Introduction to DFT and its Application to Defects in Semiconductors

Noa Marom

Physics and Engineering Physics Tulane University New Orleans



The Future: Computer-Aided Materials Design

- Can access the space of materials not experimentally known
- Can scan through structures and compositions faster than is possible experimentally
- Unbiased search can yield unintuitive solutions



Dirac's Challenge

"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. 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 ... "



P. A. M. Dirac Physics Nobel Prize, 1933

-P. A. M. Dirac, 1929

Schrödinger's Equation:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi = H\Psi$$
 $H = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\sum_{n=1}^N \nabla_n^2 + V(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, ..., \vec{r}_N, t)$

The physical laws are completely known

But...



There are as many electrons in a penny as stars in the known universe!

Electronic Structure Methods for Materials Properties

Structure Mechanical properties Vibrational spectrum

Ground State

Ionization potential (IP) Electron Affinity (EA) Fundamental gap Defect/dopant charge transition levels Charged Excitation

Absorption spectrum Optical gap Exciton binding energy Neutral Excitation



DFT- Density Functional Theory



Use what you can measure! The density is used as the basic variable instead of the many-body wave function with no loss of information

The Hohenberg & Kohn theorem (1964):

One-to-one correspondence between the ground state density and the external potential



Walter Kohn Nobel Prize in Chemistry, 1998 For DFT

3
$$n(r) \leftrightarrow V_{ext}(r) \leftrightarrow \psi(r_1, r_2, ..., r_n)$$

Solution
Belectron
Density
Belectron
Belectron

Exact mapping to a single particle problem with the many-body effects contained in the <u>exchange-correlation functional</u>

Kohn & Sham, 1965

$$\left\{ \left. -\nabla^2 \right/_2 + V_{ion}(\boldsymbol{r}) + V_{Hartree}[n(\boldsymbol{r})] + V_{xc}[n(\boldsymbol{r})] \right\} \varphi_i(\boldsymbol{r}) = \varepsilon_i \varphi_i(\boldsymbol{r})$$



ion-e

kinetic

e-e

many-body

$$n(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\substack{occupied\\states}} |\varphi_i(\mathbf{r})|^2$$

The Kohn-Sham equation is a Schrödingerlike eigenvalue equation, solved selfconsistently to find the ground state density

> *V_{xc}* is unknown and must be approximated

DFT- Density Functional Theory



The success of DFT calculations hinges on a good choice of approximation for the exchangecorrelation functional

DFT Functionals: Local and Semi-Local Functionals

<u>The local density approximation (LDA)</u> E_{xc} is approximated by its value per particle in a uniform electron gas weighted by the local density

$$E_{xc}^{LDA}[n] = \int d^3r n(\vec{r}) \varepsilon_{xc}^{unif}(n(\vec{r}))$$

D. M. Ceperley , B. J. Alder, Phys. Rev. Lett. <u>45</u>, 566 (1980)

<u>Generalized gradient approximation (GGA)</u> E_{xc} includes a dependence on the density gradient to account for density variations (PBE)

J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett. <u>77</u>, 3865 (1996); <u>78</u>, 1396 (1997)

<u>Meta-GGA</u> E_{xc} also depends on the kinetic energy density (TPSS)

$$\tau(\vec{r}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\alpha\sigma \\ \varepsilon_{\alpha\sigma} < \mu}} \left| \nabla \psi_{\alpha\sigma}(\vec{r}) \right|^2 \qquad \text{Local Density} \\ \text{Approximation} \\ \Gamma^{approx} \left[\alpha \right] = \int d^3 e^{approx} \left(\alpha(\vec{r}) \right) \nabla \alpha(\vec{r}) = (\vec{r})$$

 $E_{xc}^{approx}[n] = \int d^3r n(\vec{r}) \varepsilon_{xc}^{approx} \left(n(\vec{r}), \nabla n(\vec{r}), \tau(\vec{r}), \ldots \right)$

J. Tao , J.P. Perdew , V.N. Staroverov , G.E. Scuseria *Phys. Rev. Lett.* <u>91</u>, 146401 (2003)



DFT Functionals: Hybrid Functionals

Hybrid Functionals A fraction,α, of exact (Fock) exchange is mixed with GGA exchange and correlation. PBEO has 25% EXX

$$E_x^{HF} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \iint \varphi_i^*(r_1) \varphi_j^*(r_1) \frac{1}{r_{12}} \varphi_i(r_2) \varphi_j(r_2) dr_1 dr_2$$

C. Adamo and V. Barone, J. Chem. Phys. <u>110</u>, 6158 (1999)

<u>Range-Separated Hybrids</u> The Coulomb potential is split into short-range and long-range parts

 $\frac{1}{r_{12}} = \frac{\operatorname{erfc}(\omega r_{12})}{r_{12}} + \frac{\operatorname{erf}(\omega r_{12})}{r_{12}}$ 1/\omega is a characteristic length scale for SR-LR transition HSE reduces to PBE0 in the SR and to PBE in the LR (\alpha=0.25; \omega=0.11 Bohr^{-1})

$$E_{xc}^{HSE} = \alpha E_x^{HF,SR}(\omega) + (1 - \alpha) E_x^{\omega PBR,LR}(\omega) + E_c^{PBE}$$

J. Heyd, G. E. Scuseria, M. Ernzerhof, *J. Chem. Phys.* <u>118</u>, 8207 (2003); <u>124</u>, 219906 (2006)



Pathologies of Semi-Local Functionals

The (lack of) Derivative Discontinuity: The chemical potential is supposed to jump discontinuously when going through an integer particle number **The Self-Interaction Error:** Spurious Coulomb repulsion of an electron from itself due to incomplete cancellation of the self-interaction in the Hartree term by the approximate exchange term



<u>Effects</u>: Destabilization of localized states and severe gap underestimation Hybrid functionals mitigate (but not completely correct!) these deficiencies

The GW Approximation

The quasiparticle equation:

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^{2}+V_{ion}+V_{Hartree}+\sum(r,r',E_{i}^{QP})\right)\psi_{i}(r)=E_{i}^{QP}\psi_{i}(r)$$

many-body

colf on orm

The GW approximation (Hedin, 1965):

The self-energy is approximated by the first order term in a perturbative expansion in the screened Coulomb interaction $\sum pprox iGW$

- **G**₀**W**₀ (Hybertsen and Louie, 1986):
- Assume that the KS wave-function and eigenvalues are good approximations for the many-body wave-function and QP energies
- Calculate the QP energies non-self-consistently as perturbative corrections to the KS energies:

$$E_{i}^{G_{0}W_{0}} = \varepsilon_{i}^{KS} + \left\langle \varphi_{i} \left| \sum_{xc}^{G_{0}W_{0}} - V_{xc} \right| \varphi_{i} \right\rangle$$

Use KS orbitals and energies to evaluate G₀ and W₀

DFT in Practice: Common Basis Sets and Codes

To solve the Kohn-Sham eigenvalue equation in practice, it must be discretized in a basis set. Different DFT codes use different basis sets:

Plane-waves (PW) are the most convenient basis set for periodic systems: VASP, Quantum Espresso, ABINIT, CASTEP

Other types of basis sets: Real space: PARSEC, OCTOPUS Wavelets: BigDFT, MADNESS Gaussian orbitals (GTO): NWChem, Q-Chem, Gaussian, CRYSTAL Slater orbitals (STO): ADF Numeric atom-centered orbitals (NAO): FHI-aims, SIESTA CONQUEST Full potential linearized augmented plane-waves (FP-LAPW): EXCITING, FLEUR, ELK, WIEN2k

See also:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_quantum_chemistry_and_solidstate_physics_software

DFT in Practice: Pseudo Potentials

Core electrons do not contribute significantly to chemical bonding and physical phenomena of interest (except for X-ray spectroscopies) but do contribute high frequency terms in the wave-function that are numerically difficult to deal with

The wave-function in the core region is replaced by a smooth function and the 1/r potential by a slowly-varying pseudo-potential

Common types of pseudo-potentials:

- Norm-conserving
- Ultra-soft
- Projector augmented waves (PAW)



Keeping Supercomputers Busy...







Hopper (#34) Cray XE6 153,216 cores 1.28 petaflops

Edison (#18) Cray XC30 133,824 cores 2.77 petaflops Mira (#5) BlueGene/Q 786,432 cores 8.6 petaflops

The computational cost of quantum mechanical simulations increases with the accuracy of the method and with the system's size and complexity

Configuration space exploration may require running *thousands* of trial structures



New at Tulane: Cypress (#271) Dell cluster 2,480 Intel Ivy Bridge+ 15,128 Xeon Phi cores 0.7 petaflops

Computational Cost of Different Methods (FHI-aims)



Formation energies:

Neutral defect:
$$E^{f}[X^{0}] = E_{tot}[X^{0}] - E_{tot}[bulk] - \sum_{i} n_{i}\mu_{i}$$

Charged defect: $E^{f}[X^{q}] = E_{tot}[X^{q}] - E_{tot}[bulk] - \sum_{i} n_{i}\mu_{i} + qE_{F} + E_{corr}$



The chemical potential:

Determined by the conditions (T,P) of the experiment and used to simulate different conditions

A consistent choice of reference must be made, either to the total energy of the elemental phases at OK or at STP

Chemical potentials are bound by the existence or appearance of secondary phases

Freysoldt et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. 86, 253 (2014)

Applying DFT to Defects in Semiconductors

The supercell approximation:

The defect is placed in a large simulation cell with periodic boundary conditions

Higher effective concentration of defects

Interactions between periodic replicas may broaden the defect state

For charged defects a compensating background charge is added

The slow decay of the Coulomb potential leads to spurious interactions



Various correction schemes:

Makov and Payne (MP) Freysoldt, Neugebauer, and Van de Walle (FNV) Lany and Zunger (LZ) Potential alignment (PA) H. P. Komsa, T. Rantala, &

A. Pasquarello *PRB* <u>86</u>, 045112 (2012)

Applying DFT to Defects in Semiconductors

Comprehensive review: Freysoldt et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. 86, 253 (2014)

Things to worry about:

- **x** (In)accuracy of the exchange-correlation functional
- **x** Supercell artifacts

Best practices:

- Start by reproducing known results
- Check carefully the sensitivity of the results to the parameters of the calculations (DFT functional, supercell size, etc.)
- Cross-validate using different methods
- Qualitative trends are more reliable than absolute numbers

UT-Austin, 2010



Jonathan E. Moussa, Noa Marom, Na Sai, James R. Chelikowsky PRL <u>108</u>, 226404 (2012)

Motivation:

 Diamond has desirable properties for high-power, hightemperature electronics



- Boron is a good *p*-type dopant
- ***** The lack of appropriate *n*-type dopant limits its applications
- P. W. May "A New Diamond Age?" Science 319, 1490 (2008)

Shallow donor proposals:



The broken C-N bond near a substitutional N impurity forms a deep, localized donor state

Preserving the bond may create a shallower and more delocalized donor

A series of XN_n impurity complexes is generated by reducing the valence of the central atom and compensating with neighboring N atoms

For LiN₄ there are no broken bonds at the equilibrium geometry

Is it shallow? Can it be synthesized?

Method:

Decomposition of the donor activation energy: Energy Relaxation energy (the energy difference between the charged and neutral geometries) $E_{q-1}^{f}(\mathbf{R}_{q-1})$ calculated with a *total energy method:* PBE

Vertical ionization energy (at the fixed geometry of the ionized donor) calculated with an *accurate quasi-particle method:* PBEO-ε and *corrected for finite size effects*

$$\Delta_D = E_c + E_{\text{tot}}^+(\mathbf{R}_D^+) - E_{\text{tot}}^0(\mathbf{R}_D^0)$$
$$= \underbrace{\left[E_c - E_D(\mathbf{R}_D^+)\right]}_{\Delta_D^{\text{ionize}}} + \underbrace{\left[E_{\text{tot}}^0(\mathbf{R}_D^+) - E_{\text{tot}}^0(\mathbf{R}_D^0)\right]}_{\Delta_D^{\text{relax}}}$$



Generalized Coordinate

M. Jain, J. R. Chelikowsky, S.G. Louie *PRL* <u>107</u>, 216803 (2011)

Step 1: Pick a reliable method

<u>PBE0-ε</u>:

A PBE-based hybrid functional with a systemdependent fraction,α, of exact (Fock) exchange, determined by the dielectric constant:

 $\alpha = 1/\varepsilon$

Marquez et al. *PRB* <u>83</u>, 035119 (2011) For diamond: ε = 5.7; α= 0.18



Step 2: Finite size correction

Defect band dispersion model:

Interactions between periodic replicas cause broadening of the defect band

 Δ_D^{ionize} was calculated using supercells of 5x5x5 to 8x8x8 diamond unit cells

The impurity band becomes shallower and narrower with size



Define:
$$\Delta_D^{\text{ionize}} \approx E_c(\Gamma) - [(1-x)E_D(\Gamma) + xE_D(X)]$$

A least square fit is performed with x as a free parameter to minimize the size dependence of Δ_D^{ionize} around an asymptotic value This gives $\Delta_D^{ionize} = 0.27 \text{ eV}$ (x = 0.74)

Step 3: Cross-validation

The marker method:

Activation energies are calculated based on PBE total energy differences and referenced to an experimentally known "marker" impurity

$$\Delta_{i} = \Delta_{0} - [E_{N-1} - E_{N}]_{\text{defect }0} + [E_{N-1} - E_{N}]_{\text{defect }i}$$

fit to experiment A. Resende *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82, 2111 (1999)

The applicability of the marker method is limited to cases with:

same simulation conditions same material environment same defect type same charge state

Activation energies obtained with the marker method are overestimated due to the self-interaction (delocalization) error in PBE

LiN₄ is a promising shallow donor in diamond

Defect	Δ^{\exp}	$\Delta^{ ext{marker}}$	$\Delta^{ ext{PBE}-\epsilon}$	$\Delta^{ m ionize}$	$\delta\Delta^{ m ionize}$	Δ^{relax}
LiN ₄	•••	0.48	0.27	0.27	0.03	0.00
BeN ₃ ^a	•••	0.56	0.40	0.39	0.04	0.01
Р	0.61	0.61 ^b	0.56	0.54	0.02	0.02
BeN ₃	•••	0.78	0.62	0.39	0.04	0.23
BN_2^{a}	•••	0.88	0.77	0.50	0.03	0.27
BN_2	•••	1.30	1.19	0.50	0.03	0.69
Ν	1.7	1.67	1.71	0.86	0.04	0.85

Possible CVD precursor:

1,7-diazacyclododecane-4,10-diamine can strongly bind a Li atom

The Li atom is not bound to the B-center in diamond but kinetically stabilized by a high energy barrier



Applying DFT to Defects in Semiconductors

Comprehensive review: Freysoldt et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. 86, 253 (2014)

Things to worry about:

- **x** (In)accuracy of the exchange-correlation functional
- ***** Periodic boundary conditions artifacts

Best practices:

- Start by reproducing known results
- Check carefully the sensitivity of the results to the parameters of the calculations (DFT functional, supercell size, etc.)
- Cross-validate using different methods
- Qualitative trends are more reliable than absolute numbers