

Foundation of classical dynamical density functional theory: uniqueness of time-dependent density–potential mappings

Michael Andreas Klatt, Hartmut Löwen, René Wittmann

April 21, 2023

Abstract

When can we uniquely map the dynamic evolution of a classical density to a time-dependent potential? In equilibrium, without time dependence, the one-body density uniquely specifies the external potential that is applied to the system. This mapping from a density to the potential is the cornerstone of classical density functional theory (DFT). Here, we derive rigorous and explicit conditions for such a unique mapping between a nonequilibrium density profile and a time-dependent external potential. We thus prove the underlying assertion of dynamical density functional theory (DDFT) — with or without the so-called adiabatic approximation often used in applications. We also illustrate loopholes when our conditions are violated so that two distinct external potentials result in the same density profiles but different currents — as suggested by the framework of power functional theory (PFT).

1 Introduction

The foundation of classical density functional theory (DFT) [21, 9, 10] rests on the fact that the one-body density uniquely determines the external potential and hence the underlying Hamiltonian if the interaction potential is known. In essentially all relevant cases, there exists a unique mapping from the one-body density $\rho(x)$ to an external potential $V(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in d dimensions and for a given interaction potential, temperature, and number of particles (or chemical potential). Remarkably, because of this unique mapping, the one-body density specifies a many-body system in equilibrium and hence all higher-body correlations. The existence of such a unique density–potential mapping was first proven in the context of quantum mechanics by Hohenberg and Kohn [15], Kohn and Sham [16], and Mermin [21]. Mermin’s generalized arguments can be directly applied to classical many-body systems as elaborated by Evans [9] and later rigorously confirmed by Chayes, Chayes, and Lieb [3]. The unique mapping exists under mild and natural conditions on the density and interparticle interactions that essentially assume finite energies. Among others, this result implies a formal equivalence of Mermin-Evans DFT to the alternative framework [7] based on Levy constrained search [17] (which does not a priori restrict to density profiles that are realizable by an external potential).

*Institut für Theoretische Physik II: Weiche Materie, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany

Here, we are interested in the generalization of unique density–potential mappings to the time-dependent case, i.e., to classical dynamical density functional theory (DDFT) [20, 1, 29], as first derived by Marconi and Tarazona [20] from the stochastic Langevin equation and later by Archer and Evans [1] from the corresponding Smoluchowski equation or by Español and Löwen using the projection operator formalism [8]. More specifically, we study the fundamental relation between the time-dependent external potential $V(x, t)$ and one-body density $\rho(x, t)$, which will naturally also involve the one-body current $j(x, t)$. To this end, we use the exact nonequilibrium interaction force, i.e., we do not rely on an “adiabatic” approximation that equates equilibrium and nonequilibrium correlations (which is usually required for explicit calculations in DDFT). Therefore, our results also pertain to the recently developed superadiabatic extension of DDFT [30, 31] as well as to the framework of power functional theory (PFT) [27] derived by Schmidt and Brader [28], where both approaches incorporate “superadiabatic” forces that are neglected in standard (adiabatic) DDFT approximations. The underlying variational principle of PFT, based on Levy constrained search [17], entails the existence of a unique mapping from both $\rho(x, t)$ and $j(x, t)$ to $V(x, t)$. Since our pursuit of unique density–potential mappings neither requires an approximation nor a specific framework, our results shed light on the relation between DDFT and PFT on a formal level and help, in particular, to better understand the role of the current.

We explicitly address the question: under which conditions can we uniquely map a classical time-dependent density $\rho(x, t)$ to an external potential $V(x, t)$? As in the case of equilibrium DFT, if such a unique mapping is established, we can assert that the density profile $\rho(x, t)$ specifies the Hamiltonian and hence all relevant information about the system, including higher-order correlations. Hence, this question is of fundamental importance and practical relevance to the study of time-dependent many-body systems.

In quantum mechanics, an argument for the unique mapping from time-dependent densities $\rho(x, t)$ to potentials $V(x, t)$ was provided by Runge and Gross in 1984 [26], which became the foundation of time-dependent density functional theory (TDDFT). Assuming time-analytic potentials and smooth densities, they linked the question for uniqueness of the density–potential mapping to that of the solution for an elliptic partial differential equation (PDE). However, as pointed out later [36, 6, 12, 13], this solution is unique only under certain conditions on both $\rho(x, t)$ and $V(x, t)$. These joint assumptions on the density and potential are more complex than in equilibrium, where the conditions only depend on $\rho(x)$ [3]. Intuitively speaking, these more intricate assumptions arise in the time-dependent case because more states are allowed than in equilibrium.

For classical systems, Chan and Finken [2] asserted uniqueness following the idea of Runge and Gross [26]. However, because higher-body correlations due to interparticle interactions were omitted, the argument so far holds only under the adiabatic approximation. Moreover, no conditions have hitherto been stated for the uniqueness of classical density–potential mappings. In fact, this omission is more critical in the classical setting than it would be in the quantum case since for the latter, counterexamples to unique mappings are considered to be “largely unphysical” [13] and are hence often neglected. By contrast, diverging potentials are not only relevant but even common in classical statistical physics.

In this work, we close these two gaps by proving explicit conditions for the uniqueness of classical density–potential mappings based on an exact hierarchy for the n -body densi-

ties. Importantly, our conditions are independent of the adiabatic approximation. Thus, we provide a mathematically rigorous foundation of classical DDFT. At the same time, our conditions exemplify loopholes, where uniqueness cannot be assumed so that a more general framework, like PFT, is required that relies on both the density and current.

To this end, we first specify our setting in Sec. 2 and derive the hierarchy of reduced Smoluchowski equations for all time-dependent n -body densities $\rho_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, t)$ in Sec. 3; see Theorem 3.1. Since we are concerned with possibly diverging potentials, we accurately derive the boundary contributions and find that all corresponding terms vanish if and only if the Yvon-Born-Green (YBG)-hierarchy holds on average at the boundary.

Then, we prove our main results in Sec. 4, i.e., we rigorously derive generic conditions that guarantee a unique mapping from the time-dependent one-body density $\rho(x, t)$ to the external potential $V(x, t)$. As a mere technicality, we begin by noting that uniqueness can only hold up to physically irrelevant differences like a constant offset. We capture these subtleties by the definition of *diffusion-equivalent* potentials; see Definition 4.1.

Similar to the idea of Runge and Gross (or Chan and Finken) [26, 2], we assume analytic potentials and can thus reduce the uniqueness of the mapping to the uniqueness of a solution to a (semi-)elliptic PDE. In contradistinction to the available proofs in quantum mechanics [26, 12, 13, 24], we explicitly have to take the hierarchy of reduced Smoluchowski equations into account. By doing so, our proof requires no approximation of n -point correlations. Hence, the fundamental question of uniqueness does in no way depend on the adiabatic approximation.

Moreover, our rephrasing of the problem allows us to obtain a physically intuitive condition for uniqueness. Theorem 4.4 asserts that if the density does not vanish at the boundary, then a unique solution can be guaranteed for no-flux boundary conditions or, in fact, any specified flux in or out of the system. Even more generally, we prove that uniqueness holds for a suitable asymptotic behavior of $\rho(x, t)$ and $V(x, t)$; see Theorem 4.6.

In Sec. 5, we demonstrate that such a simultaneous condition on the density and potential is inevitable. More specifically, we present explicit counterexamples to uniqueness where for two different external potentials, the same $\rho(x, t)$ is attained at all times. Obviously, these examples violate the conditions of our theorems. For an exponentially fast decaying density profile, a non-unique external potential must necessarily include an exponential divergence (in space). In contrast, if the density profile has heavy tails, already a polynomial divergence of $V(x, t)$ can lead to non-unique mappings. Hence, the conditions on the asymptotic behavior have to depend on both $\rho(x, t)$ and $V(x, t)$.

To conclude the discussion of counterexamples in Sec. 5, we embed our findings in the framework of PFT. A unique mapping to an external potential implies a unique current $j(x, t)$. In contrast, if a suitable external potential $V'(x, t)$ that violates our conditions is added, it causes a divergence-free current $j'(x, t)$ that does not change the density $\rho(x, t)$. Such counterexamples have been simulated via a numerical procedure known as *custom flow* [4, 5] that determines, in line with PFT, the unique external force field as a functional of $\rho(x, t)$ and $j(x, t)$. The hierarchy of Smoluchowski equations from Theorem 3.1 emphasizes the necessity of this approach for interacting systems. For the ideal gas (or under the adiabatic approximation), our analytic formula 5.2 can be applied to systematically construct counterexamples for effectively one-dimensional systems.

Finally, Section 6 provides an outlook. We discuss some open questions and possible generalizations.

2 Densities and Smoluchowski operators

We here consider an overdamped many-body system with a fixed number of particles $N > 0$ in an open domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$. The interaction between the particles is given by a pair potential $U(x, y)$ with $x, y \in \Omega$. As usual, the pair potential is symmetric and only depends on the relative distance, i.e., $U(x - y) := U(x - y, 0) = U(x, y)$. The inverse temperature β and diffusion constant D are fixed.

As a side-remark, in a slight abuse of notation that is common in physics, we denote a function together with its arguments, e.g., $U(x, y)$ may represent the potential itself or the function evaluated at positions x, y . The meaning should always be clear from the context.

Since our motivation are applications in classical physics, we restrict our analysis to smooth functions (rather than aiming for the greatest possible generality). More precisely, we assume throughout the paper that all density profiles and potentials are twice continuously differentiable in space, i.e., on Ω , and continuously differentiable in time, i.e., for $t \geq 0$ (where we assume differentiability from the right-hand side for $t = 0$).

We characterize our system by its symmetric N -body probability density $P_N(x^N, t)$, where x^N is a shorthand notation for a collection of positions $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \Omega$. Note that $P_N(x^N, t)$ is a simple function of time $t \in \mathbb{R}$ but a density in the spatial coordinates x^N . More precisely, it is the density of an intensity measure (which assigns to each Borel set the number of particles inside). Hence, the total mass of the measure is constant and given by

$$\int P(x^N, t) dx^N = 1.$$

Here and in the following, each unspecified integral is over the full domain.

We obtain the (reduced) n -body densities $\rho_n(x^n, t)$ with $n \leq N$ from the symmetric N -body probability density $P_N(x^N, t)$ by applying the n -body density operator:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n(x^n, t) &:= \int P_N(y^N, t) \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq \dots \neq i_n} \delta(x_1 - y_{i_1}) \dots \delta(x_n - y_{i_n}) dy^N \\ &= \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int P_N(y^N, t) \delta(x_1 - y_1) \dots \delta(x_n - y_n) dy^N \\ &= \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) dy^{N-n}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where δ denotes a Dirac delta distribution.

The evolution of $P_N(x^N, t)$ under an external potential $V(x, t)$ for time $0 \leq t < \infty$ obeys by the following N -body Smoluchowski equation:

$$\partial_t P_N(x^N, t) = D \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{x_i}^2 P_N(x^N, t) - D\beta \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{x_i} [P_N(x^N, t) F_i(x^N, t)], \quad (2.2)$$

where the force $F_i(x^N, t)$ on particle $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ is defined as

$$F_i(x^N, t) := -\nabla_{x_i} V(x_i, t) - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - x_j). \quad (2.3)$$

The same definition of $F_i(x^N, t)$ holds for any number of particles, say $n < N$. Let us also point out here that the index i always refers to the i th argument, e.g., $F_{n+1}(x^n, y, t) = -\nabla_y V(y, t) - \nabla_y \sum_{j=1}^n U(y - x_j)$.

In shorthand notation, we combine all forces into a single vector $F(x^N, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{dN}$ (and analogously define the gradient ∇_{x^N}). We, moreover, define the N -body current field $J_N(x^N, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{dN}$ as

$$J_N(x^N, t) := -D\nabla_{x^N} P_N(x^N, t) + D\beta P_N(x^N, t)F(x^N, t)$$

that obeys the continuity equation

$$\partial_t P_N(x^N, t) = -\nabla_{x^N} J_N(x^N, t),$$

which is then equivalent to the Smoluchowski equation. By defining the Smoluchowski operator

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_N := D \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{x_i} [\nabla_{x_i} - \beta F_i(x^N, t)],$$

we can write the Smoluchowski equation (2.2) more succinctly as

$$\partial_t P_N(x^N, t) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_N P_N(x^N, t). \quad (2.4)$$

For our derivation of a reduced Smoluchowski equation for $\rho_n(x^n, t)$ in the next section, it is useful to define *partial* Smoluchowski operators as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^- &:= D \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \{ \nabla_{x_i} - \beta F_i(x^N, t) \}, \\ \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^+ &:= D \sum_{i=n+1}^N \nabla_{x_i} \{ \nabla_{x_i} - \beta F_i(x^N, t) \}. \end{aligned}$$

The behavior of the system is determined by an initial value boundary problem that, in our case, is defined by the Smoluchowski equation (2.4), the initial condition $P_N^{(0)}(x^N) := P_N(x^N, 0)$ at time $t = 0$ (for all spatial coordinates), and a boundary condition on $\partial\Omega$ (for all times). A quite general condition is defined by an oblique derivative boundary problem with variable coefficients; see [11, Section 6.7]. Among others, such a choice allows for a *no-flux boundary condition* in the physical sense, i.e., the vanishing of the normal component of the current field. The oblique derivative boundary condition also includes the classical Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions as special cases.

We say that a solution $P_N(x^N, t)$ is *well behaved* if it has the following properties for all $0 \leq t < \infty$, $x^N \in \Omega^N$, and $n < N$: (i) as a function of spatial coordinates x^N , $P_N(x^N, t)$ is twice continuously differentiable on Ω ; and as a function of time t , $P_N(x^N, t)$ is continuously differentiable for $t \geq 0$; (ii) moreover, $\partial_t P_N$, $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_N P_N$, $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_n P_N$, and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^\pm P_N$ are Lebesgue integrable; (iii) finally, the average n -body interaction force on particle $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ exists and is continuously differentiable on Ω and for $t \geq 0$:

$$E_i(x^n, t) := - \int \rho_{n+1}(x^n, y, t) \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - y) dy. \quad (2.5)$$

For convenience, we also define $E_i(x^n, t) \equiv 0$ for $n \geq N$. The index is analogously defined to that of the force $F_i(x^n, t)$.

In the following, we always assume the existence of a well-behaved solution. Even though a proof of existence is beyond the scope of this paper, we briefly discuss conditions that are to be expected and a strategy in the outlook. Moreover, we formally assume that Ω is bounded so that it has a well-defined (and sufficiently smooth boundary) $\partial\Omega$. Nevertheless, our results immediately apply to unbounded Ω whenever the integrals converge appropriately.

3 Hierarchy of reduced Smoluchowski equations

The physics literature usually neglects all boundary terms in the derivation of a reduced Smoluchowski equation [18]. These boundary terms are essential, however, to derive necessary conditions for a unique density–potential mapping (since non-unique counterexamples involve diverging external potentials).

We, therefore, first derive a reduced Smoluchowski equation paying special attention to the boundary terms. Moreover, since we do not rely on the adiabatic approximation but instead consider the exact dependencies between n -body densities, we derive a complete set of reduced Smoluchowski equations for all orders.

Theorem 3.1. *The reduced n -body density $\rho_n(x^n, t)$ with $1 \leq n < N$ obeys the following reduced Smoluchowski equation for a bounded domain Ω with a piecewise smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho_n(x^n, t) = & D \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \{ [\nabla_{x_i} - \beta F_i(x^n, t)] \rho_n(x^n, t) - \beta E_i(x^n, t) \} \\ & + D \oint_{\partial\Omega} \{ [\nabla_y - \beta F_{n+1}(x^n, y, t)] \rho_{n+1}(x^n, y, t) - \beta E_{n+1}(x^n, y, t) \} dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Under our assumptions, we can apply the n -body density operator to the N -body Smoluchowski differential equation (2.4). First, we use

$$\partial_t \rho_n(x^n, t) = \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int \partial_t P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) dy^{N-n}$$

and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_N = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^- + \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^+$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho_n(x^n, t) = & \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^- P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) dy^{N-n} \\ & + \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^+ P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) dy^{N-n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

To simplify the first term on the right-hand side, we note that

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^- = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_n + D\beta \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \left[\sum_{j=n+1}^N \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - x_j) \right]$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^- P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) dy^{N-n} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_n \rho_n(x^n, t) \\ & + D\beta \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \left[P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) \sum_{j=n+1}^N \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - y_j) \right] dy^{N-n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Using the average n -body interaction force E_i from (2.5), we can further simplify the remaining integral:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \left[P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) \sum_{j=n+1}^N \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - y_j) \right] dy^{N-n} \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \int \sum_{j=n+1}^N \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - y_j) dy^{N-n} \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \int \frac{N!}{[N-(n+1)]!} \int P_N(x^n, y, z^{N-(n+1)}, t) dz^{N-(n+1)} \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - y) dy \\ & = - \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} E_i(x^n, t). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this result in (3.3) and finally in (3.2), we have

$$\partial_t \rho_n(x^n, t) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_n \rho_n(x^n, t) - D\beta \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} E_i(x^n, t) + B(x^n, t),$$

where we define the *boundary term* by

$$\begin{aligned} B(x^n, t) & := \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{n,N}^+ P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) dy^{N-n} \\ & = D \frac{N!}{(N-n)!} \int \sum_{i=1}^{N-n} \nabla_{y_i} \{ \nabla_{y_i} - \beta F_{n+i}(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) \} P_N(x^n, y^{N-n}, t) dy^{N-n} \\ & = D \frac{N!}{[N-(n+1)]!} \oint_{\partial\Omega} \int \{ \nabla_y - \beta F_{n+1}(x^n, y, z^{N-(n+1)}, t) \} \\ & \quad \times P_N(x^n, y, z^{N-(n+1)}, t) dz^{N-(n+1)} dy. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds by the divergence theorem. To prove 3.1, it remains to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{N!}{[N-(n+1)]!} \int \{ \nabla_y - \beta F_{n+1}(x^n, y, z^{N-(n+1)}, t) \} P_N(x^n, y, z^{N-(n+1)}, t) dz^{N-(n+1)} \\ & = [\nabla_y - \beta F_{n+1}(x^n, y, t)] \rho_{n+1}(x^n, y, t) - \beta E_{n+1}(x^n, y, t). \end{aligned}$$

This assertion follows from the fact that

$$F_{n+1}(x^n, y, z^{N-(n+1)}, t) = F_{n+1}(x^n, y, t) - \sum_{j=1}^{N-(n+1)} \nabla_y U(y - z_j)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \frac{N!}{[N - (n + 1)]!} \int \sum_{j=n+2}^N [\nabla_y U(y - x_j)] P_N(x^n, y, z^{N-(n+1)}, t) dz^{N-(n+1)} \\
& = - \frac{N!}{[N - (n + 2)]!} \int [\nabla_y U(y - z)] \int P_N(x^n, y, z, v^{N-(n+2)}, t) dv^{N-(n+2)} dz,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last expression is, by definition, equal to $E_{n+1}(x^n, y, t)$. \square

Remark 3.2. *The two expressions in curly brackets in the first and second line of the reduced Smoluchowski equation (3.1) for $\rho_n(x^n, t)$ are those of the YBG hierarchy [14, Sec. 4.2] for order n and $n + 1$, respectively. In equilibrium, the two expressions always vanish, which is in agreement with $\partial_t \rho_n(x^n, t) \equiv 0$. Out of equilibrium, all boundary terms vanish if and only if the YBG hierarchy holds on average at the boundary.*

From now on, we only consider the case of vanishing boundary terms in the reduced Smoluchowski equations. Thus, we recover the well-known (reduced) Smoluchowski equation for the one-body density:

$$\partial_t \rho(x, t) = D \nabla_x \left\{ [\nabla_x + \beta \nabla_x V(x, t)] \rho(x, t) + \beta \int \rho_2(x, y, t) \nabla_x U(x - y) dy \right\} \quad (3.4)$$

where here and in the following we use $\rho(x, t) := \rho_1(x, t)$. More generally, for the n -body densities, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \rho_n(x^n, t) = D \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \left\{ [\nabla_{x_i} + \beta \nabla_{x_i} V(x_i, t)] \rho_n(x^n, t) + \beta \rho_n(x^n, t) \nabla_{x_i} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n U(x_i - x_j) \right. \\
\left. + \beta \int \rho_{n+1}(x^n, y, t) \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - y) dy \right\}.
\end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

That the boundary terms vanish must, of course, be confirmed for each example. A violation of this condition can lead to spurious counterexamples to our uniqueness theorems 4.4 and 4.6 (as discussed below).

Based on (3.4), we define the one-body current $j(x, t)$ as

$$j(x, t) := -D [\nabla_x + \beta \nabla_x V(x, t)] \rho(x, t) - D \beta \int \rho_2(x, y, t) \nabla_x U(x - y) dy, \quad (3.6)$$

so that it obeys the following continuity equation

$$\partial_t \rho(x, t) = -\nabla_x j(x, t).$$

The definition is equivalent to the ensemble average of a current operator [27].

4 Uniqueness theorems

We now turn to the central question of this paper. Given an initial condition $P_N^{(0)}(x^N)$, does $\rho(x, t)$ uniquely specify $V(x, t)$ for $t > 0$?

There are two obvious limitations to uniqueness. First, the mapping can only be unique for $x \in \Omega$ where and when $\rho(x, t) > 0$. Variations in $V(x, t)$ outside the support of $\rho(x, t)$, i.e., in the complement of the set $\text{supp}(\rho) := \{(x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ : \rho(x, t) > 0\}$, do not change the time evolution of the system as determined by the Smoluchowski equation. Secondly, adding a time-dependent constant to the potential does not change the time evolution either. In fact, for disjoint subsets of the support, we can add different constants to each subset.

We can combine both limitations in a single statement; a difference of the potentials that is constant on the support of $\rho(x, t)$ has no effect on the density. Note that, in general, the potentials can differ by more than just an offset. For a similar restriction of the uniqueness in equilibrium DFT for the canonical ensemble, see Example 9.1 in [3].

Definition 4.1. *Two external potentials $V(x, t)$ and $V'(x, t)$ are said to be diffusion equivalent, $V(x, t) \sim V'(x, t)$, for a given one-body density $\rho(x, t)$ if the difference $d(x, t) := V'(x, t) - V(x, t)$ is constant on $\text{supp}(\rho)$.*

This definition allows us to formulate our strategy of proof more specifically. In the following, we consider two systems with densities $\rho(x, t)$ and $\rho'(x, t)$ and with external potentials $V(x, t)$ and $V'(x, t)$. Both systems start from the same initial condition $P_N^{(0)}(x^N)$, and the same boundary conditions are applied. Our aim is to derive conditions for which an equivalence of $\rho(x, t)$ and $\rho'(x, t)$ implies diffusion equivalence of $V(x, t)$ and $V'(x, t)$, or equivalently that the difference

$$d(x, t) := V(x, t) - V'(x, t) \tag{4.1}$$

is diffusion equivalent to a function that is constant zero. For convenience, we will actually show the contrapositive. If the two potentials are not diffusion equivalent, then the densities must differ, and thus $\rho(x, t)$ uniquely determines $V(x, t)$.

An essential step in the proof is to reduce the uniqueness of the mapping to the uniqueness of a solution to a (semi-)elliptic PDE. As discussed in the introduction, this approach is, in parts, similar to the argument by Runge and Gross (or Chan and Finken) [26, 2], but it differs in that we have to take the hierarchy of reduced Smoluchowski equations from Theorem 3.1 into account. We, of course, pay close attention to a rigorous treatment of the boundary terms. Additionally, we rearrange the argument to obtain generic boundary conditions. Thus, we prove that a no-flux boundary condition always implies uniqueness (if the density does not vanish).

The main advantage of our strategy is a physically intuitive proof that helps to clarify the essential physical questions. This intuition comes at the price of the following three additional assumptions that could possibly be avoided by alternative methods, like a fix-point scheme that has already been employed in the quantum case [25, 24].

The first assumption (A1) for our proof is that the external potentials $V(x, t)$ and $V'(x, t)$ are real analytic in time for $t \geq 0$. By including the start time $t = 0$, we assume that the potentials are right differentiable and that the corresponding Taylor series at the origin converges in a neighborhood. Hence, the derivatives at the origin uniquely specify the potential at all times (according to the identity theorem for analytic functions).

Our second assumption (A2) is that the n -body densities $\rho_n(x^n, t)$ and $\rho'_n(x^n, t)$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$ are infinitely often differentiable from the right at $t = 0$. Note that we do not require them to be time analytic.

Thirdly, we can only derive explicit conditions for uniqueness if the support of $\rho(x, t)$ does not change with time, which is essentially equivalent to redefining the domain Ω . Hence, our third assumption (A3) is that $\rho(x, t) > 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and $t \geq 0$. Without loss of generality, we also assume that Ω is connected.

Taking advantage of our analytic potentials, we will consider the time derivatives of their difference; see (4.1). Hence, we define for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$:

$$d_k(x) := \partial_t^k d(x, t) \Big|_{t=0}.$$

By (A3), $V(x, t)$ and $V'(x, t)$ are diffusion equivalent if and only if $\nabla_x d(x, t) = 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and $t \geq 0$, which is equivalent to $\nabla_x d_k(x) \equiv 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ by (A1). Let $V(x, t)$ and $V'(x, t)$ be not diffusion equivalent; then there exists a smallest non-negative integer, say l , for which $\nabla_x d_l(x) \neq 0$.

The proof of our theorems rests on the following lemma. It allows an exact treatment of the average n -body interaction forces for all orders of n (via the hierarchy of reduced Smoluchowski equations).

Lemma 4.2. *Given two many-body systems with identical initial and boundary conditions that satisfy assumptions (A1)–(A3) as described above. Let $V(x, t)$ and $V'(x, t)$ be not diffusion equivalent and let $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be the smallest integer for which $\nabla_x d_l(x) \neq 0$. Then*

$$\partial_t^k [\rho_n(x^n, t) - \rho'_n(x^n, t)] \Big|_{t=0} \equiv 0 \quad \text{for all } n = 1, 2, \dots, N \text{ and } k = 0, 1, \dots, l \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\partial_t^{l+1} [\rho(x, t) - \rho'(x, t)] \Big|_{t=0} = D\beta \nabla_x [\rho(x, 0) \nabla_x d_l(x)]. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. We first prove (4.2) by an induction-like argument. This equation obviously holds for $k = 0$ by (2.1) because both many-body systems start from the same initial condition $P_N^{(0)}(x^N)$. In the case $l > 0$, assume that (4.2) holds for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$ for some $m < l$. We need to show that it is also true for $m + 1$. Therefore, we subtract the reduced Smoluchowski equations (3.5) for the n -body densities of the two many-body systems, take m additional time derivatives and evaluate the derivatives at $t = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t^{m+1} [\rho_n(x^n, t) - \rho'_n(x^n, t)] \Big|_{t=0} &= D \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i}^2 \partial_t^m [\rho_n(x^n, t) - \rho'_n(x^n, t)] \Big|_{t=0} \\ &+ D\beta \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \partial_t^m [\rho_n(x^n, t) \nabla_{x_i} V(x_i, t) - \rho'_n(x^n, t) \nabla_{x_i} V'(x_i, t)] \Big|_{t=0} \\ &+ D\beta \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \nabla_{x_i} \left\{ \partial_t^m [\rho_n(x^n, t) - \rho'_n(x^n, t)] \Big|_{t=0} \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - x_j) \right\} \\ &+ D\beta \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{x_i} \int \partial_t^m [\rho_{n+1}(x^n, y, t) - \rho'_{n+1}(x^n, y, t)] \Big|_{t=0} \nabla_{x_i} U(x_i - y) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

The first, third, and last term on the right-hand side vanish directly since (4.2) holds for $k = m$ by our induction argument. For the remaining derivative in the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \partial_t^m [\rho_n(x^n, t) \nabla_{x_i} V(x_i, t) - \rho'_n(x^n, t) \nabla_{x_i} V'(x_i, t)] \right|_{t=0} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} \left[\left. \partial_t^k \rho_n(x^n, t) \right|_{t=0} \nabla_{x_i} \partial_t^{m-k} V(x_i, t) \right|_{t=0} - \left. \partial_t^k \rho'_n(x^n, t) \right|_{t=0} \nabla_{x_i} \partial_t^{m-k} V'(x_i, t) \Big|_{t=0} \Big] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} \left[\left. \partial_t^k \rho_n(x^n, t) \right|_{t=0} \nabla_{x_i} d_{m-k}(x_i) \right], \tag{4.5}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds again because of our induction argument, i.e., we apply (4.2) for $k \leq m$. Now, since $\nabla_{x_i} d_k(x_i) \equiv 0$ for all $k \leq m < l$, assertion (4.2) follows for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, l$.

To prove (4.3), we subtract the reduced Smoluchowski equations (3.4) for the one-body densities of the two many-body systems, take l additional time derivatives and evaluate the result at $t = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \partial_t^{l+1} [\rho(x, t) - \rho'(x, t)] \right|_{t=0} &= D \nabla_x^2 \left. \partial_t^l [\rho(x, t) - \rho'(x, t)] \right|_{t=0} \\
&\quad + D\beta \nabla_x \left. \partial_t^l [\rho(x, t) \nabla_x V(x, t) - \rho'(x, t) \nabla_x V'(x, t)] \right|_{t=0} \\
&\quad + D\beta \nabla_x \int \left. \partial_t^l [\rho_2(x, y, t) - \rho'_2(x, y, t)] \right|_{t=0} \nabla_x U(x - y) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

The first and last term on the right-hand side vanish by (4.2). Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \partial_t^{l+1} [\rho(x, t) - \rho'(x, t)] \right|_{t=0} &= D\beta \nabla_x \left. \partial_t^l [\rho(x, t) \nabla_x V(x, t) - \rho'(x, t) \nabla_x V'(x, t)] \right|_{t=0} \\
&= D\beta \nabla_x \sum_{k=0}^l \binom{l}{k} \left[\left. \partial_t^k \rho(x, t) \right|_{t=0} \nabla_x \partial_t^{l-k} V(x, t) \right|_{t=0} - \left. \partial_t^k \rho'(x, t) \right|_{t=0} \nabla_x \partial_t^{l-k} V'(x, t) \Big|_{t=0} \Big] \\
&= D\beta \nabla_x \sum_{k=0}^l \binom{l}{k} \left[\left. \partial_t^k \rho(x, t) \right|_{t=0} \nabla_x d_{l-k}(x) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds again by (4.2). Since $\nabla_x d_{l-k}(x) \equiv 0$ for all $0 < k \leq l$, we have proven (4.3) which concludes the proof. \square

The n -body densities $\rho_n(x^n, t)$ are highly relevant for the correct dynamic evolution of the one-body density $\rho(x, t)$. The preceding lemma provides control over these contributions in our proof. In fact, they no longer appear explicitly.

To prepare our first main theorem that guarantees uniqueness under suitable boundary conditions, we define the normal flux $j_\perp(x, t)$ at the boundary via an extension of the current $j(x, t)$ from (3.6) to $\partial\Omega$:

$$\begin{aligned}
j_\perp(x, t) &= -Dn(x) \nabla_x \rho(x, t) - D\beta n(x) \rho(x, t) \nabla_x V(x, t) \\
&\quad - D\beta \int \rho_2(x, y, t) n(x) \nabla_x U(x - y) dy, \tag{4.6}
\end{aligned}$$

where $n(x)$ denotes the outward unit normal on $\partial\Omega$. As before, the product of vectors is consistently interpreted as a scalar product. We can utilize (in our proof of uniqueness) this common choice for a physical boundary condition via the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Given two many-body systems and potentials as in Lemma 4.2. If the boundary conditions specify the normal flux $j_\perp(x, t)$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega$, then*

$$n(x)\rho(x, 0)\nabla_x d_l(x) \equiv 0, \quad (4.7)$$

where l again denotes the smallest integer for which $\nabla_x d_l(x) \neq 0$.

Proof. Since the normal flux is equivalent for the two systems, subtracting (4.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} -Dn(x)\nabla_x[\rho(x, t) - \rho'(x, t)] - D\beta n(x)[\rho(x, t)\nabla_x V(x, t) - \rho'(x, t)\nabla_x V'(x, t)] \\ - D\beta n(x) \int [\rho_2(x, y, t) - \rho'_2(x, y, t)]\nabla_x U(x - y) dy = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in \partial\Omega$. By applying l subsequent time derivatives and (4.2), we get

$$n(x)\partial_t^l[\rho(x, t)\nabla_x V(x, t) - \rho'(x, t)\nabla_x V'(x, t)]\Big|_{t=0} = 0,$$

and so the assertion follows by the same argument as in (4.5). \square

Next, we state our first main Theorem 4.4 that holds for a quite general and physically intuitive boundary condition that (i) specifies the flux in and out of the system and that (ii) requires a nonvanishing density at the boundary. The second condition is necessary because our first condition on the flux is quite generic. Below, we will drop (ii) at the expense of (i), i.e., a more precise specification of the behavior of $\rho(x, t)$ and $d(x, t)$ for $x \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ allows for a more general Theorem 4.6.

For now, we require that $\rho(x, t)$ does not vanish at $\partial\Omega$, i.e., $\rho(x, t)$ is allowed to diverge at the boundary but if a smooth extension of $\rho(x, t)$ to $\partial\Omega$ exists, then it must be positive.

Theorem 4.4. *For a many-body system satisfying (A1)–(A3) and with a given normal flux $j_\perp(x, t)$ at the boundary $\partial\Omega$, the external potential $V(x, t)$ is uniquely determined (up to diffusion equivalence) by $\rho(x, t)$ if the initial density does not vanish at the boundary.*

As a special case, no-flux boundary conditions imply a unique density–potential mapping if the density is strictly positive at the wall.

Proof. Consider two many-body systems as described above with identical initial and boundary conditions and the same normal flux $j_\perp(x, t)$. Our aim is to prove that the density–potential mapping is unique, i.e., $\rho(x, t) \equiv \rho'(x, t)$ implies $V(x, t) \sim V'(x, t)$. We do so by showing the contrapositive, i.e., if $V(x, t)$ and $V'(x, t)$ are not diffusion equivalent, then $\rho(x, t)$ must differ from $\rho'(x, t)$ for some $x \in \Omega$ and $t > 0$. By (A2), the densities are not equivalent if

$$\partial_t^k [\rho(x, t) - \rho'(x, t)]\Big|_{t=0} \neq 0, \quad (4.8)$$

for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let l denote the smallest integer for which $\nabla_x d_l(x) \neq 0$, as in Lemma 4.2, and consider the case $k = l + 1$.

Using (4.3), we can reduce the proof of uniqueness for the density–potential mapping to a proof that the following elliptic PDE

$$\nabla_x [\rho(x, 0) \nabla_x d_l(x)] = 0 \quad (4.9)$$

has only trivial, i.e., constant, solutions. In that case, $\nabla_x d_l(x) \not\equiv 0$ together with (4.3) implies (4.8).

To show the uniqueness of the trivial solutions, we have to take the boundary conditions into account. We start with (4.7) from Lemma 4.3. If additionally $\rho(x, 0) > 0$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega$ (or if the density diverges), then (4.7) requires that $\nabla_x d_l(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega$; in other words, $d_l(x)$ is bounded. Thus, we have obtained a stronger condition:

$$n(x) \rho(x, 0) \nabla_x d_l(x) = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

for all $x \in \partial\Omega$.

Now, consider the following integral

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d_l(x) \nabla_x [\rho(x, 0) \nabla_x d_l(x)] dx \\ &= - \int \rho(x, 0) [\nabla_x d_l(x)]^2 dx + \oint_{\partial\Omega} \rho(x, 0) d_l(x) \nabla_x d_l(x) dx \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

using partial integration. By (4.10), the surface term vanishes, and we obtain

$$\int d_l(x) \nabla_x [\rho(x, 0) \nabla_x d_l(x)] dx = - \int \rho(x, 0) [\nabla_x d_l(x)]^2 dx.$$

By our assumptions, the right-hand side is strictly negative. Therefore, the integral on the left-hand side cannot vanish for all $x \in \Omega$, which in turn implies that (4.9) has only trivial solutions with constant $d_l(x)$. \square

Remark 4.5. *Theorem 4.4 captures a common case where the density and the flux at the boundary together uniquely specify the external potential and hence all higher-order correlations. This assertion is consistent with the PFT framework, where the density and current together yield a complete statistical description of a time-dependent many-body system [28, 27].*

However, for non-vanishing densities, our result is less restrictive since, in that case, we only need to fix the normal flux at the boundary. The latter is often already defined by the set up of the system (e.g., as a no-flux boundary condition for bounded domains).

Notice that in the proof of Theorem 4.4 the conditions on the flux and density are only used to obtain (4.10), which in turn implies that the surface term vanishes in (4.11). Therefore, we can immediately formulate a physically less intuitive but mathematically more general theorem (that extends the uniqueness of the solutions to semi-elliptic PDEs with one-body densities that can vanish at the boundary).

Theorem 4.6. *Given two many-body systems satisfying assumptions (A1)–(A3) with identical initial and boundary conditions. If*

$$\oint_{\partial\Omega} \rho(x, 0) d_k(x) \nabla_x d_k(x) dx = 0 \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad (4.12)$$

then we have a unique density–potential mapping, i.e., $\rho(x, t) \equiv \rho'(x, t)$ implies $V(x, t) \sim V'(x, t)$.

From Theorem 4.6, we can distinguish different cases of uniqueness based on the behavior of $\rho(x, t)$ close to the boundary. As before, condition (4.12) allows for diverging densities if the gradient of the potential vanishes fast enough. In distinction to Theorem 4.4, we can now assert uniqueness even if $\rho(x, 0) \equiv 0$ for all $x \in \partial\Omega$ as long as the potential remains bounded. Conversely, we learn in this case that if we want to vary the boundary flux, the potential must diverge.

Remark 4.7. *This physically intuitive interpretation holds even for $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$, where the density has to vanish at infinity (because $\rho(x, 0)$ is normalized by the total number of particles N and hence integrable). A violation of criterion (4.12), therefore, requires that at least one of the potentials $V(x, t)$ and $V'(x, t)$ diverges (rapidly) at infinity. As long as the external potentials do not diverge (faster than allowed by our criterion), they are uniquely specified by the density.*

We expect that our results can be generalized to systems with nonintegrable density profiles, to include such a simple case as the homogeneous bulk or, more interestingly, periodic boundary conditions (which are common for simulations). Indeed, we find consistent results when we discuss explicit examples for all of these scenarios in the following section.

Remark 4.8. *Theorem 4.6 can be generalized even further. Given two potentials $V(x, t) \not\sim V'(x, t)$; then, the corresponding densities will differ if suitable boundary conditions are imposed on $d(x, t)$, so that (4.9) has only trivial solutions. While this assertion is less explicit than Theorem 4.6, it can be used to choose appropriate boundary conditions for special settings (e.g., Dirichlet boundary conditions).*

5 Loopholes to uniqueness

In the previous section, we derived physically relevant conditions for which the density–potential mapping is unique. If we violate these conditions (e.g., by a vanishing density and diverging potentials), then identical one-body densities can be obtained for different external potentials; see Remark 4.7. The two systems will differ, however, in a divergence-free current field.

A generic procedure to construct such counterexamples is indicated by (4.9). The key idea is to add to the external potential a nontrivial solution of this elliptic PDE. For the ideal gas or, more generally, under the adiabatic approximation, such an additional potential leaves the one-body density $\rho(x, t)$ unchanged.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume that the two-body density $\rho_x(x, y, t)$ is a functional of the one-body density $\rho(x, t)$. Let $d(x, t)$ be a (nontrivial) solution of*

$$\nabla_x[\rho(x, t)\nabla_x d(x, t)] = 0 \tag{5.1}$$

for all $x \in \Omega$ and $t \geq 0$ (which has to violate the boundary condition of Theorem 4.6). Then adding $d(x, t)$ to the external potential does not change the density $\rho(x, t)$ but leads to an (additional) divergence-free one-body current $j(x, t) = -D\beta\rho(x, t)\nabla_x d(x, t)$.

Proof. Since (3.4) is linear in the external potential, the assertion follows directly from the PDE if the equation is closed, i.e., if $\rho_2(x, y, t)$ is a functional of $\rho(x, t)$. In that case, the time derivative of the density does not change. \square

Importantly, if $d(x, t)$ is a nontrivial solution of (5.1), then Theorem 4.6 no longer applies. Hence, for general interaction potentials, $\rho_2(x, y, t)$ will be no longer a functional of $\rho(x, t)$, and our simple procedure breaks down; instead, the entire hierarchy of n -body correlations has to be taken into account (which can be easily overlooked since it does not impose additional conditions on the uniqueness theorem); see Theorem 3.1. As a practical alternative, the potential that is then required to obtain a predefined flow profile can be calculated numerically via the so-called *custom flow* procedure [4]; see also [5].

There are, however, two notable exceptions where Proposition 5.1 can indeed be applied: first, the ideal gas, for which $\rho_2(x, y, t) = \rho(x, t)\rho(y, t)$, and secondly, the (commonly applied) adiabatic approximation [20, 1, 29] that relies on the correlations in equilibrium which are functionals of the density according to the (time-independent) density–potential mapping in classical DFT [3].

The example can be made even more explicit in one dimension. If the density $\rho(x, t) > 0$ is effectively one-dimensional, i.e., homogeneous in all coordinates but one, then the elliptic PDE (5.1) reduces to a Sturm-Liouville problem [33], which can be solved explicitly:

$$d(x, t) = \int_{x_0}^x \frac{c(t)}{\rho(y, t)} dy \quad (5.2)$$

with $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $c(t)$ a purely time-dependent constant. Thus, we obtain the following example that was inspired by [19].

Example 5.2 (Localized density profile). *Consider a one-dimensional ideal gas trapped in a harmonic potential, i.e., subject to an external potential $V(x, t) = x^2$ so that $\rho(x, t) = e^{-x^2}$, where we set all constants to zero by our choice of units; see Fig. 1 (a). Since the system is in equilibrium, there is no current $j(x, t) \equiv 0$.*

Next, we add an external potential according to (5.2). The potential

$$d(x, t) = c(t) \int_0^x e^{y^2} dy$$

quickly diverges for $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$. By construction, $\rho(x, t)$ remains unchanged even though particles get transported through the system. The trick is that the force is inversely proportional to $\rho(x, t)$, i.e., it pulls stronger when the density is lower. Hence, the current is constant.

In this example, the potential $d(x, t)$ has to diverge exponentially fast to get the same density with different potentials. A slower divergence of $d(x, t)$ suffices if the density profile has a heavy tail, e.g., $\rho(x, t) = 1/(1 + x^2)$ for $V(x, t) = \log(1 + x^2)$, in which case $d(x, t) = O(x^3)$; see Fig. 1 (b).

According to Theorem 4.6, if the density vanishes at the boundary, then the nontrivial solution $d(x, t)$ must diverge. For such a counterexample to uniqueness, it is important to check whether the boundary term of the Smoluchowski equation in Theorem 3.1 vanishes.




Figure 1: Schematics of non-unique density profiles. The same density profile is obtained for non-interacting particles if only the even external potential is applied or if the uneven external potential is added. The latter causes a constant current (as indicated by the arrows at the bottom).

Otherwise, one may obtain inconsistent results. If the example above were to be applied to a radially symmetric potential, it would result in a radially symmetric current that would not change the density profile, but particles would be missing or accumulating at the boundary.

Example 5.3 (Homogeneous bulk density). *Even though a constant $\rho(x,t)$ defined on $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$ is, strictly speaking, excluded from our setting, the construction principle of Proposition 5.1 and (5.2) still works. It provides an obvious counterexample to uniqueness, namely, a constant force applied to a constant density profile on $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^d$ (even though, strictly speaking, this example is excluded by our condition $N < \infty$). By adding the potential $d(x,t) = v(t)x$, we obtain a constant gradient that results in a constant current proportional to $v(t)$. Note that a no-flux boundary condition again implies uniqueness.*

Example 5.4 (Periodic density profiles). *Our procedure can also be applied to systems with periodic boundary conditions. Similar to the homogeneous bulk density, we obtain a diverging potential on \mathbb{R}^d in the nonunique case, but the forces remain bounded if the density is strictly positive. Such an example with $\rho(x,t) = \cos^2(x_1) + \rho_0$ and $\rho_0 > 0$ has already been numerically studied in simulations of interacting particles, going beyond the adiabatic approximation, within the framework of PFT and custom flow [4, 5].*

6 Outlook

So far, we have assumed the existence of a well-behaved solution $P(x^N, t)$, but a proof of existence can be constructed similarly to our proof of uniqueness. Analogously, van Leeuwen [32] generalized the argument by Runge and Gross [26] in quantum mechanics. We, therefore, expect that our proof can also be generalized, but an additional difficulty arises. The existence of a suitable potential requires the solution to an inhomogeneous PDE analogous to (4.9). The resulting conditions on the density and interaction potential should include, as a special case, the known conditions for systems in equilibrium [3]. Similar questions have recently been discussed in quantum mechanics [35].

Another open problem is to drop the condition of analytic potentials. As mentioned above, a fixed-point approach as in [23, 24] could avoid this restriction. A useful generalization would also be to include unnormalizable densities to rigorously treat periodic boundary conditions.

Finally, we can generalize the pairwise-interacting passive particles to *(i)* many-body interactions and marked particles, as well as to *(ii)* non-conservative forces, such as for active particles. *(i)* Higher-body interactions lead to more complex average interaction forces but do not change the structure of the hierarchy, so our method of proof should apply. Similarly, our proof should be generalizable to marked particles, where the marks may represent different particle shapes or orientations [22]. *(ii)* If a known non-conservative force field is added to (2.3), we expect that the corresponding terms drop out similar to (4.2) and (4.4). Thus, the uniqueness of the density-potential mapping equally holds for intrinsically nonequilibrium systems, such as active particles [34].

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Joseph Brader, Daniel de las Heras, Tobias Kuna, Tanniemola B. Liverpool, and Salomé Tschopp for valuable discussions. This work was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), through the SPP 2265, under Grant Nos. WI 5527/1-1 and LO 418/25-1.

References

- [1] A. J. Archer and R. Evans. Dynamical density functional theory and its application to spinodal decomposition. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 121:4246–4254, 2004.
- [2] G. K.-L. Chan and R. Finken. Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory of Classical Fluids. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 94:183001, 2005.
- [3] J. T. Chayes, L. Chayes, and E. H. Lieb. The inverse problem in classical statistical mechanics. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 93:57–121, 1984.
- [4] D. de las Heras, J. Renner, and M. Schmidt. Custom flow in overdamped Brownian dynamics. *Phys. Rev. E*, 99:023306, 2019.

- [5] D. de las Heras, T. Zimmermann, F. Sammüller, S. Hermann, and M. Schmidt. Perspective: How to overcome dynamical density functional theory. *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, 2023.
- [6] A. K. Dhara and S. K. Ghosh. Density-functional theory for time-dependent systems. *Phys. Rev. A*, 35:442–444, 1987.
- [7] W. S. B. Dwandaru and M. Schmidt. Variational principle of classical density functional theory via Levy’s constrained search method. *Phys. Rev. E*, 83:061133, 2011.
- [8] P. Español and H. Löwen. Derivation of dynamical density functional theory using the projection operator technique. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 131:244101, 2009.
- [9] R. Evans. The nature of the liquid-vapour interface and other topics in the statistical mechanics of non-uniform, classical fluids. *Adv. Phys.*, 28:143–200, 1979.
- [10] R. Evans. Density functionals in the theory of non-uniform fluids. In D. Henderson, editor, *Fundamentals of Inhomogeneous Fluids*, pages 85–175. Marcel Dekker, 1992.
- [11] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, volume 224 of *Classics in Mathematics*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001.
- [12] E. K. U. Gross and W. Kohn. Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory. In P.-O. Löwdin, editor, *Advances in Quantum Chemistry*, volume 21 of *Density Functional Theory of Many-Fermion Systems*, pages 255–291. Academic Press, 1990.
- [13] E. K. U. Gross and N. T. Maitra. Introduction to TDDFT. In M. A. Marques, N. T. Maitra, F. M. Nogueira, E. Gross, and A. Rubio, editors, *Fundamentals of Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory*, Lecture Notes in Physics, pages 53–99. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [14] J.-P. Hansen and I. R. McDonald. *Theory of Simple Liquids: With Applications to Soft Matter*. Academic Press, Amsterdam, fourth edition, 2013.
- [15] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn. Inhomogeneous Electron Gas. *Phys. Rev.*, 136:B864–B871, 1964.
- [16] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham. Self-Consistent Equations Including Exchange and Correlation Effects. *Phys. Rev.*, 140:A1133–A1138, 1965.
- [17] M. Levy. Universal variational functionals of electron densities, first-order density matrices, and natural spin-orbitals and solution of the v-representability problem. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 76:6062–6065, 1979.
- [18] H. Löwen. Dynamical Density Functional Theory for Brownian Dynamics of Colloidal Particles. In J. Wu, editor, *Variational Methods in Molecular Modeling*, Molecular Modeling and Simulation, pages 255–284. Springer, Singapore, 2017.
- [19] N. T. Maitra and K. Burke. Demonstration of initial-state dependence in time-dependent density-functional theory. *Phys. Rev. A*, 63:042501, 2001.

- [20] U. M. B. Marconi and P. Tarazona. Dynamic density functional theory of fluids. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 110:8032–8044, 1999.
- [21] N. D. Mermin. Thermal Properties of the Inhomogeneous Electron Gas. *Phys. Rev.*, 137:A1441–A1443, 1965.
- [22] M. Rex, H. H. Wensink, and H. Löwen. Dynamical density functional theory for anisotropic colloidal particles. *Phys. Rev. E*, 76:021403, 2007.
- [23] M. Ruggenthaler, K. J. H. Giesbertz, M. Penz, and R. van Leeuwen. Density-potential mappings in quantum dynamics. *Phys. Rev. A*, 85:052504, 2012.
- [24] M. Ruggenthaler, M. Penz, and R. van Leeuwen. Existence, uniqueness, and construction of the density-potential mapping in time-dependent density-functional theory. *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, 27:203202, 2015.
- [25] M. Ruggenthaler and R. van Leeuwen. Global fixed-point proof of time-dependent density-functional theory. *EPL*, 95:13001, 2011.
- [26] E. Runge and E. K. U. Gross. Density-Functional Theory for Time-Dependent Systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 52:997–1000, 1984.
- [27] M. Schmidt. Power functional theory for many-body dynamics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 94:015007, 2022.
- [28] M. Schmidt and J. M. Brader. Power functional theory for Brownian dynamics. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 138:214101, 2013.
- [29] M. te Vrugt, H. Löwen, and R. Wittkowski. Classical dynamical density functional theory: From fundamentals to applications. *Adv. Phys.*, 69:121–247, 2020.
- [30] S. M. Tschopp and J. M. Brader. First-principles superadiabatic theory for the dynamics of inhomogeneous fluids. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 157:234108, 2022.
- [31] S. M. Tschopp, H. D. Vuijk, and J. M. Brader. Superadiabatic dynamical density functional study of Brownian hard-spheres in time-dependent external potentials, 2023.
- [32] R. van Leeuwen. Mapping from Densities to Potentials in Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 82:3863–3866, 1999.
- [33] W. Walter. *Gewöhnliche Differentialgleichungen*. Springer-Lehrbuch. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, seventh edition, 2000.
- [34] R. Wittkowski and H. Löwen. Dynamical density functional theory for colloidal particles with arbitrary shape. *Mol. Phys.*, 109:2935–2943, 2011.
- [35] J. Wrighton, A. Albavera-Mata, H. F. Rodríguez, T. S. Tan, A. C. Cancio, J. W. Dufty, and S. B. Trickey. Some problems in density functional theory. *Lett Math Phys*, 113:41, 2023.
- [36] B.-X. Xu and A. K. Rajagopal. Current-density-functional theory for time-dependent systems. *Phys. Rev. A*, 31:2682–2684, 1985.