1 Additional information on the SWIG formalism

In Section 1.1 of this Supporting Information, we present a formal derivation of the SWIG methodology and a rigorous proof that this method affords smooth potential energy surfaces. These arguments generalize the S-COSMO model of York and Karplus\textsuperscript{1} to more a more general class of PCMs.\textsuperscript{2–4} In slightly modified form, these arguments can be used to extend the FIXPVA method\textsuperscript{5} to these more general PCMs, although the FIXPVA method as described in Ref. 5 uses a different switching function that the one employed here. Our switching function is described in detail in Section 1.2.

1.1 Derivation

Chipman\textsuperscript{2–4} provides a detailed discussion of the integral-equation formalism for apparent surface charge PCMs, which includes the C-PCM/COSMO, IEF-PCM, and SS(V)PE methods, and the reader is referred to Refs. 2–4 for details. For our purposes, it suffices to note that the PCM equations, in the continuous representation, are expressed in terms of a pair of integral operators, $\hat{S}$ and $\hat{D}$. The operator $\hat{S}$ acts on the surface charge density, $\sigma(s)$, to generate the corresponding surface potential at the surface point $s$,

$$\hat{S} \sigma(s) \int_{cavity} ds' \sigma(s') \frac{1}{|s - s'|}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S1)
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whereas the action of \( \hat{D} \) on \( \sigma(s) \) generates the surface dipole potential at \( s \),

\[
\hat{D}\sigma(s) = \int_{\text{cavity}} ds' \sigma(s') \frac{\partial}{\partial n_{s'}} \frac{1}{|s-s'|}.
\]

Here \( n_{s'} \) indicates the normalized, outward-pointing surface normal vector at the surface point \( s' \).

The matrices \( S \) and \( D \) are discretized representations of the operators \( \hat{S} \) and \( \hat{D} \). Within the SWIG approach, we blur the point charge \( q_i \), which is located at the \( i \)th Lebedev grid point, \( r_i \), using a normalized gaussian function

\[
g_i(r) = (\zeta_i^2 / \pi)^{3/2} e^{-\zeta_i^2 |r-r_i|^2}.
\]

The exponents of these gaussians are treated as fixed parameters that characterize the model.

The matrix element \( S_{ij} \) of \( S \) represents the projection of \( \hat{S}g_j \) onto \( g_i \). For \( i \neq j \), we determine \( S_{ij} \) by using Eq. (S1), projecting onto \( g_i \), and evaluating surface integrals over \( s \) and \( s' \). The result is

\[
S_{ij} = \frac{\text{erf}(\zeta_{ij} r_{ij})}{r_{ij}} \text{ for } i \neq j,
\]

where \( \zeta_{ij} = \zeta_i \zeta_j / (\zeta_i^2 + \zeta_j^2)^{1/2} \) and \( r_{ij} = |r_i - r_j| \). Diagonal elements of \( S \) are obtained according to \( S_{ii} = \lim_{r_{ij} \to 0} S_{ij} \). Recognizing that \( \zeta_{ii} = \zeta_i / \sqrt{2} \), this limit is evaluated to obtain

\[
S_{ii} = \zeta_i \sqrt{2/\pi}.
\]

Equations (S4) and (S5) are nearly the same as Eq. (3) in the text, except for a factor of \( F_i^{-1} \) that appears in \( S_{ii} \) as given in Eq. (3). We next explain the origin of this factor.

According to Eq. (1) in the text, the surface charges \( q_i \) are determined according to \( q = K^{-1}Rv \). If a certain switching function \( F_k = 0 \), however, we wish to ensure that \( q_k = 0 \), so that the \( k \)th surface grid point does not contribute to the PCM solvation energy. However, the electrostatic potential \( v_k \) is generally nonzero, even if \( F_k = 0 \), and furthermore \( R \propto I \) for C-PCM/COSMO. Hence the \( k \)th element of \( Rv \) is generally nonzero. As such, the only way to ensure that the “switched-off”
grid points do not contribute to the solvation energy is to require that $K^{-1}$ has a null space that corresponds precisely to those surface grid points for which $F_k = 0$.

Partitioning $K$ into diagonal and off-diagonal parts,

$$K = K_{\text{diag}} + K_{\text{off}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S6)

in which the matrix $K_{\text{diag}}$ is diagonal, we may write

$$K = K_{\text{diag}}^{1/2} \left( I + K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2} K_{\text{off}} K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2} \right) K_{\text{diag}}^{1/2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S7)

whence

$$K^{-1} = K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2} \left( I + K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2} K_{\text{off}} K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2} \right)^{-1} K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S8)

Now, if the matrix elements of diagonal matrix $K_{\text{diag}}^{-1}$ were zero whenever $F_k = 0$, the the effect of the right and left multiplication by $K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2}$ in Eq. (S8) would be to annihilate any rows and columns of $(I + K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2} K_{\text{off}} K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2})^{-1}$ for which $F_k = 0$, or in other words, to create the desired null space for $K^{-1}$. Similarly, the matrix $I + K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2} K_{\text{off}} K_{\text{diag}}^{-1/2}$ would become block diagonal and equal to the unit matrix within the null space of $K^{-1}$, and the dimension of $q = K^{-1}Rv$ could be reduced without approximation to just the number of grid points whose switching functions are non-zero.

These arguments suggest that we should replace the expression for $S_{ii}$ in Eq. (S5) with

$$S_{ii} = \frac{\zeta_i \sqrt{2/\pi}}{F_i},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S9)

so that $S_{ii} \to \infty$ as $F_i \to 0$. This equation, together with Eq. (S4) for $S_{ij}$, defines the $S$-matrix used in this work. Note that

$$(\text{DAS})_{ii} = \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij} a_j S_{ji},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S10)

owing to our choice $D_{ii} = 0$, as discussed in the text. Since $S_{ij}$ is finite, as is $D_{ij} = -\hat{n}_j \cdot (\partial S_{ij}/\partial r_j)$ [Eq. (6)], it follows that $K_{ii} \to \infty$ as $F_i \to 0$, for both C-PCM/COSMO and SS(V)PE. As York and Karplus point out, the quantity $S_{ii}$ is the self-energy of the $i$th surface tessera, so the definition in
Figure S1: Number of non-negligible \((F_i > 10^{-8})\) Lebedev grid points for NaCl, as a function of the Na–Cl distance.

Eq. (S9) has the effect of imposing an increasing steep penalty for polarizing the \(i\)th tessera, as the \(i\)th Lebedev point enters and passes through the the switching region from the cavity surface, until finally \(S_{ii} = \infty\) within the cavity interior, and the \(i\)th tesserae can no longer be polarized.

Although the dimension of the null space of \(K^{-1}\) can and does change as the atoms are moved, by construction (Section 1.2), \(F_i \rightarrow 0\) smoothly, and therefore the block structure of \(K^{-1}\) changes smoothly as well. This proves that the SWIG potential energy surfaces are rigorously smooth, using exact arithmetic. In practice, of course, we must employ a finite drop tolerance, and in the present work we remove any Lebedev point for which \(F_i < 10^{-8}\). (In practice, this is no different than the finite drop tolerances used to discard shell pairs an to screen AO integrals in standard electronic structure calculations. Potential energy surfaces are only as smooth as these finite thresholds allow, but the thresholds can be made as small as machine precision, if desired.) Figure S1 shows how the number of non-negligible points (and thus the dimension of \(K\)) changes as a function of bond length, for the NaCl calculation described in the paper. The dimension of \(K\) changes numerous times as the atoms are pulled apart, yet the SWIG potential surface remains smooth.
1.2 Switching function

The switching function $F_i$ used in the current work is equivalent to that used by York and Karplus. For a given surface grid point, $r_i$, the function $F_i$ is a product of elementary switching functions, $f$:

$$F_i = \prod_{J,i \notin J} f(\hat{r}_{i,J}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S11)

The notation “$i \notin J$” indicates that the product over $J$ omits the atom associated with the $i$th Lebedev point. The elementary switching function used in Eq. (S11) is

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } x < 0 \\
x^3(10 - 15x + 6x^2) & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq 1 \\
1 & \text{if } x > 1 
\end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (S12)

The argument of $f$ in Eq. (S11) is a dimensionless number, $\hat{r}_{i,J}$, that quantifies the extent to which the $i$th discretization point has penetrated into the buffer region surrounding the $J$th atom:

$$\hat{r}_{i,J} = \frac{r_{i,J} - R_{in,J}}{R_{sw,J}}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (S13)

Here, $r_{i,J} = |r_i - R_J|$ is the distance from the $i$th discretization point to the $J$th atom, $R_{in,J} < R_J$ is the radius of the inner limit of the switching region for atom $J$, and $R_{sw,J}$ is the width of this switching region. The parameters $R_{in,J}$ and $R_{sw,J}$ are determined by $R_J$, the radius of the $J$th atomic sphere, and $N_J$, the number of Lebedev points used to discretize this sphere. Specifically,

$$R_{sw,J} = \gamma_J R_J$$ \hspace{1cm} (S14)

and

$$R_{in,J} = R_J - \alpha_J R_{sw,J},$$ \hspace{1cm} (S15)
where

\[ \alpha_J = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\gamma_J} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{\gamma_J^2} - \frac{1}{28}} \]  

(S16)

and

\[ \gamma_J = \sqrt{\frac{14}{N_J}}. \]  

(S17)

2 Computational details

Solute cavities were discretized using atom-centered Lebedev grids.\(^6\) Grid points were discarded whenever \( F_i < 10^{-8} \); tighter thresholds had little discernible effect on the calculations. The rest of this section provides details regarding the (adenine)(H\(_2\)O)_52 and NaCl calculations discussed in this work.

2.1 (Adenine)(H\(_2\)O)_52 optimization and frequencies

An (adenine)(H\(_2\)O)_52 cluster was carved out of an equilibrated molecular dynamics simulation of adenine in bulk water under ambient conditions, by selecting all H\(_2\)O molecules within 5 Å of any adenine atom. This cluster was optimized in the gas phase (using the AMBER99 force field) for 50 optimization cycles, in order to eliminate any artifacts in the gradient caused by extracting the cluster from the bulk. The resulting structure was then used as a starting point for the VTN-, FIXPVA-, and SWIG-COSMO optimizations.

Solute cavities for these optimizations were constructed from atom-centered spheres whose radii were chosen by adding 1.4 Å to the AMBER99 Lennard–Jones radii. This surface was discretized using 50 Lebedev points per atomic sphere.

Q-Chem default convergence criteria were used for the geometry optimizations (maximum step size = 0.3 Å; maximum gradient component = \(3.0 \times 10^{-4}\) a.u.; maximum atomic displacement = \(1.2 \times 10^{-3}\) a.u.; maximum energy change = \(1.0 \times 10^{-6}\) a.u.). Harmonic frequencies were calculated by finite difference of analytic energy gradients. For the SWIG procedure, the finite-difference step size was taken to be the Q-Chem default, \(3.0 \times 10^{-4}\) Å. The step size used for FIXPVA was reduced to \(3.0 \times 10^{-5}\) Å, in order to avoid imaginary frequencies that were encountered when larger displacements...
2.2 NaCl dissociation

Dissociation curves for NaCl [computed at the HF/6-31+G*/SS(V)PE level] consist of single-point calculations spaced 0.005 Å apart. The total energy includes the SS(V)PE electrostatic interaction energy as well as non-electrostatic cavitation, dispersion, and repulsion interactions.

Each non-electrostatic component of the solvation energy is defined by a fairly simple function of the cavity surface area. The cavitation energy was computed using the formula given in Ref. 7, whereas dispersion and repulsion energies were computed as described in Ref. 8 Lennard–Jones parameters for the dispersion/repulsion energy were taken from the AMBER99 force field\(^9\) for Na\(^+\) and Cl\(^-\), and from the TIP3P force field\(^10\) for H\(_2\)O.

As suggested in Ref. 7, the non-electrostatic interaction terms utilize a somewhat different cavity surface than that used for the electrostatic interactions. For the electrostatic [SS(V)PE] terms, we use Bondi’s atomic van der Waals radii,\(^11\) each scaled by a factor of 1.2. For the dispersion and repulsion interaction energies, a solvent-accessible surface was constructed by adding the Lennard–Jones minimum-energy distance for each solvent atom to the scaled Bondi radius. In either case, each atomic sphere was discretized using 110 Lebedev points.
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