Towards a general purpose code for the evaluation of correlation in crystalline solids: the CRYSCOR project. Theory, current status and prospects.

Lorenzo Maschio

Dipartimento di Chimica I.F.M. and N.I.S. centre of excellence Università di Torino

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

The Cryscor project started in Torino in the year 2000, and it is aimed to the post-HF evaluation of electron correlation in crystalline solids.

The Cryscor group today is mainly composed by:



Roberto Dovesi Fred Manby Claudio Zicovich-Wilson

The strategy is to combine two well assessed, robust, compatible technologies

CRYSTAL 2006 Dovesi, Saunders, Roetti, Orlando, Zicovich-Wilson, Pascale, Civalleri...

http://www.crystal.unito.it

Atomic Gaussian Type Orbital basis set

Geometrical and structural analysis of **periodic** system

Accurate **HF** and **DFT** solution

Local representation of occupied manifold (WF)



LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

Our aim is to:

✓ Describe electron correlation in non-conducting crystals (bulk and surfaces), using standard *ab initio* post-HF methods

✓ Use technology and HF solution from the CRYSTAL program

✓ Adopt linear-scaling Local Correlation techniques, which have been successfully implemented in MOLPRO

✓ Produce a public domain, general purpose, robust, efficient code

✓ Adopt fast integral evaluation techniques

As a first step, an MP2 code has been prepared ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Pisani, Busso, Capecchi, Casassa, Dovesi, Maschio, Zicovich-Wilson, Schütz
 J. Chem. Phys. 122, 094113 (2005)

The program, together with preliminary results on simple test systems, was presented for the first time in Torino in 2004, during the first edition of the LCC Workshop.



LCC 2004: Workshop on

Local Correlation methods: from molecules to Crystals

September 9-11, 2004 - Torino, Italy

Director: Cesare Pisani and Roberto Dovesi, University of Torino

http://www.theochem.unito.it/lcc2004

Since then we have improved the code in many ways, improving its stability and efficiency, and we are able now to study systems of general interest.

We are looking for beta testers !!

This talk will mainly focus on the new features of the code, in particular Density Fitting and other techniques for the fast evaluation of Integrals.

Are post-HF *ab initio* treatments of crystalline **solids** and their **surfaces** really needed?

HF is often inadequate for ground state characterization: equilibrium structure, solid state reactions, **reactions at surfaces**, vibrational properties, magnetic and electric properties.

And **always** inadequate for excited state properties: band structure, electronic response properties...

DFT exists but is it the final answer?

"DFT is the ultimate semiempirical theory" [Pulay]

DFT is accurate, but often not accurate enough;

 \checkmark It can't account for dispersive interactions between remote parts of the system.

 \checkmark Different functionals must be adopted according to the system to be studied.

Post-HF ab initio treatments of crystals and their surfaces are useful

Do ab-initio periodic correlation codes already exist?

Several approaches are presently adopted by different research groups...

However, a simple, reliable, easily accessible code, could serve the purpose of:

providing **reference data**, exploring **the role of computational parameters**, checking **the usefulness of alternative techniques**, opening **the route to progressively more sophisticated techniques**...

Why MP2?

MP2 (Møller-Plesset Perturbation theory at second order) is the *simplest post-HF correlation technique,* and is inadequate in many respects (in particular, it is non-variational). Yet, it has several merits:

- 1) The MP2 energy E⁽²⁾ is **size consistent**;
- 2) MP2 provides an adequate treatment of **long-range** interactions;
- It allows the assessment of techniques, basis sets, etc., before introducing a more adequate treatment of short-range interactions (MP4, CCSD, ...);
- the MP2 correlation energy estimates can be corrected using the simple Grimme SCS (Spin-Component-Scaled) MP2 formula [Grimme, J. Chem. Phys. 118 (2003) 9095], which has proved very efficient in a molecular context [Hill, Platts, Werner, PCCP 8 (2006) 4072].

Outline of the Presentation



•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 We start from the **local** non-canonical formulation of MP2 energy for closed shell systems:

$$E_2 = \sum_{ij} \sum_{ab} K^{ij}_{ab} \left(2T^{ij}_{ab} - T^{ij}_{ba} \right) = \sum_{ij} E^{ij}_2$$

$$K_{ab}^{ij} = (ia|jb) = \int \phi_i(\mathbf{r_1})\phi_a(\mathbf{r_1})\frac{1}{r_{12}}\phi_j(\mathbf{r_2})\phi_b(\mathbf{r_2})d\mathbf{r_1}d\mathbf{r_2}$$

In this formulation the total MP2 energy is evaluated as a sum of local contributions, that is doubly excited configurations.

The excitation of a pair of electrons occurs from occupied local orbitals to virtual space.

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 We start from the **local** non-canonical formulation of MP2 energy for closed shell systems:

$$\begin{split} E_2 &= \sum_{ij} \sum_{ab} K_{ab}^{ij} \left(2T_{ab}^{ij} - T_{ba}^{ij} \right) = \sum_{ij} E_2^{ij} \\ \text{The amplitudes are obtained through self-consistent iterations} \\ K_{ab}^{ij} &= \left(ia|jb \right) = \int \phi_i(\mathbf{r_1}) \phi_a(\mathbf{r_1}) \frac{1}{r_{12}} \phi_j(\mathbf{r_2}) \phi_b(\mathbf{r_2}) d\mathbf{r_1} d\mathbf{r_2} \end{split}$$

$$R_{ab}^{ij} = K_{ab}^{ij} + \sum_{cd} \left\{ F_{ac} T_{cd}^{ij} S_{db} + S_{ac} T_{cd}^{ij} F_{db} - S_{ac} \left[\sum_{k} \left(F_{ik} T_{cd}^{kj} + T_{cd}^{ik} F_{kj} \right) \right] S_{db} \right\} = 0$$

In this formulation the total MP2 energy is evaluated as a sum of local contributions, that is doubly excited configurations.

The excitation of a pair of electrons occurs from occupied local orbitals to virtual space.

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 We start from the **local** non-canonical formulation of MP2 energy for closed shell systems:

$$E_2 = \sum_{ij} \sum_{ab} K^{ij}_{ab} (2T^{ij}_{ab} - T^{ij}_{ba}) = \sum_{ij} E^{ij}_2$$

$$K_{ab}^{ij} = (ia|jb) = \int \phi_i(\mathbf{r_1})\phi_a(\mathbf{r_1})\frac{1}{r_{12}}\phi_j(\mathbf{r_2})\phi_b(\mathbf{r_2})d\mathbf{r_1}d\mathbf{r_2}$$



The main ingredients of our method are Symmetry Adapted Wannier Functions (SAWFs), here and in the following indicated with latin letters (i,j) and Projected Atomic Orbitals (PAOs), indicated as (a,b).

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects A peculiar feature of CRYSCOR, inherited from CRYSTAL, is the full exploitation of translational *and* point symmetry

The point symmetry requires in particular that all "objects" or "groups of objects" (AOs, shells,PAOs, ...) transform into one another for any symmetry operation of the crystal.

This is generally **not** true for WFs (or localized molecular orbitals) resulting from a localization procedure



A symmetrization step of WFs is preliminarily required

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 Casassa, Zicovich-Wilson, Pisani, Theor. Chem. Acc. 116 (2006) 726

Since all the quantites of interest (Fock matrix, overlap matrix, amplitudes, integrals) are *translationally invariant*, we redefine the correction energy as an *energy per cell:*

$$E_2 = LE_2^{cell}$$
 $E_2^{cell} = \sum_{i_0 j_g} E_2^{i_0 j_g}$



Since all the quantites of interest (Fock matrix, overlap matrix, amplitudes, integrals) are *translationally invariant*, we redefine the correction energy as an *energy per cell:*



Since all the quantites of interest (Fock matrix, overlap matrix, amplitudes, integrals) are *translationally invariant*, we redefine the correction energy as an *energy per cell:*



We are confined *in a vicinity of the reference cell*. The computation becomes $\mathcal{O}(0)$ with respect to *L*, and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ with the size of the *irreducible part* of the reference cell. We are able to describe an *infinite system*.

Since all the quantites of interest (Fock matrix, overlap matrix, amplitudes, integrals) are *translationally invariant*, we redefine the correction energy as an *energy per cell:*



We are confined *in a vicinity of the reference cell*. The computation becomes $\mathcal{O}(0)$ with respect to *L*, and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ with the size of the *irreducible part* of the reference cell. We are able to describe an *infinite system*.

Since all the quantites of interest (Fock matrix, overlap matrix, amplitudes, integrals) are *translationally invariant*, we redefine the correction energy as an *energy per cell:*

$$E_2 = LE_2^{cell} \qquad \qquad E_2^{cell} = \sum_{i_0 j_g} E_2^{i_0 j_g} = \sum_{ij} E_2^{ij}$$

In order to simplify the notation, from now on we will adopt **single indices** instead of double, **implying that the summation is performed over lattice vectors** also. It is implicit that the first WF is always in the reference cell.

$$i = i_0$$

 $j = j_g$

Standard Scheme of CRYSCOR



•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 The most interesting feature of the local approach is that we are allowed to truncate summations according to thresholds. Here we present the most critical parameters for our calculation.

$$K_{ia}^{jb} = \sum_{\mu,\nu,\rho,\tau} c^i_{\mu} c^a_{\nu} c^j_{\rho} c^b_{\tau} (\mu\nu|\rho\tau)$$

 $R_{ab}^{ij} \leq \epsilon$

$$E_{2}^{cell} = \sum_{i}^{(cell \ 0)} \sum_{j} \sum_{ab} K_{ij}^{ab} (2T_{ij}^{ab} - T_{ij}^{ab})$$

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects The most interesting feature of the local approach is that we are allowed to truncate summations according to thresholds. Here we present the most critical parameters for our calculation.

Truncation on WFs and PAOs coefficients

 $K_{ia}^{jb} = \sum c^i_{\mu} c^a_{\nu} c^j_{\rho} c^b_{\tau} (\mu \nu | \rho \tau)$ μ, ν, ρ, τ

 $R_{ab}^{ij} \leq \epsilon$

$$E_2^{cell} = \sum_{i}^{(cell \ 0)} \sum_{j} \sum_{ab} K_{ij}^{ab} (2T_{ij}^{ab} - T_{ij}^{ab})$$

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07





Dresden, 13/09/07



LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07



From our experience, "good" values for the computational parameters (errors \cong 10⁻⁵ Ha) are:

✓ Maximum distance between core domains : $d \le d_{max} \ge 10$ Å (extrapolation to infinite distance feasible with Lennard-Jones-Fitting Technique!)

✓ Excitation domain \cong 2 stars of neighbors for ionic and covalent crystals,

one molecule in the case of a molecular crystal

✓ Threshold on coefficients truncation = $10^{-3} \div 10^{-4}$

Post-HF Density Matrix

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects From the knowledge of the first-order correction to the HF wavefunction ($|\Psi^{(1)}\rangle$), information can be obtained on how correlation effects may influence the electron distribution.

A size consistent expression of the MP2 correction to the HF **oneelectron density matrix** has been recently proposed and implemented in CRYSCOR.

> Pisani, Casassa, Maschio, Z. Phys. Chem. **220** (2006) 913 Casassa, Halo, Maschio, Pisani, Theor. Chem. Acc. 117 (2007) 781

It can be used for obtaining "correlated" X-ray structure factors and directional Compton profiles which can be compared to the experiment.

Post-HF Density Matrix

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 The problem of computing the corrected density matrix $\gamma'(r, r')$ is non trivial, due to *size-consistency* problems.

$$\gamma'(r,r') = \gamma^{HF}(r,r')$$

We need to define a "local one density"

$$\gamma_{loc}'(r,r') = \gamma^{HF}(r,r') + \gamma^{MP2}_{loc}(r,r';0)$$

And make a "periodization" ansatz:

$$\gamma_{per}'(r,r') = \gamma^{HF}(r,r') + \gamma_{per}^{MP2}(r,r')$$

$$\gamma_{per}^{MP2}(r,r') = \sum_g \gamma_{loc}^{MP2}(r,r';g)$$

A different technique, based on a perturbative approach, has been very recently implemented by Denis Usvyat.

1st Summary - Periodic LMP2

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects ✓Based on CRYSTAL HF solution

✓Local-MP2 energy

✓ SCS correction

✓ Full symmetry exploitation

✓MP2 correction to Density Matrix

The problem of integrals evaluation

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 The bottleneck of the whole Local-MP2 method is represented by the calculation of **4 index** integrals, which constitutes by itself about **99%** of the whole time needed for a calculation.

The computational time amounts to **several days** even for the simplest system.

This is due to the four index contraction over atomic orbitals needed to compute this integral between composite objects.

$$K_{ab}^{ij} = (ia|jb) = \int \phi_i(\mathbf{r_1})\phi_a(\mathbf{r_1})\frac{1}{r_{12}}\phi_j(\mathbf{r_2})\phi_b(\mathbf{r_2})d\mathbf{r_1}d\mathbf{r_2}$$

In order to be able to study systems of general interest it is mandatory to implement fast techniques to approximate these integrals.

The problem of integrals evaluation

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 The bottleneck of the whole Local-MP2 method is represented by the calculation of **4 index** integrals, which constitutes by itself about **99%** of the whole time needed for a calculation.

The computational time amounts to **several days** even for the simplest system.

This is due to the four index contraction over atomic orbitals needed to compute this integral between composite objects.



In order to be able to study systems of general interest it is mandatory to implement fast techniques to approximate these integrals.

The Multipolar Approximation

Pisani, Capecchi, Casassa and Maschio, Mol. Phys 103-18(2005) 2527-2536

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects The product distribution between Wannier function *i* and PAO *a* can be represented by a set of electric multipoles, $\{\mathbf{m}_{(ia)}\}_{C}^{i}$ mum order *I* and centered in C.

If the two distributions are sufficiently apart to be entirely contained in separate spheres, their electrostatic interaction can be approximated by a sum of interactions between the respective multipoles :

$$(ia|jb) = (\{\mathbf{m}_{(\mathbf{ia})}\}_{C_1}^l | \{\mathbf{m}_{(\mathbf{jb})}\}_{C_2}^l)$$

Due to translational invariance only the multipoles in the zero cell need to be computed, all the others being the same.

Mutipoles can be used for distances larger than 6 Å.

Lennard-Jones Extrapolation

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 In molecular local correlation calculations very distant pairs can be safely neglected. In crystalline systems, these pairs can contribute significantly to the correlation energy.

This is due to the fact that the number of pairs included within a sphere grows quadratically with distance.

This makes the multipolar approach itself inefficient for distances larger than, say, 12 Å.

On the other hand the distribution of atoms as a function of distance is known, and the energy contributions obey the r⁻⁶ law. This allows us to extrapolate contribution up to large distances.

$$E_2^{LJ} \approx \frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{1}{r_0^3 V_{cell}} \sum_{ij} c_{ij} n_{ij}$$

Where ij labels the individual WF pair, $n_{ij}\,$ is the multiplicity, and the LJ coefficient $\,c_{ij}\,$ is determined by fitting of all the computed contributions below $r_0\,$.

Lennard-Jones Extrapolation



LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

Schuetz, Manby, PCCP (2003) 5, 3349-3358

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects Density Fitting is a powerful technique for integral evaluation that has widely proved its efficiency in molecular codes like MOLPRO. The basic idea is to expand product distributions in an Auxiliary Basis (e.g. gaussian functions $\{\Xi\}_i$). We will from now on refer to these functions with latin capital letters P,Q.

$$\phi_{ia}(\mathbf{r}) = \phi_i(\mathbf{r})\phi_a(\mathbf{r}) \approx \tilde{\rho}_{ia}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_P d_{ia}^P \Xi_P(\mathbf{r})$$

Fitting coefficients are determined by minimizing the error functional Δ

$$\Delta = (\rho_{ia} - \tilde{\rho}_{ia} | w_{12} | \rho_{jb} - \tilde{\rho}_{jb}) \qquad \qquad w_{12} = r_{12}^{-1}$$

leading to the linear equation system

$$\sum_{P} d_{ia}^{P}(P|Q) = (ia|Q)$$

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 So that the 4-index integrals are finally approximated as :

$$(ia|jb) \approx (\widetilde{ia|jb}) = \sum_{P,Q} (ia|P)[J^{-1}]_{PQ}(Q|jb)$$

where:

$$(ia|P) = \int \phi_i({f r_1}) \phi_a({f r_1}) r_{12}^{-1} \Xi_P({f r_2}) d{f r_1} d{f r_2}$$

and:

$$J_{PQ} = (P|Q) = \int \Xi_P(\mathbf{r_1}) r_{12}^{-1} \Xi_Q(\mathbf{r_2}) d\mathbf{r_1} d\mathbf{r_2}$$

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 So that the 4-index integrals are finally approximated as :

$$(ia|jb) \approx (\widetilde{ia|jb}) = \sum_{P,Q} (ia|P)[J^{-1}]_{PQ}(Q|jb)$$

Only 3-center Coulomb integrals are needed.

where:

$$(ia|P) = \int \phi_i(\mathbf{r_1}) \phi_a(\mathbf{r_1}) r_{12}^{-1} \Xi_P(\mathbf{r_2}) d\mathbf{r_1} d\mathbf{r_2}$$

and:

$$J_{PQ} = (P|Q) = \int \Xi_P(\mathbf{r_1}) r_{12}^{-1} \Xi_Q(\mathbf{r_2}) d\mathbf{r_1} d\mathbf{r_2}$$

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 So that the 4-index integrals are finally approximated as :

$$(ia|jb) \approx (\widetilde{ia|jb}) = \sum_{P,Q} (ia|P)[J^{-1}]_{PQ}(Q|jb)$$

Only 3-center Coulomb integrals are needed.

The inverse matrix of 2-center coulomb integrals has the size of the number of auxiliary functions in the system.

where:

$$(ia|P) = \int \phi_i(\mathbf{r_1})\phi_a(\mathbf{r_1})r_{12}^{-1}\Xi_P(\mathbf{r_2})d\mathbf{r_1}d\mathbf{r_2}$$

and:

$$J_{PQ} = (P|Q) = \int \Xi_P(\mathbf{r_1}) r_{12}^{-1} \Xi_Q(\mathbf{r_2}) d\mathbf{r_1} d\mathbf{r_2}$$

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 We have seen that, thanks to translational symmetry, 4index integrals are always referred to the zero cell

$$(ia|jb) \rightarrow (i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'})$$

 $g, \overline{g}, \overline{g}'$ are lattice vector labels

This leads to the following expression for approximated integrals:

$$(i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'}) = \sum_{P, g_P, Q, g_Q} (i_0 a_g | P_{g_P}) [J^{-1}]_{P_{g_P}, Q_{g_Q}} (Q_{g_Q} | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'})$$

Maschio, Usvyat, Manby *et al.* PRB **76**, 075101 (2007) Usvyat, Maschio, Manby *et al.* PRB **76**, 075102 (2007)

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 We have seen that, thanks to translational symmetry, 4index integrals are always referred to the zero cell

$$(ia|jb) \rightarrow (i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'})$$

 $g, \overline{g}, \overline{g}'$ are lattice vector labels

This leads to the following expression for approximated integrals:

$$(i_{0}a_{g}|j_{\bar{g}}b_{\bar{g}'}) = \sum_{P,g_{P},Q,g_{Q}} (\underbrace{i_{0}a_{g}|P_{g_{P}}}_{P_{g_{P}}})[J^{-1}]_{P_{g_{P}},Q_{g_{Q}}}(Q_{g_{Q}}|j_{\bar{g}}b_{\bar{g}'})$$

3-index integrals are referred to the zero cell, all the others can be obtained by translation. In addition 3-center objects have, generally, higher point symmetry than 4-center ones

Maschio, Usvyat, Manby *et al.* PRB **76**, 075101 (2007) Usvyat, Maschio, Manby *et al.* PRB **76**, 075102 (2007)

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects We have seen that, thanks to translational symmetry, 4index integrals are always referred to the zero cell

$$(ia|jb) \rightarrow (i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'})$$

 $g, \overline{g}, \overline{g}'$ are lattice vector labels

This leads to the following expression for approximated integrals:

$$(i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'}) = \sum_{P, g_P, Q, g_Q} (i_0 a_g | P_{g_P}) [J^{-1}]_{P_{g_P}, Q_{g_Q}} (Q_{g_Q} | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'})$$

Indices g_P, g_Q over lattice vectors should go very far, since they must, at least in principle, cover all the space spanned by *all the possible i-j Wannier pairs*, with their relative domains.

Maschio, Usvyat, Manby *et al.* PRB **76**, 075101 (2007) Usvyat, Maschio, Manby *et al.* PRB **76**, 075102 (2007)

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects We have seen that, thanks to translational symmetry, 4index integrals are always referred to the zero cell

$$(ia|jb) \rightarrow (i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'})$$

 $g, \overline{g}, \overline{g}'$ are lattice vector labels

This leads to the following expression for approximated integrals:

$$(i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'}) = \sum_{P, g_P, Q, g_Q} (i_0 a_g | P_{g_P}) [J^{-1}]_{P_{g_P}, Q_{g_Q}} (Q_{g_Q} | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'})$$

Inversion of a NxN matrix scales as $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$. Inversion of such a big J matrix has high computational costs. Translational invariance is not preserved.

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 We have seen that, thanks to translational symmetry, 4index integrals are always referred to the zero cell

$$(ia|jb) \rightarrow (i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'})$$

 $g, \overline{g}, \overline{g}'$ are lattice vector labels

This leads to the following expression for approximated integrals:

$$(i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'}) = \sum_{P, g_P, Q, g_Q} (i_0 a_g | P_{g_P}) [J^{-1}]_{P_{g_P}, Q_{g_Q}} (Q_{g_Q} | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'})$$

The local domain approach is not desirable for several reasons.

•It doesn't preserve the translational periodicity.

•In some crystals (i.e. ionic) the fitting domains can be difficult to define.

•Due to close packing, domains can be very large and the method might be not efficient.

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects Let us obtain the Fourier transform of the needed integrals

$$J(\mathbf{k})_{PQ} = \sum_{\mathbf{g}'} (P|Q_{\mathbf{g}'})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}'}$$
$$J_{i_0a_g}^{P}(\mathbf{k}) = (i_0a_g|P)(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{g}'} (i_0a_g|P_{\mathbf{g}'})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}'}$$

4-index approximated integrals can now be expressed as:

$$(i_0 a_g | j_{\bar{g}} b_{\bar{g}'}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} [\sum_{P,Q} J'^P_{i_0 a_g}(\mathbf{k}) [J(\mathbf{k})^{-1}]_{PQ} J'^Q_{j_0 b_{\bar{g}'-\bar{g}}}(\mathbf{k})] e^{-i\mathbf{k}\bar{\mathbf{g}}}$$

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects Let us obtain the Fourier transform of the needed integrals

$$J(\mathbf{k})_{PQ}^{P} = \sum_{\mathbf{g}'} (P|Q_{\mathbf{g}'})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}'}$$
$$J'_{i_0a_g}^{P}(\mathbf{k}) = (i_0a_g|P)(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{g}'} (i_0a_g|P_{\mathbf{g}'})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}'}$$

4-index approximated integrals can now be expressed as:

$$(i_0 a_{\overline{g}} | \overline{j_{\overline{g}}} b_{\overline{g}'}) = \sum_{\underline{\mathbf{k}}} \left[\sum_{P,Q} J'_{i_0 a_g}^P (\mathbf{k}) [J(\mathbf{k})^{-1}]_{PQ} J'_{j_0 b_{\overline{g}'} - \overline{g}}^Q (\mathbf{k}) \right] e^{-i\mathbf{k}\overline{\mathbf{g}}}$$

The 4-index integrals are achieved through a back-transform. Assembly for each k point can be done separately (easy parallelization of the code).

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 Let us obtain the Fourier transform of the needed integrals

$$J(\mathbf{k})_{PQ}^{P} = \sum_{\mathbf{g}'} (P|Q_{\mathbf{g}'})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}'}$$
$$J'_{i_{0}a_{g}}^{P}(\mathbf{k}) = (i_{0}a_{g}|P)(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{g}'} (i_{0}a_{g}|P_{\mathbf{g}'})e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}'}$$

4-index approximated integrals can now be expressed as:

$$(\widetilde{i_0 a_g | j_{\overline{g}} b_{\overline{g}'}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[\sum_{P,Q} J'_{i_0 a_g}^P(\mathbf{k}) [J(\mathbf{k})^{-1}]_{PQ} J'_{j_0 b_{\overline{g}' - \overline{g}}}^Q(\mathbf{k})] e^{-i\mathbf{k}\overline{\mathbf{g}}} \right]$$

For each k point the size of the matrix to be inverted is given by the number of auxiliary functions in the reference cell.

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects Let us obtain the Fourier transform of the needed integrals

$$J(\mathbf{k})_{PQ}^{P} = \sum_{\mathbf{g}'} (P|Q_{\mathbf{g}'}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}'}$$
$$J_{i_0 a_g}^{P}(\mathbf{k}) = (i_0 a_g|P)(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{g}'} (i_0 a_g|P_{\mathbf{g}'}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{g}'}$$

4-index approximated integrals can now be expressed as:

$$(\widetilde{i_0 a_g} | \widetilde{j_{\bar{g}}} b_{\bar{g}'}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} [\sum_{P,Q} J'_{i_0 a_g}^P(\mathbf{k}) [J(\mathbf{k})^{-1}]_{PQ} J'_{j_0 b_{\bar{g}'-\bar{g}}}^Q(\mathbf{k})] e^{-i\mathbf{k}\overline{\mathbf{g}}}$$

The convolution over auxiliary function indices is restricted to the reference cell

The problem of Linear dependencies in the auxiliary fitting basis set

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects Atoms are packed considerably closer in crystalline systems than in molecules.

Large auxiliary basis sets, or diffuse exponents, can easily lead to quasilinear dependence, causing so the inversion of the matrix

 $[J(k)^{-1}]$

to become unstable or critical.

Solution to this problem has been found by diagonalizing the J matrix, and then inverting the diagonal elements.

This allows to remove linear dependencies by eliminating eigenvectors whose eigenvalue is below a given threshold (default is 10⁻⁴).

The problem of Coulomb series convergence

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 However this scheme cannot be adopted as it is, due to the behaviour of Coulomb series involving Gaussian functions.

For *s*-type functions the series is divergent, for *p*-type it is only conditionally convergent. For higher order functions the series converge but very slowly, and thus we need to compute integrals up to large distance.

A solution is offered by the use of Poisson-type functions as an auxiliary basis set.

Since these functions hold no charge nor multipoles of any order, their mutual interaction vanishes fast, and therefore are suitable for our purposes.

Unfortunately, for the same reasons, they are unable to fit correctly Coulomb interactions, so we nevertheless need to introduce a few "true" Gaussian Functions in the basis set.

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects On each atom A of the local fitting domain we put a set of correcting functions $\{\Pi_A^{\mu}\}$ centered on atoms.

$$\mu=s,p,d,f,g$$

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects On each atom A of the local fitting domain we put a set of correcting functions $\{\Pi_A^{\mu}\}$ centered on atoms

 $\mu = s, p, d, f, g$

We obtain a *corrected product distribution*, ρ'_{ia} , which has zero multipoles up to a given order.

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 On each atom A of the local fitting domain we put a set of correcting functions $\{\Pi_A^{\mu}\}$ centered on atoms, having multipole moments $\mathbf{m}_{\nu}^{\mu A}$

$$\int \frac{1}{r_{12}} \left[\rho_{ia}(\mathbf{r_1}) - \sum_A \sum_\mu d^{\mu A}_{ia} \Pi^{\mu}_A(\mathbf{r_2}) \right]^2 d\mathbf{r_1} d\mathbf{r_2} - \left[+ \sum_\nu \lambda^{\nu}_{ia} \left(\sum_A \sum_\mu d^{\mu A}_{ia} \mathbf{m}^{\mu A}_{\nu} - D^{\nu}_{ia} \right) \right]$$

The formulation is very similar to the usual density fitting functional.

The constraints guarantee that the multipoles D_{ia}^{ν} are cancelled up to order **v**, while the resulting density is as smooth as possible.

Good results are obtained with reasonably small domains for the local fitting (8 - 15 atoms).

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects We perform in reciprocal space the fitting of the integrals $\widetilde{K'}_{ab}^{ij}$ between corrected densities. At the end of the procedure the needed integrals are obtained through:

$$\begin{split} \widetilde{K}_{ab}^{ij} &= \widetilde{K'}_{ab}^{ij} + (\rho_{ia}|\sum_{B}\sum_{\mu} d_{jb}^{\mu B} \Pi_{B}^{\mu}) + \\ &+ (\sum_{A}\sum_{\mu} d_{ia}^{\mu A} \Pi_{A}^{\mu}|\rho_{jb}) - (\sum_{A}\sum_{\mu} d_{ia}^{\mu A} \Pi_{A}^{\mu}|\sum_{B}\sum_{\mu} d_{jb}^{\mu B} \Pi_{B}^{\mu}) \end{split}$$

Up to now we successfully implemented and tested only correcting gaussians of *s* and *p* type.



LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects It is often difficult to estimate how much the DF approach is performing better. In some cases an exact calculation with reasonable thresholds is simply unfeasible.

System / technique		Diamond		CO ₂		MgO-3Layerslab	
		LMP2	DF-LMP2	LMP2	DF-LMP2	LMP2	DF-LMP2
d _{max} =4 Å	time/min	23288	11	610	43	6247	10
	E2/Ha	-0.22865	-0.22875	-1.75366	-1.75401	-0.57774	-0.57774
d _{max} =11 Å	time/min	Too long!	38	Too long!	50	Too long!	42
	E2/Ha		-0.25765		-1.76360		-0.61002





Dresden, 13/09/07



2nd Summary- Fast Integrals Evaluation

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07 We have successfully adapted the popular Density Fitting technique to approximate two electron repulsion integrals in crystalline systems.

This implementation features:

✓ Reciprocal space formulation
✓ Use of Poisson Functions
✓ Two-step Fitting

The gain in time is up to three orders of magnitude.

Our recipe:

✓0-6Å	: Density Fitting
✓6Å-10Å	: Multipolar Approximation
✓10Å- ∞	: Lennard-Jones Extrapolatior

What Cryscor can do today:

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects We present here in the following a series of test systems which have been successfully studied with Cryscor.

We won't provide results, since a full study of each of this systems would imply careful basis set analysis, deep insight and experience. An overview of applications will be presented by Denis Usvyat in the forthcoming talk.

This list is intended to provide an insight into what is today feasible with Cryscor.

Molecular Crystals

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects







LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

Ionic Crystals

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

System	Space Group	n. atoms per cell
MgO	Cubic (Fm3m)	2
LiH	Cubic (Fm3m)	2
LiF	Cubic (Fm3m)	2
NaCl	Cubic(Fm3m)	2
TiO ₂	Tetragonal (P 42m nm)	6



LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

Covalent Crystals

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

System	Space Group	n. atoms per cell
BeS	cubic (F-43m)	2
Diamond	cubic (Fd3m)	2
Si	cubic (Fd3m)	2
Alpha-Quartz	hexagonal (P32 21)	9
Hexag. BN	hexagonal (P63mmc)	4





Weakly Bound Rare Gas Crystals

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

System	Space Group	n. atoms per cell
Argon	cubic (Fm3m)	1
Hexag. Ar	hexagonal (P63mmc)	2





2D Slabs and adsorption of molecules

- •LMP2 in crystals
- •Post-HF Density Matrix
- •Multipolar Approximation
- •Lennard-Jones extrapolation
- •Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects



System	Space Group	N. Atoms per Cell	
HBN 1L	hexagonal (P -6m2)	2	
MgO 3L	square (P 4mmm)	6	
CH4/MgO3L	no symmetry	11	
corundum 2L	hexagonal (R -3c)	10	



LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

Interaction of molecules inside crystalline bulk cages



Conclusions and Prospects

•LMP2 in crystals

•Post-HF Density Matrix

•Multipolar Approximation

•Lennard-Jones extrapolation

•Density Fitting in Crystals

•Feasibility of different systems

•Work to do and Prospects

LCC2007 -Dresden, 13/09/07

Current work :

Refinement and standardization of "basic" program
 Preparation and test of Public (beta) version and User's manual
 Tests, tests, tests

✓ Release of public version in 2008

✓ Cryscor Web site

In the next future...

✓ Auxiliary basis set (to complement the HF set)

- ✓ Providing optimized basis sets for our new two-step density fitting technique
- ✓ Improved estimates of electron density matrix
- ✓Higher efficiency, parallelization
- ✓Assessing basis set quality

...and more distant in time:

✓ Extension to other local correlation schemes (CCSD, MP4, ...)

✓ Automatic geometry optimization.

Acknowledgements

Thanks once more to all the Cryscor group:

Cesare Pisani Silvia Casassa Lorenzo Maschio Migen Halo

Martin Schütz Denis Usvyat

Roberto Dovesi Fred Manby Claudio Zicovich-Wilson

