

Perspective: Atomistic Simulations of Water and Aqueous Systems with Machine Learning Potentials*

Amir Omranpour,^{1,2} Pablo Montero De Hijos,^{3,4} Jörg Behler,^{1,2,†} and Christoph Dellago^{3,‡}

¹*Lehrstuhl für Theoretische Chemie II, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 44780 Bochum, Germany*

²*Research Center Chemical Sciences and Sustainability,
Research Alliance Ruhr, 44780 Bochum, Germany*

³*University of Vienna, Faculty of Physics, Boltzmannngasse 5, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*

⁴*University of Vienna, Faculty of Earth Sciences,
Geography and Astronomy, Josef-Holaubuek-Platz 2, 1090 Vienna, Austria*

(Dated: February 1, 2024)

As the most important solvent, water has been at the center of interest since the advent of computer simulations. While early molecular dynamics and Monte Carlo simulations had to make use of simple model potentials to describe the atomic interactions, accurate ab initio molecular dynamics simulations relying on the first-principles calculation of the energies and forces have opened the way to predictive simulations of aqueous systems. Still, these simulations are very demanding, which prevents the study of complex systems and their properties. Modern machine learning potentials (MLPs) have now reached a mature state, allowing to overcome these limitations by combining the high accuracy of electronic structure calculations with the efficiency of empirical force fields. In this Perspective we give a concise overview about the progress made in the simulation of water and aqueous systems employing MLPs, starting from early work on free molecules and clusters via bulk liquid water to electrolyte solutions and solid-liquid interfaces.

INTRODUCTION

A large fraction of the surface of the Earth is covered by water and, still, some ice, giving our planet its distinctive blue color when viewed from space. Water is carried down deep into the Earth's crust at subduction zones, influencing volcanism and plate tectonics, and in the atmosphere, in form of vapor, liquid or ice, water is a key climate factor from the troposphere up to the stratosphere and mesosphere. Down at the Earth's surface, water shapes landscapes, provides the basis for life and is central to many technologies that sustain humanity. Given its significance and abundance, it is no surprise that over the centuries much research has been undertaken to understand the properties of water and their physical origin.

One of the central scientific questions addressed in water research is how the complex behavior of water, exhibiting many anomalies and a rich phase diagram, arises from the interactions of the chemically rather simple H₂O molecules. Due to the limited temporal and spatial resolution of many experimental probes, much of what we know about water has been learned from computer simulations. Specifically, atomistic simulations have provided detailed insights into the directed network of hydrogen bonds between molecules that governs the structure and dynamics of water and its interaction with solutes and surfaces [1–4]. Moreover, computer simulations have made it possible to investigate water at extreme conditions that are not accessible in experiments. For instance, simulations have been used to study water and ice at pressure and temperature conditions prevailing in the deep Earth [5] and in the interiors of the giant

planets Uranus and Neptune [6], as well as in the deeply supercooled state, the so-called “no-man’s land”, where crystallization occurs extremely quickly [7, 8].

Following the pioneering Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of Barker [9] and molecular dynamics (MD) studies of Rahman and Stillinger [1] in the late 1960s and early 1970s, respectively, many computer simulations of water and aqueous systems were carried out. Initially, these simulations were based on empirical potentials [10], but later they relied increasingly on forces and energies obtained from electronic structure calculations [11]. In the empirical potential – or force field – approach the functional form of the interaction potential is constructed to capture the main physical interactions between molecules, with parameters adapted to reproduce some experimentally known quantities and/or quantum mechanical reference data.

Since the first water models for MD simulations were proposed more than half a century ago [12–14], a vast number of empirical potentials were developed for water and ice, ranging from simple forms based on pair interactions to sophisticated many-body potentials including polarization and charge transfer [10, 15–21]. Despite their often simple functional form, these models have been remarkably successful in capturing the key properties of water across the phase diagram [22, 23]. Modelling chemical reactivity, however, has proven difficult using empirical potentials, and with a few exceptions [24–27], empirical water models are usually non-reactive. That is, they lack the capability to represent the dissociation and recombination of water molecules, which is, *e.g.*, essential for describing the famous Grotthuss mechanism of proton transport [28]. The inclusion of proton transfer events is

not only central for simulations of acids and bases but is also of utmost importance in countless chemical reactions with water involved as reactant, from hydrolysis of biomolecules to electrochemical water splitting. Nevertheless, to this day, empirical force fields have been used for the vast majority of simulations involving water, particularly in studies of biological macromolecules, where aqueous solvation effects are of crucial importance [18].

A more fundamental route to the computer simulation of water relies on determining interactions from first principles, *i.e.*, *ab initio* by solving the electronic Schrödinger equation. The first *ab initio* molecular dynamics simulations of liquid water were carried out 30 years ago based on density functional theory (DFT). Since then, *ab initio* methods have been used extensively to study water [11, 29] and, more generally, aqueous systems [30]. While in principle *ab initio* approaches have the potential for truly predictive simulations and also provide access to electronic properties, currently available approximate methods are still somewhat limited [31]. For instance, predicting the equilibrium density of liquid water has been proven difficult within DFT based on standard exchange correlation functionals, and only the inclusion of dispersion forces produces satisfactory results [30, 32]. Moreover, some attempts to study water using methods beyond DFT have been made, *e.g.* using MP2-based simulations [33] or employing the random phase approximation (RPA) [34].

Compared to empirical force fields, *ab initio* approaches are computationally more expensive by many orders of magnitude, severely limiting the accessible system size and simulation times. Hence, many processes of interest occurring in aqueous systems, for instance freezing, glassy dynamics, the solvation of complex interfaces and biopolymers, as well as complex chemical reactions, are far beyond the capabilities of current *ab initio* simulations. Therefore, in order to transfer the reliability of *ab initio* methods to more complex systems, in the past two decades a considerable effort has been made to develop efficient but accurate potential energy surfaces based on systematic and flexible functional forms [35–38]. In particular, the growing use of machine learning techniques such as artificial neural networks and Gaussian processes for the construction of highly accurate and efficient machine learning potentials (MLP) has revolutionized – and continues to revolutionize – the field of atomistic computer simulations [39–53]. These methodological advances in modern MLPs make it now possible to predict even complex properties of condensed systems from first principles, opening up exciting new possibilities in chemistry, materials science and related disciplines.

Consequently, in recent years, atomistic modelling based on MLPs has also been increasingly applied to study water and, more generally, aqueous systems. The field has been evolving rapidly, both in terms of the un-




FIG. 1. Schematic overview of some important applications of MLPs to aqueous systems with increasing complexity (from bottom to top): neutral and protonated water clusters, liquid water and its interface with ice, liquid water–vapor interface, electrolyte solutions, and solid–water interfaces.

derlying methodology and of the complexity of systems that can be addressed, from small water clusters in vacuum via bulk water and its phase diagram to solution chemistry and processes at solid-liquid interfaces (cf. Fig. 1).

In this Perspective article we first provide a brief overview of the methodological basis and the current status of MLPs. In doing so, we focus on those types of MLPs that have been most frequently employed in simulations of systems involving water. In the subsequent sections, we then discuss different applications of MLPs to aqueous systems. While it is not the goal of this article to provide a comprehensive review covering all MLP-based studies of water and related systems exhaustively, we discuss a broad range of representative applications and point out future research directions to demonstrate the power and versatility of MLPs for the study of water and aqueous systems.

METHODOLOGY

In recent years, machine learning potentials have become an increasingly important tool for atomistic simulations of complex systems in chemistry, physics and materials science. As a consequence, the development of MLPs is a very active topic of research and here we will restrict our discussion to a concise overview about the current status of the field. Readers interested in further details are referred to a very large number of reviews covering all aspects of the methodology of MLPs [39–54].

MLPs offer many advantages, like an excellent numerical agreement with the underlying electronic structure reference method, resulting in typical energy errors of only about 1 meV/atom and force errors in the order of 100 meV/Å. These errors are significantly smaller than the uncertainty, *e.g.*, due to the choice of the exchange correlation functional in DFT, and thus replacing electronic structure calculations by MLPs does only marginally affect the accuracy of the simulations. Moreover, MLPs can describe the making and breaking of chemical bonds, and provide a rather high computational efficiency enabling simulations of systems containing many thousands of atoms. Still, they are usually about one to two orders of magnitude slower to compute than simple classical force fields.

First MLPs have been introduced more than a quarter of a century ago by Doren and coworkers [55], who suggested to use a feed-forward neural network (NN) to represent the interactions between diatomic molecules and solid surfaces. A general limitation of this first generation of MLPs, which has been further explored by numerous groups for about a decade for different types of systems, has been the limitation to a few atomic degrees of freedom only, restricting the applicability to small molecules in vacuum or small molecules interacting with frozen surfaces, as summarized in some early reviews [39, 40]. The major challenge for extending this method to high-dimensional condensed systems like liquid water at that time has been the lack of suitable structural input descriptors for the machine learning algorithms, which ensure the imperative translational, rotational and permutational invariances of the potential energy surface (PES). Only for some applications system-specific approximate solutions could be derived when neglecting less important degrees of freedom of the system [56–58]. In parallel to these efforts in the development of early neural network-based MLPs, in pioneering work Braams and Bowman [35, 59] introduced permutation invariant polynomials (PIP), which are closely related and enable the construction of very accurate PESs by linear regression based on symmetrized polynomials as basis functions. While PIPs do not employ traditional machine learning algorithms like neural networks, they show a similar flexibility and include all invariances exactly, which has been

a frustrating challenge for early MLPs employing non-linear models. Still, PIPs share with early MLPs the restriction to small systems with a very limited number of degrees of freedom. Over the years, PIPs have enabled the construction of very accurate potentials and have been applied successfully, *e.g.*, to vibrations and reaction dynamics of small molecules in vacuum as well as a variety of water clusters [35].

MLPs have become generally applicable to high-dimensional systems containing thousands of atoms in 2007, when Behler and Parrinello introduced high-dimensional neural network potentials (HDNNP) [60–63]. The key step, which paved the way to study condensed systems like liquid water by MLPs, is the construction of the potential energy E as a sum of environment-dependent local atomic energies E_i ,

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{atom}}} E_i, \quad (1)$$

where N_{atom} is the total number of atoms in the system. This general form of the total energy expression is shared by HDNNPs and many other second-generation MLPs proposed in the following years.

The energetically relevant local environment determining the E_i is defined by a cutoff radius R_c such that all interactions beyond this radius, which is typically chosen between 5 and 10 Å, are not explicitly included. While the ansatz of Eq. 1 has been used in many empirical potentials for a long time, the introduction of second-generation MLPs has only become possible by the development of many-body descriptors with full translational, rotational and permutational invariance. In case of HDNNPs atom-centered symmetry functions (ACSF) [64] are most frequently used for this purpose, but nowadays a wide range of alternative descriptors is available and employed in different types of MLPs [65–68]. All these descriptors represent structural fingerprints of the local atomic environments and serve as input for the machine learning algorithms, which then construct the functional relation between the atomic environments and the atomic energies.

In case of HDNNPs, which are often used for simulations of water and aqueous systems, there is one feed-forward NN to be parameterized per element, which is then evaluated as many times as atoms of the respective element are present in the system. Closely related is ANI, which is a HDNNP with modified angular ACSFs [69] aiming for transferability across a wide range of organic molecules. Another NN-based MLP that is very frequently used for simulations of water is Deep Potential Molecular Dynamics (DeePMD) [70–72], which employs a local atomic coordinate system and descriptors in this reference frame as input for the atomic NNs. Many other second-generation MLPs containing NNs have been proposed [73, 74], and in recent years also NN potentials

learning descriptors as part of the training process employing message passing [75] have been put forward [76–82]. Beyond neural networks, Gaussian approximation potentials (GAP) [83] combined with the SOAP descriptor [84] are among the most frequently used MLPs, with a few applications to aqueous systems reported to date. Many other second-generation MLPs are available in the literature which can be expected to be used for systems containing water in the future [68, 85, 86].

An obvious limitation of second-generation MLPs is the truncation of the atomic interactions at the cutoff radius. However, in many aqueous systems, long-range electrostatic interactions play an important role [87]. These are explicitly considered in third-generation MLPs, which include electrostatic interactions employing environment-dependent charges represented by machine learning models. Already in 2007, Popelier and coworkers have shown that it is possible to construct electrostatic multipoles using neural networks [88] and Gaussian processes [89] to improve the description of electrostatics in classical force fields, and also applications to water clusters have been reported [90].

In 2011, HDNNPs of the third-generation have been proposed by introducing a second set of atomic neural networks providing atomic partial charges trained to DFT reference data [91, 92]. From these charges the electrostatic energy can be computed and combined with the short-range expression of Eq. 1 to yield the total energy of the system. By training the short-range part to represent only the energy component not covered by electrostatics, double counting of energy contributions can be avoided. Further MLPs including long-range electrostatics are, e.g., the HDNNP TensorMol [93], the message passing network PhysNet [94], and many others [95–99]. Nowadays, the machine learning representation of atomic partial charges and electrostatic multipoles is a very active field of research opening many routes to the construction of third-generation MLPs.

A remaining limitation of third-generation MLPs is the locality of the atomic charges, which does not allow to describe systems exhibiting long-range charge transfer and other non-local dependencies between the geometric and the electronic structure [52]. These phenomena can be considered in fourth-generation MLPs. The first MLP of this generation has been the charge equilibration neural network technique (CENT) proposed by Goedecker and coworkers in 2015 [100]. Since the introduction of CENT, which employs a global charge equilibration step [101] and is intended for applications to ionic materials, several other fourth-generation MLPs have emerged, like Becke population neural networks (BpopNN) [102], fourth-generation HDNNPs (4G-HDNNP) [103], and charge recursive NNs (QRNN) [104]. To date, fourth-generation MLPs have not been extensively applied to water, but offer new interesting possibilities for studies of complex systems.

A key aspect in the training of MLPs [54] is the construction of suitable data sets covering the structures that are visited in the intended simulations, as MLPs often show a strongly reduced accuracy when extrapolating beyond the known part of configuration space. The size and composition of these data sets depend on the systems of interest, but due to the high flexibility of MLPs often energies and forces of 10,000 or more electronic structure calculations are required for training reliable potentials. For a systematic and unbiased determination of these structures, often various forms of active learning are employed [105–108].

APPLICATIONS TO AQUEOUS SYSTEMS

Neutral and Protonated Water Clusters

Water clusters have received considerable attention already during the advent of MLPs as important benchmark systems. Even for small water clusters there is a large structural variety with many energetically close local minima, posing a significant challenge for potential development. At the same time, their moderate size allows to perform accurate high-level electronic structure reference calculations.

Early first-generation MLPs for water clusters include an MP2-based six-dimensional PES for the water dimer with frozen monomer geometries reported in 1997 that made use of a single feed-forward NN [109]. In 2006, a very accurate three-dimensional NN potential for the water monomer with an RMSE of only 1 cm⁻¹ (about 0.1 meV for the molecular potential energy) was published [110], and also a NN potential for the same systems focusing on the permutation invariance of the PES has been reported in 2012 [111]. From 2005 onwards, water clusters have also been investigated in great detail using permutation invariant polynomials reaching MP2 and coupled cluster accuracies [112–123].

To address larger water clusters, second-generation HDNNPs have been developed based on DFT data for a series of neutral clusters up to the decamer [124, 125] as well as for several protonated clusters [126]. HDNNPs have also been applied to very large clusters containing hundreds of molecules [127]. Moreover, nuclear quantum effects in neutral and protonated water clusters were studied in recent years using very accurate HDNNPs trained to coupled cluster data [105, 128–132].

Starting in 2009, NNs were employed using water clusters as test bed to find ways of improving the description of Coulomb interactions in classical force fields by learning environment-dependent electrostatic multipole moments [133]. A comparison of NNs and Gaussian process regression (GPR) for the representation of multipoles found these methods to be similar in terms of accuracy and costs [90], resulting in an extension of the work

to a water molecule embedded in a water decamer [134]. Finally, this approach has been developed further to the FFLUX water model and applied to larger water clusters [135]. In related work, GPR has been employed in a similar way to express charges in water molecules [96].

A first MLP of the third generation expressing the full energy, *i.e.*, electrostatics and short-range bonding, of the system by machine learning has been a third-generation HDNNP for the water dimer reported in 2012 [92], which includes electrostatic interactions based on environment-dependent atomic partial charges expressed by a second set of atomic NNs. Another example in which electrostatics, as well as van der Waals interactions, were implemented on top of a short-range HDNNP for water clusters is TensorMol published in 2018 [93]. Moreover, small clusters have been used as benchmark for the inclusion of long-range interactions in DeePMD [98].

Finally, machine learning was used to learn tensorial properties using water clusters as benchmark [136, 137], and also the effect of noise on training HDNNPs for possible future applications on quantum computers has been tested for this system [138]. Beyond NNs and GPR, also Supports Vector Regression (SVR) has been explored for water clusters [139]. Although not directly used in the development of a high-dimensional PESs, the SVR method as well as Random Forest and Gaussian regression have also been used in specific applications like the prediction of the electron correlation energy in the water monomer and dimer [140]. Beyond atomistic potentials, machine learning methods have also been used in various forms in combination with electronic structure concepts and methods like CCSD(T) and variational quantum Monte Carlo calculations with benchmarks for monomers and small clusters [141–147].

Bulk Water and Ice

Of all aqueous systems, the construction of MLPs for bulk liquid water has received most attention due to its crucial importance as solvent for a wide range of (bio)chemical reactions, but also because of its remarkable properties making water one of the most challenging benchmarks for the construction of interatomic potentials for molecular systems.

Due to the limited dimensionality that could be dealt with at that time, the first application of machine learning for the simulation of pure liquid water in 2002 [148] aimed for the inclusion of polarization in the TIP4P water model [149]. For this purpose a feed-forward neural network was used to represent the many-body interactions in dimers of rigid water molecules. This water model, named T4NN, was trained with MP2 reference data and was then used in Monte Carlo simulations to determine a range of properties of water such as its density, heat capacity and radial distribution functions. Overall,

the agreement of many properties with experiment at standard conditions could be significantly improved with respect to the underlying TIP4P model while the transferability to different temperatures posed a challenge.

In 2013, GAPs were used to enhance the accuracy of DFT-based *ab initio* MD simulations by introducing one- and two-body corrections trained on data of water monomers and dimers at the CCSD(T) level [150]. Their application to water clusters and MD simulations of liquid water showed an improved overall potential energy surface, but additional corrections beyond two-body terms were necessary for further improvements, as also demonstrated by comparisons to quantum Monte Carlo data [151].

The first full-dimensional MLP for bulk liquid water and ice, which did not rely on a force-field or a DFT baseline potential, was reported in 2016 [152]. In this work, a series of HDNNPs were trained using DFT reference data obtained for different GGA functionals, with and without dispersion corrections. This allowed, for the first time, to benchmark the quality of common DFT functionals in the description of computationally demanding properties of water such as the density anomaly, the melting temperature, the viscosity and the dielectric constant. The calculation of such quantities requires extensive simulations of large systems, which are prohibitively expensive using *ab initio* MD directly, but become affordable with HDNNPs. In this work, particular attention was devoted to study the effect of van der Waals interactions, which were shown to govern the flexibility of the hydrogen bond network and, hence, play a crucial role in determining the properties of water and ice. In fact, if van der Waals forces are neglected, the density maximum of water disappears and ice becomes denser than liquid water. In follow-up work, HDNNPs based on BLYP-D3 and RPBE-D3 data were used to study the density anomaly of water at negative pressures (for both functionals) [153] and the kinetics of the ice-water interface (only for RPBE-D3) [154].

Shortly after the first full-dimensional MLP for water, a HDNNP trained with B3LYP+D3 data was used in conjunction with path integral MD simulations to study nuclear quantum effects (NQE) of liquid water close to the triple point [155]. Since then, several other studies of nuclear quantum fluctuations in bulk liquid water and ice have followed [156–159], including a thermodynamic stability analysis of liquid water as well as hexagonal and cubic ice employing hybrid DFT data [160], and, more recently, a study of NQEs of liquid water based on the random phase approximation [161].

The past few years have witnessed a significant expansion in the use of MLPs for bulk water and ice. This growth encompasses many applications but also the development of methods, tools and extensive benchmarking. For instance, vibrational spectroscopy features of liquid water were extensively studied over the

full frequency spectrum taking into account the effect of temperature and of overcoordinated hydrogen-bond environments employing a HDNNP based on revPBE-D3 [162, 163]. Embedded atom neural networks (EANN) have been used to represent tensorial properties in water describing vibrational features with the revPBE0-D3 functional [164]. Moreover, using water as a test example, DeePMD has been introduced in 2018 [71], which, alongside HDNNPs, emerged as one of the principal methods for modeling water using MLPs. DeePMD has also been coupled with empirical force fields [165], and employed to develop coarse grained water models [166]. Some applications of DeePMD include the analysis of hydrogen bond dynamics in supercritical water [167], the comparison of light and heavy water to assess isotope effects [168, 169], and the calculation of vibrational densities of states [170].

Crucial for the computation of vibrational features is the ability to determine the electronic polarizability tensor. In recent work, DeePMD was combined with an additional deep neural network to learn the environmental dependence of the polarizability tensor [171]. As demonstrated using the SCAN functional as reference, this approach yields accurate Raman spectra of liquid water. Furthermore, DeePMD has been integrated with a deep neural network trained to predict Wannier centers based on local environments. This approach allowed to compute infrared spectra [172, 173] and to determine the temperature dependence of the dielectric constant [174]. The methods can be also extended to account for quadrupole moments [175]. Recently, the description of tensorial properties like the polarizability tensor has been fitted to MD simulations a posteriori using equivariant neural networks to describe infrared spectra [176]. Moreover, a combination of HDNNP and GPR has allowed to model the hyper-Raman spectra of water, which helped to understand the differences in the OH stretch mode between infrared and Raman spectra [177].

The accuracy and computational efficiency of MLPs has made it possible to determine accurately thermodynamic properties of water including its phase diagram. For instance, the thermodynamic properties of water have been investigated with a DeePMD based on SCAN [178, 179] and with a HDNNP based on revPBE0-D3 [160, 180]. The phase behavior of water under the extreme conditions expected in a planetary environment was also studied employing a HDNNP [181]. Other aspects addressed with MLPs include the study of heat transport [182, 183] and the viscosity [184]. More recently, the thermodynamics of water has been investigated with a neuroevolution potential [185].

Studying the mechanism and kinetics of phase transitions is computationally very demanding and thus completely out of reach for *ab initio* simulations. MLPs, however, can be used to simulate systems of millions of water molecules with *ab initio* accuracy [186], such that the simulation of phase transitions is now possi-

ble. One example is a recent investigation of the homogeneous nucleation of ice in supercooled water studied using DeePMD, in combination with the seeding methods [187, 188], in a system of hundreds of thousands of water molecules [189]. These calculations yielded nucleation rates consistent with experimental measurements. Very recently, advanced sampling techniques covering 36 μ s of total simulation time have been used to probe the atomic structure of the critical nucleus [190]. Also the liquid-liquid transition in supercooled water has been investigated. An initial attempt using a DeePMD based on the SCAN functional found indications of this transition through anomalies in thermodynamic response functions [191]. Two years later, the existence of this transition was conclusively demonstrated [192] and its relation with the melting curves of ice polymorphs has been investigated [193]. Finally, building on previous works, the transition between ice Ih and its proton-ordered counterpart ice XI, mediated by ionic defects, has been studied based on the DeePMD model [194].

Since modern MLPs can capture reactions, important processes such as proton transfer and autoionization are accessible. In this regard, HDNNPs have allowed to describe the transport of hydronium and hydroxide ions including nuclear quantum effects [195] and the free energetics and mechanics of water dissociation [196], allowing to compute the equilibrium pK_w of water [197].

The application of MLPs has been facilitated by careful benchmarking and transferability studies and the development of new ML-based methods and workflows. Some of these ML methods have been used beyond the fitting of potential energy surfaces as is the case for ML classifiers of phases [198–200] and dynamical processes [200]. One particularly interesting finding regarding the transferability of MLPs is that liquid structures already contain the relevant information required to reproduce ice phases [201], including even ice-water interfaces. In particular, this was observed in studies of homogeneous nucleation, in which an empirical potential was benchmarked against its MLP representation containing only liquid structures [202]. The performance of different density functionals (PBE, SCAN, vdW-cx, and optB88-vdW) for modeling water and ice has been compared [203]. Moreover, HDNNP and GPR trained on the same dataset have been shown to be equivalent when compared over different thermodynamic properties of liquid water although HDNNPs seem to be more demanding in terms of the required training data [204] but are computationally more efficient. In fact, the role of the training data has been the focus in other works [205]. Furthermore, graph neural networks (GNN), which do not require predefined structural descriptors, have been applied to accelerate molecular dynamics simulations [206]. The selection of descriptors has also been automatized for HDNNPs [207, 208], whereas GPR-based potentials have been employed in on-the-fly learning workflows [204, 209].

Empirical potentials have also benefited from the development of MLPs. Coarse-grained MLPs emerged [166, 210–214], including an approach based on equivariant neural networks [215], and empirical force fields were parameterized using ML algorithms [216–219]. Moreover, the addition of polarization to empirical force fields has been revisited, including charge transfer [220]. DeePMD has been used to fit an accurate but costly many-body potential [221] reducing its computational cost by one order of magnitude [222]. Moreover, a GNN has been applied to estimate Bayesian uncertainty in molecular dynamics simulations based on an empirical potential [223].

Further progress has come again from water clusters. HDNNPs, PIP-based potentials and GAPs have been shown to be equivalent in representing many-body interactions in water clusters [224], which can be employed in the construction of improved water potentials for bulk water. In fact, recent advances suggest that reference data obtained exclusively for water clusters could be sufficient to train accurate MLPs even for the bulk liquid phase [225–229], including results from Gaussian-moment neural networks (GMNN) [229]. Recently, even gold-standard CCSD(T)-level accuracy for bulk water potentials has been reached by training to large clusters or periodic structures [122, 230, 231].

An important current topic of research is the inclusion of long-range interactions [87], which are not explicitly considered in many MLPs. This problem has been addressed by introducing non-local representations of the system remapped as local and equivariant feature vectors, capturing non-local and non-additive effects [232]. Another approach to treat this issue is to learn the long-range response with a self-consistent field neural network, which has been shown to produce correct long-range polarization correlations in liquid water, as well as the correct response of liquid water to external electrostatic fields [233, 234].

Architectures like equivariant neural networks have been combined with empirical electrostatics and dispersion [235]. Such models are highly accurate in learning reference datasets [80, 81, 236–238], but their applicability has still to be tested in long simulations and large systems, and still some instability issues need to be solved [239].

Liquid/Vapor Interface

Neural network potentials have also been used to investigate the structure, thermodynamics and spectroscopic properties of the liquid/vapor interface. As the local environments close to the interface are highly anisotropic and thus very different from the bulk, it is important that the training set explicitly includes data for interface configurations [240]. The structure of such configurations has been analyzed in detail using SOAP descriptors and

local order parameters [241]. Investigating the structure of the interface reveals the prevalence of orientations with the dipole moment roughly parallel to the surface with one OH bond pointing out of it [240], corroborating insights gained from sum frequency generation (SFG) measurements [242]. By using the surface-sensitive velocity autocorrelation function [243], such SFG spectra of the liquid/vapor interface were calculated from path integral molecular dynamics based on a HDNNP trained at the revPBE0+D3 level [244]. Recently, SFG spectra have been computed fully from first principles using a HDNNP combined with GPR [245].

In another study, it was found that a DeePMD potential relying only on local atomic energies can be applied to the liquid/vapor interface [246]. However, the explicit inclusion of long-range interactions was shown to be beneficial, confirming results of previous studies carried out for empirical potentials [247]. The effect of long-range interactions was tested for a water molecule moving away from the liquid/vapor interface using an extension of DeePMD including long-range electrostatics [98]. The case of curved liquid/vapor interfaces has been addressed as well. For instance, DeePMD has been employed to investigate the formation of bubbles in metastable water [248]. Furthermore, it was shown that the free energy of water dissociation at the liquid/vapor interface of droplets and films deviates from the bulk, leading to an enrichment of hydronium cations at the interface and a depletion of hydroxide anions [249].

Electrolyte Solutions

Beyond pure water, MLPs have been used in numerous simulations of electrolyte solutions [250]. Already in 1998, a feed-forward neural network was employed to represent the three-body interaction energies in $\text{H}_2\text{O}-\text{Al}_3^+-\text{H}_2\text{O}$ clusters with the aim to improve the force field description of Al_3^+ ions dissolved in bulk water [56]. This work represents an important milestone in the incorporation of permutation symmetry in structural descriptors. Later, HDNNPs have enabled the construction of full-dimensional DFT-quality PESs for aqueous NaOH solutions over the entire solubility range [251]. In this work, it has been found that as the NaOH concentration increases, the primary mechanism for proton transfer shifts from being acceptor-driven, influenced by the pre-solvation of hydroxide ions, to donor-driven, controlled by the pre-solvation of water molecules. Additionally, with increasing concentration, octahedral coordination geometries become less favored, in contrast to trigonal prism geometries [252]. A novel water exchange mechanism has been identified around $\text{Na}^+(\text{aq})$ ions in basic (high pH) solutions [253]. Studies comparing classical and ring-polymer molecular dynamics based on the HDNNP revealed that nuclear quantum ef-

fects significantly reduce proton transfer barriers, thus increasing proton transfer rates. This leads to an enhanced diffusion coefficient, especially for OH^- , and a shorter mean residence time of molecules in the first hydration shell around Na^+ at high NaOH concentrations [254]. Moreover, elevated temperatures in concentrated NaOH solutions amplify both the contributions of proton transfer to ionic conductivity and deviations from the Nernst–Einstein relation [255]. Further applications of HDNNPs include investigations of fluoride and sulfate ions in solution [108]. Employing similar methodologies and training on revPBE+D3 data, the dissolution mechanisms of NaCl in water have also been addressed [256]. Another example is the use of HDNNPs to study zinc ion hydration in water [257], with molecular dynamics simulations matching both the experimentally observed zinc-water radial distribution function and the X-ray absorption near edge structure spectrum. A genetic algorithm has also been utilized to study hydrated Zinc(II) ion clusters [258]. In addition, microhydrated sodium ions with a few water molecules have been studied for both the potential energy and the dipole moment employing PIPs [259].

DeePMD potentials have been used to study sodium chloride, potassium chloride, and sodium bromide at various concentrations [260]. These studies revealed that the structural changes due to the ions are confined to the immediate vicinity of the ions, where they disrupt the network of hydrogen bonds. Beyond these regions, the distribution of oxygen atoms relative to one another remains largely unchanged compared to pure water. In a related study, the dielectric permittivity of sodium chloride solutions has also been investigated [261]. Using DeePMD potentials, the uptake of N_2O_5 into aqueous aerosols has been examined, a process that is challenging to study experimentally due to the fast reaction kinetics of N_2O_5 [262]. Furthermore, the diffusivity of water in aqueous cesium iodide and sodium chloride solutions has been examined using a DeePMD framework trained on DFT data using the revPBE-D3 functional [263]. Such simulations addressing the characteristic behavior of different ions are not readily accessible through traditional force field-based molecular dynamics simulations due to less ion-specific description of ion-water interactions.

Water-Solid Interfaces

Solid-liquid interfaces are of high interest for catalysis and electrochemistry. Due to the very different bonding in liquid water and in crystalline surfaces, such as metals or oxides, constructing unified atomistic potentials that can describe all subsystems of solid-liquid interfaces with balanced high accuracy presents a substantial challenge for empirical potentials. Moreover, in many cases, water is not only in contact with the surface but can also dis-

sociate and recombine at a much higher rate than in the bulk liquid. Consequently, the use of reactive potentials, which can describe the making and breaking of bonds, is mandatory. MLPs are ideally suited for this purpose.

In 2014, an HDNNP for a thin water layer on top of 55-atom CuAu alloy clusters with varying stoichiometries and a slab model were reported to study the effect of water on the stability of different interface compositions by Monte Carlo simulations [264]. While this work exhibited a still rather large error of about 12 meV/atom, the accuracy of HDNNPs for solid-liquid interfaces has significantly improved in the following years. For instance, in studies of water at various surfaces of copper [265, 266] and zinc oxide [267, 268] energy RMSEs of less than 1 meV/atom could be reached. Detailed convergence tests with respect to the required system size were carried out [265], showing that the diameter of the liquid phase between the slab surfaces needed to decouple the two surfaces by bulk-like water is at least about 35-40 Å [265]. Such a size is beyond reach in *ab initio* molecular dynamics but necessary to ensure that the central water molecules have bulk-like environments in their local vicinity. This consideration is crucial to ensure that these molecules do not experience any significant influence from the altered water structure near the interfaces or from the surfaces directly.

While it has been found using HDNNPs that water does not spontaneously react with defect-free surfaces of certain metals, such as copper, on nanosecond time scales [265], fast dissociation and recombination processes leading to the formation of surface hydroxides have been observed on zinc oxide surfaces [267, 268]. These processes are often governed by the surrounding hydrogen bond networks, significantly influencing the free energy barriers of proton transfer processes [267]. This phenomenon has been confirmed for water at TiO_2 surfaces using DeePMD potentials [269, 270], which have also been employed to explore the impact of slab thickness [271]. Furthermore, the use of HDNNPs for computing anharmonic frequencies has been suggested as a method to elucidate the role of hydrogen bonds in surface processes [272].

Depending on the specific surface geometry, proton transfer events can lead to various topologies of proton transport networks along the surface, which can be either one-dimensional or two-dimensional. This has been demonstrated for several surfaces of zinc oxide [273] and the lithium intercalation compound LiMn_2O_4 [274] using HDNNPs. Surface defects, often stabilized by solvation compared to the vacuum interface, have also been a subject of study. The mobility of adatoms has been found to significantly vary across different low-index surfaces of copper [266]. Investigations into the defective $\text{Zr}_7\text{O}_8\text{N}_4/\text{H}_2\text{O}$ and pristine $\text{ZrO}_2/\text{H}_2\text{O}$ interfaces using neural network potentials [275] revealed a bilayer water structure for $\text{Zr}_7\text{O}_8\text{N}_4$ and a monolayer structure for

ZrO₂. Oxygen vacancies on the Zr₇O₈N₄ surface have been suggested as active sites for the oxygen reduction reaction. Furthermore, neural networks have been used to identify different oxidation states of transition metal ions at oxide-water interfaces [274], which enables the characterization of electronic structures relevant for catalytic applications.

Due to its importance in catalysis, the TiO₂-water interface has so far been the most intensely studied interface using MLPs [108, 269–271, 276–279]. Investigations into the water coverage on the anatase (101) TiO₂ surface using the DeePMD potential [276] have shown that higher water coverage prompts significant reorganization of the water monolayer at O_{2c} sites, leading to the formation of a two-dimensional hydrogen bond network with closely linked pairs of water molecules on neighboring TiO_{5c} and O_{2c} sites. Other DeePMD-based studies have examined the impact of water dissociation on thermal transport at the TiO₂-water interface [277]. While previous research on TiO₂-water interfaces mainly focused on the anatase (101) and rutile (110) TiO₂ surfaces, recent MLP-based studies [278] have explored seven different TiO₂ surfaces using three distinct functionals: SCAN, PBE, and optB88-vdW. These studies found that water dissociation is more likely on the anatase (100), anatase (110), rutile (001), and rutile (011) surfaces, while molecular adsorption is the primary process on the anatase (101) and rutile (100) surfaces. Moreover, simulations for rutile (110) showed that the slab thickness significantly influences the results, with thicker slabs favoring molecular adsorption. DeePMD has also been used to study amorphous TiO₂ (a-TiO₂) to compare its behavior with well-studied crystalline TiO₂ at aqueous interfaces [279]. These studies demonstrated that water molecules on the a-TiO₂ surface do not exhibit the distinct layering typical of the aqueous interface of crystalline TiO₂. This difference results in an approximately tenfold increase in water diffusion speed at the interface.

Other cases of employing MLPs to study solid-water interfaces include the use of HDNNPs for the Pt(111)-water interface to investigate the interaction between water and hydroxylated metal surfaces [280, 281], and for the hematite-water interface [282], revealing solvation dynamics at various time scales. DeePMD has been utilized for studying the TiS₂/water interface [283] to examine the influence of TiS₂ surface termination on the structure of interfacial water. Moreover, DeePMD has been applied to the IrO₂-water interface, exploring the hydration structure, proton transfer mechanisms, and acid-base characteristics [284], as well as to the GaP(110)-water interface [285], which has been shown to require about 12 ns to reach equilibrium, a duration not achievable with traditional AIMD simulations. DeePMD has also been used for the construction of a potential aimed at studying ice nucleation at the microcline feldspar surface using the SCAN functional [286], and for investigating

the impact of water dissociation on thermal transport at the Cu-water interface [287]. Apart from HDNNPs and DeePMD, an equivariant graph neural network has been employed to study the oxygen reduction reaction at the Au(100)-water interface [288], and on-the-fly learning kernel-based regression has been applied to investigate water adsorption on MgO and Fe₃O₄ surfaces, including surface reconstructions [289].

Confined water, which exhibits properties notably differing from bulk water, has also been studied using MLPs. Some examples include HDNNPs for water confined between two-dimensional boron nitride sheets [290] and MoS₂ [108], and water between graphite layers using DeePMD [291, 292] and committees of HDNNPs [293]. Furthermore, MD simulations have been used to investigate water in single-walled carbon and boron nitride nanotubes [108, 294], finding a fivefold reduction in friction in carbon tubes compared to boron nitride, attributed to strong hydrogen-nitrogen interactions [294]. Ion concentration profiles under nanoconfinement [295] have also been studied using neural network potentials, focusing on the effects of channel widths, ion molarity, and ion types.

Other Systems

Apart from studies of pure water, electrolytes and solid-liquid interfaces, which have been in the focus of MLP-based atomistic simulations for several years, the use of MLPs for aqueous systems has increasingly diversified and now covers essentially all fields of simulations involving water. An exhaustive coverage of the related literature is beyond the scope of this Perspective, and in this section we just point the interested readers to several typical applications of MLPs in these rapidly growing fields.

A prominent use of atomistic simulations is to study chemical reactions of organic molecules in solution. Examples for the application of MLPs are corrections to QM/MM simulations of S_N2 reactions in water [296], the solvation of protein fragments [94], the decomposition of urea in water [297], the computation of free energy profiles of reactions of organic molecules [298], and enzyme reactions [299]. Further studies include the quantum dynamics of an electron solvated in water [300] and the excited state of CH₃NNCH₃ surrounded by several water molecules [301].

Still, the all-atom description of chemical processes in solution can be demanding and consequently simplified MLPs have been proposed as well. For example, the solvated alanine dipeptide [302, 303] and the folding/unfolding of chignolin [302, 304] have been studied using the coarse-grained CGnet potential. Moreover, a DeepPot-SE model has been used to describe molecules under the influence of an implicit solvent [305].

Additional applications of MLPs for aqueous systems

include the study of diffusion in hydrogen hydrates [306], the determination of vibrational frequency shifts in formic acid C=O stretching and C=N stretching of MeCN in water [307], retinoic acid in water [308], graph-convolutional neural networks for benchmarking sets of solutes and chemical reactions in water [309], hydration dynamics and IR spectroscopy of 4-fluorophenol [310], zinc protein studies [311], conformational shifts of stacked heteroaromatics [312], and solvation free energy prediction of organic molecules in redox flow batteries [313].

DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

In recent years, MLPs have reached a high level of maturity and currently a transition from proof-of-concept and benchmark studies to practical simulations of a wide range of complex systems is taking place. Therefore, it can be anticipated that MLPs will allow to overcome the limitations of conventional methods like empirical potentials in terms of accuracy and *ab initio* molecular dynamics in terms of efficiency paving the way to simulations of extended systems with unprecedented accuracy. MLPs have demonstrated this capability already for a broad spectrum of aqueous systems, ranging from neutral and protonated water clusters to bulk liquid water and ice, liquid/vapor interfaces and from electrolyte solutions to complex solid-water interfaces (see Fig. 1). In all these studies, MLPs have enabled simulations with first principles accuracy that previously have been prohibitively demanding, as evidenced by a rapidly growing number of publications in the field shown in Fig. 2.

Over the past two decades, progress in MLPs for aqueous systems has focused on different frontiers. While right from the start the highly flexible functional form of ML algorithms has enabled a numerically very accurate representation of the electronic structure reference data, a severe challenge in the early years has been the very limited number of degrees of freedom that could be considered. Only the development of modern descriptors for the atomic environments allowed to extend MLPs to condensed systems like liquid water with all their associated degrees of freedom. Recently, message passing neural networks [75] have become a promising alternative to the use of predefined descriptors opening many new exciting possibilities. Another frontier that has increasingly received attention in recent years is the incorporation of physical concepts into hitherto purely mathematical machine learning potentials, with many developments specifically aiming for improved descriptions of long-range electrostatic interactions, van der Waals forces, long-range charge transfer [52], and electron densities [314]. This inclusion of physically meaningful terms, not only in the total energy expression but also in form of novel descriptors [315, 316], will further

increase the accuracy and transferability of the potentials.

To effectively simulate chemical processes in the aqueous phase, the underlying potential function must rely on accurate electronic structure calculations, since the chosen reference method represents a natural limit for the accuracy of MLPs. While coupled cluster accuracy has already been achieved in MLPs for liquid water [122, 230, 231], which would have been unthinkable with conventional empirical potentials, reaching this gold-standard for more complex systems like solid-liquid interfaces is very challenging. Therefore, DFT will likely remain the dominant method for the reference electronic structure calculations of many systems in the foreseeable future, in particular for those systems involving solids. Although the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) has been the most commonly employed functional in the study of aqueous systems as they offer a good compromise between computational cost and accuracy, more and more powerful computing resources increasingly enable the use of more advanced and computationally expensive functionals, such as meta-GGA (particularly SCAN) and hybrid functionals, in the investigation of several aqueous systems, and even this level of accuracy has remained essentially inaccessible by on-the-fly *ab initio* MD to date. Consequently, complex aqueous systems can now be investigated with a previously unattainable level of accuracy enabling predictive simulations. Moreover, MLPs can be employed to evaluate the accuracy of the underlying level of theory with respect to experimental values in a broad range of scenarios. This extends beyond the traditional comparison at standard temperature and pressure, allowing for a comprehensive evaluation that may provide insightful guidance for the development of theoretical methods.

The functional flexibility is a key property of MLPs, but it is a double-edged sword: on the positive side, this flexibility enables the accurate approximation of the PES based on the reference data. On the negative side, however, such flexibility severely limits the extrapolation capabilities of MLPs to chemical environments not adequately sampled during the training process. In fact, extrapolation to unfamiliar environments can lead to unphysical structures and completely wrong simulation results. Therefore, the construction and validation of MLPs have to be done with great care to ensure that all relevant local environments are included in the training set. Moreover, it is much more challenging than in case of simpler empirical potential to provide "boxed" MLPs for general usage, since not only the underlying parameters but also information about the range of validity is crucial information for successful applications. For instance, when studying solid-water interfaces, it becomes necessary to train the MLP not only on the bulk material and bulk water separately but also on systems that include all relevant interface configurations. Thus, increasing the

complexity of the system also increases the number of local environments that must be included in the training data. Although AIMD simulations are sometimes used to generate initial training sets, they are usually insufficient since they often fail to capture the less frequently visited structures. Fortunately, this challenge has been largely overcome in recent years by incorporating active learning for the generation of the reference data.

While in this Perspective we have focused on the construction and application of accurate and efficient interatomic potentials, machine learning approaches can be useful in several other ways for the atomistic simulation of aqueous systems, and, more generally, of materials and biomolecular systems [317]. For instance, neural networks have been employed to classify local structures in liquid water and various forms of ice [318, 319]. The accurate identification of molecular structures with high spatial resolution is important, for instance, in the study of crystallization, melting, crystal growth and the formation and migration of defect. Another challenge in molecular simulations lies in reducing or even completely removing correlations in the statistical sampling of configuration space as it occurs in sequential sampling methods such as molecular dynamics and Markov Chain Monte Carlo simulations. Here, normalizing flows [320, 321] or other generative methods can play an important role for sampling the equilibrium distribution and also for creating new stable crystal structures [322]. Moreover, machine learning approaches have been suggested as a way to discover reaction coordinates and enhance the sampling of rare transitions occurring in complex molecular systems [323, 324]. There is little doubt that in the years to come further new ML and AI tools will be applied to the computational investigation of matter at the atomistic level, creating new opportunities for studying complex aqueous systems

CONCLUSIONS

Machine learning and, more generally, artificial intelligence is currently revolutionizing our way to do science and is providing new opportunities not achievable with traditional approaches. In the field of computational materials science, the advent of accurate, flexible and efficient MLPs has dramatically increased the time and length scale accessible by atomistic simulations of materials with *ab initio* accuracy. In this Perspective, we have provided an overview of the key concepts of such machine learned potentials with a focus on their application to water and aqueous systems. The broad spectrum of systems successfully explored with these techniques, including water clusters, bulk liquid water and ice, the liquid/vapor interface, electrolyte solutions, and solid-liquid interfaces, underscores the flexibility, efficiency and the high level of maturity they have reached since recent




FIG. 2. Overview of the number of articles published per year for different types of MLPs applied to water and aqueous systems as discussed in this Perspective. These are, in order of first use for these systems, neural network potentials (NNP) based on simple feed-forward neural networks, Gaussian process regression (GPR), high-dimensional neural network potentials (HDNNP), deep potential molecular dynamics (DeePMD), support vector regression (SVR), random forest (RF), embedded atom neural networks (EANN), graph neural networks (GNN), Gaussian-moment neural networks (GMNN), comprehensive genetic algorithm (CGA), and neuroevolution potentials (NEP).

years.

Since machine learned potentials accurately reproduce the underlying reference data obtained with electronic structure methods but in applications require a much lower computational effort, they now make it possible to compute complex materials properties such as phase diagrams. In this way, they do not only allow to gain new insights into a variety of systems, but they also provide a way to truly test the theoretical description underlying the reference data and to reveal their possible limitations. This facilitates the generation of high quality reference data in the future as a basis for truly predictive ML-based computer simulations of complex materials.

In summary, modern MLPs have created new opportunities for the investigation aqueous systems that would have been unimaginable with conventional methods for the foreseeable future. Carefully trained and validated MLPs can be employed to study complex reactive aqueous systems accurately across large time and length scales, without imposing *ad hoc* empirical constraints. While predicting the future of this rapidly evolving field is challenging, the remarkable progress made to date suggests that we can expect exciting new developments and some surprising breakthroughs in the years to come.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

JB and AO are grateful for funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) in TRR/CRC 247 (A10, project-ID 388390466) and under Germany’s Excellence Strategy – EXC 2033 RESOLV (project-ID 390677874). CD and PMDH acknowledge funding from the Austrian Science Foundation FWF through the Projects Doctoral College Advanced Functional Materials (DOC 85-N) and the SFB TACO (F-81).

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Amir Omranpour: Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal); Visualization (equal)
Pablo Montero De Hijes: Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal); Visualization (equal)
Jörg Behler: Conceptualization (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal); Resources and Funding Acquisition (equal); Supervision (equal)
Christoph Dellago: Conceptualization (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review & editing (equal); Resources and Funding Acquisition (equal); Supervision (equal)

* All authors contributed equally.

† joerg.behler@rub.de

‡ christoph.dellago@univie.ac.at

- [1] A. Rahman and F. H. Stillinger, “Molecular dynamics study of liquid water,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3336–3359, 1971.
- [2] A. Luzar and D. Chandler, “Hydrogen-bond kinetics in liquid water,” *Nature*, vol. 379, no. 6560, pp. 55–57, 1996.
- [3] K. A. Dill, T. M. Truskett, V. Vlachy, and B. Hribar-Lee, “Modeling water, the hydrophobic effect, and ion solvation,” *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct.*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 173–199, 2005. PMID: 15869376.
- [4] O. Björneholm, M. H. Hansen, A. Hodgson, L.-M. Liu, D. T. Limmer, A. Michaelides, P. Pedevilla, J. Rossmisl, H. Shen, G. Tocci, E. Tyrode, M.-M. Walz, J. Werner, and H. Bluhm, “Water at interfaces,” *Chem. Rev.*, vol. 116, pp. 7698–7726, 07 2016.
- [5] V. Rozsa, D. Pan, F. Giberti, and G. Galli, “Ab initio spectroscopy and ionic conductivity of water under earth mantle conditions,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 115, no. 27, pp. 6952–6957, 2018.
- [6] C. Cavazzoni, G. L. Chiarotti, S. Scandolo, E. Tosatti, M. Bernasconi, and M. Parrinello, “Superionic and metallic states of water and ammonia at giant planet conditions,” *Science*, vol. 283, no. 5398, pp. 44–46, 1999.
- [7] P. Gallo, K. Amann-Winkel, C. A. Angell, M. A. Anisimov, F. Caupin, C. Chakravarty, E. Lascaris, T. Lorting, A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, J. Russo, J. A. Sellberg, H. E. Stanley, H. Tanaka, C. Vega, L. Xu, and L. G. M. Pettersson, “Water: A tale of two liquids,” *Chem. Rev.*, vol. 116, no. 13, pp. 7463–7500, 2016. PMID: 27380438.
- [8] P. G. Debenedetti, F. Sciortino, and G. H. Zerze, “Second critical point in two realistic models of water,” *Science*, vol. 369, no. 6501, pp. 289–292, 2020.
- [9] J. Barker and R. Watts, “Structure of water; a monte carlo calculation,” *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 144–145, 1969.
- [10] C. Vega and J. L. F. Abascal, “Simulating water with rigid non-polarizable models: a general perspective,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 13, pp. 19663–19688, 2011.
- [11] K. Laasonen, M. Sprik, M. Parrinello, and R. Car, ““ab initio” liquid water,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 99, no. 11, pp. 9080–9089, 1993.
- [12] J. S. Rowlinson, “The lattice energy of ice and the second virial coefficient of water vapour,” *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, vol. 47, pp. 120–129, 1951.
- [13] A. Ben-Naim and F. Stillinger, “Aspects of the statistical-mechanical theory of water,” in *Structure and transport processes in water and aqueous solutions* (R. A. Horne, ed.), Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1972.
- [14] F. H. Stillinger and A. Rahman, “Improved simulation of liquid water by molecular dynamics,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 1545–1557, 1974.
- [15] F. H. Stillinger, *Theory and Molecular Models for Water*, pp. 1–101. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 1975.
- [16] B. Guillot, “A reappraisal of what we have learnt during three decades of computer simulations on water,” *J. Mol. Liq.*, vol. 101, no. 1, pp. 219–260, 2002. Molecular Liquids. Water at the New Millenium.
- [17] C. Vega, J. L. F. Abascal, M. M. Conde, and J. L. Aragones, “What ice can teach us about water interactions: a critical comparison of the performance of different water models,” *Faraday Discuss.*, vol. 141, pp. 251–276, 2009.
- [18] A. V. Onufriev and S. Izadi, “Water models for biomolecular simulations,” *WIREs-Comput. Mol. Sci.*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. e1347, 2018.
- [19] G. A. Cisneros, K. T. Wikfeldt, L. Ojamäe, J. Lu, Y. Xu, H. Torabifard, A. P. Bartók, G. Csányi, V. Molinero, and F. Paesani, “Modeling molecular interactions in water: From pairwise to many-body potential energy functions,” *Chem. Rev.*, vol. 116, no. 13, pp. 7501–7528, 2016.
- [20] T. E. Gartner III, K. M. Hunter, E. Lambros, A. Caruso, M. Riera, G. R. Medders, A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, P. G. Debenedetti, and F. Paesani, “Anomalies and local structure of liquid water from boiling to the supercooled regime as predicted by the many-body mb-pol model,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 13, no. 16, pp. 3652–3658, 2022.
- [21] J. Abascal, E. Sanz, R. García Fernández, and C. Vega, “A potential model for the study of ices and amorphous water: Tip4p/ice,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 122, no. 23, 2005.
- [22] S. L. Bore, P. M. Piaggi, R. Car, and F. Paesani, “Phase diagram of the tip4p/ice water model by enhanced sam-

- pling simulations,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 157, no. 5, 2022.
- [23] P. Montero de Hijos, E. Sanz, L. Joly, C. Valeriani, and F. Caupin, “Viscosity and self-diffusion of supercooled and stretched water from molecular dynamics simulations,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 149, no. 9, 2018.
- [24] F. H. Stillinger and C. W. David, “Polarization model for water and its ionic dissociation products,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 1473–1484, 1978.
- [25] L. Ojamäe, I. Shavitt, and S. J. Singer, “Potential models for simulations of the solvated proton in water,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 109, no. 13, pp. 5547–5564, 1998.
- [26] M. Raju, S.-Y. Kim, A. C. T. van Duin, and K. A. Fichthorn, “Reaxff reactive force field study of the dissociation of water on titania surfaces,” *J. Phys. Chem. C*, vol. 117, p. 10558, 2013.
- [27] U. W. Schmitt and G. A. Voth, “Multistate empirical valence bond model for proton transport in water,” *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 102, pp. 5547–5551, 07 1998.
- [28] D. Marx, “Proton transfer 200 years after von grotthuss: Insights from ab initio simulations,” *ChemPhysChem*, vol. 7, pp. 1848–1870, 2006.
- [29] M. E. Tuckerman, K. Laasonen, M. Sprik, and M. Parrinello, “Ab initio simulations of water and water ions,” *J. Phys. Condens. Matter*, vol. 6, pp. A93–A100, jun 1994.
- [30] M. J. Gillan, D. Alfè, and A. Michaelides, “Perspective: How good is dft for water?,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 144, no. 13, p. 130901, 2016.
- [31] J. G. Brandenburg, A. Zen, D. Alfè, and A. Michaelides, “Interaction between water and carbon nanostructures: How good are current density functional approximations?,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 151, no. 16, p. 164702, 2019.
- [32] A. P. Gaiduk, F. Gygi, and G. Galli, “Density and compressibility of liquid water and ice from first-principles simulations with hybrid functionals,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 6, no. 15, pp. 2902–2908, 2015.
- [33] M. D. Ben, M. Schönherr, J. Hutter, and J. VandeVondele, “Bulk liquid water at ambient temperature and pressure from mp2 theory,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 4, p. 3753, 2013.
- [34] M. D. Ben, J. Hutter, and J. VandeVondele, “Probing the structural and dynamical properties of liquid water with models including non-local electron correlation,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 143, p. 054506, 2015.
- [35] B. J. Braams and J. M. Bowman, “Permutationally invariant potential energy surfaces in high dimensionality,” *Int. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, vol. 28, pp. 577–606, 2009.
- [36] G. R. Medders, V. Babin, and F. Paesani, “Development of a “first-principles” water potential with flexible monomers. iii. liquid phase properties,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 2906–2910, 2014.
- [37] E. Palos, S. Dasgupta, E. Lambros, and F. Paesani, “Data-driven many-body potentials from density functional theory for aqueous phase chemistry,” *Chem. Phys. Rev.*, vol. 4, p. 011301, 2023.
- [38] Q. Yu, C. Qu, P. L. Houston, A. Nandi, P. Pandey, R. Conte, and J. M. Bowman, “A status report on gold standard machine-learned potentials for water,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 14, pp. 8077–8087, 2023.
- [39] C. M. Handley and P. L. A. Popelier, “Potential energy surfaces fitted by artificial neural networks,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 114, pp. 3371–3383, 2010.
- [40] J. Behler, “Neural network potential-energy surfaces in chemistry: a tool for large-scale simulations,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 13, pp. 17930–17955, 2011.
- [41] J. Behler, “Perspective: Machine learning potentials for atomistic simulations,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 145, p. 170901, 2016.
- [42] O. T. Unke, S. Chmiela, H. E. Sauceda, M. Gastegger, I. Poltavsky, K. T. Schütt, A. Tkatchenko, and K.-R. Müller, “Machine learning force fields,” *Chem. Rev.*, vol. 121, no. 16, pp. 10142–10186, 2021. PMID: 33705118.
- [43] P. Friederich, F. Häse, J. Proppe, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, “Machine-learned potentials for next-generation matter simulations,” *Nat. Mater.*, vol. 20, pp. 750–761, 2021.
- [44] J. Behler and G. Csányi, “Machine learning potentials for extended systems - a perspective,” *Eur. Phys. J. B*, vol. 94, p. 142, 2021.
- [45] V. L. Deringer, M. A. Caro, and G. Csányi, “Machine learning interatomic potentials as emerging tools for materials science,” *Adv. Mater.*, vol. 31, p. 1902765, 2019.
- [46] P. O. Dral, “Quantum chemistry in the age of machine learning,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 11, pp. 2336–2347, 2020.
- [47] F. Noé, A. Tkatchenko, K.-R. Müller, and C. Clementi, “Machine learning for molecular simulation,” *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, vol. 71, pp. 361–390, 2020.
- [48] C. M. Handley and J. Behler, “Next generation interatomic potentials for condensed systems,” *Eur. Phys. J. B*, vol. 87, p. 152, 2014.
- [49] J. Behler, “Four generations of high-dimensional neural network potentials,” *Chem. Rev.*, vol. 121, no. 16, p. 10037–10072, 2021.
- [50] V. L. Deringer, A. P. Bartók, N. Bernstein, D. M. Wilkins, M. Ceriotti, and G. Csányi, “Gaussian process regression for materials and molecules,” *Chem. Rev.*, vol. 121, pp. 10073–10141, 2021.
- [51] E. Kocer, T. W. Ko, and J. Behler, “Neural network potentials: A concise overview of methods,” *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, vol. 73, pp. 163–186, 2022.
- [52] T. W. Ko, J. A. Finkler, S. Goedecker, and J. Behler, “General-purpose machine learning potentials capturing nonlocal charge transfer,” *Acc. Chem. Res.*, vol. 54, pp. 808–817, 2021.
- [53] S. Käser, L. I. Vazquez-Salazar, M. Meuwly, and K. Töpfer, “Neural network potentials for chemistry: concepts, applications and prospects,” *Digit. Discov.*, vol. 2, p. 28, 2023.
- [54] A. M. Tokita and J. Behler, “Tutorial: How to train a neural network potential,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 159, p. 121501, 2023.
- [55] T. B. Blank, S. D. Brown, A. W. Calhoun, and D. J. Doren, “Neural network models of potential energy surfaces,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 103, pp. 4129–4137, 1995.
- [56] H. Gassner, M. Probst, A. Lauenstein, and K. Hermanson, “Representation of intermolecular potential functions by neural networks,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 102, pp. 4596–4605, 1998.
- [57] S. Lorenz, A. Groß, and M. Scheffler, “Representing high-dimensional potential-energy surfaces for reactions at surfaces by neural networks,” *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 395, pp. 210–215, 2004.
- [58] J. Behler, S. Lorenz, and K. Reuter, “Representing molecule-surface interactions with symmetry-adapted

- neural networks,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 127, p. 014705, 2007.
- [59] A. Brown, B. J. Braams, K. Christoffel, Z. Jin, and J. M. Bowman, “Classical and quasiclassical spectral analysis of ch_5^+ using an ab initio potential energy surface,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 119, pp. 8790–8793, 2003.
- [60] J. Behler and M. Parrinello, “Generalized neural-network representation of high-dimensional potential-energy surfaces,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 98, p. 146401, 2007.
- [61] J. Behler, “First principles neural network potentials for reactive simulations of large molecular and condensed systems,” *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, vol. 56, p. 12828, 2017.
- [62] J. Behler, “Constructing high-dimensional neural network potentials: A tutorial review,” *Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, vol. 115, pp. 1032–1050, 2015.
- [63] J. Behler, “Representing potential energy surfaces by high-dimensional neural network potentials,” *J. Phys. Condens. Matter*, vol. 26, no. 18, p. 183001, 2014.
- [64] J. Behler, “Atom-centered symmetry functions for constructing high-dimensional neural network potentials,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 134, p. 074106, 2011.
- [65] A. P. Bartók, R. Kondor, and G. Csányi, “On representing chemical environments,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 87, p. 184115, May 2013.
- [66] W. Pronobis, A. Tkatchenko, and K.-R. Müller, “Many-body descriptors for predicting molecular properties with machine learning: Analysis of pairwise and three-body interactions in molecules,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 2991–3003, 2018. PMID: 29750522.
- [67] F. Musil, A. Grisafi, A. P. Bartók, C. Ortner, G. Csányi, and M. Ceriotti, “Physics-inspired structural representations for molecules and materials,” *Chem. Rev.*, vol. 121, no. 16, pp. 9759–9815, 2021.
- [68] R. Drautz, “Atomic cluster expansion for accurate and transferable interatomic potentials,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 99, p. 014104, 2019.
- [69] J. S. Smith, O. Isayev, and A. E. Roitberg, “Ani-1: An extensible neural network potential with dft accuracy at force field computational cost,” *Chem. Sci.*, vol. 8, pp. 3192–3203, 2017.
- [70] L. Zhang, J. Han, H. Wang, R. Car, and W. E, “Deep potential molecular dynamics: A scalable model with the accuracy of quantum mechanics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 120, p. 143001, 2018.
- [71] H. Wang, L. Zhang, J. Han, and W. E, “Deepmd-kit: A deep learning package for many-body potential energy representation and molecular dynamics,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, vol. 228, pp. 178–184, 2018.
- [72] J. Han, L. Zhang, R. Car, and W. E, “Deep potential: a general representation of a many-body potential energy surface,” *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, vol. 23, pp. 629–639, 2018.
- [73] Y. Zhang, C. Hu, and B. Jiang, “Embedded atom neural network potentials: Efficient and accurate machine learning with a physically inspired representation,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 10, pp. 4962–4967, 2019.
- [74] V. Zaverkin, D. Holzmüller, I. Steinwart, and J. Kästner, “Fast and sample-efficient interatomic neural network potentials for molecules and materials based on gaussian moments,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 17, pp. 6658–6670, 2021.
- [75] J. Gilmer, S. S. Schoenholz, P. F. Riley, O. Vinyals, and G. E. Dahl, “Neural message passing for quantum chemistry,” in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning* (D. Precup and Y. W. Teh, eds.), vol. 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1263–1272, PMLR, 2017.
- [76] K. T. Schütt, F. Arbabzadah, S. Chmiela, K. R. Müller, and A. Tkatchenko, “Quantum-chemical insights from deep tensor neural networks,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 8, p. 13890, 2017.
- [77] K. T. Schütt, H. E. Sauceda, P.-J. Kindermans, A. Tkatchenko, and K.-R. Mueller, “SchNet - a deep learning architecture for molecules and materials,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 148, p. 241722, 2018.
- [78] R. Zubatyuk, J. S. Smith, J. Leszczynski, and O. Isayev, “Accurate and transferable multitask prediction of chemical properties with an atoms-in-molecules neural network,” *Sci. Adv.*, vol. 5, p. eaav6490, 2019.
- [79] K. Schütt, O. Unke, and M. Gastegger, “Equivariant message passing for the prediction of tensorial properties and molecular spectra,” in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning* (M. Meila and T. Zhang, eds.), vol. 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 9377–9388, PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.
- [80] S. Batzner, A. Musaelian, L. Sun, M. Geiger, J. P. Mailoa, M. Kornbluth, N. Molinari, T. E. Smidt, and B. Kozinsky, “E (3)-equivariant graph neural networks for data-efficient and accurate interatomic potentials,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 2453, 2022.
- [81] A. Musaelian, S. Batzner, A. Johansson, L. Sun, C. J. Owen, M. Kornbluth, and B. Kozinsky, “Learning local equivariant representations for large-scale atomistic dynamics,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 14, p. 579, 2023.
- [82] I. Batatia, D. P. Kovacs, G. Simm, C. Ortner, and G. Csanyi, “Mace: Higher order equivariant message passing neural networks for fast and accurate force fields,” in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.* (S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, eds.), vol. 35, pp. 11423–11436, Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.
- [83] A. P. Bartók, M. C. Payne, R. Kondor, and G. Csányi, “Gaussian approximation potentials: The accuracy of quantum mechanics, without the electrons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 104, p. 136403, 2010.
- [84] A. P. Bartók, R. Kondor, and G. Csányi, “On representing chemical environments,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 87, p. 184115, 2013.
- [85] A. V. Shapeev, “Moment tensor potentials: a class of systematically improvable interatomic potentials,” *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, vol. 14, pp. 1153–1173, 2016.
- [86] A. P. Thompson, L. P. Swiler, C. R. Trott, S. M. Foiles, and G. J. Tucker, “Spectral neighbor analysis method for automated generation of quantum-accurate interatomic potentials,” *J. Comp. Phys.*, vol. 285, pp. 316–330, 2015.
- [87] S. Yue, M. C. Muniz, M. F. C. Andrade, L. Zhang, R. Car, and A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, “When do short-range atomistic machine-learning models fall short?,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 154, p. 034111, 2021.
- [88] S. Houlding, S. Y. Liem, and P. L. A. Popelier, “A polarizable high-rank quantum topological electrostatic potential developed using neural networks: Molecular dynamics simulations on the hydrogen fluoride dimer,”

- Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, vol. 107, pp. 2817–2827, 2007.
- [89] M. J. L. Mills and P. L. A. Popelier, “Polarisable multipolar electrostatics from the machine learning method kriging: an application to alanine,” *Theor. Chem. Acc.*, vol. 131, p. 1137, 2012.
- [90] C. M. Handley, G. I. Hawe, D. B. Kell, and P. L. A. Popelier, “Optimal construction of a fast and accurate polarisable water potential based on multipole moments trained by machine learning,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 11, pp. 6365–6376, 2009.
- [91] N. Artrith, T. Morawietz, and J. Behler, “High-dimensional neural-network potentials for multicomponent systems: Applications to zinc oxide,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 83, p. 153101, 2011.
- [92] T. Morawietz, V. Sharma, and J. Behler, “A neural network potential-energy surface for the water dimer based on environment-dependent atomic energies and charges,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 136, p. 064103, 2012.
- [93] K. Yao, J. E. Herr, D. W. Toth, R. Mckintyre, and J. Parkhill, “The tensormol-0.1 model chemistry: a neural network augmented with long-range physics,” *Chem. Sci.*, vol. 9, pp. 2261–2269, 2018.
- [94] O. T. Unke and M. Meuwly, “Physnet: A neural network for predicting energies, forces, dipole moments, and partial charges,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 15, pp. 3678–3693, 2019.
- [95] O. T. Unke, S. Chmiela, M. Gastegger, K. T. Schütt, H. E. Sauceda, and K.-R. Müller, “Spookynet: Learning force fields with electronic degrees of freedom and nonlocal effects,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 7273, 2021.
- [96] T. Bereau, D. Andrienko, and O. A. von Lilienfeld, “Transferable atomic multipole machine learning models for small organic molecules,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 11, pp. 3225–3233, 2015.
- [97] A. E. Sifain, N. Lubbers, B. T. Nebgen, J. S. Smith, A. Y. Lokhov, O. Isayev, A. E. Roitberg, K. Barros, and S. Tretiak, “Discovering a transferable charge assignment model using machine learning,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 9, pp. 4495–4501, 2018.
- [98] L. Zhang, H. Wang, M. C. Muniz, A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, R. Car, *et al.*, “A deep potential model with long-range electrostatic interactions,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 156, no. 12, 2022.
- [99] M. Gastegger, J. Behler, and P. Marquetand, “Machine learning molecular dynamics for the simulation of infrared spectra,” *Chem. Sci.*, vol. 8, pp. 6924–6935, 2017.
- [100] S. A. Ghasemi, A. Hofstetter, S. Saha, and S. Goedecker, “Interatomic potentials for ionic systems with density functional accuracy based on charge densities obtained by a neural network,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 92, p. 045131, 2015.
- [101] A. K. Rappe and W. A. Goddard, III, “Charge equilibration for molecular dynamics simulations,” *J. Phys. Chem.*, vol. 95, pp. 3358–3363, 1991.
- [102] X. Xie, K. A. Persson, and D. W. Small, “Incorporating electronic information into machine learning potential energy surfaces via approaching the ground-state electronic energy as a function of atom-based electronic populations,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 16, pp. 4256–4270, 2020.
- [103] T. W. Ko, J. A. Finkler, S. Goedecker, and J. Behler, “A fourth-generation high-dimensional neural network potential with accurate electrostatics including non-local charge transfer,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 12, p. 398, 2021.
- [104] L. Jacobson, J. Stevenson, F. Ramezanghorbani, D. Ghoreishi, K. Leswing, E. Harder, and R. Abel, “Transferable neural network potential energy surfaces for closed-shell organic molecules: Extension to ions,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 18, pp. 2354–2366, 2022.
- [105] C. Schran, J. Behler, and D. Marx, “Automated fitting of neural network potentials at coupled cluster accuracy: Protonated water clusters as testing ground,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 16, pp. 88–99, 2020.
- [106] J. S. Smith, B. Nebgen, N. Lubbers, O. Isayev, and A. E. Roitberg, “Less is more: Sampling chemical space with active learning,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 148, p. 241733, 2018.
- [107] L. Zhang, D.-Y. Lin, H. Wang, R. Car, and W. E, “Active learning of uniformly accurate interatomic potentials for materials simulation,” *Phys. Rev. Mater.*, vol. 3, p. 023804, 2019.
- [108] C. Schran, F. L. Thiemann, P. Rowe, E. A. Müller, O. Marsalek, and A. Michaelides, “Machine learning potentials for complex aqueous systems made simple,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 118, no. 38, p. e2110077118, 2021.
- [109] K. T. No, B. H. Chang, S. Y. Kim, M. S. Jhon, and H. A. Scheraga, “Description of the potential energy surface of the water dimer with an artificial neural network,” *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 271, pp. 152–156, 1997.
- [110] S. Manzhos, X. Wang, R. Dawes, and T. Carrington, Jr, “A nested molecule-independent neural network approach for high-quality potential fits,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 110, pp. 5295–5304, 2006.
- [111] H. T. T. Nguyen and H. M. Le, “Modified feed-forward neural network structures and combined-function-derivative approximations incorporating exchange symmetry for potential energy surface fitting,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 116, pp. 4629–4638, 2012.
- [112] X. Huang, B. J. Braams, and J. M. Bowman, “Ab initio potential energy and dipole moment surfaces for H_5O_2^+ ,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 122, p. 044308, 2005.
- [113] X. Huang, B. J. Braams, and J. M. Bowman, “Ab initio potential energy and dipole moment surfaces of $(\text{H}_2\text{O})_2$,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 110, pp. 445–451, 2006.
- [114] X. Huang, B. J. Braams, and J. M. Bowman, “New ab initio potential energy surface and the vibration-rotation-tunneling levels of $(\text{H}_2\text{O})_2$ and $(\text{D}_2\text{O})_2$,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 128, p. 034312, 2008.
- [115] Y. Wang, B. C. Shepler, B. J. Braams, and J. M. Bowman, “Full-dimensional, ab initio potential energy and dipole moment surfaces for water,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 131, p. 054511, 2009.
- [116] A. Shank, Y. Wang, A. Kaledin, B. J. Braams, and J. M. Bowman, “Accurate ab initio and “hybrid” potential energy surfaces, intramolecular vibrational energies, and classical ir spectrum of the water dimer,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 130, p. 144314, 2009.
- [117] J. M. Bowman, B. J. Braams, S. Carter, C. Chen, G. Czak, B. Fu, X. Huang, E. Kamarchik, A. R. Sharma, B. C. Shepler, Y. Wang, and Z. Xie, “Ab-initio-based potential energy surfaces for complex molecules and molecular complexes,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 1, pp. 1866–1874, 2010.
- [118] Y. Wang and J. M. Bowman, “Towards an ab initio flexible potential for water, and post-harmonic quantum vibrational analysis of water clusters,” *Chem. Phys. Lett.*,

- vol. 491, pp. 1–10, 2010.
- [119] Z. Xie and J. M. Bowman, “Permutationally invariant polynomial basis for molecular energy surface fitting via monomial symmetrization,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 6, p. 26, 2010.
- [120] Y. Wang, X. Huang, B. C. Shepler, B. J. Braams, and J. M. Bowman, “Flexible, ab initio potential, and dipole moment surfaces for water. i. tests and applications for clusters up to the 22-mer,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 134, p. 094509, 2011.
- [121] Q. Yu and J. M. Bowman, “Classical, thermostated ring polymer, and quantum vscf/vci calculations of ir spectra of h_7o_3^+ and h_9o_4^+ (eigen) and comparison with experiment,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 123, pp. 1399–1409, 2019.
- [122] Q. Yu, C. Qu, P. L. Houston, R. Conte, A. Nandi, and J. M. Bowman, “q-aqua: A many-body ccSD(t) water potential, including fourbody interactions, demonstrates the quantum nature of water from clusters to the liquid phase,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 13, pp. 5068–5074, 2022.
- [123] C. Qu, Q. Yu, R. Conte, P. L. Houston, A. Nandi, and J. M. Bowman, “A δ -machine learning approach for force fields, illustrated by a ccSD(t) 4-body correction to the mb-pol water potential,” *Digit. Discov.*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 658–664, 2022.
- [124] T. Morawietz and J. Behler, “A density-functional theory-based neural network potential for water clusters including van der waals corrections,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 117, p. 7356, 2013.
- [125] T. Morawietz and J. Behler, “A full-dimensional neural network potential-energy surface for water clusters up to the hexamer,” *Z. Phys. Chem.*, vol. 227, pp. 1559–1581, 2013.
- [126] S. K. Natarajan, T. Morawietz, and J. Behler, “Representing the potential-energy surface of protonated water clusters by high-dimensional neural network potentials,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 17, p. 8356, 2015.
- [127] H. Zhou, Y.-J. Feng, C. Wang, T. Huang, Y.-R. Liu, S. Jiang, C.-Y. Wang, and W. Huang, “A high-accuracy machine-learning water model for exploring water nanocluster structures,” *Nanoscale*, vol. 13, no. 28, pp. 12212–12222, 2021.
- [128] C. Schran, F. Briec, and D. Marx, “Converged colored noise path integral molecular dynamics study of the zundel cation down to ultralow temperatures at coupled cluster accuracy,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 14, pp. 5068–5078, 2018.
- [129] C. Schran and D. Marx, “Quantum nature of the hydrogen bond from ambient conditions down to ultralow temperatures,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 21, pp. 24967–24975, 2019.
- [130] C. Schran, F. Briec, and D. Marx, “Transferability of machine learning potentials: Protonated water neural network potential applied to the protonated water hexamer,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 154, p. 051101, 2021.
- [131] R. Beckmann, F. Briec, C. Schran, and D. Marx, “Infrared spectra at coupled cluster accuracy from neural network representations,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 18, no. 9, pp. 5492–5501, 2022.
- [132] C. Schran, F. Uhl, J. Behler, and D. Marx, “High-dimensional neural network potentials for solvation: The case of protonated water clusters in helium,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 148, p. 102310, 2017.
- [133] C. M. Handley and P. L. A. Popelier, “Dynamically polarizable water potential based on multipole moments trained by machine learning,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 5, pp. 1474–1489, 2009.
- [134] S. J. Davie, N. Di Pasquale, and P. L. Popelier, “Incorporation of local structure into kriging models for the prediction of atomistic properties in the water dodecamer,” *J. Comput. Chem.*, vol. 37, no. 27, pp. 2409–2422, 2016.
- [135] Z. E. Hughes, E. Ren, J. C. Thacker, B. C. Symons, A. F. Silva, and P. L. Popelier, “A flux water model: Flexible, polarizable and with a multipolar description of electrostatics,” *J. Comput. Chem.*, vol. 41, no. 7, pp. 619–628, 2020.
- [136] A. Grisafi, D. M. Wilkins, G. Csányi, and M. Ceriotti, “Symmetry-adapted machine learning for tensorial properties of atomistic systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 120, no. 3, p. 036002, 2018.
- [137] V. H. A. Nguyen and A. Lunghi, “Predicting tensorial molecular properties with equivariant machine learning models,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 105, no. 16, p. 165131, 2022.
- [138] J. Schuhmacher, G. Mazzola, F. Tacchino, O. Dmitriyeva, T. Bui, S. Huang, and I. Tavernelli, “Extending the reach of quantum computing for materials science with machine learning potentials,” *AIP Advances*, vol. 12, no. 11, 2022.
- [139] S. Bose, D. Dhawan, S. Nandi, R. R. Sarkar, and D. Ghosh, “Machine learning prediction of interaction energies in rigid water clusters,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 20, no. 35, pp. 22987–22996, 2018.
- [140] A. F. Silva, L. J. Duarte, and P. L. Popelier, “Contributions of iqa electron correlation in understanding the chemical bond and non-covalent interactions,” *Struct. Chem.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 507–519, 2020.
- [141] L. Cheng, J. Sun, J. E. Deustua, V. C. Bhethanabotla, and T. F. Miller, “Molecular-orbital-based machine learning for open-shell and multi-reference systems with kernel addition gaussian process regression,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 157, no. 15, 2022.
- [142] L. Cheng, M. Welborn, A. S. Christensen, and T. F. Miller, “A universal density matrix functional from molecular orbital-based machine learning: Transferability across organic molecules,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 150, no. 13, p. 131103, 2019.
- [143] J. P. Coe, “Machine learning configuration interaction,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 14, no. 11, pp. 5739–5749, 2018.
- [144] J. P. Coe, “Machine learning configuration interaction for ab initio potential energy curves,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 15, no. 11, pp. 6179–6189, 2019.
- [145] F. Lu, L. Cheng, R. J. DiRisio, J. M. Finney, M. A. Boyer, P. Moonkaen, J. Sun, S. J. Lee, J. E. Deustua, T. F. Miller III, *et al.*, “Fast near ab initio potential energy surfaces using machine learning,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 126, no. 25, pp. 4013–4024, 2022.
- [146] M. Welborn, L. Cheng, and T. F. Miller III, “Transferability in machine learning for electronic structure via the molecular orbital basis,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 14, no. 9, pp. 4772–4779, 2018.
- [147] R. J. DiRisio, F. Lu, and A. B. McCoy, “Gpu-accelerated neural network potential energy surfaces for diffusion monte carlo,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 125, no. 26, pp. 5849–5859, 2021.

- [148] K.-W. Cho, K. T. No, and H. A. Scheraga, “A polarizable force field for water using an artificial neural network,” *J. Mol. Struct.*, vol. 641, pp. 77–91, 2002.
- [149] W. L. Jorgensen, J. Chandrasekhar, J. D. Madura, R. W. Impey, and M. L. Klein, “Comparison of simple potential functions for simulating liquid water,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 79, pp. 926–935, 1983.
- [150] A. P. Bartók, M. J. Gillan, F. R. Manby, and G. Csányi, “Machine-learning approach for one- and two-body corrections to density functional theory: Applications to molecular and condensed water,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 88, p. 054104, 2013.
- [151] D. Alfè, A. P. Bartók, G. Csányi, and M. J. Gillan, “Energy benchmarking with quantum monte carlo for water nano-droplets and bulk liquid water,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 128, p. 221102, 2013.
- [152] T. Morawietz, A. Singraber, C. Dellago, and J. Behler, “How van der waals interactions determine the unique properties of water,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 113, p. 8368, 2016.
- [153] A. Singraber, R. Morawietz, J. Behler, and C. Dellago, “Density anomaly of water at negative pressures from first principles,” *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, vol. 30, p. 254005, 2018.
- [154] P. Montero de Hijes, S. Romano, A. Gorfer, and C. Dellago, “The kinetics of the ice–water interface from ab initio machine learning simulations,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 158, no. 20, 2023.
- [155] B. Cheng, J. Behler, and M. Ceriotti, “Nuclear quantum effects in water at the triple point: Using theory as a link between experiments,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 7, pp. 2210–2215, 2016.
- [156] V. Kapil, J. Behler, and M. Ceriotti, “High order path integrals made easy,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 145, p. 234103, 2016.
- [157] V. Kapil, D. M. Wilkins, J. Lan, and M. Ceriotti, “Inexpensive modeling of quantum dynamics using path integral generalized langevin equation thermostats,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 152, p. 124104, 2020.
- [158] Y. Yao and Y. Kanai, “Temperature dependence of nuclear quantum effects on liquid water via artificial neural network model based on scan meta-gga functional,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 153, no. 4, 2020.
- [159] C. Li and G. A. Voth, “Using machine learning to greatly accelerate path integral ab initio molecular dynamics,” *J. Chem. Theor. Comp.*, vol. 18, pp. 599–604, 2022.
- [160] B. Cheng, E. A. Engel, J. Behler, C. Dellago, and M. Ceriotti, “Ab initio thermodynamics of liquid and solid water,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 116, pp. 1110–1115, 2019.
- [161] Y. Yao and Y. Kanai, “Nuclear quantum effect and its temperature dependence in liquid water from random phase approximation via artificial neural network,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 12, no. 27, pp. 6354–6362, 2021.
- [162] T. Morawietz, O. Marsalek, S. R. Pattenaude, L. M. Streaker, D. Ben-Amotz, and T. E. Markland, “The interplay of structure and dynamics in the raman spectrum of liquid water over the full frequency and temperature range,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 9, pp. 851–857, 2018.
- [163] T. Morawietz, A. S. Urbina, P. K. Wise, X. Wu, W. Lu, D. Ben-Amotz, and T. E. Markland, “Hiding in the crowd: Spectral signatures of overcoordinated hydrogen bond environments,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 10, pp. 6067–6073, 2019.
- [164] Y. Zhang, S. Ye, J. Zhang, C. Hu, J. Jiang, and B. Jiang, “Efficient and accurate simulations of vibrational and electronic spectra with symmetry-preserving neural network models for tensorial properties,” *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 124, no. 33, pp. 7284–7290, 2020.
- [165] L. Zhang, H. Wang, and W. E, “Adaptive coupling of a deep neural network potential to a classical force field,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 149, p. 154107, 2018.
- [166] L. Zhang, J. Han, H. Wang, R. Car, and W. E, “Deepcpg: Constructing coarse-grained models via deep neural networks,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 149, p. 034101, 2018.
- [167] C. Andreani, G. Romanelli, A. Parmentier, R. Senesi, A. I. Kolesnikov, H.-Y. Ko, M. F. C. Andrade, and R. Car, “Hydrogen dynamics in supercritical water probed by neutron scattering and computer simulations,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 11, pp. 9461–9467, 2020.
- [168] H.-Y. Ko, L. Zhang, B. Santra, H. Wang, W. E, R. A. D. Jr, and R. Car, “Isotope effects in liquid water via deep potential molecular dynamics,” *Mol. Phys.*, vol. 117, no. 22, pp. 3269–3281, 2019.
- [169] J. Xu, C. Zhang, L. Zhang, M. Chen, B. Santra, and X. Wu, “Isotope effects in molecular structures and electronic properties of liquid water via deep potential molecular dynamics based on the scan functional,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 102, p. 214113, 2020.
- [170] J. Liu, J. Lan, and X. He, “Toward high-level machine learning potential for water based on quantum fragmentation and neural networks,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 126, no. 24, pp. 3926–3936, 2022.
- [171] G. M. Sommers, M. F. Calegari Andrade, L. Zhang, H. Wang, and R. Car, “Raman spectrum and polarizability of liquid water from deep neural networks,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 22, pp. 10592–10602, 2020.
- [172] L. Zhang, M. Chen, X. Wu, H. Wang, W. E, and R. Car, “Deep neural network for the dielectric response of insulators,” *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 102, p. 041121, Jul 2020.
- [173] C. Zhang, F. Tang, M. Chen, J. Xu, L. Zhang, D. Y. Qiu, J. P. Perdew, M. L. Klein, and X. Wu, “Modeling liquid water by climbing up jacob’s ladder in density functional theory facilitated by using deep neural network potentials,” *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 125, pp. 11444–11456, 2021.
- [174] A. Krishnamoorthy, K.-i. Nomura, N. Baradwaj, K. Shimamura, P. Rajak, A. Mishra, S. Fukushima, F. Shimojo, R. Kalia, A. Nakano, and P. Vashishta, “Dielectric constant of liquid water determined with neural network quantum molecular dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 126, p. 216403, May 2021.
- [175] Y. Shi, C. C. Doyle, and T. L. Beck, “Condensed phase water molecular multipole moments from deep neural network models trained on ab initio simulation data,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 12, pp. 10310–10317, 2021.
- [176] P. Schienbein, “Spectroscopy from machine learning by accurately representing the atomic polar tensor,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 705–712, 2023.
- [177] K. Inoue, Y. Litman, D. M. Wilkins, Y. Nagata, and M. Okuno, “Is unified understanding of vibrational coupling of water possible? hyper-raman measurement and machine learning spectra,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 12, pp. 3063–3068, 2023.

- [178] P. M. Piaggi, A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, P. G. Debenedetti, and R. Car, "Phase equilibrium of water with hexagonal and cubic ice using the scan functional," *J. Chem. Theory Comp.*, vol. 17, pp. 3065–3077, 2021.
- [179] L. Zhang, H. Wang, R. Car, and W. E, "Phase diagram of a deep potential water model," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 126, p. 236001, Jun 2021.
- [180] A. Reinhardt and B. Cheng, "Quantum-mechanical exploration of the phase diagram of water," *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 588, 2021.
- [181] B. Cheng, M. Bethkenhagen, C. J. Pickard, and S. Hamel, "Phase behaviours of superionic water at planetary conditions," *Nature Physics*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 1228–1232, 2021.
- [182] D. Tisi, L. Zhang, R. Bertossa, H. Wang, R. Car, and S. Baroni, "Heat transport in liquid water from first-principles and deep neural network simulations," *Phys. Rev. B*, vol. 104, p. 224202, 2021.
- [183] K. Xu, Y. Hao, T. Liang, P. Ying, J. Xu, J. Wu, and Z. Fan, "Accurate prediction of heat conductivity of water by a neuroevolution potential," *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 158, no. 20, 2023.
- [184] C. Malosso, L. Zhang, R. Car, S. Baroni, and D. Tisi, "Viscosity in water from first-principles and deep-neural-network simulations," *Npj Comput. Mater.*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 139, 2022.
- [185] Z. Chen, M. L. Berrens, K.-T. Chan, Z. Fan, and D. Donadio, "Thermodynamics of water and ice from a fast and scalable first-principles neuroevolution potential," *J. Chem. Eng. Data*, 2023.
- [186] D. Lu, H. Wang, M. Chen, J. Liu, L. Lin, R. Car, W. E, W. Jia, and L. Zhang, "86 pflops deep potential molecular dynamics simulation of 100 million atoms with ab initio accuracy," *Comp. Phys. Comm.*, vol. 259, p. 107624, 2021.
- [187] X.-M. Bai and M. Li, "Test of classical nucleation theory via molecular-dynamics simulation," *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 122, no. 22, 2005.
- [188] E. Sanz, C. Vega, J. Espinosa, R. Caballero-Bernal, J. Abascal, and C. Valeriani, "Homogeneous ice nucleation at moderate supercooling from molecular simulation," *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, vol. 135, no. 40, pp. 15008–15017, 2013.
- [189] P. M. Piaggi, J. Weis, A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, P. G. Debenedetti, and R. Car, "Homogeneous ice nucleation in an ab initio machine-learning model of water," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 119, no. 33, p. e2207294119, 2022.
- [190] M. Chen, L. Tan, H. Wang, L. Zhang, and H. Niu, "Imperfectly coordinated water molecules pave the way for homogeneous ice nucleation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12665*, 2023.
- [191] T. E. Gartner, L. Zhang, P. M. Piaggi, R. Car, A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, and P. G. Debenedetti, "Signatures of a liquid–liquid transition in an ab initio deep neural network model for water," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 117, no. 42, pp. 26040–26046, 2020.
- [192] T. E. Gartner III, P. M. Piaggi, R. Car, A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, and P. G. Debenedetti, "Liquid-liquid transition in water from first principles," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 129, no. 25, p. 255702, 2022.
- [193] P. M. Piaggi, I. Gartner, Thomas E., R. Car, and P. G. Debenedetti, "Melting curves of ice polymorphs in the vicinity of the liquid–liquid critical point," *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 159, p. 054502, 08 2023.
- [194] P. M. Piaggi and R. Car, "Enhancing the formation of ionic defects to study the ice ih/xi transition with molecular dynamics simulations," *Mol. Phys.*, vol. 0, no. 0, p. e1916634, 2021.
- [195] A. O. Atsango, T. Morawietz, O. Marsalek, and T. E. Markland, "Developing machine-learned potentials to simultaneously capture the dynamics of excess protons and hydroxide ions in classical and path integral simulations," *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 159, no. 7, 2023.
- [196] L. Liu, Y. Tian, X. Yang, and C. Liu, "Mechanistic insights into water autoionization through metadynamics simulation enhanced by machine learning," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 131, no. 15, p. 158001, 2023.
- [197] M. Calegari Andrade, R. Car, and A. Selloni, "Probing the self-ionization of liquid water with ab initio deep potential molecular dynamics," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 120, no. 46, p. e2302468120, 2023.
- [198] P. Geiger and C. Dellago, "Neural networks for local structure detection in polymorphic systems," *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 139, p. 164105, 2013.
- [199] M. Fulford, M. Salvalaglio, and C. Molteni, "Deepice: A deep neural network approach to identify ice and water molecules," *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, vol. 59, pp. 2141–2149, 2019.
- [200] J. Huang, G. Huang, and S. Li, "A machine learning model to classify dynamic processes in liquid water," *ChemPhysChem*, vol. 23, no. 1, p. e202100599, 2022.
- [201] B. Monserrat, J. G. Brandenburg, E. A. Engel, and B. Cheng, "Liquid water contains the building blocks of diverse ice phases," *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 5757, 2020.
- [202] F. Guidarelli Mattioli, F. Sciortino, and J. Russo, "Are neural network potentials trained on liquid states transferable to crystal nucleation? a test on ice nucleation in the mw water model," *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 127, no. 17, pp. 3894–3901, 2023.
- [203] A. Torres, L. S. Pedroza, M. Fernandez-Serra, and A. R. Rocha, "Using neural network force fields to ascertain the quality of ab initio simulations of liquid water," *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 125, pp. 10772–10778, 2021.
- [204] P. Montero de Hijes, C. Dellago, R. Jinnouchi, B. Schmiedmayer, and G. Kresse, "Comparing machine learning potentials for water: Kernel-based regression and behler-parrinello neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15213*, 2023.
- [205] M. S. Gomes-Filho, A. Torres, A. Reily Rocha, and L. S. Pedroza, "Size and quality of quantum mechanical data set for training neural network force fields for liquid water," *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 127, no. 6, pp. 1422–1428, 2023.
- [206] Z. Li, K. Meidani, P. Yadav, and A. Barati Farimani, "Graph neural networks accelerated molecular dynamics," *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 156, no. 14, 2022.
- [207] G. Imbalzano, A. Anelli, D. Giofre, S. Klees, J. Behler, and M. Ceriotti, "Automatic selection of atomic fingerprints and reference configurations for machine-learning potentials," *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 148, p. 241730, 2018.
- [208] F. Guidarelli Mattioli, F. Sciortino, and J. Russo, "A neural network potential with self-trained atomic fingerprints: a test with the mw water potential," *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 158, no. 10, 2023.
- [209] T. A. Young, T. Johnston-Wood, V. L. Deringer, and F. Duarte, "A transferable active-learning strategy for

- reactive molecular force fields,” *Chem. Sci.*, vol. 12, no. 32, pp. 10944–10955, 2021.
- [210] T. K. Patra, T. D. Loeffler, H. Chan, M. J. Cherukara, B. Narayanan, and S. K. R. S. Sankaranarayanan, “A coarse-grained deep neural network model for liquid water,” *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 115, p. 193101, 2019.
- [211] T. D. Loeffler, T. K. Patra, H. Chan, and S. K. Sankaranarayanan, “Active learning a coarse-grained neural network model for bulk water from sparse training data,” *Mol. Syst. Des. Eng.*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 902–910, 2020.
- [212] C. Scherer, R. Scheid, D. Andrienko, and T. Berau, “Kernel-based machine learning for efficient simulations of molecular liquids,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 3194–3204, 2020.
- [213] S. Thaler and J. Zavadlav, “Learning neural network potentials from experimental data via differentiable trajectory reweighting,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 6884, 2021.
- [214] F. Musil, I. Zaporozhets, F. Noé, C. Clementi, and V. Kapil, “Quantum dynamics using path integral coarse-graining,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 157, no. 18, 2022.
- [215] T. D. Loose, P. G. Sahrman, T. S. Qu, and G. A. Voth, “Coarse-graining with equivariant neural networks: A path toward accurate and data-efficient models,” *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2023.
- [216] H. Chan, M. J. Cherukara, B. Narayanan, T. D. Loeffler, C. Benmore, S. K. Gray, and S. K. R. S. Sankaranarayanan, “Machine learning coarse grained models for water,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 379, 2019.
- [217] T. D. Loeffler, H. Chan, K. Sasikumar, B. Narayanan, M. J. Cherukara, S. Gray, and S. K. R. S. Sankaranarayanan, “Teaching an old dog new tricks: Machine learning an improved tip3p potential model for liquid–vapor phase phenomena,” *J. Phys. Chem. C*, vol. 123, no. 36, pp. 22643–22655, 2019.
- [218] H.-f. Ye, J. Wang, Y.-g. Zheng, H.-w. Zhang, and Z. Chen, “Machine learning for reparameterization of four-site water models: Tip4p-bg and tip4p-bgt,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 23, no. 17, pp. 10164–10173, 2021.
- [219] J. Wang, Y. Zheng, H. Zhang, and H. Ye, “Machine learning-generated tip4p-bgwt model for liquid and supercooled water,” *J. Mol. Liq.*, vol. 367, p. 120459, 2022.
- [220] B. Han, C. M. Isborn, and L. Shi, “Incorporating polarization and charge transfer into a point-charge model for water using machine learning,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 16, pp. 3869–3877, 2023.
- [221] Y. Zhai, A. Caruso, S. L. Bore, Z. Luo, and F. Paesani, “A “short blanket” dilemma for a state-of-the-art neural network potential for water: Reproducing experimental properties or the physics of the underlying many-body interactions?,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 158, p. 084111, 2023.
- [222] M. C. Muniz, R. Car, and A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, “Neural network water model based on the mb-pol many-body potential,” *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2023.
- [223] S. Thaler, G. Doehner, and J. Zavadlav, “Scalable bayesian uncertainty quantification for neural network potentials: Promise and pitfalls,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2023.
- [224] T. T. Nguyen, E. Székely, G. Imbalzano, J. Behler, G. Csányi, M. Ceriotti, A. W. Goetz, and F. Paesani, “Comparison of permutationally invariant polynomials, neural networks, and gaussian approximation potentials in representing water interactions through many-body expansions,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 124, p. 241725, 2018.
- [225] H. Wang and W. Yang, “Force field for water based on neural network,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 9, pp. 3232–3240, 2018.
- [226] L. Yang, J. Li, F. Chen, and K. Yu, “A transferrable range-separated force field for water: Combining the power of both physically-motivated models and machine learning techniques,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 157, no. 21, 2022.
- [227] B. C. Symons and P. L. Popelier, “Application of quantum chemical topology force field flux to condensed matter simulations: liquid water,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 18, no. 9, pp. 5577–5588, 2022.
- [228] A. Konovalov, B. C. Symons, and P. L. Popelier, “On the many-body nature of intramolecular forces in fflux and its implications,” *J. Comput. Chem.*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 107–116, 2021.
- [229] V. Zaverkin, D. Holzmüller, R. Schuldt, and J. Kästner, “Predicting properties of periodic systems from cluster data: A case study of liquid water,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 156, p. 114103, 2022.
- [230] J. Daru, H. Forbert, J. Behler, and D. Marx, “Coupled cluster molecular dynamics of condensed phase systems enabled by machine learning potentials: Liquid water benchmark,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 129, p. 226001, 2022.
- [231] M. S. Chen, J. Lee, H.-Z. Ye, T. C. Berkelbach, D. R. Reichman, and T. E. Markland, “Data-efficient machine learning potentials from transfer learning of periodic correlated electronic structure methods: Liquid water at afqmc, ccsd, and ccsd (t) accuracy,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2023.
- [232] A. Grisafi and M. Ceriotti, “Incorporating long-range physics in atomic-scale machine learning,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 151, no. 20, 2019.
- [233] A. Gao and R. C. Remsing, “Self-consistent determination of long-range electrostatics in neural network potentials,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 1572, 2022.
- [234] H. S. Dhattarwal, A. Gao, and R. C. Remsing, “Dielectric saturation in water from a long-range machine learning model,” *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 127, no. 16, pp. 3663–3671, 2023.
- [235] T. Plé, L. Lagardère, and J.-P. Piquemal, “Force-field-enhanced neural network interactions: from local equivariant embedding to atom-in-molecule properties and long-range effects,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08734*, 2023.
- [236] D. P. Kovacs, I. Batatia, E. S. Arany, and G. Csányi, “Evaluation of the mace force field architecture: from medicinal chemistry to materials science,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14247*, 2023.
- [237] D. P. Kovács, J. H. Moore, N. J. Browning, I. Batatia, J. T. Horton, V. Kapil, I.-B. Magdău, D. J. Cole, and G. Csányi, “Mace-off23: Transferable machine learning force fields for organic molecules,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15211*, 2023.
- [238] I. Batatia, P. Benner, Y. Chiang, A. M. Elena, D. P. Kovács, J. Riebesell, X. R. Advincula, M. Asta, W. J. Baldwin, N. Bernstein, *et al.*, “A foundation model for atomistic materials chemistry,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00096*, 2023.
- [239] X. Fu, Z. Wu, W. Wang, T. Xie, S. Ketten, R. Gomez-Bombarelli, and T. Jaakkola, “Forces are not enough:

- Benchmark and critical evaluation for machine learning force fields with molecular simulations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07237*, 2022.
- [240] O. Wohlfahrt, C. Dellago, and M. Sega, “Ab initio structure and thermodynamics of the rpbe-d3 water/vapor interface by neural-network molecular dynamics,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 153, no. 14, p. 144710, 2020.
- [241] E. D. Donkor, A. Laio, and A. Hassanali, “Do machine-learning atomic descriptors and order parameters tell the same story? the case of liquid water,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2023.
- [242] M. Bonn, Y. Nagata, and E. H. Backus, “Molecular structure and dynamics of water at the water–air interface studied with surface-specific vibrational spectroscopy,” *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, vol. 54, no. 19, pp. 5560–5576, 2015.
- [243] T. Ohto, K. Usui, T. Hasegawa, M. Bonn, and Y. Nagata, “Toward ab initio molecular dynamics modeling for sum-frequency generation spectra; an efficient algorithm based on surface-specific velocity-velocity correlation function,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 143, no. 12, p. 124702, 2015.
- [244] S. Shepherd, J. Lan, D. M. Wilkins, and V. Kapil, “Efficient quantum vibrational spectroscopy of water with high-order path integrals: From bulk to interfaces,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 12, pp. 9108–9114, 2021.
- [245] Y. Litman, J. Lan, Y. Nagata, and D. M. Wilkins, “Fully first-principles surface spectroscopy with machine learning,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 36, pp. 8175–8182, 2023.
- [246] S. P. Niblett, M. Galib, and D. T. Limmer, “Learning intermolecular forces at liquid–vapor interfaces,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 155, no. 16, p. 164101, 2021.
- [247] M. Sega and C. Dellago, “Long-range dispersion effects on the water/vapor interface simulated using the most common models,” *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 121, 12 2016.
- [248] I. Sanchez-Burgos, M. C. Muniz, J. R. Espinosa, and A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, “A deep potential model for liquid–vapor equilibrium and cavitation rates of water,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 158, p. 184504, 2023.
- [249] M. de la Puente and D. Laage, “How the acidity of water droplets and films is controlled by the air–water interface,” *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, vol. 145, pp. 25186–25194, 2023.
- [250] Y. Shao, L. Knijff, F. M. Dietrich, K. Hermansson, and C. Zhang, “Modelling bulk electrolytes and electrolyte interfaces with atomistic machine learning,” *Batter. Supercaps*, vol. 4, pp. 1–12, 2021.
- [251] M. Hellström and J. Behler, “Concentration-dependent proton transfer mechanisms in aqueous naoh solutions: From acceptor-driven to donor-driven and back,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 7, pp. 3302–3306, 2016.
- [252] M. Hellström and J. Behler, “Structure of aqueous naoh solutions: insights from neural-network-based molecular dynamics simulations,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 19, p. 82, 2017.
- [253] M. Hellström and J. Behler, “Proton-transfer-driven water exchange mechanism in the na+ solvation shell,” *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 121, p. 4184, 2017.
- [254] M. Hellström, M. Ceriotti, and J. Behler, “Nuclear quantum effects in sodium hydroxide solutions from neural network molecular dynamics simulations,” *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 122, pp. 10158–10171, 2018.
- [255] Y. Shao, M. Hellström, A. Yllö, J. Mindemark, K. Hermansson, J. Behler, and C. Zhang, “Temperature effects on the ionic conductivity in concentrated alkaline electrolyte solutions,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 22, p. 10426, 2020.
- [256] N. O’Neill, C. Schran, S. J. Cox, and A. Michaelides, “Crumbling crystals: On the dissolution mechanism of nacl in water,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.04345*, 2022.
- [257] M. Xu, T. Zhu, and J. Z. Zhang, “Molecular dynamics simulation of zinc ion in water with an ab initio based neural network potential,” *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 123, pp. 6587–6595, 2019.
- [258] P. Wang, Y. Su, R. Shi, X. Huang, and J. Zhao, “Structures and spectroscopic properties of hydrated zinc (ii) ion clusters [zn2+ (h2o) n (n= 1- 8)] by ab initio study,” *J. Clust. Sci.*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 1625–1632, 2023.
- [259] E. Kamarchik, Y. Wang, and J. M. Bowman, “Quantum vibrational analysis and infrared spectra of microhydrated sodium ions using an ab initio potential,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 134, p. 114311, 2011.
- [260] C. Zhang, S. Yue, A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, M. L. Klein, and X. Wu, “Dissolving salt is not equivalent to applying a pressure on water,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 13, p. 822, 2022.
- [261] C. Zhang, S. Yue, A. Z. Panagiotopoulos, M. L. Klein, and X. Wu, “Why dissolving salt in water decreases its dielectric permittivity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 131, no. 7, p. 076801, 2023.
- [262] M. Galib and D. T. Limmer, “Reactive uptake of n2o5 by atmospheric aerosol is dominated by interfacial processes,” *Science*, vol. 371, no. 6532, pp. 921–925, 2021.
- [263] N. V. Avula, M. L. Klein, and S. Balasubramanian, “Understanding the anomalous diffusion of water in aqueous electrolytes using machine learned potentials,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 14, pp. 9500–9507, 2023.
- [264] N. Artrith and A. M. Kolpak, “Understanding the composition and activity of electrocatalytic nanoalloys in aqueous solvents: A combination of dft and accurate neural network potentials,” *Nano Lett.*, vol. 14, pp. 2670–2676, 2014.
- [265] S. K. Natarajan and J. Behler, “Neural network molecular dynamics simulations of solid-liquid interfaces: water at low-index copper surfaces,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 18, p. 28704, 2016.
- [266] S. Kondati Natarajan and J. Behler, “Self-diffusion of surface defects at copper-water interfaces,” *J. Phys. Chem. C*, vol. 121, p. 4368, 2017.
- [267] V. Quaranta, M. Hellström, and J. Behler, “Proton transfer mechanisms at the water-zno interface: The role of presolvation,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 8, p. 1476, 2017.
- [268] V. Quaranta, J. Behler, and M. Hellström, “Structure and dynamics of the liquid-water/zinc-oxide interface from machine learning potential simulations,” *J. Phys. Chem. C*, vol. 123, p. 1293, 2019.
- [269] M. F. Calegari Andrade, H.-Y. Ko, L. Zhang, R. Car, and A. Selloni, “Free energy of proton transfer at the water–tio2 interface from ab initio deep potential molecular dynamics,” *Chem. Sci.*, vol. 11, pp. 2335–2341, 2020.
- [270] B. Wen, M. F. C. Andrade, L.-M. Liu, and A. Selloni, “Water dissociation at the water–rutile tio2(110) interface from ab initio-based deep neural network simulations,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, vol. 120,

- p. e2212250120, 2023.
- [271] Y.-B. Zhuang, R.-H. Bi, and J. Cheng, “Resolving the odd-even oscillation of water dissociation at rutile $\text{TiO}_2(110)$ -water interface by machine learning accelerated molecular dynamics,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 157, p. 164701, 2022.
- [272] V. Quaranta, M. Hellström, J. Behler, J. Kullgren, P. Mitev, and K. Hermansson, “Maximally resolved anharmonic oh vibrational spectrum of the water/ $\text{ZnO}(10\text{-}10)$ interface from a high-dimensional neural network potential,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 148, p. 241720, 2018.
- [273] M. Hellström, V. Quaranta, and J. Behler, “One-dimensional vs. two-dimensional proton transport processes at solid-liquid zinc-oxide-water interfaces,” *Chem. Sci.*, vol. 10, p. 1232, 2019.
- [274] M. Eckhoff and J. Behler, “Insights into lithium manganese oxide-water interfaces using machine learning potentials,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 155, p. 244703, 2021.
- [275] A. Nakanishi, S. Kasamatsu, J. Haruyama, and O. Sugino, “Structural analysis of zirconium oxynitride/water interface using neural network potential,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11296*, 2023.
- [276] C. R. O’Connor, M. F. Calegari Andrade, A. Selloni, and G. A. Kimmel, “Elucidating the water-anatase $\text{TiO}_2(101)$ interface structure using infrared signatures and molecular dynamics,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 159, no. 10, 2023.
- [277] Z. Li, J. Wang, C. Yang, L. Liu, and J.-Y. Yang, “Thermal transport across $\text{TiO}_2\text{-H}_2\text{O}$ interface involving water dissociation: Ab initio-assisted deep potential molecular dynamics,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 159, p. 144701, 10 2023.
- [278] Z. Zeng, F. Wodaczek, K. Liu, F. Stein, J. Hutter, J. Chen, and B. Cheng, “Mechanistic insight on water dissociation on pristine low-index TiO_2 surfaces from machine learning molecular dynamics simulations,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 6131, 2023.
- [279] Z. Ding and A. Selloni, “Modeling the aqueous interface of amorphous TiO_2 using deep potential molecular dynamics,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 159, no. 2, 2023.
- [280] A. E. G. Mikkelsen, J. Schiøtz, T. Vegge, and K. W. Jacobsen, “Is the water/ $\text{Pt}(111)$ interface ordered at room temperature?,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 155, p. 224701, 2021.
- [281] A. E. G. Mikkelsen, H. H. Kristoffersen, J. Schiøtz, T. Vegge, H. A. Hansen, and K. W. Jacobsen, “Structure and energetics of liquid water-hydroxyl layers on $\text{Pt}(111)$,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 24, pp. 9885–9890, 2022.
- [282] P. Schienbein and J. Blumberger, “Nanosecond solvation dynamics of the hematite/liquid water interface at hybrid dft accuracy using committee neural network potentials,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 24, no. 25, pp. 15365–15375, 2022.
- [283] L. Li, M. F. Calegari Andrade, R. Car, A. Selloni, and E. A. Carter, “Characterizing structure-dependent TiO_2 /water interfaces using deep-neural-network-assisted molecular dynamics,” *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2023.
- [284] A. S. Raman and A. Selloni, “Acid–base chemistry of a model FeO_2 catalytic interface,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 14, pp. 7787–7794, 2023.
- [285] X.-T. Fan, X.-J. Wen, Y.-B. Zhuang, and J. Cheng, “Molecular insight into the gap(110)-water interface using machine learning accelerated molecular dynamics,” *J. Energy Chem.*, vol. in press, 2023.
- [286] P. M. Piaggi, A. Selloni, A. Panagiotopoulos, R. Car, and P. G. Debenedetti, “A first-principles machine-learning force field for heterogeneous ice nucleation on microcline feldspar,” *Faraday Discuss.*, 2023.
- [287] Z. Li, X. Tan, Z. Fu, L. Liu, and J.-Y. Yang, “Thermal transport across copper–water interfaces according to deep potential molecular dynamics,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 6746–6756, 2023.
- [288] X. Yang, A. Bhowmik, T. Vegge, and H. A. Hansen, “Neural network potentials for accelerated metadynamics of oxygen reduction kinetics at Au –water interfaces,” *Chem. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 14, pp. 3913–3922, 2023.
- [289] X. Li, W. Paier, and J. Paier, “Machine learning in computational surface science and catalysis: Case studies on water and metal–oxide interfaces,” *Front. Chem.*, vol. 8, p. 601029, 2020.
- [290] H. Ghorbanfekr, J. Behler, and F. M. Peeters, “Insights into water permeation through hbn nanocapillaries by ab initio machine learning molecular dynamics simulations,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 11, p. 7363, 2020.
- [291] W. Zhao, H. Qiu, and W. Guo, “A deep neural network potential for water confined in graphene nanocapillaries,” *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2022.
- [292] D. Liu, J. Wu, and D. Lu, “Transferability evaluation of the deep potential model for simulating water-graphene confined system,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 159, no. 4, 2023.
- [293] V. Kapil, C. Schran, A. Zen, J. Chen, C. J. Pickard, and A. Michaelides, “The first-principles phase diagram of monolayer nanoconfined water,” *Nature*, vol. 609, no. 7927, pp. 512–516, 2022.
- [294] F. L. Thiemann, C. Schran, P. Rowe, E. A. Müller, and A. Michaelides, “Water flow in single-wall nanotubes: Oxygen makes it slip, hydrogen makes it stick,” *ACS Nano*, vol. 16, pp. 10775–10782, 2022.
- [295] Z. Cao, Y. Wang, C. Lorsung, and A. Barati Farimani, “Neural network predicts ion concentration profiles under nanoconfinement,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 159, no. 9, 2023.
- [296] L. Shen and W. Yang, “Molecular dynamics simulations with quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics and adaptive neural networks,” *J. Chem. Theor. Comp.*, vol. 14, pp. 1442–1455, 2018.
- [297] M. Yang, L. Bonati, D. Polino, and M. Parrinello, “Using metadynamics to build neural network potentials for reactive events: the case of urea decomposition in water,” *Catal. Today*, vol. 387, pp. 143–149, 2022.
- [298] T. Devergne, T. Magrino, F. Pietrucci, and A. M. Saitta, “Combining machine learning approaches and accurate ab initio enhanced sampling methods for prebiotic chemical reactions in solution,” *J. Chem. Theor. Comp.*, vol. 18, pp. 5410–5421, 2022.
- [299] X. Pan, J. Yang, R. Van, E. Epifanovsky, J. Ho, J. Huang, J. Pu, Y. Mei, K. Nam, and Y. Shao, “Machine-learning-assisted free energy simulation of solution-phase and enzyme reactions,” *J. Chem. Theor. Comp.*, vol. 17, pp. 5745–5758, 2021.
- [300] J. Lan, V. Kapil, P. Gasparotto, M. Ceriotti, M. Iannuzzi, and V. V. Rybkin, “Simulating the ghost: quantum dynamics of the solvated electron,” *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 766, 2021.
- [301] W.-K. Chen, W.-H. Fang, and G. Cui, “Integrating machine learning with the multilayer energy-based fragment method for excited states of large systems,” *J.*

- Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 10, no. 24, pp. 7836–7841, 2019.
- [302] J. Wang, S. Olsson, C. Wehmeyer, A. Pérez, N. E. Charron, G. De Fabritiis, F. Noé, and C. Clementi, “Machine learning of coarse-grained molecular dynamics force fields,” *ACS Cent. Sci.*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 755–767, 2019.
- [303] B. E. Husic, N. E. Charron, D. Lemm, J. Wang, A. Pérez, M. Majewski, A. Krämer, Y. Chen, S. Olsson, G. de Fabritiis, *et al.*, “Coarse graining molecular dynamics with graph neural networks,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 153, no. 19, 2020.
- [304] A. krämer, A. E. Durumeric, N. E. Charron, Y. Chen, C. Clementi, and F. Noé, “Statistically optimal force aggregation for coarse-graining molecular dynamics,” *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 17, pp. 3970–3979, 2023.
- [305] S. Yao, R. Van, X. Pan, J. H. Park, Y. Mao, J. Pu, Y. Mei, and Y. Shao, “Machine learning based implicit solvent model for aqueous-solution alanine dipeptide molecular dynamics simulations,” *RSC Adv.*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 4565–4577, 2023.
- [306] J. R. Cendagorta, H. Shen, Z. Bacic, and M. E. Tuckerman, “Enhanced sampling path integral methods using neural network potential energy surfaces with application to diffusion in hydrogen hydrates,” *Adv. Theory Sim.*, vol. 4, p. 2000258, 2021.
- [307] J. Yang, Y. Cong, Y. Li, and H. Li, “Machine learning approach based on a range-corrected deep potential model for efficient vibrational frequency computation,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 19, no. 18, pp. 6366–6374, 2023.
- [308] L. Bösel, M. Thürlmann, and S. Riniker, “Machine learning in qm/mm molecular dynamics simulations of condensed-phase systems,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 2641–2658, 2021.
- [309] A. Hofstetter, L. Bösel, and S. Riniker, “Graph-convolutional neural networks for (qm) ml/mm molecular dynamics simulations,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 24, no. 37, pp. 22497–22512, 2022.
- [310] S. M. Salehi, S. Käser, K. Töpfer, P. Diamantis, R. Pfister, P. Hamm, U. Rothlisberger, and M. Meuwly, “Hydration dynamics and ir spectroscopy of 4-fluorophenol,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 24, no. 42, pp. 26046–26060, 2022.
- [311] M. Xu, T. Zhu, and J. Z. Zhang, “Automatically constructed neural network potentials for molecular dynamics simulation of zinc proteins,” *Front. Chem.*, vol. 9, p. 692200, 2021.
- [312] J. R. Loeffler, M. L. Fernández-Quintero, F. Waibl, P. K. Quoika, F. Hofer, M. Schauerl, and K. R. Liedl, “Conformational shifts of stacked heteroaromatics: vacuum vs. water studied by machine learning,” *Front. Chem.*, vol. 9, p. 641610, 2021.
- [313] P. Gao, X. Yang, Y.-H. Tang, M. Zheng, A. Andersen, V. Murugesan, A. Hollas, and W. Wang, “Graphical gaussian process regression model for aqueous solvation free energy prediction of organic molecules in redox flow batteries,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 23, no. 43, pp. 24892–24904, 2021.
- [314] A. Fabrizio, A. Grisafi, B. Meyer, M. Ceriotti, and C. Corminboeuf, “Electron density learning of non-covalent systems,” *Chem. Sci.*, vol. 10, pp. 9424–9432, 2019.
- [315] A. Grisafi and M. Ceriotti, “Incorporating long-range physics in atomic-scale machine learning,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 151, p. 204105, 2019.
- [316] T. W. Ko, J. A. Finkler, S. Goedecker, and J. Behler, “Accurate fourth-generation machine learning potentials by electrostatic embedding,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, vol. 19, pp. 3567–3579, 2023.
- [317] F. Noé, A. Tkatchenko, K.-R. Müller, and C. Clementi, “Machine learning for molecular simulation,” *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 361–390, 2020. PMID: 32092281.
- [318] P. Geiger and C. Dellago, “Neural networks for local structure detection in polymorphic systems,” *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 139, p. 164105, 10 2013.
- [319] M. Fulford, M. Salvalaglio, and C. Molteni, “Deepice: A deep neural network approach to identify ice and water molecules,” *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 2141–2149, 2019. PMID: 30875217.
- [320] F. Noé, S. Olsson, J. Köhler, and H. Wu, “Boltzmann generators: Sampling equilibrium states of many-body systems with deep learning,” *Science*, vol. 365, no. 6457, p. eaaw1147, 2019.
- [321] P. Wirnsberger, G. Papamakarios, B. Ibarz, S. Racanière, A. J. Ballard, A. Pritzel, and C. Blundell, “Normalizing flows for atomic solids,” *Mach. learn.: sci. technol.*, vol. 3, p. 025009, may 2022.
- [322] C. Zeni, R. Pinsler, D. Zügner, A. Fowler, M. Horton, X. Fu, S. Shysheya, J. Crabbé, L. Sun, J. Smith, *et al.*, “Mattergen: a generative model for inorganic materials design,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03687*, 2023.
- [323] Z. Zou, E. R. Beyerle, S.-T. Tsai, and P. Tiwary, “Driving and characterizing nucleation of urea and glycine polymorphs in water,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, vol. 120, no. 7, p. e2216099120, 2023.
- [324] H. Jung, R. Covino, A. Arjun, C. Leitold, C. Dellago, P. G. Bolhuis, and G. Hummer, “Machine-guided path sampling to discover mechanisms of molecular self-organization,” *Nat. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 334–345, 2023.