

Universal machine learning interatomic potentials poised to supplant DFT in modeling general defects in metals and random alloys

Fei Shuang^{a*}, Zixiong Wei^a, Kai Liu^a, Wei Gao^{b,c}, Poulumi Dey^{a*}

^aDepartment of Materials Science and Engineering, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Mekelweg 2, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands

^bJ. Mike Walker'66 Department of Mechanical Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, United States

^cDepartment of Materials Science & Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, United States

Abstract: Recent advances in machine learning, combined with the generation of extensive density functional theory (DFT) datasets, have enabled the development of universal machine learning interatomic potentials (uMLIPs). These models offer broad applicability across the periodic table, achieving first-principles accuracy at a fraction of the computational cost of traditional DFT calculations. In this study, we demonstrate that state-of-the-art pretrained uMLIPs can effectively replace DFT for accurately modeling complex defects in a wide range of metals and alloys. Our investigation spans diverse scenarios, including grain boundaries and general defects in pure metals, defects in high-entropy alloys, hydrogen-alloy interactions, and solute-defect interactions. Remarkably, the latest EquiformerV2 models achieve DFT-level accuracy on comprehensive defect datasets, with root mean square errors (RMSE) below 5 meV/atom for energies and 100 meV/Å for forces, outperforming specialized machine learning potentials such as moment tensor potential and atomic cluster expansion. We also present a systematic analysis of accuracy versus computational cost and explore uncertainty quantification for uMLIPs. A detailed case study of tungsten (W) demonstrates that data on pure W alone is insufficient for modeling complex defects in uMLIPs, underscoring the critical importance of advanced machine learning architectures and diverse datasets, which include over 100 million structures spanning all elements. These findings establish uMLIPs as a robust alternative to DFT and a transformative tool for accelerating the discovery and design of high-performance materials.

Keywords: universal machine learning interatomic potential, DFT accuracy, defect genome, solute-defect interaction, random alloys

1 Introduction

Machine learning is revolutionizing computational materials science across multiple dimensions, notably enhancing predictive modeling capabilities and accelerating materials discovery [1–8]. One of the most significant achievements in this transformative era is the development of universal machine learning potentials (uMLIPs). These potentials represent a paradigm shift in how scientists conduct first-principle accurate simulations across the periodic table. Unlike specialized MLIPs (sMLIPs) that require extensive recalibration for each new element or compound and substantial training, uMLIPs offer ready-to-use models that deliver unprecedented accuracy and transferability in predicting energy, force, and stress. Over the past years, uMLIPs have rapidly evolved. As of the execution of this work, the Matbench-discovery repository catalogues 17 distinct uMLIPs, each featuring its unique set of models and varying parameter counts [9]. Notable architectures include Voronoi RF [10], BOWSR [11], Wrenformer [12], CGCNN+P [13], CGCNN [14], MEGNet [15], ALIGNN [16], M3GNet [17], CHGNet [18], MACE [19], GRACE [20], SevenNet [21], Orb [22], GNoME [23], MatterSim [24], EquiformerV2 (eqV2) [25,26], and DPA3 [27,28].

The primary objective of the uMLIPs is to supplant computationally expensive DFT calculations, a goal that remains substantially unachieved, since the uncertainty regarding the accuracy of uMLIPs presents a major hurdle. To address this, systematic benchmark studies have been conducted by researchers in various fields. One of the most comprehensive of these was performed by Deng et al. [29], who observed a consistent softening phenomenon across a range of scenarios including surfaces, defects, solid-solution energetics, phonon vibration modes, ion migration barriers, and high-energy states in M3GNet, CHGNet, and MACE-MP-0. This softening originates primarily from the systematically underpredicted potential energy surface curvature, which was attributed to the biased sampling of near-equilibrium configurations in the uMLIPs' pre-training datasets. Another study assessed the performance of CHGNet, M3GNet, MACE-MP-0, and ALIGNN in terms of the equation of state, structural optimization, formation energy, and vibrational properties, noting variable convergence rates during relaxation among the different uMLIPs [30]. Further research focused on the predictive capabilities of MACE-MP-0, CHGNet,

and M3GNet regarding surface energy [31], as well as the accuracy of these models in determining mixing enthalpies and volumes of disordered alloys and complex high-entropy alloys. These findings collectively highlight considerable uncertainties in the performance of existing uMLIPs, particularly concerning defects in solid materials. Recommendations from these studies suggest that fine-tuning uMLIPs by including relevant data can enhance their accuracy. However, the amount of data required for this fine-tuning remains unclear. If an extensive amount of data is necessary, comparable to that needed for training sMLIPs, uMLIPs may not offer a competitive advantage. Furthermore, fine-tuning uMLIPs demands domain expertise in DFT calculations and access to high-performance computational resources, especially Graphics Processing Units (GPUs), which may not be accessible to all researchers.

Fortunately, the recent release of four advanced uMLIPs, including Orb, MatterSim, eqV2, and DPA3 represents a significant advancement in the Matbench-discovery repository [9]. These models, which involve tens of millions of parameters and utilize training datasets comprising hundreds of millions of structures, establish a new benchmark for accuracy. In this study, we leverage these innovations to evaluate the reliability of uMLIPs in modeling complex defects in metals and alloys. To this end, we have generated and collected DFT datasets featuring extensive defects in five pure metals (Mo, Nb, Ta, W, and Mg) and a range of alloys from low-to-high entropy (MoNb, CrCoNi, MoNbTaW, HEA10-AlHfMoNbNiTaTiVWZr), as well as metals and alloys containing interstitial atoms (MoNbTaW-H). These datasets enable a comprehensive assessment of the fidelity with which uMLIPs model common defects in metals and alloys. A systematic analysis of accuracy versus computational cost and uncertainty quantification analysis are provided. Additionally, we explore the differences between uMLIPs and sMLIPs in terms of machine learning architecture and training datasets. This analysis helps to elucidate the unexpectedly high accuracy of uMLIPs in modeling defects in these materials.

2 Methods

We utilize the Vienna Ab initio Simulation Package (VASP) to perform first-principles calculations of all new configurations [32]. A gradient-corrected functional in the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) form is used to describe the exchange and correlation interactions [33]. Electron-ion interactions are treated within the projector-augmented-wave (PAW) method, using the standard PAW pseudopotentials provided by VASP [34]. The energy convergence criterion is set

to 10^{-6} eV for electronic self-consistency calculations. The plane-wave cutoff energy is chosen to be 520 eV. The KPOINTS are generated by VASPKIT [35], based on the Monkhorst-Pack scheme, with a consistent density of $2\pi \times 0.03 \text{ \AA}$ across the entire dataset. The Atomic Simulation Environment (ASE) was used for all one-shot calculations involving uMLIPs [36]. Additionally, OVITO was employed for the visualization of the atomic structures [37].

Table 1 Different uMLIPs and corresponding models, training datasets, structures and parameters.

Framework	ID	Model name	Training dataset	Structure	Parameter
CHGNet	1	CHGNet 0.3.0	MPtrj	1.58M	413k
MACE	2	MACE-MP-0	MPtrj	1.58M	unknown
	3	MACE-MPA-0	MPtrj+sAlex	12M	9.06M
	4	MACE-omat-0	OMat24	101M	9.06M
MatterSim	5	MatterSim-v1.0.0-1M	MatterSim	17M	1M
	6	MatterSim-v1.0.0-5M	MatterSim	17M	4.55M
Orb	7	Orb-MPtraj-only-v2	MPtrj	1.58M	25.2M
	8	Orb-d3-xs-v2 (5 layers)	MPtrj+Alex	32.1M	unknown
	9	Orb-d3-sm-v2 (10 layers)	MPtrj+Alex	32.1M	unknown
	10	Orb-d3-v2	MPtrj+Alex	32.1M	25.2M
eqV2	11	eqV2-31M-mp	MPtrj	1.58M	31M
	12	eqV2-dens-31M-mp	MPtrj	1.58M	31M
	13	eqV2-dens-86M-mp	MPtrj	1.58M	86M
	14	eqV2-dens-153M-mp	MPtrj	1.58M	153M
	15	eqV2-31M-omat	OMat24	101M	31M
	16	eqV2-86M-omat	OMat24	101M	86M
	17	eqV2-153M-omat	OMat24	101M	153M
	18	eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex	OMat24+ MPtrj+sAlex	112M	31M
	19	eqV2-86M-omat-mp-salex	OMat24+ MPtrj+sAlex	112M	86M
	20	eqV2-153M-omat-mp-salex	OMat24+ MPtrj+sAlex	112M	153M
GRACE	21	GRACE-1L	MPtrj	1.58M	unknown
	22	GRACE-2L	MPtrj	1.58M	15.3M
DPA3	23	DPA3-v1-MPtrj	MPtrj	1.58M	3.37M
	24	DPA3-v1-OpenLAM	OMat24+ MPtrj+sAlex+Alex	143M	8.18M

In this study, we evaluate the performance of seven of state-of-the-art uMLIPs, encompassing a total of 24 models as detailed in Table 1. Given the proven accuracy of prior uMLIPs such as M3GNet and SevenNet, our analysis focuses exclusively on models that have demonstrated robust performance in Table 1. CHGNet is distinguished by its unique ability to predict magnetic moments. MACE is represented by three models: MACE-MP-0, MACE-MPA-0, and MACE-omat-0, where “MP” corresponds to the MPtrj dataset, “MPA” combines the MPtrj dataset with the subsampled Alexandria dataset [38], and “omat” represents the open materials dataset 2024 for inorganic materials (OMat24) [25]. MatterSim includes two models, MatterSim-v1.0.0-1M and

MatterSim-v1.0.0-5M, each differing in parameter size and trained on newly developed DFT datasets that span temperatures from 0 to 5000 K and pressures up to 1000 GPa. Orb features four models, each with distinct training datasets and complexities. eqV2, the most extensive group, consists of ten models employing comprehensive DFT datasets including MPtrj, the subsampled Alexandria (sAlex), and OMat24. It is noteworthy that MPtrj and the subsampled Alexandria datasets contain near-equilibrium configurations, whereas the OMat24 datasets consist of non-equilibrium configurations [25]. The Denoising Non-equilibrium Structure (DeNS) protocol was utilized to enhance the performance of eqV2 models (eqV2-dens models) [39]. GRACE is represented by two models, GRACE-1L and GRACE-2L, both trained on the MPtrj dataset. Lastly, DPA3-v1 is a large-scale atomic model implemented in the DeePMD-kit package [28]. Two recently released models, DPA3-v1-MPtrj and DPA3-v1-OpenLAM, have demonstrated outstanding performance in the Matbench-discovery repository [9]. Notably, DPA3-v1-OpenLAM was trained on 143 million structures, making it the largest dataset used among all uMLIPs. In the following section, we will assess the performance of these 24 models.

3 Results

3.1 Datasets collection and analysis

We have generated and collected extensive DFT datasets for various metals and alloys containing defects, as illustrated in Fig. 1. The details of these datasets are summarized in Table 2. First, we consider simple GBs for 56 elements (the GB-56 dataset), covering nearly all metals in the periodic table, as shown in Fig. 1a. These GB structures, obtained from a previous study [40], include relaxed GB structures as well as random lattice perturbations of 1% and 2% of the lattice constant. These perturbations are introduced to evaluate the reliability of uMLIPs for non-equilibrium GBs. In total, this dataset comprises 1,436 structures. Second, we consider four BCC refractory metals: Mo, Nb, Ta, and W. We adhere to the protocol from our prior study to generate comprehensive defect genomes. [41]. These genomes are combined with a standard dataset constructed using domain knowledge, which includes ground-state structures, configurations deformed under various elastic strains, ab initio molecular dynamics (AIMD) simulations at multiple temperatures, edge and screw dislocations, and simple grain boundaries. This integration results in the creation of comprehensive datasets: Mo-g, Nb-g, Ta-g, and W-g. These datasets are designed for general-purpose applications, with a representative configuration shown in Fig. 1b. It

should be noted that these datasets incorporate all the possible atomic environments that emerge during extensive plastic deformations in BCC metals, encompassing processes such as polycrystalline compression and tension, single crystal compression and tension, nanoindentation, and crack propagation [41]. To evaluate the performance of uMLIPs on systems with free surfaces, we also include the *W-s* dataset, generated through embedded atom model-guided sampling in our prior work [41]. This dataset consists of clusters containing defect derived from general GBs in random polycrystals, as depicted in Fig. 1c. Additionally, for Mg, we utilize the RANDSPG dataset from a previous study, which includes a diverse range of structures encompassing all crystal space groups [42], as illustrated in Fig. 1d.

For systems containing multiple elements, we consider the following datasets: $\text{Mo}_{50}\text{Nb}_{50}\text{-d}$, $\text{Mo}_{25}\text{Nb}_{25}\text{Ta}_{25}\text{W}_{25}\text{-d}$, $\text{Mo}_{25}\text{Nb}_{25}\text{Ta}_{25}\text{W}_{25}\text{-H}$, CrCoNi, HEA10, and MoNbTaW, which spans the entire compositional space. For the $\text{Mo}_{50}\text{Nb}_{50}\text{-d}$ and $\text{Mo}_{25}\text{Nb}_{25}\text{Ta}_{25}\text{W}_{25}\text{-d}$ datasets, “d” represent defect genomes of equimolar alloys, generated by rescaling lattice constants and substituting elements within the W defect dataset [39]. The $\text{Mo}_{25}\text{Nb}_{25}\text{Ta}_{25}\text{W}_{25}\text{-H}$ dataset includes the diffusion of a single atomic hydrogen around a screw dislocation core (Fig. 1e). The CrCoNi dataset (Fig. 1f), sourced from a recent publication [43], was used to study the formation of chemical short-range order of the medium-entropy CrCoNi alloy. Additionally, we generate a small DFT dataset HEA10 (Fig. 1g), containing 10 elements Al, Hf, Mo, Nb, Ni, Ta, Ti, V, W, Zr, which is used to study the performance of uMLIPs on such complex systems with many elements. Additionally, we consider a comprehensive dataset developed for MoNbTaW spanning the entire compositional space. This dataset was used to trained sMLIPs in the atomistic simulation of dislocation motion and polycrystal compression in our previous work [44]. Finally, to directly validate the accuracy of solute-defect interactions in alloys, we utilize data from previous study [45]. This dataset comprises solute-defect interaction energies in Mo and Ta matrices, with Pt, Re, Ta, Os, and Hf as solute elements. It includes a variety of defects, such as monovacancies, dumbbell vacancies, different types of GBs, generalized stacking faults, and screw dislocations.

The energies and atomic forces of all datasets derived from DFT calculations are presented in Figs. 1h-i. These datasets encompass a total of 54,084 configurations, a significant portion of which exhibit positive energies. These positive-energy configurations primarily correspond to the RANDSPG dataset for Mg. The broad distribution of energies, ranging from highly stable to highly unstable configurations, demonstrates that our study captures a comprehensive spectrum of

chemical and structural complexity. Furthermore, Fig. 1i illustrates the distribution of atomic forces across a total of 7,326,684 atoms. The force magnitudes exhibit a wide range, reflecting the varied atomic environments present in the dataset, from bulk-like regions to highly distorted configurations near defects and interfaces. This thorough coverage ensures that the conclusion of this study is not only applicable for low-energy, stable configurations but also capable of handling high-energy, metastable, and defect-rich environments.




Figure 1 DFT datasets used for the assessment of uMLIPs. (a) Simple GBs for 56 elements, with the corresponding structure counts for each element. A BCC bicrystal containing two GB are presented. (b) BCC Mo-g. “g” here denotes “general-purpose”. (c) BCC W-s. “s” here denotes “spherical”. (d) Mg dataset obtained by RANDSPG. (e) MoNbTaW-H dataset. A single atomic H is near a screw dislocation core. (f) CrCoNi dataset. (g) HEA10 containing 10 elements i.e. Al, Hf, Mo, Nb, Ni, Ta, Ti, V, W, Zr. (h) Histogram plot of energy for all datasets. The dashed rectangular box highlights the source of positive energy. (i) Histogram plot of atomic force for all datasets.

It is important to note that the datasets listed in Table 2, which are used to benchmark the uMLIPs in this study, differ significantly from those employed in previous research [5,29–31,46] since the existing studies have predominantly focused on perfect crystalline structures or surfaces, which do not fully capture the realistic but complex microstructural features and interactions. In contrast, defects—such as vacancies, dislocations, and grain boundaries—are crucial determinants of the mechanical, thermal, and chemical properties of metals and alloys [47]. Our datasets, illustrated in Fig. 1 and detailed in Table 1, encompass the most comprehensive defects for pure metals, as well as intricate interactions among various chemical elements in multi-component systems. By including a wide range of defect types and chemical environments, these datasets provide a robust foundation for validating the accuracy and generalizability of uMLIPs in modeling material behavior under diverse and challenging practical conditions.

Table 2 DFT datasets used to assess the accuracy of uMLIPs.

ID	Dataset	Information	cfgs
1	GB-56	All relaxed and rattled GBs of 56 metals	1436
2	Mo-g	Domain knowledge & extensive defects	1030
3	Nb-g	Domain knowledge & extensive defects	1018
4	Ta-g	Domain knowledge & extensive defects	1050
5	W-g	Domain knowledge & extensive defects	1026
6	W-s	Spherical clusters containing defect	262
7	Mg	RANDSPG	17210
8	Mo ₅₀ Nb ₅₀ -d	Extensive defects	347
9	Mo ₂₅ Nb ₂₅ Ta ₂₅ W ₂₅ -d	Extensive defects	348
10	Mo ₂₅ Nb ₂₅ Ta ₂₅ W ₂₅ -H	Atomic H around screw dislocation core	998
11	CrCoNi	Domain knowledge with magnetic calculations	1257
12	HEA10	Bulk AIMD: Al, Hf, Mo, Nb, Ni, Ta, Ti, V, W, Zr	600
13	MoNbTaW	All compositional space	17654
14	Solute-defects interactions	Mo-Pt, Mo-Re, Mo-Ta, Ta-Os, Ta-Hf	409

3.2 Accuracy assessment across different uMLIPs and datasets

We begin by computing the energies and forces of the GB-56 dataset using both DFT and all the uMLIPs under consideration in this study. The root mean square errors (RMSE) for energy and force are then calculated for each element. Figure 2 presents the results for CHGNet and eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex, representing the least and most accurate models, respectively. CHGNet demonstrates good performance for metals in groups 1-3, with energy RMSE below 10 meV/atom and force RMSE below 50 meV/Å. However, for transition metals in groups 4-11, CHGNet

exhibits significant errors, with energy RMSE ranging from 10 to 37 meV/atom and force RMSE ranging from 100 to 455 meV/Å. For metals in groups 12-14, noticeable errors are observed for Al and Pb. Among the lanthanoids and actinoids, Ce, Yb, Ac, and Th show large energy and force RMSE values. In contrast, the eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex model significantly outperforms CHGNet, as evidenced by the narrower range of the color bars for energy and force RMSE in Fig. 2. The eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex model registers the highest errors, with an energy RMSE of 6.7 meV/atom and a force RMSE of 193 meV/Å. Among the 56 elements, nearly all exhibit energy RMSEs below 5 meV/atom and force RMSEs under 100 meV/Å, with only a few exceptions. Specifically, K, Fe, Ni, and W show slightly higher energy RMSE values, while Cr and Ni have force RMSE values exceeding 100 meV/Å, likely due to their complex magnetic behavior. These results highlight that while previous uMLIPs like CHGNet exhibit notable errors, particularly for transition metals and certain lanthanoids/actinoids, eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex demonstrate remarkable accuracy for modeling simple GBs across all metal elements, approaching the precision of DFT calculations.




Figure 2 Performance of uMLIPs on the GB-56 dataset. (a, b) Energy and force RMSE using CHGNet. (c, d) Energy and force RMSE using eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex.

Next, we summarize the energy and force RMSE for all the datasets as presented in Table 2 and illustrate the best-performing uMLIPs for each dataset in Fig. 3. Detailed results across all datasets and uMLIPs are provided in the Supplementary Material. It is seen that the datasets GB-56, Mo-g, Nb-g, Ta-g, W-g, MoNb-d, MoNbTaW-g, MoNbTaWH, HEA10, and MoNbTaW demonstrate remarkably accurate predictions by uMLIPs, with energy RMSEs at or below 5 meV/atom and force RMSEs at or below 70 meV/Å. Notably, most datasets are best predicted by the eqV2-omat-mp-salex models for energy, with exceptions such as MoNbTaWH and HEA10, which are optimally predicted by the eqV2-omat models. For force predictions, most datasets are best predicted by the eqV2-omat models, except for Mo-g, MoNb-d, MoNbTaW-H, and MoNbTaW, which are optimally predicted by the eqV2-omat-mp-salex models. The exceptional performance of eqV2 models across a wide range of datasets—spanning pure metals, binary alloys, high-entropy alloys, and complex defect structures—underscores their potential as a universal tool for high-accuracy materials modeling.




Figure 3 Assessments of different datasets in terms of (a) energy RMSE and (b) force RMSE using the best performance model.

Moreover, for the W-s dataset, which includes atomic clusters with free surfaces, all uMLIPs exhibit suboptimal performance. The best energy RMSE of 18.57 meV/atom is achieved by the MACE-omat-0 model, while the best force RMSE of 189.93 meV/Å is obtained by the eqV2-153M-omat model. Notably, CHGNet fails to calculate this dataset due to errors in handling isolated atoms, while the MatterSim-v1.0.0-1M model shows the highest energy RMSE of 869 meV/atom and the highest force RMSE of 1.37 eV/Å. These results highlight that atomic clusters with free surfaces remain a significant challenge for uMLIPs. While all models struggle to achieve high accuracy for this dataset, their performance varies considerably. MatterSim performs the worst, while MACE and eqV2 models demonstrate the best performance among the tested uMLIPs. This variability underscores the need for further development of uMLIP architectures and training strategies to better handle systems with free surfaces.

For the Mg dataset, MatterSim-v1.0.0-5M demonstrates the best energy predictions, achieving an energy RMSE of 57.80 meV/atom and force RMSE of 41.11 meV/Å, while eqV2-153M-omat leads in force prediction with a force RMSE of 35.24 meV/Å. Notably, MatterSim is the only model that achieves good accuracy for both energy and force predictions on this dataset, which features configurations indicative of very high energy. This capability stems from MatterSim's training on 17 million configurations spanning high-temperature and high-pressure ranges, making it uniquely suited for such extreme conditions. Fig. 4 presents a parity plot of predicted energies by uMLIPs compared to the reference energies obtained from DFT calculations. The plot reveals that CHGNet and eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex significantly underestimate positive energies, underscoring MatterSim's superior performance in high-pressure and high-temperature conditions.




Figure 4 Parity plot of the uMLIP predictions of energy compared with the DFT energies for the dataset Mg.

For the CrCoNi dataset, which includes rattled FCC lattices and liquid configurations of equimolar medium entropy CrCoNi alloys, the MACE-OMAT-0 model delivers highly accurate energy predictions, achieving an energy RMSE of 7.45 meV per atom. This outperforms the eqV2 86M omat model, which has an energy RMSE of 8.04 meV per atom. On the other hand, the eqV2 86M omat model provides the best force predictions, with an RMSE of 207.35 meV per Å. Given the complex magnetic distributions in random CrCoNi alloys and the inclusion of liquid configurations, these low error values—particularly for energy predictions—are highly noteworthy. It is also important to note that the CrCoNi dataset includes crystalline phases with chemical ordering, extracted from various points along DFT Monte Carlo simulations. The exceptional performance of the MACE-OMAT-0 model suggests that it is particularly well suited for studying CrCoNi alloys, such as investigating the formation mechanisms of chemical short range order (CSRO), without the need for expensive DFT calculations.

We next rank all uMLIPs based on their energy and force prediction capabilities. To ensure a fair comparison, we exclude the W-s dataset, as all uMLIPs struggle with clusters with free surfaces. The Mg dataset is omitted because only MatterSim achieves moderate accuracy for its energy predictions. The CrCoNi dataset is not considered due to its inclusion of liquid configurations. The uMLIPs trained exclusively on the MPtrj dataset are represented in red. Fig. 5 presents the energy RMSE and force RMSE plotted against the different uMLIPs. In terms of energy predictions (Fig. 5a), the eqV2-omat-mp-salex models rank as the top three uMLIPs, demonstrating superior accuracy. DPA3-v1-OpenLAM follows in fourth place, trailed by MACE-MPA-0, MatterSim-v1.0.0-5M, eqV2-86M-omat, and eqV2-31M-omat. Interestingly, eqV2-31M-mp ranks next, outperforming MACE-omat-0, MatterSim-v1.0.0-5M, DPA3-v1-MPtrj, and eqV2-153M-omat. The subsequent ranking order includes Orb-MPtraj-only-v2, Orb-d3-v2, Orb-d3-sm-v2, GRACE-2L, Orb-d3-xs-v2, GRACE-1L, MACE-MP-0, and CHGNet. Notably, eqV2 models employing DNeS and trained solely with the MPtrj dataset perform the worst, suggesting that the DNeS technique may negatively impact model accuracy for energy prediction.

For force predictions (Fig. 5b), the six eqV2 models trained with the OMat24 dataset are the most accurate uMLIPs, with force RMSE values only half those of other models. This exceptional accuracy stems from OMat24's approximately 110 million non-equilibrium configurations, which are essential for predicting atomic forces in diverse systems. Following the eqV2 models, DPA3-v1-OpenLAM and MACE-omat-0 rank as the next most accurate models, though it is significantly

less accurate than the eqV2-omat models. This gap highlights the importance of both architecture and parameter count in determining model accuracy. The remaining uMLIPs are ranked as follows: MACE-MPA-0 > Orb-d3-v2 > MatterSim-v1.0.0-5M > eqV2-dens-86M-mp > Orb-d3-sm-v2 > eqV2-dens-153M-mp > eqV2-dens-31M-mp > Orb-d3-xs-v2 > DPA3-v1-MPtrj > eqV2-31M-mp > GRACE-2L > MatterSim-v1.0.0-1M > Orb-MPtraj-only-v2 > GRACE-1L > CHGNet > MACE-MP-0. This ranking underscores the critical role of dataset quality, model architecture, and parameter count in achieving high accuracy for force predictions, with eqV2 models emerging as the state of the art.

To elucidate the impact of training datasets and architecture, we compare uMLIPs trained on the same datasets. For example, uMLIPs trained exclusively with the MPtraj dataset show the following energy prediction hierarchy: eqV2-31M-mp > DPA3-v1-MPtrj > Orb-MPtraj-only-v2 > GRACE-2L > GRACE-1L > MACE-MP-0 > CHGNet. Additionally, MACE-MPA-0 (trained on MPtraj and Alexandria-related datasets) significantly outperforms Orb models in energy predictions. Similarly, MACE-omat-0 is comparable to eqV2-omat models despite having far fewer parameters (9.06M vs. 31/86/154M). For force predictions, the inclusion of OMat24 consistently improves accuracy, while uMLIPs trained solely on MPtraj perform the worst. Although the DPA3-v1-OpenLAM model incorporates 143 million structures in its training dataset, its performance in predicting energy and force is less accurate than the eqV2 models, which include fewer structures (112M). This disparity is likely due to the insufficient number of parameters in the DPA3-v1-OpenLAM model. Overall, while it is challenging to definitively conclude which uMLIP is the best due to varying datasets and parameter counts, eqV2 and DPA3-v1 models stand out as top performers. These results highlight the importance of diverse datasets for energy predictions and the critical role of OMat24 for force predictions.




Figure 5 Ranking of different uMLIP models based on (a) energy RMSE and (b) force RMSE. The uMLIPs trained exclusively on the MPtrj dataset are represented in red.

Finally, we validate the performance of the eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex model in simulating solute-defect interactions in BCC metals, as this model represents one of the most accurate uMLIPs. The DFT data is obtained from previous study [45]. The results, presented in Fig. 6, cover five binary alloy systems: W-Pt, W-Re, W-Ta, Ta-Os, and Ta-Hf. We consider 11 common defects, each evaluated at multiple data points by varying the distance between the solute atom and the defects. It is observed that the predictions by eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex closely approximate the DFT values across all defect types in all systems. Prediction errors are quantified by mean absolute error (MAE) values, ranging from 31.02 meV to 60.71 meV. These low error values demonstrate that the eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex model achieves near-DFT accuracy in modeling solute-defect interactions in these alloys.




Figure 6 Validation of eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex in modeling solute-defect interactions. (a) Atomic configurations of solute-defect interactions. (b) Comparison between DFT and uMLIP predictions.

3.3 Trade-off between computational accuracy and cost

We conduct a systematic analysis to assess the computational accuracy versus cost for several models: EAM-Zhou, sMLIPs, all uMLIPs, and DFT using a single CPU test. Notably, eqV2 models with 86 M and 153 M parameters are excluded from this analysis due to their excessive computational memory demands for a single CPU setup. To evaluate the computational cost, we perform ten steps of NVE MD simulations on a 125-atom BCC W and calculate the cost per MD step per atom. The computational accuracy is quantified by the energy RMSE from Fig. 5a. For EAM-Zhou, ACE, and MTPs, we consider only the RMSE of the W-g dataset, as these potentials are not universal. All data points are depicted in Fig. 7. Fig. 7(a) reveals that EAM is the fastest potential with an accuracy of approximately 52.5 meV/atom, while sMLIPs such as ACE and

MTPs are 1-2 orders of magnitude slower but offer accuracy approaching that of DFT. uMLIPs without fine-tuning display a significant variation in accuracy and efficiency, being 1-3 orders of magnitude slower than sMLIPs. The most accurate model, eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex, approaches the accuracy of sMLIPs but is still 3-4 orders of magnitude faster than DFT calculations. Notably, Fig. 7(b) shows that Orb-d3-xs-v2, MatterSim-v1.0.0-1M, MatterSim-v1.0.0-5M, MACE-MPA-0, DPA3-v1-OpenLAM and eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex are positioned on the Pareto frontier. In contrast, eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex, while being the least efficient, offers the highest accuracy, with its computational cost being 30 times that of Orb-d3-xs-v2. Among all uMLIPs, CHGNet and MACE-MP-0 are positioned far from the Pareto frontier, indicating a less favorable balance between computational cost and accuracy.




Figure 7 Trade-off between computational accuracy and cost of (a) EAM-Zhou, sMLIPs (ACE and MTPs from level 12 to 20), all uMLIPs, and DFT, and (b) detailed analysis of all uMLIPs.

Our results presented in Fig. 7 highlight the significant computational cost advantage of uMLIPs over DFT, with uMLIPs being at least three orders of magnitude faster. This advantage is even more pronounced in magnetic systems, where DFT typically requires more electronic steps. Additionally, uMLIPs exhibit linear scaling with an increasing number of atoms [46], in contrast to the cubic scaling behavior of DFT. This indicates that the computational efficiency advantage of uMLIPs over DFT becomes increasingly significant as the number of atoms increase. Consequently, uMLIPs are well-suited for relatively large systems, capable of handling hundreds of thousands of atoms effectively.

3.4 Uncertainty quantification of eqV2 models

Uncertainty quantification (UQ) is critical for the reliable application of uMLIPs. For uMLIPs to serve as a viable replacement for DFT, it is essential to ensure that predictions made by these models exhibit low uncertainty or error. However, robust UQ functionality is not inherently available for uMLIPs. To address this, we employ an ensemble method, leveraging multiple models to estimate uncertainty. Specifically, we use six eqV2 models to compute the standard deviation of configurational energies and atomic forces, which serve as quantitative measures of uncertainty. All datasets, except W-s and Mg, are included in this analysis. The W-s dataset is excluded because uMLIPs are known to exhibit inaccuracies for surface structures, while the Mg dataset contains very high-energy configurations that fall outside the typical scope of reliable uMLIP predictions. The standard deviations of energy and atomic force are directly compared to the real errors (deviations from DFT reference values), as illustrated in Fig. 8. For energy, Fig. 8a shows that the energy standard deviation is of the same order of magnitude as the energy error and captures the overall trend of the latter. This suggests that the ensemble method provides a reasonable estimate of energy uncertainty. However, for atomic forces, Fig. 8b reveals a more nuanced picture. While some points exhibit a strong correlation between force standard deviation and force error, the majority of points fall significantly below the diagonal line, indicating that the force standard deviation systematically underestimates the force error. This behavior aligns with the UQ performance observed in MatterSim models [24], highlighting a common challenge in force uncertainty estimation. Overall, our results in Fig. 8 demonstrate that the ensemble method can provide useful estimates of uncertainty for eqV2 calculations, particularly for energies. However, its reliability is limited, especially for atomic forces. These findings underscore the need for further development of UQ techniques tailored to uMLIPs, particularly for improving force uncertainty estimation, to ensure their robust application in materials modeling and discovery.




Figure 8 Uncertainty quantification of eqV2 models using (a) energy and (b) atomic force.

3.5 Comparison between uMLIP and sMLIP

In this section, we compare the performance of uMLIPs and sMLIPs. Specifically, we evaluate the eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex model against ACE and MTP in terms of accuracy. The ACE potential is specifically developed for BCC W and trained on the W-g dataset [41], while the MTP22 potential is trained on the MoNbTaW dataset [44]. Here, “22” refers to the level of the MTP potential, which represents a very high level of complexity suitable for practical simulations. We assess the energy RMSE and force RMSE for GBs in BCC W across various temperatures and deformation states, as well as for the entire MoNbTaW dataset. The results, displayed in Fig. 9, show that eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex provides highly accurate predictions, with energy RMSEs between 3 and 6 meV/atom and force RMSEs between 50 and 100 meV/atom. This accuracy is maintained even under extreme conditions, such as temperatures up to 2000 K, severe plastic deformation in GBs, and complex chemical environments in MoNbTaW. These errors are significantly lower than those predicted by ACE or MTP22, particularly for force predictions, highlighting the superior performance of uMLIPs over sMLIPs in modeling complex defects and chemical interactions.




Figure 9 Comparison of prediction accuracy between eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex and sMLIPs (ACE and MTP22) for GBs in BCC W and MoNbTaW.

It should be noted that the ACE potentials are specifically developed for W by considering extensive defects. Previous studies have shown that the extrapolation grade for general plastic deformation, based on the W-g dataset, is lower than 1. This indicates the high comprehensiveness of the W-g dataset, as it effectively captures a wide range of defect configurations and deformation scenarios. Despite this, the eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex model outperforms ACE in accuracy, demonstrating the superior generalization capabilities of uMLIPs even when compared to highly specialized ACE. To investigate why eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex outperforms ACE, we extract all configurations containing only W from the MPTrj, sAlex, and OMat24 datasets, totaling 40, 49, and 425 structures, respectively. These configurations are collectively referred to as the W-uMLIP dataset. We then conduct a principal component analysis (PCA) on the local atomic environments (LAEs) of each atom in these configurations, using the SOAP descriptor to quantify the LAEs [48]. The W-g dataset is also included for comparison. The first two principal components are plotted against each other in Fig. 10a, revealing that W-g encompasses a wide range of LAEs corresponding to various defects. In contrast, MPTrj primarily includes relaxation trajectories of

eight different lattice structures, while sAlex contains a broader array of structures. Interestingly, OMat24 features more complex LAEs derived from non-equilibrium configurations in MPTrj and sAlex. However, even when combined, MPTrj, sAlex, and OMat24 contain significantly fewer LAEs than W-g.

To further discern the differences between eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex and ACE, we developed a new sMLIP, ACE-new, using the W-uMLIP dataset. Fig. 10b illustrates that eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex consistently shows higher energy RMSE values than ACE-new, although the dataset W-uMLIP is included in the training processing of eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex. Subsequently, we employ ACE-new to predict various GB datasets for W under different temperatures and deformation states, as depicted in Fig. 10c. Interestingly, ACE-new exhibits undesirable energy RMSE values, significantly higher than those of both eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex and ACE trained with W-g. This indicates that the W-select dataset alone is not enough for modeling complex GBs in W. This suggests that the superior accuracy of eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex arises not only from configurations involving W but also from its ability to generalize across diverse atomic environments and interactions beyond a single element.




Figure 10 (a) Principal component analysis of atomic environments of configurations from W-g and W-uMLIP. (b) Energy RMSE of datasets MPTrj, OMat24, and sAlex obtained from eqV2 and ACE-new trained by W-select. (c) Energy RMSE of GB datasets obtained from eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex, ACE trained by W-g, and ACE-new trained by W-uMLIP.

4 Discussion

We have generated and collected DFT datasets that encompass a comprehensive array of defects in metals and alloys. These datasets have been meticulously curated to cover a wide spectrum of defects, ranging from dislocations and complex grain boundaries to interstitial atoms, ensuring a robust representation of potential structural imperfections. By incorporating various alloy compositions and diverse defect configurations, our datasets serve as a valuable resource for validating the predictive capabilities of uMLIPs. Remarkably, the calculated energy and force RMSEs are below 5 meV/atom and 100 meV/Å, respectively, outperforming documented sMLIPs such as MTP and ACE in modeling complex defects. Particularly, given that the datasets Mo-g, Nb-g, Ta-g, and W-g encompass all possible atomic environments encountered in complex deformation scenarios, and considering that these elements were not specifically treated during the pretraining process, we believe that the eqV2-omat-mp-salex models can simulate defects in other metals with comparably high accuracy. In applications to random alloys, eqV2 also demonstrates excellent accuracy in systems such as Mo₅₀Nb₅₀-d, CrCoNi (with magnetism calculations), Mo₂₅Nb₂₅Ta₂₅W₂₅-d, Mo₂₅Nb₂₅Ta₂₅W₂₅-H, and HEA10-AlHfMoNbNiTaTiVWZr. These datasets include extensive defects, complex chemical ordering, and sophisticated elemental interactions. Additionally, we find that eqV2-31M-omat-mp-salex can capture the subtle energy changes in solute-defect interactions due to varying defect-defect distances in W and Ta binary alloys. Collectively, our results demonstrate that eqV2, trained on MPTrj, sAlex, and OMat24, can effectively replace computationally costly DFT calculations in key applications within the mechanical and materials science communities.

On the other hand, our results highlight a significant advantage of uMLIPs over sMLIPs. As demonstrated in Figs 9 and 10, uMLIPs exhibit superior extrapolation capabilities. For instance, despite the limited data for pure W in the MPTrj, sAlex, and OMat24 datasets, the eqV2-omat-mp-salex model accurately predicts complex defects in W, as demonstrated by its high accuracy on the W-g dataset. In contrast, sMLIPs such as ACE or MTP require explicit training on these defects, as their parameters are constrained to specific elements and inter-element interactions, limiting their transferability. uMLIPs, however, leverage shared parameters and element embeddings to generalize across the periodic table. Element embeddings encode the chemical identity of each atom, capturing similarities between elements based on their electronic structure, atomic size, and bonding behavior. This allows uMLIPs to learn a unified representation of atomic interactions that

extends beyond the training data, enabling accurate predictions even for untrained defects or elements [21,49–52]. This flexibility reduces the need for defect-specific training data, making uMLIPs a powerful tool for modeling diverse materials and defects in these materials. One promising application is using uMLIPs to develop sMLIPs via teacher-student architectures for knowledge distillation, as uMLIPs can study large defects that DFT cannot handle. This approach has been demonstrated by the DPA-2 architecture [27], though the accuracy of DPA-2 models remains critical for success.

Finally, our results provide critical insights into the future direction of uMLIPs. A key question arises: should the focus be on developing more advanced machine learning architectures, or on generating more comprehensive DFT datasets? The ongoing competition in the Matbench-discovery repository highlights that both the academic community and industrial companies, including Meta and Microsoft, are actively pursuing both avenues. These efforts involve developing more sophisticated architectures with increased parameters and training on larger datasets. For instance, the advanced eqV2 models now contain 153 million parameters and are trained on 110 million structures, showcasing the trend toward scaling up both model complexity and dataset size. Our results demonstrate that eqV2 models are already highly accurate for predicting general defects in metals and alloys, with accuracy approaching the noise level of DFT calculations. This indicates that the three datasets—MPTrj, sAlex, and OMat24—are sufficient for modeling defects in bulk systems. However, the next steps should focus on addressing current limitations of uMLIPs. First, more structures involving free surfaces need to be included, as current uMLIPs still struggle with surface-dominated systems. Second, for magnetic systems such as Fe, Cr, and CrCoNi, our results indicate relatively low accuracy, suggesting the need to explicitly incorporate magnetic properties as input features, as demonstrated by models like CHGNet. Third, datasets from MatterSim, which include high-temperature and high-pressure structures, should be integrated to improve performance in extreme-condition applications. Addressing these limitations will be crucial for expanding the applicability of uMLIPs to a broader range of materials science problems. Another key aspect for advancing uMLIPs is the development of reliable UQ methods. By quantifying uncertainty, users can identify regions of low confidence in predictions and take appropriate measures to validate or refine results. Although our results in Fig. 8 demonstrate the potential of ensemble methods in eqV2 models for UQ, further improvements are needed. This

advancement is crucial for the future goal of enabling MLIPs to fully replace DFT calculations for any kind of microstructural features and defects present in wide class of materials.

5 Conclusions

In conclusion, our study demonstrates the remarkable potential of uMLIPs in accurately modeling defects and complex interactions in metals and alloys, rivaling the precision of DFT at a fraction of the computational cost. The eqV2 models, trained on diverse datasets such as MPTrj, sAlex, and OMat24, achieve exceptional accuracy in predicting energies and forces, with RMSEs below 5 meV/atom and 100 meV/Å, respectively. These models outperform sMLIPs like ACE and MTP, particularly in extrapolating to unseen defect configurations and complex chemical environments. Our findings underscore the significance of both advanced machine learning architectures and comprehensive datasets in advancing uMLIPs. The OMat24 dataset plays a critical role in force predictions, while the eqV2 models demonstrate superior generalization capabilities in defect modeling. Collectively, these advancements position uMLIPs as transformative tools for accelerating materials discovery and design, offering a robust alternative to traditional DFT in computational materials science.

Acknowledgments

This work was sponsored by Nederlandse Organisatie voor WetenschappelijkOnderzoek (The Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, NWO) domain Science for the use of supercomputer facilities. The authors also acknowledge the use of DelftBlue supercomputer, provided by Delft High Performance Computing Center (<https://www.tudelft.nl/dhpc>). We are grateful to Dr. Luca Laurenti for his valuable insights.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Fei Shuang: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Validation, Methodology, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Zixong Wei:** Writing – review & editing, Data curation and Analysis. **Kai Liu:** Writing – review & editing, Data curation and Analysis. **Wei Gao:** Writing – review & editing, Data curation and Analysis. **Poulumi Dey:** Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Methodology, Funding acquisition, Conceptualization.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

All simulations were performed using the open-source package ASE. The uMLIP models are available in their respective GitHub repositories.

Reference

- [1] K. Song, R. Zhao, J. Liu, Y. Wang, E. Lindgren, Y. Wang, S. Chen, K. Xu, T. Liang, P. Ying, N. Xu, Z. Zhao, J. Shi, J. Wang, S. Lyu, Z. Zeng, S. Liang, H. Dong, L. Sun, Y. Chen, Z. Zhang, W. Guo, P. Qian, J. Sun, P. Erhart, T. Ala-Nissila, Y. Su, Z. Fan, General-purpose machine-learned potential for 16 elemental metals and their alloys, *Nat Commun* 15 (2024) 10208. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-54554-x>.
- [2] R. Gurnani, S. Shukla, D. Kamal, C. Wu, J. Hao, C. Kuenneth, P. Akhujkar, A. Khomane, R. Daniels, A.A. Deshmukh, Y. Cao, G. Sotzing, R. Ramprasad, AI-assisted discovery of high-temperature dielectrics for energy storage, *Nat Commun* 15 (2024) 6107. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-50413-x>.
- [3] Z. Wang, J. Cai, A. Chen, Y. Han, K. Tao, S. Ye, S. Wang, I. Ali, J. Li, AlphaMat: A Material Informatics Hub Connecting Data, Features, Models and Applications, (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11651> (accessed December 31, 2024).
- [4] N.T. Hung, R. Okabe, A. Chotrattanapituk, M. Li, Universal Ensemble-Embedding Graph Neural Network for Direct Prediction of Optical Spectra from Crystal Structures, *Advanced Materials* 36 (2024) 2409175. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.202409175>.
- [5] A. Loew, D. Sun, H.-C. Wang, S. Botti, M.A.L. Marques, Universal Machine Learning Interatomic Potentials are Ready for Phonons, (2024). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2412.16551> (accessed December 31, 2024).
- [6] H. Lee, V.I. Hegde, C. Wolverton, Y. Xia, Accelerating High-Throughput Phonon Calculations via Machine Learning Universal Potentials, (2024). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.09674> (accessed December 31, 2024).
- [7] Y. Zuo, C. Chen, X. Li, Z. Deng, Y. Chen, J. Behler, G. Csányi, A. V. Shapeev, A.P. Thompson, M.A. Wood, S.P. Ong, Performance and Cost Assessment of Machine Learning Interatomic Potentials, *J Phys Chem A* 124 (2020) 731–745. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpca.9b08723>.

- [8] C. Zeni, R. Pinsler, D. Zügner, A. Fowler, M. Horton, X. Fu, Z. Wang, A. Shysheya, J. Crabbé, S. Ueda, R. Sordillo, L. Sun, J. Smith, B. Nguyen, H. Schulz, S. Lewis, C.-W. Huang, Z. Lu, Y. Zhou, H. Yang, H. Hao, J. Li, C. Yang, W. Li, R. Tomioka, T. Xie, A generative model for inorganic materials design, *Nature* (2025) 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-025-08628-5>.
- [9] J. Riebesell, R.E.A. Goodall, P. Benner, Y. Chiang, B. Deng, G. Ceder, M. Asta, A.A. Lee, A. Jain, K.A. Persson, *Matbench Discovery -- A framework to evaluate machine learning crystal stability predictions*, (2023). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.14920v3> (accessed January 25, 2025).
- [10] L. Ward, R. Liu, A. Krishna, V.I. Hegde, A. Agrawal, A. Choudhary, C. Wolverton, Including crystal structure attributes in machine learning models of formation energies via Voronoi tessellations, *Phys Rev B* 96 (2017) 024104. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.96.024104>.
- [11] Y. Zuo, M. Qin, C. Chen, W. Ye, X. Li, J. Luo, S.P. Ong, Accelerating materials discovery with Bayesian optimization and graph deep learning, *Materials Today* 51 (2021) 126–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mattod.2021.08.012>.
- [12] R.E.A. Goodall, A.S. Parackal, F.A. Faber, R. Armiento, A.A. Lee, Rapid discovery of stable materials by coordinate-free coarse graining, *Sci Adv* 8 (2022) 4117. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abn4117>.
- [13] J. Gibson, A. Hire, R.G. Hennig, Data-augmentation for graph neural network learning of the relaxed energies of unrelaxed structures, *NPJ Comput Mater* 8 (2022) 211. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-022-00891-8>.
- [14] T. Xie, J.C. Grossman, Crystal Graph Convolutional Neural Networks for an Accurate and Interpretable Prediction of Material Properties, *Phys Rev Lett* 120 (2018) 145301. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.145301>.
- [15] C. Chen, W. Ye, Y. Zuo, C. Zheng, S.P. Ong, Graph Networks as a Universal Machine Learning Framework for Molecules and Crystals, *Chemistry of Materials* 31 (2019) 3564–3572. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemmater.9b01294>.
- [16] K. Choudhary, B. DeCost, Atomistic Line Graph Neural Network for improved materials property predictions, *NPJ Comput Mater* 7 (2021) 185. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-021-00650-1>.
- [17] C. Chen, S.P. Ong, A universal graph deep learning interatomic potential for the periodic table, *Nat Comput Sci* 2 (2022) 718–728. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-022-00349-3>.

- [18] B. Deng, P. Zhong, K. Jun, J. Riebesell, K. Han, C.J. Bartel, G. Ceder, CHGNet as a pretrained universal neural network potential for charge-informed atomistic modelling, *Nat Mach Intell* 5 (2023) 1031–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-023-00716-3>.
- [19] I. Batatia, P. Benner, Y. Chiang, A.M. Elena, D.P. Kovács, J. Riebesell, X.R. Advincula, M. Asta, M. Avaylon, W.J. Baldwin, F. Berger, N. Bernstein, A. Bhowmik, S.M. Blau, V. Cărare, J.P. Darby, S. De, F. Della Pia, V.L. Deringer, R. Elijošius, Z. El-Machachi, F. Falcioni, E. Fako, A.C. Ferrari, A. Genreith-Schriever, J. George, R.E.A. Goodall, C.P. Grey, P. Grigorev, S. Han, W. Handley, H.H. Heenen, K. Hermansson, C. Holm, J. Jaafar, S. Hofmann, K.S. Jakob, H. Jung, V. Kapil, A.D. Kaplan, N. Karimitari, J.R. Kermode, N. Kroupa, J. Kullgren, M.C. Kuner, D. Kuryla, G. Liepuoniute, J.T. Margraf, I.-B. Magdău, A. Michaelides, J.H. Moore, A.A. Naik, S.P. Niblett, S.W. Norwood, N. O’Neill, C. Ortner, K.A. Persson, K. Reuter, A.S. Rosen, L.L. Schaaf, C. Schran, B.X. Shi, E. Sivonxay, T.K. Stenczel, V. Svahn, C. Sutton, T.D. Swinburne, J. Tilly, C. van der Oord, E. Varga-Umbrich, T. Vegge, M. Vondrák, Y. Wang, W.C. Witt, F. Zills, G. Csányi, A foundation model for atomistic materials chemistry, (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2401.00096> (accessed December 31, 2024).
- [20] A. Bochkarev, Y. Lysogorskiy, R. Drautz, Graph Atomic Cluster Expansion for Semilocal Interactions beyond Equivariant Message Passing, *Phys Rev X* 14 (2024) 021036. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.14.021036>.
- [21] Y. Park, J. Kim, S. Hwang, S. Han, Scalable Parallel Algorithm for Graph Neural Network Interatomic Potentials in Molecular Dynamics Simulations, *J Chem Theory Comput* 20 (2024) 4857–4868. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.4c00190>.
- [22] M. Neumann, J. Gin, B. Rhodes, S. Bennett, Z. Li, H. Choubisa, A. Hussey, J. Godwin, Orb: A Fast, Scalable Neural Network Potential, (2024). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.22570> (accessed December 31, 2024).
- [23] A. Merchant, S. Batzner, S.S. Schoenholz, M. Aykol, G. Cheon, E.D. Cubuk, Scaling deep learning for materials discovery, *Nature* 624 (2023) 80–85. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06735-9>.
- [24] H. Yang, C. Hu, Y. Zhou, X. Liu, Y. Shi, J. Li, G. Li, Z. Chen, S. Chen, C. Zeni, M. Horton, R. Pinsler, A. Fowler, D. Zügner, T. Xie, J. Smith, L. Sun, Q. Wang, L. Kong, C. Liu, H. Hao, Z. Lu, MatterSim: A Deep Learning Atomistic Model Across Elements, Temperatures and Pressures, (2024). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.04967> (accessed December 31, 2024).
- [25] L. Barroso-Luque, M. Shuaibi, X. Fu, B.M. Wood, M. Dzamba, M. Gao, A. Rizvi, C.L. Zitnick, Z.W. Ulissi, Open Materials 2024 (OMat24) Inorganic Materials Dataset and Models, (2024). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2410.12771> (accessed December 31, 2024).

- [26] Y.-L. Liao, B. Wood, A. Das, T. Smidt, EquiformerV2: Improved Equivariant Transformer for Scaling to Higher-Degree Representations, 12th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024 (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.12059> (accessed December 31, 2024).
- [27] D. Zhang, X. Liu, X. Zhang, C. Zhang, C. Cai, H. Bi, Y. Du, X. Qin, A. Peng, J. Huang, B. Li, Y. Shan, J. Zeng, Y. Zhang, S. Liu, Y. Li, J. Chang, X. Wang, S. Zhou, J. Liu, X. Luo, Z. Wang, W. Jiang, J. Wu, Y. Yang, J. Yang, M. Yang, F.-Q. Gong, L. Zhang, M. Shi, F.-Z. Dai, D.M. York, S. Liu, T. Zhu, Z. Zhong, J. Lv, J. Cheng, W. Jia, M. Chen, G. Ke, W. E, L. Zhang, H. Wang, DPA-2: a large atomic model as a multi-task learner, *Npj Computational Materials* 2024 10:1 10 (2024) 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-024-01493-2>.
- [28] J. Zeng, D. Zhang, D. Lu, P. Mo, Z. Li, Y. Chen, M. Rynik, L. Huang, Z. Li, S. Shi, Y. Wang, H. Ye, P. Tuo, J. Yang, Y. Ding, Y. Li, D. Tisi, Q. Zeng, H. Bao, Y. Xia, J. Huang, K. Muraoka, Y. Wang, J. Chang, F. Yuan, S.L. Bore, C. Cai, Y. Lin, B. Wang, J. Xu, J.X. Zhu, C. Luo, Y. Zhang, R.E.A. Goodall, W. Liang, A.K. Singh, S. Yao, J. Zhang, R. Wentzcovitch, J. Han, J. Liu, W. Jia, D.M. York, E. Weinan, R. Car, L. Zhang, H. Wang, DeePMD-kit v2: A software package for deep potential models, *Journal of Chemical Physics* 159 (2023) 54801. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0155600/18281512/054801_1_5.0155600.AM.PDF.
- [29] B. Deng, Y. Choi, P. Zhong, J. Riebesell, S. Anand, Z. Li, K. Jun, K.A. Persson, G. Ceder, Systematic softening in universal machine learning interatomic potentials, *NPJ Comput Mater* 11 (2025) 9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41524-024-01500-6>.
- [30] H. Yu, M. Giantomassi, G. Materzanini, J. Wang, G. Rignanese, Systematic assessment of various universal machine-learning interatomic potentials, *Materials Genome Engineering Advances* 2 (2024) e58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mgea.58>.
- [31] B. Focassio, L.P. M. Freitas, G.R. Schleder, Performance Assessment of Universal Machine Learning Interatomic Potentials: Challenges and Directions for Materials' Surfaces, *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsami.4c03815>.
- [32] G. Kresse, J. Furthmüller, Efficiency of ab-initio total energy calculations for metals and semiconductors using a plane-wave basis set, *Comput Mater Sci* 6 (1996) 15–50. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0927-0256\(96\)00008-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0927-0256(96)00008-0).
- [33] J.P. Perdew, K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, Generalized Gradient Approximation Made Simple, *Phys Rev Lett* 77 (1996) 3865–3868. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.3865>.
- [34] P.E. Blöchl, Projector augmented-wave method, *Phys Rev B* 50 (1994) 17953–17979. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.50.17953>.

- [35] V. Wang, N. Xu, J.-C. Liu, G. Tang, W.-T. Geng, VASPKIT: A user-friendly interface facilitating high-throughput computing and analysis using VASP code, *Comput Phys Commun* 267 (2021) 108033. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2021.108033>.
- [36] A. Hjorth Larsen, J. Jørgen Mortensen, J. Blomqvist, I.E. Castelli, R. Christensen, M. Dułak, J. Friis, M.N. Groves, B. Hammer, C. Hargus, E.D. Hermes, P.C. Jennings, P. Bjerre Jensen, J. Kermode, J.R. Kitchin, E. Leonhard Kolsbjerg, J. Kubal, K. Kaasbjerg, S. Lysgaard, J. Bergmann Maronsson, T. Maxson, T. Olsen, L. Pastewka, A. Peterson, C. Rostgaard, J. Schiøtz, O. Schütt, M. Strange, K.S. Thygesen, T. Vegge, L. Vilhelmsen, M. Walter, Z. Zeng, K.W. Jacobsen, The atomic simulation environment—a Python library for working with atoms, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* 29 (2017) 273002. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-648X/aa680e>.
- [37] A. Stukowski, Visualization and analysis of atomistic simulation data with OVITO—the Open Visualization Tool, *Model Simul Mat Sci Eng* 18 (2010) 015012. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0965-0393/18/1/015012>.
- [38] J. Schmidt, T.F.T. Cerqueira, A.H. Romero, A. Loew, F. Jäger, H.-C. Wang, S. Botti, M.A.L. Marques, Improving machine-learning models in materials science through large datasets, *Materials Today Physics* 48 (2024) 101560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtphys.2024.101560>.
- [39] Y.-L. Liao, T. Smidt, M. Shuaibi, A. Das, Generalizing Denoising to Non-Equilibrium Structures Improves Equivariant Force Fields, (2024). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.09549> (accessed January 25, 2025).
- [40] H. Zheng, X.-G. Li, R. Tran, C. Chen, M. Horton, D. Winston, K.A. Persson, S.P. Ong, Grain boundary properties of elemental metals, *Acta Mater* 186 (2020) 40–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actamat.2019.12.030>.
- [41] F. Shuang, K. Liu, Y. Ji, W. Gao, L. Laurenti, P. Dey, Modeling Extensive Defects in Metals through Active Machine Learning and Automated Configuration Reconstruction, (2024). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2411.07367> (accessed December 31, 2024).
- [42] M. Poul, L. Huber, E. Bitzek, J. Neugebauer, Systematic atomic structure datasets for machine learning potentials: Application to defects in magnesium, *Phys Rev B* 107 (2023) 104103. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.107.104103>.
- [43] K. Sheriff, Y. Cao, T. Smidt, R. Freitas, Quantifying chemical short-range order in metallic alloys, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121 (2024) e2322962121. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2322962121>.
- [44] F. Shuang, Y. Ji, L. Laurenti, P. Dey, Size-Dependent Strength Superiority in Multi-Principal Element Alloys Versus Constituent Metals: Insights from Machine Learning Potential and Embedded-Atom Model, (2024). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4986636>.

- [45] Y.-J. Hu, G. Zhao, B. Zhang, C. Yang, M. Zhang, Z.-K. Liu, X. Qian, L. Qi, Local electronic descriptors for solute-defect interactions in bcc refractory metals, *Nat Commun* 10 (2019) 4484. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-12452-7>.
- [46] D. Wines, K. Choudhary, CHIPS-FF: Evaluating Universal Machine Learning Force Fields for Material Properties, (2024). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2412.10516> (accessed December 31, 2024).
- [47] R. Freitas, Y. Cao, Machine-learning potentials for crystal defects, *MRS Commun* 12 (2022) 510–520. <https://doi.org/10.1557/s43579-022-00221-5>.
- [48] L. Himanen, M.O.J. Jäger, E. V. Morooka, F. Federici Canova, Y.S. Ranawat, D.Z. Gao, P. Rinke, A.S. Foster, DScribe: Library of descriptors for machine learning in materials science, *Comput Phys Commun* 247 (2020) 106949. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2019.106949>.
- [49] C. Chen, S.P. Ong, A universal graph deep learning interatomic potential for the periodic table, *Nat Comput Sci* 2 (2022) 718–728. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-022-00349-3>.
- [50] S. Kang, How graph neural network interatomic potentials extrapolate: Role of the message-passing algorithm, *J Chem Phys* 161 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0234287>.
- [51] N. Lopanitsyna, G. Fraux, M.A. Springer, S. De, M. Ceriotti, Modeling high-entropy transition metal alloys with alchemical compression, *Phys Rev Mater* 7 (2023) 045802. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevMaterials.7.045802>.
- [52] J.P. Darby, D.P. Kovács, I. Batatia, M.A. Caro, G.L.W. Hart, C. Ortner, G. Csányi, Tensor-Reduced Atomic Density Representations, *Phys Rev Lett* 131 (2023) 028001. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.028001>.