

The ground state elemental crystals as a benchmark set for solid state DFT: intrinsic accuracy and code comparison

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 Phone: +32 (0)9 264 65 60

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 when applying DFT for property predictions 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 [1]. 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 [2] 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 , B_1 [-] | +6% | 0.5 |
| elastic moduli C_{ij} [GPa] | -2% | 6 |
| melting temperature T_m [K] | -4% | 165 |

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 [3], 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 a Δ of 1.8 meV was found, while for GPAW [4], a similar grid-based code, it was 3.3 meV.

Keywords: density functional theory, benchmark study, code comparison, solids

[1] Lejaeghere, K., Van Speybroeck, V., Van Oost, G. and Cottenier, S., article in preparation.

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

[3] Blaha, P., Schwarz, K., Madsen, G., Kvasnicka, D. and Luitz, J., "WIEN2k, An Augmented Plane Wave + Local Orbitals Program for Calculating Crystal Properties," (Karlheinz Schwarz, Technische Universität Wien, Austria, 1999).

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