How errors in densities contaminate empirical density functionals
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Abstract

Empirical fitting of parameters in approximate density functionals is commonplace. Such database fits conflate errors in the self-consistent density with errors in the energy functional, but density-corrected DFT (DC-DFT) separates these two. Three examples both show the pitfalls and how they can be avoided: Catastrophic failures in a toy example, $H_2$ at varying bond lengths, where the standard fitting procedure misses the exact functional; Grimme’s D3 fit to noncovalent interactions, which can be contaminated by large density errors such as in the WATER27 and B30 data sets; and double-hybrids trained on self-consistent densities perform badly on systems with density-driven errors. For binding energies of small water clusters, errors are reduced from 8 to less than 1 kcal/mol. In all three cases, more accurate results are found at no additional cost, by simply using Hartree-Fock densities instead of self-consistent densities.

For the last quarter century, fitting of empirical parameters in approximate exchange-correlation functionals has been popular, especially given the early successes of Becke88 exchange,[1] Lee-Yang-Parr correlation,[2] and the global hybrid ideas of Becke,[3] ultimately leading to the hugely successful B3LYP.[4] Since then, the number of functionals and the number of parameters has hugely proliferated,[5, 6] and often dozens of parameters are fitted to dozens of databases, with thousands of benchmark data.

There are many pitfalls to such fitting, but we focus on just one. This danger is unambiguous, nothing to do with choices of parameters or data sets, and entirely avoidable. Almost all such fitting consists of running one or more self-consistent DFT calculations, evaluating an energy difference, and comparing it with a (presumably accurate) energy from the database. (In the case of bond lengths, the difference is an infinitesimal, determining where an energy derivative vanishes). The accuracy of self-consistent densities was recently highlighted,[7] and how errors in the density can be related to errors in the energy.[8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]

Figure 1 illustrates the importance of this point. Double-hybrids add some fraction of MP2 correlation to standard hybrid functionals.[21] Over a large number of reaction energies, ranging from weak van der Waals interactions to strong covalent bonds (included in the GMTKN55 database), a double-hybrid which is trained on more accurate densities (for these systems, when the self-consistent density error is significant, the Hartree-Fock (HF) density is more accurate) gives substantially more accurate results. More details on the databases and methodology is given toward the end of this paper, and in Table S2 of the supporting information.

Background: The theory of density-corrected DFT (DC-DFT) has been developed over the past decade.[12] Whenever a self-consistent (SC) DFT calculation is run, there are two distinct sources of error. The total error of such calculation is $\Delta E = \hat{E}[\tilde{n}] - E[n]$, where $E$ and $n$ are the exact energy functional and density, and $\hat{E}$ and $\tilde{n}$ are their approximate counterparts. We decompose $\Delta E$ as[14, 19, 22, 23]:

$$\Delta E = \Delta E_D + \Delta E_F,$$

where $\Delta E_D$ is the functional error, defined as the error that would be found if the exact density were used, while $\Delta E_F$ is the (usually much smaller) contribution to the energy error due to the error in the self-consistent density.

So long as density-driven errors were small compared to the functional errors (as was the case in the halcyon days...
We first create a totally artificial problem that highlights the
where $E_{2}$ vast databases that include weak interactions, stretched bonds,
etc., these errors are sometimes as big as (or larger than) the
differences between functional errors. [17] [20] However, the
common practice of direct comparison with accurate energies
conflates both errors and cannot distinguish the two. Recent
advances in machine learning of density functionals target the
density as well as the energy, and likely succeed because both
errors are simultaneously minimized.[24]

The cure for this difficulty is simple: where relevant, empiri-
cal schemes should be trained on purely functional errors, i.e.,
the functional error of a parameterized approximation to the
energy should be optimized against accurate energy databases,
rather than the self-consistent error. For calculations that are
not density-sensitive, the differences are so small as to make
this irrelevant. But for those that are, this procedure isolates
the self-consistency error, and avoids the corruption of the
optimization process, and allows density-sensitive cases to be
included, even for training.

The current paper demonstrates the dangers of ignoring this
distinction when optimizing parameters in empirical functionals.
We first create a totally artificial problem that highlights the
difficulties, especially when one uses a semilocal approximation
for the self-consistent density, but a more accurate form for
the energy. In this case, we show how the exact functional
is missed by the standard procedure. Next, we take the D3
correction of Grimme and co-workers,[25] and show how, if
complexes with large density-driven errors are naively included,
the results become noticeably worse. On the other hand, the
use of DC-DFT allows previous good results to be retained,
and the more difficult complexes to be included. Lastly, we
apply our method to double-hybrids, producing a combination
that competes with similar functionals, but also works when
density-driven errors become strong.

For the purposes of this paper, we write a 4-parameter
double-hybrid functional ($DH4p$) as:

$$E_{XC}^{DH4p} = E_{X}^{Slater} + a(E_{X}^{HF} - E_{X}^{Slater}) + b(E_{X}^{GGA} - E_{X}^{Slater})$$
$$+ cE_{C}^{GGA} + dE_{C}^{ab-initio},$$

(2)

where $E_{X}^{Slater}$ is the local density approximation for exchange,
$E_{X}^{HF}$ is the HF exchange, $E_{X}^{GGA}$ and $E_{C}^{GGA}$ denote the
approximate GGA exchange and correlation energy, respectively,
and $E_{C}^{ab-initio}$ is the correlation energy from an $ab-initio$
calculation such as MP2. The standard procedure then is to
run self-consistent calculations of Eq. 2 without the $ab-initio$
correlation, but evaluate energies with the full DH expression
on the orbitals.[21] [26] [27] The parameters are then chosen to
minimize errors for specific molecular data sets. As we show,
this assumes that density-driven differences between this and
doing the entire procedure self-consistently are negligible.

Often, highly-accurate densities required in Eq. 1 are too expen-
sive to calculate. A practical measure of density sensitivity
is given by:[19] [20] [23]

$$\tilde{S} = |\tilde{E}[\rho_{LDA}^*] - \tilde{E}[\rho_{HF}]|,$$

(3)

where tilde indicates a given functional approximation. Given
the HF tendency to overlocalize, and the LDA tendency to
delocalize, and that both are non-empirical, $\tilde{S}$ is a practical
guide to the density sensitivity of a given reaction and ap-
xproximate functional. For small molecules, $\tilde{S} > 2$ kcal/mol
implies density sensitivity and suggests DC-DFT will improve a
functional’s performance. In such cases, usually the HF density
is sufficient to produce improved energies (HF-DFT).

![Figure 2: Potential energy surface (PES) of H$_2$ from: (a)
exactly (black), self-consistent PBE$_X$ (blue) and PBE$_X$ on the
exact (HF) density (green) and on the LDA density (grey); (b)
the toy functional of Eq. 3 with $c = d = 0$ and no HF in the
self-consistent density, with the a and b parameters optimized in
different regions: (magenta) the density-insensitive (DI) region
(0.9Å-1.5Å), (green) the density-sensitive (DS) region (2.5Å-
3.1Å), (blue) combination of both DS and DI regions. The inset
shows $\Delta E$ decomposition for the toy functional trained on the
DI region. See also Figures S1, S2, and Table S3.](image)

Illustration: Missing the exact solution for one electron–
In this section, we illustrate the dangers of ignoring the distinc-
tion between density-driven and functional errors in a simple,
toy model: A simplified hybrid applied to the elementary case of \( \text{H}_2^+ \) as a function of bond length, which is a paradigm of self-interaction error, or more generally, delocalization error. \[28, 29\]

Standard semilocal approximations yield long-recognized catastrophic errors as the bond is stretched, missing entirely the dissociation limit (see Fig. 2). \[29\] An HF calculation trivially gets this exactly right, since it is exact for (fully spin-polarized) one-electron systems.

We apply the double-hybrid philosophy to our \( \text{H}_2^+ \) molecule, using different separations to generate data sets. Because this is a one-electron system, we simplify the general DH form to just exchange, setting \( c = d = 0 \) in Eq. 2 and use PBE\[20\] as an example GGA. Figure 2(a) shows the exact binding curve (black) easily found by HF, and two other curves of the PBE\(_X\) evaluated either self-consistently (blue) or on the HF density (green). The largely irrelevant difference between blue and green curves show that this is a true functional error, not a density-driven one. Even on the exact density, PBE\(_X\) fails very badly as the bond is stretched. However, the difference in the two curves becomes greater than 2 kcal/mol at about 1.5 Å, showing a density sensitivity (the curve with LDA density is indistinguishable from the self-consistent curve) in this problem. (Standard HF-DFT produces accurate curves for heteronuclear diatomics, not homonuclear ones. \[16, 17\])

Now, to mimic the DH procedure, we perform self-consistent calculations without the HF contribution (since it yields the exact answer in this case), but evaluate the energy with it included. Figure 2(b) shows the results of training in the density-sensitive (stretched, DS) and density-insensitive (near equilibrium, DI) region of the binding curve. In each case, the optimal parameterization yields accurate energies on the training data, but fails badly outside the training range. Even a combination of both equilibrium and stretched data does not help much.

How can this be happening? Obviously, if we set \( a = 1 \) and \( b = 0 \) in Eq. 2, we get HF, and so produce the exact answer. But, because the self-consistent calculation uses only a GGA form, which has an unbalanced self-interaction error as the bond is stretched, the exact result is never found. To illustrate the issue, we use Eq. 1 to partition the error for the functional trained near equilibrium, showing \( \Delta E_D \) and \( \Delta E_F \) in the inset of Figure 2(b). The optimal parameters (which are nonsensical, see Table S3 of the supporting information) keep the total error to a minimum in the training region by having \( \Delta E_D \) and \( \Delta E_F \) be about equal and opposite. Outside the training region, this artificial cancellation of errors fails badly. Obviously, we trivially solve this toy problem if we always train on the HF density instead of the self-consistent GGA density.

**DFT-D3 for weak interactions** – The D3 empirical correction of Grimme and co-workers has become a standard technique for improving the accuracy of DFT approximations when applied to noncovalent interactions. \[25, 31\] While most such calculations are density insensitive, DFT calculations of specific types of noncovalent interactions, such as halogen bonds, are seriously plagued by density-driven error, which can be larger than the D3 correction itself. \[20\]

DC-DFT fixes this problem by replacing the SC density with the HF density, on which semilocal functionals yield more accurate energies in such cases. \[20\] This procedure is HF-DFT, and it represents the simplest form of DC-DFT. \[14, 19, 20, 22\] It was recently shown that use of the HF density in place of the exact density introduces much smaller errors than the improvements made by HF-DFT. \[23\] (As an aside, this does not imply that the pointwise accuracy of the underlying HF density is better than that of SC-DFT densities. \[19\])

The example of Ref. \[20\] was an extreme case. Here we study the effects of density-driven errors of SC-DFT-D3 calculations of weak interactions when they are more subtle. We use 12 data sets (7 from the original D3 parameterization \[25\]) of noncovalent interactions (320 data points in total, see Table S1, S4, and S5 of the supporting information). \[32\] The data points are classified as DS or DI based on their PBE sensitivity, \( \text{S}^{\text{PBE}} \) (see Eq. 3 and Figure S3). Only 46 are DS, and these are mostly from B30\[33\] and WATER27\[32\], with only one such data point present in the data set used for the training of the original D3 parameters.

In Table 1 we demonstrate the importance of accounting for density-driven errors when optimizing parameters for D3 corrections. The first two numbers in the 2nd column show the dramatic reduction in error in the B3LYP functional when the original D3 correction is made, on the density-insensitive cases. The next entry shows that when we optimize over our much expanded database, the errors for DI cases are only slightly worse. But if we optimize specifically over our DS cases (4th entry), this greatly worsens results on our DI test cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opt. data set</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>DS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>without opt.</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3(_{\text{orig}})</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12DB</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-12DB</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI-12DB</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Mean absolute errors (kcal/mol) of B3LYP and modifications on density-insensitive (DI) and density-sensitive (DS) test cases (columns) versus optimization on various databases (rows), with self-consistent (SC) densities on left and HF densities on right. D3\(_{\text{orig}}\) denotes the original Grimme data set, 12DB is our large (360 values) mixed data set, DI-12DB are its 276 DI cases, and DS-12DB its 46 DS cases.
of interest, the results are (slightly) improved, but for the DS optimized parameters, greatly improved (a factor of 3), showing that the differences in optimized parameters are much smaller when HF densities are used. This is shown in Figure 3 which shows the variation of the error with parameters. Figure 3(a) shows the usual case (SC densities on DI cases). Figure 3(b) is SC densities on DS cases, showing a total different landscape. Figure 3(c) is HF densities on DS cases, showing about the same landscape as (a). The position of the minimum (marked by an X) is about the same for (a) and (c), but very different in (b).

Finally, the fourth column of Table 1 shows results on the DS cases using HF densities. While overall, these are much less accurate than the DI cases (by about a factor of 5), they are much better than those of column 2, which uses SC densities (See also Table S6 and Figure S4).

Figure 5: Mean absolute errors for the training data set (orange), test (blue), and all (purple) of HF-DHs as a function of $\alpha$, with MP2 (solid) and CC2 (dashed) correlation. Vertical lines are at the optimal $\alpha$ values.

Double-hybrids – The energy functional of widely popular DHs (e.g. Eq. 2) is typically evaluated on the hybrid density and orbitals found in a self-consistent calculation that neglects the $E_{\text{ab-initio}}$ term.[21, 26] We test the DH idea with only one empirical parameter:[26]

$$E_{\text{XC}}^{\text{DH1p}} = E_{\text{XC}}^{\text{GGA}} + \alpha(E_{\text{HF}} - E_{\text{X}}^{\text{GGA}}) + \alpha^2(E_{\text{GGA}}^{\text{ab-initio}} - E_{\text{X}}^{\text{GGA}})$$

(4)
Figure 6: MAEs for several methods on many databases: BL1p with CC2 and MP2, other double-hybrids (B2PLYP and XYG3), B3LYP on SC and HF densities, a range-separated meta-GGA hybrid (\(\omega\)B97M-V), and MP2 and CC2. Blue data sets were used to optimize \(\alpha\) in BL1P (Eq. 4). For details, see Table S8.

Figure 7: Dissociation curve of NaCl: BL1p(MP2) works well compared to CCSD(T) while other double-hybrid functionals fail after 5~6 Å. Such failures are explained in Ref. [16]. Note that aug-cc-pVTZ basis set is used.

Returning to our starting point, stretched NaCl is a prototypical case where self-consistent hybrids and GGAs are contaminated by large density errors. These errors are typical of semilocal functionals for dissociating heterodimers. HF densities fix this problem, and HF-DFT is able to dissociate heterodimers correctly. From Figure 7, in contrast to a standard DHs (B2PLYP and XYG3 shown here) that fail at large bond lengths, our HF-DHs dissociate NaCl correctly (See also Figure S6 and S7). In the supporting information, we show other examples (e.g. bonding energies of \(\pi\)-complexes in Figure S8) where the HF-DHs developed here outperform their conventional counterparts.
Concluding remarks—We have shown the dangers of ignoring density-driven errors in the construction of empirical approximations. In our simple \( H_2^+ \) example, a parameterized semilocal functional trained on a specific \( H_2^+ \) binding curve region fails in all other regions. Moreover, high accuracy in the training region results from an enforced error cancellation between the density-driven and functional error (Eq. 1), which fails outside this region. We showed standard DFT with empirical D3 corrections breaks down when applied to density-sensitive noncovalent systems, but is fixed by using the HF density. Finally, we found that greater accuracy and reliability could be achieved with simple 1-parameter double-hybrids, once they are trained and applied to HF densities. As always, we stress that our use of HF densities does not imply that they are point-wise more accurate than self-consistent densities. HF densities simply yield more accurate energetics when a reaction is density sensitive.

Our main goal is not to introduce a new empirical XC functional, but to warn of the contamination due to \( \Delta E_D \) in fitting procedures and to show how minimizing \( \Delta E_F \) improves the performance of empirical functionals. Our selection of training sets has not been carefully scrutinized or designed for optimal performance for general use. Nevertheless, our 1-parameter double-hybrids trained on HF densities outperform the standard approximations for most of the GMTKN55 database considered here. While it is beyond the scope of this work, technical advances in optimization details should further improve statistical accuracy. In summary, we recommend that all empirical functionals be trained on HF densities to reduce density-driven errors and so choose the best energy functional. Moreover, for any density-sensitive systems, they should be applied to HF densities (unless these are extremely flawed, such as severe spin-contamination.) With the use of HF densities where applicable, the dangers of contamination by errors in the density can be avoided with minimal extra effort.

Computational Details

All HF, DFT, and HF-DFT calculations have been performed with the TURBOMOLE v7.0.2 [40]. The following functionals have been used in DFT and HF-DFT calculations: LDA (SVWN [41, 42]), GGA (PBE [30], BLYP [1, 2], mGGA (TPSS [43]), hybrids (B3LYP [4], PBE0 [44], M06, M06-2X [45], B2PLYP [21], XYG3 [36], and \( \omega B97M-V \) [37]). The scripts for performing HF-DFT energy calculations are available. [46] Unless otherwise stated, the def2-QZVP basis set has been used. All molecular geometries and multiplicities have been taken from Ref. [32]. Further computational details can be found in the supporting information.
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Supplementary Information

- Data set description
- Optimized parameters and mean absolute error for \( H_2^+ \), revD3, and HF-DHs
- HF-DHs for Na-Cl potential energy curve, \( \pi-\pi \) interaction, and AE6 data set
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