

**INVESTIGATIONS OF EXACT
PROPERTIES OF TIME-DEPENDENT
SYSTEMS AND THEIR APPLICATION TO
DENSITY FUNCTIONAL THEORY**

BY PAUL HESSLER

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate School—Camden
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Chemistry

Written under the direction of

Professor Kieron Burke

and approved by

Camden, New Jersey

September, 2004

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Investigations of exact properties of time-dependent systems and their application to Density Functional Theory

by Paul Hessler

Dissertation Director: Professor Kieron Burke

Quantum mechanics has been around since Erwin Shroedinger first wrote down the equations used to describe such systems in 1926. Since that time, the need for a wave function to describe the system and be used in the Shroedinger equation has made all but the simplest systems impossible to investigate exactly. In thoery, the Shroedinger equation allows for calculation of many quantities of atoms and molecules but in practice, the wave function of such systems is not known and nearly impossible to determine.

Upon the realization that this problem existed with the wave function, scientists started trying to devise approximate methods that might produce the correct results of the actual system of interest with. Early attempts provided encouraging, but not accurate results.

In 1964, Walter Kohn and Lou Sham devised a methodical system that mapped the actual density of the system onto a fictious system where the electrons did

not interact, called Density Functional Theory. It is the interaction between the electrons that complicates the process of determining a wavefunction of an actual atom or molecule. This theory is also exact and has a flaw in practice. The energy of the actual interaction between the electrons is broken into pieces, most of which can be calculated relatively easily. However, one quantity known as the exchange-correlation energy has no explicit functional form. This means that it must be approximated. Done well, this energy can be calculated within a few percent of the correct value for a large collection of atoms and molecules in their ground states.

Much less research has focussed on systems that have external time-dependent fields applied to them and how that effects the exchange-correlation functional. There have been many attempts to write functionals that generate ground-state exchange-correlation energies. These have been implemented in commercially available programs and have been widely used. While these functionals work well in some time-dependent cases, they work very poorly in others. The body of research prented here is an attempt to discover the properties of time-dependent systems and improve functionals for time-dependent systems.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank Kieron Burke for sharing his knowledge, taking his time to work with me and having the patience to assist me. Without his expertise and tutelage, I would not have earned this degree.

I would like to thank the Research Corporation for funding my research the entire time.

I would like to thank the Chemistry Department at Rutgers University, Camden Campus for supplying facilities so that I could complete my research work.

I would like to thank Professor Paul Maslen for his willing assistance and valuable discussions during my time on the Camden Campus.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to the members of the BURG for their unqualified support of my research efforts.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Dedication	v
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
List of Abbreviations	xii
1. Introduction	1
2. The basics of Time-Dependent Density Functional theory . . .	3
2.1. Introduction	3
2.2. Theory and Background	4
2.3. Results	6
2.4. Conclusions	8
2.5. Acknowledgements	8
References	9
3. Several Theorems in Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory	10
References	20
4. Correlation in Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory . .	22
4.1. Introduction	22

4.2. Theory	27
4.3. Algorithm	31
4.4. One electron	33
4.4.1. A measure of system response	34
4.4.2. Time-dependent perturbation theory and linear response .	36
4.4.3. Perturbation of finite duration	38
4.5. Two electrons	39
4.5.1. Positive correlation energies	39
4.5.2. Non-locality in time	41
4.5.3. Linear Response Regime	43
4.5.4. High-density limit	45
4.6. Conclusions	47
4.7. Acknowledgment	49
References	50
Vita	54

List of Tables

4.1. Table of figures and their run parameters.	33
---	----

List of Figures

2.1.	Virial plot for the time-dependent Kohn-Sham system. The solid line is $E_c + T_c$, the dotted line very close to the solid line is the virial of the correlation potential and the bottom dashed line is the corresponding ground-state calculation of $E_c + T_c$	7
3.1.	Occupation numbers for the u wavefunction and $\omega(t)$ (atomic units).	16
3.2.	Energy components for the time-dependent Hooke's atom (Hartrees); virial = $2(T - V_{\text{ext}}) + V_{\text{ee}}$	16
3.3.	Time-dependent correlation potentials (atomic units).	17
3.4.	Time-dependent energy components (Hartrees).	18
4.1.	Correlation energy components as a function of time when the force constant is changed as shown in the top panel (all in atomic units): Instantaneous ground-state correlation energy (bottom dashed line), true correlation energy (solid line), dynamical part of the correlation energy (top dashed line).	26
4.2.	A test of accuracy of the solution of the time-dependent system for the truncated run (T) (see table 1). $\bar{k} = .25, \omega = .75, \epsilon = .1$ but held constant after $\frac{1}{2}$ oscillation. $E_c + T_c$ and the virial of the correlation potential are plotted. The two curves lie about on top of each other indicating a highly accurate solution.	31

4.3.	Spread of parabolic well in linear response regime as a function of time for the weak non-resonant run (WNR) (see table 1). The solid line is for two interacting electrons and the dashed is for two non-interacting electrons. The top panel shows the rms variance had the system remained in the non-interacting instantaneous ground-state of the potential.	36
4.4.	Spread of parabolic well for Hooke's atom in resonance (R) as a function of time . The solid line is for two interacting electrons, the dashed line is for two non-interacting electrons. The top panel shows the rms variance had the system remained in the non-interacting instantaneous ground-state of the potential.	37
4.5.	Top graph: Oscillations in an envelope of a slow beating period for time-dependent Hooke's atom where the perturbation is turned off after one half-oscillation for $\bar{k} = .25, \omega = .75, \epsilon = .1$. Bottom graph: 3DHO with same perturbation. $\omega_f = 0.591$ for all runs.	38
4.6.	Hooke's atom in resonance (R): $E_C(t)$ (solid line) and $E_C^{\text{dyn}}(t)$ (dashed line) match almost exactly demonstrating the importance of the dynamical component in resonance.	41
4.7.	A measure of the nonlocality of \dot{E}_C with respect to time for the non-resonant run (NR): Contrast the very similar density profiles implied in the top panel near times $t = 4.8$ and 28.9 with the very different values of \dot{E}_C there in the graph above. Similar comparisons may be made near $t = 9.35$ and $t = 24.3$	43

4.8.	Correlation energy as a function of time for time-dependent Hooke's atom for the non-resonant run (NR) : exact quantity (solid line), the ground-state approximation (bottom dashed line), and the dynamical component (top dashed line).	44
4.9.	E_C^{dyn} scales quadratically with respect to ϵ in the linear response regime while T_C^{dyn} scales linearly (LR) (see table 1).	44
4.10.	Scaling of the system changes the values only slightly as they go to the 3dHO limit. E_C is plotted for scaling factors of $\gamma = 1, 2, 4, 8$ for the weak non-resonant run (WNR).	46

List of Abbreviations

ADFT	atomic density functional theory code
BLYP	Becke-Lee-Yang-Parr functional
E_c	cCorrelation energy
DF	density functional
DFT	density functional theory
EXX	exact exchange
GGA	generalized gradient approximation
HF	Hartree-Fock
KS	Kohn-Sham
LDA	local density approximation
LSD	local spin-density
PBE	Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof GGA functional
SC	self-consistent
TDSE	Time-Dependent Schrödinger equation
X	exchange
XC	exchange-correlation
Δ SCF	Δ self-consistent field

Chapter 1

Introduction

The following three papers were written all or in part by me. This introduction will detail my contributions to each of the papers. The first paper was an invited paper published in a high school teacher's conference proceedings. The last two papers were accepted to peer-reviewed journals.

The first paper was an invited paper following a presentation at the Partners in Science conference in Tuscon, Arizona in January, 2000. Partners in Science is a high school teacher and college professor two-year research collaboration. The paper appeared in the Partners in Science conference proceeding for that year. This paper was written entirely by me and serves as an introduction to the subject matter contain in the two other papers included here.

The programming, generation of the data, figures and results pertaining the the time-dependent virial theorem were done by Jang Park and me in the second paper. Jang was responsible for the solution of the Kohn-Sham equations given the time-dependent densities generated by my code. This work lays the foundation for the third paper in which the theorems and theoretical results were explored in more detail.

In the third paper, all the programming that generated the data, figures and results were done by me. The sections on memory and inital-state dependence were contributions of Neepa Maitra. I was responsible for the exploration of the behavior of the radically different behavior of the time-dependent correlation energy.

These three published works serve as an investigation of the behavioral differences of Kohn-Sham density functional quantities in time-dependent potentials.

Chapter 2

The basics of Time-Dependent Density Functional theory

2.1 Introduction

In the early part of this century scientists first discovered the equations that describe the relationship between a wave function for an electronic system and the energies arising from that wave function. Since that time, attempts have been made at accurate calculations for the energies of real materials such as atoms, molecules and solids. Density functional theory (DFT) has enjoyed increasing popularity in recent years as a calculation tool in chemistry and physics due to its combination of accuracy and efficiency [1]. In fact, there have been such significant advances in DFT that Walter Kohn was the co-recipient of the 1998 Nobel prize in chemistry [1] for his development of density functional theory and his subsequent work to advance density functional theory. Most of the work in DFT has been done on systems in their ground-state: a system that is in its lowest energy state and is not changing over time. Ground-state calculations predict geometries of molecules, bond energies, rotational and vibrational spectra, etc. [3]. Now, time-dependent systems, systems that do change over time, must be more thoroughly explored. This will allow calculations of atoms and molecules in intense laser fields, atoms and molecules undergoing energetic collisions, calculation of excitation spectra, etc [3]. In the present work, some exciting new time-dependent behaviors have been observed.

2.2 Theory and Background

Before continuing, some basic definitions will be presented. The most basic item in the systems which apply to our work is the wave function. A wave function is a mathematical description of the arrangement and interaction of electrons in a system. A system can be any arrangement of electrons with a potential to keep them in the system. Interesting real systems are atoms, molecules, and solids. For our work, Hooke's atom (two electrons in a harmonic potential) was chosen. Hooke's atom has two electrons that interact, as do the electrons in a He atom. Hooke's atom was chosen as a model because the potential force holding the two electrons together is different from that of an atom, which simplifies the calculations.

As explained in Sec. 2.1, there is a mathematical equation that relates the wave function and the energies that a particular wave function will produce. This is a partial differential equation named the Schrödinger equation after Erwin Schrödinger, the physicist who discovered it. The Schrödinger equation simply describes how the different kinetic and potential energies change with respect to their position in the system. The wave function and Schrödinger equation have both a ground-state and a time-dependent form. The time-dependent forms have been used in this work. The time-dependent Schrödinger equation not only describes changes due to position but also changes due to time [2]. When the system is moved forward in time a new wave function, a new electron density, and different energies are produced. An electron density is an expression of the probability distribution of the electrons in a system. The potential keeping the electrons in the system and the electron-electron interaction which causes the electrons to repel each other both play a part in the distribution of the electrons.

Although the Schrödinger equation is the equation that must be used to calculate the energy of an electronic system, it acts on a wave function. This presents a

significant computational problem: for interacting systems with many electrons, the wave function is far too complex to write down. This means that simply inserting a wave function into the Schrödinger equation and calculating the energy is impractical. If, however, the interaction between the electrons could somehow be ignored, that would simplify the wave function and the calculations could be performed. In effect, the problem need only be solved for each electron in the system. However, simply ignoring the electron-electron interaction will remove a significant part of the system and the energies will be incorrect.

Since the development of the Schrödinger equation, scientists have been seeking a way to ignore the interaction between the electrons and still get accurate energies. Density functional theory was the answer to this question. Density functional theory was formalized in 1964 when Walter Kohn and Pierre Hohenberg proved that there is at most one exact mapping from an interacting to a non-interacting system [6]: these are mappings in which the density distribution of the electrons in the system remains exactly the same. The new equations for this system are called the Kohn-Sham equations [60].

Once the transformation has taken place, the resulting system is a fictitious one where the density is the same but the wave function and energy components are different. Although the Kohn-Sham equations are an exact mapping, there still exists one piece of these equations, the exchange-correlation potential, that must be approximated because its exact form is not known [3]. It is the accuracy of this piece that determines the accuracy of a real DFT calculation. Over the last two decades, many functional approximations for the exchange-correlation potential have been made. Improvements have all been for the ground-state of a system. These functionals are functions that act on the density of the system rather than the wave function. Time-dependent systems have been studied using these ground-state functionals but little is known about the accuracy of the application of ground-state functionals to time-dependent systems. The focus of

the work contained in this paper is to explore these differences.

2.3 Results

In ground-state density functional theory, the development of constraints on the exchange-correlation potential has produced more accurate functionals. One such constraint has been generalized to time-dependent systems [48]. The constraint is familiar in this field of study and is called the virial theorem. This theorem describes the relationship between the energy components in an electronic system and the potential. For any atom or molecule in its ground-state, twice the kinetic energy minus the external potential energy plus the electron-electron interaction energy is zero [20]. This makes sense as this would imply that the energy is balanced and the system is not changing. The virial theorem for the time-dependent systems is not zero and this was also as expected. Since a time-dependent system changes over time, there must be an external force acting on the system thus changing the energy of the system over time. This force is *adding* energy to the system and there would not necessarily be a balance of the internal energies in the system. Once the theorem was written down for the interacting system, it was transformed for the Kohn-Sham system and lead to a constraint on the exchange-correlation potential. Although the time-dependent constraint is the same as the ground-state form, the quantities being constrained can behave quite differently in a time-dependent problem.

The virial theorem can be used as a check on the solution of a system. Since it describes how the energies relate to other system components, plotting both sides of the equation on one graph will indicate the accuracy of the calculations. The plot in Fig. 1 displays the accuracy of a calculation that was performed. Time is plotted along the x axis and energy is plotted along the y axis. The top two curves being plotted are $E_c + T_c$, the limiting quantity, and the virial for the




Figure 2.1: Virial plot for the time-dependent Kohn-Sham system. The solid line is $E_c + T_c$, the dotted line very close to the solid line is the virial of the correlation potential and the bottom dashed line is the corresponding ground-state calculation of $E_c + T_c$.

Kohn-Sham equations of the correlation potential. E_c and T_c are energies that are only present when there is some electron-electron interaction present. These quantities are part of the difference between the interacting system and the Kohn-Sham system. The virial is a quantity that describes the change in the correlation potential with respect to position. As the plot indicates, these quantities are very close to each other indicating very good accuracy of the calculations. Both quantities also change over time, indicating a change in the system over time.

The bottom curve plotted in Fig. 1 is the value of $E_c + T_c$ for a ground-state calculation. This would be the result of ignoring the time-dependence of the functional and calculating $E_c + T_c$ for a system in its ground state with the density at that instant in time. It agrees with the true time-dependent curve initially, as the calculation begins with the system in its ground state. The difference in the two curves indicates that using a ground-state functional in a time-dependent calculation would not properly include the correlation energy. $E_c + T_c$ for the time-dependent functional achieved a positive value as the system changed over time. $E_c + T_c$ for ground-state ground-state calculations has always been found

to be negative. No ground-state functional can produce the positive value found in our accurate time-dependent calculation.

2.4 Conclusions

Calculations that are performed using density functional theory depend on the accuracy of the approximation used for the exchange-correlation potential. Since the behavior of time-dependent systems can be very different from ground-state systems, it will be necessary to develop new approximate functionals that will behave properly in time-dependent systems. Although the work done in this paper is but a first step, the results clearly show that time-dependent systems exhibit very different behavior and ground-state functionals will not work for all time-dependent systems.

2.5 Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the Research Corporation for their generous support, without which this work would not have been possible.

References

- [1] *Density Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules*, R.G. Parr and W. Yang (Oxford, New York, 1989).
- [2] *Nobel Lecture: Electronic structure of matter - wave functions and density functionals*, W. Kohn, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 1253 (1999).
- [3] *The density functional formalism, its applications and prospects*, R.O. Jones and O. Gunnarsson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 689 (1989).
- [4] *A guided tour of time-dependent density functional theory*, K. Burke and E.K.U. Gross, in *Density functionals: Theory and applications*, ed. D. Joubert (Springer, Berlin, 1998).
- [5] *Density-functional theory for time-dependent systems*, E. Runge and E.K.U. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 997 (1984).
- [6] *Inhomogeneous electron gas*, P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **136**, B 864 (1964).
- [7] *Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation effects*, W. Kohn and L.J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A 1133 (1965).
- [8] *Several theorems in time-dependent density functional theory*, P. Hessler, J. Park, and K. Burke, Phys. Rev. Letts. **82**, 378 (1999); Phys. Rev. Letts. **83**, 5184 (1999) (E).
- [9] *Hellmann-Feynman, virial, and scaling requisites for the exact universal density functionals. Shape of the correlation potential and diamagnetic susceptibility for atoms*, M. Levy and J.P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. A **32**, 2010 (1985).

Chapter 3

Several Theorems in Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory

The time-dependence of the exchange-correlation energy in density functional theory is given in terms of the exchange-correlation potential. The virial theorem for the exchange-correlation potential is shown to hold also for *time-dependent* electronic systems, and is demonstrated for an exactly-solved model, Hooke's atom with a time-dependent force constant. A relation between the coupling constant and functionals evaluated on scaled densities is derived.

Ground-state electronic density functional theory (DFT) has long been used to perform electronic structure calculations of solids, and has recently become popular in quantum chemistry[1]. Many useful properties can be derived from calculations of ground-state electronic energies, such as geometric and vibrational structure and static response functions.

An important part of making DFT results useful to the broad community of users has been in improving the accuracy of approximations to the exchange-correlation energy functional, $E_{xc}[n]$, the only part of the energy which must be approximated in a Kohn-Sham calculation[60]. A vital part of this approach, in turn, has been the study of exact conditions satisfied by density functionals, especially the exchange and correlation energies. A simple example is that the correlation energy is never positive, and always finite[75]. Satisfaction of energetically relevant conditions is often used to guide construction of approximations, such as the PBE generalized gradient approximation (GGA)[41]. This functional

is now commonly used in electronic structure calculations.

In the past several years, interest has grown in *time-dependent* density functional theory (TDDFT), which is now a very active research area[3]. There are a wealth of applications for an accurate theory, such as atoms, molecules, and solids in intense laser fields[6, 7, 8], dynamic response properties[13], and electronic spectroscopy[9]. A fully developed TDDFT would allow, e.g., study of optical limiting materials[11] or electron dynamics on a femtosecond time scale[12].

While formal TDDFT was put on solid ground with the Runge-Gross theorem[2] (the analog of the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem), exploration of the exact properties of time-dependent functionals is still in its infancy. Several exact conditions have been found, including Newton's third law[14], which implies that the net exchange-correlation force must vanish, and translational invariance, which states that the time-dependent exchange-correlation potential $v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}t)$ for a boosted static density will be that of the unboosted density, evaluated at the boosted point. The latter theorem, applied to a harmonic potential, showed that the Gross-Kohn approximation[50] for frequency-dependent response properties violates the Kohn theorem[47]. This led to several new approximations[49, 68, 69], which overcome this difficulty, but remain largely untested.

In this work, we take a different approach from previous workers, in that we consider the energy components of the system, even though the total energy is not conserved. We find several simple relations satisfied by these energy components, which are then restrictions which approximate functionals should satisfy. We also derive the relation between coordinate scaling and the adiabatic coupling constant.

We begin our proofs with the Heisenberg equation of motion for any operator \hat{A} on a quantum-mechanical system:

$$\dot{\hat{A}} = \left\langle \frac{\partial \hat{A}}{\partial t} \right\rangle + \frac{i}{\hbar} \langle [\hat{H}, \hat{A}] \rangle, \quad (3.1)$$

where $A = \langle \hat{A} \rangle$, and the dot denotes a time derivative. We apply this to a system of N identical particles, with $\hat{H} = \hat{T} + \hat{V}$, where \hat{T} is the kinetic energy operator, and \hat{V} is the potential energy operator. For interacting electronic systems, the potential consists of a time-dependent one-body contribution, $V_{\text{ext}}(t)$, and a two-body contribution, V_{ee} , the Coulomb interaction between the electrons. Applying Eq. (3.1) to $\hat{A} = \hat{H}$ itself, we find

$$\dot{T} + \dot{V}_{\text{ee}} + \dot{V}_{\text{ext}} = \left\langle \frac{\partial V_{\text{ext}}}{\partial t} \right\rangle. \quad (3.2)$$

Since $V_{\text{ext}} = \int d^3r n(\mathbf{r}t) v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}t)$,

$$\dot{T} + \dot{V}_{\text{ee}} = - \int d^3r \dot{n}(\mathbf{r}t) v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}t). \quad (3.3)$$

So far, we have simply derived a general result for time-dependent quantum mechanics. But we now apply this to the Kohn-Sham system, i.e., that fictitious system of non-interacting particles which has the same time-dependent density $n(\mathbf{r}t)$. Thus

$$\dot{T}_{\text{s}} = - \int d^3r \dot{n}(\mathbf{r}t) v_{\text{s}}(\mathbf{r}t), \quad (3.4)$$

where T_{s} is the non-interacting kinetic energy and $v_{\text{s}}(\mathbf{r}t)$ is the Kohn-Sham potential. Analogous to the ground state[60], we write $T_{\text{C}} = T - T_{\text{s}}$ and $E_{\text{xc}} = V_{\text{ee}} - U + T_{\text{C}}$, where U is the Hartree energy, while $v_{\text{s}} = v_{\text{ext}} + v_{\text{H}} + v_{\text{xc}}$, where v_{H} is the Hartree potential. These are all time-dependent quantities here, and energy is not conserved. Since $\dot{U} = \int d^3r \dot{n}(\mathbf{r}t) v_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{r}t)$, we find, subtracting Eq. (3.4) from (3.3),

$$\frac{dE_{\text{xc}}}{dt} = \int d^3r \dot{n}(\mathbf{r}t) v_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}t). \quad (3.5)$$

The time-dependence of the exchange-correlation energy is solely determined by the exchange-correlation potential.

Another simple result is the virial theorem. We write $\hat{A} = \sum a(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{p}_i)$, where \mathbf{r}_i is the position of the i -th particle and \mathbf{p}_i is its momentum, and choose $a =$

$(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r})/2$:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \langle (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}) \rangle = 2T - \langle \sum_i \mathbf{r}_i \cdot \nabla_i V \rangle. \quad (3.6)$$

For a stationary state, the left-hand-side vanishes, yielding the customary virial theorem[20]. Since V_{ee} is homogeneous of degree -1 in the coordinates, its virial is equal to minus itself, yielding:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \langle (\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}) \rangle = 2T + V_{ee} - \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla v_{\text{ext}} \rangle. \quad (3.7)$$

To further simplify the left-hand side above, we consider Eq. (3.1) for $a = r^2$, finding $md\langle r^2 \rangle/dt = \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r} \rangle$. Insertion into Eq. (3.7) yields

$$\frac{m}{2} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \langle r^2 \rangle = 2T + V_{ee} - \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla v_{\text{ext}} \rangle. \quad (3.8)$$

In the Kohn-Sham system, this becomes

$$\frac{m}{2} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \langle r^2 \rangle = 2T_s - \langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla v_s \rangle. \quad (3.9)$$

Since the left side of Eq. (3.8) depends only on the density, it is the same in both the physical and the Kohn-Sham systems. Since the Hartree energy is also homogeneous of degree -1, we find:

$$E_{\text{xc}}[n](t) + T_{\text{c}}[n](t) = - \int d^3r n(\mathbf{r}t) \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla v_{\text{xc}}[n](\mathbf{r}t). \quad (3.10)$$

In deriving Eq. (3.10), we never require v_{xc} to be a functional derivative, thereby avoiding the need to define an action[3]. Eq. (3.7) also implies an exact condition on the Kohn-Sham density matrix:

$$\int d^3r \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla \gamma(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'t)|_{\mathbf{r}'=\mathbf{r}} = \int d^3r \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla \gamma_s(\mathbf{r}\mathbf{r}'t)|_{\mathbf{r}'=\mathbf{r}}. \quad (3.11)$$

A last theorem relates coordinate scaling to the coupling constant for the electron-electron repulsion[21]. The Schrödinger equation for N electrons is

$$\left\{ \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} - i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right\} \Psi(\mathbf{r}_1 \dots \mathbf{r}_N t) = -\hat{V}_{\text{ext}} \Psi(\mathbf{r}_1 \dots \mathbf{r}_N t). \quad (3.12)$$

(Note that we could have derived Eq. (3.7) by replacing \mathbf{r}_i by \mathbf{r}'_i/γ everywhere, and taking $d/d\gamma|_{\gamma=1}$ of both sides.) Consider $\Psi^\lambda[n]$ to be the solution of Eq. (4.1), but with electron-electron repulsion $\lambda\hat{V}_{ee}$, and $v_{\text{ext}}^\lambda(\mathbf{r}, t)$ chosen to keep the density fixed (at its $\lambda = 1$ value). Then let $\mathbf{r}_i \rightarrow \gamma\mathbf{r}'_i$ and $t \rightarrow \beta t'$ and multiply through by γ^2 . If we define

$$\Psi_{\gamma\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1 \dots \mathbf{r}_N t) = \gamma^{3N/2} \Psi(\gamma\mathbf{r}_1 \dots \gamma\mathbf{r}_N \beta t), \quad (3.13)$$

we find

$$\left\{ \hat{T} + \lambda\gamma\hat{V}_{ee} - i\frac{\gamma^2}{\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right\} \Psi_{\gamma\beta}^\lambda[n] = -\gamma^2 \hat{V}_{\text{ext}}^\lambda \Psi_{\gamma\beta}^\lambda[n]. \quad (3.14)$$

By choosing $\beta = \gamma^2$ and $\gamma = 1/\lambda$, we find $\Psi_{1/\lambda, 1/\lambda^2}^\lambda[n]$ satisfies Eq. (4.1), i.e. is equal to $\Psi[n]$. (By the Runge-Gross theorem, the potentials must be identical if the densities are the same for both wavefunctions.) Thus

$$\Psi^\lambda[n] = \Psi_{\lambda\lambda^2}[n_{1/\lambda, 1/\lambda^2}] \quad (3.15)$$

and, by subtracting out Hartree and Kohn-Sham contributions,

$$v_{\text{xc}}^\lambda[n](\mathbf{r}t) = \lambda^2 v_{\text{xc}}[n_{1/\lambda, 1/\lambda^2}](\lambda\mathbf{r}, \lambda^2 t) \quad (3.16)$$

Thus any functional of the density, evaluated at coupling constant λ , can be written in terms of the physical functional, evaluated on a scaled density at the scaled coordinates. For example, following arguments first applied to the ground state[20],

$$E_{\text{x}}[n_{\gamma\gamma^2}](t) = \gamma E_{\text{x}}[n](\gamma^2 t). \quad (3.17)$$

Highly accurate calculations on time-dependent systems are usually extremely demanding[3], making tests of exact theorems and approximations very difficult in TDDFT. We performed exact numerical calculations on Hooke's atom, two interacting electrons in parabolic potential, with a time-dependent force constant, $k(t) = m\omega^2(t)$. This model is solvable because

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, t) = \Phi(\mathbf{R}, t) \phi(\mathbf{u}, t), \quad (3.18)$$

where $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2)/2$ and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1$. Each wavefunction satisfies a single-particle time-dependent Schrodinger equation, e.g.,

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2\mu}\nabla^2 + \frac{\mu\omega^2(t)}{2}u^2 + \frac{1}{u}\right)\phi = i\dot{\phi}, \quad (3.19)$$

where $\mu = m/2$ is the reduced mass. Then ϕ is expanded in the adiabatic basis of instantaneous eigenstates of its Hamiltonian:

$$\phi(u, t) = \sum_j b_j(t)\chi_j(\omega(t); u)e^{-i\epsilon_j(\omega(t))t}, \quad (3.20)$$

where

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2\mu}\nabla^2 + \frac{\mu\omega^2}{2}u^2 + \frac{1}{u}\right)\chi_j(\omega; u) = \epsilon_j(\omega)\chi_j(\omega; u). \quad (3.21)$$

These eigenstates in turn are solved by expanding the wavefunction in a power series in u times a Gaussian[22]. The coefficients b_k satisfy

$$\dot{b}_k = i\dot{\epsilon}_k b_k t - \sum_{j \neq k} b_j \langle j | \dot{V}(t) | k \rangle e^{-i(\epsilon_j - \epsilon_k)t} / (\epsilon_j - \epsilon_k), \quad (3.22)$$

where $\dot{V} = \mu\omega\dot{\omega}u^2$, and are solved numerically.

We start our system in the ground state at $t = 0$ with $\omega = \omega_0$, and then let $\omega(t) = \omega_0 + (\omega_0 - \omega_1) \sin(\pi((t/t_1 - \frac{1}{2}) + 1)/2)$, as shown in Fig. 3.1. We show results for the time evolution with $\omega_0 = 0.5$, $\omega_1 = 1$, and $t_1 = 1$ in atomic units ($e^2 = m = \hbar = 1$). The first three occupation numbers (in u) and the time-dependent frequency are shown in Fig. 3.1. By $t = 1.6$, the system is about 30% excited. After $t = 1.6$, the number of u -levels in our calculation (12) were no longer sufficient to guarantee the accuracy needed for the calculations shown below.

In Fig. 3.2, we plot T , V_{ext} , and V_{ee} as a function of time, as well as $\frac{1}{2}md^2\langle r^2 \rangle/dt^2$. Here $\langle \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla v_{\text{ext}} \rangle = 2V_{\text{ext}}$. We find the virial theorem of Eq. (3.8) to be satisfied to within 0.1 milliHartrees. If we contrast our results with an adiabatic situation (in which the system remains in the instantaneous ground state for all times), we see that T remains remarkably low, as the wavefunction takes




Figure 3.1: Occupation numbers for the u wavefunction and $\omega(t)$ (atomic units).

time to respond to the stimulus. V_{ext} grows, but then drops after $t = 0.9$, while ω is still increasing. The Coulomb repulsion barely changes during the entire run. Finally, the large value of $2(T - V_{\text{ext}}) + V_{\text{ee}}$ contrasts with its vanishing in any single eigenstate.




Figure 3.2: Energy components for the time-dependent Hooke's atom (Hartrees); virial = $2(T - V_{\text{ext}}) + V_{\text{ee}}$.

Next, we calculate the exact Kohn-Sham potential for this two-electron system. We have a single orbital, doubly occupied, but the calculation is more

involved than for a ground state, as the phase of the wavefunction becomes important. We write $\phi(\mathbf{r}t) = e^{i\alpha} \sqrt{n/2}$, and insert this form into the time-dependent Kohn-Sham equation. Requiring that the imaginary part of $v_s(\mathbf{r}t)$ be zero yields

$$\alpha' = -\frac{1}{n(r,t)} \int_0^r \dot{n}(r',t) r'^2 dr' \quad (3.23)$$

where the prime indicates d/dr , and

$$v_s = \frac{1}{2r} \left(\frac{n'}{n} \right) + \frac{n''}{4n} - \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{n'}{n} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha'^2 - \dot{\alpha}. \quad (3.24)$$

The last two terms arise purely from the time-dependence of the density. Even for a non-interacting system, they are non-zero. The exchange-correlation contribution is then found by subtracting the external and Hartree potentials.

In Fig. 3.3, we plot $v_c(\mathbf{r}t)$ at several times during the excitation. We do not plot $v_x(\mathbf{r}t)$, as this is just $-v_H(\mathbf{r}t)/2$ for two electrons. These curves are qualitatively similar to those in the adiabatic ground states. The strange behavior beyond $r = 3$ for $t = 1.5$ is due to numerical inaccuracy. We tested Eq. (4.16) on these potentials, finding it satisfied within the accuracy of the calculations.




Figure 3.3: Time-dependent correlation potentials (atomic units).

Lastly, we plot the quantities appearing in Eq. (3.10) in Fig. 3.4. We subtract out the exchange contribution, which trivially satisfies the virial theorem in this

case ($E_x = -U/2$). The line denoted virial is just the virial of the correlation potential, and is indistinguishable from $E_C + T_C$ until about $t = 1.4$, where numerical inaccuracies arise. As noted above, V_{ee} is very unresponsive to the external potential, and this is reflected in E_C . The kinetic correlation energy follows T , and starts to grow at about $t = 0.8$. What is remarkable is that this means that the sum $E_C + T_C$, which has never been found to be positive in any ground state, becomes *positive* around 1.2. This shows that time-dependent energy components can behave very differently from their ground state analogs.




Figure 3.4: Time-dependent energy components (Hartrees).

To illustrate our scaling theorem, Eq. (3.15), consider the plasmon frequency of a uniform gas, ω_p where $\omega_p^2 = 4\pi e^2 n/m$. Under scaling, $n \rightarrow \gamma^3 n$ and $\omega \rightarrow \omega/\gamma^2$, so that, according to Eq. (3.15), $(\omega_p^\lambda)^2 = 4\pi e^2 \gamma^3 n / (m \gamma^4) = \lambda \omega_p^2$, correctly. The importance of Eq. (3.16) is that it applies to all inhomogeneous systems also.

Last, we discuss the implications of Eqs. (4.16) and (3.10) for the construction of approximate time-dependent functionals. These are usually written as approximations to the exchange-correlation potential. If an approximation implies an assumption about energy components, then Eqs. (4.16) and (3.10) should be checked. If not, then Eqs. (4.16) and (3.10) can be used to construct energy components. An adiabatic approximation employs only the instantaneous density

to approximate the potential at any given time. Such an approximation satisfies Eqs. (4.16) and (3.10) if it satisfies them in the ground state. If it is an accurate approximation for the energy components, it will then be accurate for the virial of the potential, providing a constraint on the approximate potential. This may explain the “surprising” accuracy of approximate potentials in Ref. [23]. The oldest and most commonly used[54] is adiabatic LDA (ALDA), which simply constructs properties, such as the time-dependent exchange-correlation potential, using ground-state uniform gas functions, at the given instant in time. On the other hand, in regions where the time-dependent energy components differ qualitatively from their ground-state counterparts, such approximations will fail badly. For example, $E_C^{\text{ALDA}} + T_C^{\text{ALDA}} < 0$ always.

Acknowledgments

We thank E.K.U. Gross for invaluable discussions. This research was (partially) supported by a Bristol Myers Squibb Award of Research Corporation. Acknowledgment is made to the Donors of the Petroleum Research Fund, administered by the American Chemical Society, for partial support of this research. After this work was complete, we learned of the work of Ref [23], which was for a 2D Hooke’s atom.

References

- [*] Permanent address: Camden High School, Baird Ave. and Park Blvd., Camden, NJ 08103.
- [**] Present address: Engineering Sciences & Applied Mathematics, 2145 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208.
- [1] *Recent developments and applications of modern density functional theory*, ed. J.M. Seminario (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1996).
- [2] *Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation effects*, W. Kohn and L.J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A 1133 (1965).
- [3] *Density-functional exchange-correlation through coordinate scaling in adiabatic connection and correlation hole*, M. Levy, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 4637 (1991).
- [4] *Generalized gradient approximation made simple*, J.P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3865 (1996); **78**, 1396 (1997) (E).
- [5] *A guided tour of time-dependent density functional theory*, K. Burke and E.K.U. Gross, in *Density functionals: Theory and applications*, ed. D. Joubert (Springer, Berlin, 1998).
- [6] C.A. Ullrich, S. Erhard, and E.K.U. Gross, in *Super Intense Laser Atom Physics IV*, edited by H.G. Muller (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1996).
- [7] *Time-dependent density-functional theory for strong-field multiphoton processes: Application to the study of the role of dynamical electron correlation in multiple high-order harmonic generation*, X.-M. Tong and S.-I. Chu, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 452 (1998).
- [8] *Floquet-Bloch theory of photoeffect in intense laser fields*, F.H.M. Faisal, J.Z. Kamiński, Phys. Rev. A, **58**, 19 (1998).
- [9] *Time-dependent density functional results for the dynamic hyperpolarizability of C_{60}* , S.J.A. van Gisbergen, J.G. Shijders, and E.J. Baerends, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3097 (1997).
- [10] *Dynamic polarizabilities and excitation spectra from a molecular implementation of time-dependent density functional response theory: N_2 as a case study*, C. Jamorski, M.E. Casida, D.R. Salahub, J. Chem. Phys. **104**, 5134 (1996).

- [11] *Enhanced optical limiting in derivatized fullerenes*, L. Smilowitz, D. McBranch, V. Klimov, J.M. Robinson, A. Koskelo, M. Grigorova, B.R. Mattes, H. Wang, and F. Wudl, *Opt. Lett.*, **21**, 922 (1996).
- [12] *Femtosecond 1P-to-1S electron relaxation in strongly confined semiconductor nanocrystals*, V.I. Klimov and D.W. McBranch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **80**, 4028 (1998).
- [13] *Density-functional theory for time-dependent systems*, E. Runge and E.K.U. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 997 (1984).
- [14] *Center of mass and relative motion in time dependent density functional theory*, G. Vignale, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3233 (1995).
- [15] *Local density-functional theory of frequency-dependent linear response*, E.K.U. Gross and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 2850 (1985); **57**, 923 (1986) (E).
- [16] *Harmonic potential theorem: Implications for approximate many-body theories*, J.F. Dobson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 2244 (1994).
- [17] *Current-Dependent Exchange-Correlation Potential for Dynamical Linear Response Theory*, G. Vignale and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2037 (1996).
- [18] *Time-dependent density functional theory beyond linear response: An exchange-correlation potential with memory*, J.F. Dobson, M. Büchner, and E.K.U. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 1905 (1997).
- [19] *Time-dependent density functional theory beyond the adiabatic local density approximation*, G. Vignale, C.A. Ullrich, and S. Conti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4878 (1997).
- [20] *Hellmann-Feynman, virial, and scaling requisites for the exact universal density functionals. Shape of the correlation potential and diamagnetic susceptibility for atoms*, M. Levy and J.P. Perdew, *Phys. Rev. A* **32**, 2010 (1985).
- [21] *Time-dependent Kohn-Sham formalism*, A. Görling, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 2630 (1997).
- [22] *Exact high-density limit of correlation potential for two-electron density*, S. Ivanov, K. Burke, and M. Levy, submitted to *J. Chem. Phys.*, Fall 1998.
- [23] I. D'Amico and G. Vignale, *Exact exchange-correlation potential for a time-dependent two electron system*, cond-mat preprint 9809146, Sep 9, 1998
- [24] *Density-functional approach to local-field effects in finite systems: Photoabsorption in the rare gases*, A. Zangwill and P. Soven, *Phys. Rev. A* **21**, 1561 (1980).

Chapter 4

Correlation in Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory

The exact time-dependent correlation energy in time-dependent density functional theory is shown to sometimes become positive, which is impossible with most present TDDFT approximations. Both the correlation potential and energy can be strongly non-local in time. A new inequality is derived for the time-dependent exchange-correlation energy. The correlation energy appears to scale to a constant function of scaled time in the high-density limit. In the linear response regime, the correlation energy is shown to become purely adiabatic, but the correlation potential is generally non-adiabatic. The usefulness of the virial theorem as a test of numerical accuracy is demonstrated. All results are found or inspired by exact numerical solution of a simple model system (Hooke's atom), and inversion of the corresponding Kohn-Sham equations.

4.1 Introduction

Ground-state density functional theory (DFT) has become a useful alternative to traditional methods in quantum chemistry, because of its ability to treat large numbers of electrons with reasonable accuracy[1]. Time-dependent density functional theory (TDDFT) is the generalization of ground-state DFT to include *time-dependent* external potentials on electrons, and its formal validity was established with the Runge-Gross theorem[2]. The one-to-one correspondence between time-dependent densities and time-dependent potentials for a given initial

state leads to the time-dependent Kohn-Sham system, a set of non-interacting fictitious electrons moving in a time-dependent Kohn-Sham potential. TDDFT has now been applied to many problems in atomic, molecular and solid-state systems, including optical response, dynamic polarizabilities and hyperpolarizabilities, excitation energies, species in intense laser fields and highly energetic collisions [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34]. Although most of these calculations take place in the linear response regime, TDDFT also applies to species in intense fields and is perhaps the only feasible method to study many-electron dynamics in this regime [35, 36, 37, 38, 39].

The only unknown part of a TDDFT calculation (beginning in a non-degenerate ground state[40]) is the exchange-correlation potential $v_{\text{xc}}[n](\mathbf{r}t)$ as a functional of the entire history of the density, $n(\mathbf{r}t)$. In the special case of optical response, including electronic excitation energies, this is needed only in the vicinity of the ground-state density of the system, and this information is contained in the exchange-correlation kernel, $f_{\text{xc}}[n](\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', t - t')$. But relatively little is known about these functionals, partly because relatively few conditions that the exact functionals satisfy are known.

Exact conditions have been essential in ground-state DFT, both for guiding construction of universally applicable functionals[41], and in explaining why some approximations work well while others do not [42, 43]. Known exact conditions in TDDFT include Newton's third law [44, 45, 46], the harmonic potential theorem [47], a virial theorem [48], the relation between coupling constant and scaling[48], and the memory formula [40]. For example, part of the motivation for developing the Vignale-Kohn approximation for the exchange-correlation kernel [49] was that the Gross-Kohn approximation [50] violated the harmonic potential theorem. The present work makes several new exact statements about correlation functionals in TDDFT, many of which are *not* satisfied by the present generation of approximate

functionals.

A key focus in this work is on the limitations of adiabatic approximations to correlation functionals. Such an approximation ignores the temporal non-locality of the correlation potential, i.e., its dependence on the history of the density. In the case of linear response, this leads to a real-valued, frequency-independent, exchange-correlation kernel. Most (if not all) chemical applications of TDDFT[51] employ an adiabatic approximation such as ALDA [52, 53, 54, 55], but little is known about its reliability or accuracy. Almost all our results demonstrate *failures* of this approximation; failures that likely must be addressed if ultimately TDDFT is to achieve the quantitative accuracy enjoyed by ground-state DFT today.

The errors made by the adiabatic approximation are called dynamical effects, due to history-dependence in the time-dependent functionals. A key technique of the present work is to study the time-dependent correlation *energy*, as opposed to the potential. This is primarily a technical device, designed to limit the amount of information presented. The time-dependent correlation energy is determined by integrals over the correlation potential, so that poor approximations to the energy imply poor approximations to the potential. Also, approximations that are poor for the potential point-wise in space may produce reasonable approximations for integrated quantities, as is true in the ground-state case. Lastly, the time-derivative of the correlation energy yields the correlation contribution to the power absorbed during the disturbance.

Our calculations are performed on a time-dependent Hooke’s atom, two electrons in a harmonic well[56] with a time-dependent force constant [57]. Because the system remains spherical, the time-dependent Schrödinger equation can easily be solved numerically, and the Kohn-Sham equation inverted. The model system is *not* intended to represent an atom or molecule under conditions in present-day experiments. But, Hooke’s atom is a Coulomb-interacting fermion

system and so its behavior is governed by the same functionals as for all electronic systems: atoms, molecules and solids. Until recently [59, 48], there have been no exact TDDFT calculations on any system. These two previous exact calculations [59, 48] employ this system: in two-dimensions in Ref. [59] and in three-dimensions in Ref. [48].

Our most dramatic result is to show that, due to dynamic correlation, the correlation energy can become positive. In Fig. 4.1, we plot the correlation energy of Hooke's atom as a function of time when the force constant is increased smoothly from 0.15 to 0.35 during $t = 0$ to 4 and then held constant, as shown in the top panel. We also plot the (almost) exact correlation energy if the instantaneous density was the ground-state density of some system, i.e., $E_C^{\text{gs}}[n(\mathbf{r}t)]$, where $n(\mathbf{r}t)$ is the time-dependent density. (Precisely how this is done is given in section 4.3.) The difference between the two, which we call the dynamical contribution $E_C^{\text{dyn}}(t)$, is very significant, so much so that the correlation energy even becomes positive. Clearly, any adiabatic approximation, being local in time, can at best approximate $E_C^{\text{gs}}[n(\mathbf{r}t)]$, and will miss the dynamical contribution entirely. Such strong exchange-correlation effects *must* be present in any species perturbed by a laser field near a resonance. In the linear response formalism, exchange and correlation change ground-state Kohn-Sham transition frequencies and oscillator strengths into exact quantities of the true system. A perturbation tuned to a Kohn-Sham transition will cause the Kohn-Sham system to resonate, but exchange-correlation corrections stop the true system from doing so.

We prove rigorously an inequality relating the dynamic exchange-correlation energy and the dynamic non-interacting kinetic energy (see Sec. 4.5.1). We also demonstrate explicitly that the correlation potential and energy can have a strong non-locality in time, depending on the history of the density (see Sec. 4.5.2). Again, any adiabatic approximation fails to capture this effect. On the other hand, we argue that the exchange energy for N electrons, will typically




Figure 4.1: Correlation energy components as a function of time when the force constant is changed as shown in the top panel (all in atomic units): Instantaneous ground-state correlation energy (bottom dashed line), true correlation energy (solid line), dynamical part of the correlation energy (top dashed line).

depend only weakly on the history (for a two electron singlet, as in our model, it depends only on the instantaneous density).

Notwithstanding a previous study in two-dimensions [59], we show in Sec. 4.5.3, that there *is* a finite dynamical contribution to the correlation potential in this limit. (Ironically, this does *not* show up in the correlation energy, which can be proven to be second-order in the strength of the perturbation in general.) Even in Hooke’s atom, corrections to an adiabatic approximation can be important in linear response as well as in strong fields.

The behavior of functionals under uniform coordinate scaling has been an important guide to the construction of functionals in the ground-state theory. A key improvement of the PBE generalized gradient approximation [41] over LDA[60] and PW91[61] is that, for a finite system, it scales correctly to a constant in the high-density limit, while remaining exact for the uniform electron gas (unlike LYP[62]). In Ref. [48], the relation between coupling constant and scaling within TDDFT was deduced. We demonstrate here that, in the high-density limit, the correlation energy numerically scales to a constant function of scaled

time (see Sec. 4.5.4) for Hooke’s atom. If universally true, this plausible result would imply that the Görling-Levy second-order perturbation energy remains finite in TDDFT. In the same way that there has been much recent interest in orbital-dependent functionals for accurate ground-state calculations [63, 64, 65], the time-dependent OEP scheme [6] could be used (suitably modified to avoid asymptotic difficulties with the correlation potential [66]) to include correlation.

The paper begins with some formal theory and definitions. We introduce some terms with very precise meanings, including the idea of dynamical contributions to time-dependent quantities. In the third section, we discuss our numerical algorithm, and the various tests based on the equations of motion, which demonstrate the accuracy of our solutions. Section 4.4 is a discussion of many effects that can be seen in the one-electron version of our system: a time-dependent three-dimensional harmonic oscillator. This is needed to illustrate the qualitative one-body features of our electronic system, to be contrasted with the next section, where two interacting electrons are introduced and the correlation effects summarized above are discussed in detail. Atomic units ($e^2 = \hbar = m = 1$) are used throughout, so that all energies are in Hartree, all distances are in Bohr radii, and all times are in units of $2.419 \times 10^{-17} s$.

4.2 Theory

The Schrödinger equation for time-dependent systems is

$$\{\hat{T} + \hat{V}_{\text{ext}} + \hat{V}_{\text{ee}}\}\Psi(t) = i\dot{\Psi}(t), \quad (4.1)$$

where \hat{T} is the kinetic energy operator, \hat{V}_{ext} is the external one-body potential, \hat{V}_{ee} is the electron-electron repulsion operator, and a dot implies a derivative with respect to time. The Kohn-Sham equations are

$$\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + v_s(\mathbf{r}t)\right\}\phi_i(t) = i\dot{\phi}_i(t), \quad (4.2)$$

where $v_s(\mathbf{r}t)$ is the Kohn-Sham potential, an effective (one-body) external potential chosen to make

$$n(\mathbf{r}t) = \sum_{i=1}^N |\phi_i(\mathbf{r}t)|^2 \quad (4.3)$$

exactly equal the time-dependent density of the interacting wavefunction $\Psi(t)$ in Eq. (4.1). In general, the one-to-one mapping between densities and potentials depends on the initial state (both for the physical system and the Kohn-Sham system) [2, 67]. In this paper, we study the evolution of the system initially prepared in its non-degenerate ground state, so that the initial wavefunction is a functional of the ground-state density.

For two electrons in a spin-singlet, we decompose the Kohn-Sham orbital as

$$\phi(\mathbf{r}t) = A(\mathbf{r}t) \exp(i\alpha(\mathbf{r}t)), \quad n(\mathbf{r}t) = 2|\phi(\mathbf{r}t)|^2, \quad (4.4)$$

where A and α are real. Insertion of Eq. (4.4) into Eq. (4.2), and the requirement that the resulting potential be real leads to

$$v_s = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\nabla^2 n}{n} - \frac{1}{8} \frac{|\nabla n|^2}{n^2} - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \alpha|^2 - \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial t}, \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$\nabla \cdot \nabla \alpha + \frac{1}{n} \nabla \alpha \cdot \nabla n + \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

In the special case of a spherical system:

$$v_s = \frac{1}{2r} \left(\frac{n'}{n} \right) + \frac{n''}{4n} - \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{n'}{n} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha'^2 - \dot{\alpha}, \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$\alpha' = -\frac{1}{n(rt) r^2} \int_0^r \dot{n}(r't) r'^2 dr' \quad (4.8)$$

and the prime denotes a derivative with respect to r .

Once $v_s(rt)$ has been found, we define energies in the same fashion as for the ground state: the Kohn-Sham non-interacting kinetic energy is

$$T_s[n](t) = \int d^3r |\nabla \phi(rt)|^2, \quad (4.9)$$

the Hartree energy is

$$U[n](t) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3r \int d^3r' \frac{n(\mathbf{r}t)n(\mathbf{r}'t)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}, \quad (4.10)$$

and the external potential is

$$V_{\text{ext}}[n](t) = \int d^3r v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}t) n(\mathbf{r}t). \quad (4.11)$$

The exchange and correlation contributions are given as differences between quantities evaluated on the interacting and non-interacting system. Exchange is trivial for two electrons, $E_x(t) = -U(t)/2$. Correlation contains both kinetic and potential contributions:

$$E_c(t) = T_c(t) + U_c(t), \quad (4.12)$$

where

$$T_c(t) = T(t) - T_s(t), \quad U_c(t) = V_{\text{ee}}(t) - U(t)/2. \quad (4.13)$$

This paper will focus almost exclusively on the time-dependent energy components. However, most approximations for time-dependent density functional theory have been given directly in terms of the exchange-correlation *potential* [49, 68, 69], defined as

$$v_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}t) = v_s(\mathbf{r}t) - v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}t) - v_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{r}t), \quad (4.14)$$

where $v_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{r}t)$ is the time-dependent Hartree potential

$$v_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{r}t) = \int d^3r' \frac{n(\mathbf{r}'t)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}. \quad (4.15)$$

We can extract time-dependent energy components from any approximation to the potential, via two results proved using equations of motion in Ref. [48]: the time-dependence of the energy

$$E_{\text{xc}}(t) = E_{\text{xc}}(0) + \int_0^t dt' \int d^3r v_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}t') \dot{n}(\mathbf{r}t'), \quad (4.16)$$

and the virial theorem

$$T_c(t) = -E_{\text{xc}}(t) - \int d^3r n(\mathbf{r}t) \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla v_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}t). \quad (4.17)$$

Thus time-dependent energy components encapsulate global information about potentials.

A very useful formal device is to consider, at some instant in time, the density $n(\mathbf{r}t)$ as the *ground-state* density of some system, even though the wavefunction at this time is typically not the ground state of *any* potential. For any energy component, e.g., the correlation energy, we then define the *dynamical* contribution as

$$E_{\text{C}}^{\text{dyn}}[n](t) = E_{\text{C}}[n](t) - E_{\text{C}}^{\text{gs}}[n(\mathbf{r}t)]. \quad (4.18)$$

where $E_{\text{C}}^{\text{gs}}[n(\mathbf{r}t)]$ is the ground-state correlation energy functional evaluated on the time-dependent density. For an approximate functional, $E_{\text{C}}^{\text{dyn}}[n](t) = E_{\text{C}}^{\text{approx}}[n](t) - E_{\text{C}}^{\text{approx,gs}}[n(\mathbf{r}t)]$, where $E_{\text{C}}^{\text{approx,gs}}[n]$ is the approximate ground-state energy of density n , evaluated from $E_{\text{C}}^{\text{approx}}[n]$. Any adiabatic approximation, eg. ALDA, has $E_{\text{C}}^{\text{dyn}} = 0$. Such dynamical effects appear as memory effects: the energies have a non-local dependence in time on the density. Note however that the dynamical component as defined here may exist even for static densities if the underlying wavefunction is an excited state. Provided we begin in the ground-state of some potential, the dynamical contribution vanishes if the external potential is static, or for any problem in which it is varied infinitely slowly.

Functionals that are truly local in time, such as the Hartree energy, have no dynamical component. We know this dynamical component for one non-trivial case. From Eq. (4.9), for the non-interacting kinetic energy functional for one electron (or two paramagnetic electrons in the same spatial state),

$$T_{\text{s}}[n](t) = \int d^3r \frac{|\nabla n(\mathbf{r}t)|^2}{8n(\mathbf{r}t)} + \int d^3r \frac{|\mathbf{j}_{\text{s}}(\mathbf{r}t)|^2}{n(\mathbf{r}t)}. \quad (4.19)$$

where $\mathbf{j}_{\text{s}}(\mathbf{r}t) = \nabla\alpha(\mathbf{r}t)$ is the Kohn-Sham current density,

$$\mathbf{j}_{\text{s}}(\mathbf{r}t) = \frac{1}{i} \{ \phi^*(\mathbf{r}t) \nabla \phi(\mathbf{r}t) - \phi(\mathbf{r}t) \nabla \phi^*(\mathbf{r}t) \}. \quad (4.20)$$

The first term in Eq. (4.19) is the ground-state contribution to the non-interacting




Figure 4.2: A test of accuracy of the solution of the time-dependent system for the truncated run (T) (see table 1). $\bar{k} = .25, \omega = .75, \epsilon = .1$ but held constant after $\frac{1}{2}$ oscillation. $E_C + T_C$ and the virial of the correlation potential are plotted. The two curves lie about on top of each other indicating a highly accurate solution.

kinetic energy density, $T_s^{\text{gs}}[n]$. The second term is therefore $T_s^{\text{dyn}}[n]$, and is semilocal in time, since the continuity equation

$$\dot{n}(\mathbf{r}t) = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}t) \quad (4.21)$$

implies that (for spherical systems at least) \dot{n} uniquely determines the current:

$$j(rt) = \mathbf{j} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}} = \int_r^\infty dr' \dot{n}(r't) \quad (4.22)$$

Thus T_s^{dyn} is a functional of the density which is semilocal in time, but highly nonlocal in space. However, as a functional of both the density and current, it is local in both space and time. The local approximation for T_s would be to ignore T_s^{dyn} and to approximate T_s^{gs} by the Thomas-Fermi contribution.

4.3 Algorithm

The time-dependent Schrödinger equation was solved in Ref. [48] by expanding the wave function in a basis set and solving the partial differential equation in time using the Runge-Kutta method. In Fig. 4 of Ref. [48] the virial of the correlation potential (right-hand-side of Eq. (4.17) excluding the exchange contribution) deviates from $E_c(t) + T_c(t)$ around $t = 1.6$. If the virial and $E_c(t) + T_c(t)$ do not agree, the wave function generated by the algorithm is inaccurate beyond this point in time. This illustrates the usefulness of Eq. (4.17) as a stringent test of the numerical accuracy of a solution of the time-dependent Kohn-Sham equations. Note that a standard test of accuracy in the ground-state problem, that of making small changes in densities and checking that the corresponding change in an energy is accurately reproduced by integrating its potential (functional derivative) times the density change is not available for time-dependent problems. The time-dependent potentials are not typically functional derivatives of the time-dependent energies [70]. Possible sources of error in Ref. [48] are the fourth-order Runge-Kutta method or an insufficient number of levels in the basis set to accurately construct the wave function after the wave function was sufficiently excited by the perturbation. In the present paper, the Crank-Nicolson method is used to solve the Schrödinger equation. For this method, we first construct the ground-state wave function for a given external potential. The wave function is transformed onto a grid and propagated forward in time. The normality of the wave function is guaranteed at each time step because Crank-Nicolson employs a unitary operator (unlike Runge-Kutta). For all calculations with this algorithm, we have found that we can satisfy the virial theorem of Eq. (4.17) to arbitrary accuracy once sufficiently fine grids in space and time are used. Fig. 4.2 gives an example of this, showing that the virial theorem for correlation is satisfied at each time step. Note the magnitude of energies involved. The spatial grid used for the Crank-Nicolson algorithm was typically steps of .0025 and the time grid was 0.0001 (both in atomic units).

Considering the time-evolving two-electron density at time t as the ground-state density of some static potential is very useful in analyzing the interacting system. For our choice of time-dependent potential, the density closely retains its Gaussian-like shape throughout the modulation of the external frequency. This suggests that the time-independent potential which has a ground-state density matching our instantaneous density, is very close to that of a static Hooke's atom of a certain effective force constant which we shall denote k^{eff} . Comparisons to this instantaneous ground state will be made throughout this paper.

The ground-state quantities that were used for this comparison were produced by matching the Hartree energy from the exact Kohn-Sham calculation to one in a table of ground-state values for Hooke's atom [71]. The energies for that ground-state Hooke's atom with force constant k_{eff} , were taken as approximations to $E_C^{\text{gs}}, T_C^{\text{gs}}$, etc. This process was repeated by matching values of $\langle r^2 \rangle$, and again by matching values of T_s . All three matching procedures produced essentially identical ground-state results and the Hartree energy was chosen as the matching parameter for all runs.

Run parameters and figures						
type	k	ω	ϵ	Duration	Figures	
non-resonant (NR)	0.25	0.75	0.1	entire run	7,8	
non-resonant (WNR)	0.25	0.75	0.05	entire run	3,10	
linear response (LR)	0.25	0.75	≤ 0.025	entire run	9	
resonant (R)	0.25	1.0	0.05	entire run	4,6	
truncated (T)	0.25	0.75	0.1	$\frac{1}{2}$ oscillation	1,2,5	

Table 4.1: Table of figures and their run parameters.

4.4 One electron

Before studying correlation effects, it is necessary to understand the non-interacting system, a non-trivial task for most time-dependent systems. Much about the

dynamics of the interacting two-electron density can be understood from the dynamics of one electron in the same time-dependent potential, $V(t) = k(t)r^2/2$.

The quantum time evolution in the 3dHO is generally related to the 1dHO when we begin in the ground state of each at $t = 0$ because of the separability of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation in Cartesian coordinates. Expectation values of observables are then simply related to the 1-d case, *e.g.* $\langle r^2 \rangle_{3d} = 3\langle x^2 \rangle_{1d}$.

The time-dependent force constant used in all our calculations is

$$k(t) = \bar{k} - \epsilon \cos \omega t \quad (4.23)$$

The values of the control parameters $\bar{k}, \epsilon, \omega$ for each figure are given in Table 1. In the one-electron case, this is the Mathieu oscillator (see, for example, ref. [72]).

4.4.1 A measure of system response

The dynamics of the density are reflected in the time-evolution of the spread of the density $\langle r^2(t) \rangle$. In Fig. 4.3 we plot the root-mean-square (rms) variance, $r_{rms}(t) = \sqrt{\langle r^2(t) \rangle}$, for two non-interacting electrons in the Mathieu oscillator (dashed line in lower panel) and compare this with its value had the system remained in the instantaneous ground-state of the external potential (upper panel).

We see how the wave function is initially unchanged, and then compresses far more than an instantaneous ground-state wave function would. After the slow initial response during the first half-oscillation, during the second half-oscillation, the potential broadens again, but the density continues to compress at first, because the response of the wave function continues to lag behind the changes in the perturbation.

In thinking of the time-dependent response of an oscillator, two extreme limits come to mind. In the first, adiabatic, the potential is turned on infinitely slowly, and the wavefunction is always in its instantaneous ground-state. In this case, the response to any external potential is immediate. At the opposite extreme

is ‘sudden switching,’ in which the force constant is instantly changed from one value to another. The wave function is not an eigenstate of the new potential, and evolves accordingly. In such cases, the change in the wave function is quadratic in t for small t . The time-scale of our perturbation is in between these two extremes.

In fact, the quantum dynamics follows directly from the classical dynamics due to the harmonic nature of the potential. Classically evolving an initial ensemble, distributed in phase-space according to the initial quantum ground-state (quasi-classical evolution), results in phase-space distributions close to that of the quantum state at later times.

The solid line in Fig. 4.3 is the rms variance for the evolving density of the interacting two-electron system (see Sec. 4.5). We observe how it also displays the response time lag and the overshooting/undershooting pattern present in the one-electron case. In fact it resembles twice the one-electron value closely in both its amplitude and frequency patterns; the differences are due to the interaction of the two electrons. Consequently, the kinetic and potential energies of the interacting system, follow similar trends (see section 4.5).

Fig. 4.4 shows the same quantities for a different (resonant) choice of external spring constant; the response of the system is rather dramatic. The overshooting/undershooting behavior is present again, as it is in all our runs; and is particularly striking in this case. Note especially the increasingly extreme compression of the density near $t = 17$ and periodically thereafter. Again, the classical result is a very good approximation and again, the interacting two-electron case closely resembles twice the one-electron case. How we can understand the behavior of the one-electron system under the various spring constants is explained in the next subsection.




Figure 4.3: Spread of parabolic well in linear response regime as a function of time for the weak non-resonant run (WNR) (see table 1). The solid line is for two interacting electrons and the dashed is for two non-interacting electrons. The top panel shows the rms variance had the system remained in the non-interacting instantaneous ground-state of the potential.

4.4.2 Time-dependent perturbation theory and linear response

For small enough ϵ , perturbation theory can predict the dynamics of the Mathieu oscillator. (The discussion in the previous subsection suggests that classical perturbation theory on the 1-d case can capture most of the behavior of the fully quantum 3-d case, provided gaussian averaging over initial conditions is performed. It is simpler to do quantum time-dependent perturbation theory.) For the variance in position, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle r^2(t) \rangle = & \frac{3}{2\bar{\omega}} + \frac{3\epsilon}{4k} \left[\frac{\cos(2\bar{\omega}t)}{\bar{\omega}} + 2 \sin\left(\frac{(2\bar{\omega} - \omega)t}{2}\right) \right. \\ & \left. \sin\left(\frac{(2\bar{\omega} + \omega)t}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2\bar{\omega} - \omega} + \frac{1}{2\bar{\omega} + \omega} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

where $\bar{\omega} = \sqrt{k}$. This is a good approximation to the dynamics, with the term involving the product of the sines giving the essential dynamical behavior: beating at frequency $(2\bar{\omega} - \omega)/2$ superposed on the faster oscillations of frequency $(2\bar{\omega} +$




Figure 4.4: Spread of parabolic well for Hooke's atom in resonance (R) as a function of time . The solid line is for two interacting electrons, the dashed line is for two non-interacting electrons. The top panel shows the rms variance had the system remained in the non-interacting instantaneous ground-state of the potential.

$\omega)/2$ (see Fig. 4.3). The beating amplitude is approximately $3\epsilon/(2\bar{k}(2\bar{\omega} - \omega))$ when ω and $\bar{\omega}$ are of the same order, as in our calculations.

On resonance, $\omega = 2\bar{\omega}$, the oscillator becomes unstable and we obtain

$$\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \frac{3}{2\bar{\omega}} + \frac{3\epsilon}{4\bar{k}} \left[\frac{\cos(2\bar{\omega}t)}{\bar{\omega}} + t \sin(2\bar{\omega}t) + \frac{2 \sin((2\bar{\omega} - \omega)t/2) \sin((2\bar{\omega} + \omega)t/2)}{2\bar{\omega} + \omega} \right] \quad (4.25)$$

The middle term in the brackets describes a secular growth, evident in Fig. 4.4 (see also Fig. 4.6). Note that the factor of 2 multiplying $\bar{\omega}$ in the resonance condition and in the beat frequency off-resonance, is a consequence of the perturbation being quadratic and only connecting states of quantum number differing by 2.

For larger ϵ a full non-linear analysis needs to be done. Much has been studied about the parameter regimes of stability and instability in the Mathieu oscillator [72]. In the limit that $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, it can be shown [72] that the seeds of the unstable regions are at $\omega = 2\sqrt{\bar{k}}, \sqrt{\bar{k}}$ and $2\sqrt{\bar{k}}/3$. Only the first emerges as unstable in our linear response analysis, because the instability of the other cases only occurs at larger ϵ .




Figure 4.5: Top graph: Oscillations in an envelope of a slow beating period for time-dependent Hooke's atom where the perturbation is turned off after one half-oscillation for $\bar{k} = .25, \omega = .75, \epsilon = .1$. Bottom graph: 3DHO with same perturbation. $\omega_f = 0.591$ for all runs.

4.4.3 Perturbation of finite duration

In some of our runs, we turn off the perturbation after half a cycle. After this time in the harmonic oscillator, $\langle r^2 \rangle$ oscillates at frequency $2\omega_f$ where ω_f is the frequency in which the harmonic oscillator is left (see Fig. 4.5). This can be explained by expanding the wavefunction in eigenstates of the final oscillator and noting that matrix elements of x^2 are only non-zero between quantum states differing in quantum number by 2 or 0. In the case of Hooke's atom, one observes a slow beating on top of the fast oscillation in Fig. 4.5. Unlike the harmonic oscillator, the eigen-energies of Hooke's atom are not quite equally spaced so that the terms in the wavefunction expansion no longer all oscillate at the same frequency. The slight difference between the frequencies gives rise to a fast oscillation close to that of the harmonic oscillator but contained within a slow envelope.

4.5 Two electrons

In this section, we present results for the time-dependent Hooke’s atom. The overall trends of the dominant contributions are guided by the shape of the density which is similar to that in the one-electron case as shown in Figs. 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5. Now, however, we have correlation effects.

We shall be comparing the exact energies to those obtained from an almost exact ground-state approximation, as described in sections 4.2 and 4.3. Dynamical contributions to the energy components (Eq. (4.18)) can be significant even when the potential becomes static, as shown in Fig. 4.1 for the correlation energy, because the time-evolving density is not static. Because the evolving wavefunction is not generally a ground-state of any potential (except at $t = 0$), any calculation of its correlation energy based on a ground-state functional will be erroneous. This is demonstrated by the qualitatively different behavior of the time-dependent correlation energy (see next section).

4.5.1 Positive correlation energies

In ground-state DFT calculations, it has always been found that $E_C + T_C < 0$. The unusual positive behavior of $E_C + T_C$ of this time-dependent system was first reported in Ref. [48]. Here we show that $E_C(t)$ can itself be positive. This differs dramatically from the ground-state problem where E_C is a negative quantity as a consequence of the variational principle. Thus, any *adiabatic* approximate ground-state correlation energy functional will fail to capture this behavior (as can be seen in Figs. 4.1, 4.6, and 4.8) because they are constructed from ground-state functionals evaluated on the time-dependent density.

A striking example of how the exact correlation energy can differ significantly from any approximation that assumes the system is in its instantaneous ground state, e.g. ALDA, is provided by our Hooke’s atom at resonance. Fig. 4.6 plots

$E_C(t)$ and $E_C^{dyn}(t)$ for the resonance case $\omega = 2\sqrt{k}$. On this scale, $E_C^{gs}(t)(= E_C(t) - E_C^{dyn}(t))$ would be a relatively flat line. For most of the run, the full correlation energy and its dynamical component lie on top of each other, showing that $E_C(t)$ is almost completely dynamical. $E_C^{gs}(t) \approx -0.04$ while $E_C^{dyn}(t)$ can reach ≈ 4 , causing an error of two orders of magnitude if a ground-state approximation is made for the correlation energy. This error is much greater than desired chemical accuracy.

In all runs we found $E_C^{dyn}(t)$ to be greater or equal to zero. Because the instantaneous ground-state minimizes the energy over all wavefunctions of that instantaneous density, $E^{gs}(t) \leq E(t)$. Here $E(t)$ is the energy of the evolving wavefunction at time t , $E(t) = T_s(t) + V_{ext}(t) + U(t) + E_{xc}(t)$, and $E^{gs}(t)$ is the energy of the ground-state whose density is the instantaneous density at time t . Then it follows that $E^{dyn}(t) \geq 0$, and hence

$$E_C^{dyn}(t) \geq -T_s^{dyn}(t). \quad (4.26)$$

We have used the fact that for two electrons in the same spatial state, $E_x(t) = -U(t)/2$ has no dynamical component. In the general N -electron case, the relation is

$$E_{xc}^{dyn}(t) \geq -T_s^{dyn}(t). \quad (4.27)$$

Note that the right-hand-side of these inequalities is always less than or equal to zero by the ground-state variational principle for the Kohn-Sham kinetic energy. Thus we have proved that $E_C^{dyn}(t)$ is always greater than a negative number $-T_s^{dyn}(t)$. Whether the stronger statement of positivity of $E_C^{dyn}(t)$ is generally true remains an open question.

We also found in all our runs that $T_C(t) > 0$, i.e., $T(t) > T_s(t)$, much like in the ground-state case. Whether this is true in general also has yet to be proved.




Figure 4.6: Hooke’s atom in resonance (R): $E_C(t)$ (solid line) and $E_C^{\text{dyn}}(t)$ (dashed line) match almost exactly demonstrating the importance of the dynamical component in resonance.

4.5.2 Non-locality in time

Little is known about the importance of non-local effects in time in TDDFT. These are completely lost by any adiabatic approximation which considers only the density at the present time. The dynamical effects can be very large as seen above. To what degree does our system remember the past? How far back in time do we need to know the density in order to evaluate the various energy components?

In Ref. [48] equations of motion for various energy components were derived. For example, $\dot{T}_s = -\int d^3r \dot{n}(\mathbf{r}t) v_s(\mathbf{r}t)$ and $\dot{E}_{\text{xc}} = \int d^3r \dot{n}(\mathbf{r}t) v_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}t)$. Integrating the right-hand-side of these from 0 to t gives $T_s(t)$ and $E_{\text{xc}}(t)$ respectively but these do not imply that the density along the entire history from 0 to t is required to evaluate the energy component at time t . Certainly it is not if the integrand is the exact time-derivative of some function. This is the case for \dot{T}_s , at least for two electrons in the same spatial state where $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j}_s$. Consequently, $T_s(t)$ is semi-local in time: it depends only on $n(\mathbf{r}t)$ and $\dot{n}(\mathbf{r}t)$ (see Eq. (4.19)).

The exchange energy E_x for this case is completely local, since it is simply

minus half the Hartree energy. We suspect that even in general it is not strongly non-local in time for the following reasons. E_x may be expressed as the classical Coulomb energy between the charge density and its exchange hole $n_x(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', t)$ [73], $E_x = \int \int d^3r d^3r' n(\mathbf{r}, t) n_x(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', t) / |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$. The exchange hole satisfies two fundamental constraints at each instant in time: (i) its on-top value is a local function of the spin-densities $n_x(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}, t) = -(n_\alpha^2(\mathbf{r}, t) + n_\beta^2(\mathbf{r}, t)) / n(\mathbf{r}, t)$, and (ii) it satisfies the sum-rule $\int d^3r n_x(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', t) = -1$ [73]. These two conditions, which depend only on the value of the density at the present time, determine much about the shape of the exchange hole. Consequently we may expect that a good approximation to the exact exchange energy can be obtained using only the density at the present time. Indeed, a recent calculation of the exchange kernel in linear response for the uniform electron gas [74] was dominated by the frequency-independent contribution.

In contrast, the correlation energy $E_c(t)$ and the correlation potential $v_c(\mathbf{r}t)$ appear to have a very non-local component, depending on the entire history of the density. Consider the plot of \dot{E}_c in Fig. 4.7 together with its density profile implied by the rms variance shown above. The figure suggests that \dot{E}_c is a very non-local functional of the density: The density profile for a time range centered at time $t = 4.8$ and that centered near $t = 28.9$ are very similar, yet the values of $\dot{E}_c(t)$ near those times are significantly different. Similarly one may contrast the very similar densities in a time range centered near $t = 9.35$ and near $t = 24.3$ with the very different shape of $\dot{E}_c(t)$ in that time range. Then Eq. (4.16) directly implies that $v_c(\mathbf{r}t)$ is a highly non-local functional of the density.

Non-locality of \dot{E}_c implies non-locality of the correlation energy $E_c(t)$. This is clearly evident in our runs. Consider the $E_c(t)$ of Fig. 4.8 corresponding to the run discussed above. Again, we contrast the very similar density profiles centered at time $t = 4.8$ (or $t = 9.35$) and $t = 28.9$ (or $t = 24.3$, respectively) with the significantly different values of $E_c(t)$ centered there. This implies that local (in




Figure 4.7: A measure of the nonlocality of \dot{E}_C with respect to time for the non-resonant run (NR): Contrast the very similar density profiles implied in the top panel near times $t = 4.8$ and 28.9 with the very different values of \dot{E}_C there in the graph above. Similar comparisons may be made near $t = 9.35$ and $t = 24.3$.

time) information is not adequate for a reasonable estimate of $E_C(t)$. The highly non-local-in-time nature of correlation must be captured by the correlation energy and potential functionals for accurate results.

4.5.3 Linear Response Regime

The most well-studied regime of TDDFT is the linear response regime, in which the time-dependence of the external potential is weak relative to the static potential. Electronic excitation energies (and oscillator strengths) can be extracted from analysis of this linear response regime. The first TDDFT calculations were in this regime[54].

We present only one basic result in this regime, but one which explains qualitative trends in our data. Writing[3]

$$n(\mathbf{r}t) = n_0(\mathbf{r}) + \epsilon n_1(\mathbf{r}t) + \dots \quad (4.28)$$

where ϵ is a small parameter to be taken to zero at the end of the derivation, we first note that, by construction, dynamical quantities are at least first-order




Figure 4.8: Correlation energy as a function of time for time-dependent Hooke's atom for the non-resonant run (NR) : exact quantity (solid line), the ground-state approximation (bottom dashed line), and the dynamical component (top dashed line).




Figure 4.9: E_C^{dyn} scales quadratically with respect to ϵ in the linear response regime while T_C^{dyn} scales linearly (LR) (see table 1).

in ϵ . Secondly, we note that \dot{n} also has no zero-order component. Clearly then, from Eq. (4.16), the dynamical contribution to the correlation energy is at least *second-order* in ϵ . This means that, in the limit of weak time-dependent potentials, $T_C^{\text{dyn}} \approx -U_C^{\text{dyn}}$. This effect can be seen at the start of most runs where the system has not yet responded to the full strength of the perturbation. In Fig. 4.9, we plot the dynamical contribution to the kinetic-correlation and total correlation energies for two values of small ϵ , differing by a factor of two. We see that the kinetic contribution scales linearly, while the dynamical correlation energy scales quadratically with ϵ .

These results shed more light on those of Ref. [59], who argue that the dynamic contribution to the exchange-correlation potential vanishes in linear response. This is clearly true for exchange, which dominates weakly interacting systems. While we find it to be true for the correlation energy, our results show this not to be the case for the potential, or the kinetic contribution would also vanish. In fact, from the virial theorem and the vanishing of the total correlation energy, we find

$$T_C^{\text{dyn}} = - \int d^3r n_0(\mathbf{r}t) \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla v_C^{\text{dyn}}(\mathbf{r}t) \quad (4.29)$$

to leading order in ϵ . Thus a linear term in T_C^{dyn} implies a linear term in v_C^{dyn} . However, if the dynamical correlation in TDDFT scales the same way as the ground-state case in the low density limit, where T_C^{gs} vanishes relative to E_C^{gs} , then T_C^{dyn} would vanish also.

4.5.4 High-density limit

In the case of the ground state, the behavior of various functionals under uniform scaling of the density, in which $n(\mathbf{r})$ becomes

$$n_\gamma(\mathbf{r}) = \gamma^3 n(\gamma\mathbf{r}), \quad (4.30)$$




Figure 4.10: Scaling of the system changes the values only slightly as they go to the 3dHO limit. E_C is plotted for scaling factors of $\gamma = 1, 2, 4, 8$ for the weak non-resonant run (WNR).

has proven useful in the construction and analysis of approximate functionals. In particular, the ground-state correlation energy follows no simple rule when scaled, but is known to scale to a finite negative constant in the high-density limit[75]:

$$E_C[n_\gamma] \rightarrow E_C^{(2)}[n], \gamma \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.31)$$

This property is *not* satisfied by LDA, but is built in to most modern generalized gradient approximations[41].

As shown in Ref. [48], the relevant density scaling for the time-dependent theory is

$$n_{\gamma^2}(\mathbf{r}t) = \gamma^3 n(\gamma\mathbf{r}, \gamma^2 t) \quad (4.32)$$

and so the expected analog of Eq. (4.31) would be

$$E_C[n_{\gamma,\gamma^2}](t) \rightarrow E_C^{(2)}[n](\gamma^2 t), \gamma \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.33)$$

However, the proof from the ground-state case does not easily generalize, as there is no minimum principle for the time-dependent theory. We therefore numerically implement this scaling, to see if Eq. (4.33) appears to be satisfied. Just as earlier in the paper, it is technically difficult to scale the density, as the potential

becomes non-harmonic. Instead, we simply scaled the force constant, writing $k_\gamma = \gamma^4 k$, which causes the density to scale approximately, and (for some quantities) becomes equivalent to density-scaling in the high-density (i.e., non-interacting) limit. The energies $V_{\text{ext}}(\gamma^2 t)$ and $T(\gamma^2 t)$ of the system approach twice those of the time-dependent 3dHO with the same time-dependent external potential, as they should. Fig. 4.10 indicates that the correlation energy $E_c(\gamma^2 t)$ becomes independent of γ as the system is scaled to high densities.

To see this in detail, note that the value at $t = 0$ is the ground-state correlation energy for each system, and its variation with γ is a measure of both how close the $k = 1/4$ Hooke's atom is to the high-density limit and (to a lesser extent) the error in our approximate scaling procedure. Thus the fact that, out to about $\gamma^2 t = 36$, the differences between curves become no larger than at $t = 0$, while undergoing significant changes as a function of $\gamma^2 t$, shows that (numerically), Eq. (4.33) is satisfied.

This will only hold for a finite amount of time, not the entire run. As the system is scaled to higher densities, the effective electron-electron interaction becomes weaker[48]. For large but finite γ , the difference in the time evolution of the interacting and Kohn-Sham systems eventually becomes significant. For the conditions of the run shown above, this appears to occur at about $\gamma^2 t = t_o$, where t_o is about 24.

4.6 Conclusions

In all the data presented in this paper, comparisons between the exact correlation energy and a ground-state approximation are made. In a truly adiabatic system where the system has time to adjust to the external perturbation, a ground-state approximation will work well. But in any non-adiabatic case there are important dynamical effects present in the exact correlation energy that must be captured

by any approximate functional.

We found that the dynamical effects can be very large and lead to qualitatively different behavior of the functionals than that predicted by any ground-state approximation. The most striking example of this is the correlation energy, $E_C(t)$, which can become positive unlike any ground-state approximation. It has been seen in all runs that E_C^{dyn} was always a positive quantity so the adjustment from the ground state values have *raised* the value of the correlation energy. We proved that $E_C^{dyn}(t)$ is always bounded below by a negative number, $-T_s^{dyn}$, but whether the stronger statement of positivity is always true remains to be proved. We found that $E_C(t)$ and $v_C(\mathbf{r}t)$ are very non-local functionals of the density in time, and cannot be accurately predicted from only the density at recent times.

In the ground-state case T_C is always positive, which follows from a ground-state variational principle. In the time-dependent case, $T_C(t)$ was also found to be positive in all our runs, but we found no proof that this is true generally.

We proved in the linear response regime, that although the dynamical correlation energy $E_C^{dyn}(t)$ vanishes, the correlation potential $v_C(\mathbf{r}t)$, and therefore the exchange-correlation kernel $f_{XC}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', t - t')$, has a non-zero dynamical piece. This piece is completely missed by the commonly used adiabatic approximation for f_{XC} (e.g. ALDA, or any adiabatic GGA).

Future work remains in many areas. Our runs were mostly in the moderate to high density regime. The low-density properties of our system remain to be investigated. The study of the dynamics when the initial state is other than the ground-state of the system must be explored. These results must be compared to approximate calculations made at the present time with adiabatic approximations. An approximate functional which includes the non-local effects discussed in Sec. 4.5 must be constructed and tested. We believe that ensuring the satisfaction of the exact statements shown in this paper will lead to the development of more accurate functionals.

4.7 Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant no. CHE-9875091. PH was also supported by Research Corporation. KB acknowledges partial support of the Petroleum Research Fund.

References

- [1] W. Kohn, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71**, 1253 (1999).
- [2] E. Runge and E.K.U. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 997 (1984).
- [3] K. Burke and E.K.U. Gross, in *Density functionals: Theory and applications*, ed. D. Joubert (Springer, Berlin, 1998).
- [4] O.J. Wacker, R. Kümmel, and E.K.U. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 2915 (1994).
- [5] M. Stener, P. Decleva, and A. Lisini, *J. Phys. B:At. Mol. Opt. Phys.*, **28**, 4973, (1995).
- [6] C.A. Ullrich, U.J. Gossmann, and E.K.U. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 872 (1995).
- [7] M.E. Casida, in *Recent developments and applications in density functional theory*, ed. J.M. Seminario (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1996).
- [8] E.K.U. Gross, J.F. Dobson, and M. Petersilka, *Topics in Current Chemistry*, **181**, 81 (1996).
- [9] C. Jamorski, M.E. Casida, D.R. Salahub, *J. Chem. Phys.* **104**, 5134 (1996).
- [10] T. Bandy and K. Haug, *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 4543 (1997).
- [11] A.G. Ioannou, R.D. Amos, *Chem. Phys. Lett*, **279**, 17 (1997).
- [12] M. Petersilka, U.J. Gossmann, and E.K.U. Gross, in *Electronic Density Functional Theory: Recent Progress and New Directions*, eds. J.F. Dobson, G. Vignale, and M.P. Das (Plenum, NY, 1997).
- [13] S.J.A. van Gisbergen, J.G. Snijders, and E.J. Baerends, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3097 (1997).
- [14] M.E. Casida, K.C. Casida, and D.R. Salahub, *Int. J. Quant. Chem.* **70**, 933 (1998).
- [15] M.E. Casida, C. Jamorski, K.C. Casida, and D.R. Salahub, *J. Chem. Phys.* **108**, 4439 (1998).
- [16] S.J.A. van Gisbergen, J.G. Snijders, and E.J. Baerends, *J. Chem. Phys.* **109** (24), 10644 (1998).

- [17] R.E. Stratmann and G.E. Scuseria, J. Chem. Phys. **109**, 8218 (1998).
- [18] R.E. Stratmann, G. E. Scuseria and M.J. Frisch, J. Chem. Phys. **109**, 8218 (1998).
- [19] K.W. Wiberg, R.E. Stratmann, M.J. Frisch, Chem. Phys. Lett., **297**, 60 (1998).
- [20] C. Adamo, G.E. Scuseria, and V. Barone, J. Chem. Phys. **11** (7), 2889 (1999).
- [21] F. Aiga, T. Tada, and R. Yoshimura, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 2878 (1999).
- [22] S. Hirata, M. Head-Gordon, Chem. Phys. Lett., **302**, 375 (1999).
- [23] K. Yabana and G.F. Bertsch, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 1271 (1999).
- [24] K. Burke, M. Petersilka, and E.K.U. Gross, in *Recent advances in density functional methods, vol. III*, ed. P. Fantucci and A. Bencini (World Scientific Press, 2000).
- [25] M. E. Casida, F. Gutierrez, J. G. Guan, F. X. Gadea, D. Salahub, and J. P. Daudey, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 7062 (2000).
- [26] M.E. Casida, D.R. Salahub, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 8918 (2000).
- [27] Z.L. Cai and J. R. Reimers, J. Chem. Phys., **112**, 527 (2000).
- [28] S.J.A. Van Gisbergen, C.F. Guerra, and E.J. Baerends, J. Comput. Chem. **21**, 1511 (2000).
- [29] T. Grabo, M. Petersilka, and E.K.U. Gross, in J. Mol. Structure (Theochem), **501**, 353 (2000).
- [30] F. Kootstra, P.L. Boeij, and J.G. Snijders, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 6517 (2000).
- [31] M. Stener and P. Decleva, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 10871 (2000).
- [32] I.V. Tokatly and O. Pankratov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 2078 (2001).
- [33] V. Chernyak, S.N. Volkov, and S. Mukamel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 995 (2001).
- [34] K. Tatarczyk, A. Schindlmayr, and M. Scheffler, Phys. Rev. B, **6323**, 5106 (2001).
- [35] F. Ceccherini, D. Bauer, and P. Mulser, Laser Part. Beams **18**, 449 (2000).
- [36] D. Bauer and F. Ceccherini, Opt. Express **8**, 377 (2001).
- [37] C. A. Ullrich, Theochem-J. Mol. Struct. **501**, 315 (2000).
- [38] X. Chu and S. I. Chu, Phys. Rev. A **6302**, 3411 (2001).

- [39] X. M. Tong and S. I. Chu, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **69**, 293 (1998).
- [40] N. T. Maitra, K. Burke and C. Woodward, submitted (2001).
- [41] J.P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996); **78**, 1396 (1997) (E).
- [42] M. Ernzerhof, J.P. Perdew, and K. Burke, in *Density Functional Theory*, ed. R. Nalewajski, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [43] K. Burke, J.P. Perdew, and M. Ernzerhof, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **61**, 287 (1997).
- [44] G. Vignale, *Phys. Lett. A* **209**, 206 (1995).
- [45] S. Erhard, Diplomarbeit, Universität Würzburg, 1996.
- [46] E.K.U. Gross, J.F. Dobson, M. Petersilka, in *Topics in Current Chemistry* **181**, pg. 81 (Springer, 1996).
- [47] J.F. Dobson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 2244 (1994).
- [48] P. Hessler, J. Park, and K. Burke, *Phys. Rev. Letts.* **82**, 378 (1999); *Phys. Rev. Letts.* **83**, 5184 (1999) (E).
- [49] G. Vignale and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2037 (1996).
- [50] E.K.U. Gross and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 2850 (1985); **57**, 923 (1986) (E).
- [51] N. T. Maitra, K. Burke, H. Appel, E.K.U. Gross, and R. van Leeuwen, to appear in *Reviews in Modern Quantum Chemistry: A celebration of the contributions of R. G. Parr*, ed. K. D. Sen, (World-Scientific, 2001).
- [52] T. Ando, *Z. Phys. B.* **26**, 263 (1977).
- [53] T. Ando, *Solid State Commun.* **21**, 133 (1977).
- [54] A. Zangwill and P. Soven, *Phys. Rev. A* **21**, 1561 (1980).
- [55] A. Zangwill and P. Soven, *Phys. Rev. B* **24**, 4121 (1981).
- [56] M. Taut, *Phys. Rev. A* **48**, 3561 (1993).
- [57] Although the external potentials used here do not vanish at large distances, the surface integral condition in the proof of the Runge-Gross theorem [2, 58] is not violated because the density decays as a Gaussian at large distances for all time.
- [58] E.K.U. Gross and W. Kohn, *Adv. Quant. Chem.* **21**, 255 (1990); B-X. Xu and A.K. Rajagopal, *Phys. Rev. A.* **31**, 2682 (1985); A.K. Dhara and S.K. Ghosh, *Phys. Rev. A.* **35**, 442 (1987).

- [59] I. D'Amico and G. Vignale, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 7876 (1999).
- [60] W. Kohn and L.J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A 1133 (1965).
- [61] J. P. Perdew, J. A. Chevary, S. H. Vosko, K. A. Jackson, M. R. Pederson, D.J. Singh, and C. Fiolhais, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 6671 (1992); **48**, 4978 (1993) (E).
- [62] C. Lee, W. Yang, and R.G. Parr, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 785 (1988).
- [63] A. Görling, Phys. Rev. Letts. **83**, 5459 (1999).
- [64] S. Ivanov, S. Hirata, and R.J. Bartlett, Phys. Rev. Letts. **83**, 5455 (1999).
- [65] M. Seidl, J.P. Perdew, and S. Kurth, Phys. Rev. Lett., **84**, 5070 (2000).
- [66] A. Facco Bonetti, E. Engel, R. N. Schmid, and R. M. Dreizler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2241 (2001).
- [67] N.T. Maitra and K. Burke, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 042501 (2001).
- [68] J.F. Dobson, M. Büchner, and E.K.U. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1905 (1997).
- [69] G. Vignale, C.A. Ullrich, and S. Conti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4878 (1997).
- [70] M. Levy, in *Recent developments and applications of modern density functional theory*, ed. J. Seminario (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1996).
- [71] D. Frydel, W. Terilla, and K. Burke, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 5292 (2000).
- [72] A. H. Nayfeh and D. T. Mook, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York (1979).
- [73] O. Gunnarsson and B.I. Lundqvist, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 4274 (1976).
- [74] M. Lein, E.K.U. Gross, and J.P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 13431 (2000).
- [75] M. Levy, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 4637 (1991).

Vita

Curriculum Vitae

Paul L. Hessler, Jr.
4413 Terrace Avenue
Pennsauken, NJ 08109
phessler@crab.rutgers.edu

Education

1997 - Present: 30 credits in Mathematics and Chemistry, Rutgers University

1993: MA Mathematics, Villanova University, Villanova, PA

1990: BS Computer Science, Villanova University, Villanova, PA

Teaching Positions Held

2001 – Present: Teacher of Physical Science and Chemistry, Lindenwold High School, Lindenwold, NJ

Taught AP Calculus, Trigonometry, Chemistry, Honors Algebra II, Algebra I, Physical Science, and Pre-Algebra.

1997: – Present Research Assistant, Rutgers University, Research Advisor: Dr. Kieron Burke

Applied Calculus, Chemistry and Physics to problems in the field of Quantum Chemistry.

1994 – 2001: Teacher of Mathematics, Camden High School

Taught Trigonometry, Pre-Calculus, Geometry, Algebra I, Pre-Algebra, and Basic Skills Mathematics.

Software Positions Held

1991 – 1994: Software Engineer, General Electric, Malvern, PA

Programmed power line protective digital relays using assembly-level and C programming languages.

1988 – 1990: Project Engineer, Brandt, Inc, Bensalem, PA

Lead projects to add communications ports to money counting machines and to add paper width detection systems to the feed path.

1986 – 1990: Software Engineer, Brandt, Inc, Bensalem, PA

Programmed money counting machines using assembly-level programming language. Assisted in introduction of new models to the production line. Participated in the design of new circuit boards.

1985 – 1986: Consulting Software Engineer, General Electric, Malvern, PA

Programmed man-machine interface for a power line protection system.

Publications

Correlation in time-dependent density functional theory
P. Hessler, N. Maitra, and K. Burke, *J. Chem. Phys.* 117, 72 (2002).

The Time Dependent Virial Theorem for Hooke's Atom
P. Hessler, *Partners in Science Annual Conference Proceedings*, Research Corporation (2000).

Several theorems in time-dependent density functional theory
P. Hessler, J. Park, and K. Burke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 378 (1999).

Talks

Exact Time-Dependent Calculations for Hooke's Atom
Partners in Science Annual Conference, Tucson, AZ, January 2001

Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory and Hooke's Atom
Partners in Science Annual Conference, Tucson, AZ, January 2000

Time-Dependent Systems and Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory
University of Delaware, August 1999

Calculations Using the Time-Dependent Schrodinger Equation
New Jersey Academy of Science Annual meeting, April 1999

The Basics of a Time-Dependent Quantum System
Math Department Seminar, Rutgers University, August 1998

Poster Presentations

Correlation in Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory, *American Conference on Theoretical Chemistry*, Seven Springs, PA, July 2002

Correlation effects in Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory, *Princeton University*, July 2001

Exact Time-Dependent Kohn-Sham Calculations, Sanibel Symposium, St. Augustine, FL, March 2001

Exact Time-Dependent Kohn-Sham Calculations, DFT Satellite Meeting, 10th Annual Meeting of the International Congress on Quantum Chemistry, Menton, France, June 2000

Time-Dependent Virial Theorem, Partners in Science Poster Session, Princeton University, Chemistry Department, August 1999

Memberships

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics

National Science Teachers Association

American Chemical Society