

Domain-averaged Fermi hole versus regional reduced density matrices: a critical comparison

Diego R. Alcoba^a, Roberto C. Bochicchio^{a*}, Luis Lain^b, Alicia Torre^b

In their recent work Cooper and Ponec [Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys., 2008, 10, 1319-1329] proposed a “one-electron approximation to domain-averaged Fermi hole (DAFH)” used in electronic population studies. The goal of this comment is to note that the proposal had been already published within the framework of domain-restricted reduced density matrices (Ω -RDM) and to show that it cannot conceptually be considered as an approximation to DAFH as the authors invoke.

^a*Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Ciudad Universitaria, 1428, Buenos Aires, Argentina. E-mail: rboc@df.uba.ar*

^b*Departamento de Química Física. Facultad de Ciencias. Universidad del País Vasco. Apdo. 644 E-48080 Bilbao, Spain.*

The *domain-averaged Fermi hole* (DAFH) approach to analyze electronic structures has been widely used in the recent past¹. However, its correlated counterpart (correlated hole) has not been considered on an equal footing due to the high computational cost required for the use of second-order reduced density matrices (2-RDM), ²D. In ref. 1, the authors mention their early work using these matrices² but omit to advise that the first attempt to extend domain-averaged Fermi hole analysis to the correlated case has been published by some of us in ref. 3, making explicit use of the ²D structure in matrix form. The aim of the authors of ref. 1 is to approach the DAFH analysis by a simple model that avoids the use of ²D. The goal of this report is twofold. On the one side to show that this one-electron model the authors claim for themselves in this reference is nothing but a model previously developed by us within the scenario of the domain-restricted first-order reduced density matrices⁴, ¹D(Ω). On the other side we attempt to clarify the physical and mathematical reasons, misunderstood in ref. 1, showing that what is there called one-electron approximation to DAFH is unsuitable for such a task.

Let us first show that the approach called *pseudo*-DAFH [cf. eqn (2.9) of ref. 1] is nothing but the model we called *symmetric* approach to ¹D(Ω) in ref. 4. Following the authors in ref. 1, we will focus attention on closed-shell wave functions. Eqn (11) in ref. 4 reads,

$${}^1D_j^i(\Omega) = \sum_{k,l} ({}^1D^{\frac{1}{2}})_k^i S(\Omega)_l^k ({}^1D^{\frac{1}{2}})_j^l \quad (1)$$

where $({}^1D^{\frac{1}{2}})_j^i$ mean the elements of the positive square root matrix arising from the spin-free first-order reduced density matrix (1-RDM), ¹D, and $S(\Omega)_j^i = \langle i|j \rangle_\Omega$ ($a_j^{i\Omega}$ in ref. 1) are the overlap integrals over Bader domains Ω in an orthonormal basis set labeled as i, j, k, l, \dots ⁴. This ¹D(Ω) arises from a partitioning of ¹D in terms of Bader's regions, so that ${}^1D_j^i = \sum_\Omega {}^1D_j^i(\Omega)$. The expression of eqn (1) in the natural basis set in which ${}^1D_j^i = n_i \delta_i^j$ where n_i and δ_i^j stand for the natural occupation numbers and the Kronecker delta, respectively, yields the symmetric form $G^\Omega = n^{\frac{1}{2}} S(\Omega) n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ of

ref. 1 [cf. eqn (2.9)]. Let us note that eqn (1) formulates a true domain-restricted first-order reduced density matrix associated with the domain Ω , i.e., a representable matrix, ${}^1D(\Omega)$ ⁵, which is valid for any type of wave function⁵, such as independent particle models and correlated particle models with non-integer occupation numbers⁵.

Our second aim is to show the inconsistencies of the proposal of one-electron approximation to DAFH in ref. 1. The errors arise from wrong assumptions of mathematical and physical nature performed to state the there called *pseudo*-DAFH¹ model as an approximation to DAFH. Let us first explain the scenario of the domain-restricted decompositions of the 1-RDM, in order to analyze these assumptions. A reduced density matrix must fulfil necessary and sufficient conditions to be representable, i.e., to assure that there exists a wave function or a statistical ensemble, though unknown, from which it derives. The 1-RDM is hermitian, positive semidefinite and bounded⁵ and is normalized to the number of electrons, N . The necessary and sufficient conditions to be fulfilled by a closed-shell system domain-restricted first-order density matrix ${}^1D(\Omega)$ (for any domain Ω in the system) are that its eigenvalues, n_i^Ω must lie within the real interval $[0, 2]$, i.e., $0 \leq n_i^\Omega \leq 2$ ⁵; note that the domains Ω define open systems which necessarily become described by grand-canonical ensembles⁵. Let us now consider the one-electron approximation to DAFH in ref. 1. This approximation is nothing but our symmetric approach to ${}^1D(\Omega)$ as we have shown above. Consequently, it turns out to be a true domain-restricted first-order density matrix, according to the enumerated representability conditions. An appropriate model must predict approximate values of a determined quantity keeping its physical nature; that is not the case of the symmetric model of ${}^1D(\Omega)$ in relation with the approximation of DAFH matrices. Thus, as has been shown, both local⁷ and non-local (or integrated) matrix formulations³ of the correlated hole (DAFH) are not positive semi-definite^{2,3}. Consequently, negative eigenvalues (populations) can appear from both formulations, which make this quantity physically unacceptable as a density. Furthermore, populations greater than 2 do not fulfilling the Pauli principle arise. Examples showing populations out of the interval $[0, 2]$ may be found in both the local and domain-averaged formulations of correlated hole^{3,7}.

Simple systems like N_2 molecule at equilibrium geometry calculated at a single-double configuration interaction level with the PSI 3.2 package⁸ in a 6-31G basis set, exhibit negative eigenvalues (~ -0.03)⁹. This is a significant negative value which must be neglected in DAFH analysis, as was made in refs. 1-3 and consequently the isopycnic transformation¹⁰ used to localize the eigenvectors of DAHF in those references is no longer valid. Also, to neglect the negative eigenvalues of the DAFH matrices permits the density to be delocalized due to the particle conservation, i.e., the density integration over a domain does not keep the right population for the domain and thus for the whole system¹. This is not the case of the symmetric model of ${}^1D(\Omega)$ which do not behave in this way, since it can properly support an isopycnic transformation because all its eigenvalues are positive. Thus, this difficulty is completely avoided within the framework of domain-restricted first-order reduced density matrix theory, which provides a more localized picture of electron distributions as shown in the comparison of both ${}^1D(\Omega)$ and DAHF pictures⁴. These results may not be considered as unexpected because, as shown above, correlated DAFH are not true *particle* densities. Namely, DAFH may not satisfy the rigorous conditions to be a *true* first-order reduced density matrix, and thus it may not properly describe an open system. Consequently, DAFH are not density matrices but different entities and it is a severe conceptual shortcoming to approximate DAFH by means of any approach to ${}^1D(\Omega)$ including the symmetric one. In fact, the above commented results induced us to study decomposition schemes in the physical space providing the ${}^1D(\Omega)$ matrices^{4,6}.

It may be noted that DAHF model turns out to be a true density matrix only for closed-shell wave functions having 2 or 0 orbital populations. In this case it is equivalent to our symmetric approach because then the density cumulant terms of 2D vanish and 1D is *duodempotent* (${}^1D^2 = 2 {}^1D$)⁴. Other important remark to be made in relation with the topics treated in ref. 1 is that this one-electron symmetric approach ${}^1D(\Omega)$ to DAFH has not a common basis of eigenvectors for all the Ω domains in the system, i.e., the corresponding matrices are not diagonal in the same basis set⁶. Therefore, calculating quantum chemical descriptors depending on the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of two

domains, as made in refs. 1, 2 and 4, is neither mathematically nor physically rigorous⁶. This drawback may be avoided using a model with a common eigenbasis to all domains such as the isopycnic approach to the domain-restricted decomposition of the first-order reduced density matrix⁶.

Grants in aid from the Universidad de Buenos Aires, (Project No. X-024), the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, República Argentina (PIP No. 5098/05), the Spanish Ministry of Education (Grant No. CTQ2006-01849/BQU) and the Universidad del Pais Vasco (Grant No. GIU06/03) are acknowledged.

References

- 1 D. L. Cooper and R. Ponec, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2008, **10**, 1319-1329 and references therein.
- 2 R. Ponec and D. L. Cooper, *Faraday Discuss.*, 2007, **135**, 31-42.
- 3 R. C. Bochicchio, L. Lain and A. Torre, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **122**, 084117.
- 4 D. R. Alcoba, L. Lain, A. Torre and R. C. Bochicchio, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **123**, 144113.
- 5 D. R. Alcoba, R. C. Bochicchio, G. E. Massacessi, L. Lain and A. Torre, *Phys. Rev. A*, 2007, **75**, 012509.
- 6 D. R. Alcoba, R. C. Bochicchio, A. Torre and L. Lain, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2006, **110**, 9254-9260.
- 7 M. A. Buijse, *Electron Correlation*, Centrale Huisdrukkerij Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, 1991.
- 8 T. D. Crawford, C. D. Sherrill, E. F. Valeev, J. T. Fermann, R. A. King, M. L. Leininger, S. T. Brown, C. L. Janssen, E. T. Seidl, J. P. Kenny and W. D. Allen, PSI 3.2 2003.
- 9 D. R. Alcoba, R. C. Bochicchio, L. Lain and A. Torre, unpublished results.
- 10 J. Cioslowski, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, 1990, **S24**, 15.