Monte Carlo Methods for Sampling Classical and Quantum Particles

Jennifer Barry Advisor: Amy Bug



Swarthmore College Department of Physics and Astronomy 2007

Thesis Overview

"Monte Carlo" (MC) methods are nondeterministic algorithms for simulating various phenomena in the physical and social sciences. In this study, we evaluated several MC methods for simulating a light particle in a Lennard-Jones (LJ) fluid. We began this research in possession of a basic code that modeled the fluid and light particle in a canonical ensemble. It used Metropolis sampling to equilibrate the fluid and Path Integral Monte Carlo (PIMC) to sample the light particle. This method has been used successfully to calculate positronium lifetimes in spherical and cylindrical pores, but, like all computer simulations, it has its limitations. The canonical ensemble limits us to a fixed number of fluid atoms, making it difficult to simulate a multi-phase system at coexistence, and Metropolis sampling allows us to simulate only one temperature at a time.

Our first major modification to this program was to introduce an option to allow simulation of the fluid within a grand canonical ensemble. Using the Widom Test Particle Insertion Method, we were able to show that these grand canonical simulations agreed with the original canonical simulations for average quantities of density and chemical potential. We then used the grand canonical ensemble simulation to find a point on the phase coexistence curve for the fluid.

Metropolis sampling is inefficient at phase coexistence because the simulation is slow to overcome the free energy barriers. Therefore, we next implemented a method that modifies Metropolis sampling by using a weighting function to help the system explore the whole energy space. We were able to show that, given the optimal weighting function, this "Multicanonical sampling" allows the system to reach every point in the space with equal probability, sampling evenly even in systems with high free energy barriers.

The usefulness of Multicanonical sampling is limited by a fundamental ignorance of this optimal weighting function. To combat this difficulty, we implemented Wang-Landau sampling, which constructs the density of energy states as the simulation proceeds. The results of a Wang-Landau simulation can therefore be used to find ensemble averages at any temperature. We were able to show that one Wang-Landau simulation for the fluid could generate literature results that would require many different Metropolis simulations.

We also implemented Wang-Landau for a light particle in a simple harmonic potential and obtained results matching analytical calculations. The analytical calculation we used was specific to the Path Integral approach, showing that our work agrees with the previous work in this field. In particular, we found excellent agreement with the computational and analytical work of Vorontsov-Velaminov and Lyubartsev [30].

We then extended these techniques to the combined system, simulating helium as a light particle in an argon LJ fluid. A comparison of classical Metropolis sampling, PIMC, and Quantum Wang-Landau showed agreement between PIMC and Quantum Wang-Landau and classical sampling at high temperatures, but only between Wang-Landau and PIMC at low temperatures. From this we conclude that helium must be modeled as a quantum particle at low temperatures in this environment and that our different techniques are consistent.

Finally, we report on efforts to benchmark the PIMC and Quantum Wang-Landau algorithms. We found that, for any individual temperature, Quantum Wang-Landau is 100 to 500 times slower than PIMC. Keeping in mind that we did not use a system that would be too inefficient for PIMC and that Wang-Landau gives information about almost any temperature, while PIMC only gives information about one, these are not unpromising results. Clearly, the next step is to choose a system that is time-consuming for a standard PIMC algorithm to see if the Quantum Wang-Landau benchmark is even more favorable in comparison.

Contents

1	Intr	roduction	5
2	The	eorv	6
-	21	Monte Carlo Sampling Algorithms	6
	2.1	Random Number Generator Tests	8
	2.2	2.2.1 Pariodicity Test	8
		2.2.1 Terroucity Test	0
		2.2.2 Officiently fest	9
		2.2.3 On-Square lest	9
	0.0	2.2.4 Hidden Correlations Test	9
	2.3	Thermodynamics Review	9
		2.3.1 Canonical Ensemble	9
		2.3.2 Grand Canonical Ensemble	.0
	2.4	Quantum Mechanics Review	.3
૧	Mot	thods	5
J	2 1	Fluid Simulation 1	15
	ე.1 ე.ე	Techniquez for Sevenling Classical Denticles	.0 17
	3.2	1 Particles 1 2 2 1 Mature alia Comparison 1 1	.1
		3.2.1 Metropolis Canonical Monte Carlo	.1
		3.2.2 Metropolis Grand Canonical Monte Carlo	.8
		3.2.3 Multicanonical Method	.9
		3.2.4 Histogram Reweighting 1	.9
		3.2.5 Classical Wang-Landau Method	20
		3.2.6 Entropic Sampling	21
	3.3	Methods for Sampling Quantum Particles	21
		3.3.1 Path Integral Monte Carlo (PIMC)	21
		3.3.2 PIMC with Threading	22
		3.3.3 Quantum Wang-Landau	23
	34	Methods for Determining Chemical Potential	24
	0.1	3.4.1 Widom Test Particle Insertion Method)/
		3.4.2 Bennet Method	25
4	\mathbf{Res}	ults and Discussion 2	6
	4.1	Random Number Generator Tests 2	26
		4.1.1 Periodicity	26
		4.1.2 Uniformity	26
		4.1.3 Chi-Square Test	27
		4.1.4 Hidden Correlations	27
	4.2	CMC Simulation Results	27
		4.2.1 Comparison of Average Potential Energy 2	27
		4.2.2 Calculation of Pressure	bg
	13	CCMC Simulation Bosults	20
	4.0	4.2.1 Widow Test Dentiale Insention	.9 19
		4.5.1 Widom Test Particle Insertion	:9 51
		4.3.2 Multicanonical Results)1 \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
	4.4	Wang-Landau Results	53
		4.4.1 Classical Wang-Landau Results	33
		4.4.2 Quantum Wang-Landau Simulation Results	36
	4.5	Light Particle in a Frozen Fluid 3	37
5	Con	aclusion 4	2
Gl	ossa	ry	i
٨	TT •		1
A	Uni	A.	T

В	Sou	rce Code	B.1
	B.1	Fluid Codes	B.1
	B.2	Light Particle Codes	B.24
	B.3	General Codes	B.58
	B.4	Post Processing Codes	B.66

1 Introduction

"Monte Carlo" (MC) is a collection of computational methods that simulate complex statistical behaviors. Radiation damage, the stock market, phase transitions in materials, and many other such problems have all been the subjects of MC simulations [16].

Here we describe different sampling methods for a light particle in a fluid. In this context "light" means that the particle's state can only be accurately described with quantum mechanics. Specifically, for this project, our model of the light particle will correspond to a helium atom in a system of heavier atoms. Our goal was to allow efficient sampling of this system under as many different conditions as possible.

We model both the light particle and an environment, a Lennard-Jones (LJ) fluid. The LJ fluid has been the focus of a number of numerical studies [[15], [29], [34], [35]], as it is a realistic model of atomic fluids. Many groups, including our own, have written codes to simulate a LJ fluid in a canonical ensemble using a basic Metropolis sampling algorithm [[6], [10]]. However, this type of simulation is slow to converge under certain conditions, such as a high-density fluid or a fluid at a phase coexistence point. In this thesis, we study other methods of simulating a LJ fluid in an attempt to circumvent these problems.

Physicists need simulation techniques that are consistent with not just classical, but also quantum mechanical behavior. For example, we might want to use a simulation to explore such quantum properties as tunneling and light particle lifetimes that cannot be modeled accurately using classical methods. The problem of simulating a quantum particle using MC methods has been widely studied [[22], [23], [24], [26], [30]]. In previous work, this lab has used the Path Integral Monte Carlo (PIMC) method, which treats each quantum particle as a "polymer" made up of a number of "beads" [[6], [7], [8], [10], [17], [18], [36]]. Using this method, modeling "one" particle actually requires modeling anywhere from five to two thousand beads. Because the basic accept/reject MC algorithm (described in Section 3.3.1) is somewhat computationally inefficient, many programs use a modified version of this algorithm, such as threading or staging [9], [26]. Our lab has a history of modeling positronium (the bound state of a positron and electron) in a fluid using PIMC with the threading technique and has used these simulations to successfully calculate the lifetime of positronium in spherical and cylindrical pores [[6], [10], [36]]. However, even this algorithm is inefficient in certain systems. For example it may take prohibitively many time steps to converge in a system with a light particle made up of a large number of beads, a dense fluid and/or in a large pore. Thus, in my thesis work, we explore other sampling techniques that are designed to overcome these limitations and allow for a simulation that can work at a range of temperatures, fluid densities and, perhaps, pore sizes.

In the course of developing our research codes, we have written programs that allow us to simulate the fluid and the light particle, separately or together, using a variety of techniques, including Metropolis, Multicanonical, and Wang-Landau sampling. This ability to simulate the classical and quantum parts of our system individually allows us to use our codes, not only to study a light particle in a fluid, but also to study certain properties of the fluid or light particle alone. For example, in this thesis we begin to use our techniques to study a fluid at a phase coexistence point. This work could be expanded in the future to trace out the fluid coexistence curve for a LJ fluid or even more interestingly, isotherms for such a fluid absorbed into pores in a model of a porous solid. In addition, in this thesis we test our techniques by simulating a quantum particle in a simple harmonic potential. Were we to change that potential to the appropriate cubic or quartic form, we might be able to use the new techniques to study tunneling. Whether for the classical or the light particle or both, our algorithms (which are all "modern" in the sense that they have been developed in the last decade or two) allow the system to explore regions that are thermodynamically important, but might not be visible in a reasonable amount of computation time with more conventional MC methods.

The most prevalent application of this work is to the study of positronium (the bound state of a positron and an electron) in a fluid. Although our light particle is currently being modeled as helium, we could turn it into positronium by decreasing the mass of the particle, increasing the number of beads and using the appropriate interaction potential with the fluid to give us a simulation similar to that of Miller and Reese [[22], [23]]. We could then use the simulation to investigate such properties as bubble formation and positronium lifetimes in a fluid [[21], [23]]. Knowledge of positron or positronium lifetimes is important in many fields, including industry and medicine. PET (Positron Emission Tomography) scans, for example, which are used to detect brain tumors, rely on the annihilation of positrons. We could also use positron lifetimes to explore defects in nickel [28]. If we filled nickel with a gas, the lifetime of a positron in a void in the metal would be correlated with the size and shape of the cavity and we could use this technique to explore the integrity of the nickel.

Previously in this field there has been concentration on sampling techniques for a LJ fluid alone. Wilding pioneered the technique of combining histogram reweighting and Multicanonical sampling to trace the phase coexistence curve [35]. Landau and Wang introduced what is now known as the Wang-Landau method as a technique for constructing the density of states for an Ising model [32]. In 2002, Shell et al [27] extended this technique to continuous systems and tested it on a LJ fluid.

Less work has been done on extending more modern MC sampling techniques to quantum particles. Vorontsov-Velyaminov and Lyubartsev [30] used the Wang-Landau technique for a quantum particle in a simple harmonic potential. There appears to have been little investigation into more complicated potentials. To date, no one has tried to use these techniques for sampling a system comprised of a quantum particle and a LJ fluid as we do in this thesis.

This thesis is arranged in five more sections. We discuss the theory of basic MC sampling and present an overview of the necessary quantum mechanics and thermodynamics in the Theory section. We then treat specific MC sampling algorithms for both the classical and the quantum particles in the Methods section. In the Results and Discussion section, we first present results for the fluid and light particle individually, including showing agreement with analytical or literature values where appropriate. We then explain our results from the combined system and show benchmarks to evaluate the computational efficiency of our algorithms.

For the Theory and Methods portions of this thesis, we are presenting computational algorithms that may be considered "common knowledge" to a computational physicist. As a result, we do not give specific citations for every derivation, but, rather, at the end of each subsection refer the reader to a list of references.

2 Theory

We begin this section with an overview of the theory behind MC algorithms and then present a short review of the necessary thermodynamics and quantum mechanics. In Section 3 we will tie these together and give algorithms for classical and quantum Monte Carlo.

2.1 Monte Carlo Sampling Algorithms

All of the simulations we discuss in this thesis can be said to use Monte Carlo sampling algorithms. Monte Carlo algorithms are nondeterministic methods for simulating various phenomena and they are widely applied. For example, there is a rich history behind using Monte Carlo algorithms to calculate the value of π [2]. The method presented below [1], whimsically known as "integration by darts," is intended to introduce the reader to the concept of using probabilistic techniques to construct an estimate of a result we may not be able to obtain analytically.

Consider a unit circle inscribed in a square as shown in Figure 2.1. To calculate π , we "throw darts" at this square and count the number that fall within the unit circle. In other (more mathematical) words, we randomly generate τ pairs of numbers where each member of the pair is chosen randomly to fall between



Figure 2.1: We count the number of darts that "hit" within the first quadrant of the unit circle and use this value to estimate π .

0 and 1, and count the number τ_{hit} that are less than a distance of one away from the origin. Clearly, if we repeat this process long enough

$$\pi \approx 4 \times Area \ of \ circle \ in \ first \ quadrant = \frac{4\tau_{hit}}{\tau}.$$
(1)

Viola! A Monte Carlo method for computing the value of π . Of course, this is not the most efficient method for calculating π (even after ten million repetitions the answer is only exact to two decimal places [1]), but it is a MC method.

In general, however, we need not depend on sampling in such a blind fashion. In many calculations, including those we are going to be using in this thesis, we are interested in functions that are negligible in all but a small fraction of the total space. Basically, instead of sampling randomly we would like to sample according to some probability distribution. Focusing on only the "important" regions of the space (if known) is a way of reducing the variance of an estimation technique; it is known as "importance sampling."

Notice that in calculating π above, we were calculating an average, of sorts. Now consider a general average of the form:

$$\langle A \rangle = \frac{\int A(\mathbf{x})\rho(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}}{\int \rho(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}}.$$
 (2)

The probability of finding the system around \mathbf{x} is given by the probability density

$$W(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\rho(\mathbf{x})}{\int \rho(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}.$$
(3)

Now if we were somehow able to generate configurations $\{x_i\}$ according to W (we will address exactly how we do that in a moment), we would have a distribution such that we are sampling much more often in those areas of the space in which the function is likely to be non-negligible. If we sample a total of npoints, the average is:

$$\langle A \rangle = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i}^{n} A(\mathbf{x_i})$$
 (4)

Notice that we were able to calculate $\langle A \rangle$ without explicitly calculating $\int \rho(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$. This will be very important later.

Now we come to the question of *how* we generate points according to W. We first assume the system can be set up as an "irreducible Markov chain." A Markov chain is a sequence of trials that fulfills two conditions: (1) the outcome of each trial belongs to a finite set of possible outcomes (the "state space"), and (2) the outcome of each trial depends *only* on the outcome of the trial immediately preceding it [1].

A Markov chain is considered "irreducible" (or "ergodic") if every state in the chain can eventually be reached from every other state. If we have a system that satisfies these requirements, we can use an "accept/reject" method known as a Metropolis method to calculate points distributed according to W. Suppose we start with the system in state o and randomly generate the next possible state n. We need a criterion that determines whether we transition to ("accept") n or stay in o (thereby "rejecting" n). After a large number of trials, we want the probability of finding the system in state n to be proportional to W(n).

Let the transition probability from o to n be denoted by $\pi(o \to n)$. Once we reach an equilibrium distribution, we do not want $\pi(o \to n)$ to destroy that distribution. Therefore, in equilibrium, the average rate of transitions into n must equal the average rate of transitions out of n (the balance condition). This "balance" condition is sufficient, but most working algorithms rely on the stronger "detailed balance" condition [13] and thus we use that here. We let the number of moves from n to o be equal to the number of moves from o to n:

$$W(o)\pi(o \to n) = W(n)\pi(n \to o).$$
(5)

Now we need to construct $\pi(o \to n)$. We let

$$\pi(o \to n) = \alpha(o \to n) \times acc(o \to n) \tag{6}$$

where $acc(o \to n)$ is the probability that we accept a trial move from o to n and α can be chosen to be any function such that $\alpha(o \to n) = \alpha(n \to o)$ (when writing these formulas in matrix form, α is a symmetric matrix). Since α is symmetric, we can substitute equation (6) for π in (5) and cancel the α terms:

$$W(o)acc(o \to n) = W(n)acc(n \to o).$$
⁽⁷⁾

Therefore:

$$\frac{acc(o \to n)}{acc(n \to o)} = \frac{W(n)}{W(o)}.$$
(8)

While infinitely many choices of $acc(o \rightarrow n)$ satisfy equation (8), the choice made for the Metropolis algorithm is [13]:

$$acc(o \to n) = \begin{cases} \frac{W(n)}{W(o)} & W(n) < W(o) \\ 1 & W(n) \ge W(o). \end{cases}$$
(9)

To decide whether to accept or reject a trial move, we first compute $\frac{W(n)}{W(o)}$. If this is greater than or equal to one, we automatically accept the move. Otherwise, we generate a random number between 0 and 1. If this number is less than $\frac{W(n)}{W(o)}$, we accept the move, if not, we reject it. This is the basic Metropolis sampling algorithm and will form the foundation for many of the sampling techniques we use.

References for this section: Allen and Tildesley Ch. 4 [1], Frenkel and Smit Ch. 3 [13], Gould et. al Ch. 11 and 16 [14], Kalos and Whitlock [16]

2.2 Random Number Generator Tests

From the last section it is clear that random numbers are extremely important to Monte Carlo simulations and thus we need a good pseudo-random number generator. The question is then, of course, what do we mean by "good"? The definition of a "good" generator is going to depend on the application, but for the purposes of this research, there are a number of tests we can use to determine the properties of a random number generator. If our generator passes these tests, described below, we can be fairly sure that we are getting an adequately random distribution of numbers.

2.2.1 Periodicity Test

The first test we do is a test for the period of the random number generator. If the period is shorter than the length of our run, the generator could potentially cause problems. This test is easy to implement; we simply plot a random walk from the origin using the random number generator. When we reach the period of the random number generator, the plot will start to repeat itself.

2.2.2 Uniformity Test

It is also of vital importance to us that the random number generator generate all machine representable numbers between 0 and 1 with equal probability. We can test for uniformity simply by creating a histogram of how often numbers fall within a certain interval. If the histogram is flat, the generator is uniform. That brings up the question of how flat is "flat," which leads us to our next test.

2.2.3 Chi-Square Test

The Chi-Square Test tells us whether the distribution of numbers into the histogram bins in the "Uniformity Test" is consistent with the laws of statistics. If we distribute the numbers into M bins, y_i is the number in each bin and E_i is the expected number in each bin, then the chi-square statistic is

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{(y_i - E_i)^2}{y_i}.$$
(10)

In general each of the terms in Equation (10) should be of order 1. Thus to pass this test, χ^2 should be of the same order as M. Clearly, a smaller χ^2 is better, but a χ^2 of zero or very nearly zero is actually probably indicative of a short period. In other words, we are seeing such a low χ^2 because, if we are generating N random numbers, N is either very close to a multiple of the period of the generator or (more likely) N is much larger than the period of the generator.

2.2.4 Hidden Correlations Test

The last property we check for is hidden-correlations. We do not want k successive random numbers to be correlated in any way. The easiest way to check for these "hidden correlations" is simply to plot x_{i+k} against x_i . If there is an obvious pattern to the plot, there is probably something wrong with the random number generator.

References for this section: Gould et al Ch. 7 [14]

2.3 Thermodynamics Review

In this section, we briefly review the two thermodynamic ensembles we are interested in simulating in this thesis.

2.3.1 Canonical Ensemble

We begin with the canonical ensemble. Suppose we want the average of an observable A and, for the moment, that we can describe the system using classical mechanics (we will address quantum mechanics later in this thesis). The partition function for a canonical ensemble of N particles is

$$Q = \frac{1}{\Lambda^{3N} N!} \int \exp\left(\frac{-H(\mathbf{r}^N, \mathbf{p}^N)}{k_B T}\right) d\mathbf{r}^N d\mathbf{p}^N,\tag{11}$$

where Λ is the thermal de Broglie wavelength $\sqrt{\frac{\hbar^2}{2\pi m k_B T}}$, $H(\mathbf{r}^{\mathbf{N}}, \mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{N}})$ is the Hamiltonian of the system, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and T is the temperature. The average value of an observable in the system $\langle A \rangle$ is then

$$\langle A \rangle = \frac{\int A(\mathbf{r}^{N}, \mathbf{p}^{N}) \exp(-\beta H(\mathbf{r}^{N}, \mathbf{p}^{N})) d\mathbf{r}^{N} d\mathbf{p}^{N}}{\int \exp(-\beta H(\mathbf{r}^{N}, \mathbf{p}^{N})) d\mathbf{r}^{N} d\mathbf{p}^{N}}$$
(12)

where $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$. Notice that this average is in a form to which we could easily apply the Metropolis algorithm. From equation (12) the probability density of finding configuration \mathbf{r}^N and momenta \mathbf{p}^N for the canonical ensemble is clearly

$$W_{N,V,T}(\mathbf{r}^{N}, \mathbf{p}^{N}) = \frac{\exp(-\beta H(\mathbf{r}^{N}, \mathbf{p}^{N}))}{\int \exp(-\beta H(\mathbf{r}^{N}, \mathbf{p}^{N})) d\mathbf{r}^{N} d\mathbf{p}^{N}}.$$
(13)

As a point of interest, notice that if we can split the Hamiltonian into two pieces, a kinetic energy piece $\kappa(\mathbf{p}^N)$ that depends only on momentum and a potential $U(\mathbf{r}^N)$ that depends only on position:

$$H(\mathbf{r}^{N}, \mathbf{p}^{N}) = \kappa(\mathbf{p}^{N}) + U(\mathbf{r}^{N})$$
(14)

our probability distribution and partition function will likewise "split":

$$W_{N,V,T}(\mathbf{r}^{N}, \mathbf{p}^{N}) = \left(\frac{\exp(-\beta\kappa(\mathbf{p}^{N}))}{\int \exp(-\beta\kappa(\mathbf{p}^{N}))d\mathbf{p}^{N}}\right) \left(\frac{\exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{r}^{N}))}{\int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{r}^{N}))d\mathbf{r}^{N}}\right)$$
(15)

and

$$Q = \frac{1}{\Lambda^{3N} N!} \left(\int \exp\left(\frac{-\kappa(\mathbf{p}^N)}{k_B T}\right) d\mathbf{p}^N \right) \left(\int \exp\left(\frac{-U(\mathbf{r}^N)}{k_B T}\right) d\mathbf{r}^N \right).$$
(16)

If we have an ideal gas (U = 0) then the potential energy parts of Q and W vanish. Therefore, if we are modeling a fluid as a system of particles with the kinetic energy of an ideal gas, but also some "excess" potential that depends only on position (pair interactions for example), we can write the probability distribution and partition function for that system as

$$W_{N,V,T}(\mathbf{r}^N, \mathbf{p}^N) = W_{ideal} W_{excess}$$
⁽¹⁷⁾

and

$$Q = Q_{ideal} Q_{excess}.$$
 (18)

where W_{ideal} is the probability distribution for an ideal gas and Q_{ideal} is the partition function for an ideal gas. Since both of these quantities can be solved for analytically, that leaves us with only the task of finding the "excess" quantities. We will discuss in the Methods section how we use the Metropolis algorithm to do this.

References for this section: Allen Tildesley Ch. 4 [1], Frenkel and Smit Ch. 3 [13], McQuarrie Ch. 3 [20]

2.3.2 Grand Canonical Ensemble

In a simulation of the grand-canonical ensemble, we hold chemical potential μ , volume V, and temperature T fixed, but allow the number of particles N to change. The chemical potential is the derivative of the Helmholtz free energy F with respect to particle number when we hold V and T constant:

$$\mu = \left(\frac{dF}{dN}\right)_{V,T}.$$
(19)

Recall that Helmholtz free energy is defined as

$$F = U - TS \tag{20}$$

where U is the internal energy of the system, T is the temperature and S is the entropy. Basically, μ is the amount by which the free energy will change if we add another particle to the system while holding the volume and temperature constant. In other words, the chemical potential is how much a system "wants" more particles. Note that if we have a fluid in phase coexistence, the chemical potential must be the same for both phases. Were it not, one phase would "want" particles more and the particles would diffuse to that phase until the chemical potentials equilized. Thus equal chemical potentials are a stability criterion for phase coexistence.

The complete grand canonical partition function, given a hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{r}^N, \mathbf{p}^N)$ is [20]

$$Q_{\mu,V,T} = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N! \Lambda^{3N}} \exp(\beta \mu N) \int \exp(-\beta H(\mathbf{r}^N, \mathbf{p}^N)) d\mathbf{r}^N d\mathbf{p}^N.$$
(21)

where N indexes the number of particles. In our simulation N will vary in a manner described in Section 3.2.2. We will not derive equation (21) here, but we will give an idea of how it might be derived by deriving a simpler (and more applicable to this thesis) case.

For this derivation, we first assume that when adding and removing particles, we are actually just exchanging particles with a reservoir of an ideal gas. We assume that in our subsystem of interest we have particles with the kinetic energy of an ideal gas interacting via a potential $U(\mathbf{r}^N)$ that is not dependent on momentum.

First, just consider a system of N such identical atoms. The partition function is

$$Q(N,V,T) = \frac{1}{\Lambda^{3N}N!} \int_0^L \cdots \int_0^L \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{r}^N) d\mathbf{r}^N.$$
 (22)

If we let **s** represent **r** scaled by L equation (22) becomes

$$Q(N,V,T) = \frac{V^N}{\Lambda^{3N}N!} \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N;L)d\mathbf{s}^N$$
(23)

where $U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)$ indicates that U depends on the real rather than the scaled distances. The Helmholtz free energy is

$$F(N, V, T) = -k_B T \ln Q$$

= $-k_B T \ln \left(\frac{V^N}{\Lambda^{3N} N!}\right) - k_B T \ln \left(\int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)) d\mathbf{s}^N\right)$
= $F^{id}(N, V, T) + F^{ex}(N, V, T).$ (24)

As shown in the last line of equation (24), the free energy can be written as the free energy of an ideal gas plus an excess free energy. Thus assume the system is separated by a piston from an ideal gas reservoir. The total volume of the system plus the reservoir is held at V_0 and there are a total of M particles (see Figure 2.2). In other words, we have M - N ideal gas molecules in a volume of $V_0 - V$. We take the product of the partition function of our system and that of the ideal gas to find the total partition function of the ideal gas plus the reservoir

$$Q(N, M, V, V_0, T) = \frac{V^N (V_0 - V)^{M-N}}{\Lambda^{3M} N! (M-N)!} \int d\mathbf{s}^{M-N} \int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)) d\mathbf{s}^N.$$
 (25)

Note that the factor $\int d\mathbf{s}^{M-N}$ is equal to unity and that we have assumed the thermal wavelength of the ideal gas is also equal to Λ .

Now we allow the two systems to exchange particles. Basically, we assume that the particles are identical, but inside the volume V they interact with one another and outside they do not. Thus a transfer from a coordinate outside to a coordinate inside changes the potential energy from $U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)$ to $U(\mathbf{s}^{N+1}; L)$. The partition function taking into account all possible distributions of the M particles over the two volumes is

$$Q(M, V, V_0, T) = \sum_{N=0}^{M} Q(N, M, V, V_0, T) = \sum_{N=0}^{M} \frac{V^N (V')^{M-N}}{N! (M-N)! \Lambda^{3N} \Lambda^{3(M-N)}} \int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)) d\mathbf{s}^N.$$
(26)

Using the definition of μ from equation (19) and that of F^{id} from equation (24), we find that for an ideal gas

$$\mu^{id} = k_B T \ln(\Lambda^3 \rho). \tag{27}$$

We define

$$e^{C_M} = \Lambda^{3M} \frac{M^M}{V_0^M} = \Lambda^{3M} \rho^M = e^{\beta \mu M}.$$
 (28)



Figure 2.2: We model the grand canonical ensemble as applying to an "interacting" gas of N particles (where N is variable) in a volume V that can exchange particles with an ideal gas. The total volume of the ideal plus interacting gas is V_0 and the total number of particles is M.

Using e^{C_M} , we can rewrite Q as

$$Q(M, V, V_0, T) = e^{-C_M} \sum_{N} \frac{V^N (V_0 - V)^{M-N} / V_0^M}{(N!(M-N)!/M^M)(\Lambda^{3N} \Lambda^{3(M-N)} / \Lambda^{3M})} \int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)) d\mathbf{s}^N.$$
(29)

Thus if we take the limit that the ideal gas is much larger than the interacting one $(M \to \infty, V' \to \infty, (M/V') \to \rho)$, we come up with an expression for $Q(\mu, V, T)$

$$Q(M, V, V_0, T) = e^{-C_M} \sum_{N} \frac{V^N V_0^{M-N} / V_0^M}{N! (M^{M-N} / M^M)} \int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)) d\mathbf{s}^N$$
(30)

$$= e^{-C_M} \sum_{N} \frac{V^N M^N \Lambda^{3N}}{N! V_0^N \Lambda^{3N}} \int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)) d\mathbf{s}^N$$
(31)

$$= e^{-C_M} \sum_N \frac{V^N}{N! \Lambda^{3N}} e^{\beta \mu N} \int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)) d\mathbf{s}^N$$
(32)

$$= Q(\mu, V, T)e^{-C_M} \tag{33}$$

The only worrisome part of this derivation is the inclusion of the extra e^{-C_M} term. The argument of the exponent represents the free energy of the total system (V_0 in its entirety). If we always consider a system where M is extremely large (as we are doing), this term does not affect the physics in any way as it will be the same for any system we are studying and we drop it. Thus the partition function we use for this system is

$$Q(\mu, V, T) = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{\exp(\beta\mu N)V^N}{\Lambda^{3N}N!} \int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N; L))d\mathbf{s}^N.$$
(34)

From this partition function, we can calculate the probability density for having N particles in the configuration \mathbf{s}^{N} :

$$W_{\mu,V,T}(\mathbf{s}^N, N) \propto \frac{\exp(\beta\mu N)V^N}{\Lambda^{3N}N!} \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)).$$
(35)

From this probability distribution, the average value of an observable in this system is

$$\langle A \rangle = \frac{\sum_{N} \int A(\mathbf{r}^{N}) W_{\mu,V,T}(\mathbf{r}^{N}, N) d\mathbf{r}^{N}}{\sum_{N} \int W_{\mu,V,T}(\mathbf{r}^{N}, N) d\mathbf{r}^{N}}.$$
(36)

Another quantity useful to introduce here is the activity z defined as

$$z = \frac{\exp(\beta\mu)}{\Lambda^3}.$$
(37)

In chemistry and physics, the activity can tell us something about the partial pressure of a gas. At low pressure, the activity is equal to the ratio of the partial pressure of the gas to the standard pressure. Thus in some ways activity is a measure of how "close" our gas is to an ideal gas. In practical terms, using z instead of μ makes the mathematics slightly simpler and allows us to use units in which $\Lambda = 1$. In terms of z the probability density is

$$W_{\mu,V,T}(\mathbf{s}^N, N) = \frac{(zV)^N}{N!} \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N)).$$
(38)

Notice that there is no dependence on Λ in this expression.

To calculate z without involving Λ look again at equation (24). Since $\mu = dF/dN$, it is clear that at large N, we can write the chemical potential as

$$\mu = -k_B T \ln\left(\frac{Q_{N+1}}{Q_N}\right). \tag{39}$$

Substituting for Q and solving gives

$$\mu = -k_B T \ln\left(\frac{V/\Lambda^3}{N+1}\right) - k_B T \ln\left(\frac{\int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^{N+1})) d\mathbf{s}^N}{\int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N)) d\mathbf{s}^N}\right)$$
(40)
$$= \mu_{ideal} + \mu_{excess}$$

Using this expression for μ in equation (37) we find

$$z = \exp(\beta \mu_{excess}) \frac{\exp\left(\ln\left[\frac{(N+1)\Lambda^3}{V}\right]\right)}{\Lambda^3}$$

$$= \frac{(N+1)\exp(\beta \mu_{excess})}{V}$$
(41)

Thus z has no dependence on the thermal de Broglie wavelength and we can calculate it either from knowledge of the excess chemical potential and the volume of the system or from the excess chemical potential and the ideal chemical potential expressed in a units system where $\Lambda = 1$.

We will explain how to use Metropolis sampling with these two ensembles in the Methods section.

References for this section: Allen and Tildesley Ch. 4 [1], Frenkel and Smit Ch. 5 [13], McQuarrie Ch. 3 [20]

2.4 Quantum Mechanics Review

Here we present a brief overview of a few topics in quantum mechanics that are relevant to our simulations.

In quantum mechanics, the expected value $\langle \hat{A} \rangle$ of an observable \hat{A} is given as [5]

$$\langle \hat{A} \rangle = Tr(\hat{W}\hat{A})$$
(42)

where \hat{W} is the density operator for the system. Recall that the density operator \hat{W} is defined as a positive, self-adjoint operator. Here we will usually use the coordinate representation of the density operator:

$$W(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \beta) = <\mathbf{r}|\hat{W}|\mathbf{r}'> = \sum_{n} \psi_{n}^{*}(\mathbf{r})\hat{W}\psi_{n}(\mathbf{r}')$$
(43)

where the ψ_n are a complete set of quantum states.

For the canonical ensemble (and we always simulate our light particle in a canonical ensemble), the quantum mechanical density operator is

$$\hat{W} = \exp(-\beta \hat{H}) \tag{44}$$

where \hat{H} is the Hamiltonian operator for the system.

In this thesis, we use a discretization of the path intregral form of the density operator for our numerical calculations. We begin with the partition function. In quantum statistical mechanics, rather than having the trace of the density operator equal to unity as is often the case, the trace is instead interpreted as the partition function of the system. To obtain the trace of the density operator (and hence the partition function), we set \mathbf{r} equal to $\mathbf{r'}$ in equation (43) and integrate over the coordinate

$$Q_{NVT} = \int \sum_{n} \psi_n^*(\mathbf{r}) \hat{W} \psi_n(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}.$$
(45)

This is not an easy partition function with which to work since, except for specific, special cases of H, we have no easy way of doing the integral in equation (45). We attempt to put it into a more tractable form for approximation by breaking the exponent into P parts:

$$Q_{1VT} = \int \langle \mathbf{r_1} | e^{\frac{-\beta \hat{H}}{P}} \dots e^{\frac{-\beta \hat{H}}{P}} \dots e^{\frac{-\beta \hat{H}}{P}} | \mathbf{r_1} \rangle d\mathbf{r}.$$
(46)

Note that equation (46) is written just for N = 1 particles. Generalization is possible, but only the N = 1 case is relevant to this thesis so we will concentrate on that. If we insert the identity in the form $\int |\mathbf{r}\rangle \langle \mathbf{r} | d\mathbf{r}$ between each exponent in equation (46), our expression becomes

$$Q_{1VT} = \int \langle \mathbf{r_1} | e^{\frac{-\beta \hat{H}}{P}} | \mathbf{r_2} \rangle \langle \mathbf{r_2} | e^{\frac{-\beta \hat{H}}{P}} | \mathbf{r_3} \rangle \dots \langle \mathbf{r_P} | e^{\frac{-\beta \hat{H}}{P}} | \mathbf{r_1} \rangle d\mathbf{r_1} d\mathbf{r_2} \dots d\mathbf{r_P}$$
(47)

which we can simplify to

$$Q_{1VT} = \int W(\mathbf{r_1}, \mathbf{r_2}, \beta/P) W(\mathbf{r_2}, \mathbf{r_3}, \beta/P) \dots W(\mathbf{r_P}, \mathbf{r_1}, \beta/P) d\mathbf{r_1} d\mathbf{r_2} \dots d\mathbf{r_P}.$$
 (48)

At first glance this expression may seem anything but "more tractable." However, we now have P different density matrices all corresponding to lower β (ie, higher temperature) than the original. At sufficiently large P, and therefore high temperature, we can use the approximation¹

$$W(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{b}}, \beta/P) \approx W_{free}(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{b}}, \beta/P) \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{2P}(U(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{a}}) + U(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{b}}))\right)$$
(49)

where $U(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{a}})$ is the classical potential energy and \hat{W}_{free} is coordinate representation of the density matrix for a free particle

$$W_{free}(\mathbf{r_a}, \mathbf{r_b}, \beta/P) = \left(\frac{Pm}{2\pi\beta\hbar^2}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{Pm}{2\beta\hbar^2}r_{ab}^2\right).$$
(50)

 1 A short derivation of this approximation [25]. We begin with the identity:

$$e^{-\tau (A+B)} = e^{-\tau U/2} e^{-\tau K} e^{-\tau U/2} + O(\tau^3)$$

Then

 $W(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}';\tau) = <\mathbf{r}|e^{-\tau(U+K)}|\mathbf{r}'> = <\mathbf{r}|e^{-\tau K}|\mathbf{r}'>e^{-\tau/2(U(\mathbf{r})+U(\mathbf{r}'))}.$

The first term is just $W_{free}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'; \tau)$.

where $r_{ab}^2 = |\mathbf{r_a} - \mathbf{r_b}|$. We can now write the full expression for Q_{1VT} as

$$Q_{1VT} = \left(\frac{Pm}{2\pi\beta\hbar^2}\right)^{\frac{3P}{2}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{Pm}{2\beta\hbar^2}(r_{12}^2 + r_{23}^3 + \dots + r_{P1}^2)\right) \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{P}(U(\mathbf{r_1}) + U(\mathbf{r_2}) + \dots + U(\mathbf{r_P}))\right) d\mathbf{r_1} \dots d\mathbf{r_P}.$$
(51)

To make this slightly clearer, we rewrite Q_{1VT} as

$$Q_{1VT} = \int \exp(-\beta V(\mathbf{r})) d\mathbf{r_1} \dots d\mathbf{r_P}$$
(52)

and \boldsymbol{W} in the coordinate representation as

$$W(\mathbf{r}) = \exp(-\beta V(\mathbf{r})) \tag{53}$$

where V is given by

$$V(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{P}U(\mathbf{r}) + \kappa(\mathbf{r}).$$
(54)

Here $U(\mathbf{r})$ is the classical potential and $\kappa(\mathbf{r})$ can be written as

$$\kappa(\mathbf{r}) = \left(\frac{Pm}{2\beta^2\hbar^2}\right) (|\mathbf{r}_{12}|^2 + |\mathbf{r}_{23}|^2 + \dots + |\mathbf{r}_{P1}|^2)$$
(55)

$$= \left(\frac{Pm}{2\beta^2\hbar^2}\right)\sum_{a=1}^{P} |\mathbf{r}_a - \mathbf{r}_{a+1}|^2.$$
(56)

where $\mathbf{r}_{P+1} = \mathbf{r}_1$. Notice that equation (56) appears similar to the harmonic oscillator potential; this is a point we will make great use of in the Methods section when we fully explain how to use Monte Carlo methods to equilibrate quantum particles.

References for this section: Allen and Tildesley Ch. 10 [1], Boccio Ch. 6 [5]

We now have all the pieces we need to develop sampling algorithms for our system. In the next section we put these pieces together to describe our various simulation techniques.

3 Methods

In this section we discuss the application of the theory to actual sampling techniques. We give details of our fluid simulation and of the different sampling methods we have employed.

3.1 Fluid Simulation

We simulate an argon fluid of temperature T and volume V. We assume a kinetic energy whose thermodynamic average value is $\frac{3}{2}Nk_BT$ and a pair-pair potential, known as the Lennard-Jones potential

$$U_{LJ}(r) = 4\epsilon \left(\left(\frac{\sigma}{r}\right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r}\right)^6 \right).$$
(57)

A diagram of this potential is shown in Figure 3.1. Clearly at large r, this potential is proportional to r^{-6} ; at this range all we are modeling is the attractive dipole-induced dipole (London dispersion) force between the molecules². The exact form of the non-assymptotic behavior, including the repulsion term,

$$\langle U \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \int_{all_space} E^2 d\tau \propto r^{-6}$$

²An easy way to see that the dipole-induced dipole potential goes as r^{-6} is that for a dipole $E \propto r^{-3}$. Then



Figure 3.1: The Lennard-Jones potential. The parameters ϵ and σ are marked on the diagram.

however, is empirical. The parameters ϵ and σ are specific to the fluid(s) being modeled, where ϵ is the depth of the well and σ is the hard sphere diameter (also known as the van der Waals Radius). For argon, $\epsilon = 3.794 \cdot 10^{-4}$ au and $\sigma = 6.433$ au. We use both atomic units and reduced units in this thesis; for a full discussion, see Appendix A. For the parameters used during simulation, see the modules *FLInfo.f95* and *LPInfo.f95* in Appendices B.1 and B.2 respectively.

In order to speed the simulation and to work sensibly with a periodic boundary condition, we also use a cutoff of $r_{cut} = 2.5\sigma$, giving us a potential energy for the entire fluid of

$$U_{fluid} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j>i}^{N} 4\epsilon \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ij}}\right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ij}}\right)^{6} & r_{ij} \le r_{cut} \\ 0 & r_{ij} > r_{cut} \end{cases}$$
(58)

If we can approximate the structure of the fluid for $r > r_{cut}$, we can correct for this cutoff later by adding a correction u^{tail} to the calculated energy. In this thesis, for u^{tail} we use the simplest possible approximation, given, for each individual particle in the fluid, by

$$u^{tail} = \frac{1}{2} 4\pi \rho \int_{r_{cut}}^{\infty} r^2 U(r) dr$$

$$= \frac{8}{3} \pi \epsilon \sigma^3 \rho \left(\frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{\sigma}{r_{cut}} \right)^9 - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r_{cut}} \right)^3 \right)$$
(59)

where ρ is the number density of the fluid.

We can also calculate the pressure of the fluid during the simulation by using the virial. The pressure P of the fluid is given by

$$P = \frac{\rho}{\beta} + \frac{vir}{V} \tag{60}$$

where $\beta = 1/k_B T$ and *vir* is the virial defined by

$$vir = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i} \sum_{j>i} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{r}_{ij}) \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij}.$$
(61)

Here

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{r}_{ij}) = -\frac{dU}{d\mathbf{r}_{ij}}.\tag{62}$$

The tail correction to the pressure is [13]

$$P^{tail} = \frac{16}{3}\pi\rho^2\epsilon\sigma^3 \left(\frac{2}{3}\left(\frac{\sigma}{r_{cut}}\right)^9 - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r_{cut}}\right)^3\right).$$
(63)

Thus equations (60)-(63) give us a way of sampling the pressure during the simulation.

We simulate the fluid as a bulk and hence we use periodic boundary conditions. In other words, we take a cubic cell and assume that the cell repeats itself infinitely. However, in computing the potential, we use the minimum image convention [1] that we only consider the potential from the closest "image" of a given atom. Since we are using a truncated potential, it is clear that so long as our cutoff radius is less than half the box size, the minimum image convention is a consistent method for obtaining the properties of a bulk.

In the next sections we discuss different methods for sampling the fluid.

References for this section: Allen and Tildesley Ch. 4 [1], Frenkel and Smit Ch. 3 [13]

3.2 Techniques for Sampling Classical Particles

We use a wide variety of techniques to sample our fluid. In all of them, we treat the fluid using classical statistical mechanics (we will discuss sampling for quantum particles in Section 3.3).

3.2.1 Metropolis Canonical Monte Carlo

Recall from the Theory section that Metropolis Sampling is an algorithm for sampling according to a probability distribution. We derived the probability distributions for our thermodynamic ensembles of interest in the Theory section as well; all that remains is to write down the specific sampling algorithms for each.

Recall from equation (13) that the probability density in the canonical ensemble is

$$W_{N,V,T}(\mathbf{r}^N,\mathbf{p}^N) = rac{\exp(-eta H(\mathbf{r}^N,\mathbf{p}^N))}{\int \exp(-eta H(\mathbf{r}^N,\mathbf{p}^N))d\mathbf{r}^Nd\mathbf{p}^N}.$$

As explained in Section 3.1, we can split the Hamiltonian for our fluid into two pieces, a kinetic energy $\kappa = \sum_{N} p_i^2/(2m)$ and the Lennard-Jones Potential energy $U(\mathbf{r}^N)$:

$$H(\mathbf{r}^{N}, \mathbf{p}^{N}) = \kappa + U(\mathbf{r}^{N}) \tag{64}$$

We know that κ integrates to a known constant and thus do not need to calculate it in the simulation. Therefore, we can use equation (15) to write the probability distribution function for this system:

$$W_{N,V,T}(\mathbf{r}^N) \propto \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{r}^N)). \tag{65}$$

Now $W_{N,V,T}(\mathbf{r}^N)$ is of a form to allow us to use the Metropolis algorithm to equilibrate the fluid. The Metropolis canonical Monte Carlo (CMC) algorithm that we use is:

For each particle in the system:

- 1. Calculate the potential energy of the system U
- 2. Give the particle a random displacement $\mathbf{r}' = \mathbf{r} + \Delta$
- 3. Calculate the new energy of the system U'
- 4. Accept the move with probability:

$$acc(\mathbf{r} \to \mathbf{r}') = \min(1, \exp(-\beta(U' - U)))$$
(66)

This procedure has been shown to satisfy balance (although not detailed balance) [13]. Our Fortran 95 implementation of it can be found in Appendix B.1, in the *FLFluidFncs.f95* module on pages 11-13.

References for this section: Allen Tildesley Ch. 4 [1], Frenkel and Smit Ch. 3 [13], Gould et. al Ch. 11 and 16 [14], McQuarrie Ch. 3 [20]

3.2.2 Metropolis Grand Canonical Monte Carlo

From the Theory section (equation (38)) the probability density of the grand canonical ensemble (with only pair interactions) is

$$W_{\mu,V,T}(\mathbf{s}^N, N) = \frac{(zV)^N}{N!} \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N)).$$

The exact Metropolis algorithm for this ensemble is the similar to that for CMC except that this time we can choose to move, create, or destroy a particle. In this simulation, we do each of these with equal probability (ie, we move a particle 1/3 of the time, create a particle 1/3 of the time, and destroy a particle 1/3 of the time). In our code in Appendix B.1, we make this choice on line 81 of the *FLFLuidFncs.f95* module in the *flMCStep* subroutine on page 12.

For moving a particle the ratio of distributions is

$$\frac{W(\mathbf{s'}^N, N)}{W(\mathbf{s}^N, N)} = \exp(-\beta(U(\mathbf{s'}^N; L) - U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)),$$

and thus $acc(\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{s}')$ is the same as for the canonical ensemble

$$acc(\mathbf{s} \to \mathbf{s}') = \min(1, \exp(-\beta(U(\mathbf{s}'; L) - U(\mathbf{s}; L)))).$$
(67)

To create a particle:

$$\frac{W(\mathbf{s}^{N+1},N+1)}{W(\mathbf{s}^N,N)} = \frac{zV}{N+1}\exp(-\beta(U(\mathbf{s}^{N+1};L) - U(\mathbf{s}^N;L))),$$

and to destroy:

$$\frac{W(\mathbf{s}^{N-1}, N-1)}{W(\mathbf{s}^N, N)} = \frac{N}{zV} \exp(-\beta(U(\mathbf{s}^{N-1}; L) - U(\mathbf{s}^N; L))).$$

The corresponding acceptance probabilities are:

$$acc(N \to N+1) = \min\left(1, \frac{zV}{(N+1)}\exp(\beta(-U(\mathbf{s}^{N+1}; L) + U(\mathbf{s}^{N}; L)))\right)$$
 (68)

$$acc(N \to N-1) = \min\left(1, \frac{N}{zV}\exp(-\beta(U(\mathbf{s}^{N-1}; L) - U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)))\right).$$
(69)

We now have all of the theory required to implement GCMC. For our implementation of this GCMC algorithm see Appendix B.1, pages 11-13.

The Metropolis method is a useful simulation technique, but, like all such techniques, it has its weaknesses. For our purposes, the main limitation of the Metropolis algorithm is its inefficiency in exploring spaces with high free energy barriers. Thus we now discuss modifications of, and alternatives to, the Metropolis method, beginning with the Multicanonical method.

References for this section: Allen and Tildesley Ch. 4 [1], Frenkel and Smit Ch. 5 [13], Gould et. al Ch. 11 and 16 [14], McQuarrie Ch. 3 [20]

3.2.3 Multicanonical Method

The Multicanonical method is a modification of the Metropolis method that, for example, when used on a fluid at a phase coexistence boundary, artificially enhances the probability that the system will be found in a mixed state. When using this method we sample, not from a distribution with our usual Hamiltonian, but rather from a modified distribution with effective Hamiltonian [35]

$$\tilde{H}(\mathbf{r}^N, \mathbf{p}^N) = H(\mathbf{r}^N, \mathbf{p}^N) + \eta(N).$$
(70)

Here $\eta(N)$ is a preweighting function chosen such that the associated probability distribution

$$\tilde{W}(N|V,\beta,\mu,\eta(N)) = \frac{1}{\tilde{Q}} \int e^{-\beta \tilde{H}(\mathbf{r}^N,\mathbf{p}^N)} d\mathbf{r}^N d\mathbf{p}^N.$$
(71)

is a constant. Here V is volume, β is $\frac{1}{kT}$ where T is temperature and k is Boltzmann's constant, and μ is chemical potential. Note that \tilde{Q} is the partition function for the modified distribution using \tilde{H} . Clearly the choice $\eta(N) = \ln W(N)$ gives a constant \tilde{W} , where W(N) is the original unmodified probability distribution function appropriate for the ensemble

$$W(N|V,\beta,\mu,\eta(N)) = \frac{1}{Q} \int e^{-\beta H(\mathbf{r}^N,\mathbf{p}^N)} d\mathbf{r}^N d\mathbf{p}^N.$$
(72)

However, calculating this optimal $\eta(N)$ must in principle be as difficult as solving the original problem since it is simply the logarithm of the function we are trying to find. There are many methods for making sensible choices for $\eta(n)$; we will discuss one such method in section 3.2.4. We introduce this weighting function in our code as the variable *eta* in the subroutine *flMCStep* in the *FLFluidFncs.f95* module on pages 11-13 of Appendix B.1.

Once we have found a good choice for $\eta(N)$ we need a method of regaining W(N) from data for W(N). Given that we know $\eta(N)$ the conversion is actually very simple:

$$W(N|V,\beta,\mu) = e^{\eta(n)}\tilde{W}(N|\beta,\mu,\eta(N)).$$
(73)

Simulating a fluid in a grand canonical ensemble using this algorithm is similar to Metropolis GCMC with a modified Hamiltonian \tilde{H} . Using this modified Hamiltonian, the acceptance probabilities of creation and destruction are modified to

$$a\tilde{c}c(N \to N+1) = \min(1, \exp(\eta(N) - \eta(N+1))\frac{zV}{N+1}\exp(\beta(-U(\mathbf{s}^{N+1}; L) + U(\mathbf{s}^{N}; L)))$$
 (74)

$$\tilde{acc}(N \to N-1) = \min(1, \exp(\eta(N) - \eta(N-1))) \frac{N}{zV} \exp(-\beta(U(\mathbf{s}^{N-1}; L) - U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)))).$$
(75)

In a 2001 paper Wilding used this method to calculate a number of points on the phase coexistence curve for a fluid [35], effectively demonstrating that the Multicanonical method helps surmount the phase transition barrier. We follow his lead in testing this algorithm in section 4.3.2.

References for this section: Berg and Neuhaus [4], Wilding [35]

3.2.4 Histogram Reweighting

Histogram reweighting is a technique that allows us to use histograms with one set of model parameters to estimate histograms with other values of those parameters. In this case, our parameters are β (temperature) and μ . Consider a histogram taken at parameters β_0 and μ_0 . The probability density is [35]

$$W(N, U|V, \beta_0, \mu_0) = \frac{1}{Q_0} \int \delta(U - U(\mathbf{r}^N)) e^{-\beta_0(U(\mathbf{r}) - \mu_0 N)} d\mathbf{r}^N.$$
 (76)

To find the probability density at β_1 and μ_1 we can simply reweight the histogram

$$W(N, U|V, \beta_1, \mu_1) = \frac{Q_0}{Q_1} \exp(-(\beta_1(U - N\mu_1) - \beta_0(E - N\mu_0))p(N, E|V, \beta_0, \mu_0).$$
(77)

This allows us then to extrapolate from known data to obtain histograms at different temperatures and chemical potentials.

One use for this technique, proposed by Wilding [35], is to combine histogram reweighting and Multicanonical simulations. In this method, we reweight a histogram from one run into the preweighting function for a Multicanonical simulation at a different temperature and chemical potential. Although this sounds at first like an ideal solution, the process is slower and more cumbersome than it first appears. By the time we have data on which we can do histrogram reweighting, we have lost enough precision to make reweighting to anything but a β_1 near to our original β_0 difficult. For a full explanation of this process and its limitations, see section 4.3.2.

References for this section: Ferrenberg and Swensden [11], [12], Wilding [35]

3.2.5 Classical Wang-Landau Method

The Wang-Landau Method is an alternative to using Metropolis importance sampling. This algorithm solves for the density of states g(E) where g(E) is defined such that the probability that a system has energy E is

$$P(E,\beta) = \frac{g(E)e^{-\beta E}}{Q}.$$
(78)

An algorithm designed to compute g(E) is a different approach from the Metropolis algorithm. Note that were we able to find just g(E) we would not have to run simulations at more than one temperature; we could simply vary the value of β in our post-analysis. Wang and Landau [[31], [32]] propose a method for finding g(E) that we outline here.

This method for determining g(E) is through a random walk in state-space. At every state visited, the energy is noted and the appropriate bin in an energy histogram H(E) is marked. However, since unlikely states rarely get visited in an unweighted random walk, we need to weight the random walk in some way that allows all the states to be visited with approximately equal probability [[31], [32]]. The easiest way to do this is simply to weight by $\frac{1}{g(E)}$, giving a flat histogram for the energy distribution H(E). Of course, we do not know g(E) so we must construct it "on the fly" during the simulation.

We begin with an arbitrary state and an initial guess at g(E) (in general we set g(E) = 1 for all E). We then do a Monte Carlo move and compute the energy before the move E_0 and after the move E_1 and accept the move with probability

$$acc(E_0 \to E_1) = \min\left(1, \frac{g(E_0)}{g(E_1)}\right).$$
 (79)

We update g(E) by multiplying the accepted energy E_{acc} (E_0 if the move is rejected and E_1 if the move is accepted) by a modification factor f > 1:

$$g(E_{acc}) = fg(E_{acc}),\tag{80}$$

and increment our histogram. Generally we begin with an initial value for f of $f_0 = e$. We continue until we have produced a "flat" histogram. We define "flat" to mean that the minimum value of the histogram divided by the mean value of the histogram is greater than some set constant (we use 0.93 for most runs). Once we have a flat histogram we reset the histogram by setting H(E) = 0 for all E and reduce f with the rule $f_{n+1} = \sqrt{f_n}$. We stop the simulation when f falls below a preset value. Note that in practice we work with the logarithms of g(E) and f rather than their full values to avoid losses of precision. The code for this is in Appendix B.1. The Wang-Landau move itself is part of the code in *flMCStep* in the FLFLuidFncs.f95 module on pages 11-13 with the histogram and density of states being updated by the function updateWL on page 14. Checking to see if the histogram is flat and incrementing accordingly is done in FLMain.f95 on page 2. We use the function binE in FLFluidFncs.f95 on page 11 to put the energy into the correct histogram bin.

Unlike Metropolis sampling, the data from a Wang-Landau run is not useful without some post-processing analysis because all of our data needs to be reweighted by that factor of $e^{-\beta E}$. Fortunately, this is a quick and simple computation. Suppose we have data for an observable x. We need two pieces of data for each step i: the value of x at that step x_i and the energy E_i at that step. We then construct the two dimensional histogram H(E, x). The average value of x, < x >, for a particular value of β can be found from this histogram using

$$\langle x \rangle = \frac{1}{\sum_{i} \sum_{j} g(E_j) e^{-\beta E_j} H(E_j, x_i)} \sum_{i} x_i \left(\sum_{j} g(E_j) e^{-\beta E_j} H(E_j, x_i) \right)$$
(81)

An example of this reweighting can be found in Appendix B.4 on line 40 of the Matlab function reweight.m.

References for this section: Gould et al Ch. 15 [14], Wang and Landau [31], [32]

3.2.6 Entropic Sampling

In many papers one will find references to "entropic sampling" so, although we did not implement this sampling technique, we give a brief mention of it here. This technique, first proposed by Jooyoung Lee in 1993 [19], is similar to Wang-Landau sampling. As with Wang-Landau sampling, we construct $S(E) = \ln(g(E))$ and we sample in the same manner

$$acc(E_0 \to E_1) = \min\left(1, \frac{\exp(S(E_0))}{\exp(S(E_1))}\right).$$

$$(82)$$

However, for this method we do not construct S(E) during the simulation. Instead, we run one short simulation with $S_0(E) = 0$ for all E and construct the histogram $H_0(E)$. We then make a new estimate $S_1(E)$ for S(E) as

$$S_1(E) = \begin{cases} S_0(E) & H_0(E) = 0\\ S_0(E) + \ln(H_0(E)) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$
(83)

For our next run we can use this as the estimate of S(E), which, in turn, generates a better guess at S(E). Thus this algorithm is thus a cross between Wang-Landau and Multicanonical sampling.

References for this section: Lee [19]

3.3 Methods for Sampling Quantum Particles

3.3.1 Path Integral Monte Carlo (PIMC)

Recall from the Theory section (equation (53)) that we can treat a quantum particle as a chain made up of P pseudo-particles (or "beads"). If we use this approximation, we can write the probability density for quantum particles in a canonical ensemble as we did in equation (53).

$$W(\mathbf{r}) = \exp(-\beta V(\mathbf{r}))$$

where V is given by equation (54)

$$V(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{P}U(\mathbf{r}) + \kappa(\mathbf{r}).$$

Here $U(\mathbf{r})$ is the classical potential and $\kappa(\mathbf{r})$ can be written for a single quantum particle as shown in equation (56)

$$\kappa(\mathbf{r}) = \left(\frac{Pm}{2\beta^2\hbar^2}\right) \sum_{a=1}^{P} |\mathbf{r}_a - \mathbf{r}_{a+1}|^2.$$

As we mentioned in the Theory section, this equation is reminiscent of a harmonic oscillator potential. In fact, in our simulation we make use of that analogy, visualizing the single quantum particle as a "polymer" of P beads in which neighboring beads are held together with a spring. The full chain contributes its harmonic potential and each bead also contributes $\frac{1}{P}U$ to the total energy of the system. Thus, we can write down a Monte Carlo algorithm for sampling a single quantum particle in a potential U that is very similar in concept to our CMC algorithm:

For each bead:

- 1. Calculate the energy of the system $E = \kappa + \frac{1}{P}U$
- 2. Give a bead a random displacement $\mathbf{r}' = \mathbf{r} + \Delta$
- 3. Calculate the new energy of the system $E' = \kappa' + \frac{1}{P}U'$
- 4. Accept the move with probability:

$$acc(\mathbf{r} \to \mathbf{r}') = \min(1, \exp(-\beta(E' - E)))$$
(84)

Our implementation of PIMC is the function *move* in the module *LPFncs.f95* on page 40 of Appendix B.2.

References for this section: Allen and Tildesley Ch. 10 [1], Boccio Ch. 6 [5], Coker et al [9], Cronin [10], Larrimore [18], Miller and Reese [22], Miller et al [23], Wolfson [36]

3.3.2 PIMC with Threading

When using PIMC, a large number of moves are rejected because the "springs" between the beads are usually very "stiff" thanks to the "kinetic" part of the energy. One method of fixing this, proposed by Pollock and Ceperley [24], is to use "threading." Threading involves directly sampling from the kinetic energy propagator rather than accepting and rejecting moves based on kinetic energy.

Consider the kinetic part of the density matrix W_{κ} . By direct substitution, we can write $W_{\kappa}(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}')$ as

$$W_{\kappa}(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}') = \int W_{\kappa}(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}';\beta-\beta')W_{\kappa}(\mathbf{r}'',\mathbf{r}';\beta')d\mathbf{r}''.$$
(85)

If we iterate this process P times, we find

$$W_{\kappa}(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r}') = \int \dots \int W_{\kappa}(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{r_1};\tau) W_{\kappa}(\mathbf{r_1},\mathbf{r_2};\tau) \dots W_{\kappa}(\mathbf{r_{P-1}},\mathbf{r}';\tau) d\mathbf{r_1} \dots d\mathbf{r_{P-1}}.$$
(86)

Now we can write the integrand of equation (86) as

$$W(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'; \beta) \left(\frac{W(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_{1}; \tau) W(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}'; \beta - \tau)}{W(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'; \beta)} \right) \left(\frac{W(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}; \tau) W(\mathbf{r}_{2}, \mathbf{r}'; \beta - 2\tau)}{W(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}'; \beta - \tau)} \right) \dots \left(\frac{W(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{P}-2}, \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{P}-1}; \tau) W(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{P}-1}, \mathbf{r}'; \beta - \tau)}{W(\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{P}-2}, \mathbf{r}'; 2\tau)} \right).$$
(87)

where $\tau = \beta/P$. Note that the extra terms all cancel. Now the *n*th term brackets in equation (87) is the properly normalized probability that, given endpoints $\mathbf{r_n}$ and $\mathbf{r'}$, the next internal point chosen will be



Figure 3.2: The "chain" of possible next states. There are a total of P steps in the chain.

at $\mathbf{r_{n+1}}$. To lowest order in τ these terms are Gaussians:

$$f(\mathbf{r_{n+1}},\tau) = \frac{W(\mathbf{r_n},\mathbf{r_{n+1}};\tau)W(\mathbf{r_{n+1}},\mathbf{r}';\beta-(n+1)\tau)}{W(\mathbf{r_n},\mathbf{r}';\beta-n\tau)}$$
$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_{n+1}^2}}\exp\left(\frac{-(\mathbf{r_{n+1}}-\bar{\mathbf{r}_{n+1}})^2}{2\sigma_{n+1}^2}\right)$$
(88)

Now we just need expressions for $\bar{\mathbf{r}}_{n+1}$ and σ_{n+1} . Clearly, the average value for $\bar{\mathbf{r}}_{n+1}$ should be one step along the chain from \mathbf{r}_n to \mathbf{r}' . The chain has a total of P steps with P - n steps between \mathbf{r}_n and \mathbf{r}' (see Figure 3.2). Thus

$$\overline{\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{n+1}} = \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{n}} + \frac{1}{P-n} (\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{n}}).$$
(89)

Rearranging equation (89) and multiplying by τ/τ

$$\bar{\mathbf{r}}_{\mathbf{n+1}} = \frac{\beta - (n+1)\tau}{\beta - n\tau} \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{n}} + \frac{\tau}{\beta - n\tau} \mathbf{r}'.$$
(90)

We can find σ_{n+1} by normalizing f. We find

$$\sigma_{n+1}^2 = \tau \Lambda^2 \left(\frac{\beta - (n+1)\tau}{\beta - n\tau} \right) \tag{91}$$

Pollock and Ceperley [24] show this algebraically.

Thus we can use equation (88) to approximate the acceptance probability for a single bead move as a Gaussian. Then, instead of doing trial moves and explicitly calculating "kinetic" energy, we just pick trial moves from the appropriate Gaussian distribution. To speed up the process, we actually move a number of sequential beads (a "thread") at one time. This guarantees that we will have the correct distribution of moves under the kinetic energy propagator. We then accept and reject moves explicitly based only on the potential energy U. Our implementation of threading is the *moveThread* function of the module LPFncs.f95 on pages 40-41 of Appendix B.2. We pick trial moves from the correct Gaussian distribution in the function tryboth on page 44 and calculate potential energy in the function lpflPot on page 39.

References for this section: Cronin [10], Pollock and Ceperly [24], Wolfson [36]

3.3.3 Quantum Wang-Landau

We can also adapt the Wang-Landau method to simulate a quantum particle. However, now we have β both in the numerator and denominator of the exponent in the integrand of our partition function:

$$Q = \int \exp\left(-\frac{\kappa(\mathbf{r}^N, \mathbf{p}^N)}{\beta} - \beta U(\mathbf{r}^N)\right) d\mathbf{r}^N d\mathbf{p}^N.$$
(92)

Vorontsov-Velyaminov and Lyubartsev [30] point out that this difference in β dependence does not prevent us from using Wang-Landau, but does require that we sample a two-dimensional density of states $g(E_1, E_2)$, where E_1 corresponds to kinetic energy, and E_2 corresponds to potential energy. Rewriting the partition function in terms of E_1, E_2 and $g(E_1, E_2)$ gives

$$Q = \int \exp\left(-\frac{E_1}{\beta} - \beta E_2\right) g(E_1, E_2) dE_1 dE_2$$
(93)

Thus, because g is a function of two variables, we must construct a two-dimensional histogram when carrying out the Wang-Landau method in order to find observables. Reweighting the simulation data to find the average value of an observable is similar to the classical case, but now we need to store the kinetic and potential energies separately so that they can be properly reweighted at the end of the simulation. When we actually reweight an observable we now need a three-dimensional histogram consisting of kinetic energy, potential energy, and the observable. See the function reweightSHO.m in Appendix B.4 for an example of how this is implemented. Otherwise, however, we do not need to modify our algorithm for the Wang-Landau method from the classical case. A Wang-Landau move is implemented in the function moveWL on page 43 of Appendix B.2 in the module LPFncs.f95. We calculate energies in this same module using the functions kinEnergy, kin1 and potEnergy on pages 38 and 44 and bin them using the functions binKin and binPot in the LPGenFncs.f95 module on page 46.

References for this section: Gould et al Ch. 15 [14], Vorontsov-Velyaminov and Lyubartsev [30], Wang and Landau [31], [32]

3.4 Methods for Determining Chemical Potential

For simulations in a grand canonical ensemble we need to input a chemical potential and therefore we require a method for determining the chemical potential of a system. Here we discuss algorithms that can be used to find the chemical potential for a simulation.

3.4.1 Widom Test Particle Insertion Method

The Widom Test Particle Insertion Method is a simple way of calculating the chemical potential during a simulation. We start from the thermodynamic definition of chemical potential

$$\mu = \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial N}\right)_{VT} \tag{94}$$

where F is the free energy of the system. Recall from equation (41) that we can write μ as

$$\mu = -k_B T \ln\left(\frac{V}{\Lambda^3(N+1)}\right) - k_B T \ln\left(\frac{\int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^{N+1};L))d\mathbf{s}^{N+1}}{\int \exp(-\beta U(\mathbf{s}^N;L))d\mathbf{s}^N}\right)$$
$$= \mu_{id} + \mu_{ex},$$

separating μ into an ideal gas component (which we can solve for analytically) and an "excess" component. Now let $\Delta U = U(\mathbf{s}^{N+1}; L) - U(\mathbf{s}^N; L)$. Then we can write the excess chemical potential as

$$\mu_{ex} = -k_B T \ln\left(\int \langle \exp(-\beta \Delta U) \rangle_N \, d\mathbf{s}^{N+1}\right) \tag{95}$$

where $\langle \cdots \rangle_N$ is the canonical ensemble average over the N-particle system. Therefore, we now have μ_{ex} in a form we can compute using Monte Carlo sampling. To carry out this calculation, we create an N-particle system and then compute the change in energy that would result if we added another the particle to the system in a random location. Note that we do not actually add the particle to the simulation; the particle number always remains fixed at N. The average of $\exp(-\beta\Delta U)$ over all random locations gives the value for the integral in equation (95). Note that this method is efficient and reasonably accurate, but only suited to low density simulations. Our implementation of the Widom Method can be found in the function widomTest on page 15 of Appendix B.1 as part of the FLFluidFncs.f95 module.

References for this section: Frenkel and Smit Ch. 7 [13], Widom [33]

3.4.2 Bennet Method

The Bennet Method, or the Overlapping Distribution Method, is another method for determining chemical potential that, unlike the Widom Method, does not fail at high density. However, it is less efficient as it requires that two different simulations be run.

Consider two N-particle systems, system 0 and system 1, with partition functions Q_0 and Q_1 . For convenience's sake, we assume these systems have the same volume. The difference in free energy between these systems is given by

$$\Delta F = -k_B T \ln\left(\frac{Q_1}{Q_0}\right)$$

= $-k_B T \ln\left(\frac{\int \exp(-\beta U_1(\mathbf{s}^N; L)) d\mathbf{s}^N}{\int \exp(-\beta U_0(\mathbf{s}^N; L)) d\mathbf{s}^N}\right).$ (96)

Consider the energy difference $\Delta U = U_1(\mathbf{s}^N; L) - U_0(\mathbf{s}^N; L)$ between the two systems. The probability density function for ΔU when sampling system 1 is given by

$$W_1(\Delta U) = \frac{\int \exp(-\beta U_1)\delta(U_1 - U_0 - \Delta U)d\mathbf{s}^N}{q_1}$$
(97)

where $Q_1 = \int \exp(-\beta U_1(\mathbf{s}^N)) d\mathbf{s}^N$. Using properties of the delta function we can rewrite W_1 in the following manner:

$$W_{1}(\Delta U) = \frac{\int \exp(-\beta(U_{0} + \Delta U))\delta(U_{1} - U_{0} - \Delta U)d\mathbf{s}^{N}}{Q_{1}}$$
$$= \frac{Q_{0}}{Q_{1}}\exp(-\beta\Delta U)\frac{\int \exp(-\beta U_{0})\delta(U_{1} - U_{0} - \Delta U)d\mathbf{s}^{N}}{Q_{0}}$$
$$= \frac{Q_{0}}{Q_{1}}\exp(-\beta\Delta U)W_{0}(\Delta U)$$
(98)

where W_0 is the probability of finding ΔU when sampling from system 0. Now $\Delta F = -k_B T \ln \left(\frac{Q_1}{Q_0}\right)$ and therefore

$$\ln(W_1(\Delta U)) = \beta(\Delta F - \Delta U) + \ln(W_0(\Delta U)).$$
(99)

We define the quantities f_0 and f_1

$$f_0(\Delta U) = \ln(W_0(\Delta U)) - \frac{\beta \Delta U}{2}$$
(100)

$$f_1(\Delta U) = \ln(W_1(\Delta U)) + \frac{\beta \Delta U}{2}$$
(101)

such that

$$f_1(\Delta U) = f_0(\Delta U) + \beta \Delta F. \tag{102}$$

If we have two systems, we can find ΔF by fitting a polynomial in ΔU to the data for f_1 and f_0 and looking at the difference between them. This difference should be a constant equal to $\beta \Delta F$.

For the particular problem of calculating chemical potential, we can consider system 1 to have N + 1 particles and system 0 to have N particles. From equation (95) it is clear that the difference in free energy between these systems is μ_{ex} . Thus

$$\beta \mu_{ex} = f_1(\Delta U) - f_0(\Delta U). \tag{103}$$

In practice, we run two simulations, one with N particles and one with N + 1 particles. Similar to the Widom Method, in the N+1 particle system, we record the change in potential energy were we to *destroy*

one of the particles. Conversely, in the N particle system we record is the change in potential energy were we to *create* a particle. While it might seem that this could all be done in the same system (by recording the energy change both when we remove and when we create a particle), it turns out at that at a relatively low number of particles (hundreds), the exact size of the system can make a difference and we really do need two simulations, one with N particles and one with N + 1.

References for this section: Bennet [3], Frenkel and Smit Ch. 7 [13]

Other sampling methods for classical and light particles can be found in the literature. We have given a broad overview of the topic and have discussed enough possible sampling methods to explain the significance of our results.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Random Number Generator Tests

Firstly, we discuss our results from the random number generator tests. These are not research results, but a working random number generator is a prerequisite to all of the results that follow in the next sections. We use a Mersenne Twister (MT) generator in our simulations, but for comparison, we here present tests of both the MT generator and a linear congruential (LC) generator with reshuffling, the algorithms for which can be found in Appendix B.3.

4.1.1 Periodicity

We ran random walks using the MT and LC generators. The two plots are shown in Figures 4.1(a) and 4.1(b). The period of the linear congruential generator is very clear; it looks to be approximately



4.1(a) Periodicity test for linear congruential random number generator.



4.1(b) Periodicity test for Mersenne Twister generator.

Figure 4.1: Periodicity Tests

250,000 steps. However, despite running the Mersenne Twister for a hundred million steps, we are unable to identify the length of the period. Since most of our runs are on the order of a million steps and approximately one billion random numbers, it is clear that the Mersenne Twister is better suited to our needs.

4.1.2 Uniformity

The histograms for the linear congruential generator and the Mersenne Twister generator for ten million random numbers are given in Figures 4.2(a) and 4.2(b). These both appear somewhat "flat," and we can confirm that appearance if we define the "flatness" of a histogram as the minimum value of the histogram



4.2(a) Uniformity Test for linear congruential random number generator.

4.2(b) Uniformity Test for Mersenne Twister generator.

Figure 4.2: Uniformity Tests

divided by the mean value. With that definition, the linear congruential generator has a flatness of 0.9995 and the Mersenne Twister has a flatness of 0.9923.

4.1.3 Chi-Square Test

We compute χ^2 for the linear congruential and the Mersenne Twister generator using the histogram created when we tested for uniformity. For the Mersenne Twister $\chi^2 = 76.8599$ and for the linear congruential generator $\chi^2 = 0.5263$. Since, in this case, M = 100, the Mersenne Twister generator passes this test. However, the linear congruential generator has an incredibly tiny χ^2 confirming our hypothesis that we are running close to a multiple of the period. However, since the period is so small, this is hard to avoid.

4.1.4 Hidden Correlations

Neither generator appears to have any hidden correlations. The plots are not included because they are simply filled-in unit squares.

For all of the results presented in the remainder of this section, we have used the MT generator.

4.2 CMC Simulation Results

4.2.1 Comparison of Average Potential Energy

We begin with a simple comparison of our original Metropolis CMC simulation with literature values. We ran the simulation with 864 particles at a reduced density of 0.45 and a temperature of 1.764 (parameters picked to match [29]) for 15000 time steps starting from an ordered configuration and recorded the average potential energy per particle at each time step. The resulting graph of particle energy at each time step is shown in Figure 4.3. The tail correction (equation (59)) has been included in the graph.

We find an average energy of 2.91 ± 0.03 . For these same parameters, Verlet [29] found an average potential of -2.89, which is within the error of our result.

We also must ask ourselves how we know that our simulation has run long enough. We first must make sure the system is equilibrated. Here, we do this by plotting the running average and considering the system "equilibrated" when the running average is always within 5% of the time average (this run took



Figure 4.3: Average potential energy for our Metropolis CMC simulation.



Figure 4.4: Time correlation function for a CMC run.

approximately 500 steps to equilibrate). Once we have an equilibrated system, we need to know how long we should run the system afterwards to allow it to fully explore the state space. We do this in two steps.

We first compute the normalized time correlation function of the data, which is shown in Figure 4.4. From this, we estimate how many time steps are "correlated" by finding the first point where the time correlation function drops below 0.01. For the potential energy for this fluid simulation, we find that energies separated by at least 80 times steps are uncorrelated.

We then arrange our data into "blocks" of large numbers of data points in an attempt to find how long we need to run a simulation (see the function *blocking.m* in Appendix B.4). Basically, we want blocks for which the error between the means of the blocks is of the same order as the error of the means within



Figure 4.5: Blocks for a CMC run. The error bars show the error within each block.

the blocks. To compute the error of the mean within a block, we divide the standard deviation of a block by the square root of the number of *uncorrelated* data points in the block. Figure 4.5 shows data blocks of 1000 time steps (corresponding to 1000/80 = 12.5 uncorrelated points). Here the average error within one block is 0.0092 while the standard deviation of the block means is 0.0031. These are "on the same order" and we conclude that the system needs approximately 1000 steps to explore the full space.

4.2.2 Calculation of Pressure

As a matter of practical interest, as well as a test of our fluid simulation, we can compute the pressure at different densities. Using a temperature of $T^* = 2$ and N = 500 particles, we ran simulations at 9 different densities and computed the pressure using equation (60) and adding in the correction given in equation (63). We ran the simulations for 2000 time steps, allowing 500 time steps for the system to equilibrate. A comparison of our data with that of the molecular dynamics simulations from [15] is given in Figure 4.6

Once again, our simulation data is acceptably close to data given in the literature, showing that the basic CMC simulation is sound. Further, we can say something about the physics of the situation. At low densities, the fluid should behave as an ideal gas and P/ρ should be equal to $\frac{3}{2}kT$. Looking at Figure 4.6, we do see this linear relationship in this region. As the density increases, pressure scales as $\rho/\beta + A\rho^2$ where A is a constant. To see this relationship, consider equation (60). The virial is basically a measure of the number of interactions. The number of interactions per particle should scale linearly with density and the virial is N times this quantity. Thus the term vir/V scales as a function of density squared, and we can see this relationship in Figure 4.6.

4.3 GCMC Simulation Results

4.3.1 Widom Test Particle Insertion

The first test of our GCMC simulation involved a comparison to runs of our CMC simulation. We ran several CMC simulations at different densities and, as a run at a given density proceeded, used the Widom method to determine the corresponding chemical potential, μ . The simulations were done for a total of 2000 steps using a temperature of $T^* = 2$. For the CMC simulation, we used N = 500 Lennard-Jones



Figure 4.6: A comparison of pressure data between our simulation and literature.

particles. We then ran independent GCMC simulations at the chemical potentials calculated from the CMC simulations, and recorded the average density of the GCMC runs. The data are shown in Table 1. Graphical presentation of the data shown in Table 1 is given in Figure 4.7.

CMC Density $\left(\frac{N}{\sigma^3}\right)$	GCMC Density $\left(\frac{N}{\sigma^3}\right)$	Error $(\%)$
0.1	0.0974	2.6
0.15	0.1514	0.93
0.2	0.2070	3.5
0.25	0.2700	8.0
0.3	0.3029	1.0
0.35	0.3529	0.83
0.4	0.3926	1.7
0.45	0.4681	4.0
0.5	0.4909	1.8

Table 1: The average density of GCMC simulations (middle column) run at chemical potentials found from CMC simulations (density left column).

We see from Table 1 and Figure 4.7 that the density obtained from the GCMC simulation is close to the original density of the CMC simulation. This is a good indication that both the grand-canconical sampling and the Widom method are working correctly, and give a consistent picture of the fluid in equilibrium.

As another test, we can use the Widom method during the GCMC simulation to calculate chemical potential as the run proceeds. If the Widom Method is working properly, it should calculate the same





Figure 4.7: Density from GCMC simulations compared with density from CMC simulations. Here "target" density refers to the density from the CMC simulations that we hope is matched by the GCMC simulation.

chemical potential as originally input. For these simulations, we actually use the activity $z = \frac{\exp(\beta\mu)}{\Lambda^3}$ where Λ is the thermal deBroglie wavelength (see the code in Appendix B.1). The results of this test are given in Table 2 and Figure 4.8.

Input Activity $\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^3}\right)$	Widom Test Activity $\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^3}\right)$	Error $(\%)$
0.0820	0.0827	0.85
0.1184	0.1193	0.76
0.1541	0.1575	2.2
0.1956	0.1769	9.6
0.2178	0.2090	4.0
0.2585	0.2707	4.7
0.3002	0.2768	7.8
0.4211	0.4258	1.1
0 4608	0.4162	97

Table 2: The activity calculated by the Widom method (middle column) and the original inputted activity (left column). The agreement between these two columns is an indication that our Widom method and GCMC simulation are performing correctly.

Once again, we have evidence that our simulation, and in particular our implementation of the Widom method, is sound. The GCMC simulations give back almost exactly the same activity as was originally input. However, we do see a tendency for the error in activity to increase at higher density. This tendency owes to the issues with the Widom method at higher densities discussed in section 3.4.1. Should one need a method more accurate at high densities one could implement the Bennet method described in 3.4.2.

4.3.2 Multicanonical Results

In order to get interesting data for the Multicanonical runs, we first had to find a point near the liquid-gas phase transition. For the truncated Lennard-Jones potential for argon, the critical point is at $\beta = 0.842$ and z = 0.0388 [35]. We chose a temperature just a little below the critical temperature and adjusted the value of μ until we found the value of μ that would place us on the coexistence curve. This "adjustment" of μ was an iterative process. We started with the value of μ almost at the critical point and did a



Figure 4.8: Activity as calculated by Widom Test vs the input ("target") activity.

run. When that run finished, we took the resulting histogram (which did not show phase coexistence) and used histogram reweighting as in equation (77) until we found a value of μ that produced a density histogram with two peaks of roughly the same height. We then used this value of μ in simulation and repeated the process until we found a value for μ where the simulation produced a density histogram with two peaks of approximately the same height with the same area underneath. The input parameters of z = 0.0597103 (this precision is needed) and $\beta = 0.855$ eventually produced the density plot shown in Figure 4.9. Note that nothing yet discussed has actually involved Multicanonical sampling; we were still just attempting to find a first guess for a preweighting function.

Just observing the data in Figure 4.9 by eye, we can conclude that the system appears to be spending approximately equal time in the liquid and gas phases. We can do a better analysis, however, computing the histogram shown in Figure 4.10.

As a last step in implementing the Multicanonical technique, we used a smoothed version of the histogram shown in Figure 4.10 as a preweighting function for a Multicanonical simulation run with the same parameters ($\beta = 0.855$ and z = 0.0597103). A summary of that run is shown in Figure 4.11.

With the exception of the large left-hand spike in the raw data histogram shown in the bottom-left of Figure 4.11, we obtain a flat histogram of raw densities. The "spike" is caused because in the original (unweighted) simulation, the simulation was never able to explore that area. The "perfect" histogram for these parameters would have slightly-larger-than-zero values in this region, but our simulation never explored that space at all. Note that we will almost always have this "edge" to our data. This is the region that Multicanonical sampling is "pushed" into where it really should not be. Looking closely at Figure 4.11, we see that there is also a jagged edge on the high density side. However, this edge is damped down because the energy is higher in this region and the $e^{-\beta H}$ term in equation (71) forces the height of the spike down. However, the spikes do not affect the data in the area of interest (they are, in fact, there because they are *not* in the area of interest); the re-biased histogram in the bottom-right of Figure



Figure 4.9: Reduced density over the GCMC run



Figure 4.10: Density histogram

4.11 is similar in form to the original simulation. We conclude that the Multicanonical simulations of the fluid are giving accurate results.

4.4 Wang-Landau Results

4.4.1 Classical Wang-Landau Results

The Multicanonical method is not as useful as it first appears. Simply finding that first point to create figure 4.10 took a number of simulations because we had to iteratively calculate μ . Should we wish to explore a system at a different temperature, we would have to reweight the histogram to a different temperature and chemical potential before we could use it as our preweighting function. However, this reweighting in temperature does not give a completely accurate histogram; the reweighting only varies



Figure 4.11: Top-left: The preweighting function. Top-right: Raw densities over the simulation. Bottomleft: The density histogram of the raw density data before unweighting it with the preweighting function. Bottom-right: The density histogram after unweighting with the preweighting function.

the heights of the peaks without moving them further apart. In fact, if we look at the mathematics of the situation, reweighting *cannot* move the peaks further apart. The top of the peak is a maximum and thus the first derivative with respect to number of particles is zero. Therefore, there is no set "direction" for the peaks to move with changing temperature. Thus changes in temperature have to be very small so that the fluid and gas densities are approximately the same in order to have this method work at all. Trying to use Multicanonical sampling and histogram reweighting to trace a coexistence curve or find a stable point low on the curve can be done [35], but it is a long and tedious process. Adding a light particle to the system would triple the number of preweighting functions required (since we need one for kinetic and potential energy of the light particle) and, in all probability, make simulation at more than a few temperatures extremely difficult.

Thus we consider another sampling method that does not require a preweighting function or a temperature of simulation. The Wang-Landau method takes longer than any single Multicanonical simulation, but gives information about all temperatures and thus does not require the iterative methods of multicaonical sampling.

Our first step upon implementing Wang-Landau sampling for the argon fluid was to try to compare our results with those in the literature. We ran one Wang-Landau simulation for a canonical ensemble $(\rho^* = 0.1, N = 100)$ and used the resulting density of states to calculate the average potential energies at numerous different temperatures. For this system, we could pick "all E" by looking at our data from previous Metropolis runs, such as that shown in Figure 4.3. From these data, we chose a lower bound of -4 reduced units per particle and an upper bound of 0 (recall that we are bounded above by zero). The density of states as it evolved over the run is shown in Figure 4.12. In this figure, an "iteration" refers



Figure 4.12: Evolution of density of states for a Wang-Landau simulation.

to a point in the run where we have a flat histogram and are about to decrease our f value in Equation (80). In the calculations and results presented below, we used g(E) after 13 iterations.

From equation (78), the potential energy $U(\beta)$ at a particular value for β is given by

$$U(\beta) = \int_{all E} \frac{1}{Q} g(E) e^{-\beta E} dE.$$
 (104)

Since g(E) is necessarily discrete in a numerical simulation, we can evaluate this integral as a sum in post-processing (see *reweight.m* in Appendix B.4). Doing so for a range of temperatures gives average potential energy as a function of temperature. Making use of the data in Johnson, et al [15] for comparison purposes once again, we get the results shown in Figure 4.13. Most of the results we compare to are from Molecular Dynamics (MD) simulations, but we also included the few Monte Carlo simulation data points.

This is a very impressive result. One Wang-Landau simulation gives data that would, for this particular figure, take 12 MD or Metropolis sampling MC simulations to reproduce.

Looking at the figure, we do see that Wang-Landau appears to be less accurate at low temperatures. This is for a variety of reasons. First of all, the simulations from [15] to which we are comparing have slightly different parameters, which could cause some minor differences in results. The MD simulations utilize another algorithm entirely and even the MC simulations use a different cutoff radius than we do. We guess that the greatest inaccuracy occurs, however, because, of necessity, the Wang-Landau simulation has a lower and upper bound set on the energies it can explore. We set up the historgram for the density of states before running the simulation can reach by the bounds we set on the density of states. In this case, they were $U^* = 0$ and $U^* = -4$. Clearly, $U^* = -4$ was not quite low enough and the system might, if we had let it, have spent time in a lower energy state. It is true that there is an absolute lowest energy for this configuration; however, if we allowed the simulation to explore all the way down to that energy, the simulation would take much longer to run without generating much more useful data. If we were to run a simulation where we knew we wanted high temperature results, we would use a lower lower bound on energy (and probably a lower upper bound as well to keep the simulation from running too long).



Figure 4.13: Average internal energy as obtained from a Wang-Landau simulation at different temperatures.

4.4.2 Quantum Wang-Landau Simulation Results

3

Our eventual goal is to use Wang-Landau to simulate a light particle in a fluid. Thus, we first implemented Wang-Landau PIMC for a light particle in a one-dimensional, simple harmonic oscillator (SHO) potential. Interestingly, the SHO has an analytical solution not just for the "exact" case of $P = \infty$ but even at a finite number of beads P [30], though this expression can be difficult to evaluate as P increases. We tested our implementation of Wang-Landau on a system with 8 beads. For this system, the analytical solution for average potential energy $\langle U \rangle$ is

$$\langle U \rangle_{P=8} = \frac{\beta}{4P^2} \frac{32C^7 - 48C^5 + 20C^3 - 2C}{4C^8 - 8C^6 + 5C^4 - C^2}$$
 (105)

where $C = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\beta}{P}\right)^2$. This equation is derived in [30]. Qualitatively we can see that the behavior is correct. At large β , $\langle U \rangle$ goes as $1/\beta$. The low temperature limit is therefore 0 and not 0.5 as it would be for the $P = \infty$ case. At low β , the expression goes to the equipartition theoretical limit³ $\frac{1}{2}kT$.

As with our testing of the classical simulation, we ran one Wang-Landau simulation and used that to calculate potential energy at a variety of different values of β . The two-dimensional density of states is shown as a surface plot in Figure 4.14. One potential issue we address here is the that the density of states appears to peak where we cut off kinetic energy and that if we allowed higher kinetic energies, the peak would increase in height. This is true, but it really only effects low values of β where the term $\exp(-E_1/\beta)$ is far from one and therefore a significant factor in the partition function. As a result, so long as we are interested in higher values for β , we can cut off the energy where we do without having it affect the solution too greatly. Note also that the density of states is not discrete, although harmonic

$$< U >_{\beta \to 0} = \frac{\beta}{4P^2} \frac{32\left(1 + 7/2\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) - 48\left(1 + 5/2\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) + 20\left(1 + 3/2\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) - 2\left(1 + \left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right)}{4\left(1 + 4\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) - 8\left(1 + 3\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) + 5\left(1 + 2\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) - \left(1 + \left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right)}{4\left(1 + 4\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) - 8\left(1 + 3\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) + 5\left(1 + 2\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) - \left(1 + \left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right)}{4\left(1 + 4\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) - 8\left(1 + 3\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) + 5\left(1 + 2\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) - \left(1 + \left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right)}{4\left(1 + 4\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) - 8\left(1 + 3\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right)} = \frac{1}{4\beta}\left(2 + 21\left(\frac{\beta^2}{P^2}\right)\right) \approx \frac{1}{2}kT$$
oscillator energy levels are. This is because, although the kinetic and potential energy should always add to a multiple of $\frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega$, their ratio to each other is not fixed. Thus the two dimensional density of states is, in theory, continuous.



Figure 4.14: Density of states for SHO Wang-Landau simulation.

Finding average potential energy from the density of states in this case is similar to the classical case except that now we need to do the two dimensional integral (see reweightSHO.m in Appendix B.4 for an idea of how we might do this integral)

$$U(\beta) = \int_{allE_1} \int_{allE_2} \frac{1}{Q} E_2 g(E_1, E_2) \exp\left(-E_1/\beta - E_2\beta\right) dE_1 dE_2$$
(106)

where E_1 is kinetic energy and E_2 is potential energy.

For comparison, we also ran a Metropolis sampling PIMC at $\beta = 0.5$ and reweighted the resulting histogram with different values of β . The graph comparing analytical potential energy, energy from the Wang-Landau simulation, and energy reweighted from a Metropolis simulation is shown in Figure 4.15. Even in this simple system where we might expect histogram reweighting to be quite effective, it appears that Wang-Landau does a much better job than histogram reweighting. We can make this even clearer by plotting the fractional error of the Wang-Landau and histogram reweighted runs against the analytical value. This plot is shown in Figure 4.16.

From the plot of error, we conclude that Wang-Landau is much more accurate than histogram reweighting; it almost never shows more than a 0.1 fractional error. The reweighted results of a Metropolis sampling run have a consistently larger error except right around $\beta = 0.5$, where the run actually took place. The high error in Wang-Landau at low β arises from the reason discussed above; the range over which we sampled kinetic energies was not quite broad enough to get an accurate result at this high a temperature. Breadth and good resolution are competing needs for the histogram used in the Wang-Landau method.

4.5 Light Particle in a Frozen Fluid

Finally, we put the light-particle in a non-trivial potential. In order to have a physical identity for our light particle, we simulated helium with five beads interacting with a fluid via the Lennard-Jones potential. As



Figure 4.15: Average potential energy for Wang-Landau simulation, reweighted Metropolis sampling, and analytical solution of a simple harmonic oscillator.



Figure 4.16: The fractional error between the analytical solution and the simulations for potential energy.

a first step, we allowed only the helium to move; we kept the fluid frozen and did both Quantum Wang-Landau and PIMC with threading sampling runs. We used the same analysis as in section 4.4.2 to find average potential energy at many different temperatures from the Wang-Landau data. This potential has no analytical solution so we ran our PIMC algorithm for a range of different temperatures and recorded the average potential energies. We also ran a classical Metropolis sampling to determine whether it was necessary to treat He as a quantum particle. The comparison between classical Metropolis, PIMC, and Quantum Wang-Landau is shown in Figure 4.17.

This plot shows agreement between the Wang-Landau and PIMC algorithms, although we see that the Wang-Landau algorithm is plagued by the same problems at high values of β as we have been seeing throughout this thesis. Once again, our potential energy setting was too high to capture the full range at these lower temperatures. To lower it, however, would require either a substantially longer running time or less accurate answers at lower β . Note that we can, in the same running time, obtain accurate answers at high β , we would just need to sacrifice accuracy at the lower values.

The agreement between classical Metropolis and PIMC is also good at low values for β and falls away at higher values. Here, however, we cannot fix this disagreement by changing the parameters of our simulation; we are finding that at low temperatures we can no longer approximate helium as a quantum



Figure 4.17: Average potential energy for Wang-Landau, PIMC, and classical Metropolis sampling for a light particle in a frozen fluid.

particle. We can see this more quantitatively by explicitly calculating de Broglie wavelengths for the particles. In order that we model the particles as classical particles, the mean separation between the particles needs to be much greater than their wavelength. For our system, an approximation of the mean separation \bar{R} between particles is just

$$\bar{R} = \left(\frac{V}{N}\right)^{1/3} = \left(\frac{1}{1.127 \cdot 10^{-3}}\right)^{1/3} = 9.609 \text{ au.}$$
 (107)

The relevant de Broglie wavelength is actually the sum of the de Broglie wavelengths of the quantum and fluid particles

$$\bar{\lambda} = \lambda_{Ar} + \lambda_{He} = \frac{h}{\bar{p}_{Ar}} + \frac{h}{\bar{p}_{He}} = \frac{h}{\sqrt{3m_{Ar}kT}} + \frac{h}{\sqrt{3m_{He}kT}}$$
(108)

where we have just used $\frac{1}{2m}\bar{p}^2 = \frac{3}{2}kT$ for the last step. Plugging in $\beta = 500 \text{ au}^{-1}$ into this, we find $\bar{\lambda} = 1.25$ au, and the condition $\bar{R} >> \bar{\lambda}$ is satisfied. If, however, we move out to $\beta = 8000 \text{ au}^{-1}$, $\bar{\lambda} = 5.011$ au. This is only a factor of two smaller than \bar{R} and, therefore, at this value for β , we are no longer in a region in which classical approximations apply. This is reflected in Figure 4.17 where we see that the classical and PIMC results diverge at high β .

Having established agreement between PIMC and Quantum Wang-Landau, we can also do benchmarking tests to compare the computational efficiency of the two quantum algorithms. In other words, it is hoped that Wang-Landau allows us to simulate the light particle in potentials requiring infeasible equilibration times by conventional Metropolis algorithms, which makes computation time of interest here. Wang-Landau and PIMC are roughly equivalent in terms of the amount of time per MC step. Wang-Landau takes on the order of 60 seconds for 100000 steps and PIMC takes 40 seconds. Thus here we compare MC steps.

We ran a Wang-Landau simulation, recording the density of states each time we reduced f and calculated average potential energy for each iteration of the density of states. With Wang-Landau sampling, there is no way to get a running average for potential energy. Rather we only get successively better and better estimates for g(E) at discrete points when the energy histogram is flat. Our calculations for potential energy for $\beta = 5272$ au are shown as a function of MC steps in Figure 4.18.



Figure 4.18: Average potential energy as a function of MC steps for a Wang-Landau simulation. Stars are the data points showing the average using successively better estimates for g(E). The system appears to reach a steady average around 60 million MC steps.

To estimate how long this run takes, we use the following procedure. We consider the expected value of potential energy to be the value at the last data point in Figure 4.18. We then find the standard deviation of all the points in Figure 4.18 from this expected value and plot the number of standard deviations each point is from the expected value in Figure 4.19. The run is considered long enough when we are within one standard deviation of the expected value. This occurs at approximately 60 million MC steps.



Figure 4.19: Simulation error as a function of MC steps for a Wang-Landau simulation. Stars are the data points showing the error at successively better estimates for g(E). The system appears to reach a steady average around 60 million MC steps.

For PIMC sampling, we are able to calculate the energy every MC step, but just looking at that graph



Figure 4.20: Time correlation function for a PIMC run.



Figure 4.21: Average potential energy as a function of MC steps for a PIMC blocks of 200000 data points.

is not very enlightening. Thus we use the technique described in section 4.2.1 to estimate how long we need to run the simulation before it has fully explored the space. The time correlation function for a PIMC run is shown in Figure 4.20. From it, we found that steps at least 900 steps apart are uncorrelated. Then, using blocks of size 200000 for a 1000000 step run, we obtain the graph shown in Figure 4.21. Here the standard deviation of the means is $2.8 \cdot 10^{-6}$ and the average error per block is $8.2 \cdot 10^{-6}$. Blocks any smaller have a standard deviation of the means that is greater than the average error per block and we conclude that for this sampling technique, the simulation requires approximately 200000 MC steps to successfully explore the whole space. We used the function *blocking.m* in Appendix B.4 to do the calculations and generate figure 4.21.

Thus, for each individual temperature, Wang-Landau sampling is about two orders of magnitude slower

(by MC steps) than Metropolis sampling. However, Wang-Landau sampling is not limited to a single temperature; we could generate data for almost any temperature whose accessible range is consistent with the histogram we generate. In addition, we are using a density of $1.127 \cdot 10^{-3}$ au and only five beads for this test, making our space relatively easy to explore. Were we to increase the complexity of the simulation by increasing the density or the number of beads, we would see a large decrease in the efficiency of Metropolis sampling. Wang-Landau sampling in principle is advantageous by a system with energy barriers. The hope is that it will still perform well under conditions where conventional sampling is unacceptably slow.

5 Conclusion

We have discussed a number of MC techniques for sampling both classical and quantum particles. Beginning with basic CMC sampling for classical particles and PIMC sampling using threading for quantum particles, we have extended our simulation codes to allow Multicanonical and Wang-Landau sampling for classical particles in either a canonical or grand canonical ensemble and Quantum Wang-Landau for light particles.

We first showed that our basic CMC simulation was producing results that agreed with literature values, and, using the Widom Test Particle Insertion Method, we demonstrated that our GCMC simulations gave results consistent with this CMC code. We then used the GCMC simulation to locate a point on the argon liquid/gas coexistence curve.

In an effort to sample efficiently in a larger variety of environments, we also introduced Multicanonical sampling into our code. This allowed us to use information about the system to "push" the simulation into regions that were energetically unfavorable. However, problems in acquiring the necessary information about the system led us to try other sampling techniques.

Our last modification of the classical codes, was the Wang-Landau sampling method which allowed us to run one simulation to find average quantities at almost any temperature. We used this method to generate data about the potential energy of a fluid that agreed with literature results from MD and other MC simulations.

With these sampling algorithms working for classical particles, we began to explore algorithms for sampling quantum particles. The basic algorithms discussed in this thesis were PIMC, PIMC with threading, and Quantum Wang-Landau. Of these, threading was implemented by another researcher so our main interest was in the Quantum Wang-Landau results.

We began our research into Quantum Wang-Landau using a light particle in a simple harmonic potential. When we found that our results closely matched the analytical solution for finite bead numbers, we went on to try a more complex and interesting potential. We put the light particle into a fluid and used a Lennard-Jones potential to describe interactions between the particle and the fluid. Comparisons between Quantum Wang-Landau and PIMC with threading for this potential were favorable.

We lastly presented a benchmarking technique for Quantum Wang-Landau and PIMC with threading. We found that for a system of 5 beads in an argon fluid with a density of $1.127 \cdot 10^{-3}$ au, Quantum Wang-Landau is on the order of 100 to 500 times slower than PIMC with threading. However, these tests were done in a system that was fairly easy to equilibrate. In future work we hope to choose a system that is more time consuming for traditional PIMC algorithms and see if the Quantum Wang-Landau benchmark is more favorable in comparison.

Future work might also include allowing the fluid to move in simulation and trying to model the light particle as positronium (rather than helium). This work could also be extended to the two-chain approach pioneered by this lab in earlier work [17].

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my thesis advisor Amy Bug for her help and support throughout the research and writing of this thesis and my second reader John Boccio for his input and second opinion. In addition, thanks to George Hang, Dan Peterson, Joe Grimm, and Michelle Tomasik for many helpful and enlightening conversations during our Wednesday lunch meetings. Funding for the summer research for this thesis was provided by Swarthmore College.

References

- [1] M.P. Allen and D.J. Tildesley. Computer Simulation of Liquids. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987.
- [2] Petr Beckmann. A History of Pi. Golem Press, Boulder, CO, 1970.
- [3] C. H. Bennet. Efficient estimation of free energy differences from monte carlo data. J. Comp. Phys., 22:245–268, 1976.
- [4] Bernd A. Berg and Thomas Neuhaus. Multicanonical ensemble: A new approach to simulate firstorder phase transitions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 68(1):9–12, January 1992.
- [5] John R. Boccio. Quantum Mechanics: Mathematical Structure, Physical Structure and Applications in the Physical World. In Preparation, 2007.
- [6] A. L. R. Bug, T. W. Cronin, P. A. Sterne, and Z. S. Wolfson. Simulation of positronium: Toward more realistic models of void spaces in materials. *Radiat. Phys. Chem.*, Preprint, 2006.
- [7] A. L. R. Bug, M. Muluneh, J. Waldman, and P. A. Sterne. Positronium in solids: Computer simulation of pick-off and self annihilation. *Mater. Sci. Forum*, 445-446:375–79, 2004.
- [8] A. L. R. Bug and P. A. Sterne. Pimc simulation of ps annihilation: From micro to mesopores. *Phys. Rev. B*, 173:094106, 2006.
- [9] D. F. Coker, B. J. Berne, and D. Thirumalai. Path integral monte carlo studies of the behavior of excess electrons in simple fluids. J. Chem. Phys., 86(10):5689–5701, 1987.
- [10] Timothy Cronin. Path integral monte carlo simulations of positronium in cylindrical pore spaces. Undergraduate thesis, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA, 2006.
- [11] Alan M. Ferrenberg and Robert H. Swendsen. New monte carlo technique for studying phase transitions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 61(23):2635–2638, December 1988.
- [12] Alan M. Ferrenberg and Robert H. Swendsen. Optimized monte carlo data analysis. Phys. Rev. Lett., 63(21):1195–1198, September 1989.
- [13] Daan Frenkel and Berend Smit. Understanding Molecular Simulation: From Algorithms to Applications. Academic Press, New York, 2nd edition, 2002.
- [14] Harvey Gould, Jan Tobochnik, and Wolfgang Christian. An Introduction to Computer Simulation Methods: Applications to Physical Systems. Addison Wesley, New York, 3rd edition, 2007.
- [15] J. Karl Johnson, John A. Zollweg, and Keith E. Gubbins. The lennard-jones equation of state revisited. Mol. Phys., 78(3):591–618, 1993.
- [16] Malvin H. Kalos and Paula A. Whitlock. Monte Carlo Methods Volume I: Basics. John Whiley and Sons, New York, 1986.
- [17] L. Larrimore, R. N. McFarland, P. A. Sterne, and A. L. R. Bug. A two-chain path integral model of positronium. J. Chem. Phys., 113:10642, 2000.
- [18] Lisa Larrimore. Path integral monte carlo simulations of positronium in argon. Undergraduate thesis, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA, 2002.
- [19] Jooyoung Lee. New monte carlo algorithm: Entropic sampling. Phys. Rev. Lett., 71(2), 1993.
- [20] Donald A. McQuarrie. Statistical Thermodynamics. University Science Books, Mills Valley, CA, 1973.
- [21] Konstantin V. Mikhin, Sergey V. Stepanov, and Vsevolod M. Byakov. Formation of the ps bubble in liquid media. *Radiat. Phys. Chem.*, 68:413–417, 2003.

- [22] Bruce N. Miller and Terrence Reese. Path integral simulation of positronium. Nucl. Instrum. Meth. B, 192:176–179, 2002.
- [23] Bruce N. Miller, Terrence L. Reese, and Gregory Worrell. Positron lifetime distributions in fluids. *Phys. Rev. E*, 47(6):4083–4087, 1993.
- [24] E. L. Pollock and D. M. Ceperley. Simulation of quantum many-body systems by path-integral methods. *Phys. Rev. B*, 30(5), 1984.
- [25] E. L. Pollock and Karl J. Runge. Lectures on path-integral computations. In Proceedings of the Workshop on Path Integral Methods in Theoretical Physics, 1991.
- [26] T. Reese and B. N. Miller. Positronium in xenon: The path-integral approach. Phys. Rev. E, 487(4), April 1993.
- [27] M. S. Shell and A. Z. Panagiotpoulos P. G. Debenedetti. Generalization of the wang-landau method for off-latice simulations. *Phys. Rev. E*, 66, 2002.
- [28] B. L. Shivachev, T. Troev, and T. Yoshiie. Positron lifetime computations of defects in nickel containing hydrogen or helium. J. Nucl. Mater., 306:105–111, 2006.
- [29] Loup Verlet. Computer experiments on classical fluids. i. thermodynamical properties of lennardjones molecules. J. Phys. Rev., 159(1):98–103, 1967.
- [30] P. N. Vorontsov-Velyaminov and A. P. Lyubartsev. Entropic sampling in the path integral monte carlo method. J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., 36:685–693, 2003.
- [31] Fugao Wang and D. P. Landau. Determining the density of states for classical statistical models: A random walk algorithm to produce a flat histogram. *Phys. Rev. E*, 64, October 2001.
- [32] Fugao Wang and D. P. Landau. Efficient, multiple-range random walk algorithm to calculate the density of states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 86(10), March 2001.
- [33] B. Widom. Some topics in the theory of fluids. J. Chem. Phys., 59(11), December 1963.
- [34] N. B. Wilding. Critical-point and coexistence-curve properties of the lennard-jones fluid: A finite-size scaling study. *Phys. Rev. E*, 52(1), July 1995.
- [35] N. B. Wilding. Computer simulation of fluid phase transitions. Am. J. Phys., 69(11), November 2001.
- [36] Zachary Wolfson. Path integral monte carlo simulation of positronium within a dielectric spherical cavity. Undergraduate thesis, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA, 2006.

Glossary

Activity	In thermodynamics, the quantity $\exp(\beta\mu)/\Lambda^3$ where μ is the chemical potential, $\beta = 1/(kT)$ and Λ is the thermal de Broglie wavelength. It gives information about the partial pressure of a gas.	13, 30
Bennet Method	A method used to find the chemical potential of a simulation that is computationally more inten- sive than the Widom Method, but works better at higher density.	25, 31
Canonical Ensemble	A thermodynamic ensemble in which we fix vol- ume, temperature and number of particles.	9,17,27–29
Chemical Potential	In thermodynamics, the derivative of free energy with respect to particle number. Equal chemi- cal potentials are a stability criterion for phase coexistence.	10, 24–26
Complete	A set of states (or vectors) $\{\psi\}$ is complete if every other state in the system can be written as a linear combination of the ψ_i .	13
Entropic Sampling	A cross between Wang-Landau and Multicanon- ical sampling that constructs the density of en- ergy states during simulation.	21
Ergodic	See Irreducible	7
Grand Canonical Ensemble	A thermodynamics ensemble in which we fix vol- ume, temperature and chemical potential.	10–13, 18, 29–31
Importance Sampling	A method of sampling where focus on areas we consider more "important".	7, 8
Irreducible	A system is "irreducible" (or "ergodic") if every state can eventually be reached from every other state.	7
Light/Quantum Particle	A particle whose dynamics can only be accurately modeled using quantum mechanics.	5

Markov Chain	A sequence of trials that fulfills two conditions: (1) the outcome of each trial belongs to a finite set of possible outcomes (the "state space), and (2) the outcome of each trial depends <i>only</i> on the outcome of the trial immediately preceding it.	7
Metropolis Sampling	An accept/reject method of importance sampling.	7, 17, 18
Monte Carlo (MC) Algorithms	Nondeterministic algorithms used for simulating various phenomena.	6-8
Multicanonical Sampling	An modification of Metropolis sampling where we sample from a modified distribution to help the system explore energetically unfavorable states.	18, 31, 32
Overlapping Distribution Method	See Bennet Method	25
Path Integral Monte Carlo (PIMC)	An MC algorithm for simulating quantum par- ticles by visualizing them as a polymer of beads connected by "springs".	21–23, 35, 37, 39, 41
Positive Operator	All eigenvalues of the operator are positive.	13
Self-Adjoint Operator	The operator and the hermitian conjugate of the operator are equal.	13
Threading	A modification of PIMC that increases the speed of the algorithm.	22, 37, 39, 41
Wang-Landau Sampling	An alternative method to Metropolis sampling where we construct the density of energy states during simulation.	20, 21, 23, 33–35, 37, 39,
Widom Method	A method used to find the chemical potential of a simulation.	24, 29

A Units

We use two sets of units predominantly in this thesis: reduced units and atomic units. For the fluid simulations with no light particle, we use reduced units, as this allows the quantities in which we are interested (namely, $\beta = 1/(kT)$, energy, density, and position) to all be of order unity. Reduced units for a Lennard-Jones fluid have distance in terms of the hard sphere diameter σ and energy in terms of the well depth ϵ . This gives us densities that vary between 0 and 1. In addition, we consider "reduced temperature" to actually be the quantity $T^* = k_B T$, where k_B is Boltzmann's constant. For argon, the conversions from standard units to reduced units are

$$\rho^* = \frac{\rho}{\sigma^3} = \frac{\rho}{(3.405 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ m})^3} = (2.53 \cdot 10^{28} \text{ m}^{-3}) \rho$$
$$\beta = \frac{\epsilon}{k_B T} = \frac{119.8 \text{ K}}{T}$$
$$U^* = \frac{U}{\epsilon} = (6.05 \cdot 10^{20} \text{ J}^{-1})U$$

Notice that quantities, with the exception of β , expressed in reduced units are usually denoted with a * after the variable name.

When we introduce the light particle, reduced units no longer make sense and we use atomic units instead. In atomic units, we write mass in terms of the mass of an electron, angular momentum in terms of \hbar , and charge in terms of the charge on the electron. The conversions from standard units are

$$\begin{split} m_{au} &= \frac{m}{m_e} = (1.10 \cdot 10^{30} \text{ au } (\text{mass}) \cdot \text{kg}^{-1})m \\ l_{au} &= \frac{l}{\hbar} = (9.48 \cdot 10^{33} \text{ au } (\text{angular momentum}) \cdot \text{J}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1})l \\ q_{au} &= \frac{q}{q_e} = (6.24 \cdot 10^{18} \text{ au } (\text{charge}) \cdot \text{C}^{-1})q \end{split}$$

We also need the conversions between atomic units and reduced units for density, energy, and temperature. For argon, these conversions are

$$\rho^* = \sigma_{au}^3 \rho_{au} = 6.433^3 \rho_{au} = 266.23 \rho_{au}$$
$$\beta^* = \epsilon_{au} \beta_{au} = 3.79 \cdot 10^{-4} \beta_{au}$$
$$U^* = \frac{U_{au}}{\epsilon_{au}} = 2635.87 U_{au}$$

B Source Code¹

B.1 Fluid Codes

PROGRAM FLMAIN

c Adap	oted from Ar_cylinder.f90 by Jenny Barry, Summer 2006	
c~~~~	c	
c Mod	ules (in alphabetical order):	
c	FLFluidFncs.f95 (~350 lines) - functions and subroutines dealing with a fluid	
c	interacting via the Lennard-Jones potential	
c	FLGenFuncs (~200 lines) - functions less specific to this code but still	
с	involving physics (calculating average	
c	energy for example)	10
с	FLInfo.f95 (~150 lines) - all global variables and constants	
с	FLMain. 195 ("100 lines minus comments) - main method	
с	FLInitEnd (400 lines) - functions and subroutines required to initialize	
c	El 1441 605 (~100 km/s) harding and or end the program	
c	<i>Thotal 395</i> (100 times) - functions and suboutines of general use (abuoting the size of an array for example)	
c	Mac times f90 (~10 lines) - Times definitions	
C	nac_syperior (10 second) Types activities	
cINPU		
c	COMMAND FILE:	20
С	The prompt requires a loop file that contains a list of data file names.	
c	Ints allows the program to run many data runs at once	
c	Example Jue: ./example/Juoop.m	
c	FLUID DATA FILE	
c	This file has information about the fluid and the ontions for simulation	
c	Examples: /example/basic/fibasic in	
c	//example/cul/flcul.in	
c	./example/grand/flgrand.in	
с	/example/multi/ffmulti.in	30
с		
c	INIT DATA FILE	
c	Line 1: starting step size	
c	Rest of file: positions of atoms (note that it is important to get the number of atoms right	
с	in the main input file as well)	
c	Example: ./example/init.in	
c		
c	MULTI DATA FILE (when running a MULTICANONICAL simulation):	
С	Line 1: number of bins in the eta weighting function	
с	Line 2: the file name with the data for the eta weighting function	40
с	Example: ./example/multi.in	
с		
С	ETA DATA FILE (when running a MULTICANONICAL simulation):	
с	Contains the eta function when using multicanonical weighting	
c	Example: ./example/multi/eta.in	
c cout	PUT (9 files):	
с	floos: contains the x, y, z coordinates of each fluid atom at every WRITEDATA timesteps	
c	the first line for each time step is the number of particles, the current stepsize,	
c	and a throwaway number (to make the file easy to read into a data analysis program)	50
c	density: contains density, number of atoms at every WRITEDATA timesteps	
c	energy: contains average energy at every WRITEDATA timesteps	
c	restart: contains fluid positions and other data necessary to restart the simulation from the	
c	point it ended. formatted correctly so that it can be used as an input file to start	
c	a new simulation from the last position of this simulation	
c	initfl: the initial position of the fluid	
c	widom: contains number of particles, dE , $exp(-beta*dE)$ where dE is from widom particle insertion	
c	denstate: contains the density of states after EACH flat histogram (Wang-Landau ONLY)	
c	histe: contains the energy histogram after EACH flat histogram (Wang-Landau ONLY)	
с	pressure: contains pressure data	60

 $^{^1\}mathrm{We}$ used lgrind to convert from source code to latex.

 $c \\ c$

c

TO CHANGE THESE FILES OR ADD ANOTHER, LOOK AT THE SYNTAX IN FLInfo.f95. To add a file, increase NUMOUT, add another file descriptor to OUTFILES and add another name to OUTNAMES.

	use types use FLInfo use FLInitEnd use FLFluidFncs use FLGenFncs use FLUtil	70
с	Main Program	
	implicit NONE	
	integer :: i, irun,j, cnt, WRITEDATA = 1 real (dp) :: V, avE, flatness, wid !! real (dp) is defined in MacTypes character(fileNameLength) :: fname	80
	call init_genrand() !! Inits the Mersenne twister	80
с	Getting the command input file write(*,*) "Enter the name of the input file:" read(*,*) fname open(unit=CMDFILE, file=fname, status='old',action='read') read(CMDFILE,*); read(CMDFILE,*) loop read(CMDFILE,*)	
	runs: do j=1,loop	90
c c	<pre>read in data file read(CMDFILE,*) fname open(unit=FLFILE, file=fname,status='old',action='read')</pre>	
с	initialize program (in FLInitEnd) call FLInit()	
с	calculate the volume if (isCyl) then $V = pi^*rcav2^*hcav$ else $V = rcav^{**}3$ endif	100
с	initial values numWid = 0 irun = 0 fmsize = fmSTART	
с	main loop MC_{passes} : do $!!$ if $W-L$ we need a while loop so this cannot be a for loop	110
	if (irun.GT.npass-1.AND.(.NOT.isWL)) then exit	
С	<pre>else if (isWL.AND.irun > 0.AND.minval(histE)/(sum(histE)/(1.0*size(histE))) > FLAT) then flat histogram! fwl = sqrt(fwl) !! decrease f print *, "flat histogram!, f = ",fwl irun = 0 write(HISTENG, *) size(histE) write(GFILE, *) size(histE) do i=1,size(histE) write(HISTENG,*) histE(i) write(GFILE,*) g(i) enddo call resetHist() !! in FLInitEnd if (fwl < MINE) exit</pre>	120

 \mathbf{endif}

```
130
                      do a move!
c
                      call flMCStep() !! in FLFluidFncs
                      if (MOD(irun,WRITEDATA) == 0) then
                      write data
c
                             avE = averageEnergy()
                             wid = widomTest()
                             write(WIDOMDATA,*) irun, wid, exp(-beta*wid)
                             write(AVGENG,*) avE
                             write(HISTRHO,*) (nf*sig0**3)/V, nf
write(PLOTPOS,*) nf, fmsize, -1
                                                                                                                            140
                             \mathbf{do}~\mathrm{i=1,nf}
                                    write(PLOTPOS,*) xf(i,1), xf(i,2), xf(i,3)
                             enddo
                             write(PRESSURE,*) rhof, ((rhof/sig0**3)/beta+virial()/V)/eps0*sig0**3
                      endif
                      if (isWL.AND.mod(irun, 100)==0) then
                      print out some info (what you might want to know depends on what is running)
c
                             if (irun > 0) then
                                                                                                                            150
                                    flatness = minval(histE)/(sum(histE)/(1.0*size(histE)))
                                    print *, "flatness: ", flatness
                             else
                                    \mathrm{flatness} = 0
                             \mathbf{endif}
                             print *, "te = ",totalEnergy(), "nf = ",nf, "f = ", fwl
                             if (flatness < 1e-8) then
                                    {\rm cnt}\,=\,0
                                    do i=1,size(histE)
                                            if (histE(i) < 1) then
                                                                                                                            160
                                                  cnt = cnt+1
                                            endif
                                    enddo
                                    \mathbf{print} *, "There are ", cnt, " zero elements."
                             endif
                      else if ((.NOT.isWL).AND.irun*100/npass > (irun-1)*100/npass) then
                             write(*,*) (irun*100/npass), "percent done"
                      endif
                      \mathrm{irun}\,=\,\mathrm{irun}\,+\,1
                                                                                                                            170
              end do MC_{-}passes
              call cleanUp() !! in FLInitEnd
       enddo runs
       call endPro() !! in FLInitEnd
       print *, "program finished, see data files for results"
END PROGRAM FLMAIN
                                                                                                                            180
```

 $c \ FLInitEnd$ c Contains routines used to initialize or end/clean up after FLMain c Subroutines: cleanUp, endPro, FlInit, initMulti, initWL, openFiles, packCube, packCyl, c $startFromConfig, \ resetHist$ cMODULE FLInitEnd use types 10use FLInfo CONTAINS *c* -----c cleanUp subroutine c~~~~ c Cleans up after one run by deallocating variables and closing single-run files $c \ Deallocates:$ 20xf, xfn, eta, g, histEcc Closes: INFILES, OUTFILES cc Called by: Maincsubroutine cleanUp() implicit none integer :: i 30 write restart file cwrite(RESTART,*) fmsize do i=1,nf write(RESTART,*) xf(i,1), xf(i,2), xf(i,3)enddo write(RESTART,*) !! a blank line is needed $close \ input \ files$ cdo i=1,size(INFILES) 40close(INFILES(i)) enddo $close \ output \ files$ cdo i=1,size(OUTFILES) close(OUTFILES(i)) enddo deallocate (or we can't reallocate for another run cdeallocate(xf, xfn) 50if (isMulti) then deallocate(eta) endif if (isWL) then deallocate(g, histE) \mathbf{endif} end subroutine cleanUp c -----60 c endPro subroutine c~~~~~ c Cleans up after entire program by closing multiple-run files $c \ Closes:$ GBLINFILEScc Called by:

с	Main	
c Note	es: does NOT call cleanUn!	70
subro	utine endPro()	10
	implicit none	
	integer :: i	
с	close global in files - probably just command loop do i=1,size(GBLINFILES) close(GBLINFILES(i))	
	enddo	80
end s	abroutine endPro	
~ ~ ~ ~ ~	~~~~~~~~~~	
c c FLII c~~~~	NIT SUBROUTINE	
c Initi c Initi	alizes the fluid atoms, based on data from FLFILE falizes:	
c c Also	npass, rhof, fmass, beta, z, isGrand, isCyl, isMulti, isWL, nf, rcav, rcav2 allocates space for xf and xfn (and eta, g, histe if appropriate) and places the fluid atoms	90
c Call c Call	, initMulti, initWL, openFiles, packCyl, packCube, startFromConfig, resetHist ed by: Main	
subro	utine FlInit() implicit none	
	integer :: bool, i logical :: initCond	100
	call openFiles() !! open output files	
с	<pre>basic data read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) npass read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) rhof read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) fmass read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) beta read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) z read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) bool !!isGrand</pre>	110
с	<pre>isGrand if (bool.EQ.0) then isGrand = .false. else isGrand = true</pre>	
	endif	
с	<pre>isCyl read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) bool if (bool.EQ.0) then</pre>	120
	else isCyl = .true. endif	
с	<pre>isMulti read(FLFILE,*); read(FLFILE,*) bool if (bool == 1) then</pre>	130
	else isMulti = .FALSE. endif	

```
isWL
c
        read(FLFILE,*); read(FLFILE,*) bool
        if (bool == 1) then
               isWL = .TRUE.
                                                                                                                                  140
               call initWL()
        else
               isWL = .FALSE.
        endif
c
        dimensions and number of fluid atoms
        if (isGrand) then
               read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) rcav !! We specify rcav for gc
               if (isCyl) then
                       nf = int(rhof*pi*hcav*rcav**2)
                                                                                                                                  150
                       read(FLFILE,*) hcav
               else
                       nf = int(rhof*rcav**3.0)
               endif
        else
               read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) nf !! We specify nf for can
               if (isCyl) then
                       rcav = (nf/(rhof*pi*hcav))**(1.0/2.0)
                       read(FLFILE,*) hcav
                else
                                                                                                                                  160
                       rcav = (nf/rhof)^{**}(1.0/3.0)
               \mathbf{endif}
        \mathbf{endif}
       rcav2 = rcav*rcav
        allocate stuff
c
        if (isGrand) then
                TOTAL = nf*2 !! We do not know exactly how much to allocate so start with 2X
        else
                                                                                                                                  170
                TOTAL = nf+1 !! we allocate one extra in case we want to do widom test
        endif
        \operatorname{allocate}(\operatorname{xf}(\operatorname{TOTAL},3), \operatorname{stat} = \operatorname{error})
        if (error .ne. 0) then
               write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: xf(:,:)"
               STOP
        endif
        \operatorname{allocate}(\operatorname{xfn}(\operatorname{TOTAL},3), \operatorname{stat} = \operatorname{error})
        if (error .ne. 0) then
                write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: xfn(:,:)"
               STOP
                                                                                                                                  180
        endif
        start from initial condition
c
       read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) bool
        if (bool.NE.0) then
               initCond = .TRUE.
               call startFromConfig()
       else if (isCyl) then
                initCond = .FALSE.
               call packCyl()
                                                                                                                                  190
        else
               initCond = .FALSE.
               call packCube()
        endif
        write initial positions to file
c
        do i=1,nf
               write(INITIAL,*) xf(i,1), xf(i,2), xf(i,3)
        enddo
       print *, "the requested density gives", nf, "fluid atoms", " and a cavity of size", rcav
                                                                                                                                  200
end subroutine FlInit
```

c initA c initA	Multi subroutine	
c initia	alizes program to use multicanonical sampling	
subro	implicit none	210
	integer :: i character(fileNameLength) :: fname	
с	<pre>open MULTIFILE read(FLFILE,*) fname open(unit=MULTIFILE, file = fname, status='old', action='read') read(MULTIFILE, *); read(MULTIFILE,*) multibins</pre>	220
с	<pre>allocate space for eta allocate(eta(multibins), stat = error) if (error .ne. 0) then write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: eta(:)" STOP endif</pre>	220
c end si	open ETAFILE read(MULTIFILE,*); read(MULTIFILE,*) fname open(unit=ETAFILE, file=fname,status='old', action='read') do i=1,multibins read(ETAFILE,*) eta(i) enddo ubroutine initMulti	230
c initi c initi c initic subro	WL subroutine alizes program to use wang-landau sampling putine initWL() implicit none	240
	allocate(g(gbins), stat = error) if (error .ne. 0) then write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: g(:)" STOP endif	250
	<pre>allocate(histE(gbins), stat = error) if (error .ne. 0) then</pre>	
end si	<pre>do i=1,gbins g(i) = 0.0 !! this is actually ln(g) enddo fwl = exp(1.0) ubroutine initWL</pre>	260
c open c open	aFiles subroutine	270

c opens input files

subroutine openFiles() implicit none integer :: i character(fileNameLength) :: dirname read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) dirname 280 do i=1,size(OUTFILES) open(unit=OUTFILES(i),file=(trim(dirname) // trim(OUTNAMES(i))),status='replace',action='write') enddo $\mathbf{end}\ \mathbf{subroutine}\ \mathrm{openFiles}$ c ~ $c \ packCube \ subroutine$ c $c\ Places\ fluid\ atoms\ uniformly\ in\ a\ cube\ (for\ when\ using\ periodic\ boundary\ conditions)$ 290 c Called by: cFLInit subroutine packCube() integer :: i real (dp) :: spc, rat if $(nf^{**}(1.0/3.0)^*sig0.GT.rcav)$ then write(*,*) "Too many atoms for this volume. Increase rcav or decrease rhof." 300 STOP endif if (nf.LT.1) then write(*,*) "No atoms!" STOP endif $spc = rcav/(nf^{**}(1.0/3.0))$!! spacing between the atoms do i=1,nf 310 rat = spc*i/rcavxf(i,1) = (rat - int(rat))*rcavxf(i,2) = (int(rat)*spc/rcav - int(int(rat)*spc/rcav))*rcavxf(i,3) = int(int(rat)*spc/rcav)*spcenddo end subroutine packCube*c* ----- $c \ packCyl \ subroutine$ 320 cc Places fluid atoms uniformly in a cylinder c Called by: FLInit csubroutine packCyl() real (dp) :: rpack, rring, zring integer :: nlayers, npack, nrings, l 330 now we need to place the fluid atoms in the cavity in a dense fashion crpack=2.0*rcav/sig0if (rpack.LT.1.0) then print *, "cannot pack any fluid atoms into a cylinder so small" STOP endif

if (rpack.LT.2.0) then 340 print *, " we use simple axial packing" if (nf.GT.int(hcav/sig0)) then print *, "we cannot fit all requested atoms by axial packing" STOP endif nlavers=nf do k=1,nlayersxf(k,1)=0.0xf(k,2) = 0.0xf(k,3)=k*sig0350 enddo else npack=6nrings=0l = 0RingIteration: do !! this blind loop iterates over multiple packing rings if (l.GT.nf) exit !! will never exit initially, only after running out of fluid atoms to place npack=int(pi/asin(1.0/(rpack-1.0)))nrings=nrings+1rring=sig0/(2.0*sin(pi/npack))360 LayerIteration: do k=1,int(hcav/sig0) !! loop over the layers of atoms zring=k*sig0 do l=l+1if (l.GT.nf) exit xf(l,1) = rring*cos(2.0*l*pi/npack)xf(l,2) = rring*sin(2.0*l*pi/npack)xf(l,3)=zringif (mod(l,npack).EQ.0) exit enddo 370 $end do \ LayerIteration$ $\rm rpack{=}1.0/sin(pi/npack){-}1.0$ if (rpack.LT.2.0.AND.ℓ.LT.nf) then \mathbf{print} *, " we use simple axial packing for the remaining atoms" if ((nf-l).GT.int(hcav/sig0)) then print *, "we cannot fit all remaining atoms by axial packing" STOP endif 380 do k=l,nf xf(k,1)=0.0xf(k,2)=0.0xf(k,3)=(k-l)*sig0enddo l=l+int(hcav/sig0) endif if (npack.LT.6.AND. <code>ℓ.LT.nf</code>) then !! abort if there are atoms let to place and we're trying to put them inside a less than 6-ring 390 print *, "too many atoms for too small a cavity" STOP endif enddo RingIteration endif end subroutine packCyl c ~ $c \ start From Config \ subroutine$ 400 \boldsymbol{c} starts the simulation from an initial configuration stored in a file subroutine startFromConfig() integer :: i

character(fileNameLength) :: init

c

c

```
read(FLFILE,*) init !! Name of initial configuration file
open(unit=INITFILE, file=init, status='old', action='read')
        read(INITFILE,*) fmsize
        do i=1,nf
                read(INITFILE,*) xf(i,1), xf(i,2), xf(i,3)
        enddo
\mathbf{end}\ \mathbf{subroutine}\ \mathrm{startFromConfig}
c ------
c \ reset {\it Hist \ subroutine}
c ~~~~~~
c\ resets\ the\ energy\ histogram\ for\ wang-landau\ sampling
c Called by:
        FLInit, Main
c
subroutine resetHist()
        \mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}
        integer :: i
        do \ \mathrm{i=1,gbins}
                 histE(i) = 0
        enddo
end subroutine resetHist
```

 $\mathbf{end}\ \mathrm{MODULE}$

430

410

420

 $c \ FLFluidFncs$ c Contains functions specific to the fluid for use with FLMain.f95. c Functions: binE, updateWL, widomTestc $c \ Subroutines$ flMCStepcMODULE FLFluidFncs use types 10use FLInfo use FLUtil use FLGenFncs CONTAINS *c* ----- $c \ binE \ function$ c ~ ~ 20 $c \ \mathit{Input:}$ the energy to bin c $c \ Returns:$ the bin in the histogram corresponding to energy $% \left(f_{i} \right) = \left(f_{i} \right) \left(f_{i} \right)$ cc Called by: updateWLcinteger function binE(energy) $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ 30 real (dp), INTENT(IN) :: energy binE = int(energy/GRES + size(histE))end function binE *c* ----- $c \ flMCS tep \ subroutine$ 40c'c Moves, creates, or destroys a fluid atom using the Metropolis method $c \ Modifies:$ cxf, xfn, fmac, fmacsum, fmacsize, nf, TOTAL c Called by: Maincc Calls: calcLJ, increaseCapacityc $c \ Notes:$ 50cI am not sure Wang-Landau and grand canonical work together; they have c $not \ been \ thoroughly \ tested$ subroutine flMCStep() $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ integer :: i,move_index, bin1, bin2 $c \ destroy, \ create, \ or \ move$ real (dp) :: dcm real (dp) :: fboltzf, cavfactor, flenergy, flenergyn, deltaE, rn, dstr, crt, V, nm, nmsum, wt, te 60 if (isCyl) then V = pi*rcav2*hcavelse $V = rcav^{**3}$ \mathbf{endif} $\mathrm{fmacsum} = 0.0$

 $\mathrm{nmsum}\,=\,0.0$

	te = totalEnergy()	70
	$move_index = 1$	
	MoveCreateDestroyLoop: do	
c	This has to be a while loop because of will change if using g.c.!	
	if (move_index > nf) exit	
	flenergy=0.0	
	flenergyn=0.0	
	$delta \overline{E} = 0.0$	
	fmac = 0.0	
	nm=0.0	80
	if (isGrand) then	
	dcm = ran1(initrand)	
	else	
c	We always just move	
	dcm = 0	
	endif	
	$rn = ran1(initrand) \parallel in FLUtil$	
	xfn=xf	
c	Move, create destroy choices	
	if $(dcm < 1.0/3.0)$ then	90
c	Move this atom	
	$xfn(move_index,1)=xf(move_index,1)+fmsize*(ran1(initrand)-0.5)$	
	$xfn(move_index,2) = xf(move_index,2) + fmsize*(ran1(initrand) - 0.5)$	
	$xfn(move_index,3) = xf(move_index,3) + fmsize*(ran1(initrand) - 0.5)$	
	if (isCvl) then	
с	culinder	
c	outer reaches of atoms electron cloud	
	cayfactor = sort(xfn(move index 1)**2+xfn(move index 2)**2)+0.5*sig0	
		100
с	periodic z-condition	
	if $(xfn(move_index.3), GT, hcay) xfn(move_index.3) = xfn(move_index.3) - hcay$	
	if $(xfn(move index 3), LT, 0, 0) xfn(move index 3) = xfn(move index 3) + hcav$	
	else	
с	neriodic boundaries	
0	cavitation $= 0$ If we do not need to worry about going "outside" the cavity	
с	periodic conditions in all three directions	
-	do $i=1$ 3	
	do	110
	if $((xfn(move index i) \mathbf{LT} reav) \mathbf{AND} (xfn(move index i) \mathbf{GT} 0))$ evit	110
	if ((xfn(move_index_i)) GT reav) xfn(move_index_i)-gt.of) index i)=reav	
	if $((xfn(move index i)) \cup T \cap O) \times fn(move index i) - xfn(move index i) + reav$	
	and do	
	anddo	
	endud	
	enun	
	colorists and many emprises	
С	do in 1 mf	
		100
	II (1.EQ.move_index) cycle	120
	$Henergy = Henergy + calcLJ(move_index_i,x)$	
	$flenergyn = flenergyn+calcLJ(move_index,i,xin)$	
	enddo	
	deltaE = flenergyn - flenergy	
	if (isWL) then	
с	do Wang-Landau stuff	
	if (updateWL(te, (te+deltaE), cavfactor)) then	
	$\mathbf{x}\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{f}\mathbf{n}$	
	fmac = 1.0	
	te = te + deltaE	130
	endif	
	else	
c	do Metropolis stuff	
	if (flenergyn.LT.flenergy.AND.cavfactor.LT.rcav) then	
	xf=xfn	

	fmac=1.0 !! move accepted	
	else if (cavfactor.LT.rcav) then	
	fboltzf=dexp(-beta*(flenergyn-flenergy))	
	if (rn.LT.fboltzf) then	1.40
	xI=XII fmag=1.0 II man accepted	140
	endif	
	endif	
	endif	
	nm = 1.0 !! the number of times we moved a particle	
	else if $(dcm < 2.0/3.0)$ then	
с	destroy the atom	
	do i=1,nf	
	if (i.EQ.move_index) cycle	
	$deltaE = deltaE - calcLJ(move_index,i,xf)$	150
	enddo	
	do WI ctuff	
С	if $(\text{undateWL}(\text{te}, (\text{te}+\text{deltaE}), \text{cayfactor}) AND nf GT 1) then$	
с	destruction accented	
0	$xf(move_index, :) = xf(nf, :)$	
	nf = nf - 1	
	$move_index = move_index - 1 !!$ so we visit the last atom	
	te = te + deltaE	
	endif	160
	else	
с	do Metropolis stuff	
	if (isMult) then	
с	ao muticanonical weighting $h = 1 - i \pi i (1 - 2 \pi i ($	
	bin $2 = \inf((1.0 \text{ multibing}) \cdot (nf - 1)/V)$	
	$m_{\pm} = \exp((10 \text{ mutual})(m-1)/v)$ wt = $\exp(\operatorname{eta}(\operatorname{hin}) - \operatorname{eta}(\operatorname{hin}^2))$	
	else	
	wt = 1.0 !! normal metropolis has no weight	
	endif	170
	dstr = (deltaE - 1.0/beta*log(nf/(z*V)))	
	$\mathbf{if} \; (\mathrm{wt}^*\mathrm{exp}(-\mathrm{beta}^*\mathrm{dstr}).\mathbf{GT.rn}) \; \mathbf{then}$	
с	destruction accepted	
	$xf(move_index, :) = xf(nf, :)$	
	nI = nI - I	
	move_index = move_index-1 is so we visit the last atom	
	endif	
	else	
с	create an atom	180
	if (isCyl) then	
с	Cylinder	
	xfn(nf+1,1) = (rcav-0.5*sig0)*(2*ran1(initrand) - 1)	
	xfn(nf+1,2) = (rcav-0.5*sig0)*(2*ran1(initrand) -1)	
	xfn(nf+1,3) = hcav*ran1(initrand)	
	else	
с	Periodic do i=12	
	$x_{0}(n_{f+1}) = rev *ren1(initrand)$	
	enddo	190
	endif	100
	if ((nf+1).GE.TOTAL) call increaseCapacity() !! in FLUtil	
	do i=1,nf	
	deltaE = deltaE + calcLJ(nf+1,i,xfn)	
	enddo	
	if (isWL) then	
c	Wang-Landau stuff	
	II (updatewL(te, (te+deltaE), caviactor)) then $y = y f_{1}$	
	$x_1 - x_{111}$ nf - nf+1	200
	m = m + 1 te = te+deltaE	200
	endif	
	else	

(c Metropolis stuff	
Ċ	c Multicanonical weighting	
	bin 1 = int((1.0*multibins)*nf/V) bin 2 = int((1.0*multibins)*(nf+1)/V)	
	$wt = \exp(\operatorname{eta}(\operatorname{bin1}) - \operatorname{eta}(\operatorname{bin2}))$	
ć	c else No weighting for Metropolis	210
	wt = 1.0	
	crt = (deltaE - 1.0/beta*log(z*V/(nf+1)))	
(f (wt*exp(-beta*crt). GT .rn) then c creation accepted	
	xf = xfn	
	m = m + 1 endif	
	endif endif	220
0	c Move rate stuff (for adjusting step size) fmacsum=fmacsum+fmac	
	nmsum = nmsum + nm move index-move index+1	
	enddo MoveCreateDestroyLoop	
	fmac = fmacsum/nmsum !! Determine fraction of accepted moves (we tried nmsum moves)	230
Ċ	c adjust fmsize so the acceptance rate is roughly 30%	200
	if (mac.G1.0.55) $\text{imsize}=\text{imsize}^{+1.1}$ if (fmac.LT.0.25) $\text{imsize}=\text{imsize}/1.1$	
	do if (fmsize < rcay) exit	
	fmsize = fmsize/2 !! do not let fmsize get too big	
	enddo fmacsum = 0.0	
e	end subroutine flMCStep	240
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	210
0	c c updateWL Function	
0	c ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
0	c updates the histogram and density of states for use with wang-landau sampling c Input:	
0	c flenergy: energy before move c flenergy: energy after move	
0	c cavfactor: factor to make sure we do not leave the cylinder if we are in one	250
0	c Returns: c true if move is accepted, false otherwise	
0	c Called by:	
6	c Calls:	
0	c $binE$	
1	logical function updateWL(flenergy, flenergyn, cavfactor) implicit none	
	real (dp), INTENT(IN) :: flenergy, flenergyn, cavfactor integer :: bin1, bin2	260
	r hins	
ſ	bin1 = binE(flenergy)	
	bin2 = binE(flenergyn)	
	if ((bin1.LE.size(histE).AND.bin1.GT.0).AND.(bin2.LE.size(histE).AND.bin2.GT.0)) then	
(	f we are not moving outside the histogram if (ran1(initrand).LT.exp(g(bin1) - g(bin2)).AND.cavfactor.LT.rcav) then	270
(	c accept move	

```
updateWL = .TRUE.
                    histE(bin2) = histE(bin2) + 1
                    g(bin2) = log(fwl)+g(bin2)
              else
              reject\ move
c
                     updateWL = .FALSE.
                     histE(bin1) = histE(bin1) + 1
                     g(bin1) = log(fwl)+g(bin1)
              endif
                                                                                                                    280
       else if (bin1.GT.size(histE).OR.bin1.LE.0) then
       we somehow wound up outside the histogram (if we start in a bad configuration for example)
c
             print *, 'An impossible configuration has been reached.'
              STOP
       \mathbf{else}
       the move would take us outside the histogram so we reject it
c
              updateWL = .FALSE.
              histE(bin1) = histE(bin1) + 1
              g(bin1) = log(fwl)+g(bin1)
       endif
                                                                                                                    290
end function updateWL
c ------
c \ widom Test \ Function
c ~
c performs a widom insertion and looks at the change in energy
c Returns:
       the change in energy a random insertion of a particle would cause
                                                                                                                    300
c
c Called by:
      Main
c
c Calls:
       calcLJ
c
real (dp) function widomTest()
       real (dp) :: deltaE
       integer :: i
       deltaE = 0
                                                                                                                    310
       "insert" particle
c
       if (isCyl) then
c
       cylinder
             xfn(nf+1,1) = (rcav-0.5*sig0)*(2*ran1(initrand) -1)
             xfn(nf+1,2) = (rcav-0.5*sig0)*(2*ran1(initrand) -1)
              xfn(nf+1,3) = hcav*ran1(initrand)
       else
c
       periodic
              do i=1,3
                                                                                                                    320
                    xfn(nf+1,i) = rcav*ran1(initrand)
              enddo
       \mathbf{endif}
       calculate energy change
c
       do i=1,nf
              deltaE = deltaE + calcLJ(nf+1,i,xfn)
       enddo
       numWid = numWid+1 !! keep track of the number of tests we have done
                                                                                                                    330
       widomTest = deltaE
end function widomTest
```

```
end MODULE FLFluidFncs
```

c ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
end function calcF	
calcF = 0.0 endif	60
c sets cutoff distance for LJ interaction to rcut if ((isCyl.AND.dist.LT.min(0.5*hcav,rcut)).OR.((.NOT.isCyl).AND.dist.LT.(rcut))) then calcF = 4.0*eps0*(12*(sig0**12/dist**13)-6*(sig0**6/dist**7)) else	
dist = firrel(i,j,mols) !! we need the actual distance	
<pre>integer, INTENT(IN) :: i, j real (dp), DIMENSION(:,:), INTENT(IN) :: mols real (dp) :: dist</pre>	50
real (dp) function calcF(i, j, mols) implicit none	
c Called by: c virial	
c Returns:	10
c Parameters: c i, j: indices in mols of the two atoms between which to calculate the force c mols: an nx3 array of the positions of atoms interacting via Lennard-Jones potential	40
c calculates force assuming a Lennard-Jones potential	
c calcf Function c	
c	
averageEnergy = totalEnergy()/nf end function averageEnergy	30
real (dp) function averageEnergy() implicit none	
c totalEnergy	
c Main c Calle:	
c average energy c Called bu:	20
c calculates the average energy c Returns:	
c averageEnergy Function c	
c	
use FLUtil	10
use types use FLInfo	
MODULE FLGenFncs	
c Functions: c averageEnergy, calcF, calcLJ, flrrel, flrrel2, totalEnergy, virial	
c FLGenFncs c Contains general functions (or functions that could be generalized)	

c calcLJ Function

```
c ~
c calculates Lennard-Jones potential between two molecules
                                                                                                                            70
c Parameters:
       i, j: indices in mols of the two atoms between which to calculate the Lennard-Jones potential
c
       mols: an nx3 array of the positions of atoms interacting via Lennard-Jones
c
c Returns:
        The Lennard-Jones potential between mols(i) and mols(j)
c
c Called by:
       flMCStep
c
real (dp) function calcLJ(i, j, mols)
                                                                                                                            80
       \mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}
       integer, INTENT(IN) :: i, j
       real (dp), DIMENSION(:,:), INTENT(IN) :: mols
       real (dp) :: dist2
       dist2 = flrrel2(i,j,mols) !! we use the squared value since that is faster to calculate
       sets cutoff distance for LJ interaction to rcut
c
       if ((isCyl.AND.dist2.LT.(min((0.5*hcav)**2,rcut**2))).OR.((.NOT.isCyl).AND.dist2.LT.(rcut**2))) then
                                                                                                                            90
              calcLJ = 4.0^{eps0}((sig0^{**2}/dist2)^{**6}-(sig0^{**2}/dist2)^{**3})
       else
               calcLJ = 0.0
       endif
end function calcLJ
    c ~
c flrrel and flrrel2 Functions
                                                                                                                            100
c
c calculates the (squared - flrrel2) distance between two molecules using the minimum image convention
c Parmeters:
       i, j: indices in mols of the two atoms between which to calculate the distance (squared)
c
c
       mols: an nx3 array of the positions of atoms
c Returns:
        The distance (firrel) or distance squared (firrel2) between mols(i) and mols(j)
c
c Called by:
       calcF, calcLJ, virial
c
c \ Notes:
                                                                                                                            110
       It is noticeably faster to not take a square root if it can be avoided
c
real (dp) function firrel(i,j,mols)
       implicit none
       integer, INTENT(IN) :: i, j
       real (dp), DIMENSION(:,:), INTENT(IN) :: mols
       flrrel = sqrt(flrrel2(i,j,mols))
end function firrel
                                                                                                                            120
real (dp) function flrrel2(i,j,mols)
       implicit none
       integer, INTENT(IN) :: i, j
       real (dp), DIMENSION(:,:), INTENT(IN) :: mols
       integer :: n
       flrrel 2 = 0
       if (isCyl) then
                                                                                                                            130
c
       cylinder
c
               try distance above and below
               \mathrm{flrrel2}{=}\;(\mathrm{mols}(i,1){-}\mathrm{mols}(j,1))^{**}2{+}(\mathrm{mols}(i,2){-}\mathrm{mols}(j,2))^{**}2{+}\&
               (\min(abs(mols(i,3)-mols(j,3)), abs(hcav-abs(mols(i,3) - mols(j,3)))))**2
       else
```

periodicctry distance above and below for all three dimensions c**do** n=1,3 flrrel2 = flrrel2 + & $(\min(\mathrm{abs}(\mathrm{mols}(i,n)-\mathrm{mols}(j,n)),\ \mathrm{abs}(\mathrm{rcav}-\mathrm{abs}(\mathrm{mols}(i,n)\ -\ \mathrm{mols}(j,n)))))**2$ 140enddo endif end function flrrel2 *c* ----- $c \ total Energy \ Function$ *c*~~ c calculates the total energy 150 $c \ Returns:$ total energy cc Called by: averageEnergy, flMCStepcc Calls: calcLJcreal (dp) function totalEnergy() implicit none 160integer :: i,j  ${\rm totalEnergy}\,=\,0$  $\mathbf{do} ~\mathrm{i=1,nf}$ do j=i+1,nftotalEnergy = totalEnergy + calcLJ(i,j,xf)enddo enddo  $\mathbf{end}\ \mathbf{function}\ \mathrm{totalEnergy}$ 170c virial Function c~~~~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ c calculate the virial  $c \ Returns:$ cvirialc Called by: 180 cMain (to calculate pressure) c Calls: calcF, flrrelcreal (dp) function virial()  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ integer :: i,j virial = 0190  $\mathbf{do} ~\mathrm{i=1,nf}$ do j=i+1,nf $\label{eq:virial} {\rm virial} = {\rm virial} + 1.0/3.0*{\rm calcF(i,j,xf)}*{\rm flrrel(i,j,xf)}$ enddo enddo end function virial end MODULE FLGenFncs

 $c \ FLUtil$ c Useful routines mostly involving array manipulation or random numbers c Contains: copyArray, increaseCapacity, ran1 cMODULE FLUtil use types use FLInfo 10CONTAINS  $c \ copy Array \ subroutine$ c $c \ Copies \ 1\text{-}D \ array \ src \ to \ dest$ c Intent(in): src - the array from which to copy c $c \ Intent(out)$ 20dest - the array into which to copy cc Called by: increase Capacitycsubroutine copyArray(src, dest)  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ real (dp), DIMENSION(:), INTENT(IN) :: src real (dp), DIMENSION(:), INTENT(OUT) :: dest integer :: i 30 do i=1,size(src) dest(i) = src(i)enddo end subroutine *c* ----- $c \ increase Capacity \ subroutine$ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ c  $\hat{}$ 40 $c\ Doubles\ the\ capacity\ of\ xf\ and\ xfn$ c Modifies: xf, xfn, TOTAL cc Called by: cflMCStep c Calls: copyArraycsubroutine increaseCapacity() 50implicit none real (dp), DIMENSION(TOTAL,3) :: tmp, tmpn integer :: j **do** j = 1,3 **call** copyArray(xf(:,j), tmp(:,j)) **call** copyArray(xfn(:,j), tmpn(:,j)) enddo 60 you must deallocate an array before you can reallocate it! cdeallocate(xf, xfn, stat = error)if (error.ne.0) then write(*,*) "Unable to deallocate xf and xfn" STOP endif

```
allocate(xf(TOTAL*2,3), stat = error)
       if (error .ne. 0) then
                                                                                                                         70
              write(*,*) "Unable to increase size of xf. error was ",error
              STOP
       \mathbf{endif}
       allocate(xfn(TOTAL*2,3), stat = error)
       if (error .ne. 0) then
              write(*,*) "Unable to increase size of xfn. error was ",error
              STOP
       endif
                                                                                                                         80
       \mathbf{do} \ \mathbf{j} = 1,3
              \textbf{call copyArray(tmp(:,j), xf(:,j))}
              call copyArray(tmpn(:,j), xfn(:,j))
       enddo
       TOTAL = TOTAL*2
       print *, "increased capacity to ",TOTAL
{\bf end \ subroutine \ increaseCapacity}
                                                                                                                         90
c ------
c RAN1 FUNCTION
c\ Generates\ random\ numbers\ using\ the\ Mersenne\ twister
c This function takes extra arguments because it was also
c a linear congruential generator
double precision function ran1(idum)
       implicit none
                                                                                                                         100
       integer, INTENT(IN) :: idum
       double precision :: genrand_res53
       ran1 = genrand_res53()
```

end function ran1

c

end MODULE FLUtil

 $c \ FLInfo$ 

c Global variables and constants for FLMain

MODULE FLInfo

use types

implicit none

c -----10c Constants integer, PARAMETER :: initrand = 0integer, PARAMETER :: fileNameLength=200 !! maximum file name length real (dp), PARAMETER :: pi = 3.1415926535 !! pi real (dp), PARAMETER :: kB = 3.16679e-6 !! Boltzmanns constant in AU !! To keep error return values integer :: error ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ c ~  $c \ Conversions$ 20creal (dp), PARAMETER :: ANGSTR2AU = 1.8893 *c*~~~~~~~~  $c \ Files$ cinteger, PARAMETER :: NUMIN=10, NUMOUT=9 integer, DIMENSION(NUMIN), PARAMETER :: INFILES = (/14, 15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23/) integer, DIMENSION (NUMIN), PARAMETER :: GBLINFILES = (/33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42/) 30 integer, DIMENSION(NUMOUT), PARAMETER :: OUTFILES=(/43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48,49,50, 51/) c names to identify files in code integer, PARAMETER :: CMDFILE = GBLINFILES(1), & FLFILE = INFILES(1), INITFILE = INFILES(2), & MULTIFILE = INFILÉS(3), ETAFILE = INFILÉS(4), & PLOTPOS = OUTFILES(1), HISTRHO = OUTFILES(2), &AVGENG = OUTFILES(3), RESTART=OUTFILES(4), & INITIAL=OUTFILES(5), WIDOMDATA = OUTFILES(6), & GFILE = OUTFILES(7), HISTENG = OUTFILES(8), & PRESSURE = OUTFILES(9)40 c file names CHARACTER(len=8), DIMENSION(NUMOUT), PARAMETER :: OUTNAMES = & (/"flposn ", & !! The fluid position "density ", &!! Density/number of atoms in fluid "energy ", & !! Average energy of the fluid "restart ", & !! Use to restart sim if necessary "initfl ", & !! Initial fluid positions "widom ", & **!! Data** from Widom Test "denstate", & !! ln(density of states) for WL "histe ", & !! Energy histogram for WL 50"pressure"/) !!pressure data (no correction) *c*~~  $c \ General \ Fluid \ Information$ integer :: loop !! The number of runs to **do** integer :: npass !! Number of MC steps to  $\mathbf{do}$ !! Current number of fluid atoms (will change with GC) integer :: nf  $\mathbf{integer} :: \mathsf{TOTAL}$ !! Current max number of fluid atoms (for GC) 60 real (dp), ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:,:) :: xf, xfn !! Arrays to store position info real (dp), PARAMETER :: eps0 = 1.0!! Depth of well is 1.0 in reduced units real (dp), PARAMETER :: sig0 = 1.0!! Van der Waals radius is 1.0 in reduced units real (dp), PARAMETER :: rcut = 2.5*sig0 !! Cutoff radius !! fluid mass real (dp) :: fmass real (dp) :: rhof !! fluid density real (dp), PARAMETER :: fmSTART = 0.9 !! Starting step size for fluids

real (dp) :: rcav, rcav2, hcav **!!** Cavity properties real (dp) :: beta !! 1/kT !! exp(beta*mu)/GAMMA^3 real (dp) :: z 70!! mu = chemical potential  $!! \text{ GAMMA} = (h^2/(2*pi*fmass)*beta)^(1/2)$ real (dp) :: fmac, fmacsum, fmsize=fmSTART !! Accepted move stuff for fluids !! (real to avoid problems with integer division)  $c \ Options$ logical :: isGrand !! True to use grand canonical, false to use canonical !! True to use cylinder logical :: isCyl 80 logical :: isMulti !! True to use multicanonical !! True to use Wang–Landau  $\mathbf{logical} :: \mathrm{isWL}$ c Widom Test c ~ real (dp) :: widom = 0!! fluid averages  $\mathbf{integer} :: \operatorname{numWid} = 0$ !! number info for averages *c* -----90  $c \ Multicanonical$  $c^{\hat{}}$ real (dp), ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:) :: eta !! Weighting for multicanonical  $\mathbf{integer} :: \mathbf{multibins}$ !! for multicanonical: size of eta *c* ----- $c \ Wang\mathcal{-Landau}$ c ~ ~ real (dp), ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:), TARGET :: g !! g(E) for W-L real (dp), ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:), TARGET :: histE !! H(E) for W-L 100 real (dp), PARAMETER :: GRES = 0.5!! Resolution of g(E) and histE real (dp), PARAMETER :: FLAT = 0.93!! When the histogram is considered "flat" real (dp), PARAMETER :: MINF = 1.0000001 !! Stop when fwl falls below this value  $\mathbf{integer}:: \, \mathrm{gbins}\,=\,5000$ !! g(E) info real (dp) :: fwl !! g(E) = fwl*g(E)end MODULE FLInfo

#### Makefile:

## B.2 Light Particle Codes

### PROGRAM LPMAIN

c~~~~	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
c Mod	ules (in alphabetical order):	
c	LPFncs.[95 (700 lines) - functions and subroutines dealing with the light particle	
c	LPGenFres f95 (~350 lines) - functions less specific to this code but still	
c	involving physics (calculating average	
c	energy for engage	
c	LPInto f05 (~175 linee) - all alabel variables and constants	
c	I Phyles ( '10 lines) - functions and exhaustics security to initialize	10
с о	In Thildria (100 times) - functions and subsources required to initialize	10
c	I. D. Main 405 (~200 lines minus comments) method	
C	LF Wath 39 ( 200 times minus comments) - main method	
с	LP Utit. 195 (125 lines) - functions and subroutines of general use (doubling	
с	the size of an array for example)	
с	Mac_types. 190 ( 10 lines) - Types definitions	
c		
cINPU		
с	COMMAND FILE:	
c	The prompt requires a loop file that contains a list of data file names.	
с	This allows the program to run many data runs at once	20
с	Example file: ./example/loop.in	
c		
c	GENERAL DATA FILE:	
с	This file has general information about the simulation, such as the directory	
c	to store output files and general simulation constants.	
с	Examples: ./example/metr/genInfo.in	
с	./example/wanglandau/genInfo.in (careful! this one runs a wang-	
с	landau simulation so there's no way of making it short. once you	
с	start it, it could take up to 3 days to finish)	
c		30
c	FLUID DATA FILE:	
c	This file has information about the fluid	
c	Eramples: /erample/fluid in	
c	Launpics. / Launpic/ Julia. in	
c	INIT FLUID DATA FILE	
c	Time 1: starting sten size	
с о	Date of flar monitors of fluid atoms (note that it is important to get the number of	
c	Acts of jue, positions of juita atoms (note that it is important to get the nameer of	
c	alons right in the futur right fue as well	
c	Example: ./example/jrozenji	10
С		40
с	LIGHT PARTICLE FILE	
с	This file has information about the light particle.	
c	Example: ./example/lp.in	
с		
с		
c		
cOUT	PUT (7 files):	
c	lpposn: contains the x, y, z coordinates of each bead at every WRITEDATA timesteps	
с	the first line for each time step is the number of particles, and two	
с	throwaway numbers (to make the file easy to read into a data analysis program)	50
c	flposn: could contain the x, y, z coordinates of each fluid atom at every WRITEDATA timesteps	
c	the first line for each time step is the number of particles, the current stepsize,	
с	and a throwaway number (to make the file easy to read into a data analysis program)	
с	currently, not usually written to since we are not moving the fluid	
c	density: could contain density, number of atoms at every WRITEDATA timesteps	
c	currently, not usually written to since we are not moving the fluid	
с	energy: contains average potential and kinetic energy at every WRITEDATA timesteps	
с	denstate: contains the density of states after EACH flat histogram. written as	
с	two-dimensional (Wang-Landau ONLY)	
с	histe: contains the energy histogram after EACH flat histogram written as	60
с	two-dimensional (Wang-Landau ONLY)	
c	accept: data about the acceptance rate and number of beads moved	
c		
c	TO CHANGE THESE FILES OF ADD ANOTHER, LOOK AT THE SYNTAX IN LPInfo f95 To add a file	
с	increase NUMOUT, add another file descriptor to OUTFILES and add another name to OUTNAMES.	
use types use LPInfo use LPInitEnd use LPFncs

c Main Program

implicit none integer :: i, loops, irun, j, cnt, counter, WRITEDATAWL = 5000, WRITEDATAM = 10 real (dp) :: V, flatness character(fileNameLength) :: fname 80 call init_genrand(initrand) !! Inits the Mersenne twister call openCommandFile() !! In LPInitEnd runs: do loops=1,loop c $reset\ variables$  $\operatorname{numWid} = 0$  $\operatorname{irun} = 0$  $\operatorname{acsum} = 0$ fmsize = fmSTART90 cmmove = cmSTARTLPmove = LPSTARTinitialize everything with the input files cread(CMDFILE, *); read(CMDFILE,*) fname open(unit=GENFILE, file=fname,status='old', action='read') call GenInit() read(CMDFILE,*) fname **open**(unit=FLFILE,file=fname,status='old',action='read') 100 call FLInit() read(CMDFILE,*) fname open(unit=LPFILE, file=fname,status='old',action='read') call LPInit() calculate the volume cif (isCyl) then V = pi*rcav2*hcavelse  $V = rcav^{**3}$ endif 110 main loop cMC_passes: do !! this needs to be a while loop for WL if (irun.GT.npass-1.AND.(.NOT.isWL)) then exitelse if (isWL.AND.irun > 0.AND.(mod(irun,CHECK)==0).AND.minval(histE)/(sum(histE)/(1.0*gbins1*gbins2)) > flat histogram cwrite(HISTENG, *) gbins1, gbins2 write(GFILE, *) irun, fwl 120 do i=1,gbins1write(HISTENG,*) histE(i,:) write(GFILE,*) g(i,:) enddo call resetHist() !! in LPInitEnd  $\operatorname{irun} = 0$ fwl = sqrt(fwl) !! decrease fprint *, "flat histogram!, f = ",fwl if (fwl < MINF) exit if (fwl < REDF) then 130FLAT = FLAT - REDFPER*FLAT print *, "FLAT = ", FLAT endif

## endif

с	move	
	if $(nb == 1)$ then	
С	classical particle	
	call moveOne() !! in LPFncs	
	else if (isWL) then	140
С	Wang-Landau	
	call moveWL(irun) !! in LPFncs	
	call updateCM() !! in LPGenFncs	
	else if (isThread) then	
С	Threading	
	call moveThread(irun) !! in LPFncs	
	call updateCM() !! in LPGenFncs	
	else	
С	Metropolis	
	call move(irun) !! in LPFncs	150
	call updateCM() !! in LPGenFncs	
	endif	
С	print some data to a file	
	if (isWL.AND.(mod(irun, WRITEDATAWL)==0)) then	
c	WL data	
	write(LPPOS, *) nb,irun,fwl	
	do i=1,nb	
	write(LPPOS,*) x(i,1,1),x(i,1,2),x(i,1,3)	
	enddo	160
С	we don't let the files get too big	
	counter = counter + 1	
	<pre>write(AVGENG, *) kinEnergy(), potEnergy(), irun, fwl</pre>	
	if (counter $>$ 1000000) then	
	${f print}$ *, 'exceeded maximum lines in fileexiting'	
	exit	
	endif	
	else if (.NOT.isWL.AND.mod(irun,WRITEDATAM)==0) then	
с	Metropolis data	170
	write(LPPOS, *) irun,-1,-1	
	do = 1,nb	
	write(LPPOS,*) x(i,1,1), x(i,1,2), x(i,1,3)	
	enddo	
	<b>write</b> (AVGENG,*) kinEnergy(), potEnergy(), irun, mb	
	endif	
с	print to screen	180
	if $(isWL.AND.mod(irun, 5000) == 0)$ then	
с	WL stuff	
	if $(irun > 0)$ then	
	flatness = minval(histE)/(sum(histE)/(1.0*gbins1*gbins2))	
	<b>print</b> *, "flatness: ", flatness	
	else	
	flatness = 0	
	endif	
	<pre>print *, "pe = ",potEnergy(), "ke = ", kinEnergy(), "nf = ",nf, "f = ", fwl</pre>	
с	calculate how many zero elements if flatness $= 0$	190
	if (flatness $< 1e-8$ ) then	
	cnt = 0	
	do i=1,gbins1	
	do j=1,gbins2	
	if $(histE(i,j) < 1)$ then	
	$\operatorname{cnt} = \operatorname{cnt} + 1$	
	$\mathbf{endif}$	
	enddo	
	enddo	
	<pre>print *, "There are ", cnt, " zero elements."</pre>	200
	endif	

с	else if (.NOT.isWL.AND.int(irun*100/npass) > int((irun-1)*100/npass)) then Metropolis write(*,*) (irun*100/npass), "percent done" endif	
c c	using accepted move ratios to determine cm step size and how many beads we use acsum = acsum + ac accmsum = accmsum + accm if (.NOT.isWL.AND.mod(irun,nevalu) == nevalu-1) then	210
	ac = acsum/(nevalu-1) ! Determine fraction of accepted moves ! single bead moves only occur nevalu-1 times	
с	adjust mb so the acceptance rate is roughly $50\%$ if(ac > 0.5) mb=mb+1 if(ac < 0.5) mb=mb-1 if(mb < 1) mb=1 if(mb > nb) mb=nb acsum = 0 write(ACCFILE, *) irun, ac, mb	220
	endif	
c	Every (nevalu ² )-th move, we look at accmsum, and see how many moves are being accepted. If the rate is too low or two high, we adjust the size of the cm step.	
	if (.NOT.isWL.AND.mod(irun,nevalu**2) == nevalu**2-1) then	
с	adjust commove so the acceptance rate is roughly 50% if(accm.GT.0.6.AND.cmmove.LT.rcav/4.0) cmmove=cmmove*1.2 if(accm.GT.0.6.AND.cmmove.GE.rcav/4.0) cmmove=rcav/4.0 if(accm.LT.0.4) cmmove=cmmove*0.8 accmsum = 0	230
	endif	
	irun = irun + 1	
	end do MC_passes	
	call cleanUp() !! LPInitEnd enddo runs	240

call endPro() print *, "program finished, see data files for results"

END PROGRAM LPMAIN

c InitFncs c Contains routines used to initialize and/or end the program c Subroutines: c cleanUp, endPro, FlInit, GenInit, initBeads, c initMulti, initWL, LPInit openCommandFile, c openFiles, packCube, packCyl, placeBeads, c resetHist, startFromConfig	
MODULE LPInitEnd	10
use types use LPInfo use LPFncs use LPUtil	
CONTAINS	
c cleanUp subroutine c cleanUp subroutine	20
c Cleans up after one run by deallocating variables and closing single-run files c Deallocates: c x, xn, x_changed, xf, xfn, eta, g, histE c Closes: c INFILES, OUTFILES c Called by:	
c Main subroutine cleanUp() implicit none	30
integer :: i	
do i=1,size(INFILES) close(INFILES(i)) enddo	
do $i=1,size(OUTFILES)$ close(OUTFILES(i)) enddo	40
deallocate(x, xn, xf, xfn, x_changed) if (isMulti) then deallocate(eta) endif	
if (isWL) then deallocate(g, histE)	50
end subroutine cleanUp	50
c endPro subroutine c	
c Cleans up after entire program by closing multiple-run files c Closes:	
c GBLINFILES c Called by:	60
c Main c Notes: c does NOT call cleanUp!	
subroutine endPro() implicit none	

integer :: i

do i=1,size(GBLINFILES) close(GBLINFILES(i)) enddo

## end subroutine endPro

*c* -----c FLINIT SUBROUTINE c ~ 80  $c\ Initializes\ the\ fluid\ atoms\ based\ on\ data\ from\ FLFILE$ c Initializes: rhof, rcav, hcav, nf cc Allocates space for: xf, xfn c $c \ Calls:$ packCyl, packCube, startFromConfig cc Called by: Mainc90 subroutine FlInit() implicit none  $\mathbf{logical} :: \operatorname{initCond}$ integer :: bool read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) rhof dimensions and number of fluid atoms cfor now, this should always be canonical and periodic, but we leave this in here 100 cto make updating the code for the other options reasonably easy cif (isGrand) then read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) rcav !! We specify rcav for gc if (isCyl) then nf = int(rhof*pi*hcav*rcav**2)read(FLFILE,*) hcav else nf = int(rhof*rcav**3.0)endif else 110read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) nf !! We specify nf for can if (isCyl) then rcav = (nf/(rhof*pi*hcav))**(1.0/2.0)read(FLFILE,*) hcav else  $rcav = (nf/rhof)^{**}(1.0/3.0)$ endif endif rcav2 = rcav*rcav120 if (isGrand) then  $TOTAL = nf^2$ else TOTAL = nf+1 !! we allocate one extra in case we want to do widom test endif  $\operatorname{allocate}(\operatorname{xf}(\operatorname{TOTAL},3), \operatorname{stat} = \operatorname{error})$ if (error .ne. 0) then write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: xf(:,:)" 130 STOP endif  $\operatorname{allocate}(\operatorname{xfn}(\operatorname{TOTAL},3), \operatorname{stat} = \operatorname{error})$ if (error .ne. 0) then write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: xfn(:,:)"

	STOP endif	
c c	at the moment, we should always be starting from an initial condition, but the day may come when we are not read(FLFILE,*);read(FLFILE,*) bool !! start from initial condition if (bool.NE.0) then initCond = .TRUE.	140
	call startFromConfig() else if (isCyl) then initCond = .FALSE. call packCyl() else initCond = .FALSE	
	call packCube() endif	150
	print *, "the requested density gives", nf, "fluid atoms", " and a cavity of size", rcav	
end s	subroutine FlInit	
~ ~ ~ ~	~~~~~~~~~~~~	
с с GE. с~~~~	NINIT SUBROUTINE	160
c Init c base c Init c	ializes the general variables for the simulation and opens files ed on data in GENFILE tializes: beta, hbar, isWL	
c Cal c c Cal c	ls: openFiles !led by: Main	170
subro	outine GenInit() integer :: bool	170
	call openFiles()	
	read(GENFILE,*);read(GENFILE,*) beta read(GENFILE,*);read(GENFILE,*) hbar read(GENFILE,*);read(GENFILE,*) bool !! isWL	
с	<pre>isWL if (bool == 1) then     isWL = .TRUE.     isThread = .FALSE. !! cannot do threading and WL together     call initWL()</pre>	180
	else isWL = .FALSE.	
	endif read(GENFILE,*);read(GENFILE,*) bool !! isThread if (bool == 1 .ANDNOT.isWL) then isThread = .TBUE	100
	else isThread = .FALSE. endif	190
end s	subroutine GenInit	
c~~~~	Prade submartine	
$c^{111t}$		200

 $c\ Initializes\ positronium\ beads\ from\ a\ file\ c\ Modifies:$ 

x, xncc Called by: cLPInitsubroutine initBeads()  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ 210  $\mathbf{integer} :: \mathbf{ierror}$ integer :: ibeadcount ! number of beads in reading file integer :: ic ! charge (electron = 1 or positron = 2) integer :: ib ! bead character(fileNameLength) :: fname  $\mathrm{ibeadcount}\,=\,0$ read(LPFILE, *) fname open(unit=LPINITFILE, file = fname, status = 'old', action = 'read', iostat = ierror) if (ierror = 0) then 220 write(*,*) 'An error occured opening init file for bead' STOP end if charge3: do ic = 1, 2 bead3: do ib = 1, nb read(LPINITFILE,*,iostat = ierror) x(ib,ic,1), x(ib,ic,2), x(ib,ic,3)  ${\rm ibeadcount} = {\rm ibeadcount}{+}1$ if (ierror = 0) STOP end do bead3 end do charge3 230 !Close off the chain x(nb+1,:,:) = x(1,:,:)if (ibeadcount  $= 2^{*}$ nb) then write(*,*) 'too few or too many beads in bead init file' STOP endif if (isCyl) then 240 x(:,:,3)=x(:,:,3)+0.5*hcav !! put the positronium halfway up the cylinder (in the middle) endif xn = xend subroutine initBeads c ---- $c \ initMulti \ subroutine$ c  $\hat{}$ 250 $c\ Initializes\ the\ program\ to\ use\ multicanonical\ sampling$ c Allocates space for: cetac Modifies:  $eta,\ multibins$ cc Called by: nothing at the moment, but might be useful to c $reintroduce\ multicanonical\ sampling$ c260 subroutine initMulti()  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ integer :: i character(fileNameLength) :: fname read(FLFILE,*); read(FLFILE,*) fname **open**(unit=MULTIFILE, file = fname, status='old', action='read') read(MULTIFILE, *); read(MULTIFILE,*) multibins 270allocate(eta(multibins), stat = error)

```
if (error .ne. 0) then
               write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: eta(:)"
               STOP
        endif
        read(MULTIFILE,*); read(MULTIFILE,*) fname
        open(unit=ETAFILE, file=fname,status='old', action='read')
        do i=1,multibins
               read(ETAFILE,*) eta(i)
                                                                                                                                   280
        enddo
end subroutine initMulti
c -----
c \ initWL \ subroutine
c^{\prime}
c Initializes the program to use Wang-Landau sampling
c Allocates space for:
c
       g, histE
                                                                                                                                   290
c Called by:
c
       GenInit
subroutine initWL()
       \mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}
       allocate(g(gbins1, gbins2), stat = error)
        if (error .ne. 0) then
                write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: g(:)"
               STOP
                                                                                                                                   300
       \mathbf{endif}
        allocate(histE(gbins1, gbins2), stat = error)
        if (error .ne. 0) then
               write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: histE(:)"
               STOP
        endif
        call resetHist()
                                                                                                                                   310
       \mathrm{g}\,=\,0.0
       fwl = exp(1.0)
end subroutine initWL
c ------
c\ LPInit\ subroutine
c ~
c \ {\it Initializes} \ {\it light} \ particle \ beads
                                                                                                                                   320
c Initializes:
c
       nb, mb, numcharge, npass, amass
c Allocates space for:
c
       x, xn, x\_changed
c \ Calls:
       initBeads, placeBeads, CreateTable
c
c Called by:
        Main
c
                                                                                                                                   330
subroutine LPInit()
       implicit none
        integer :: bool
        read(LPFILE,*);read(LPFILE,*) nb !! # beads for the particle
        read(LPFILE,*);read(LPFILE,*) mb !! # beads moved per staging pass
       read(LPFILE,*);read(LPFILE,*) npass !! # staging passes
read(LPFILE,*);read(LPFILE,*) amass !! mass of a single quantum particle
read(LPFILE,*);read(LPFILE,*) bool !! start from config
```

		340
	allocate(x(nb+1,2,3), stat = error)	
	if (error .ne. 0) then write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: x(:,:,:)"	
	endif	
	allocate(xn(nb+1,2,3), stat = error) if (error .ne. 0) then	
	<pre>write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: xn(:,:,:)" stop endif</pre>	350
	endir	
	allocate(x_changed(nb+1,2), stat = error) if (error .ne. 0) then write(*,*) "Unable to allocate memory for the array: x_changed(:,:)"	
	stop endif	
с	The deB wavelength is a useful bit of trivia, so we calculate it out here. wave = $sqrt(beta*hbar*hbar/amass)$	360
	$x_{changed}(:,:) = .TRUE.$	
	if $(bool == 1)$ then	
с	start from init file call initBeads()	
	else	
С	call placeBeads()	
	endif	370
end s	subroutine LPInit	
c ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
c oper	1CommandFile subroutine	
с		
c Prot c Call	mpts the user for and opens the command file led by:	
c	Main	380
subro	outine     openCommandFile()       implicit     none	
	character(fileNameLength) :: fname	
	write(*,*) "Enter the name of the input file:"	
	open(unit=CMDFILE, file=fname, status='old', action='read')	
	read(CMDFILE,*); read(CMDFILE,*) loop	390
	read(CMDFILE,*)	
end s	ubroutine openCommandFile	
c~~~~	~~~~~~~~~~~~	
c oper c~~~~	aFiles subroutine	
c oper	rs input files led bu:	400
c Curr	genInit	100
subro	implicit none	

integer :: i
character(fileNameLength) :: dirname

```
\mathbf{read}(\mathrm{GENFILE},*); \mathbf{read}(\mathrm{GENFILE},*) \ \mathrm{dirname}
       do i=1,size(OUTFILES)
                                                                                                                              410
               open(unit=OUTFILES(i),file=(trim(dirname) // trim(OUTNAMES(i))),status='replace',action='write')
       enddo
end subroutine openFiles
c \ packCube \ subroutine
c
c Places fluid atoms uniformly in a cube
                                                                                                                              420
c Modifies:
c
       xf
c Called by:
       FLInit
c
subroutine packCube()
       integer :: i
       real (dp) :: spc, rat
                                                                                                                              430
       if (nf^{**}(1.0/3.0)^*sig0.GT.rcav) then
               write(*,*) "Too many atoms for this volume. Increase rcav or decrease rhof."
               STOP
       \mathbf{endif}
       if (nf.LT.1) then
               write(*,*) "No atoms!"
               STOP
       endif
                                                                                                                              440
       {\rm spc} = {\rm rcav}/({\rm nf}^{**}(1.0/3.0)) !! spacing between the atoms
       do i=1,nf
               \mathrm{rat}\,=\,\mathrm{spc}^{\boldsymbol{\ast}}\mathrm{i}/\mathrm{rcav}
               xf(i,1) = (rat - int(rat))*rcav
               xf(i,2) = (int(rat)*spc/rcav - int(int(rat)*spc/rcav))*rcav
               xf(i,3) = int(int(rat)*spc/rcav)*spc
       enddo
end subroutine packCube
                                                                                                                              450
c ------
c packCyl subroutine
c
c Places fluid atoms uniformly in a cylinder
c Modifies:
c
       xf
c Called by:
       FLInit
                                                                                                                              460
c
subroutine packCyl()
       real (dp) :: rpack, rring, zring
       integer :: nlayers, npack, nrings, l
       now we need to place the fluid atoms in the cavity in a dense fashion
c
       rpack=2.0*rcav/sig0
       if (rpack.LT.1.0) then
                                                                                                                              470
               print *, "cannot pack any fluid atoms into a cylinder so small"
               STOP
       endif
```

if (rpack.LT.2.0) then

print *, " we use simple axial packing" if (nf.GT.int(hcav/sig0)) then **print** *, "we cannot fit all requested atoms by axial packing" STOP endif 480 nlayers=nf do k=1,nlayers xf(k,1)=0.0xf(k,2)=0.0 xf(k,3)=k*sig0 enddo else npack=6nrings=0490 l=0RingIteration: do !! this blind loop iterates over multiple packing rings if (l.GT.nf) exit !! will never exit initially, only after running out of fluid atoms to place npack=int(pi/asin(1.0/(rpack-1.0)))print *, "we pack in a ring of", npack, "fluid atoms" nrings=nrings+1rring=sig0/(2.0*sin(pi/npack))print *, "we pack at radius", rring LayerIteration: do k=1,int(hcav/sig0) !! loop over the layers of atoms zring=k*sig0  $\mathbf{do}$ 500 l=l+1if (l. $\mathbf{GT}$ .nf) exit xf(l,1)=rring*cos(2.0*l*pi/npack) xf(l,2) = rring*sin(2.0*l*pi/npack)xf(l,3)=zringif (mod(l,npack).EQ.0) exit enddo enddo LayerIteration rpack=1.0/sin(pi/npack)-1.0510if (rpack.LT.2.0.AND.*l*.LT.nf) then print *, " we use simple axial packing for the remaining atoms" if ((nf-l).GT.int(hcav/sig0)) then print *, "we cannot fit all remaining atoms by axial packing" STOP endif  $\mathbf{do} \ \mathrm{k=l,nf}$ xf(k,1)=0.0xf(k,2)=0.0520xf(k,3)=(k-l)*sig0enddo l=l+int(hcav/sig0)endif if  $(npack.LT.6.AND.\ell.LT.nf)$  then abort if there are atoms let to place and we're trying to put them inside a less than 6-ring print *, "too many atoms for too small a cavity" STOP 530 endif enddo RingIteration endif end subroutine packCyl *c* ----- $c \ subroutine \ placeBeads$ c Places beads in a Gaussian distribution 540c Modifies: x, xnc Calls:

c

c

c

c

cgaussc Called by: cLPInitsubroutine placeBeads()  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ integer :: is = 1! (rightnow, a dummy) variable for gaussian RNG 550! counter for **dimension** integer :: idinteger :: ic ! charge (electron = 1 or positron = 2) integer :: ib ! bead real (dp) :: xsum, xshift double precision :: gg  $\textbf{logical}:: \operatorname{goodPos}$ if (isCyl) then gg = min(wave*wave,rcav*rcav/12.0)else 560 gg = min(wave*wave, rcav/2.0) $\mathbf{endif}$ ! start gg smaller if you wish if (isWL) gg = 0.2 $\dim:\,\mathbf{do}\,\,\mathrm{id}\,=\,1,3$ xsum = 0.0charge1: do ic = 1,2!numcharge bead1: do ib = 1, nb x(ib,ic, id) = gauss(gg,is)570xsum=xsum+x(ib,ic,id) end do bead1 x(nb+1,ic,id) = x(1,ic,id)end do charge1 xsum = xsum/2.0/float(nb)xshift = xc(id)-xsumcharge2: do ic = 1,2bead2: do ib = 1,nb+1 x(ib,ic,id)=x(ib,ic,id)+xshift end do bead2 580end do charge2 end do dim  $x_{changed}(:,:) = .TRUE.$ if (isCyl) then x(:,:,3)=x(:,:,3)+0.5* heav !! put the positronium halfway up the cylinder (in the middle) else if (.NOT. isWL) then x(:,:,3) = x(:,:,3)+0.5*rcavelse find a place where they aren't too close to the fluid 590cgoodPos = .FALSE.do if (goodPos) exit goodPos = .TRUE.if (((potEnergy() < CENTER2.OR.potEnergy() > (1.0*gbins2)*GRES2+CENTER2))) then goodPos = .FALSE.x(:,:,3) = x(:,:,3)+0.5*ran1(initrand) $x_{-}changed = \mathbf{TRUE}.$  $do \ \mathrm{ib} = 1, \ \mathrm{nb}$  $\mathbf{do} ~\mathrm{id} = 1{,}3$ 600 do ic = 1,numcharge if (x(ib,ic,id). $\mathbf{GT}$ .rcav) then print *, 'No good initial position' STOP endif enddo enddo enddo endif enddo 610 $\mathbf{endif}$ 

 $\mathbf{endif}$ xn = xend subroutine placeBeads *c* -----c resetHist subroutine ~ c' $c \ Sets \ histE \ to \ all \ zeroes$ 620c Modifies: histEcc Called by: initWL, Main csubroutine resetHist() implicit none  ${\rm histE}\,=\,0.0$ 630 $\mathbf{end}\ \mathbf{subroutine}\ \mathrm{resetHist}$ *c* -----c startFromConfig subroutine c ~  $c\ Initializes\ the\ fluid\ atoms\ from\ a\ file$ c Modifies: xf 640 csubroutine startFromConfig() integer :: i character(fileNameLength) :: init read(FLFILE,*) init !! Name of initial configuration file print *, 'reading initial fluid positions from ', init open(unit=INITFILE, file=init, status='old', action='read') read(INITFILE,*) fmsize fmsize= fmsize*REDUCED2AU 650  $\mathbf{do} ~\mathrm{i=1,nf}$ read(INITFILE,*) xf(i,1), xf(i,2), xf(i,3)enddo xf(:,:) = xf(:,:)*REDUCED2AUprint *, 'The energy of the starting configuration is ', totalFluidEnergy() end subroutine startFromConfig

 $\mathbf{end} \ \mathrm{MODULE} \ \mathrm{LPInitEnd}$ 

c LPFncs c Functions and subroutines for light particle c Functions:  $kinEnergy,\ kin1,\ lpflPot,\ potEnergy$ c $c \ Subroutines:$ move, move_cm, moveOne, moveWL, tryboth cMODULE LPFncs use types 10use LPInfo use LPUtil use LPGenFncs CONTAINS *c* -----c kinEnergy Function c20c Returns:  $current\ kinetic\ energy\ of\ the\ system$ creal (dp) function kinEnergy()  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ integer :: i,j kinEnergy = 0.030 do i=1,nbj = i+1if (i==nb) j = 1kinEnergy = kinEnergy + kin1(i,x,j,x)enddo  $end \ function \ \mathrm{kinEnergy}$ *c* ---- $c \ kin1 \ Function$ 40c  $\hat{}$ c Calculates the kinetic energy between two beads in chains x1 and x2c Parameters: i: index of bead in x1 ccx1: first chainj: index of bead in x2 cx2: second chain (usually same as x1) cc Returns: the kinetic energy between x1(i,1,:) and x2(j,1,:)c50real (dp) function kin1(i,x1, j, x2)  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ integer, INTENT(IN) :: i, j real (dp), dimension(nb+1,2,3), intent(in) :: x1, x2 kin1 = 0.5*amass*nb/hbar**2*(mag2(x1(i,1,:), x2(j,1,:)))end function kin1 *c* ------60  $c \ lpflPot \ Function$  $c^{\prime}$ c Calculates the potential between the fluid and light particle  $c\ We\ use\ the\ truncated\ Lennard-Jones\ potential\ between\ argon\ and\ helium\ with$ c Parameters:

 $c \qquad LP \ \text{-light particle to calculate potential for, 0 to use all particles}$ 

fl - fluid particle to calculate potential for, 0 to use all particles cxbead - bead positions cxfluid - fluid positions c70 checkChanged - true if we only calculate potentials for beads that have been cmoved (ie,  $x_{changed} = true$ ), false to calculate regardless of  $x_{changed}$ cc Returns: the potential between LP and fl cc Notes: the input vseudoar1(0,0,x,xf,false.) will calculate the full potential energy of the system creal (dp) function lpflPot(LP, fl, xbead, xfluid, checkChanged) implicit none 80 real (dp), dimension(nb+1,2,3), intent(in) :: xbead real (dp), dimension(nf,3), intent(in) :: xfluid integer, INTENT(IN) :: fl, LP logical, intent(in) :: checkChanged integer :: i, j real (dp) :: dist2 ${\rm lpflPot}\,=\,0.0$ if (LP < 1 AND. fl < 1) then calculate potential of whole system 90 cdo i = 1,nbif  $(.NOT.checkChanged.OR.(checkChanged.AND.x_changed(i,1)))$  then do j=1,nfdist2 = reldist2(xbead(i,1,:), xfluid(j,:)) !!in GenFncsif (dist2.LT.(rcutLp**2)) then lpflPot = lpflPot + 4.0*epsLp*((sigLp**2/dist2)**6-(sigLp**2/dist2)**3)endif enddo endif enddo 100 else if (LP < 1) then calculate potential of all beads with one fluid atom c $do \ \mathrm{i=1,nb}$ if  $(.NOT.checkChanged.OR.(checkChanged.AND.x_changed(i,1)))$  then dist2 = reldist2(xbead(i,1,:), xfluid(fl,:))if (dist2.LT.(rcutLp**2)) then lpfPot = lpfPot + 4.0*epsLp*((sigLp**2/dist2)**6-(sigLp**2/dist2)**3) endif endif enddo 110 else if (fl < 1) then calculate potential of all fluid atoms with one fluid bead cif (.NOT.checkChanged.OR.(checkChanged.AND.x_changed(i,1))) then do j=1,nf dist2 = reldist2(xbead(LP,1,:), xfluid(j,:))if  $(dist2.LT.(rcutLp^{**2}))$  then lpflPot = lpflPot + 4.0*epsLp*((sigLp**2/dist2)**6-(sigLp**2/dist2)**3) $\mathbf{endif}$ enddo endif 120 else calculate potential between one fluid atom and one bead c $if (.NOT.checkChanged.OR.(checkChanged.AND.x_changed(i,1))) then$ dist2 = reldist2(xbead(LP,1,:), xfluid(fl,:)) if (dist2.LT.(rcutLp**2)) then  ${\rm lpflPot} = 4.0^{*} {\rm epsLp}^{*} (({\rm sigLp}^{**2}/{\rm dist2})^{**6} - ({\rm sigLp}^{**2}/{\rm dist2})^{**3})$ endif endif  $\mathbf{endif}$ 130 end function lpflPot . . . . . . . . . . . . . c ~  $c\ move\ subroutine$ c

c Moves beads using basic PIMC c Parameters: irun - the step number of the loop cc Modifies: 140cx, xn c Calls: kinEnergy, kin1, lpflPot, ran1 cc Called by: Main csubroutine move(irun)  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ integer, INTENT(IN) :: irun 150integer :: ib, id, ibm, ibp real (dp) :: ke, kenew, pe, penew c $initial\ energies$ ke = kinEnergy()/(beta**2)pe = potEnergy()do ib=1,nb we always attempt to move all the beads one by one cibp = ib + 1160 ibm = ib-1if (ib == nb) ibp = 1if (ib == 1) ibm = nbdo id = 1,3xn(ib,1,id) = x(ib,1,id) + LPmove*(ran1(initrand) - 0.5)enddo calculate energies c $\operatorname{kenew} = \operatorname{ke} - \operatorname{kin1(ib,x,ibp,x)/(beta^{**2})} - \operatorname{kin1(ib,x,ibm,x)/(beta^{**2})} + \operatorname{kin1(ib,xn,\,ibp,\,xn)/(beta^{**2})} \&$ + kin1(ib,xn, ibm,xn)/(beta**2) 170  $penew = pe - \frac{1.0}{float(nb)} pflPot(ib,0,x,xf,.false.) + \frac{1.0}{float(nb)} pflPot(ib,0,xn,xf,.false.)$ if (dexp(-beta*(kenew+penew-(ke+pe))) > ran1(initrand)) then  $\mathrm{ac}{=}1.0d0$ x = xn;pe = penewke = kenewx = xnelsexn = xendif 180 enddo end subroutine move *c*~~  $c \ moveThread \ subroutine$ 190 c $c\ Moves\ beads\ or\ the\ center\ of\ mass\ using\ a\ threading\ algorithm$ *c* Parameters: cirun - the step number of the loop c Modifies: x, xn, xc, x_changed, ac, accm cc Calls: move_cm, tryboth, lpflPot c

c Called by:

c Nain

subroutine moveThread(irun)

B.40

implicit none integer, INTENT(IN) :: irun integer :: i, j real (dp) :: vsum, vsumnew, vchange, de, det !! beta / number of beads real (dp) :: effBeta effBeta = beta / float(nb)210cdo a staging move on the beads (re-pick from a gaussian distribution) do electron and positron moves serially cif (mod(irun,NCMMOVE).eq.0) then call move_cm(xn) !! move center of mass else call tryboth(xn) !! move according to threading 220end if c $calculate\ potentials$ vsum=lpflPot(0, 0, x, xf, .true.) vsumnew=lpflPot(0, 0, xn, xf, .true.) vchange = (vsumnew - vsum)*effBetadet = -vchangede = dlog(ran1(initrand) + 1.0d-10) $\mathrm{ac}\,=\,0.0d0$ 230 $\mathrm{accm}\,=\,0.0d0$ if (det.GT.de) then the move was accepted cif (mod(irun,NCMMOVE).eq.0) then  $\mathrm{accm}\,=\,1.0d0$ else  ${\rm ac}{=}1.0d0$ endif 240 $do \ \mathrm{i} = 1, \mathrm{nb}$ do j = 1,numcharge  $if(x_changed(i,j))$  then x(i,j,:) = xn(i,j,:)if(i.EQ.1) x(nb+1,j,:) = xn(nb+1,j,:)endif enddo enddo  $\mathbf{else}$ the move was rejected 250cdo i = 1,nbdo j = 1,numcharge  $if(x_changed(i,j))$  then xn(i,j,:) = x(i,j,:)if(i.EQ.1) xn(nb+1,j,:) = x(nb+1,j,:)endif enddo enddo endif 260end subroutine moveThread *c* ----- $c \ move_cm \ subroutine$ c ~ c moves the center of mass of the two chains c Parameters: xnew - the old center of mass 270cc Pass-by-reference

xnew - will contain the new center of mass cc Modifies: c $x_changed$ c Called by: cmovesubroutine move_cm(xnew)  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ integer :: ic, ib 280 real (dp), DIMENSION(3) :: d real (dp), intent(INOUT), DIMENSION(:,:,:) :: xnew  $d(1) = \text{cmmove}^*(\text{ran1(initrand)} - 0.5)$ d(2) = cnmove*(ran1(initrand) - 0.5)d(3) = cnmove*(ran1(initrand) - 0.5)do ic = 1,numcharge  $do \ \mathrm{ib} = 1, \mathrm{nb}{+}1$ xnew(ib,ic,:) = xnew(ib,ic,:) + d $\mathbf{enddo}$ 290enddo  $x_{changed}(:,:) = .true.$ end subroutine move_cm *c* ----- $c \ moveOne \ subroutine$ c  $\hat{}$ 300 c Moves a classical particle ("one bead") c Modifies:  $x, xn, x_changed, xEnergyOld, xEnergyNew,$ cc Calls:  $move_cm, tryboth, LookUpTable, vfun1, vspeudoar$ c $c\ Called\ by:$ Maincsubroutine moveOne() implicit none 310 integer :: i real (dp) :: vold, vnew, vchange do i=1,3 xn(1,1,i) = x(1,1,i)+LPmove*(ran1(initrand)-0.5)enddo  $calculate\ potentials$ cvold = lpflPot(0,0,x,xf, false.) 320vnew = lpflPot(0,0,xn,xf, false.)vchange = vnew - voldif (dexp(-beta*vchange) > ran1(initrand)) then  $accept\ move$ cx = xnelse  $reject\ move$ cxn = xendif 330 end subroutine moveOne

c moveWL c

c Does a Wang-Landau move c INPUT:

irun - the current loop index (for printing purposes, not used in calculation) 340 cc Modifies: x, xn, g, histEcc Calls:  $kinEnergy,\ potEnergy,\ binPot,\ binKin$ cc Called by: MainccNotes: Assumes one chain only subroutine moveWL(irun) implicit none 350 integer, intent(in) :: irun real (dp) :: ke, pe, kenew, penew integer :: ib, id, ibp, ibm, binp, bink, binpnew, binknew  $\mathrm{ac}\,=\,0$ initial energies cke = kinEnergy()pe = potEnergy()360 do ib=1,nb we always attempt to move all the beads one by one cibp = ib+1ibm = ib-1if (ib == nb) ibp = 1if (ib == 1) ibm = nbdo id = 1,3xn(ib,1,id) = x(ib,1,id) + LPmove*(ran1(initrand) - 0.5)enddo 370 ccalculate energies kenew = ke - kin1(ib,x,ibp,x) - kin1(ib,x,ibm,x) + kin1(ib,xn, ibp, xn) + kin1(ib,xn, ibm,xn) $\mathrm{penew} = \mathrm{pe} - 1.0/\mathrm{float(nb)}*\mathrm{lpflPot(ib,0,x,xf,.false.)} + 1.0/\mathrm{float(nb)}*\mathrm{lpflPot(ib,0,xn,xf,.false.)}$ bin energies (binning functions in LPGenFncs) cbinp = binPot(pe)bink = binKin(ke)binpnew = binPot(penew)binknew = binKin(kenew)if ((bink.LE.gbins1.AND.bink.GT.0).AND.(binp.LE.gbins2.AND.binp.GT.0) & 380 .AND.(binknew.LE.gbins1.AND.binknew.GT.0).AND.(binpnew.LE.gbins2.AND.binpnew.GT.0)) then everything is within the histograms cif (ran1(initrand).LT.exp(g(bink,binp)-g(binknew,binpnew))) then  $move \ accepted!$ cpe = penewke = kenewx = xnhistE(binknew, binpnew) = histE(binknew, binpnew)+1g(binknew, binpnew) = log(fwl) + g(binknew, binpnew)else 390 move rejected! cxn = xhistE(bink, binp) = histE(bink, binp)+1g(bink,binp) = g(bink,binp) + log(fwl)endif else if (.NOT.((bink.LE.gbins1.AND.bink.GT.0).AND.(binp.LE.gbins2.AND.binp.GT.0))) then we are outside our histogram... maybe a bad initial configuration? cprint *, 'An impossible configuration has been reached with pe = ',  $\rm pe$ print *, ' ke = ',ke, ' tf = ', totalFluidEnergy(), 'bink = ', bink, 'binp = ', binp STOP 400 else moving may not be energetically wrong, but it would put us outside the c $histogram \implies$  we reject the move cxn = xhistE(bink, binp) = histE(bink, binp)+1g(bink,binp) = g(bink,binp) + log(fwl)endif

enddo

end subroutine moveWL		410
c~~~^	~~~~~	
c poth	Energy	
c~~~~	~~~~~	
c Ret	urns:	
c	current potential energy	
real (	(dp) function potEnergy() implicit none	420
	potEnergy = totalFluidEnergy() + 1.0/float(nb)*lpflPot(0,0,x,xf, .false.)	
end f	function potEnergy	
c~~~~	~~~~~~~~~	
c tryb	both subroutine	
c~~~~	~~~~~~~~~~	
c Mai	kes trial moves of the beads	430
c Par	ameters:	
c	xnew - old positions	
c Pas	s-by-reference	
c a Ma	xnew - will contain new positions	
с 10100 с	repersed	
c Cal	led by:	
с	move	
c Cal	ls:	
с	gauss	440
subro	implicit none	
	integer :: is $= 1 !!$ (rightnow, a dummy) variable for gaussian RNG	
	integer :: ic, id, ib, i, j	
	real (dp), intent(INOUT), DIMENSION(:,:,:) :: xnew	
	double precision :: const, g	
	const=2.0d0*wave*wave/dfloat(nb)	450
	$x_changed(:,:) = .FALSE.$	
с	pick new bead positions according to gaussian distn	
с	id is the axis direction	
	charge: do ic=1,numcharge	
	dim: do id=1,3 $a_{ij}$ are as from the i head to the it mb head	
c	(i is selected at random)	
0	j=int(nb*ran1(initrand))+1	460
	beads: do $i=1,mb$	
	ib=j+mb-i+1	
с	account for periodicity in the chain	
	If (1b. GT. nb) $1b = 1b - nb$	
С	g = const*dfloat(mb-i+1)/dfloat(mb-i+2)	
	$x_{new}(ib,ic,id) = (x_{new}(ib+1,ic,id)*(mb-i+1)+x_{new}(i,ic,id))/float(mb-i+2) \&$	
	+ gauss(g,is)	
С	flag the fact that this bead has been moved $x$ changed(ib.ic) = . <b>TRUE</b> .	470
	x = 0.000  Bod(10, 10) =	
с	close the chain if we have moved the 1st bead.	
	if(ib EQ. 1)then	
	xnew(nb+1,nc,nd)=xnew(1,nc,nd)	

endif

endif enddo beads enddo dim enddo charge end subroutine tryboth

end MODULE LPFncs

c LPGenFncs: c Contains functions relating to physics but not necessarily only applicable to this program c Functions: averageEnergy, binKin, binPot, calcF, calcLJ, flrrel, flrrel2, reldist, reldist2, virial c $c \ Subroutines:$ updateCMcMODULE LPGenFncs use types 10use LPInfo use LPUtil CONTAINS *c* ---- $c \ average Energy \ function$ c ~ 20 $c \ Returns:$ the average energy of the fluid cc Called by: Maincc Calls: ctotal Energyreal (dp) function averageFluidEnergy()  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ 30 averageFluidEnergy = totalFluidEnergy()/nfend function averageFluidEnergy c ---- $c\ binKin\ and\ binPot\ Functions$ c ~  $c \ bins \ (kinetic/potential) \ energy \ for \ Wang-Landau$ c Parameters: energy - energy to bin 40c $c \ Returns$ bin number corresponding to input energy cinteger function binKin(energy) real (dp), INTENT(IN) :: energy binKin = int((energy-CENTER1)/GRES1+1)end function binKin integer function binPot(energy) 50real (dp), INTENT(IN) :: energy binPot = int((energy-CENTER2)/GRES2+1)end function binPot *c* ----- $c \ calcF \ Function$ cc Parameters: 60 i, j: indices in mols of the two atoms between which to calculate the cLennard-Jones force for ARGON (not Ar-He) cmols: an nx3 array of the positions of atoms interacting via Lennard-Jones cc Returns: The Lennard-Jones force between mols(i) and mols(j)c $c\ Called\ by:$ virialc

real (dp) function calcF(i, j, mols) implicit none	70
<pre>integer, INTENT(IN) :: i, j real (dp), DIMENSION(:,:), INTENT(IN) :: mols real (dp) :: dist</pre>	
dist = firrel(i,j,mols)	
$ \begin{array}{l} \mbox{if ((isCyl.AND.dist.LT.min(0.5*hcav,rcut)).OR.((.NOT.isCyl).AND.dist.LT.(rcut))) then} \\ & \ calcF = 4.0*eps0*(12*(sig0**12/dist**13)-6*(sig0**6/dist**7)) \\ \mbox{else} \\ & \ calcF = 0.0 \\ \mbox{endif} \end{array} $	80
end function calcF	
c calcLJ Function c ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	90
c Parameters: c i, j: indices in mols of the two atoms between which to calculate c the Lennard-Jones potential for ARGON (not Ar-He) c mols: an nx3 array of the positions of atoms interacting via Lennard-Jones c Returns:	
c The Lennard-Jones potential between mols(i) and mols(j) c Called by: c totalEnergy	
real (dp) function calcLJ(i, j, mols) implicit none	100
<pre>integer, INTENT(IN) :: i, j real (dp), DIMENSION(:,:), INTENT(IN) :: mols real (dp) :: dist2</pre>	
dist2 = flrrel2(i,j,mols)	
c sets cutoff distance for LJ interaction to rcut if ((isCyl.AND.dist2.LT.(min((0.5*hcav)**2,rcut**2))).OR.((.NOT.isCyl).AND.dist2.LT.(rcut**2))) then calcLJ = 4.0*eps0*((sig0**2/dist2)**6-(sig0**2/dist2)**3) else	110
calcLJ = 0.0 endif	
end function calcLJ	120
c ^{~~~~~~} cfirrel function c ^{~~~~~~~~~~} c	
c Parameters: c i, j: indices in mols of the two atoms between which to calculate the relative distance c mols: an nx3 array of the positions of atoms c Returns:	
c the relative distance between mols(i) and mols(j) taking into account image positions c Calls: c firrel2 c Called bu:	130
c calcF, virial c Notes:	

c Avoid calling this if you can just call flrrel2 since it's faster to avoid taking square roots

<pre>real (dp) function firrel(i,j,mols) implicit none integer, INTENT(IN) :: i, j real (dp), DIMENSION(:,:), INTENT(IN) :: mols</pre>	140
firrel = sqrt(firrel2(i,j,mols))	
end function firrel	
c	
c flrrel2 function	
c	150
c Parameters: <ul> <li>c i, j: indices in mols of the two atoms between which to calculate the relative distance</li> <li>c mols: an nx3 array of the positions of atoms</li> <li>c Returns:</li> <li>c the square of the relative distance between mols(i) and mols(j) taking</li> <li>c into account image positions (fluid-fluid and fluid-bead but NOT bead-bead)</li> </ul>	
c Called by:	
c calcF, calcLJ, reldistz	
real (dp) function firrel2(i,j,mols) implicit none	160
<pre>integer, INTENT(IN) :: i, j real (dp), DIMENSION(:,:), INTENT(IN) :: mols</pre>	
integer :: n	
firrel = 0	
	170
do n=1,3 firrel2 = firrel2 + & $(\min(abs(mols(i,n)-mols(j,n))), abs(rcav-abs(mols(i,n) - mols(j,n)))))**2$ enddo endif	
	180
end function flrrel2	
c~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
c reldist function	
c Parameters: c v1, v2 - three dimesional vectors between which to find the relative distance taking into c account any periodic boundry conditions c Returns: c the relative distance between v1 and v2 taking into account any periodic boundry c conditions (use for fluid-bead, fluid-fluid, NOT bead-bead) c Calls: c reldist2	190
real (dp) function reldist(v1, v2) implicit none	
real (dp), DIMENSION(3) :: v1, v2	200
reldist = sqrt(reldist2(v1,v2)) end function reldist	

```
c ------
c \ reldist2 \ function
c \hat{}
c Parameters:
      v1, v2 - three dimesional vectors between which to find the relative distance taking into
                                                                                                                         210
c
                     account any periodic boundry conditions
c
c Returns:
       the square of the relative distance between v1 and v2 taking into account
c
             any periodic boundry conditions (use for fluid-bead, fluid-fluid, NOT bead-bead)
c
c Called by:
      reldist, \ lpflPot
c
c Calls:
       flrrel2
c
real (dp) function reldist2(v1, v2)
                                                                                                                         220
       implicit none
       integer i
       real (dp), DIMENSION(3), INTENT(IN) :: v1, v2
       real (dp), DIMENSION(2,3) :: mols
       mols(1, :) = v1
       mols(2, :) = v2
       if (isCyl) then
                                                                                                                         230
              mols(1, 3) = mols(1, 3) - hcav*ANINT(mols(1,3)/hcav)
mols(2, 3) = mols(2, 3) - hcav*ANINT(mols(2,3)/hcav)
       else
              do i=1,3
                     mols(1, i) = mols(1, i) - rcav*ANINT(mols(1,i)/rcav)
                     mols(2, i) = mols(2, i) - rcav*ANINT(mols(2,i)/rcav)
              enddo
       endif
       reldist2 = flrrel2(1,2,mols)
end function reldist2
                                                                                                                         240
c ------
c \ mag \ and \ mag2 \ Functions
c~~~~
c \ Returns:
       the distance (mag) or the squared distance (mag2) between two
c
              vectors
c
c Called by:
                                                                                                                         250
c
      kin1
c Notes:
       Call mag2 if possible since it's faster to avoid taking square roots
c
real (dp) function mag(v1, v2)
       implicit none
       real(dp), DIMENSION(2), INTENT(IN)::v1, v2
       mag = sqrt(mag2(v1,v2))
                                                                                                                         260
end function mag
real (dp) function mag2(v1, v2)
       implicit none
       real(dp), DIMENSION(2), INTENT(IN)::v1, v2
       mag2 = (v1(1) - v2(1))^{**2} + (v1(2) - v2(2))^{**2} + (v1(3) - v2(3))^{**2}
end function mag2
                                                                                                                         270
```

```
c \ total Energy \ function
c^{\prime}
c Returns:
       the total energy of the system
c
c Calls:
       calcLJ
c
c Called by:
                                                                                                                                280
       Main, \ potEnergy
c
real (dp) function totalFluidEnergy()
       \mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}
       integer :: i,j
       {\rm totalFluidEnergy}\,=\,0
       do i=1,nf
                                                                                                                                290
               \mathbf{do} \ j=i+1,\mathrm{nf}
                      totalFluidEnergy = totalFluidEnergy + calcLJ(i,j,xf)
               enddo
       enddo
\mathbf{end}\ \mathbf{function}\ \mathrm{totalFluidEnergy}
c ------
c \ update CM \ subroutine
c ~
                                                                                                                                300
c\ Updates\ the\ center\ of\ mass\ of\ the\ beads\ after\ a\ move
c Modifies:
c
       xc
subroutine updateCM()
       implicit none
       integer :: i,j
       real (dp), DIMENSION(3) :: xc1, xc2
       xc1(:)=0.0
                                                                                                                                310
       xc2(:)=0.0
       xc(:)=0.0
       \mathbf{do} ~ \mathrm{i=1,3}
               do \ j{=}1{,}\mathrm{nb}
                      xc1(i) = xc1(i)+x(j,1,i)/float(nb)
                      if (.NOT.isWL) xc2(i) = xc2(i)+x(j,2,i)/float(nb)
               enddo
       enddo
                                                                                                                                320
       if (isWL) then
               xc = xc1
       else
              xc = (xc1+xc2)/2.0
        \mathbf{endif}
end subroutine updateCM
c ------
                                                                                                                                330
c\ virial\ function
c~~~~~~
         ~~~~~~~~~~~
c Returns:
 the virial of the system
c
c\ Called\ by:
c
 Main
c Calls:
 calcF, flrrel
c
```

end MODULE LPGenFncs

 $c \ LPUtil$ c Useful routines mostly involving array manipulation or random numbers c Contains: copyArray, gauss, increaseCapacity, ran1 cMODULE LPUtil use types use LPInfo 10CONTAINS *c* ----- $c \ copy Array \ subroutine$ c $c \ Copies \ 1\text{-}D \ array \ src \ to \ dest$ c Intent(in): src - the array from which to copy c $c \ Intent(out)$ 20dest - the array into which to copy cc Called by: increase Capacitycsubroutine copyArray(src, dest)  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ real (dp), DIMENSION(:), INTENT(IN) :: src real (dp), DIMENSION(:), INTENT(OUT) :: dest integer :: i 30 do i=1,size(src) dest(i) = src(i)enddo end subroutine *c* ----c GAUSS FUNCTION 40cc Generates random numbers with a gaussian width c Called by:  $placeBeads,\ tryBoth$ cdouble precision function gauss(g,ix) implicit double precision (a-h, o-z) double precision :: rr, ss integer :: ix 50 $\rm rr = (-dlog(ran1(initrand)+1.0d-10)*g$  ) ** 0.5 ss = 6.283185307d0*ran1(initrand)gauss = rr*dcos(ss) $end \ function \ gauss$ *c* ----- $c \ increase Capacity \ subroutine$ c60 c Doubles the capacity of xf and xfn (just GCMain!) c Modifies: xf, xfn, TOTAL cc Calls: copyArraycsubroutine increaseCapacity()

implicit none

c

c

70real (dp), DIMENSION(TOTAL,3) :: tmp, tmpn  $\mathbf{integer} :: j$ **do** j = 1,3 **call** copyArray(xf(:,j), tmp(:,j)) call copyArray(xfn(:,j), tmpn(:,j)) enddo you must deallocate an array before you can reallocate it! deallocate(xf, xfn, stat = error)80 if (error.ne.0) then write(*,*) "Unable to deallocate xf and xfn" STOP endif allocate(xf(TOTAL*2,3), stat = error)if (error .ne. 0) then write(*,*) "Unable to increase size of xf. error was ",error STOP 90 endif allocate(xfn(TOTAL*2,3), stat = error)if (error .ne. 0) then write(*,*) "Unable to increase size of xfn. error was ",error STOP endif  $\mathbf{do}~\mathrm{j}\,=\,1,3$ **call** copyArray(tmp(:,j), xf(:,j)) 100 **call** copyArray(tmpn(:,j), xfn(:,j)) enddo TOTAL = TOTAL*2print *, "increased capacity to ",TOTAL end subroutine increaseCapacity *c* -----c RAN1 FUNCTION 110c Generates random numbers via a multiple linear congruential method c and a table (it takes an input because it was once a linear congruential c generator) double precision function ran1(idum)  $\mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}$ integer, intent(IN) :: idum double precision genrand_res53 120 $ran1 = genrand_res53()$ end function ran1 end MODULE LPUtil

c LPInfo c Global variables and constants

MODULE LPInfo

use types

implicit none

```
c -----
 10
c Constants
integer, PARAMETER :: fileNameLength=200
real (dp), PARAMETER :: pi = 3.1415926535
real (dp), PARAMETER :: kB = 3.16679e-6 !! Boltzmanns constant in AU
real (dp), PARAMETER :: sigAR = 3.405*1.8893 !! sig in au for Ar-Ar
real (dp), PARAMETER :: epsAR = 119.8*kB !! eps in au for Ar-Ar
real (dp), PARAMETER :: sigLp = 6.4236
 !! sig in au for He-Ar (should be 6.4236)
real (dp), PARAMETER :: epsLp = 9.5181e-5 !! eps in au for He-Ar
real (dp), PARAMETER :: rcutLp = 2.5*sigLp !! cutoff distance for He-Ar LJ Pot
 20
 !! To keep error {\bf return} values
\mathbf{integer} :: \operatorname{error}
c -----
c Conversions (conversions from and to reduced units assume we are using Ar)
c
c note that these may or may not be used in the code, but they're good to have around
real (dp), PARAMETER :: ANGSTR2AU = 1.8893 !! Angstrom to atomic units (distance)
real (dp), PARAMETER :: ANGSTR2REDUCED = 1.0/sigAR !! Angstroms to reduced units
real (dp), PARAMETER :: AU2REDUCED=1.0/(sigAR) !! Atomic units (distance) to reduced units
real (dp), PARAMETER :: KELVIN2AUENG = kB !! Temperature in Kelvin to atomic energy units
 30
real (dp), PARAMETER :: AUENG2REDUCED = 1.0/(epsAR) !! Atomic units (energy) to reduced units/Users/jbarry/Documents/Th
 !! (we multiply by kB to convert eps to atomic)
c Going the other way.
real (dp), PARAMETER :: AU2ANGSTR = 1.0/ANGSTR2AU, REDUCED2ANGSTR = 1.0/ANGSTR2REDUCED, &
 REDUCED2AU = 1.0/AU2REDUCED, AUENG2KELVIN = 1.0/KELVIN2AUENG, &
 REDUCED2AUENG = 1.0/AUENG2REDUCED
c \ Files
 40
c~~~~~
integer, PARAMETER :: NUMIN=10, NUMOUT=7
integer, DIMENSION(NUMIN), PARAMETER :: INFILES = (/14, 15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23/)
integer, DIMENSION(NUMIN), PARAMETER :: GBLINFILES = (/33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42/)
integer, DIMENSION(NUMOUT), PARAMETER :: OUTFILES=(/43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49/)
c names to identify files
integer, PARAMETER :: CMDFILE = GBLINFILES(1), &
 GENFILE = INFILES(1), &
 FLFILE = INFILES(2), INITFILE = INFILES(7), &
 MULTIFILE = INFILES(3), ETAFILE = INFILES(4), &
 50
 LPFILE = INFILES(5), LPINITFILE = INFILES(6), &
 LPPOS = OUTFILES(1), FLPOS = OUTFILES(2), \&
 HISTRHO=OUTFILES(3), AVGENG = OUTFILES(4), &
 GFILE = OUTFILES(5), HISTENG = OUTFILES(6), \&
 ACCFILE = OUTFILES(7)
c file names
CHARACTER(len=8), DIMENSION(NUMOUT), PARAMETER :: OUTNAMES = &
 !! The light particle beads position
 (/"lpposn ", &
 "flposn ", &
 !! The fluid position
 "density ", \&
 !! Density/number of atoms in fluid
 60
 "energy ", &
 !! Average energy of the fluid
 "denstate", &
 !! ln(density of states) for WL
 "histe ", &
 !! Energy histogram for WL
 !! Data about acceptance rates
 "accept "/)
```

c General Information

!! The number of runs to do integer :: loop integer :: npass !! Number of MC steps to do 70 real (dp) :: beta !! 1/kT !! exp(beta*mu)/GAMMA^3 real (dp) :: z $!!\ \mathrm{mu}$  = chemical potential  $!! \text{ GAMMA} = (h^2/(2*pi*fmass)*beta)^(1/2)$ real (dp) :: hbar real (dp) :: rcav, rcav2, hcav **!!** Cylinder properties  $c \ random \ number \ info$ 80 integer, PARAMETER :: initrand = 27651 !! init for Mersenne Twister c ----c options c'c for the moment, some of these need to be false because the options do not c work yet. when they do work, these can become part of the input !! True to use grand canonical, false to use canonical logical :: isGrand = .false.logical :: isCyl = .false.!! True to use cylinder logical :: isMulti = .false.**!!** True to use multicanonical 90 !! True to use Wang-Landau (part of input) logical :: isWL logical :: isThread !! True to use threading (part of input) *c* -----c Fluid Information integer, PARAMETER :: WIDOMNUM = 1 !! Number of times to do widom test per step real (dp), PARAMETER :: fmSTART = 0.9 !! Starting step size integer :: nf !! Current number of fluid atoms (will change with GC) 100 !! Every fmnum steps execute a fluid move integer :: fmnum integer :: TOTAL !! Current max number of fluid atoms (for GC) integer :: numWid = 0!! number info for averages !! for multicanonical: size of eta integer :: multibins real (dp), ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:,:) :: xf, xfn !! Arrays to store position info real (dp), ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:) :: eta !! Weighting for multicanonical real (dp), PARAMETER :: eps0 = epsAR!! we are assuming for now that the fluid is always Ar real (dp), PARAMETER :: sig0 = sigAR!! we are assuming for now that the fluid is always Ar real (dp), PARAMETER :: rcut = 2.5*sig0 !! cutoff radius 110 real (dp) :: rhof !! fluid density real (dp) :: widom = 0!! fluid averages real (dp) :: fmac, fmacsum, fmsize=fmSTART !! Accepted move stuff for fluids !! (real to avoid problems with integer division) c ~  $c \ Wang\mathcar{-}Landau \ Information$ real (dp), PARAMETER :: GRES1 = 400000/20.0 !! Resolution for "kinetic" real(dp), PARAMETER :: GRES2 = 0.003/50.0 !! Resolution for potential 120 real (dp) :: FLAT = 0.93!! When the histogram is considered "flat" real (dp), PARAMETER :: REDFPER = 0!! Reduce FLAT by this percent of current value real (dp), PARAMETER :: REDF = 1.05!! Start reducing FLAT when fwl is below this value real (dp), PARAMETER :: MINF = 1.0000001 !! Stop when fwl falls below this value real (dp), PARAMETER :: CENTER1 = 0 !! subtract this value for kinetic energy real (dp), PARAMETER :: CENTER2 = -0.0359 !! subtract this value for potential energy integer, PARAMETER :: gbins1 = int(400000/GRES1+0.5) !! number of bins for "kinetic" integer, PARAMETER :: gbins2 = int(0.003/GRES2+0.5) !! number of bins for potential 130 integer, PARAMETER :: CHECK = 5000!! check for flatness every CHECK steps real (dp), ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:,:) :: g !! g(E) for W-L real (dp), ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:,:) :: histE !! H(E) for W-L !! g(E) = fwl*g(E)real (dp) :: fwl

*c* ----- $c\ Light\ Particle\ Information$ cinteger, PARAMETER :: nevalu = 100!! Update acceptance rate after nevalu steps 140integer, PARAMETER :: NCMMOVE = 5000 !! Move cm after ncmmove steps real (dp), PARAMETER :: cmSTART = 0.2 !! Starting stepsize for cm moves real (dp), PARAMETER :: LPSTART = 0.2 !! Starting stepsize for positron moves integer, **PARAMETER** :: RECENTER = 50 !! Recenter every this many moves integer, PARAMETER :: numcharge = 1 !! one chain **or** two integer :: nb !! Number of beads !! Number of beads moved per pass integer :: mb integer :: nequil !! Number of equilibration steps 150logical, ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:,:) :: x_changed !! True if the bead was moved real (dp), ALLOCATABLE, DIMENSION(:,:,:) :: x, xn !! Arrays to store position info real (dp), DIMENSION(3) :: xc !! Center of mass coordinates **!!** Mass of particle real (dp) :: amass  $!!~{\rm deB}$  wavelength real (dp) :: wave real (dp) :: ac, acsum, LPmove !! Accepted move stuff for positron real (dp) :: accm, accmsum, cmmove = cmSTART !! Accepted move stuff for center of mass 160end MODULE LPInfo

## Makefile:

#dependent files must be listed AFTER those files on which they are dependent SRCFILES = mt19937ar.f Mac_types.f90 LPInfo.f95 LPUtil.f95 LPGenFncs.f95 LPFncs.f95 LPInitEnd.f95 LPMain.f95 LDFLAGS = -L/Users/jbarry/Documents/Thesis/lib -lplplot \ -X -framework -X Carbon -YEXT_NAMES=LCS OPTFLAGS = -O3 -cpu:g5 PROFLAGS = -profile -P default: LPMain LPMain: \$(SRCFILES) f90 \$(SRCFILES) -o LPMain \$(OPTFLAGS) \$(LDFLAGS) clean: rm *.mod rm LPMain

## **B.3** General Codes

The code below defines types for use on a Macintosh computer

Module types c Useful types c Author: J. E. Pask c Dept. of Physics c University of California c Davis, California, 1/97 implicit none private public dp, hp

integer, parameter :: dp=kind(0.d0), & !! double precision hp=selected_real_kind(15) !! high precision End Module types

The code below was used in testing random number generators. It includes the code for the linear congruential generator written by Tim Cronin [10] and calls the Mersenne generator, the algorithm for which is given in the module after this.

10

20

30

40

50

60

 $c \ testRan$ 

c a simple program designed to test to random number generators

 $\mathbf{PROGRAM}$  testRan

implicit none

integer :: i, j integer, parameter :: ndim = 10character(1), dimension(ndim) :: fc = (/'0', '1', '2', '3', '4', '5', '6', '7', '8', '9')character(25) :: fname double precision :: x, genrand_res53 integer, parameter :: limit = 1e7

x = 0

call init_genrand(27651) !! init Mersenne twister

```
open(unit = 90, file = 'random1', status = 'replace', action = 'write')
open(unit = 91, file = 'randommt', status = 'replace', action = 'write')
```

do i=1,limit write(90,*) ran1(1) write(91,*) genrand_res53() enddo

CONTAINS

с́

```
c -----
RAN1 FUNCTION
c Generates random numbers via a multiple linear congruential method
c \ and \ a \ table
double precision function ran1(idum)
 \mathbf{implicit} \ \mathbf{none}
 double precision :: r(97)
 integer, intent(IN) :: idum
 save
 integer, parameter :: M1=259200,IA1=7141,IC1=54773
 real, parameter :: RM1=1.0d0/M1
 integer, parameter :: M2=134456, IA2=8121, IC2=28411
 real, parameter :: RM2=1.0d0/M2
 integer, parameter :: M3=243000, IA3=4561, IC3=51349
 integer :: IX1, IX2, IX3, jjj
 integer :: iff=0
 if (idum < 0 .or. iff == 0) then
 iff = 1
 IX1 = mod(IC1-idum,M1)
 IX1 = mod(IA1*IX1+IC1,M1)
 IX2 = mod(IX1,M2)
 IX1 = mod(IA1*IX1+IC1,M1)
```

```
do jjj = 1,97
 IX1 = mod(IA1*IX1+IC1,M1)
 IX2 = mod(IA2*IX2+IC2,M2)
 r(jjj) = (dfloat(IX1)+dfloat(IX2)*RM2)*RM1
enddo
```

endif

IX3 = mod(IX1,M3)

$$\begin{split} IX1 &= \mod(IA1^*IX1+IC1,M1) \\ IX2 &= \mod(IA2^*IX2+IC2,M2) \\ IX3 &= \mod(IA3^*IX3+IC3,M3) \\ jjj &= 1+(97^*IX3)/M3 \\ \text{if } (jjj) &> 97 \text{ .or. } jjj &< 1) \text{ PAUSE} \\ ran1 &= r(jjj) \\ r(jjj) &= (dfloat(IX1)+dfloat(IX2)^*RM2)^*RM1 \\ \text{end function } ran1 \end{split}$$

end PROGRAM testRan
The code below is code we did not write for the Mersenne twister random number generator.

cA C-program for MT19937, with initialization improved 2002/1/26. cCoded by Takuji Nishimura and Makoto Matsumoto. ccc Before using, initialize the state by using init_genrand(seed) or init_by_array(init_key, key_length). ccc Copyright (C) 1997 - 2002, Makoto Matsumoto and Takuji Nishimura, All rights reserved. cc Copyright (C) 2005, Mutsuo Saito, 10 All rights reserved. ccRedistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or without cc modification, are permitted provided that the following conditions c are met: c1. Redistributions of source code must retain the above copyright cnotice, this list of conditions and the following disclaimer. cc2. Redistributions in binary form must reproduce the above copyright 20ccnotice, this list of conditions and the following disclaimer in the documentation and/or other materials provided with the distribution. cc3. The names of its contributors may not be used to endorse or promote cproducts derived from this software without specific prior written ccpermission. cTHIS SOFTWARE IS PROVIDED BY THE COPYRIGHT HOLDERS AND CONTRIBUTORS c"AS IS" AND ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT cc LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR 30 c A PARTICULAR PURPOSE ARE DISCLAIMED. IN NO EVENT SHALL THE COPYRIGHT OWNER OR c CONTRIBUTORS BE LIABLE FOR ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, c EXEMPLARY, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, c PROCUREMENT OF SUBSTITUTE GOODS OR SERVICES; LOSS OF USE, DATA, OR c PROFITS; OR BUSINESS INTERRUPTION) HOWEVER CAUSED AND ON ANY THEORY OF c LIABILITY, WHETHER IN CONTRACT, STRICT LIABILITY, OR TORT (INCLUDING c NEGLIGENCE OR OTHERWISE) ARISING IN ANY WAY OUT OF THE USE OF THIS SOFTWARE, EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE. cc40 Any feedback is very welcome. chttp://www.math.sci.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/~m-mat/MT/emt.htmlcemail: m-mat cccc FORTRAN77 translation by Tsuyoshi TADA. (2005/12/19) c-- initialize routines csubroutine init_genrand(seed): initialize with a seed csubroutine init_by_array(init_key,key_length): initialize by an array 50cc- generate functions cc integer function genrand_int32(): signed 32-bit integer integer function genrand_int31(): unsigned 31-bit integer cdouble precision function genrand_real1(): [0,1] with 32-bit resolution cc double precision function  $genrand_real_2()$ : [0,1) with 32-bit resolution double precision function genrand_real3(): (0,1) with 32-bit resolution cdouble precision function genrand_res53(): (0,1) with 53-bit resolution cC This program uses the following non-standard intrinsics. 60 cishft(i,n): If n>0, shifts bits in i by n positions to left. cIf n < 0, shifts bits in i by n positions to right. ciand (i,j): Performs logical AND on corresponding bits of i and j. cior (i,j): Performs inclusive OR on corresponding bits of i and j. c

$c \\ c -$		
с с	initialize mt(0:N-1) with a seed	
C	subroutine init_genrand(s)	70
	integer s	
	integer N	
	Integer DONE	
	integer ALLBIT_MASK	
	parameter $(N=0.24)$	
	integer mti initialized	
	integer $mt(0:N-1)$	
	common /mt state1 / mti initialized	
	common /mt_state2/ mt	80
	common /mt_mask1/ ALLBIT_MASK	
c		
	call mt_initln	
	$mt(0)=iand(s,ALLBIT_MASK)$	
	do 100 mti=1,N-1	
	mt(mti) = 1812433253*	
	ieor(mt(mti-1),ishft(mt(mti-1),-30))+mti	
	$mt(mti) = iand(mt(mti), ALLBIT_MASK)$	
1	100 continue	
	initialized=DONE	90
С	roturn	
	end	
c-		
c	initialize by an array with array-length	
с	init_key is the array for initializing keys	
с	key_length is its length	
c-		
	subroutine init_by_array(init_key,key_length)	100
	integer Init_key(0:")	100
	integer key_length	
	integer N	
	integer TOPBIT MASK	
	parameter (N=624)	
	integer i i k	
	integer $mt(0:N-1)$	
	common /mt_state2/ mt	
	common /mt_mask1/ ALLBIT_MASK	
	common /mt_mask2/ TOPBIT_MASK	110
c		
	$call init_genrand(19650218)$	
	i=1	
	do 100 k=max(N,key_length),1,-1	
	mt(1)=1cor(mt(1),1cor(mt(1-1),1snft(mt(1-1),-30))*1004525)	
	$\operatorname{III}(I) = \operatorname{IaII}(\operatorname{III}(I), \operatorname{ALLDII} = \operatorname{IIIASK})$ i = i + 1	
	i=i+1	120
	if (i.ge. N) then	120
	mt(0)=mt(N-1)	
	i=1	
	endif	
	$if(j.ge.key_length)then$	
	j=0	
	endif	
1	100 continue	
	do 200 k=N-1,1,-1	
	mt(1)=1cor(mt(1),1cor(mt(1-1),1cor(mt(i-1),-30))*1566083941)-i	130
	$\operatorname{Int}(1) = \operatorname{Iand}(\operatorname{Int}(1), \operatorname{ALLBI1}_{\operatorname{IVIASK}})$ :=: + 1	

```
if(i.ge.N)then
 mt(0)=mt(N-1)
 i=1
 \mathbf{endif}
 200 continue
 mt(0) = TOPBIT_MASK
c
 140
 return
 end
c
 generates a random number on [0,0xfffffff]-interval
c
c
 function genrand_int32()
 integer genrand_int32
 integer N,M
 integer DONE
 integer UPPER_MASK,LOWER_MASK,MATRIX_A
 integer T1_MASK,T2_MASK
 150
 parameter (N=624)
 parameter (M=397)
 parameter (DONE=123456789)
 integer mti, initialized
 integer mt(0:N-1)
 integer y,kk
 integer mag01(0:1)
 common /mt_state1/ mti,initialized
 \mathbf{common}~/\mathrm{mt\_state2}/~\mathrm{mt}
 common /mt_mask3/ UPPER_MASK,LOWER_MASK,MATRIX_A,T1_MASK,T2_MASK
 160
 common /mt_mag01/ mag01
c
 if(initialized.ne.DONE)then
 call init_genrand(21641)
 endif
c
 if(\mathrm{mti.ge.N}) then
 do 100 kk=0,N-M-1
 y=ior(iand(mt(kk),UPPER_MASK),iand(mt(kk+1),LOWER_MASK))
 mt(kk) = ieor(ieor(mt(kk+M), ishft(y, -1)), mag01(iand(y, 1)))
 170
 100 continue
 do 200 kk=N-M,N-1-1
 y=ior(iand(mt(kk), UPPER_MASK), iand(mt(kk+1), LOWER_MASK))
 mt(kk) = ieor(ieor(mt(kk+(M-N)), ishft(y, -1)), mag01(iand(y, 1)))
 200 continue
 y=ior(iand(mt(N-1),UPPER_MASK),iand(mt(0),LOWER_MASK))
 mt(kk) = ieor(ieor(mt(M-1), ishft(y, -1)), mag01(iand(y, 1)))
 \mathrm{mti}{=}0
 endif
 180
c
 y=mt(mti)
 \mathrm{mti} \mathrm{=} \mathrm{mti} \mathrm{+} 1
c
 y = ieor(y, ishft(y, -11))
 y=ieor(y,iand(ishft(y,7),T1_MASK))
 y=ieor(y,iand(ishft(y,15),T2_MASK))
 y = ieor(y, ishft(y, -18))
c
 genrand_int32=y
 return
 190
 end
c
 generates a random number on [0, 0x7ffffff]-interval
c
c
 function genrand_int31()
 integer genrand_int31
 integer genrand_int32
 genrand_int31 = int(ishft(genrand_int32(), -1))
 return
 \mathbf{end}
 200
```

c - c	generates a random number on [0,1]-real-interval	
c—	<pre>function genrand_real1() double precision genrand_real1,r integer genrand_int32 r=dble(genrand_int32()) if(r.lt.0.d0)r=r+2.d0**32 genrand_real1=r/4294967295.d0 return end</pre>	210
<i>c</i> —-		
с с—–	generates a random number on [0,1)-real-interval	
c—	<pre>function genrand_real2() double precision genrand_real2,r integer genrand_int32 r=dble(genrand_int32()) if(r.lt.0.d0)r=r+2.d0**32 genrand_real2=r/4294967296.d0 return end</pre>	220
с	generates a random number on $(0,1)$ -real-interval	
c—	<pre>function genrand_real3() double precision genrand_real3,r integer genrand_int32 r=dble(genrand_int32()) if(r.lt.0.d0)r=r+2.d0**32 genrand_real3=(r+0.5d0)/4294967296.d0 return end</pre>	230
с с—–	generates a random number on [0,1) with 53-bit resolution	
<i>c</i> —	function genrand_res53() double precision genrand_res53 integer genrand_int32 double precision a,b $a=dble(ishft(genrand_int32(),-5))$ $b=dble(ishft(genrand_int32(),-6))$ if (a.lt.0.d0) $a=a+2.d0^{**}32$ if (b.lt.0.d0) $b=b+2.d0^{**}32$ genrand_res53=(a*67108864.d0+b)/9007199254740992.d0 return end	240
c - c	initialize large number (over 32-bit constant number)	
<i>c</i> —–	subroutine mt_initln integer ALLBIT_MASK integer TOPBIT_MASK integer UPPER_MASK,LOWER_MASK,MATRIX_A,T1_MASK,T2_MASK integer mag01(0:1) common /mt_mask1/ ALLBIT_MASK common /mt_mask2/ TOPBIT_MASK common /mt_mask3/ UPPER_MASK,LOWER_MASK,MATRIX_A,T1_MASK,T2_MASK common /mt_mag01/ mag01	250
CC CC CC CC CC CC CC	$TOPBIT_MASK = Z'8000000'$ $ALLBIT_MASK = Z'fffffff'$ $UPPER_MASK = Z'80000000'$ $LOWER_MASK = Z'9908b0df'$ $T1_MASK = Z'9908b0df'$ $T2_MASK = Z'efc60000'$ $TOPBIT_MASK=1073741824$ $TOPBIT_MASK=ishft(TOPBIT_MASK,1)$	260

```
ALLBIT_MASK=2147483647
ALLBIT_MASK=ior(ALLBIT_MASK,TOPBIT_MASK)
UPPER_MASK=TOPBIT_MASK
LOWER_MASK=2147483647
MATRIX_A=419999967
MATRIX_A=ior(MATRIX_A,TOPBIT_MASK)
T1_MASK=489444992
T1_MASK=ior(T1_MASK,TOPBIT_MASK)
T2_MASK=1875247104
T2_MASK=ior(T2_MASK,TOPBIT_MASK)
mag01(0)=0
mag01(1)=MATRIX_A
return
end
```

280

270

## **B.4** Post Processing Codes

This appendix contains codes used in post processing. All post processing was done in Matlab.



function [xhist] = reweightSHO(x, H1, H2, g, beta) % reweight: Matlab post-processing function %Uses data from a Wang-Landau simulation in an SHO % potential to calculate position at a number of  $\% different \ temperatures$ %Parameters: %x: the list of x values from the simulation %H1: the list of kinetic energy values from 10% the simulation. %H2: the list of potential energy values from % the simulation %g: the density of states %beta: beta value we are interested in %NOTES: % The entries in x, H1, and H2 all need to correspond % ie, x(3) needs to be from the same timestep of the % simulation as H1(3) and H2(3)% 20% The g file from the simulations is usually ln(g)% Don't forget to exponentiate it! %Returns:  $\% \;$  xhist: the probability density function for position % to calculate average position do x.*xhist/sum(xhist) % where x is the range of position values %set these constants if your range changes!! interval = 0.08%assuming a square histogram, the bin size 30  $\% kinetic \ energy \ range$ engrng1 = 20engrng2 = 20%potential energy range nbins = engrng1/interval $\mathrm{xrng} = 13$ %position range hist3 = zeros(nbins, nbins, nbins);xhist = zeros(1,nbins);h1hist = zeros(1, nbins);h2hist = zeros(1,nbins);enghist = zeros(nbins, nbins);40 for i=1:length(x)indx = ceil((x(i) + xrng/2.0)*nbins/xrng);indh1 = ceil(H1(i)*nbins/engrng1);indh2 = ceil(H2(i)*nbins/engrng2);hist3(indx, indh1, indh2) = hist3(indx, indh1, indh2) + 1;end eng1 = 0:interval:engrng1-interval;eng2 = 0:interval:engrng2-interval;50for i=1:nbins for j=1:nbins %%reweighting!  $hist3(:,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}) = hist3(:,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j})^* exp(-eng1(\mathbf{i})/beta - beta^* eng2(\mathbf{j}))^* g(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j});$  $\mathbf{end}$  $\mathbf{end}$ xhist = sum(sum(hist3,2),3);enghist = **reshape**(**sum**(hist3,1),nbins,nbins); 60 h1hist = sum(enghist,2);h2hist = sum(enghist,1);avh1 = sum(eng1'.*h1hist)/sum(h1hist) avh2 = sum(eng2.*h2hist)/sum(h2hist)

function [avgs, sds, x] = blocking(data, block, nstep) %blocking: Matlab post-processing function %Calculates the number of correlated steps % for data and uses this to plot blocks with %error bars %Parameters: %data: data to block % block: size of a block%nstep: the number of actual steps each data 10% point represents %NOTES % block should be indices in data, not actual steps  $\%\,$  for example, if we have 1000 MC steps and data contains % energy, say, for every 10 steps and we want blocks of 1000 MC steps, block = 10 because we only have data every 10 steps % % (and nstep = 10) %Returns: % avgs: block averages20% sds: block standard deviations%x: x-coordinate corresponding to each average (useful for plotting) c = xcov(data, 'coeff'); %normalized tcf (xcov is a built-in matlab function) c = c(ceil(end/2):end); % does the correlation going both directions, but we % only need onewidth = 500/nstep; % to find how far we have to go to get noncorrelating steps  $\% we \ look \ for \ where \ the \ average \ of \ c \ over \ a$ % window of width*2 drops below 0.05 30 % find non-correlated step number $\mathbf{i} = \text{width} + 1;$ a = 1:  $\rm FL=-3.533120381468512E{-}002$  % for the frozen fluid, this is the fluid energy %it is always a constant so we just  $\% subtract \ it \ out \ to \ make \ the \ graphs \ easier$ %to look at while(q > 0.05)q = mean(c(i-width:i+width));40i = i+1; $\mathbf{end}$ noncorr = i %how far apart steps need to be before they're noncorrelated for i=block:block:length(data) avgs((i)/block) = sum(data(i-block+1:i))/(block)-FL;sds(i/block) = std(data(i-block+1:i));x(i/block) = i*nstep; $\mathbf{end}$ 50n = block/noncorrsds = sds/sqrt(n); % error of the means%make a plot figure errorbar(x,avgs, sds,'.k', 'MarkerSize', 20)