Self-consistent charge embedding at very low cost, with application to symmetry-adapted perturbation theory
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ABSTRACT
Extended symmetry-adapted perturbation theory (XSAPT) uses a self-consistent charge embedding to capture many-body polarization, in conjunction with a pairwise-additive SAPT calculation of intermolecular interaction energies. The original implementation of XSAPT is based on charges that are fit to reproduce molecular electrostatic potentials, but this becomes a computational bottleneck in large systems. Charge embedding based on modified Hirshfeld atomic charges is reported here, which dramatically reduces the computational cost without compromising accuracy. Exemplary calculations are presented for supramolecular complexes such as C₆₀@C₆₀H₂₈, a DNA intercalation complex, and a 323-atom model of a drug molecule bound to an enzyme active site. The proposed charge embedding should be useful in other fragment-based quantum chemistry methods as well.

Quantum-based modeling of noncovalent interactions in sizeable supramolecular assemblies has become possible, thanks to increases in computing power, but hardware improvements alone are insufficient to tackle the complexes of interest in drug discovery, which often involve binding of ligands to proteins or DNA. A plethora of fragment-based quantum chemistry methods has emerged to address this issue by reducing the supersystem problem to a many-body problem involving relatively small fragments. Along these lines, our group has developed extended symmetry-adapted perturbation theory (XSAPT), an accurate and efficient monomer-based approach to compute intermolecular interaction energies that generalizes traditional SAPT-based energy decomposition analysis to the case of more than two monomers. XSAPT combines traditional dimer SAPT with the explicit polarization or “XPol” method, using the latter to obtain the monomer wave functions. In this way, many-body polarization is included in the unperturbed wave functions by means of self-consistent electrostatic embedding. Considering closed-shell fragments for simplicity, the XPol energy expression is

$$E = \sum_A \left[ 2 \sum_n (c_A^n)^2 \left( \mathbf{h}^A + \mathbf{f}^A \right) c_A^n + E_{\text{mac}} \right] + E_{\text{embed}}. \quad (1)$$

The expression in square brackets represents the Hartree-Fock energy for monomer $A$, expressed in terms of “absolutely localized” molecular orbitals (MOs), $c_A^n$. The final term, $E_{\text{embed}}$, is the sum of electrostatic embedding energies involving wave function-derived point charges.

Variation of the energy expression in Eq. (1) within the absolutely localized ansatz affords a Fock matrix

$$F_A = f_A^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\beta=\delta=A} \sum_{b} q_b \left( I_b^{\mu\nu} \right) + \sum_{a \in A} \frac{\partial E_{\text{embed}}}{\partial q_a} \frac{\partial q_a}{\partial F_{\mu\nu}} \quad (2)$$

for monomer $A$. Here, $f_A^{\mu\nu}$ is the Fock matrix for the isolated monomer and

$$\left( I_b^{\mu\nu} \right) = \left\{ \phi_{\mu} \left| \frac{1}{|r - R_b|} \right| \phi_{\nu} \right\} \quad (3)$$

is a one-electron integral representing the electrostatic potential generated by the function pair $\phi_{\mu}(r)\phi_{\nu}(r)$ at the point $R_b$, which specifies the location of the atomic embedding charge $q_b$. We use the “SAPTO” energy formula, which describes the interaction energy through second order in the intermolecular perturbation,
In order to incorporate *intramolecular* electron correlation in an efficient fashion, we adopt the SAPT(KS) variant of this theory, where “KS” indicates that the MOs are obtained from Kohn-Sham density functional theory (DFT). This approach should not be confused with SAPT(DFT), in which the dispersion energy is computed using density susceptibilities obtained from Kohn-Sham response theory, as an alternative to the second-order expressions in Eq. (4). Second-order dispersion energies are especially sensitive to problems with the asymptotic behavior of the exchange-correlation (XC) functional, but it is possible to obtain dispersion energies that are no worse than their SAPT0 counterparts (based on Hartree-Fock theory), by using range-separated hybrid functionals that are tuned for each monomer. The other SAPT(KS) energy components are improved relative to SAPTO.

XSAPT approximates the total interaction energy by pairwise application of Eq. (4), with non-pairwise-additive polarization effects included implicitly in the unperturbed XPol wave functions. The SAPTO formula can also be corrected for nonadditive dispersion. The electrostatics, exchange, induction, and exchange-induction contributions to Eq. (4) can be evaluated at \( O(N^5) \) cost, but the dispersion and exchange-dispersion terms scale as \( O(N^4) \) and \( O(N^5) \), respectively. These are also the least accurate parts of a SAPTO or SAPT(KS) calculation, so we usually replace them with either *ab initio* atom–atom dispersion potentials (*+aID*) or self-consistently screened many-body dispersion (MBD).

Construction of the XPolFock matrix in Eq. (2) requires a prescription for how the embedding charges are to be derived from the monomer wave functions. For this, we have used “ChElPG” charges that are fit to reproduce the molecular electrostatic potential, evaluated on a real-space grid in regions beyond the atomic van der Waals radii. ChElPG charges are physically appealing, numerically stable, and afford good accuracy when used in XSAPT. However, the equations for the charge derivatives \( \partial q_a/\partial P_{\mu\nu} \) that appear in the monomer Fock matrices are quite complicated, and evaluation of these derivatives is costly. In fact, this quickly becomes the computational bottleneck for XSAPT calculations involving large monomers, e.g., the bucky- catcher/fullerene \((\text{C}_{60}@\text{C}_{60}H_{36})\) complex that is depicted in Fig. 1. In an XSAPT calculation for this complex, 35% of the computational time is spent in evaluating ChElPG charge derivatives.

In view of this, we sought an alternative way to perform the charge embedding and settled on “Charge Model 5” (CMS), which amounts to an empirical modification to Hirshfeld population analysis. Hirshfeld atomic charges are obtained from the molecular density by using a superposition of isolated-atom densities \( \langle \rho_a \rangle \) to define a weight function

\[
W_a(r) = \frac{\rho_a(r)}{\sum_b \rho_b(r)}
\]

for atom \( a \). The weight functions are then used to partition the molecular density \( \rho(r) \) into atomic contributions, with the Hirshfeld charge on atom \( a \) defined as

\[
q_a^{\text{Hirsh}} = Z_a - \int W_a(r) \rho(r) \, dr.
\]

These charges are sometimes considered to be too small, in the sense that the dipole moment obtained from them is smaller than the true dipole moment obtained from \( \rho(r) \), and CMS introduces an empirical modification to correct for this. We express this as

\[
q_a^{\text{CMS}} = q_a^{\text{Hirsh}} \rho(r) + q_a^v,
\]

where the empirical correction \( q_a^v \) depends on the atomic number \( Z_a \) and the molecular geometry but is independent of \( \rho(r) \).

The charge derivatives needed in Eq. (2) are

\[
\frac{\partial q_a^{\text{CMS}}}{\partial P_{\mu\nu}} = -\int W_a(r) \phi_i(r) \phi_j(r) \, dr.
\]

These integrals can be evaluated using the same numerical quadrature used to compute the XC contribution to the Fock matrix, but a naive implementation proves to be costly. Introducing a molecular quadrature grid consisting of points \( \{r_i\} \) and weights \( \{w_i\} \), we have

\[
\frac{\partial q_a^{\text{CMS}}}{\partial P_{\mu\nu}} = -\sum_i w_i W_a(r_i) \phi_i(r_i) \phi_j(r_i).
\]

The cost of this implementation scales with the number of atoms \( N_{\text{atoms}} \) and basis functions \( N_{\text{basis}} \) as \( O(N_{\text{atoms}} \times N_{\text{basis}} \times N_{\text{mol-Leb}}) \), where \( N_{\text{mol-Leb}} \) represents the number of Lebedev grid points that is required for accurate integration of \( \rho(r) \). For typical quadrature
grids, this number ranges from \( \approx 3800 \) points per atom (low-quality, SG-1) to 15,000–19,000 points per atom (high quality, SG-3). In contrast, the cost to evaluate ChElPG charge derivatives scales as \( \mathcal{O}(N_{\text{atoms}} \times N_{\text{basis}} \times N_{\text{ESP-grid}}) \), where \( N_{\text{ESP-grid}} \) represents the number of electrostatic potential grid points. Because the ChElPG procedure fits only to the long-range, slowly-varying parts of the electrostatic potential, it is possible to make \( N_{\text{ESP-grid}} \ll N_{\text{mol-Leb}} \), especially if atom-centered Lebedev grids are used in the ChElPG algorithm.\(^3\),\(^4\) (For example, \( N_{\text{ESP-grid}} = 3044 \) for the \( \text{C}_{60}\text{@C}_{60}\text{H}_{32} \) calculations reported in Fig. 1, using the Lebedev-based ChElPG algorithm described in Ref. 37.) In this case, no actual cost savings are realized by replacing ChElPG charges with CM5 charges.

That said, the cost to implement Eq. (9) can be reduced dramatically by recognizing that the integrand vanishes as \( r \) moves away from \( \mathbf{r}_a \), the position of nucleus \( a \). This occurs both because the free-atom density \( \rho_0(r) \) vanishes in this limit, and also because the basis functions \( \phi_i(r) \) and \( \phi_j(r) \) must both be associated with atom \( a \), else \( \partial \delta q_a / \partial P_{\mu} \equiv 0 \). This implies that both \( \phi_i(r) \) and \( \phi_j(r) \) decay to zero as \( r \) moves away from \( \mathbf{r}_a \). As such, the integral required to compute this derivative can be evaluated accurately and efficiently using just the atom-centered grid for \( a \), not the entire molecular grid. In effect, we restrict the summation in Eq. (9) to just those grid points \( i \in a \). This reduces the cost of the CM5 charge derivatives to \( \mathcal{O}(N_{\text{atoms}} \times N_{\text{basis}}^2 \times N_{\text{atom-Leb}}) \), which is essentially the same as the cost of the XC quadrature step in a DFT calculation.

The accuracy of the atomic-grid implementation of Eq. (9) has been tested by computing XSAPT interaction energies for the S\( ^{22} \) data set.\(^5\) The maximum deviation (with respect to an implementation that uses the full molecular quadrature grid) is 0.02 kcal/mol, with no systematic deviation, and the total molecular charge is conserved to within \( \sim 10^{-5} \) e. Figure 1 presents a timing comparison for the CM5-based implementation of XSAPT as compared to the original ChElPG-based implementation,\(^6\) as applied to \( \text{C}_{60}\text{@C}_{60}\text{H}_{32} \). The time required to compute charge derivatives \( \partial q_a / \partial P_{\mu} \) has been reduced from 16.7 h to 2.0 h, and even larger speedups are anticipated as the system size increases, since \( N_{\text{ESP-grid}} \) increases with molecular size but \( N_{\text{atom-Leb}} \) does not. A secondary cost reduction reflected in the timing data stems from improved multithreading of the repeated matrix multiplications required for the basis transformation or “pseudocanonicalization” step.\(^7\) This transformation represents an alternative to using the dimer basis to compute the monomer wave functions,\(^8\),\(^9\) as is often done in dimer SAPT calculations but which becomes ill-defined in XSAPT calculations involving more than two monomers.\(^1\) Together, these improvements alter the nature of the bottleneck in large XSAPT calculations, which are now dominated by the more traditional parts of the self-consistent field calculations that comprise the XPol step.

The remainder of this work documents the accuracy of the new CM5-based implementation of XSAPT. We first consider the standard S\( ^{22} \) and S\( ^{66} \) data sets, which consist of dimers of charge-neutral molecules, along with the ion–molecule hydrogen bonding (IMHB) data set of Rezác and Hobza,\(^10\) and an ion-pair data set from Lao and Herbert.\(^1\) Error statistics for both CM5- and ChElPG-based implementations of XSAPT, as compared to the benchmark interaction energies for each data set, are listed in Table 1. Both charge schemes provide comparable results for S\( ^{22} \) and S\( ^{66} \), but significant differences are observed where ions are involved. For the IMHB data set, the largest absolute deviation between CM5- and ChElPG-based XSAPT interaction energies occurs in the case of the imidazolium...methyleneimine complex. Here, the charge difference \( |q_a - q_c| \) between the heavy atoms in methyleneimine is an unrealistically large 2.3 e in the case of ChElPG charges, vs only 0.5 e for CM5 charges. For the ion-pair data set, the largest deviation is found in the complex of \( \text{Cl}^- \) with dimethyl ethyl amine, where the ChElPG atomic charges result in bond dipoles whose positive ends point toward the nitrogen atom, whereas in the CM5 case they point away.

These observations bring to mind a frequent criticism of ChElPG charges, at least when it comes to their use in force-field parameterization, which is that the ChElPG procedure may sacrifice chemically intuitive atomic partial charges in the interest of better fitting the molecular electrostatic potential.\(^1\) This problem becomes more severe for large molecules with “buried” atoms whose ChElPG charges may be devoid of any chemical significance whatsoever. Related to this is an unwanted conformational dependence of the ChElPG charges.\(^1\) We have previously considered these criticisms not to be relevant in the context of XSAPT, since we have no interest in the atomic partial charges per se, beyond their ability to reproduce the electrostatic potential. However, it appears that for monomers with net charge, the CM5 procedure affords both more intuitive atomic charges and smaller errors in intermolecular interaction energies. That said, a recent study of various wave function-derived charge models concluded that CM5 charges were slightly less accurate than ChElPG charges for describing strong electrostatic interactions.\(^1\) The reasons for this discrepancy (as compared to the present results) are unclear.

We next examine the performance of CM5-based XSAPT in different basis sets. Table II shows mean unsigned errors (MUEs) for several different data sets containing ionic monomers.\(^1\) These include the AHB21 and CHB6 data sets in which one monomer is an anion or a cation, respectively, and also the IL16 data set consisting of ion-pairs that are common constituents of room-temperature ionic liquids. These systems are rather small, and perhaps for that reason the XSAPT results converge already in the aug-cc-pVDZ basis set. A more detailed breakdown can be found...
TABLE II. XSAPT error statistics for several data sets from Ref. 48 that contain ionic monomers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis set</th>
<th>MUE (kcal/mol)</th>
<th>AHB21</th>
<th>CHB6</th>
<th>IL16</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CM5</td>
<td>ChElPG</td>
<td>CM5</td>
<td>ChElPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc-pVDZ</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jun-cc-pVDZ</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aug-cc-pVDZ</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc-pVTZ</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aug-cc-pVTZ</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>def2-TZVPP</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>def2-TZVPDD</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in Tables S7–S9 of the supplementary material, and these data reveal that the difference between the CM5 and ChElPG charges is marginal for the AHB21 and CHB6 data sets but quite pronounced for IL16, where both monomers are ions. Note that ChElPG charges have occasionally been used as a metric for intermolecular charge transfer, e.g., in ionic liquids, but this seems rather dubious in view of the unphysical values that we sometimes encounter in ionic systems.

The S30L data set consists of 30 sizable host/guest complexes, including the C\(_{60}\)@C\(_{60}\)H\(_{28}\) complex in Fig. 1 that we have previously used to benchmark various versions of XSAPT. Our ChElPG-based implementation of XSAPT affords a MUE of 4.7 kcal/mol for S30L, which is competitive with the best-available quantum chemistry approaches, at reduced cost even as compared to supramolecular DFT. To give context to this MUE, note that the S30L benchmark interaction energies are back-corrected to the gas phase starting from experimental binding affinities measured in solution, and come with estimated uncertainties of 2–3 kcal/mol.

The CM5-based version of XSAPT affords a slightly lower MUE (4.1 kcal/mol) even while it accelerates the calculation of the C\(_{60}\)@C\(_{60}\)H\(_{28}\) interaction energy by nearly a factor of two!

![FIG. 2. Model systems for drug binding: (a) ellipticine/DNA intercalation complex (157 atoms) and (b) the indinavir molecule in a model of the HIV-2 binding pocket (323 atoms). In both cases, the drug molecule is shown in a ball-and-stick representation, while the rest of the system is depicted with a tubular representation.](image)

TABLE III. Interaction energies for the ligand/macromolecule complexes in Fig. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>DNA/ellipticine</th>
<th>HIV/indinavir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QMC(^a)</td>
<td>−33.6</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B97M-V (+counterpoise)</td>
<td>−41.3</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ωB97M-V (+counterpoise)</td>
<td>−43.7</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF-3c</td>
<td>−41.7</td>
<td>−132.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBEh-3c</td>
<td>−37.3</td>
<td>−119.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XSAPT+aiD3 (CM5)(^b)</td>
<td>−36.7</td>
<td>−106.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XSAPT+aiD3 (ChElPG)(^b)</td>
<td>−35.7</td>
<td>−103.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XSAPT+MBD (CM5)(^c)</td>
<td>−41.7</td>
<td>−125.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XSAPT+MBD (ChElPG)(^c)</td>
<td>−40.7</td>
<td>−123.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The XSAPT energy decomposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy component</th>
<th>Value (kcal/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E(_{\text{elst}})</td>
<td>−22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(_{\text{exch}})</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(_{\text{ind}})</td>
<td>−8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(_{\text{disp}})</td>
<td>−65.7 – 115.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBD+esDQ(^e)</td>
<td>−70.7 – 134.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)From Ref. 52.
\(^b\)def2-TZVPPD basis set.
\(^c\)def2-hpTZVPP basis set (Ref. 20).
\(^d\)Includes Axilrod-Teller-Muto (ATM) three-body dispersion (Ref. 21).
\(^e\)Many-body dispersion with effectively screened dipole–quadrupole dispersion (MBD+esDQ) model (Ref. 23).
describes dispersion by means of pairwise atom–atom dispersion potentials ("+atD3"), underestimates the interaction energy as compared to DFT, even when Axilrod-Teller-Muto (ATM) triatomic C6 dispersion corrections are included.21 The recently developed XSAPT+MBD method3 predicts an interaction energy in much better agreement with the DFT values. Most important from the standpoint of this work is the fact that both CheIEPG- and CM5-based versions of XSAPT predict interaction energies within 1.0 kcal/mol of one another. For reasons that are unclear, all of these methods overestimate the interaction energy as compared to a quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) estimate from Ref. 32.

A supramolecular DFT calculation on the HIV/indinavir complex (8346 basis functions using def2-TZVPPD) would strain our computational capabilities, but XSAPT calculations are quite feasible and are reported in Table III. As a sanity check, we have computed Eint for both ligand/macromolecule complexes using the semiempirical HF-3c14 and PBEh-3c15 methods, which perform reasonably well for supramolecular complexes despite their low cost.21 For the DNA/ellipticine complex, HF-3c predicts an interaction energy comparable to the DFT methods, while PBEh-3c underestimates this value. Assuming roughly the same behavior for the HIV/indinavir complex, we can say that XSAPT+MBD interaction energies seem reasonable while those obtained with XSAPT+atD3+ATM are underestimated. Note that these two XSAPT methods differ only in the dispersion energy, and so this comparison underscores the fact that nonadditive dispersion is even more important in the larger HIV/indinavir complex than it is in the smaller intercalation complex, despite the latter being a prototypical example of π-stacking.

In summary, we have adapted CM5 charge embedding for use with the XSAPT methodology, finding that it improves both the accuracy and the efficiency of the method, as compared to our original CheIEPG-based implementation. Where high-level ab initio benchmarks are available, interaction energies computed with CM5-based XSAPT are consistently a bit more accurate than CheIEPG-based results, when the constituent molecules are charge-neutral. For systems involving ions (and especially ion pairs), however, the CM5-based version improves the accuracy considerably, mainly by removing some outliers where the CheIEPG embedding charges adopt counter-intuitive values. This improvement iscoupled toa dramatic reduction in the cost of CM5-based XSAPT, reducing the time required to compute charge derivatives ∂Qa/∂Pμν by a factor of 8.4 for the Cs0@C60H28 complex. As a result, the charge-embedding terms no longer contribute appreciably to the cost of an XSAPT calculation, whereas previously these terms were a significant computational bottleneck.

CM5 (or other Hirshfeld-inspired atomic charge models67) will likely prove beneficial in other quantum chemistry methods that employ self-consistent charge embedding. For example, our group has recently reported a variational formulation of the generalized many-body expansion that underlies most fragment-based quantum chemistry approaches,7 which employs fragment Fock matrices identical to those in Eq. (2). Similar Fock matrices also arise in our CheIEPG-based formulation of Ewald summation for quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics (QM/MM) calculations under periodic boundary conditions.22,23 Evaluation of the charge derivatives ∂Qa/∂Pμν proves to be a serious bottleneck in calculation of the QM/MM-Ewald energy gradient,1 even when the QM region is relatively small, and work is underway to implement a CM5-based version of this method.

See supplementary material for errors in Eint for each individual system in the data sets.
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