

The ground state elemental crystals as a guideline for the assessment of solid state DFT accuracy

K. Lejaeghere¹, V. Van Speybroeck¹, G. Van Oost² and S. Cottenier^{1,3}

¹ *Center for Molecular Modeling, Ghent University, Technologiepark 903, BE-9052 Zwijnaarde, Belgium. E-mail: kurt.lejaeghere@ugent.be*

² *Department of Applied Physics, Ghent University, Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 41, BE-9000 Ghent, Belgium.*

³ *Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Ghent University, Technologiepark 903, BE-9052 Zwijnaarde, Belgium.*

ABSTRACT A central issue for experimentalists when confronted with property predictions by density functional theory (DFT) is an assessment of the error bars on the computed quantities. These are usually determined by performing calculations for a set of experimentally well-known benchmark systems. For molecules, some commonly accepted test sets are available for the evaluation of various properties at various levels of theory. Similar systematic and broad tests for crystalline solids are not that easily found. Therefore, several basic properties have been computed for a test set with nearly all ground state elemental crystals. This test set contains many different elements, crystal structures and chemical bond types in a natural way. Three general-purpose DFT codes have been employed, using a Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof functional. The following table summarizes a comparison between VASP and experiment. It presents both the systematic deviation of the DFT numbers and the remaining error bars.

	deviation	error bar
cohesive energy ΔE_{coh} [kJ/mol]	0 %	17
equilibrium volume V_0 [$\text{\AA}^3/\text{atom}$]	+4 %	0.6
equilibrium bulk modulus B_0 [GPa]	-5 %	9
pressure derivative of B_0 [-]	+6 %	0.5
elastic moduli C_{ij} [GPa]	-2 %	6

Although the major part of the error bars stems from the choice of a particular DFT functional, a sometimes non-negligible part of it is due to the computational approach, and is hence code-dependent. The same test set of elemental crystals can provide insight into this aspect as well. A quality factor Δ has been defined to compare the equations of state for different codes directly. This quantity expresses the rms energy deviation between the $E(V)$ curve of a code under test, and that of the APW+lo code WIEN2k, averaged over the entire test set. WIEN2k is an all-electron method, believed to provide results that are as close as possible to the true results for the chosen functional. For VASP Δ was 1.8 meV/atom, while for GPAW, a similar grid-based code, it was 3.3 meV/atom.

Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.2733>.

[1] Kresse, G. and Furthmüller, J. *Comp. Mater. Sci.*, 6 (1996) 15-50.

[2] Blaha, P. *et al.* "WIEN2k, An Augmented Plane Wave + Local Orbitals Program for Calculating Crystal Properties," (K. Schwarz, TU Wien, Austria, 1999).

[3] Mortensen, J.J., Hansen, L.B., and Jacobsen, K.W. *Phys. Rev. B*, 71 (2005) 035109.