

# Hidden Relaxation Term in Approximate Treatments of Responses to Electric and Magnetic Fields

Jacques K. Desmarais<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Dipartimento di Chimica, Università di Torino, via Giuria 5, 10125 Torino, Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, CNRS, IPREM, E2S UPPA, Pau, France*

(Dated: September 6, 2023)

Recently a generalization of the “*modern theory of orbital magnetization*” to include non-local Hamiltonians (e.g. hybrid functionals of the generalized Kohn-Sham theory) was provided for magnetic response properties. Results indicated inequivalence between sampling of direct and reciprocal spaces for those calculations far from the complete basis set limit. We show that this can be explained by a hidden “relaxation” contribution to the reciprocal-space derivatives. The missing relaxation term is shown to (generally) affect the results of calculations of not only magnetic, but also electric response properties, within the context of the “*modern theory of polarization*”. Necessary conditions are provided to permit avoiding the calculation of the hidden relaxation term.

Keywords:

Desmarais *et al.*<sup>1</sup> provided a generalization of Ceresoli *et al.*'s<sup>2</sup> “*modern theory of orbital magnetization*” to include non-local Hamiltonians and applied the theory to the calculation of the optical rotatory power (OR) of periodic systems. The reported calculations on infinite chains of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, show visible differences in the calculated OR for:

- i) the infinite periodic system versus the large finite system
- ii) the 3× replicated supercell with 3 evenly spaced  $\mathbf{k}$  points versus the 9× replicated supercell with 1  $\mathbf{k}$  point

In both cases i) and ii), the differences diminish as the calculation approaches the complete basis set limit. In the article, these differences (suggestive of a “non-periodic” formulation) were attributed to the gauge-origin dependence of the first-order magnetic Hamiltonian.<sup>1</sup>

$$H_{\text{mag}}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{r} + i\nabla_{\mathbf{k}}) \wedge \mathbf{p} + \text{H.c.} . \quad (1)$$

Here we show that the differences are instead the result of an approximate treatment therein of the action of the  $\nabla_{\mathbf{k}}$  operator. In fact, we show that the same differences i) and ii) between the infinite periodic vs. large finite system, as well as between uniform sampling of direct and reciprocal spaces (i.e. uniform sampling of  $\mathbf{k}$ -points vs. supercells) are not only obtained for magnetic properties from Eq. (1), but also electric properties, within a similar approximation to the action of  $\nabla_{\mathbf{k}}$ . That is, the same “non-periodic” behaviour is found for calculation of those properties employing the first-order electric Hamiltonian.<sup>3-8</sup>

$$H_{\text{ele}}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{r} + i\nabla_{\mathbf{k}}) + \text{H.c.} . \quad (2)$$

which coincides exactly with King-Smith, Vanderbilt and Resta’s “*modern theory of polarization*”.<sup>9-12</sup> We begin by

a review of the state of the art in application of the  $\nabla_{\mathbf{k}}$  operator.

The action of  $\nabla_{\mathbf{k}}$  on Bloch orbitals built from atom-centered atomic orbitals (AOs)  $|\mu^{\mathbf{g}}\rangle$ :

$$|\psi_i(\mathbf{k})\rangle = \sum_{\mu} C_{\mu,i}(\mathbf{k}) |\phi_{\mu}(\mathbf{k})\rangle = \sum_{\mu} C_{\mu,i}(\mathbf{k}) \sum_{\mathbf{g}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{g}} |\mu^{\mathbf{g}}\rangle \quad (3)$$

is trivial to apply on the  $|\phi_{\mu}(\mathbf{k})\rangle$  part. The problem of calculating the derivative of the orbital coefficients  $\nabla_{\mathbf{k}} C_{\mu,i}(\mathbf{k})$  is more subtle.

In general, an expansion:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{k}} C_{\mu,i}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_l^{\text{all}} C_{\mu,l}(\mathbf{k}) Q_{l,i}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (4)$$

with (as of yet undetermined) coefficients  $Q_{i,l}(\mathbf{k})$  provides a solution. To find the coefficients  $Q_{i,l}(\mathbf{k})$ , the derivative is typically applied to the Kohn-Sham (KS) single-particle equation  $\hat{F}|\psi_i(\mathbf{k})\rangle = \epsilon_{i,\mathbf{k}}|\psi_i(\mathbf{k})\rangle$  yielding:<sup>5,6</sup>

$$Q_{i,l}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{K_{i,l}(\mathbf{k}) - \epsilon_{l,\mathbf{k}} R_{i,l}(\mathbf{k})}{\epsilon_{l,\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{i,\mathbf{k}}} \quad l \neq i \quad (5a)$$

in which  $\mathbf{K}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  are the derivatives of the KS Hamiltonian  $\mathbf{F}$  and basis-function overlap  $\mathbf{S}$  matrices at fixed orbital coefficients:

$$K_{i,l}(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow i \sum_{\mathbf{g}} \mathbf{g} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{g}} F_{i,l}(\mathbf{g}) \quad (5b)$$

$$R_{i,l}(\mathbf{k}) = i \sum_{\mathbf{g}} \mathbf{g} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{g}} S_{i,l}(\mathbf{g}) \quad (5c)$$

Here we show that Eq. (5b) is, in fact, an approximation to the full  $K_{i,l}(\mathbf{k})$  (i.e. the  $\rightarrow$  should be replaced by an approximate equal sign  $\approx$ ), in that “orbital-relaxation” or “response” contributions to the derivatives are dropped. This approximation explains the discrepancies i) and ii) in the approximate calculation of responses to external electromagnetic fields.

To develop the exact treatment, let us now approach the problem of the analytical calculation of  $\mathbf{k}$ -space derivatives from the perspective of linear-response theory. We consider a small displacement  $\mathbf{h}$  away from  $\mathbf{k}$  and write the displaced KS single-particle equation, as well as orthonormality condition:

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \quad (6a)$$

$$\mathbf{C}^\dagger(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{1} \quad (6b)$$

$$\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \equiv \mathbf{C}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \quad (6c)$$

with (generally) non-canonical displaced Lagrange multipliers  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h})$  and (as of yet) undetermined coefficients  $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h})$ . Expanding all quantities in a power series around the point  $\mathbf{k}$ :

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{F}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) + \mathbf{h} \mathbf{F}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) + \dots \quad (7a)$$

$$\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{C}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) + \mathbf{h} \mathbf{C}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) + \dots \quad (7b)$$

$$\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{S}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) + \mathbf{h} \mathbf{S}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) + \dots \quad (7c)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) + \mathbf{h} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) + \dots \quad (7d)$$

$$\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{h} \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) + \dots \quad (7e)$$

and taking the derivative of both sides of Eq. (7c) gives:

$$\mathbf{S}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \left. \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h})}{\partial \mathbf{h}} \right|_{\mathbf{h}=\mathbf{0}} \quad (8)$$

then, inserting Eqs.(7b) and (7e) into Eq. (6c) yields:

$$\mathbf{C}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{C}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (9)$$

At this point, it is convenient to define the matrices:

$$\mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \left[ \mathbf{C}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \right]^\dagger \mathbf{F}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{C}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (10)$$

and:

$$\mathbf{R}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \left[ \mathbf{C}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \right]^\dagger \mathbf{S}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{C}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (11)$$

Inserting Eqs. (7) and (9) in Eq. (6) and collecting terms in the first order, then left-multiplying by  $\left[ \mathbf{C}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \right]^\dagger$  and using Eqs. (10) and (11) leads directly to the first order perturbation equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) &= \mathbf{R}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \\ + \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) & \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Eq. (12) must be solved self-consistently for  $\mathbf{Q}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$ , under the condition of orthonormality. The requisite first order orthonormality condition may now be written by inserting Eqs. (7b), (7c), (9) and (11) into Eq. (6b) to get:

$$\left[ \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \right]^\dagger + \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = -\mathbf{R}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (13)$$

The standard non-canonical solution procedure<sup>13,14</sup> provides, by taking advantage of the fact that the occ-virt blocks of perturbed Lagrange multipliers are vanishing:

$$\varepsilon_{ia}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \varepsilon_{ai}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = 0 \quad i \in occ, a \in virt \quad (14)$$

the following solution for the occ-virt and virt-occ blocks of  $\mathbf{Q}^{(1)}$ :

$$Q_{ia}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{K_{ia}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) - \varepsilon_a^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) R_{ia}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})}{\varepsilon_a^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) - \varepsilon_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{k})} \quad i \in occ, a \in virt \quad (15a)$$

and for the occ-occ block (by imposing Hermiticity):

$$Q_{ij}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = -\frac{1}{2} R_{ij}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \quad i, j \in occ \quad (15b)$$

with (here and elsewhere) exactly analogous expressions for the virt-virt block. Eq. (15b) is consistent with the following non-canonical matrices of Lagrange multipliers:

$$\varepsilon_{ij}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = K_{ij}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) - \frac{1}{2} \left( \varepsilon_i^{(0)} + \varepsilon_j^{(0)} \right) R_{ij}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \quad i, j \in occ \quad (16)$$

In Eqs. (15a) and (16)  $K_{ll'}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$  is the first-order perturbed KS Hamiltonian matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} iK_{l,l'}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) &= -\sum_{\mathbf{g}} \mathbf{g} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{g}} F_{l,l'}^{(0)}(\mathbf{g}) + \sum_{\mathbf{g}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{g}} \\ &\times \sum_{\mu\nu} C_{\mu,l}^{(0)*}(\mathbf{k}) C_{\nu,l'}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) V_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}(\mathbf{g}) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

with a first term representing the contribution as in Eq. (5b) from standard approaches, and the second term is an additional ‘‘orbital-relaxation’’ or ‘‘response’’ correction. Thus, the relaxation term is proportional to the KS potential  $V^{(1)}$  depending on the derivative of the reduced density matrix coefficients  $P_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}(\mathbf{g}) &\approx \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{h}} \frac{2}{\Omega} \sum_{\Omega} \Re e^{i[\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{h}]\cdot\mathbf{g}} P_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \right|_{\mathbf{h}=\mathbf{0}} \\ &= \frac{2}{\Omega} \Re e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{g}} \sum_i^{\text{occ}} \sum_l^{\text{all}} C_{\mu,l}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) iQ_{l,i}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \left[ C_{\nu,i}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \right]^* \\ &+ C_{\mu,i}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) i \left[ Q_{i,l}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \right]^* \left[ C_{\nu,l}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \right]^* \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with summation being over quadrature points in the volume  $\Omega$  of the first Brillouin zone (FBZ).

Once  $\mathbf{Q}^{(1)}$  has been obtained from a non-canonical solution of Eq. (12) we need to transform the Bloch orbitals at point  $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}$  to canonical ones in order to use them as field-free orbitals for perturbation by an electric or magnetic field. We can transform the Bloch orbitals to canonical form by finding the unitary matrix  $\mathbf{T}$  that diagonalizes the occ-occ (or virt-virt) block of the matrix of Lagrange multipliers  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{OO}$ , that is  $\mathbf{T}_O^\dagger \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{OO} \mathbf{T}_O = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{OO}$ .

This means that we need to solve the following eigenvalue equation:

$$\epsilon_{OO}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{T}_O(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{T}_O(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \epsilon_O(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \quad (19)$$

To obtain the orbital energy  $\epsilon_i$  and corresponding eigenvector  $\mathbf{T}_i$  at point  $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}$  in reciprocal space.

Once the matrix  $\mathbf{T}_O$  has been obtain, returning to (19), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{C}'(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) &= \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \\ &\times \mathbf{C}'(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \epsilon(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where:

$$\mathbf{C}'(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) \quad (21)$$

Then, defining:

$$\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h}) = \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{h} \mathbf{T}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) + \dots \quad (22)$$

and proceeding as in Eqs. (7)-(9), we obtain:

$$\mathbf{C}'^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{C}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{Q}'^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (23)$$

with:

$$\mathbf{Q}'^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) + \mathbf{T}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (24)$$

We can calculate  $\mathbf{T}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$  by solving the eigenvalue Eq. (19) by non-degenerate Rayleigh-Schrodinger perturbation theory giving:

$$\mathbf{T}_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{T}_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \frac{\left[ \mathbf{T}_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) \right]^\dagger \epsilon^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{T}_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{k})}{\epsilon_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) - \epsilon_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{k})} \quad (25)$$

We note in passing that degenerate or quasi-degenerate states would require appropriate modification of our treatment.

Then, inserting Eqs. (14) and (16) in Eq. (25) we obtain:

$$T_{ia}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = 0 \quad i \in occ, a \in virt \quad (26a)$$

$$T_{ji}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\epsilon_{ji}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})}{\epsilon_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) - \epsilon_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{k})} \quad i \in occ, j \in occ \quad (26b)$$

Note that substitution of Eq. (26b) for occ-occ and virt-virt blocks, along with Eqs. (14)-(16) into Eq. (24) gives  $\mathbf{Q}'^{(1)}$  that exactly coincide with the canonical approach of Eq. (5), apart from the correction due to the relaxation term:

$$Q_{ll'}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{K_{ll'}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) - \epsilon_{l'}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) R_{ll'}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})}{\epsilon_{l'}^{(0)}(\mathbf{k}) - \epsilon_l^{(0)}(\mathbf{k})} \quad (27)$$

Indeed, Eq. (27) is exactly identical to Eq. (5a), except that  $K_{ll'}^{(1)}$  now includes also the second term in Eq. (17) (the response correction).

At this point, we note three important situations in which the new relaxation term correction vanishes:

1. For a sufficiently fine sampling of the FBZ  $\int_{\mathbb{F}\Omega} \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} d\mathbf{k}$  becomes an integral and  $P_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}(\mathbf{g}) = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{k}} \mathcal{F} [P_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h})] \right|_{\mathbf{h}=\mathbf{0}}$  vanishes because the Fourier transform  $\mathcal{F} [P_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h})]$  is independent of  $\mathbf{k}$ .
2. For a ‘‘real  $\mathbf{k}$  point’’ (i.e. a point  $\mathbf{k}_{\text{real}}$  in which  $\sin(\mathbf{k}_{\text{real}} \cdot \mathbf{g})$  vanishes, that is to say at the  $\Gamma$  point or at the edge of the FBZ), the Hermiticity of  $iQ_{i,l}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}) + \frac{i}{2}R_{i,l}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k})$  leads to  $P_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}_{\text{real}}) = 0$
3. At the complete basis set limit, the relaxation term vanishes by virtue of the Hellmann-Feynman theorem

From the above discussion, we expect the relaxation term to be significant for calculations employing few  $\mathbf{k}$  points away from  $\Gamma$  and away from the edge of the FBZ, while employing a small basis set. Below we show numerical results explicitly demonstrating this behaviour for responses to electromagnetic fields. In practice, we admit that an actual calculation of the relaxation term is not computationally practical, because Eq. (18) requires an independent self-consistent calculation of  $\mathbf{P}^{(1)}$  for each  $\mathbf{k}$  point. In fact, the numerical results below suggest that a fine sampling of  $\mathbf{k}$ -space (resulting in a vanishing relaxation term, regardless of the basis set) is probably much cheaper and computationally convenient.

To show the effect of the missing relaxation term for reciprocal space derivatives, we may choose any response property to external electric and/or magnetic fields that require the  $Q_{i,l}$  matrix. Two such properties are dynamical hyperpolarizabilities (a third order property to an electric field perturbation) and OR (mixed second order property to magnetic and electric field perturbations). Calculations are performed on infinite chains of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  at a light wavelength of 300 nm, employing the local density approximation and a developer’s version of the CRYSTAL23 code.<sup>15</sup> For the hyperpolarizabilities, we use the unmodified algorithm of Ref. 16 and report second-harmonic generation (SHG) coefficients with three electric perturbations along the x y and z Cartesian axes. For OR, we report the trace of the optical rotation tensor, employing our gauge-origin independent velocity formulation.<sup>1,17</sup>

Results are presented in Table I for different basis sets and supercell/ $\mathbf{k}$ -point combinations. The first three rows of the table report SHG coefficients and the last three rows are for OR. At the limit of many  $\mathbf{k}$  points (first two columns), the relaxation term is vanishing, and consistent results are obtained per  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  unit with either a single cell or a  $2 \times$  supercell. This is especially true for large basis sets (another criterion for diminishing the otherwise missing relaxation term). For instance, with 500  $\mathbf{k}$ -points and the quadruple zeta basis set, we obtain SHG coefficients of 101.3 and 103.2 a.u. (single and doubled cells, respectively), but a larger disagreement of 710.7 vs. 625.5 a.u. with the triple zeta basis set. More

TABLE I: Second-harmonic generation coefficients in [a.u.] along XYZ (first three rows) per formula unit in infinite chains of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  for different supercell and  $\mathbf{k}$ -point combinations, as well as basis sets. The last three columns report a similar analysis for the trace of the OR tensor in [ $^\circ/mm$ ].

cells/ $\mathbf{k}$ -points	1/500	2/500	1/2	2/1	1/3	3/1
cc-pvDz	36.7	37.0	-25.7	-25.7	52.3	49.1
cc-pvTz	710.7	625.5	-235.7	-235.7	-1208	-1212
cc-pvQz	103.2	101.3	-33.64	-33.64	96.5	101.2
cc-pvDz	47.9	47.9	19.6	19.6	58.1	47.3
cc-pvTz	47.8	47.9	27.9	27.9	53.4	60.8
cc-pvQz	53.5	53.5	38.7	38.7	62.0	62.7

details are provided at Ref. 18. Calculations with one or two  $\mathbf{k}$  points include only “real” points (i.e. points  $\mathbf{k}_{\text{real}}$  for which  $\sin(\mathbf{k}_{\text{real}} \cdot \mathbf{g})$  is vanishing) and the otherwise

missing relaxation term is also vanishing. Thus, we always obtained perfectly consistent results both for SHG and OR between the 2/1 and 1/2 calculations (i.e. 2/1 meaning double cell and 1  $\mathbf{k}$  point, 1/2 meaning single cell and 2  $\mathbf{k}$  points). The 1/3 calculation, on the other hand, includes points away from  $\Gamma$ , and away from the edge of the Brillouin zone, and at such points the relaxation term is not vanishing. In this case, we obtain significant differences between the 1/3 and 3/1 calculations, particularly for small basis sets (e.g. 58.1 vs. 47.3  $^\circ/mm$ . for OR and a double-zeta basis set). The differences are diminished by employing larger basis sets (e.g. 62.0 vs. 62.7  $^\circ/mm$ . for OR and a quadruple-zeta basis set). Thus, we may avoid explicit calculation of the costly (and complicated) relaxation term to reciprocal space derivatives for electric and magnetic properties in different ways: namely, i) by employing many  $\mathbf{k}$  points and a small cell or ii) by employing only  $\mathbf{k}$  points at  $\Gamma$  and the edge of the Brillouin zone and a large supercell and/or iii) by employing a large basis set.

*Acknowledgements* I am grateful to Profs. Michel Rérat, Bernard Kirtman and Michael Springborg for valuable discussions.

\* Electronic address: jacqueskontak.desmarais@unito.it

<sup>1</sup> J. K. Desmarais, B. Kirtman, and M. Rérat, Phys. Rev. B **107**, 224430 (2023).

<sup>2</sup> D. Ceresoli, T. Thonhauser, D. Vanderbilt, and R. Resta, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 024408 (2006).

<sup>3</sup> E. Blount, in *Solid state physics* (1962), vol. 13, pp. 305–373.

<sup>4</sup> M. Rérat, M. Ferrero, E. Amzallag, I. Baraille, and R. Dovesi, in *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* (2008), vol. 117, p. 012023.

<sup>5</sup> B. Kirtman, F. L. Gu, and D. M. Bishop, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 1294 (2000).

<sup>6</sup> D. M. Bishop, F. L. Gu, and B. Kirtman, J. Chem. Phys. **114**, 7633 (2001).

<sup>7</sup> M. Ferrero, M. Rérat, R. Orlando, and R. Dovesi, J. Comp. Chem. **29**, 1450 (2008).

<sup>8</sup> M. Ferrero, M. Rérat, R. Orlando, and R. Dovesi, J. Chem. Phys. **128**, 014110 (2008).

<sup>9</sup> R. King-Smith and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 1651 (1993).

<sup>10</sup> R. Resta, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 899 (1994).

<sup>11</sup> R. Resta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1800 (1998).

<sup>12</sup> M. Springborg and B. Kirtman, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 045102 (2008).

<sup>13</sup> S. Karna and M. Dupuis, J. Comput. Chem. **12**, 487 (1991).

<sup>14</sup> J. Pople, R. Krishnan, H. Schlegel, and J. S. Binkley, Int. J. Quant. Chem. **16**, 225 (1979).

<sup>15</sup> A. Erba, J. K. Desmarais, S. Casassa, B. Civalleri, L. Donà, I. J. Bush, B. Searle, L. Maschio, L. Edith-Daga, A. Cos-sard, et al., J. Chem. Theor. Comput. (2022).

<sup>16</sup> L. Maschio, M. Rérat, B. Kirtman, and R. Dovesi, J. Chem. Phys. **143** (2015).

<sup>17</sup> M. Rérat and B. Kirtman, J. Chem. Theor. Comput. **17**, 4063 (2021).

<sup>18</sup> The agreement with the single and doubled cells and many  $\mathbf{k}$  points, is always much closer for OR than for SHG (e.g. 47.8 vs. 47.9 with triple-zeta and 53.5 vs. 53.5 with quadruple-zeta basis sets for OR compared to 710.7 vs. 625.5 and 101.3 vs. 103.2 for SHG). This is, in part, because of our numerically more robust treatment of quasi-degeneracies in the calculation of  $Q_{i,l}$  coefficients for OR, employing a third-order self-consistent Brillouin-Wigner perturbation theory approach, which will be presented elsewhere. On the other hand, for SHG, we simply use the unmodified algorithm of Maschio et al., in which quasi-degenerate  $Q_{i,l}$  coefficients are set to zero.