

# Locality and Computational Reliability of Linear Response Calculations for Molecular Systems

Marco D'Alessandro

*Istituto di Struttura della Materia-CNR (ISM-CNR),  
Via del Fosso del Cavaliere 100, 00133 Roma, Italia*

Luigi Genovese

*Laboratoire de Simulation Atomistique (LSim), INAC,  
CEA-UGA, 17 Av. des Martyrs, 38054 Grenoble, France*

(Dated: June 21, 2019)

By performing a critical analysis of the fundamental equations of linear-response (LR) formalism in molecules, we explore the interplay between locality of the response density operator and numerical convergence of LR-related quantities. We show that for frequencies below the first ionization potential (IP) of the system, it is possible to express the response density by employing localized states only. Above this threshold energy, such a locality property cannot be achieved. Such considerations may be transposed in terms of the molecule's excited states. We show that not all the system's excitations can be considered on equal footing. There is a discrete sector of excitations – which may extend above IP – that can be parametrized by observable, localized states, which can be computationally expressed with high precision, provided an adequate level of completeness. We present indicators that can help to quantify such potential observable property of an excitation, that can be evaluated in any discretization scheme. The remaining excitation modes belong to a continuum spectrum that, on the contrary, is not directly associated to observable properties and can only be effectively represented in a given computational setup. Such considerations are important not only for reproducibility of the results among different computer codes employing diverse formalisms, but also in view of providing a deeper understanding on the impact of models' approximations on the scientific outcomes of the simulation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since the days of their foundations, disciplines like Computational Physics or Quantum Chemistry always had to deal with the problem of the computational reliability of the results. More specifically, a computational result may be considered reliable for various reasons. For example, it may be in agreement with some previous observation or measurement that the employed computational model is susceptible to reproduce. The model itself may in this way be classified as “accurate”; it can then be employed to extract, *in silico*, other quantities that might be then used to *predict* or *interpret* experiments. Another concept of reliability is the concept of “precision”, which is more focused to the actual results that a given computational model provides for a specific set of quantities, regardless of their potential agreement with experimental data. The aim of precise computational approach is to reduce the *computational* uncertainties of quantities extracted out of a well-defined model, and provide reference results, to which other computer codes employing the same model can be compared.

A recent, remarkable example of precision-driven initiative is provided by the DeltaCodes project<sup>1</sup>, where a grassroot community of code-owners struggled to extract well-defined computational results in the context of Density Functional Theory (DFT) calculations. Ground-State quantum mechanical quantities as lattice constants and bulk modulus of elementary crystals extracted from different codes were compared with each other, with the

objective of reducing the uncertainties on such data, and in some sense, to define a *calibration* procedure for a Solid-State Physics DFT code. Any other code able to extract the same quantities with the same approximations may be compared with the results of the community in order to assess its computational reliability.

For a theoretical approach that is based on numerical calculations, for which no analytic reference solution exists, reducing the computational uncertainty is the only possible way to shed light on the predictivity power of the model. In other terms, the “accuracy” of a result with respect to experimental data may be reliably quantified only when the computational uncertainty is guaranteed to be significantly lower than the found discrepancy. For communities like DFT, such a “calibration” of computer codes among each other is a discipline that is still in its infancy; the DeltaCodes initiative and the foundations of DFT are separated in time by more than 50 years, and the computational model employed in the comparison (the Perdew-Burke-Erzerhof functional<sup>2</sup>) has been introduced more than 20 years ago.

The problem is even more stringent for calculations that refer to quantities *beyond* ground state, like for instance the time-dependent density functional theory (TDDFT)<sup>3–5</sup>, from which quantities like optical excitations or polarizability tensors of a given system may be studied and put in relation with experimental data. Here also, a plethora of computational approaches exist, that employ different numerical formalism and basis sets, and it will be of great importance to identify quantities that can be “measured” in a given model, to assess and quan-

tify their computational uncertainty.

In this paper, we focus our attention to Linear-Response treatments of *molecular* systems, in particular referring to LR-TDDFT calculation. We will investigate the impact that *open* (i.e. Isolated) Boundary Conditions (BC) that have to be imposed to the system will have on the computational evaluation of LR quantities. In order to do this, we perform analytic considerations on the equations beyond LR treatment. Such considerations will enable us to distinguish quantities that *a priori* can be compared among different treatments - and therefore tested for reproducibility - from others that would *explicitly* depend of the employed computational treatment. In particular, we will discuss the interplay between reproducible LR quantities and the *locality* of the related objects.

The paper is organized as follows. Initially we will inspect how the question of reproducibility may be expressed for ground state calculations of molecules. Following these guidelines, we will then move to LR equations, by first considering the equations of motion of the response density operator, given the application of a perturbing field. Then we will consider the behavior of the “free oscillations”, i.e. the excited states of the molecule. Our considerations will also reveal useful for the understanding of the *analytic structure* of LR quantities like the linear susceptibility of the system (i.e. the reducible polarizability). We support our considerations with numerical results on simple LR-TDDFT quantities. For readability purposes, the details of each calculation are explained in Appendix C.

Although we refer, as anticipated, to TDDFT models, such considerations might also be transposed to Many-Body Perturbation Theory approaches, in the context of Quasi-Particle equations.

### A. Long range behavior of the eigenvalue solution of the Schrödinger equation

Let us start our discussion by revisiting the impact that the Isolated BC have on the solutions of the time-independent Schrödinger Equation. We here present well-known concepts of quantum mechanics, under a perspective that will turn out to be very useful in the forthcoming considerations about linear-response quantities.

Consider a (one-body) wavefunction  $|\psi\rangle$  solution of the equation  $\hat{H}|\psi\rangle = \epsilon|\psi\rangle$ , where we split the Hamiltonian operator into the sum of a kinetic  $\hat{T}$  and a potential  $\hat{V} \equiv \hat{H} - \hat{T}$  term. In view of analysing the impact of the BC, it is instructive to transform the Schrödinger equation in a scattering problem, by writing

$$|\psi\rangle = \hat{G}_{\hat{T}}(\epsilon) |\hat{V}\psi\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where we have introduced the Green function of the Helmholtz operator  $\hat{G}_{\hat{T}}(\epsilon) = (\epsilon - \hat{T})^{-1}$ , resolvent of the free-particle Hamiltonian  $H_s \equiv \hat{T}$ .

When describing the Ground State of a molecule, we suppose that the potential operator, even if non-local, can be effectively restricted on wavefunctions that can be considered as nonzero only on a bounded domain. In other terms, a molecule can be associated to a “scatterer” that has a *finite* spatial extension; if a state  $|\psi\rangle$  is localized, it will be the same for the ket  $|\hat{V}\psi\rangle$ , though perhaps in a larger region. For a computational analysis of the problem, this property is fundamental in the choice of the numerical treatment as we know that computational basis sets that are tailored to express asymptotically vanishing wavefunctions are better suited for the solution of the problem.

This fact is made apparent by the expression of the kernel of  $\hat{G}_{\hat{T}}(\epsilon)$  in the coordinate representation. When dealing with Isolated BC, it is easy to see that the solution of Eq. (1) can be expressed by:

$$\langle \mathbf{r} | \hat{G}_{\hat{T}}(\epsilon) | \mathbf{r}' \rangle = \frac{1}{4\pi} \begin{cases} \frac{e^{-\alpha|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}, & \text{for } \epsilon < 0 \\ \frac{e^{i\alpha|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}, & \text{for } \epsilon \geq 0 \end{cases}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha = \sqrt{2|\epsilon|}$ .

From the above expressions we can see that, for molecular systems, the value  $\epsilon = 0$  represents a *threshold*<sup>6</sup> energy that separates two different classes of solutions. Negative-energy solutions are *localized*, i.e. they exhibit bound-state behavior far away from the scatterer. These are bound states and, by means of their normalizability, they are associated to *discrete*, well-defined energies. The bound states can be of course labelled by quantum numbers that are defined by the properties of the scatterer, namely the symmetries of the potential  $\hat{V}$ . In a computational discretization of the Schrödinger equation, such states can be in principle expressed with arbitrary precision, provided that the numerical treatment offers the adequate level of completeness. Being discrete and well-identified, the bound-state energies are a property of the molecule and can be associated to *observable* quantities. The values of their energies can be compared among different treatments and it is in principle possible to provide reference results on them.

On the other hand, positive energy solutions behave differently. Even though the potential is localized, their positive energy are spherical waves and the convolution with the source term provides a delocalized wavefunction  $\psi(\mathbf{r})$  in the whole space. As they cannot be normalized they belong to the essential spectrum of the Hamiltonian operator and form a *continuum* of states. Outside of the support of the  $|\hat{V}\psi\rangle$  the solutions of Eq. (1) can be put in bijection with the eigenstates of the free-particle Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_s$ . For positive energies, the quantum numbers of the eigenstates are determined by the Laplacian operator, regardless of the particular features of the potential.

It is easy to see from these concepts that a computational treatment that is tailored for the discretization of bound states will not be as effective for continuum states, due to the different long-range asymptotic behavior - which in turn is a clear consequence of the BC of the

problem. In a numerical treatment, where we discretize the problem with a *finite* number of degrees of freedom, we will only have access to a *pseudo*-continuum of states, whose energy values and density of states will depend on the representation of the kinetic operator in the basis set. As a consequence, the set of eigenstates with  $\epsilon > 0$  expressed in a given computational setup depends on the features of the employed basis set.

A direct numerical evidence of this problem has been discussed in<sup>7</sup>, where the authors analyze the effects of a finite basis set on the occupied and virtual orbitals of a molecular system and establish a clear correspondence between the orbital localization character, and the independence of its energy with respect to the basis set. Furthermore, it is clearly shown that the energies of the unbound orbitals are not stable with respect to parameters like the size of the computational domain.

## II. FLUCTUATION STATES. A LOCALIZATION ARGUMENT FOR THE RESPONSE DENSITY

It is evident that the arguments presented above have a limited interest for the study of Ground State quantities of molecules. By definition, all these quantities can be expressed as a functional which *entirely* depends on bound states. As an illustration it is sufficient to recall the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem that states that the Ground-State (GS) energy is a functional of the GS charge density  $\hat{\rho}_0$ . For molecular systems that are electronically stable (i.e. no anionic or metastable configurations), such quantity is localized, in the sense of the above section. Stated otherwise, *there is no need to express efficiently any portion of the continuum spectrum* to have a reliable GS treatment of molecules.

Let us now inspect the case of LR calculations. In this framework one consider the unperturbed Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_0$  and assume that the GS density  $\hat{\rho}_0$  is accessible and expressed in a given computational treatment. The linear response formalism allows us to evaluate the modification of the expectation value of a generic observable induced by a time (or frequency)-dependent perturbing field  $\hat{\Phi}(\omega)$  acting on the system. This quantity, written in the frequency domain, can be expressed through the evaluation of the *linear response functional*

$$\langle \delta \hat{O} \rangle_{\Phi}(\omega) = \text{tr} \left( \hat{\rho}'_{\Phi}(\omega) \hat{O} \right), \quad (3)$$

where  $\hat{O}$  represents the observable<sup>8</sup> under inspection and we have introduced the *response density operator*  $\hat{\rho}'_{\Phi}(\omega)$  that codifies the modification of  $\hat{\rho}_0$  induced by the perturbation  $\hat{\Phi}(\omega)$ .

The response density operator is expressed as the first-order variation of  $\hat{\rho}_0 = \sum_{\{p\}} |\psi_p\rangle \langle \psi_p|$ , where the set  $\{|\psi_p\rangle\}$  denote the occupied states, *i.e.* the subset of the bound eigenstates<sup>9</sup> of  $\hat{H}_0$  with (negative) energy  $\epsilon_p$  lower than the Fermi level. Using this notation we denote the

energy of the HOMO level as  $\epsilon_h$  and identify the value of the first ionization potential with  $\text{IP} \equiv |\epsilon_h|$ .

The response density satisfies an equation of motion written in the form of a quantum Liouville operator (for example see<sup>10</sup>)

$$\left( \omega - \hat{\mathcal{L}} \right) \hat{\rho}'_{\Phi}(\omega) = \left[ \hat{\Phi}(\omega), \hat{\rho}_0 \right]. \quad (4)$$

The Liouvillian superoperator  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  for self-consistent systems is expressed as the sum of the unperturbed part  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0$  plus a coupling term  $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ . The action of these terms reads, respectively

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}} \hat{O} \equiv \left( \hat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \hat{\mathcal{K}} \right) \hat{O} = \left[ \hat{H}_0, \hat{O} \right] + \left[ \hat{V}'[\hat{O}], \hat{\rho}_0 \right], \quad (5)$$

where  $\hat{V}'[\hat{O}] \equiv \int d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \frac{\delta \hat{V}[\hat{\rho}_0]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')} O(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$  encodes the response of the  $\hat{\rho}$ -dependent potential to a modification of the density operator. The inspection of the linear order time evolution of the eigenstates of  $\hat{H}_0$  evidences that the response density acts as a transition operator, linking the occupied and empty subspaces of  $\hat{H}_0$ . An operator  $\hat{O}_{\perp}$  with this feature satisfy the *transverse* condition

$$\hat{O}_{\perp} \equiv \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{O} \hat{Q}_0 + \hat{Q}_0 \hat{O} \hat{\rho}_0, \quad (6)$$

where  $\hat{Q}_0 = \hat{1} - \hat{\rho}_0$  is the projector in empty subspace of  $\hat{H}_0$  (for more details see Appendix A). In other terms, the condition  $\hat{\rho}'_{\Phi} = \hat{\rho}'_{\Phi \perp}$  holds.

We can therefore introduce an explicit representation of the response density parametrized as

$$\hat{\rho}'_{\Phi}(\omega) = \sum_p \left( |\psi_p\rangle \langle f_p^{\Phi}(-\omega)| + |f_p^{\Phi}(\omega)\rangle \langle \psi_p| \right). \quad (7)$$

Here we have introduced the set of  $\omega$ -dependent *fluctuation states*  $|f_p^{\Phi}(\omega)\rangle = \hat{\rho}'_{\Phi}(\omega) |\psi_p\rangle$ , that have values in the unoccupied subspace of  $\hat{H}_0$ . An analysis of the Liouville equation (4) for the response density written in this fashion evidences that the equations of motion of fluctuation states (FS) are written as a modified Sternheimer equation<sup>11-13</sup>

$$\left[ \omega - (\hat{H}_0 - \epsilon_p) \right] |f_p^{\Phi}(\omega)\rangle = \hat{Q}_0 \left( \hat{\Phi}(\omega) + \hat{V}'[\hat{\rho}'_{\Phi}(\omega)] \right) |\psi_p\rangle, \quad (8)$$

and we observe that the first-order Hamiltonian contains, apart from the perturbing field, a further term  $\hat{V}'[\hat{\rho}'_{\Phi}]$  due to the density-dependence of  $\hat{H}_0$ . It is easy to see that the solution of equation (8) can be casted in the form of a set of scattering problems:

$$|f_p^{\Phi}(\omega)\rangle = \hat{G}_{\hat{T}}(\omega + \epsilon_p) \left( \hat{V} |f_p^{\Phi}(\omega)\rangle + |s_p^{\Phi}(\omega)\rangle \right), \quad (9)$$

with the state  $|s_p^{\Phi}(\omega)\rangle = \hat{Q}_0 \left( \hat{\Phi}(\omega) + \hat{V}'[\hat{\rho}'_{\Phi}(\omega)] \right) |\psi_p\rangle$  as a source term.

It can be seen that for each choice of  $p$ , the value  $\omega = |\epsilon_p|$  represents the threshold level that governs the localization properties of the FS. As a *stringent* hypothesis,




Figure 1: (Color online) Convergence of the static polarizability  $\alpha_{zz}$  (blue continuous line) and of the ground state dipole  $d_z$  (red dotted line) of  $CO$  molecule as a function of the size of the computational domain. The inset evidences the relative convergence (in percent) of the two quantities w.r.t. the corresponding value associated to the largest box.

let us now assume that the source term  $|s_p^\Phi(\omega)\rangle$  is localized, *i.e.* its evaluation can be restricted on a bounded real-space domain. Even when such locality argument holds true, for  $\omega > |\epsilon_p|$ , the Helmholtz kernel behaves as a spherical wave and gives raise to a  $|f_p^\Phi(\omega)\rangle$  which is *delocalized* in the entire real-space domain. Such delocalization is an intrinsic consequence of the value of  $\omega$ , and does not depend on the particular choice of  $\Phi$ . Only for  $\omega < |\epsilon_p|$  the kernel contains an exponential damping factor and  $|f_p^\Phi(\omega)\rangle$  exhibits a bound-state behavior in the long range, once again provided that the above locality arguments on  $|s_p^\Phi(\omega)\rangle$  – hence on  $\hat{V}'$  and  $\Phi$  – are valid.

Such locality property of the fluctuation state can be directly confirmed for static perturbations at  $\omega = 0$ . Let us consider a static perturbing operator  $\hat{\Phi}_s$  that can be restricted to a finite domain. Any local operator, like *e.g.* a static electric field  $\mathbf{F}$ , with associated scalar potential  $\Phi_s[\mathbf{F}](\mathbf{r}) = -\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{r}$ , would satisfy such property. We consider the perturbed Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_0[\hat{\rho}_{\Phi_s}] + \hat{\Phi}_s[\mathbf{F}]$ , where  $\hat{\rho}_{\Phi_s}$  represents the GS density of the perturbed system, and assume that the perturbation strength ( $|\mathbf{F}|$  in the above example) is sufficiently small to be consistent with a LR treatment of the problem. In this case, the occupied eigenfunction  $|\psi_p^{\Phi_s}\rangle$  of the perturbed Hamiltonian can be extracted with traditional GS techniques, as from the discussion around Eq. (1), they exhibit bound-state behavior.

From the linearized Schrödinger Equation of the perturbed problem, it is easy to see that the FS at  $\omega = 0$  can be expressed in terms of the corresponding bound state of the perturbed Hamiltonian, *i.e.*  $|f_p^{\Phi_s}(0)\rangle \simeq \hat{Q}_0 |\psi_p^{\Phi_s}\rangle$ . For any value of  $p$ , the locality of the  $|f_p^{\Phi_s}(0)\rangle$  therefore directly stems from the bound-state behavior of  $|\psi_p^{\Phi_s}\rangle$ .

As  $\omega = 0$  is by hypothesis lower than any of the  $|\epsilon_p|$ , this is consistent with the above considerations.

Thanks to such observations one can express quantities like the static polarizability tensor  $\alpha_{ij}$  (see *e.g.*<sup>14</sup>) from GS calculations of the perturbed Hamiltonian. By expressing the induced dipole  $\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{r}} \rangle_{\Phi_s}$  in the form Eq. (3), and identifying the static response density as  $\hat{\rho}'_{\Phi_s}(0) = \hat{\rho}_{\Phi_s} - \hat{\rho}_0$ , we have

$$\alpha_{ij} = -\frac{1}{F_j} \left( \text{tr} (\hat{r}_i \hat{\rho}_{\Phi_s}[F_j]) - d_i^{(GS)} \right), \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathbf{d}^{(GS)}$  is the ground state dipole. Fig. (1) illustrates this procedure for a  $CO$  molecule perturbed by a static electric field. Care has been taken in keeping the field strengths  $F_j$  small enough to preserve the validity of the linear response regime. The local character of the fluctuation states at  $\omega = 0$  is probed by verifying the convergence of the static polarizability versus the size of the computational domain used to express the fluctuation states. The convergence rate is compared with the one of the static dipole of the molecule computed at zero external field. The results evidence that the typical sizes of  $|f_p^\Phi(0)\rangle$  are analogous to the ones of the unperturbed KS orbitals, which is a direct proof of the bound-state behaviour of the FS.

### A. Strong and weak convergence

The analysis described above has shown that the building blocks of the response density  $\{|f_p(\omega)\rangle\}$  are susceptible to exhibit bound-state long-range behavior *only* when  $\omega < |\epsilon_p|$ , while they behave as unbound states for values of  $\omega$  above the threshold levels. This fact has interesting implications in the evaluation of LR quantities. Indeed, writing the response density in terms of FS implies that

$$\langle \delta \hat{O} \rangle_{\Phi}(\omega) = 2\text{Re} \left( \sum_p \langle \psi_p | \hat{O} | f_p^\Phi(\omega) \rangle \right). \quad (11)$$

Let us suppose that also the observable of interest  $\hat{O}$  exhibits the locality properties introduced for the potentials  $\hat{V}$ ,  $\hat{\Phi}$  and  $\hat{V}'$ . Once again, it would be enough to consider a local operator for this condition to be met.

We observe that there exists two distinct regimes, on the basis of value of  $\omega$ . The first one, which we will refer to as the *below threshold* regime, is realized when  $\omega$  is lower than the ionization potential  $|\epsilon_h|$ . In this case all the FS are below their threshold level and equation (11) is expressed in terms of genuinely localized quantities. At these frequencies, the linear response functional  $\langle \delta \hat{O} \rangle_{\Phi}(\omega)$  may thus be evaluated with computational setups that are similar to the ones usually employed for GS calculations. The convergence in this regime is “strong”, in the sense that the basis functions employed enables us to express with arbitrary precision *both* the states  $|\psi_p\rangle$  and  $|f_p^\Phi(\omega)\rangle$ . This is of course true even when the above

states are only implicitly expressed by the employed LR treatment, as e.g. in the case of Krylov spaces generated from the states  $|\hat{\Phi}(\omega)\psi_p\rangle$ <sup>10,15,16</sup>.

On the contrary, the computation of the linear response functional can be much more demanding in the *above threshold regime*, realized for  $\omega > |\epsilon_h|$ , in which fluctuation states start behaving as unbound wave functions. As by hypothesis  $|\hat{O}\psi_p\rangle$  is bound-state like, *only* the scalar products of Eq. (11) can be evaluated in a localized domain. In this case a computational description of fluctuation states is only meaningful in “weak” sense, where the bound state character of  $\{\langle\psi_p|\hat{O}\rangle\}$  behaves as a regulator. This is naturally achieved in the above mentioned Krylov space treatments, which explicitly deal with the expression of the scalar products. However it is important that the underlying basis set is able to express delocalised states.

These considerations prove why, when a given computer code employs established GS numerical techniques, *it is much easier to converge LR quantities for  $\omega$  below IP*. Above the IP threshold, a computational setup provides a reliable assessment of (11) only if it is able (even implicitly) to express an unbiased description of the fluctuation states in the support of  $\{\langle\psi_p|\hat{O}\rangle\}$ . The non-vanishing spherical-wave behavior in the long range of  $|f_p^\Phi(\omega)|$  is therefore responsible of this convergence difficulties, especially for high frequencies. The IP threshold has an evident physical interpretation: for energies in a range higher than the ionization potential, localized and delocalized states might be coupled by the perturbation. Obtaining convergence of the observable quantities at these energies is therefore much more challenging if one employs numerical techniques which were originally tailored for GS calculations.

As an example in support of these arguments we compare the absorption spectrum of a *CO* molecule computed in three distinct real-space computational setups, which differs for the dimension of the computational domain. Results reported in figure 2 evidences a typical behavior: the curves are almost coincident in the below threshold regime, whereas the effect of the computational setup are clearly visible for values of  $\omega$  that exceed the threshold value. For these high-frequency regions, convergence might be reached for domains of much larger sizes than what presented here<sup>10</sup>, which are – as already noticed – more than sufficient below threshold.

### III. EXCITATION OPERATORS. THE ANALYTIC STRUCTURE OF THE SUSCEPTIBILITY FUNCTIONAL

In view of reproducibility, the scalar product of Eq. (3), defining the observable fluctuation, may be compared among various numerical treatments. However, even though directly related to experimental results, such quantity is not by itself a property of the molecule, as it is a function of  $\omega$  that explicitly depends on the perturba-




Figure 2: (Color online) Illustrative LR absorption spectra of the *CO* molecule in computational setups with different sizes of the simulation domain. The value of the IP threshold is indicated by a vertical dashed line.

tion operator  $\hat{\Phi}$ , not to mention the target observable  $\hat{O}$ . Alternatively, we may consider only the fluctuation state, but it is still a  $\hat{\Phi}$ -dependent wavefunction, with a potential local behavior only for  $\omega$  below the ionization threshold. Hence, comparing fluctuation states among diverse numerical treatments would be a challenging task.

It is therefore much more interesting to concentrate on LR quantities that are defined independently from the perturbing operators and target observables. This can be achieved by studying the *susceptibility functional*, defined implicitly through the operator equation

$$\hat{\rho}'(\omega) = (\omega - \mathcal{L})^{-1} \left[ \hat{\Phi}(\omega), \hat{\rho}_0 \right] = \hat{\chi}(\omega) \hat{\Phi}(\omega). \quad (12)$$

The susceptibility (super)operator  $\chi(\omega)$  is therefore closely related to the resolvent of the Liouvillian of Eq. (4), which is completely defined from the molecule Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_0[\hat{\rho}]$ . The “excitation modes” of the molecule are defined through the *excitation operators*, satisfying

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}\hat{E}_a = \Omega_a\hat{E}_a \quad \hat{E}_a\hat{\mathcal{L}} = \Omega_a\hat{E}_a, \quad (13)$$

together with the operator orthonormalization condition

$$\text{tr} \left( \hat{E}_a \hat{E}_b \right) = \delta_{ab}. \quad (14)$$

Excitations defined in that way may be considered as a basis of the operators that satisfy the transverse condition as in Eq. (6), and enable us to express the susceptibility as a spectral decomposition:

$$\hat{\chi}(\omega) = \sum_{\{a\}} \hat{E}_a \frac{\text{tr} \left( \left[ \hat{E}_a, \hat{\rho}_0 \right] \right)}{\omega - \Omega_a}. \quad (15)$$

### A. The analytic structure of linear susceptibility

Each excitation “mode” of the system  $\hat{E}_a$  with energy  $\Omega_a$ , can be associated to a set of states  $\{\phi_p^a, \chi_p^a\}_{p \in a}$ , entirely defined in the unoccupied subspace. In this way we can parametrize, without loss of generality, the excitation operators of the system as:

$$\hat{E}_a = \sum_p (|\phi_p^a\rangle \langle \psi_p| + |\psi_p\rangle \langle \chi_p^a|) ,$$

$$\hat{E}_a = [\hat{\rho}_0, \hat{E}_a^t] = \sum_p (|\psi_p\rangle \langle \phi_p^a| - |\chi_p^a\rangle \langle \psi_p|) . \quad (16)$$

For each choice of  $\{\phi_p^a, \chi_p^a\}_{p \in a}$ , these objects represent, respectively, the state in which  $|\psi_p\rangle$  is excited – or from whom it decays – when the system is subject to the *monochromatic* perturbation  $\hat{\Phi}_a \equiv [\hat{\rho}_0, \hat{E}_a]$ . We denote with the shorthand  $p \in a$  the fact that the sum of Eq. (16) is in general restricted only to a  $a$ -dependent subset of the occupied orbitals, depending on the particular symmetry of the excitation. Excited states satisfy the normalization condition

$$\sum_p ((\langle \phi_p^a | \phi_p^b \rangle - \langle \chi_p^b | \chi_p^a \rangle) = \delta_{ab} . \quad (17)$$

By applying (13) to the above parametrization of the excitations, we obtain the following Sternheimer-like equations for the excited states:

$$\begin{aligned} [\Omega_a - (\hat{H}_0 - \epsilon_p)] |\phi_p^a\rangle &= \hat{Q}_0 \hat{V}' [\hat{E}_a] |\psi_p\rangle , \\ \langle \chi_p^a | [-\Omega_a - (\hat{H}_0 - \epsilon_p)] &= \langle \psi_p | \hat{V}' [\hat{E}_a] \hat{Q}_0 . \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

By writing these equations in a basis set of virtual states we obtain the well-known Casida’s eigenvalue equation<sup>17</sup> associated to the excitation energy  $\Omega_a$  (see appendix B). The spectrum is symmetric w.r.t the inversion of the eigenvalues  $\Omega_a \rightarrow -\Omega_a$  and the associated excitation with negative energy are described by the transposed pair  $\{\chi_p^a, \phi_p^a\}$ . We concentrate our analysis on the sector of positive energies, i.e.  $\Omega_a > 0$ .

With the same spirit of the previous sections, we present a formal solution of (18) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_p^a\rangle &= \hat{G}_{\hat{T}}(\Omega_a + \epsilon_p) \left( \hat{V} |\phi_p^a\rangle + |s_p[\hat{E}_a]\rangle \right) , \\ \langle \chi_p^a | &= \left( \langle \chi_p^a | \hat{V} + \langle s_p[\hat{E}_a] | \right) \hat{G}_{\hat{T}}(-\Omega_a + \epsilon_p) , \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the source terms are here defined as:

$$|s_p[\hat{O}]\rangle = \hat{Q}_0 \hat{V}' [\hat{O}] |\psi_p\rangle , \quad \langle s_p[\hat{O}] | = \langle \psi_p | \hat{V}' [\hat{O}] \hat{Q}_0 .$$

We first point out that the Helmholtz kernel associated to the  $|\chi_p^a\rangle$  state contains an exponential damping factor for *all* the positive values of  $\Omega_a$ . The asymptotic long-range behavior of  $|\chi_p^a\rangle$  thus depends only on the locality properties of  $\langle s_p[\hat{E}_a] |$ , which in turn is related to the behavior of the operator  $\hat{V}'[\hat{E}_a]$ .




Figure 3: Excitation landscape. Excitations are split in horizontal line according to the threshold levels  $p$ . Filled bullets refer to localized excitations whereas the thick black lines describe delocalized ones belonging a continuum spectrum.

On the other hand, the long-range behavior of  $\hat{G}_{\hat{T}}(\Omega_a + \epsilon_p)$  depends from  $\Omega_a$ , with a threshold of value  $\Omega_a = |\epsilon_p|$ . For energies above this value, the behavior of the state  $|\phi_p^a\rangle$  is delocalized regardless of the particular nature of the operators  $\hat{V}$  and  $\hat{V}'$ . This means that, if an excitation operator  $\hat{E}_a$  has an energy such that  $\Omega_a > |\epsilon_p|$  for at least one of the  $p \in a$  defining the excitation, such operator *cannot* be parametrized by employing localized states only.

As a consequence, we deduce that a molecular excitation *may* be expressed in terms of localized states *only* when its energy is lower than *all* the ionization potentials of the occupied states participating to the excitation, namely if  $\Omega_a < |\epsilon_p| \forall p \in a$ . This will only be true if the operator  $\hat{V}'[\hat{E}_a]$  can be restricted to localized kets and bras. If any of these hypothesis does not hold, the excitations of the systems are defined via genuinely delocalized wavefunctions. Furthermore, excited states are subjected to the orthonormalization condition (17) that acts as a ulterior constraint and has the effect of determining the *quantization* of the energy levels  $\Omega_a$  associated to the bound-state-like objects. For delocalized states, as in the case of the continuum states of  $\hat{H}_0$ , such a condition has to be interpreted in distributional sense and does not lead to quantization of  $\Omega_a$ . Thus we can conclude that all the states  $|\chi_p^a\rangle$  and the  $|\phi_p^a\rangle$  with  $\Omega_a$  below the threshold value constitute – if localized – a genuine *discrete* set, while the ones in the unbound energy range behaves as generalized eigenvectors associated to a continuum spectrum.

The susceptibility functional has therefore a peculiar analytic structure, that is made of multiple threshold energies, one for each of the ionization potentials associated to the occupied states. If an excitation  $\hat{E}_a$  has an energy  $\Omega_a < |\epsilon_a|$  with  $\epsilon_a = \max(\epsilon_p)_{p \in a}$ , it may belong to a discrete spectrum; otherwise it *has* to belong to a con-

tinuum of states. The typical structure of the excitation landscape is depicted in figure 3, once again assuming a reasonable behavior of the perturbed potential  $\hat{V}'$ . Below the first ionization energy  $|\epsilon_h|$  only localized excitations are present. Conversely, in the intermediate energy interval that extends from  $|\epsilon_h|$  to the absolute value of the deepest occupied orbital, other discrete excitations may exist, and are embedded in a continuum of delocalized excitations. For energies higher than  $|\epsilon_1|$  no localized excitations are anymore possible, regardless of the particular behavior of  $\hat{V}'$ : the excitation landscape in this region only contains continuum states.

### B. Observable features of the excitation spectrum

The analysis of the above section reveals that the excitation spectrum is composed by two distinct sectors. The first one is realized by the (finite) set of localized excitations with discrete eigenvalues. Borrowing the terminology introduced in section I A to the present case, we can affirm that such localized excitations behave as *observable* quantities and the associated energies possess ideal features of reproducibility: if the numerical basis employed is complete enough to represent the states  $\{\phi_p^a, \chi_p^a\}$ , the energy  $\Omega_a$  converges to its reference value.

The second sector contains a continuum spectrum of delocalized excitations. The associated states  $|\phi_p^a\rangle$  behave as the unbound virtual orbitals analyzed in<sup>7</sup> and are deeply affected by the computational setup used to represent them. In particular, the presence of a finite computational domain implies a fictitious discretization of the excitation levels and the associated spectrum exhibits an explicit dependence from the size of the domain. Excitations belonging to this sector thus lose their intrinsic physical meaning and have to be understood simply as a representation of the density of states (DOS) of the Liouvillian superoperator.

In Fig. 4 and 5b we plot the DOS of the Liouvillian for the *CO* and Benzene molecules, for two different numerical setups of increasing size of the simulation domain. The figures show clearly that all the excitations of energy  $\Omega_a$  lying below the molecule ionization potential (IP) have a localized behavior, as their energy does not vary with the size of the simulation domain. On the other hand, above the first ionization threshold the excitations have an energy that strongly depends on the computational setup, which is in line with the expected pseudo-continuum character of this sector. In addition, for the benzene molecule it is also possible to identify excitations of energy above IP that still possess a localized behavior, fulfilling the condition  $\Omega_a < |\epsilon_a|$ . In Fig. 5a we collect the excitations of the benzene molecule following this criterion: the agreement with the expected analytic structure presented in Fig. 3 is remarkable.




Figure 4: (Color online) DOS of *CO* excitation energies  $\Omega_a$ . The two curves correspond to two computational domain of different sizes. The inset contains the sole contribution of localized excitations. The first IP threshold is depicted as the vertical dashed line.

### C. Physical relevance of the continuum sector

We have presented formal arguments, confirmed by numerical calculations, that show that the excitations belonging to the discrete sector of the spectrum have energies that can be *quantitatively* compared between codes, thanks to their localized character. Such objects are LR quantities, associated to the molecule, whose numerical convergence can be found by employing techniques which can be borrowed from the ones adopted for GS calculations. Being expressed by localized excited states, computational setups with sufficient level of completeness are able to express with high *precision* such section of the excitation spectrum.

We have also seen in Sec. II that there exist a sector where the fluctuation states are genuinely localized, thereby presenting reproducibility features. Therefore, knowing that  $|f_p^\Phi(\omega)\rangle = \hat{\chi}(\omega)\hat{\Phi}(\omega)|\psi_p\rangle$ , it would be interesting to obtain information on whether the discrete, localized sector of the excitations which appear in the spectral decomposition of  $\hat{\chi}(\omega)$  will be sufficient to express a localized FS. Considering Eq. (12) and expressing the spectral decomposition of the linear susceptibility we find:

$$|f_p^\Phi(\omega)\rangle = |f_p^\Phi(\omega)^D\rangle + |f_p^\Phi(\omega)^C\rangle, \quad (20)$$


with

$$|f_p^\Phi(\omega)^D\rangle = \sum_a^{\Omega_a < |\epsilon_a|} |w_p^a\rangle \frac{\varphi_p^a[\hat{\Phi}(\omega)]}{\omega^2 - \Omega_a^2},$$


$$|f_p^\Phi(\omega)^C\rangle = \int_{\Omega_a > |\epsilon_a|} da |w_p^a\rangle \frac{\varphi_p^a[\hat{\Phi}(\omega)]}{\omega^2 - \Omega_a^2},$$

where  $\varphi_p^a[\hat{\Phi}(\omega)] \equiv \langle \psi_p | \hat{\Phi}(\omega) | w_p^a \rangle$ , and  $|w_p^a\rangle = |\phi_p^a\rangle + |\chi_p^a\rangle$ .

In the above equation we have explicitly separated the contributions of the discrete (*D*) and continuous (*C*) exci-



(a) Excitation landscape



(b) DOS of Excitation energies

Figure 5: (Color online) Benzene molecule. (a): Excitation Landscape: the excitations have been separated in discrete and continuum sector following the criteria of Sec. 3. (b): DOS of excitation energies  $\Omega_a$ . The first IP threshold is depicted as the vertical dashed line.

tations in the spectral decomposition (12). The summation and the integration run only on the positive values of  $\Omega_a$ . The states  $|w_p^a\rangle$  that appear in the discrete sum or in the integral are genuinely localized and delocalized, respectively. For *any* value of  $\omega$  the ket  $|f_p^\Phi(\omega)^D\rangle$  has, by definition, a bound-state like character as it is expressed as a sum of localized contributions. For  $\omega < \text{IP}$ , the equivalence of the Sternheimer formalism with the spectral representation of the LR susceptibility implies that the integral defining  $|f_p^\Phi(\omega)^C\rangle$  should resum into a localized, asymptotically vanishing state<sup>18</sup>.

We may then decompose the linear response functional of Eq. (3) for any operator  $\hat{O}$  as  $\langle \delta \hat{O} \rangle_\Phi = \langle \delta \hat{O} \rangle_\Phi^D + \langle \delta \hat{O} \rangle_\Phi^C$ , where

$$\langle \delta \hat{O} \rangle_\Phi^{D,C}(\omega) = 2\text{Re} \left( \langle \psi_p | \hat{O} | f_p^\Phi(\omega)^{D,C} \rangle \right). \quad (21)$$

For instance, the static polarizability tensor  $\alpha_{ij}$  can be




Figure 6: (Color online) Convergence of the static polarizability  $\alpha_{zz}$  of the *CO* molecule, in a box of 11.5 Ångström, w.r.t the excitations considered in the integral of Eq. (22). The reference value obtained from Eq. (10) is represented as a horizontal red dashed line. The value of the IP energy is indicated by a vertical black dashed line. For each excitation energy, the values of the oscillator strengths  $w_{zz}^a$  of Eq. (22) are also plotted.

easily expressed from the above quantities as

$$\alpha_{ij} = \int da \frac{w_{ij}^a}{\Omega_a^2}, \quad w_{ij}^a \equiv \sum_{p \in a} \varphi_p^a[\hat{r}_i] \varphi_p^a[\hat{r}_j]. \quad (22)$$

Such value can be straightforwardly compared with results of Eq. (10), where the localized FS is obtained from GS techniques as described in Sec. II. This is the well-know  $S_{-2}$  sum-rule (see e.g.<sup>19</sup>), that express the value of the static polarizability in terms of the molecule's oscillator strengths.

In Fig. 6 we show explicitly such a comparison in the case of the *CO* molecule. We notice that a considerable number of pseudo-continuum excitations is required to find the correct result; the sector of the discrete excitations, even though parametrised by localized, observable (in the sense of reproducible) excited states, appears to be largely insufficient to express the reference fluctuation state. Its contribution is even negligible w.r.t. the one coming from the continuum sector.

Hence, contrary to GS, *for LR calculation, even when the response density is localized, the contribution coming from the continuum sector of the excitations can never be neglected*. In other terms, we *cannot* exclude that a fluctuation state, even if genuinely localized, will have a nonzero projection in the essential part of the Liouvillian spectrum. This fact shows that it is *impossible* to restrict the spectral representation of  $\chi(\omega)$  only localized, discrete, *code-independent* excitations, even for representing LR results in the  $\omega = 0$  limit.

Such considerations are independent on the number of atoms of the molecule, as the range in  $\omega$  needed to achieve satisfactory agreement is largely above the last valence ionization threshold, which is a intensive quantity. In addition, we can see that the  $S_{-2}$  sum-rule *cannot* be

used to assess the correctness of  $\chi(\omega)$  for values of  $\omega$  above IP; it is enough to recall the strong dependency on the box size of the absorption spectra of Fig. 4. For all these computational setups, the  $S_{-2}$  sum rule is, on the contrary, perfectly satisfied.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

By analysing the fundamental equations of LR calculations of molecules, we have shown that the response density for values of  $\omega$  above the first IP *have* to be expressed in terms of genuinely delocalized states. Below this threshold, under reasonable assumptions on the perturbing operators, the perturbed density operator is genuinely localized. In this localized regime, it is possible to achieve convergence of the numerical result by increasing the basis completeness in the same spirit of GS calculations. One might expect that more complete basis will give more precise results, regardless of their asymptotic behavior. A comparison among various codes in view of reproducibility should therefore be performed initially in this regime.

The situation is not so simple in the above-threshold regime. In this case what is important is the matrix element of the observable of interest between the bound, occupied state and the fluctuation state (FS). The FS is here an unbound, delocalized function, and a numerical treatment tailored for localized functions will *never* be able to discretise such function with arbitrary accuracy. To achieve numerical convergence, care should be taken in expressing accurately the FS on the appropriate region of space. In view of reproducibility, computational setups which are able to express precisely delocalized states seem more interesting in this regime.

Such point of view have also enabled us to shed light on the analytic structure of the linear susceptibility, which is an intrinsic property of the molecule and does not depend on the perturbing fields. In particular, we have concentrated our interest in its spectral representation in terms of “free oscillation” (i.e. excitations) of the system. We have found that *not all* the excitations have to be considered on equal footing. As the excitation spectrum has several energy thresholds, one per quasi-particle IP, there is a sector of *discrete, localized* excitations – whose energies are below the corresponding threshold – which can be compared among different computational treatments. Their energies are *true* poles of the linear susceptibility, the excited states being their residues. We can *quantify* the reliability of such discrete energies, as the corresponding excited states may be discretized with arbitrary accuracy on a localized region.

On the other hand, the excitation energies which lie above these thresholds are only pseudo-poles of  $\chi(\omega)$ , and will *strongly* depend on the computational setup. This is visible for energies higher than IP, and it has been pointed out several times (see e.g.<sup>12,13</sup>) in the literature. These excitations belong to a continuum sector

that embeds the above mentioned discrete excitations. We remark that we are not referring here to the continuum eigenstates of the unperturbed GS Hamiltonian, but to the continuum of excitations expressed as eigenstate of the Liouvillian superoperator of Eq. (5), needed to express the spectral representation of the linear susceptibility.

Both the sectors of the excitations energies have to be considered in view of the extraction of computationally reliable quantities, and this *even below* the first IP. For generic LR quantities, which are functionals of the linear susceptibility, the quality of the  $\chi(\omega)$  (super)operator will depend on the frequency  $\omega$  of interest: a given spectral representation may provide high-quality results for static  $\omega = 0$  regimes, while being unable to provide convergence for high-energy absorption spectra. On the contrary, absorption spectra below IP are relatively easy to converge, as they are observables which depend only on localized quantities.

We believe that these considerations, based on simple manipulations on the fundamental LR equations, will help in increase the reliability of LR calculations in the community, and in building test-sets that would help in the *calibration* of present and future computer codes, thereby increasing the predictivity of present-day theoretical approaches. The example of the static polarizability of molecules presents ideal features as an initial playground. Work is ongoing in this direction.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Thierry Deutsch for useful comments on the manuscript.

#### Appendix A: Transverse operators and right action of the Liouvillian superoperator

Given a unperturbed Hamiltonian and density operator, which satisfy  $[\hat{H}_0, \hat{\rho}_0] = 0$ , we may decompose a generic operator in two contributions,  $\hat{O} = \hat{O}_{\parallel} + \hat{O}_{\perp}$ , defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{O}_{\parallel} &\equiv \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{O} \hat{\rho}_0 + \hat{Q}_0 \hat{O} \hat{Q}_0, \\ \hat{O}_{\perp} &\equiv \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{O} \hat{Q}_0 + \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{O} \hat{Q}_0 = \left[ \hat{\rho}_0, \left[ \hat{\rho}_0, \hat{O} \right] \right],\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A1})$$

with  $\hat{Q}_0 = \hat{\mathbb{I}} - \hat{\rho}_0$ . The operator  $\hat{O}_{\parallel}$  is constructed to satisfy  $[\hat{\rho}_0, \hat{O}_{\parallel}] = [\hat{H}_0, \hat{O}_{\parallel}] = 0$ . Also, it is easy to verify that given two generic  $\hat{O}, \hat{O}'$ , we have  $\text{tr}(\hat{O}'_{\parallel} \hat{O}_{\perp}) = 0$ .

The projection  $\hat{O}_{\perp}$  is therefore the relevant part for the commutator:

$$\left[ \hat{\rho}_0, \hat{O} \right] = \left[ \hat{\rho}_0, \hat{O}_{\perp} \right] = \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{O} \hat{Q}_0 - \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{O} \hat{Q}_0. \quad (\text{A2})$$

The Liouvillian superoperator is therefore constructed such as  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}\hat{O} = \hat{\mathcal{L}}O_{\perp}$ . In addition, the image operator satisfies the transverse condition  $(\hat{\mathcal{L}}\hat{O})_{\parallel} = 0$ .

Here  $\hat{V}'$ , which expresses the perturbation induced by the density dependence on ground state Hamiltonian, can be conveniently expressed by defining the *scalar coupling kernel*

$$U[\hat{O}; \hat{O}'] \equiv \int d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}' \text{tr} \left( \hat{O} \frac{\delta \hat{V}[\hat{\rho}_0]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')} \right) \text{tr} (\hat{O}' |\mathbf{r}\rangle \langle \mathbf{r}'|), \quad (\text{A3})$$

on the basis of which

$$\hat{V}'[\hat{O}] = \int d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}' U[|\mathbf{r}\rangle \langle \mathbf{r}'|; \hat{O}] |\mathbf{r}'\rangle \langle \mathbf{r}|. \quad (\text{A4})$$

We notice here in passing that in general  $\hat{V}'[\hat{O}_{\perp}] \neq \hat{V}'[\hat{O}]$ . We assume nonetheless that the scalar coupling kernel is symmetric, i.e.  $U[\hat{O}; \hat{O}'] = U[\hat{O}'; \hat{O}]$ , which is a condition generally satisfied in DFT Hamiltonians.

The action from the right of  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  can be assessed through the equivalence  $\text{tr}(\hat{O}'(\hat{\mathcal{L}}\hat{O})) = \text{tr}((\hat{O}'\hat{\mathcal{L}})\hat{O}_{\perp})$ , which implies that also  $(\hat{O}'\hat{\mathcal{L}})_{\parallel} = 0$ . We obtain:

$$\hat{O}\hat{\mathcal{L}} = -[\hat{H}_0, \hat{O}] + \int d\mathbf{r}d\mathbf{r}' U[[\hat{\rho}_0, \hat{O}]; |\mathbf{r}'\rangle \langle \mathbf{r}|] (|\mathbf{r}\rangle \langle \mathbf{r}'|)_{\perp}.$$

With this definition it is explicitly apparent that  $\hat{O}\hat{\mathcal{L}} = \hat{O}_{\perp}\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ , similarly to the left action. The action of the Liouvillian reads

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{O}\hat{\mathcal{L}} = & -[\hat{H}_0, \hat{O}] + (V'[[\hat{\rho}_0, \hat{O}]])_{\perp} = -[\hat{H}_0, \hat{O}] + \\ & + \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{V}'[[\hat{\rho}_0, \hat{O}]] \hat{Q}_0 + \hat{Q}_0 \hat{V}'[[\hat{\rho}_0, \hat{O}]] \hat{\rho}_0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

In the last equivalence we have made usage of the transverse property (see equation (6)) of the coupling superoperator. The above formulae together with Eq. (5) are the starting point for the solution of the eigenvalues equations (13).

## Appendix B: Casida equations

We show that Casida equations are equivalent to the equations of motion for the excited states (18). To this aim we introduce an explicit basis  $\{|s\rangle\}$  in the subspace of empty states so that both  $|\phi_p^a\rangle$  and  $\langle \chi_p^a|$  can be represented as

$$|\phi_p^a\rangle = \sum_s X_{ps}^a |s\rangle, \quad \langle \chi_p^a| = \sum_s \langle s| Y_{ps}^a. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Plugging this expansion into equations (18) and projecting on a arbitrary element of the basis provides a linear

systems of equations for the coefficients  $X_{ps}^a$  and  $Y_{ps}^a$ , namely

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s'} (H_{0ss'} - \epsilon_p \delta_{ss'}) X_{ps'}^a + \langle s| \hat{V}'[\hat{E}_a] |\psi_p\rangle &= \Omega_a X_{ps}^a, \\ - \sum_{s'} (H_{0s's} - \epsilon_p \delta_{ss'}) Y_{ps'}^a - \langle \psi_p| \hat{V}'[\hat{E}_a] |s\rangle &= \Omega_a Y_{ps}^a. \end{aligned}$$

Using this basis, excitation operators are expressed as a linear combination of transition operators  $\hat{e}_{ps} \equiv |s\rangle \langle \psi_p|$  and  $\hat{d}_{sp} \equiv |\psi_p\rangle \langle s|$ , as follows

$$\hat{E}_a = \sum_{ps} \hat{e}_{ps} X_{ps}^a + \hat{d}_{sp} Y_{ps}^a. \quad (\text{B2})$$

The contribution of the coupling operator in the equations of motion of excited states can be expressed by means of the coupling kernel (A3) as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s| \hat{V}'[\hat{E}_a] |\psi_p\rangle &= \sum_{qs'} \left( U[\hat{d}_{sp}; \hat{e}_{qs'}] X_{qs'}^a + U[\hat{d}_{sp}; \hat{d}_{s'q}] Y_{qs'}^a \right), \\ \langle \psi_p| \hat{V}'[\hat{E}_a] |s\rangle &= \sum_{qs'} \left( U[\hat{e}_{ps}; \hat{e}_{qs'}] X_{qs'}^a + U[\hat{e}_{ps}; \hat{d}_{s'q}] Y_{qs'}^a \right), \end{aligned}$$

Given that we employ real functions both for  $p$  and  $s$  is real we also have  $\hat{e}_{ps}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \hat{d}_{sp}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r})$  and the density operator is symmetric in  $\mathbf{r} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{r}'$ . These conditions applied together imply that  $U[\hat{e}_{ps}; \hat{e}_{qs'}] = U[\hat{d}_{sp}; \hat{d}_{s'q}]$ , as well as  $U[\hat{d}_{sp}; \hat{e}_{qs'}] = U[\hat{e}_{ps}; \hat{d}_{s'q}]$ , and so equations (18) can be recasted in matrix form

$$\sum_{qs'} \begin{pmatrix} F_{ps}^{qs'} & D_{ps}^{qs'} \\ -D_{ps}^{qs'} & -F_{ps}^{qs'} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_{qs'}^a \\ Y_{qs'}^a \end{pmatrix} = \Omega_a \begin{pmatrix} X_{ps}^a \\ Y_{ps}^a \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B3})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_{pp}^{q\eta} &= (H_{0p\eta} - \epsilon_p \delta_{p\eta}) \delta_{pq} + U[\hat{d}_{pp}; \hat{e}_{q\eta}], \\ D_{pp}^{q\eta} &= U[\hat{d}_{pp}; \hat{d}_{\eta q}]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

This is the well-known Casida Equation in the basis of transitions for the excitation of energy  $\Omega_a$ . The computational reliability of the eigenvalue  $\Omega_a$  depends on the capability of the basis set  $|s\rangle$  to fulfill of Eq. (B1). Note that this may be valid only for a subset of the solutions of the eigenproblem (B3).

## Appendix C: Computational details

The illustrative calculations presented in this paper are all KS-DFT calculations at the LDA level of theory. We employed the BigDFT code<sup>20</sup>, which employs Daubechies Wavelets as computational basis set. Such orthonormal basis presents optimal features of in view of reproducibility of the results, and it has proven to represent precisely and explicitly system with Free as well as Periodic boundary conditions (BC), without any basis set superposition error nor supercell aliasing, for Free BC.

For Ground State results, the important parameters in the context of convergence of the calculations are the spacing of the wavelet grid and the size of the simulation domain: for bound-state like functions, convergence is achieved by reducing the grid spacing and increasing the simulation box size. Norm Conserving Pseudopotentials (PSP) of the HGH<sup>21</sup> type are employed to remove the core electrons. Such PSP have proven to be able to provide all-electron accuracy for molecular systems.

Our LR calculation are performed with the Casida formalism<sup>22</sup>, where it is also important to include a sufficient number of unoccupied states in the transition operators. As pointed out in the text such states behave as plane waves: the features of wavelets enable us to represent localized and delocalized states on equal footing. For each size of the simulation domain, the number of unoccupied states used for building the Casida' eigenproblem has been increased up to convergence of the presented results.

## 1. CO

The molecule is oriented along the  $z$  axis and the  $z$ -dimension of the box is equal to 11.5, 15.1 and 16.6 Angström. 280 unoccupied states have been computed in each setup, which span an energy range of the empty KS orbitals of 30.7, 19.3 and 15.4 eV respectively. Such energy values should not be confused with the excitations energy ranges reported in Figs. 2 and 4. Once again, such choices of unoccupied states ensures convergence in of excitations spectrum in the presented range.

The DOS reported in figure 4 are obtained by adding a smearing parameter of  $8 \times 10^{-2}$  eV whereas in the inset shift is  $5 \times 10^{-3}$  eV.

## 2. Benzene

The molecule is oriented in the  $xy$  plain and the  $x$ -dimension of the box is equal to 15.0, 18.2 and 19.7 Angström. 220 states have been computed in each setup and the corresponding energy reange for the unoccupied states is 16.9, 11.6 and 9.7 eV.

The DOS reported in figure 5b are obtained by adding a complex shift of  $1.3 \times 10^{-2}$  eV whereas in the inset shift is  $5 \times 10^{-3}$  eV.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> K. Lejaeghere, G. Bihlmayer, T. Björkman, P. Blaha, S. Blügel, V. Blum, D. Caliste, I. E. Castelli, S. J. Clark, A. Dal Corso, S. de Gironcoli, T. Deutsch, J. K. Dewhurst, I. Di Marco, C. Draxl, M. Dulak, O. Eriksson, J. A. Flores-Livas, K. F. Garrity, L. Genovese, P. Giannozzi, M. Giantomassi, S. Goedecker, X. Gonze, O. Grranäs, E. K. U. Gross, A. Gulans, F. Gygi, D. R. Hamann, P. J. Hasnip, N. A. W. Holzwarth, D. Iuşan, D. B. Jochym, F. Jollet, D. Jones, G. Kresse, K. Koepnik, E. Küçükbenli, Y. O. Kvashnin, I. L. M. Locht, S. Lubeck, M. Marsman, N. Marzari, U. Nitzsche, L. Nordström, T. Ozaki, L. Paulatto, C. J. Pickard, W. Poelmans, M. I. J. Probert, K. Refson, M. Richter, G.-M. Rignanese, S. Saha, M. Scheffler, M. Schlipf, K. Schwarz, S. Sharma, F. Tavazza, P. Thunström, A. Tkatchenko, M. Torrent, D. Vanderbilt, M. J. van Setten, V. Van Speybroeck, J. M. Wills, J. R. Yates, G.-X. Zhang, and S. Cottenier, *Science* **351** (2016), 10.1126/science.aad3000.
- <sup>2</sup> J. P. Perdew, M. Ernzerhof, and K. Burke, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **105**, 9982 (1996), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.472933>.
- <sup>3</sup> M. E. Casida, "Time-dependent density functional response theory for molecules," in *Recent Advances in Density Functional Methods* (World Scientific, 1995) pp. 155–192.
- <sup>4</sup> E. Runge and E. K. U. Gross, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 997 (1984).
- <sup>5</sup> G. Onida, L. Reining, and A. Rubio, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 601 (2002).
- <sup>6</sup> The threshold value in general should correspond to asymptotic value of the potential at infinity.
- <sup>7</sup> N. M. Boffi, M. Jain, and A. Natan, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **144**, 084104 (2016).
- <sup>8</sup> For a sake of concreteness, we are limiting our considerations to observables that do not explicitly depend on time.
- <sup>9</sup> In what follows we will assume that the set of states  $\{|\psi_p\rangle\}$  are described by real functions, when projected in the  $\mathbf{r}$ -representation.
- <sup>10</sup> D. Rocca, R. Gebauer, Y. Saad, and S. Baroni, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **128**, 154105 (2008).
- <sup>11</sup> G. D. Mahan, *Phys. Rev. A* **22**, 1780 (1980).
- <sup>12</sup> H. Hübener, M. A. Pérez-Osorio, P. Ordejón, and F. Giustino, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 245125 (2012).
- <sup>13</sup> H. Hübener and F. Giustino, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 085129 (2014).
- <sup>14</sup> D. S. De, S. Saha, L. Genovese, and S. Goedecker, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 063401 (2018).
- <sup>15</sup> B. Walker, A. M. Saitta, R. Gebauer, and S. Baroni, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 113001 (2006).
- <sup>16</sup> J. Brabec, L. Lin, M. Shao, N. Govind, C. Yang, Y. Saad, and E. G. Ng, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **11**, 5197 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.5b00887>.
- <sup>17</sup> M. Casida, "Time-dependent density functional response theory for molecules," in *Recent Advances in Density Functional Methods*, pp. 155–192.
- <sup>18</sup> There is no particular reason to believe that  $|f_p^\Phi(\omega)^C\rangle$  should be zero. Since  $|w_p^a\rangle$  states are linearly independent,  $|f_p^\Phi(\omega)^C\rangle = 0$  would imply  $\varphi_p^a[\hat{\Phi}(\omega)] = 0$  for any  $a$  labelling the continuum excitations, which is too strong a condition for a general choice of  $\hat{\Phi}$ .

- <sup>19</sup> L. O. Wagner, Z.-h. Yang, and K. Burke, “Exact conditions and their relevance in tddft,” in *Fundamentals of Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory*, edited by M. A. Marques, N. T. Maitra, F. M. Nogueira, E. Gross, and A. Rubio (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012) pp. 101–123.
- <sup>20</sup> L. Genovese, A. Neelov, S. Goedecker, T. Deutsch, S. A. Ghasemi, A. Willand, D. Caliste, O. Zilberberg, M. Rayson, A. Bergman, and R. Schneider, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **129**, 014109 (2008), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2949547>.
- <sup>21</sup> A. Willand, Y. O. Kvashnin, L. Genovese, . Vzquez-Mayagoitia, A. K. Deb, A. Sadeghi, T. Deutsch, and S. Goedecker, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **138**, 104109 (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4793260>.
- <sup>22</sup> B. Natarajan, L. Genovese, M. E. Casida, T. Deutsch, O. N. Burchak, C. Philouze, and M. Y. Balakirev, *Chemical Physics* **402**, 29 (2012).