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Time-dependent density functional theory (TDDFT) is presently enjoying enormous popularity in quantum chemistry, as a useful tool for extracting electronic excited state energies. This article explains what TDDFT is, and how it differs from ground-state DFT. We show the basic formalism, and illustrate with simple examples. We discuss its implementation and possible sources of error. We discuss many of the major successes and challenges of the theory, including weak fields, strong fields, continuum states, double excitations, charge transfer, high harmonic generation, multiphoton ionization, electronic quantum control, van der Waals interactions, transport through single molecules, currents, quantum defects, and, elastic electron-atom scattering.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Ground-state density functional theory [1–3] has become the method of choice for calculating ground-state properties of large molecules, because it replaces the interacting many-electron problem with an effective single-particle problem that can be solved much more quickly. It is based on rigorous theorems[1, 2, 4] and a hierarchy of increasingly accurate approximations, such as the local density approximation (LDA), generalized gradient approximations (GGA’s)[5–7], and hybrids of exact exchange with GGA[8]. For example, a recent ground-state calculation[9] for crambin (C_{203}H_{317}N_{55}O_{66}S_{6}), a small protein, using TURBOMOLE[10] on a 1.5 GHZ HP Itanium workstation took just 6h52m, extraordinarily fast for 2528 electrons. But, formally, ground-state density functional theory predicts only ground-state properties, not electronic excitations.

On the other hand, time-dependent density functional theory (TDDFT)[11–15] applies the same philosophy to time-dependent problems. We replace the complicated many-body time-dependent Schrödinger equation by a set of time-dependent single-particle equations whose orbitals yield the same time-dependent density. We can do this because the Runge-Gross theorem[16] proves that, for a given initial wavefunction, particle statistics and interaction, a given time-dependent density can arise from at most one time-dependent external potential. This means that the time-dependent potential (and all other properties) is a functional of the time-dependent density.

Armed with a formal theorem, we can then define time-dependent Kohn-Sham (TDKS) equations that describe non-interacting electrons that evolve in a time-dependent Kohn-Sham potential, but produce the same density as that of the interacting system of interest. Thus, just as in the ground-state case, the demanding interacting time-dependent Schrödinger equation is replaced by a much simpler set of equations to propagate. The price of this enormous simplification is that the exchange-correlation piece of the Kohn-Sham potential has to be approximated.

The most common time-dependent perturbation is a long-wavelength electric field, oscillating with frequency ω. In the usual situation, this field is a weak perturbation on the molecule, and one can perform a linear response analysis. From this, we can extract the optical absorption spectrum of the molecule due to electronic excitations. Thus linear response TDDFT predicts the transition frequencies to electronic excited states and many other properties. This has been the primary use of TDDFT so far, with lots of applications to large molecules.

Figure 1 compares TDDFT and experiment for the electronic CD spectrum of fullerene \( (\mathcal{A})-C_{76} \). TDDFT calculations were performed with the BP86 functional and an augmented SVP basis set [17]. The RI-J approximation together with TZVP auxiliary basis sets [18] was used. Experimental data (in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\)) are from [19].

![Figure 1: TDDFT calculation and experiment for the electronic CD spectrum of fullerene \((\mathcal{A})-C_{76}\). TDDFT calculations were performed with the BP86 functional and an augmented SVP basis set [17]. The RI-J approximation together with TZVP auxiliary basis sets [18] was used. Experimental data (in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\)) are from [19].](image)

A random walk through some recent papers using TDDFT gives some feeling for the breadth of applications. Most are in the linear response regime. In inorganic chemistry, the optical response of many transition metal complexes [20–35] has been calculated, and even some X-ray absorption [36, 37]. In organic chemistry, heterocycles[38–43] among others[44–46] have been examined. Other examples include the response of thiouracil [47], s-tetrazine [48], and annulated porphyrins [49]. We also see TDDFT’s use in studying various fullerenes [50–55]. In biochemistry, TDDFT is finding many uses [56–66]. DNA bases are under examination, and an overview of their study may be found in Ref. [67]. In photobiology, potential energy curves for the trans-cis photo-isomerization of protonated Schiff base of retinal [68] have been calculated. Large calculations for green and blue fluorescent proteins have also been performed [69, 70]. Doing photochemistry with TDDFT [71], properties of chromophores [72–76] and dyes [77–83] have been computed. For these and other systems, there is great interest in charge-transfer excitations [84–92], but (as we later discuss) intermolecular charge transfer is a demanding problem for TDDFT.

Another major area of application is clusters, large and small, covalent and metallic, and everything in between [93–112], including Met-Cars [113]. Several studies include solvent effects [114–122], one example being the behavior of metal ions in explicit water [123]. TDDFT in linear response can also be used to examine chirality [124–127], including calculating both electric and magnetic circular dichroism [26, 128–132], and has been applied to both helical aromatics [133] and to artemisinin complexes in solution [134]. There have also been applications in materials [135, 136] and quantum dots [137] but, as discussed below, the optical response of bulk solids requires some non-local approximations [138].
Beyond the linear regime, there is also growing interest in second- and third-order response[139–142] in all these fields. In particular the field of non-linear optics has been heavily investigated[143–145], especially the phenomenon of two photon absorption[146, 146–153].

In fact, TDDFT yields predictions for a huge variety of phenomena, that can largely be classified into three groups: (i) the non-perturbative regime, with systems in laser fields so intense that perturbation theory fails, (ii) the linear (and higher-order) regime, which yields the usual optical response and electronic transitions, and (iii) back to the ground-state, where the fluctuation-dissipation theorem produces ground-state approximations from TDDFT treatments of excitations.

A. Overview

This work focuses primarily on the linear response regime. Throughout, we emphasize the difference between small molecules (atoms, diatomics, etc.) and the larger molecules that are of greater practical interest, where TDDFT is often the only practical first-principles method. We use naphthalene (C_{10}H_{8}) as an example to show how the selection of the basis set and of the XC functional affects excitation energies and oscillator strengths computed using TDDFT. Small molecules are somewhat exceptional because they usually exhibit high symmetry which prevents strong mixing of the KS states due to configuration interaction; also, basis set requirements are often exacerbated for small systems. Naphthalene is large enough to avoid these effects, yet reasonably accurate gas phase experiments and correlated wavefunction calculations are still available.

We use atomic units throughout (\(e^2 = \hbar = m_e = 1\)), so that all energies are in Hartrees (1 H\(\approx\)27.2 eV\(\approx\)627.5 kcal/mol) and distances in Bohr (\(\approx\)0.529 Å) unless otherwise noted. For brevity, we drop comma’s between arguments wherever the meaning is clear. In DFT and TDDFT, there is a confusing wealth of acronyms and abbreviations. Table I is designed to aid the readers navigation through this maze.

The content of this review is organized as follows. Sections II and III cover the basic formalism of the theory, that is needed to understand where it comes from, why it works, and where it can be expected to fail. Section IV is all about details of implementation, especially basis-set selection. On the other hand, section V is devoted to performance, and analyzing the sources of error in the basis-set limit. In section VI, we then look at a few atoms in microscopic detail: this is because we know the exact ground-state Kohn-Sham potential in such cases, and so can analyze TDDFT performance in great depth. Section VII is devoted to the many attempts to go beyond standard functional approximations, and especially discusses where such attempts are needed. The last substantial section, section VIII, covers topics outside the usual linear response approach to excitations, including ground-state functionals derived from TDDFT, challenges for strong fields, and transport through single molecules. Section IX is a summary.

II. GROUND-STATE REVIEW

In this section, we review ground state DFT rather quickly. For a more comprehensive review, we recommend [154]. Many of the results discussed here are referred to in later sections.

A. Formalism

Ground-state DFT is a completely different approach to solving the many-electron problem than the traditional solution of the Schrödinger equation. The Hohenberg-Kohn (HK) theorem[1] of 1964 states that for a given non-degenerate ground-state density \(n(r)\) of Fermions with a given interaction, the external potential \(v_{\text{ext}}(r)\) that produced it is unique (up to an additive constant). Hence if the density is known, then \(v_{\text{ext}}(r)\) is known and so \(\hat{H}\), the Hamiltonian, is known. From this and the number of particles (determined by the integral of the density), all properties of the system may be determined. In particular, the ground-state energy of the system \(E\) would be known. This is what we mean when we say these properties are functionals of the density, e.g., \(E[n]\). It was later shown that this holds even for degenerate groundstates[4], and modern DFT calculations use an analogous theorem applied to the spin densities, \(n_\alpha(r)\), \(n_\beta(r)\). Where \(\alpha, \beta = \pm \frac{1}{2}\) respectively.
The total energy for \( N \) electrons consists of three parts: the kinetic energy \( T[\Psi] \), the electron-electron interaction \( V_{ee}[\Psi] \), and the external potential energy \( V_{ext}[\Psi] \), each of which is defined below:

\[
T[\Psi] = \langle \Psi | -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \nabla_i^2 | \Psi \rangle ,
\]

\[
V_{ee}[\Psi] = \langle \Psi | \sum_{j \neq i}^{N} \frac{1}{|r_i - r_j|} | \Psi \rangle ,
\]

\[
V_{ext}[\Psi] = \langle \Psi | \sum_{i}^{N} v_{ext}(r_i) | \Psi \rangle .
\]

By the Rayleigh-Ritz principle:

\[
E = \min_{\Psi} \langle \Psi | \hat{H} | \Psi \rangle = \min_{\Psi} (T[\Psi] + V_{ee}[\Psi] + V_{ext}[\Psi]) .
\]

If we simply rewrite the minimization as a two step process[155]:

\[
E = \min_{n_\alpha, n_\beta} \left\{ \min_{\Psi \sim (n_\alpha, n_\beta)} (T[\Psi] + V_{ee}[\Psi] + V_{ext}[\Psi]) \right\} ,
\]

where the inner search is over all interacting wavefunctions yielding spin densities \( n_\alpha, n_\beta \). We may pull the last term out of the inner minimization:

\[
E = \min_{n_\alpha, n_\beta} \left( F[n_\alpha, n_\beta] + \sum_{\sigma} \int d^3r \, v_{ext,\sigma}(r) \, n_\sigma(r) \right)
\]

\[
= \min_{n_\alpha, n_\beta} (E[n_\alpha, n_\beta]) ,
\]

where

\[
F[n_\alpha, n_\beta] = \min_{\Psi \sim (n_\alpha, n_\beta)} (T[\Psi] + V_{ee}[\Psi])
\]

\[
= T[n_\alpha, n_\beta] + V_{ee}[n_\alpha, n_\beta] ,
\]

is a universal functional independent of \( v_{ext,\sigma}(r) \).

Minimizing the total energy density functional, Eq. (5), for both spin densities by taking the functional derivative \( \delta F / \delta n_\sigma \), and using the Euler-Lagrange multiplier technique leads to the equation:

\[
\frac{\delta F[n_\alpha, n_\beta]}{\delta n_\sigma} + v_{ext,\sigma}(r) = \mu ,
\]

where \( \mu \) is the chemical potential of the system.

Next we imagine a system of non-interacting electrons with the same spin densities. Applying the HK theorem to this non-interacting system, the potentials, \( v_{\sigma}(r) \), that give densities \( n_\sigma(r) \) as the ground-state spin densities for this system are unique. This is the fictitious Kohn-Sham (KS) system[2], and the fully interacting problem is mapped to a non-interacting one which gives the exact same density. Solving the KS equations, which is computationally simple (at least compared to the fully interacting problem which becomes intractable for large particle numbers), then yields the ground-state density. The KS equations are

\[
\left( -\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 + v_{\sigma}(r) \right) \phi_{\sigma}(r) = \epsilon_{\sigma} \phi_{\sigma}(r) ,
\]

with spin densities

\[
v_\sigma(r) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\sigma} |\phi_{\sigma}(r)|^2 ,
\]

where \( v_{\sigma_\alpha}, v_{\sigma_\beta} \) are the KS potentials and \( N_\sigma \) is the number of spin \( \sigma \) electrons, \( (N_\alpha + N_\beta = N) \).

In Fig 2, we plot the exact density for the He atom from a highly accurate wavefunction calculation, and below we plot the exact KS potential for this system. One can see that the KS potential is very different from the external potential. This is due to the fact that the KS single effective potential for the non-interacting system must give the correct interacting electron density. Because the coulomb repulsion between the electrons shields the nucleus, and makes the charge density decay less rapidly than \( e^{-4r} \), the KS potential is shallower than \( v_{ext}(r) \).

To derive an expression for \( v_{\sigma}(r) \) we note that the Euler equation that yields the KS equations is:

\[
\frac{\delta T_0[n_\alpha, n_\beta]}{\delta n_\sigma} + v_{\sigma}(r) = \mu .
\]

Here \( T_0 \) is the kinetic energy of the KS electrons,

\[
T_0 = \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{j=1}^{N_\sigma} \int d^3r \, \frac{1}{2} \left| \nabla \phi_{\sigma}(r) \right|^2 .
\]

If we rewrite \( F[n_\alpha, n_\beta] \) in terms of the KS system:

\[
F[n_\alpha, n_\beta] = T_0[n_\alpha, n_\beta] + U[n] + E_{XC}[n_\alpha, n_\beta] ,
\]

where \( U[n] \) is the Hartree energy, given by

\[
U[n] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma_\sigma'} \int d^3rd^3r' \, n_\sigma(r)n_{\sigma'}(r') \frac{\phi_\sigma(r)\phi_{\sigma'}(r')}{|r-r'|} ,
\]

and the exchange-correlation (XC) energy is defined by Eq. (7) and Eq. (12):

\[
\]

Inserting this into Eq. (8) and comparing to Eq. (11) gives a definition of the KS potential:

\[
v_{\sigma}(r) = v_{ext}(r) + v_{H}(r) + v_{XCS}(r) ,
\]
where the Hartree potential is the functional derivative of \( U[n] \):

\[
v_H(r) = \frac{\delta U[n]}{\delta n(r)} = \sum_{\sigma'} \int d^3 r' \frac{n_{\sigma'}(r')}{|r - r'|},
\]

while the XC potential is given by the functional derivative of the XC energy:

\[
v_{\text{XC}\sigma}(r) = \frac{\delta E[n_\alpha, n_\beta]}{\delta n_\sigma(r)}.
\]

This then closes the relationship between the KS system and the original physical problem. Once \( E_{\text{XC}}[n_\alpha, n_\beta] \) is known exactly or approximated, \( v_{\text{XC}\sigma}(r) \) is determined by differentiation. The KS equations can be solved self-consistently for the spin densities and orbitals, and the total energy found by inserting these into the total energy functional \( E = T + U + E_{\text{XC}} + V_{\text{ext}} \). Unfortunately \( E_{\text{XC}}[n_\alpha, n_\beta] \) is not known exactly and must be approximated. There exists a functional soup of many different approximations of varying accuracy and computational cost. Many of these are discussed in Section II B.

In Fig 2, when the KS equation is solved with this exact potential, the HOMO level is at \(-24.592 \text{ eV}\). This is minus the ionization energy for Helium. In exact DFT, Koopman’s theorem, which states \( I = -\epsilon_{\text{HOMO}} \), is exactly true[157]. In ground-state DFT, this is the only energy level of the fictitious KS system that has an immediate physical interpretation.

Before leaving the ground-state review, we mention the optimized effective potential (OEP) method[158, 159]. Here the XC functional is written as a functional of the KS orbitals (which in turn are functionals of the density). The exchange energy is then given by the familiar HF definition.

\[
E_X = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \sum_{\sigma} \int dr dr' \frac{\phi_i^{\sigma}(r) \phi_j^{\sigma}(r') \phi_j^{\sigma}(r) \phi_i^{\sigma}(r')}{|r - r'|}
\]

However in contrast to HF, a single effective potential \( v^{\text{XXS}}(r) \) is found via the chain rule. Accurate orbital dependent functionals for the correlation energy are extremely difficult to find, so often only exchange is used. In DFT, this is called exact exchange (EXX), since exchange is usually only treated approximately. EXX gives useful features such as derivative discontinuities and the correct asymptotic decay of the KS potential[160]. As we will see in Section V B, these are important for TDDFT linear response.

### B. Approximate Functionals

In any ground-state DFT calculation, we must use approximations for the functional dependence of the XC energy on the spin densities. There now exists a hierarchy of such approximations. The simplest of these is the local density approximation (LDA), where the XC energy at a point \( r' \) is calculated as if it were a uniform electron gas with the spin densities \( n_{\sigma} = n_{\sigma}(r') \) in a constant positive background. The exchange energy for the uniform gas can be deduced analytically, but the correlation contribution is found using a combination of many-body theory and highly accurate Monte Carlo simulations for the electron gas of different densities[161–164].

LDA works remarkably well, given the vast different between homogeneous electron gases and atoms or molecules. However total energies are generally underestimated. Typically the XC energy is underestimated by...
about 7%. When the performance of LDA is examined carefully, this comes about via a nice (but not completely accidental) cancellation of errors between the exchange part (underestimated by about 10%) and correlation (overestimated by 200% – 300%), which is typically 4 times smaller than exchange.

An obvious improvement to LDA would be to include information about how rapidly the density is changing via its gradient. This leads to the generalized gradient approximation (GGA). In the original Kohn-Sham paper of 1965, the simplest of these was suggested. The gradient expansion approximation (GEA) is found by examining the slowly varying limit of the electron

potential compared to the exact KS potential. While the poor potentials, at least far from nuclei. Fig.

3 illustrates this for the He atom, showing the LDA

potential is generally good in the region $r < 2$, it decays much too fast far from the nucleus. The true KS potential falls off as $-1/r$ whereas LDA decays exponentially. Hence the KS eigenvalues and eigenvalues will be poor for the higher levels. To understand why poor potentials do not imply poor energies (and why these potentials are not as bad as they look), see Ref. [170]. But, as we shall see in section V, this has major consequences for TDDFT.

Over the past decade, the technology for treating orbital-dependent functionals has developed, and such functionals help cure this problem[158]. This is called the optimized effective potential (OEP)[171–173]. The first useful orbital functional was the self-interaction corrected LDA of Perdew and Zunger[162]. More generally, the OEP method can handle any orbital-dependent functional including treating exchange exactly. Orbital-dependent functionals naturally avoid the self-interaction error that is common in density functionals. An (almost) exact implementation of the OEP equations is localized Hartree-Fock (LHF)[174, 175], available in TURBOMOLE[10].

C. Basis Sets

To actually solve the KS equations, the KS orbitals $\phi_{p\sigma}(r)$ are expanded in a finite set of basis functions $\chi_\nu(r)$,

$$\phi_{p\sigma}(r) = \sum_\nu C_{p\nu\sigma} \chi_\nu(r).$$  

(19)

The most common choice for the basis functions in quantum chemistry are atom-centered contracted Cartesian Gaussians[176],

$$\chi_\nu(r) = \sum_i c_i \varphi_i x_i^{l_x}(\nu) y_i^{l_y}(\nu) z_i^{l_z}(\nu) \left(1 - e^{-\zeta_{\nu}(r-R_\nu)^2}\right).$$  

(20)

$l_x(\nu)$, $l_y(\nu)$, and $l_z(\nu)$ are positive integers or zero, and $l(\nu) = l_x(\nu) + l_y(\nu) + l_z(\nu)$ is somewhat loosely called l-quantum number of $\chi_\nu$. (l = 0, 1, 2, 3, . . . corresponds to
TABLE II: Single-point calculations using PBE functional for the reaction energy for naphthalene combustion using PBE/TZVP/RI geometries. Reference value computed using standard enthalpies of formation (from NIST[178]) using thermal and ZVPE corrections at the PBE/TZVP/RI level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis set</th>
<th>Negative reaction energy (kcal/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>916.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV(P)</td>
<td>1060.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-31G*</td>
<td>1047.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVP</td>
<td>1108.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aug-SV(P)</td>
<td>1115.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZVP</td>
<td>1124.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZVPP</td>
<td>1131.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc-pVTZ</td>
<td>1129.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aug-TZVP</td>
<td>1130.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aug-TZVP/RI</td>
<td>1130.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QZVP</td>
<td>1140.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Value: 1216.3

s, p, d, f, . . . type Cartesian Gaussians.) The exponents \( \zeta_{\mu} \) and the contraction coefficients \( c_{\mu} \) are optimized in atomic calculations. Other common basis functions in use are Slater type orbitals, plane waves, or piecewise defined functions on a numerical grid.

The approximation of the orbitals \( \phi_{\mu\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \) by a finite linear combination of basis functions (also called LCAO, linear combination of atomic orbitals), Eq. (19), leads to a finite number of MOs. Thus, the KS equations and all derived equations are approximated by finite-dimensional matrix equations. These equations can be treated by established numerical linear and non-linear algebra methods. When the basis set size is systematically increased, the computed properties converge to their basis set limit.

In a finite basis set, all operators become finite matrices; the matrix elements are integrals, e.g.,

\[
H_{\mu\nu}[n] = \int d^3r \, \chi_{\mu}(\mathbf{r}) H_{\sigma}[n] \chi_{\nu}(\mathbf{r}).
\] (21)

The calculation and processing of such integrals is the main effort in virtually all DFT calculations. Gaussian basis functions have the distinct advantage that most integrals can be evaluated analytically, and that they are spatially local. The latter implies that many integrals vanish and need not be calculated. Whether a certain integral vanishes or not can be decided in advance by so-called pre-screening techniques[177].

To illustrate the effect of choosing various basis sets, we show in Fig. II, the reaction energy for naphthalene combustion in the gas phase:

\[
\text{C}_{10}\text{H}_8 + 12\text{O}_2 \rightarrow 10\text{CO}_2 + 4\text{H}_2\text{O}
\] (22)

The basis sets are listed in order of increasing size, and are well-know in quantum chemistry (and are described in detail in section IV). We see that hydrogen polarization functions (basis sets ending in P) are important, because C-H bonds are broken and O-H bonds are formed. Augmentation (aug-) with diffuse functions somewhat improves the smaller basis-set results, but is not economical in this case. Using the resolution of the identity for the Coulomb operator (RI) saves computational time, with no loss of accuracy. Reasonable results are found with SVP, but convergence improves all the way to TZVP. We can see after the TZVP result, the basis set error is below the functional error and the result is effectively converged. We have reached the stage where adding more orbitals, which increases the computational cost, is no longer going to drastically improve the result. (On the other hand, the crambin calculation mentioned in the introduction is very large and so only an SV(P) basis set could be used).

On first impression, comparison to the reference value indicates quite a large error, \( \Delta E = 76 \text{ kcal/mol} \). However, given that 48 electron pair bonds are broken and formed, the error per carbon atom, 7.6 kcal/mol, is typical for this functional.

III. TIME-DEPENDENT THEORY

In this section, we introduce all the basis elements of TDDFT, and how it differs from the ground-state case.

A. Runge-Gross theorem

The analog of the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem for time-dependent problems is the Runge-Gross theorem[16], which we state here. Consider \( N \) non-relativistic electrons, mutually interacting via the Coulomb repulsion, in a time-dependent external potential. The Runge-Gross theorem states that the densities \( n(\mathbf{r},t) \) and \( n'(\mathbf{r},t) \) evolving from a common initial state \( \Psi_0 = \Psi(t=0) \) under the influence of two external potentials \( v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r},t) \) and \( v'_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r},t) \) (both Taylor expandable about the initial time 0) are always different provided that the potentials differ by more than a purely time-dependent (t-independent) function:

\[
\Delta v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r},t) \neq c(t),
\] (23)

where

\[
\Delta v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r},t) = v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r},t) - v'_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r},t).
\] (24)

Thus there is a one-to-one mapping between densities and potentials, and we say that the time-dependent potential is a functional of the time-dependent density (and the initial state).

The theorem was proven in two distinct parts. In the first (RGI), one shows that the corresponding current densities differ. The current density is given by

\[
\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r},t) = \langle \Psi(t) | \mathbf{\hat{j}}(\mathbf{r}) | \Psi(t) \rangle
\] (25)
where
\[ j(r) = \frac{1}{2i} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (\nabla_j \delta(r-r_j) + \delta(r-r_j) \nabla_j) \] (26)

is the current density operator. The equation of motion for the difference of the two current densities gives[16]:
\[ \frac{\partial \Delta j(rt)}{\partial t} \bigg|_{t=0} = -n_0(r) \nabla \Delta v_{\text{ext}}(r,0) \] (27)

If the Taylor-expansion about \( t = 0 \) of the difference of the two potentials is not spatially uniform for some order, then the Taylor-expansion of the current density difference will be non-zero at a finite order. This establishes that the external potential is a functional of the current density, \( v_{\text{ext}}[\mathbf{j},\Psi_0](r,t) \).

In the second part of the theorem (RGII), continuity is used:
\[ \frac{\partial \Delta n(rt)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot j(rt) \] (28)

which leads to:
\[ \frac{\partial \Delta n(rt)}{\partial t^2} \bigg|_{t=0} = \nabla \cdot (n_0(r) \nabla v_{\text{ext}}(r,0)) \] (29)

Now, suppose \( \Delta v_{\text{ext}}(r,0) \) is not uniform everywhere. Might not the left-hand-side still vanish? Apparently not, for real systems, because it is easy to show[179]:
\[
\int d^3r \Delta v_{\text{ext}}(r,0) \nabla \cdot (n_0(r) \nabla v_{\text{ext}}(r,0)) \\
= \int d^3r \left[ \nabla \cdot (\Delta v_{\text{ext}}(r,0)n_0(r) \nabla v_{\text{ext}}(r,0)) \\
- n_0 \nabla \Delta v_{\text{ext}}(r,0)|^2 \right] \] (30)

Using Green’s theorem, the first term on the right vanishes for physically realistic potentials (i.e., potentials arising from normalizable external charge densities), because for such potentials, \( \Delta v_{\text{ext}}(r) \) falls off at least as \( 1/r \). But the second term is definitely negative, so if \( \Delta v_{\text{ext}}(r,0) \) is non-uniform, the integral must be finite, causing the densities to differ in 2nd order in \( t \). This argument applies to each order and the densities \( n(r,t) \) and \( n'(r,t) \) will become different infinitesimally later than \( t \). Thus, by imposing this boundary conditions, we have shown that \( v_{\text{ext}}[n,\Psi_0](rt) \).

Notes:
- The difference between \( n(rt) \) and \( n'(rt) \) is non-vanishing already in first order of \( \Delta v_{\text{ext}}(rt) \), ensuring the invertibility of the linear response operators of section III C.
- Since the density determines the potential up to a time-dependent constant, the wavefunction is in turn determined up to a time-dependent phase, which cancels out of the expectation value of any operator.

We write
\[ v_{\text{ext}}[n;\Psi_0](rt) \]
because it depends on both the history of the density and the initial wavefunction. This functional is a very complex one, much more so than the ground-state case. Knowledge of it implies solution of all time-dependent Coulomb interacting problems.

- If we always begin in a non-degenerate ground-state[180, 181], the initial-state dependence can be subsumed by the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem[1], and then \( v_{\text{ext}}(rt) \) is a functional of \( n(rt) \) alone:
\[ v_{\text{ext}}[n](rt) \]

- A spin-dependent generalization exists, so that \( v_{\text{ext}}(rt) \) will be a functional of the spin densities \( n_\alpha, n_\beta[182] \).

B. Kohn-Sham equations

Once we have a proof that the potential is a functional of the time-dependent density, it is simple to write the TD Kohn-Sham (TDKS) equations as
\[
i \frac{\partial \phi_{j\sigma}(rt)}{\partial t} = \left( -\frac{\nabla^2}{2} + v_{\sigma}[n](rt) \right) \phi_{j\sigma}(rt) , \] (31)

whose potential is uniquely chosen (via the RG theorem) to reproduce the exact spin densities:
\[ n_\sigma(rt) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\sigma} |\phi_{j\sigma}(rt)|^2 , \] (32)

of the interacting system. We define the exchange-correlation potential via
\[ v_{\sigma}(rt) = v_{\text{ext}}[n](rt) + \int d^3r' \frac{n(r't)}{|r-r'|} + v_{\text{XC}}(rt) , \] (33)

where the second term is the familiar Hartree potential.

Notes:
- The exchange-correlation potential, \( v_{\text{XC}}(rt) \), is in general a functional of the entire history of the densities, \( n_\sigma(rt) \), the initial interacting wavefunction \( \Psi(0) \), and the initial Kohn-Sham wavefunction, \( \Phi(0)[181] \). But if both the KS and interacting initial wavefunctions are non-degenerate ground-states, it becomes a simple functional of \( n_\sigma(rt) \) alone.
- By inverting the single doubly-occupied KS equation for a spin-unpolarized two-electron system, it is quite straightforward (but technically demanding) to find the TDKS potential from an exact time-dependent density, and has been done several times[183–185].
• In practical calculations, some approximation is used for $v_{xc}(r)$ as a functional of the density, and so modifications of traditional TDSE schemes are needed for the propagation[186].

• Unlike the ground-state case, there is no self-consistency, merely forward propagation in time, of a density dependent Hamiltonian.

• Again, contrary to the ground-state, there is no central role played by a single-number functional, such as the ground-state energy. In fact, an action was written down in the RG paper, but extremizing it was later shown not to yield the TDKS equations[187].

C. Linear response

The most common application is the response to a weak long-wavelength optical field,

$$\delta v_{\text{ext}}(rt) = -\xi \exp(i\omega t)z .$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

In the general case of the response of the ground-state to an arbitrary weak external field, the system’s first-order response is characterized by the non-local susceptibility

$$\delta n_{\sigma}(rt) = \sum_{\sigma'} \int dt' \int d^3r' \chi_{\sigma\sigma'}[n_0](r, r'; t-t') \delta v_{\text{ext}\sigma'}(r't') .$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

This susceptibility $\chi$ is a functional of the ground-state density, $n_0(r)$. A similar equation describes the density response in the KS:

$$\delta n_{\sigma}(rt) = \sum_{\sigma'} \int dt' \int d^3r' \chi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}'}[n_0](r, r'; t-t') \delta v_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}'}(r't') .$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

Here $\chi$ is the \textit{Kohn-Sham} response function, constructed from KS energies and orbitals:

$$\chi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}'}(rr'\omega) = \delta_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}'} \sum_q \left( \frac{\Phi_{q\bar{\sigma}}(r) \Phi^*_{q\bar{\sigma}'}(r') - \Phi_{q\sigma}(r) \Phi^*_{q\sigma'}(r')}{\omega - \omega_q + i0_+} \right) \frac{\Phi_{q\bar{\sigma}}(r) \Phi^*_{q\bar{\sigma}'}(r')}{\omega + \omega_q - i0_+}$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

where $q$ is a double index, representing a transition from occupied KS orbital $i$ to unoccupied KS orbital $a$, $\omega_q = \epsilon_a - \epsilon_i$, and $\Phi_{q\sigma}(r) = \phi_{q\sigma}^R(r) \phi_{q\sigma}^A(r)$. $0_+$ means the limit as $0_+$ goes to zero from above (i.e., along the positive real axis). Thus $\chi$ is completely determined by the ground-state KS potential. It is the susceptibility of the non-interacting electrons sitting in the KS ground-state potential.

To relate the KS response to the true response, we examine how the KS potential in Eq. (33) changes:

$$\delta v_{\sigma}(r, t) = \delta v_{\text{ext}\sigma}(r, t) + \delta v_{\\text{HXC}\sigma}(rt) .$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)

Since $\delta v_{\\text{HXC}\sigma}(rt)$ is due to an infinitesimal change in the density, it may be written in terms of its functional derivative, i.e.,

$$\delta v_{\\text{HXC}\sigma}(rt) = \sum_{\sigma'} \int d^3r' \int dt' f_{\\text{HXC}\sigma}(rr', t-t') \delta n_{\sigma'}(r't') ,$$  \hspace{1cm} (39)

where

$$f_{\\text{HXC}\sigma}(rr', t-t') = \left. \frac{\delta v_{\\text{HXC}\sigma}(rt)}{\delta n_{\sigma'}(r't')} \right|_{n_0} .$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

The Hartree contribution is found by differentiating Eq. (16):

$$f_{\text{H}}[n_0](rr', t-t') = \frac{\delta v_{\text{H}}(rt)}{\delta n_{\sigma'}(r't')} = \frac{\delta(t-t')}{|r-r'|}$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)

while the remainder $f_{\text{XC}\sigma'}[n_0](rr', t-t')$ is known as the XC kernel.

By the definition of the KS potential, $\delta n_{\sigma}(rt)$ is the same in both Eq. (35) and Eq. (36). We can then insert Eq. (39) into Eq. (36), equate with Eq. (35) and solve for a general relation for any $\delta n_{\sigma}(rt)$. After Fourier transforming in time, the central equation of TDDFT linear response[188] is a Dyson-like equation for the true $\chi$ of the system:

$$\chi_{\sigma\sigma'}(rr'\omega) = \chi_{\bar{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}'}(rr'\omega) + \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} \int d^3r_1 \int d^3r_2 \chi_{\bar{\sigma}\sigma_1}(rr_1\omega)$$
$$\times \left( \frac{1}{|r_1-r_2|} + f_{\text{XC}\sigma_1}(r_1r_2\omega) \right) \chi_{\bar{\sigma}_2\sigma'}(r_2r'\omega) ,$$  \hspace{1cm} (42)

Notes:

• The XC kernel is a much simpler quantity than $v_{\text{XC}}[n](rt)$, since the kernel is a functional of only the ground-state density.

• The kernel is non-local in both space and time. The non-locality in time manifests itself as a frequency dependence in the Fourier transform, $f_{\text{XC}\sigma'}(rr\omega)$.

• If $f_{\text{xc}}$ is set to zero in Eq. (42), physicists call it the Random Phase Approximation (RPA). The inclusion of $f_{\text{xc}}$ is an exactification of RPA, in the same way the inclusion of $v_{\text{xc}}(r)$ in ground-state DFT was an exactification of Hartree theory.

• The Hartree kernel is instantaneous, i.e., local in time, i.e., has no memory, i.e., given exactly by an adiabatic approximation, i.e., is frequency independent.
The frequency-dependent kernel is a very sophisticated object, since its frequency-dependence makes the solution of an RPA-type equation yield the exact $\chi$ (including all vertex corrections at every higher order term). It defies physical intuition and arguments based on the structure of the TDDFT equations are at best misleading. If any argument cannot be given in terms of many-body quantum mechanics, Eq. (42) cannot help.

The kernel is, in general, complex, with real and imaginary parts related via Kramers-Kronig[189].

Next, Casida[190] used ancient RPA technology, to produce equations in which the poles of $\chi$ are found as the solution to an eigenvalue problem. We write $\delta n_\sigma (rt)$ as:

$$\delta n_\sigma (rt) = \sum_q (P_{q\sigma} (\omega) \Phi_{q\sigma}^* (r) + P_{q\sigma} (\omega) \Phi_{q\sigma} (r))$$

(43)

where $q = (a, i)$ if $q = (i, a)$. This representation is used to solve Eq. (36) self-consistently using Eq. (39), and yields two coupled matrix equations[191]:

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ B^* & A^* \end{bmatrix} - \omega \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X \\ Y \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} \delta v \\ \delta v^* \end{bmatrix}$$

(44)

where $A_{q\sigma q'\sigma'} = \delta_{qq'} \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} \omega_{q\sigma} + K_{q\sigma q'\sigma'}$, $B_{q\sigma q'\sigma'} = K_{q\sigma q'\sigma'}$, $X_{q\sigma} = P_{q\sigma}$, $Y_{q\sigma} = P_{q\sigma}$ and

$$K_{q\sigma q'\sigma'} (\omega) = \int dr \int dr' \Phi_{q\sigma} (r) f_{\text{HXC}\sigma\sigma'} (rr') \Phi_{q'\sigma'}^* (r') ,$$

(45)

with

$$\delta v_{q\sigma} (\omega) = \int dr \Phi_{q\sigma} (r) \delta v_{\text{ext}} (r, \omega) .$$

(46)

At an excitation energy, $\delta \omega = 0$ and choosing real KS orbitals and since $(A - B)$ is positive definite, we get:

$$\sum_{q'\sigma'} \tilde{\Omega}_{q\sigma q'\sigma'} (\omega) \tilde{a}_{q'\sigma'} = \omega^2 \tilde{a}_{q\sigma} ,$$

(47)

where

$$\tilde{\Omega} = (A - B)^{1/2} (A + B) (A - B)^{1/2} ,$$

or

$$\tilde{\Omega}_{q\sigma q'\sigma'} (\omega) = \omega_{q\sigma}^2 \delta_{qq'} \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} + 2 \sqrt{\omega_{q\sigma} \omega_{q'\sigma'}} K_{q\sigma q'\sigma'} .$$

(48)

Oscillator strengths $f_q$ may be calculated[190] from the normalized eigenvectors using

$$f_{q\sigma} = \frac{2}{3} \left( |z^T S^{-1/2} \tilde{a}_q |^2 + |y^T S^{-1/2} \tilde{a}_q |^2 + |z^T S^{-1/2} \tilde{a}_q |^2 \right) ,$$

(49)

FIG. 4: Transitions for the Helium atom using in ground-state DFT on the left, and TDDFT on the right. In both cases, the exact functionals have been used. The results for employing the exact XC kernel in TDDFT linear response are known from calculations using Ref. [192]. In each pair of lines on the right, the triplet is the lower.

where

$$S_{qq'} = \delta_{qq'} \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} / \omega_{q} .$$

D. Approximations

As in the ground-state case, while all the equations above are formally exact, a practical TDDFT calculation requires an approximation for the unknown XC potential. The most common approximation in TDDFT is the adiabatic approximation, in which

$$v^{\text{ad}}_{\text{X}C\text{Or}} [n] (r) = v^{\text{ex}}_{\text{X}C\text{Or}} [n_0] (r) |n_{\text{Or}} (r) = n_0 (r) ,$$

(50)

i.e., the XC potential at any time is simply the ground-state XC potential at that instant. This obviously becomes exact for sufficiently slow perturbations in time, in which the system always stays in its instantaneous ground-state. Most applications, however, are not in this slowly varying regime. Nevertheless, results obtained within the adiabatic approximation are remarkably accurate in many cases.
Any ground-state approximation (LDA, GGA, hybrid) automatically provides an adiabatic approximation for use in TDDFT. The most famous is the adiabatic local density approximation (ALDA). It employs the functional form of the static LDA with a time-dependent density:

\[
v^{\text{ALDA}}_{\text{XC}}[n](r,t) = v^{\text{unif}}_{\text{XC}}(n_{\alpha}(r,t), n_{\beta}(r,t)) = \frac{d_{\text{XC}}^{\text{unif}}}{dn_{\sigma}} \bigg|_{n_{\sigma}=n_{\sigma}(r,t)}. \tag{51}
\]

Here \(v^{\text{unif}}_{\text{XC}}(n_{\alpha}, n_{\beta})\) is the accurately known exchange-correlation energy density of the uniform electron gas of spin densities \(n_{\uparrow}, n_{\downarrow}\). For the time-dependent exchange-correlation kernel of Eq. (40), Eq. (51) leads to

\[
f^{\text{ALDA}}_{\text{XC},\sigma}(n_{0})(r, r'; t, t') = \delta^{(3)}(r-r') \delta(t-t') \frac{d_{\text{XC}}^{\text{unif}}}{dn_{\sigma} dn_{\sigma'}} \bigg|_{n_{\sigma}=n_{\sigma}(r)} \tag{52}
\]

The time Fourier-transform of the kernel has no frequency-dependence at all in any adiabatic approximation. Via a Kramers-Kronig relation, this implies that it is purely real[189].

Thus, any TDDFT linear response calculation can be considered as occurring in two steps:

1. An approximate ground-state DFT calculation is done, and a self-consistent KS potential found. Transitions from occupied to unoccupied KS orbitals provide zero-order approximations to the optical excitations.

2. An approximate TDDFT linear response calculation is done on the orbitals of the ground-state calculation. This corrects the KS transitions into the true optical transitions.

In practice both these steps have errors built into them.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION AND BASIS SETS

In this section we discuss how TDDFT is implemented numerically. TDDFT has the ability to calculate many different quantities and different techniques are sometimes favored for each type. For some purposes, e.g., if strong fields are present, it can be better to propagate forward in time the KS orbitals using a real space grid[193, 194] or with plane waves[195]. For finite-order response, Fourier transforming to frequency space with localized basis functions may be preferable[196]. Below, we discuss in detail how this approach works, emphasizing the importance of basis-set convergence.

A. Density matrix approach

Instead of using orbitals, we can write the dynamics of the TDKS systems in terms of the one-particle density matrix \(\gamma_{\sigma}(r r')\) of the TDKS determinant. \(\gamma_{\sigma}(r r')\) has the spectral representation

\[
\gamma_{\sigma}(r r') = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \phi_{j\sigma}(r) \phi_{j\sigma}^{*}(r'),
\]

i.e., the \(N_{\sigma}\) TDKS orbitals are the eigenfunctions of \(\gamma_{\sigma}\). The eigenvalue of all TDKS orbitals, which is their occupation number, is always 1, which reflects the fact that the TDKS system is non-interacting. Equivalently, \(\gamma_{\sigma}\) satisfies the idempotency constraint

\[
\gamma_{\sigma}(r r') = \int dx_{1} \gamma_{\sigma}(r_{1} r) \gamma_{\sigma}(r_{1} r').
\]

The normalization of the TDKS orbitals implies that the trace of \(\gamma_{\sigma}\) be \(N_{\sigma}\).

Using the TDKS equations (31), one finds that the time-evolution of \(\gamma_{\sigma}\) is governed by the von-Neumann equation

\[
i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma_{\sigma}(t) = [H_{\sigma}[n](t), \gamma_{\sigma}(t)],
\]

where \(H_{\sigma}[n](r,t) = -\nabla^{2}/2 + \nu_{\sigma}[n](r)\) is the TDKS one-particle Hamiltonian. Although \(\gamma_{\sigma}\) has no direct physical meaning, it provides the interacting density and current density: The density is simply

\[
n_{\sigma}(r,t) = \gamma_{\sigma}(r r'),
\]

and the current density can be obtained from

\[
j_{\sigma}(r,t) = \frac{1}{2i} \left( \nabla_{r} - \nabla_{r'} \right) \gamma_{\sigma}(r r') \bigg|_{r'=r}.
\]

Thus, one can either propagate the TDKS orbitals using the TDKS equations (31), or equivalently one can propagate the TDKS one-particle density matrix \(\gamma_{\sigma}\) using the von-Neumann equation (55), subject to the idempotency constraint (54) and normalized to \(N_{\sigma}\).

In practice, it is often preferable to use \(\gamma_{\sigma}\) instead of the TDKS orbitals. \(\gamma_{\sigma}\) is unique (up to a gauge transformation), while the orbitals can be mixed arbitrarily by unitary transformations. Both \(n_{\sigma}\) and \(j_{\sigma}\) are linear in \(\gamma_{\sigma}\), while they are quadratic in the orbitals; also, the TDKS equations are inhomogeneous in the orbitals due to the density dependence of \(H_{\sigma}\), while they are homogeneous in \(\gamma_{\sigma}\). A response theory based on the TDKS density matrix is therefore considerably simpler than one based on the orbitals. Finally, the use of \(\gamma_{\sigma}\) is computationally more efficient than using orbitals[196].

B. Basis Sets

In response theory, the basis functions \(\chi_{\nu}(r)\) are usually chosen to be time-independent; for strong fields or coupled electron-nuclear dynamics, time-dependent basis functions can be more appropriate.
Table III shows the basis set convergence of the first six singlet excitation energies of naphthalene computed using the PBE XC functional; the corresponding oscillator strengths for some of the transitions are also given. Similar basis-set convergence studies on small model systems should preclude applications to large systems. In practice, the systems and states of interest, the target accuracy, the methods used, and the computational resources available will determine which basis set is appropriate.

With a model small molecule, we can find the basis-set convergence limit of a method. Both excitation energies and oscillator strengths are essentially converged within the aug-QZVP basis set. QZVP stands for a quadruple zeta valence basis set with polarization functions[199], and the prefix aug- denotes additional diffuse functions on non-hydrogen atoms, which were taken from Dunning’s aug-cc-pVQZ basis set[200]. For C and H, this corresponds to [8s5p4d3f2g] and [4s3p2d1f], respectively, where the numbers in brackets denote shells of contracted Gaussian type orbitals (CGTOs), as usual. We will take the aug-QZVP results as a reference to assess the effect of smaller basis sets.

D. Double zeta basis sets

The smallest basis in Table III is of split valence (SV) or double zeta valence quality[201], without polarization functions. This basis set consists of two CGTOs per valence orbital and one per core orbital, i.e. [3s2p] for C and [2s] for H. Another popular double zeta valence basis set is 6-31G [202]. The SV basis set can be used to obtain a very rough qualitative description of the lowest valence excited states only, e.g. 1^1B_3u and 1^1B_2u. Higher and diffuse excitations, such as 1^1A_u, are much too high in energy or can be missed completely in the spectrum. Since unpolarized basis sets also give poor results for other properties such as bond lengths and energies, their use is generally discouraged nowadays.

E. Polarization functions

By adding a single set of polarization functions to non-hydrogen atoms, the SV results for valence excitations can be considerably improved, at still moderate computational cost. The resulting basis set is termed SV(P) and consists of [3s2p1d] for C and [2s] for H[201]. The basis set errors in the first two valence excitation energies is reduced by about 50%. There is also a dramatic improvement in the oscillator strength of the dipole allowed transitions. This is expected from the limiting case of a single atom, where the first dipole allowed transition from a valence shell of l quantum number l_c generally involves orbitals with l-quantum number l_c + 1. Basis sets of SV(P) or similar quality are often the first choice for TDDFT applications to large systems, especially if only the lowest states are of interest and/or diffuse excitations are quenched, e.g. due to a polar environment. The popular 6-31G^* basis set [202, 203] has essentially the same size as SV(P) but performs slightly poorer in our example.

Adding a single set of p type polarization functions to hydrogen atoms produces the SVP basis set[201]. These functions mainly describe C-H σ^* type excitation in molecules which usually occur in the far UV and are rarely studied in applications. In our example, going from SV(P) to SVP has no significant effect. This may be different for molecules containing strongly polarized hydrogen-element or hydrogen bridge bonds.

Next, aug-SV(P) is an SV(P) basis set augmented by a [1s1p1d] set of primitive Gaussians with small exponents (from Dunning’s aug-cc-pVDZ [200]), often called “diffuse functions”. As shown in Table III, the effect of diffuse augmentation is a moderate downshift of less than 0.1 eV for the first two singlet excitation energies. This behavior is typical of lower valence excited states having a similar extent as the ground-state. Our example also shows that diffuse functions can have a significant effect on higher excitations. An extreme case is the 1^1A_u state which is an excitation into the 10au orbital having the character of a 3s Rydberg state (of the entire molecule). The excitation energy of this state is lowered by more than 1 eV upon diffuse augmentation.

While polarization functions are necessary for a qualitatively correct description of transition dipole moments, additional diffuse polarization functions can account for radial nodes in the first-order KS orbitals, which further improves computed transition moments and oscillator strengths. These benefits have to be contrasted with a significant increase of the computational cost: In our example, using the aug-SV(P) basis increases the computation time by about a factor of 4. In molecules with more than 30-40 atoms, most excitations of interest are valence excitations, and the use of diffuse augmentation may become prohibitively expensive because the large extent of these functions confounds integral prescreening.

F. Triple zeta basis sets

In such cases, triple zeta valence (TZV) basis sets can be a better alternative. The TZVP (def-2-TZVP, Ref. [204]) basis set corresponds to [5s3p2d1f] on C and [3s1p] on H. It provides a description of the valence electrons that is quite accurate for many purposes when density functionals are used. At the same time, there is a second set of polarization functions on non-hydrogen atoms. The excitation energies of valence states are essentially converged in this basis set, see Table III. However, diffuse states are too high in energy. There is very little change going to the TZVPP basis, which differs from TZVP only by an additional set of polarization functions on H. Dunning’s cc-pVTZ basis set [205] performs similar to TZVP
TABLE III: Basis set convergence of the first six singlet excitation energies (in eV) and oscillator strengths (length gauge) of naphthalene. The basis set acronyms are defined in the text. $N_{bf}$ denotes the number of Cartesian basis functions, and CPU denotes the CPU time (seconds) on a single processor of a 2.4 GHz Opteron Linux workstation. The PBE functional was used for both the ground-state and TDDFT calculations. The ground-state structure was optimized at the PBE/TZVP/RI-level. Experimental results were taken from Ref. [197].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis set</th>
<th>1 $^1B_{1u}$</th>
<th>1 $^1B_{2u}$ (Osc. Str.)</th>
<th>2 $^1A_g$</th>
<th>1 $^1B_{1g}$</th>
<th>2 $^1B_{3u}$ (Osc. Str.)</th>
<th>1 $^1A_u$</th>
<th>$N_{bf}$</th>
<th>CPU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>4.352</td>
<td>4.246 (0.0517)</td>
<td>6.084</td>
<td>5.254</td>
<td>5.985 (1.1933)</td>
<td>6.566</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV(P)</td>
<td>4.272</td>
<td>4.132 (0.0461)</td>
<td>5.974</td>
<td>5.149</td>
<td>5.869 (1.1145)</td>
<td>6.494</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-31G*</td>
<td>4.293</td>
<td>4.154</td>
<td>6.021</td>
<td>5.185</td>
<td>5.902</td>
<td>7.013</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVP</td>
<td>4.262</td>
<td>4.125 (0.0466)</td>
<td>5.960</td>
<td>5.136</td>
<td>5.852 (1.1402)</td>
<td>6.505</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aug-SV(P)</td>
<td>4.213</td>
<td>4.056 (0.0417)</td>
<td>5.793</td>
<td>4.993</td>
<td>5.666 (1.1628)</td>
<td>5.338</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZVP</td>
<td>4.209</td>
<td>4.051 (0.0424)</td>
<td>5.834</td>
<td>5.030</td>
<td>5.715 (1.1455)</td>
<td>6.215</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TZVPP</td>
<td>4.208</td>
<td>4.050 (0.0425)</td>
<td>5.830</td>
<td>5.027</td>
<td>5.711 (1.1464)</td>
<td>6.231</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc-pVTZ</td>
<td>4.222</td>
<td>4.064 (0.0427)</td>
<td>5.870</td>
<td>5.061</td>
<td>5.747 (1.1355)</td>
<td>6.062</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aug-TZVP</td>
<td>4.193</td>
<td>4.031 (0.0407)</td>
<td>5.753</td>
<td>4.957</td>
<td>5.622 (1.1402)</td>
<td>5.141</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aug-TZVP/RI</td>
<td>4.193</td>
<td>4.031 (0.0407)</td>
<td>5.752</td>
<td>4.957</td>
<td>5.621 (1.1401)</td>
<td>5.142</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QZVP</td>
<td>4.197</td>
<td>4.036 (0.0416)</td>
<td>5.788</td>
<td>4.989</td>
<td>5.667 (1.1569)</td>
<td>5.672</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>6104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aug-QZVP</td>
<td>4.192</td>
<td>4.029 (0.0406)</td>
<td>5.748</td>
<td>4.954</td>
<td>5.616 (1.1330)</td>
<td>5.071</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>28216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expt.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.45, 4.7 (0.102, 0.109)</td>
<td>5.50, 5.52</td>
<td>5.28, 5.22</td>
<td>5.63, 5.55, 5.89 (1.2, 1.3)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and TZVPP. However, Dunning basis sets are based on a generalized contraction scheme for valence orbitals, as opposed to the segmented contracted SV, TZV and QZV basis sets. The latter are more efficient for larger systems, because more integrals vanish.

G. Diffuse functions

Adding a $[1s1p1d1f]$ set of diffuse functions to TZVP we obtain the aug-TZVP basis set. The aug-TZVP excitation energies of all states except the $1^1A_u$ Rydberg state are within 0.01 eV of the reference aug-QZVP results and can be considered essentially converged for the purposes of present TDDFT. A similar observation can be made for the oscillator strengths in Table III.

Going to the even larger quadruple zeta valence (QZV) basis sets, the results change only marginally, but the computation times increase substantially. In density functional theory, these basis sets are mainly used for bechmarks and calibration.

H. Resolution of the identity

For comparison, we have included results that were obtained using the resolution of the identity approximation for the Coulomb energy (RI-J) [206, 207]. It is obvious that the error introduced by the RI-J approximation is much smaller than the basis set error, while the computation time is reduced by a factor of 5. The RI-J approximation is so effective because the computation of the Coulomb (Hartree) energy and its response is the bottleneck in conventional (TD)DFT calculations. RI-J replaces the four-index Coulomb integrals by three-index and two-index integrals, which considerably lowers the algorithmic pre-factor[208]. It is generally safe to use with the appropriate auxiliary basis sets. As soon as hybrid functionals are used, however, the computation of the exact exchange becomes rate-determining.

I. Summary

To summarize, for larger molecules, SV(P) or similar basis sets are often appropriate due to their good cost-to-performance ratio. We recommend to check SV(P) results by a TZVP calculation whenever possible. Diffuse functions should be used sparingly for molecules with more than about 20 atoms.

V. PERFORMANCE

This chapter is devoted to studying and analyzing the performance of TDDFT, assuming basis-set convergence. We dissect many of the sources of error in typical TDDFT calculations. To get an overall impression, a small survey is given by Furche and Ahlrichs[209]. Typical chemical calculations are done with the B3LYP[167] functional, and typical results are transition frequencies within 0.4 eV of experiment, and structural properties of excited states are almost as good as those of ground-state calculations (bond lengths to within 1%, dipole moments to within 5%, vibrational frequencies to within 5%). Most importantly, this level of accuracy appears sufficient in most cases to qualitatively identify the nature of the most intense transitions, often debunking cruder models that have been used for interpretation for decades. This is proving especially useful for the photochemistry of biologically relevant molecules[69]
TABLE IV: Performance of various density functionals for the first six singlet excitation energies (in eV) of naphthalene. An aug-TZVP basis set and the PBE/TZVP/RI ground-state structure was used. The "best" estimates of the true excitations were from experiment and calculations, as described in text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$1^1B_{3u}$</th>
<th>$1^1B_{2u}$</th>
<th>$2^1A_g$</th>
<th>$1^1B_{1g}$</th>
<th>$2^1B_{3u}$</th>
<th>$1^1A_u$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSDA</td>
<td>4.191</td>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>5.751</td>
<td>4.940</td>
<td>5.623</td>
<td>5.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP86</td>
<td>4.193</td>
<td>4.027</td>
<td>5.770</td>
<td>4.974</td>
<td>5.627</td>
<td>5.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBE</td>
<td>4.193</td>
<td>4.031</td>
<td>5.753</td>
<td>4.957</td>
<td>5.622</td>
<td>5.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3LYP</td>
<td>4.393</td>
<td>4.282</td>
<td>6.062</td>
<td>5.422</td>
<td>5.794</td>
<td>5.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBE0</td>
<td>4.474</td>
<td>4.379</td>
<td>6.205</td>
<td>5.611</td>
<td>5.889</td>
<td>5.603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Example: Naphthalene Results

As an illustration, compare the performance of various density functionals and wavefunction methods for the first singlet excited states of naphthalene in Tables IV, V and VI. All calculations were performed using the aug-TZVP basis set; the complete active space SCF with second-order perturbation theory (CASPT2) results from Ref. [197] were obtained in a smaller double zeta valence basis set with some diffuse augmentation. The experimental results correspond to band maxima from gas-phase experiments; however, the position of the band maximum does not necessarily coincide with the vertical excitation energy, especially if the excited state structure differs significantly from the ground-state structure. For the lower valence states, the CASPT2 results can therefore be expected to be at least as accurate as the experimental numbers. For higher excited states, the basis set used in the CASPT2 calculations appears rather small, and the approximate second-order coupled cluster values denoted RICC2 [210–212] might be a better reference. Thus our best guess (denoted "best" in the Tables) is from experiment for the first 4 transitions, CASPT2 for the 5th, and RICC2 for the 6th.

We begin with some general observations.

- The excitation energies predicted by the GGA functionals BP86 and PBE differ only marginally from the LSDA results (an exception being the $1^1A_u$ Rydberg state, whose PBE excitation energy is substantially lower than those of all other methods). Note however that GGA functionals generally improve over LSDA results for other excited state properties such as structures or vibrational frequencies.

- Hybrid mixing leads to systematically higher excitation energies. On average, this is an improvement over the GGA results which are systematically too low. However, while diffuse excitations benefit from hybrid mixing due to a reduction of self-interaction error, valence excitation energies are not always improved, as is obvious for the $1^1B_{3u}$ and $2^1B_{3u}$ valence states.

- The $1^1B_{2u}$ state is erroneously predicted below the $1^1B_{3u}$ state by all density functionals, which is a potentially serious problem for applications in photochemistry; this is not corrected by hybrid mixing.

- The configuration-interaction singles (CIS) method which uses a Hartree-Fock reference that is computationally as expensive as hybrid TDDFT produces errors that are substantially larger, especially for valence states. The coupled cluster and CASPT2 methods are far more expensive, and scale prohibitively as the system size grows.

The $1^1B_{2u}$ excitation is polarized along the short axis of the naphthalene molecule. In Platt’s nomenclature of excited states of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), $1^1B_{2u}$ corresponds to the $1^1L_a$ state. This state is of more ionic character than the $1^1B_{3u}$ or $1^1L_b$ state. Parac and Grimme have pointed out [213] that GGA functionals considerably underestimate the excitation energy of the $1^1L_a$ state in PAHs. This agrees with the observation that the $1^1B_{2u}$ excitation of naphthalene is computed 0.4-0.5 eV too low in energy by LSDA.
and GGA functionals, leading to an incorrect ordering of the first two singlet excited states.

B. Influence of the ground-state potential

From the very earliest calculations of transition frequencies[188, 190], it was recognized that the inaccuracy of standard density functional approximations (LDA, GGA, hybrids) for the ground-state XC potential leads to inaccurate KS eigenvalues. Because the approximate KS potentials have incorrect asymptotic behavior (they decay exponentially, instead of as \(-1/r\), as seen in Fig. 3), the KS orbital eigenvalues are insufficiently negative, the ionization threshold is too low, and Rydberg states are often unbound.

Given this disastrous behavior, many methods have been developed to asymptotically correct potentials[214, 215]. Any corrections to the ground-state potential are dissatisfying, however, as the resulting potential is not a functional derivative of an energy functional. Even mixing one approximation for \(v_{xc}(r)\) and another for \(f_{xc}\) has become popular. A more satisfying route is to use the optimized effective potential (OEP) method[159, 173] and include exact exchange or other self-interaction-free functionals[216]. This produces a far more accurate KS potential, with the correct asymptotic behavior. The chief remaining error is simply the correlation contribution to the position of the HOMO, i.e., a small shift. All the main features below and just above \(I\) are retained.

1. \(N_2\), a very small molecule

A simple system to see the effect of the various ground-state potentials is the \(N_2\) molecule. In all the cases discussed below, a SCF step was carried out using the ground-state potential to find the KS levels. These are then used as input to Eq. (47) with the ALDA XC kernel.

In Table VII, the KS energy levels for the LDA functional are shown. It is very clear to see that the eigenvalues for the higher unoccupied states are positive. As mentioned this is due to the LDA potential being too shallow and not having the correct asymptotic behavior. Comparing the basis-set calculation with the basis-set-free calculation, the occupied orbitals are in good agreement. However for the unoccupied states that are unbounded in LDA, basis sets cannot describe these correctly and give a positive energy value which can vary greatly from one basis set to another.

In Table VIII, the bare KS transition frequencies between these levels are shown. Note that they are in rough agreement with the experimental values and that they lie in between the singlet-singlet and singlet-triplet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orbital</th>
<th>LDA energies in (eV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDA basis set free(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied orbitals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(\sigma_g)</td>
<td>-380.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(\sigma_u)</td>
<td>-380.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(\sigma_g)</td>
<td>-28.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(\sigma_u)</td>
<td>-13.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(\pi_u)</td>
<td>-11.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(\pi_g)</td>
<td>-10.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied orbitals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(\pi_g)</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(\sigma_g)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(\pi_u)</td>
<td>&gt; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(\pi_u)</td>
<td>&gt; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(\sigma_g)</td>
<td>&gt; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(\sigma_g)</td>
<td>&gt; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(\sigma_g)</td>
<td>&gt; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(\pi_g)</td>
<td>&gt; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(\pi_u)</td>
<td>&gt; 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)From Ref.[218]. \(^b\)From Ref.[219].

| State Excitation | BARE KS\(^a\) ALDA\(^b\) ALDA\(^b\) LB94\(^d\) OEP\(^e\) Expt\(^f\) |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|
| Singlet to singlet transitions |                  |                  |            |             |
| \(w^1\Delta_u\) | 1\(\pi_u\) - 1\(\sigma_g\) | 9.63            | 10.20       | 10.27       | 9.82        | 10.66       | 10.27       |
| \(s^1\Sigma^+\) | 1\(\pi_u\) - 1\(\sigma_g\) | 9.63            | 9.63        | 9.68        | 9.18        | 10.09       | 9.92        |
| \(a^3\Pi_g\)   | 3\(\pi_g\) - 1\(\pi_u\)  | 8.16            | 9.04        | 9.23        | 8.68        | 9.76        | 9.31        |
| \(a^1\Pi_u\)   | 3\(\pi_g\) - 4\(\sigma_g\) | -          | -           | 10.48       | -           | 12.47       | 12.20       |
| \(a^3\Sigma^+\) | 3\(\pi_g\) - 1\(\pi_g\)  | -          | -           | 13.87       | -           | 14.32       | 13.63       |
| \(c^3\Pi_u\)   | 3\(\pi_g\) - 2\(\pi_u\)  | -          | -           | 11.85       | -           | 13.07       | 12.90       |
| Singlet to triplet transitions |                  |                  |            |             |
| \(C^3\Pi_g\)   | 2\(\pi_u\) - 1\(\pi_g\)  | 11.21          | 10.36       | 10.44       | 10.06       | 11.05       | 11.19       |
| \(B^3\Sigma^+\) | 1\(\pi_u\) - 1\(\pi_u\)  | 9.63            | 9.63        | 9.68        | 9.18        | 10.09       | 9.67        |
| \(W^3\Delta_u\) | 1\(\pi_u\) - 1\(\pi_u\)  | 9.63            | 8.80        | 8.91        | 8.32        | 9.34        | 8.88        |
| \(B^3\Pi_g\)   | 3\(\pi_g\) - 1\(\pi_u\)  | 8.16            | 7.50        | 7.62        | 7.14        | 8.12        | 8.04        |
| \(A^3\Sigma^+\) | 1\(\pi_u\) - 1\(\pi_u\)  | 9.63            | 7.84        | 8.07        | 7.29        | 8.51        | 7.74        |
| \(E^3\Sigma^+\) | 3\(\pi_g\) - 4\(\sigma_g\) | -          | -           | 10.33       | 12.32       | 11.96       | 12.00       |

Mean Absolute Error (0.61) (0.27) 0.34 (0.64) 0.34

\(^a\)Using Sadlej basis set. From Ref.[219].
\(^b\)Basis set free. From Ref.[218].
\(^c\)From Ref.[220].
\(^d\)Using KLI approximation. From Ref.[218].
\(^e\)Computed in [221] from the spectroscopic constants of Huber and Herzberg [222].
transitions[223]. The ALDA XC kernel \( f_{XC}^{ALDA} \) then shifts the KS transitions towards their correct values. For the eight lowest transitions LDA does remarkably well, the mean absolute error (MAE) being 0.27 eV for the Sadlej basis set. For higher transitions it fails drastically, the MAE increases to 0.54 eV when the next four transitions are included. This increase in the MAE is attributed to a cancellation of errors that lead to good frequencies for the lower transitions[218]. Since LDA binds only two unoccupied orbitals, it cannot accurately describe transitions to higher orbitals. In basis set calculations, the energies of the unbound orbitals which have converged will vary wildly and cannot give trusted transition frequencies.

One class of XC functionals that would not have this problem are the asymptotically corrected (AC) functionals [214, 215, 224–226]. LB94[227] is one such of these and its performance is shown in Table VIII. AC XC potentials tend to be too shallow in the core region, so the KS energy levels will be too low while the AC piece will force the higher KS states to be bound and their energies will cluster below zero. Thus it is expected that using AC functionals will consistently underestimate the transition frequencies.

A much better approach is using the OEP method. The KS orbitals found using this method are self-interaction free and are usually better approximations to the true KS orbitals. OEP will also have the correct asymptotic behavior and as we can see in Table VII, all orbital energies are negative. In Table VIII, the MAE for OEP is 0.34 eV, much lower than LDA. Since OEP binds all orbitals, it allows many more transitions to be calculated. A common OEP functional is exact exchange (or the KLI approximation[228] to it) which neglects correlation effects, but these are generally small contributions to the KS orbitals. Using these with ALDA for \( f_{XC} \) (which does contain correlation) leads to good transition frequencies as shown in Table VIII. Although LDA is sometimes closer to the experimental values for the lower transitions, the value of OEP lies in its ability to describe both the higher and lower transitions.

2. Napthalene, a small molecule

Returning to our benchmark case of Naphthalene, using more accurate LHF exchange-only potentials from Sec. II B together with an LSDA or PBE kernel produces excitation energies in between the GGA and the hybrid results, except for the \( 1^1A_u \) Rydberg state, whose excitation energy is significantly improved. Whether the LSDA kernel or the PBE GGA kernel is used together with an LHF potential does not change the results significantly.

The \( 1^1B_{1g} \) and especially the \( 1^1A_u \) states are diffuse, and it is not surprising that their excitation energy is considerably underestimated in the LSDA and GGA treatment. Using the asymptotically correct LHF potential corrects the excitation energy of the \( 1^1A_u \), which is a pure one-particle excitation out of the \( 1a_u \) valence into the \( 10a_g \) Rydberg orbital; the latter may be viewed as a \( 3s \) orbital of the \( C_{10}H_8 \) ion. On the other hand, a strong mixture of valence and Rydberg excitations occurs in \( 1^1B_{1g} \). The LHF potential improves the GGA results only marginally here, suggesting that more accurate XC kernels are necessary to properly account for valence-Rydberg mixing.

C. Analyzing the influence of the XC kernel

In this section, we discuss the importance of the XC kernel in TDDFT calculations. As mentioned earlier, the kernels used in practical TDDFT are local or semi-local both in space and time. Even hybrids are largely semi-local, as they only mix in 20 – 25% exact exchange.

![FIG. 5: The spectrum of Helium calculated using the ALDA XC kernel[229] with the exact KS orbitals.](image-url)
tential and TDDFT XC kernel are approximated. A simple way to separate the error in the XC kernel is to look at a test case where the exact KS potential is known. Figure 5 shows the spectrum of He using the exact KS potential, but with the ALDA XC kernel. It does rather well[229] (very well, as shall see later in section VI, when we examine atoms in more detail). Very similar results are obtained with standard GGA’s.

FIG. 6: The spectrum of Helium calculated using the ALDAx kernel and the exact exchange kernel[229]. Again the exact KS orbitals were used. The importance of non-locality for the XC kernel can be seen as the exchange part of ALDA gives a noticeable error compared to the exchange part of the true functional (the AEXX kernel for He).

The errors in such approximate kernels come from the locality in space and time. We can test one of these separately for the He atom, by studying the exchange limit for the XC kernel. For two spin-unpolarized electrons, \( f_x = -1/2 |r - r'| \), i.e., it exactly cancels half the Hartree term. Most importantly, it is frequency-independent, so that there is no memory, i.e., the adiabatic approximation is exact. In Fig. 6, we compare ALDAX, i.e., the ALDA for just exchange, to the exact exchange result for He. Clearly, ALDA makes noticeable errors relative to exact exchange, showing that non-locality in space can be important.

Thus the hybrid functionals, by virtue of mixing some fraction of exact exchange with GGA, will have only slightly different potentials (mostly in the asymptotic region), but noticeably different kernels.

D. Errors in potential vs. kernel

In this section, we examine the relative importance of the potential and kernel errors. It has long been believed that fixing the defects in the potential, especially its asymptotic behavior, has been the major challenge to improving TDDFT results[224–226]. We argue here that this is overly simplistic, and is due to tests being carried out on atoms and small molecules. In large molecules, where the interest is in the many low-lying transitions, the potential can be sufficiently accurate, while the kernel may play a larger role.

In fact, our analysis of the general failure of TDDFT in underestimating the \( 1L_a \) transitions in PAH’s sheds some light on its origin. Using the self-interaction free LHF potential does not cure this problem, as is obvious from Tab. IX. To the best of our knowledge, the cause of this shortcoming of TDDFT is not well understood. We note, however, that the same incorrect ordering of \( 1L_a \) and \( 1L_b \) occurs in the CIS approximation, which is self-interaction free. The analysis here shows that this is a failure of our approximations to the XC kernel rather than to the ground-state potential.

E. Understanding linear response TDDFT

Several simple methods have evolved for qualitatively understanding TDDFT results. The most basic is the single-pole approximation (SPA), which originated[188] in including only one pole of the response function. The easiest way to see this here is to truncate Eq. (47) to a \( 1 \times 1 \) matrix, yielding an (often excellent) approximation to the change in transition frequency away from its KS value[193, 230]:

\[
\omega^2 \approx w_{q \sigma}^2 + 2\omega_{q \sigma} K_{q \sigma q \sigma} \quad \text{(SPA),} \tag{58}
\]

(The original SPA was on the unsymmetric system yielding \( \omega \approx w_{q \sigma} + K_{q \sigma q \sigma} \), which for a spin-saturated system becomes \( \omega \approx \omega_q + 2 K_{qq} \) [229]). This can also provide a quick and dirty estimate, since only KS transitions and one integral over \( f_{xc} \) are needed. While it allows an estimate of the shift of transitions from their KS energy eigenvalue differences, it says nothing about oscillator strengths, which are unchanged in SPA from their KS values. In fact, a careful analysis of the TDDFT equation shows that oscillator strengths are particularly sensitive to even small off-diagonal matrix elements, whereas transition frequencies are less so[231].

A more advanced analysis is the double pole approximation[232] (DPA), which applies when two transition are strongly coupled to one another, but not strongly to the rest of the transitions. Then one can show explicitly the very strong effect that off-diagonal elements have on oscillator strengths, showing that sometimes an entire peak can have almost no contribution. One also sees pole-repulsion in the positions of the transitions, a phenomenon again missing from SPA.

The DPA was used recently and very successfully to explain X-ray edge spectroscopy results for 3d-transition metal solids as one moves across the periodic table[233]. These transitions form a perfect test case for DPA, as the only difference between them is caused by the spin-orbit
TABLE X: Transition frequencies and oscillator strengths (O.S) calculated using the double pole approximation (DPA) for the lowest $^1B_{3u}$ transitions in Naphthalene. The PBE functional was used with an aug-TZVP basis set on top of a PBE/TZVP/RI ground state structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>DPA</th>
<th>Full TDDFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^1B_{3u}$</td>
<td>4.117 (1.02)</td>
<td>4.245 (0.001)</td>
<td>4.191 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^2B_{3u}$</td>
<td>4.131 (1.00)</td>
<td>6.748 (2.02)</td>
<td>5.633 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

splitting (several eV) of the $2p^{1/2}$ and $2p^{3/2}$ levels. In a ground-state KS calculation, this leads to a 2:1 branching ratio for the two peaks, based simply on degeneracy, as all matrix elements are identical for the two transitions. Experimentally, while this ratio is observed for Fe, large deviations occur for other elements.

These deviations could be seen in full TDDFT calculations, and were attributed to strong core-hole correlations. The SPA, while it nicely accounts for the shifts in transition frequencies relative to bare KS transitions, but yields only the ideal 2:1 branching ratio. However, the DPA model gives a much simpler, and more benign interpretation. The sensitivity of oscillator strengths to off-diagonal matrix elements means that, even when the off-diagonal elements are much smaller than diagonal elements (of order 1 eV), they cause rotations in the 2-level space, and greatly alter the branching ratio. Thus a KS branching ratio occurs even with strong diagonal ‘correlation’, so long as off-diagonal XC contributions are truly negligible. But even small off-diagonal ‘correlation’, can lead to large deviations from KS branching ratios.

We can use DPA to understand the lowest $^1B_{3u}$ transitions in our naphthalene case. In Table X, we list the TDDFT matrix elements for the PBE calculation for the two nearly degenerate KS transitions, $1a_u \rightarrow 2b_{3g}$ and $2b_{1u} \rightarrow 2b_{2g}$, along with their corresponding KS transition frequencies. Contour plots of the four orbitals involved are shown in Fig. 7. We note first that these two KS transitions are essentially degenerate, so that there is no way to treat them within SPA. The degeneracy is lifted by the off-diagonal elements, which cause the transitions to repel each other, and strongly rotate the oscillator strength between the levels, removing almost all the oscillator strength from the lower peak[232]. The DPA yields almost the correct frequency and oscillator strength (i.e., none) for the lower transition, but the higher one is overestimated, with too much oscillator strength. This must be due to coupling to other higher transitions. In the DPA, in fact the higher transition lands right on top of the third transition, so strong coupling occurs there too. This example illustrates (i), that solution of the full TDDFT equations is typically necessary for large molecules which have many coupled transitions, but also (ii), that simple models can aid the interpretation of such results. All of which shows that, while models developed for well-separated transi-

FIG. 7: The four orbitals involved in the first two $^1B_{3u}$ (contour value ± 0.07 a.u.). The PBE functionals and an aug-TZVP basis set were used.

VI. ATOMS AS A TEST CASE

In this section, we look more closely at how well TDDFT performs for a few noble gas atoms. As explained above, this is far from representative of its behavior for large molecules, but this does allow careful study of the electronic spectra without other complications. Most importantly, for the He, Be, and Ne atoms, we have essentially exact ground-state KS potentials from Umrigar and coworkers[156, 234]. This allows us to dissect the sources of error in TDDFT calculations.
FIG. 8: Singlet energy level diagram for the helium atom. The Rydberg series of transition frequencies clustered below the ionization threshold can be seen. The frequencies cluster together, making it difficult to assess the quality of the TDDFT calculated spectra. As discussed in the text, the quantum defect is preferable for this purpose.

A. Quantum defect

In Fig. 8 we show the KS orbital energy level diagram of the helium atom. The zero is set at the onset of the continuum and is marked with a dotted line. For closed shell atoms and for any spherical one-electron potential that decays as $-1/r$ at large distances, the bound-state transitions form a Rydberg series with frequencies:

$$\omega_{nl} = I - \frac{1}{2(n - \mu_{nl})^2}$$

(59)

where $I$ is the ionization potential, and $\mu_{nl}$ is called the quantum defect. Quantum defect theory was developed by Ham [235] and Seaton [236] before even the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem[1].

The great value of the quantum defect is its ability to capture all the information about the entire Rydberg series of transitions in a single slowly-varying function, the quantum defect as a function of energy, $\mu(E = \omega - I)$, which can often be fit by a straight line or parabola. In Table XI, we report extremely accurate results from wavefunction calculations for the helium atom. We show singlet and triplet values that have been obtained by Drake [198]. We also give results from the exact ground-state KS potential shown in Fig 2 [156]. For each column, on the left are the transition frequencies, while on the right are the corresponding quantum defects. Note how small the differences between transitions become as one climbs up the ladder, and yet the quantum defect remains finite and converges to a definite value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Singlet $^a$</th>
<th>Triplet $^a$</th>
<th>KS $^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s $\rightarrow$ 2s</td>
<td>0.7578 0.1493</td>
<td>0.7285 0.3108</td>
<td>0.7459 0.2196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s $\rightarrow$ 3s</td>
<td>0.8425 0.1434</td>
<td>0.8350 0.3020</td>
<td>0.8391 0.2169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s $\rightarrow$ 4s</td>
<td>0.8701 0.1417</td>
<td>0.8672 0.2994</td>
<td>0.8688 0.2149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s $\rightarrow$ 5s</td>
<td>0.8825 0.1409</td>
<td>0.8883 0.2984</td>
<td>0.8818 0.2146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s $\rightarrow$ 6s</td>
<td>0.8892 0.1405</td>
<td>0.8926 0.2978</td>
<td>0.8888 0.2144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s $\rightarrow$ 7s</td>
<td>0.8931 0.1403</td>
<td>0.8926 0.2975</td>
<td>0.8929 0.2143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Accurate non-relativistic calculations from Ref. [198].

$^b$The differences between the KS eigenvalues obtained with the exact potential from Ref. [156].

All the information of the levels of Fig. 8 and of Table XI is contained in Fig. 9. This clearly illustrates that the quantum defect is a smooth function of energy, and is well approximated (in these cases) as a straight line. The quantum defect is thus an extremely compact and sensitive test of approximations to transition frequencies. Any approximate ground-state KS potential suggested for use in TDDFT should have its quantum defect compared with the exact KS quantum defect, while any approximate XC-kernel should produce accurate corrections to the ground-state KS quantum defect, on the scale of Fig. 9.

To demonstrate the power of this analysis, we test two common approximations to the ground-state potential, both of which produce asymptotically correct potentials. These are exact exchange [237] (see Sec II B)
and LB94 [227]. Exact exchange calculations are more demanding than traditional DFT calculations, but are becoming popular because of the high quality of the potential [238, 239]. On the other hand, LB94 provides an asymptotically correct potential at little extra cost beyond traditional DFT [215, 226, 240]. In Fig. 10 we show the Be quantum defect obtained with LB94, OEP, and exact KS potentials. Fig. 10 immediately shows the high quality of the exact exchange potential. The quantum defect curve is almost identical to the exact one, apart from being offset by about 0.1. On the other hand, the quantum defect of LB94 was poor for all cases studied [241, 242]. This shows that just having a potential that is asymptotically correct is not enough to get a good quantum defect.

### B. Testing TDDFT

To see how well TDDFT really does, we plot quantum defects for atoms. We take the He atom as our prototype, as usual in this section. In Fig. 11, we plot first the KS quantum defect and the exact singlet and triplet lines, as before in Fig. 9. Then we consider the Hartree approximation. This is equivalent to setting the XC kernel to zero. This changes the position of the singlet curve, but leaves the triplet unchanged from its KS value, because the direct term includes no spin-flipping. It definitely improves over the KS for the singlet. Lastly, we include ALDA XC corrections. Only if these significantly improve over the Hartree curves can we say TDDFT is really working here. Clearly it does, reducing the Hartree error enormously.

These results are also typical of He P transitions, and Be S and P transitions. For reasons as yet unclear, the 

### C. Saving standard functionals

We have a problem with the incorrect long-range behavior of the potential from standard density functionals only when Rydberg excitations are needed. But it would be unsatisfactory to have to perform a completely different type of calculation, eg OEP, in order to include such excitations when desired, especially if the cost of that calculation is significantly greater.

However, it is possible, with some thought and care, and using quantum defect theory, to extract the Rydberg series from the short-ranged LDA potential. To see this, consider Fig. 12, which shows both the bare KS response and the TDDFT corrected response of the He atom. The δ-function absorptions at the discrete transitions have been replaced by straightlines, whose height represents the oscillator strength of the absorption, multiplied by the appropriate density of states [247]. In the top panel, just the KS transitions are shown, for both the KS potential and the LDA potential of Fig 3 from section II B. The exact curve has a Rydberg series converging to 0.903, the exact ionization threshold for He. The LDA curve, on the other hand, has a threshold at just below 0.6. But clearly its optical absorption mimics...
that of the exact system, even in the Rydberg series region, and is accurate to about 20%. The TDDFT ALDA corrections are small, and overcorrect the bare LDA results, but clearly are consistent with our observations for the bare spectra.

Why is this the case? Is this a coincidence? Returning to Fig. 3 of the introduction, we notice that the LDA (or GGA) potential runs almost exactly parallel to the true potential for \( r \lesssim 2 \), i.e., where the density is. Thus the scattering orbitals of the LDA potential, with transition energies between 0.6 and 0.9, almost exactly match the Rydberg orbitals of the exact KS potential with the same energy. When carefully defined, i.e., phase space factors for the continuum relative to bound states, the oscillator strength is about the same. This is no coincidence but, due to the lack of derivative discontinuity of LDA, its potential differs from the exact one by roughly a constant.

The ‘fruitfly’ of TDDFT benchmarks is the \( \pi \rightarrow \pi^* \) transition in benzene. This occurs at about 5 eV in a ground-state LDA calculation, and ALDA shifts it correctly to about 7 eV[230]. Unfortunately, this is in the LDA continuum, which starts at about 6.5 eV! This is an example of the same general phenomenon, where LDA has pushed some oscillator strength into the continuum, but its overall contribution remains about right.

We can go one step further, and even deduce the energies of individual transitions. While the existence of a quantum defect requires a long-ranged potential, its value is determined by the phase-shift caused by the deviation from \(-1/r\) in the interior of the atom. The quantum defect extractor (QDE)[248], is a formula for extracting the effective quantum defect from a scattering orbital of a short-ranged KS potential, such as that of LDA. The QDE is:

\[
\frac{d \ln \phi}{dr} = \frac{1}{n^*} - \frac{n^*}{r} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{U(-n^*; 2; 2r/n^*)}{U(1-n^*; 2; 2r/n^*)}
\]  

Here \( k = \sqrt{2|E|} \) is written as \( k = (n^*)^{-1} \), with \( n^* = (n - \mu_n) \), where \( n \) numbers the bound state, and \( \mu_n \) is the quantum defect; \( U \) is the confluent hypergeometric function [249]. If the extractor is applied to an orbital of a long-ranged potential, it rapidly approaches its quantum defect.

In Fig 13, we plot the results of the QDE for the He atom, applied to both the exact KS potential and the LDA potential. The LDA potential runs almost parallel to the exact one in the region \( 1 < r < 2 \) (where \( \mu_\infty \) can already be extracted accurately), and orbitals corresponding to the same frequency (exact and LDA) are therefore very close in that region. In the spirit of Ref.[250], we compare the exact energy-normalized 20s orbital (which is essentially identical to the zero-energy state in the region \( 0 < r < 6 \)) and the LDA orbital of energy \( I + \epsilon_{1s}^{LDA} = 0.904 - 0.571 = 0.333 \). Notice how good the LDA orbital is in the region \( 1 < r < 2 \). We show in Fig.13 the solution of Eq.(60) when this scattering LDA orbital is employed. Clearly, the plateau of the LDA curve in the \( 1 < r < 2 \) region is an accurate estimate of the quantum defect. The value of \( \mu \) on this plateau is 0.205, an underestimation of less than 4% with respect to the exact value.

Thus, given the ionization potential of the system, LDA gives a very accurate prediction of the asymptotic quantum defect. The ionization potential is needed to choose the appropriate LDA scattering orbital, but the results are not terribly sensitive to it. We repeated the same procedure with the LDA ionization potential (defined as \( E_{LDA}(He) - E_{LDA}(He^+) = 0.974 \)) instead of the exact one, and found \( \mu_\infty^{LDA} = 0.216 \), overestimating the exact \( \mu_\infty \) by just 1%.
D. Electron scattering

Lastly in this section, we mention recent progress in developing a theory for low-energy electron scattering from molecules. This was one of the original motivations for developing TDDFT. One approach would be to evolve a wavepacket using the TDKS equations, but a more direct approach has been developed[251, 252], in terms of the response function \( \chi \) of the \( N + 1 \) electron system (assuming it is bound).

This uses similar technology to the discrete transition case. Initial results for the simplest case, electron scattering from He\(^+\), suggest a level of accuracy comparable to bound-bound transitions, at least for low energies (the most difficult case for traditional methods, due to bound-free correlation[253]). TDDFT, using the exact ground-state potential and ALDA, produces more accurate answers than static exchange[251], a traditional low cost method that is used for larger molecules[254, 255].

However, that TDDFT method fails when applied to electron scattering from Hydrogen, the true prototype, as the approximate solution of the TDDFT equations (very similar to the single pole approximation of Sec VE) fails, due to stronger correlations. To overcome this, a much simpler method has been developed, that uses an old scattering trick[256] to deduce scattering phase shifts from bound-state energies when the system is placed in a box, yielding excellent results for a very demanding case.

VII. BEYOND STANDARD FUNCTIONALS

We have surveyed and illustrated some of the many present successful applications of TDDFT in the previous section. In these applications, standard approximations (local, gradient-corrected, and hybrid, see sec. II B) are used both for the ground-state calculation and the excitations, via the adiabatic approximation (sec. III D). In this section, we survey several important areas in which this approach has been found to fail, and what might be done about it.

The errors are due to locality in both space and time, and these are intimately related. In fact, all memory effects, i.e., dependence on the history of the density[184], implying a frequency-dependence in the XC kernel, can be subsumed into an initial-state dependence[180], but probably not vice-versa. Several groups are attempting to build such effects into new approximate functionals [257–266], but none have shown universal applicability yet.

The failure of the adiabatic approximation is most noticeable when higher-order excitations are considered, and found to be missing in the usual linear response treatment[190]. The failure of the local approximation in space is seen when TDDFT is applied to extended systems, e.g., polymers or solids. Local approximations yield short-ranged XC kernels, which become irrelevant compared to Hartree contributions in the long-wavelength limit. The Coulomb repulsion between electrons generally requires long-ranged (ie 1/r) exchange effects when long-wavelength response is being calculated.

Thus several approaches have been developed and applied in places where the standard formulation has failed. These approaches fall into two distinct categories. On the one hand, where approximations that are local in the density fail, approximations that are local (or semi-local) in the current-density might work. In fact, for TDDFT, the gradient expansion, producing the leading corrections to ALDA, only works if the current is the basic variable[267]. Using the gradient expansion itself is called the Vignale-Kohn (VK) approximation[268, 269], and it has been tried on a variety of problems.

The alternative approach is to construct orbital-dependent approximations with explicit frequency-dependence[270, 271]. This can work well for specific cases, but it is then hard to see how to construct general density functional approximations from these examples. More importantly, solution of the OEP equations is typically far more expensive than the simple KS equations, making OEP impractical for large molecules.

A. Double excitations

As first pointed out by Casida[190], double excitations appear to be missing from TDDFT linear response, within any adiabatic approximation. Experience[272, 273] shows that, like in naphthalene, sometimes adiabatic TDDFT will produce a single excitation in about the right region, in place of two lines, where a double has mixed strongly with a single.

In fact, when a double excitation lies close to a single excitation, elementary quantum mechanics shows that \( f_{\text{xc}} \) must have a strong frequency dependence [270]. Recently, post-adiabatic TDDFT methodologies have been developed[270, 274, 275] for including a double excitation when it is close to an optically-active single excitation, and works well for small dienes[270, 276]. It might be hoped that, by going beyond linear response, non-trivial double excitations would be naturally included in, e.g., TDLDA, but it has recently been proven that, in the higher-order response in TDLDA, the double excitations occur simply at the sum of single-excitations[277]. Thus we do not currently know how best to approximate these excitations. This problem is particularly severe for quantum wells, where the external potential is parabolic, leading to multiple near degeneracies between levels of excitation[274].

Returning to our naphthalene example, based on a HF reference, the \( 2 \ 1^1 \Delta_g \) state has, according to the RICC2 results, a considerable admixture of double excitations. This is consistent with the fact that the CIS method yields an excitation energy that is too high by 1.5 eV compared to experiment. The TDDFT results are much closer, yet too high by several tenths of eV.
B. Polymers

![Graph showing ALDA and VK static axial polarizability of polyacetylene compared with RHF and MP2 results from Refs. [278–280]. ALDA severely overestimates the polarizability compared to the accurate MP2 calculation. Hartree-Fock is also incorrect. However using the VK functional gives almost exact agreement, at least in this case.]

An early triumph of the VK functional was the static polarizabilities of long-chain conjugated polymers. These polarizabilities are greatly underestimated by LDA or GGA, with the error growing rapidly with the number of units[281]. On the other hand, HF does rather well, and does not overpolarize. The VK correction to LDA yields excellent results in many (but not all) cases, showing that a current-dependent functional can correct the over-polarization problem. Naturally, orbital-dependent functionals also account for this effect[282], but at much higher computational cost.

C. Solids

Again, in trying to use TDDFT to calculate the optical response of insulators, local approximations has been shown to fail badly. Most noticeably, they do not describe excitonic effects[283], or the exciton spectrum within the band gap. On top of this, the gap is usually much smaller than experiment, because adiabatic approximations cannot change the gap size from its KS value.

One approach is using the VK approximation in TD-CDFT. This has proven rather successful, although a single empirical factor was needed to get agreement with experiment[284–286]. An alternative is to study the many-body problem[287], and ask which expressions must the XC kernel include in order to yield an accurate absorption spectrum[288, 289]. However, the presently available schemes require an expensive GW calculation in the first place[290]. A recent review can be found in Ref. [291].

D. Charge transfer

As is usually the case whenever a method is shown to work well, it starts being applied to many cases, and specific failures appear. Charge transfer excitations are of great importance in photochemistry, especially of biological systems, but many workers have now found abysmal results with TDDFT for these cases.

This can be understood from the fact that TDDFT is a linear response theory. When an excitation moves charge from one area in a molecule to another, both ends will relax. In fact, charge transfer between molecules can be well-approximated by ground-state density functional calculations of the total energies of the species involved. But TDDFT must deduce the correct transitions by infinitesimal perturbations around the ground-state, without an relaxation. Thus it seems a poor problem to tackle with linear response. Many researchers are studying this problem, to understand it and find practical solutions around it[88, 292–295].

VIII. OTHER TOPICS

In this chapter, we discuss several topics of specialized interest, where TDDFT is being applied and developed in ways other than simple extraction of excitations from linear response.

In the first of these, we show how TDDFT can be used to construct entirely new approximations to the ground-state XC energy. This method is particularly useful for capturing the long-range fluctuations that produce dispersion forces between molecules, which are notoriously absent from most ground-state approximations.

In the second, we briefly survey strong field applications, in which TDDFT is being used to model atoms and molecules in strong laser fields. We find that it works well and easily for some properties, but less so for others.

In the last, we discuss the more recent, hot area of molecular electronics. Here, many workers are using ground-state DFT to calculate transport characteristics, but a more careful formulation can be done only within (and beyond) TDDFT. We review recent progress toward a more rigorous formulation of this problem.

A. Ground-state XC energy

TDDFT offers a method[296, 298–301] to find more sophisticated ground-state approximate energy functional using the frequency-dependent response function. Below we introduce the basic formula and discuss some of the exciting systems this method is being used to study.

This procedure uses the adiabatic connection
linear response, if the XC kernel is zero (i.e. within the Hartree method of 1928. However when calculating the random phase approximation), the XC energy calculated using Eq. (61) still gives useful results.

Conversely, we end up with the highly inaccurate results. Using this method to find the electron-electron repulsion in the Hamiltonian, but the external potential is adjusted to keep the density fixed[302, 303]. Any approximation to the XC kernel at short distances[296].

It is interesting that if we set XC effects to zero in conventional DFT, we end up with the highly inaccurate Hartree method of 1928. However when calculating the linear response, if the XC kernel is zero (i.e. within the random phase approximation), the XC energy calculated using Eq. (61) still gives useful results.

Computationally this procedure is far more demanding than conventional DFT, but as the above example has shown, even poor approximations to the XC kernel can still lead to good results. Using this method to find the XC energy has the ability to capture effects such as dynamical correlation or Van der Waal interactions, which are missing from conventional ground-state DFT approximations, and are thought to be important in biological systems.

In particular, the coefficient in the decay of the energy between two such pieces \(C_6\) in \(E \rightarrow -C_6/R^6\), where \(R\) is their separation) can be accurately (within about 20%) evaluated using a local approximation to the frequency-dependent polarizability[299, 304–306]. In Fig. 15, the binding energy curve for two Helium atoms interacting via Van der Waals is shown. Using the fluctuation-dissipation formula, Eq. (61), and the PBE0 XC kernel clearly gives more accurate results than semi-local functionals. Recently, the frequency integral in Eq. (61) has been performed explicitly but approximately, yielding an explicit non-local density functional[299, 301, 304, 307–312] applicable at all separations. TDDFT response functions have also been used in the framework of symmetry-adapted perturbation theory to generate accurate binding energy curves of Van der Waals molecules [313].

One can go the other way, and try using Eq. (61) for all bond lengths[314, 315]. In fact, Eq (61) provides a KS density functional that allows bond-breaking without artificial symmetry breaking[300]. In the paradigm case of the H2 molecule, the binding energy curve has no Coulson-Fischer point, and the dissociation occurs correctly to two isolated H atoms. Unfortunately, simple approximations, while yielding correct results near equilibrium and at infinity, produce an unphysical repulsion at large but finite separations. This can be traced back[300] to the lack of double excitations in any adiabatic \(f_{XC}\). Study of the convergence of \(E_{XC}\) with basis sets has also led to an obvious flaw in the ALDA kernel at short distances[296].

Further work is needed to find accurate XC kernels. One method[298] to test these is by examining the uniform electron gas as the frequency dependent susceptibility can be found easily and uses the well known Lindhard function. Hence different approximate XC kernels may be tested and their results compared to highly accurate Monte-carlo simulations.

B. Strong fields

Next we turn our attention to the non-perturbative regime. Due to advances in laser technology over the past decade, many experiments are now possible in regimes where the laser field is stronger than the nuclear attraction[11]. The time-dependent field cannot be treated perturbatively, and even solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation in three dimensions for the evolution of two interacting electrons is barely feasible with present-day computer technology[316].

For more electrons in a time-dependent field, wavefunc-
tion methods are prohibitive, and in the regime of (not too high) laser intensities, where the electron-electron interaction is still of importance, TDDFT is essentially the only practical scheme available[317–323]. There are a whole host of phenomena that TDDFT might be able to predict: high harmonic generation, multi-photon ionization, above-threshold ionization, above-threshold dissociation, etc., but only if accurate approximations are available.

With the recent advent of atto-second laser pulses, the electronic time-scale has become accessible. Theoretical tools to analyze the dynamics of excitation processes on the attosecond time scale will become more and more important. An example of such a tool is the time-dependent electron localization function (TDELФ) [325, 326]. This quantity allows the time-resolved observation of the formation, modulation, and breaking of chemical bonds, thus providing a visual understanding of the dynamics of excited electrons (for an example see Ref. [324]). The natural way of calculating the TDELФ is from the TDKS orbitals.

High harmonic generation (HHG) is the production from medium intensity lasers of very many harmonics (sometimes hundreds) of the input intensity. Here TDDFT calculations have been rather successful for atoms [327–329] and molecules[330, 331]. Recent experiments have used the HHG response of molecules to determine their vibrational modes[332]. Calculations have been performed using traditional scattering theory[333]. If this method grows to be a new spectroscopy, perhaps the electron scattering theory of Sec VID will be used to treat large molecules.

Multi-photon ionization occurs when an atom or molecule loses more than one electron in an intense field. About a decade ago, this was discovered to be a nonsequential process, i.e., the probability of double ionization can be much greater than the product of two independent ionization events, leading to a ‘knee’ in the double ionization probability as a function of intensity[334–336]. TDDFT calculations have so far been unable to accurately reproduce this knee, and it has recently been shown that a correlation-induced derivative discontinuity is needed in the time-dependent KS potential[185].

Above-threshold ionization (ATI) refers to the probability of ionization when the laser frequency is less than the ionization potential, i.e., it does not occur in linear response[337, 338]. Again, this is not well given by TDDFT calculations, but both this and MPI require knowledge of the correlated wavefunction, which is not directly available in a KS calculation.

Since the ionization threshold plays a crucial role in most strong field phenomena, Koopmans theorem relating the energy level of the KS HOMO to the ionization energy must be well satisfied. This suggests the use of self-interaction free methods such as OEP[159, 173] or LDA-SIC rather than the usual DFT approximations (LDA,GGA,etc), with their poor potentials (see Fig. 3 in Sec. II B).

The field of quantum control has mainly concentrated on the motion of the nuclear wave packet on a given set of precalculated potential energy surfaces, the ultimate goal being the femto-second control of chemical reactions [339]. With the advent of atto-second pulses, control of electronic dynamics has come within reach. A marriage of optimal-control theory with TDDFT appears to be the ideal theoretical tool to tackle these problems[340, 341]. Recent work[342–344] has shown the ability of TDDFT to predict the coherent control of quantum wells using Terahertz lasers. However they remains many difficulties and challenges, including the coupling between nuclei and electrons[345–347], in order to develop a general purpose theory.

C. Transport

There is enormous interest in transport through single molecules as a key component in future nanotechnology[348]. Present formulations use ground-state density functionals to describe the stationary non-equilibrium current-carrying state[349]. But several recent suggestions consider this as a time-dependent problem[350–353], and use TD(C)DFT for a full description of the situation. Only time will tell if TDDFT is really needed for an accurate description of these devices.

FIG. 16: Schematic representation of a benzene-1,4-di-thiol molecule between two gold contacts. The molecule plus gold pyramids (55 atoms each) constitute the extended molecule as used in the DFT calculations for the Landauer approach.

Imagine the setup shown in Fig. 16 where a conducting molecule is sandwiched between two contacts which are connected to semi-infinity leads. The Landauer formula for the current is

$$I = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE T(E)[f_L(E) - f_R(E)]$$

where $T(E)$ is the transmission probability for a given energy and $f_{L/R}(E)$ is the Fermi distribution function
for the left/right lead. The transmission probability can be written using the non-equilibrium Green's functions (NEGF) of the system. Ground-state DFT is used to find the KS orbitals and energies of the extended molecule and used to find the self-energies of the leads. These are then fed into the NEGF method, which will determine $T(E)$ and hence the current.

The NEGF scheme has had a number of successes, most notably for atomic-scale point contacts and metallic wires. Generally it does well for systems where the conductance is high. However, it was found that for molecular wires, the conductance is overestimated by $1 - 3$ orders of magnitude. Various explanations for this and the problems with DFT combined with NEGF in general have been suggested.

Firstly, the use of the KS orbitals and energy levels has no theoretical basis. The KS orbitals are those orbitals for the non-interacting problem that reproduce the correct ground-state density. They should not be thought of as the true single-particle excitations of the true system. However as we have seen they often reproduce these excitations qualitatively, so it is not clear to what extent this problem affects the conductance.

The geometry of the molecules was also suggested as a source of error. DFT first relaxes the molecule to find its geometry, whereas in the experiments the molecule may be subject to various stresses that could rotate parts of it and/or squash parts together. However calculations have shown that the geometry corrections are small[354].

The approximation that the non-equilibrium XC functional is the same as for the static case has been suggested as a major source of error. In fact neither the HK theorem nor the RG theorem are strictly valid for current-carrying systems in homogeneous electric fields. A dynamical correction to the LDA functional for the static case has been derived using the Vignale-Kohn functional TDCDFT but were found to yield only small corrections to ALDA[355].

In a similar vein, the lack of the derivative discontinuity and self interacting errors (SIE) in the approximations to the XC functional may be the source of the problem[354]. In Hartree-Fock (HF) calculations (and also in OPM calculations[282] with EXX, exact exchange), which have no SIE, the conductances come out a lot lower in most regions[356]. Also calculations have been done using a simple model[357] with a KS potential with a derivative discontinuity. The I-V curves for this system are significantly different from those predicted by LDA. This problem is most severe when the molecule is not strongly coupled to the leads, but goes away when it is covalently bonded. Recent OEP calculations of the transmission along a H-atom chain verify these features[356].

Despite these problems, quantitative results can be found for molecular devices. By looking at what bias a KS energy level gets moved between the two chemical potentials of the leads (and hence by Eq. (62) there should be a conductance peak), one can qualitatively predict positions of these peaks[358], although the magnitude of the conductance may be incorrect by orders of magnitude.

Since transport is a non-equilibrium process, we should expect that using static DFT will not be able to accurately predict all the features. Recently a number of methods have been suggested to use TDDFT to calculate transport. In Ref. [359], the authors present a practical scheme using TDDFT to calculate current. The basic idea is to 'pump' the system into a non-equilibrium initial state by some external bias and then allow the KS orbitals to evolve in time via the TDKS equations. The RG theorem then allows one to extract the longitudinal current using the continuity equation. Using transparent boundary conditions in the leads (these solve problems with propagating KS in the semi-infinite leads) and using an iterative procedure to get the correct initial state, they are able to find the steady state current.

An alternative formulation uses periodic boundary conditions and includes dissipation[360]. In the Landauer-Büttiker formulism, dissipation effects due to electron-electron interaction and electron-phonon interaction are neglected as the molecule is smaller than the scattering length. However, there would be scattering in the leads. Imagine a molecule in the ring geometry, with a spatially constant electric field. Via a gauge transformation, this can be replaced by a constant time-dependent magnetic field through the center of the ring. If there is no dissipation, the electrons would keep accelerating indefinitely and never reach a steady state.
In the classical Boltzmann equation for transport, scattering is included via a dissipation term using \( \tau \), the average collision time. A master equation approach is basically a generalization of the Boltzmann equation to a fully quantum mechanical system. The master equation is based on the Louville equation in quantum mechanics and for a quantum mechanical density coupled to a heat bath (or reservoir), it is written as

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \rho(t) = -i[H, \rho(t)] + C[\rho(t)] \tag{63}
\]

where \( C \) is a superoperator acting on the density whose elements are calculated using Fermi’s Golden rule with \( V_{el-ph} \) in a certain approximation (weak coupling and instantaneous processes). A KS master equation[353] can be set up, modifying \( C \) for single particle reduced density matrices so that it will give the correct steady state. The TDKS equations are then used to propagate forward in time until the correct steady state density is found. The current in then extracted from this. Recent calculations have shown it can give correct behaviour, such as hysteresis in I-V curves.[352, 361]

**IX. SUMMARY**

We hope we have conveyed some of the spirit and excitement of TDDFT in this non-comprehensive review. We have explained what TDDFT is, and where it comes from. We have shown that it is being used, and often works well, for many molecular excitations. Its usefulness lies neither in high accuracy nor reliability, but in its qualitative ability to yield roughly correct absorption spectra for molecules of perhaps several hundred atoms. Thus we emphasize that, usually, there are many excitations of the same symmetry, all coupled together, and that these are the circumstances under which the theory should be tested. For many molecular systems, TDDFT is now a routine tool that produces useful accuracy with reasonable confidence.

That said, we have discussed some of the areas where TDDFT in its current incarnation is not working, such as double excitations, charge transfer, and extended systems. But there has been significant progress in two out of three of these, both in understanding the origin of the problem, and finding alternative approaches that may ultimately yield a practical solution. We also studied how well TDDFT works for a few cases where the exact ground-state solution is known, describing the accuracy of different functionals. We also surveyed some applications beyond simple linear response for optical absorption, such as ground-state functionals from the adiabatic connection, strong fields, and transport. In each of these areas, more development work seems needed before TDDFT calculations can become a routine tool with useful accuracy.

Many wonder how long DFT’s preeminence in electronic structure can last. For sure, Kohn-Sham DFT is a poor player that struts and frets his hour upon the stage of electronic structure, and then is heard no more. After all, its predecessor, Thomas-Fermi theory, is now obsolete, being too inaccurate for modern needs. Many alternatives for electronic excitations, such as GW, are becoming computationally feasible for interesting systems. But we believe DFT, and TDDFT, should dominate for a few decades yet.
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