

FIRST-PRINCIPLES PSEUDOPOTENTIAL IN THE LOCAL-DENSITY-FUNCTIONAL FORMALISM

Alex ZUNGER ‡

Department of Physics and Materials Research Center, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60201, USA

and

Sid TOPIOL and Mark A. RATNER

Department of Chemistry and Materials Research Center, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60201, USA

Received 13 September 1978

A first principles approach to the pseudopotential method is developed in the local density formalism (LDF). As an example, tests on the carbon and tungsten atom potentials are given. Comparison of the energy eigenvalues and total energy differences obtained in accurate self-consistent numerical solutions of the all-electron problem with those of the pseudopotential problem reveals an error smaller than 10^{-3} au for a very wide range of electronic configuration and excitation states. Charge density observables such as moments of r and X-ray scattering factors are also accurately obtained. Applications to large-scale electronic structure calculations as well as comparison of the results with the empirical pseudopotential scheme are discussed.

1. Introduction

The Hartree–Fock (HF) model provides a widely used and well accepted scheme for obtaining all-electron density matrices and related observables for atoms, molecules and recently for periodic solids [1–3], which correlate favorably with many ground and excited state observables. A huge body of chemical evidence as well as extensive experience with electronic structure calculations indicates that the changes in the first-order density matrices due either to bonding or to low-energy excitations, relative to some standard reference level (e.g. the electronic ground state or the non-interacting atoms limit in a molecule or solid) are mainly brought about by the outer “valence” orbitals while the inner “core-like” orbitals remain largely unchanged. These latter orbitals are not only of little direct interest for many electronic-structure problems, but also necessitate an additional substantial computational effort particularly in methods that expand the wavefunctions in a

fixed basis set (e.g. linear combination of atomic orbitals or LCAO). Although for many electronic structure problems it is desirable from the computational point of view to eliminate these core orbitals (the computation time increasing as about the third to fourth power of the basis set size), it is impossible simply to discard these orbitals and the electrons occupying them due to their indistinguishability from all other electrons. To overcome this difficulty the pseudopotential scheme is often introduced [4]. The basic idea is then to remove the constraint of the standard canonical HF theory which requires the valence orbitals to be orthogonal to the core orbitals. This is accomplished by adding to the hamiltonian a term (Phillips–Kleinman pseudopotential [4]), which projects out the core components of a valence type wavefunction. This permits the use of smooth and nodeless valence “pseudo-orbitals” which are usually obtained by a transformation of the atomic HF orbitals. A second term, approximating the coulombic and exchange effects of the missing core electrons (without having explicitly to introduce core orbitals into the problem) is then added and the core electrons are removed. This transformation on the wave-

‡ Present address: Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA.

function is not *unique* since there is an infinite number of ways one can transform the HF eigenfunctions to obtain nodeless orbitals. One then chooses a *useful* transformation of the HF orbitals that results in pseudo-orbitals having, say, a maximum similarity to the original orbitals, in some preferred parts of space [5–8].

The HF pseudopotential scheme involves three major assumptions: (i) the core orbitals entering the density matrix and the pseudopotential are “frozen” in a given reference electronic state and are taken as such for all excited states as well as for all the different bonding situations (e.g. atoms in molecules and solids) ‡. This “frozen-core” pseudopotential scheme for HF calculations has been tested extensively in the past [8,9–12] and seems to be useful for evaluating electronic properties that do not sample directly the core region. (ii) Unlike the situation encountered in the all-electron HF model, it is assumed that a radially *local* equivalent to the core part of the non-local Fock operator arising from the Coulomb and exchange terms exists. This assumption is needed in the HF pseudopotential theory due to the explicit occurrence of all valence orbitals in the non-local HF exchange operator and yields reasonably accurate results in practical calculations when the spacial behavior of all valence orbitals belonging to the same *l*-value and different excitation states is similar in the core region. (iii) The pseudopotentials for all *l*-states not appearing in the core (or for the next higher *l* value) are assumed to be identical. Although this approximation can be relaxed, it appears to be useful in practical applications. Accurate pseudopotential HF calculations have been recently applied to numerous atoms [6] and molecules [7–12] with considerable saving in computational effort.

Parallel with the development of first-principles HF pseudopotentials, substantial effort has been

directed in the past towards the construction of both *semi-empirical pseudopotential* schemes aimed at simulating observed quantities [13] and *parametrized model pseudopotential* schemes [14–17] which attempt to simulate HF results via model potentials with adjustable parameters. While being useful in practical applications [13–17] both schemes show a substantial dependence of the potential parameters on the basis set used.

The local density functional (LDF) formalism developed by Hohenberg and Kohn [18] and by Kohn and Sham [19] offers a different route to the solution of electronic structure problems in that it provides an effective (all-electron) Schrödinger equation which in principle incorporates all exchange and correlation effects in the form of a single-particle potential. It has been widely used in one form or another (including the simplified Hartree–Fock–Slater method) by the vast majority of electronic solid-state band structure practitioners [20,21] as well as for many molecular [22,23] and atomic [24] studies. The difficulties in having to include the core orbitals in electronic structure calculations are similar here to those pertaining to the HF model. The Phillips–Kleinman pseudopotential approach [4] offers here a straightforward simplification of the problem by including in the local potential a term projecting out explicitly the core orbitals. This enables one to use smooth nodeless valence wavefunctions instead of the original all-electron wavefunctions that have pronounced nodal character due to the core orthogonality requirement. There are, however, practical difficulties involved in using the Phillips–Kleinman scheme. In addition to the usual non uniqueness of the definition of the pseudo-orbitals, this scheme is hard to carry out in practice due to the need to use exact core orbitals (which require a full solution of some related all-electron problem), and the need to recalculate the projection operators for each excited state. More importantly, one is still faced with the problem of evaluating all the Coulomb and exchange integrals describing valence-core interactions. This pseudopotential model has consequently become more useful in its semi-empirical modification, in which the various Fourier components of the crystal pseudopotential are used as adjustable parameters modified to obtain agreement with some observed eigenvalue differences [13].

‡ The elimination of the core orbitals from the electronic structure problem in the pseudopotential method should be contrasted with standard frozen-core approximations in LCAO model: while in the latter the *potential* is unchanged relative to the all-electron problem and only the *wavefunctions* are orthogonalized to the core (and hence matrix elements of core basis functions still need to be evaluated), in the pseudopotential scheme both the potential and the core orbitals of the all-electron problem are replaced and hence the consideration of core integrals is not necessary.

In this paper we present a first-principles approach to the pseudopotential problem in the local density formalism. This approach has several advantages compared to the analogous procedure within the HF model. In particular, we show that due to the locality of the all-electron potential appearing in the "standard" LDF formalism (i.e. in which only the non-gradient electron correlation functionals [19,25] are included), approximations (ii) and (iii) which are pertinent to the HF pseudopotential model become unnecessary. The resulting pseudopotential is therefore exact for the reference state, while for states different from the prescribed "reference state" it contains inaccuracies proportional to the change in the core contribution to the density matrix. These changes are very small for many electronic structure problems of interest. For example, the n th moment of the vector r within the $1s$ orbital density $\rho_{1s}(r)$ of carbon: $\int \rho_{1s}(r)r^n dr$ equals in atomic units 64.1056; 5.5995; 0.27303; 0.10104 for $n = -2, -1, 1$ and 2 respectively in the ground $1s^2 2s^2 2p^2$ configuration and 64.1942; 5.6036; 0.2728; 0.10089 for the excited $1s^2 2s^1 2p^3$ configuration where all the quantities are calculated using all-electron LDF. In addition, the use of the pseudopotential approach for atoms, molecules and solids within the LDF formalism is conceptually more appealing than in the Hartree-Fock method, due to the suitability of the slowly-varying-density approximation [19,25,26] used in the expansion of the total exchange and correlation energy [25] to the present theory involving only smooth and nodeless valence orbitals. As in any pseudopotential scheme, the LDF pseudopotentials may be defined in several arbitrarily chosen ways. This seeming arbitrariness is, however, less serious than first appears. We show that although many useful (but non-unique) transformations of the original valence orbitals into the pseudo-orbitals can be conveniently defined, the differences among these disappear if the pseudo-orbitals are orthogonalized to the core orbitals *after* the self-consistent pseudo-hamiltonian has been solved.

Section 2 is devoted to the derivation of our LDF pseudopotential and to discussion of some of its properties. Section 3 contains details of the calculational procedure, while section 4 gives numerical applications for both eigenvalues and total energy differences as well as wavefunction related properties for

the carbon and tungsten atoms. Section 5 consists of general remarks and a brief discussion of the relation of this work to previous work on pseudopotentials in the density functional approach.

2. Development of the local density pseudopotential

Our development of the local density pseudopotential proceeds as follows: one first solves the local density ($N_c + N_v$)-electron problem for an atom in some electronic configuration (say, the ground state), where N_c and N_v denote the number of core and valence electrons, respectively. For each angular momentum species a rotation of the ground state orbitals is performed such that one obtains new valence orbitals (pseudo-orbitals) which are deorthogonalized to the core, smooth and nodeless. One then concentrates on the variational local density solutions of a fictitious N_v -electron atom (pseudo-atom) having the pseudo-orbitals as its eigenvectors and the exact all-electron-orbital energies as its eigenvalues. Such a pseudo-atom experiences the Coulomb and exchange-correlation field of its N_v -electrons plus some yet unspecified external static potential (which can be different for different angular momenta). This pseudopotential is then solved for in terms of the known all-electron eigenvalues, the pseudo-orbitals and the corresponding local density potentials. It is then fixed at its value obtained for the chosen reference electronic state and applied as such (static core approximation) to the study of any other electronic state of the pseudo-atom. The properties calculated for the pseudo-atom in these other states will parallel those of the real atom (i.e., approximately equal orbital energies and excited state pseudo-orbitals whose changes from the ground state pseudo-orbitals match the changes that the real atomic orbitals would have undergone had the core orbitals of the real atom been frozen in their ground state). By orthogonalizing these pseudo-orbitals to the ground state core orbitals of the real atom, one would recover the orbitals for the real atom in the corresponding state subject to a frozen core approximation.

We write the local-density one-particle eigenvalue equation for the electronic states ψ_{nl}^s of an atom with nuclear charge Z (in atomic units) as:

$$H\psi_{nl}^s(\mathbf{r}) = \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})] \right\} \psi_{nl}^s(\mathbf{r}) = \epsilon_{nl}^s \psi_{nl}^s(\mathbf{r}), \quad (1a)$$

where the one-body potential is given by:

$$V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})] = -Z/r + V_{\text{Coul}}[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})] + V_{\text{xc}}[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})]. \quad (1b)$$

Here $V_{\text{Coul}}[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})]$ and $V_{\text{xc}}[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})]$ are respectively the electronic Coulomb and the exchange- and-correlation local potentials [26] due to the all-electron charge density $\rho_s(\mathbf{r})$, and $\psi_{nl}^s(\mathbf{r})$ and ϵ_{nl}^s denote the central-field (n, l) eigenfunction and eigenvalue, respectively (square brackets denote functional dependence; s is a running index). The Coulomb potential is given by the Poisson equation as

$$V_{\text{Coul}}[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})] = \int \frac{\rho_s(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} d\mathbf{r}' \quad (2)$$

and incorporates the effect of all N electrons in the system (including the self-interaction term). The exchange and correlation potential is given to the lowest order of the gradient expansion [19] as:

$$V_{\text{xc}}[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})] = V_x[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})] + V_c[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})], \quad (3)$$

where $V_x[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})]$ is the well known [19,25] " $\rho^{1/3}$ " term:

$$V_x[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})] = -(3/\pi)^{1/3} [\rho_s(\mathbf{r})]^{1/3} \quad (4)$$

and $V_c[\rho_s(\mathbf{r})]$ is likewise a local function of \mathbf{r} , which was worked out by several authors [26,27] in numerical form and given by Hedin and Lundqvist [25] in an analytically fitted form. The total charge density is related to the eigenvectors of all the σ_{oc} occupied states by:

$$\rho_s(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{nl}^{\sigma_{\text{oc}}} N_{nl}^s \psi_{nl}^{s*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{nl}^s(\mathbf{r}), \quad (5)$$

where N_{nl}^s are the occupation numbers for the electronic configuration s . Eq. (1) is solved self-consistently by iteratively updating the potential functional on the basis of the wavefunction-dependent diagonal density matrix [eq. (5)]. Since only the total wavefunction [and not the individual orbitals $\psi_{nl}^s(\mathbf{r})$ of eq. (1)] is invariant under point-group rotation, the orbitals themselves are not determined uniquely by that equation and hence one usually requires orthogonality between them. This results in the familiar nodal behavior of the higher eigenfunctions (due to core character) and to the need to use a large number of basis functions to adequately describe them in LCAO type expansion models.

We now divide the eigenvectors and the charge density into two parts: the "core" part (with eigenvectors $\psi_{nl}^{c,s}(\mathbf{r})$ containing N_c^s electrons) and a "valence" part (with eigenvectors $\psi_{nl}^{v,s}(\mathbf{r})$ and density $n_s^v(\mathbf{r})$ with N_v^s electrons). We will denote all-electron (core + valence) densities by $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ and valence pseudo-densities by $n(\mathbf{r})$. By valence electrons we mean those given by the aufbau principle as outside a rare gas core (2s, 2p for row 1, 3s, 3p for row 2, 4s, 4p, 3d for row 3, etc.). It would hence suffice for our purposes to label these orbitals by the angular momentum quantum number l . It is noted that this partitioning of orbitals is rather arbitrary and based essentially on the relative insensitivity of the bonding characteristics to dynamic electron-electron interactions in the above-defined core; it does not imply any distinguishability between core and valence electrons. A generalization of our formalism to a more flexible definition of core is straightforward but will not concern us here. (Such a generalization is presented in ref. [28].) Since we will be interested in a smooth and nodeless representation for the valence orbitals $\psi_{nl}^{v,s}(\mathbf{r})$, we generate these by relaxing the orthogonality constraint to the core orbitals. Concentrating on a chosen reference electronic state e of the atom, we generate the smooth orbitals for this state by a deorthogonalization procedure, namely:

$$\varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r}) = C_{nl,nl}^e \psi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r}) + \sum_{n'l' \neq nl}^{\text{core}} C_{nl,n'l'}^e \psi_{n'l'}^{c,e}(\mathbf{r})$$

or

$$\varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{n'l} C_{n'l,nl}^e \psi_{n'l}^e(\mathbf{r}), \quad (6)$$

where $\psi_{n'l}^e(\mathbf{r})$ stands for both core and valence orbitals and the sum over $n'l$ includes one valence (n, l) state only. The coefficients $C_{nl,n'l}^e$ are chosen so that $\varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r})$ is normalized and nodeless. This would leave (for an atom belonging to the second or higher rows in the periodic table) some unused degree of freedom in constructing $C_{nl,n'l}^e$. (See ref. [28] for details.)

We will now be interested in the local-density variational problem for a "pseudo-atom" having only N_v^e electrons arranged in the electronic configuration e with a probability density given by the smooth orbitals $\{\varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r})\}$. To obtain the N_v -electron one-body potential that would yield such variational solutions we

consider first the local-density total energy E_t of such an electronic system subject to the Coulomb and exchange-correlation interactions among its N_v -electrons plus an additional static external field $V_{\text{ext}}^e(\mathbf{r}) = -N_v/r + V_l^e(\mathbf{r})$:

$$E_t = \int n_e(\mathbf{r}) V_{\text{ext}}^e(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \frac{1}{2} \int n_e(\mathbf{r}) V_{\text{Coul}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})] d\mathbf{r} + E_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})] + T_0[n_e(\mathbf{r})], \quad (7)$$

where $n_e(\mathbf{r})$ is the variational density for the system in state e and $T_0[n_e(\mathbf{r})]$ is the non-interacting kinetic energy of the electron system with density $n_e(\mathbf{r})$. $E_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})]$ is the total exchange and correlation energy of the interacting N_e^e -electron system. For sufficiently slowly varying densities, one obtains [19]:

$$E_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})] = \int n_e(\mathbf{r}) \epsilon_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})] d\mathbf{r}, \quad (8)$$

where $\epsilon_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})]$ is the homogeneous exchange and correlation energy per particle [19]. Following the Kohn and Sham treatment, one performs a variation on E_t with respect to the density $n_e(\mathbf{r})$ and replaces the functional derivative of the non-interacting kinetic energy $T_0[n_e(\mathbf{r})]$ with respect to $n_e(\mathbf{r})$ by the laplacian operator to obtain the effective one-particle equation:

$$\{-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + V_{\text{eff}}^e(\mathbf{r})\} \varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r}) = \lambda_{nl}^{v,e} \varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (9)$$

where

$$V_{\text{eff}}^e(\mathbf{r}) = -N_v/r + V_l^e(\mathbf{r}) + V_{\text{Coul}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})] + V_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})],$$

and the exchange and correlation potential is given by:

$$V_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})] = d(n_e(\mathbf{r}) \epsilon_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})])/dn_e(\mathbf{r}) \quad (10)$$

and leads to the forms similar to those used in eqs. (3) and (4). The charge density $n_e(\mathbf{r})$ is given by the self-consistent solutions to (9) as:

$$n_e(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{nl}^{\text{occ}} N_{nl}^e |\varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r})|^2. \quad (11)$$

The solution of eq. (9) involves iterative refinements of the functionals $V_{\text{Coul}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})]$ and $V_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})]$ with fixed $V_l^e(\mathbf{r})$. (Note that the quantum numbers n, l in eqs. (9) and (11) refer to the lowest central-field states that are not present in the core of the real atom and that therefore $\varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r})$ is nodeless for the lowest state of a given l .) The effective one-particle equation

(9) with the density given in (11) is now used to define the external potential $-N_v/r + V_l^e(\mathbf{r})$ in terms of the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_{nl}^{v,e}\}$ and eigenvectors $\{\varphi_{nl}^{v,e}\}$. We require that the pseudo-hamiltonian in eq. (9):

$$H_l^{\text{PS}} \varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r}) = \lambda_{nl}^{v,e} \varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (12)$$

have the same eigenvalues as the exact all-electron hamiltonian [eq. (1)] for the reference state e (i.e. $\lambda_{nl}^{v,e} = \epsilon_{nl}^{v,e}$). Hence for a single chosen reference state e , it is possible to define an external potential:

$$V_{\text{ext}}^e(\mathbf{r}) = -N_v/r + V_l^e(\mathbf{r}) = \epsilon_{nl}^e + \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r}) / \varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r}) - V_{\text{Coul}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})] - V_{\text{xc}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})], \quad (13)$$

which when added to the (dynamic) Coulomb and exchange-correlation field of a N_v -electron pseudo-atom would yield via the self-consistent solution of the LDF equations smooth and nodeless eigenfunctions [related to the corresponding all-electron solutions by eq. (6)] and the exact eigenvalues $\epsilon_{nl}^{v,e}$. The pseudopotential $V_l(\mathbf{r})$ can be expressed more conveniently by using the fact that $\psi_{nl}^e(\mathbf{r})$ are solutions to the all-electron hamiltonian $-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + V_{\text{tot}}[\rho(\mathbf{r})]$ [eq. (1)], yielding

$$V_l^e(\mathbf{r}) = \epsilon_{nl}^e - \frac{\sum_{n'l'} C_{nl,n'l'}^e \psi_{n'l'}^e(\mathbf{r}) \epsilon_{n'l'}^e}{\sum_{n'l'} C_{nl,n'l'}^e \psi_{n'l'}^e(\mathbf{r})} + \{V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_e(\mathbf{r})] - V_{\text{tot}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})]\}, \quad (14)$$

where $V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_e(\mathbf{r})]$ is the total potential of the all-electron density $\rho_e(\mathbf{r})$ [eq. (1)] and $V_{\text{tot}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})]$ is the corresponding total potential of the pseudo (valence) charge density. One has hence replaced the $(N_v + N_c)$ -electron equation (1) with a simpler N_v -electron equation which does not necessitate a large number of basis functions in its LCAO solution on account of the nodeless character of its occupied orbitals.

Obviously, this simplification by itself does not offer sufficient flexibility in practical applications to arbitrary electronic configurations of the atom or to molecular and solid-state problems where the atom is in a bonding environment, since the solution of the pseudopotential problem for a given state requires the construction of $V_l^e(\mathbf{r})$ for this state. However, to the extent that the dynamic effects of the core electrons on the valence field of the real atom can be replaced

by an *external* potential (which replaces these effects exactly for one chosen reference electronic state) acting statically on the electrons in any arbitrary state, such a pseudopotential transformation becomes useful. Our basic approximation ("static core" pseudopotential approximation) is hence that the external potential $V_{\text{ext}}^e(\mathbf{r})$ defined for some reference state e , replaces the dynamic core effects for any electronic arrangement of the valence electrons. The pseudopotential $V_l^e(\mathbf{r})$ is calculated directly from (14) for several l -values using the exact reference state eigenvalues ϵ_{nl}^e , eigenvectors $\psi_{nl}^e(\mathbf{r})$, the total potential $V_{\text{tot}}[\rho(\mathbf{r})]$ and expansion coefficients $\{C_{nl,n'l}^e\}$. This fixes $V_l^e(\mathbf{r})$ at the reference state e and from this point on $V_l(\mathbf{r})$ is treated as a static external field acting on the electrons of the pseudo-atom via eq. (9) for any arbitrary electronic state $s \neq e$. In the general case, the eigenvalues ϵ_{nl}^s and the total energy [eq. (6)] differences ΔE_{ij} (corresponding to different electronic states i and j) would not equal exactly those obtained from the all-electron problem [eq. (1)] (H_l^{PS} in (12) does not commute with the all-electron hamiltonian in (1a)). The usefulness of our present approach hence depends entirely on the question of whether our static external potential $V_l(\mathbf{r})$ is capable of simulating the dynamic effects of the core electrons for any arbitrary electronic state of the atom or the atom placed in a bonding environment (e.g. the validity of our static core approximation). This can be tested by solving both (1) and (9) self-consistently for a series of states, using for the latter a fixed pseudopotential generated, say, from the ground state. We will show in the next section by means of particular examples that remarkably high accuracy is indeed obtained in solving (9) with the pseudopotential (14), hence confirming the insensitivity of the valence field to the small core changes attendant on such processes.

We note that our static core approximation is exactly equivalent to the "frozen-core" approximation common in quantum-chemical electronic structure calculations in that the results obtained with the pseudopotential defined in eq. (14) when solving eq. (9) for an arbitrary excited state are exactly the same as those obtained by pre-orthogonalizing the valence orbitals to some "frozen" core orbitals and solving the *full* hamiltonian.

The distinct advantage of our pseudopotential

method over the frozen-core approach is that with the former method no core matrix elements need to be computed whatsoever. We note that the equivalence of the presently developed static core approximation to the frozen-core approximation does not occur in the HF pseudopotential method [8] and that in the latter scheme additional approximations to the all-electron problem are necessary (see introduction) to reduce the all-electron problem into a pseudopotential problem; this difference stems essentially from the non-local effect of the core electrons on the valence field in the HF scheme, while in the local density model the diagonal first-order density matrix determines the potential field uniquely.

It is obvious from eq. (14) that the effective potential in the pseudo-atom $V_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r})$ is weaker than the full core + valence potential in the real atom $V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_e(\mathbf{r})]$ due to the cancellation with the first two terms on the rhs of eq. (14). This is a manifestation of the "Phillips cancellation theorem" [4] and is brought about by the balancing of the attractive Coulomb singularity that a valence electron feels in the core region and the repulsive kinetic terms arising from the nodal behavior of the all-electron valence orbitals. It is noted that for valence orbitals that do not have a matching l -counterpart in the core orbitals (and are therefore nodeless), the sum in the second term in (14) reduces to one term (over the nodeless valence orbital only) and hence cancels with the first term, leaving a relatively "strong" external potential. Hence, while the "s" total effective potential in first-row atoms is relatively weak and can be treated perturbationally in solid-state pseudopotential calculations [13] (the terms strong and weak used apply for radial distances larger than 1.5 bohr) the p and d total effective potentials are not amenable to such treatments and indeed give rise to serious convergence difficulties in their plane-wave expansions [29].

We note that the presently developed pseudopotential differs distinctly from many other pseudopotential schemes [30–32] in that in the latter case atoms with more than one valence electron are not treated as such but replaced with a corresponding *ion* with a single valence electron and then screened linearly say, by some free-electron dielectric function [13]. Instead, our pseudopotential is constructed from the ground state of the real atom, so that the effective valence field includes the indirect valence-

core-valence type effects. (The core of, say, an O^{5+} ion is not very much like that of the O atom.) Similar advantages are enjoyed by the Hartree-Fock potentials which have been constructed by an analogous procedure [5-8].

We may briefly discuss some properties of the pseudopotential in eq. (14). When one considers the lowest nodeless valence orbitals in an atom (e.g. 2p, 3d) the transformation in (6) is trivial since no core orbitals have to be mixed into the valence orbitals to produce a nodeless functions and hence $\varphi_{nl}^{v,s}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \psi_{nl}^{v,s}(\mathbf{r})$ and as mentioned above, the sum in eq. (14) reduces to one term. For such l values (denoted L), the pseudopotential is l -independent and given by:

$$V_L^e(\mathbf{r}) = V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_e(\mathbf{r})] - V_{\text{tot}}[n_e(\mathbf{r})]. \quad (15)$$

Hence, for a first row-atom only $l = 0$ and $l = 1$ pseudopotentials have to be computed since V_2 equals exactly V_1 , etc. This is distinctly different from the situation encountered in the HF pseudopotential theory [8] in which, due to the non-locality of the exchange, V_2 is only approximately equal to V_1 . (Similarly, if one is to use the exact all-electron orbital $\psi_{nl}^c(\mathbf{r})$ in eq. (14) instead of the pseudo-orbital (eq. (6)) the pseudopotential would reduce to the form (15) for all l -components.) Hence, when the pseudopotential is used in molecular or solid-state calculations in the form:

$$V_A^{\text{PS}}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{l_A=0}^{\infty} V_{l_A}(\mathbf{r}) \sum_{m_{l_A}} |l_A m_{l_A}\rangle \langle l_A m_{l_A}|, \quad (16)$$

where l_A and m_{l_A} define the spherical harmonics on site A, only the lowest members need to be calculated (e.g., s and p for first row atoms).

We note that we have not so far restricted the pseudo-orbital expansion coefficients $C_{nl,n'l}^e$ in eq. (6) except that they yield a normalized and nodeless orbital. Any choice of these coefficients that fulfills the above requirements should yield, for the reference state, eigenvalues that are identical to those of the all-electron local-density hamiltonian. If, however, it is desired that expectation values (other than orbital energies) over the pseudo-orbitals match closely those yielded by the exact all-electron valence orbitals, two routes are possible: (a) one can choose the coefficients $\{C_{nl,n'l}^e\}$ so that $\varphi_{nl}^{v,e}(\mathbf{r})$ would closely

match the real atom valence orbitals $\psi_{nl}^{v,s}(\mathbf{r})$ in the region of space considered relevant for the observable of interest. This approach has led to many prescriptions in HF pseudopotential schemes and leads to acceptable but approximate results. In this approach the expectation value of an operator \hat{O} is usually calculated directly from the pseudo-charge density:

$$n^v(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{nl}^{\text{valence}} N_{nl} |\varphi_{nl}^v(\mathbf{r})|^2, \quad (17)$$

combined with the frozen-core (reference level) density of the real atom

$$n^c(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{nl}^{\text{core}} N_{nl} \psi_{nl}^c(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{nl}^c(\mathbf{r}) \quad (18)$$

to yield:

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle = \int \{n^c(\mathbf{r}) + n^v(\mathbf{r})\} \hat{O} d\mathbf{r}, \quad (19)$$

with the expectation value over a valence pseudo-orbital is given by:

$$\langle \hat{O} \rangle_{nl} = \int \varphi_{nl}^{v*}(\mathbf{r}) \hat{O} \varphi_{nl}^v(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (20)$$

We will illustrate in the next section some numerical results obtained with this "maximum similarity" approach (b). Alternatively, one can use for the atom any convenient choice of $\{C_{nl,n'l}^e\}$ (obtaining in each case the exact reference state valence eigenvalues) e.g. minimizing the kinetic energy $T[\varphi_{nl}^v]$ [5,6,8] but after the self-consistent pseudo-equations have been solved, one orthogonalizes the pseudo-orbitals to the core orbitals of the real atom. This yields orthogonalized pseudo-orbitals $\tilde{\varphi}_{nl}^v(\mathbf{r})$ given by:

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{nl}^v(\mathbf{r}) = \left[\varphi_{nl}^v(\mathbf{r}) - \sum_{nl}^{\text{core}} \langle \varphi_{nl}^v(\mathbf{r}) | \varphi_{nl}^c(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \psi_{nl}^c(\mathbf{r}) \right] A^{-1}, \quad (21)$$

where A is the normalization constant, and the related orthogonalized valence charge density is:

$$\tilde{n}^v(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{nl}^{\text{valence}} N_{nl} |\tilde{\varphi}_{nl}^v(\mathbf{r})|^2. \quad (22)$$

In this case, expectation values are taken directly on $\tilde{n}^v(\mathbf{r}) + n^c(\mathbf{r})$ or for the valence contribution only, on $\tilde{\varphi}_{nl}^v(\mathbf{r})$. If the pseudo-orbitals $\varphi_{nl}^v(\mathbf{r})$ are found for the

reference electronic state, this approach leads to $n^v(r) + n^c(r)$, while if the equation is solved for a *different excited state* or for a polyatomic system, the resulting density matrix is inexact (but expected to be very accurate). We will illustrate this choice numerically in the next section. We note that the orthogonalization procedure in (21) is easy and straightforward to perform since the major time-saving step has already been utilized in solving a simplified self-consistent local density equation for the valence electrons only.

3. Details of calculation

The calculations required here contain two essential steps: (a) development of the pseudopotential [eq. (14)] for all relevant l -components of a chosen electronic state of the atom, and (b) testing the pseudopotential by solving the pseudo one-particle equation (9) for arbitrary electronic states and using the resulting orbitals to calculate various observables [eqs. (17)–(22)] for these states. Step (a) involves first the self-consistent solution of the all-electron local density equation [eq. (1) with the functionals defined in (2)–(5)] for a chosen reference state. It has been customary in the HF pseudopotential approaches [5–7] to carry out this step (as well as to test the pseudopotential) by expanding the solution $\psi_{nl}^s(r)$ in (1) or $\phi_{nl}^s(r)$ in (6) in a fixed basis set (e.g. gaussians) and similarly to represent the pseudopotential by some analytical fit. Although this procedure is usually satisfactory [5–8], it represents an unnecessary approximation for the atomic problem. We avoid these approximations by employing a direct numerical technique with no basis set expansions. We use a standard predictor–corrector method [33] in an inwards–outwards integration scheme. The numerical accuracy in the eigenvalues is 10^{-8} au. The total energy is calculated from (7) by using the charge density matrix constructed from the eigenvalue problem, to yield

$$E_t = \sum_i^{\text{occ}} \epsilon_i - \frac{1}{2} \iint \frac{\rho(r)\rho(r')}{|r-r'|} dr dr' + \int \rho(r) \{ \epsilon_{xc}[\rho(r)] - V_{xc}[\rho(r)] \} dr, \quad (23)$$

where $\rho(r)$ indicates the all-electron density when (1)

is solved, and the pseudo-density when (9) is solved. E_t is the total energy for the all-electron and for the valence-electron cases, respectively. The sum in the first term in (23) is carried over all (valence + core) orbitals in the former case and on the pseudo-orbital eigenvalues in the latter case. The two integrals in (23) are calculated by direct numerical integration. The accuracy in evaluating the total energy in eq. (23) is 10^{-7} au.

We chose here as a reference state for the atom the ground electronic state (although, as demonstrated in the next section, a similar accuracy in the predictions of the pseudopotential one-particle equations can be obtained with other choices too). Having solved eq. (1) for this state, the eigenvalues ϵ_{nl}^s , the eigenfunctions $\psi_{nl}^s(r)$ and the total self-consistent potential $V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_e(r)]$ are used in (14) together with the Coulomb and exchange integrals $V_{\text{tot}}[n_e(r)] = -N_v/r + V_{\text{Coul}}[n_e(r)] + V_{\text{xc}}[n_e(r)]$ computed numerically from the pseudo-orbitals. In step (b) we use these pseudopotentials to solve eq. (9) for a series of electronic configurations using the same integration technique with identical error tolerances. The pseudo-charge density and the core density are then calculated from eqs. (17) and (18) and the orthogonality coefficients required in eqs. (21) and (22) are computed numerically.

The operators \hat{O} [eqs. (19) and (20)] chosen for testing the resulting pseudo wavefunctions are r^n with $-2 < n \leq +3$ for the orbital expectation values, and $\exp(i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r})$ for the charge density expectation values. The latter quantity (atomic X-ray scattering factor) is calculated for a series of momentum values \mathbf{q} from the standard form for the central field given by

$$f(\mathbf{q}) = \int \frac{\sin(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r})}{\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \rho(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}, \quad (24)$$

where $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ can be: (a) the all-electron density, (b) the pseudo-charge density plus frozen core density or (c) the orthogonalized pseudo-charge density plus frozen core density.

4. Illustrative results; carbon and tungsten atoms

4.1. The pseudopotential

We generate the pseudopotential $V_s(r)$ and $V_p(r)$ for the ground (g) $1s^2 2s^2 2p^2$ configuration of carbon




Fig. 1. All-electron (—) and pseudo (---) 2s wavefunctions for: (a) the s^2p^2 ground state of carbon atom. (b) the ionized state.

[34]. The exact $\psi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ orbital obtained from the solution of (1) is depicted in fig. 1a together with the pseudo-orbitals $\varphi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ (the pseudo 2p orbital equals here the exact 2p orbital as discussed above). The coefficients of eq. (6) are $C_{2s,1s}^{\xi} = 0.2213783$ and $C_{2s,2s}^{\xi} = 0.9509916$ for $\varphi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ and $C_{2p,1s}^{\xi} = 0$, $C_{2p,2p}^{\xi} = 1$ for $\varphi_{2p}^{\xi}(r)$. This choice assures that the pseudo-orbitals have zero amplitude at the origin, are normalized and show maximum similarity to the exact valence orbitals (any increased mixing of $\psi_{1s}^{\xi}(r)$ into $\varphi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ will still assure the absence of the node in $\varphi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ and would hence be a legitimate choice yielding accurate eigenvalues, however this would cause $\varphi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ to deviate more significantly from $\psi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ in the tail region and would consequently lead to differences in the observables computed from these orbitals unless $\varphi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ is specifically orthogonalized to the core [35]. It is seen from fig. 1a that for distances from the nucleus larger than about 1 bohr, $\varphi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ and

$\psi_{2s}^{\xi}(r)$ are very similar (relative absolute amplitude differences of less than 3%).

Fig. 2 depicts the pseudopotentials $V_{s}^{\xi}(r)$ and




Fig. 2. Pseudopotentials for carbon — $rV_s(r)$, --- $rV_p(r)$.

$V_{\text{ps}}^{\text{E}}(r)$ for carbon. To analyze the various components appearing in them we rewrite eq. (14) as^{*}

$$V_{\text{ps}}^{\text{E}}(r) = u_l^{\text{E}}(r) + \{V_{\text{tot}}^{\text{E}}[\rho_{\text{g}}(r)] - V_{\text{tot,ps}}[n_{\text{g}}(r)]\}, \quad (25a)$$

where

$$V_{\text{tot,ps}}[n_{\text{g}}(r)] = (-Z_{\text{v}}/r + V_{\text{xc,ps}}^{\text{E}}[n_{\text{g}}(r)] + V_{\text{Coul,ps}}^{\text{E}}[n_{\text{g}}(r)]). \quad (25b)$$

The l -dependent non-locality appears in the first term of (25a):

$$U_l^{\text{E}}(r) = \epsilon_{nl}^{\text{E}} - \frac{\sum_{n'l} C_{nl,n'l} \psi_{n'l}^{\text{E}} \epsilon_{n'l}^{\text{E}}}{\sum_{n'l} C_{nl,n'l} \psi_{n'l}^{\text{E}}}, \quad (26)$$

while the last two terms in (25a) are common to all the l -components of the pseudopotential. (This last feature arises from the locality of the LDF exchange, and does not hold in Hartree–Fock [8].) Here $V_{\text{tot}}^{\text{E}}[\rho_{\text{g}}(r)]$ contains the Coulomb and exchange-correlation potentials of the carbon atom and $V_{\text{xc,ps}}^{\text{E}}[n_{\text{g}}(r)]$ and $V_{\text{Coul,ps}}^{\text{E}}[n_{\text{g}}(r)]$ denote the exchange-correlation and Coulomb potentials, respectively, associated with the pseudo-charge density. Fig. 3 shows separately the last two terms in eq. (25a) (where each of them was multiplied by r to produce an effective charge) together with the Coulomb and exchange correlation components of eq. (25b).




Fig. 3. Components of the carbon pseudopotential compared with the all-electron potential $V_{\text{tot}}^{\text{E}}(r)$.

Several features are apparent. At large distances, where the non-local term $u_l^{\text{E}}(r)$ is no longer important, the decay of the pseudopotential $V_{\text{ps}}^{\text{E}}(r)$ is determined by the small difference $V_{\text{tot}}^{\text{E}}[\rho_{\text{g}}(r)] - V_{\text{tot,ps}}[n_{\text{g}}(r)]$ between the Coulomb, exchange and correlation potentials corresponding to the all-electron and the pseudo-charge densities, respectively. Past a distance of about 3 au from the origin, the total Coulomb contributions to both $V_{\text{tot}}^{\text{E}}[\rho_{\text{g}}(r)]$ and $V_{\text{tot,ps}}[n_{\text{g}}(r)]$ are practically zero, leaving the exchange-correlation of the valence orbitals (the core contributions being already negligible at these distances) as a dominant term. As seen from fig. 3, the pseudo exchange-correlation term $V_{\text{xc,ps}}[n_{\text{g}}(r)]$ closely matches $V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_{\text{g}}(r)]$ in the tail region due to the similarity of the all-electron and pseudo-charge density [c.f. eq. (6)] in this region. The large r behavior of the pseudo-potential $V_{\text{ps}}^{\text{E}}(r)$ is hence determined by the small differences between the real and pseudo exchange-correlation potentials (which can be arbitrarily reduced through a minimization of the differences between the real and pseudo-orbitals at the tail region) [35]. The pseudopotential $V_{\text{ps}}^{\text{E}}(r)$ is hence shorter range than the full all-electron potential $V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_{\text{g}}(r)]$ ‡.

At short distances, the non-local term $u_l^{\text{E}}(r)$ is strongly repulsive for the l -components present in the core and decays rapidly to small values. For *all* the l -components not present in the core, the sum in eq. (26) reduces to $n'l = nl$ (since no core orbitals need to mix into this nodeless valence state) and hence $u_l^{\text{E}}(r) \equiv 0$, leaving a simple l -independent pseudopotential for these states with a $-N_{\text{c}}/r$ dependence at small r .

In fig. 4 we display the carbon effective potential in a form more familiar in solid-state applications, i.e.

‡ We have repeated the construction of the pseudopotential excluding the exchange-correlation potential both from the solution of the all-electron eigenvalue problem (1) and from the pseudopotential expression (14). The results indicated that in this case the behavior of $V_{\text{ps}}(r)$ at long range is entirely governed by the different decays of the valence Coulomb term in (25a) and the pseudo-valence Coulomb term $V_{\text{Coul,ps}}^{\text{E}}(r)$ of (25b). In the presence of exchange-correlation, on the other hand, the long-range behavior is dictated by the small differences between the valence exchange in $V_{\text{tot}}[\rho_{\text{g}}(r)]$ and the pseudo-valence exchange $V_{\text{xc,ps}}^{\text{E}}(r)$ in (25).




Fig. 4. Effective potential form factors $V_l(q) = \int \exp(-iq \cdot r) \times V_l^{\text{eff}}(r) dr$ for carbon.

in Fourier space. The effective potential form factor

$$v_l(q) = \int \exp(-iq \cdot r) V_l^{\text{eff}}(r) dr,$$

where $V_l^{\text{eff}}(r)$ is given in eq. (9), is seen to be divergent (i.e., q^{-2}) at $q = 0$ with a cross-over ($v_s(q_0) = 0$) at $q_0 = 1.86 a_0^{-1}$ for the s-potential and a maximum ($v_s(q_m) = \text{max}$) at $q_m = 4 a_0^{-1}$. It is more common to define these quantities relative to the Fermi wave-number k_F ($= 1.4594 a_0^{-1}$ for carbon) [13], i.e. $q_0/2k_F = 0.64$ and $q_m/2k_F = 1.37$. Numerous empirical calculations done on diamond (i.e. adjusting $v_l(\mathbf{G})$ to obtain agreement with experiment for some low-lying interband transition energies, where \mathbf{G} is a reciprocal lattice vector) yield widely scattered values for the parameters of $v_l(q)$ (e.g. $q_0/2k_F = 0.725, 0.92$ and 0.76 in refs. [36–38], respectively and $q_m/2k_F = 1.09$ in ref. [38]). Our present calculation yields the direct first-principle values for $v_l(q)$ as predicted by the local density model for carbon (atomically screened) subject to the static 1s core approximation. In particular, we notice that our calculations show a larger pseudopotential core (i.e. smaller q_0) and more noticeably a slower decay of $v_l(q)$ with momentum at

‡ This would facilitate the use of these pseudopotentials in solid-state *real-space* band calculations (e.g., LCAO) since lattice sums of $V_l(r)$ converge much more rapidly than the corresponding sums on the real atomic potentials. On the other hand, in calculations carried out in *Fourier space* (e.g., orthogonalized plane waves-OPW or pseudopotential-OPW) slower convergence is expected.

large q † than the semi-empirically adjusted results [36–38]. The $l \neq 0$ components (“non-local pseudopotential”) have been neglected in many solid state applications and simulated semi-empirically by the $-Ae^{-\alpha r}$ form ($A, \alpha > 0$) by Hemstreet et al. [39] this is qualitatively similar to the form shown in fig. 4.

4.2. Eigenvalues and total energy differences

Tables 1 and 2 show the energy eigenvalues and the differences in total energy (excitation energies) for a series of electronic configurations for carbon [34] and tungsten [28] as obtained in an all-electron SCF calculation (“full SCF”) and with the pseudopotential calculation (“effective potential”). The errors in the ground state ($< 10^{-7}$ au) reflect the numerical uncertainty in the calculation.

It is seen that a remarkably high accuracy is obtained over a large range of electronic configurations including excited and ionic species, using the ground state pseudopotential. As described above, these discrepancies are a measure of the errors introduced by frozen core approximation. To test the sensitivity of the results to the assumed reference level we recomputed the carbon pseudopotential using the $s^1 p^3$ configuration as reference. The numerical error in the eigenvalues of the tested $s^1 p^3$ eigenvalues dropped from 2×10^{-3} au to 5×10^{-8} au, while the errors in all other tested configurations did not exceed 2×10^{-3} au for the eigenvalues and 10^{-4} au for the total energy differences, confirming thereby the relative insensitivity of the valence state to the form of the static core. The test for the extravalence excitation (the highly excited $2s^2 2p^0 3s^2$ configuration) similarly shows good agreement with the exact results [35].

4.3. Wavefunctions and charge densities

In table 3 we compare the calculated orbital moments using the all-electron wavefunctions [“exact orbital”, $\psi_{nl}^s(r)$ of eq. (1)], the pseudo-orbitals [$\phi_{nl}^s(r)$ of eq. (9)] and the orthogonalized pseudo-orbitals [$\tilde{\phi}_{nl}^s(r)$ of eq. (21)] for the carbon 2s orbital. We note that the pseudo wavefunction introduces substantial errors in the moments – a factor of 4.3 in the $n = -2$ carbon moment (being sensitive to the small- r behavior) and about up to 5% error in the high moments. Hence, although the pseudo-orbital $\phi_{nl}^s(r)$ was con-

Table 1

Comparison between all-electron (full SCF) and pseudopotential (effective potential) results for the carbon atom in different electronic configurations. E_t is the total energy and ΔE_t is the difference in total energy relative to the ground state s^2p^2 . Energies in atomic units

Configuration	Full SCF	Effective potential	Error	Configuration	Full SCF	Effective potential	Error		
$C^0 : s^2p^2$	ϵ_{2s}	-0.4573838	-0.4573838	7×10^{-8}	$C^{1/2+} : s^2p^{1.5}$	ϵ_{2s}	-0.6590256	-0.6601143	0.001
	ϵ_{2p}	-0.1579533	-0.1579534	1×10^{-7}		ϵ_{2p}	-0.3525969	-0.3520554	0.0005
	E_t	-37.0536044	-5.2037811	-		E_t	-36.9274553	-5.0777439	-
	ΔE_t	0.0	0.0	-		ΔE_t	0.1261490	0.1260370	0.0001
$C^0 : s^1p^3$	ϵ_{2s}	-0.4744846	-0.172654	0.002	$C^{1/2+} : s^{1.5}p^2$	ϵ_{2s}	-0.6648014	-0.6676590	0.003
	ϵ_{2p}	-0.1734399	-0.1755639	0.002		ϵ_{2p}	-0.3579445	-0.3593705	0.001
	E_t	-36.7533514	-4.9035473	-		E_t	-36.7741344	-4.9236569	-
	ΔE_t	0.3002530	0.3002337	0.0002		ΔE_t	0.2794699	0.2801240	0.001
$C^{1+} : s^2p^1$	ϵ_{2s}	-0.8899874	-0.8924458	0.002	$C^0 2s^2 2p^0 3s^2$	ϵ_{2s}	-0.0943490	-0.0942194	0.00014
	ϵ_{2p}	-0.5799256	-0.5781562	0.002		ϵ_{3s}	-0.0093509	-0.0093402	0.00001
	E_t	-36.6955825	-4.8464138	-		E_t	-36.3706176	-4.520895	-
	ΔE_t	0.3580219	0.3573672	0.0006		ΔE_t	0.6829869	0.6828861	0.0001

structured to have the maximum possible similarity with the exact wavefunction in the region past the node, still the accuracy of orbital observables is fundamentally limited [c.f. eq. (6)]. This point should be emphasized in the context of discussing bonding effects and core-sensitive observables in molecules and solids using pseudo wavefunctions, see also ref. [40] ‡. On the other hand, once the pseudo-orbital is orthogonalized to the (frozen) core orbital (last column in tables 2 and 3) a remarkably high accuracy is obtained in the 2s orbital moments (errors less than $10^{-4}\%$ for the ground state and less than 1% for the excited species). This orthogonalization is simple to perform even in polyatomic systems once the all-electron SCF problem has been replaced by the simpler

pseudopotential eigenvalue problem and should be undertaken if a meaningful discussion of wavefunction-dependent effects is sought.

In table 4 we present the X-ray structure factors of carbon calculated from the ground state (frozen) core density plus the all-electron valence density (column 2), the pseudo-orbital valence density (column 3) and the orthogonalized pseudo-orbital valence density (column 4). Again it is observed that while the use of the pseudo-orbital valence density introduces substantial errors in the structure factors, the orthogonalized pseudo-orbitals give rise to the correct structure factors †. (At $\sin \theta/\lambda = 0$ the error is forced to be zero due to the normalization requirement while for very large $\sin \theta/\lambda$ all results should be identical since the

‡ The nuclear magnetic shielding constant is $\frac{1}{4}\alpha^2 \times \langle \psi | \sum_j r_j^{-1} | \psi \rangle$ (where α is the fine-structure constant, ψ is the all-electron wavefunction and the sum extends on all electrons) is $25.8320 \times 10^{-5} \text{ au}^{-1}$ using the exact LDF carbon wavefunctions and, $25.4254 \times 10^{-5} \text{ au}^{-1}$ using the pseudo wavefunctions (1.6% error) and $25.8320 \times 10^{-5} \text{ au}^{-1}$ using the orthogonalized pseudo wavefunctions. Similarly the use of the pseudo wavefunctions introduces 1.49% error in the calculated diamagnetic susceptibility $\chi_{d\alpha} \langle \psi | \sum_j r_j^{-2} | \psi \rangle$ and 4% error in the magnetic hyperfine structure constant $a_{d\alpha} \langle \psi | \sum_j r_j^{-3} | \psi \rangle$ while no error is introduced if the orthogonalized orbitals are used.

† This is in contrast with the results obtained by Euwema and Green [14] in their pseudopotential calculation on diamond structure factors in which the use of pseudo-orbitals produced structure factors in very good agreement with those obtained from the all-electron orbitals while considerably poorer agreement was obtained when orthogonalized pseudo-orbitals were used. From our discussion in section 2 as well as from our present results it is clear that if a first-principle ground-state pseudopotential is used, the orthogonalized pseudo-orbitals should match *exactly* the ground-state all-electron orbital (used to construct the pseudopotential).

Table 2

Results for ^{74}W in hartrees; $\langle r \rangle$ in bohr. Core:
 $1s^2 2s^2 2p^6 3s^2 3p^6 3d^{10} 4s^2 4p^6 4d^{10} 4f^{14} 5s^2 5p^6$

Energies	Pseudo-potential	All-electron	Orthogonalized pseudo
$W^0: 6s^2 6p^0 5d^4$			
ϵ_{6s}	-0.1478	-0.1478	
ϵ_{6p}	-0.0327	-0.0327	
ϵ_{5d}	-0.1783	-0.1783	
$\langle r \rangle_{6s}$	3.4241	3.5756	3.5756
$\langle r \rangle_{6p}$	5.1157	5.2435	5.2435
$\langle r \rangle_{5d}$	1.9296	1.9996	1.9996
$W^0: 6s^1 6p^1 5d^4$ ($\Delta E_t = 3.25$ eV)			
ϵ_{6s}	-0.1801	-0.1793	
ϵ_{6p}	-0.0561	-0.05579	
ϵ_{5d}	-0.2252	-0.22387	
$\langle r \rangle_{6s}$	3.3134	3.4805	3.4699
$\langle r \rangle_{6p}$	4.7351	4.8984	4.8781
$\langle r \rangle_{5d}$	1.8913	1.9652	1.9611
$W^0: 6s^0 6p^0 5d^6$ ($\Delta E_t \approx 0.04$ eV)			
ϵ_{6s}	-0.1039	-0.1023	
ϵ_{6p}	-0.01326	-0.01278	
ϵ_{5d}	-0.07001	-0.0666	
$\langle r \rangle_{6s}$	3.8003	3.9468	3.9384
$\langle r \rangle_{6p}$	6.4531	6.7574	6.6556
$\langle r \rangle_{5d}$	2.2403	2.3089	2.3152
$W^{1+}: 6s^2 6p^0 5d$ ($\Delta E_t = 9.33$ eV)			
ϵ_{6s}	-0.4125	-0.4049	
ϵ_{6p}	-0.2527	-0.2471	
ϵ_{5d}	-0.5200	-0.5156	
$\langle r \rangle_{6s}$	2.9707	3.1553	3.1217
$\langle r \rangle_{6p}$	3.1722	3.9016	3.8469
$\langle r \rangle_{5d}$	1.7657	1.8434	1.8317
$W^{3+}: 6s^2 6p^0 5d^1$ ($\Delta E_t = 60.22$ eV)			
ϵ_{6s}	-1.0521	-1.0386	
ϵ_{6p}	-0.8367	-0.8121	
ϵ_{5d}	-1.3709	-1.3536	
$\langle r \rangle_{6s}$	2.4690	2.6886	2.6142
$\langle r \rangle_{6p}$	2.8443	3.0638	2.9659
$\langle r \rangle_{5d}$	1.5617	1.6471	1.6234

structure factor reflects then only the core density. Consequently the error is negative at small $\sin \theta/\lambda$, e.g. -1.6% at $\sin \theta/\lambda = 2.1 a_0^{-1}$ and positive at medium $\sin \theta/\lambda$, e.g. 5.4% at $\sin \theta/\lambda = 13.6 a_0^{-1}$.) We note

Table 3

Moments of the 2s orbital density in carbon (in units of a_0^{-n} for the n th moment)

Moment	Pseudo-orbital	Exact orbital	Orthogonalized pseudo-orbital
$C^0: 2s^2 2p^2$			
$\langle r^{-2} \rangle$	0.8214358	3.5499372	3.5494371
$\langle r^{-1} \rangle$	0.7990946	0.9135809	0.9135808
$\langle r^1 \rangle$	1.5625877	1.5938337	1.5938337
$\langle r^2 \rangle$	2.9787695	3.0896185	3.0896183
$\langle r^3 \rangle$	6.7936328	7.1030495	7.1030496
$C^{1+}: 2s^2 2p^1$			
$\langle r^{-2} \rangle$	0.9051024	4.0291539	4.0570634
$\langle r^{-1} \rangle$	0.8456368	0.9771805	0.9796634
$\langle r^1 \rangle$	1.4495504	1.4815605	1.4793120
$\langle r^2 \rangle$	2.5132019	2.6221502	2.6142221
$\langle r^3 \rangle$	5.1099245	5.3930103	5.3681710
$C^{1-}: 2s^2 2p^3$			
$\langle r^{-2} \rangle$	0.7967260	3.4205884	3.4260397
$\langle r^{-1} \rangle$	0.7825223	0.8919433	0.8919970
$\langle r^1 \rangle$	1.6227521	1.6551629	1.6538959
$\langle r^2 \rangle$	3.2845638	3.4036979	3.4066762
$\langle r^3 \rangle$	8.1686368	8.5248036	8.5353401
$C^0: 2s^2 3s^2$			
$\langle r^{-2} \rangle$	0.9860846	4.5376364	4.5885756
$\langle r^{-1} \rangle$	0.8870820	1.0382943	1.0417387
$\langle r^1 \rangle$	1.3694056	1.3994561	1.3985313
$\langle r^2 \rangle$	2.2264337	2.3252487	2.3733574
$\langle r^3 \rangle$	4.7719507	4.4611905	4.4581860
$C^0: 2s^1 2p^3$			
$\langle r^{-2} \rangle$	0.8293108	3.5802110	3.5972737
$\langle r^{-1} \rangle$	0.8035044	0.9177704	0.9197704
$\langle r^1 \rangle$	1.5514342	1.5855766	1.5825911
$\langle r^2 \rangle$	2.9313405	3.0535451	3.0413864
$\langle r^3 \rangle$	6.6152805	6.9637727	6.9199654

that the errors introduced by using the nonorthogonalized pseudo-orbitals are quite sizable and substantially larger than the accuracy of most experimental structure factor measurement techniques.

Although one has broad latitude in choosing the coefficients $C_{nl,n'l}$, particular choices may have special advantages or disadvantages [5-8,35,41-44]. The choice actually made above (adding just enough core to remove the first node) or suggested later (adding enough core to make the pseudo-valence exchange nearly cancel the valence exchange in the large- r region) are obvious ones; as long as the final valence orbitals are reorthogonalized to the core, no

Table 4
X-ray structure factors for the ground state carbon atom

$\sin \theta/\lambda$ (a_0^{-1})	f^{exact}	f^{pseudo}	$f^{\text{pseudo-orth}}$
0.0	6.000000	6.000000	6.000000
0.3	5.778677	5.781887	5.778679
0.6	5.210876	5.222423	5.210886
1.0	4.254419	4.279708	4.254418
1.5	3.199111	3.236315	3.199107
2.1	2.374506	2.411824	2.374506
2.8	1.879442	1.902297	1.879443
3.6	1.614311	1.614498	1.614311
4.5	1.442790	1.421250	1.442791
5.5	1.282316	1.246075	1.282316
7.8	0.925535	0.883754	0.925535
10.5	0.591291	0.560647	0.591291
13.6	0.348089	0.329355	0.348089
19.0	0.146508	0.138699	0.146508
30.0	0.035460	0.633669	0.035461

particularly serious errors in the calculated charge distribution occur (table 3). This will be true, generally, so long as the $C_{nl,n'l}$ are chosen with reasonable caution. One extreme choice of the $C_{nl,n'l}$ permits comparison with the Phillips–Kleinman pseudopotential. If one were to choose, in (6), $\varphi_{2s}^v = \psi_{1s}$, then (26) gives $u_s(r) = \epsilon_{2s}^v - \epsilon_{1s}^v$. Thus we obtain

$$V_l^g(r) = (\epsilon_{2s} - \epsilon_{1s})|l=0\rangle\langle l=0| + V_{\text{tot}}^g[\rho_g(r)] - V_{\text{tot,ps}}^g[n_g(r)]. \quad (27)$$

Notice that this result has the form of the Phillips–Kleinman potential [4]: the first (pseudopotential) term accounts for the orthogonality and drives the orbital energy up to the correct value, while the last two terms account for valence interactions. We would expect this potential to yield quite good orbital energies, and, as table 5 shows, it does. On the other hand, the ψ_{1s} is not very much like ψ_{2s} in the tail region, so that the resulting pseudopotential (27) would be expected to yield rather poor wavefunctions and orbital densities; again, table 5 shows this expectation to be correct. In this case, however (unlike the choices taken previously for the $C_{nl,n'l}$), we cannot simply reorthogonalize the valence to the core, since we choose $\varphi_{2s}^v = \psi_{1s}$, so that the valence orbital is the core orbital. Thus, although the choice

Table 5

Carbon ground state eigenvalues and moments of r in the $2s$ state, computed with the pseudopotential of eq. (27). The results are compared with the exact all-electron solutions, eq. (1). Energies in atomic units and $\langle r^n \rangle$ in a_0^n

	Effective potential	Full SCF
ϵ_{2s}	-0.4573829	-0.4573838
ϵ_{2p}	-0.157951	-0.1579534
$\langle r^{-2} \rangle$	64.1055643	3.5499372
$\langle r^{-1} \rangle$	5.5995528	0.9135809
$\langle r \rangle$	0.2730326	1.5938337
$\langle r^2 \rangle$	0.10104083	3.0896185

of $C_{nl,n'l}$ is arbitrary and unimportant in some limits, extreme choices like this one can lead to poor results for *wavefunction* quantities, even though the *orbital energies* are very satisfactory. This must be kept in mind when using empirically-derived pseudopotentials for calculating such observables as charge densities, oscillator strengths or Compton profiles.

Table 2 presents additional results, for the tungsten atom [28]. Again, the first-principles pseudopotential reproduced energy quantities to extremely high accuracy, while the pseudo wavefunction reorthogonalized to the frozen core yields excellent moments of the charge distribution. We note that even for W^{3+} , with a energy 60 eV above the reference state, the errors are no larger than 2%. Thus even for this stringent test, on a large system with occupied high angular momentum states and at high excitation energies, our pseudopotential performs admirably.

5. Remarks

The established utility of the pseudopotential concept has led to proposal of several pseudopotential procedures for use in the LDF context [34,35,45–48]. Several of these pseudopotential methods are semi-empirical [36–38] and are subject to some errors, particularly for wavefunction-related quantities [49,50]; we feel that these failures are due to both the failure to include the full angular momentum dependence and the absence of explicit constraints of wavefunction similarity. More recently, several first-principles pseudopotential-LDF procedures have been proposed

[34,35,45,46], some of which have been successfully tested in molecular [50] or solid-state [51] calculations. We feel that our method [28,34,35,51] which retains the symmetry of the spherical harmonic expansion about each center, enjoys some efficiency advantages, particularly for band-structure studies employing plane-wave or gaussian basis sets [51] over procedures [45] which actually employ the differences between pseudo-densities and true valence densities in the calculation of the local-exchange potential. For molecular studies, the situation is not so clear, and the method employing density differences may actually be preferable. Both our method and those developed by Snijders and Baerends [45] and by Moriarty [46] employ a first-principles approach to definition of the potential, are not dependent upon fitting of experimental data, and do not make (often unjustifiable) oversimplifications in the treatment of the higher l -components of the pseudopotential; as expected on the basis of our formal arguments, first-principles potentials of the present type seem noticeably superior to earlier semi-empirical potentials for calculation of wavefunction-related quantities.

We have presented here a first-principle method of obtaining atomic pseudopotentials in the local-density formalism subject to the static core approximation [34,35]. The pseudopotentials are straightforward to calculate once an exact solution to the all-electron local density problem for the chosen reference state of the atom is available, and should offer great economies in electronic structure calculations for polyatomic systems. Tests for the performance of the atomic pseudopotential for the C and W atoms in predicting excited-state properties show accuracy better than 2×10^{-3} au for eigenvalues and 10^{-3} au for total energy differences for an excitation energy range up to 10 eV. While the direct use of the self-consistent pseudo-orbitals to compute orbital moments and X-ray scattering factors introduces non-negligible errors, a simple orthogonalization procedure was shown to produce excellent agreement with the exact all-electron results. Energy results for other first-row atoms are equally satisfactory, and are presented elsewhere [34]. Band structure studies [51] and some calculations on diatomic molecules [52] indicate that the present method does indeed produce a useful, viable, efficient, accurate first-principles LDF pseudopotential.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Jules Moskowitz, Michael Boring, John Wood, Luis Kahn and Don Ellis for helpful discussions of this material. This work was partially supported by the NSF-MRL program through the Materials Research Center of Northwestern University (grant No. DMR76-80847).

References

- [1] A.B. Kunz and D.J. Mickish, *Phys. Rev.* B8 (1973) 779; *J. Phys.* C6 (1973) 1723.
- [2] F.E. Harris and H.J. Monkhorst, in: *Computational methods in band theory*, eds. P.M. Marcus, J.F. Janak and A.R. Williams (Plenum Press, New York, 1971) p. 517.
- [3] R.N. Euwema, D.L. Wilhite and G.T. Surratt, *Phys. Rev.* B7 (1973) 818; B9 (1973) 5249.
- [4] J.C. Phillips and L. Kleinman, *Phys. Rev.* 116 (1959) 187; J.D. Weeks and S.A. Rice, *J. Chem. Phys.* 49 (1968) 2741.
- [5] L.R. Kahn and W.A. Goddard, *Chem. Phys. Letters* 2 (1968) 667; L.R. Kahn and W.A. Goddard III, *J. Chem. Phys.* 56 (1972) 2685; C.F. Melius, L.R. Kahn and W.A. Goddard III, *J. Chem. Phys.* 56 (1972) 3342; C.F. Melius, B.D. Olafson and W.A. Goddard III, *Chem. Phys. Letters* 28 (1974) 457, and later papers.
- [6] S. Topiol, Ph.D. Thesis, New York University (1976); S. Topiol et al., ERDA Courant Report No. COO-3-105 (1976); S. Topiol, J.W. Moskowitz and M.A. Ratner, *Chem. Phys. Letters* 46 (1977) 256.
- [7] P. Durand and J.C. Barthelat, *Theoret. Chim. Acta* 38 (1975) 283; *Chem. Phys. Letters* 27 (1974) 191, and later papers.
- [8] L.R. Kahn, P. Baybutt and D.G. Truhlar, *J. Chem. Phys.* 65 (1976) 3826.
- [9] S. Topiol, J.W. Moskowitz and C.F. Melius, *J. Chem. Phys.* 68 (1978) 2364.
- [10] S. Topiol, M.A. Ratner and J.W. Moskowitz, *Chem. Phys.* 20 (1977) 1.
- [11] M.A. Ratner, S. Topiol and J.W. Moskowitz, *Chem. Phys. Letters* 46 (1977) 495.
- [12] S.P. Walch and W.A. Goddard III, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 98 (1976) 7908.
- [13] M.L. Cohen and V. Heine, *Solid State Phys.* 24, 1970, 38.
- [14] R.N. Euwema and R.L. Green, *J. Chem. Phys.* 62 (1975) 4455.

- [15] G. Simons, *J. Chem. Phys.* 55 (1970) 756;
M.F. Schwartz and J. Switalski, *J. Chem. Phys.* 57 (1972) 4132.
- [16] V. Bonifacic and S. Huzinaga, *J. Chem. Phys.* 60 (1974) 2779; 62 (1975) 1507.
- [17] G.A. Hart and P.L. Goodfriend, *Mol. Phys.* 29 (1975) 1109;
T.V. Chang et al., *Theoret. Chim. Acta* 34 (1974) 263.
- [18] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev.* 136 (1964) 864.
- [19] W. Kohn and L.J. Sham, *Phys. Rev.* 170 (1965) 1133.
- [20] A. Zunger and A.J. Freeman, *Phys. Rev B* 15 (1977) 5049; *B16* (1977) 906, 2901; *Intern. J. Quant. Chem. S10* (1976) 383.
- [21] J.F. Janak, V.L. Moruzzi and A.R. Williams, *Phys. Rev. B* 12 (1975) 1757.
- [22] E.J. Baerends, D.E. Ellis and P. Ros, *Chem. Phys.* 2 (1973) 41;
E.J. Baerends and P. Ros, *Mol. Phys.* 30 (1975) 1735;
D.E. Ellis and G.S. Painter, *Phys. Rev. B* 2 (1970) 2882.
- [23] O. Gunnarsson, P. Johansson, S. Lundqvist and B.I. Lundqvist, *Intern. J. Quant. Chem. S9* (1971) 83.
- [24] B.Y. Tong and L.J. Sham, *Phys. Rev.* 144 (1966) 1.
- [25] L. Hedin and B.I. Lundqvist, *J. Phys. C4* (1971) 2064.
- [26] K.S. Singwi, A. Sjolander, P.M. Tosi and R.J. Land, *Phys. Rev. B* 1, (1970) 1044.
- [27] E. Wigner, *Phys. Rev.* 46 (1934) 1002;
M. Gell-Mann and K. Brueckner, *Phys. Rev.* 106 (1957) 364.
- [28] A. Zunger and M.L. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. B*, to be published.
- [29] R.N. Euwema and D.J. Stukel, *Phys. Rev. B* 1 (1970) 4692.
- [30] J.D. Weeks, A. Hazi and S.A. Rice, *Advan. Chem. Phys.* 16 (1969) 283.
- [31] W. Kutzelnigg, R.J. Koch and W.A. Bingel, *Chem. Phys. Letters* 1 (1968) 197.
- [32] L. Szasz, *J. Chem. Phys.* 49 (1968) 679.
- [33] P.J. David and P. Rabinowitz, *Numerical integration* (Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967).
- [34] S. Topiol, A. Zunger and M.A. Ratner, *Chem. Phys. Letters* 49 (1977) 367.
- [35] A. Zunger and M.A. Ratner, *Chem. Phys.* 30 (1978) 423.
- [36] W. Saslow, T.K. Bergstresser and M.L. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. Letters* 16 (1966) 354.
- [37] L.R. Saravia and D. Brust, *Phys. Rev.* 170 (1968) 683.
- [38] A.E.O. Animalu, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London* 294 (1966) 376.
- [39] L.A. Hemstreet, C.Y. Fong and M.L. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. B* 2 (1970) 7054.
- [40] R.N. Euwema and L.R. Kahn, *J. Chem. Phys.* 66 (1977) 306.
- [41] G.T. Surratt, M.S. Thesis, Calif. Inst. of Technology (1970);
M.H. Cohen and V. Heine, *Phys. Rev.* 122 (1961) 1821.
- [42] C.F. Melius, Thesis, Calif. Inst. of Technology (1972).
- [43] L.R. Kahn and W.A. Goddard III, *Chem. Phys. Letters* 2 (1968) 667; *J. Chem. Phys.* 56 (1972) 2685.
- [44] W.A. Goddard III, *Phys. Rev.* 174 (1968) 659.
- [45] J.G. Snijders and E.J. Baerends, *Mol. Phys.* 33 (1977) 1651.
- [46] J. Moriarty, *Phys. Rev. B* 16 (1977) 2537.
- [47] J.A. Appelbaum and D.R. Hamann, *Phys. Rev. B* 8 (1973) 1777; *Phys. Rev. Letters* 36 (1976) 168; *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 48 (1976) 479.
- [48] T. Starkoff and J.D. Joannopoulos, *Phys. Rev. B* 16 (1977) 5212.
- [49] D.J. Miller et al., *Phys. Rev. Letters* 41 (1978) 197.
- [50] J. Harris and R.O. Jones, *Phys. Rev. Letters* 41 (1978) 191.
- [51] A. Zunger and M.L. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. Letters* 41 (1978) 53; *Phys. Rev. B*, to be published.
- [52] M. Schlüter, A. Zunger, G. Kerker, K.M. Ho and M.L. Cohen, unpublished.