

Comparison of the Spherical Averaged Pseudopotential Model with the Stabilized Jellium Model

Amando Vieira¹, M. Begona Torres², Carlos Fiolhais¹ and L. Carlos Balbas²

¹Departamento de Física da Universidade de Coimbra,
P-3000 Coimbra, Portugal

²Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de Valladolid,
E-47011 Valladolid, Spain

April 15, 2024

PACS: 36.40-c, 36.40.Wa, 71.10+x

Abstract

We compare Kohn-Sham results (density, cohesive energy, size and effect of charging) of the Spherical Averaged Pseudopotential Model with the Stabilized Jellium Model for clusters of sodium and aluminum with less than 20 atoms. We find that the Stabilized Jellium Model, although conceptually and practically more simple, gives better results for the cohesive energy and the elastic stiffness. We use the Local Density Approximation as well as the Generalized Gradient Approximation to the exchange and correlation energies.

1 Introduction

The energy functional for an electronic system under the influence of a positive charge distribution (ions) is

$$E[n; n_+] = T[n] + E_{xc}[n] + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3r \int d^3r' \frac{n(\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \quad (1)$$

$$+ \int d^3r V_+(\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3r \int d^3r' \frac{n_+(\mathbf{r})n_+(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} ;$$

where $n(\mathbf{r})$ is the density of the valence electrons, $n_+(\mathbf{r})$ is the ionic density, T is the kinetic energy, E_{xc} is the exchange and correlation energy, and $V_+(\mathbf{r})$ is the potential created by the ions. Atomic units are used in this paper.

The Jellium Model is a simple model to describe simple metals. To study a spherical cluster in this model, the ions are replaced by a continuous positive background which is constant inside a sphere of radius $R_{jel} = r_s N^{1/3}$, where N is the number of valence electrons, and zero outside:

$$n_+(r) = \bar{n} \quad (R_{jel} - r) ; \quad (2)$$

with $\bar{n} = 3/(4 r_s^3)$. For this model the external potential is simply

$$V_+(\mathbf{r}) = v_{jel}(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{N}{2R_{jel}^3} \left(3 - \frac{r^2}{R_{jel}^2} \right) & (r < R_{jel}) \\ \frac{N}{r} & (r \geq R_{jel}) \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The Stabilized Jellium Model (SJM) [1] represents an improvement over the Jellium Model. For the bulk matter, it yields more realistic binding energies and bulk moduli [1]. For semi-infinite systems, it provides more correct surface energies and work functions [2]. For clusters, it gives very reasonable cohesive energies, dissociation energies, ionization energies, etc. [3, 4]. Its energy functional may be written as

$$E_{SJ}[n; n_+] = E_J[n; n_+] + \hbar v_i \int_0^Z dr r^2 [w(r) - v_{jel}(r)] + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3r n_+(r) ; \quad (4)$$

where $E_J[n; n_+]$ is the jellium energy functional (Eq. (1) with the external potential given by Eq. (3)), and

$$\hbar v_i = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{r_0} dr r^2 [w(r) - v_{jel}(r)] = \frac{3}{10} \frac{r_0^2}{r_s} + \frac{3}{2} \frac{r_c^2}{r_s^3} \quad (5)$$

is the average, in the Wigner-Seitz cell (taken to be a sphere of radius $r_0 = r_s^{-1/3}$, with the valence), of the difference between the pseudopotential

$$w(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & (r < r_c) \\ =r & (r \geq r_c) \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

(Ashcroft empty core potential [5], with core radius r_c) and the jellium potential.

In the last term of Eq. (2), \sim is the spurious background repulsion inside each Wigner-Seitz cell, which is equal to the sum of the Madelung energy

$$E_M = -\frac{1}{2} \int_0^{r_0} dr 4\pi r^2 \bar{n} \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{2} v_{jel} = -\frac{9}{10} \frac{r_s^{-2/3}}{r_s} \quad (7)$$

and the average of the pseudopotential repulsion [1]:

$$-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^{r_c} dr 4\pi r^2 \bar{n} \frac{1}{r} = -\frac{3}{2} \frac{r_c^2}{r_s^3} : \quad (8)$$

Physically, Eq. (4) means that we start with jellium and localize uniformly the ions but their interaction with the valence electrons (accounted for by the pseudopotential) is only taken into account perturbatively and in a spherical averaged way.

With the energy functional (4) we may extract results for clusters, via the Kohn-Sham method in the Local Density Approximation (LDA) for exchange and correlation, going from the single stabilized jellium atom all the way up to the bulk solid. We use the Perdew-Wang interpolative formula [6] for the correlation energy. We consider that the jellium background is either fixed with the bulk density value or relaxed in order to give the minimal energy for a given number of particles (using a fixed pseudopotential, e.g., transferred from the bulk). In the latter case, which is in principle more realistic, we speak of self-compression of the neutral cluster, a phenomenon which may be classically explained by the effect of the surface tension on the density [7, 8, 9]. We take here, when not otherwise indicated, the SJM including self-compression. The energetics of the cluster ground states is similar to that of the Jellium Model, with the same shell structure, but shifted down, i.e., the valence electrons are more bound.

Let $E = E(N; r_s; r_c; \dots)$ be the binding energy of a neutral spherical cluster with N valence electrons. The equilibrium ionic density, r_s , of a cluster is obtained imposing the following equilibrium condition:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r_s} \left(\frac{E(N; r_s; r_c; \dots)}{N} \right)_{r_s = r_s^B} = 0; \quad (9)$$

where the derivative is taken at constant N and $r_c = r_c(r_s^B; \dots)$, where r_s^B is the bulk density parameter. The core radius is fixed by the bulk stability condition, which is Eq. (9) in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. We have self-compression if $r_s < r_s^B$ and self-expansion if $r_s > r_s^B$.

The elastic stiffness of the cluster is defined by

$$B(N; r_s; r_c) = -V \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial V^2} \Big|_{r_s=r_c} = \frac{1}{12} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_s^2} \left(\frac{E(N; r_s; r_c)}{N} \right) \Big|_{r_s=r_c} : \quad (10)$$

In the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, this quantity goes over to the bulk modulus. Stability demands that $B > 0$.

On the other hand, the Spherical Averaged Pseudopotential Model (SAPM) takes into account the geometrical arrangement of the ions located at positions \mathbf{R}_j [10, 11]. This is optimized by minimizing the total energy of the cluster.

Only valence electrons are explicitly treated, as in the SJM, being the ion cores replaced by atomic pseudopotentials $w(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_j)$. The simplification introduced by the SAPM model for clusters of simple metals consists of replacing the external potential felt by the valence electrons, $V_+(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_j^{N_{at}} w(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_j)$, by its spherical average, $\langle V_+(r) \rangle$, around the cluster center. In this way, the energy functional in the SAPM model reads as

$$E_{SAPM}[\mathbf{n}; \mathbf{R}_i] = T[\mathbf{n}] + E_{xc}[\mathbf{n}] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i^Z \int d^3r \int d^3r' \frac{n(\mathbf{r}) n(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \quad (11)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} \sum_i^Z \int d^3r \langle V_+(r) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}^{N_{at}} \frac{z_i z_j}{|\mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{R}_j|},$$

where z_i denotes the charge of the ions and $N_{at} = N - 1$ is the number of atoms. The last term in Eq. (11) represents the repulsion between the ion cores, which is approximated by the interaction between point charges. As in the SJM, we have used the LDA with the correlation energy functional of Perdew-Wang.

In order to determine the cluster energy, we start from a randomly initial atomic configuration \mathbf{R}_j^0 , and solve the Kohn-Sham equations, evaluating the valence electron density and the total energy given by Eq. (11). To obtain the geometry that minimizes the total energy, we calculate the energy variation (E_j) , corresponding to the displacement of the ion at position \mathbf{R}_j in each Cartesian direction $(\mathbf{e} = x; y; z)$, by a small quantity d , keeping the electron density and the other ions coordinates frozen. Then we choose the maximal energy variation E_{max} , and move each ion coordinate by the amount $[(E_j) = E_{max}] d$, obtaining a new geometry, \mathbf{R}_j^1 , for which we calculate the corresponding electron density. With this new geometry we repeat the cycle again, being the process iterated until convergence is achieved and an equilibrium geometry is found. This generally leads to a local minimum. To find the global minimum we have repeated the calculations for a large number (typically 20) of random initial configurations.

To obtain the elastic stiffness in the SAPS model, we use an analogue of Eq. (10) with the approximation

$$\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial r^2} = \frac{E(R_j - \epsilon) + E(R_j + \epsilon) - 2E(R_j)}{j \epsilon^2} ; \quad (12)$$

The energy of the cluster is calculated with the atoms at the equilibrium positions R_j and displaced radially in and out by a small amount, ϵ , from R_j (for simplicity we have omitted the energy functional dependence on n).

An extension of the SAPS model which exploits all ionic degrees of freedom in three dimensions but restricts the electronic many-body problem to axial symmetry has been recently introduced by Montag and Reinhard [12, 13]. This model is known as CAPS (Cylindrical-Averaged Pseudopotential Scheme), since a cylindrical average is taken instead of a spherical average.

In this work we compare the SAPS model with the SJM because the two schemes use a spherical average of the atomic pseudopotential, and one could expect the two descriptions of some clusters properties to be similar. In particular, one could expect that the phenomena of self-compression of neutral clusters with respect to the bulk density and self-compression or self-expansion of charged clusters, which have been identified in the SJM [8, 9], are also described in the SAPS. With this goal, we examine the two models for small clusters of sodium and aluminum. In the Appendix we compare the LDA cohesive energies with the Generalized Gradient Approximation (GGA) ones.

2 Results

Fig. 1 shows the SAPS valence electron density for 8-atoms clusters of sodium ($r_s = 3.93$, $Z = 1$) and aluminum ($r_s = 2.07$, $Z = 3$), in comparison with the SJM one, if the jellium edge is allowed to move. In the SAPS, we have used the recently proposed evanescent core pseudopotential model, which has the advantages of being local and analytical and which describes generally well the main physical properties of bulk simple metals [14, 15, 16]. In the SJM, we have used the simpler and more common Ashcroft pseudopotential with the core radius fixed by the condition of bulk stability. We could as well have used any other local pseudopotential with a single free parameter, arriving at the same results. We conclude that the two densities are somewhat different, especially in the interior for aluminum (the SAPS density is much lower there). The surface diffusivity is bigger for SAPS than for SJM (this leads to a larger redshift of the surface plasmon resonance with respect to the Mie peak [17]). However, the radial probability density $r^2 n(r)$, represented in the inset, is similar in the two models. We have performed the same comparison for positively ionized systems (Na_8^{3+} and

Al_8^{12+}), arriving at the same conclusions.

Let us consider the energy of the cluster in the two models. The cohesive energy is the difference between the energy of the free atom and the energy of the cluster per atom,

$$E_{\text{coh}}(N_{\text{at}}) = E(\text{atom}) - \frac{E(N_{\text{at}})}{N_{\text{at}}} : \quad (13)$$

For the bulk, Eq. (13) leads to the heat of sublimation: $E_{\text{coh}}(N_{\text{at}} = 1) = E(\text{atom}) - a_v$, where a_v is the bulk energy per valence electron. Fig. 2 represents the cohesive energy for small clusters of sodium and aluminum using the SAPS model, and the two versions of the SJM: one with the self-compression effect and another with the background density frozen at the bulk value, r_s^B . In Fig. 2 we have also plotted the liquid drop energy in the SJM

$$E_{\text{coh}}^{\text{LDM}}(N_{\text{at}}) = a_s N_{\text{at}}^{-2/3} (1 - N_{\text{at}}^{-1/3}) + a_c N_{\text{at}}^{-1/3} (1 - N_{\text{at}}^{-2/3}) ; \quad (14)$$

with a_s and a_c the surface and curvature energy coefficients. In the case of self-compression, the curvature energy coefficient is replaced by [7]

$$a_c = a_c^0 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(a_s^0)^2}{a_v^0} : \quad (15)$$

For sodium we have $a_c = 0.18$ eV, and for aluminum $a_c = 0.10$ eV, which contrast with the non-compression values, respectively 0.26 eV and 0.65 eV. The surface energy ($a_s = 0.57$ eV for sodium and 0.86 eV for aluminum) is not affected by compression.

The cohesive energy in the SAPS is much lower than any of the SJM results, although a similar pattern (with maxima at shell closures) is apparent. For sodium, the self-compressed SJM results are in very good agreement with LDA-Car-Parrinello calculations [18] (and also close to the experimental values [19]). For aluminum, the frozen density SJM results are in good agreement with Car-Parrinello calculations [20] (and experiment [21]), while self-compressed SJM and SAPS yield negative values for very small clusters. This fact should be seen as a drawback of the spherical approximation used in both models. The spherical restriction, valid for the atom, is indeed an artificial constraint for the bulk solid. This makes the SAPS valence-electron energies too high and the cohesive energies too low. In the SJM, the errors made for the atom and the solid seem to be similar.

The SAPS result for the cohesive energy depends somewhat on the selected pseudopotential, but replacing the evanescent core pseudopotential by a different one such as Manninen's [22], the SAPS results remain negative for small clusters. The error made in using the pseudopotential for the atom may be estimated replacing the binding energy of the pseudo-atom by the sum of the first ionization potentials in an all-electron calculation using the

same exchange and correlation energies. That correction, using the evanescent core pseudopotential, yields a shift upwards in the cohesive energy of 0.2 eV for sodium, and 0.0 eV for aluminum.

In Appendix, we compare the LDA with the GGA results for the cohesive energy, concluding that the density gradient corrections reduce this quantity.

Besides the electronic shell structure, leading to magic numbers, which appears in both the SJM and the SAPS model, there is in the latter an ionic structure which also reflects itself in oscillations of the total energy. In order to disentangle the electronic and geometric shell effects, we have evaluated the kinetic energy contribution by means of an Extended Thomas-Fermi energy functional with fourth-order gradient corrections (TFDGW4) [23, 24] using, however, the self-consistent Kohn-Sham density of each model (Fig. 3). In this way the electronic shell-structure due to the quantum kinetic energy operator of the Kohn-Sham equations is partially erased. In both cases, it is clear that with the new functional we would obtain self-consistently a different ionic background and ionic structure, but we have just evaluated a semi-classical kinetic energy with the quantal density as in Ref. [24]. The resulting binding energies of sodium neutral clusters are represented in Fig. 3. In the SJM, we obtain a smooth curve, which may be fitted by a liquid drop formula; the surface and curvature coefficients are $a_s = 0.52$ eV and $a_c = 0.22$ eV, which agree very well with results obtained from the planar surface problem, respectively 0.58 eV and 0.26 eV [2]. But, in the SAPS, we are left with some wiggles, which are mainly due to the reorganization of ionic shells. An increase of the energy arises when a new shell is added. For instance, this happens when going from $N_{at} = 4$ to $N_{at} = 5$ or from $N_{at} = 13$ to $N_{at} = 14$. Note that, except for the $N_{at} = 1$ case, the SJM results is always above the SAPS results.

For the sake of comparing the cluster size evolution in the two models, we have plotted, in Fig. 4, the radius of the outer ionic shell R_{out} in SAPS divided by $R(N) = R_{jel}(N) - d/2$, where d is the distance between parallel closed packed planes in the bulk solid, against the number of atoms. In fact, the planar surface is the limit of the curved surface of a big cluster, and it is known from surface physics that the first lattice plane is located at a distance $x = -d/2$ from the jellium edge located at $x = 0$. The quantity $d = 1.436 r_0$ is the distance between the (110) planes in the bcc structure (these are the planes with the biggest separation) and $d = 1.477 r_0$ is the distance between the (111) planes of the fcc structure. We see that R_{out}/R approaches 1 from above, although it becomes increasingly difficult to apply the SAPS to very big clusters and to attain the planar surface limit. This dilatation effect of the outer ion shell with respect to the surface limit is particularly clear for very small clusters. On the other hand, we observe contraction in the SJM: in Fig. 4, $r_s = r_s^B$ goes

from below to 1 when N_{at} increases. In both models, the approach to the asymptotic limit is more rapid for sodium than for aluminium.

Notwithstanding the expansion of the outer ionic shell, the distances between next neighbour ions inside each shell are smaller than in the bulk environment differing from ionic shell to ionic shell. This inhomogeneous contraction observed in SAPS has been reported before [25, 26]. Such an effect is outside the scope of the SJM, since the jellium background must have a constant density [1].

To analyse the behaviour of charged systems we may keep the size fixed (e.g., Na_8 and Al_8) and increase the charge all the way up to Coulomb explosion of the volume (Fig. 5). In the first case, the radius of the jellium sphere is increasing, while in the SAPS the same happens with the radii of the ionic shells. We see a strong similarity of the phenomenon of volume explosion described by the SJM and the SAPS model. The maximal positive charge that Na_8 can hold is $q = 3$, whereas for Al_8 is $q = 13$ for the SJM and $q = 14$ for the SAPS (the charged systems of Fig. 1 are therefore close to their stability limit). For Al_8^+ , we observe in both models a small self-compression instead of self-expansion with respect to the neutral system. This is an interesting effect since it goes against the expectations.

The type of instability we are describing is different from usual fission since, in the latter, volume is fixed while shape is deformed and here volume changes keeping the shape. The fissibility, defined as $x = E_C/2E_S$, where E_C is the Coulomb and E_S is the surface energy of a spherical cluster, controls the fission probability. For $x = 1$ the fission barrier vanishes and the cluster decays spontaneously. A different parameter should be considered for the explosion of the background. Anyway, within the SJM, we get $x = 3.4$ for Na_8 and $x = 26.6$ for Al_8 as critical fissibilities for volume explosion, which indicates that excited clusters prefer to lower their energy by deforming and breaking into two or more pieces than by exploding the volume.

Finally, in Fig. 6 we compare the elastic stiffness of charged aluminium clusters. The two values agree when the charge is big, but differ for small charges: the elastic stiffness of neutral aluminium clusters in the SAPS model is much larger than in the SJM. We remind that the aluminium bulk modulus given by the SJM is a factor of 2 bigger than the experimental value, as indicated in the picture.

3 Conclusions

We have examined comparatively some physical properties of small clusters of sodium and aluminium as given by the SJM and the SAPS model.

The radial electronic probabilities are similar for sodium and somewhat different for aluminum. Although the SJM is conceptually and practically more simple, its results for the cohesive energy are in better agreement with more involved theoretical results. The restriction to the spherical symmetry seems to be a serious drawback of the SAPS model. The outer ionic radius in the SAPS and the jellium edge in the SJM for neutral clusters approach the asymptotic limit in different ways. However, the results of the two models compare very well when we normalize the ionic radius of a charged cluster to that of the corresponding neutral cluster, and keep the number of atoms fixed when increasing the charge. The elastic stiffness given by the SJM, although too high in comparison with data for high density metals such as aluminum, is better than the SAPS output. This indicates that the spherical restriction to the ionic structure, besides giving too low cohesive energy for high density metal clusters, also makes them too hard. Therefore, the corresponding monopole compression mode in the SAPS has an energy which is expected to be too high in comparison with experiment [27].

In conclusion, the results obtained with the SAPS for the energetics and compression properties of small clusters should be taken with some care. Simpler models, such as SJM, may surprisingly perform better. On the other hand, the SJM is useless for heterogeneous clusters, while SAPS is able to describe them. The two types of models are useful for understanding the main trends of small and large clusters, since *ab initio* theoretical models are computationally more elaborated and, at present, almost impossible to apply to clusters with more than 20 atoms. Since the SJM and the SAPS model assume spherical symmetry, they are particularly suitable for systems with spherical geometries (for instance, $N_{\text{at}} = 8$ and 20 for sodium). They are not adequate for systems with $N_{\text{at}} = 5$, which are known, from first principles calculations, to be planar.

The assumptions of stabilized jellium are not restricted to a compact spherical shape making it more versatile than the SAPS model to describe some properties of metallic clusters. A simple modification of the SJM which should bring it to a better agreement with SAPS is the hollow SJM [28, 29]. Indeed, for a small system, we may open a hole in the middle and vary the size of the system so that the energy is minimal for a given number of particles. Deformed jellium [30] and CAPS [12, 13] represent improvements of respectively spherical SJM and SAPS which correct the spherical approximation.

Appendix: The Generalized Gradient Approximation for small clusters

The Local Density Approximation (LDA) for exchange and correlation is the most used scheme in Density Functional Theory, but other approximations, which try to correct some of its deficiencies (e.g., incapacity to bound extra electrons), may be implemented. One of the most popular is a semi-local approach named Generalized Gradient Approximation (GGA) from which there are a couple of versions, e.g. Refs. [31] and [32]. Instead of LDA, we have used the GGA, in the form recently proposed by Perdew, Burk and Ernzerhof [32], for calculating the cohesive energies for sodium and aluminum clusters in the SJM as well as in the SAPS. In the SAPS we have taken the ionic configuration optimized within the LDA. For SJM we are not considering self-compression.

The results are shown in Fig. 7, in comparison with LDA theory and experimental data. We obtain a small decrease of the cohesive energy for both metals. This fact reiterates our conclusion, reached with the LDA, that the SJM is in better agreement with the experimental data than the SAPS. The decrease of the cohesive energy, due to gradient corrections, is a well-known feature of Density Functional Theory [31].

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to J.P. Perdew (Tulane University, USA) and A. Marañes (Universidad de Cantabria) for their helpful comments. This work has been partially supported by the Praxis XXI projects No. 2/2.1/FIS/26/94 and No. 2/2.1/FIS/473/94. One of us (A.V.) has been supported by a grant of the Praxis XXI program.

References

- [1] Perdew J P, Tran H Q and Smith E D 1990 Phys. Rev. B 42 11627.
- [2] Fiolhais C and Perdew J P 1992 Phys. Rev. B 45 6207.
- [3] Brajczewska M, Fiolhais C and Perdew J P 1993 Int. J. Quantum Chem. 27 249.
- [4] Perdew J P, Ziesche P and Fiolhais C 1993 Phys. Rev. B 47 16460.
- [5] Ashcroft N W 1966 Phys. Lett. 23 48.
- [6] Perdew J P and Wang Y 1992 Phys. Rev. B 45 13 244.
- [7] Perdew J P, Brajczewska M and Fiolhais C 1993 Solid State Commun. 88 795.

- [8] V ieira A , B ra jzew ska M , F iolhais C and Perdew J P 1996 Int. J. Quantum Chem . S 30, 325.
- [9] B ra jzew ska M , V ieira A , F iolhais C and Perdew J P 1996 Progress in Surface Science, in print.
- [10] Iniguez M P , Lopez M J, Alonso J A and Soler J 1989 Z . Phys. 11, 163.
- [11] M ananes A , Iniguez M P , Lopez M J and Alonso J A 1990 Phys. Rev. B 42 5000.
- [12] Montag B and Reinhard P G 1994 Phys. Lett. A 193 380.
- [13] Montag B and Reinhard P G 1995 Z . Phys. D 33 265.
- [14] F iolhais C , Perdew J P , Am ster S Q , M acLaren J M and B ra jzew ska M 1995 Phys. Rev. B 51 14001.
- [15] Nogueira F , F iolhais C , He J, Perdew J P and Rubio A 1996 J. Phys.: Cond. Matter 8 287.
- [16] Pollack L , He J, Perdew J P , Marques M , Nogueira F and F iolhais C , Phys. Rev. B , in print.
- [17] Brack M , 1993 Rev. Mod. Phys. 65 677.
- [18] R thlisberger U , Andreoni W 1991 J. Chem . Phys. 94 8129.
- [19] Brechignac C , Cahuzac Ph, Leygnier J and W einer J 1989 J. Chem . Phys. 90 1492.
- [20] Jones R O 1991, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 224.
- [21] Ray U , Jarrold M F , Bower J E and K rauss J S 1989 J. Chem . Phys. 91 2912.
- [22] M anninen M 1986 Phys. Rev. B 34 6886.
- [23] Engel E and Perdew J P 1991 Phys. Rev. B 43 1331.
- [24] Engel E , LaRocca P and D reizler R M 1994 Phys. Rev. B 49 16728.
- [25] M ananes A , Alonso J A , Lam mers U and Borstel G 1991 Phys. Rev. B 44 7273.
- [26] G lossman M D , Iniguez M P and Alonso J A 1992 Z . Phys. D 22 541.
- [27] Aguilar J G , M ananes A , Duque F , Lpez M J, Iguiez M P , Alonso J A 1997 Int. J. Quantum Chem . 61 613.

- [28] Membrado M , Pacheco A F and Sarudo J 1991 Solid State Commun. 77 887.
- [29] Yannouleas C and Landman U 1994 Chem . Phys. Lett. 217 175.
- [30] Hirschmann Th, Brack M , and Meyer J 1994 Ann. Physik 3 336.
- [31] Perdew J P , Chevary J A , Vosko S H , Jackson K A , Pederson M R , Singh D J, and Fiolhais C 1992 Phys. Rev. B 46 6671.
- [32] Perdew J P, Burke K , and Ernzerhof M 1996 Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 3865.

Figure 1: Valence electron densities of neutral and charged octamers of sodium and aluminum, obtained with the SAPS and the SJM. In insert, we represent the radial probability density of the neutral clusters, $r^2 n(r)$, in arbitrary units. The horizontal line represents the background density of the neutral cluster in the SJM (its radius is $R_{jel} = r_s N^{\frac{1}{3}}$, with $r_s = 3.70$, for sodium, and $r_s = 1.92$ for aluminum). The vertical arrows on the horizontal axis denote the position of ionic shells in the SAPS: in each picture the left arrow marks the position of the ionic shell for the neutral cluster, whereas the right one stands for the charged case. Each cluster has a single ionic shell, with D_{4d} symmetry.

Figure 2: Cohesive energies of sodium and aluminum clusters obtained in the SAPS model and the SJM. The SJM is shown in two versions: one, denoted by $SJM(r_s^B)$, with the background density fixed at the bulk value, and another denoted by $SJM(r_s)$ including self-compression, where the background density of the cluster is allowed to change. The solid lines are obtained with the liquid drop formula, with (below) and without (above) the self-compression effect. (We take the Kohn-Sham energy of the atom instead of the liquid drop value.) Our results are compared with Car-Parrinello calculations [18, 20]

Figure 3: Binding energies per atom for sodium clusters in the SJM and SAPS models. The lines marked with TFDGW4 represents the energy obtained by replacing the quantal kinetic energy by the TFDGW4 functional of the Kohn-Sham density. The numbers denote the structure of ionic shells in SAPS, and have the following meaning: 1-one ionic shell; 2-one ionic shell with one atom at the center; 3-two ionic shells; and 4-two ionic shells with one atom at the center.


Figure 4: Size evolution of the outer ionic shell radius, R_{out} , in the SAPS, and of the equilibrium ionic density of SJM, r_s , for sodium clusters and aluminum. Both quantities are normalized to the corresponding limit $N \rightarrow 1$. The numbers over the SAPS points have the same meaning as in Fig. 3.

Figure 5: Size of Na_8^{q+} and Al_8^{q+} , normalized to the corresponding size of the neutral system, as a function of charge q . For the SAPS we represent the ratio between the outer ionic shell radius of the charged and the neutral cluster. For the SJM we represent the ratio between the equilibrium density parameter, r_s , of the charged and the neutral cluster. The inset is a blow-up between $q = -2$ and $q = 3$ (for Al_8^{q+} the SAPS has no bound solutions for $q < 0$).


Figure 6: Elastic stiffness B of Al_8^{q+} , as a function of charge q , obtained with the SAPS and the SJM.

Figure 7: Cohesive energies of sodium (above) and aluminum (below) clusters obtained within the SAPS and the SJM, with the LDA and GGA for exchange and correlation.


Al




Al




Na




Al




Al_8^q




Al_8^{q+}




Na




Na_8^q




Al_8^q



Na_8^q



Na



Na

