

Comment on "Diffusion Monte Carlo study of jellium surfaces: Electronic densities and pair correlation functions"

J. M. Pitarke

Materia Kondentsatuaren Fisika Saila, Zientzi Fakultatea, Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea,
644 Posta kutxatila, E-48080 Bilbo, Basque Country
and Donostia International Physics Center (DIPC) and Centro Mixto CSIC-UPV/EHU,
Manuel de Lardizabal Pasealekua, E-20018 Donostia, Basque Country
(Dated: 11 August 2003)

In a fixed-node diffusion Monte Carlo calculation of the total energy of jellium slabs, Acioli and Ceperley [Phys. Rev. B 54, 17199 (1996)] reported jellium surface energies that at low electron densities were significantly higher than those predicted in the local-density approximation (LDA) of density-functional theory. Assuming that the fixed-node error in the slab and the bulk calculations cancel out, we show that their data yield surface energies that are considerably closer to the LDA and in reasonable agreement with those obtained in the random-phase approximation.

PACS numbers: 71.15.Mb, 71.45.Gm

Acioli and Ceperley¹ presented the results of fixed-node diffusion Monte Carlo (DMC) calculations of the total energy of jellium slabs at various electron densities. Assuming that the release-node correction is very small at the electron densities of interest, these authors extracted surface energies by subtracting from the fixed-node slab energy the corresponding release-node bulk energies of Ceperley and Alder,² as parametrized by Perdew and Zunger.³ They concluded that at low electron densities jellium surface energies are significantly higher than those predicted in the local-density approximation (LDA) of density-functional theory (DFT).

In this Comment, we show that combining fixed-node slab and release-node bulk energies results in substantial improvement. Instead, we expect a large degree of cancellation between the fixed-node error in the slab and the bulk calculations, and conclude that by subtracting from the fixed-node slab energies the corresponding fixed-node bulk energies one obtains jellium surface energies that are considerably closer to the LDA⁴ and in reasonable agreement with those obtained in the random-phase approximation (RPA).⁵

Acioli and Ceperley¹ considered jellium slabs of density $n_0 = 3/4 (r_s a_0)^3$ (a_0 is the Bohr radius), the thickness of the positive background in each slab being $L = 7.21 (r_s a_0)$. Surface energies were then obtained from

$$E_s = E_{\text{slab}} - E_{\text{bulk}} \frac{n_0 L}{2}; \quad (1)$$

where E_{slab} and E_{bulk} represent slab and bulk energies per particle, respectively. Fixed-node energies per particle in bulk jellium were reported by Ceperley⁶ to be higher than their release-node counterparts by 9×10^{-4} Ry for $r_s = 2$ and 2×10^{-4} Ry for $r_s = 5$. Hence, combining fixed-node slab and release-node bulk energies Eq. (1) yields for $r_s = 2$ and 5 surface energies that are too large by 150 and 5 erg/cm², respectively. These fixed-node errors represent 40% and 20% of the LDA correlation energy for $r_s = 2$ and 5, respectively. Furthermore,

they are comparable to the deviation of the total surface energies reported in Ref. 1 from those obtained in the LDA.

In order to derive reliable surface energies from the fixed-node slab calculations of Ref. 1, we require fixed-node energies of bulk jellium. Such calculations were reported by Ceperley⁶ and more recently by Kwon et al.⁷ for $r_s = 1, 5, 10$, and 20. The fixed-node Slater-Jastrow correlation energies of Kwon et al.⁷ can be parametrized in Perdew-Zunger³ form, as follows⁸

$$E_c^{\text{bulk}} = \frac{0.32172}{1 + 1.3606 \frac{P}{r_s} + 0.3391 r_s} \text{ Ry } (r_s \geq 1); \quad (2)$$

or in Perdew-Wang⁹ form, as follows

$$E_c^{\text{bulk}} = (0.12436 + 0.027404 r_s) \ln(1 + \frac{16.082}{r_s}) \text{ Ry}; \quad (3)$$

with

$$P = 7.5957 r_s^{1/2} + 3.5876 r_s + 1.8207 r_s^{3/2} + 0.47746 r_s^2; \quad (4)$$

Both Eqs. (2) and (3) have been adjusted to the fixed-node correlation energies of Kwon et al.⁷ for $r_s = 1, 5$, and 10. The fixed-node bulk energy $E_c^{\text{bulk}} = 0.01482$ Ry obtained by Ceperley and Alder¹⁶ for $r_s = 2.07$ is underestimated by Eq. (2) by 2×10^{-5} Ry and overestimated by Eq. (3) by 2×10^{-4} Ry. At $r_s = 20$, Eqs. (2) and (3) underestimate the fixed-node bulk energy of Kwon et al.⁷ by 2×10^{-4} Ry and 10^{-4} Ry, respectively.

Adding to the correlation energy of Eqs. (2) and (3) the well-known kinetic and exchange energies of a uniform electron gas¹⁰ and combining these energies with the fixed-node slab energies of Acioli and Ceperley,¹ Eq. (1) yields the surface energies (ϵ_1 and ϵ_2) shown in Table I. Also shown in this Table are the surface energies reported in Ref. 1 (ϵ_{AC}), together with the LDA and RPA surface energies that we have obtained for jellium slabs with $L = 7.21 (r_s a_0)$. Small differences of no more than 10 erg/cm² between these LDA and RPA surface energies

TABLE I: Surface energies of jellium slabs with $L = 7.21$ ($r_s a_0$), as obtained from Eq. (1) by combining the Acioli-Ceperley xed-node slab energies with the xed-node bulk energies of either Eq. (2) (1) or Eq. (3) (2), and by combining the Acioli-Ceperley xed-node slab energies with release-node bulk energies (σ_{AC}). At $r_s = 2.07$, combining the Acioli-Ceperley xed-node slab energy with the corresponding xed-node bulk energy $\mu_{bulk}^{bulk} = 0.01482$ Ry of Ceperley and Alder¹⁶ yields $\sigma = 558$. σ_{LDA} and σ_{RPA} represent LDA and RPA surface energies. $\sigma_0 = \sigma_s + \sigma_{es} + \sigma_x$ represents the combined kinetic (σ_s), electrostatic (σ_{es}), and exchange (σ_x) contributions to the total surface energy. The correlation surface energy is simply $\sigma_c = \sigma_0$. Units are erg/cm^2 ($1 \text{ erg}/\text{cm}^2 = 6.2415 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}/\text{\AA}^2$).

r_s	0	1	2	AC	LDA	RPA
1.87	-2402	-1197	-1247	-1035	-1557	-1424
2.07	-1234	-554	-592	-416	-600	-497
2.66	-131	242	226	327	180	233
3.25	52	312	305	365	227	258
3.93	72	251	249	284	173	191

and those reported before for the semi-infinite jellium^{4,5} are due to the finite size of our jellium slabs.

An inspection of Table I shows that using in Eq. (1) the xed-node bulk energies of either Eq. (2) or Eq. (3) brings the DMC surface energies closer to the LDA and to reasonable agreement with the RPA. This is consistent with recent work, where it was shown that upon surface formation there is a persistent cancellation of short-range correlation effects beyond the RPA.¹¹ Other approaches have also led to the conclusion that the actual jellium surface energies should be only slightly higher than those obtained in the LDA.^{12,13,14}

Liet al.¹⁵ calculated the xed-node DMC surface energy of a jellium slab with $r_s = 2.07$, the thickness of the positive background being $L = 8.52$ ($r_s a_0$). These authors,¹⁵ unlike Acioli and Ceperley,¹ extracted from their xed-node slab energy the corresponding xed-node bulk energy ($\mu_{bulk}^{bulk} = 0.01482$ Ry),¹⁶ and found $\sigma = 465 \text{ erg}/\text{cm}^2$;¹⁷ they also performed LDA calculations and found an LDA surface energy of $567 \text{ erg}/\text{cm}^2$. We have calculated the LDA and RPA surface energies of a jellium slab with $r_s = 2.07$ and $L = 8.52$ ($r_s a_0$), and have found $\sigma_{RPA} = 485 \text{ erg}/\text{cm}^2$ and $\sigma_{LDA} = 589 \text{ erg}/\text{cm}^2$,¹⁸ which are both only $20 \text{ erg}/\text{cm}^2$ smaller than the corresponding DMC surface energy reported in Ref. 15.

Fig. 1 exhibits the surface energies of Table I, as a function of r_s . At the highest densities the agreement between DMC and RPA surface energies is good. At the smallest densities ($r_s = 3.25$) the corrected DMC surface energies are still larger than their RPA counterparts. Nevertheless, we note that DMC surface energies are very sensitive to small uncertainties in the parametrization of the bulk energy. Therefore, if one is to quantitatively account for jellium surface energies, both DMC slab and bulk energies entering Eq. (1) should be computed on the




FIG. 1: Surface energies of jellium slabs with $L = 7.21$ ($r_s a_0$), as obtained from Eq. (1). Stars and open circles represent DMC surface energies obtained by combining the Acioli-Ceperley xed-node slab energies with the xed-node bulk energies of Eqs. (2) and (3), respectively. The solid circle represents the DMC surface energy obtained at $r_s = 2.07$ by combining the Acioli-Ceperley xed-node slab energy with the corresponding xed-node bulk energy $\mu_{bulk}^{bulk} = 0.01482$ Ry of Ceperley and Alder.¹⁶ Crosses represent the surface energies obtained in Ref. 1 by combining xed-node slab and release-node bulk energies. Dashed and solid lines represent LDA and RPA calculations, respectively.




FIG. 2: Correlation contribution to the surface energy. Stars and open circles represent DMC correlation surface energies obtained by combining the Acioli-Ceperley xed-node slab energies with the xed-node bulk energies of Eqs. (2) and (3), respectively. The solid circle represents the DMC correlation surface energy obtained at $r_s = 2.07$ by combining the Acioli-Ceperley xed-node slab energy with the corresponding xed-node bulk energy $\mu_{bulk}^{bulk} = 0.01482$ Ry of Ceperley and Alder.¹⁶ Dashed and solid lines represent LDA and RPA calculations, respectively.

same footing.

Small differences between the DM C and RPA calculations come from the correlation contribution to the surface energy. We have carried out calculations of exact kinetic (ϵ_s), electrostatic (ϵ_{es}), and exchange (ϵ_x) surface energies for jellium slabs with $L = 7.21$ ($r_s a_0$), and we have defined the correlation contribution to the DM C surface energy as

$$\epsilon_c = (\epsilon_s + \epsilon_{es} + \epsilon_x): \quad (5)$$

The results we have obtained from our analysis of the Acioli-Ceperley DM C slab energies are shown in Fig. 2 (see also Table I), together with the LDA and RPA correlation energies that we have obtained for the same jellium slabs. This figure clearly shows that combining ϵ -node slab energies with their ϵ -node bulk counterparts yields DM C correlation surface energies in reasonable agreement with the results obtained in the RPA. While the LDA underestimates considerably the correlation surface energy for all electron densities, it overestimates the exact exchange surface energy. Large and opposite separate corrections to the LDA for exchange and correlation largely compensate, as discussed before,^{5,19}

and yield LDA surface energies that are close to their non-local counterparts.

In conclusion, assuming that the ϵ -node error in the slab and the bulk calculations cancel out, the DM C data reported in Ref. 1 yields surface energies that are considerably closer to the LDA and in reasonable agreement with those obtained in the RPA. Nevertheless, at the smallest densities the corrected DM C surface energies are still larger than their RPA counterparts; at these densities, they are also larger than the jellium surface energies extracted from DM C calculations for jellium spheres,²⁰ which are found to be close to the LDA.¹⁴ Surface energies are extremely sensitive to little uncertainties in both slab and bulk energies; hence, in order to quantitatively account for the impact of nonlocal ϵ -node effects on the surface energy one needs to pursue DM C evaluations of both slab and bulk energies on the same footing.

Partial support by the University of the Basque Country, the Basque Unibertsitate eta Ikerketa Saila, and the Spanish MCT is acknowledged. I thank J. P. Perdew for stimulating discussions and D. M. Ceperley for correspondence related to the unpublished uniform-gas ϵ -node data for $r_s = 2.07$.

¹ P. H. Acioli and D. M. Ceperley, Phys. Rev. B 54, 17199 (1996).

² D. M. Ceperley and B. J. Alder, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 166 (1980).

³ J. P. Perdew and A. Zunger, Phys. Rev. B 23, 5048 (1981).

⁴ See, e.g., Z. Y. Zhang, D. C. Langreth, and J. P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B 41, 5674 (1990).

⁵ J. M. Pitarke and A. G. Eguiluz, Phys. Rev. B 57, 6329 (1998); 63, 045116 (2001).

⁶ D. M. Ceperley, in Recent Progress in Many Body Theories, edited by Zabolitzky, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 142 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1981).

⁷ Y. Kwon, D. M. Ceperley, and R. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B 58, 6800 (1998).

⁸ J. P. Perdew (unpublished).

⁹ J. P. Perdew and Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. B 45, 13244 (1992).

¹⁰ D. Pines and P. Nozieres, The Theory of Quantum Liquids, Vol. I: Normal Fermi Liquids (Addison-Wesley, New York, 1989), page 274.

¹¹ J. M. Pitarke and J. P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B 67, 045101 (2003).

¹² Z. Yan, J. P. Perdew, S. Kurth, C. Fiolhais, and L.

A Almeida, Phys. Rev. B 61, 2595 (2000).

¹³ Z. Yan, J. P. Perdew, and S. Kurth, Phys. Rev. B 61, 16430 (2000).

¹⁴ L. M. Almeida, J. P. Perdew, and C. Fiolhais, Phys. Rev. B 66, 75115 (2002).

¹⁵ X.-P. Li, R. J. Needs, R. M. Martin, and D. M. Ceperley, Phys. Rev. B 45, 6124 (1992).

¹⁶ D. M. Ceperley and B. J. Alder (unpublished).

¹⁷ The difference between this surface energy and the surface energy of 558 erg/cm^2 that we have obtained from the Acioli-Ceperley slab energy (see caption of Table I) is partially due to the difference in the thickness of the jellium slabs considered in Refs. 1 and 15.

¹⁸ Due to oscillatory quantum-size effects, differences between the finite-slab surface energies and those reported before for the semi-infinite jellium^{4,5} are larger for $L = 8.52$ ($r_s a_0$) than in the case of $L = 7.21$ ($r_s a_0$).

¹⁹ N. D. Lang and L. J. Sham, Solid State Commun. 17, 581 (1975); D. C. Langreth and J. P. Perdew, Solid State Commun. 17, 1425 (1975); Phys. Rev. B 15, 2884 (1977).

²⁰ F. Sottile and P. Ballone, Phys. Rev. B 64, 045105 (2001).