

On the relation between the Hartree-Fock and Kohn-Sham approaches

M.Ya. Amusia^{a,b}, A.Z. Msezane^c, V.R. Shaginyan^{c,d}, D.Sokolovski^e^aRacah Institute of Physics, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel; ^bA.F. Io

Physical-Technical Institute, 194021 St. Petersburg, Russia;

^cCTSPS, Clark Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia 30314, USA;^dPetersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina, 188300, Russia^eQueen's University of Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN, UK

Abstract

We show that the Hartree-Fock (HF) results cannot be reproduced within the framework of Kohn-Sham (KS) theory because the single-particle densities of finite systems obtained within the HF calculations are not v -representable, i.e., do not correspond to any ground state of a N non-interacting electron systems in a local external potential. For this reason, the KS theory, which finds a minimum on a different subset of all densities, can overestimate the ground state energy, as compared to the HF result. The discrepancy between the two approaches provides no grounds to assume that either the KS theory or the density functional theory suffers from internal contradictions.

PACS: 31.15.Ew, 31.10.+z, 71.10.-w

Keywords: Kohn-Sham theory; Hartree-Fock method; v -representability

Typeset using REVTeX

The Hartree-Fock method (HF), first proposed in the pioneering works of Hartree and Fock [1,2] is known to be successful in calculating properties of electron systems, in particular, the ground state properties of atoms. Based on a variational principle, the HF method estimates the ground state energy E of an electron system from above, i.e., $E_{\text{HF}} \leq E$, where E_{HF} is the ground state energy calculated within the HF method. If the ground state wave function of N electrons is approximated by a single N -electron Slater determinant, the HF solution delivers the minimum value E_{HF} on the set of all such determinants. Agreement, or otherwise, with the HF results is often used to estimate the success of other approximate computational schemes.

The Density Functional Theory (DFT) exploits the one-to-one correspondence between the single-particle electron density and an external potential acting upon the system and relies on the existence of a universal functional $F[\rho(r)]$ which can be minimized in order to find the ground state energy [3]. The Kohn-Sham (KS) theory goes further in reducing the problem of calculating ground state properties of a many-electron system in a local external single-particle potential to solving Hartree-like one-electron equations [3,4]. Successful solution of these equations allows to predict, at least in principle, the atomic, molecular, cluster and solid bodies binding energies, phonon spectra, activation barriers etc., see e.g. [5].

It is natural, therefore, to ask whether the HF ground state energy can be successfully reproduced in the Kohn-Sham approach. We note first that a universal density functional $F_{\text{HF}}[\rho]$ can be defined with the help of the constrained-search technique [6]. Had the explicit form of $F_{\text{HF}}[\rho]$ been available, the HF and the DFT approach would have yielded the same results for the ground state energy, $E_{\text{HF}} = E_{\text{DHF}}$, and the electron density, $\rho_{\text{HF}}(r) = \rho_{\text{DHF}}(r)$, [6]. Here, E_{DHF} and $\rho_{\text{DHF}}(r)$ are the exact DFT Hartree-Fock energy and density respectively, while $\rho_{\text{HF}}(r)$ is the HF density. Unfortunately, the correspondence theorem [3,6] establishes the existence of the functional only in principle, and provides no unique practical recipe for its construction. Rather, for practical calculations one has to resort to the KS approach. Exhaustive calculations [7-9] of the ground state energies of different atoms show that, if the KS approach is used, the resulting energy E_{KSHF} usually exceeds the energy E_{HF} obtained by the HF method,

$$E_{\text{KSHF}} > E_{\text{HF}} : \quad (1)$$

Recently, there have been suggestions that this disagreement may point to intrinsic flaws in both the DFT and the KS theories. One might suspect, therefore, that an exact local exchange potential does not exist for ground states of typical atoms (see [8,9] and references therein). We will, however, argue that the discrepancy (1) between the HF and KS is due to the different domains on which the respective functionals are defined. More specially, we will show that while a KS density is v -representative, a HF density is not, i.e., it cannot be obtained as the ground state density of any N non-interacting electrons in a local potential. As a result, the KS method simply delivers a minimum on a different class of electron densities, and its disagreement with the HF approach does not indicate the existence of any internal contradictions either in KS or DFT approach.

The purpose of this Letter is to show that HF results cannot be reproduced within the framework of KS theory because the single-particle densities of finite N electron systems obtained within the HF calculations are not v -representable. This means that the HF densities cannot be obtained as the ground state density of any N non-interacting electrons in a local potential. Thus, the discrepancy between the two approaches, which manifests itself in the inequality (1), provides no grounds to assume that either the KS theory or the DFT suffers from internal contradictions.

We begin our study with considering the HF ground state energy which is given by the equation

$$E_{HF} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N n_j \int \psi_j^*(r) r^{-2} \psi_j(r) dr + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1, i=1}^N n_j n_i \frac{\int \psi_j^*(r_1) \psi_i(r_2) \psi_j(r_1) \psi_i(r_2) dr_1 dr_2}{\int \psi_j^* \psi_j \int \psi_i^* \psi_i} + E_x + \sum_{j=1}^N n_j \int \psi_j^*(r) \psi_j(r) v(r) dr; \quad (2)$$

We use an atomic system of units: $e = m = \hbar = 1$, where e and m are electron charge and mass, respectively. Here N is the total number of electrons, n_i are the occupation numbers: $n_i = 1$ if the corresponding single-particle level is occupied, otherwise $n_i = 0$. For an atom one has $v(r) = -Z/r$, where Z is the nuclear charge. The exchange energy E_x can be represented as follows

$$E_x = \frac{1}{2} \int \chi_0(r_1; r_2; i\omega) + 2 \frac{\int \psi_i^*(r_1) \psi_j(r_2) \psi_j^*(r_1) \psi_i(r_2) dr_1 dr_2}{\int \psi_i^* \psi_i \int \psi_j^* \psi_j} \frac{d\omega}{2} + \sum_{k,i} n_k n_i \frac{\int \psi_i^*(r_1) \psi_i(r_2) \psi_k(r_2) \psi_k^*(r_1) dr_1 dr_2}{\int \psi_i^* \psi_i \int \psi_k^* \psi_k}; \quad (3)$$

and $\chi_0(r_1; r_2; i)$ is the linear response function, which is of the form

$$\chi_0(r_1; r_2; i) = \sum_{i \neq k} n_i (1 - n_k) \frac{\int \psi_i^*(r_1) \psi_i(r_2) \psi_k(r_2) \psi_k^*(r_1) dr_1 dr_2}{(i - \epsilon_{ik}) (i + \epsilon_{ik})} + \sum_{i \neq k} n_i (1 - n_k) \frac{\int \psi_i^*(r_1) \psi_i(r_2) \psi_k(r_2) \psi_k^*(r_1) dr_1 dr_2}{(i - \epsilon_{ik}) (i + \epsilon_{ik})}; \quad (4)$$

with ϵ_{ik} defined as $\epsilon_{ik} = \epsilon_k - \epsilon_i$, ϵ_k and functions $\psi_k(r_1)$ being respectively the one-particle energies and wave functions of the HF equations; and ϵ is the infinitely small number, $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Varying Eq. (2) with respect to the single-particle wave functions $\psi_i(r)$, one obtains the HF system of equations:

$$\left[\frac{r^2}{2} + v(r) \right] \psi_i^{HF}(r) + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{dr^0}{dr} \frac{\int \psi_j^{HF}(r^0) \psi_j^{HF}(r) \psi_i^{HF}(r^0) \psi_i^{HF}(r) dr^0}{\int \psi_j^{HF} \psi_j^{HF} \int \psi_i^{HF} \psi_i^{HF}} = E_i^{HF} \psi_i^{HF}(r) \quad (5)$$

These equations differ from an ordinary Schrodinger equation in two essential aspects: they are non-linear in $\psi_i^{HF}(r)$ and the second term under the sum on the left hand side of Eq. (5) that represents the so-called Fock's potential is non-local.

The asymptotic behavior in r of $\psi_i^{HF}(r)$, contrary to the case of an ordinary one-particle Schrodinger equation, is not determined by E_i^{HF} and does not have the form

$$\psi_i(r) \sim \exp\left(-\sqrt{2(E_i^{HF} - \epsilon_F)} r\right); \quad (6)$$

On the contrary, it was shown in [10] that at $r \rightarrow \infty$ the function $\psi_i^{HF}(r)$ is not determined by E_i^{HF} but behaves as

$$\psi_i^{HF}(r) \sim \sum_{l=1}^N C_l \exp\left(-\sqrt{2(E_F^{HF} - \epsilon_l)} r\right); \quad (7)$$

where E_F^{HF} is the energy of the so-called Fermi-level (with wave function $\psi_F^{HF}(r)$), which is the smallest binding energy of the occupied single-particle levels among all E_i in the considered system, and

$$C_l = \sum_{m=-l}^{l} \int_0^Z \rho_{HF}^{(m)}(r) r^l Y_{lm}(r=r) \rho_{HF}^{(m)}(r) dr; \quad (8)$$

and $Y_{lm}(r=r)$ is the l^{th} order spherical polynomial. The uniform behavior of the occupied levels given by Eq. (7) is a consequence of the long range nature of the non-local Fock potential. The uniform behavior (7) leads to a number of very specific features of the ground state wave function, which, as we will see, cannot occur in the KS equations and makes it impossible for the KS equations (see Eq. (13)) to reproduce the HF density. That is, it makes the HF densities be non-v-representable.

Consider next the HF calculations based on the constrained-search formulation of DFT which employs the HF density functional $F_{HF}[\rho]$ [6]. The functional $F_{HF}[\rho]$ is obtained by minimizing the expectation value $F_{HF}[\rho] = \langle [\hat{H}] \hat{\rho} \rangle$ over all single-electron Slater determinants consistent with a fixed density $\rho(r)$. The Hamiltonian \hat{H} is of the form

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z \rho(r) r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z \frac{\rho(r_1) \rho(r_2)}{r_{12}} dr_1 dr_2; \quad (9)$$

From the manner in which the functional $F_{HF}[\rho]$ is constructed it is clear that the resulting ground state energy E_{DHF} equals that obtained in the HF method, E_{HF} ,

$$E_{DHF} = E_{HF} = F_{HF}[\rho_{DHF}] + \int_0^Z v(r) \rho_{DHF}(r) dr; \quad (10)$$

Obviously, $\rho_{DHF}(r) = \rho_{HF}(r)$, where $\rho_{HF}(r)$ is the HF density obtained upon solving Eq. (5), while the determinant Ψ_{HF} , which yields the minimum value, is composed of the eigenfunctions of Eq. (5) [6].

To give proof of the non-v representability of the HF densities, we assume for a moment that $\rho_{HF}(r)$ is non-interacting v-representable i.e., that it can be represented as the ground state density of N non-interacting electrons described by the Schrodinger equation with some local potential $v_L(r)$. Equivalently, we assume that the functional $F_{HF}[\rho]$ is defined in the domain of v-representable densities. As a result, the HF functional $F_{HF}[\rho]$ can be represented as $F_{HF}[\rho] = F_x[\rho]$ with $F_x[\rho]$ being a functional defined in the domain of v-representable densities,

$$F_x[\rho] = T_k[\rho] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N n_j n_i \int_0^Z \frac{\rho_j(r_1) \rho_i(r_2)}{r_{12}} dr_1 dr_2 + E_x + \int_0^Z v(r) \rho(r) dr; \quad (11)$$

The second term in Eq. (11) being the Hartree term is obviously a functional of the density. The KS kinetic energy functional $T_k[\rho]$ is known to be defined in the domain of v-representable densities [4,7] and so is the fourth term in Eq. (11). Thus, the exchange energy E_x given by Eq. (3) is also to be a functional $E_x[\rho]$, defined on the v-representable densities, as has been shown in [11], with the help of the representation (3). It has also been demonstrated in [11] that the variational derivative of $E_x[\rho]$ exists and can be evaluated explicitly to produce the KS exchange potential [11]

$$V_x(r) = \frac{\delta E_x[\rho]}{\delta \rho(r)}; \quad (12)$$

We can then proceed to obtain the eigenvalues ϵ_i and the wave functions $\psi_i(r)$ in Eqs. (4) and (11), by solving the KS single-particle equations

$$\left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{dr_j^0}{dr_j} \right) \psi_j(r_j^0) \psi_j + V_x(r) + v(r) \psi_i(r) = \epsilon_i \psi_i(r) \quad (13)$$

and compute the density $\rho(r)$ as

$$\rho(r) = \sum_i n_i \psi_i(r)^2 \quad (14)$$

We note that due to the constrained-search technique [6] the minimum of the functional $F_x[\rho]$ is given by

$$F_x[\rho] = \langle \psi_{KS} | \hat{H} | \psi_{KS} \rangle + \int v(r) \rho(r) dr; \quad (15)$$

where ψ_{KS} is a single N -electron Slater determinant which delivers the lowest energy expectation value of \hat{H} given by Eq. (9). This determinant is composed of the single-particle wave functions $\psi_i(r)$ which are the solutions of one-particle equations (13). Thus, we are led to the conclusion that the determinant ψ^{HF} has to coincide with the determinant ψ_{KS} . Then the HF wave functions ψ_i^{HF} and the eigenvalues ϵ_i^{HF} given by Eq. (5) must be equal to the wave-functions ψ_i and the eigenvalues ϵ_i given by Eq. (13). However, it is seen from Eq. (7) that all single-particle HF functions have the same asymptotic behavior determined by the smallest orbital energy [10], even though the eigenvalues ϵ_i^{HF} are not, in general, degenerate. On the other hand, eigenfunctions of Eq. (13) may exhibit such behavior only if the eigenvalues ϵ_i are degenerate as it follows from Eq. (6). As a result, we arrived at contradiction. This contradiction is resolved once we recognize that at least some of the HF densities are not non-interacting v -representable. Note that examples of non- v -representable densities were given in Ref. [13]. Obviously, a one-to-one correspondence between non-local potentials and local ones does not exist [14]. Therefore, if the explicit form of the functionals $F^{HF}[\rho]$ and $T_k[\rho]$ was known, we would not have been able to obtain the HF ground state within the KS theory because they are defined on the different subsets of densities. For example, it is impossible to reproduce the HF single-particle eigenvalues ϵ_i^{HF} within the KS theory [15]. In other words, the two approximate methods have different domains of applicability and are not amenable to a direct comparison. Consequently, the result (1) cannot be used to prove that the KS method or DFT is in any way deficient, as was suggested in Refs. [8,9].

A few remarks are in order here. A single N -electron Slater determinant coinciding with ψ_{KS} can be obtained in the optimized effective potential method with the local exchange potential V_{OPM} [12]. Because of one-to-one correspondence that exists between the wave function, the density and the local single-particle potential [3,6], V_{OPM} must coincide with V_x given by Eq. (12), $V_x(r) = V_{OPM}(r)$ as has been demonstrated in [11]. Therefore, the ground state energy E_{OEP} of a many-electron system calculated in OPM has to be equal to the corresponding energy E_{KSHF} calculated with the functional $F_x[\rho]$, $E_{KSHF} = E_{OEP}$. It is now tempting to assume that all three energies agree, i.e., that $E_{HF} = E_{KSHF} = E_{OEP}$ [8,9]. But it is not the case since the HF densities are not v -representable. This fact is in agreement with numerical calculations showing that $E_{HF} < E_{KSHF}$ [7,9]. One should also mention one special case where the HF and KS theories give the same answer. For a He atom, the HF potential acting on the occupied states is local and the HF density is v -representable, so that, $E_{OEP} = E_{KSHF} = E_{DHF} = E_{HF}$. This observation is confirmed by numerical calculations [8]. For all other atoms, the HF potentials are non-local, and the HF densities are not v -representable.

Obviously, in that case, one has $E_{\text{OEP}} = E_{\text{KSHF}} > E_{\text{DHF}} = E_{\text{HF}}$ in accordance with the numerical calculations [8].

In summary, by clarifying the relationship between the non-local exchange HF potential and the local exchange KS potential, we have shown that the Hartree-Fock method cannot be reproduced within the framework of Kohn-Sham theory because the single-particle densities of finite systems obtained in Hartree-Fock calculations are not v -representable. We have demonstrated that the fact that the KS calculations of finite electron systems lead to higher ground state energies cannot be used to infer the existence of inconsistencies in either KS or DFT theory. Most of the specific features of the HF method result from the non-local nature of the HF potential. For this reason, they provide no grounds to criticize the Kohn-Sham theory which deals with local single-particle potentials and v -representable densities. To conclude, it is worth mentioning that at present there is no compelling evidence to believe the HF method to be superior to the KS approach. Among the drawbacks of the HF theory is the well-known fact that the HF non-local single-particle potential acting on the unoccupied states falls off exponentially. As a result, the HF potential can only support very few unoccupied energy levels, which leads to difficulties in treating the excited states. By contrast, the KS theory does not suffer from the drawbacks inherent in the HF method. Thus, a further study is needed to clarify which type of behavior actually occurs in atoms with a large number of electrons and whether the failure to agree with the HF results can, indeed, be considered a fault of the KS theory.

The visit of VRS and DS to Clark Atlanta University has been supported by NSF through a grant to CTSPS. MYA is grateful to the S.A. Shonbrunn Research Fund for support of his research. AZM is supported by US DOE, Division of Chemical Sciences, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Office of Energy Research. This work was supported in part by INTAS, project no. 03-51-6170.

REFERENCES

- [1] D . R . Hartree, Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 24 (1928) 89, 111; D . R . Hartree, The Calculation of Atomic Structures, Wiley Interscience, New York, 1957.
- [2] V A . Fock, Z . Phys. 61 (1930) 126; V A . Fock, Z . Phys. 62 (1930) 795.
- [3] P . Hohenberg, W . Kohn, Phys. Rev. 136 (1965) B 864.
- [4] W . Kohn, L . J . Sham , Phys. Rev. 140 (1965) A 1133.
- [5] R G . Parr, W . Yang, Density-functional theory of atoms and molecules, New York, Oxford University Press, 1989.
- [6] M . Levy, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 76 (1979) 6062.
- [7] A . Gorling, M . Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. A 51 (1995) 4501.
- [8] R K . Nesbet, R . Colle, Phys. Rev. A 61 (1999) 012503.
- [9] R K . Nesbet, Phys. Rev. A 58 (1998) R12; R K . Nesbet, Phys. Rev. A 65 (2001) 010502; R K . Nesbet, Int. J. Quantum Chem. 95 (2003) 816.
- [10] N C . Handy, M . T . Marron, H . J . Silvertson, Phys. Rev. 180 (1969) 45.
- [11] V R . Shaginyan, Phys. Rev. A 47 (1993) 1507.
- [12] J D . Talmán, W . F . Shadwick, Phys. Rev. A 14 (1976) 36.
- [13] M . Levy, Phys. Rev. A 26 (1982) 1200.
- [14] T L . Gilbert, Phys. Rev. B 12 (1975) 2111.
- [15] M . Ya . Amusia, M . Z . Msezane, V R . Shaginyan, Physica Scripta 68 (2003) C133.