

Variational Density Functional Perturbation Theory for Metals

Xavier Gonze*,¹ Samare Rostami,¹ and Christian Tantardini*^{2,3}

¹*European Theoretical Spectroscopy Facility, Institute of Condensed Matter and Nanosciences, Université catholique de Louvain, Chemin des étoiles 8, bte L07.03.01, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium*

²*Hylleraas center, Department of Chemistry, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, PO Box 6050 Langnes, N-9037 Tromsø, Norway.*

³*Department of Materials Science and Nanoengineering, Rice University, Houston, Texas 77005, United States of America.**

(Dated: February 16, 2024)

Density functional perturbation theory is a well-established method to study responses of molecules and solids, especially responses to atomic displacements or to different perturbing fields (electric, magnetic). Like for density functional theory, the treatment of metals is delicate, due to the Fermi-Dirac statistics and electronic bands crossing the Fermi energy. At zero temperature, there is an abrupt transition from occupied states to unoccupied ones, usually addressed with smearing schemes. Also, at finite temperature, fractional occupations are present, and the occupation numbers may vary in response to the perturbation.

The present work establishes the characteristics of density functional perturbation theory stemming from the underlying variational principle, in the case of metals. After briefly reviewing variational density functional theory for metals, the convexity of the entropy function of the occupation number is analyzed, and, at finite temperature, the benefit of resmearing the Fermi-Dirac broadening with the Methfessel-Paxton one is highlighted. Then the variational expressions for the second-order derivative of the free energy are detailed, exposing the different possible gauge choices. The influence of the inaccuracies in the unperturbed wavefunctions from the prior density functional theory calculation is studied. The whole formalism is implemented in the ABINIT software package.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Density functional perturbation theory (DFPT) has been implemented and used for decades for the study of responses of molecules, solids, and nanostructures to different types of perturbations, including atomic displacements, applied electric field or magnetic field, or cell parameter changes.^{1–10} It proves a method of choice for the computation of phonon band structures,¹¹ linear dielectric response¹², Born effective charges¹³, thermal expansion^{14,15}, piezoelectricity⁹, Raman tensors¹⁶, electro-optic effect¹⁷, electron-phonon^{18,19} and phonon-phonon couplings^{20,21}, flexoelectricity²², thermodynamical^{15,23} and many other properties. The list of applications of DFPT continues to increase regularly.

Many basic concepts and theorems of DFPT have been established a long time ago^{1,2,4–7,24}. DFPT stems from the Taylor expansion of quantities present in density functional theory (DFT) when an external parameter is changed by a small amount. The above-mentioned properties are directly connected to the (possibly high-order) derivatives of the energy with respect to such small parameters characterizing the strength of the perturbations. Since the first-order derivatives of the energy with respect to atomic displacement, electric field, magnetic fields and cell parameter changes, respectively, are forces, electric dipole or electric polarization, magnetic dipole or magnetic polarization, and stress, respectively, their linear response to additional applied fields are linked to

second-order derivatives of the energy.

It is well-known that DFT is based on a variational principle: the energy is minimized with respect to trial Kohn-Sham wavefunctions. DFPT inherits also from this property of DFT a variational principle for the second-order derivative of the energy with respect to trial first-order wavefunctions². While the linear-response formalism can be derived without making explicit usage of this variational property, the quantities computed numerically, determined using iterative solvers with some stopping criterion, are more accurate with the variational formulation than with alternative, possibly simpler, non-variational formulations. Also, algorithms to determine the optimal first-order wavefunctions can benefit from the variational character of the second-order energy. In addition, the variational principle is crucial for establishing higher-order DFPT, thanks to the so-called “2n+1” theorem^{4,20,24}.

The specificities of the treatment of metals within DFPT have been established by de Gironcoli³ in 1997, based on the treatment of metals in DFT. At variance with the DFT theory for finite systems and insulators, in the DFT theory of metals, the occupation numbers, usually fractional, have to be determined. The electronic entropy appears, and the internal energy is replaced by the free energy. Such varying occupation numbers are present when dealing with finite temperature, but also appear in practice even at zero temperature, in order to deal with the abrupt transition between occupied states to unoccupied state at the Fermi energy. Such case is

tackled using smearing schemes, that allow to reduce the numerical burden of the integration of a discontinuous occupation function in the Brillouin Zone. The most efficient high-order smearing schemes²⁵ have their own problems, as described by dos Santos *et al.*²⁶ since the occupation function of the energy becomes non-monotonic.

For DFPT, de Gironcoli described the specificities of linear responses due to varying occupation numbers and due to entropy, and provided phonon band structures for Al, Pb and Nb. However, he did not present a variational formulation of the second-order derivative of the free energy. This result is still lacking in the literature. However, it had been derived, implemented (at least in the ABINIT package)^{27–29}, and used for many studies of metals, e.g. for computing the phonon band structure of lead³⁰, bismuth^{31,32} and polonium³³, all three with spin-orbit coupling, or the electronic transport properties of lithium,³⁴ and osmium and osmium silicide³⁵ among others.

Motivated by the interest to fill this gap, but also by some recent publications related to the response properties of metals by Cancès *et al.*³⁶ as well as improved treatment in high-order smearing schemes in DFT, by dos Santos *et al.*²⁶, the present publication has the aim to lay down the variational treatment of DFPT for metals. The second-order derivative of the free energy is formulated as a variational functional of trial first-order wavefunctions and trial first-order density matrix. The second-order entropy is present in the second-order free energy, and depends on the first-order and selected second-order changes of the occupation numbers, both derived from the first-order density matrix. Non-variational expressions are also presented.

The invariance of DFT for metals with respect to unitary transformations inside the wavefunction space is more intricate than in the case of DFT for gapped systems at 0 K.⁴ In the latter, a unitary transformation of wavefunctions inside the occupied space leaves the density, total energy, and Kohn-Sham potential invariant. In the case of metals, a unitary transformation of the wavefunctions must be accompanied by a simultaneous transformation of the (one-body) density matrix. The wavefunctions might not be eigenstates of the Hamiltonian, and the density matrix might not be diagonal. Still, such transformed trial wavefunctions and trial density matrix correspond to the same free energy, and hence minimize the free energy functional. This has been developed in 1997 by Marzari, Payne and Vanderbilt (MPV),³⁷ in their variational formulation of DFT for metals, on which we will rely to derive the variational formulation of DFPT for metals.

As outlined for DFT above, in DFPT also, several sets of first-order wavefunctions (and first-order density matrix elements for the metal case) minimize the energy, related by some well-defined transformation rule. A choice among such possibilities is referred to fixing the gauge, and the invariance of the second-order free energy with respect to the gauge choice is called the gauge freedom.

The gauge freedom in the DFPT of metals is more complicated than the one in the DFPT of gapped systems at 0 K, and this is described as well in the present work. The parallel and diagonal gauges are defined, extending to the metal case the well-known results obtained for gapped systems. However, more freedom is allowed, due to the added variability of the density matrix. This will be described as well, as different formulations might be of interest in different contexts. The connection with the article of Cancès *et al.*³⁶ will be made.

Concerning smearing schemes, we first remark that the non-monotonic behavior of the occupation number as a function of the energy not only induces problems at the level of the determination of the Fermi energy, as outlined recently by dos Santos *et al.*²⁶ but also makes the one-level entropy function of the occupation number multivalued and non-convex. DFPT is also impacted, as the second-order free energy might not be an extremum, because of the non-positive-definiteness of the contribution of the second-order entropy. When a finite temperature is considered, it is shown that the resmearing procedure³⁸ is a procedure in which, possibly, higher-order smearing might be used without sacrificing the monotonic behavior of the occupation function, provided the resmearing parameter is not too large. For the resmearing using the Methfessel-Paxton (MP) scheme,²⁵ it is shown that a smearing parameter smaller or equal to twice the physical electronic temperature can be used. For such range of parameters, the occupation function is monotonic, the one-level entropy is univalued and convex.

Coming to applications, in addition to the results already available in the literature, the convergence of phonon frequencies of copper, with respect to the wavevector grid and to smearing schemes is provided. For this case, one can distinguish two regimes, a first one, “medium precision”, in which the target numerical precision is requested at the level of the absolute value of phonon frequencies, and a second one, “high precision”, in which the target is the study of the temperature dependence of the phonon frequencies.

Finally, the impact of the precision requirement (or lack of precision) for the unperturbed wavefunctions, on the precision of the second-order free energy, is examined. Indeed, when dealing with metals, in practice, the preliminary DFT calculation of the density also includes wavefunctions with vanishing occupations. Depending on the stopping criterion, the highest energy ones might possibly not be well converged, as they do not influence the density anyhow. Thus, the impact of lack of precision of such wavefunctions in DFT is negligible. By contrast, it is found that such lack of numerical convergence might have an impact in the subsequent DFPT calculations, in agreement with the recent observation by Cancès *et al.*³⁶ This impact is analyzed thanks to a simple three-level model. The error in the second-order free energy is found to be proportional to the norm of the residual of such wavefunctions. Cancès *et al.*³⁶ propose a Schur complement technique to deal with such problem. Ac-

tually, increasing the number of states in the underlying DFT calculation, then filtering less-converged states to start subsequent DFPT calculations solves the problem, if their occupation is really negligible.

The structure of this article is as follows. After the present introduction, Sec. II deals with variational DFT for metals: the MPV³⁷ variational DFT for metals is reviewed, some considerations on the space of potentially occupied wavefunctions are introduced, and then smearing schemes are detailed. In the latter it is shown that resmearing³⁸ the Fermi-Dirac distribution with the MP smearing²⁵ at finite temperature does not break the monotonic behavior of the occupation function, for a range of resmearing parameter. Related to section Sec. II, Sec. S1 in the Supporting Information fixes notation problems and typos present in Ref. 38.

In Sec. III the variational second-order free energy within DFPT, that includes the treatment of the second-order entropy, is presented. The gradient of the second-order free energy is written, and linked with the de Gironcoli linear-response DFPT approach for metals³. In the Supporting Information, the Sec. S2 gives a detailed derivation of the variational second-order free energy, while the Secs. S3 and S4 give some technical details to obtain the gradients, also related to the non-hermiticity freedom for the first-order off-diagonal density matrix elements.

Sec. IV focuses on the choice of gauge. The gauge freedom is first presented, followed by the definition and properties of the parallel gauge, as well as the definition and properties of the diagonal gauge. The section finishes with the complete suppression of first-order occupation matrix elements. In the Supporting Information, the covariance of first-order wavefunctions and first-order density matrix elements is presented in Sec. S5. Then the derivation of the first-order density expression with modified first-order wavefunctions is explained in Sec. S6, and finally non-variational expressions are written down, for the case of the parallel gauge, in Sec. S7.

While the previous sections neglected the Bloch characteristics of the first-order wavefunctions and energies, as well as the presence of a Brillouin Zone, Sec. V upgrades such results for explicitly periodic systems.

Sec. VI presents the study of some phonon frequencies of copper, especially focusing on the wavevector grid sampling and its interplay with the smearing parameter. The “medium-precision” and “high-precision” regimes are distinguished. In the Supporting Information, Sec. S8 provides additional figures.

The influence of underconverged unoccupied states on the second-order free energy is quantified, and analyzed using a simple model in Sec. VII, with details of the mathematical treatment given in the Supporting Information, Sec. S9.

Sec. VIII summarizes the results.

II. VARIATIONAL DFT FOR METALS

In this section, first, the variational approach to DFT of metals³⁷ is reviewed, with notations that will then be used to treat the DFPT case. The need to define a space of potentially occupied wavefunctions is highlighted. Smearing schemes are the focus of the last part of this section on DFT. In particular, the monotonic behavior of the occupation function is linked to the convexity and singlevaluedness of the entropy function of the occupation number.

A. Variational formulation of DFT with varying occupation numbers at finite temperature

MVP³⁷ introduced in 1997 a variational free energy for the density functional theory with varying occupation numbers at finite temperature, especially relevant to treat metals. This approach will also be a basis for variational DFPT. For simplicity, the formalism is presented for non-spin-polarized systems ($n_s = 2$ accounts for the spin degeneracy). Generalization to spin-polarized systems, including the non-collinear case is trivial. In this section, as well as Secs. III and IV, one considers finite systems (with N being the total number of electrons). Periodic systems are treated in Sec. V. Atomic (Hartree) units are used throughout.

The MVP electronic free energy $F[T; \{\psi_i\}, \{\rho_{ij}\}]$, for a given temperature T , is a functional of the (trial) wavefunctions $\{\psi_i\}$ that form an orthonormal basis set, and of the (trial) matrix representation $\{\rho_{ij}\}$ of the one-particle density matrix operator $\hat{\rho}$ in this orthonormal set. Explicitly:

$$F[T; \{\psi_i\}, \{\rho_{ij}\}] = n_s \sum_{ij} \rho_{ji} \langle \psi_i | \hat{K} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext}} | \psi_j \rangle + E_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho] - TS[\{\rho_{ij}\}]. \quad (1)$$

In this expression, the sums over i and j extend to infinity, \hat{K} is the kinetic energy operator, \hat{v}_{ext} is the external potential (e.g. created by the nuclei, as well as any other additional external potential), E_{Hxc} is the DFT Hartree and exchange-correlation energy functional of the density $\rho(\mathbf{r})$, which is defined as

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = n_s \sum_{ij} \rho_{ji} \psi_i^*(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j(\mathbf{r}). \quad (2)$$

The one-particle density matrix is hermitian, with all its eigenvalues f_γ - actually occupation numbers of the corresponding state - being between 0 and 1 for the Fermi-Dirac entropy (see later for the behavior of occupation numbers with high-order smearing schemes). $S[\{\rho_{ij}\}]$ is the entropy, considered as a functional of the density matrix elements. Explicitly,

$$S[\{\rho_{ij}\}] = n_s \sum_{\gamma} k s(f_\gamma) = n_s \text{Tr}[k s(\hat{\rho})], \quad (3)$$

where $s(f)$, the one-level entropy function (adimensional), is to be specified, and k is Boltzmann's constant. The usual physical situation corresponds to the Fermi-Dirac entropy function $s_{\text{FD}}(f)$, given by

$$s_{\text{FD}}(f) = -\left(f \ln(f) + (1-f) \ln(1-f)\right), \quad (4)$$

Smearing techniques, introduced for numerical reasons, will modify such entropy function. In what follows, equations are presented in terms of a generic $s(f)$ function, with examples using the Fermi-Dirac entropy function. The formulas for other entropy functions are presented in Sec. II C.

The trace of the occupation matrix is constrained to N , the number of electrons, possibly taking into account the spin degeneracy,

$$n_s \sum_i \rho_{ii} = n_s \sum_{\gamma} f_{\gamma} = N. \quad (5)$$

Following MVP³⁷, one defines the Hamiltonian matrix, with elements

$$H_{ij}[\rho] = \langle \psi_i | \hat{K} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext}} + \hat{v}_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho] | \psi_j \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{v}_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho]$ is a local operator with

$$v_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho](\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\delta E_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})}. \quad (7)$$

MVP introduce the Lagrange multiplier μ (identified to the chemical potential) that enforces the constraint Eq. (5). It is such that

$$H_{ij}[\rho] - kT[s'(\hat{\rho})]_{ij} = \mu \delta_{ij}, \quad (8)$$

where the notation $[s'(\hat{\rho})]_{ij}$ is used in place of $d(\text{tr}[s(\hat{\rho})])/d\rho_{ji}$. MVP also obtain that at the minimum, the Hamiltonian and occupation matrices can be simultaneously diagonalized.

Working with diagonal Hamiltonian and occupation matrices is convenient, but one is free to avoid diagonalizing them, the so-called ‘‘gauge freedom’’ that MVP exploit indeed. Arbitrary unitary transformations between the wavefunctions can be accompanied by adequate unitary transformation of the occupation matrix, such that the density, Eq. (2), the entropy, Eq. (3), and the free energy, Eq. (1), are invariant.

If the wavefunctions are chosen such as to diagonalize both Hamiltonian and density matrices, one has

$$H_{ij}[\rho] = \epsilon_i \delta_{ij}, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\epsilon_i - kT s'(f_i) = \mu. \quad (10)$$

In particular, for the Fermi-Dirac entropy,

$$s'_{\text{FD}}(f) = \frac{ds_{\text{FD}}}{df} = \ln\left(\frac{1}{f} - 1\right). \quad (11)$$

Eq. 10 can be inverted, to deliver the occupation number as a function of the eigenenergy,

$$f_i = [s']^{-1}\left(\frac{\epsilon_i - \mu}{kT}\right), \quad (12)$$

where the notation $[s']^{-1}$ is for the reciprocal of the s' function.

For the Fermi-Dirac entropy function Eq. (4), the Eq. (12) delivers the usual Fermi-Dirac occupations, where

$$f_i = f_{\text{FD}}((\mu - \epsilon_i)/kT) \quad (13)$$

$$f_{\text{FD}}(x) = (\exp(-x) + 1)^{-1}. \quad (14)$$

Note that, for consistency with the usual definitions for smearing schemes, we choose the $f_{\text{FD}}(x)$ function to monotonically increase from 0 to 1. Then, Eq. (13) is such that for high-energy states (large ϵ_i), the occupation number tends rapidly to zero, exponentially.

In what follows, the choice to diagonalize the Hamiltonian (together with the occupation matrix) will be referred to as the ‘‘diagonal gauge’’. In the diagonal gauge,

$$\hat{H}|\psi_i\rangle = (\hat{K} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext}} + \hat{v}_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho])|\psi_i\rangle = \epsilon_i|\psi_i\rangle. \quad (15)$$

For the derivation of DFPT equations, done later, this variational formulation of DFT for metals at finite temperature is reformulated as an unconstrained minimization, based on Lagrange multipliers, as follows. The free energy is augmented with the Lagrange contributions from both types of constraints, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} F^+[T; \{\psi_i\}, \{\rho_{ij}\}] &= F[T; \{\psi_i\}, \{\rho_{ij}\}] \\ &- \sum_{ij} \Lambda_{ji} n_s \left(\langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle - \delta_{ij} \right) \\ &- \mu \left(n_s \sum_i \rho_{ii} - N \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The optimal electronic free energy $F_{\text{el}}(T)$ is obtained by minimizing such augmented free energy,

$$F_{\text{el}}[T] = \min_{\{\psi_i\}, \{\rho_{ij}\}} F^+[T; \{\psi_i\}, \{\rho_{ij}\}], \quad (17)$$

without specific constraints on $\{\psi_i\}, \{\rho_{ij}\}$ during the minimization, but where the Lagrange multipliers Λ_{ji} and μ are chosen to enforce them afterwards. In this formulation as well, unitary transforms between the wavefunctions and occupation matrix leave the density, entropy and free energy invariant. One can check that, at the minimum,

$$\Lambda_{ki} = \sum_j H_{kj} \rho_{ji}. \quad (18)$$

In the diagonal gauge, this becomes

$$\Lambda_{ji} = \epsilon_i \delta_{ji} \rho_{ii}. \quad (19)$$

B. The space of potentially occupied wavefunctions

In practice, first-principles calculations for metals at finite temperature (or finite smearing) only treat explicitly a finite number of eigenstates, among which, some are (nearly) fully occupied, some have intermediate occupation numbers, and some have vanishing occupation numbers. Occupation numbers of the states outside of this space of potentially occupied states are so small that they can be set to zero and ignored. Thus, there is an “active space” of potentially occupied wavefunctions. This space plays the same role than the occupied state space for the first-principles treatment of semiconductors.

This approach might not be practical when the temperature is quite large, yielding a large number of wavefunctions in the active space. However, even a temperature as high as 6000 Kelvin (corresponding to about 0.5 eV, that is beyond melting of all known materials at ordinary pressure), does not induce an unreasonable increase of the number of states, compared to the number of bands strictly needed at 0 Kelvin.

The number of potentially occupied wavefunctions, $pocc$, is defined at the start of the computation. It must exceed sufficiently the number of electrons N , in order for the highest states in this space to have vanishing occupations. So, instead of minimizing Eq. (16) with definition Eq. (1), that implicitly suppose that the set of $\{\psi_i\}$ spans the whole Hilbert space, the functional to be considered is defined in terms of a finite number of orthonormal functions, and the corresponding finite occupation matrix elements, with i and j running from 1 to $pocc$. This gives the following modified definition:

$$\begin{aligned}
 F^+[T, \{\psi_i\}, \{\rho_{ij}\}] = & n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{ji} h_{ij} + E_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho] \\
 & - kT n_s \sum_{\gamma}^{pocc} s(f_{\gamma}) - \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \Lambda_{ji} n_s (\langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle - \delta_{ij}) \\
 & - \mu \left(\left(\sum_i^{pocc} n_s \rho_{ii} \right) - N \right). \quad (20)
 \end{aligned}$$

The orthonormalization constraint only applies between the functions belonging to the potentially occupied wavefunctions. The notation “ S_{pocc} ” will later denote that space of functions.

C. Smearing schemes

Smearing schemes have the goal to decrease the numerical effort needed to deal with rapidly varying occupation numbers when the Brillouin Zone of metals is sampled. They allow to rely on fewer wavevectors to obtain the same numerical precision than without smearing. The difficulty to reach numerical convergence is

especially acute for a vanishing temperature, since the occupation of levels discontinuously changes from 1 to 0 at the Fermi level. Generally speaking, the occupation of an energy level is defined through an occupation function $f(x)$ whose argument is the difference between the Fermi energy and the energy of the level, rescaled by either kT , for the Fermi-Dirac case, or by a smearing energy σ , for pure numerical smearing schemes. The occupation function $f(x)$ vanishes for infinitely negative x and tends to 1 for infinite positive x .

As mentioned in Refs. 25,26, all such occupation functions can be generated from an associated smearing function $\tilde{\delta}(\varepsilon)$, which is normalized to 1. The related occupation function is

$$f(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \tilde{\delta}(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon. \quad (21)$$

where $x = \frac{\mu - \varepsilon}{\sigma}$. Note that x is adimensional, as well as the integrand ε , while ε , μ , σ and kT have the dimension of an energy. x and ε are actually “rescaled” energies, without dimensions. For the Fermi-Dirac (FD) case, the smearing function is

$$\tilde{\delta}_{\text{FD}}(x) = \frac{1}{(\exp(x) + 1)(\exp(-x) + 1)}. \quad (22)$$

The occupation function deduced from this smearing function is given by Eqs. (13) and (14) as expected.

In order to obtain the entropy $s(f)$ as a function of the occupation, one defines first the entropy $\tilde{s}(x)$ as a function of the adimensional x ,

$$\tilde{s}(x) = - \int_{-\infty}^x \varepsilon \tilde{\delta}(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon. \quad (23)$$

Note the slight change of notation for the entropy function of the rescaled energy, \tilde{s} , with respect to the one in Ref. 26, “ s ” for the same quantity. Indeed, the notation “ s ” is already used in the present context for the entropy as a function of f , see Eq. (3). The latter had not been examined in Ref. 26.

Such function $s(f)$ is deduced from Eq. (23) by using the reciprocal of Eq. (21), denoted $[f]^{-1}$ so that

$$s(f) = \tilde{s}([f]^{-1}(f)). \quad (24)$$

Indeed, with definitions Eqs. (21) and (23), and the same definition of x as in the text before Eq. (21), the relation Eq. (12), that links the occupation number to the energy through the derivative of the entropy as a function of the occupation number, is fulfilled. Note however that $s(f)$ might be a multivalued function, in the case where the $f(x)$ function is not monotonically decreasing. This is encountered for advanced smearing schemes. Also, the one-level contribution to the free energy, $-Ts(f)$, might not be convex.

For the Fermi-Dirac case, the corresponding $-kT s_{\text{FD}}(f)$, Eq. (4), is univalued and convex.

Beyond the Fermi-Dirac case, the Gaussian and MP smearing functions are often encountered. We will not analyze so-called “cold smearings”,³⁹ that for the purpose of the present analysis, exhibit the same problematic feature as the MP smearing, namely the non-monotonicity of the occupation function.

For the Gaussian (G) case, the smearing function is

$$\tilde{\delta}_G(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp(-x^2). \quad (25)$$

The occupation function $f_G(x)$ is $1 + \operatorname{erf}(x)/2$. Its reciprocal cannot be expressed easily. The entropy function of x is half the broadening function,

$$\tilde{s}_G(x) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \exp(-x^2). \quad (26)$$

This entropy function of the occupation is univalued.

For the MP broadening,

$$\tilde{\delta}_{\text{MP}}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(\frac{3}{2} - x^2 \right) \exp(-x^2). \quad (27)$$

$f_{\text{MP}}(x)$ can be larger than 1 and smaller than 0, and is not easily expressed. It is not monotonically increasing, hence the $s_{\text{MP}}(f)$ function is multivalued. The corresponding entropy function of the scaled energy is

$$\tilde{s}_{\text{MP}}(x) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{2} - x^2 \right) \exp(-x^2). \quad (28)$$

By convention, for the Gaussian and MP scheme, one replaces kT by the smearing parameter σ in the definition of the individual occupations in terms of the distribution function, Eq. (13). As mentioned earlier, the goal of the Gaussian and MP smearings is to provide the $T = 0$ properties of metals with less numerical effort than with the sudden change of the occupation from 1 to 0 at the Fermi energy, albeit with some loss of precision, nevertheless under control. The advantage of the MP smearing function comes from vanishing low-order Taylor terms up to and including the third order with respect to the smearing parameter σ , in the expansion of the correction to the free energy due to the smearing. In the Gaussian smearing, the second order does not vanish, while it vanishes for MP and cold smearing. However, as mentioned above, the MP occupation function becomes non-monotonic.

At finite temperatures, a smearing methodology can also help. The so-called “resmearing” scheme has been introduced to obtain physical finite-temperature quantities with decreased numerical effort.^{38,40} The resmeared delta function $\tilde{\delta}_{\text{rsm}}$ is defined as

$$\tilde{\delta}_{\text{rsm}}(y, R) = \int \tilde{\delta}_{\text{FD}}(y - Rz) \tilde{\delta}_2(z) dz, \quad (29)$$

where $R = \frac{\sigma}{kT}$ is the ratio between the smearing parameter and the physical electronic temperature, and δ_2 is

the broadening function (either the Gaussian broadening or the MP broadening in the present work) that is convoluted with the Fermi-Dirac broadening function $\tilde{\delta}_{\text{FD}}$. While the broadening function δ_2 might indeed be such generic function, in the remaining of this work, we will focus on the case $\delta_2 = \delta_{\text{MP}}$.

The actual broadening function corresponding to some physical electronic temperature T , denoted as the “total broadening” in Refs. 38 and 40, is obtained as

$$\tilde{\delta}_{\text{tot}}(\mu - \epsilon, kT, \sigma) = \frac{1}{kT} \tilde{\delta}_{\text{rsm}} \left(\frac{\mu - \epsilon}{kT}, \frac{\sigma}{kT} \right), \quad (30)$$

where the explicit dependence of such function on three arguments having the dimension of an energy has been made clear.


While preparing the present publication, it became clear that the notation in the original reference³⁸, to which one of us contributed, was fuzzy. Also, several typos were present. In order to bypass such problems, the Sec. S1 of the Supporting Information contains a mathematically rigorous rewriting of the key equations found in the original reference.

Depending on the ratio R , the total broadening resembles the original Fermi-Dirac broadening (small R) or the other broadening function $\tilde{\delta}_2$ (large R), although in the latter case, its argument is rescaled by R , and its value is inversely rescaled by R , to keep the integral unity.


For the specific resmearing of the Fermi-Dirac broadening with MP broadening function, the value $R = 2$ is critical, since it is the largest R value for which the total broadening is positive for the entire range of its argument, as will be shown later. For this reason, the resmeared function with $R = 2$ will be illustrated: in the forthcoming figures, results are presented with a smearing parameter σ twice bigger than the energy corresponding to the physical electronic temperature, kT . Note that the authors of Ref. 26 used R of about 2.565 in comparing the FD and Gaussian cases. On the one hand, they were interested to work with the FD and G functions, while we are interested in the FD and MP functions, and, on the other hand, they based their study on another criterion (the similarity between the Gaussian and Fermi-Dirac occupation function). In practice, the resmearing parameter σ is however taken to be a constant, irrespective of the physical electronic temperature.

Fig. 1a presents the different broadening functions mentioned above (with $R = 2$ and $\delta_2 = \delta_{\text{MP}}$ for $\tilde{\delta}_{\text{rsm}}$). All functions, except MP, are positive, going smoothly from 0 to their maximum, then back to 0. Only the MP broadening exhibits negative values for some range of its argument. The asymptotic behavior of $\tilde{\delta}_{\text{rsm}}$ is analyzed in Sec. S1 of the Supporting Information. It is shown there that the exponentially decreasing tail of $\tilde{\delta}_{\text{rsm}}$ changes sign at $R = 2$.


Similarly, Fig. 1b presents the different associated occupation functions, with the characteristic monotonically increasing behavior, except for the MP scheme, and




(a) Comparative representation of the Fermi-Dirac broadening function $\tilde{\delta}_{FD}(x)$ with the rescaled Methfessel-Paxton one $R\tilde{\delta}_{MP}(x/R)$, the rescaled Gaussian one $R\tilde{\delta}_G(x/R)$, and the rescaled smearing one $R\tilde{\delta}_{rsm}(x/R, R)$, with $R=2$, see text.



(b) Comparative representation of various occupation functions $f_{FD}(x)$, $f_{MP}(x/R)$, $f_G(x/R)$, and $f_{rsm}(x/R, R)$, with $R=2$, see text.



(c) Comparative representation of various entropy functions $\tilde{s}_{FD}(x)$, $\tilde{s}_{MP}(x/R)$, $\tilde{s}_G(x/R)$ and $\tilde{s}_{rsm}(x/R, R)$, with $R=2$, see text.



(d) Comparative analysis of various entropy functions $s(f)$ of the occupation f .

FIG. 1: Comparative representation of the broadening function, occupation function, and entropy functions (\tilde{s} and s) in the Fermi-Dirac (FD), Methfessel-Paxton (MP), Gaussian (G) and resmeared cases. The last three are displayed with rescaling factor $R = 2$. Also, $\delta_2 = \delta_{MP}$ for the resmearing case.

Fig. 1c presents the different one-level entropy functions $\tilde{s}(x)$, all positive everywhere except the MP one. In the context of the variational DFT (or DFPT), the shape of the entropy function with the occupation as argument, $s(f)$, is crucial. Indeed, it enters the free energy to be minimized through the $-kTs(f)$ contribution of each one-electron level. Non-convexity of this term might induce non-convexity of the global free energy functional.

The positive monotonic behavior of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}$ is directly linked to the convexity of the $-kTs(f)$ function. Indeed,

using the chain rule followed by Eqs. 21 and 23, one finds

$$\frac{\partial s}{\partial f} = \frac{\partial \tilde{s}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial x}{\partial f} = -x \tilde{\delta}(x) (\tilde{\delta}(x))^{-1} = -x \quad (31)$$

This equation is derived with respect to f , to give

$$\frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial f^2} = -\frac{\partial x}{\partial f} = -\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\right)^{-1} \quad (32)$$

So, if $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \geq 0$ everywhere, then also everywhere

$$\frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial f^2} \leq 0, \quad (33)$$

and $-kTs(f)$ is convex. $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \geq 0$ everywhere is also the criterion to avoid multiple chemical potentials, as described in Ref. 26. This criterion is violated by the MP scheme, but fulfilled in the other schemes.

The $s(f)$ function is represented in Fig. 1d for the different smearing schemes. The MP one is particularly interesting. Its domain of definition extends beyond the 0 to 1 range, and, outside of this range, the function is multivalued, with two branches. This multivalued function has characteristic singularities at the smallest values that it can reach, where two branches merge with common tangent. This happens at the critical rescaled energy x^* at which the broadening MP function vanishes, $x^* = \pm\sqrt{3/2}$. Indeed, at that value, both $f_{\text{MP}}(x)$ and $\tilde{s}_{\text{MP}}(x)$ reach an extremum. Their curvature is identical on the left and right of x^* , which explains the common tangent.

III. SECOND-ORDER FREE ENERGY FOR METALS

A. Variational formulation of DFPT for metals

Ref. 24 describes a general framework for the perturbation theory of variational principles, including the case of

constraints. In Ref. 4, such framework is applied to DFT in case of discretized levels and fixed occupation numbers at zero Kelvin. We follow the variational framework of Ref. 24, including its notations, and generalize Ref. 4 to varying, metallic occupations. The details of the derivation are presented in the Sec. S2 of the Supporting Information.

For the unperturbed wavefunctions and occupation matrix, one works in the diagonal gauge: the starting wavefunctions $|\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle$, belonging to S_{pocc} , fulfill Eq. (15), and the unperturbed occupation numbers are obtained from Eq. (12) - or its equivalent for smearing schemes other than FD. Due to Eq. (15), all off-diagonal elements of the unperturbed density matrix vanish.

The augmented variational second-order free energy, a functional of the first-order wavefunctions and first-order density matrix elements, including Lagrange multipliers terms, is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}
F^{+(2)}[T, \{\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}] &= n_s \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} f_i^{(0)} F_i^{(2)}[\psi_i^{(1)}] + n_s \sum_{ij}^{\text{pocc}} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} F_{ij}^{(1)}[\psi_i^{(1)}] \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \int \int K_{\text{Hxc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \\
&- TS^{(2)}[T; \{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}] - n_s \sum_{ij}^{\text{pocc}} \Lambda_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right) - n_s \mu^{(1)} \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} \rho_{ii}^{(1)}, \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

with the shorthand notations

$$F_i^{(2)}[\psi_i^{(1)}] = \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)} | \psi_i^{(1)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(2)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \left(\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + (\text{c.c.}) \right) \quad (35)$$

and

$$F_{ij}^{(1)}[\psi_i^{(1)}] = \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle. \quad (36)$$

The dependence of this second-order free energy $F^{+(2)}$ on the zero-order quantities $\{|\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle\}$ and $\{f_i^{(0)}\}$ is not mentioned explicitly, for sake of compactness. Similarly, the dependence of the second-order entropy $S^{(2)}$ on $\{f_i^{(0)}\}$ is not mentioned. This choice is made because the unperturbed system is considered known, and one is focusing on the effect of perturbations on the system.

In Sec. VII, we will study the effect of underconverged $\{|\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle\}$.

The temperature is explicitly mentioned as an argument of $F^{+(2)}$ and $S^{(2)}$. They indeed depend on it, directly. Moreover, note that a change of T also affects $|\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle$ and $\{f_i^{(0)}\}$, and thus, indirectly, $F^{+(2)}$ and $S^{(2)}$.

The Hartree and exchange-correlation kernel is defined

as

$$K_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho](\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \frac{\delta^2 E_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho]}{\delta\rho(\mathbf{r})\delta\rho(\mathbf{r}')}. \quad (37)$$

The first-order density is computed from

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) &= n_s \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} f_i^{(0)} \left(\psi_i^{(1)*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \psi_i^{(0)*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \right) \\ &+ n_s \sum_{ij}^{\text{pocc}} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} \psi_i^{(0)*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

As in the case of the unperturbed situation, the minimization of the augmented second-order free energy delivers the optimal electronic second-order free energy

$$F_{\text{el}}^{(2)}[T] = \min_{\{\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}} F^{+(2)}[T; \{\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}]. \quad (39)$$

The Lagrange parameters $\Lambda_{ji}^{(1)}$ and $\mu^{(1)}$ in Eq. (34) must

be tuned, after minimization, so that the constraints

$$\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle = 0, \quad (40)$$

for i and j in S_{pocc} , and

$$\sum_i^{\text{pocc}} \rho_{ii}^{(1)} = 0 \quad (41)$$

are enforced.

The second-order entropy term, evaluated with zero- and first-order elements of the density matrix (no second-order elements, see Ref. 4,24) needs to be worked out carefully. Indeed, although none of the second-order elements of the density matrix should be taken into account (following Ref. 24), the eigenvalues of the density matrix will be modified up to second order from first-order variations of the density matrix, and this will have an effect on the evaluation of the trace present in the second-order entropy term. From Eq. (3),

$$\left(S[\{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}] \right)^{(2)} = n_s \sum_{\gamma} k \left(s(f_{\gamma}) \right)^{(2)} = n_s \sum_{\gamma} k \left(s'(f_{\gamma}^{(0)}) f_{\gamma}^{(2)} + s''(f_{\gamma}^{(0)}) \frac{(f_{\gamma}^{(1)})^2}{2} \right). \quad (42)$$

In the Fermi-Dirac case, the first-order derivative of s with respect to its argument is given by Eq. (11), while the second-order derivative is

$$s''_{\text{FD}}(f) = \frac{d^2 s_{\text{FD}}}{df^2} = -\frac{1}{(1-f)f}, \quad (43)$$

a function that is negative for all values of f between 0 and 1, with negative curvature in this range, and that diverges at both 0 and 1. Taking into account the $-kT$ prefactor of the second-order entropy in the augmented second-order free energy, Eq. (34), the s'' term gives a positive contribution to that second-order free energy. The derivatives of occupation matrix eigenvalues $f_{\gamma}^{(1)}$ and $f_{\gamma}^{(2)}$ are to be computed from $f_i^{(0)}$ and $\rho_{ij}^{(1)}$, excluding any higher-order contribution from the occupation matrix, in line with the general DFPT formalism.^{4,24} The eigenvalues f_{γ} are computed by diagonalizing the ρ matrix, and similarly for their perturbation expansion, expressed in terms of Sternheimer equations of different

orders. The first-order eigenvalues are found easily using the Hellmann-Feynman theorem^{41,42},

$$f_{\gamma}^{(1)} = \rho_{\gamma\gamma}^{(1)}, \quad (44)$$

while the second-order eigenvalues are obtained as

$$f_{\gamma}^{(2)} = \rho_{\gamma\gamma}^{(2)} - \sum_i^{\text{pocc}'} \frac{|\rho_{i\gamma}^{(1)}|^2}{f_i^{(0)} - f_{\gamma}^{(0)}}, \quad (45)$$

where the prime superscript to the summation sign means that the sum over i excludes the vanishing denominator case. The latter equation is valid in the non-degenerate case, but might be generalized to the degenerate case through degenerate perturbation theory. Eq. (45) contains the second-order $\rho_{\gamma\gamma}^{(2)}$ that must be discarded in the context of the computation of Eq. (42) and its contribution to Eq. (34), as mentioned previously. Thus the second-order entropy contribution is

$$-TS^{(2)}[\{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}] = -kTn_s \left[-\sum_{ij}^{\text{pocc}'} s'(f_j^{(0)}) \frac{|\rho_{ij}^{(1)}|^2}{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}} + \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} s''(f_i^{(0)}) \frac{(\rho_{ii}^{(1)})^2}{2} \right], \quad (46)$$

where the prime superscript to the summation sign means that the double sum over i and j excludes the vanishing denominator case. It can be further worked out, using Eq. (10) and (32), eliminating the s function and its derivatives, then using the hermiticity of the $\hat{\rho}^{(1)}$ operator:

$$-TS^{(2)}[\{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}] = -n_s \left[\sum_{ij}^{\text{pocc}'} \frac{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}}{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}} \frac{|\rho_{ij}^{(1)}|^2}{2} + \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \Big|_{x=\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}} \right)^{-1} \frac{(\rho_{ii}^{(1)})^2}{2} \right]. \quad (47)$$

With this explicitation of the second-order entropy, the expression of the second-order variational free energy Eqs. (34)-(36) is complete.

Quadratic terms in $\{\psi_i^{(1)}\}$ appear in Eq. (35) and in the Hxc contribution, third term of Eq. (34). Quadratic terms in $\{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}$ appear in the entropy contribution, Eq. (47), as well as in the Hxc contribution. Also, bilinear terms in $\{\psi_i^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}$ appear in the second term of Eq. (34), and in the Hxc contribution.

The whole expression must be definite positive with respect to changes of $\{\psi_i^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}$ taken in their quadratic/bilinear contribution. For a monotonically decreasing $f(x)$ function, the prefactor of $\rho_{ij}^{(1)}$ or $\rho_{ii}^{(1)}$ in Eq. (46) (or Eq. (47)) is positive, and these contributions are convex. The situation is also clear for the K_H contribution to Eq. (34), but not so for the whole K_{Hxc} . Indeed, while K_H is a positive-definite kernel, the kernel K_{xc} is not (even, K_{xc} is definite-negative in the LDA). In order to finalize the analysis of the extremal character of Eq. (34), we need also to address the term quadratic in $\psi_i^{(1)}$. This will be done when discussing the gauge choices.

B. Minimization of the second-order free energy

The second-order free energy $F^{+(2)}$, Eq. (34), can now be minimized, by computing the gradients with respect to the variables $\{\psi_i^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}$. The need to impose the hermitian character of $\{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}$ might seem to yield some complication. However this can be bypassed by generalizing Eq. (34) to non-hermitian $\{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}$, as it is done in the Supporting Information Sec. S3. The gradients are explicitly written in Supporting Information Sec. S4. At the minimum, the gradients vanish, and one finds the following equations, that are independent of the choice of gauge. Depending on the gauge, such expressions might further simplify. This will be seen in the next Sec. IV.

Imposing zero diagonal occupation gradient delivers

$$\rho_{ii}^{(1)} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}} (\epsilon_i^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}), \quad (48)$$

while for the case of off-diagonal occupation gradients,

one gets

$$\rho_{ij}^{(1)} = \frac{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}}{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}} \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle - (f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}) (\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle - \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle), \quad (49)$$

where

$$\hat{H}^{(1)} = \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} + \int K_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho](\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}'. \quad (50)$$

Imposing zero projected gradient of $F^{+(2)}$ with respect to $\langle \psi_i^{(1)} |$ in the S_{pocc} space gives an expression for the first-order Lagrange multipliers

$$\Lambda_{ki}^{(1)} = f_i^{(0)} [(\epsilon_k^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}) \langle \psi_k^{(0)} | \psi_i^{(1)} \rangle + \langle \psi_k^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle] + \rho_{ki}^{(1)} \epsilon_k^{(0)}. \quad (51)$$

The diagonal elements are

$$\Lambda_{ii}^{(1)} = f_i^{(0)} \epsilon_{ii}^{(1)} + \rho_{ii}^{(1)} \epsilon_i^{(0)}. \quad (52)$$

Imposing zero projected gradient of $F^{+(2)}$ with respect to $\langle \psi_i^{(1)} |$ out of the S_{pocc} space gives the usual Sternheimer equation of DFPT⁴,

$$\hat{P}_\perp (\hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}) \hat{P}_\perp | \psi_i^{(1)} \rangle = -\hat{P}_\perp \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle. \quad (53)$$

This is also directly connected to a key equation in the work of de Gironcoli,³ the projection of his Eq.(11) in the space perpendicular to the active space of unperturbed wavefunctions.

IV. THE DIFFERENT GAUGES

A. The gauge freedom

From the very start, the diagonal gauge has been chosen for the unperturbed wavefunctions and occupations, namely Eq. (15), giving Eq. (19) and

$$\rho_{ij}^{(0)} = \delta_{ij} f_i^{(0)}, \quad (54)$$

$$\hat{H}^{(0)}|\psi_j^{(0)}\rangle = \epsilon_j^{(0)}|\psi_j^{(0)}\rangle, \quad (55)$$

and

$$\Lambda_{kj}^{(0)} = f_j^{(0)}\delta_{kj}\epsilon_j^{(0)}. \quad (56)$$

However, no gauge choice has been made for the first-order quantities, while there is indeed a gauge freedom, originating from the possibilities of a unitary transform in the starting problem. The constraints (to be fulfilled whatever the gauge) are Eqs. (40) and (41). Eq. (40) fixes the symmetric part of the scalar product between the zero-order and first-order wavefunctions. However, the asymmetric part of the scalar product between the zero-order and first-order wavefunctions is not fixed:

$$\langle\psi_i^{(1)}|\psi_j^{(0)}\rangle - \langle\psi_i^{(0)}|\psi_j^{(1)}\rangle = A_{ij} \quad (57)$$

We first examine the consequences of choosing $A_{ij} = 0$, that is called parallel gauge for the first-order wavefunctions, then examine other possibilities. Note

One gets

$$F^{+(2)}[T; \{\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\}; \{\rho_{||,ij}^{(1)}\}] = n_s \sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} [\langle\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}|\hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}|\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\rangle + \langle\psi_i^{(0)}|v_{\text{ext}}^{(2)}|\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle + (\langle\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}|v_{\text{ext}}^{(1)}|\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle + \text{c.c.})] \quad (59)$$

$$+ n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{||,ji}^{(1)} \langle\psi_i^{(0)}|v_{\text{ext}}^{(1)}|\psi_j^{(0)}\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int \int K_{\text{Hxc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \quad (60)$$

$$- \frac{n_s}{2} \sum_{ij}^{pocc'} \frac{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}}{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}} |\rho_{||,ij}^{(1)}|^2 - \frac{n_s}{2} \sum_i^{pocc} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \Big|_{f_i^{(0)}} \cdot (\rho_{||,ii}^{(1)})^2 - n_s \mu^{(1)} \sum_i^{pocc} \rho_{||,ii}^{(1)}. \quad (61)$$

The analysis of the extremal character of $F^{+(2)}$, started at the end of Sec. III A, can be pursued. Indeed, the term quadratic in $\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}$ in Eq. (59),

$$\langle\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}|\hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}|\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\rangle, \quad (62)$$

is obviously convex, since $\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}$ can be decomposed in the basis of eigenvectors of $\hat{H}^{(0)}$, and has only components with eigenenergies $\epsilon_j^{(0)}$ higher (or equal) to $\epsilon_i^{(0)}$ (see details in Sec. S7 of the Supporting Information).

The combination of K_{Hxc} with the positive-definiteness of Eq. (62), and the ones of Eq. (60) and Eq. (61) (discussed at the end of Sec. III A) allows one to better understand the $F^{(2)}$ extremal character. In any case, this property is also linked to the extremal character of the unperturbed F .

Let us now examine the equations at the minimum, in the parallel gauge. Some of them do not change: Eq. (48) is unchanged and $\rho^{(1)}$ is still obtained from Eq. (38).

that $\hat{H}^{(1)}$, $\rho^{(1)}$ and $F^{(2)}$ must be invariant under such choice. Sec. S5 of the Supporting Information shows how the first-order wavefunctions and occupation matrix elements change concurrently.

B. The parallel gauge

First-order wavefunctions in the parallel gauge are noted $|\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\rangle$, and similarly for the first-order density matrix elements. One imposes

$$\langle\psi_i^{(0)}|\psi_{||,j}^{(1)}\rangle = 0 \quad (58)$$

when i and $j \in S_{pocc}$. The second-order free energy $F^{+(2)}$, Eqs. (34)-(36), simplifies: the two last contributions to Eq. (36) vanish, as well as the fifth term of Eq. (34).

The off-diagonal first-order density matrix gradients, see Eq. (49), are simplified and deliver at the minimum :

$$\rho_{||,ij}^{(1)} = \frac{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}}{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}} \langle\psi_i^{(0)}|\hat{H}^{(1)}|\psi_j^{(0)}\rangle. \quad (63)$$

The projected gradient of 1st order wavefunctions in the S_{pocc} space, Eq. (51), becomes

$$\Lambda_{ki}^{(1)} = f_i^{(0)} \langle\psi_k^{(0)}|\hat{H}^{(1)}|\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle + \rho_{||,ki}^{(1)} \epsilon_k^{(0)}. \quad (64)$$

C. The diagonal gauge

Is it possible to choose a gauge where all the matrix elements $\rho_{ij}^{(1)}$ vanish ? Indeed, this would bring back the formalism for metals to the one found for gapped systems, without modification of the occupations.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to adjust the diagonal values of $\rho^{(1)}$ thanks to a choice of gauge. Indeed, whatever the gauge,

$$\rho_{ii}^{(1)} = \rho_{||,ii}^{(1)} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \bigg|_{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}} (\epsilon_i^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}). \quad (65)$$

If some states are partially occupied, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon}$ does not vanish, and thus also $\rho_{ii}^{(1)}$ does not vanish (except possibly due to symmetry reasons). By contrast, for the non-diagonal elements, it is possible to impose

$$0 = \rho_{||,ji}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} A_{ji} (f_j^{(0)} - f_i^{(0)}). \quad (66)$$

This choice will be called the diagonal gauge. The relation between the diagonal and parallel gauge wavefunctions is

$$|\psi_{di}^{(1)}\rangle = |\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\rangle - \sum_j \frac{\langle \psi_j^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle}{\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}} |\psi_j^{(0)}\rangle. \quad (67)$$

Then, $|\psi_{di}^{(1)}\rangle$ fulfills

$$\hat{P}_{\perp,i} (\hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}) \hat{P}_{\perp,i} |\psi_{di}^{(1)}\rangle = -\hat{P}_{\perp,i} \hat{H}^{(1)} |\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle, \quad (68)$$

that is, the Sternheimer equation, in the diagonal gauge. The notation $\hat{P}_{\perp,i}$ is for the projector on the space perpendicular to the unperturbed state i . Also,

$$\langle \psi_{di}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_{dj}^{(1)} \rangle = 0. \quad (69)$$

The second-order free energy can be computed in the diagonal gauge, and simplifies due to the constraint Eq. (69). Eqs. (34)-(36) become

$$\begin{aligned} F^{+(2)}[T, \{\psi_{di}^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{dii}^{(1)}\}] = & n_s \sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} \left[\langle \psi_{di}^{(1)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)} | \psi_{di}^{(1)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(2)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \left(\langle \psi_{di}^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \text{c.c.} \right) \right] \\ & + n_s \sum_i^{pocc} \rho_{dii}^{(1)} \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \int \int K_{\text{Hxc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}', \\ & - \frac{n_s}{2} \sum_i^{pocc} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \bigg|_{f_i^{(0)}} (\rho_{dii}^{(1)})^2 - n_s \mu^{(1)} \sum_i^{pocc} \rho_{dii}^{(1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = & n_s \left[\sum_i^{pocc} \rho_{dii}^{(1)} \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \right. \\ & \left. + f_i^{(0)} (\psi_{di}^{*(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{di}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Note the presence of only the diagonal elements of $\rho^{(1)}$ in both Eqs. (70) and (71).

D. Complete suppression of first-order occupation matrix elements

The diagonal gauge is numerically inconvenient, because of the presence of the denominator $\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}$ in Eq. (67), so that the corresponding term can become very large for small differences, while the contribution of pairs ij and ji will nearly cancel each other in Eq. (69)

and in Eqs. (71). Also, one would prefer to use the same formula (hence the same coding) to build $\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})$ as in the case of insulator, with the only modification being the presence of occupation numbers:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = & n_s \sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} \\ & \left(\psi_{\text{mod},i}^{*(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{\text{mod},i}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

This can be achieved as follows. Instead of Eq. (67) one defines

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{\text{mod},i}^{(1)}\rangle = & |\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\rangle + \sum_j^{pocc} \Theta(f_i^{(0)}, f_j^{(0)}) \\ & \frac{f_j^{(0)} - f_i^{(0)}}{f_i^{(0)}} \frac{\langle \psi_j^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle}{\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}} |\psi_j^{(0)}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where $\Theta(f_i^{(0)}, f_j^{(0)})$, to be defined later, is such that

$$\Theta(f_i^{(0)}, f_j^{(0)}) + \Theta(f_j^{(0)}, f_i^{(0)}) = 1 \quad (74)$$

$$\Theta(f_i^{(0)} = 0, f_j^{(0)}) = 0 \quad (75)$$

This allows one to avoid the divergence in Eq. (73). Note that when $f_i^{(0)} = f_j^{(0)}$,

$$\Theta(f_i^{(0)}, f_j^{(0)}) = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (76)$$

Also, in Eq. (73), one has to understand that

$$\frac{f_j^{(0)} - f_i^{(0)}}{\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}} = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon_i^{(0)}} \quad (77)$$

when $\epsilon_j^{(0)} = \epsilon_i^{(0)}$.

In principle, the occupation numbers are positive, but this is broken in case of advanced smearing schemes. So, the function Θ should be defined also outside of the $0 \leq f^{(0)} \leq 1$ range.

In the Supporting Information, Sec. S6, it is checked that the condition expressed by Eq. (74) insures that the computation of Eq. (72) delivers the correct $\rho^{(1)}$, equal to the one obtained in the parallel gauge. Similarly, one can show that the terms linear in $\psi_i^{(1)}$ and $\rho_{ji}^{(1)}$ in Eq. (59) are equivalent in the parallel gauge or with the modified wavefunctions. By contrast, for the evaluation of $F^{+(2)}$, the terms quadratic in $\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}$ in Eq. (59) are not left invariant. Instead of correcting them, it is better to stick with the formula for $F^{+(2)}$ in the parallel gauge.

In ABINIT, the following Θ function is implemented :

$$\Theta(f_i, f_j) = H(|f_i| - |f_j|), \quad (78)$$

where $H(x)$ is the Heaviside step function, with value 1/2 at $x = 0$:

$$H(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x > 0 \\ 1/2 & x = 0 \\ 0 & x < 0 \end{cases} \quad (79)$$

The advantage of this formulation, beyond satisfying Eq. (74) and Eq. (75) trivially, comes from the fact that the sum \sum_j^{pocc} in Eq. (73) includes only the wavefunctions $|\psi_j^{(0)}\rangle$ with absolute occupation lower than the one of $|\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle$, that translates usually (when $f(\epsilon)$ is a monotonically decreasing function of ϵ , bounded by 0 and 1) into energy $\epsilon_j^{(0)}$ higher than $\epsilon_i^{(0)}$. This yields some CPU time saving, about a factor of two in that operation, instead of doing the sum \sum_j^{pocc} on all states.

In practice, the parallel gauge first-order wavefunctions $|\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\rangle$ are computed, at fixed $\hat{H}^{(1)}$, and then $|\psi_{\text{mod},i}^{(1)}\rangle$ is computed, that allows afterwards to compute $\rho^{(1)}$. The computation of the second-order free energy can be done using the parallel gauge formula Eqs. (59)-(61), that is variational.

V. PERIODIC SYSTEMS

Although the occupation numbers and the density matrix have been explicitly treated, the DFT and DFPT formulas presented until now are valid for the case of finite systems, with a set of discretized levels where occupation number varies with temperature according to the Fermi-Dirac statistics. Systems are now treated with lattice periodicity, hence corresponding to the case of extended metals. The above theory is adapted to such case, with treatment of Brillouin Zone integral, and the appearance of a continuous band structure as a function of the wavevector. Notations are obvious adaptations to the metallic case of those from Ref. 5, Appendix A. One focuses first on DFT then on DFPT.

A. DFT for metallic periodic systems

The DFT electronic free energy per unit cell writes

$$F[T; \{u_{n\mathbf{k}}\}, \{\rho_{nm\mathbf{k}}\}] = \frac{n_s \Omega_0}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\text{BZ}} \sum_{nm} \rho_{nm\mathbf{k}} \langle u_{m\mathbf{k}} | \hat{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}} | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle d\mathbf{k} + E_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho] - TS[\{\rho_{nm\mathbf{k}}\}]. \quad (80)$$

This is a generalization of Eq. (1) to periodic solids. The matrix element of the kinetic operator and external potential operator is evaluated over the primitive cell with

volume Ω_0 . The Hartree and exchange-correlation energy $E_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho]$ is also evaluated for one primitive cell. Similarly for the entropy. The u are periodic parts of Bloch wave-

functions. The wavevector \mathbf{k} integral is performed over the Brillouin Zone, with volume $\frac{(2\pi)^3}{\Omega_0}$. n and m are band indices. The expression of the electronic density is

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{n_s}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\text{BZ}} \sum_{nm} \rho_{nm\mathbf{k}} u_{m\mathbf{k}}^*(\mathbf{r}) u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{k}. \quad (81)$$

In Eq. (80) and (81), the wavefunctions are normalized as follows

$$\langle u_{m\mathbf{k}} | u_{n\mathbf{k}} \rangle = \frac{1}{\Omega_0} \int_{\Omega_0} u_{m\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})^* u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} = \delta_{mn}. \quad (82)$$

The Hamiltonian and occupation matrix can be simultaneously diagonalized, as in the discrete situation, with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}} |u_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle &= (\hat{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}} + \hat{v}_{\text{Hxc},\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}}[\rho]) |u_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle \\ &= \epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}} |u_{n\mathbf{k}}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Minimization of the free energy yields the same relationship between eigenenergy and occupation number than in the discrete case, Eq. (12).

In this diagonal gauge, the Brillouin Zone integral entering the electronic density can be transformed to an energy integral, as follows. The energy-resolved electronic density is defined as

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}, \epsilon) = \frac{n_s}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\text{BZ}} \sum_n \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}}) u_{n\mathbf{k}}^*(\mathbf{r}) u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{k}, \quad (84)$$

such that

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f((\mu - \epsilon)/kT) \rho(\mathbf{r}, \epsilon) d\epsilon. \quad (85)$$

B. DFPT for metallic periodic systems

DFPT for periodic systems allows one to treat perturbations that are characterized by a wavevector \mathbf{q} : like Bloch wavefunctions, they have a periodic part, and a phase. In Sec. IV of Ref. 5, the strategy to deal with such generic perturbations is explained, and involves factorizing the phase in all DFPT equations. We keep the same notations as in this reference, and proceed with the systematic generalization of the quantities developed in the DFPT for varying occupations, as obtained in the previous sections, for the parallel gauge case. The generalization to other gauges proceeds in a similar way.

Starting with first-order quantities, one finds that Eq. (58) becomes

$$\langle u_{m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)} | u_{||,n\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}}^{(1)} \rangle = 0 \quad [m, n \in S_{pocc}], \quad (86)$$

that is similar to Eq. (43) of Ref. 5. For Eq. (63), one defines

$$\epsilon_{m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},n\mathbf{k}}^{(1)} = \langle u_{m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)} | \hat{H}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{(1)} | u_{n\mathbf{k}}^{(0)} \rangle, \quad (87)$$

then

$$\rho_{||,m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},n\mathbf{k}}^{(1)} = \frac{f_{m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)} - f_{n\mathbf{k}}^{(0)}}{\epsilon_{m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)} - \epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}}^{(0)}} \epsilon_{m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},n\mathbf{k}}^{(1)}. \quad (88)$$

Eq. (38) becomes (see Eq. (44) of Ref. 5):

$$\bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\text{BZ}} n_s \left[\sum_{nm}^{pocc} \rho_{||,m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},n\mathbf{k}}^{(1)} \cdot u_{n\mathbf{k}}^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) u_{m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + 2 \sum_m^{pocc} f_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(0)} u_{m\mathbf{k}}^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) u_{m\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \right] d\mathbf{k} \quad (89)$$

where $\bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})$ is the periodic part of the first-order density change. The Sternheimer equation in the periodic case, coming from Eq. (53) is

$$\hat{P}_{\perp\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} (\hat{H}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)} - \epsilon_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(0)}) \hat{P}_{\perp\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} |u_{||,m\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}}^{(1)}\rangle = -\hat{P}_{\perp\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} \hat{H}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{(1)} |u_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(0)}\rangle, \quad (90)$$

where

$$\hat{H}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{(1)} = \hat{v}_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{(1)} + \int K_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho](\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') e^{-i\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')} d\mathbf{r}'. \quad (91)$$

Eqs. (90) and (91), respectively, can be compared with Eqs. (45) and (46) of Ref. 5, respectively. The two Sternheimer equations are identical, while the definition of $\hat{H}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{(1)}$ is similar, although in Ref. 5 an additional term

is also coming from a possible dependence of the Hartree and exchange-correlation potential on the perturbation, neglected in the present account for sake of simplicity, but implemented in ABINIT.

Let us now examine the second-order free energy $F^{+(2)}$. For a non-periodic perturbation, *i.e.* $\mathbf{q} \neq 0$, all diagonal elements of $\epsilon^{(1)}$ or $\rho_{||}^{(1)}$ vanish. For such case,

Eq.(61) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{el,-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q}}^{+(2)}[T, \{u_{||}^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{||}^{(1)}\}] &= \frac{\Omega_0}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\text{BZ}} n_s \left[\sum_m^{pocc} f_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(0)} F_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(2)}[u_{||}^{(1)}] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{mn}^{pocc} \left(\rho_{||,n\mathbf{k},m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(1)} \langle u_{m,\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{(1)} | u_{n\mathbf{k}}^{(0)} \rangle + (\text{c.c.}) \right) \right] d\mathbf{k} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_0} \int K_{\text{Hxc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{q}}^{*(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \bar{\rho}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') e^{-i\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')} d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \\
&- \frac{n_s}{2} \frac{\Omega_0}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\text{BZ}} \sum_{mn}^{pocc} \frac{\epsilon_{m,\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)} - \epsilon_{n\mathbf{k}}^{(0)}}{f_{m,\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)} - f_{n\mathbf{k}}^{(0)}} |\rho_{||,m\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},n\mathbf{k}}^{(1)}|^2 d\mathbf{k}, \tag{92}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(2)}[u_{||}^{(1)}] = \langle u_{||,m\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}}^{(1)} | \hat{H}_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{(0)} - \epsilon_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(0)} | u_{||,m\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}}^{(1)} \rangle + \langle u_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}}^{(2)} | u_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(0)} \rangle + \left(\langle u_{||,m\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}}^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}}^{(1)} | u_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(0)} \rangle + (\text{c.c.}) \right). \tag{93}$$

Eqs. (92) and (93) can be compared with Eq. (42) of Ref. 5. In the latter, three additional terms also come from a possible dependence of the Hartree and exchange-correlation potential on the perturbation, also not included in the present account, like in the equation for the first-order Hamiltonian. Also, the dependence of $F_{el,-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q}}^{+(2)}$ on \mathbf{q} is not mentioned in the present Eq. (92), for sake of simplicity. By the same token, the \mathbf{q} dependence is also not indicated for the second-order $F_{m\mathbf{k}}^{(2)}$. By contrast, $\hat{v}_{\text{ext},\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}}^{(2)}$ has no \mathbf{q} dependence, see the Eq. (49) of Ref. 5.

The commensurate perturbation case, that is, either $\mathbf{q} = 0$, or \mathbf{q} is a vector of the reciprocal lattice, is quite similar to the case of finite systems, so the explicit formula is obvious and will not be written down here.

VI. APPLICATIONS

As mentioned in the introduction, there have been many different applications of the formalism presented in the previous sections. However, in such studies, usually, results have been presented with little or no emphasis on understanding and characterizing the convergence characteristics with respect to the temperature (or with respect to the smearing energy) jointly with the sampling of the Brillouin Zone. Interestingly, the target precision of the calculation, or its purpose, is seen to play an important role for the definition of the convergence regime.


In the following, the phonon frequencies of copper, at the X point in the Brillouin Zone, for both transverse and longitudinal modes are taken as examples. The PBE (Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof) exchange-correlation functional is used, with the optimized norm-conserving vanderbilt pseudopotential⁴³ from the

Pseudo-Dojo⁴⁴, and an energy cutoff of 46.0 Ha. Bulk copper metal is FCC, with optimized lattice parameter 3.63 Å for the conventional cell edge. Calculations have been done with ABINIT v9.8.3.


Computing the phonon frequencies is often done with a target of 1 cm⁻¹. This will be our reference target indeed for this property. Such precision is not difficult to reach, and corresponds to a range of parameters that might be called “medium precision”. However, one might also be interested in the examination of the specific change of phonon frequencies as a function of electronic temperature. The changes are much smaller, and it is much more demanding to obtain reliably such temperature dependence. This regime is called “high precision”.

In Fig. 2, the phonon frequencies are presented, as a function of the discreteness of the grid used to sample the Brillouin Zone. One targets the estimation of the phonon frequencies at zero Kelvin. The Fermi-Dirac broadening is used here only for the purpose of alleviating some of the numerical burden.

The precision obtained for the longitudinal and the transverse frequencies, for the same parameters of the computation is quite different. With the coarse $4 \times 4 \times 4$ mesh at the lowest temperature (50 K), the longitudinal frequency (lower panel) is not so bad, and already close to the target precision of 1 cm⁻¹. At variance, for such coarse grid, the transverse frequency is hardly significant. Moreover, the computation of the low-temperature phonon frequencies actually does not need a low temperature: indeed, for the larger grid used in Fig. 2, $26 \times 26 \times 26$, it is seen that the effect of the temperature is very small: going from 50 K to 2000 K modifies the phonon frequencies by much less than 1 cm⁻¹ for such grid. Hence, the large smearing temperature of 2000 K can be used for the coarser grids, the low-temperature phonon frequency is obtained well within the target pre-



(a) Transverse phonon frequencies




(b) Longitudinal phonon frequencies

FIG. 2: Phonon frequencies as a function of the wavevector mesh (linear discretization factor), using the Fermi-Dirac statistics, across a range of physical electronic temperatures (50 K - 2000 K). The inset provides a closer view of the 160-172 cm^{-1} range.


cision of 1 cm^{-1}

Being more quantitative, with a small broadening temperature of 50 K, one needs a $16 \times 16 \times 16$ wavevector grid to reach the target precision for the transverse mode frequency (see the inset), while for a broadening temperature of 2000 K, the same precision is obtained with a $8 \times 8 \times 8$ wavevector grid. This amounts to a large saving of computational resources. Computing time and memory (or disk space) scale indeed linearly with the number of wavevectors in the Brillouin Zone. Hence the speed-up obtained by using the coarser grid instead of the fine grid is about order of magnitude.

Fig. 3 presents results obtained with the resmearing scheme (Fermi-Dirac statistics and Methfessel-Paxton smearing) where the MP smearing parameters corresponds to a temperature of 3000 K. One sees that irrespective of the physical electronic temperature value, the phonon frequencies are converged within the target value for a $8 \times 8 \times 8$ wavevector grid.



(a) Transverse phonon frequencies




(b) Longitudinal phonon frequencies


FIG. 3: Phonon frequencies as a function of the wavevector mesh (linear discretization factor) obtained with the resmearing scheme (broadening value 3000 K), across physical electronic temperatures from 50 K to 2000 K.

Let us now turn to the “high-precision regime”, for which the target is to obtain the change of phonon frequencies as a function of the physical electronic temperature. Using $4 \times 4 \times 4$ wavevector grid, $8 \times 8 \times 8$ wavevector grid or $16 \times 16 \times 16$ wavevector grids does not yield meaningful temperature dependence of these phonon frequencies. Such a temperature dependence can be obtained with much finer grids, $30 \times 30 \times 30$ or even $42 \times 42 \times 42$ (for the latter, see the Supporting Information Sec. S8).

Fig. 4 presents the phonon frequencies as a function of the physical temperature, for different values of the MP broadening parameter, again for the transverse as well as longitudinal phonon modes. The scale of this figure is quite different than the one of the previous figures. Indeed, the change of phonon frequencies from a low temperature to the highest temperature (2000 K) is on the order of 0.5 cm^{-1} for the frequency of the transverse mode and even smaller for the frequency of the



(a) Transverse phonon frequencies



(b) Longitudinal phonon frequencies

FIG. 4: Phonon frequencies obtained from various MP broadening values (0 - 5000 K), as a function of physical electronic temperatures (50 K - 2000 K), obtained with a $30 \times 30 \times 30$ wavevector grid.

longitudinal mode, as seen previously. Thus, the target precision must be much smaller as well. Having in mind the description of the global behavior, one sees that for MP broadening smaller than 3000-4000 K, at small physical electronic temperature, there are considerable deviations from the expected parabolic behavior, for this very fine $30 \times 30 \times 30$ wavevector grid. In the Sec. S8 of the Supporting Information an even finer $42 \times 42 \times 42$ grid is used. However, without MP broadening, the behavior

is not guaranteed to be even qualitatively correct. We have not pushed beyond such $42 \times 42 \times 42$ grid.

VII. UNDERCONVERGED GROUND-STATE WAVEFUNCTIONS

Until now, all the formulas in DFPT assume that the unperturbed wavefunctions $\psi_i^{(0)}$ are “perfect” solutions to the unperturbed Schrödinger equation. In practice, while the occupied ones are usually excellent indeed, the unoccupied ones can be loosely converged, since they do not contribute to the ground-state unperturbed total energy or to the density. Actually, they might be more difficult to converge than the lower lying ones, especially if there is a degeneracy between the highest state in the partially occupied space and the lowest state outside of it.

However, in DFPT, slightly incorrect $\psi_i^{(0)}$ in the partly occupied space (or even $\psi_i^{(0)}$ associated with vanishing occupations) will induce proportional errors in $F^{(2)}$. This can be seen and quantified, as shown hereafter, analytically in a simple model, as well as numerically.

Let us first examine a three-state model, in the non-interacting case. The three exact eigenstates are denoted $|\psi_1^{(0)}\rangle$, $|\psi_2^{(0)}\rangle$ and $|\psi_3^{(0)}\rangle$ with exact eigenvalues $\epsilon_1^{(0)}$, $\epsilon_2^{(0)}$ and $\epsilon_3^{(0)}$.

The first state occupation number is $1 - \delta f$ where δf is not very large, still finite, while the second state occupation number is δf , and the third state is unoccupied. This is the S_{pocc} space of the problem.

The ground-state total energy of this independent-particle system, taking into account the spin degeneracy, as done in the previous sections, is

$$E^{(0)} = n_s [(1 - \delta f)\epsilon_1^{(0)} + \delta f\epsilon_2^{(0)}]. \quad (94)$$

The perturbation couples the different states, with matrix elements denoted

$$H_{ij} = \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle. \quad (95)$$

The computation of $E^{(2)}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} E^{(2)} &= \frac{n_s}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}}{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}} |\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle|^2 \\ &= n_s \left[\frac{2\delta f - 1}{\epsilon_2^{(0)} - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} |H_{12}|^2 - \frac{1 - \delta f}{\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} |H_{13}|^2 - \frac{\delta f}{\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_2^{(0)}} |H_{23}|^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

with the hypothesis that the occupation numbers are

frozen (this hypothesis might be removed, and does not

affect the final proportionality relation).

Now let us suppose that the ground-state Schrödinger equation has not been solved exactly, but approximately, so that there is a small contamination of the second eigenvector $|\psi_2^{(0)}\rangle$ by the third eigenvector $|\psi_3^{(0)}\rangle$ and vice-versa. The “contaminated” quantities are denoted with a tilde. This contamination is determined by the admixture angle α , that should be small:

$$|\tilde{\psi}_2^{(0)}\rangle = \cos \alpha |\psi_2^{(0)}\rangle + \sin \alpha |\psi_3^{(0)}\rangle. \quad (97)$$

Similarly the third eigenvector is contaminated by $|\psi_2^{(0)}\rangle$, and both contaminated vectors are kept orthogonal:

$$|\tilde{\psi}_3^{(0)}\rangle = -\sin \alpha |\psi_2^{(0)}\rangle + \cos \alpha |\psi_3^{(0)}\rangle. \quad (98)$$

The error in the second eigenvector is quantified in term of its “residual” $|R_2\rangle$ defined as

$$|R_2\rangle = (\hat{H}^{(0)} - \tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)})|\tilde{\psi}_2^{(0)}\rangle, \quad (99)$$

where

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)} = \langle \tilde{\psi}_2^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} | \tilde{\psi}_2^{(0)} \rangle. \quad (100)$$

The norm of the residual vector (or its square) of an approximate eigenvector is a common measure of the convergence of a solution of the Schrödinger equation.

After some intermediate calculation (see the Sec. S9 of the Supporting Information), the squared norm R^2 of the residual of the second eigenvector is obtained :

$$R_2^2 = \langle R_2 | R_2 \rangle = \cos^2 \alpha \sin^2 \alpha \cdot (\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_2^{(0)})^2. \quad (101)$$

It is proportional to $\sin^2 \alpha$, hence the square of the admixture angle when the latter is small.

Then, the “contaminated”, approximate, second-order derivative of the energy is computed, starting from

$$\tilde{E}^{(2)} = \frac{n_s}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}}{\tilde{\epsilon}_i^{(0)} - \tilde{\epsilon}_j^{(0)}} |\langle \tilde{\psi}_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \tilde{\psi}_j^{(0)} \rangle|^2. \quad (102)$$

For the three-state model, $\tilde{\epsilon}_1^{(0)} = \epsilon_1^{(0)}$ (no contamination), $\tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)}$ is given by Eq. (100) and a similar formula holds for $\tilde{\epsilon}_3^{(0)}$. This expression is worked out, see Sec. S9 of the Supporting Information, and a Taylor expansion of $\tilde{E}^{(2)}$ in term of the small admixture angle is performed, where quadratic contributions are discarded (e.g. $\cos^2 \alpha \simeq 1$).

After such computation, the difference between the approximate $\tilde{E}^{(2)}$ and $E^{(2)}$ is found

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}^{(2)} - E^{(2)} &\cong n_s \cdot 2 \sin \alpha \cdot \Re e(H_{12}^* H_{13}) \\ &\left[\frac{-1 + 2\delta f}{\epsilon_2^{(0)} - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} + \frac{1 - \delta f}{\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} \right] + O(\sin^2 \alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Thus, the error $\tilde{E}^{(2)} - E^{(2)}$ is proportional to the admixture angle, not to its square. This is at variance with the error of $E^{(2)}$ with respect to an error in $\psi^{(1)}$, since $E^{(2)}$ is variational with respect to $\psi^{(1)}$. It emphasizes that the determination of eigenvectors in the potentially occupied space must be rather accurate in order for $E^{(2)}$ to be accurate. Ignoring prefactors, improving R^2 by about 10^{-6} brings only 10^{-3} decrease of the difference $\tilde{E}^{(2)} - E^{(2)}$.

Also, Eq. (103) reveals that, in this three-band model, an error is present even if $\delta f = 0$, provided $\epsilon_2^{(0)} \neq \epsilon_3^{(0)}$. For the more general many-band case, there will always be unoccupied states with different energies, so that the outcome of this analysis is that, whatever occupation, metallic or insulating materials, if some states in the space of explicitly treated, unperturbed, wavefunctions are approximate, there will be non-negligible errors. Finally, the $\Re(H_{12}^* H_{13})$ factors indicates that an interference effect between the transition from state 1 to state 2 and the transition from state 1 to state 3 is at the origin of the dominant error.

In order to substantiate these statements, numerical tests have been made, in which the convergence of the explicitly treated highest-lying states was not perfect, and the second-order derivative of the total energy error was monitored.




FIG. 5: Relationship between the resulting errors in the second-order derivative of the free energy and the square of the wavefunction residual. The scatter plot illustrates the observed errors, while the solid line corresponds to a square root behavior.

As for the previous section, calculations were done for phonon frequencies in copper. The planewave kinetic energy cutoff was 50 Ha and a $12 \times 12 \times 12$ wavevector grid was used for the Brillouin Zone sampling. Phonon calculations were done on a $6 \times 6 \times 6$ phonon wavevector sampling grid, such as to accumulate statistics. In the ground-state calculations, the number of explicitly treated bands was varied between 10 and 22. A stringent convergence criterion was set for the potential residual at

10^{-20} , ensuring precise results for the potential and density. Still, the higher-lying bands, that do not contribute to the density, were not fully converged. We systematically varied the number of line steps for the conjugate gradient minimization in the Sternheimer equation from 4 to 18 and monitored the maximum of the square of the wavefunction residuals. Fig. 5 collects the resulting errors in the second-order derivative of the free energy for a whole set of elements of the dynamical matrices, as a function of the maximum squared wavefunction residual. The global trend is in line with the expectations, namely, the maximum absolute error is roughly proportional to square root of the the maximum squared wavefunction residual (or equivalently proportional to the wavefunction residual). When the maximum squared residual is lower than about 10^{-13} , the maximum absolute error saturates at about 10^{-8} Ha. Without having pursued further this matter, it seems plausible that sources of errors independent of the wavefunction residual exist at that numerical level, and start to dominate.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In the present work, a variational formulation of density-functional perturbation theory for metals has been described, covering in detail : the consequences of the presence of an entropy contribution; different smearing schemes, including a resmearing scheme to deal with finite temperatures; the treatment of the space of potentially occupied wavefunctions; the different possible gauges, their advantages and drawbacks; specificities of the treatment of periodic systems. In line with the well-established generic theorems in DFPT, the second-order derivative of the free energy is formulated as a varia-

tional functional of trial first-order wavefunctions and trial first-order density matrix. A contribution from the second-order entropy is present in the second-order free energy. The changes of the occupation numbers are explicitly taken into account.

Concerning applications, this formalism has been available for some time in ABINIT, and has already yielded many publications. Nevertheless, two advanced application-related topics have been covered. For the first topic, the study of the convergence of phonon frequencies with respect to wavevector sampling, two regimes, “medium precision” and “high precision”, naturally emerge, corresponding to whether the phonon frequencies as such are the target property, or whether their temperature dependence is the target property. The second topic relates to the impact of the preliminary unperturbed calculation on the subsequent DFPT calculation if the unoccupied wavefunctions have not been sufficiently accurately computed.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique (FRS-FNRS Belgium) through the PdR Grant No. T.0103.19 – ALPS. It is an outcome of the Shapeable 2D magnetoelectronics by design project (SHAPEme, EOS Project No. 560400077525) that has received funding from the FWO and FRS-FNRS under the Belgian Excellence of Science (EOS) program. Ch.T. acknowledges support from the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence scheme (262695), through the FRIPRO grant ReMRChem (324590), and from NOTUR – The Norwegian Metacenter for Computational Science through grant of computer time (nn14654k).

-
- * Electronic address: xavier.gonze@uclouvain.be, christiantantardini@gmail.com
- ¹ S. Baroni, P. Giannozzi, and A. Testa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1861 (1987).
 - ² X. Gonze, D. C. Allan, and M. P. Teter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 3603 (1992).
 - ³ S. de Gironcoli, *Phys. Rev. B* **51**, 6773 (1995).
 - ⁴ X. Gonze, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 1096 (1995).
 - ⁵ X. Gonze, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 10337 (1997).
 - ⁶ X. Gonze and C. Lee, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 10355 (1997).
 - ⁷ S. Baroni, S. de Gironcoli, A. Dal Corso, and P. Giannozzi, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 515 (2001).
 - ⁸ X. Gonze, G. M. Rignanese, and R. Caracas, *Zeit. Kristall.* **220**, 458 (2005).
 - ⁹ X. Wu, D. Vanderbilt, and D. R. Hamann, *Phys. Rev. B* **72**, 035105 (2005).
 - ¹⁰ F. Ricci, S. Prokhorenko, M. Torrent, M. J. Verstraete, and E. Bousquet, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 184404 (2019).
 - ¹¹ G. Petretto, S. Dwaraknath, H. P. Miranda, D. Winston, M. Giantomassi, M. J. van Setten, X. Gonze, K. A. Persson, G. Hautier, and G.-M. Rignanese, *Scientific Data* **5**, 180065 (2018).
 - ¹² 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, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 064305 (2014).
 - ¹³ P. Ghosez, J. P. Michenaud, and X. Gonze, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 6224 (1998).
 - ¹⁴ A. Fleszar and X. Gonze, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 2961 (1990).
 - ¹⁵ G. M. Rignanese, J. P. Michenaud, and X. Gonze, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 4488 (1996).
 - ¹⁶ M. Veithen, X. Gonze, and P. Ghosez, *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 125107:1 (2005).
 - ¹⁷ M. Veithen, X. Gonze, and P. Ghosez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 187401:1 (2004).
 - ¹⁸ F. Giustino, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 015003 (2017).
 - ¹⁹ A. Miglio, V. Brousseau-Couture, E. Godbout, G. Antonius, Y.-H. Chan, S. G. Louie, M. Côté, M. Giantomassi, and X. Gonze, *npj Computational Materials* **6**, 167 (2020).
 - ²⁰ X. Gonze and J. P. Vigneron, *Phys. Rev. B* **39**, 13120 (1989).
 - ²¹ A. Debernardi, *Solid State Comm.* **113**, 1 (2000).
 - ²² M. Royo and M. Stengel, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 021050 (2019).

- ²³ C. Lee and X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 8610 (1995).
- ²⁴ X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 1086 (1995).
- ²⁵ M. Methfessel and A. T. Paxton, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 3616 (1989).
- ²⁶ F. J. dos Santos and N. Marzari, Phys. Rev. B **107**, 195122 (2023).
- ²⁷ X. Gonze, J. M. Beuken, R. Caracas, F. Detraux, M. Fuchs, G. M. Rignanese, L. Sindic, M. Verstraete, G. Zerah, F. Jollet, M. Torrent, A. Roy, M. Mikami, P. Ghosez, J. Y. Raty, and D. C. Allan, Comput. Mat. Science **25**, 478 (2002).
- ²⁸ X. Gonze, B. Amadon, G. Antonius, F. Arnardi, L. Baguet, J.-M. Beuken, J. Bieder, F. Bottin, J. Bouchet, E. Bousquet, N. Brouwer, F. Bruneval, G. Brunin, T. Cavignac, J.-B. Charraud, W. Chen, M. Côté, S. Cottenier, J. Denier, G. Geneste, P. Ghosez, M. Giantomassi, Y. Gillet, O. Gingras, D. R. Hamann, G. Hautier, X. He, N. Helbig, N. Holzwarth, Y. Jia, F. Jollet, W. Lafargue-Dit-Hauret, K. Lejaeghere, M. A. L. Marques, A. Martin, C. Martins, H. P. C. Miranda, F. Naccarato, K. Persson, G. Petretto, V. Planes, Y. Pouillon, S. Prokhorenko, F. Ricci, G.-M. Rignanese, A. H. Romero, M. M. Schmitt, M. Torrent, M. J. van Setten, B. Van Troeye, M. J. Verstraete, G. Zerah, and J. W. Zwanziger, Computer Phys. Comm. **248**, 107042 (2020).
- ²⁹ A. H. Romero, D. C. Allan, B. Amadon, G. Antonius, T. Applencourt, L. Baguet, J. Bieder, F. Bottin, J. Bouchet, E. Bousquet, F. Bruneval, G. Brunin, D. Caliste, M. Côté, J. Denier, C. Dreyer, P. Ghosez, M. Giantomassi, Y. Gillet, O. Gingras, D. R. Hamann, G. Hautier, F. Jollet, G. Jomard, A. Martin, H. P. C. Miranda, F. Naccarato, G. Petretto, N. A. Pike, V. Planes, S. Prokhorenko, T. Rangel, F. Ricci, G.-M. Rignanese, M. Royo, M. Stengel, M. Torrent, M. J. van Setten, B. V. Troeye, M. J. Verstraete, J. Wiktor, J. W. Zwanziger, and X. Gonze, J. Chem. Phys. **152**, 124102 (2020).
- ³⁰ M. J. Verstraete, M. Torrent, F. Jollet, G. Zerah, and X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 045119:1 (2008).
- ³¹ L. E. Díaz-Sánchez, A. H. Romero, M. Cardona, R. K. Kremer, and X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 165504:1 (2007).
- ³² L. E. Díaz-Sánchez, A. H. Romero, and X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 104302:1 (2007).
- ³³ M. J. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 035501 (2010).
- ³⁴ B. Xu and M. J. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 196603 (2014).
- ³⁵ B. Xu and M. J. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. B **87** (2013).
- ³⁶ E. Cancès, M. F. Herbst, G. Kemlin, A. Levitt, and B. Stamm, Lett. in Math. Phys. **113**, 21 (2023).
- ³⁷ N. Marzari, D. Vanderbilt, and M. C. Payne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1337 (1997).
- ³⁸ M. Verstraete and X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 035111 (2001).
- ³⁹ N. Marzari, D. Vanderbilt, A. D. Vita, and M. C. Payne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3296 (1999).
- ⁴⁰ M. Verstraete and X. Gonze, Comput. Mat. Science **30**, 27 (2004).
- ⁴¹ H. Hellmann, *Einführung in die Quantenchemie* (Deuticke, Leipzig, 1937).
- ⁴² R. P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **56**, 340 (1939).
- ⁴³ D. R. Hamann, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 085117 (2013).
- ⁴⁴ M. van Setten, M. Giantomassi, E. Bousquet, M. Verstraete, D. Hamann, X. Gonze, and G.-M. Rignanese, Computer Phys. Comm. **226**, 39 (2018).

Supplemental Material
of
Variational Density Functional Perturbation Theory for Metals

Xavier Gonze*,¹ Samare Rostami,¹ and Christian Tantardini*^{2,3}

¹*European Theoretical Spectroscopy Facility, Institute of Condensed Matter and Nanosciences,
Université catholique de Louvain, Chemin des étoiles 8,
bte L07.03.01, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium*

²*Hylleraas center, Department of Chemistry, UiT The Arctic University of Norway,
PO Box 6050 Langnes, N-9037 Tromsø, Norway.*

³*Department of Materials Science and Nanoengineering, Rice University, Houston, Texas 77005, USA.**
(Dated: February 16, 2024)

S1. SMEARING SCHEME FOR FINITE-TEMPERATURE ELECTRONIC-STRUCTURE CALCULATIONS

A couple of equations in Ref. ? (denoted V01 in what follows, for convenience) appear to be incorrect, or to rely on fuzzy (ambiguous) notations. This section fixes such problem, and makes sure that the results presented in the main text are in line with those of Ref. ? . Also, additional comments are made. In this section S1 of the supplementary information, in order to ease the comparison with V01, we stick to V01 notations in the few cases where they differ from those used in the body of the present paper, and also the Boltzmann constant k is set to 1, like in V01 (to recover the equations in the body of the paper, simply replace T by kT). In particular, the “distribution function” δ considered here is not a function of the occupation numbers, but is a function of the energy (or the rescaled energy). This function is denoted $\tilde{\delta}$ in the main part of this paper.

Such “ δ ” function is supposed to be normalized with respect to its argument. Checking that this is indeed the case brings us straight to the ambiguity of notation in V01. $\delta_1(x)$ is indeed normalized, in Eq. (4) of V01 as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta_1(x) dx = 1. \quad (\text{S1})$$

This is also true of $\tilde{\delta}_T(\epsilon)$ in Eq. (3) of V01 from

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{\delta}_T(\epsilon) d\epsilon = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta_1\left(\frac{\epsilon}{T}\right) \frac{d\epsilon}{T} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta_1(x) dx = 1. \quad (\text{S2})$$

However this is not clear to be valid for the non-numbered original equations at the end of page 035111-2⁷ . Indeed, the strict interpretation of these equations, that corresponds to the following “original” function

$$\delta_{\text{tot}}^{\text{ori}}\left(x, \frac{\sigma}{T}\right) = \frac{1}{T} \int \delta_2(z) \delta_1\left(x - \frac{\sigma}{T}z\right) dz, \quad (\text{S3})$$

is not normalized:

$$\int \delta_{\text{tot}}^{\text{ori}}\left(x, \frac{\sigma}{T}\right) dx = \frac{1}{T} \int \delta_2(z) \left[\int \delta_1\left(x - \frac{\sigma}{T}z\right) dx \right] dz = \frac{1}{T}.$$

For such $\delta_{\text{tot}}^{\text{ori}}$ the usual normalization is obtained by considering it as a function of ϵ with $x(\epsilon) = \frac{\mu - \epsilon}{kT}$, and not as a function of x .

$$\int \delta_{\text{tot}}^{\text{ori}}\left(x(\epsilon), \frac{\sigma}{T}\right) d\epsilon = 1. \quad (\text{S4})$$

However, this is only loosely implied by the notation

$$\delta_{\text{tot}}\left(x = \frac{\mu - \epsilon}{kT}, \dots\right) \quad (\text{S5})$$

used in V01.

Having identified the ambiguity, the present supplementary information provide rigorous mathematical formulas for the resmearing scheme presented in V01. The numerical results of V01 are not modified.

So, more rigorously, one defines

$$\delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma) = \int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(x - z) dz, \quad (\text{S6})$$

where

$$\tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) = \frac{1}{T} \delta_1\left(\frac{z}{T}\right), \quad (\text{S7})$$

$$\tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(z) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \delta_2\left(\frac{z}{\sigma}\right). \quad (\text{S8})$$

In these formulas, the z variable has the dimension of an energy (or a temperature, as $k=1$ in this SI). The arguments of δ_1 and δ_2 are adimensional, while the argument of the $\tilde{\delta}$ functions are energies. Likewise, all the arguments of δ_{tot} , including x , have the dimension of an energy. Note that these conventions, coherent with V01, are not the same as in the main text.

$\delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma)$ is correctly normalized,

$$\int \delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma) dx = \int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) \left[\int \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(x - z) \right] dz = \int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) dz = 1. \quad (\text{S9})$$

By the variable change $z' = x - z$ one obtains the symmetric formula

$$\delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma) = \int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(x - z') \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(z') dz'. \quad (\text{S10})$$

In terms of δ_1 and δ_2 ,

$$\delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma) = \frac{1}{T\sigma} \int \delta_1\left(\frac{z}{T}\right) \delta_2\left(\frac{x - z}{\sigma}\right) dz = \frac{1}{T\sigma} \int \delta_1\left(\frac{x - z'}{T}\right) \delta_2\left(\frac{z'}{\sigma}\right) dz'. \quad (\text{S11})$$

From Eq. (S11), a change of variable $w = z'/\sigma$ (w is adimensional) brings

$$\delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma) = \frac{1}{T} \int \delta_1\left(\frac{x}{T} - \frac{\sigma}{T}w\right) \delta_2(w) dw. \quad (\text{S12})$$

Now one sets $x = Tv$ (v is adimensional) and exchanges the two delta functions,

$$\delta_{\text{tot}}(Tv, T, \sigma) = \frac{1}{T} \int \delta_2(w) \delta_1\left(v - \frac{\sigma}{T}w\right) dw. \quad (\text{S13})$$

The right-hand side is the right-hand side of Eq. (S3), with z replaced by w , while the argument of δ_{tot} is actually Tv . This gives another correct mathematical formula that might have been used in V01.

The definition in Eq.(S6), or equivalently Eqs. (S10) or (S11), allows one to recover Eq. (7) of V01. Indeed, one defines

$$\tilde{n}(\epsilon) = \int n(\epsilon_2) \delta_{\text{tot}}(\epsilon - \epsilon_2, T, \sigma) d\epsilon_2, \quad (\text{S14})$$

(in this equation, we use the notations of Ref. ? , namely \tilde{n} and n , instead of n and n_0 of V01), that is, \tilde{n} is n smeared with δ_{tot} . Using Eq. (S11), it follows

$$\tilde{n}(\epsilon) = \int n(\epsilon_2) \left[\frac{1}{T\sigma} \int \delta_1 \left(\frac{\epsilon - \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3}{T} \right) \delta_2 \left(\frac{\epsilon_3}{\sigma} \right) d\epsilon_3 \right] d\epsilon_2, \quad (\text{S15})$$

that is indeed Eq. (7) of V01, except for the typo present in Eq. (7) of V01, the argument of δ_2 being typed $\frac{\epsilon_2}{\sigma}$ instead of the above correct $\frac{\epsilon_3}{\sigma}$.

Now one focuses on occupation functions, also presented in connection to those in V01, but here with mathematical rigor. Following the usual definition,

$$f_{\text{tot}}(y, T, \sigma) = \int_{-\infty}^y \delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma) dx \quad (\text{S16})$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^y \left[\int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(x - z) dz \right] dx = \int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) f_{\sigma 2}(y - z) dz = \int \frac{1}{T} \delta_1 \left(\frac{z}{T} \right) f_{\sigma 2}(y - z) dz, \quad (\text{S17})$$

with the definition

$$f_{\sigma 2}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(x') dx' = \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{-\infty}^x \delta_2 \left(\frac{x'}{\sigma} \right) dx'. \quad (\text{S18})$$

Also, following the usual definition,

$$f_2(u) = \int_{-\infty}^u \delta_2(w) dw, \quad (\text{S19})$$

one gets

$$f_{\sigma 2}(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{-\infty}^x \delta_2 \left(\frac{x'}{\sigma} \right) dx' = \int_{-\infty}^{x/\sigma} \delta_2(w) dw = f_2 \left(\frac{x}{\sigma} \right). \quad (\text{S20})$$

Thus

$$f_{\text{tot}}(y, T, \sigma) = \int \frac{1}{T} \delta_1 \left(\frac{z}{T} \right) f_2 \left(\frac{y - z}{\sigma} \right) dz. \quad (\text{S21})$$

After rescaling with $w = z/T$,

$$f_{\text{tot}}(y, T, \sigma) = \int \delta_1(w) f_2 \left(\frac{y}{\sigma} - \frac{T}{\sigma} w \right) dw. \quad (\text{S22})$$

Thus, the two non-numbered equations, present after Eq.(8) of V01, should be written

$$f_{\text{tot}}(Tu, T, \sigma) = \int \delta_2(w) f_1 \left(u - \frac{\sigma}{T} w \right) dw, \quad (\text{S23})$$

and

$$f_{\text{tot}}(\sigma u, T, \sigma) = \int \delta_1(w) f_2 \left(u - \frac{T}{\sigma} w \right) dw. \quad (\text{S24})$$

Let us now turn to the formulas for the entropy, formulated rigorously mathematically. Following the usual definition,

$$s_{\text{tot}}(y, T, \sigma) = - \int_{-\infty}^y x \delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma) dx \quad (\text{S25})$$

$$= - \int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) \int_{-\infty}^y x \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(x-z) dx dz = - \int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) \int_{-\infty}^{(y-z)} (x'+z) \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(x') dx' dz \quad (\text{S26})$$

$$= \int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) s_{\sigma 2}(y-z) dz - \int \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) \cdot z f_{\sigma 2}(y-z) dz, \quad (\text{S27})$$

with the definition

$$s_{\sigma 2}(x) = - \int_{-\infty}^x x' \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(x') dx' = - \frac{1}{\sigma} \int_{-\infty}^x x' \delta_2\left(\frac{x'}{\sigma}\right) dx'. \quad (\text{S28})$$

Let us define

$$s_2(x) = - \int_{-\infty}^x w \delta_2(w) dw, \quad (\text{S29})$$

where w is adimensional.

Hence,

$$s_{\sigma 2}(x) = -\sigma \int_{-\infty}^{x/\sigma} w \delta_2(w) dw = \sigma \cdot s_2\left(\frac{x}{\sigma}\right). \quad (\text{S30})$$

After further manipulations of the second term in the total entropy, Eq. (S27), that involve using Eq. (S7) and expressing differently the obtained two-dimensional domain, Eq. (S25) becomes

$$s_{\text{tot}}(y, T, \sigma) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{\delta}_{T1}(z) s_{\sigma 2}(y-z) dz + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}(z) s_{T1}(y-z) dz, \quad (\text{S31})$$

that is, the convolution of $s_{\sigma 2}$ by $\tilde{\delta}_{T1}$ plus the convolution of s_{T1} by $\tilde{\delta}_{\sigma 2}$, as announced in V01 paper, now with the appropriate smearing functions. Equivalently,

$$s_{\text{tot}}(y, T, \sigma) = T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sigma} \delta_2\left(\frac{z}{\sigma}\right) s_1\left(\frac{y-z}{T}\right) dz + \sigma \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{T} \delta_1\left(\frac{z}{T}\right) s_2\left(\frac{y-z}{\sigma}\right) dz, \quad (\text{S32})$$

a formulation that is closer to the equations in V01.

Finally, in the resmearing scheme, the free energy becomes

$$\tilde{E}_{free} = \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} \epsilon \tilde{n}(\epsilon) d\epsilon \quad (\text{S33})$$

$$= \int \epsilon_2 n(\epsilon_2) f_{\text{tot}}(\mu - \epsilon_2, T, \sigma) d\epsilon_2 - T \int n(\epsilon_2) \left[\int \frac{1}{\sigma} \delta_2\left(\frac{z}{\sigma}\right) s_1\left(\frac{\mu - \epsilon_2 - z}{T}\right) dz \right] d\epsilon_2 - \sigma \int n(\epsilon_2) \left[\int \frac{1}{T} \delta_1\left(\frac{z}{T}\right) s_2\left(\frac{\mu - \epsilon_2 - z}{\sigma}\right) dz \right] d\epsilon_2, \quad (\text{S34})$$

that is in line with Eq. (8) of V01, except that $f_{\text{tot}}\left(\epsilon_2, \frac{\sigma}{T}\right)$ in Eq. (8) of V01 should be replaced by

$$f_{\text{tot}}\left(x = \frac{\mu - \epsilon_2}{T}, \frac{\sigma}{T}\right) \text{ in the fuzzy notations of V01.}$$

Thus, the equations of V01 can be fixed, albeit by a meticulous approach, and notwithstanding some typos (in addition to thos already signaled, note sign errors in Eqs. (5) and (6), and a typo in Eq. (8)).

δ_{tot} can be rewritten, in order to examine how the original Fermi-Dirac $\delta_{\text{FD}} = \delta_1$ with fixed T is broadened by δ_2 , where the ratio $R = \frac{\sigma}{T}$ appears explicitly.

One starts from Eq. (S11):

$$\delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma) = \frac{1}{T\sigma} \int \delta_1\left(\frac{x-z'}{T}\right) \delta_2\left(\frac{z'}{\sigma}\right) dz' = \frac{1}{T} \int \delta_1\left(\frac{x}{T} - \frac{\sigma}{T}w\right) \cdot \delta_2(w) dw. \quad (\text{S35})$$

Then, the ‘‘resmeared’’ delta function δ_{rsm} is defined, as

$$\delta_{\text{rsm}}(u, R) = \int \delta_1(u - Rw) \delta_2(w) dw, \quad (\text{S36})$$

where all arguments are adimensional, and in term of which

$$\delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma) = \frac{1}{T} \delta_{\text{rsm}}\left(\frac{x}{T}, \frac{\sigma}{T}\right). \quad (\text{S37})$$

So, for fixed T , the ratio $R = \frac{\sigma}{T}$ can be scanned, and the behavior of $\delta_{\text{tot}}(x, T, \sigma)$ can be plotted for different smearings σ .

Let us now examine the asymptotic behavior of δ_{rsm} , for different values of R . It will be shown that, at the leading order, this function has an exponentially decreasing tail, with either positive or negative coefficient, depending on the value of R , and changing sign at $R = 2$. So, at $R = 2$, this leading asymptotic order vanishes, and numerical evidence shows that the function is positive everywhere, see Fig. 1 in the main text.

The analysis starts by expanding $\delta_1(x)$ in a serie for $x \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\delta_1(x \rightarrow +\infty) = \frac{e^{-x}}{(1 + e^{-x})^2} \quad (\text{S38})$$

$$\simeq e^{-x}(1 - 2e^{-x} + 3e^{-2x} - 4e^{-3x} \dots) = e^{-x} - 2e^{-2x} + 3e^{-3x} - 4e^{-4x} + \dots = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n e^{-nx}. \quad (\text{S39})$$

The series expansion converges for $|e^{-x}| < 1$. At the lowest order,

$$\delta_1(x) \simeq e^{-x} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2x}). \quad (\text{S40})$$

Focusing on this first term,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{rsm}}(y, R) &\cong \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(\frac{3}{2} - z^2\right) e^{-z^2} e^{-(y-Rz)} dz + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2(y-Rz)}) \\ &\cong \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-y} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial R^2}\right) e^{-z^2 + Rz} dz \\ &\cong \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-y} \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial R^2}\right) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{(-z^2 + Rx - \frac{R^2}{4})} e^{\frac{R^2}{4}} dz \\ &\cong e^{-y} \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial R^2}\right) e^{\frac{R^2}{4}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-(z - \frac{R}{2})^2} dz \\ &\cong e^{-y} \left(\frac{3}{2} e^{\frac{R^2}{4}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial R} \left(\frac{2R}{4} e^{\frac{R^2}{4}}\right)\right) \\ &\cong e^{-y} \left(\frac{3}{2} e^{\frac{R^2}{4}} - \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{R^2}{4}} - \left(\frac{R}{2}\right)^2 e^{\frac{R^2}{4}}\right) \\ &\cong e^{-y} \left(1 - \left(\frac{R}{2}\right)^2\right) e^{\frac{R^2}{4}} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2(y-Rz)}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S41})$$

As expected, for $R = 2$, the leading contribution vanishes. For R smaller than 2 the function is asymptotically exponentially decreasing, with a positive prefactor, while for R larger than 2, it is also exponentially decreasing, but with a negative prefactor.

S2. DERIVATION OF THE EXPRESSION FOR THE SECOND-ORDER FREE ENERGY

In this section, the details of the derivation of the variational expression for the second-order free energy, Eq. (34) in the main text, are explained. One starts from

$$F^{+(2)} = \min_{\{\psi_i^{(1)}, \rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}} F^{+(2)}[T, \{\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}], \quad (\text{S42})$$

where $F^{+(2)}$ is obtained from Eq. (20) in the main text by the application of the methodology explained in Ref. ? ,

$$F^{+(2)}[T, \{\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}] = \left(F^+[T, \{\psi_i^{(0)} + \lambda\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ij}^{(0)} + \lambda\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}] \right)^{(2)}. \quad (\text{S43})$$

The zeroth order quantities have been obtained previously in the diagonal gauge, self-consistently, see Sec. II in the main text.

The five terms of Eq. (20) in the main text are treated in turn,

$$F^{+(2)} = F_1^{+(2)} + F_2^{+(2)} + F_3^{+(2)} + F_4^{+(2)} + F_5^{+(2)}. \quad (\text{S44})$$

Contribution 1
 $n_s \sum_{ij} \rho_{ij} h_{ij}$ becomes

$$F_1^{+(2)} = n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} (\rho_{ij}^{(0)} + \lambda\rho_{ij}^{(1)}) \langle \psi_i^{(0)} + \lambda\psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{K} + \lambda\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(0)} + \lambda\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} + \lambda^2\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(2)} | \psi_j^{(0)} + \lambda\psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \quad (\text{S45})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= n_s \sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{K} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(0)} | \psi_i^{(1)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(2)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + (\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \text{c.c.}) \right) \\ &+ n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{K} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{K} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S46})$$

Contribution 2
 $E_{\text{Hxc}}[\rho]$ becomes

$$F_2^{+(2)} = \left(E_{\text{Hxc}}[\{\psi_i^{(0)} + \lambda\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ji}^{(0)} + \lambda\rho_{ji}^{(1)}\}] \right)^{(2)} \quad (\text{S47})$$

$$= E_{\text{Hxc}} \left[\rho^{(0)} + \lambda\rho^{(1)} + \lambda^2 \left(n_s \left\{ \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{ji}^{(0)} \psi_i^{*(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) + \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\psi_i^{(0)*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) + \psi_i^{(1)*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \right) \right\} \right) \right]^{(2)} \quad (\text{S48})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{2} \int \int K_{\text{Hxc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \\ &+ \int V_{\text{Hxc}}^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \left\{ \sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} \psi_i^{(1)*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') + \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\psi_i^{(0)*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') + \psi_i^{(1)*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}') \right) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S49})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{2} \int \int K_{\text{Hxc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \\ &+ n_s \sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{Hxc}}^{(0)} | \psi_i^{(1)} \rangle + n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{Hxc}}^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{Hxc}}^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S50})$$

where $\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})$ is obtained from Eq.(38) in the main text.

Contribution 3

This contribution comes from the term $-TS[\{\rho_{ij}\}]$. One needs to understand the second-order expansion of the entropy. One starts from

$$S[\hat{\rho}] = n_s \sum_{\gamma}^{pocc} k s(f_{\gamma}^{(0)} + \Delta f_{\gamma}), \quad (\text{S51})$$

where

$$\Delta f_{\gamma} = \lambda f_{\gamma}^{(1)} + \lambda^2 f_{\gamma}^{(2)} + \dots \quad (\text{S52})$$

A Taylor series is used,

$$S[\hat{\rho}] = n_s \sum_{\gamma}^{pocc} k \left(s(f_{\gamma}^{(0)}) + s'(f_{\gamma}^{(0)}) \Delta f_{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} s''(f_{\gamma}^{(0)}) (\Delta f_{\gamma})^2 + \dots \right), \quad (\text{S53})$$

from which

$$S^{(2)}[\hat{\rho}^{(0)} + \lambda \hat{\rho}^{(1)}] = n_s \sum_{\gamma}^{pocc} k \left(s'(f_{\gamma}^{(0)}) \cdot f_{\gamma}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} s''(f_{\gamma}^{(0)}) \cdot (f_{\gamma}^{(1)})^2 \right), \quad (\text{S54})$$

where, in the last equation, no contribution from $\hat{\rho}^{(2)}$ is included. Using Eq. (10) in the main text, one obtains

$$F_3^{+(2)} = -TS^{(2)}[\hat{\rho}^{(0)} + \lambda \hat{\rho}^{(1)}] = -n_s \sum_{\gamma}^{pocc} \left((\epsilon_{\gamma}^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}) \cdot f_{\gamma}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \Big|_{f_{\gamma}^{(0)}} \cdot (f_{\gamma}^{(1)})^2 \right), \quad (\text{S55})$$

where also $s''(f_{\gamma}^{(0)}) = \frac{1}{kT} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \Big|_{f_{\gamma}^{(0)}}$, see Eq.(32) in the main text, has been used.

Now, one has to compute $f_{\gamma}^{(1)}$ and $f_{\gamma}^{(2)}$. Standard perturbation theory treatment of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the (hermitian) one-particle density matrix $\hat{\rho}$, at first order, delivers

$$f_{\gamma}^{(1)} = \rho_{\gamma\gamma}^{(1)}, \quad (\text{S56})$$

that is, the Hellmann-Feynman theorem. For the second-order $f_{\gamma}^{(2)}$, one finds

$$f_{\gamma}^{(2)} = \rho_{\gamma\gamma}^{(2)} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i(\neq\gamma)}^{pocc} \frac{|\rho_{i\gamma}^{(1)}|^2}{f_i^{(0)} - f_{\gamma}^{(0)}}, \quad (\text{S57})$$

where $\rho_{\gamma\gamma}^{(2)}$ has to be set to zero, see Eq. (S54) and the comment afterwards. Then, Eq. (S55) becomes

$$F_3^{+(2)} = n_s \sum_{\gamma}^{pocc} \left[(\epsilon_{\gamma}^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}) \sum_{i(\neq\gamma)}^{pocc} \frac{|\rho_{i\gamma}^{(1)}|^2}{f_i^{(0)} - f_{\gamma}^{(0)}} - \frac{1}{2} (f_{\gamma}^{(1)})^2 \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \Big|_{f_{\gamma}^{(0)}} \right]. \quad (\text{S58})$$

This contribution can be reformulated switching γ and i for half the contribution, and also using the hermiticity of $\rho^{(1)}$ to obtain

$$F_3^{+(2)} = -\frac{n_s}{2} \sum_{\gamma}^{pocc} \left[\sum_{i(\neq\gamma)}^{pocc} \frac{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_{\gamma}^{(0)}}{f_i^{(0)} - f_{\gamma}^{(0)}} |\rho_{i\gamma}^{(1)}|^2 + (f_{\gamma}^{(1)})^2 \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \Big|_{f_{\gamma}^{(0)}} \right]. \quad (\text{S59})$$

Note that if $f(\epsilon)$ is monotonically decreasing as a function of ϵ , the term between parentheses is negative, as well as the derivative $\frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f}$, hence this contribution $F_3^{+(2)}$ is definite positive. This is not the case for advanced smearing schemes.

Contribution 4

$-n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \Lambda_{ji} \left(\langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle - \delta_{ij} \right)$ becomes

$$F_4^{+(2)} = -n_s \left[\sum_{ij}^{pocc} \Lambda_{ji}^{(2)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle - \delta_{ij} \right) + \Lambda_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right) + \Lambda_{ji}^{(0)} \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right]. \quad (\text{S60})$$

The expansion of the constraints (for $i, j \in S_{pocc}$) $\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle - \delta_{ij} = 0$, at first order, delivers the first-order constraints shown in Eq. (40) in the main text. This can be used to obtain

$$F_4^{+(2)} = -n_s \left[\sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} \epsilon_i^{(0)} \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(1)} \rangle + \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \Lambda_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right) \right]. \quad (\text{S61})$$

Contribution 5

$-\mu \left(n_s \sum_i^{pocc} \rho_{ii} - N \right)$ becomes

$$F_5^{+(2)} = -\mu^{(2)} \left(n_s \sum_i^{pocc} \rho_{ii}^{(0)} - N \right) - \mu^{(1)} n_s \sum_i^{pocc} \rho_{ii}^{(1)} = -\mu^{(1)} n_s \sum_i^{pocc} \rho_{ii}^{(1)}, \quad (\text{S62})$$

with the first-order constraint

$$\sum_i^{pocc} \rho_{ii}^{(1)} = 0. \quad (\text{S63})$$

Thus, gathering the terms, and with several rearrangements, one finds the expressions in Sec. III A.

There might be a slight rewriting of such expressions. For example, the contribution Eq. (36) in the main text coming from $\rho_{ij}^{(1)}[\psi_i^{(1)}]$ might be modified, thanks to

$$\begin{aligned} & n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \epsilon_j^{(0)} \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \epsilon_i^{(0)} \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right) \\ &= n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \left(\frac{\epsilon_j^{(0)} + \epsilon_i^{(0)}}{2} + \frac{\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}}{2} \right) \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \left(\frac{\epsilon_j^{(0)} + \epsilon_i^{(0)}}{2} - \frac{\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}}{2} \right) \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right) \\ &= n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + (\epsilon_j^{(0)} + \epsilon_i^{(0)}) \Re \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + (\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}) \Im \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S64})$$

S3. NON-HERMITICITY FREEDOM FOR THE FIRST-ORDER OFF-DIAGONAL OCCUPATION MATRIX ELEMENTS

Until now, one has supposed that the $\rho^{(1)}$ matrix is hermitian. However, this condition can be relaxed at this stage. Indeed, let us start from an unrestricted $\tilde{\rho}^{(1)}$ matrix. One can generate a hermitian matrix f from

$$f^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{f}^{(1)} + \tilde{f}^{+(1)} \right). \quad (\text{S65})$$

The first-order density Eq. (38) in the main text becomes

$$\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = n_s \left[\sum_{ij}^{pocc} \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)} + \tilde{\rho}_{ji}^{*(1)} \right) \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} \left(\psi_i^{*(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \right) \right] \quad (\text{S66})$$

The contribution of $\rho_{ij}^{(1)}[\psi_i^{(1)}]$ to Eq. (34) in the main text becomes

$$n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)} + \tilde{\rho}_{ji}^{*(1)} \right) \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | v_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | H^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | H^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right) \quad (\text{S67})$$

The contribution to Eq. (S59) that is quadratic in $\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)}$ becomes

$$-\frac{n_s}{2} \sum_i^{pocc} \sum_{j(\neq i)}^{pocc} \frac{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}}{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)} + \tilde{\rho}_{ji}^{*(1)}}{2} \frac{\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)} + \tilde{\rho}_{ji}^{*(1)}}{2} \quad (\text{S68})$$

In this way, $\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{ji}^{(1)}$ can be varied independently of each other. Note that some terms in Eq. (34) in the main text, like the last one, involve only diagonal elements of ρ , that must be real. Full freedom of $\tilde{\rho}$, implies the possibility to have complex diagonal elements, that will nevertheless induce real diagonal elements of ρ through Eq. (S65).

S4. GRADIENTS OF THE SECOND-ORDER FREE ENERGY

The expression to be minimized is $F^{+(2)}[T, \{\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}]$, Eq.(34) from Sec. III A. In the current section, the gradients of $F^{+(2)}[T, \{\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}]$ with respect to its arguments are listed, taking into account the freedom discussed in the previous section. The equalities obtained at the minimum, i.e., when the gradient vanishes, are also deduced, as listed in Sec. III B.

Let us start with the gradients with respect to occupation matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial(\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)*})} &= \frac{n_s}{2} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int \int K_{\text{Hxc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot n_s \psi_i^{(0)*}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \\ &- (1 - \delta_{ij}) \frac{n_s}{2} \frac{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}}{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}} \frac{\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)} + \tilde{\rho}_{ji}^{(1)}}{2} - \delta_{ij} \frac{1}{2} n_s \rho_{ii}^{(1)} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \Big|_{f_i^{(0)}} - \frac{1}{2} n_s \mu^{(1)} \delta_{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S69})$$

Also,

$$\frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial(\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)*})} = \frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial(\tilde{\rho}_{ji}^{(1)})}. \quad (\text{S70})$$

When considering only the gradients with respect to diagonal occupations, Eq. (S69) simplifies to

$$\frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial(\tilde{\rho}_{ii}^{(1)*})} = \frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial(\tilde{\rho}_{ii}^{(1)})} = \frac{n_s}{2} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} | \psi_i^{(1)} \rangle - \rho_{ii}^{(1)} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \Big|_{f_i^{(0)}} - \mu^{(1)} \right). \quad (\text{S71})$$

Imposing now the constraint Eq. (40) in the main text on the diagonal occupation gradient, these gradients become

$$\frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial(\tilde{\rho}_{ii}^{(1)*})} = \frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial(\tilde{\rho}_{ii}^{(1)})} = \frac{n_s}{2} \left(\epsilon_i^{(1)} - \rho_{ii}^{(1)} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \Big|_{f_i^{(0)}} - \mu^{(1)} \right), \quad (\text{S72})$$

with

$$\epsilon_i^{(1)} = \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle. \quad (\text{S73})$$

At the minimum of the variational expression, the gradient vanishes, and so one obtains

$$\rho_{ii}^{(1)} = \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}} (\epsilon_i^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)}). \quad (\text{S74})$$

The $\mu^{(1)}$ can be determined from the condition Eq. (S63):

$$\mu^{(1)} = \left(\sum_i \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}} \epsilon_i^{(1)} \right) / \left(\sum_i \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right|_{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}} \right). \quad (\text{S75})$$

Considering now the off-diagonal occupation gradients (with $i \neq j$), Eq. (S69) simplifies to

$$\frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial (\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)*})} = \frac{n_s}{2} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \epsilon_j^{(0)} \langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \epsilon_i^{(0)} \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle - \frac{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}}{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}} \rho_{ij}^{(1)} \right). \quad (\text{S76})$$

Imposing the constraint Eq. (40) in the main text on the non-diagonal occupation gradient gives

$$\frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial (\tilde{\rho}_{ij}^{(1)*})} = \frac{n_s}{2} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle + \frac{\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}}{2} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle - \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right) - \frac{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}}{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}} \rho_{ij}^{(1)} \right). \quad (\text{S77})$$

At the minimum, the gradient vanishes, and

$$\rho_{ij}^{(1)} = (f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}) \left(\frac{\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle}{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}} - \left(\langle \psi_i^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle - \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(1)} \rangle \right) \right). \quad (\text{S78})$$

Note that Eq. (S78) shows that $\rho_{ij}^{(1)}$ is hermitian.

Let us focus now on the gradients with respect to the 1st-order wavefunction $\langle \psi_i^{(1)} |$,

$$\frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial \langle \psi_i^{(1)} |} = n_s f_i^{(0)} \left[(\hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}) | \psi_i^{(1)} \rangle + \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle \right] + n_s \sum_j^{pocc} \rho_{ji}^{(1)} \epsilon_j^{(0)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle - n_s \sum_j^{pocc} \Lambda_{ji}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle. \quad (\text{S79})$$

At the minimum, the projected gradient on $\langle \psi_k^{(0)} |$ in the S_{pocc} space must vanish:

$$0 = \left\langle \psi_k^{(0)} \left| \frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial \langle \psi_i^{(1)} |} \right. \right\rangle = n_s f_i^{(0)} \left[(\epsilon_k^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}) \langle \psi_k^{(0)} | \psi_i^{(1)} \rangle + \langle \psi_k^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle \right] + n_s f_{ki}^{(1)} \epsilon_k^{(0)} - n_s \Lambda_{ki}^{(1)}. \quad (\text{S80})$$

For the diagonal case, $i=k$, one gets

$$0 = n_s \left(f_i^{(0)} \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \rho_{ii}^{(1)} \epsilon_i^{(0)} - \Lambda_{ii}^{(1)} \right). \quad (\text{S81})$$

This is indeed the derivative of the relation Eq. (19) in the main text. Also, the projection out of the potentially occupied space is relevant:

$$\hat{P}_\perp \left| \frac{\partial F^{+(2)}}{\partial \langle \psi^{(1)} |} \right\rangle = n_s f_i^{(0)} \left[\hat{P}_\perp (\hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}) \hat{P}_\perp |\psi_i^{(1)}\rangle + \hat{P}_\perp \hat{H}^{(1)} |\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle \right]. \quad (\text{S82})$$

At the minimum one recovers the usual projected Sternheimer equation,

$$\hat{P}_\perp (\hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}) \hat{P}_\perp |\psi_i^{(1)}\rangle = -\hat{P}_\perp \hat{H}^{(1)} |\psi_i^{(0)}\rangle. \quad (\text{S83})$$

S5. COVARIANCE OF FIRST-ORDER QUANTITIES

The parallel gauge choice, $A_{ij} = 0$, delivers the equations mentioned in Sec. IV B. Other choices are possible, and the present section has the goal to analyze the covariance of $\rho^{(1)}$ and $|\psi_i^{(1)}\rangle$. When A_{ij} does not vanish, one can compare the first-order wavefunctions $|\psi_i^{(1)}\rangle$ with the parallel gauge ones $|\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\rangle$. They differ only by their content of unperturbed eigenfunctions in the partially occupied space:

$$|\psi_i^{(1)}\rangle = |\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\rangle + \sum_k^{pocc} c_{ik}^{(1)} |\psi_k^{(0)}\rangle. \quad (\text{S84})$$

One can check that

$$c_{ij}^{*(1)} + c_{ji}^{(1)} = 0, \quad (\text{S85})$$

and

$$c_{ij}^{*(1)} - c_{ji}^{(1)} = A_{ij}. \quad (\text{S86})$$

Also

$$A_{ij} = -A_{ji}^*. \quad (\text{S87})$$

Due to Eq. (53) in the main text, taken to be zero at the minimum, there is no change in the projected $\hat{P}_\perp |\psi_i^{(1)}\rangle$ outside of the potentially occupied space.

The expression Eq. (38) in the main text, for the first-order $\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})$, becomes

$$\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = \rho_{||}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) + n_s \left[\sum_{ij}^{pocc} (\rho_{ji}^{(1)} - \rho_{||,ji}^{(1)}) \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \left(\sum_{ik}^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} c_{ik}^{*(1)} \psi_k^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + (\text{c.c.}) \right) \right]. \quad (\text{S88})$$

Invariance for each ordered pair ji is obtained when

$$\rho_{ji}^{(1)} = \rho_{||,ji}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} A_{ji} (f_j^{(0)} - f_i^{(0)}). \quad (\text{S89})$$

This describes the covariance between $\rho_{ji}^{(1)}$ and $|\psi_i^{(1)}\rangle$, through A_{ji} . From this equation, the diagonal occupation factor does not change,

$$\rho_{ii}^{(1)} = \rho_{||,ii}^{(1)}. \quad (\text{S90})$$

Finally, one can check that

$$F^{+(2)}[T, \{\psi_i^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{ij}^{(1)}\}] = F^{+(2)}[T, \{\psi_{||,i}^{(1)}\}, \{\rho_{||,ij}^{(1)}\}]. \quad (\text{S91})$$

S6. THE FIRST-ORDER DENSITY OBTAINED FROM THE MODIFIED FIRST-ORDER WAVEFUNCTIONS

In this section, it is checked that the condition expressed by Eq. (74) in the main text insures that the computation of Eq. (72) in the main text delivers the correct $\rho^{(1)}$, equal to the one obtained in the parallel gauge.

Indeed, combining Eqs. (72-74) of the main text, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = n_s & \left[\sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} (\psi_{||,i}^{*(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{||,i}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \Theta(f_i^{(0)}, f_j^{(0)}) \frac{f_j^{(0)} - f_i^{(0)}}{\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}} \left(\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle \psi_j^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \langle \psi_j^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S92})$$

Exchange of the $i \leftrightarrow j$ indices in the second line of this equation, combined with Eq. (75) and Eq. (63) in the main text gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \frac{f_j^{(0)} - f_i^{(0)}}{\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}} \langle \psi_j^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) (\Theta(f_j^{(0)}, f_i^{(0)}) + \Theta(f_i^{(0)}, f_j^{(0)})) = \\ \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \frac{f_j^{(0)} - f_i^{(0)}}{\epsilon_j^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)}} \langle \psi_j^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) = n_s \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{||,ji}^{(1)} \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S93})$$

This finally yields the expected

$$\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = n_s \left[\sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{||,ji}^{(1)} \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} \left(\psi_{||,i}^{*(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_{||,i}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \right) \right], \quad (\text{S94})$$

that is, the formula for $\rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r})$ in the parallel gauge.

S7. NON-VARIATIONAL EXPRESSIONS

As in the DFPT for gapped systems, simpler expressions for $F^{+(2)}$ can be obtained, although for such expressions the variational property is lost. Let us examine some parts of Eq. (59) in the main text. With the use Eq. (53) in the main text,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_{||,i}^{(1)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} - \epsilon_i^{(0)} | \psi_{||,i}^{(1)} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle \psi_{||,i}^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + (\text{c.c.}) \right) &= -\langle \psi_{||,i}^{(1)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle \psi_{||,i}^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_{||,i}^{(1)} \rangle \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(\langle \psi_{||,i}^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{Hxc}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + (\text{c.c.}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S95})$$

On the other hand, the second part of Eq. (60) in the main text can be modified:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int \int K_{\text{Hxc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' &= \frac{1}{2} \int \hat{v}_{\text{Hxc}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \rho^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \hat{v}_{\text{Hxc}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \left\{ n_s \left[\sum_i^{pocc} f_i^{(0)} \left(\psi_{||,i}^{*(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_i^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + (\text{c.c.}) \right) + \sum_{ij}^{pocc} \rho_{||,ji}^{(1)} \psi_i^{*(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \psi_j^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \right\} d\mathbf{r}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S96})$$

This delivers a non-variational expression for $F^{(2)}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\text{non-var}}^{(2)} &= n_s \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} f_i^{(0)} \left[\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(2)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} (\langle \psi_{||,i}^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + (\text{c.c.})) \right] + n_s \sum_{ij}^{\text{pocc}} \rho_{||,ji}^{(1)} \frac{1}{2} \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{n_s}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}^{\text{pocc}} \frac{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}}{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}} |\rho_{||,ij}^{(1)}|^2 - \frac{n_s}{2} \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial f} \Big|_{f_i^{(0)}} (\rho_{||,ii}^{(1)})^2 - n_s \mu^{(1)} \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} \rho_{||,ii}^{(1)}. \tag{S97}
\end{aligned}$$

The last term can be suppressed, due to the constraint Eq. (41) in the main text. Also Eq. (63) in the main text can be used, as well as Eq. (48) in the main text, which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\text{non-var}}^{(2)} &= n_s \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} f_i^{(0)} \left[\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(2)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} (\langle \psi_{||,i}^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + (\text{c.c.})) \right] + n_s \sum_{ij}^{\text{pocc}} \rho_{||,ji}^{(1)} \frac{1}{2} \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle \\
&\quad - \frac{n_s}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}^{\text{pocc}} \frac{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}}{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}} |\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle|^2 - \frac{n_s}{2} \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}} (\epsilon_i^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)})^2, \tag{S98}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu^{(1)}$ is determined from Eq. (65) in the main text. Finally, the non-variational expression can be written in terms of $\psi_{\text{mod}}^{(1)}$, see Sec. IV D:

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\text{non-var}}^{(2)} &= n_s \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} f_i^{(0)} \left[\frac{1}{2} (\langle \psi_{\text{mod},i}^{(1)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(1)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle + (\text{c.c.})) \langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}^{(2)} | \psi_i^{(0)} \rangle \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{n_s}{2} \left[\sum_{i \neq j}^{\text{pocc}} \frac{f_i^{(0)} - f_j^{(0)}}{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_j^{(0)}} |\langle \psi_i^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(1)} | \psi_j^{(0)} \rangle|^2 + \sum_i^{\text{pocc}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \Big|_{\epsilon_i^{(0)} - \mu^{(0)}} (\epsilon_i^{(1)} - \mu^{(1)})^2 \right]. \tag{S99}
\end{aligned}$$

S8. TEMPERATURE-DEPENDENT PHONON FREQUENCIES

This section provides additional figures related to the Sec. VI of the main text.

In particular, data are presented as a function of the electronic physical temperature, as well as for a $42 \times 42 \times 42$ wavevector grid, finer than the $30 \times 30 \times 30$ wavevector grid of the main text.




FIG. S1: Transverse phonon frequencies as a function of electronic physical temperature in the range from 50 K to 2000 K, for various MP broadening values between 0 and 8000 K, with a $30 \times 30 \times 30$ grid on the left and a $42 \times 42 \times 42$ grid on the right.




FIG. S2: Longitudinal phonon frequencies as a function of electronic physical temperature in the range from 50 K to 2000 K, for various MP broadening values between 0 and 8000 K, with a $30 \times 30 \times 30$ grid on the left and a $42 \times 42 \times 42$ grid on the right.

S9. THE EFFECT OF UNDERCONVERGED UNPERTURBED WAVEFUNCTIONS

In this subsection, intermediate steps in the treatment of the three-level model, Sec. VII of the main text, are provided.

The approximate eigenenergies are

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)} = \langle \tilde{\psi}_2^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} | \tilde{\psi}_2^{(0)} \rangle = \cos^2 \alpha \cdot \epsilon_2^{(0)} + \sin^2 \alpha \cdot \epsilon_3^{(0)} = \epsilon_2^{(0)} + \sin^2 \alpha \cdot (\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_2^{(0)}), \quad (\text{S100})$$

and

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_3^{(0)} = \langle \tilde{\psi}_3^{(0)} | \hat{H}^{(0)} | \tilde{\psi}_3^{(0)} \rangle = \sin^2 \alpha \cdot \epsilon_2^{(0)} + \cos^2 \alpha \cdot \epsilon_3^{(0)} = \epsilon_3^{(0)} + \sin^2 \alpha \cdot (\epsilon_2^{(0)} - \epsilon_3^{(0)}). \quad (\text{S101})$$

For the second approximate eigenvector, the residual is

$$|R_2\rangle = (\hat{H}^{(0)} - \tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)}) | \tilde{\psi}_2^{(0)} \rangle = (\epsilon_2^{(0)} - \tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)}) \cos \alpha | \psi_2^{(0)} \rangle + (\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)}) \sin \alpha | \psi_3^{(0)} \rangle, \quad (\text{S102})$$

with squared norm R^2 :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle R_2 | R_2 \rangle &= \cos^2 \alpha \cdot (\epsilon_2^{(0)} - \tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)})^2 + \sin^2 \alpha \cdot (\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)})^2 \\ &= \cos^2 \alpha \cdot \sin^4 \alpha (\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_2^{(0)})^2 + \sin^2 \alpha \cdot \cos^4 \alpha (\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_2^{(0)})^2 = \cos^2 \alpha \cdot \sin^2 \alpha (\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_2^{(0)})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S103})$$

Hence, Eq. (101) in the main text.

Concerning the approximate second-order derivative of the energy, one starts from Eq. (102) in the main text, with actual eigenenergies and eigenfunctions for the case of the three-level system:

$$\tilde{E}^{(2)} = \frac{n_s}{2} \left[\frac{f_2^{(0)} - f_1^{(0)}}{\tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)} - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} |\langle \tilde{\psi}_2^{(0)} | \hat{H} | \psi_1^{(0)} \rangle|^2 + \frac{f_3^{(0)} - f_1^{(0)}}{\tilde{\epsilon}_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} |\langle \tilde{\psi}_3^{(0)} | \hat{H} | \psi_1^{(0)} \rangle|^2 + \frac{f_3^{(0)} - f_2^{(0)}}{\tilde{\epsilon}_3^{(0)} - \tilde{\epsilon}_2^{(0)}} |\langle \tilde{\psi}_3^{(0)} | \hat{H} | \psi_2^{(0)} \rangle|^2 \right]. \quad (\text{S104})$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}^{(2)} &= \frac{n_s}{2} \left[\frac{\delta f - (1 - \delta f)}{\epsilon_2^{(0)} + \sin^2 \alpha (\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_2^{(0)}) - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} \cdot |\cos \alpha H_{12} + \sin \alpha H_{13}|^2 \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{1 - \delta f}{\epsilon_3^{(0)} + \sin^2 \alpha (\epsilon_2^{(0)} - \epsilon_3^{(0)}) - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} |\cos \alpha H_{13} - \sin \alpha H_{12}|^2 \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\delta f}{\epsilon_3^{(0)} + \sin^2 \alpha (\epsilon_2^{(0)} - \epsilon_3^{(0)}) - (\epsilon_2^{(0)} + \sin^2 \alpha (\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_2^{(0)}))} \cdot |\cos^2 \alpha H_{32} - \sin^2 \alpha H_{23}|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S105})$$

A Taylor expansion of $\tilde{E}^{(2)}$ in term of small parameter $\sin \alpha$ is now performed, and the quadratic contributions are discarded. This means $\cos \alpha \simeq 1$ and $\cos^2 \alpha \simeq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}^{(2)} = -n_s \left[\frac{1 - 2\delta f}{\epsilon_2^{(0)} - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} (|H_{12}|^2 + 2 \sin \alpha \Re(H_{12}^* H_{13})) - \frac{1 - \delta f}{\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_1^{(0)}} (|H_{13}|^2 - 2 \sin \alpha \Re(H_{12}^* H_{13})) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{\delta f}{\epsilon_3^{(0)} - \epsilon_2^{(0)}} |H_{23}|^2 \right] + O(\sin^2 \alpha) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S106})$$

The difference between the contaminated $\tilde{E}^{(2)}$ and $E^{(2)}$ is thus Eq. (103) in the main text.

* Electronic address: xavier.gonze@uclouvain.be;
christiantantardini@gmail.com