Formulating Reduced Density Gradient Approaches for Noncovalent Interactions
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Abstract

This work elucidates several forms of reduced electron density gradient (RDG) to describe non-covalent interactions (NCIs). By interpreting the RDG as a local-moment function, we systematically leveraged Weizacker’s and Fermi’s local moments. This resulted in high-fidelity RDG representations consistent with the NCI analysis. In addition, the RDG version derived from the Lagrangian kinetic energy density is conveniently normalized. These results suggest the non-existence of a particular RDG
formulation when performing NCI analysis. Thus, an in-depth examination of the theoretical foundations connecting the RDG function with the nature of non-covalent interactions is necessary.

Introduction

Real-space functions have successfully connected empirical evidence with physical and chemical phenomena. In particular, electron density-based functions such as the electronic localization function (ELF) and the reduced gradient of the electron density (RDG) exemplify some of the most widely utilized physicochemical models for scrutinizing electronic structure properties, including chemical bonding, reactivity, and interaction energies. ELF’s bonding analysis has extensively provided fundamental mechanistic insights into electron rearrangements, cycloadditions, photoreactions, distinct covalent bonding scenarios, and pyrolytic processes. Additionally, this framework has proven instrumental in developing models to predict activation barriers of both organic and organometallic systems. Conversely, several indices have been proposed for studying atomic interactions in the DFT context, covering the weak-to-strong spectrum. The non-covalent interaction (NCI) index was elucidated to characterize the weak portion, the bonding and non-covalent index (BNI) was designed to describe the weak-to-moderate range, the strong covalent interaction (SCI) index was proposed to gain information on the moderate-to-strong interval, and the ultra-strong interaction (USI) index was derived to identify strong interactions. In particular, NCI analysis based on RDG has been diverse and impactful across various fields such as chemistry, biology, and material science, including systems in both the gas phase and solid state. Its main advantage lies in the fast characterization of non-covalent interactions based on the curvature of the electron density. Even the promolecular approach is compatible with RDG, allowing the study of large molecular systems. In this context, NCI has emerged as a popular tool for assessing properties of crystals, in drugs and materials discovery, testing electrochemical sensors, in biological studies, and investi-
gating racemization\textsuperscript{46} and organocatalytic mechanisms,\textsuperscript{47} as well as exploring hydrogen\textsuperscript{48} and halogen bonds.\textsuperscript{49}

A prevalent issue in developing new scalar fields is \textit{the clarity of their physical foundations and formal derivation}. The well-known reduced electron density gradient \(s(r)\textsuperscript{50–53}\) exemplifies this situation:

\[
s(r) = \frac{1}{2(3\pi^2)^{1/3}} \frac{\nabla \rho(r)}{\rho(r)^{4/3}}
\]  

(1)

Notably, the nature of these interactions is characterized by the electron density curvature over regions defined by \(s(r)\). This dimensionless quantity was initially derived from the generalized gradient approximation (GGA)\textsuperscript{54,55} to fine-tune the performance of functionals:

\[
E[\rho]\textsuperscript{GGA} = \int d\mathbf{r} \epsilon\textsuperscript{LDA}X(\mathbf{r}) F\textsuperscript{GGA}(s)
\]  

(2)

Both \(\epsilon\textsuperscript{LDA}X\) and \(F\textsuperscript{GGA}(s)\) have a clear physical interpretation within the framework of density functional theory (DFT).\textsuperscript{56,57} However, no relationship between NCI and RDG can be anticipated. Indeed, the nonexistence of a formal demonstration connecting RDG with the physicochemistry of NCI has led to misinterpretations\textsuperscript{58} and algebraic modifications of RDG\textsuperscript{59} lacking physical rigor. On the other hand, \(s(r)\) contributes to estimating energy rather than describing the physics of NCIs directly. For DFT applications, \(s(r)\) is crucial as it effectively incorporates the inhomogeneity of the electron density into the exchange-correlation functionals.\textsuperscript{60} Extracting \(s(r)\) from the energy density functional \(E[\rho]\textsuperscript{GGA}X\) and its further use as an NCI descriptor raises challenging questions: (i) Does \(s(r)\) represent a property of a quantum system? No. Despite its dependence on the observable \(\rho\), \(s(r)\) does not inherently represent fundamental physical quantities like momentum or energy as it is unlinked to a quantum observable. (ii) Is the RDG based on realistic physicochemical models? To some extent. The RDG can be written as an algebraic relationship between kinetic energy densities (KED).\textsuperscript{61–65} as follows:
Contreras and coworkers\textsuperscript{52,53} found this relation between $s(r)$ and the Von Weizsacker (WZ)\textsuperscript{66–69} $\tau_W(r)$ and Thomas-Fermi (TF)\textsuperscript{70–72} $\tau_{TF}(r)$ KEDs. The first KED describes a bosonic system, while the other represents a gas of non-interacting electrons. The nexus between $s(r)$ and KEDs is evidenced by equation (3). It is worth mentioning that $\tau_W(r)$ and $\tau_{TF}(r)$ are derived from physical models under ideal considerations. The WZ model was initially conceived to correct the significant overestimation in the kinetic energy density of molecular systems given by the TF model.\textsuperscript{56} One might assume that, due to the direct dependence of $s(r)$ on $\rho(r)$, it would suffice to solve any N-electron problem and obtain a high-quality density in order to calculate $s(r)$ regardless of the level of theory (e.g., DFT, MP2, CASSCF, CCSD, and MRCI). Nevertheless, issues inherent to the descriptions provided by either $\tau_W(r)$ or $\tau_{TF}(r)$ are encapsulated within $s(r)$.

(iii) Considering the arbitrary use of RDG to describe non-covalent interactions, is there space for conceptual improvements? Yes. More accurate energies are obtained using DFT by a linear combination of WZ and TF, $\alpha \tau_{TF}(r) + \beta \tau_{WZ}(r)$.\textsuperscript{54–56,64,68} This entails the feasible derivation of new forms of $s(r)$, which poses concerns about its uniqueness and optimal expression for describing NCIs. These challenges will remain open to further investigations that must focus on establishing $s(r)$ as a quantum property. This manuscript discusses the conceptual limitations of the original RDG and proposes alternative ways of designing this function to perform NCI analysis, stressing that the RDG should not be restricted to one type of computation. By exploring the direct relationship between $\tau(r)$ and $s(r)$, we improve the description provided by $s(r)$ by refining the $\tau(r)$, with particular emphasis on $\tau_{TF}(r)$ and $\tau_{WZ}(r)$. Furthermore, the suitability of various representations of $\tau_{TF}^n(r)$ and $\tau_{WZ}^n$ to construct $s(r)$ is assessed. The performance of the derived RDG in characterizing non-covalent interactions is also evaluated.
Methodology

We have carefully considered several corrections to $\tau_{TF}(r)$ and $\tau_{WZ}(r)$\textsuperscript{67,69} to derive the new forms of $s(r)$, as KEDs are the most challenging component to model in the DFT domain:

\begin{equation}
\tau_{WZ}^1(r) = \frac{1}{9} \tau_{WZ}(r) \tag{4}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\tau_{TF}^1(r) = \left(1 - \frac{C}{N^{1/3}}\right) \tau_{TF}(r) \tag{5}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\tau_{TF}^2(r) = \left(1 - \frac{2}{N}\right) \left(1 - \frac{C_0}{N^{1/3}} - \frac{C_1}{N^{2/3}}\right) \tau_{TF}(r) \tag{6}
\end{equation}

In equation (4), $\tau_{WZ}^1$ is the Weizacker kinetic energy density derived from the power series expansion of the kinetic energy functional, which has demonstrated good performance within the framework of GGA.\textsuperscript{55,73} Conversely, $\tau_{TF}^1$ and $\tau_{TF}^2$ represent the adjustments made to the Thomas-Fermi kinetic energy density by Acharya and Gazquez, respectively.\textsuperscript{67,69} $C$, $C_0$, and $C_1$ represent numerical constants with values 1.412, 1.015, and 0.150, respectively.

It is widely recognized that $\tau(r)$ is typically used to describe chemical bonding rather than non-covalent interactions. Thus, we have opted to define $s(r)$ using Cohen’s notation\textsuperscript{74} for local moments, contrary to KED notation:

\begin{equation}
s^1(r) = \frac{|P_{WZ}(r)|}{P_{TF}(r)} \tag{7}
\end{equation}

where $P_{WZ}(r)$ is the local monoelectronic momentum,\textsuperscript{75,76} hereafter referred to as Weizacker’s momentum. Additionally, $P_{TF}(r)$ represents Thomas-Fermi’s momentum. This paper considers also the following expressions for $s(r)$:

\begin{equation}
s^2(r) = \frac{1}{6} \frac{P_{WZ}(r)}{P_{TF}(r)} \tag{8}
\end{equation}
\[ s^3(r) = \frac{1}{6} \frac{P_{WZ}(r)}{\sqrt{(1 - \frac{C}{N^{1/3}}) P_{TF}(r)}} \quad (9) \]

\[ s^4(r) = \frac{1}{6} \frac{P_{WZ}(r)}{(1 - \frac{2}{N}) (1 - \frac{C_0}{N^{1/3}} + \frac{C_1}{N^{2/3}}) P_{TF}(r)} \quad (10) \]

These equations resulted from approximations for \( \tau_{TF}(r) \) and \( \tau_{WZ}(r) \), and can be found in the available literature.\(^{55,56,64,68}\) Detailed information regarding the derivation of \( s^n(r) \) is available in the Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI). It is crucial to emphasize that these models are conceptually more robust than both the Thomas-Fermi and Weizacker derivations. The 1/6 term added to \( P_{WZ}(r) \) comes from the gradient expansion performed on \( T[\rho] \), since it has been shown that the combination \( \frac{1}{6} T_{WZ}[\rho] + T_{TF}[\rho] \) best approximates the kinetic energy in DFT.\(^{56,71,73}\) Also, the electron-number-dependent terms \( (N) \) included in \( s^3(r) \) and \( s^4(r) \) correct for the excess kinetic energy contained in \( T_{WZ} \). This correction is particularly relevant in the region where \( \rho(r) \) is a function that varies slowly with the distance to the nucleus.

Using the well-established \( s^1(r) \) as a reference, we have re-examined systems previously characterized through the NCI methodology of Contreras et al.,\(^{51}\) including the water dimer, benzene dimer, methane dimer, and adenine-thymine nitrogen base pair, among others. To enhance the applicability of our RDG version, we performed NCI analysis on a DNA fragment using promolecular densities. More detailed information can be found in the supplementary information. Additionally, we discuss the performance of \( s^n(r) \) concerning other RDG applications, such as calculating the charge associated with noncovalent interactions and chemical bonding analysis. This study was carried out using a modified version of the Multi-wavefunction Analyzer (Multiwfn),\(^{77}\) which incorporates small Fortran subroutines specifically designed for this purpose. Information regarding the subroutines is available upon reasonable request from the authors.
Results and discussion

Despite the widespread use of NCI analysis based on $s(r)$, criticism regarding its fundamental nature has been relatively neglected in non-covalent interaction scenarios. Figure 1 illustrates the values of $s^n(r)$ for bicyclo[2.2.2]octane and both methane and water dimers. These molecules exhibit the three most common types of interactions—van der Waals interactions, hydrogen bonds, and repulsive interactions—typically identified through RDG analysis.

![Figure 1](https://doi.org/10.26434/chemrxiv-2024-bgpj2-v2)

**Figure 1**: $s^n(r)$ for the methane dimer (Panel a), the water dimer (Panel b), and bicyclo[2.2.2]octane (Panel c), showing that low values of $s^n(r)$ correlate with regions where $\rho(r)$ varies slowly. It is worth mentioning that $s^1(r) = s(r)$.

The description provided by $s^1(r)$ and $s^n(r)$ follows the same trend. Particularly, near the nuclear positions associated with C, O, and H atoms, as well as intermolecular regions where weak interactions typically occur. However, $s^2(r)$, $s^3(r)$, and $s^4(r)$ exhibit smaller values compared to $s^1(r)$ due to the correction on $\tau_{TF}(r)$ and $\tau_{WZ}(r)$, which are reflected by the local momentum behavior. This means that the critical points of $s^n(r)$ are associated with regions where $\nabla \rho(r) \to 0$. Consequently, in regions of low $s^n(r)$ the $\rho(r)$ varies slowly, which is frequently assumed when interpreting RDG.

While $s^n(r) \leq s^1(r)$, the optimal formulation of $s(r)$ for characterizing non-covalent interactions remains an open question. Exploring a potential solution involves delving into
the theoretical framework of DFT. It is essential to bear in mind that, despite \( s(r) \) exhibiting a general dependence on \( \rho(r) \), it is inseparable from the N-electron problem from which it originated. It is a well-established fact that the accuracy of GGA functionals relies heavily on the convergence of the gradient expansion, particularly as it diverges for terms of higher order \((n > 4)\).\(^{55}\) This divergence leads to issues in estimating energy and, consequently, results in poorly-behaved electron densities. Thus, it is imperative to ensure that the regions bounded by the function \( s(r) \) are adequately defined, ensuring a well-behaved electron density \( \rho(r) \). It is worth emphasizing that the qualitative description of NCI analysis unequivocally depends on the curvature of \( \rho(r) \). As such, precision and rigor in defining \( \rho(r) \) are essential for a meaningful NCI analysis. It is necessary to explore the limit condition associated with the NCI model.

Figure 2: In Panel a, \( s^1(r) \) tends to the unity for \( \text{Cl}_1 \cdots \text{Cl}_4 \) distances greater than 3.5 Å. This indicates the regions where gradient expansions can lead to convergence issues. In Panel b, \( s^4(r) \) displays the highest sensitivity, although all the functions show a similar trend for the \( \text{Cl}_2 \) dimer. It is worth noting that \( s^1(r) = s(r) \).

The \( \text{Cl}_2 \cdots \text{Cl}_2 \) dimer is a suitable system for exploring the \( s(r) \to \infty \) as \( \rho(r) \to 0 \) relationship, as depicted in Figure 2. This suggests that in regions of low electron density, the disparities between \( P_{WZ}(r) \) and \( P_{TF}(r) \) would be negligible, thereby precluding the emergence of an asymptotic behavior of \( s(r) \). Nevertheless, such a conclusion overlooks
the relevance of NCIs concerning long-range domains involving low electron densities. \( s^1(\mathbf{r}) \) augments as the Cl-Cl distance increases, tending to the unity for distances greater than 3.5 Å. This result is particularly relevant since high values of \( s^1(\mathbf{r}) \) are associated with problems in gradient expansion in the DFT context, where this function behaves poorly.

The inequality:

\[
\frac{\nabla \rho(\mathbf{r})}{2C_F \rho(\mathbf{r})^{4/3}} < 1
\]

(11)

gives the necessary condition for the convergence of the gradient expansion, which is essential for high-quality kinetic energy functionals.\(^{60}\) Diverging values correspond to unreliable electron densities. Regardless of the method used to calculate \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \), the function \( s^1(\mathbf{r}) \) continues to represent the inherent strengths or limitations of the model from which it is elucidated. In this context, the analysis of long-range interactions using the most popular version of RDG questions the physical source of \( s(\mathbf{r}) \)’s high values as \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \to 0 \).

Moreover, the fulfillment of the following condition is also relevant in regions where \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \) exhibits slow variation:\(^{60}\)

\[
\frac{\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{r})}{2C_F \rho(\mathbf{r})^{1/3} \nabla \rho(\mathbf{r})} \ll 1
\]

(12)

Domains delimited by \( s(\mathbf{r}) \) should be restricted and/or scrutinized using \( q(\mathbf{r}) \). \( q(\mathbf{r}) \) is critical in addressing inhomogeneities in the electron gas and defining the convergence of the KED gradient expansion. The Cl\(_2\) dimer unveils a surprising correlation between \( s^n(\mathbf{r}) \) and \( q(\mathbf{r}) \), particularly \( q(\mathbf{r}) \) tends to 1 as \( s^1(\mathbf{r}) \) approaches this value; see Figure 3.

Conversely, the values of \( q(\mathbf{r}) \) are closer to 0.5 for \( s^2(\mathbf{r}) \), \( s^3(\mathbf{r}) \), and \( s^4(\mathbf{r}) \). This indicates the NCIs description provided by these new functions is more fine-tuned, as they delimit regions matching equation (12) better than the popular \( s(\mathbf{r}) \). Consequently, future NCI analysis must consider the \( q(\mathbf{r}) \) criterion. The versions of \( s(\mathbf{r}) \) proposed in this manuscript are better suited to satisfy inequalities (12) and (13), potentially signifying a conceptual
advancement in the NCI analysis within the RDG framework.

Figure 4 presents a classical 2D NCI diagram for the Adenine-Thymine (AT) dimer, which allows assessing the performance of the proposed functions in distinguishing between repulsive and attractive interactions according to the sign of the second eigenvalue ($\lambda_2$) of the Hessian matrix of the electron density. A similar pattern is observed in the description provided by both the new, i.e., $s^2(r)$, $s^3(r)$, and $s^4(r)$ regarding the interactions in AT. As expected, steric effects associated with the 5- and 6-membered rings show repulsive character in regions bounded by $s^n(r)$. Peaks of $s^n(r)$ correspond to hydrogen bridges $\text{O} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{H}$ formed between the carbonyl and amino groups, which appear in domains where $\lambda_2 < 0$. van der Waals’ interactions between the adenine and thymine units are associated with values of $\lambda_2 \simeq 0$. Notably, the expression $s^1(r) > s^n(r)$ holds for the A-T dimer. These results emphasize the robustness of modified versions of the RDG concerning NCI analysis.

As for the physical relevance of the regions defined by the RDG, methods other than partitioning the molecular space based on the gradient field of $s(r)$ have been explored so far. The zero-flux condition $s(r) \cdot n(r) = 0$ might allow bounding volumes associated with NCIs
Figure 4: NCI diagrams for the adenine-thymine dimer. Notably, the new functions $s^2(r)$ (Panel b), $s^3(r)$ (Panel c), and $s^4(r)$ (Panel d) show lower values than $s(r)$. It is worth mentioning that $s^1(r) = s(r)$.

$(\Omega_{NCI})$. Therefore, providing a definition of $\Omega_{NCI}$ that complies with the virial theorem is a topic open to discussion. Although gauging this theorem to derive quantitative indices from properties such as volume is beyond the scope of NCI analysis, it plays a relevant role in defining $\Omega_{NCI}$. The virial theorem has the local form:

\[
\int_\Omega 2G(r) + V(r) - \frac{1}{4} \nabla^2 \rho(r) = 0 \quad (13)
\]

The symbols $G(r)$ and $V(r)$ denote the local kinetic energy density and the local potential energy density, respectively. Figure 5 illustrates $\Omega_{NCI}$ for different non-covalent interactions associated with H$_2$S ··· HCl, H$_4$C ··· HF, C$_2$H$_2$ ··· C$_2$H$_4$, and H$_2$O ··· H$_3$N. The numerical integration of equation (13) over these regions shows that $\Omega_{NCI}$ derived from the proposed $s^n(r)$ fulfill the virial theorem, as presented in Table 1.

Although these outcomes may be promising, they do not constitute rigorous proof of the local virial form fulfillment, meaning that further studies are needed. The asymptotic behavior of $s(r)$ as $\rho(r)$ approaches 0 does not necessarily reflect a physical situation inherent
to molecular interactions. Indeed, \( s(\mathbf{r}) \) should not tend to a finite value in the absence of such interactions. This evidences that \( s(\mathbf{r}) \) fails in fully incorporating NCI’s physics. The disparity between \( P_{WZ}(\mathbf{r}) \) and \( P_{TF}(\mathbf{r}) \) as \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \) approaches 0 is the origin of the asymptotic behavior of \( s(\mathbf{r}) \).

In modeling electronic structures using density functionals, the kinetic energy functional is defined in terms of Fermi and Weizacker KEDs. Thus, the following RDG form is proposed:

\[
\text{NRDG}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{P_{WZ}(\mathbf{r})}{P_{WZ}(\mathbf{r}) + P_{TF}(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{\lvert \nabla \rho(\mathbf{r}) \rvert}{\lvert \nabla \rho(\mathbf{r}) \rvert + C_F \rho(\mathbf{r})^{4/3}} \quad (14)
\]

In equation (14), the Fermi gas reference \( P_{TF}(\mathbf{r}) \) is replaced by the sum of local moments \( P_{WZ}(\mathbf{r}) \) and \( P_{TF} \) to incorporate a more realistic representation. This results in a
sionless NRDG(r), which is bounded between 0 and 1 and describes the inhomogeneity of the electron density at a specific point r within a molecular system. Unlike the unbounded RDG, NRDG allows evaluating the inhomogeneity portion of ρ(r) within P_{WZ}(r) rigorously. The NCI analysis using the NRDG(r) matches closely the derived from the classical version, as shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6: The proposed normalized RDG, NRDG, accurately describes the van der Waals and repulsive interactions for the benzene dimer indicated by the peaks at ρ(r) = 0.007 and ρ(r) = 0.02, respectively, (Panel a). The second eigenvalue of the Hessian matrix of the electron density further supports this result (Panel b).

The benzene dimer exhibits two types of interactions: i. the van der Waals interaction between the H atoms of one of the benzenes with the electronic cloud π of the remaining, which is evidenced by a peak at ρ(r) = 0.007, ii. the repulsive, associated with the ring strains and signaled by the peak ρ(r) = 0.02; see Figure 6, Panel a. These results can be derived from the curvature of NRDG(r) as well; see Figure 6, Panel b. The normalized RDG version allows incorporating suitable local functions τ_{WZ}(r) and τ_{TF}(r) to describe the slow and rapid variations of ρ(r).

To this point, we have shown the need to formulate new versions of the RDG by deriving local moments from more rigorous KEDs, i.e., the models of Weizacker and Fermi. As a subsequent step, the s^5(r) is derived from the local momentum representation, P_G(r) = \sqrt{\frac{2G(r)}{\rho(r)}}), of the Lagrangian kinetic energy density G(r), a more real-world KED.\(^6\text{1-63,81,82}\)
\[ s^5(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{P_{WZ}(\mathbf{r})}{P_G(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{|\nabla \rho(\mathbf{r})|}{2\sqrt{2\rho(\mathbf{r})G(\mathbf{r})}} \] (15)

It should be noted that the introduction of \( G(\mathbf{r}) \) in the RDG implies an explicit dependence on the orbitals rather than a dependence solely on \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \). Figure 7 presents an NCI analysis based on \( s^5(\mathbf{r}) \) for the uracil dimer. The plot of \( s^5(\mathbf{r}) \) versus \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \) shows characteristic peaks at low values of \( s^5(\mathbf{r}) \) (Figure 7, Panel a). Similar to the case of the popular \( s^1(\mathbf{r}) \), these interactions are classified as repulsive and attractive using \( \text{sgn}(\lambda_2(\mathbf{r}))\rho(\mathbf{r}) \) (Figure 7, Panels b and c).

Figure 7: The Lagrangian kinetic-derived, \( s^5(\mathbf{r}) \), provides a reliable picture of NIC interactions for the uracil dimer, evidenced by the peaks at low \( s^5(\mathbf{r}) \) (Panels a-c). Remarkably, \( s^5(\mathbf{r}) \) exhibits lower values than \( s^1(\mathbf{r}) \) for the C-C (Panel d), N-C (Panel e), and O-H (Panel f) internuclear distances. It is worth emphasizing that \( s^1(\mathbf{r}) = s(\mathbf{r}) \).

\( s^5(\mathbf{r}) \) and \( s^1(\mathbf{r}) \) provide a similar description for C-C (van der Waals interaction), N-C (steric interaction) and N-H (hydrogen bonding). Particularly, in regions where \( s^5(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \). However, \( s^5(\mathbf{r}) \) exhibits smaller values. The latter feature is desirable, as high values of \( s^1(\mathbf{r}) \) could limit regions where \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \) does not behave properly. The noticeable difference around the nuclei is expected as \( P_{TF}(\mathbf{r}) \) poorly describes the rapid changes in \( \rho(\mathbf{r}) \); in contrast to the representation provided by \( P_G(\mathbf{r}) \), which considers the specificities of the system,
bypassing thus the Fermi gas model. It is important to stress that the implementation of the Lagrangian local momentum into the RDG equation requires additional computational cost, as it exhibits orbital dependence.

The purpose of this manuscript is to demonstrate that the RDG can be written in several ways to describe NCIs, without replacing its current version, but rather to have alternatives for its calculation. In addition, the existence of these versions also brings into discussion its physical foundations since the uniqueness of the RDG in the analysis of molecular interactions does not hold. Our RDG formulations offer mainly conceptual improvements for characterizing noncovalent interactions. Alternative expressions, including \( s^2(r) \), \( s^3(r) \), \( s^4(r) \), and \( s^5(r) \), provide a more rigorous definition of NCI volumes and address normalization issues encountered in the original RDG framework. These formulations feature enhanced delineation of interaction volumes and normalization procedures that overcome non-physical behaviors. By revising the expressions for Weizacker and Fermi kinetic energies based on DFT framework, our approach ensures better alignment with physical models since corrected versions of such quantities are included within RDG equation.

Conclusions

The effectiveness of the popular reduced electron density gradient (RDG) in qualitatively characterizing non-covalent interactions (NCIs) is well-documented. However, challenges persist in interpreting its results and understanding its physical significance, mainly because it is arbitrarily extracted from the GGA formalism, lacking a mathematical demonstration that establishes its connection to the underlying physics of NCIs. We have shown the feasibility of enhancing RDG to identify a local function directly relevant to NCIs by modifying the local kinetic energy densities (KEDs). Therefore, new versions capable of characterizing the nature of NCIs were derived. Notably, refining the local moments based on the Weizacker and Thomas-Fermi KEDs yielded four well-founded RDG versions, providing high-quality results comparable with the established formulation. From a theoretical viewpoint, these
surprising findings indicate the non-existence of a unique way to define the RDG scalar field to characterize NCIs. Exploring other virial local relationships within RDG-defined volumes and quantities in GGA approximations could provide key insights, thereby deepening our understanding of using RDG to characterize non-covalent interactions.

Supporting Information

Derivation of $s^n(r)$; Isosurfaces of $s^1(r)$, $s^2(r)$, $s^3(r)$ and $s^4(r)$ for several molecular systems and DNA fragments.
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