arXiv:1802.05185v1 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci] 14 Feb 2018

Performance of Tao-Mo semilocal density functional in projector-augmented-wave method

Subrata Jana,[1,*] Abhilash Patra,[1] and Prasanjit Samal[1,†]

[1] *School of Physical Sciences, National Institute of Science Education and Research, HBNI, Bhubaneswar 752050, India*

(Dated: March 15, 2022)

We assess the performance of Tao-Mo semilocal exchange correlation (TM) functional [J. Tao and Y. Mo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 073001 (2016)] using projector-augmented-wave method with the plane wave basis set in Vienna *ab initio* simulation package (VASP). The meta-GGA level semilocal functional TM is an all purpose exchange-correlation functional which performs accurately for the wide range of molecular and solid state properties. The exchange functional part of TM is designed from the density matrix expansion (DME) technique together with the slowly varying fourth order gradient expansion. The correlation functional of the corresponding exchange is based on Tao-Perdew-Staroverov-Scuseria (TPSS) functional. We assess the performance of TM for solid state lattice constants, bulk moduli, band gaps, cohesive energies and magnetic moments of solids. It has been established that in plane wave basis the TM functional performs accurately in predicting all the solid state properties in semilocal level.

I. INTRODUCTION

The calculations of the electronic structure of molecules and solids are done mostly within the framework of Kohn-Sham (KS) density functional theory[1,2]. The accuracy of density functional theory (DFT) depends upon the accuracy of the exchange-correlation (XC) functionals which contain all the many electron effects. In principle the exact form of XC functional is unknown. Therefore, one need to approximate it from different physical perspective. The accuracy of the XC functionals are classified through the Jacob's ladder[3], where each rung of the ladder adds an extra ingredients. The first three rungs of the Jacob's ladder are classified as local density approximation (LDA)[4], the generalized gradient approximations (GGAs)[5–16] and meta-generalized gradient approximations (meta-GGAs)[17–24]. The LDA, GGAs and meta-GGAs utilize density, gradient of density and Kohn-Sham kinetic energy density as its main ingredient, therefore all are semilocal in nature. The XC functionals based on the semilocal quantities are very attractive because of low computational cost and high accuracy. The semilocal functionals are very accurate in describing several thermochemical properties[25–34], bond lengths[29], equilibrium lattice constants[34–41], bulk modulus, cohesive energy[34–41] and solid state surface properties[35–41]. Several accurate semilocal density functionals have been developed for last couple of decades from different new perspective. The semilocal functionals are developed from exchange hole[24] or by satisfying exact constraints[10,23]. Functionals which are designed by satisfying exact constraints non-empirical in nature and very popular in quantum chemistry and solid state physics[10,23,24]. Beyond these classes of XC functionals highly empirical XC functionals[19] are also proposed by properly parameterize with a test set. Those functionals are very accurate in describing thermochemical properties[26] but not popular for solid state systems. Therefore, it is always interesting to test the robustness of a functional which is universal in nature i.e., useful both for quantum chemistry and solid state systems.

Recently, Tao-Mo (TM)[24] developed an accurate semilocal functional based on the density matrix expansion (DME). The slowly varying forth order gradient correction of exchange enhancement factor is introduced within DME by interpolating it with DME enhancement factor. The DME based enhancement factor is accurate for localized electron systems, whereas, slowly varying density correction is accurate for solid state systems. The correlation part TM functional has been derived from one electron self-interaction free Tao-Perdew-Staroverov-Scuseria (TPSS) functional[20]. The TM functional is very accurate in describing both the thermochemical[33] and solid state properties in semilocal level[37,38]. TM functional is extensively tested in all electron code but has not been benchmarked in plane wave basis set. Due to its higher degree of accuracy for solid state properties it is always interesting to test the TM functional using plane wave basis set. Present paper assess the performance of TM functional using projector-augmented-wave (PAW)[42,43] method with plane wave basis set in Vienna *ab initio* simulation package (VASP)[44–46]. For the benchmark calculation of TM functional we choose solid state lattice constants, bulk moduli, semiconductor band gaps, cohesive energies and magnetic moments of ferromagnetic materials. We compare the performance of TM functional against other popular semilocal functionals like local spin density approximation (LSDA)[4], Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE)[10] functional and its revised form for solid state system (PBEsol)[13], meta-GGA level TPSS[20], revTPSS[21] and recently proposed strongly constrained and appropriately normed (SCAN)[23] functional. It is shown that the performance of TM functional is very accurate in describing lattice constants, bulk moduli, cohesive energies and magnetic properties except band gap. In describing the band gap, SCAN meta-GGA performs in more satisfactory way. To put our comparison in a broader perspective we also in-

clude Heyd-Scuseria-Ernzerhof (HSE)[47–51] hybrid functional for studying magnetic properties.

Present paper is organized as follows. In the following we will discuss the details of the implementation of TM based semilocal functionals in VASP. Next we do the benchmark performance of the TM based functionals with other popular GGA and meta-GGA level semilocal functionals for lattice constants, bulk moduli, band gaps, cohesive energies and magnetic moments of ferromagnetic materials.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The PAW[42,43] method was first proposed by Blöchl[42] and later it is adopted by Kresse and Joubert[43]. The PAW potential reserves both the computational efficiency and accuracy of ultrasoft pseudo-potential (UPP)[52] and all electron (full-)potential. The accuracy of PAW is same as the full potential linearized augmented plane wave (plus local potential) implemented in other codes[53]. In PAW method, any semilocal operator (i.e.,kinetic energy operator or density operator) is presented by plane wave (PW) expansion for valance region. The core region is presented by projecting it on the radial grid at the atom center. Therefore, the core region is well presented in this method and its accuracy is same as the all electron (AE) calculation. After doing all these the additional part is subtracted from the additive augmentation of core and valence. The general implementation of all the meta-GGA functional in VASP is based on the method proposed by Sun et. al.[41]. In this method the KS kinetic energy density also divided in core-valance region. We implemented the TM semilocal functional by locally modifying the meta-GGA routine implemented in VASP code. The self-consistence exchange-correlation potential computed for meta-GGA in VASP is based on generalized KS (gKS) framework. In gKS, the exchange-correlation potential for meta-GGA is defined as,

$$v_{xc}\Psi_i = \Big[\frac{\partial(\rho\epsilon_{xc})}{\partial\rho} - \vec{\nabla}\frac{\partial(\rho\epsilon_{xc})}{\partial\vec{\nabla}\rho}\Big]\Psi_i - \frac{1}{2}\vec{\nabla}\Big(\frac{\partial(\rho\epsilon_{xc})}{\partial\tau}\Big)\vec{\nabla}\Psi_i - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial(\rho\epsilon_{xc})}{\partial\tau}\vec{\nabla}^2\Psi_i \ . \quad (1)$$

Therefore, in addition to the partial derivative of XC functional with respect to density and gradient of density, one need to perform the partial derivative with respect to KS kinetic energy density. Thus, for meta-GGA one need to calculate the partial derivative of XC functional with respect to density, gradient of density and KS kinetic energy density. In terms of enhancement factor the general formulation of the exchange functional in meta-GGA level is described as,

$$E_x = -\int d\mathbf{r}\ \rho(\mathbf{r})\epsilon_x^{unif}F_x^{meta-GGA}[\rho,\nabla\rho,\tau] \ . \quad (2)$$

In the present case of TM functional the enhancement factor becomes,

$$F_x^{meta-GGA}[\rho,\nabla\rho,\tau] = F_x^{TM} \ , \quad (3)$$

which have the following semilocal form,

$$F_x^{TM} = wF_x^{DME} + (1-w)F_x^{sc}, \quad (4)$$

where $F_x^{DME} = 1/f^2 + 7R/(9f^4)$ is the density matrix expansion based enhancement factor[24] (with $R = 1 + 595(2\lambda-1)^2p/54 - [\tau - (3\lambda^2 - \lambda + 1/2)(\tau - \tau^{unif} - |\nabla\rho|^2/(72\rho))]/\tau^{unif}$) and $F_x^{sc} = \Big[1 + 10\Big\{\Big(\frac{10}{81} + \frac{50p}{729}\Big)p + \frac{146}{2025}\tilde{q}^2 - \Big(\frac{73\tilde{q}}{405}\Big)\Big[\frac{3\tau^w}{5\tau}\Big](1 - \frac{\tau^w}{\tau})\Big\}\Big]^{\frac{1}{10}}$ is the slowly varying forth order gradient expansion to the TM semilocal functional[24]. In TM functional w is used as the weight factor between DME expansion and slowly varying density correction, which is the functional of meta-GGA ingredient $z = \tau_W/\tau$ (where τ_W is the von Weizsäcker kinetic energy density). For the details of the mathematical expression and parameter related to the TM functional readers are suggested to go through the refs[24,37]. It is noteworthy to mention that the discontinuity effect and convergence issue of the terms related to the z in TM functional is removed as it was suggested by Sun et. al.[41]. In meta-GGA subroutine of the VASP code we calculate analytically the terms related to the partial derivatives i.e., $\frac{\partial(\rho\epsilon_x)}{\partial\rho}$, $\frac{\partial(\rho\epsilon_x)}{\partial\vec{\nabla}\rho}$ and $\frac{\partial(\rho\epsilon_x)}{\partial\tau}$. This completes the implementation of exchange part of TM functional. The correlation of TM functional is based on the Tao-Perdew-Staroverov-Scuseria (TPSS)[20] correlation. TM modifies the correlation part to be used for slowly varying density correction. This leads to the two functional − TM-TPSS (which uses TM exchange plus TPSS correlation) and TM (which uses TM exchange plus modified TPSS correlation). Here we assess the performance of both TM-TPSS and TM for all our solid state calculations. The spin density scaling relation is used in the VASP implementation of TM functional. To test the accuracy of all the functionals under study we calculate mean (relative) error (ME/MRE), mean absolute (relative) error (MAE/MARE) and the standard deviation of the (relative) error (STDE/STDRE) which are defined as, ME $= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(Y_i - y_i)$, MAE $= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}|Y_i - y_i|$, STDE $= \Big[\sum_i^N(Y_i - y_i) - \frac{1}{N}\sum_i^N(Y_i - y_i)\Big]^2$, MRE $= \sum_i^N(Y_i - y_i)/y_i$, MARE $= \sum_i^N|Y_i - y_i|/|y_i|$ and STDRE $= \Big[\sum_i^N(Y_i/y_i) - \frac{1}{N}(Y_i/y_i)\Big]^2$, where Y_i and y_i are the calculated and experimental values respectively.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Lattice constants

We first perform the benchmark calculations for equilibrium lattice constant of TM-TPSS and TM against

TABLE I. Equilibrium lattice constant a_0 (in Å) of different solid structures. The mean error, mean absolute error, mean relative error, and mean absolute relative error are reported in the last row are determined with respect to the ZPAE uncorrected experimental values. All the experimental reference values are collected from ref.[37,51]. The structures we consider here are A1 = face-centered cubic, A2 = diamond, A3 = body-centered cubic, B3 = zinc blende, and B1 = rock salt.

Solids	LSDA	PBE	PBEsol	TPSS	revTPSS	SCAN	TM-TPSS	TM	Expt.
C (A2)	3.536	3.573	3.557	3.572	3.563	3.555	3.560	3.554	3.567
Si (A2)	5.400	5.467	5.433	5.450	5.436	5.425	5.423	5.411	5.430
Ge (A2)	5.648	5.785	5.704	5.754	5.710	5.687	5.691	5.672	5.652
SiC (B3)	4.332	4.379	4.359	4.365	4.357	4.352	4.351	4.344	4.358
BN (B3)	3.583	3.625	3.607	3.624	3.618	3.605	3.615	3.608	3.607
BP (B3)	4.490	4.546	4.521	4.545	4.531	4.521	4.522	4.510	4.538
BAs (B3)	4.742	4.817	4.778	4.810	4.787	4.779	4.775	4.763	4.777
BSb (B3)	5.198	5.280	5.234	5.270	5.242	5.257	5.227	5.212	n/a
AlP (B3)	5.433	5.504	5.470	5.489	5.480	5.478	5.463	5.450	5.460
AlAs (B3)	5.637	5.732	5.681	5.707	5.685	5.670	5.669	5.656	5.658
AlSb (B3)	6.120	6.232	6.168	6.208	6.180	6.173	6.161	6.143	6.136
$\beta-$GaN (B3)	4.503	4.588	4.547	4.581	4.569	4.524	4.559	4.549	4.531
GaP (B3)	5.425	5.533	5.474	5.523	5.499	5.457	5.482	5.464	5.448
GaAs (B3)	5.627	5.763	5.684	5.737	5.699	5.664	5.681	5.664	5.648
GaSb (B3)	6.067	6.226	6.130	6.190	6.144	6.117	6.126	6.102	6.096
InP (B3)	5.878	6.001	5.932	5.989	5.965	5.938	5.945	5.923	5.866
InAs (B3)	6.061	6.211	6.122	6.182	6.144	6.122	6.126	6.104	6.054
InSb (B3)	6.472	6.651	6.543	6.611	6.565	6.545	6.546	6.521	6.479
ZnS (B3)	5.403	5.440	5.355	5.401	5.358	5.370	5.388	5.364	5.409
ZnSe (B3)	5.570	5.734	5.634	5.681	5.625	5.652	5.658	5.633	5.668
ZnTe (B3)	5.995	6.178	6.064	6.115	6.048	6.077	6.082	6.056	6.089
CdS (B3)	5.758	5.926	5.824	5.933	5.926	5.856	5.889	5.857	5.818
CdSe (B3)	6.009	6.195	6.080	6.192	6.195	6.100	6.133	6.102	6.052
CdTe (B3)	6.405	6.610	6.291	6.604	6.610	6.521	6.532	6.497	6.480
MgO (B1)	4.145	4.242	4.206	4.224	4.222	4.184	4.209	4.202	4.207
MgS (B3)	5.580	5.684	5.642	5.681	5.673	5.634	5.643	5.629	5.202
MgSe (B1)	5.382	5.501	5.445	5.491	5.476	5.454	5.456	5.435	5.400
MgTe (B3)	6.365	6.506	6.439	6.500	6.478	6.452	6.444	6.422	6.420
CaS (B1)	5.570	5.710	5.632	5.698	5.694	5.683	5.681	5.657	5.689
CaSe (B1)	5.798	5.955	5.869	5.947	5.932	5.921	5.919	5.894	5.916
CaTe (B1)	6.215	6.389	6.291	6.386	6.366	6.375	6.350	6.317	6.348
SrS (B1)	5.910	6.056	5.973	6.047	6.040	6.031	6.035	6.007	5.990
SrSe (B1)	6.129	6.297	6.203	6.286	6.270	6.264	6.264	6.234	6.234
SrTe (B1)	6.531	6.714	6.609	6.708	6.685	6.693	6.677	6.641	6.640
BaS (B1)	6.289	6.433	6.362	6.448	6.440	6.441	6.423	6.390	6.389
BaSe (B1)	6.510	6.681	6.577	6.670	6.657	6.659	6.659	6.622	6.595
BaTe (B1)	6.890	7.080	6.964	7.075	7.054	7.071	7.056	7.012	7.007
Ag (A1)	4.001	4.148	4.052	4.092	4.059	4.084	4.082	4.067	4.069
Al (A1)	3.987	4.043	4.081	4.014	4.009	4.009	3.984	3.982	4.032
Cu (A1)	3.520	3.634	3.566	3.568	3.538	3.555	3.528	3.528	3.603
Pd (A1)	3.844	3.949	3.878	3.912	3.884	3.906	3.908	3.894	3.881
K (A3)	5.029	5.300	5.222	5.394	5.349	5.262	5.186	5.167	5.225
Li (A3)	3.368	3.441	3.444	3.458	3.452	3.474	3.400	3.402	3.477
LiCl (B1)	4.977	5.148	5.071	5.123	5.104	5.097	5.071	5.047	5.106
LiF (B1)	3.940	4.059	4.006	4.022	4.005	3.975	3.974	3.969	4.010
NaCl (B1)	5.432	5.648	5.558	5.648	5.616	5.526	5.415	5.496	5.595
NaF (B1)	4.437	4.621	4.548	4.599	4.569	4.475	4.498	4.492	4.609
ME(Å)	-0.055	0.076	0.002	0.061	0.039	0.020	0.019	0.000	–
MAE(Å)	0.072	**0.078**	0.041	0.065	0.053	0.041	0.045	**0.038**	–
STDE(Å)	0.082	0.076	0.079	0.079	0.081	0.074	0.077	0.075	–
MRE(%)	-1.045	1.361	0.027	1.059	0.657	0.310	0.274	-0.065	–
MARE(%)	1.375	1.406	0.738	1.157	0.961	0.753	0.854	0.753	–
STDRE(%)	1.573	1.407	1.469	1.483	1.537	1.423	1.524	1.478	–

TABLE II. Bulk moduli, B_0 (GPa) of 20 solids are shown for different functionals. The LSDA, PBE, PBEsol, TPSS, revTPSS results for Ag, Al, C, GaAs, Ge, Li, LiCl, LiF, NaF, Pd, Rh are collected from ref.[41]. For rest of the solids and functionals we perform self consistence calculations followed by the fitting of E vs V curve using Murnaghan equation of states[57] sing VASPKIT[54] post-processing code. The structures consider here are the same as it is given in Table-I. All the experimental values are collected from ref.[37,49].

Solids	LSDA	PBE	PBEsol	TPSS	revTPSS	SCAN	TM-TPSS	TM	Expt.
Ag	138.5	90.9	118.9	110.0	120.5	111.5	111.3	115.1	109.0
Al	83.7	77.3	81.9	85.6	85.7	85.7	91.7	93.2	79.4
AlAs	74.5	67.4	71.6	70.3	72.2	75.5	75.7	76.4	82.0
AlP	89.0	82.0	85.9	84.9	86.1	90.7	89.4	90.7	86.0
BP	168.0	156.2	162.5	155.7	158.3	166.5	164.4	165.8	173.0
C	465.8	433.2	450.2	430.3	439.5	461.4	447.9	455.2	443.0
Cu	185.4	139.4	165.4	158.6	172.4	161.7	170.1	173.2	142.0
GaAs	75.1	60.5	69.9	64.8	66.8	73.3	71.7	74.1	75.6
GaN	209.8	183.5	197.1	188.9	191.2	210.2	197.3	200.5	190.0
GaP	90.7	78.0	85.3	79.6	82.5	90.7	87.5	90.1	88.0
Ge	70.5	59.4	65.8	60.2	65.0	71.4	58.4	58.4	75.8
K	4.6	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.7
Li	15.1	13.8	13.7	13.3	13.4	13.2	14.6	14.6	13.0
LiCl	41.5	31.7	35.4	33.4	34.0	35.8	36.2	36.7	35.4
LiF	86.7	66.9	72.2	66.2	68.9	81.2	79.6	80.2	69.8
NaF	61.5	45.2	48.8	42.9	44.0	61.9	59.5	59.9	51.4
Pd	226.3	169.4	205.2	195.4	209.7	194.8	191.3	199.5	195.0
Rh	315.6	256.4	295.0	281.9	296.1	290.9	283.4	291.2	269.0
Si	95.4	87.9	92.7	91.3	93.0	98.7	96.3	98.4	99.2
SiC	221.5	205.1	213.7	217.7	221.3	225.7	217.8	221.1	225.0
ME (GPa)	10.695	-9.870	1.335	-3.545	0.935	0.485	2.145	4.650	–
MAE (GPa)	**13.255**	9.950	7.615	7.285	8.235	7.785	**7.195**	8.290	–
STDE (GPa)	16.432	7.385	10.384	8.783	11.897	11.644	9.795	10.653	–
MRE(%)	9.752	-8.521	-0.331	-4.617	-1.384	-1.797	2.748	4.435	–
MARE(%)	12.260	9.136	6.380	7.389	7.518	7.105	7.684	8.282	–
STDRE(%)	12.115	7.225	7.746	8.287	9.425	9.048	9.945	9.986	–

TABLE III. Band gaps using different functionals at their equilibrium lattice constant are shown here. The mean absolute error is mentioned in the last row. All the experimental references are collected from ref.[51]. The structures consider here are the same as it is given in Table-I.

Solids	LSDA	PBE	PBEsol	TPSS	revTPSS	SCAN	TM-TPSS	TM	Expt.
C	4.17	4.13	4.03	4.17	4.04	4.56	4.15	4.09	5.48
Si	0.46	0.64	0.48	0.67	0.57	0.85	0.65	0.56	1.17
Ge	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.23	0.29	0.74
SiC	1.38	1.47	1.34	1.42	1.30	1.82	1.47	1.38	2.42
BN	4.48	4.52	4.36	4.52	4.38	5.04	4.59	4.49	6.22
BP	1.17	1.28	1.14	1.29	1.15	1.55	1.28	1.19	2.4
BAs	1.14	1.22	1.10	1.21	1.10	1.44	1.19	1.13	1.46
BSb	0.70	0.75	0.65	0.65	0.54	0.88	0.61	0.57	n/a
AlP	1.47	1.68	1.50	1.73	1.64	1.95	1.75	1.63	2.51
AlAs	1.36	1.54	1.38	1.59	1.51	1.79	1.59	1.49	2.23
AlSb	1.11	1.24	1.13	1.32	1.23	1.39	1.25	1.16	1.68
$\beta-$GaN	1.82	1.41	1.54	1.31	1.28	2.05	1.47	1.48	3.30
GaP	1.45	1.51	1.52	1.72	1.60	1.89	1.46	1.56	2.35
GaAs	0.50	0.15	0.39	0.38	0.57	0.80	0.80	0.84	1.52
GaSb	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.12	0.39	0.46	0.73
InP	0.52	0.37	0.48	0.54	0.59	0.87	0.71	0.73	1.42
InAs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41
InSb	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.23
ZnS	1.89	2.02	2.09	2.29	2.33	2.71	2.32	2.31	3.66
ZnSe	1.28	1.15	1.24	1.45	1.51	1.80	1.60	1.59	2.70
ZnTe	1.31	1.07	1.24	1.42	1.58	1.62	1.63	1.64	2.38
CdS	0.97	1.04	1.01	1.23	1.18	1.47	1.23	1.21	2.55
CdSe	0.43	0.49	0.48	0.71	0.70	0.94	0.81	0.79	1.90
CdTe	0.66	0.59	0.93	0.82	0.82	0.97	1.01	1.00	1.92
MgO	5.13	4.53	4.68	4.77	4.72	5.77	4.96	4.88	7.22
MgS	3.14	3.34	3.35	3.63	3.64	4.19	3.80	3.70	5.4
MgSe	1.80	1.84	1.85	2.14	2.16	2.51	2.23	2.15	2.47
MgTe	2.41	2.32	2.35	2.66	2.72	3.03	2.89	2.74	3.6
CaS	2.00	2.40	2.18	2.47	2.46	2.84	2.54	2.43	n/a
CaSe	1.73	2.10	1.90	2.18	2.18	2.55	2.26	2.15	n/a
CaTe	1.33	1.57	1.37	1.64	1.63	2.14	1.71	1.80	n/a
SrS	2.14	2.52	2.30	2.59	2.54	2.92	2.57	2.47	n/a
SrSe	1.91	2.25	2.05	2.32	2.29	2.67	2.33	2.23	n/a
SrTe	1.43	2.09	2.12	2.31	2.38	2.74	2.51	2.44	n/a
BaS	1.14	2.17	1.98	2.26	2.19	2.52	2.16	2.08	3.88
BaSe	1.67	1.97	1.79	2.05	2.01	2.33	2.01	1.92	3.58
BaTe	1.30	1.61	1.41	1.67	1.63	1.94	1.66	1.56	3.08
MAE (eV)	1.158	1.154	**1.173**	1.033	1.055	**0.736**	0.949	0.996	–

the LSDA, PBE, PBEsol, TPSS, revTPSS and SCAN functional. For the benchmark test set we consider 47 crystalline structures which include (i) semiconductor diamond structures C, Si and Ge, (ii) zinc blende structures Sic, BN, BP, BAs, BSb, AlP, AlAs, AlSb, $\beta-$GaN, GaP, GaAs, GaSb, InP, InAs, InSb, ZnS, ZnSe, ZnTe, CdS, CdSe, CdTe, MgS, MgTe, (iii) ionic structures MgO, MgSe, CaS, CaSe, CaTe, SrS, SrSe, SrTe, BaS, BaSe, BaTe, LiCl, LiF, NaCl, LiF, NaCl, NaF, and (iv) metal structures Li, K, Al, Cu, Pd, Ag. All the calculations are performed using 11×11×11 Monkhorst-Pack[55] **k** meshes with tetrahedron method[56]. The self-consistence calulation of meta-GGAs (TPSS, revTPSS, SCAN, TM-TPSS and TM) are performed starting from the converged wavefunction obtained in PBE calculations.

In Table-I, we list the benchmark calculations of TM-TPSS and TM with other semilocal functionals. There we also calculate the mean (relative) error (ME/MRE), mean absolute (relative) error (MAE/MARE) and the standard deviation of the (relative) error (STDE/STDRE). We obtain the maximum MAE using PBE and local density approximate (LSDA) functional. The MAE of PBE and LSDA are obtained to be 0.078 Å and 0.072 Å respectively. LSDA has the tendency to underestimate the lattice constant while PBE overestimates the lattice constant. The reduction in MAE is observed using meta-GGA TPSS and revTPSS functionals. The TPSS functional performs slightly better than PBE while the revised version of TPSS (revTPSS) reduces the MAE significantly. Recently proposed SCAN meta-GGA by Sun et. al.[23] gives the same MAE as obtain from the PBEsol GGA functional. Interestingly, the lowest MAE is obtained from TM functional (with MAE 0.038 Å). The unmodified

TABLE IV. Cohesive energies of 9 solids in eV/atom using different functionals at static-lattice constant are shown. The experimental reference values are taken from ref.[41]. The structures consider here are the same as it is given in Table-I.

Solids	LSDA	PBE	PBEsol	TPSS	revTPSS	SCAN	TM-TPSS	TM	Expt.
Li	1.786	1.583	1.653	1.738	1.625	1.545	1.664	1.662	1.658
C	8.867	7.714	8.215	7.420	7.504	7.899	7.624	7.845	7.545
SiC	7.305	6.356	6.779	6.298	6.380	6.689	6.478	6.652	6.478
Si	5.194	4.464	4.810	4.444	4.531	4.811	4.628	4.788	4.685
LiF	4.867	4.411	4.515	4.469	4.389	4.784	4.565	4.554	4.457
LiCl	3.739	3.332	3.467	6.442	3.430	3.632	3.551	3.536	3.586
NaF	4.396	3.962	4.061	4.272	3.944	4.394	4.163	4.147	3.970
NaCl	3.438	3.085	3.197	6.389	3.199	3.438	3.349	3.326	3.337
MgO	5.982	5.152	5.441	5.271	5.295	5.654	5.439	5.496	5.203
ME(eV/atom)	0.450	-0.163	0.068	-0.080	-0.139	0.147	-0.007	0.053	–
MAE(eV/atom)	**0.450**	0.201	0.153	0.152	0.139	0.171	**0.041**	0.053	–
STDE(eV/atom)	0.394	0.153	0.258	0.162	0.077	0.137	0.067	0.109	–
MRE(%)	8.593	-4.196	0.438	-0.952	-3.205	2.404	-0.136	0.769	–
MARE(%)	8.593	4.696	2.670	3.496	3.205	3.905	0.837	0.769	–
STDRE(%)	4.229	2.976	3.935	3.960	1.594	3.782	1.331	1.478	–

TABLE V. Comparison between the calculated magnetic moments (M_s/atom) and the experimental total magnetic moments of Fe, Co and Ni using different functionals. Values are in μB. The Fe (bcc) and Ni (fcc) values of LSDA, PBE, PBEsol, TPSS and revTPSS are taken from ref.[41].

Solids	Magnetic Ordering		LSDA	PBE	PBEsol	TPSS	revTPSS	SCAN	TM-TPSS	TM	HSE06	Expt.
Fe (bcc)	FM	a_0	2.747	2.829	2.782	2.803	2.794	2.844	2.811	2.803	2.903	2.853 (2.861)[a]
		M_s	1.97	2.18	2.11	2.19	2.20	2.64	2.25	2.22	2.896	2.20[a]
Co (fcc)	FM	a_0	3.420	3.514	3.460	3.479	3.468	3.479	3.481	3.469	3.547	3.537−3.558[b]
		M_s	1.49	1.61	1.57	1.61	1.62	1.77	1.64	1.60	1.852	1.71[c]
Ni (fcc)	FM	a_0	3.428	3.520	3.463	3.481	3.465	3.456	3.468	3.460	3.504	3.508 (3.516)[a]
		M_s	0.56	0.62	0.60	0.63	0.65	0.66	0.61	0.60	0.839	0.61[a]

[a] ref.[41]
[b] ref.[60]
[c] ref.[61]

TPSS correction coupled with TM exchange produce the equivalent MAE as obtain from PBEsol and SCAN. It is noteworthy to mention that the experimental lattice constants we consider hare not corrected for zero point anharmonic expansion (ZPAE) and all the experimental lattice constant are taken from ref.[37,51]. The results we obtain here using the TM-TPSS and TM can be compared to the all electron calculation performed using Gaussian09[58] which is given in ref.[37]. In ref.[37] the lowest mean absolute error is also reported using TM.

B. Bulk moduli

The bulk modulus is defined as the change in the volume of the crystalline structures upon acting the pressure. In terms of total energy of the cell E, the bulk modulus is expressed as $K = V\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial V^2}$. In density functional theory the bulk modulus is calculated at the equilibrium lattice constant a_0 by scanning over the range of lattice constant (or volume). Several equation of states (EOS)[57] are available to fit the energy versus volume curve to obtain the bulk modulus. In our present case we used the post-processing code VASPKIT[54] to fit and obtain the bulk modulus of all the crystalline solids we compared here. The E vs V output from VASP is used as an input of VASPKIT. The VASPKIT is very well established post-processing code which is used to obtain several post-processing calculations[54]. In VASPKIT, Murnaghan equation of states[57] is used for the fitting. The test set we use here and the performance of all the corresponding functionals are listed in Table-II. For few selected solids we collect the values of LSDA, PBE, PBEsol, TPSS, revTPSS from ref.[41]. For all other functionals and solids the calculation is performed using the same **k** points meshes as mentioned in subsection-A.

From the results reported in Table-II it is indicative that the performance of TM-TPSS is best compared to all other functionals. The MAE of TM-TPSS even better than SCAN functionals with MAE 7.195 GPa compared to MAE 7.785 GaP obtain from SCAN. The performance of SCAN, PBEsol and TPSS almost equivalent. It is also indicative that TM-TPSS performs better than TM functional though the performance of TM is better than TM-TPSS in predicting lattice constant. The maximum MAE is obtained from LSDA funcional. The

performance of PBE is better than LSDA. The results we obtain using the TM functional are also very close to that obtain using G09 all electron calculation reported by Mo et. al[37].

C. Band gaps

The band gap calculation using semilocal functional is fraught with difficulties due to the absence of inherent non-locality and many electron self-interaction (MESI)[27]. The hybrid functional proposed using semilocal exchange hole are very popular in predicting the band gap for semiconductor materials accurately[47–51]. It has been observed that the meta-GGA functional implemented in generalized KS formalism give more realistic band gap than GGA functionals[59]. Therefore, the improvement in band gap is observed using meta-GGA type semilocal functionals compared to LSDA and GGA functionals. Here, we assess the performance of TM-TPSS and TM for 37 semiconductors at their equilibrium lattice constant (reported in Table-I) of each functionals.

From Table-III, it is evident that all the density functionals underestimate the band gap of all semiconductor which is obvious due to the absence of non-locality and MESI. Interestingly, using SCAN meta-GGA we obtain more realistic band gap within all semilocal functionals. TPSS, revTPSS, TM-TPSS and TM perform equivalently in predicting band gaps. It is indicative from the obtained results of the SCAN, TM-TPSS and TM that the SCAN functional outperformed the TM based functionals almost in every cases. Interestingly, for Ge, InAs and InSb which are the difficult cases within semilocal formalism, SCAN, TM-TPSS and TM perform extremely well and predict non-zero band gap except only one for InAs. For Ge and InSb TM functional have non-zero band gap, whereas, for Ge both SCAN and TM based functionals predict non-zero values. Also, in all these cases the TM functional performs better than SCAN functional. This is actually a most attractive feature of TM based functional than other semilocal functionals.

D. Cohesive energies

Cohesive energy is equivalent to the molecular atomization in the case of crystalline solids. It is defined as the energy difference of the solid from its neutral from as an atom. Finally the cohesive energy (in eV) per atom is obtain by dividing the energy difference of the atoms in the unit cell. Here, we consider a set of 9 crystalline solids to perform the benchmark calculations of all the functionals. Among all the functionals under consideration TM-TPSS is accurate with MAE of 0.041 eV/atom. In this case TM-TPSS is more accurate than TM functional. From Table-IV, we observed that the performance of TM-TPSS and TM are accurate compared to all other GGA and meta-GGA based functionals with MAE 0.041 eV/atom and 0.053 eV/atom respectively. It is also noteworthy that TM has tendency to overestimate the cohesive energy for all the crystalline solids considered here, whereas, TM-TPSS overestimates the cohesive energies for few cases and underestimate for few cases. Overall, TM-TPSS performs accurately in predicting cohesive energy of all the solids.

E. Magnetic properties

Studying strongly correlated systems within semilocal density functional is quite difficult because of the different levels of interaction of d and f blocks. In Table-V we calculate the magnetic moments and lattice constant of ferromagnetic Fe, Ni and Co. Here the results of all the semilocal functionals are also compared with the range separated hybrid functional HSE06. All magnetic moments are calculated by optimizing the structure with the corresponding semilocal functionals.

The results presented in Table-V show that for Fe all the semilocal functional predicts the lattice constant quite appropriately. In the case of magnetic moment, all the functionals are accurate except LSDA and SCAN functional. For LSDA the underestimation of magnetic moment is observed. While SCAN overestimates the magnetic moment. In this case, both TM-TPSS and TM predict the magnetic moment accurately . In the case of Co, PBE is better than all other semilocal functional in predicting the lattice constant. LSDA underestimate magnetic moment of Co, while SCAN is close to the experimental values. All other semilocal functional perform equivalently in predicting magnetic moment. In case of Ni, both the lattice constant and magnetic moment are obtained accurately within all the semilocal functionals. Now we come to the discussion of range separated hybrid HSE06 in predicting all properties. HSE06 predicts accurately various properties but computationally very expensive. In this case, HSE06 accurately predict lattice constant for all the solids but overestimate the magnetic moments due to the inclusion of too much HF exchange. This drawback has been discussed by Paier et. al.[49].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We assess the performance of TM functional in projector-augmented-wave method with plane wave basis set for solid state band gaps, bulk moduli, cohesive energies and magnetic properties. It has been shown that the performance of TM-TPSS and TM are quite accurate within the popular semilocal functionals in predicting all the properties except semiconductor band gaps. In that case SCAN meta-GGA performs better than TM. The TM-TPSS functional is accurate for bulk moduli and cohesive energies, whereas, TM is accurate in predicting lattice constants. For the band gap the performance of TM-TPSS is second best after SCAN. In particular,

TM-TPSS and TM predict non-zero band gap for several semiconductor for which LSDA, PBE, PBEsol, TPSS and revTPSS predict metallic. Lastly we conclude that the TM functional can be used with confidence using plane wave basis in predicting all the solid state properties accurately over the GGA and meta-GGA functionals.

* subrata.jana@niser.ac.in
† psamal@niser.ac.in

[1] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A1133 (1965).
[2] Density Functional Theory: An Advanced Course, E. Engel and R. M. Dreizler, Springer (2011).
[3] J. P. Perdew and K. Schmidt, AIP Conference Proceedings **577**, 1 (2001).
[4] J. P. Perdew and A. Zunger. Phys. Rev. B, **23** 5048, (1981).
[5] J. P. Perdew and Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. B **33**, 8800 (1986).
[6] A. D. Becke, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 3098 (1988).
[7] C. Lee, W. Yang, and R. G. Parr, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 785 (1988).
[8] J. P. Perdew, J. A. Chevary, S. H. Vosko, K. A. Jackson, M. R. Pederson, D. J. Singh, and C. Fiolhais, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 6671 (1992).
[9] A. D. Becke, J. Chem. Phys. **104**, 1040 (1996).
[10] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3865 (1996).
[11] R. Armiento and A. E. Mattsson, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 085108 (2005).
[12] Z. Wu and R. E. Cohen, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 235116 (2006).
[13] J. P. Perdew, A. Ruzsinszky, G. I. Csonka, O. A. Vydrov, G. E. Scuseria, L. A. Constantin, X. Zhou, and K. Burke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 136406 (2008).
[14] L. A. Constantin, J. P. Perdew, and J. M. Pitarke, Phys. Rev. B 79, 075126 (2009).
[15] E. Fabiano, L. A. Constantin, and F. Della Sala, Phys. Rev. B 82, 113104 (2010).
[16] E. Fabiano, L. A. Constantin, and F. Della Sala, J. Chem. Theory Comput., 7 (11), pp 35483559 (2011).
[17] A. D. Becke and M. R. Roussel, Phys. Rev. A **39**, 3761 (1989).
[18] T. V. Voorhis and G. E. Scuseria, J. Chem. Phys. **109**, 400 (1998).
[19] Y. Zhao and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **125**, 194101 (2006).
[20] J. Tao, J. P. Perdew, V. N. Staroverov, and G. E. Scuseria, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 146401 (2003).
[21] J. P. Perdew, A. Ruzsinszky, G. I. Csonka, L. A. Constantin, and J. Sun, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 026403 (2009).
[22] L. A. Constantin, E. Fabiano, and F. Della Sala, J. Chem. Theory Comput., 9 (5), pp 22562263 (2013).
[23] J. Sun, A. Ruzsinszky, and J. P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 036402 (2015).
[24] J. Tao and Y. Mo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 073001 (2016).
[25] C. J. Cramer and D. G. Truhlar, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **11**, 10757 (2009).
[26] R. Peverati and D.G. Truhlar, Phys. Phil.Trans. R. Soc. A **372**, 20120476 (2011).
[27] A. J. Cohen, P. Mori-Sanchez, and W. Yang, Chem.Rev. **112**, 289 (2012).
[28] A. D. Becke, J. Chem. Phys. **140**, 18A301 (2014).
[29] V. N. Staroverov, G. E. Scuseria, J. Tao, and J. P. Perdew, J. Chem. Phys. **119**, 12129 (2003); 121, 11507(E) (2004).
[30] P. Hao, J. Sun, B. Xiao, A. Ruzsinszky, G. I. Csonka, J. Tao, S. Glindmeyer, and J. P. Perdew, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **9**, 355 (2013).
[31] L. Goerigk and S. Grimme, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **6**, 107 (2010).
[32] L. Goerigk and S. Grimme, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **7**, 291 (2011).
[33] Y. Mo, G. Tian and J. Tao, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys., .**19**, 21707-21713 (2017)
[34] J. Paier, R. Hirschl, M. Marsman, G. Kresse, J. Chem. Phys. **122**, 234102 (2005).
[35] P. Haas, F. Tran, and P. Blaha, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 085104 (2009).
[36] F. Tran, J. Stelzl, and P. Blaha, J. Chem. Phys. **144**, 204120 (2016).
[37] Y. Mo, G. Tian, R. Car, V. N. Staroverov, G. E. Scuseria, and J. Tao, Phys. Rev. B 95, 035118 (2017).
[38] Y. Mo, G. Tian and J. Tao, Chem. Phys. Lett. **628**, 38−42 (2017).
[39] A. E. Mattsson, R. Armiento, J. Paier, G. Kresse, J. M. Wills, and T. R. Mattsson, J. Chem. Phys. **128**, 084714 (2008).
[40] J. Sun, M. Marsman, A. Ruzsinszky, G. Kresse, and J. P. Perdew Phys. Rev. B **83**, 121410(R).
[41] J. Sun, M. Marsman, G. I. Csonka, A. Ruzsinszky, P. Hao, Y. S. Kim, G. Kresse, and J. P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 035117 (2011).
[42] P. E. Blöchl, Phys. Rev. B, 50:17953, (1994).
[43] G. Kresse and D. Joubert, Phys. Rev. 59 , 1758 (1999).
[44] G. Kresse and J. Hafner, Phys. Rev. B 47 , 558 (1993); ibid. 49 , 14 251 (1994).
[45] G. Kresse and J. FurthmAller, Comput. Mat. Sci. 6 , 15 (1996).
[46] G. Kresse and J. FurthmAller, Phys. Rev. B 54 , 11 169 (1996).
[47] J. Heyd, G. E. Scuseria, and M. Ernzerhof, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 8207 (2003).
[48] M. Marsman, J. Paier, A. Stroppa, G. Kresse Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **20 (6)**, 064201 (2008).
[49] J. Paiera, M. Marsman, K. Hummer, and G. Kresse J. Chem. Phys. **124**, 154709 (2006).
[50] L. Schimkaa, J. Harl, and G. Kresse J. Chem. Phys. **134**, 024116 (2011).
[51] J. Heyd, J. E. Peralta, G. E. Scuseria and R. L. Martin, J. Chem. Phys. **123**, 174101 (2005).
[52] G. Kresse and J. Hafner, J. Phys.: Condens. Matt. **6**, 8245 (1994).
[53] P. Blaha, K. Schwarz, G. K. H. Madsen, D. Kvasnicka, and J. Luitz, WIEN2K, an augmented plane wave + local orbitals program for calculating crystal properties, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, 2001, ISBN 3-9501031-1-2.
[54] http://vaspkit.sourceforge.net/ and V. Wang, W. Xiao, D.M. Ma1, R.J. Liu, and C. M. Yang J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 043708 (2014).
[55] H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 5188 (1976).

[56] Peter E. Blöchl, O. Jepsen, and O. K. Andersen Phys. Rev. B **49**, 16223 (1994).
[57] F. D. Murnaghan, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **30**, 244 (1944).
[58] Gaussian 09, Revision A.02, M. J. Frisch et. al. Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2016.
[59] Zeng-hui Yang, H. Peng, J. Sun, and J. P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 205205 (2016).
[60] E A Owen and D Madoc Jones, Proceedings of the Physical Society. Section B, **67**, 6 (1954).
[61] S. Shallcross, A. E. Kissavos, V. Meded and A. V. Ruban, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 104437 (2005).