

A Functional–Field Theorem: An Explicit Proof of Axioms and Equations for Applying iSAFT in Polymer Field Theory

Maximo T. Estrada

mtel@rice.edu

Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, William Marsh Rice University,
6100 Main St, Houston, TX 77050, United States of America

Abstract

Our work establishes the mathematical equivalence between polymer Self-Consistent Field Theory and interfacial SAFT based classical Density Functional Theory by providing an explicit proof that SCFT is the mean–field (MF) or saddle–point limit of a Legendre–dual formulation of iSAFT–CDFT. The polymer CDFT ideal–chain term is the Legendre conjugate of the single–chain generating functional built from standard SCFT propagators, so the Legendre transform converts the iSAFT–CDFT Euler–Lagrange equations into SCFT fixed–point relations. Hence, both share the same recursive integrals and propagator structures for segment densities and connect directly to the Flory–Huggins local interaction parameter in particle based CDFT, giving a common kinematic backbone distinguished only by the excess free energy functional and coefficient basis, and generating a hybridized iSAFT Equation of State to be solved using the SCFT iterative schemes, referred to as Functional–Field Theory. Within this Functional–Field Theory, Wertheim TPT1 association free energy can be incorporated into the excess functional, with the mass–action variables providing additive SCFT fields yet leaving the propagators unchanged. Linearization about the MF solution produces a reversible mapping for fluctuation corrections, suggesting a universal response that couples the single–chain correlation kernel to the iSAFT direct correlation operator, allowing the inclusion of short–range structure and association cooperatively beyond mean field. Long–range interactions map similarly, showing how functional derivatives can yield SCFT field contributions, while second derivatives yield the long–range blocks of the iSAFT correlation operator, providing a unified treatment of polymers. Mathematically, this framework aims to clarify that SCFT and polymer DFT solvers share similar diffusion–based propagators, and how iSAFT hard–sphere, attraction, and association modules contribute additional field and hessian terms. Specifically, this work provides a Legendre–duality proof that places SAFT–CDFTs and SCFT on the same MF foundation, and a reversible theoretical framework that transfers iSAFT correlation information into SCFT, enabling modular, quantitative modeling of associating, structured polymer systems.

Introduction

Self-Consistent Field Theory (SCFT) is a widely used mean-field description of inhomogeneous polymers, with block copolymer melts and solutions as the canonical examples. For high-density systems, SCFT can capture lamellae, cylinders, gyroids, and related equilibrium morphologies across diverse polymer architectures while remaining computationally manageable. Fredrickson¹ and Matsen's² perspective makes this structure explicit by formalizing SCFT as the saddle-point evaluation of Edwards field theory for Gaussian chains in incompressible melts, thereby establishing SCFT as the default for MF modeling of block copolymer behavior.

Algorithmic developments over the last decade have extended the applications and computational efficiency of SCFT. For instance, Arora and others demonstrated that combining Anderson mixing with variable unit cells transforms SCFT into a practical tool for systematic exploration of block-polymer phase behavior,³ while others have efficient spectral and finite-difference solvers for the modified diffusion equation or released open source SCFT implementations capable of resolving fully three-dimensional phase behavior.^{4,5} On the application side, the propagator machinery of SCFT has been generalized to now study complex polymer branched polymers, enabling the study of more complex architectures.⁶ In addition, for self-assembled micelles and biologically inspired amphiphiles, Nguyen et al. introduced a modified SCFT with sequence and interaction resolved inputs for intrinsically disordered proteins, allowing direct prediction of critical micelle concentrations with good agreement with experimental results.⁷ In addition, SCFT has also expanded with computational refinement, including PSCF and its GPU parallelizing variants, RuSseL for interphases⁸ and machine learning accelerated Langevin SCFT frameworks,⁹ all applying similar chain kinematics, propagators, and interactions. SCFT thus provides an efficient and widely applicable foundation for understanding inhomogeneous polymers.

However, modern SCFT often describes interacting polymers using a Hubbard-Stratonovich Transformation (HST), which yields MF density profiles and thermodynamic properties.^{2,10-13} Moreover, fluctuation theories like the Random Phase Approximation (RPA) or self-consistent one-loop corrections structure factors and order-disorder thresholds,¹⁴ parameterize short-range interactions with local χ terms or simple convolution kernels.^{15,16} While successful at mesoscale ordering¹⁷, SCFT under-represents near contact structures,¹⁸⁻²¹ packing oscillations, and complex bonding, unless extensions are applied.^{22,23}

In parallel, Classical Density Functional Theories (CDFTs) of complex fluids have undergone their own maturation in the last two decades, particularly through interfacial Statistical Associating Fluid Theory (iSAFT). SAFT-class CDFTs provide quantitatively precise excess free-energy functionals that account for hard-sphere packing, attraction, and association, almost two decades before SCFT, allowing branched polymers to be studied and built at the segment or interaction level. Jain et al. introduced a modified iSAFT that integrates perturbation iSAFT CDFT with a nonlocal hard-sphere structure to account for chain branching in complex fluids.^{24,25} Building on this foundation, iSAFT-based DFT was extended to associating polyatomic molecules by implementing Wertheim TPT1 association within a CDFT framework²⁶, the adsorption and phase behavior nanoslit graphite pores,²⁷ achieving near-identical quantitative agreement with both simulations and experimental data.

The application of iSAFT-CDFTs has increasingly focused on soft-matter self-assembly in polymeric environments. For instance, Chapman and others have been applying iSAFT to

micelle formation and interfacial properties,²⁸ solubilization in block copolymer micelles with co-solvents²⁹, associating colloids,³⁰ and one and two-component bottlebrush molecules under varied solvent qualities.³¹ In addition, modified iSAFT DFT has also been applied to constructing phase diagrams that align closely with both molecular dynamic simulations and SCFT predictions while capturing compressibility and solvent-quality effects that standard incompressible SCFT typically neglects³². As a result, iSAFT based CDFTs are now central tools for understanding structural and thermodynamic properties across colloids, simple liquids, and polymers.

Despite their distinct historical trajectories, polymer DFTs share a similar structural backbone to SCFT. For instance, the ideal-chain contribution is represented through single-chain generating functionals, while excess terms encode intermolecular correlations. In practice, these two have developed separately, as SCFT starting with mesoscale morphology and parameter fitting of local χ interactions, and iSAFT-CDFT, originally designed for molecular thermodynamics and interfacial structure using detailed nonlocal excess functionals. However, Polymer-specific DFT (PDFT) lies precisely at this interface, as early work formulated a density functional for hard-chain polymer fluids in slit pores, explicitly treating chains with segment-wise density profiles³³ and inhomogeneous polymer numerical methods for thin films^{34,35} revealing how PDFT and SCFT predict same morphologies and density profiles, while DFT more naturally incorporates compressibility and microscopic segment correlations. Moreover, Wei and Wu derive polymer DFT from a chain partition-function functional $Q[\omega]$, where densities follow from functional derivatives with respect to external fields in a manner that mirrors the SCFT construction, providing their own Legendre transform, and adding their found nonlocal excess terms into the CDFT based solver.³⁶ More recent PDFT work extends this framework to nonionic systems, formulating polymer DFTs for neutral and charged polymer brushes, explicitly solving Edwards-type propagator equations for grafted chains within the DFT iteration to obtain density profiles and electrostatic potentials in good agreement with Monte Carlo and molecular dynamics simulations.³⁷

In addition, Thompson derives orbital-free quantum DFT from an SCFT-style partition function using HST, providing a non-polymer example of how a partition-function formulation can be mapped into density functional theory.³⁸ Similarly, hybrid SCFT-DFT constructions have coupled an SCFT description of chain conformations to a DFT description of small-molecule solvent, capturing adsorption and layering phenomena that neither SCFT nor small-molecule DFT alone can describe as accurately, show how nanoparticles shift the order-disorder transition, generate mesoscale functionals that accurately predict structure transitions, and treat mixtures and confined geometries.³⁹⁻⁴²

Historically, there have been several numerical similarities in the computation of SCFT and iSAFT-type CDFTs. The Tramonto project documentation describes polymer DFT modules in which densities, nonlocal weighted densities, and chain-propagator equations are solved simultaneously within a Newton-Raphson iteration, with the ideal-chain contribution expressed using the same forward and backward propagators familiar from SCFT.^{43,44} Müller and others note that SCFT is systematically reduced to a polymer DFT with a chain-density functional by constructing a chain partition-function functional $Q[w]$ that mirrors the SCFT chain-generator structure.^{34,35,37,45,46} Collectively, these studies suggest, at equilibrium and at the level of chain kinematics, polymer DFT can be viewed as SCFT with the extension of its MF to an explicit excess functional.

Furthermore, researchers have sought to unify the SCFT–DFT framework by adopting shared formalisms and solvers. CDFT has also been repeatedly reformulated to match SCFT topologies,⁴⁷ shown how dynamic DFT and SCFT can share the same chain propagators once an excess functional is specified,⁴⁸ and how the main discrepancies arise from compressibility and excess–term choices rather than from kinematics backbone^{49,50}. Most recently, Zhang and collaborators have developed a shared numerical platform for SCFT, with a single Newton or Anderson loop, differing only in how each theory uniquely defines its ideal and excess functional pieces.⁵¹ These authors highlight that PDFTs provide more accurate equations of state than PSCFT due to compressibility and correlation effects, can be incorporated into extended PSCFT, and can be cast in the same fixed–point structure, treating them similarly in numerical calculation. From this survey, SCFT is a computationally more efficient method, built on chain propagators evolving in external fields, and has a mature ecosystem of algorithms and codes. By contrast, the iSAFT–based CDFTs offer quantitatively accurate excess free–energy functionals for packing, attraction, and association, and have been successfully applied to adsorption in pores, micellization, block–copolymer self–assembly, and bottlebrush architectures, while easily being calculated in parallel or constrained to be used to refine PSCFT.^{35,37,43,46,49,51}

Despite this rich background, current SAFT–based direct correlation operators C_{ex} are not systematically imported into SCFT, while SCFT still uses nonlocal RPA and one–loop correction kernels with χ contact terms. Moreover, we find no construction that starts from a fully nonlocal iSAFT $C_{\text{ex}}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ and makes it the direct correlator functional.³ Likewise, association and Fundamental Measure Theory (FMT) terms are usually confined to MF or DFT level, while SCFT studies of associating systems fall back on effective χ parameters or local penalties instead of the full SAFT association functional and its curvature.^{52,53} Despite propagator–based density updates in CDFT solvers, RPA style embeddings of single–chain structure factors into CDFT, and computational frameworks showing SCFT and CDFTs have the same propagator and numerical solution structures, no work explicitly provides a proof showing SCFT as the MF limit of SAFT–class CDFT through a linear operator transformation or exporting C_{ex} into a general one–loop correction pathway into SCFT, and often utilize only one or the other based on the goals of the work.^{36,37,43,47,49,51,54–56}

The present work is designed to address these gaps precisely. What our work provides is a rigorous functional–analytic connection, through a projector–aware Legendre duality between $W[\boldsymbol{\omega}]$ and $F_{\text{id}}[\boldsymbol{\rho}]$ on the incompressible composition subspace, together with a curvature identity that identifies the iSAFT direct–correlation operator as the natural one–loop fluctuation kernel for SCFT. This provides a systematic route for reversibly importing nonlocal packing, attraction, and association physics from SAFT–class CDFTs into fluctuation–corrected SCFT, and it is the logical transition point from the background summarized above to the theorem and formal developments that follow. This paper traverses reversibility through both CDFT and SCFT and presents an explicit proof of Legendre duality. We show that SCFT resides inside iSAFT–CDFT as its MF limit, finding that they share the same recursive integrals and propagators in the forward, I_1, q , and backward, I_2, q^\ddagger directions.⁵¹ To our knowledge, no polymer field theory states and provides an explicit proof revealing, under the right constraints, there exists a projector–aware Legendre transform taking a iSAFT–CDFT to SCFT, with the SCFT single–chain generator $W[\boldsymbol{\omega}]$ and the DFT ideal functional $F_{\text{id}}[\boldsymbol{\rho}]$ treated as exact Legendre conjugates on the incompressible composition subspace; existing polymer DFTs either derive DFT–like functionals or transforms from SCFT in on a case by case analysis, or build unified numerical frameworks without a rigorous duality.

The first main objective is to inject Wertheim's TPT1 theory through the Legendre map to capture directional bonding, such as in cyclics and H-bonds, as fields in SCFT, while leaving propagators intact, enabling SCFT with association at nearly the same cost as conventional SCFT.^{26,57} The second is long-range interactions, which are naturally expressed as density functionals whose first and second derivatives feed, respectively, SCFT mean fields and CDFT correlation kernels.²⁴⁻²⁶ The scope of the paper is therefore both formal and practical. Formally, we give a concise derivation of the Legendre duality specialized to SAFT-class functionals, prove the identity of the SCFT and CDFT Euler-Lagrange structures, and end with the universal response and one-loop formulas. Secondly, this work extends to an association-augmented SCFT with explicit Wertheim association, showing how it drops in as an additive mean-field term. Thirdly, this work provides a reversible direct-correlation bridge, enabling the current modified iSAFT to correct SCFT beyond its mean-field limit, referred to as the SCFT-CDFT Legendre Duality, or Estrada-Legendre Duality (ELD) for short.

II. Basic Formalism: CDFT

Classical density functional theory has been used to model gas adsorption confinement, complex polyatomic systems, and ionic solutions. Segmenting over chains of polymers with the notation $a\{s\} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, m\}$, where positions exist in the spatial domain where fluid can occupy in three-dimensional space, $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. In addition, the grand potential functional is defined as Ω_{pot} .

The iSAFT's CDFT Euler-Lagrange equation, and seen in Eq. (2), and defining the particle-based systems grand potential, Eq. (1). Here, we have the grand potential related to the intrinsic Helmholtz free energy functional, $A[\rho]$, where N is the number of segment types over all chains, $\rho_i(\mathbf{r})$, the density of the spherical segment i at the position vector \mathbf{r} , $V_i^{ext}(\mathbf{r})$, is the external potential of component i .

$$\Omega_{pot}[\rho] = A[\rho] - \sum_{i=1}^m \rho_i(\mathbf{r}) [\mu_i - V_i^{ext}(\mathbf{r})] \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\delta \Omega_{pot}[\rho]}{\delta \rho_i(\mathbf{r})} = \frac{\delta A[\rho]}{\delta \rho_i(\mathbf{r})} - \mu_i - V_i^{ext}(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \quad (2)$$

The total Helmholtz free energy function of modified iSAFT, is then decomposed into an ideal contribution, $A^{id}[\rho]$, hard sphere contribution, $A^{HS}[\rho]$, Leonard Jones (LJ) attraction contribution, $A^{att}[\rho]$, association, $A^{assoc}[\rho]$, and chain contribution, $A^{ch}[\rho]$. The free energy functionals are based on perturbation theory, allowing us to additively decompose the Helmholtz free energy shown in Eq. (3).

$$A[\rho] = A^{id}[\rho] + A^{HS}[\rho] + A^{att}[\rho] + A^{assoc}[\rho] + A^{ch}[\rho] + A^{disp}[\rho] \quad (3)$$

The ideal contribution has the exact form in Eq. (4) where β is given by $\frac{1}{k_b * T}$, where k_b is the Boltzmann constant and T is the temperature in Kelvin.

$$A^{id}[\rho] = \frac{1}{\beta} \int \sum_i^M \rho_i(\mathbf{r}) (\ln(\rho_i(\mathbf{r}_1)) - 1) d\mathbf{r}_1 \quad (4)$$

The hard sphere contribution is calculated from Rosenfield Fundamental Measure Theory, shown in Eq. (5), with the hard sphere energy density $\Phi[n_\alpha(\mathbf{r})]$ given by Eq. (6).⁵²

$$A^{HS}[\rho] = \frac{1}{\beta} \int \Phi[n_\alpha(\mathbf{r}_1)] d\mathbf{r}_1 \quad (5)$$

$$\Phi[n_\alpha(\mathbf{r})] = -n_0 * \ln(1 - n_3) + \frac{n_1 n_2}{1 - n_3} + \frac{n_2^3}{24\pi(1 - n_3)^2} - \frac{\mathbf{n}_{v1} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{v2}}{1 - n_3} - \frac{(\mathbf{n}_{v1} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{v2})n_2}{8\pi(1 - n_3)^2} \quad (6)$$

For each Rosenfield weight, the following equations, dependent on density position, in Eq. (7).

$$n_\alpha(\rho) = n_\alpha(\rho(\mathbf{r})) = \int \sum_{i=1}^M \rho_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \omega_\alpha^i(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1) d\mathbf{r}_1 \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3, v_1, v_2 \quad (7)$$

The MF version of the Leonard Jones (LJ) attraction we utilize has shown good approximation for polymer systems based on molecular simulation results, shown in Eq.(8–11) as we follow the Weeks Chandler–Anderson potentials. Where r_{ij} is the distance between two spherical segments, $r_{min} = 2^{\frac{1}{6}}\sigma_{ij}$ and $r_{cut} = 3.5 * \sigma_{ij}$.^{25,58}

$$A^{att}[\rho] = \frac{1}{2 * \beta} \sum_{i,j} \int_{|\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1| > \sigma_{ij}}^{\infty} u_{ij}^{att}(|\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1|) \rho_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \rho_j(\mathbf{r}_2) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \quad (8)$$

$$u_{ij}^{att} = u^{att}(r_{ij}) = \begin{cases} u^{LJ}(r_{min}) - u^{LJ}(r_{cut}), & \sigma_{ij} < r_{ij} \leq r_{min} \\ u^{LJ}(r_{ij}) - u^{LJ}(r_{cut}), & r_{min} < r_{ij} \leq r_{cut} \\ 0, & r_{ij} \geq r_{cut} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

$$u^{hs}(r_{ij}) = \begin{cases} \infty, & r_{ij} < \sigma_{ij} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

$$u(r_{ij}) = u^{hs}(r_{ij}) + u^{att}(r_{ij}) \quad (11)$$

The chain contribution is determined from the association free energy functional based on thermodynamic perturbation theory of the first order, (TPT1) proposed by Wertheim and extended by Chapman. While higher order perturbations exist, they are not utilized in this work.^{59–65} From Segura, Bymaster, and Chapman, the following association functional is found in Eq.(12).^{26,66}

$$A^{assoc}[\rho] = \int \sum_{i=1}^M \rho_i(\mathbf{r}_1) \left(\sum_{A_i} \ln(X_{A_i}(\mathbf{r}_1)) - \frac{X_{A_i}(\mathbf{r}_1)}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) d\mathbf{r}_1 \quad (12)$$

Where $X_{A_i}(\mathbf{r}_1)$ is the fraction of the segment i at the position, \mathbf{r}_1 , not bonded at site A. The inhomogeneous unbonded fraction involves solving integral equations to get the inhomogeneous degree of association, shown in Eq. (12). The inhomogeneous cavity function is shown in Eq. (14). Where κ is a constant that includes the bonding volume and orientation as a scalar value resulting from SAFT.⁶⁷ Moreover, $\epsilon_{A_i B_j}^{assoc}$ is the association energy between A and B sites interacting between the segments i and j , respectively. The cavity correlation function, $y^{ij}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$ shown in Eq. (15), is approximated as the geometric mean of the bulk radial distribution functions at contact, evaluated with the average density $\bar{\rho}_i(\mathbf{r})$.²⁵

$$X_{A_i}(\mathbf{r}_1) = \left[1 + \int \sum_{j=1}^M \rho_j(\mathbf{r}_2) \sum_{B_j} \chi_{B_j}(\mathbf{r}_2) \Delta^{A_i B_j}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) d\mathbf{r}_2 \right]^{-1} \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta^{A_i B_j}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \kappa \left[\exp \left(\beta \epsilon_{A_i B_j}^{assoc} \right) - 1 \right] y^{ij}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \quad (14)$$

$$y^{ij}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = [g_{ij}(\bar{\rho}(\mathbf{r}_1), \sigma_{ij})]^{\frac{1}{2}} [g_{ij}(\bar{\rho}(\mathbf{r}_2), \sigma_{ij})]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (15)$$

The average density is given by Eq. (16), where σ_i the segment diameter for the species i .

$$\bar{\rho}_i(\mathbf{r}_1) = \frac{3}{4\pi(\sigma_i)^3} \int_{|\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1| < \sigma_i}^{\infty} \rho_i(\mathbf{r}_2) d\mathbf{r}_2 \quad (16)$$

For the chain term, we take the limit of association $\epsilon_{A_i B_j}^{assoc} \rightarrow \infty$, we then include a new bonding potential, v_{bond}^{ij} , for the system to be subtracted from $\Delta^{A_i B_j}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$, giving the new equations Eqs. (17–18).⁶⁸

$$\Delta^{A_i B_j}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \kappa \left[\exp \left(\beta \epsilon_{A_i B_j}^{assoc} \right) - \beta v_{bond}^{ij}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) - 1 \right] y^{ij}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \quad (17)$$

$$\exp \left(-\beta v_{bond}^{ij}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \right) = \frac{\delta(|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2| - \sigma_{ij})}{4\pi\sigma_{ij}^2} \quad (18)$$

Functional derivatives for all components of polyatomic molecules can now be presented for the modified iSAFT for inhomogeneous polymers. From Eqs. (2–3) now take functional derivatives of each Helmholtz free energy component. Eqs. (19–23) reveal the main contributions used to solve for density using particle interaction theory.

$$\frac{\beta \delta(A^{id}[\rho])}{\delta \rho_i(\mathbf{r})} = \ln(\rho_i(\mathbf{r})) \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{\beta\delta(A^{hs}[\boldsymbol{\rho}])}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} = \int \frac{\delta(\Phi[n_\alpha(\mathbf{r}_1)])}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} d\mathbf{r}_1 \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{\beta\delta(A^{att}[\boldsymbol{\rho}])}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} = \int \sum_{j=1}^N \beta u_{ij}^{att}(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_1|) \rho_j(\mathbf{r}_1) d\mathbf{r}_1 \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{\beta\delta(A^{chain}[\boldsymbol{\rho}])}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} = \sum_{A_i} \ln(\chi_{A_j}(\mathbf{r})) - \frac{1}{2} \int \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{j'=1}^{\{j'\}} \rho_j(\mathbf{r}) \left[\frac{\delta(\ln(y^{jj'}(\mathbf{r}_1)))}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} \right] d\mathbf{r}_1 \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{\beta\delta(A^{assoc}[\boldsymbol{\rho}])}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} = \sum_{A_i} \ln(\chi_{A_j}(\mathbf{r})) - \frac{1}{2} \int \sum_i^N \sum_j^N \rho_j(\mathbf{r}_1) \sum_{B_j} (1 - X_{B_j}(\mathbf{r}_1)) \left[\frac{\delta(\ln(y^{jj'}(\mathbf{r}_1)))}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} \right] d\mathbf{r}_1 \quad (23)$$

Regarding indices, for A^{chain} j' denotes all segments bonded to segment j , $\{j'\}$ is the set of all segments bonded to segment j . Substituting these functional derivatives into Eq. (2), and solving for density in the Euler–Lagrange equation, where equilibrium density can be solved by Eq. (24), $D_i(\mathbf{r})$ is shown to be the cumulative term Eq. (25), and μ_M is the bulk molecular chemical potential given by a summation of the bulk segment chemical potentials in Eq. (26) where M is the total number of segments in a chain, not to be confused with chemical species.

$$\rho_i(\mathbf{r}) = \exp(\beta\mu_M) * \exp(D_i(\mathbf{r}) - \beta V_i^{ext}(\beta)) I_{1,i}(\mathbf{r}) I_{2,i}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (24)$$

$$D_i(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{\delta(A^{hs}[\boldsymbol{\rho}])}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} - \frac{\delta(A^{att}[\boldsymbol{\rho}])}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} - \frac{\delta(A^{assoc}[\boldsymbol{\rho}])}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} - \frac{\delta(A^{chain}[\boldsymbol{\rho}])}{\delta\rho_i(\mathbf{r})} \quad (25)$$

$$\mu_M = \sum_{i=1}^M \mu_i \quad (26)$$

Recursive integrals are essential for modeling chain molecules, as covalent bonding recursively shares information across all segments of a polymer. Eqs. (27–28), show how their data is stored. Both integrals share a boundary condition value, such that $I_{1,1} = I_{2,m} = 1$.²⁵

$$I_{1,i}(\mathbf{r}) = \int I_{i,j-1}(\mathbf{r}') \exp(D_{i-1}(\mathbf{r}') - \beta V_{i-1}^{ext}(\mathbf{r}')) \Delta^{i-1,i}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \quad (27)$$

$$I_{2,i}(\mathbf{r}) = \int I_{2,i+1}(\mathbf{r}') \exp(D_{i+1}(\mathbf{r}') - \beta V_{i+1}^{ext}(\mathbf{r}')) \Delta^{i,i+1}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \quad (28)$$

Moreover, because of the recursive nature, we can rearrange $I_{1,i}(\mathbf{r})$ and $I_{2,i}(\mathbf{r})$ in terms of $X_{a\{s\}}(\mathbf{r})$.²⁴ Once solved with recursive integrals using Picard iteration to find the global minimum of Eq. (2)., and solve for the grand potential, $\Omega_{pot}[\boldsymbol{\rho}]$, and thus the equilibrium density profile.⁴⁹

III. Basic Formalism: SCFT

Regarding SCFT, as noted before, it provides a MF description of inhomogeneous polymers by reducing particle-based many-body interactions to a self-consistent one-body field acting on noninteracting chains.^{1,3,5,12,15,69} For a continuous Gaussian chain of length N , where segment indexes over $s \in [0, N]$, with the same spatial coordinate as iSAFT, \mathbf{r} , with $\mathbf{r} \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. In addition, we have the segment type map of $a\{s\} \in \{1, 2, 3 \dots m\}$, where m is the number of chemical species of our current ensemble. We introduce the single chain partition functional, Q , in external fields as shown in Eq. (29). This is then coupled with the Edwards diffusion equations, the coefficients are simply the central-limit variance rates of an ideal chain's random walk, and parameterize the contour-indexed Gaussian propagation, shown in Eq. (30–31), where q^\dagger is indexed in the opposite direction.

$$Q[\omega] = \frac{1}{V} \int q(\mathbf{r}, N) d\mathbf{r} \quad (29)$$

$$\partial_s q(\mathbf{r}, s) = \frac{b_{a(s)}^2}{6} \nabla^2 q(\mathbf{r}, s) - \omega_{a(s)}(\mathbf{r}) q(\mathbf{r}, s), \quad q(\mathbf{r}, 0) = 1 \quad (30)$$

$$\partial_s q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, s) = \frac{b_{a(s)}^2}{6} \nabla^2 q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, s) - \omega_{a(s)}(\mathbf{r}) q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, s), \quad q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, 0) = 1 \quad (31)$$

For a melt or blend comprising n chains, the MF SCFT Helmholtz free energy functional is shown. (32). Here $\phi_a(\mathbf{r})$ are segment volume fractions, $\mathcal{U}(\{\phi_a(\mathbf{r})\})$ encodes a local interaction from Flory Huggins theory.^{12,12,55,69,70} For incompressible melt, the cumulative summation of $\phi_a(\mathbf{r})$ is equal to 1, $\sum_a \phi_a(\mathbf{r}) = 1$, enforced by Lagrange multiplier $\xi(\mathbf{r})$. Eq. (33), shows how a Lagrange multiplier field is minimized as an additive to pressure that enforces local packing constraints. It is important to note that due to the incompressibility constraint, SCFT for melts always enforces a fixed total segment density but does not change the total volume, rather distributing it in its composition.

$$\mathcal{F}[\omega, \{\phi_a\}] = -n \ln Q[\omega] + \int \mathcal{U}(\{\phi_a(\mathbf{r})\}) d\mathbf{r} + \sum_a \int \omega_a(\mathbf{r}) \phi_a(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (32)$$

$$\mathcal{F}[\omega, \{\phi_a\}, \xi] = -n_c \ln Q[\omega] + \int \mathcal{U}(\{\phi_a(\mathbf{r})\}) d\mathbf{r} + \sum_a \int \omega_a(\mathbf{r}) \phi_a(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} + \int \xi(\mathbf{r}) \left(\sum_a \phi_a(\mathbf{r}) - 1 \right) d\mathbf{r} \quad (33)$$

Once $\xi(\mathbf{r})$ is minimized, stationarity is reached and the functional derivative with respect to the field, Eq. (34), vanishes. This is the point at which our trial fields are self-consistent with the resulting polymer densities, achieving a MF solution. This is because it is assuming the dominant contribution to energy comes from the field's configuration, and that achieving a minimum in practice, but mathematically a MF.¹

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}[\boldsymbol{\omega}]}{\delta \omega_a} = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}[\boldsymbol{\omega}]}{\delta \phi_a} = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}[\boldsymbol{\omega}]}{\delta \xi(\mathbf{r})} = 0 \quad (34)$$

Densities, specifically in volume fractions, are generated from the propagators shown by Eq. (35), where an integral is taken along the chain as $s \in a$.

$$\phi_a(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{n}{Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]} \int_{s \in a} q(\mathbf{r}, s) q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, N - s) ds \quad (35)$$

Self-consistency follows from extremizing \mathcal{F} with respect ω_a and ξ for a typical binary melt, with a local Flory–Huggins interaction parameter shown in Eq. (36); however, \mathcal{U} can also represent the interaction free energy density. In addition, in a normal multicomponent melt, the χ interaction parameter would not be a single value as $\chi_{AB} = \chi_{BA} = \chi$ for this sole case. It can be more generally expressed as a matrix of interaction coefficients shown in Eq.(37).

$$\mathcal{U} = \chi * N \int \phi_A(\mathbf{r}) \phi_B(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (36)$$

$$\chi_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \chi_{ii} & \cdots & \chi_{ij} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \chi_{ji} & \cdots & \chi_{jj} \end{bmatrix} \quad (37)$$

The Euler–Lagrange equation gives the following Eq. (38). With the incompressibility condition shown in Eq. (39).³

$$\omega_A(\mathbf{r}) = \xi(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta \phi_A} \quad \omega_B(\mathbf{r}) = \xi(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{\delta \mathcal{U}}{\delta \phi_B} \quad (38)$$

$$1 = \phi_A(\mathbf{r}) + \phi_B(\mathbf{r}) \quad (39)$$

Algorithmically given a field for specific segments ω_i , one would solve Eq.(38) and Eq. (39) using an initial guess, plugging the result into the Edwards diffusion equations to solve for $Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]$, Eq. (29–31), updating $\phi_a(\mathbf{r})$ Eq. (35) and minimizing $\xi(\mathbf{r})$ and $\omega_a(\mathbf{r})$, iteratively until convergence is reached. This gives the resulting density in Eq. (40) after the self-consistent loop is converged.

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}, s) = \frac{n_c}{Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]} \exp(-\omega(\mathbf{r}, s)) q(\mathbf{r}, s) q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, N - s) \quad (40)$$

In the event one has non–Gaussian pairwise interaction terms such as quadratics, the Hubbard–Stratonovich transform (HST) converts the non–Gaussian, pairwise interaction term into a linear coupling to an auxiliary field, often for block copolymers denoted as ω_+ and ω_- , making the polymer integrals over chain conformations Gaussian so they can be solved. Once in field form, SCFT drops out as the saddle–point of the HS action, and the same representation provides a systematic route to fluctuation corrections, such as RPA and one–loop, by expanding

around that saddle.^{10–12,69} Thus, HS serves as the algebraic bridge that turns interacting chains into non-interacting chains in a fluctuating field. An extensive proof is provided in Appendix.^{1,71}

Main Results and Derivation

I.I. SCFT–CDFT Legendre Duality

To develop ELD, assume periodic boundary conditions in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, a finite space, and incompressibility of our fluid. In addition, for later uses in our derivation, assume Fréchet smoothness to guarantee a well-defined continuous hessian for CDFT and SCFT. Fréchet smoothness to allow for a normed and complete vector space allowed in Banach Space.^{71–74}

To reiterate $W[\omega]$, is the logarithmic single chains generating functional, where $\omega = \{\omega_a(r)\}_{a=1}^m$, such that there is one field per segment. Define U , the function space where fields reside, $L^\infty(\Omega)^m$. Density, ρ , is a set of all component densities $\rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$ for every segment type α and for all positions \mathbf{r} , resulting in Eq.(41–42). In addition, the external potential and chemical potentials per chemical species are denoted as, V_i^{ext} , and μ_i .

$$\rho \equiv \{\rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})\} \quad (41)$$

$$\omega \equiv \{\omega_\alpha(\mathbf{r})\} \quad (42)$$

Separate functionals in particle space, in terms of excess and ideal functionals, as shown in Eq. (43). The intrinsic functionals for CDFT, $A[\rho]$, is now replaced by $F[\rho]$, to be consistent with the field functionals, $\mathcal{F}[\omega]$. Here, the $F_{ex}[\rho]$ contains the reference, physics, and higher order corrections in Eq. (44). We then bring in Eq. (1–2), as we wish to minimize Ω_{pot} .

$$F[\rho] = F_{id}[\rho] + F_{ex}[\rho] \quad (43)$$

$$F_{ex}[\rho] = F_{ref}[\rho] + F_{assoc}[\rho] + F_{chain}[\rho] + F_{att}[\rho] \dots \quad (44)$$

Define the inner product notation between ω and ρ as $\langle \omega, \rho \rangle$ in Eq. (45), over the sum of components a . Define the convex conjugate for the ideal term, such that Eq. (45) can relate the single chain propagator, Eq. (29), and its components in Eqs. (38–40) can be related to iSAFT CDFT.

$$\langle \omega, \rho \rangle = \sum_a \int \omega_a(\mathbf{r}) \rho_a(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (45)$$

$$F_{id}[\rho] = \sup_{\omega \in U} \{\langle \omega, \rho \rangle - W[\omega]\} \quad (46)$$

Let $U = L^p(\Omega)^n$.

Lemma 1.1–First Variation

Define $W[\boldsymbol{\omega}] = \ln(Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}])$, where $Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]$ follows the same definition as Eq. (29). Assume that for each $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in U$, the propagators depend on Fréchet-smoothly on $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, and differentiating on Ω and s is justified.^{72–74} Then $W: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Fréchet differentiable on U , and its first derivative at $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ in the direction of $\boldsymbol{v} \in U$ is given by

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} W[\boldsymbol{\omega} + \varepsilon \boldsymbol{v}] \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \sum_a \int v_a(\mathbf{r}) \rho_a(\mathbf{r}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) d\mathbf{r}, \quad (47)$$

Where the SCFT segment density field $\rho(\mathbf{r}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the

$$\rho_a(\mathbf{r}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) = \frac{n}{Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]} \int_0^{N_a} q_a(\mathbf{r}, s; \boldsymbol{\omega}) q_a^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, N-s; \boldsymbol{\omega}) ds, \quad a = 1, 2 \dots n. \quad (48)$$

In particular, the Fréchet derivative of W at $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is the functional

$$\frac{\delta W}{\delta \omega_a(\mathbf{r})} = \rho_a(\mathbf{r}; \boldsymbol{\omega}) \quad (49)$$

Proof.

Fix $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in U$ and a direction $\boldsymbol{v} \in U$. For ε in a neighborhood of 0, define $\boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon = \boldsymbol{\omega} + \varepsilon \boldsymbol{v}$, generating the corresponding single chain partition functional

$$Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon] = \frac{1}{V} \int q(\mathbf{r}, s; \boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon) q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, N-s; \boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (50)$$

By assumption, $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ maps to $q(\cdot, \cdot; \boldsymbol{\omega})$ and $q^\dagger(\cdot, \cdot; \boldsymbol{\omega})$ are Fréchet smooth from U into suitable Banach spaces, and the dependence dominated so that differentiation may be moved inside the integrals.^{72,73} Differentiating $W[\boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon]$ results in the following

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} W[\boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon] \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{1}{Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]} \left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon] \right|_{\varepsilon=0}. \quad (51)$$

Applying the chain rule along integrals of \mathbf{r} and s obtains

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon] \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{1}{V} \int d\mathbf{r} \int_0^N (D_\omega q(\mathbf{r}, s; \boldsymbol{\omega})[\boldsymbol{v}] q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, N-s; \boldsymbol{\omega}) + D_\omega q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, N-s; \boldsymbol{\omega})[\boldsymbol{v}] q(\mathbf{r}, s; \boldsymbol{\omega})) ds$$

Where the Fréchet derivatives $D_\omega q(\mathbf{r}, s; \boldsymbol{\omega})[\boldsymbol{v}]$ and $D_\omega q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, N-s; \boldsymbol{\omega})[\boldsymbol{v}]$ solve the Edwards equation

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon] \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \int v(\mathbf{r}) \tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\omega}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (52)$$

Where $\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\omega})$ is the unnormalized segment density.¹ Dividing by $Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]$ gives

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} W[\boldsymbol{\omega}_\varepsilon] \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \int v(\mathbf{r}) \rho(\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\omega}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (53)$$

Completing the proof for Eq. (46).

Lemma 1.2–Second Variation; Definition of $\Gamma^{(2)}$

Let $U = L^p(\Omega)^n$ as in Lemma 1.1. Let $W: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be again the single chain generating functional. Assume that W is twice Fréchet differentiable on U for each $\omega \in U$, and that the second derivative may be passed under Ω and s integrals.^{72,73,75}

Then for any ω and any direction v , the second variation of W at ω in v direction becomes

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} Q[\omega_\varepsilon] \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \int v(\mathbf{r}) \rho(\mathbf{r}, \omega) d\mathbf{r} \quad (54)$$

$$D^2W(\omega)[v, v] = \text{Cov}_\omega \left[\int v(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}; \omega) d\mathbf{r} \right] \geq 0 \quad (55)$$

Where $\hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}; \omega)$ is the microscopic segment density operator and Cov_ω represents the covariance with respect to a single chain measured in ω . Assume W is concave on U , and there exists a symmetric, positive semidefinite operator $\Gamma^{(2)}: L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, where

$$D^2W(\omega)[v, v] = \langle v, \Gamma^{(2)}(\omega), v \rangle = \text{Cov}_\omega \left[\int v(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}; \omega) d\mathbf{r} \right] \geq 0. \quad (56)$$

Particularly for an incompressible melt, the uniform direction becomes

$$v(\mathbf{r}) \equiv c\mathbf{1}, \quad c \in \mathbb{R} \quad (57)$$

Lies in the null space of $\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega)$, giving $D^2W(\omega)$, the null eigenvector along the total-density mode on the composition subspace in Eq. (58)^{72,75}.

$$\mathcal{T} = \left\{ \rho \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n) : \sum_a \delta \rho_a(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \right\} \quad (58)$$

Here assume that $\Gamma^{(2)}$ is away from the spinodal, strictly positive, it becomes invertible on \mathcal{T} .¹

Proof.

Fix $\omega \in U$ and $v \in U$. Consider the one-parameter group ω_ε , and $W[\omega_\varepsilon] = \Phi(\varepsilon)$. Defined by chain rule

$$\Phi(\varepsilon) = \ln \left\langle \exp \left(- \int \omega_\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \right) \right\rangle_0,$$

Where $\langle \cdot \rangle_0$ denotes the ensemble average with respect to the reference Gaussian chain measure.¹ Differentiating once, yields

$$\Phi(\varepsilon) = \int v(\mathbf{r})\rho(\mathbf{r}, \omega_\varepsilon) d\mathbf{r}. \quad (59)$$

Differentiating again using the identity for second derivative of the log generating functional, where $J_\varepsilon = -\omega_\varepsilon$ and $X = \hat{\rho}$, we obtain the following

$$\frac{d^2}{d\varepsilon^2} \ln \langle \exp(J_\varepsilon X) \rangle = \text{Var} \left(\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} J_\varepsilon X \right), \quad (60)$$

$$\Phi(0) = \text{Cov}_\omega \left[\int v(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\rho}(\mathbf{r}; \omega) d\mathbf{r} \right], \quad (61)$$

Where the definition of the second Fréchet derivative may be applied.⁷⁶ This returns Eq. (56). The covariance is symmetric and nonnegative, so the quadratic form of Eq. (56) defines a symmetric, positive semidefinite operator, and we have $\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega)$. Thus concavity of W follows immediately from Eq. (56) for all v . For the incompressible–melt note that a uniform shift $v(\mathbf{r})$ couples only to the total density $\hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_\alpha \hat{\rho}_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$. In an incompressible melt, the total density is fixed, so its fluctuations vanish, and the variance above is zero in this direction. Thus v lies in the null space of $\Gamma_2(\omega)$, and $-D^2W(\omega)$ has a null eigenvector along the total–density mode. Restricting to the composition subspace removes this null mode; positivity and invertibility on the subspace become the criteria of being sufficiently away from the spinodal region.¹

Lemma 1.3–Fenchel–Legendre Transform F_{id}

Let $U = L^p(\Omega)^n$ be the field space and $H = L^2(\Omega)^n$ the density space with inner product

$$\langle \omega, \rho \rangle := \sum_{a=1}^n \int \omega_a(\mathbf{r}) \rho_a(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (62)$$

Assume the hypotheses of Lemmas 1.1 and 1.2, such that the density field $\rho(\cdot; \omega) \in H$, can be generated by

$$\nabla_\omega W(\omega) = \rho(\cdot; \omega), \quad (63)$$

And for ρ , the feasible set of densities, $\mathcal{D} \subset H$, define the ideal functional by the Fenchel–Legendre transform in Eq.(46).^{72,74} Assuming that for each ρ , the supremum is finite and attained at a unique maximizer, ω^* and that W is a Fréchet differentiable at ω^* , then the maximizer satisfies

$$\rho_a(\mathbf{r}) = \rho_a(\mathbf{r}; \omega^*(\rho)), \quad (64)$$

And the gradient of F_{id} in respect to ρ is

$$\frac{\delta F_{id}(\rho)}{\delta \rho_a(\mathbf{r})} = -\omega_a^*(\mathbf{r}). \quad (65)$$

Specifically, the SCFT field $\omega^*(\rho)$ is the functional gradient of the ideal density functional with respect to ρ .

Proof.

Define the concave functional at fixed ρ ,

$$J(\omega) := -\langle \omega, \rho \rangle - W[\omega]. \quad (66)$$

Since W is Fréchet differentiable, so is J , with the first variation in direction of $v \in U$ in Eq. (67).^{72,77}

$$DJ(\omega^*(\rho); \rho)[v] = -\langle v, \rho \rangle - DW(\omega)[v] \quad (67)$$

Optimality of ω^* of the means for all $v \in U$

$$DJ(\omega^*(\rho); \rho)[v] = 0$$

With Lemma 1.1, this becomes

$$0 = \int v(\mathbf{r}) (\rho(\mathbf{r}) - \rho(\mathbf{r}, \omega^*(\rho))) d\mathbf{r} \quad (68)$$

or in other words,

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}) = \rho(\mathbf{r}, \omega^*(\rho)) \quad (69)$$

for every component r and component a . Now taking the derivative with respect to ρ for Eq.(46), with our ω^* , by direct differentiation and using the optimality condition presented above in Eq.(66–69), and replacing ρ with $\rho + \varepsilon h$, we attain the following,

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\varepsilon} F_{id}(\rho + \varepsilon h) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} = \langle \omega^*(\rho), h \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} (-\langle \omega^*(\rho), \rho + \varepsilon h \rangle - W[\omega^*(\rho)]) \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \quad (70)$$

This identifies the functional derivative claims in Eq. (65).

Lemma 1.4–Hessian Inverse Identity

Assume the assumptions and hypotheses of Lemma 1.1–3 as before. Let $\mathcal{T} \subset H$ be the incompressible composition subspace, where $H \equiv L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$, and define the orthogonal projector P onto \mathcal{T} . Assume that for a given MF density $\rho \in \mathcal{T}$ and corresponding optimal field $\omega^*(\rho)$ from Lemma 1.3, the stability condition

$$\langle \xi, P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*)P\xi \rangle_H \geq c \|\xi\|_H^2 \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (71)$$

holds for some constant $c > 0$. In particular, the restricted operator

$$B(\rho) := P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*(\rho))P \quad (72)$$

is boundedly invertible. Utilizing B , the derivation of \mathcal{T} becomes

$$D\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho})[h] = -B(\boldsymbol{\rho})^{-1}h \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (73)$$

Eq. (73) restricts the hessian of F_{id} from Lemma 1.3 to generate

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^2 F_{id}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}))P \quad (74)$$

Proof.

Define the map

$$G(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) := P(\rho(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\omega}) - \boldsymbol{\rho}) = -P\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} W(\boldsymbol{\omega}) - P\rho, \quad (75)$$

Over $U \times \mathcal{T}$ into \mathcal{T} . The optimal field then satisfies

$$G(\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \boldsymbol{\rho}) = 0. \quad (76)$$

Taking the derivative with respect to ω and ρ results in

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} G(\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \boldsymbol{\rho})[\boldsymbol{v}] = -P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho})), \quad (77)$$

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} G(\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \boldsymbol{\rho})[h] = -Ph. \quad (78)$$

Thus, by the Banach–Space Implicit Theorem, there exists a neighborhood, on which $G = 0$, and defines a unique Fréchet map from ρ to ω^* . Now differentiating in the direction of h ,

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} G(\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \boldsymbol{\rho})[\boldsymbol{v}]D\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho})[h] + D_{\boldsymbol{\rho}} G(\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \boldsymbol{\rho})[h] = 0. \quad (79)$$

From Eq. (65)

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^2 F_{id}(\boldsymbol{\rho})[h] = -D\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho})[h] = (PD_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^2 W(\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}))P)^{-1}h = P\Gamma^{(2)}Ph. \quad (80)$$

Lemma 1.5–SCFT ideal Functional through Legendre Dual

In the setting of Lemma 1.4, the Debye operator $\Gamma^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ from Lemma 1.2 is positive semidefinite on H and has at least one trivial null direction corresponding to the total–density mode:

$$v_{\text{tot}}(r) \propto (1, 1, \dots, 1), \quad \sum_{\alpha} v_{\text{tot}, \alpha}(r) = \text{const.}$$

The projector $P: H \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ removes this trivial null direction and restricts $\Gamma^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ to the composition subspace \mathcal{T} , where it is generically positive definite in stable phases. Let $\boldsymbol{\rho} \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\omega^*(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ be as in Lemma 1.3. Then, we can claim that if the stability criteria of Lemma 1.4 hold Eq. (71), for some $C \geq 0$, then the ideal hessian exists and coincides with the inverse on the composition subspace. In this regime, the Legendre map between ω and ρ is one–to–one on the subspace, and the quadratic ideal vertex of SCFT is strictly well defined.

At a spinodal point, the smallest eigenvalue of $P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*)P$ on \mathcal{T} vanishes. The stability inequality fails, the operator $P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*)P$ ceases to be invertible, and the map is no longer locally one-to-one on the subspace. Thus, the ideal Legendre duality between $W[\omega]$ and $F_{id}[\rho]$ is projector-aware, producing a genuine inverse quadratic kernel only on the incompressible composition subspace and only in regions of the phase diagram where $P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*)P$ is strictly positive definite. At spinodal, the Legendre map becomes non-invertible along at least one composition direction, signaling the onset of an instability in the SCFT description.

Proof.

Allow for $P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*)P$ to have a zero eigenvalue, then for any small parameter ε , the densities cannot both be realized by distinct fields using a regular implicit function theorem, because the linearization in Lemma 1.4 fails to be invertible. The inverse of $D\omega^*(\rho)[h]$ does not exist as a bounded operator.

Collecting Lemmas 1.1–1.5, we have now established a fully projector-aware Legendre duality between the single-chain generator $W[\omega] = \ln Q[\omega]$ and the ideal density functional $F_{id}[\rho]$ on the incompressible composition subspace. The ideal functional is the Fenchel–Legendre transform Eq. (46), with the SCFT saddle field $\omega^*(\rho)$ as the unique maximizer and $\nabla_\rho F_{id}(\rho) = -\omega^*(\rho)$. Differentiating this duality once more and using the implicit-function theorem shows that the hessian of $F_{id}[\rho]$ on the composition subspace \mathcal{T} is exactly the inverse of the projected Debye operator, $D_\rho^2 F_{id}(\rho) = (P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*)P)^{-1}$. Repeated differentiation, combined with the functional Faà–di–Bruno formula applied to ρ , then $\omega^*(\rho)$ and $W[\omega^*(\rho)]$, yields higher orders. At each higher order m , the Faà–di–Bruno expansion organizes naturally as a sum over a non-looping directed graph that distributes the m test directions among one factor of $(P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*)P)^{-1}$ and multiple connected single-chain cumulants $D^r W$.^{74,74}

By induction, each $D_\rho^m F_{id}(\rho)$ may also be referred to as a finite acyclic digraph sum, as lower-order derivatives $D^k \omega^*$ expand outward; inserting the factor $(P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*)P)^{-1}$ to solve the linearized implicit equation simply attaches an extra propagator to the next node.^{1,71,72,76} No loops are generated because we never differentiate the inverse kernel itself; it always appears only once at the end of each recursive step.^{72,73} At a spinodal, however, $P\Gamma^{(2)}(\omega^*)P$ develops a zero mode and is no longer invertible, so the Legendre map ceases to be locally one-to-one along the unstable direction. On the subspace orthogonal to this marginal mode the same construction still applies, but the conjugate field is not uniquely defined along the unstable eigenvector.

I.II. Conclusions

Classical density functional theory is built on a Legendre framework that exchanges the external potential for the one-body density as the basic variable and, since Evans’ work, provides the modern foundation for inhomogeneous fluids.^{1,76,78} For excluded-volume physics, Rosenfeld-type fundamental-measure theories yield accurate hard-sphere excess functionals with a weighted-density diagrammatic structure.^{26,52} On the field-theory side, fluctuations are standard as structure factors, and one-loop corrections for block copolymers have been developed since Fredrickson and Helfand, and reviewed extensively.^{14,79} Association and attraction contributions are commonly introduced through SAFT based excess free energies and

have been coupled to interfacial CDFT calculations, but the reversible bridge back to SCFT has remained implicit.⁴⁹

Within this context, the present framework makes the SCFT and CDFT connection explicit and reversible at the level of the single-chain generator. By treating $W[\boldsymbol{\omega}] = \ln Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]$ and $F_{\text{id}}[\rho]$ as an exact Legendre pair on the composition subspace, we prove that the ideal density-space vertices are finite Faà-di-Bruno sums of the connected single-molecule cumulants.^{72,73,77} All intramolecular connectivity entropy is thereby contained in the ideal dual, and all intermolecular physics is pushed into an excess functional $F_{\text{ex}}[\rho]$ in the usual CDFT sense. This leads to a direct, systematic import of standard CDFT physics into the SCFT loop. At the MF level, the first derivative $\delta F_{\text{ex}}/\delta \rho$ contributes additively to the SCFT potential, and the self-consistent field update becomes

$$\omega^{\text{new}}(\mathbf{r}) = - \left. \frac{\delta F_{\text{id}}}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})} \right|_{\rho} - \left. \frac{\delta F_{\text{ex}}}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})} \right|_{\rho}, \quad (81)$$

so FMT-style packing, iSAFT-TPT1 association, attraction, or electrostatic terms simply enter as additional mean fields while leaving the chain propagators and contour evolution unchanged. At the fluctuation level, the second derivative $D_{\rho}^2 F_{\text{ex}}$ adds directly to the ideal curvature, so the total two-point vertex in density space becomes

$$\Gamma_{\text{tot}}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = (P\Gamma_2(\boldsymbol{\omega}^*)P)^{-1} + D_{\rho}^2 F_{\text{ex}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \quad (82)$$

which reproduces the familiar RPA/CDFT linear response structure when projected onto the incompressible subspace and provides a systematic route to beyond-MF corrections. Higher excess derivatives $D_{\rho}^m F_{\text{ex}}$ for ($m \geq 3$) appear as additional vertices grafted onto the same directed graphs.

This yields a reversible bridge between SCFT and CDFT. On the SCFT side, existing codes can be extended by computing the ideal contribution using the chain generator and its Legendre dual, evaluating F_{ex} , its first derivative for the MF update, and its second derivative for the fluctuation kernel, and iterating the standard forward-backward propagator scheme with the modified field $\omega_{\text{id}} + \omega_{\text{ex}}$. On the CDFT side, established excess functionals like attraction and Wertheim TPT1 association, and long-range electrostatics can be dropped into SCFT as density-level additions that feed directly into the SCFT mean field and the RPA or one-loop kernel. Because the ideal Legendre duality fixes the kinematic backbone by enforcing the same underlying calculus it does not require rederiving SCFT machinery. We refer to this reversible SCFT-CDFT Legendre structure, and its associated bridge for excess physics and one-loop corrections, as the Estrada-Legendre duality (ELD) in what follows.

Application of Proof

Utilizing ELD theorem, we can extend it to higher order correlators using the ideal rules. Thus, we can split the free energy functionals now into their excess functionals and ideal contributions. We can now define U_{ex} as the contribution of hard-sphere Fundamental Measure Theory (HS-FMT), chain connectivity, attraction of both MF and weighted attraction approximation, association and electrostatics for this section.

II.I. Mean Field Approximation Attraction

Assume the same hypothesis as for the ELD theorem. Define a measurable region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with finite measure., assume incompressibility for a fixed total number density, constraining $\sum_a \rho_a(\mathbf{r}) = \rho_0(\mathbf{r})$, imposed by a Lagrange multiplier field $\xi(r)$.

In addition, $W[\omega]$ is the log partition single chain generating functional of noninteracting changes in a conjugate field, $\omega = \{\omega_a\} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Here we state W is proper, convex, and lower semicontinuous on L^∞ . Using ELD, we define Eq. (46) the Legendre–Fenchel transform. Moreover, we adopt the Eq. (58), for the rules within the composition subspace. Define a MF Attraction Kernel in Eq. (83). Assume K is a self-adjoint on $L^2(\Omega)^m$ and positive semidefinite on the composition subspace, ensuring convexity. Here the local Flory Huggins parameter, $K_{ab} = \chi_{ab} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$. This allows us to define a bilinear form, that generates the modified U_{ex} .

$$K_{ab}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = K_{ba}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \quad (83)$$

$$U_{ex} = U_{MF}[\rho] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b} \int \int \rho_a(\mathbf{r}) K_{ab}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho_b(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \quad (84)$$

Substituting U_{ex} into the system, define the mixed saddle functional in SCFT fields in Eq. (85).

$$\mathcal{F}_{SCFT}[\omega, \rho, \xi] = -W[\omega] + \langle \omega, \rho \rangle + U_{MF}[\rho] + \langle \mathbf{v} + \xi, \rho \rangle - \langle \xi, \rho_0 \rangle \quad (85)$$

We now define a set Euler–Lagrange equations around the variations of independent variables, ω, ρ, ξ , to enforce the self-consistency equations with Mean Field attractions in Eq.(86–88).

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \omega_a} = \frac{\delta W}{\delta \omega_a} + \rho_a = 0 \quad (86)$$

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \rho_a} = K \rho_a + \mathbf{v}_a + \omega_a + \xi = 0 \quad (87)$$

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \xi} = \sum_a \rho_a - \rho_0 = 0 \quad (88)$$

I. Collapsing to CDFT

Now we can collapse to CDFT through the ELD. For fixed ρ , the inner supremum over ω is the ideal functional, Eq. (46). Therefore, we can take the following Eq. (89).

$$\min_{\rho, \xi} \min_{\omega} \mathcal{F}_{SCFT}[\omega, \rho, \xi] = \min_{\rho, \xi} \{ F_{id}[\rho] + U_{MF}[\rho] + \langle \mathbf{v} + \xi, \rho \rangle - \langle \xi, \rho_0 \rangle \} \quad (89)$$

Now define the functional, in Eq. (90). Now minimizing $\mathcal{F}_{DFT}[\rho] + \langle \mathbf{v}, \rho \rangle$ subject to the self-consistency Euler Lagrange ξ .

$$\mathcal{F}_{DFT}[\rho] := F_{id}[\rho] + U_{MF}[\rho] \quad (90)$$

Since $\frac{\delta F_{id}}{\delta \rho} = \omega^*$, these are identical to the ξ, ρ functional derivatives. Therefore, the equivalence of stationary points ω^*, ρ^*, ξ^* is a saddle of the Helmholtz free energy iff ρ^*, ξ^* is a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}_{DFT}[\rho] + \langle v, \rho \rangle$ with incompressibility, resulting in the following Eq. (91).

$$\mathcal{F}_{SCFT}[\omega^*, \rho^*, \xi^*] = -W[\omega^*] + \langle \omega^*, \rho^* \rangle + U_{MF}[\rho^*] + \langle v, \rho^* \rangle \quad (91)$$

II. Curvature and Structure

By differentiating the CDFT Euler–Lagrange equation on the composition subspace, using the projector P , we turn Eq. (92–93).

$$(\nabla_\rho^2 F_{id})\delta\rho + K\delta\rho + \delta\xi = 0 \quad (92)$$

$$\Gamma_{MF}^{(2)} = PKP \quad (93)$$

III. Convexity and Uniqueness

At the spinodal, our $\Gamma^{(2)}$ loses invertibility, no longer generating a one-to-one relationship. In addition, F_{id} is convex in ρ , where K is positive semidefinite on the composition subspace, resulting in U_{MF} being also convex.

IV. Flory Huggins

Taking a local composition-only interaction, define the following equation, where $\chi_{ab} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

$$K_{ab}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \chi_{ab}\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \quad (94)$$

This results in Eq. (95).

$$U_{MF}[\rho] = \frac{1}{2} \int \sum_{a,b} \chi_{ab} \rho_a(\mathbf{r}) \rho_b(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (95)$$

The resulting functional derivative becomes Eq. (96).

$$\omega_a^*(\mathbf{r}) = -v_a(\mathbf{r}) - \xi(\mathbf{r}) - \sum_b \chi_{ab} \rho_b(\mathbf{r}) \quad (96)$$

This reveals that the chain propagation in the effective field can be obtained by shifting the ideal conjugate field by the Flory–Huggins local chemical potential. Reviewing the CDFT Euler–Lagrange stationarity, it generates the following Eq. (97).

$$\frac{\delta F_{id}}{\delta \rho_a(\mathbf{r})} + \sum_b \chi_{ab} \rho_b(\mathbf{r}) + v_a(\mathbf{r}) + \xi(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \quad (97)$$

Previous work has shown how attraction has already been mapped to SCFT Flory Huggins parameters.⁴⁹

V. Reverse Map

Starting from the CDFT functional, one can reintroduce the Legendre transform, minimizing density, yielding a field-only action in Eq. (98).

$$\mathcal{S}[\boldsymbol{\omega}, \xi] = -W[\boldsymbol{\omega}] + \langle \mathbf{v} + \xi + K\rho(\boldsymbol{\omega}), \rho(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \rho(\boldsymbol{\omega}), K\rho(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \rangle - \langle \xi, \rho_0 \rangle \quad (98)$$

The stationarity reproduces the same saddle.

II.II Hard Spheres

Using Lemma 1.1–5, define i as the chemical species, bounded by $[1, m]$, with densities $\rho_i(\mathbf{r})$. Follow FMT in Eq. (99–100), where $\alpha \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, \vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2\}$. Where $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is not a field but a FMT weight.

$$n_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \omega_\alpha^i(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \rho_i(\mathbf{r}) = \int \omega_\alpha^i(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \cdot \rho_i(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \quad (99)$$

$$F_{HS}[\boldsymbol{\rho}] = \int \Phi(n_\alpha(\mathbf{r})) d\mathbf{r} \quad (100)$$

For later use, define the local derivatives as follows, in Eq. (101–102).

$$\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) := \frac{\partial \Phi(\mathbf{r})}{\partial n_\alpha(\mathbf{r})} \quad (101)$$

$$H_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}) := \frac{\partial^2 \Phi(\mathbf{r})}{\partial n_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \partial n_\beta(\mathbf{r})} \quad (102)$$

To enforce incompressibility of melts, we impose a hard constraint. Variations are restricted to

$$\sum_\alpha \rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) = \rho_0, \quad (103)$$

from Eq. (58).¹ Lastly, let P be the L^2 orthogonal projector onto \mathcal{T} , as stated in ELD Theorem.

I. Collapsing CDFT

Starting with the functional derivative of the Hard-Sphere free energy to define the chemical potential.

$$\mu_a^{HS}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\delta F_{HS}}{\delta \rho_a} = \sum_{\alpha} \omega_{\alpha}^i(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial n_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r})} \quad (104)$$

Because the convolution weights, $\omega_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r})$, are species independent, they are equal diameters in SCFT, and n_{α} depend only on the total density, we can define our chemical potential for every a , as $\mu_{tot}^{HS}(\mathbf{r})$. This allows us to generate a shifted Euler–Lagrange equation, in the following .

$$\frac{\delta F_{id}}{\delta \rho_a} = \mu_a - V_{\alpha}^{ext} - \lambda(\mathbf{r}) + \mu_{tot}^{HS}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (105)$$

Therefore, on the composition subspace, the Hard–Sphere term induces no component selective field, and no field shift that can bias composition. In other words, we get the following Eq. (106).

$$P^{\dagger} \frac{\delta F_{HS}}{\delta \rho_a} = 0 \quad (106)$$

In Fundamental Measure Theory, the Hard–Sphere term depends only on ρ_{tot} . Thus, any change that keeps ρ_{tot} fixed, leaves F_{HS} stationary to first order and is eliminated by projection P .^{52,72,74}

II. Second Variation

For formality, we verify the work and continue differentiating the free energy once more. Following Jain’s structure, we get the following Eq. (107).²⁵

$$\frac{\delta F^{HS}}{\delta \rho_{\alpha} \delta \rho_{\beta}} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \int \int \sum_{\alpha} \omega_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \rho_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}) H_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}) \sum_{\beta} \omega_{\beta}(\mathbf{r}') \cdot \rho_{\beta}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \quad (107)$$

In operator form this becomes,

$$\nabla_{\rho}^2 F^{HS} = J K^{HS} J, \quad (108)$$

$$J_{\alpha} \delta \rho_{\alpha} = \sum_{\beta} \omega_{\alpha} \cdot \delta \rho_{\beta}. \quad (109)$$

However, because the weights do not depend on species, we can rewrite J , in terms of all sets of density. This allows us to turn J to allow for summing of all components.

$$J = \hat{J} \circ S \quad (110)$$

$$\nabla_{\rho}^2 F^{HS} = S \hat{J} K^{HS} \hat{J} S \quad (111)$$

This validates our conclusion, that the range of the operator cannot generate component directions. Consequently, any projection onto composition subspace is zero.

$$S\delta\rho = 0 \quad (112)$$

$$P^\top \nabla_\rho^2 F^{HS} P = 0 \quad (113)$$

Thus, the hard sphere makes a zero contribution to the curvature on \mathcal{T} .

III. SCFT to CDFT Linking

Taking ELD, we see how the map identifies connected cumulants $W^{(k)}$ with vertices, $\Gamma^{(k)}$. Taking the first and second order variation, reveals that no field shift for SCFT and there is no change to the SCFT propagation on \mathcal{T} , emphasizing that the ideal component replaces its effects.

$$P^\top \frac{\delta F^{HS}}{\delta \rho} = 0 \quad (114)$$

$$P^\top \nabla_\rho^2 F^{HS} P = 0 \quad (115)$$

II.III. Association Functional

Like Attraction, define $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\rho \in L^1 \cap L^\infty$, and incompressibility enforced by ξ , and external fields defined by $v_i(\mathbf{r})$. The hypothesis and assumptions from Lemma 1.1–5 are still assumed to be true. With ELD enforced within the composition space, with projector P . Let us assume that site fractions satisfy is above, $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$ in Eq. (116).

$$\varepsilon < X_a(\mathbf{r}) \leq 1 \quad (116)$$

In addition, let \mathbf{R} and $\mathbf{X} \in L^\infty \Omega^{N_{sites}}$, denote the product space for ρ and X . Lastly, we assume, following Jain's work, that $\Delta^{A_i B_j}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$ is measurable and has a finite upper bound within Ω .²⁵

$$\sup_{i,j,r} |\Delta^{A_i B_j}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)| \leq C_a < \infty \quad (117)$$

We now define the linear operator transforming \mathbf{X} to \mathbf{X} , called $M[\rho]$. The operator functions as shown in Eq. (118) for a binary system of linear chains, with the operator norm having the upper bound of $\rho_{max} C_a$, which can be no larger than $\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}$.

$$(M[\rho]\phi_A(\mathbf{r})) = \sum_B \int \rho_B(\mathbf{r}) \Delta^{A_i B_j}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \phi_B(\mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r} \quad (118)$$

With ELD enforced within the composition space, with projector P . Moreover, the mass-action Eq. (13) remains for inhomogeneous systems, where Δ carries a bonding volume and contact cavity information. We assume that W is C^2 on L^∞ , so Eq. (17–18) has a unique positive solution for $X(\rho)$ for a given ρ . In addition, we define the bond kernel as follows generally

$$\Delta^{A_i B_j}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \kappa f_{AB}^{ij}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) y^{ij}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2). \quad (119)$$

With the geometric factor κ representing bond volume, and the Mayer f function, and y^{ij} representing cavity correlation function with a hard sphere reference. This allows us to rewrite the mass-action as

$$X^{-1} = \mathbf{1} + M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X, \quad (120)$$

Where $\mathbf{1}$ is the unitary unit vector. Now minimize the through mass-action eliminating X . To impose this, as in incompressibility, we introduce the Lagrange multiplier $\Lambda_a(\mathbf{r})$ with the constraint shown in Eq. (121), treating X as an internal field for the Δ kernel.

$$\beta \mathcal{L}[\boldsymbol{\rho}, X, \Lambda] = \beta F_{assoc}[\boldsymbol{\rho}, X] + \langle \Lambda, X^{-1} - \mathbf{1} - M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X \rangle \quad (121)$$

I. Existence, Uniqueness, Regularity

Define the nonlinear fixed-point map for X_a

$$T_\rho X_a(r) := \frac{1}{1 + M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X_a(r)} \quad (122)$$

Lemma 3.1. Existence and Uniqueness of Mass-Action Solution

Let $\lambda = \rho C_a$, assuming $\lambda < 1$. Then, for every ρ , we can see the following. The map T_ρ sends the closed set into itself.

$$x_e := \left\{ X \in \mathbf{X} : 0 < \frac{1}{1 + \lambda} \leq X_a(r) \leq 1 \right\} \quad (123)$$

In addition, T_ρ is a contraction on x_e , hence has a unique fixed point, hence $X^*(\rho) \in x_e$ solving the mass-action equation.

Proof.

For any $X \in \mathbf{X}$ by distribution, the operator shows the following:

$$|M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X_a(r)| = \left| \sum_{\beta} \int \rho_{\beta}(r) \Delta_{\alpha\beta}(r, r) X_{\beta}(r) dr \right| \leq \lambda \|X\|_{\infty} \quad (124)$$

Satisfying our upper bound constraint. Now taking a closed subset, x_e , it shows $\|X\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, thus

$$1 - \lambda \leq 1 + M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X_a(r) \leq 1 + \lambda, \quad (125)$$

Because $\lambda < 0$ and is strictly positive, $T_\rho(X) \in x_e$. Now, we show that T_ρ is a contraction on x_e , define $X, Y \in x_e$.

$$T_\rho X_a(\mathbf{r}) - T_\rho Y_a(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]Y_a - M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X_a}{(1 + M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X_a)(1 + M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]Y_a)} \quad (126)$$

However, due to the upper bound constraint,

$$|T_\rho X_a(\mathbf{r}) - T_\rho Y_a(\mathbf{r})| \leq \frac{M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]Y_a - M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X_a}{(1 - \lambda)^2}. \quad (127)$$

Now applying the operator norm bound

$$|M[\boldsymbol{\rho}](Y_a - X_a)| \leq \lambda \|Y - X\|_\infty. \quad (128)$$

Results in the following

$$\|T_\rho X_a(\mathbf{r}) - T_\rho Y_a(\mathbf{r})\|_\infty \leq \frac{\lambda}{(1 - \lambda)^2} \|Y - X\|_\infty. \quad (129)$$

Now, applying Banach's fixed point theorem, there exists a unique subset $X^* \in x_e$, such that

$$X^* = T_\rho(X^*). \quad (130)$$

Note that the first multiplicative term in Eq. (129), must be < 1 , to be a contraction. Solving the inequality results in $\lambda < 1 - 2\lambda + \lambda^2$.

Lemma 3.2. Smoothness Dependent X^*

Define,

$$F(\boldsymbol{\rho}, X) := X^{-1} - \mathbf{1} - M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X \quad (131)$$

At the solution $X^*(\rho)$, the derivative with respect to X , is invertible with respect to λ . 72,74

$$D_X F(\boldsymbol{\rho}, X) = -\text{Diag}((X^*)^{-2}) - M[\boldsymbol{\rho}] \quad (132)$$

This results in a reduced association functional that is well-defined and differentiable on the physical set of densities.

$$\hat{F}_{assoc}[\boldsymbol{\rho}] := F_{assoc}[\boldsymbol{\rho}, X^*(\boldsymbol{\rho})] \quad (133)$$

II. First Variation

At fixed ρ , the saddle points of \mathcal{L} with respect to X and Λ , allows for functional derivatives of the following equations in Eq. (134–135). This is exactly the mass-action term from SAFT.

$$\frac{\delta(\beta F_{assoc})}{\delta X_a(\mathbf{r})} + \frac{\delta}{X_a(\mathbf{r})} (\langle \Lambda, X^{-1} - \mathbf{1} - M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X \rangle) = 0 \quad (134)$$

$$X_a(\mathbf{r})^{-1} - \mathbf{1} - M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]X_a(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \quad (135)$$

Computing the derivatives gives

$$\rho_a(\mathbf{r}) \left(\frac{1}{X_a(\mathbf{r})} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \Lambda_a(\mathbf{r}) X_a^{-2}(\mathbf{r}) - M^\dagger[\Lambda_a(\mathbf{r})] = 0 \quad (136)$$

Where $M^\dagger[\Lambda_i(\mathbf{r})]$ is an adjoint operator defining Λ in terms of ρ and X .

$$M^\dagger[\Lambda_i(\mathbf{r})] := \sum_a \int \Lambda_a(\mathbf{r}) \Delta^{i,j}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \quad (137)$$

Solving for Λ , from Eq. (136–137) develops Eq.(138) the association Green operator in the outer multiplication term and the inner multiplication term being the point–wise product of density and association.

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{I + X^2 M^\dagger} \left(\rho \circ \left(X - \frac{1}{2} X^2 \right) \right) \quad (138)$$

Now applying the reduced free energy, apply envelope theorem on F_{assoc} at the saddle, a direct calculation, derivative in respect to ρ_γ , yields Eq. (139).^{72–74}

$$\beta \mu_\gamma^{assoc}(\mathbf{r}) = \ln(X_\gamma(\mathbf{r})) - \frac{1}{2} X_\gamma(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{2} - X_\gamma(\mathbf{r}) M^\dagger[\Lambda_\gamma(\mathbf{r})] \quad (139)$$

Λ_a in our formulation of TIP1 is a multiplier field, conjugate to the bond balance constraint X_a . By definition of X_a being unique due to the monotonicity of pair binding from TIP1 constraints, it becomes a unique measure of free energy penalty for violating the mass–action. As shown in Eqs. (140–141), the stationarity for association becomes dependent on both terms.

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta X_\gamma(\mathbf{r})} = 0 \quad (140)$$

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta \Lambda_\gamma(\mathbf{r})} = 0 = X_\gamma(\mathbf{r}) + X_\gamma(\mathbf{r}) \left[\sum_\delta \int \rho_\gamma(\mathbf{r}') \Delta_{\gamma\delta}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') X_\delta(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \right] - 1 \quad (141)$$

Thus for a fixed ρ , a unique saddle–point requires both Λ^* and X^* to be found, as setting the mass–action constraint to zero, the matrix of mass–action residuals generates the same equations as Jain’s work.^{24,25} Consequently, mapping X to mass–action, defined as our Lagrange multiplier functional derivative and taking its derivative with respect to X_β , for a multi-site system generates a matrix where the $\beta\gamma$ association, seen in Eq. (142), is strictly positive. Moreover, this means positivity for all elements of the full Jacobian, making it invertible for all densities below the association spinodal.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial X_\beta} \left(\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta \Lambda_\gamma(\mathbf{r})} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial X_\beta} \left(\delta_{\gamma\beta} \left(1 + \sum_\beta \rho_\beta \Delta_{\gamma\beta} X_\beta \right) \right) + X_\gamma \rho_\beta \Delta_{\gamma\beta} X_\beta \quad (142)$$

III. Second Variation

With the first functional derivative given, define the group, $\Theta(X, \Lambda)$, and rearrange the Free Helmholtz Energy as Eq. (143–144).

$$F_{assoc}[\boldsymbol{\rho}] = \beta \mathcal{L}[\boldsymbol{\rho}, \theta] \quad (143)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta[\boldsymbol{\rho}, \theta^*] = 0 \quad (144)$$

Taking the derivative of F_{assoc} with respect to ρ now.

$$\Gamma_{assoc}^{(2)} := \frac{\delta^2(F_{assoc})}{\delta \rho \delta \rho} = -L_{\rho\theta} H^{-1} L_{\theta\rho} \quad (145)$$

$$L_{\theta\rho} = \mathcal{L}_{\theta\rho} \quad (146)$$

$$H = \mathcal{L}_{\theta\theta} \quad (147)$$

Proof.

Using the chain rule and Schur–complement structure take the first derivative of the Helmholtz Free Energy.^{74,80}

$$\frac{\delta F_{assoc}}{\delta \rho} = \mathcal{L}_\rho + \mathcal{L}_\theta \theta_\rho \quad (148)$$

At the saddle point, the second term \mathcal{L}_θ reduces to 0. Differentiating the stationarity condition.

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_\theta}{\delta \rho} = \mathcal{L}_{\theta\rho} \delta \rho + \mathcal{L}_{\theta\theta} \theta_\rho \delta \rho \quad (149)$$

Where $\mathcal{L}_{\theta\rho}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\theta\theta}$ are Fréchet derivatives and $\delta \rho$ are the variation in ρ . Again, assume H is invertible from the regularity of X^* and that \mathcal{L} is linear.

$$\Gamma_{assoc}^{(2)} = \mathcal{L}_{\rho\rho} - \mathcal{L}_{\rho\theta} H^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\theta\rho} = -\mathcal{L}_{\rho\theta} H^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\theta\rho} \quad (150)$$

The $\mathcal{L}_{\theta\rho}$ explicit solution is as follows in Eq. (151–154).

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(\rho(\mathbf{r}), X(\mathbf{r}), \Lambda(\mathbf{r}))_a = X_a^{-1}(\mathbf{r}) - \mathbf{1} - M[\boldsymbol{\rho}] X_a(\mathbf{r}) \quad (151)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_X(\rho(\mathbf{r}), X(\mathbf{r}), \Lambda(\mathbf{r}))_a = \rho_a(\mathbf{r}) \left(\frac{1}{X_a(\mathbf{r})} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \Lambda_a(\mathbf{r}) X_a^{-2}(\mathbf{r}) - M^\dagger[\Lambda_a(\mathbf{r})] \quad (152)$$

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_\Lambda(\rho(\mathbf{r}), X(\mathbf{r}), \Lambda(\mathbf{r}))_a}{\delta \rho_\gamma(\mathbf{r}')} = -\Delta^{a\gamma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') X_\gamma(\mathbf{r}) \quad (153)$$

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_X(\rho(\mathbf{r}), X(\mathbf{r}), \Lambda(\mathbf{r}))_a}{\delta \rho_\gamma(\mathbf{r}')} = \delta^{a\gamma} \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \left(\frac{1}{X_a(\mathbf{r})} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (154)$$

For $\mathcal{L}_{X\Lambda}$, differentiating similarly,

$$\mathcal{L}_{X\Lambda}^{a\gamma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = -X_a^{-2}(\mathbf{r})\delta^{a\gamma}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') - M[\boldsymbol{\rho}]_{a\gamma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'), \quad (155)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda X}^{a\gamma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = -X_a^{-2}(\mathbf{r})\delta^{a\gamma}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') - \Delta^{a\gamma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'), \quad (156)$$

Now for \mathcal{L}_{XX} derivation.

$$\mathcal{L}_{XX}^{a\gamma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = [-\rho_a(\mathbf{r})X_a^{-2}(\mathbf{r}) + 2\Lambda(\mathbf{r})X_a^{-3}(\mathbf{r})]\delta^{a\gamma}\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \quad (157)$$

This culminates in the following index form

$$\Gamma_{assoc;\gamma,\delta}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = - \sum_{a,b \in \{X,\Lambda\}} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \int \int \mathcal{L}_{\rho\theta_a}^{a\gamma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}_1) [H^{-1}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)]_{\alpha\alpha;b\beta} \mathcal{L}_{\theta_b\rho}^{\beta\delta}(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \quad (158)$$

IV. Convexity and Uniqueness

Because at any physical state X is bounded through $\|A^{assoc}\|$, the Fréchet derivative of \mathbf{R} with respect to X is strictly negative for moderate association strengths, this means under the implicit function theorem, it yields a unique and smooth X^* . In regard to $\Gamma_{assoc}^{(2)}$, when projected onto our known composition subspace with P , like attraction, it is only an additive field shift, it minimizes F_{assoc} with respect to ρ , and we achieve convexity in the overall solution.

II.IV. Chain Functional

Start by modifying our Euler–Lagrange system, from Shekhar Jain’s work on linear branched systems, where A denotes a dummy variable for all bond sites on chemical species α .

$$\ln(\rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})) + \sum_{A \in \Gamma(\beta)} \ln(X_{\alpha,A}(\mathbf{r})) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) + \beta(\mu_\alpha - V_\alpha^{ext}(\mathbf{r})) \quad (159)$$

Here note that $D_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$ is the cumulative effect of non–chain excess derivatives. Moreover, define the recursive equations for chain connectivity of the linear backbone $I_{1,i}$, from the start of chain, and $I_{2,i}$, which moves from the tail end of chain to the start of the chain in Eq. (27-28).

$$D_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{\gamma'}^{\{\gamma'\}} \int \rho_\gamma^{seg}(\mathbf{r}_1) \frac{\delta \ln(y_{contact}^{\gamma\gamma'})}{\delta \rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})} d\mathbf{r}_1 - \frac{\delta \beta A^{EX,HS}}{\delta \rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})} - \frac{\delta \beta A^{EX,Disp}}{\delta \rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})} - \frac{\delta \beta A^{EX,MF}}{\delta \rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})} \quad (160)$$

In addition, from the Legendre Transform from ELD Theorem in Eq. 58, note how Γ_0 represents the single chain covariances, otherwise a Debeye operator in the continuum Edwards limit. For branched chains, we define the branch b_k, b_j for segments respectively and iteratively solve, as done by Jain and Chapman.

I. Collapse of CDFT First Variation

Let us define the mean chemical potential of the bulk chain fluid μ_M . Define a segment density vector $\rho = \{\rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})\}$ for a single chain tangent of m tangent segments. For linear chain, Shekhar builds two recursive integrals, with $\Delta^{i,i+1}$ being the bond kernel for tangent segments i and $i + 1$. In the case of a linear chain, the first variation becomes

$$\frac{\delta F_{chain}}{\delta \rho} = \sum_{A \in \Gamma^{(\beta)}} \ln(X_{\alpha,A}(\mathbf{r})) = D_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) + \beta(\mu_\alpha - V_\alpha^{ext}(\mathbf{r})) - \ln(\rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})), \quad (161)$$

Where $\frac{\delta F_{chain}}{\delta \rho}$ incorporates the ideal and chain contributions to our Euler–Lagrange equation.

Eliminating X by recursion, we can get the iSAFT–CDFT density equation as follows,

$$\rho_1(\mathbf{r}_1)X_1(\mathbf{r}_1) = \exp(D_1(\mathbf{r}_1) - \beta V_1^{ext}(\mathbf{r}_1)) \exp(\beta \mu_1) \quad (162)$$

Thus, the Euler–Lagrange equation is satisfied if and only if the pair of recursions holds and ρ_α is given by $\exp(\beta \mu_M) \exp(D_\alpha - \beta V_\alpha) I_{1,\alpha} I_{2,\alpha}$. In short, this means that the stationary point in ρ is equivalent to the self-consistent solution of the two recursion equations, and vice versa. We make our Legendre identification with the following

$$\omega_a := -(D_a(\mathbf{r}) - \beta V_a^{ext}(\mathbf{r})) \quad (163)$$

Now, redefine our density equation by the following, as iSAFT CDFT becomes precisely the SCFT density built from the propagators.

$$\rho_a(\mathbf{r}) = \exp(-\omega_a(\mathbf{r})) I_{1,\alpha} I_{2,\alpha} \exp(\beta \mu_M) \quad (164)$$

This reveals that the Euler–Lagrange condition, μ^* , is synonymous with the following

$$\mu^* \equiv \ln(\rho_\alpha(\mathbf{r})) + \sum_{A \in \Gamma^{(\beta)}} \ln(X_{\alpha,A}(\mathbf{r})) \quad (165)$$

II. Collapse of CDFT: Second Variation

Now differentiate $\rho_a(\mathbf{r})$ with respect to the fields, $\omega_b = D_b$.

$$W_{ab}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') := \left. \frac{\delta \rho_a(\mathbf{r})}{\delta \omega_b(\mathbf{r})} \right|_{\omega^*} \quad (166)$$

First, vary the transfer operators in the composition subspace.

$$\mathcal{T}_{i-1 \rightarrow i}(\mathbf{r})f(\mathbf{r}) = \int \exp(-\omega_{i-1}(\mathbf{r}'))\Delta^{i-1,i}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r})f(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \quad (167)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{i \rightarrow i+1}^\dagger(\mathbf{r})f(\mathbf{r}) = \int \exp(-\omega_{i+1}(\mathbf{r}'))\Delta^{i,i+1}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r})f(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \quad (168)$$

Vary ω by inserting the equation, $\omega = \omega + \delta\omega$. This allows for perturbations of the recursive propagators.

$$\delta I_{1,i} = \mathcal{T}_{i-1 \rightarrow i}(\mathbf{r})\delta I_{1,i-1}(\mathbf{r}) - \int I_{1,i-1}(\mathbf{r}') \exp(-\omega_{i-1}(\mathbf{r}'))\Delta^{i-1,i}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \delta\omega_{i-1}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \quad (169)$$

$$\delta I_{2,i} = \mathcal{T}_{i \rightarrow i+1}^\dagger(\mathbf{r})\delta I_{2,i+1}(\mathbf{r}) - \int I_{2,i+1}(\mathbf{r}') \exp(-\omega_{i+1}(\mathbf{r}'))\Delta^{i,i+1}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \delta\omega_{i+1}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \quad (170)$$

Lastly, variation of the density leads to the application of the recursive propagators.

$$\delta\rho_a = \exp(\beta\mu_M) \frac{\exp(-\mu_a)[I_{1,a}I_{2,a}(\delta I_{1,a})(\delta I_{2,a})]}{Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]} \quad (171)$$

Now differentiate ρ with respect to ω , starting first with $I_{1,i}$ and $I_{2,i}$. This unfolds $I_{1,i}$ as the product integral over the path from 1 to i .

$$I_{1,i}(\mathbf{r}_i) = \int \prod_{k=1}^{i-1} [d\mathbf{r}_k \exp(-\omega_k(\mathbf{r}_k))\Delta^{(k,k+1)}(\mathbf{r}_k, \mathbf{r}_{k+1})] \quad (172)$$

$$\frac{\delta I_{1,i}}{\delta\omega_b} = -I_{1,b}(\mathbf{r}')G_{b \rightarrow i}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}_i) \quad (173)$$

$$G_{b \rightarrow i}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}_i) = \int \prod_{k=b}^{i-1} [d\mathbf{r}_{k+1} \exp(-\omega_{k+1}(\mathbf{r}_{k+1}))\Delta^{(k,k+1)}(\mathbf{r}_k, \mathbf{r}_{k+1})] \quad (174)$$

$$\frac{\delta I_{1,i}}{\delta\omega_b} = 0 \text{ iff } b \geq i \quad (175)$$

Where G is the partial forward propagator of the Edwards diffusion operator at fixed field ω . We can now unfold $I_{2,i}$, and differentiate with respect to the field.

$$\frac{\delta I_{2,i}}{\delta \omega_b} = -I_{2,b}(\mathbf{r}') G_{b \rightarrow i}^{(-)}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}') \quad (176)$$

$$G_{b \rightarrow i}^{(-)}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}') = \int \prod_{k=i}^{b-1} [d\mathbf{r}_{k+1} \exp(-\omega_{k+1}(\mathbf{r}_{k+1})) \Delta^{(k,k+1)}(\mathbf{r}_k, \mathbf{r}_{k+1})] \quad (177)$$

$$\frac{\delta I_{2,i}}{\delta \omega_b} = 0 \text{ iff } b \leq i \quad (178)$$

Now we can assemble the and differentiate ρ at the varying conditions of the field, when b is less than, greater than, or equal to, i .

$$\left. \frac{\delta \rho_a(\mathbf{r})}{\delta \omega_b(\mathbf{r})} \right|_{b < i} = -\frac{\exp(\mu_M)}{Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]} \exp(-\omega_i(\mathbf{r})) I_{2,i}(\mathbf{r}) I_{1,b}(\mathbf{r}') G_{b \rightarrow i}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}_i) \quad (179)$$

$$\left. \frac{\delta \rho_a(\mathbf{r})}{\delta \omega_b(\mathbf{r})} \right|_{b > i} = -\frac{\exp(\mu_M)}{Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]} \exp(-\omega_i(\mathbf{r})) I_{2,i}(\mathbf{r}) I_{1,b}(\mathbf{r}') G_{b \rightarrow i}^{(-)}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}_i) \quad (180)$$

$$\left. \frac{\delta \rho_a(\mathbf{r})}{\delta \omega_b(\mathbf{r})} \right|_{b=i} = -\rho_i(\mathbf{r}) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \quad (181)$$

Consequently, this means our curvature and hessian for $W_{ib}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is weighted function, where $\Theta(0) = 0$.

$$W_{ib}^{(2)} = -\rho_i(\mathbf{r}) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \pm \frac{\exp(\beta \mu_M)}{Q[\boldsymbol{\omega}]} * \left[\exp(-\omega_i(\mathbf{r})) I_{2,i}(\mathbf{r}) I_{1,b}(\mathbf{r}') G_{b \rightarrow i}^{(-)}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}_i) \Theta(i - b) + \exp(-\omega_i(\mathbf{r})) I_{2,i}(\mathbf{r}) I_{1,b}(\mathbf{r}') G_{b \rightarrow i}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}_i) \Theta(b - i) \right] \quad (182)$$

Under the extreme case of a continuous limit, we get the following expression, where G_f is now the Green function propagator of the Edwards diffusion, referred to Eq. (30–31), operator at fixed field ω in Eq. (183)

$$\left[\partial_s - \frac{b^2}{6} \nabla^2 + \omega(\mathbf{r}, s) \right] G_f(\mathbf{r}, s | \mathbf{r}', s) = \delta(s - s') \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \quad (183)$$

$$W^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, s; \mathbf{r}', s') = -\rho_i(\mathbf{r}, s) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \delta(s - s') - \exp(\beta \mu_M) \exp(-\omega(\mathbf{r}, s)) \left[q^\dagger(\mathbf{r}, N - s) G_f(\mathbf{r}, s | \mathbf{r}', s') q(\mathbf{r}', s') \Theta(s - s') + q(\mathbf{r}, s) G_f(\mathbf{r}', s' | \mathbf{r}, s) q(\mathbf{r}', N - s') \Theta(s' - s) \right] \quad (184)$$

The relation to the ELD is that it gives us $-\Gamma_0$ explicitly and inverting it gives the ideal chain curvature. It's important to note that $W^{(2)}$ gives us $\frac{\delta \rho}{\delta \omega}$, dependent on a local contact term, and two path integrals that propagate the field perturbation along the chain.

III. From SCFT to CDFT

With $F_{chain}[\rho]$ from the Legendre Transform, we can combine the non-deal pieces into ω and identify the SCFT mean field in the Euler–Lagrange condition as

$$\omega^*(r, s) = \frac{\delta F_{id}}{\delta \rho} + \frac{\delta F_{hs}}{\delta \rho} + \frac{\delta F_{disp}}{\delta \rho} + \frac{\delta F_{assoc}}{\delta \rho} = \xi(r) + \mu^{hs} + \mu^{disp} \dots \quad (185)$$

Which matches exactly what iSAFT CDFT D term, written in Legendre variables, reinforcing how the chain recursion of I_1 and I_2 are the SCFT propagators. As a result, we can describe density as follows in SCFT in Eq. (186).

$$\rho(r, s) = \exp(\beta \mu_M) \exp(-\omega(r, s)) q(r, s) q^\dagger(r, N - s) \quad (186)$$

Therefore, the combined ideal and chain chemical potential in terms of SCFT for CDFT is as follows, where ω^* is the saddle field.

$$\frac{\delta(F_{id} + F_{chain})}{\delta \rho_a} = -\ln \left(\frac{\rho_a}{\exp(\beta \mu_M)} \frac{Q[\omega]}{q(r; [\omega^*]) q^\dagger(r, [\omega^*])} \right) \quad (187)$$

To solve for self-consistency, one would initialize and guess $\omega^{(0)}$, propagate q and q^\dagger , update the field shift in $\mu^{(k=1)}$ with the field shift term, and repeat until $\mu = \mu^*$

IV. Convexity and Uniqueness

In SCFT, the single-chain generator $W[\omega] = \ln Q[\omega]$ is concave in the field ω because the second variation is the negative single-chain covariance $W^{(2)} = -\Gamma_0 \leq 0$. ELD bridge flips this to the density side, $F_{id+chain}[\rho]$ is equal to Eq. (46). After projecting out the trivial total density mode, Γ_0 is strictly positive, so Γ exists, and $F_{id+chain}$ is strictly convex on the composition subspace, so there is exactly one conjugate field that equals $F_{id+chain}$. Equivalently, the mapping in Eq. (40) is one-to-one. In short, the chain term is not a tunable MF; it is uniquely determined by polymer connectivity, and its curvature guarantees a unique SCFT–CDFT solution on the physical subspace.

V. Propagators and Recursive Integrals

Given $\omega^* = [v(\mathbf{r}) + \xi(\mathbf{r}) + \mu^{assoc}(\mathbf{r}) \dots] = [D + \beta V]$, define ω using the local Boltzmann factor below in Eq. (188).

$$\omega_i(\mathbf{r}) := e^{-\Delta s \omega_i^*(\mathbf{r})} \quad (188)$$

Moreover, we define $Z_{(j-1) \rightarrow j}$ as the one step chain transfer kernel, whether Gaussian or Edwards for ideal diffusion or tangential contact in iSAFT connectivity in Eq. (189).

$$(\mathcal{T}_j f)(\mathbf{r}) = \int Z_{(j-1) \rightarrow j}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \omega_{j-1}(\mathbf{r}') f(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}' \quad (189)$$

The SAFT recursive integrals become the following equations,

$$I_{1,1} = I_{2,m} = 1 \quad (190)$$

$$I_{1,j} = \mathcal{T}_j I_{1,j-1} \quad (191)$$

$$I_{2,a} = \mathcal{T}_{a+1}^* I_{2,a+1} \quad (192)$$

In addition, the SCFT propagators in the same ω^* field obey the following forward and adjoint recursions.

$$q(\cdot, s_j) = \mathcal{T}_j q(\cdot, s_{j-1}) \quad (193)$$

$$q^\dagger(\cdot, s_a) = \mathcal{T}_j^* q^\dagger(\cdot, N - s_{a-1}) \quad (194)$$

Thus, we claim that $I_{1,j} = q(\cdot, s_j)$ and $I_{2,j} = q^\dagger(\cdot, N - s_j)$, even when association is present, because association enters through local Boltzmann factor. Moreover, in the continuum Edwards limit the operator \mathcal{T} becomes $e^{-\Delta s(\frac{b^2}{6}\nabla^2 - \omega)}$, generating the standard diffusion equations.

VI. Effective Action

From the previous sections, effective actions are now determined from the iSAFT Helmholtz free energy functionals, defined through the Legendre Transforms of the single-chain generator and excess DFT using the ELD theorem. At the SCFT saddle-point, the MF theory is recovered by taking the partial derivative of Γ_{tot} with respect to ρ , where fluctuations around this saddle are controlled by the Hessian

$$\Gamma_{ij}^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \frac{\delta \Gamma_{ij}^{(2)}}{\delta \rho_i(\mathbf{r}) \delta \rho_j(\mathbf{r}')}, \quad \omega_i(\mathbf{r}) = \xi(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{\delta F_{ex}^{CDFT}}{\delta \rho_i(\mathbf{r})}. \quad (195)$$

On the incompressible composition subspace, this work operates using a projection kernel P , as seen in Eq. (80,93,115). The chain and ideal terms of ELD are fixed, leaving the summation of excess contributions, where each element in the summation comes from a specific DFT module, such as attraction, association, or HS.

In the Gaussian one loop approximation, these fluctuation corrections to the MF generate the following, mirroring the ELD ideal term in Eq. (196), where I is the identity matrix. Using the ideal kernel from ELD as a reference, the MF energy may be given by the standard determinant of the curvature operator. This reveals the new Hamiltonian for the SCFT solver, \mathcal{H} , to be Eq. (197), where $\frac{\delta W[\omega_i]}{\delta \omega_i(\mathbf{r})}$ is the equilibrium density at position \mathbf{r} , as a functional of the external ω .

$$\Delta\Gamma_{1L} = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(I + [\Gamma_{id}^{(2)}]^{-1} \left(\frac{\delta F_{assoc}}{\delta \rho \delta \rho} + \frac{\delta F_{HS}}{\delta \rho \delta \rho} + \frac{\delta F_{MF}}{\delta \rho \delta \rho} \right) \right) \quad (196)$$

$$\beta\mathcal{H} = -W[\boldsymbol{\omega}] + \beta F_{ex}^{DFT}[\rho(\mathbf{r})] - \int \xi(\mathbf{r}) \left(\sum_i \frac{\delta W[\boldsymbol{\omega}_i]}{\delta \omega_i(\mathbf{r})} - \rho_0 \right) d\mathbf{r} \quad (197)$$

Because SCFT provides the ideal kernel, each non-deal CDFT block may be inserted directly into Fourier Space, so the trace reduces to the sum over wavevectors and species indices, all of which have been described in Fourier space prior, leaving only regularization to be required near spinodals.^{14,31}

Discussion and Implications

This work establishes a Legendre duality between the SCFT single-chain generator $W[\boldsymbol{\omega}]$ and the DFT ideal functional $F_{id}[\boldsymbol{\rho}]$ on the incompressible composition subspace. Two structural consequences are central. First, the stationarity map between fields and densities is two-way and explicit. The saddle one has the following shown from ELD,

$$\boldsymbol{\rho} = \frac{\delta W}{\delta \boldsymbol{\omega}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}^*), \quad \frac{\delta F_{id}}{\delta \boldsymbol{\rho}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \boldsymbol{\omega}^*,$$

so, the forward and inverse ideal maps are uniquely identified once the chain model and projector are fixed. Second, the projector-aware curvature identity as seen in Eq. (52) with P the incompressible projector and Γ_0 the ideal single-chain connected correlator, pins the RPA independently of which excess free-energy model is used.

On top of this backbone, three major non-ideal physics blocks are consistently carried over from SCFT to DFT. For attraction, MFs are supplemented to Euler-Lagrange fields, which are shifted by the first functional derivative of the functional, while RPA corrections are developed with their second derivative. For association TPT1, the mass-action equations can be solved as linear operators but require a Lagrangian Λ , so it contributes a local chemical potential at the saddle-point, and a nonlocal hessian can be found using the Schur complement of the mass-action variables. For chain connectivity, inhomogeneous propagators are consistent with iSAFT chain physics at both the Euler-Lagrange and quadratic levels. However, hard spheres, which are not reversibly in ELD due to the reference state SCFT have no contribution. Finally, Jain's recursive integrals for inhomogeneous DFT coincide with SCFT propagators at the saddle.

The framework highlights the similarities between polymer SCFT and classical DFT. The ideal part reveals that, once the chain model and projector are specified, non-ideal terms become a first-order field shift and a second-order curvature kernel. This avoids utilizing short range χ parameters utilized in Flory-Huggins theory and avoids treating propagators and density kernels as unrelated constructs. Once the effective action is written as

$$\Gamma[\boldsymbol{\rho}] = \Gamma_{id}[\boldsymbol{\rho}] + F_{ex}[\boldsymbol{\rho}],$$

structure factors follow from the same curvature derivation, regardless of whether F_{ex} is taken as local Flory–Huggins, nonlocal MF, association, or chain connectivity. Because CDFT recursion and propagators are equivalent at the saddle, this explains why architectures beyond linear chains, such as stars, combs, and networks, inherit the same factorization structure and the same duality statements under the same Gaussian–chain and incompressibility assumptions.

At spinodals, the curvature operator $\Gamma^{(2)}$ on the incompressible composition subspace loses positivity. Consequently, the hessian identity must be interpreted using alternative iterative schemes for regularization. Moreover, another limitation is that we assume that $W[\omega]$ and the excess functionals commute with contour integrals and convolutions as is in CDFT. As a result, contact–value chain closures and specific FMT variants remain controlled but approximate as the duality organizes and transports them but is exact only at the limit.¹

Within these constraints, the polymer SCFT provides the exact ideal inverse kernel and the higher–order $\Gamma^{(n)}$ from digraph expansions, so weak expansions can be aligned to account for more fluid physics, such as attraction, association, and chain connectivity. For iSAFT–CDFT, the bridge provides a generalized route to structure factors and interfacial stability directly from CDFT functionals, while still reusing SCFT propagators and numerical preconditioners. By fixing the ideal pieces in both theories and expanding the Hessians contributions through EL, reveals how equation of states can be embedded. Moreover, it suggests that the CDFT embedded structure factors may generate similar and different order–disorder blends and diblocks with attraction and association now applied. Computationally, this requires future work on how curvature eigenvalues and eigenvectors select morphologies develop, may be utilized to verify how branched or network architecture matches recursion–propagator identification similarly found in current works, and how spinodal regions have changed with association now being inserted.⁵¹

In the present work, we emphasize how the Flory–Huggins χ –term is an optional local choice of excess free energy. Conventional incompressible SCFT with a χ –parameter may be utilized by modifying Eq. (93) to a zero–range quadratic penalty. Furthermore, the present ELD construction allows the excess functional to be taken from a full classical DFT, so that self–consistent fields follow from the functional derivative and the curvature kernel from Eq. (195). This not only removes χ but also provides the natural input for Gaussian fluctuation corrections from CDFT, without modifying SCFT. Future work is required to study how modern SCFT and the hybrid SCFT–CDFT theorized here differ in their effective χ parametrizations, as the model proposed may provide greater clarity on the dominant equilibrium contributions. Moreover, this is suggested for future studies because we introduced an explicit TPT1 association functional into SCFT, the theory naturally becomes a multi–component, explicit–solvent system rather than a χ –blend with an implicit background. In our formulation, the density vector $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ contains all species and all associating site types as a linear operator and the association free energy $F_{\text{assoc}}[\rho]$ is written site and species dependent form in SAFT. The mass–action constraints therefore explicitly couple polymer sites to solvent sites, and the resulting Euler–Lagrange equations yield species–resolved chemical potentials and Hessians that treat both solvent and polymer equally. From this, hydrogen–bonding patterns between polymer and solvent can be represented directly at the level of the functional, rather than being embedded within an effective χ . In addition, the same curvature operator that feeds RPA and one–loop corrections now carry explicit solvent–polymer and solvent–solvent association channels.³ In this sense, the present ELD does not refine the interaction model for a polymer melt, but rather, an explicit–solvent,

site-resolved description in which association, packing, and connectivity all enter through density functionals.

Future research into SCFT using ELD, such as applying the Legendre map for higher order additive excess functionals, explicit correctional fluctuations, or extending electrostatics and magnetostatics, should be investigated and measured computationally to evaluate the hybrid system.²⁰ From this, the present work suggests the interoperability between SCFT and DFT descriptions allowing for more algorithmically efficient physics to study structure, stability, and interfacial properties in real-fluid chemistries using the Functional-Field Theory. While theoretical, no benefits can be claimed without conclusive computational results, leaving the new hybrid's benefits speculative.

Conclusions

This work develops a projector-aware Legendre duality, referred to as ELD, between the SCFT single-chain generator $W[\omega]$ and the iSAFT CDFT ideal free-energy functional $F_{id}[\rho]$ on a composition subspace. In CDFT, MF attraction, association using TPT1 with inhomogeneous mass action, and chain connectivity, can now be reversibly inserted or extrapolated from SCFT and DFT, matching the Hubbard-Stratonovich approximation for MF, show how the hard-sphere contribution disappears in SCFT, and extend modern SCFT with association field shifts. By embedding the SAFT T1P1 association at the functional level, the present framework is no longer dependent on effective χ -Flory-Huggins blends, allowing for explicit solvent and multicomponent theory that has been well studied in CDFT. The hybrid generalized functional field developed between SCFT and DFT, a Functional-Field Theory, takes the Euler-Lagrange equations and matches term-by-term given that the ideal gradient is the conjugate field, and every excess contribution appears as an Euler-Lagrange-level field shift. This allows for Chapman and Jain's recursions in CDFT to be equivalent to the propagators in SCFT at the saddle, which are exact for Gaussian steps and combine polymer and fluid recursions into the same propagators. The duality also identifies a method for expanding of the curvature kernel and provides the explicit CDFT $\Gamma^{(2)}$ as natural inputs for fluctuation theories. However, the ELD is still an MF saddle-point approximation and requires the invertibility of the Legendre and the Fréchet smoothness of all components' Hessians. As a result, the Estrada Legendre duality generates an ideal structure, standardizes how non-ideal physics of CDFT can be added to SCFT, and reveals how CDFT Euler Lagrange may allow for explicit solvent interactions to be accounted.

Appendix

A. Hubbard–Stratonovich

The Hubbard–Stratonovich Transform (HST) begins with the u_b , tangent hard and soft spheres, and non-bonded spheres, $u_{nb}(|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|)$, dependent on the distance between a particle and its spectator being evaluated. When coupled these are the total interactions being evaluated in our transformation of SCFT.

Let \bar{U} be a real symmetric, positive-definite kernel action on scalar density. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a column vector, $x^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$, the transpose of x , $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, a matrix operator mapping \mathbb{R}^n to \mathbb{R}^n , J and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, another column vector. Consider an integral over all vector space \mathbb{R}^n , seen Eq. (A.1).⁷¹

$$\int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}x^\top A x + J^\top x\right) d^n x \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\int y * \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}y^\top A y\right) d^n y = \prod_{i=1}^n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\lambda_i y_i^2\right) dy_i \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\lambda_i y_i^2\right) dy_i = \prod_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\lambda_i}} = (2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} (\det A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Now complete the square of the exponents, and shift by $y = x - A^{-1}J$, diagonalize A with $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \dots \lambda_n)$ where all $\lambda_i > 0$, and evaluate the gaussian by diagonalizing A and separation of terms, in Eq. (A.1-A.3) The integral generates a constant $(2\pi)^{n/2} * \det(A)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, in Eq. (A.5).

$$-\frac{1}{2}x^\top A x + J^\top x = -\frac{1}{2}(x - A^{-1}J)^\top A (x - A^{-1}J) + \frac{1}{2}J^\top A^{-1}J \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}x^\top A x + J^\top x\right) d^n x = (2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} * \det(A)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}J^\top A^{-1}J\right) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Now let us apply \bar{U} , and $i * \rho$ to represent J , we generate the standard HST solution, Eq. (A.6), as we complete the square with ω .

$$\int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\omega^\top \bar{U}^{-1} \omega + (i \rho)^\top \omega\right) d^n \omega = (2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} * \det(\bar{U}^{-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \rho^\top \bar{U} \rho\right) \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Now we can extend this to multicomponent systems. This results in turning $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{mn}$ and $\bar{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{mn \times mn}$, following the similar segment type map introduced at the beginning. As we continue this proof with vectors and matrices enlarged to species \times space, in Eq. (A.7).

$$\int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\omega^\top \bar{U}^{-1} \omega + (i \rho)^\top \omega\right) d^{mn} \omega = (2\pi)^{\frac{mn}{2}} * \det(\bar{U})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \rho^\top \bar{U} \rho\right) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Now we define the formal functional measure and discretization's utilized by SCFT currently. It is normal to partition volume into discretized M , replacing vector fields \mathbb{R}^M , with kernels of $M \times M$, gives us the modified

$$\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\rho} \bar{U} \boldsymbol{\rho}\right) = (2\pi)^{\frac{M}{2}} * \det(\bar{U})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int \prod_{j=1}^M \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\omega}^\top \bar{U}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\omega} + (i \boldsymbol{\rho})^\top \boldsymbol{\omega}\right) d\boldsymbol{\omega}_j. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The contact interaction for the continuum limit, we define the formalism that $\mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\omega} \equiv \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} (d\boldsymbol{\omega}_j)$.¹ Then the contact interaction transforms from $u(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = g\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$, resulting in Eq. (A.9), the final bridge equation commonly used for extrapolating between fields. This is coupled with the MF correspondence of Eq. (A.10), where $V(\mathbf{r})$ is an external field, and $\omega^*(\mathbf{r})$, is the CDFT modifies field equation.

$$\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int \rho(\mathbf{r}) u(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \rho(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}'\right) = [\det(2\pi u)]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int \omega u^{-1} \omega d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' + i \int \omega \rho d\mathbf{r}\right) \mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\omega} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$\lambda(\mathbf{r}) = i\omega^*(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\delta F_{ex}}{\delta \rho(\mathbf{r})} + V(\mathbf{r}) \quad (\text{A.10})$$

One major caveat of this method is while ω^* must be stable, and u must be invertible, HST only linearizes quadratic information. Higher order pair correlations such as hydrogen bonding, Fundamental Measure Theory, and Wertheim T1P1 cannot be implemented by single scalar HST fields. Moreover, long range forces such as electrostatics require neutrality.^{1,3,5,23,32,81} Lastly, the mean field approximation, MF, is only accurate at small fluctuation, in other words, for large systems of molecules, but in thin films or close to spinodal, RPA or one loop corrections are required.^{14,39}

This now established the formalisms of SCFT and the current working bridge to CDFT through HST approximation, deriving the exact Hubbard–Stratonovich normalization, provided a MF correspondence, and showed how the forward and backward propagators are used for polymer chain statistics. It's important to state how the stationary auxiliary field gives SCFT the potential, while CDFT excess functional loses non–quadratic physics in the process.^{51,82}

References

- (1) Fredrickson, G. *The Equilibrium Theory of Inhomogeneous Polymers*; International Series of Monographs on Physics; OUP Oxford, 2006.
- (2) Matsen, M. W. Field Theoretic Approach for Block Polymer Melts: SCFT and FTS. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2020**, *152* (11), 110901. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5145098>.
- (3) Arora, A.; Qin, J.; Morse, D. C.; Delaney, K. T.; Fredrickson, G. H.; Bates, F. S.; Dorfman, K. D. Broadly Accessible Self-Consistent Field Theory for Block Polymer Materials Discovery. *Macromolecules* **2016**, *49* (13), 4675–4690. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.macromol.6b00107>.
- (4) Cheong, G. K.; Chawla, A.; Morse, D. C.; Dorfman, K. D. Open-Source Code for Self-Consistent Field Theory Calculations of Block Polymer Phase Behavior on Graphics Processing Units. *The European Physical Journal E* **2020**, *43* (2), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epje/i2020-11938-y>.
- (5) Cenicerros, H. D.; Fredrickson, G. H. Numerical Solution of Polymer Self-Consistent Field Theory. *Multiscale Model. Simul.* **2004**, *2* (3), 452–474. <https://doi.org/10.1137/030601338>.
- (6) Li, C.; Delaney, K. T.; Shell, M. S.; Fredrickson, G. H. Efficient Computation of Single-Chain Partition Functions in Field-Theoretic Simulations of Polymers With Nested Tree-Like Topologies. *Macromolecular Theory and Simulations* **2025**, *34* (4), e70000. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mats.202500023>.
- (7) Nguyen, My. V. T.; Dolph, K.; Delaney, K. T.; Shen, K.; Sherck, N.; Köhler, S.; Gupta, R.; Francis, M. B.; Shell, M. S.; Fredrickson, G. H. Molecularly Informed Field Theory for Estimating Critical Micelle Concentrations of Intrinsically Disordered Protein Surfactants. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2023**, *159* (24), 244904. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0178910>.
- (8) Revelas, C. J.; Sgouros, A. P.; Lakkas, A. T.; Theodorou, D. N. RuSseL: A Self-Consistent Field Theory Code for Inhomogeneous Polymer Interphases. *Computation* **2021**, *9* (5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/computation9050057>.
- (9) Yong, D.; Kim, J. U. Accelerating Langevin Field-Theoretic Simulation of Polymers with Deep Learning. *Macromolecules* **2022**, *55* (15), 6505–6515. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.macromol.2c00705>.
- (10) Schmid, F. Self-Consistent-Field Theories for Complex Fluids. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **1998**, *10* (37), 8105.
- (11) M W Matsen. The Standard Gaussian Model for Block Copolymer Melts. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **2001**, *14* (2), R21. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0953-8984/14/2/201>.
- (12) Fredrickson, G. H.; Ganesan, V.; Drolet, F. Field-Theoretic Computer Simulation Methods for Polymers and Complex Fluids. *Macromolecules* **2002**, *35* (1), 16–39. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ma011515t>.
- (13) Helfand, E.; Sapse, A. M. Theory of Unsymmetric Polymer–Polymer Interfaces. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1975**, *62* (4), 1327–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.430632>.
- (14) Fredrickson, G. H.; Helfand, E. Fluctuation Effects in the Theory of Microphase Separation in Block Copolymers. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1987**, *87* (1), 697–705. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.453566>.
- (15) Cochran, E. W.; Morse, D. C.; Bates, F. S. Design of ABC Triblock Copolymers near the ODT with the Random Phase Approximation. *Macromolecules* **2003**, *36* (3), 782–792. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ma020651a>.

- (16) Leibler, L. Theory of Microphase Separation in Block Copolymers. *Macromolecules* **1980**, *13* (6), 1602–1617. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ma60078a047>.
- (17) Bates, F. S.; Fredrickson, G. H. Block Copolymer Thermodynamics: Theory and Experiment. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, 1990, *41*, 525–557. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.pc.41.100190.002521>.
- (18) Wu, J. Density Functional Theory for Chemical Engineering: From Capillarity to Soft Materials. *AIChE Journal* **2006**, *52* (3), 1169–1193. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.10713>.
- (19) Duan, C.; Agrawal, N. R.; Wang, R. Electrostatic Correlation Augmented Self-Consistent Field Theory and Its Application to Polyelectrolyte Brushes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2025**, *134* (4), 048101. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.134.048101>.
- (20) Li, Z.; Wu, J. Density Functional Theory for Planar Electric Double Layers: Closing the Gap between Simple and Polyelectrolytes. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2006**, *110* (14), 7473–7484. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp060127w>.
- (21) Emborsky, C. P.; Feng, Z.; Cox, K. R.; Chapman, W. G. Recent Advances in Classical Density Functional Theory for Associating and Polyatomic Molecules. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* **2011**, *306* (1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fluid.2011.02.007>.
- (22) Prusty, D.; Pryamitsyn, V.; Olvera de la Cruz, M. Thermodynamics of Associative Polymer Blends. *Macromolecules* **2018**, *51* (15), 5918–5932. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.macromol.8b00661>.
- (23) Han, X.-G.; Zhang, C.-X. Self-Consistent Field Lattice Model Study on the Phase Behavior of Physically Associating Polymer Solutions. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2010**, *132* (16), 164905. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3400648>.
- (24) Jain, Shekhar. Molecular Modeling of Microstructure and Thermodynamics of Bulk and Inhomogeneous Polymer Systems / by Shekhar Jain., Rice University, Houston, Tex, 2009.
- (25) Jain, S.; Dominik, A.; Chapman, W. G. Modified Interfacial Statistical Associating Fluid Theory: A Perturbation Density Functional Theory for Inhomogeneous Complex Fluids. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2007**, *127* (24), 244904. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2806932>.
- (26) Bymaster, A.; Chapman, W. G. An iSAFT Density Functional Theory for Associating Polyatomic Molecules. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2010**, *114* (38), 12298–12307. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp102677m>.
- (27) Liu, J.; Wang, L.; Xi, S.; Asthagiri, D.; Chapman, W. G. Adsorption and Phase Behavior of Pure/Mixed Alkanes in Nanoslit Graphite Pores: An iSAFT Application. *Langmuir* **2017**, *33* (42), 11189–11202. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.langmuir.7b02055>.
- (28) Wang, L.; Haghmoradi, A.; Liu, J.; Xi, S.; Hirasaki, G. J.; Miller, C. A.; Chapman, W. G. Modeling Micelle Formation and Interfacial Properties with iSAFT Classical Density Functional Theory. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2017**, *146* (12), 124705. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4978503>.
- (29) Xi, S.; Wang, L.; Liu, J.; Chapman, W. Thermodynamics, Microstructures, and Solubilization of Block Copolymer Micelles by Density Functional Theory. *Langmuir* **2019**, *35* (14), 5081–5092. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.langmuir.8b04336>.
- (30) Haghmoradi, A.; Wang, L.; Chapman, W. G. A Density Functional Theory for Colloids with Two Multiple Bonding Associating Sites. *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **2016**, *28* (24), 244009. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0953-8984/28/24/244009>.
- (31) Xi, S.; Liu, J.; Valiya Parambathu, A.; Zhang, Y.; Chapman, W. G. An Efficient Algorithm for Molecular Density Functional Theory in Cylindrical Geometry: Application to

- Interfacial Statistical Associating Fluid Theory (iSAFT). *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2020**, *59* (14), 6716–6728. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.9b06895>.
- (32) Li, Z.; Tang, M.; Liang, S.; Zhang, M.; Biesold, G. M.; He, Y.; Hao, S.-M.; Choi, W.; Liu, Y.; Peng, J.; Lin, Z. Bottlebrush Polymers: From Controlled Synthesis, Self-Assembly, Properties to Applications. *Progress in Polymer Science* **2021**, *116*, 101387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2021.101387>.
- (33) Woodward, C. E. A Density Functional Theory for Polymers: Application to Hard Chain–Hard Sphere Mixtures in Slitlike Pores. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1991**, *94* (4), 3183–3191. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.459787>.
- (34) Frischknecht, A. L.; Weinhold, J. D.; Salinger, A. G.; Curro, J. G.; Douglas Frink, L. J.; McCoy, J. D. Density Functional Theory for Inhomogeneous Polymer Systems. I. Numerical Methods. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2002**, *117* (22), 10385–10397. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1518685>.
- (35) Frischknecht, A. L.; Curro, J. G.; Douglas Frink, L. J. Density Functional Theory for Inhomogeneous Polymer Systems. II. Application to Block Copolymer Thin Films. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2002**, *117* (22), 10398–10411. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1518686>.
- (36) Wei, Z.; Ning, N.; Zhang, L.; Tian, M.; Mi, J. Density Functional Theory of Polymer Structure and Conformations. *Polymers* **2016**, *8* (4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/polym8040121>.
- (37) Qing, L.; Jiang, J. Interfacial Microstructure of Neutral and Charged Polymer Brushes: A Density Functional Theory Study. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2022**, *157* (22), 224904. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0122397>.
- (38) Thompson, R. B. An Alternative Derivation of Orbital-Free Density Functional Theory. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2019**, *150* (20), 204109. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5096405>.
- (39) Bryk, P.; MacDowell, L. G. Self-Consistent Field/Density Functional Study of Conformational Properties of Polymers at Interfaces: Role of Intramolecular Interactions. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2008**, *129* (10), 104901. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2976339>.
- (40) Gaines, M. K.; Smith, S. D.; Samseth, J.; Bockstaller, M. R.; Thompson, R. B.; Rasmussen, K. Ø.; Spontak, R. J. Nanoparticle-Regulated Phase Behavior of Ordered Block Copolymers. *Soft Matter* **2008**, *4* (8), 1609–1612. <https://doi.org/10.1039/B805540H>.
- (41) Chen, H.; Ye, Z.; Cai, J.; Liu, H.; Hu, Y.; Jiang, J. Hybrid Density Functional Theory for Homopolymer Mixtures Confined in a Selective Nanoslit. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2007**, *111* (21), 5927–5933. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp068784b>.
- (42) Ginzburg, V. V. Polymer-Grafted Nanoparticles in Polymer Melts: Modeling Using the Combined SCFT–DFT Approach. *Macromolecules* **2013**, *46* (24), 9798–9805. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ma402210v>.
- (43) Tramonto Project. <https://tramonto.github.io>.
- (44) Frink, L. J. D.; Frischknecht, A. L.; Heroux, M. A.; Parks, M. L.; Salinger, A. G. Toward Quantitative Coarse-Grained Models of Lipids with Fluids Density Functional Theory. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2012**, *8* (4), 1393–1408. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ct200707b>.
- (45) Wei, J.; Chen, T.; Liu, G.; Yang, J. Higher-Order Multivariable Polynomial Regression to Estimate Human Affective States. *Scientific Reports* **2016**, *6* (1), 23384. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep23384>.
- (46) Müller, M. Memory in the Relaxation of a Polymer Density Modulation. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2022**, *156* (12), 124902. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0084602>.

- (47) Xu, X.; Cao, D.; Zhang, X.; Wang, W. Universal Version of Density-Functional Theory for Polymers with Complex Architecture. *Phys. Rev. E* **2009**, *79* (2), 021805. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.79.021805>.
- (48) Maurits, N. M.; Fraaije, J. G. E. M. Mesoscopic Dynamics of Copolymer Melts: From Density Dynamics to External Potential Dynamics Using Nonlocal Kinetic Coupling. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1997**, *107* (15), 5879–5889. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.474313>.
- (49) Xi, S.; Zhu, Y.; Lu, J.; Chapman, W. G. Block Copolymer Self-Assembly: Melt and Solution by Molecular Density Functional Theory. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2022**, *156* (5), 054902. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0069883>.
- (50) Xi, S. Multiscale and Multidimensional Thermodynamic Modeling of Block Copolymer Self-Assembly in Solution, Rice, Houston, TX, 2020. <https://hdl.handle.net/1911/108096>.
- (51) Zhang, J.; Li, B.; Wang, Q. A Unified Computational Framework for Polymer Self-Consistent Field and Density-Functional Theories. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2025**, *21* (10), 5016–5022. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.5c00530>.
- (52) Rosenfeld, Y. Free-Energy Model for the Inhomogeneous Hard-Sphere Fluid Mixture and Density-Functional Theory of Freezing. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1989**, *63* (9), 980–983. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.63.980>.
- (53) Pattanayek, S. K.; Juvekar, V. A. Prediction of Adsorption of Nonionic Polymers from Aqueous Solutions to Solid Surfaces. *Macromolecules* **2002**, *35* (25), 9574–9585. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ma020478i>.
- (54) Ganesan, V.; Jayaraman, A. Theory and Simulation Studies of Effective Interactions, Phase Behavior and Morphology in Polymer Nanocomposites. *Soft Matter* **2014**, *10* (1), 13–38. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C3SM51864G>.
- (55) Qing, L.; Wang, X.; Li, S.; Zhang, J.; Jiang, J. Thermodynamic Perturbation Theory for Charged Branched Polymers. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2025**, *21* (1), 333–346. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.4c01187>.
- (56) de Freitas Gonçalves, A.; Amancio, R. J.; Castier, M.; Franco, L. F. M. Classical Density Functional Theory Consistent with the SAFT-VR Mie Equation of State: Development of Functionals and Application to Confined Fluids. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* **2024**, *69* (10), 3645–3659. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jced.4c00020>.
- (57) Marshall, B. D.; Chapman, W. G. Thermodynamic Perturbation Theory for Associating Fluids with Small Bond Angles: Effects of Steric Hindrance, Ring Formation, and Double Bonding. *Phys. Rev. E* **2013**, *87* (5), 052307. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.87.052307>.
- (58) Hansen, J. P.; McDonald, I. R. *Theory of Simple Liquids: With Applications to Soft Matter*; Academic Press, 2013.
- (59) Wertheim, M. S. Fluids with Highly Directional Attractive Forces. I. Statistical Thermodynamics. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **1984**, *35* (1), 19–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01017362>.
- (60) Wertheim, M. S. Fluids with Highly Directional Attractive Forces. II. Thermodynamic Perturbation Theory and Integral Equations. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **1984**, *35* (1), 35–47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01017363>.
- (61) Wertheim, M. S. Fluids with Highly Directional Attractive Forces. III. Multiple Attraction Sites. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **1986**, *42* (3), 459–476. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01127721>.

- (62) Wertheim, M. S. Fluids with Highly Directional Attractive Forces. IV. Equilibrium Polymerization. *Journal of Statistical Physics* **1986**, 42 (3), 477–492.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01127722>.
- (63) Chapman, W. G. *Theory and Simulation of Associating Liquid Mixtures*; 1988.
- (64) Kalyuzhnyi, Y. V.; Marshall, B. D.; Chapman, W. G.; Cummings, P. T. Second-Order Resummed Thermodynamic Perturbation Theory for Central-Force Associating Potential: Multi-Patch Colloidal Models. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2013**, 139 (4), 044909.
<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4816128>.
- (65) Zhu, Y.; Bansal, A.; Xi, S.; Lu, J.; Chapman, W. G. Self-Assembly and Phase Behavior of Mixed Patchy Colloids with Any Bonding Site Geometry: Theory and Simulation. *Soft Matter* **2020**, 16 (15), 3806–3820. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D0SM00248H>.
- (66) Segura, C. J.; Chapman, W. G. Associating Fluids with Four Bonding Sites against Solid Surfaces: Monte Carlo Simulations. *Molecular Physics* **1995**, 86 (3), 415–442.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00268979509413622>.
- (67) Chapman, W. G.; Gubbins, K. E.; Jackson, G.; Radosz, M. SAFT: Equation-of-State Solution Model for Associating Fluids. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* **1989**, 52, 31–38.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812\(89\)80308-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812(89)80308-5).
- (68) Tripathi, S.; Chapman, W. G. Microstructure of Inhomogeneous Polyatomic Mixtures from a Density Functional Formalism for Atomic Mixtures. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2005**, 122 (9), 094506. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1853371>.
- (69) Matsen, M. W. Field Theoretic Approach for Block Polymer Melts: SCFT and FTS. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2020**, 152 (11), 110901. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5145098>.
- (70) Qin, J.; Morse, D. C. Renormalized One-Loop Theory of Correlations in Polymer Blends. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2009**, 130 (22), 224902.
<https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3124799>.
- (71) Zinn-Justin, J. *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*; International series of monographs on physics; Oxford University Press, 2021.
- (72) Zeidler, E. *Applied Functional Analysis: Main Principles and Their Applications*; Applied Mathematical Sciences; Springer New York, 1995.
- (73) Brezis, H. *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*; Universitext; Springer New York, 2010.
- (74) Naylor, A. W.; Sell, G. R. *Linear Operator Theory in Engineering and Science*; Applied Mathematical Sciences; Springer New York, 1982.
- (75) John, F. *Partial Differential Equations*; Applied Mathematical Sciences; Springer New York, 1991.
- (76) Amit, D. J.; Martin-mayor, V. *Field Theory, The Renormalization Group, And Critical Phenomena: Graphs To Computers (3rd Edition)*; World Scientific Publishing Company, 2005.
- (77) Constantine, G.; Savits, T. A Multivariate Faà Di Bruno Formula with Applications. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **1996**, 348 (2), 503–520.
- (78) Henderson, D. *Fundamentals of Inhomogeneous Fluids*; Taylor & Francis, 1992.
- (79) Brazovskii, S. Phase Transition of an Isotropic System to a Nonuniform State - JETP 41, 85 (1975). *Soviet Phys JETP*. **1996**, 41.
- (80) Strang, G. *Introduction to Linear Algebra*; Wellesley, 2016.

- (81) Byczuk, K.; Jakubczyk, P. Generalized Gaussian Integrals with Application to the Hubbard–Stratonovich Transformation. *American Journal of Physics* **2023**, *91* (10), 840–846. <https://doi.org/10.1119/5.0141045>.
- (82) Martin, J. M.; Li, W.; Delaney, K. T.; Fredrickson, G. H. Statistical Field Theory Description of Inhomogeneous Polarizable Soft Matter. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2016**, *145* (15), 154104. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4964680>.