

# Long-range-corrected hybrids including RPA correlation

Benjamin G. Janesko, Thomas M. Henderson, and Gustavo E. Scuseria  
*Department of Chemistry, Rice University*  
*Houston, Texas, USA 77005*

We recently demonstrated a connection between the random phase approximation (RPA) and coupled cluster theory [J. Chem. Phys. **129**, 231101 (2008)]. Based on this result, we here propose and test a simple scheme for introducing long-range RPA correlation into density functional theory. Our method provides good thermochemical results and models van der Waals interactions accurately.

We recently demonstrated that the ground state correlation energy associated with the random phase approximation (RPA)<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8</sup> is connected with an approximate ring coupled cluster doubles (rCCD) approach. The RPA excitation problem requires the solution of

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ -\mathbf{B} & -\mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{Y} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{Y} \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\omega}, \quad (1)$$

where the matrices  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{X}$ , and  $\mathbf{Y}$  are of dimension  $ov \times ov$ , with  $o$  and  $v$  being the number of occupied and unoccupied spin-orbitals, respectively. The plasmonic formula<sup>2</sup> for the RPA ground state correlation energy is

$$E_c^{RPA} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\omega} - \mathbf{A}). \quad (2)$$

As shown in our previous paper,<sup>8</sup> Eq. 1 is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{T} \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{T} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (3)$$

an approximate coupled cluster (CC) doubles equation with excitation amplitudes  $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{X}^{-1}$ . Further, the RPA correlation energy can be evaluated from the CC-like expression

$$E_c^{rCCD} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{B} \mathbf{T}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\omega} - \mathbf{A}). \quad (4)$$

The excitation amplitudes  $\mathbf{T}$  imply the existence of an underlying wave function in RPA. This lets us follow Savin, Stoll, and coworkers<sup>9,10</sup> and introduce range separation between density functional theory (DFT) and wave function theory, with RPA for the long-range correlation. Range separation is a powerful technique<sup>11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19</sup> that can improve upon both standard wave function methods and semilocal exchange-correlation (xc) functionals. Range separated DFT partitions the electron-electron interaction operator into short (SR) and long (LR) ranges

$$\frac{1}{r_{12}} = \underbrace{\frac{\text{erfc}(\boldsymbol{\omega} r_{12})}{r_{12}}}_{SR} + \underbrace{\frac{\text{erf}(\boldsymbol{\omega} r_{12})}{r_{12}}}_{LR}, \quad (5)$$

and typically (but not always, see Refs. 13,19) treats the SR (LR) component with semilocal (wave function) approximations.

Toulouse *et al.*<sup>20</sup> recently proposed a range-separated treatment of RPA via the adiabatic-connection fluctuation-dissipation theorem,<sup>3,5,21</sup> combining a short-range semilocal xc functional with long-range full RPA. Consistent with other work,<sup>17,18</sup> they find that their long-range correlation energy has a relatively weak basis set dependence. They also remove some artifacts of full-range RPA, including a "bump" in the symmetry-restricted singlet Be<sub>2</sub> dissociation curve.

*Theory.* We propose a simpler long-range RPA based on the connection to coupled cluster theory discussed above, which avoids a costly adiabatic connection integral. We evaluate long-range RPA as a one-shot correction to a self-consistent generalized Kohn-Sham<sup>22</sup> (GKS) calculation combining long-range exact (Hartree-Fock-type, HF) exchange and short-range local spin density (LSDA) exchange-correlation. Our xc energy is

$$E_{xc} = E_{xc}^{SR-LSDA} + E_x^{LR-HF} + c_{RPA} E_c^{LR-RPA}. \quad (6)$$

We evaluate  $E_c^{LR-RPA}$  with Eq. 3-4, and build  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  from the long-range two-electron integrals and the GKS spin-orbitals and orbital energies. The coefficient  $c_{RPA}$  is discussed below.

In this work, we focus on what we will refer to as direct RPA. In the (real) canonical spin-orbital basis we use throughout this paper, the direct RPA matrices are

$$A_{ia,jb} = (\epsilon_a - \epsilon_i) \delta_{ij} \delta_{ab} + \langle ib | aj \rangle, \quad (7a)$$

$$B_{ia,jb} = \langle ij | ab \rangle. \quad (7b)$$

Here  $\epsilon$  is a generalized Kohn-Sham orbital energy. Indices  $i$  and  $j$  indicate occupied spin-orbitals,  $a$  and  $b$  indicate virtual spin-orbitals, and  $\langle ij | ab \rangle$  is a two-electron integral in Dirac's notation. For real orbitals, note that  $\langle ib | aj \rangle = \langle ij | ab \rangle$ . What we refer to as full RPA uses antisymmetrized two-electron integrals in Eq. 7.

For practical calculations, direct RPA has the great advantage that the correlation energy is guaranteed to be real if the orbitals obey the aufbau principle. This is not true of full RPA, where instabilities in the reference determinant<sup>23</sup> can produce a complex correlation energy.<sup>3</sup> In cases such as Be<sub>2</sub> where the reference has triplet instabilities,<sup>24</sup> one may have to limit full RPA to singlet excitations, while with direct RPA no such restriction is needed.

An additional advantage of direct RPA is that it reduces the dimension of the problem compared to full RPA

(ring CCD with antisymmetrized two-electron integrals). Consider the block of  $\mathbf{B}$  corresponding to spatial orbitals  $\varphi_I$ ,  $\varphi_A$ ,  $\varphi_J$ , and  $\varphi_B$  and spin ordering  $\alpha\alpha$ ,  $\beta\beta$ ,  $\alpha\beta$ , and  $\beta\alpha$ . The  $\mathbf{B}$  matrix for full RPA and closed shells becomes

$$\mathbf{B}_{IA,JB} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{J} - \mathcal{K} & \mathcal{J} & 0 & 0 \\ \mathcal{J} & \mathcal{J} - \mathcal{K} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\mathcal{K} \\ 0 & 0 & -\mathcal{K} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

with  $\mathcal{J} = \langle IJ | AB \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{K} = \langle IJ | BA \rangle$ . For open shells (unrestricted), the  $\mathcal{J}$  and  $\mathcal{K}$  entries in different blocks will generally differ. Direct RPA ( $\mathcal{K} = 0$ ) zeros the “spin-flip” block of  $\mathbf{B}$  containing only  $-\mathcal{K}$ , reducing the dimension by a factor of 2 compared to full RPA. For both closed and open shell systems, we can diagonalize the remaining upper block of  $\mathbf{B}$  with the unitary transformation

$$\mathbf{Q} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

For closed shells,  $\mathbf{Q}$  is a spin-adaptation operator. The resulting  $2 \times 2$  diagonal matrix for direct RPA has only one non-zero eigenvalue, corresponding to singlet excitations. Since only the singlet block of  $\mathbf{B}$  is non-zero, we only need the singlet part of  $\mathbf{T}$  to evaluate the correlation energy of Eq. 4. Additionally, in blocks where  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{0}$  the ring CCD equation (Eq. 3) becomes

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{T} + \mathbf{T} \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (10)$$

Because the direct RPA  $\mathbf{A}$  is positive definite,<sup>8</sup> the only solution is  $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{0}$ . Thus the spin flip components of  $\mathbf{T}$  vanish, and in the closed shell case all triplet components of  $\mathbf{T}$  vanish. Triplets do not contribute to direct RPA.

A third advantage of direct RPA is that the correlation energy expression is well defined, unlike in full RPA.<sup>1</sup> While in both direct and full RPA, we have  $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{T}) = \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\omega} - \mathbf{A})$ ,<sup>8</sup> only in direct RPA is the prefactor in the correlation energy unambiguously 1/2. For full RPA, the plasmonic formula suggests the prefactor should be 1/2, while the connection to CC theory suggests that the prefactor should be 1/4. Jeziorski and coworkers have presented another alternative full RPA energy expression that uses the plasmonic prefactor of 1/2, but subtracts the second-order MP2 correlation energy.<sup>25</sup>

The elimination of exchange integrals in direct RPA may appear artificial from a wave function perspective, and in fact the wave function underlying direct RPA can violate the Pauli exclusion principle. However, direct RPA can be rigorously derived by applying the adiabatic connection fluctuation-dissipation theorem to the Kohn-Sham noninteracting reference system.<sup>3,5</sup> On balance, long-range direct RPA from the GKS reference appears to be a practical ansatz for long-range correlation.

*Computational details.* We have implemented our expressions into the development version of the GAUSSIAN suite of programs.<sup>26</sup> Matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  are evaluated in the full spin-orbital basis set, without symmetry adaptation. We use the range-separated LSDA correlation




FIG. 1: Basis set dependence of LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA. (Top) Total energy of N atom. (Bottom) Dissociation energy of N<sub>2</sub> at experimental bond length 1.098 Angstrom. Results are calculated with aug-cc-pV $\zeta$ Z basis sets, and normalized to the aug-cc-pV5Z result. LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA calculations use  $c_{RPA} = 1$  and either  $\omega = 0.5$  or  $\omega = 1.2$  Bohr<sup>-1</sup>.

functional of Paziani and coworkers.<sup>27</sup> In what follows, “LC- $\omega$ LDA” denotes GKS calculations using short-range LSDA xc and long-range HF exchange. (Note that in our previous papers, this acronym denoted SR LSDA exchange, LR HF exchange, and *full range* LSDA correlation.) Adding long-range direct RPA correlation as described above results in “LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA”. The “dRPA” acronym by itself denotes conventional, full range (*i.e.*, not range separated) HF exchange and direct RPA correlation; this “dRPA” energy is evaluated from self-consistent Kohn-Sham orbitals and orbital energies calculated with the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) generalized gradient (GGA) xc functional.<sup>28</sup> Open-shell systems are treated spin unrestricted. Eq. 3 is solved iteratively using DIIS<sup>29,30</sup> for coupled clusters. Correlated calculations use frozen core electrons.

Like other workers,<sup>9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19</sup> we select the range separation parameter  $\omega$  empirically. Our standard LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA calculations set  $c_{RPA} = 1$  in Eq. 6. We also explore treating  $c_{RPA}$  as an empirical parameter.




FIG. 2: Counterpoise-corrected dissociation curves of van der Waals dimers. Aug-cc-pV5Z basis, other details in the text.

*Numerical results.* Figure 1 shows the basis set dependence of LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA for the total energy of N atom (top) and the dissociation energy of N<sub>2</sub> (bottom). As in previous work,<sup>17,20,32</sup> the long-range correlation has a much weaker basis set dependence than full-range correlation. Calculations at the relatively large  $\omega = 1.2$  Bohr<sup>-1</sup>, which incorporate a larger fraction of direct RPA correlation, converge more slowly with basis set size.

Figure 2 shows counterpoise-corrected dissociation curves of van der Waals dimers He<sub>2</sub>, Ne<sub>2</sub>, and Ar<sub>2</sub>,

TABLE I: Mean absolute errors (kcal/mol) in AE6 atomization energies, G2/97 heats of formation, BH6 and HTBH38/04 hydrogen-transfer reaction barrier heights, and NHTBH38/04 non-hydrogen-transfer barrier heights. 6-311+G(2d,2p) basis set.  $\omega$  in Bohr<sup>-1</sup>.

Method	$\omega$	AE6	G2	BH6	HT	NHT
LC- $\omega$ BPBE <sup>a</sup>	0.4	5.5	4.2	1.2	1.3	2.0
LC- $\omega$ LDA <sup>b</sup>	0.5	5.8	7.0	2.3	3.0	4.4
LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA	0.7	5.6	6.2	1.8	2.3	3.5
LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA <sup>c</sup>	1.2	4.0	4.4	1.2	1.6	3.5

<sup>a</sup>Ref. 31

<sup>b</sup>Short-range LSDA exchange-correlation

<sup>c</sup> $c_{RPA} = 1.5$




FIG. 3: Dissociation of symmetry-restricted singlet H<sub>2</sub>. Aug-cc-pVTZ basis set,  $\omega = 1.2$  Bohr<sup>-1</sup>. "Accurate" results are full CI/aug-cc-pV5Z.

evaluated in the large aug-cc-pV5Z basis set.<sup>33</sup> Accurate curves are from Ref. 34. LC- $\omega$ LDA and LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA use  $\omega = 1.2$  Bohr<sup>-1</sup>. Rescaling the long-range dRPA correlation with  $c_{RPA} = 1.5$  significantly improves the results, suggesting that the rescaling primarily corrects for beyond-dRPA correlation effects rather than basis set incompleteness. The weak He<sub>2</sub> binding of standard (full-range) dRPA is increased by using BP86 rather than PBE orbitals and orbital energies, consistent with Ref. 5 (not shown).

Table I shows mean absolute errors in the small AE6 and BH6 sets of 6 atomization energies and 6 reaction barrier heights,<sup>35</sup> the G2/97 set of 148 heats of formation<sup>36</sup> and the HTBH38/04 and NHTBH38/04 sets of 38 hydrogen-transfer and 38 non-hydrogen-transfer barrier heights.<sup>37,38</sup> Calculations use the 6-311+G(2d,2p) basis set. G2/97 calculations use B3LYP/6-31G(2df,p) geometries and vibrational frequencies,<sup>39</sup> other geometries and reference values are taken from Refs. 35,36, 37,38. Results are presented for the thermochemically optimal  $\omega$ . LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA is quite accurate for thermochemistry and kinetics, particularly with the empir-

ical rescaling  $c_{RPA} = 1.5$ . It improves upon the underlying LC- $\omega$ LDA, giving results comparable to the accurate LC- $\omega$ PBE combination of range-separated GGA exchange and *full-range* GGA correlation.<sup>31</sup> Adding long-range dRPA to LC- $\omega$ PBE appears to give significant double-counting of correlation (not shown). However, combining long-range dRPA with a short-range GGA (as in Ref. 20) may provide further improvements.

One of our goals is to apply range-separated dRPA to metallic systems. This is possible because dRPA is robust as the band gap closes. Figure 3 illustrates LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA in one such prototypical system. The figure plots the energy of spin- and symmetry-restricted aug-cc-pVTZ H<sub>2</sub> as a function of H-H bond length. The MP2 correlation energy diverges as the bond length increases and the HOMO-LUMO gap approaches zero. Full RPA (not shown) yields non-real correlation energies for bonds stretched beyond the Coulson-Fischer point. In contrast, the LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA energy is real and finite at all bond lengths. Long-range dRPA does not capture

all of the nondynamical correlation present in stretched symmetric singlet H<sub>2</sub>, and the dissociation limit is thus predicted too high in energy. The functional also overestimates the energy near equilibrium, especially with the empirical  $c_{RPA}$  rescaling. However, there is a definite improvement over both LC- $\omega$ LDA and MP2.

The addition of long-range RPA correlation to range-separated hybrid density functionals is a promising route to systematically incorporating nonlocal correlation effects into DFT. LC- $\omega$ LDA+dRPA can be evaluated in  $\mathcal{O}(N^4)$  time via Cholesky decomposition of **A** and **B**. It is robust to unstable and degenerate reference states, and shows promise for systems from metals, to covalent bonds, to van der Waals complexes.

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation (CHE-0807194) and the Welch Foundation (C-0036). We thank Janos Ángyán, Filipp Furche, Andreas Savin, and Julien Toulouse for useful discussions.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> J. Oddershede, *Adv. Quant. Chem.* **11**, 275 (1978).  
<sup>2</sup> P. Ring and P. Schuck, *The Nuclear Many-Body Problem* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980).  
<sup>3</sup> F. Furche, *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 195120 (2001).  
<sup>4</sup> J. F. Dobson, J. Wang, B. P. Dinte, K. McLennan, and H. M. Le, *Int. J. Quant. Chem.* **101**, 579 (2005).  
<sup>5</sup> F. Furche and T. Van Voorhis, *J. Chem. Phys.* **122**, 164106 (2005).  
<sup>6</sup> J. Harl and G. Kresse, *Phys. Rev. B* **77**, 045136 (2008).  
<sup>7</sup> F. Furche, *J. Chem. Phys.* **129**, 114105 (2008).  
<sup>8</sup> G. E. Scuseria, T. M. Henderson, and D. C. Sorensen, *J. Chem. Phys.* **129**, 231101 (2008).  
<sup>9</sup> H. Stoll and A. Savin, in *Density Functional Methods in Physics*, edited by R. Dreizler and J. da Providencia (Plenum, New York, 1985), p. 177.  
<sup>10</sup> A. Savin, in *Recent Developments and Applications of Modern Density Functional Theory*, edited by J. M. Seminario (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1996), p. 327.  
<sup>11</sup> T. Leininger, H. Stoll, H.-J. Werner, and A. Savin, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **275**, 151 (1997).  
<sup>12</sup> H. Iikura, T. Tsuneda, T. Yanai, and K. Hirao, *J. Chem. Phys.* **115**, 3540 (2001).  
<sup>13</sup> J. Heyd, G. E. Scuseria, and M. Ernzerhof, *J. Chem. Phys.* **118**, 8207 (2003), **124**, 219906(E) (2006).  
<sup>14</sup> J. Toulouse, F. Colonna, and A. Savin, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 062505 (2004).  
<sup>15</sup> E. Goll, H.-J. Werner, and H. Stoll, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **7**, 3917 (2005).  
<sup>16</sup> J. C. Ángyán, I. C. Gerber, A. Savin, and J. Toulouse, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 012510 (2005).  
<sup>17</sup> E. Goll, H.-J. Werner, H. Stoll, T. Leininger, P. Gori-Giorgi, and A. Savin, *Chem. Phys.* **329**, 276 (2006).  
<sup>18</sup> I. C. Gerber and J. G. Ángyán, *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 044103 (2007).  
<sup>19</sup> T. M. Henderson, A. F. Izmaylov, G. E. Scuseria, and A. Savin, *J. Chem. Phys.* **127**, 221103 (2007).  
<sup>20</sup> J. Toulouse, I. C. Gerber, G. Jansen, A. Savin, and J. G. Ángyán, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* in press, arXiv:0812.3302v2.  
<sup>21</sup> W. Kohn, Y. Meir, and D. E. Makarov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 4153 (1998).  
<sup>22</sup> A. Seidl, A. Görling, P. Vogl, J. A. Majewski, and M. Levy, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 3764 (1996).  
<sup>23</sup> R. Seeger and J. A. Pople, *J. Chem. Phys.* **66**, 3045 (1977).  
<sup>24</sup> M. B. Lepetit and J. P. Malrieu, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **169**, 285 (1990).  
<sup>25</sup> R. Moszynski, B. Jeziorski, and K. Szalewicz, *Int. J. Quant. Chem.* **45**, 409 (1993).  
<sup>26</sup> Gaussian Development Version, Revision G.01, M. J. Frisch *et al.*, Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2007.  
<sup>27</sup> S. Pazziani, S. Moroni, P. Gori-Giorgi, and G. B. Bachelet, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 155111 (2006).  
<sup>28</sup> J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996), **78**, 1396(E) (1997).  
<sup>29</sup> P. Pulay, *J. Comp. Chem.* **3**, 556 (1982).  
<sup>30</sup> G. E. Scuseria, T. J. Lee, and H. F. Schaefer III, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **130**, 236 (1986).  
<sup>31</sup> O. A. Vydrov and G. E. Scuseria, *J. Chem. Phys.* **125**, 234109 (2006).  
<sup>32</sup> E. Goll, H.-J. Werner, and H. Stoll, *Chem. Phys.* **346**, 257 (2008).  
<sup>33</sup> T. H. Dunning Jr., *J. Chem. Phys.* **90**, 1007 (1989), D. E. Woon and T. H. Dunning, Jr., *J. Chem. Phys.* **98**, 1358 (1993); **100**, 2975 (1994).  
<sup>34</sup> K. T. Tang and J. P. Toennies, *J. Chem. Phys.* **118**, 4976 (2003).  
<sup>35</sup> B. J. Lynch and D. G. Truhlar, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **107**, 8996 (2003), **108**, 1460(E) (2004).  
<sup>36</sup> L. A. Curtiss, K. Raghavachari, P. C. Redfern, and J. A. Pople, *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 1063 (1997).  
<sup>37</sup> Y. Zhao, B. J. Lynch, and D. G. Truhlar, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **108**, 2715 (2004).  
<sup>38</sup> Y. Zhao, N. González-García, and D. G. Truhlar, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **109**, 2012 (2005), **110**, 4942(E) (2006).  
<sup>39</sup> L. A. Curtiss, P. C. Redfern, K. Raghavachari, and J. A. Pople, *J. Chem. Phys.* **114**, 108 (2001).