

## Construction of Localized Basis for Dynamical Mean Field Theory

I. Paul

SPHT, CEA-Saclay, L'Orme des Merisiers, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

G. Kotliar

Center for Materials Theory, Department of Physics and Astronomy,  
Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854

(Dated: February 19, 2019)

Many-body Hamiltonians obtained from first principles generally include all possible non-local interactions. But in dynamical mean field theory the non-local interactions are ignored, and only the effects of the local interactions are taken into account. The truncation of the non-local interactions is a basis dependent approximation. We propose a criterion to construct an appropriate localized basis in which the truncation can be carried out. This involves finding a basis in which a functional given by the sum of the squares of the local interactions with appropriate weight factors is maximized under unitary transformations of basis. We argue that such a localized basis is suitable for the application of dynamical mean field theory for calculating material properties from first principles. We propose an algorithm which can be used for constructing the localized basis. We test our criterion on a toy model and find it satisfactory.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the last decade and a half dynamical mean field theory (DMFT) has emerged as an important tool for studying condensed matter systems with strong correlation.<sup>1</sup> The principal difficulty in understanding these systems is the non-perturbative character of such systems, for which the physical properties cannot be understood by expanding various quantities in powers of the interaction. In this respect DMFT is a powerful tool for studying problems of interacting electrons on a lattice. It is a non-perturbative technique which is able to capture fully the local dynamical correlations in the system. Single site DMFT, as an approximation scheme, is controlled in that the result is exact in the limit of large co-ordination numbers.<sup>1</sup> Recent extensions to clusters seem to be rapidly convergent for local observables.<sup>2</sup> More recently it has been recognized that DMFT can be used as a powerful tool for the realistic computation of properties of materials as in the LDA+DMFT scheme.<sup>3,4,5</sup> Indeed results for a large variety of materials ranging from Cerium,<sup>6</sup> Iron and Nickel,<sup>7</sup> Plutonium<sup>8</sup> and many other oxides have been successfully studied with this method starting from first principles.

A common way to utilize DMFT in first principles calculations is to first derive a Hamiltonian with a kinetic energy part and a general interaction part. This Hamiltonian, which will be the starting point of this paper in Eq. (1), is subsequently studied by DMFT. There are various methods to obtain the starting Hamiltonian. (1) In one of the approaches the kinetic energy term is the Kohn Sham Hamiltonian of a density functional theory calculation written in a local basis set. The interaction terms, which can include on-site (Hubbard) as well as the short range part of the Coulomb interaction, is evaluated using constrained LDA.<sup>3</sup> (2) In an alternative procedure, one could start with the electron gas Hamiltonian and the periodic potential, and perform the Bohm-Pines canonical transformation<sup>9</sup> to reduce the range of the Coulomb in-

teractions, and then write the transformed Hamiltonian in a local basis set. (3) A third approach proposed recently<sup>10</sup> uses the GW approach to obtain the interaction strength.

The next step is the study of the resulting Hamiltonian using DMFT. This involves local approximations, and the notion of locality depends explicitly on the basis set considered. To illustrate the point, if we perform an invertible transformation of the original basis, we merely re-express the original Hamiltonian in a new basis, provided we keep all the terms in the Hamiltonian. The full electron Green's function is obtained by applying the same transformation to the creation and destruction operators. But in practice, one performs two approximations that explicitly depend on the basis set. The first one is to neglect interactions whose range exceeds the cluster size (truncation). The second (local approximation) consist of setting equal to zero the elements of the self energy which exceeds that size. These two approximations explicitly depend on the definition of locality which is encoded in the basis set. In this paper we address only the first issue, and argue that truncating non-local interactions is appropriate when the wave-functions of the basis are well localized. As DMFT techniques are beginning to be applied to Hamiltonians with realistic interactions involving non-local terms,<sup>11</sup> there is need for well-defined criteria for choosing optimal bases for computations. The purpose of this paper is to propose one criterion which can be used to construct a localized basis for DMFT computations.

The method of choosing a suitable localized basis of wave-functions has been studied earlier in quantum chemistry and in band structure theory.<sup>12</sup> The formulation of the problem consists of two steps. First, one identifies a certain group of transformations of the basis states, say for example, unitary transformations. Second, one identifies a criterion that picks out one basis out of all possible choices that are connected by the transform-

tions. The criterion is a basis dependent quantity, and therefore is a functional in the space of the transformations. It is a measure of the amount of localization of the wave-functions in a given basis. For example, in quantum chemistry "energy localized molecular orbitals" have been studied.<sup>13</sup> These are obtained by maximizing under unitary transformations a functional given by the sum of the Coulomb self-interaction of the orbitals. Similarly, for band structure calculations the use of "maximally-localized" Wannier functions has been proposed.<sup>12</sup> The idea is to exploit the freedom that is present in the choice of the phases of the Bloch orbitals. With a given set of Bloch orbitals one can define a new set by a unitary transformation. From each such set of Bloch orbitals one can obtain a corresponding set of Wannier functions by Fourier transformation. The maximally-localized Wannier functions are obtained by minimizing the spread functional, which is the sum of the second moments of the Wannier functions, in the space of unitary transformations. More recently, the construction of localized basis states has been extended to include non-orthogonal molecular orbitals.<sup>14</sup>

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section II we identify a criterion for choosing a basis suitable for DMFT. We construct a functional which is maximum in the preferred basis. We discuss the properties of such a basis by studying linear variations of the functional under unitary transformations. We also propose a method for constructing the preferred basis. In section III we test the criterion on a toy model. We find that the criterion and the associated functional is well behaved provided the starting Hamiltonian retains all the generic non-local interactions. In conclusion, we summarize our main results.

## II. LOCALIZED BASIS FOR DMFT

To keep the discussion general, in the following we formulate the problem in a basis which is non-orthogonal. For this purpose we consider a system of interacting electrons on a lattice whose Hamiltonian is expressed in a basis of atomic orbitals. The single particle states are denoted by  $(r, R_n)$   $h r j i$ , where  $i$  is a symmetry related index (say, orbital) and  $R_n$  is a lattice position. We suppose there are  $m$  orbitals per site such that the index  $i = 1; \dots; m$ , and there are  $N$  lattice sites with the index  $n = 0; \dots; N-1$ . We also impose periodic boundary condition  $j; i = j + N; i$ . The states defining the basis, unlike those in a Wannier basis, are not orthogonal. We denote the overlap between any two states by  $O^{-1}(n, m) = \langle h n j i | h m i i \rangle$ . The second quantized many-body Hamiltonian can be written as

$$H = \sum_{n, m} t^{nm} c_{n; i}^\dagger c_{m; i} + \sum_{n, m, k, l} V^{nm, kl} c_{n; i}^\dagger c_{m; i}^\dagger c_{k; i} c_{l; i} : \quad (1)$$

We assume that the matrix elements  $t^{nm}$   $\langle h n j i | h m i i \rangle$  for the non-interacting part, and  $V^{nm, kl}$   $\langle h n j i | h m i i \rangle \langle h k i i | h l i i \rangle$  for the interacting part are known from first principles studies such as band structure calculations. It is useful to bear in mind that the anti-commutation relation between the creation and annihilation operators in a non-orthogonal basis is given by  $\{c_{n; i}^\dagger, c_{m; i}\} = O^{-1}(n, m)$ . We now consider an invertible transformation of the single particle basis that preserves the lattice translation invariance,  $\langle h n j i | h m i i \rangle = \langle h n' j' i | h m' i i \rangle$ . Expressed in the new basis the Hamiltonian, say  $H^0$ , has the same form as in Eq. (1) except with all the indices primed. We know that  $H^0 = H$ , since it is the same operator expressed in two different bases. However, when we truncate all the non-local interactions, we deal with a model Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_{tr} = \sum_{n, m} t^{nm} c_{n; i}^\dagger c_{m; i} + \sum_n V^{nnnn} c_{n; i}^\dagger c_{n; i}^\dagger c_{n; i} c_{n; i} : \quad (2)$$

But the process of truncation is a basis dependent step. If we perform the truncation in the new basis, i.e., on  $H^0$ , the resulting new truncated Hamiltonian  $H_{tr}^0 \notin H_{tr}$ . This observation implies that ignoring non-local interactions is a good approximation only if the single particle basis is sufficiently localized. In the following we develop a systematic criterion for constructing such a basis.

Here we consider only unitary transformations of basis. Later we comment about the possibility of extending the scheme to include non-unitary invertible transformations as well. We start from an initial basis  $f j i g$ , and consider unitary transformations

$$| h n j i \rangle = \sum_m U_{jm} | h m i i \rangle \quad (3)$$

to new basis states  $f j^0 i g$ . In order to find a criterion to choose the most localized basis among the possible bases  $f j^0 i g$ , we first identify a quantity which is invariant under unitary transformations. The trace of any operator has this property. Since we are concerned about truncating the interacting part of the Hamiltonian, we consider the trace of the square of the interaction operator. In terms of the overlap matrix and the interactions expressed in the  $f j i g$  basis this is given by

$$I = \text{Tr}(\hat{V}^2) = O^{-1}(n, m) O^{-1}(l, k) O^{-1}(r, s) O^{-1}(p, q) V^{m, k, p, r} V^{s, q, l, n} : \quad (4)$$

Here, and in the rest of the paper we adopt the convention that repeated indices are summed. The invariant defined above has two basis dependent parts, namely, terms that involve only the local interactions and those involving non-local interactions. Keeping only the local interactions in a given basis, we define the "local interaction functional". For example, in the basis  $f j i g$  the functional has the value

$$F[f j i g] = O^{-1}(0) O^{-1}(0) O^{-1}(0) O^{-1}(0) V^{0000} V^{0000} :$$



should choose a basis in which orbitals on neighbouring sites are mixed to  $O(1)$ . However, the pathology is not in the criterion, but rather in the choice of the interaction terms of the toy model. We note that, the behaviour of the local interaction functional depends crucially on the choice of the interaction terms in the original basis. For example, in the toy model we ignore non-local interactions such as the correlated hopping terms of the form  $c_{0;a}^\dagger c_{1;a} n_{1;b}$ . It turns out that as a result  $F$  has no term linear in  $\beta$ . This is the reason for the pathology. It is important to realize that the criterion is suited to work for Hamiltonians which are obtained from first principles studies. Typically, such Hamiltonians contain all possible non-local interactions, for which the pathology does not exist. (3) When  $\beta > 1$ , the original basis destabilizes. There is no unique most localized basis, but rather families where orbitals on adjacent sites are mixed, say, in the bonding and antibonding combinations. This implies that the criterion now prefers a basis where wave-functions are delocalized over the two sites. However, one can check that such delocalization is restricted to the range of the interaction, nearest-neighbour in this case. For example, if one studies the same toy model with more than two sites for  $\beta > 1$ , the preferred basis will have wave-functions that are delocalized only over two sites (and not delocalized over the entire lattice). This is because to  $O(1)$  the functional has no contribution from mixing sites further than nearest-neighbours.

Two more comments are of relevance. First, our criterion ignores the non-interacting part of the Hamiltonian. If one starts with nearest neighbour hopping in the original basis, in the localized basis the hopping will be more complicated. But the point of view adopted here is that the non-interacting part can still be solved exactly. Second, in this paper we consider only unitary transformations of basis. This implies that one maximizes the local interaction functional within a family of bases with the same overlap matrix (say, orthonormal bases, if the original basis is orthonormal). In principle one could probe for bases with different overlap matrices by general invertible transformations. Such a group is non-compact and one needs to impose constraints such that the functional is bounded from above. One possible constraint can be imposed in terms of the singular value decomposition of the transformation matrix, say, the ratio of the maximum and the minimum singular values be within a

specified bound.

In conclusion, we propose a criterion for constructing a localized single particle basis where non-local interactions can be truncated. Such a basis is appropriate for using DMFT for the calculation of material properties. We suggest a simple algorithm by which the construction of the localized basis can be carried out. We tested the criterion on a toy Hamiltonian. We conclude that the criterion and the associated functional is well-behaved if the starting Hamiltonian includes general non-local interactions.

#### IV. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank D. Vanderbilt, S. Savrasov, V. Oudovenko, and H. Jeschke for stimulating discussions and useful suggestions.

#### APPENDIX A

In this appendix we prove the assertion in Eq. (14).

First, if the basis is orthonormal to begin with, i.e.,  $O(n, m) = \delta_{nm}$ , it is easy to see that

$$A(t) = L(N(t))L^\dagger(t) = A(t): \quad (A1)$$

Then,  $F = (4) \sum_t (N(t))^2 \geq 0$ .

If the basis  $f_{ji}$  is non-orthogonal, we assume there exists an orthonormal basis  $f_{ji}^o$  (say, a Wannier basis) to which it is related by  $f_{ji} = S(n; a) f_{ji}^o$  and  $\langle f_{ji} | f_{mj} \rangle = \delta_{nm} S(n; a; )$ . One can show that

$$O^{-1}(n, m) = S(n; a; ) S(m; a; ): \quad (A2)$$

Using the above relation and Eq. (11) one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} F &= (4) O^{-1}(m, n) A(m) O(n, t) A(t) \\ &= \frac{4}{N} \sum_{ab} \sum_{tm} S^{-1}(b; t; ) A(t, m) S(m; a; ) \\ &\geq 0: \end{aligned} \quad (A3)$$

<sup>1</sup> For reviews see, e.g., A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth, and M. J. Rozenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. 68, 13 (1996). T. P. Ruschke, M. Jarrell, and J. K. Freericks, Adv. Phys. 44, 187 (1995).

<sup>2</sup> G. Biroli, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. B 65, 155112 (2002).

<sup>3</sup> V. I. Anisimov, A. I. Poteryaev, M. A. Korotin, A. O. Anokhin, and G. Kotliar, J. Phys.-Condens. Mat. 9, 7359 (1997).

<sup>4</sup> K. Held, I. A. Nekrasov, N. Blümer, V. I. Anisimov, and

D. Vollhardt, Intl. J. Mod. Phys. B 15, 2611 (2001).

<sup>5</sup> A. I. Lichtenstein, and M. I. Katsnelson, Phys. Rev. B 57, 6884 (1998).

<sup>6</sup> K. Held, A. K. M. M. Mahan, R. T. Scalettar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 276404 (2001).

<sup>7</sup> I. Yang, S. Y. Savrasov, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 216405 (2001).

<sup>8</sup> S. Savrasov, G. Kotliar, and E. Abrahams, Nature 410, 793 (2001).

- <sup>9</sup> D. Bohm, and D. Pines, *Phy. Rev.* **92**, 609 (1953).
- <sup>10</sup> F. Aryasetiawan, S. Biermann, and A. Georges, *cond-mat/0401626*.
- <sup>11</sup> A. Schiller, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 15 660 (1999).
- <sup>12</sup> N. Marzari, and D. Vanderbilt, *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 12 847 (1997), and references therein.
- <sup>13</sup> C. Edmiston, and K. Ruedenberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **35**, 457 (1963).
- <sup>14</sup> S. Liu, J. M. Perez-Jorda, and W. Yang, *J. Chem. Phys.* **112**, 1634 (2000).