

# OrthoBoXY: A Simple Way to Compute True Self-Diffusion Coefficients from MD Simulations with Periodic Boundary Conditions Without Prior Knowledge of the Viscosity

Johanna Busch<sup>1</sup> and Dietmar Paschek<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institut für Chemie, Abteilung Physikalische und Theoretische Chemie,  
Universität Rostock, Albert-Einstein-Str. 27, D-18059 Rostock, Germany*

(Dated: 2023/07/31 at 01:17:22)

Recently, an analytical expression for the system size dependence and direction-dependence of self-diffusion coefficients for neat liquids due to hydrodynamic interactions has been derived for molecular dynamics (MD) simulations using orthorhombic unit cells. Based on this description, we show that for systems with a “magic” box length ratio of  $L_z/L_x = L_z/L_y = 2.7933596497$  the computed self-diffusion coefficients  $D_x$  and  $D_y$  in  $x$ - and  $y$ -direction become system-size independent and represent the true self-diffusion coefficient  $D_0 = (D_x + D_y)/2$ . Moreover, by using this particular box geometry, the viscosity can be determined with a reasonable degree of accuracy from the difference of components of the diffusion coefficients in  $x$ -,  $y$ - and  $z$ -direction using the simple expression  $\eta = k_B T \cdot 8.1711245653 / [3\pi L_z (D_x + D_y - 2D_z)]$ , where  $k_B$  denotes Boltzmann’s constant, and  $T$  represents the temperature. MD simulations of TIP4P/2005 water for various system-sizes using both orthorhombic and cubic box geometries are used to test the approach.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Self-diffusion coefficients obtained from MD simulations with periodic boundary conditions (PBCs) show a systematic system size dependence.[1, 2] This effect is caused by the altered hydrodynamic interactions between particles in a periodic system.[1–5] It has been demonstrated for simulations of polymers in solution [1], TIP3P model water molecules, and Lennard-Jones particles [2], as well as CO<sub>2</sub>, n-alkanes, and poly(ethylene glycol) dimethyl ethers for a wide variety of conditions [5]. An exact expression, often referred to as Yeh-Hummer approach, has been derived to describe the effect for simulations with a cubic unit cell as [1, 2]

$$D_0 = D_{\text{PBC}} + \frac{k_B T \zeta}{6\pi\eta L}, \quad (1)$$

with the box size  $L$ , and the shear viscosity  $\eta$ . Here,  $D_{\text{PBC}}$  is the self-diffusion coefficient obtained for a system with PBCs, and  $D_0$  is the self-diffusion coefficient obtained for  $L \rightarrow \infty$ . The parameter  $\zeta \approx 2.8372974795$  is the analogue to a Madelung constant [6] of a cubic lattice, which can be computed via Ewald summation [3, 6, 7] according to

$$\zeta = -L \cdot \left\{ \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq 0} \frac{\text{erfc}(\alpha n)}{n} \right] + \frac{\pi}{V} \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \frac{4e^{-k^2/(4\alpha^2)}}{k^2} \right] - \frac{\pi}{\alpha^2 V} - \frac{2\alpha}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right\} \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the Ewald convergence parameter. The vectors  $\mathbf{n} = (n_x, n_y, n_z)$ , and  $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y, k_z)$  are the real and reciprocal lattice vectors with  $n_i = L m_i$  and  $k_i = 2\pi \cdot m_i / L$  with  $m_i$  being integer numbers, and  $n = |\mathbf{n}|$  and  $k^2 = |\mathbf{k}|^2$ , respectively. Equation 1 has been widely applied to determine the

system-size independent *true* self-diffusion coefficient from MD simulations with PBCs.[8] However, prior knowledge of the shear viscosity  $\eta$  is required to perform the correction.

For orthorhombic box geometries, the presence of unequal box-lengths leads to different system-size dependencies for each of the components  $D_{ii}$  of the diffusion tensor  $\mathbf{D}$  such that the self-diffusion tensor becomes anisotropic even for an isotropic fluid. To describe such a behavior, Kikugawa et al. [3] have derived generalized versions of Equations 1 and 2, which can be applied to systems with an orthorhombic geometry using

$$D_0 = D_{\text{PBC},ii} + \frac{k_B T \zeta_{ii}}{6\pi\eta L_i} \quad (3)$$

with  $i \in \{x, y, z\}$ . Here,  $L_i$  are the individual box-lengths of the orthorhombic unit cell and  $D_{\text{PBC},ii}$  are the components of the self-diffusion tensor in the system with PBCs. The  $\zeta_{ii}$  represent the direction-dependent Madelung constant analogues of the orthorhombic lattice using

$$\zeta_{ii} = -\frac{3}{2} L_i \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq 0} \frac{\text{erfc}(\alpha n)}{n} \right] + \frac{n_i^2}{n^2} \left( \frac{\text{erfc}(\alpha n)}{n} + \frac{2\alpha}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\alpha^2 n^2} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\pi}{V} \left[ \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \frac{4e^{-k^2/(4\alpha^2)}}{k^2} \right] - \frac{k_i^2}{\alpha^2 k^2} e^{-k^2/(4\alpha^2)} \left( 1 + \frac{4\alpha^2}{k^2} \right) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{\pi}{\alpha^2 V} - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right\} \quad (4)$$

with  $\mathbf{n} = (n_x, n_y, n_z)$ , and  $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y, k_z)$  being real and reciprocal lattice vectors with  $n_i = L_i m_i$  and  $k_i = 2\pi \cdot m_i / L_i$ , based on integer numbers for  $m_i$ . Again, we use  $n = |\mathbf{n}|$  and  $k^2 = |\mathbf{k}|^2$ , while  $\alpha$  represents the Ewald convergence

\* dietmar.paschek@uni-rostock.de

parameter. Vögele and Hummer [4] have derived a similar expression using Beenakker’s expression for the Rotne-Prager tensor under PBCs.[6]

## II. THE “ORTHOBOXY” METHOD

From Equation 1 follows that for a cubic unit cell, the obtained self-diffusion coefficients  $D_{\text{PBC}}$  are always smaller than the true self-diffusion coefficient  $D_0$ . For orthorhombic unit cells, however, this does not necessarily need to be the case.[9] In fact, for a unit cell with  $L_x = L_y \neq L_z$ , diffusion in  $x$ - and  $y$ -direction can even become accelerated for certain ratios  $L_z/L_x = L_z/L_y$ . [3, 9] Using Equation 4, we have determined the exact ratio where this change in sign occurs: by numerically computing the Madelung constant analogues  $\zeta_{xx}$ ,  $\zeta_{yy}$ , and  $\zeta_{zz}$  from Equation 4, we have obtained, in accordance with the analysis of Kikugawa et al. [3], the condition  $\zeta_{xx} = \zeta_{yy} = 0$  to be related to a box geometry with a “magic” box-length ratio of  $L_z/L_x = L_z/L_y \approx 2.7933596497$ . Since the computation has been performed numerically, we have determined  $\zeta_{xx} = \zeta_{yy} < 10^{-10}$  using the box geometry indicated above. For this geometry, we have also computed the Madelung constant analogue in  $z$ -direction to be  $\zeta_{zz} \approx 8.1711245653$ . The computations of Equation 4 and Equation 2 discussed above were performed using double precision floating point arithmetic, and an Ewald convergence parameter of  $\alpha = L_x^{-1} = L_y^{-1}$  for Equation 4 and  $\alpha = L^{-1}$  for Equation 2, with  $m_i$  ranging between  $-m_{\text{max}} \leq m_i \leq m_{\text{max}}$  using  $m_{\text{max}} = 100$  for both the real and reciprocal lattice summation, ensuring that the calculations are converged.

Given that we have two unknowns,  $D_0$  and  $\eta$ , and three equations, it is always possible to determine both  $D_0$  and  $\eta$  from direction-dependent diffusion coefficients obtained from a single MD simulation run based on an orthorhombic unit cell. However, utilizing MD simulations of an orthorhombic box with  $L_z/L_x = L_z/L_y \approx 2.7933596497$  is particularly intriguing, since now the  $x$ - and  $y$ - component of the diffusion tensor become system-size independent such that  $D_{\text{PBC},xx} = D_{\text{PBC},yy} = D_0$ . Note that for such a case a prior knowledge of the shear viscosity is not required for determining  $D_0$ , and the self-diffusion coefficient for an infinitely large system can be simply obtained via

$$D_0 = \frac{D_{\text{PBC},xx} + D_{\text{PBC},yy}}{2}. \quad (5)$$

In fact, from Equation 3 follows, that for this case the shear viscosity can also be computed directly from the knowledge of the three components of the diffusion tensor using

$$\eta = \frac{k_B T \zeta_{zz}}{3\pi L_z (D_{\text{PBC},xx} + D_{\text{PBC},yy} - 2D_{\text{PBC},zz})} \quad (6)$$

with  $\zeta_{zz} \approx 8.1711245653$ . Moreover, Equation 6 suggests that it is perhaps beneficial to employ particularly small system sizes for determining  $\eta$  due to an increasing difference between  $D_0$  and  $D_{\text{PBC},zz}$  with decreasing system size. This




Figure 1. Self-diffusion coefficients of TIP4P/2005 water at 298 K determined from MD simulations employing orthorhombic simulation boxes with  $L_z/L_x = L_z/L_y \approx 2.7933596497$  for varying system sizes. Blue symbols indicate the system-size independent  $D_0$ , which are determined according to Equation 5. The blue line indicates the average over all system sizes with  $D_0 = 2.277 \times 10^{-9} \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ . Red symbols indicate the system-size dependent diffusion coefficient in  $z$ -direction  $D_{\text{PBC},zz}$ . The red line is determined according to Equation 3 employing the average values for  $D_0 = 2.277 \times 10^{-9} \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$  and  $\eta = 0.900 \text{mPa s}$ .

approach might therefore offer the opportunity for determining the viscosity and true self-diffusion coefficient from computationally expensive calculations such as *ab initio* MD simulations.

## III. MOLECULAR DYNAMICS SIMULATIONS

To test the above outlined ORTHOBOXY approach, MD simulations of TIP4P/2005 model water [10] were carried out, which has been demonstrated to accurately describe the properties of water compared to other simple rigid nonpolarizable water models.[11]. Simulations were performed at a temperature of  $T = 298 \text{K}$  under NVT and NPT conditions, either at a density of  $\rho = 0.9972 \text{g cm}^{-3}$  (NVT), or at a pressure of  $P = 1 \text{bar}$  (NPT). Various system sizes are used for both cubic and orthorhombic box geometries. MD simulations of 10 ns length each were performed using GROMACS 5.0.6.[12, 13] The integration time step for all simulations was 2 fs. The temperature of the simulated systems was controlled employing the Nosé-Hoover thermostat [14, 15] with a coupling time  $\tau_T = 1.0 \text{ps}$ . Constant pressure simulations were realized using a Rahman-Parrinello-barostat [16, 17] employing  $\tau_p = 2.0 \text{ps}$  and  $\chi_T = 33 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{bar}^{-1}$ . Both, the Lennard-Jones and electrostatic interactions were treated by smooth particle mesh Ewald summation.[18–20] The Ewald convergence parameter was set to a relative accuracy of the Ewald

Table I. Parameters describing the MD simulations using an orthorhombic unit cell with  $L_z/L_x = L_z/L_y \approx 2.7933596497$  performed under NVT and NPT conditions at a temperature of  $T = 298$  K and a density of  $\rho = 0.9972$  g cm $^{-3}$  (NVT), or a pressure of  $P = 1$  bar (NPT) with  $N$  indicating the number of water molecules and  $L_x$ ,  $L_y$ , and  $L_z$  representing the box lengths of the orthorhombic unit cell. The direction-dependent self-diffusion coefficients  $D_{\text{PBC},ii}$  are determined from the slope of the center-of-mass mean square displacement of the water molecules. The true self-diffusion coefficient  $D_0$  is determined according to Equation 5 and the shear viscosity  $\eta$  is determined according to Equation 6. The errors indicate a range of  $\pm 1\sigma$ .

$N$	$L_x, L_y/\text{nm}$	$L_z/\text{nm}$	$D_0/10^{-9}\text{m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$	$D_{\text{PBC},zz}/10^{-9}\text{m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$	$\eta/\text{mPa s}$
NVT:					
768	2.02050	5.64398	$2.267 \pm 0.039$	$1.922 \pm 0.020$	$0.916 \pm 0.116$
1536	2.54566	7.11097	$2.283 \pm 0.027$	$1.989 \pm 0.010$	$0.853 \pm 0.084$
3072	3.20734	8.95925	$2.270 \pm 0.021$	$2.066 \pm 0.011$	$0.975 \pm 0.113$
6144	4.04100	11.28796	$2.289 \pm 0.019$	$2.104 \pm 0.008$	$0.854 \pm 0.095$
NPT:					
3072	$3.20734 \pm 7.7 \times 10^{-5}$	$8.95924 \pm 2.2 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.290 \pm 0.030$	$2.065 \pm 0.010$	$0.884 \pm 0.124$

Table II. Parameters describing the MD simulations using a cubic unit cell performed under NVT conditions at a temperature of  $T = 298$  K and a density of  $\rho = 0.9972$  g cm $^{-3}$  with  $N$  indicating the number of water molecules and  $L$  representing box length. The self-diffusion coefficients  $D_{\text{PBC}}$  are determined from the slope of the center-of-mass mean square displacement of the water molecules. The true self-diffusion coefficient  $D_0$  is obtained for systems with periodic boundary conditions according to Equation 1 using a shear viscosity of  $\eta = (0.900 \pm 0.051)$  mPa s. The errors indicate a range of  $\pm 1\sigma$ .

$N$	$L/\text{nm}$	$D_{\text{PBC}}/10^{-9}\text{m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$	$D_0/10^{-9}\text{m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$
256	1.97300	$1.932 \pm 0.021$	$2.275 \pm 0.027$
512	2.48582	$2.001 \pm 0.013$	$2.273 \pm 0.019$
1024	3.13194	$2.068 \pm 0.012$	$2.284 \pm 0.016$
2048	3.94600	$2.110 \pm 0.010$	$2.282 \pm 0.013$

sum of  $10^{-5}$  for the Coulomb-interaction and  $10^{-3}$  for the LJ-interaction. All bond lengths were kept fixed during the simulation run and distance constraints were solved by means of the SETTLE procedure. [21] The simulations were carried out in 20 subsequent segments of 500 ps length. All reported properties were then calculated for those segments separately in order to be able to estimate the error using standard statistical analysis procedures.[22, 23]

#### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Self-diffusion coefficients were computed from the slope of the center-of-mass mean square displacement of the water molecules using the Einstein formula [22] according to

$$D_{\text{PBC}} = \frac{1}{6} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle |\mathbf{r}(0) - \mathbf{r}(t)|^2 \rangle, \quad (7)$$

and

$$D_{\text{PBC},ii} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle |r_i(0) - r_i(t)|^2 \rangle, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}(t) = [r_x(t), r_y(t), r_z(t)]$  represent the position of the center of mass of a water molecule at time  $t$  and the  $r_i(t)$  are its respective components in  $x$ -,  $y$ -, and  $z$ -direction. All computed self-diffusion coefficients shown Tables I and II were determined from the slope of the mean square displacement of the water molecules fitted to time intervals between 15 ps and 200 ps.

Table I contains results from MD simulations using orthorhombic unit cells with  $L_z/L_x = L_z/L_y \approx 2.7933596497$  for system sizes between 768 and 6144 water molecules, while Table II contains the data obtained for cubic unit cells with system sizes between 256 and 2048 water molecules. The diffusion coefficients  $D_0$  obtained from the simulations based on an orthorhombic system, shown in Figure 1 and given in Table I, exhibit no systematic system size dependence. Here the average over the different system sizes is determined to be  $D_0 = (2.277 \pm 0.013) \times 10^{-9} \text{m}^2\text{s}^{-1}$ . As shown in Figure 1, the computed self-diffusion coefficients in  $z$ -direction  $D_{\text{PBC},zz}$ , however, show a strong system size dependence. From the knowledge of  $D_0$  and  $D_{\text{PBC},zz}$  we compute the shear viscosity  $\eta$ . The computed viscosities for all systems considered are shown in Table I. No systematic system size dependence is observed, leading to an average value of  $\eta = (0.900 \pm 0.051)$  mPa s for the viscosity of TIP4P/2005 water at  $T = 298$  K when averaging over all systems. Note that the computed errors of  $\eta$  also do not show any systematic variation with the system size although the accuracy of the computed self-diffusion coefficients decreases with decreasing system size. Possibly, the increasing difference between  $D_0$  and  $D_{\text{PBC},zz}$  with decreasing system size is compensating for this loss of accuracy, as anticipated earlier. The computed average viscosity is close to the experimental value for water of 0.8928 mPa s at 298 K given by Harris and Woolf.[24, 25] It is, however, slightly larger than the viscosity value of 0.855 mPa s reported by Gonzales and

Abascal [26], and the value of  $0.83 \pm 0.07$  mPa s reported by Tazi et al. [27] for the TIP4P/2005 model. We would like to point out that this slightly enhanced viscosity might be related to the fact that we applied the PME summation for both the Lennard-Jones interactions and the Coulomb interactions in our simulations. Note that the enhanced viscosity is accompanied by a similarly reduced diffusivity: when scaling the diffusion coefficient of  $(2.49 \pm 0.06) \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ , reported by Tazi et al. [27] (which was also determined by applying the Yeh-Hummer correction) by a factor of  $0.83/0.90$ , we end up with a diffusion coefficient of  $2.296 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ , which matches very well the diffusion coefficient determined here. Both values are lying close to the experimental value of  $2.3 \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  at 298 K.[28] The computed viscosities shown in Table I are estimated with a relative accuracy between 10% and 14%, which is not a particularly impressive. However, it is comparable to the accuracy which is available via the integration over the stress-tensor auto-correlation function reported by Tazi et al. [27]

The diffusion coefficients  $D_{\text{PBC}}$  obtained for the cubic systems shown in Table II exhibit the familiar system size dependence [2] and are corrected according to Equation 1 using the average shear viscosity of  $\eta = (0.900 \pm 0.051)$  mPa s discussed above. Again, the computed  $D_0$  show no systematic system size dependence and are leading to an average value of  $D_0 = (2.279 \pm 0.010) \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ , which is consistent with our simulations employing orthorhombic unit cells.

To test whether the outlined procedure is also applicable to MD simulations performed under NPT conditions, we have conducted an additional constant pressure simulation of an orthorhombic system using the “magic” box-length ratio of  $L_z/L_x = L_z/L_y \approx 2.7933596497$  for a system-size of  $N = 3072$  water molecules, as shown in Table I. Here, we have applied an equal scaling of the box-lengths in the Rahman-Parrinello barostat to keep the box-length ratio fixed. The computed diffusion coefficient  $D_0 = (2.290 \pm 0.030) \times 10^{-9} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  and viscosity of  $\eta = (0.884 \pm 0.124)$  mPa s fall well within the range of data computed from NVT simulations.

## V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we would like to point out that with the proposed ORTHOBOXY approach of using an orthorhombic system with a “magic” box-length ratio of  $L_z/L_x = L_z/L_y \approx 2.7933596497$ , we are able to determine the *true* (i.e. system size independent) self-diffusion coefficient  $D_0$  for TIP4P/2005 water without prior knowledge of the shear viscosity from a single MD simulation run by doing nothing more than just employing a particularly odd shaped simulation box. The computed values for  $D_0$  agree with the values determined from MD simulations employing cubic unit cells by applying the widely used Yeh-Hummer correction. In addition, from the analysis of the diffusion coefficients it is also possible to derive the shear viscosity with an accuracy, comparable to the accuracy which is achieved via the integration over the stress-tensor auto-correlation function. Both, the computed self-diffusion coefficient and shear viscosity agree nearly quantitatively with the experimentally observed data for water at 298 K.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the computer center at the University of Rostock (ITMZ) for providing and maintaining computational resources. The authors thank J.K. Philipp for proofreading the manuscript.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The code of GROMACS is freely available. Input parameter and topology files for the MD simulations and the code for computing the Madelung constant analogues for cubic and orthorhombic lattices can be downloaded from GitHub via <https://github.com/Paschek-Lab/OrthoBoXY/>

- 
- [1] B. Dünweg and K. Kremer. Molecular dynamics simulation of a polymer chain in solution. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 99:6983–6997, 1993.
  - [2] I.-C. Yeh and G. Hummer. System-size dependence of diffusion coefficients and viscosities from molecular dynamics simulations with periodic boundary conditions. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 108:15873–15879, 2004.
  - [3] G. Kikugawa, T. Nakano, and T. Ohara. Hydrodynamic consideration of the finite size effect on the self-diffusion coefficient in a periodic rectangular parallelepiped system. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 143:024507, 2015.
  - [4] M. Vögele and G. Hummer. Divergent diffusion coefficients in simulations of fluids and lipid membranes. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 120:8722–8732, 2016.
  - [5] O. A. Moulτος, Y. Zhanf, I. O. Tsimpanogiannis, I. G. Economou, and E. J. Maginn. System-size corrections for self-diffusion coefficients calculated from molecular dynamics simulations: The case of CO<sub>2</sub>, n-alkanes, and poly(ethylene glycol) dimethyl ethers. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 145:074109, 2016.
  - [6] C. W. J. Beenakker. Ewald sum of the Rotne-Prager tensor. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 85:1581–1582, 1986.
  - [7] H. Hasimoto. On the periodic fundamental solutions of the Stokes equations and their application to viscous flow past a cubic array of spheres. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 5:317–328, 1959.
  - [8] E. J. Maginn, R. A. Messerly, D. J. Carlsson, D. R. Roe, and J. R. Elliott. Best practices for computing transport properties 1. self-diffusivity and viscosity from equilibrium molecular dynamics [articlev1.0]. *Living. Comp. Mol. Sci.*, 1:6324, 2019.
  - [9] G. Kikugawa, S. Ando, J. Suzuki, Y. Naruke, T. Nakano, and T. Ohara. Effect of the computational domain size and shape on the self-diffusion coefficient in a Lennard-Jones liquid. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 142:024503, 2015.
  - [10] J. L. F. Abascal and C. Vega. A general purpose model for the condensed phases of water: TIP4P/2005. *J. Chem. Phys.*,

- 123:234505, 2005.
- [11] C. Vega and J. L. F. Abascal. Simulating water with rigid non-polarizable models: a general perspective. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 13:19633–19688, 2011.
- [12] D. van der Spoel, E. Lindahl, B. Hess, G. Groenhof, A. E. Mark, and H. J. C. Berendsen. GROMACS: fast, flexible, and free. *J. Comput. Chem.*, 26(16):1701–1718, 2005.
- [13] B. Hess, C. Kutzner, D. van der Spoel, and E. Lindahl. Gromacs 4: algorithms for highly efficient, load-balanced, and scalable molecular simulation. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 4(3):435–447, 2008.
- [14] S. Nosé. A molecular dynamics method for simulations in the canonical ensemble. *Mol. Phys.*, 52:255–268, 1984.
- [15] W. G. Hoover. Canonical dynamics: Equilibrium phase-space distributions. *Phys. Rev. A*, 31:1695–1697, 1985.
- [16] M. Parrinello and A. Rahman. Polymorphic transitions in single crystals: A new molecular dynamics method. *J. Appl. Phys.*, 52:7182–7190, 1981.
- [17] S. Nosé and M. L. Klein. Constant pressure molecular dynamics for molecular systems. *Mol. Phys.*, 50:1055–1076, 1983.
- [18] U. Essmann, L. Petera, M. Berkowitz, T. Darden, H. Lee, and L. Pedersen. A smooth particle mesh ewald method. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 103:8577–8593, 1995.
- [19] C. L. Wennberg, T. Murtola, B. Hess, and E. Lindahl. Lennard-Jones lattice summation in bilayer simulations has critical effects on surface tension and lipid properties. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 9:3527–3537, 2013.
- [20] C. L. Wennberg, T. Murtola, S. Páll, M. J. Abraham, B. Hess, and E. Lindahl. Direct-space corrections enable fast and accurate Lorentz-Berthelot combination rule Lennard-Jones lattice summation. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 11:5737–5746, 2015.
- [21] S. Miyamoto and P. A. Kollman. Settle: An analytical version of the shake and rattle algorithm for rigid water models. *J. Comput. Chem.*, 13:952–962, 1992.
- [22] M. P. Allen and D. J. Tildesley. *Computer Simulation of Liquids*. Oxford University Press, Clarendon, Oxford, 1987.
- [23] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and P. Flannery. *Numerical Recipes in C: The Art of Scientific Computing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, USA, 2 edition, 1992.
- [24] K. R. Harris and L. A. Woolf. Temperature and volume dependence of the viscosity of water and heavy water at low temperatures. *J. Chem. Eng. Data*, 45:1064–1069, 2004.
- [25] K. R. Harris and L. A. Woolf. Correction: Temperature and volume dependence of the viscosity of water and heavy water at low temperatures. *J. Chem. Eng. Data*, 45:1851, 2004.
- [26] M.A. Gonzáles and J.L.F. Abascal. The shear viscosity of rigid water models. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 132:096101, 2010.
- [27] S. Tazi, A. Botan, M. Salanne, V. Marry, P. Turq, and B. Rotenberg. Diffusion coefficient and shear viscosity of rigid water models. *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, 24:284117, 2012.
- [28] K. Krynicki, C. D. Green, and D. W. Sayer. Pressure and temperature dependence of self-diffusion in water. *Faraday Discuss. Chem. Soc.*, 66:199–208, 1978.