

A dual view on Marcus functionals and ion solvation

H. Berthoumieux^{1,2} and R. Blossey³

¹ CNRS, UMR 7600, LPTMC, F-75005, Paris, France

² Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, UMR 7600, LPTMC, F-75005, Paris, France

³ University of Lille, UGSF CNRS UMR8576, 59000 Lille, France

Poisson-Boltzmann (PB) theory is the cornerstone of soft matter electrostatics. The free energy functional of PB theory is nonconvex and therefore not amenable to direct minimization approaches. A way out of this problem is provided by a Legendre transform (LT) of PB theory which leads to a convex vector-field functional (dielectric displacement, polarization). In this paper we discuss the LT for the Dipolar Poisson-Boltzmann-Langevin (DPBL) theory which models water molecules as point dipoles. We show how the resulting functional generalizes the Marcus functional to nonlinear regimes and compare the solvation of ions in the dual theories of non-convex PB theory and the convex polarization functional.

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern soft matter electrostatics is based on Poisson-Boltzmann (PB) theory [1]. The free energy functional of this theory is, however, non-convex. Therefore, the equilibrium properties of charged soft matter systems are evaluated from the Poisson-Boltzmann equation and its extensions rather than from direct minimization of the free energy, which would often be desirable in problems in which electrostatics couples to non-electrostatic degrees of freedom.

Maggs and collaborators outlined a way to avoid this problem. The Legendre transform (LT), a standard tool in statistical physics, allows to transform the non-convex PB theory into a convex vector-field based theory, in which the field variable is either, e.g., the dielectric displacement field \mathbf{D} or the polarization field \mathbf{P} [2–4]. Although vectorial in character rather than scalar, such functionals enjoy an important range of applications.

The most prominent example is certainly the Marcus functional, the fundamental basis of continuum theories of electron transfer [5–7]. The classical theory of electron transfer in solution, pioneered by Marcus in the 1950’s, relies on a harmonic polarization functional for a continuum solvent, allowing for a linear response treatment of solvent effects [5]; for reviews, see [6, 7]. The linear response/harmonic functional approximation has been questioned by several authors [8–10] leading to a debate about the relevance of nonlinear effects. More recently, generalizations of Marcus theory have tried to include molecular details of the solvent response [11]. The authors of this work develop a more microscopic approach based on molecular density-functional theory, arguing in particular that “Marcus theory does not take into account the molecular nature of the solvent which can break the linear assumption of solvent response. In such cases, we must resort to molecular simulation” [11].

In this work, we like to partially challenge this view. To be precise, we will present an argument against the word ‘must’ in the above quotation from [11]. The Legendre transform of PB theory offers, depending on the chosen degrees of freedom within PB theory, for a sys-

tematic generalization of the Marcus functional, which is one aspect of our present work. For this we make use of the Dipolar Poisson-Boltzmann-Langevin (DPBL) model, developed in several papers in recent years. It describes an explicit solvent of point dipoles within Poisson-Boltzmann theory [12–14]. Many other choices beyond the specific version of the DPBL we employ are possible [15], and can be treated in an analogous fashion.

The second aspect of this work is the interplay of duality and convexity of the respective functionals. In order to gain insight into what this results in, we discuss the classic example of ion solvation in the dual theories and carefully look into the corrections due to nonlinearities arising from the nonlinear generalizations of the dipolar PB-functional.

II. DUAL SOFT MATTER ELECTROSTATICS, A BRIEF PRIMER

As discussed in the introduction, our starting point is the dipolar Poisson-Boltzmann (DPBL)-functional in the form [3]

$$U_{PB} = \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\nabla\phi)^2 - \lambda \frac{\sinh(\beta p_0 |\nabla\phi|)}{\beta p_0 |\nabla\phi|} + \varrho_f \phi \right], \quad (1)$$

where ε is the vacuum permittivity and with ϕ as the electrostatic potential, which we want to transform into a polarization functional. Note that this functional does not contain mobile ions which usually justifies the notion ‘Boltzmann’ in its name. Here, we only retain fixed charges of density ϱ_f , and the point dipoles of the water molecules p_0 , which gives rise to the nonlinear expression in (1); $\beta = 1/k_B T$.

We now follow [2, 3] and introduce the electric field $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla\phi$ with a vector-valued Lagrange parameter \mathbf{D} , the dielectric displacement field, yielding

$$U_{PB} = \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathbf{E}^2 - h(\mathbf{E}) + \varrho_f \phi + \mathbf{D} \cdot (\nabla\phi - \mathbf{E}) \right], \quad (2)$$

where $h(\mathbf{E})$ abbreviates the nonlinear expression in (1). With the further introduction of the polarization field \mathbf{P} the functional transforms into the expression

$$U_{PB} = \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[-\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \mathbf{E}^2 + \tilde{h}(\mathbf{P}) - \phi(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{D} - \varrho_f) + \mathbf{E} \cdot (\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{P}) \right], \quad (3)$$

which then leaves us, after the variation with respect to the electric field \mathbf{E} , with the convex functional

$$U_D = \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[\frac{(\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{P})^2}{2\varepsilon} + \tilde{h}(\mathbf{P}) - \phi(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{D} - \varrho_f) \right]. \quad (4)$$

What is essential now is to determine the function $\tilde{h}(\mathbf{P})$ which follows from the Legendre transform [2]

$$\tilde{h}(\mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{E} - h(\mathbf{E}) \quad (5)$$

with

$$\mathbf{P} \equiv \frac{dh(\mathbf{E})}{d\mathbf{E}}. \quad (6)$$

To make the link with the Marcus functional explicit, we start with the harmonic approximation by expanding the hyperbolic sine to second order. We are then left with

$$h(\mathbf{E}) = -\lambda + \frac{\lambda\beta^2 p_0^2}{3} \mathbf{E}^2 \quad (7)$$

so that one obtains after a little algebra

$$\tilde{h}(\mathbf{P}) = -\lambda + \frac{3}{2\lambda\beta^2 p_0^2} \mathbf{P}^2. \quad (8)$$

It is noteworthy that the relations (7) and (8) are not only dual in the field variables \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{P} , but also in the temperature dependence β^{-1} .

The link with the Marcus functional can be made by identifying the prefactor

$$\frac{3}{\lambda\beta^2 p_0^2} \equiv \frac{1}{\varepsilon\chi_0}, \quad (9)$$

where χ_0 is related to the electrostatic susceptibility of the system. In this work, the values of the microscopic and macroscopic parameters, the dipole moment p_0 and the susceptibility χ_0 related to the relative permittivity ε_r via the relation $\chi_0 = 1 - 1/\varepsilon_r$ are fixed to model either water, ($p_0 = 1.8$ D, $\chi_0 = 77/78$) or the explicit model of water, SPC/E [16], used in molecular dynamics simulations ($p_0 = 2.1$ D, $\chi_0 = 70/71$).

We thus arrive at the expression for the Marcus expansion of the convex functional given in Eq.(4), $U_D = U_M$, which is given by (dropping the constants in (8))

$$U_M = \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[\frac{(\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{P})^2}{2\varepsilon} + \frac{\mathbf{P}^2}{2\varepsilon\chi_0} - \phi(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{D} - \varrho_f) \right]. \quad (10)$$

Maggs and Everaers [17] (see also [3]) have shown that standard expression of the Marcus functional

$$U_M = \frac{1}{8\pi\varepsilon} \int d^3\mathbf{r} \int d^3\mathbf{r}' \frac{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \cdot \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} + \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[\frac{\mathbf{P}^2(\mathbf{r})}{2\varepsilon\chi_0} - \mathbf{E}_0(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) + \varepsilon \frac{\mathbf{E}_0^2(\mathbf{r})}{2} \right]. \quad (11)$$

where \mathbf{E}_0 is the bare electric field which is generated by the fixed charges in the system, i.e. $\mathbf{E}_0 = -\nabla\phi_0$, with $\varepsilon\nabla^2\phi_0 = -\varrho_f$.

These results set the stage for the following. We now turn to the computation of the Legendre transform $\tilde{h}(\mathbf{P})$ of the dipolar energy density $h(\mathbf{E})$ and its expansion to higher order in \mathbf{P} .

III. THE FULL LEGENDRE TRANSFORM OF THE DIPOLE ENERGY DENSITY

Since we will mostly be interested in one-dimensional applications, in this and the following sections we treat the electrostatic and polarization fields as scalars; the generalization to the full vectorial case is evident. Expressed in the modulus of the electric field the energy density of the solvent dipoles reads as

$$h(E) = \lambda \frac{\sinh(\beta p_0 E)}{\beta p_0 E}. \quad (12)$$

Defining $x \equiv \beta p_0 E$ and using the relation given in Eq. (6) we have

$$P(x) = \frac{dh}{dx} \frac{dx}{dE} = \beta p_0 \lambda \left(\frac{\cosh(x)}{x} - \frac{\sinh(x)}{x^2} \right). \quad (13)$$

We expand $P(x)$ to the seventh order in x

$$P(x) = \beta p_0 \lambda \left(\frac{x}{3} + \frac{x^3}{30} + \frac{x^5}{840} + \frac{x^7}{45360} \right), \quad (14)$$

and set the respective approximation for the expansion of E as

$$E(y) = \frac{1}{\beta p_0} (a_1 y + a_3 y^3 + a_5 y^5 + a_7 y^7) \quad (15)$$

with $y = P/(\beta p_0 \lambda)$. Inserting $\beta p_0 E(y)$ into (14) and identifying terms we find the coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= 3, & a_3 &= -27/10, & a_5 &= 8991/1400, \\ a_7 &= -281961/14000. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Fig.1 presents the polarization P as a function of the electrostatic field obtained from Eq.(13) and the expanded expressions to the orders $i = (2, 4, 6)$ in E around a vanishing field given in Eq.(14). Note that the order i of the expansion is associated with the expansion of the energy which is an even function of the field. The corresponding




FIG. 1. Polarization as a function of the electrostatic field. Exact expression, Eq.(13), and expansion in E^2 (Marcus), E^4 and E^6 . The parameters values are $p_0 = 1.8$ D, $\beta = 4.11 \times 10^{21}$ J $^{-1}$ and $\lambda = 6.5 \times 10^8$ J.m $^{-3}$ given by Eq.(9) for $\chi_0 = 77/78$.




FIG. 2. Electrostatic field as a function of the polarization. Exact expression, Eq.(13), and expansion in P^2 (Marcus), P^4 and P^6 . The curves are plotted using the parameters given in Fig.1 Inset: electrostatic field as a function of the polarization for large values of P . Exact expression Eq.(13) and expansion in P^2 (Marcus), P^4 and P^6 .

expression of E_i as a function of P is an odd polynomial of degree $i - 1$. The expressions are plotted for parameter values corresponding to liquid water.

The electrostatic field as a function of the polarization is obtained by numerically inverting Eq.(13). It is plotted in Fig.2 and compared to the expanded expressions of E with respect to P to the orders $i = (2, 4, 6)$ given in Eq. (15). As one sees, increasing the order of the expansion leads to a better approximation of the exact expression in $P = 0$ but is valid in a narrower range in P . The inset represents the exact and expanded expressions of E for large values of P and one sees that, counterintuitively, the Marcus model gives a better estimate of the field than higher expansions.

From the definition of the Legendre transform one has




FIG. 3. Plot of $\tilde{h}(P)/\lambda + 1$ as a function the polarization P . Exact expression (numerical) and expansion in P^2 (Marcus), P^4 and P^6 . The parameters values are given in Fig.1. The inset represents the plots for large values of P .

the approximation

$$\tilde{h}(P) = E(P)P - \frac{\sinh(\beta p_0 E(P))}{\beta p_0 E(P)}. \quad (17)$$

An expansion of this equation to the sixth order then yields the result

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}(P) = \lambda \left(-1 + \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{P}{\beta p_0 \lambda} \right)^2 - \frac{27}{40} \left(\frac{P}{\beta p_0 \lambda} \right)^4 \right. \\ \left. + \frac{2997}{28000} \left(\frac{P}{\beta p_0 \lambda} \right)^6 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

In order to get a better idea of the magnitudes of the prefactors, the numerical values are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}(P) = \lambda \left(-1 + 1.5 \left(\frac{P}{\beta p_0 \lambda} \right)^2 - 0.675 \left(\frac{P}{\beta p_0 \lambda} \right)^4 \right. \\ \left. + 0.107 \left(\frac{P}{\beta p_0 \lambda} \right)^6 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

which clearly shows that this is an expansion around $P = 0$ which corrects the basic Marcus parabola, see Fig.3. The exact value of \tilde{h} , given in Eq.(17), is plotted by using the numerical function $E(P)$ represented in Fig.2. The inset of the figure representing $\tilde{h}(P)$ for large values of P confirms that the Marcus functional is a correct approximation of the functional on this range.

If we return to expression (4) and drop the last term, which enforces Gauss' law, we can compute the response to a given dielectric displacement field D_0 by deriving the variation of the functional U_D with respect to P , which yields

$$P + \varepsilon \frac{d\tilde{h}(P)}{dP} - D_0 = 0. \quad (20)$$

For the variational derivation of the configurational energy, $\tilde{h}(P)$, we use Eq.(5) and we take advantage of the relation

$$\frac{d\tilde{h}(P)}{dP} = E(P)$$

which is a consequence of the involutive property of the Legendre transform. Eq.(21) can be rewritten as

$$P + \varepsilon E(P) = D_0. \quad (21)$$

The expression of $E(P)$, derived from the expansion of $\tilde{h}(P)$ to the orders $i = (2, 4, 6)$ is obtained using Eq. (15)

$$\begin{aligned} E_2(P) &= (\varepsilon\chi_0)^{-1}P, \\ E_4(P) &= (\varepsilon\chi_0)^{-1}P - \nu P^3, \\ E_6(P) &= (\varepsilon\chi_0)^{-1}P - \nu P^3 + \gamma P^5 \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

with

$$\nu = \frac{27}{10} \frac{1}{(\beta p_0)^4 \lambda^3}, \quad \gamma = \frac{7.062}{(\beta p_0)^6 \lambda^5}. \quad (23)$$

Considering Eq.(21), one sees that the difference between the expanded expression $d\tilde{h}_i(P)/dP = E_{i-1}(P)$, ($i = 2, 4, 6$) and the exact expression $E(P)$ will govern the error made when estimating the response field P to an excitation D_0 using polynomial expressions of P for the configurational energy. To estimate the error made and the range of validity of an expansion we plot in Fig.4 the function $\Delta h_i(P)$ defined by

$$\Delta h_i(P) \equiv \left| 1 - \frac{P - \varepsilon E_{i-1}(P)}{P - \varepsilon E(P)} \right| \quad (24)$$

as a function of P . This function evaluates the deviation of the expanded expression of Eq.(21) with its exact expression. As one sees in Fig.4, $\Delta h_i(P)$ tends to 0 for all i for $P \rightarrow 0$, showing that a polynomial expansion gives rise to an excellent estimation of the polarization response to D_0 if the response is small. Larger responses ($P = 0.1$ to 0.8 C.m^{-2}) are better estimated with an expansion in P^6 , which is improves upon one in P^4 , and again more precise than the Marcus expansion. However, the precision, when compared to the exact expression, remains excellent in all cases (about $\sim 10^{-3}$ for the Marcus expansion). For larger responses, the expansions in P^4 and P^6 diverge rapidly from the exact solution and the Marcus expansion ultimately is the best approximation.

We identify in particular the value of the polarization $P_{2/4} = 1.01 \text{ C.m}^{-2}$ for which the variation of the Marcus functional gives a better approximation than the fourth-order expansion. This threshold value can also be computed for the parameters for the explicit model of water, SPC/E, and one finds $P_{2/4} = 0.79 \text{ C.m}^{-2}$. These values give the range of validity in P of the P^4 -expansion.




FIG. 4. $\Delta h_i(P)$, $i = 2, 4, 6$ given in Eq. (24) as a function of P . The values of the parameters are given in the caption of Fig. 1.

IV. SOLVATION OF A POINT CHARGE

In this section we turn to the application of our approach to the case of a point charge, an ion of charge Q , located at $r = 0$ generating the dielectric displacement,

$$\mathbf{D}_0(r) = \frac{Q}{4\pi r^2} \mathbf{e}_r. \quad (25)$$

The radial response of a medium described with a Marcus functional is given by

$$P_M(r) = \frac{Q}{4\pi(1 + 1/\chi_0)r^2} \quad (26)$$

obtained by solving Eq.(21) for $\tilde{h} = \tilde{h}_2$ and consequently $E(P) = E_2(P)$ given in Eq. (22).

The expansion in of \tilde{h} to P^4 gives a more precise estimation of the polarization response than the Marcus expression for responses smaller than the cut-off polarization field $P_{2/4}$, which corresponds to a distance larger than $r_{2/4}$ given by $r_{2/4} = \sqrt{\frac{Q}{4\pi(1/\chi_0+1)P_{2/4}}}$, determined using Eq.(26). This distance scales as \sqrt{Q} . For a monovalent ion, $Q = 1.6 \times 10^{-19} \text{ C}$ the model in P^4 becomes worse than the Marcus model for $r < 0.9 \text{ \AA}$, for a trivalent ion, for $r < 1.6 \text{ \AA}$. As shown for radial distribution functions obtained experimentally or using molecular dynamics [18], there is no water in this shell that corresponds to the spatial extension of the ions. It is thus reasonable to use the model in P^4 to determine the polarization in water induced by the electrostatic field of a hydrated ion. Note that, for molecular dynamics simulations of ions solvated in SPC/E water, one can also use the P^4 model to study the polarization in ions solvation shells, the cutoff distance $r_{2/4}$ remaining smaller than the distance between the ion and the first shell of water molecules hydrating the inclusion.

We now determine the polarization $P_4(r)$, the radial response to \mathbf{D}_0 of a medium described using a functional

in P^4 , obtained by solving Eq.(21) for $\tilde{h} = \tilde{h}_4$ and $E(P) = E_4(P)$ given in Eq.(22) and investigate the improvement obtained with this expansion when compared to the Marcus model. The polarization field $P_4(r)$ is solution of the equation

$$P_4(r)^3 - \frac{10(\beta p_0)^4 \lambda^3}{27\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{\chi_0} + 1 \right) P_4(r) + \frac{10}{27} (\beta p_0)^4 \lambda^3 P_M(r) = 0 \quad (27)$$

which can be rewritten as

$$P_4^3 - P_T^2(P_4 - P_M) = 0, \quad (28)$$

where $P_T = \sqrt{\frac{10\lambda^3(1/\chi_0+1)(\beta p_0)^4}{27\epsilon}}$ is a threshold value between a linear regime far from the ion, $P(r) \ll P_T$, for which the solution of Eq. (28) can be well approximated by P_M and a regime, $P(r) \gg P_T$, in the solvation shell of the ion for which nonlinear effects are important. The analytical solution of this equation is

$$P_4(r) = P_T \left(\frac{P_M(r)}{2P_T} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{4}{27} - \frac{P_M(r)^2}{P_T}} \right) + P_T \left(\frac{P_M(r)}{2P_T} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{4}{27} - \frac{P_M(r)^2}{P_T}} \right). \quad (29)$$

Fig.5 shows the ratio of the polarization $P_M(r)$, respectively $P_4(r)$ and the exact polarization, $P_{ion}(r)$, obtained by solving numerically Eq.(21) with \mathbf{D}_0 given in Eq.(25), for a monovalent ion ($Q = \pm e$) and a trivalent ion ($Q = \pm 3e$). One sees that both the Marcus model and the P^4 model give a very good estimate of the field. The first one underestimates the response, while the second one overestimates it by $\sim 10^{-3}$ for each model. Note that the Marcus model is sufficient to determine the water polarization induced by an ion; however it cannot describe the zone of low permittivity in the solvation shell of ions [19]. This nonlinear effect that is partly responsible of the decrease of the permittivity of electrolytes and cannot be neglected when one is interested in the description of dielectric properties of aqueous solutions [20].

V. CHECKING BACK: THE ELECTROSTATIC FIELD AROUND A POINT CHARGE

In this final section, we compare our results for the nonlinear generalization of the Marcus functional with the result that can be obtained from its dual theory. We thus study the expansion of the Poisson-Boltzmann energy (1) as a function of the electrostatic field $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla\phi$. One finds for the expansion to the 6th-order in $x = \beta p_0 E$ the following expression:

$$U_{PB}^6 = \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[-\lambda - \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2p_0^2\beta^2} + \frac{\lambda}{6} \right) x^2 - \lambda \frac{x^4}{120} - \lambda \frac{x^6}{5040} \right]. \quad (30)$$




FIG. 5. Ratio of the polarization obtained with an expanded functional (P_M and P_4) with $P_{ion}(r)$ the polarization obtained from exact functional for a monovalent and a trivalent ion.




FIG. 6. Electrostatic energy, $h(E)/\lambda + 1$, of the dipolar liquid. Exact expression and expansion in powers of the electrostatic field. The parameter values are given in Fig.1.

The exact energy density and its expansion to the orders $i = (2, 4, 6)$ in the field E are shown in Fig.6. One sees that the energy is a non-convex function of the field that decreases faster than any polynomial expansion. We now determine the radial component E of the electrostatic field around a point charge solving

$$\epsilon \frac{dE}{dr} = -n_a p_0 \frac{d\mathcal{G}(\beta p_0 E)}{dr} + e\delta(r) \quad (31)$$

with

$$\mathcal{G}(u) = \frac{\cosh(u)}{u} - \frac{\sinh(u)}{u^2}. \quad (32)$$

Using the relation

$$\delta(r) = \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{1}{4\pi r^2} \mathbf{e} \right), \quad (33)$$




FIG. 7. Ratio of the electrostatic field response $E_2(r)$ and $E_4(r)$ with the exact electrostatic field response $E_{ion}(r)$ for a monovalent ion and a trivalent ion. The parameters are given in Fig.1




FIG. 8. Comparison of the dual models for the ion solvation. Marcus Polarization $P_M(r)$ and electrostatic field $E_4(r)$ rescaled by the corresponding exact field, $P_{ion}(r)$ and $E_{ion}(r)$ for a trivalent ion. The parameters are given in Fig.1

we rewrite Eq.(31) and obtain the equation

$$\varepsilon E = -n_d p_0 \mathcal{G}(\beta p_0 E) + \frac{e}{4\pi r^2} \quad (34)$$

which can be solved numerically to determine $E_{ion}(r)$, the electrostatic field generated by a point ion in water, which is modeled as a dipolar fluid.

Expanding $\mathcal{G}(\beta p_0 E)$ to the first, and respectively the third, order in E , we obtain the linear, respectively the cubic, expansion of Eq.(34) and determine the corresponding expression for the fields $E_2(r)$ and $E_4(r)$. It reads as

$$\varepsilon E(r) = -\frac{\beta^2 p_0^2 \lambda}{3} E(r) + \frac{e}{4\pi r^2} \quad (35)$$

whose solution is $E_2(r) = \frac{e}{4\pi \varepsilon \varepsilon_r r^2}$, for the first order. Expanding $\mathcal{G}(\beta p_0 E)$ to the third order in E , we find

$$E^3(r) + \frac{30 \varepsilon \varepsilon_r}{p_0^4 \beta^4 \lambda} (E(r) - E_2(r)) = 0. \quad (36)$$

Introducing the threshold electrostatic field $E_T = \sqrt{30 \frac{\varepsilon \varepsilon_r}{p_0^4 \beta^4 \lambda}}$, we derive $E_4(r)$, the solution of this equation as

$$E_4(r) = E_T \left(-\frac{E_2}{2E_T} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{4}{27} + \left(\frac{E_2}{E_T} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right)^{1/3} + E_T \left(-\frac{E_2}{2E_T} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{4}{27} + \left(\frac{E_2}{E_T} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right)^{1/3} \quad (37)$$

The ratio $E_i(r)/E_{ion}(r)$, $i = (1, 2)$ of the electrostatic field E_i -response to a monovalent ion, obtained with the expansion in E^2 , E^4 , respectively, and field E_{ion} solution of the exact functional (see Eq.(34)) is shown as a function of the distance r in Fig.7. The second-order model and the fourth-order model underestimate the response. The model in E^2 gives a limited description of the electrostatic field in the solvation shell of the ion ($r < 5 \text{ \AA}$) with an error increasing with the valence of the ion up to 20 per cent for a trivalent ion at $r = 3 \text{ \AA}$.

Finally, we compare the validity of the Marcus model and of the model in E^4 for a trivalent ion by plotting in Fig.8 the ratio P_M/P_{ion} and E_4/E_{ion} as a function of r . As one sees the Marcus model, although associated with a linear response to a perturbation, remains much more precise than the model in E^4 .

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have discussed two classical problems of solvation theory, the Marcus functional and the solvation of single ions, in the context of the recently formulated dual theory to the Poisson-Boltzmann approach, which leads to convex free energy functionals. By choosing the example of the Dipolar-Poisson-Boltzmann-Langevin (DBPL) theory, we derive corrections to the Marcus functional and determine their range of validity. A comparison of analytical (polynomial) approximations to the exact functional, computed numerically, allows us to quantify the ranges over which these approximations can be considered as improvements. Surprisingly, the (harmonic) Marcus approximation comes out as an extremely reliable approximation, in particular for large polarization fields. Our results were tested with two different parametrizations of the theories (water and explicit water model SPC/E), yielding consistent results.

Further, we have studied the solvation of single ions in the dual approaches. For this we have used the quadratic and forth-order approximations to the minimizer of the polarization functional, and the linear and cubic approximations to the DLPB mean field equation, which was already studied in [14]. Compared to the dual route via the polarization field, the electrostatic approach turns out to be quantitatively less reliable. This is illustrated in Figure 8.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated the usefulness of the dual approach to soft matter electrostatics. They can be easily extended beyond the specific model system we chose, the DPBL-model of point dipoles. Our results on ion solvation demonstrate that a change of dual perspec-

tive can improve the quality of approximations. This is likely to be relevant in more complex situations, in particular when non-electrostatic degrees of freedom have to be considered as well.

-
- [1] D. Dean, J. Dobnikar, A. Naji and R. Podgornik (eds.), *Electrostatics of Soft and Disordered Matter*, Pan Stanford Publishing (2014)
- [2] A.C. Maggs, A minimizing principle for the Poisson-Boltzmann equation, *Europhys. Lett.* **98** 16012 (2012)
- [3] J.S. Pujos and A.C. Maggs, Legendre transforms for electrostatic energies, in D. Dean *et al* (eds), *Electrostatics of Soft and Disordered Matter*, Pan Stanford Publishing (2014)
- [4] R. Blossey and A. C. Maggs, A fluctuation-corrected functional of convex Poisson-Boltzmann theory, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **51**, 385001 (2018)
- [5] R.A. Marcus, On the Theory of Oxidation-Reduction Reactions Involving Electron Transfer. I, *J. Chem. Phys.* **24** 966-978 (1956)
- [6] M.Z. Bazant, Theory of Chemical Kinetics and Charge Transfer based on Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **46** 1144-1160 (2013)
- [7] J. Blumberger, Recent Advances in the Theory and Molecular Simulation of Biological Electron Transfer Reactions, *Chem. Rev.* **115** 11191-11238 (2015)
- [8] H.-X. Zhou and A. Szabo, Microscopic formulation of Marcus' theory of electron transfer, *J. Chem. Phys.* **103**, 3481-3494 (1995)
- [9] T. Ichiye, Solvent free energy curves for electron transfer reactions: A nonlinear solvent response model, *J. Chem. Phys.* **104**, 7561-7571 (1996)
- [10] R. Vuilleumier, A.K. Tay, G. Jeanmairet, D. Borgis and A. Boutin, Extension of Marcus Picture for Electron Transfer Reactions with Large Solvation Changes, *J. Am. Chem.Soc.* **134**, 2067-2074 (2012)
- [11] G. Jeanmairet, B. Rotenberg, M. Levesque, D. Borgis and M. Salanne, A molecular density functional theory approach to electron transfer reactions, *Chem. Sci.* **10**, 2130-2143 (2019)
- [12] A. Abrashkin, D. Andelman and H. Orland, Dipolar Poisson-Boltzmann Equation: Ions and Dipoles Close to Charge Interfaces, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 227801 (2012)
- [13] A. Levy, D. Andelman and H. Orland, Dielectric Constant of Ionic Solutions: A Field-Theory Approach, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 164909 (2013)
- [14] A. Levy, D. Andelman and H. Orland, Dipolar Poisson-Boltzmann approach to ionic solutions: A mean field and loop expansion analysis, *J. Chem. Phys.* **139**, 164909 (2013)
- [15] D. Frydel, Mean-field electrostatics beyond the point-charge description, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **160** 209-260 (2016)
- [16] P. E. Smith and W. F. van Gunsteren, Consistent dielectric properties of the simple point charge and extended simple point charge water models at 277 and 300 K, *J. Chem. Phys.* **100**, 3169-3174 (1994).
- [17] A.C. Maggs and R. Everaers, Simulating Nanoscale Dielectric Response, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 230603 (2006)
- [18] R. K. Ramamoorthy, M. Levesque, L. Belloni and D. Carriere, Structure Factor of EuCl₃ Aqueous Solutions via Coupled Molecular Dynamics Simulations and Integral Equations, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **124**, 1787-1793 (2020)
- [19] H. Berthoumieux and F. Paillusson, Dielectric response in the vicinity of an ion: A nonlocal and nonlinear model of the dielectric properties of water, *J. Chem. Phys.* **150**, 094507 (2019).
- [20] D. J. Grzetic, K. T. Delaney, G. H. Fredrickson, Contrasting Dielectric Properties of Electrolyte Solutions with Polar and Polarizable Solvents. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 128007 (2019)