Real-space methods for ab initio modeling of surfaces and interfaces under external potential bias

Kartick Ramakrishnan,[†] Gopalakrishnan Sai Gautam,^{*,‡} and Phani Motamarri^{*,†}

†Department of Computational and Data Sciences, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore ‡Department of Materials Engineering, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore

E-mail: saigautamg@iisc.ac.in; phanim@iisc.ac.in

Abstract

Accurate *ab initio* modelling of surfaces and interfaces, especially under an applied external potential bias, is important for describing and characterizing various phenomena that occur in electronic, catalytic, and energy storage devices. Leveraging the ability of real-space density functional theory (DFT) codes to accommodate generic boundary conditions, we introduce two methods for applying an external potential bias that can be suitable for modelling surfaces and interfaces. In the first method, an external constant electric field is applied by modifying the DFT Hamiltonian via introduction of an auxiliary linear potential while solving the electrostatic potential arising in DFT using a Poisson equation with zero-Neumann boundary conditions. The second method directly enforces the desired external potential bias by imposing constraints on the electrostatic potential, thereby naturally mimicking experimental conditions. We describe the underlying DFT governing equations for the two setups within the realspace formalism employing finite-element discretization. First, we validate the constant electric field setup within real-space finite-element DFT (DFT-FE) with an equivalent approach using plane-wave DFT (i.e., using periodic boundary conditions) on three representative benchmark systems, namely La-terminated Li₇La₃Zr₂O₁₂, GaAs (111), and Al FCC (111) slabs. Subsequently, we present a comprehensive evaluation of the two setups in terms of the average ground-state properties, such as surface and adsorption energies. The methods developed in our work provide an attractive alternative to plane-wave DFT approaches in applying external potential bias that usually suffer from the periodic boundary conditions restrictions and poor scalability on parallel computing architectures. Our framework offers a robust approach for investigating surfaces and interfaces without any underlying assumptions or correction schemes while allowing for simulations of larger length scales than possible with plane-wave DFT.

1 Introduction

Ab initio calculations of surfaces and interfaces provide a rigorous, atomistic-level understanding of the intrinsic properties that govern their behaviour in various applications. Accurate computation of surface energies, work functions, and the underlying ground-state electronic structures is critical for determining chemical reactivity, electronic phenomena, and catalytic adsorption. Typically, calculations involving surfaces and interfaces are done using a 2-dimensional slab model of definite material thickness with a suitable vacuum layer in codes with periodic boundary conditions. This allows for detailed investigations into surface relaxation, surface reconstruction, defect formation, and diffusion mechanisms, which are pivotal in applications such as catalysis,¹ electronics,² energy storage,^{3,4} and corrosion inhibition.⁵

Plane-wave density functional theory (PW-DFT) is a widely used approach today for accurate electronic structure calculations employing pseudopotentials. The popularity stems from the systematic convergence offered by the plane wave basis set, which ensures spectral convergence in the computation of ground-state material properties.^{6,7} However, the choice of the basis set restricts the nature of electronic fields to be periodic. Furthermore, sufficient vacuum sizes or large cell sizes are required to minimise the interaction between their periodic images when computing ground state properties for molecules, nanoclusters, defective solids, slabs, and interfaces. Additionally, in the case of interfaces or surfaces with an intrinsic dipole moment, enforcing periodicity can lead to a spurious electric field, resulting in incorrect results and convergence issues.⁸ To mitigate these effects, larger symmetric slabs can be employed to eliminate net internal dipole moments. However, the requirement for large vacuums and larger slabs is computationally expensive, and the problem is compounded further due to the inferior scaling of plane wave codes on modern supercomputing architectures.

To address the computational expense and convergence issues of surface/interface calculations, several strategies^{9,10} have been proposed where an auxiliary linear potential is applied numerically to ensure the periodicity of electronic fields, often referred to as dipole correction schemes which recover the original nature of the problem. In contrast, real-space methods such as finite difference methods,^{11–15} wavelet-based methods^{16–18} or finite-element (FE) methods^{19–34} naturally accommodate generic boundary conditions and are systematically improvable while exhibiting excellent scalability on massively parallel computing architectures. In these methods, zero-Neumann boundary conditions on the electrostatic potential (i.e., the normal components of potential gradients are set to zero) can be imposed on the boundary parallel to the slab surface, with an additional constraint imposed to fix the electrostatic potential reference. Notably, for neutral slabs, zero-Neumann boundary conditions can eliminate the need for large vacuum and the dipole correction schemes, improving accuracy and computational efficiency using real-space methods.

Beyond analysing ground-state properties of material systems involving surfaces and interfaces, such as surface energies and work of adhesion, it is often necessary to investigate the other material parameters that control surface reactivity, diffusion mechanisms, and surface polarizability, to understand phenomena that occur at the application level. Such important material properties or parameters can be tuned by applying an external potential bias across the slab, i.e., by applying an external electric field. For example, applying an external po-

tential bias enables the tuning of surface polarization to control ferroelectricity in nanoscale electronics³⁵ and the manipulation of spin polarization for spintronic applications.³⁶ Additionally, external bias can regulate surface adsorption and modify chemical kinetics to enhance catalytic performance.^{37,38} In battery systems, electrode||electrolyte interfaces experience significant electrostatic potential differences, which can alter ion migration pathways, ultimately impacting performance and efficiency.^{39,40} Moreover, electrochemical impedance spectroscopy is a commonly used characterization technique in electrochemical devices that involves the application of an alternating potential bias across an interface to study the ionic and electronic transport mechanisms within the interface or material of interest.⁴¹ So far, PW-DFT calculations⁴²⁻⁴⁴ have been used to provide theoretical insights into the effect of applying an external potential bias, where the bias is typically treated as a constant external electric field across the material system, ^{42,45–47} which may not depict what is actually happening in a system, given that the electronic cloud within a solid will respond to any constant applied electric field. An alternative approach, based on Green's functions,⁴⁸ reformulates the electrostatic problem such that the computational domain is decoupled from periodic boundary conditions through an analytical form of Green's functions for Poisson's equation for various boundary conditions. However, this method is restricted to boundary conditions for which an explicit analytical form of Green's function is available. Thus, it is important to develop calculation strategies to accurately model scenarios where an external potential bias is applied to a surface or an interface system, either during device operation or during characterization.

In this work, we leverage the ability of real-space density functional theory (DFT) methodologies to accommodate generic boundary conditions to introduce two setups for applying an external potential bias across a slab system: (a) imposing a uniform constant external electric field (CEF) and (b) directly applying a potential difference (APD). We introduce both setups using aperiodic boundary conditions in the DFT electrostatics problem. In the CEF setup, the external electric field is the tuning parameter that determines the result-

ing applied potential difference across the slab, as commonly done in plane-wave codes.^{42–44} To achieve a CEF in real-space DFT, we need to impose a constant external electric field in the non-periodic direction of the slab by modifying the DFT Hamiltonian, which is done by adding a sawtooth-shaped potential to the Kohn-Sham effective potential. Note that the linear segment of the sawtooth potential has a slope corresponding to the magnitude of the applied electric field. Further, the electrostatic problem involving the total charge density is solved by imposing zero-Neumann boundary conditions with a zero mean value constraint to fix the reference of the electrostatic potential. In the APD setup, we directly control the electrostatic potential bias is applied. In the APD approach, the underlying electrostatics problem corresponding to the total charge density is solved by imposing inhomogeneous boundary conditions that respect the external potential bias, which ensures that the potential bias across the slab is maintained during the self-consistent field iteration employed for solving the underlying DFT problem.

We have adopted a finite-element (FE) methodology for solving the DFT problem in our current work. FE basis sets are systematically convergent and are compactly supported piecewise polynomial bases that can naturally accommodate generic boundary conditions. The locality of FE basis sets can exploit fine-grained parallelism on modern heterogeneous architectures while ensuring excellent scalability on distributed systems.^{49,50} Indeed, recent studies^{33,34,50,51} have demonstrated that FE-based methods significantly outperform planewave approaches for norm-conserving pseudopotential DFT calculations, particularly for large systems to achieve a given accuracy of ground-state energy and forces.^{31,52} The opensource code DFT-FE,^{50,51} incorporates these features while leveraging scalable and efficient solvers for solving the Kohn-Sham equations. Additionally, the recently developed projector augmented wave method formalism within the FE framework (PAW-FE)⁵³ has demonstrated nearly a tenfold speedup over existing FE-based norm-conserving pseudopotential methods, thereby extending the length scales accessible to DFT computations. In this work, we implement both setups (CEF and APD) for applying an external potential bias within the DFT-FE framework, utilizing the advantages discussed earlier, thereby establishing a robust framework for large-scale simulations of surfaces and interfaces under an external potential bias.

We begin by benchmarking the CEF setup implemented in DFT-FE with an equivalent approach^{9,45} used in plane wave codes. We consider three representative systems for our benchmarking, namely, La-terminated Li₇La₃Zr₂O₁₂ (LLZO), GaAs(111), and Al FCC(111) slab, covering a diverse range of systems from polar to non-polar and from insulating to metallic, with applications in semiconductor devices, solid-state batteries, and catalysis. Subsequently, to examine the differences between the two setups (CEF vs. APD) in DFT-FE, we plot the planar average electron density and planar average bare potential as a function of position along the non-periodic direction for the benchmark systems considered. Importantly, we observe that the bare potential for a given material system at the ground state is different between CEF and APD, resulting in different ground-state solutions. Finally, we compare the surface energy of (111) GaAs slab and La-terminated LLZO, and the adsorption energy of Na on the Al(111) surface as a function of the tuning parameters available in the CEF and APD setups.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows: Section 2 discusses the real-space formulation and FE discretization necessary for solving the Kohn-Sham ground-state problem. A detailed description of the two methods of applying an external potential bias is presented. Section 3 presents a comprehensive benchmarking of the CEF setup against an equivalent approach used in plane-wave codes. Following this, we demonstrate the differences between CEF and APD setups in DFT-FE when applying an external potential bias across the slab and extend the comparison by evaluating the surface energy of GaAs(111) and Laterminated LLZO, as well as the adsorption energy of Na on Al(111). Finally, we discuss our observations, outline future prospects arising from this work, and finish with a few concluding remarks.

2 Methods

In this section, we outline the governing equations for determining the ground-state material properties involving slab models using the real-space methods employed. Subsequently, we examine different approaches for incorporating an external potential bias, detailing the modifications to the Hamiltonian, and the resulting energy and ionic forces expressions. Finally, we provide an overview of the FE formulation used in the current work to compute the ground-state properties of slabs under an applied potential bias.

2.1 Governing equations and force expression in DFT-FE

The ground-state properties of a slab comprising of N_a nuclei and N_e electrons in a representative supercell within the norm-conserving pseudopotential formalism are governed by the following Kohn-Sham DFT (KS-DFT) energy functional, ^{54,55}

$$E\left[\left\{\psi_n\right\}, \left\{\mathbf{R}^a\right\}\right] = \min_{\{\psi_n\}\in\chi(\Omega_p)}\left\{T_{\rm s} + E_{\rm xc} + E_{\rm el} + E_{\rm psp}\right\}$$
(1)

where $\{\psi_n\}$ denotes the single-electron wavefunctions satisfying the orthonormality condition $\langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ with $1 \leq n \leq N$ where $N \geq \frac{N_e}{2}$, and $\{\mathbf{R}^a\}$ signifies the position vectors of the N_a nuclei. $\chi(\Omega_p)$ indicates an appropriate function space in which the single-electron wavefunctions lie, with Ω_p representing the 2D periodic slab domain. We focus here on the spin-unpolarized formulation for clarity and notational convenience, while the extension to the spin-polarized framework is straightforward. The term T_s in Equation (1) represents the kinetic energy of the non-interacting electrons, while $E_{\rm xc}$ represents the exchange-correlation energy that accounts for the quantum mechanical many-body effects. In this work, we adopt the generalised gradient approximation (GGA ⁵⁵⁻⁵⁷) for the exchange-correlation energy and hence we have $E_{\rm xc}[\rho(\mathbf{x})] = \int \epsilon_{\rm xc} [\rho(\mathbf{x}), \nabla \rho(\mathbf{x})] d\mathbf{x}$. Here $\rho(\mathbf{x})$ and $\nabla \rho(\mathbf{x})$ denote the electron

density and its gradient, respectively, which are computed as,

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}) = 2\sum_{n}^{N} f_{n} |\psi_{n}(\mathbf{x})|^{2}; \quad \nabla \rho(\mathbf{x}) = 2\sum_{n}^{N} f_{n} \left(\psi_{n}^{*}(\mathbf{x})\nabla\psi_{n}(\mathbf{x}) + \psi_{n}(\mathbf{x})\nabla\psi_{n}^{*}(\mathbf{x})\right)$$
(2)

where **x** denotes the spatial coordinate, and f_n is the occupation number corresponding to the electronic wavefunction indexed by 'n'.

Furthermore, $E_{\rm el}$ in Equation (1) represents the classical electrostatics energy computed as,

$$E_{\rm el}[\rho(\mathbf{x}), \{\mathbf{R}^a\}] = \max_{\phi \in \kappa(\Omega_p)} \left\{ \int_{\Omega_p} \left(\rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x})\right) \phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\Omega_p} |\nabla \phi(\mathbf{x})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \right\} - \sum_a E_{\rm self}^a \quad (3)$$

where $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the trial function for the electrostatic potential due to the total charge density $(\rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x}))$ and belongs to a suitable function space $\kappa(\Omega_p)$. E_{self}^a represents the selfenergy associated with a smeared charge $b_{\text{sm}}^a(\mathbf{x})$,⁵⁸ which is due to the introduction of atomcentered smeared charges in the local real-space electrostatics reformulation. Equation (3) results in an additional atom-centered potential, $V_{\text{self}}^a(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^a)$, which is described in our previous works.^{33,51} The electrostatic potential ($\phi(\mathbf{x})$) arising due to the total charge density $(\rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x}))$, with $b(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_a b_{\text{sm}}^a(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^a)$, is computed as the solution to the following Poisson's equation,

$$-\frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla^2\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x}) \tag{4}$$

Finally, $E_{psp}[\{\psi_n\}, \{\mathbf{R}^a\}]$ in Equation (1) represents the pseudopotential energy contribution, which is written as the sum of local and nonlocal contributions, i.e., $E_{psp}[\{\psi_n\}, \{\mathbf{R}^a\}] = E_{loc}[\rho(\mathbf{x})] + E_{nloc}[\{\psi_n\}, \{\mathbf{R}^a\}]$, where the local pseudopotential, E_{loc} , is expressed as,

$$E_{\rm loc}[\rho(\mathbf{x})] = \int_{\Omega_p} \left(V_{\rm loc}(\mathbf{x}) - V_{\rm self}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \rho(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$$
(5)

 $V_{\rm loc}(\mathbf{x})$ is the sum of atom-dependent local pseudopotentials, i.e., $V_{\rm loc}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{a} V_{\rm loc}^{a}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a})$, while $V_{\rm self}(\mathbf{x})$ is given by the sum of atom-dependent self-potentials, i.e., $V_{\rm self}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{R}^{a}$

 $\sum_{a} V_{\text{self}}^{a}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a})$. Since the electrostatic energy computed from Equation (3) involves the electrostatic potential $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ due to the electron charge and smeared charge density ($\rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x})$), the $E_{\text{loc}}[\rho(\mathbf{x})]$ term not only includes the contribution from $V_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{x})$ but is adjusted to exclude the contribution of V_{self} arising from the smeared charge density, $b(\mathbf{x})$.

Additionally, the non-local pseudopotential energy contribution, E_{nloc} , for optimized norm-conserving (or ONCV) pseudopotentials⁵⁹ is given by

$$E_{\text{nloc}}[\{\psi_n\}, \{\mathbf{R}^a\}] = 2\sum_n f_n \int_{\Omega_p} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi_n^*(\mathbf{x}) V_{\text{nloc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \psi_n(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{x}$$
(6)

where the action of $V_{\text{nloc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ on electronic wavefunction is given as follows,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} V_{\text{nloc}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \psi_n(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} = \sum_a^{N_a} \sum_\beta p_\beta^a(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^a) D_\beta^a \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} p_\beta^a(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{R}^a) \psi_n(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}$$
(7)

The composite index $\beta = \{n, l, m\}$ in Equation (7) is such that l and m denote the orbital and magnetic angular momentum index, respectively. Furthermore, $p_{\beta}^{a}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a})$ indicates the atom-centred projector of index β while D_{β}^{a} represents the pseudopotential coupling coefficients. Finally, the problem of determining the ground-state properties for given positions of nuclei ({ \mathbf{R}^{a} }) is determined by solving the following variational problem,

$$E_{\text{GS}}\left[\left\{\psi_{n}\right\},\left\{\mathbf{R}^{a}\right\}\right] = \min_{\left\{\psi_{n}\right\}\in\chi(\Omega_{p})} \max_{\phi\in\kappa(\Omega_{p})} \left\{T_{s}\left[\left\{\psi_{n}\right\}\right] - \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\Omega_{p}} |\nabla\phi(\mathbf{x})|^{2} d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega_{p}} (\rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x}))\phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \sum_{a}^{N_{a}} E_{\text{self}}^{a} + E_{\text{xc}}[\rho(\mathbf{x})] + E_{\text{loc}}[\rho(\mathbf{x})] + E_{\text{nloc}}\left[\left\{\psi_{n}\right\},\left\{\mathbf{R}^{a}\right\}\right]\right\}$$
(8)

The Euler-Lagrange equation corresponding to the minimization of the energy functional in Equation (8) subject to the orthonormality constraint on the single-electron wavefunctions $(\int \psi_i^*(\mathbf{x})\psi_j(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = \delta_{ij})$ leads to the Hermitian eigenvalue problem $\mathcal{H}\psi_i = \varepsilon_i\psi_i$ that needs to be solved for the smallest $N \ge N_e$ eigenpairs $\{\varepsilon_i, \psi_i\}$ of the Hamiltonian operator \mathcal{H} . In turn, \mathcal{H} is decomposed as $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{loc} + \mathcal{H}_{nloc}$, where \mathcal{H}_{loc} is given by,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm loc} = \left[-\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 + V_{\rm eff}(\mathbf{x}) \right], \quad V_{\rm eff}(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\delta E_{\rm xc}[\rho(\mathbf{x}), \nabla \rho(\mathbf{x})]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{x})} + \widetilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \tag{9}$$

with $\tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) = \phi(\mathbf{x}) + V_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{x}) - V_{\text{self}}(\mathbf{x})$, henceforth referred to as total electrostatic potential which includes the electron-electron and electron-nuclear interactions. Additionally, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{nloc}}$ is defined as,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm nloc}\psi_n = \sum_a^{N^a} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} V^a_{\rm nloc}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\psi_n(\mathbf{y})d\mathbf{y}$$
(10)

When dealing with periodic crystals, 2D slabs or surfaces, it is computationally efficient to invoke Bloch's theorem^{55,60} along the periodic directions and instead of solving the problem on large periodic supercells, we solve the problem on smaller unit-cells with periodic boundary conditions. Using Bloch's theorem, the electronic wavefunction becomes $\psi_n(\mathbf{x}) = e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x})$, where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ and $u_{nk}(\mathbf{x})$ is periodic within the unit-cell satisfying the condition $u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L}_r) = u_{nk}(\mathbf{x})$ for all \mathbf{k} in the first Brioullin zone of the reciprocal lattice, and lattice vectors \mathbf{L}_r along the periodic axes. To this end, the governing equations involving Bloch wavefunctions to be solved for determining the ground-state properties are given as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}^{\boldsymbol{k}} u_{n\boldsymbol{k}} = \varepsilon_{n\boldsymbol{k}} u_{n\boldsymbol{k}}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{\boldsymbol{k}} = \mathcal{H}^{\boldsymbol{k}}_{\text{loc}} + \mathcal{H}^{\boldsymbol{k}}_{\text{nloc}}$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{\boldsymbol{k}}_{\text{loc}} = \left[-\frac{1}{2} \nabla^{2} - i\boldsymbol{k} \cdot \nabla + \frac{1}{2} |\boldsymbol{k}|^{2} + V_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{x}) \right], \quad V_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{x}) = \left[\frac{\delta E_{\text{xc}}[\rho(\mathbf{x}), \nabla \rho(\mathbf{x})]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{x})} + \widetilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) \right]$$

$$V_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{r} \sum_{a \in \Omega_{p}} V^{a}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a} + \mathbf{L}_{r}), \quad V_{\text{self}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{r} \sum_{a \in \Omega_{p}} V^{a}_{\text{self}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a} + \mathbf{L}_{r})$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{\boldsymbol{k}}_{\text{nloc}} u_{n\boldsymbol{k}} = \sum_{a \in \Omega_{p}} \sum_{\beta} \sum_{r} e^{-i\boldsymbol{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{L}_{r})} p^{a}_{\beta}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a} - \mathbf{L}_{r}) D^{a}_{\beta} \int_{\Omega_{p}} \sum_{r'} e^{i\boldsymbol{k}\cdot(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{L}_{r'})} p^{a}_{\beta}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{R}^{a} - \mathbf{L}_{r'}) u_{n\boldsymbol{k}}(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}$$

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}) = 2 \sum_{n} \int_{BZ} f_{n\boldsymbol{k}} |u_{n\boldsymbol{k}}(\mathbf{x})|^{2} d\boldsymbol{k}, \quad \nabla \rho(\mathbf{x}) = 2 \sum_{n} \int_{BZ} f_{n\boldsymbol{k}} (u^{*}_{n\boldsymbol{k}}(\mathbf{x}) \nabla u_{n\boldsymbol{k}}(\mathbf{x}) + u_{n\boldsymbol{k}}(\mathbf{x}) \nabla u^{*}_{n\boldsymbol{k}}(\mathbf{x})) d\boldsymbol{k}$$

$$- \frac{1}{4\pi} \nabla^{2} V^{a}_{\text{self}} = b^{a}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a}), \quad - \frac{1}{4\pi} \nabla^{2} \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x}) \qquad (11)$$

where f_{BZ} denotes the volume average of the integral over the first Brillouin zone (BZ) corresponding to the periodic unit cell Ω_p . A detailed discussion on computing ion forces and cell stresses can be found in our previous work.^{51,61} For completeness, we mention here the expressions for the ionic force in the norm-conserving pseudopotential formulation:

$$\mathbf{F}^{a} = -\frac{dE_{\rm GS}}{d\mathbf{R}^{a}} = F_{\rm loc}^{a} + F_{\rm nloc}^{a} + F_{\rm nloc}^{a^{*}}$$

$$\mathbf{F}_{\rm loc}^{a} = -\int_{\Omega_{p}} \nabla\rho(\mathbf{x}) \left(V_{\rm loc}^{a}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a}) - V_{\rm self}^{a}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a}) \right) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_{p}} b^{a}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{R}^{a}) \nabla\phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$$
(12)

$$\begin{split} \boldsymbol{F}_{n\text{loc}}^{a} &= 2\sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{BZ} f_{n,\boldsymbol{k}} \bigg[\int_{\Omega_{p}} \sum_{\beta} \sum_{r} e^{-i\boldsymbol{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{L}_{r})} p_{\beta}^{a}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{R}^{a}-\mathbf{L}_{r}) d\mathbf{x} D_{\beta}^{a} \int_{\Omega_{p}} \sum_{r'} e^{i\boldsymbol{k}\cdot(\mathbf{y}-L_{r'})} \\ & p_{\beta}^{a}(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{R}^{a}-\mathbf{L}_{r'}) (\nabla u_{n\boldsymbol{k}}(\mathbf{y})+i\boldsymbol{k}u_{n\boldsymbol{k}}(\mathbf{y})) d\mathbf{y} \bigg] d\boldsymbol{k} \end{split}$$

2.2 Applying an external potential bias

First, we consider the effect of a constant external electric field (or CEF), which is analogous to the sawtooth method with dipole correction employed in plane-wave codes.^{9,45} Second, we examine the case where the classical electrostatic potential ($\phi(\mathbf{x})$) conforms to the external potential bias through the boundary conditions imposed on $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ in the Poisson equation (Equation (4)), referred to as the applied potential difference (or APD) setup.

2.2.1 CEF setup

The typical approach to imposing an external electric field on slabs is to employ a sawtooth potential,⁴⁵ which is the method of choice for slabs in Quantum Espresso (QE^{62}) and one of the approaches used in our work as well. An alternative approach to applying a constant electric field is by introducing a dipole sheet in the vacuum region.^{10,42} In the current CEF setup, the effective potential ($V_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{x})$) in Equation (9) is modified to take the form,

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\delta E_{\text{xc}}[\rho(\mathbf{x}), \nabla \rho(\mathbf{x})]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{x})} + \widetilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) + V_{\text{app}}(\mathbf{x})\right)$$
(13)



Figure 1: CEF – The boundary conditions for the electrostatic potential $(\phi(\mathbf{x}))$ are periodic along the periodic boundaries Γ_{y_0} , Γ_{y_1} , Γ_{x_0} (not shown), and Γ_{x_1} (not shown). Zero-Neumann conditions are applied on the non-periodic boundaries Γ_{z_0} , Γ_{z_1} . The constant electric field is applied by introducing the saw-tooth potential V_{app} . The electric field (\mathcal{E}) is determined as $-\mathcal{E}\Delta Z = \delta V$).

where $V_{app}(\mathbf{x})$ is the linear periodic potential across the material system as indicated in Figure 1. The slope of V_{app} dictates the magnitude of the electric field, $-\mathcal{E} = \frac{dV_{app}}{dz}$. We design the profile of $V_{app}(\mathbf{x})$ to be a sawtooth function, similar to plane-wave codes, with the maximum and the minimum values located close to the simulation cell boundaries, as shown in Figure 1. Unlike planewave basis, the electrostatic potential $(\phi(\mathbf{x}))$ in DFT-FE need not be fully periodic and we impose semi-periodic boundary conditions on $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ to simulate neutral slabs. Specifically, as displayed in Figure 1, we impose periodic boundaries parallel to the slab surface while solving for $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ using the Poisson equation (see Equation (4)). Additionally, we apply a zero mean-value constraint, $\int_{\Omega_p} \phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 0$, to fix the reference potential and remove the arbitrary constant offset.

Finally, we summarize the governing equation and boundary conditions to determine $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ in the CEF setup as:

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{1}{4\pi} \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_p, \\ \phi(\mathbf{x})\Big|_{\Gamma_{x_0}} = \phi(\mathbf{x})\Big|_{\Gamma_{x_1}}, \quad \phi(\mathbf{x})\Big|_{\Gamma_{y_0}} = \phi(\mathbf{x})\Big|_{\Gamma_{y_1}}, \\ \nabla \phi(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\Big|_{\Gamma_{z_0}} = 0, \quad \nabla \phi(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\Big|_{\Gamma_{z_1}} = 0, \quad \int_{\Omega_p} \phi(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = 0. \end{cases}$$
(14)

The inclusion of $V_{\text{app}}(\mathbf{x})$ requires the energy functional in Equation (8) to be modified as:

$$E_{\rm GS}\left[\left\{\psi_n\right\}, \left\{\mathbf{R}^a\right\}\right] = \min_{\left\{\psi_i\right\}\in\ \phi\in\ } \left\{T_s\left[\left\{\psi_n\right\}\right] - \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\Omega_p} |\nabla\phi(\mathbf{x})|^2 d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega_p} \left(\rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x})\right)\phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega_p} \left(\rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x})\right)V_{\rm app}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} + E_{\rm xc}[\rho(\mathbf{x})] + E_{\rm loc}[\rho(\mathbf{x})] + E_{\rm nloc}[\left\{\psi_n\right\}, \left\{\mathbf{R}^a\right\}]\right\}$$
(15)

Additionally, the ionic forces are modified as

$$\boldsymbol{F}^{a} = \boldsymbol{F}^{a}_{\text{loc}} + \boldsymbol{F}^{a}_{\text{nloc}} + \boldsymbol{F}^{a^{*}}_{\text{nloc}} + \boldsymbol{F}^{a}_{\text{app}}$$
(16)

where $\mathbf{F}_{\text{loc}}^{a}, \mathbf{F}_{\text{nloc}}^{a}$ are defined in Equation (12) and $\mathbf{F}_{\text{app}}^{a} = -\nabla V_{\text{app}} \mathcal{Z}_{v}$, with \mathcal{Z}_{v}^{a} being the valence charge of atom 'a'.

2.2.2 APD setup



Figure 2: APD— The boundary conditions for the total electrostatic potential $(\phi(\mathbf{x}))$ is periodic along the periodic boundaries Γ_{y_0} , Γ_{y_1} , Γ_{x_0} (not shown), and Γ_{x_1} (not shown), while Dirichlet boundary conditions are imposed on the non-periodic boundaries. Z_A and Z_B denote the interface between the vacuum and metal conductors. L_w denotes the distance between the surface and metal conductors. Furthermore, $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ is constrained in the region of metal conductors as shown in the shaded region, ensuring the electric field in the conductor region is zero.

The natural approach to applying an external potential bias is to impose constraints on the total electrostatic potential ($\tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x})$) so that the desired potential difference is maintained. In contrast to the CEF setup, where δV_{app} is controlled via the value of the constant electric field, this method

directly enforces the total electrostatic potential difference across the slab, $\delta \tilde{\phi}$ as the boundary condition. Since $\delta \tilde{\phi}$ corresponds directly to the controlling parameters used in electrochemical and surface science measurements, this approach provides a more direct link to the experimental setup. To implement APD, the solution of the electrostatic variational problem in Equation (3) should satisfy the boundary conditions shown in Figure 2. Thus, we can summarize the governing equation and boundary conditions for computing the electrostatic potential ($\phi(\mathbf{x})$) in the APD setup as:

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{1}{4\pi} \nabla^2 \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_p, \\ \phi(\mathbf{x})\Big|_{\Gamma_{x_0}} = \phi(\mathbf{x})\Big|_{\Gamma_{x_1}}, \quad \phi(\mathbf{x})\Big|_{\Gamma_{y_0}} = \phi(\mathbf{x})\Big|_{\Gamma_{y_1}}, \\ \phi(\mathbf{x}) = -(V_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{x}) - V_{\text{self}}(\mathbf{x})) \; \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_0 \quad \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \delta V - (V_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{x}) - V_{\text{self}}(\mathbf{x})) \; \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega_1. \end{cases}$$
(17)

Notably, the Kohn-Sham energy functional remains unchanged from Equation (8), thereby, the governing equation and the expression for ionic forces are exactly the same as in Equation (11) and (12), respectively. We note that the electrostatic screening method, ⁴⁸ designed for use with plane-wave codes is in a similar spirit. However, it relies on Green's functions of the Poisson equation for various boundary conditions, restricting the applicability to cases where analytical solutions are available.

2.3 FE discretization

4

We discretize the governing equation in Equation (11) by employing the FE basis, 63,64 which comprises of C^0 -continuous piecewise Lagrange polynomials interpolated over Gauss-Lobatto-Legandre nodal points. To this end, the FE representation of the various electronic fields in Equation (11) are given by,

$$u_{n\boldsymbol{k}}^{h}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{I}^{M} N_{I}^{h,p}(\mathbf{x}) u_{n\boldsymbol{k}}^{I}, \quad \phi^{h}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{I}^{M_{el}} N_{I}^{h,p_{el}}(\mathbf{x}) \phi^{I}$$
(18)

where u_{nk}^{I} , ϕ^{I} present the FE discretized fields, while $N_{I}^{h,p}(\mathbf{x})$, $N_{I}^{h,p_{el}}(\mathbf{x})$ are the strictly local Lagrange polynomials of degrees p, p_{el} , respectively. The resulting discretized eigenvalue problem $\mathbf{H}^{k} \boldsymbol{u}_{nk} = \varepsilon_{n,k}^{h} \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{u}_{nk}$ is a nonlinear generalized eigenvalue problem where \mathbf{H}^{k} is the FE-discretised Hamiltonian and **M** represents the FE-basis overlap matrix. Furthermore, to determine the electrostatics potential $(\phi^h(\mathbf{x}))$, the FE-discretized Poisson equation $\mathbf{K}\phi = \mathbf{c}$ is solved with appropriate boundary conditions, where the entries of **K** are $K_{IJ} = \int_{\Omega_p} \nabla N_I^{h,p_{el}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla N_J^{h,p_{el}}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ and $c_I = \int_{\Omega_p} N_I^{h,p_{el}}(\mathbf{x})(\rho(\mathbf{x}) + b(\mathbf{x}))d\mathbf{x}$. A detailed discussion on the eigensolver, self-consistent-field iteration related mixing strategies and the efficient solution strategies that leverage the sparsity of the FE basis are discussed in our previous works.^{33,49,51,65}

2.4 Computational details

The two setups for applying an external potential bias (CEF and APD), as discussed in the previous subsections, were implemented within the DFT-FE framework employing norm-conserving pseudopotentials. In our calculations, we employed GGA^{66,67} for the exchange-correlation functional, specifically utilizing the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) form,⁶⁸ as implemented in the libxc⁶⁹ library. Furthermore, the plane-wave calculations for some of the validation studies were performed using QE, using the dipfield option to enable dipole correction and the tefield option to add the sawtooth potential. The ONCV pseudopotentials⁵⁹ used for these simulations were from pseudodojo⁷⁰ and SPMS⁷¹ repositories (refer to Supporting Information, Section S1 for more details). The plane-wave discretization parameter, $E_{\rm cut}$ for QE, was selected such that the discretization error with respect to refined calculation $(E_{\text{cut}} = 100 \ E_h)$ is of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5}) \frac{E_h}{\text{atom}}$ for DFT ground-state energy, $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})\frac{E_h}{\text{bohr}}$ for ionic forces and $\mathcal{O}(10^{-6})\frac{E_h}{\text{bohr}^3}$ for unit-cell stresses, wherever applicable. Similarly, the discretization parameters in DFT-FE are the FE interpolating polynomial degree 'p' and mesh size around atom 'h'. These were chosen such that a discretization error of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})\frac{E_h}{\text{atom}}$ for ground-state energy, $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})\frac{E_h}{\text{bohr}}$ for ionic forces and $\mathcal{O}(10^{-6})\frac{E_h}{\text{bohr}^3}$ was achieved with reference to a refined calculation $(E_{\rm cut} = 100 E_h)$ in QE for each bulk system. For the Brillouin zone integration, we employ Monkhorst-Pack (MP) grids⁷² to ensure systematic convergence of electronic properties. The k-point sampling rule for Brillouin zone integration was chosen so that the errors from successive refined samplings were of a higher order relative to the discretization errors incurred, ensuring systematic convergence of electronic properties.

3 Results

In this section, we begin by benchmarking the CEF setup implemented in DFT-FE against an equivalent setup^{9,45} in QE. We compare the dipole moment, free energy, and ionic forces with various magnitudes of constant external electric fields and compute the dielectric response of the three systems considered in this work. Following this validation study for the CEF setup, we compare the CEF and the APD setups by analyzing the difference in the ground state solutions of electron density $(\rho(\mathbf{x}))$ and bare potential $(V_{\text{bare}}(\mathbf{x}))$. Finally, we compare the influence of external potential bias in the two setups on ground-state properties, namely, surface and adsorption energies.



Figure 3: Systems considered – (a) La-terminated LLZO (Li: blue spheres, La: yellow, Zr: green, O: red), (b) GaAs (111) (Ga: red, As: green), (c) Al (111), and (d) Na adsorbed on Al (111) (Al: blue, Na: yellow). The locations Z_A and Z_B denote the metal-vacuum interfaces for the APD setup. Furthermore, the external potential bias δV across $Z_B - Z_A$ is δV_{app} in the CEF setup and $\delta \phi$ in the APD setup.

The systems considered in this work, as showcased in Figure 3, are: (a) La-terminated LLZO slab- identified as one of the favourable terminations in a previous study,⁷³ consists of 12 formula units of Li₇La₃Zr₂O₁₂. LLZO is an insulating system, has applications as a solid electrolyte in lithium-based batteries, and we employ Γ -point sampling for Brillouin zone integration. (b) GaAs (111) slab- consists of four alternating layers of Ga and As atoms, comprising 24 atoms. The slab is polar, with Ga and As terminations on opposite surfaces. The bulk crystal structure was obtained

from the Materials Project database,⁷⁴ and is well-known to be a semiconducting material with applications in electronic devices. For Brillouin zone integration, we use a $10 \times 10 \times 1$ Monkhorst-Pack grid. (c) Al (111) slab – comprising four layers of the FCC structure with a total of 32 Al atoms. We used the bulk geometry of this metallic system from the Materials Project database.⁷⁴ We use a $12 \times 12 \times 1$ k-point grid for Brillouin zone integration. As a sample system to model a simple adsorption process, we evaluate the adsorption energy of Na on Al (111). Note that we place the adsorbed Na at a distance of 5 bohr 'above' the 'top' layer of Al atoms in the (111) slab (see panel d in Figure 3). We limit the maximum external electric field to 0.2 V/A for the LLZO slab and 0.15 V/A for the GaAs slab, where these limits are determined based on bulk calculated band gap and the slab thickness to ensure there is no dielectric breakdown.

3.1 Validation of CEF setup

In this subsection, we benchmark the CEF setup implemented in DFT-FE as described in Section 2.2.1 with that of the constant electric field setup^{9,45} used in QE. For various magnitudes of external electric field \mathcal{E} , we compare the DFT internal energy, ionic forces, and dipole moments between the two codes. The dipole moment(μ) is computed relative to the center of the simulation domain as $\mu_z = \int_{\Omega_p} (b(\mathbf{x}) + \rho(\mathbf{x})) z d\mathbf{x}$, where z represents the position along the non-periodic axis. We follow the convention that electron density ($\rho(\mathbf{x})$) is positive while the nuclear charge density ($b(\mathbf{x})$) is negative. The internal energy and forces are computed as per Equation (15) and Equation (16), respectively.

As discussed in Section 2.2.1, referring to Equation (14), the electrostatic problem for the total charge density in the CEF setup is solved using Neumann boundary conditions on the non-periodic boundaries, with an additional zero-mean value constraint to fix the electrostatic potential reference. \mathcal{E} is included in the DFT Hamiltonian using the auxiliary potential, V_{app} . In contrast, periodic boundary conditions are used in QE when computing the electrostatic potential. However, non-zero dipole moment in the system results in artificial electric fields in QE and is mitigated using a dipole correction scheme⁹ in the course of the self-consistent-field iteration. The potential corresponding to the constant external electric field is of sawtooth form in both DFT-FE and QE, with maximum

and minimum values positioned at 0.1 fractional units from the simulation boundaries.



Figure 4: Dielectric response comparison of CEF in DFT-FE (triangles) against sawtooth potential with dipole correction in QE (squares). The plots show the dipole moment (μ) in units of debye (D) as a function of applied external field (\mathcal{E}) in V/Å for (a) La-terminated LLZO, (b) GaAs (111), and (c) Al (111). The plots also highlight the dipole moment at zero external electric field.

Figure 4 compares the dielectric response of CEF implemented in DFT-FE, against the setup in QE for (a) La-terminated LLZO, (b) GaAs (111), and (c) Al (111) slabs. The slope of the dipole moment against the external electric field quantifies the material's polarization ($\alpha_z = \frac{\Delta \mu}{\Delta \mathcal{E}}$). Table 1 compiles the calculated dipole moments (μ) for all systems at zero external electric field ($\mathcal{E} = 0$) with DFT-FE and QE. For the Al (111) slab, the presence of inversion symmetry results in a nearly vanishing dipole moment at $\mathcal{E} = 0$. In contrast, for the La-terminated LLZO and GaAs (111) slabs, a nonzero dipole moment of 1.57 D and 1.47 D, respectively, is observed. These non-zero dipole moments highlight the importance of boundary conditions imposed: the presence of a large non-zero dipole moment suggests that if short circuit boundary conditions (i.e., periodic or homogeneous Dirichlet) were imposed on the total electrostatic potential ($\tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x})$), as would be the case in the APD setup, the resulting ground-state obtained would be different. Hence, we emphasize that by imposing zero-Neumann boundary conditions (or open circuit boundary conditions) for slabs, we ensure that the electrostatic potential can adjust naturally, leading to a physically accurate description of the ground state.

Furthermore, from Tables 2, 3 and 4 in Section S2 of the Supporting Information, we observe a difference of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-6})\frac{E_h}{\text{atom}}$ in free energy, $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})\frac{E_h}{\text{bohr}}$ in ionic forces and $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ D in dipole moment between DFT-FE and QE. The close agreement in ground-state properties leads to excellent consistency in polarizability (α_z) between DFT-FE and QE, as shown in Table 1, suggesting the equivalency of both approaches in implementing a CEF. Having validated the CEF setup, we next compare this setup with the APD setup, a more natural way of applying an external potential difference. We consider the same representative benchmark systems for the study.

Table 1: Comparison of polarization (α_z) and dipole moment (μ) at zero external electric field $(\mathcal{E} = 0.0)$ for the benchmark systems.

System	$\alpha_z(in$	$\mathrm{bohr}^3)$	μ at $\mathcal{E} = 0$ (in D)		
System	QE	DFT-FE	QE	DFT-FE	
La-terminated LLZO	1422.19	1422.27	1.5764	1.5756	
GaAs (111)	357.89	357.92	1.4689	1.4713	
Al (111)	318.56	318.62	1.95×10^{-5}	1.98×10^{-5}	

3.2 Comparison between CEF and APD setups

In this section, we compare CEF and APD setups of applying an external potential bias by analyzing planar average electron density ($\rho^0(z)$) and planar average bare potential ($V_{\text{bare}}^0(z)$), where $V_{\text{bare}}(\mathbf{x})$ is defined as $V_{\text{bare}}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) + V_{\text{app}}(\mathbf{x})$ with $\tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) = \phi(\mathbf{x}) + (V_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{x}) - V_{\text{self}}(\mathbf{x}))$ denoting the total electrostatic potential due to electron and nuclear charge density. Specifically, $\rho^0(z)$ and $V_{\text{bare}}^0(z)$ are computed as follows,

$$\rho^{0}(z) = \int_{S_{z}} \rho(\mathbf{x}) dx dy, \quad V_{\text{bare}}^{0}(z) = \frac{1}{A_{z}} \int_{S_{z}} V_{\text{bare}}(\mathbf{x}) dx dy \tag{19}$$

where S_z denotes the planar surface within the simulation domain located at position z along the non-periodic axis, while A_z corresponds to the area of S_z . Note that $V_{app}(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the applied potential arising due to the constant electric fields across the slab. As discussed in Section 2.2.1, CEF setup introduces V_{app} as a sawtooth potential with slope $-\mathcal{E}$ across the slab. In contrast, the APD setup (see Section 2.2.2) imposes the external potential bias as a constraint on the electrostatic potential ($\tilde{\phi}$) at a distance of L_w from the slab surface (see Figure 2), while $V_{app} = 0$ throughout the simulation domain. We position the metal-vacuum interface at $L_w = 10$ bohr from the slab's surface to provide a sufficiently thick vacuum region that minimizes electron density penetration into the conductor, since the atomic valence density, as obtained from the pseudopotential file,^{71,75} remains below $5 \times 10^{-6} \frac{e}{bohr^3}$ at $L_w = 10$ bohr. Table 2 shows the external potential bias imposed for the various systems considered, and this corresponds to an electric field of $\mathcal{E} = 0.1 \frac{V}{A}$ for Laterminated LLZO and GaAs (111) and $\mathcal{E} = 0.15 \frac{V}{A}$ for Al (111) with and without Na adsorbed in the CEF setup.

Figures 5 and 6 show the plot of the difference in the ground-state planar average electron density $(\Delta \rho^0(z) = \rho^{0,\text{CEF}}(z) - \rho^{0,\text{APD}}(z))$ and planar average bare potential $(\Delta V_{\text{bare}}^0(z) = V_{\text{bare}}^{0,\text{CEF}}(z) - V_{\text{bare}}^{0,\text{APD}}(z))$. Additionally, Table 2 compares the differences in dipole moments (μ) , free energies (ΔE) and ionic forces (ΔF) between the two setups studied in this work. For the case of Al (111) slab, with or without Na adsorbed, the intrinsic metallic screening results in negligible difference in V_{bare} within the slab region between the two setups (Figure 5), while a similarly strong internal screening is also observed in GaAs (111) slab, where no significant variation in V_{bare} is observed within the slab between the two setups. In contrast, the insulating La-terminated LLZO slab shows a significant difference in V_{bare} between the two setups within the slab region (Figure 6).

As discussed earlier in this subsection, the potential bias is applied such that the potential at Z_A is higher than that of Z_B (see Figures 1 and 2). Consequently, we observe the electron density, and hence the dipole moment (μ) to shift towards Z_B . Furthermore, μ values in Table 2 indicate that the shifts in μ for the APD setup is greater than CEF, which is due to the fact that the APD setup precisely maintains the target potential bias, while δV_{bare}^0 is lower in the CEF setup. The δV_{bare}^0 being lower than the target value in the CEF setup is expected since $\delta V_{\text{app}}(\neq \delta V_{\text{bare}}^0)$ is obtained via the electric field \mathcal{E} , which is the controlling parameter. On the other hand, $\delta \tilde{\phi}(=\delta V_{\text{bare}}^0)$ is the controlling parameter in the APD setup. As a consequence, we treat the control parameters, namely \mathcal{E} or δV_{app} in CEF and δV_{bare}^0 or $\delta \tilde{\phi}$ in APD, for each setup separately and emphasize that for experimental setups where the total electrostatic potential ($\tilde{\phi}$) across the surface or interface is controlled, the APD setup is a natural choice in the modelling strategy. In the next subsection, we present the surface energies and adsorption energies using both setups.



Figure 5: Comparison of CEF against APD. The shaded region depicts the region of the slab. The plot on the left shows $\Delta \rho^0(z)$ with respect to z-coordinate in fractional units, while the plot on the right shows $\Delta V_{\text{bare}}^0(z)$ with respect to z-coordinate in fractional units. We offset $V_{\text{bare}}^0(z)$ such that $V_{\text{bare}}^0(0.5) = 0$, aligning the reference for both the potentials.



Figure 6: La-terminated LLZO slab. Comparison of CEF against APD. The shaded region depicts the region of the slab. The plot on the left shows $\Delta \rho^0(z)$ with respect to z-coordinate in fractional units, while the plot on the right shows $\Delta V_{\text{bare}}^0(z)$ with respect to z-coordinate in fractional units. We offset $V_{\text{bare}}^0(z)$ such that $V_{\text{bare}}^0(0.5) = 0$, aligning the reference for both the potentials.

Table 2: Comparison of δV_{bare}^0 compared to the target value, dipole moments (μ) , differences in free energies (ΔE) and ionic forces (ΔF) between the CEF and APD setups for the benchmark systems considered.

System Target δV (in $\frac{E_h}{e}$)	$\delta V_{\text{bare}}^0 (\text{in } \frac{E_h}{e})$		μ (in D)		$\Delta E (in \underline{E_h})$	$\Delta \mathbf{F}$ (in $\underline{E_h}$)	
	$\operatorname{Target } OV \left(\operatorname{III} \frac{-}{e} \right)$	CEF	APD	CEF	APD	$\Delta E \left(\lim \frac{1}{a tom} \right)$	$\Delta \Gamma (\Pi \overline{bohr})$
La-terminated LLZO	-0.143	-0.072	-0.143	8.2	19.39	3.51×10^{-5}	4.04×10^{-3}
GaAs (111)	-0.072	-0.008	-0.072	3.3	8.64	2.22×10^{-4}	$7.78 \times 10 - 4$
Al (111)	-0.099	-0.040	-0.099	2.43	6.08	1.42×10^{-4}	9.73×10^{-5}
Al (111) + Na	-0.113	-0.021	-0.113	5.5	13.83	3.81×10^{-4}	$2.6 imes 10^{-3}$

3.3 Surface and adsorption energies: CEF vs. APD

In this section, we examine the relaxed surface energies of the La-terminated LLZO surface and GaAs (111) surface at various external potential biases. Furthermore, we also investigate the effect of external potential bias on the adsorption energy of Na on Al (111) surface. We compare the surface energies (γ) and adsorption energies (E_{ads}) obtained between the two setups CEF and APD. All relaxed structures are obtained using the LBFGS algorithm until the atomic forces are below $4 \times 10^{-4} \frac{E_h}{\text{bohr}}$, ensuring well-converged structures for subsequent analyses.

Comparison of surface energies: The surface energy (γ) in J/m^2 is computed from DFT as $\gamma(\delta V) = \frac{1}{2A} \left[E_{\text{slab}}(\delta V) - \frac{N}{N_{\text{bulk}}} E_{\text{bulk}} \right]$, where A denotes the surface area in m^2 . $E_{\text{slab}}(\delta V)$ and E_{bulk} are the DFT total energies of the relaxed slab and bulk structures, with $\frac{N}{N_{\text{bulk}}}$ indicating the ratio of the number of formula units present in the slab to the number of formula units in the bulk unit cell. In the CEF setup, the potential bias is such that $\delta V_{\text{app}} = \delta V$, while for APD setup, the total electrostatic potential difference satisfies $\delta \tilde{\phi} = \delta V$ (see Figures 1 and 2).

Figure 7 compares the surface energies (γ) and dipole moments (μ) for La-terminated LLZO and GaAs (111) slabs. Note that each panel in Figure 7 shows the control parameter $\delta V_{\rm app}$ (bottom x-axis) for CEF and $\delta \phi$ (top x-axis) for APD separately. From Figure 7(a) for La-terminated LLZO, we observe that the surface energy of APD is consistently lower than CEF. Moreover, the difference in surface energies increases with increasing magnitude of potential difference, with a maximum difference of 0.049 J/m^2 at a potential difference (δV_{app}) of -0.178 E_h/e . A similar trend is observed in Figure 7(b) for GaAs (111) slab, where the surface energy computed in APD setup is consistently lower than CEF, with the maximum difference in γ of 0.03 J/m^2 . The minimum difference in γ between the two setups occurs at a positive bias of 0.018 E_h/e for GaAs (111), while the minimum difference in γ for LLZO occurs at zero bias. Additionally, for both the LLZO and GaAs, we observe the variation of dipole moment (μ) of relaxed structures in the APD setup to exhibit a steeper variation with applied bias than CEF. The steeper variation of μ in APD is in line with our previous observation of a larger dipole shift in the APD setup, as described in Section 3.2. The differences observed in γ and μ between the two setups indicate the fundamental differences in interpreting an applied potential bias across a system and the importance of the different control parameters involved.

Adsorption energy: The adsorption energy (E_{ads}) of Na on Al (111) surface is computed as $E_{ads}(\delta V) = [E_{slab}^{Al+Na}(\delta V) - E_{slab}^{Al}(\delta V) - E^{Na}]$, where $E_{slab}^{Al+Na}(\delta V)$ denotes the DFT internal energy of Na atom on Al (111) slab and $E_{slab}^{Al}(\delta V)$ denotes the internal energy of Al (111) slab at external potential bias δV . E^{Na} is the internal energy of single Na atom in vacuum without any potential bias. We ensure that the locations $(Z_A \text{ and } Z_B)$ of the metal-vacuum interface for both Na on Al (111) slab and standalone Al (111) slab are the same with $\Delta Z = Z_A - Z_B = 33.8$ bohr.





Figure 7: Comparison of surface energy (in J/m^2) and dipole moment (in debye) between CEF and APD setups. The systems considered are (a) **La-terminated LLZO** (top row) and (b) **GaAs (111) slab** (bottom row). The control parameters, δV_{app} (black) for CEF and $\delta \tilde{\phi}$ (blue) for APD are shown as separate x-axes.

Figure 8 compares the adsorption energy (E_{ads}) and dipole moments (μ) of the relaxed structures of Na adsorbed on Al (111) and Al (111) slab for both the setups. Similar to the surface energy plots (Figure 7), the panels in Figure 8 show the control parameter δV_{app} (bottom x-axis) for CEF and control parameter $\delta \tilde{\phi}$ (top x-axis) for APD separately. From Figure 8, we observe that the adsorption energy decreases with decrease in external potential bias for both setups, which can be attributed to Na being near the Z_A interface and adsorbs on the Al by partial electron transfer (see Figure 3). Under a positive bias, the electron density is drawn toward the Na atom, inhibiting further transfer of electrons and thereby weakening the ability of Na to get adsorbed. In contrast, a negative bias redistributes electron density away from the Na site, promoting charge transfer and strengthening Na adsorption. Additionally, from Figure 8, we observe that the change in Na adsorption energy is more sensitive to the applied bias in the APD setup than the CEF setup. Similarly, we observe a steeper variation in the μ of relaxed structures versus applied bias in the APD setup compared to CEF, in agreement without our observation in Section 3.2.



Figure 8: Comparison of adsorption energy (in eV) and dipole moment (in debye) between CEF and APD. The adsorption energy of Na on Al (111) surface is computed along with the dipole moment of the relaxed Al (111) slab at various external potential biases. The control parameters $\delta V_{\rm app}$ (black) for CEF and $\delta \phi$ (blue) for APD are shown as separate x-axes.

4 Perspectives and concluding remarks

Accurate and efficient first-principles modelling of surfaces and interfaces is essential for gaining theoretical insights into essential processes such as charge transfer, reaction kinetics, material stability, and polarization, which are highly important to understand and optimize in applications such as catalysis, batteries, fuel cells, sensors, and electronics. While PW-DFT has long been the preferred method for first-principles simulations, the inherent restriction in plane-wave methodologies to impose periodic boundary conditions leads to undesirable consequences such as spurious image-image interactions and the emergence of artificial electric fields in the case of systems with a net-dipole. Additionally, plane-wave-based codes exhibit poor scalability on multi-node CPU-GPU architectures, restricting the system sizes that can be handled. In contrast, real-space FE methods employed in this work can accommodate generic boundary conditions and have demonstrated exceptional ability to scale on massively parallel supercomputing architectures across the world. The ability of DFT-FE to efficiently handle large systems and accomodate generic boundary conditions presents new opportunities for modelling surfaces and interfaces with minimal approximations, which has been leveraged in this work for modelling surfaces and interfaces.

The control of external parameters, such as potential bias, solvation effects, or their combination, plays a critical role in tailoring the properties of slabs and interfaces. PW-DFT calculations using a constant electric field^{42,43,45} have provided insights on controlling properties such as surface diffusion, polarization and ferroelectricity. Additionally, the ESM method⁴⁸ in PW-DFT decouples the periodicity of the electrostatic potential by analytically solving for the electrostatic potential using the Greens function approach with non-periodic boundary conditions. This method provides flexibility in modelling surfaces and interfaces by introducing a generic framework to control potential bias, solvation effects or their combination. However, when employed in conjunction with PW-DFT, the ESM method assumes that the mean field effective potential is short-ranged, which is not necessarily true when exact exchange⁷⁶ or van-der-waals⁷⁷ functionals are employed. Consequently, employing semi-periodic boundary conditions is essential for the accurate modelling of surfaces and interfaces without any spurious periodic interactions in the presence of a potential bias. Addressing the above limitations and to model larger-scale systems involving surfaces and interfaces, we implement in DFT-FE two setups of applying an external potential bias: (i) constant electric field (CEF) and (ii) applied potential difference (APD). These setups, in contrast to the NEGF (nonequilibrium Green's functions)⁷⁸ formulation, ensure that the electrons are in the ground state and the electronic current is negligible. We benchmark and validate the CEF setup with the constant electric field setup in QE by comparing ground-state properties such as internal energy, ion forces and dipole moment. We observe an excellent agreement in the ground-state properties for the benchmark systems considered, namely, LLZO, GaAs, and Al.

In the CEF setup, a constant electric field (\mathcal{E}) is applied along the non-periodic direction in DFT-FE. The DFT Hamiltonian is modified by introducing an auxiliary linear potential, $V_{\text{app}}(\mathbf{x})$, such that the slope of this linear potential equals $-\mathcal{E}$. Furthermore, the electrostatic potential arising from the electron and nuclear densities is obtained by solving the Poisson's problem with zero-Neumann boundary conditions on boundaries parallel to the slab surface. Additionally, a zero mean-value constraint is imposed to fix the reference of the electrostatic potential ($\phi(\mathbf{x})$). In this setup, the modelling of surfaces and interfaces in a vacuum can be accomplished by setting the external electric field to zero ($\mathcal{E}=0$).

In contrast to the CEF setup, the APD setup directly enforces the desired (experimental) potential bias by imposing constraints on the total electrostatic potential ($\tilde{\phi}(\mathbf{x})$). Note that the APD setup can be modified to include solvation effects^{79,80} with appropriate changes to the Poisson problem to determine the total electrostatic potential. The two setups (CEF and APD) control different parameters (δV_{app} and $\delta \tilde{\phi}$, respectively) and hence have different electronic ground-states as demonstrated in Figures 5 and 6.

To further contrast the two setups, we compared the planar average electron density ($\rho^0(z)$) and bare potential within our representative systems. We observed for (111) Al FCC and (111) GaAs a similar behaviour of $V_{\text{bare}}^0(z)$ within the slab due to screening effects, while for La-terminated LLZO slab, we noticed a significant difference in $V_{\text{bare}}^0(z)$ in the region of the slab. For all the systems considered, we observed that the dipole moment response to the potential bias was stronger in the APD setup than CEF, resulting in steeper variations in surface and adsorption energies with applied bias. Overall, the APD setup consistently demonstrates greater sensitivity to the external potential bias in both surface energy and adsorption energy calculations compared to the CEF setup, and should represent experimental scenarios of an applied potential bias better. Finally, the two setups (CEF and APD) as implemented in DFT-FE offer a robust framework for investigating surfaces and interfaces without any underlying assumptions or correction schemes, while also enabling simulations at that scale better with available computational resources compared to most state-of-the-art PW-DFT codes.

Acknowledgement

P.M. gratefully acknowledges the seed grant from the Indian Institute of Science and the SERB Startup Research Grant from the Department of Science and Technology India (Grant Number: SRG/2020/002194), which supported the purchase of GPU clusters used in the current work. P.M and S.G acknowledge National Supercomputing Mission (NSM) R&D for exascale grant (DST/NSM/R&D Exascale/2021/14.02) that supported the use of PARAM Pravega supercomputer at the Indian Institute of Science. This research also used computational resources at the Argonne and the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facilities. The Argonne Leadership Computing Facility at Argonne National Laboratory is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. DOE under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357. The Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. DOE under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725. K.R. acknowledges the Prime Minister Research Fellowship(PMRF) from the Ministry of Education India for financial support. P.M. acknowledges the Google India Research Award 2023 for financial support during the course of this work.

References

- Hammer, B.; Nørskov, J. Impact of Surface Science on Catalysis; Advances in Catalysis; Academic Press, 2000; Vol. 45; pp 71–129.
- (2) Zhang, Z.; Yates, J. T. J. Band Bending in Semiconductors: Chemical and Physical Consequences at Surfaces and Interfaces. *Chemical Reviews* 2012, 112, 5520–5551.

- (3) Peled, E.; Menkin, S. Review—SEI: Past, Present and Future. Journal of The Electrochemical Society 2017, 164, A1703.
- (4) Xiao, Y.; Wang, Y.; Bo, S.-H.; Miara, L. J.; Ceder, G. Understanding interface stability in solid-state batteries. *Nature Reviews Materials* **2020**, *5*, 105–126.
- (5) Oguzie, E. E.; Li, Y.; Wang, S. G.; Wang, F. Understanding corrosion inhibition mechanismsexperimental and theoretical approach. *RSC Advances* **2011**, *1*, 866–873.
- (6) Kresse, G.; Furthmüller, J. Efficient iterative schemes for ab initio total-energy calculations using a plane-wave basis set. *Phys. Rev. B* 1996, 54, 11169–11186.
- (7) Kaplan, A. D.; Levy, M.; Perdew, J. P. The Predictive Power of Exact Constraints and Appropriate Norms in Density Functional Theory. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* 2023, 74, 193–218.
- (8) Freysoldt, C.; Mishra, A.; Ashton, M.; Neugebauer, J. Generalized dipole correction for charged surfaces in the repeated-slab approach. *Phys. Rev. B* 2020, *102*, 045403.
- (9) Bengtsson, L. Dipole correction for surface supercell calculations. *Phys. Rev. B* 1999, 59, 12301–12304.
- (10) Neugebauer, J.; Scheffler, M. Adsorbate-substrate and adsorbate-adsorbate interactions of Na and K adlayers on Al(111). *Phys. Rev. B* 1992, 46, 16067–16080.
- (11) Kronik, L.; Makmal, A.; Tiago, M. L.; Alemany, M. M. G.; Jain, M.; Huang, X.; Saad, Y.; Chelikowsky, J. R. PARSEC — the pseudopotential algorithm for real-space electronic structure calculations: recent advances and novel applications to nano-structures. *Phys. Status Solidi B* **2006**, *243*, 1063–1079.
- Michaud-Rioux, V.; Zhang, L.; Guo, H. RESCU: A real space electronic structure method. J. Comput. Phys. 2016, 307, 593–613.

- (13) Ghosh, S.; Suryanarayana, P. SPARC: Accurate and efficient finite-difference formulation and parallel implementation of density functional theory: Isolated clusters. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 2017, 212, 189–204.
- (14) Andrade, X.; Strubbe, D.; De Giovannini, U.; Larsen, A. H.; Oliveira, M. J. T.; Alberdi-Rodriguez, J.; Varas, A.; Theophilou, I.; Helbig, N.; Verstraete, M. J.; Stella, L.; Nogueira, F.; Aspuru-Guzik, A.; Castro, A.; Marques, M. A. L.; Rubio, A. Real-space grids and the Octopus code as tools for the development of new simulation approaches for electronic systems. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2015**, *17*, 31371–31396.
- (15) Enkovaara, J.; Rostgaard, C.; Mortensen, J. J.; Chen, J.; Dułak, M.; Ferrighi, L.; Gavnholt, J.; Glinsvad, C.; Haikola, V.; Hansen, H. A.; Kristoffersen, H. H.; Kuisma, M.; Larsen, A. H.; Lehtovaara, L.; Ljungberg, M.; Lopez-Acevedo, O.; Moses, P. G.; Ojanen, J.; Olsen, T.; Petzold, V.; Romero, N. A.; Stausholm-Møller, J.; Strange, M.; Tritsaris, G. A.; Vanin, M.; Walter, M.; Hammer, B.; Häkkinen, H.; Madsen, G. K. H.; Nieminen, R. M.; Nørskov, J. K.; Puska, M.; Rantala, T. T.; Schiøtz, J.; Thygesen, K. S.; Jacobsen, K. W. Electronic structure calculations with GPAW: a real-space implementation of the projector augmented-wave method. Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter 2010, 22, 253202.
- (16) Genovese, L.; Neelov, A.; Goedecker, S.; Deutsch, T.; Ghasemi, S. A.; Willand, A.; Caliste, D.; Zilberberg, O.; Rayson, M.; Bergman, A.; Schneider, R. Daubechies wavelets as a basis set for density functional pseudopotential calculations. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 2008, 129, 014109.
- (17) Genovese, L.; Ospici, M.; Deutsch, T.; Méhaut, J.-F.; Neelov, A.; Goedecker, S. Density functional theory calculation on many-cores hybrid central processing unit-graphic processing unit architectures. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2009**, *131*, 034103.
- (18) Mohr, S.; Ratcliff, L. E.; Boulanger, P.; Genovese, L.; Caliste, D.; Deutsch, T.; Goedecker, S. Daubechies wavelets for linear scaling density functional theory. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2014**, *140*, 204110.

- (19) White, S. R.; Wilkins, J. W.; Teter, M. P. Finite-element method for electronic structure. *Phys. Rev. B* 1989, 39, 5819–5833.
- (20) Tsuchida, E.; Tsukada, M. Electronic-structure calculations based on the finite-element method. Phys. Rev. B 1995, 52, 5573–5578.
- (21) Tsuchida, E.; Tsukada, M. Adaptive finite-element method for electronic-structure calculations. Phys. Rev. B 1996, 54, 7602–7605.
- (22) Pask, J. E.; Klein, B. M.; Fong, C. Y.; Sterne, P. A. Real-space local polynomial basis for solid-state electronic-structure calculations: A finite-element approach. *Phys. Rev. B* 1999, 59, 12352–12358.
- (23) Goedecker, S. Linear scaling electronic structure methods. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 1999, 71, 1085–1123.
- (24) Pask, J. E.; Sterne, P. A. Finite element methods in ab initio electronic structure calculations.
 Modell. Simul. Mater. Sci. Eng. 2005, 13, R71.
- (25) Bylaska, E. J.; Holst, M.; Weare, J. H. Adaptive Finite Element Method for Solving the Exact Kohn-Sham Equation of Density Functional Theory. J. Chem. Theory. Comput. 2009, 5, 937–948.
- (26) Suryanarayana, P.; Gavini, V.; Blesgen, T.; Bhattacharya, K.; Ortiz, M. Non-periodic finiteelement formulation of Kohn–Sham density functional theory. J. Mech. Phys. Solids 2010, 58, 256–280.
- (27) Motamarri, P.; Nowak, M.; Leiter, K.; Knap, J.; Gavini, V. Higher-order adaptive finiteelement methods for Kohn-Sham density functional theory. J. Comput. Phys. 2013, 253, 308–343.
- (28) Schauer, V.; Linder, C. All-electron Kohn–Sham density functional theory on hierarchic finite element spaces. J. Comput. Phys. 2013, 250, 644–664.

- (29) Chen, H.; Dai, X.; Gong, X.; He, L.; Zhou, A. Adaptive Finite Element Approximations for Kohn–Sham Models. *Multiscale Model. Simul.* **2014**, *12*, 1828–1869.
- (30) Davydov, D.; Young, T. D.; Steinmann, P. On the adaptive finite element analysis of the Kohn–Sham equations: methods, algorithms, and implementation. Int. J. Numer. Methods Eng. 2016, 106, 863–888.
- (31) Kanungo, B.; Gavini, V. Large-scale all-electron density functional theory calculations using an enriched finite-element basis. *Phys. Rev. B* 2017, *95*, 035112.
- (32) Kanungo, B.; Gavini, V. Real time time-dependent density functional theory using higher order finite-element methods. *Phys. Rev. B* 2019, 100, 115148.
- (33) Motamarri, P.; Das, S.; Rudraraju, S.; Ghosh, K.; Davydov, D.; Gavini, V. DFT-FE A massively parallel adaptive finite-element code for large-scale density functional theory calculations. *Computer Physics Communications* 2020, 246, 106853.
- (34) Das, S.; Motamarri, P.; Gavini, V.; Turcksin, B.; Li, Y. W.; Leback, B. Fast, Scalable and Accurate Finite-Element Based Ab Initio Calculations Using Mixed Precision Computing: 46 PFLOPS Simulation of a Metallic Dislocation System. Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis. New York, NY, USA, 2019; pp 1–11.
- (35) Matveyev, Y.; Mikheev, V.; Negrov, D.; Zarubin, S.; Kumar, A.; Grimley, E. D.; LeBeau, J. M.; Gloskovskii, A.; Tsymbal, E. Y.; Zenkevich, A. Polarization-dependent electric potential distribution across nanoscale ferroelectric Hf0.5Zr0.5O2 in functional memory capacitors. *Nanoscale* **2019**, *11*, 19814–19822.
- (36) Yazyev, O. V.; Moore, J. E.; Louie, S. G. Spin Polarization and Transport of Surface States in the Topological Insulators Bi₂Se₃ and Bi₂Te₃ from First Principles. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2010, 105, 266806.
- (37) Pan, Y.; Wang, X.; Zhang, W.; Tang, L.; Mu, Z.; Liu, C.; Tian, B.; Fei, M.; Sun, Y.; Su, H.;

Gao, L.; Wang, P.; Duan, X.; Ma, J.; Ding, M. Boosting the performance of single-atom catalysts via external electric field polarization. *Nature Communications* **2022**, *13*, 3063.

- (38) Che, F.; Gray, J. T.; Ha, S.; Kruse, N.; Scott, S. L.; McEwen, J.-S. Elucidating the Roles of Electric Fields in Catalysis: A Perspective. ACS Catalysis 2018, 8, 5153–5174.
- (39) Famprikis, T.; Canepa, P.; Dawson, J. A.; Islam, M. S.; Masquelier, C. Fundamentals of inorganic solid-state electrolytes for batteries. *Nature Materials* **2019**, *18*, 1278–1291.
- (40) Wang, J.; Panchal, A. A.; Sai Gautam, G.; Canepa, P. The resistive nature of decomposing interfaces of solid electrolytes with alkali metal electrodes. J. Mater. Chem. A 2022, 10, 19732–19742.
- (41) Chang, B.-Y.; Park, S.-M. Electrochemical Impedance Spectroscopy. Annual Review of Analytical Chemistry 2010, 3, 207–229.
- (42) Feibelman, P. J. Surface-diffusion mechanism versus electric field: Pt/Pt(001). Phys. Rev. B 2001, 64, 125403.
- (43) Meyer, B.; Vanderbilt, D. Ab initio study of BaTiO₃ and PbTiO₃ surfaces in external electric fields. *Phys. Rev. B* 2001, 63, 205426.
- (44) Galvez-Aranda, D. E.; Seminario, J. M. Ab Initio Study of the Interface of the Solid-State Electrolyte Li9N2Cl3 with a Li-Metal Electrode. *Journal of The Electrochemical Society* 2019, 166, A2048.
- (45) Kunc, K.; Resta, R. External fields in the self-consistent theory of electronic states: a new method for direct evaluation of macroscopic and microscopic dielectric response. *Physical Review Letters* 1983, 51, 686.
- (46) Taylor, C. D.; Wasileski, S. A.; Filhol, J.-S.; Neurock, M. First principles reaction modeling of the electrochemical interface: Consideration and calculation of a tunable surface potential from atomic and electronic structure. *Phys. Rev. B* 2006, *73*, 165402.

- (47) Fu, C. L.; Ho, K. M. External-charge-induced surface reconstruction on Ag(110). *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1989, 63, 1617–1620.
- (48) Otani, M.; Sugino, O. First-principles calculations of charged surfaces and interfaces: A planewave nonrepeated slab approach. *Phys. Rev. B* 2006, 73, 115407.
- (49) Panigrahi, G.; Kodali, N.; Panda, D.; Motamarri, P. Fast hardware-aware matrix-free algorithms for higher-order finite-element discretized matrix multivector products on distributed systems. Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing 2024, 192, 104925.
- (50) Das, S.; Kanungo, B.; Subramanian, V.; Panigrahi, G.; Motamarri, P.; Rogers, D.; Zimmerman, P.; Gavini, V. Large-Scale Materials Modeling at Quantum Accuracy: Ab Initio Simulations of Quasicrystals and Interacting Extended Defects in Metallic Alloys. Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis. New York, NY, USA, 2023.
- (51) Das, S.; Motamarri, P.; Subramanian, V.; Rogers, D. M.; Gavini, V. DFT-FE 1.0: A massively parallel hybrid CPU-GPU density functional theory code using finite-element discretization. *Computer Physics Communications* **2022**, *280*, 108473.
- (52) Ghosh, K.; Ma, H.; Onizhuk, M.; Gavini, V.; Galli, G. Spin–spin interactions in defects in solids from mixed all-electron and pseudopotential first-principles calculations. *npj Comput. Mater.* 2021, 7, 123.
- (53) Ramakrishnan, K.; Das, S.; Motamarri, P. Fast and scalable finite-element based approach for density functional theory calculations using projector augmented wave method. *Phys. Rev. B* 2025, 111, 035101.
- (54) Parr, R. G.; Gadre, S. R.; Bartolotti, L. J. Local density functional theory of atoms and molecules. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **1979**, *76*, 2522–2526.
- (55) Martin, R. M. *Electronic structure: basic theory and practical methods*; Cambridge university press, 2020.

- (56) Langreth, D. C.; Mehl, M. J. Beyond the local-density approximation in calculations of groundstate electronic properties. *Phys. Rev. B* 1983, *28*, 1809–1834.
- (57) Perdew, J. P.; Burke, K.; Ernzerhof, M. Generalized Gradient Approximation Made Simple. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1996**, 77, 3865–3868.
- (58) Pask, J.; Sukumar, N.; Mousavi, S. Linear scaling solution of the all-electron Coulomb problem in solids. International Journal for Multiscale Computational Engineering 2012, 10, 83 – 99, Cited by: 25.
- (59) Hamann, D. R. Optimized norm-conserving Vanderbilt pseudopotentials. *Phys. Rev. B* 2013, 88, 085117.
- (60) Ashcroft, N. W.; Mermin, N. D. Solid state physics; Cengage Learning, 2022.
- (61) Motamarri, P.; Gavini, V. Configurational forces in electronic structure calculations using Kohn-Sham density functional theory. *Phys. Rev. B* 2018, *97*, 165132.
- (62) Giannozzi, P.; Baroni, S.; Bonini, N.; Calandra, M.; Car, R.; Cavazzoni, C.; Ceresoli, D.; Chiarotti, G. L.; Cococcioni, M.; Dabo, I.; Corso, A. D.; de Gironcoli, S.; Fabris, S.; Fratesi, G.; Gebauer, R.; Gerstmann, U.; Gougoussis, C.; Kokalj, A.; Lazzeri, M.; Martin-Samos, L.; Marzari, N.; Mauri, F.; Mazzarello, R.; Paolini, S.; Pasquarello, A.; Paulatto, L.; Sbraccia, C.; Scandolo, S.; Sclauzero, G.; Seitsonen, A. P.; Smogunov, A.; Umari, P.; Wentzcovitch, R. M. QUANTUM ESPRESSO: a modular and open-source software project for quantum simulations of materials. *Journal of physics: Condensed matter* 2009, *21*, 395502.
- (63) Hughes, T. J. The finite element method: linear static and dynamic finite element analysis; Courier Corporation, 2012.
- (64) Bathe, K. J. Finite Element Procedures; Prentice Hall International Editions (Prentice Hall International, Englewood Cliffs, 1986.
- (65) Das, S.; Gavini, V. Accelerating self-consistent field iterations in Kohn-Sham density functional theory using a low rank approximation of the dielectric matrix. 2022,

- (66) Langreth, D. C.; Mehl, M. J. Beyond the local-density approximation in calculations of groundstate electronic properties. *Phys. Rev. B* 1983, *28*, 1809–1834.
- (67) Perdew, J. P.; Burke, K.; Ernzerhof, M. Generalized Gradient Approximation Made Simple. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1996**, 77, 3865–3868.
- (68) Perdew, J. P.; Burke, K.; Ernzerhof, M. Generalized Gradient Approximation Made Simple.
 Phys. Rev. Lett. 1996, 77, 3865–3868.
- (69) Lehtola, S.; Steigemann, C.; Oliveira, M. J.; Marques, M. A. Recent developments in libxc —
 A comprehensive library of functionals for density functional theory. *SoftwareX* 2018, 7, 1–5.
- (70) van Setten, M.; Giantomassi, M.; Bousquet, E.; Verstraete, M.; Hamann, D.; Gonze, X.; Rignanese, G.-M. The PseudoDojo: Training and grading a 85 element optimized normconserving pseudopotential table. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **2018**, *226*, 39–54.
- (71) Shojaei, M. F.; Pask, J. E.; Medford, A. J.; Suryanarayana, P. Soft and transferable pseudopotentials from multi-objective optimization. *Computer Physics Communications* 2023, 283, 108594.
- (72) Monkhorst, H. J.; Pack, J. D. Special points for Brillouin-zone integrations. *Phys. Rev. B* 1976, 13, 5188–5192.
- (73) Canepa, P.; Dawson, J. A.; Sai Gautam, G.; Statham, J. M.; Parker, S. C.; Islam, M. S. Particle Morphology and Lithium Segregation to Surfaces of the Li7La3Zr2O12 Solid Electrolyte. *Chemistry of Materials* **2018**, *30*, 3019–3027.
- (74) Jain, A.; Ong, S. P.; Hautier, G.; Chen, W.; Richards, W. D.; Dacek, S.; Cholia, S.; Gunter, D.;
 Skinner, D.; Ceder, G.; Persson, K. a. The Materials Project: A materials genome approach to accelerating materials innovation. *APL Materials* 2013, 1, 011002.
- (75) van Setten, M.; Giantomassi, M.; Bousquet, E.; Verstraete, M.; Hamann, D.; Gonze, X.; Rignanese, G.-M. The PseudoDojo: Training and grading a 85 element optimized normconserving pseudopotential table. *Computer Physics Communications* **2018**, *226*, 39–54.

- (76) Becke, A. D. Density-functional thermochemistry. III. The role of exact exchange. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 1993, 98, 5648–5652.
- (77) Dion, M.; Rydberg, H.; Schröder, E.; Langreth, D. C.; Lundqvist, B. I. Van der Waals Density Functional for General Geometries. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2004, *92*, 246401.
- (78) Taylor, J.; Guo, H.; Wang, J. Ab initio modeling of quantum transport properties of molecular electronic devices. *Phys. Rev. B* 2001, 63, 245407.
- (79) Mathew, K.; Sundararaman, R.; Letchworth-Weaver, K.; Arias, T. A.; Hennig, R. G. Implicit solvation model for density-functional study of nanocrystal surfaces and reaction pathways. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2014**, *140*, 084106.
- (80) Ringe, S.; Hörmann, N. G.; Oberhofer, H.; Reuter, K. Implicit Solvation Methods for Catalysis at Electrified Interfaces. *Chemical Reviews* 2022, 122, 10777–10820, PMID: 34928131.

TOC Graphic

Constant Electric Field (CEF)	$\int_{V_{y_1}} \delta V = \delta V_{app} = V_{app}(Z_B) - V_{app}(Z_A)$
	$V_{app} = V_{AZ} = V_{ap} = 0$
Applied Potential Difference (AP	D) $\Gamma_{y_1} = \tilde{z} = \tilde$