

Determination of a wave function functional: The constrained search variational method

Xiao-Yin Pan, Virahat Sahni, and Lou Massa

The Graduate School of the City University of New York, New York, New York 10016.

(Dated: November 20, 2018)

Abstract

In a recent paper we proposed the expansion of the space of variations in energy calculations by considering the approximate wave function ψ to be a functional of functions $\chi : \psi = \psi[\chi]$ rather than a function. For the determination of such a wave function functional, a constrained search is first performed over the subspace of all functions χ such that $\psi[\chi]$ satisfies a physical constraint or leads to the known value of an observable. A rigorous upper bound to the energy is then obtained by application of the variational principle. To demonstrate the advantages of the expansion of variational space, we apply the constrained-search-variational method to the ground state of the negative ion of atomic Hydrogen, the Helium atom, and its isoelectronic sequence. The method is equally applicable to excited states, and its extension to such states in conjunction with the theorem of Theophilou is also described.

Keywords: wave function functional, constraint search, variational principle

1. Introduction

In the traditional application of the variational principle for the energy [1], the space of variations is limited by the choice of the analytical form chosen for the approximate wave function. For example, if Gaussian or Slater-type orbitals or a linear combination of such orbitals is employed in the energy functional of the wave functions, then the variational space is limited by this choice of functions of the wave functions. In a recent paper [2] we proposed the idea of overcoming this limitation by expanding the space over which the variations are performed. This allows for a greater flexibility for the structure of the wave function. A consequence of this greater variational freedom is that better energies can be obtained. Or, equivalently, fewer variational parameters are needed to achieve a required accuracy.

The manner by which the space of variations can be expanded *in principle* is by considering the approximate wave function ψ to be a functional of a set of functions $\chi : \psi = \psi[\chi]$, rather than a function. The space of variations is expanded because the functional $\psi[\chi]$ can be adjusted through the function χ to reproduce any well behaved function. The space over which the search for the functions χ is to be performed, however, is too large for practical purposes, and a subset of this space must be considered. The subspace over which the search for the functions χ is to be performed is defined by the requirement that the wave function functional $\psi[\chi]$ satisfy a constraint. Typical constraints on the functional $\psi[\chi]$ are those of normalization, the satisfaction of the Fermi-Coulomb hole sum rule, the requirement that it lead to observables such as the electron density, diamagnetic susceptibility, nuclear magnetic constant, Fermi contact term, or any other physical property of interest. With the wave function functional $\psi[\chi]$ thus determined, a rigorous upper bound to the energy is obtained by application of the variational principle. In this manner, a particular property of interest is obtained *exactly* while simultaneously the energy is determined accurately. We refer to this way of determining an approximate wave function as the constrained-search-variational method. The method is general in that it is applicable to both ground and excited states.

In section 2 of the paper, we explain the constrained-search-variational method in

further detail. To demonstrate the ideas involved, we apply the method in section 3 to the ground state of the Helium atom, its isoelectronic sequence, and the negative ion of atomic Hydrogen. Concluding remarks are made in section 4.

2. Constrained- search-variational method

To explain the method for the determination of a wave function functional, consider the non-relativistic Hamiltonian of the Helium atom, the ions of its isoelectronic sequence, and the negative ion of atomic Hydrogen. In atomic units ($e = \hbar = m = 1$)

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla_1^2 - \frac{1}{2}\nabla_2^2 - \frac{Z}{r_1} - \frac{Z}{r_2} + \frac{1}{r_{12}}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2$ are the coordinates of the two electrons, r_{12} is the distance between them, and Z is the atomic number. In terms of the Hylleraas coordinates[3]: $s = r_1 + r_2$, $t = r_1 - r_2$, $u = r_{12}$, which are the natural coordinates for this atom, we choose the approximate wave function functional to be of the general form

$$\psi[\chi] = \Phi(s, t, u)[1 - f(\chi; s, t, u)], \quad (2)$$

with $\Phi(s, t, u)$ a Slater determinantal pre-factor and $f(\chi; s, t, u)$ a correlated correction term:

$$f(s, t, u) = e^{-qu}(1 + qu)[1 - \chi(q; s, t, u)(1 + u/2)], \quad (3)$$

where q is a variational parameter. Note *any* two electron wave function in a *ground* or *excited* state maybe expressed in this form. The Slater determinant may be chosen to be the Hartree-Fock theory wave function [4], or determined self-consistently within the framework of Quantal Density Functional Theory [5]. For purposes of explanation, we consider here the determinant composed of Hydrogenic functions. Thus, for the ground state 1^1S of the Helium atom we have $\Phi[\alpha, s] = (\alpha^3/\pi)e^{-\alpha s}$, and for the excited triplet 2^3S state $\Phi[\alpha, s, t] = \sqrt{2/3}(\alpha^4/\pi)e^{-\alpha s}t$. (In the latter, for explanatory purposes, screening effects are ignored). Further, we assume that χ is a function only of the variable s : $\Psi = \Psi[\chi(q, s)]$. The approximate wave function functional $\Psi[\chi(q, s)]$ for the ground state then satisfies the electron-electron cusp condition [6]. It also satisfies the electron-nucleus cusp condition for

$\alpha = Z$.

Next consider observables such as the size of the atom, diamagnetic susceptibility, nuclear magnetic constant, Fermi contact term, etc, which are represented by the expectation of operators $W = r_1 + r_2$, $W = r_1^2 + r_2^2$, $W = 1/r_1 + 1/r_2$, $W = \delta(\mathbf{r}_1) + \delta(\mathbf{r}_2)$, respectively. For the normalization constraint $W = 1$. In terms of the Hylleraas coordinates, these operators are $W(s) = s$, $W(s, t) = (s^2 + t^2)/2$, $W(s, t) = \frac{4s}{s^2 - t^2}$, $W(s, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} [\frac{\delta(\frac{s+t}{2})}{(s+t)^2} + \frac{\delta(\frac{s-t}{2})}{(s-t)^2}]$, and $W(s, t) = 1$. In general, observables can be represented by single-particle operators expressed as $W(s, t)$. The expectation of the operator $W(s, t)$ is then

$$\langle W \rangle = \int \Psi^*[\chi] W \Psi[\chi] d\tau = \langle W_0 \rangle + \Delta W, \quad (4)$$

where (for the ground state)

$$\langle W \rangle_0 = \int |\Phi(\alpha, s)|^2 W(s, t) d\tau, \quad (5)$$

$$\Delta W = \int |\Phi(\alpha, s)|^2 W(s, t) [f^2(q, s, t, u) - 2f(q, s, t, u)] d\tau \quad (6)$$

$$= 2\pi^2 \int_0^\infty |\Phi(\alpha, s)|^2 g(s) ds, \quad (7)$$

where

$$g(s) = \int_0^s u du \int_0^u dt W(s, t) (s^2 - t^2) [f^2(q, s, t, u) - 2f(q, s, t, u)]. \quad (8)$$

We now assume that the expectation $\langle W \rangle$ is known either through experiment or via some accurate calculation [7]. As our choice of $\Phi(\alpha; s)$ is analytical, then both $\langle W \rangle_0$ and ΔW are now known.

The next step is the constrained search over functions $\chi(q, s)$ for which the expectation $\langle W \rangle$ of Eq.(4) is obtained. If the parameter α in Eq.(7) is fixed, then there exist *many* functions $g(s)$ for which the expectation $\langle W \rangle$ can be obtained. This corresponds to a large subspace of wave function functionals (See Ref. 2). On the other hand, if the parameter α is variable, then the only way in which Eq.(7) can be satisfied is if

$$g(s) = G, \quad (9)$$

where G is a determinable constant. *This is equivalent to the constrained search of all wave function functionals over the subspace in which Eq.(7) is satisfied.*

As an example consider the normalization constraint for which $\langle W \rangle = \langle W \rangle_0 = 1$, so that $\Delta W = 0$. Then the only way in which Eq.(7) can be satisfied, (for variable α) is if

$$g(s) = 0. \quad (10)$$

This condition is thus equivalent to the constrained search over the subspace of all normalized functionals $\Psi[\chi(q, s)]$.

Substitution of $f(\chi; s, t, u)$ into Eq.(10) leads to a quadratic equation for the function $\chi(q, s)$:

$$a(q, s)\chi(q, s)^2 + 2b(q, s)\chi(q, s) + c(q, s) = 0, \quad (11)$$

where

$$a(q, s) = \int_0^s (s^2 u^2 - u^4/3)(1 + u/2)^2(1 + qu)^2 e^{-2qu} du, \quad (12)$$

$$b(q, s) = - \int_0^s (s^2 u^2 - u^4/3)(1 + u/2)(1 + qu) [e^{-2qu}(1 + qu) - e^{-qu}] du, \quad (13)$$

$$c(q, s) = \int_0^s (s^2 u^2 - u^4/3)(1 + qu)[e^{-2qu}(1 + qu) - 2e^{-qu}] du. \quad (14)$$

The integrals for the coefficients $a(q, s)$, $b(q, s)$, and $c(q, s)$ are determined analytically. Solution of the quadratic equation is equivalent to searching over the entire subspace of normalized wave function functionals. In this example, the subspace corresponds to two points. The two solutions $\chi_1(q; s)$ and $\chi_2(q; s)$ lead to two normalized wave functions $\psi[\chi_1]$ and $\psi[\chi_2]$.

The generalization to the case when $W = W(s)$ or $W = W(s, t)$ follows readily. In either case, one has also to solve a quadratic equation for the determination of the functions $\chi(q, \alpha; s)$. One thus obtains two wave function functionals that lead to the exact value for

$\langle W \rangle$.

For the normalized wave function functionals determined above, the energy functional in terms of (s, t, u) coordinates which is

$$\begin{aligned}
 I[\psi[\chi]] &= \int \psi^* \hat{H} \psi d\tau & (15) \\
 &= 2\pi^2 \int_0^\infty ds \int_0^s du \int_0^u dt \{ u(s^2 - t^2) [(\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial s})^2 + (\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t})^2 + (\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial u})^2] \\
 &\quad + 2\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial u} [s(u^2 - t^2)\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial s} + t(s^2 - u^2)\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}] \\
 &\quad - [4Zsu - (s^2 - t^2)]\psi^2 \}, & (16)
 \end{aligned}$$

is then minimized with respect to the parameters α and q . (The prefactor minimizes the energy at $\alpha = Z - 5/16$).

For wave function functionals determined by sum rules other than normalization, the functional $I[\psi[\chi]]$ must be divided by the normalization integral $\int \psi^* \psi d\tau$. In this manner, the wave function functionals $\psi[\chi]$ are normalized, obtain the exact value of the expectation $\langle W(s, t) \rangle$, and lead to an accurate value for the ground state energy.

3. Application to two-electron atomic and ionic systems

In this section, we apply the constrained-search-variational method to two-electron atomic and ionic systems. The two wave function functionals $\psi[\chi_1]$ and $\psi[\chi_2]$ employed are those determined via the constraint of normalization as described in the previous section with the crude Hydrogenic prefactor. In Table I we quote the values for the ground state energy for H^- , the He atom, and its isoelectronic sequence. For the He atom we also quote the values of Hartree-Fock theory [4], the 3-parameter Caratzoulas-Knowles wave function [8], and the 1078-parameter Pekeris wave function [7]. For H^- and the other negative ions corresponding to $Z = 3 - 8$, we give the values of the variational-perturbation results of Aashamar [9]. The satisfaction of the virial theorem and the percent errors as compared to the Pekeris and Aashamar values are also given. The functions $\chi_1(q, s)$ and $\chi_2(q, s)$ for H^- , B^{3+} , and O^{6+} are plotted in Figs. 1-3.




FIG. 1: Fig.1: The functions $\chi_1(q, s)$ and $\chi_2(q, s)$ for H^- .

Observe that the improvement of the energies of the two wave function functionals over the prefactor values is generally an order of magnitude. As expected, the energies as well as the satisfaction of the virial theorem improves with increasing atomic number Z . For the He atom, the energies of both $\psi[\chi_1]$ and $\psi[\chi_2]$ are superior to those of Hartree-Fock theory and of the 3-parameter Caratzoulas-Knowles wave function. Furthermore, whereas the prefactor leads to a negative electron affinity, both wave function functionals lead to a positive electron affinity for H^- as must be the case as H^- is stable. The exact satisfaction of the virial theorem by the prefactor is a consequence of scaling, whereas that of Hartree-Fock theory is because of self-consistency.

In Table II we quote the values of the operators $W = \sum_{i=1}^2 r^n, n = -2, -1, 1, 2$, and

TABLE I: Rigorous upper bounds to the ground state of H^- , He , Li^+ , Be^{2+} , B^{3+} , C^{4+} , N^{5+} , O^{6+} , in atomic units as determined from the wave function functionals determined via the constraint of normalization together with the values due to Hartree-Fock (HF) theory [4], Caratzoulas-Knowles(CK)[8], Pekeris[7] and Aashamar[9]. The satisfaction of the virial theorem, and the percent errors compared to the values of Pekeris and Aashamar are also given.

Ion or Atom	Wave function	Parameters	Ground state energy	% error	$-V/T$
H^-	Φ		-0.473	10.37	2.0000
	$\psi \chi_1$	$\alpha = 0.6757, q = 0$	-0.50946	3.486	2.0019
	$\psi \chi_2$	$\alpha = 0.6757, q = 0$	-0.50946	3.486	2.0019
	Aashamar		-0.52775		2.0000
He	Φ		-2.84766	1.931	2.0000
	$\psi \chi_1$	$\alpha = 1.6614, q = 0.5333$	-2.89072	0.448	1.9973
	$\psi \chi_2$	$\alpha = 1.6629, q = 0.1705$	-2.89122	0.430	1.9984
	HF		-2.86168	1.448	2.0000
	CK		-2.89007	0.470	1.9890
	Pekeris		-2.90372		2.0000
Li^+	Φ		-7.22266	0.786	2.0000
	$\psi \chi_1$	$\alpha = 2.6595, q = 1.2287$	-7.26687	0.179	1.9981
	$\psi \chi_2$	$\alpha = 2.6610, q = 0.2897$	-7.26820	0.161	1.9992
	Aashamar		-7.27991		2.0000
Be^{2+}	Φ		-13.59766	0.424	2.0000
	$\psi \chi_1$	$\alpha = 3.6584, q = 1.8950$	-13.64219	0.098	1.9987
	$\psi \chi_2$	$\alpha = 3.6599, q = 0.3722$	-13.64416	0.084	1.9995
	Aashamar		-13.65557		2.0000
B^{3+}	Φ		-21.97266	0.265	2.0000
	$\psi \chi_1$	$\alpha = 4.6578, q = 2.5711$	-22.01729	0.062	1.9991
	$\psi \chi_2$	$\alpha = 4.6592, q = 0.4401$	-22.01973	0.051	1.9997
	Aashamar		-22.03097		2.0000
C^{4+}	Φ		-32.34766	0.181	2.0000
	$\psi \chi_1$	$\alpha = 5.6574, q = 3.2528$	-32.39230	0.043	1.9993
	$\psi \chi_2$	$\alpha = 5.6578, q = 0.4839$	-32.39511	0.034	1.9997
	Aashamar		-32.40625		2.0000
N^{5+}	Φ		-44.72266	0.131	2.0000
	$\psi \chi_1$	$\alpha = 6.6572, q = 3.9381$	-44.76729	0.032	1.9995
	$\psi \chi_2$	$\alpha = 6.6584, q = 0.5511$	-44.77035	0.025	1.9998
	Aashamar		-44.78145		2.0000
O^{6+}	Φ		-59.09766	0.100	2.0000
	$\psi \chi_1$	$\alpha = 7.6570, q = 4.6257$	-59.14226	0.024	1.9996
	$\psi \chi_2$	$\alpha = 7.6582, q = 0.5985$	-59.14554	0.019	1.9998
	Aashamar		-59.15660		2.0000




FIG. 2: Fig.2: The functions $\chi_1(q, s)$ and $\chi_2(q, s)$ for B^{3+} .

$W = \delta(\mathbf{r}_1) + \delta(\mathbf{r}_2)$ for the He atom as determined by both $\psi[\chi_1]$ and $\psi[\chi_2]$ together with the Hartree-Fock theory, Caratzoulas-Knowles, and Pekeris values. The accuracy of these results is, of course, not correct to second order as are those for the energy. Nonetheless, the results are considerable improvements over the prefactor values. They are also all superior to the 3-parameter results of Caratzoulas-Knowles. The latter indicates that the two wave function functionals although also determined via energy minimization, are superior throughout space. Thus, by expanding the space of variations, one obtains a superior wave function not only in the region contributing most to the energy, but also in other regions of space. The superiority of the Hartree-Fock theory values, on the other hand, is due to the fact that in this theory, the expectations of single-particle operators is correct to second order [10].




FIG. 3: Fig.3: The functions $\chi_1(q, s)$ and $\chi_2(q, s)$ for O^{6+} .

We note that the two functions $\chi_1(q, s)$ and $\chi_2(q, s)$ are very different from each other: $\chi_1(q, s)$ is positive whereas $\chi_2(q, s)$ is negative. See Figs. 1-3. Thus, although the analytical form of the wave function is the same, the two functionals $\psi[\chi_1]$ and $\psi[\chi_2]$ are very different. Nevertheless, they lead to accurate results that are essentially the same. Thus, the constrained search for the functions χ over this subspace of normalized wave functions leads to two physically meaningful functionals.

4. Concluding remarks

In this paper we have shown how to expand the space of variations in calculations of the energy by constructing approximate wave functions that are functionals rather than

TABLE II: The expectation value of the operator $W = \sum_{i=1}^2 r_i^n; n = -2, -1, 1, 2$ and $W = \delta(\mathbf{r}_1) + \delta(\mathbf{r}_2)$ for the *He* atom employing the wave function functionals determined by the normalization constraint, and by the Hartree-Fock theory(HF)[4], Caratzoulas-Knowles(CK)[8], and Pekeris [7] wave functions (WF).

WF	$\langle (1/r_1 + 1/r_2) \rangle$	$\langle (1/r_1^2 + 1/r_2^2) \rangle$	$\langle (r_1^2 + r_2^2) \rangle$	$\langle r_1 + r_2 \rangle$	$\langle \delta(\mathbf{r}_1) + \delta(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle$
Φ	3.3750	11.391	2.1069	1.7778	3.05922
$\psi[\chi_1]$	3.3773	11.726	2.1924	1.8057	3.37921
$\psi[\chi_2]$	3.3784	11.727	2.1876	1.8041	3.37925
<i>HF</i>	3.3746	11.991	2.3697	1.8545	3.5964
<i>CK</i>	3.3911	11.714	2.1292	1.7848	
<i>Pekeris</i>	3.3766	12.035	2.3870	1.8589	3.6208

functions. The wave function functionals depend upon functions that are chosen so as to satisfy a sum rule or reproduce the value of an observable. In this constrained-search-variational method, wave functions that are accurate over all space are thereby obtained. The framework presented is general and applicable to both ground and excited states. For excited states, one would in addition employ the theorem of Theophilou [11] according to which if $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_m, \dots$, are orthonormal trial functions for the m lowest eigenstates of the Hamiltonian H , having exact eigenvalues E_1, E_2, E_m, \dots , then $\sum_{i=1}^m \langle \varphi_i | H | \varphi_i \rangle \geq \sum_{i=1}^m E_i$. In this way, a rigorous upper bound to the *sum* of the ground and excited states is achieved. With the ground state energy known, a rigorous upper bound to the excited state energy is then determined, while simultaneously a physical constraint or sum rule is satisfied or an observable obtained exactly.

In the calculations presented to demonstrate these ideas, a crude Hydrogenic Slater determinantal prefactor was employed. Improved results may be obtained through a better prefactor. Fully self-consistently determined prefactors for many-electron systems may be achieved, for example, via Quantal density functional theory. The latter is a local effective potential energy theory of noninteracting Fermions with the true density in which

the multiplicative potential energy operator representative of all the many-body effects is explicitly defined in terms of the interacting system wave function and the orbitals of this model system. These orbitals, determined self-consistently, then constitute the Slater determinantal prefactor. Or one could employ analytical or self-consistently determined Hartree-Fock theory orbitals for the prefactor. Another step towards improved results would be to further expand the space of variations defining the functions χ . In such a case, the equation for the functions χ could be an integral equation. Other analytical forms for the correlation factor could also be employed. These avenues are being pursued to better understand the ideas underlying the construction of wave function functionals, and to employ these functionals within the context of Quantal density functional theory.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the Research Foundation of CUNY. L. M. was supported in part by NSF through CREST, and by a “Research Centers in Minority Institutions” award, RR-03037, from the National Center for Research Resources, National Institutes of Health.

-
- [1] B. L. Moisewitsch, *Variational Principles*, John Wiley and Sons, (New York , 1966).
 - [2] X.-Y. Pan, V. Sahni, and L. Massa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 130401 (2004).
 - [3] E. A. Hylleraas, *Z. Physik*, **48**, 469 (1928); X.-Y Pan, V. Sahni, and L. Massa, *physics/0310128*.
 - [4] C. F. Fischer, *The Hartree-Fock Method for Atoms*, John Wiley and Sons, (New York, 1977).
 - [5] V. Sahni, *Quantal Density Functional Theory*, Springer-Verlag, (Berlin, 2004).
 - [6] X.-Y. Pan and V. Sahni, *J. Chem. Phys.* **119**, 7083 (2003); R. T. Pack and W. Byers Brown, *J. Chem. Phys.* **45**, 556 b(1966); W. A. Bingel, *Theor. Chim. Acta* **8**, 54 (1967).
 - [7] C. L. Pekeris, *Phys. Rev.* **115**, 1216 (1959).
 - [8] S. Caratzoulas and P. J. Knowles, *Mol. Phys.* **98**, 1811 (2000).

- [9] K. Aashamar, *Physica Mathematica*, University of Osloensis, Report No. **35** and **36** (1969).
- [10] J. Goodisman and Klemperer, *J. Chem. Phys.* **38**, 721 (1963).
- [11] A. Theophilou, *J. Phys. C* **12**, 5419 (1979).