

May 31, 2018

# Analytical calculation of pressure for confined atomic and molecular systems using the eXtreme-Pressure Polarizable Continuum Model

Roberto Cammi,\*

*Department of Chemical Science Department of Chemical Science,  
Life Science and Environmental Sustainability ,  
University of Parma, I-43100 Parma, Italy*

Bo Chen

*Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Baker Laboratory,  
Cornell University, Ithaca NY 14853-1301 (USA)*

Martin Rahm

*Department of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering,  
Division of Chemistry and Biochemistry,  
Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden*

(Dated: v8.0)

## Abstract

We show that the pressure acting on atoms and molecular systems within the compression cavity of the eXtreme-Pressure Polarizable Continuum method can be expressed in terms of the electron density of the systems and of the Pauli-repulsion confining potential. The analytical expression holds for spherical cavities as well as for cavities constructed from van der Waals spheres of the constituting atoms of the molecular systems.

**Keywords:** Confined quantum systems, analytical derivatives, atoms and molecules at high-pressure

## I. INTRODUCTION

This paper presents a new development of the eXtreme-Pressure Polarizable Continuum Model (XP-PCM), a Quantum Chemical method recently developed for the description of molecular systems at high pressure in condensed phases [1–4] and already applied to study the effects of pressure on the electron density and the equilibrium geometry [2, 5–8], on the IR/Raman vibrational frequencies [2, 5–8], on the electronic excitation energy [9], and on chemical reaction energy profiles [3, 4, 10, 11].

The XP-PCM method describes the effects of the pressure by confining a molecular system within a cavity of an external transmitting medium that it is characterized by a dielectric permittivity and an averaged electronic charge density, both depending on the given condition of pressure. Forced within the cavity, the molecule has tails of its electronic distribution that can penetrate the cavity walls overlapping with the electron distribution of the surrounding medium and giving rise to a Pauli repulsive and confining interaction. Pressure enters through this Pauli repulsive interaction between the molecule and the external medium, with the pressure that increases with the increase of the Pauli repulsion. Operatively, the increase of the pressure is modeled by a suitable shrinking of the molecular cavity and by a correlated increase of the electron density of the medium [12].

The new development of the XP-PCM we are presenting regards the analytical calculation of the pressure acting on the confined atomic/molecular system. The pressure is defined as minus the derivative of the electronic energy of the molecule in the solvent field with respect to the volume of the confining cavity. So far this derivative has been evaluated only by numerical methods [2, 9]. An analytical calculation of the pressure is attractive from a theoretical as well as a computational point of view. From a theoretical perspective it satisfies our desire to discover new and unexpected relationships between physical observables, hence strengthening a unified view of the phenomenon under examination. From a computational point of view an analytical approach offers a more stable and accurate approach to the calculation of physical observables, hence opening new possibilities of application for the underlying theoretical methodology.

In particular, our analytical theory of the pressure has been motivated by a study of the properties of compressed atoms of all the elements (1-96) of the periodic table, whereas numerical methods for the calculation of the pressure have failed to account for sudden changes

in the electronic configuration of compressed atoms. We have first developed an analytical theory for the case of atomic systems confined by simple spherical cavities. Then we have generalized it, in the form we are presenting now, to the case of cavities constituted from superimposed spheres (i.e. van der Waals cavities) used for the compression of molecular systems.

## II. THE XP-PCM THEORY: ELECTRONIC ENERGY, PRESSURE AND CAVITY STEP FUNCTION

The electronic energy,  $G_{er}$ , for a molecular system confined within a XP-PCM cavity is given by:

$$G_{er}(p, \mathbf{R}) = \langle \Psi | \hat{H}^o + \frac{1}{2} \hat{V}_e(\Psi) + \hat{V}_r | \Psi \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where  $|\Psi\rangle$  is the electronic wave-function,  $H^o$  the Hamiltonian operator of the isolated molecule,  $\hat{V}_e(\Psi)$  and  $\hat{V}_r$  operators representing, respectively, the electrostatic and the Pauli repulsion interactions between the molecule and the external medium. [13–15].

The Pauli repulsion operator  $\hat{V}_r$  of Eq. (1), a key physical component of the XP-PCM model, corresponds to a repulsive step potential located at the boundary of the cavity enclosing the molecular solute [14]:

$$\hat{V}_r = \int \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}) \Gamma(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_i^N \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i)$  is the electron density operator (over the  $N$  electrons of the molecular system) and  $\Gamma(\mathbf{r})$  a step barrier potential at the boundary of the molecular cavity:

$$\Gamma(\mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{Z} \Theta_C(\mathbf{r}) \quad \Theta_C(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \mathbf{r} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_C \\ 1 & \mathbf{r} \notin \mathbb{D}_C \end{cases}. \quad (3)$$

In Eq. (3),  $\mathcal{Z}$  is the height of the potential barrier and  $\Theta_C(\mathbf{r})$  the cavity step function, a Heaviside unit step function having a value equal to zero inside the cavity and equal to one outside of it ( $\mathbb{D}_C$  denotes the domain of the physical space inside the cavity). The height of the potential barrier  $\mathcal{Z}$  depends on the mean valence electron density  $\rho_S$  of the external medium, estimated at the given condition of the pressure  $p$ . [2]. Here, we note that an alternative form of the Pauli repulsion operator  $V_r$  has been proposed by Chipman and

co-workers [16, 17].

The Schrödinger equation which determines the electronic wave-function  $|\Psi\rangle$  of the compressed molecular systems is given by

$$\left[\hat{H}^o + \hat{V}_e(\Psi) + \hat{V}_r\right] |\Psi\rangle = E|\Psi\rangle$$

and its solutions can be obtained at the various levels of Quantum Chemistry (Hartree-Fock, DFT, Coupled-Cluster,...).

The electronic energy  $G_{er}$  is central in the study of the properties of compressed atoms and molecules. In fact, the derivatives of the electronic energy  $G_{er}$  with respect to suitable parameters describing perturbing agents [5] determine the various electronic properties of compressed systems. Furthermore,  $G_{er}$  acts as effective potential for the nuclei and the minima of the corresponding potential energy surface (PES)  $G_{er}(\mathbf{R})$  correspond to equilibrium geometries of a compressed molecule. For a fast and effective exploration of the PES analytical derivatives of  $G_{er}$  with respect to the Cartesian coordinates of the atomic nuclei has been proposed in Ref. [2] and systematically applied to the study of equilibrium geometries and vibrational frequencies of compressed molecules [2, 6–8].

### A. The pressure

As mentioned in the Introduction, the pressure is defined as the change of the electronic energy  $G_{er}$  under variation of the volume,  $V_c$ , of the molecular cavity:

$$p = - \left( \frac{\partial G_{er}}{\partial V_c} \right). \quad (4)$$

The volume  $V_c$  pertains to a molecular van der Waals cavity constructed from a set of spheres centered on the nuclei of the constituting atoms. The spheres have radii,  $R_i = R_i^0 f$ ,  $R_i^0$  being the atomic van der Waals radii [44–49], and  $f$  being a scale factor. An upper value of the scaling factor,  $f_0$ , is set as a reference and lower values of  $f$  are used to decrease the volume  $V_c$  and hence increase the pressure  $p$ . The reference scaling factor  $f_0$  depends on the chosen set of van der Waals atomic radii. The value  $f_0 = 1.2$  is commonly used [2] in combination with radii as tabulated by Bondi [45], while  $f_0 = 1.3$  is used in combination with a new set of radii for the elements (1–96) of the atomic table as proposed by one of the

present authors [49]. We note that in general the volume of the cavity scales as a cubic polynomial in  $f$ .

The XP-PCM definition of the pressure given in Eq. (4) is equivalent to the definition of pressure given for simple quantum confining models (“box models”), that have been used since the fourth decade of the past century for the study of the effect of the very high pressure on the properties of atoms and simple diatomic molecules [18–36]. In these models a atom or a simple diatomic is collocated in a spherical or ellipsoidal box having an impenetrable (or even penetrable) confining boundary potential. To model compression on the quantum system the size of the box is decreased and for a give size the pressure is computed as the minus the derivative of the electronic energy of the system with respect to the volume fo the box, as in our Eq. (4).

It is worth to recall other two approaches for the calculation of the pressure based on a quantum mechanical calculations on atoms or molecules. The first approach has been proposed by R. F. Bader, and it is rooted in the definition of atoms in molecules as open systems bounded by a surface of zero flux of the gradient vector field of the electron density [37]. In this approach the pressure acting on a given open system is defined as the quantum force exerted per unit area of the surface enclosing the open system [38, 39], then the pressure may be determined exploiting the virial theorem for open quantum systems or as the derivative of the energy of the open quantum systems with respect to its volume. When an entire molecule is considered as a quantum system this definition of pressure corresponds formally to Eq. (4) [40].

The second approach is based the Weisskopf’s kinetic energy pressure concept of steric repulsion [41], as expressed within the Natural Bond Orbital (NBO) analysis of Weinhold [42]. In this case, the pressure may be evaluated by encircling the target molecule with a cluster of noble gas and computing the NBO steric repulsion. The formal connection with the XP-PCM pressure implies to consider the derivative of the steric repulsion energy with respect to a suitable definition of the volume of the target molecular system [43]. This NBO approach for the calculation of the pressure may be of particular interest as an alternative way to calibrate the boundary confining barrier of the XP-PCM model.

## B. The van der Waals cavity step function: the cavity volume and the Pauli repulsion operator

For a molecular van der Waals cavity the cavity step function  $\Theta_C$  of Eq. (3) assumes a simple analytical form. Let us consider a van der Waals cavity constituted by the superposition of  $N_S$  atomic van der Waals spheres with centers  $\{\mathbf{C}_i\}$  and radii  $\{R_i = fR_i^0\}$  (see Fig. 1). The corresponding cavity step function can be expressed as

$$\Theta_C(\mathbf{r}; f) = \prod_{i=1}^{N_S} \Theta_i(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{C}_i, fR_i^0), \quad (5)$$

where the product extends over the  $N_S$  atomic spheres and the  $\Theta_i(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{C}_i, fR_i^0)$  are spherical Heaviside step functions:

$$\Theta_i(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{C}_i, fR_i^0) = \begin{cases} 0 & \mathbf{r} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_i \\ 1 & \mathbf{r} \notin \mathbb{D}_i. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbb{D}_i$  are the domains of space internal to the spheres.

In terms of the van der Waals cavity step function (5) the volume of the cavity,  $V_C(f)$  is given by

$$V_C(f) = \int \left( 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{N_S} \Theta_i(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{C}_i, fR_i^0) \right) d\mathbf{r}, \quad (7)$$

and the Pauli repulsion operator  $\hat{V}_r(\mathbf{r}; f)$  can be rewritten as:

$$\hat{V}_r(\mathbf{r}; f) = \mathcal{Z}(f) \int \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}) \prod_{i=1}^{N_S} \Theta_i(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{C}_i, fR_i^0) d\mathbf{r}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathcal{Z}(f)$  is given by [3, 50]

$$\mathcal{Z}(f) = \mathcal{Z}_0 \left( \frac{V_c(f)}{V_c(f_0)} \right)^{\frac{-(3+\eta)}{3}}. \quad (9)$$

In Eq. (9),  $\mathcal{Z}_0$  is the step barrier at the standard condition of pressure [14], and  $\eta$  a semi-empirical parameter that gauges how strong the Pauli repulsive barrier of the external medium. From Eq. (9) it follows that Pauli barrier increases as  $\eta$  increases and therefore a higher  $\eta$  denotes a harder (and less compressible) external medium.

The value of the Pauli repulsion parameter  $\eta$  can be estimated by comparison of the

computed pressure-Volume results of XP-PCM with available experimental pressure-Volume data [2, 6, 9]. A value of  $\eta = 6$  gives a dependence of the computed pressure (4) on the cavity volume  $V_C$  in reasonable agreement with the dependence of the experimental pressure on the molar volume in molecular solids. We will give an example of such a numerical comparison in Section IV for the case of a compressed argon atom. We note, as historical remark, that the calibration of a boundary potential of a compressed quantum system by comparison with the experimental pressure-Volume data has been first suggested by R. LeSar and D. R. Herschbach in their seminal paper [24] on a confining spheroidal box model for the description of the effect of the pressure on the electronic and vibrational properties of the hydrogen molecule.

### III. ANALYTICAL THEORY OF THE PRESSURE

Using the cavity scale factor  $f$  as the operative parameter to gauge the volume of the cavity, the expression of the pressure in Eq. (4) should be rewritten using the chain rule of differentiation as :

$$p = - \left( \frac{\partial G_{er}}{\partial f} \right) \left( \frac{\partial V_c}{\partial f} \right)^{-1}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\partial G_{er}/\partial f$  is the derivative of the electronic energy functional with respect to the cavity scaling factor  $f$ , and  $\partial V_c/\partial f$  the corresponding derivative of the volume of the cavity.

#### A. The derivative of the volume of the cavity with respect to the scaling factor $f$

A direct differentiation of Eq. (7) with respect to the cavity scaling factor  $f$  gives

$$\frac{dV_c(f)}{df} = - \int \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \frac{d\Theta_i(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{C}_i, fR_i^0)}{df} \prod_{j \neq i}^{N_S-1} \Theta_j(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{C}_j, fR_j^0) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (11)$$

The derivative of the  $i$ -th atomic spherical Heaviside function of Eq. (11) is given by

$$\frac{d\Theta_i(\mathbf{r}; fR_i^0)}{df} = -R_i^0 \delta(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{C}_i| - fR_i^0), \quad (12)$$

where  $\delta$  is the unit impulse function (or Dirac delta function); hence the derivative of the cavity volume with respect to the cavity scaling factor  $f$  may be expressed as

$$\frac{dV_c(f)}{df} = \sum_i R_i^0 S_i, \quad (13)$$

where  $S_i$  denotes the contribution of the  $i$ -th atomic sphere to the total cavity surface  $S_C$  (see Fig. 1):

$$S_i = \int \delta(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{C}_i| - fR_i^0) \prod_{j \neq i} \Theta_j(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{C}_i, fR_j^0) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (14)$$

The surface  $S_i$  can also be expressed in terms of spherical coordinates as: [51]

$$S_i = \int_0^\pi \int_0^{2\pi} (fR_i^0)^2 \prod_{j \neq i} \Theta_j(fR_i^0, \theta, \phi; fR_j^0) \sin\theta d\theta d\phi, \quad (15)$$

where the product of the spherical step functions is non-zero only if the point on the  $i$ -th sphere, with polar coordinates  $fR_i^0, \theta, \phi$ , is outside of all other van der Waals spheres (i.e. if the point is on the boundary of the cavity and not on its interior)[52].

## B. The derivative of the electronic energy with respect to the cavity scaling factor $f$

This derivative of the electronic energy  $G_{er}$  can be evaluated by applying an extension of the Hellmann-Feynman theorem to the XP-PCM model [53, 54]. According to this extension the derivative of the electronic energy  $G_{er}$  with respect to the cavity scaling factor  $f$  is given by [55] :

$$\left( \frac{\partial G_{er}}{\partial f} \right) = \langle \Psi | \frac{\partial \hat{V}_r}{\partial f} | \Psi \rangle, \quad (16)$$

where  $\frac{\partial \hat{V}_r}{\partial f}$  is the partial derivative of the Pauli repulsion operator  $\hat{V}_r$  of Eq. (8) with respect to the cavity scaling factor  $f$ .

A direct differentiation with respect to the cavity scaling factor  $f$  of  $\hat{V}_r$  leads to the following form of the derivative of the electronic energy  $G_{er}$ :

$$\left( \frac{\partial G_{er}}{\partial f} \right) = \frac{dZ(f)}{df} \int \rho(\mathbf{r}) \Theta_C(\mathbf{r}; f) d\mathbf{r} + Z(f) \int \rho(\mathbf{r}) \frac{d}{df} \prod_i \Theta_i(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{C}_i, fR_i^0) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (17)$$



Here, the first term on the right side represents the contribution to the pressure due to the dependence of the Pauli repulsion barrier  $\mathcal{Z}(f)$  on the cavity scaling factor (see Eq. 10), while the second term represents the contribution to the pressure due to the contraction of the boundary of the cavity determined by the cavity scaling factor  $f$ .

### C. The analytical expression fo the pressure

A direct differentiation of Eq. (9) gives the following expression for the derivative of the Pauli repulsion barrier in the first term on the right side of Eq. (17):

$$\frac{d\mathcal{Z}(f)}{df} = \frac{-(3+\eta)}{3V_c(f)} \frac{dV_c(f)}{df} \mathcal{Z}(f), \quad (18)$$

where  $\frac{dV_c(f)}{df}$  is the derivative of the cavity volume; hence by introducing Eq. (15) we obtain:

$$\frac{d\mathcal{Z}(f)}{df} = \frac{-(3+\eta)}{3V_c(f)} \left( \sum_i R_i^0 S_i \right) \mathcal{Z}(f). \quad (19)$$

The derivative of the cavity step function within the integral of the second term of the right side of Eq. (17) can be rewritten as

$$\int \rho(\mathbf{r}) \frac{d}{df} \prod_i \Theta_i(\mathbf{r}; R_i^0, f) d\mathbf{r} = \sum_i R_i^0 S_i[\rho], \quad (20)$$

where  $S_i[\rho]$  is give by:

$$S_i[\rho] = \int_0^\pi \int_0^{2\pi} \rho(fR_i^0, \theta, \phi) (fR_i^0)^2 \prod_{j \neq i} \Theta_j(fR_i^0, \theta, \phi; fR_j^0) \sin\theta d\theta d\phi. \quad (21)$$

From Eq.s (18-21) it follows that the derivative of  $G_{er}$  with respect to the cavity scaling factor can be expressed as:

$$\left( \frac{\partial G_{er}}{\partial f} \right) = \left( \frac{-(3+\eta)}{3V_c(f)} \right) \left( \sum_i R_i^0 S_i \right) \mathcal{Z}(f) \int \rho(\mathbf{r}) \Theta_C(\mathbf{r}; f) d\mathbf{r} + \mathcal{Z}(f) \sum_i R_i^0 S_i[\rho]. \quad (22)$$

Finally, by substituting Eq.s (13) and (22) into Eq. (10) the pressure  $p$  is given by

$$p = \frac{(3 + \eta)}{3V_c(f)} \mathcal{Z}(f) \int \rho(\mathbf{r}) \Theta_C(\mathbf{r}; f) d\mathbf{r} - \mathcal{Z}(f) \frac{\sum_i R_i^0 S_i[\rho]}{\sum_i R_i^0 S_i}. \quad (23)$$

This analytical expression relating the pressure on atomic/molecular systems within the XP-PCM method to their electron density  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$  and to the confining potential  $\mathcal{Z}(f)$  represents the key theoretical development of this paper.

We remark that in the case of a spherical cavity the analytical expression of pressure of Eq. (23) reduces to the simplified form

$$p = \frac{(3 + \eta)}{4\pi (fR_0)^3} \mathcal{Z}(f) \int \rho(\mathbf{r}) \Theta_i(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} - \mathcal{Z}(f) \frac{S_i[\rho]}{4\pi (fR_0)^2}. \quad (24)$$

#### IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section we present the results of applying our analytical theory for the calculation of the pressure in the XP-PCM method.

The analytical pressures are compared with those obtained from two pure numerical methods. The first numerical method is based on a simple finite difference approximation of the derivatives of the electronic energy with respect to the volume of the cavity in Eq. (4). We use a central difference method and the pressure is evaluated as

$$p \simeq - \frac{G_{er}(f + \Delta f) - G_{er}(f - \Delta f)}{V_c(f + \Delta f) - V_c(f - \Delta f)}, \quad (25)$$

where  $\{f_i\}$  is a reference cavity scaling factor and  $\Delta f$  is a suitably small variation of it.

The second numerical method is based on an analytical fitting of the electronic energy  $G_{er}(f)$  as a function of the cavity volume  $V_c(f)$ . Electronic energies and cavity volumes are computed for a selected set of values  $\{f_i\}$  of the cavity scaling factor, and the fitting is performed by using the following functional form [9]:

$$G_{er}(V_v) \simeq G_{er}(V_c^0) + a * V_c \left[ \frac{1}{b-1} \left( \frac{V_c^0}{V_c} \right)^b + 1 \right] + c * V_c. \quad (26)$$

Hence, a direct differentiation gives the pressure as a function of the volume of the cavity:

$$p = a * \left[ \left( \frac{V_c^0}{V_c} \right)^b - 1 \right] - c. \quad (27)$$

The numerical fitting method encounters problems of numerical inaccuracy when the fitting functional form (26) is not adequate, as in the case of sudden variations of the electronic energy due to changes of the ground state electronic configuration of the atomic or molecular system.

### A. Computational details

The XP-PCM calculation was carried out on an argon (*Ar*) and an acetylene molecule ( $C_2H_2$ ). All the calculations have been performed at the DFT [57] level using the B3LYP exchange-correlation functional [58] and the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set [59]. For sake of simplicity, in the comparison of the three methods for the calculation of the pressure we have taken fixed all the other parameters of the calculation; in the case of the acetylene molecule we have therefore assumed for all the values of the pressure a fixed geometry, corresponding to the equilibrium geometry of acetylene in the gas phase [60]. Cyclohexane was used as the external transmitting medium ( $\rho_M = 0.2004e/\text{\AA}^3$ ,  $\epsilon = 2.0165$  at standard condition of temperature and pressure). A value of  $\eta = 6$  for the Pauli repulsion parameter (cfr. Eq. (9)). The pertinent van der Waals cavities have been defined using the Bondi atomic van der Waals radii [45] ( $R_H^0 = 1.2\text{\AA}$ ,  $R_C^0 = 1.7\text{\AA}$ ,  $R_{Ar}^0 = 1.88\text{\AA}$ ). All the calculations were performed using a local version of the Gaussian 09 suite of programs [61].

### B. An Argon atom compressed within a spherical cavity

The values of electronic energy  $G_{er}$  of argon as a function of the cavity scaling factor  $f$  and of the cavity volume  $V_c$  are reported in Table I [62]. As expected, the electronic energy increases as the volume of the cavity decreases; a nonlinear fitting with the analytical form (26) of the electronic energy  $G_{er}$  as a function of the cavity volume  $V_c$  gives the following values of the fitting parameters:  $a = (3.25 \pm 0.11) * 10^{-4} \text{Hartree}/\text{\AA}^3$ ,  $b(4.139 \pm 0.044)$ ,  $c = -(4.36 \pm 0.29) * 10^{-4} \text{Hartree}/\text{\AA}^3$ .

TABLE I: Electronic energy  $G_{er}$  (Hartree) for an argon atom in a XP-PCM spherical cavity as a function of the cavity scaling factor  $f$  and cavity volume  $V_C$  ( $\text{\AA}^3$ ).

$f$	$V_c$	$G_{er}$
1.2	48.096	-527.559602330
1.15	42.331	-527.558750538
1.1	37.046	-527.557027784
1.05	32.220	-527.553522729
1	27.833	-527.546360053
0.95	23.863	-527.531687868
0.925	22.029	-527.519335543
0.9	20.290	-527.501677093
0.875	18.646	-527.476504211
0.85	17.093	-527.440710191

The values of the pressure  $p$  as function of cavity volume  $V_c$  are reported in Table II for the three different methods: the finite difference method (24), the analytical method (23) and the numerical fitting method (27). The values of the finite difference method have been obtained using a finite step of the cavity scale factor  $f = \pm 0.005$  and the values of the fitting method have been obtained using the pertinent fitting parameters  $a, b, c$ .

TABLE II: Pressure  $p$  (GPa) as a function of the cavity scaling factor  $f$  and volume  $V_c$  ( $\text{\AA}^3$ ) for an argon atom in a XP-PCM spherical cavity, as computed using (Eq. 23), the finite difference method (Eq. 25) and the fitting method (Eq. 27).

$f$	$V_c$	$p$		
		<i>Analytical</i>		<i>Numerical</i>
		<i>Eq. 23</i>	<i>Eq. 25</i>	<i>Eq. 27</i>
1.2	48.096	0.42	0.45	0.786
1.15	42.331	0.94	0.94	1.339
1.1	37.046	2.08	2.08	2.481
1.05	32.220	4.65	4.65	4.926
1	27.833	10.49	10.48	10.350
0.95	23.863	23.81	23.81	22.875
0.925	22.029	35.91	35.84	34.633
0.9	20.290	54.15	54.57	53.112
0.875	18.646	81.58	81.60	82.475
0.85	17.093	122.68	122.74	129.794

Comparing the finite difference and the analytical methods calculations, the results of Table II show very good agreement between these two methods. The differences between the analytical values and the numerical values are physically negligible, with a mean unsigned error between analytical values and the finite difference values of  $\Delta p = 0.06$  GPa.

Comparing the finite difference and the fitting methods calculations, the results of Table II show some significant differences, with a mean unsigned error with respect to the finite difference values of  $\Delta p = 1.31$  GPa.

Hence, for the case of spherical cavities the finite difference and the analytical methods give equivalent results, more accurate than those obtained from the fitting method. However, the analytical method is by far the most computationally effective: for a given value of the cavity scaling factor  $f$ , the pressure is computed by a single point QM calculation, while in the finite difference method the pressure requires additional QM calculations in nearby values of the cavity scaling factor  $f$ , requiring also care in the selection of the finite scaling factor step  $\Delta f$ .

We close this section on the compressed argon atom with a comparison between the XP-PCM computed values of the pressure as function of the volume compression with the corresponding experimental pressure-volume data of solid argon [64]. Table III shows the values of the pressure are expressed as a function the compression  $V/V_1$ ; for the XP-PCM model  $V$  is the volume of the cavity corresponding to the pressure  $p$  and  $V_1$  is a reference volume of the cavity corresponding to the pressure  $p = 1.1GPa$ , while for the experimental data  $V$  and  $V_1$  are, respectively, the molar volume at the pressure  $p$  and at the reference pressure  $p = 1.1GPa$ . This comparison shows that the values of XP-PCM method are in good agreement with the experimental data of pressure as a function the volume compression.

TABLE III: Comparison of the pressure  $p$  (GPa) as a function of the volume compression  $V/V_1$  for a compressed argon atoms within the XP-PCM model and for the experimental solid argon [64].

	$V/V_1$	
$p$	<i>XP-PCM</i>	<i>Exp.</i>
1	1	1
2	0.900	0.918
5	0.759	0.798
10	0.678	0.705
24	0.573	0.583
36	0.529	0.528
54	0.489	0.476
82	0.448	0.426

### C. An Acetylene molecule compressed within a van der Waals cavity

The values of electronic energy  $G_{er}$  as a function of the cavity scaling factor  $f$  and of the cavity volume  $V_c$  for molecular acetylene are reported in table IV [63]. As expected, the electronic energy increases as the volume of the cavity decreases; the nonlinear fitting (26) of the electronic energy  $G_{er}$  as a function of the cavity volume  $V_c$  gives the following values of the parameters:  $a = (2.3953 \pm 0.065) * 10^{-4} Hartree/\text{\AA}^3$ ,  $b = (4.720 \pm 0.0495)$ ,  $c = -(2.9845 \pm 0.128) * 10^{-4} Hartree/\text{\AA}^3$ .

TABLE IV: Electronic energy  $G_{er}$  (Hartree) for an acetylene molecule in a XP-PCM van der Waals cavity as a function of the cavity scaling factor  $f$  and cavity volume  $V_c$  ( $\text{\AA}^3$ ).

$f$	$V_c$	$G_{er}$ (Hartree)
1.200	54.33	-77.365143
1.150	48.832	-77.363467
1.100	43.724	-77.360207
1.050	38.982	-77.354720
1.000	34.58	-77.344027
0.950	30.489	-77.325121
0.925	28.566	-77.309103
0.900	26.701	-77.287310

The pressure  $p$  for the acetylene molecule as function of cavity volume  $V_c$  is shown in Table V. As for the case of the argon atom, the pressure has been computed with three different methods: the finite difference method (24), using with a finite step of the cavity scaling factor  $f = \pm 0.002$ , the analytical method (23) and the numerical fitting method (27).

TABLE V: Pressure  $p$  (in  $GPa$ ) as a function of the cavity volume  $V_c$  (in  $\text{\AA}^3$ ) and of the cavity scale factor  $f$  for molecular acetylene in a van der Waals cavity of cyclohexane using (Eq. 23), the finite difference method (Eq. 25) and the fitting method (Eq. 27).

		$p$ (GPa)		
		<i>Analytical</i>	<i>Numerical</i>	
$f$	$V_c$	<i>Eq. 23</i>	<i>Eq. 25</i>	<i>Eq. 27</i>
1.200	35.561	1.1	0.9	1.3
1.150	31.299	2.2	1.7	2.2
1.100	27.391	4.1	3.9	3.9
1.050	23.823	7.8	9.3	7.2
1.000	20.58	15.3	14.7	14.1
0.950	17.644	29.7	30.5	28.7
0.925	16.288	42.2	44.1	41.5
0.900	15.002	60.0	58.8	61.0

The results of Table V show good agreement between the finite difference and the analytical methods for the calculation of the pressure; the differences between the analytical and the numerical values correspond to a mean unsigned difference of  $\Delta p = 0.8 \text{ GPa}$ . Also the numerical fitting method gives similar results, with a mean unsigned differences with respect to the finite difference method of  $\Delta p = 1.1 \text{ GPa}$ .

Hence, even for the case of a non spherical van der Waals cavity the numerical methods and the analytical methods are in good agreement. However, the analytical method is by far the most computationally effective for the same reasons discussed for a spherical confining cavity.

## V. CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

We have presented an analytical theory for the calculation of the pressure for molecular systems confined in cavities with the XP-PCM method. The analytical theory exceeds in efficiency and accuracy compared to pure numerical methodologies and increases the computational robustness of the XP-PCM methodology.

The analytical theory for pressure can be extended along several directions. One of



them regards the quantum mechanical (QM) level for the description of the compressed molecular system. In this work we have assumed variational QM methods as Hartee-Fock or Density Functional Theory; however, the analytical theory can be easily generalized to non-variational methods like MP2 or coupled-cluster methods by exploiting the analytical derivative theories of the energy developed for these methods with the PCM solvation model [65, 66]. The theory can also be extended from a the time-independent to a time-dependent Quantum Mechanical description (i.e Real-time description) with the perspective of real-time computational study of molecular processes at extreme-high pressure [67].

Another interesting generalization of the present theory regards the use of more complex confining cavities. If a van der Waals cavity presents interstitial spaces between the atomic spheres that are not accessible to the solvent molecules the van der Waals surface does't accurately represent the boundary of the Pauli confining potential exerted by the external medium. In this case a more complex cavity based on the Solvent Excluding Surface (SES) [68] is more physically appropriate to represent the boundary of the Pauli confining potential. The extension of our theory to this type of cavities will be presented in a future paper.

## **VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The authors thank Prof. Roald Hoffmann for useful discussions and comments on the manuscript.

## VII. FIGURES




FIG. 1: Schematic representation of a molecular van der Waals cavity. The atomic spheres have centers  $\{\mathbf{C}_i\}$  and radii  $\{f * R_i^0\}$ , being  $f$  the cavity scaling factor and  $R_i^0$  the reference atomic van der Waals radii (cfr. Eq. (5)).  $\mathbf{D}_i$  denotes the domains of the atomic spheres and  $\Theta_i$  the corresponding unit spherical step functions (cfr. Eq. (6)).  $\mathbf{D}_C = \bigcup \{\mathbf{D}_i\}$  denotes the internal domain of the van der Waals cavity and  $\Theta_C = \prod_i \Theta_i$  the corresponding unit step function (cfr. Eq. (3)).  $S_C = \sum_i S_i$  represents the area of the cavity surface, sum of atomic spheres contributions  $S_i$  corresponding to the portions of the atomic spheres exposed to the solvent. Finally, the  $\{a_k^{i+1}\}$  denote the area of the tesserae in which the atomic surfaces are partitioned, with  $S_{i+1} = \sum_k a_k^{i+1}$ .

## VIII. REFERENCES

---

- [1] R. Cammi, V. Verdolino, B. Mennucci, and J. Tomasi, *Chem. Phys.* **344**, 135 (2008).
- [2] R. Cammi, C. Cappelli, B. Mennucci, and J. Tomasi, *J. Chem. Phys.* **137**, 154112 (2012)
- [3] R. Cammi, *J. Comp. Chem.* **36**, 2246(2015)
- [4] B. Chen, R. Hoffmann, R. Cammi, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **56**, 11126 (2017)
- [5] R. Cammi, “Quantum Chemistry at the High Pressures: The eXtreme Pressure Polarizable Continuum Model (XP-PCM)”, in ”Frontiers of Quantum Chemistry”, M.J. Wójcik, H. Nakatsuji, B. Kirtman, and Y. Ozaki (Ed.s), Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2018
- [6] M. Pagliai, G. Cardini, and R. Cammi, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **118**, 5098(2014)
- [7] M. Pagliai, R. Cammi, G. Cardini, V. Schettino, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **120**, 5136 (2016).
- [8] C. Caratelli, R. Cammi, R. Chelli, M. Pagliai, G. Cardini, and V. Schettino, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **121**, 8825 (2017).
- [9] R. Fukuda, M. Ehara, and R. Cammi, *J. Chem. Theor. Comp.* **11**, 2063(2015)
- [10] T. Yang, R. Fukuda, R. Cammi, and M. Ehara *J. Phys. Chem. A* **121**, 4363 (2017).
- [11] R. Cammi, ”The Quantum Chemical Study of Chemical Reactions at Extreme High Pressure by Means of the Extreme-Pressure Polarizable Continuum Model“, *Annu. Rep. Comput. Chem.* **13**, 117 135 (2017, ).
- [12] In general, a XP-PCM study requires an initial definition of the portion of matter to consider as the Quantum Mechanical active part and the definition of the chemically inert one. Furthermore an initial high end of the pressure range has to be chosen. These operative aspects of the XP-PCM model must be decided on the basis of the nature of specific chemical problem under examination (spectroscopic problem, chemical reactions problem, etc ...). . If necessary, the XP-PCM model has the capability to overcome the limit of a chemically inert environment by explicitly including some selected molecular components of the environment as part of the active Quantum Mechanical portion.
- [13] J. Tomasi, B. Mennucci, and R. Cammi, *Chem. Rev.* **105**, 2999 (2005).
- [14] C. Amovilli, and B. Mennucci, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **101**, 1051 (1997).

- [15] The argument of the electrostatic interaction operator  $\hat{V}_e(\Psi)$  denotes its non-linear character resulting from its functional dependence on the electronic wave-function  $\Psi$  of the molecular solute.
- [16] A. Pomogova and D. Chipman, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **117**, 5212 (2014).
- [17] A. Pomogova and D. Chipman, *J. Chem. Theo. Comp.* **A 10**, 211 (2014).
- [18] A. Michels, J. de Boer, and A. Bijl, *Physica (Amsterdam)* **4**, 981 (1937).
- [19] A. Sommerfeld and H. Welker, *Ann. Phys.* **32**, 56 (1938).
- [20] ten Seldam, and S.R. de Groot, *Physica* **18**,891(1952).
- [21] W. Byers-Brown, *J. Chem. Phys.* **28**, 522 (1955).
- [22] E.V. Ludeña, *J. Chem. Phys.* **69**, 1770 (1978).
- [23] E. Ley-Koo and S. Rubinstein, *J. Chem. Phys.* **71**, 351 (1979).
- [24] R. LeSar, and D.R. Herschbach, *J. Phys. Chem.* **85**, 2798 (1981).
- [25] R. LeSar, and D.R. Herschbach, *J. Phys. Chem.* **87**, 5202 (1983).
- [26] W. Jaskolski, *Phys. Rep.*, **271**, 1 (1996).
- [27] J.-P. Connerade, V. Dolmatov, and P. A. Lakshmi, *J. Phys. B: At., Mol. Opt. Phys.* **33**, 251 (2000).
- [28] A. Banerjee, K. D. Sen, J. Garza, and R. Vargas, *J. Chem. Phys* **116**, 4054 (2002).
- [29] K. D. Sen, *J. Chem. Phys* **122**, 194324 (2005).
- [30] K. D. Sen, *J. Chem. Phys* **123**, 074110 (2005).
- [31] N. Aquino, Jorge Garza, A. Flores-Riveros, J. F. Rivas-Silva, and K. D. Sen, *J. Chem. Phys* **124**, 054311 (2006).
- [32] J. Garza, and R. Vargas, Comparative Study Between the Hartree-Fock and Kohn-Sham Models for the Lowest Singlet and Triplet States of the Confined Helium Atom, in *Advances in Quantum Chemistry* **57**, pp. 241-254, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2009.
- [33] P. Guerra, R. Vargas, P. Fuentealba, and J. Garza, Modeling Pressure Effects on the Electronic Properties of Ca, Sr, and Ba by the Confined Atoms Model, in *Advances in Quantum Chemistry* **57**, pp. 1-12, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2009.
- [34] J. Katriel and H.E. Montgomery, *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 114109 (2012).
- [35] , K.D. Sen (Ed.)”Electronic Structure of Quantum Confined Atoms and Molecules”, Springer, New York, 2014.

- [36] M. Rodriguez-Bautista, C. Daz-Garca, A. M. Navarrete-Lpez, R. Vargas, and J. Garza J. Chem. Phys **143**, 034103 (2015).
- [37] R.F.W. Bader, *Atoms in Molecules: A Quantum Theory*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1994
- [38] R.F.W Bader, and M.A. Austen, J. Chem. Phys **107**, 4271 (1997).
- [39] R.F.W Bader, and D.-C. Fang Austen, J. Chem. Theo. Comp. **1**, 403 (2005).
- [40] R.F.W. Bader, *Confined Atoms Treated as Open Quantum Systems*, in *Advances in Quantum Chemistry* **57**, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2009.
- [41] V. F. Weisskopf, Science, **187**, 605(1975); V. F. Weisskopf, Am. J. Phys. **53**, 109(1985)
- [42] J.K. Badenhoop, F. Weinhold, J. Chem. Phys. **107**, 5406 (1997).
- [43] J. K. Badenhoop, F. Weinhold, J. Chem. Phys. **107**, 5422 (1997).
- [44] L. Pauling, *The Nature of Chemical Bond and the Structure of Molecules and Crystals. An Introduction to Modern Structural Chemistry*, 3rd ed, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y., 1960, p.644
- [45] A. Bondi, J. Phys. Chem. **68**, 441 (1964).
- [46] S.S. Batsanov, Inorg. Mater. **37**, 871 (2001).
- [47] M. Mantina, A.C. Chamberlin, V.Rosendo, C.J. Cramer, and D.G. Truhlar, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **113**, 5606 (2009).
- [48] S. Alvarez, Dalton Trans. **42**, 8617 (2013).
- [49] M. Rahm, R. Hoffmann, and N.W. Ashcroft, Chem. Eur. J. **22**, 14625 (2016).
- [50] The XP-PCM method assumes a dependence of the height of Pauli barrier potential  $\mathcal{Z}(f)$  on the cavity scaling factor  $f$  to implicitly account for the dependence on the pressure of the properties (dielectric permittivity and mean electron density) of the external medium
- [51] The polar spherical coordinates have center on the center  $\mathbf{C}_i$  of the sphere.:
- [52] The exposed surfaces  $\{S_i\}$  of the atomic spheres are computed in terms of the area of the tesserae in which the cavity surface is discretized :  $S_i = \sum_k a_k(i)$  being  $a_k(i)$  a tessera that belongs to the  $i$ -th sphere (see C. S. Pomelli, *Cavity Surface and their Discretization*, in *Continuum Solvation Models in Chemical Physics*, B. Mennucci and R. Cammi (Ed.s), Wiley, Chichester, 2007.)
- [53] R. Cammi, *Molecular response functions for the Polarizable Continuum Model: physical basis and Quantum Mechanical formalism*, Spriger Verlag, Heidelberg, 2013

- [54] R. Cammi *J. Chem. Phys.* **140**, 084112 (2014).
- [55] In Eq. (15) we have omitted the contribution of the derivative of the long-range electrostatic interaction,  $\frac{\partial V_e(\Psi)}{\partial f}$  that has a negligible contribution to the pressure. An analytical evaluation of the derivative  $\frac{\partial V_e(\Psi)}{\partial f}$  has been given already by R. Cammi and J. Tomasi, *J. Chem. Phys.* 1994.
- [56] From the computational point of view, the exposed sphere surface  $S_i$  can be expressed in terms of the area of the tesserae in which the cavity surface is partitioned:

$$\sum_i R_i^0 \int_{\mathbf{r}_i \in S_i} \rho(\mathbf{r}_i) \sin\theta d\theta d\phi = \sum_i R_i^0 \left( \sum_k \rho(\mathbf{r}_i) a_k(i) \right)$$

- [57] W. Kohn, and L.J. Sham, *Phys. Rev.* **140**, A1133 (1965).
- [58] A.D. Becke, *J. Chem. Phys.* **98**, 5648 (1993).
- [59] R. A. Kendall, T. H. Dunning Jr., and R. J. Harrison, Electron affinities of the first-row atoms revisited. Systematic basis sets and wave functions, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 96 (1992) 6796-806. DOI: 10.1063/1.462569; D. E. Woon and T. H. Dunning Jr., Gaussian-basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. 3. The atoms aluminum through argon, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 98 (1993) 1358-71. DOI: 10.1063/1.464303
- [60] Note that within the XP-PCM method the equilibrium geometry of a compressed molecular system can be determined from a geometry optimization on the potential energy surface  $G_{er}(\mathbf{R})$ , given by the electronic energy (1) as a function of the nuclei Cartesian coordinates  $\mathbf{R}$ , as we have already described in Section II. Examples of equilibrium geometries of compressed molecular systems can be found in Ref.s [2, 6–8].
- [61] M.J. Frisch, et al. Gaussian 09 (Gaussian, inc., Pittsburgh, PA, 2011).
- [62] All the results have been obtained using a tessellation of the surface of the cavity with an average area of tesserae  $a_i = 0.075\text{\AA}^2$ .
- [63] All the results have been obtained using a tessellation of the surface of the cavity with an average area of tesserae  $a_i = 0.050\text{\AA}^2$ .
- [64] D. A. Young, H. Cynn, P. Sölderling, A. Landa, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **45**, 043101(2006)
- [65] R. Cammi, B. Mennucci, and J. Tomasi *J. Phys. Chem. A* **103**, 9100(1999)
- [66] R. Cammi, *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 164104(2009)
- [67] S. Pipolo, and S. Corni, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **120**, 28774(2016)

[68] F. M. Richards, *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Bioeng.***6**, 151(1977)