

Nonlinear instability of density-independent orbital-free kinetic energy functionals

X. Blanc¹, E. Cancès²

¹ Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions,
Université Paris 6, Boîte courrier 187
75252 Paris cedex 05, FRANCE

² CERMICS, École Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées and INRIA,
6 & 8, avenue Blaise Pascal, Cité Descartes,
Champs sur Marne, 77455 Marne-La-Vallée Cedex 2, FRANCE

March 23, 2022

Abstract

We study in this article the mathematical properties of a class of orbital-free kinetic energy functionals. We prove that these models are linearly stable but nonlinearly unstable, in the sense that the corresponding kinetic energy functionals are not bounded from below. As a matter of illustration, we provide an example of an electronic density of simple shape the kinetic energy of which is negative.

1 Introduction

Kohn-Sham models have brought a considerable breakthrough in atomic-scale simulation of materials in condensed phase. However, the use of the Kohn-Sham kinetic energy is problematic when the number of electrons by unit cell exceeds a few hundreds (for computational means available to date). Some authors therefore proposed to approximate the Kohn-Sham kinetic energy functional in order to get rid of both the orbital and k-point dependencies. Their approach consists in improving the Thomas-Fermi model, for which the kinetic energy functional reads

$$T_{TF}[\rho] = C_{TF} \int_Q \rho^{5/3} \quad (1.1)$$

where Q is the simulation unit cell, ρ a given density, and $C_{TF} = \frac{3}{10} (3\pi^2)^{2/3}$ the Thomas-Fermi constant, by adding some correction terms. The functionals under consideration in this article are referred to as *density-independent* in the literature [6]. They formally read

$$T[\rho] = C_{TF} \int_Q \rho^{5/3} + \frac{1}{2} \int_Q |\nabla \rho|^2 + C_{TF} \int_Q \rho(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{w(y)}{|x-y|} dy \quad (1.2)$$

where α and β are positive real numbers such that $\alpha + \beta = 5=3$, where $k_0[\rho] = 3^{-2} \rho^{1=3}$ is the Fermi wavenumber associated with the average density $\rho = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{Q})}$ (here and below $\mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{Q})$ denotes the volume of the unit cell \mathfrak{Q}), and where $w_{\beta;\alpha}$ is some Green kernel. We will denote respectively by T_{TF} , T_W and T_C the Thomas-Fermi, von Weizsäcker and convolution term in (1.2):

$$T_{TF}[\rho] = C_{TF} \int_{\mathfrak{Q}} \rho^{5=3}; \quad (1.3)$$

$$T_W[\rho] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathfrak{Q}} \rho^{p-\beta} \quad (1.4)$$

$$T_C[\rho] = C_{TF} \int_{\mathfrak{Q}} (\mathbf{x}) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w_{\beta;\alpha}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y}) \rho(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{x}; \quad (1.5)$$

Note that $w_{\beta;\alpha}$ is a function of two variables. The first one, denoted by k_F , is a real number which has the dimension of a wavenumber. The second one is the convolution variable; it is a vector of \mathbb{R}^3 which has the dimension of a position vector. Energy functionals of this type were introduced by Wang and Teter [9] (with $\alpha = \beta = 5=6$), and further generalized by several authors [6, 7, 8]. For a given pair $(\beta; \alpha)$, the Green kernel $w_{\beta;\alpha}$ is completely determined by the requirement that the kinetic energy functional $T_{\beta;\alpha}$ must be compatible with the Lindhard perturbation theory (see e.g. [1]). This compatibility condition has been written as early as in 1964, in the article by Hohenberg and Kohn founding the Density-Functional Theory [3]. Imposing that $T_{\beta;\alpha}$ must be compatible with the Lindhard theory leads to the relation

$$\hat{w}_{\beta;\alpha}(\mathbf{k}_F; \mathbf{x}) = \frac{5}{9} G \frac{\mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{Q})}{2k_F}$$

where $\hat{w}_{\beta;\alpha}$ denotes the Fourier transform of $w_{\beta;\alpha}(\mathbf{k}_F; \mathbf{x})$ with respect to the convolution variable \mathbf{x} and where for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$G(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \rho^2 \log \frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho} - \frac{1}{3} \rho^2 - 1;$$

It is important to note that the normalization convention entering in the definition of the Fourier transform used above is the following: for all $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$,

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(\mathbf{y}) e^{-i\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}} d\mathbf{y};$$

The purpose of this article is to analyze the mathematical properties of the kinetic energy functionals of the form (1.2). The main results are presented in Section 2. We prove that these models are linearly stable but nonlinearly unstable, in the sense that the corresponding kinetic energy functionals are not bounded from below. As a matter of illustration, we provide an example of an electronic density of simple shape the kinetic energy of which is negative (all the numbers are in atomic units). Let us consider a cubical simulation cell $\mathfrak{Q} =]-L=2; L=2[$ and the \mathfrak{Q} -periodic function $\rho_N(\mathbf{x})$ with $N > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$ defined on \mathfrak{Q} by

$$\rho_N(\mathbf{x}) = N \frac{1}{r_0^2} e^{-\frac{3}{2}(\mathbf{x}^2 + \mathbf{y}^2 + \mathbf{z}^2)/r_0^2};$$

For $r_0 < L$, one has (up to machine precision),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_Q(\mathbf{x}) \chi_L(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} &= N; \\ T_{TF}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{x}_0, L) &= \frac{C_{TF}}{5} \left(\frac{3}{5} \right)^{3=2} \left(\frac{5}{0} \right)^{5=3} \frac{L^5}{r_0^2}; \\ T_W(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{x}_0, L) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_Q(\mathbf{x}) \chi_L(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{0}{0} \right)^{\frac{L^3}{r_0^2}}; \end{aligned}$$

and

$$T_C(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{x}_0, L) = \frac{5}{9} T_{TF}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{x}_0, L) h(\mathcal{Q});$$

In the above expressions, T_{TF} , T_W and T_C are defined by (1.3), (1.4) and (1.5), and

$$h(\mathcal{Q}) = \frac{1}{3=2} h^3 \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(\mathbf{x}) \chi_Q(\mathbf{x}) e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{x}|^2}{2}} d\mathbf{x}; \quad (1.6)$$

with

$$h = \frac{5}{3} \left(\frac{0}{0} \right)^{1=2} \frac{r_0}{L} \quad \text{and} \quad = \frac{3}{5} \left(\frac{0}{0} \right)^{1=2} \frac{1}{k_0(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{x}_0, L) r_0};$$

Notice that (1.6) is a Riemann sum which approximates the integral

$$h(\mathcal{Q}) = \frac{1}{3=2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(\mathbf{x}) \chi_Q(\mathbf{x}) e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{x}|^2}{2}} d\mathbf{x};$$

For $N = 13$, $r_0 = 0.5$ and $L = 4.906$, and with $\chi_Q = \frac{5}{6} \chi_{\overline{5}}$, one has for instance $T(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{x}_0, L) = 8.183$ (for the sake of comparison, the kinetic energy of the uniform electron gas of density $\rho = N/L^3$ is $T(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}) = 8.573$). The parameters $N = 13$ and $L = 4.906$ correspond to an all electron calculation on Aluminium.

2 Main results

Let us first recall the definitions of the functional spaces under consideration below: for $1 \leq p < +\infty$,

$$L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3) = \{u : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable}; \int_K |u|^p < +\infty \text{ for all compact sets } K \subset \mathbb{R}^3\};$$

$$L^p(\mathcal{Q}) = \{u : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ measurable}; \int_{\mathcal{Q}} |u|^p < +\infty\};$$

$$H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) = \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3); \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 < +\infty\};$$

$$H^1_{per}(\mathcal{Q}) = \{u \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3); \int_{\mathcal{Q}} |\nabla u|^2 < +\infty; u \text{ } \mathcal{Q}\text{-periodic}\};$$

$H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q}) = (H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q}))^0$ is the topological dual of $H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q})$:

The space $L^p(\mathbb{Q})$ is equipped with the norm $\|u\|_{L^p} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{Q}} |u|^p \right)^{1/p}$ and the space $H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q})$ with the norm $\|u\|_{H^1} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{Q}} |u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \right)^{1/2}$.

The main mathematical properties of the orbital-free kinetic energy functionals T_γ are put together in the following two theorems.

Theorem 2.1 *Let us consider two positive real numbers γ and β such that $\gamma + \beta = 5/3$. Let us consider a \mathbb{Q} -periodic potential $V \in L^{3/2}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and the minimization problem*

$$I_N = \inf_{\psi \in H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q})} \left(T_\gamma[\psi] + \int_{\mathbb{Q}} V |\psi|^2 \right); \quad 0 \leq \beta \leq 2; \quad N = N(\gamma, \beta); \quad (2.1)$$

where N is the number of electrons per unit cell. Then,

1. The real number T_γ formally defined by (1.2) can be rigorously defined for any nonnegative function V such that $V \in L^{3/2}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$.
2. If V is constant, $\psi_0 = N^{-1/2} \chi_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a stable local minimizer of (2.1).
3. For $V \in L^{3/2}(\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{Q}} V$ is small enough (for the $L^{3/2}(\mathbb{Q})$ norm), problem (2.1) has a unique local minimizer in the neighborhood of ψ_0 .
4. Assume that $V \in L^p(\mathbb{Q})$ with $p > 3/2$. When

$$N > N_\gamma; \quad N_\gamma = 4 \frac{A_0}{2C_{\text{TF}} \frac{8}{9} - 1}; \quad \gamma \geq \frac{3}{5}$$

with

$$A_0 = \inf_{\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \psi|^2}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\psi|^{10/3}}; \quad \psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3); \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi^2 = 1;$$

the ground state energy I_N equals -1 .

It is easy to obtain a numerical value of A_0 ($A_0 \approx 9.5785$), hence of N_γ for all $\gamma \geq 3/5$. The results are displayed on Fig 1. One can see that the critical values N_γ are not very large. In particular, $N_\gamma \approx 4.636$ for the values recommended in [6], namely $\gamma = \frac{5}{6}$.




Figure 1: Plot of the function \mathcal{T}_N , $N=5=3$ for $\alpha \in [0; 5=3]$

Similar results can be obtained for models in which the electronic interaction is taken into account, such as the ones used in atomic-scale simulation of materials. Let us notably consider the minimization problem

$$\mathcal{E}_N = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_N} \left(T(\rho) + \frac{1}{2} J[\rho] + E_{xc}[\rho] \right); \quad \rho \in \mathcal{P}_N \cap H^1_{\text{per}}(\mathbb{Q}); \quad \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \rho = N; \quad (2.2)$$

where $\rho \in L^6_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is a given nonnegative \mathbb{Q} -periodic density such that $\int_{\mathbb{Q}} \rho = N$ (ρ represents the density of smeared nuclear charges), and where J and E_{xc} are the Coulomb energy functional and some exchange-correlation energy functional, respectively. Recall that

$$J[\rho] = \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{Q}} \rho(x) W(x-y) dy \right) dx$$

with W denoting the unique solution in $H^1_{\text{per}}(\mathbb{Q})$ of

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta W &= 4 \rho; \\ W &= 0; \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

For simplicity, we consider the case of the so-called X exchange-correlation functional

$$E_{xc}[\rho] = C_{xc} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \rho^{4/3};$$

where $C_{xc} = \frac{3}{4} \pi^{1/3}$ is a positive constant, but similar results can be obtained for more complicated functionals.

Theorem 2.2 *Let us consider two positive real numbers α and β such that $\alpha + \beta = 5/3$. Then,*

1. *If $\rho_n = N/|\Omega|$ (Jellium background) with $N/|\Omega| > \inf \frac{C_{xc}}{C_{TF}}^3$, then $\rho_0 = N/|\Omega|$ is a stable local minimizer of (2.2).*
2. *For ρ_n \mathbb{Q} -periodic, such that $\rho_n = N/|\Omega|$ and close enough, for the $L^{6/5}(\mathbb{Q})$ norm, to some constant density ρ_0 with $\rho_0 > \inf \frac{C_{xc}}{C_{TF}}^3$, problem (2.2) has a unique local minimizer in the neighborhood of ρ_0 .*
3. *When $N > N_c$, $\beta = 4 \frac{A_0}{2C_{TF} \frac{8}{9} - 1} \frac{5}{3}$, the ground state energy \mathcal{E}_N equals -1 .*

Note that the constant $\inf \frac{C_{xc}}{C_{TF}}^3 = 0.102$ is not very high ($\beta = 0.110$ for Al and $\beta = 0.309$ for Fe).

3 Concluding remarks

Density-independent orbital-free kinetic energy functionals of the form (1.2) are all nonlinearly unstable: when the number N of electrons per unit cell exceeds a few units ($N > 5$ for $\beta = \frac{5}{6} \frac{1}{5}$), the kinetic energy goes to minus infinity when the density concentrates in some point of the unit cell. As proved in Theorem 2.2, the Coulomb repulsion (which tends to prevent the density from concentrating) is not able to stabilize the model. For large, inhomogeneous systems simulated on fine grids, one can therefore fear that the numerical solution obtained with such models will be meaningless.

This serious drawback is an additional motivation for constructing more elaborate functionals such as the so-called *density-dependent* orbital-free functional introduced in [8]. The mathematical analysis, as well as the numerical simulation of the latter models, are more difficult. Hopefully, this will be the matter of a future work.

4 Mathematical proofs

Let us begin this section by a formal calculation. In the sequel, the periodic lattice associated to the cell \mathbb{Q} is denoted by \mathbb{R} , and its dual lattice (see e.g. [1]) by \mathbb{R}^* . If k_F is a positive real number, and if f and g are two \mathbb{Q} -periodic functions, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} f(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(k_F; x-y) g(y) dy dx &= \int_{\mathbb{Q}} f(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(k_F; x-y-k) g(y+k) dy dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{Q}} f(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(k_F; x-y-k) g(y) dy dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} f(x) g(y) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(k_F; x-y-k) dx dy \end{aligned}$$

As R is symmetric with respect to the origin and as $w(\cdot; (k_F; \mathbf{x})) = w(\cdot; (k_F; -\mathbf{x}))$, it follows in particular that

$$\int_Q f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{R^3} w(\cdot; (k_F; \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) g(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{x} = \int_Q g(\mathbf{x}) \int_{R^3} w(\cdot; (k_F; \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) f(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{x};$$

and therefore that $T(\cdot; [\cdot]) = T(\cdot; [-\cdot])$. In addition, using Poisson formula, one obtains

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in 2R} w(\cdot; (k_F; \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{k})) = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R} \hat{w}(\cdot; (k_F; \mathbf{q})) e^{i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{q}} = \frac{5}{9} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R} G(\frac{\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{j})}{2k_F}) e^{i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{q}}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q f(\mathbf{x}) \int_{R^3} w(\cdot; (k_F; \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) g(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{x} &= \int_Q \int_Q f(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{y}) \mathfrak{C} \left(\frac{5}{9} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R} G(\frac{\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{j})}{2k_F}) e^{i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{q}} \right) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \frac{5}{9} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R} G(\frac{\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{j})}{2k_F}) \overline{c_q(f)} c_q(g) \end{aligned}$$

where $(c_q(h))_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R}$ denote the Fourier coefficients of the Q -periodic function h , namely

$$c_q(h) = \int_Q h(\mathbf{x}) e^{-i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}} d\mathbf{x};$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1: In view of the preceding remark, we can consider that (1.2) is a formal notation for

$$T(\cdot; [\cdot]) = C_{TF} \sum_Q \mathfrak{I}^{5=3} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_Q \mathfrak{J}^{P-2} + C_{TF} \frac{5}{9} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R} G(\frac{\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{j})}{2k_0[\cdot]}) \overline{c_q(\cdot)} c_q(\cdot) : \quad (4.1)$$

Note that the latter expression of the nonlocal term is the one which is actually used in numerical simulations (see e.g. [8]). Now, it is easy to see that $T(\cdot; [\cdot])$ is well defined by (4.1) for any nonnegative function \cdot such that $\mathfrak{I}^{P-2} \in H^1_{\text{per}}(Q)$ as soon as $\mathfrak{I}^{5=3}$ and \mathfrak{J}^{P-2} are positive real numbers such that $\mathfrak{I}^{5=3} + \mathfrak{J}^{P-2} = \frac{5}{3}$. Indeed, when $\mathfrak{I}^{P-2} \in H^1_{\text{per}}(Q)$, both $\mathfrak{I}^{5=3}$ and \mathfrak{J}^{P-2} are in $L^1(Q)$. Besides, the sum over the dual lattice is normally convergent. This can be proved by remarking that, on the one hand, G is a bounded function, and that, on the other hand, \cdot and \cdot are in $L^2(Q)$ for $\mathfrak{I}^{P-2} \in H^1_{\text{per}}(Q)$ and for \cdot and \cdot are in $[0; 5=3]$ (these are consequences of Sobolev inequalities [10]). Thus, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Parseval relation,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R} G(\frac{\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{j})}{2k_0[\cdot]}) \overline{c_q(\cdot)} c_q(\cdot) &= \sup_{R^+} \mathfrak{F}(\mathbf{j}) \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R} \overline{c_q(\cdot)} c_q(\cdot) \\ &= \sup_{R^+} \mathfrak{F}(\mathbf{j}) \mathfrak{C} \left(\frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R} \overline{c_q(\cdot)}^2 \right) \mathfrak{A} \left(\frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}(\mathbf{j})} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in 2R} c_q(\cdot)^2 \right) \mathfrak{A} \\ &= \sup_{R^+} \mathfrak{F}(\mathbf{j}) k_{L^2(Q)} k_{L^2(Q)} < +1 : \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the first statement of Theorem 2.1. Let us now prove the second statement. For this purpose we introduce the problem

$$\inf_{\mathbb{Q}} E_K[\cdot] + \int_{\mathbb{Q}} V^2; \quad 2 \int_{\mathbb{Q}} H^1_{\text{per}}(\mathbb{Q}); \quad \int_{\mathbb{Q}}^2 = N; \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$E_K[\cdot] = T; \quad [\cdot^2] = C_{TF} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} j^{j0=3} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathfrak{F}^2 + C_{TF} \frac{5}{9} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}j} \int_{q^2R}^X G \frac{\mathfrak{H}j}{2k_0[\cdot]} \overline{c_q(j^2)} c_q(j^2) : \quad (4.3)$$

It is easy to check that the infimum of (4.2) is equal to I_N and that \cdot is a local minimum of (2.1) if and only if $\cdot = P^-$ is a local minimum of (4.2). The Euler-Lagrange equation associated with problem (4.2) reads

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{5}{3} C_{TF} j^{4=3} + V + L[\cdot] = \quad (4.3)$$

where $L[\cdot]$ denotes the continuous linear form on $H^1_{\text{per}}(\mathbb{Q})$ defined by

$$L[\cdot] h = G_F \frac{5}{9} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}j} \int_{q^2R}^X G \frac{\mathfrak{H}j}{2k_0[\cdot]} \overline{c_q(j^2 - h)} c_q(j^2) + \overline{c_q(j^2)} c_q(j^2 - h) : \quad (4.4)$$

and where \cdot is a Lagrange multiplier associated with the constraint $\int_{\mathbb{Q}}^2 = N$. Let us denote by

$\cdot_0 = P^-$. As on the one hand, $c_q \cdot_0^2 = c_q \cdot_0^2 = 0$ for all $q \notin 0$, and as on the other hand, $G(0) = 0$, one has $L[\cdot_0] = 0$. Therefore, \cdot_0 solves the Euler-Lagrange equation (4.3) for V equal to the constant V_0 , with $\cdot_0 = \frac{5}{3} \cdot_0^{2=3} + V_0$; if V is constant, \cdot_0 is thus a critical point of (4.2). In order to complete the proof of the second statement of Theorem 2.1, it is sufficient to show that the continuous symmetric bilinear form

$$B[\cdot_0; \cdot_0](h_1; h_2) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} r h_1 - r h_2 + \frac{35}{9} C_{TF} \int_{\mathbb{Q}}^{4=3} h_1 h_2 + \frac{5}{9} C_{TF} K[\cdot_0](h_1; h_2) \int_{\mathbb{Q}}^2 h_1 h_2; \quad (4.5)$$

is positive definite on the tangent subspace $h \in H^1_{\text{per}}(\mathbb{Q}); \quad \int_{\mathbb{Q}} h = 0$. In the above expression $\cdot_0 = \frac{5}{3} \cdot_0^{2=3}$ and $K[\cdot_0]$ denotes the bilinear form defined by

$$\begin{aligned} K[\cdot_0](h_1; h_2) &= \frac{1}{\mathfrak{D}j} \int_{q^2R}^X G \frac{\mathfrak{H}j}{2k_0[\cdot_0]} (2 - 1) \overline{c_q(\cdot_0^2)}^2 h_1 h_2 c_q(\cdot_0^2) + (2 - 1) \overline{c_q(\cdot_0^2)} c_q(\cdot_0^2) h_1 h_2 \\ &\quad + 2 \overline{c_q(\cdot_0^2 - h_1)} c_q(\cdot_0^2 - h_2) + \overline{c_q(\cdot_0^2 - h_2)} c_q(\cdot_0^2 - h_1) \\ &= \frac{4}{\mathfrak{D}j} \int_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2+2-2} \int_{q^2R}^X G \frac{\mathfrak{H}j}{2k_0[\cdot_0]} \text{Re} \overline{c_q(h_1)} c_q(h_2) \\ &= \frac{4}{\mathfrak{D}j} \int_{\mathbb{Q}}^{4=3} \int_{q^2R}^X G \frac{\mathfrak{H}j}{2k_0[\cdot_0]} \text{Re} \overline{c_q(h_1)} c_q(h_2) : \end{aligned}$$

The latter equality has been obtained using that for all $q \notin 0$, $c_q \frac{2}{0} = c_q \frac{2}{0} = 0$, that $G(0) = 0$, and that $\alpha + \beta = 5=3$. A simple calculation then leads to

$$\begin{aligned} B[\alpha; \beta](h; h) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \text{tr} h^2 + \frac{20}{9} C_{TF} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}^{4=3} G \left(\frac{\text{tr} j}{2k_0[\alpha]} + 1 \right) \overline{c_q(h) c_q(h)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \text{tr} h^2 + \frac{2}{3} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} (k_0[\alpha])^2 \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}^{4=3} G \left(\frac{\text{tr} j}{2k_0[\alpha]} + 1 \right) \overline{c_q(h) c_q(h)} \\ &= \frac{2}{3} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} (k_0[\alpha])^2 \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}^{4=3} G \left(\frac{\text{tr} j}{2k_0[\alpha]} + 1 \right) \overline{c_q(h) c_q(h)} \\ &= \frac{2}{3} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} (k_0[\alpha])^2 \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}^{4=3} F \left(\frac{\text{tr} j}{2k_0[\alpha]} \right) \overline{c_q(h) c_q(h)} \end{aligned}$$

where the function F is defined by

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \log \frac{1+x}{1-x}.$$

Not surprisingly, one recovers the function $F(x)$ arising in Lindhard theory [1]. As $F(x) \sim 1$ for all $x \rightarrow 0$, one obtains

$$B[\alpha; \beta](h; h) = \frac{2}{3} (k_0[\alpha])^2 \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} h^2; \quad (4.6)$$

which completes the proof of the second statement.

Let us now consider the function

$$F : H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q}) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow L^{3=2}(\mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q}) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad ; \quad \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \frac{1}{2} + \frac{5}{3} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}^{4=3} + V + L[\cdot] \quad ; \quad \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}}^2 \quad N : \quad ((\cdot; \cdot); V)$$

The function F is of class C^1 and satisfies, for any constant V_0 , $F((\alpha; \beta + V_0); V_0) = 0$. Besides, the partial derivative of F with respect to the pair $(\cdot; \cdot)$, at the point $((\alpha; \beta + V_0); V_0)$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial ((\alpha; \beta + V_0); V_0)}(h) = B[\alpha; \beta](h; \cdot); \quad \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} h$$

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial ((\alpha; \beta + V_0); V_0)} = (\alpha; 0);$$

where $B[\alpha; \beta]$ denotes the bilinear form defined by (4.5). Next, it is possible to improve (4.6), by showing that there exists some constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that $F(x) \sim 1 + x^2$ for all $x \rightarrow 0$ (actually, one can use $\epsilon = 1=4$). Hence, we have

$$B[\alpha; \beta](h; h) = \frac{2}{3} (k_0[\alpha])^2 \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} h^2 + \frac{1}{6} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \text{tr} h^2;$$

For some ε large enough, the function

$$\chi(\mathbf{x}) = \varepsilon^{3/2} \chi(\mathbf{x})$$

is supported in the set $B(0; \varepsilon)$ introduced above and the function $\chi_1(\mathbf{x}) = N \chi(\mathbf{x})^2$ is such that $\chi_1 \in C_0^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\text{Supp } \chi_1 \subset B(0; \varepsilon)$, $\chi_1 \geq 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_1 = N$. In addition,

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \chi_1|^2 + C_{TF} \frac{8}{9} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_1^5 > 0:$$

One therefore has,

$$T; [\chi]_{1+1}^2:$$

Besides, from Hölder inequality [4],

$$\int_{\mathbb{Q}} V |\chi|^{p^0} \leq \|\chi\|_{L^{p^0}(\mathbb{Q})}^{p^0} \|\chi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{Q})}^{p-p^0}$$

where $p^0 = 1 - \frac{1}{p} < 3$. As $\|\chi\|_{L^{p^0}(\mathbb{Q})}^{p^0} = \varepsilon^{3-3p^0} \|\chi_1\|_{L^{p^0}(\mathbb{Q})}^{p^0} = o(\varepsilon^2)$, we finally conclude that

$$T; [\chi] + \int_{\mathbb{Q}} V |\chi|^{p^0} \leq \varepsilon^{2+1} \|\chi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{Q})}^2;$$

and therefore that $I_N = 1$.

Remark 4.1 *Let us point out that one can carry out the same analysis with the density*

$$\chi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{N}{\mathcal{Q}} \frac{N_c}{j} + N_c \varepsilon^{3/2} \chi_1(\mathbf{x}); \quad (4.8)$$

with $N_c < N_c < N$ instead of the above N . This is physically more satisfactory since the densities defined by (4.8) are uniformly bounded away from zero.

Proof of Theorem 2.2: We use the same strategy as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, and thus define the following minimization problem:

$$\inf E_K[\chi] + \frac{1}{2} J[\chi^2 - n] + E_{xc}[\chi^2]; \quad 2 H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q}); \quad \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \chi^2 = N; \quad (4.9)$$

A function χ is a solution of (4.9) if and only if χ^2 is a solution of (2.2). Let us write down the corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation:

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta \chi^2 + \frac{5}{3} C_{TF} \chi^4 + L[\chi] + W - \frac{4}{3} C_{xc} \chi^2 = \lambda; \quad (4.10)$$

where the electrostatic potential W is defined by (2.3), and the linear form $L[\chi]$ by (4.4). The constant λ is the Lagrange multiplier associated to the charge constraint. As pointed out in the proof of Theorem 2.1,

if we define $\phi_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \phi$, we have $L[\phi_0] = 0$. In addition, ϕ_0 is then a solution of $\Delta \phi_0 = 0$, and is thus identically zero in view of its periodicity and of the normalization condition in (2.3). This shows that ϕ_0 is a solution of (4.10) with

$$\phi_0 = \frac{5}{3} C_{TF} \phi_0^{2=3} - \frac{4}{3} C_{xc} \phi_0^{1=3} : \quad (4.11)$$

Hence, ϕ_0 is a critical point of the energy. We need now to show that it is a local minimizer. In order to do so, we show that the bilinear form

$$\begin{aligned} B[\phi_0; \phi_0](h_1; h_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \langle h_1, h_2 \rangle + \frac{35}{9} C_{TF} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \phi_0^{4=3} h_1 h_2 + \frac{5}{9} C_{TF} K[\phi_0](h_1; h_2) \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{\mathbb{Q}} D(h_1; h_2) - C_{xc} \frac{20}{9} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \phi_0^{2=3} h_1 h_2 - \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \phi_0 h_1 h_2; \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

is positive definite on the tangent subspace $h \in H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q})$; $\int_{\mathbb{Q}} \phi_0 h = 0$. In the above expression ϕ_0 is defined by (4.11), $K[\phi_0]$ denotes the bilinear form defined by

$$K[\phi_0](h_1; h_2) = \frac{4}{\int_{\mathbb{Q}} \phi_0^{4=3}} \sum_{q \in 2\mathbb{R}} \langle G, \frac{\hat{\phi}_q}{2k_0[\phi_0]} \text{Re} \overline{c_q(h_1)} c_q(h_2) \rangle ;$$

and D is defined by

$$D(h_1; h_2) = \int_{\mathbb{Q}} W_1 h_2; \text{ with } W_1 = 4 \phi_1; \quad W_1 \in H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q}); \quad \int_{\mathbb{Q}} W_1 = 0 :$$

We now point out that actually, W_1 may be defined by its Fourier coefficients through $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^2 c_q(W_1) = 4 c_q(h_1)$ and $c_0(W_1) = 0$, so that

$$D(h_1; h_2) = \frac{4}{\int_{\mathbb{Q}} \phi_0^{4=3}} \sum_{q \in 2\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{c_q(h_1) \overline{c_q(h_2)}}{\hat{\mathcal{H}}^2} :$$

Hence, carrying out the same computation as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B[\phi_0; \phi_0](h; h) &= \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{Q}} \phi_0^{4=3}} \sum_{q \in 2\mathbb{R}} \frac{20}{9} C_{TF} \phi_0^{2=3} \hat{F} \frac{\hat{\mathcal{H}}^2}{2k_0[\phi_0]} - \frac{20}{9} C_{xc} \phi_0^{1=3} \hat{\mathcal{H}}^2(h) \hat{F} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{Q}} \phi_0^{4=3}} \sum_{q \in 2\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{4}{\hat{\mathcal{H}}^2} \hat{\mathcal{H}}^2(h) \hat{F} : \end{aligned}$$

Now, we know that $F(\cdot) \geq 1$, which, with the help of $\phi_0^{1=3} > \frac{C_{xc}}{C_{TF}}$, implies that

$$B[\phi_0; \phi_0](h; h) \geq \int_{\mathbb{Q}} h^2 ;$$

for some positive constant independent of h . This proves that ϕ_0 is a local minimizer of (2.2).

We now prove the second statement of Theorem 2.2. For this purpose, we introduce the function

$$G : H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q}) \times \mathbb{R} \times L^{6=5}(\mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H_{\text{per}}^1(\mathbb{Q}) \times \mathbb{R} \\ ((\cdot; \cdot); n) \mapsto \frac{1}{2} + \frac{5}{3} C_{\text{TF}} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} j^4 + L[\cdot] + W + \frac{4}{3} C_{\text{xc}} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} j^2 = 3; \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \cdot^2 - N; \cdot;$$

where W is here again defined by (2.3), where $\cdot = \int_{\mathbb{Q}} j^2$. The function G is of class C^1 (all terms are clearly C^1 except W , but this one may be shown to have the desired regularity with the help of standard elliptic estimates). In addition, $G((\cdot; \cdot); 0) = 0$; and the partial derivatives of G at this point read

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial ((\cdot; \cdot); 0)}(h) = B[\cdot; 0](h; \cdot); \int_{\mathbb{Q}} h; \cdot; \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial ((\cdot; \cdot); 0)} = (\cdot; 0);$$

where $B[\cdot; 0]$ is defined by (4.12). Here again, using the fact that $F(\cdot) = 1 + \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \cdot^2$ for some positive constant and that $\frac{1}{0} = 3 > \frac{C_{\text{xc}}}{C_{\text{TF}}}$; one easily shows that

$$B[\cdot; 0](h; h) = \int_{\mathbb{Q}} h^2 + \int_{\mathbb{Q}} j h j^2;$$

for some constant > 0 . Hence, one may apply Lax-Milgram theorem [4] to prove that $\frac{\partial G}{\partial ((\cdot; \cdot); 0)}$ is invertible. The second statement of Theorem 2.1 then follows from the implicit function theorem [4].

We now turn to the third statement of Theorem 2.2. We use test functions of the form

$$(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}); \quad 1:$$

We can carry out the same computation for the kinetic energy, showing here again that, if $\mathbf{1}$ satisfies (4.7), choosing $\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}) = N \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}) j^2$ leads to

$$T; [\cdot] = \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \cdot^2;$$

with

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} j^p - \frac{1}{2} + C_{\text{TF}} \frac{8}{9} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} j \mathbf{1} j^3 > 0:$$

We therefore only need to check that the remaining terms of the energy have a scaling of lower order as goes to infinity. First, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{Q}} \cdot^{4=3} = \int_{\mathbb{Q}} \cdot^4 - \frac{4}{1} \int_{\mathbb{Q}} (\cdot \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \cdot^{4=3} \mathbf{1}:$$

We then compute the Coulomb term, using its Fourier expression:

$$J(\cdot; n) = \frac{4}{\int_{\mathbb{Q}} j} \sum_{q \in 2\mathbb{R} \setminus n f_0 g} \frac{j_q(\cdot; n) j^2}{j^2} - \frac{8}{\int_{\mathbb{Q}} j} \sum_{q \in 2\mathbb{R} \setminus n f_0 g} \frac{j_q(\cdot) j^2 + j_q(n) j^2}{j^2}:$$

Pointing out, as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, that $c_q(\cdot) = \hat{c}_1 \frac{\rho}{2}$; we thus have

$$J(\rho_n) = \frac{8}{\pi} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\hat{c}_1 \frac{\rho}{2}}{\frac{\pi q^2}{2}} + C;$$

where C is a constant depending only on ρ_n . The sum is, up to a factor $\frac{1}{2}$, a Riemann sum, and we thus have

$$J(\rho_n) = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\hat{c}_1(\rho)^2}{j^3} d\mathbf{d} + o(1);$$

This allows to conclude that both the exchange term and the electrostatic term have a scaling of order strictly lower than ρ^2 as ρ goes to infinity. We thus come to the same conclusion as in Theorem 2.1.

References

- [1] N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin. *Solid state physics*. Holt-Saunders International Editions, 1976.
- [2] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Springer, 1997.
- [3] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn. Inhomogeneous electron gas. *Phys. Rev.*, 136:B864–B871, 1964.
- [4] James R. Munkres. *Analysis on manifolds*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Advanced Book Program, Redwood City, CA, 1991.
- [5] Dreizler R.M. and Gross E.K.U. *Density functional theory*. Springer, 1990.
- [6] Yan Alexander Wang and Emily A. Carter. Orbital-free kinetic energy density functional theory. In *Theoretical methods in condensed phase chemistry*, volume 5 of *Progress in theoretical chemistry and physics*, pages 117–184. Kluwer, 2000.
- [7] Yan Alexander Wang, Niranjana Govind, and Emily A. Carter. Orbital-free kinetic-energy for the nearly free electron gas. *Phys. Rev. B*, 58(20):13465, 1998.
- [8] Yan Alexander Wang, Niranjana Govind, and Emily A. Carter. Orbital-free kinetic-energy density functionals with a density-dependent kernel. *Phys. Rev. B*, 60(24):16350, 1999.
- [9] Yan Alexander Wang and Michael P. Teter. Kinetic-energy functional of the electron density. *Phys. Rev. B*, 45(23):13196, 1992.
- [10] Eberhard Zeidler. *Applied functional analysis*, volume 108 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. Applications to mathematical physics.