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The Hohenberg-Kohn theorem and constrained search formalism of density functional theory are in principle sufficient to address the question of mapping from an excited-state density of an interacting many-electron system to the external potential. Which is also equally applicable to the model noninteracting system. Be it the lowest (non)degenerate excited state of a given symmetry or any other many-particle quantum states with differing symmetry and thus corresponding to arbitrary order of excitations, the analogue of Hohenberg-Kohn theorem and constrained search formalism can uniquely establish the one-to-one density-to-potential mapping. We have rigorously investigated and also shown by examples that the existence of multiple effective/external potentials for excited-states and the seemingly contradictory results in connection to the applicability of Gunnarsson-Lundqvist theorem even for the lowest excited-state is not truly a failure or violation of Hohenberg-Kohn/Gunnarsson-Lundqvist theorem. Rather these are nothing but our limited understanding of the subtle differences between the ground and excited-state density-functional theory. So these are in fact no issues in the context of the foundational aspects of excited-state density-functional formalism. Our critical analysis outlines that the multiplicity of potentials for a given density (i.e. the symmetries of the quantum states involve) never guarantee the violation of one-to-one correspondence between the two most valuable physical quantities of interest in modern density-functional theory. By furthering the existing theories and basic principles, we have provided a firm footing to the density-to-potential mapping for excited-states in general. We have shown that our proposed criterions based on generalized constrained search formalism keep the excited-state density-to-potential mapping intact.

INTRODUCTION

Since its advent, density-functional theory (DFT) is the most widely used, popular and successful many body quantum mechanical (QM) approach for describing matter and still continuing to be the same. DFT is now routinely applied for calculating the e.g. electronic, magnetic, spectroscopic and thermodynamic properties of atoms, molecules and materials for both ground and excited states. Its because the most straightforward approach to characterizing electronic system i.e. solving the many particle Schrödinger equation is impractical except for very small systems, as the wavefunction’s complexity grows rapidly with increasing size. Thus the earlier attempts were to simplify the many-body problem using particle density as a basic variable started with the Thomas-Fermi approximation and later Hohenberg, Kohn and Sham (HKS) formulation of modern DFT for non-degenerate ground state. Hohenberg and Kohn (HK) proved that ground state of a many-electron system is uniquely determined by it’s particle density. Analogus to the QM variational approach, HK developed the variational DFT principle which states, the energy can be expressed as a functional of the density which assume its minimum value for the correct ground-state density. The HK theorems proved via the variational principle of energy also gives the one-to-one mapping between the ground state density \( \rho(\vec{r}) \) and the external potential \( \varphi(\vec{r}) \). Hence, the knowledge of density \( \rho(\vec{r}) \), which in turn predicts the external potential \( \varphi(\vec{r}) \) to within an additive constant and under the constraint of particle number \( N \) conservations is sufficient to address and describe the many-body problem. The significance of HK theorem is that the ground state density \( \rho(\vec{r}) \) of a physical system uniquely determines the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}[\varphi(\vec{r}), N] \) and other physical properties.

In the past couple of decades, it became apparent to ask whether the HK and KS ground-state DFT can be extended for successfully studying the excited-states and perform self-consistent Kohn-Sham calculations for energy and other desired properties. As several excitonic phenomenas attributing to various effects are now an area of active research, so to do such calculations time dependent density functional theory (TDDFT) gained overwhelming response. But the theory has its limitations and several foundational as well as technical issues to handle different types of excitation effects. Then one of a most natural approach to excited-state DFT is to use time-independent density functionals, where the
individual excited-state energies and electron densities arise as stationary states of the energy density functional of the form

$$E[\rho(\vec{r})] = F[\rho(\vec{r})] + \int \rho(\vec{r}) \, \hat{v}(\vec{r}) \, d\vec{r},$$

(1)

where $\hat{v}(\vec{r})$ is the external potential, $\rho(\vec{r})$ is the electron density, and $F[\rho]$ is the sum of the kinetic and electron-electron interaction energies, expressed as a functional of $\rho(\vec{r})$. Eq. (1) is the form of energy expression for the HKS variational ground state. But the question is whether there exists an analogous expression for the excited state. Another crucial requirement for implementing excited-state density-functional theory (eDFT) is that whether there exists one-to-one mapping from an excited-state density $\rho_e(\vec{r})$ to the external potential $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$.

Some of the earlier eDFT work includes the extension of ground state formalism to the lowest excited states of a given symmetry e.g. Gunnarsson and Lundqvist (GL) \cite{5, 6}. In their work, GL have advocated the usefulness of spin-density-functional (sDFT) formalism and analogously extended the ground state energy functional to the excited state. Within the local-spin-density (LSD) approximation, GL have claimed that there exists an one-to-one mapping between the density $\rho(\vec{r})$ and potential $\hat{v}(\vec{r})$ for the lowest excited state of a given symmetry (i.e. GL theorem \cite{5, 6}). Thus far it has been considered to be the HK like theorem for low lying excited-states. In a recent work, Li et al. \cite{43} provided demonstration of GL theorem for a simple model system and they claimed multiple potential only for higher excited states. Although the issue of density $\rho(\vec{r})$ to potential $\hat{v}(\vec{r})$ mapping for excited states has been addressed recently in a series of papers by Salmi et al. \cite{44}, Harbola \cite{45} and Gaudoin and Burke \cite{46}, but the question still remained open. In the work of \cite{44} and \cite{45}, it was shown that a given ground or excited state density can be generated as a noninteracting system density by a configuration of one’s choice. Salmi and coworkers obtained the potentials using the differential virial theorem \cite{44}, whereas Harbola did so using the constrained-search approach \cite{17}. The work of Gaudoin and Burke \cite{46} demonstrate the lack of HK theorem \cite{4} for excited states. Where they have studied it for the second excited triplet state of a model system within the linear response kernel. Also in recent times, the work of Perdew and Levy \cite{19}, Görling \cite{22, 23}, Levy-Nagy \cite{48, 49} opened the avenue to formulate eDFT based on CS formalism \cite{17}. In the work of \cite{19}, they have explored the form of ground-state constrained search functional, whereas the work of \cite{22, 23} and \cite{48, 49} based on excited state constrained search functional. Following this, Samal and Harbola explored DFT for excited-states further \cite{43, 51, 54, 65}. The current work stems from the above studies and in particular further progress being made on the foundational aspects of eDFT.

In this work, we again critically analyse and make furtheration to the eDFT ideas proposed by Samal and Harbola (SH) \cite{35, 53}. Where they have shown (i) that the extension of CS approach from ground-state to excited-state in the light of the stationary state formalism of Görling \cite{22, 23} and variational eDFT formalism by Lávy-Nagy (LN) \cite{48, 49}; (ii) within the variational eDFT formalism, the construction of the KS system by comparison of the ground-state density only is not sufficient to explain the existence of multiple alternative effective potentials; (iii) what are the different criterions for density-to-potential mapping in eDFT. Compare the ground states of the true and KS system energetically so that it can take care of the fact that the densities resembles most closely in a least square sense. So comparison of the expectation value of the original ground-state KS Hamiltonian (constructed using the HS \cite{64} exact exchange potential) with that of the obtained alternative KS systems. Lastly, the kinetic energy of true and KS system need to be kept closest. Which is also another way of comparing the ground states based on the differential virial theorem (DVT); (iv) CS approach is capable to generate all the potentials for a given excited state density and how to fix the density-to-potential mapping. The above propositions of SH eDFT are also valid within the generalized adiabatic connection (GAC) and in principle applicable to (non-)coulombic densities. Besides all these, for completeness we will show even within the procedure adopted by Li et al. \cite{43}, one can also generate alternative potentials for given ground or excited state densities. This is actually not the violation of density-to-potential mapping. Which will be demonstrated by making use of SH eDFT for two model systems (i.e. 1D quantum harmonic oscillator and infinite well external potentials).

**CONSTRANDED-SEARCH FORMULATION OF eDFT**

One of the conventional way to study eDFT is the ”constrained-search (CS)” method \cite{14, 17, 18, 56, 57}.
Through CS, for a given ground-state density $\rho_0(\vec{r})$, one can construct ground state wavefunction and find potential, which establishes the density-to-potential mapping. This is a quite rigorous and conceptually very well established result. Although the ground-state CS formulation in principle have all the information about the excited-states. But, the concerned density-to-potential mapping for individual excited-states are not so trivial and straightforward. To do so, there are series of propositions being made based on the original CS method [17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 35, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 58, 59]. The above interesting results, prompted us to persue our work in a similar direction. In recent past, the form of functional for ground state (both for degenerate and non-degenerate) has been extended [52, 53, 60–63] to study the excited states. In the following sections, we will describe how to use the CS formalism for addressing the issue of density-to-potential mapping from and excited-states. But, the concerned density-to-potential mapping for individual excited-states are not so trivial.

Extremum Principle and Stationary state eDFT: density-to-potential mapping

To bring out the implicit dependence of the excited-states on the ground-state, we go back to the work of Perdew and Levy (PL) [19], who first investigated the applicability of ground-state functional for studying excited-states in general. They adopted CS [17, 18] to setting up the extremum principle involving excited-state densities. To begin with, we will start from the original ground-state CS functional and show that the excited-states are just extrema of such functional which are lying above the absolute minimum. In principle, these extrema corresponds to some stationary-excited-state densities $\rho_e(\vec{r})$ which are not pure state $v$–representable unless one uses density-functionals for excited-states [52, 53, 60–63]. The CS formalism is preferred over HK theory, because in the HK density variational principle [1, 4], the universal density functional $F[\rho]$ is defined only for $v$–representable densities $\rho[\hat{v}; N] = |\Psi[\hat{v}; N]|^2$. Where $\Psi[\hat{v}; N]$’s are the anti-symmetric wavefunctions of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}[\hat{v}; N]$. So its quite natural that the Hilbert subspace of $N$–representable densities $\rho[N] = |\Psi[N]|^2$ have much larger set than the $v$–representable ones. As the identity of the physical system is captured in the external potential $\hat{v} = \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$, so one requires to have the information about it directly from the density. To do so, let’s consider $N$ fermions in a local external potential $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$, with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r}_i), \quad (2)$$
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Now for the ground-state wavefunction $\Psi_0$, the potential $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$ can be determined from (3) i.e.

$$\mu = \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r}) + \left( \frac{\delta Q[\rho]}{\delta \rho} \right)_{\rho = \rho_0}$$

(11)

where $\mu$ is arising as Lagrange multiplier. Thus from the above discussion it is obvious that the energy density functional $E[\rho]$ provides lower bound on the stationary-state energies for a given ground-state density. So $E_0 = E[\rho_0(\vec{r})]$ is the global minimum of the density functional $E[\rho]$ for the external potential $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$. In this minimization process, the external potential and the density remains fixed. So the minimization occurs only on the density functional $Q[\rho]$. Not only ground-state but the energy density functional is also stationary for any arbitrary excited state density. For many arbitrary excited-state electron densities, Eq. (11) in general not true [58]. This is because the density which may correspond to the excited-state of one electronic system can be associated with the ground or symmetrically different excited state of some other system. As a matter of which during the variational minimization the CS will pick a state having lowest $F[\rho_\text{exc}]$ out of all the possibilities. In such situation, the pure state $\psi$—representability will be lost (which is described in the following section).

For the clear interpretation and understanding of the point made in the previous section, let’s consider a problem of finding a many-body wavefunction $\Psi[\rho, N]$ which minimizes $\langle \Psi | T + \lambda \hat{V}_{\text{exc}} | \Psi \rangle$ subject to the constraint that $\Psi \rightarrow \rho$. Where $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ is the electron-electron coupling constant. Whenever we will be changing $\lambda$ value from 0 to 1 in each and every path of $\lambda$ the constraint condition $\Psi \rightarrow \rho$ should be satisfied. Upon considering this condition we can introduce a Langrange multiplier $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}[\rho(\vec{r})]$ such that $\Psi[\rho, N]$ satisfies the eigenvalue equation,

$$[\hat{T} + \lambda \hat{V}_{\text{exc}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}[\rho_i \vec{r}_i]] \Psi[\rho, N] = E[\rho] \Psi[\rho, N].$$

(12)

Now this $\rho(\vec{r})$ may correspond to a quantum state of different symmetry for another potential $\hat{v}'_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r}) \neq \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r}) + C$ (i.e. $\rho(\vec{r}) = \rho_k[\hat{v}'_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})]$ whereas $\rho(\vec{r}) = \rho_l[\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})]$). So $\rho_0[\hat{v}]$ could also be same as $\rho_0[\hat{v}']$ in a fixed Hilbert subspace. Which we will show latter in this paper taking into consideration two simple systems. That means now $\Psi[\rho, N]$ and $\rho[\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}, N]$ are the excited-state wavefunction and excited-state density of the potential $\hat{v}'_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$ respectively. From the quantum mechanical variational principle, every stationary state $\Psi_i$ must deliver the extremum for the $\langle \Psi(\vec{r}) | \hat{H} | \Psi(\vec{r}) \rangle$. But it does not guarantee that every stationary-state density $\rho_i(\vec{r})$ will also deliver the extremum of $\langle \Psi(\vec{r}) | \hat{H} | \Psi(\vec{r}) \rangle$. However, if $\Psi_i(\vec{r})$ need to deliver the minimum for its own density $\rho_i(\vec{r})$ and also give the extremum of the functional $E_v[\rho(\vec{r})] = \langle \Psi(\vec{r}) | \hat{H} | \Psi(\vec{r}) \rangle$ then only one can conclude that $E_v[\rho]$ is the extremum of the lowest stationary state corresponding to that density. So the Perdew and Levy [19] extremum principle within CS formulation has been extended to excited states [22, 23] in general. As in principle, the energy functional Eq. (15) is also stationary for any excited state with some external potential which may differ from that corresponding to ground state. Which means quantum states having different symmetries can be the extremum of the energy density functional corresponding to different external potentials. If so, then in one case $\rho_i(\vec{r})$ be the $i^{th}$ excited state of an external potential $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$ with stationary-state wavefunction $\Psi_i$ and it may be the $k^{th}$ excited state for a different potential $\hat{v}'_{\text{ext}}$ with the corresponding stationary-state wavefunction $\Psi_k$. So the comparison of $F[\Psi_i[\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}, N]]$ and $F[\Psi_k[\hat{v}'_{\text{ext}}, N]]$ is non-trivial. Such a comparison never results any extra information relating to excited-states as described in [58].

A DFT approach [22, 23] which evolved as successor to [19], aimed at treating both ground as well as excited-states on the same footing. This was achieved by the generalization of the CS procedure through the inclusion of the symmetry of the individual quantum states. In fact, the stationarity of the CS functional for any arbitrary excitations placed [22, 23] one step ahead of [19] and in an way for better access to the excited-state counterpart of HK theorem. This is because the HK density functional [4] is defined only for $\psi$—representable densities. So the absolute minima of the functional $F[\rho]$ gives the ground-state energy $E_0$ and the density that minimizes the functional is the ground state density of the external potential $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$. As in principle some $N$—representable density may also minimize the functional, so this problem of the HK universal functional is solved by Levy [17, 18] in their CS formalism. But the formal way of obtaining the excited state remain an unknown task until the appearance of TDDFT. This is because, Lieb [14] had claimed that there exists no such density functional for excited state whose minimization provides it’s energy. Which made Görling [22, 23] to bypass the energy minimization method and construct the excited state DFT using “stationary state formula-
tion”. In the stationary state eDFT, a given wavefunction $\Psi[\rho, \nu]$ is the $\rho-$stationary wavefunction means according to quantum mechanics it satisfies the following

$$\langle \delta \Psi | \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} | \Psi[\rho, \nu] \rangle + \langle \Psi[\rho, \nu] | \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} | \delta \Psi \rangle = 0$$  (13)

With the total particle number preservation constraint,

$$\delta \rho(\vec{r}) = \int [\Psi|^\dagger[\rho, \nu] \delta \Psi + \langle \Psi[\rho, \nu] | \delta \Psi^\dagger \rangle d\vec{r} = 0.$$  (14)

Where $\nu$–level means the $\nu^{th}$ stationary point with the stationary state $\Psi(\rho, \nu)$. The set of stationary points also includes the absolute minimum within it. So by using Eq.(14), from Eq.(13) we get

$$\int [\Psi|^\dagger[\rho, \nu] (\hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee}) \delta \Psi + \langle \Psi[\rho, \nu] | (\hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee}) | \delta \Psi^\dagger \rangle d\vec{r} = 0.$$  (15)

Thus Görling’s formulation summarizes that all eigenstates $\Psi_k$ of the system are $\rho-$stationary and all $\rho-$stationary wavefunctions of a given density is an eigenstate of an electronic system. This is also true even for totally non–$\nu-$representable densities. So there may exists a generalized potential function $\Upsilon(\vec{r})$ such that every $\Psi[\rho, \nu]$ may be an eigenfunction of the corresponding Hamiltonian. In general, the $\rho-$stationarity constraint of $\Psi[\rho, \nu]$ implies that

$$\left(\hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee}\right) \Psi[\rho, \nu] = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \zeta_i(\vec{r}_i)\right) \Psi[\rho, \nu].$$  (16)

Since the kinetic energy operator $\hat{T}$ and electron-electron repulsion operator $\hat{V}_{ee}$ are symmetric operators. Thus it follows that $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \zeta_i(\vec{r}_i)\right)$ also be symmetric. Then all $\zeta_i$’s must be the same function $\zeta(\vec{r})$. Identifying this function as $\zeta(\vec{r}) = \Upsilon(\vec{r}) + \varepsilon$, where $\lim_{\varepsilon \to \infty} \Upsilon(\vec{r}) = 0$, we get the following eigenvalue equation for $\Psi[\rho, \nu]$.

$$\left[Q[\rho] + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Upsilon(\vec{r}_i)\right] \Psi[\rho, \nu] = E \Psi[\rho, \nu]$$  (17)

So the $\rho-$stationary theory discussed so far, alone is insufficient to decide on the density- to-potential mapping due to the following factors. Let $\rho_k(\vec{r})$ be the density of an excited stationary state $\Psi_k$ with energy $E_k$. Then from variational principle

$$E_k = \langle \Psi_k | \hat{H} | \Psi_k \rangle \leq \min_{\rho} \min_{\rho_k(\vec{r})} \langle \Psi[\rho] | \hat{H} | \Psi[\rho] \rangle$$  (18)

or, $E_k \leq E[\rho_k]$  (19)

The equality in Eq.(18) holds if $\Psi_k$ delivers the minimum for its own $\rho_k$ in the CS formalism i.e. if $\Psi_k$ equals to the $\Psi[\rho_k]$.

$$E[\rho_k] = \min_{\Psi_k[N]\to \rho_k} \langle \Psi_k[\rho_k] | \hat{H} | \Psi_k[\rho_k] \rangle$$

$$= \min_{\Psi_k[N]\to \rho_k} \left[\langle \Psi_k[\rho_k] | \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} | \Psi_k[\rho_k] \rangle + \int \rho_k(\vec{r}) \hat{v}_{ext}(\vec{r}) d\vec{r}\right]$$

$$= \min_{\Psi_k[N]\to \rho_k} \left(\langle \Psi_k[\rho_k] | \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} | \Psi_k[\rho_k] \rangle + \int \rho_k(\vec{r}) \hat{v}_{ext}(\vec{r}) d\vec{r}\right)$$

$$\int \rho_k(\vec{r}) \hat{v}_{ext}(\vec{r}) d\vec{r} = Q[\rho_k] + \int \rho_k(\vec{r}) \hat{v}_{ext}(\vec{r}) d\vec{r}$$  (20)

In Eq.(20) the minimization is only over the functional $Q[\rho_k]$ and from it one can obtain the stationary states

$$\Psi_k = \arg \min_{\Psi_k[N]\to \rho_k} \langle \Psi_k[\rho_k] | \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} | \Psi_k[\rho_k] \rangle.$$  (21)

Thus the stationary state CS formalism can be extended to the $k^{th}$ excited-state [19, 58]. As the universal functional will be stationary with the number preserving variation of wavefunction i.e.

$$\left(\frac{\delta E_S[\rho_k]}{\delta \Psi_k}\right)_{\Psi_k\to \Psi_k^e\to \rho_k} = 0$$  (22)

and

$$\left(\frac{\delta \rho_k}{\delta \Psi_S^e}\right)_{\Psi_S^e\to \rho_k} = 0$$  (23)

So the stationary state formalism gives a map from $k^{th}$ excited state density $\rho_k$ to $k^{th}$ stationary state $\Psi_k$. Here density is also stationary with the variation of $k^{th}$ state. As the stationary-state energy functional $E_S^k$ is always stationary w.r.t. the the variation of $E_S^k[N, \Psi_k]$ about $\Psi_k = \Psi_k^e[N]$ i.e.

$$\left(\frac{\delta E_S^k[N, \Psi_k]}{\delta \Psi_k}\right)_{\Psi_k=\Psi_k^e} = 0.$$  (24)

So its always associated with the generalized potentials $\Upsilon(i)$ as mentioned earlier and energy of the excited-state is given by

$$E_S^k = Q[\rho_k] + \Upsilon[\rho_k].$$  (25)

From the analysis of the stationary state formalism it is quite clear that for an excited-state density $\rho_c(\vec{r})$ one can obtain several $\rho-$stationary states corresponding to different external potentials $\hat{v}_{ext}$ [13, 46, 51]. Now the question is how to fixed the $\rho_c \iff \hat{v}_{ext}$ mapping and also form the KS system using this formalism?

**Variational eDFT: density-to-potential mapping**

Insufficiency of the stationary state argument for excited states as discussed in the preceding sections leads
to development of a variational approach to describe it analogous to ground state DFT. But the most promising factor about the stationary state eDFT is that it can decide on the adiabatic connection path. So the density-to-potential mapping remains consistent for the interacting electronic system and it’s KS counterpart. However, the crucial things is to first establish such mapping. Resorting back to the variational HKS theory, Levy and Nagy (LN) shown that there exists an analogous formulation with a minimum principle, for individual excited states \[ 48, 49, 58 \]. The LN formulation provides a variational DFT approach for \( k^{th} \) excited state of an N-electron interacting system by defining the density bi-functional \( F_k[ρ, ρ_0] \) such that the energy of the \( k^{th} \) state is given by

\[
E_k[ρ, ρ_0] = \min_{ρ|v|→N} \left\{ \int \hat{v}_{ext}(r)ρ(r)dr + F[ρ, ρ_0] \right\}
\]

\[
= \int \hat{v}_{ext}(r)ρ_k(r)dr + F[ρ_k, ρ_0], \quad (26)
\]

where \( ρ_0 \) is the ground state density of this system and \( ρ_k \) is the density of it’s \( k^{th} \) excited-state. The energy density functional is different from HKS ground-state and stationary state eDFT functional due to the bi-functional \( F[ρ, ρ_0] \), which is defined by,

\[
F_k[ρ, ρ_0] = \min_{Ψ[|N|→ρ, ⟨Ψ[|N|]|Ψ_j[|v|, |N|]=0,j<k⟩} \langle Ψ[|N|]|T + \hat{V}_{ee}|Ψ \rangle
\]

\[
= F[ρ_k, ρ_0], \quad (27)
\]

for the \( k^{th} \) excited state. Now inserting Eq. (26) back in Eq. (27)

\[
E_k[ρ, ρ_0] = \min_{Ψ[|N|→ρ, ⟨Ψ[|N|]|Ψ_j[|v|, |N|]=0,j<k⟩} \left\{ \int \hat{v}_{ext}(r)ρ_k(r)dr + F_k[ρ, ρ_0] \right\}
\]

\[
= \min_{Ψ[|N|→ρ, ⟨Ψ[|N|]|Ψ_j[|v|, |N|]=0,j<k⟩} \langle Ψ[|N|]|T + \hat{V}_{ee}|Ψ \rangle. \quad (28)
\]

The important requirement is that the trial \( N \) electron wavefunctions are restricted to be orthogonal to the lower \((k-1)\) states of the system. Since all the lower states \( Ψ_j[|v|, |N|](j < k) \) are determined from the external potential \( \hat{v}_{ext} \) (which is a unique functional of ground state density \( ρ_0 \) according to HK [4] theorem), implies that the ground state density plays an important role in LN-formalism. So, one can also write the bi-functional as \( F_k[ρ, \hat{v}_{ext}] \) instead of \( F_k[ρ, ρ_0] \) when the electronic densities are \( v \)--representable and Eq. (28) modifies to

\[
E_k[\hat{v}_{ext}; |N|] = \int \hat{v}_{ext}(r)ρ_k(r)dr + F_k[ρ, \hat{v}_{ext}]. \quad (29)
\]

From which the concerned local potential \( \hat{v}_{ext}(r) \) for the excited-state can be obtained from the Euler Lagrange equation

\[
[\delta E_k/\delta \rho] - \mu \left\{ \int ρ_k(r)dr - N \right\} = 0 \quad (30)
\]

\[
\hat{v}_{ext}(r) = \mu - \left( \delta F_k[ρ, ρ_0]/\delta ρ \right)\bigg|_{ρ=ρ_k}. \quad (31)
\]

To obtain KS like equation for the generation of \( ρ_k \) and obtain to \( E_k \) one needs to first construct a non-interacting system with some external potential \( \hat{v}_{ext}' \) such that it’s \( m^{th} \) excited state density \( ρ_{m^{*}}(r) \) (say) may be the same as \( ρ_k(r) \) of the original system \( \hat{v}_{ext} \). In CS approach this is done by minimizing the expectation value \( ⟨Ψ[|v|_{ext}, ρ_{m^{*}}(r)]|T + \hat{V}_{ee} = 0|Ψ[|v|_{ext}, ρ_{m^{*}}(r)]⟩ \). Where \( Ψ[|v|_{ext}, ρ_{m^{*}}(r)] \) gives the particular density of interest. Out of many different non-interacting \( Ψ[|v|_{ext}, ρ_{m^{*}}(r)]\)'s (different systems) the unique one is chosen whose ground-state density \( ρ_{0}^{|v|_{ext}}(r) \) resembles with the ground-state density \( ρ_{0}^{ee}(r) \) of the original system "most closely in a least-square sense" (i.e. LN criterion). The matching of the ground-state density actually match the external potentials \( \hat{v}_{ext} \) and \( \hat{v}_{ext} \) according to HK theorem [4] which map the ground-state density to external potential. But the difference will occur in the kinetic energies of the two systems. However, the LN criterion strictly depends upon the behavior of the bifunctional and which leads to the discrepancy in the \( ρ \rightleftharpoons \hat{v} \) mapping.

With all the theoretical formulations described so far, the content of the excited density functionals \( Q[ρ_0] \) and \( F[ρ_0, ρ_0] \) differs quite naturally from the HK universal functional \( F[ρ] \). But only in the case of ground-state, all the three functionals are identical to one another. Not only that, all these functionals are also similar in view of their stationarity with respect to variation in the external potential. So in the variational eDFT formalism, for a given excited-state eigendensity \( ρ(r) \), \( F[ρ, \hat{v}_{ext}] \) is stationary about the corresponding \( \hat{v}_{ext} \) (so also the desired excited-state \( Ψ_{k^{th}}^{LN} \)) [58]. Due to the presence of orthogonality constraint in \( F[ρ, \hat{v}_{ext}] \), several choice for the set of low lying states can be made to which \( Ψ_{k^{th}}^{LN} \) will be orthogonal. And for each choice there exists a potential \( \hat{v}_{ext} \). Again we need some extra deciding factors for \( ρ \rightleftharpoons \hat{v} \) mapping. So serious consideration of the above arguments are necessary for the construction excited-state density functionals. Such attempts have been initiated by Samal and Harbola [52–54, 60–63] but it is still in the developing phase. Although in a recent work, Ayers et.al. [59] claimed that for coulombic system there exists the universal functional for both ground as well
as excited state but it needs to be explored in practice. Through the CS formalism results in the following sections, we will show that excited-state functionals are in principle state dependent and have direct consequences concerning to the density- to-potential mapping. Since the given ground/excited state density may be the excited/ground state density of many other systems, which overrules the idea to adopt same set of universal functionals for different kinds of densities.

FIG. 1. (a) $\rho_e[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_4(1)]$ is the excited-state density of 1D potential well with ground-state $\rho_0$. $\rho_0^{(1)}$ is the ground-state density of potential $V_1$ whose excited-state configuration $[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_3(1)]$ results the same $\rho_e$. (b) $V_2[\rho_e]$ is the potential whose ground-state configuration results the same $\rho_e$ of (a) and is shown along with $V_1[\rho_0^{(1)}]$. (c) $\rho_e[n_1(2), n_3(1), n_4(1)]$ is the excited-state density of 1D potential well with ground-state $\rho_0$ and produced in an alternative configuration $[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_4(1)] (V_1[\tilde{\rho}_0^{(1)}])$ besides the ground-state configuration leading to $V_2[\rho_e]$. (d) Shows all the alternative potentials of (c).

**Criterions for density-to-potential mapping in eDFT**

For the sake of completeness we would like to re-emphasize that the work of Samal et al. [51] shows that the direct or indirect comparison of ground-states are not sufficient to obtain $\rho(\vec{r}) \iff \tilde{v}_{ext}(\vec{r})$ mapping or to form a KS system for excited-states. Given the discussions on stationary-state and variational eDFT in the previous sections, we now present a consistent theory of excited-state density-functional approach. Foundationally rigorous and crucial tenets of the eDFT are: (i) There exist ways for mapping an excited-state density $\rho_e(\vec{r})$ to the corresponding many-electron wavefunction $\Psi(\vec{r})$ so also the external potential $\tilde{v}_{ext}(\vec{r})$ using the $\rho$-stationary wavefunctions. In which the wavefunction depends upon the ground-state density $\rho_0$ implicitly. (ii) The KS system is defined through a comparison of the kinetic energy, ground-state density and variation of the energy w.r.t. to the symmetry of the excited-states.

The claim is, CS approach can give us the mapping from an excited-state density $\rho_e(\vec{r})$ to many-body wavefunction. Stationary state formalism provides a straightforward method of mapping $\rho_e(\vec{r}) \iff \tilde{v}_{ext}(\vec{r})$, just by looking whether $\langle \Psi_k| \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{ee} | \Psi_k \rangle$ is stationary or not, subject to the condition that $\Psi_k$ gives $\rho_e$. But the theoretical background presented earlier shows that different $\Psi_k(\vec{r})$s correspond to particular external potentials $\tilde{v}_{ext}^{k}(\vec{r})$. The same problem also pervades within the variational eDFT approach as proposed by LN [52]. Let’s now discuss these two points one by one. To describe the mapping from an excited-state density $\rho_e(\vec{r})$ to a many-body wavefunc-
tion, we take recourse to the CS approach. This gives, as discussed earlier, many different wavefunctions $\Psi_k(\vec{r})$ and the corresponding external potential $\hat{v}^k_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$. If in addition to the excited-state density we also know the ground-state information $\rho_0$, then $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$ is uniquely determined by the HK theorem. Thus with the knowledge of $\rho_0$, it is quite trivial to select a particular $\Psi$ that belongs to a $[\rho_e, \rho_0]$ combination by comparing $\hat{v}^k_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$ with $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$. Alternatively, one can think of it as finding $\Psi$ variationally for a $[\rho_e, \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}]$ combination. Because the knowledge of $\rho_0$ and $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$ is equivalent. Through the CS, bifunctional

$$F[\rho_e, \rho_0] = \langle \Psi[\rho_e, \rho_0]|\hat{T} + \hat{V}_{\text{ext}}|\Psi[\rho_e, \rho_0]\rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

is also defined. The prescription above is similar to that of LN but avoids the orthogonality constraint imposed by them. This is because, the densities for different excited state for a given ground-state density $\rho_0$ (that corresponds to a unique external potential $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$) can be found in following manner: take a density and search for $\Psi$ that makes $\langle \Psi|\hat{T} + \hat{V}_{\text{ext}}|\Psi\rangle$ stationary and simultaneously make sure whether the corresponding $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$ resembles the given $\rho_0$ (or $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$); if not, search for another density and repeat the procedure until the correct $\rho$ is found. Thus it is clear that excited state orbitals $\Psi$ are now functional of $[\rho_e, \rho_0]$. So the correct density $\rho$ is excited state density of the potential and the $\Psi$ obtained in this method is also excited state wavefunctions corresponding to that potential and density. After finding the correct density $\rho_e$, make a variation over it so that $(\rho_e \rightarrow \rho_e + \delta \rho)$ and again perform the CS to find $\Psi[\rho_e + \delta \rho; \rho_0]$. In this case, choose that $(\hat{v}_{\text{ext}} + \delta \hat{v}_{\text{ext}})$ which converges to $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$ as $\delta \rho \rightarrow 0$. This is in principle a straightforward approach as it’s development is similar to that for the ground-states. So the Euler equation for the excited-state density becomes

$$\frac{\delta F[\rho_e, \rho_0]}{\delta \rho(\vec{r})} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r}) = \mu,$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

where $\mu$ is the Lagrange multiplier ensuring that $\int \rho_e(\vec{r})d\vec{r} = N$. The above propositions for the excited-states in terms of their densities is quite reasonable, particularly because it’s development is parallel to that for the ground-state. On the other hand, to construct a Kohn-Sham system for a given density is not so trivial; and to carry out accurate calculations for excited-states, it is of prime importance to construct a KS system. Further, a KS system will be meaningful if the orbitals involved in an excitation match with the corresponding excitations in the true system. Samal et.al. showed that the KS system constructed using the Levy-Nagy criterion fails in this regard. Using the form of the functional above a KS system can be defined for excited state.

![FIG. 3. (a) $\rho_e[n_1(1), n_2(2), n_3(1)]$ is the excited-state density of 1D infinite potential well with ground-state $\rho_0$. $\rho_e^{(1)}$ and $\rho_e^{(2)}$ are the ground-state densities of $V_1$ and $V_2$, whose excited-state configurations $[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_3(1)]$ and $[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_3(1)]$ results the same $\rho_e$. (b) $V_3$ is the potential whose ground-state density is same as $\rho_e$ of (a) and is shown along with $V_1$, $V_2$. (c) $\rho_e[n_2(1), n_3(2), n_4(1)]$ is the excited-state density produced via the alternative configurations $[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_3(1)]$ (d) shows all the alternative potentials of (c).](image_url)

It has been observed that because of the state dependence involved in the excited-state exchange-correlation potential leads to the discrepancies while one compares the ground-states either directly or indirectly. But in principle, obtaining a Kohn-Sham system is quite easy. By defining the non-interacting kinetic energy $T_s[\rho_e, \rho_0]$ and using it to further define the exchange-correlation functional as

$$E_{\text{xc}}[\rho_e, \rho_0] = F[\rho_e, \rho_0] - E_{\text{Hartree}}[\rho_e] - T_s[\rho_e, \rho_0],$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

solves the purpose. Then the Euler equation for the excited-state densities will read as

$$\frac{\delta T_s[\rho_e, \rho_0]}{\delta \rho_e(\vec{r})} + \hat{V}_{\text{Hartree}}[\rho_e] + \frac{\delta E_{\text{xc}}[\rho_e, \rho_0]}{\delta \rho_e(\vec{r})} + \hat{v}_{\text{ext}} = \mu,$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

where $\hat{V}_{\text{Hartree}}[\rho_e] = \int \frac{\rho_e(\vec{r})}{|\vec{r}-\vec{r}'|}d\vec{r}'$. Eq. (35) is equivalent to
FIG. 4. (a) $\rho_e[n_1(1), n_2(1), n_4(2)]$ is the excited-state density of 1D infinite potential well with ground-state $\rho_0$, $\rho_0^{(1)}$, $\rho_0^{(2)}$, $\rho_0^{(3)}$ are the ground-state densities of $V_1$, $V_2$ and $V_3$ whose excited-state configurations $[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_3(1)]$, $[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_4(1)]$ and $[n_1(2), n_3(1)]$ results the same $\rho_e$. (b) $V_4$ is the potential whose ground-state density is same as $\rho_e$ of (a) and is shown along with $V_1$, $V_2$ and $V_3$. (c) $\rho_e[n_1(1), n_3(1), n_4(2)]$ is the excited-state density produced in the alternative configurations $[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_3(1)]$, $[n_1(2), n_2(1), n_4(1)]$, $[n_3(1), n_4(1)]$ and $[n_1(2), n_3(1), n_4(1)]$ besides the ground-state configuration leading to $V_4[\rho_e]$. (d) Shows all the alternative potentials of (c).

solving

$$\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 + \hat{v}_{KS}(\vec{r})\right\} \Psi_i(\vec{r}) = \varepsilon_i \Psi_i(\vec{r}) \quad (36)$$

where

$$\hat{v}_{KS}(\vec{r}) = \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r}) + \hat{V}_{\text{Hartree}}[\rho_e] + \frac{\delta E_{xc}[\rho_e, \rho_0]}{\delta \rho_e(\vec{r})}. \quad (37)$$

In ground state DFT, one can easily find the $T_s[\rho_0]$ by minimizing the kinetic energy for a given density; here $T_s[\rho_0]$ for a given density is obtained by occupying the lowest energy orbitals for a non-interacting system. But in eDFT, to define $T_s[\rho_e, \rho_0]$ is not easy as for the excited-states it is not clear which orbitals to occupy for a given density. Particularly because a density can be generated by many different configuration of the non-interacting systems. Levy-Nagy select one of these systems by comparing the ground-state density of the excited-state non-interacting system with the true ground-state density. However, their criterion is not satisfactory as it is pointed out by Samal et. al. [41]. The reason of this discrepancies is due to the inconsistency of the ground-state density of an excited state KS system with the true ground-state density. The ground-state density corresponding to the excited-state KS system is not same as the ground-state density of the true system (or $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$ rather than it comes from a potential $\hat{v}'_{\text{ext}}(\vec{r})$). To settle this inconsistency, KS system must be so chosen that it is energetically very close to the original system and to ensure the non-interacting kinetic energy $T_e[\rho_e, \rho_0]$ obtained through the CS need to be very close to the $T[\rho_e, \rho_0]$. Where $T_s[\rho_e, \rho_0]$ and $T[\rho_e, \rho_0]$ are defined as

$$T_s[\rho_e, \rho_0] = \min_{\Psi \rightarrow \rho_e} \langle \Psi | \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{\text{ext}} | \Psi \rangle$$

$$T[\rho_e, \rho_0] = \min_{\Psi \rightarrow \rho_e} \langle \Psi | \hat{T} + \hat{V}_{\text{ext}} | \Psi \rangle. \quad (38)$$

Defining $\Delta T = T - T_s$ smallest not only ensures that DFT exchange-correlation energy remain close to the conventional quantum mechanical exchange-correlation energy but also keeps the structure of the KS potential appropriate for the desired excited-state. Based on the differential virial theorem (DVT) [45], we will now argue how for a given density $\rho_e$ one can have different exchange-correlation $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$ and external potentials $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$.

Within DVT, the exact expression for the gradient of the external potential (for interacting system) for a given excited-state density $\rho_e$

$$-\nabla \hat{v}_{\text{ext}} = -\frac{1}{4\rho_e(\vec{r})} \nabla \nabla^2 \rho_e(\vec{r}) + \frac{1}{\rho_e(\vec{r})} \vec{Z}(\vec{r}; \Gamma_1(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')) + \frac{2}{\rho_e(\vec{r})} \int [\nabla \hat{u}(\vec{r}, \vec{r}'')] \Gamma_2(\vec{r}, \vec{r}') d\vec{r}'', \quad (39)$$

where $\hat{u} = \frac{1}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}''|}$. This equation represents an exact relation between the gradient of the external potential $\hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$, the $e - e$ interaction potential $\hat{u}(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')$ and the density matrices $\rho(\vec{r})$, $\Gamma_1(\vec{r}; \vec{r}')$ and $\Gamma_2(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')$. The vector field $\vec{Z}$ is related to the kinetic-energy density tensor via

$$Z_\alpha[\vec{r}; \Gamma_1(\vec{r}; \vec{r}')] = \left[ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_\alpha \partial r_\beta} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r_\beta \partial r_\alpha} \right) \Gamma_1(\vec{r}; \vec{r}') \right]_{\vec{r}'' = \vec{r}'} \quad (40)$$

So, $\vec{Z}$ can be called a ”local” function of $\Gamma_1$. For KS potential Eq. [39] becomes

$$\nabla \hat{v}_{KS} = -\frac{1}{4\rho_e(\vec{r})} \nabla \nabla^2 \rho_e(\vec{r}) + \frac{1}{\rho_e(\vec{r})} \vec{Z}_{KS}(\vec{r}; \Gamma_1(\vec{r}; \vec{r}')). \quad (41)$$

As a given ground-state density $\rho_0$ fixes the external potential uniquely via HK theorem which implies that $\rho$, $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ are also fixed from Eq. [39]. The density matrices
generated by some eigenfunction $\Psi$ of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$. Now the fixed excited-state and ground-state density combination i.e. $[\rho_e, \rho_0]$ may be arising from different configurations – different configurations can be thought of as arising from different external potential or different exchange-correlation potential and this is due to the different $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ for a fixed $\rho_e$. Suppose a given density $\rho_e$ is generated through an $i^{th}$ KS system, then
\begin{equation}
\nabla \hat{v}_{KS}^i = -\frac{1}{4\rho_e(\vec{r})} \nabla \nabla \rho_e(\vec{r}) + \frac{1}{\rho_e(\vec{r})} \hat{Z}_{KS}^i(\vec{r}; \Gamma_{1(KS)}^i(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')) .
\end{equation}
If the density is generated through a $j^{th}$ external potential then
\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
- \nabla \hat{v}_{ext}^j &= -\frac{1}{4\rho_e(\vec{r})} \nabla \nabla \rho(\vec{r}) + \frac{1}{\rho(\vec{r})} \hat{Z}^j(\vec{r}; \Gamma_1^j(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')) \\
&+ \frac{2}{\rho_e(\vec{r})} \int [\nabla u(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')] |\Gamma_1^j(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')}d\vec{r}' .
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
As a matter of which
\begin{equation}
- \nabla \hat{v}_{ex} = \frac{\hat{Z}_{KS}(\vec{r}; \Gamma_1(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')) - \hat{Z}(\vec{r}; \Gamma_1(\vec{r}, \vec{r}'))}{\rho_e(\vec{r})} + \frac{\int [\nabla \hat{u}(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')] |\rho_e(\vec{r})\rho_e(\vec{r}') - \Gamma_2(\vec{r}, \vec{r}')]d\vec{r}'}{\rho_e(\vec{r})}
\end{equation}
becomes
\begin{equation}
- \nabla \hat{v}_{ex}^{ij} = \frac{\hat{Z}_{KS}^i - \hat{Z}^j}{\rho(\vec{r})} + \varepsilon_{xc}^{ij} ,
\end{equation}
where $\varepsilon_{xc}^{ij}$ is the field due to the Fermi-Coulomb hole field of the $j^{th}$ system $[\Gamma_3^j]$. So the kinetic energy difference between the true system and KS system is given by
\begin{equation}
\Delta T = \frac{1}{2} \int \vec{r} \left\{ \hat{Z}_{KS}(\vec{r}; [\Gamma_{1(KS)}]) - \hat{Z}(\vec{r}; [\Gamma_1]) \right\} d\vec{r}.
\end{equation}
This difference should be kept the smallest for the true KS system so that it gives the KS system consistent with the original system. For sake of completeness we conclude that one way to investigate the $\rho_e \Leftrightarrow \hat{v}_{ext}$ mapping, i.e. the LN formalism was if among the several potentials – which have the same excited-state density, one can choose the correct KS potential by comparing the ground-state density i.e. keep that KS-potential whose ground-state density resembles with the true ground-state density. Keeping the ground-system density close we actually keep the external potential fixed via HK theorem. Thus LN criterion is exact for non-interacting system as there is no interaction so the ground-state density match perfectly. This proposal of LN for $\rho_e \Leftrightarrow \hat{v}_{ext}$ mapping was carried by Samal et.al. as described in the previous sections are also justified within the generalized adiabatic connection (GAC) The GAC-KS in principle helps for the self-consistent treatment of excited states and could be considered as a plausible extension of HK theorem to the same. Indeed the relying principles of the GAC-KS formalism makes it more general over other existing theorems relating the densities of electronic states to potentials. Thus giving us another way of mapping the excited-state density to the external potential. In GAC, the $\lambda$ dependent Hamiltonian is given by
\begin{equation}
\hat{H}_\lambda(\hat{v}, N) = \hat{T} + \lambda \hat{V}_{ec} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{v}(\vec{r}_i),
\end{equation}
with the Schrödinger equation
\begin{equation}
\hat{H}_\lambda(\hat{v}, N)\Psi(\hat{v}, N) = E(\hat{v}, N)\Psi(\hat{v}, N),
\end{equation}
where $\lambda$ is the coupling constant with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ allowing us to trigger the electron-electron interaction. Unlike the AC-DFT, the external potential $\hat{v}(\vec{r})$, is independent of $\lambda$. Analogous to the Levy-Lieb CS functionals, the GAC for the conjugate density functionals $F_\lambda[\rho]$ (density fixed AC) and $E_\lambda[\hat{v}]$ (potential fixed AC) are given by

$$F_{\lambda=1}[\rho] = F_{\lambda=0}[\rho] + \int_0^1 \frac{dF_\lambda[\rho]}{d\lambda} \, d\lambda \, ,$$

$$E_{\lambda=1}[\hat{v}] = E_{\lambda=0}[\hat{v}] + \int_0^1 \frac{dE_\lambda[\hat{v}]}{d\lambda} \, d\lambda \, .$$

Similar to Eqs.\((40)\) and \((51)\) one can define the excited-state functionals $T[\rho, \rho_0]$, $Q[\rho, \nu, \lambda]$, $F_\lambda[\rho, \rho_0]$ and $E_\lambda[\rho, \rho_0]$. On defining the preceding eDFT functionals, we can define the GAC by starting at a $\rho$ stationary wavefunction for $\lambda = 1$ and then by gradually turning off ($\lambda = 0$) the electron-electron interaction. Thus the $\rho$-stationary wavefunctions for $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ will form the GAC in eDFT. Since the $\rho$-stationary wave functions for a given $\rho$ are numerable and the adiabatic connections do not overlap with each other, states $\Phi_i$ of noninteracting model systems equal the $\rho$-stationary wave functions ($\Phi_i = \Psi[\rho, \nu, \lambda = 0]$) at $\lambda = 0$. And can be assigned to real electronic states $\Psi_j = \Psi[\rho, \nu, \alpha = 1]$. These assigned model states are the KS states of the GAC-KS formalism. As discussed above, they are eigenstates of a Hamiltonian operator with local multiplicative potential. In this way, the GAC will define the path of going from a non-interacting system to a interacting system via a $\rho-$stationary path. Although for each of the interacting system one can still end up with multiple non-interacting KS system but with the criterions discussed above we can pick an appropriate one. So once we fix the $\rho \leftrightarrow \hat{v}_{\text{ext}}$ for the interacting system, it do carries over to KS system via GAC and vice versa.

**RESULTS WITHIN CS-FORMALISM**

In this section we will discuss the results in connection with the density-to-potential mapping based on the CS-formalism. As described earlier, within this formalism one can produce multiple potentials for a given ground or excited state density. In the case of excited state density, even the ground-states of these potentials are totally different from the ground-state of the original system. One can also produce a potential whose ground-state density may be the excited-state of the original system. The results we have obtained for the systems of our study are fully consistent with the theories developed for eDFT. Let’s illustrate these facts one by one.

As our starting case (shown in Fig.1), we consider 4 non-interacting fermions in an 1D potential well. Where two fermions are in $n = 1(f_1 = 2)$ state and one fermion each in $n = 2(f_2 = 1)$ and $n = 4(f_4 = 1)$ state. This gives some excited state density $\rho_c(x)$ associated with the above configuration for the 1D well which is shown in the Fig.1(a). Thus the excited-state density ($\rho(x) = \sum_i f_i |\Psi_i(x)|^2$) is given by

$$\rho_c(x) = \rho_c^{\text{ext}}(x) = 2|\Psi_1(x)|^2 + |\Psi_2(x)|^2 + |\Psi_4(x)|^2 \quad (52)$$

where $\Psi_i(x)$'s are the wavefunctions of the 1D potential well. In all our results shown in the figures 11 to 17, we have in general used $\rho(n_i(f_j))$ notations where $i$ denotes the quantum eigenfunction of the potential $V$ or $V_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and $f_j$ denotes the number of non-interacting fermions occupying that quantum state. Now
keeping this excited state density fix, one can produce an alternative potential $V_1$ (say) whose $n = 1$ state is occupied with 2 fermions (i.e. $f_1 = 2$) and $n = 2, n = 3$ with one fermion (i.e. $f_2 = 1 = f_3$) each resulting the density same as $\rho_e(x)$. And the ground state density of the potential $V_1$ is different from that of the $V_0$ (i.e. particle in an infinite potential well) which is given by $\rho_0^{(1)}$ (Fig. 6). As per our formalism there can be many such multiple potentials having the given density as it’s eigendensity associated with some combination of eigenfunctions. So it is possible that one can also obtain second alternative potential $V_2$ (say) whose ground-state density is same as the excited state density ($\rho_e(x)$) of the origin system ($V_0$). In this way, we have studied six such excited states of the 1D potential well (Figs. 7 to 9) and for each case we are able to produce symmetrically different multiple potentials for fix densities. Also in each cases we produce the alternative potential whose ground-state density is nothing but the excited-state density of the original configuration (i.e. 1D potential well).

As our next case study, we have considered the excited-states of the 1D quantum harmonic oscillator (QHO). This is also an interesting model system like the potential well. The results for this case, are shown in Fig. 7. Now consider the Fig. 7, in this case we have produced three symmetrically different alternative potentials $V_1$, $V_2$ and $V_3$ (shown in Fig. 7b) whose ground-states densities are same as the different excited-states densities (i.e. $\rho_e^{(1)}(1)$, $\rho_e^{(2)}(2)$ and $\rho_e^{(3)}(3)$) of the QHO potential $V(x)$. Where $\rho_e^{(1)}(1)$ corresponds to the configuration $[n = 0(f_0 = 1), n = 3(f_3 = 1)]$, $\rho_e^{(2)}(2)$ corresponds to the $[n = 1(f_1 = 1), n = 2(f_2 = 1)]$ configuration and $\rho_e^{(3)}(3)$ be the density of $[n = 2(f_2 = 1), n = 3(f_3 = 1)]$ configuration are various excited-states of the QHO potential. In Fig. 7(d), we have produced a different potential $V_1$ whose excited-state density corresponding to the configuration $[n = 0(f_0 = 1), n = 2(f_2 = 1)]$ is the excited-state density $\rho_e(x)$ $([n = 0(f_0 = 1), n = 3(f_3 = 1)])$ of the original 1D QHO potential. Although we have produced so many potentials, but our criterions will only select the original potentials (i.e. the infinite potential well and QHO) for any excited-state density. Thus establishes the excited-state $\rho(x) \iff \hat{\psi}(x)$ mapping.
eDFT BEYOND THE GL THEOREM: DENSITY-TO-POTENTIAL MAPPING

The issue of the multiple potentials for excited state and the problem with the density-to-potential mapping is also persuaded [43] in the context of GL theorem [3,4]. Although this issue has been addressed recently by series of papers [46,51], but never paid attention to the validity of GL theorem in eDFT. However, the recent work of Li et al. [43] demonstrated the validity of GL theorem for a simple 1D system with two non-interacting fermions in consideration. They have shown that for higher excited states of this simple model system there is no equivalence of the GL and HK theorem. For higher excited states they [43] have produced multiple potentials and concluded the non-suitability of HK/GL theorem for such states. Now based on our previous analysis of eDFT, we show in this section that for the said purpose, the claim made in [43] is under question mark. We will first make a very detail analysis of the GL theorem demonstration for excited states and argue how for the ground as well as lowest excited state obtaining multiple potentials is never a serious issue. We will describe how everything still remains consistent within HK/GL framework. We will first consider the examples of the quantum harmonic oscillator and then take up the case of 1D infinite potential well. Although we also produce results same as [43], but for the ground and first excited state of each case we show that the results which we obtain differs quite significantly from the claim made in the earlier attempt by Li et al. [43]. Next we will provide a firm basis relying on our proposed criterions, why the results obtained by us, violates nothing about HK and GL theorem within our present knowledge of eDFT.

Model Systems: 1D QHO and Infinite Potential Well

Schrödinger equation of two non-interacting fermions in a local one dimensional potential \( v(x) \) is given by

\[
-\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + v(x) \Psi_i(x) = \epsilon_i \Psi_i(x). \tag{53}
\]

Similarly for another local potential \( w(x) \) the corresponding Schrödinger equation will be

\[
-\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + w(x) \Psi_i(x) = \lambda_i \Psi_i(x). \tag{54}
\]

Suppose that the eigenfunctions of the local potential \( w(x) \) generates the ground/excited-state eigendensity of \( v(x) \) as it’s eigendensity but with some arbitrary configuration which is not same as the original one. Then one possible way of having the above is: the wavefunctions \( \Psi_i(x) \) of the potential \( w(x) \) can be related to the wavefunctions \( \Phi_i(x) \) of the potential \( v(x) \) via a unitary transformation as a matter of which the density preserving constraint will be satisfied (i.e.,

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\Psi_k(x) \\
\Psi_l(x)
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
\cos \theta(x) & \sin \theta(x) \\
-\sin \theta(x) & \cos \theta(x)
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
\Phi_i(x) \\
\Phi_j(x)
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{pmatrix}
\Phi_i(x) \cos \theta(x) + \Phi_j(x) \sin \theta(x) \\
-\Phi_i(x) \sin \theta(x) + \Phi_j(x) \cos \theta(x)
\end{pmatrix} \tag{55}
\]

such that the ground/excited state density of two potentials remains invariant i.e. \( \rho(x) = |\Phi_i(x)|^2 + |\Phi_j(x)|^2 = |\Psi_k(x)|^2 + |\Psi_l(x)|^2 \) \tag{56}

From Eqs. 53 and 54 we obtain

\[
v(x) = \epsilon_i + \frac{\Psi_i(x)}{2 \Psi_i(x)} = \epsilon_j + \frac{\Psi_j(x)}{2 \Psi_j(x)} \tag{57}
\]

\[
w(x) = \lambda_k + \frac{\Psi_k(x)}{2 \Psi_k(x)} = \lambda_l + \frac{\Psi_l(x)}{2 \Psi_l(x)} \tag{58}
\]

Now let’s define the quantities \( \Delta \) and \( \Delta' \) as the difference between the eigenvalues of the Eqs. 53 and 54

\[
\Delta = \epsilon_j - \epsilon_i = \frac{d}{dx} \frac{d}{dx} [\Phi_i(x) \Phi_j(x) - \Phi_i(x) \Phi_j(x)] \tag{59}
\]

and

\[
\Delta' = \lambda_k - \lambda_l = \frac{d}{dx} \frac{d}{dx} [\Psi_i(x) \Psi_k(x) - \Psi_i(x) \Psi_k(x)] \tag{60}
\]

Now plugging the values \( \Psi_k(x) \) and \( \Psi_l(x) \) from Eq. 55 back in Eq. 60, we will obtain

\[
\frac{d}{dx} \frac{d}{dx} [\theta(x) \{ \Phi_i^2(x) + \Phi_j^2(x) \} + \{ \Phi_j(x) \Phi_i(x) - \Phi_i(x) \Phi_j(x) \}]
\]

\[
= \Delta' [2 \Phi_i(x) \Phi_j(x) \cos 2 \theta(x) + \{ \Phi_j^2(x) - \Phi_i^2(x) \} \sin 2 \theta(x)] \tag{61}
\]

or

\[
\rho(x) \hat{\theta}(x) + \hat{\rho}(x) \hat{\theta}(x) + f(\Phi_i(x), \Phi_j(x), \Delta, \Delta', \theta) = 0 \tag{62}
\]

where

\[
f = 2 \Delta \Phi_i(x) \Phi_j(x) - \Delta' [\Phi_i(x) \Phi_j(x) \cos 2 \theta(x) + \{ \Phi_j^2(x) - \Phi_i^2(x) \} \sin 2 \theta(x)] \tag{63}
\]

Results for 1D Quantum Harmonic Oscillator

As a first case let’s consider 1D quantum harmonic oscillator potential given by

\[
v(x) = \frac{1}{4} x^2 x^2 \text{ where } -l \leq x \leq l \tag{64}
\]
As usual the wavefunctions and energy eigenvalues for \(n^{th}\) state of the QHO are

\[
\Phi_n(x) = \left(\frac{\omega}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n n!}} H_n(\sqrt{\omega}x) \exp\left(-\frac{\omega x^2}{2}\right) \quad (65)
\]

\[
\varepsilon_n = (n + \frac{1}{2})\omega \quad (66)
\]

where \(n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\)

(In all throughout this paper we will use atomic units i.e. \(\hbar = 1\) and \(m = 1\))

Two Non-Interacting Fermions in '\(n = 0 = m\)' State

![Graph](image)

**FIG. 8.** The renormalization \(R\) given by Eq.\((69)\) as a function of \(\theta(x = 0)\). The points where \(R = 0\) corresponds to the normalization of the wavefunctions \(\Psi_k(x)\) and \(\Psi_l(x)\). These points also provide the initial conditions for solving the differential Eq.\((62)\).

We consider two non-interacting fermions in \(n = 0 = m\) state of a QHO potential i.e. two fermions in the ground-state of the QHO potential. In this case \(\Delta = \varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_0 = 0\) and the density

\[
\rho(x) = 2\left(\frac{\omega}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\omega x^2}{2}\right) \quad (67)
\]

Then the corresponding equation for rotation \(\theta(x)\) can be obtained from the Eq.\((62)\) and is given by

\[
\rho(x)\dot{\theta}(x) + \dot{\rho}(x)\theta(x) - \Delta'[2\left(\frac{\omega}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\omega x^2) \cos 2\theta(x)].
\]

(68)

Now we have to solve the differential Eq.\((68)\) with proper initial conditions. The boundary conditions can be fixed by taking into consideration the symmetry of the differential Eq.\((68)\) and the normalization condition of the wavefunction. From the Eq.\((68)\) it is clear that \(\frac{d\Phi}{dx}\mid_{x=0} = 0\) as both \(\Phi(x)\) and \(\rho(x)\) are symmetric about \(x = 0\). Now another condition is that \(\Psi_k(x)\) and \(\Psi_l(x)\) must be normalized. If we plot

\[
\int_{-l}^{l} |\Psi_k,l(x)|^2 dx - 1 = R = 0 \quad (69)
\]

as a function of \(\theta(x = 0)\), then the points where \(R = 0\) corresponds to the normalization of \(\Psi_k(x)\) and \(\Psi_l(x)\). Which will give us the initial condition on \(\theta(x = 0)\) (see Fig. 11). The potential \(w(x)\) is determined from the Eq.\((68)\). In Fig. 11(a), we have shown two different potentials which is obtained for eigenvalue difference \(\Delta' = 8.0\) and \(\Delta' = 12.00\) with the corresponding wavefunctions shown in the plots Fig. 11(a) and 11(b). The plots of the wavefunctions shows that \(\Psi_k(x)\) is the ground state wave function for the potential \(w(x)\) because at the middle of this wavefunction there is no node. Though there are fluctuations in this wavefunction towards the boundary but that is due to the abrupt change of the \(\theta\) value at the boundary region (shown in the Fig. 11). As \(\theta(x)\) increases abruptly at the boundary, so the wavefunctions are also oscillating rapidly in that region because wavefunctions contain \(\sin \theta(x)\) and \(\cos \theta(x)\) terms in it. If we neglect the boundary behaviour of the wavefunctions, then \(\Psi_1(x)\) is the ground state wavefunction of the newly formed potential \(w(x)\) and \(\Psi_2(x)\) is some excited state wavefunction of it. In this case \(\rho_0(x)\) be the ground-state density of the the potential \(w(x)\), and \(\rho_e(x)\) is the ground-state density of the potential \(v(x)\). Which may be the excited state density for the potential \(w(x)\).

Two Non-Interacting Fermions in '\(n=0, m=1\)' State

Now we consider the lowest excited-state of the QHO. So two non-interacting fermions occupying the \(n = 0\) and \(m = 1\) state. In this case also we obtain multiple potentials for a fixed excited state density. For this case \(\varepsilon_0 = \frac{1}{2}\omega\), and \(\varepsilon_1 = \frac{3}{2}\omega\), so the \(\Delta = \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_0 = \omega\). The density corresponding to these two states

\[
\rho(x) = \left(\frac{\omega}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\omega x^2}{2}\right)(1 + 2\omega x^2). \quad (70)
\]

So the corresponding equation for rotation \(\theta(x)\) follows from the Eq.\((62)\) and is given by

\[
\rho(x)\dot{\theta}(x) + \dot{\rho}(x)\theta(x) + 2\omega x\left(\frac{\omega}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\omega x^2) \\
- \Delta'[2\left(\frac{\omega}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\omega x^2) \cos 2\theta(x)] + \frac{\omega}{\pi} \exp(-\omega x^2) (2\omega x^2 - 1) \sin 2\theta(x) = 0 \quad (71)
\]
FIG. 9. (a) Shown are the densities and wavefunctions of 2 fermions in the ground-state of the 1D QHO for $\Delta' = 8.00$. Here $\Psi_1(x)$ and $\Psi_2(x)$ are the wavefunctions associated with the alternative potential $w(x)$. $\rho_0$ is the ground-state density of $v(x)$. Whereas $\rho_e = |\Psi_1(x)|^2$ be the ground-state density of $w(x)$. (b) Captions are same as that of (a) but for $\Delta' = 12.00$. (c) Shows the structure of the alternative potentials $w(x) = v'(x)$ for the above $\Delta'$ values.

Since in this case $\Phi_0(x)$ is symmetric, $\Phi_1(x)$ is antisymmetric, so $\rho(x)$ symmetric about $x = 0$. Then Eq. (71) implies that $\theta(x)$ should be symmetric about $x = 0$. The condition on $\frac{d\theta}{dx}(x=0)$ is obtained by plotting renormalization $R$ as a function of $\frac{d\theta}{dx}(x=0)$ and is shown in the Fig.10. Now the multiple potentials for different values of $\Delta'$ are shown in the Fig.11. But the ground-state density of the alternative potential $w(x)$ is different from that of $v(x)$.

**Particles Trapped Inside an 1D Infinite Well**

As our final case study, we consider the model system same as that reported in [43]. For an infinite potential well with length varying from 0 to 1, the $n^{th}$ wavefunction $\Phi_n(x)$ and energy eigenvalue $\varepsilon_n$ are given by

$$\Phi_n(x) = \sqrt{2} \sin(n\pi x); \quad \varepsilon_n = \frac{n^2\pi^2}{2}$$

(72)

where $n = 1, 2, 3, ...$. The density $\rho(x)$ corresponding to the two potentials $v(x)$ and $w(x)$ is given by

$$\rho(x) = \Phi_i^2(x) + \Phi_j^2(x) = \Psi_k^2(x) + \Psi_l^2(x).$$

(73)

**Two Non-Interacting Fermions in ’$n = 1 = m$’ State**

For two spinless non-interacting fermions in $n = 1 = m$ states, the energies of two states and the difference are

$$\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\pi^2}{2} = \varepsilon_2; \quad \Delta = \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1 = 0.$$  

(74)

The density corresponding to these states is

$$\rho(x) = 4\left[\sin^2(\pi x)\right],$$

(75)

and the equation corresponding to Eq. (62) for rotation $\theta(x)$ is

$$\rho(x)\ddot{\theta}(x) + \dot{\rho}(x)\dot{\theta}(x) - \Delta'[4\sin^2\pi x \cos 2\theta(x)] = 0.$$  

(76)
FIG. 11. (a) Shows the wavefunction and density plots for 2 fermions occupying the lowest excited state of the 1D QHO with $\Delta' = 8.00$. Here $\Psi_1(x)$ and $\Psi_2(x)$ are the wavefunctions for the alternative potential $w(x)$. And $\rho_0$ is the excited-state density of the $v(x)$ and $w(x)$ corresponding to different symmetries. $\rho_0 = |\Psi_1(x)|^2$ is the ground-state density of the potential $w(x)$. (b) Captions are same as (a) but for $\Delta' = 15.00$ (c) Shown are the multiple potentials for the previously mentioned $\Delta'$ values.

Since $\Phi_1(x)$ is symmetric and $\rho(x)$ is symmetric about $x = \frac{1}{2}$, then Eq. (76) dictates that $\theta(x)$ is symmetric so that $\theta\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = 0$. With this initial condition and choosing a value of $\Delta'$ we can solve for $\theta(x)$ and hence we can find $\Psi_k$s and from $\Psi_k$s we can obtain $w(x)$ from Eq. (75). The transformed wavefunction $\Psi_k(x)$ must be normalized. This condition will be fulfilled by choosing the appropriate value of $\theta\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$ at which the $\Psi_k(x)$ should be normalized. Once $\Psi_k(x)$ is normalized then $\Psi_l$ will also be normalized. Again we adopt the same procedure to obtain the alternative multiple potentials by plotting the renormalization $R$ given by

$$\int_0^1 |\Psi_k(x)|^2 dx - 1 = R = 0$$ (77)

All the wavefunctions, densities and multiple potentials are shown in the Fig. 14.

Two Non-Interacting Fermions in 'n=1, m=2' State

Now we will demonstrate that for the $|n = 1, m = 2|$ lowest excited-state of the infinite potential well, we do obtain multiple potentials unlike [43]. For this excited-state, $\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\pi^2}{2}$, $\varepsilon_2 = 2\pi^2$ and $\Delta = \frac{3\pi^2}{2}$. Now the density arising from these two states is

$$\rho(x) = 2[\sin^2(\pi x) + \sin^2(2\pi x)].$$ (78)
And the equation for rotation $\theta(x)$ is

$$
\rho(x)\ddot{\theta}(x) + \dot{\rho}(x)\dot{\theta}(x) + 6\pi^2 \sin(\pi x) \sin(2\pi x)
- \Delta'[4\sin(\pi x) \sin(2\pi x) \cos 2\theta(x)]
+ 2\{\sin^2(2\pi x) - \sin^2(\pi x)\} \sin 2\theta(x) = 0 . \tag{79}
$$

Here $\Phi_1(x)$ is symmetric, $\Phi_2(x)$ is antisymmetric and $\rho(x)$ symmetric about $x = \frac{1}{2}$. Thus Eq. (79) gives us that $\theta(x)$ is antisymmetric so that $\theta(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$. In this case also normalization of both $\Psi_k(x)$ and $\Psi_l(x)$ has been take care by plotting the $R$ (renormalization) value against $\frac{d\theta}{dx}(\frac{1}{2})$.

**DISCUSSIONS**

Now the conceptually basic questions of eDFT: what are the consequences, similarities and differences between the results of the CS formalism and the ones demonstrating the GL theorem? The question is: whether there is any violation of the HK and/or GL theorem(s) as we get multiple potentials for non-interacting fermions even for the ground and lowest excited state? Since HK theorem of DFT gives us the one-to-one mapping for the ground state between it’s density and the corresponding external potential, whereas the GL theorem is the excited-state counterpart of the HK theorem for the lowest excited state of a given symmetry. So one may conclude its due to the manifestation of the failure of these fundamental theorems of modern DFT. Also the results of the Li et.al. [43] shows that there are multiple potentials associated with higher excited state i.e. there exists no HK theorem for such excitations. But surprisingly our results for 1D QHO and potential well shows that not only for higher excited-states but even for the ground and lowest excited states also there exists multiple potentials for various energy differences. So one may get the feeling that the violation is occurring with both the theorems no matter which states we are taking into consideration.
Now let’s take up these questions and confusions one-by-one. Let’s come to our results of CS formalism. The results of the CS formalism shows that the ground-state density of a given symmetry (potential) may be the excited-state density of other symmetry (potential). So for a fixed excited-state density one can able to produce different potentials whose ground-state densities are totally different from the actual one. Which is also true if we consider the ground state density (when it will be same as the excited-state density of another potential) instead of the excited ones. Now taking the notion of all these results within CS formalism in eDFT, one can very nicely interpret ours as well as Li et.al. [43]’s results. In this formalism, keeping the excited/ground state density fix via a unitary transformation does not guarantee the fixing of the symmetries involve in the problem. More elaborately we can say that when we are changing the ∆’ value and keeping either ground or the excited state density fix, means that we are forcing the system to change itself accordingly without hindering only the density. Since ∆’ is nothing but the difference between the eigenvalues of the states involve. So one can make several choices for the pair of eigenstates resulting the ∆’ constraint. For every pair (i.e. a fix ∆’) there will be a corresponding potential. Actually, what is happening in this procedure is that we are forcing to search over all the the excited states (may be the ground- state) of different potentials such that the eigenvalue difference of the states

FIG. 15. (a) Shown are the wavefunctions Ψ₁ and Ψ₂, densities ρ₀ and ρₑ for ∆’ = 250.00 associated with 2 fermions occupying the 1 – 2 state of 1D potential well. ρ₀ is the ground-state density of the alternative potential w(x) and ρₑ be the excited-state density of the original potential v(x). (b) The captions are same as (a) but with ∆’ = 600.00. (c) Shown are the alternative potentials w(x) = v'(x) for ∆’ = 250.00 and ∆’ = 600.00 respectively.

FIG. 16. (a) Shows the variation of θ(x) for 2 fermions in the ground (i.e. 1 – 1) state of 1D potential well. (b) Captions are same as (a) but for the lowest (i.e. 1 – 2) excited state. At the boundary of the the well the rapid increse in the θ(x) value causes the oscillating behaviour of the Ψ(x) values.
give us the desired $\Delta'$ and the density of the two states involve leading to the density of ground/excited-state of the original system (potential/configurations). So everything is again coming under CS formalism. Rather something really different and contradicting the eDFT formulations provided by Samal and Harbola [35, 53]. The SH criterions can be considered as most essential steps for establishing the $\rho(\mathbf{r}) \iff \hat{\rho}_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r})$. Now the next desirable step would be to address the purely interacting fermions and also to go beyond the exchange-only work reported by SH. To include correlation in eDFT one may require to suitably use the orbitals involve in the excitation process, their symmetries as well as occupations. The development of exchange-correlation functionals in eDFT certainly will be a demanding task for the future.

Now the question is out of these existing multiple potentials in association with a fix density and $\Delta'$, which potential in principle should be picked in view of the $\rho(x) \iff \hat{\rho}(x)$? The criterions of selecting the exact potential out of all possibilities have already been discussed in our previous sections. Firstly, as shown in the Fig.\ref{fig:8} to Fig.\ref{fig:11} and from Fig.\ref{fig:12} to Fig.\ref{fig:16} the ground-state densities of the different potentials are different from that of the original potential. This is also true even for the results for CS formalism as shown in the Fig.\ref{fig:11} to Fig.\ref{fig:7}. So when we are fixing the excited-state density at the same time we have to take care of the ground-state of the newly found system and the old one. The criteria of taking care of the ground-states of the two system is given in Eq.\ref{eq:17}. Secondly, the kinetic energies of the two systems are to be kept closest which we have discussed on the basis of DVT. In all the non-interacting model systems reported here, $\Delta T$ should be zero. But the non-vanishing difference of kinetic energies leads to multiple potentials as shown in the lower panel of each wavefunction and/or density plots. Thirdly, the most significant differences between the symmetries of the old and new systems implies that there exists discrepancies in the Hamiltonian expectation values w.r.t. the ground-states of various multiple potentials. Which one can easily figure out from our reported results.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS**

In this work, we have tried to obtain a consistent theory for eDFT based on the stationary state, variational and GAC formalism of modern DFT. We have provided a unified and general approach for dealing with excited-states which follows from previous attempts made by Perdew-Levy, Görling, Levy-Nagy-Ayers and in particular the work of Samal-Harbola in the recent past. Its actually the CS formalism which plays the most crucial role in describing the excited-states. Within our work, we have answered the questions raised about the validity of HK and GL theorems to excited-states. We have settled the issues by explaining why there is the existence of multiple potentials even for the ground and lowest excited state of given symmetry. So established in a rigorous foundational footing the non-violation of the HK and GL theorems. In fact, the generalized CS approach gives us a strong basis in choosing a potential out of multiple potentials for a fixed (ground)excited-state density. In our propositions, we have strictly defined the bi-density functionals for a fix pair of ground and excited-state densities to address the density-to-potential mapping. Not only that, the theory also gives us a clear definition of excited-state KS systems by comparing the K.E. and exchange-correlation energy with the true system. It does take care of the stationarity and orthogonality of the quantum states. So everything fits quite naturally into the realm of modern DFT.

To conclude, we have shown the results for non-interacting fermions. For interacting case the GAC can be used to formulate all the theoretical and numerical contents in a similar way. We are also working along this line for strictly correlated fermions and the results will be reported in future. Finally, our conclusion is that nothing really reveals the manifestation of the failure or violation of the basic theorems and existing principles of modern DFT irrespective of the states under consideration. The method presented by Samal-Harbola and further progress being made here provides a framework and the starting point for the development of new density-functional methods for the self-consistent treatment of excited states. More realistically, for a unified treatment of arbitrary states, whether ground or excited states. So in this work, we have provided the uniqueness of density-to-potential mapping for excited-states a firm footing.
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