Using a monomer potential energy surface to perform approximate path integral molecular dynamics simulation of ab-initio water at near-zero added cost
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It is now established that nuclear quantum motion plays an important role in determining water’s hydrogen bonding, structure, and dynamics. Such effects are important to consider when evaluating density functional theory (DFT) methods for accurate ab-initio simulation of water. The standard way of treating nuclear quantum effects, path integral molecular dynamics (PIMD), multiplies the number of energy/force calculations by the number of beads, which is typically 32. Here we introduce a method whereby PIMD can be incorporated into a DFT molecular dynamics simulation with very little extra cost. The method is based on the many body expansion of the energy. We first subtract the DFT monomer energies & forces using a custom monomer potential energy surface fit to DFT data. The evolution of the PIMD beads is then performed using only the highly accurate Partridge-Schwenke monomer energy surface. DFT calculations are done using the centroid positions. We show how all method can be used in conjunction with a multiple timestep algorithm and how it relates to bead contraction and other schemes that have been introduced to speed up PIMD. We show that our method, which we call “monomer PIMD” correctly captures the structure and nuclear delocalization of water found in full PIMD simulation but at much lower computational cost.

There is great interest in being able to accurately treat liquid water at the quantum mechanical level. The most widely used methodology for this is density functional theory. However, most density functionals fail to accurately reproduce key thermodynamic properties of water such as its density, compressibility, and diffusion constant. Moreover, different density functionals fail in different ways. PBE creates a overstructured liquid, while some vdW functionals such as vdW-DF2 and optPBE-vdW create an understructured liquid.

Most ab-initio techniques are based on the Born-Oppenheimer approximation and the assumption that nuclear dynamics can be treated classically. However, over the past two decades a wide range of studies have demonstrated that this is not a good assumption for water because the OH stretching mode of water is very quantum mechanical (zero point temperature $T_z = \hbar \omega / 2k_b = 2600$ K) and hydrogen nuclei are delocalized. Currently, many DFT simulations of water are done with D$_2$O, where NQEs are much smaller. However, the structure and dynamics of D$_2$O is different than H$_2$O, as can be seen from experiments that compare the two. In the primary isotope effect, the OH distance is observed to be longer than the OD distance. In the secondary isotope effect, also called the Ubbelöhde effect, the H-bond donor-acceptor (oxygen-oxygen) distance $R$ changes open isotopic substitution. The magnitude and direction of the change depends on the strength of the hydrogen bond, due to competing quantum effects. In particular, the zero-point motion of hydrogen in the out-of-plane direction (a type of librational motion) acts to increase $R$ while the zero point motion of the stretching mode acts to decrease $R$. The competition between the OH stretching and the bending+librational modes is reflected in the mode specific Grüneisen parameters for ice calculated from DFT by Pamuk et al. - the OH stretch Grüneisen parameters are negative, while the libtrational Grüneisen parameters are positive. The HOH bending Grüneisen parameter is positive but very close to zero, showing that it has a much smaller role. Similarly, a study of liquid water showed that the competing quantum effects from libration are about 50% larger than those from bending.

In materials with strong H-bonds, NQEs decrease the donor-acceptor distance (positive Ubbelöhde effect), while in materials with weaker H-bonds the opposite effect occurs (negative Ubbelöhde effect). The crossover between from positive to negative Ubbelöhde effect has been estimated to be around $R = 2.6\text{Å}$ or $R = 2.7\text{Å}$, so relative to other H-bonding materials its secondary isotope effect is small. The secondary isotope effect in ice is known to be positive (NQEs decrease $R$), leading to the anomalous isotope effects discovered by Pamuk et al. Surprisingly, the anomalous isotope effect as reflected in the volume of water per molecule becomes greater at room temperature water - the volume per molecule of D$_2$O is slightly larger than H$_2$O, suggesting that H-bonds...
in H$_2$O water are stronger than in D$_2$O.

In biophysics, the strengthening of hydrogen bonds by NQEs is believed to very slightly increase protein stability\cite{10} and may play an important role in the behaviour of the DNA binding agent ellipticine.\cite{11} The balance of competing quantum effects is very sensitive to the $r_{OH}$ distance and degree of anharmonicity in the OH potential\cite{12} which explains the broad spectrum of sometimes conflicting results obtained from PIMD simulation of water with different forcefield models and DFT functionals.\cite{13,14} As an example, the change in the dipole moment of H$_2$O when NQEs are included is very sensitive to competing quantum effects.\cite{15,16} PIMD simulations with classical forcefields show both increases or decreases in dipole moment\cite{17} and while PIMD simulations of ice with PBE show an a significant increase in $\mu$,\cite{18} PIMD simulations with BLYP show no change.\cite{19} Experimentally, the dielectric constants for H$_2$O and D$_2$O water are nearly identical, while the dielectric constant of D$_2$O ice is $\approx 5\%$ larger than H$_2$O ice.\cite{20} The dispersion in PIMD results for different DFT functionals is likely related to slight variations in monomer geometry (for instance PBE gives an $r_{OH}$ that is too long) and differences in the anharmonicity of the monomer potential energy surface. To better determine the accuracy of DFT functionals in reproducing NQEs, more comparisons of DFT functionals with PIMD need to be done.

Currently many people introduce “effective NQEs” by raising the temperature of the simulation. This can be justified theoretically for weakly interacting systems such as gases or van der Waals bonding materials,\cite{21} but the same justification does not apply to hydrogen bonded materials. Increasing the temperature can be useful for compensating for the overstructuring of GGA functionals, but should not be described as an effective treatment of NQEs. Recently it was shown that colored noise thermostats tuned to quantum zero point temperatures of different modes in liquid water provides a more rigorous and effective way of taking into account NQEs.\cite{22} Still, the “gold standard” technique for treating NQEs is path integral molecular dynamics (PIMD).\cite{23}

In PIMD simulations, hydrogen nuclei become delocalized along H-bonds. This delocalization increases the probability of dissociation by several orders of magnitude\cite{24,25} and causes an excess proton in water to become delocalized over several molecules.\cite{26,27} PIMD has proven useful to understanding proton tunnelling in acids,\cite{28} enzymes,\cite{29} ice,\cite{30} and small water clusters.\cite{31,32} PIMD has also proved useful for reproducing the ab initio spectra of water, protonated methane,\cite{33} and the DNA base guanine.\cite{34} NQEs decrease the band gap of diamond,\cite{35} and were recently shown to significantly reduce the bandgap of water as well (by 0.6 eV).\cite{36} Interestingly, GW-corrected DFT simulations result in a bandgap that is 0.4 eV larger than the experimental value – an overestimation that is likely due to the lack of NQEs.\cite{37} NQEs play an important role in the surface structure of water\cite{38} and were recently found to play an important role in the dissociation of water molecules on platinum.\cite{39}

We note that classical forcefield models are not a rigorous way of studying NQEs because they are parametrized to experimental data, leading to a double counting of NQEs when used with PIMD simulation. Additionally, harmonic models do not allow for a change in the average OH distance from NQEs, and thus cannot capture primary or secondary isotope effects. Even worse, we have found that PIMD simulation with the harmonic model SPC-\cite{40} (and to a lesser extent q-SPC/Fw) shows an unphysical decrease in r$_{OH}$ which must be due to the “curvature problem” intrinsic to PIMD simulation. In the curvature problem, beads curve around a spherical shell of near constant $r_{OH}$, causing the centroid to lie in the interior, leading to a shorter $r_{OH}$.\cite{41,42,43} While classical forcefields have been reparametrized specifically for use with PIMD and have also been parametrized from Born Oppenheimer ab-initio simulation using force matching and other approaches\cite{44,45} PIMD simulation with DFT is a more rigorous way of simulating nuclear quantum effects.

I. PATH INTEGRAL MOLECULAR DYNAMICS METHODS

Path integral molecular dynamics maps the partition function for the quantum mechanical system onto the partition function of a classical system with the following
Hamiltonian:

\[ H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( \frac{p_i^k}{2m_i^k} + \frac{m_i\omega_n^2}{2} (q_i^k - q_{i+1}^k)^2 \right) 
+ \sum_{k=1}^{n} V(q_1^k, \ldots, q_N^k) \] (1)

Here \( i = 1 \ldots N \) is the atomic index and \( k = 1 \ldots n \) is the bead index. We have put a prime on \( m_i^k \) to indicate that these masses (called fictitious masses) may be different than the physical masses \( m_i \). A full derivation of the PIMD method is described elsewhere. Craig & Manolopoulos argue that simply setting \( m_i^k = m_i \) for all \( i \) does the best job of reproducing the actual quantum dynamics, and call this methodology “Ring Polymer Molecular Dynamics” (RPMD). However, when RPMD is used the spectra are contaminated by spurious peaks caused by the normal mode frequencies which span the entire spectrum from 0 to \( 2\omega_n \) where \( \omega_n = k_B T n_b / \hbar \). In this section we discuss different options for rescaling the fictitious masses as \( m_i^k = \sigma_j m_j \), where \( \sigma_j \) is a “mass rescaling factor”. The re-scaling is typically done in normal mode coordinates as \( \sigma_j \) is an index that runs over the normal modes of the ring polymer. The mass rescaling factor rescales the bead normal mode frequencies as \( \Omega_i^k = \Omega_i / \sqrt{\sigma_k} \). Ignoring choice of thermostating, the major different PIMD implementations that have been introduced are distinguished solely by their choice of mass rescaling.

In their original paper on PIMD Parrinello et al. choose to bring all of the non-centroid frequencies to the value of \( \omega_n \). A better approach is to scale the frequencies of the normal modes to above the highest frequency of interest in the system, thus avoiding the problem of normal mode contamination. To shift all of the normal modes to a particular frequency, one rescales the normal mode masses as:

\[ \sigma_j = \begin{cases} 
1 & j = 0 \\
\gamma^2 \frac{\omega_j^2}{\omega_n^2} & j \neq 0 
\end{cases} \] (2)

\( \gamma \) is called the adiabaticity parameter. \( \gamma \) rescales the frequencies to \( \omega_n/\gamma \).

In effect, this rescaling is what is done in centroid molecular dynamics (CMD). CMD rescales the normal modes to a very high frequency. The disadvantage of this is that it requires using a very short timestep, even when the exact propagator is used to evolve the normal mode coordinates. The PIMD simulation methodology we use is sometimes called “partially adiabatic centroid molecular dynamics”, denoted PA-CMD, because we choose an intermediate rescaling.

In most of our work we scale all normal modes to 10,000 cm\(^{-1}\), well above the overtones found at 5260 cm\(^{-1}\) and 6800 cm\(^{-1}\). The other ingredient to PIMD is to attach thermostats to each degree of freedom to overcome the ergodicity problems first pointed out by Hall and Berne (1984). We use Nosé-Hoover chain thermostats, with a chain length of 2. Alternatively, our code allows for Langevin thermostats to be used. The thermostating is done in normal-mode space, with the thermostats optimally tuned to each normal mode as they are in the PILE thermostat scheme of Ceriotti et al. Importantly, the centroid mode is not thermostatized, since doing so washes out the dynamics (as shown in fig. 1).

### Table I. A sampling of some recent published simulations of water with various DFT functionals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>authors / year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>time(ps)</th>
<th>functionals focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wang, et al. (2011)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>var vdW density, detailed structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsetti, et al. (2013)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>vdW-DF, VV10 compressibility, diffusivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt, et al. (2009)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>24-48</td>
<td>BLYP, PBE density, pressure, RDFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiStasio, et al. (2014)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>PBE0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaiduk, et al. (2015)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>330+</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>PBE, PBE0, PBE+D density, compressibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giacomino, et al. (2015)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>PBE, rVV10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang, et al. (2011)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>320+</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>DSSLPBE, LMKLL, OptB88, PBE, PBE0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongelto, et al. (2011)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PBE, optPBE-vdW, vdW-DF2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. The many body expansion

Our method is based on the many body expansion, which gives an exact decomposition of the potential into 1-body, 2-body, 3-body, and higher order terms:

\[ V(\{ R_I \}) = \sum_{I=1}^{N_{mol}} V_1(\{ R_I \}) + \sum_{I<J}^{N_{mol}} V_2(\{ R_I, R_J \}) 
+ \sum_{I<J<K}^{N_{mol}} V_3(\{ R_I, R_J, R_K \}) + \cdots \] (3)

In our method, we first subtract off the DFT monomer energies using a monomer potential energy surface (described below) fitted to the DFT functional being used. In our method, intramolecular forces on the beads are calculated using the Partridge-Schwenke monomer potential energy surface, which is a highly accurate surface derived from CCSD calculations. This can thought of as a
monomer correction to the DFT potential:

\[ V'(\{R_i\}) = V_{\text{DFT}}(\{R_i\}) - \sum_{i=1}^{\text{N}_{\text{mol}}} V_{\text{DFT}}(R_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{\text{N}_{\text{mol}}} V_{\text{PS}}(R_i) \]

The intermolecular forces on the beads are all set equal to the intermolecular forces computed from the bead centroids. Thus, in each timestep we only have to do one DFT calculation, using the centroid coordinates. Our method has the added advantage that it includes a monomer correction which increases the accuracy of the simulation, as a large contribution to DFT error in the monomer term. A comparison of radial distribution functions (RDFs) for conventional PBE and monomer-corrected PBE with 64 molecules is shown in figure 4. It is worth noting that in place of a monomer correction, the energy surface fit to the functional being used may be used instead, as may be desired for doing a full comparison of different functionals with PIMD.

### B. Monomer potential energy surface

The functional form of the potential energy surface (PES) developed by Partridge & Schwenke is:

\[ V(r_1, r_2, \theta) = V^a(r_1) + V^a(r_2) + V^b(r_{\text{HH}}) + V^c(r_1, r_2, \theta) \]

where

\[ V^a(r) = D[e^{-2a(r-r_0)} - 2e^{-a(r-r_0)}] \]
\[ V^b(r) = Ae^{-br} \]
\[ V^c(r_1, r_2, \theta) = c_{000} + e^{-\beta[(r_1-r_e)^2+(r_2-r_e)^2]} \]
\[ \times \sum_{ijk}[(r_1-r_e)/r_e]^i[(r_2-r_e)/r_e]^j \]
\[ \times [\cos(\theta) - \cos(\theta_e)]^k \]

as in the work of Partridge & Schwenke we truncate the polynomial at \( i + j \leq 8 \) and \( k \leq 14 - (i + j) \) for a total of 245 \( c_{ijk} \). We found that fitting this PES to DFT monomer data was the most technically challenging part of implementing our method. The fit was performed with a training set of DFT energies for 1,176 monomer configurations. We found that the PES had to be fit carefully out to large \( r_{\text{OH}} \) as otherwise the polynomial functions would not have the correct asymptotic behaviour, leading to occasional water dissociation events in the simulation. As was done by Partridge & Schwenke, we found that we had to compute points on a nonlinearly spaced grid, with more points where the PES changes rapidly. More specifically, we computed DFT energies at \( r_{\text{OH1}}, r_{\text{OH2}} \in \{0.65, 0.75, 0.85, 0.95, 0.975, 1.0, 1.05, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7\} \) Å and \( \theta_{\text{HOH}} \in \{85, 95, 100, 105, 110, 115\} \). The fitting was performed using the nonlinear regression routine \texttt{nlinfit()} in MATLAB. The results of our fitting are visualized in figures 2 and 3.

### C. Multiple timestep algorithm

The use of the monomer potential energy surface introduces a split between intramolecular and intermolecular forces which is similar to the type of split between long-range (slow) and short-range (fast) forces used in multiple time step (MTS) algorithms. Tuckerman, Berne, & Martyna derived an MTS integration algorithm which has the desirable properties of being phase space area-preserving (symplectic) and reversible. The method is derived from the classical propagator \( e^{tL\Delta t} \) which exactly evolves the system from an initial phase space point \( \Gamma(t) = \{\sum r_i, \sum p_i\} \) at time \( t \) to a final point at \( t + \Delta t \) through \( \Gamma(t+\Delta t) = e^{L\Delta t}\Gamma(t) \). The Liouville operator \( L \) is written as

\[ L = L_r + L_v + I_s^r + I_p^v \]

\[ = L_r + \sum_i \frac{n_m}{m_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_i} + \sum_i \frac{n_m}{m_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} + \sum_i \frac{n_m}{m_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \]

\[ (7) \]
The multiple timestep algorithm is derived by Trotter splitting the propagator with timestep $\Delta t$:

$$\begin{align*}
e^{iL_\Delta t} &\approx e^{iL_\Delta t/2} e^{iL_\Delta t/2} \\
&\times \left[ e^{iL_\Delta t/2} e^{iL_\Delta t/2} e^{iL_\Delta t/2} \right]^M \\
&\times e^{iL_\Delta t/2} e^{iL_\Delta t/2}
\end{align*}$$

(8)

Here the inner timestep is $\frac{\Delta t}{M}$, where $M$ is an integer. Expression (8) can be translated into an algorithm by reading the sequence of propagators from right to left. First, the global thermostat is applied for half of the outer timestep, followed by a modification of the momenta by the slowly varying force. Next, the inner loop is performed $M$ times. The inner loop consists of an update of the momentum with the fast varying force and evolution of the free ring polymer ($L_0$) for a timestep $\delta t = \Delta t/M$. Finally, in a symmetric fashion one applies an update of the momenta with the slowly varying force and an update of the thermostat. When using a multiple timestep method, one should be aware that resonances can occur between the fast timestep(s) and the slower timestep(s). The first resonance occurs when the outer timestep becomes larger than $t_{\text{max}} = \tau/\pi$, where $\tau$ is the period of the fastest mode in the problem. For water, this would be the OH stretch frequency $\approx 3600$ cm$^{-1}$ which leads to a value of $\Delta t_{\text{max}} = 2.95$ fs. However, in PIMD simulation one must also consider the highest frequency normal mode of the ring polymer when combined with the OH potential, which is $\sqrt{\omega_{R,\text{P, max}}^2+\omega_{H,\text{max}}^2}$. For a full PIMD simulation with 32 beads this corresponds to a max frequency of 13,300 cm$^{-1}$ and a resonance at $\Delta t = 0.8$ fs. If we instead scale the normal modes to 4100 cm$^{-1}$ (as done here), then one obtains a resonance at $\Delta t_{\text{max}} = 1.9$ fs. Because of resonances and non-conservation of energy, our testing showed that the size of the outer timestep cannot go above $\approx 1.5$ fs – any longer and the simulation quickly becomes unstable. However, Morrone, et al. have shown that the use of colored noise thermostats can stabilize resonances, offering the possibility of higher outer timesteps. 

II. COMPARISON TO OTHER METHODS

Our method can be understood as an extension to ab-initio MD of the ring polymer contraction method introduced by Markland and Manolopoulos for classical MD. In ring polymer contraction, long-range forces are analyzed using a contracted ring polymer with $n'$ beads that are constructed by taking the $n'$ lowest frequency ring polymer normal modes in Fourier space and transforming them into real space. Short range forces are analysed on all $n$ beads. Our method corresponds to contraction to $n = 1$, namely the centroid mode (also called the 0th order mode), and a separation between long range and short range forces that corresponds to intermolecular vs intramolecular forces.

Because it is based on a separation of long range and short range forces, ring polymer contraction can be combined with a multiple time step (MTS) method. Recently a technique called basis set partitioning was developed to incorporate MTS into ab-initio simulation. Luehr, Markland, and Martinez have demonstrated how MTS can be implemented in Hartree-Fock calculations for water clusters using a fragment-based approach. Recently a number of papers have been published that combine ring polymer contracted PIMD with a MTS integrator and the idea of mixing forces from higher level and lower level ab initio methods. The lower level ab-initio technique can be used to handle the short timestep & full ring polymer, while the higher level (more expensive) technique can be used with the longer timestep and contracted ring polymer. For example, in two recent studies, MP2 was combined with DFT in this manner to study small gas phase molecular systems. A variation of this method called multilevel sampling has also been introduced and applied to FCC hydrogen, resulting in a 3-4x speedup.

Recently, two separate groups have published a method called “quantum ring polymer contraction”, which uses an auxiliary potential to perform PIMD with little added cost. The method they employed, while couched in different language, is similar to the method we present here. The principal difference is that they use self consistent charge density functional tight binding (SCC-DFTB) as the auxiliary potential in place of the monomer PES we use here. Our method has the advantage of introducing a monomer correction.

Two additional methods were introduced recently - ring polymer interpolation, which yields a 2x speedup, and adaptive resolution PIMD, which allows for PIMD simulation to be mixed with classical simulation. Both of these methods are complementary to our method and
FIG. 5. Validation with TTM3F: hydrogen density of states (DOS) for one molecule (gas phase) at 300 K.

could be used in conjunction with it.

III. VERIFICATION OF THE METHOD

To verify that our method captures nuclear quantum effects with minimal losses in accuracy compared to a full PIMD simulation, we compare several observables - RDFs, infrared spectra, density of states, and OH distance histograms. The infrared spectrum is calculated using:

$$ I(\omega) = \frac{1}{N_{hyd}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i\omega t} \langle \mathbf{P}(0) \cdot \mathbf{P}(t) \rangle dt \quad (12) $$

The extent of delocalization of the hydrogen atoms is quantified through the radius of gyration, which is the root mean square displacement of ring polymer beads from the center of the ring:

$$ r_{gyr,H} = \frac{1}{N_{H}N_{b}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{H}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{b}} || \mathbf{r}_j^i - \mathbf{r}_i^c || \quad (13) $$

A. Initial tests with TTM3F

The first verification of our method was done with the polarizable TTM3F potential which is parametrized from...
The nuclear delocalization in the full and approximate methods is nearly the same.

B. Tests with DFT

We tested our method with PBE and the Berland-Hyldgaard (BH) functional, which is a version of the DRSLL vdW functional introduced by Dion et al. with modified exchange. We began by simulating isolating molecules with both full PIMD and monPIMD, and then progressed to simulating a pentamer cluster. The distribution of \( r_{OH} \) for the pentamer cluster simulations of BH with both full PIMD and monPIMD are shown in fig. 9. The distributions of centroid-centroid and bead-bead \( r_{OH} \) distances are nearly the same, with slightly more delocalization observed in the full PIMD simulation as compared to monomer PIMD. Similar results were observed for PBE.

Figure 12 shows the DOS for a single molecule simulated using the BH functional with conventional PIMD and our monomer PIMD method with 1 bead and 32 beads. The expected redshifting of the bending and
FIG. 10. Comparison of RDFs for BH simulated at 350 K with the monomer PIMD method (with the monomer correction) compared to a conventional BH simulation.

FIG. 11. Density of states (eqn. 12) for 64 molecules with conventional MD, compared with the monomer PIMD method (32 beads).

FIG. 12. Density of states (eqn. 12) for a single molecule with the BH functional simulated with traditional classical DFT and the monomer PIMD method with 1 bead and 32 beads at 350 K.

stretching bands is observed, however additional peaks are observed at \( \approx 2250 \text{ cm}^{-1} \) and \( \approx 5250 \text{ cm}^{-1} \). The spurious peaks are observed both with 1 beads and 32 beads, indicating that they stem from some aspect of the effective potential energy surface rather than bead normal mode contamination. However, careful inspection of our fit potential energy surface did not reveal any spurious minima or other irregularities. Attempts to refit the surface with more data points were not successful in removing the peaks from the spectra. It is possible they arise from the residual error surface that comes from subtracting the PES energies & forces from the DFT energies & forces. Spurious peaks in the same locations were observed for PBE simulations as well, suggesting a more general origin. Interestingly, the experimental water IR spectrum contains a small peak at \( \approx 2100 \text{ cm}^{-1} \), called the “association band” which is due to a combination of libration and HOH bending. The intensity of the association band has been found to be very sensitive to the coordinates used to construct the dipole moment surface among other factors such as H-bonding configuration.

We observed that the association band sometimes appears in simulation of water monomer with TTM3F (see the tiny peak in fig. 3) both with our monomer method and classical simulation. The true origin of the spurious peaks observed with DFT simulation requires further study to fully understand. Given the fact that PIMD is only rigorous for the calculation of equilibrium properties and that many methods suffer from similar spurious peaks from normal mode contamination, the presence of spurious peaks in the spectrum is not as large of an issue as it may appear.

Next we performed a simulation of 64 molecules with the monomer PIMD method for both BH and PBE. A comparison of RDFs is shown in fig. 10 for BH. We observe the correct destructuring of the first O-O peak and first O-O valley as well as the expected destructuring of the the O-H and H-H peaks. Information on the average water molecule geometry, dipole moment, and diffusion constant is shown in table III B. Our simulation with monPIMD results in a slightly larger \( r_{\text{OH}} \) and HOH angle, and leads to a slightly smaller (-0.5 %) dipole moment, and larger diffusion constant. The density of states for the 64 molecule BH simulation is shown in fig. 11. Again we see the same spurious peaks observed with the monomer.

IV. CONCLUSION

We have introduced a new methodology for speeding up PIMD simulation with density functional theory and have shown that it allows for computationally tractable PIMD DFT calculations of the equilibrium properties of water. While our method can be extended to any molecular system, we focused on liquid water and our code is designed specifically with water in mind. Our custom PIMD code is open source and the latest version is avail-
able at https://github.com/delton137/PIMD-F90. Our method and code was fully validated for TTM3F through a comparison of full PIMD simulation with the monomer PIMD method, showing that the method reproduces both the structure and dynamics of liquid water observed in full PIMD simulation. The advantage of our method is the ≈ 30 x speedup obtained, which makes ab-initio PIMD simulations of water practical. The disadvantage of our method is that it requires careful mapping and fitting of a monomer potential energy surface for each DFT functional & basis set combination which one wishes to use. In principle, the process of PES fitting could be fully automated, however. While we used a carefully selected PES function, potential energy surfaces may be accurately fit using neural networks. Such an approach would be in line with recent work showing how PIMD simulation may be done with deep neural network potentials.

TABLE III. Note: distances for PIMD simulation are reported in the form centroid-centroid distance / bead-bead distance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>property</th>
<th>BH vdW</th>
<th>class. monPIMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⟨r_{OH}⟩</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.986/.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⟨\theta_{HOH}⟩</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>105.02/104.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⟨μ⟩</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (10^{-10} cm^2/s)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⟨rgy⟩(Å)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max bead r_{OH}</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max cent. r_{OH}</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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