How to generate a pseudopotential with the semicore in the valence



Objectives

Check whether semicore states should be explicitly included in the valence and how it should be done

Generation of *l***-dependent**

norm-conserving pseudopotential

Choose an atomic reference configuration, i.e., a given distribution of electrons in the atomic energy levels (degree of freedom)

Solve the all-electron radial Schrödinger equation for the chosen atomic reference configuration

$$\left[-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2r^2} + V_{\text{eff}}[n](r) \right] u_{nl}^{\text{AE}}(r) = \varepsilon_{nl}u_{nl}^{\text{AE}}(r)$$

$$V_{\text{eff}}[n](r) = V_{\text{ext}}(r) + V_{\text{Hartree}}[n] + V_{xc}[n] = -\frac{Z}{r} + \int \frac{n(r)}{|r - r'|} dr' + V_{xc}[n]$$

n(r) =sum of electronic charges Z =bare nuclear charge for occupied states

Parametrization of the pseudo-wave functions for $r < R_c$ according to any of the available prescriptions (degree of freedom)

Invert the radial Schrödinger equation for the screened pseudopotential

Subtract (unscreen) the Hartree and exchange-correlation potentials

Generation of *l*-dependent norm-conserving pseudo: unscreening of the pseudopotential

The pseudo-wave function obeys

$$\left[-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2r^2} + V_{(\mathrm{sc})l}^{\mathrm{PS}}(r) \right] u_l^{\mathrm{PS}}(r) = \varepsilon_l u_l^{\mathrm{PS}}(r)$$

Where the effective potential is computed in the atom



In the molecular system or condensed phase, we have to screen the (ion+core)-valence interaction with the valence charge density computed in the targeted system

Generation of *l*-dependent norm-conserving pseudo: unscreening of the pseudopotential

In the molecular system or condensed phase, we have to screen the (ion+core)valence interaction with the valence charge density computed in the targeted sytem

So, the pseudopotential is finally obtained by subtracting (unscreening) the Hartree and exchange and correlation potential calculated only for the valence electrons (with the valence pseudo-wave function)

$$V_{l}^{\text{PS}} = V_{(\text{sc})l}^{\text{PS}} - V_{\text{Hartree}}[n_{v}] - V_{xc}[n_{v}]$$
$$= V_{(\text{sc})l}^{\text{PS}} - \int \frac{n_{v}(r')}{|r - r'|} dr' - V_{xc}[n_{v}]$$

Where the pseudo-valence charge density is computed as

$$n_v(r) = \sum_{l=0}^{l_{max}} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} |u_{nl}^{PS}(r)|^2$$

Exchange-correlation functional in the DFT all-electron calculation used to construct the pseudopotential has to be the same as in the target calculation

When there is a significant overlap of core and valence charge densities: problem with unscreening

The exchange and correlation potential and energy are not linear functions of the density

 $E_{xc}[n_{\text{atom}}(\vec{r})] \neq E_{xc}[n_{\text{atom}}^{\text{core}}(\vec{r})] + E_{xc}[n_{\text{atom}}^{\text{valence}}(\vec{r})]$

In cases where the core and valence charge density overlap significantly:

- In systems with few valence electrons (alkali atoms)

- In systems with extended core states

- In transition metals, where the valence *d* bands overlap spatially with the core *s* and *p* electrons

the unscreening procedure as explained before is not fully justified.

 $V_{xc}[n_{\text{atom}}^{\text{core}}(\vec{r}) + n_{\text{atom}}^{\text{valence}}(\vec{r})] = \left(V_{xc} \left[n_{\text{atom}}^{\text{core}}(\vec{r}) + n_{\text{atom}}^{\text{valence}}(\vec{r}) \right] - V_{xc}[n_{\text{atom}}^{\text{valence}}(\vec{r})] \right) + V_{xc}[n_{\text{atom}}^{\text{valence}}(\vec{r})]$

xc potential that appears in the unscreened potential Since xc is not linear, if core and valence overlaps, the contribution from valence is not fully canceled xc potential that is removed in the unscreening procedure

Then, the screening pseudopotentials are dependent on the valence configuration, a feature highly undesirable since it reduces the transferability of the potential.

When there is a significant overlap of core and valence charge densities: non-linear core correction

Solution 1: Include explicitly the extended core orbitals in the valence (semicore in valence)

Expensive since:

- We have to include explicitly more electrons in the simulation

-The semicore orbitals tend to be very localized and hard, in the sense that high Fourier components are required



- ../../Utils/pg.sh Ba.semicore.inp
- ==> Output data in directory Ba.semicore
- ==> Pseudopotential in Ba.semicore.vps and Ba.semicore.psf (and maybe in Ba.semicore.xml)

../../Utils/pt.sh Ba.test.inp Ba.semicore.vps
==> Output data in directory Ba.test-Ba.semicore

See previous examples to understand how to generate and test norm-conserving pseudopotentials

Both the 5s and 5p states are normally thought of as "core states"

But now, they have been included in the valence.

As the program can only deal with one pseudized state per angular momentum channel, this implies the elimination of the "genuinely valence" 6s state from the calculation

In other words, the pseudopotential has been generated for an ion

\$ cd Ba.semicore			
\$ more OUT			
Ba pseudopotential generation			
relativistic!!			
correlation = ca spin-polarized			
nuclear charge= 56.000000number of core orbitals= 14number of valence orbitals= 7electronic charge= 54.000000ionic charge= 2.000000			

The semicore orbitals are very extended. 5*s* and 5*p* orbitals overlap strongly with 4*d* orbitals

The reason why the semicore orbitals have to be included in the valence is that they are very extended, and overlap a lot with the valence states

This can be seen plotting the semicore orbitals

\$ gnuplot –persist pseudo.gplot

(To generate a figure on the screen using gnuplot)

\$ gnuplot pseudo.gps





(To generate a postscript file with the figure)

The pseudopotential constructed is not expected to reproduce perfectly the 6s and 6p states, as their eigenvalues are more than 1 eV from those of the reference states 5s and 5p, but the actual results are not bad at all.

<pre>\$ cd \$ cd Ba.test-Ba.semicore/ \$ grep "&d" OUT ATM3.3 12-APR-13 Ba ATM3.3 12-APR-13 Ba ATM3.3 12-APR-13 Ba</pre>	True ground state (6s2) 6s1 6p1 5d0 6s1 6p0 5d1	&v&d &v&d &v&d
&d total energy differenc	es in series	
&d 1 2	3	
&d 1 0.0000		
&d 2 0.1551 0.0000		
&d 3 0.0978 -0.0573	0.0000	
* End of series*	spdfg &d&v	
ATM3.3 12-APR-13 Ba	True ground state (6s2)	&v&d
ATM3.3 12-APR-13 Ba	6s1 6p1 5d0	&v&d
ATM3.3 12-APR-13 Ba	6s1 6p0 5d1	&v&d
&d total energy differenc	es in series	
&d 1 2	3	
&d 1 0.0000		
&d 2 0.1569 0.0000		
&d 3 0.1011 -0.0558	0.0000	
* End of series*	spdfg &d&v	

Not only the differences in energies are well reproduced, but also the shape of the orbitals:

\$ gnuplot –persist pt.gplot

(To generate a figure on the screen using gnuplot)

\$ gnuplot pt.gps



Note that the 6s and 6p states have a node, as they must be orthogonal to the 5s and 5p states, respectively.