## Quantum ESPRESSO tutorial: Self-Consistent Calculations, Supercells, Structural Optimization

What can I learn in this tutorial?

1. How to run PWscf (pw.x) in self-consistent mode for Silicon
2. How to deal with metals (Aluminum )
3. How to deal with Ultrasoft pseudopotentials and with spin polarization ( Iron )
4. How to set up a supercell and optimize a structure ( Graphene )

More info can be found in

- on-line manuals at http://www.quantum-espresso.org/users-manual
- Doc/ subdirectories in the Quantum ESPRESSO distribution


## 0. Getting example files

Download example file day1-handson.tgz and unpack it:
\$ tar -xzvf day1-handson.tgz
(\$ is the prompt of your computer). This will create a sub-directory named Day1 containing several files.

Move to Day1 and check its content:
\$ cd Day1
\$ ls
Aluminum day1_handson.pdf doc Graphene Iron pseudo Silicon
The doc directory contains the input description files for the codes used in this tutorial. The pseudo directory contains pseudopotential files used in this tutorial. The day1_handson.pdf file contains these slides.

## 1. Getting started: Silicon

Self-consistent calculation for Silicon in the diamond structure:

- Move to the Silicon/ sub-directory
- Look at the input file si.scf.in. It is composed of three "namelists" \&control (notice that calculation='scf' is the default value), \&system, \&electrons, followed by three "cards" ATOMIC_SPECIES, ATOMIC_POSITIONS, K_POINTS
- Write the appropriate values for the two variables
- outdir: temporary directory for large files. Must be writable, will be created if not existent. You may set environment variable ESPRESSO_TMPDIR instead. outdir='. ./tmp' should be fine.
- pseudo_dir: directory where pseudopotential (PP) files are kept. It must exist, be readable, and contain the required PP file (in this example, Si.pz-vbc.UPF for Silicon). You may set environment variable ESPRESSO_PSEUDO instead. pseudo_dir=' . ./pseudo' should be fine


## Providing atomic structure in input

How is the crystal structure defined? This is a very simple case: Diamond lattice is a fcc (facecentered cubic) lattice with two atoms per unit cell. You need to specify:


- What is the Bravais lattice ibrav=2, meaning fcc lattice
- How many and which parameters are needed to completely define Bravais lattice geometry

```
just one: celldm(1)=10.2, lattice parameter }a\mathrm{ in a.u.
```

- How many atoms there are in the unit cell nat=2: two atoms
- How many different atomic species are present ntyp=1: one species
- Which ones, described by which pseudopotential See card ATOMIC_SPECIES
- Where the atoms are located in the unit cell See card ATOMIC_POSITIONS: here, in Cartesian axis, in units of $a$ ("alat")

Notice that there are several alternative methods to specify an atomic structure!

## Brillouin zone (BZ) sampling

BZ sampling is performed using the "2 Chadi-Cohen special points" (D.J. Chadi and M.L. Cohen, Phys. Rev. B 8, 5747 (1973)) for the fcc lattice.
k-points are described in card K_POINTS. One has to choose

- Whether to provide a list of k-points, or a uniform grid In this case: a list in Cartesian axis in units of $2 \pi / a$ ("tpiba")
- If a list is chosen: list of k-points in the Irreducible BZ and corresponding symmetry weights; the latter do not need to add up to 1 , they are normalized by the code Frequently Asked Question: where do I find special k-points and their weights? Answer: 1) in papers, 2) use auxiliary code kpoints.x, 3) use uniform grids
- If a uniform grid is chosen: Monkhorst-Pack parameters (H.J. Monkhorst and J.D. Pack, Phys. Rev. B 13, 5188 (1976)), and offsets along the three directions


## Running the pw.x code

For serial (single processors) execution you can use
\$ pw.x -in si.scf.in > si.scf.out
(note: input redirection pw. x < si.scf.in works but it is not recommended on parallel machines)
Look at the scratch directory outdir and its content:
\$ ls my_outdir_directory
silicon.save silicon.wfc1
The scratch directory contains temporary files used during the calculation as well as the final data directory for further processing. The name of the files is determined by the value of the prefix variable, by their content, number of processors, options, ....

Do not run two instances of pw.x that access the same outdir with the same prefix! Unpredictable behavior may follow. In case of trouble, clean the scratch directory.

## Running the pw.x code II

Examine output file si.scf.out, look how self-consistency proceeds:
\$ grep -e 'total energy' -e estimated si.scf.out

| total energy | $=$ | -15.79103344 Ry |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| estimated scf accuracy | $<$ | 0.06376674 Ry |
| total energy | $=$ | -15.79409289 Ry |
| estimated scf accuracy | $<$ | 0.00230109 Ry |
| total energy | $=$ | -15.79447822 Ry |
| estimated scf accuracy | $<$ | 0.00006291 Ry |
| total energy | $=$ | -15.79449510 Ry |
| estimated scf accuracy | $<$ | 0.00000448 Ry |
| total energy | $=$ | -15.79449593 Ry |
| estimated scf accuracy | $<$ | 0.00000005 Ry |

The total energy is the sum of the following terms:
Notice that there are 8 electrons in the cell: 2 (pseudo-)atoms/cell with 4 electrons. The system is a non-magnetic insulator, so just the lowest $4=8 / 2$ valence bands (Kohn-Sham states) are computed.

## Convergence w.r.t. kinetic energy cutoff

The kinetic energy cutoff ecutwfc (in Ry) determines the size of the Plane-Wave (PW) basis set used to expand wavefunctions (i.e. Kohn-Sham orbitals) (for Norm-Conserving PP, the PW set for charge density ecutrho=4*ecutwfc, do not specify it)

1. Change value of ecutwfc in si.scf.in input file to $16,20,24,28,32$ Ry
2. Run pw. x again and again, noting the final energy;
3. Complete the data in file si.etot_vs_ecut;
4. Plot file si.etot_vs_ecut using your preferred plotting program, for instance:
```
$ gnuplot
```

gnuplot > plot 'si.etot_vs_ecut' using 1:2 with lines

You should get a plot like the one in next page. Notice the monotonic convergence, as a consequence of the variational principle

## Convergence w.r.t. kinetic energy cutoff II



## Reminder:

- Convergence w.r.t to cutoff is a property of the pseudopotential(s) used.
- Convergence of absolute energy is typically slower than convergence on interesting physical properties, e.g. structure.
- Absolute values of total energy do not have any physical meaning (and depend upon the specific PP): only energy differences do


## Convergence w.r.t. k-points

A sufficiently dense grid of $k$-points is needed in order to account for periodicity

1. Edit si.scf.in (set ecutwfc back to 12 Ry), modifying the K_POINTS card to use automatic Monkhorst-Pack grids:

K_POINTS automatic
nk1 nk2 nk3 k1 k2 k3
with $n k 1=n k 2=n k 3=2,4,6$ (increasing number of $k$-points), $k 1=k 2=k 3=1$
2. Run pw. x , complete entries in file si.etot_vs_nks (nks is the actual number of k-points in the Irreducible BZ used in the calculation, reprinted on output)
3. Plot column 3 vs column 1, for instance using the following syntax:
\$ gnuplot gnuplot > plot 'si.etot_vs_nks' u 1:3 with lines

You should get a plot like the one in next page.

## Convergence w.r.t. k-points II



Reminder:

- The first three "nk1 nk2 nk3" numbers mean "there are nk1,nk2,nk3 grid points along crystal axis $1,2,3$ "; the second three "k1 k2 k3" numbers, either 0 or 1 , mean "grid starts from 0" or "displaced by half a step" along crystal axis 1,2,3

Also note that:

- Convergence is not necessarily monotonic: there is no variational principle w.r.t. $k$-point number
- The "2 2211 1" Monkhorst-Pack grid is the same as the "two Chadi-Cohen points"


## Equation of State of Silicon

Equilibrium in Si is determined by the minimum-energy lattice parameter alone: there are no forces on atoms, by symmetry (please verify this by setting tprnfor=.true. in namelist \&control and looking for forces reprinted at the end)

- Choose suitable values for ecutwfc and the k-point grid (e.g.: 20 Ry, 444111 )
- Run the code for values of celldm(1) ranging from 9.8 a.u to 10.7 a.u in steps of 0.1 a.u.; to extract the final energy, use command "grep ! output-file"
- Collect the results into a file si.etot_vs_alat as a sequence of rows $a_{i}, E\left(a_{i}\right)$
- Plot content of si.etot_vs_alat as in previous examples

Lazy (or maybe efficient?) people may edit script run_si_eos, defining variables espresso_dir, pseudo_dir and outdir, and run it as
\$ sh run_si_eos
File si.etot_vs_alat is created at the end of the script file

## Equation of State of Silicon II

The experimental lattice parameter for Si is $5.47 \AA$, or 10.26 a.u.: this is a case where plain simple LDA yields remarkable results You may experiment changing cutoff, k-points, pseudopotential, ... You should find that


- The energy vs lattice parameter $E(a)$ curves are shifted down rather uniformly with increasing cutoff and are not strongly dependent on $k$-points.
- Structural properties and energy differences converge faster that total energies.

Use code ev.x to fit your results to a phenomenological EOS (e.g. Murnaghan) and to get accurate values for the lattice parameter and for the bulk modulus. The code prompts for some data, reads a file like si.etot_vs_alat: for cubic systems, rows $a_{i} \quad E\left(a_{i}\right)$

## Band Structure of Silicon

Re-run the self-consistent calculation at equilibrium lattice parameter, then run a non-self-consistent (fixed-potential) calculation, with the same input as for scf, but

- variable calculation is set to 'bands' ;
- the number nbnd of Kohn-Sham states must be explicitly set;
- k-points are chosen along suitable high-symmetry lines. See sample file si.bands.in, containing the $L-\Gamma-X-K-\Gamma$ path.


Important: outdir and prefix must be the same in bands and in scf calculations. Important: the k-point path must be continuous in k -space
\$ pw.x -in si.bands.in > si.bands.out
The list of k-points and of Kohn-Sham energies can be found after the line

> End of band structure calculation

## Plotting Band Structure

There are various ways to plot the band structure. The simplest: use command bands. x with the following input (outdir and prefix as in previous steps):
\&bands
prefix='...', outdir='...', filband = 'sibands.dat', lsym=.true. /

Two files are produced: sibands.dat.gnu, directly plottable with gnuplot, and sibands.dat, for further processing by auxiliary command plotband.x.

If option lsym=.true, bands.x performs a symmetry analysis. An additional file sibands.dat.rep is generated, containing information on symmetry labels of the various bands.

If option lsym=.true, bands.x does not perform the symmetry analysis.

## Plotting Band Structure II

plotband.x prompts for terminal input:
\$ plotband.x
Input file > sibands.dat
Reading 8 bands at 36 k-points
Range: -6.3010 13.7920eV Emin, Emax >-6.30 10.30
high-symmetry point: 0.50000 .50000 .5000 x coordinate 0.0000
high-symmetry point: 0.00000 .00000 .0000 x coordinate 0.8660
high-symmetry point: 0.00000 .00001 .0000 x coordinate 1.8660
high-symmetry point: 0.00000 .50001 .0000 x coordinate 2.3660
high-symmetry point: 0.00001 .00001 .0000 x coordinate 2.8660
high-symmetry point: 0.00000 .00000 .0000 x coordinate 4.2802
output file (gnuplot/xmgr) > sibands.plot
bands in gnuplot/xmgr format written to file sibands.plot output file (ps) > (press Return)

If symmetry analysis was performed in the previous step, the output is written to several plottable files sibands.plot.N.M, where $N$ labels the high-symmetry lines, $M$ labels irreducible representations.

## 2. A metallic example: Aluminum

Aluminum is even simpler than Silicon: one atom per unit cell in a fcc lattice. BUT: it is a metal, valence bands only and a few k -points will not suffice.

- Move to the Aluminum sub-directory
- Edit file al.scf.in, define suitable values for outdir and pseudo_dir;
- Notice the presence of new variables: occupations, smearing, degauss;
- Run pw. x in the following way:
\$ pw.x -in al.scf.in > al.scf.out
- Notice in output file that
- the number of bands (Kohn-Sham states) is automatically set to a value larger than the number of electrons divided by 2
- the Fermi energy is computed.


## Convergence with respect to degauss/smearing

1. Now edit file al.scf.in, varying

- variable smearing, possible values:
'gauss' (g), 'marzari-vanderbilt' (m-v), 'methfessel-paxton' (m-p)
- variable degauss, suggested values: $0.06,0.07,0.08,0.09,0.10$ (in Ry)
so that you can complete the entries in files al.g.6, al.m-v.6, al.m-p. 6

2. Do the same with denser k-point grid, e.g. replacing 666 in card K_POINTS with 88 8, 1212 12, 161616 (this step has already been done for you: the relative results are in files al.g.8, al.g.12, al.g.16, and similarly for m-p and m-v)

Plot the content of files al.g.6, al.g.8, al.g.12, al.g.16, and similarly for m-v and m-p. Notice how much slower the convergence is for metals than for insulators!

Both m-v and m-p are much less dependent upon degauss and allow for faster and safer convergence than simple gaussian broadening. For Al and $\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{v}$ or $\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{p}$ smearing, good convergence is achieved for a 121212 grid and degauss $\sim 0.01 \div 0.05$ Ry.

## Convergence with respect to degauss/smearing II





Notice that quantities like the force on an atom may also be used instead of, and be better suited than, the total energy in this kind of testing.

Also notice that you cannot reduce the broadening too much: the energy levels must have some overlap, or else the advantage of broadening is lost!

You may take inspiration from script run_al_test for further testing

## 3. A magnetic example: Iron

Iron has two remarkable features: it is magnetic, and it requires Ultrasoft PP (USPP) since its localized 3d atomic states are very hard.

- Move to the Iron sub-directory, edit file fe_fm.scf.in, defining suitable values for outdir and pseudo_dir;
- The structure is bcc (ibrav=3) with one atom per unit cell
- The number of Kohn-Sham states to be computed is explicitly indicated: nbnd=8
- Notice the presence of variables nspin and of starting_magnetization, indicating LSDA (nspin=2) with unconstrained total magnetization and initial symmetry broken; plus, variables for metallic calculations
- Notice that this calculation uses GGA (PBE): it is specified inside the PP file (can be guessed from the PP file name), reprinted on output as "Exchange-correlation"
- Also notice that with USPP, it is typically needed to set ecutrho $>4 \times$ ecutwfc (it should be at least 8 to 12 times larger)


## Magnetic structures

Run pw. x in the usual way. In the output, notice:

- the number of k-points is doubled w.r.t the non-magnetic case: the first set of kpoints contains spin-up states, the second set spin-down states (use verbosity='high' in namelist \&control if there are more than 100 k -points)
- the lines

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { total magnetization } & = \\
\text { absolute magnetization } & =2.41 \mathrm{Bohr} \mathrm{mag} / \mathrm{cell} \\
2.60 \mathrm{Bohr} \mathrm{mag} / \mathrm{cell}
\end{array}
$$

Since there is a single (magnetic) atom per unit cell, the only possible magnetic structure is ferromagnetic. In order to reach antiferromagnetic states, you need to

- Introduce a supercell with two sublattices of different species of atoms (even if they are the same, it is important that they are labeled as different)
- Start with opposite initial magnetization for the two sublattices

Can you write input data for an AFM structure? (hint: split bcc into two simple cubic sublattices, ibrav=1, with two atoms at ( $0,0,0$ ) and ( $1 / 2,1,2,1 / 2$ )

## Convergence check for USPP

For computational efficiency, it is convenient to keep ecutwfc as low as possible, while ecutrho is less critical (look at the CPU time report at the end of an output: there are very many fftw, depending upon ecutwfc, while a much smaller number of $f f t$ depends upon ecutrho)

Fix the ecutrho/ecutwfc ratio ("dual") to 4, $6,8,12$ and compute the energy vs ecutwfc curve. For dual=4 it will look funny: energy increases with increasing cutoff, but for higher dual (i.e. better description of augmentation charge) the normal behavior is observed.


Once convergence is reached for both cutoffs and k-points, you may compare the stability of Iron in the bcc, fcc, hcp phases (the latter being a slightly more complicated structure)

## Density of States (DOS)

1. Run a non self-consistent calculation (calculation='nscf' in namelist \&control), using a previously computed scf potential. Input file fe_fm.nscf.in:

- has the same prefix and outdir of the previous scf step
- uses a denser k-point mesh than in the previous scf step
- uses the linear tetrahedron method (variable occupations='tetrahedra')

2. Run code dos.x, using input file fe.dos.in: $\$$ dos. $x$-in fe.dos.in, where

- prefix and outdir are the same of the previous non-scf step
- output is written to file fildos

Plot spin-up (column 2) and down (column 3) DOS as a function of $E$ (column 1)
3. (step 1 is not strictly needed, but if you want a nice DOS you need tetrahedra and a dense k-point grid) Reminder: Absolute values of Kohn-Sham eigenvalues have no direct physical meaning


## Projected Density of States (PDOS)

1. Run a non self-consistent calculation as for the DOS case
2. Run code projwfc.x, using input file fe.pdos.in:
\$ projwfc.x -in fe.pdos.in, where

- gaussian broadening degauss is used (tetrahedra not yet implemented)
- prefix and outdir are the same of the previous non-scf step
- the prefix to all output files in in variable filpdos

Plot spin-up (column 2) and down (column 3) PDOS for $s$ and $d$ states: fe.pdos.pdos_atm\#1(Fe)_wfc\#1(s),
3. fe.pdos.pdos_atm\#1(Fe)_wfc\#2(d), as a function of $E$ (column 1), compared to the sum of all PDOS (columns 4 and 5 of fe.pdos.pdos_tot, total DOS in column 2 and 3: they aren't exactly the same, why?)


## A slightly more complex structure: hcp Iron

Iron in the hcp structure has a hexagonal lattice with two parameters, $a$ and $c$ :

$$
\mathbf{a}_{1}=(a, 0,0), \quad \mathbf{a}_{2}=\left(-\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a \sqrt{3}}{2}, 0\right), \quad \mathbf{a}_{3}=(0,0, c)
$$

and two atoms in the unit cell, at positions

$$
\mathbf{d}_{1}=(0,0,0), \quad \mathbf{d}_{2}=\left(0, \frac{a \sqrt{3}}{3}, \frac{c}{2}\right)
$$

The noncubic lattice can be described in many equivalent ways:

- ibrav=4, celldm(1) $=a$, celldm $(3)=c / a$, as in sample file fe_hcp.scf.in
- ibrav=4, $\mathrm{a}=a, \mathrm{c}=c$, both in $\AA$, not a.u.
- ibrav=0, celldm(1) $=a$, lattice vectors in card

CELL_PARAMETERS (alat)
1.0000000 .0000000 .000000
$-0.5000000 .8660250 .000000$
0.0000000 .0000001 .633000

- Using space_group=194, and Wyckoff positions $2 c$ (see fe_hcp.wy.in)

Useful hint: use xcrysden --pwi fe_hcp.scf.in to verify the structure.

## Equation of state for noncubic structures

For a few selected values of the unit cell volume,

1. Perform a series of calculations with different $c / a$, locate minimum $E$; or
2. Perform a variable-cell calculation (sample file fe_hcp.vcr.in:

- set calculation='vc-relax'
- add two namelists, \&ions ... / and \&cell . . /, after \&electrons
- in \&cell ... /, set cell_dofree='shape' (keeps volume fixed)

Inspect output of \$ pw.x -in fe_hcp.vcr.in > fe_hcp.vcr.out:

- several scf steps are performed, forces (zero by symmetry) and stresses computed
- the energy decrease and the stress becomes more and more isotropic as the minimum is approached
- a final scf step is performed with plane waves computed for the final cell
- the final cell is printed after the last CELL_PARAMETERS card


## 4. A more complex example: Graphene-based materials

- Graphene has a 2 -atom hexagonal unit cell in the $x y$ plane: ibrav=4, celldm(1)=4.6542890, celldm (3) =some suitably large value, e.g. 3.0) (remember: celldm(1) in Bohr radii, celldm(3)=c/a; alternatively: $\mathrm{A}=2.463, \mathrm{C}=7.389$, in $\AA$ )

- Atomic positions:

ATOMIC_POSITIONS (alat)
C 0.0000000 .0000000 .000000
C 0.0000000 .57735030 .000000
or, equivalently:
ATOMIC_POSITIONS (crystal)
C 0.0000000 .0000000 .000000
C 0.3333330 .66666660 .000000

- K-points: use a dense grid in the $x y$ plane only, e.g.

K_POINTS (automatic)
991000
(a uniform $9 \times 9 \times 1$ grid, centered on $\mathbf{k}=(0,0,0)$ )

- Run the scf calculation for graphene, file graphene.in (or graphene-alt.in), analyze the output.


## Bands of graphene

Can you reproduce the "cones" of the band structure at the Fermi surface? The most difficult (?) part is to figure out a suitable path of k-points.

You may either use the " $k$-path selection" tool of xcrysden ...
XCrySDen: pwi2xsf.xsf_out
$\times$

.... or the SeeK-path web site at http://materialscloud.org/tools/seekpath:
SeeK-path: the k-path finder and visualizer - Mozilla Firefox

then proceed as for Si : scf calculation followed by a band calculation and bands. x , plotband.x postprocessing.

For DOS: scf calculation followed by a dense-grid calculation with tetrahedra, dos.x postprocessing.

## Graphene ( $3 \times 3$ supercell)

- The previous calculation is periodic in the $x y$ plane, has a slab geometry in the $z$ direction, with a large vacuum space separating layers and a fictitious periodicity (no crystalline states). We want now to build a supercell in the $x y$ plane.

- Let us build a $3 \times 3$ supercell in the $x y$, file graphene $3 x 3$.in:
- Primitive lattice vectors $a$ and $b$ are multiplied by 3: celldm (1) $=13.9628670$
- Primitive lattice vector $c$ remains the same, so: celldm(3)=1.0. If you want the same k-point grid, just use K_POINTS (automatic) with 331000 grid
- Reciprocal lattice vectors in the $x y$ plane are divided by 3 (look at the output)
- There are 9 times the atoms of the original unit cell (that is, 18 atoms)
- There are $\sim 9$ times more Kohn-Sham energies per k-point
- Provided that the two k-point grids are equivalent (please check!):
- The energy of the supercell $E^{S C}=9 E^{U C}$ almost exactly (UC=unit cell)
- all $\epsilon^{S C}\left(\mathbf{k}_{i}\right)$ are (almost) equal to some $\epsilon^{U C}\left(\mathbf{k}_{j}\right)$ if $\mathbf{k}_{j}$ refolds into $\mathbf{k}_{i}$


## Graphane (structural optimization)

- Graphane is like graphene, with a H atom bound to each C atom, on opposite sides. You need to optimize atomic positions, i.e. find the minimum-energy structure (zero forces).

- File graphane.in is a modified version of graphene.in, with
- calculation='relax' for structural optimization, new namelist IONS
- ntyp=2 (2 types of atoms), nat=4 (4 atoms in the cell)
- ATOMIC_POSITION card with 4 initial positions (C-H distance $\sim 1 \AA$ )
- ATOMIC_SPECIES card with 2 species of atoms and pseudopotentials
- Run the structural optimization, analyze the output: it consists of several scf steps, followed by calculation of forces and generation of new positions

In the picture, the final structure of graphane, exhibiting "buckling"


## Graphene Oxide

- The first stage of graphene oxidation is the formation of an epoxy bridge. Let us add an O atom on a $3 \times 3$ supercell of graphene

- File graphene3x3-0.in is a modified version of graphene3x3.in, with
- calculation='relax' for structural optimization, new namelist IONS
- ntyp=2 (2 types of atoms), nat=19 (19 atoms in the cell)
- ATOMIC_POSITION card with 19 initial positions (C-O distance $\sim 1.5 \AA 8$ )
- ATOMIC_SPECIES card with 2 species of atoms and pseudopotentials
- Run the structural optimization, analyze the output

