Properties of constraint-based single-point approximate kinetic energy functionals

V. V. Karasiev,1,2,* R. S. Jones,3 S. B. Trickey,2,8 and Frank E. Harris2,4

1Centro de Química, Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Científicas, Apartado 21827, Caracas 1020-A, Venezuela
2Quantum Theory Project, Departments of Physics and of Chemistry, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, USA
3Department of Physics, Loyola College in Maryland, 4501 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21210, USA
4Department of Physics, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84112 USA

(Received 10 September 2008; revised manuscript received 6 November 2009; published 31 December 2009)

We present an analysis and extension of our constraint-based approach to orbital-free (OF) kinetic-energy (KE) density functionals intended for the calculation of quantum-mechanical forces in multiscale molecular-dynamics simulations. Suitability for realistic system simulations requires that the OF-KE functional yield accurate forces on the nuclei yet be computationally simple. We therefore require that the functionals be based on density-functional theory constraints, be local, be dependent at most upon a small number of parameters fitted to a training set of limited size, and be applicable beyond the scope of the training set. Our previous “modified-conjoint” generalized-gradient-type functionals were constrained to producing a positive-definite Pauli potential. Though distinctly better than several published generalized-gradient-approximation-type functionals in that they gave semiquantitative agreement with Born-Oppenheimer forces from full Kohn-Sham results, those modified-conjoint functionals suffer from unphysical singularities at the nuclei. Here we show how to remove such singularities by introducing higher-order density derivatives and analyze the consequences. We give a simple illustration of such a functional and a few tests of it.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Simulation of the structure and properties of complicated materials is a demanding task, particularly away from equilibrium, for example, in the simultaneous presence of solvents and mechanical stress. Though the present results are not limited to it, our motivating problem has been tensile fracture of silica in the presence of water.

For such problems, quantum-mechanical treatment of the reactive zone is essential at least at the level of realistic Born-Oppenheimer (B-O) forces to drive an otherwise classical molecular-dynamics (MD) or molecular mechanics (MM) calculation. Computational cost then leads to a nested-region strategy. Internuclear forces in the reactive zone are obtained from an explicitly quantum-mechanical treatment. Forces between other nuclei are calculated from classical potentials.

Forces between other nuclei are calculated from classical potentials. Such partitioning is called multiscale simulation in the computational materials community and QM/MM methodology in computational molecular biology.

The QM calculation is the computationally rate-limiting step. QM approximations good enough yet computationally fast on the scale of the MD algorithms are therefore critical. Both the inherent form and the growing dominance of density-functional theory (DFT) for describing molecular, biomolecular, and materials systems make it a reasonable candidate QM. Despite advances in pseudopotentials and order-N approximations, however, solution of the DFT Kohn-Sham (KS) problem is too slow computationally to be fully satisfactory. An alternative, Car-Parrinello dynamics,1 does not guarantee that the motion is restricted to the B-O energy surface.

Thus, there is continuing need for methods which yield essentially full DFT accuracy at significantly lower computational cost. In response, we and co-workers proposed and demonstrated a graded sequence of approximations2 scheme. Its essence is use of a simple classical potential for the majority of MD steps, with periodic correction by calibration to forces obtained from more accurate but slower methods. An example graded sequence of approximations would be as follows: (1) classical potential; (2) simple reactive (charge redistribution) potential;3–5 (3) orbital-free (OF) DFT, the subject of this paper; (4) quasi-spin-density DFT (Ref. 6) (a way to approximate spin-dependent effects at the cost of non-spin-polarized KS-DFT); (5) full spin-polarized DFT (the level of refinement ultimately required for bond breaking).

In this hierarchy, a large gap in computational cost separates reactive potentials and quasi-spin-density DFT. Since the cost of conventional KS calculations comes from solving for the KS orbitals, an obvious candidate to fill the gap is listed: OF-DFT. The long-standing barrier is a lack of an effective OF approximation to the kinetic energy (KE). Background and a description of our first OF-KE functionals were reported in a paper addressed to the computational materials science community,7 with a more didactic survey in Ref. 8. The present analysis focuses on identifying the causes of limitations of those functionals and ways to eliminate those limitations.

II. BACKGROUND AND BASICS

Construction of an accurate, explicit, total electronic kinetic energy density functional $T[n] = \langle \Psi | \hat{T} | \Psi \rangle$ for a many-electron system in state $| \Psi \rangle$ with electron number density $n$ is an unresolved task.9–11 The Coulomb virial theorem suggests that the task is equivalent to seeking the total energy functional itself. The Kohn-Sham KE is thus a more attractive target for multiple reasons. Of course, the appeal of OF-DFT predates modern DFT, as witness the Thomas-Fermi-Dirac12,13 and von Weizsäcker14 models.
There has been considerable activity more recently. A review with extensive references is given in Ref. 15. Other relevant work is that of Carter and co-workers; a helpful review with many references is Ref. 16. More recent developments include, for example, Refs. 17–22 as well as our own work already cited.

Distinct from most other recent efforts, our approach is to construct one-point, i.e., local, approximate KE functionals specifically for MD computations. We insist on constraint-based forms and parameters, that is, satisfaction of known exact results for positivity, scaling, and the like. We are willing, as needed, to simplify the search by requiring only that the functional give adequate interatomic forces, not total energies (and certainly not KS band structures nor general linear response).

To summarize basics and set notation, the Kohn-Sham kinetic energy $T_k$, the major contribution to $T$, is defined in terms of the KS orbitals (Hartree atomic units unless otherwise noted):

$$T_k[n] = \sum_{\alpha} \int \phi_{\alpha}^*(\mathbf{r}) \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \right] \phi_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r} = \int t_{\text{orb}}(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r}. \quad (1)$$

Although $T_k > 0$, $t_{\text{orb}}$ is not necessarily greater than zero. It is preferable, therefore, to use the equivalent form

$$t_s = t_{\text{orb}} + \frac{1}{4} \nabla^2 n, \quad (2)$$

which is positive definite.\(^{24}\)

The remainder, $T - T_k$, is included in the exchange-correlation (XC) functional $E_{\text{xc}}[n]$. Since successful $E_{\text{xc}}$ approximations assume this KS KE decomposition, we focus on $T_k$. This approach also evades the formidable task associated with the full $T[n]$ just mentioned.

For $T_k[n]$ an explicit functional of $n$, the DFT total energy functional is orbital-free:

$$E_{\text{OF-DFT}}[n] = T_k[n] + E_{\text{NC}}[n] + E_{\text{RI}}[n] + E_{\text{xc}}[n] + E_{\text{NN}}, \quad (3)$$

Here $E_{\text{NC}}[n]$ is the nuclear-electron interaction energy functional, $E_{\text{RI}}[n]$ is the Hartree functional (classical electron-electron repulsion), and $E_{\text{NN}}$ is the internuclear repulsion. Then the variational principle gives the single Euler equation

$$\frac{\delta T_s[n]}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})} + v_{\text{KS}}[n](\mathbf{r}) = \mu, \quad (4)$$

where $\mu$ is the Lagrange multiplier for density normalization $\int n(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r} = N$ at the nuclear configuration $\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \ldots$, and $v_{\text{KS}} = \delta E_{\text{xc}} + E_{\text{RI}} + E_{\text{NC}} / \partial n$. The force on nucleus $I$ at $\mathbf{R}_I$ is simply

$$F_I = -\nabla_{\mathbf{R}_I} E_{\text{OF-DFT}} = -\nabla_{\mathbf{R}_I} E_{\text{NC}} - \int n(\mathbf{r}) \nabla_{\mathbf{R}_I} \nabla_{\mathbf{R}_I} n(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r}$$

$$- \int \left[ \frac{\delta T_s[n]}{\delta n(\mathbf{r})} + v_{\text{KS}}[n](\mathbf{r}) \right] \nabla_{\mathbf{R}_I} n(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r}. \quad (5)$$

The third term in Eq. (5) shows that the biggest error in the calculated force will come from the gradient of the approximate $T_s[n]$ functional, because the kinetic energy is an order of magnitude larger than the magnitude of $E_{\text{xc}}$ (which also must be approximated in practice). As will be discussed, when the development of approximate KE functionals focuses on forces, it is convenient to use Eq. (5) with number density $n(\mathbf{r})$ from a conventional KS calculation (with a specific approximate $E_{\text{xc}}$) as input.

In constructing approximate functionals it is quite common to begin with the Thomas-Fermi (TF) functional\(^{12,13}\)

$$T_{\text{TF}}[n] = c_0 \int n^{5/3}(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r} = \int t_\theta(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r}, \quad (6)$$

By itself, the TF functional is not an acceptable approximation, because of, for example, the Teller nonbinding theorem.\(^{25}\) A more productive route for our purposes is to decompose $T_{\text{TF}}[n]$ into the von Weizsäcker energy $T_{\text{W}},$\(^{14}\) plus a non-negative remainder, known as the Pauli term $T_{\theta}$\(^{26–29}\)

$$T_s[n] = T_{\text{W}}[n] + T_{\theta}[n], \quad T_{\theta}[n] \geq 0, \quad (7)$$

with

$$T_{\text{W}}[n] = \frac{1}{8} \int \frac{[\nabla n(\mathbf{r})]^2}{n(\mathbf{r})} d^3\mathbf{r} = \int t_{\text{W}}[n(\mathbf{r})] d^3\mathbf{r}. \quad (8)$$

As analyzed in detail below, the non-negativity of $T_{\theta}$ and $t_\theta(\mathbf{r})$ defined by

$$T_{\theta} = \int t_\theta(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r},$$

$$t_\theta := t_s - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 \sqrt{n} \quad (9)$$

is a crucial but not sufficient condition for determining a realistic OF-KE approximation.\(^3\) Details of the consequences of enforcing that condition are a focus of this paper.

### III. GGA-TYPE KE FUNCTIONALS AND THEIR LIMITATIONS

#### A. Basic structure

Pursuit of single-point approximations for $t_s(\mathbf{r})$\(^{=t_{\text{W}}[n(\mathbf{r})], \nabla n(\mathbf{r})} + t_\theta[\mathbf{r}, \nabla n(\mathbf{r}), \ldots]$ stimulates consideration of a counterpart to the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) for XC,\(^{30}\) namely,

$$T_{s[GGA]}[n] = c_0 \int n^{5/3}(\mathbf{r}) F_s[s(\mathbf{r})] d^3\mathbf{r}. \quad (10)$$

Here $s$ is a dimensionless reduced density gradient

$$s = \frac{[\nabla n]}{2nk_F}, \quad k_F = (3\pi^2n)^{1/3}. \quad (11)$$

$F_s$ is a kinetic energy enhancement factor which goes to unity for uniform density. Equation (10) is motivated in part by the
conjointness conjecture,\textsuperscript{31} which posits that $F_{x}(s) \propto F_{x}(s)$, where $F_{x}$ is the enhancement factor in GGA exchange. We showed previously that this relationship cannot hold strictly,\textsuperscript{7} but the form is suggestive and useful.

For connection with $T_{\theta} \geq 0$, we re-express $T_{W}$ in a form parallel with Eq. (10). From Eqs. (7), (8), and (11),

$$T_{W}[n] = c_{0} \int n^{5/3}(r) \frac{5}{3} s^{2}(r) d^{3}r,$$  \hfill (12)

$$T_{s}^{\text{GGA}}[n] = T_{W}[n] + c_{0} \int n^{5/3}(r) F_{\theta}(s(r)) d^{3}r,$$  \hfill (13)

where

$$F_{\theta}(s) = F_{\theta}(s) - \frac{5}{3} s^{2}. \hfill (14)$$

The final term of Eq. (13) thus is a formal representation of the GGA Pauli term $T_{s}^{\text{GGA}}$. Note that the form of Eq. (13) automatically preserves proper uniform scaling of $T_{s}$ (see Ref. \textsuperscript{32}):

$$T_{s}[n_{s}] = \gamma T_{s}[n],$$  \hfill (15)

$$n_{s}(r) = \gamma n(\gamma r).$$

Constraints that must be satisfied by the enhancement factors associated with any satisfactory GGA KE functional include

$$t_{\theta}[n;r] \geq 0, \hfill (16)$$

as well as \textsuperscript{29,33,34}

$$\nu_{\theta}[n;r] = \delta T_{\theta}[n]/\delta n(r) \geq 0, \quad \forall \quad r.$$  \hfill (17)

The quantity $\nu_{\theta}$ is known as the Pauli potential. Constraint Eq. (16) implies the non-negativity of the GGA enhancement factor, $F_{\theta}(s[r]) \geq 0$.

For a slowly varying density that is not itself small, we have $s \approx 0$, and it is appropriate to write $T_{s}$ as a gradient expansion:\textsuperscript{35}

$$T_{s}[n] = T_{\text{FF}}[n] + \frac{1}{9} T_{W}[n] + \text{higher-order terms}. \hfill (18)$$

Truncation at second order in $s$ gives the second-order gradient approximation (SGA), with the SGA enhancement factor\textsuperscript{36}

$$F_{t}^{\text{SGA}}(s) = 1 + \frac{5}{9} s^{2} = 1 + \frac{5}{27} s^{2} \hfill (19)$$

or

$$F_{\theta}^{\text{SGA}}(s) = 1 - \frac{40}{27} s^{2}. \hfill (20)$$

These forms should be exhibited by the exact functional in the limit of small density variation. (Though there are $s \rightarrow \infty$ constraints,\textsuperscript{11} we have not used them so far.)

For GGA functionals, $\nu_{\theta}$, Eq. (17), can be written\textsuperscript{36,37} as

$$\frac{\partial T_{\theta}^{\text{GGA}}}{\partial n(r)} = \frac{\partial T_{\theta}[n(r),\nabla n(r)]}{\partial n(r)} - \nabla \cdot \frac{\partial T_{\theta}[n(r),\nabla n(r)]}{\partial \nabla n(r)}. \hfill (21)$$

After some tedium, one finds

$$\nu_{\theta}^{\text{GGA}} = \frac{5}{3} c_{0} \delta^{3/2} F_{\theta} + c_{0} \delta^{5/3} \frac{\partial F_{\theta}}{\partial s} \left[ \frac{5}{3} \frac{\partial s}{\partial n} - \frac{5}{3} \frac{\partial s}{\partial n} - \nabla \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial \nabla n} \right]$$

$$- c_{0} \delta^{5/3} \frac{\partial^{2} F_{\theta}}{\partial s^{2}} \left( \nabla s \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial \nabla n} \right). \hfill (22)$$

[The last line was omitted in Eq. (34) of Ref. 7 but included in the actual numerical work.] A somewhat cleaner expression that also facilitates understanding the extension presented below comes from shifting to the variable $s^{2}$ and defining both the reduced Laplacian density $p$,

$$p = \frac{\nabla^{2} n}{(2\epsilon_{F})^{3/2}} = \frac{\nabla^{2} n}{(3\pi^{2})^{3/4} n^{3/2}},$$  \hfill (23)

and one of the various possible dimensionless fourth-order derivatives $q$,

$$q = \frac{\nabla n \cdot (\nabla n) \cdot \nabla n}{(2\epsilon_{F})^{4} n^{4}} = \frac{\nabla n \cdot (\nabla n) \cdot \nabla n}{16(3\pi^{2})^{2} n^{13/4}}. \hfill (24)$$

(Not that our $s^{2}$, $p$ correspond to $p$, $q$, respectively, in Ref. 19.) Then Eq. (22) becomes

$$\nu_{\theta}^{\text{GGA}}(s^{2}) = c_{0} \delta^{3/2} F_{\theta} - \left( \frac{2}{3} s^{2} + 2p \right) \frac{\partial F_{\theta}}{\partial s^{2}}$$

$$+ \left\{ \frac{16}{3} s^{4} - 4q \right\} \frac{\partial F_{\theta}}{\partial (s^{2})^{2}}. \hfill (25)$$

See Appendix A for details.

\section*{B. Singularities}

Near a point nucleus of charge $Z$ at the origin, the number density behaves to first order in $r$ as

$$n(r) \sim (1 - 2Z |r|) + O(|r|^2), \hfill (26)$$

as required by Kato's cusp condition.\textsuperscript{38-42} Sufficiently close to a nucleus, therefore, $n(r)$ behaves as a hydrogenlike $1s$-electron density

$$n_{p}(r) \sim \exp(-2Z |r|). \hfill (27)$$

That is, the variation in $n'(r)/n(r)$ is equal for these densities sufficiently close to the nucleus, hence, the form in Eq. (27) is a reasonable near-nucleus approximation.\textsuperscript{43} Consequences of differences in the higher-order terms in the respective Taylor expansions of actual and hydrogenic $1s$ densities are discussed in Sec. IV A. See Refs. 29 and 44 for related discussions.

For $n(r)$ of the form of Eq. (27) at $r \rightarrow 0$, $s$ and $q$ remain finite while $\rho \rightarrow -4Z/(2\epsilon_{F})^{2} r$. In this case, Eq. (25) becomes
If $s^2$ is sufficiently small that it is a good approximation to write $F_{\theta}^{\text{GGA}} \approx 1 + a s^2$ (note that this is exactly the form of $F_{\theta}^{\text{SGA}}$), Eq. (28) simplifies to

$$v_{\theta}^{\text{GGA}}(r \to 0) = \frac{3aZ}{5r} + \text{nonsingular terms},$$

in which case $v_{\theta}^{\text{GGA}}$ tends to infinity at the nuclei with the same sign as the GGA parameter $a$. The small values of $s^2$ at the nuclei make this a general phenomenon. [Near typical nuclei ($r \to 0$), numerical experience shows that $s^2 \approx 0.15$, so that the small-$s^2$ behavior of any $F_{\theta}^{\text{GGA}}$ of GGA form is relevant there.]

Equation (29) shows that purely GGA Pauli potentials have singularities in the vicinity of nuclear sites. In contrast, calculations using KS quantities as inputs show that the exact Pauli potential is finite at the nuclei (see, for example, Ref. 27 as well as Fig. 2). Moreover, the positivity requirement for $v_{\theta}$ will certainly be violated near the nuclei both for $F_{\theta}^{\text{GGA}}$ and for any GGA form with $a < 0$.

### C. Positivity: tests and enforcement

To assess these positivity constraints, we tested six published KE functionals that either are strictly conjoint or are based closely on conjointness. The test used the diatomic molecule SiO, an important reference species for us. With local-density approximation (LDA) XC, we did a conventional orbital-dependent KS calculation as a function of bond length (details are in Appendix B). At each bond length, the converged KS density was used as input to the orbital-free $E[n]$ corresponding to one of the six $T_s[n]$ approximations. None of the six gave a stable SiO molecule. All six produced $a \approx 0$ in Eq. (29); hence, all six have nontrivial violations of $v_{\theta}$ positivity. In fact, all the effective enhancement factors are very close to that of the SGA, $F_{\theta}(s) = 1 - 40/27 s^2$. Details are in Refs. 7 and 8. Because of the constraint violation, conjointness can at most be a guide.

We enforced positivity of $v_{\theta}^{\text{GGA}}$ by particular parametrization of two $F_{\theta}(s)$ forms. One is based on the Perdew, Burke, and Ernzerhof (PBE) (Ref. 46) GGA XC form

$$F_{\theta}^{\text{PBE}}(s) = 1 + \frac{1}{\nu - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{\nu-1} C_i \left( \frac{s^2}{1 + \nu s^2} \right)^i, \quad \nu = 2,3,4,$$

$$F_{\theta}^{\text{exp}}(s) = C_1(1 - e^{a_1 s^2}) + C_2(1 - e^{a_2 s^2}).$$

Our PBE2 form is identical (but with different parameters) to the form used by Tran and Wesolowski. Our PBE3 corresponds to the form introduced by Adamo and Barone, but again, with different parameters. Quite similar forms also were explored by King and Handy in the context of directly fitting a KS potential kinetic $v_{\theta} = \delta T_{\theta}/\delta n$ to conventional KS eigenvalues and orbitals; see Eq. (34) below.

We fitted the parameters in the enhancement factors, Eq. (30), to match the conventional KS internuclear forces for various nuclear configurations of a three-molecule training set: SiO, H2SiO3, and H2SiO4. With conventional KS densities as input, we found semiquantitative agreement with the conventional KS calculations for single bond stretching in H2SiO3, H2Si2O7, H2O, CO, and N2. All had energy minima within 5%–20% of the conventional KS equilibrium bond-length values. The latter two molecules were particularly encouraging, since no data on C or N was included in the parametrization. Details, including parameter values, are in Ref. 7.

### D. Analysis of fitted functional behavior

Despite this progress, there is a problem. Although the PBE and exp4 forms give Pauli potentials that are everywhere positive, yielding $a > 0$ in Eq. (29), they are singular at the nuclei, in contrast to the negative singularities of previously published forms. For clarity about the developments which follow, observe that these nuclear-site singularities occur in $v_{\theta}$, hence, are distinct from the intrinsic nuclear-site singularity of the von Weizsäcker potential, which by operation on Eq. (8) can be shown to be

$$v_{\text{W}} = \frac{\delta T_{\text{W}}(n)}{\delta n(r)} = \frac{1}{8} \frac{\nabla^2 n}{n^2} - \frac{2\nabla n}{n}.$$

The intrinsic singularity of $v_{\text{W}}$ near a nucleus follows from Eq. (26) as

$$v_{\text{W}} = -\frac{2Z}{r}.$$

Insight regarding the behavior of our modified-conjoint functionals can be gained from consideration of the energy density $dT_{\theta}^{\text{approx}}(s)/ds$ as a function of $s$ for various functionals indicated by the generic superscript “approx.” This quantity comes from differentiation of the integrated contribution $T_{\theta}^{\text{approx}}(s)$ of the region $s(r) \leq s$ to the kinetic energy:

$$T_{\theta}^{\text{approx}}(s) = \int_{s(r) \leq s} t_{\theta}^{\text{approx}}(n; r) d^3 r = \int_0^s ds \int_{s(r) \leq s} t_{\theta}^{\text{approx}}(n; r) \delta[s - s(r)] d^3 r.$$

Figure 1 shows $dT_{\theta}^{\text{approx}}(s)/ds$ for the SiO molecule at bond length $R = 1.926$ Å (slightly stretched). Values are shown for the PBE2 parametrization (that respects positivity), the Tran-Wesolowski parametrization of the same form (PBE-TW), and for the exact orbital-dependent KS Pauli term calculated from $t_{\theta}^{\text{KS}}$.
FIG. 1. Energy density contributions to the Pauli term $T_\theta$ as a function of $s$ presented as values of $dT_\theta(s)/ds$ from Eq. (33); shown are conventional Kohn-Sham $dT_\theta^{KS}(s)/ds$ (the reference), our PBE2 functional, and the older PBE-TW GGA functional. Data are for the SiO diatomic molecule at bond length 1.926 Å and are based on the density from fully numerical KS-LDA computations.

FIG. 2. (Color online) Conventional (reference) KS values for electronic density (scaled by the factor $4\pi(|z|−R/2)^2$, with $R$ the internuclear distance), Pauli term $t_{\theta}$, Pauli potential $v_{\theta}$, and enhancement factor $F_\theta$ calculated for points on the internuclear axis using KS-LDA fully numerical orbitals for the SiO molecule; Si at $(0,0,0.963)$ Å, O at $(0,0,0.963)$ Å.

A conventional GGA PBE-TW functional has a spurious minimum at this point. Moreover, the PBE-TW Pauli term goes negative for all $s > 0.82$. In addition, Fig. 1 shows that the KS kinetic energy is nearly totally determined by the behavior of $F_\theta$ over a relatively small range of $s$, approximately $0.26 \leq s \leq 1.30$ for the SiO diatomic. The asymptotic regions ($s → 0$ and $s → \infty$) do not play a significant role. The range $0.26 \leq s \leq 0.9$ has the highest weight of contribution (the highest differential contribution). As an aside, we surmise that PBE2 overestimates the KE because it was fitted purely to forces without regard to total energies.

Figures 2–4 provide comparisons of the reference $t_\theta^{KS}$, $v_\theta^{KS}$, and $F_\theta^{KS}$ (where $F_\theta^{KS} = t_\theta^{KS}/c_{\theta}^{\beta/3}$) with the corresponding quantities for the PBE-TW and PBE2 approximations. The values are along the internuclear axis of the SiO molecule with internuclear separation 1.926 Å. The KS Pauli potential was calculated using the exact orbital-dependent expression

$$v_\theta([n];\mathbf{r}) = \frac{t_\theta([n];\mathbf{r})}{n(\mathbf{r})} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\varepsilon_N - \varepsilon_i) \frac{|\phi_i(\mathbf{r})|^2}{n(\mathbf{r})},$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)$$

where $\phi_i$ and $\varepsilon_i$ are the occupied KS orbitals and eigenvalues, respectively. Equation (35) is obtained in a way similar to that used in Ref. 29; see Ref. 8.

In Fig. 2, all three KS quantities, $t_\theta^{KS}$, $v_\theta^{KS}$, and $F_\theta^{KS}$ are everywhere non-negative, as they must. Observe that $v_\theta^{KS}$ is finite at the nuclei and has local maxima at positions close to the internuclear minima of the electronic density.

In contrast, the energy density of the PBE-TW Pauli term and corresponding enhancement factor have negative peaks in the internuclear regions, violations of the non-negativity constraint for $t_\theta$. However, addition to $v_\theta^{approx}$ of any multiple of a Laplacian term $\nabla^2 n$ would change only the local behavior without altering the value of $T_\theta^{approx}$, so the PBE-TW misbehavior might be resolved by such an addition. See discussion below. Figure 3 also shows that $v_\theta$ for the PBE-TW functional has very sharp negative peaks exactly at the nuclear positions in accord with Eq. (29).

Figure 4 shows that the modified-conjoint PBE2 $v_\theta$ respects the positivity constraint everywhere. Internuclear forces in the attractive region are described at least qualitatively correctly as a result. The PBE2 potential is still divergent at the nuclei in accordance with Eq. (29).

There are two small computational side issues. First, the absence of nuclear-site singularities in the computed correct Pauli potentials $v_\theta^{KS}$ might be argued to occur because the computed density does not have precisely the proper nuclear-site cusp, i.e., does not strictly obey Eq. (26). However, our numerical results are consistent with those in Ref. 27. Those authors used numerical orbitals which presumably satisfied the cusp condition approximately. More importantly, if a specific numerical technique gives a KS density and associated KS $t_\theta$ that produce a nonsingular $v_\theta^{approx}$, then an approximate $v_\theta$ evaluated with the same density should not introduce singularities. Second, the reader may notice that Fig. 4 shows small negative values for $t_\theta$ far from the bonding region of the molecule. This behavior seems to arise from numerical instability associated with fitting for small values of the density. In any event, those negative values make no appreciable contribution to the kinetic energy.

Finally, an insight to the harm of excess positivity of $v_\theta$ can be seen by examining the dependence of $T_\theta[n]$ upon $v_\theta$. From a known virial relation we have

$$T_\theta[n] = \int v_\theta([n];\mathbf{r})(3 + \mathbf{r} \cdot \nabla)n(\mathbf{r})d^3\mathbf{r}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)$$

Any spurious singularities of $v_\theta^{approx}$ at the nuclei clearly will cause special problems in overweighting the integrand.
IV. BEYOND GGA-TYPE FUNCTIONALS

The preceding analysis makes clear the need for more flexible functionals than the forms of Eq. (30). In particular, nuclear-site divergences of \( v_\theta \) are unavoidable for all purely GGA-type functionals, e.g., GGA, GGA-conjoint, and modified-conjoint KE functionals; recall Eqs. (28) and (29). Additional variables and constraints upon them are required to eliminate the singularities.

A. Reduced derivatives of the density

Consider again the gradient expansion of \( T_s[n] \), Eq. (18) (see Refs. 35 and 53–55 for details), recast as

\[
T_s[n] = \int \{ t_0([n];r) + t_2([n];r) + t_4([n];r) + \cdots \} d^3r.
\]

Here \( t_0 \) is as in Eq. (6), \( t_2 = (1/9)t_W \), and

FIG. 3. (Color online) As in Fig. 2 for the PBE-TW conjoint approximation. Lower left panel: region near Si center; lower right panel: region near O center.

FIG. 4. (Color online) As in Fig. 2 for the PBE2 modified-conjoint approximation.
The sixth-order term, dependent on \( n, |\nabla n|, \nabla^2 n, |\nabla^3 n| \), and \( \nabla^4 n \), is given in Ref. 53.

Once again, in a finite system (e.g., molecule), a Laplacian-dependent term \( \nabla^2 n \) affects only the local behavior of the kinetic energy density. Arguments have been advanced for and against including such Laplacian dependence in the KE density functional; for example, see Refs. 24, 51, 55, and 56. Recently Perdew and Constantin\(^{19}\) presented a KE density functional that depends on \( \nabla^4 n \) via a modified fourth-order gradient expansion. Though not stated as such, their functional obeys the decomposition of Eq. (7). It is intended to be universal (or at least very broadly applicable), whereas we are focused on simpler functionals that may require parametrization to families of systems. The Perdew-Constantin form involves a rather complicated functional interpolation between the gradient expansion and the von Weizsäcker functional. They did not discuss the corresponding potential \( v_n \) nor Born-Opennheimer forces and they characterized the performance of their functional for the energetics of small molecule dissociation as “still not accurate enough for chemical applications.” So we proceed rather differently.

Rearrange the foregoing gradient expansion into \( T_w + T_\theta \) form [recall Eq. (7)]:

\[
T_\theta[n] = \frac{1}{540(3\pi^2)^{2/3}} \left[ \nabla^2 n(r) \right] \left( 1 - \frac{40}{27} s^2 + t_4 + t_6 + \cdots \right) d^3 r
\]

\[
= \int \left[ t_0((n);r) - \frac{5}{3} s^2 \right] + t_4 + t_6 + \cdots \right] d^3 r
\]

\[
= \int \left[ t_0^{(0)}([n];r) + t_0^{(1)}([n];r) + t_0^{(2)}([n];r) + \cdots \right] d^3 r,
\]

where

\[
t_0^{(0)}([n];r) = t_0([n];r) \left[ 1 - \frac{5}{3} s^2 \right],
\]

\[
t_0^{(1)}([n];r) = t_0([n];r) \left[ \frac{5}{27} s^2 \right],
\]

and

\[
t_0^{(2)}([n];r) = t_0([n];r) \left[ \frac{8}{81} \left( p^2 - \frac{9}{8} s^2 p + \frac{1}{3} s^4 \right) \right].
\]

Each term, Eqs. (40)–(42), of Eq. (39) can be put straightforwardly into a GGA-like form:

\[
t_0^{(2)}([n];r) = t_0([n];r) F_\theta^{(2)}(s,p,\ldots),
\]

(43)

where \( s, p \) are as in Eqs. (11) and (23), respectively. The first two terms of the expansion yield the SGA enhancement factor already discussed,

\[
F_{\text{SGA}} = F_\theta^{(0)} + F_\theta^{(2)} = 1 + a_3 s^2,
\]

(44)

with \( a_3 = -40/27 \). The fourth-order (in highest power of \( s \)) term is

\[
F_\theta^{(4)} = a_4 s^4 + b_2 p^2 + c_{21} s^2 p,
\]

(45)

with coefficients \( a_4 = 8/243, b_2 = 8/81, \) and \( c_{21} = -1/9 \).

Rather than retain those values of \( a_2, a_4, b_2, \) and \( c_{21}, \) we instead treat them as parameters and seek values or relationships among them which would yield a nonsingular \( v_\theta \) through a given order. (Corresponding improvement of Thomas-Fermi theory by imposition of the nuclear cusp condition was introduced in Ref. 57.)

Functional differentiation of each term in Eq. (39) gives the formal gradient expansion \( v_\theta = v_\theta^{(0)} + v_\theta^{(1)} + v_\theta^{(2)} + \cdots \), where \( F_\theta^{(2)} \) (shown below with its arguments suppressed for clarity) is a function of \( s^2, p, \) and in principle, higher derivatives of \( n(r) \):

\[
v_\theta^{(2)}(r) = t_0([n];r)
\times \left[ \frac{5}{3 n(r)} F_\theta^{(2)} + \frac{\partial F_\theta^{(2)}}{\partial \beta}(s^2) \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial n(r)} + \frac{\partial F_\theta^{(2)}}{\partial p}(p^2) \frac{\partial p}{\partial n(r)} + \cdots \right]
\]

\[
- \nabla \cdot t_0([n];r) \frac{\partial F_\theta^{(2)}}{\partial s^2} \frac{\partial s^2}{\partial n(r)}
\]

\[
+ \nabla^2 t_0([n];r) \frac{\partial F_\theta^{(2)}}{\partial p} \frac{\partial p}{\partial \nabla^2 n(r)} + \cdots.
\]

(46)

The ellipses in Eq. (46) correspond to additional terms that are needed only if \( F_\theta^{(2)} \) depends upon derivatives other than \( s \) and \( p \).

After manipulation (see Appendix A), one obtains the potentials corresponding to the enhancement factors in Eqs. (44) and (45):

\[
v_\theta^{\text{SGA}} = c_0 n^{2/3} \left[ \frac{5}{3} + a_3 s^2 - 2 a_2 p \right],
\]

(47)

\[
v_\theta^{(4)} = c_0 n^{2/3} \left[ \left( 11 a_4 + \frac{88}{9} c_{21} \right) s^4 - (5 b_2 + 2 c_{21}) p^2 - 2 b_2 q' \right]
\]

\[
+ 2 b_2 q'' + 2 c_{21} q''' \].
\]

(48)

Here \( q \) is as in Eq. (24) and \( q', q'', \) and \( q''' \) are other dimensionless fourth-order reduced density derivatives defined as

\[
q' = \frac{\nabla n \cdot \nabla^2 n}{(2 k_F)^n} = \frac{\nabla n \cdot \nabla^2 n}{16 (3 \pi^2)^{1/3} n^{10/3}},
\]

(49)
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\[ q'' = \frac{\nabla^4 n}{(2k_F)^4 n} = \frac{\nabla^2 n}{16(3\pi^2)^{4/3} r^{7/3}}, \]  
(50)

\[ q'' = \frac{\nabla \nabla_n \nabla_n \nabla_n n}{(2k_F)^4 n^2} = \frac{\nabla \nabla_n \nabla_n n}{16(3\pi^2)^{4/3} n^{10/3}}. \]  
(51)

The operation denoted by the colon in the numerators of \( q'' \) is \( A : B = \sum_i A_i B_{ji} \).

At Eq. (28) we have already pointed out that an enhancement factor of SGA form, specifically, that of Eq. (44), produces a Pauli potential

\[ v_{\phi}^{\text{SGA}}(r) = v_{\phi}^{(0)}(r) + v_{\phi}^{(2)}(r) = \frac{3Za_2}{r} + \text{nonsingular terms}. \]  
(52)

This exhibits the \( 1/r \) SGA Pauli potential nuclear singularity already discussed; we return to this point in a moment.

For the fourth-order enhancement factor, Eq. (45), we again note that \( s \) and \( q \) are nonsingular near the nucleus, while

\[ \lim_{r \to 0} s^2(r) = Z^2/[3\pi^2 n(0)]^{2/3}. \]  
(53)

With a density of the form of Eq. (27), Eq. (48) thus gives the near-nucleus behavior of the fourth-order potential as

\[ v_{\phi}^{(4)}(r) = \frac{c_0}{16[9\pi^2 n(r)]^{2/3}} \left[ -\frac{16Z^2}{3r^2} (5b_2 + 3c_{21}) + \frac{16Z^2}{9r} (18a_4 \right. \]
\[ + (18b_4 + 18c_{21}) \left. \right] + \text{nonsingular terms}. \]  
(54)

The singularities in \( 1/r^2 \) and \( 1/r \) can be removed by requiring that the numerators of the first two terms of Eq. (54) both vanish. This is equivalent to imposition of constraints on the coefficients, namely,

\[ c_{21} = \frac{5}{3} b_2, \]
\[ a_4 = \frac{13}{18} b_2. \]  
(55)

In the spirit of the GGA, we are led to defining a fourth-order reduced density derivative (RDD) as

\[ \kappa_4 = s^4 + \frac{18}{13} p^2 - \frac{30}{13} \bar{p}. \]  
(56)

This RDD with Eq. (45) gives an enhancement factor

\[ F_{\phi}^{(4)}(\kappa_4) = a_4 \kappa_4, \]  
(57)

which yields a Pauli potential with \( \text{finite} \) values at point nuclei. Clearly it is not the only \( \kappa_4 \)-dependent enhancement factor with that property. So, we seek \( F_{\phi}^{(4)}(\kappa_4) \) functional forms which are more general than Eq. (57) and which give a positive-definite nonsingular \( v_{\phi} \). A few examples were given in Ref. 8.

At this point, it is prudent to consider how many terms in the Taylor series expansion of the density Eq. (27) are relevant for the cancellation of singularities in Eq. (54). The answer is four terms: \( n(r) \propto 1 - 2Zr + 2Z^2r^2 - (4/3)Z^2r^3 \). That is, the singularities will reappear for a density of the form of Eq. (26) if the second- and third-order terms differ from those defined by a hydrogenlike density expansion, e.g., Eq. (27). Thus, the foregoing cancellation fails for a density with power series expansion \( n(r) \propto 1 - 2Zr - (4/3)Z^2r^3 + \cdots \). This fact will limit applications of simple \( \kappa_4 \)-based KE functionals to those densities which have precisely hydrogenlike behavior up to fourth order.

It is necessary, therefore, to consider other candidates for RDD variables which would provide cancellation of singularities for the density Eq. (26) independently of hydrogenic higher-order terms in the Taylor series expansion of the density. The observation that \( \kappa_4 \sim O(\nabla^4) \) suggests that the effective or operational order of \( \nabla \) in such a candidate variable should be reduced to second order. This in turn suggests a candidate variable, still based on the fourth-order gradient expansion Eq. (42), namely,

\[ F_{\phi}^{(4-2)} = \bar{u}_4 s^4 + b_2 p^2 + c_{21} \bar{p}. \]  
(58)

[compare Eq. (45)]. Now consider a density of the form of Eq. (26) but with arbitrary first- and higher-order near-nucleus expansion coefficients,

\[ n(r) \sim (1 + C_1 r + C_2 r^2 + C_3 r^3). \]  
(59)

Following the same lines as those used to reach Eq. (54), one finds

\[ v_{\phi}^{(4-2)}(r) \sim \frac{c_{21}}{\sqrt{b_2}} \frac{1}{r} + \text{nonsingular terms}. \]  
(60)

The singular term would be eliminated by the choice \( c_{21} = 0 \). The cancellation is universal in that it does not depend on the density expansion coefficients, \( C_4 \) (while the singular term prefactor and nonsingular terms do, of course, depend on those expansion coefficients). Hence a candidate RDD variable (denoted as \( \tilde{\kappa}_4 \)) which provides cancellation of singular terms in the Pauli potential could be defined as

\[ \tilde{\kappa}_4 = \sqrt{s^4 + b_2 p^2}, \quad b_2 > 0. \]  
(61)

Note that this form is manifestly positive.

This RDD can be used to construct a variety of enhancement factors to replace Eq. (45) for the fourth-order approximation to the Pauli term, for example, \( F_{\phi}(\tilde{\kappa}_4) = u_4 \tilde{\kappa}_4 \). This simplest enhancement factor corresponds to a Pauli potential with \( \text{finite} \) values at point nuclei but clearly it is not the only \( \tilde{\kappa}_4 \)-dependent one with that property. Any linear combination of nonsingular enhancement factors (including the simple \( F_{\phi} = 1 \)) will also be nonsingular. A combination of two PBE-like forms [see Eq. (71) below] is also nonsingular, as can be checked analytically for any density with near-nucleus behavior defined by Eq. (59), hence, also Eqs. (26) and (27).

There are, of course, \( \tilde{\kappa}_4 \)-dependent functionals that yield a divergent potential, e.g.,

\[ F_{\phi}(\tilde{\kappa}_4) = \kappa_4^2 \]  
(62)

so one must be cautious.
Regarding the second-order forms, Eq. (52) shows that, short of complete removal of the $s^2$ term from $F_{\theta}^{\text{SGA}}$, we cannot cure the singularity in $v_{\theta}^{\text{SGA}}$. There is no direct analogy to the removal of singularities in $v_{\theta}^{(b)}$ just discussed. Instead, in parallel with Eq. (56) or Eq. (61), we introduce a second-order RDD,

$$\kappa_2 = s^2 + b_1 p,$$

with $b_1$ to be determined. Then, in analogy with a PBE-type enhancement factor, we can define an enhancement factor dependent only on second-order variables as

$$F_{\theta}^{(2)}(\kappa_2) = \frac{\kappa_2}{1 + \alpha \kappa_2}. \quad (64)$$

For it, the near-nucleus (small $r$) behavior of the Pauli potential is

$$v_{\theta}^{(2)}(r) = C_1^2 \left(1 + \frac{C_2^2 b_1 \alpha}{b_1 \alpha^2} \right) + O(r), \quad (65)$$

with constants $C_1^2, C_2^2 > 0$ which depend on the specific density behavior being handled.

The RDDs considered thus far are combinations of powers of $s$ and $p$ which ensure cancellation of nuclear cusps divergences in $v_{\theta}$. Thus, we define a class of approximate KE functionals, the reduced derivative approximation (RDA) functionals, as those with enhancement factors depending on the RDDs,

$$T_{\theta}^{\text{RDA}}[n] = T_{\theta}[n] + \int t_{\theta}[n]:r\{F_{\theta}(\kappa_2(r), \tilde{\kappa}_4(r))\} d^3 r, \quad (66)$$

$[t_{\theta}[n]$ from Eq. (6)] with nondivergent Pauli potentials as a consequence of constraints imposed on the coefficients in the RDDs. This route of development of KE functionals is under active investigation; see below.

For insight, Fig. 5 shows the behavior of the RDD $\tilde{\kappa}_4$ along the SiO internuclear axis for four values of $b_2$. The behavior in the vicinity of the Si atom is shown. Both the $s$ and $p$ variables have four maxima which lie close to the internuclear minimum in the density. Increasing the value of $b_2$ increases the height of the corresponding maxima for $\tilde{\kappa}_4$ RDD (because the contributions from the $p$ maxima increase). Behavior of the RDD $\kappa_2$ is defined by a linear combination of the $s$ and $p$ variables.

One of the peculiarities is that the reduced density Laplacian $\rho$ is divergent at the nucleus and, as a consequence, $\kappa_2$ and $\tilde{\kappa}_4$ itself are also divergent, even though it generates a nondivergent $v_{\theta}$. This divergence will not affect the KE enhancement factors provided that $\lim_{\kappa_2 \to \infty} F_{\theta}(\kappa_2) = \text{constant}$ and $\lim_{\tilde{\kappa}_4 \to \infty} F_{\theta}(\tilde{\kappa}_4) = \text{constant}$. One of the advantages of the $\tilde{\kappa}_4$ variable is its positiveness everywhere (by definition).

Consider near-nucleus behavior in a bit more detail. In that region, the electron-nuclear-cusp condition$^{38-42}$ means that the density will have hydrogenic form (at least to first order); recall Eq. (27). For such an $N$-electron density, one can form $N$ orthonormal isodensity orbitals,$^{58}$
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Weizsäcker functional again is a reasonable approximation.\textsuperscript{11} This behavior is the case for systems for which the tail region has the one-particle reduced density matrix dominated by a single valence orbital $\gamma(r, r') = \int \psi_i^*(r) \psi_j(r') \, \text{d}r \, \text{d}r'$ occupied by one or two electrons. But that is not the case for all systems at large but finite distances. For example, numerical calculations for the SiO molecule show that two valence orbitals, $7\sigma$ and $6\sigma$, have similar magnitude in the tail region (see Fig. 7). As a consequence $\gamma(r, r') = 2\psi_{7\sigma}(r)\psi_{7\sigma}^*(r') + 2\psi_{6\sigma}(r)\psi_{6\sigma}^*(r')$ in the tail region (at least near the internuclear axis). Hence, the von Weizsäcker KE functional is not an appropriate approximation in the large but finite-distance part of the tail region of that molecule. The Pauli term enhancement factor, in fact, is not small there, but has growing values (recall Fig. 2).

B. Parametrization of a RDA functional

In addition to the positive singularities, another limitation of our earlier modified-conjoint-type KE functionals was the inability to parametrize them to provide both forces and total energies simultaneously.\textsuperscript{7} Given the emphasis on MD simulations, parametrization to the forces was the priority. With the spurious repulsive singularities removed from RDD functionals, the question arises whether total energy parametrization can be used and, if so, if it is beneficial. The usual energy fitting criterion is to minimize

$$
\omega_E = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |E_{\text{i}}^{\text{KS}} - E_{\text{i}}^{\text{OF-DFT}}|^2
$$

over systems (e.g., atoms and molecules) and configurations (e.g., diatomic molecule bond length) indexed generally here by $i$. When the parameter adjustment is done for fixed-density inputs (i.e., conventional KS densities as inputs), this total energy optimization is equivalent to optimization of the $T_s$ functional. We did this for determination of the empirical parameters for the new RDA-type functionals $F_{\varphi}^{\text{RDA}} = F_{\varphi}(\kappa_2, \kappa_4)$.

Since $F_{\varphi} = 1$ (or any constant in general) also yields a nonsingular Pauli potential, we can form $\kappa_2, \kappa_4$-dependent enhancement factors which resemble GGA forms and thereby enable connection with the modified-conjoint GGA functionals discussed already. One form which we have begun exploring (see below) is

$$
F_{\varphi}^{\text{m0}}(\{k\}) = A_0 + A_1 \left( \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{4a}}{1 + \beta_1 \tilde{\kappa}_{4a}} \right)^i + A_2 \left( \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{4b}}{1 + \beta_2 \tilde{\kappa}_{4b}} \right)^j + A_3 \left( \frac{\kappa_2}{1 + \beta_3 \kappa_2} \right)^k.
$$

(71)

$A_1$ and $\beta_j$ are parameters to be determined, along with the constants $a$, $b$, and $c$ which appear in the definition of the $\tilde{\kappa}_2$ and $\kappa_4$ variables; see Eqs. (61) and (63). Even this simple form has two desirable properties: (i) the corresponding $v_{\varphi}$ is finite for densities with the near-nucleus behavior defined by Eq. (59), hence, also Eq. (26) or Eq. (27) (this has been checked by explicit analytical calculation); (ii) the divergences of $\tilde{\kappa}_{4a}$, $\tilde{\kappa}_{4b}$, and $\kappa_2$ near the nucleus (see Fig. 5) cancel in Eq. (71) (lim$_{r \to 0} \tilde{\kappa}_{4a}, \tilde{\kappa}_{4b}, \kappa_2 \to 0$) $F_{\varphi}^{\text{m0}}(\{k\}) = A_0 + A_1 / \beta_1 + A_2 / \beta_2 + A_3 / \beta_3$. Positivity of $F_{\varphi}^{\text{m0}}$ depends on the specific parameters of the functional, hence, must be checked for each case.

After limited exploration, we used $i=2$, $j=4$, and $k=1$. Again because the motivating materials problem was brittle fracture in the presence of water, our choice of training set $M$ has a focus on Si and O. In an attempt to gain a bit of generality, we used two molecules with Si-O bonds and two closed shell atoms $M = \{\text{H}_4\text{Si}_2\text{O}_7, \text{H}_4\text{SiO}_4, \text{Be}, \text{Ne}\}$, with a set of six bond lengths for each molecule. In detail, for the H$_4$Si$_2$O$_7$ one of the central Si-O bond lengths varied: $R(\text{Si}_1-\text{O}_1) = \{1.21, 1.41, 1.61, 1.91, 2.21, 2.81\}$ Å. For H$_4$SiO$_4$, the deformation was in $T_{d}$ mode, that is, all four Si-O bonds were changed identically: $R(\text{Si}-\text{O}) = \{1.237, 1.437, 1.637, 1.937, 2.237, 2.437\}$ Å. KS-LDA den-
eties and energies were the inputs (again see Appendix B for computational details). Minimization of the target function defined by Eq. (70) gave $A_0=0.506$ 16, $A_1=3.041$ 21, $A_2=-0.345$ 67, $A_3=-1.897$ 38, $\beta_1=1.296$ 91, $\beta_2=0.561$ 84, $\beta_3=0.219$ 44, and $a=46.476$ 62, $b=18.806$ 58, and $c=-0.903$ 46.

The KE functional defined by Eq. (71) does not satisfy several of the exact constraints. A simple check shows that $F_{\theta}^{\eta}(\kappa_2, \kappa_3)$ unfortunately is not positive for all values of $\kappa_2$ and for all positive values of $\kappa_3$ (recall $\kappa_3$ is positive by definition). Moreover, it does not recover the constant density limit nor is its $F_\eta$ contribution to $F_i$ small at the nucleus (recall discussion at the end of preceding section). These deficiencies illustrate the challenge in finding the universal functional. A pressing question is which constraints should be placed at higher priority than others when using a functional form as simple as defined by Eq. (71). One part of exploring that issue is to study how well or poorly this functional does despite the constraint violations.

Table I shows kinetic energies for the first row atoms from conventional KS calculations and from approximate OF-DFT functionals using the KS density as input. The Thakkar empirical functional was chosen as an example of a GGA KE functional. The Perdew-Constantin meta-GGA (Ref. 19) “MGGA” was chosen because it, like our functional, is based on quantities that are at fourth order in the density gradient expansion. The mean absolute errors (MAE) for the GGA and RDA-$m0$ functionals are of the same order of magnitude, with the distinction that the GGA functional underestimates the KE for the He, C, O, and F atoms, whereas RDA-$m0$ overestimates. The underestimates may be a sign of violation of $N$ representability. We defer discussion of that issue to Sec. V. The MAE for the MGGA functional is 50% larger than for RDA-$m0$ and 100% for GGA.

Table II displays kinetic energies for 14 molecules (four of them with Si-O bonds) calculated at equilibrium geometries with the conventional KS method and with the same three approximate OF-DFT functionals (Thakkar-GGA, MGGA, and RDA), again using the KS density as input for the approximate functional calculations. The results are a bit surprising, because the MAE for the RDA-$m0$ functional is about 2/3 the MAE for the GGA KE and less than 1/7 the MAE for the MGGA. Given that the GGA is heavily parametrized compared to the small RDA-$m0$ training set (recall $M$ above; two molecules with Si-O bonds and two closed shell atoms), we had not expected to obtain such comparatively good transferability to other systems.

Because the objective is a KE functional capable of predicting correct interatomic forces, an important aspect of any functional is its behavior in the attractive regions of the potential surface. Table III shows energy gradients for the molecules listed in Table II calculated at the stretched bond length(s) for which the “exact” (i.e., reference) KS attractive force has maximum magnitude. One and two bonds were deformed in the water molecule [respectively denoted in the table as $H_2O(1R)$ and $H_2O(2R)$], while $SiH_4$ and $H_2SiO_4$ were deformed in $T_d$ mode, and only one Si-O bond was stretched in $H_2SiO$ and $H_2Si_2O_7$.

The forces were calculated by a three-point centered finite-difference formula. As found previously and summarized above, the GGA functionals (again the Thakkar functional is the GGA example) generally are incapable of predicting the correct sign (attraction) for the force. The only molecules in Table III for which GGA predicts attraction are $H_2$, LiH, and SiH 4. The MGGA functional behaves rather similarly, with its predicted energy gradient having the wrong sign in most cases. In contrast, for all of the table entries, the RDA-$m0$ functional predicts the correct sign of the gradient. In many cases [H$_2$(1R), H$_2$O(2R), HF, CO, BF, H$_2$SiO, H$_2$SiO$_4$, and H$_6$Si$_2$O$_7$] it yields values very close to the reference KS results.
TABLE III. Energy gradient (hartree/Å) calculated at point $R_m$ corresponding to the extremum of attractive force as calculated by the KS method. Approximate OF-DFT energy gradients are obtained by replacing $T^2_{KS}$ by $T^{OF-DFT}$, LDA-KS densities for LDA equilibrium geometries (calculated as described in Appendix B) were used as input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_m$ (Å)</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Thakkar</th>
<th>MGGA</th>
<th>RDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$</td>
<td>1.2671</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiH</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2O(1R)$</td>
<td>1.3714</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2O(2R)$</td>
<td>1.3714</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>1.3334</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2$</td>
<td>1.3986</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>-0.349</td>
<td>-0.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiF</td>
<td>2.0405</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1.4318</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>-0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>1.6687</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaF</td>
<td>2.4284</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>1.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiH$_4$</td>
<td>1.9974</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO</td>
<td>1.9261</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>-0.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4SiO$</td>
<td>2.057</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2SiO_4$</td>
<td>2.037</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>-0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3SiO_4$</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 shows the energy for the water molecule as a function of the O-H$_1$ bond length. Again, neither the GGA nor the MGGA curve exhibits a minimum. This is a case for which the new RDA-m0 functional behaves relatively poorly. Though it yields a minimum, it is at too large a bond length, while in the tail region the RDA-m0 curve goes almost flat. Thus, the structure predicted by RDA-m0 would be more expanded than the correct value and the attractive force in the tail region would be significantly underestimated. The “DPK-refitted” curve corresponds to the DePristo and Kress KE functional$^{10}$ with all seven parameters refitted using exactly the same fitting procedure as used for the RDA-m0 functional. The refitted DPK curve fails to yield a minimum not only for the water molecule (not included in the fitting set) but also for one of the molecules ($H_4SiO$) from the fitting set. For the other fitting set molecule ($H_3SiO_4$), the curve has unphysical behavior, namely, dual minima. From this comparison, one deduces that the comparative success of the RDA-m0 is not an artifact of the fitting procedure but instead is a consequence of using the new RDD variables which provide correct behavior of the Pauli potential in the region near the nucleus. Of course the correct behavior of the Pauli potential (non-negativeness, nonsingularity at nucleus) is not a sufficient condition for good performance of a KE functional.

Regarding the behavior of the MGGA, there is another interesting aspect of finding energy minima. Very recently Constantin and Ruzsinszky$^{60}$ have presented binding energies as a function of bond length for the $N_2$ molecule for various orbital-free KE functionals including both TF and MGGA. Both functionals overbind the molecule. Since TF cannot bind a molecule on fundamental grounds (Teller’s theorem$^{25}$), attention is drawn immediately to their procedure. It appears plausible that the reason for their contradictory outcome is the use of broken-symmetry Hartree-Fock densities as input. There simply is no guarantee that use of one of these functionals in the OF-DFT Euler equation, Eq. (4), would generate anything like the HF density. The contradictory outcome confirms that, in fact, the self-consistent OF-DFT density with one of these functionals would differ in crucial ways. Reference 60 does, however, raise two subtle and difficult issues, namely, that symmetry-broken solutions do occur and that it is not obvious how to get such solutions out of a full self-consistent OF-DFT treatment.

C. Atomic analysis of the RDA-m0 functional

For further analysis of the RDA-m0 functional, we calculated the Pauli potential near the nucleus ($r \rightarrow 0$) for the Be atom using a simple H-like model density. A single-ξ Slater orbital density with exponents $\zeta_{1s}=3.6848$ and $\zeta_{2s}=0.9560$ taken from Ref. 61 near $r=0$ has the following Taylor series expansion: $n(r) \approx 415.0479 \times (1-7.3971 r)$. The density $n(r)=415.0479 \times \exp(-7.3971 r)$ has the same slope at $r=0$. It can be used as an approximate density for the Be atom near $r=0$ to calculate the Pauli potential for the RDA-m0 Eq. (71), for the GGA (Ref. 45), and for the PBE2 modified-conjoint GGA functionals. Calculations were performed using our own MAPLE code. For RDA-m0, we find

$$V^\text{RDA-m0}(r \rightarrow 0) = 4.5355 \times 10^{-2}-1.2225 \times 10^{0} r$$
$$+2.1912 \times 10^{12} r^2 + O(r^3),$$

while for the GGA the result is...
The RDA-functional has a large negative value, whereas it should be very close to zero. The value of the potential at the nucleus is approximated by a small region near the nucleus and in the tail region. The RDA-functional reproduces reasonably well by the RDA-functional. As expected, the first term in the GGA potential is divergent and negative, while the modified-conjoint GGA functionals generate bound molecules and give semi-quantitative interatomic forces. However, they are singular at the nuclear positions, hence, severely overestimate the KS kinetic energy. Examination of the near-nucleus behavior of both original conjoint and modified-conjoint GGA functionals shows that the singularities cannot be eliminated within that simple functional form.

As expected, the first term in the GGA potential is divergent and negative, while the PBE2 modified-conjoint GGA functional has a divergent but positive first term. The numerical coefficients for the rest of the terms are very close for the GGA and PBE2 modified-conjoint GGA functionals. This closeness is consistent with the analysis in Ref. 30.

Figure 9 shows the KS-LDA Pauli potential for the model Be atom. The value of the potential at the nucleus is approximately 3.5 hartrees. The RDA-m0 potential has a finite (and positive) value at nucleus, but it is a strong overestimate, hence, cannot be displayed on the scale of the figure. Further comparison shows that the slope of the RDA-m0 potential at the nucleus has a large negative value, whereas it should be very close to zero (see Fig. 9). To complete the study, three enhancement factors, KS, GGA, and RDA-m0, are shown in the same figure. Again, as was seen in Fig. 3 for the SiO molecule, there is an important region where $F_{\theta}^{\text{RDA}}$ is negative. The RDA-m0 enhancement factor goes negative in a small region near the nucleus and in the tail region. The maximum of the KS enhancement factor near $r = 0.75$ Å is reproduced reasonably well by the RDA-m0 functional both with respect to position and amplitude.

Though the positivity constraint on $F_{\theta}$ still seems to be highly significant, this numerical study suggests that the failure of the RDA-m0 enhancement factor to satisfy that condition everywhere does not necessarily have disastrous consequences on the predicted interatomic forces. Presumably this is because the interatomic forces do not depend explicitly on $F_{\theta}$, only nuclear position gradients. For the correct prediction of forces the conditions on the corresponding Pauli potential are more important, since it enters explicitly in the equation for forces [see Eq. (5) and discussion in Ref. 7]. In principle, a functional of the Laplacian of the density might be added to the enhancement factor, whereby the region where the original enhancement factor is negative is removed without altering the predicted interatomic forces.) Supposing that the density and the KS effective potential in Eq. (5) are exact (i.e., taken from the reference KS calculation), error will be introduced solely by the Pauli potential.

Since $\partial n / \partial R$ has large values, the near-nucleus behavior of the Pauli potential is particularly important.

**V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

Success for the OF-DFT calculation of quantum forces in molecular dynamics requires a reliable explicit form for $T_i$. Though previously published GGA-type (conjoint and nearly so) KE functionals yield reasonable KE values, they fail to bind simple molecules even with the correct KS density as input: such functionals produce completely unusable interatomic forces. This poor performance stems from violation of the positivity requirement on the Pauli potential near nuclei. Our first remedy was to constrain conjoint GGA KE functionals to yield positive-definite Pauli potentials. Those functionals generate bound molecules and give semi-quantitative interatomic forces. However, they are singular at the nuclear positions, hence, severely overestimate the KS kinetic energy. Examination of the near-nucleus behavior of both original conjoint and modified-conjoint GGA functionals shows that the singularities cannot be eliminated within that simple functional form.

Truncation of the gradient expansion, at higher orders in $s$ and $p$, allows us to identify near-nucleus singular behavior and obtain relationships among the coefficients of those truncations that will eliminate such singularities. The resulting reduced density derivatives and related reduced-density-approximation functionals are promising for the simultaneous description of kinetic energies and interatomic forces. A challenge is that there are many possible RDD functionals: so far we do not have a systematic way to select a particular form. Explicit analytic enforcement of the constraints as a means of selection is yet to be done. Also, the RDA-m0 form studied here is sufficiently complicated that we do not yet know how to fit it such that all relevant constraints are satisfied.

Two other aspects of the numerical results in Table II relate to exact constraints, hence, deserve brief comment. First, the von Weizsäcker KE is the exact $T_i$ for two-electron singlets. We have not enforced that limit, yet the error from RDA-m0 in $H_{2s}$ is 36 mHartree. Second, violation of $N$ representability by an approximate $T_{\text{approx}}^{\text{pair}}[n]$ is signaled by $T_{\text{approx}}^{\text{pair}}[n] - T[n]<0$ for at least one $n_i$. Five (out of 14) of the RDA-m0 entries in Table II have such negative differences. MGGA has none versus all but two being negative for the earlier GGA by Thakkar. However, interpretation of those
computed differences is a bit tricky, in that they do not cor-
respond to the rigorous N-representability-violation test but
to $T_{\text{approx}}^n [n] - T_{\text{SLLDA}}^n [n]$. That is, the reference KS KE is not
from the unknown exact density functional but from LDA.
With that limitation in mind, the results in Table II are at
least suggestive of the notion that the MGGA and RDA-m0
functionals are $N$ representable or, in an operational sense,
close. It is also important to remember that the narrow goal
of scope is a practical means for limiting the risks of non-$N$
representability. In addition, we have many RDD forms open for exploration other than RDA-m0.

More positively, the RDA-m0 functional form shows en-
couraging signs of transferability outside the range of the
training set (recall: only geometries of two molecules and
energies of functional forms open for exploration other than RDA-
least suggestive of the notion that the MGGA and RDA-
forms open for exploration other than RDA-
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**APPENDIX A: FUNCTIONAL DERIVATIVES OF $F_\theta$**

This appendix provides details relative to derivation of the
expressions given in Eqs. (25), (47), and (48). All these for-
mulas follow from an evaluation of an expression of the
generic form presented as $v^{(2)}_\theta (r)$, Eq. (46). That equation is
a straightforward expression of the rules for the evaluation of
a functional derivative. For clarity in what follows, we re-
state here the definitions

$$
s^2 = \frac{\nabla n \cdot \nabla n}{\xi_n^{-s^3}}, \quad p = \frac{\nabla^2 n}{\xi_n^{-s^3}}, \quad t_0^s [n; r] = c_0 \xi_n^{s^3}, \quad (A1)
$$

where $\xi^s = 4 (3 \pi^2)^{2s}$ and $c_0 = \frac{3}{10} (3 \pi^2)^{2s}$. We also remind the
reader that

$$
q = \frac{\nabla n \cdot \nabla n \cdot \nabla n}{\xi_n^{-s^3}}, \quad q' = \frac{\nabla n \cdot \nabla^2 n}{\xi_n^{-s^3}},
$$

$$
q'' = \frac{\nabla^4 n}{\xi_n^{-s^3}}, \quad q'' = \frac{\nabla n \cdot \nabla n \cdot \nabla n}{\xi_n^{-s^3}},
$$

(A2)

recall that $A: B = \sum_i A_i B_i$. In addition, we introduce the
sixth-order reduced density derivatives

$$
h = \frac{|\nabla n \cdot \nabla^2 n|^2}{\xi_n^{s^3}}, \quad h' = \frac{|\nabla^2 n|^3}{\xi_n^{s^3}}, \quad h'' = \frac{(\nabla^2 n) \cdot (\nabla n \cdot \nabla n)}{\xi_n^{s^3}}.
$$

(A3)

Finally, we write $n$ instead of the more explicit form $n(r)$, and we note that the derivatives of $s^2$ and $p$ with respect to $n$, $\nabla n$, and $\nabla^2 n$ are

$$
\frac{\partial (s^2)}{\partial n} = - \frac{8 s^2}{3 n^3}, \quad \frac{\partial (s^2)}{\partial (\nabla n)} = \frac{2 \nabla n}{\xi_n^{-s^3}}, \quad \frac{\partial (s^2)}{\partial (\nabla^2 n)} = 0;
$$

$$
\frac{\partial p}{\partial n} = - \frac{5 p}{3 n^3}, \quad \frac{\partial p}{\partial (\nabla n)} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial p}{\partial (\nabla^2 n)} = \frac{1}{\xi_n^{s^3}}
$$

(A4)

Substituting these relations into Eq. (46), and restricting con-
sideration to cases where $F_\theta$ depends only on $s^2$ and $p$ for
which all the terms we need to use are explicitly shown in
that equation), we have immediately

$$
v_\theta (r) = c_0 \xi_n^{s^3} \left[ \frac{5}{3} \frac{F_\theta}{\xi_n^{s^3}} - \frac{8}{3} s^2 \frac{\partial F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)} - \frac{5}{3} p \frac{\partial F_\theta}{\partial p} \right]
$$

$$
- \frac{2 c_0}{\xi_n^{s^3}} \nabla \cdot \left[ \frac{\partial F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)} \frac{\nabla n}{n} + \frac{c_0}{\xi_n^{s^3}} \frac{\partial^2 F_\theta}{\partial p \partial (s^2)} \frac{\nabla p}{\nabla n} \right].
$$

(A5)

At this point we remark that some terms that would oth-
erwise be expected in Eq. (46) are absent because of the zeros
in Eq. (A4).

To proceed further we need to expand the last two terms of
Eq. (A5). The first of these terms expands into

$$
- \frac{2 c_0}{\xi_n^{s^3}} \left[ \frac{\partial F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)} \frac{\nabla (n^{-1}) \cdot (\nabla n + n^{-1} \nabla^2 n)}{\xi_n^{s^3}} \right]
$$

$$
+ \left( \frac{\partial^2 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)^2} \frac{\nabla s^2 \cdot \nabla n}{\xi_n^{s^3}} + \frac{\partial F_\theta}{\partial p \partial (s^2)} \frac{\nabla p \cdot \nabla n}{\xi_n^{s^3}} \right].
$$

(A6)

Observing now that $\nabla (n^{-1}) = - n^{-2} \nabla n$ and that
\[ \nabla(s^2) = -\frac{8s^2}{3n} \nabla n + \frac{2 \nabla n \cdot \nabla n}{\xi^2 n^{3/3}}. \]

\[ \nabla p = \frac{\nabla^2 n}{\xi^2 n^{3/3}} - \frac{5 (\nabla^2 n) \nabla n}{3 \xi^2 n^{3/3}}. \]  

(A7)

the expression in Eq. (A6) can be brought to the form

\[ + 2c_0 p^{2/3} \left[ \left( s^2 - p \right) \left( \frac{\partial F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)} \right) + \left( \frac{8}{3} s^4 - 2q \right) \left( \frac{\partial^3 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)^2} \right) \right] \]

\[ - \left( q' - \frac{5}{3} s^2 p \right) \left( \frac{\partial^2 F_\theta}{\partial p \partial (s^2)} \right). \]  

(A8)

Continuing now to the final term of Eq. (A5), we expand the Laplacian obtaining initially

\[ \frac{c_0^2}{\xi^2} \nabla^2 \left( \frac{\partial F_\theta}{\partial p} \right) = c_0 p^{2/3} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial^2 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)^2} \right) \nabla^2 s^2 + \frac{2}{3} \nabla \left( \frac{\partial F_\theta}{\partial p} \right) \nabla s^2 \right] \]

\[ + \frac{\partial^2 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2) \partial p} \nabla s^2 \cdot \nabla \nabla s^2 \]

\[ + 2 \left( \frac{\partial^2 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2) \partial p} \right) \nabla s^2 \cdot \nabla p + \left( \frac{\partial^3 F_\theta}{\partial p^2} \right) \nabla p \cdot \nabla p \].  

(A9)

Using Eq. (A7), we next find

\[ \nabla^2 s^2 = -\frac{8}{3} \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{s^2}{n} \nabla n \right) + \frac{2}{3} \nabla \left( \frac{\nabla n \cdot \nabla n}{n^{3/3}} \right) \]

\[ = -\frac{8}{3} \left[ \frac{s^2}{n} \nabla n \cdot \nabla n + \frac{2}{3} \nabla \left( \nabla^2 n \cdot \nabla n \right) \right] \]

\[ + 2 \left( \frac{\nabla^2 n}{n^{1/3}} + \frac{\nabla \nabla n \cdot \nabla n + \nabla n \cdot \nabla^2 n}{n^{3/3}} \right). \]

\[ \nabla^2 p = \frac{1}{\xi^2} \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\nabla^2 n}{n^{3/3}} \right) - \frac{5}{3} \frac{s^2}{\xi^2} \nabla \left( \frac{\nabla^2 n}{n^{3/3}} \right) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{\xi^2} \left[ \frac{5}{3} \nabla n \cdot \nabla n + \frac{\nabla^2 n}{n^{1/3}} \right] \]

\[ - \frac{5}{3} \left( \frac{\nabla^2 n}{n^{1/3}} + \frac{\nabla \nabla n \cdot \nabla n + \nabla n \cdot \nabla^2 n}{n^{3/3}} \right) \].

\[ \nabla s^2 \cdot \nabla s^2 = \frac{64s^4}{9n^2} \nabla n \cdot \nabla n - \frac{32s^2}{3} \nabla n \cdot \nabla n \cdot \nabla n \]

\[ + 4 \frac{\nabla n \cdot \nabla n \cdot \nabla n}{\xi^2 n^{1/3}}. \]

\[ \nabla s^2 \cdot \nabla p = \frac{8s^2}{3} \nabla n \cdot \nabla \nabla n \cdot \nabla n - \frac{2}{3} \frac{\nabla \nabla n \cdot \nabla n \cdot \nabla n}{\xi^2 n^{1/3}} \]

\[ + 4 \frac{(\nabla n \cdot \nabla n \cdot \nabla n)}{\xi^2 n^{3/3}} - \frac{10 \nabla n \cdot \nabla n \cdot \nabla n \cdot \nabla n}{3 \xi^2 n^{16/3}}. \]

(A10)

Then, combining material from Eqs. (A5) and (A8)–(A10), and introducing the notations in Eqs. (A1)–(A3), we obtain the final result, applicable for any \( F_\theta \) that depends only on \( s \) and \( p \):

\[ v_\theta = c_0 p^{2/3} \left[ \frac{5}{3} \frac{\nabla^2 n}{n^{3/3}} + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\nabla \nabla n \cdot \nabla n}{n^{3/3}} \right] \]

\[ \times \frac{2}{3} \frac{\nabla^2 n}{n^{3/3}} + \frac{88}{9} \frac{s^4}{n^2} + \frac{2}{3} s^2 p - \frac{32}{9} q + 2q^m \]

\[ \times \left( \frac{\partial^2 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)^2} \right) \frac{40}{9} \frac{s^4 p}{n^2} - \frac{10}{3} q' + q'' \left( \frac{\partial^3 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)^2} \right) \]

\[ \times \frac{64}{9} \frac{s^6}{n^2} + \frac{32}{3} s^2 q + 4h \left( \frac{\partial^3 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)^2} \partial p \right) \]

\[ + \frac{80}{9} \frac{s^6 p}{n^2} - \frac{16}{3} s^4 q' - \frac{20}{3} p q + 4h' \left( \frac{\partial^3 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)^2} \partial p^2 \right) \]

\[ + \frac{25}{9} \frac{s^6 p^2}{n^2} - \frac{10}{3} p q' + h'' \left( \frac{\partial^3 F_\theta}{\partial (s^2)^2} \partial p^3 \right). \]

(A11)

We may now specialize Eq. (A11) to the cases needed in the present work. Taking first \( F_\theta^{SGA} \), which has no \( p \) dependence, all the terms of Eq. (A11) containing derivatives with respect to \( p \) vanish, leaving only the expression previously given as Eq. (25).

Turning next to the specific forms of \( F_\theta \) discussed in Sec. IV A, we note that \( F_\theta^{SGA} = 1 + a_1 s^2 \) is not only independent of \( p \), but is also linear in \( s^2 \), so \( \partial F_\theta / \partial (s^2) = a_2 \) and \( \partial^3 F_\theta / \partial (s^2)^2 = 0 \). This causes \( v_\theta^{SGA} \) to have the form

\[ v_\theta^{SGA} = c_0 p^{2/3} \left[ \frac{5}{3} (1 + a_2 s^2) - a_2 \left( \frac{2}{3} s^2 + 2p \right) \right], \]

(A12)

which simplifies to the result given in Eq. (47).

Finally, we consider \( F_\theta^{(4)} \) as given in Eq. (45). All the third derivatives of \( F_\theta \) in Eq. (A11) vanish; the first and second derivatives of \( F_\theta \) have simple forms. We have

\[ v_\theta^{(4)} = c_0 p^{2/3} \left[ \frac{5}{3} (a_4 s^4 + b_2 p^2 + c_2 s^2 p) \right] \]

\[ - \frac{2}{3} \frac{s^2 + 2p}{n^2} \left( 2a_4 s^4 + c_2 s^2 p - \frac{5}{3} p (2b_2 p + c_2 s^2) \right) \]

\[ + 2a_4 \left( \frac{16}{3} s^4 - 4q \right) + c_2 \left( \frac{88}{9} s^4 + \frac{2}{3} s^2 p - \frac{32}{3} q + 2q^m \right) \]

\[ + 2b_2 \left( \frac{40}{9} s^6 p - \frac{5}{3} s^2 + \frac{10}{3} q' + q'' \right) \].

(A13)

Equation (A13) simplifies to the result given as Eq. (48) in the main text.
APPENDIX B: COMPUTATIONAL METHODS

We assess functionals by comparing results from them with those of conventional orbital-dependent Kohn-Sham calculations in the LDA using standard methods described in, for example, Refs. 23 and 63–69. The reference molecular KS calculations were done with a triple-zeta basis with polarization functions. All integrals were calculated by a Gauss-Legendre procedure, while integration over the angular variables is accomplished by a Gauss-Legendre procedure, with high-order quadrature formulas developed by Lebedev and used with routines downloaded from Ref. 76. These computations were performed using routines developed by Salvador and Mayer and included in their code Fuzzy. The Vosko-Wilk-Nussair LDA (Ref. 68) was used.

Given the KS density, for each OF functional under study we computed the total energy $E^{DFT}$ from Eq. (3) and the interatomic forces from Eq. (5). The result is a non-self-consistent calculation which tests whether a given OF functional can reproduce $T_{ij}^{\text{KS}}[n_{\text{KS}}]$ or at least $\nabla R_i T_{ij}^{\text{KS}}[n_{\text{KS}}]$ if $n_{\text{KS}}$ is provided. There is no sense in trying to solve Eq. (4) with an approximate OF functional that cannot pass this test.
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