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In this work, we present a general framework that unites the two primary strategies for constructing density functional approximations (DFAs): non-empirical (NE) constraint satisfaction and semi-empirical (SE) data-driven optimization. The proposed method employs B-splines—bell-shaped spline functions with compact support—to construct each inhomogeneity correction factor (ICF). This choice offers several distinct advantages over a polynomial basis by enabling explicit enforcement of linear and non-linear constraints as well as ICF smoothness using Tikhonov regularization and penalized B-splines (P-splines). As proof of concept, we use this approach to construct CASE21—a Constrained And Smoothed semi-Empirical hybrid generalized gradient approximation that completely satisfies all but one constraint (and partially satisfies the remaining one) met by the PBE0 NE-DFA and exhibits enhanced performance across a diverse set of chemical properties. As such, we argue that the paradigm presented herein maintains the physical rigor and transferability of NE-DFAs while leveraging high-quality quantum-mechanical data to improve performance.

Kohn-Sham density functional theory (KS-DFT) is the de facto standard for electronic structure calculations in chemistry, physics, and materials science due to its favorable trade-off between accuracy and computational cost.1 While there now exist hundreds of density functional approximations (DFAs) of varying complexity across all rungs of Perdew’s popular Jacob’s ladder,2 most have been designed using either non-empirical (NE) or semi-empirical (SE) strategies.1,3 NE strategies seek to construct DFAs by proposing simple ansätze designed to satisfy well-defined physical constraints (e.g., the uniform electron gas (UEG) limit,3 second-order gradient responses,1,4). Resulting NE-DFAs (e.g., PBE,1 PBE0,10 SCAN11) tend to be more transferable across systems and favored in the physics and materials science communities. SE strategies seek to construct DFAs by optimizing a physically motivated and flexible functional form to best reproduce high-quality reference quantum-mechanical data. Resulting SE-DFAs (e.g., B3LYP,12 Minnesota functionals,13–15 the B97 family13,15) often perform quite well (typically exceeding NE-DFAs) on chemical systems/properties similar to the training data, and are popular for chemical applications.

When used independently, both of these DFA strategies have shortcomings. For one, NE-DFA ansätze are somewhat arbitrary, i.e., there is some flexibility when constructing an NE-DFA that satisfies a given set of constraints.11,12 Consequently, there is no guarantee that the chosen ansatz will perform best in practice. In the same breath, the choice of constraints is also somewhat arbitrary/empirical, e.g., the correct series expansion of the exchange-correlation (xc) energy is sometimes ignored as it often results in inaccurate DFAs for real systems.15 On the other hand, striving for the best-performing functional using only an SE-DFA strategy often goes hand-in-hand with sacrificing exact physical constraints.11,13,16,17 Furthermore, some SE-DFAs suffer from non-physical “bumps” or “wiggles” in the inhomogeneity correction factor (ICF), which violate an implicit smoothness constraint and can require significantly larger quadrature grids for accurate integration.20–22 Clearly, both paradigms provide useful information about the optimally performing DFA, but neither suffices on its own.

While several groups have advocated for combining these strategies,15,23 constraint satisfaction during the data-driven optimization process has remained difficult to date. To address the smoothness problem in SE-DFAs, the BEEF24,25 and Minnesota26 functionals have adopted an explicit smoothness penalty in the regression procedure with reasonable success; the resulting ICFs are significantly smoother than previous generations, albeit not always completely devoid of spurious features. Furthermore, the recent MCML approach22 has made efforts to combine NE-DFA and SE-DFA strategies by algebraically enforcing three linear constraints during the SE-DFA optimization process (an approach originally used in the M05 family25). While successful in enforcing the targeted constraints, the polynomial basis used in MCML (and the vast majority of SE-DFAs to date) prevents explicit enforcement of non-linear constraints (such as inequalities), and makes satisfying new constraints non-trivial as each regression coefficient appears in every algebraic constraint.

In this work, we present a general framework that unites NE-DFA and SE-DFA strategies by enabling straightforward enforcement of both physical constraints and ICF smoothness while leveraging high-quality quantum-mechanical data. The proposed DFA strategy uses B-splines, compact bell-shaped piece-wise functions,20 to construct the ICF, which allows for a tunable trade-off between ICF smoothness and flexibility using penalized B-spline (P-spline) regularization,21 while still allowing for explicit enforcement of both linear and non-linear constraints via generalized Tikhonov regularization.22,23
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regularization. As proof of concept, we use this framework to construct a hybrid generalized gradient approximation (GGA): CASE21—Constrained And Smoothened semi-Empirical 2021, which completely satisfies all but one constraint (and partially satisfies the remaining one) met by the PBE0 NE-DFA. When compared to PBE0 (and the popular B3LYP SE-DFA), CASE21 attains higher accuracy across a diverse set of chemical properties without sacrificing transferability or requiring large numerical quadrature grids. As such, we argue that the CASE paradigm presented herein maintains the physical rigor and transferability of NE-DFAs while leveraging high-quality quantum-mechanical data to remove the arbitrariness of ansatz selection.

Functional Form. We write CASE21 as the sum of exchange and correlation contributions,

\[ E^{\text{CASE21}} = \frac{3}{4} E_x[\rho_\uparrow, \rho_\downarrow] + \frac{1}{4} E_{xx} + E_c[\rho, \zeta], \]

where the exchange contribution uses 25% exact exchange \( E_{xx} \), as generally recommended for global hybrid GGA.\(^{13,13}\) The semi-local exchange is defined using the exchange spin scaling relationship\(^{33}\)

\[ E_x[\rho_\uparrow, \rho_\downarrow] = \frac{1}{2} (E_x[2\rho_\uparrow] + E_x[2\rho_\downarrow]), \]

in which

\[ E_x[\rho_\sigma] = \int \rho_\sigma \xi^{\text{LDA}}(\rho_\sigma) F_x(u_{x,\sigma}) \, d\mathbf{r}, \]

\( \rho_\sigma \) is the spin density (with spin \( \sigma \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow\} \)), \( \xi^{\text{LDA}} \) is the exchange energy density per particle within the local density approximation (LDA), and \( F_x(u_{x,\sigma}) \) is the yet to be determined CASE21 exchange ICF. We employ \( 0 \leq u_{x,\sigma} = (\gamma_x s_x^2)/(1 + \gamma_x s_x^2) < 1 \) (as originally proposed by Becke\(^{13}\)) as the finite-domain representation of the PBE dimensionless spin density gradient, \( s_x = |\nabla \rho_\sigma|/\pi^{2/3} (2\rho_\sigma)^{4/3} \). Here, we note that the PBE exchange ICF can be written as a linear function of \( u_{x,\sigma} \) if \( \gamma_x = \mu/\kappa \approx 0.273022 \) (where \( \mu \) and \( \kappa \) are the NE parameters in PBE), which we denote by \( F_x(u_{x,\sigma}) \equiv 1 + \kappa u_{x,\sigma} \). Hence, we argue that this is an appropriate choice for \( \gamma_x \) since the UEG limit\(^2\) and Lieb-Oxford bound\(^{33} \) can still be straightforwardly enforced in this smooth limiting form (vide infra).

We construct \( E_c[\rho, \zeta] \) by analogy to \( E_x[\rho_\sigma] \), namely,

\[ E_c[\rho, \zeta] = \int \rho \zeta^{\text{LDA}}(\rho, \zeta) F_c(u_c) \, d\mathbf{r}, \]

in which \( \zeta^{\text{LDA}}(\rho, \zeta) \) is the PW92\(^{39}\) LDA correlation energy density per particle, \( \rho = \rho_\uparrow + \rho_\downarrow \) is the total density, \( \zeta = (\rho_\uparrow - \rho_\downarrow)/\rho \) is the relative spin polarization, and \( F_c(u_c) \) is the yet to be determined CASE21 correlation ICF. As with exchange, we suggest a form for \( u_c \) such that a linear ICF, i.e., \( F_c(u_c) \equiv 1 - u_c \), would satisfy the UEG correlation limit\(^3\) rapidly varying density limit\(^3\) and second-order gradient expansion for correlation.\(^{39} \) Namely, we propose \( 0 \leq u_c \equiv (-\phi \omega^2)/(\phi \omega^2 + \gamma_c \epsilon_c \xi^{\text{LDA}}) < 1 \), where \( \phi = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \zeta^{2/3} (1 - \zeta^{2/3}) \) is a spin scaling factor\(^3\) \( \gamma_c \approx 1/3 \approx 14.986886 \) (where \( \beta \) is another NE parameter in PBE), and \( t \) is a dimensionless spin-separated density gradient,

\[ t \equiv \sqrt{\omega_o} \left( \frac{\pi}{3} \right)^{1/6} \frac{|\nabla \rho_\uparrow| + |\nabla \rho_\downarrow|}{4\rho^{7/6} \phi}, \]

which reduces to the PBE dimensionless density gradient \( t^{\text{PBE}} \), which has \( |\nabla \rho| \) instead of \( |\nabla \rho_\uparrow| + |\nabla \rho_\downarrow| \) in the numerator when \( |\nabla \zeta| = 0 \) (which was assumed during the construction of PBE correlation, and is a relationship that allows DFAs based on \( t \) to satisfy PBE correlation constraints). We note in passing that the use of \( t^{\text{PBE}} \) yields qualitatively similar results to \( t \) (which might be expected, given that \( t \) and \( t^{\text{PBE}} \) are equivalent for closed-shell systems), although \( t \) slightly outperforms \( t^{\text{PBE}} \) quantitatively. Importantly, \( u_c \) increases monotonically with \( t \), suggesting a one-to-one mapping between \( t \) and \( u_c \) for a given \( \epsilon_c \xi^{\text{LDA}} \); hence, \( u_c \) is an appropriate finite-domain transformation of \( t \). While Eq. (4) with this definition of \( u_c \) does not fully satisfy uniform scaling to the high-density limit for correlation\(^2\) it does completely cancel the \( c^{\text{LDA}} \) logarithmic singularity\(^{53} \) and allows for satisfaction of all other PBE correlation constraints. However, such partial satisfaction of this constraint is not a restriction of the presented method—in principle, an (albeit more complex) functional form that completely satisfies all PBE correlation constraints could have also been used.

We write the CASE21 exchange and correlation ICFs as linear combinations of \( N_{sp} \) compact piece-wise bell-shaped cubic \( (k = 3) \) uniform B-spline basis functions \( \{B_i\}^{39} \)

\[ F_x(u_{x,\sigma}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{sp}} c_{x,i} B_i(u_{x,\sigma}) = c_x \cdot B_{x,\sigma} \]

\[ F_c(u_c) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{sp}} c_{c,i} B_i(u_c) = c_c \cdot B_c, \]

which is equivalent to constructing each ICF using a cubic spline\(^{53} \) (see Supporting Information (SI) for more details). With the choice of knot vector employed herein\(^{39} \) the \( B_i(u_{x,\sigma}) \) and \( B_i(u_c) \) are uniformly spaced with all points in \( 0 \leq u_{x,\sigma} \leq 1 \) and \( 0 \leq u_c \leq 1 \) supported by three non-zero B-splines. As depicted in Fig. 1(a), setting \( c_x = 1 = c_c \) in Eq. (6) results in \( F_x(u_{x,\sigma}) = 1 = F_c(u_c) \); in this limit, CASE21 exchange and correlation reduce to LSDA exchange and LDA correlation, respectively.

Having defined the CASE21 functional form, we now discuss a general framework that unites NE-DFA and SE-DFA strategies. Namely, we determine \( c \equiv (c_x, c_c) \) using generalized Tikhonov regularization\(^{33} \), i.e., by minimiz-
FIG. 1. (Top) B-spline basis functions \( \{b_i\}_{i=1,10} \), rainbow used to represent the exchange and correlation ICFs in this work. When all expansion coefficients are set to unity, the resulting B-spline curve \( F(u) = \sum c_i b_i(u) \), black) is uniform in \( 0 \leq u \leq 1 \) and recovers the LSDA/LDA limit. (Bottom) B-spline curve with non-uniform coefficients. Note again how the coefficients closely align with the curve for \( 0 \leq u \leq 1 \).
grid dependence, these approaches have been largely ineffective when enforced alongside constraints. On the other hand, we find no issues when simultaneously enforcing ICF smoothness as well as numerous linear and non-linear constraints.

Constraint Satisfaction. During CASE21 construction, we fully enforce the following 10 constraints: exchange spin scaling, uniform density scaling for exchange, UEG exchange limit, UEG linear response, Lieb-Oxford bound, exchange energy negativity, UEG correlation limit, second-order gradient expansion for correlation, rapidly varying density limit for correlation, and correlation energy non-positivity. We also partially enforce uniform scaling to the high-density limit for correlation, forcing ICF smoothness as well as numerous linear and non-linear constraints.

Training Procedure. Our self-consistent training procedure (Scheme 1) leverages three distinct data sets (see SI): training (X_train, y_train), validation (X_val, y_val), and testing (X_test, y_test). In a given iteration, the training set (a single database of heavy atom transfer reaction energies, HAT705) is used to initially determine c by minimizing L (in conjunction with the SCA for satisfying inequality constraints) for a range of λ and a given set of orbitals {ψ_i} (with initial {ψ_i} generated using F_x(u_x,σ) and F_c(u_c)). With c(λ), a weighted-root-mean-square error,

\[ \text{wRMSE}(\lambda) = \sqrt{\text{diag}(W) \cdot \text{r}(\lambda)^2 / \text{Tr}(W)} \]

in which r(λ) = X_valc(λ) − y_val is the error vector and r(λ)^2 is the element-wise square of r(λ), is computed on the validation set (which contains absolute energies of H–O from AE119 and all atomization energies in TAE203). Using \( \lambda^* = \text{argmin}_\lambda \text{wRMSE}(\lambda) \), c* is determined by re-optimizing L (in conjunction with the SCA) over the training and validation sets. New \{ψ_i\} are then generated using c*, and the entire cycle is repeated until c* is stationary. At this point, the testing set (which contains a significantly more diverse range of chemical properties than the training and validation sets, vide infra) is used to assess the performance and transferability of the self-consistent DFA.

Preliminary fits using \{ψ_i\} suggested that the effective degrees of freedom (DoF, see SI for derivation) change slowly starting around N_sp = 10, and the performance of the corresponding (non-self-consistently optimized) DFA was representative of those with N_sp > 10. Hence, we used N_sp = 10 in Scheme 1 to generate the self-consistently optimized CASE21 DFA (six iterations; convergence criterion: \( |\Delta c| < 10^{-5} \); see SI for c*).

To confirm that CASE21 remains representative of DFAs trained with other N_sp values, we (non-self-consistently) optimized c for select N_sp \in [6, 40] using the CASE21 \{ψ_i\}. As depicted in Fig. 2, the resulting ICFs and their first derivatives were all smooth and very similar (particularly for N_sp ≥ 10), thereby providing an a posteriori justification for our choice of N_sp = 10 for CASE21.
From this plot, one can also see that the CASE21 ICFs (DoF = 1.22) subtly deviate from linearity in ways that simply cannot be obtained using low-order polynomial expansions.

**Final Testing.** The performance of CASE21 across a diverse set of chemical properties is compared to that of the PBE0 and B3LYP hybrid DFAs in Fig. 3. CASE21 outperforms the PBE0 NE-DFA on 10/11 properties, with improvements as large as 0.81 kcal/mol and 0.82 kcal/mol for bond dissociation energies and electron affinities, respectively. In the testing set, CASE21 improves upon PBE0 in 7/8 properties by an average of 0.38 kcal/mol. On the other hand, PBE0 only outperforms CASE21 for ionization potentials. CASE21 also outperforms B3LYP (a popular SE-DFA for chemical applications) on 8/11 properties; in the testing set, CASE21 improves upon B3LYP in 6/8 properties by an average of 0.41 kcal/mol (while B3LYP only offers a marginal ∼0.07 kcal/mol improvement on the remaining 2/8). We therefore conclude that CASE21 preserves the physical rigor and transferability of the PBE0 NE-DFA while still outperforming the B3LYP SE-DFA. Although the CASE21 ICFs are clearly smooth (cf. Fig. 2), we also investigated the grid dependence of this DFA for completeness. Since Lebedev-Treutler grids with 50 radial and 194 angular grid points (i.e., (50, 194)) are typically large enough to obtain accurate energetics with standard hybrid GGAs (such as PBE0) we compared the performance of CASE21 using this grid to the larger grids employed during the training procedure (see Computational Methods). Using all points in the training, validation, and testing data sets (N = 2,263), we find nearly identical mean absolute deviations of 1.84 × 10−2 kcal/mol for CASE21 and 1.83 × 10−2 kcal/mol for PBE0, thereby indicating that CASE21 does not require larger quadrature grids than PBE0 for accurate integration.

In this work, we presented the CASE (Constrained and Smoothened semi-Empirical) framework for uniting NE-DFA and SE-DFA construction paradigms. By employing a B-spline representation for the ICFs, this approach has several distinct advantages over the historical choice of a polynomial basis, namely, explicit enforcement of linear and non-linear constraints (using Tikhonov regularization) as well as explicit penalization of nonphysical ICF “bumps” or “wiggles” (using P-splines). As proof of concept, we used this approach to construct CASE21, a hybrid GGA that completely satisfies all but one constraint (and partially satisfies the remaining one) met by the PBE0 NE-DFA. Despite being trained on only a handful of properties, CASE21 outperforms PBE0 and B3LYP (arguably the most popular SE-DFA for chemical applications) across a diverse set of chemical properties. As such, we argue that the CASE framework can be used to design next-generation DFAs that maintain the physical rigor and transferability of NE-DFAs while leveraging...
benchmark quantum-mechanical data to remove the arbitrariness of ansatz selection and improve performance. Future work will extend this approach to more sophisticated DFAs (e.g., meta-GGAs, range-separated hybrids) as well as explore the use of B-splines in constructing robust features for machine-learning chemical properties.

COMPUTATIONAL METHODS

All electronic structure calculations were performed using in-house versions of Psi4 (v1.3.2) and LibXC (v4.3.4) modified with a self-consistent implementation of the CASE21 DFA (including functional derivatives analytically computed using Mathematica v12.1). All self-consistent field (SCF) calculations were performed using density fitting (DF) in conjunction with the def2-QZVPP-JKFIT basis sets and an energy convergence threshold of $e_{\text{convergence}} = 1e-12$. During DFA training, all calculations employed (99,590) Lebedev-Treutler grids except for the calculations of the absolute energies in AE18, which used (500,974). Minimization of $\mathcal{L}$ in Eq. (7) and optimization of wRMSE($\lambda$) in Eq. (10) were performed in Mathematica v12.1.
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SUPPORTING INFORMATION AVAILABLE:

Supporting Information (SI) includes:

- B-spline definitions
- Enforcement of ICF constraints
- Training, validation, and testing data sets
- Derivation of optimal coefficients and effective degrees of freedom for weighted generalized Tikhonov regularization
- Optimized CASE21 ICF coefficients
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