

The Need, Benefits, and Demonstration of a Minimization Principle for Excited States

Naoum C. Bacalis

Theoretical and Physical Chemistry Institute, National Hellenic Research Foundation, Vasileos Constantinou 48, GR-116 35 Athens, Greece

Abstract. It is shown that the standard methods of computing excited states in truncated spaces **must** yield wave functions that, beyond truncation, are in principle veered away from the exact, and a remedy is demonstrated via a presented functional, F_n , obeying a minimization principle for excited states. It is further demonstrated that near avoided crossings, between two MCSCF “flipped roots” the wave function that leads to the excited state has the lowest F_n .

Keywords: Minimization Principle, Excited States, Truncated, Avoided Crossing, Conical Intersection,
PACS: 31.15.-p 31.15.A- 31.15.vj 31.15.xt 31.50.Gh

THE NEED AND BEBEFITS OF A MINIMIZATION PRINCIPLE FOR EXCITED STATES

In this presentation two subjects, constituting the essence of the “truncation problem”, and their remedy are addressed. The central idea can be exposed by an example: Consider, for example, He $1s^2\ ^1S$: Due to the electron repulsion the orbital $1s$, doubly occupied, is more diffuse than singly occupied. When excited to $1s2s\ ^1S$, the outer $2s$ electron pushes the inner in, making $1s$ more compact than before. If the previous more diffuse $1s$ is used to describe the excited state $1s2s$, then, in an *ab-initio* calculation, many configurations will be needed to “fix” it more compact, and current methods resort to just huge wave functions to “fix” relatively simple orbitals. But then, large systems cannot be treated. Contrarily, our method finds directly the correct compact $1s$ orbital, independently of the ground state $1s$, and many configurations are not needed: A small space suffices.

If, on the other hand, one *optimizes* the *excited state*, $1s2s$, toward the correct energy, then its (compact) $1s$, used in the *same* truncated space for the description of the orthogonal ground state $1s^2$, deteriorates the ground state, so, an *excited function is obtained orthogonal to a deteriorated ground state*, therefore the “optimized” $1s2s$ function, cannot be correct (despite its correct energy, as explained below), veered away from the exact excited function.

Besides, an alternative attempt: i.e. to minimize the energy “*orthogonally to a ground state approximant*” must, as shown below, yield energy not collapsed, nevertheless *below* the exact excited, of course also veered away from the exact excited function. Therefore, in both methods of approach we have a “truncation problem”.

Thus, the two issues addressed, and their remedy, are: (i) According to the standard methods for computing excited states, based on the Hylleraas, Undheim, and McDonald (HUM) theorem [1], the eigenvectors in a truncated space of the higher secular equation roots inevitably **must** be veered away from the corresponding exact excited Hamiltonian eigenfunctions while their eigenvalues are *upper* bounds of the exact energy. (ii) Any energy minimization *orthogonally to lower lying* (truncated) *approximants* is not collapsed to lower lying states, but **must** yield a function that is veered away from the exact Hamiltonian excited eigenfunction [2-5], with energy that is a *lower* bound of the exact energy (after passing the *closest to the exact*, which necessarily lies *below* the exact [3 and cf. below]). However, as Shull and Löwdin have shown [6], the excited states can be computed independently.

Our method, a minimization principle for excited states, $F_n[\phi_n, \{\phi_{i<n}\}]$,

$$F_n = F_n[\phi_n, \{\phi_{i<n}\}] \equiv E[\phi_n] + 2 \sum_{i<n} \frac{(E[\phi_n] \langle \phi_i | \phi_n \rangle - \langle \phi_i | H | \phi_n \rangle)^2}{E[\phi_n] - E[\phi_i]} \left(1 - \sum_{i<n} \langle \phi_i | \phi_n \rangle^2 \right)^{-1} \quad (1)$$

preliminarily successfully tested for atoms within variational configuration interaction [2-5], overcomes both of the above problems, approaching variationally the exact excited state wave functions ψ_n : $\phi_n \rightarrow \psi_n$, (i.e., in the above example, finding the correct compact $1s$ of $1s2s$), as local minima of F_n , which do not depend crucially on the ground and lower excited state approximants ϕ_i , (i.e., in the above example, in Eq.1 the diffuse $1s^2$ is used as $\phi_{i=0}$, which may be not so accurate, only reasonable, [3]) and the minima are located *at* the excited states ψ_n of a non

degenerate Hamiltonian in a truncated space (i.e. without resorting to huge functions - to “fix”, in the example, 1s), contrary [see below] to the standard methods, which, in truncated spaces approach points that *must* be veered away from the exact ψ_n . This issue is very important, and lacking from standard literature, unless huge functions are successfully used (: infinite complete space \leftrightarrow exact eigenfunctions), impractical for large systems.

Furthermore, in avoided crossings of energy surfaces, the functional F_n recognizes [5] the flipped root, necessarily appearing within one of the most accurate standard methods, multi-configuration self-consistent field (MCSCF) [7,8], as the root with the smallest $F_n[\text{root}, \{\phi_{i<n}\}]$, rendering unnecessary to resort to state averaging [9], which, as shown in [5] and demonstrated below, for truncated functions is inaccurate (*in principle*: incorrect, regardless of whether huge wave functions may “fix” it, because the exact state is not at the parameter crossing [5]). Therefore, as a demonstration, F_n will be used, within Hylleraas coordinates, to compute correct excited state wave functions for He $1s2s\ ^1S$, without needing large expansions of functions, i.e. in convenient small truncated spaces, that would be suitable for large systems.

For completeness of this presentation, proofs for both above issues [3] are indicated in Fig.1. Also the method of identifying a flipped root by F_n within (MCSCF) is demonstrated.

Fig. 1 displays: (i) Three lowest exact (unknown) states mutually orthogonal, ψ_0, ψ_1, ψ_2 , with energies $E_0 < E_1 < E_2$. (ii) One (known) approximant, “ ϕ_0 ”, of the ground state ψ_0 , and all (trial) functions “ Φ ” orthogonal to ϕ_0 (on the AFB cycle orthogonal to ϕ_0). (iii) The (unknown) function ϕ_1^+ : the closest to the exact ψ_1 among all Φ 's on the AFB cycle orthogonal to ϕ_0 , i.e. ϕ_1^+ is the Gramm-Schmidt orthogonal to ϕ_0 in the subspace of $\{\phi_0, \psi_1\}$ [3]. (All functions are normalized). Evidently [3], ϕ_1^+ lies below ψ_1 :

$$\phi_1^+ \equiv (\psi_1 - \phi_0 \langle \psi_1 | \phi_0 \rangle) / \sqrt{1 - \langle \psi_1 | \phi_0 \rangle^2} \Rightarrow E[\phi_1^+] = E[\psi_1] - (E[\psi_1] - E[\phi_0]) \langle \psi_1 | \phi_0 \rangle^2 / (1 - \langle \psi_1 | \phi_0 \rangle^2) \Rightarrow E[\phi_1^+] < E[\psi_1]$$




FIGURE 1. Schematic representation of normalized states: Φ_{HUM} ($E[\Phi_{\text{HUM}}] = E_1$) and Φ_{Min} ($E[\Phi_{\text{Min}}] < E_1$) are orthogonal to the approximant ϕ_0 and are veered away from the exact ψ_1 . $\Phi_{\text{VPES}} \rightarrow \psi_1$, independently of the orthogonality to ϕ_0 (generally to lower lying approximants ϕ_i), and regardless of the accuracy of the latter, i.e. of their closeness to the exact, provided that, if used in VPES $F_n[\phi_n, \{\phi_{i<n}\}]$, they are reasonable approximants, as explained in the text [3].

and is *not* a Hamiltonian eigenfunction on the subspace of the AFB cycle orthogonal to ϕ_0 , while many other Φ 's on the AFB cycle orthogonal to ϕ_0 lie above ψ_1 , $E[\Phi] > E_1$. Therefore, in going on AFB cycle, i.e. orthogonally to ϕ_0 , from lower $E[\Phi] < E_1$ to higher $E[\Phi] > E_1$, at least one Φ has $E[\Phi] = E_1$ (labeled by “ Φ_{HUM} ” in Fig. 1 - the best, according to HUM theorem, converged 2nd HUM root) having $E[\Phi] = E[\Phi_{\text{HUM}}] = E_1$. Actually for truncated expansion approximants, for every ϕ_0 , the algebraic system of equations $\{\langle \phi_0 | \Phi \rangle = 0$ (orthogonal), $\langle \phi_0 | H | \Phi \rangle = E_1\}$ has many solutions - expansion coefficients of Φ - and none equals ψ_1 [3]. Φ_{HUM} , for this ϕ_0 , is on the AFB cycle orthogonal to ϕ_0 , if we consider as ϕ_0 the lowest HUM root (which, even worse, in optimizing Φ as 2nd HUM root, *deteriorates*, compared to any previously independently optimized lowest root) [8], therefore the best Φ_{HUM} is not ψ_1 .

Besides, we can always diagonalize the Hamiltonian in the AFB cycle, i.e. in the subspace of $\{\Phi_{\text{HUM}}, \phi_1^+\}$ and this will open their “gap” yielding a lower eigenfunction (labeled Φ_{MIN} in Fig. 1) lying even lower than ϕ_1^+ ($E[\Phi_{\text{MIN}}] \leq E[\phi_1^+]$), on the AFB cycle orthogonal to ϕ_0 [3]. Φ_{MIN} should be found by a straightforward energy minimization “orthogonally to ϕ_0 ”. Therefore, such an energy minimization in a subspace orthogonal to ϕ_0 is expected to yield a function lying lower than the exact ψ_1 and veered away from ψ_1 . [3] Thus, both “standard” kinds of methods, “based on HUM theorem” and “orthogonal minimization” yield “final” functions which are *veered away from* ψ_1 (even from ϕ_1^+). [3]

The presented “variational principle” for truncated excited wave functions, F_n , are proven [3] to have minimum at the exact eigenfunctions (labeled Φ_{VPES} in Fig. 1) for *any reasonable* lower lying truncated approximants. To the

author's knowledge, there is no other method, in the literature, to unambiguously *approach* the exact excited state wave functions in truncated spaces, without resorting to huge wave functions impractical for large systems.

DEMONSTRATION OF CONVERGING TO THE EXACT Ψ_1

The above are demonstrated for He 1S ($1s^2$ and $1s2s$), using Hylleraas variables $\{s=r_1+r_2, t=r_1-r_2, u=|\vec{r}_1-\vec{r}_2|\}$ $u=|\vec{r}_1-\vec{r}_2|$ [1]: $\sum_{i_s, i_t, i_u=0}^{n_s, n_t, n_u} c_{i_s, i_t, i_u} s^{i_s} t^{i_t} u^{i_u}$, by establishing, a reliable basis $\{\psi_0, \psi_1\} \rightarrow$ the exact $\{\Psi_0, \Psi_1\}$ out of variationally optimized state-specific Laguerre-type orbitals [2]: $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_{n,k} (-2rz_n/n)^k z_n^{3/2} e^{-rz_n/n}$ (via $s \pm t$) whose polynomial coefficients and exponents are optimized, in a Slater determinant, thus achieving accurate (27 term - compared to Pekeris' 95 terms [10]) series expansions $\{\psi_0, \psi_1\}$, in terms of $s^i t^j u^k$, ($E_0 = -2.90371$, $E_1 = -2.14584$ a.u.), in order to compare (project on it) the demonstrated truncated approximants of up to 8 terms ($s^1 t^2 u^1$).

TABLE 1. Optimized 8-term truncated approximants, Φ , (up to: $s^1 t^2 u^1$)

Φ	E_0 (a.u.)	E_1 (a.u.)	$\langle \psi_0 \Phi \rangle$	$\langle \psi_1 \Phi \rangle$
$\Psi^{(*)}$	-2.90371	-2.14584		
$\Phi_0^{1r \text{ HUM}}$	-2.90312	$(E[^{2r}] -2.02)^{(1)}$	0.99996	0.00001
$\Phi_1^{2r \text{ HUM}}$	$(E[^{1r}] -2.897)^{(1)}$	-2.14449	0.0033	0.9986
$\Phi_1^{F[\varphi_0]}$	$E[\varphi_0] -2.848^{(2)}$	-2.14515	0.0049	0.9998
$\Phi_1^{F[\varphi'_0]}$	$E[\varphi'_0] -2.842^{(2)}$	-2.1452		

(*) Optimized 27-term (up to: $s^2 t^2 u^2$)
(1) Other eigenvalues of the secular matrix concomitant to the optimized (deteriorated)
(2) 1-term $\varphi_0 s$ (up to: $s^0 t^0 u^0$) used in F_1 (i.e. $F_n, n=1$, in Eq.1)

Beyond the above established $\{\psi_0, \psi_1\}$, Table 1 shows the optimized 8-term approximants and their overlaps with $\{\psi_0, \psi_1\}$ of: (i) The ground state $\Phi_0^{1r \text{ HUM}}$ along with its orthogonal deteriorated 2^{nd} root. (ii) The 2^{nd} HUM root $\Phi_1^{2r \text{ HUM}}$. Its main two orbitals **resemble $1s1s'$** (rather than $1s2s$); its orthogonal deteriorated 1^{st} root is also shown. (iii) The functions Φ_1^F obtained by *minimizing* F_1 , by using, in F_1 , two different, rather inaccurate, 1-term lower approximants φ_0 (also shown). Contrary to the aforesaid 2^{nd} HUM root $\Phi_1^{2r \text{ HUM}}$, now the main orbitals **resemble $1s2s$** , as expected, and, as seen by the overlaps, Φ_1^F is much closer to ψ_1 than $\Phi_1^{2r \text{ HUM}}$. Thus, the truncated approximant Φ_1^F , obtained by *minimizing* F_1 , reliably approaches ψ_1 .

DEMONSTRATION OF IDENTIFYING A "FLIPPED ROOT"

Parametrize the ground and 1^{st} excited wave functions of a hydrogen-like ion as

$$\psi_0(z_0; r) = a_0(z_0) e^{-z_0 r}, \quad \psi_1(z_1, g; r) = a_1(z_1, g) e^{-z_1 r/2} (1 - g Z r/2) \quad (2)$$

where Z is the nuclear charge, (z_0, z_1, g) are variational parameters and $a_0(z_0), a_1(z_1, g)$ are normalization constants. These functions are not orthonormal, unless $z_0 = 1, z_1 = 1, g = 1$, when they form eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian $H\psi_j(r) = -\psi_j''(r)/2 - \psi_j'(r)/r - Z\psi_j(r)/r$. In their 2×2 subspace create an orthonormal basis whose overlap matrix is δ_{ij} : $\{\Psi_0(r) = \psi_0(r), \Psi_1(r) = (\psi_1(r) - \psi_0(r)\langle\psi_0|\psi_1\rangle) / \sqrt{1 - \langle\psi_0|\psi_1\rangle^2}\}$. Let $\{\Phi^{1r}, \Phi^{2r}\}$ be the two normalized eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian matrix $\langle\Psi_i|H|\Psi_j\rangle = \int_0^\infty 4\pi r^2 \Psi_i(r) H\Psi_j(r) dr$, with their eigenvalues ("roots") depending on (z_0, z_1, g) .

Now, around $z_0 \approx 2$, a root crossing occurs for a wide range around $z_1 \approx 1$, and $g \approx 1$. Near and "before" the crossing the continuation of $\psi_0(z_0, r)$ is $\Phi^{1r}(r)$, and the continuation of $\psi_1(z_1, g; r)$ is $\Phi^{2r}(r)$, whereas "beyond" the crossing the lowest $\Phi^{1r}(r)$ is the continuation of $\psi_1(z_1, g; r)$ and the continuation of $\psi_0(z_0, r)$ is $\Phi^{2r}(r)$. The question is to decide, via F_1 , whether a given value of (z_0, z_1, g) , near the crossing, is "before" or "beyond" the crossing, in order to use the continuation, ε , of (always) $E[\psi_1(z_1, g; r)]$ in an optimization algorithm. (In the present demonstration by Newton-Raphson (NR), $\varepsilon' = \nabla_{(z_0, z_1, g)} \varepsilon = 0$ is solved by proceeding iteratively to a new point $\mathbf{p} + \delta\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{J}^{-1} \cdot \varepsilon'$ -or less if the method diverges-having started at some point $\mathbf{p}=(z_0, z_1, g)$, where \mathbf{J} is the Jacobian matrix - Hessian of ε .)

Thus, consider F_1 (i.e. $F_n, n=1$, in Eq.1) for both "roots", Φ^{1r}, Φ^{2r} , and use a fixed predetermined (deliberately not very accurate) ground state approximant φ_0 with $z_0 = 1-0.05$. ($F_1[\varphi_0; \Phi^{2r}(r)]$ is directly minimized at $z_1 = 1$, and $g = 1$, ($z_1 = 0.95 \approx 1$), to $F_1 \rightarrow E[\Phi^{2r}(r)] = E[\psi_1(1, 1; r)] = -0.125$.) Among the two "roots", *the continuation of the*

excited state, near the crossing, is the one with the lowest F_1 . Indeed, for $Z=1$, using (first trial traditionally:) always the “2nd root”, i.e. keeping ε to $E^{2r}=E[\Phi^{2r}(r)]$, [regardless of which n (n^{th} root) the lowest F_1 suggests] “root-flipping” shows up: Even by using half NR-step: $p=(2.7, 0.95, 0.8)$, $n=1$, $E^{2r}=1.09915$ is obtained, the sequence of p -values *does not converge*, whereas, by consulting F_1 the continuation of the excited state is recognized near the crossing and used (until finally, at convergence, only $n=2$, the 2nd root, is suggested by the *lowest* F_1) cf. case (i) of Table 2. Observe that at the beginning, “beyond” the crossing, the lowest F_1 dictates to use, for the next step, the (*lower* than E_1) value of $\varepsilon = E[\Phi^{1r}(r)]=-0.1423$ ($n=1$, the **lowest** wave function at that point).

TABLE 2. The lowest F_1 recognizes which n^{th} root approximates the excited state near a crossing

(i) E^{2r} fails, F_1 succeeds			(ii) E^{2r} succeeds accidentally- F_1 ignored			(iii) F_1 succeeds (same starting p)		
p	n	ε	p	n	E^{2r}	p	n	ε
(2.70, 0.95, 0.80)	1	-0.1423	(2.70, 1.20, 1.10)	1	0.9948	(2.70, 1.20, 1.10)	1	-0.1197
(2.63, 0.96, 0.91)	1	-0.1272	(1.94, 1.03, 0.98)	1	-0.1262
...	(1.59, 0.52, 0.72)	2	-0.0866	(1.77, 0.89, 1.08)	2 ⁽⁺⁾	-0.1213
(1.93, 0.99, 1.01)	1	-0.1251	(-3.06, -10.9, -12.3)	1	69.042
(1.32, 1.03, 0.95)	2 ⁽⁺⁾	-0.1249	(1.04, 0.96, 1.19)	2	-0.1249
...	(-0.01, -0.03, 0.02)	2	0.0214
(0.91, 1.00, 0.98)	2	-0.1250	(0.74, 0.99, 1.08)	2	-0.1250
(0.84, 1.00, 0.98)	2	-0.125	(0.52, 1.00, -0.43)	2	-0.125	(0.70, 1.00, 1.07)	2	-0.125

⁽⁺⁾Root recognized, lowest F_1 suggests: For the next step “take” $n=2$, the 2nd root

Similarly, using only the 2nd root (not dictated by the lowest F_1) and starting, again “beyond” the crossing ($n=1$) [cf. case (ii) in Table 2], despite the original irregularities due to root-flipping, the 2nd root finally happened to remain “before” the crossing ($n=2$), and converged; 0.3 of NR-step was used. Now, by consulting F_1 no irregularities occurred [cf. case (iii) in Table 2]. Note that finally, near the minimum of the 2nd root, where $E[\Psi_1(\mathbf{p}_1)] > E[\Psi_1(\mathbf{p}_1)]$ “before” the crossing, the convergence *should* use the 2nd root.

Note that the graphs (Eq.2) of all converged functions, above, are practically identical to the exact.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Financial support of this work by the General Secretariat for Research and Technology, Greece, (project Polynano-Kripis 447963) is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

1. E. Hylleraas and B. Undheim, *Z. Phys.* **65**, 759; (1930) J. K. L. McDonald, *Phys. Rev.* **43**, 830 (1933).
2. Z. Xiong and N. C. Bacalis, *Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* **53**, 283 (2005); Z. Xiong, M. Velgakis, and N. C. Bacalis, *Int. J. Q. Chem.*, **104**, 418 (2005).
3. N. C. Bacalis, “Utilizing the fact ...” in *Computational Methods in Science and Engineering-2007*, edited by T. E. Simos et al., AIP Conference Proceedings 963, American Institute of Physics, Melville, NY, 2007, vol. 2, part A, pp. 6-9; N. C. Bacalis, “Remarks on the Hylleraas-Undheim and MacDonald higher roots, and functionals having local minimum at the excited states” in *Computational Methods in Science and Engineering-2008*, edited by T. E. Simos et al., AIP Conference Proceedings 1148, American Institute of Physics, Melville, NY, 2009, Vol. 2, pp. 372-375; N. C. Bacalis, Z. Xiong and D. Karaoulanis, *J. Comput. Meth. Sci. Eng.*, **8**, 277 (2008).
4. Z. Xiong and N.C. Bacalis, *Chinese Physics B*, **19**, 023601 (2010); Z. Xiong, Z.-X. Wang and N. C. Bacalis, *Acta Phys. Sin.*, **63**, 053104 (2014); unpublished (*Int. J. Q. Chem.*)
5. N. C. Bacalis, unpublished (ICCMSE-2015).
6. H. Shull and P. -O. Löwdin, *Phys. Rev.* **110**, 1466 (1958)
7. P. -O. Löwdin, *Phys. Rev.*, **97**, 1509 (1955); P. -O. Löwdin, *Adv. Chem. Phys.*, **2**, 207 (1959);
8. R. Shepard, *Adv. Chem. Phys.*, **69**, 63 (1987); H. -J. Werner, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **69**, 1 (1987); H. -J. Werner, W. Meyer, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **73**, 342 (1980); M. Frisch, I. Ragazos, M. Robb, H. Schlegel, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **189**, 524 (1992);
9. L. Cheung, S. Elbert, K. Ruedenberg, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, **16**, 1069 (1979); K. Docken, J. Hinze, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **57**, 4928 (1972); H. -J. Werner, W. Meyer, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **74**, 5794 (1981); D. Yeager, D. Lynch, J. Nichols, P. Jørgensen, J. Olsen, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **86**, 2140 (1982); J. Olsen, P. Jørgensen, D. Yeager, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **76**, 527 (1982); J. Golab, D. Yeager, P. Jørgensen, *Chem. Phys.* **1985**, 93, 83.
10. C. L. Pekeris, *Phys. Rev.* **126**, 1470 (1962).