

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Efficient Implementation of NOCI-MP2 Using the Resolution of the Identity Approximation with Application to Charged Dimers and Long C—C Bonds in Ethane Derivatives

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2g4304dh>

Journal

Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation, 14(9)

ISSN

1549-9618

Authors

Yost, Shane R

Head-Gordon, Martin

Publication Date

2018-09-11

DOI

10.1021/acs.jctc.8b00697

Peer reviewed

This document is confidential and is proprietary to the American Chemical Society and its authors. Do not copy or disclose without written permission. If you have received this item in error, notify the sender and delete all copies.

Efficient Implementation of NOCI-MP2 using the Resolution of the Identity Approximation with Application to Charged Dimers and Long C-C Bonds in Ethane Derivatives

Journal:	<i>Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation</i>
Manuscript ID	ct-2018-00697r
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Jul-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Yost, Shane; Texas State University San Marcos Head-Gordon, Martin; University of California, Berkeley, Chemistry

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Efficient implementation of NOCI-MP2 using the resolution of the identity approximation with application to charged dimers and long C-C bonds in ethane derivatives

Shane R. Yost^{†,‡,¶} and Martin Head-Gordon^{*,‡,¶}

[†]*Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Texas State University, San Marcos TX 78666*

[‡]*Department of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley CA 94720*

[¶]*Chemical Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley CA 94720*

E-mail: mhg@cchem.berkeley.edu

Abstract

An efficient implementation of the perturb-then-diagonalize non-orthogonal configuration interaction method with second order Møller-Plesset perturbation theory (NOCI-MP2) is presented. Relative to other low scaling multireference perturbation theories, NOCI-MP2 often requires a much smaller active space because of the use of non-orthogonal reference configurations. Reworking the NOCI-MP2 equations with the resolution of the identity (RI) approximation enables the method to have the same memory requirements and computational scaling as single reference RI-MP2. The working equations are extended to include single substitutions as required when the reference determinants do not satisfy the Hartree-Fock equations. A detailed computational algorithm is presented along with timings to establish the performance of the

1
2
3 implementation. NOCI-MP2 is applied to the binding energy and charge resonance
4 energy in dication and monocation π dimers, as well as di-diamantane ethane, and
5 hexaphenyl ethane. A well-defined set of non-orthogonal determinants are obtained us-
6 ing absolutely localized molecular orbitals (ALMOs), as solutions to the self-consistent
7 field for molecular interactions (SCF-MI) equations corresponding to covalent and ionic
8 determinants. Agreement with experimental information where available, and other
9 multi-reference methods, is satisfactory, with the use of an 0.3 a.u. level shift to guard
10 against large MP2 amplitudes. For di-diamantane ethane and hexaphenyl ethane, large
11 dispersion forces help stabilize the molecules despite the steric repulsion. By contrast,
12 in the case of hexaphenyl ethane, the energy penalty from the geometric distortion of
13 the fragments significantly weakens the bond.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Introduction

27
28
29 Standard electronic structure methods, such as Kohn-Sham density functional theory (DFT)
30 are able to treat most energy differences associated with non-covalent interactions, isomer-
31 ization energies, atomization energies, and barrier heights in molecules with increasing ac-
32 curacy.¹⁻⁵ However, striking degradation occurs for some classes of problems.⁶ In fact, only
33 high levels of wavefunction-based electronic structure theory can accurately describe chemi-
34 cal problems such as bond breaking,⁷⁻⁹ avoided crossings,¹⁰⁻¹² antiferromagnetically coupled
35 metal centers,¹³⁻¹⁵ and polyradical systems.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ In these cases, a single Hartree-Fock (HF)
36 (or Kohn-Sham) determinant is not able to properly describe the electronic wavefunction
37 because the mean field approximation is not adequate to describe a set of strongly corre-
38 lated electrons. The exact full configuration interaction (FCI) method captures both strong
39 correlation and weak correlations by composing the electronic wavefunction as a linear com-
40 bination of all possible single determinants. However, FCI scales exponentially with the
41 number of electrons when computed exactly. Therefore there is much research activity on
42 methods that approximate FCI, such as the density matrix renormalization group,¹⁹⁻²¹ FCI
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 quantum Monte-Carlo,²²⁻²⁴ and related adaptive CI methods.²⁵⁻²⁷
4

5 Alternatively, approximate multireference (MR) electronic structure theories²⁸ are de-
6 signed to enable the inclusion of just the essential configurations in the reference itself,
7 which can therefore be dramatically more compact than either FCI or any accurate approx-
8 imation. For instance, in lithium fluoride, a single reference description works well in the
9 bonded region where the ionic configuration is dominant. Likewise, a covalent spin-polarized
10 single configuration of two neutral atoms is adequate at dissociation. But at intermedi-
11 ate separations, the wavefunction has essential contributions (> 25%) from both the ionic
12 and covalent configurations, and is multireference in character. In an approximate MR the-
13 ory the total wavefunction is then just a linear combination of these more dominant single
14 reference wavefunctions. The most common method of this type is complete active space
15 self-consistent field (CASSCF).^{29,30} In CASSCF one defines a set of occupied and unoccupied
16 orbitals as the active space, and the total wavefunction is then defined as a small FCI wave-
17 function in that active space. CASSCF computational costs increase exponentially with the
18 size of the active space, which can be reduced by approximations that truncate the number
19 of determinants,^{31,32} in addition to the FCI approximations mentioned above.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 While CASSCF is most widely used, there are other treatments of strong correlation
36 worth mentioning. Spin-flip CAS (SF-CAS) methods is one alternative that has attracted
37 recent interest.³³⁻³⁵ Valence bond (VB) methods are another approach that captures essen-
38 tial electron correlations within a very compact pairing wavefunction. VB methods range
39 from classical valence bond approaches^{36,37} to exponential-scaling spin-coupled VB,³⁸ to its
40 low scaling coupled cluster valence bond approximation,^{8,39} to breathing orbital VB wave-
41 functions^{40,41} that mix together two or more VB wavefunctions to capture resonance effects.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Alternatively, a very general approach to strong correlation is to variationally combine a
50 set of determinants that are individually energy optimized. One early example are ionization
51 energies corresponding to valence oxygen hole states in the tetrahedral CrO_4^{2-} ion,⁴² where
52 HF breaks spatial symmetry to localize the hole on a single O atom. Non-orthogonal CI
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(NOCI) between the 4 symmetry broken solutions is a compact and natural description of such states.^{42,43} The same authors explored a similar NOCI approach for describing magnetic interactions between localized spin centers, to obtain the coupling constants that enter the Heisenberg model Hamiltonian.⁴⁴ In general, NOCI can be performed^{45,46} on as many SCF solutions as one can identify,⁴⁷ although typically the higher determinants are not true minima in Hilbert space. Alternatively, approaches can be developed to define those determinants that contribute to essential correlation (e.g. ionic and covalent determinants).⁴⁸ In all these approaches, since each determinant undergoes orbital relaxation, the final set of HF determinants are non-orthogonal because they do not share the same set of molecular orbitals. NOCI is the reference of interest in this work.

Beyond the strong or essential correlation is the remaining weak or dynamic correlation. For simple problems, dynamic correlation is efficiently captured by well-established single reference methods such as coupled cluster (CC) theory⁴⁹ and Møller-Plesset (MP) perturbation theory.⁵⁰ From a CASSCF reference, there are many different methods that correct for the effects of weak correlation using either coupled cluster theory^{51,52} or perturbation theory^{53,54} corrections to a multireference wavefunction problem. MRCC methods are capable of obtaining highly accurate results but the computational cost scales at least as the number of determinants in the MR wavefunction multiplied by the scaling of the coupled cluster approximation. Beginning from a classical VB starting point,³⁶ VBPT2 has been developed as a correction for dynamical correlation^{55,56} that plays a role akin to CASPT2 corrections to CASSCF.

MRPT can be formulated as either a non-degenerate (diagonalize-then-perturb) or a quasi-degenerate (perturb-then-diagonalize) fashion. Diagonalize-then-perturb methods include the commonly used CASPT2 method⁵⁷ in which the PT expansion involves iterative N^5 steps to obtain the final energy. CASPT2 combines low computational cost with nearly quantitative accuracy. However, it requires expertise to select an appropriate active space and a suitable level shift for the PT2 correction.⁵⁸ For avoided crossings and conical intersec-

1
2
3 tions, one needs to use the multi-state CASPT2 approach, which involves M^2N^5 computa-
4 tional effort, where M is the number of state-averaged CAS states.⁵⁹ The n-electron valence
5 states for multireference perturbation theory (NEVPT)^{60,61} also uses the CASSCF reference
6 wavefunction with a different definition of the zeroth order Hamiltonian, and has similar
7 computational cost (it can even be lower when internally contracted). The state specific
8 MRPT theory by Mukherjee and co-workers^{51,62} uses a different perturbation expansion to
9 avoid the need for an orbital level shift and is formally size extensive. However, the increased
10 robustness comes with increased computational cost. Perturb-then-diagonalize approaches
11 include methods like the generalized van Vleck perturbation theory (GVVPT2),^{63,64} the ef-
12 fective valence shell Hamiltonian,⁵³ and the intermediate Hamiltonian method.⁶⁵ GVVPT2
13 is a more accurate and stable method, but more computationally expensive than the other
14 perturb-then-diagonalize approaches.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Beginning from a NOCI reference rather than CASSCF, one perturb-then-diagonalize
method that was introduced years ago⁶⁶ but not fully realized until recently is NOCI-
MP2.^{67,68} Note that only the most recently reported formulation of NOCI-MP2 is size-
consistent.⁶⁸ In NOCI-MP2, each NOCI determinant is expanded to first order correction in
Møller-Plesset perturbation theory. Both Hamiltonian and overlap matrix elements of the
NOCI problem are corrected via MP theory before diagonalizing. The advantage of using
the non-orthogonal approach is that orbital relaxation introduces some of the missing weak
electronic correlation. This has been shown in both the NOCI^{45,46} and breathing orbital
valence bond approach^{41,69} to yield improved results over their strictly orthogonal counter-
parts. Both NOCI and NOCI-MP2 methods can often use significantly smaller active space
sizes^{46,67,68} than conventional active space methods.

A main objective of this paper is to report the first efficient implementation of the NOCI-
MP2 method with the inclusion of singles excitations, which therefore opens the way for large-
scale testing and applications. The computational cost of NOCI-MP2 scales as $N_o^2N_v^3$ with a
memory demand that scales as $N_o^2N_v^2$. The memory requirement is associated with storage

1
2
3 of the full set of two-electron integrals, and it can be reduced by employing the resolution
4 of the identity (RI) approximation in the PT2 correction.^{70,71} The RI approximation does
5 not introduce significant errors with an appropriately chosen basis set, but can reduce the
6 memory cost to $N_v N_{aux}$. The methodological part of this paper will summarize the working
7 equations of NOCI-MP2, which are extended to include contributions from single excitations.
8 This permits use of non-Hartree-Fock determinants (i.e. which do not satisfy the Brillouin
9 condition) within the NOCI reference. We next focus on introducing the RI approximation
10 within the NOCI-MP2 framework and present the algorithms used to evaluate the steps that
11 are important for efficient evaluation. Finally, we discuss how the computation of the off
12 diagonal matrix elements scale with basis set size when compared to the RI-MP2 method.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The results presented in this paper have three separate components. The first part in-
24 volves assessment of the observed computational cost of the NOCI-MP2 implementation
25 as a function of molecular size, relative to single reference RI-MP2. The second part is a
26 short study of antiferromagnetically coupled dimer dications and radical monocation dimers.
27 These species are examples of multicenter long-bond complexes (about 3.7 Å for TCNE^{-•}-
28 TCNE^{-•}) that are attracting interest in the context of both novel chemical bonding and
29 possible relevance to organic materials.^{72,73} The third part is a NOCI-MP2 study of the un-
30 usually long C-C single bond in the sterically crowded di-diamantane ethane and hexaphenyl
31 ethane molecules. While alkanes normally have C-C single bond lengths of roughly 1.54 Å,
32 the di-diamantane molecule was synthesized and characterized by crystallography as having
33 a C-C single bond that is 1.65 Å. Chemical bonding in these compounds can be viewed as
34 a tradeoff between Pauli repulsion between the bulky side groups (which forces lengthening
35 and destabilization of the bond), and attractive London dispersion which provides compen-
36 sating stabilization. However, this interpretation has been recently challenged,⁷⁴ with an
37 alternative explanation in terms of small radical stabilization energy. Regardless of the de-
38 tails of interpretation, di-diamantane and hexaphenyl ethane can be viewed as models for
39 how these effects play out in more complex supramolecular systems.⁷⁵
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Theory

Here we present the equations and algorithms for the RI approximation within the size consistent version of NOCI-MP2. The notation we use is described in Table 1. For simplicity, we use spin orbitals in the equations and algorithms, but of course the implementation is accomplished in terms of (unrestricted) spatial orbitals.

Table 1: Summary of index conventions.

Notation	Description
i, j, k, l	occupied spin orbital
a, b, c, d	virtual spin orbital
p, q, r, s	any spin orbital
$\tilde{i}, \tilde{j}, \tilde{k}, \tilde{l}$	occupied corresponding spin orbital
P, Q	auxiliary basis function
superscript A, B	NOCI state
N	number of basis functions
N_o	number of occupied spin orbitals
N_v	number of virtual spin orbitals
N_{aux}	number of auxiliary basis functions
$S_{\tilde{p}\tilde{q}}$	$\langle^A\psi_{\tilde{p}} ^B\psi_{\tilde{q}}\rangle$

NOCI-MP2 Ansatz

We refer the reader to previous work on the NOCI-MP2 method for the derivation of the size consistent formulation.⁶⁸ In this work we present what was previously called version 2 of the NOCI-MP2 method outlined in ref. 68, because this version includes the contribution of the MP2 overlap in the final set of equations. There is no significant computational cost difference between the two different size consistent variations of NOCI-MP2, because the MP2 overlap is freely obtained during the computation of the Hamiltonian. Version 1, also size-consistent, is obtained simply by removing some terms from version 2, and thus is a special case of the theory presented below.⁶⁸

In this paper we will introduce extra terms in the expansion of the wavefunction corresponding to singles amplitudes, which are non-zero only if the occupied-virtual block of

the Fock matrix is non-zero. In earlier work 66–68 the different NOCI determinants are all chosen to be solutions to the HF equation. Each NOCI state is made up of a set of canonical orbitals that fully diagonalize the Fock matrix. In the results section below, we will use other computational tools to find solutions to modified HF equations that do not fully diagonalize the Fock matrix. It is important to consider singles excitations for these cases because they are no longer strictly zero. Of course, if a NOCI determinant does fully diagonalize its Fock matrix, then all of the single excitation terms can be ignored in the NOCI-MP2 computation.

Given a set of NOCI determinants, $\{|^A\Psi\rangle\}$, that are expanded out to their first order correction in MP perturbation theory, $|^A\Psi\rangle = |^A\Psi^{(0)}\rangle + |^A\Psi^{(1)}\rangle$, then the size consistent NOCI-MP2 ansatz is:

$$\langle ^A\Psi|\hat{H}|^B\Psi\rangle = \langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|\hat{H}|^B\Psi^{(0)}\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|\hat{H}|^B\Psi^{(1)}\rangle + \langle ^A\Psi^{(1)}|\hat{H}|^B\Psi^{(0)}\rangle \right) \quad (1)$$

$$\langle ^A\Psi|^B\Psi\rangle = \langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|^B\Psi^{(0)}\rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left(\langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|^B\Psi^{(1)}\rangle + \langle ^A\Psi^{(1)}|^B\Psi^{(0)}\rangle \right) \quad (2)$$

The first order overlap term and the second order Hamiltonian term are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|\hat{H}|^B\Psi^{(1)}\rangle &= \frac{1}{4}t_{ij}^{ab} (E_{HF}^A + E_{MP2}^A) \langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|^B\Psi_{ij}^{ab}\rangle + \frac{1}{4}F_k^c t_{ij}^{ab} \langle ^A\Psi_k^c|^B\Psi_{ij}^{ab}\rangle + \frac{1}{16}\langle kl||cd\rangle t_{ij}^{ab} \langle ^A\Psi_{kl}^{cd}|^B\Psi_{ij}^{ab}\rangle \\ &+ t_i^a (E_{HF}^A + E_{MP2}^A) \langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|^B\Psi_i^a\rangle + F_k^c t_i^a \langle ^A\Psi_k^c|^B\Psi_i^a\rangle + \frac{1}{4}\langle kl||cd\rangle t_i^a \langle ^A\Psi_{kl}^{cd}|^B\Psi_i^a\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|^B\Psi^{(1)}\rangle = \frac{1}{4}t_{ij}^{ab} \langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|^B\Psi_{ij}^{ab}\rangle + t_i^a \langle ^A\Psi^{(0)}|^B\Psi_i^a\rangle \quad (4)$$

In the above equations, and henceforth, the t -amplitudes (and orbital energies) refer to the first order expansion of determinant B : $|^B\Psi^{(1)}\rangle = \sum_{ia} t_i^a |^B\Psi_i^a\rangle + \sum_{ijab} t_{ij}^{ab} |^B\Psi_{ij}^{ab}\rangle$; we suppress the state labels because only one determinant is referred to, although each NOCI determinant has its own first order amplitudes.

To evaluate the overlap terms between the molecular wavefunctions we rotate the occupied orbitals into the biorthogonal corresponding orbital basis.⁷⁶ The corresponding orbital

basis is formed by performing a singular value decomposition, SVD, on the occupied block of the overlap matrix

$$\mathbf{O}_{\text{MO}} = (\mathbf{C}_{\text{MO}}^A)^T \mathbf{O}_{\text{AO}} \mathbf{C}_{\text{MO}}^B \quad (5)$$

\mathbf{C}_{MO}^X and \mathbf{O}_{AO} are the molecular orbital (MO) coefficients for state X and the atomic orbital (AO) overlap matrix, respectively. SVD of the occupied-occupied block of the MO overlap matrix \mathbf{O}_{occ} yields

$$\mathbf{O}_{\text{occ}} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{V} \quad (6)$$

The singular values, $S_{\tilde{j}}$, obtained from the SVD are the individual overlaps between the corresponding \tilde{j}^{th} occupied orbitals in state A and B . Only the occupied block of the molecular orbitals needs to be biorthogonalized to evaluate the NOCI-MP2 matrix elements. The overlap between the two determinants is then just a product of these overlaps, $O_{\text{HF}} = \langle {}^A\Psi^{(0)} | {}^B\Psi^{(0)} \rangle = \prod_{\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{i}}$. From the unitary matrices \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} we obtain the corresponding molecular orbitals

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_{\sigma\tilde{i}}^A &= \sum_j C_{\sigma j}^A U_{j\tilde{i}} \\ \tilde{C}_{\sigma\tilde{i}}^B &= \sum_j C_{\sigma j}^B V_{j\tilde{i}} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Using the corresponding MOs we define the overlap quantities, $S_{\tilde{p}\tilde{q}}$, that are used to solve $\langle A | B_{ij}^{ab} \rangle$ and $\langle A_{kl}^{cd} | B_{ij}^{ab} \rangle$ and are given in the bottom of Table 1. We use the accented indices only for the occupied corresponding orbitals. Within the corresponding orbital basis we can rewrite Eqs (3) and (4) as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle {}^A\Psi^{(0)} | \hat{H} | {}^B\Psi^{(1)} \rangle &= H_{\text{sing}} + \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \frac{1}{2} t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} (E_{\text{HF}}^A + E_{\text{MP2}}^A) \frac{S_{\tilde{i}a} S_{\tilde{j}b}}{S_{\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{j}}} O_{\text{HF}} \\ &+ \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{\tilde{k}c} \frac{1}{4} F_{\tilde{k}}^c t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \langle {}^A\Psi_{\tilde{k}}^c | {}^B\Psi_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \rangle + \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{\tilde{k}\tilde{l}cd} \frac{1}{16} \langle \tilde{k}\tilde{l} | | cd \rangle t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \langle {}^A\Psi_{\tilde{k}\tilde{l}}^{cd} | {}^B\Psi_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\text{sing}} = & \sum_{\tilde{i}a} t_{\tilde{i}}^a (E_{\text{HF}}^A + E_{\text{MP2}}^A) \frac{S_{\tilde{i}a}^i}{S_{\tilde{i}}} O_{\text{HF}} + \sum_{\substack{\tilde{i} \neq \tilde{k} \\ \tilde{i}\tilde{k}ac}} F_{\tilde{k}}^c t_{\tilde{i}}^a \frac{S_{\tilde{i}a}^i S_{c\tilde{k}}^i}{S_{\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{k}}} O_{\text{HF}} + \sum_{\tilde{i}ac} F_{\tilde{i}}^c t_{\tilde{i}}^a \frac{S_{ab}^i}{S_{\tilde{i}}} O_{\text{HF}} \\
& + \sum_{\substack{\tilde{i} \neq \tilde{k}, \tilde{l} \\ \tilde{k}\tilde{l}cd}} \sum_{\tilde{i}a} \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{k}\tilde{l} || cd \rangle t_{\tilde{i}}^a \frac{S_{\tilde{i}a}^i S_{\tilde{l}d}^i S_{c\tilde{k}}^i}{S_{\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{l}} S_{\tilde{k}}} O_{\text{HF}} + \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{l}cd} \sum_a \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{i}\tilde{l} || cd \rangle t_{\tilde{i}}^a \frac{S_{\tilde{l}d}^i S_{ac}^i}{S_{\tilde{l}} S_{\tilde{i}}} O_{\text{HF}} \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\langle {}^A\Psi^{(0)} | {}^B\Psi^{(1)} \rangle = \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \frac{1}{2} t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \frac{S_{\tilde{i}a}^i S_{\tilde{j}b}^i}{S_{\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{j}}} O_{\text{HF}} + \sum_{\tilde{i}a} t_{\tilde{i}}^a \frac{S_{\tilde{i}a}^i}{S_{\tilde{i}}} O_{\text{HF}} \quad (10)$$

The singles terms from Eq. (9) are computed in a straight forward manner. The singles amplitude, $t_{\tilde{i}}^a$, can be stored on disk, unlike the doubles amplitude, $t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab}$. Likewise, all of the rotated matrix elements in the corresponding orbital basis are formed and stored on disk. The overall computation of Eq. (9) is on the order of $N_v^2 N_o$. The rest of this section will be focused on the computation of the last two terms in Eq. (8). The overlap matrix elements with excitations in state A and state B depend on how many of the occupied orbital indices in state A and state B are the same. When there are two excitations in both states the three different cases are

Case 1: $\tilde{i} \neq \tilde{l}/\tilde{k}, \tilde{j} \neq \tilde{l}/\tilde{k}$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{\tilde{k}\tilde{l}cd} \frac{\langle \tilde{k}\tilde{l} || cd \rangle S_{c\tilde{k}}^i S_{d\tilde{l}}^i t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} S_{\tilde{i}a}^i S_{\tilde{j}b}^i O_{\text{HF}}}{4 S_{\tilde{k}}^i S_{\tilde{l}}^i S_{\tilde{i}}^i S_{\tilde{j}}^i} - \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{\tilde{l}cd} \frac{\langle \tilde{i}\tilde{l} || cd \rangle S_{c\tilde{i}}^i S_{d\tilde{l}}^i t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} S_{\tilde{i}a}^i S_{\tilde{j}b}^i O_{\text{HF}}}{4 S_{\tilde{i}}^i S_{\tilde{l}}^i S_{\tilde{i}}^i S_{\tilde{j}}^i} \\
& + \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{cd} \frac{\langle \tilde{i}\tilde{j} || cd \rangle S_{c\tilde{i}}^i S_{d\tilde{j}}^i t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} S_{\tilde{i}a}^i S_{\tilde{j}b}^i O_{\text{HF}}}{4 S_{\tilde{i}}^i S_{\tilde{j}}^i S_{\tilde{i}}^i S_{\tilde{j}}^i} \quad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $\tilde{i} = \tilde{k}, \tilde{j} \neq \tilde{l}/\tilde{k}$

$$\sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{\tilde{l}cd} \frac{\langle \tilde{i}\tilde{l} || cd \rangle S_{d\tilde{i}}^i t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} S_{\tilde{j}b}^i S_{ca}^i O_{\text{HF}}}{4 S_{\tilde{i}}^i S_{\tilde{j}}^i S_{\tilde{i}}^i} - \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{cd} \frac{\langle \tilde{i}\tilde{j} || cd \rangle S_{d\tilde{j}}^i t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} S_{\tilde{j}b}^i S_{ca}^i O_{\text{HF}}}{4 S_{\tilde{j}}^i S_{\tilde{j}}^i S_{\tilde{i}}^i} \quad (12)$$

Case 3: $\tilde{i} = \tilde{k}, \tilde{j} = \tilde{l}$

$$\sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{cd} \frac{\langle \tilde{i}\tilde{j} || cd \rangle S_{ac}^{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} S_{bd}^{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} O_{\text{HF}}}{4S_{\tilde{i}}S_{\tilde{j}}} \quad (13)$$

The extra terms for Cases 1 and 2 are due to the sums not being restricted over situations like $\tilde{j} = \tilde{l}$. While not restricting the sums introduces extra terms that need to be computed, we will show that the low computational scaling can only be achieved by unrestricted the sums. The projected overlap terms in Cases 2 and 3 are defined as

$$S_{ac}^{\tilde{i}} = S_{ac} - \sum_{\tilde{k} \neq \tilde{i}} \frac{S_{a\tilde{k}}S_{\tilde{k}c}}{S_{\tilde{k}}} \quad (14)$$

$$S_{ac}^{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} = S_{ac} - \sum_{\tilde{k} \neq \tilde{i}, \tilde{j}} \frac{S_{a\tilde{k}}S_{\tilde{k}c}}{S_{\tilde{k}}} \quad (15)$$

Equations (8)-(13) define the specifics of the NOCI-MP2 off-diagonal Hamiltonian and overlap matrix elements. The diagonal matrix elements are just the MP2 energy for the Hamiltonian and 1.0 for the overlap. All of these equations assume that the SVD of \mathbf{O}_{occ} does not include any zero singular values, i.e. $S_{\tilde{k}} \neq 0$. We will not give the specific equations for the cases when $S_{\tilde{k}} = 0$ or is near 0. These equations require expanding the sum over occupied indices into a sum over occupied orbitals with a non-zero $S_{\tilde{k}}$ and a sum over $S_{\tilde{k}}$ less than a threshold value. We use 10^{-4} as the threshold because dividing by numbers smaller than $(10^{-4})^4$ can yield numerically unstable results.

The extra term, $\sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{\tilde{k}c} \frac{1}{4} F_{\tilde{k}}^c t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \langle {}^A\Psi_{\tilde{k}}^c | {}^B\Psi_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \rangle$, that is needed for cases when the Fock matrix is not diagonal is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{\tilde{k}c} \frac{1}{4} F_{\tilde{k}}^c t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \frac{S_{\tilde{i}a}S_{\tilde{j}b}S_{c\tilde{k}}}{S_{\tilde{i}}S_{\tilde{j}}S_{\tilde{k}}} O_{\text{HF}} - \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_{kc} \frac{1}{2} F_{\tilde{i}}^c t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \frac{S_{\tilde{i}a}S_{\tilde{j}b}S_{c\tilde{i}}}{S_{\tilde{i}}S_{\tilde{j}}S_{\tilde{i}}} O_{\text{HF}} \\ + \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ab} \sum_c \frac{1}{2} F_{\tilde{i}}^c t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} \frac{S_{\tilde{j}b}S_{ac}^{\tilde{i}}}{S_{\tilde{j}}S_{\tilde{i}}} O_{\text{HF}} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

These two terms are computed in the same way as Eqs. (11) and (12). The specifics of which will be outlined below.

Finally we need to define the two-electron integrals within the RI approximation. The main advantage of the RI approximation is that it greatly reduces the memory demand, and slightly reduces the computational cost. Within the RI approximation a two-electron integral becomes

$$\langle ij|ab\rangle \approx \sum_{PQ} \frac{(ia|P)(Q|jb)}{(P|Q)} = \sum_Q B_{ia}^Q B_{jb}^Q \quad (17)$$

$$B_{pq}^Q = \sum_P (pq|P)(P|Q)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (18)$$

So instead of storing the four index two-electron integral on disk or in memory the three index B amplitudes defined in Eq. (18) can be stored on disk or in memory. We will show later that use of the RI approximation requires only $N_v N_{aux}$ elements of the B tensor to be stored in memory. Due to use of the corresponding orbitals, the two electron integrals need to be rotated into the corresponding orbital basis. The t amplitudes in Eqs. (8)-(10) then become:

$$t_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^{ab} = \sum_{ij} V_{\tilde{i}\tilde{i}} t_{ij}^{ab} V_{\tilde{j}\tilde{j}} = \sum_{ij} \frac{V_{\tilde{i}\tilde{i}} B_{ia}^Q B_{jb}^Q V_{\tilde{j}\tilde{j}} - V_{\tilde{i}\tilde{i}} B_{ib}^Q B_{ja}^Q V_{\tilde{j}\tilde{j}}}{\epsilon_i + \epsilon_j - \epsilon_a - \epsilon_b} \quad (19)$$

$$t_{\tilde{i}}^a = \sum_i \frac{V_{\tilde{i}\tilde{i}} F_{ia}}{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_a} \quad (20)$$

In the next section we will present the final set of RI equations through combining Eqs. (8)-(13) with Eq. (19) for a low scaling algorithm. First we will mention that if the t amplitudes correspond to the ket state then the two-electron integrals in Eq. (8) correspond to the bra state, or vice versa. This means that the NOCI-MP2 equations require at least twice the number of B tensors as normal RI-MP2. The NOCI-MP2 algorithm can still scale similarly to RI-MP2, but will in general have a larger prefactor.

NOCI-MP2 Algorithm

This section focuses on the equations and algorithm used for the fast NOCI-MP2 algorithm within the RI approximation. The first step is to combine Eq. (10) with Eq. (19). The resulting equation is also used for the first term in Eq. (8), with the difference that it is multiplied by $(E_{\text{HF}}^A + E_{\text{MP2}}^A)$. Using the RI approximation the MP2 overlap becomes

$$\sum_{ijab} \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} \frac{S_{\tilde{i}a} S_{\tilde{j}b} V_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} t_{ij}^{ab} V_{j\tilde{j}} O_{\text{HF}}}{2S_{\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{j}}} = \sum_{ijab} \frac{1}{2} R_{ia} R_{jb} t_{ij}^{ab} O_{\text{HF}} \quad (21)$$

$$R_{ia} = \sum_{\tilde{i}} \frac{V_{\tilde{i}\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{i}a}}{S_{\tilde{i}}} \quad (22)$$

By pre-summing over the corresponding orbital indices (Eq. (22)) Eq. (21) scales as an RI-MP2 calculation with the slowest step being the formation of the t amplitudes. As we will see, with some reworking of the equations we can achieve the same scaling for all of the other terms in Eqs. (11)-(13). We can rewrite Eq. (11) using the same property of associativity in the summation indices to obtain the final set of equations for Case 1

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{O_{\text{HF}}}{4} \sum_{klcd} \langle kl || cd \rangle Q_{ck} Q_{dl} \sum_{ijab} t_{ij}^{ab} R_{ia} R_{jb} - O_{\text{HF}} \sum_{\tilde{i}} \left(\sum_{kc} \frac{U_{k\tilde{i}} S_{c\tilde{i}}}{S_{\tilde{i}}} (W1)_{kc} \right) \left(\sum_{ia} \frac{V_{\tilde{i}\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{i}a}}{S_{\tilde{i}}} (Z1)_{ia} \right) \\ + \frac{O_{\text{HF}}}{2} \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} (X1)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} (Y1)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Q_{ai} = \sum_{\tilde{i}} \frac{U_{\tilde{i}\tilde{i}} S_{a\tilde{i}}}{S_{\tilde{i}}} \quad (24)$$

and

$$(W1)_{ic} = \sum_{ld} \langle il || cd \rangle Q_{dl}; \quad (Z1)_{ia} = \sum_{jb} t_{ij}^{ab} R_{jb} \quad (25)$$

and

$$(X1)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} = \sum_{klcd} \frac{U_{k\tilde{i}} \langle kl || cd \rangle U_{l\tilde{j}} S_{c\tilde{i}} S_{d\tilde{j}}}{S_{\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{j}}}; \quad (Y1)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} = \sum_{ijab} \frac{V_{\tilde{i}\tilde{i}} t_{ij}^{ab} V_{j\tilde{j}} S_{\tilde{i}a} S_{\tilde{j}b}}{S_{\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{j}}} \quad (26)$$

The second and third terms in Eq. (23) correct for the unrestricted summations over k and l . These summations should be restricted to not include i or j , but the calculation greatly benefits from being able to separate the summations. Specifically, if the first term in Eq. (11) has restricted sums, then that term scales at best as $N_o^4 N_v^2$. So even though extra terms with similar computational cost are added in, the overall cost is substantially reduced by unrestricting the sums. Similarly, Case 2 becomes

$$O_{\text{HF}} \sum_{\tilde{i}ac} \frac{S_{ca}^{\tilde{i}}}{S_{\tilde{i}}} \left(\sum_k (W1)_{kc} U_{k\tilde{i}} \right) \left(\sum_i (Z1)_{ia} V_{i\tilde{i}} \right) - O_{\text{HF}} \sum_{\tilde{i}jac} \frac{S_{ca}^{\tilde{i}} (I2)_{\tilde{i}j}^c (L2)_{\tilde{i}j}^a}{S_{\tilde{i}}} \quad (27)$$

where

$$(I2)_{ij}^c = \sum_{kld} \frac{U_{k\tilde{i}} \langle \tilde{k}l || cd \rangle U_{l\tilde{j}} S_{d\tilde{j}}}{S_{\tilde{j}}}, \quad (L2)_{ij}^a = \sum_{ijb} \frac{V_{i\tilde{i}} t_{ij}^{ab} V_{j\tilde{j}} S_{j\tilde{b}}}{S_{\tilde{j}}} \quad (28)$$

For this case we need to form an intermediate three index quantity. This means that we will have cubic storage, though with a small prefactor since it scales as $N_o^2 N_v$. The size of these three index tensors are sometimes smaller than the largest two index tensors that are stored in memory due to the typically small size of N_o compared to N_v and N_{aux} .

In the case when the Fock matrix is not diagonal the terms, given in Eq. (16), need to be computed. The resulting terms when combining Eq. (16) and (19) are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{O_{\text{HF}}}{2} \sum_{\tilde{k}c} \frac{F_{\tilde{k}}^c S_{c\tilde{k}}}{S_{\tilde{k}}} \sum_{ijab} t_{ij}^{ab} R_{ia} R_{jb} - O_{\text{HF}} \sum_{\tilde{i}} \left(\sum_c \frac{F_{\tilde{i}}^c S_{ic}}{S_{\tilde{i}}} \right) \left(\sum_{ia} \frac{V_{i\tilde{i}} S_{ia}}{S_{\tilde{i}}} (Z1)_{ia} \right) \\ + O_{\text{HF}} \sum_{\tilde{i}ac} \frac{S_{ca}^{\tilde{i}} F_{\tilde{i}}^c}{S_{\tilde{i}}} \left(\sum_i (Z1)_{ia} V_{i\tilde{i}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

These contributions to the off-diagonal NOCI Hamiltonian scale by at least a factor of N less than their counterparts in Eqs. (23) and (27). Just like the additional terms in Eq. (9), all of the contributions from singles excitations are relatively cheap compared to the doubles excitations and are not the dominant factors in determining the overall time and computational scaling of the NOCI-MP2 method.

In computing the final term, Eq. (13), we cannot use Eq. (15) in the given compact form because it does not allow the terms to be refactored into a lower scaling form like in Eqs. (23) and (27). In order to reduce the number of coupled indices in Eq. (15) we define

$$S_{\text{Proj}}^{ac} = S_{ac} - \sum_k \frac{S_{ak}S_{kc}}{S_{\tilde{k}}} \quad (30)$$

Using this, Eq. (15) can be written as

$$S_{ab}^{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} = S_{\text{Proj}}^{ac} + \frac{S_{a\tilde{i}}S_{\tilde{i}b}}{S_{\tilde{i}}} + \frac{S_{a\tilde{j}}S_{\tilde{j}b}}{S_{\tilde{j}}} \quad (31)$$

Now no more than two indices that are strictly coupled. Substituting this into Eq. 13 and expanding, we get four unique terms and the final set of equations

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{O_{\text{HF}}}{4} \sum_{ijab} \langle ij || ab \rangle t_{ij}^{ab} + O_{\text{HF}} \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}a} \frac{(I3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^a (L3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^a}{S_{\tilde{i}} S_{\tilde{j}}^2} \\ & + \frac{O_{\text{HF}}}{4} \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} \frac{(X3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} (Y3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}}{S_{\tilde{i}}^2 S_{\tilde{j}}^2} + \frac{O_{\text{HF}}}{2} \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} \frac{(W3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} (Z3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}}{S_{\tilde{i}}^3 S_{\tilde{j}}} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where

$$(I3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^a = \sum_{klcd} U_{k\tilde{i}} \langle kl || cd \rangle U_{l\tilde{j}} S_{\text{Proj}}^{ac} S_{d\tilde{j}}; \quad (L3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^a = \sum_{ijb} V_{i\tilde{i}} t_{ij}^{ab} V_{j\tilde{j}} S_{j\tilde{j}} \quad (33)$$

and

$$(X3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} = \sum_{klcd} U_{k\tilde{i}} \langle kl || cd \rangle U_{l\tilde{j}} S_{c\tilde{i}} S_{d\tilde{j}}; \quad (Y3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} = \sum_{ijab} V_{i\tilde{i}} t_{ij}^{ab} V_{j\tilde{j}} S_{i\tilde{i}} S_{j\tilde{j}} \quad (34)$$

and

$$(W3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} = \sum_{klcd} U_{k\tilde{i}} \langle kl || cd \rangle U_{l\tilde{j}} S_{c\tilde{i}} S_{d\tilde{i}}; \quad (Z3)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} = \sum_{ijab} V_{i\tilde{i}} t_{ij}^{ab} V_{j\tilde{j}} S_{i\tilde{i}} S_{i\tilde{j}} \quad (35)$$

and

$$\langle ij || ab \rangle = \sum_Q ({}^A \bar{B}_{ia}^{QA} \bar{B}_{jb}^Q - {}^A \bar{B}_{ja}^{QA} \bar{B}_{ib}^Q) \quad (36)$$

where

$${}^A\bar{B}_{ia}^Q = \sum_{kc} {}^A B_{kc}^Q S_{\text{Proj}}^{ac} \sum_i \frac{U_{i\bar{i}} V_{k\bar{i}}}{S_i} \quad (37)$$

We have defined a rotated two electron integral in Eq. (36), where the integral for state A is essentially rotated into the state B basis. Equations (21), (23), (27), and (32) are the set of working equations that need to be computed for the MP2 correction to the off diagonal matrix elements. All of these equations assume that the occupied-occupied and virtual-virtual blocks of the Fock matrix are diagonal.

Now that the working equations are defined, we present a sketch of the NOCI-MP2 algorithm within the RI approximation. The matrix elements we are looking for are between the zeroth order wavefunction of basis determinant A and the first order wavefunction of determinant B . The algorithm is broken up into three major steps: first the formation of Eqs. (18) and (37), followed by computing the contributions from Case 1, 2, and then 3.

In the first part of the algorithm, given in Figure 1, we create B_{ia}^Q in the same way as the RI-MP2 method,^{77,78} the details of which we will not give here. The next step is to create and store Eq. (37) on disk. This step just involves rotating the virtual and occupied orbitals into the basis of the ket determinant. This scales as N^4 because we are rotating the three index quantity B_{ia}^Q .

Figure 1: Sketch for the formation of the B matrices used in the RI expansion to form the two-electron integrals.

	CPU	Disk
Form ${}^A B_{ia}^Q, {}^B B_{ia}^Q$	$N^2 N_v N_{aux}$	$N_o N_v N_{aux}$
Loop over k		
Read ${}^B B_{kc}^Q$		
${}^B \tilde{B}_{kc}^Q = \sum_c {}^B B_{kc}^Q S_{\text{Proj}}^{ac}$	$N_o N_v^2 N_{aux}$	
Loop over i		
${}^B \bar{B}_{ia}^Q = (\sum_i \frac{U_{i\bar{i}} V_{k\bar{i}}}{S_i}) {}^B \tilde{B}_{ka}^Q$	$N_o^2 N_v N_{aux} + N_o^3$	$N_o N_v N_{aux}$

Next we compute Eqs. (10), (23), (27), and (29) using the algorithm sketched in Figure 2. The slowest scaling part of this step is the formation of the two-electron integrals ($N_o^2 N_v^2 N_{aux}$), which is the same as the slowest scaling part in the RI-MP2 method.⁷⁸ There

is another step that has fifth order scaling, but it scales as $N_o^3 N_v^2$.

As mentioned, one of the intermediate terms formed is a three index tensor. The price of storing these quantities on disk would be an excessive number of reads from disk. The number of seeks would scale as N_o^4 , and the total data transfer would be $N_o^5 N_v$. Since this third rank tensor is also relatively small ($N_o^2 N_v$) we choose to store it in memory. For moderately large basis sets where $N_v \gg N_o$ these three index tensors are not the most memory intensive terms. In the systems studied in this paper, over 600 basis functions, these tensors require less than 300 hundred megabytes of memory.

Figure 2: Sketch for the formation of the Hamiltonian contributions for Case 1 and Case 2, as well as the MP2 overlap term.

	CPU	Memory
Loop over i		
Read ${}^A B_{ia}^Q, {}^B B_{ic}^Q$		
Loop over j		
Read ${}^A B_{jd}^Q, {}^B B_{jb}^Q$		
Form $t_{ij}^{ab}, \langle ij cd \rangle$	$N_o^2 N_v^2 N_{aux}$	N_v^2
$O_{MP2} = \sum_{ab} t_{ij}^{ab} R_{ia} R_{jb} O_{HF}$	$N_o^2 N_v^2$	
$C_{1+} = O_{MP2}$		
$H_{MP2+} = O_{MP2} * (E_{HF} + E_{MP2})$		
$C_{2+} = \sum_{cd} \langle ij cd \rangle Q_{ic} Q_{jd}$	$N_o^2 N_v^2$	
Form $(W1)_{ic}, (Z1)_{ia}$	$N_o^2 N_v^2$	$N_o N_v$
Form $(X1)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}, (Y1)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}$	$N_o^2 N_v + N_o^3 N_v^2$	$N_o N_v + N_o^2 N_v$
Form $(I2)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^c, (L2)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^a$	$N_o^2 N_v + N_o^3$	$N_o^2 + N_o^2 N_v$
$H_{MP2+} = C_1 (\frac{C_2}{4} + \sum_{\tilde{k}c} \frac{F_{\tilde{k}}^c S_{\tilde{k}c}}{2S_{\tilde{k}}})$		
$H_{MP2-} = O_{HF} \sum_{\tilde{i}} (\sum_{kc} \frac{U_{k\tilde{i}} S_{c\tilde{i}} (W1)_{kc}}{S_{\tilde{i}}} + \sum_c \frac{F_{\tilde{i}}^c S_{ic}}{S_{\tilde{i}}}) (\sum_{ia} \frac{V_{i\tilde{i}} S_{ia} (Z1)_{ia}}{S_{\tilde{i}}})$	$N_o^2 N_v$	
$H_{MP2+} = \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} \frac{(X1)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} (Y1)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}} O_{HF}}{2}$	N_o^2	
$H_{MP2+} = \sum_{\tilde{i}ac} \frac{O_{HF} S_{ca}^{\tilde{i}} (F_{\tilde{i}}^c + \sum_k (W1)_{kc} U_{k\tilde{i}}) (\sum_i (Z1)_{ia} V_{i\tilde{i}})}{S_{\tilde{i}}}$	$N_o N_v^2 + N_o^2 N_v$	
$H_{MP2-} = \sum_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}ac} \frac{S_{ca}^{\tilde{i}} (I2)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^c (L2)_{\tilde{i}\tilde{j}}^a}{S_{\tilde{i}}}$	$N_o^2 N_v^2$	

Finally we compute the last contribution to the Hamiltonian, Eq. (32) using the steps outlined in Figure 3. Despite the simple form in the original NOCI-MP2 method in Eq. (13) the new form required to optimally use the RI approximation takes just as long, if not longer, than the computation of Eqs. (23) and (27). This part of the matrix element is the most

computational expensive because there are three different two-electron integrals needed. In addition, the formation of Eq. 33 scales as $N_o^2 N_v^3$. The size of N_v and N_{aux} are typically similar, which is why these terms typically take the longest time to compute. Eq. (32) is almost always the largest contributor to the Hamiltonian matrix element due to the fact that the overlap between virtual orbitals in the bra and ket determinants, S_{ac} , are typically much larger than the occupied-virtual overlap, S_{ia} .

Figure 3: Sketch for the formation of Case 3 in the Hamiltonian.

	CPU	Memory
Loop over i		
Read ${}^A B_{ia}^Q, {}^B B_{ic}^Q, {}^B \bar{B}_{ia}^Q$		
Loop over j		
Read ${}^A B_{jd}^Q, {}^B B_{jb}^Q, {}^B \bar{B}_{jb}^Q$		
Form $t_{ij}^{ab}, \langle ij cd \rangle, \langle ij cd \rangle$	$N_o^2 N_v^2 N_{aux}$	N_v^2
Form $(I3)_{ij}^a$	$N_o^2 N_v^3 + N_o^3 N_v^2$	$N_o^2 N_v$
Form $(L3)_{ij}^a$	$N_o^3 N_v^2$	$N_o^2 N_v$
Form $(X3)_{ij}^a, (Y3)_{ij}^a, (W3)_{ij}^a, (Z3)_{ij}^a$	$N_o^3 N_v^2 + N_o^3 N_v$	N_o^2
$H_{\text{MP2}+} = \sum_{ab} \langle ij ab \rangle t_{ij}^{ab} \frac{O_{\text{HF}}}{4}$	$N_o^2 N_v^2$	
$H_{\text{MP2}+} = \sum_{ija} \frac{(I3)_{ij}^a (L3)_{ij}^a O_{\text{HF}}}{S_i S_j^2}$	$N_o^2 N_v$	
$H_{\text{MP2}+} = \sum_{ij} \frac{(X3)_{ij}^a (Y3)_{ij}^a O_{\text{HF}}}{4 S_i^2 S_j^2} + \sum_{ij} \frac{(W3)_{ij}^a (Z3)_{ij}^a O_{\text{HF}}}{2 S_i^3 S_j^2}$	N_o^2	

We conclude this section by mentioning a few things about the implementation of the presented algorithm. As mentioned previously, we have assumed that all singular values, $S_{\tilde{i}}$, are greater than a threshold to avoid numerical instability problems. In practice the algorithm is modified by splitting up the sum into two different terms, one with $S_{\tilde{i}}$ greater than some threshold value and one term with $S_{\tilde{i}}$ smaller than that threshold value. This does not create any more computation, but does mean that there are a few more \bar{B}_{ia}^Q matrices that must be stored on disk. In general, as the number of below-threshold singular values grows, the cost of the NOCI-MP2 method decreases because the sum over the corresponding orbitals becomes just a sum over one or two indices since the sum over $S_{\tilde{i}}$ greater than the threshold becomes zero. Therefore, what is presented here represents the worst case (largest possible amount of computation) for the NOCI-MP2 method.

1
2
3 To further increase the speed, we integrate out the spin, which creates a total of five
4 unique non-zero cases for Eqs. (23)-(32). The reason there are five potential unique terms
5 rather than three is because we have two different two-electron integrals multiplied together.
6
7 Out of the five non-zero integrals only some contribute to all the cases; for example, if there
8 are all alpha spins for one two-electron integral and all beta spins for the other two electron
9 integral then only the first term in Eq. (23) is nonzero because the overlap integrals are zero
10 for all other cases.
11
12

13
14
15 It is also worth mentioning that this method is easily parallelized over multiple CPUs.
16
17 The computation of each Hamiltonian matrix element is independent of each other. Since
18 the corresponding orbitals are also unique for a given bra-ket pair, it is only the atomic
19 orbital two-center one-electron integrals from the RI expansion that are shared across all
20 matrix elements (i.e. all processors). The code can then be easily parallelized over multiple
21 processors based on the number of Hamiltonian matrix elements that need to be computed.
22
23

24
25 We have also implemented the frozen core approximation within the NOCI-MP2 method.
26
27 The computational speed up is not as large as in the case of RI-MP2 because only the t_{ij}^{ab}
28 amplitudes use the frozen core approximation. The other two-electron integral is not a part of
29 the MP2 expansion, but instead arises because of the insertion of the identity used to solve the
30 NOCI-MP2 Hamiltonian. We do not apply the frozen core approximation to this resolution
31 of the identity because it introduces a larger error than the frozen core approximation in the
32 MP2 method.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Results and Discussion

46
47
48 In this section, we discuss some timing comparisons against conventional RI-MP2, and two
49 chemical applications of NOCI-MP2, including examples of larger molecules than was possi-
50 ble previously. The RI algorithm for the NOCI-MP2 method is implemented within a devel-
51 opment version of the Q-Chem 5 quantum chemistry package⁷⁹ with OpenMP parallization.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

1
2
3 All calculations were performed using a threshold value for $S_{\bar{i}}$ of 0.001 and NOCI-MP2 v1⁶⁸
4 (i.e. neglecting the correction to the off-diagonal overlap matrix element that defined ver-
5 sion 2). We then examine a number of singlet biradicaloid systems that require an electronic
6 structure method capable of handling strong correlation.
7
8
9


10
11 The results for the biradicaloid systems use a damping or level shift term for t amplitudes
12 based on the difference between the occupied and virtual orbital energies. We use this to
13 guard against cases where the energy denominator in the t amplitudes approaches zero,
14 which potentially leads to divergent amplitudes and second order energies. The parameter
15 used for this damping is 0.3 Hartree, similar to the parameter that was determined to be
16 optimal for regularized orbital optimized MP2.⁸⁰ In the sections below, we will discuss why
17 this is used and the impact it has on the results.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 27 **Scaling**

28
29 The timing of NOCI-MP2 with the RI approximation is compared to the corresponding RI-
30 MP2 algorithm⁷⁸ within Q-Chem on a set of planar conjugated molecules, shown in Figure
31 4. We choose this test set to keep the density matrix denser than in the more standard
32 test case of a set of linear alkanes, as well as to yield lower sparsity in AO basis matrix
33 elements. The timing recorded for RI-NOCI-MP2 is for the computation of a single off-
34 diagonal Hamiltonian matrix element. Because this is a perturb-then-diagonalize method all
35 of the computational cost comes in forming the Hamiltonian and overlap in the NOCI basis.
36 The timing of the overlap terms itself is not needed because they are obtained freely by just
37 dividing the first term in Eq (8) by the total energy of the bra state.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 In Figure 5 we plot the timing of a single off-diagonal Hamiltonian matrix element for
48 RI-NOCI-MP2 and the timing to compute the RI-MP2 energy with respect to the basis set
49 size. We use the aug-cc-pvdz basis set, which for our test set means we go from 192 to 770
50 basis functions. The slope for both of these methods does not quite reach 5 (asymptotically
51 $N_o^2 N_v^2 N_{aux}$) on the log-log plot in Figure 5 reflecting two possible factors. First is the fact
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Figure 4: The set of molecules used for timing calculations for RI-NOCI-MP2 and RI-MP2.



that the linear algebra associated with the rate-determining 5th order steps executes faster as the problem size increases (approaching peak performance), and second is the fact that cubic and quartic scaling steps also make contributions to the timings. Both RI-MP2 and RI-NOCI-MP2 show similar scaling with respect to the size of the problem indicating that similar considerations apply to both algorithms. Similarly Figure 6 shows that RI-NOCI-MP2 and RI-MP2 display similar speed up over multiple processors. RI-NOCI-MP2 gains a little more than RI-MP2 with the increase in number of processors because RI-NOCI-MP2 has a larger ratio of computational vs. read/write time.

The prefactor associated with RI-NOCI-MP2 scaling ends up being roughly 10 times larger than RI-MP2. Part of this is due to the formation of the intermediates in Eqs. (33) and (36). Unrestricted RI-MP2 requires the formation of 3 different types of two-electron integrals; two same spin terms and the opposite spin term. For NOCI-MP2 there are those


Figure 5: Log-Log plot of the RI-NOCI-MP2 and RI-MP2 timings for the molecules shown in Figure 4 with respect to the number of basis functions. The RI-MP2 and RI-NOCI-MP2 scale a little lower than 5 because the asymptotic regime has not quite been reached for these problem sizes. Both calculations are executed presuming unrestricted orbitals, and were recorded on a 64 core node based on AMD Opteron 6134 processors running at a clock speed of 3.2 GHz. Both calculations were performed on a single processor.



three cases for both of the spin integrated two-electron integrals $\langle kl||cd \rangle$ and t_{ij}^{ab} in Eq. (8). All of these extra terms add up to give roughly a factor of 10 times a conventional RI-MP2 calculation. In practice there are a number of ways to reduce the cost of a given matrix element by avoiding the computation of nearly zero terms based on the resulting overlap integrals, S_{ia} , and singular values, S_i , from the SVD in Eq. (5). These are utilized in the rest of the calculations presented in this paper, but Figures 5 and 6 use the slowest case scenario.

The other critical factor, so far ignored, in determining the computational cost of the NOCI-MP2 calculation is the rank of the NOCI matrix. The case of 4 determinants corresponds to the NOCI analog of a single spin-flip calculation and is appropriate for biradicaloids and single bond-breaking as treated in the following subsections. With the use of the sym-

Figure 6: Ratio of timing using N cores vs. one core for OpenMP parallized RI-MP2 and RI-NOCI-MP2. The black curve is a perfect parallization speedup. Both calculations are executed presuming unrestricted orbitals, and were recorded on a 64 core node based on AMD Opteron 6134 processors running at a clock speed of 3.2 GHz.



metry in the NOCI-MP2 Hamiltonian there are 3 diagonal and 8 off-diagonal elements to consider. The timing is therefore approximately 8.3 times longer than the single matrix element tests reported above. This common case then involves approximately 83 times more computation for the NOCI-MP2 correction than the RI-MP2 correction. Since we have excluded the SCF times, the overall computational cost increase for the complete NOCI-MP2 calculation versus RI-MP2 can be considerably less than this estimate. For example, a calculation with 692 basis functions on one processor the RI-NOCI-MP2 correction is 70 times longer than the RI-MP2 expansion. With the SCF time, the total RI-NOCI-MP2 calculation is 25 times longer than a RI-MP2 calculation.

Charged dimers


The recoupling of two π aromatic radicals, such as two ethene radical cations, can lead to a stacking complex with non-bonded contact distances that are shorter than a normal van

1
2
3 der Waals complex, yet much longer than a normal chemical bond. The resulting complex
4 is biradicaloid in character, with a long, weak multicenter bond that reflects competition
5 between stabilization due to recoupling of the two radical electrons, as well as dispersion in-
6 teractions, countered by non-bonded contacts between other doubly occupied orbitals. If the
7 radicals are charged, there is also significant electrostatic repulsion, which will typically ren-
8 der the complex meta-stable with respect to dissociation in the gas phase. Either way, these
9 long, weak multicenter bonds require an electronic structure treatment capable of describ-
10 ing strong correlations because of their significant biradicaloid character.⁸¹⁻⁸³ Additionally
11 dispersion interactions play a key role, and therefore a suitable electronic structure method
12 must also include dynamic correlation.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 To explore the performance of NOCI-MP2 for treating multi-center bonds in dication
24 dimers, we must first specify the determinants that will be included in the reference NOCI
25 calculation. One well-defined choice that seems appropriate is to obtain the covalent (radical)
26 and ionic (closed shell) NOCI states using the absolutely localized molecular orbital (ALMO)
27 method.⁸⁴⁻⁸⁶ In the ALMO model, the MOs are constrained to be fragment block-diagonal
28 such that AOs from one fragment cannot contribute to the MOs of any other fragment.
29 This enables the optimization of constrained determinants, which correspond to well-defined
30 covalent and ionic diabatic states. Due to the constraints, an ALMO determinant has non-
31 zero occupied-virtual Fock matrix elements, and therefore requires inclusion of the single
32 excitations in the MP2 treatment, as given in the theory section. Using the ALMO method
33 we create 2 covalent ($\text{Monomer}^{+\bullet}\text{-Monomer}^{+\bullet}$) and 2 ionic ($\text{Monomer}^+\text{-Monomer}^{2+}$) determi-
34 nants where the radical electrons are fragment localized into (nonorthogonal) orbitals on one
35 monomer or the other. We pseudo-canonicalize the occupied-occupied and virtual-virtual
36 block of the final MOs from the ALMO calculation in order to compute the MP2 correc-
37 tion to each of the 4 resulting determinants. This does not change the NOCI energies, but
38 simplifies evaluation of the first order MP expansion of the wavefunction.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 We first start with a simple model system of di-ethylene di-cation, plotted in Figure 7.
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 7: Dissociation curve in D_{2h} symmetry for ethylene dimer di-cation in the cc-pVTZ basis. There is a metastable minimum corresponding to weak 4-center inter-fragment bonding, although this minimum is unbound with respect to dissociation.



The D_{2h} geometry of di-ethylene dication is optimized using the ω B97X-D functional⁸⁷ with the cc-pVTZ basis set, and is given in the supporting information. The coordinates for each point on the curve shown in in Figure 7 are generated by rigidly pulling apart the ethylene cation radicals. We compute the ground state with SF-EOM-CCSD, NOCI, and NOCI-MP2 using the cc-pVTZ basis set. The SF-EOM-CCSD and NOCI-MP2 curves are corrected for basis set superposition error, while there is no basis set superposition error at the NOCI level because the molecular orbitals are restricted to one of the two monomers. To compute the basis set superposition error for NOCI-MP2 we use the basis set superposition error for single reference MP2 and remove the HF basis set superposition error.

Compared to SF-EOM-CCSD, NOCI-MP2 underbinds by about 3 kcal/mol, and shows very good qualitative agreement in the potential curves, by contrast with the NOCI method, which greatly underbinds the local minimum. A major reason for the good agreement between SF-EOM-CCSD and NOCI-MP2 is the inclusion of the singles amplitudes in the NOCI-MP2 perturbation theory expansion. Without singles, NOCI-MP2 underbinds by 15 kcal/mol and overestimates the bond distance by 0.3 Å.

One technical comment is in order. As mentioned above, there is an 0.3 a.u. damping or

1
2
3 level shift added to the energy denominators of the t amplitudes. This is most significant for
4 short contacts i.e. equilibrium or shorter). The largest the HOMO and LUMO gap is over
5 the entire curve is 0.2 Hartree and reaches values as small as 0.06 Hartree. Without damping,
6 NOCI-MP2 overbinds by 12 kcal/mol, while it underbinds by 3 kcal/mol by adopting the level
7 shift that has proved useful in OO-MP2. The character of the ground state also significantly
8 changes without damping: the dominant ALMO NOCI states are the two radical ALMO
9 states that spin-couple together to form the weak covalent bond, but for NOCI-MP2 without
10 damping, the dominant ALMO NOCI states are the ionic states. Since the damped and
11 undamped NOCI-MP2 results straddle the reference SF-EOM-CCSD results, one might infer
12 that an optimal damping parameter (for this problem) would be slightly smaller than 0.3
13 a.u. However, we will not consider tuning the damping parameter or modifying its functional
14 form here, as the present unbiased choice appears adequate.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Using the ALMO NOCI basis states makes it possible to further analyze the long multi-center bond that is formed. Assuming a simple covalent bond would imply that the two radical states are all that is needed to form the bond. However, if one uses just those two states then the NOCI-MP2 minimum is reduced by 18 kcal/mol. The barrier also decreases from 12 kcal/mol to 1 kcal/mol without the ionic states. This bonding may be viewed as an extreme case of the charge-shift bonding that has been identified in other molecules such as F_2 that have some diradicaloid character.^{88,89} Other biradicaloid dimers with long intermonomer separations will very likely exhibit the same character. Such systems have more typically been treated by CAS(2,2) wavefunctions which typically give delocalized active orbitals.

To compare with other multi-reference perturbation theory methods, like CASPT2, we model the tetracyano ethylene (TCNE) dimer di-anion, also in D_{2h} symmetry. In Table 2 we give the NOCI-MP2 results and the CASPT2 and RASPT2 results from reference 82. All of the values are computed with the 6-31+G* basis and corrected for basis set superposition error. NOCI-MP2 values are computed with geometries optimized using the

1
2
3 ω B97X-D functional and the 6-31+G* basis set. At each point along the potential energy
4 scan the geometry is optimized while constraining the intermolecular separation distance.
5
6 The geometries used as well as the raw data for NOCI-MP2 with and without the damping
7 is given in the supporting information. For NOCI and NOCI-MP2 the 4 ALMO NOCI basis
8 states are again used.
9
10
11
12

13 Due to lack of dispersion interactions, the di-anion dimer is completely unbound by the
14 NOCI method and has no metastable state. The minimum for NOCI-MP2, given in Table
15 2, is 0.05 Å less bound than RASPT2, which is significantly better than CASPT2 based on
16 the similar sized active space CAS(2,2) results. However, NOCI-MP2 with the damped t
17 amplitudes is less bound than by CASPT2 and RASPT2 methods. By contrast, without
18 damping, the minimum is overbound (30 kcal/mol vs dissociation) with a barrier that is
19 significantly too large (14 kcal/mol). The barrier and the minimum shift by roughly similar
20 amounts (18 and 12 kcal/mol) because the damping has less impact on the barrier height
21 and a larger impact on the minimum, because the singles amplitudes are the largest near the
22 bonded region. The HOMO to LUMO energy difference is between 1.3-0.07 Hartree for the
23 bonded region of the di-anion TCNE dimer. Overall, these results are broadly similar to the
24 case of ethene dimer dication: without damping we over correlate, and the optimal result
25 is somewhere between the damped and undamped results. Like the ethene dimer dication
26 case, these results also suggest that there is scope for further investigation and optimization
27 of the strategy for damping in the future.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Table 2: Meta-stable minimum and energy barriers for the di-anion TCNE dimer in the
44 6-31+G* basis for a variety of multi-reference perturbation theory methods. The CAS and
45 RAS results are taken from reference 82. All energies are given in kcal/mol. Bond distances
46 are given in Å
47
48

	NOCI-MP2	CAS(2,2)	CAS(6,4)	RAS(22,2,2;10,2,8)	RAS(22,2,2;8,4,8)
Minimum	48.4	34.8	37.9	37.3	36.7
Energy Barrier	2.28	9.43	7.02	5.31	6.14
Bond Distance	2.75	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.7

49
50
51
52
53
54
55 Just like in inorganic semiconductors, organic semiconductors exhibit increased conduc-
56
57
58

1
2
3 tance by doping with a small fraction of ionized molecules (i.e. holes). In these materi-
4 als, the radical cation can form a dimer with a neutral molecule to delocalize the positive
5 charge, and it is this monocation dimer that causes a significant increase in the charge mo-
6 bility in the material.⁹⁰⁻⁹² To explore the use of NOCI-MP2 for aromatic dimer cations, we
7 looked at the binding energy and the charge resonance energy for 4 examples (aniline, naph-
8 thalene, anthracene, and phenalenyl), and compare to gas phase experimental data where
9 available.⁹³⁻⁹⁵ Using the ALMO strategy for these species suggests that two diabatic config-
10 urations are natural: (Monomer^{+•}-Monomer and Monomer-Monomer^{+•}). These will give rise
11 to two NOCI states associated with constructive and destructive interference between these
12 localized charge diabatic determinants.

13
14
15 Since there is no long-range coulomb repulsion between the two monomers, the mono-
16 cation dimers are bound with respect to dissociation in the gas phase: they represent a long
17 multicenter interaction that is formally a half-bond. The ground state is not typically strong
18 correlated (it is the delocalization of the odd electron or hole between the two monomers) and
19 so single reference methods can do a good job at obtaining the binding energies (although
20 hybrid functionals are essential in DFT to keep delocalization errors from being too large).
21 Using the four state ALMO basis, the charge resonance energy (i.e. the excitation energy
22 difference between the $\psi_{\pm} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|A^+A\rangle \pm |AA^+\rangle)$ states) is freely obtained.

23
24
25 In table 3 we give the NOCI, NOCI-MP2, MP2, and DFT (using the accurate ω B97X-
26 V hybrid⁹⁶) calculations, and experimental binding energies and charge resonance energies.
27 All of the computational values are corrected for basis set superposition error, and use the
28 cc-pVTZ basis set. All of the geometries used for the dimers are given in the supporting
29 information. As expected normal MP2 overbinds the π -stacked dimers compared to the
30 DFT or experimental values: MP2 is known to overbind π stacking systems, as indicated
31 by the benzene dimer,⁹⁷ DNA stacking complexes,⁹⁸ and related systems.⁹⁹ The difference
32 between MP2 and the DFT results increases with the number of π electrons. This overbinding
33 tendency will be directly reflected in the diagonal elements of the NOCI-MP2 method, which
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

would lead to overbinding in the absence of damping.

The binding of the cation-dimers can be viewed as having two main origins. One is the electrostatic/dispersion interactions, and the other is the splitting of the plus/minus combination of the localized ionic states given by the charge resonance energy. With the ALMO NOCI basis, the diagonal elements can tell us the impact of the electrostatic/dispersion interaction and the off-diagonal element determines the charge resonance energy. For example, the localized cation state ($|A^+A\rangle$) in naphthalene is bound by 6.45 kcal/mol at the MP2 level. This part of the binding is dominated by dispersion since without any dispersion, (the NOCI result), the state is unbound by 8 kcal/mol. The rest of the 10 kcal/mol binding energy is due to the weak one-electron bond formed in the ψ_+ state.

The damped NOCI-MP2 results in Table 3 are generally in quite good agreement with the ω B97X-V binding energy calculations, as well as the available experimental binding energies, with no deviation larger than 2 kcal/mol. The charge resonance energies predicted by damped NOCI-MP2 match up very well with the available experimental values, which also suggests that the off-diagonal matrix elements are quite accurate. One interesting subtlety is that in contrast to the experimental results, none of the dispersion including methods find that anthracene is less bound than naphthalene. Only with the NOCI method, where there are no dispersion interactions, is anthracene more bound. Comparing to experiments, it would seem that all methods (apart from NOCI, of course) over-estimate the importance of the dispersion interactions.

Long C-C bonds in di-diamantane ethane and hexaphenyl ethane

A normal alkane C-C bond is 1.54 Å long, but through the use of steric crowding in combination with favorable dispersion interactions, different stable alkanes with a C-C bond over 0.2 Å longer have been synthesized.¹⁰⁰⁻¹⁰³ Despite appearing to have a partly broken C-C bond, some of these species are stable at room temperature. We first look at di-diamantane ethane,¹⁰⁰ shown in Figure 8, which is stable at room temperature with a bond distance of

Table 3: Binding energy and charge resonance states for a variety of mono-cation dimers. Experimental data is provided when available. The binding energy is in kcal/mol and the Charge Resonance energy is in eV.

molecule	Binding energy				Charge Resonance			
	NOCI	NOCI-MP2	MP2	ω B97x-V	Exp.	NOCI	NOCI-MP2	Exp.
aniline	3.3	14.7	16.1	14.02		1.17	1.02	1.12 ^a
naphthalene	2.4	16.8	24.0	16.4	17.8 ^b	1.12	1.00	1.05 ^c
anthracene	-1.3	18.3	25.9	20.5	16.4 ^b	1.05	0.92	
phenalenyl	-2.0	25.7	36.6	25.1		1.43	1.27	


^a Values taken from reference 93

^b Values taken from reference 94

^c Values taken from reference 95

1.65 Å. This system has attracted considerable interest.^{104–107}

Figure 8: A visualization of di-diamantane ethane at its equilibrium geometry, and the dissociation curve at the NOCI, red, and NOCI-MP2 level, blue.



As one stretches the ethane C-C bond, the molecular wavefunction changes from being closed shell single reference to open-shell multireference where the two fragments contain a lone radical electron each. For both molecules we use the two radical and two ionic ALMO NOCI states, as employed in the previous subsection for the ethene dimer dication, and

1
2
3 TCNE dimer dianion. We use the same 6-31G(d,p) basis set that was used in reference
4 100 for di-diamantane ethane, and all geometry optimizations are done with the B97-D
5 functional. At each point on the potential energy surface the geometry is optimized while
6 constraining the central C-C bond distance. These geometries are given in the supporting
7 information. The plot of the dissociation curve for di-diamantane ethane is in Figure 8.
8
9


10
11
12
13 The NOCI and NOCI-MP2 binding energies, after correcting for basis set superposition
14 error (BSSE), are 23 and 56 kcal/mol, respectively. The NOCI-MP2 value is underbound
15 by about 10 kcal/mol when compared to the dispersion corrected B3LYP-D results of 70.7
16 kcal/mol.,¹⁰⁰ or the ω B97M-V value of 65 kcal/mol.¹⁰⁵ Considering that neither of the DFT
17 calculations were BSSE-corrected, and also that closer approach to the complete basis set
18 limit would increase the NOCI-MP2 binding more significantly than the DFT binding (due
19 to slower algebraic convergence of the wavefunction method with cardinal number of the
20 basis,¹⁰⁸ we view this result as quite promising. By contrast, without damping the t ampli-
21 tudes, the NOCI-MP2 binding energy is approximately 80 kcal/mol, which is significantly
22 overbound compared to the DFT results, and would be further overbound upon improvement
23 of the basis.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 At the NOCI level (i.e. without dispersion interactions) di-diamantane ethane is still
36 bound, which indicates that despite the steric repulsion of the bulky side groups, the electrons
37 involved in the C-C single bond still strongly couple to each other. However, with the
38 dispersion interactions included in NOCI-MP2 the molecule is significantly more bound.
39 The attractive dispersion interactions outweigh the repulsive steric crowding for this system.
40 However, the bond is still significantly weaker than the roughly 90 kcal/mol value for the
41 ethane C-C bond.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 From equilibrium to dissociation, roughly 30 kcal/mol of relaxation energy occurs in the
50 side groups of di-diamantane ethane. This side-group distortion associated with binding is
51 why, in the NOCI case, the relaxed binding curve goes above 0.0 at 3.6 Å. If there was no side-
52 group distortion due to steric hindrance during the bonding process the molecule would be
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

bound by almost 100 kcal/mol, larger than the roughly 90 kcal/mol bond dissociation energy of ethane. Other studies on di-diamantane ethane have pointed to the minimal geometry distortion in the diamantane side group upon formation of the C-C bond as the source of its stability.⁷⁴ The NOCI-MP2 calculations suggest that there is competition between steric repulsions that increase as the CC distance shortens, and attractive dispersion interactions that strengthen as the CC distance shortens. The result of this competition, in concert with the energetic cost of stretching the bonds (due to poorer electron pairing via spin coupling^{109–111}) causes the optimal geometry of di-diamantane ethane to be 0.1 Å longer than the bond distance in ethane.

Figure 9: A model of hexaphenyl ethane, and the dissociation curve at the NOCI, red, and NOCI-MP2 level, blue.



For hexaphenyl ethane, shown in Figure 9, we use the def2-TZVP basis set for all atoms except the two C atoms in the ethane C-C bond, for which we use the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set. This mixed basis description yields a total basis set size of 1388 functions. The quality of the ALMO NOCI determinants depend strongly on the quality of the basis set on the two C atoms involved in the bond that is being formed/broken. The accuracy of the ALMO determinants greatly improves with an increased basis set for the bonded atoms, and is less

1
2
3 important for the other atoms involved.
4

5 Unlike di-diamantane ethane, hexaphenyl ethane does not show a typical dissociation
6 curve: as shown in Figure 9, the NOCI dissociation curve is unbound. Without the singles
7 correction to the ALMO states, due to the non-Brillouin orbitals (i.e. they are not fully
8 relaxed at the SCF level due to the ALMO constraint), the NOCI state doesn't even show an
9 unstable minimum at the bonding distance. The shape of the NOCI curve shows the impact
10 of steric hindrance and the relaxation energy gained in the triphenyl methyl radicals as they
11 are pulled apart. At the bonded minimum, the bonded carbon atoms have slightly distorted
12 tetrahedral geometry, with the distortion reflecting steric repulsions. Upon dissociation,
13 the central radical carbon atom adopts a trigonal planar geometry, where, due to steric
14 repulsion between phenyl groups, they twist out of the plane in a propeller-like structure.
15 In this geometry the radical electron is able to couple better with the phenyl π electrons,
16 which stabilizes the radical fragment.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 With the inclusion of dispersion interactions via the NOCI-MP2 method, a weakly bound
30 molecule is obtained. NOCI-MP2 is bound, with only by 1 kcal/mol of net binding at 1.69
31 Å. There is a more strongly bound second minimum (a bond stretch isomer) that appears
32 around 4 Å. This isomer is calculated to be bound by 7.5 kcal/mol, and exhibits a much
33 broader minimum. The relative heights of these two minima can change with the extent of
34 damping of the small energy denominator t amplitudes. As we have seen in the previous
35 examples, the chosen damping parameter, which is not optimized for this work, appears to
36 lead to a slight underestimation of the dispersion energy.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The second minimum at 4 Å is strictly due to the dispersion interactions between the
46 phenyl groups on the different methyl fragments: it is a broken bond that is stabilized
47 by dispersion. A plot of the phenyl-phenyl distance between phenyl groups on the top
48 and bottom methyl fragments, given in the Supporting Information, shows that the closest
49 contact distance between them doesn't significantly change until after 4 Å. At this point,
50 there starts to be a linear relationship between the central C-C bond distance and the closest
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contact distance on the phenyl rings.
4

5 Based on these results, it is not surprising that hexaphenyl ethane has not been exper-
6 imentally observed, since in this case the energy penalty required to distort the triphenyl
7 methyl fragments in order to form the ethane bond is too large, and there is not enough
8 compensating dispersion interaction to obtain a reasonably stable bond. In solution, the
9 triphenyl methyl radical binds to a carbon atom in a phenyl ring over the formation of the
10 ethane bond. The stability of the t-butyl version of hexaphenyl ethane in reference 100
11 appears to be due to two factors: the steric repulsions cause a C-phenyl interaction to be
12 more difficult, and the increased dispersion interactions stabilize formation of the C-C bond.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Conclusion

24
25
26 Non-orthogonal configuration interaction with a second order perturbation correction (NOCI-
27 MP2) is a flexible method that can describe some types of strong correlation with exception-
28 ally compact wavefunctions. In this paper, we have presented working equations that enable
29 an efficient NOCI-MP2 implementation, using the resolution of the identity (RI) approxi-
30 mation to the two-electron integrals. No individual term requires more computational time
31 than RI-MP2, though there are multiple terms that do scale as RI-MP2 giving NOCI-MP2
32 a much larger prefactor. Using a set of conjugated organic molecules, we show that this
33 prefactor no larger than 10 per off-diagonal element. In practice, the prefactor is smaller
34 because in many cases some of the occupied orbital overlaps between different NOCI states
35 are near zero. Overall, this implementation makes NOCI-MP2 comparable to low scaling
36 multireference perturbation theory methods like CASPT2. The advantage of NOCI-MP2 is
37 that a much smaller active space can often be used.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 NOCI-MP2 is applied to a number of mono- and di-cation aromatic dimers. In these
51 cases, we show that NOCI-MP2 can be combined with the absolutely localized MO (ALMO)
52 method to create the set of NOCI determinants that rather directly represent covalent and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ionic diabatic states. We further show that the use of a singles correction to the MP2 energy
4 brings yields relative energies that are in line with other multi-reference correlation theory
5 methods like SF-EOM-CCSD and CASPT2. Inspection of the results shows that the coupling
6 between the radical electrons, one on each monomer, is not enough to accurately describe the
7 binding in the di-cation species. It is only after the addition of the ionic states, which account
8 for 70% of the binding energy, that we get results which agree well with other theory and
9 experiments. This illustrates that NOCI-MP2 has interpretative, as well as computational
10 value when applied to molecules where the bonding is not already well-understood.

11
12 For aromatic mono-cation dimers (i.e. having a delocalized multi-center one-electron
13 bond, rather than a two-electron bond), NOCI-MP2 shows itself to be capable of obtaining
14 accurate charge resonance energies, using just two ALMO reference determinants. Currently
15 we are limited to gas phase studies, but it is very promising that the results agree with avail-
16 able experimental results to about 2 kcal/mol. However, we note that this good agreement
17 was only obtained after addressing the challenge of overbinding in NOCI-MP2, whose origin
18 (small denominators) is the same as the cause of the well-known tendencies of MP2 to signif-
19 icantly overbind π -stack dimers between closed shell monomers. To damp the effects of small
20 orbital differences, we apply a denominator level shift of 0.3 Hartree, taken from previous
21 work on regularized orbital optimized MP2.⁸⁰ Inspecting our results suggests that slightly
22 better accuracy might be possible by optimizing the damping parameter to a slightly smaller
23 value. Systematic exploration of this optimization problem may be useful in the future.

24
25 We also presented NOCI-MP2 calculations for two bulky ethane derivatives: di-diamantane
26 ethane and hexaphenyl ethane. Due to the minimal geometric relaxation in di-diamantane
27 ethane, the dissociation curve is representative of a typical single bond, with or without
28 the dispersion interactions. Upon inclusion of dispersion interactions via NOCI-MP2, the
29 binding energy is only 30 kcal/mol less stable than the ethane C-C bond. This relatively
30 strong bond results from the strong dispersion interactions combined with relatively small
31 geometric distortion in the diamantane side groups upon formation of a C-C bond that is
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 only stretched by 0.1 Å relative to ethane. For hexaphenyl ethane the geometric distortion
4
5 is much more significant, such that at the NOCI level the system is unbound.
6

7 The work presented here shows the promise of the NOCI-MP2 method for applications
8
9 to large molecular systems. The largest calculations employed 1388 basis functions, and
10
11 were successful in treating systems that show strong correlation. The NOCI-MP2 method
12
13 is especially useful in cases where the set of non-aufbau configurations (i.e. diabatic states)
14
15 used in the non-orthogonal CI is well defined. This was accomplished here using covalent and
16
17 ionic ALMO determinants. All of the potential energy surfaces presented here were done
18
19 with either rigid monomers or using a different method to perform constrained geometry
20
21 optimization. In the future it would be greatly beneficial (though also quite non-trivial) to
22
23 implement analytical gradients for NOCI-MP2.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231.

References

- (1) Goerigk, L.; Grimme, S. A thorough benchmark of density functional methods for general main group thermochemistry, kinetics, and noncovalent interactions. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2011**, *13*, 6670–6688.
- (2) Peverati, R.; Truhlar, D. G. Quest for a universal density functional: the accuracy of density functionals across a broad spectrum of databases in chemistry and physics. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **2014**, *372*.
- (3) Mardirossian, N.; Head-Gordon, M. ω B97M-V: A combinatorially optimized, range-separated hybrid, meta-GGA density functional with VV10 nonlocal correlation. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *144*, 214110.
- (4) Goerigk, L.; Hansen, A.; Bauer, C.; Ehrlich,; Stephan,; Najibi, A.; Grimme, S. A look at the density functional theory zoo with the advanced GMTKN55 database for general main group thermochemistry, kinetics and noncovalent interactions. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *19*, 32184–32215.
- (5) Mardirossian, N.; Head-Gordon, M. Thirty years of density functional theory in computational chemistry: an overview and extensive assessment of 200 density functionals. *Molecular Physics* **2017**, *115*, 2315–2372.
- (6) Cohen, A. J.; Mori-Sanchez, P.; Yang, W. T. Challenges for Density Functional Theory. *Chem. Rev.* **2012**, *112*, 289–320.

- 1
2
3 (7) Krylov, A. I.; Sherrill, C. D.; Byrd, E. F.; Head-Gordon, M. Size-consistent wave
4 functions for nondynamical correlation energy: The valence active space optimized
5 orbital coupled-cluster doubles model. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1998**, *109*, 10669–10678.
6
7
8
9
10 (8) Small, D. W.; Head-Gordon, M. Post-Modern Valence Bond Theory for Strongly Cor-
11 related Electron Spins. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2011**, *13*, 19285–19297.
12
13
14 (9) Krylov, A. I. Size-Consistent Wave Functions for Bond-Breaking: The Equation-of-
15 Motion Spin-Flip Model. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2001**, *338*, 375–384.
16
17
18
19 (10) Serrano-Andres, L.; Merchán, M.; Lindh, R. Computation of Conical Intersections by
20 Using Perturbation Techniques. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *122*, 104107.
21
22
23
24 (11) Alguire, E.; Subotnik, J. E. Diabatic couplings for charge recombination via Boys
25 localization and spin-flip configuration interaction singles. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2011**, *135*,
26 044114.
27
28
29
30 (12) Hanrath, M. Multi-reference coupled-cluster study of the ionic-neutral curve crossing
31 LiF. *Mol. Phys.* **2008**, *106*, 1949–1957.
32
33
34
35 (13) Malrieu, J. P.; Caballol, R.; Calzado, C. J.; De Graaf, C.; Guihéry, N. Magnetic Inter-
36 actions in Molecules and Highly Correlated Materials: Physical Content, Analytical
37 Derivation, and Rigorous Extraction of Magnetic Hamiltonians. *Chem. Rev.* **2013**,
38 *114*, 429–492.
39
40
41
42 (14) Mayhall, N. J.; Head-Gordon, M. Computational quantum chemistry for single Heisen-
43 berg spin couplings made simple: Just one spin flip required. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**,
44 *141*, 134111.
45
46
47
48 (15) Mayhall, N. J.; Head-Gordon, M. Computational Quantum Chemistry for Multiple-
49 Site Heisenberg Spin Couplings Made Simple: Still Only One Spin-Flip Required. *J.*
50 *Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2015**, *6*, 1982–1988.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (16) Rajca, A. Organic Diradicals and Polyradicals - from Spin Coupling to Magnetism.
4 *Chem. Rev.* **1994**, *94*, 871–893.
5
6
7
8 (17) Slipchenko, L. V.; Krylov, A. I. Singlet-Triplet Gaps in Diradicals by the Spin-Flip
9 Approach: A Benchmark Study. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *117*, 4694–4708.
10
11
12
13 (18) Shao, Y.; Head-Gordon, M.; Krylov, A. I. The Spin-Flip Approach within Time-
14 Dependent Density Functional Theory: Theory and Applications to Diradicals. *J.*
15 *Chem. Phys.* **2003**, *118*, 4807–4818.
16
17
18
19 (19) Chan, G. K. L.; Head-Gordon, M. Highly correlated calculations with a polynomial
20 cost algorithm: A study of the density matrix renormalization group. *J. Chem. Phys.*
21 **2002**, *116*, 4462–4476.
22
23
24
25
26 (20) Mitrushenkov, A.; Linguerri, R.; Palmieri, P.; Fano, G. Quantum chemistry using the
27 density matrix renormalization group II. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2003**, *119*, 4148–4158.
28
29
30
31 (21) Chan, G. K.-L.; Sharma, S. The density matrix renormalization group in quantum
32 chemistry. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **2011**, *62*, 465–481.
33
34
35
36 (22) Booth, G. H.; Thom, A. J. W.; Alavi, A. Fermion Monte Carlo without fixed nodes:
37 A game of life, death, and annihilation in Slater determinant space. *J. Chem. Phys.*
38 **2009**, *131*, 054106.
39
40
41
42 (23) Cleland, D.; Booth, G. H.; Alavi, A. Communications: Survival of the fittest: Accel-
43 erating convergence in full configuration-interaction quantum Monte Carlo. *J. Chem.*
44 *Phys.* **2010**, *132*, 041103.
45
46
47
48
49 (24) Li Manni, G.; Smart, S. D.; Alavi, A. Combining the Complete Active Space Self-
50 Consistent Field Method and the Full Configuration Interaction Quantum Monte Carlo
51 within a Super-CI Framework, with Application to Challenging Metal-Porphyrins. *J.*
52 *Chem. Theor. Comput.* **2016**, *12*, 1245–1258.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (25) Schriber, J. B.; Evangelista, F. A. Communication: An adaptive configuration interac-
4 tion approach for strongly correlated electrons with tunable accuracy. *J. Chem. Phys.*
5 **2016**, *144*, 161106.
6
7
8
9
10 (26) Tubman, N. M.; Lee, J.; Takeshita, T. Y.; Head-Gordon, M.; Whaley, K. B. A deter-
11 ministic alternative to the full configuration interaction quantum Monte Carlo method.
12 *J. Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *145*, 044112.
13
14
15
16
17 (27) Holmes, A. A.; Tubman, N. M.; Umrigar, C. J. Heat-Bath Configuration Interaction:
18 An Efficient Selected Configuration Interaction Algorithm Inspired by Heat-Bath Sam-
19 pling. *J. Chem. Theor. Comput.* **2016**, *12*, 3674–3680.
20
21
22
23 (28) Szalay, P. G.; Mueller, T.; Gidofalvi, G.; Lischka, H.; Shepard, R. Multiconfigura-
24 tion Self-Consistent Field and Multireference Configuration Interaction Methods and
25 Applications. *Chem. Rev.* **2012**, *112*, 108–181.
26
27
28
29
30 (29) Roos, B. O.; Taylor, P. E. M.; Siegbahn, A Complete Active Space SCF Method
31 (CASSCF) Using a Density Matrix Formulated Super-CI Approach. *Chem. Phys.*
32 **1980**, *48*, 157–173.
33
34
35
36
37 (30) Roos, B. O. The Complete Active Space Self-Consistent Field Method and its Appli-
38 cations in Electronic Structure Calculations. *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **1987**, *69*, 399–445.
39
40
41
42 (31) Vogiatzis, K. D.; Li Manni, G.; Stoneburner, S. J.; Ma, D.; Gagliardi, L. System-
43 atic Expansion of Active Spaces beyond the CASSCF Limit: A GASSCF/SplitGAS
44 Benchmark Study. *Journal of chemical theory and computation* **2015**, *11*, 3010–3021.
45
46
47
48
49 (32) Malmqvist, P. Å.; Rendell, A.; Roos, B. O. The Restricted Active Space Self-
50 Consistent-Field Method, Implemented with a Split Graph Unitary Group Approach.
51 *J. Phys. Chem.* **1990**, *94*, 5477–5482.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (33) Casanova, D.; Head-Gordon, M. Restricted Active Space Spin-Flip Configuration
4 Interaction Approach: Theory, Implementation and Examples. *Phys. Chem. Chem.*
5 *Phys.* **2009**, *11*, 9779–9790.
6
7
8
9
10 (34) Zimmerman, P. M.; Bell, F.; Goldey, M.; Bell, A. T.; Head-Gordon, M. Restricted
11 Active Space Spin-Flip Configuration Interaction: Theory and Examples for Multiple
12 Spin Flips with Odd Numbers of Electrons. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2012**, *137*, 164110.
13
14
15
16
17 (35) Mayhall, N. J.; Head-Gordon, M. Increasing Spin-flips and Decreasing Cost: Pertur-
18 bative Corrections for External Singles to the Complete Active Space Spin Flip Model
19 for Low-Lying Excited States and Strong Correlation. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *141*,
20 044112.
21
22
23
24
25 (36) Wu, W.; Su, P.; Shaik, S.; Hiberty, P. C. Classical Valence Bond Approach by Modern
26 Methods. *Chem. Rev.* **2011**, *111*, 7557–7593.
27
28
29
30 (37) Su, P.; Wu, W. Ab initio nonorthogonal valence bond methods. *WIREs Comput. Mol.*
31 *Sci.* **2013**, *3*, 56–68.
32
33
34
35 (38) Gerratt, J.; Cooper, D. L.; Karadakov, P. B.; Raimondi, M. Modern Valence Bond
36 Theory. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **1997**, *26*, 87–100.
37
38
39
40 (39) Small, D. W.; Lawler, K. V.; Head-Gordon, M. Coupled Cluster Valence Bond Method:
41 Efficient Computer Implementation and Application to Multiple Bond Dissociations
42 and Strong Correlations in the Acenes. *J. Chem. Theor. Comput.* **2014**, *10*, 2027–2040.
43
44
45
46
47 (40) Hiberty, P. C.; Humbel, S.; Byrman, C. P.; van Lenthe, J. H. Compact Valence Bond
48 Functions with Breathing Orbitals: Application to the Bond Dissociation Energies of
49 F₂ and FH. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, *101*, 5969–5976.
50
51
52
53
54 (41) Hiberty, P. C.; Shaik, S. Breathing-Orbital Valence Bond Method—A Modern Valence
55
56
57
58
59
60

- Bond Method That Includes Dynamic Correlation. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2002**, *108*, 255–272.
- (42) Broer, R.; Nieuwpoort, W. Broken orbital symmetry and the description of valence hole states in the tetrahedral CrO_4^{2-} ANION. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1988**, *73*, 405–418.
- (43) Broer, R.; Nieuwpoort, W. Hole localization and symmetry breaking. *J. Mol. Struct. Theochem* **1999**, *458*, 19–25.
- (44) Broer, R.; Hozoi, L.; Nieuwpoort, W. Non-orthogonal approaches to the study of magnetic interactions. *Mol. Phys.* **2003**, *101*, 233–240.
- (45) Thom, A. J.; Head-Gordon, M. Hartree-Fock Solutions As a Quasidiabatic Basis for Nonorthogonal Configuration Interaction. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2009**, *131*, 124113.
- (46) Sundstrom, E. J.; Head-Gordon, M. Non-Orthogonal Configuration Interaction for the Calculation of Multielectron Excited States. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *140*, 114103.
- (47) Thom, A.; Head-Gordon, M. Locating Multiple Self-Consistent Field Solutions: An Approach Inspired by Metadynamics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2008**, *101*, 193001.
- (48) Mayhall, N. J.; Horn, P. R.; Sundstrom, E. J.; Head-Gordon, M. Spin-Flip Non-Orthogonal Configuration Interaction: A Variational and Almost Black-Box Method for Describing Strongly Correlated Molecules. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *16*, 22694–22705.
- (49) Bartlett, R. J.; Musiał, M. Coupled-Cluster Theory in Quantum Chemistry. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **2007**, *79*, 291.
- (50) Møller, C.; Plesset, M. S. Note on an Approximation Treatment for Many-Electron Systems. *Phys. Rev.* **1934**, *46*, 618.

- 1
2
3 (51) Mahapatra, U. S.; Datta, B.; Mukherjee, D. Molecular Applications of a Size-
4 Consistent State-Specific Multireference Perturbation Theory with Relaxed Model-
5 Space Coefficients. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **1999**, *103*, 1822–1830.
6
7
8
9
10 (52) Mahapatra, U. S.; Datta, B.; Mukherjee, D. A state-specific multi-reference coupled
11 cluster formalism with molecular applications. *Mol. Phys.* **1998**, *94*, 157–171.
12
13
14 (53) Chaudhuri, R. K.; Freed, K. F.; Hose, G.; Piecuch, P.; Kowalski, K.; Włoch, M.;
15 Chattopadhyay, S.; Mukherjee, D.; Rolik, Z.; Szabados, Á.; Tóth, G.; Surján, P. R.
16 Comparison of low-order multireference many-body perturbation theories. *J. Chem.*
17 *Phys.* **2005**, *122*, 134105.
18
19
20
21
22 (54) Ghosh, P.; Chattopadhyay, S.; Jana, D.; Mukherjee, D. State-specific Multi-reference
23 Perturbation Theories with Relaxed Coefficients: Molecular Applications. *Int. J. Mol.*
24 *Sci.* **2002**, *3*, 733–754.
25
26
27
28
29 (55) Chen, Z.; Song, J.; Shaik, S.; Hiberty, P. C.; Wu, W. Valence Bond Perturbation
30 Theory. A Valence Bond Method That Incorporates Perturbation Theory. *J. Phys.*
31 *Chem. A* **2009**, *113*, 11560–11569.
32
33
34
35
36 (56) Chen, Z.; Chen, X.; Ying, F.; Gu, J.; Zhang, H.; Wua, W. Nonorthogonal orbital
37 based n-body reduced density matrices and their applications to valence bond theory.
38 III. Second-order perturbation theory using valence bond self-consistent field function
39 as reference. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *141*, 134118.
40
41
42
43
44 (57) Andersson, K.; Malmqvist, P. Å.; Roos, B. O. Second-Order Perturbation Theory with
45 a Complete Active Space Self-Consistent Field Reference Function. *J. Chem. Phys.*
46 **1992**, *96*, 1218–1226.
47
48
49
50
51 (58) Pulay, P. A perspective on the CASPT2 method. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **2011**, *111*,
52 3273–3279.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (59) Finley, J.; Malmqvist, P. Å.; Roos, B. O.; Serrano-Andrés, L. The Multi-State
4 CASPT2 Method. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1998**, *288*, 299–306.
5
6
7
8 (60) Angeli, C.; Cimiraglia, R.; Evangelisti, S.; Leininger, T.; Malrieu, J.-P. Introduction
9 of n-electron Valence States for Multireference Perturbation Theory. *J. Chem. Phys.*
10 **2001**, *114*, 10252–10264.
11
12
13
14 (61) Angeli, C.; Pastore, M.; Cimiraglia, R. New perspectives in multireference perturba-
15 tion theory: the n-electron valence state approach. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2007**, *117*,
16 743–754.
17
18
19
20
21 (62) Mahapatra, U. S.; Datta, B.; Mukherjee, D. Development of a Size-Consistent State-
22 Specific Multireference Perturbation Theory with Relaxed Model-Space Coefficients.
23 *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1999**, *299*, 42–50.
24
25
26
27 (63) Mbote, Y. E. B.; Khait, Y. G.; Hardel, C.; Hoffmann, M. R. Multireference Generalized
28 Van Vleck Perturbation Theory (GVVPT2) Study of the NCO+ HCNO Reaction:
29 Insight into Intermediates. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2010**, *114*, 8831–8836.
30
31
32
33 (64) Khait, Y. G.; Song, J.; Hoffmann, M. R. Explication and revision of generalized Van
34 Vleck perturbation theory for molecular electronic structure. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**,
35 *117*, 4133–4145.
36
37
38
39 (65) Malrieu, J.; Durand, P.; Daudey, J. Intermediate Hamiltonians as a new class of
40 effective Hamiltonians. *J. Phys. A Math. Gen.* **1985**, *18*, 809.
41
42
43
44 (66) Ayala, P. Y.; Schlegel, H. B. A Nonorthogonal Ci Treatment of Symmetry Breaking
45 in Sigma Formyloxyl Radical. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1998**, *108*, 7560–7567.
46
47
48
49 (67) Yost, S. R.; Kowalczyk, T.; Van Voorhis, T. A Multireference Perturbation Method
50 Using Non-Orthogonal Hartree-Fock Determinants for Ground and Excited States. *J.*
51 *Chem. Phys.* **2013**, *139*, 174104.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (68) Yost, S. R.; Head-Gordon, M. Size consistent formulations of the perturb-then-
4 diagonalize Møller-Plesset perturbation theory correction to non-orthogonal config-
5 uration interaction. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *145*, 054105.
6
7
8
9
10 (69) Wu, W.; Zhang, H.; Braida, B.; Shaik, S.; Hiberty, P. C. The V state of ethylene:
11 valence bond theory takes up the challenge. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2014**, *133*.
12
13
14 (70) Weigend, F.; Häser, M.; Patzelt, H.; Ahlrichs, R. RI-MP2: optimized auxiliary basis
15 sets and demonstration of efficiency. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1998**, *294*, 143–152.
16
17
18
19 (71) Vahtras, O.; Almlöf, J.; Feyereisen, M. Integral approximations for LCAO-SCF calcu-
20 lations. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1993**, *213*, 514–518.
21
22
23
24 (72) Miller, J. S. Long, Multicenter Bonding: A New Concept for Supramolecular Materials.
25 *Chem. Eur. J.* **2015**, *21*, 9302–9305.
26
27
28
29 (73) Zhang, D.-W.; Tian, J.; Chen, L.; Zhang, L.; Li, Z.-T. Dimerization of Conjugated
30 Radical Cations: An Emerging Non-Covalent Interaction for Self-Assembly. *Chem.*
31 *Asian J.* **2015**, *10*, 56–68.
32
33
34
35 (74) Cho, D.; Ikabata, Y.; Yoshikawa, T.; Lee, J.; Nakai, H. Theoretical Study of Extremely
36 Long yet Stable Carbon-Carbon Bonds: Effect of Attractive C center dot center dot
37 center dot H Interactions and Small Radical Stabilization of Diamondoids. *Bull. Chem.*
38 *Soc. Jpn.* **2015**, *88*, 1636–1641.
39
40
41
42
43 (75) Wagner, J. P.; Schreiner, P. R. London Dispersion in Molecular Chemistry-
44 Reconsidering Steric Effects. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2015**, *54*, 12274–12296.
45
46
47
48
49 (76) King, H. F.; Stanton, R. E.; Kim, H.; Wyatt, R. E.; Parr, R. G. Corresponding orbitals
50 and the nonorthogonality problem in molecular quantum mechanics. *J. Chem. Phys.*
51 **1967**, *47*, 1936–1941.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




- 1
2
3 (77) Distasio, R.; Steele, R.; Rhee, Y.; Shao, Y.; Head-Gordon, M. An improved algorithm
4 for analytical gradient evaluation in resolution-of-the-identity second-order Moller-
5 Plesset perturbation theory: Application to alanine tetrapeptide conformational anal-
6 ysis. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2007**, *28*, 839–856.
7
8
9
10
11 (78) Goldey, M.; DiStasio, R. A.; Shao, Y. H.; Head-Gordon, M. Shared memory mul-
12 tiprocessing implementation of resolution-of-the-identity second-order Moller-Plesset
13 perturbation theory with attenuated and unattenuated results for intermolecular in-
14 teractions between large molecules. *Mol. Phys.* **2014**, *112*, 836–843.
15
16
17
18
19 (79) Shao, Y. et al. Advances in Molecular Quantum Chemistry Contained in the Q-Chem
20 4 Program Package. *Mol. Phys.* **2015**, *113*, 184–215.
21
22
23
24 (80) Stück, D.; Head-Gordon, M. Regularized Orbital-Optimized Second-Order Perturba-
25 tion Theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2013**, *139*, 244109.
26
27
28
29 (81) Mota, F.; Miller, J. S.; Novoa, J. J. Comparative analysis of the multicenter, long
30 bond in [TCNE]⁻ and phenalenyl radical dimers: a unified description of multicenter,
31 long bonds. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 7699–7707.
32
33
34
35 (82) Capdevila-Cortada, M.-a.; Ribas-Arino, J.; Novoa, J. J. Assessing the Performance
36 of CASPT2 and DFT Methods for the Description of Long, Multicenter Bonding in
37 Dimers between Radical Ions. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2014**, *10*, 650–658.
38
39
40
41 (83) Capdevila-Cortada, M.; Ribas-Arino, J.; Chaumont, A.; Wipff, G.; Novoa, J. J. For-
42 mation of Long, Multicenter pi-[TCNE]⁽²⁾(²⁻) Dimers in Solution: Solvation and Sta-
43 bility Assessed through Molecular Dynamics Simulations. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2016**, *22*,
44 17035–17044.
45
46
47
48 (84) Stoll, H.; Wagenblast, G.; Preuß, H. On the use of local basis sets for localized molec-
49 ular orbitals. *Theor. Chim. Acta.* **1980**, *57*, 169–178.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (85) Khaliullin, R. Z.; Head-Gordon, M.; Bell, A. T. An efficient self-consistent field method
4 for large systems of weakly interacting components. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2006**, *124*, 204105.
5
6
7
8 (86) Horn, P. R.; Sundstrom, E. J.; Baker, T. A.; Head-Gordon, M. Unrestricted absolutely
9 localized molecular orbitals for energy decomposition analysis: Theory and applica-
10 tions to intermolecular interactions involving radicals. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2013**, *138*,
11 134119.
12
13
14
15
16 (87) Chai, J. D.; Head-Gordon, M. Long-range corrected hybrid density functionals with
17 damped atom-atom dispersion corrections. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *10*, 6615–
18 6620.
19
20
21
22
23 (88) Shaik, S.; Danovich, D.; Silvi, B.; Lauvergnat, D. L.; Hiberty, P. C. Charge-shift
24 bonding - A class of electron-pair bonds that emerges from valence bond theory and
25 is supported by the electron localization function approach. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2005**, *11*,
26 6358–6371.
27
28
29
30
31 (89) Braïda, B.; Hiberty, P. C. The essential role of charge-shift bonding in hypervalent
32 prototype XeF₂. *Nat. Chem.* **2013**, *5*, 417–422.
33
34
35
36 (90) Yamada, J.-i.; Sugimoto, T. *TTF Chemistry: Fundamentals and Applications of*
37 *Tetrathiafulvalene*; Springer, 2004.
38
39
40
41 (91) Bendikov, M.; Wudl, F.; Perepichka, D. F. Tetrathiafulvalenes, oligoacenes, and
42 their buckminsterfullerene derivatives: The brick and mortar of organic electronics.
43 *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *104*, 4891–4946.
44
45
46
47 (92) Ishiguro, T.; Yamaji, K.; Saito, G. *Organic superconductors*; Springer Science & Busi-
48 ness Media, 2012; Vol. 88.
49
50
51
52 (93) Roy, M.; Kim, K. K.; Nam, S. H.; Alauddin, M.; Song, J. K.; Park, S. M. Charge
53 resonance structure of aniline dimer cation. *Int. J. Mass Spectrom.* **2016**, *402*, 66–72.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (94) Meot-Ner, M. Dimer cations of polycyclic aromatics. Experimental bonding energies
4 and resonance stabilization. *J. Phys. Chem* **1980**, *84*, 2724–2728.
5
6
7
8 (95) Fujiwara, T.; Lim, E. C. Binding energies of the neutral and ionic clusters of naph-
9 thalene in their ground electronic states. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2003**, *107*, 4381–4386.
10
11
12 (96) Mardirossian, N.; Head-Gordon, M. omega B97X-V: A 10-parameter, range-separated
13 hybrid, generalized gradient approximation density functional with nonlocal correla-
14 tion, designed by a survival-of-the-fittest strategy. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2014**,
15 *16*, 9904–9924.
16
17
18
19
20
21 (97) Sinnokrot, M.; Sherrill, C. Highly accurate coupled cluster potential energy curves
22 for the benzene dimer: Sandwich, T-shaped, and parallel-displaced configurations. *J.*
23 *Phys. Chem. A* **2004**, *108*, 10200–10207.
24
25
26
27
28 (98) Hobza, P.; Sponer, J. Toward true DNA base-stacking energies: MP2, CCSD(T), and
29 complete basis set calculations. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 11802–11808.
30
31
32
33 (99) Bachorz, R. A.; Bischoff, F. A.; Höfener, S.; Klopper, W.; Ottiger, P.; Leist, R.;
34 Frey, J. A.; Leutwyler, S. Scope and limitations of the SCS-MP2 method for stacking
35 and hydrogen bonding interactions. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *10*, 2758–2766.
36
37
38
39 (100) Schreiner, P. R.; Chernish, L. V.; Gunchenko, P. A.; Tikhonchuk, E. Y.; Hausmann, H.;
40 Serafin, M.; Schlecht, S.; Dahl, J. E.; Carlson, R. M.; Fokin, A. A. Overcoming lability
41 of extremely long alkane carbon-carbon bonds through dispersion forces. *Nature* **2011**,
42 *477*, 308–311.
43
44
45
46
47
48 (101) Flamm-ter Meer, M.; Beckhaus, H.-D.; Peters, K.; von Schnering, H.-G.; Rüchardt, C.
49 Thermolabile hydrocarbons. XXVII: 2, 3-Di-1-adamantyl-2, 3-dimethylbutane; long
50 bonds and low thermal stability. *Chem. Ber.* **1985**, *118*, 4665–4673.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (102) Fokin, A. A.; Chernish, L. V.; Gunchenko, P. A.; Tikhonchuk, E. Y.; Hausmann, H.;
4 Serafin, M.; Dahl, J. E.; Carlson, R. M.; Schreiner, P. R. Stable alkanes containing
5 very long carbon–carbon bonds. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 13641–13650.
6
7
8
9
10 (103) Kahr, B.; Van Engen, D.; Mislow, K. Length of the ethane bond in hexaphenylethane
11 and its derivatives. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1986**, *108*, 8305–8307.
12
13
14 (104) Meitei, O. R.; Hesselmann, A. Intramolecular Interactions in Sterically Crowded Hy-
15 drocarbon Molecules. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2017**, *38*, 2500–2508.
16
17
18
19 (105) Levine, D. S.; Head-Gordon, M. Energy decomposition analysis of single bonds within
20 Kohn-Sham density functional theory. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **2017**, *114*,
21 12649–12656.
22
23
24
25
26 (106) Fokin, A. A. et al. Intramolecular London Dispersion Interaction Effects on Gas-Phase
27 and Solid-State Structures of Diamondoid Dimers. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2017**, *139*,
28 16696–16707.
29
30
31
32
33 (107) Ishigaki, Y.; Shimajiri, T.; Takeda, T.; Katoono,; Ryo,; Suzuki, T. Longest C-C Single
34 Bond among Neutral Hydrocarbons with a Bond Length beyond 1.8 angstrom. *CHEM*
35 **2018**, *4*, 795–806.
36
37
38
39
40 (108) Helgaker, T.; Klopper, W.; Tew, D. Quantitative quantum chemistry. *Mol. Phys.*
41 **2008**, *106*, 2107–2143.
42
43
44
45 (109) Ruedenberg, K. The Physical Nature of the Chemical Bond. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **1962**,
46 *34*, 326–376.
47
48
49
50 (110) Schmidt, M. W.; Ivanic, J.; Ruedenberg, K. Covalent bonds are created by the drive of
51 electron waves to lower their kinetic energy through expansion. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**,
52 *140*, 204104.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (111) Levine, D. S.; Horn, P. R.; Mao, Y.; Head-Gordon, M. Variational Energy Decompo-
4 sition Analysis of Chemical Bonding. 1. Spin-Pure Analysis of Single Bonds. *J. Chem.*
5 *Theor. Comput.* **2016**, *12*, 4812–4820.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18





19

20


21

22


23



ACS Paragon Plus Environment




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32





ACS Paragon Plus Environment
Number of Processors

Binding Energy

(kcal/mol)

9
10
11
12






$$H = H_{\text{NOCI}} - \sum_{ia} \frac{F_{ia}^2}{\Delta \epsilon_i^a} - \sum_{ijab} \frac{\langle ij || ab \rangle^2}{\Delta \epsilon_{ij}^{ab}}$$

$$\langle ij || ab \rangle \approx \sum_P B_{ia}^P B_{jb}^P$$

Covalent

Ionic



ACS Paragon Plus Environment