by Michel Côté, Université de Montréal, département de physique

Introduction to DFT and Density Functionals

Introduction:

carbazole molecule inside diamond

… a lot more than pretty pictures…

Hamiltonian in condensed matter

$$
H = \sum_{i}^{N_{\text{el}}} -\frac{\hbar^2 \nabla_{r_i}^2}{2m} + \sum_{l}^{N_{\text{ion}}}.
$$

$$
-\frac{\hbar^2 \nabla_{R_l}^2}{2M_l} + V_{el} + V_{ion} + V_{ion-el}
$$

Here's the complete hamiltonian in condensed matter including electrons and ions :

$$
V_{\rm el} = \sum_{i,j,j \neq i} \frac{e^2}{|r_i - r_j|}
$$

$$
V_{\text{ion}} = \sum_{l,k,l \neq k} \frac{Z_l Z_k e^2}{|R_l - R_k|}
$$

$$
V_{\text{ion}-\text{el}} = \sum_{i}^{N_{\text{el}}} \sum_{l}^{N_{\text{ion}}} V_{l}(r_{i} - R_{l})
$$

We assign the interaction between electrons and ions to a potential *Vl* and not simply $Z_{l}e^{2}/|r_{i} - R_{l}|$ as the ion potential could be "pseudo" potential" that accounts for the interaction of the atomic nucleus and the core electrons contributions. In that case, the Z_l are pseudo $\frac{Z_l}{2}$ charges, meaning only the charge of the valence electrons of that atoms. We can always revert back to the coulomb form of the

potential if need be.

Interaction terms:

After Born-Oppenheimer approximation: The electronic hamiltonian

$$
H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\frac{-\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla_i^2 + V_{\text{ext}}(r_i) \right] + \sum_{i < j}^{N} \frac{e^2}{|r_i - r_j|}
$$

 $V_{\text{ext}}(r_i)$ is the external potential, most often produced by the ions. It will be represented by pseudopotentials in DFT.

$$
H\Psi_n = E_n \Psi_n
$$

We are looking for the solutions of the time-independent Schrödinger equation:

The wave function is a multi-variable function:

$$
\Psi(r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_N)
$$

An impractical problem: $\Psi(r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_N)$

Storage required:

- 10 electrons \rightarrow 1000¹⁰ data \rightarrow 10³⁰ ×16 bytes $=16 \times 10^{21}$ Gh
	-

Impracticable!!!

Let us assume that each coordinate is discretized on a 10x10x10 real space grid, which means that there are 1000 data per coordinate.

Dirac's quote of 1929

« The underlying physical laws necessary for the mathematical theory of a large part of physics and the whole of chemistry are thus completely known, and the difficulty is only that the exact application of these laws leads to equations much too complicated to be soluble. »

Réf: *Quantum mechanics of many-electron systems*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, pp.714. (1929)

Dirac's quote of 1929 (suite)

« It, therefore, becomes desirable that approximate practical methods of applying quantum mechanics should be developed, which can lead to an explanation of the main features of complex atomic systems without too much computation. »

Réf: *Quantum mechanics of many-electron systems*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, pp.714. (1929)

This is the subject of this school!

Wavefunction approaches: Hartree method

$$
E = \langle \Psi | H | \Psi \rangle - \sum_{I=1}^{N} \lambda_{I} \langle \phi_{I} | \phi_{I} \rangle
$$

$$
\Psi(\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_N) = \phi_1(\mathbf{X}_1)\phi_2(\mathbf{X}_2)\cdots\phi_N(\mathbf{X}_N) = \prod_{l=1}^N \phi_l(\mathbf{X}_l)
$$

$$
n(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{l=1}^N \phi_l^*(\mathbf{X})\phi_l(\mathbf{X}) \qquad \text{La}
$$

agrange multipliers to assure that the φ*^l* remain orthogonal.

$$
\frac{\partial E}{\partial \phi_i^*(x)} = \left[\frac{-\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + U_{\text{ion}}(x) + \mathbf{e}^2 \int dx' \frac{n(x)}{|x - x|} \right] \phi_i(x) - \lambda_i \phi_i(x) = 0
$$

$$
\left[\frac{-\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + U_{\text{ion}}(x) + V_H(x) \right] \phi_i(x) = \lambda_i \phi_i(x)
$$

Same equation for all φ*l.*

Hartree-Fock method (X_1) $\phi_N(X_2)$ \cdots $\phi_N(X_N)$ (X_1) $\phi_2(X_2)$ \cdots $\phi_2(X_N)$ (X_1) $\phi_1(X_2)$ \cdots $\phi_1(X_N)$!
!
. 1 $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}$ (-1)^P $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}$ $\phi_{PI}(X_i) = \Phi_0(X_1, X_2, ..., X_N)$ $(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_N) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ γ γ γ γ $2(\gamma_1)$ $\gamma_2(\gamma_2)$ γ_2 $1 \left(\mathbf{A} \right)$ $\mathbf{\Psi}_1 \left(\mathbf{A} \right)$ $\mathbf{\Psi}_1$ $\eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, \Lambda_N$) – π_1, \ldots, Λ_N $N(\Lambda)$ $\forall N(\Lambda_2)$ $\forall N(\Lambda_N)$ *N N N l l Pl* $\left\langle \right\rangle$ *P P N* x_1 $\phi_N(x_2)$ \cdots $\phi_N(x)$ x_1 $\phi_2(x_2)$ \cdots $\phi_2(x)$ x_1 $\phi_1(x_2)$ \cdots $\phi_1(x)$ *N* X_j = $\Phi_0(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ *N* $\Psi(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_N) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} \sum_i (-1)^p \prod_i \phi_{P_i}(X_i) = \Phi_0(X_1, X_2, \ldots)$ $\phi_N(\mathbf{x}_1) \quad \phi_N(\mathbf{x}_2) \quad \cdots \quad \phi$ $\phi_2(\mathbf{x}_1)$ $\phi_2(\mathbf{x}_2)$... ϕ $\phi_1(\mathbf{X}_1)$ $\phi_1(\mathbf{X}_2)$ \cdots ϕ . . . $\begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array}$ = = Slater determinant

Particles are not independent, change the position of one and all the others are affected.

Pauli's exclusion principle is respected.

"Correlation" is purely statistics, and not due to interaction.

Hartree-Fock method

 $(x) \int dx \frac{\phi_j^*(x)\phi_j(x)}{1} = \lambda_j \phi_j(x)$ *x x x x x l l j l H l* φ $\delta_{\rm ss}\phi_i(x)\int dx \frac{\phi_i(x)\phi_i(x)}{|\phi_i(x)|^2} = \lambda_i\phi_i$ $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ ⎦

$$
\left[\frac{-\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2 + U_{\text{ion}}(\mathbf{x}) + V_H(\mathbf{x})\right]\phi_I(\mathbf{x})
$$

$$
-\sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{ss} \phi_j(x) \int dx \frac{\phi_j^*(x) \phi_j(x)}{|x-x|}
$$

Exchange potential

Because of the exchange term, the problem is much harder to resolve.

-
- Results are better than those of the Hartree method but still not very satisfying.

Sum of Slater determinants (configurations)

Configuration Interaction method $(X_1, X_2, ..., X_N) = \sum_i C_i \Phi_i(X_1, X_2, ..., X_N)$ *i* Ψ (*x*₁, *x*₂,..., *x*_{*N*}) = $\sum_i C_i \Phi_i$ (*x*₁, *x*₂,..., *x*

Must find the coefficients *Ci*

- CI = configuration interaction
- $CIS = CI$ with single excitations only
- CISD = CI with single and double excitations only

Correlation energy (chemistry): contribution over that of Hartree-Fock

Wavefunction methods

Advantages:

- Control approximations
- Systematic approach (H, HF, CIS, …)
- Upper bound (variational principle)

Disadvantages:

○ Very costly numerically

(up to 20-30 electrons, forget solids!)

Progress in theoretical methods Nobel Prize 1998 in Chemistry

Walter Kohn

John A. Pople

- efficient
- flexible
- precise
- parameter free

"for his development of computational methods in quantum chemistry"

"for his development of the density-functional

theory"

Walter Kohn and Canada/Sherbrooke

Walter Kohn

EVENTS

CALENDAR

SERIES OF SEMINARS Walter Kohn

Walter Kohn died April 16, 2016.

 \rightarrow

André-Marie initiated the Walter Kohn public lecture at UdeS.

- Walter Kohn himself was the first speaker.
	-

Milestones in DFT

Precursor: Thomas-Fermi approximation (1927)

Inhomogeneous electron gas P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **136**, B864 (1964) Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation effects W. Kohn and L. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A1133 (1965)

Ceperley, Alder (1980); Perdew, Zunger (1981) : computation and parametrization of the exchange and correlation energy needed in the local density approximation

Most cited papers Papers published in APS journals (PRL, PRA, PRB, .. RMP), most cited by papers published in APS journals

S. Redner, *Citation Statistics from 110 Years of Physical Review*, Physics Today, June 2005.

Today, according to Google Scholar: K&S, 66k; H&K, 58k; PBE functional, 150k !

THE reference in DFT for solids

LOOK INSIDE Electronic Structure uchard M. Martin Electronic Structure Basic Theory and Practical Methods 2nd Edition **SECOND EDITION** Champaign DATE PUBLISHED: October 2020 **AVAILABILITY: Available FORMAT: Hardback** ISBN: 9781108429900 Average user rating **xxx** (1 review) Rate & review

Basic Theory and Practical Methods

AUTHOR: Richard M. Martin, University of Illinois, Urbana-

What is a functional? A **function** takes a *number* as argument and returns a *number*. A **functional** takes a *function* as argument and returns a *number*. Example of a function: $f(x) = Ax^2$ $f[n] = \int v(x)n(x)dx$ Example of a functional: Function derivative: *df dx* $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ *α* $=$ \lim $f(x + \alpha) - f(x)$ Functional derivative: ∂*f* ∂*n*(*x*′) $=$ \lim *α*→0 $f[n(x) + \alpha \delta(x - x')] - f[n(x)]$ *α* A functional is like a multi-variable function but with

continuous argument instead of being discrete.

-
-

DFT: first theorem Hohenberg et Kohn, Physical Review, vol 136, B864, (1964) Proof by contradiction

 $v(r) \rightarrow \Psi_o(r_1, \ldots, r_n) \rightarrow n_o(r)$ $v'(r) \rightarrow \Psi'_{o}(r_1, \ldots, r_n) \rightarrow n_o(r)$ Different potentials $\frac{\partial (V)}{\partial x}$ is $\frac{\partial (V)}{\partial y}$ ame density

Using variational principle:

 $E_o = \langle \Psi | H | \Psi \rangle < \langle \Psi' | H | \Psi' \rangle = \langle \Psi' | H' - \nu'(r) + \nu(r) | \Psi' \rangle = E_o'$

$$
\langle \left| H' - \nu'(r) + \nu(r) \left| \Psi' \right\rangle \right| = E'_{o} + \int n(r)(-\nu'(r) + \nu(r))
$$

But also:

E′ *o*

$$
= \langle \Psi' | H' | \Psi' \rangle < \langle \Psi | H' | \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi | H - v(r) + v'(r) | \Psi \rangle = E_o + \int n(r)(-v(r) + v'(r))
$$

-
- $E_o + E_o' < E_o' + E_o$

Adding the last two expressions, we get:

$$
\dots, r_n) \to n_o(r)
$$
 same density

$$
\dots, r_n) \to n_o(r)
$$

an obvious contradiction.

DFT: first theorem

The <u>ground state</u> density $n_o(r)$ of a many-electron system determines uniquely the external potential $v(r)$, modulo one global constant.

Consequence : **formally**, the density can be considered as the fundamental variable of the formalism, instead of the potential.

$$
V_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) \underbrace{\left(\frac{\mathbf{H}\mathbf{K}}{\mathbf{\psi}}\right)}_{\psi_i(\{\mathbf{r}\})} n_0(\mathbf{r})
$$

$$
\psi_i(\{\mathbf{r}\}) \Rightarrow \psi_0(\{\mathbf{r}\})
$$

No need for wavefunctions or Schrödinger equation !

The second theorem is actually simply the demonstration that the variation principle still holds.

The constrained-search approach to DFT M. Levy, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA, 76, 6062 (1979)

Use the extremal principle $E_o = \min_{\mathbf{w}}$ Ψ $\langle \Psi | H | \Psi \rangle = \min_{n(r)} \{ \min_{\Psi \to n(r)} \}$ $E_o = \min_{n(r)} \left\{ \min_{\Psi \to n(r)} \right\}$ $E_o = \min_{n(r)} \left\{ \min_{\Psi \to n(r)} \right\}$ $E_o = \min_{n(r)} \{ F[n] + E_{ext}[n(r)] \}$

 $F[n]$ is a universal functional of the density. The problem is that we do not know it explicitly.

principle of QM.
\n
$$
\rangle = \min_{n(r)} \left\{ \min_{\Psi \to n(r)} \langle \Psi | H | \Psi \rangle \right\},
$$
\n
$$
\langle \Psi | T + v_{int} + v_{ext} | \Psi \rangle,
$$
\n
$$
\langle \Psi | T + v_{int} | \Psi \rangle + \int n(r) v_{ext}(r) dr \right\},
$$
\n
$$
F_{\text{max}}(\omega)
$$

Thomas-Fermi method A pure density approach

- Although introduced before DFT, it can be considered as a pure DFT
- approximated as the kinetic energy of the non-interacting homogeneous
- For a non-interacting homogeneous electron gas of density n , we can define its density kinetic energy by the *function:* $E_{\mathrm{kin}}(n)$. In the TF method, the

approach that relies only on the density.

In DFT, the $F[n]$ needs to be approximated. In the TF method, it is electron gas at each point in space. kinetic energy contribution to the total energy is computed be:

$$
F[n] = E_{\text{kin}}^{TF}[n] = \int E_{\text{kin}}(n(r)) dr
$$

We then proceed with a minimization that involves only the density.

The Kohn-Sham approach A way to get a better value for the kinetic energy

 $F[n]$: large part of the total energy, hard to approximate

-
-
- A mapping of the interacting system on a non-interacting system in order to
- For a non-interacting system, the ground state is a single Slater determinant
	- $\Psi(r_1, \ldots, r_N) =$ Slater determinant of $\phi_i(r)$

Kohn & Sham (Phys. Rev. 140, A1133 (1965)) :

get a better approximation for the kinetic energy.

which kinetic energy is easy to evaluate.

$$
\Psi(r_1,\ldots,r_N)=\Omega
$$

$$
T_S[n] = \sum_{i}^{N} \int_{i} \phi_i^*(r) \left(\frac{-\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \right) \phi_i(r) dr
$$

Definition of exchange-correlation energy *à la* **DFT not quite the same as for the wave function methods**

K&S assumed that there exists a non-interacting system with the same density as the studied interacting system which they can use to approximate the kinetic energy contribution.

This definition of $E_{\rm xc}$ differs from the definition of the usual definition as it also $\overline{E}_{\rm xc}$ includes the difference between the true kinetic energy and the real system

$$
F[n] = T[n] + E_{int}[n],
$$

\n
$$
F[n] = T_S[n] + E_H[n] + (E_{int}[n] - E_H[n] + T[n] - T_S[n]),
$$

\n
$$
F[n] = T_S[n] + E_H[n] + E_{xc}[n]
$$

 $E_{\rm xc}[n] = F[n]$

and the one obtained from the non-interacting system.

$$
-E_H[n] - T_S[n]
$$

The K-S non-interacting system

Tuteracting
system

 N_{KS} $N_{on-inttracting}$

Vert

The question is now: How to obtain $v_{KS}(r)$?

The K-S potential

We have to minimize (under the constraint of the number of particles):

$$
E_{KS}[n] = T_S[n] + E_H[n] + E_{ext}[n] + E_{xc}[n],
$$

\n
$$
E_{KS}[n] = T_S[n] + \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{n(r)n(r')}{|r - r'|} dr dr' + \int v_{ext}(r)n(r) dr + E_{xc}[n]
$$

Introducing Lagrange multipliers for the constraint:

$$
0 = \delta \left(E_{KS}[n] - \lambda \left\{ \int n(r) dr - N \right\} \right) = \int \left\{ \frac{\partial T_S}{\partial n(r)} + \int \frac{n(r')}{|r - r'|} dr' + v_{ext}(r) + \frac{\partial E_{xc}}{\partial n(r)} - \lambda \right\} \delta n(r) dr
$$

If one considers the minimization for non-interacting electrons in potential $v_{KS}(r)$, with the same density $n(r)$, one gets:

$$
0 = \int \left\{ \frac{\partial T_S}{\partial n(r)} + v_{KS}(r) - \lambda \right\} \delta n(r) dr \qquad \text{Hence:} \quad v_{KS}(r) = v_{\text{ext}}(r) + \int \frac{n(r')}{|r - r'|} dr' + \frac{\partial E_{xc}}{\partial n(r)}
$$

K-S orbitals and eigenvalues

Non-interacting electrons in the Kohn-Sham potential :

To be solved self-consistently !

Note : by construction, at self-consistency, and assuming the exchange-correlation functional to be exact, the density will be the exact density, the total energy will be the exact one, but Kohn-Sham wavefunctions and eigenenergies correspond to a fictitious set of independent electrons, so they do not correspond to any exact physical quantities.

$$
\phi_i(r) = \epsilon_i \phi_i(r)
$$

nge-correlation al

Density
$$
n(r) = \sum_{i}^{N} \phi_i^*(r)\phi_i(r)
$$

\nDensity $n(r) = \sum_{i}^{N} \phi_i^*(r)\phi_i(r)$
\n
$$
v_{KS}(r) = v_{ext}(r) + \left(\frac{n(r')}{|r - r'|}dr'\right) + \left(\frac{\partial E_{xc}}{\partial n(r)}\right)
$$
\nHartree
\nFactorized potential potential potential potential

Constructing Functionals Doing clever approximations

(without demonstration)

local exchange-correlation energy per particle

$$
E_{\rm xc}[n] = \int n(\mathbf{r}_1) \varepsilon_{\rm xc}(\mathbf{r}_1;n) d\mathbf{r}_1
$$

exchange-correlation hole.

$$
\varepsilon_{xc}(\mathbf{r}_1; n) = \int \frac{1}{2} \frac{n^{xc}(\mathbf{r}_2 | \mathbf{r}_1; n)}{|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|} d\mathbf{r}_2
$$

Sum rule :
$$
\int n^{xc}(\mathbf{r}_2 | \mathbf{r}_1; n) d\mathbf{r}_2
$$

- The hope is that it is easier to find good approximations for $E_{xc}[n]$ than for $F[n]$.
	- The exchange-correlation energy, functional of the density is the integral over the whole space of the density times the
	- while the local exchange-correlation energy per particle is the electrostatic interaction energy of a particle with its DFT

Local-density approximation (I)

Hypothesis :

- the local XC energy per particle only depend on the local density - and is equal to the local XC energy per particle of an homogeneous electron gas of same density (in a neutralizing background $-$ « jellium »)
-

 $\epsilon_{\rm xc}^{\rm LDA}(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{n}) = \epsilon_{\rm xc}^{\rm hom}(\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{r}_1))$

Gives excellent numerical results ! Why?

1) Sum rule is fulfilled

2) Characteristic screening length indeed depend on local density

Local-density approximation (II)

Actual function : exchange part

 $\varepsilon_r^{\text{hom}}(n) = C n^{1/3}$ with

for the correlation part, one resorts to accurate numerical simulations beyond DFT (e.g. Quantum Monte Carlo)

Corresponding exchange-correl

$$
V_{\text{xc}}^{\text{approx}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mu_{\text{xc}}\left(n(\mathbf{r})\right)
$$

$$
\mu_{\text{xc}}(n) = C \frac{4}{3} n^{1/3} = \frac{4}{3} \varepsilon_{\text{x}}^{\text{hom}}(n)
$$

$$
C = -\frac{3}{4\pi} (3\pi^2)^{1/3}
$$

lation potential
$$
V_{xc}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\delta E_{xc}[n]}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})}
$$

$$
\mu_{xc}(n) = \frac{d(n\epsilon_{xc}^{approx}(n))}{dn}
$$

Local-density approximation (III)

To summarize :

$$
E^{LDA}\left[n\right] = T_s\left[n\right] + \int V_{ext}(\mathbf{r})n(\mathbf{r})d\mathbf{r} + \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{n(\mathbf{r}_1)n(\mathbf{r}_2)}{|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|}d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 + E_{xc}^{LDA}\left[n\right]
$$

or

$$
E^{LDA}\left[\left\{\psi_i\right\}\right] = \sum_i \langle \psi_i | -\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 | \psi_i \rangle + \int V_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) n(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{n(\mathbf{r}_1) n(\mathbf{r}_2)}{|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|} d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2
$$

$$
+ \int n(\mathbf{r}_1) \varepsilon_{xc}^{LDA}(n(\mathbf{r}_1)) d\mathbf{r}_1
$$

and

$$
V_{\text{KS}}^{LDA}(\mathbf{r}) = V_{ext}(\mathbf{r}) + \int \frac{n(\mathbf{r}_1)}{|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}|} d\mathbf{r}
$$

 $\mathbf{r}_1 + \mu_{xc}^{\text{hom}}(n(\mathbf{r}))$

Beyond the local-density approximation

Generalized gradient approximations (GGA)

$$
E_{\rm xc}^{\rm approx}\big[n\big]=\int n(\mathbf{r}_1)\varepsilon_{\rm xc}^{\rm approx}\big(n\big)
$$

No model system like the homogeneous electron gas! Many different proposals, including one from Perdew, Burke and Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3865 (1996), often abbreviated \langle PBE \rangle . Others: $PW86, PW91, LYP...$

Also: « hybrid » functionals (B3LYP), α exact exchange α functional, κ self-interaction corrected » functionals ...

 $\left[n(\mathbf{r}_1), |\nabla n(\mathbf{r}_1)|, \nabla^2 n(\mathbf{r}_1)\right] d\mathbf{r}_1$

Jacob's ladder of functional

HSE06

SCAN

PBEsol

PZ

Hartree world

SCAN, r2SCAN an accurate meta-GGA functional

- SCAN satisfies all 17 known constraints of meta-G
- r2SCAN let go of a few constraints, but it is smooth and therefore more suitable for plane-wave basis.

J. W. Furness, Y. Zhang, C. Lane, I. G. Buda, B. Barbiellini, R. S. Markiewicz, A. Bansil, and J. Sun, *An Accurate First-Principles Treatment of Doping-Dependent Electronic Structure of High-Temperature Cuprate Superconductors*, Communications Physics **1**, 1 (2018).

Table 1 Various theoretically predicted properties for LTO, LTT, and HTT structures of LCO using SCAN, PBE and LSDA

functionals are compared with the corresponding experimental results

FU denotes formula unit ^aOnly stabilized under special conditions, see text ^bLeading edge in optical spectrum. ΔE and ΔE_d are energies relative to the LTO phase in the pristine and doped cases, respectively ^cSee "Comment on Calculated Lattice Volumes" in Methods section for discussion

What to remember

- DFT is excellent to predict ground state properties (bond length, etc.), at a reasonable computation cost.
- Using Kohn-Sham eigenvalues as band structure is certainly abusing the method, but it is a good first approximation.
- Treatment of Kohn-Sham eigenvalues can give them physical meaning.
- The accuracy of DFT functionals relies on exact physical constraints.