

# Foundation for the $\Delta SCF$ Approach in Density Functional Theory

Weitao Yang

*Department of Chemistry and Department of Physics,  
Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708\**

Paul W. Ayers

*Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology,  
McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario L8S 4M1†*

(Dated: March 8, 2024)

We extend ground-state density-functional theory to excited states and provide the theoretical formulation for the widely used  $\Delta SCF$  method for calculating excited-state energies and densities. As the electron density alone is insufficient to characterize excited states, we formulate excited-state theory using the defining variables of a noninteracting reference system, namely (1) the excitation quantum number  $n_s$  and the potential  $w_s(\mathbf{r})$  (excited-state potential-functional theory,  $nPFT$ ), (2) the noninteracting wavefunction  $\Phi$  ( $\Phi$ -functional theory,  $\Phi FT$ ), or (3) the noninteracting one-electron reduced density matrix  $\gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$  (density-matrix-functional theory,  $\gamma_s FT$ ). We show the equivalence of these three sets of variables and their corresponding energy functionals. Importantly, the ground and excited-state exchange-correlation energy use the *same* universal functional, regardless of whether  $(n_s, w_s(\mathbf{r}))$ ,  $\Phi$ , or  $\gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$  is selected as the fundamental descriptor of the system. We derive the excited-state (generalized) Kohn-Sham equations. The minimum of all three functionals is the ground-state energy and, for ground states, they are all equivalent to the Hohenberg-Kohn-Sham method. The other stationary points of the functionals provide the excited-state energies and electron densities, establishing the foundation for the  $\Delta SCF$  method.

The mathematical framework of density-functional theory (DFT), in its original formulations, is based on the minimum-energy variational principle and is thus restricted to ground states.[1–8] However, the importance of photochemical and nonadiabatic dynamics provides impetus for a treatment of excited states with DFT. Early successes allowed ground-state DFT to be extended to the lowest-energy excited state of a given symmetry.[9–14], but this requires symmetry-specific functionals and only provides access to a tiny fraction of excited states.

The theoretical formulation of ground-state DFT cannot be directly extended to excited states because there is no excited-state extension of the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem.[15–18] Specifically, it is possible for the  $m^{\text{th}}$  excited state density of one system to be the  $n^{\text{th}}$  excited state density of a different system. Therefore one needs more than just the excited-state electron density to fully specify the state of the system. This additional information can come from: (1) A real number, or pair of integers, specifying the excitation level, [12, 19–22] (2) The ground-state density and the excitation level, [19, 22–28] (3) ensemble weights, [29–42] or (4) a matrix of densities. [43–46]

There are also approaches based on ground-state *response* properties. For example, the dynamic linear response of the ground state diverges when the frequency is matched to an excitation energy. This motivates time-dependent DFT (TDDFT), [47–50] as well as closely related approaches based on the random phase approxima-

tion (including particle-hole and particle-particle/hole-hole flavors), equations of motion, and propagator theory.[51–56] Establishing the exactness of such approaches is significantly harder than the analogous Levy-Lieb formulations of ground-state DFT.[57–59]

An attractive *practical* approach is the  $\Delta SCF$  method, which was first proposed in the context of what we now call DFT by Slater.[60, 61] In  $\Delta SCF$ , one constructs the excited-state density by choosing a non-aufbau population of the Kohn-Sham (KS) orbitals and converges the associated self-consistent field (SCF) calculation; the energy is evaluated using the *ground-state* density functional even though one is targeting an excited state.[62, 63] Results are often excellent, comparable to the accuracy of TDDFT for well-behaved excited states but superior for excitations with charge-transfer or multiple-excitation character.[64–73] This begs the question: why can one apply a density functional that was developed for ground states to excited states?

To formulate the  $\Delta SCF$  approach as a density-functional method, one needs to define an energy functional that is stationary for excited excited states.[20] For the restricted set of excited-state electron densities that are not the ground-state density for any system, the Levy constrained search functional is stationary.[74] To extend this result to arbitrary excited states, Görling replaced the minimization of the Levy constrained search functional with a stationary principle and labeled the stationary states with a real number  $\nu$ . [20], leading to a procedure where the functionals depend on the  $\nu$  that specifies the system and state of interest. Indeed, the theoretical foundation of the  $\Delta SCF$  method as it is used in practice has not been established.[75, 76]

\* weitao.yang@duke.edu

† ayers@mcmaster.ca

Here, we show that the  $\Delta$ SCF method is exact and reveal the universal ground-and-excited-state energy functional. Instead of the density, our approach uses the potential as the basic variable and uses the fact that  $\Delta$ SCF theory only requires that excited-state electron densities, which are inherently interacting  $v$ -representable, also be noninteracting  $v$ -representable. We use the fundamental excited-state potential functionals to build practical  $\Delta$ SCF methods based on the stationary-state wavefunctions and density matrices of the noninteracting system.

Let  $\Psi_{n,w}^\lambda$  and  $\rho_{n,w}^\lambda(\mathbf{r})$  denote the wavefunction and density of the  $n$ th eigenstate of a  $N$ -electron Hamiltonian with a local potential,

$$\hat{H}_w^\lambda = \hat{T} + \lambda V_{ee} + \sum_{i=1}^N w(\mathbf{r}_i). \quad (1)$$

Extending the concept of ground-state  $v$ -representability, the wavefunctions, density matrices, and densities of eigenstates from Hamiltonians of this form are said to be excited-state  $v$ -representable. Extending the ground-state potential functional theory for a physical system with external potential  $v(\mathbf{r})$ , [77] define the excited-state potential functional:

$$\begin{aligned} E_v^\lambda[n, w] &= \langle \Psi_{n,w}^\lambda | \hat{H}_v^\lambda | \Psi_{n,w}^\lambda \rangle \\ &= \langle \Psi_{n,w}^\lambda | \hat{H}_w^\lambda | \Psi_{n,w}^\lambda \rangle + \int d\mathbf{r} (v(\mathbf{r}) - w(\mathbf{r})) \rho_{n,w}^\lambda(\mathbf{r}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

**Theorem 1.**  $E_v^\lambda[n, w]$  is stationary with respect to variations in the trial potential,  $w(\mathbf{r})$ , if  $w(\mathbf{r})$  and the physical potential,  $v(\mathbf{r})$ , differ by at most a constant.

*Proof.* Consider a variation  $\delta w(\mathbf{r})$ . For a nondegenerate eigenstate,  $\delta \langle \Psi_{n,w}^\lambda | \hat{H}_w^\lambda | \Psi_{n,w}^\lambda \rangle = \int d\mathbf{r} \delta w(\mathbf{r}) \rho_{n,w}^\lambda(\mathbf{r})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta E_v^\lambda[n, w] &= \delta \langle \Psi_{n,w}^\lambda | \hat{H}_w^\lambda | \Psi_{n,w}^\lambda \rangle - \int d\mathbf{r} \delta w(\mathbf{r}) \rho_{n,w}^\lambda(\mathbf{r}) \\ &\quad + \iint d\mathbf{r}' d\mathbf{r} (v(\mathbf{r}') - w(\mathbf{r}')) \frac{\delta \rho_{n,w}^\lambda(\mathbf{r}')}{\delta w(\mathbf{r})} \delta w(\mathbf{r}) \\ &= \iint d\mathbf{r}' d\mathbf{r} (v(\mathbf{r}) - w(\mathbf{r})) \frac{\delta \rho_{n,w}^\lambda(\mathbf{r}')}{\delta w(\mathbf{r}')} \delta w(\mathbf{r}') \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

$\delta E_{N,v}^\lambda[n, w(\mathbf{r})] = 0$  when  $v(\mathbf{r}) - w(\mathbf{r})$  is a constant.  $\square$

**Note.** See the supplemental material for the theorem's converse and its extension to degenerate states. This result, and all subsequent analysis, is easily extended to spin-resolved (unrestricted) calculations: just replace the spatial variable  $(\mathbf{r})$  with the spin variable  $(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{r}, \sigma)$ .

Theorem 1 allows us to shift variables from the many-electron wavefunction to the potential: the  $n^{\text{th}}$  excited state can be determined by making the energy functional  $E_v^1[n, w]$ , stationary with respect to the potential  $w$ . The potential and  $n$  then suffice to determine the excited-state wavefunction,  $\Psi_{n,v}^\lambda$ , (by solving the Schrödinger equation).

Conversely, because Hamiltonians,  $\hat{H}_w^\lambda$ , with different potentials have different eigenfunctions and different eigenfunctions of the same Hamiltonian are not only different, but orthogonal,

**Lemma.** *There is a mapping from the space of excited-state  $v$ -representable wavefunctions to their corresponding potentials and excitation levels.*

This lemma is proved in the supplementary material.

We now address practical KS-DFT calculations. The *ground-state Kohn-Sham assumption* is that for the ground state of any physical system, there exists a noninteracting system with the same ground-state density,  $\rho_{0,w}^1(\mathbf{r}) = \rho_{0,w_s}^0(\mathbf{r})$ . (I.e., every ground-state  $v$ -representable density is assumed to be ground-state noninteracting  $v$ -representable.) The Hohenberg-Kohn theorem then guarantees that the ground-state density uniquely determines the (non)interacting potential,  $w_s(\mathbf{r})$ , and the number of electrons, ergo the noninteracting Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_s = \hat{T} + \sum_i^N w_s(\mathbf{r}_i) = \hat{H}_{w_s}^0, \quad (4)$$

and its eigenfunctions, which can be chosen to be Slater determinants,  $\Phi$ .

We first recognize that  $\Delta$ SCF calculations rely upon the *excited-state Kohn-Sham assumption*, namely that for any bound state of any physical system, there exists a bound state of a noninteracting system with the same electron density,  $\rho_{n,w}^1(\mathbf{r}) = \rho_{n_s,w_s}^0(\mathbf{r})$ . (I.e., each excited-state  $v$ -representable density is also excited-state noninteracting  $v$ -representable.) For the same electron density, there may be multiple noninteracting systems with different excitation quantum numbers  $n_s$  and local potentials  $w_s(\mathbf{r})$ . Starting from any of these noninteracting systems, the many-electron wavefunction  $\Psi_{n,w}$  can be approached from the noninteracting  $\Phi_{n_s w_s}$  through an adiabatic connecting Hamiltonian,  $\hat{H}_{w^\lambda}^\lambda$  (cf. Eq. (1)), where  $w^\lambda(\mathbf{r})$  is any parameterized path of local potentials that satisfies the boundary conditions:  $w^0(\mathbf{r}) = w_s(\mathbf{r})$  and  $w^1(\mathbf{r}) = w(\mathbf{r})$ . [78–80] (For example, one may choose  $w_\lambda(\mathbf{r}) = (1 - \lambda)w_s(\mathbf{r}) + \lambda w(\mathbf{r})$ . [81]) The adiabatic connection maps the excitation quantum number  $n$  and the local potential  $w(\mathbf{r})$ , or equivalently,  $\Psi$ , of a bound state of an interacting system to the corresponding quantities of a computationally convenient noninteracting system,  $n_s$  and  $w_s(\mathbf{r})$ , or equivalently,  $\Phi_{n_s w_s}$ .

Our excited state KS assumption is parallel to the KS assumption for the ground states, with one critical difference: we do not assume the one-to-one mapping between excited-state densities and local potentials. It is not even necessary to choose the noninteracting reference so that its excitation number,  $n_s$ , matches that of the physical system: to construct the adiabatic connection we only need assume that there exists *some* eigenstate of *some* noninteracting reference system with the same density as the targeted eigenstate of the physical system.

We now use the excited-state KS assumption to construct the energy functionals and variational principles for  $\Delta$ SCF calculations. Using the excited state KS mapping from  $\{n_s, w_s(\mathbf{r})\}$  to  $\{n, w(\mathbf{r})\}$ , we can reexpress the excited-state potential functional, Eq. (2), in terms of the noninteracting reference system,

$$E_v[n_s, w_s] = E_v^1[n, w] = \left\langle \Psi_{n,w}^1 \left| \hat{H}_v^1 \right| \Psi_{n,w}^1 \right\rangle. \quad (5)$$

As a consequence of the Lemma, an excited-state noninteracting  $v$ -representable wavefunction,  $\Phi$ , uniquely determines  $n_s$  and  $w_s$ ; we can thus define a functional of the KS wavefunction,

$$E_v[\Phi] = E_v[n_s, w_s]. \quad (6)$$

Similarly, as shown in the supplementary material, an excited-state one-electron density matrix,  $\gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ , determines  $n_s$  and  $w_s$ . We thus define a (noninteracting) density-matrix functional,

$$E_v[\gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')] = E_v[n_s, w_s]. \quad (7)$$

We call these three equivalent approaches the excited-state potential-functional theory ( $n$ PFFT), the  $\Phi$ -functional theory ( $\Phi$ FT), and the  $\gamma_s$ -functional theory ( $\gamma_s$ FT). These functionals, together with the following variational principle, provide the foundation for the  $\Delta$ SCF method.

**Theorem 2.**  $E_v[n_s, w_s]$  is stationary with respect to variations in the trial potential  $w_s(\mathbf{r})$ , when  $w(\mathbf{r})$ , the map of  $w_s(\mathbf{r})$  to the potential at full interaction strength, equals the physical potential  $v(\mathbf{r})$  (up to a constant).

*Proof.* Consider a variation  $\delta w_s(\mathbf{r})$ . From Eqs. (2) and (5),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta E_v}{\delta w_s(\mathbf{r})} &= \int d\mathbf{r}' \left[ \frac{\delta \langle \Psi_{n,w} | H_w | \Psi_{n,w} \rangle}{\delta w(\mathbf{r}')} - \rho_{n,w}(\mathbf{r}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int d\mathbf{r}'' (v(\mathbf{r}'') - w(\mathbf{r}'')) \frac{\delta \rho_{n,w}(\mathbf{r}'')}{\delta w(\mathbf{r}')} \right] \frac{\delta w(\mathbf{r}')}{\delta w_s(\mathbf{r})} \\ &= \int d\mathbf{r}'' (v(\mathbf{r}'') - w(\mathbf{r}'')) \frac{\delta \rho_{n,w}(\mathbf{r}'')}{\delta w_s(\mathbf{r})} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

if  $v(\mathbf{r}) - w(\mathbf{r})$  is a constant,  $\delta E_v[n_s, w_s(\mathbf{r})] = 0$ .  $\square$

**Note.** See the supplemental material for the theorem's converse and its extension to degenerate states.

The variational principle for  $E_v[n_s, w_s]$  with respect to  $w_s$  implies corresponding variational principles for  $E_v[\Phi]$  and  $E_v[\gamma_s]$ . E.g., from the definition, (6),

$$E_v[\Phi] = \langle \Phi | \hat{T} | \Phi \rangle + J[\rho] + E_{xc}[\Phi] + \int d\mathbf{r} v(\mathbf{r}) \rho(\mathbf{r})$$

where we use  $\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \rho_{n,w}(\mathbf{r}) = \gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) = \langle \Phi | \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}) | \Phi \rangle$ , denote the classical Coulomb energy as  $J[\rho]$ , and define the exchange-correlation energy functional as

$$E_{xc}[\Phi] = \langle \Psi_{n,w}^1 | \hat{T} + V_{ee} | \Psi_{n,w}^1 \rangle - \langle \Phi | \hat{T} | \Phi \rangle - J[\rho] \quad (9)$$

Subject to the ground-state KS assumption, there exists a ground-state wavefunction for a system with full electron interaction,  $\Psi_{0,w}^1$ , and these expressions for the exchange-correlation energy are equivalent to the traditional KS definition. Moreover, as the ground-state density  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$  uniquely determines  $\Phi$  and  $\gamma_s$ , we can use the density as the basic variable and define the exchange-correlation energy (and, if we wish, even the noninteracting kinetic energy) as implicit functionals of  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ .

Similarly, subject to the excited-state KS assumption, there exists an excited-state wavefunction for a system with full electron interaction,  $\Psi_{n,w}^1$ , and  $E_{xc}$  can be expressed as a functional of the noninteracting wavefunction,  $\Phi$ , or the noninteracting density matrix,  $\gamma_s$ . This leads to Eqs. (9), which are applicable to both ground and excited states. The basic variable is  $(n, w_s)$ ,  $\gamma_s$  or  $\Phi$ ; the electron density  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$  no longer suffices. Thus, while ground-state KS theory is a DFT, excited-state KS theory is a  $n$ PFT,  $\Phi$ FT, or  $\rho_s$ FT. Thus, as shown in Table I, excited-state KS theory subsumes ground-state KS-DFT.

We now derive the working equations for the stationary points. For convenience, we will work directly with the set of  $N$  orbitals,  $\{\phi_i(\mathbf{r})\}$ , that are occupied in the  $n_s^{\text{th}}$  excited state of the noninteracting Hamiltonian (cf. Eq. (4)), each of which is an eigenfunction of the one-electron Hamiltonian with the trial potential  $w_s(\mathbf{r})$ :

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + w_s(\mathbf{r})\right) \phi_i(\mathbf{r}) = \varepsilon_i \phi_i(\mathbf{r}). \quad (10)$$

We can then express Theorem 2's stationarity condition in terms of the occupied orbitals or, equivalently,  $\Phi$  or  $\gamma_s$ . E.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\delta E_v[\gamma_s]}{\delta w_s(\mathbf{r}')} = \sum_i \int d\mathbf{r} \frac{\delta E_v[\gamma_s]}{\delta \phi_i^*(\mathbf{r})} \frac{\delta \phi_i^*(\mathbf{r})}{\delta w_s(\mathbf{r}')} + c.c. \\ &= \sum_i \int d\mathbf{r} \frac{\delta \phi_i^*(\mathbf{r})}{\delta w_s(\mathbf{r}')} \left[ \left(-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + v(\mathbf{r}) + v_J\right) \phi_i(\mathbf{r}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\delta E_{xc}[\gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')]}{\delta \phi_i^*(\mathbf{r}')} \right] + c.c. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here  $v_J(\mathbf{r})$  denotes the classical Coulomb potential. This stationary condition is the excited-state generalization of the optimized effective potential (OEP) minimum energy condition for the ground states.[82, 83]

When  $E_{xc}[\gamma_s]$  is approximated by an explicit functional of the electron density,  $E_{xc}[\rho(\mathbf{r})]$ , as in the local density functional approximation or a generalized gradient approximation, we have

$$\frac{\delta E_{xc}[\gamma_s]}{\delta \phi_i^*(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{\delta E_{xc}[\rho]}{\delta \phi_i^*(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{\delta E_{xc}[\rho]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})} \phi_i(\mathbf{r}) = v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}) \phi_i(\mathbf{r}),$$

where  $v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\delta E_{xc}[\rho]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})}$  is the (local) exchange-correlation potential. The OEP stationary condition (11) is then satisfied when the trial potential is equal to the Kohn-Sham potential constructed from the density composed by the orbitals occupied in the  $n_s^{\text{th}}$  excited state,

$$w_s(\mathbf{r}) = v_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r}) = v(\mathbf{r}) + v_J(\mathbf{r}) + v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (12)$$

TABLE I. Ground- and excited-state energy functionals and their variables. The new functionals are in the last row.

Theory	States	Theoretical Formulations			
		DFT	$n$ PFT	$\Phi$ FT	$\gamma_s$ FT
HK	ground	$E_v[\rho(\mathbf{r})]$	$E_v^1[0, w]$		
KS	ground	$E_v[\rho(\mathbf{r})]$	$E_v[0, w_s]$	$E_v[\Phi]$	$E_v[\gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')] ]$
	all	N/A	$E_v[n_s, w_s]$	$E_v[\Phi]$	$E_v[\gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')] ]$

The  $\Delta$ SCF approach is to reach the stationary condition by solving, self-consistently, the excited-state KS equations obtained by inserting Eq. (12) into Eq. (10).

When  $E_{xc}[\gamma_s]$  is given as an explicit functional of  $\gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ , as in Hartree-Fock and hybrid DFT,

$$\frac{\delta E_{xc}[\Phi]}{\delta \phi_i^*(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{\delta E_{xc}[\gamma_s]}{\delta \gamma_s^*(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')} = \int d\mathbf{r}' v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \phi_i(\mathbf{r}') \quad (13)$$

where the nonlocal exchange-correlation operator is defined as  $v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \frac{\delta E_{xc}[\gamma_s]}{\delta \gamma_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')}$ . The noninteracting potential can be determined by substituting (13) into the OEP equation (11). Alternatively, a different stationary point can be obtained using a generalized Kohn-Sham (GKS) approach where one allows the noninteracting reference system described by the one-electron equations (10) to have a nonlocal effective potential,[84]

$$w_s(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = v_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = (v(\mathbf{r}) + v_J(\mathbf{r})) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') + v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'). \quad (14)$$

This GKS approach was already developed in the original work of Kohn and Sham and was called Hartree-Fock-Kohn-Sham method[2, 85]. GKS calculations are much easier computationally than OEP calculations, but the difference in total energy and electron density, for ground states, is usually small. However, there is a major difference in the values of the (virtual) orbital energies and their interpretation.[86, 87]

Theorem 2 establishes the foundation for  $\Delta$ SCF calculations in KS, OEP and GKS calculations. As expressed in the Figure, while  $\gamma_s$  or  $\Phi$  are used as explicit variables in ground-state KS theory, they are inferred from the noninteracting Hamiltonian and its potential  $w_s(\mathbf{r})$ , which are determined uniquely (up to a trivial constant) by the ground-state density. Thus ground-state KS theory is still a *bona fide* DFT. Because excited-state densities do not uniquely determine their associated potentials, excited-state KS theory cannot be based only on the density, but it can be based on the noninteracting potential. The excited-state electron density, as the functional derivative of the eigenenergy with respect to the potential, still plays a key role.[88] Specifically, at stationary points of our new functionals the density of the noninteracting system is equal to the density of corresponding physical system, for both ground and excited states.

To construct the exchange-correlation energy functional, one uses the adiabatic connection. It is simplest and most conventional to choose a constant-density adiabatic connection, where  $n^\lambda$  and  $w^\lambda(\mathbf{r})$  are chosen so that




FIG. 1. Variables and Their Relationship for Describing Excited States.

the specified excited state density,  $\langle \Psi_{n^\lambda, w^\lambda}^\lambda | \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}) | \Psi_{n^\lambda, w^\lambda}^\lambda \rangle$ , of the adiabatic connection Hamiltonian (cf. Eq. (1)) remains constant.[20] By tracing this pathway,  $(n^0, w^0)$  (equivalently  $\Phi$  and  $\gamma_s$ ) determine the properties of the relevant excited state of the interacting system,  $(n^1, w^1)$ , and the exchange-correlation functional can be explicitly written,

$$E_{xc}[\gamma_s] = \int_0^1 d\lambda \langle \Psi_{n^\lambda, w^\lambda}^\lambda | \hat{V}_{ee} | \Psi_{n^\lambda, w^\lambda}^\lambda \rangle - J[\rho] \quad (15)$$

As a functional of  $\gamma_s$  or  $\Phi$ , Eq. (15) is the same for ground and excited states. This justifies the using approximations to  $E_{xc}$  that were originally designed for ground states for excited states in the  $\Delta$ SCF method. We are certainly not the first to note the utility of  $\Phi$ - or  $\gamma_s$ -functionals for treating excited states, as  $\Phi$  or  $\gamma_s$  are always the operational variables in  $\Delta$ SCF calculations.[19–21, 41, 60–63, 89] Our work defines the corresponding energy functionals and formulates their variational principles, based on the potential-functional formulation.

For ground states, the original Hohenberg-Kohn-Sham theorems were restricted to  $v$ -representable densities,[1, 2] motivating the development of functionals defined on the broader set of  $N$ -representable densities.[3–7] However, because there is no excited-state Hohenberg-Kohn theorem,  $N$ -representable DFT frameworks cannot be directly extended to excited states.[6, 19–26] Our ground-state potential functional theory preserves the  $v$ -representable framework of the original Hohenberg-Kohn-Sham DFT[77] and has now been extended to excited states, establishing the rigor of the  $\Delta$ SCF method.

Summarizing, we present three universal ground-and-excited-state functionals  $E_v[n, w_s] = E_v[\Phi] = E_v[\gamma_s]$ . The first functional generalizes the ground-state PFT formulation.[77] Similarly,  $E_v[\Phi]$  and  $E_v[\gamma_s]$  extend the ground-state (generalized) Kohn-Sham approach. The minimum of these functionals yields the ground state energy and its density. Their other stationary points yield excited-state energies and electron densities, as shown in Theorem 2. The realization that functionals can give exact results for ground states *and* excited states should be used when designing and testing new exchange-correlation functionals.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

WY acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation (CHE-2154831) and the National Institute of Health (R01-GM061870). PWA acknowledges support from NSERC, the Canada Research Chairs, and the Digital Research Alliance of Canada.

- 
- [1] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Inhomogeneous electron gas, *Phys.Rev.* **136**, B864 (1964).
- [2] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation effects, *Phys.Rev.* **140**, A1133 (1965).
- [3] M. Levy, Universal variational functionals of electron-densities, 1st-order density-matrices, and natural spin-orbitals and solution of the  $v$ -representability problem, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **76**, 6062 (1979).
- [4] S. M. Valone, A One-to-One Mapping Between One-Particle Densities and Some Normal-Particle Ensembles, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **73**, 4653 (1980).
- [5] E. H. Lieb, Density functionals for coulomb systems, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **24**, 243 (1983).
- [6] E. H. Lieb, Density functionals for coulomb systems, *NATO ASI Series, Series B* **123**, 31 (1985).
- [7] P.W. Ayers, Axiomatic formulations of the Hohenberg-Kohn functional, *Physical Review A* **73**, 10.1103/PhysRevA.73.012513 (2006).
- [8] A. M. Teale, T. Helgaker, A. Savin, C. Adano, B. Aradi, A. V. Arbuznikov, P. Ayers, E. J. Baerends, V. Barone, P. Calaminici, *et al.*, Dft exchange: sharing perspectives on the workhorse of quantum chemistry and materials science, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* (2022), á.
- [9] U. Von Barth and L. Hedin, A local exchange-correlation potential for the spin polarized case i, *J. Phys. C* **5**, 1629 (1972).
- [10] O. Gunnarsson and B. I. Lundqvist, Exchange and correlation in atoms, molecules and solids by the spin-density-functional formalism, *Physical Review B* **13**, 4274 (1976).
- [11] J. P. Perdew and A. Zunger, Self-interaction correction to density-functional approximations for many-electron systems, *Physical Review B* **23**, 5048 (1981).
- [12] A. Gorling, Symmetry in density-functional theory, *Physical Review A* **47**, 2783 (1993).
- [13] A. K. Theophilou, Density functional theory for excited states and special symmetries, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **61**, 333 (1997).
- [14] A. K. Theophilou, Rigorous formulation of a kohn and sham theory for states with special symmetries, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **69**, 461 (1998), 0020-7608.
- [15] R. Gaudoin and K. Burke, Lack of hohenberg-kohn theorem for excited states, *Physical Review Letters* **93**, 173001 (2004).
- [16] R. Gaudoin and K. Burke, Lack of hohenberg-kohn theorem for excited states (vol 93, art no 073001, 2004), *Physical Review Letters* **94**, 029901 (2005).
- [17] P. Samal and M. K. Harbola, Exploring foundations of time-independent density functional theory for excited states, *Journal of Physics B* **39**, 4065 (2006).
- [18] P. Samal, M. K. Harbola, and A. Holas, Density-to-potential map in time-independent excited-state density-functional theory, *Chemical Physics Letters* **419**, 217 (2006).
- [19] A. Gorling, Density-functional theory for excited states, *Physical Review A* **54**, 3912 (1996), 1050-2947.
- [20] A. Gorling, Density-functional theory beyond the hohenberg-kohn theorem, *Physical Review A* **59**, 3359 (1999).
- [21] A. Gorling, Proper treatment of symmetries and excited states in a computationally tractable kohn-sham method, *Physical Review Letters* **85**, 4229 (2000).
- [22] P. W. Ayers and M. Levy, Time-independent (static) density-functional theories for pure excited states: Extensions and unification, *Physical Review A* **80**, 012508 (2009), 1050-2947.
- [23] M. Levy and A. Nagy, Excited-state koopmans theorem for ensembles, *Physical Review A* **59**, 1687 (1999).
- [24] M. Levy and A. Nagy, Variational density-functional theory for an individual excited state, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, 4361 (1999).
- [25] A. Nagy and M. Levy, Variational density-functional theory for degenerate excited states, *Physical Review A* **63**, 052502 (2001).
- [26] A. Nagy, M. Levy, and P. W. Ayers, Time-independent theory for a single excited state, in *Chemical reactivity theory: A density functional view*, edited by P. K. Chattaraj (Taylor and Francis, Boca Raton, 2009) p. 121.
- [27] M. K. Harbola and P. Samal, Time-independent excited-state density functional theory: study of  $1s(2)2p(3)(s-4)$  and  $1s(2)2p(3)(d-2)$  states of the boron isoelectronic series up to  $ne5+$ , *Journal of Physics B-Atomic Molecular and Optical Physics* **42**, 015003 (2009), 0953-4075.
- [28] M. K. Harbola, M. Shamim, P. Samal, M. Rahaman, S. Ganguly, and A. Mookerjee, Time-independent excited-state density functional theory, in *Computational Methods in Science and Engineering, Vol 1 - Advances in Computational Science*, Aip Conference Proceedings, Vol. 1108, edited by G. Maroulis and T. E. Simos (2009) pp. 54-70, 0094-243X 978-0-7354-0644-5.
- [29] A. K. Theophilou, Energy density functional formalism for excited-states, *Journal of Physics C* **12**, 5419 (1979).
- [30] E. K. U. Gross, L. N. Oliveira, and W. Kohn, Rayleigh-ritz variational principle for ensembles of fractionally occupied states, *Physical Review A* , 2805 (1988), journal APR 15 N0593 PHYS REV A NOT IN FILE.
- [31] L. N. Oliveira, E. K. U. Gross, and W. Kohn, Density-functional theory for ensembles of fractionally occupied states .2. application to the he atom, *Physical Review A*

- 37**, 2821 (1988).
- [32] L. N. Oliveira, E. K. U. Gross, and W. Kohn, Ensemble density functional theory for excited-states, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **S24**, 707 (1990).
- [33] A. K. Theophilou and N. I. Gidopoulos, Density-functional theory for excited-states, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **56**, 333 (1995).
- [34] N. I. Gidopoulos, P. G. Papaconstantinou, and E. K. U. Gross, Spurious interactions, and their correction, in the ensemble-kohn-sham scheme for excited states, *Physical Review Letters* **88** (2002).
- [35] N. I. Gidopoulos, P. G. Papaconstantinou, and E. K. U. Gross, Spurious interactions, and their correction, in the ensemble-kohn-sham scheme for excited states, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, 033003 (2002), pRL.
- [36] O. Franck and E. Fromager, Generalised adiabatic connection in ensemble density-functional theory for excited states: example of the h-2 molecule, *Molecular Physics* **112**, 1684 (2014).
- [37] M. Filatov, Spin-restricted ensemble-referenced kohn-sham method: basic principles and application to strongly correlated ground and excited states of molecules, *WIREs Computational Molecular Science* **5**, 146 (2015).
- [38] F. Cernatic, B. Senjean, V. Robert, and E. Fromager, Ensemble density functional theory of neutral and charged excitations, *Topics in Current Chemistry* **380**, 4 (2021).
- [39] K. Deur and E. Fromager, Ground and excited energy levels can be extracted exactly from a single ensemble density-functional theory calculation, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **150**, 094106 (2019).
- [40] E. Fromager, Individual Correlations in Ensemble Density Functional Theory: State- and Density-Driven Decompositions without Additional Kohn-Sham Systems, *Physical Review Letters* **124**, 243001 (2020).
- [41] T. Gould and L. Kronik, Ensemble generalized kohn-sham theory: The good, the bad, and the ugly, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **154**, 094125 (2021).
- [42] T. Gould, D. P. Kooi, P. Gori-Giorgi, and S. Pittalis, Electronic excited states in extreme limits via ensemble density functionals, *Physical Review Letters* **130**, 106401 (2023), pRL.
- [43] A. Klein and R. M. Dreizler, Extension of kohn-sham theory to excited states by means of an off-diagonal density array, *Journal of Physics A* **35**, 2685 (2002).
- [44] J. L. Gao, A. Grofe, H. S. Ren, and P. Bao, Beyond kohn sham approximation: Hybrid multistate wave function and density functional theory, *Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **7**, 5143 (2016), 1948-7185.
- [45] Y. Lu and J. Gao, Fundamental variable and density representation in multistate dft for excited states, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **18**, 7403 (2022), doi: 10.1021/acs.jctc.2c00859.
- [46] Y. Lu and J. Gao, Multistate density functional theory of excited states, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **13**, 7762 (2022), doi: 10.1021/acs.jpcllett.2c02088.
- [47] E. Runge and E. K. U. Gross, Density-functional theory for time-dependent systems, *Physical Review Letters* **52**, 997 (1984).
- [48] E. K. U. Gross and W. Kohn, Local density-functional theory of frequency-dependent linear response, *Physical Review Letters* **55**, 2850 (1985).
- [49] M. E. Casida and D. P. Chong, Time-dependent density functional response theory for molecules, in *Recent Advances in Density Functional Methods. Part1.* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995) pp. 155–192.
- [50] M. E. Casida, Time-dependent density-functional theory for molecules and molecular solids, *Journal of Molecular Structure-Theochem* **914**, 3 (2009), 0166-1280.
- [51] Y. Yang, H. van Aggelen, and W. Yang, Double, rydberg and charge transfer excitations from pairing matrix fluctuation and particle-particle random phase approximation, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **139**, 224105 (2013).
- [52] Y. Yang, D. Peng, J. Lu, and W. Yang, Excitation energies from particle-particle random phase approximation: Davidson algorithm and benchmark studies, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **141**, 124104 (2014).
- [53] D. Zhang, D. Peng, P. Zhang, and W. Yang, Analytic gradients, geometry optimization and excited state potential energy surfaces from the particle-particle random phase approximation, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **17**, 1025 (2015).
- [54] Y. Yang, D. Peng, E. R. Davidson, and W. Yang, Singlet-triplet energy gaps for diradicals from particle particle random phase approximation, *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **119**, 4923 (2015).
- [55] Y. Yang, E. R. Davidson, and W. Yang, Nature of ground and electronic excited states of higher acenes, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**, E5098 (2016), doi: 10.1073/pnas.1606021113.
- [56] Y. Mei and W. Yang, Excited-state potential energy surfaces, conical intersections, and analytical gradients from ground-state density functional theory, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **10**, 2538 (2019), doi: 10.1021/acs.jpcllett.9b00712.
- [57] R. van Leeuwen, Mapping from densities to potentials in time-dependent density-functional theory, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, 3863 (1999).
- [58] R. Van Leeuwen, Key concepts in time-dependent density-functional theory, *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **15**, 1969 (2001).
- [59] M. Ruggenthaler, M. Penz, and R. v. Leeuwen, Existence, uniqueness, and construction of the density-potential mapping in time-dependent density-functional theory, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **27**, 203202 (2015), 0953-8984.
- [60] J. C. Slater, The self-consistent field for molecules and solids: Quantum theory of molecules and solids, vol. 4 (1974).
- [61] J. C. Slater and J. H. Wood, Statistical exchange and the total energy of a crystal, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **5**, 3 (1970).
- [62] T. Ziegler, A. Rauk, and E. J. Baerends, On the calculation of multiplet energies by the hartree-fock-slater method, *Theoretica chimica acta* **43**, 261 (1977).
- [63] R. O. Jones and O. Gunnarsson, The density functional formalism, its applications and prospects, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **61**, 689 (1989), rMP.
- [64] L. Triguero, O. Plashkevych, L. G. M. Pettersson, and H. Ågren, Separate state vs. transition state kohn-sham calculations of x-ray photoelectron binding energies and chemical shifts, *Journal of Electron Spectroscopy and Related Phenomena* **104**, 195 (1999).
- [65] C.-L. Cheng, Q. Wu, and T. Van Voorhis, Rydberg energies using excited state density functional theory, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **129**, 124112 (2008).
- [66] A. T. B. Gilbert, N. A. Besley, and P. M. W. Gill,

- Self-consistent field calculations of excited states using the maximum overlap method (mom), *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **112**, 13164 (2008), doi: 10.1021/jp801738f.
- [67] I. Seidu, M. Krykunov, and T. Ziegler, Applications of time-dependent and time-independent density functional theory to rydberg transitions, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **119**, 5107 (2015), doi: 10.1021/jp5082802.
- [68] J. Liu, Y. Zhang, P. Bao, and Y. Yi, Evaluating electronic couplings for excited state charge transfer based on maximum occupation method delta scf quasi-adiabatic states, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **13**, 843 (2017), doi: 10.1021/acs.jctc.6b01161.
- [69] G. M. J. Barca, A. T. B. Gilbert, and P. M. W. Gill, Excitation number: Characterizing multiply excited states, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **14**, 9 (2018), doi: 10.1021/acs.jctc.7b00963.
- [70] G. M. J. Barca, A. T. B. Gilbert, and P. M. W. Gill, Simple models for difficult electronic excitations, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **14**, 1501 (2018), doi: 10.1021/acs.jctc.7b00994.
- [71] D. Hait and M. Head-Gordon, Highly accurate prediction of core spectra of molecules at density functional theory cost: Attaining sub-electronvolt error from a restricted open-shell kohn–sham approach, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **11**, 775 (2020), doi: 10.1021/acs.jpcclett.9b03661.
- [72] C. Kumar and S. Lubner, Robust Delta scf calculations with direct energy functional minimization methods and step for molecules and materials, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **156**, 154104 (2022).
- [73] L. Kunze, A. Hansen, S. Grimme, and J.-M. Mewes, Pcm-roks for the description of charge-transfer states in solution: Singlet–triplet gaps with chemical accuracy from open-shell kohn–sham reaction-field calculations, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **12**, 8470 (2021), doi: 10.1021/acs.jpcclett.1c02299.
- [74] J. P. Perdew and M. Levy, Extrema of the density functional for the energy: excited states from the ground-state theory, *Physical Review B* **31**, 6264 (1985).
- [75] E. Vandaele, M. Mališ, and S. Lubner, The  $\Delta$ scf method for non-adiabatic dynamics of systems in the liquid phase, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **156**, 130901 (2022).
- [76] J. M. Herbert, Chapter 3 - density-functional theory for electronic excited states, in *Theoretical and Computational Photochemistry*, edited by C. Garcia-Iriepa and M. Marazzi (Elsevier, 2023) pp. 69–118.
- [77] W. T. Yang, P. W. Ayers, and Q. Wu, Potential functionals: Dual to density functionals and solution to the upsilon-representability problem, *Physical Review Letters* **92**, 146404 (2004).
- [78] D. C. Langreth and J. P. Perdew, Exchange-correlation energy of a metallic surface: Wave-vector analysis, *Physical Review B* **15**, 2884 (1977).
- [79] J. Harris, Adiabatic-connection approach to Kohn-Sham theory, *Physical Review A* **29**, 1648 (1984).
- [80] W. Yang, Generalized adiabatic connection in density functional theory, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **109**, 10107 (1998).
- [81] J. Harris and R. O. Jones, The surface energy of a bounded electron gas, *J.Phys.F* **4**, 1170 (1974).
- [82] R. T. Sharp and G. K. Horton, A variational approach to the unipotential many-electron problem, *Physical Review* **90**, 317 (1953).
- [83] J. D. Talman and W. F. Shadwick, Optimized effective atomic central potential, *Physical Review A* **14**, 36 (1976).
- [84] Y. Jin, D. Zhang, Z. Chen, N. Q. Su, and W. Yang, Generalized Optimized Effective Potential for Orbital Functionals and Self-Consistent Calculation of Random Phase Approximations, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **8**, 4746 (2017).
- [85] R. G. Parr and W. Yang, *Density-Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules* (Oxford UP, New York, 1989).
- [86] A. J. Cohen, P. Mori-Sanchez, and W. T. Yang, Fractional charge perspective on the band gap in density-functional theory, *Physical Review B* **77**, 115123 (2008).
- [87] R. Garrick, A. Natan, T. Gould, and L. Kronik, Exact Generalized Kohn-Sham Theory for Hybrid Functionals, *Physical Review X* **10**, 021040 (2020).
- [88] Y. Jin, N. Q. Su, Z. Chen, and W. Yang, Introductory lecture: When the density of the noninteracting reference system is not the density of the physical system in density functional theory, *Faraday Discussions* **224**, 9 (2020).
- [89] T. Kowalczyk, S. R. Yost, and T. V. Voorhis, Assessment of the  $\Delta$ scf density functional theory approach for electronic excitations in organic dyes, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **134**, 054128 (2011).