$\Sigma_{pp}^{(2)}(\omega) = \sum_{iab} \frac{(pa|ib)(2(qa|ib) - (qb|ia))}{\omega - \epsilon_a - \epsilon_b + \epsilon_i + i\eta} + \sum_{ija} \frac{(pi|aj)(2(qi|aj) - (qj|ai))}{\omega - \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j + \epsilon_a + i\eta} \quad (2)$$



# Algorithm for QP MP2

Likely, we want to do:

- 1 Start with HF reference orbitals and energies.
- 2 Solve QP equation for each orbital using MP2 self-energy of 2.
- 3 Update *some* orbital energies in 2, keeping the numerator fixed.
- 4 Repeat steps 2-3 until convergence in the orbital energies *of interest*.

$$\Sigma_{pp}^{(2)}(\omega) = \sum_{iab} \frac{(pa|ib) \left( 2(qa|ib) - (qb|ia) \right)}{\omega - \epsilon_a - \epsilon_b + \epsilon_i + i\eta} + \sum_{ija} \frac{(pi|aj) \left( 2(qi|aj) - (qj|ai) \right)}{\omega - \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j + \epsilon_a + i\eta} \quad (2)$$

When solving the QP equation, we can linearize, so do

$$\epsilon_p^i = \epsilon_p^{i-1} + Z_p \Sigma_{pp}^c(\omega = \epsilon_p^{i-1}) \quad (3)$$

where  $\epsilon_p^i \equiv \epsilon_p^{HF}$  at  $i = 0$  and

$$Z_p = \left[ 1 - \left. \frac{\partial \Sigma_{pp}^c(\omega)}{\partial \omega} \right|_{\omega = \epsilon_p^{i-1}} \right]^{-1} \quad (4)$$

# Choices to make

- 1 Basis choice: I think def2-TZVPP-RIFIT would be good and then all-electron?

# Choices to make

- 1 Basis choice: I think def2-TZVPP-RIFIT would be good and then all-electron?
- 2 Orbital energy updates: Do we update all orbital energies in 2, just HOMO/LUMO, or all occupied plus some virtuals?

# Choices to make

- 1 Basis choice: I think def2-TZVPP-RIFIT would be good and then all-electron?
- 2 Orbital energy updates: Do we update all orbital energies in 2, just HOMO/LUMO, or all occupied plus some virtuals?
- 3 Is GW100 the right test set? They compare to some  $\Delta CCSD(T)$  results. Do we want to use that reference or do something else?

# Outline

1. Why UEG MP2 poles are bad
2. Implementation of QP MP2
3. Comparison to evGW

# Comparison to evGW

We could try to

- 1 Implement  $G_0 W_0$  with AC for periodic systems, as suggested by Tianyu
- 2 Then, translate into miniqc for molecules
- 3 Add partial self consistency, to do evGW for molecules

# Comparison to evGW

We could try to

- 1 Implement  $G_0 W_0$  with AC for periodic systems, as suggested by Tianyu
- 2 Then, translate into miniqc for molecules
- 3 Add partial self consistency, to do evGW for molecules

Note that we can do evGW and/or evGW<sub>0</sub>. To understand the difference, consider the GW self-energy

$$\Sigma_{pq}^c(\omega) = \sum_{im} \frac{M_{pi,m} M_{qi,m}}{\omega - \epsilon_i + \Omega_m - i\eta} + \sum_{am} \frac{M_{pa,m} M_{qa,m}}{\omega - \epsilon_a - \Omega_m + i\eta} \quad (5)$$

In evGW<sub>0</sub>, we update only green, while in evGW we update both green and red.