



This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Exchange-Correlation Energy from Green's Functions

Steven Crisostomo, E. K. U. Gross, and Kieron Burke

Phys. Rev. Lett. **133**, 086401 — Published 21 August 2024

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.133.086401](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.133.086401)

Exchange-correlation energy from Green's functions

Steven Crisostomo,¹ E.K.U. Gross,² and Kieron Burke^{1,3}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, USA**

²*Fritz Haber Center for Molecular Dynamics, Institute of Chemistry,
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem 91904, Israel*

³*Department of Chemistry, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, USA*

DFT calculations yield useful ground-state energies and densities, while Green's function techniques (such as *GW*) are mostly used to produce spectral functions. From the Galitskii-Migdal formula, we extract the exchange-correlation of DFT directly from a Green's function. This spectral representation provides an alternative to the fluctuation-dissipation theorem of DFT, identifying distinct single-particle and many-particle contributions. Results are illustrated on the uniform electron gas and the two-site Hubbard model.

Ground-state density functional theory [1, 2] (DFT) is used to great effect in modern molecular and materials calculations, limited only by the approximation for the exchange-correlation (XC) energy [3]. But there is also interest in the response properties of a system, such as its spectral function and associated gap [4]. While range-separated hybrids can yield moderately accurate gaps within the generalized KS scheme [5–7], the standard method for gaps remains *GW* calculations [8–10]. For strongly-correlated materials, dynamical mean field theory has become a very useful tool [11–15]

Such Green's function (GF) methods come from traditional many-body theory. KS-DFT does not, and it is difficult to relate the two [16–19]. In practical calculations, DFT is used to find some set of KS orbitals, which form the starting point of GF calculations [20]. The choice of initial orbitals can be important [21–23], while a self-consistent GF can eliminate this dependence [24–29]. The XC energy of DFT is traditionally analyzed in terms of static quantities extractable from the ground-state wave-function, such as the XC hole, the dearth of conditional electronic density around an electron [30–32]. If a frequency decomposition is performed, it is in terms of the density-density response function [33].

We provide a bridge between these two distinct approaches by extracting the contribution to the XC energy directly from an interacting GF. Our GXC formula can be used to (a) extract approximate XC energies from approximate GF, (b) provide a novel decomposition of XC energies into single-particle and many-particle contributions, (c) provide models for existing DFT approximations in terms of GF, (d) relate the quality of spectral functions to their performance for XC energies. We illustrate our results on the uniform electron gas and the two-site Hubbard model.

Consider Hamiltonians of the form (in Hartree atomic units)

$$\hat{H} = \sum_j^N \hat{h}(\mathbf{r}_i) + \sum_{i>j}^N \hat{V}_{ee}(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|), \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{h}(\mathbf{r}) = \hat{t}(\mathbf{r}) + v(\mathbf{r})$ is the single-particle Hamiltonian, with kinetic energy operator $\hat{t}(\mathbf{r}) = -\nabla^2/2$, multiplicative

spin-independent external potential $v(\mathbf{r})$, and $\hat{V}_{ee}(u) = 1/u$ is the Coulomb repulsion between pairs of electrons. We work within the Born-Oppenheimer approximation in the non-relativistic limit, with no external magnetic fields. We use $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{r}, \sigma)$ as a space-spin coordinate, and $n(\mathbf{x})$ is the ground-state spin density.

Within spin-DFT, the corresponding KS system consists of fictitious non-interacting electrons with the same ground-state density as the interacting system. The exact ground-state energy is then

$$E = T_S + V + E_{\text{HXC}}, \quad (2)$$

where T_S is the kinetic energy of non-interacting electrons, V is the external potential energy, and E_{HXC} is the sum of the Hartree (electrostatic) and XC energies. The KS potential is

$$v_S(\mathbf{x}) = v(\mathbf{r}) + v_{\text{HXC}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3)$$

where $v_{\text{HXC}}(\mathbf{x}) = \delta E_{\text{HXC}}[n]/\delta n(\mathbf{x})$, and is generally spin-dependent. The KS equations are solved self-consistently, yielding the exact density and energy given the exact XC [2]; this was demonstrated with exact calculations in Ref. [34].

The time-ordered Green's function is

$$G(\mathbf{x}t, \mathbf{x}'t') = -i\langle \mathcal{T}[\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x}t)\hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}'t')] \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is the time-ordering operator and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the expectation value over the N -electron ground-state $|\Psi_0\rangle$. The fermionic operators, $\hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x})$ and $\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x})$, create and destroy a particle of spin σ at $\mathbf{r}$ and are time-evolved in the Heisenberg picture according to $\hat{H}$. For time-independent $\hat{H}$, we denote the Fourier transform $G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \omega)$. We define

$$\text{Tr}\{F\} = -i \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \text{tr}\{F\}, \quad (5)$$

where a convergence factor $\exp(i\omega\delta)$ with $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ is implied, to respect time-ordering ($t' \rightarrow t^+$). Here tr denotes

$$\text{tr}\{F\} = \int d^3r \sum_\sigma F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x}, \omega). \quad (6)$$

Changed definition in Eq. 6. The Galitskii-Migdal (GM) formula [35] yields the total interacting ground-state energy from the GF

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}\{(\omega + \hat{h}(\mathbf{r}))G\}. \quad (7)$$

To isolate XC, apply GM to the KS system,

$$E_s = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}\{(\omega + \hat{h}_s(\mathbf{x}))G_s\}, \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{h}_s(\mathbf{x}) = \hat{h}(\mathbf{r}) + v_{\text{HXC}}(\mathbf{x})$ and $G_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ are the KS single-particle Hamiltonian and Green's function. Subtraction yields GXC, the GF XC contribution

$$G_{\text{XC}} = E_{\text{XC}} - \frac{\langle v_{\text{XC}} \rangle}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}\{(\omega + \hat{t}(\mathbf{r})) \Delta G\}, \quad (9)$$

where $\Delta G = G - G_s$. More explicitly

$$G_{\text{XC}} = -\frac{i}{2} \int d^3r \sum_{\sigma} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \times \left(\omega - \frac{\nabla_{\mathbf{u}}^2}{2} \right) \Delta G_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{u}, \omega) \Big|_{\mathbf{u}=0}, \quad (10)$$

where $\Delta G_{\sigma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{u}, \omega)$ is an analog of the XC hole. Like the XC hole, ΔG has analogous sum rules. Without the ω term, Eq. (10) yields $T_{\text{C}}/2 = (T - T_s)/2$, half the correlation kinetic energy. Moreover

$$-i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \Delta G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, \omega) = 0, \quad (11)$$

because both Green's functions have the same density. An early version appeared [36] even before the adiabatic connection formula of DFT was precisely defined [33, 37]. Godby and García-González have also derived closely related expressions [18].

First, Eq. (9) provides a method for extracting an XC contribution directly from any GF. At the end of any GF calculation, the density of G can be extracted, a KS inversion [38–42] performed and the corresponding G_s constructed. But G_{XC} is not E_{XC} . Given an explicit approximation for E_{XC} , it is easy to construct G_{XC} , but not vice versa. Thus, for a non-self-consistent GW calculation (the vast majority), a measure of inconsistency would be G_{XC} of the original DFT calculation versus that of Eq. (9). A self-consistent calculation would presumably satisfy Eq. (9) on its final iteration. An important feature of G_{XC} is that it can be used to construct the total energy from the sum of KS orbital energies E_s :

$$E = E_s + \left(G_{\text{XC}} - \frac{\langle v_{\text{HXC}} \rangle}{2} \right). \quad (12)$$

Since E_s and $\langle v_{\text{HXC}} \rangle$ are given by a KS calculation, G_{XC} corrects the KS energy into the true many-body energy. This is analogous to (but not the same as) double-counting corrections in the literature [43, 44].

Now we use Eq. (9) to create a novel decomposition of XC energies in DFT. For finite systems, we define the energy difference

$$\omega_J = E_0(N) - E_J(N-1), \quad (13)$$

where $E_J(M)$ is the energy of the J th interacting eigenstate of the M -electron system; $J = 0$ denotes the ground-state. Then the Lehmann representation is

$$G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \omega) = \sum_J \frac{\rho_J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')}{\omega - \omega_J - i\delta} + \sum_{J'} \frac{\bar{\rho}_{J'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')}{\omega - \bar{\omega}_{J'} + i\delta}, \quad (14)$$

where the spectral weights are

$$\rho_J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \langle \Psi_0 | \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}') | J \rangle \langle J | \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) | \Psi_0 \rangle. \quad (15)$$

Here $\{|J\rangle\}$ are the interacting eigenstates of the N -1-electron system, while $\bar{\rho}_{J'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ is defined analogously, with fermionic operators in Eq. (15) swapped, and $\{|J'\rangle\}$ enumerating eigenstates of the $N+1$ -electron system. The sum over J of $\rho_J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ is simply the first-order density matrix. Likewise, we write

$$G_s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \omega) = \sum_j \frac{\rho_{s,j}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')}{\omega - \epsilon_j - i\delta} + \sum_{j'} \frac{\bar{\rho}_{s,j'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')}{\omega - \bar{\epsilon}_{j'} + i\delta}, \quad (16)$$

where j runs over KS orbitals and we consider only the occupied orbitals. Inserting into Eq. (9) yields

$$G_{\text{XC}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_J (T_J + \omega_J f_J) - \sum_j (T_{s,j} + \epsilon_j f_{s,j}), \quad (17)$$

T_J are the kinetic contributions from J enumerating the interacting N -1-electron eigenstates and $f_J = \text{tr}\{\rho_J\}$ are the 'occupations', with analogous contributions from the KS system. They satisfy the sum rule that each, when summed over all occupied states, yields N .

To make further progress, we relate the two sums in Eq. (17) via the adiabatic connection of DFT. Multiply V_{ee} in Eq. (1) by λ while choosing a λ -dependent one-body potential to keep the density fixed [45]. As $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, a subset of J approach KS Slater determinants, while all other eigenstates vanish. We call the non-vanishing eigenstates the single-particle contributions (SP), the rest many-particle (MP). This is analogous to how we define single-particle excitations in TDDFT [46]. Thus

$$G_{\text{XC}} = G_{\text{XC}}^{\text{SP}} + G_{\text{XC}}^{\text{MP}}, \quad (18)$$

where the SP contribution is

$$G_{\text{XC}}^{\text{SP}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j (T_{\text{C},j} + \omega_j f_j - \epsilon_j f_{s,j}), \quad (19)$$

and $T_{\text{C},j} = T_j - T_{s,j} = \text{tr}\{\hat{t}(\mathbf{r})(\rho_j - \rho_{s,j})\}$ is the contribution to the correlation kinetic energy from each SP state. The

many-particle contributions, enumerated by K , are purely correlation

$$G_C^{\text{MP}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_K (T_K + \omega_K f_K). \quad (20)$$

In the SP contribution, the highest occupied KS level is special, as KS-DFT guarantees that the HOMO KS eigenvalue is exactly minus the ionization potential for finite systems, i.e., $\omega_0 = -I = \epsilon_0$. Labelling it as zero, we write

$$G_{\text{xc},0}^{\text{SP}} = \frac{1}{2} (T_{\text{c},0} - I(f_0 - f_{\text{s},0})). \quad (21)$$

The exchange contribution is found by using the exchange self-energy,

$$G_{\text{x}} = \sum_j \text{tr}\{(\Sigma_{\text{x}}[G_{\text{s}}] - v_{\text{x}})\rho_{\text{s},j}\} = G_{\text{x}}^{\text{SP}}, \quad (22)$$

with a detailed description in the Supplemental Materials (SM). For a two-electron singlet G_{x} vanishes.

The ground-state density matrix is

$$\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} d\omega A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \omega), \quad (23)$$

where μ is the chemical potential and the spectral function is

$$A(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im}\{G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', \omega)\} \text{sgn}(\omega - \mu). \quad (24)$$

Thus ρ (and its diagonal, the ground-state density) can be uniquely decomposed into its spectral contributions. Decomposing $\langle v_{\text{xc}} \rangle$ via the density, and using Eq. (9),

$$E_{\text{xc}} = E_{\text{xc}}^{\text{SP}} + E_{\text{c}}^{\text{MP}}, \quad (25)$$

i.e. individual peaks in the spectral function yield individual contributions to the E_{xc} energy.

An alternative decomposition uses $\omega_j = -I - \Delta E_j$, where $\Delta E_j = E_j(N-1) - E_0(N-1) \geq 0$ are the transition frequencies. Then

$$G_{\text{xc}} = G_{\text{xc}}^{\text{SPI}} + G_{\text{c}}^{\text{MPI}}, \quad (26)$$

with different SP and MP contributions

$$G_{\text{xc}}^{\text{SPI}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j [T_{\text{c},j} - (\Delta E_j f_j - \Delta E_{\text{s},j} f_{\text{s},j})], \quad (27)$$

$$G_{\text{c}}^{\text{MPI}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_K [T_K - \Delta E_K f_K]. \quad (28)$$

In particular, $G_{\text{xc},0}^{\text{SPI}} = T_{\text{c},0}/2$. Each decomposition is useful in different circumstances.

The asymmetric two-site Hubbard model [47, 48] is particularly well-suited as an illustration, because of its

extremely truncated Hilbert space. We have two fermions in the Hamiltonian,

$$-t \sum_{\sigma} (\hat{c}_{1\sigma}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{2\sigma} + \text{h.c.}) + U \sum_{j=1}^2 \hat{n}_{j\uparrow} \hat{n}_{j\downarrow} + \sum_{j=1}^2 v_j \hat{n}_j, \quad (29)$$

where t is the hopping term, U the on-site interaction strength, $\hat{n}_j$ the site-occupation operator, and $\hat{c}_{j\sigma}^{\dagger}$, $\hat{c}_{j\sigma}$ are the fermionic operators associated to each site. The ground-state is a singlet, and its density is characterized by one number, $\Delta n = n_2 - n_1$, and we define $\Delta v = v_2 - v_1$. KS-DFT applies [47] and the KS system is simply the tight-binding dimer.




FIG. 1: Hubbard dimer local spectral functions $A_{11}(\omega)$ (black) and $A_{\text{s},11}(\omega)$ (red). Here $\mu = U/2$ and $t = 1/2$. The spectral weight below 0 sums to $n_1 = 1.147$, and above to n_2 .

Figure 1 shows a typical spectral function [47] with bars whose height is the pole weight. G has 4 poles, two for removal and two for gain, but G_{s} has only one of each. The difference between the two central peaks is the gap, with the KS gap famously being smaller than the true gap [49, 50]. Only the removal peaks contribute to XC. The larger exact removal peak is the only single-particle contribution, and the smaller is a many-particle. By Eq. (23), they sum to n_1 , and the KS peak must be higher. Because G_{c} is negative and its SP contribution is positive, the behavior of G_{c} requires understanding both SP and MP contributions simultaneously. Moreover, for large U , both SP and MP contributions grow linearly with U , just as E_{c} does, but such contributions cancel in G_{c} (and the corresponding SPI/MPI terms also remain constant).

The first use of our formula is to identify how much each peak contributes to XC. Table I shows values of various quantities for a range of U . G_{xc} is comparable to E_{c} for weak correlation (as $G_{\text{x}} = 0$ for $N = 2$), but

U	E_{xc}	E_{C}	G_{C}	G_{C}^{SP}	G_{C}^{MP}	$G_{\text{C}}^{\text{SPI}}$	$G_{\text{C}}^{\text{MPI}}$
0.5	-0.339	-0.01062	-0.013	0.011	-0.024	0.00338	-0.0164
1	-0.643	-0.0676	-0.0524	0.0516	-0.104	0.0189	-0.0713
2	-1.39	-0.3666	-0.139	0.224	-0.363	0.0847	-0.224
4	-3.23	-1.224	-0.194	0.689	-0.883	0.188	-0.381
10	-9.1	-4.098	-0.206	2.16	-2.36	0.27	-0.476
20	-19.	-9.05	-0.207	4.64	-4.85	0.297	-0.504

 TABLE I: XC of dimer with $t = 1/2$ and $\Delta v = 1$.

significantly smaller for strong correlation, with cancellation between SP and MP contributions (see SM). The alternative decomposition yields terms of much smaller magnitude, especially for large U .

Z	E_{xc}	$\langle v_{\text{xc}} \rangle / 2$	E_{C}	T_{C}	G_{xc}
1	-0.4229	-0.3562	-0.04199	0.02788	-0.06667
2	-1.067	-1.01	-0.04211	0.03664	-0.05691
3	-1.695	-1.638	-0.04352	0.03983	-0.05627
4	-2.321	-2.265	-0.04427	0.04148	-0.05604
6	-3.572	-3.516	-0.04506	0.04318	-0.05584
10	-6.073	-6.017	-0.04569	0.04456	-0.0557
20	-12.32	-12.27	-0.04618	0.0456	-0.0556

TABLE II: XC for the two-electron ions [51].

For realistic DFT calculations, as the local density approximation yields $E_{\text{x}}^{\text{LDA}}[n] = -A_{\text{x}} \int n^{4/3}(\mathbf{r})$, typically $G_{\text{xc}} \approx E_{\text{xc}}/3$, especially for large N . For $N = 2$, we cannot assume Hubbard results are typical, but (essentially) exact DFT calculations have been performed for two-electron ions (Table II) and Hooke's atom (quadratic confining potential in the SM), where G_{C} is comparable to E_{C} in magnitude.

The LDA can be understood as a local approximation to the XC hole [52, 53], as the system- and spherically averaged LDA XC hole reflects the accuracy of LDA [54]. The real-space construction of the GGA from the gradient expansion for the hole underlies both the PW91 and PBE XC approximations [31, 55]. XC holes are also behind some of the most popular functionals in chemistry [30, 32, 55]. Now we derive $G_{\text{xc}}^{\text{LDA}}$ from an ansatz for the Green's function. Define $\Delta G^{\text{UEG}}(n, u, \omega)$ as the difference between exact and KS Green's functions of a uniform gas of density n , separation $u = |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$, and frequency ω . Approximating ΔG with $\Delta G^{\text{UEG}}(n(\mathbf{r}), |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|, \omega)$ in Eq. (9) directly yields

$$G_{\text{xc}}^{\text{LDA}} = \int d^3r g_{\text{xc}}^{\text{UEG}}(n(\mathbf{r})), \quad (30)$$

where $g_{\text{xc}}^{\text{UEG}}(n) = (2 - d/dn)e_{\text{xc}}^{\text{UEG}}(n)/2$ is the G_{xc} energy density, $\text{Tr}\{(\omega + i\eta)\Delta G^{\text{UEG}}\}/V$, and V is the volume. System-averaged and frequency-integrated quantities should agree to the extent that LDA yields

reasonably accurate energies, but are there major cancellations of errors inside the frequency integral? And do approximate GF calculations improve this frequency dependence? These are the sorts of questions that can be explored with our formula.

Our final point concerns the approximate GF calculations that our formula is designed to analyze, illustrated for GW calculations on the Hubbard dimer. We use the Hartree-Fock GF to generate the initial GW self-energy and iterate until the total energy converges. Each iteration generates extra poles, but we retain only a few (see SM). If the self-energy has (correctly) only two poles, the next G^{GW} generally has six, instead of the correct four. But if we reduce the 6 poles of G to the correct 4, the self-energy has 4. We chose the former scheme with two-pole approximation to the self-energy, denoted by " $2\text{psc}GW$ ". To aid convergence, for cases with moderate to strong correlation we generated the n th GF according to: $G^{(n)} = \gamma G^{(n-1)} + (1 - \gamma)G^{(n-2)}$, with $\gamma = 0.67$. Our one-shot results are identical to Ref [56] when $\Delta v = 0$.

Both the six-pole and four-pole GW GF yield the same density and v_{xc} , but they differ considerably. Both satisfy the Sham-Schlüter equation at each iteration [50],

$$-i \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} [G_{\text{S}} \Sigma G]_{ii} = -i \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} [G_{\text{S}} v_{\text{HXC}} G]_{ii}, \quad (31)$$

but have different kinetic and XC energies. For the dimer

$$G_{\text{xc}} = \int_{-\infty}^0 d\omega [\omega(\Delta A_{11}(\omega) + \Delta A_{22}(\omega)) - 2t\Delta A_{12}(\omega)], \quad (32)$$

where we have summed over spins and ΔA_{ij} is the difference in retarded spectral functions. Due to Eq. (11), the frequency integral of $\Delta A_{11}(\omega) + \Delta A_{22}(\omega)$ up to the chemical potentials yields 0. Fig. 2 shows ΔA_{11} , which comprises a majority of G_{xc} , as ΔA_{22} gives a negligible contribution.

From Fig. 2, the SP pole positions and heights for one-shot GW are more accurate than $2\text{psc}GW$. Table III also shows a poorer approximation to E_{C} , worsening with increasing U . However, full self-consistency produces better total energies for weak correlation, while in the strongly-correlated case, neither flavor of GW produces accurate energies (see SM).

Practical GF calculations are performed on solids and molecules, with a variety of approximations, such as GW and dynamical mean field theory [19, 57–60]. Once a KS inversion can be performed [40–42] on the density of the approximate GF, a value for G_{xc} can be extracted which can be compared with a DFT counterpart, especially when standard XC functionals are known to fail. However, molecules have both bound and continuum states, while all states are in continua in solids, complicating the identification of SP and MP contributions. For GW , there are many different recipes yielding distinct spectral features [22, 25, 61, 62], but one must always use the KS GF of




FIG. 2: Spectral function differences $\Delta A_{11}(\omega)$ with $\mu = U/2$ and $t = 1/2$. Exact (black), one-shot (orange), and $2psGW$ (green). The separation of the SP and MP poles is twice the energy of the one-particle groundstate, but GW introduces an erroneous interaction dependence.

U	Exact			one-shot			$2psGW$		
	G_C	G_C^{SPI}	G_C^{MPI}	G_C	G_C^{SPI}	G_C^{MPI}	G_C	G_C^{SPI}	G_C^{MPI}
0.25	-3.05	0.67	-3.72	-4.88	1.12	-6.	-4.95	1.15	-6.1
0.5	-13.	3.38	-16.4	-15.9	4.4	-20.3	-16.9	4.69	-21.6
1	-52.4	18.9	-71.3	-41.9	14.4	-56.3	-54.8	16.2	-71.
2	-139.	84.7	-224.	-98.1	33.8	-132.	-186.	42.	-228.
4	-194.	188.	-381.	-232.	57.5	-289.	-583.	88.	-671.

U	Exact			one-shot			$2psGW$		
	E_C	E_C^{SPI}	E_C^{MPI}	E_C	E_C^{SPI}	E_C^{MPI}	E_C	E_C^{SPI}	E_C^{MPI}
0.25	-1.95	1.76	-3.71	-3.09	2.88	-5.97	-3.83	2.25	-6.08
0.5	-10.6	5.62	-16.2	-13.8	6.29	-20.1	-19.3	2.18	-21.5
1	-67.6	1.43	-69.	-68.1	-13.3	-54.9	-87.9	-16.5	-71.4
2	-367.	-142.	-225.	-288.	-153.	-135.	-292.	-56.3	-236.
4	-1220.	-627.	-597.	-798.	-463.	-335.	-761.	-60.	-701.

TABLE III: Decompositions for the asymmetric dimer with $t = 1/2$ and $\Delta v = 1$, in milliHartrees.

the density of the approximate GF, as the XC contributions depend on cancellations, as illustrated here. Recently Ref. [63] showed that exact XC energies can be produced via approximate self-energies. Our work is complementary, with our focus primarily being representations of XC energies via approximate GF. Our systematic determination of sources of XC errors should aid in designing future alternative approximate density functionals or GF methods.

We thank Lucia Reining, Abdallah El-Sahili, and Vojtěch Vlček for valuable discussions. S.C. and K.B. were

supported by NSF Award No. CHE-2154371. E.K.U.G acknowledges support from the European Research Council. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant Agreement No. ERC-2017-AdG-788890).

* crisosts@uci.edu

- [1] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev.* **136**, B864 (1964).
- [2] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, *Phys. Rev.* **140**, A1133 (1965).
- [3] W. Kohn, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71**, 1253 (1999).
- [4] B. Lenz, C. Martins, and S. Biermann, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **31**, 293001 (2019).
- [5] A. Seidl, A. Görling, P. Vogl, J. A. Majewski, and M. Levy, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 3764 (1996).
- [6] J. P. Perdew, W. Yang, K. Burke, Z. Yang, E. K. U. Gross, M. Scheffler, G. E. Scuseria, T. M. Henderson, I. Y. Zhang, A. Ruzsinszky, H. Peng, J. Sun, E. Trushin, and A. Görling, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**, 2801 (2017), <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1621352114>.
- [7] R. Garrick, A. Natan, T. Gould, and L. Kronik, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 021040 (2020).
- [8] L. Hedin, *Phys. Rev.* **139**, A796 (1965).
- [9] M. S. Hybertsen and S. G. Louie, *Phys. Rev. B* **34**, 5390 (1986).
- [10] D. Golze, M. Dvorak, and P. Rinke, *Frontiers in Chemistry* **7**, 10.3389/fchem.2019.00377 (2019).
- [11] A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth, and M. J. Rozenberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 13 (1996).
- [12] E. Pavarini, S. Biermann, A. Poteryaev, A. I. Lichtenstein, A. Georges, and O. K. Andersen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 176403 (2004).
- [13] G. Kotliar, S. Y. Savrasov, K. Haule, V. S. Oudovenko, O. Parcollet, and C. A. Marianetti, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 865 (2006).
- [14] J. Grotendorst, D. Marx, and A. Muramatsu, eds., *Quantum simulations of complex many-body systems : from theory to algorithms, audio-visual lecture notes : winter school, 25 February - 1 March 2002, Rolduc Conference Centre, Kerkrade, The Netherlands (DVD)*, NIC series, Vol. 14 (John von Neumann Institute for Computing, Jülich, 2002) record converted from VDB: 12.11.2012.
- [15] A. Georges, *AIP Conference Proceedings* **715**, 3 (2004), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/acp/article-pdf/715/1/3/12154920/3.1_online.pdf.
- [16] R. W. Godby, M. Schlüter, and L. J. Sham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 2415 (1986).
- [17] R. W. Godby, M. Schlüter, and L. J. Sham, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 10159 (1988).
- [18] R. W. Godby and P. García-González, *Density Functional Theories and Self-energy Approaches*, in *A Primer in Density Functional Theory*, edited by C. Fiolhais, F. Nogueira, and M. A. L. Marques (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003) pp. 185–217.
- [19] X.-J. Zhang, E. Koch, and E. Pavarini, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 035113 (2020).
- [20] M. J. van Setten, F. Caruso, S. Sharifzadeh, X. Ren, M. Scheffler, F. Liu, J. Lischner, L. Lin, J. R. Deslippe, S. G. Louie, C. Yang, F. Weigend, J. B. Neaton,

- F. Evers, and P. Rinke, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **11**, 5665 (2015), pMID: 26642984, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.5b00453>.
- [21] F. Bruneval and M. A. L. Marques, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **9**, 324 (2013), pMID: 26589035, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ct300835h>.
- [22] L. Reining, *WIREs Computational Molecular Science* **8**, e1344 (2018), <https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/wcms.1344>.
- [23] S. E. Gant, J. B. Haber, M. R. Filip, F. Sagredo, D. Wing, G. Ohad, L. Kronik, and J. B. Neaton, *Phys. Rev. Mater.* **6**, 053802 (2022).
- [24] B. Holm and U. von Barth, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 2108 (1998).
- [25] M. van Schilfgaarde, T. Kotani, and S. Faleev, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 226402 (2006).
- [26] F. Bruneval and M. Gatti, Quasiparticle self-consistent gw method for the spectral properties of complex materials, in *First Principles Approaches to Spectroscopic Properties of Complex Materials*, edited by C. Di Valentin, S. Botti, and M. Cococcioni (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014) pp. 99–135.
- [27] A. Kutepov, *Computer Physics Communications* **257**, 107502 (2020).
- [28] A. Förster and L. Visscher, *Frontiers in Chemistry* **9**, 10.3389/fchem.2021.736591 (2021).
- [29] C.-N. Yeh, S. Isakov, D. Zgid, and E. Gull, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 235104 (2022).
- [30] A. D. Becke, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **88**, 1053 (1988), <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jcp/article-pdf/88/2/1053/11192435/1053.1.online.pdf>.
- [31] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- [32] C. Adamo and V. Barone, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **110**, 6158 (1999), <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jcp/article-pdf/110/13/6158/10797469/6158.1.online.pdf>.
- [33] J. Harris and R. O. Jones, *Journal of Physics F: Metal Physics* **4**, 1170 (1974).
- [34] E. M. Stoudenmire, L. O. Wagner, S. R. White, and K. Burke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 056402 (2012).
- [35] V. M. Galitskii and A. B. Migdal, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **7**, 18 (1958).
- [36] L. J. Sham, *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 3876 (1985).
- [37] D. Langreth and J. Perdew, *Solid State Communications* **17**, 1425 (1975).
- [38] S. Nam, S. Song, E. Sim, and K. Burke, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 5014 (2020), pMID: 32667787.
- [39] S. Nam, R. J. McCarty, H. Park, and E. Sim, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **154**, 124122 (2021).
- [40] Y. Shi and A. Wasserman, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **12**, 5308 (2021), pMID: 34061541, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpclett.1c00752>.
- [41] Y. Shi, V. H. Chávez, and A. Wasserman, *WIREs Computational Molecular Science* **12**, e1617 (2022), <https://wires.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/wcms.1617>.
- [42] A. Aouina, M. Gatti, S. Chen, S. Zhang, and L. Reining, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 195123 (2023).
- [43] V. I. Anisimov, F. Aryasetiawan, and A. I. Lichtenstein, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **9**, 767 (1997).
- [44] K. Haule, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 196403 (2015).
- [45] A. Savin, F. Colonna, and R. Pollet, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **93**, 166 (2003), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/qua.10551>.
- [46] N. T. Maitra, *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* **73**, 117 (2022), pMID: 34910562, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-physchem-082720-124933>.
- [47] D. J. Carrascal, J. Ferrer, J. C. Smith, and K. Burke, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **27**, 393001 (2015).
- [48] K. Burke and J. Kozłowski, Lies my teacher told me about density functional theory: Seeing through them with the hubbard dimer, in *Simulating Correlations with Computers*, edited by E. Pavarini and E. Koch (Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH Institute for Advanced Simulation, 2021) pp. 65–96.
- [49] J. P. Perdew and M. Levy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 1884 (1983).
- [50] L. J. Sham and M. Schlüter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 1888 (1983).
- [51] C.-J. Huang and C. J. Umrigar, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 290 (1997).
- [52] O. Gunnarsson and B. I. Lundqvist, *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 4274 (1976).
- [53] O. Gunnarsson and R. O. Jones, *Physica Scripta* **21**, 394 (1980).
- [54] O. Gunnarsson, M. Jonson, and B. Lundqvist, *Solid State Communications* **24**, 765 (1977).
- [55] K. Burke, J. P. Perdew, and Y. Wang, Derivation of a generalized gradient approximation: The pw91 density functional, in *Electronic Density Functional Theory: Recent Progress and New Directions*, edited by J. F. Dobson, G. Vignale, and M. P. Das (Springer US, Boston, MA, 1998) pp. 81–111.
- [56] P. Romaniello, S. Guyot, and L. Reining, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **131**, 154111 (2009), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3249965>.
- [57] F. Aryasetiawan, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 13051 (1992).
- [58] F. Aryasetiawan, L. Hedin, and K. Karlsson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2268 (1996).
- [59] M. Guzzo, G. Lani, F. Sottile, P. Romaniello, M. Gatti, J. J. Kas, J. J. Rehr, M. G. Silly, F. Sirotti, and L. Reining, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 166401 (2011).
- [60] J. Kuneš, I. Leonov, P. Augustinský, V. Křápek, M. Kollar, and D. Vollhardt, *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* **226**, 2641 (2017).
- [61] R. M. Martin, L. Reining, and D. M. Ceperley, *Interacting Electrons: Theory and Computational Approaches* (Cambridge University Press, 2016).
- [62] A. Stan, N. E. Dahlen, and R. van Leeuwen, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **130**, 10.1063/1.3089567 (2009), 114105, <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jcp/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/1.3089567/15424617/114105.1.online.pdf>.
- [63] A. El-Sahili, F. Sottile, and L. Reining, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **0**, null (0), pMID: 38324673, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.3c01200>.
- [64] See Supplemental Material at <http://example.com/supplemental> for additional formulas, discussion, and details of our self-consistent *GW* implementation. We include the following additional references [65–67].
- [65] P. Romaniello, F. Bechstedt, and L. Reining, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 155131 (2012).
- [66] Di Sabatino, S. and Loos, P.-F. and Romaniello, P., *Frontiers in Chemistry* **9**, 10.3389/fchem.2021.751054 (2021).
- [67] C. Mejuto-Zaera and V. Vlček, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 165129 (2022).