



CHORUS

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

Diffusion Monte Carlo: A pathway towards an accurate theoretical description of manganese oxides

Kayahan Saritas, Jaron T. Krogel, P. R. C. Kent, and Fernando A. Reboredo

Phys. Rev. Materials **2**, 085801 — Published 14 August 2018

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevMaterials.2.085801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevMaterials.2.085801)

Diffusion Monte Carlo: A Pathway Towards an Accurate Theoretical Description of Manganese Oxides*

Kayahan Saritas^{1,†}, Jaron T. Krogel^{1,‡}, P. R. C. Kent^{2,§}, and Fernando A. Reboredo^{1,¶}

¹ *Materials Science and Technology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, USA* and

² *Center for Nanophase Materials Sciences and Computational Science and Engineering Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, USA*

(Dated: July 23, 2018)

We present diffusion Monte Carlo (DMC) results for equation of state and quasiparticle gaps of manganese binary oxides MnO and MnO₂ and the ternary oxide LaMnO₃. Owing to the limited approximations made and the direct treatment of electronic correlations, our DMC-based study correctly describes structural properties such as the lattice constant, bulk moduli, and cohesive energies. It correctly predicts the ground-state phase of these oxides, which have different valences. Our study demonstrates the capability of DMC methods to predict the structural properties of highly correlated systems, which have been identified as suitable candidates for many applications ranging from catalysis to electronic devices. Our study also serves as a benchmark for both the manganese pseudopotential and other methodological choices to be used in calculations of similar oxides.

I. INTRODUCTION

Transition metal oxides (TMOs) possess a variety of structures and exhibit a multitude of collective effects such as metal-insulator transitions; ferro-, ferri-, and antiferromagnetism; ferroelectricity; superconductivity; colossal magnetoresistance; etc.^{1–11}. The unusual electronic properties of TMOs are closely related to the strongly correlated nature of the *d*-orbital electrons. In TMOs, the localized character of the partially filled *d* states and the multiplicity of their valence lead to the competition of several physical interactions (spin, charge, and lattice). The concurrence of strong lattice-electron, spin-electron, and spin-orbit couplings causes fascinating phenomena, including metal-insulator transitions^{1–3}, superconductivity⁴, colossal magnetoresistance^{5–7}, and multiferroicity⁷. Their band gaps span from the infrared to the ultraviolet⁸, while their surface chemical reactivity ranges from active to inert^{9,10}.

To understand and predict the structural, electronic, and magnetic properties of these oxides using theoretical methods, it is necessary to have a reliable description of the electronic structure. Because of the strong electron correlation, it is very challenging to model these materials from first principles. Conventional methods based on density functional theory^{12–14} (DFT) approximations are seldom accurate enough to account for the electronic structure of materials with localized *d*-orbitals and frequently lead to unrealistic results. In particular, for transition-metal oxides, the electronic self-interaction error¹⁵ propagates with the treatment of the Coulomb interaction^{16–29}.

Since transition metals are multivalent in nature, each valence state can result in different oxide crystal structures with a qualitative different crystalline field around the transition metal atom. The identification of the correct lowest energy lattice structure is a strong validation of the accuracy of the theoretical approximations used to calculate the electronic structure. In manganese ox-

ides, it is well established experimentally that the rock salt (RS) phase is the most stable form of MnO. However, some methods and approximations^{30,31} predict the zinc blende (ZB) structure to be lower in energy. The magnetic ground-state configuration also depends on the approximation used^{32,33}.

Rapid advancements in the development of electronic-structure methods such as Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC)^{34–37} and increasing computational resources have provided a viable alternative theoretical approach for these complex systems. Because of the few fundamental approximations made and the direct treatment of electron correlation, QMC methods—such as fixed-node diffusion Monte Carlo (FN-DMC)—are among the most accurate electronic structure methods available³⁸. The number of published reports using DMC in elemental solids, semiconductors, metals, oxides, and transition metal-oxides^{16–29,39–45} is still very small compared with similar calculations using DFT approximations even though DMC methods already show systematic improvements compared with DFT methods. Nevertheless, since this type of calculation is not routine, the parameters required to obtain accurate results with high-performance-computer resources, as well as the validity of the pseudopotentials and other fundamental approximations of the approach, need to be established for every material family before more demanding calculations are attempted.

In this contribution, we assess the accuracy of the DMC method in predicting the structural and electronic properties of some manganese-based binary oxides (MnO and MnO₂) and the ternary oxide LaMnO₃. The DMC calculated cohesive energies and structural parameters (equilibrium lattice constants and bulk modulus) are within the uncertainty of the available experiments. Our study demonstrates the capability of DMC methods to predict the structural properties of highly correlated systems. We also find that for these manganese compounds, the structural properties such as cohesive energy, equilib-

rium lattice constants, and bulk modulus are not modified by the fundamental approximations in the theoretical approach. For detailed discussion regarding the approximations involved, see Section II, C-F.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Section II, we give a brief overview of the computational details and the DMC method. In Section III, we present and discuss our main results: DMC-calculated structural properties of MnO, MnO₂, and LaMnO₃ compared with experiments and various computational approaches. We focus on (1) the bulk properties: cohesive energies and equation of states and (2) quasiparticle gaps. In Section IV, we compare the performance of exchange-correlation functionals with DMC for various manganese-based oxides. Finally, we summarize our findings in Section IV.

II. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

A. Diffusion Monte Carlo

QMC methods use statistical sampling to evaluate many-body wave functions. In these methods the total energies are directly evaluated from the first-principles many-body Schrödinger equation, which greatly reduces the extent of necessary approximations. In the present work, to assess the properties of manganese-based oxides we applied the FN-DMC method as implemented in the QMCPACK code³⁶. The entire study was managed, monitored, and analyzed using the modular workflow automation system Nexus⁴⁶. Since the details of the DMC approach are already available in the literature,^{38,47–50} here we provide only a brief overview.

FN-DMC finds the lowest energy of all the wave functions that share the nodes (or the phases) of an input trial wave function. This constraint forces the wave function to remain antisymmetric (fermionic). Within the fixed-node approximation, the DMC algorithm projects out all the excited state components of the wave function except the ground state. To define the nodal surfaces, a reasonable and commonly chosen starting point for the trial wave function is to use orbitals from DFT calculations or other mean field approaches. The ground-state energy is only exact if the exact nodes are provided. The nodal error is a positive contribution to the exact ground state energy. The finite-size (FS) errors also affect the accuracy of DMC results. Two potential sources for these errors are (1) single-particle errors and (2) the artificial periodicity of the exchange-correlation hole. The first error arises from the discrete sampling of the Brillouin zone, which can be minimized by using twist-averaged boundary conditions⁵¹. The second error can be minimized by increasing the size of the supercells. To minimize the FS errors, in the present work, the DMC calculations were performed using twist-averaged boundary conditions⁵¹ on 64-, 48-, and 40-atom supercells for MnO, MnO₂, and LaMnO₃, respectively.

B. Trial wave-function construction

The Slater-Jastrow form with the single particle orbitals obtained from DFT was used as trial wave functions. The Slater determinants^{50,52,53} were constructed with DFT orbitals. Electron correlations were introduced to the trial wave function via a correlating Jastrow factor⁵⁴:

$$\psi(R) = e^{-J(R)} D_{\uparrow}(R) D_{\downarrow}(R), \quad (1)$$

where the Slater determinants $D_{\uparrow}(R)$ and $D_{\downarrow}(R)$ correspond to spin-up and spin-down subspaces, respectively. Conventionally, the Jastrow factor $J(R)$ is the sum of the contributions from electron-ion, electron-electron, and electron-electron-ion correlation terms. These terms are known as one-body ($e^{-J_1(R)}$), two-body ($e^{-J_2(R)}$) and three-body ($e^{-J_3(R)}$) Jastrow terms, respectively. To accelerate the generation of results to the desired statistical accuracy, we optimize parameters in the Jastrow factors with energy and variance minimization within variational Monte Carlo⁵⁵.

In this work, we used trial wave functions of a single-determinant Slater-Jastrow form with one- and two-body Jastrow factors because the increasing computational cost required for evaluation of the three-body Jastrow did not result in a significant reduction of the error bar.

For the DMC calculations of oxides, monoatomic solids (lanthanum and manganese), and oxygen molecules, the single-particle orbitals used in the trial wave function were generated with the local density approximation (LDA)¹⁵ as implemented in the Quantum ESPRESSO (QE) package⁵⁶. Convergence tests of plane-wave cutoff energies (E_{cut}), k-point meshes, and smearing parameters were performed for all the compounds considered in the present work. A strict convergence criterion was used: ± 1.0 mRy per formula unit in the ground-state energy. In the case of MnO, 8-atom cells were used for both RS and ZB in conjunction with an $8 \times 8 \times 8$ Monkhorst-Pack sampling of k-points in the Brillouin zone. While for MnO₂ and LaMnO₃, 6-atom and 10-atom cells were used. The QMC calculations were performed in larger supercells. The wave functions were constructed using translational symmetry from the wave functions of smaller cells to save memory. For DMC calculations, the wave function was unfolded to 64-, 48-, and 40-atom supercells for MnO, MnO₂, and LaMnO₃, respectively.

QE was used solely as a source of orbitals for QMC. DFT results reported in the present work were calculated using the Vienna *ab initio* software package (VASP)^{57,58}.

C. Fixed-node error

Because the approximations in DMC can be systematically improved, it has produced results with exceptional accuracy^{17,21,59}. However, as mentioned previously, DMC requires the following approximations. In




FIG. 1. (Color online) (a) **Minimization of fixed-node error.** Calculated DMC energies for LaMnO₃ (40-atom supercell) as a function of Hubbard parameter U . (b) **Time-step extrapolation.** DMC energies of the RS phase of MnO as a function of time step. Reference energies (E^{Ref}) for Fig. (a) and (b) are -5015.82 eV and -3273.00 eV, respectively.

DMC methods, the fixed-node approximation is introduced to maintain the antisymmetry of the wave function and to overcome the fermion sign problem (the determination of the node, where the wave function changes sign). The fixed-node approximation prevents walker moves that cross fermion nodes and change the sign of the trial wave function. The fixed-node approximation in DMC gives exact results if the trial nodal surface is exact. Although the fixed-node error is small (typically, a few percent of the correlation energy), the error can still be too large for some applications, particularly in important cases of computing very small energy differences. In the present work, we have explored the nodal surfaces arising from the Hubbard-corrected LDA functionals to perform a simple one-parameter optimization of the nodal surface. As a representative case in Fig. 1, we show the DMC energy as a function of Hubbard parameter U for LaMnO₃. Our DMC calculations found that U values of 3.5, 3.5, and 3 eV minimize the DMC energies for MnO, MnO₂, and LaMnO₃, respectively. The subsequent calculations were performed using these U values.

D. Pseudopotential generation

Pseudopotentials (PPs) are the backbone of DMC simulations, and the accuracy of the DMC results significantly depends on the availability of high-quality PPs. At present, generation of PPs within DMC is not practical. Before use with DMC, PPs must be carefully tested with other theories (such as Hartree-Fock or DFT). In the present work, we used norm-conserving PPs for the oxygen, manganese, and lanthanum atoms, which are generated with OPIUM. The O-PP is based on a He-core PP. All PPs are tested and used for DMC studies of dimers and solids^{17,21,59}. Our PPs have been shown to present Jastrow sensitivities comparable or better to previously

developed Hartree Fock PPs appropriate for Gaussian basis set calculations⁶⁰. The hard PPs used in the present work require a high plane-wave cutoff energy. Therefore, for MnO, MnO₂, and LaMnO₃, a plane-wave energy cutoff was set to 350, 350, and 300 Ry, respectively. To treat the nonlocal part of the PPs within DMC and avoid the numerical instabilities of the locality approximation, the T-moves⁶¹ scheme was used.

E. Time-step error

In principle, DMC provides the fixed-node solution of the imaginary time-dependent Schrödinger equation, where the many-body wave function is statistically sampled using a Green's function approach by propagating a set of walkers in a $3N$ -dimensional space (N is the number of electrons). Since the Green's function projector obtained within the short time approximation is exact only in the limit of a vanishingly small time step ($\tau \simeq 0$), finite time steps introduce a time-step error. It is important to show that errors in the projected energy, due to the finite time step, are small. Note that the associated computational cost for the same statistical error increases as τ^{-1} .

To understand the effect of DMC time step, in Fig. 1 (b) we have plotted the DMC energies (twist averaged over k -points) calculated for the rocksalt phase of MnO as a function of the DMC time step. It is evident from Fig. 1 (b) that the DMC energies show a nearly linear dependence with decreasing time step. In particular, for sufficiently small time steps (smaller than 0.01 Ha⁻¹), the energy varies within ≈ 0.02 eV/fu of the extrapolated value. A similar trend is observed for MnO₂ and LaMnO₃ (not shown here). In practice, the evaluation of energies requires extrapolations to infinitesimal time step within the validity of linear extrapolation.




FIG. 2. (Color online) **Time-step dependence of the cohesive energy.** DMC-calculated cohesive energies (per fu) as a function of time step for (a) RS phase of MnO, (b) β -MnO₂, and (c) LaMnO₃. The green regions correspond to the available experimental cohesive energies collected from MnO⁷³, MnO₂⁷³⁻⁷⁵, and LaMnO₃⁷⁶⁻⁷⁹. The height of each green area represents the variations between different experimental values. The statistical uncertainties in the DMC data are shown with error bars.

Although the time-step correction (Fig. 1 (b)) is of the order of the statistical error for the time steps used, it is important to estimate the effect of DMC time step on the calculated properties to test the systematic cancellation of time step errors. In Fig. 2 (a-c), we have plotted the DMC calculated cohesive energies for MnO, MnO₂, and LaMnO₃ as a function of DMC time step. The DMC energies (twist averaged) for the rocksalt phase of MnO, MnO₂, and LaMnO₃ are calculated using a 32-, 48- and 40-atom supercell, respectively. It is evident from Fig. 2 (a-c) that for all three cases the DMC cohesive energies do not show strong time-step dependence (i.e., the energy differences benefit somewhat from a cancellation of time-step errors). In the limit of zero time step, compared with experimental results, the cohesive energies differ by 0.08(4) eV/fu, 0.10(6) eV/fu, and 0.10(5) eV/fu for MnO, MnO₂, and LaMnO₃, respectively. Therefore a time step of 0.01 Ha⁻¹ is used for the DMC calculations presented in the rest of this paper.

F. Cohesive energy and equation of state

The cohesive energy (E^{Coh}) of a solid can be determined as

$$E^{Coh} = \sum E_g^i - E_s^{Tot}, \quad (2)$$

where E_s^{Tot} is the total DMC or DFT energy of the solid. The respective energies of the monoatomic gas phase components are shown as E_g^i . In the case of LaMnO₃, E_s^{Tot} is the energy of solid LaMnO₃, whereas the monoatomic energies of lanthanum, manganese, and oxygen would be given as E_g^{La} , E_g^{Mn} , and E_g^O , respectively. We calculated the cohesive energies at 0 Kelvin and compared our results to the experimental cohesive energies in Fig. 2.⁷³⁻⁷⁹ We presented the statistical and experimental uncertainties between different results using standard deviation error bars.

Structural parameters such as equilibrium lattice constants (a), bulk modulus (B), and bulk modulus's pressure derivative (B') were calculated by fitting the Murnaghan equation of state (EOS)⁸⁰ to the total energy as a function of volume.

The Murnaghan EOS is given as

$$E_T(V) = E_T(V_0) + \frac{B_0 V}{B'_0} \left[\frac{(V_0/V)^{B'_0}}{B'_0 - 1} + 1 \right] - \frac{V_0 B_0}{B'_0 - 1}, \quad (3)$$

where $E_T(V)$ represents the energy at volume V and B_0 , B'_0 , and V_0 represent the bulk modulus, pressure derivative, and equilibrium volume, respectively.

The cohesive energies were calculated at the optimized geometries within each theoretical method employed (i.e., at the equilibrium volume found by each respective QMC method or DFT functional). All the DFT results reported in the figures, tables, and text were calculated using VASP^{57,58} with Projector Augmented Wave potentials.

G. Excited-state properties

We studied the quasiparticle gaps and band dispersion of MnO, MnO₂, and LaMnO₃ using the DMC method. The quasiparticle gap, E_g , can be calculated using the following formula:

$$E_g = E_a - IP, \quad (4)$$

where E_a is the electron affinity and IP is the ionization potential. The electron affinity is defined as $E_a = E_{N+1} - E_N$, where N is the number of electrons in a charge neutral system. Similarly, the ionization potential is defined as $IP = E_N - E_{N-1}$. Performing these calculations using DMC requires charged simulation cells. Therefore, DFT calculations were performed with a uniform, neutralizing background charge density to obtain trial wave functions




FIG. 3. (Color online) An asterisk (*) denotes the results from the present work, while the other results are from a^{30} , b^{26} , c^{31} , d^{62} , e^{63} , f^{64} , g^{65} , h^{66-70} , and i^{70-72} . (a) Comparison of the calculated and available results for phase stability (difference between total energies of ZB and RS phases) of MnO. Standard deviation error bars (red bars) show statistical uncertainties in the DMC data. Note that the experimental data drawn (in yellow) for the ground-state energy difference ($E_{ZB} - E_{RS}$) for MnO is some unknown positive quantity. (b) and (c) Comparison (relative error) of calculated and available theoretical and experimental results for (b) lattice constants and (c) cohesive energies of the RS phase of MnO. Statistical uncertainties in the experimental data are shown with red deviation error bars. In (b), Fock-0.35⁶⁵ is a hybrid functional with PBE and 0.35 fraction of HF exchange.

for DMC calculations. This procedure has also been implemented in Refs.^{81,82}. Charged cells introduce an error of order $1/N$, which originates in a compensating density inversely proportional to the number of electrons in the system N . Therefore, simulation cells with increasing sizes were used to extrapolate quasiparticle gaps at the infinitely large simulation cell.

To study the band dispersion, we performed excited-state DMC calculations at relevant high-symmetry k-points. We identified the high-symmetry k-points for direct and indirect transitions using DFT+U⁸³ calculations. Excited-state calculations were performed via promotion of an electron from valence band to conduction band. Therefore, charge neutral simulation cells were used.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. MnO

1. Ground-state identification

Identification of the correct ground-state structure is one of the basic results that can be expected from any computational methodology. Before investigating other structural properties, we benchmarked the adequacy of the DMC methods within the aforementioned approximations by predicting the correct ground-state phase of MnO. In the present work, DMC calculations were performed for 32-atom unit cells (for both RS and ZB) in conjunction with a $4 \times 4 \times 4$ Monkhorst-Pack sampling of k-points in the Brillouin zone. Experimental lattice constant (4.43 \AA)⁶⁶ was used for the RS phase. For the ZB phase, because of the unavailability of the experimental lattice constant, the lattice constant was obtained using the PBE0 functional (4.73 \AA)²⁶. In Fig. 3 (a), we show the ground-state energy difference between the ZB and RS MnO phases as a function of DFT functionals (the different approximation to the exchange-correlation energy) compared with DMC results and experiment. DMC correctly predicts the stability order of the phases $E_{RS} > E_{ZB}$. Positive values of ($E_{ZB} - E_{RS}$) in Fig. 3 (a) denote a more stable RS phase, which is found to be consistent with experiments and a previous DMC study²⁶. For the RS-MnO, we used the AFM-II type magnetic configuration that is also found to be the magnetic ground state using neutron diffraction experiments^{66,91}.

2. Structural properties

The structural parameters—namely lattice constants (a), bulk modulus (B), and bulk modulus's pressure derivative (B')—are determined by fitting the Murnaghan EOS to the calculated data. The energy vs. volume curves for the RS phase of MnO, β -MnO₂, and

TABLE I. The calculated equilibrium lattice parameter (a), bulk modulus (B), bulk modulus's pressure derivative (B'), and cohesive energies (E^{Coh}) of the RS phase of MnO. For comparison, available computational and experimental results are also included. The statistical uncertainty in DMC is provided in parentheses. Fock-0.35⁶⁵ and Fock-0.50⁶⁵ are hybrid functionals with PBE and fraction of HF exchange 0.35 and 0.50, respectively. An asterisk (*) denotes results obtained in the present work.

	a (Å)	B (GPa)	B'	E^{Coh} (eV)
UHF	4.53 ⁸⁴			6.20 ⁸⁴
HF	4.38 ⁶⁴			-
LDA	4.35*, 4.32 ⁶⁵	184 ⁶⁵ , 170 ⁸⁵		8.08*
GGA (ideal)	4.44 ²⁶	196	3.9 ⁸⁵	9.73 ²⁶
GGA (relaxed)	4.46 ²⁶	196 ⁸⁶	3.9 ⁸⁶	9.74 ²⁶
PBE	4.37*, ⁶⁴ , 4.45 ⁶⁵ , 4.47 ³⁰	141*, 147 ⁶⁵ , 145 ³⁰	3.8*	9.20*
PBEsol	4.41*	156*	4.6*	9.00*
Rev. PBE	4.55*	256*	4.30*	7.60*
B3PW91	4.46 ⁶⁵	154 ⁶⁵		
PBE+U	4.48 ⁶⁴			10.77*
LDA+U	4.40 ⁶⁵	174 ⁶⁵	3.2 ⁸⁵	
RPA	4.49 ³⁰	158 ³⁰		
Fock-0.35	4.40 ⁶⁵	174 ⁶⁵		
Fock-0.50	4.44 ⁶⁵	170 ⁶⁵		
B3LYP	4.50 ^{64,87}			9.21 ⁸⁷
PBE0	4.51 ⁶⁵ , 4.40 ⁶⁴	143 ⁶⁵		
HSE	4.43 ⁸⁵	187 ⁸⁵	3.3 ⁸⁵	
DMC	4.43 ²⁶	163 ²⁶		9.41 ²⁶
DMC	4.43*	158*	4.1*	9.43 (7)*
Expt	4.43 ^{66,67} , 4.445 ⁶⁸⁻⁷⁰ 4.446 ⁶⁹	144 ⁶⁹ , 147 ⁸⁸ , 150 ⁸⁸ 148 ⁶⁹ , 151 ⁹⁰ , 162 ⁸⁹	4.8(±1.1) ^{88,89} , 4, 5.28 ⁶⁹	9.50 ⁷⁰⁻⁷²

LaMnO₃ were calculated using DMC, and the various functionals of DFT are plotted in Fig. 4 (a-c).

First, we discuss the equilibrium lattice constant. In Fig. 3 (b), we compare the relative errors (with respect to the experimental values) in lattice constants calculated within DMC, as well as using the different DFT functionals as implemented in the VASP^{57,58}. Comparative analysis suggests that our DMC results agree well with the experiments and the DMC results from Mitas *et al.*⁶³. The difference between both DMC results is small and within the statistical error. It is well known that Generalized Gradient Approximation (GGA)¹⁵ tends to overestimate the lattice parameters⁹⁴. However, in the case of the RS phase of MnO, the GGA³¹ predicted lattice constant is found to be in agreement with results from experiments and DMC calculations. For all other studied DFT functionals, the observed errors in the lattice constant range from 1 to 2% (see Fig. 3 (b)).

The relative errors in the calculated cohesive energies (using DMC and various approximations using the VASP^{57,58} package) for MnO in the RS phase with respect to the experimental values are shown in Fig. 3 (c). Our DMC-based cohesive energy is in excellent agreement with experimental and available DMC-calculated values⁶³. Note that our cohesive energies are reported at the theoretical optimum volume found within each theoretical method. Although PBE provides reasonable results for total energies across a wide range of chem-

ical compositions, it suffers from significant electronic structure errors arising from self-interaction, as well as a tendency to disfavor the density overlap between atoms (making lattice constants larger). It is evident from Fig. 3 (c) that the relative error is larger for the PBE+U than the PBE and that the deviations in cohesive energies have negative and positive signs, respectively. Although PBE+U is supposed to describe the localized nature of the electrons for oxides, the relative error of 12% for cohesive energy using PBE+U is much higher than that for PBE. However, PBE+U is more accurate than PBE for the lattice constant (see Fig. 3 (b)).

In Table II, we presented our results for the optical and quasiparticle gaps of MnO compared with DFT and other DMC calculations. All DFT results reported in Table II correspond to the the band gaps that are given by the generalized Kohn-Sham eigenvalues from a band structure calculation. Table II shows our DMC results for both the optical gaps, along with the DFT results, and DMC quasiparticle gap energies (DMC_{QP}). Our PBE+U calculations yielded an indirect band gap $E_g^{K \rightarrow \Gamma}$; while the direct band gap, $E_g^{\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma}$, was identified as $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ transition. These findings were consistent within all DFT methods we used. They are also in agreement with the LDA+U calculations of Anisimov *et al.*⁸³ and the GW calculations of Rodl *et al.*⁹⁵.

For MnO, and in the rest of this work, we determined the wavevectors for the direct and indirect transitions




FIG. 4. (Color online) **EOS**. DFT and DMC energies (per formula unit) versus volume (per formula unit) together with fitted Murnaghan curves for (a) RS phase of MnO, (b) β -MnO₂, and (c) LaMnO₃. Reference energy (E^{Ref}) is the minimum energy of the respective structure obtained from the Murnaghan fit. The statistical uncertainty in DMC energies and experimental data is also shown. In the case of MnO₂, the statistical uncertainty in DMC energies is smaller than the symbol size. The experimental equilibrium volumes for MnO⁶⁹, MnO₂^{35,92,93}, and LaMnO₃⁷⁶⁻⁷⁹ are also shown for comparison. Statistical uncertainties in the experimental data is shown using standard deviation error bars.

from PBE+U calculations. We performed QP calculations in DMC via a two-point extrapolation using 16- and 32-atom cells. Our DMC_{QP} results are in good agreement with the band gaps obtained from photoemission measurements⁹⁶ with $E_g=3.9(4)$ eV and conductivity measurements⁹⁷ with $E_g=4.0(2)$ eV. Whereas, our DMC indirect gap result, 3.74(19) eV, is similar to the optical absorption measurements⁹⁸ with $E_g=3.7(1)$ eV. Our results also provide an improvement over the previously performed DMC calculations in comparison with the optical gap of 4.47(16) eV by Schiller *et al.*²⁶ and 4.8(2) eV by Mitas and Kolorenc⁶³. For the quasiparticle gap, our results have only minimal improvement over the 4.55(26) eV calculated by Schiller *et al.*²⁶. The difference in our DMC results compared with the previously calculated DMC results can be related to the quality of the wave functions and the finite size effects. It has been shown that transition metal PPs that are used in this work yield much improved first and second ionization potentials compared with previous DMC calculations⁵⁹. Therefore, the improved results can be a direct consequence of using better optimized PPs for the excited-state properties.

TABLE II. Excited-state properties of MnO. DFT calculations are differences in Kohn-Sham eigenstates, whereas DMC stands for the optical band gap and DMC_{QP} is the quasiparticle gap.

	indirect gap (eV)	direct gap (eV)
DMC	3.74(19)	4.0(2)
	4.47(16) ²⁶ , 4.8(2) ⁶³	
PBE	0.98	1.31
PBE+U	1.12	1.28
SCAN	0.79	1.46
SCAN+U	0.86	1.53
HSE03 ⁹⁵	2.6	3.2
HSE03+G ₀ W ₀ ⁹⁵	3.4	4.0
DMC _{QP}	3.98(21), 4.55(26) ²⁶	
Experiment	3.9(4) ⁹⁶ , 4.0(2) ⁹⁷ , 3.7(1) ⁹⁸	

B. MnO₂

The various calculated quantities (equilibrium volume, bulk modulus, bulk modulus's pressure derivative, and cohesive energies) for MnO₂ using different computational schemes are given in Table III, along with the available computational³³ and experimental results,^{72,92,93}. For the ground state, we used AFM-I type magnetic configuration since the magnetic and crystallographic space groups are the same. Parallel spins are aligned on the (001) plane, whereas an antiparallel orientation exists in [111] direction. Similar to MnO, our DMC-calculated values agree better with the experimental results compared with various DFT functionals. Among all the DFT functionals used in the present work, the bulk mod-




FIG. 5. (Color online) Comparison (relative error) of calculated and available computational and experimental results for (a) lattice constants and (b) cohesive energies of β -MnO₂. Standard deviation error bars (red bars) show statistical uncertainties in the DMC data. An asterisk (*) denotes results from the present work, while the available results are collected from a ³³, b ^{35,92,93}, and c ⁷².

TABLE III. The calculated equilibrium volume, bulk modulus (B), bulk modulus's pressure derivative (B'), and cohesive energies (E^{Coh}) of MnO₂. For comparison, available computational³³ and experimental^{35,72,92,93} results are also included. An asterisk (*) denotes results generated in the present work. The statistical uncertainty in DMC is provided in parentheses.

	volume/f.u. (\AA^3)	B (GPa)	B' (GPa)	E^{Coh} (eV)
LDA	26.28*	424.65*	5.32*	16.76*
PBE	28.23*, 28.24 ³³	344.77*	5.06 *	13.83*
PBEsol	27.20*	387.48*	5.27*	15.33*
Rev PBE	29.03*	310.89*	4.98*	12.36*
PBE+U	29.06*, 29.66 ³³	304.40*	5.55*	11.62*
PBEsol+U	27.99*	349.77*	5.67*	12.53*
PBE0	27.53 ³³			
HSE	27.64 ³³			
DMC	26.59*	289.00*	5.14*	13.54(3)
Exp	27.38 ⁹² , 27.8 ⁹³ 27.74 ³⁵	328(18) ⁹²	4(2) ⁹²	13.52(2) ⁷²

ulus and cohesive energies, calculated with PBE, are found to be closest compared with experimental results, while PBEsol predicts the equilibrium volume with the lowest relative error. However, both PBE and PBEsol fail to predict the correct energy ordering of MnO₂ polymorphs³.

For equilibrium volume, the relative error for PBE+U (5.78%), revised PBE (5.67%), and LDA (4.19%), while the DMC method gives roughly half of the relative error difference (2.97%), and the PBEsol and PBEsol+U methods gives roughly of 0.64% and 2.19%, respectively. Particularly noticeable are the results for calculated cohesive energies, where PBE+U, PBEsol+U, and revised PBE show a tendency to overbind with a relative error of 16.36%, 7.93%, and 9.43%, respectively.

Our DMC-calculated cohesive energy of ground-state structure β -MnO₂ (13.54 ± 0.03 eV) is in excellent agreement with available experimental results (13.52 ± 0.02 eV). We also compare the relative error in calculated equilibrium volume and cohesive energies obtained using different computational schemes as shown in Fig. 5 (a-b).

Hossain *et al.*⁹⁹ studied the band gap of β -MnO₂ thin films using conductivity experiments, whereas Li *et al.*¹⁰⁰ performed UV-Vis absorption spectroscopy measurements on β -MnO₂ powders that are prepared using electrodeposition. Our literature search provided no results for optical measurements on the single crystals of β -MnO₂. Sato *et al.*¹⁰¹ showed that even under highly controlled environments, it is possible to have very small nonstoichiometry β -MnO_{2- γ , $\gamma = 0.0014$, in the single crystals. It was shown that even a very small nonstoichiometry in β -MnO₂ can lead to metalliclike properties (e.g., conductive surface states)^{101,102}. Since the electronic properties of β -MnO₂ can be very sensitive with respect to defects, it would be misleading to compare the results in Ref.⁹⁹ to the bulk β -MnO₂. However, it must be noted that in Ref.¹⁰⁰ the exact crystalline structure of the samples are not reported, but it is shown that two of the x-ray diffraction peaks correspond to the orthorhombic phase. The only orthorhombic phase available to MnO₂ is the Ramsdellite, R -MnO₂, phase. Among all the MnO₂ phases, β -MnO₂ has the smallest known experimental formation energy¹⁰³, which is only smaller than the R -MnO₂ phase by 56 ± 32 meV/MnO₂. It is likely that these two phases can coexist at room temperature depending on the technique used to prepare the samples. Therefore, we used the ultraviolet-visible (UV-Vis) absorption spectroscopy measurements of Li *et al.*¹⁰⁰ as the experimental reference for the band gap of β -MnO₂, 2.57 eV, although further experimental studies are needed.}

In Table IV, we presented our results for the excited-

state properties of β -MnO₂. Using PBE+U calculations, we determined that β -MnO₂ is a direct band gap material at the Γ point, $E_g^{\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma}$. For β -MnO₂, we performed QP calculations in DMC via two-point extrapolation at 36- and 48-atom cells. We found very good agreement with the experimental band gap of β -MnO₂ and the DMC calculations. We found the DMC quasiparticle and optical gaps to be close to each other; however, the DMC optical gap is the quantity that must be compared against the UV-Vis result in Ref.¹⁰⁰.

TABLE IV. Excited-state properties of β -MnO₂ calculated at different levels of theory. DFT calculations are differences in Kohn-Sham eigenstates, whereas DMC stands for the optical band gap and DMC_{QP} is the quasiparticle gap. All values are given in eV.

	PBE+U	HSE	SCAN	DMC	DMC _{QP}	Expt
E_g	0.2 ³	1.75 ³	0.43 ³	2.27(28)	2.19(50)	0.27 ⁹⁹ 2.57 ¹⁰⁰

C. LaMnO₃

Now, we move to the manganese-based ternary oxide namely, LaMnO₃. In Fig. 6 (a-b), we compare the relative error (with respect to the experimental values) in calculated lattice parameters and cohesive energies of cubic LaMnO₃. In this work we used the 10-atom rhombohedral LaMnO₃ unit cell for all calculations⁷⁹. We used the AFM-I magnetic configuration on this unit cell, where the spins on the two cobalt atoms are in antiparallel alignment. In the structural analysis, shown in Fig. 6 (a), it is surprising that HF provides the best lattice parameter among all mean field calculations. LDA underestimates the lattice parameter while PBE leads to overestimation, which is typically observed in many materials. Among all the computational approaches compared in the present work, DMC-predicted lattice parameters are in best agreement with available experimental results, followed by HF¹⁰⁷, UHF¹⁰⁶, and B3LYP¹⁰⁴. In our calculations, the DMC method gives the lowest percent error (0.47%) in lattice parameters, while revPBE gives the highest percent error (1.44%).

In the case of cohesive energies, behavior differs considerably among methods, varying up to 9.9% (observed using LDA method). Better DFT cohesive energies were obtained using PBE and PBE+U methods, with only 1.60% and 1.84% deviation. We derived the experimental cohesive energy to be 30.6(5) eV and found that all DFT methods, except revPBE, overbind the atoms in LaMnO₃ crystal. The relative error for the revPBE approximation was 2.07%. In comparison, the DMC method provided the best cohesive energy with only a 0.64% error, slightly underbinding the LaMnO₃ crystal.

Table V presents our results for the optical and quasiparticle gaps of LaMnO₃. All DFT results presented were obtained from generalized Kohn Sham eigenstates.

We present only the quasiparticle gap using DMC for LaMnO₃. We performed QP calculations in DMC via a two-point extrapolation using 20- and 40-atom cells. Our PBE+U calculations yield an indirect transition from (0.389,0.0,0.5) to Γ wavevectors. Therefore, the calculation of the optical transition requires a very large supercell. Similarly, all the band structure calculation methods shown in Table V predict an indirect band gap for LaMnO₃. Compared with the rest of the theoretical methods investigated, our DMC results have better agreement with the experiments, although experimental uncertainty is rather large, 1.1–1.7 eV.

TABLE V. Excited-state properties of LaMnO₃ (in eV) DFT calculations are differences in Kohn-Sham eigenstates, whereas DMC_{QP} is the quasiparticle gap. The optical band gap is not calculated at the DMC level because of computational limitations.

	PBE+U	HSE	B3LYP	GW	DMC _{QP}	Expt
E_g	0.2	2.47 ¹¹⁴	2.3 ¹¹⁵	0.82 ¹¹⁶ , 0.96 ¹¹⁷ , 1.6 ¹¹⁹	1.45(15)	1.1 ⁸ , 1.3 ¹¹⁸ , 1.7 ¹²⁰

IV. CROSS COMPARISON

The most common computational approaches to studying the properties of solids are based on DFT. Despite the application and success of DFT in many branches of science and engineering, however, transition metal-based compounds remain challenging to study using current approximations of DFT^{16–29}. This section presents a comparative analysis of various properties of manganese-based oxides calculated from different computational techniques. The aim is to provide a comparative picture of the performance of exchange-correlation functionals in predicting the properties of various manganese-based oxides.

As mentioned earlier, prediction of the correct ground-state structure is one of the most basic properties used to validate the accuracy of any underlying approximation. Most of the semilocal functionals (LDA, PBE, PBEsol, and AM05), Hubbard-corrected (PBE+U³⁰), and hybrid functionals (HSE06³⁰) contradict the experimental observation on the prediction of the ground-state structure of MnO (see Fig. 3(a)). Whereas other than DMC only PW91³¹, revised PBE and random phase approximation (RPA)³⁰ correctly predicted the RS phase as the ground state of MnO. Although revised PBE correctly identified the ground state of MnO, this is likely fortuitous because it overestimated the lattice parameter by $\sim 2.5\%$ and underestimated the cohesive energy by $\sim 25\%$.

As is evident from Fig. 3 (b and c), the accuracy of semilocal and hybrid functionals in predicting lattice parameters and cohesive energies ranges from 1% to 4%, respectively. Moreover, most semilocal and hybrid functionals also overestimated the bulk modulus for the RS




FIG. 6. (Color online) Comparison (relative error) of calculated and available computational and experimental results for (a) lattice constants and (b) cohesive energies of LaMnO_3 . Standard deviation error bars (red bars) show statistical uncertainties in the DMC data. An asterisk (*) denotes results from the present work, while the available results are collected from a^{104} , b^{105} , c^{106} , d^{107} , e^{108} , f^{109} , g^{110} , h^{111} , i^{108} , j^{112} , k^{113} , and l^{76-79} .

TABLE VI. DMC-calculated cohesive energies (per fu) along with available mean experimental values for MnO^{73} , MnO_2^{73-75} , and LaMnO_3^{76-79} .

	MnO	MnO ₂	LaMnO ₃
DMC	9.52 (4)	13.54 (3)	30.32 (6)
Expt.	9.50 (2)	13.52 (2)	30.6 (5)

phase of MnO . On the other hand, the bulk modulus in the RPA is in good agreement with experimental results irrespective of the considerable variations among different experimental values^{69,88-90}. As shown in Fig. 3 (a-c) and Table I, the present and previously published^{26,63} DMC results for lattice parameters, bulk moduli, and cohesive energies lie within the experimental uncertainties.

In the case of $\beta\text{-MnO}_2$, PBE, revised PBE, and most of the Hubbard-corrected functionals overestimate the equilibrium volume, while PBEsol underestimates the volume by $\sim 2\%$ (Fig. 5 (a)). Figure 5 (a) also suggests that the equilibrium volume of MnO_2 increases with the increased value of U in Hubbard-corrected functionals. For LaMnO_3 , similar to two other cases, semilocal functionals largely underestimate the lattice constant by 1% to 4%. However, Hubbard-corrected and hybrid functionals predict lattice parameters and energetics better and repair the weakness of the semilocal functionals. Basically, for all compounds the accuracy in the lattice parameters and cohesive energies increases as we move from semilocal to hybrid functionals. However, the most accurate results, within the experimental uncertainties, are obtained from DMC. For example, in Table III, we compare the DMC-calculated cohesive energies with the mean experimental values.

To date, materials modeling has been largely dominated by either quantum mechanical methods (e.g., DFT) or force-field-based methods. Both approaches

are versatile and have shown potential for providing a good description of a range of chemistries and chemical environments. However, because of the limited predictive power of existing approximate exchange-correlation energy functionals, significant failures have been made in predicting the properties of transition metal oxides. Particularly for manganese-based oxides such as $\text{TbMnO}_3^{121,122}$, HoMnO_3^{123} , AMn_2O_4 ($A=\text{Co}$ and Zn)¹²⁴, $\text{CaMn}_7\text{O}_{12}^{125}$, and mixed metal oxides¹²⁶, DFT results are very sensitive to the choice of the parameters and/or functionals. Having established the accuracy of the DMC methods in predicting the properties of manganese-based oxides—namely MnO , MnO_2 , and LaMnO_3 —we now have confidence that the DMC methodology is the gold standard to be applied to obtain accurate results in more complex manganese-based oxides.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have demonstrated the accuracy of the DMC methods in predicting the structural and electronic properties of manganese-based binary (MnO and MnO_2) and ternary (LaMnO_3) oxides. Our results for MnO are within the error bars of previous DMC calculations^{26,63} performed using different PPs, basis sets, and QMC codes. DMC-calculated lattice constants (except for MnO_2), bulk modulus, and cohesive energies are found to be within the uncertainty of the available experiments. DMC has produced accurate ground and excited-state energies for manganese-based oxides, which exhibit strong electron correlation effects. The present work validates the use of DMC methods for manganese-based oxides, which have complicated electronic structure and are challenging to theory. Having applied DMC to relatively simple polymorphs where good experimental data

is available, we have confidence that the methodology can be applied to obtain accurate results in more complex manganese-based oxides such as manganites and manganese-based mixed metal oxides suitable for electrochemical energy storage and conversion devices, catalysis to electronic devices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

KS, JTK, and FAR were supported by the Materials Sciences and Engineering Division of the US Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences. PRCK (DFT and QMC discussions) was supported by the US Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Sciences and Engineering Division, as part of the Computational Materials Sciences Program and Center for Predictive Simulation of Functional Materials. This research used resources of the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is supported by the Office of Science of the US Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC05-00OR22725.

* Notice: This manuscript has been authored by UT-Battelle, LLC, under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the US Department of Energy (DOE). The US government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the US government retains a nonexclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for US government purposes. DOE will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan (<http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan>).

† saritask@ornl.gov

‡ krogeljt@ornl.gov

§ kentpr@ornl.gov

¶ reboredofa@ornl.gov

- ¹ N. Mott, *Journal of Solid State Chemistry* **88**, 5 (1990).
- ² M. Imada, A. Fujimori, and Y. Tokura, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **70**, 1039 (1998).
- ³ D. A. Kitchaev, H. Peng, Y. Liu, J. Sun, J. P. Perdew, and G. Ceder, *Physical Review B* **93**, 045132 (2016).
- ⁴ J. G. Bednorz and K. A. Müller, in *Ten Years of Superconductivity: 1980–1990* (Springer, 1986) pp. 267–271.
- ⁵ R. von Helmolt, J. Wecker, B. Holzapfel, L. Schultz, and K. Samwer, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, 2331 (1993).
- ⁶ M. B. Salamon and M. Jaime, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **73**, 583 (2001).
- ⁷ K. Wang, J.-M. Liu, and Z. Ren, *Advances in Physics* **58**, 321 (2009).
- ⁸ T. Arima, Y. Tokura, and J. B. Torrance, *Physical Review B* **48**, 17006 (1993).
- ⁹ H. Tanaka and M. Misono, *Current Opinion in Solid State and Materials Science* **5**, 381 (2001).
- ¹⁰ J. Suntivich, H. A. Gasteiger, N. Yabuuchi, H. Nakanishi, J. B. Goodenough, and Y. Shao-Horn, *Nature chemistry* **3**, 546 (2011).
- ¹¹ J. He and C. Franchini, *Physical Review B* **86**, 235117 (2012).
- ¹² W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, *Physical Review* **140**, A1133 (1965).
- ¹³ W. Kohn, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71**, 1253 (1999).
- ¹⁴ R. M. Martin, *Electronic structure: basic theory and practical methods* (Cambridge university press, 2004).

- ¹⁵ J. P. Perdew and A. Zunger, *Physical Review B* **23**, 5048 (1981).
- ¹⁶ C. Mitra, J. T. Krogel, J. A. Santana, and F. A. Reboredo, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **143**, 164710 (2015).
- ¹⁷ J. A. Santana, J. T. Krogel, J. Kim, P. R. Kent, and F. A. Reboredo, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **142**, 164705 (2015).
- ¹⁸ F. Ma, S. Zhang, and H. Krakauer, *New Journal of Physics* **15**, 093017 (2013).
- ¹⁹ J. Yu, L. K. Wagner, and E. Ertekin, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **143**, 224707 (2015).
- ²⁰ G. H. Booth, A. Grüneis, G. Kresse, and A. Alavi, *Nature* **493**, 365 (2013).
- ²¹ J. A. Santana, J. T. Krogel, P. R. Kent, and F. A. Reboredo, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **144**, 174707 (2016).
- ²² D. Alfe and M. J. Gillan, *Physical Review B* **71**, 220101 (2005).
- ²³ E. Ertekin, L. K. Wagner, and J. C. Grossman, *Physical Review B* **87**, 155210 (2013).
- ²⁴ H. Zheng and L. K. Wagner, *Physical Review Letters* **114**, 176401 (2015).
- ²⁵ Y. Luo, A. Benali, L. Shulenburg, J. T. Krogel, O. Heinonen, and P. R. Kent, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 113049 (2016).
- ²⁶ J. A. Schiller, L. K. Wagner, and E. Ertekin, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 235209 (2015).
- ²⁷ Y. Lin, R. E. Cohen, S. Stackhouse, K. P. Driver, B. Militzer, L. Shulenburg, and J. Kim, *Physical Review B* **90**, 184103 (2014).
- ²⁸ L. K. Wagner and P. Abbamonte, *Physical Review B* **90**, 125129 (2014).
- ²⁹ K. Foyevtsova, J. T. Krogel, J. Kim, P. R. C. Kent, E. Dagotto, and F. A. Reboredo, *Physical Review X* **4**, 031003 (2014).
- ³⁰ H. Peng and S. Lany, *Physical Review B* **87**, 174113 (2013).
- ³¹ A. Schrön, C. Rödl, and F. Bechstedt, *Physical Review B* **82**, 165109 (2010).
- ³² E. Cockayne, I. Levin, H. Wu, and A. Llobet, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 184413 (2013).
- ³³ C. Franchini, R. Podloucky, J. Paier, M. Marsman, and G. Kresse, *Physical Review B* **75**, 195128 (2007).

- ³⁴ L. K. Wagner, M. Bajdich, and L. Mitas, *Journal of Computational Physics* **228**, 3390 (2009).
- ³⁵ N. Ohama and Y. Hamaguchi, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **30**, 1311 (1971).
- ³⁶ J. Kim, K. P. Esler, J. McMinis, M. A. Morales, B. K. Clark, L. Shulenburg, and D. M. Ceperley, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **402**, 012008 (2012).
- ³⁷ K. Esler, J. Kim, D. Ceperley, and L. Shulenburg, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **14**, 40 (2012).
- ³⁸ L. K. Wagner and D. M. Ceperley, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **79**, 094501 (2016).
- ³⁹ R. Q. Hood, P. R. C. Kent, and F. A. Reboredo, *Physical Review B* **85**, 134109 (2012).
- ⁴⁰ W.-K. Leung, R. J. Needs, G. Rajagopal, S. Itoh, and S. Ihara, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, 2351 (1999).
- ⁴¹ E. Ertekin, M. T. Winkler, D. Recht, A. J. Said, M. J. Aziz, T. Buonassisi, and J. C. Grossman, *Physical Review Letters* **108**, 026401 (2012).
- ⁴² R. Q. Hood, P. R. C. Kent, R. J. Needs, and P. R. Bridgdon, *Physical Review Letters* **91**, 076403 (2003).
- ⁴³ N. Devaux, M. Casula, F. Decremps, and S. Sorella, *Physical Review B* **91**, 081101 (2015).
- ⁴⁴ K. P. Esler, R. E. Cohen, B. Militzer, J. Kim, R. J. Needs, and M. D. Towler, *Physical Review Letters* **104**, 185702 (2010).
- ⁴⁵ J. A. Santana, J. T. Krogel, P. R. C. Kent, and F. A. Reboredo, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **147**, 034701 (2017).
- ⁴⁶ J. T. Krogel, *Computer Physics Communications* **198**, 154 (2016).
- ⁴⁷ B. M. Austin, D. Y. Zubarev, and W. A. Lester Jr, *Chemical Reviews* **112**, 263 (2011).
- ⁴⁸ L. K. Wagner, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **114**, 94 (2014).
- ⁴⁹ L. Shulenburg and T. R. Mattsson, *Physical Review B* **88**, 245117 (2013).
- ⁵⁰ W. Foulkes, L. Mitas, R. Needs, and G. Rajagopal, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **73**, 33 (2001).
- ⁵¹ C. Lin, F. H. Zong, and D. M. Ceperley, *Physical Review E* **64**, 016702 (2001).
- ⁵² J. C. Slater, *Phys. Rev.* **81**, 385 (1951).
- ⁵³ V. Fock, *Zeitschrift für Physik A Hadrons and Nuclei* **61**, 126 (1930).
- ⁵⁴ R. Jastrow, *Physical Review* **98**, 1479 (1955).
- ⁵⁵ J. Toulouse and C. J. Umrigar, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **126**, 084102 (2007).
- ⁵⁶ P. Giannozzi, S. Baroni, N. Bonini, M. Calandra, R. Car, C. Cavazzoni, D. Ceresoli, G. L. Chiarotti, M. Cococcioni, I. Dabo, A. Dal Corso, S. de Gironcoli, S. Fabris, G. Fratesi, R. Gebauer, U. Gerstmann, C. Gougousis, A. Kokalj, M. Lazzeri, L. Martin-Samos, N. Marzari, F. Mauri, R. Mazzarello, S. Paolini, A. Pasquarello, L. Paulatto, C. Sbraccia, S. Scandolo, G. Sclauzero, A. P. Seitsonen, A. Smogunov, P. Umari, and R. M. Wentzcovitch, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **21**, 395502 (19pp) (2009).
- ⁵⁷ G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Physical review B* **54**, 11169 (1996).
- ⁵⁸ G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Computational materials science* **6**, 15 (1996).
- ⁵⁹ J. T. Krogel, J. A. Santana, and F. A. Reboredo, *Physical Review B* **93**, 075143 (2016).
- ⁶⁰ A. L. Dzubak, J. T. Krogel, and F. A. Reboredo, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **147**, 024102 (2017).
- ⁶¹ M. Casula, *Physical Review B* **74**, 161102 (2006).
- ⁶² M. D. Towler, N. L. Allan, N. M. Harrison, V. R. Saunders, W. C. Mackrodt, and E. Aprà, *Phys. Rev. B* **50**, 5041 (1994).
- ⁶³ L. Mitas and J. Kolorenč, *Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry* **71**, 137 (2010).
- ⁶⁴ C. Franchini, V. Bayer, R. Podloucky, J. Paier, and G. Kresse, *Physical Review B* **72**, 045132 (2005).
- ⁶⁵ F. Tran, P. Blaha, K. Schwarz, and P. Novák, *Physical Review B* **74**, 155108 (2006).
- ⁶⁶ W. Roth, *Physical Review* **110**, 1333 (1958).
- ⁶⁷ B. Fender, A. Jacobson, and F. Wedgwood, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **48**, 990 (1968).
- ⁶⁸ R. W. G. Wyckoff and R. W. Wyckoff, *Crystal structures*, Vol. 2 (Interscience New York, 1960).
- ⁶⁹ J. Zhang, *Physics and Chemistry of Minerals* **26**, 644 (1999).
- ⁷⁰ Y. Sumino, M. Kumazawa, O. Nishizawa, and W. Pluschkell, *Journal of Physics of the Earth* **28**, 475 (1980).
- ⁷¹ I. Barin and G. Platzki, *Thermochemical data of pure substances*, Vol. 304 (Wiley Online Library, 1989).
- ⁷² H. Schlosser, *Physica Status Solidi (b)* **179** (1993).
- ⁷³ W. A. Harrison, *Physical Review B* **77**, 245103 (2008).
- ⁷⁴ M. Zhuang and J. W. Halley, *Physical Review B* **64**, 024413 (2001).
- ⁷⁵ W. Harrison, *Elementary electronic structure* (World Scientific Publishing Co Inc, 1999).
- ⁷⁶ M. W. Chase, *Journal of physical and chemical reference data Monograph* **9** (1998).
- ⁷⁷ G. Sinquin, C. Petit, J. Hindermann, and A. Kienemann, *Catalysis Today* **70**, 183 (2001).
- ⁷⁸ L. Rørmark, S. Stølen, K. Wiik, and T. Grande, *Journal of Solid State Chemistry* **163**, 186 (2002).
- ⁷⁹ J. Rodriguez-Carvajal, M. Hennion, F. Moussa, A. H. Moudden, L. Pinsard, and A. Revcolevschi, *Physical Review B* **57**, R3189 (1998).
- ⁸⁰ F. Murnaghan, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **30**, 244 (1944).
- ⁸¹ R. J. Needs, P. R. C. Kent, A. R. Porter, M. D. Towler, G. Rajagopal, T. C. M. Group, M. Road, C. Cb, and U. Kingdom, *Int. J. Quantum Chemistry* **86**, 218 (2002).
- ⁸² A. J. Williamson, R. Q. Hood, R. J. Needs, and G. Rajagopal, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 12140 (1998), arXiv:9803207 [cond-mat].
- ⁸³ V. I. Anisimov, F. Aryasetiawan, and A. I. Lichtenstein, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **9**, 767 (1997).
- ⁸⁴ M. D. Towler, N. L. Allan, N. M. Harrison, V. R. Saunders, W. C. Mackrodt, and E. Apra, *Physical Review B* **50**, 5041 (1994).
- ⁸⁵ D. Kasinathan, J. Kuneš, K. Koepernik, C. V. Diaconu, R. L. Martin, I. D. Prodan, G. E. Scuseria, N. Spaldin, L. Petit, T. C. Schulthess, and W. E. Pickett, *Physical Review B* **74**, 195110 (2006).
- ⁸⁶ R. E. Cohen, I. Mazin, and D. G. Isaak, *Science* **275**, 654 (1997).
- ⁸⁷ X. Feng, *Physical Review B* **69**, 155107 (2004).
- ⁸⁸ R. Pacalo and E. Graham, *Physics and Chemistry of Minerals* **18**, 69 (1991).
- ⁸⁹ R. Jeanloz and A. Rudy, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* **92**, 11433 (1987).
- ⁹⁰ Y. Noguchi, K. Kusaba, K. Fukuoka, and Y. Syono, *Geophysical research letters* **23**, 1469 (1996).
- ⁹¹ C. G. Shull, W. A. Strauber, and E. O. Wollan, *Phys. Rev* **83** (1951).

- ⁹² J. Haines, J. Léger, and S. Hoyau, *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids* **56**, 965 (1995).
- ⁹³ S. Fritsch, J. E. Post, S. L. Suib, and A. Navrotsky, *Chemistry of materials* **10**, 474 (1998).
- ⁹⁴ L. He, F. Liu, G. Hautier, M. J. T. Oliveira, M. A. L. Marques, F. D. Vila, J. J. Rehr, G. M. Rignanese, and A. Zhou, *Physical Review B* **89**, 064305 (2014).
- ⁹⁵ C. Rodl, F. Fuchs, J. Furthmüller, and F. Bechstedt, *Phys. Rev. B - Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.* **79**, 235114 (2009).
- ⁹⁶ J. van Elp, J. L. Wieland, H. Eskes, P. Kuiper, G. A. Sawatzky, F. M. F. de Groot, and T. S. Turner, *Phys. Rev. B* **44**, 6090 (1991).
- ⁹⁷ *Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad)* **10**, 3082 (1968).
- ⁹⁸ *Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad)* **7**, 1884 (1982).
- ⁹⁹ M. S. Hossain, R. Islam, M. Shahjahan, and K. A. Khan, *Journal of Materials Science: Materials in Electronics* **19**, 1114 (2008).
- ¹⁰⁰ T. Li, J. Wu, X. Xiao, B. Zhang, Z. Hu, J. Zhou, P. Yang, X. Chen, B. Wang, and L. Huang, *RSC Adv.* **6**, 13914 (2016).
- ¹⁰¹ H. Sato, T. Enoki, M. Isobe, and Y. Ueda, *Physical Review B* **61**, 3563 (2000).
- ¹⁰² D. A. Tompsett and M. S. Islam, *Journal of Physical Chemistry C* **118**, 25009 (2014).
- ¹⁰³ S. Fritsch, J. E. Post, S. L. Suib, and A. Navrotsky, *Chemistry of Materials* **10**, 474 (1998).
- ¹⁰⁴ D. Fuks, L. Bakaleinikov, E. Kotomin, J. Felsteiner, A. Gordon, R. Evarestov, D. Gryaznov, and J. Maier, *Solid State Ionics* **177**, 217 (2006).
- ¹⁰⁵ G. Pilania and R. Ramprasad, *Surface Science* **604**, 1889 (2010).
- ¹⁰⁶ M. Nicastro and C. H. Patterson, *Physical Review B* **65**, 205111 (2002).
- ¹⁰⁷ R. Evarestov, E. Kotomin, E. Heifets, J. Maier, and G. Borstel, *Solid state communications* **127**, 367 (2003).
- ¹⁰⁸ E. Kotomin, R. Evarestov, Y. A. Mastrikov, and J. Maier, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **7**, 2346 (2005).
- ¹⁰⁹ D. Fuks, S. Dorfman, J. Felsteiner, L. Bakaleinikov, A. Gordon, and E. Kotomin, *Solid State Ionics* **173**, 107 (2004), proceedings of EMRS Symposium K on Solid State Ionics: High Temperature vs. Low Temperature Defect Chemistry.
- ¹¹⁰ C. Raisch, C. Langheinrich, R. Werner, R. Kleiner, D. Koelle, M. Glaser, T. Chassé, and A. Chassé, *Journal of Applied Physics* **113**, 063511 (2013).
- ¹¹¹ E. A. Ahmad, L. Liborio, D. Kramer, G. Mallia, A. R. Kucernak, and N. M. Harrison, *Physical Review B* **84**, 085137 (2011).
- ¹¹² S. Piskunov, E. Heifets, T. Jacob, E. A. Kotomin, D. E. Ellis, and E. Spohr, *Physical Review B* **78**, 121406 (2008).
- ¹¹³ E. A. Kotomin, Y. A. Mastrikov, E. Heifets, and J. Maier, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **10**, 4644 (2008).
- ¹¹⁴ J. He, M.-X. Chen, X.-Q. Chen, and C. Franchini, *Physical Review B - Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* **85**, 195135 (2012), arXiv:arXiv:1205.1303v1.
- ¹¹⁵ D. Muñoz, N. M. Harrison, and F. Illas, *Physical Review B* **69**, 085115 (2004).
- ¹¹⁶ Y. Nohara, A. Yamasaki, S. Kobayashi, and T. Fujiwara, *Physical Review B* **74**, 064417 (2006).
- ¹¹⁷ Z. Ergonenc, B. Kim, P. Liu, G. Kresse, and C. Franchini, (2017), arXiv:1711.00916.
- ¹¹⁸ A. Chainani, M. Mathew, and D. D. Sarma, *Physical Review B* **47**, 15397 (1993).
- ¹¹⁹ Y. Nohara, S. Yamamoto, and T. Fujiwara, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 195110 (2009).
- ¹²⁰ T. Saitoh, A. E. Bocquet, T. Mizokawa, H. Namatame, A. Fujimori, M. Abbate, Y. Takeda, and M. Takano, *Physical Review B* **51**, 13942 (1995).
- ¹²¹ V. Sharma, A. McDannald, M. Staruch, R. Ramprasad, and M. Jain, *Applied Physics Letters* **107**, 012901 (2015).
- ¹²² M. Staruch, V. Sharma, C. dela Cruz, R. Ramprasad, and M. Jain, *Journal of Applied Physics* **116**, 033919 (2014).
- ¹²³ S. Picozzi, K. Yamauchi, B. Sanyal, I. A. Sergienko, and E. Dagotto, *Physical Review Letters* **99**, 227201 (2007).
- ¹²⁴ Y. Deng, L. Wan, Y. Xie, X. Qin, and G. Chen, *RSC Advances* **4**, 23914 (2014).
- ¹²⁵ X. Z. Lu, M.-H. Whangbo, S. Dong, X. G. Gong, and H. J. Xiang, *Physical Review Letters* **108**, 187204 (2012).
- ¹²⁶ Y. Guo, L. Yu, C.-Y. Wang, Z. Lin, and X. W. D. Lou, *Advanced Functional Materials* **25**, 5184 (2015).