I. INTRODUCTION

The \textit{ab initio}, density functional theory (DFT) based determination of structural and electronic properties of correlated systems remains an outstanding challenge in materials modeling. The crucial bottleneck is that approaches general and powerful enough to tackle the description of strongly-correlated systems are also heavily demanding in terms of the required computing resources. This limits the size system that can be practically afforded to at most a few tens of atoms per primitive cell. In contrast, many interesting properties of correlated systems call for large cell sizes already at the bulk level due to the possible coexistence of several competing and juxtaposed orderings (structural, magnetic, orbital, and charge ordering). Furthermore, several much-celebrated phenomena such as high-$T_c$ superconductivity in cuprates, colossal magnetoresistivity in manganites, magnetic ordering in diluted magnetic semiconductors, etc., involve doping, the treatment at generic concentration of which is a formidable computing task. Finally, oxide interfaces and multilayers, which are the basis of recent intriguing discoveries such as two-dimensional (2D) electron liquid behavior, may require even a larger simulation effort.

One thus needs to treat routinely a few hundred atoms, a size that can be only afforded at a computational cost similar to that of standard local (spin) density functional theory [L(S)DA] or its generalized gradient approximation (GGA) version. Beyond LSDA, approaches that are agile enough to satisfy this requirement are very few: the very popular LDA + U (Ref. 2) is certainly one of them. A more recent approach with similar characteristics is the pseudo self-interaction correction (PSIC) approach implemented in the past in two different settings: plane-wave basis and ultrasoft pseudopotentials, and localized orbital basis and norm-conserving pseudopotentials [this is called atomic self-interaction correction (ASIC) approach in the framework of the SIESTA code]. LDA + U and PSIC and ASIC move from different conceptual viewpoints: the former introduces an effective Coulomb repulsion, which is typically poorly treated in LSDA. The latter subtracts from the LSDA functional an approximate (i.e., atomic-orbital-averaged) self-interaction (SI henceforth), that is, the unphysical interaction of an electron with its own generated potential.

Despite this apparent conceptual difference, the two theories act in similar way, i.e., they correct the LSDA eigenvalues by a quantity linearly dependent on orbital occupation. In fact, the PSIC approach may be viewed as a self-consistent all-orbital generalization of the LDA + U correction, but with two distinct advantages over the latter: the ability to cure the LSDA failures in more general situations (i.e., not limited to magnetic and/or orbital-polarized systems) and the absence of an explicit parametric dependence. In PSIC and ASIC approaches, indeed, a role similar to the $U$ correction is played by atomic self-interaction potentials, which are extracted from the free atom (thus, they are universal, i.e., only depend on atomic species) and then incorporated into the band-structure Hamiltonian. At variance with more fundamental SI removal strategies such as the original Perdew-Zunger approach (PZ-SIC), or its later generalization to extended systems, which imply dramatic complications in formalism and conceptual interpretation, the PSIC approach retains all the simplicity typical of the LDA and GGA: a single-particle potential, which is not explicitly orbital dependent and is translationally invariant (i.e., obeys Bloch symmetry), and an energy functional invariant under unitary rotations of the occupied eigenstates.

The PSIC-ASIC approach demonstrated a consistently improved accuracy in the description of the electronic properties for a vast range of systems at a computational cost not much larger than that of the LSDA itself. The ASIC approach (Ref. 5) is the implementation of choice for large-size systems, as it can easily afford thousands-of-atoms simulations, while the heavier PSIC approach is the standard reference for accuracy. Despite their advantages, the PSIC and ASIC approaches have had limited following so far, for instance, in comparison with the . One reason may be rooted into their lack of variationality. In Ref. 4, the PSIC potential is in fact generated as an ansatz on the single-particle Kohn-Sham (KS) potential, meaning that it does not derive from a germinal
energy functional, a shortcoming precluding access to many ground-state properties, including geometry optimization.

In this paper, we overcome such a limitation by introducing a fully variational version of PSIC and ASIC, named VPSIC. This builds an energy functional that produces, by Euler-Lagrange derivative, a set of single-particle KS equations similar to those of the previous PSIC scheme, thus keeping the successful description of the electronic properties (see Ref. 4 and references therein for a number of case studies), but adding the ability to deliver the ground-state properties expected of standard ab initio theories.

Here, we describe these formulations and give ample evidence of the aforementioned capabilities. We present results for both solids (oxides including nonmagnetic aluminate and $d^3$ titanates, and highly correlated cases such as magnetic $d^1$ titanates and $d^3$ manganites) and molecules (a large benchmark molecular database). Extended systems are treated by using the plane-wave-basis implementation and the molecules by using the atomic-orbital basis one. The results presented here indicate that this method is accurate and effective in the study of systems characterized by a wide range of degrees of correlation and localization. Note that other VPSIC results have been already recently presented: a thorough description of correlation and localization. We present results and references therein for a number of case studies), but adding the ability to deliver the ground-state properties expected of standard ab initio theories.

The peculiarity of the VPSIC approach resides in the way the second term of Eq. (1) is written for an extended system, the eigenfunctions of which are Bloch states $\psi_n^\sigma$. The orbital occupations are then calculated as the projection of such Bloch states onto localized (e.g., atomic) orbitals, hereafter indicated as $\langle \phi \rangle$:

$$P_{ij}^\sigma = \sum_n f_{\sigma n}^j \langle \psi_n^\sigma | \phi_{i,j}^\sigma | \psi_n^\sigma \rangle,$$

where $f_{\sigma n}^j$ are the Fermi occupations. For the effective SI energies, we adopt a similar approach, namely,

$$E_{ij}^{SI} = \sum_n f_{\sigma n}^j \langle \psi_n^\sigma | C_{ij}^\sigma \gamma_{i,j}^\sigma | \psi_n^\sigma \rangle,$$

where $\gamma_{i,j}^\sigma$ is the projection function associated to the SI potential of the $i$th atomic orbital centered on atom $\nu$ and $n_{\nu}(\mathbf{r}) = \phi_{\nu}^\sigma(\mathbf{r})$, $\gamma_{i,j}^\sigma(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_\nu) = V_{Hxc} [n_{\nu}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_\nu),0] \phi_{\nu}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_\nu)$.

The Hartree plus exchange-correlation atomic SI potential $V_{Hxc}$ is written in a radial approximation as

$$V_{Hxc} = V_{H}[n_{\nu},0] + V_{xc}[n_{\nu},0] = \frac{\partial E_{Hxc}[n_{\nu}]}{\partial n_{\nu}}$$

and calculated at full polarization ($n = n_+ + n_- = 0$). Finally, $C_{ij}$ are normalization coefficients

$$C_{i,j}^{-1} = \int d\mathbf{r} \phi_{i,m_j}(\mathbf{r}) V_{Hxc}[n_{\nu}(\mathbf{r}),0] \phi_{j,m_j}(\mathbf{r}).$$

II. VARIATIONAL PSEUDO-Self-INTERACTION FORMULATION

In this section, we present the general variational formulation, not related to any specific basis function implementation, of the pseudo-self-interaction approach.

A. VPSIC energy functional and related Kohn-Sham equations

We start from the following VPSIC energy functional:

$$E^{VPSIC}[[\psi]] = E^{LSD}[[\psi]] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij\nu} E_{ij}^{SI} P_{ij}^\nu,$$

where $E^{LSD}$ is the usual LSDA energy functional

$$E^{LSD}[[\psi]] = T[[\psi]] + E_H[n] + E_{xc}[n_+,n_-] + E_{ion}[[[\psi]]]$$

written as sum of (noninteracting) kinetic ($T$), Hartree ($E_H$), exchange-correlation ($E_{xc}$), and electron-ion ($E_{ion}$) energies. Here, $\psi$ are single-particle wave functions, $n_+$ and $n_-$ are up- and down-polarized electron densities, and $n = n_+ + n_-$. Equation (1) follows the spirit of the original Perdew-Zunger procedure (hereafter called PZ-SIC) and subtracts from the LSDA total energy a SI term, written as a sum of effective single-particle SI energies ($E^{SI}_{ij}$) rescaled by some orbital occupations $P_{ij}^\nu$. Here $i,j$ span a set of atomic quantum numbers typically relative to a minimal atomic wave-function basis set [a nondiagonal formulation is necessary to enforce covariancy: $i = (l_i,m_i), j = (l_j,m_j)$ with $l$ and $m$ the angular momentum and the magnetic quantum number, respectively], while $\sigma$ and $\nu$ indicate spin and atomic site, respectively.

Thus, the orbital occupations $P_{ij}^\nu$ (if suitably normalized) act as scaling factors for the atomic SI energies, which are then assumed to be the upper limit of the SI correction amplitude. We remark that, in the atomic limit, Eq. (1) recovers the PZ-SIC total energy expression only for the Hartree SI part. Our SI exchange-correlation energy density, instead, is

$$\frac{1}{2} V_{xc}[n_+,0] = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial E_{xc}}{\partial n_+}.$$
which differs from the PZ-SIC expression $\epsilon_{\alpha,n}$. From Eq. (1), we obtain the corresponding VPSIC KS equations through the usual Euler-Lagrange derivative

$$\frac{\partial E_{\text{VPSIC}}}{\partial \psi_{n\kappa}} = \tilde{\epsilon}_{n\kappa} \psi_{n\kappa} = \tilde{h}_{\sigma}^{\text{LSD}} \psi_{n\kappa} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \left\{ \frac{\partial \epsilon_{\text{SI}}}{\partial \psi_{n\kappa}} p_{\text{ij},\sigma}^* + \epsilon_{\text{SI}} \frac{\partial p_{\text{ij},\sigma}}{\partial \psi_{n\kappa}} \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_{n\kappa}$ are VPSIC eigenvalues and

$$h_{\sigma}^{\text{LSD}}(r) = -\frac{V_2}{2} + V_{\text{H}}[n(r)] + V_{\text{xc}}[n_{\alpha}(r),n_{-\alpha}(r)] + V_{\text{ion}}(r) \quad (10)$$

is the usual KS LSDA Hamiltonian and

$$\frac{\partial \epsilon_{\text{SI}}}{\partial \psi_{n\kappa}} = |y_{\kappa,\sigma}| C_{ij\nu}(y_{\kappa,\sigma}|\psi_{n\kappa}), \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{\partial p_{\text{ij},\sigma}}{\partial \psi_{n\kappa}} = |\phi_{j,\sigma}| \langle \phi_{j,\sigma}|\psi_{n\kappa} \rangle. \quad (12)$$

The first sum term in curly brackets of Eq. (9) corresponds to the SI potential projector written as in the original PSIC KS equations. Since the two sums in the curly brackets essentially describe the same physical quantity (i.e., the SI potential), in practice, they give similar results when applied to a Bloch state. It follows that Eq. (9) describes an energy spectrum substantially similar to that of our previous nonvariational scheme, but with the advantage to derive from the VPSIC energy functional via the Euler-Lagrange construction.

In DFT, it is customary to rewrite the total energy in terms of the sum of the Kohn-Sham eigenvalues. By writing $\epsilon_{n\kappa}$ as the LSDA eigenvalues, it is easy to verify that

$$\sum_{n\kappa} f_{n\kappa} \tilde{\epsilon}_{n\kappa} = \sum_{n\kappa} f_{n\kappa} \left\langle \psi_{n\kappa} | \frac{\partial E_{\text{VPSIC}}}{\partial \psi_{n\kappa}} \right\rangle$$

$$= \sum_{n\kappa} f_{n\kappa} \tilde{\epsilon}_{n\kappa} - \sum_{ij\nu} \epsilon_{\text{SI}} p_{ij,\sigma}^* p_{\text{ij},\sigma}^* \quad (13)$$

Equation (1) can then be rewritten as

$$E_{\text{VPSIC}}[\psi] = E_{\text{LSD}}[\psi] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij\nu} \epsilon_{\text{SI}} p_{ij,\sigma}^* p_{\text{ij},\sigma}^* \quad (14)$$

where

$$E_{\text{LSD}}[\psi] = \sum_{n\kappa} f_{n\kappa} \tilde{\epsilon}_{n\kappa} + E_{\text{Hxc}}[n_{\alpha}(r),n_{-\alpha}(r)]$$

$$+ E_{\text{ion}} = \sum_{\sigma} \int d\mathbf{r} n_{\sigma}(r) V_{\text{Hxc}}[n_{\sigma}(r),n_{-\sigma}(r)]$$

is the LSDA energy functional where the VPSIC eigenvalues now replace those of the LSDA.

Finally, in the original PSIC formulation, the SI $V_{\text{Hxc}}$ potential is rescaled by a relaxation factor $\alpha = 1/2$ to take into account the screening (i.e., the suppression) of atomic self-interaction by the surrounding charge of the extended system (see Ref. 4 for an extended discussion). Careful tests on a large set of solids\textsuperscript{5} show that this value is adequate for a vast array of crystalline systems, whereas for molecules, a full atomic SI ($\alpha = 1$) is more appropriate. We keep this empirical recipe also in our present formulation.

B. Simplified variants of VPSIC approach and relation with the original nonvariational method

From the general expression of Eq. (1), two interesting subcases can be derived. By assuming fixed (i.e., non-self-consistently calculated) orbital occupations $P_{ij}$ in Eq. (9), the second term in the curly brackets vanishes and the VPSIC KS equations reduce to those of the original PSIC scheme of Ref. 3. Indeed, it was previously pointed out\textsuperscript{4} that the original scheme becomes variational at fixed orbital occupations.

Another useful subcase is obtained by replacing Eq. (3) with the simplified expression

$$E_{\text{LSD}}[\psi] = E_{\text{LSD}}[\psi] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij\nu} p_{ij,\sigma}^* p_{\text{ij},\sigma}^* \epsilon_{\text{SI}}^{\alpha,\nu}$$

$$= E_{\text{LSD}}[\psi] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij\nu} p_{ij,\sigma}^* p_{\text{ij},\sigma}^* \epsilon_{\text{SI}}^{\alpha,\nu} \quad (17)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial E_{\text{VPSIC}}}{\partial \psi_{n\kappa}} = \tilde{h}_{\sigma}^{\text{LSD}} \psi_{n\kappa} - \sum_{ij\nu} p_{ij,\sigma}^* \frac{\partial p_{\text{ij},\sigma}}{\partial \psi_{n\kappa}} \epsilon_{\text{SI}}^{\alpha,\nu}. \quad (18)$$

This simplified VPSIC formalism (hereafter indicated as VPSIC$_0$) is a computationally convenient alternative (especially in terms of memory) to perform structural optimizations in large-size systems. In Sec. III, we will show that, for nonmagnetic semiconductors and insulators, it provides electronic and structural properties in good agreement with those calculated with the complete VPSIC approach. However, VPSIC$_0$ is typically less satisfactory for the electronic properties of magnetic materials.

C. Forces formulation

In the VPSIC approach, the atomic forces formulation follows from the usual Hellmann-Feynmann procedure. It is obtained as the LSDA expression augmented by a further additive contribution due to the atomic-site dependence of the SI projectors

$$-\frac{\partial E_{\text{VPSIC}}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_i} = E_{\text{LSD}}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij,n\kappa} f_{n\kappa}^* \left\{ \left| \psi_{n\kappa}^* \right| \frac{\delta y_{\sigma}}{\delta \mathbf{R}_i} C_{ij\nu}(y_{\kappa,\sigma}|\psi_{n\kappa}) p_{\text{ij},\sigma}^* p_{\text{ij},\sigma}^* \left| \psi_{n\kappa} \right|^2 \right\}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij,n\kappa} f_{n\kappa} \left\{ \epsilon_{\text{SI}}^{\alpha,\nu}[\psi] \left| \psi_{n\kappa}^* \right| \frac{\delta \phi_{j,\sigma}}{\delta \mathbf{R}_i} \left| \phi_{j,\sigma} \right|^2 \right\}. \quad (19)$$

The complex conjugate must be summed to the terms in curly brackets.
In the simplified VPSIC\(_0\) version, the term to be added to \(F_v^{\text{LSD}}\) reduces to

\[
\sum_{ijk,\alpha} f^\sigma_{nk} \left\{ p_{ij,\alpha}^\sigma \psi_{nk}^\sigma \frac{\delta \phi_{j,\nu}}{\delta R_\nu} \langle \phi_{i,\nu} | \psi_{nk}^\sigma \rangle \right\}
\]

(20)

with complex conjugate sum also implied.

In writing Eqs. (19) and (20), we have assumed that the force acting on a given atom \(\nu\) only depends on the single atomic projector centered on \(\nu\) itself. Such an assumption is not necessarily true if the orbital occupations are to be reorthonormalized in the cell. This choice, which complicates significantly the formulation described above, is discussed in detail in the Appendices together with the specific implementations to the plane waves plus USPP and the local orbital plus norm-conserving pseudopotential approaches.

III. RESULTS: EXTENDED SYSTEMS

As pointed out in the previous sections, there is a substantial formal similarity between the KS equations derived for VPSIC and PSIC and ASIC. As this section proves, the long series of results for the electronic properties of many solids obtained with PSIC and ASIC approaches in recent years are confirmed by the theoretical framework presented here. Namely, the VPSIC approach gives only marginal differences with respect to PSIC and ASIC as the band energies and the densities of states (DOSs) are concerned. Hereafter, we consider as test cases for VPSIC a number of materials, either never tackled before (\(d^1\)-titanates) or revisited (e.g., CaMnO\(_3\)), to specifically address total energy-derived properties such as the equilibrium structure and the magnetic exchange interactions.

Specifically, we have selected three classes of solids, which, at the same time, test the broad spectrum of applicability of the VPSIC approach and are interesting compounds by themselves, both from the conceptual and the technological points of view. These are wide-gap oxide insulators, magnetic titanates representative of the 3\(d\)-titanates, and magnetic manganites representative of the 3\(d\)-\(e\_g\) charge-transfer insulating perovskites.

Calculations are carried out with ultrasoft pseudopotentials\(^{15}\) and a plane-wave basis set with cutoff energy ranging from 30 to 35 Ryd depending on the specific system, \(6 \times 6 \times 6\) special \(k\)-point grids for self-consistent calculations, \(10 \times 10 \times 10\) special \(k\) points, and linear tetrahedron interpolation method for the DOS. The Ceperley-Alder-Perdew-Zunger\(^1\) local density approximation is used for the exchange-correlation functional. Structural relaxations are carried out with a threshold of 1 mRy/Bohr \(\sim 0.02\) eV/Å on the largest force component.

A. Wide-gap insulators: LaAlO\(_3\), SrTiO\(_3\), and TiO\(_2\)

As prototypes of nonmagnetic wide-gap insulators, we selected materials widely in use in the field of functional oxides, rutile TiO\(_2\), and the perovskite LaAlO\(_3\) and SrTiO\(_3\). Given the abundant theoretical and experimental results already available, these represent ideal test cases for the VPSIC approach.

For nonmagnetic oxides, the level of accuracy of standard LDA calculations may vary according to the property investigated. Typically, a good rendition of structural properties is juxtaposed to an unsatisfactory match of the calculated band-structure and interband transition energies, involving the well-known underestimation of the fundamental band gap and the poor description of transition-metal \(d\) and (to a lesser extent) oxygen \(p\) states. We find that the VPSIC approach systematically improves the electronic properties over the LSDA, while preserving a similar accuracy for structural properties. In any comparison, it must be kept in mind that subtleties in the results may (and usually do) vary appreciably depending on a number of computational details largely independent of the underlying formalism (e.g., the type of wave-function basis set, the type of pseudopotentials, etc.) and yet typical of this class of simulations. In order to achieve an evaluation as unbiased as possible, it is useful to compare the VPSIC results with experiments as well as with their LDA counterparts, obtained for identical computational details.

We start our analysis by looking at the electronic structure. The band structures calculated within VPSIC, VPSIC\(_0\), and LDA are displayed in Figs. 1, 2, and 3 for TiO\(_2\), SrTiO\(_3\), and LaAlO\(_3\), respectively. The corresponding gap values are reported in Table I. For an unbiased comparison, the bands are calculated at the same (experimental) structure.

As expected, the TiO\(_2\) (Fig. 1) gap opens between occupied \(O\ 2p\) valence and empty Ti \(3d\) conduction bands. According to the VPSIC, the minimum gap is indirect between \(\Gamma\) at valence-band top (VB\(T\)) and \(M\) (i.e., the BZ edge along [1\(10\)]) at the conduction-band bottom (CB\(B\)), while the direct gap is at \(M\). The gap values are in satisfactory good agreement with the experiments, while the LDA results present the well-known band-gap underestimate of nearly 40\%, a typical LDA error bar for nonmagnetic insulators. In contrast, the VPSIC\(_0\) operates a partial (about 80\%) recovery of the correct energy gap over the LDA result. While this may be unsatisfactory for the prediction of the optical spectra, it is sufficient for structural optimization at a pace substantially similar to that
of LDA itself. Notice that VPSIC and VPSIC0 change the (mainly O 2p) valence bandwidth (∼6.5 eV for VPSIC, 5.7 eV for VPSIC0) in opposite directions from the LDA value (∼6.0 eV); this illustrates the fact that the VPSIC0 is not simply a rescaled VPSIC.

It is worth emphasizing that the VPSIC (or VPSIC0) ability to correct the LDA gap problem in nonmagnetic oxides, the ground state of which is only residually affected by d-type orbitals, spurs from its all-orbital corrective character (in particular, from corrections to the O 2p band). In contrast, the GGA + U band gap of 2.2 eV (with $U = 3.4\,\text{eV}$ applied to Ti 3d) calculated in Ref. 21, is only marginally larger than the GGA value of 1.9 eV. The necessity of applying a corrective U onto the O 2p orbital energies was indeed discussed in previous works.22

We now turn to SrTiO3, for which we adopt the cubic structure to avoid structural bias. The band structure is reported in Fig. 2. The dominant (and, where relevant, the secondary) orbital character for each group of bands is also reported in the figure. The energy gap opens between a VBT dominated by the O 2p valence band and a CBB of mainly Ti 3d character, with the Sr 4d contributions placed at higher energies. We can see in Table I that the LDA band gaps are only ∼55% of the experimental direct (3.25 eV) and indirect (3.75 eV) gaps. The VPSIC approach, in contrast, recovers most (∼90%), although not all, of the LDA discrepancy. This is, in part, attributed rather than to a VPSIC insufficiency to a much too small LDA value originating from the specific LDA flavor and the pseudopotentials used. Indeed, previous LDA determinations19,23 gave 1.9 and 2.24 eV, respectively, for the indirect and direct band gaps, and a "scissor" operator of 1.5 eV was employed in Ref. 19 to readjust the band energies to match ellipsometry data. According to our calculations, the VPSIC approach provides a "scissor" shift of about 1.3 eV with respect to the LDA. While in general the action of the VPSIC approach over the LDA bands can be remarkably $k$-point dependent, for these wide-gap, highly ionic, nonmagnetic oxides, the LDA band dispersion is not modified significantly. This fact provides an a posteriori justification of the use of a scissor operator.

However, while the band shape is little altered, the bandwidths change appreciably. Consider, for example, the first unoccupied doublet of Ti 3d $t_{2g}$ character: in LDA, this spans about 2.5 eV, while in VPSIC or VPSIC0, it is reduced to about 2 eV. This is a consequence of the enhanced localization (i.e., reduced $p$-$d$ hybridization), which typically follows from the removal of SI. In contrast, the VPSIC approach increases the LDA O 2p bandwidth because of its different spectral weight distribution, namely, the top manifold is purely O 2p, while the bottom ($R$ point) shows a significant admixture of Ti 3d and Sr 3s states. The different effective SI energies related to these different orbital characters eventually stretches the band bottom down to lower energies, thus resulting in an increase of bandwidth. In VPSIC0, the effective SI energies are fixed to their atomic counterparts, thus, that the effect over the LDA values is more that of a rigid band shift.
by LDA, VPSIC, and VPSIC0. While for VPSIC0, the same bands now span an energy window value 0.644, while the internal parameter for cubic SrTiO3, LaAlO3, and rutile TiO2, we find overestimates as large as 1.5% when compared to experiments. In contrast, the lattice constant of LaAlO3 is underestimated by little more than 1%. The VPSIC approach operates a systematic (0.5%–1%) reduction of the corresponding LDA values and ends up to be in very good agreement with the experiments (within 1%) for SrTiO3 and TiO2, and to a slightly less satisfactory agreement (−2%) for LaAlO3. VPSIC0 again corrects in the opposite direction and it systematically increases the LDA values by 0.5%–1%.

The different behavior of VPSIC and VPSIC0 can be easily linked back to our previous findings about the band structure. In fact, VPSIC widens the occupied valence-band manifold (O 2p, O 2s) with respect to the LDA, it reduces the effective screening and, thus, the bond length gets reduced. In contrast, the VPSIC0 shrinks the occupied band manifolds with respect to the LDA, and it causes an increase of effective screening and, thus, of the bond length. The shrinking of equilibrium volume caused by the VPSIC approach was also reported for transition-metal monoxides MnO and NiO. Clearly, this should not be intended as a universal trend, as the bandwidth and the charge localization are material-dependent quantities, and such are the VPSIC modifications over the LDA electronic structure.

We conclude this section by emphasizing the overall good quality of the VPSIC predictions for the three compounds examined. These present lattice parameters and energy band gaps are, respectively, 1%–2% and ~10% within the experimental values. While additional studies will be necessary for a full assessment of the theory, the results of this section should definitely encourage the use of the VPSIC approach for the investigation of wide-gap oxide insulators.

### B. Magnetic $d^1$ titanates: YTiO3, LaTiO3

Magnetic titanates LaTiO3 and YTiO3 are the subject of a long-standing and still ongoing debate. Titanates, characterized by the nominal Ti $d^1$ configuration, rank among the most peculiar and intriguing magnetic perovskites. At variance with manganites and cuprates, the fundamental chemistry of which is governed by the 3d $e_g$ states, in titanates, the 3d valence states have $t_{2g}$ symmetry, thus, they are orbitals not directly oriented toward the oxygen. This produces a much weaker $p$-$d$ hybridization and a crystal field splitting smaller than in $e_g$ systems. Indeed, experiments show that the phenomenology of these materials is crucially affected by small structural details.

A nice illustration of the highly sensitive magnetostuctural coupling is provided by the comparative study of YTiO3 (YTO) and LaTiO3 (LTO). Both materials are $Pnma$ perovskites, with relatively small Jahn-Teller distortions and large GdFeO3-type rotations of the Ti-centered octahedra. In agreement with the classic space-filling criterion, the difference in the A-cation size (with La being bigger than Y) enhances both distortions and rotations in YTO compared to LTO. These relatively subtle differences, in turn, lead to quite different magnetic behaviors. YTO is ferromagnetic (FM) with a Curie temperature $T_C \approx 30 \, \text{K}$, a sizable band gap (~1 eV), and a magnetic moment of 0.8 $\mu_B$ per formula unit, in agreement with a Ti $d^1$ ionic configuration. In contrast, LTO is G-type antiferromagnetic (AF) with a Néel temperature $T_N \approx 130 \, \text{K}$, a very small energy gap (~0.05–0.2 eV), and considerably smaller magnetic moment (~0.57 $\mu_B$).

![FIG. 4. (Color online) Total energies as a function of lattice parameter for cubic SrTiO3, LaAlO3, and tetragonal TiO2 as calculated by LDA, VPSIC, and VPSIC0.](image-url)
Attempts to explain the small magnetic moment and the nearly isotropic spin-wave dispersion\textsuperscript{29} in LaTiO\textsubscript{3} have generated substantial debate. It was pointed out that a single electron in the triple-degenerate \(t_2g\) manifold may quantum fluctuate, giving rise to an exotic orbital-liquid state.\textsuperscript{30,31} However this fascinating hypothesis is contrasted by a body of evidence\textsuperscript{27,28,30,32-35} showing that the crystal field splitting is actually not small enough to maintain the \(t_2g\) degeneracy substantially uplifted. As a consequence, a Jahn-Teller distorted orbital-ordered state is realized in LTO as well as in YTO.

It is needless to say that these issues have stimulated a number of attempts at describing the titanates with \textit{ab initio} approaches, including LSDA,\textsuperscript{36} LDA + U\textsuperscript{37,38} and several LSDA + DMFT calculations.\textsuperscript{39-41} The VPSIC results presented here are a valuable addition to this rich literature since they give an internally coherent description of the structural and electronic properties on a purely \textit{ab initio} basis, in the framework of the same theory and without system-dependent parameters (e.g., \(U/J\)). Here we proceed by first illustrating the electronic properties of YTO calculated at the experimental lattice structure as a prototypical \(t_2g\) system. We then move on to the more peculiar LTO and highlight the differences with respect to YTO. Then, we conclude with the structural properties of both systems, which rationalize their different behavior.

Figure 5 shows the orbital-resolved DOS of YTO. The occupied DOS has two major contributions: at the VBT, there is a ∼0.8-eV-wide fully spin-polarized peak associated to the Ti \(3d\) states (and some residual hybridization with a small O 2\(p\) fraction). Although the nominal configuration is \(t_{1g}^\uparrow\) \(d^1\), a small amount of Ti \(-O\) \(p\) hybridization is clearly visible (notice the scale, though: here, the O 2\(p\) weight is way smaller than, e.g., that in manganites). It follows that the calculated static charges and magnetic moment differ considerably from their nominal values. For Ti, we obtain ∼1.6 and ∼0.7 electrons for up- and down-polarized \(3d\) state, respectively, with a magnetic moment of 0.92 \(\mu_B\), slightly larger than the experimentally observed 0.8 \(\mu_B\). At much lower energies (∼4 to ∼8 eV below the Ti \(3d\) peak), there is a broader, unpolarized DOS of O 2\(p\) character, not shown in the figure. The CBB bands are also dominated by Ti \(3d\) \(t_{2g}\) states, residually hybridized with O 2\(p\) and Y 4\(d\). Thus, YTO falls unambiguously in the category of true Mott-Hubbard insulators, at variance with most manganites or cuprates, which are actually charge-transfer insulators or in an intermediate regime (we will come back to this important point later on).

In the band energy plot for FM YTO (see Fig. 6, left panel), we observe four occupied bands (one for each Ti) separated from the 3\(d\) empty conduction bands by 1.8 eV. The fundamental gap only involves majority bands and it is direct at \(\Gamma\). The CBB bands span a ∼1-eV-wide interval. According to our calculations, the sharp DOS peak at the valence top is a complex admixture of the five Ti \(3d\) orbitals.

In order to analyze quantitatively the identity of this state, we diagonalize the corresponding \(P_{mn}\) density matrix in the \(3d\) orbital subspace. The results are reported in Table III for two coordinate systems: the orthorhombic \(\sqrt{2} \times \sqrt{2} \times 2\ \text{Pnma}\ (x',y',z')\) and the conventional cubic \((x,y,z)\), which differ by a 45° rotation\textsuperscript{42} of the \((x,y)\) plane. Let us focus first our attention on the Ti ion placed at (0,0,0) in the cubic YTO reference system. This shows prevailing contributions from the \(|yz\rangle\) and \(|xy\rangle\) orbitals. However, also the \(e_g\) contributions are not completely negligible. The corresponding state can be expressed as \(|\Psi_1\rangle \sim 0.75|yz\rangle + 0.56|xy\rangle\), as visually confirmed by the charge density isosurface plot in the left panel of Fig. 7. The same figure highlights the resulting orbital ordering: coplanar states show an alternance of dominant \(|yz\rangle\) and \(|xz\rangle\) contributions, plus a change in sign for \(|xy\rangle\), which causes the lobes of \(|yz\rangle\) (or \(|xz\rangle\)) to lean back and forth toward the \((x,y)\) plane (i.e., \(|\Psi_2\rangle \sim 0.75|zx\rangle - 0.56|xy\rangle\)). In contrast, states aligned along \(z\) only differ by the alternance of \(|xy\rangle\) sign, thus, \(|\Psi_3\rangle \sim 0.75|yz\rangle - 0.56|xy\rangle\) and \(|\Psi_4\rangle \sim 0.75|zx\rangle + 0.56|xy\rangle\). Our results are in excellent agreement with linear-dichroism x-ray absorption,\textsuperscript{43} which gives 0.8 and 0.6 for the coefficients of the two most occupied \(t_{2g}\) orbitals,\textsuperscript{44} and with the LDA + DMFT results\textsuperscript{39} giving 0.78 and 0.62, respectively.

Now, we move to analyze the results for LTO. Remarkable differences from YTO emerge from the calculated DOS (Fig. 8) and band structure (Fig. 6): the fundamental band gap is slightly smaller for LTO, but still quite sizable (1.6 eV); furthermore, the bands are flatter than in YTO (the occupied \(3d\) states at VBT are only 0.4 eV wide) and the hybridization
with O is even more marginal, although still visible. Even the conduction bands in LTO appear flatter and, in fact, they are separated in two groups by a gap of 0.2 eV. The magnetic moment is 0.89 $\mu_B$, similar to that of YTO.

The difference with YTO is also clearly borne out by the diagonalized density matrix reported in Table III. By looking at the cubic reference system, one can see that the $e_g$ contribution is now almost vanishing (at variance with YTO) and the occupied states have essentially a pure $t_{2g}$ character. Moreover, the diversification of the $t_{2g}$ occupancies is much reduced with respect to YTO as a result of the smaller rotations. This state approximately shapes as cigar-shaped [111]-directed lobes resulting from the nearly even $t_{2g}$ combination, as the corresponding charge density isosurface plot of Fig. 7 (right panel) confirms. Note that, if the $t_{2g}$ coefficients were exactly the same, $\Psi_1$ and $\Psi_2$ as well as $\Psi_3$ and $\Psi_4$ would have been identical and the resulting “cigars” in each plane would have been exactly parallel to each other and pointing along [111].

Although the orbital charge distribution in YTO and LTO is markedly different and causes much of their macroscopic differences, the relative ordering is the same. In fact, also for
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### Table III

3$d$ orbital decomposition of the four occupied states (one for each Ti) at the VBT of YTO and LTO. The coordinates $(x', y', z')$ and $(x, y, z)$ refer to the orthorhombic and conventional cubic Cartesian axes, respectively, as indicated in Fig. 7.

|       | $|x'y'|$ | $|x'z'|$ | $|y'z'|$ | $|z|^2$ | $|x^2 - y^2|$ |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| **YTO** |         |         |         |       |         |
| Ti 1  | 0.11    | 0.48    | 0.58    | 0.33  | 0.56    |
| Ti 2  | 0.11    | −0.48   | −0.58   | −0.33 | −0.56   |
| Ti 3  | −0.11   | 0.48    | 0.58    | −0.33 | −0.56   |
| Ti 4  | −0.11   | 0.48    | −0.58   | 0.33  | 0.56    |
| **LTO** |         |         |         |       |         |
| Ti 1  | 0.02    | 0.15    | 0.78    | 0.08  | 0.60    |
| Ti 2  | 0.02    | 0.15    | −0.78   | −0.08 | −0.60   |
| Ti 3  | −0.02   | 0.15    | 0.78    | −0.08 | −0.60   |
| Ti 4  | −0.02   | 0.15    | −0.78   | 0.08  | 0.60    |
|       | $|x'y'|$ | $|xz| |yz|$ | $|z|^2$ | $|x^2 - y^2|$ |
| **YTO** |         |         |         |       |         |
| Ti 1  | 0.56    | −0.07   | 0.75    | 0.33  | 0.11    |
| Ti 2  | −0.56   | 0.75    | −0.07   | −0.33 | −0.11   |
| Ti 3  | −0.56   | −0.07   | 0.75    | −0.33 | −0.11   |
| Ti 4  | 0.56    | 0.75    | −0.07   | 0.33  | −0.11   |
| **LTO** |         |         |         |       |         |
| Ti 1  | 0.60    | −0.45   | 0.66    | 0.08  | 0.02    |
| Ti 2  | −0.60   | 0.66    | −0.45   | −0.08 | −0.02   |
| Ti 3  | −0.60   | −0.45   | 0.66    | −0.08 | −0.02   |
| Ti 4  | 0.60    | 0.66    | −0.45   | 0.08  | −0.02   |
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**FIG. 6.** Band structure of FM YTO (left, up spin; right, down spin) and AF-G LTO (right).
LTO in the plane, there is a perfect alternance (i.e., chessboard-like order) of the leading \(|xy\) and \(|yz\) contributions (this is less evident than in YTO since the \(t_{2g}\) coefficients are not as different as those in YTO), plus a sign alternance for \(|xz\). Along \(z\), only the sign alternance occurs. Our calculated \(t_{2g}\) coefficients for LTO (Table III) are again remarkably close to the NMR values (0.56, 0.45, 0.69) from Ref. 30, as well as to those calculated (0.6, 0.39, 0.69) by a model Hamiltonian in Ref. 27.

The observed magnetic ground state is correctly predicted for both materials (in the calculated structure discussed below). For YTO, we found the FM state lower than both the AF-G and AF-C phases by 10.1 and 8.3 meV/f.u., respectively. This is in agreement with previous LDA+U results\(^37\) obtained with \(U−J=3.2\) eV. For LTO, instead, we obtain that the AF-G phase is lower than the FM and AF-A phases by 15.2 and 10.05 meV/f.u., respectively. We then fit our total energies to a two-parameter nearest-neighbor Heisenberg Hamiltonian of the form

\[
H = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i} [J_{pl}(\hat{S}_i \cdot \hat{S}_{i+x} + \hat{S}_i \cdot \hat{S}_{i+y}) + J_z \hat{S}_i \cdot \hat{S}_{i+z}],
\]

where \(i + x, i + y, \) and \(i + z\) indicate the nearest neighbors of the \(i\)th atom, respectively, in the \(x, y,\) and \(z\) directions. We calculate \(J_{pl} = 4.15\) meV and \(J_z = 1.8\) meV, respectively, for the planar and orthogonal exchange interaction parameters in YTO, while the same quantities for LTO are \(J_{pl} = −5.02\) meV and \(J_z = −5.03\) meV. These results nicely confirm the conjectures derived by the analysis of the orbital ordering, namely, that, while a remarkable anisotropy is present in YTO, LTO is substantially isotropic.

We now come to discuss the structure of the two titanates. Table IV compares the experimental and VPSIC calculated internal atomic coordinates and the most important structural parameters, namely, the Ti-O-Ti angles (\(\theta\)) and the Ti-O distances (see also Fig. 9). The VPSIC calculated structure is very close to the experimentally determined one for both LTO and YTO (although, for the latter, the oxygen rotations are slightly overemphasized along the \(z\) axis). There are two types of in-plane Ti-O bonds, long (\(d_L\)) and short (\(d_S\)), which alternate along both \(x\) and \(y\) (see Fig. 9), while along \(z\), there is only one, \(d_z\). This gives an easy rationale for the chessboardlike Ti d ordering: on each Ti atom, the occupied state prefers to lie along the longer Ti–O bond (thus, alternatively \(|xz\) and \(|xy\) for \(d_L\) parallel to \(x\), or \(|yz\) and \(|xy\) for \(d_S\) parallel to \(y\)). For YTO, the difference between \(d_L\) and \(d_S\) is quite substantial and gives rises to a very pronounced ordering, as seen in the analysis of the charge density. For LTO, the \(d_L\) and \(d_S\) difference is much reduced and it results in a planar chessboard ordering.

For both materials, the large GdFeO\(_3\)-type distortion is the main factor determining the observed structures and the consequent splitting of the \(t_{2g}\) triplet state. The Jahn-Teller distortions are instead small (i.e., the properties along \(x, y, \) and \(z\) are similar, on average, especially for LTO). Remarkably, our method predicts these subtle but important details with great accuracy.

An issue that still remains to be clarified is the large difference between the calculated and the measured energy gaps. This is particularly dramatic in LTO [over 1 eV against around 0.1 eV (Ref. 35)] and it is a problem shared by all \textit{ab initio} methods. Such a problem, however, lies in a confusion about the actual definition of the gap. In fact, the VBT and CBB band energies are approximations to removal and addition energies, and their difference estimates the onsite Coulomb energy \(U\). In contrast, the lowest-energy electronic excitation measured for these true Mott-Hubbard insulators is very likely an intrasite, intra-\(t_{2g}\) excitation, which of course does not involve any \(U\). Inferring a small effective \(U\) from the tiny measured (direct forbidden) gap\(^35\) of LaTiO\(_3\) is
then a misinterpretation. According to our band structure, U is in the order of approximately 3 eV, as expected for a system of this kind. In fact, similar values have been used in LDA + U and DMFT calculations. It is also not very convincing to estimate the intrasite excitation energy from the LDA calculated $t_{2g}$ (average) band splitting. The result may be deemed plausible since excitation and addition or removal energies become identical in the limit of vanishing U (i.e., delocalized electrons). However, here a vanishing U is an artifact of the LDA and not a true feature of the titanate. A better grounded strategy, suggested in Ref. 38, constructs a Hamiltonian for the excited state explicitly by projecting out the electronic ground state (an approach beyond our present methodological scope).

In summary, the VPSIC approach provides a coherent understanding of YTO and LTO, of their relevant differences in terms of structure, magnetism, orbital ordering, and charge decomposition. The larger GdFeO$_3$-type distortion of YTO results in a larger Ti 3$d$-O 2$p$ and $t_{2g}$-$e_g$ mixing, larger occupied 3$d$ state bandwidth, and crucially different charge density distribution around Ti. The wider the rotations, in particular, the stronger is the destabilization of the AF superexchange coupling, which otherwise would prevail in a purely $d^1$ $t_{2g}$ unrotated Pnma environment.

Note that the connection between structural and electronic and magnetic properties would be completely reverted for doped manganites, the chemistry of which is governed by the $e_g$ orbitals. In that case, the cubic symmetry and the absence of octahedral rotations work in favor of an $e_g$-$p$ hybridization. Conversely, in titanates, the absence of octahedral rotations implies vanishing $p$-$d$ hybridization, pure $t_{2g}$ charge character, and minimal $t_{2g}$ bandwidth.

Finally, it is worth noticing the good quantitative agreement of the orbital ordering predicted by VPSIC with that obtained in LDA + DMFT (Ref. 39). More in general, in a relevant number of strong-correlated materials, the description by the VPSIC approach (or its predecessor PSIC-ASIC) of electronic and magnetic properties is found in very good agreement with theories that include dynamical effects.

While the importance of dynamical corrections in the general case is undeniable, we emphasize that a sound quantitative estimate of the dynamical corrections can not leave aside the error proper of the static limit with respect to which they are evaluated. Thus, we may argue that the role of dynamical effects may be overemphasized if the LDA, or even LDA + U, are taken as reference static limit. On the other hand, the VPSIC approach, which we regard as a more accurate static limit than LDA or LDA + U, might even consent a better evaluation of dynamical effects. To this aim, it is obviously instrumental in the implementation of the VPSIC + DMFT approach, an achievement that indeed stands in our future plans.

C. Magnetic manganites: CaMnO$_3$

As a further example of the capability of the VPSIC approach in describing solids, we consider the prototypical AF-$G$-type insulator CaMnO$_3$ (CMO) as representative of magnetic manganites. The nominal Mn$^{4+}$ $d^3$ configuration triggers the AF superexchange coupling via the fully polarized majority $t_{2g}$ orbitals and an AF semicovalent exchange interaction through the empty $e_g$ states. The $t_{2g}$ spherical charge distribution favors a robust centrosymmetric octahedral structure, and the near complete absence of rotations leaves the systems substantially cubic (a small Pnma distortion is actually observed, but it will not be considered here since it is immaterial for the magnetic and electronic properties). According to the Goodenough-Kanamori rules, the spin coupling is expected to be AF and isotropic (G type). While this is indeed verified by a series of experiments and calculations, a detailed determination of the electronic and magnetic properties is less clear, and some discrepancies between the interpretation of photoemission data and band energies obtained with standard local functionals make the system an interesting test case for our methods. Indeed, from the theoretical side, CMO was studied in the past by using LDA, GGA, LDA + U, GGA + U, unrestricted Hartree-Fock (HF), configuration interaction (CI), and model (Hubbard) Hamiltonian. At the same time, experimentally, a number of optical and transport measurements have been carried out.

The general electronic characteristics of CMO can be illustrated with the help of our calculated DOS (Fig. 10) and band energies (Fig. 11) for the observed AF G-type phase at the experimental lattice parameter. All levels of theory (LDA, VPSIC, and VPSIC$_0$) describe the system as an insulator, with a $\sim$7-eV-wide valence-band manifold of mixed O $p$ and majority Mn $d$ $t_{2g}$ states. Very importantly, at variance with the nominal configuration, a consistent amount of filled $e_g$ states is present in all the three calculated DOS. At about 18 eV below the $p$-$d$ valence bands lies a narrow, mostly O 2$s$, manifold. Above the fundamental gap, we find distinct groups of majority $e_g$, minority $t_{2g}$, and minority $e_g$ states. By looking closer at the DOS, important differences appear in the LSDA and VPSIC and VPSIC$_0$ descriptions. For both computational schemes, the $p$-$d$ valence manifold shows a double-peaked structure, in agreement with x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) and ultraviolet photoemission

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig10.png}
\caption{(Color online) Density of states of the most important orbitals (Mn $d$ and O $p$) of AF-G CMO calculated within LDA, VPSIC, and VPSIC$_0$. Light (red) shadowed areas are for Mn $t_{2g}$ and O $p$ orthogonal orbitals; solid black lines for Mn $e_g$ and O $p$ ligand orbitals.}
\end{figure}

195127-10
...the orbital character of the peaks is different: in LSDA, most of $t_{2g}$ spectral weight is right below the VBT, while the tail region from $-5$ to $-7$ eV is mainly O 2$p$. In contrast, the VPSIC and VPSIC$_0$ recover a spectral redistribution more in line with the experimental observations, with prevalently O 2$p$ states near VBT and the highest peak of $t_{2g}$ states at the bottom of the valence bands. The LSDA inaccuracy is clearly related to an insufficient $t_{2g}$ spin splitting, which amounts to a mere 2.5 eV and leaves the majority $t_{2g}$ too much high in the energy. In the VPSIC approach, the $t_{2g}$ splitting increases up to about 9 eV, which is consistent with the estimated $U$. Notably, a single energy parameter is actually not enough to properly locate the $t_{2g}$ states since a consistent portion thereof is also present in the 4-eV-wide region below the VBT, where the $p$-$d$ hybridization is strong.

In LSDA, we obtain an energy band gap of 0.42 eV. By looking at the band picture (Fig. 11), the VBT runs flat between $X$ and $W$, while the CBB $e_g$ is flat between $\Gamma$ and $X$, in agreement with previous LDA calculations (see, e.g., Ref. 49). In the VPSIC approach, the gap is now 1.01 eV, and both VBT and CBB are flat between $\Gamma$ and $X$. Above the energy gap, LSDA describes the 2-eV-wide majority $e_g$ bands overlapped with the very narrow minority $t_{2g}$ peak, whereas in VPSIC and VPSIC$_0$, the latter lies about 2 eV above the centroid of the $e_g$. Although we could not find in literature a clear determination of the band-gap value, interband transitions extracted from photoemission$^{37}$ and optical conductivity measurements$^{36}$ seem to be very consistent with the VPSIC calculations. Specifically, the distance between O 2$p$ and the majority $e_g$ peaks ($\sim$3 eV) and between O 2$p$ and the minority $e_g$ peak ($\sim$6.5 eV) compare well with the respective values 3.07 and 6.49 eV extracted by Lorentz oscillator fitting of the conductivity spectra (Ref. 56). Also quite consistent, albeit with a slightly larger value (3.7 eV) for the O 2$p$-Mn $e_g$ transition, is the valence-band spectra deduced in Ref. 57 by fitting a Cl cluster model to XPS data.

Next, we move to examine the structural and magnetic properties. Figure 12 reports the total energies calculated with LSDA, VPSIC, and VPSIC$_0$ as a function of lattice parameter for both the AF-G and FM CMO phases. The values of the equilibrium lattice are reported in Table V. The trend is similar to that seen already in Sec. III A for wide-gap oxides: VPSIC and VPSIC$_0$, respectively, reduce and expand the volume with respect to the LSDA. Here, however, the VPSIC correction is tiny and both the LSDA and VPSIC approach give lattice constants rather close (within 1%) to experiments. In contrast, the VPSIC$_0$ is much less satisfying and overestimates the lattice constant by $\sim$2.5%.

Concerning the difference of AF-G and FM energies, LSDA is known to overestimate the contribution of the AF superexchange due to the excessive $t_{2g}$-$p$ hybridization in the region near VBT (as discussed in Fig. 10), thus, it predicts a strong AF-G stability (in agreement with previous$^{40,46}$ LSDA calculations) through the entire examined range of lattice parameters. The VPSIC approach, in contrast, suggests a much tighter competition: while at equilibrium, the AF-G phase is stable, a moderate lattice stretching (a tensile strain of about 2.5%) is sufficient to reverse the magnetic order and stabilize the lattice parameter $a_0$ (in Å) for the AF-G and FM phases and exchange interaction $J$ (in meV) for cubic CaMnO$_3$ calculated by LSDA, VPSIC, and VPSIC$_0$ (experimental values are reported for comparison). $J_{ex}$ and $J_{eq}$ are values calculated for equilibrium and experimental $a_0$, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LSDA</th>
<th>VPSIC</th>
<th>VPSIC$_0$</th>
<th>Expt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_0$ (AF-G)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_0$ (FM)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_{ex}$</td>
<td>$-37.0$</td>
<td>$-6.1$</td>
<td>$+6.5$</td>
<td>$-6.6$ (Ref. 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_{eq}$</td>
<td>$-35.3$</td>
<td>$-5.7$</td>
<td>$+27.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 11. Band energies of AF-G type CMO in the cubic fcc symmetry, calculated with LSDA, VPSIC, and VPSIC$_0$. The k-point coordinates (units of $2\pi/a$) are $\Gamma = [0,0,0]$, $X = [1,0,0]$, $W = [1,1/2,0]$, $L = [1/2,1/2,1/2]$, $K = [1,1,0]$. The dominant and secondary orbital character for each group of bands is also indicated.

FIG. 12. (Color online) Total energies per cell as a function of the lattice parameter calculated by LSDA, VPSIC, and VPSIC$_0$ for the AF-G (solid symbols) and FM (open symbols) ordering. The differences in total energy between the different methods have no physical meaning, and the curves are arbitrarily translated vertically for the sake of clarity.
the FM ground state. Finally, the VPSIC\textsubscript{0} apparently performs very poorly for magnetic coupling: it completely reverses the LSDA description and predicts the FM as the stable phase in a wide lattice constant range.

The magnetic competition can be better appreciated in terms of exchange-interaction parameters $J$, plotted in Fig. 13. For the sake of comparison, we have adopted the same definition of $J$ given in Ref. 54, which is based on the single-parameter Heisenberg Hamiltonian

\[ H = -J \sum_{ij} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_j, \]

where $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_i$ is the unit vector of the $i$-site spin direction. Values calculated at equilibrium ($J_{eq}$) and experimental ($J_{ex}$) lattice constant are reported in Table V. We remark here the excellent agreement of the VPSIC value of $-6.1$ meV with $J = -6.6$ meV extracted from the diagrammatic Rushbrooke-Wood formula\textsuperscript{60} for the magnetic susceptibility corresponding to the experimental Néel temperature $T_N = 130$ K. The VPSIC approach also compares fairly well with those calculated by CI (8.1 meV) and HF (10.7 meV) in Ref. 54. This contrasts with both the LSDA and VPSIC\textsubscript{0} values, which largely deviate from these estimates, albeit in opposite directions.

It is interesting to speculate on the remarkably different magnetic behavior described by the three methods. This mainly reflects the difference in the $t_{2g}$ spectral weight seen in Fig. 10, specifically, the substantial DOS shift from the top to the bottom of the $p$-$d$ band manifold when moving from LSDA to VPSIC and to VPSIC\textsubscript{0}. In order to quantify this effect, in Fig. 14, we report the integrated charge for the majority $t_{2g}$ orbitals, normalized to their respective degeneracies 3 and 2. The DOS are also reported for clarity. The length of red arrows indicate the amount of $t_{2g}$ charge without the lowest $t_{2g}$ peak.

in the upper part of the valence-band region, which does not include the towering lower-end peak and mainly hybridizes with oxygens (quantified in Fig. 14 by the vertical red arrows), we find that this charge in LSDA is about 73%, in VPSIC just 43%, and finally in VPSIC\textsubscript{0} a mere 33% of the entire majority $t_{2g}$ charge. Our interpretation is then the following: when going from LDA to VPSIC to VPSIC\textsubscript{0}, the $t_{2g}$ spectral weight is progressively transferred toward the lower end of the valence band. Its hybridization with oxygen decreases and so does the superexchange AF contribution (through $t_{2g}$-$p\pi$-type bonding). The $e_g$ charge distribution, instead, remains substantially unchanged in the three methods, so that the FM contribution increases as compared to AF superexchange from weak in LDA to competitive in VPSIC to dominant in VPSIC\textsubscript{0}.

In summary, the VPSIC approach provides a very consistent description of the electronic, structural, and magnetic properties of CMO. VPSIC calculated values compare well with the experiments and with results of other beyond-local approaches, i.e., the most obvious deficiencies of the LSDA are corrected. This is not the case for VPSIC\textsubscript{0}. In fact, while it offers a band spectrum substantially similar to that of the VPSIC approach, it fails in the precise account of structural and magnetic properties. Our study has revealed that subtle differences in the electronic properties can result in visible errors in some observable quantities. Specifically, a slightly narrower $p$-$d$ valence bandwidth and an excessive $t_{2g}$ localization toward the lower end of the valence-band manifold can result in a 2%–3% overestimation of the lattice constant and in an unreliable value of the exchange-interaction parameter.

IV. RESULTS: MOLECULES

While the PSIC approach was originally formulated for extended solids (i.e., for periodic boundary conditions), it may be just as useful for finite systems. Indeed, the full PZ-SIC is easy and straightforward for isolated atoms, but for large molecules, clusters, or complex structures such as molecular contacts, its application may become cumbersome and expensive, when not outright impossible. The PSIC approach provides a practical and reliable alternative. The implementation within local orbital basis set and pseudopotentials (ASIC), carried out in Ref. 5 in the framework of the SIESTA code,\textsuperscript{59} can treat both extended and finite systems on the same footing (of course, in principle, the plane-wave implementation can be applied.
to finite systems via a supercell approach, albeit much less efficiently). In the last few years, a series of works related to molecules have been carried out by the ASIC approach (Refs. 61–65) with typically satisfactory results (provided that the relaxation parameter \( \alpha \) is kept fixed to unity). The VPSIC approach implemented in local orbital basis set (i.e., the variational generalization of the ASIC) is expected to yield KS spectra largely similar, although not identical, to those obtained with ASIC. Additionally, the performance of the VPSIC energy functional [Eq. (1)] and the associated forces [Eq. (19)] for equilibrium molecular geometries need to be investigated.

In this section, we look at the VPSIC description of the spectral and geometric properties of several molecules selected mostly, but not exclusively, from the standard G2 set. Calculations are carried out using a development version of the SIESTA code within which the VPSIC method was implemented. Some details regarding the implementation are given in Appendices C and D. For all of the atomic species, standard norm-conserving pseudopotentials generated by using the Troullier-Martins scheme are employed including core corrections where necessary. Scalar relativistic pseudopotentials are used for the period III elements. A numerical double-zeta-polarized (DZP) basis set is employed for all of the atomic species, and an energy shift of 50 meV is used to set the cutoff radius for the pseudatomic orbital (PAO) basis functions. Geometry optimizations are performed by using a conjugate gradients algorithm until all of the forces are smaller than 0.01 eV/Å.

### A. Equilibrium bond lengths

Table VI shows the equilibrium bond lengths obtained within the VPSIC approach for selected bonds in several gas phase molecules. The representative set chosen includes molecules mainly built from I, II, and III period elements as well as nonmagnetic transition metals. Furthermore, it includes several species hosting different types of chemical bonds. Also presented for comparison are the corresponding LSDA and experimental bond lengths. We find that the calculated VPSIC bond lengths are generally shorter than the corresponding LSDA estimates. From column 5 in Table VI, we see that the calculated VPSIC bond lengths are typically a few percent longer than those of the LSDA bond lengths, while (see column 4 in Table VI) those of the LSDA bond lengths are typically a few percent longer than the experimental bond lengths. We find that the calculated VPSIC bond lengths are smaller than 0.01 eV and 0.5 Å.

#### A.1. VPSIC vs. LSDA

In Table VII and Fig. 15, we compare the experimental bond lengths \( L_{\text{expt}} \) to the calculated ones \( L_i(X) \) obtained by using either the LSDA or VPSIC approach. It is clear that LSDA underestimates the removal energies significantly in all the cases. In contrast, the mapping between the experimental IP and the electron affinity (EA), respectively. However, local and semilocal functionals such as the LSDA and GGA are known to perform poorly at satisfying the equations (22) and (23), particularly for molecular systems. In the following, we assess the mapping between electron removal or addition energies and the KS spectrum obtained from the VPSIC approach, also showing the corresponding LSDA results for comparison. Furthermore, for both LSDA and VPSIC, the molecular geometries used to estimate the IP and EA are the corresponding equilibrium geometries in the neutral configuration.

In Table VII and Fig. 15, we compare the experimental IP for several molecules with the corresponding negative \( \epsilon_{\text{HOMO}} \) obtained by using either the LSDA or VPSIC approach. It is clear that LSDA underestimates the removal energies significantly in all the cases. In contrast, the mapping between the experimental IP and \( \epsilon_{\text{HOMO}} \) from the VPSIC approach is excellent. In this case, the mean absolute deviation from experiment

\[
\Delta_{\text{IP}}(X) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{M} |\epsilon_{\text{HOMO},i}(X) + \epsilon_{\text{IP},\text{expt}}|}{M},
\]

with \( X = \text{LSDA, VPSIC} \), is estimated to be 4.29 eV for LSDA and 0.72 eV for VPSIC. The IP is typically under 2.0%. Interestingly, we find that the VPSIC considerably worsens over the LSDA bond lengths for single covalent bonds between identical atoms (see, for instance, C\(_2\)H\(_4\), C\(_2\)H\(_6\), C\(_3\)H\(_6\), O\(_3\)), while it significantly improves them when the bond is either double (C\(_2\)H\(_4\), CO, CO\(_2\), or triple (N\(_2\) and C\(_2\)H\(_2\))). For other bonds between nonidentical atoms, the results are mixed.

In summary, as previously found for solids, also for molecules the VPSIC yields structural properties of rather similar quality to those calculated with the LSDA. In this case, however, for most of the molecules investigated, we found the VPSIC approach to overcorrect the LSDA, so that although the errors are similar, they have the opposite signs.

#### B. Ionization potentials

As in the case of the ASIC method, the primary advantage over LSDA afforded by the VPSIC method is expected to lie in the systematic improvement of KS eigenvalue spectra as approximate proxies for addition and removal energies. The method is particularly relevant for DFT-based transport theory, where an accurate description of the KS spectra is important. In exact KS DFT, only the highest occupied orbital eigenvalue (\( \epsilon_{\text{HOMO}} \)) has a rigorous physical interpretation and corresponds to the negative of the first ionization potential. In general, for an \( N \) electron system, the following equations hold in exact KS DFT:

\[
\epsilon_{\text{HOMO}}(M) = -I_N(N - 1 < M \leq N),
\]

\[
\epsilon_{\text{HOMO}}(M) = -A_N(N < M \leq N + 1),
\]
TABLE VI. Calculated bond lengths of selected bonds from several molecules compared to experimental values. Both VPSIC and LSDA bond lengths are shown. δr_L in column 6 (7) denotes the absolute percentage difference between the calculated VPSIC (LSDA) and experimental bond length.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecule</th>
<th>Bond</th>
<th>Bond length (Å)</th>
<th>δr_L (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VPSIC</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCl₃</td>
<td>B–Cl</td>
<td>1.748</td>
<td>1.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>C–H</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>1.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₆ (ethane)</td>
<td>C–C</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>1.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₆ (cyclobutane)</td>
<td>C–C</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>1.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₆ (cyclopropane)</td>
<td>C–C</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>1.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>O–O</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>1.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>Na–Cl</td>
<td>2.317</td>
<td>2.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiH₄</td>
<td>Si–H</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>1.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiCl₄</td>
<td>Si–Cl</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>2.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH₃</td>
<td>P–H</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>1.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF₃</td>
<td>P–F</td>
<td>1.576</td>
<td>1.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH₂</td>
<td>S–H</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>1.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuF</td>
<td>Cu–F</td>
<td>1.763</td>
<td>1.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZnH</td>
<td>Zn–H</td>
<td>1.527</td>
<td>1.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₄ (ethylene)</td>
<td>C = C</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>1.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>C = O</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>1.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>C = O</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>1.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>O = O</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>N≡N</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₆ (acetylene)</td>
<td>C≡C</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>1.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₆H₆ (benzene)</td>
<td>C:C</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>1.397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VII. Experimental ionization potential (IP) compared to the calculated negative HOMO eigenvalues for neutral molecules. Columns 2 and 3 present the results from LSDA and VPSIC, respectively. The experimental data are taken from Ref. 75.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecule</th>
<th>-eHOMO (eV)</th>
<th>IP (eV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSDA</td>
<td>VPSIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCl₃</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₆ (ethane)</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>12.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₆ (cyclobutane)</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₆ (cyclopropane)</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>13.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiH₄</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiCl₄</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>12.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH₃</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF₃</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH₂</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuF</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₄ (ethylene)</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>10.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>13.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>13.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₆ (acetylene)</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₆H₆ (benzene)</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PZ-SIC scheme, and it has been suggested that some additional rescaling procedure is needed. 73, 74

C. Electron affinities and the HOMO-LUMO gap

In Hartree-Fock theory, Koopmans’ theorem 76 implies that the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) energy (e LUMO) corresponds to the EA of the N electron system.

FIG. 15. (Color online) Experimental negative ionization potential IP compared to the calculated HOMO eigenvalues for molecules. The experimental data are from Ref. 75, while the star symbol represents full PZ-SIC calculations from Ref. 72.
when electronic relaxation is neglected. No such physical interpretation exists for the Kohn-Sham ($\epsilon^{\text{LUMO}}$) in DFT and so the EA is not directly accessible from the ground-state spectrum of the $N$ electron system. However, as Eq. (22) indicates, the EA is, in principle, accessible from the ground-state spectrum of the $N + 1 - f$ ($0 < f < 1$) electron system and, furthermore, it must be relaxation free through noninteger occupation. Approximate functionals such as the LSDA and GGA, however, perform rather poorly even in this regard as the $N + 1$ electron state is often unbound with a positive eigenvalue. Therefore, in practice, electron affinities are usually extracted either from more accurate total energy differences or by extrapolating them from LSDA calculations for the $N$ electron system. The failure of approximate functionals in reproducing the spectra of anions has been traced for the largest considered. Over the set of molecules in Table VIII, the mean absolute errors with respect to experiment for the electron affinities

$$\Delta_{\text{EA}}(X) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |\epsilon_{N+1}^{\text{HOMO}}(X) + \text{EA}_{\text{exp}}|}{N}$$

(X = LSDA, VPSIC) stands at 4.67 and 0.54 eV for LSDA and VPSIC, respectively. In Fig. 16, we present our data together with $\epsilon_{N+1}^{\text{HOMO}}$ as calculated using the PZ-SIC. For the electron affinities as well, we see that the PZ-SIC seems to systematically overcorrect the LSDA shortfall.

We now discuss briefly the HOMO-LUMO gap in the VPSIC approach. As it is apparent from columns 5 and 6 in Table VIII, the LUMO eigenvalues of the neutral species differ substantially from the corresponding negative electron affinities both within the LSDA and VPSIC approach. In general, DFT LSDA states are expected to be lower than $-\text{EA}$ by an amount equal to the derivative discontinuity $\Delta_{xc}$ defined as

$$\Delta_{xc} = \lim_{f \to 0^+} \epsilon_{N,f}^{\text{HOMO}} - \epsilon_{N}^{\text{LUMO}},$$

i.e., $\Delta_{xc}$ is the discontinuity in the eigenvalue of the LUMO state at $N$. Thus, the HOMO-LUMO gap is usually underestimated with respect to the true quasiparticle gap $E_q = I_N - A_N$. In Table IX, we compare the HOMO-LUMO gaps from LSDA and VPSIC calculated in the neutral configuration for the molecular test set of Table VII. We see that, although the VPSIC HOMO eigenvalues are generally significantly lower than those of the corresponding LSDA (see Table VII), the HOMO-LUMO gaps differ by a smaller extent. This is because, in contrast to other methods, such as LSDA + U (Ref. 79), wherein the occupied levels are pushed lower and the unoccupied ones are pushed higher relative to the LSDA spectrum, within the VPSIC approach, the entire spectrum is lowered, with the occupied and empty levels being shifted by different amounts depending upon their orbital character. For instance, the mean absolute difference between the LSDA and VPSIC HOMO-LUMO gaps for the test set in Table IX comes out to be $\sim 2.52$ eV, while the correction to the HOMO levels alone with respect to LSDA is around 4 eV. In general, the VPSIC method is expected to open the HOMO-LUMO gap substantially in systems where the occupied and unoccupied KS eigenstates have markedly

![FIG. 16. (Color online) Experimental negative electron affinities ($-\text{EA}$) compared to calculated HOMO eigenvalues of negative radicals.](image)

Table VIII. Calculated HOMO eigenvalues for singly negatively charged molecules compared to the experimental negative electron affinities ($-\text{EA}$). Columns 6, 7, and 8 present the LUMO eigenvalues for the corresponding neutral species. Experimental values for the electron affinities are taken from Ref. 72.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecule</th>
<th>$\epsilon_{N+1}^{\text{HOMO}}$ (eV)</th>
<th>Expt. $-\text{EA}$ (eV)</th>
<th>$\epsilon_{N}^{\text{LUMO}}$ (eV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC≡C⁻</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>-6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₃≡CH⁻</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC≡CO⁻</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH⁻</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₃⁻</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₃O⁻</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂S⁻</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃C=O⁻</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN⁻</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>-3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNO⁻</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-3.58</td>
<td>-3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₂⁻</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂⁻</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF⁻</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH⁻</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH₂⁻</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S²⁻</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH⁻</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>-2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiH₃⁻</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IX. Calculated HOMO-LUMO gaps ($E_g$) of neutral molecules from LSDA and VPSIC. $\delta E_g$ in column 4 represents the difference between corresponding VPSIC and LSDA gaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecule</th>
<th>LSDA</th>
<th>VPSIC</th>
<th>$\delta E_g$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCl$_3$</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_4$, (benzene)</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_2$, (acetylene)</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_4$, (ethylene)</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_6$, (ethane)</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuF</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_6$, (cyclobutane)</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_6$, (cyclopropane)</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N$_2$</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_2$</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF$_3$</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH$_3$</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH$_2$</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiCl$_4$</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiH$_4$</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO$_2$</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have introduced the first-principles VPSIC approach, a variational generalization of the method formerly known as PSIC and ASIC. This is based on the idea of removing the spurious self-interaction from the local density functional energy. In the VPSIC approach, the self-interaction is removed in an effective albeit approximate (i.e., orbitally averaged) manner, which gives several advantages over the full SI removal (applied, for example, in the PZ-SIC approach or in related methods for extended systems). In particular, the method conserves translational invariance (i.e., Bloch theorem) in solids and the total energy is invariant under unitary rotations of the occupied KS eigenfunction manifold. The VPSIC approach emerges as applicable to a vast series of systems (insulators and metals, magnetic and nonmagnetic, extended or finite) with an overall satisfactory accuracy. Furthermore, it is not more demanding than LDA and GGA from a computational viewpoint.

We have implemented the method in two numerical frameworks, namely, plane-wave basis set and ultrasoft pseudopotentials, and local orbital basis set plus norm-conserving pseudopotentials. The former scheme was applied here to extended systems (nonmagnetic oxides, magnetic titanates, and magnetic manganites), the latter to a vast range of molecules. In both cases, we have tested structural and electronic properties. Overall, the performance of the VPSIC approach can be summarized as follows: the predicted equilibrium structures are substantially in the same range of accuracy than those of the LDA and LSDA, with the VPSIC that on average reduces the bond lengths predicted by LDA and LSDA. This results to an average underestimate of the experimental lattice constant by about 1% for bulk systems and by just less than 2% for the molecule bond lengths. It is possible that the same approach built on top of the GGA might cure this problem since GGA generally overestimates bond lengths, and the SI removal would bring the final result closer to experiment. In contrast, as for the case of the PSIC and ASIC methods, the electronic properties are highly improved with respect to LDA and GGA, with bulk band gaps and molecular ionization potentials and electron affinities typically within 10% from the respective experimental determinations. The overall high quality of these results encourages us to pursue further explorations and applications of the VPSIC approach for finite and extended systems alike.
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APPENDIX A: GENERALIZATION OF VPSIC FORMALISM TO USPP IMPLEMENTATION

For large-sized magnetic and strong-correlated systems, the ultrasoft pseudopotential (USPP) method$^{15}$ associated to a
plane-wave basis set is a formidable tool enabling the use of cutoff energies as low as 30–40 Ryd even for “hard” transition-metal ions such as Mn or Cu. The trade-off for this computational efficiency is a significant complication of the VPSIC formulas presented in Sec. II. In the following, we provide the VPSIC formulation adapted to the USPP formalism, which is our implementation of choice. For the sake of brevity, here we focus on the additional parts specific for the USPP approach, and refer the reader to Ref. 15 for details of the USPP formalism.

In short, in the USPP approach, the atomic valence charge is partitioned into outer ultrasoft (US) and intracore, augmented (AU) contributions. Only the former changes self-consistently with the surrounding chemical environment. Thus, the charge associated to the Bloch states $\psi_{n,k}^a$ appearing in Sec. II only represents the very smooth US part. The Bloch states obey the generalized orthonormality conditions

$$\langle \psi_{n,k}^a | \hat{S} | \psi_{n,k}^b \rangle = \delta_{n,n'},$$

where the overall matrix $\hat{S}$ is given by

$$\hat{S} = \hat{I} + \sum_{ab} |\beta_{a,v}|q_{ab,v}|\beta_{b,v}|.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

Here, $\beta_{a,v}(r)$ and $q_{ab,v}$ are, respectively, the atomic projector functions and the augmented charges characteristic of the USPP formalism, and $(a,b)$ label atomic quantum numbers $(l_a,m_{a\mu})$ ($q_{ab,v} \neq 0$ only for $l_a = l_b$). Consistently, the total charge density is generalized as

$$n(r) = \sum_{nk} \langle \psi_{n,k}^a | \hat{S}(r) | \psi_{n,k}^a \rangle,$$

$$\hat{S}(r) = |r\rangle\langle r| + \sum_{ab} |\beta_{a,v}(r)|^2 q_{ab,v}|\beta_{b,v}|,$$  \hspace{1cm} (A4)

where $Q_{ab,v}(r)$ are augmented atomic charge densities. Within this generalized framework, the VPSIC energy functional described in Eq. (1) only includes the ultrasoft (US-SIC) part. In order to recover the full VPSIC energy functional, a further augmented contribution must be added:

$$E^{\text{VPSIC-AU}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} B^\sigma_{ij} P^\sigma_{ij} E^\text{AU}_{ij},$$

where $B^\sigma_{ij}$ is the matrix of Bloch state projections onto the $\beta$-function basis

$$B^\sigma_{ab,v} = \sum_{nk} f_{nk}^a \langle \psi_{n,k}^a | \beta_{a,v} \rangle \langle \beta_{b,v} | \psi_{n,k}^b \rangle,$$

and $E^\text{AU}$ are the SI energy associated to the augmented atomic charges $Q_{ab,v}(r)$:

$$E^\text{AU}_{ij} = \int dr Q_{ab,v}(r) V_{\text{Hxc}}[n_{ab}(r),0].$$  \hspace{1cm} (A7)

In radial symmetry, $V_{\text{Hxc}}[n_{ab},0] = V_{\text{Hxc}}[n_{ab},0]$ for $n_a \neq n_b$. Notice that we use different indices for the USPP projector $(a, b)$ and for the SI projector $(i, j)$ since the two basis sets are conceptually and practically different. The latter is built on a minimal set of atomic orbitals and, to be physically sound, it must be associated to bound atomic states. In contrast, in order to improve the USPP transferability, it is customary to include in the $(a,b)$ matrix more than one state per angular moment (typically, the bound atomic state plus one unbound state relative to some diagnostic energy reference). This difference introduces some ambiguities in Eq. (A7) relative to the definition of $V_{\text{Hxc}}[n_{ab},0]$ and $P_{ab}$. The ambiguity can be solved by associating the same atomic $V_{\text{Hxc}}$ (relative to the bound state) to all the beta projectors with same angular momentum $l_a$. Another possibility is that of rewriting the VPSIC-AU energy as

$$E^{\text{VPSIC-AU}}[[\psi]] = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} P^\sigma_{ij} E^\text{AU}_{ij},$$

where

$$E^\text{AU}_{ij} = \sum_{ab} (\hat{\delta}_{a,v} | \beta_{a,v} \rangle E^\text{AU}_{ab,i} \langle \beta_{b,v} | \hat{\delta}_{b,v}).$$

is just the augmented-only SI energy relative to the atomic state $i$ at full occupancy and can be directly calculated in the atom. The use of the simplified Eq. (A8) bypasses altogether the explicit presence of the augmented charges, thus, greatly simplifying the VPSIC AU energy functional calculation. Since our many test cases reveal that Eqs. (A5) and (A8) give indeed very similar results, we decide to adopt the latter as standard choice. Then, Eq. (A8) brings a corresponding contribution to the VPSIC KS equations

$$\frac{\partial E^{\text{VPSIC-AU}}}{\partial \psi^*_{n,k}} = -\sum_{ij} P^\sigma_{ij} \frac{\partial P^\sigma_{ij}}{\partial \psi^*_{n,k}} E^\text{AU}_{ij},$$

Finally, the orbital occupations defined in Eq. (2) must be also generalized as

$$P^\sigma_{ij} = \sum_{nk} f_{nk}^a \langle \psi_{n,k}^a | \hat{\delta}_{i,v} \rangle \langle \hat{\delta}_{j,v} | \psi_{n,k}^a \rangle,$$

where the ultrasoft atomic orbitals $\hat{\delta}_{i,v}$ have been replaced by

$$|\hat{\delta}_{i,v} \rangle = \sum_{l'} S_{i'v,l',i}^0 |\delta_{i',v} \rangle,$$

with $\hat{S}$ given in Eq. (A2). Thus, we have

$$|\hat{\delta}_{i,v} \rangle = |\delta_{i,v} \rangle + \sum_{ab,\mu} (\beta_{a,\mu} q_{ab,\mu} |\beta_{b,\mu} \rangle |\phi_{i,v} \rangle,$$

and

$$S_{i'v,l',i}^0 = \langle \phi_{i,v} | \hat{S} | \delta_{i',v} \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A14)

is the overlap matrix in the atomic-orbital basis set. By construction, this is Hermitian and also positive defined, so its square-root matrix can always be defined in the following, unique way: Since (dropping indexes for clarity) $|\hat{S}^{-1/2}, \delta_i \rangle = 0, \hat{S}$ can be diagonalized in the $(i,j)$ subspace, and from its eigenvalues $\lambda_k$, we have $S_{k'k}^{-1/2} = \delta_{k'k}^{-1/2}$. The latter is finally rotated back to the original $(i,j)$ basis set to obtain $S_{ij}^{-1/2}$. The replacement of simple atomic-site-centered $\delta_{i,v}$ orbitals with the $\hat{\delta}_{i,v}$ orbitals given by Eq. (A12) (known as L"owdin orthonormalization) is required by the necessity to enforce, at any $(R)$, the orthonormality conditions $\langle \delta_{i,v} | \hat{\delta}_{j,v'} \rangle = \delta_{ij} \delta_{v'v}$ and, in turn, the correct normalization of the orbital occupation matrix defined in Eq. (A11). Upon diagonalization, $0 \leq P^\sigma_{ij} \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i'v} P^\sigma_{i'v} = N$, with $N$ the total number of electrons in
the cell. These constraints are essential to the interpretation of $P_{ij}^{\sigma}$ as physically sound orbital occupancies.

In contrast, the Löwdin renormalization implies a remarkable complication in the formulation of the atomic forces since it is clear from Eqs. (A12) and (A14) that $\phi_{ij}$ is not simply centered on a single atomic site, but includes contributions from the overlap with all other atomic orbitals $\beta_{ij}$, as well as beta functions $\beta_{ij}$ of the cell. Since the forces formulation in the case of Löwdin-normalized orbitals may be useful even in other methodological contexts (e.g., in the LDA + U method, the Hamiltonian of which is also written in terms of orbital occupancies), we dedicate the next section to describe it in detail.

APPENDIX B: FORCES FORMULATION WITHIN PLANE WAVES AND USPP

In the case of USPP formalism, the forces expression given in Eq. (19) or Eq. (20) if the simplified approach is considered] must be generalized in order to include the contribution generated by the additional AU energy of Eq. (A8):

$$\frac{\partial E^{\text{AU}}[\psi]}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} = \sum_{ij,\kappa} f_{\kappa}^\sigma \left\{ P_{ij}\psi_i^\sigma \left( \frac{\partial \phi_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right) |\phi_{ij}\rangle |\psi_{nk}\rangle + \text{c.c.} \right\}.$$  

(B1)

When using a plane-wave basis set, the implementation of Eqs. (19), (20), or (B1) is rather straightforward except for one ingredient, which requires attention: the atomic-orbital derivative. The simplest case is that of atomic orbitals that remain centered on the atomic positions (i.e., orbitals that simply translate along with their reference atomic displacement). In this case, the force on a given atom $\mathbf{R}_v$ only depends on the change of the orbitals sited on $v$, and the orbital derivative is easily calculated as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} (\mathbf{k} + G | \phi_{iv}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} e^{-i(\mathbf{k} + G) \cdot \mathbf{R}_v} (\mathbf{k} + G | \phi_{0v}) = -i (\mathbf{k} + G) (\mathbf{k} + G | \phi_{iv}).$$  

(B2)

where, clearly, $\phi_{iv} = \phi_{iv}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_v)$ and $\phi_{0v} = \phi_{iv}(\mathbf{r})$. However, as discussed in the previous section, orbitals $\phi_{iv}$ must be replaced by $\tilde{\phi}_{iv}$, and the forces equation generalized accordingly to

$$-\frac{\partial E^{\text{PSIC}}[\psi]}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} = F_{v,SD}^\text{PSIC} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij,\kappa} f_{\kappa}^\sigma \left\{ \left( \frac{\partial \gamma_{ij}^\sigma}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right) C_{ij} \langle \gamma_{ij^\prime} | \phi_{nk}^\sigma P_{ij^\prime}^\sigma + \text{c.c.} \right\} + \sum_{ij,\kappa} f_{\kappa}^\sigma \left\{ \left( \frac{\partial \phi_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right) \tilde{\phi}_{ij}^\sigma |\psi_{nk}\rangle + \text{c.c.} \right\}.$$  

(B3)

Here, the first two terms account for the US contribution and the third for the AU part. The presence of the Löwdin-normalized orbitals brings one more sum over the atomic positions in the second and third terms since now the displacement of one single atom in $\mathbf{R}_v$ changes, in principle, all the orbitals, not just those sited on $\mathbf{R}_v$. The Löwdin orbital derivatives gives

$$\left\langle \psi_{nk} \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right| S_{ij}^{1/2} \right\rangle = \left\langle S_{ij}^{1/2} \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right| \psi_{nk} \right\rangle$$

$$+ \left\langle \psi_{nk} \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right| S_{ij}^{1/2} \right\rangle$$  

(B4)

(where sum over repeated indices is understood).

Let us start by considering the first term

$$\left\langle \psi_{nk} \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right| S_{ij}^{1/2} \right\rangle.$$  

$$= \left\langle \psi_{nk} \left| S_{ij}^{1/2} \right| \psi_{ij^\prime} \right\rangle + \left\langle \psi_{nk} \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right| \psi_{ij^\prime} \right\rangle$$

$$= \left\langle \psi_{nk} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} + S_{ij}^{1/2} \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right) |\psi_{ij^\prime}\rangle \right\rangle |\beta_{ij}\rangle q_{ab} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} q_{ab} |\beta_{ij^\prime}\rangle \right) \right\rangle$$

$$+ \sum_{ab} \left[ \left\langle \psi_{nk} \left| \frac{\partial \beta_{ab}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right| q_{ab} (\beta_{ij^\prime}) |\beta_{ij^\prime}\rangle \right\rangle \right]$$

$$+ \left\langle \psi_{nk} |\beta_{ij^\prime}\rangle q_{ab} \left( \frac{\partial \beta_{ab}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} |\beta_{ij^\prime}\rangle \right) \right\rangle.$$  

(B5)

Here, the first term in square brackets selects the contribution to the derivative due to the atomic orbital $\phi_{ij}$ displacement, while the second term selects the contribution due to the $\beta$-functions displacement. Despite the apparent complexity, Eq. (B5) is rather straightforward to calculate in plane waves since all these derivatives are easily obtained through Eq. (B2).

The calculation of the second term in Eq. (B5), which includes an uncommon square-root matrix derivative, is more involved. We can proceed as follows (dropping the atomic indices for brevity): from $S^{-1/2} S^{-1/2} = S^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial S^{-1}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} = \frac{S^{-1/2} S^{-1/2}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v}.$$  

(B6)

The left-hand side of Eq. (B6) can be transformed by using the expression

$$\frac{\partial S^{-1}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} = \left( \frac{\partial S^{-1}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right) S^{-1},$$  

(B7)

where $S^{-1}$ can be easily obtained from $S$ (just like $S^{-1/2}$, as explained in the previous section). Then, we need to calculate the overlap matrix derivative (reintroducing atomic indices) as

$$\frac{\partial S_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} = \left\langle \psi_{nk} \left| \frac{\partial \phi_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right| S_{ij^\prime} \right\rangle$$

$$+ \left\langle \phi_{ij} \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_{ij}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_v} \right| S_{ij^\prime} \right\rangle.$$  

(B8)

This expression is clearly similar to that in Eq. (B5) and we can give it as understood. Therefore, the matrix on the left-hand side in Eq. (B6) is determined. Now, by looking at the right
side, we notice that, if $S^{-1/2}$ commutes with its derivative, the latter is easily extracted as

$$\frac{\partial S^{-1/2}}{\partial \mathbf{R}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial S^{-1}}{\partial \mathbf{R}} S^{-1/2}. \quad (B9)$$

However, they do not generally commute (except when the Hermitian matrix $S^{-1/2}$ is also real) and Eq. (B9) does not hold. Thus, we need to solve Eq. (B6), which is nothing but a Lyapunov matrix equation of the form $B = XA + AX$, where the known terms are $A = S^{-1/2}$ and $B = dS^{-1}/d\mathbf{R}$, and $X = dS^{-1/2}/d\mathbf{R}$. The general Lyapunov equation can be solved exactly, but for the specific values of $A$ and $B$, we can apply the simple strategy proposed in Ref. 80, which we repeat here to the benefit of the reader: we can rewrite $A = CVC^*$, where $V$ and $C$ can be easily determined as the diagonalized matrix and the basis change matrix; then, we can multiply both members of Eq. (B6) by $C^*$ on the left-hand side and $C$ on the right-hand side:

$$C^*BC = C^*AXC + C^*XAC = VC^*XC + C^*XCV. \quad (B10)$$

By introducing $R = C^*BC$ and $Y = C^*XC$, Eq. (B10) can be rewritten as $R = VY + YV$, which is now trivially solved, given the diagonal character of $V$:

$$Y_{ij} = \frac{R_{ij}}{V_{ii} + V_{jj}}. \quad (B11)$$

Once $Y$ is determined, the unknown $X$ can be finally obtained as $X = CYC^*$.

**APPENDIX C: VPSIC FORMALISM WITHIN ATOMIC-ORBITALS BASIS SET**

As the VPSIC correction is based on a projection of the occupied KS orbital manifold onto a localized subspace of atomic orbitals, the formalism naturally lends itself to an implementation within a localized orbital basis set framework. Here, we provide some details of the current VPSIC implementation within the SIESTA code. The first step in setting up the VPSIC algorithm consists in constructing a minimal set of atomic orbitals $\{\phi_{i,v}\}$ and the associated projectors $\{\gamma_{i,v}\}$, which will be used to calculate the occupation numbers [Eq. (2)] and the effective SI energies [Eq. (3)]. Within SIESTA, the functions $\phi_{i,v}$ are numerical pseudoatomic orbitals with a finite range, constructed as solutions of the atomic Schrödinger equation with an additional confining potential at the cutoff radius $r_c$. The finite extent of the functions $\phi_{i,v}$ ensures that the corresponding SIC projectors $\gamma_{i,v}$ [Eq. (4)] also vanish beyond $r_c$. In the current implementation, the SIC potential $V_{\text{htc}}(\rho_{i,v}(r); 1)$ in Eq. (4) is obtained from a full PZ-SIC-LSDA (Ref. 7) calculation for a free atom and imported into SIESTA via a pseudopotential. An appropriate choice for the cutoff radius $r_c$ is then dictated by the requirement that the expectation value

$$\delta_{i,v}^{\text{SIC}} = \int d\mathbf{r} \phi_{i,m}(\mathbf{r}) V_{\text{htc}}[\rho_{i,v}(r); 1] \phi_{i,m}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (C1)$$

reproduces the PZ-SIC-LSDA correction of the corresponding orbital in the free atom to within a small tolerance. Simultaneously, the cutoff should be reasonably short so as not to change the connectivity of the matrix elements of the pseudoatomic orbital (PAO) Hamiltonian. Therefore, in practice, we set the cutoff radius for the projection orbitals on a given atom $\phi_{i,v}$ to be either equal to the largest among the cutoff radii of the PAO basis set for that particular atom (typically, the first $\xi$ of the lowest angular momentum) or, if shorter, to the radius at which $\delta_{i,v}^{\text{SIC}} < 0.1$ mRy. For typical cutoff radii (6 to 9 Bohr), we find that the atomic SIC-LSDA eigenvalues are reproduced to within 1 to 5 mRy for the most extended shells and to within 0.1 mRy for more confined ones. Thus, $\delta_{i,v}^{\text{SIC}}$ is rather well converged already for cutoff radii defined by PAO energy shifts of around 20 mRy.

By using the orbitals $\phi_{i,v}$ and the projectors $\{\gamma_{i,v}\}$, the occupation numbers $p_{i,v}^\alpha$ and the effective SI energies $\epsilon_{i,v}^\text{SI}$ for the extended system can be calculated. Different choices are possible for the projection operators that yield the occupation numbers $p_{i,v}^\alpha$. In our implementation, we use the so-called dual projection operator given by

$$\tilde{p}_{i,v}^\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \left| \phi_{i,v}^\alpha \right\rangle \langle \phi_{i,v}^\alpha | + | \phi_{i,v}^\alpha \rangle \langle \phi_{i,v}^\alpha |, \quad (C2)$$

where $| \phi_{i,v}^\alpha \rangle$ is the dual orbital of $| \phi_{i,v} \rangle$ and is given by

$$\phi_{i,v}^\alpha = \sum_{j,\mu} S_{i,\mu,j}^{-1} | \phi_{j,\mu} \rangle, \quad (C3)$$

with $S^{-1}$ being the inverse of the overlap matrix over the nonorthogonal set $\{\phi_{i,v}\}$:

$$S_{i,\mu,j} = \langle \phi_{i,v}^\alpha | \phi_{j,\mu} \rangle. \quad (C4)$$

The dual orbitals satisfy the orthogonality relation

$$\langle \phi_{i,v}^\alpha | \phi_{j,\mu} \rangle = \delta_{i,v} \delta_{\mu,j}. \quad (C5)$$

With this choice for the occupation number operator, the matrix elements of the VPSIC potential between two basis functions $\alpha, \beta$ become

$$V_{\alpha,\beta}^{\text{SIC}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijV} \epsilon_{i,jV}^\text{SI} \left\{ \left( | \phi_{i,v}^\alpha \rangle \langle \phi_{j,v}^\alpha | \beta \right) + \left( | \phi_{i,v} \rangle \langle \phi_{j,v}^\beta | \right) \right\} + p_{i,v}^\alpha (\alpha | \gamma_{i,v} \rangle C_{j,v} (\gamma_{j,v} | \beta) - (C6)$$

The expression for the VPSIC contribution to the atomic forces also involves two-center-type integrals and their derivatives. By setting $\Omega_{\alpha,i,v} = (\alpha | \phi_{i,v} \rangle, \Omega_{\alpha,i,v} = (\alpha | \phi_{i,v}^\alpha \rangle$, and $G_{\alpha,i,v} = (\alpha | \gamma_{i,v} \rangle$, we have

$$F_{\alpha,\beta}^{\text{SIC}} = -\frac{\partial V_{\alpha,\beta}^{\text{SIC}}[\psi]}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \right|_{\mathbf{R}_\mu} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijV} \epsilon_{i,jV}^\text{SI} \frac{\partial p_{i,v}^\alpha}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} + p_{i,v}^\alpha \frac{\partial \epsilon_{i,jV}^\text{SI}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu}, \quad (C7)$$

with

$$\frac{\partial p_{i,v}^\alpha}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{\partial \rho_{\alpha}^\beta}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \left[ \Omega_{\alpha,i,v} \Omega_{\beta,j,v} + \Omega_{\alpha,i,v} \Omega_{\beta,j,v} \right]$$

$$+ \rho_{\alpha}^\beta \left[ \Omega_{\alpha,i,v} \Omega_{\beta,j,v} + \Omega_{\alpha,i,v} \Omega_{\beta,j,v} \right]$$

$$+ \rho_{\alpha}^\beta \left[ \Omega_{\alpha,i,v} \Omega_{\beta,j,v} + \Omega_{\alpha,i,v} \Omega_{\beta,j,v} \right] \right|_{\mathbf{R}_\mu} \quad (C8)$$
\[ \frac{\partial \epsilon_{ij,\sigma}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} = \sum_{\alpha \beta} \frac{\partial \rho_{\beta \alpha}^\sigma}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} G_{\alpha,iv} C_{ij,\sigma} G_{\beta,jv} + \rho_{\beta \alpha}^\sigma \left[ \frac{\partial G_{\alpha,iv}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} C_{ij,\sigma} G_{\beta,jv} + G_{\alpha,iv} C_{ij,\sigma} \frac{\partial G_{\beta,jv}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \right], \]

where the sum is over the SIESTA basis functions \( \alpha, \beta \), and \( \rho_{\beta \alpha}^\sigma \) is the density matrix given by

\[ \rho_{\beta \alpha}^\sigma = \sum_{nk} f_{nk}^\sigma \langle \beta | \phi_{nk}^\sigma | \alpha \rangle. \]

Quantities of the type \( \frac{\partial p_{\sigma}^\mu}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \) and \( \frac{\partial G_{\alpha,iv}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \) are easily calculated as derivatives of two-center integrals as they vanish unless one of the functions \( | \alpha \rangle \) or \( | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle \) is centered on the atom at \( \mathbf{R}_\mu \). However, the dual orbitals \( | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle \) are not simple atom-centered functions, and derivatives of the type \( \frac{\partial G_{\alpha,iv}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \) can be nonzero even when neither \( | \alpha \rangle \) nor \( | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle \) is centered on atom \( \mu \). These may, in principle, be evaluated as follows. We start by expanding the matrix element between a SIESTA basis function \( | \alpha \rangle \) and a projector function \( | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle \) by inserting the identity operator in the space of projector functions

\[ \langle \alpha | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle = \sum_{n \mu} \langle \alpha | \phi_{n \mu} \rangle \langle \phi_{n \mu} | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle. \]

The derivative of this expression with respect to \( \mathbf{R}_I \) where \( I \) is any atom index is

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_I} \langle \alpha | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle = \sum_{\mu n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_I} \langle \alpha | \phi_{n \mu} \rangle \langle \phi_{n \mu} | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle + \langle \alpha | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{R}_I} \langle \phi_{n \mu} | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle. \]

A similar equation can be written for all of the matrix elements in the overlap matrix \( \Omega \) of basis functions with projector functions \( \Omega_{ij,\mu} = \langle \phi_{ij,\mu} \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle \) so that the above equation is equivalent to the matrix equation

\[ \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \Omega = (\nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \tilde{\Omega}) \cdot S + \tilde{\Omega} \cdot (\nabla_{\mathbf{R}} S), \]

where in \( \tilde{\Omega}_{ij,\mu} = \langle \alpha | \phi_{ij,\mu} \rangle \) and \( S \) is the overlap matrix in the space of the projector functions as defined in Eq. (C4). The required derivatives involving the dual orbitals \( \frac{\partial G_{\alpha,iv}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \) in Eq. (C12) are the elements of \( \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \tilde{\Omega} \), which can be solved for as

\[ \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \tilde{\Omega} = \left[ \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} U - U \cdot (\nabla_{\mathbf{R}} S) \right] \cdot S^{-1}. \]

A corresponding set of equations can be written down involving the matrix elements \( W_{iv,\alpha} = \langle \phi_{iv} | \alpha \rangle \) and \( \tilde{W}_{iv,\alpha} = \langle \tilde{\phi}_{iv} | \alpha \rangle \) with \( \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \tilde{W} \) being given by

\[ \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \tilde{W} = S^{-1} \cdot \left[ \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} W - (\nabla_{\mathbf{R}} S) \cdot W \right]. \]

Equations (C14) and (C15) can be readily evaluated as all the derivatives appearing on the right-hand side are simple two-center integrals and, furthermore, \( S^{-1} \) is well defined since \( S \) is a square matrix and positive definite. However, this additional linear algebra required to handle the dual orbitals \( | \tilde{\phi}_{ij,\mu} \rangle \) is rather cumbersome as Eqs. (C14) and (C15) need to be solved separately for each atom in the system. In order to avoid these additional computational overheads in estimating the forces, one may in practice adopt a slightly different approach for calculating the VPSIC orbital occupation numbers within the framework of a localized orbital basis. This is described in Appendix D.

### Appendix D: Simplified VPSIC Orbital Occupation Scheme for LCAO Basis Sets

We take advantage of the Mulliken orbital population decomposition of the electronic charge density readily available in SIESTA and define the VPSIC occupation number \( p_{ij,\nu}^\sigma \) as a sum over the Mulliken occupations of the underlying local orbital basis set. Since SIESTA employs a multiple-\( \xi \) numerical basis set,\(^5\) it is possible to define a mapping between a VPSIC projector on an atom and basis orbitals on the same atom enumerated by their \( \xi \) index. For instance, on any atom, a VPSIC projector function \( | \phi_{ij,\nu} \rangle \), with the index \( i \) specifying cumulatively the \((n, l, m)\) quantum numbers, can be mapped to all of the basis functions on the atom with the same \((n, l, m)\) quantum numbers, but with different \( \xi \) indices. Thus, in the case of a single-\( \xi \) basis being employed, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the VPSIC projector functions and the orbitals in the basis set. Within this scheme, polarization orbitals in the basis set are treated simply as additional \( \xi \) functions of higher-\( l \) quantum number. Therefore, all basis functions corresponding to a given projector function \( | \phi_{ij,\nu} \rangle \) may be represented by attaching an additional multiplicity index \( \xi \) as \( | \tilde{\phi}_{ij,\nu} \rangle \). The VPSIC occupation numbers are then given by

\[ p_{ij,\nu}^\sigma = \sum_{\tau} p_{ij,\tau,\nu}^\sigma = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha} \left( \rho_{\nu \alpha}^\sigma S_{\alpha,j\nu} + S_{\tau \nu,\alpha} \rho_{\nu \alpha}^\sigma \right), \]  

where \( p_{ij,\tau,\nu}^\sigma \) is the overlap occupation number for the pair of basis functions \( | \tilde{\phi}_{ij,\nu} \rangle \) and \( | \phi_{ij,\nu} \rangle \). The sum over the index \( \alpha \) represents an unrestricted summation over all of the basis functions in the calculation. The terms \( \rho_{\nu \alpha}^\sigma \) and \( S_{\nu \tau,\alpha} \) are, respectively, the spin density matrix and the overlap matrix elements between basis functions \( | \phi_{ij,\nu} \rangle \) and \( | \phi_{ij,\nu} \rangle \). By defining the VPSIC occupation numbers in this way, we avoid having to deal with the dual orbitals [see Eq. (C3)] of the projector functions. Furthermore, the occupation numbers defined in Eq. (D1) satisfy the sum rule

\[ \sum_{iv,\sigma} p_{ij,\nu}^\sigma = N, \]

i.e., the diagonal occupations \( p_{ij,\nu}^\sigma \) sum to the total number of electrons \( N \) in the system. The VPSIC forces follow once again from Eq. (C7), but with

\[ \frac{\partial p_{ij,\nu}^\sigma}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\tau} \left\{ \frac{\partial \rho_{\nu \alpha}^\sigma}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} S_{\alpha,j\nu} + \rho_{\nu \alpha}^\sigma \frac{\partial S_{\alpha,j\nu}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} + \frac{\partial S_{\tau \nu,\alpha}}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \rho_{\nu \alpha}^\sigma + S_{\tau \nu,\alpha} \frac{\partial \rho_{\nu \alpha}^\sigma}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \right\}. \]

The terms such as \( \frac{\partial \rho_{\nu \alpha}^\sigma}{\partial \mathbf{R}_\mu} \), involving the derivatives of the density matrix, are treated separately, being incorporated into
the orthogonality force and stress contributions. In contrast, the derivatives of the overlap matrix with respect to atomic positions \[ \frac{\partial S_{\alpha \nu}}{\partial \zeta} \] are readily available in Ref. 6. We note that results obtained by adopting Eq. (D1) to define the occupation numbers are very similar to those obtained by using the original definition of Eq. (2).
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