

Simple and accurate exchange energy for density functional theory

Teepanis Chachiyo,^{1,2,*} and Hathaithip Chachiyo³

¹ Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Naresuan University, Phitsanulok 65000 Thailand
email: teeapanisc@nu.ac.th

² Thailand Center of Excellence in Physics, Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation, 328 Si Ayutthaya Road, Bangkok 10400, Thailand

³ Private Residence, Phitsanulok 65000, Thailand email: hathaithip.chachiyo@gmail.com

* Corresponding author

Abstract

A non-empirical exchange functional based on an interpolation between two limits of electron density: slowly varying limit and asymptotic limit, is proposed. In the slowly varying limit, we follow the study by Kleinman in 1984 which considered the response of a free-electron gas to an external periodic potential, but further assume that the perturbing potential also induces Bragg diffraction of the Fermi electrons. The interpolation function is motivated by the exact exchange functional of a hydrogen atom. Combined with our recently proposed correlation functional, tests on 56 small molecules show that, for the first-row molecules, the exchange-correlation combo predicts the total energies four times more accurate than presently available Quantum Monte Carlo results. For the second-row molecules, errors of the core electrons exchange energies can be corrected, leading to the most accurate molecular total energy predictions to date despite minimal computational efforts. The calculated bond energies, zero point energies, and dipole moments are also presented.

Keyword

Exchange Energy, Density Functional Theory, Quantum Monte Carlo, Generalized Gradient Approximation

I. INTRODUCTION

Exchange energy plays an important role in density functional theory (DFT).¹ Even though much has been understood regarding its behavior,^{2,3} there is plenty of room for more understanding. For example, it is well-established that the exchange energy obeys two limiting cases: (i) the slowly varying density, and (ii) the asymptotic limit where the density decays rapidly in the outer regions of molecules.⁴ In 1988, Becke proposed a functional that satisfied the two limits.² The question remains, however, what exactly happens in the intermediate region? In this work, we explicitly use an interpolation function to merge the two limits, and show that the resulting functional is simple and accurate.

Another example is related to the slowly varying limit where the exchange energy increases as a function of the reduced gradient parameter $s \equiv |\vec{\nabla}\rho|/2(3\pi^2)^{1/3}\rho^{4/3}$.³ Although it is well known that the exchange energy enhancement factor increases quadratically ($1 + \mu s^2$), the value of μ is not exactly understood.⁵ An often cited value comes from a study by Klienman which considered how free-electron eigenfunctions were perturbed by an external periodic potential.⁶ The exchange energy was then evaluated and rewritten as a function of electron density and its gradient. If the wavelength of the external potential was large, it was estimated that $\mu = \frac{8}{81}$ which was too low to give accurate predictions for atoms and molecules.⁵ In this work, we assume an additional condition on the external periodic potential. That is, the potential also induces Bragg diffraction of the Fermi electrons. This assumption leads to a higher value of μ and gives accurate predictions of total energies, bond energies, zero point energies, and dipole moments of test systems, which include first- and second-row atoms and 56 small molecules.

This report is organized as follow. In Theoretical Method, we layout the mathematical form, propose the interpolating function, derive the value of μ , and fully construct the exchange functional. Then, we describe benchmarking procedures. In Results and Discussions, we show that the exchange functional is accurate, particularly in comparison to the previously published Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) calculations.⁷ In Conclusion, we list all the theoretical arguments that lead to the non-empirical exchange functional in this work.

II. THEORETICAL METHOD

Traditionally, a dimensionless parameter s was used to quantify the inhomogeneity of electron density. The exchange energy was then written with an ‘‘enhancement factor’’ $F(s)$,³

$$E_x[\rho] = \int \rho \varepsilon_x F(s) d^3r. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\varepsilon_x = -\frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{3}{\pi} \rho \right)^{1/3}$ was the Dirac exchange energy density⁸ for uniform electron gas. As the electron density deviated from the homogeneous case $s = 0$, the function $F(s)$ increased from the baseline value of 1, effectively enhancing the strength of the exchange energy from that of the uniform electron gas.

As March elaborated,⁹ in the asymptotic limit $s \rightarrow \infty$, the exchange energy density needed to behave as $\varepsilon_x F(s) \rightarrow -1/2r$. Also asymptotically, the electron density decayed exponentially $\rho(r) \rightarrow Ne^{-ar}$. This asymptotic behavior was not specific to a hydrogen atom but occurred in general,⁴ where the parameter a was related to the ionization potential. Therefore, to satisfy the limit, the enhancement factor was thought to take the form $F(s) = \frac{cs}{\ln s}$, which however, diverged to infinity at $s = 1$. Therefore, as the first step, we proposed the following modification.

$$s \rightarrow \infty: \quad F(s) = \frac{cs}{\ln(cs+1)}; \quad c = \frac{4\pi}{9}, \quad (2)$$

which was well behaved in the entire range $s \in [0, \infty)$ with an additional advantage: $F(0) = 1$. It was easy to show that for the $\varepsilon_x F(s) \rightarrow -1/2r$ in this limit, the constant c had to be equal to $4\pi/9$.

The next step was to merge $F(s)$ in Eq. (2) with the slowly varying case. It was known^{5,6} that in this region the enhancement factor grew quadratically as $1 + \mu s^2$. Ignoring altogether the μs^2 behavior in the beginning and conjecturing that the quadratic dependence would have emerged naturally after the interpolation, we simply tried to interpolate between the *perfectly uniform* electron gas $F(s) = 1$ in the ($s = 0$) limit, and the $F(s) = \frac{cs}{\ln(cs+1)}$ in the asymptotic limit ($s \rightarrow \infty$) with the simplest interpolation scheme possible, namely

$$F(s) = 1 \cdot w(s) + \frac{cs}{\ln(cs+1)} \cdot [1 - w(s)]. \quad (3)$$

Here, $w(s)$ was the weighting function which took a value between $[0,1]$. We used $w(s) = \frac{1}{ds+1}$ with the constant d controlling how rapidly the weighting function migrated from the slowly varying limit to the asymptotic limit. Substituting the $w(s)$ into Eq. (3) yielded

$$F(s) = \frac{dcs^2 + \ln(cs+1)}{(ds+1)\ln(cs+1)}. \quad (4)$$

The choice of the weighting function $w(s) = \frac{1}{ds+1}$ was motivated by the exact exchange functional for a hydrogen atom. Consider a hydrogen atom whose normalized electron density was $\rho(r) = \frac{1}{\pi} e^{-2r}$. Recall that the electron repulsion energy $E_{e-e} = \frac{1}{2} \iint d^3r_1 d^3r_2 \frac{\rho(\vec{r}_1)\rho(\vec{r}_2)}{|\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|}$ of the Kohn-Sham DFT was always there in the formalism regardless of the physical system under study. However, there was only one electron in hydrogen atom; hence, the role of the exchange energy in this case was to cancel exactly the E_{e-e} in the Kohn-Sham formalism. For a hydrogen atom,

$$E_{e-e} = \int d^3r \rho(\vec{r}) \left[e^{-2r} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) + (1 - e^{-2r}) \frac{1}{2r} \right]. \quad (5)$$

Therefore, the exchange energy density which cancelled the above expression exactly was

$$\varepsilon_x(\rho)F(s) = e^{-2r} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + (1 - e^{-2r}) \left(-\frac{1}{2r}\right). \quad (6)$$

Notice the curious pattern which mimicked an interpolation with the term e^{-2r} representing the weighting function. Note that weighting function decayed exponentially in r .

Using $\rho(r) = \frac{1}{\pi} e^{-2r}$, we had $s \propto e^{2r/3}$. In other words, $\frac{1}{ds+1}$ also decayed exponentially in r , approximately mimicking the behavior of the exact exchange functional of a hydrogen atom. In fact, even if we had allowed a more general form $w(s) = \frac{1}{ds^{n+1}}$, the second order Taylor expansion of $F(s)$ in Eq. (3) would have vanished for all positive integers n , except when $n = 1$. In other words, $n = 1$ was the only case consistent with the quadratic behavior of the enhancement factor. Therefore, we believed $w(s) = \frac{1}{ds+1}$ was the optimal form of the weighting function.

Next, we determined the value of μ in the slowly varying limit. In generalize gradient approximation, when the gradient parameter s was small, the exchange energy (per unit volume) was approximately

$$\frac{E_x}{V} = -\frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{3}{\pi}\right)^{1/3} \rho^{4/3} (1 + \mu s^2). \quad (7)$$

In 1984, Kleinman studied how free-electron eigenfunctions were perturbed by an external periodic potential $V_{\text{ext}}(\vec{K})e^{+i\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}} + V_{\text{ext}}(-\vec{K})e^{-i\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}}$.⁶ To avoid confusion, we will use the notation Eq. (K-Number) when referring to a specific equation in the Kleinman's paper. From Eq. (K-17), the exchange energy per normalization volume Ω was

$$\frac{E_x}{\Omega} = -\frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{3}{\pi}\right)^{1/3} \rho_0^{4/3} - \frac{2\pi}{3K^2} \{[\rho(\vec{K})]^2 + [\rho(-\vec{K})]^2\}. \quad (8)$$

Using $\rho(\vec{K}) = \rho(-\vec{K})$ as indicated in the Eq. (K-10), we had

$$\frac{E_x}{\Omega} = -\frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{3}{\pi}\right)^{1/3} \rho_0^{4/3} \left(1 + \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right)^{1/3} \rho_0^{-4/3} \frac{2\pi}{3K^2} 2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2\right). \quad (9)$$

Comparing Eq. (7) and Eq. (9), we could identify

$$\frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right)^{1/3} \rho_0^{-4/3} \frac{2\pi}{3K^2} 2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2 = \mu S^2 = \mu \frac{1}{4(3\pi^2)^{2/3}} \frac{|\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2}{\rho^{8/3}}. \quad (10)$$

Using $\rho \approx \rho_0$ as generally the case for perturbed free-electron gas, and $k_F = (3\pi^2\rho_0)^{1/3}$, we had

$$\mu = \frac{32 k_F^4}{27 K^4} \frac{2K^2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2}{|\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2}. \quad (11)$$

It was possible to mathematically deduce that $\frac{2K^2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2}{|\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2} = 1$ on average (see supplementary material). Therefore,

$$\mu = \frac{32}{27} \left(\frac{k_F}{K}\right)^4. \quad (12)$$

One choice of $\left(\frac{k_F}{K}\right)^4$ was of particular interest. Consider the case when the external potential induced Bragg diffraction of the Fermi electrons. The mathematical condition for this to occur was¹⁰

$$2\vec{k}_F \cdot \vec{K} = K^2 \quad \text{or} \quad 4k_F^2 K^2 \cos^2(\theta) = K^4. \quad (13)$$

Replacing $\cos^2(\theta)$ with its average value $\frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \cos^2(\theta) d\theta = \frac{1}{2}$, and rearranging the above expression, we had $\left(\frac{k_F}{K}\right)^4 = \frac{1}{4}$. Hence,

$$\mu = \frac{8}{27} = \frac{24}{81}. \quad (14)$$

Having elaborated on the choice of the weighting function, and determined the value of μ , we revisited Eq. (4) and attempted to compute the constant d using Taylor expansion up to the second order:

$$s \ll 1: \quad F(s) \approx 1 + 0 \cdot s + \frac{1}{2}(dc)s^2, \quad (15)$$

which could readily be compared to the known $1 + \mu s^2$ behavior of the slowly varying limit. We used the value $\mu = \frac{8}{27}$ from Eq. (14), yielding

$$\frac{1}{2}(dc) = \frac{8}{27} \quad \text{or} \quad d = \frac{8}{27} \frac{2}{c} = \frac{4}{3\pi}. \quad (16)$$

Putting the constant d and c back into Eq. (4) and defining another variable $x \equiv cs = \frac{|\nabla\rho|}{\rho^{4/3}} \frac{2}{9} \left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right)^{1/3}$, we finally arrived at the non-empirical exchange functional in this work

$$E_x = \int \rho \varepsilon_x \frac{3x^2 + \pi^2 \ln(x+1)}{(3x + \pi^2) \ln(x+1)} d^3r. \quad (17)$$

To produce the results as shown in the following section, one also needed a correlation energy contribution. We used our recently published correlation functional¹¹

$$E_c = \int \rho \varepsilon_c (1 + t^2)^{h/\varepsilon_c} d^3r. \quad (18)$$

This exchange-correlation combo was shown to give very accurate total energies for a small set of molecules. Here, we expanded the size of test molecules, and the variety of atoms to cover second-row elements.

To allow direct comparisons with the previous QMC results,⁷ we used a set of 56 molecules with the exact same geometries as described in the supplementary material of Ref. 7. Experimentally derived total energies¹² and zero point energies¹⁷ were also available for comparisons. We used a large basis set QZP¹³-gh (with g and h GTO removed) for single point calculations, and a smaller basis 6-31G* for zero point energy calculations. The basis sets were downloaded from EMSL Basis Set Exchange database.¹⁴ The reported values were calculated using the Siam Quantum program.¹⁵ The detailed methods for solving the Khon-Sham SCF equation for this exchange-correlation functionals were described in the supplementary material of Ref. 11. Very recently, the functionals in Eq. (17) and Eq. (18) were implemented in the LibXC library¹⁶ where the calculated energies agreed with that of the Siam Quantum’s implementation to within micro-hartrees.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Fig. 1 illustrates the accuracy of the exchange functional in this work when predicting the total energies of neutral atoms. The label “(This Work) DFT” is from the exchange and correlation functional in Eq. (17) and Eq. (18), respectively. The performance is satisfactory for small atoms, but increasingly poorer starting from Ne onward. The results from QMC calculation⁷ also show the same trend.




FIG. 1. Errors of the calculated total energies as compared to the “exact” values¹² (kcal/mol). The QMC results⁷ are also shown.

After a few trial-and-error attempts, we discover that the errors of the predicted total energies for Ne and the second-row atoms are related to the core electrons’ exchange energy. A simple ad-hoc correction scheme for atoms and molecules can be devised very accurately. As shown in Fig. 2, we first compute the error of exchange energy at Hartree-Fock (HF) density for each ion core. For example, HF calculation is performed on Ne^{8+} , yielding HF orbitals and HF density. Then, the orbitals are used to compute HF exchange energy; whereas the density is used to compute the DFT exchange energy via Eq. (17). The difference ($\text{DFT}_x - \text{HF}_x$) is reported in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2. Schematic of the Core Exchange Correction.

From the graph, $(\text{DFT}_x - \text{HF}_x)$ of the core electrons track quite accurately with the errors of the predicted total energies. Therefore, we devise an error correction scheme by simply subtracting the $(\text{DFT}_x - \text{HF}_x)$ of the core electrons from the DFT's total energy. In other words,

$$\text{Core Exchange Correction } \Delta E_x^{(\text{core})} \equiv -(\text{DFT}_x^{(\text{core})} - \text{HF}_x^{(\text{core})}). \quad (19)$$

The corrected total energies, $E_{\text{total}}^{(\text{DFT})} + \Delta E_x^{(\text{core})}$, are shown in Fig. 1. The mean-absolute-error (MAE) is now dropped to only 2.7 kcal/mol. The list of $(\text{DFT}_x^{(\text{core})} - \text{HF}_x^{(\text{core})})$ is given in Fig. 2. In this ad-hoc scheme, the correction is only applied to Ne through Ar.

The main results of this report are the errors of the calculated total energies of 56 molecules as shown in Fig. 3. Even without any correction, the DFT energies perform very well for the first row molecules with MAE of 3.2 kcal/mol, four times more accurate than the presently available QMC results. However, when the test molecules contain second-row atoms, the errors rise to match that of the QMC. After we apply the correction scheme, the errors suddenly drop; and the MAE of the full set is now only 3.5 kcal/mol.




FIG. 3. Errors of calculated total energies (kcal/mol). The reference total energies¹² are derived from experimental atomization energies.

For molecules, the correction is done “atom-wise”, and only on the second-row atoms. That is,

$$\text{Corrected Molecular Total Energy} = E_{\text{total}}^{(\text{DFT})} + \sum_{\text{atoms}}^{\text{2nd-row}} \Delta E_x^{(\text{core})}. \quad (20)$$

For example, Si_2H_6 contains 2 silicon atoms. Its corrected total energy is $E_{\text{total}}^{(\text{DFT})} + 2 \times (-21.1 \text{ kcal/mol})$.

The fact that this atom-wise correction scheme works very well implies that the errors stem from the core electrons which in general do not participate in chemical bonding. If so, the DFT energies without any correction should work well when predicting the bond energies, which is the case as shown in Fig. 4.




FIG 4. Errors of calculated bond energies (kcal/mol). The reference values are from Ref. 12.

Bond energies are the atomization energies without zero point energies nor relativistic contributions. We report the bond energies to allow direct comparisons with the reported QMC results.⁷

$$\text{Bond Energies} = \sum_{A \in \text{atoms}} E_{\text{total}}^{(A)} - E_{\text{total}}^{(M)} \quad (21)$$

The summation runs through all constituent atoms in the molecule. In Fig. 4, under the label “(This Work) DFT”, errors of the predicted bond energies are shown. The molecular total energies and the atomic total energies are from the DFT calculations without any correction. The MAE is 4.7 kcal/mol.

An alternative way to compute the bond energies is to use the “exact” atomic energies, as supposed to the same method that has been used to compute the molecular energy. Typically, this will lead to huge errors if we cannot predict the molecular total energies accurately enough. It is interesting to see how the corrected molecular energies perform in this test. The results are shown in Fig. 4 under the label “(This Work) DFT+Core Exchange Correction”. In this case, the molecular total energies that enter Eq. (21) are the corrected ones; whereas the atomic total energies are the exact values from Ref. 12. The MAE now drops to 3.5 kcal/mol, very close to that of the QMC results. In fact, the 3.5 kcal/mol MAE for the bond energies is identical to that of the total energies. This is no coincidence as one can mathematically show that both errors are identical, provided that we use the “exact” atomic energies to evaluate the bond energies. The proof is provided in the supplementary material.

TABLE I. Errors of the calculated total energies, bond energies, dipole moments (Debye), and zero point energies of test molecules. All energies are in kcal/mol. Experimental dipole moments and zero point energies are from Ref. 17.

	Eq. (17-18)	Eq. (17-18) + $\Delta E_x^{(\text{core})}$
<i>Total Energy</i>		
ME	16.9	1.0
MAE	18.5	3.5
first-row ME	0.4	0.4
first-row MAE	3.2	3.2
<i>Bond Energy</i>		
ME	-1.9	-1.0
MAE	4.7	3.5
first-row ME	-0.3	-0.4
first-row MAE	4.4	3.2
<i>Dipole Moment</i>		
MAE	0.11	
<i>Zero Point Energy</i>		
MAE (6-31G*)	0.12	

In addition to the energies previously discussed, one may look at other physical properties such as dipole moments or zero point energies. Table I shows the errors of calculated dipole moments which reflect the accuracy of the predicted electron density (i.e. the x-component of a dipole moment involves an integral $\int x\rho(\vec{r})d^3r$). The MAE is 0.11 Debye which is comparable to that of other DFT functionals.¹⁸

We believe zero point energies (ZPE) are indicators of how well the functional predicts the derivatives of energies. The first derivatives are needed for geometry optimization. At the optimized geometries, the second derivatives are needed to compute vibration frequencies; and the sum of those frequencies are then translated to the vibrational ZPEs. Due to our limited computational resources, we can only use the small 6-31G* basis set. From Table I, the MAE is 0.12 kcal/mol which is comparable to that of the highly cited technique¹⁹ of predicting ZPEs. Therefore, in addition to the total energies, the functionals in Eq. (17) and Eq. (18) are able to predict the derivatives of energies quite accurately.

The accuracies of Eq. (17) and Eq. (18) are perplexing when considering how much total energies are involved in the calculations. Despite nearly 1,000 folds increase in total energies, 739 kcal/mol for H₂ to more than half a million kcal/mol for Cl₂, the errors in Fig. 3 remain flat on the order of a few kcal/mol without apparent over-shooting nor under-shooting. From this data set, it is reasonable to project that even if the molecules are much larger, the errors should remain roughly the same. In other words, the DFT exchange-correlation functional combo has no systematic error. Even if the molecules contain second-row atoms, the energies can still be corrected very accurately.

For molecules, the most accurate all-electron total energy predictions are from QMC method such as the one by Nemeč and coworkers,⁷ where a set of 55 molecules were studied. Using the data from their supplementary material, we computed the MAE to be 13.5 kcal/mol for the first-row molecules, and 23.7 kcal/mol for the full set. A slightly more accurate (much smaller set of molecules) QMC total energies were also reported.²⁰ The MAE for the first-row homonuclear diatomic molecules was 11.4 kcal/mol. As evident from Fig. 3 and Table I, the DFT results in this work are the most accurate molecular total energy predictions to date, representing significant advances in the field of quantum mechanics.

The success of Eq. (17) and Eq. (18) does not imply that these functionals perform better than QMC method in general. QMC method has been shown to produce very accurate atomic energies with only 1.5 kcal/mol MAE;²¹ but the same level of accuracy has not been achieved for molecules. QMC calculations generally require huge computing power. For example, the QMC energies shown in Fig. 3 required 40 CPU hours per electron (Intel XEON, 3 GHz CPU).⁷ In contrast, our DFT calculations used 10 CPU hours to complete the full set of 56 molecules, translating to 0.01 CPU hours per electron (Intel Celeron, 1.86 GHz). Therefore, if one needs a speedy result with an overall error of a few kcal/mol, this functional combo provides a good alternative to the existing theoretical methods.

While preparing the manuscript, the exchange functional has drawn interest from a few authors. It was implemented in the LibXC¹⁶ under the name “Chachiyo exchange”. It was also used²² to compute atomic potentials for a new initial guess method called SAP (Superposition of Atomic

Potential). The study used 259 test molecules and reported that the Chachiyo exchange yielded the best initial guess wave functions on average out of hundreds functionals available in LibXC.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we show that a simple and accurate exchange functional can be devised using a model that a free-electron gas is perturbed by the periodic external potential which also induces Bragg diffraction of the Fermi electrons. Using this model, we have determined the quadratic coefficient of the exchange enhancement factor to be $\mu = \frac{8}{27}$, which governs how the exchange energy is enhanced by electron density gradient in the slowly varying limit. We also show that the slowly varying limit can be merged into the asymptotic limit using an interpolation scheme, yielding the complete exchange energy functional applicable to the full range of electron density gradients. The interpolating function is $w(s) = \frac{1}{ds+1}$, which mimics the exact exchange functional of a hydrogen atom.

Tests on 56 small molecules indicate that the exchange energy functional, in combination with the recently published correlation functional, is uniquely accurate when predicting the total energies of molecules, with the MAE of only 3.2 kcal/mol for the first-row molecules. For the second-row molecules, errors of the core electron exchange energies can be corrected, leading to the most accurate molecular total energy predictions to date despite minimal computational efforts.

For bond energies, dipole moments, and zero point energies, the MAEs are 3.5 kcal/mol, 0.11 Debye, and 0.12 kcal/mol, respectively. Eq. (17) and Eq. (18) are able to capture the behavior of valent electrons quite well as seen from the successful bond energy calculations. Accurate dipole moments reflect how well the functionals predict the electron density on average; whereas the zero point energies indicate the performance of first and second derivatives of energy predictions.

In DFT, the basic variable is the density of electron, a function that holds very little mathematical information compared to the full multi-electron wave functions, yet theoretically capable of determining exactly the ground-state total energies of electronic systems. The exchange energy functional in Eq. (17) is a practical demonstration that the basic premise of DFT is valid. Its non-empirical form, and its unique accuracy when predicting the total energies of molecules represent a mile stone in quantum mechanics, in the pursuit to understand how the energies could be determined exactly by the density of electron.

Supplementary Material

See supplementary material for additional theoretical proofs, detailed energies, dipole moments, and zero point energies of the test molecules.

Acknowledgements

Support by Thailand Center of Excellence in Physics grant No. ThEP-60-PET-NU9 is gratefully acknowledged.

Reference

- ¹ W. Kohn and L.J. Sham, *Phys. Rev.* **140**, A1133 (1965).
- ² A.D. Becke, *Phys. Rev. A* **38**, 3098 (1988).
- ³ J.P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- ⁴ C.O. Almbladh and U. Von Barth, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 3231 (1985).
- ⁵ P. Elliott and K. Burke, *Can. J. Chem.* **87**, 1485 (2009).
- ⁶ L. Kleinman, *Phys. Rev. B* **30**, 2223 (1984).
- ⁷ N. Nemeč, M.D. Towler, and R.J. Needs, *J. Chem. Phys.* **132**, 034111 (2010).

- ⁸ P.A.M. Dirac, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **26**, 376 (1930).
- ⁹ N.H. March, *Phys. Rev. A* **36**, 5077 (1987).
- ¹⁰ C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics* (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1996).
- ¹¹ T. Chachiyo and H. Chachiyo, *Comput. Theor. Chem.* **1172**, 112669 (2020).
- ¹² D.P. O'Neill and P.M.W. Gill, *Mol. Phys.* **103**, 763 (2005).
- ¹³ P.L. Barbieri, P.A. Fantin, and F.E. Jorge, *Mol. Phys.* **104**, 2945 (2006).
- ¹⁴ K.L. Schuchardt, B.T. Didier, T. Elsethagen, L. Sun, V. Gurumoorthi, J. Chase, J. Li, and T.L. Windus, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **47**, 1045 (2007).
- ¹⁵ T. Chachiyo, *et al.* computer code Siam Quantum, Thailand, 2016.
- ¹⁶ S. Lehtola, C. Steigemann, M.J.T. Oliveira, and M.A.L. Marques, *SoftwareX* **7**, 1 (2018).
- ¹⁷ D.R. Lide, *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics* (CRC Press, Florida, 2005).
- ¹⁸ S.G. Dale, E.R. Johnson, and A.D. Becke, *J. Chem. Phys.* **147**, 154103 (2017).
- ¹⁹ A.P. Scott, and L. Radom, *J. Phys. Chem.* **100**, 16502 (1996).
- ²⁰ J. Toulouse and C.J. Umrigar, *J. Chem. Phys.* **128**, 174101 (2008).
- ²¹ M.D. Brown, J.R. Trail, P. López Ríos, and R.J. Needs, *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 224110 (2007).
- ²² S. Lehtola, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **15**, 1593 (2019).

TABLE I. Errors of the calculated total energies, bond energies, dipole moments (Debye), and zero point energies of test molecules. All energies are in kcal/mol. Experimental dipole moments and zero point energies are from Ref. 17.

	Eq. (17-18)	Eq. (17-18) $+\Delta E_x^{(\text{core})}$
<i>Total Energy</i>		
ME	16.9	1.0
MAE	18.5	3.5
first-row ME	0.4	0.4
first-row MAE	3.2	3.2
<i>Bond Energy</i>		
ME	-1.9	-1.0
MAE	4.7	3.5
first-row ME	-0.3	-0.4
first-row MAE	4.4	3.2
<i>Dipole Moment</i>		
MAE	0.11	
<i>Zero Point Energy</i>		
MAE (6-31G*)	0.12	

Supplementary Material

Simple and accurate exchange energy for density functional theory

Teepanis Chachiyo,^{1,2,*} and Hathaithip Chachiyo³

¹ Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Naresuan University, Phitsanulok 65000 Thailand
email: teepanisc@nu.ac.th

² Thailand Center of Excellence in Physics, Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation, 328 Si Ayutthaya Road, Bangkok 10400, Thailand

³ Private Residence, Phitsanulok 65000, Thailand email: hathaithip.chachiyo@gmail.com

* Corresponding author

Acknowledgements

Support by Thailand Center of Excellence in Physics grant No. ThEP-60-PET-NU9 is gratefully acknowledged.

	Page
1) Proof that $\frac{2K^2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2}{ \vec{\nabla}\rho ^2} = 1$ on average	S2
2) Proof that the errors of total energies and bond energies are the same (magnitude)	S3
3) Calculated Energies	S5
4) Errors of the Calculated Energies	S7
5) Dipole Moments and Zero Point Energies	S10
6) Molecular Coordinates	S11
7) References	S12

Proof that $\frac{2K^2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2}{|\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2} = 1$ on average

Upon perturbation by a periodic external potential $V_{\text{ext}}(\vec{K})e^{+i\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}} + V_{\text{ext}}(-\vec{K})e^{-i\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}}$, the free-electron gas density becomes

$$\rho = \rho_0 + \rho(\vec{K})e^{+i\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}} + \rho(-\vec{K})e^{-i\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}} = \rho_0 + 2\rho(\vec{K})\cos(\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}), \quad (\text{S1})$$

which leads to the gradient of electron density

$$\vec{\nabla}\rho = -2\rho(\vec{K})\sin(\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r})\vec{K} \quad (\text{S2})$$

and

$$|\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2 = 4K^2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2\sin^2(\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}). \quad (\text{S3})$$

Therefore, the average of $|\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2$ over the normalization volume Ω is

$$\frac{1}{\Omega} \int |\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2 d^3r = \frac{1}{\Omega} 4[\rho(\vec{K})]^2 K^2 \int \sin^2(\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}) d^3r. \quad (\text{S4})$$

Since the volume is periodic, replacing the integrand with $\cos^2(\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r})$ would only shift the phase, but the integrated value would not change. In other words,

$$\int \sin^2(\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}) d^3r = \int \cos^2(\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}) d^3r = \frac{1}{2} \int [\cos^2(\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r}) + \sin^2(\vec{K}\cdot\vec{r})] d^3r = \frac{\Omega}{2}. \quad (\text{S5})$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{\Omega} \int |\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2 d^3r = 2K^2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2. \quad (\text{S6})$$

Consider $\frac{2K^2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2}{|\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2}$. If we replace the term $|\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2$ by its average value as shown in the above expression, we have

$$\frac{2K^2[\rho(\vec{K})]^2}{|\vec{\nabla}\rho|^2} = 1 \text{ on average.} \quad (\text{S7})$$

Proof that the errors of total energies and bond energies are the same (magnitude)

Let $E_{\text{exact}}^{(\text{M})}$ and $E_{\text{exact}}^{(\text{A})}$ be the exact total energies of molecules and of atoms, respectively. If a theory predicts the total energy of a molecule to be $E_{\text{theory}}^{(\text{M})}$, then the error is equal to

$$\Delta E^{(\text{M})} = E_{\text{theory}}^{(\text{M})} - E_{\text{exact}}^{(\text{M})}. \quad (\text{S8})$$

A (positive value) bond energy is computed by subtracting the molecular total energy from the sum of atomic energies.

$$E_{\text{exact}}^{(\text{Bond})} = \sum_{A \in \text{atoms}} E_{\text{exact}}^{(\text{A})} - E_{\text{exact}}^{(\text{M})}. \quad (\text{S9})$$

For a theoretical prediction of bond energy, both the molecular energy and the atomic energies are from the same theory, relying on a certain degree of error cancellation, even though the $E_{\text{theory}}^{(\text{M})}$ and $E_{\text{theory}}^{(\text{A})}$ are both off by huge amount, the difference is still quite accurate.

However, let us evaluate the bond energy using

$$E_{\text{theory}}^{(\text{Bond})} = \sum_{A \in \text{atoms}} E_{\text{exact}}^{(A)} - E_{\text{theory}}^{(M)}. \quad (\text{S10})$$

Notice how we are using the exact atomic energies instead of the theoretical ones. The error of the bond energy in Eq. (S10) is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E^{(\text{Bond})} &= E_{\text{theory}}^{(\text{Bond})} - E_{\text{exact}}^{(\text{Bond})} \\ &= \left(\sum_{A \in \text{atoms}} E_{\text{exact}}^{(A)} - E_{\text{theory}}^{(M)} \right) - E_{\text{exact}}^{(\text{Bond})}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S11})$$

Substituting $E_{\text{exact}}^{(\text{Bond})} = \sum_{A \in \text{atoms}} E_{\text{exact}}^{(A)} - E_{\text{exact}}^{(M)}$ from Eq. (S9) into the above expression yields,

$$\Delta E^{(\text{Bond})} = \left(\sum_{A \in \text{atoms}} E_{\text{exact}}^{(A)} - E_{\text{theory}}^{(M)} \right) - \left(\sum_{A \in \text{atoms}} E_{\text{exact}}^{(A)} - E_{\text{exact}}^{(M)} \right) \quad (\text{S12})$$

The atomic energies cancel and we are left with

$$\Delta E^{(\text{Bond})} = -E_{\text{theory}}^{(M)} + E_{\text{exact}}^{(M)}, \quad (\text{S13})$$

which is precisely the negative of Eq. (S8). Therefore,

$$\Delta E^{(M)} = -\Delta E^{(\text{Bond})} \quad (\text{S14})$$

In other words, the error of predicted the molecular total energies is of the same magnitude as that of the bond energies prediction, provided that we use the exact atomic energies as in Eq. (S10).

Calculated Energies

Reference total energies used to compute the errors are from Ref. [1].

1) Atoms

Color Code						
Calculated Values << Copied by values from Siam Quantum						
Analysis << Worksheet formula						
---- Core Exchange Correction Scheme for Ne and 2nd-row atoms ----						
name	(This Work)	Exchange Energy @HF Density			(This Work)	
	Etotal QZP-gh [Ha]	Core Config.	DFT ex.	HF ex.	Correction [Ha]	Corrected Energies [Ha]
H	-0.502981				0	-0.502981 (No Correction)
He	-2.908144				0	-2.908144 (No Correction)
Li	-7.486352				0	-7.486352 (No Correction)
Be	-14.659224				0	-14.659224 (No Correction)
B	-24.647743				0	-24.647743 (No Correction)
C	-37.839799				0	-37.839799 (No Correction)
N	-54.582274				0	-54.582274 (No Correction)
O	-75.066050				0	-75.066050 (No Correction)
F	-99.731913				0	-99.731913 (No Correction)
Ne	-128.928050	Ne8+ [1s]	-6.0070	-6.0277	-0.0207	-128.948712
Na	-162.240410	Na9+ [1s]	-6.6291	-6.6526	-0.0235	-162.263942
Mg	-200.026734	Mg10+[1s]	-7.2511	-7.2776	-0.0265	-200.053214
Al	-242.317156	Al11+[1s]	-7.8733	-7.9027	-0.0294	-242.346556
Si	-289.322973	Si4+[1s2s2p]	-19.1780	-19.2117	-0.0337	-289.356653
P	-341.212425	P5+[1s2s2p]	-20.9280	-20.9719	-0.0439	-341.256335
S	-398.057341	S6+[1s2s2p]	-22.6763	-22.7297	-0.0535	-398.110801
Cl	-460.087376	Cl7+[1s2s2p]	-24.4236	-24.4858	-0.0621	-460.149526
Ar	-527.466732	Ar8+[1s2s2p]	-26.1695	-26.2403	-0.0709	-527.537593

2) 56 Molecules.

name	(This Work) Etotal QZP-gh [Ha]	(This Work) Corrected Etot QZP-gh [Ha]	(This Work) Ebond QZP-gh [kcal/mol]	(This Work) Corrected Ebond QZP-gh [kcal/mol]
H2	-1.178148	-1.178148	108.04833	111.789543
LiH	-8.074777	-8.074777	53.616912	60.66572539
BeH	-15.252419	-15.252419	56.610132	53.35022091
Li2	-14.998953	-14.998953	16.471494	26.82790899
CH	-38.475660	-38.475660	83.383448	81.99037703
CH2 (1A1)	-39.126332	-39.126332	176.06094	176.538472
CH2 (3B1)	-39.152413	-39.152413	192.42701	192.9045444
NH	-55.223226	-55.223226	86.578098	84.10257364
CH3	-39.836455	-39.836455	306.04449	308.3926278
NH2	-55.882231	-55.882231	184.48462	183.8797044
OH	-75.739939	-75.739939	107.24637	108.3325938
CH4	-40.512545	-40.512545	414.67201	418.8907564
H2O	-76.437104	-76.437104	229.09866	232.0554828
HF	-100.456684	-100.456684	139.17531	139.7990522
NH3	-56.562424	-56.562424	295.68682	296.952504
LiF	-107.430160	-107.430160	132.9661	136.8974487
CN	-92.720175	-92.720175	187.0618	179.4519981
C2H2	-77.326369	-77.326369	402.11367	399.3275236
CO	-113.318379	-113.318379	258.86645	254.818386
HCN	-93.426175	-93.426175	314.45813	308.7189326
N2	-109.534502	-109.534502	232.14961	223.4573492
HCO	-113.861188	-113.861188	283.85889	281.6814355
NO	-129.905881	-129.905881	161.61944	156.4889194
C2H4	-78.579291	-78.579291	557.08338	558.0384538
H2CO	-114.507057	-114.507057	373.52245	373.2156029
O2	-150.345597	-150.345597	133.97137	132.402599
C2H6	-79.816232	-79.816232	702.02488	706.7211564
F2	-199.537481	-199.537481	46.219204	43.72548187
H2O2	-151.568159	-151.568159	269.88991	272.0623441
H3COH	-115.724642	-115.724642	506.31787	509.7522337
N2H4	-111.873459	-111.873459	437.36589	436.1560498
CO2	-188.605665	-188.605665	397.69412	392.8616669
SiH2 (1A1)	-290.562529	-290.596209	146.58243	148.8508751
SiH2 (3B1)	-290.538366	-290.572046	131.41992	133.6883657
PH2	-342.461371	-342.505281	152.47474	154.5436403
SiH3	-291.184418	-291.218098	221.19832	225.3373673
H2S	-399.348422	-399.401882	178.91485	183.1586961
HCl	-460.756891	-460.819041	104.50165	107.3298337
PH3	-343.097163	-343.141073	235.81489	239.7543955
SiH4	-291.831002	-291.864682	311.31055	317.3202039
CS	-436.168105	-436.221565	170.03308	167.2720408
SiO	-364.685259	-364.718939	185.89087	183.6337207
SO	-473.330888	-473.384348	130.20632	129.9245644
ClO	-535.267984	-535.330134	71.886221	72.05941341
CH3Cl	-500.056311	-500.118461	389.17693	392.4826512
CIF	-559.921683	-559.983833	64.253197	63.96391475
H3CSH	-438.651663	-438.705123	465.98785	470.7092269
HOCl	-535.919752	-535.981902	165.25146	167.2952587
SO2	-548.595256	-548.648716	254.65272	253.5865851
Na2	-324.499718	-324.546782	11.858672	23.58305793
NaCl	-622.471571	-622.557253	90.226438	97.04620985
Si2	-578.766347	-578.833707	75.552758	72.6072291
P2	-682.606650	-682.694470	114.08121	110.7365822
S2	-796.284027	-796.390947	106.26558	107.2708479
Cl2	-920.267031	-920.391331	57.905939	59.82109775
Si2H6	-582.479772	-582.547132	512.01001	520.2881164

Errors of the Calculated Energies

Refer to the supplemental material of Ref. [2] for the reported QMC total energies and bond energies. We calculated the errors as compared to the experimentally derived energies from Ref. [1].

1) Atoms

name	Error of Etot		
	As IS	Corrected	DMC
	QZP-gh [kcal/mol]	QZP-gh [kcal/mol]	Nemec2010 [kcal/mol]
H	-1.9	-1.9	0.0
He	-2.8	-2.8	0.0
Li	-5.2	-5.2	0.1
Be	5.1	5.1	6.3
B	3.9	3.9	8.6
C	3.3	3.3	9.3
N	4.3	4.3	7.9
O	0.8	0.8	9.3
F	1.2	1.2	9.9
Ne	6.0	-7.0	8.9
Na	8.9	-5.9	9.4
Mg	16.5	-0.1	13.1
Al	18.1	-0.3	15.8
Si	22.6	1.5	19.7
P	29.2	1.7	22.9
S	33.0	-0.5	27.7
Cl	38.0	-1.0	33.3
Ar	46.0	1.5	36.8
Average	12.6	-0.1	13.3
MAE	13.7	2.7	13.3
First row MAE	3.4	3.5	6.0
First row Avg	1.5	0.2	6.0

2) Molecules

name	Error of Etot			Error of E_bond		
	As IS	Corrected	DMC	As IS	Corrected	DMC
	QZP-gh [kcal/mol]	QZP-gh [kcal/mol]	Nemec2010 [kcal/mol]	QZP-gh [kcal/mol]	QZP-gh [kcal/mol]	Nemec2010 [kcal/mol]
H2	-2.3	-2.3		-1.5	2.3	
LiH	-2.7	-2.7	0.0	-4.3	2.7	0.0
BeH	-3.5	-3.5	0.5	6.8	3.5	5.8
Li2	-2.4	-2.4	2.1	-7.9	2.4	-2.0
CH	2.0	2.0	9.4	-0.6	-2.0	-0.1
CH2 (1A1)	5.2	5.2	9.8	-5.7	-5.2	-0.5
CH2 (3B1)	-2.5	-2.5	4.5	2.0	2.5	4.8
NH	-0.3	-0.3	8.9	2.8	0.3	-1.0
CH3	-0.6	-0.6	4.9	-1.7	0.6	4.4
NH2	-1.8	-1.8	7.7	2.4	1.8	0.2
OH	-1.8	-1.8	9.3	0.7	1.8	0.0
CH4	2.0	2.0	5.2	-6.3	-2.0	4.1
H2O	0.8	0.8	9.0	-3.7	-0.8	0.3
HF	1.6	1.6	9.6	-2.2	-1.6	0.3
NH3	1.4	1.4	7.6	-2.7	-1.4	0.3
LiF	2.7	2.7	9.8	-6.6	-2.7	0.1
CN	3.0	3.0	22.5	4.6	-3.0	-5.3
C2H2	5.7	5.7	13.7	-2.9	-5.7	4.9
CO	4.8	4.8	20.8	-0.8	-4.8	-2.2
HCN	3.1	3.1	16.5	2.6	-3.1	0.7
N2	4.8	4.8	22.4	3.9	-4.8	-6.5
HCO	-2.6	-2.6	18.3	4.8	2.6	0.3
NO	-0.7	-0.7	27.3	5.9	0.7	-10.1
C2H4	6.0	6.0	13.5	-6.9	-6.0	5.0
H2CO	1.2	1.2	18.0	-0.9	-1.2	0.6
O2	-11.9	-11.9	23.1	13.4	11.9	-4.5
C2H6	7.0	7.0	11.1	-11.7	-7.0	7.5
F2	-4.5	-4.5	27.3	7.0	4.5	-7.5
H2O2	-2.9	-2.9	22.6	0.8	2.9	-4.0
H3COH	3.7	3.7	15.0	-7.2	-3.7	3.6
N2H4	2.6	2.6	17.2	-1.4	-2.6	-1.3
CO2	-2.9	-2.9	29.7	7.7	2.9	-1.9
SiH2 (1A1)	24.7	3.6	18.4	-5.8	-3.6	1.4
SiH2 (3B1)	19.3	-1.8	16.3	-0.5	1.8	3.4
PH2	26.4	-1.1	22.5	-1.0	1.1	0.4
SiH3	23.4	2.3	17.0	-6.4	-2.3	2.7
H2S	34.0	0.5	28.3	-4.7	-0.5	-0.6
HCl	39.1	0.1	34.7	-2.9	-0.1	-1.4
PH3	30.8	3.2	24.7	-7.2	-3.2	-1.8
SiH4	27.2	6.1	14.9	-12.1	-6.1	4.8
CS	38.3	4.7	42.1	-2.0	-4.7	-5.1
SiO	30.4	9.3	32.3	-7.0	-9.3	-3.3
SO	29.8	-3.8	41.2	4.1	3.8	-4.2
ClO	32.7	-6.3	48.9	6.1	6.3	-6.3
CH3Cl	42.7	3.7	39.2	-7.0	-3.7	3.4
ClF	37.8	-1.2	47.9	1.4	1.2	-4.6
H3CSH	38.1	4.6	35.7	-9.3	-4.6	1.3
HOCl	37.5	-1.5	45.5	-0.5	1.5	-2.9
SO2	39.9	6.3	55.5	-5.3	-6.3	-9.1
Na2	22.8	-6.8	20.6	-5.0	6.8	-1.8
NaCl	55.8	2.0	43.4	-8.9	-2.0	-0.7
Si2	45.3	3.1	40.8	-0.1	-3.1	-1.4
P2	61.3	6.2	53.5	-2.8	-6.2	-7.7
S2	62.9	-4.2	61.1	3.2	4.2	-5.7
Cl2	77.1	-0.9	68.8	-1.0	0.9	-2.2
Si2H6	54.9	12.6	33.7	-20.9	-12.6	5.7
Average	16.9	1.0	23.7	-1.9	-1.0	-0.7
MAE	18.5	3.5	23.7	4.7	3.5	3.1
first-row AVG	0.4	0.4	13.5	-0.3	-0.4	-0.1
first-row MAE	3.2	3.2	13.5	4.4	3.2	2.9
second-row AVG	38.8	1.7	37.0	-4.0	-1.7	-1.5
second-row MAE	38.8	4.0	37.0	5.2	4.0	3.4

3) Other QMC results. Refer to Ref. [3] and Ref. [4] for the reported QMC total energies. Here we computed the errors in kcal/mol as compared to the exact energies (quoted in the references).

[Toulouse2008]		
QMC - exact		
name	QMC Type	[kcal/mol]
Li2	DMC J×FVCAS	0.3
Be2	DMC J×FVCAS	0.4
B2	DMC J×FVCAS	5.2
C2	DMC J×FVCAS	10.0
N2	DMC J×FVCAS	13.9
O2	DMC J×FVCAS	20.7
F2	DMC J×FVCAS	21.0
Ne2	DMC J×SD	17.7
MAE		11.14

[Brown2007]		
QMC - exact		
	QMC Type	[kcal/mol]
Li	DMC2-MDBF	0.00
Be	DMC2-MDBF	0.03
B	DMC2-MDBF	0.21
C	DMC2-MDBF	0.72
N	DMC2-MDBF	1.19
O	DMC2-MDBF	3.51
F	DMC2-MDBF	4.08
Ne	DMC2-MDBF	2.32
MAE		1.51

Dipole Moments and Zero Point Energies

<u>Dipole</u>		<u>ZPE</u>			
(This Work) QZP-gh Calc. [Debye]	(This Work) QZP-gh Calc. - exp [Debye]	exp. ZPE [kcal/mol]	6-31G* ZPE [Ha]	6-31G* ZPE [kcal/mol]	6-31G* Calc. - exp [kcal/mol]
0.0000		6.2	0.00996	6.2	0.0
5.7155	-0.1685	2.0	0.00307	1.9	-0.1
0.2744		2.9	0.00455	2.9	-0.1
0.0000		0.5	0.00073	0.5	0.0
1.4316	-0.0284	4.0	0.00614	3.9	-0.2
1.7713			0.01600	10.0	
0.5995			0.01705	10.7	
1.4964	0.1064	4.6	0.00716	4.5	-0.1
0.0000			0.02916	18.3	
1.7602		11.5	0.01844	11.6	0.1
1.6224	-0.0326	5.3	0.00807	5.1	-0.2
0.0000		27.1	0.04417	27.7	0.6
1.8436	-0.0110	12.9	0.02065	13.0	0.1
1.7639	-0.0623	5.9	0.00884	5.5	-0.3
1.5085	0.0367	20.6	0.03373	21.2	0.5
6.0996	-0.2278	1.3	0.00218	1.4	0.1
1.1573		2.9	0.00475	3.0	0.0
0.0002		15.3	0.02459	15.4	0.1
0.1849	0.0751	3.1	0.00481	3.0	-0.1
2.9238	-0.0614	8.7	0.01422	8.9	0.2
0.0006		3.4	0.00535	3.4	0.0
1.3894		7.8	0.01259	7.9	0.1
0.2064	0.0477	2.7	0.00431	2.7	0.0
0.0000			0.04981	31.3	
2.2030	-0.1290	16.1	0.02588	16.2	0.1
0.0002		2.3	0.00356	2.2	0.0
0.0000			0.07341	46.1	
0.0000		1.3	0.00228	1.4	0.1
1.7142	0.1412		0.02535	15.9	
1.5683	-0.1317		0.05006	31.4	
1.8773	0.1273		0.05197	32.6	
0.0002		6.2	0.00979	6.1	-0.1
0.2229		7.2	0.01132	7.1	-0.1
0.0490			0.01180	7.4	
0.6047			0.01310	8.2	
0.0239			0.02069	13.0	
1.0313	0.0530	9.2	0.01479	9.3	0.1
1.1216	0.0130	4.2	0.00657	4.1	-0.1
0.6647	0.0907	14.6	0.02354	14.8	0.2
0.0000		19.2	0.03035	19.0	-0.2
1.9319	-0.0261	1.8	0.00282	1.8	-0.1
2.8138	-0.2844	1.8	0.00269	1.7	-0.1
1.3671	-0.1829	1.6	0.00243	1.5	-0.1
1.3514	0.0544	1.2	0.00187	1.2	0.0
1.8790	-0.0173		0.03717	23.3	
0.7458	-0.1423	1.1	0.00170	1.1	-0.1
1.5600	0.0400		0.04523	28.4	
1.5324	0.2324	8.0	0.01263	7.9	0.0
1.5061	-0.1270	4.3	0.00639	4.0	-0.3
0.0000		0.2	0.00034	0.2	0.0
8.6939	-0.3073	0.5	0.00078	0.5	0.0
0.0000		0.7	0.00121	0.8	0.0
0.0007		1.1	0.00175	1.1	0.0
0.0002		1.0	0.00154	1.0	-0.1
0.0000		0.8	0.00115	0.7	-0.1
0.0000			0.04776	30.0	
Avg E	-0.03			Avg E	-0.003
MAE	0.11			MAE	0.120
Count	28			Count	42

For dipole moments, refer to the experimental values from Ref. [5]. For the zero point energies, we calculated the “exp.” values listed above from experimental vibration energies in Ref. [5]. For diatomic molecules where the anharmonic term $\omega_e x_e$ was available, we used

$$\text{ZPE} = \frac{1}{2}\omega_e - \frac{1}{4}\omega_e x_e. \quad (\text{S15})$$

For polyatomic molecules, we used

$$\text{ZPE} = \sum_{\text{all modes}} \frac{1}{2}\omega_e. \quad (\text{S16})$$

Molecular Coordinates

For H₂ we used experimental bond length of 0.741 angstroms. For other 55 molecules, the geometries could be downloaded from the supplementary material of Ref. [2], (doi: 10.1063/1.3288054)

References

- 1 D.P. O'Neill and P.M.W. Gill, *Mol. Phys.* **103**, 763 (2005).
- 2 N. Nemec, M.D. Towler, and R.J. Needs, *J. Chem. Phys.* **132**, 034111 (2010).
- 3 J. Toulouse and C.J. Umrigar, *J. Chem. Phys.* **128**, 174101 (2008).
- 4 M.D. Brown, J.R. Trail, P. López Ríos, and R.J. Needs, *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 224110 (2007).
- 5 D.R. Lide, *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics: A Ready-Reference of Chemical and Physical Data* (CRC press, Florida, 2005).