Low complexity method for large-scale self-consistent ab initio electronic-structure calculations without localization

M.J.Rayson

Institut fur Physik, Universitat Basel, Klingelbergstrasse 82, 4056 Basel, Switzerland.

(Dated: April 17, 2024)

A novel low complexity method to perform self-consistent electronic-structure calculations using the K ohn-Sham form alism of density functional theory is presented. Localization constraints are neither im posed nor required thereby allowing direct comparison with conventional cubically scaling algorithms. Them ethod has, to date, the lowest complexity of any algorithm for an exact calculation. A simple one-dimensional model system is used to thoroughly test the numerical stability of the algorithm and results for a real physical system are also given.

PACS num bers: 71.15 M b

Low complexity electronic-structure methods [15], using the Kohn-Sham density functional approach [1, 2], where the operation count scales with respect to system size (N-scaling') as N where 2 have been around for a few decades. A com prehensive review of low com plexity m ethods is given in reference [3]. Contrary to what is often reported the theoretical upper bound for the N-scaling of an exact self-consistent algorithm has been set at 0 (N²) ever since Ferm i operator expansion (FOE) methods were developed [4]. This letter shows how the theoretical upper bound for the scaling of such calculations can be low ered to 0 ((d; N)N $\frac{2d-1}{d}$) where d is the dimensionality of repetition of a full threedimensional system and $(1; N) = \log_2(N)$, (2; N)2 4=3. For large scale calculations low and (3;N) com plexity algorithms are without doubt the future of electronic-structure in plem entations. How ever, low com plexity ab initio algorithms are not in common usage at the moment, primarily due to two main reasons. Firstly, much of the work currently being carried out deals with systems that are too small to be amenable to low complexity approaches if high accuracy is desired. Secondly, low complexity algorithms are not yet fully functional and fully stable for general system s - so a su cient level of con dence in using these codes has not been established. While the rst reason is rapidly being diminished due to the ever reducing cost of a oating point operation, the second m ay prove to be farm ore stubborn.

M ost low complexity algorithms fall broadly into two categories; either they attempt to calculate localized orbitals or they seek to evaluate the density matrix (DM) directly. For a general system only the latter is known to provide a low complexity solution. In the case of a m etal, for example, delocalized states at the Ferm i level prevent the occupied subspace being represented in terms of orthogonal localized orbitals.

P roblem s associated with low complexity approaches commonly stem from the imposition of a priori localization constraints. The e ect of this restriction varies depending on the algorithm and physical system. In orbital minimization algorithm s even the initial guess can

alter the obtained solution. In some cases localization will always cast a degree of doubt over the nalanswers (except in the simplest wide-gap system s), and in others prohibits obtaining the relevant physics/chem istry all together. Ferm i operator expansion (FOE) algorithms (either using a polynom ial [4, 5] or rational [6] approximation) for systems with a DM localized in real-space provide arguably the most natural and foolproof way of obtaining results in O (N). In these m ethods the locality does not necessarily have to be in posed a priori, rather the system can be allowed to inform us of the locality in a system atic way. M ethods that im pose unsystem atic localization are invariably open to more doubt. W hile a great deal of progress has been made in understanding the inherent locality present in many systems, low tem perature m etallic system s and charged insulating system s with long-ranged DM correlations are still a significant challenge. The method presented in this letter is primarily aim ed at such systems. However, it has also been noted that the onset of sparsity of the DM, even for wide-gap systems, is discouragingly slow ' [7] especially if high accuracy is required. The main advantage of the m ethod in this work is that it relies purely on the locality of the basis functions allow ing the use of non-orthogonal localized basis sets, such as Gaussians, with rather less localized orthogonal and dual com plem ents. A lso, the fullDM need not be explicitly calculated.

The energy renorm alization group (ERG) approach [8, 9, 10] is a beautiful and elegant concept that has also been suggested to cope with such di cult problem s. In an ideal in plem entation it may be possible for its scaling to better the method given here for d > 1 and equal it for d = 1. However, it remains unclear whether an ERG algorithm can also provide the density in an elecient manner and to some extent the ERG method employs cuto s. Therefore, the ERG method will not be included in the de nition of FOE methods in the following.

To date, standard FOE m ethods have been considered to scale quadratically for system s where the DM decay length is of the order of the system size. This can be the case for very large system s especially for m etals at low tem perature or if high accuracy is required. The m ethod presented here imposes no localization constraints and scales as 0 ($(d; N) N^{\frac{2d-1}{d}}$) where (d; N) is a weak logarithm ic factor for d = 1 and tends to a constant in higher dim ensions. Not only does this represent a new theoreticalupper bound for the N -scaling of an exact algorithm (upto the basis set lim it) it is also expected to make a signi cant and im m ediate im pact on system s of low dim ensionality. Furtherm ore, for d = 1 it can be implemented using exclusively standard direct linear algebra routines (eq. LAPACK) for the bulk of the computation. This is because a d = 1 H am iltonian (with zero or periodic boundary conditions) can always be arranged so that it is a banded matrix, with a bandwidth that is independent of system size, if it is constructed from localized basis functions.

W e now turn to what will be referred to as the recursive bisection density matrix (RBDM) algorithm. We begin with a rational approximation of the density matrix [16]

$$F (H) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{(H)}} ' \sum_{k=1}^{X_{1r}} !_{k} (H) z_{k})^{-1} !_{k} ; z_{k} 2 C;$$
(1)

where and are the inverse tem perature and Ferm i energy respectively. The inverses of the shifted Ham iltonians in equation (1) may be evaluated by solving linear equations. A number of methods to construct such rational approxim ations have previously appeared in the literature [11, 12, 13]. For a given tem perature, the condition of the shifted m atrices is asymptotically independent of system size. Therefore, if no localization of the DM can be taken advantage of the solution of each equation requires O (N) operations. Since we must solve O (N) equations the overall scaling is 0 (N 2) - as stated previously. A key point is that to calculate the band-structure energy and density

$$E_{bs} = \begin{cases} X & X \\ F_{ij}H_{ij}; n(r) = & F_{ij i}(r)_{j}(r) \end{cases} (2)$$

using a localized basis set f ig only requires elements of the DM that lie within the sparsity pattern of the Ham iltonian. The inverse of such a shifted matrix is clearly sym m etric as

(H
$$z_k$$
) $^1 = c c^T$; $_{ij} = _{ij} = (_i z_k)$ (3)

$$[(H z_k)^{-1}]^{T} = [c c^{T}]^{T} = [(c^{T})^{T} c^{T}] = c c^{T} (4)$$

where f ig and c are the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of H respectively. For sim plicity the H am iltonian m atrix H in equations (1)-(4) is taken to be constructed from an orthogonal basis. Generalization to the non-orthogonal case simply requires replacing (H z_k)with (H z_kS) throughout and noting that the eigenvectors in equations (3) and (4) satisfy $c^{T} S c = I w$ here S is the overlap m atrix of the basis functions.



FIG.1: Schematic of bisection of matrix inverses for d = 1. The broad diagonal line represents the band of the matrix. The narrow vertical lines represent the columns of the matrix inverses (H z_k)¹ that are calculated. The dashed horizontal lines are rows that are known from the calculated columns due to the matrix being symmetric. These rows then specify boundary conditions for smaller sets of independent linear equations at each sweep (a-d).

We may then proceed with a recursive bisection of the matrix approach without approximation. The easiest way to dem onstrate this principle is to see how one can obtain the density for a d = 1 system, such as a linearm olecule or carbon nanotube. For such a system the Ham iltonian is a banded matrix. The width of the band, although independent of system size, is in plan entation and system speci c. Therefore, for the sake of clarity a truly one-dimensional system will be considered. The sim plest H am iltonian we can im agine is a nite-di erence stencil representing the Laplacian and the local potential represented on a grid of spacing h

$$H_{ii} = 1 = h^{2} + V(x_{i})$$

$$H_{ij} = 1 = (2h^{2}); ji j = 1$$
(5)
$$H_{ij} = 0; ji j > 1:$$

As this matrix is tridiagonal, a submatrix (on the diagonal) of H requires two boundary points to determ ine the linear equation (H_{sub} z_k)x = b. Fig. 1 shows a schematic of the RBDM strategy for d = 1. After the

rst sweep (Fig 1 (a)) the rst, central and last columns are known. From the rows (known as the matrix is sym metric) we now have boundary conditions of two smaller problem swhich can be solved independently (Fig 1 (b)).

W e m ay then bisect these two subproblems in a similar fashion (Fig 1 (c)). The process continues until the dimensions of the submatrices are comparable to the bandwidth of the matrix (Fig 1(d)), and then direct evaluation can be used for the remaining subproblems (sm allest blocks on the diagonal in Fig 1(d)).

We now turn to the scaling of the method for 1 d 3. We start with a cubic system and imagine increasing the size of the system by a factor in d dimensions thereby increasing the total size of the system by ^d. Firstly, we consider only the cost of the st bisection (Fig 1 (a)) of the system and we consider the DM to have e ectively in nite range. To bisect the system into two subsystems requires calculating n_{col} columns (represented by vertical lines in Fig 1) of the DM and each column requires O (N) operations to compute. As the system size is increased (d 1) n_{col} columns are required to bisect the system. Therefore, the st sweep scales as $O(N^{(2d 1)=d})$ - and this is the leading term. This bisection operation must then be repeated until all of the desired elements of the DM have been calculated. The number of bisections required goes like $\log_{2d} (N)$. The number of operations required to perform sweep m $N_1=2^{(d-1)(m-1)}$ where N_1 is the number (m > 1) is of operations to perform the str sweep. Therefore, the total num ber of operations m ay be written as

$$N_{tot} / N_{0} \stackrel{(2d 1)=d}{=} \frac{\log_{2^d} (N)}{2^{(d 1)(m 1)}} = (6)$$

For d = 1 the sum mation is clearly proportional to $\log_2 N$. However, in higher dimensions the sum mation is a convergent series and gives 2 for d = 2 and 4=3 for d = 3. This is an upper bound for the number of operations. E laborate bisection schemes may reduce the total number of operations but the leading scaling with N will not be a ected. Ham iltonians with broader bands from the use of more extended basis functions or non-local pseudopotentials require an increase in $n_{\rm col}$, how ever, this does not a ect the N -scaling.

A nother in portant aspect of any algorithm is num erical stability. As many elements of the DM rely on previous solutions of linear equations we may expect errors to accumulate the more bisections we use. It is di cult to gauge the precise e ect on the total energy, however we may concentrate on a single inverse and assume the worst case scenario. If we take one of our shifted matrices that is closest to being singular (the matrix shifted closest to the Fermi energy) (H $z_{\rm c}$) then the error in solving for one column of the matrix is proportional to z_c) where m and are m achine precision andm (H condition of the matrix respectively. At worse we may expect the error to grow linearly with the bisection num ber, though a random -walk accumulation leading to a square root dependence is more realistic. Fig. 2 shows this slow drift in the value of Tr(H (H z_{c})¹) where



FIG.2: Relative error in Tr(H (H z_c)¹) (single precision) compared to the case where no bisections were used (solid line). The condition of (H z_c)¹ is of the order 10^6 . For such an ill-conditioned matrix even the relative error in single precision direct diagonalization was 10^5 . The dashed line shows a t of the square root of the number of bisections.

(H z_c) ¹ is a very ill conditioned matrix (certainly as ill-conditioned as any in a realistic electronic structure calculation). However, each submatrix will have eigenvalue range similar to that of the full matrix but a less clustered eigenspectrum. This will render sub-linear systems becoming further from singularity during the bisection process. The numerics in a full calculation are clearly very complex. One-dimensional model systems were extensively tested in single precision, including double precision iterative in provem ent of the solutions, from a range of ill-conditioned matrices. In some cases increasing the bisection number produced results closer to that of double precision diagonalization and no catastrophic num erical instabilities were detected.

As a nalexample we take a more physically realistic Hamiltonian. A minimal Gaussian basis was used to construct H am iltonian and overlap m atrices for linear C_nH_{2n+2} molecules using a norm-conserving non-local pseudopotential [14]. To obtain a physically reasonable eigenspectrum using the minim albasis for this molecule requires basis functions with a spatial extent which corresponds to the bandwidth of the matrix being approxim ately 50. This corresponds to a chain length of around 8 carbon atom s before the bandwidth of the matrix becom es less than the dimension of the matrix. For testing purposes a low temperature (0:04eV) Ferm i distribution distribution with taken to be an eigenvalue in the valence band was chosen. This corresponds to a highly charged insulating system with a long range DM (Fig. 3) and also provides an ill-conditioned problem ideal to test num erical stability. The absolute/relative error, compared to direct diagonalization, for the 1001 atom $C_{333}H_{668}$ was 10 $^{10}/10$ 13 and 5 bisections were required. This further puts into context the num erical



FIG.3: Decay of the central column of the density matrix (squares) and two inverses of shifted Ham iltonians for the highly charged $C_{333}H_{668}$ system. The Ham iltonian closest to the Ferm i energy (crosses) and the Ham iltonian shifted furthest from the realaxis (triangles).

drift m entioned in the previous section. No iterative im provem ent was used in this example, only full double precision arithm etic, and the ill-conditioning of the linear system's represents the worst case in a typical calculation. Therefore, in a realistic calculation, chain lengths containing at least one m illion basis functions in onedim ension (and m ore in higher dim ensions) should be accessible (by which point the natural decay of the density m atrix will surely lim it the num ber of required bisections in any case).

We now discuss some further im plementation issues. For large system atic basis sets the memory required to store the boundary conditions may become prohibitive -especially in three dimensions. The method can overcome this to some extent by bisecting the system by a factor, q, greater than two and building up the density matrix in segments. However, when using large basis sets, a smaller litered set of basis functions expanded in terms of the underlying basis would be a more realistic approach. It can now be clearly seen how conventional linear algebra can be used for d = 1 system s. A banded m atrix can be LU factorized in O (N) operations and a linear equation solved in O (N) using direct m ethods. Therefore, for d = 1 iterative algorithm s need not be considered - this is useful when using localized basis functions such as G aussians where iterative m ethods are still di cult to precondition. A lso, the matrices shifted close to , at low tem perature, becom e close to singular therefore even basis sets that can be readily preconditioned in a conventional sense (by damping of high kinetic energy components) will also su er in this regime, so direct m ethods are desirable. As solving sparse linear system s of equations form s the kernel of the m ethod it is naturally open to any advances in direct sparse solvers for system s where d > 1.

In principle, a sim ilar procedure can be used if one opts for a polynom ial, rather than a rational, approximation to the Fermi function. If $_{p}F(H)$ is approximated by a polynom ial in H, F(H)' $_{k}^{n_{p}} !_{k}H^{k}$, we may construct a set of columns of H k $k = 2; :::; n_{p}$ and store the necessary boundary matrix elements for each k in a similar fashion to that already described above.

Even if a system has a DM that is su ciently localized to take advantage of the RBDM m ethod can still be used to dram atically reduce the prefactor if the localization regions are signicantly larger than the spatial extent of the basis functions. This will offen be the case if highly accurate relative energies are desired. A lso, the inverses of H am iltonians shifted far from the real-axis have more rapid decay allowing true O(N) evaluation (Fig. 3).

In conclusion, a simple modi cation of FOE methods has been presented allowing O ($(d;N)N^{\frac{2d-1}{d}}$) scaling where $(1;N) = \log_2(N)$, (2;N) = 2 and (3;N) = 4=3 without the need for localization. This is a especially useful for system s of low dimensionality with long-ranged DM correlations.

The author thanks S.G oedecker for helpfulcom m ents regarding the m anuscript and P.R.Briddon for providing the C $_{333}H_{668}$ test m atrix. This work was supported by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Program methrough NEST-BigDFT (Contract No. BigDFT-511815).

Electronic address: mark_rayson@unibas.ch

- [1] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. 136, B864 (1964).
- [2] W .Kohn and L.J.Sham, Phys.Rev.140, A1133 (1965).
- [3] S.G oedecker, Rev.M od.Phys 71, 1085 (1999).
- [4] S.G oedecker and L.Colom bo, Phys.Rev.Lett.73, 122
 (1994).
- [5] S. G oedecker and M. Teter, Phys. Rev. B. 51, 9455 (1995).
- [6] S.Goedecker, J.Com put. Phys. 118, 216 (1995).
- [7] P.E.M aslen, C.O chsenfeld, C.A.W hite, M.S.Lee, and M.Head-Gordon, J.Phys.Chem. A 102, 2215 (1998).
- [8] R.Baerand M.Head-Gordon, J.Chem. Phys. 109, 10159 (1998).
- [9] R.Baer and M.Head-Gordon, Phys. Rev. B. 58, 15296 (1998).
- [10] A. Kenou and J. Polonyi, Phys. Rev. B. 70, 205105 (2004).
- [11] S.Goedecker, Phys. Rev. B. 48, 17573 (1993).
- [12] D.M.C.N icholson and X.-G.Zhang, Phys. Rev. B. 56, 12805 (1993).
- [13] F.Gagel, J.Com put. Phys. 139, 399 (1998).
- [14] C. Hartwigsen, S. Goedecker, and J. Hutter, Phys. Rev. B 58, 3641 (1998).
- [15] Throughout this letter it will be assumed the methods can furnish both the band-structure energy and the density leading to a self-consistent solution.
- [16] A polynom ial expansion could also be used.