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The very first dynamical implementation of the combined $\text{GW}$ and dynamical mean field scheme “$\text{GW}+\text{DMFT}$” for a real material was achieved recently [J.M. Tomczak et al., Europhys. Lett. 2012], and applied to the ternary transition metal oxide SrVO$_3$. Here, we review and extend that work, giving not only a detailed account of full $\text{GW}+\text{DMFT}$ calculations, but also discussing and testing simplified approximate schemes. We give insights into the nature of exchange and correlation effects: Dynamical renormalizations in the Fermi liquid regime of SrVO$_3$ are essentially local, and nonlocal correlations mainly act to screen the Fock exchange term. The latter substantially widens the quasi-particle band structure, while the band narrowing induced by the former is accompanied by a spectral weight transfer to higher energies. Most interestingly, the exchange broadening is much more pronounced in the unoccupied part of spectrum. As a result, the $\text{GW}+\text{DMFT}$ electronic structure of SrVO$_3$ resembles the conventional density functional based dynamical mean field (DFT+DMFT) description for occupied states, but is profoundly modified in the empty part. Our work leads to a reinterpretation of inverse photoemission spectroscopy (IPES) data. Indeed, we assign a prominent peak at about 2.7 eV dominantly to $e_g$ states, rather than to an upper Hubbard band of $t_{2g}$ character. Similar surprises can be expected for other transition metal oxides, calling for more detailed investigations of the conduction band states.

PACS numbers: 71.15.-m,71.27.+a,71.10.-w,71.15.Mb

I. INTRODUCTION

Within the last decade, a new research field has developed at the interface of many-body theory and first principles electronic structure calculations. The aim is the construction of materials-specific parameter-free many-body theories that preserve the \textit{ab initio} nature of density functional based methods, but incorporate at the same time a many-body description of Coulomb interactions beyond the independent-electron picture into computational approaches for spectroscopic or finite-temperature properties.

Historically, the first non-perturbative electronic structure techniques for correlated materials evolved from many-body treatments of the multi-orbital Hubbard Hamiltonian with realistic parameters. The general strategy of these so-called “LDA++” approaches$^{1,2}$ (for reviews see, e.g.,$^{3-6}$) consists in the extraction of the parameters of a many-body Hamiltonian from first principles calculations and then solving the problem by many-body techniques. In practice, this procedure has met tremendous success in the description of the electronic structure of correlated materials, for a wide range of materials, from transition metals$^{7,8}$, their oxides$^{9-30}$, sulphides$^{31,32}$, or silicides$^{33,34}$, to $f$-electron compounds$^{35-38}$. More recently, iron pnictide compounds (see e.g. Refs. 39–47) or spin-orbit materials$^{48}$ have come into the focus of many-body electronic structure calculations, emphasizing the need for fully \textit{ab initio} techniques, including a first principles description of the effective Coulomb interactions. The challenge here is an accurate description of screening of low-energy interactions by high-energy degrees of freedom, as well as the screening of local interactions by nonlocal charge fluctuations$^{39-51}$.

Despite the tremendous success of LDA++ schemes, one should be aware of the fact that the ambiguities in the construction of the Hamiltonian are not limited to the many-body part: not even the use of the Kohn-Sham band structure of DFT as a starting Hamiltonian has a direct microscopic justification beyond heuristic arguments. Though renormalization group techniques suggest that in many cases the relevant low-energy effective Hamiltonian can indeed be cast into a generalized (multi-orbital) Hubbard form, in practice neither the precise form nor the parameters can be derived directly from the Coulomb Hamiltonian in the continuum. In this sense, the construction of an “LDA++” Hamiltonian amounts to a rather \textit{ad hoc} combination of a Kohn-Sham Hamiltonian and multi-orbital Hubbard (and Hund) interaction terms for a subset of “correlated orbitals”. Conceptually, there is moreover a mismatch arising from the fact that the full long-range Coulomb interactions enter the one-particle part of the Hamiltonian (even if only in a mean-field fashion), while in the many-body part they are replaced by effective local interactions acting only in
a low-energy subspace. This has two consequences. The first – well-known one – is related to the double counting correction: Correlation effects accounted for in the exchange-correlation potential of DFT have to be subtracted. Yet, a microscopically motivated definition of this term is, even on a conceptual level, impossible. The second one is more subtle, and has only recently started to receive some attention: in fact, the same processes that screen the effective Coulomb interactions are also responsible for renormalizations of the one-body part of the Hamiltonian. This can be understood from an analysis of screening as resulting from coupling of the electrons to bosonic excitations, such as plasmons, particle-hole excitations or more complex many-body processes. The diagonalization of the corresponding electron-boson Hamiltonian results in fermionic quasi-particles (“electronic polarons”) corresponding to electrons dressed by their screening bosons, and thus having heavier masses. This mass enhancement corresponds to an effective renormalization of their kinetic energy, and hence of the one-body part of the Hamiltonian. This kind of effect has recently been demonstrated explicitly, based on the constrained random phase approximation (cRPA), which allows for an explicit (yet approximate) estimation of dynamical Hubbard interactions in solids. The corresponding one-body renormalizations have been investigated in the framework of dynamical mean field theory (DMFT) for SrVO$_3$ and BaFe$_2$As$_2$, and a low-energy effective Hamiltonian comprising these renormalizations has been derived in Ref. 52.

In addition to these effects related to the long-range nature of the Coulomb interactions and the resulting quantum dynamical screening, in practice, yet another difficulty arises when proceeding to (approximate) many-body solutions of the multi-orbital Hubbard Hamiltonian. Indeed, while the construction of the one-body part of the Hamiltonian (within DFT) naturally puts the electronic density at the center of the attention, many-body theory is most readily formulated within a Green’s function language. This mismatch in language is the final capstone that ensures that matching contributions between the effective one-body Hamiltonian and the many-body terms are truly impossible to identify.

Ideally, the desired specifications of new many-body electronic structure techniques beyond “LDA++” approaches can thus be summarized in three main requirements:

- The theory should be entirely formulated in the Green’s function language, even at the one-body level.
- The theory should deal directly with the long-range Coulomb interactions, and any effective local “Hubbard-like” interactions should arise only as intermediate auxiliary quantities.
- At the same time, the theory should retain the non-perturbative character of dynamical mean field theory, thus avoiding limitations due to a truncation of the perturbation series. This latter point is essential to ensure the scheme to be equally appropriate in the weak, strong and intermediate coupling regimes.

The combination of Hedín’s $GW$ approximation – many-body perturbation theory to first order in the screened Coulomb interaction $W$ – and dynamical mean field theory meets these criteria. Such a scheme was proposed a decade ago, based on the construction of the free energy of a solid as a functional of the Green’s function $G$ and $W$.

Only very recently have practical implementations for real materials been achieved that go beyond simple static approximation schemes. The reason was the necessity of dealing with frequency-dependent interactions at the DMFT level, which has remained a major bottleneck until recently. Recent advances in Monte Carlo techniques and the invention of a reliable cumulant-type scheme, the “Bose factor ansatz,” have unblocked the situation: two calculations within $GW$+DMFT taking into account dynamical interactions have been achieved recently, for SrVO$_3$ and for systems of adatoms on surfaces. In this work, we review and extend the former calculations, giving a detailed account of fully dynamical $GW$+DMFT calculations for SrVO$_3$. The paper is organised as follows: In Sect. II, we give an extensive summary of the concepts of the combined $GW$+DMFT scheme and discuss aspects of its practical implementation, in particular related to the Bose factor ansatz. Furthermore, we devote an extensive discussion to the question of how to treat multi-orbital materials: we propose that for ligand and conduction band shells a perturbative treatment might be sufficient, and show how such a procedure can be combined with the non-perturbative DMFT treatment of the low-energy correlated shells. In Sect. III, we review the electronic structure of our target compound, pointing out problems left open within conventional LDA++ schemes. Section IV presents the results of fully dynamical $GW$+DMFT calculations, in comparison to $GW$ calculations, LDA+DMFT with static and dynamic interactions, and to simplified combinations of $GW$ and DMFT which allow for a detailed analysis of the importance of the different terms entering the theory. We discuss the implications of our results in Section V, before arriving at our conclusions in Sect. VI.

II. THE “GW+DMFT” METHODOLOGY

A. Overview

The starting point of the $GW$+DMFT scheme is Hedin’s $GW$ approximation (GWA), in which the self-energy of a quantum many-body system is obtained from a frequency convolution (or product in time) of the Green’s function $G$ with the screened Coulomb interaction $W = \epsilon^{-1} V$. The dielectric function $\epsilon$, which screens
the bare Coulomb potential \( V \), is – within a pure \( GW \) scheme – obtained from the random phase approximation. The \( GW+DMFT \) scheme, as proposed in\(^{55}\), combines the first principles description of screening inherent in \( GW \) methods with the non-perturbative nature of DMFT, where local quantities such as the local Green’s function are calculated to all orders in the interaction from an effective reference system (“impurity model”)\(^{61}\). In DMFT, one imposes a self-consistency condition for the one-particle Green’s function, namely, that its on-site projection equals the impurity Green’s function. In \( GW+DMFT \), the self-consistency requirement is generalized to encompass also two-particle quantities, namely, the local projection of the screened interaction is required to equal the impurity screened interaction. This in principle promotes the Hubbard \( U \) from an adjustable parameter in DMFT techniques to a self-consistent auxiliary function that incorporates long-range screening effects in an \textit{ab initio} fashion. Indeed, as already alluded to above, not only higher energy degrees of freedom can be downfolded into an effective dynamical interaction, but one can also aim at incorporating nonlocal screening effects into an effective dynamical \( U(\omega) \). The theory is then free of any Hubbard \textit{parameter}, and the interactions are directly determined from the full long-range Coulomb interactions in the continuum.

From a formal point of view, the \( GW+DMFT \) method, as introduced in\(^{55,62}\), corresponds to a specific approximation to the correlation part of the free energy of a solid, expressed as a functional of the Green’s function \( G \) and the screened Coulomb interaction \( W \): the nonlocal part is taken to be the first order term in \( W \), while the local part is calculated from a local impurity model as in (extended) dynamical mean field theory. This leads to a set of self-consistent equations for the Green’s function \( G \), the screened Coulomb interaction \( W \), the self-energy \( \Sigma \), and the polarization \( P \)\(^{63,64}\). Specifically, the self-energy is obtained as \( \Sigma = \Sigma_{\text{local}} + \Sigma_{\text{nonlocal}} + \Sigma_{\text{GW}} \), where the local part \( \Sigma_{\text{local}} \) is derived from the impurity model. In practice, however, the calculation of a self-energy for (rather delocalized) s- or p-orbitals has never been performed within DMFT, and it appears to be more physical to approximate this part also by a \( GW \)-like expression. For these reasons Ref. 56 proposed a practical scheme, in which only the local part of the self-energy of the “correlated” orbitals is calculated from the impurity model and all other local and nonlocal components are approximated by their first order expressions in \( W \).

In the following subsections, we first briefly summarize the functional formulation of the \( GW \), DMFT and \( GW+DMFT \) schemes from a general point of view (section II B). The corresponding \( GW+DMFT \) equations are summarized in appendix A. Sections II C and II D are devoted to the “orbital-separated scheme” implemented for SrVO\(_3\), defining the equations solved in practice. We then review the dynamic atomic limit approximation for the solution of dynamical impurity models (section II E), while section II F summarizes some technicalities.

### B. Unified view on \( GW, \) DMFT, and \( GW+DMFT \)

Within the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, the electronic many-body states in a solid are determined by the eigenstates of the Coulomb Hamiltonian

\[
H = H_{\text{kin}} + H_{\text{pot}} + H_{\text{ee}}
\]

where the first two terms denote the kinetic energy part and one-body potential created by the ions respectively. The last term, \( H_{\text{ee}} = \sum_{nmnm'} v_{nmnm'} a_n^\dagger a_m a_{nm'} \) with \( v_{nmnm'} = \langle nm | \frac{1}{r_{nm}} | n'm' \rangle \) the matrix elements of the Coulomb interaction in the continuum, denotes the electron-electron interaction.

Following Almbladh et al.\(^{65}\), the free energy of a solid can be formulated as a functional \( \Gamma[G,W] \) of the Green’s function \( G \) and the screened Coulomb interaction \( W \) of the solid. The latter is defined as the correlation function of bosonic excitations corresponding to density fluctuations, that is, in mathematical terms, as the propagator of the Hubbard-Stratonovich field decoupling the Coulomb interaction term. The \( GW \) method, dynamical mean field theory and the combined \( GW+DMFT \) scheme can then be viewed as different approximations to this \( \Gamma[G,W] \) functional.

The functional \( \Gamma \) can trivially be split into a Hartree part \( \Gamma_H \) and a many body correction \( \Psi \), which contains all corrections beyond the Hartree approximation : \( \Gamma = \Gamma_H + \Psi \). The Hartree part can be given in the form

\[
\Gamma_H[G,W] = Tr \ln G - Tr[(G^{-1}_H - G^{-1})G] - \frac{1}{2} Tr \ln W + \frac{1}{2} Tr[(V_q^{-1} - W^{-1})W]
\]

with \( G_H \) being the Hartree Green’s function, and \( V_q \) the Fourier transform of the bare Coulomb interaction. The \( \Psi \)-functional is the sum of all skeleton diagrams that are irreducible with respect to both one-electron propagator and interaction lines. \( \Psi[G,W] \) has the following properties:

\[
\frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta G} = \Sigma_{xc} \\
\frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta W} = P.
\]

The \( \Psi \) functional was first derived in\(^{65}\). A detailed discussion in the context of extended DMFT can be found in Ref. 66, while Refs. 55, 63, and 64 view it from the \( GW+DMFT \) point of view.

An elegant derivation (see e.g. 51, 63, and 64) of the Almbladh free energy functional is obtained through a Hubbard Stratonovich decoupling of the interaction term by a bosonic field \( \phi \), the introduction of Lagrange multipliers \( \Sigma \) and \( P \) imposing \( \langle c \phi \rangle \) and \( \langle c^\dagger \phi \rangle \) to equal externally chosen fermionic and bosonic propagators \( G \) and \( W \), and finally a Legendre transformation to obtain a functional of the latter two quantities.

The \( GW \) approximation consists in retaining the first order term in the screened interaction \( W \) only, thus ap-
proximating the $\Psi$-functional by

$$\Psi[G, W] = -\frac{1}{2} Tr(G W G).$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)$$

We then trivially find

$$\Sigma^{xc} = \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta G} = -GW$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)$$

$$P = \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta W} = GG.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

Extended DMFT$^{67-69}$, on the other hand, would calculate all local quantities that should be derived from this functional from a local impurity model. One can thus formally write

$$\Psi = \Psi_{\text{imp}}[G^{\text{loc}}, W^{\text{loc}}].$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

The combined $GW$+DMFT scheme$^{55}$ consists in approximating the $\Psi$ functional as a direct combination of local and nonlocal parts from $GW$ and extended DMFT, respectively:

$$\Psi = \Psi_{\text{GW}}^{\text{non-local}}[G, W] + \Psi_{\text{imp}}[G^{\text{loc}}, W^{\text{loc}}]$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

More explicitly, the nonlocal part of the $GW$+DMFT $\Psi$-functional is given by

$$\Psi_{\text{GW}}^{\text{non-local}}[G, W] = \Psi_{\text{GW}}[G, W] - \Psi_{\text{GW}}^{\text{loc}}[G, W]$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)$$

while the local part is taken to be an impurity model $\Psi$ functional. Following (extended) DMFT, this on-site part of the functional is generated from a local quantum impurity problem. The expression for its free energy functional $\Gamma_{\text{imp}}[G_{\text{imp}}, W_{\text{imp}}]$ is analogous to (2) with the Weiss field $G$ replacing $G_H$ and the Hubbard $U$ replacing $V$:

$$\Gamma_{\text{imp}}[G_{\text{imp}}, W_{\text{imp}}] = Tr\ln G_{\text{imp}} - Tr[(G^{-1} - G_{\text{imp}}^{-1})G_{\text{imp}}]$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} Tr\ln W_{\text{imp}} + \frac{1}{2} Tr[(U^{-1} - W_{\text{imp}}^{-1})W_{\text{imp}}]$$

$$+ \Psi_{\text{imp}}[G_{\text{imp}}, W_{\text{imp}}]$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)$$

The impurity quantities $G_{\text{imp}}, W_{\text{imp}}$ can thus be calculated from the effective action:

$$S = \int d\tau d\tau' \left[ -\sum L \cdot \sum_{LL'} c_{LL'}^{\dagger}(\tau) c_{LL'}(\tau') \right]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_L : c_L^\dagger(\tau) c_L(\tau) : U_{L L' L_{L'} L_{L'}}(\tau - \tau') : c_{L'}^\dagger(\tau') c_{L'}(\tau')$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)$$

where the sums run over all orbital indices $L$. In this expression, $c_L^{\dagger}$ is a creation operator associated with a localized orbital $L$, and the double dots denote normal ordering (taking care of Hartree terms). For simplicity, we restrict the discussion to the paramagnetic case and omit any spin indices.

The construction (8) of the $\Psi$-functional is the only ad hoc assumption in the $GW$+DMFT approach. The explicit form of the $GW$+DMFT equations follows then directly from the functional relations between the free energy, the Green’s function, the screened Coulomb interaction etc. Taking derivatives of the functional (8) as in (3) yields the complete self-energy and polarization operators:

$$\Sigma^{xc}(k, i\omega_n)_{LL'} = \Sigma^{xc}_{\text{GW}}(k, i\omega_n)_{LL'}$$

$$- \sum_k \Sigma^{xc}_{\text{GW}}(k, i\omega_n)_{LL'} + \Sigma^{xc}_{\text{imp}}(i\omega_n)_{LL'}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)$$

$$P(q, i\nu_n)_{\alpha\beta} = P_{\text{GW}}(q, i\nu_n)_{\alpha\beta}$$

$$- \sum_{k} P_{\text{GW}}(q, i\nu_n)_{\alpha\beta} + P_{\text{imp}}(i\nu_n)_{\alpha\beta}$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)$$

Here, Greek letters indicate a two-particle basis, constructed from the localized (Wannier) basis indexed by $L$. The ad hoc combination of the functional $\Psi$ constructed as a sum of local and nonlocal parts thus leads to a physically attractive result: The off-site part of the self-energy (12) is taken from the $GW$ approximation, whereas the on-site part is calculated to all orders from the dynamical impurity model. This treatment thus goes beyond usual extended DMFT, where the lattice self-energy and polarization are just taken to be their impurity counterparts. The second term in (12) subtracts the on-site component of the $GW$ self-energy thus avoiding double counting. At self-consistency this term can be rewritten as:

$$\sum_k \Sigma^{xc}_{\text{GW}}(k, \tau)_{LL'} = - \sum_{L L' L_{L'} L_{L'}} G_{\text{imp}}(\tau)_{L' L_{L'}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)$$

so that it precisely subtracts the contribution of the $GW$ diagram to the impurity self-energy. Similar considerations apply to the polarization operator.

The general set of $GW$+DMFT equations to be solved self-consistently is summarized in Appendix A. In the following, we discuss a variant, which allows for a physically motivated cheaper treatment of ligand and itinerant empty states.

C. The “orbital-separated” $GW$+DMFT scheme

In the original $GW$+DMFT scheme as described in Ref. 55, the $\Psi$ functional is decomposed into nonlocal and local parts, which are then approximated by $GW$ and DMFT respectively. This means that the local physics of all valence orbitals, including rather itinerant $s$ or $p$ states, would be generated from a self-consistent impurity model. It stands to reason that the self-consistent dynamical $U$ for those orbitals would in fact come out to be rather small, so that the local dynamical contribution to the self-energy is also small and well described by its first order term in $W$. In practice, the self-energy for the itinerant states would thus be well described by a perturbative self-energy, that is by the $GW$ self-energy for both, local and nonlocal parts.

In view of these considerations, it seems a waste of computing time to attempt to solve a dynamical impurity models for all valence states, since the same result can
be obtained by applying the DMFT construction only to a subset of “correlated” states, and to treat all others entirely by \( GW \). A scheme along these lines was proposed and implemented in Ref. 56.

The equations for the self-energy and polarization are in this case replaced by

\[
\Sigma^{xc}(k, i\omega_n)_{LL'} = \Sigma^{xc}_{GW}(k, i\omega_n)_{LL'} - \sum_k \Sigma^{xc,d}_{GW}(k, i\omega_n)_{LL'} + \Sigma^{imp}_{GW}(i\omega_n)_{LL'}
\]

\[
P(q, i\nu_n)_{\alpha\beta} = P_{GW}(q, i\nu_n)_{\alpha\beta} - \sum_q P^{d}_{GW}(q, i\nu_n)_{\alpha\beta} + P^{imp}(i\nu_n)_{\alpha\beta}
\]

where the superscript \( d \) denotes the projection onto the low-energy correlated space.

One may be tempted to redefine the \( \Psi \) functional as the one of the \( GW \) approximation \( GW \), corrected for its local part by DMFT only within the correlated subspace (denoted here as \( d \)), as follows:

\[
\Psi[G, W] = GWG - G^{loc,d}W^{loc,d}G^{loc,d} + \Psi^{imp}[G^{loc,d}, W^{loc,d}]
\]

or, alternatively, by keeping the original decomposition into local and nonlocal parts

\[
\Psi[G, W] = \Psi^{nonlocal} + \Psi^{local}
\]

but approximating the local one by a combination of \( GW \) and DMFT

\[
\Psi^{loc}[G, W] = G^{loc}W^{loc}G^{loc} - G^{loc,d}W^{loc,d}G^{loc,d} + \Psi^{imp}[G^{loc,d}, W^{loc,d}]
\]

Here, the superscript \( loc \) denotes the projection on the local component, and \( d \) the projection onto the correlated subspace.

Though appealing at first sight, such combinations cannot be justified without further approximations on a functional basis. This is due to the fact that screening couples the correlated and itinerant subspaces, so that “downfolding” of the interactions to obtain an effective bare interaction within the correlated subspace necessarily involves a decoupling approximation. In the functionals above, this is born out of the difficulty of defining \( W^{loc,d} \), as well as of postulating that \( \Psi^{imp} \) is a functional of the Green’s function and screened Coulomb interaction of the correlated subspace only.

Fortunately, in practice, these conceptual difficulties do not prevent us from identifying a well-defined scheme, that corresponds to a combination of \( GW \) and DMFT, where the impurity model is used for the correlated space only. The application to \( SrVO_3 \) presented below confirms the accuracy of such a scheme. In the following subsection we therefore describe the “orbital-separated scheme” used in the present work, where only the local part of the self-energy of the “correlated” orbitals is calculated from the impurity model and all other local and nonlocal components are approximated by their first order expressions in \( W \).

D. Orbital-separated scheme: the Equations

For the reasons discussed above, in the orbital-separated scheme, one deviates from the general prescription Eqs. (12-13) for the self-energy and polarization by replacing their local parts by their counterparts generated from an impurity model within the correlated subspace only. We outline in the following the iterative loop obtained at the one-shot \( GW \) level but with full self-consistency at the impurity level. We call the correlated subspace \( d \)-space and its complement the \( r \)-space. Projections onto these spaces are noted by superscripts. We furthermore assume that we dispose of a Wannier basis which blockdiagonalizes the full LDA Hamiltonian, and that the \( GW \) self-energy is block-diagonal in the same basis. The Wannier basis can be thought of as obtained from the construction of maximally localized Wannier functions in the \( d \) and in the \( r \) space separately. The assumption of a vanishing \( GW \) self-energy block \( \Sigma^{dr} \) in this basis is an additional approximation,\(^{20}\) which is however very accurate, as we have explicitly verified for our target compound \( SrVO_3 \). We note that the common assumption in \( GW \) calculations of a diagonal self-energy in the Kohn-Sham basis is in fact a less justified approximation, and even this is not a severe restriction for \( SrVO_3 \).\(^{58}\)

Starting with a guess for the Weiss field and the auxiliary Hubbard \( U \), the impurity model is solved, that is the impurity Green’s function \( G^{imp} \) and screened Coulomb interaction \( W^{imp} \) are obtained. These are matrices in the orbital space of the correlated states only. In order to obtain the full self-energy and polarization the combined quantities

\[
\Sigma = \Sigma_{GW} - \Sigma^{loc,d}_{GW} + \Sigma^{imp}
\]

\[
P = GG - G^{loc,d}G^{loc,d} + P^{imp}
\]

involve “upfolding” to the full Hilbert space.

Then, the self-consistency equations for the determination of the Weiss mean-field and the auxiliary dynamical \( U \) of the impurity model require the \( d \) projections \( G^{loc,d}, W^{loc,d} \) of the local Green’s function and screened Coulomb interaction

\[
G^{loc}(\omega) = \sum_k [\omega + \mu - H_0 - \Sigma]^{-1}
\]

\[
W^{loc}(\omega) = \sum_q [V_q - P]^{-1}
\]

to equal their impurity model counterparts. In the self-consistency cycle, they are used to update the auxiliary impurity model quantities:

\[
\mathcal{G} = [G^{loc,d}]^{-1} + \Sigma^{imp}_{GW}^{-1}
\]

\[
\mathcal{U} = [W^{loc,d}]^{-1} + P^{imp}_{GW}^{-1}
\]

The impurity model is solved for these new Weiss field and dynamical \( U \), the resulting impurity Green’s function and screened Coulomb interaction are obtained and the cycle is iterated until self-consistency.
In the present work, we resort to a further simplification allowing us to carry out the full self-consistency cycle only for the one-body quantities (Green’s function, self-energy and Weiss field) in the correlated subspace, but to work with fixed dynamical interaction \( \mathcal{U} \). This is achieved by approximating \( P_{\text{imp}} \) in Eq. (21) non-selfconsistently by its RPA value \( G^{\text{loc},d}G^{\text{loc},d} \) leaving us, see Eq. 21, with \( P = GG \) where the LDA Green’s function is used for \( G \). Furthermore, we replace Eq. (25) by

\[
\mathcal{U} = \left[ \sum_q [W^{-1} + P^d]^{-1} \right]_d
\]

(26)

projected on the \( d \) space and its local component. These approximations consist in taking as dynamical impurity \( \mathcal{U} \) simply the cRPA estimate for the dynamical Hubbard interaction of the \( d \) subspace. This is done by partitioning the RPA polarization into two contributions, \( P^d \) and \( P^r \), calculated at the one-shot level from the LDA electronic structure. \( P^d \) includes only \( d-d \) transitions, while \( P^r \) includes all the rest.

For SrVO\(_3\), we consider the subset of \( t_{2g} \) states as correlated, while oxygen \( p- \), vanadium \( e_g- \), and strontium-\( d \) states are considered as \( r \)-space. The scheme implemented in the present work can then be summarized as follows:

- Obtain \( \mathcal{U}(\omega) \) from a cRPA calculation for a \( t_{2g} \) low-energy subspace, that is as matrix element

\[
\mathcal{U}(\omega) = \langle t_{2g} | \frac{V}{1-V(P-P_{t_{2g}})} | t_{2g} \rangle
\]

(27)

- Obtain \( \Sigma = GW \) from a one-shot \( GW \) calculation, decompose it into the Fock part \( \Sigma^F = GV \) and the correlation part \( \Sigma^C = GW - GV \).

- Construct the one-body Hamiltonian

\[
H_0 = H_{\text{LDA}} - \mu \epsilon_{d_{\text{LDA}}} + \Sigma^F
\]

(28)

where the LDA exchange-correlation potential has been replaced by the Fock exchange \( \Sigma^F \).

- Construct an impurity model in the \( t_{2g} \) subspace: start from an educated guess for the Weiss field (in practice, at first iteration we use the LDA local Green’s function).

- Solve the impurity for the Green’s function, that is calculate the expectation value

\[
G_{\text{imp}}(\tau) = -\langle Tc(\tau)c^\dagger(0) \rangle_S
\]

(29)

using the impurity action

\[
S = -\int d\tau d\tau' c^\dagger(\tau)\bar{G}(\tau - \tau')c(\tau') + \int d\tau H_{\text{inst}}
\]

(30)

Here, \( H_{\text{inst}} \) denotes the standard Hubbard-Kanamori Hamiltonian for \( t_{2g} \) states, parametrized by the intra-orbital interaction \( U = U(\omega = 0) \), its inter-orbital counterpart \( U - 2J \), and the inter-orbital interaction for like-spin electrons \( U - 3J \), which is reduced by the Hund’s exchange coupling \( J \). The quantity \( \bar{U}(\tau - \tau') = U(\tau - \tau') - U(\tau - \tau') \) denotes the dynamical interaction without the instantaneous part \( U = U(\omega = 0) \).

- From the impurity Green’s function, obtain the impurity self-energy via the Dyson equation

\[
\Sigma_{\text{imp}} = G^{-1} - G_{\text{imp}}^{-1}
\]

(31)

- The full self-energy within the \( t_{2g} \) space is obtained by combining the nonlocal \( GW \) self-energy, projected onto this subspace, with the impurity self-energy:

\[
\Sigma(k, i\omega) = \Sigma_{GW} - \Sigma_{GW}^{t_{2g}} + \Sigma_{\text{imp}}
\]

(32)

- Calculate the local Green’s function within the \( t_{2g} \) space using the combined self-energy

\[
G^{\text{loc}} = \sum_k (i\omega + \mu - H_0 - \Sigma(k, i\omega))^{-1}
\]

(33)

- and use this Green’s function to update the Weiss field:

\[
G = [G^{\text{loc},t_{2g}}^{-1} + \Sigma_{\text{imp}}]^{-1}
\]

(34)

- Go back to the solver step, that is calculate the impurity Green’s function (29) for the impurity model defined by \( \mathcal{U}(\omega) \) and the new Weiss field \( G \).

- Iterate until self-consistency.

E. The Bose Factor Ansatz

At the heart of the set of \( GW+\text{DMFT} \) equations is the solution of an impurity model with dynamical interactions. As will be discussed in the results section, the typical energy scale of variation of the latter is the plasma energy, which for transition metal oxides is an order of magnitude larger than the bandwidth. In this limit, the solution of the dynamical impurity model can be greatly simplified. Indeed, the Bose factor ansatz (BFA) within the “dynamic atomic limit approximation” (DALA) introduced in Ref. 54 yields an excellent approximation to the full solution. In this scheme, the Green’s function of
the dynamical impurity model is obtained from a factorization ansatz
\[ G(\tau) = \left( \frac{G(\tau)}{G_{\text{stat}}(\tau)} \right) G_{\text{stat}}(\tau) \sim \left( \frac{G(\tau)}{G_{\text{stat}}(\tau)} \right)_{\Delta=0} G_{\text{stat}}(\tau) \]
where \( G_{\text{stat}} \) is the Green’s function for a static impurity model with constant \( U=U(\omega = 0) \), and the first factor is approximated by its value for vanishing bath hybridization \( \Delta \).

The bosonic factor \( B(\tau) = \left( \frac{G(\tau)}{G_{\text{stat}}(\tau)} \right)_{\Delta=0} \) (36)
can be interpreted as the density of screening modes\(^{54} \). The bosonic factor (36) can be expressed in terms of the frequency-dependent interaction as
\[ B(\tau) = \exp \left( -\int_0^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\pi} \frac{1}{\omega^2} \left( G_\omega - G_{\text{stat}}(\omega) \right) \right) \]
with the bosonic kernel
\[ K_\omega(\omega) = \frac{\exp(-\omega \tau) + \exp(-\omega(\beta - \tau))}{1 - \exp(-\omega \beta)} \]

**F. Technicalities**

In the practical calculations for SrVO\(_3\), we use the experimental (perfectly cubic perovskite) structure with lattice constant \( a=3.844 \text{ Å} \). Calculations are performed at inverse temperature \( \beta = 10 \text{ eV}^{-1} \) unless otherwise noted. We perform a maximally localized Wannier function construction\(^{71,72} \) for the \( t_{2g} \) part of the Kohn-Sham spectrum within LDA. A one-shot \( GW \) calculation is performed within the full valence orbital space and then projected into the \( t_{2g} \) space. The \( GW \) calculations are performed using a k-mesh of \( 8 \times 8 \times 8 \) k-points (\( 4 \times 4 \times 4 \) for the ARPES spectra), which is then Wannier-interpolated\(^{72} \) to a dense grid of \( 27 \times 27 \times 27 \) k-points for the \( GW+\text{DMFT} \) calculation.

The nonlocal self-energy is fixed at the one-shot level from the initial \( GW \) calculation, and the frequency-dependent interaction \( U(\omega) \) at its cRPA value as discussed above. At the DMFT level our calculations are fully self-consistent for all one-particle quantities within the \( t_{2g} \)-space, determining the self-consistent Weiss field that together with \( U(\omega) \) - defines the auxiliary impurity model, self-consistently solved for fixed nonlocal-\( GW \) self-energies. This loop is performed in imaginary time/frequency space at an inverse temperature \( \beta = 10 \text{ eV}^{-1} \), allowing at the same time for the chemical potential to adjust self-consistently so as to provide the correct particle number. The resulting Green’s functions are analytically continued by means of a maximum entropy algorithm, using the technology of Ref. 54 to access the high-energy features.

**III. ELECTRONIC STRUCTURE OF SrVO\(_3\)**

Our target material, SrVO\(_3\), has been the subject of intense experimental and theoretical studies (for a review of work until 1998 see\(^{73} \)). In this section, we provide a brief summary of our previous knowledge about the electronic properties of this material, in particular concerning photoemission spectroscopy and the corresponding theoretical works.

SrVO\(_3\) crystallizes in the cubic perovskite structure: the \( V^{4+} \) ions are surrounded by oxygen octahedra, and these octahedra occupy the sites of a simple cubic lattice. The \( Sr^{2+} \) cation sits in the center of the cubes. The electron count leaves a single \( d \) electron in the \( V \)-d states, which is largely responsible for the electronic properties of the compound. The octahedral crystal field splits the \( V \)-d states into a lower-lying threefold degenerate \( t_{2g} \) manifold, thus filled with one electron per \( V \), and an empty \( e_g \) doublet. The compound exhibits a metallic resistivity with a Fermi liquid \( T^2 \) behavior up to room temperature\(^{74} \) and temperature-independent Pauli paramagnetism without any sign of magnetic ordering\(^{75} \). Hall data and NMR measurements confirm the picture of a Fermi liquid with moderate correlations\(^{74,76} \). These properties make SrVO\(_3\) an ideal model material for studying the effects of electronic Coulomb interactions.

Figure 1 summarizes the Kohn-Sham electronic structure of density functional theory within the local density approximation (LDA): the O-2p states disperse between -2 and -7 eV, separated from the \( t_{2g} \) states whose bandwidth extends from -1 eV to 1.5 eV. While the \( t_{2g} \) and \( e_g \) bands are well separated at every given k-point, the partial density of states (DOS) slightly overlap, and the \( e_g \) states display a pronounced peak at 2.3 eV.
nally, peaks stemming from the Sr-d states are located at 6.1 eV and 7.1 eV. We have superimposed to the LDA DOS the experimental PES and Bremsstrahl-Isochromat spectroscopy (BIS) curves taken from Refs. 77 and 78. The comparison reveals the main effects of electronic correlation in this material: as expected on quite general grounds, LDA locates the filled O-2p states at too high and the empty Sr-d manifold at too low energies. The $t_{2g}$ manifold undergoes a strong quasi-particle renormalization with a concomitant shift of spectral weight, both of which are effects beyond the one-particle picture. Photoemission studies\textsuperscript{79} early on provided detailed information on the disagreement between the measured spectra and the LDA DOS: In the experimental spectra the $t_{2g}$ spectral weight extends down to binding energies of about -2 eV, i.e. to 1 eV lower than is found in LDA. On the basis of comparison with the Mott insulating compound YTiO$_3$ the observed additional peak between -1.5 eV and -2 eV was identified as a lower Hubbard band (LHB) – due to the removal process of an electron from an atomic-like localized $t_{2g}$ state –, whereas the low-energy spectral weight was attributed to renormalized but coherent band states. A BIS study located an electron addition peak at energies around 2.7 eV\textsuperscript{78}.

With the advent of dynamical mean field theory, explicit calculations for spectra for an infinite-dimensional Hubbard model became available\textsuperscript{80}, supporting the idea of Hubbard bands persisting in the metallic state. The qualitative resemblance of the photoemission spectra with the occupied part of the three-peak structure of the infinite-dimensional one-band Hubbard model suggested SrVO$_3$ to be a prototypical correlated metal, in which the coexistence of quasi-particle states and Hubbard bands as well as their dispersions could be studied. Due to the high symmetry of the crystal structure, and the resulting threefold degeneracy of the $t_{2g}$ bands, it was moreover argued that a purely local self-energy would lead to “pinning” of the value of the fully interacting spectral function at the Fermi level to the one corresponding to the density of states of the one-particle band structure. Any deviation from such “pinning” behavior\textsuperscript{81} can thus be taken as a proxy for nonlocal components in the many-body self-energy\textsuperscript{78}.

A difficulty arose from the extreme surface sensitivity of the photoemission process, as evidenced in Refs. 82–85. These authors performed systematic photoemission studies at different photon energies, and witnessed a pronounced photon energy dependence of the quasi-particle peak, which they rationalized as a varying surface sensitivity to the density of states of the one-particle band structure at these very low energies. For a half-filled one-band Hubbard model on a cubic lattice, a similar “dip” effect was indeed found within a cluster dynamical mean field study\textsuperscript{80}. Very recently, a realistic dynamical cluster approximation study\textsuperscript{81} confirmed the possibility of nonlocal effects inducing such a depletion at the Fermi level.

Takizawa et al. used thin films with atomically flat surfaces prepared \textit{in situ}\textsuperscript{92}, and were able to observe the band dispersions not only of the coherent band but also of the Hubbard bands. An interesting effect was observed concerning the lower Hubbard band: its intensity is strongly momentum-dependent, with its maximum in regions where also the band states are occupied (k < k$F$), whereas they fade away for k-points corresponding to empty coherent bands\textsuperscript{83}, in agreement with theoretical modeling within DMFT\textsuperscript{92}. Recently, also SrVO$_3$-based hetero-structures have been studied experimentally\textsuperscript{94} and suggested for electronic device applications\textsuperscript{95}.

The overall picture which emerges from all these works is that of a correlated metal with a quasiparticle mass enhancement of about 27,78,85,92,96 and a photoemission (Hubbard–)satellite at around -1.6 eV binding energy. This physics is reproduced by dynamical mean field calculations using the LDA electronic structure as input. The first works\textsuperscript{9,10,14,86} used a low-energy model comprising only the $t_{2g}$ manifold, where the local orbitals are constructed from a downfolding procedure that incorporates also the ligand O-2p tails. Different choices of such orbitals were compared\textsuperscript{97}, demonstrating that as long as the considered energy window is restricted to the $t_{2g}$ bands only, results do not depend on the precise choice of the local orbitals (maximally localized Wannier functions, Nth order muffin tin orbitals, or projected atomic orbitals).

SrVO$_3$ became the drosophila of combined LDA and DMFT calculations, and new implementations were quite systematically tested on this compound (see e.g.\textsuperscript{42,97–100}). Apart from the effective $t_{2g}$ model, also Hamiltonians including explicitly V-d and O-2p ligand states in the non-interacting Hamiltonian were used\textsuperscript{72,99,100}. It has been argued that the inclusion of ligand states leads to more localized d-orbitals, and an
a priori better justification of the local approximation made by DMFT.

Momentum-resolved spectral functions were calculated from dynamical mean field theory in Ref. 16, in agreement with the experimental dispersion. They evidenced an additional feature, a “kink” structure at around -0.3 eV binding energy, which was later on rationalized as a generally expected phenomenon in correlated electron materials\textsuperscript{103}, of purely electronic origin, kinks appear at the crossover scale at which the low-energy linear (Fermi liquid) behavior of the real part and the quadratic behavior of the imaginary part of the self-energy cease to be valid. In the meanwhile, kink structures observed in other materials, e.g. \textit{LaNiO}_\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{102}, were also investigated theoretically and have been consistently reproduced by dynamical mean field calculations\textsuperscript{103}. For SrVO\textsubscript{3}, the theoretical predictions stimulated an intense search in photoemission spectra. While Ref. 92 still had to conclude that “the kink is weak and broad, if it exists, but the curvature does indeed change sign at around -0.2eV, as predicted”, the very recent work by Aizaki et al. indeed identified such a kink structure at around -0.3 eV\textsuperscript{96}.

Besides dynamical mean field theory and extensions, also other techniques of many-body theory were employed to investigate SrVO\textsubscript{3}. A Gutzwiller study\textsuperscript{104} investigated the mass renormalizations, and renormalized densities of states as a function of the Hubbard \textit{U}. Interestingly, to obtain the experimentally observed mass enhancement a \textit{U} value beyond 5 eV was found to be necessary in this scheme. Cluster model calculations systematically addressed the spectroscopic properties of SrVO\textsubscript{3} and analyzed the necessary ingredients for a minimal model thereof\textsuperscript{105–108}. These studies emphasized the strong pd-hybridization, which is responsible for the large charge transfer energy \(\epsilon_d - \epsilon_p\). Interestingly, an analysis of the orbital character of the different spectral contributions identifies the spectral weight corresponding to the t\textsubscript{2g} addition process as lying mainly between the Fermi level and about 1 eV, in contradiction with the dynamical mean field studies which suggest an upper Hubbard band of t\textsubscript{2g} character at around 2.7 eV, that is at the precise location of the pronounced peak in BIS spectra. The cluster model calculation attributed this latter peak to the electron addition into e\textsubscript{g} states\textsuperscript{106}. We will come back to this point below.

With the advent of the constrained random phase approximation (cRPA)\textsuperscript{53} it became possible to calculate the values of the local Coulomb interactions (“Hubbard \textit{U}”) specifically for the model under consideration. Again, SrVO\textsubscript{3} was chosen as a test material to demonstrate the power of the method\textsuperscript{109,110}, and it was shown that while \textit{U} values for a full model comprising ligand states as well as V-d states can be as large as 8 eV for the d-orbitals, for a t\textsubscript{2g}-only model the obtained value was quite small: 3.5 eV. The \textit{U} values used in the above cited LDA+DMFT calculations, on the other hand, varied rather between 4 eV and 5.5 eV. These values were such as to reproduce the observed mass enhancement, even though the position of the lower Hubbard band (LHB) was generally at slightly too high binding energies, suggesting that these values of \textit{U} were indeed on the large side. LDA+DMFT calculations with a \textit{U} value of 3.5 eV, however, do not reproduce the observed mass enhancement, nor result in a clear LHB. This puzzle was solved only recently\textsuperscript{54}: it was pointed out that \textit{U} should be considered as a dynamical quantity rather than a static interaction\textsuperscript{53,106}. An LDA+\textit{U}(\omega)+DMFT calculation taking not only the \textit{ab initio} value of the static component of \textit{U} = 3.5 eV but also its full frequency dependence into account indeed reproduced the observed mass enhancement as well as the position of the lower Hubbard band\textsuperscript{54}. This effect has very recently been confirmed within an analogous study, using a different impurity solver scheme\textsuperscript{111}.

In the following, we briefly emphasize a few puzzles, that remain within the dynamical mean field description of SrVO\textsubscript{3}, resulting from the above mentioned works.

- **Inconsistency between LDA+DMFT and cluster model calculations in the unoccupied part of the spectra**
  While the assignment of orbital character to the peaks in the spectral function made by the cluster model calculations\textsuperscript{106} coincides in the occupied part of the spectra with the results of dynamical mean field theory (or, to account also for the correct position of the LHB, of LDA+\textit{U}(\omega)+DMFT), the position of the upper Hubbard band (UHB) at 2.7 eV found within the LDA+DMFT literature is inconsistent with the cluster model findings.

- **Interpretation of 2.7 eV BIS feature as an upper Hubbard band inconsistent with \textit{ab initio} \textit{U} values**
  The interpretation of the BIS peak at 2.7 eV as an UHB of t\textsubscript{2g} character, done in the LDA+DMFT literature, is inconsistent with the static value of \textit{U} from cRPA. Indeed, from the position of the LHB (\sim -1.5 ev) and the static \textit{U} value (3.5eV) one would expect an UHB at 2 eV (as found in the LDA+\textit{U}(\omega)+DMFT calculation)\textsuperscript{54}. This leaves the photoemission feature at 2.7 eV unexplained within LDA+DMFT.

- **Position of O2p ligand states**
  LDA+DMFT calculations that also include oxygen ligand orbitals, do not in principle account for corrections to the LDA for these orbitals. Such corrections have been introduced by hand as an arbitrary shift on the O2p states\textsuperscript{42,99}. This means that this position is not known \textit{ab initio} from LDA+DMFT. On the other hand, it is well-known that in the related compound SrTiO\textsubscript{3}, which is isostructural to SrVO\textsubscript{3} but of d\textsuperscript{10} configuration, the pd-gap of Kohn-Sham theory within the LDA is underestimated by 1.3 eV compared to experiment\textsuperscript{112}.

- **Position of Sr-4d states**
  An analogous problem arises when comparing the
The energetic position of the Sr-4d states in BIS and in Kohn-Sham density functional theory, which underestimates their energy by almost 2 eV. By construction, combined LDA+DMFT schemes do not correct for this error.

- Relation between laser ARPES results and nonlocal effects

To the best of our knowledge, it remains open at this stage how to reconcile the laser ARPES experiments (and in particular the finding of a dip at the Fermi level) with the high-photon energy PES which display a pronounced peak. The study of nonlocal many-body effects on a very low-energy scale remains thus a challenging task for the future.

The present work addresses the first four issues, leaving the last one for future work. In particular, we review and extend the $GW+\text{DMFT}$ calculations of Ref. 56. Since the publication of Ref. 56 electronic structure calculations for SrVO$_3$ have met renewed interest: besides a study within the $GW$ approximation (including a cumulant correction similar to the above discussed Bose factor ansatz), several groups have embarked into attempts of setting up simplified schemes mimicking the results of $GW+\text{DMFT}$. Interestingly, while different elements of the full calculations are indeed captured in the different schemes, no scheme so far could fully reproduce the low-energy behavior, and the question of designing approximate schemes in a specific low-energy range remains a largely open one. We will therefore also devote an extended paragraph to a systematic comparison of different approximate schemes and a discussion of what they can be expected to provide.

IV. RESULTS

We now turn to the description of the results of $GW+\text{DMFT}$ calculations using the formalism outlined above for our target compound, SrVO$_3$. The $GW+\text{DMFT}$ calculations will be put into perspective by confronting them to pure $GW$ calculations, as well as to LDA+DMFT calculations both, with static and dynamical interactions. As a prelude, we discuss the dynamical Hubbard interactions obtained for SrVO$_3$ within the eRPA scheme.

A. Dynamical interactions

In Figure 2, we plot the screened and partially screened Coulomb interactions: $W$ denotes the matrix element of the fully screened interaction in $t_{2g}$ maximally localized Wannier functions and the Hubbard $U$ is defined in Eq. (27).

The physical interpretation of the frequency-dependence of the interactions is transparent, if one recalls that the effective bare interaction within a subspace of the original Hilbert space should include screening by the omitted (e.g. higher-energy or nonlocal) degrees of freedom. Indeed, the net result of the rearrangement of the high-energy degrees of freedom as response to a perturbation of the system is an effective reduction of the perturbation strength in the low-energy space. The effective Coulomb interaction in a low-energy effective model for a correlated system is therefore in general an order of magnitude smaller than the matrix element of the bare Coulomb interaction. Nevertheless, the latter is recovered in the limit of high-frequencies of the perturbation, when screening becomes inefficient. The crossover – as a function of frequency – from the low-energy screened regime to the high-frequency bare matrix element of $\epsilon^2/|\mathbf{r}\mathbf{-r}'|$ takes place at a characteristic screening (plasma) frequency where the dielectric function exhibits a pole structure.

For SrVO$_3$, the (partially) screened interaction, corresponding to the dynamical Hubbard interaction at vanishing frequency, takes on a value of $U = 3.5$ eV for the $t_{2g}$ orbital-subspace spanned by maximally localized Wannier functions. The corresponding Hund’s rule exchange $J$ is 0.6 eV. The bare interaction, the matrix element of the Coulomb interaction within the $t_{2g}$ Wannier orbitals, equals $V = 15$ eV. As seen in Fig. 2, the crossover from the low-energy screened regime to the high-energy tail takes place at about 15 eV.
ergy, a well-defined plasma excitation is observed. Indeed, the upper panel reproduces experimental electron energy loss (EELS) spectra for the related compound SrTiO$_3$. This material is isostructural to our target compound, and has one electron less (d$^0$ configuration). The EELS data display a well-defined plasmon excitation at about 15 eV. The experimental spectrum is well-reproduced by the theoretical imaginary part of the inverse dielectric function calculated within the RPA. The reason that, besides higher energy one-particle derived features, also the collective plasmon satellite of SrTiO$_3$ is well described by our calculation for the non-isoelectronic d$^1$ SrVO$_3$ resides in the fact that it is not dominated by d-electron contributions. This is evident since the fully and partially screened interaction of the t$_{2g}$ orbitals, $W_{t_{2g}}$ and $U_{t_{2g}}$, are very similar at these energies. Overall, this validates using the LDA electronic structure for the purpose of calculating the effective interaction $U(\omega)$ of SrVO$_3$.

The fully screened interaction $W$ furthermore exhibits a weaker feature at low energies ($\sim 2$ eV), a “subplasmon”, corresponding to a collective charge oscillation of the t$_{2g}$ charge only. This peak is therefore not present when the t$_{2g}$ screening processes are cut out, as is the case in the construction of the effective interaction $U(\omega)$. As we will see later, this is the energy regime where the local vertex corrections introduced by DMFT modify the GW description of the spectral properties. Features at these energies produced within GW calculations are thus not present any more in the GW+DMFT results (see below).

In the many-body calculation, the frequency-dependent interaction enters the bosonic factor $B(\tau)$ of Eq. (37) in the form of $\text{Im} U(\omega)/\omega^2$. This function can be interpreted as the density of screening modes. It is plotted in the lowest panel of Fig. (2), together with the spectral function of $B(\tau)$ defined in Eq. (36). Interestingly, these functions allow to identify yet another feature, namely a well-defined peak at about 5 eV. We will come back to this point later.

B. GW

Several of the deficiencies of DFT calculations mentioned above can be addressed with Hedin’s GW approximation, that uses the fully screened interaction $W$ discussed in the previous section. We will in particular address the following two issues:

1. higher energy states (O2p, Sr4d, ...). Improvement of these is governed by exchange and correlation effects (beyond DFT) that (i) lie outside the realm of purely local interactions, and (ii) are beyond the (low energy / t$_{2g}$) orbital subspace. Thus inaccessible to DMFT-based methods, their correction is one pivotal merit that GW contributes to theories beyond DFT and DFT+DMFT.

2. many-body effects at low energies. Here we will discuss the impact of many-body renormalization on the t$_{2g}$ spectrum, with particular focus on nonlocal self-energy effects (beyond DFT, and absent in DMFT).

Besides a better description of the electronic structure of SrVO$_3$, our GW calculation also gives useful fundamental insights into the nature of correlation effects in transition metal oxides. We will present evidence that dynamical and nonlocal self-energy effects can essentially be separated (this was previously discovered for the iron pnictides and chalcogenides in Ref. 117). Further we will discuss the spatial extent of correlation effects in real space, putting into perspective corrections to the local picture of DMFT.

1. Correction of higher energy features

The GW spectral function is shown in Fig. 3. In the unoccupied part of the spectrum a substantial improvement over the LDA band-structure result, Fig. 1, is seen: states beyond the t$_{2g}$-s are in excellent agreement with inverse photoemission results. In particular the lump at around 2-5eV is very well captured. In contrast to assignments in the DMFT literature, its spectral weight stems largely from the vanadium $e_g$ states within GW, in congruence with cluster based methods. Beyond 5eV appear the Sr4d orbitals, again in remarkable accordance with the experimental intensity.

Also the position of occupied states, the O2p orbitals in the shown energy range, improve to the extent that the experimental satellite at -1.6eV is no longer obscured by oxygen spectral weight. With respect to the photoemission experiment however, the binding energy of the O2p is still too small by at least an electronvolt. A possible remedy to this issue could be to extend the Wannier space to the O2p and vanadium $e_g$ states and include a local Hubbard interaction on the latter in the GW+DMFT. This would favour a charge transfer into the O2p orbitals with which the $e_g$ states hybridize most, thus pushing the
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In DMFT-based approaches, where the self-energy is located nonlocality via the part of the self-energy through the quasi particle weight dynamical electron density, two ingredients for changes in effective GW potential: ΣGW evaluated on the Fermi surface. Here, the self-energy

about 25% with respect to LDA, see also the momentun resolved spectra in Fig. 5 and Fig. 10. This suggests an overall effective mass mGW/mLDA ∼ 1.3. The corresponding spectral weight is transferred to satellites that correspond to the features seen in the fully screened interaction W, see Fig. 2, namely at ±(∼2)eV as well as the t2g contributions to the plasmon satellite at 17eV.

To analyze the low-energy renormalizations further, we note that the mass enhancement relative to the LDA band masses is given by the ratio of the magnitudes of the group velocities within LDA, \( \frac{dW}{dk} = \langle \Psi_{k\alpha} | \partial_{\kappa,\alpha} H_{\text{LDA}}(\kappa) | \Psi_{k\alpha} \rangle_{k=k_F,\omega} \), and the GW

evaluated on the Fermi surface. Here, the self-energy is defined with respect to the LDA exchange-correlation potential: \( \Sigma_{\text{GW}} = \Sigma_{\text{loc}} - \Sigma_{\text{LDA}} \). Thus (besides a modified electron density), two ingredients for changes in effective many-body masses can be identified: (a) the dynamical part of the self-energy through the quasi particle weight \( Z_k = 1/(1 - \partial_\omega \Sigma_{\text{GW}}(k,\omega)) \) \( \omega \to 0 \), and (b) a renormalization via the nonlocality of the self-energy, \( \partial_{\kappa,\alpha} Re \Sigma(k,\omega) \).

In DMFT-based approaches, where the self-energy is local by construction, only the first mechanism is present, hence \( m_{\text{DMFT}}/m_{\text{LDA}} = 1/Z_{\text{DMFT}} \).

The weight of the t2g quasi-particles in SrVO3 is

Thus, the fact that the LDA and full (local + nonlocal self-energy) GW dispersion is somewhat comparable is owing to the competition of a band-width narrowing through the dynamics of the self-energy, and the tendency of nonlocal contributions to delocalize charge carriers. However, the physics underlying these similar dispersions is very different: Indeed within the GW approximation for SrVO3 can also be evidenced as follows: Indeed, for a purely local self-energy, and in the absence of orbital charge transfers (the t2g-orbitals are locally degenerate), the value of the spectral function at the Fermi level, A(\( \omega = 0 \)), is “pinned” to its non-interacting (LDA) value. The violation of this pinning condition, see Fig. 4, is thus heralding a nonlocal self-energy. Obviously, the evidences nonlocal renormalization is also beyond DFT+DMFT approaches, and hence another crucial contribution of the GW to schemes such as GW+DMFT.
3. Separability of dynamical and nonlocal correlations

Having discussed different ingredients to band-width renormalizations, we now examine the nature of correlation effects in more detail.

For the case of the iron pnictides and chalcogenides, Tomczak et al.\textsuperscript{117} found that – within the $GW$ approximation – electronic correlation effects in the Fermi liquid regime are separable into a dynamical self-energy that is local, and nonlocal contributions that are static. This notion of locality holds when the self-energy is expressed in a local basis, in our case the maximally localized Wannier functions for the $t_{2g}$ subspace. Does this empirical finding extend to the transition metal oxide SrVO$_3$? In the upper panel of Fig. 6 the real part of the $GW$ self-energy of SrVO$_3$ is shown for several high symmetry points in the Brillouin zone as well as the local, i.e. momentum summed, element, as a function of frequency. The offset, $\Sigma_{GW}(\omega = 0)$, is positive for unoccupied orbital characters (xy/xz at the X point, and all $t_{2g}$'s at the M point, cf. Fig. 10), and negative for the occupied orbitals. Thus (un)occupied spectral weight gets pushed (up) down in energy, congruent with the changes in the bandwidth seen in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5(b), as well as the reduction of the effective mass from the value of the inverse quasi-particle weight $1/Z$.

Regarding the frequency dependence, one can see that the self-energy is linear from roughly -2 to +1.8 eV, which thus delimits the Fermi liquid regime within the $GW$ approximation. The slope of the self-energy is slightly larger for $\omega > 0$, thus compensating, in part, the static shift that is larger for unoccupied states. Correspondingly, the imaginary part of the self-energy also grows faster with frequency in the unoccupied part, signalling stronger correlations for $\omega > 0$. The important finding here is that in the Fermi liquid regime, the frequency dependence (the linear slope in the real parts) at different momenta are very similar. That is to say that dynamical renormalizations in different regions of the Brillouin zone are comparable. To investigate this more quantitatively, we define

$$Z_k(\omega) = \left[ 1 - \frac{\partial \text{Re} \Sigma_k(\omega)}{\partial \omega} \right]^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

as a generalization of the quasi-particle weight $Z_{kF}(\omega = 0)$. We further introduce its momentum variance\textsuperscript{117}

$$\Delta_k Z = \sqrt{\sum_k \text{Tr} \left| Z_k(\omega) - Z^{\text{loc}}(\omega) \right|^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)

as defined with respect to the local projection $Z^{\text{loc}}$ of Eq. 40, where the trace sums over the Wannier orbitals.
As a consequence, the self-energy becomes separable into local dynamical and nonlocal static parts. The local part can be interpreted as a generalization of the Kohn-Sham self-energy into a local dynamical and a nonlocal static contribution. This separation into local and nonlocal self-energies is used to explain the widening of the band as compared to the Kohn-Sham band structure is virtually vanishing.

Then, $\Delta_k Z$ is a measure for the importance of dynamical effects that are nonlocal. As is apparent from Fig. 6, $\Delta_k Z$ virtually vanishes at the Fermi level and is small compared to $Z^\text{tot} (\omega = 0) = 0.53$ within the linear regime.

This means that at least at the GW level, the dynamics of the quasi-particle renormalization is local, and, conversely, that nonlocal correlation effects are static. As a consequence, the self-energy becomes separable: The dynamical part is (almost) purely local, thus justifying the use of local but dynamic theories such as DMFT. The nonlocal part, on the other hand, is static, as in theories employing generalized (orbital and momentum dependent) effective potentials such quasi-particle self-consistent (QS) $GW$.

This non-trivial finding suggests that for many materials, the separation into local and nonlocal self-energies à la $GW$+DMFT simplifies to the extent that nonlocal correlations can be accounted for by a nonlocal yet static potential. This led the authors of Ref. 117 to propose a QSGW+DMFT scheme, in which the QSGW construction is used to provide that potential.

4. Bandwidth widening by nonlocal self-energy contributions

We now discuss more in detail the widening of the band by nonlocal self-energy contributions, as seen in Fig. 5. To this effect, we note that the separation of the self-energy into a local dynamical and a nonlocal static part can be interpreted as a generalization of the familiar Coulomb-hole-screened exchange (COHSEX) approximation to a full $GW$ treatment. Indeed, in the COHSEX approximation, the $GW$ self-energy is given by a static self-energy of the following form:

$$\Sigma(r, r', \omega) = \Sigma_{\text{SEX}}(r, r') + \Sigma_{\text{COH}}(r, r')$$

where the first term is a screened exchange self-energy built from the static screened Coulomb interaction

$$\Sigma_{\text{SEX}}(r, r') = -\sum_{k_n} \phi_{kn}(r)\phi^*_n(r') W(r, r', \omega = 0)$$

and the second contains the effect of the Coulomb hole

$$\Sigma_{\text{COH}}(r, r') = \frac{1}{2} \delta(r - r') (W(r, r', \omega = 0) - v(r - r'))$$

Here, the indices $k, n$ denote Kohn-Sham states of wave vector $k$, and the sum runs over occupied states only. Interestingly, when separating the COHSEX self-energy into local and nonlocal parts in the many-body sense (that is, with respect to a localized basis set), the nonlocal contribution stems from the screened exchange self-energy only. For a system such as SrVO$_3$, the local part of $\Sigma_{\text{SEX}}$ is by symmetry - a scalar in the space of $t_2g$-orbitals, and can thus be considered an irrelevant constant in that space. The Coulomb hole self-energy, on the other hand, is purely local.

The separation in static nonlocal and dynamical local parts found in the preceding section can therefore be interpreted in the following way:

1. The nonlocal contribution to the self-energy can be interpreted as a screened exchange self-energy $\Sigma_{\text{SEX}}(\omega = 0) = [GW(\omega = 0)]_{\text{local}}$.

2. The local contribution contains the Coulomb hole effect as well as band renormalizations beyond the COHSEX approximation, stemming from the frequency-dependence of the local dynamical self-energy.

Therefore, when considering the band structure corresponding to the nonlocal self-energy contribution only, the Coulomb hole part as well as the dynamical correlations are taken out since they are purely local, and the remaining correction can thus be interpreted as the screened exchange contribution. The widening of the band as compared to the Kohn-Sham band structure is therefore the familiar broadening by exchange interactions (which, here, are screened, thus leading to substantial but not as large effects as in unscreened Hartree Fock theory).

The screened exchange self-energy correction to the DFT exchange correlation potential can be written as:

$$\langle \Sigma_{\text{SEX}} - v_{xc} \rangle(r, r') = -\sum_{k' n'} \psi_{k'n'}^*(r) \psi_{k'n'}(r') \times (W(r, r', \omega = 0) - \delta(r - r') \tilde{v}(r))$$

with a potential $\tilde{v}(r)$ representing the Kohn-Sham exchange-correlation contribution.

Matrix elements of this quantity in the Kohn-Sham basis read

$$\langle k_0 n_0 | \Sigma_{\text{SEX}} - v_{xc} | k_0 n_0 \rangle$$
FIG. 8. (Color online) Local spectral function from standard LDA+DMFT with static interactions (left). LDA+DMFT with dynamical interactions (right). Here, the spectral functions are normalized to one, such that the filling corresponding to SrVO$_3$ is 1/6.

\[
\sum_{k' n'} \int d^3r \int d^3r' \psi_{k' n'}^*(r) \psi_{k n'}(r') W(r, r', \omega = 0) \times \psi_{k_0 n_0}(r) \psi_{k_0 n_0}(r') + \int d^3r \tilde{v}(r) n(r) |\psi_{k_0 n_0}(r)|^2 (46)
\]

An intuitive inspection of these matrix elements suggests the resulting correction to be small for occupied \(|k_0 n_0\rangle\) states, but to result in an upward shift for unoccupied states. Indeed, for unoccupied states, the matrix elements \(\langle k_0 n_0 k' n' | W | k_0 n_0 k' n' \rangle\) are necessarily between product states that mix occupied \(|k_0 n_0\rangle\) and unoccupied states \(|k' n'\rangle\), and thus small compared to \(V_{xc}\). This results in the familiar effect of a \(GW\) correction to conduction band states in simple semiconductors, leading to a “scissors” correction to the too small Kohn-Sham band gaps.

In the case of the metallic SrVO$_3$ with d$^1$ filling, the band widening by nonlocal contributions is much stronger for the unoccupied part of the spectrum (which is enhanced by more than 1 eV) than for the occupied part. As we will see below, this effect will carry through the GW+DMFT treatment, where the screened exchange band structure becomes renormalized by local dynamical correlations encoded in the DMFT self-energy.

5. The spatial range of correlations

Having established the importance of nonlocal correlation effects, as well as their static nature at low energies, we want to characterize their extent in real space. Indeed there are efforts to extend DMFT calculations from the single impurity setup to a cluster of several sites (or several momenta) even for \textit{ab initio} calculations. For the case of SrVO$_3$ this was first done in Ref. 91 using the dynamical cluster approximation (DCA) method, that partitions the Brillouin zone into momentum patches (two patches, in the cited work) and thus gives momentum resolved information on a coarse grid.

Here, we will rather follow the spirit of cellular DMFT, in which real-space clusters are embedded into the solid, thus allowing nonlocal correlations of the range of the cluster size. The important question now is how big that cluster has to be in order to exhaust the extent of pertinent nonlocal correlations. For this we note that self-energy diagrams beyond \(GW\) give mainly local contributions\textsuperscript{123}, and thus our findings based on the \(GW\) approximation are expected to have a wide range of validity\textsuperscript{124}.

In Fig. 7 we show the magnitudes of the \(GW\) self-energy corrections with respect to LDA at the Fermi level (\(\omega = 0\)) and at energies near the plasmon peak (\(\omega = 15\) eV) as a function of the real space distance to a reference vanadium atom. At the Fermi level, this correction is indeed rather short-ranged: Already at the next-nearest (vanadium) neighbour it has decreased by one order of magnitude. This advocates that a 2x2x2 unit-cell cluster (beyond current computational capabilities) might already give meaningful results. In the region of the collective (plasmon) excitation, the decrease in magnitude occurs more slowly, suggesting much larger cluster sizes. This does not come as a surprise, since at these energies collective long-ranged excitations are dominant.

C. DMFT

1. DMFT with static interaction

SrVO$_3$ has been used as a benchmark compound for standard LDA+DMFT calculations, both within a low-energy description comprising only the $t_{2g}$ states and including the oxygen ligands. It was argued that the static Hubbard interactions have to be at least as large as 4 eV to reproduce the experimentally observed mass enhancement. The local spectral function then displays a three-peak structure as in the correlated metal phase of SrVO$_3$.\footnote{\textsuperscript{125} See also Ref. 92 for a discussion of \(GW\) calculations on SrVO$_3$ without Hubbard interactions, which yield a one-peak structure.}
the half-filled single-band Hubbard model, even though
the low filling of 1 electron in 3 bands makes the spectra
highly asymmetric. The lower Hubbard band, at \( U = 4 \)
eV, is located at slightly too low binding energy (nearly
-2eV, instead of the experimentally observed -1.5 eV). At
about 2.5 to 2.7 eV, an upper Hubbard band is found.
Since this feature coincides in energy with an experimentally
observed electron addition peak, the LDA+DMFT literature has thus identified the latter as an upper Hub-
bard band (see however the \( GW \) spectrum in Fig. 3 and
the discussion below). When using the static component
of the Hubbard interaction calculated within cRPA (\( \sim 
3.5 \) eV), however, a very weakly correlated metal is ob-
tained, where the lower Hubbard band is barely a shoul-
der structure and the mass enhancement is much smaller
than the experimentally observed one. Figure 8(a) re-
produces the local spectral function for \( U \) values varying
between 3.5 eV and 4 eV, as calculated in Ref. 97.

2. DMFT with dynamical interaction

The puzzle of the too weak mass renormalizations
within LDA+DMFT when the static component of the
cRPA \( U \) is used was solved when it was realized that
taking into account the frequency-dependence of the
interactions leads to additional mass enhancements\(^{54} \). In-
deed, the high-energy tail of the dynamical interaction
alone was shown to be at the origin of a mass enhance-
ment of \( Z_B^{-1} \) with \( Z_B = 0.7 \)^{54}. The overall mass en-
hancement of the calculation with the dynamical cRPA
interaction is \( m^*/m_{\text{LDA}} \sim 2 \), in reasonable agreement
with ARPES estimates. Since, however, the static com-
ponent of \( U \) is smaller than what was used before in static
LDA+DMFT calculations, the position of the lower Hub-
bard band is shifted towards the Fermi level, correct-
ing the deficiency of LDA+DMFT discussed above. On
the unoccupied side of the spectrum, an upper Hubbard
band feature appears at about 2 eV, substantially lower
than what was discussed within LDA+DMFT. Exper-
imentally, such a feature is not clearly resolved.
We can thus summarise the effect of dynamical interactions
within LDA+\( U(\omega)+\)DMFT calculations by noting that
the only notable modification in the electronic structure
is the improved description of the lower Hubbard band,
comparing to experiment, whereas the situation is
less clear for the unoccupied part of the spectrum. We
will argue below that this scheme is actually as little ap-
propriate for unoccupied states as is the standard static
LDA+DMFT.

D. \( GW+\text{DMFT} \)

1. Full calculations

We now discuss the results of our combined \( GW+\text{DMFT} \)
calculations for the spectral properties of SrVO\(_3\). Fig. 9(a,b) displays the local projection of
the spectral function, while Fig. 10 shows momentum
dependent \( t_{2g} \) spectra in comparison with ARPES
measurements\(^{92,96} \). The global view on the spectral func-
tion in the full energy range of valence and conduc-
tion band states, Fig. 9(a), reveals an overall remarkable
agreement with experiments. Indeed, \( GW+\text{DMFT} \) in-
herits from the \( GW \) calculation the excellent agreement
of the Sr-d states, both, in position and shape, with BIS
spectra, and the improved agreement of the O-p ligand
states with photoemission. The low-energy part of the
spectrum is dominated by the \( t_{2g} \) contribution, which,
here, is profoundly modified with respect to pure \( GW \)
results. A renormalized quasi-particle band disperses
around the Fermi level: At the \( \Gamma \) point (see Fig. 10)
the peak is located at about -0.5 eV – this reveals (in
agreement with ARPES) a strong renormalization of the
corresponding Kohn-Sham state which, at this momen-
tum, has an energy of -1 eV. At the X-point, the \( t_{2g} \)
bands are no longer degenerate, and surprisingly weakly
renormalized xy/\( xz \) states are observed at 0.9 eV, while
the yz band is located at nearly the same energy as at
the \( \Gamma \) point, again in agreement with ARPES. At binding
energies of -1.6 eV, ARPES witnesses a weakly dispersive
Hubbard band, whose intensity varies significantly as a
function of momentum\(^{92} \). In the \( GW+\text{DMFT} \) spectral func-
tion the Hubbard band – absent in \( GW \) – is cor-
rectly observed at about -1.6 eV and its k-dependent in-
tensity variation (see Fig. 10) is indeed quite strong. Pre-
vious LDA+DMFT calculations placed the lower Hub-
bard band at larger negative energies (see e.g.\(^{10} \)). This
is owing to the fact discussed above that when using a
Hubbard interaction, a value of 4–6 eV\(^{10,99} \), that is
larger than the zero frequency limit of the \( ab \text{intio} \)
\( U(\omega=0)=3.5\text{eV}\)^{125}, is needed to account for the observed
transfers of spectral weight. As in DMFT with dynamic
\( U \), \( GW+\text{DMFT} \) yields a good description of the Hubbard
band and the spectral weight reduction at the same time,
thanks to the additional transfers of spectral weight due
to the dynamical screening\(^{92,54,56} \).

At positive energies nonlocal self-energy effects are
larger. Interestingly, our k-integrated spectral function,
(see the dashed line in Fig.9(a) for the \( t_{2g} \) contribution
in the total (solid line) spectrum) does not display a clearly
separated Hubbard band. The reason is visible from the
k-resolved spectra: the upper Hubbard band is located
at around 2 eV, as expected from the location of the
lower Hubbard band and the fact that their separation
is roughly given by the zero-frequency value of \( U \).
The peak around 2.7 eV that appears in the inverse photoe-
mission spectrum\(^{78} \) – commonly interpreted as the upper
Hubbard band of \( t_{2g} \) character in the DMFT literature –
arises in fact from\( e_g \) states located in this energy range.
The nonlocal self-energy effects lead, in the unoccupied
part of the spectrum, to overlapping features from differ-
ent k-points and an overall smearing of the total spectral
function.

The Bose factor ansatz discussed above does not only
provide us with an efficient technique for solving the \(GW\)+DMFT equations. It also allows for a transparent physical interpretation of the arising spectral properties. Indeed the spectral representation of the bosonic renormalization factor \(B(\tau)\) of Eq. 35 (displayed in the lower panel of Fig. 2) is directly related to the density of screening modes \(\text{Im} \, U(\omega)/\omega^2\). In this way, we can trace back the \(GW\)+DMFT satellite at \(-4.5\) eV to the onset of \(p-t_{2g}\) excitations, discussed above for \(W\) and \(U\). On the other hand, since the feature below \(3\) eV in \(W\) is absent in \(U\) and \(B\), the spurious \(GW\) peaks are consistently eliminated. The strong peak at \(15\) eV is the well-known plasma excitation, seen e.g., in electron energy loss spectra of \(\text{SrTiO}_3\).

2. Test of simplified schemes

We now turn to the question of how to set up simplified schemes that would still reproduce the results of the full \(GW\)+DMFT calculations within the low-energy regime. Besides the methodological interest, this study also allows us to analyse more in detail the dominant effects leading to corrections to the Kohn-Sham band structure.

As can be seen from the methodological section, the DMFT self-consistency condition for the one-body quantities requires the local Green’s function to equal

\[
G^{\text{loc}}(i\omega) = \sum_k [i\omega + \mu - H_0(k) - \Sigma_{\text{non-loc}}^{\text{GW}}(k,i\omega) - \Sigma_{\text{imp}}(i\omega)]^{-1} \tag{47}
\]

with \(H_0 = H_{\text{LDA}} - v_{\text{LDA}}^x + \Sigma^x\) from Eq. 28, and \(\Sigma_{\text{non-loc}}^{\text{GW}}(k,i\omega)\) is the nonlocal part of the \(GW\) \(t_{2g}\) correlation self-energy \(\Sigma^c = GW - GV\). If the nonlocal correlation self-energy were purely static, that is \(\omega\)-independent, \(\Sigma_{\text{non-loc}}^{\text{GW}}(k,\omega) = \Sigma_{\text{non-loc}}^{\text{GW}}(k)\), one could construct an effective quasi-particle Hamiltonian that also comprises these correlation effects:

\[
H^{\text{qp}}(k) = H_0(k) + \text{Re}\Sigma_{\text{non-loc}}^{\text{GW}}(k). \tag{48}
\]

In Section IV B we have empirically shown (as seen before in Ref. 117 for the iron pnictides) that nonlocal correlations are static within the low-energy Fermi liquid regime. This thus provides a justification for using \(H^{\text{qp}}\) for the construction of the free (of local correlation) propagator of the DMFT impurity. \(H^{\text{qp}}\) is the simplified one-shot analogue of the QS\(GW\) Hamiltonian \(H^{\text{QS}GW}\) that was proposed in the context of the QSGW+DMFT formalism.\(^{117}\) Then the DMFT self-consistency is much simpler since quantities are either frequency or momentum dependent, but not both, which drastically reduces memory requirements. In QSGW+DMFT, an additional self-consistency on the \(GW\)-level is performed which circumvents the full \(GW\)+DMFT self-consistency that is
computationally very demanding and has so far has only been achieved on the model level\textsuperscript{49,50}, and the simpler case of a two-dimensional systems of adatoms on surfaces\textsuperscript{51}. Since, here, we only use a one-shot GW self-energy, without a self-consistency for its nonlocal contributions, we will refer to the scheme that uses Eq. 48 as “DMFT@nonlocal-GW”.

Here we will present a proof of principle that the described scheme yields excellent results for the properties that it was designed for. Of course, the simplified DMFT@nonlocal-GW scheme is not expected to give quantitatively accurate results outside the quasi-particle energy range. In particular the dispersion of collective excitations will not be captured. However, their position in the local spectrum which is determined by the structure of the dynamic interaction $U(\omega)$ is still meaningful as seen below.

For our current material, we can further simplify the approach. Indeed, for the fully degenerate $t_{2g}$ states, the local self-energy is by symmetry a scalar (that is proportional to the $3 \times 3$ matrix). Eq. (47) then reads for each of the three orbital components

$$G_{loc}^{\text{eff}}(\epsilon) = \int \! d\omega D^{\text{eff}}(\epsilon) \frac{1}{i\omega + \mu - \epsilon - \Sigma_{\text{imp}}(\omega)} \tag{49}$$

where we have defined the density of states of the effective nonlocal-GW Hamiltonian $H^{\text{eff}}$ as

$$D^{\text{eff}}(\epsilon) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im Tr} \sum_{k} [\epsilon - H^{\text{eff}}(k) + i0^+]^{-1} \tag{50}$$

This auxiliary quantity was discussed in the GW section and plotted in Fig. 4. It contains all information on nonlocal correlations, and is double counting free when combined with the DMFT self-energy. Using this DOS with the cRPA $U(\omega)$ in the DMFT methodology yields the spectral function that is displayed in Fig. 11(a) along the usual k-path. A comparison with Fig. 5 shows a remarkable agreement with the full $GW+DMFT$ dispersion. In panel (b) is further shown the local projection of this spectral function in comparison to the full $GW+DMFT$ and the LDA+$U(\omega)+DMFT$ results. Bearing in mind the different conditions for the analytical continuation necessary to obtain these spectra, the agreement between the DMFT@nonlocal-GW and the full $GW+DMFT$ is more than satisfactory: captured are the $t_{2g}$ bandwidth, the position of the lower Hubbard band, the satellite at $+4\text{eV}$, and even the plasmon. The DMFT@nonlocal-GW, or the related $QS\text{GW}+\text{DMFT}$\textsuperscript{117} approach, are thus promising approaches when a full $GW+DMFT$ calculation is too costly.

3. Further methodological remarks

Finally, we turn to a comparison of the contributions contained in the different schemes, on the basis of the local part of the Matsubara axis self-energies $\Sigma(\omega)$, plotted in Fig. (12). The most striking feature in the comparison is the small amplitude of the standard LDA+DMFT self-energy. This can be trivially understood from the fact that only the partially screened value of the interaction, the Hubbard $U$, enters into the description. This scheme does not contain any information about the bare interaction – in contrast to all the other schemes, where it is recovered as the high-frequency limit. This information does lead to much higher characteristic energy scales in the schemes beyond LDA+DMFT, with self-energies living on the scale of the plasma energy of $\sim 15\text{eV}$.

When comparing the shape of the self-energies at low-energies, one can observe that the one for LDA+$U(\omega)+DMFT$ is slightly steeper, leading to an overestimation of the mass renormalization. The self-consistency loop in the full $GW+DMFT$ scheme leads to a relaxation of the impurity self-energy, and thus less important renormalization effects. The change is in fact quite substantial, leading to different quasi-particle weights corresponding to the different self-energies: while the local $Z$ factor for the fully self-consistent $GW+DMFT$ calculation is nearly 0.7, the LDA+DMFT calculation with dynamical $U$ yields 0.5. A non-selfconsistent calculation combining a local LDA+$U(\omega)+DMFT$ self-energy with a nonlocal-GW self-energy could therefore be expected to underestimate the bandwidth by a factor $0.7/0.5$. This may explain why a recent paper for SrVO$_3$\textsuperscript{126} using such a non-selfconsistent “[LDA+$U(\omega)+DMFT]_{\text{local}}+GW_{\text{nonlocal}}” approach finds a much narrower empty band than our $GW+DMFT$ calculations. This puts strong constraints on the design of simplified schemes: it highlights the importance of having the nonlocal correlations present in the DMFT self-consistency, as done in the DMFT@nonlocal-GW discussed above, or also in the $QS\text{GW}+\text{DMFT}$ scheme\textsuperscript{117}.

Finally, DMFT@nonlocal-GW and full $GW+DMFT$ are very close at low energies, as expected from the analysis above, but start to deviate on a scale of a few eV where the nonlocal self-energy correction on the real axis recovers some frequency-dependence. For obvious reasons, also a conceptually correct treatment of higher energy satellite features will require the use of the full $GW+DMFT$ scheme.

V. SUMMARY

We now come back to the list of physics questions on our target compound, outlined in the introductory section on SrVO$_3$:

- Reconciliation of results of DMFT and cluster model calculations in the unoccupied part of the spectra, and consistency with \textit{ab initio} $U$ values

Our finding of the IPES peak at 2.7 eV being dominantly of $e_g$ character, rather than being an up-
per Hubbard band of $t_{2g}$ character, coincides with the interpretation of cluster model calculations\textsuperscript{106}, thus reconciling DMFT with the cluster model literature. Cluster model calculations place an upper Hubbard band of $t_{2g}$ character at about 2 eV, which would be consistent with the static value of $U(\omega = 0) = 3.5$ eV. The cluster calculations, however, do not have access to the effects of the enhancement of the bare band dispersion by nonlocal exchange. Our GW+DMFT calculations reveal that the latter is in fact the dominant effect, preventing the formation of a clearly separated sharp upper Hubbard band.

- **The 2.7eV feature in BIS spectra**
  Related to the previous point, the photoemission feature at 2.7 eV is not an upper Hubbard band, but rather dominated by $e_g$ states. It would be most interesting to perform orbital-resolved inverse photoemission studies to confirm this orbital assignment.

- **Position of O2p ligand states**
  The inclusion of the GW self-energy for the “un-correlated” states, as explained in the section on the orbital-separated GW+DMFT scheme, introduces corrections on the O2p ligand states, which are pushed down in energy, improving the agreement with experiment. We note, however, that the size of the correction is not quite large enough, compared to experiment. To some extent, this could have been expected: indeed, we believe feedback effects of the Coulomb interactions on the V-d states (and their hybridization) to be important for determining the O2p position. However, such effects would only be included if an update of the GW part of the calculation were also performed. This observation thus opens important perspectives for further work.

- **Position of Sr-4d states**
  The Sr-d states are pushed up by the GW self-energy. The total O-p to Sr-d energetic distance is enhanced by about 1.25eV. Comparison with the experimental spectra shows that this correction is excellent in the unoccupied part of the spectrum. Most importantly, however, we identify a substantial broadening of the unoccupied bandwidth with respect to standard LDA+DMFT calculations. Indeed, the nonlocal part of the GW self-energy, when applied as a correction to the LDA band structure, leads to a widening by more than 40 percent. When local correlations (within DMFT with $U(\omega)$) are added, the corresponding renormalizations re-narrow the unoccupied band roughly such as to recover the original LDA bandwidth. For this reason, while being similar to the LDA+DMFT description for the occupied states, our results suggest an entirely new description for the unoccupied part of the spectrum, calling for a reinvestigation within techniques capturing empty states properties (BIS, IPES, time-resolved ARPES or similar).

### VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have implemented the combined GW+DMFT scheme in a fully dynamical manner, by treating the GW part at the one-shot level, but self-consisting over the DMFT part. Comparisons with pure LDA, pure GW, and LDA+DMFT calculations with static and dynamic interactions allow to assess the importance of the various features of these schemes, such as inclusion of dynamical screening, local and nonlocal self-energy contributions, and self-consistency.

In particular our analysis suggests that at low-energies, the dynamical self-energy contributions of GW or combined GW+DMFT schemes are strongly dominated by the local part, and that the crucial nonlocal corrections
are a purely static correction to the LDA exchange-correlation potential. This is strongly encouraging in view of the accuracy of DMFT-based schemes for correlated materials, and may allow for shortcuts when going beyond them (see e.g. the QSGW+DMFT scheme).\(^{117}\)

The calculated GW+DMFT spectral functions for \(\text{SrVO}_3\) are in good agreement with available experimental data for the occupied electronic states. In this part of the spectra, the GW+DMFT scheme only leads to a slight improvement over conventional LDA+DMFT results (provided that in the latter the dynamics of the spectra, the self-energies of correlated oxides by techniques suitable for measuring empty electronic states. Candidates could be bremsstrahl-isochromatography (BIS)/inverse photoemission, time-resolved ARPES, or more indirect probes such as resonant inelastic x-ray scattering (RIXS), optical spectroscopy, or x-ray absorption (XAS).
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A. Appendix: The \(\text{GW+DMFT} \) Equations

As discussed in Sec. II B, the GW+DMFT scheme as formulated in Refs. 55, 63, and 64 can be derived as a stationary point \((G, W)\) of the Almbladh free energy functional\(^{55}\) after approximating the correlation part of this functional by a combination of local and nonlocal terms stemming from DMFT and GW, respectively.

For reference, we here review the equations derived from this construction, leading to an iterative loop which determines \(G\) and \(U\) self-consistently (and, eventually, the full self-energy and polarization operators):

- The impurity problem (11) is solved, for a given choice of \(G^L_{LL'}\) and \(U_{\alpha\beta}\): the “impurity” Green’s function
  \[
  G^L_{\text{imp}} \equiv (T c_{L}(\tau)c_{L'}(\tau'))_{S} \tag{51}
  \]
  is calculated, together with the impurity self-energy
  \[
  \Sigma_{\text{imp}}^{\text{xc}} \equiv \delta \Psi_{\text{imp}}/\delta G_{\text{imp}} = G^{-1} - G_{\text{imp}}^{-1}. \tag{52}
  \]
  The two-particle correlation function
  \[
  \chi_{L_{1}L_{2}L_{3}L_{4}} \equiv \langle \phi_{L_{1}}(\tau)\phi_{L_{2}}(\tau) : c_{L_{3}}(\tau')c_{L_{4}}(\tau') : S \rangle \tag{53}
  \]
  must also be evaluated.

- The impurity effective interaction is constructed as follows:
  \[
  W_{\text{imp}}^{\beta\alpha} = U_{\alpha\beta} - \sum_{L_{1} \cdots L_{4}} \sum_{\gamma\delta} U_{\alpha\gamma} O^\gamma_{L_{1}L_{2}} \chi_{L_{1}L_{2}L_{3}L_{4}}[O^\delta_{L_{3}L_{4}}]^* U_{\delta\beta} \tag{54}
  \]
  where \(O^\gamma_{L_{1}L_{2}} \equiv \langle \phi_{L_{1}}\phi_{L_{2}}|B^\alpha\rangle\) is the overlap matrix between two-particle states and products of one-particle basis functions. The polarization operator of the impurity problem is then obtained as:
  \[
  P_{\text{imp}} \equiv -2\delta \Psi_{\text{imp}}/\delta W_{\text{imp}} = U^{-1} - W^{-1}_{\text{imp}}, \tag{55}
  \]
  where all matrix inversions are performed in the two-particle basis \(B^\alpha\) (see the discussion in\(^{63,64}\)).

FIG. 12. (Color online) Comparison of local \(t_{2g}\) self-energies on the Matsubara axis: usual LDA+DMFT, LDA+DMFT with dynamical interactions, DMFT@nonlocal \(GW\) and local part of full \(GW+\text{DMFT}\).
• From Eqs. (12) and (13) the full $k$-dependent Green’s function $G(k, i\omega_n)$ and effective interaction $W(q, i\nu_n)$ can be constructed. The self-consistency condition is obtained, as in the usual DMFT context, by requiring that the on-site components of these quantities coincide with $G_{\text{imp}}$ and $W_{\text{imp}}$. In practice, this is done by computing the on-site quantities

\begin{align*}
G^{\text{loc}}(i\omega_n) &= \sum_k [G_H^{\text{loc}}(k, i\omega_n) - \Sigma^{xc}(k, i\omega_n)]^{-1} \\
W^{\text{loc}}(i\nu_n) &= \sum_q [V_q^{-1} - P(q, i\nu_n)]^{-1}
\end{align*}

(56) (57)

and using them to update the Weiss dynamical mean field $G$ and the impurity model interaction $U$ according to:

\begin{align*}
G^{-1} &= G^{\text{loc}}^{-1} + \Sigma^{xc} \\
U^{-1} &= W^{\text{loc}}^{-1} + P_{\text{imp}}
\end{align*}

(58) (59)

The set of equations (51) to (59) (including (12) and (13)) is iterated until self-consistency.

This in fact means that, conceptually, there are two levels of self-consistency: the one over local quantities, for a given GW calculation, and, eventually, also the update of non-local quantities by recalculation the GW self-energies and polarisation. In real materials calculations, this full self-consistency has been only performed once so far, namely in the relatively simple case of a single-orbital system. Here, we restrict ourselves to self-consistency at the DMFT level for a given GW calculation, as discussed in the methodological sections above.
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