

c.2



# Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

RECEIVED  
LAWRENCE  
BERKELEY LABORATORY

## Materials & Molecular Research Division

JAN 17 1984

LIBRARY AND  
DOCUMENTS SECTION

Presented at the Workshop on Energetic Material  
Initiation Fundamentals, Chestertown, MD,  
August 15-17, 1983


ACHIEVING CHEMICAL ACCURACY BY QUANTUM MONTE CARLO

W.A. Lester, Jr. and P.J. Reynolds

August 1983

**TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY**

*This is a Library Circulating Copy  
which may be borrowed for two weeks.  
For a personal retention copy, call  
Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 6782.*



LBL-16954  
c.2

## **DISCLAIMER**

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

## ACHIEVING CHEMICAL ACCURACY BY QUANTUM MONTE CARLO\*

William A. Lester, Jr.<sup>†</sup> and Peter J. Reynolds  
Materials and Molecular Research Division  
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

In order to better understand the processes resulting in the release of chemical energy, one needs a computational technique of high accuracy. One alternative approach to the current quantum chemistry techniques for molecular studies which holds great promise is the quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) method.<sup>1-8</sup> In this approach the many-body Schrödinger equation is re-interpreted as a diffusion equation. Simulation of an appropriate random-walk process enables one to calculate expectation values of molecular properties exactly, in principle, subject only to statistical errors (which may be made arbitrarily small). The computational effort with QMC rises roughly as  $N^2$ , where  $N$  is the number of electrons, making calculations on relatively large systems feasible. Using a simple, but accurate fixed-node approximation, the calculated total energy remains an upper bound to the true energy. The quality of the bound and the magnitude of the statistical error depend on an "importance function" which guides the diffusion through phase space. The location of the nodes of this function determines the accuracy which can be obtained. Even with very simple importance functions, we have obtained from 75-100% of the correlation energy of two to ten electron molecules (cf., Table I).

The QMC procedure applies equally well in situations away from the equilibrium geometry. In Table II we present some results for the ground-state energy of  $\text{Li}_2$  at a few different nuclear separations. We chose the same importance function—with the same parameters—for all nuclear separations. Although this choice is not optimal, point-wise agreement with the exact results was nevertheless quite good.

\*This work was supported in part by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Chemical Sciences Division of the U. S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098 and Director's Program Development Fund.

<sup>†</sup>Also University of California, Berkeley, California.

Table I. Comparison of the total ground-state energy obtained in the fixed-node QMC procedure, with the estimated Hartree-Fock limit, CI, and "exact" energies. Except as noted, "exact" means the non-relativistic, Born-Oppenheimer energy, derived from experiment. The "quality" of each of the three importance functions ( $\Psi_I$ ,  $\Psi_{II}$ , and  $\Psi_{III}$ ) is also indicated, by giving the energy obtained from them in a variational calculation. Energies are in Hartrees. [After Ref. 7]

	H 2	LiH	Li 2	H O 2
Hartree-Fock	a -1.1336	b -7.987	c -14.872	d -76.0675
$\Psi_I$ {	variational -1.1507±0.0009	-7.91±0.01	-14.85 ±0.03	-75.69 ± 0.03 <sup>e</sup>
fixed-node	-1.1745±0.0008	-8.047±0.005	-14.985±0.005	-76.23 ± 0.02
$\Psi_{II}$ {	variational	-7.975±0.005	-14.900±0.004 <sup>f</sup>	-76.13 ±0.07 <sup>e</sup>
fixed-node		-8.059±0.004	-14.991±0.007	-76.377±0.007
$\Psi_{III}$ {	variational -1.162±0.001	-8.041±0.008	-14.95 ± 0.01	
fixed-node	-1.174±0.001	-8.067±0.002	-14.990±0.002	
Best CI	g -1.1731	h -8.0647	i -14.903	j -76.3683
"Exact"	k -1.17447...	l,n -8.0699	m,n -14.9967	d -76.4376

(a) Obtained with a nine term expansion in Ref. 9.

(b) Ref. 10.

(c) Ref. 11.

(d) Rosenberg and Shavitt in Ref. 12.

(e) Slater determinant part of wavefunction from Ref. 13.

(f) Variational energy from Moskowitz and Kalos in Ref. 8.

(g) Ref. 14. Of course, better correlated wavefunctions than CI exist for H<sub>2</sub>. For example, Ref. 9 obtains E=-1.1744 from a 40 term expansion which includes r<sub>ij</sub> explicitly, and the "exact" result of Ref. 15 also uses this method.

(h) Ref. 16.

(i) Refs. 17, 18.

(j) Meyer in Ref. 12.

(k) Ref. 15. This value is not derived from experiment, but directly from theory.

(l) Ref. 19.

(m) Ref. 20.

(n) Here the zero-point energy has not been subtracted; also the relativistic correction is assumed independent of r<sub>αβ</sub>, and the Lamb shift has not been included.

Table II. Ground-state energies at selected nuclear separations for  $\text{Li}_2$ . Results of the fixed-node QMC calculation, obtained using the importance function  $\Psi_I$ , are compared with Hartree-Fock and "exact" energies (in Hartrees). Typical statistical uncertainty in the fixed-node results is 0.005 a.u. [After Ref. 7]

R (Bohr)	a		b
	E HR	E F-N	E "exact"
3	-14.786	-14.905	-14.915
4	-14.853	-14.968	-14.983
5.05	-14.872	-14.991	-14.997
6	-14.869	-14.985	-14.992
7	-14.859	-14.976	-14.982

(a) Refs. 11, 17, 18.

(b) Ref. 20.

Our current work includes exploration of the following directions: (1) development and application of methods for excited states. In principle, at least certain excited-state calculations can be performed readily. For example, if the spin symmetry of a state is different from the ground state, this may be enforced on the calculated state  $\Psi$  by choosing an importance function  $\Psi_I$  with this same symmetry. The spin arrangement reflected in  $\Psi_I$  results in a significantly different nodal structure, and thus in different volume elements for the diffusion process than for the ground state. We have introduced the above considerations in calculations on the  $1A_1 - 3B_1$  energy splitting of methylene. In addition to the intrinsic interest in this value,<sup>22</sup> this calculation also gives insight into how well the QMC method obtains excited-state properties and to its sensitivity in calculating small energy differences. (2) Development of adaptive or self-improving Monte Carlo schemes. The goal is to feed back knowledge gained from a simulation with a  $\Psi_I$  into a improved function  $\Psi_I'$ . Such an algorithm should iteratively correct a given starting  $\Psi_I$  to achieve the best possible importance function, even correcting the nodes. (3) As a more long-range goal, one wishes to eliminate the fixed-node constraint entirely. Such approaches,<sup>21</sup> although of great interest, are currently not practical for molecular calculations. The limitation arises from an inherent difficulty in reducing the variances with these algorithms. Attempts to overcome this problem create a new problem: the power law

dependence of the computation time on the number of electrons increases, making large calculations impractical. (4) Use of "differential" methods to obtain potential surfaces. In order to obtain a potential curve or surface, in principle, one must re-calculate the Born-Oppenheimer energy at various nuclear geometries. This is feasible (cf., Table II) however, a separate statistical error bar is associated with each calculation. This means that there is also an uncertainty in the shape of the potential curve--i.e., in the slope of the curve (or surface) joining the points. This problem derives largely from the separateness of the Monte Carlo calculations--involved--a different set of random numbers is used for each calculation but may be circumvented by calculating averages at nearby geometries using the same random numbers. Energies thus calculated are strongly correlated. Thus, the "differential" procedure can give more accurate relative energies than is possible from separate calculations of the absolute energies. In this way, accurate slopes (and hence forces), as well as energies, may be obtained. (5) Use of more accurate, compact importance functions. Our present importance functions  $\Psi_I$  all consist of a single Slater determinant multiplied by a fairly simple correlation factor. We have already found that (within the fixed-node approximation) we can obtain an additional 50% of the missing correlation energy simply by either enlarging the basis set slightly or optimizing further the parameters in  $\Psi_I$ . In this way we have brought the total correlation energy obtained to the order of 90%. At the same time, this improvement in  $\Psi_I$  has led to an appreciable reduction in the fluctuations in the energy, and hence a reduction in the statistical error. We have studied the effect of a continued increase in the size of the basis set on the accuracy and on the precision of the calculated quantities, and find it to be negligible. However, to make computational time used more practical, we are investigating the reduction in statistical error which may be achieved by using different correlation functions. This reduction is needed in order to obtain energy differences in the kcal/mole range. To further improve absolute energies, we also wish to investigate other relatively compact forms of  $\Psi_I$  consisting of more than one Slater determinant.

An understanding of the improvement in the results which can be derived from improvements in  $\Psi_I$ , should enable one to obtain reliably between 90-95% (or better) of the correlation energy, and to extrapolate with some confidence the total energy and other properties of molecular systems, even without the self-adaptive or released-node approaches.

#### REFERENCES

1. M. H. Kalos, Phys. Rev. 128, 1791 (1962); J. Comp. Phys. 2, 257 (1967).
2. W. L. McMillan, Phys. Rev. A138, 442 (1965).
3. J. B. Anderson, J. Chem. Phys. 63, 1499 (1975); *ibid* 65, 4121 (1976); *ibid* 73, 3897 (1980); *ibid* 74, 6307 (1981).

4. D. M. Ceperley, G. V. Chester, and M. H. Kalos, Phys. Rev. B 16, 3081 (1977).
5. D. M. Ceperley and M. H. Kalos, in Monte Carlo Methods in Statistical Physics, K. Binder ed. (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1979), pp. 145-97.
6. D. M. Ceperley, "The Stochastic Solution of the Many-Body Schrödinger Equation for Fermions" in Recent Progress in Many-Body Theories, J. G. Zabolitzky, M. de Llano, M. Fortes, and J. W. Clark eds., (Springer-Verlag, 1981) pp. 262-9.
7. P. J. Reynolds, D. M. Ceperley, B. J. Alder and W. A. Lester Jr., J. Chem. Phys. 77, 5593 (1982).
8. J. W. Moskowitz and M. H. Kalos, Int. J. Q. Chem. 20, 1107 (1981) and J. W. Moskowitz, K. E. Schmidt, M. A. Lee, and M. H. Kalos, J. Chem. Phys. 76, 1064 (1982).
9. W. Kolos and C.C.J. Roothaan, Rev. Mod. Phys. 32, 219 (1960).
10. P. E. Cade and W. M. Huo, J. Chem. Phys. 47, 614 (1967).
11. G. Das and A. C. Wahl, J. Chem. Phys. 44, 87 (1966).
12. B. J. Rosenberg and I. Shavitt, J. Chem. Phys. 63, 2162 (1975); W. Meyer, Int. J. Q. Chem., Symp. No. 5, 341 (1971).
13. S. Aung, R. M. Pitzer, and S. I. Chan, J. Chem. Phys. 49, 2071 (1968).
14. B. Liu, J. Chem. Phys. 58, 1925 (1973).
15. W. Kolos and L. Wolniewicz, J. Chem. Phys. 41, 3663 (1964); *ibid* 43, 2429 (1965); *ibid* 49, 404 (1968).
16. W. Meyer and P. Rosmus, J. Chem. Phys. 63, 2356 (1975).
17. G. Das, J. Chem. Phys. 46, 1568 (1967).
18. D. D. Konowalow and M. L. Olson, J. Chem. Phys. 71, 450 (1979).
19. G. C. Lie and E. Clementi, J. Chem. Phys. 60, 1275 (1974).
20. G. C. Lie and E. Clementi, J. Chem. Phys. 60, 1288 (1974).
21. D. M. Ceperley and B. J. Alder, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45, 566 (1980).
22. See for example C. C. Hayden, D. M. Neumark, K. Shobatake, R. K. Sparks, and Y. T. Lee, J. Chem. Phys. 76, 3607 (1982).

This report was done with support from the Department of Energy. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the Department of Energy.

Reference to a company or product name does not imply approval or recommendation of the product by the University of California or the U.S. Department of Energy to the exclusion of others that may be suitable.



TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT  
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720