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Introduction. Hohenberg-Kohn density functional theory (DFT) [1, 2] has come to prominence mainly in Kohn-Sham (KS) orbital form [3]. However, driving \textit{ab initio} molecular dynamics (AIMD) [4, 5] with KS DFT exposes a computational cost-scaling burden. The KS computational cost scales no better than $N_e^3$ with $N_e$ the number of electrons or number of thermally occupied bands. Additionally there is reciprocal space sampling cost or equivalent costs from large real-space unit cells used with Γ-point sampling. In contrast, orbital-free DFT (OF-DFT) offers linear scaling with system size [6, 7] for use of AIMD on arbitrarily large systems.

The long-standing barrier to widespread use of OF-DFT has been the lack of reliable non-empirical approximate kinetic energy density functionals (KEDFs). In terms of the KS orbitals $\varphi_j$, the exact, positive definite KS kinetic energy (KE) density is

$$t_s[n] = t_s^{orb} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_e} |\nabla \varphi_j|^2,$$

in Hartree atomic units with $n(r)$ the electron number density (and unit occupation for simplicity). Two types of approximate KEDFs have been explored, semi-local (one-point)

$$T_s[n] = \int \text{d}r t_s[n(r), \nabla n(r), \ldots]$$

and two-point with a non-local term

$$T_{NL}[n] = c_{TF} \int \text{d}r \nabla n(r) K[n(r), n'(r), r, r'] n^{\beta}(r'),$$

with $c_{TF} = \frac{3}{10}(3\pi^2)^{2/3}$. For a dimensionless $K$, $\alpha + \beta = 8/3$. Most approximate KEDs are parametrized; see Refs. [8, 9] for details as well as brief discussion below. In this communication, we propose a novel non-empirical one-point KEDF and show that it is competitive with current two-point KEDFs, generally better than other one-point functionals, more transferable, and notably faster.

Generalized Gradient Approximations. The simplest one-point functionals are Thomas-Fermi [14, 16]

$$T_{TF}[n] := \int \text{d}r t_{TF}(r), t_{TF}(r) := c_{TF} n^{2/3}(r),$$

and von-Weizsäcker [17]

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

Neither is satisfactory as a general KEDF. As with approximate exchange-correlation (XC) functionals [18], the gradient expansion of the weakly inhomogeneous electron gas KE leads to consideration of generalized gradient approximations (GGA) for $T_s$,

$$T_{s}^{GGA}[n] = \int \text{d}r T_{TF}(r) F_{t}(s(r)).$$

Here $F_t(s)$ is the GGA KE enhancement factor, a function of the dimensionless reduced density gradient $s := \frac{\nabla n}{2n^{3/2}} \equiv \frac{1}{2n^{3/2}} |\nabla n|$ familiar from GGA X functionals. GGA KEDFs so constructed automatically satisfy $T_s$ uniform scaling requirements [19]. In GGA form the von Weizsäcker KE becomes $F_{W}(s) = \frac{3}{2} s^2$. From the Pauli term decomposition [8, 20, 21],

$$T_s[n] = T_{W}[n] + T_{\theta}[n],$$

three constraints follow [22]:

$$T_{\theta}[n] \geq 0,$$

$$\nu_{\theta}(r) \geq 0 \forall r,$$

$$\nu_{\theta}(r) \geq \frac{t_{\theta}(r)}{n(r)} \forall r, \quad t_{\theta} := t_s^{orb} - t_{W},$$

with the Pauli potential defined as $\nu_{\theta}(r) := \delta T_{\theta}[n]/\delta n(r)$ and the Pauli enhancement factor is $F_{\theta}(s) = F_{t}(s) - F_{W}(s)$.

To date, perhaps the best constraint-based GGA KEDF is VT84F (evaluated at $T=0$ K of course) [23].
It is successful in finite-T AIMD simulations \cite{24} and is the only non-empirical GGA KEDF that yields reasonable binding in simple solids. It was constrained to satisfy Eqs. \cite{8} and \cite{9} for physical atom densities, i.e., those that obey the Kato cusp condition \cite{25}. VT84F also was constrained to respect \( \lim_{s \to -\infty} F_\theta (s)/F_W (s) = 0 \). This comes from the one-electron tail region of a many-electron atom \cite{26} where \( t_\theta /t_W \) must vanish, hence \( t_s \to t_W \) \cite{27}.

In terms of the universal Hohenberg-Kohn-Levy density functional, such a physically motivated constraint is non-universal: the Kato cusp condition is specific to an external Coulomb potential. Such non-universality is rational for material and molecular property calculations. But the ubiquitous use of pseudo-potential plane-wave basis methods in AIMD simulations means that it is not the optimal non-universality for them. OF-DFT calculations in fact require a local pseudo-potential (LPP). The OF-DFT Euler equation then implies that \( v_\theta \) is closely related to the LPP \( v_\text{ext}^{\, \text{pseudo}} \) and that \( v_\theta \) is evaluated with the corresponding pseudo-density. Thus any constraint based on density characteristics should be specific to a particular type or class of pseudo-potential.

Ref. \cite{28} explored some elementary consequences for constraint satisfaction (or violation) with non-Kato densities. Difficulties with simpler one-point KEDFs (linear combinations of \( T_{TF} \) and \( T_W \)) used with orbital-free projector augmented-wave pseudo-densities also have been reported \cite{29}. So far as we know, no approximate KEDF has been constructed by explicit satisfaction of the foregoing constraints, Eqs. \cite{8}–\cite{9}, for a specified type of pseudo-densities. Nor has Eq. \cite{10} been used.

New GGA KEDF. We resolve this pseudopotential AIMD deficiency by devising a GGA KEDF constrained to satisfy Eqs. \cite{8} and \cite{9} for pseudo-densities of a particular kind and show that in most spatial regions its \( v_\theta \) satisfies Eq. \cite{10} as well. The new GGA KEDF enhancement factor is

\[
F_{\theta}^{LKT} (s) = \frac{1}{\cosh (a s)} + \frac{5}{3} s^2 \quad (11)
\]

with parameter \( a > 0 \). Fig. 1 compares \( F_{\theta}^{LKT} \) with the VT84F and APBEK \cite{30} enhancement factors. It satisfies the obvious homogeneous electron gas constraint \( \lim_{s \to 0} F_{\theta} (s) = 1 \) and obeys \( 0 \leq F_{\theta}^{LKT} \leq 1 \) so as to satisfy the bound conjectured by Lieb \cite{31, 32}

\[
T_s \leq T_{TF} + T_W . \quad (12)
\]

\( F_{\theta}^{LKT} \) also satisfies \cite{22, 26, 33} \( t_\theta ([n]; r) \geq 0 \ \forall \ r \) thus \( T_{\theta}^{LKT} \geq 0 \).

The sole parameter \( a = 1.3 \) was determined as follows. A set of pseudo-densities was generated for the atoms H through Ne with a typical Hamann norm-conserving non-local pseudo-potential (NLPP) scheme \cite{34} using default radii in the APE code \cite{35} and the Perdew-Zunger (PZ) XC local density approximation (LDA) \cite{36}. Then \( a \) was found such that all the post-scf Pauli potentials from those pseudo-densities satisfied \( v_\theta \geq 0 \ \forall \ r \). Importantly, as long as an \( a \) value gave \( v_\theta \geq 0 \) for the H atom, positivity also was met for all the heavier atoms. For Li \( a < 1.4 \) is required, while for H, \( a \leq 1.3 \) is needed to get a post-scf \( v_\theta \geq 0 \). For He, the \( a \) value does not seem to matter within the range tested. While the \( a \) value is non-universal, we expect reasonable transferability to those other pseudo-potential types for which the pseudo-densities are similar, specifically those with nearly flat pseudo-densities near the nucleus. The expectation is confirmed by post-scf and scf calculations for atoms.

Though reference atom set, H–Ne, encompasses 1–8 pseudo-electrons, equally good performance for other elements is not assured. Post-scf determination of \( a \) also is distinct from self-consistent calculation, which might vitiate the supposedly constrained behavior. Atomic tests are the first line of investigating these issues. For a given pseudo-potential and XC approximation, self-consistent solution of the KS equation provides the exact KS \( t_\theta \) and the ingredients to construct the exact KS Pauli \( v_\theta \) (see Eq. (35) in Ref. \cite{20}). Those are the standards against which to judge \( t_\theta \) and \( v_\theta \) from an approximate KEDF. In anticipation of the OF-DFT calculations on periodically bounded systems reported below, we focused upon the bulk-derived LPP (BLPS) \cite{37, 38} for two atoms, Al and Li. Here we discuss Al because it was not in the \( a \) calibration. Li discussion is in the Supplemental Material \cite{39}. (The Li pseudo-atom is challenging because it is a one-orbital system (2s\(^3\)) for which \( T_\theta \) should vanish.) Again the XC functional is PZ.

Fig. 2 displays the exact \( t_\theta /n \) and \( v_\theta \) for the BLPS Al pseudo-atom in the 3s\(^2\)3p\(^1\) configuration and the post-scf results with that pseudo-density for both VT84F and LKT. Note several features. Though VT84F was constructed to satisfy \( v_\theta^{VT84F} \geq 0 \) near a nucleus for Kato-cusped densities, it also satisfies that constraint arbitrarily close to the nucleus for the cusp-less pseudo-density.
However, $v_\theta^{VT84F}$ becomes negative near $r = 0.1$ bohr, a clear example of the crucial non-universality. LKT does not have that problem. Second, $v_\theta^{LKT}$ is much smoother than $v_\theta^{VT84F}$, though not as smooth as $v_\theta^{KS}$. Third, except for a small region around $r = 1.8$ bohr, $v_\theta^{LKT}$ respects the Pauli potential inequality, Eq. (10), whereas $v_\theta^{VT84F}$ violates it in four regions that span much of the significant density magnitude.

Note also that, unlike some other GGA KEDFs, e.g. E00 [13], PBE2 [21], and APBEK, $v_\theta^{LKT}(r)$ decays correctly to zero asymptotically for an atom. This may be useful in the AIMD simulation of low-density regions of matter. Though $v_\theta^{VT84F}$ decays similarly, its rapid oscillations in the dominant density region might slow scf convergence rates as well as cause other difficulties.

Self-consistent OF calculations for the BLPS Al pseudo-atom show that $v_\theta^{LKT}$ stays positive, though it exhibits oscillations quite similar to those seen in the post-scf case; see Fig. 3. The inequality of Eq. (10) is violated only around $r = 1.8$ bohr as in the post-scf case. However, the LKT Pauli energy per particle is far from the KS value.

**Performance on Solids.** Validation of the new functional for AIMD requires accuracy tests on extended systems. We therefore did KS-DFT and OF-DFT calculations on simple metals and semiconductors. Conventional KS calculations were done with ABINIT [11] and the OF-DFT calculations used PROFESS [42] and/or PROFESS@QUANTUM-ESPRESSO [43]. Again the PZ LDA XC functional and BLPS were used. For comparison we included the Wang-Govind-Carter (WGC) [10], Huang-Carter (HC) [11], and Constantin et al. KGAP [13] two-point KEDFs and the one-point Constantin et al. SOF-CFD [44] meta-GGA (Laplacian-dependent)

![FIG. 2. Upper left: Al BLPS as function of radial position (inset: KS pseudo density); Upper right: exact KS $v_\theta$ and $t_\theta/n$. Lower left: post-scf $v_\theta$ (solid) and $t_\theta/n$ for VT84F (dashed). Lower right: Same for LKT.](image)

![FIG. 3. Top: Al KS (solid, red) and LKT (dashed, blue) pseudo-densities as function of radial position. Bottom: KS vs. LKT $v_\theta$ (solid red vs. dash-dotted blue, upper pair) and similarly $t_\theta/n$ (dashed red v. dotted blue; lower pair).](image)

KEDF. Technical details and parameter values are in the Supplemental Material [45].

Note that WGC was parametrized for main-group metals and yields poor binding curves for semiconductors, while HC was parametrized for semiconductors. KGAP is parametrized to experimental direct band gaps. Results from the one-point functionals E00, APBEK, and PBE2 are omitted because of unrealistic binding curves for the former two and instability problems for the latter one. KGAP comparisons are from Tables I and II of Ref. [13]. SOF-CFD values are from Table I of Ref. [44]. Equilibrium volumes, energies, and bulk moduli for other functionals were generated by varying $\pm 5\%$ around the equilibrium volume to obtain $11$ energy-volume points, which then were fitted to the Birch-Murnaghan equation of state [45].

The metals were Li, Mg, and Al in the simple cubic, body-centered cubic, face-centered cubic, and hexagonal close-packed structures. Nine III-V semiconductors in zinc-blende structures were treated: AlP, AlAs, AlSb, GaP, GaAs, GaSb, InP, InAs, and InSb.

**TABLE I. KEDF performance on solid metals and semiconductors: MARE of equilibrium volumes $V_0$, energies $E_0$, and bulk moduli $B_0$, as percentages. See text for notation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEDF</th>
<th>Metals</th>
<th>Semiconductors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WGC</td>
<td>$V_0$</td>
<td>$E_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGAP</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT84F</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOF-CFD</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LKT</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: only metals with cubic symmetry were included and PBE XC was used.*
With KS quantities as references, Table 1 shows the mean absolute relative error (MARE) percentages for equilibrium volume $V_0$, energy $E_0$ per atom (for metals) or per cell (for semiconductors), and bulk moduli $B_0$ from WGC, HC, KGAP, VT84F, SOF-CFD, and LKT. These are calculated as $|Q_{OF} - Q_{KS}|/Q_{KS} \times 100/N_{systems}$, where $Q$ is $V_0$, $E_0$, or $B_0$. (More detailed tabulations are in the Supplemental Material [34].) For $V_0$ and $B_0$, LKT is a significant improvement over VT84F. The $V_0$ and $B_0$ MAREs are reduced by 33% in metals. The reduction is more dramatic in the semi-conductors, a factor of 5 for $V_0$ and 13 for $B_0$. The semiconductor $E_0$ MARE is reduced by 22% but worsened slightly from 0.1% to 0.2% for the metals. Except for performance on semiconductor $E_0$, it is also clear that the LKT GGA is superior to the more-complicated non-empirical SOF-CFD meta-GGA KEDF.

Regarding the two-point functionals, WGC outperforms all the other functionals on the metals but is inapplicable on semiconductors, recall above [10]. Conversely, HC with averaged parameters exhibits balanced error, with all three MAREs within 5% (except $B_0$ for metals). KGAP does well on volumes in both classes but not $B_0$. Remarkably LKT exhibits performance competitive with both HC and KGAP in prediction of equilibrium volumes for both material classes. Moreover, LKT outperforms HC for $B_0$ and is much more balanced than KGAP for $B_0$. (Comparison with the recent MGP two-point functional is of no avail, since its parametrization is tuned to match KS results for each system [12].)

For the case of AlP, we found that LKT converges for relatively smaller energy cutoff than needed with VT84F and HC. Typically LKT also requires fewer self-consistent iterations for solution to a given tolerance than are needed by either HC or VT84F and each LKT iteration is typically about one-fifth the time of an HC iteration. Thus the one-point LKT is more useful as a broadly applicable functional than the highly parametrized two-point HC KEDF or the experimentally parametrized two-point KGAP KEDF yet is simpler, faster, and mostly better than the SOF-CFD one-point KEDF. LKT seems therefore to be currently the most promising candidate for general AIMD OF-DFT use or with small-box algorithms [16]. Though it remains to be tested, we anticipate the finite-T generalization [17] of LKT will be of value for warm dense matter simulations.

As to limitations, LKT does not yield a good value of $V_0$ for bcc Li with a 3-electron LPP. So far as we know, all GGA KEDFs developed so far share this limitation. The extent of transferability to another distinct class of pseudo-potential, along with the post-scf determination of $a$, remains to be examined.
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