Published in final edited form as:

J Phys Chem Lett. 2017 October 05; 8(19): 4746–4751. doi:10.1021/acs.jpclett.7b02165.

Generalized Optimized Effective Potential for Orbital Functionals and Self-Consistent Calculation of Random Phase Approximations

Ye Jin, Du Zhang, Zehua Chen, Neil Qiang Su, and Weitao Yang*

Department of Chemistry, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, United States

Abstract

A new self-consistent procedure for calculating the total energy with an orbital-dependent density functional approximation (DFA), the generalized optimized effective potential (GOEP), is developed in the present work. The GOEP is a nonlocal Hermitian potential that delivers the sets of occupied and virtual orbitals and minimizes the total energy. The GOEP optimization leads to the same minimum as does the orbital optimization. The GOEP method is promising as an effective optimization approach for orbital-dependent functionals, as demonstrated for the self-consistent calculations of the random phase approximation (RPA) to the correlation functionals in the particle–hole (ph) and particle–particle (pp) channels. The results show that the accuracy in describing the weakly interacting van der Waals systems is significantly improved in the self-consistent calculations. In particular, the important single excitations contribution in non-self-consistent RPA calculations can be captured self-consistently through the GOEP optimization, leading to orbital renormalization, without using the single excitations in the energy functional.

Graphical Abstract

*Corresponding Author: weitao.yang@duke.edu.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the [ACS Publications website](https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.jpclett.7b02165) at DOI: 10.1021/acs.jpclett.7b02165.

More introductions to the GOEP, proof of unitary invariance of the RPA, derivation of the gradient needed for the optimization, derivation of the SE, and some additional results. (PDF)

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

Density functional theory (DFT)^{1–5} has achieved much success in electronic structure theory. It has been widely implemented in modern quantum chemistry softwares and has made significant impacts in many fields. However, challenges remain for DFT in describing van der Waals interaction,⁶ strongly correlated systems,⁷ and systems having features of fractional charges and fractional spins because of the delocalization and static correlation errors.⁸ In general, the accuracy of density functionals can be improved by introducing the orbital dependence into the exchange-correlation energy expression.⁹ Hybrid functionals such as B3LYP^{10–13} are the simplest type of orbital functionals depending on the occupied orbitals through the one-electron density matrix. For such functionals, self-consistent calculations are carried out normally by solving the generalized Kohn—Sham (GKS) equations. Virtual orbitals can be used in the correlation energy functionals as in the second-order Møller—Plesset (MP2),¹⁴ double hybrid (DH) functionals,^{15–20} and random-phase approximations (RPA).^{21–32} Orbital dependent functionals can also be more complicated because of the lack of invariance with respect to unitary rotations, such as the self-interaction correction (SIC)³³ and Koopmans-compliant (KC) functionals.³⁴

The calculations with functionals depending on virtual orbitals are usually performed in a post-SCF procedure, which will lead to nonvariational total energies and unrelaxed orbitals.¹⁸ A self-consistent field (SCF) calculation is desired for higher accuracy. The optimized effective potential (OEP)^{35–39} and orbital optimization (OO)⁴⁰ are widely used for SCF calculations. For the OEP, it can provide accurate local exchange-correlation potentials and has been used extensively for functionals of occupied orbitals, such the exact exchange and hybrid functionals. However, the ground-state energies are not improved for functionals depending on virtual orbitals.^{41–43} The reason for this failure is that the orbitals are only optimized in the space of v -representable densities by a local potential, the OEP, rather than

the whole space. In contrast, the orbitals from OO are optimized in the whole space. Both MP2 and DH functionals have been self-consistently calculated with OO,^{44,45} but no OO has been developed for the RPA functionals.

Here we developed a new optimization method, the generalized optimized effective potential (GOEP) method, to achieve the SCF calculations for general orbital-dependent functionals. The GOEP is a nonlocal potential in space

$$v_s^{\text{GOEP}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \sum_{pq} \langle \mathbf{r} | \phi_p \rangle (v_s^{\text{GOEP}})_{pq} \langle \phi_q | \mathbf{r}' \rangle \quad (1)$$

where p and q are GOEP orbital indices. The orbitals $\{\phi_p\}$ are defined to be eigenvectors of the GOEP nonlocal Hamiltonian $h_s^{\text{GOEP}} = t + v_s^{\text{GOEP}}$. Thus, unlike the local OEP method, the density matrix obtained from the GOEP is fully flexible because there is no restriction of the locality in real space of the potential within the GOEP. Note that the mapping of h_s^{GOEP} to the noninteracting density matrix, or the set of occupied and virtual orbitals, is many-to-one. For example, within the occupied space, the diagonal elements of h_s^{GOEP} can vary arbitrarily as long as they are less than all the diagonal elements in the virtual space. Therefore, the eigenvalues of the GOEP do not have physical meanings. They only partition the space into occupied and virtual spaces during the optimization to ensure the occupied and virtual spaces will not cross. This many-to-one mapping does not pose any issue because the unique noninteracting density matrix or the set of GOEP orbitals is what determines the total energy. We have proved that the optimization of an orbital functional with respect to the GOEP Hamiltonian is equivalent to OO (see Section 1 in the Supporting Information (SI)). Computationally, it is convenient to perform the GOEP in the eigenvector or GOEP orbital space. Because all orbitals are determined uniquely by h_s^{GOEP} , a total energy orbital functional, E , is thus a functional of h_s^{GOEP} . The energy derivatives with respect to GOEP off-diagonal elements can be expressed as follows (see the SI)

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial (v_s^{\text{GOEP}})_{pq}} = \frac{\left\langle \phi_q \left| \frac{\delta E}{\delta \phi_p^*} \right\rangle - \left(\left\langle \frac{\delta E}{\delta \phi_q} \right\rangle^* \right) \phi_p}{\epsilon_p - \epsilon_q} \quad (2)$$

We use the index $i/a/p$ to represent occupied/virtual/general orbitals. Notice that this expression assumes nondegenerate orbitals. Because the GOEP is Hermitian, $\partial E / \partial (v_s^{\text{GOEP}})_{qp}$ will be the complex conjugate of $\partial E / \partial (v_s^{\text{GOEP}})_{pq}$. At the stationary point, we have

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial (v_s^{\text{GOEP}})_{pq}} = 0 \quad (3)$$

The change in the GOEP, δv_s^{GOEP} , is equivalent to the change in the Hamiltonian δh_s^{GOEP} .

For orbital functionals with invariance to unitary rotations within both occupied and virtual spaces, we only need to consider the variation of the occupied—virtual block because the variation of the occupied—occupied and virtual—virtual blocks only leads to unitary rotations within the occupied and virtual spaces. In this case, degeneracy within the occupied or virtual space in eq 2 does not matter because the denominator in eq 2, $\epsilon_a - \epsilon_i$, cannot be zero if the occupied and virtual spaces are not mixed.

Now we apply the GOEP method to the RPA for the correlation energy functional. The RPA can be developed in two channels: particle—hole (ph) channel leads to ph-RPA,^{21–28} particle—particle (pp) and hole—hole (hh) channels lead to pp-RPA.^{29,30} The ph-RPA is a fully nonlocal functional of density and can describe van der Waals interactions, crystalline solids, and surface adsorption;²⁷ furthermore, the pp-RPA meets the flat-plane condition for systems with fractional charges and spins.²⁹ RPA calculations are usually performed in a post-SCF fashion. Despite the correct dissociation limit of diatomic systems with ph-RPA, the lack of SCF will lead to problems in the intermediate distance.⁴⁶ Although RPA has been self-consistently calculated with the local OEP, the binding energy curves are not improved compared with those from post-SCF calculations.^{41,42} In this work, we aim to explore the SCF calculations of RPA correlation functionals in both the ph-channel and the pp-channel with self-consistent calculations and without the local OEP restriction. The total energy expression is

$$E^{\text{total}} = E^{\text{HF}}[\rho_s] + E_c^{\text{RPA}}[\{\phi_p\}] \quad (4)$$

where $\{\phi_p\}$ are the canonical orbitals of the GOEP and ρ_s is the reference density matrix consisting of the occupied GOEP orbitals

$$\rho_s = \sum_i |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i| \quad (5)$$

The total energy is calculated by combining the HF energy and RPA correlation energy, which are both evaluated with the GOEP orbitals. The RPA correlation energy can be formulated from the solution of the generalized eigenvalue problem (see SI eqs 32 and 34). The ph-RPA correlation energy can be expressed as

$$E_c^{\text{ph-RPA}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{n>0} \omega_n^N - \text{Tr} \mathbf{A} \right) \quad (6)$$

and that of the pp-RPA is

$$E_c^{\text{pp-RPA}} = \sum_n \omega_n^{N+2} - \text{Tr} \mathbf{A} \quad (7)$$

where ω_n are the neutral excitation energies, ω_n^{N+2} are two-electron addition energies, and A represents matrices in the RPA eigenvalue equations.^{25,29} Note that the noncanonical form of the generalized ph- or pp-RPA eigenvalue problem is used.⁴⁷ Because this expression is invariant with rotations, as we have shown (see the SI), we can perform the optimization in the occupied-virtual space only. The ph-RPA can be derived within the framework of DFT via the adiabatic-connection fluctuation—dissipation (ACFD) theorem;^{23,48–50} the pp-RPA can also be derived in the equivalence of ACFD in the pairing channel.²⁹ In all applications, a density functional approximation (DFA) is adopted as the reference DFA functional, the KS or GKS orbitals of which are used for constructing the RPA correlation energy.

It is important to realize that in the eigenvalue equations for either ph-RPA or pp-RPA, as shown in Section 2 of the SI, a DFA is used, explicitly through the KS or GKS Hamiltonians, defined as the functional derivatives of the energy with respect to the density matrix. The use of DFA cannot be replaced with the GOEP because the GOEP does not provide meaningful orbital energies. The second-order functional derivatives of the DFA are also involved in the energy gradient for the GOEP calculations (see Section 3 in the SI). The full process of this optimization is as follows: (1) Carry out an SCF calculation with a certain DFA; (2) build the RPA matrix and calculate the total energy perturbatively; (3) calculate the gradient $\delta E/\delta h_s^{\text{GOEP}}$ and update h_s^{GOEP} with the gradient information; (4) diagonalize the Hamiltonian h_s^{GOEP} to obtain the canonical orbitals $\{\phi_p\}$; and (5) go to step 2 until both total energy and gradient converge.

We first tested van der Waals systems. Figure 1 shows the binding energy curves with both ph and pp-RPA for He₂. The post-SCF results have the correct dissociation limit; however, at the intermediate distance it is underbinded. With the Hartree—Fock (HF) reference, the SCF calculation does not change from the post-SCF result. In contrast, both curves of SCF-ph-PBE and SCF-pp-PBE are improved significantly from the post-SCF results and in excellent agreement with the reference. This is a major difference from the SCF-RPA calculations carried out with the local OEP, where the converged total energies are not much changed from the post-SCF calculations,⁴² highlighting the importance of full optimization with the GOEP.

Because the total energy contains several energy contributions, we decompose the total energy to investigate which part is improved in the GOEP calculation. In the following notations, $E@F$ refers to the energy E evaluated with the canonical orbitals of the reference DFA functional F and $E@ \text{SCF-}F$ refers to the energy E evaluated with the GOEP orbitals, where F is the DFA reference in the RPA functional. In this case, the total energy of a post-SCF calculation is further decomposed into

$$E^{\text{total}} = E^{\text{T}}@F + E^{\text{ext}}@F + E^{\text{J}}@F + E^{\text{EX}}@F + E^{\text{RPA}}@F \quad (8)$$

where E^{T} , E^{ext} , E^{J} , E^{EX} , and E^{RPA} refer to the kinetic energy, external energy, Coulomb energy, exchange energy, and RPA correlation energy, respectively. In post-SCF RPA

calculations, Ren and coworkers⁵³ show that the exchange-correlation part is better described in a hybrid way with two sets of orbitals from HF and PBE⁵⁴ calculations,

$$E^{\text{xc}} = E^{\text{EX}}@HF + E^{\text{RPA}}@PBE \quad (9)$$

To develop a clear understanding of the effects of full orbital optimization as in the GOEP, we analyzed the exchange and correlation energies with different methods and plotted the results in Figure 2. For post-SCF calculations, HF reference can provide better exchange energy, but the correlation energy has large error. PBE reference provides accurate correlation energy; however, the exchange energy has a 4 meV barrier in the intermediate range. The self-consistent calculation with HF reference does not change the binding energy, as $E^{\text{EX}}@SCF\text{-HF}$ and $E^{\text{RPA}}@SCF\text{-HF}$ are almost the same with $E^{\text{EX}}@HF$ and $E^{\text{RPA}}@HF$, but for the self-consistent calculation with PBE reference, $E^{\text{RPA}}@SCF\text{-PBE}$ keeps the accuracy of $E^{\text{RPA}}@PBE$, while the exchange energy, $E^{\text{EX}}@SCF\text{-PBE}$, is corrected toward $E^{\text{EX}}@HF$. Therefore, the binding energy curve is significantly improved with the GOEP. The failure of the post-SCF RPA in the intermediate distance has been attributed to the neglect of the contribution from single excitations (SEs).⁵³

Whether there is a SE contribution to the RPA approximate correlation energy depends on the derivation. In the usual derivation of the ACFD theory, when the electron density is kept constant along the adiabatic connection, the singles contribution does not appear.^{23,48,50,55} If the density is not kept constant along the adiabatic connection, then the singles contributes to the correlation energy.⁵⁵ With the commonly used post-SCF RPA scheme, most molecular systems are underbinned systematically. By adding the SE perturbatively, it has been shown that the SE contribution to the energy improves the result significantly.⁵³ However, in our GOEP calculations, the binding energy curves are improved greatly, without adding the SE contribution. We now analyze the SE within the GOEP. The SE contribution to the second-order correlation energy can be expressed as (see Section 4 in the SI)^{50,56}

$$E_c^{\text{SE}} = \sum_i^{\text{occ}} \sum_a^{\text{vir}} \frac{|\langle \phi_i | f^{\text{HF}} - h_s^{\text{GOEP}} | \phi_a \rangle|^2}{\tilde{\epsilon}_i - \tilde{\epsilon}_a} \quad (10)$$

where $\{\phi_j\}$ are the orbitals of the nonlocal GOEP Hamiltonian h_s^{GOEP} . The orbital energies, $\tilde{\epsilon}_i$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_a$, are from the rotated GOEP orbitals that diagonalize the occupied and virtual subspaces of the reference KS or GKS Hamiltonian h_s from the DFA

$$\begin{aligned} (h_s)_{ij} &= \delta_{ij} \tilde{\epsilon}_i \\ (h_s)_{ab} &= \delta_{ab} \tilde{\epsilon}_a \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Because $\{\phi_i\}$ are the eigenvectors of h_s^{GOEP} , $\langle \phi_i | h_s^{\text{GOEP}} | \phi_a \rangle$ will be zero. The only existing term on the numerator is thus the single-particle HF Fock operator, $|\langle \phi_i | f^{\text{HF}} | \phi_a \rangle|^2$.

The absolute values of the second-order SE contribution were plotted with and without the SCF in Figure 3c. In the intermediate range, the second-order SE contribution from the PBE is -0.5 meV, while that from the GOEP is only -0.008 meV. Moreover, the second-order SE contribution from the GOEP is almost 0 along all distances. A test set of atoms also shows a significant reduction of the second-order SE with the GOEP (Table 1). This reduction is caused by the orbital renormalization. Because the HF energy is the predominant term in the total energy expression (eq 4), the optimized orbitals within the GOEP bear great similarity to HF orbitals and the term $|\langle \phi_i | f^{\text{HF}} | \phi_a \rangle|^2$ will approach zero. Therefore, at the stationary point, the effect of second-order SE is mostly brought into the total energy. As a consequence, the optimal orbitals provide the much improved description for binding energy curves. A diagrammatic representation of this renormalization process is shown in Figure 3, from (a) to (b).

While the second-order SE was shown to be important for post-SCF calculations with a semilocal functional (e.g., PBE) as reference,^{53,55} it will be ill-behaved for systems with small energy gaps, such as the dissociation limit, because the gap of the molecule will approach zero. Thus higher order diagrams are required in this situation, and the correction to the correlation energy is named renormalized SE (rSE).⁵³ However, in the SCF calculations with GOEP method, no ill behavior is found at the dissociation limit because the second-order SE is not included. It is absorbed into the total energy through the orbital renormalization in the self-consistent calculation. This is a key result from present SCF calculations of RPA functionals; we can have the RPA total energy functional with good accuracy and without the SE contribution, just as given in the derivation from ACFD with density being kept constant.

A more challenging case, Be_2 , was also tested. The commonly used CCSD(T) method overbinds at the equilibrium region, and both ph and pp-RPA not only underbind but also show an unphysical local maximum beyond the binding region. Previous work suggested that this behavior may be caused by the lack of self-consistency in the calculation.⁴⁶ Moreover, this unphysical maximum was also observed in the SCF calculations with the local OEP method.⁴² This now can be explained from eq 10: Orbitals from the local OEP are not fully optimized because of the local potential restriction, and thus the second-order SE correction is still required for RPA. Therefore, the SCF-RPA calculations with the GOEP is desirable for systems like Be_2 because of the orbital renormalization. The result shows that although the GOEP does not improve the binding length with the pp-RPA significantly, it completely eliminates the unphysical local maximum and corrects the binding energy- (Figure 4). From the exchange energy decomposition, we notice that different from He_2 , the barrier of $E^{\text{EX}}@ \text{PBE}$ curve emerges beyond the equilibrium bond length, which is exactly the region where the unphysical maximum (marked in the shaded area) occurs. The SCF calculation brings down this barrier so that the binding energy curve is corrected.

We finally consider the $H + H_2$ exchange reaction with the GOEP SCF calculations, along with the post-SCF pp-RPA. The reaction energy curve is shown in Figure 5. The pp-RPA overestimates the reaction barrier by 4 kcal/mol. The SCF calculation brings down this barrier by 0.5 kcal/mol, and the reaction energy profile is closer to the reference with the SCF procedure. In addition, several bonded systems, such as He_2^+ , H_2 , and LiH , were tested. These systems do not show significant improvement with the SCF in comparison with the post-SCF results. In all cases, SE contributions are reduced with the SCF calculation. For these bonded systems, the error of the RPA originates mostly from the inherent error of the RPA functional itself. One explanation is that for bonded systems the correlation energy is mainly contributed from double excitations.⁵⁶ It has been proved that the ph-RPA is equivalent to ring couple-cluster doubles (CCD)²⁴ and the pp-RPA is equivalent to ladder CCD.^{30,59} Neither includes full diagrams of the doubles.

To summarize, we have developed a new optimization method, GOEP, to achieve SCF calculations for general orbital-dependent functionals. We applied the GOEP method to phand pp-RPA correlation energy functionals. We have shown that for van der Waals systems, SCF is of great importance and the SCF-RPA using the GOEP performs well. It significantly improves the accuracy of the binding energy curves: The underbonded feature of He_2 is corrected and the unphysical local maximum of Be_2 is totally eliminated. The energy decomposition reveals that the exchange energy, $E^{EX}@SCF-PBE$, is much improved from $E^{EX}@PBE$, and the effect of second-order SE contribution is brought into the total energy functional with the SCF calculation through the orbital renormalization without using the single excitations in the energy functional. This is significant because the SE part of the functional can become singular for systems with zero or small gaps. Our results strongly support using the RPA correlation energy functional without the SE term in SCF calculations to achieve good accuracy and eliminate the possible singularity of the SE term. We conclude that the GOEP is a promising tool to achieve SCF calculation for orbital-dependent functionals.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge support from the Center for the Computational Design of Functional Layered Materials, an Energy Frontier Research Center funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences under Award #DE-SC0012575 (Y.J. and D.Z.). Z.C. and N.Q.S. acknowledge the support from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under award number R01-GM061870. W.Y. acknowledges the support from the National Science Foundation (Grant No. CHE-1362927). Y.J. also appreciates Mr. Xinchang Xie for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

1.) Hohenberg P; Kohn W Inhomogeneous electron gas. Phys. Rev 1964, 136, B864.
2.) Kohn W; Sham LJ Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation effects. Phys. Rev 1965, 140, A1133.

3.) Levy M Universal variational functionals of electron densities, first-order density matrices, and natural spin-orbitals and solution of the v -representability problem. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A* 1979, 76, 6062–6065. [PubMed: 16592733]
4.) Parr RG; Yang W *Density-Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules*; Oxford University Press, 1989; Vol. 16.
5.) Gross EK; Dreizler RM *Density Functional Theory*; Springer Science & Business Media, 2013; Vol. 337.
6.) Berland K; Cooper VR; Lee K; Schröder E; Thonhauser T; Hyldgaard P; Lundqvist BI van der Waals forces in density functional theory: a review of the vdW-DF method. *Rep. Prog. Phys* 2015, 78, 066501. [PubMed: 25978530]
7.) Himmetoglu B; Floris A; de Gironcoli S; Cococcioni M Hubbard-corrected DFT energy functionals: The LDA+ U description of correlated systems. *Int. J. Quantum Chem* 2014, 114, 14–49.
8.) Cohen AJ; Mori-Sánchez P; Yang W Insights into current limitations of density functional theory. *Science* 2008, 321, 792–794. [PubMed: 18687952]
9.) Kümmel S; Kronik L Orbital-dependent density functionals: Theory and applications. *Rev. Mod. Phys* 2008, 80, 3.
10.) Becke AD Density-functional exchange-energy approximation with correct asymptotic behavior. *Phys. Rev. A: At., Mol., Opt. Phys* 1988, 38, 3098.
11.) Lee C; Yang W; Parr RG Development of the Colle-Salvetti correlation-energy formula into a functional of the electron density. *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys* 1988, 37, 785.
12.) Becke AD Beckes three parameter hybrid method using the LYP correlation functional. *J. Chem. Phys* 1993, 98, 5648–5652.
13.) Stephens P; Devlin F; Chabalowski C; Frisch MJ Ab initio calculation of vibrational absorption and circular dichroism spectra using density functional force fields. *J. Phys. Chem* 1994, 98, 11623–11627.
14.) Møller C; Plesset MS Note on an approximation treatment for many-electron systems. *Phys. Rev* 1934, 46, 618.
15.) Zhao Y; Lynch BJ; Truhlar DG Development and assessment of a new hybrid density functional model for thermochemical kinetics. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2004, 108, 2715–2719.
16.) Grimme S Semiempirical hybrid density functional with perturbative second-order correlation. *J. Chem. Phys* 2006, 124, 034108. [PubMed: 16438568]
17.) Schwabe T; Grimme S Double-hybrid density functionals with long-range dispersion corrections: higher accuracy and extended applicability. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys* 2007, 9, 3397–3406. [PubMed: 17664963]
18.) Zhang Y; Xu X; Goddard WA Doubly hybrid density functional for accurate descriptions of nonbond interactions, thermochemistry, and thermochemical kinetics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A* 2009, 106, 4963–4968. [PubMed: 19276116]
19.) Zhang IY; Xu X Doubly hybrid density functional for accurate description of thermochemistry, thermochemical kinetics and nonbonded interactions. *Int. Rev. Phys. Chem* 2011, 30, 115–160.
20.) Goerigk L; Grimme S Double-hybrid density functionals. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science* 2014, 4, 576–600.
21.) Bohm D; Pines D A collective description of electron interactions: III. Coulomb interactions in a degenerate electron gas. *Phys. Rev* 1953, 92, 609.
22.) Gell-Mann M; Brueckner KA Correlation energy of an electron gas at high density. *Phys. Rev* 1957, 106, 364.
23.) Langreth DC; Perdew JP Exchange-correlation energy of a metallic surface: Wave-vector analysis. *Phys. Rev. B* 1977, 15, 2884.
24.) Scuseria GE; Henderson TM; Sorensen DC The ground state correlation energy of the random phase approximation from a ring coupled cluster doubles approach. *J. Chem. Phys* 2008, 129, 231101. [PubMed: 19102519]
25.) Furche F Developing the random phase approximation into a practical post-Kohn—Sham correlation model. *J. Chem. Phys* 2008, 129, 114105. [PubMed: 19044948]

26.) Heßelmann A; Görling A Random-phase approximation correlation methods for molecules and solids. *Mol. Phys* 2011, 109, 2473–2500.
27.) Ren X; Rinke P; Joas C; Scheffler M Random-phase approximation and its applications in computational chemistry and materials science. *J. Mater. Sci* 2012, 47, 7447–7471.
28.) Bleiziffer P; Heßelmann A; Görling A Efficient self-consistent treatment of electron correlation within the random phase approximation. *J. Chem. Phys* 2013, 139, 084113. [PubMed: 24006980]
29.) van Aggelen H; Yang Y; Yang W Exchange-correlation energy from pairing matrix fluctuation and the particle-particle random-phase approximation. *Phys. Rev. A: At., Mol., Opt. Phys* 2013, 88, 030501.
30.) Peng D; Steinmann SN; van Aggelen H; Yang W Equivalence of particle-particle random phase approximation correlation energy and ladder-coupled-cluster doubles. *J. Chem. Phys* 2013, 139, 104112. [PubMed: 24050333]
31.) Blaizot J-P; Ripka G *Quantum Theory of Finite Systems*; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, 1986; Vol. 3.
32.) Fetter AL; Walecka JD *Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems*; Courier Corporation, 2012.
33.) Perdew JP; Zunger A Self-interaction correction to density-functional approximations for many-electron systems. *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys* 1981, 23, 5048.
34.) Borghi G; Ferretti A; Nguyen NL; Dabo I; Marzari N Koopmans-compliant functionals and their performance against reference molecular data. *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys* 2014, 90, 075135.
35.) Talman JD; Shadwick WF Optimized effective atomic central potential. *Phys. Rev. A: At., Mol., Opt. Phys* 1976, 14, 36.
36.) Krieger J; Li Y; Iafate G Derivation and application of an accurate Kohn-Sham potential with integer discontinuity. *Phys. Lett. A* 1990, 146, 256–260.
37.) Krieger J; Li Y; Iafate G Systematic approximations to the optimized effective potential: Application to orbital-density-functional theory. *Phys. Rev. A: At., Mol., Opt. Phys* 1992, 46, 5453.
38.) Wu Q; Yang W A direct optimization method for calculating density functionals and exchange—correlation potentials from electron densities. *J. Chem. Phys* 2003, 118, 2498–2509.
39.) Yang W; Wu Q Direct method for optimized effective potentials in density-functional theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett* 2002, 89, 143002. [PubMed: 12366042]
40.) Yaffe LG; Goddard WA, III Orbital optimization in electronic wave functions; equations for quadratic and cubic convergence of general multiconfiguration wave functions. *Phys. Rev. A: At., Mol., Opt. Phys* 1976, 13, 1682.
41.) Hellgren M; Rohr DR; Gross E Correlation potentials for molecular bond dissociation within the self-consistent random phase approximation. *J. Chem. Phys* 2012, 136, 034106. [PubMed: 22280743]
42.) Nguyen NL; Colonna N; De Gironcoli S Ab initio self-consistent total-energy calculations within the EXX/RPA formalism. *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys* 2014, 90, 045138.
43.) miga S; Franck O; Mussard B; Bukszel A; Grabowski I; Luppi E; Toulouse J Self-consistent double-hybrid density-functional theory using the optimized-effective-potential method. *J. Chem. Phys* 2016, 145, 144102. [PubMed: 27782500]
44.) Neese F; Schwabe T; Kossmann S; Schirmer B; Grimme S Assessment of orbital-optimized, spin-component scaled second-order many-body perturbation theory for thermochemistry and kinetics. *J. Chem. Theory Comput* 2009, 5, 3060–3073. [PubMed: 26609985]
45.) Peverati R; Head-Gordon M Orbital optimized double-hybrid density functionals. *J. Chem. Phys* 2013, 139, 024110. [PubMed: 23862932]
46.) Nguyen H-V; Galli G A first-principles study of weakly bound molecules using exact exchange and the random phase approximation. *J. Chem. Phys* 2010, 132, 044109. [PubMed: 20113021]
47.) Zhang D; Peng D; Zhang P; Yang W Analytic gradients, geometry optimization and excited state potential energy surfaces from the particle-particle random phase approximation. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys* 2015, 17, 1025–1038. [PubMed: 25410624]

48.) Langreth DC; Perdew JP The exchange-correlation energy of a metallic surface. Solid State Commun 1975, 17, 1425–1429.
49.) Gunnarsson O; Lundqvist BI Exchange and correlation in atoms, molecules, and solids by the spin-density-functional formalism. Phys. Rev. B 1976, 13, 4274.
50.) Görling A; Levy M Exact Kohn-Sham scheme based on perturbation theory. Phys. Rev. A: At., Mol., Opt. Phys 1994, 50, 196.
51.) Tang K; Toennies J The van der Waals potentials between all the rare gas atoms from He to Rn. J. Chem. Phys 2003, 118, 4976–4983.
52.) QM4D, an in-house program for QM/MM simulations. Available at www.qm4d.info.
53.) Ren X; Tkatchenko A; Rinke P; Scheffler M Beyond the random-phase approximation for the electron correlation energy: The importance of single excitations. Phys. Rev. Lett 2011, 106, 153003. [PubMed: 21568551]
54.) Perdew JP; Burke K; Ernzerhof M Generalized gradient approximation made simple. Phys. Rev. Lett 1996, 77, 3865. [PubMed: 10062328]
55.) Klimeš J; Kaltak M; Maggio E; Kresse G Singles correlation energy contributions in solids. J. Chem. Phys 2015, 143, 102816. [PubMed: 26374009]
56.) Szabo A; Ostlund NS Modern Quantum Chemistry: Introduction to Advanced Electronic Structure Theory; Courier Corporation, 2012.
57.) Røeggen I; Veseth L Interatomic potential for the $X1\Sigma^+$ g state of Be₂, revisited. Int. J. Quantum Chem 2005, 101, 201–210.
58.) Boothroyd AI; Keogh WJ; Martin PG; Peterson MR A refined H₃ potential energy surface. J. Chem. Phys 1996, 104, 7139–7152.
59.) Scuseria GE; Henderson TM; Bulik IW Particle-particle and quasiparticle random phase approximations: Connections to coupled cluster theory. J. Chem. Phys 2013, 139, 104113. [PubMed: 24050334]

Figure 1. Binding energy curves for He_2 with both ph and pp-RPA. The reference curve is from Tang and Toennies.⁵¹ The dashed lines refer to the bonding distance. SCF-ph-HF stands for the ph-RPA with HF reference in a self-consistent procedure. Calculations are done in QM⁴D.⁵²

Figure 2.
Decomposition of exchange and correlation energies from the SCF-ph-RPA and post-ph-RPA result. The dashed line refers to the equilibrium bond length.

Figure 3.

(a,b) Goldstone diagrammatic representation of the second-order SE contribution before and after the GOEP. (c) Second-order SE contribution comparison between post-SCF-RPA and SCF-RPA of He_2 . Notice that the absolute value of the SE contribution is taken in panel c.

Figure 4.

Left: binding energy curve of Be₂ with the pp-RPA. Right: relative exchange energy of different methods. The dashed line refers to the equilibrium bond length. The reference is from ref 57.

Figure 5. Potential energy surface of H + H₂ exchange reaction. The reference BKMP2 potential energy surface is from ref 58.

Table 1.
Contribution of the Second-Order SE for Atoms with Simple Shell Structures (units: meV)

	H	He	Li	Be	Ne	Na	Mg	Ar
PBE	-0.5	-0.2	-19.5	-22.1	-22.4	-47.0	-54.5	-60.0
GOEP	0	-0.02	-0.1	-1.0	-3.9	-1.2	-2.9	-1.3