

# Scaled opposite spin second order Møller-Plesset correlation energy: An economical electronic structure method

Yousung Jung<sup>\*</sup>, Rohini C. Lochan<sup>\*</sup>, Anthony D. Dutoi, and Martin Head-Gordon<sup>†</sup>

Department of Chemistry, University of California, and,  
Chemical Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Abstract.

A simplified approach to treating the electron correlation energy is suggested in which only the alpha-beta component of the second order Møller-Plesset energy is evaluated, and then scaled by an empirical factor which is suggested to be 1.3. This scaled opposite spin second order energy (SOS-MP2) yields results for relative energies and derivative properties that are statistically improved over the conventional MP2 method. Furthermore, the SOS-MP2 energy can be evaluated without the 5th order computational steps associated with MP2 theory, even without exploiting any spatial locality. A 4th order algorithm is given for evaluating the opposite spin MP2 energy using auxiliary basis expansions, and a Laplace approach, and timing comparisons are given.

---

<sup>\*</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.

<sup>†</sup> To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: [mhg@cchem.berkeley.edu](mailto:mhg@cchem.berkeley.edu)

## 1. Introduction.

The most popular electronic structure method for application to systems with large numbers of electrons is density functional theory (DFT) [1, 2]. However DFT methods at present completely neglect the dispersion interactions [3] that give rise to base pair stacking and other long-range correlation effects (for example the TCNE dimer dianion [4]). Novel workarounds are being explored for dispersion interactions of monomers [5][6] or ordered layers and surfaces [7, 8], but do not presently apply to molecular systems. More empirical modifications of standard functionals have also been developed to improve non-bonded interactions [9, 10]. Also we note that present-day DFT methods are somewhat suspect for reaction barriers. Standard functionals tend to underestimate activation energies [11], largely as a consequence of the self-interaction issue [12].

The simplest electronic structure alternative to DFT that can correctly treat dispersion and hydrogen-bonding interactions is second order Møller-Plesset theory (MP2) [13]. MP2 theory is capable of quite accurately treating long-range dispersion interactions [14], as well as the dispersion, polarization and covalency effects associated with hydrogen bonding (for instance in water clusters [15]). However, MP2 has several significant drawbacks: First is relatively high computational cost, even with the best standard algorithms. Second is the need for quite large atomic orbital basis sets in order to obtain good results [16], which can further reduce the upper limit on system size. Third is the fact that poor results can be obtained for open shell systems [17], in contrast to the good behavior for closed shell molecules [18].

There has been significant progress in addressing the steep cost increase of MP2 calculations with molecular size in recent years. Three main types of developments can be

identified. First are methods that reduce the prefactor without changing the underlying scaling, such as “resolution of the identity” methods [19, 20] or the pseudo-spectral approach [21], and others [22]. Second are methods that attempt to exploit “underlying locality” in the MP2 problem, which have demonstrated linear scaling using small basis sets and 1-dimensional materials [23, 24]. Third, are “local MP2” methods that exploit locality of electronic structure by ansatz [25-28].

It is clearly desirable to implement and explore enhancements to the basic MP2 method that permit increased accuracy as well as improved computational performance. One well-known example of this type is the fact that MP2 correlation energies (or any wavefunction-based correlation energy) can be systematically extrapolated towards the complete basis set limit [16], using the  $X^{-3}$  behavior of the basis set error with respect to the cardinal number  $X$ , of the Dunning cc-pVXZ basis sets [29]. Indeed a refinement of this approach suggested separate scaling [30] of the same-spin (SS) and opposite spin (OS) correlation energies because the former actually converges as  $X^{-5}$  while the latter component, which is numerically far larger, converges as  $X^{-3}$ .

This different behavior of the two spin-cases may have provided part of the inspiration for a very intriguing recent report by Grimme [31] showing that MP2 energies can be systematically improved by separate scaling of the opposite-spin (OS) and same-spin components of the MP2 correlation energy:

$$E_{MP2} = E_{MP2}^{OS} + E_{MP2}^{SS} \quad (1)$$

This method was termed “spin-component scaled” MP2, or simply SCS-MP2, and, denoting the scaling factors as  $c_{OS}$  and  $c_{SS}$ , the modified correlation energy is simply:

$$E_{SCS-MP2} = c_{OS}E_{MP2}^{OS} + c_{SS}E_{MP2}^{SS} \quad (2)$$

The scaling parameters used by Grimme are  $c_{OS}=6/5$  for the OS correlation, and  $c_{SS}=1/3$  for the SS correlation. We note also that there have been ongoing efforts to scale the entire MP2 correlation energy [32-34], with the objective of removing basis set deficiencies and limitations of the correlation treatment together. For a given (large) basis, Grimme’s new approach showed clear statistical improvements in the quality of geometries (of diatomics), and a wide range of relative energies of reactions, and atomization energies. Additionally, an application of this approach to problems that contain long-range correlation such as stacking complexes has been recently reported[35], as well as an extension to yield a scaled MP3 correlation energy [36].

The purpose of this report is to explore the consequences of a simplified variant of Grimme’s idea. Since the damping of the SS contribution is large ( $c_{SS}=1/3$ ), perhaps results of comparable quality can be obtained by scaling just the OS component (i.e. never evaluating the SS components). If so, this would have very desirable practical implications for the efficiency of implementation, because many of the algorithmic complications that arise in fast MP2 methods are associated with the exchange contribution to the SS correlation. Accordingly we define the “scaled opposite spin” second order correlation energy (or simply SOS-MP2) as:

$$E_{SOS-MP2} = c_{SOS} E_{MP2}^{OS} \quad (3)$$

The OS scaling factor we employ is  $c_{SOS}=1.3$ , which is (roughly) optimized based on results discussed in Section 2 below. The rough magnitude of this value can be anticipated from Grimme’s parameters by noting that the ratio of OS:SS correlation is typically 3 or 4 to 1, and thus we need to increment the OS scaling factor by about  $1/(3 \times 3)$  in order to mimic the absence of explicit SS correlations, yielding about 1.3.

The remainder of this paper consists of three sections in which we first discuss chemical tests of the SOS-MP2 approach in Sec. 2. These tests are largely similar to those reported by

Grimme [31], with additional tests on atomization energies, molecular geometries and barrier heights. Comparisons are made to both usual MP2 theory, and also against the SCS-MP2 method, and higher correlation methods. In Sec. 3, we describe how the opposite spin MP2 energy (and thus SOS-MP2) can be efficiently implemented by describing an algorithm that does not require any 5<sup>th</sup> order computational steps, without exploiting localization. This contrasts with conventional MP2 methods that inevitably require a 5<sup>th</sup> order step. Our approach uses auxiliary basis expansions [19, 20, 37-39], together with a Laplace approach [40] to eliminate energy denominators. The final section demonstrates the computational effectiveness of this approach in comparison to a conventional 5<sup>th</sup> order-scaling auxiliary basis evaluation of the MP2 energy. We finish with some conclusions.

## 2. Chemical tests.

We have modified our standard MP2 program for energies and gradients [41] to implement the SOS-MP2 and SCS-MP2 energy and gradient, within a development version of the Q-Chem program [42]. This was used for all calculations reported in this section. Unless stated otherwise, all geometries were completely optimized at the MP2 level using the 6-31G\* basis set. These were used to perform subsequent single-point calculations using the Dunning cc-pVTZ basis [29]. All calculations were carried out using the frozen core approximation.

The objective of this section is to estimate the optimal opposite spin scaling factor,  $c_{SOS}$  and compare the performance of SOS-MP2 with Grimme's SCS-MP2 [31], MP2 and higher correlation methods like QCISD and QCISD(T). In this study, we have not only adopted test molecules and reactions similar to those described by Grimme [31], but also included several

other molecules, and also reaction barriers. As a consequence of using different initial geometry (MP2/6-31G\*) and basis (cc-pVTZ) there are also slight variations in the energy values reported herein and those reported by Grimme [31].

## 2.1 Correlation Energies

Table I shows the percentage of the total QCISD(T) correlation energy that is recovered by MP2, SCS-MP2 and SOS-MP2 (with  $c_{SOS} = 1.2$  and  $1.3$  respectively). It can be seen that SOS-MP2 ( $c_{SOS} = 1.3$ ) performs almost as well as SCS-MP2 in most cases. SOS-MP2 ( $c_{SOS} = 1.2$ ) does not perform as well as  $c_{SOS} = 1.3$  because in this case the value of  $c_{SOS}$  is probably insufficient to mimic the same spin component, which is absent. This results in an underestimation of the correlation energy. SOS-MP2 ( $c_{SOS} = 1.3$ ), on the other hand, approximately accounts for the absence of the same spin component with an increased scaling factor of the opposite spin component. Indeed, the average recovery percentage for SOS-MP2 ( $c_{SOS} = 1.3$ ) ( $93.3 \pm 2.9$ ) seems better than SCS-MP2 ( $92.8 \pm 1.9$ ) and MP2 ( $91.8 \pm 5.2$ ). With scaling it is of course possible to over-estimate the correlation energy. This is most acute in the case of the  $H_2$  molecule, where there is no same-spin correlation energy, and as a consequence the total correlation (104.7%) is over-estimated by SOS-MP2. However, even if one does not consider the  $H_2$  molecule in the statistics, SOS-MP2 ( $c_{SOS} = 1.3$ ) ( $92.7 \pm 1.2$ ) is on a par with SCS-MP2 ( $92.6 \pm 1.7$ ) and performs better than MP2 ( $92.4 \pm 4.6$ ), considering the range of deviation.

## 2.2 Reaction energies

Using a least-squares fitting procedure to the QCISD(T) reaction energies (see Table II) with the correlation consistent Dunning cc-pVTZ basis set, the opposite spin scaling factor  $c_{SOS}$

was optimized. Our reference set consisted of 41 reactions shown in Table II. The optimized value of  $c_{SOS}$  was determined to be between 1.2-1.25 depending upon the choice of reactions. We choose to retain the initial estimate of  $c_{SOS} = 1.3$  as the final scaling factor for two reasons. First, we found that small changes in the scaling factor ( $\pm 0.1$ ) resulted in modest rms changes of less than 0.4 kcal/mol, while, as Table I indicates,  $c_{SOS} = 1.3$  does a better job of recovering the QCISD(T) correlation energy than  $c_{SOS} = 1.2$ . Second, we have physical reasons for preferring a slightly larger scaling factor. For long-range correlation (where electrons are distinguishable) the same spin and opposite-spin contributions become equal, and so both SCS-MP2 and SOS-MP2 will underestimate the result relative to unscaled MP2. Mimicking full MP2 thus requires  $c_{SOS} = 2$  in the long-range limit, and therefore we take the larger scaling factor. Henceforth, we will refer to SOS-MP2 ( $c_{SOS} = 1.3$ ) as simply SOS-MP2.

Table II shows us that both SOS-MP2 and SCS-MP2 produce smaller errors than MP2 with respect to the QCISD(T) values in most of the reactions, and compare well with the QCISD values. Indeed, the rms errors of MP2 and QCISD come down from 4.4 and 3.8 kcal/mol to 2.2 and 2.4 kcal/mol for SCS-MP2 and SOS-MP2 respectively. In particular, MP2 struggles with reactions that involve  $^1\text{CH}_2$ , while SOS-MP2 produces the least error and does better than SCS-MP2 and QCISD. While SOS-MP2, SCS-MP2 and MP2 fare well with reactions that involve ozone ( $\text{O}_3$ ) molecule, QCISD produces the largest error in these cases. Some of the reactions that involve  $\text{N}_2$  prove to be difficult for both SOS-MP2 and SCS-MP2 and seem to be the only instance where the MP2 results are considerably better. These observations are consistent with those reported by Grimme [31]. We can conclude that SOS-MP2 and SCS-MP2 perform roughly equivalently, as can be seen from their similar rms errors (0.2 kcal/mol difference), mean absolute errors, and differences in reaction energies relative to QCISD(T) (refer Table II).

In the remainder of this section, we will test the performance of SOS-MP2 ( $c_{SOS} = 1.3$ ) by analyzing atomization energies of about 80 different molecules, barrier heights of 15 reactions and also look at the structure of some molecules that were optimized with SOS-MP2.

### 2.3 *Atomization Energies*

Table III shows the atomization energy errors obtained from various methods (MP2, SCS-MP2, SOS-MP2 and QCISD) with the QCISD(T) energy values chosen as the reference. This is appropriate because we are not trying to compensate for basis set incompleteness effects – we are attempting to compare MP2, SCS-MP2 and SOS-MP2 in a given basis set. As can be seen from Table III, SOS-MP2 provides better atomization energies than MP2 and QCISD in more than 70% of the cases. Particularly, SOS-MP2 performs really well with most of the molecules that contain fluorine and oxygen while MP2, QCISD and, in many cases (like  $\text{BF}_3$ ,  $\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{ClF}_3$ ), SCS-MP2 suffer from large errors. The exceptions where SOS-MP2 produces errors larger than MP2 seem to arise from molecules that contain nitrogen. In fact, the  $\text{N}_2$  molecule corresponds to the largest error for both SOS-MP2 and SCS-MP2. Statistical analysis shows that SOS-MP2 provides the smallest rms error (a value of 6.0 kcal/mol), followed by SCS-MP2 with 6.7 kcal/mol. This is a significant improvement when compared with the MP2 and QCISD rms errors of 10.5 kcal/mol and 8.2 kcal/mol respectively. A similar trend is observed with the mean absolute errors. The success of SOS-MP2 at reproducing atomization energies (of QCISD(T) quality) is quite remarkable considering that the scaling factor of the opposite spin component ( $c_{SOS} = 1.3$ ) was not optimized over these atomization reactions. It



again suggests that SOS-MP2 is of comparable quality to SCS-MP2, despite its greater simplicity.

#### **2.4 Molecular geometries.**

The molecules shown in Table IV were optimized using the Dunning cc-pVTZ basis. The QCISD(T) bond lengths were taken as the reference for statistical analysis. The rms values indicate that MP2 (rms = 0.0126 Å) and SOS-MP2 (rms = 0.0124 Å) perform comparably in predicting the bond lengths, while SCS-MP2 (rms = 0.0121 Å) seems slightly more favorable. We should point here that SOS-MP2 and SCS-MP2 perform as well as MP2 (or at least no more badly!) even for molecules like CN and NO that are known to be difficult systems. Also shown in Table IV are the calculated bond angles of a few molecules. QCISD(T) bond angles were set as reference. The rms and MAE values suggest that SOS-MP2 (0.11, 0.05) fares well when compared to SCS-MP2 (0.24, 0.10) and MP2 (0.20, 0.08) respectively.

#### **2.5 Barrier heights.**

Table V shows the calculated reaction barrier energies (both forward and reverse) for a set of 15 reactions adopted from Database/3 developed by Truhlar et al.<sup>34</sup> The transition state (TS) geometries were optimized at MP2/6-31G\* level and single-point calculations were further carried out using cc-pVTZ basis set similar to the calculations described before. The reaction barrier heights reported here refer to the difference in the total electronic energies between the TS and the reactants. Data in Table V shows that QCISD does the best job of predicting barrier heights of QCISD(T) quality, indicating that the correlation energy of the TS is important for the estimation of barrier heights. Both SCS-MP2 and SOS-MP2 seem to consistently overestimate

the barrier heights and fall behind MP2 when the respective rms and MAE values are compared. The extent of degradation is not severe, however.

The above observations suggest that SOS-MP2 is a very reasonable variant of Grimme's SCS-MP2 with comparable strengths (and weaknesses). Both scaled approaches improve the MP2 results and produces results of almost QCISD(T) quality for several systems. SOS-MP2 has the added advantage of completely avoiding the same spin component of the correlation energy, leading to computational advantages that are exploited in the following two sections.

### 3. 4th order algorithm using auxiliary basis expansion and Laplace transformation.

The evaluation of the opposite spin MP2 correlation energy can be performed without any 5<sup>th</sup> order steps, unlike conventional MP2 theory. This can be seen as follows. Following Almlöf [40], we eliminate the energy denominators via the identity  $\frac{1}{x} = \int_0^\infty \exp(-xt) dt$  so that:

$$E_{MP2}^{OS} = -\sum_{ia}^{\alpha} \sum_{jb}^{\beta} \frac{(ia|jb)^2}{\Delta_{ij}^{ab}} = -\int_0^\infty dt \sum_{ia}^{\alpha} \sum_{jb}^{\beta} (ia|jb)^2 \exp(-\Delta_{ij}^{ab} t) \quad (4)$$

As usual, the two-electron repulsion integrals in the molecular orbital basis are given by:

$$(ia|jb) = \int d\mathbf{r} \int d\mathbf{r}' \phi_i(\mathbf{r}) \phi_a(\mathbf{r}) \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|} \phi_j(\mathbf{r}') \phi_b(\mathbf{r}') \quad (5)$$

The energy denominators are defined in terms of the orbital energies (in the canonical basis) of occupied levels  $i,j$  and empty levels  $a,b$  as  $\Delta_{ij}^{ab} = \epsilon_a + \epsilon_b - \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j$ . Introducing a discrete quadrature (involving  $Q$  points) for the integration over  $t$  allows us to write the energy as:

$$E_{MP2}^{OS} = -\sum_q w_q \sum_{ia} \sum_{jb} (ia|jb)^2 \exp(-\Delta_{ij}^{ab} t_q) = -\sum_q \sum_{ia} \sum_{jb} \overline{(ia|jb)}^2 \quad (6)$$

The scaled canonical orbitals in Eq. (6) depend on each quadrature point  $q$  according to:

$$\bar{\phi}_i = \phi_i w_q^{1/8} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_i t_q\right) \quad (7)$$

$$\bar{\phi}_a = \phi_a w_q^{1/8} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_a t_q\right) \quad (8)$$

We next introduce an auxiliary basis for evaluation of the two-electron integrals. This is crucial for eliminating the fifth order step present in regular MP2 (and also in MP2 with an auxiliary basis). Denoting the auxiliary basis functions by  $K, L, \dots$  we can write the Coulomb fit of a two-electron integral in terms of 2 and 3-center Coulomb integrals as:

$$\overline{(ia|jb)} = \sum_K B_{ia}^K B_{jb}^K \quad (9)$$

$$B_{ia}^K = \sum_L \overline{(ia|L)} (L|K)^{-1/2} \quad (10)$$

With this additional approximation we can now re-express the OS-MP2 correlation energy as:

$$E_{MP2}^{OS} = -\sum_q \sum_{ia} \sum_{jb} \sum_{KL} B_{ia}^K B_{jb}^K B_{ia}^L B_{jb}^L = -\sum_q \sum_{KL} \bar{X}_{KL}^\alpha \bar{X}_{KL}^\beta \quad (11)$$

This working expression is now directly in terms of the auxiliary basis, where  $\mathbf{X}$  is defined as:

$$\bar{X}_{KL}^\alpha = \sum_{ia} B_{ia}^K B_{ia}^L \quad (12)$$

with the obvious analog for beta spin.

The steps and computational cost associated with implementing this algorithm are as follows:

- (1) Prepare the un-scaled  $\mathbf{B}$  coefficients from the two and three-center Coulomb integrals. This step is exactly like a conventional auxiliary basis MP2 algorithm, and requires evaluating:

$$B_{ia}^K = \sum_L \sum_{\mu\nu} \{C_{va} \{C_{\mu i}(\mu\nu|L)\}\}(L|K)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (13)$$

This requires a cubic scaling step to form the inverse square root of the 2-center Coulomb integrals, followed by fourth order steps,  $on^2N + ovnN$ , to transform the 3-center integrals, and finally another fourth order step,  $ovN^2$ , to postmultiply by the 2-center matrix function. Here  $o, v, n$  are the number of active occupied, virtual (empty) and atomic orbital functions, and  $N$  is the number of auxiliary basis functions.

(2) For each quadrature point  $q$ , scale the **B** coefficients.

$$B_{ia}^K = B_{ia}^K w_q^{1/4} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_i t_q\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_a t_q\right) \quad (14)$$

This step requires  $QovN$  operations, and is thus  $O(M^3)$  in the size of the molecule, since the number of quadrature points  $Q$  is independent of molecular size.

(3) For each quadrature point, construct the X matrix (or matrices if open shell), by evaluating Eq. (12). This step is the most expensive in the calculation and requires  $QovN^2$  operations, which is  $O(M^4)$  in the size of the molecule.

(4) Evaluate the increment to the correlation energy for the current quadrature point. This requires only quadratic effort.

#### 4. Timings

Linear alkane chains to represent one-dimensional systems and silicon clusters for three-dimensional systems were used for timings. All calculations (MP2, RI-MP2, and SOS-MP2) for timing purposes were performed on IBM Power 3 p640 servers (375Mhz) with a memory limit

of 1 GB. The standard 6-31G\* Pople-type basis set was used as the atomic orbital basis, and Ahlrich's SVP-type auxiliary basis set was used for SOSMP2. The contraction pattern of this auxiliary basis is (8s6p5d3f)/[6s5p4d1f] [20]. Weigend et al report that their optimized auxiliary basis expansions in RI-MP2 introduce errors less than 60 micro-hartree/atom compared to the canonical MP2 [20]. Comparable errors were also seen for the systems we considered here, as shown in Table VI. For example, for  $C_{50}H_{102}$ , RI-MP2 yielded an error of 3 mH, relative to the conventional MP2. Conventional MP2 energies were evaluated with a semidirect algorithm [41].

The SOS-MP2 algorithm, in which the energy denominator is absorbed into the Laplace transformed orbitals in addition to the auxiliary basis expansion, will in principle exactly reproduce the alpha-beta component of the RI-MP2 correlation energy when a sufficient number of Laplace quadrature points are used. Some additional error will be associated with the use of a modest number of quadrature points, which of course is desirable for efficiency. Table VII indeed shows that alpha-beta correlation energy in our Laplace-RI algorithm for SOS-MP2 is nearly the same as the same component from the RI-MP2 method. In achieving this accuracy, 7 quadrature points were used.

Timings are compared in Table VIII, IX and X. Table VIII shows the overall speed-ups of RI-MP2 and the RI-based SOS-MP2 codes, relative to the conventional MP2 algorithm. Both RI-MP2 and SOS-MP2 methods are about 2~4 times faster than the semidirect MP2 for linear systems, and 4~32 times faster for 3D systems. Greater speed-ups observed for 3D systems appear to be due to the larger number of significant function pairs for a system of given size, which in turn leads to repeated two-electron integral evaluation in the conventional code, due to the limited disk space available to store the half-transformed integrals. In our implementation of RI-MP2 and the Laplace-RI algorithm for SOS-MP2, the **B** matrix is stored on disk, which

requires  $oN$  disk space, while memory requirements are only quadratic. This means that calculations are limited primarily by the computer time demands.

As described in the previous section, SOS-MP2 is a 4<sup>th</sup> order-scaling correlation method, while MP2 and RI-MP2 both are formally 5<sup>th</sup> order scaling. Timings in Table VIII indeed cleanly reflect the limiting scaling behavior of each method. While RI-MP2 is faster than the Laplace RI algorithm for SOS-MP2 on small systems, the two algorithms cross over as early as at systems with roughly 500 basis functions.

In Table IX, the total timings for RI-MP2 and SOS-MP2 are decomposed into their major contributions. In RI-MP2, the formation of  $(ia|jb)$  MO integrals from the  $\mathbf{B}$  matrix is the dominant step, while in SOS-MP2, the formation of the  $\mathbf{X}$  matrix from the  $\mathbf{B}$  matrix is the most time-consuming step. The data show that the scaling of these dominant steps are indeed 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> order with the system size, respectively. To summarize, the elimination of energy denominators in RI-MP2, by absorbing them into the Laplace transformed orbitals has reduced the formal scaling of calculating the alpha-beta correlation energy to 4<sup>th</sup> order. For SOS-MP2 this will be scaled by an empirical factor described in section 2 to produce the total second order correlation energy. Interestingly, this difference in the scaling properties of the direct versus indirect correlation contributions in MP2 is reminiscent of the difference between evaluating Coulomb and exchange interactions in RI-based Hartree-Fock calculations.

## 5. Conclusions.

(1) We have proposed a simplification of Grimme's spin-component scaled (SCS) MP2 method which entirely eliminates the same-spin component of the MP2 energy, and, to

compensate, scales the opposite spin contribution by a slightly larger empirical factor. We call this method scaled opposite spin (SOS) MP2.

(2) Based on both simple arguments, and in particular detailed calculations of absolute correlation energies, we suggest that this factor should be 1.3, although further tests are no doubt desirable. Independent calculations of atomization energies suggest that there is relatively little difference in the quality of results obtained by SCS-MP2 and SOS-MP2. Both are significantly improved relative to the parent MP2 method itself, for reaction energies and atomization energies. Slight degradation is observed for reaction barriers.

(3) It is possible to evaluate the opposite spin MP2 energy (and thus the SOS-MP2 energy) with computational complexity that scales only with the 4<sup>th</sup> power of molecule size, in contrast to the usual 5<sup>th</sup> order scaling for full MP2 theory. This 4<sup>th</sup> order algorithm requires use of the resolution-of-the-identity (RI) approximation, together with a Laplace transformation to treat energy denominators. Timings show cross-overs between the two formulations occur as early as 500 basis functions.

(4) While the reduced scaling of SOS-MP2 and its improved quality relative to MP2 are very desirable, the method does have some undesirable features. First, of course is its empirical nature. Second is the fact that the best scaling factor (1.3) is not physically correct for long-range correlation where it should approach 2. Considering alternative scalings that depend on the inter-electronic distance could be a way to address this issue in the future.

(5) This 4<sup>th</sup> order form may offer a very promising starting point for lower-scaling algorithms for the opposite spin MP2 energy. We hope to report on this problem in due course.

## Acknowledgements.

This work was supported in part by funding from Q-Chem Inc via an SBIR subcontract from the National Institutes of Health, and in part by the Department of Energy through the Computational Nanosciences Program. MHG is a part owner of Q-Chem Inc.

## References.

- [1] R.G. Parr, and W. Yang, *Density-functional theory of atoms and molecules* (Oxford, New York, 1989).
- [2] W. Kohn, A.D. Becke, and R.G. Parr, *J. Phys. Chem.* **100**, 12974 (1996).
- [3] S. Kristyan, and P. Pulay, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **229**, 175 (1994).
- [4] Y.S. Jung, and M. Head-Gordon, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **6**, 2008 (2004).
- [5] A. Hesselmann, and G. Jansen, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **367**, 778 (2003).
- [6] A.J. Misquitta, B. Jeziorski, and K. Szalewicz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, (2003).
- [7] H. Rydberg, B.I. Lundqvist, D.C. Langreth, and M. Dion, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 6997 (2000).
- [8] H. Rydberg, M. Dion, N. Jacobson, E. Schroder, P. Hyldgaard, S.I. Simak, D.C. Langreth, and B.I. Lundqvist, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, (2003).
- [9] Q. Wu, and W.T. Yang, *J. Chem. Phys.* **116**, 515 (2002).
- [10] X. Xu, and W.A. Goddard, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **101**, 2673 (2004).
- [11] B.J. Lynch, P.L. Fast, M. Harris, and D.G. Truhlar, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **104**, 4811 (2000).
- [12] B.G. Johnson, C.A. Gonzales, P.M.W. Gill, and J.A. Pople, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **221**, 100 (1994).
- [13] J.A. Pople, J.S. Binkley, and R. Seeger, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **S10**, 1 (1976).
- [14] T. Van Mourik, A.K. Wilson, and T.H. Dunning, *Mol. Phys.* **96**, 529 (1999).



- [15] S.S. Xantheas, and E. Apra, J. Chem. Phys. **120**, 823 (2004).
- [16] T. Helgaker, W. Klopper, H. Koch, and J. Noga, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 9639 (1997).
- [17] E.F.C. Byrd, C.D. Sherrill, and M. Head-Gordon, J. Phys. Chem. A **105**, 9736 (2001).
- [18] T. Helgaker, J. Gauss, P. Jorgensen, and J. Olsen, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 6430 (1997).
- [19] M. Feyereisen, G. Fitzgerald, and A. Komornicki, Chem. Phys. Lett. **208**, 359 (1993).
- [20] F. Weigend, M. Haser, H. Patzelt, and R. Ahlrichs, Chem. Phys. Lett. **294**, 143 (1998).
- [21] R.A. Friesner, R.B. Murphy, M.D. Beachy, M.N. Ringnalda, W.T. Pollard, B.D. Dunietz, and Y.X. Cao, J. Phys. Chem. A **103**, 1913 (1999).
- [22] P. Pulay, S. Saebo, and K. Wolinski, Chem. Phys. Lett. **344**, 543 (2001).
- [23] P.Y. Ayala, and G.E. Scuseria, J. Chem. Phys. **110**, 3660 (1999).
- [24] P.Y. Ayala, K.N. Kudin, and G.E. Scuseria, J. Chem. Phys. **115**, 9698 (2001).
- [25] S. Saebo, and P. Pulay, Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem. **44**, 213 (1993).
- [26] M. Schutz, G. Hetzer, and H.J. Werner, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 5691 (1999).
- [27] M.S. Lee, P.E. Maslen, and M. Head-Gordon, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 3592 (2000).
- [28] H.J. Werner, F.R. Manby, and P.J. Knowles, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 8149 (2003).
- [29] T.H. Dunning, J. Chem. Phys. **90**, 1007 (1989).
- [30] W. Klopper, Mol. Phys. **99**, 481 (2001).
- [31] S. Grimme, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 9095 (2003).
- [32] M.S. Gordon, and D.G. Truhlar, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **108**, 5412 (1986).
- [33] P.L. Fast, J. Corchado, M.L. Sanchez, and D.G. Truhlar, J. Phys. Chem. A **103**, 3139 (1999).
- [34] B.J. Lynch, and D.G. Truhlar, J. Phys. Chem. A **107**, 3898 (2003).
- [35] M. Piacenza, and S. Grimme, J. Comput. Chem. **25**, 83 (2004).

- [36] S. Grimme, *J. Comput. Chem.* **24**, 1529 (2003).
- [37] F. Weigend, and M. Haser, *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **97**, 331 (1997).
- [38] R.A. Kendall, and H.A. Fruchtl, *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **97**, 158 (1997).
- [39] F. Weigend, A. Kohn, and C. Hattig, *J. Chem. Phys.* **116**, 3175 (2002).
- [40] J. Almlöf, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **181**, 319 (1991).
- [41] M. Head-Gordon, *Mol. Phys.* **96**, 673 (1999).
- [42] J. Kong, C.A. White, A.I. Krylov, D. Sherrill, R.D. Adamson, T.R. Furlani, M.S. Lee, A.M. Lee, S.R. Gwaltney, T.R. Adams, C. Ochsenfeld, A.T.B. Gilbert, G.S. Kedziora, V.A. Rassolov, D.R. Maurice, N. Nair, Y.H. Shao, N.A. Besley, P.E. Maslen, J.P. Dombroski, H. Daschel, W.M. Zhang, P.P. Korambath, J. Baker, E.F.C. Byrd, T. Van Voorhis, M. Oumi, S. Hirata, C.P. Hsu, N. Ishikawa, J. Florian, A. Warshel, B.G. Johnson, P.M.W. Gill, M. Head-Gordon, and J.A. Pople, *J. Comput. Chem.* **21**, 1532 (2000).

Table I. Total Correlation Energy (CE) recovered by MP2, SCS-MP2 and SOS-MP2 ( $c_{SOS} = 1.2$  and 1.3) relative to QCISD(T).

Molecule	QCISD(T)	MP2			SCS-MP2	SOS-MP2 (%CE)	
	(mH)	SS <sup>a</sup> (mH)	OS <sup>b</sup> (mH)	%CE	%CE	$c_{SOS} = 1.2$	$c_{SOS} = 1.3$
<sup>1</sup> CH <sub>2</sub>	-169.1	-10.2	-118.2	82.0	87.9	83.9	90.9
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub>	-340.4	-36.1	-239.4	91.5	91.5	84.4	91.4
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	-375.4	-35.5	-264.7	89.4	90.9	84.6	91.7
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>6</sub>	-414.9	-37.1	-295.8	89.2	91.5	85.6	92.7
CH <sub>4</sub>	-224.9	-18.1	-162.1	88.2	91.9	86.5	93.7
CO	-379.4	-45.6	-267.5	94.5	92.6	84.6	91.6
Cyclopropene	-533.7	-56.6	-374.1	91.3	91.2	84.1	91.1
F <sub>2</sub>	-545.6	-65.8	-391.9	95.9	94.2	86.2	93.4
H <sub>2</sub> O	-276.1	-31.8	-198.6	95.0	94.0	86.3	93.5
H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	-525.6	-61.9	-375.5	95.0	93.6	85.7	92.9
HCN	-371.8	-43.1	-263.7	94.1	92.8	85.1	92.2
HF	-281.3	-34.8	-203.0	96.9	94.8	86.6	93.8
H <sub>2</sub>	-39.3	0.0	-31.7	80.5	96.6	96.6	104.7
N <sub>2</sub>	-398.5	-49.3	-284.2	96.1	93.8	85.6	92.7
N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub>	-475.4	-51.4	-337.8	92.7	92.5	85.3	92.4
N <sub>2</sub> O	-672.1	-89.6	-479.4	98.0	94.5	85.6	92.7
NH <sub>3</sub>	-255.8	-26.0	-183.4	92.0	92.8	86.0	93.2
Ozone	-805.5	-105.3	-579.2	98.0	95.0	86.3	93.5
N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	-475.4	-51.4	-337.8	92.7	92.5	85.3	92.4
BH <sub>3</sub>	-137.6	-5.7	-102.0	82.4	91.7	88.9	96.4
			Average %	91.8 ± 5.2	92.8 ± 1.9	86.2 ± 2.7	93.3 ± 2.9
			Average % <sup>c</sup>	92.4 ± 4.6	92.6 ± 1.7	85.6 ± 1.1	92.7 ± 1.2

<sup>a</sup> Same spin component of the correlation energy

<sup>b</sup> Opposite spin component of the correlation energy

<sup>c</sup> Average %CE recovered excluding H<sub>2</sub> molecule

Table II. Calculated reaction energies with QCISD, MP2, SCS-MP2 and SOS-MP2 ( $c_{SOS} = 1.3$ ) relative to QCISD(T) in kcal/mol.

	Reaction	$\Delta E_{\text{QCISD(T)}}$	Error <sup>a</sup>			
			QCISD	MP2	SCS-MP2	SOS-MP2 <sup>b</sup>
1	$\text{F}_2 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{HF}$	-130.3	-3.2	-7.7	-2.4	0.3
2	$\text{F}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{F}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	-66.5	-2.4	-3.5	-2.0	-1.3
3	$\text{O}_3 + 3\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 3 \text{H}_2\text{O}$	-216.8	-15.4	1.6	3.2	4.0
4	$\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$	-83.7	-2.0	-4.1	-1.3	0.1
5	$\text{CO} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{O}$	-3.7	-0.2	-0.7	0.6	1.3
6	$\text{CO} + 3\text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	-61.1	-1.6	-2.1	1.7	3.7
7	$\text{N}_2 + 3\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{NH}_3$	-35.6	-2.4	1.2	5.1	7.1
8	$^1\text{CH}_2 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_4$	-128.3	0.9	-7.2	-2.2	0.4
9	$\text{N}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$	-79.3	-5.9	5.3	1.7	-0.1
10	$\text{HNO}_2 + 3\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{NH}_3$	-116.8	-5.6	-4.6	-1.6	-0.1
11	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_4$	-49.4	-1.0	2.0	2.3	2.5
12	$\text{CH}_2=\text{C}=\text{O} + 2\text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{CH}_4$	-43.1	-2.1	1.8	0.6	0.0
13	$\text{BH}_3 + 3\text{HF} \rightarrow \text{BF}_3 + 3\text{H}_2$	-98.0	1.4	-1.3	0.0	0.6
14	$\text{HCOOH} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2$	1.3	1.4	-2.5	-2.8	-2.9
15	$\text{CO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2$	-7.7	2.4	-4.1	-1.9	-0.8
16	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{HF} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{F}$	-28.3	-0.3	3.0	2.6	2.4
17	$\text{HCN} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{NH}_3$	-13.7	-1.1	3.4	2.1	1.4
18	$\text{HCN} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{HCONH}_2$	-21.9	-0.3	1.0	2.7	3.5
19	$\text{HCN} + \text{NH}_3 \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{CH}_4$	-39.2	-0.2	0.0	-1.3	-2.0
20	$\text{CO} + \text{CH}_4 \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{CHO}$	4.6	0.6	-1.4	0.8	2.0
21	$\text{O}_3 + \text{CH}_4 \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{CO}$	-155.7	-13.8	3.7	1.5	0.4
22	$\text{N}_2 + \text{F}_2 \rightarrow \text{N}_2\text{F}_2$	18.0	0.8	2.4	5.5	7.1
23	$\text{BH}_3 + 2\text{F}_2 \rightarrow \text{BF} + 3\text{HF}$	-242.5	-5.4	-11.6	-1.6	3.3
24	$2 \text{ } ^1\text{CH}_2 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_4$	-198.4	3.3	-13.3	-4.2	0.3
25	$\text{CH}_3\text{ONO} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{NO}_2$	-0.5	0.8	-5.0	-3.3	-2.4
26	$\text{CH}_2=\text{C} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_2$	-44.3	1.5	-7.9	-4.8	-3.2
27	Allene $\rightarrow$ Propyne	-1.2	-0.2	-3.5	-2.9	-2.6
28	Cyclopropene $\rightarrow$ Propyne	-23.6	-0.3	-0.3	-1.0	-1.4
29	Oxirane $\rightarrow$ $\text{CH}_3\text{CHO}$	-26.8	-0.2	1.1	0.3	-0.1
30	Vinylalcohol $\rightarrow$ $\text{CH}_3\text{CHO}$	-10.1	-0.4	-0.3	-1.0	-1.4
31	$\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{}^1\text{CH}_2 \rightarrow \text{C}_3\text{H}_6$	-114.4	1.7	-8.3	-2.3	0.6

32	$^3\text{CH}_2 \rightarrow ^1\text{CH}_2$	10.3	0.9	5.1	-0.9	-3.9
33	$\text{HF} + \text{H}^+ \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{F}^+$	-124.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	-0.2
34	$\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{H}^+ \rightarrow \text{H}_3\text{O}^+$	-172.9	-0.5	0.9	-0.1	-0.6
35	$\text{NH}_3 + \text{H}^+ \rightarrow \text{H}_4\text{N}^+$	-214.6	-0.6	1.0	-0.5	-1.2
36	$\text{F}^- + \text{H}^+ \rightarrow \text{HF}$	-401.4	0.5	2.3	1.2	0.7
37	$\text{OH}^- + \text{H}^+ \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}$	-423.2	-0.1	2.1	0.8	0.1
38	$\text{NH}_2^- + \text{H}^+ \rightarrow \text{NH}_3$	-434.6	-0.7	1.6	-0.1	-0.9
39	$2\text{NH}_3 \rightarrow (\text{NH}_3)_2$	-1.3	0.2	-0.1	0.3	0.4
40	$2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow (\text{H}_2\text{O})_2$	-5.9	0.3	-0.2	0.3	0.6
41	$2\text{HF} \rightarrow (\text{HF})_2$	-4.2	0.1	-0.1	0.2	0.4
		MAE <sup>c</sup>	2.0	3.2	1.8	1.7
		Rms <sup>d</sup>	3.8	4.4	2.2	2.4
		MAX <sup>e</sup>	15.4	13.3	5.5	7.1
		MSE <sup>f</sup>	-1.2	-1.2	-0.1	0.4

<sup>a</sup>  $\Delta E - \Delta E_{\text{QCISD}(T)}$

<sup>b</sup>  $c_{\text{SOS}} = 1.3$

<sup>c</sup> mean absolute error

<sup>d</sup> root mean square error,  $\sqrt{\sum(\Delta E - \Delta E_{\text{QCISD}(T)})^2 / N}$ ,  $N = 41$

<sup>e</sup> maximum absolute error

<sup>f</sup> mean signed error

Table III. Calculated atomization energies relative to QCISD(T) in kcal/mol

Molecule	$\Delta E_{\text{QCISD(T)}}$	Error <sup>a</sup>			
		QCISD	MP2	SCS-MP2	SOS-MP2 <sup>b</sup>
<sup>1</sup> CH <sub>2</sub>	210.0	0.1	6.0	5.9	5.8
<sup>3</sup> CH <sub>2</sub>	186.6	-0.8	-0.1	-1.3	-1.9
BF	178.1	-3.5	8.3	3.1	0.5
BF <sub>3</sub>	459.6	-7.3	26.2	10.5	2.7
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub>	393.3	-7.6	9.9	6.7	5.1
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	551.1	-6.7	3.0	3.5	3.8
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>6</sub>	699.2	-5.7	-0.1	2.9	4.4
CH <sub>3</sub> CHO	660.2	-10.2	11.7	8.3	6.7
CH <sub>3</sub> ONO	577.3	-18.6	17.3	12.1	9.4
CH <sub>4</sub>	413.0	-2.6	-2.7	1.0	2.8
CO	251.8	-7.1	13.0	8.2	5.8
CO <sub>2</sub>	376.2	-12.5	25.3	13.9	8.3
Cyclopropene	663.1	-11.2	12.9	7.9	5.4
F <sub>2</sub>	34.9	-6.6	5.0	1.9	0.4
F <sub>2</sub> O	85.0	-12.0	9.7	3.7	0.8
FCI	55.2	-4.5	5.6	2.3	0.6
H <sub>2</sub>	108.4	0.0	-4.8	-0.8	1.1
H <sub>2</sub> O	225.0	-3.0	3.4	3.0	2.8
H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	258.0	-7.9	7.5	5.5	4.5
HCHO	363.9	-6.9	8.8	6.8	5.7
HCN	301.2	-8.5	11.6	11.1	10.8
HCOOH	485.9	-11.0	18.0	10.3	6.5
HF	136.8	-1.7	4.0	1.7	0.6
Ketene	517.0	-11.6	17.5	10.0	6.2
N <sub>2</sub>	215.5	-9.0	12.9	15.1	16.3
N <sub>2</sub> F <sub>2</sub>	232.4	-16.5	15.5	11.5	9.5
NH <sub>3</sub>	288.1	-3.3	-1.4	3.8	6.3
O <sub>2</sub>	113.2	-7.8	12.2	0.2	-5.9
Ozone	133.2	-24.2	26.1	14.7	9.0
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	591.1	-4.9	0.3	1.6	2.3

CCH	254.0	-6.3	-0.3	-7.1	-10.6
CH <sub>3</sub> OH	500.1	-6.0	4.8	5.0	5.1
CH <sub>3</sub> Cl	385.3	-4.7	3.1	2.6	2.3
CH <sub>3</sub> SH	461.6	-5.5	0.4	2.3	3.3
CH <sub>3</sub>	301.7	-1.6	-1.9	0.2	1.2
ClF <sub>3</sub>	105.0	-13.8	19.4	6.1	-0.5
CN	169.1	-7.5	-5.3	-9.2	-11.2
CS	162.9	-8.5	7.4	3.4	1.4
SO	114.6	-6.9	9.1	0.8	-3.3
H <sub>2</sub> S	177.2	-2.0	-2.7	0.0	1.4
HCl	103.9	-1.3	0.4	0.2	0.0
HCO	270.1	-6.9	10.5	5.5	3.1
HOCl	156.4	-6.0	6.3	3.6	2.3
N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>4</sub>	420.6	-7.3	0.8	8.1	11.7
NF <sub>3</sub>	191.9	-13.7	15.1	6.8	2.7
PF <sub>3</sub>	340.4	-8.3	20.0	10.5	5.8
NH	79.2	-0.9	-3.0	0.5	2.2
NH <sub>2</sub>	175.3	-2.1	-3.2	2.2	4.9
OH	102.9	-1.4	0.1	1.0	1.5
Oxirane	633.4	-10.5	12.8	8.6	6.6
PH <sub>2</sub>	148.1	-1.0	-6.8	-0.7	2.4
PH <sub>3</sub>	233.4	-1.7	-8.5	-0.3	3.8
SH	84.0	-0.9	-2.0	-0.2	0.7
Si <sub>2</sub> H <sub>6</sub>	520.6	-2.7	-11.5	-0.4	5.2
Si <sub>2</sub>	69.0	-6.5	0.1	-3.4	-5.1
P <sub>2</sub>	104.0	-9.1	3.0	4.8	5.6
S <sub>2</sub>	93.4	-6.3	5.4	-0.5	-3.5
Cl <sub>2</sub>	52.1	-4.0	4.3	1.2	-0.4
<sup>1</sup> SiH <sub>2</sub>	170.2	0.5	2.6	4.7	5.8
<sup>3</sup> SiH <sub>2</sub>	129.3	-0.4	-2.9	-1.8	-1.2
SiH <sub>3</sub>	222.1	-0.6	-5.7	-0.5	2.1
SiH <sub>4</sub>	316.9	-0.8	-8.2	0.2	4.4
SiO	181.4	-7.1	12.2	7.6	5.3
SO <sub>2</sub>	232.5	-14.9	24.2	13.4	8.0

BH <sub>3</sub>	276.2	-0.7	-1.4	2.8	5.0
CH <sub>3</sub> NH <sub>2</sub>	566.2	-6.4	0.7	5.8	8.3
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> F	558.5	-9.0	10.8	5.8	3.3
HNO <sub>2</sub>	296.2	-14.8	15.2	10.6	8.4
Vinylalcohol	650.1	-10.6	11.5	7.3	5.2
CH <sub>2</sub> =C	349.1	-6.1	1.9	1.9	1.9
CH <sub>3</sub> CN	597.6	-11.7	14.7	13.1	12.3
(NH <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub>	573.6	-6.7	-2.2	7.4	12.2
(H <sub>2</sub> O) <sub>2</sub>	455.9	-6.2	6.9	5.6	5.0
HCONH <sub>2</sub>	548.1	-11.2	14.0	11.4	10.1
Propyne	686.7	-10.9	13.2	8.9	6.8
B <sub>2</sub> H <sub>6</sub>	552.4	-1.5	-2.9	5.7	9.9
(HF) <sub>2</sub>	277.8	-3.5	8.0	3.2	0.8
	rms	8.2	10.5	6.7	6.0
	MAE	6.6	8.2	5.2	4.9
	MSE	-6.6	6.1	4.5	3.7
	MAX	24.2	26.2	15.1	16.3

<sup>a</sup>  $\Delta E - \Delta E_{\text{QCISD(T)}}$

<sup>b</sup>  $c_{\text{SOS}} = 1.3$



Table IV. Molecular geometries obtained from optimization calculations.<sup>a</sup>

Molecule	QCISD(T)	MP2	SCS-MP2	SOS-MP2 <sup>b</sup>
<i>Bond Lengths (Å)</i>				
H <sub>2</sub>	0.7424	0.7371	0.7375	0.7375
N <sub>2</sub>	1.1043	1.1136	1.1098	1.1080
CH <sub>4</sub>	1.0891	1.0853	1.0869	1.0877
H <sub>2</sub> O	0.9594	0.9591	0.9594	0.9594
F <sub>2</sub>	1.4155	1.3977	1.4088	1.4148
BF	1.2722	1.2682	1.2682	1.2682
CN	1.1791	1.1265	1.1228	1.1211
CO	1.1368	1.1384	1.1361	1.1350
FCI	1.6455	1.6358	1.6424	1.6459
HCHO (C=O)	1.2102	1.2104	1.2097	1.2094
(C-H)	1.1036	1.1004	1.1007	1.1008
HF	0.9175	0.9182	0.9182	0.9182
HF <sup>+</sup>	1.0019	1.0001	1.0001	0.9997
NO	1.1592	1.1371	1.1364	1.1361
O <sub>2</sub>	1.2133	1.2243	1.2112	1.2056
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub> (C≡C)	1.2103	1.2114	1.2099	1.2092
(C-H)	1.0636	1.0615	1.0620	1.0622
NH <sub>3</sub>	1.0142	1.0114	1.0123	1.0128
CO <sub>2</sub>	1.1673	1.1693	1.1673	1.1663
HCN (C≡N)	1.1607	1.1668	1.1640	1.1628
(C-H)	1.0670	1.0643	1.0645	1.0647
<sup>1</sup> CH <sub>2</sub>	1.1106	1.1044	1.1057	1.1064
<sup>3</sup> CH <sub>2</sub>	1.0785	1.0736	1.0744	1.0747
F <sub>2</sub> O	1.4112	1.4012	1.4088	1.4131
SiH <sub>4</sub>	1.4826	1.4774	1.4779	1.4779
H <sub>2</sub> S	1.3407	1.3352	1.3366	1.3371
PH <sub>2</sub>	1.4229	1.4150	1.4165	1.4170
	MSE <sup>c</sup>	-0.0050	-0.0048	-0.0047
	rms <sup>c</sup>	0.0126	0.0121	0.0124
	MAE <sup>c</sup>	0.0074	0.0056	0.0054
	MAX <sup>c</sup>	0.0525	0.0562	0.0580
<i>Bond Angles (degrees)</i>				
CH <sub>4</sub>	109.47	109.47	109.47	109.47

H <sub>2</sub> O	103.62	103.51	103.62	103.62
HCHO (CCH)	121.94	121.87	121.89	121.91
(HCH)	116.12	116.26	116.21	116.19
NH <sub>3</sub>	105.63	105.96	105.95	105.91
<sup>1</sup> CH <sub>2</sub>	101.61	101.81	101.81	101.76
F <sub>2</sub> O	103.12	102.88	102.76	103.23
SiH <sub>4</sub>	109.47	109.47	109.47	109.47
H <sub>2</sub> S	92.25	92.55	92.65	92.30
PH <sub>2</sub>	91.99	92.27	92.36	91.86
	MAE <sup>c</sup>	0.08	0.10	0.05
	rms <sup>c</sup>	0.20	0.24	0.11
	MAX <sup>c</sup>	0.17	0.18	0.08
	MSE <sup>c</sup>	0.33	0.40	0.27

---

<sup>a</sup> cc-pVTZ basis

<sup>b</sup>  $c_{SOS} = 1.3$

<sup>c</sup> with QCISD(T) as reference

Table V. Calculated errors in reaction energy barriers with QCISD(T) as reference. Both forward and reverse barrier heights (in parentheses) are shown for each reaction in kcal/mol.

Reaction	$\Delta E_{\text{QCISD(T)}}$	Error <sup>a</sup>			
		QCISD	MP2	SCS-MP2	SOS-MP2 <sup>b</sup>
Cl + H <sub>2</sub> → HCl + H	10.0(5.5)	1.8(0.4)	-1.1(4.1)	2.7(3.7)	4.6(3.5)
OH + H <sub>2</sub> → H + H <sub>2</sub> O	6.4(20.2)	1.5(-0.2)	1.4(9.5)	4.3(7.1)	5.7(5.9)
CH <sub>3</sub> + H <sub>2</sub> → H + CH <sub>4</sub>	12.1(15.1)	1.1(0.2)	0.9(4.9)	2.5(4.1)	3.3(3.8)
OH + CH <sub>4</sub> → CH <sub>3</sub> + H <sub>2</sub> O	7.4(18.3)	2.2(1.5)	1.0(5.0)	4.3(5.5)	6.0(5.7)
H + CH <sub>3</sub> OH → CH <sub>2</sub> OH + H <sub>2</sub>	9.5(15.6)	0.6(1.2)	4.9(0.6)	4.8(2.1)	4.7(2.9)
H + H <sub>2</sub> → H <sub>2</sub> + H	10.0(10.0)	0.3(0.3)	3.3(3.3)	3.5(3.5)	3.6(3.6)
OH + NH <sub>3</sub> → H <sub>2</sub> O + NH <sub>2</sub>	4.3(13.6)	2.7(2.3)	3.3(4.8)	6.6(7.0)	8.3(8.1)
HCl + CH <sub>3</sub> → Cl + CH <sub>4</sub>	2.2(9.6)	1.5(1.9)	0.5(-0.7)	2.0(2.6)	2.7(4.3)
OH + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>6</sub> → H <sub>2</sub> O + C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	4.6(18.7)	2.3(1.6)	1.4(5.2)	4.8(5.5)	6.5(5.6)
F + H <sub>2</sub> → H + HF	2.2(30.7)	1.0(-0.7)	3.0(11.8)	5.6(8.1)	6.8(6.3)
H + PH <sub>3</sub> → PH <sub>2</sub> + H <sub>2</sub>	2.0(25.0)	0.6(1.3)	3.7(0.5)	3.9(2.7)	4.1(3.8)
H + ClH' → HCl + H'	19.8(19.8)	1.0(1.0)	4.6(4.6)	5.4(5.4)	5.8(5.8)
OH + H → H <sub>2</sub> + O	10.0(15.5)	0.2(1.5)	7.0(2.1)	6.4(4.5)	6.1(5.7)
H + H <sub>2</sub> S → H <sub>2</sub> + HS	3.5(18.7)	0.6(1.7)	3.8(-0.4)	3.8(2.7)	3.8(4.3)
CH <sub>4</sub> + NH → NH <sub>2</sub> + CH <sub>3</sub>	23.4(8.2)	2.0(1.8)	1.5(2.1)	3.2(4.1)	4.1(5.1)
	MSE <sup>c</sup>	1.2	3.2	4.4	5.0
	rms <sup>c</sup>	1.4	4.3	4.7	5.2
	MAE <sup>c</sup>	1.2	3.4	4.4	5.0
	MAX <sup>c</sup>	2.7	11.8	8.1	8.3

<sup>a</sup>  $\Delta E - \Delta E_{\text{QCISD(T)}}$

<sup>b</sup>  $c_{\text{SOS}} = 1.3$

<sup>c</sup> considering both forward and reverse barrier data ( $N = 30$ )

Table VI. Accuracy of RIMP2, relative to the canonical MP2, with optimized SVP-type auxiliary basis set. Energies are in hartrees.

	Nbas <sup>a</sup>	MP2	RIMP2	Error
<b><i>1D</i></b>				
C <sub>10</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	194	-1.317544	-1.316951	-0.000593
C <sub>20</sub> H <sub>42</sub>	384	-2.631574	-2.630387	-0.001187
C <sub>30</sub> H <sub>62</sub>	574	-3.945605	-3.943822	-0.001782
C <sub>40</sub> H <sub>82</sub>	764	-5.259634	-5.257257	-0.002377
C <sub>50</sub> H <sub>102</sub>	954	-6.573645	-6.570673	-0.002972
<b><i>3D</i></b>				
Si <sub>9</sub> H <sub>14</sub>	199	-0.738268	-0.737022	-0.001246
Si <sub>21</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	443	-1.781793	-1.779456	-0.002337
Si <sub>41</sub> H <sub>38</sub>	855	-3.543034	-3.537852	-0.005182

<sup>a</sup> Number of atomic orbital basis functions

Table VII. Accuracy of SOSMP2 with optimized SVP-type auxiliary basis set, compared to the opposite spin component of RIMP2 correlation energy (OS-RIMP2). 7 quadrature points were used in achieving the following accuracy. Energies are in hartrees.

	OS-RIMP2	SOSMP2	<sup>a</sup> Error
<b><i>1D</i></b>			
C <sub>10</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	-1.006416	-1.006417	0.000002
C <sub>20</sub> H <sub>42</sub>	-2.003362	-2.003362	0.000000
C <sub>30</sub> H <sub>62</sub>	-3.000309	-3.000307	-0.000002
C <sub>40</sub> H <sub>82</sub>	-3.997255	-3.997252	-0.000003
C <sub>50</sub> H <sub>102</sub>	-4.994189	-4.994185	-0.000004
<b><i>3D</i></b>			
Si <sub>9</sub> H <sub>14</sub>	-0.579078	-0.579079	0.000001
Si <sub>21</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	-1.348226	-1.348221	-0.000005
Si <sub>41</sub> H <sub>38</sub>	-2.644667	-2.644660	-0.000007

Table VIII. RIMP2 and SOSMP2 speed-ups, relative to the conventional MP2.

	MP2 <sup>a</sup>	RIMP2 <sup>a</sup>	SOSMP2 <sup>a</sup>	RIMP2 speed-up	SOSMP2 speed-up
<b><i>1D</i></b>					
C <sub>10</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	158	53	98	3.0	1.6
C <sub>20</sub> H <sub>42</sub>	2719	893	1145	3.0	2.4
C <sub>30</sub> H <sub>62</sub>	13400	5681	4955	2.4	2.7
C <sub>40</sub> H <sub>82</sub>	45490	21540	14550	2.1	3.1
C <sub>50</sub> H <sub>102</sub>	144400	58640	34130	2.5	4.2
<b><i>3D</i></b>					
Si <sub>9</sub> H <sub>14</sub>	245	36	75	6.8	3.3
Si <sub>21</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	5588	759	1126	7.4	5.0
Si <sub>41</sub> H <sub>38</sub>	417400	14410	13110	29.0	31.8

<sup>a</sup> Timings are in seconds, on a 375 MHz IBM Power3-based computer (p640)

Table IX. RIMP2 detailed timings in seconds, on a 375 MHz IBM Power3-based computer  
(p640)

	$(K L)^{-1/2}$	$(ia K)$	$B_{ia}^K$	$(ia jb)$	total
<b>1D</b>					
C <sub>10</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	11	13	6	22	53
C <sub>20</sub> H <sub>42</sub>	84	114	89	606	893
C <sub>30</sub> H <sub>62</sub>	273	423	435	4550	5681
C <sub>40</sub> H <sub>82</sub>	611	1095	1394	18440	21540
C <sub>50</sub> H <sub>102</sub>	1090	2226	3254	52070	58640
<b>3D</b>					
Si <sub>9</sub> H <sub>14</sub>	9	13	4	10	36
Si <sub>21</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	95	139	85	440	759
Si <sub>41</sub> H <sub>38</sub>	910	1594	1098	10810	14410

Table X. SOSMP2 detailed timings in seconds. The steps (and the timings) for making  $(K|L)^{-1/2}$ ,  $(ia|K)$ , and the  $\mathbf{B}$  matrix are identical to those of RIMP2 (above in Table IX), and therefore are omitted here.

	$X_{KL}$	Total
<b>1D</b>		
C <sub>10</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	63	98
C <sub>20</sub> H <sub>42</sub>	803	1145
C <sub>30</sub> H <sub>62</sub>	3585	4955
C <sub>40</sub> H <sub>82</sub>	11030	14550
C <sub>50</sub> H <sub>102</sub>	26520	34130
<b>3D</b>		
Si <sub>9</sub> H <sub>14</sub>	45	75
Si <sub>21</sub> H <sub>22</sub>	757	1126
Si <sub>41</sub> H <sub>38</sub>	9083	13110