

# No need for a grid: Adaptive fully-flexible gaussians for the time-dependent Schrödinger equation

Simen Kvaal\* and Thomas Bondo Pedersen

*Centre for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, Drammensveien 78, N-0271 Oslo, Norway and  
Hylleraas Centre for Quantum Molecular Sciences, Department of Chemistry,  
University of Oslo, P.O. Box 1033 Blindern, N-0315 Oslo, Norway*

Caroline Lasser

*Centre for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, Drammensveien 78, N-0271 Oslo, Norway and  
Zentrum Mathematik, Technische Universität München, München, Germany*

Ludwik Adamowicz

*Centre for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, Drammensveien 78, N-0271 Oslo, Norway and  
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721, USA*

(Dated: July 29, 2022)

Linear combinations of complex gaussian functions, where the nonlinear parameters are allowed to vary, are shown to be an extremely flexible representation for the solution of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation in one spatial dimension. Propagation of such wavefunctions using the Dirac–Frenkel variational principle is notoriously hard, and we present instead a scheme based on the method of vertical lines, or Rothe’s method. We apply the method to a simple test system mimicking an atom subject to an extreme laser pulse, producing complicated ionization dynamics. The scheme is shown to perform very well on this model. Since the propagation method can be formulated entirely in terms of gaussian integrals and expectation values, we eliminate the need for large grids using only a handful of gaussian functions but with the same accuracy. This paves the way for accurate and affordable solutions of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation for multi-atom molecules beyond the Born–Oppenheimer approximation.

## INTRODUCTION

When atoms and molecules are subject to ultrashort and intense laser pulses, their wavefunctions become highly complicated and dynamical objects [1]. In particular, the Born–Oppenheimer approximation may no longer be appropriate, and ionization and Coulomb explosion mandates both high spatial resolutions and large computational domains when solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (TDSE) numerically. For even the most modestly sized atoms, it is simply impossible to achieve experiment-level accuracy with a grid or an otherwise fixed basis due to the curse of dimensionality. Therefore, it is essential to have a compact and flexible wavefunction representation that can be propagated efficiently.

In this Letter, we demonstrate that linear combinations of gaussians (LCGs) form an extremely flexible approximation set. Notably, the gaussians are complex, and the nonlinear parameters of each gaussian are variables. We consider a 1D model problem mimicking an atom subject to an extreme laser pulse, and using a novel time-propagation scheme based on nonlinear least-squares optimization, we show that a compact LCG can reproduce the essentially exact solution of the TDSE for our model problem. In particular, the ionization tails of the wavefunction are very well captured at every stage of the dynamics, using only a handful of gaussians. For each time step, on average, the most time consuming part is one

single linear solve of the same dimension as the number of wavefunction parameters. Considering that our method has a local error of third order in the time step, our method is therefore quite efficient.

Perhaps ironically, the flexibility of the LCG wavefunctions make them very hard to propagate using the standard Dirac–Frenkel variational principle [2], leading to ill-conditioned variational equations [3, 4]. The propagation scheme described in this Letter is based on the *method of vertical lines*, or Rothe’s method [5, 6]. It is a variational approach which in a natural manner allows for adaptivity in the sense that gaussian functions may be added whenever the error becomes too large. Moreover, the method can be entirely formulated in terms of matrix elements of certain operators in the gaussian basis and their derivatives with respect to parameters, and our method thus *completely eliminates* the need for a grid, while allowing the wavefunction to freely roam space with in principle infinite level of detail.

The compression levels achieved with LCG wavefunctions for the 1D case can be even more pronounced for multi-particle systems. Indeed, multidimensional explicitly correlated gaussians are routinely optimized to yield highly accurate eigenstates of small molecules without the Born–Oppenheimer approximation [7]. Analytical formulas for matrix elements of gaussians can also be obtained [8]. Thus, the methodology presented in this Letter paves the way for grid-free yet highly accurate solutions of the TDSE for realistic systems, and even a

modest desktop computer could be able to produce grid-free and full-dimensional accurate simulations of, say, the hydrogen and helium atoms.

### 1D GAUSSIANS AND MODEL SYSTEM

A single complex gaussian in 1D is determined by four real parameters  $(q, p, a, b)$  as

$$g(x; q, p, a, b) = \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2}(a^2 + ib)(x - q)^2 + ip(x - q) \right], \quad (1)$$

and by forming linear combinations of  $N$  independent such functions, we obtain the LCG( $N$ ) ansatz. Importantly, both the linear expansion coefficients *and* the non-linear parameters of each function are free variables. In Eq. (1), the exponent is a general second-order polynomial with complex coefficients (such that  $g$  is square-integrable), a functional form invariant under Fourier transformation. As is well-known, the family of gaussian functions are complete in more than one sense [9, 10]. Therefore, choosing even a modest  $N$  and allowing all the parameters to be free should form an inordinately flexible wavefunction ansatz. In  $d$  spatial dimensions, the number of free parameters increase:  $q$  and  $p$  become  $d$ -vectors, while  $a$  and  $b$  become symmetric matrices ( $a$  can be chosen upper triangular), producing enormously flexible individual gaussians.

We will apply the LCG( $N$ ) ansatz to the dynamics of the TDSE  $i\dot{\psi}(t) - \hat{H}(t)\psi(t) = 0$  for an elementary model Hamiltonian of the form

$$\hat{H}(t) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x) + x\mathcal{E}(t), \quad (2)$$

where  $V(x) = -(1/2)/\sqrt{x^2 + 1/4}$  mimics the nuclear potential of a hydrogen atom, with a ground-state energy conveniently located at  $E_0 = -1/2$ , and where  $\mathcal{E}(t)$  is a time-varying electric field nonzero only in the region  $t_0 < t < t_1$ , where we have

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \mathcal{E}_0 \sin^2 \left( \pi \frac{t - t_0}{t_1 - t_0} \right) \cos(\omega(t - \bar{t})), \quad \bar{t} = \frac{t_0 + t_1}{2}. \quad (3)$$

In our model, we set  $\omega = 0.25$ ,  $t_0 = 20$ , and  $t_1 = 80$ . The maximum amplitude is  $\mathcal{E}_0 = 0.225$  atomic units, and occurs at  $t = 50$ . Our laser pulse parameters are chosen not for their significance in relation to any experiment, but rather such that it generates complicated ionization dynamics. We consider the dynamics for times  $0 \leq t \leq 100$ , including periods of free evolution before and after the laser pulse.

In Fig. 1, the ground-state wavefunction  $\psi_{\text{gs}}$  of the field-free Hamiltonian is shown, together with the local error of a nonlinear least-squares fit  $\psi_{\text{gs},4}$  to an LCG(4) function. The gaussian parameters of




FIG. 1. Ground-state wavefunction for model potential  $V(x)$  (top), and local error in an LCG(4) least-squares fit. The error is so small that the approximate and exact ground states are not distinguishable on the scale of the upper plot, therefore only one is plotted.

this function is  $q_i = p_i = b_i = 0$  and  $a = [0.37745, 2.0681, 0.61766, 1.0688]$ , with linear coefficients  $c = [0.08719, 0.061077, 0.29305, 0.23122]$ . The error is  $\|\psi_{\text{gs}} - \psi_{\text{gs},4}\|^2 = 4.3485 \cdot 10^{-7}$ , so that the energy is accurate to around 7 digits for this compact approximation. We will use  $\psi_{\text{gs},4}$  as initial condition in our propagation.

A highly accurate reference calculation is produced by spatially discretizing the real line using a grid with  $n_{\text{grid}} = 4096$  equidistant points in the interval  $[-L, L] = [-500, 500]$ , approximating the kinetic energy part using a standard Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) approach. This approach introduces artificial periodic boundary conditions, which have negligible effect due to the large domain. The time evolution can be approximated in a num-




FIG. 2. History of system (top) and final wavefunction (bottom), propagated on a fine grid using the Crank–Nicholson method. The final wavefunction is complicated, with nonlinear phase, amplitude oscillations, and localized features.

ber of ways, but we will choose the well-known Crank–Nicholson scheme [11] with time step  $h = 10^{-3}$ , since our proposed LCG propagation scheme to be described is an approximation of this scheme. In each time step, the method produces an error of order  $O(h^3)$ . In Fig. 2, the complete history of the wavefunction  $\psi_{\text{CN}}(x, t)$  of the system is shown together with the final wavefunction  $\psi_{\text{CN}}(x, 100)$ , which is a complicated wavefunction with many features.

## THE METHOD OF VERTICAL LINES

The time-dependent Schrödinger equation can be phrased variationally as

$$\dot{\psi}(t) = \underset{\chi}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|i\chi - \hat{H}(t)\psi(t)\|, \quad (4)$$

where  $\chi$  ranges over all allowed infinitesimal variations in  $\psi(t)$ .

For some approximate ansatz depending smoothly on some (real) parameter set, the variations  $\omega$  are restricted, leading to an implicit system of ODEs for the parameters. This is the method of (horizontal) lines, or the Dirac–Frenkel variational principle. The system of ODEs are now integrated using some numerical integration scheme. Now, Gaussians are *very* flexible, which means that there may be several distinct LCGs that approximate the same wavefunction to a very high accuracy, i.e., the nonlinear parameters are *almost* redundant. This leads to the system of ODEs being very stiff, and time-propagation with the Dirac–Frenkel variational principle is therefore very challenging for the LCG ansatz [4].

The method of vertical lines, or Rothe’s method, proceeds differently, and removes emphasis on the evolution of the nonlinear Gaussian parameters. After all, it is the total *wavefunction* which counts. Equation (4) is discretized *first* by some suitable scheme in time, here exemplified by the implicit midpoint rule with time step  $h$ ,

$$\psi^n = \underset{\varphi}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\| \left( I + \frac{ih}{2} \hat{H}(t_n) \right) \varphi - \left( I - \frac{ih}{2} \hat{H}(t_{n-1}) \right) \psi^{n-1} \right\|. \quad (5)$$

Of course, many other propagation schemes could be used instead. Here  $\psi^n \approx \psi(t_n)$  is an approximation to the wavefunction at time  $t_n = nh$ . The exact solution of this minimization problem in Hilbert space is given by the Crank–Nicholson scheme in Hilbert space, which has local error  $O(h^3)$ . Due to the accurate spatial discretization we have used, our reference calculation is virtually identical to an evolution using this abstract scheme. Having obtained a discrete counterpart of the time-dependent variational principle, one *then* introduces an ansatz, here the LCG( $N$ ) wavefunction  $\psi^n = \psi(\alpha^n, c^n)$ , and restricts the optimization problem correspondingly. To control the error in the scheme, a tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$  is chosen, and an LCG wavefunction  $\psi(\alpha^n, c^n)$  is sought such that

$$F_0(\alpha^n, c^n) = \frac{1}{2} \|A_n \psi(\alpha^n, c^n) - A_{n-1}^\dagger \psi(\alpha^{n-1}, c^{n-1})\|^2 < \epsilon h, \quad (6)$$

with  $A_n = I + ih\hat{H}(t_n)/2$ . The completeness of the Gaussians ensure that, by possibly adding Gaussians, the tolerance  $\epsilon h$  can always be achieved. This defines our propagation scheme for the LCG ansatz from time  $t_{n-1}$  to  $t_n$ .

The reason for including the time step  $h$  in the tolerance criterion is the following: Since the Crank–Nicholson scheme has local error  $O(h^3)$ , the local error in the proposed scheme is  $O(h^3) + O(\epsilon h)$ . If the final time is  $T = n_T h$ , then the global error after  $n_T$  steps is  $O(T h^2) + O(T \epsilon)$ .

### PERFORMING NONLINEAR OPTIMIZATION

The problem (6) is separable, in the sense that if  $\alpha^n$  is given, the optimal value for  $c^n$  is obtained using a *linear* least-squares problem [12]. This leads to a reduced problem only in terms of  $\alpha^n$  which reads: Find  $\alpha^n$  such that

$$F(\alpha^n) = \frac{1}{2} \|(I - P_{A_n}) A_{n-1}^\dagger \psi(\alpha^{n-1}, c^{n-1})\|^2 < \epsilon h, \quad (7)$$

where  $P_{A_n}$  is an orthogonal projector, not on the gaussians, but on the gaussians premultiplied with  $A_n$ , i.e., onto the functions  $\chi_i = A_n g(q_i, p_i, a_i, b_i)$ . Performing the elimination of the variables  $c^n$  is essential, as any dependent variables in a nonlinear least-squares problem will lead to ill-conditioning [12].

Our nonlinear optimization scheme is a variant of the iterative Gauss–Newton method with step-size control via a simple Armijo backtracking strategy to ensure sufficient decrease of the objective function at each iteration [13]. (The naming of the Gauss–Newton method is unrelated to the use of gaussian functions [14].) The Gauss–Newton method requires one solution of a linear system in each iteration, and approaches quadratic convergence when the objective function becomes smaller. As an approximate Newton method for the equation  $\nabla F(\alpha^n) = 0$ , it is reliant on a sufficiently good initial guess. We reuse the optimized nonlinear parameters  $\alpha^{n-1}$  for  $t_{n-1}$  as initial guess, which works quite well. If the time step is lowered, this guess becomes even better. However, the nonlinear optimization routine may get trapped in a local minimum with  $F(\alpha^n) \geq \epsilon h$ . In such cases, we add a gaussian. Our chosen strategy for basis enlargement is simplistic, but works well enough for the present experiment: The parameters  $(q, p, a, b)$  of a gaussian are completely determined by its expectation values of position, momentum, position variance, and momentum variance. The residual expression (inside the norm bars of  $F(\alpha^n)$ ) is considered a wavefunction  $r(x)$ , and we match the expectation values of the gaussian to those of  $r(x)$ . The gaussian is added to the LCG and subsequently optimized, followed by a complete optimization of all gaussians.

### NUMERICAL RESULTS

For our simulation, we reuse  $h = 10^{-3}$  as time step, and choose  $\epsilon = 10^{-7}$ , so that the global error of our




FIG. 3. Objective function and number of gaussians as function of time for the time propagation using Rothe’s method.

scheme is comparable to that of the Crank–Nicholson scheme of the reference calculation. For simplicity, our implementation evaluates gaussian matrix elements using quadrature, sufficient for a 1D model calculation, and virtually exact. Recall that our initial condition was the LCG(4) approximation  $\psi_{\text{gs},4}$  to the ground-state wavefunction of the time-independent Hamiltonian. As the calculation progresses, the Gauss–Newton method uses a single iteration for the vast majority of time steps (using two iterations for a tiny fraction of the time steps, and three and nine iterations for exactly one time step each). Thus, on average only one linear solve is required per time step. The time propagation produces near-smooth paths for all gaussians except where functions are added. At these points, the reoptimization of all gaussians requires varying numbers of iterations, but they always converge without problems. In Fig. 3, the objective function  $F(\alpha^n)$  is shown, together with the number of gaussians needed as a function of time. The number of functions increases throughout the simulation, with a modest value of  $N = 18$  at the final time  $t = 100$ , which is the most complicated and spread-out wavefunction of the simulation.

The local error of the LCG propagation relative to the




FIG. 4. Local errors of the LCG propagation relative to the Crank–Nicholson propagation. Boundary artifacts from the periodic boundary conditions can be seen, but these have extremely small values.

Crank–Nicholson propagation is shown in Fig. 4. The density plot corresponding to Fig. 2 is not shown, as the local errors are too small to make the plots visibly different. The log-scale plot of the local error reveals that errors are present, but with very small values in general. In Fig. 5 the final wavefunctions are compared.

Our investigations show that the integration scheme is quite robust, and can be applied to a variety of challenging models, such as variations of the model presented here, and reflection of a wavepacket of a (smoothed) potential barrier.

We have demonstrated that grid-free propagation scheme for linear-combinations of gaussians is possible using the method of vertical lines. We have introduced an efficient time integration method that approximates the Crank–Nicholson scheme. Our initial investigations show that this approach is quite robust, producing very accurate wavefunction histories with only a handful of gaussians, even for extremely violent laser pulses. The scheme is also applicable to realistic models of multiparticle atoms and molecules using explicitly correlated gaussians, eliminating completely the need for a large grid in order to resolve both ionization dynamics, Coulomb explosion, and local details of the wavefunction.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the support of the Centre for Advanced Study in Oslo, Norway, which funded and hosted our CAS research project *Attosecond Quantum Dynamics Beyond the Born-Oppenheimer Approxima-*





FIG. 5. Top: Real parts of final wavefunctions. At the resolution of the plot, no difference can be seen. Bottom: Absolute value squared of the error in the final wavefunction.

tion during the academic year 2021/2022. The work was supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence scheme, Project No. 262695. Partial support from the National Science Foundation (grant No. 1856702) is also acknowledged.

\* simen.kvaal@kjemi.uio.no

- [1] M. Nisoli, P. Decleva, F. Calegari, A. Palacios, and F. Martín. Attosecond Electron Dynamics in Molecules. *Chem. Rev.*, 117(16):10760–10825, May 2017.
- [2] C. Lubich. On variational approximations in quantum molecular dynamics. *Math. Comp.*, 74:765–779, 2005.
- [3] G.W. Richings, Iakov Polyak, Kaite Spinlove, G.A. Worth, Irene Burghardt, and Benjamin Lasorne. Quan-

- tum dynamics simulations using gaussian wavepackets: the vmcg method. *International Reviews in Physical Chemistry*, 34, 04 2015.
- [4] K. Rowan, L. Schatzki, T. Zaklama, Y. Suzuki, K. Watanabe, and K. Varga. Simulation of a hydrogen atom in a laser field using the time-dependent variational principle. *Phys. Rev. E*, 101(2):023313, February 2020.
- [5] E. Rothe. Zweidimensionale parabolische Randwertaufgaben als Grenzfall eindimensionaler Randwertaufgaben. *Math. Ann.*, 102(1):650–670, December 1930.
- [6] P. Deuffhard and M. Weiser. *Adaptive numerical solution of PDEs*. De Gruyter textbook. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2012.
- [7] J. Mitroy, S. Bubin, W. Horiuchi, Y. Suzuki, L. Adamowicz, W. Cencek, K. Szalewicz, J. Komasa, D. Blume, and K. Varga. Theory and application of explicitly correlated Gaussians. *Rev. of Mod. Phys.*, 85(2):693–749, May 2013.
- [8] S. Bubin and L. Adamowicz. Matrix elements of N-particle explicitly correlated Gaussian basis functions with complex exponential parameters. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 124(22):224317, June 2006.
- [9] M. Bachmayr, H. Chen, and R. Schneider. Error estimates for Hermite and even-tempered Gaussian approximations in quantum chemistry. *Numer. Math.*, 128(1):137–165, September 2014.
- [10] C. Lasser and C. Lubich. Computing quantum dynamics in the semiclassical regime. *Acta Numerica*, 29:229–401, May 2020.
- [11] K. Varga and J.A. Driscoll. *Computational Nanoscience: Applications for Molecules, Clusters, and Solids*. Cambridge University Press, first edition, April 2011.
- [12] G.H. Golub and V. Pereyra. The Differentiation of Pseudo-Inverses and Nonlinear Least Squares Problems Whose Variables Separate. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 10(2):413–432, April 1973.
- [13] J. Nocedal and S.J. Wright. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer Series in Operation Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, NY, 2. ed edition, 2006.
- [14] C.A. Floudas and P.M. Pardalos, editors. *Encyclopedia of Optimization*. Springer Reference. Springer, New York, 2nd ed edition, 2009.