

ARE UNOCCUPIED KOHN-SHAM EIGENVALUES RELATED TO EXCITATION ENERGIES?

C. J. Umrigar,¹ A. Savin,² and Xavier Gonze³

¹Cornell Theory Center and Laboratory of Atomic and Solid State Physics,
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853.

²Laboratoire de Chimie Théorique (CNRS),
Université de Paris

³ Unité P.C.P.M.,
Université Catholique de Louvain,
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

INTRODUCTION

In the Kohn-Sham density functional method [1, 2, 3, 4], the true interacting-electron system is replaced by a system of non-interacting electrons in an effective potential, v_{eff} , defined by the requirement that the density of the non-interacting electrons equals the true density. The single particle orbitals and their eigenenergies were originally introduced as a mathematical artifact in order to achieve a good approximation to the kinetic energy, leaving only a relatively small term, the exchange-correlation energy E_{xc} , to be approximated in practical implementations of the theory. It was later shown [5] that the energy of the highest occupied orbital is in fact the negative of the ionization energy. However, most approximate functionals (such as the commonly used local density approximation [2, 3, 4]) yield poor approximations to it. The energies of the other occupied orbitals and of the unoccupied orbitals do not have a rigorous correspondence to excitation energies. Nevertheless, it is common practice to compare eigenvalue differences to optical spectra of molecules and solids. Since these comparisons are made using Kohn-Sham eigenvalues obtained from approximate exchange-correlation functionals, it is not clear how much of the discrepancy between theory and experiment would persist if the true Kohn-Sham eigenvalues were to be used. In this paper we show that there is a surprising degree of agreement between the exact ground-state Kohn-Sham eigenvalue differences and excitation energies, for excitations from the highest occupied orbital to the unoccupied orbitals.

METHOD

The first step in the calculation is the evaluation of accurate densities. In the case of the 2-electron systems they were obtained [6] by numerically integrating extremely accurate wave functions [7] that yield energies that are correct to 14 and 16 significant digits respectively for He and Li^+ . In the case of Be, the density was obtained [8] by a combination of variational and diffusion quantum Monte Carlo, using a wave function that recovers 99.2% of the correlation energy in variational Monte Carlo and 99.9% of the correlation energy in diffusion Monte Carlo. Efficient implementations [9, 10] of the variational and diffusion Monte Carlo methods are employed to rapidly sample the many-dimensional space of the wave functions.

The true Kohn-Sham potential is then obtained from the density. For the two-electron systems, it is obtained directly from the single-particle Kohn-Sham equation for the sole occupied orbital. For systems with more electrons, the potential is expanded in a set of functions and the expansion parameters varied such that the potential yields the true density [8, 11]. All the Kohn-Sham eigenvalues can then be obtained by solving the Kohn-Sham equation

$$-\frac{\nabla^2\psi}{2} + v_{\text{eff}}\psi = \epsilon\psi. \quad (1)$$

RESULTS

In Tables 1, 2 and 3, we show the excitation energies of He Li^+ and Be respectively, obtained from differences of Kohn-Sham eigenvalues, and compare them to the corresponding experimental energies. Of course, the single-electron Kohn-Sham energies do not distinguish between the energies within a multiplet. The energies obtained from the eigenvalue differences, lie between the experimental singlet and triplet excitation energies with the exception of only the $(1s \rightarrow 3d)$ $1D$ excitation for He and Li^+ . The calculated energies are for an infinite mass nucleus and do not include relativity, whereas the experimental numbers are, of course, for finite mass nuclei and are relativistic. In the case of the two-electron systems it is possible to calculate exceedingly accurate infinite nuclear mass non-relativistic total energies [12, 13]. The excitation energies obtained from these calculations are also shown for He in Table 1. We observe that now even the $(1s \rightarrow 3d)$ $1D$ excitation energy of He obtained from the eigenvalue differences agrees with the true calculated excitation energy to the number of digits shown. To the best of our knowledge, this remarkable agreement between the Kohn-Sham eigenvalue differences and the excitation energies has not been noticed before for any real system, though it has been noticed for a model semiconductor [14].

It should be emphasised that the agreement exists only for accurate Kohn-Sham eigenvalues. Those obtained from popular approximate density functionals, such as the local density approximation (LDA) and various generalized gradient approximations (GGAs) are nowhere close to being sufficiently accurate. In fact, it is not even possible to make such a comparison with LDA or GGA orbitals because for neutral atoms the LDA or GGA potentials bind few, if any, unoccupied orbitals. This, of course, is due to the fact that the exchange-correlation potential of these approximate functionals decays considerably faster than $-1/r$.

Table 1. Excitation energies of He in Hartree atomic units. The theoretical energies of Drake [12] and the eigenvalue differences are for infinite nuclear mass and neglect relativity. The experimental energies are from Ref. [15].

Transition	Final State	Experiment	Drake	Kohn-Sham eigenvalue differences
$1s \rightarrow 2s$	2^3S	0.72833	0.72850	0.7460
	2^1S	0.75759	0.75775	
$1s \rightarrow 2p$	1^3P	0.77039	0.77056	0.7772
	1^1P	0.77972	0.77988	
$1s \rightarrow 3s$	3^3S	0.83486	0.83504	0.8392
	3^1S	0.84228	0.84245	
$1s \rightarrow 3p$	2^3P	0.84547	0.84564	0.8476
	2^1P	0.84841	0.84858	
$1s \rightarrow 3d$	1^3D	0.84792	0.84809	0.8481
	1^1D	0.84793	0.84809	
$1s \rightarrow 4s$	4^3S	0.86704	0.86721	0.8688
	4^1S	0.86997	0.87014	

DISCUSSION

It should come as no surprise that the higher excitations are accurately given by the eigenvalue differences since that follows from the following two well-known facts. First, the highest occupied eigenvalue is exact, *i.e.* it is minus the ionization energy[5]. Second, the higher unoccupied eigenvalues approach a Rydberg series since the exchange-correlation potential approaches $-1/r$ at large distances. Hence, it is to be expected that the higher excitations will be progressively better approximated by the eigenvalue differences. However, this argument does not explain the agreement observed for the lower lying states. Second, the agreement for the higher lying states is better than can be explained by the above argument since the manner in which the eigenvalues approach the Rydberg limit is also in agreement with the excitation energies. The deviation of the eigenvalues from a Rydberg series is given by the quantum defect.

$$\delta_n = n - \sqrt{\frac{-1}{2\epsilon_n}}, \quad (2)$$

where ϵ_n is the n^{th} eigenvalue. In the left panel of Fig. 1 we compare the S and P quantum defects of He from the Kohn-Sham eigenvalues to those obtained for the $^3S, ^1S, ^3P$ and 1P states obtained from highly accurate calculations [12]. The right panel of Fig. 1 is a similar plot for Be, except that the comparison is made to experiment [15] rather than to accurate theoretical calculations. It is apparent that both for He and for Be the quantum defects obtained from the Kohn-Sham eigenvalues are in rather good agreement with the average of the true singlet and triplet quantum defects. A similar agreement has previously been observed for Neon [16]. Since the quantum defects

Table 2. Excitation energies of Li^+ in Hartree atomic units. The theoretical energies of Drake [13] and the eigenvalue differences are for infinite nuclear mass and neglect relativity. The experimental energies are from Ref. [15].

Transition	Final State	Experiment	Drake	Kohn-Sham eigenvalue differences
$1s \rightarrow 2s$	$2\ ^3S$	2.1690	2.1692	2.2082
	$2\ ^1S$	2.2330	2.2390	
$1s \rightarrow 2p$	$1\ ^3P_o$	2.2521	2.2522	2.2733
	$1\ ^1P_o$	2.2865	2.2866	
$1s \rightarrow 3s$	$3\ ^3S$	2.5277	2.5278	2.5375
	$3\ ^1S$	2.5460	2.5462	
$1s \rightarrow 3p$	$2\ ^3P_o$	2.5493	2.5495	2.5554
	$2\ ^1P_o$	2.5595	2.5597	
$1s \rightarrow 3d$	$1\ ^3D$	2.5572	2.5574	2.5576
	$1\ ^1D$	2.5574	2.5575	
$1s \rightarrow 4s$	$4\ ^3S$	2.6426	2.6428	2.6466
	$4\ ^1S$	2.6499	2.6501	

Table 3. Excitation energies of Be in Hartree atomic units. The eigenvalue differences are for infinite nuclear mass and neglect relativity. The experimental energies are from Ref. [15].

Transition	Final State	Experiment	Kohn-Sham eigenvalue differences
$2s \rightarrow 2p$	1 3P	0.100153	0.1327
	1 1P	0.193941	
$2s \rightarrow 3s$	2 3S	0.237304	0.2444
	2 1S	0.249127	
$2s \rightarrow 3p$	2 3P	0.267877	0.2694
	2 1P	0.274233	
$2s \rightarrow 3d$	1 3D	0.282744	0.2833
	1 1D	0.293556	
$2s \rightarrow 4s$	3 3S	0.293921	0.2959
	3 1S	0.297279	
$2s \rightarrow 4p$	3 3P	0.300487	0.3046
	3 1P	0.306314	
$2s \rightarrow 4d$	2 3D	0.309577	0.3098
	2 1D	0.313390	
$2s \rightarrow 5s$	4 3S	0.314429	0.3153
	4 1S	0.315855	

describe the deviation from a Rydberg series, this finding cannot be explained in terms of the well-known fact that the true Kohn-Sham potential decays at large distances as $-(Z - N + 1)/r$, where Z is the nuclear charge and N is the number of electrons. Clearly some further explanation is needed.




Figure 1. Comparison of the S and P quantum defects of He and Be obtained from the Kohn-Sham eigenvalues with accurate ${}^3S, {}^1S, {}^3P$ and 1P quantum defects. For He, the latter are obtained from accurate theoretical calculations [12] while for Be they are obtained from experiment [15].

We now argue that the explanation lies in the fact that the Kohn-Sham orbitals and quasiparticle amplitudes (defined below) satisfy the same equation not only up to order $(1/r)$ but up to order $(1/r^4)$ inclusive. Consider an N -electron system in its i^{th} state Ψ_i^N , obtained by exciting an electron from the highest occupied level of the ground state Ψ_0^N . If we keep the 1^{st} electron fixed, we have an $(N - 1)$ -electron function which we can expand in any complete basis set, with the expansion coefficients f being functions of the position of the 1^{st} electron. Choosing the complete set to be the eigenstates of the $N - 1$ electron system, we have

$$\Psi_i^N(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_N) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f_{ij}(r_1) \Psi_j^{N-1}(r_2, \dots, r_N). \quad (3)$$

The expression on the right hand side must be antisymmetric because the left hand side is. We will refer to the f_{ij} as quasiparticle amplitudes but we note that they are not the usual Dyson quasiparticle amplitudes.

At large distances, the quasiparticle amplitudes f_{i0} obey the equation

$$\left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2} - \frac{(Z - N + 1)}{r} + \frac{Q}{r^3} - \frac{\alpha}{2r^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^5}\right) \right) f_{i0} = (E_i^N - E_0^{N-1}) f_{i0}, \quad (4)$$

where Q and α are the quadrupole moment and the dipole polarizability of the ground state Ψ_0^{N-1} of the $(N - 1)$ -electron system. Further it can be shown that

$$f_{ij} \sim f_{i0}/r^2 \quad \text{for } j \neq 0. \quad (5)$$

Equations 4 and 5 are generalizations of equations obtained by Almbladh and von Barth [18] for the ground ($i = 0$) state of the N -electron system.

At large distances, the Kohn-Sham orbitals ϕ_i satisfy the equation

$$\left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2} - \frac{(Z - N)}{r} + v_{xc}(r) + \mathcal{O}(\text{exp}) \right) \phi_i = \epsilon_i \phi_i \quad (6)$$

Now consider the densities resulting from the many-body quasiparticle equations and the Kohn-Sham equation:

$$\rho_i^{\text{MB}} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f_{ij}^2 \rightarrow f_{i0}^2 \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^4}\right)\right) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty, \quad (7)$$

$$\rho_0^{\text{KS}} = \sum_{j=1}^N \phi_j^2 \rightarrow \phi_N^2 (1 + \mathcal{O}(\text{exp})) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty, \quad (8)$$

Equating the ground state many-body and Kohn-Sham densities we obtain:

$$\rho_0^{\text{KS}} = \rho_0^{\text{MB}} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \epsilon_N = (E_0^N - E_0^{N-1}) \\ \phi_N = f_{00} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^4}\right)\right) \\ V_{xc} = -\frac{1}{r} + \frac{Q}{r^3} - \frac{\alpha}{2r^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^5}\right). \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

The first of these follows from the fact that the exponential decay is governed only by the right hand side of Eqs. 4 and 6 and is the well-known result that the highest occupied KS eigenvalue yields the ionization energy [5]. The second of these follows from Eqs. 7 and 8. The third follows from relating the coefficients of a $1/r$ expansion of the density or equivalently the highest KS orbital to a $1/r$ expansion of V_{xc} . If the KS and the quasiparticle orbitals are equal to $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^n}\right)$, then it is easy to show that the potentials must be equal to $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^{n+1}}\right)$.

Of course all the KS orbitals satisfy the same equation, while the quasiparticle amplitudes all satisfy different equations, but the quasiparticle equations differ from each other and from the KS equation only at order $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^5}\right)$.

The question now arises: Is the fact that the highest occupied eigenvalue is correct plus the fact that the Kohn-Sham and the quasiparticle potentials agree to order $1/r^4$ sufficient to pin down the unoccupied eigenvalues with sufficient accuracy? We conjecture the answer is yes, at least for sufficiently smooth potentials. In order to provide evidence for our conjecture we constructed two model potentials both of which yield the true occupied Kohn-Sham eigenvalue for Helium. The first of these potentials agrees with the true Kohn-Sham potential to order $1/r$ while the second agrees up to order $1/r^4$. The procedure used to construct the model potentials has similarities to the standard procedure used to generate pseudopotentials but we do not impose the norm-conservation condition.

Motivated by the long-range asymptotic behavior of many-body wave functions[19], we construct these potentials by choosing the Kohn-Sham orbital to be

$$\psi \propto (r+1)^a e^{-\zeta r} \left(1 + \frac{q_1}{(r+1)} + \frac{q_2}{(r+1)^2} + \frac{q_3}{(r+1)^3}\right), \quad (10)$$

where $\zeta = \sqrt{2E_{\text{ion}}}$, $a = Z_{\text{eff}}/\zeta - 1$, $Z_{\text{eff}} = Z - N + 1$, Z is the nuclear charge, N is the number of electrons and E_{ion} is the ionization energy. The Kohn-Sham potential that yields this orbital is obtained simply by solving the single-particle Schrödinger equation for the potential. The first potential, which agrees with the true Kohn-Sham potential to order $1/r$, is obtained by setting $q_1 = q_2 = q_3 = 0$. The second potential, which

Table 4. Comparison of the Kohn-Sham eigenvalues for He with those with those of two model systems that have the same occupied eigenvalue and have potentials that agree with the He potential to order $1/r$ and $1/r^4$.

Orbital	Model		Helium
	$\mathcal{O}(1/r)$	$\mathcal{O}(1/r^4)$	
1s	-0.9037	-0.9037	-0.9037
2s	-0.1748	-0.1588	-0.1577
2p	-0.1594	-0.1284	-0.1266
3s	-0.0696	-0.0648	-0.0645
3p	-0.0653	-0.0566	-0.0561
3d	-0.0621	-0.0557	-0.0556
4s	-0.0370	-0.0350	-0.0349

agrees with the true Kohn-Sham potential to order $1/r^4$, is obtained by setting

$$\begin{aligned}
 q_1 &= p_1 - a, \\
 q_2 &= p_2 - \frac{a(a-1)}{2} + (1-a)q_1, \\
 q_3 &= p_3 - \frac{a(a-1)(a-2)}{6} - \frac{a(a-1)}{2}q_1 + a(q_1 - q_2) - q_1 + 2q_2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 p_1 &= \frac{1}{\zeta} \left(\frac{-Z_{\text{eff}}(Z_{\text{eff}} - \zeta)}{2\zeta^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2} \right), \\
 p_2 &= \frac{1}{2\zeta} \left(Q + p_1 \left(-\frac{(Z_{\text{eff}} - \zeta)(Z_{\text{eff}} - 2\zeta)}{2\zeta^2} \right) + \frac{l(l+1)}{2} \right), \\
 p_3 &= \frac{1}{3\zeta} \left(\frac{-\alpha}{2} + p_1 Q + p_2 \left(-\frac{(Z_{\text{eff}} - 2\zeta)(Z_{\text{eff}} - 3\zeta)}{2\zeta^2} \right) + \frac{l(l+1)}{2} \right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where Q is the quadrupole moment and α the dipole polarizability of the residual He^+ ion.

In Table 4, we compare the eigenvalues obtained from the two model potentials with the KS eigenvalues for He. It is apparent that the eigenvalues of the second model are closer, by a factor of 20 or more, to the eigenvalues of He than are the eigenvalues of the first model. The differences of the eigenvalues of the second model and those of He are of comparable magnitude to the differences of the true He Kohn-Sham eigenvalue differences from the excitation energies. Hence, it appears that our conjectured explanation is correct. We have performed the same test for Li^+ and find very similar results. In Fig. 2 we compare the two model potentials to the true Kohn-Sham potential. The external potential has been subtracted from each of the potentials. Clearly, the three potentials differ considerably at short distances, hence precluding the possibility that the agreement in the eigenvalues is merely due to a chance agreement of the $\mathcal{O}(1/r^4)$ model potential with the true Kohn-Sham potential.

In conclusion we have discovered that excitations from the highest occupied orbital are in surprising agreement with differences of Kohn-Sham eigenvalues and we present a plausible explanation for this finding. The present results indicate that useful information about excited states could be obtained from ground-state single-particle energies




Figure 2. Comparison of true Kohn-Sham effective potential, with two model potentials. The external potential has been subtracted from each of the potentials. All three potentials have the same highest occupied eigenvalue. At large distances, the first model potential agrees with the Kohn-Sham potential to $\mathcal{O}(1/r)$ while the second model potential agrees with the Kohn-Sham potential to $\mathcal{O}(1/r^4)$. It is apparent that the three potentials are very different at short distances.

provided that the approximate functional used yields single-particle energies that are sufficiently close to the true Kohn-Sham values. Unfortunately the popular LDA and GGA functionals are nowhere near sufficiently accurate. The exact exchange-only potential, obtained from the optimized effective potential (OEP) method, does better [20] since it decays as $-1/r$ at large distances but it is much inferior to the true Kohn-Sham potential. Hence it is necessary to combine it with an accurate correlation potential but unfortunately all existing correlation functionals, that we have studied, yield potentials that bear little resemblance [11] to the true correlation potential. The Kohn-Sham eigenvalues are also the starting point for two more accurate methods for calculating excitation energies, namely the time-dependent density functional theory [21, 22] and density functional perturbation theory [17, 20]. Again, the success of these methods (for all excitations except those within the same principal quantum number shell as the highest occupied level) relies on having functionals that yield good approximations to the true Kohn-Sham eigenvalues.

Acknowledgments We thank John Morgan and Jonathan Baker for making available their program for calculating very accurate two-electron wave functions and Raffaele Resta, Mel Levy, Hardy Gross and Sharad Patil for useful discussions. The computations were performed on IBM RS-6000 workstations provided by the Cornell Theory Center. This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research and NATO.

REFERENCES

1. P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev.* **136**, B864 (1964).
2. W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, *Phys. Rev.* **140**, A1133 (1965).
3. R. G. Parr and W. Yang, *Density Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules*, (Oxford University Press, 1989)

4. R. M. Dreizler and E. K. U. Gross, *Density Functional Theory*, (Springer-Verlag, 1990)
5. J. P. Perdew, R. G. Parr, M. Levy and J. L. Balduz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 1691 (1982); M. Levy, J. P. Perdew and V. Sahni Phys. Rev. B **30**, 2745 (1984); U. von Barth in *Electronic Structure of Complex Systems*, edited by P. Phariseau and W. M. Temmerman, NATO, ASI Series B, vol. 113 (1984).
6. C. J. Umrigar and X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 3827 (1994).
7. The wave function used is a minor modification of that in D. E. Freund, B. D. Huxtable and J. D. Morgan, Phys. Rev. A **29**, 980 (1984). The precise form of the wave function used is described in Ref. [6].
8. C. J. Umrigar and X. Gonze, in *High Performance Computing and its Application to the Physical Sciences*, proceedings of the Mardi Gras '93 Conference, edited by D. A. Browne *et al.*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993); unpublished.
9. C. J. Umrigar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 408 (1993).
10. C. J. Umrigar, P. Nightingale and K. J. Runge, J. Chem. Phys. **99**, 2865 (1993).
11. C. Filippi, C. J. Umrigar and X. Gonze in *Theoretical and Computational Chemistry: Recent Developments in Density Functional Theory*, edited by J. Seminario (Elsevier Publisher, 1996).
12. G. W. F. Drake in *Casimir Forces: Theory and Recent Experiments on Atomic Systems*, edited by F. S. Levin and D. A. Micha, (Plenum, New York 1993); G. W. F. Drake and Zong-Chao Yan, Chem. Phys. Lett. **229**, 486 (1994).
13. G. W. F. Drake in *Handbook of Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics*, edited by G. W. F. Drake (AIP Press, New York, 1996), pp. 154-171; E. Riis, A. G. Sinclair, O. Poulsen, G. W. F. Drake, W. R. C. Rowley and A. P. Levick, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 207 (1994); private communication.
14. O. Gunnarson and K. Schönhammer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 1968 (1986).
15. S. Bashkin and J. D. Stoner, *Atomic Energy Levels and Groatian Diagrams*, vol. 1. (1975, addendum 1978).
16. Abdullah Al-Sharif, R. Resta and C. J. Umrigar, unpublished.
17. A. Görling and M. Levy, Int. J. Quant. Chem, Symp. **29**, 93 (1995); Phys. Rev. A **50**, 196 (1994).
18. C. -O. Almbladh and U. von Barth, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 3231 (1985).
19. S. H. Patil, J. Phys. B **23**, 1 (1990); J. Chem. Phys. **95**, 4245 (1991).
20. C. Filippi, C. J. Umrigar and X. Gonze, submitted to J. Chem. Phys.
21. Mark E. Casida in *Theoretical and Computational Chemistry: Recent Developments in Density Functional Theory*, edited by J. Seminario (Elsevier Publisher, 1996).
22. M. Petersilka and E. K. U. Gross, Int. J. Quant. Chem. **30**, 1393 (1996); M. Petersilka, U. J. Gossmann and E. K. U. Gross, contribution in this volume.