

Density functional prediction of quasiparticle, excitation and resonance energies of molecules with a global scaling correction approach

Xiaolong Yang¹, Xiao Zheng^{1,*} and Weitao Yang^{2,3,*}

¹*Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at the Microscale and Synergetic Innovation Center of Quantum Information and Quantum Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

²*Department of Chemistry, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA*

³*Key Laboratory of Theoretical Chemistry of Environment, School of Chemistry and Environment, South China Normal University, Guangzhou, China*

Correspondence*:

Xiao Zheng
xz58@ustc.edu.cn

Weitao Yang
weitao.yang@duke.edu

2 ABSTRACT

Molecular quasiparticle and excitation energies determine essentially the spectral characteristics measured in various spectroscopic experiments. Accurate prediction of these energies has been rather challenging for ground-state density functional methods, because the commonly adopted density function approximations suffer from delocalization error. In this work, by presuming a quantitative correspondence between the quasiparticle energies and the Kohn-Sham orbital energies, and employing a previously developed global scaling correction approach, we achieve substantially improved prediction of molecular quasiparticle and excitation energies. In addition, we also extend our previous study on temporary anions in resonant states which are associated with negative molecular electron affinities. The proposed approach does not require any explicit self-consistent-field calculation on the excited-state species, and is thus highly efficient and convenient for practical purposes.

Keywords: density functional theory, delocalization error, scaling correction approach, quasiparticle energies, electronic excitation energies, electron affinity

1 INTRODUCTION

Density function theory (DFT) (Hohenberg and Kohn, 1964) has made great success in practical calculations for ground-state electronic properties because of its outstanding balance between accuracy and computational cost. In the Kohn-Sham (KS) scheme of DFT (Hohenberg and Kohn, 1964; Kohn and Sham, 1965), the effective single-particle equations can be written as (by omitting the spin indices and adopting

the atomic units)

$$\left[-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + v_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{r}) + v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}) + v_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \phi_m(\mathbf{r}) = \varepsilon_m \phi_m(\mathbf{r}). \quad (1)$$

Here, $v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r})$ is the external potential, $v_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{r})$ is the Hartree potential, $v_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r})$ is the local exchange-correlation (XC) potential, and $\{\phi_m(\mathbf{r})\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_m\}$ are the KS orbitals and their eigenvalues, respectively. In the generalized KS (GKS) scheme, $v_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r})$ is replaced by a nonlocal potential, $v_{\text{xc}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. The KS equations can be solved self-consistently to produce the ground-state energy and charge density. However, it is challenging to apply conventional ground-state density functional methods to calculate excited-state-related properties, such as the quasiparticle (QP) energies and the electronic excitation energies, which will be introduced as follows.

When an electronic system is perturbed by incoming photons or electrons, in order to preserve a single-particle picture, the concept of QP is often adopted. In a direct photoemission experiment, an electron on a molecule absorbs the energy of a photon and gets excited away from the molecule. Such a process leaves a quasihole in the molecule whose energy level is renormalized by the presence of the other electrons. In an inverse photoemission experiment, an electron attaches to a molecule by emitting a photon (Onida et al., 2002). Similarly, this leads to the formation of a quasielectron whose energy level is influenced by the existing electrons in the molecule. The actual QP energies and wavefunctions can be obtained by solving the QP equations as follows (Hedin, 1965; Aulbur et al., 2000),

$$\left[-\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 + v_{\text{H}}(\mathbf{r}) + v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}) \right] \psi_m(\mathbf{r}) + \int \Sigma(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'; \omega_m) \psi_m(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' = \omega_m \psi_m(\mathbf{r}). \quad (2)$$

Here, $\{\psi_m(\mathbf{r})\}$ and $\{\omega_m\}$ are the QP wavefunctions and energies, respectively; and Σ is a nonlocal and energy-dependent self-energy operator, with the imaginary part of its eigenvalues giving the lifetime of the QPs. To enable practical calculations, an approximate scheme for Σ is to be employed. The most widely used scheme is the *GW* approximation (Hedin, 1965; Hybertsen and Louie, 1986; Aulbur et al., 2000; Dvorak et al., 2014). Therefore, regarding the calculation of QP energies, many-body perturbation theory within the *GW* approximation has become a popular method at present (Louie and Hybertsen, 1987; Dvorak et al., 2014; Hedin, 1965; Hybertsen and Louie, 1986; Aulbur et al., 2000; Onida et al., 2002). However, the somewhat large computational cost makes it difficult to apply the *GW* method to complex systems. Thus, a highly efficient and accurate method for the prediction of QP energies is sought for.

Within the framework of DFT, the KS orbital energies are frequently identified as QP energies, because the KS are GKS schemes are in conformity with an effective single-electron description. However, with conventional density functional approximations (DFAs), such as the local density approximation (LDA) (Slater, 1951; Vosko et al., 1980), generalized gradient approximations (GGAs) and hybrid functionals, the calculated KS orbital energies usually deviate severely from the QP energies. Such deviations have also led to significant underestimation of band gaps, which is largely due to the delocalization error associated with the DFAs (Zheng et al., 2011). In the exact DFT, the ground-state energy of a system with a fractional number of electrons, $E_0(N + n)$ (subscript 0 denotes the ground state corresponding to the fixed v_{ext}), should satisfy the Perdew-Parr-Levy-Baldur (PPLB) condition (Perdew et al., 1982; Yang et al., 2000; Perdew et al., 2007): $E_0(N + n) = (1 - n)E_0(N) + nE_0(N + 1)$, where $0 < n < 1$ is a fractional number.

The PPLB condition infers that $(\frac{\partial E_0}{\partial N})_- = -I$ and $(\frac{\partial E_0}{\partial N})_+ = -A$, where $I \equiv E_0(N - 1) - E_0(N)$ and $A \equiv E_0(N) - E_0(N + 1)$ are the vertical ionization potential (IP) and electron affinity (EA) of the N -electron system, respectively. It has been proved (Cohen et al., 2008a; Yang et al., 2012) that

if the XC energy is an explicit and differentiable functional of the electron density or the KS reduced density matrix, we have $(\frac{\partial E_0}{\partial N})_- = \varepsilon_{\text{HOMO}}$ and $(\frac{\partial E_0}{\partial N})_+ = \varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}}$, where $\varepsilon_{\text{HOMO}}$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}}$ are the energies of the highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) and the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO), respectively. Therefore, if the PPLB condition can be satisfied, we should have $I = -\varepsilon_{\text{HOMO}}$ and $A = -\varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}}$.

Within the framework of ground-state DFT, a rigorous mapping between the KS orbital energies and the QP energies has not been established. However, in practice the Koopmans-like relations have been proposed and adopted by several authors (Hill et al., 2000; Coropceanu et al., 2002; Vargas et al., 2005; Dauth et al., 2011; Körzdörfer et al., 2012; Baerends et al., 2013; Thierbach et al., 2017; Puschnig et al., 2017; Ranasinghe et al., 2017; Bartlett, 2009; Bartlett and Ranasinghe, 2017). These relations have the form of $\varepsilon_i \approx -I_i^v = -[E_i(N-1) - E_0(N)]$ and $\varepsilon_a \approx -A_a^v = -[E_0(N) - E_a(N+1)]$. Here, the index i (a) denotes the occupied (virtual) KS orbital of the N -electron system from (to) which an electron is deprived (added), with I_i^v (A_a^v) being the corresponding vertical IP (EA). It is easily recognized that these vertical IPs and EAs coincide with the energies of quasiholes and quasielectrons, i.e., $\omega_i = -I_i^v$ and $\omega_a = -A_a^v$, respectively. Computationally, approximating QP energies by KS orbital energies has the advantage of requiring only a single self-consistent-field (SCF) calculation for the ground state of the interested molecule.

The excited-state properties of molecular systems can be probed by photon absorption experiments (Onida et al., 2002). However, since the excited electron and the resulting hole cannot be treated separately, theoretical characterization of the excited states is rather challenging. Numerous methods have been developed for the calculation of excitation energies. Coupled cluster (CC) (Dreuw and Wormit, 2015; Winter et al., 2013; Jacquemin et al., 2015; Schreiber et al., 2008; Silva-Junior et al., 2008) and multi-reference methods (Andersson et al., 1990; Hoyer et al., 2016; Potts et al., 2001; Slavicek and Martinez, 2010) are able to describe electronic excited states with a high accuracy. However, the expensive computational cost makes the application of these methods to large systems rather difficult. As a straightforward extension of the *GW* approach (Onida et al., 2002; Hedin, 1965; Hybertsen and Louie, 1986), the Bethe-Salpeter equation (BSE) (Rohlfing and Louie, 2000; Onida et al., 2002; Jacquemin et al., 2017) provides another method for the calculation of excited states, which is however also quite expensive. The time-dependent DFT (TDDFT) (Runge and Gross, 1984; Casida, 1995) is in principle an exact extension of the ground-state DFT, and it has been widely employed to study neutral excitations. Despite its success, TDDFT faces several challenges, such as double excitation character, multi-reference problems, and high-spin excited-states (Ipatov et al., 2009; Laurent and Jacquemin, 2013; Santoro and Jacquemin, 2016). Recently, a simple method has been proposed, which attempts to acquire excitation energies by using only the KS orbital energies of the molecular cations calculated by ground-state DFT (Mei et al., 2018; Haiduke and Bartlett, 2018; Mei and Yang, 2019; Hirao et al., 2020). Such a method is referred to as the QE-DFT (QP energies from DFT), which has been employed to describe excited-state potential energy surfaces and conical intersections (Mei and Yang, 2019). Details about QE-DFT are to be presented in Section 2.1.

In addition to neutral molecules, in this work we also consider the excited states of temporary anions. A temporary anion has an energy higher than that of the neutral species, and thus its EA has a negative value. This means the anion is unstable and lasts only a short time. Although temporary anions cannot be studied by traditional spectroscopic techniques, they can be observed via resonances (sharp variations) in the cross sections of various electron scattering processes (Jordan and Burrow, 1987). In the gas phase, the resonances can be identified by the electron transmission spectroscopy (Sanche and Schulz, 1972; Schulz, 1973; Jordan and Burrow, 1987). Since these resonances belong to the continuous part of the

spectrum, they cannot be addressed by conventional electronic structure methods. A number of theoretical methods have been proposed to tackle the problem of temporary anions. For instance, it has been proposed that the attractive components of electron-molecule interaction are combined with a long-range repulsive potential to produce a barrier, behind which the excess electron can be temporarily trapped (Jordan et al., 2014). Moreover, the negative EAs have been studied by the *GW* method (Hedin, 1965; Hybertsen and Louie, 1986; Govoni and Galli, 2018), the electron-propagator methods (Longo et al., 1995; Ortiz, 2013; Dolgounitcheva et al., 2016), and the equation-of-motion coupled cluster (EOM-CC) approach (Stanton and Bartlett, 1993; Nooijen and Bartlett, 1995; Dutta et al., 2014; Ma et al., 2020), again with considerable computational cost.

For achieving an accurate prediction of QP energies with ground-state density functional methods, it is crucial to reduce the delocalization error associated with the adopted density functional approximation (DFA). Enormous efforts have been made, which have led to the development of the global scaling correction (GSC) (Zheng et al., 2011) and local scaling correction (LSC) (Li et al., 2015) approaches, which alleviate substantially the delocalization error of various DFAs for systems involving global and local fractional electron distributions, respectively. This is done by imposing explicitly the PPLB condition on the form of DFA. Recently, a localized orbital scaling correction (LOSC) (Li et al., 2017; Su et al., 2020) has been constructed to join the merits of GSC and LSC. The LOSC approach is capable of correcting the energy, energy derivative, and electron density of any finite system in a self-consistent and size-consistent manner. In particular, the LOSC approach has been applied in conjunction with the QE-DFT to predict QP and excitation energies of molecules (Mei et al., 2018).

In this work, we revisit the non-empirical GSC approach (Zheng et al., 2011, 2013, 2015; Zhang et al., 2015) and explore the possibility of using it to achieve an accurate prediction of QP and excitation energies. With a perturbative treatment of the orbital relaxation induced by the addition (removal) of an infinitesimal amount of electron to (from) a molecule, the GSC approach has been demonstrated to improve systematically the prediction of KS frontier orbital energies and band gaps of molecules (Zhang et al., 2015). Based on the idea of QE-DFT, we will extend the scope of GSC from the frontier orbitals to the other KS orbitals.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the QE-DFT method to calculate the QP and excitation energies within the framework of ground-state DFT, as well as the GSC approach to achieve the accurate KS orbital energies. In Section 3, numerical results of the QP energies, electronic excitation energies, and resonance energies are presented and discussed. Finally, we summarize this work in Section 4.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 QE-DFT method for the calculation of QP, excitation and resonance energies

In the QE-DFT method, the following Koopmans-like relations are adopted, which use the energies of occupied and virtual KS orbitals to approximate the quasihole and quasielectron energies, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_a(N) &\approx \omega_a(N) = E_a(N+1) - E_0(N), \\ \varepsilon_i(N) &\approx \omega_i(N) = E_0(N) - E_i(N-1).\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

Here, $\{\varepsilon_i(N)\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_a(N)\}$ are the occupied and virtual orbital energies of the N -electron system, respectively. $E_a(N+1)$ denotes the energy of the $(N+1)$ -electron system formed by adding an excess

electron to the a th virtual orbital of the N -electron system at its ground state. Note that the subscript a refers to the N -electron system, and the value of such an orbital index may vary in the $(N + 1)$ -electron system because of the relaxation and re-ordering of the orbitals upon the perturbation induced by electron addition. A similar argument applies to the i th occupied orbital of the N -electron system.

From Eq. (3) it is obvious that the excitation energy of an electron from the HOMO to a virtual orbital of the N -electron system, which corresponds to the a th orbital of the $(N - 1)$ -electron system, can be calculated as follows (Mei et al., 2018; Haiduke and Bartlett, 2018; Mei and Yang, 2019),

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E_a(N) &\equiv E_a(N) - E_0(N) \\ &= [E_a(N) - E_0(N - 1)] - [E_0(N) - E_0(N - 1)] \\ &= \omega_a(N - 1) - \omega_{\text{LUMO}}(N - 1) \\ &\approx \varepsilon_a(N - 1) - \varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}}(N - 1).\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

Here, in the second equality of Eq. (4), we have chosen to use the $(N - 1)$ -electron system as a reference system. This means the electronic excitation from the HOMO to a virtual orbital can be regarded as consisting of two steps: first an electron is removed from the HOMO of the N -electron system, giving rise to an $(N - 1)$ -electron system in its ground state; and then an excess electron is put to the a th virtual orbital of the $(N - 1)$ -electron system, which is energetically higher than the frontier orbitals, resulting in an excited N -electron system. Accordingly, $E_0(N - 1)$ is the ground-state energy of the $(N - 1)$ -electron system, and $E_a(N)$ denotes the energy of the N -electron system that is finally obtained. Thus, Eq. (4) can describe the excitation of an electron from the HOMO to any virtual KS orbital (LUMO and above), as long as the orbital finds its counterpart in the $(N - 1)$ -electron system.

Specifically, if we presume the $(N - 1)$ -electron reference system contains one more spin- α electrons than spin- β electrons, the first triplet-state excitation energy of the N -electron system is calculated by

$$\Delta E_{\text{T1}}(N) \equiv E_{\text{T1}}(N) - E_0(N) \approx \varepsilon_{\alpha, \text{LUMO}}(N - 1) - \varepsilon_{\beta, \text{LUMO}}(N - 1). \quad (5)$$

Consider now the first singlet excited state formed by adding a spin- β electron to the virtual orbital of the ground-state $(N - 1)$ -electron system. Since a single Slater determinant of KS orbitals is not an eigenstate of the spin operator $\hat{S}^2$, a spin purification procedure (Ziegler et al., 1977) is adopted, so that the first singlet-state excitation energy is obtained as

$$\Delta E_{\text{S1}}(N) \equiv E_{\text{S1}}(N) - E_0(N) \approx 2\varepsilon_{\beta, \text{LUMO}+1}(N - 1) - \varepsilon_{\alpha, \text{LUMO}}(N - 1) - \varepsilon_{\beta, \text{LUMO}}(N - 1). \quad (6)$$

Higher excitation energies can be calculated by following similar processes. Obviously, with the QE-DFT method, the calculation of excitation energies requires the SCF calculations to be performed explicitly only for the ground-state $(N - 1)$ -electron system.

Regarding temporary anions, we only consider the scenario that the LUMO of the neutral molecule is already an unbound orbital, which corresponds to a negative EA. Consequently, addition of an excess electron to the LUMO gives rise to a resonant state. Traditionally, the molecular EA is obtained by performing SCF calculations separately for the neutral and anionic systems and taking the energy difference between them. This is referred to the Δ SCF method. However, in practice it is extremely difficult to carry out an SCF calculation for the anionic species if it is in a resonant state.

165 Since the LUMO is a frontier orbital, the PPLB condition holds exactly, and thus the negative EA can be
166 obtained directly from the positive LUMO energy via the following equality:

$$A = -\varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}}(N). \quad (7)$$

167 By using Eq. (7), the SCF calculation on the temporary anion that is potentially problematic is no longer
168 needed.

169 2.2 GSC approach for the accurate prediction of KS orbital energies

170 From Section 2.1, the prediction of QP and excitation energies is transformed to the accurate calculation
171 of KS orbital energies. To this end, we employ a non-empirical GSC approach developed in our previous
172 works Zheng et al. (2013); Zhang et al. (2015) to reduce the delocalization error of some frequently used
173 DFAs. It has been demonstrated that the GSC approach greatly improves the accuracy of the frontier KS
174 orbitals. In the following, we shall go beyond the frontier orbitals and extend the application of GSC to all
175 the KS orbitals.

176 In the KS or GKS scheme, the total electronic energy in the ground state is $E_0(N) = T_s + V_{\text{ext}} + J + E_{\text{xc}}$.
177 With the KS orbitals fixed as the electron number is varied, the KS kinetic energy T_s and external potential
178 energy V_{ext} are linear in $\rho(\mathbf{r})$, while the electron Coulomb energy J is quadratic, and E_{xc} is usually
179 nonlinear in $\rho(\mathbf{r})$. The GSC approach establishes a linear energy function that satisfies the PPLB condition,

$$\tilde{E}_0(N+n) \equiv (1-n)E_0(N) + nE_0(N+1), \quad (8)$$

180 by linearizing both J and E_{xc} with respect to the fractional electron number n . The difference between $\tilde{E}_0$
181 and E_0 is just the GSC for the energy:

$$\Delta E_0^{\text{GSC}} = \tilde{E}_0(N+n) - E_0(N+n). \quad (9)$$

182 Here, ΔE_0^{GSC} can express explicitly by the electron density $\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_m n_m [\phi_m(\mathbf{r})]^2$ and some other
183 quantities, where $\phi_m(\mathbf{r})$ and n_m are the m th KS orbital and electron occupation number, respectively. For
184 simplicity, the spin indices are omitted.

185 The addition of the n fractional electron to the LUMO presents a perturbation to the N -electron system,
186 and the change in electron density in response to such a perturbation is

$$\delta\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \rho^{N+n}(\mathbf{r}) - \rho^N(\mathbf{r}) = nf(\mathbf{r}) + n^2\gamma(\mathbf{r}) + \cdots, \quad (10)$$

187 where $f(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{r})}{\partial n} |_{v_{\text{ext}}}$ and $\gamma(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \rho(\mathbf{r})}{\partial n^2} |_{v_{\text{ext}}}$ are the first- and second-order Fukui
188 functions (Parr and Yang, 1984; Yang et al., 1984; Yang and Parr, 1985), respectively. Accordingly, the
189 relaxation of KS orbitals upon the addition of n fractional electron can be expanded in a perturbative series
190 as $\delta\phi_m(\mathbf{r}) = \phi_m^{N+n}(\mathbf{r}) - \phi_m^N(\mathbf{r}) = n\delta\phi_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) + n^2\delta\phi_m^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}) + \cdots$, with $\delta\phi_m^{(k)}(\mathbf{r})$ being the k th-order orbital
191 relaxation. Thus, the Fukui functions can be expressed explicitly in terms of orbital relaxation. For instance,
192 the first-order Fukui function is

$$f(\mathbf{r}) = |\phi_f(\mathbf{r})|^2 + 2 \sum_m n_m \delta\phi_m^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) \phi_m(\mathbf{r}). \quad (11)$$

Here, the subscript f denotes the frontier orbital, with $f = \text{LUMO}$ ($f = \text{HOMO}$) in the case of electron addition (removal). The explicit forms of orbital relaxation up to the third order have been derived and provided in (Zhang et al., 2015), with all the perturbation Hamiltonian matrices determined by a self-consistent process. Ultimately, all orders of orbital relaxation and Fukui quantities are expressed in terms of $\{\phi_m(\mathbf{r})\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_m\}$ of the N -electron system. The scaling correction to the frontier orbital energy is then evaluated by the Janak's theorem (Janak, 1978) in a post-SCF manner,

$$\Delta\varepsilon_f^{\text{GSC}} = \frac{\partial\Delta E_0^{\text{GSC}}}{\partial n} = \Delta\varepsilon_f^{(1)} + \Delta\varepsilon_f^{(2)} + \cdots, \quad (12)$$

where $\Delta\varepsilon_f^{(k)}$ is the k th-order correction to the frontier orbital energy.

An accurate prediction of molecular IP and EA has been achieved by employing the GSC approach (Zheng et al., 2013, 2015; Zhang et al., 2015, 2018) via

$$I = -\varepsilon_{\text{HOMO}}^{\text{GSC-DFA}} = -(\varepsilon_{\text{HOMO}}^{\text{DFA}} + \Delta\varepsilon_{\text{HOMO}}^{\text{GSC}}), \quad (13)$$

$$A = -\varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}}^{\text{GSC-DFA}} = -(\varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}}^{\text{DFA}} + \Delta\varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}}^{\text{GSC}}). \quad (14)$$

In practical calculations, the perturbative series needs to be truncated at a certain order. It is worth pointing out that the accuracy of the GSC does not necessarily increase with further inclusion of higher-order orbital relaxation. This is because the present form of GSC only treats the exchange energy E_x , while the correlation energy E_c is presumed to be much smaller and hence its correction is omitted. However, the correction to E_c may have a comparable magnitude to the high-order corrections to E_x . For instance, regarding the prediction of EA, while the inclusion of first-order orbital relaxation is found optimal for the LDA and GGA (such as BLYP (Lee et al., 1988; Becke, 1988)), the inclusion of orbital relaxation up to second-order is most favorable for the hybrid functional B3LYP (Lee et al., 1988; Becke, 1993).

To extend the GSC approach beyond the frontier KS orbitals, we presume the PPLB condition could be generalized to the following energy linearity relation:

$$\tilde{E}_a(N+n) \equiv (1-n)E_0(N) + nE_a(N+1). \quad (15)$$

The GSC to the energy of the $(N+n)$ -electron system is

$$\Delta E_a^{\text{GSC}} = \tilde{E}_a(N+n) - E_a(N+n), \quad (16)$$

where $E_a(N+n)$ is the energy of the $(N+n)$ -electron system in an excited state, since the n fractional electron is now added to the a th virtual orbital of the N -electron system. Similarly, the changes of electron density and KS orbitals in response to the perturbation caused by the electron addition process, as well as their contributions to ΔE_a^{GSC} , are calculated by using the self-consistent perturbation theory presented in (Zhang et al., 2015). This finally gives rise to the GSC to the KS orbital energies:

$$\Delta\varepsilon_a^{\text{GSC}} = \frac{\partial\Delta E_a^{\text{GSC}}}{\partial n} = \Delta\varepsilon_a^{(1)} + \Delta\varepsilon_a^{(2)} + \cdots. \quad (17)$$

Likewise, for the scenario that n fractional electron is deprived from the i th occupied orbital of the N -electron system, we have

$$\Delta\varepsilon_i^{\text{GSC}} = \frac{\partial\Delta E_i^{\text{GSC}}}{\partial n} = \Delta\varepsilon_i^{(1)} + \Delta\varepsilon_i^{(2)} + \dots \quad (18)$$

With the QE-DFT method, we can now use the scaling corrected KS orbital energies to approximate the QP energies and the related vertical IPs and EAs as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_i &= -I_i^{\text{v}} \approx \varepsilon_i^{\text{GSC-DFA}} = \varepsilon_i^{\text{DFA}} + \Delta\varepsilon_i^{\text{GSC}}, \\ \omega_a &= -A_a^{\text{v}} \approx \varepsilon_a^{\text{GSC-DFA}} = \varepsilon_a^{\text{DFA}} + \Delta\varepsilon_a^{\text{GSC}}.\end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 QP energies

3.1.1 Quasihole energies of molecules




Figure 1. The MAEs (in units of eV) between the occupied KS orbital energies $\{\varepsilon_i\}$ calculated by various DFAs and the experimentally measured quasihole energies $\{\omega_i\}$. The experimental data are extracted from (Chong et al., 2002) and (Schmidt, 1977). The basis set adopted in the density functional calculations is aug-cc-pVTZ (Woon and Dunning Jr, 1993; Kendall et al., 1992).

Because of the lack of highly accurate experimental or theoretical data for the molecular quasielectron energies (except for those associated with the LUMOs), in this work we only compare the calculated quasihole energies which are associated with the occupied KS orbitals to the reference data available in the literature.




Figure 2. A comparison between 56 KS orbital energies $\{-\varepsilon_i\}$ calculated by B3LYP and GSC-B3LYP and the corresponding vertical IPs $\{I_i^V\}$ measured experimentally for 12 molecules (see the main text). The green solid line indicates exact equality.

224 We first look into 56 quasihole energies of 12 molecules by calculating the scaling corrected orbital
 225 energies, and make comparison with experimentally measured vertical IPs. The examined molecules are
 226 cyanogen, CO, acetylene, water, ethylene, ammonia, acetonitrile, fluoromethane, benzene, naphthalene,
 227 furan and formic acid, which exhibit diversified geometric and electronic features. Among these molecules,
 228 the geometries of benzene and naphthalene are extracted from (Mei et al., 2018), while the structures of
 229 the other molecules are optimized with the B3LYP/6-311+g** method by using the Gaussian09 package
 230 (Frisch et al., 2009).

231 The GSC approach presented in Section 2.2 is employed to correct the orbital energies calculated by
 232 various mainstream DFAs, including the LDA, the GGAs (BLYP and PBE (Perdew et al., 1996)), and
 233 the hybrid functional B3LYP. For these DFAs, the orbital relaxation up to second-order is considered for
 234 calculating the scaling corrections of the occupied orbital energies. The GSC approach is implemented in
 235 an in-house built quantum chemistry software package QM⁴D (Hu et al., 2020).

236 Figure 1 compares the averaged deviations of the calculated $\{\varepsilon_i^{\text{DFA}}\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_i^{\text{GSC-DFA}}\}$ from the quasihole
 237 energies $\{\omega_i\}$ extracted from the experimentally measured vertical IPs. It is shown clearly that the mean
 238 absolute errors (MAEs) associated with the original DFAs are as large as several eVs, while by applying
 239 the GSC approach, the MAEs are substantially reduced to less than 0.5 eV. Take the B3LYP functional as
 240 an example. It yields an MAE of 3.05 eV, which is the smallest among all the uncorrected DFAs, and the
 241 MAE is greatly reduced to 0.28 eV by using the GSC-B3LYP. If instead the orbital relaxation is treated up

to the first- and third-order, the MAE becomes 0.74 eV and 0.43 eV, respectively. The dependence on the order of orbital relaxation is consistent with the trend observed in our previous work (Zhang et al., 2015).

In a previous study by Chong et al. (Chong et al., 2002), 10 out of 12 molecules examined in Fig. (1) (without benzene and naphthalene) have been investigated by calculating their KS orbital energies by using an approximate XC potential obtained with the statistical averaging of (model) orbital potentials (SAOP). For these 10 molecules, the MAE reported in (Chong et al., 2002) is 0.38 eV, while the GSC-B3LYP yields a somewhat smaller MAE of 0.28 eV, albeit the different molecular geometries and basis sets adopted.

The comparison between the individual orbital energies $\{-\varepsilon_i\}$ calculated by B3LYP and GSC-B3LYP and the experimentally measured vertical IPs $\{I_i^v\}$ is depicted in Fig. (2). It is apparent that the uncorrected orbital energies deviate systematically and significantly from the experimental QP energies, while such deviations are largely alleviated by applying the GSC approach.

3.1.2 Photoemission spectra




Figure 3. A comparison between the experimental and simulated PES of (a) a maleic anhydride and (b) a benzoquinone. The experimental PES are extracted from (Brundle et al., 1972; Knight et al., 2016), with the rightmost quasidelectron peak added manually. The quasidelectron peak is centered at the experimental EA of the molecule, and is broadened artificially by a Gaussian function with the width of $\lambda = 0.2$ eV. The simulated PES by using the QE-DFT are explained in the main text, and the results of the self-consistent GW (scGW) and non-self-consistent G_0W_0 methods are extracted from (Knight et al., 2016).

The QP energies can also be extracted from the peak positions of experimentally measured photoemission spectra (PES). We employ the QE-DFT to study the PES of 14 molecules. The same molecular geometries and basis set (cc-pVTZ (Dunning Jr, 1989; Woon and Dunning Jr, 1993)) as those adopted in (Mei et al., 2018) are used here. The PES are simulated by setting the energy of each KS orbital as the center of a QP peak, and assuming all QP peaks have the same amplitude and are broadened by the same Gaussian function $e^{-(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_i)^2 / 2\lambda^2}$ with $\lambda = 0.2$ eV.

Figure 3 depicts the experimentally measured and theoretically simulated PES of a maleic anhydride and a benzoquinone, while those of the other 12 molecules are presented in Supplementary Material. Clearly, both the PBE and B3LYP yield considerable errors in the peak positions of the simulated PES. More specifically, they tend to predict much too high quasihole energies and too low quasidelectron energies. This is because the uncorrected DFAs (PBE and B3LYP) suffer from delocalization error, as they violate the rigorous PPLB condition and the extended energy linearity relation.

The use of GSC improves significantly the simulated PES. For GSC-PBE the orbital relaxation is considered up to first- and second-order for the virtual and occupied KS orbitals, respectively; while for GSC-B3LYP the orbital relaxation is included up to second-order for all the KS orbitals. From the comparison shown in Fig. (3), it is evident that the GSC-DFAs achieve at least the same level of accuracy as the results of *GW* method (Knight et al., 2016). Moreover, the computational cost of the QE-DFT method by using a GSC-DFA is supposedly much cheaper than that of the *GW* method, because the former requires only a single SCF calculation at the DFT level.

3.2 Energies of low-lying excited states

We now turn to the energies of low-lying excited states of molecules. By employing the QE-DFT method, we carry out calculations on 48 low excitation energies of the 16 molecules investigated previously in (Mei et al., 2018). The cationic species of all these molecules indeed contain one more spin- α electrons than spin- β electrons, and hence their triplet and singlet excitation energies are computed by using Eq. (5) and Eq. (6), respectively. Since the calculations involve only the virtual KS orbitals of the cations, the orbital relaxation is considered up to second-order for GSC-B3LYP, and to first-order for other GSC-DFAs, respectively.

Figure 4 compares the MAEs of different types of excitation energies calculated by various DFAs, and the detailed results can be found in Supplementary Material. Intriguingly, for the lowest HOMO-to-LUMO excitations, the uncorrected DFAs yield reasonably accurate excitation energies, and the application of the GSC approach does not lead to any improvement. In particular, B3LYP yields MAEs as small as 0.17 eV and 0.45 eV for the T1 and S1 excitations, respectively. Such an appealing accuracy is likely due to the cancellation of delocalization error. Both Eq. (5) and Eq. (6) involve differences between pairs of virtual orbital energies. Thus, when a pair of virtual orbitals are close in energy, their associated delocalization errors are expected to cancel out (Mei et al., 2018). Consequently, the GSC approach does not help. Such an error cancellation mechanism becomes less favorable for higher excitations. For instance, as displayed in Fig. (4), the uncorrected DFAs tend to yield larger MAEs for the T2 and S2 excitations, and applying the GSC indeed leads to improved accuracy. The latter is because the scaling correction to each individual QP energy starts to take effect.

Among all the DFAs examined, the GSC-B3LYP functional achieves an optimal performance for all the low-lying excitations studied, and the results of GSC-B3LYP achieve an overall accuracy that is comparable to the prediction of the TDDFT-B3LYP method. This affirms that it is entirely possible and practical to access excited-state properties of molecules within the framework of ground-state DFT.

3.3 Resonance energies of temporary anions

For a temporary anion in a resonant state, the corresponding neutral molecule has a negative EA, for which the conventional Δ SCF method often yields problematic results. This is because the choice of an appropriate basis set is difficult for the SCF calculation of a temporary anion. On one hand, the energy of a temporary anion is rather sensitive to the inclusion of diffuse basis functions (Guerra, 1990). On the other




Figure 4. The MAEs of the energies of different types of excitations calculated by using the QE-DFT method with various DFAs and the basis set 6-311++G(3df, 3pd). For comparison purpose, the MAEs of the TDDFT-B3LYP results extracted from (Mei et al., 2018) are also displayed. Excitation energies calculated by high-level wavefunction methods are used as the reference data (Schreiber et al., 2008). T1 and S1 (T2 and S2) refer to the triplet and singlet HOMO to LUMO (LUMO+1) excitations, respectively. The numbers in the parentheses record the numbers of energy data belonging to the different types of excitations.

hand, the diffuse basis functions may artificially delocalize the excess electron (Cohen et al., 2008c, 2012), and thus result in incorrect electron density distribution.

Alternatively, using the scaling corrected LUMO energy to determine the energy of the temporary anion has made impressive progress. It has been demonstrated that the GSC-PBE functional predicts highly accurate negative EAs by using Eq. (14) (Zhang et al., 2018). For a set of 38 molecules proposed in (Tozer and De Proft, 2005), the resulting MAE is as small as 0.18 eV with the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set. Recently, a similar accuracy has been reached by the explicit inclusion of derivative discontinuity in the GGA exchange potential (Carmona-Espíndola et al., 2020). In this section, we extend our calculation to 26 new molecules which are beyond the above mentioned works, and hence expand the test set to a total of 64 molecules. The molecular geometries are optimized at the B3LYP/6-311+G** level with the Gaussian09 suite of programs (Frisch et al., 2009). For the GSC approach, the relaxation of KS orbitals is considered up to second-order for GSC-B3LYP, and to first-order for other GSC-DFAs, respectively.

Table 1 lists the experimental and calculated EAs of the newly added 26 molecules. The experimental data are extracted from (Jordan and Burrow, 1978; Chiu et al., 1979; Ng et al., 1983), while the theoretical data take either the values of $-\varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}}$ (or $-\varepsilon_a$ if it is the a th virtual orbital that is related to the resonant state), or the energy difference between the neutral and anionic species (the ΔSCF method). More details are given in the Supplementary Material.

Table 1. Experimental and calculated EAs of 26 new molecules which are not included in (Tozer and De Proft, 2005; Zhang et al., 2018). The calculated EAs are obtained by using the Δ SCF method, or take the values of the uncorrected $-\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}}^{\text{DFA}}$ or scaling corrected $-\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}}^{\text{GSC-DFA}}$. All energies are in units of eV. The aug-cc-pVTZ basis set is adopted for all the calculated data listed in this table.

Molecule	Exp.	LDA	BLYP	B3LYP	PBE	GSC-LDA	GSC-BLYP	GSC-B3LYP	GSC-PBE	Δ SCF-PBE	Δ SCF-B3LYP
Monofluoroethylene	-1.91	1.25	0.95	0.31	1.03	-1.97	-2.18	-2.06	-2.15	-0.47	-0.52
<i>trans</i> -1,2-difluoroethylene	-1.84	1.32	1.01	0.39	1.07	-1.95	-2.18	-2.09	-2.16	-0.50	-0.58
<i>cis</i> -1,2-difluoroethylene ^a	-2.18	1.14	0.82	0.19	0.89	-2.18	-2.42	-2.34	-2.40	-0.36	-0.40
1,1-Difluoroethylene ^a	-2.39	1.09	0.79	0.17	0.84	-2.15	-2.32	-2.09	-2.33	-0.42	-0.47
Trifluoroethylene ^a	-2.45	1.06	0.74	0.11	0.77	-2.30	-2.53	-2.38	-2.53	-0.41	-0.45
Tetrafluoroethylene ^b	-3.00	0.82	0.47	0.21	0.49	-2.71	-3.04	-3.07	-3.03	-0.89	-0.91
Nitrogen	-2.20	2.18	1.88	0.98	1.92	-2.20	-2.41	-2.40	-2.41	N/A	-1.83
Formaldehyde	-0.86	2.91	2.57	1.75	2.66	-0.92	-1.18	-1.14	-1.14	N/A	-0.46
Butadiene	-0.62	2.12	1.76	1.18	1.90	-0.61	-0.93	-0.85	-0.82	N/A	-0.73
Biphenyl	-0.30	2.04	1.63	1.13	1.80	0.01	-0.40	-0.39	-0.24	N/A	-0.37
Trichloromethane	-0.35	2.47	2.22	1.55	2.31	-0.24	-0.44	-0.46	-0.38	-0.15	-0.26
Dichlorofluoromethane	-0.96	1.99	1.74	1.08	1.81	-0.90	-1.06	-1.00	-1.04	-0.36	-0.44
Dichlorodifluoromethane	-0.98	2.37	2.11	1.43	2.17	-0.61	-0.80	-0.79	-0.77	-0.42	-0.48
Dichloromethane	-1.23	1.74	1.52	0.90	1.59	-1.02	-1.08	-0.89	-1.09	-0.31	-0.38
Benzene	-1.15	1.44	1.06	0.50	1.21	-1.18	-1.52	-1.48	-1.40	-0.36	-0.42
CO	-1.80	2.24	1.94	1.12	2.00	-1.89	-2.07	-1.96	-2.08	-1.05	-1.11
Cyanogen	-0.58	3.87	3.48	2.84	3.61	-0.48	0.12	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.29
Propyne ^d	-2.95	0.13	0.02	-0.40	0.01	-2.29	-1.83	-1.23	-2.13	-0.40	-0.47
Butadiyne	-1.00	2.09	1.73	1.16	1.87	-0.77	-1.07	-0.96	-0.97	-0.25	-0.36
Tetramethylethylene ^e	-2.27	0.42	0.20	-0.31	0.28	-1.81	-1.79	-1.48	-1.86	-0.34	-0.41
Acetylene ^c	-2.60	0.57	0.32	-0.28	0.39	-2.51	-2.58	-2.36	-2.61	-0.46	-0.53
Acrylonitrile	-0.21	3.00	2.62	2.01	2.76	-0.01	-0.35	-0.27	-0.24	0.02	-0.16
1,4-Cyclohexadiene ^a	-1.75	1.05	0.67	0.34	0.81	-1.45	-1.80	-1.89	-1.68	-0.34	-0.56
Toluene	-1.11	1.39	1.01	0.46	1.16	-1.11	-1.45	-1.43	-1.33	-0.34	-0.42
Ethylbenzene	-1.17	1.37	0.99	0.47	1.14	-1.07	-1.43	-0.90	-1.31	-0.28	-0.37
Isopropylbenzene	-1.08	1.39	0.99	0.44	1.16	-1.01	-1.38	-1.41	-1.25	-0.26	-0.34
MAE		3.17	2.85	2.23	2.95	0.17	0.25	0.30	0.21	1.22	1.01

^a The $-\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+1}$ calculated with the GSC-B3LYP is taken as the EA of this molecule.
^b The $-\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+1}$ calculated with the GSC-B3LYP, GSC-BLYP and GSC-PBE are taken as the EA of this molecule.
^c The $-\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+2}$ calculated with the GSC-B3LYP is taken as the EA of this molecule.
^d The $-\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+2}$ calculated with the GSC-B3LYP and $-\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+1}$ calculated with other DFAs are taken as the EA of this molecule.
^e The $-\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+3}$ calculated with the GSC-B3LYP and $-\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+1}$ calculated with other DFAs are taken as the EA of this molecule.

319 Figure 5 visualizes the MAEs of the calculated EAs of the extended set of 64 molecules. Obviously, the
320 application of the GSC approach greatly improves the accuracy of the virtual orbital energies (particularly
321 the ϵ_{LUMO}). The MAE is reduced from several eVs with the original DFAs to less than 0.5 eV with the
322 GSC-DFAs. Moreover, the MAE is further reduced by adopting a more diffuse basis set. This is because a
323 more complete basis set is more favorable for a perturbative treatment of scaling correction and orbital
324 relaxation. The lowest MAE reached for the whole extended set is 0.14 eV with the GSC-LDA.




Figure 5. The MAEs of the EAs for an extended set of 64 molecules calculated by employing the QE-DFT method with various DFAs and by using the Δ SCF method. Note that when the more diffuse aug-cc-pVTZ basis set is adopted, the energy of a certain virtual KS orbital should be taken as the predicted EA; see Table 1 for details. If the orbital relaxation is considered up to first-order for the GSC-B3LYP, the MAEs become 0.21 eV and 0.28 eV with the cc-pVTZ and aug-cc-pVTZ basis sets, respectively.

As already been pointed out in (Zhang et al., 2018), the use of a very diffuse basis set (such as aug-cc-pVTZ) may give rise to highly delocalized virtual KS orbitals with energies close to the molecular chemical potential. These orbitals are actually not relevant to the resonant state of the temporary anion of our interest, and should be left out of theoretical analysis. Therefore, we need to choose carefully the virtual orbital which is genuinely pertinent to the formation of the temporary anion. For instance, in the case of a *cis*-butene molecule, the few lowest virtual orbitals calculated at the B3LYP/cc-pVTZ and B3LYP/aug-cc-pVTZ levels are depicted in Fig. (6). Apparently, with the B3LYP/aug-cc-pVTZ method, the three lowest virtual orbitals (from LUMO to LUMO+2) are rather diffuse. Occupation on any of these orbitals by an excess electron will lead to an unbound state. Therefore, these orbitals are not relevant to the formation of the temporary anion. By scrutinizing the spatial distribution of the virtual KS orbitals, it is recognized that $\phi_{\text{LUMO}+3}(\mathbf{r})$ would give rise to the resonant state of the temporary anion, as it exhibits a same shape as $\phi_{\text{LUMO}}(\mathbf{r})$ obtained with the cc-pVTZ basis set. In such a case, instead of using Eq. (14), the EA is predicted by $A = -\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+3}^{\text{GSC-B3LYP}} = -(\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+3}^{\text{B3LYP}} + \Delta\epsilon_{\text{LUMO}+3}^{\text{GSC}})$. Similarly, with the B3LYP/aug-cc-pVTZ method there are some other molecules for which a virtual orbital other than the LUMO should be chosen. The virtual orbital pertinent to the temporary anion is $\phi_{\text{LUMO}+1}(\mathbf{r})$ for 9 molecules (aniline, propene, CO_2 , guanine, 1,4-cyclohexadiene, *cis*-1,2-difluoroethylene, 1,1-difluoroethylene, trifluoroethylene and tetrafluoroethylene), $\phi_{\text{LUMO}+2}(\mathbf{r})$ for 3 molecules (trimethylethylene, propyne and acetylene), $\phi_{\text{LUMO}+3}(\mathbf{r})$ for 3 molecules (pyrrole, *trans*-butene, and tetramethylethylene), and $\phi_{\text{LUMO}+4}(\mathbf{r})$ for one molecule (cyclohexene).

As shown in Fig. (5), unlike the QE-DFT method, increasing the size of basis set does not improve the accuracy of the Δ SCF method. This is because through the SCF calculation of the molecular anion by using a diffuse basis set, the excess electron is more inclined to reside on the delocalized orbital which has a lower energy. Consequently, it is difficult to have the excess electron correctly occupying the virtual orbital

that is pertinent to the resonant state of temporary anion. In contrast, the QE-DFT method in conjunction with the GSC approach does not require an SCF calculation for the anionic species, and is clearly more favorable for the prediction of resonance energies of temporary anions.




Figure 6. Contour plots of the lowest virtual KS orbitals of the neutral *cis*-butene molecule calculated at the B3LYP/cc-pVTZ and B3LYP/aug-cc-pVTZ levels. The isosurfaces of ± 0.022 a.u. are shaded in yellow and green, respectively).

4 CONCLUSION

To summarize, we have calculated the QP, excitation and resonance energies of molecules by employing the QE-DFT method. A non-empirical GSC approach is used to reduce the delocalization error associated with the DFAs by imposing an energy linearity condition for systems with a fractional number of electrons. For the various DFAs considered in this paper, the GSC-B3LYP yields the overall best performance. Our calculation results achieve at least the same level of accuracy as some more expensive methods such as the *GW* method for QP energies and the TDDFT for excitation energies. This thus affirms that it is entirely possible and practical to study excited-state properties within the framework of ground-state DFT. Despite the promising results, the prediction of singlet excitation energies still has plenty of room for improvement. This is because another source of error associated with the DFAs, the static correlation error, comes into play, which may be corrected by imposing a constancy condition on systems with fractional spins Cohen et al. (2008b). Further work is needed along this direction.

FUNDING

The authors acknowledge the support from the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (Grant Nos. 2016YFA0400900 and 2016YFA0200600), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 21973086), and the Ministry of Education of China (111 Project Grant No. B18051).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Support from the Supercomputing Center of University of Science and Technology of China is appreciated.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Supplementary Material should be uploaded separately on submission, if there are Supplementary Figures, please include the caption in the same file as the figure. LaTeX Supplementary Material templates can be found in the Frontiers LaTeX folder.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All datasets generated for this study are included in the Supplementary Material.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, K., Malmqvist, P. A., Roos, B. O., Sadlej, A. J., and Wolinski, K. (1990). Second-order perturbation theory with a CASSCF reference function. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* 94, 5483–5488. doi:10.1021/j100377a012
- Aulbur, W. G., Jönsson, L., and Wilkins, J. W. (2000). Quasiparticle calculations in solids. *Solid State Physics* 54, 1–218. doi:10.1016/S0081-1947(08)60248-9
- Baerends, E., Gritsenko, O., and Van Meer, R. (2013). The Kohn–Sham gap, the fundamental gap and the optical gap: the physical meaning of occupied and virtual Kohn–Sham orbital energies. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* 15, 16408–16425. doi:10.1039/C3CP52547C
- Bartlett, R. J. (2009). Towards an exact correlated orbital theory for electrons. *Chemical Physics Letters* 484, 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.cplett.2009.10.053
- Bartlett, R. J. and Ranasinghe, D. S. (2017). The power of exact conditions in electronic structure theory. *Chemical Physics Letters* 669, 54–70. doi:10.1016/j.cplett.2016.12.017
- Becke, A. D. (1988). Density-functional exchange-energy approximation with correct asymptotic behavior. *Physical Review A* 38, 3098. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.38.3098
- Becke, A. D. (1993). Density-functional thermochemistry. III. the role of exact exchange. *Journal of Chemical Physics* 98, 5648–5652. doi:10.1063/1.464913
- Brundle, C., Robin, M., and Kuebler, N. (1972). Perfluoro effect in photoelectron spectroscopy. II. Aromatic molecules. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 94, 1466–1475. doi:10.1021/ja00760a007
- Carmona-Espíndola, J., Gázquez, J. L., Vela, A., and Trickey, S. B. (2020). Negative electron affinities and derivative discontinuity contribution from a generalized gradient approximation exchange functional. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* 124, 1334–1342. doi:10.1021/acs.jpca.9b10956
- Casida, M. E. (1995). Time-dependent density functional response theory for molecules. In *Recent Advances In Density Functional Methods: (Part I)* (Singapore: World Scientific). 155–192
- Chiu, N. S., Burrow, P. D., and Jordan, K. D. (1979). Temporary anions of the fluoroethylenes. *Chemical Physics Letters* 68, 121–126. doi:10.1016/0009-2614(79)80082-2

- Chong, D. P., Gritsenko, O. V., and Baerends, E. J. (2002). Interpretation of the Kohn–Sham orbital energies as approximate vertical ionization potentials. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 116, 1760–1772. doi:10.1063/1.1430255
- Cohen, A. J., Mori-Sánchez, P., and Yang, W. (2008a). Fractional charge perspective on the band gap in density-functional theory. *Physical Review B* 77, 115123. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.77.115123
- Cohen, A. J., Mori-Sánchez, P., and Yang, W. (2008b). Fractional spins and static correlation error in density functional theory. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 129, 121104
- Cohen, A. J., Mori-Sánchez, P., and Yang, W. (2008c). Insights into current limitations of density functional theory. *Science* 321, 792–794. doi:10.1126/science.1158722
- Cohen, A. J., Mori-Sánchez, P., and Yang, W. (2012). Challenges for density functional theory. *Chemical Reviews* 112, 289–320. doi:10.1021/cr200107z
- Coropceanu, V., Malagoli, M., da Silva Filho, D., Gruhn, N., Bill, T., and Brédas, J. (2002). Hole-and electron-vibrational couplings in oligoacene crystals: intramolecular contributions. *Physical Review Letters* 89, 275503. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.275503
- Dauth, M., Körzdörfer, T., Kümmel, S., Ziroff, J., Wiessner, M., Schöll, A., et al. (2011). Orbital density reconstruction for molecules. *Physical Review Letters* 107, 193002. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.193002
- Dolgounitcheva, O., Díaz-Tinoco, M., Zakrzewski, V. G., Richard, R. M., Marom, N., Sherrill, C. D., et al. (2016). Accurate ionization potentials and electron affinities of acceptor molecules IV: Electron-propagator methods. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* 12, 627–637. doi:10.1021/acs.jctc.5b00872
- Dreuw, A. and Wormit, M. (2015). The algebraic diagrammatic construction scheme for the polarization propagator for the calculation of excited states. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science* 5, 82–95. doi:10.1002/wcms.1206
- Dunning Jr, T. H. (1989). Gaussian basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. I. The atoms boron through neon and hydrogen. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 90, 1007–1023. doi:10.1063/1.456153
- Dutta, A. K., Gupta, J., Pathak, H., Vaval, N., and Pal, S. (2014). Partitioned EOMEA-MBPT (2): An efficient N^5 scaling method for calculation of electron affinities. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* 10, 1923–1933. doi:10.1021/ct4009409
- Dvorak, M., Chen, X.-J., and Wu, Z. (2014). Quasiparticle energies and excitonic effects in dense solid hydrogen near metallization. *Physical Review B* 90, 035103. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.90.035103
- Frisch, M. J., Trucks, G. W., Schlegel, H. B., Scuseria, G. E., Robb, M. A., Cheeseman, J. R., et al. (2009). Gaussian 09, Revision A.01 Wallingford, CT: Gaussian, Inc.
- Govoni, M. and Galli, G. (2018). GW100: Comparison of methods and accuracy of results obtained with the WEST code. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* 14, 1895–1909. doi:10.1021/acs.jctc.7b00952
- Guerra, M. (1990). On the use of diffuse functions for estimating negative electron affinities with LCAO methods. *Chemical Physics Letters* 167, 315–319. doi:10.1016/0009-2614(90)87174-P
- Haiduke, R. L. A. and Bartlett, R. J. (2018). Communication: Can excitation energies be obtained from orbital energies in a correlated orbital theory? *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 149, 131101. doi:10.1063/1.5052442
- Hedin, L. (1965). New method for calculating the one-particle GREEN's function with application to the electron-gas problem. *Physical Review* 139, A796. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.139.A796

- Hill, I., Kahn, A., Cornil, J., Dos Santos, D., and Brédas, J. (2000). Occupied and unoccupied electronic levels in organic π -conjugated molecules: comparison between experiment and theory. *Chemical Physics Letters* 317, 444–450. doi:10.1016/S0009-2614(99)01384-6
- Hirao, K., Chan, B., Song, J.-W., Bhattarai, K., and Tewary, S. (2020). Excitation energies expressed as orbital energies of Kohn–Sham density functional theory with long-range corrected functionals. *Journal of Computational Chemistry* 41, 1368–1383. doi:10.1002/jcc.26181
- Hohenberg, P. and Kohn, W. (1964). Inhomogeneous electron gas. *Physical Review* 136, B864. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.136.B864
- Hoyer, C. E., Ghosh, S., Truhlar, D. G., and Gagliardi, L. (2016). Multiconfiguration pair-density functional theory is as accurate as CASPT2 for electronic excitation. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* 7, 586–591. doi:10.1021/acs.jpclett.5b02773
- Hu, X., Hu, H., Zheng, X., Zeng, X., Wu, P., Peng, D., et al. (2020) QM⁴D, see <http://www.qm4d.info> for detailed information about the software package QM⁴D which uses combined quantum mechanics and molecular mechanics method to perform molecular dynamics simulations.
- Hybertsen, M. S. and Louie, S. G. (1986). Electron correlation in semiconductors and insulators: Band gaps and quasiparticle energies. *Physical Review B* 34, 5390. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.34.5390
- Ipatov, A., Cordova, F., Doriol, L. J., and Casida, M. E. (2009). Excited-state spin-contamination in time-dependent density-functional theory for molecules with open-shell ground states. *Journal of Molecular Structure: THEOCHEM* 914, 60–73. doi:10.1016/j.theochem.2009.07.036
- Jacquemin, D., Duchemin, I., and Blase, X. (2015). 0-0 energies using hybrid schemes: Benchmarks of TD-DFT, CIS(D), ADC(2), CC2, and BSE/GW formalisms for 80 real-life compounds. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* 11, 5340–5359. doi:10.1021/acs.jctc.5b00619
- Jacquemin, D., Duchemin, I., and Blase, X. (2017). Is the Bethe–Salpeter formalism accurate for excitation energies? Comparisons with TD-DFT, CASPT2, and EOM-CCSD. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* 8, 1524–1529. doi:10.1021/acs.jpclett.7b00381
- Janak, J. (1978). Proof that $\frac{\partial E}{\partial n_i} = \varepsilon_i$ in density-functional theory. *Physical Review B* 18, 7165. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.18.7165
- Jordan, K. D. and Burrow, P. D. (1978). Studies of the temporary anion states of unsaturated hydrocarbons by electron transmission spectroscopy. *ChemInform* 10, 341–348. doi:10.1021/ar50129a004
- Jordan, K. D. and Burrow, P. D. (1987). Temporary anion states of polyatomic hydrocarbons. *Chemical Reviews* 87, 557–588. doi:10.1021/cr00079a005
- Jordan, K. D., Voora, V. K., and Simons, J. (2014). Negative electron affinities from conventional electronic structure methods. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* 133, 1445. doi:10.1007/s00214-014-1445-1
- Kendall, R. A., Dunning Jr, T. H., and Harrison, R. J. (1992). Electron affinities of the first-row atoms revisited. Systematic basis sets and wave functions. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 96, 6796–6806. doi:10.1063/1.462569
- Knight, J. W., Wang, X., Gallandi, L., Dolgounitcheva, O., Ren, X., Ortiz, J. V., et al. (2016). Accurate ionization potentials and electron affinities of acceptor molecules III: A benchmark of GW methods. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* 12, 615–626. doi:10.1021/acs.jctc.5b00871
- Kohn, W. and Sham, L. J. (1965). Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation effects. *Physical Review* 140, A1133. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.140.A1133
- Körzdörfer, T., Parrish, R. M., Marom, N., Sears, J. S., Sherrill, C. D., and Brédas, J.-L. (2012). Assessment of the performance of tuned range-separated hybrid density functionals in predicting accurate quasiparticle spectra. *Physical Review B* 86, 205110. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.86.205110

- Laurent, A. D. and Jacquemin, D. (2013). TD-DFT benchmarks: A review. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* 113, 2019–2039. doi:10.1002/qua.24438
- Lee, C., Yang, W., and Parr, R. G. (1988). Development of the Colle-Salvetti correlation-energy formula into a functional of the electron density. *Physical Review B* 37, 785. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.37.785
- Li, C., Zheng, X., Cohen, A. J., Mori-Sánchez, P., and Yang, W. (2015). Local scaling correction for reducing delocalization error in density functional approximations. *Physical Review Letters* 114, 053001. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.053001
- Li, C., Zheng, X., Su, N. Q., and Yang, W. (2017). Localized orbital scaling correction for systematic elimination of delocalization error in density functional approximations. *National Science Review* 5, 203–215. doi:10.1093/nsr/nwx111
- Longo, R., Champagne, B., and Öhrn, Y. (1995). Electron propagator theory and application. *Theoretica Chimica Acta* 90, 397–419. doi:10.1007/BF01113544
- Louie, S. G. and Hybertsen, M. S. (1987). Theory of quasiparticle energies: Band gaps and excitation spectra in solids. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* 32, 31–44. doi:10.1002/qua.560320706
- Ma, F., Wang, Z., Guo, M., and Wang, F. (2020). Approximate equation-of-motion coupled-cluster methods for electron affinities of closed-shell molecules. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 152, 124111. doi:10.1063/1.5142736
- Mei, Y., Li, C., Su, N. Q., and Yang, W. (2018). Approximating quasiparticle and excitation energies from ground state generalized Kohn–Sham calculations. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* 123, 666–673. doi:10.1021/acs.jpca.8b10380
- Mei, Y. and Yang, W. (2019). Excited-state potential energy surfaces, conical intersections, and analytical gradients from ground-state density functional theory. *Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* 10, 2538–2545. doi:10.1021/acs.jpclett.9b00712
- Ng, L., Balaji, V., and Jordan, K. D. (1983). Measurement of the vertical electron affinities of cyanogen and 2,4-hexadiyne. *Chemical Physics Letters* 101, 171–176. doi:10.1016/0009-2614(83)87365-5
- Nooijen, M. and Bartlett, R. J. (1995). Equation of motion coupled cluster method for electron attachment. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 102, 3629–3647. doi:10.1063/1.468592
- Onida, G., Reining, L., and Rubio, A. (2002). Electronic excitations: Density-functional versus many-body Green-function approaches 74, 601
- Ortiz, J. V. (2013). Electron propagator theory: An approach to prediction and interpretation in quantum chemistry. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science* 3, 123–142. doi:10.1002/wcms.1116
- Parr, R. G. and Yang, W. (1984). Density functional approach to the frontier-electron theory of chemical reactivity. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 106, 4049–4050. doi:10.1021/ja00326a036
- Perdew, J. P., Burke, K., and Ernzerhof, M. (1996). Generalized gradient approximation made simple. *Physical Review Letters* 77, 3865. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.3865
- Perdew, J. P., Parr, R. G., Levy, M., and Balduz Jr, J. L. (1982). Density-functional theory for fractional particle number: Derivative discontinuities of the energy. *Physical Review Letters* 49, 1691. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.49.1691
- Perdew, J. P., Ruzsinszky, A., Csonka, G. I., Vydrov, O. A., Scuseria, G. E., Staroverov, V. N., et al. (2007). Exchange and correlation in open systems of fluctuating electron number. *Physical Review A* 76, 040501. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.76.040501
- Potts, D. M., Taylor, C. M., Chaudhuri, R. K., and Freed, K. F. (2001). The improved virtual orbital-complete active space configuration interaction method, a “packageable” efficient ab initio many-body

- method for describing electronically excited states. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 114, 2592–2600. doi:10.1063/1.1337053
- Puschig, P., Boese, A., Willenbockel, M., Meyer, M., Lüftner, D., Reinisch, E., et al. (2017). Energy ordering of molecular orbitals. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* 8, 208–213. doi:10.1021/acs.jpcclett.6b02517
- Ranasinghe, D. S., Margraf, J. T., Jin, Y., and Bartlett, R. J. (2017). Does the ionization potential condition employed in QTP functionals mitigate the self-interaction error? *Journal of Chemical Physics* 146, 034102–034102. doi:10.1063/1.4973727
- Rohlfing, M. and Louie, S. G. (2000). Electron-hole excitations and optical spectra from first principles. *Physical Review B* 62, 4927. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.62.4927
- Runge, E. and Gross, E. K. (1984). Density-functional theory for time-dependent systems. *Physical Review Letters* 52, 997. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.52.997
- Sanche, L. and Schulz, G. (1972). Electron transmission spectroscopy: Rare gases. *Physical Review A* 5, 1672. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.5.1672
- Santoro, F. and Jacquemin, D. (2016). Going beyond the vertical approximation with time-dependent density functional theory. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science* 6, 460–486. doi:10.1002/wcms.1260
- Schmidt, W. (1977). Photoelectron spectra of polynuclear aromatics. V. Correlations with ultraviolet absorption spectra in the catacondensed series. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 66, 828–845. doi:10.1063/1.433961
- Schreiber, M., Silva-Junior, M. R., Sauer, S. P., and Thiel, W. (2008). Benchmarks for electronically excited states: CASPT2, CC2, CCSD, and CC3. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 128, 134110. doi:10.1063/1.2889385
- Schulz, G. J. (1973). Resonances in electron impact on atoms. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 45, 378. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.45.378
- Silva-Junior, M. R., Schreiber, M., Sauer, S. P., and Thiel, W. (2008). Benchmarks for electronically excited states: Time-dependent density functional theory and density functional theory based multireference configuration interaction. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 129, 104103. doi:10.1063/1.2973541
- Slater, J. C. (1951). A simplification of the Hartree-Fock method. *Physical Review* 81, 385. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.81.385
- Slavicek, P. and Martinez, T. J. (2010). Ab initio floating occupation molecular orbital-complete active space configuration interaction: An efficient approximation to CASSCF. *Journal of Chemical Physics* 132, 234102–234102. doi:10.1063/1.3436501
- Stanton, J. F. and Bartlett, R. J. (1993). The equation of motion coupled-cluster method. A systematic biorthogonal approach to molecular excitation energies, transition probabilities, and excited state properties. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 98, 7029–7039. doi:10.1063/1.464746
- Su, N. Q., Mahler, A., and Yang, W. (2020). Preserving symmetry and degeneracy in the localized orbital scaling correction approach. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* 11, 1528–1535. doi:10.1021/acs.jpcclett.9b03888
- Thierbach, A., Neiss, C., Gallandi, L., Marom, N., Körzdörfer, T., and Görling, A. (2017). Accurate valence ionization energies from Kohn–Sham eigenvalues with the help of potential adjustors. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* 13, 4726–4740. doi:10.1021/acs.jctc.7b00490
- Tozer, D. J. and De Proft, F. (2005). Computation of the hardness and the problem of negative electron affinities in density functional theory. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* 109, 8923–8929. doi:10.1021/jp053504y

- Vargas, R., Garza, J., and Cedillo, A. (2005). Koopmans-like approximation in the Kohn-Sham method and the impact of the frozen core approximation on the computation of the reactivity parameters of the density functional theory. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* 109, 8880–8892. doi:10.1021/jp052111w
- Vosko, S. H., Wilk, L., and Nusair, M. (1980). Accurate spin-dependent electron liquid correlation energies for local spin density calculations: A critical analysis 58, 1200–1211
- Winter, N. O., Graf, N. K., Leutwyler, S., and Hättig, C. (2013). Benchmarks for 0–0 transitions of aromatic organic molecules: DFT/B3LYP, ADC (2), CC2, SOS-CC2 and SCS-CC2 compared to high-resolution gas-phase data. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* 15, 6623–6630. doi:10.1039/C2CP42694C
- Woon, D. E. and Dunning Jr, T. H. (1993). Gaussian basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. III. The atoms aluminum through argon. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 98, 1358–1371. doi:10.1063/1.464303
- Yang, W., Cohen, A. J., and Mori-Sánchez, P. (2012). Derivative discontinuity, bandgap and lowest unoccupied molecular orbital in density functional theory. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 136, 204111. doi:10.1063/1.3702391
- Yang, W. and Parr, R. G. (1985). Hardness, softness, and the fukui function in the electronic theory of metals and catalysis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 82, 6723–6726. doi:10.1073/pnas.82.20.6723
- Yang, W., Parr, R. G., and Pucci, R. (1984). Electron density, Kohn–Sham frontier orbitals, and Fukui functions. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 81, 2862–2863. doi:10.1063/1.447964
- Yang, W., Zhang, Y., and Ayers, P. W. (2000). Degenerate ground states and a fractional number of electrons in density and reduced density matrix functional theory. *Physical Review Letters* 84, 5172. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.5172
- Zhang, D., Yang, X., Zheng, X., and Yang, W. (2018). Accurate density functional prediction of molecular electron affinity with the scaling corrected Kohn–Sham frontier orbital energies. *Molecular Physics* 116, 927–934. doi:10.1080/00268976.2017.1382738
- Zhang, D., Zheng, X., Li, C., and Yang, W. (2015). Orbital relaxation effects on Kohn–Sham frontier orbital energies in density functional theory. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 142, 154113. doi:10.1063/1.4918347
- Zheng, X., Cohen, A. J., Mori-Sánchez, P., Hu, X., and Yang, W. (2011). Improving band gap prediction in density functional theory from molecules to solids. *Physical Review Letters* 107, 026403. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.026403
- Zheng, X., Li, C., Zhang, D., and Yang, W. (2015). Scaling correction approaches for reducing delocalization error in density functional approximations. *Science China Chemistry* 58, 1825–1844. doi:10.1007/s11426-015-5501-z
- Zheng, X., Zhou, T., and Yang, W. (2013). A nonempirical scaling correction approach for density functional methods involving substantial amount of Hartree–Fock exchange. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 138, 174105. doi:10.1063/1.4801922
- Ziegler, T., Rauk, A., and Baerends, E. J. (1977). On the calculation of multiplet energies by the Hartree-Fock-Slater method. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* 43, 261–271. doi:10.1007/BF00551551