## Correlation kinetic energy of the uniform electron gas: a modified Colle-Salvetti approach

#### Sébastien RAGOT and Pietro CORTONA

Laboratoire Structure, Propriété et Modélisation des Solides (CNRS, Unité Mixte de Recherche 85-80). École Centrale Paris, Grande Voie des Vignes, 92295 CHATENAY-MALABRY, FRANCE

#### Abstract

This paper addresses the possibility of performing empirical calculations of the correlated kinetic energy of many-electron systems. A Jastrow-like correlated wave function is used to derive an approximate expression for the one-electron density matrix, which includes effects beyond the usual independent pair approximation. We then consider the example of a uniform electron gas. Use of the Colle-Salvetti correlation functional (Theor. Chim. Acta, **37** 329-334 (1975)) combined with a gaussian approximation to the one-matrix yields an analytical expression for the correlated kinetic energy. An optimal parameterization of the correlation functional allows the correct behavior of the kinetic energy of correlation *vs.* the Seitz radius to be recovered and leads to a qualitative agreement with the results of Perdew and Wang (Phys. Rev. B **45**, 13244 (1992)). The optimal parameter (q = 1.57) differs significantly from the value determined by Colle-Salvetti (q = 2.29).

Keywords: Density matrices, correlation functional, kinetic energy, uniform electron gas.

#### I. Introduction

The basic idea of the Colle-Salvetti (CS) approach for the empirical calculation of the correlation energy of many-electron systems is the following: from an empirically correlated wave function, an approximate twoelectron reduced density matrix (2-RDM) is derived, which allows for the computation of the correlation energy [1]. The resulting 2-RDM takes the form of the uncorrelated 2-RDM multiplied by a correlation factor [2]. The uncorrelated reference 2-RDM is the Hartree-Fock (HF) one, so that the CS expression for the correlation energy becomes a functional of the HF one-electron reduced density matrix (1-RDM). It is further assumed that the correlation effects on the 1-RDM can be neglected: as a consequence the correlation kinetic energy is effectively assumed to be zero. The only contribution to the correlation energy is thus an effective electron-electron potential energy of correlation, which is computed from the model 2-RDM. Then, an empirical parameterization of the correlation functional results in accurate correlation energies for atomic systems or small molecules. The parameter involved (q) is related to the size of the Coulomb-correlation hole.

Because of both its simplicity and accuracy, the Colle-Salvetti approach has received considerable attention [3,4]. However, it suffers from physical inconsistencies [5,6,7], many of which result from an incorrect normalization of the empirically correlated 2-RDM. All studies based on the correlation factor

approach are likely to bypass electron correlation effects on the 1-RDM and thus, to bypass the correlation kinetic energy.

Paradoxically, the analysis of the correlation energy  $(E_c)$  of first and second-row atoms reveals two dominant contributions [8], which arise from the correlation corrections to the HF electron-pair potential energy  $(V_c^{ee})$  and to the HF kinetic energy  $(T_c)$ . For such systems, the correlation correction  $T_c$  is approximately half the magnitude of  $V_c^{ee}$ . Thus, imposing any parameterized form for  $V_c^{ee}$  to equal  $E_c$ amounts to underestimate the true  $V_c^{ee}$  by a factor of about 2. Such shortcomings are of little importance as long as one is interested in estimating the whole correlation energy. However, as outlined by Singh and coworkers [5]: "Although the CS correlation energies are often accurate and, in that sense pragmatic; none the less, there remains the deeper question of whether or not the physics of the separate components of the correlation energy are described correctly". In particular, it is physically not acceptable to neglect the correlation correction to the kinetic energy, because the mutual correlation of electrons must make them move faster than predicted at HF level.

Therefore, this work aims at extending the CS approach to the 1-RDM and, thus, to the kinetic energy of correlation, with application to the uniform electron gas (UEG). There are many alternative approaches for accessing the kinetic energy of correlation alone (see for example [9,10]). However, one of our key aims is to improve the understanding of the correlation effects on the 1-RDM. After recalling some definitions (sect. I), we derive an approximate expression for the correlated 1-RDM (sect. II). A gaussian approximation to the 1-RDM is made, which allows an analytical expression for the correlated kinetic energy of the UEG to be derived (sect. III). Our results are discussed and challenged in the last section. Atomic units are used throughout.

#### **II. Definitions**

Let the variable  $x_i$  denote the space and spin coordinate for the electron *i*:  $x_i \equiv r_i \sigma_i$ . The 1- and 2-RDMs derived from a general many-electron wave function  $\psi$  are defined by [11,12]:

$$\gamma_1(\mathbf{x}_1; \mathbf{x}_1') = N \int \psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, ..., \mathbf{x}_N) \psi^*(\mathbf{x}_1', \mathbf{x}_2, ..., \mathbf{x}_N) d\mathbf{x}_2 ... d\mathbf{x}_N$$
(1)

and

$$\gamma_{2}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1}, \boldsymbol{x}_{2}; \boldsymbol{x}_{1}', \boldsymbol{x}_{2}') = \frac{N(N-1)}{2} \int \psi(\boldsymbol{x}_{1}, \boldsymbol{x}_{2}, ..., \boldsymbol{x}_{N}) \psi^{*}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1}', \boldsymbol{x}_{2}', ..., \boldsymbol{x}_{N}) d\boldsymbol{x}_{3} ... d\boldsymbol{x}_{N}$$
<sup>(2)</sup>

respectively. Integrating (1) and (2) over the spin variables leads to the spinless RDMs:

$$\rho_{1}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') = \int [\gamma_{1}(\mathbf{x}_{1};\mathbf{x}_{1}')]_{\sigma_{1}=\sigma_{1}'} d\sigma_{1}$$
<sup>(3)</sup>

$$\rho_{2}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}') = \int [\gamma_{2}(\mathbf{x}_{1},\mathbf{x}_{2};\mathbf{x}_{1}',\mathbf{x}_{2}')]_{\sigma_{1}=\sigma_{1}'\sigma_{2}=\sigma_{2}';} d\sigma_{1}d\sigma_{2}$$
(4)

For simplicity, the short notation «RDMs» will hereafter apply for the spinless matrices as well. The diagonal elements of expressions (3) and (4) are the electron charge and pair densities, respectively denoted by:

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}_1) = \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1; \mathbf{r}_1) \tag{5}$$

$$P(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \boldsymbol{\rho}_2(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \tag{6}$$

Note that the definitions (1) and (2) implies the condition:

$$\rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1;\mathbf{r}_1') = \frac{2}{(N-1)} \int \rho_2(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_2;\mathbf{r}_1',\mathbf{r}_2) d\mathbf{r}_2$$
<sup>(7)</sup>

The electron-electron potential energy is given by:

$$V^{ee} = \int \frac{P(\boldsymbol{r}_1, \boldsymbol{r}_2)}{r_{12}} d\boldsymbol{r}_1 d\boldsymbol{r}_2$$
<sup>(8)</sup>

where  $r_{12} = |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|$ .

The RDMs derived from a single determinant can be expressed from the 1-RDM only [12]. In particular:

$$\gamma_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1}, \boldsymbol{x}_{2}; \boldsymbol{x}_{1}', \boldsymbol{x}_{2}') = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \gamma_{1}^{\text{HF}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1}; \boldsymbol{x}_{1}') \gamma_{1}^{\text{HF}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{2}; \boldsymbol{x}_{2}') - \gamma_{1}^{\text{HF}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1}; \boldsymbol{x}_{2}') \gamma_{1}^{\text{HF}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{2}; \boldsymbol{x}_{1}') \right\}$$
(9)

Thus, the HF pair density obtained from (9) reads:

$$P^{\rm HF}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \rho_1^{\rm HF}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_1) \rho_1^{\rm HF}(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_2) - \frac{1}{2} \rho_1^{\rm HF}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \rho_1^{\rm HF}(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1) \right\}$$
(10)

In the following, we shall call a "correlation quantity" the difference between the exact non-relativistic quantity and the HF-approximated one. The electron-electron potential energy of correlation is thus:

$$V_{c}^{ee} = \int \frac{P(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}) - P^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2})}{r_{12}} d\mathbf{r}_{1} d\mathbf{r}_{2}$$
(11)

We now turn to the kinetic energy of correlation, the definition of which is natural in momentum space. First, we rewrite  $\rho_1(\mathbf{r};\mathbf{r'})$  in terms of center-of-mass and relative coordinates, *i.e.* in its intracular-extracular representation [13]:

$$\rho_1(\boldsymbol{r};\boldsymbol{r}') = \widetilde{\rho}_1(\boldsymbol{R},\boldsymbol{s}) \tag{12}$$

where **R** stands for  $(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}')/2$  and **s** is the difference vector  $\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'$ . The momentum density is defined as  $n(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \rho_1(\mathbf{r};\mathbf{r}') e^{i\mathbf{p}.(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')} d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \widetilde{\rho}_1(\mathbf{R},\mathbf{s}) e^{i\mathbf{p}.\mathbf{s}} d\mathbf{R} d\mathbf{s}$ (13)

Thus,  $n(\mathbf{p})$  turns out to be the Fourier transform of the so-called auto correlation function [14,15], which is obtained by integrating  $\tilde{\rho}_1(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{s})$  over the extracular coordinate:

$$B(s) = \int \widetilde{\rho}_1(\boldsymbol{R}, s) d\boldsymbol{R}$$
<sup>(14)</sup>

so that, from (13):

$$B(s) = \int n(p) e^{-ip \cdot s} dp \tag{15}$$

Note that from (5) and (12), we can derive a simple relation between the electron charge density and the intracular-extracular representation of the spinless 1-RDM:  $\rho(\mathbf{R}) \equiv \tilde{\rho}_1(\mathbf{R}, 0)$ . It follows the normalization condition:

$$B(0) = \int \widetilde{\rho}_1(\boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{R} = \int \rho(\boldsymbol{R}) d\boldsymbol{R} = N$$

or conversely, from (15):

$$B(0) = \int n(\mathbf{p}) d\mathbf{p} = N$$

so that the condition B(0) = N ensures a correct normalization of one-electron distributions.

Next, from (13), (14) and (15), one can verify that:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\nabla_s^2 B(\boldsymbol{s})\big|_{\boldsymbol{s}=\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \int \frac{p^2}{2} n(\boldsymbol{p}) d\boldsymbol{p} = T$$
(16)

This expression shows that the curvature of B(s) near s = 0 determines the kinetic energy [16]. The kinetic energy of correlation is simply:

$$T_{c} = \int \frac{p^{2}}{2} \left( n(\boldsymbol{p}) - n^{\mathrm{HF}}(\boldsymbol{p}) \right) d\boldsymbol{p} = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla_{s}^{2} B(\boldsymbol{s}) \Big|_{s=\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_{s}^{2} B^{\mathrm{HF}}(\boldsymbol{s}) \Big|_{s=\boldsymbol{\theta}}$$
(17)

Moreover, for spherically symmetric systems, we have B(s) = B(s), so that eq. (16) reduces to

$$T = -\frac{3}{2}B''(0) \tag{18}$$

This simple expression for the kinetic energy of a spherically symmetric system is a key element in the present contribution. In the following, we derive a simple approximation for the auto-correlation function of a correlated uniform electron gas near s = 0, which shall, in turn, allow us to derive an analytical expression for the kinetic energy through eq. (18). To achieve this aim, we first need an expression for the correlated 1-RDM.

#### III. Empirically correlated reduced density matrices

The CS correlated ground-state wave function is written as [1,17]:  

$$\boldsymbol{\psi} = \boldsymbol{\psi}^{\text{HF}}(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{x}_N) \prod_{i < j} \left( 1 - f(\boldsymbol{r}_i, \boldsymbol{r}_j) \right)$$
(19)

where  $f(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j)$  correlates the electron pair (i, j), regardless of the spin coordinates of both electrons, and  $\psi^{\text{HF}}$  denotes the HF approximation to the ground-state wave function. Assuming real functions  $f(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j)$ , it is straightforward to show that  $\rho_2$  must develop as:

$$\rho_{2}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}') = \rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}')(1-f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})-f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}')+f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}'))+R(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}')$$
(20)

where  $\rho_2^{\text{HF}}$  is the HF 2-RDM and *R* includes all the terms for which  $\rho_2^{\text{HF}}$  can not be factorized out [18]. The CS model takes a truncated form of eq. (20):

$$\rho_{2}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}') = \rho_{2}^{\mathrm{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}')(1 - f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) - f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}') + f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}'))$$
(21)

as a starting point for the derivation of a correlation energy expression. Eq. (21) is exact for 2-electron systems (to a normalization factor) but, for larger systems, it neglects the *N*-electron effects on the 2-RDM beyond the direct pair interactions. In this sense, the CS approach has a close connection with the independent pair approximation (IPA), which is known to be correct to first order in the correlation function f [19]. Moreover, it has been shown that the 2-RDM (21) is not *N*-representable [20]. An important consequence of this is that the 1-RDM derived from (7) and (21) differs from that obtained by calculating (1) with the wave function defined in (19). In fact, the condition (7) applied to (21) yields:

$$\rho_{1}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') = \rho_{1}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') + \frac{2}{(N-1)} \int (-f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) - f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2})) \rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) d\mathbf{r}_{2}$$
(22)

while a direct calculation, using wave function (19) and definition (1) (see [18] and appendix), shows that  $\rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_1')$  should develop as:

$$\rho_{1}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') = \rho_{1}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') + 2\int (-f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) - f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}))\rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2})d\mathbf{r}_{2} + \dots$$
(23)

The comparison of expressions (22) and (23) shows that the CS approximation to the 2-RDM (21) is not an appropriate starting point for the calculation of the correlated 1-RDM: it widely underestimates the correlation effects on the 1-RDM and so, the kinetic counterpart of correlation.

It should be noted that neither the 2-RDMs (20), (21), nor the wave function given in eq. (19) are normalized. The expression that we finally retain for the model correlated 1-RDM is thus:

$$\rho_{1}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') = \mathscr{N} \left\{ \rho_{1}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') + 2 \int [-f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) - f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2})] \rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) d\mathbf{r}_{2} \right\}$$
(24)

where  $\mathcal{N}$  is a normalization factor. This approximation discards the *N*-electron effects on the 1-RDM, though it goes beyond the IPA. For a uniform electron gas, it should be valid at small densities (see the discussion in appendix).

# IV. A model for the kinetic energy of correlation of a uniform electron gas

Consider the case of a uniform electron gas (UEG), whose constant density  $\rho$  can be related either to the Seitz radius  $r_s$  or to the Fermi momentum  $k_F$ :

$$\rho = \frac{3}{4\pi r_s^3} = \frac{k_F^3}{3\pi^2}$$
(25)

The spinless 1-RDM solely depends on  $s = |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r'}|$  in that case and, from (14), is proportional to B(s). A convenient normalization choice for the UEG is to set B(0) = 1. Using periodic boundary conditions, the HF description of the UEG yields [21]:

$$B^{\rm HF}(s) = 3 \frac{\sin(k_F s) - k_F s \cos(k_F s)}{(k_F s)^3}$$
(26)

Such a function depends implicitly on  $\rho$ , is maximum at s = 0 and vanishes as  $s \to \infty$ , while oscillating (see fig. 1). Now, the HF pair density (10) of the UEG can be explicitly stated as:

$$P^{\rm HF}(r_{12}) = \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left[ B^{\rm HF}(r_{12}) \right]^2 \right\}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 g^{\rm HF}(r_{12})$$
(27)

The term in curly bracket  $(g^{HF})$  in eq. (27) is often referred to as the HF pair-distribution function. It satisfies the normalization condition:

$$\int \rho \left\{ g^{\text{HF}}(r_{12}) - 1 \right\} d\mathbf{r}_{12} = -1 \tag{28}$$

The HF approximation generates the so-called "exchange hole" around the position of any reference electrons. This kind of correlation arises from the determinantal nature of the wave function but does not include correlation beyond the Pauli level.

The next step consists of including Coulomb correlation by means of a Jastrow-like correlation factor, which Colle and Salvetti formulated as:

$$f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) = \left\{1 - \Phi(\mathbf{R}_{12})\left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{r}_{12}}{2}\right)\right\} e^{-\beta_{c}^{2}(\mathbf{R}_{12})r_{12}^{2}}$$
(29)

Such a correlation function has a cusp in  $r_{12} = 0$  and rapidly falls off as  $r_{12}$  increases, because of the gaussian term. In (29),  $\mathbf{R}_{12}$  is the pair center-of-mass vector  $\mathbf{R}_{12} = (\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2)/2$  and  $\beta_c$  has the meaning of an inverse radius of the correlation hole. Colle and Salvetti assumed this radius to be proportional to  $r_s$ , which amounts to assume  $\beta_c(\mathbf{R}_{12}) = q\rho(\mathbf{R}_{12})^{1/3}$ , where q is to be parameterized. In the case of a UEG, eq. (29) can be rewritten:

$$f(r_{12}) = \left\{ 1 - \Phi\left(1 + \frac{r_{12}}{2}\right) \right\} e^{-\beta_c^2 r_{12}^2}$$
(30)

where  $\beta_c$  and  $\Phi$  do not depend on  $\mathbf{R}_{12}$  but still depends on  $\rho$  or, equivalently, on  $r_s$ . In order to determine  $\Phi$ , Colle and Salvetti assumed that  $\rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_1) = \rho_1^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_1,\mathbf{r}_1)$ . This condition, which is exact for the UEG, but not for atomic systems [5], is verified if the correction term to  $\rho_1^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_1;\mathbf{r}_1)$  in eq. (22) does cancel, that is, if:

$$\int (-f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) - f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}))\rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})d\mathbf{r}_{2} = 0$$
(31)

Using further approximations, they finally obtained:

$$\Phi = \sqrt{\pi}\beta_c / \left(1 + \sqrt{\pi}\beta_c\right) \tag{32}$$

This expression ensures the correct asymptotic limits that we can expect for  $\Phi$ , which varies between 0 and 1 as  $\beta_c$ , and therefore  $\rho$ , goes from 0 to infinity. Since (32) is not the exact solution to (31), it is interesting to understand its exact physical meaning. Consider, for instance, the first-order correction term (in *f*) to the Hartree-Fock 1-RDM (24):

$$\int [f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2})] \rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) d\mathbf{r}_{2}$$
(33)

The term  $\rho_2^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2; \mathbf{r}_1', \mathbf{r}_2)$  separates into two components:

$$\rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) = \frac{1}{2}\rho^{2} \left\{ B^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{11'}) - \frac{1}{2}B^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{12})B^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{12}) \right\}$$
(34)

The first-order correlation correction term (33) can thus be rewritten as a sum of two terms: a first-order Coulomb-correlation term:

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho^{2}B^{\rm HF}(r_{11'})\int [f(r_{12})+f(r_{1'2})]dr_{2}$$
(35)

and a first-order exchange-correlation term:

$$-\frac{1}{4}\rho^{2}\int [f(r_{12})+f(r_{12})]B^{\rm HF}(r_{12})B^{\rm HF}(r_{12})dr_{2}$$
(36)

Imposing the first-order coulomb-correlation term (35) to cancel yields the condition:

$$\int f(\mathbf{r}_{12}) d\mathbf{r}_2 = \int f(\mathbf{r}_{1'2}) d\mathbf{r}_2 = 0$$
(37)

Using (30), one can verify that the condition (37) is satisfied if  $\Phi = \sqrt{\pi}\beta_c / (1 + \sqrt{\pi}\beta_c)$ : this result is identical to that of CS. Thus, expression (32) implies that the first-order Coulomb-correlation correction to the 1-RDM must cancel. For practical reasons, we shall make use of expression (32) in the following.

Incidentally, the CS approach is completed by assuming that:

$$\rho_1(\boldsymbol{r}_1, \boldsymbol{r}_1') = \rho_1^{\text{HF}}(\boldsymbol{r}_1, \boldsymbol{r}_1')$$
(38)

Such a condition might, at first, seem reasonable, since correlation effects on  $\rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_1')$  are known to be of "second order" while being of "first order" on the pair density [19,22]. However, condition (38) makes  $V_c^{ee}$  the only contribution to the correlation energy and becomes particularly "doubtful" (quoting ref. [23]) for isolated atoms or molecular systems, for which the Virial theorem implies:

$$T_c = -E_c \tag{39}$$

For the uniform electron gas, the relation is somewhat less straightforward [24]:

$$t_c = -\frac{\partial(r_s \varepsilon_c)}{\partial r_s} \tag{40}$$

where  $t_c$  and  $\varepsilon_c$  denote energies per electron.

The damping by the gaussian function in (30) suggests that a gaussian approximation may be made to  $B^{\rm HF}(s)$ , in the spirit of refs. [2], [25], [26] and [27]. As we shall see now, the gaussian approximation simplifies considerably the derivation of an analytical expression for the correlation kinetic energy, while ensuring a correct normalization of  $n^{\rm HF}(p)$  together with the exact HF kinetic energy. For small *s*,  $B^{\rm HF}(s)$ behaves like  $B^{\rm HF}(s) \approx 1 - \beta_x^2 s^2$ , with  $\beta_x = C_x \rho^{1/3}$  and  $C_x = 10^{-1/2} (3\pi^2)^{1/3}$ . An appropriate gaussian resummation is thus:

$$B_G^{\rm HF}(s) = e^{-\beta_x^2 s^2} \tag{41}$$

The comparison of  $B^{\text{HF}}$  and  $B_G^{\text{HF}}$  is shown in fig. 1. The gaussian approximation bypasses the oscillations of  $B^{\text{HF}}(s)$  at large s.



Figure 1: Comparison of  $B^{HF}(s)$  and  $B_{G}^{HF}(s)$ . The Wigner-Seitz radius  $r_s$  has been set to 3 a.u.

However, since  $B^{HF}(s)$  and  $B_{G}^{HF}(s)$  becomes identical at small *s*, they result in identical kinetic energy expressions, from (18).

Replacing now  $B^{\rm HF}(s)$  by  $B_{G}^{\rm HF}(s)$  in (27) leads to the approximate HF pair density:

$$P^{\rm HF}(r_{12}) \approx \frac{1}{2} \rho^2 \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-2\beta_x^2 r_{12}^2} \right\}$$
(42)

Such an approximation gives to  $\beta_x^{-1}$  the meaning of an exchange hole radius. Notice that  $\beta_c$  is proportional to  $\beta_x$ :

$$\beta_c = q\rho^{1/3} \tag{43}$$

Due to the gaussian approximation, the exchange part of the pair density (42) is not properly normalized, which would require another parameterization of  $\beta_x$  [21,25]. The gaussian approximation in (42) leads to a 5% error in the normalization condition (28) of the pair-distribution. The choice adopted here should however be appropriate for the present purpose, since correlation effects on the pair density are expected to be important near  $r_{12} = 0$  (at least when using the CS correlation functional).

As already mentioned, the calculation of the correlated kinetic energy requires knowledge of B(s) near s = 0. From (24), we derive an expression for B(s):

$$B(s) = \mathscr{H}\left\{B^{\mathrm{HF}}(s) + B^{\mathrm{Corr}}(s)\right\}$$
(44)

The normalization factor is simply determined by imposing B(0)=1. The correlation correction  $B^{\text{Corr}}(s)$  can be written as:

$$B^{\text{Corr}}(s) = 2 \int [f(r_{12}) + f(r_{12}) + f(r_{12}) f(r_{12})] \rho_2^{\text{HF}}(r_1, r_2; r_1', r_2) dr_2$$
(45)

Using (41), one can replace the term  $\rho_2^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2; \mathbf{r}_1', \mathbf{r}_2)$  in eq. (45) by:

$$\rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) = \frac{1}{2}\rho^{2} \left\{ e^{-\beta_{x}^{2}s^{2}} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-\beta_{x}^{2}\left(2[\mathbf{r}_{2}-\mathbf{R}]^{2} + \frac{1}{2}s^{2}\right)} \right\}$$
(46)

where  $\mathbf{R}$  and s have been defined in sect. I. Expression (46) suggests introducing the new variable  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{R}$ . All quantities appearing in (45) can thus be re-expressed as functions of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}$  and s variables, or even as functions of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}$ , s and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{\theta}}$ , where  $\widetilde{\mathbf{\theta}}$  is the angle between  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}$  and s vectors. Now, developing (44) to second order in s (higher order terms give a zero contribution to the kinetic energy) and replacing  $d\mathbf{r}_2$  by  $d\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}$  under the integral sign makes the integration easily handled with the *Mathematica* computing software [28]. Applying (18) then yields the following result for the correlated kinetic energy:

$$T = (47)$$

$$\mathscr{N} \frac{(9\pi)^{1/6}}{802^{5/6}}$$

$$\left(\frac{36\sqrt{2\pi}}{r_s^2} - \frac{1600\sqrt{5}\left(-3\hat{q}^4 + 3\sqrt{\hat{q}^2 + 2}\,\hat{q}^3 - 9\,\hat{q}^2 + 2\sqrt{\hat{q}^2 + 2}\,\hat{q} - 6\right)}{(\hat{q}^2 + 2)^{7/2}r_s\left(3^{2/3}\sqrt{5}\,\hat{q}(2\pi)^{5/6} + 20r_s\right)} - \frac{125\sqrt{5}\left(\sqrt{2}\left(48 + 7\pi\right)\hat{q}^2 - 64\sqrt{\hat{q}^2 + 1}\,\hat{q} + 48\sqrt{2}\right)}{(\hat{q}^2 + 1)^{3/2}\left(3^{2/3}\sqrt{5}\,\hat{q}(2\pi)^{5/6} + 20r_s\right)^2} - \frac{250\sqrt{10}\left(-48\left(\hat{q}^2 + 2\right) + 32\sqrt{2}\left(\hat{q}^2 + 3\right) - \pi\left(7\hat{q}^2 + 18\right)\right)}{\hat{q}^3\left(3^{2/3}\sqrt{5}\,\hat{q}(2\pi)^{5/6} + 20r_s\right)^2}\right)_{\text{where}}$$

e  $\hat{q} = q/C_x$  and the normalization factor is given by:  $\mathcal{H}^{-1} =$ 

(48)

$$1 + \frac{3}{4\pi r_s^{-3}} \left\{ \frac{250\sqrt{10\pi} \left(16\left(-2+\sqrt{2}\right)+3\sqrt{2}\pi\right)r_s^{-5}}{9\hat{q}^3 \left(3^{2/3}\sqrt{5}\left(2\pi\right)^{5/6}\hat{q}+20r_s\right)^2} - \frac{250\sqrt{5\pi} \left(16+\left(16+3\pi\right)\hat{q}^2-16\sqrt{2}\hat{q}\sqrt{1+\hat{q}^2}\right)r_s^{-5}}{9\left(1+\hat{q}^2\right)^{5/2} \left(3^{2/3}\sqrt{5}\left(2\pi\right)^{5/6}\hat{q}+20r_s\right)^2} - \frac{800\sqrt{10\pi} \left(-2+\hat{q}\left(-\hat{q}+\sqrt{2+\hat{q}^2}\right)\right)r_s^{-4}}{9\left(2+\hat{q}^2\right)^{5/2} \left(3^{2/3}\sqrt{5}\left(2\pi\right)^{5/6}\hat{q}+20r_s\right)}\right)$$

Expression (47) is obviously more involved than its HF counterpart, to which it reduces as  $q \rightarrow \infty$ , *i.e.* as the Coulomb hole volume tends to zero:

$$T^{\rm HF} = 9 \frac{\sqrt[3]{\frac{3}{2}} \pi^{2/3}}{20 r_s^2}$$
(49)

Using eqs. (47) and (49), we obtain an expression for  $T_c = T - T^{HF}$ , which asymptotic forms are:

$$T_c(r_s \to 0) = \frac{A_0(\hat{q})}{r_s}$$

and

$$T_c(r_s \to \infty) = \frac{A_{\infty}(\hat{q})}{r_s^2}$$

Both asymptotic forms are incorrect, since  $T_c(r_s \to 0)$  should diverge [29,30] like  $-\ln r_s$  and  $T_c(r_s \to \infty)$ should decay [31,32] like  $r_s^{-3/2}$ . This is however not surprising, since the approximation (24) to the 1-RDM is supposed to be valid at large  $r_s$  only, whereas the CS correlation function is not well-suited for describing the long-range correlation (see next section). We can nevertheless expect an intermediate range of densities for which the present approach gives reliable results. The function  $A_0(\hat{q})$  has a simple expression:

$$A_{0}(\hat{q}) = \frac{5(2/3)^{1/3} \left(-6 - 3\hat{q}^{2} + 4\hat{q}\sqrt{2 + \hat{q}^{2}}\right)}{\pi^{2/3} \hat{q} \left(2 + \hat{q}^{2}\right)^{7/2}}$$

The expected limit  $T_c \to +\infty$  (as  $r_s \to 0$ ) imposes the condition  $A_0(\hat{q}) > 0$ , which is verified if  $\hat{q} > 3\sqrt{2/7}$ . The critical value  $q^*$ , above which the divergence of  $T_c$  (as  $r_s \to 0$ ) has the correct sign, is thus  $q^* \approx 1.569$ . Conversely, the expression of  $A_{\infty}(\hat{q})$  is rather involved,  $A_{\infty}(\hat{q})$  is a positive function of  $\hat{q}$  ( $\hat{q} > 0$ ) which has a maximum near  $\hat{q} = 1.15$  (i.e.  $q \approx 1.12$ ). So, q should be the closest possible to 1.12 in order to maximize  $T_c$  at large  $r_s$ , while it must remain above 1.569 in order to give the correct divergence sign at small  $r_s$ . For practical calculations, we shall take q = 1.57.

#### V. Results and discussion

Our results are compared with those of Perdew and Wang (PW) [24] in fig. 2. Taking q = 1.57 results in a qualitative agreement with PW's result, whereas larger values of q's enlarge the discrepancies.



Figure 2: Comparison of correlation kinetic energies. *Dotted-dashed*: computed from eq. (47), with q = 1.57. *Dotted*: from eq. (47) with q = 2.29. *Full line*: result of Perdew and Wang [24].

In particular, the correlation kinetic energy obtained with the original CS parameterization (q = 2.29) is also displayed in fig. 2. Although the correlation kinetic energies, computed from (47) with  $q \ge 1.57$ , show a correct behavior, they systematically underestimate the PW's values. Using q = 1.57, the recovered kinetic energy of correlation passes from 83% at  $r_s = 1$  to 39% at  $r_s = 5$ . Provided the model 1-RDM (24) is valid at large  $r_s$ , the increasing discrepancies with PWs results should be due to the damping by the gaussian function in  $f(r_{12})$  rather than the gaussian approximation used for  $B^{\text{HF}}(s)$  and subsequently for  $\rho_2^{\text{HF}}(r_1, r_2; r_1', r_2)$  in (45). In order to check this, we computed the value  $B^{\text{Corr}}(0)$  by using either the exact HF pair density or the gaussian-approximated one. The relative differences were found to be less than 5 % in the range  $0.1 < r_s < 0.1$  and less than 0.6 % for  $r_s > 1$ ; the error then continuously decreases as  $r_s$  increases. The fact that the agreement on fig. 2 becomes poor at large  $r_s$  indicates that long-range correlation effects are not properly accounted for in (30), as shown by Tao and co-workers [23].

Now, we check the consistency of our expression for the correlation kinetic energy by extrapolating the correlation energy from eq. (40), provided that the Virial theorem applies. To achieve this in a simple way we approximate  $\varepsilon_c$  by a Padé form, from which is derived the corresponding approximant for  $t_c$  using eq. (40). The coefficients of the Padé form are then refined to fit  $t_c$  (as obtained with q = 1.57). The subsequent relative errors are negligible, except at very small  $r_s$ . Next, the refined coefficients are used to plot  $\varepsilon_c$ . The resulting curve is shown in fig 4 and compared to the PWs results, as well as the correlation energies derived from the CS classic approach.

From the CS most fundamental equation:

$$E_{c} = \int \left( f(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2})^{2} - 2f(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}) \right) \rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}; \mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}) \frac{1}{r_{12}} d\mathbf{r}_{1} d\mathbf{r}_{2}$$
(50)

which corresponds to eq. (9) of ref. 1, we derive a correlation energy per electron:

$$\varepsilon_{c} = \int \left( f(r_{12})^{2} - 2f(r_{12}) \right) \frac{1}{2} \rho g^{\text{HF}}(r_{12}) \frac{1}{r_{12}} d\mathbf{r}_{12}$$
(51)

We computed eq. (51) with two different values for q (2.29 and 1.57, see fig. 3). Note in passing that eq. (51) has been computed by using either the exact HF pair-distribution or the gaussian ansatz, yielding relative differences less than 2% (in the range  $r_s = 0.1$  to 10 a.u.). As reported in [23], the original CS parameterization (q = 2.29) poorly reproduces the PW correlation energy. Using q = 1.57 yields a better approximation, which however overestimates the PW reference curve as well as the  $t_c$ -extrapolated one. Notice that this is what we would expect when using any approximation to the exact wave function. At  $r_s = 3$  a.u., the  $t_c$ -extrapolated model allows to recover 78% of the PW correlation energy, vs. 67% for the CS model (with q = 1.57). This improvement indicates that the post IPA effects (neglected in the CS approach) might be significant. N. B. The lack of divergence of the  $t_c$ -extrapolated curve at  $r_s = 0$  is an artifact due to our Padé approximant.



Figure 3: Comparison of correlation energies obtained from various models. *Dotted-dashed*: extrapolated from the correlation kinetic energy, eq. (47), with q = 1.57. *Dashed*: from the CS pair density, eq. (51) of text, with q = 2.29. *Dotted*: from the CS pair density with q = 1.57. *Full line*: PW's result [24].

We conclude that our approach, based on an empirically correlated 1-RDM, offers an interesting alternative for computing the correlation kinetic energy. This component of the correlation energy is usually bypassed in the framework of the correlation factor approach. Although approximate, the underlying 1-RDM expression includes effects beyond the independent pair approximation and leads to correctly normalized one-electron densities. The resulting correlation kinetic energy is in qualitative agreement with that of Perdew and Wang though its asymptotic forms are incorrect, this is also the case for the extrapolated correlation energy. These shortcomings are due to (i) to an inadequacy of the empirically correlated 1-RDM at high densities and (ii) an improper description of the long-range correlation effects in the correlation functional, as previously shown [23]. However, other correlation functionals can be tested for improving the calculations, some of which are currently being investigated. The empirical parameter q of the correlation functional is determined analytically, in order to retrieve a correct sign for the divergence of the correlation kinetic energy. The resulting optimal q is found to be smaller than the original one, showing thereby that the Coulomb-hole is larger than predicted in the CS model, at least for the uniform electron gas. Next, our approach should be applied to atomic and molecular systems, which obviously requires some modifications in order to take into account strongly varying densities. Notice however, that considering the expression of  $T_c$ defined by eq. (47) as a local formula, together with q = 1.57, results in a correlation kinetic energy of 0.0583

a.u. for the Helium atom (The HF density was used), *i.e.* 135% of the exact value. Finally, an ideal extension would consist of deriving compatible expressions for both correlated 1- and 2-RDMs, approximately N-representable, in order to variationally optimize the parameter q.

### Appendix

The formulation (19) of the correlated wave function does not allow closed-form expressions for the correlated RDMs to be derived, because of the global correlation factor  $\prod_{i < j} (1 - f(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j))$ . One can consider

instead the pair wise correlated wave function:

$$\boldsymbol{\psi} = \boldsymbol{\psi}^{\text{HF}}(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{x}_N) \left( 1 - \sum_{i < j} f(\boldsymbol{r}_i, \boldsymbol{r}_j) \right)$$
(52)

The integral  $\int \psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, ..., \mathbf{x}_N) \psi^*(\mathbf{x}_1', \mathbf{x}_2, ..., \mathbf{x}_N) d\mathbf{x}_2 ... d\mathbf{x}_N$  appearing in (1) involves at the maximum 4 electrons other than the reference electron 1. From (52), we can derive the following closed-form expression for the correlated 1-matrix:

$$\rho_{1}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') = \rho_{1}^{HF}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}')$$

$$+2\int [f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2})]\rho_{2}^{HF}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2})d\mathbf{r}_{2}$$

$$+3\int [2f(\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3})f(\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3}) + 2f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{3})]\rho_{3}^{HF}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3})d\mathbf{r}_{2}d\mathbf{r}_{3}$$

$$+24\int [f(\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3})f(\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{4})]\rho_{4}^{HF}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3},\mathbf{r}_{4};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3},\mathbf{r}_{4})d\mathbf{r}_{2}d\mathbf{r}_{3}d\mathbf{r}_{4}$$

$$+30\int [f(\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3})f(\mathbf{r}_{4},\mathbf{r}_{5})]\rho_{5}^{HF}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3},\mathbf{r}_{4},\mathbf{r}_{5};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2},\mathbf{r}_{3},\mathbf{r}_{4},\mathbf{r}_{5})d\mathbf{r}_{2}d\mathbf{r}_{3}d\mathbf{r}_{4}d\mathbf{r}_{5}$$

$$(53)$$

As before, this expression needs to be correctly normalized. Limiting expression (53) to the first correction term yields the approximate expression:

$$\rho_{1}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') = \rho_{1}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{1}') + 2\int [f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2}) + f(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2})f(\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2})]\rho_{2}^{\text{HF}}(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2};\mathbf{r}_{1}',\mathbf{r}_{2})d\mathbf{r}_{2}$$
(54)

which is identical to the reference expression (24), though a normalization factor. The following terms of the development of  $\rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1;\mathbf{r}_1')$  in eq. (53) involves integrals of  $\rho_3^{\text{HF}}$ ,  $\rho_4^{\text{HF}}$ , etc. However,  $\rho_3^{\text{HF}}$  is of the order of  $\rho_2^{\text{HF}}$  times  $\rho$ , so that for sufficiently small densities, the correction terms involving  $\rho_3^{\text{HF}}$  and so RDMs of higher order should be negligible.

### References

- [1] R. Colle and O. Salvetti, Theor. Chim. Acta, 37 329-334 (1975).
- [2] This approach is sometimes referred to as the "correlation factor approach". See F. Moscardó and A. J. Pérez-Jiménez. Int. J. Quantum Chem. **61**, 313 (1997).
- [3] O.A.V Amaral and R. Mc Weeny, Theor. Chim. Acta 64, 171-180 (1983).
- [4] For an extensive list of references to the Colle-Salvetti approach, see S. Caratzoulas, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 062506 (2001).
- [5] R. Singh, L. Massa and V. Sahni. Phys. Rev. A 60, 4135 (1999).
- [6] S. Caratzoulas and P. J. Knowles, Mol. Phys. 98, 1811 (2000).
- [7] Some of these shortcomings can be corrected through simple ansatzs: see for instance the gaussian resummation ansatz proposed in ref. 4.
- [8] H. Meyer, T. Müller, A. Schweig, J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem) 360, 55 (1996).
- [9] F. A. Stevens, Jr. and M. A. Pokrant. Phys. Rev. A 8, 990 (1973).
- [10] A. Görling, M. Levy, and J.P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B 47, 1167 (1993).
- [11] The normalisazion choice of P. O. Löwdin is adopted: Phys. Rev. 97, 1474 (1955).
- [12] For general properties of reduced density matrices, see E.R. Davidson, *Reduced Density Matrices in Quantum Chemistry*. Academic Press (1976).
- [13] See the road map proposed by A. J. Thakkar, A. C. Tanner, and V. H. Smith, Jr. in *Density Matrices and Density Functionals: Inter-relationships Between Various Representations of One-matrices and Related Densities: A Road Map and an Example*, edited by R.M. Erdahl and V.H. Smith, Jr. (Reidel, Dordrecht, Holland, 1987), pp. 327-337.
- [14] This function is sometimes referred to as the reciprocal structure factor. See an example of analysis of such a function in Patisson P., Weyrich W., J. Phys. Chem. Sol. **40** (1979) 40.
- [15] See also S. Ragot, J. M. Gillet, P. J. Becker. Phys. Rev. B 65, 235115 (2002).
- [16] Paola Gori-Giorgi and Paul Ziesche. ArXiv: cond-mat/0205342
- [17] L. Cohen, C. Frishberg, C. Lee, and L. J. Massa, Int. J. Quantum Chem. Symp. 19, 525-533 (1986).
- [18] A. Soirat, M. Flocco and L. Massa, Int. J. Quantum Chem. 49, 291-298 (1994).
- [19] As discussed in ref. 12, pp. 117. It is however more customary to consider pair excitation operators instead of correlation functions in that case.
- [20] As shown by R. Morrison, Int. J. Quantum Chem. 46, 583 (1993).
- [21] See R. G. Parr and W. Yang: "Density-Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules". Oxford University Press (1989)
- [22] P. Fulde. Electron Correlations in Molecules and Solids. Springer-Verlag (1993).
- [23] J. Tao, P. Gori-Giorgi, J. P. Perdew and R. Mc Weeny. Phys. Rev. A 63, 032513 (2001).
- [24] J. P. Perdew and Y. Wang. Phys. Rev. B 45, 13244 (1992), ibid. Phys. Rev. B 46, 12947 (1992).
- [25] C. Lee and R. G. Parr. Phys. Rev. A 35, 2377 (1987).
- [26] J. Meyer, J. Bartel, M. Brack, P. Quentin and S. Aicher. Phys. Lett. B 172, 122 (1986).
- [27] M. Berkowitz. Chem. Phys. Lett. 129, 486 (1986).
- [28] Stephen Wolfram. Mathematica Version 4.0
- [29] M. Gell-Mann and K. A. Brueckner. Phys. Rev. 106, 364 (1957).
- [30] W. J. Carr Jr. And A. A. Maradudin. Phys. Rev. A 133, 371 (1964).
- [31] W. J. Carr Jr. Phys. Rev. 122, 1437 (1961).
- [32] P. Nozieres and D. Pines. The Theory of Quantum Liquids. I. New York : Benjamin. (1966).