

State Specific Kohn–Sham Density Functional Theory

James P. Finley

Department of Physical Sciences, Eastern New Mexico University,

Station #33, Portales, NM 88130 and

Department of Applied Chemistry, Graduate

School of Engineering, The University of Tokyo

*7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 113-8656 Japan**

(Dated: November 5, 2018)

Abstract

A generalization of the Kohn–Sham approach is derived where the correlation-energy functional depends on the one-particle density matrix of noninteracting states and on the external potential from the interacting target-state. The one-particle equations contain the exact exchange potential, a nonlocal correlation potential, and an additional operator involving the correlation density. The electronic-energy functional has multiple solutions: Any one-particle density matrix delivering the target-state density yields a solution. In order to obtain the Kohn–Sham solution, the nonlocal operators are converted into local ones using an approach developed by Sala and Görling. Since the exact exchange-potential is used, and the N -representability problem does not arise—in contrast to the Kohn–Sham approach—errors from Coulomb self-interactions do not occur, nor the need to introduce functionals defined by a constraint search. Furthermore, the approach does not use the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem. A density functional formalism is also derived that assumes that the one-particle density matrices of interest have v -representable (non-interacting) densities and that these density matrices can be written as an explicit functional of the electron density. For simplicity, we only consider noninteracting closed-shell states and target states that are nondegenerate, singlet ground-states.

*Electronic address: james.finley@enmu.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

The Kohn-Sham version of density functional theory plays a major role in both quantum chemistry and condensed matter physics [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. The local density approximation [8] has been widely used for the solid state. While for molecules, by far, the most successful functional, a hybrid one [9, 10, 11, 12], is known as B3LYP [9, 13].

The Kohn-Sham approach, however, does have well known shortcomings. For example, a constraint search definition [14, 15, 16, 17] is required to treat the v -representability problem that arises in the original Kohn-Sham method [8]. Unfortunately, this formal definition is difficult to consider when deriving approximate functionals. Furthermore, in contrast to wave function based methods, the exchange-correlation functional is an unknown, implicit functional, and there is no systematic method to improve approximations. In addition, there are well known errors arising from Coulomb self-interactions that appears when using approximate functionals [1, 2, 18]. Also, the most widely used approximate functional for molecular systems, the B3LYP functional, includes a component of the exact exchange-potential, even though the Kohn-Sham approach requires the noninteracting state to come from a local potential. The optimized potential method [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25] is an approach to convert a nonlocal operator into a local potential. Unfortunately, this method leads to potentials that are not invariant to a unitary transformation of orbitals and depend explicitly on the individual orbitals and orbital energies.

The formalism presented below uses an electronic-energy functional containing a correlation energy functional \mathcal{E}_{co} that depends on the external potential v and on the one-particle density matrix ρ_1 of determinantal states. Since the v -representability problem does not appear, a constrain search definition is not needed. Also, since the approach uses the exact exchange-potential, errors from Coulomb self-interactions do not occur. The energy functionals, however, contains multiple solutions, since any one-particle density matrix ρ_1 delivering the density from the interacting state yields a solution. In order to obtain the Kohn-Sham solution, the nonlocal operators are converted into local ones using an approach developed by Sala and Görling [26]. In contrast to the optimized potential method [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25], the energy functionals and local potentials are invariant to a unitary transformation of orbitals and do not depend on the individual orbital or the orbital energies. A density functional formalism is also derived that assumes that the one-particle

density matrices of interest have v -representable (non-interacting) densities and that these density matrices can be written as an explicit functional of the electron density.

Previously we have shown that the correlation energy from many body perturbation theory [27, 28, 29] can be written as an explicit functional of v and ρ_1 [30]. In a similar manner, but using less restrictive energy denominators, the correlation energy functionals presented below can be shown to be an explicit functional of v and ρ_1 [31]. Hence, in contrast to the Kohn–Sham method, it maybe possible to derive approximate functionals that can be improved in a systematic manner. For simplicity, we only consider noninteracting closed-shell states and target states that are nondegenerate, singlet ground-states.

II. THE ENERGY FUNCTIONALS AND TRIAL WAVE FUNCTIONS

Our interest is in finding the ground-state eigenvalue of the Hamiltonian operator,

$$\hat{H}_{Nv} = \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} + \hat{V}_v, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\hat{T} = \sum_i^N \left(-\frac{1}{2}\nabla_i^2\right), \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{V}_{ee} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}^N r_{ij}^{-1}, \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{V}_v = \sum_i^N v(i), \quad (4)$$

and v is the external potential; N is the number of electrons. Since the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{Nv} is determined by N and v , so are the ground state wave functions $|\Psi_{Nv}\rangle$ that satisfy the Schrödinger equation:

$$\hat{H}_{Nv}|\Psi_{Nv}\rangle = \mathcal{E}_{Nv}|\Psi_{Nv}\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where, for simplicity, we only consider wave functions that are nondegenerate, singlet ground-states.

Using a second quantization approach, our spin-free Hamiltonian does not depend on N , and it can be expressed by

$$\hat{H}_v = \sum_{ij} (i|(-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2)|j)\hat{E}_{ij} + \sum_{ij} (i|v|j)\hat{E}_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijkl} (ij|kl)\hat{E}_{ijkl}, \quad (6)$$

where the symmetry-adapted excitation operators are given by

$$\hat{E}_{ij} = \sum_{\sigma} a_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} a_{j\sigma}, \quad (7)$$

$$\hat{E}_{ijkl} = \sum_{\sigma\lambda} a_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} a_{k\lambda}^{\dagger} a_{l\lambda} a_{j\sigma}, \quad (8)$$

and the one- and two electrons integrals are spin-free integrals written in chemist's notation [32] using a spatial orbital set, say $\{\chi\}$; this set has the following form:

$$\psi_{j\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = \chi_j(\mathbf{r})\sigma(\omega); \quad \sigma = \alpha, \beta, \quad (9)$$

where the spatial and spin coordinates, \mathbf{r} and ω , are denoted collectively by \mathbf{x} .

Wave function-based methods including perturbation theory, configuration interaction, and coupled cluster theory, use one or more reference states to express Ψ and \mathcal{E} . For closed-shell ground-state wave functions, a single determinant can be used, where closed-shell determinantal, or noninteracting, states can be constructed from a set of doubly occupied spatial-orbitals; these occupied orbitals also determine the spin-less one-particle density-matrix of the noninteracting state, given by [2, 33]

$$\rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = 2 \sum_{w \in \{\chi_o\}} \chi_w(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_w^*(\mathbf{r}_2), \quad (10)$$

where the sum is over the occupied orbitals; this set of orbitals is denoted by $\{\chi_o\}$.

For later use, we also mention that for a complete basis set we have

$$2\delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) = \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + \kappa_{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2), \quad (11)$$

where κ_{ρ_1} is determined by the excited orbitals,

$$\kappa_{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = 2 \sum_{r \in \{\chi_u\}} \chi_r(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_r^*(\mathbf{r}_2), \quad (12)$$

and $\{\chi_u\}$ denotes the set of orbitals orthogonal to the occupied set $\{\chi_o\}$. The operator form of Eq. (11) is

$$2\hat{I} = \hat{\rho}_1 + \hat{\kappa}_{\rho_1}, \quad (13)$$

where \hat{I} is the identity operator; so, the kernels of the three operators within Eq. (13) are given by the corresponding terms within Eq. (11).

It is well known that there is a one-to-one mapping between determinantal states and their one-particle density matrices [2, 34], say γ , where for a closed-shell state described by the orbitals given by Eq. (9), we have [35, 36, 37, 38]

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \sum_{w \in \{\chi_o\}} \sum_{\sigma} \chi_w(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_w^*(\mathbf{r}_2) \sigma(\omega_1) \sigma^*(\omega_2), \quad (14)$$

and by using Eq. (10), we obtain

$$\gamma(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \frac{1}{2} \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \delta_{\omega_1 \omega_2}. \quad (15)$$

Since our closed-shell determinantal states are determined by ρ_1 , we denote these kets by $|\rho_1\rangle$.

According to the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem [1, 2, 39], the external potential v is determined by the density, and the density also determines N . So, in principle, we can replace the variables N and v by the electronic density n and, at least for nondegenerate ground-states, write

$$\hat{H}_v |\Psi_n\rangle = \mathcal{E}_n |\Psi_n\rangle; \quad n \longrightarrow N, v, \quad (16)$$

where these functions serve as density-dependent trial-wave functions for the Kohn-Sham approach. Notice we have omitted the N subscript on the Hamiltonian operator, since \hat{H}_v is independent of N when this operator is expressed in second quantization.

As an alternative to a density-dependent wave function, we consider trial wave functions, say $|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle$, that are determined by the one-body external potential v and, in addition, by the spin-less one-particle density-matrix ρ_1 of a noninteracting state, and, as mentioned previously, these noninteracting states are denoted by $|\rho_1\rangle$.

By definition, our trial wave function $|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle$ yields the exact ground-state wave function $|\Psi_n\rangle$ when the noninteracting density ρ_s , i.e., the density of $|\rho_1\rangle$, equals the exact density n of the interacting state $|\Psi_n\rangle$, where n also determines the v and N . This state of affairs can be represented by the following:

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle = |\Psi_n\rangle; \quad \rho_1 \longrightarrow \rho_s = n, \quad n \longrightarrow N, v. \quad (17)$$

In other words, ρ_1 determines ρ_s , and when $\rho_s = n$, $|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle$ yields $|\Psi_n\rangle$. Letting ϱ_1 denote the one-particle density matrix of interest, we can write

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\varrho_1}\rangle = |\Psi_n\rangle; \quad \varrho_1 \longrightarrow n, \quad n \longrightarrow N, v. \quad (18)$$

For later use, we also mention that the density n of an interacting state can be partitioned as

$$n = \rho_s + \rho_c, \quad (19)$$

where the correlation density is given by

$$\rho_c(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\langle \Psi_n | \hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) | \Psi_n \rangle}{\langle \Psi_n | \Psi_n \rangle} - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}), \quad (20)$$

and $\hat{\Gamma}$ is the density operator, given by Eq. (A7).

Using our trial wave function, we introduce a variational energy functional:

$$E_v[\rho_1] = \frac{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \hat{H}_v | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle}. \quad (21)$$

Our trial wave functions $|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle$ and energy functionals $E_v[\rho_1]$ are assumed to be explicit functionals of ρ_1 and v . However, two different one-particle density matrices, say ρ_1 and ρ_1' , that yield the same density ρ_s , i.e., $\rho_1 \rightarrow \rho_s$ and $\rho_1' \rightarrow \rho_s$, yield the same $|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle$ and $E_v[\rho_1]$, so these functions are implicit functionals of ρ_s , and, therefore, we can write $|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_s}\rangle$ and $E_v[\rho_s]$. However, we will continue to consider them as functionals of their explicit variable ρ_1 .

Using Eqs. (16) and (18), we observe that our energy functional E_v , given by Eq. (21), delivers the exact energy \mathcal{E}_n when the one-particle density matrix determines the exact density n :

$$E_v[\rho_1] = \mathcal{E}_n, \quad \rho_1 \rightarrow n, \quad n \rightarrow N, v, \quad (22)$$

and for an arbitrary density we get

$$E_v[\rho_1] \geq \mathcal{E}_n, \quad \rho_1 \rightarrow \rho_s \rightarrow N, \quad (23)$$

where the density ρ_s from the noninteracting state $|\rho_1\rangle$ is not necessarily v -representable.

III. TRIAL HAMILTONIANS

Our trial wave function is a ground-state eigenfunction of a Hamiltonian operator that depend explicitly on the one-particle density of a noninteracting state:

$$\hat{H}_{v\rho_1} |\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle = \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{v\rho_1} |\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle. \quad (24)$$

As in our trial wave functions $|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle$ and energy functionals $E_v[\rho_1]$, the trial Hamiltonians $\hat{H}_{v\rho_1}$ are explicit functionals of ρ_1 , but implicit functionals of ρ_s . So two trial Hamiltonians, say $\hat{H}_{v\rho_1}$ and $\hat{H}_{v\rho_1'}$, are equal if both ρ_1 and ρ_1' yield the same density, i.e., $\rho_1, \rho_1' \rightarrow \rho_s$.

Our trial Hamiltonians must be chosen so that Eq. (18) is satisfied, indicating the following identity:

$$\hat{H}_{v\rho_1} = \hat{H}_v, \quad \rho_1 \longrightarrow n, \quad n \longrightarrow N, v. \quad (25)$$

There are many ways to obtain a trial Hamiltonian that satisfies Eq. (25). Consider the following trial Hamiltonian obtained by adding a term to the Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H}_{v\rho_1} = \hat{H}_v + \lambda \int d\mathbf{r} g_{\rho_c}(\mathbf{r}) \left(\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) \right), \quad \rho_1 \longrightarrow \rho_s, \quad (26)$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r})$ is the density operator, given by Eq. (A7); $(\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}))$ is the one-body portion of $\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r})$ when this operator is written in normal-ordered form [27, 40, 41, 42], given by Eq. (A6). Furthermore, λ is an arbitrary constant, and the functional g is also arbitrary, except that it vanishes when the correlation density ρ_c vanishes

$$\lim_{\rho_c \rightarrow 0} g_{\rho_c}(\mathbf{r}) = 0, \quad (27)$$

where ρ_c is defined by Eqs. (19) and (20).

Since $(\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}))$ is normal-ordered, we have

$$\langle \rho_1 | \left(\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) \right) | \rho_1 \rangle = 0. \quad (28)$$

Therefore, the added term appearing in Eq. (26) can be considered a sort of correlation term, since it does not contribute in first order. Hence, we have

$$\langle \rho_1 | \hat{H}_{v\rho_1} | \rho_1 \rangle = \langle \rho_1 | \hat{H}_v | \rho_1 \rangle. \quad (29)$$

One possible choice for g_{ρ_c} , and presented in Appendix A, is given by

$$g_{\rho_c}(\mathbf{r}_1) = \int d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho_c(\mathbf{r}_2). \quad (30)$$

IV. A GENERALIZATION OF THE KOHN-SHAM FORMALISM

We now obtain a generalization of the Kohn-Sham formalism. Substituting Eq. (1) into Eq. (21) gives

$$E_v[\rho_1] = \frac{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \hat{T} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle} + \frac{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \hat{V}_{ee} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle} + \int d\mathbf{r} v(\mathbf{r}) \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) + \int d\mathbf{r} v(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{\rho}_c(\mathbf{r}), \quad (31)$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_c$ is the correlation density of the trial wave function, i.e, as in Eq. (20), we have

$$\tilde{\rho}_c(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \hat{T}(\mathbf{r}) | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle} - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) = \tilde{n} - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}), \quad \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \longrightarrow \tilde{n}, \rho_1 \longrightarrow \rho_s, \quad (32)$$

and \tilde{n} is the density of $\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}$.

Through the first-order, the kinetic energy and electron-electron repulsion energy are given, respectively, by

$$\langle \rho_1 | \hat{T} | \rho_1 \rangle = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \left[-\frac{1}{2} \nabla_1^2 \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \right]_{\mathbf{r}_2=\mathbf{r}_1}, \quad (33)$$

$$\langle \rho_1 | \hat{V}_{ee} | \rho_1 \rangle = E_J[\rho_s] + E_x[\rho_1], \quad (34)$$

where the Coulomb and exchange energies are

$$E_J[\rho_s] = \frac{1}{2} \int \int r_{12}^{-1} d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \rho(\mathbf{r}_1) \rho(\mathbf{r}_2), \quad (35)$$

$$-E_x[\rho_1] = \frac{1}{4} \int \int r_{12}^{-1} d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1). \quad (36)$$

Adding and subtracting $\langle \rho_1 | \hat{T} | \rho_1 \rangle$ and $\langle \rho_1 | \hat{V}_{ee} | \rho_1 \rangle$, Eq. (31) can be written as

$$E_v[\rho_1] = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \left[-\frac{1}{2} \nabla_1^2 \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \right]_{\mathbf{r}_2=\mathbf{r}_1} + \int d\mathbf{r} v(\mathbf{r}) \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) \\ + E_J[\rho_s] + E_x[\rho_1] + E_{co}[\rho_1, v] + \int d\mathbf{r} v(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{\rho}_c(\mathbf{r}), \quad (37)$$

where the correlation-energy functional is given by

$$E_{co}[\rho_1, v] = \frac{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \hat{T} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle} - \langle \rho_1 | \hat{T} | \rho_1 \rangle + \frac{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \hat{V}_{ee} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle} - \langle \rho_1 | \hat{V}_{ee} | \rho_1 \rangle. \quad (38)$$

Recognizing the first four terms from Eq. (37) as the energy through the first order, \mathcal{E}_1 , we can write

$$E_v[\rho_1] = \mathcal{E}_1[\rho_1, v] + E_{co}[\rho_1, v] + \int d\mathbf{r} v(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{\rho}_c(\mathbf{r}), \quad (39)$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_1[\rho_1, v] = \langle \rho_1 | H_v | \rho_1 \rangle = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \left[-\frac{1}{2} \nabla_1^2 \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \right]_{\mathbf{r}_2=\mathbf{r}_1} \\ + \int d\mathbf{r}_1 v(\mathbf{r}_1) \rho(\mathbf{r}_1) + \frac{1}{2} \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho(\mathbf{r}_1) \rho(\mathbf{r}_2) - \frac{1}{4} \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1). \quad (40)$$

Now consider the correlation energy that is obtained by wave function methods. Using the notation from Eq. (5), and a reference state $|\rho_1\rangle$, the correlation energy is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_{co}[\rho_1, v] = \frac{\langle \Psi_{Nv} | \hat{H}_v | \Psi_{Nv} \rangle}{\langle \Psi_{Nv} | \Psi_{Nv} \rangle} - \mathcal{E}_1[\rho_1, v], \quad (41)$$

where previously we have shown that \mathcal{E}_{co} can be written as an explicit functional of v and ρ_1 [30]. In a similar manner, but using less restrictive energy denominators, our correlation energy functional E_{co} , given by Eq. (38), can be shown to be an explicit functional of v and ρ_1 [31]. Therefore, by requiring the last term within Eq. (39) to be an explicit functional of v and ρ_1 , E_v can also be written as an explicit functional of v and ρ_1 [31].

We now focus our attention on minimizing the energy functional E_v , subject to the constraint that the spin-less one-particle density-matrix ρ_1 comes from a closed-shell single-determinantal state. For the more general case of a determinantal state, say $|\gamma\rangle$, with the (spin-dependent) one-particle density matrix γ , as in Eq. (14), the two necessary conditions for γ to satisfy are given by the following [2, 34]:

$$\int \int \gamma(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_4) \delta(\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{x}_4) d\mathbf{x}_3 d\mathbf{x}_4 = N, \quad (42)$$

$$\int \gamma(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_5) \gamma(\mathbf{x}_5, \mathbf{x}_4) d\mathbf{x}_5 = \gamma(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_4), \quad (43)$$

where the first relation indicates that the electron density yields the number of electrons N ; the second relation indicates that γ is idempotent. For our special closed-shell case, we substitute Eq. (15) into the above constraints, yielding the following conditions:

$$\int \int \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_4) \delta(\mathbf{r}_3 - \mathbf{r}_4) d\mathbf{r}_3 d\mathbf{r}_4 = N, \quad (44)$$

$$\int \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_5) \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_5, \mathbf{r}_4) d\mathbf{r}_5 = 2\rho_1(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_4). \quad (45)$$

It is well known that the functional derivative of \mathcal{E}_1 with respect to the γ yields the kernel of the Fock operator [2]. For the closed-shell case, we have

$$F(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}_1[\rho_1, v]}{\delta \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)}, \quad (46)$$

where, using Eq. (40), the Fock kernel is given by

$$F_{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \left(-\frac{1}{2} \nabla_2^2 + v(\mathbf{r}_2) + \int d\mathbf{r}_3 r_{23}^{-1} \rho(\mathbf{r}_3) \right) + v_{\text{x}}^{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2), \quad (47)$$

and the exchange operator, say $\hat{v}_{\text{x}}^{\rho_1}$, has the following kernel:

$$v_{\text{x}}^{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = -\frac{1}{2} r_{12}^{-1} \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2). \quad (48)$$

By generalizing Eq. (46), we define a generalized, or exact, Fock operator $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$, where the kernel of this operator is

$$\mathcal{F}_{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{\delta E_v[\rho_1]}{\delta \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)} = F_{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + v_{\text{co}}^{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + v_{\text{ec}}^{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2), \quad (49)$$

and the correlation operator $\hat{v}_{\text{co}}^{\rho_1}$ and external-correlation operator $\hat{v}_{\text{ec}}^{\rho_1}$ are defined by their kernels:

$$v_{\text{co}}^{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{\delta E_{\text{co}}[\rho_1, v]}{\delta \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)}, \quad (50)$$

$$v_{\text{ec}}^{\rho_1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{\delta \left(\int d\mathbf{r}_3 v(\mathbf{r}_3) \tilde{\rho}_c(\mathbf{r}_3) \right)}{\delta \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)}. \quad (51)$$

Minimizing the functional E_v , given by Eq. (39), subject to the constraints given by Eqs. (44) and (45), is very similar to the corresponding Hartree–Fock derivation [2] and the derivation for reference-state one-particle density matrix theory [30, 43, 44]. The only difference being that the spin variable has been eliminated, and we have a factor of two appearing in Eq. (45). Therefore, we only state the main results, i.e., this minimization yields the exact electronic energy \mathcal{E}_n for the interacting state, as given by Eq. (22), where the one-particle density-matrix ϱ_1 satisfies the following conditions:

$$\hat{\kappa}_{\varrho_1} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varrho_1} \hat{\varrho}_1 = 0, \quad (52)$$

$$\hat{\varrho}_1 \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varrho_1} \hat{\kappa}_{\varrho_1} = 0, \quad (53)$$

and the kernels of the operators $\hat{\rho}_1$ and $\hat{\kappa}_{\rho_1}$ are given by the terms on the right side of Eq. (11); also, as mentioned previously, ϱ_1 yields the exact density n of the interacting state Ψ_n . Using Eqs. (52) and (53), it is readily shown that $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varrho_1}$ and $\hat{\varrho}_1$ commute:

$$\left[\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varrho_1}, \hat{\varrho}_1 \right] = 0, \quad (54)$$

and the occupied orbitals satisfy a generalized Hartree–Fock equation:

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varrho_1} \chi_w = \sum_{x \in \varrho_1} \varepsilon_{xw} \chi_x, \quad (55)$$

where the notation $x \in \varrho_1$ indicates a summation over the occupied orbitals from the determinantal state $|\varrho_1\rangle$; χ_w is also an occupied orbital from $|\varrho_1\rangle$. Furthermore, we can choose orbitals that diagonalize the matrix ε_{xw} , yielding exact, canonical Hartree–Fock equations:

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 + v + v_j^n + \hat{v}_x^{\varrho_1} + \hat{v}_{\text{co}}^{\varrho_1} + \hat{v}_{\text{ec}}^{\varrho_1} \right) \chi_w = \varepsilon_w \chi_w, \quad \chi_w \in \varrho_1, \quad (56)$$

where the Coulomb operator is defined by

$$v_j^{\rho}(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi(\mathbf{r}_1) = \int d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho(\mathbf{r}_2) \chi(\mathbf{r}_1), \quad (57)$$

and we have

$$\varrho_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) = n(\mathbf{r}). \quad (58)$$

Equation (56) is also satisfied by the canonical excited orbitals.

For later use, we also mention that the determinantal states $|\varrho_1\rangle$ satisfy the following noninteracting Schrödinger equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varrho_1}(\mathbf{r}_i) |\varrho_1\rangle = 2 \left(\sum_w \varepsilon_w \right) |\varrho_1\rangle. \quad (59)$$

Appendix B presents an alternative way of partitioning the energy functional that differs from Eq. (39).

V. CONVERSION OF THE NONLOCAL POTENTIAL INTO A LOCAL ONE

As mentioned previously, our energy functionals E_v are implicit functionals of the noninteracting density ρ_s . Hence, any one-particle density-matrix that yields the interacting density minimizes our energy functional, i.e., we have

$$\mathcal{E}_n = E_v[\varrho_1] = E_v[\varrho'_1] = E_v[\varrho''_1] \cdots, \quad (60)$$

where

$$n(\mathbf{r}) = \varrho_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) = \varrho'_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) = \varrho''_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) \cdots, \quad (61)$$

and there are other solutions besides Eq. (56), e.g,

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varrho'_1} \chi_w = \left(-\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 + v + v_j^n + \hat{w}_{\varrho'_1} \right) \chi_w = \varepsilon'_w \chi_w, \quad \chi_w \in \varrho'_1, \quad (62)$$

where the nonlocal potential \hat{w}_{ρ_1} is given by

$$\hat{w}_{\rho_1} = \hat{v}_x^{\rho_1} + \hat{v}_{co}^{\rho_1} + \hat{v}_{ec}^{\rho_1}. \quad (63)$$

Assuming n is a noninteracting v -representable density, there exist a noninteracting state, say $|\varphi_1\rangle$, that has n as its density:

$$n(\mathbf{r}) = \varphi_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}), \quad (64)$$

and this determinant—assuming it is a closed-shell determinant—is the ground-state solution of the following noninteracting Schrödinger equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{f}(\mathbf{r}_i) |\varphi_1\rangle = 2 \left(\sum_w \epsilon_w \right) |\varphi_1\rangle, \quad (65)$$

where

$$\hat{f} = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + v_s, \quad (66)$$

and v_s is a local potential. Therefore, the canonical occupied orbitals from $|\varphi_1\rangle$ satisfy the following one-particle Schrödinger equation:

$$\hat{f}\phi_w = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + v + v_j^n + v_{xc}\right)\phi_w = \epsilon_w\phi_w, \quad \phi_w \in \varphi_1, \quad (67)$$

where with no loss of generality, we have required v_s to be defined by

$$v_s = v + v_j^n + v_{xc}. \quad (68)$$

By definition, or using Eqs. (60), (61), and (64), φ_1 is a one-particle density matrix that minimizes our energy functional:

$$\mathcal{E}_n = E_v[\varphi_1], \quad (69)$$

and, therefore, φ_1 also satisfies Eq. (59):

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varphi_1}(\mathbf{r}_i) |\varphi_1\rangle = 2 \left(\sum_w \epsilon_w \right) |\varphi_1\rangle. \quad (70)$$

Hence, it follows from Eqs. (65) and (70) that $|\varphi_1\rangle$ is an eigenstate of two different noninteracting Hamiltonians. By comparing Eq. (62) and (67) with $\varrho'_1 = \varphi_1$, we see that the two operators, $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varphi_1}$ and \hat{f} , are identical, except that $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\varphi_1}$ contains the nonlocal operator \hat{w}_{φ_1} and \hat{f} contains the local potential v_{xc} . Furthermore, the occupied orbitals from Eq. (62) and (67) with $\varrho'_1 = \varphi_1$ may differ by a unitary transformation, but they yield the same one-particle density matrix:

$$\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = 2 \sum_{w \in \varphi_1} \chi_w(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_w^*(\mathbf{r}_2) = 2 \sum_{w \in \varphi_1} \phi_w(\mathbf{r}_1) \phi_w^*(\mathbf{r}_2). \quad (71)$$

Using the approach by Sala and Görling [26], and Eqs. (65), (70), (62) and (67), but permitting the orbitals to be complex, it is readily demonstrated that v_{xc} is given by

$$v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{2n(\mathbf{r})} \int d\mathbf{r}_1 [2w(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r})\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1) - \varphi_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1) \int d\mathbf{r}_2 \varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r})w(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + \varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r})\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1)v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}_1)]. \quad (72)$$

By substituting v_{xc} repeatedly on the right side we can obtain an expansion for v_{xc} :

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{xc}(\mathbf{r}) = & \frac{1}{2n(\mathbf{r})} [2w(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r})\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1) - \varphi_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1)\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r})w(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \\
& + \varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r})\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1)\frac{1}{n(\mathbf{r}_1)} \{w(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) - \frac{1}{2}\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_1)w(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3)\} \\
& + \varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r})\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1)\frac{1}{2n(\mathbf{r}_1)}\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)\frac{1}{n(\mathbf{r}_2)}w(\mathbf{r}_3, \mathbf{r}_2)\varphi_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) + \dots], \quad (73)
\end{aligned}$$

where there are integrations over the dummy variables \mathbf{r}_1 , \mathbf{r}_2 and \mathbf{r}_3 . The leading term of Eq. (73) is the Slater potential [45, 46, 47]; this term also appears within the Krieger–Li–Iafrate (KLI) approximation of the optimized potential method [19, 22, 47, 48].

The orbitals ϕ_w satisfying Eq. (67) are the Kohn–Sham orbitals [8]; $|\varphi_1\rangle$ is the Kohn–Sham noninteracting state. However, \hat{f} differs from the Kohn–Sham operator, since, in addition to depending explicitly φ_1 , instead of n , \hat{f} depends explicitly on the external potential v from the interacting Hamiltonian \hat{H}_v . Furthermore, the external-correlation operator $\hat{v}_{ec}^{\rho_1}$ does not appear in Kohn–Sham formalism. In addition, unlike the original Kohn–Sham approach [8], the N -representability problem does not arise, nor the need to introduce a constraint-search definition [14, 15, 16, 17] to avoid this problem.

In our derivation we have assumed that $|\varphi_1\rangle$ is a ground state solution of Eq. (65). However, the results may also be valid if $|\varphi_1\rangle$ is an excited state solution, since the Sala and Görling approach may also be valid in this case.

VI. CONVERSION OF THE ONE-PARTICLE DENSITY-MATRIX FUNCTIONALS INTO DENSITY FUNCTIONALS

For noninteracting states, the wave function is determined by the one-particle density matrix. For certain closed-shell determinantal states, we can write $\rho_1[\rho_s]$, where this functional includes all densities that are noninteracting v -representable, but it is also defined for all N -representable densities. Using the constraint search approach [14, 15, 16, 17], for a given density, say ρ' , the functional $\rho_1[\rho']$ yields the one-particle density matrix that minimizes the expectation value of the kinetic energy:

$$\text{Min}_{\rho_1 \rightarrow \rho'} \langle \rho_1 | \hat{T} | \rho_1 \rangle = \langle \rho_1[\rho'] | \hat{T} | \rho_1[\rho'] \rangle, \quad (74)$$

where the search is over all determinantal states that have a density of ρ' .

Substituting $\rho_1[\rho]$ into E_{co} of Eq. (37) gives

$$E_v[\rho_1] = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \left[-\frac{1}{2} \nabla_1^2 \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \right]_{\mathbf{r}_2=\mathbf{r}_1} + \int d\mathbf{r} v(\mathbf{r}) \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) \\ + E_J[\rho_s] + E_x[\rho] + E_{\text{co}}[\rho, v] + \int d\mathbf{r} v(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{\rho}_c(\mathbf{r}), \quad \rho \longrightarrow \rho_1, \quad (75)$$

where, using $\rho_1[\rho]$, the last term is also a functional of v and ρ . This equation differs from the Kohn–Shan density functional, since the correlation-energy functional depends on the external potential v , and the last term does not appear in the Kohn–Sham approach. However, mathematically speaking, the minimization of Eq. (75) follows the same procedure as in the Kohn–Sham method, yielding

$$\hat{f} \phi_w = \left(-\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 + v + v_j^n + v_x^n + v_{\text{co}}^n + v_{\text{ec}}^n \right) \phi_w = \epsilon_w \phi_w, \quad \phi_w \in \varphi_1, \quad (76)$$

where the local potentials are given by

$$v_x^\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\delta E_x[\rho, v]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})}, \quad (77)$$

$$v_{\text{co}}^\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\delta E_{\text{co}}[\rho, v]}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})}, \quad (78)$$

$$v_{\text{ec}}^\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\delta \left(\int d\mathbf{r}_1 v(\mathbf{r}_1) \tilde{\rho}_c(\mathbf{r}_1) \right)}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})}. \quad (79)$$

Assuming the density n from the interacting state is noninteracting v -representable, we have

$$E_v[n] = \mathcal{E}_n, \quad n \text{ is noninteracting } v\text{-representable}. \quad (80)$$

Note that Eq. (75) is a valid energy functional only when the one-particle density matrix that enters the first term is the same one generated by the functional $\rho_1[\rho]$; this is the case, at least when ρ is non-interacting v -representable.

APPENDIX A: A POSSIBLE CHOICE FOR $g_{\rho C}$

The electron-electron repulsion operator is spin-free and can be written as

$$\hat{V}_{\text{ee}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} (ij | r_{12}^{-1} | kl) \hat{E}_{ijkl}, \quad (A1)$$

where the two-electron integral is written in chemist's notation [32] and the two-electron spin-adapted excitation-operator is given by Eq. (8). This operator can also be written as

$$\hat{V}_{ee} = \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}_2(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where the pair-function operator is given by

$$\hat{\Gamma}_2(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijkl} \chi_j(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_l(\mathbf{r}_2) \chi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_2) \hat{E}_{ijkl}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

and this operator yields the diagonal elements of the spinless two-particle density matrix as the expectation value. Writing this operator in normal-ordered form [27, 40, 41, 42] with respect to the vacuum state $|\rho_1\rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_{ee} = & \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho_2(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)_{\rho_1} + \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho_s(\mathbf{r}_2) \hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1)_{\rho_s} \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1) \hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)_{\rho_1} + \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}_2(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)_{\rho_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where, examining each term in turn, from the first term we have

$$\rho_2(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)_{\rho_1} = \frac{1}{2} \rho_s(\mathbf{r}_2) \rho_s(\mathbf{r}_1) - \frac{1}{4} \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1) \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2), \quad (\text{A5})$$

and this function is the diagonal elements of the spinless second-order density matrix of the determinantal state $|\rho_1\rangle$. From the second term, we have

$$\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r})_{\rho_s} = \sum_{ij} \chi_j(\mathbf{r}) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}) \{\hat{E}_{ij}\}_{\rho_1}, \quad \rho_1 \longrightarrow \rho_s, \quad (\text{A6})$$

and this operator is the one-body portion of the density operator, where the density operator is given by

$$\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{ij} \chi_j(\mathbf{r}) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}) \hat{E}_{ij}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Note that we can write

$$\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r})_{\rho_s} = \hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}), \quad (\text{A8})$$

indicating that $\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r})_{\rho_s}$ is determined by ρ_s and not by ρ_1 ; two different one-particle density matrices that yield the same density have the same $\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r})_{\rho_s}$.

Returning to Eq. (A4), from the third term we have

$$\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)_{\rho_1} = \sum_{ij} \chi_j(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_2) \{\hat{E}_{ij}\}_{\rho_1}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

and this operator is the one-body portion of the one-particle density-matrix operator, given by

$$\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \sum_{ij} \chi_j(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_2) \hat{E}_{ij} = \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) + \hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)_{\rho_1}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

And from the last term, we have

$$\hat{\Gamma}_2(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)_{\rho_1} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijkl} \chi_j(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_i^*(\mathbf{r}_1) \chi_l(\mathbf{r}_2) \chi_k^*(\mathbf{r}_2) \{\hat{E}_{ijkl}\}_{\rho_1}, \quad (\text{A11})$$

and this operator is the two-body portion of the pair-function operator, Eq. (A3).

To obtain a slight modification of \hat{V}_{ee} , we replace the determinantal state density ρ_s , that appears in Eq. (A4), with the exact density n , giving

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_{ee}^{\rho_1} = & \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho_2(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)_{\rho_1} + \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} n(\mathbf{r}_2) \hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1)_{\rho_s} \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho_1(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1) \hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)_{\rho_1} + \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}_2(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1)_{\rho_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A12})$$

and this operator can also be written as

$$\hat{V}_{ee}^{\rho_1} = \hat{V}_{ee} + \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho_c(\mathbf{r}_2) \left(\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}_1) \right), \quad (\text{A13})$$

Replacing \hat{V}_{ee} by $\hat{V}_{ee}^{\rho_1}$ within the Hamiltonian operator, we have obtain a trial Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H}_{v\rho_1} = \hat{H}_v + \lambda \int \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 r_{12}^{-1} \rho_c(\mathbf{r}_2) \left(\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}_1) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}_1) \right), \quad (\text{A14})$$

where λ is unity, but it can be permitted to be any constant value. Comparing this equation with Eq. (26) yields Eq. (30).

APPENDIX B: ENERGY FUNCTIONAL USING INTERMEDIATE NORMALIZATION

Using Eq. (26), our energy functional E_v , Eq. (21), can be also be written as

$$E_v[\rho_1] = \frac{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \hat{H}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle} - \lambda \int d\mathbf{r} g_{\rho_c}(\mathbf{r}) \left(\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) \right). \quad (\text{B1})$$

By requiring our trial wave functions to satisfy intermediate normalization,

$$\langle \rho_1 | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle = 1, \quad (\text{B2})$$

we have

$$E_v[\rho_1] = \langle \rho_1 | \hat{H}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1} \rangle - \lambda \int d\mathbf{r} g_{\rho_c}(\mathbf{r}) \left(\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) \right). \quad (\text{B3})$$

This form suggest the following partitioning:

$$E_v[\rho_1] = \mathcal{E}_1[\rho_1, v] + \tilde{E}_{\text{co}}[\rho_1, v] - \lambda \int d\mathbf{r} g_{\rho_c}(\mathbf{r}) \left(\hat{\Gamma}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho_s(\mathbf{r}) \right), \quad (\text{B4})$$

where \tilde{E}_{co} is the correlation-energy (functional) of the trial wave function:

$$\tilde{E}_{\text{co}}[\rho_1, v] = \langle \rho_1 | \hat{H}_{v\rho_1} | \tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}^Q \rangle, \quad (\text{B5})$$

and the correlation function $\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}^Q$ is defined by

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}\rangle = |\rho_1\rangle + |\tilde{\Psi}_{v\rho_1}^Q\rangle. \quad (\text{B6})$$

-
- [1] R. M. Dreizler and E. K. U. Gross, *Density Functional Theory: An Approach to the Quantum Many-Body Problem* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, London, Paris, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Barcelona, 1990).
 - [2] R. G. Parr and W. Yang, *Density-Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1989).
 - [3] M. Springborg, ed., *Density Functional Methods in Chemistry and Material Science* (Wiley, Chichester, 1997).
 - [4] D. E. Ellis, ed., *Density Functional Methods of Molecules, Clusters, and Solids* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995).
 - [5] E. K. U. Gross and R. M. Dreizler, eds., *Density Functional Theory* (Plenum, New York, 1994).
 - [6] J. Seminario and P. Politzer, eds., *Modern Density Functional Theory. A Tool for Chemsitry* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995).
 - [7] N. C. Handy, in *Europe Summerschool in Quantum Chemistry*, B. O. Roos and P. -O. Widmark eds. (1997), 2nd ed., (see internet address www.teokem.lu.se/esqc).
 - [8] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. **140**, A1133 (1965).
 - [9] A. D. Becke, J. Chem. Phys. **98**, 5648 (1993).

- [10] K. Burke, M. Ernzerhof, and J. P. Perdew, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **265**, 115 (1997).
- [11] J. P. Perdew, M. Ernzerhof, and K. Burke, *J. Chem. Phys.* **105**, 9982 (1996).
- [12] M. Ernzerhof, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **263**, 499 (1996).
- [13] P. J. Stephens, J. F. Devlin, and C. F. Chabalowski, *J. Phys. Chem.* **98**, 11623 (1994), (see also internet address <http://www.gaussian.com/q3.htm>).
- [14] M. Levy, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **13**, 89 (1978).
- [15] M. Levy, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **76**, 6062 (1979).
- [16] M. Levy, *Phys A* **26**, 1200 (1982).
- [17] M. Levy and J. P. Perdew, in *Density Functional Methods Physics*, Dreizler, R. M. and Providencia, J. da, eds., (Plenum, New York, 1985), pp. 11–30.
- [18] W. Koch and M. C. Holthausen, *A Chemist's Guide to Density Functional Theory* (Wiley-VCH, New York, 2000).
- [19] C. Fiolhais, F. Nogueira, and M. Marques, eds., *Lecture Notes in Physics: A primer on Density Functional Theory* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, NewYork, Barcelona, Hong Kong, London, Milan, Paris, Tokyo, 2003), (and references therein).
- [20] R. T. Sharp and G. K. Horton, *Phys. Rev.* **90**, 317 (1953).
- [21] J. Talman and W. Shadwick, *Phys. Rev. A* **14**, 36 (1976).
- [22] Y. Li, J. B. Krieger, and G. J. Iafrate, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 165 (1993).
- [23] V. Shaginyan, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 1507 (1994).
- [24] A. Görling and M. Levy, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, 196 (1994).
- [25] T. Grabo, T. Kreibich, S. Kurth, and E.K.U Gross, in *Strong Coulomb Correlation in Electronic Structure: Beyond the Local Density Approximation* (Gordon and Breach, Tokyo, 2000).
- [26] F. D. Sala and A. Görling, *J. Chem. Phys.* **115**, 5718 (2001).
- [27] I. Lindgren and J. Morrison, *Atomic Many-Body Theory*, Springer Series on Atoms and Plasmas (Springer-Verlag, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1986), 2nd ed.
- [28] F. E. Harris, H. J. Monkhorst, and D. L. Freeman, *Algebraic and Diagrammatic Methods in Many-Fermion Theory* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1992).
- [29] S. Raimès, *Many-Electron Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1972).
- [30] J. P. Finley (2003), arXiv:physics/0308056.
- [31] J. P. Finley (2005), (to be published).
- [32] A. Szabo and N. S. Ostlund, *Modern Quantum Chemistry: Introduction to Advanced Electronic*

- Structure Theory* (Macmillian, New York, 1982).
- [33] R. McWeeny, Rev. Mod. Phys. **32**, 335 (1960).
 - [34] J.-P. Blaizot and G. Ripka, *Quantum Theory of Finite Systems* (MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1986).
 - [35] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **26**, 376 (1930).
 - [36] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **27**, 240 (1931).
 - [37] P. -O. Löwdin, Phys. **97**, 1474 (1955).
 - [38] P. -O. Löwdin, Phys. **97**, 1490 (1955).
 - [39] P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **136B**, 864 (1964).
 - [40] J. Čížek, J. Chem. Phys. **45**, 4256 (1966).
 - [41] J. Čížek, Adv. Chem. Phys. **14**, 35 (1969).
 - [42] J. Paldus and J. Čížek, Adv. Quantum Chem. **9**, 105 (1975).
 - [43] J. P. Finley, Phys. Rev. A. **69**, 042514 (2004).
 - [44] J. P. Finley, Mol. Phys. **102**, 627 (2004), also arXiv:physics/0308084.
 - [45] J. C. Slater, Phys. Rev. **81**, 385 (1951).
 - [46] M. K. Harbola and V. Sahni, J. Chem. Ed. **70**, 920 (1993).
 - [47] S. Hirata, S. Ivanov, I. Grabowski, R. Bartlett, K. Burke, and T. J., J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 1635 (2001).
 - [48] J. B. Krieger, Y. Li, and G. J. Iafrate, Phys. Rev. A **45**, 101 (1992).