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Abstract

Density-corrected density functional theory (DC-DFT) is enjoying substantial success in improving semilocal DFT calculations in a wide variety of chemical problems. This paper provides the formal theoretical framework and assumptions for the analysis of any functional minimization with an approximate functional. We generalize DC-DFT to allow comparison of any two functionals, not just comparison with the exact functional. We introduce a linear interpolation between any two approximations, and use the results to analyze global hybrid density functionals. We define the basins of density-space in which this analysis should apply, and give quantitative criteria for when DC-DFT should apply. We also discuss the effects of strong correlation on density-driven error, utilizing the restricted HF Hubbard dimer as an illustrative example.

I. Introduction and background

Kohn-Sham density functional theory (KS DFT) [1] is widely popular as an electronic structure method [2]. Despite the proliferation of choices of approximate functionals, most calculations use one of a few standard approximations that have been available for the past twenty years, namely generalized gradient approximations (GGAs) or global hybrids, with some enhancements, such as van der Waals corrections [3] or range separation [4]. While moderately accurate for many useful properties, these functionals suffer from well-known deficiencies, including unbound anions, poorly positioned eigenvalues, incorrect molecular dissociation curves, underestimation of reaction barriers, and many others [5, 6]. Thus the never-ending search for improved functionals.

Over the years, many pioneers have shown in specific cases that use of approximate functionals on Hartree-Fock (HF) densities can yield surprisingly accurate results. This includes the early work of Gordon and Kim for weak forces [7], Janesko and Scuseria for reaction barriers and other properties [8, 9], and the original works of Gill et al. testing GGA’s and hybrids for main group chemistry that led to the adoption of DFT for widespread use in chemistry [10]. Even the prototype of KS-DFT, the X–α-method of Slater [11], was designed to yield approximations to HF potentials, which led to an inconsistency between the associated energy functional and its derivative, the potential (see Ref. [12] for a recent discussion on this topic). Analysis of this difficulty was part of the impetus for the KS paper.

The errors made in DFT calculations were formally separated into two contributions, a functional error and a density-driven error, thereby yielding a formal framework in which the two errors could be analyzed independently [13]. This led to the theory of density-corrected DFT (DC-DFT), which explains the success of the early work, and has provided a simple procedure for significantly improving the results of semi-local DFT calculations in many situations. For example, for Halogen and Chalcogen weak bonds, which have been used in databases to train van der Waals functionals, the errors are dominated by density-driven errors in the semilocal functional, so such databases cannot be used for that purpose without a correction [14]. In addition to the standard semilocal functionals, it has been recently shown that in specific situations, the energetic accuracy of other density functionals, such as the nonlocal functionals based on adiabatic connection models [15], can be greatly improved by using the HF density and orbitals [16, 17].

Thus, DC-DFT, especially in the form of HF-DFT, in which the Hartree-Fock density is used in place of the exact density, is an extremely practical procedure for improving energetics of abnormal DFT calculations, i.e., those dominated by density-driven errors, but in which the approximate functional is still highly accurate.

Here, we give a detailed formal analysis of the differences that arise between the self-consistent solutions of two distinct density functionals. We consider any two functionals, including the possibility of two different approximations. Thus, DC-DFT is a special case of this more general analysis. We also consider other special cases, including the one-electron case, for which we can calculate all the quantities arising from our analysis that require access to the exact functional and the exact density. The accuracy of PBE for the H-atom is due to a spurious cancellation of both density and functional errors, as well as exchange and correlation errors. We extend our analysis to energy differences, that are of the key importance in chemistry. We also construct measures for the abnormality character of DFT calculations.
II. Density functional analysis

In KS DFT [1, 2, 6, 13, 19], the ground state energy and density of a system with an external potential \( v \) are given by:

\[
E_v = \min_n \{ F[n] + n \cdot v \},
\]

where \( n \cdot v = \int d^3r \ n(r)v(r) \), and where \( F[n] \) is the universal part of the functional commonly partitioned as:

\[
F[n] = T_S[n] + U_H[n] + E_{XC}[n],
\]

where \( F_{SH}[n] \) is the universal functional within the Hartree approximation, which neglects exchange and correlation effects:

\[
F_{SH}[n] = T_S[n] + U_H[n].
\]

The total energy functional is then given by:

\[
E_v[n] = F[n] + n \cdot v,
\]

where \( E_{v}[n] \) is the universal functional within the Hartree approximation, which neglects exchange and correlation effects:

\[
F_{SH}[n] = T_S[n] + U_H[n].
\]

As usual, the corresponding ground state energy is obtained from the following minimization over all \( N \)-representable densities:

\[
E_v = \min_n E_v[n],
\]

and the density that achieves the minimum in Eq. 5 we denote by \( n_v \). We define an energetic measure of any arbitrary density difference from \( n_v \) as:

\[
D_v[\Delta n] = E_v[n_v + \Delta n] - E_v \geq 0,
\]

where Eq. 5 ensures that \( D_v[\Delta n] \geq 0 \) for any isoelectronic change in \( n_v \) (i.e. \( \int d^3r \Delta n(r) = 0 \)). We refer to this as the energetic distance from the minimum. We can use this measure to see that \( n \) is sufficiently close to \( n_v \), if:

\[
D_v[n - n_v] \leq \Delta_v,
\]

provided that \( \Delta_v \) is sufficiently small.

Throughout this work, we encounter simple quadratic density functionals, which correspond to normal forms in algebra, and we write:

\[
A[\Delta n] = \int d^3r' \int d^3r A(r, r') \Delta n(r) \Delta n(r').
\]

To gain more insight into the \( D_v[\Delta n] \) functional, we can expand \( E_v[n] \) around its minimum in a Taylor series:

\[
E_v[n + \Delta n] = E_v + \frac{1}{2} K_v[\Delta n] + O(\Delta n^2),
\]

where \( \Delta n(r) = n(r) - n_v(r) \), and \( K_v(r, r') \) is given by:

\[
K_v(r, r') = \frac{\delta^2 E_v[n]}{\delta n(r') \delta n(r)}|_{n=n_v}.
\]

Combining Eqs. 3 and 10 we can write \( K_v(r, r') \) as:

\[
K_v(r, r') = f_{SH}[n_v](r, r') + f_{XC}[n_v](r, r'),
\]

where

\[
f_{SH}[n](r, r') = \frac{\delta^2 T_S[n]}{\delta n(r') \delta n(r)} + \frac{1}{|r - r'|} f_S(r, r')
\]

and

\[
f_{XC}[n](r, r') = \frac{\delta^2 E_{XC}[n]}{\delta n(r') \delta n(r)}
\]

is the static XC kernel. Combining now Eqs. 6 and 9 for arbitrary and sufficiently small density difference (i.e. \( D_v[\Delta n] \leq \Delta_v \)), we can write \( D_v[\Delta n] \) as:

\[
D_v[\Delta n] \approx \frac{1}{2} K_v[\Delta n].
\]

For any \( \Delta n(r) \), satisfying \( \int d^3r \Delta n(r) = 0 \), we define:

\[
\beta = \frac{\delta \Delta_{\beta}}{\delta \Delta n} = \frac{\beta \Delta n(r)}{\Delta n(r)}.
\]

In this way, we can see how far one can go away from \( n_v(r) \), in the \( \Delta n(r) \) 'direction', and yet stay within \( \Delta_v \) energetically. Plugging Eq. 15 into Eq. 14 we can easily find the \( \beta = \beta_c \) parameter at the boundary (i.e., the one satisfying:

\[
D_v[\Delta n_{\beta}] = \Delta_v,
\]

and it is given by:

\[
\beta_c = \sqrt{\frac{2\Delta_v}{K_v[\Delta n]}}.
\]

The principal goal of the theory outlined here is to carefully analyze the origin of the energy difference that arises between a pair of different density functionals, when applied to the same system/process. For a given pair of approximate (or one approximate and the other exact) XC functionals: \( E^{(0)}_{XC} \) and \( E^{(1)}_{XC} \), we define their difference as:

\[
\Delta E_{XC}[n] = E^{(1)}_{XC}[n] - E^{(0)}_{XC}[n].
\]

For a given \( v(r) \), the difference in the two ground state energies arising from a pair of different functionals is:

\[
\Delta E_v = E^{(1)}_v[n^{(1)}_v] - E^{(0)}_v[n^{(0)}_v].
\]

By simply adding and subtracting \( E^{(1)}_v[n^{(0)}_v] \) from the r.h.s. of Eq. 18 we find:

\[
\Delta E_v = -D_v^{(1)}[-\Delta n_v] + \Delta E_{XC}[n^{(0)}_v]
\]
where $\Delta n_v(r) = n_v^{(1)}(r) - n_v^{(0)}(r)$. Reversing the choice of 1 and 0, we also find:

$$\Delta E_v = \Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(1)}] + D_v^{(0)}[\Delta n_v]. \quad (20)$$

Given that $D_v^{(j)} \geq 0$, Eqs. 19 and 20 dictate the following chain of inequalities:

$$\Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(1)}] \leq \Delta E_v \leq \Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(0)}]. \quad (21)$$

![Figure 1: Cartoon showing the density-driven and functional-driven contributions to $\Delta E_v$ (Eqs. 19 and 20) in an energy-driven difference (top panel) and a density-driven difference (bottom panel).](image)

By virtue of Eq. 17, the $\Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(1)}]$ quantity represents the difference between the two functionals evaluated on each density. Therefore, we can identify $\Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(1)}]$ and $\Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(0)}]$ of Eqs. 19 and 20 as functional-driven terms. On the other hand, $D_v^{(0)}[n_v^{(1)}]$ and $D_v^{(1)}[n_v^{(0)}]$ are the density-driven terms, as they are given by the difference between the same energy functional evaluated on different densities. Generalizing the ideas of DC-DFT [13, 14, 21], for any pair of density functionals, we classify energy-driven difference as energy- or density-driven. We consider energy-driven $\Delta E_v$ as ones whose functional-driven terms in Eqs. 19 and 20 strongly dominate the density-driven terms (i.e. $|\Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(1)}]| \gg |D_v^{(1)}[\Delta n_v]|$ and $|\Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(0)}]| \gg |D_v^{(0)}[\Delta n_v]|$). On the other hand, in density-driven cases the density-driven terms are no longer negligible. In Figure 1, we show the two density-driven and the two functional-driven contributions to their energy difference in a cartoon representing an energy-driven difference (top panel) and a density-driven difference (bottom panel). Measures that quantify density-driven character in a given system (again for a given pair of functionals) will be introduced and discussed in Section [V].

III. Density functional interpolation

To derive an exact expression for $\Delta E_v$ by smoothly connecting $E_v^{(0)}[n]$ to $E_{XC}^{(1)}[n]$, we introduce the $\alpha$-parameter dependent XC functional:

$$E_{XC}^{(\alpha)}[n] = E_{XC}^{(0)}[n] + \alpha \Delta E_{XC}[n]. \quad (22)$$

The corresponding total energy functional reads as:

$$E_v^{(\alpha)}[n] = E_{SH}[n] + n \cdot v + E_{XC}^{(\alpha)}[n] + \alpha \Delta E_{XC} \quad (23)$$

and achieves its minimum at $n_v^{(\alpha)}(r)$. Thus its ground state energy is given by $E_v^{(\alpha)}[n_v^{(\alpha)}]$. More generally, we consider the following energy difference:

$$\Delta E_v^{(\alpha)} = E_v^{(\alpha)} - E_v^{(0)} = E_v^{(\alpha)}[n_v^{(\alpha)}] - E_v^{(0)}[n_v^{(0)}]. \quad (24)$$

Writing:

$$\Delta E_v^{(\alpha)} = \int_0^\alpha d\alpha' \frac{\partial E_v^{(\alpha')}}{\partial \alpha'}, \quad (25)$$

from Eq. 23 via the Hellmann-Feynman theorem, it follows:

$$\frac{\partial E_v^{(\alpha)}}{\partial \alpha} = \Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(\alpha)}]. \quad (26)$$

Plugging Eq. 26 into Eq. 25 we find:

$$\Delta E_v^{(\alpha)} = \int_0^\alpha d\alpha' \Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(\alpha')}]. \quad (27)$$

Equation 27 is analogous to, but different from, the adiabatic connection formula for the correlation energy in DFT [26, 27, 28]. When $\alpha = 1$, Eq. 27 becomes:

$$\Delta E_v = \int_0^1 \! d\alpha \Delta E_{XC}[n_v^{(\alpha)}]. \quad (28)$$

This shows that the energy difference between two KS calculations with different XC functionals can be found knowing only the difference functional and the interpolating ground-state density. Obtaining $\Delta E_v$ from Eq. 28 requires knowledge of
\( n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \) for all values between 0 and 1. To find \( n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \), we write the corresponding Euler equation:
\[
v^{(0)}_{\text{SHXC}}[n](r) + \alpha \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n](r) + v(r) = \mu. \tag{29}
\]
where \( v^{(0)}_{\text{SHXC}}[n](r) = \delta F^{(0)}[n]/\delta n(r) \), and where \( \mu \) is the chemical potential. The role of \( \mu \) is not relevant here, as we always keep the number of electrons fixed. The density that satisfies Eq. (29) is \( n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \), and by expanding it around \( n^{(0)}_v(r) \):
\[
\Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) = n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) - n^{(0)}_v(r) + \alpha \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r),
\]
we can write Eq. (29) as:
\[
v^{(0)}_{\text{SHXC}}[n^{(0)}_v](r) + \alpha \left[ K^{(0)}_v \cdot \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \right](r) + \alpha \left( \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v](r) + \alpha \left[ \Delta f^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] \cdot \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \right](r) \right) + v(r) = \mu, \tag{30}
\]
where we simplified the notation for the following integral:
\[
[ A \cdot \Delta n ](r) = \int d^3r' A(r, r') \Delta n (r'). \tag{31}
\]
At \( \alpha = 0 \), Eq. (29) becomes:
\[
v^{(0)}_{\text{SHXC}}[n^{(0)}_v](r) + v(r) = \mu \tag{32}
\]
Plugging Eq. (32) into Eq. (30) gives:
\[
\left[ K^{(0)}_v \cdot \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \right](r) + \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v](r) + \alpha \left[ \Delta f^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] \cdot \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \right](r) = 0. \tag{33}
\]
Also plugging \( K^{(\alpha)}_v(r, r') = K^{(0)}_v(r, r') + \alpha \Delta f^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}(r, r') \) (Eqs. (11) and (23)) into Eq. (33) we obtain:
\[
\int d^3r' K^{(\alpha)}_v[n^{(0)}_v](r, r') \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r') = - \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v](r). \tag{34}
\]
In principle, \( \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r') \) can be obtained by solving Eq. (34) and we can write the solution in terms of the inverse of \( K^{(\alpha)}_v[n^{(0)}_v] \):
\[
\Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) = - \int d^3r' \left\{ K^{(\alpha)}_v \right\}^{-1} [n^{(0)}_v](r, r') \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v](r'). \tag{35}
\]
We expect that \( \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \) of Eq. (35) can be fairly approximated by \( \Delta v\bar{n}(r) \) and this is equivalent to approximating \( n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \) via the following linear interpolation:
\[
n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \approx n^{(0)}_v(r) + \alpha \Delta v\bar{n}(r). \tag{36}
\]
To explore in what situation the approximation of Eq. (36) becomes exact, we now write \( n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) = n^{(1)}_v(r) - \bar{\alpha} \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \), where \( \bar{\alpha} = 1 - \alpha \). Repeating the steps given by Eqs. (29) to (35) we find:
\[
\Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) = - \int d^3r' \left\{ K^{(\alpha)}_v \right\}^{-1} [n^{(1)}_v](r, r') \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(1)}_v](r'). \tag{37}
\]
In this way, when \( \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \) is equal to \( \Delta n_v(r) \) of Eq. (35), then the exact \( n^{(\alpha)}_v \) is indeed given by the r.h.s of Eq. (36).
To obtain the leading order of \( E^{(\alpha)}_v \) in powers of \( \alpha \), we set again: \( n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) = n^{(0)}_v(r) + \alpha \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \). Then, \( E^{(\alpha)}_v \) becomes:
\[
E^{(\alpha)}_v[n^{(\alpha)}_v] = E_{\text{SH}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] \cdot v + \alpha \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \cdot v + E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \cdot \varepsilon^{(\alpha)}_v 
\]
\[
+ \alpha \Delta E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v. \tag{38}
\]
We can expand \( E^{(\alpha)}_v[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \) around \( n^{(0)}_v(r) \), and write \( E^{(\alpha)}_v \) in powers of \( \alpha \):
\[
E^{(\alpha)}_v = E^{(0)}_v[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \Delta E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \varepsilon^{(\alpha)}_v \cdot v + \alpha \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \cdot \varepsilon^{(\alpha)}_v + E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \cdot \varepsilon^{(\alpha)}_v 
\]
\[
+ O(\alpha^3). \tag{39}
\]
Combining Eqs. (32) and (39) the third term on the r.h.s of Eq. (39) vanishes:
\[
E^{(\alpha)}_v = E^{(0)}_v[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \Delta E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha^2 \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] \cdot \varepsilon^{(\alpha)}_v + O(\alpha^3). \tag{40}
\]
Using Eq. (34) we can further simplify Eq. (40):
\[
E^{(\alpha)}_v = E^{(0)}_v[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \Delta E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] \cdot \varepsilon^{(\alpha)}_v + O(\alpha^3). \tag{41}
\]
From Eq. (41) we can see that to leading order in \( \alpha \), the \( \alpha \)-dependence of the minimizing energies is quadratic, and it can be found from the xc energies and xc potentials at the endpoints. We can also use the following functional expansion:
\[
\Delta E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v + \frac{\alpha}{2} \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v] = \Delta E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \frac{\alpha}{2} \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] \cdot \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v + O(\alpha^2). \tag{42}
\]
and plug it into Eq. (41) to finally obtain:
\[
E^{(\alpha)}_v = E^{(0)}_v[n^{(0)}_v] + \alpha \Delta E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \Delta v^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(0)}_v] \cdot \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v + \cdots. \tag{43}
\]
Similarly, writing \( n^{(\alpha)}_v = n^{(1)}_v(r) - \bar{\alpha} \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v(r) \), we can expand \( E^{(\alpha)}_v \) around \( n^{(1)}_v \) to obtain:
\[
E^{(\alpha)}_v = E^{(1)}_v[n^{(1)}_v] - \bar{\alpha} \Delta E^{(\alpha)}_{\text{XC}}[n^{(1)}_v] - \bar{\alpha} \Delta n^{(\alpha)}_v \cdot \varepsilon^{(1)}_v + \cdots. \tag{44}
\]
Both results are consistent with applying Eq. (27) and expanding only the density to first order in \( \alpha \). In Section [IVC] we will illustrate the usefulness of the formalism developed in this section for connecting a global hybrid functional to its parent GGA.
IV. Specific cases

A. Quantifying errors with DC-DFT

There has been recent great interest in quantifying the errors in densities in DFT [29, 30, 31, 32]. However, in Ref [25], it was shown that the theory of DC-DFT provides a natural and unambiguous measure of density error. With that measure, it was not possible to distinguish the densities of empirical and non-empirical functionals based on their self-consistent densities alone.

To understand the background to this, we first must distinguish ground-state KS DFT from other areas of electronic structure. The primary purpose of such calculations is to produce the ground-state energy as a function of nuclear coordinates. Indeed, in principle, one can deduce the density (and hence any integral over it) from a sequence of such calculations, via the functional derivative with respect to the potential. Of course, such calculations produce KS potentials, orbitals, and eigenvalues, as well as densities and ground-state energies, and all such quantities can be compared (for systems for which the calculation is feasible) to their exact counterparts extracted from a more accurate quantum solver [33, 34, 35]. These are of great interest as inputs to response calculations, such as in linear-response TDDFT or GW methods, and such procedures might be extremely sensitive to such inputs. But in ground-state DFT, the main prediction is the energy of the many-body system, for which the KS scheme is simply a brilliant construct that balances efficiency and accuracy.

Intuitively, one feels that a ‘better’ XC potential must yield a ‘better’ density, and in turn, a ‘better’ density must yield a better energy. After all, the Hohenberg-Kohn (HK) theorem tells us that we reach the ground-state energy only with a better energy. After all, the Hohenberg-Kohn (HK) theorem tells us that we reach the ground-state energy with a positive energy for any \( \tilde{n}_v(r) \) and vanishes only for the exact density. This choice is ideal because (a) there are no human choices within the measure to argue over, and (b) the measurement is in terms of the energetic consequences. Thus it even provides a scale for density differences. For example, if this measure yields results in the microHartree range, why would one even care about errors in the density? Given that it is very difficult in practice to evaluate the exact functional it is very difficult in practice to evaluate the exact functional on an approximate density (but see e.g., Refs. [36] and [37]), DC-DFT procedures use the following equation instead:

\[
\Delta \tilde{E}_v = \tilde{E}_v[\tilde{n}_v] - \tilde{E}_v[n_v] + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{E}_v[\tilde{n}_v] - E_v[n_v].
\]

For this special case, Eq. (20) becomes:

\[
\Delta \tilde{E}_v = E_v[\tilde{n}_v] - E_v[n_v].
\]

Figure 2: Various errors of Eqs. 52 and 53 for the alpha-BLYP calculations of the hydrogen atom as a function of amount of exact exchange mixing made by \( \tilde{E}_{\text{XC}}[\tilde{n}_v] \) and \( \tilde{n}_v \), into the functional error \( \Delta E_v = \Delta \tilde{E}_{\text{XC}}[\tilde{n}_v] \) and the density-driven error \( \Delta E_D = -\tilde{D}_v[-\Delta \tilde{n}_v] \), which is much more practical than the ideal, as it needs only be evaluated on the approximate functional. We can in fact expect \( \Delta E_D \) to be a practical proxy for the intractable \( \Delta E_{\text{ideal}} \) measure. When the approximate density is sufficiently close to its exact counterpart (more precisely, when the two inequalities hold: \( D_v[\Delta \tilde{n}_v] \leq \Delta_v \) and \( \tilde{D}_v[-\Delta \tilde{n}_v] \leq \Delta_v \), we can write \( \Delta E_{\text{ideal}}[\Delta \tilde{n}_v] \) as:

\[
\Delta E_{\text{ideal}}[\Delta \tilde{n}_v] \approx \frac{1}{2} K_v[\Delta \tilde{n}_v],
\]

and \( \tilde{D}_v[-\Delta \tilde{n}_v] \) as:

\[
\tilde{D}_v[-\Delta \tilde{n}_v] \approx \frac{1}{2} \tilde{K}_v[\Delta \tilde{n}_v].
\]
From Eqs. 48 and 49, we can see that if the approximate functional has accurate curvature, \( D_v \equiv -\Delta \tilde{n}_v = \Delta E_{D}^{\text{ideal}}[\Delta \tilde{n}_v] \).

### B. Illustration

Figure 2 illustrates many aspects of the analysis described so far. Here we consider the hydrogen atom and the BLYP GGA [38, 39]. We choose this example carefully, because (a) we have easy access to the exact density, since this is a one-electron case, and (b) our functional correctly has no correlation energy (as LYP correlation vanishes for all fully spin-polarized systems). Thus, when we interpolate between BLYP and HF, we create a global hybrid with a fraction \( \alpha \) of exact exchange (EXX):

\[
E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha][n] = E_{\alpha}^{\text{GGA}}[n] + \alpha \left( E_X[n] - E_{\alpha}^{\text{GGA}}[n] \right),
\]

(50)

For this specific cases \( E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha][n] \) reduces to:

\[
E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha][n] = E_{\alpha}^{\text{B88}}[n] + \alpha \left( E_X[n] - E_{\alpha}^{\text{B88}}[n] \right),
\]

(51)

where \( E_{\alpha}^{\text{B88}}[n] \) stands for the exchange functional of Becke [38].

For the \( \Delta E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] = E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] - E_{\alpha} \) energy difference (i.e. the error of the hybrids functional), we can rewrite Eq. 47 as:

\[
\Delta E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] = \Delta E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] - \Delta \tilde{n}_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] + \Delta E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] \tilde{\alpha}_{\alpha}[n_{\alpha}],
\]

(52)

where \( \Delta \tilde{n}_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] = \tilde{n}_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] - n_{\alpha} \). In Eq. 52 we can recognize \( \alpha \)-dependent density-driven and functional errors. In the same manner, we can re-write Eq. 46:

\[
\Delta E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] = \Delta E_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha] \tilde{\alpha}_{\alpha}[n_{\alpha}] + D_v[\Delta \tilde{n}_{\alpha}^{(\text{EX}}[\alpha]].
\]

(53)

In this case, all error contributions (Eqs. 52 and 53), shown in Figure 2, vanish at \( \alpha = 1 \). On the extreme left (\( \alpha = 0 \)), we see the functional error exceeds the self-consistent error, and the density-driven error is negative, as it should be. The functional error is exactly linear, going to zero as \( \alpha \rightarrow 1 \). Notice that the density-driven error must always behave parabolically around \( \alpha = 1 \).

We also compare the two choices of reference for \( D_v \) (blue and red), finding that they are almost identical. This is telling us that the BLYP density is sufficiently close to the exact density that the expansion to second-order is fine. Moreover, note that as \( \alpha \rightarrow 1 \), the blue and red merge datapoints, and both are on top of a perfect parabola whose curvature is given by \( K_v[\Delta n] \) (again as \( \alpha \rightarrow 1 \)). Since the self-consistent error is the sum of the functional and density-driven errors, we can deduce its curve just from the values at \( \alpha = 0 \). Thus the black line is always a parabola if the densities are sufficiently similar, as is the case here. Note that we can see that the energetic difference between the \( D_v \) values (blue and red plots) is rather low, showing that they are indeed sufficiently close that there are no significant energetic consequences to approximating all such curves as parabolas.

Finally, we note that, relative to DC-DFT, we have chosen the two functionals in the reverse order: 0 denotes the approximate functional, 1 the exact answer. This is to make these results more readily comparable to other results for hybrids. Simply replace \( \alpha \) by \( 1 - \alpha \) to make Fig. 2 in the form for DC-DFT.

### C. Self-interaction error and one-electron systems

For one-electron systems:

\[
F[n] = T_s[n], \quad E_X[n] = -U_H[n], \quad E_C = 0 \quad (N = 1).
\]

(54)

Standard DFT approximations typically do not satisfy all the conditions of Eq. 54 and for this reason, they suffer from one-electron self-interaction error (SIE) [6, 40]. On the other hand, the HF method is exact for one-electron systems, and thus we can use the HF method to calculate the functional- and density-driven term of SIE. This has been already done in

Figure 3: Density-driven and functional errors for the \( \alpha \)-PBEExc (Eq. 55) calculations of the hydrogen atom as a function of amount of exact exchange mixing.

Figure 2 for the BLYP hybrids, and in Figure 3 we apply the same analysis to hybrids from the PBE functional [41]. The PBE correlation energy, unlike that of LYP, does not vanish for one-electron systems. For this reason, in the case of the PBE functional we modify Eq. 50:

\[
E_{\alpha}^{(\text{PBE}}[\alpha][n] = E_{\alpha}^{\text{PBE}}[n] + \alpha \left( E_X[n] - E_{\alpha}^{\text{PBE}}[n] \right),
\]

(55)

In this way, we ensure that the error of the PBE hybrid of Eq. 55 (hereinafter \( \alpha \)-PBEExc) vanishes at \( \alpha = 1 \). Note that this does not include PBE0 [42], as this PBEExc has only 0.75 of PBE correlation at \( \alpha = 1/4 \). In Figure 3, we show the density-driven and functional error of \( \alpha \)-PBEExc for the hydrogen atom.
First, note that the scale of the errors is minuscule. We can also see that both $|\Delta E_p^{(\alpha)}|$ and $|\Delta E_D^{(\alpha)}|$ errors of $\alpha$-PBE$^\text{exc}$ decrease with $\alpha$. Nonetheless, its total $\Delta E^{(\alpha)}$ error peaks at $\alpha \approx 0.5$ and nearly vanishes for the PBE functional (the $\alpha = 0$ case). The fact that the PBE gives almost exact energy for the hydrogen atom relies on a cancellation between the functional and density-driven errors (as well as a cancellation between exchange and correlation errors).

The same plot for the hydrogen atom obtained with the regular $\alpha$-PBE hybrid (Eq. 50) is shown in Figure 4. Note that now the $\alpha = 1/4$ point represents the PBE0 functional. We can see from Figure 4 that as $\alpha$ approaches 1, the functional error strongly dominates its functional-driven counterpart. Note here the much larger scale: The self-interaction error in the PBE correlation functional error yields much larger total energy errors than in the previous figure, illustrating the increased error when semilocal correlation functionals are combined with exact exchange. We can also note that $E_{\text{tot}}$ gets very close to 0 as $\alpha$ approaches 1, although the PBE correlation potential does not vanish for $N = 1$ systems.

### D. The Hartree approximation

Another special case is the Hartree approximation, i.e., solution of the KS equations with XC set to zero. Here, we compare any non-zero $\tilde{E}_{\text{XC}}$ with pure Hartree. We choose Hartree to be $\alpha = 0$, so that $\alpha$ then represents the fraction of $\tilde{E}_{\text{XC}}$ included in the calculation. While Hartree calculations are certainly too inaccurate for chemical purposes [45, 46], one would expect them to have the greatest delocalization error of any approximate functional, since not even LDA exchange is opposing the Hartree energy. They might thus prove useful in creating a non-empirical measure of delocalization to be used in DC-DFT.

If the reference is the exact XC energy, then the functional difference is just the XC energy itself, while the density-driven error is just: $\Delta E_D = -\frac{1}{2}f_{\text{SH}}[n_v^{(0)},\Delta n]$. In this case, one would expect $E_{\text{tot}}$ to be different from the ideal, which includes the XC contributions. However, as we will show below the two quantities are nearly the same for the hydrogen atom.

To give an illustration, we consider the following functional: $\tilde{E}_{\text{XC}}^{(\alpha)}[n] = \alpha E_{\text{X}}[n]$, which for one-electron systems connects the Hartree approximation ($\alpha = 0$) to the exact functional ($\alpha = 1$). In Figure 5 we show the errors of this functional as a function of $\alpha$ for the hydrogen atom. As expected, the scale of errors is much larger than those shown in Figures 2-4. We find it interesting that the $-\Delta E^{\text{ideal}}$ datapoints in Figure 5 are hardly distinguishable from their $\Delta E_D$ counterparts. Thus, at $\lambda = 0$ we have:

$$
\frac{f_S[n_v,\Delta n]}{-2\Delta E^{\text{ideal}}} \approx \frac{f_{\text{SH}}[n_v^{(0)},\Delta n]}{-2\Delta E_D} \quad (\text{H atom}),
$$

(56)

where $f_S(r,r')$ is the kinetic component of $f_{\text{SH}}(r,r')$ (see Eq. 12).

### E. Pure density functionals

So far, we have considered only approximations to XC within the KS scheme, as this is the most common DFT calculation today by far. However, there is much interest in developing orbital-free functionals, especially in contexts when the KS scheme becomes too cumbersome.

Since the entire functional $F[n]$ is approximated in such a scheme, the density is often much poorer than in a KS calculation. In fact, estimates suggest that simple orbital-free approximations, such as those used in Thomas-Fermi theory [45, 46, 47], produce sufficiently poor densities that their errors are dominated by errors in the density, i.e., the density-driven error is much larger than the functional error in most calculations. This is seen in total energy calculations of atoms and of one-dimensional fermions in a flat box [23].
Thus, as \( Z \to \infty \), our blue curve in Figure 6 should vanish. Nevertheless, in Figure 6 we are still far from this limit, as at our largest \( Z \) value (\( Z = 36 \)), \( \Delta E_{Z}^{TF} / E_{Z} \) is around 1/5.

This suggests several important points regarding these functionals. First, they must always be tested self-consistently, as tests of new orbital-free approximations on KS densities does not tell us much about their overall accuracy, given that the density-driven errors can be very large. At the same time, comparison of the functional on the KS density then provides enough information to separate functional- from density-driven errors, and we expect that even the KS densities obtained from the (semi)local XC approximations are sufficiently accurate for this purpose. Second, reports of failures of TF theory and its extensions should be revisited to determine if these are density-driven or functional-driven. If the former, one should focus on improving the densities rather than the total energies alone. Third, this supports efforts [54] to approximate the Pauli potential [55, 56] directly as a density functional, without requiring that the KS potential be a functional derivative.

In the context of the present paper, it should prove useful when comparing two orbital-free approximations to decompose their differences into functional- and density-driven contributions. If two different approximations differ in both contributions, this would suggest that good aspects of both might be combined to separately minimize each error.

F. Strong correlation

In our last example, we show that density-driven errors can become large when systems are strongly correlated, but need not be. Generating a simple example is not so easy, as one needs essentially exact densities upon which to make evaluations and comparisons. Fortunately, the two-site two-fermion Hubbard model is an example where all quantities can be determined analytically. Many relevant KS-DFT quantities have been calculated exactly and summarized in two recent reviews, one on ground-state [57] and one on linear-response TDDFT [58].

For any two-electron system (in the absence of magnetic fields), the restricted HF functional is:

\[
E^{RHF}[n] = T[n] + U[n]/2,
\]

as half the Hartree is canceled by exchange, and correlation is ignored. In fact, the traditional definition of correlation energy in quantum chemistry, is

\[
E^{QC}_{C} = E - E^{RHF}[n^{RHF}].
\]

Thus the energy-driven error of RHF is:

\[
\Delta E_{F} = -E_{C},
\]

while the density-driven error is

\[
\Delta E_{D} = E_{C} - E^{QC}_{C}.
\]
For our 2-site model, the functional reduces to a simple function. The onsite occupations are \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \), i.e., the density is just two non-negative real numbers. Moreover, since they always sum to 2, the density is fully represented by their difference. Likewise, we can choose the average potential to be zero and represent the inhomogeneity in the potential by a single number, \( \Delta v \), the on-site potential difference. If we choose the hopping parameter \( t = 1/2 \), the only other parameter is \( U \), the energy cost of double occupation of a site.

The error in RHF and the exact ground state energy is explored in Figure 7 for varying levels of correlation and inhomogeneity. The absolute error increases with \( U \), as expected. The energy error in energy for each level of correlation is most prominent in the symmetric dimer (\( \Delta v = 0 \)), and diminishes and rapidly vanishes beyond \( \Delta v \) larger than \( U \), where the energy becomes linearly correlated with the on-site potential difference. Thus the system becomes weakly correlated for \( \Delta v > U \).

The functional-driven and density-driven contributions to this HF error were then isolated through the use of Eqs. 61 and 62. The fraction of the total error attributed to the density-driven component (\( \Delta E_D / E_{XC}^{SC} \)) is shown in Figure 8 for weakly correlated dimers with values of \( U \) up to 1. As \( U \) decreases in size, both the magnitude of total error and its density-driven contribution decrease substantially. For \( U < 0.5 \), there is no \( \Delta v \) for which there is a density-driven contribution greater than 5% of the total error. Of course, as \( U \to 0 \), this ratio must vanish, so this is not unexpected. But we also see that the density-driven error vanishes at \( \Delta v = 0 \) for any value of \( U \), no matter how large, for symmetry reasons. Thus even a strongly correlated system might have no density-driven error. Moreover, for \( \Delta v > 1 + 2U \), again the error is less than 5%, due to correlation being weakened by inhomogeneity. So for any given \( U \), there is a maximum in the fraction of density-driven error as a function of \( \Delta v \), and it is at non-zero \( \Delta v \).

The density-driven error ratio for more strongly correlated dimers is shown in Figure 9 and has characteristics identical to the weak correlation plot, but on a larger scale. Clearly the maximum fractional density-driven error becomes much larger with \( U \) and can even exceed -1. We also see that for \( U > 1 \), the region of small density-driven error around \( \Delta v = 0 \) can even increase with \( U \). For fixed \( \Delta v \), the fraction of density-driven error goes down with sufficiently large \( U \). The relation between RHF density-driven error and strong correlation is clearly not trivial.

To avoid confusion, we note that this section has focused on the density-driven error in RHF. In the more realistic calculations of weakly-correlated systems in the rest of this work, we often assume that error is much smaller than the density-driven error of a semilocal DFT calculation, and hence HF-DFT yields more accurate energies in such cases. Because the Hubbard dimer is a site model, there is no genuine correspondence with semilocal DFT approximations to test on here.

V. Energy differences

Key chemical concepts are determined by energy differences (e.g., atomization energies, ionization energies, barrier heights, reaction energies, etc.). For this reason, we extend our analysis to energy differences. For simplicity, we first look at the energy difference of systems A and B, whose external potentials are \( v_A \) and \( v_B \), respectively. This energy difference obtained from a total energy functional that corresponds to a given \( E_{XC}^{(j)} \) is given by:

\[
E_{AB}^{(j)} = E_A^{(j)}[n_A] - E_B^{(j)}[n_B].
\] (64)
When two functionals are involved, we can also define the difference between $E^{(1)}_{AB}$ and $E^{(0)}_{AB}$:

$$\Delta E_{AB} = E^{(1)}_{AB} - E^{(0)}_{AB}. \quad (65)$$

Plugging Eq. 64 into Eq. 65 gives:

$$\Delta E_{AB} = E^{(1)}_{A} \{ n^{(1)}_{A} \} - E^{(0)}_{A} \{ n^{(0)}_{A} \} - \left( E^{(1)}_{B} \{ n^{(1)}_{B} \} - E^{(0)}_{B} \{ n^{(0)}_{B} \} \right). \quad (66)$$

Plugging Eq. 19 into Eq. 66, we can obtain the counterpart of Eq. 19 for the energy differences between systems A and B:

$$\Delta E_{AB} = \Delta E_{XC} \{ n^{(0)}_{A} \} - \Delta E_{XC} \{ n^{(0)}_{B} \} - D^{(1)}_{A} [\Delta n_{A}] + D^{(1)}_{B} [\Delta n_{B}]. \quad (67)$$

Similarly, we can also plug Eq. 20 into Eq. 66 to obtain the counterpart of Eq. 20 for the energy differences between systems A and B:

$$\Delta E_{AB} = \Delta E_{XC} \{ n^{(0)}_{A} \} - \Delta E_{XC} \{ n^{(0)}_{B} \} + D^{(0)}_{A} [\Delta n_{A}] - D^{(0)}_{B} [\Delta n_{B}]. \quad (68)$$

In Eqs. 67 and 68, we recognize $D^{(1)}_{AB}$ and $D^{(0)}_{AB}$ as the density-driven terms, pertinent to the energy differences between systems A and B. While $D^{(j)}_{ED}$ of Eq. 6 which corresponds to the total energies is always greater or equal to 0, its counterpart that pertains to the energy differences (Eqs. 67 and 68) does not have a definite sign. Furthermore, if we look at $D^{(0)}_{AB} = D^{(0)}_{A} [\Delta n_{A}] - D^{(0)}_{B} [\Delta n_{B}]$ (Eq. 68), where $D^{(0)}_{A} [\Delta n_{A}] \geq 0$ and $D^{(0)}_{B} [\Delta n_{B}] \geq 0$ we can see that $D^{(0)}_{AB}$ can easily vanish when $D^{(0)}_{A} [\Delta n_{A}] \sim D^{(0)}_{B} [\Delta n_{B}]$. Therefore, $D^{(1)}_{AB}$ and $D^{(1)}_{AB}$ can vanish even when $n^{(1)}_{A}$ and $n^{(1)}_{B}$ are drastically different from $n^{(0)}_{A}$ and $n^{(0)}_{B}$, respectively.

The shown example that involves the energy difference between systems A and B, can be easily generalized to any energy difference of interest. For instance, consider the following chemical reaction:

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_{l} \rightarrow \sum_{m=1}^{M} P_{m}, \quad (69)$$

where $\{ R_{l} \}$ is a set of reactants and $\{ P_{m} \}$ is a set of products.

Then the energy of this reaction obtained from the $E^{(j)}_{ED}$ functional is:

$$E^{(j)}_{ED} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} E^{(j)}_{P_{m} \{ n^{(j)}_{P_{m}} \}} - \sum_{l=1}^{L} E^{(j)}_{R_{l} \{ n^{(j)}_{R_{l}} \}}. \quad (70)$$

The corresponding difference in $E^{(j)}_{ED}$ between $j = 0$ and $j = 1$ functional is:

$$\Delta E_{ED} = E^{(1)}_{ED} - E^{(0)}_{ED}. \quad (71)$$

Then $D^{(0)}_{ED}$ that corresponds to $\Delta E_{ED}$ is given by:

$$D^{(0)}_{ED} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} D^{(0)}_{P_{m} \{ \Delta n_{P_{m}} \}} - \sum_{l=1}^{L} D^{(0)}_{R_{l} \{ \Delta n_{R_{l}} \}}. \quad (72)$$

and its $D^{(1)}_{ED}$ counterpart is given by:

$$D^{(1)}_{ED} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} D^{(1)}_{P_{m} \{ -\Delta n_{P_{m}} \}} - \sum_{l=1}^{L} D^{(1)}_{R_{l} \{ -\Delta n_{R_{l}} \}}. \quad (73)$$

Now that we established the density-driven terms of any energy difference of interest, we ask the following key question: how can we quantify the abnormality character of a given property/system obtained from a pair of functionals? Along these lines, we first define:

$$\Delta_{n} = \max \{ |D^{(0)}|, |D^{(1)}| \}. \quad (74)$$

One would naturally think of the following indicator of abnormality:

$$\eta = \frac{\Delta_{n}}{|\Delta E_{ED}|}. \quad (75)$$

Following this indicator, the abnormality character of a given property of interest increases with $\eta$. However, the $\eta$ indicator would be problematic when $|\Delta E_{ED}|$ is small, and such properties/system will always be abnormal by default. To fix this problem, we introduce the abnormality scale. For a chosen property of interest (e.g., a barrier height involving organic molecules) we calculate the abnormality scale by using a dataset with similar systems/properties (e.g., other similar
barrier heights involving organic molecules). We then set the abnormality as the root-mean-square of $K$ datapoints (i.e. $\Delta E_{\text{ED}}$ energies) that form the dataset:

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{\text{ED}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} (\Delta E_{\text{ED},k})^2},$$

(76)

Therefore, $\Delta_{\text{ED}}$ determines our abnormality scale, and it is specific to a given class of properties/system and to a given pair of energy functionals. Finally, we use $\Delta$ to define our abnormality indicator:

$$\tilde{\eta} = \frac{\Delta_{n}}{\Delta_{\text{ED}}}$$

(77)

Also in the case of this indicator, the abnormality increases with $\tilde{\eta}$. To classify systems as normal or abnormal (again for a given pair of functionals) based on the $\tilde{\eta}$ indicator, we introduce a cut-off, e.g., $\tilde{\eta}_c \sim \frac{1}{3}$, and consider abnormal systems/properties those that have $\tilde{\eta}$ greater than $\tilde{\eta}_c$. The primary goal of the present work is to outline the theory behind the density functional analysis. Therefore, showing numerical examples where we will illustrate (ab)-normality of different properties for different pairs of DFT approximations, we leave for future work.

Returning to DC-DFT, where functional 1 is some approximation and 0 is exact, we do not of course have access to $D^{(0)}$ in order to calculate $\tilde{\eta}$, so we settle for $|D^{(1)}|$ alone, which is simply the usual density-driven error. But as noted in Ref. [25], that error would usually require knowing the exact density, which is usually either unavailable or unaffordable. (In normal systems, the HF density is NOT more accurate than that of HF.

Finally, we note that of course it is highly unsettling to run KS calculations in this non-self-consistent fashion. Many advantages that are often taken for granted, such as the exactness of the Hellmann-Feynman theorem in the basis-set limit, are no longer true, and many corrections need to be coded. But, in fact, all information about the density can be extracted from a sequence of total energy calculations, since:

$$n(r) = \frac{\delta E_v}{\delta v(r)}.$$  

(79)

Treating HF as EXX, this leads to a predicted change in the density of a HF-DFT calculation relative to a self-consistent DFT density:

$$\Delta n(r) = \frac{\delta (E_{\text{DFT}}[n^{\text{HF}}] - E_{\text{DFT}}[n^{\text{DFT}}])}{\delta v(r)}.$$  

(80)

Thus, in principle, one could calculate the improvement to the density predicted by HF-DFT, and any other properties depending only on the density.
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