

Benchmark calculations for reduced density-matrix functional theory

N. N. Lathiotakis^{1,2,3} and Miguel A. L. Marques^{4,5,3}

¹*Theoretical and Physical Chemistry Institute, National Hellenic*

Research Foundation, Vas. Konstantinou 48, GR11635 Athens, Greece.

²*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Freie Universität Berlin, Arnimallee 14, D-14195 Berlin, Germany.*

³*European Theoretical Spectroscopy Facility.*

⁴*Laboratoire de Physique de la Matière Condensée et Nanostructures, Université Lyon I, CNRS, UMR 5586, Domaine scientifique de la Doua, F-69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France*

⁵*Centre for Computational Physics, Department of Physics, University of Coimbra, 3004-516 Coimbra, Portugal.*

(Dated: October 25, 2018)

Reduced density-matrix functional theory (RDMFT) is a promising alternative approach to the problem of electron correlation. Like standard density functional theory, it contains an unknown exchange-correlation functional, for which several approximations have been proposed in the last years. In this article, we benchmark some of these functionals in an extended set of molecules with respect to total and atomization energies. Our results show that the most recent RDMFT functionals give very satisfactory results compared to more involved quantum chemistry and density functional approaches.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Reduced density-matrix functional theory (RDMFT) is based on Gilbert’s theorem¹ which guarantees that the expectation value of any observable of a system in its ground-state is a unique functional of the ground-state one-body reduced density-matrix (1-RDM). Thus, the fundamental quantity in RDMFT is the 1-RDM instead of the electronic density upon which DFT is built. Although this idea is relatively old, functionals of the 1-RDM have been exploited for practical applications only in the last decade.

The total energy of the ground state of a system of N electrons can be written in terms of the 1-RDM γ as

$$E_{\text{tot}}[\gamma] = \int d^3r \int d^3r' \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \left[-\frac{1}{2} \nabla_{\mathbf{r}}^2 \right] \gamma(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int d^3r \int d^3r' \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') v(\mathbf{r}) \gamma(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \frac{1}{2} \int d^3r \int d^3r' \frac{\gamma(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}) \gamma(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} + E_{\text{xc}}[\gamma]. \quad (1)$$

The first term is the kinetic energy of the system. The second is the energy due to an external potential $v(\mathbf{r})$ acting on the system. This external potential, which for simplicity is assumed to be local, is normally the ionic potential for atoms and molecules. The last two terms account for the electron-electron interaction that can be cast into a usual Coulomb part and the remainder, which in the DFT fashion we will call exchange-correlation term E_{xc} . This last part is the only term that is unknown and, for practical applications of the theory, needs to be approximated. A great advantage of RDMFT, compared to DFT, is that the kinetic energy term is an explicit functional of the ground state γ . Another advantage is that γ is a non-local quantity and contains more information than the electronic density.

The knowledge of the exact, or of a reasonable approximation, of the functional (1) allows for the minimization with respect to γ to determine the total energy and γ for the ground state. In basically all practical implementations of RDMFT, the minimization with respect to γ is replaced by a minimization with respect to its eigenvalues n_i and its eigenfunctions $\varphi_i(\mathbf{r})$, called respectively the occupation numbers and natural orbitals. In such a minimization, the N -representability conditions for the 1-RDM^{2,3} have to be enforced. These conditions are

$$\sum_i n_i = N, \quad 0 \leq n_i \leq 1. \quad (2)$$

The first represents particle number conservation, while the second reflects the Pauli antisymmetry principle. The first can be enforced through the minimization of the quantity

$$F = E_{\text{tot}} - \mu \left(\sum_i n_i - N \right) \quad (3)$$

instead of the total energy E_{tot} . The quantity μ is the appropriate Lagrange multiplier. A dramatic consequence of the second condition is that it allows for occupation numbers being border minima, i.e., exactly equal to one or zero. We refer to the corresponding states as “pinned states”. The fundamental difference between these states and those with fractional occupancy is that for the pinned states the derivative $\partial F / \partial n_p \neq 0$, where n_p is the occupation number of the pinned state. Thus, $\delta F / \delta \gamma \neq 0$ at the minimizing γ . It has been demonstrated⁴ that this is not an exceptional situation but rather the rule for several approximate functionals of the 1-RDM.

The N -representability conditions warrant that the trial $\gamma(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ corresponds to either a pure N -electron state or to an ensemble of N -electron states.³ However,

they do not warrant that the reconstructed two-body reduced density-matrix (2-RDM) is also N -representable.⁵ The N -representability of the 2-RDM is a much more complex problem.

Most of the approximations to E_{xc} do not depend explicitly on γ , but are written in terms of the natural orbitals and the occupation numbers. For this reason, RDMFT is also called natural orbital functional theory. The first functional was devised by Müller in 1984,⁶ but it attracted little interest for almost 15 years. The situation changed due to the works of Goedecker and Umrigar⁷ and Buijse and Baerends,⁸ who demonstrated that correlation energies for small atomic and molecular systems calculated with the Müller functional (or simple modifications of it) were in good agreement with the exact ones. Since then, several promising new functionals have appeared in the literature.^{4,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18}

The real quality of an approximate functional comes from its ability to describe accurately electronic correlation and other properties of real systems. Ideally, the performance of a functional should also be uniform over a large class of systems. Furthermore, it is important to know the limitations of existing functionals, as that increases their reliability. In this respect, benchmarking has a fundamental role in the development of any approach to electronic correlation.

Significant effort has been devoted to the assessment of the quality of existing exchange-correlation functionals of the 1-RDM. A few of the articles that proposed new functionals also presented example calculations, normally for atoms or small molecular systems.^{7,8,9,10,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24} Particular attention has been paid to the performance of several functionals for the whole dissociation curve of dimers.^{17,22,25,26,27} Besides atomic and molecular systems, RDMFT functionals have also been applied to the homogeneous electron gas (HEG).^{4,15,16,28} This prototype metallic system has proven quite useful in the evaluation and the development of 1-RDM functionals.^{4,16} Apart from the correlation energy, other properties were also calculated like ionization potentials,^{19,20,21,29} the chemical hardness and the fundamental gap,^{21,30} dipole moments and static polarizabilities,^{18,21,23,31} and vibrational frequencies.¹⁹ Finally, effort has been devoted recently in the formulation of time dependent RDMFT.^{32,33}

However, a thorough benchmark of the most used functionals for larger molecular systems is still lacking. In this Article, we address this issue, and present a systematic study of the most common exchange-correlation functionals within RDMFT for the G2/97 molecule set.^{34,35} This set comprises 148 neutral molecules, including 29 radicals, 35 non-hydrogen systems, 22 hydrocarbons, 47 substituted hydrocarbons, and 15 inorganic hydrides. Furthermore, the molecules present in the G2/97 set are well known experimentally and theoretically, which allows us to compare the relative merits of current RDMFT functionals with other quantum chemistry approaches and standard DFT. We present both correlation and at-

omization energies.

The rest of this Article is structured as follows. In section II, we give an overview of the existing 1-RDM functionals with a special emphasis on those we chose to include in our benchmark. Then, in section III, we describe our numerical method and discuss our results. Finally, in section VII, we conclude and give a brief outlook on the present status of RDMFT.

II. FUNCTIONALS

In this section, we present some of the most known functionals of the 1-RDM that have been introduced to date. A number of these, including those of interest in the present work, can be cast into the form

$$E_{xc} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} \int d^3r \int d^3r' f(n_{j\sigma}, n_{k\sigma}) \times \frac{\varphi_{j\sigma}^*(\mathbf{r}) \varphi_{k\sigma}^*(\mathbf{r}') \varphi_{k\sigma}(\mathbf{r}) \varphi_{j\sigma}(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}, \quad (4)$$

i.e., they have the form of the usual Hartree-Fock (HF) exchange modified by the function $f(n_{j\sigma}, n_{k\sigma})$ of the occupation numbers. Functionals of this form are sometimes referred to as of J-K type, as they only involve Coulomb (J) and exchange (K) type integrals over the natural orbitals. The symbol σ in Eq. (4) denotes the spin index and will be omitted in the following, i.e., we restrict the presentation of functionals to closed shell systems for simplicity. In that case, a factor of 2 should be introduced in the expression (4). We refer to Refs.21,24 for the generalization of the functionals to open shell systems.

The first approximation to E_{xc} , introduced by Müller in 1984,⁶ corresponds to the simple formula

$$f^{\text{Müller}}(n_j, n_k) = \sqrt{n_j n_k}. \quad (5)$$

In reality, Müller considered a more general form $f = n_j^\alpha n_k^{1-\alpha}$, but found that $\alpha = 1/2$ was the optimal value. He showed that the probability of finding an electron at \mathbf{r} when a second one is at \mathbf{r}' becomes negative in the neighborhood of \mathbf{r}' . This unphysical negative value is minimized for $\alpha = 1/2$. Buijse and Baerends⁸ arrived at the same formula for f by modelling the exchange and correlation hole. Interestingly, the reconstructed second density associated with his functional satisfies the sum rule relating the second and the first order densities. In addition, it yields the correct dissociation limit of dimers of open shell atoms like H_2 . Note that HF and also standard DFT functionals fail for these cases. However, the Müller functional overestimates substantially the correlation energy^{26,27} of all systems it has been applied to (including the HEG).^{4,15,28} It was recently shown by Frank *et al.*³⁶ that for two electron systems the Müller functional provides a lower-bound for the total energy. They also showed that, for this functional, the total energy

does not go to zero if the ionic potential is switched off but to the value $-N/8$ a.u. They interpreted this value as an effective self-interaction (SI) error and proposed a correction to the Müller functional equal to $N/8$ a.u.

A modified form of the Müller functional was introduced independently by Goedecker and Umrigar (GU).⁷ In the GU functional the SI terms are removed from the xc term of the Eq. (4) and the direct Coulomb term. The corresponding function f takes the form

$$f^{\text{GU}}(n_j, n_k) = \sqrt{n_j n_k} - \delta_{jk} (n_j - n_j^2). \quad (6)$$

Contrary to the functional of Müller, GU is not consistent with the sum rule relating the second and the first order densities.⁷ Furthermore, it can not be expressed as an explicit functional of γ . However, it yields much better correlation energies than the Müller functional for atoms and molecules at the equilibrium geometry. Unfortunately, it fails to reproduce the correct dissociation limit of small molecules.^{26,27}

Csányi and Arias,¹⁵ devised a functional by considering a class of computationally feasible approximations of the two-body density matrix as a finite sum of tensor products of single-particle operators. They called their approximation corrected Hartree-Fock (CHF). It reads

$$f^{\text{CHF}} = n_j n_k + \sqrt{n_j(1-n_j)}\sqrt{n_k(1-n_k)}. \quad (7)$$

They applied CHF and the Müller functionals to the HEG,¹⁵ and found that the two functionals coincide in the low density limit. As the density increases, however, CHF undercorrelates considerably and the solution collapses quickly to the HF idempotent solution. The same is found for a series of two-electron systems.^{25,26,27} For example, CHF gives the idempotent solution for H₂ at equilibrium (but not for large distances).^{25,27} Thus, the tendency to fall to the idempotent HF solution is a drawback of this functional, especially at the equilibrium geometries. We also found this behavior for most of the molecular systems we applied it to. For this reason, we did not consider this functional in our evaluation.

Noticing that, in the high density limit, CHF underestimates the correlation energy while the Müller functional overcorrelates it considerably, Csányi, Goedecker, and Arias (CGA) introduced¹⁶ a form for the function f which is an average between these two functionals

$$f^{\text{CGA}} = \frac{1}{2} \left[n_j n_k + \sqrt{n_j(2-n_j)}\sqrt{n_k(2-n_k)} \right]. \quad (8)$$

This functional is very accurate in the high-density limit of the HEG,¹⁶ and is comparable to common generalized-gradient approximations (GGA) for atoms (albeit not as precise as the GU functional). Interestingly, it reproduces the correct dissociation limit for small molecules.^{26,27}

We now turn our attention to the most recent functionals of the 1-RDM. A promising approach was recently put forth by Gritsenko, Pernal, and Baerends.¹⁷ They proposed three hierarchical corrections in order to treat the overcorrelation of the Müller functional: the BBC1, BBC2, and BBC3. For all these functionals it is essential to divide the natural orbitals into strongly and weakly occupied. This distinction appears naturally for finite systems since usually in this case the natural orbitals have occupation numbers that are either close to one or to zero. We denote the set of strongly occupied orbitals as S and the set of the weakly occupied as W . For the BBC1, the function $f(n_j, n_k)$ is

$$f^{\text{BBC1}}(n_j, n_k) = \begin{cases} -\sqrt{n_j n_k}, & j \neq k \wedge \phi_j, \phi_k \in W, \\ \sqrt{n_j n_k}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

while for BBC2, we have

$$f^{\text{BBC2}}(n_j, n_k) = \begin{cases} -\sqrt{n_j n_k}, & j \neq k \wedge \phi_j, \phi_k \in W, \\ n_j n_k, & j \neq k \wedge \phi_j, \phi_k \in S, \\ \sqrt{n_j n_k}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The symbol \wedge stands for the logical “and” while \in means that the orbitals on the left belong to the set on the right. In other words, the BBC1 functional consists in a sign change of the function f of the Müller functional for orbitals $i \neq j$ that are both weakly occupied while the BBC2, in addition to BBC1 correction, restores the exchange-like form for orbitals $i \neq j$ that are both strongly occupied. The reconstructed second order density associated with BBC1 and BBC2 is also consistent with the sum rule relating the second and first order densities.

Finally, in the BBC3 functional, there are corrections that apply only to the bonding and anti-bonding orbitals. An issue that emerges especially when BBC3 is applied to systems with large number of electrons is the possibility of degenerate bonding and anti-bonding orbitals. Selecting one of the degenerate orbitals as bonding or anti-bonding breaks the symmetry of the molecule. For this reason, in our treatment, we consider a modification that respects the degeneracies of bonding and/or anti-bonding orbitals. We subdivide further the set S into two subsets: the subset S_b for the degenerate bonding orbitals, and the subset S_c for the rest. Accordingly, we subdivide the set W into the subset W_a of the degenerate anti-bonding orbitals and W_h of the rest weakly occupied orbitals. The function f for the BBC3 becomes

$$f^{\text{BBC3}}(n_j, n_k) = \begin{cases} -\sqrt{n_j n_k}, & j \neq k \wedge \phi_j, \phi_k \in W, \\ n_j n_k, & j \neq k \wedge \phi_j, \phi_k \in S, \\ n_j n_k, & (\phi_j \in S_c \wedge \phi_k \in W_a) \vee (\phi_k \in S_c \wedge \phi_j \in W_a), \\ n_j^2, & j = k \wedge \phi_j, \phi_k \in S_c \cup W_h, \\ \sqrt{n_j n_k}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where \cup stands for the union of two sets and \vee for the logical “or”. The first two cases in the definition (11) represents the BBC1 and BBC2 corrections, the third the inclusion of the anti-bonding orbitals in the BBC2 correction (unless they interact with bonding orbitals). Finally, the fourth case stands for the removal of the SI terms as in the GU functional for all orbitals apart from those belonging to the bonding or anti-bonding subsets. This final correction violates the sum rule between the second and first order densities.

Gritsenko *et al.*¹⁷ applied the BBC functionals to diatomic molecules and showed that they give an accurate description of these molecules at both the equilibrium distance and at the dissociation limit. BBC1 and BBC2 were also applied to the HEG.⁴ BBC3 involves single orbital type of corrections and for the HEG it coincides with BBC2.

Another functional that was recently introduced by Piris,¹⁸ uses the cumulant expansion to derive a reconstructed functional of the two-matrix. Under further considerations, Piris arrived at the functional (which we will call PNOF0 from Piris Natural Orbital Functional)

$$f^{\text{PNOF0}} = \Lambda_{jk}^{(0)} - \delta_{jk} (n_j - n_j^2) \quad (12)$$

with

$$\Lambda_{jk}^{(0)} = [1 - 2\theta(\frac{1}{2} - n_j) \theta(\frac{1}{2} - n_k)] \sqrt{n_j n_k}, \quad (13)$$

where θ is the Heaviside step function. This approximation can be seen as a combination of the removal of the SI terms, as in the GU functional, applied on top of the BBC1 correction. In order to avoid the effect of state pinning, Piris modified Λ_{jk} by adding an extra term. We refer to this functional as PNOF. It reads

$$f^{\text{PNOF}} = \Lambda_{jk} - \delta_{jk} (n_j - n_j^2), \quad (14)$$

with

$$\Lambda_{jk} = \Lambda_{jk}^{(0)} + \theta(n_j - \frac{1}{2}) \theta(n_k - \frac{1}{2}) \sqrt{(1 - n_j)(1 - n_k)} \quad (15)$$

PNOF was applied to a set of 57 molecules by calculating the correlation energies and dipole moments and comparing with coupled cluster theory and experimental values.¹⁸ It was also applied to the calculation of ionization potentials and vibrational frequencies.^{19,20,21} Recently a generalization of this functional to open shell

systems was introduced,²¹ and applied to the calculation of correlation energies, ionization potentials and electron affinities. Finally, a new ansatz based on PNOF²² has been introduced for the calculation of dispersion forces and applied to the calculation of helium dimer.

III. RESULTS

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

Our implementation of RDMFT for finite systems is based on an expansion of the natural orbitals on Gaussian basis sets. The total energy as well as its gradients with respect to the occupation numbers and the natural orbitals can then be written in terms of the so-called one and two-electron integrals. Thus, the numerical treatment can be based on a HF implementation provided that the functional is of J-K type. Note that all functionals we are concerned with in this Article are of this type. The required one and two-electron integrals are inputs to our program. In the current implementation, we have been using the GAMESS program³⁷ for this task.

We minimize the total energy of Eq. (1) following two steps that are repeated alternately. In the first, we minimize with respect to the occupation numbers keeping the natural orbitals fixed. For this step, we use a sequential quadratic programming method.³⁸ For the second, we use a conjugate gradient method. We use appropriate energy gradients which respect the orbital orthonormality.^{25,39} The gradients of the total energy with respect to the natural orbitals have the form

$$\frac{\delta E_{\text{tot}}}{\delta \phi_i^*} = F^{(i)} \phi_i, \quad (16)$$

where $F^{(i)}$ is a generalization of the Fock matrix of HF theory, that in RDMFT depends on the orbital i . Consequently, the problem does not reduce to a simple diagonalization, and the matrices $F^{(i)}$ have to be updated very often in the minimization process. This turns out to be the most time-consuming part of our implementation, since the calculation of $F^{(i)}$ involves the summation over the two electron integrals. A possible workaround to the orbital minimization problem has been proposed by Pernal.⁴⁰ In this approach, all natural orbitals stem from the same non-local potential that is obtained from

a procedure inspired by the optimized effective potential method (OEP) of DFT.

We used two sets of calculations: The first set includes all molecules of the G2/97 set, calculated with the Cartesian 6-31G* Gaussian basis set. In the second, we employed the significantly larger cc-pVDZ basis set but we considered a subset of the G2/97 set (G2-1), that includes 55 molecules. In this way, we could check the dependence of our findings on the choice of basis set. As reference we used the coupled cluster method with singles, doubles and perturbative triples [CCSD(T)]⁴¹ employing the same basis sets.

Apart from the orbitals with occupancy close to one, we included 40 extra natural orbitals in the minimization procedure. It has been shown that this number is sufficient to achieve convergence of the total energy.^{7,24} For systems that are small enough and this number exceeds the size of the basis, we performed full variation, i.e., the number of the varied natural orbitals was equal to the size of the basis. For comparison, we computed the correlation energy using DFT with the Becke 3 parameter exchange-correlation functional (B3LYP)^{42,43} and Møller Plesset second-order perturbation theory (MP2). For these, as well as for the CCSD(T) calculations, we used the Gaussian 98 program.⁴⁴ In all calculations, the geometries optimized with the MP2 method were used.

For the open shell systems, our implementation²⁴ assumes spin dependent occupation numbers but spin independent natural orbitals. Furthermore, in the minimization with respect to the spin dependent occupation numbers, both spin-up and spin-down total numbers of electrons were kept fixed. One can show that in this formulation the S_z component of the total spin of the system is preserved. Moreover, this approach is very efficient numerically, as the number of orbitals included in the variation process is half the number for the full unrestricted case. We should mention that there is not a unique way to generalize 1-RDM functionals to the case of open shell systems. For example, a generalization, alternative to the one used in this work, was recently introduced for the PNOF functional.²¹

V. TOTAL ENERGY

In the Fig. 1, we plot the correlation energy obtained with various methods versus the reference values. The dashed lines correspond to the perfect agreement with the reference energies calculated with the CCSD(T) method. The complete set of our results can be found as supplementary material to this Article. It can be easily seen from the figure that the Müller functional overcorrelates substantially all systems. This is in complete agreement with previous calculations for finite systems and for the HEG and supports the idea that this functional could be a lower bound for the total energy.³⁶ In Figs. 1(a) and (b), we show the improvement over the Müller and GU functionals which is provided by the BBC's and Piris




FIG. 1: Correlation energy calculated by a variety of methods versus reference values ($E_c^{(\text{ref})}$) obtained with CCSD(T). The dashed line corresponds to $E_c = E_c^{(\text{ref})}$.

functionals respectively. In Fig. 1(c), we compare the results obtained with the more accurate functionals, i.e. PNOF0 and BBC3, with MP2 and B3LYP values.

In Tables I and II, we show a few quantities that measure the deviation from the reference values. The mean-

Method	$\bar{\Delta}$	Δ_{\max}	$\bar{\delta}$	δ_{\max}	$\bar{\delta}_e$
Müller	0.55	1.23 (C ₂ Cl ₄)	135.7%	438.3% (Na ₂)	0.0193
GU	0.26	0.79 (C ₂ Cl ₄)	51.63%	114.2% (Si ₂)	0.0072
CGA	0.22	0.55 (C ₂ Cl ₄)	69.11%	331.9% (Na ₂)	0.0077
BBC1	0.29	0.75 (C ₂ Cl ₄)	69.91%	159.1% (Na ₂)	0.0098
BBC2	0.18	0.50 (C ₂ Cl ₄)	45.02%	125.0% (Na ₂)	0.0058
BBC3	0.068	0.27 (SiCl ₄)	18.37%	50.8% (SiH ₂)	0.0017
PNOF	0.102	0.42 (SiCl ₄)	20.84%	59.1% (SiCl ₄)	0.0021
PNOF0	0.072	0.32 (SiCl ₄)	17.11%	46.0% (Cl ₂)	0.0015
MP2	0.040	0.074 (C ₂ Cl ₄)	11.86%	35.7% (Li ₂)	0.0015
B3LYP	0.75	2.72 (SiCl ₄)	305.0%	2803.7% (Li ₂)	0.022

TABLE I: Error in the correlation energies calculated with a variety of methods for the first set of calculations (whole G2/97 set, 6-31G* basis). The reference energies (E_c^{ref}) were obtained with CCSD(T). The values in the first, second and last column are in a.u.

Method	$\bar{\Delta}$	Δ_{\max}	$\bar{\delta}$	δ_{\max}	$\bar{\delta}_e$
Müller	0.34	0.56 (Cl ₂)	154.7%	438.8% (Na ₂)	0.0191
GU	0.12	0.28 (Cl ₂)	45.59%	120.4% (Na ₂)	0.0049
CGA	0.16	0.33 (Si ₂)	89.23%	330.9% (Na ₂)	0.0085
BBC1	0.18	0.36 (ClO)	75.48%	180.8% (Na ₂)	0.0096
BBC2	0.10	0.23 (Cl ₂)	49.10%	144.6% (Na ₂)	0.0055
BBC3	0.043	0.14 (Cl ₂)	19.98%	68.9% (Na ₂)	0.0018
PNOF	0.046	0.16 (Cl ₂)	18.36%	49.5% (Cl ₂)	0.0017
PNOF0	0.040	0.14 (Cl ₂)	16.84%	44.6% (Na ₂)	0.0016
MP2	0.026	0.057 (Si ₂ H ₆)	14.55%	34.1% (Li ₂)	0.0016
B3LYP	0.51	1.117 (Cl ₂)	423.5%	2642.5% (Na ₂)	0.023

TABLE II: Error in the correlation energies calculated with a variety of methods for the second set of calculations (G2-1 set, cc-pVDZ basis). The reference energies (E_c^{ref}) were obtained with CCSD(T). The values in the first, second and last column are in a.u.

ing of the columns is the following:

$$\bar{\Delta} = \sqrt{\sum (E_c - E_c^{\text{ref}})^2 / N_{\text{mol}}}, \quad (17a)$$

$$\Delta_{\max} = \max |E_c - E_c^{\text{ref}}|, \quad (17b)$$

$$\bar{\delta} = 100 \sqrt{\sum [(E_c - E_c^{\text{ref}}) / E_c^{\text{ref}}]^2 / N_{\text{mol}}}, \quad (17c)$$

$$\delta_{\max} = 100 \times \max |(E_c - E_c^{\text{ref}}) / E_c^{\text{ref}}|, \quad (17d)$$

$$\bar{\delta}_e = \sum |E_c - E_c^{\text{ref}}| / (N \times N_{\text{mol}}), \quad (17e)$$

where N_{mol} is the number of molecules in the test set, and N is the number of electrons in the molecule.

Clearly, the least performing approximation is the Müller functional. On average it overestimates the correlation energy by more than 100% while in the worst case the error exceeds 400%. The GU, CGA, BBC1 and BBC2 functionals improve significantly with errors of the order of 45-90% for both sets of calculations. Finally, BBC3 and the Piris functionals are the most accurate. Their performance is quite remarkable, with average errors in the range 17-20% which are by merely a factor of 1.5 larger than the average error of MP2. They correct 85% of the error of the Müller functional. Interestingly, PNOF0, i.e. the Piris functional without the additional term which keeps the occupations fractional,

is slightly better in performance than BBC3 or PNOF and is the most accurate as far as correlation energies are concerned.

As we see in Fig. 1(a), all 1-RDM functionals we tested tend to overcorrelate compared to CCSD(T). This trend is the same for both sets of calculations. For the first set, BBC3, PNOF and PNOF0 give total energies lower than CCSD(T) for 120, 126 and 104 systems respectively out of the 148 of the G2 set. The other 1-RDM functionals overcorrelate for nearly all the cases.

Note that the performance of the functionals for the two sets of calculations is quite similar (see Tables I and II). This indicates that the convergence rate of the correlation energies obtained with 1-RDM functionals is similar to variational methods like MP2 or CCSD(T). Note that it is well known that DFT functionals converge faster with respect to the basis set faster than these variational methods.^{45,46}

In the last column of Tables I and II, we show the average error, $\bar{\delta}_e$, of the correlation energy per electron. The largest value is for the Müller functional, 0.019 a.u., and is one order of magnitude smaller than the correction of 1/8 a.u. per electron proposed by Frank *et al.*³⁶ Thus, it is clear that this correction is rather unrealistic leading to very high total energies.

We now turn our attention to the quality of the min-

imizing γ . We have already mentioned that most of the functionals considered in this work (all except PNOF) produce pinned states for all systems except those with only two electrons. The presence of a pinned state means that the particular natural orbital is present in all determinants of the full configuration-interaction expansion with non-zero coefficients. This situation is rather unlikely for the systems included in the present benchmark. Nevertheless, we would not consider it necessarily as a serious drawback. Pinned states are usually core states with occupation extremely close to one also in the exact γ . Moreover, these core states do not affect significantly many important quantities based on total energy differences.

A quantity which is a measure, although still not absolute, of the quality of the occupation numbers produced by the 1-RDM functionals is the total charge q_w occupying the weakly occupied states of the set W . The quantity q_w shows how much the calculated γ differs from an idempotent matrix, i.e., it is a measure of the degree of correlation of the system. We calculated this quantity for a few representative molecules using the 1-RDM functionals. The results are in the Table III where we have also included the values obtained with coupled cluster with double excitations (CCD).⁴⁷ For the CCD calculations, we used the Gaussian 98 program employing the same basis set as above. The overcorrelation of the Müller functional is again obvious, overestimating q_w by a factor of 4. The rest of the functionals improve significantly as far as this quantity is concerned, with BBC3 being the most accurate, with an error of only 15%. The second best is the PNOF0 functional with an error of 17%.

We would like to close the discussion on the occupation numbers by mentioning a minor problem of the BBC3 functional. This functional introduces orbital specific corrections involving the bonding and anti-bonding orbitals. These corrections are repulsive, i.e., they reduce (in absolute value) the correlation energy. As a consequence, the tendency in the minimization process is to lower the occupation of these states and in that way counteract the effect of the repulsive correction. In several cases, the impact of this counteraction is so strong that the occupation number of some of the anti-bonding orbitals gets equal to zero (pinned at zero). One remedy that we tried for this problem was to update, during the variation, the grouping of the orbitals into the 4 sets mentioned in the previous section. This involves a mechanism that repeatedly finds the anti-bonding orbitals, for example, according to their occupation. However, this process adds a non-analytic behavior to the total energy as a function of the occupation numbers. For this reason, it was not possible to converge the calculation for several molecules, which lead us to abandon this path. Thus, the version of BBC3 functional that we used for all our calculations is the one of Eq. (11), with the grouping of the orbitals into the 4 different sets defined at the beginning from the HF initial guess. However, it is very common that some of the orbitals chosen as anti-bonding are left

with zero or almost zero occupation for the optimal γ .

VI. ATOMIZATION ENERGIES

It is clear from Tables I, and II that all 1-RDM functionals give a better account for the correlation energy than B3LYP (which strongly overcorrelates). However, for methods that are not variational, like RDMFT or DFT, one should not fall in the temptation of using the quality of the calculated correlation energy as the only criterion to assess the performance of functionals. In fact, quantities that are total energy differences are sometimes much more important than the correlation energy. For this reason we also included atomization energies in our benchmark.

For this task, we calculated the energies of the atoms with the same functionals and basis sets used for the molecules (these results can also be found as supplementary material). The large majority of the atoms involved are open shell systems. Like in the case of the open shell systems of the G2/97 set, we employed the open shell generalization introduced in Ref.24. Clearly, the performance of the functionals in the calculation of the atomization energies is also affected by this choice.

Tables with atomization energies of all functionals are included as supplementary material to this Article. The performance of all the methods is summarized in Table IV. As in the case of total energies, the latest generation functionals, i.e. BBC3 and Piris functionals, perform better compared to their predecessors. Again, in this case, PNOF0 gives slightly better results than BBC3 and PNOF. Even if the performance of the Piris and BBC3 functionals is quite satisfactory, they still do not provide the accuracy of MP2 or even B3LYP. The error of PNOF0 is 1.5 times the error of B3LYP and about 3 times the error of MP2. Furthermore, the BBC3 functional yields a negative atomization energy (unbound system) for Li_2 . This is probably due to a size-inconsistency problem of the open shell treatment. Indeed, most of the atoms involved are open shell systems. It is a question whether the sum of the total energies of the atoms consisting a molecule equals the total energy of the stretched molecule obtained by a single closed-shell calculation. Li_2 is an extreme case, which is also enhanced by the very small value of its atomization energy. However, more atomization energies might deviate from the exact due to this inconsistency. It would be interesting to investigate if different open shell schemes, like for example that of Ref.21, improve the results of RDMFT on the atomization energies.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We presented benchmark calculations on an extended set of molecules for a series of exchange-correlation functionals proposed within RDMFT. We assessed the accu-

Molecule	Müller	GU	CGA	BBC1	BBC2	BBC3	PNOF	PNOF0	CCD
Ammonia	0.246	0.080	0.219	0.153	0.126	0.071	0.053	0.052	0.061
Ethane	0.379	0.183	0.309	0.126	0.154	0.093	0.106	0.095	0.112
CO ₂	0.560	0.276	0.520	0.329	0.229	0.149	0.167	0.154	0.131
H ₂ O	0.220	0.066	0.200	0.148	0.114	0.065	0.047	0.048	0.055
Acetylene	0.447	0.183	0.435	0.239	0.191	0.108	0.088	0.087	0.115
$\bar{\delta}$ (%)	293	65	258	132	82	15	18	17	

TABLE III: Total charge q_w (electrons per spin) occupying weakly occupied natural orbitals for a few representative molecules, compared with the result of coupled cluster doubles (CCD).

Calculation	R(O)HF	MP2	B3LYP	Mueller	GU	CGA	BBC1	BBC2	BBC3	PNOF0	PNOF
set 1	42.4	6.24	11.7	32.7	43.7	42.5	31.0	26.9	18.0	17.5	25.5
set 2	53.8	7.94	12.1	40.6	50.4	47.4	34.8	40.1	25.6	23.9	30.4

TABLE IV: The error average error $\bar{\delta}$ (%), defined in Eq. 17c, for the atomization energies calculated with different methods for the two sets of calculations. Reference values are the atomization energies calculated with CCSD(T) method.

racy of these functionals concerning both the correlation and the atomization energy.

All functionals fared quite well in the test, with errors in the correlation energy at least an order of magnitude smaller than B3LYP, perhaps the most used functional in the world of DFT. To summarize, the oldest of the approximations within RDMFT, the functional of Müller, overcorrelates substantially. The GU and CGA improve significantly compared to the functional of Müller. Finally, the BBC3 functional of Gritsenko *et al.*, and the functional of Piris are the most successful in correcting the error of the Müller functional. PNOF0, i.e. the Piris functional *without* the term which prevents pinned states, performs better than all the functional we considered, with a precision already comparable to MP2 theory.

For the atomization energies, 1-RDM functionals are also satisfactory, yielding however a somewhat lower accuracy than B3LYP. The best 1-RDM functional for this quantity is again PNOF0, with an average error 1.5 times larger than B3LYP. We found that the treatment of open shell atoms introduces a size inconsistency which affects significantly the accuracy of the atomization energies.

We also report a problem in the behavior of BBC3 functional which comes from the orbital-specific corrections introduced in this functional. More specifically, we observed a counteraction to the repulsive correction, that leads to zero occupation for some of the anti-bonding orbitals. In spite of this problem, BBC3, as well as the Piris functional, was found very accurate in reproducing the total charge that occupies the weakly occupied states.

It is clear from our results that the available functionals already have enough precision to be used in many quantum chemistry problems, especially for systems that DFT results are not satisfactory. Furthermore, RDMFT is still a young field, and it is reasonable to expect fast advances in the construction of new functionals, with increased precision and range of applicability. However, one big problem still remains to be solved: the efficiency of the minimization of the total energy with respect to the 1-RDM. In addition, up to now, the existing RDMFT codes are research codes, relatively slow, and of limited availability. We hope that the results present in this paper will motivate developers of mainstream quantum chemistry codes to include RDMFT in their set of methods, bringing therefore this very promising approach to a much wider public.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft within the program SPP 1145, by the Portuguese FCT through the project PTDC/FIS/73578/2006, and by the EC Network of Excellence NANOQUANTA (NMP4-CT-2004-500198). Part of the calculations were performed at the Laboratório de Computação Avançada of the University of Coimbra.

¹ T. L. Gilbert, Phys. Rev. **B12**, 2111 (1975).

² P-O Löwdin, Phys. Rev. **97**, 1474 (1954).

³ A. Coleman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **35**, 668 (1963).

⁴ N. N. Lathiotakis, N. Helbig, and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 195120 (2007)

⁵ J. M. Herbert J. E. Harriman, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 10835

(2003).

⁶ A. M. K. Müller, Phys. Lett. A **105**, 446 (1984).

⁷ S. Goedecker, C. J. Umrigar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 866 (1998).

⁸ M.A. Buijse, PhD Thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (1991); M. A. Buijse, E. J. Baerends, Mol. Phys. **100**, 401

- (2002).
- ⁹ K. Yasuda, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 032517 (2001).
 - ¹⁰ K. Yasuda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 053001 (2002).
 - ¹¹ C. Kollmar, J. Chem. Phys. **121**, 11581 (2004).
 - ¹² J. Cioslowski, K. Pernal, M. Buchowiecki, J. Chem. Phys. **119**, 6443 (2003).
 - ¹³ K. Pernal, J. Cioslowski, J. Chem. Phys. **120**, 5987 (2004).
 - ¹⁴ J. Cioslowski and K. Pernal, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 113103 (2005).
 - ¹⁵ G. Csányi and T. A. Arias, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 7348 (2000).
 - ¹⁶ G. Csányi, S. Goedecker, T. A. Arias, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032510 (2002).
 - ¹⁷ O. Gritsenko, K. Pernal, E. J. Baerends, J. Chem. Phys., **122**, 204102 (2005).
 - ¹⁸ M. Piris, Int. J. Quant. Chem. **106**, 1093 (2006).
 - ¹⁹ P. Leiva and M. Piris, J. Chem. Phys., **123**, 214102 (2005).
 - ²⁰ P. Leiva, M. Piris, J. Mol. Struct.-Theochem., **770**, 45 (2006).
 - ²¹ P. Leiva, M. Piris, Int. J. Quant. Chem., **107**, 1 (2007).
 - ²² M. Piris, X. Lopez, and J. M. Ugalde, J. Chem. Phys. **126**, 214103 (2007).
 - ²³ P. Leiva, M. Piris, J. Theo. Comp. Chem. **4**, 1165 (2005).
 - ²⁴ N. N. Lathiotakis, N. Helbig, and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 030501(R) (2005).
 - ²⁵ A. J. Cohen, E. J. Baerends, Chem. Phys. Lett., **364**, 409 (2002).
 - ²⁶ V. N. Staroverov and G. E. Scuseria, J. Chem. Phys. **117**, 2489 (2002).
 - ²⁷ J. M. Herbert, J. E. Harriman, Chem. Phys. Lett. **382**, 142 (2003).
 - ²⁸ J. Cioslowski and K. Pernal, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 3396 (1999).
 - ²⁹ K. Pernal, J. Cioslowski, Chem. Phys. Lett., **412**, 71 (2005).
 - ³⁰ N. N. Lathiotakis, N. Helbig, and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 195120 (2007).
 - ³¹ K. Pernal, E. J. Baerends, J. Chem. Phys., **124**, 014102 (2006).
 - ³² K. Pernal, O. Gritsenko, E. J. Baerends, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 012506 (2007).
 - ³³ K. Pernal, J. Cioslowski, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys., **9**, 5956 (2007).
 - ³⁴ L. A. Curtiss, K. Raghavachari, P. C. Redfern, and J. A. Pople, J. of Chem. Phys. **106**, 1063 (1997).
 - ³⁵ L. A. Curtiss, P. C. Redfern, K. Raghavachari, and J. A. Pople, J. of Chem. Phys., **109**, 42 (1998).
 - ³⁶ R. L. Frank, E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, H. Siedentop, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052517 (2007).
 - ³⁷ Schmidt M. W. *et al.*, J. Comp. Chem. **14**, 1347 (1993).
 - ³⁸ Fletcher R (1987) Practical Methods of Optimization (2nd Edition) Wiley.
 - ³⁹ S. Goedecker and C. J. Umrigar, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 1765 (1997).
 - ⁴⁰ K. Pernal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 233002 (2005)
 - ⁴¹ J. A. Pople, M. Head-Gordon, and K. Raghavachari, J. Chem. Phys. **87**, 5968 (1987).
 - ⁴² A. D. Becke, J. Chem. Phys. **98**, 5648 (1993).
 - ⁴³ C. Lee, W. Yang, and R. G. Parr, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 785 (1988).
 - ⁴⁴ M. J. Frisch, *et al.*, Gaussian 98, Rev A.9 (Gaussian Inc., Pittsburgh PA, 1998)
 - ⁴⁵ P. M. W. Gill, B. G. Johnson, J. A. Pople, M. J. Frisch, Chem. Phys. Lett. **197**, 499 (1992).
 - ⁴⁶ J. M. L. Martin, J. El-Yazal, J.-P. Francois, Mol. Phys. **86**, 1437 (1995).
 - ⁴⁷ J. A. Pople, R. Krishnan, H. B. Schlegel, and J. S. Binkley, Int. J. Quant. Chem. **14**, 545 (1978).
-

Supplementary material

I. CORRELATION ENERGIES

A. G2/97 set, 6-31G* basis

System	$-E_{\text{tot}}$ RHF	$-E_c$ CCSD(T)	$-E_c$ BBC1	$-E_c$ BBC3	$-E_c$ PNOF0	$-E_c$ PNOF
LiH	7.98087	0.0226	0.0393	0.0266	0.0161	0.0161
BeH	15.14697	0.0339	0.0764	0.0473	0.0380	0.0380
CH radical	38.26128	0.1063	0.2507	0.1210	0.1074	0.1083
CH ₂ (³ B ₁)	38.91631	0.1104	0.1806	0.1226	0.1129	0.1134
CH ₂ (¹ A ₁)	38.87219	0.1299	0.2651	0.1489	0.1266	0.1275
CH ₃ radical	39.55461	0.1406	0.2127	0.1468	0.1344	0.1363
CH ₄	40.19507	0.1653	0.2187	0.1637	0.1490	0.1555
NH	54.95210	0.1297	0.2356	0.1410	0.1297	0.1316
NH ₂ radical	55.55299	0.1613	0.2766	0.1711	0.1549	0.1567
NH ₃	56.18384	0.1912	0.2908	0.2077	0.1811	0.1819
OH radical	75.37792	0.1612	0.3171	0.1779	0.1592	0.1606
H ₂ O	76.00981	0.2002	0.3017	0.2131	0.1861	0.1857
HF	100.00229	0.1878	0.2647	0.1921	0.1685	0.1716
SiH ₂ (¹ A ₁)	289.99970	0.1038	0.2438	0.1546	0.1382	0.1401
SiH ₂ (³ B ₁)	289.99090	0.0856	0.1995	0.1291	0.1210	0.1225
SiH ₃ radical	290.60476	0.1034	0.2185	0.1465	0.1348	0.1375
SiH ₄	291.22504	0.1189	0.2237	0.1611	0.1469	0.1586
PH ₂ radical	341.84526	0.1263	0.2753	0.1751	0.1668	0.1683
PH ₃	342.44775	0.1430	0.2870	0.2036	0.1848	0.1861
H ₂ S	398.66711	0.1559	0.3249	0.2270	0.2057	0.2068
HCl	460.05985	0.1608	0.3145	0.2262	0.2082	0.2112
Li ₂	14.86689	0.0310	0.0593	0.0340	0.0230	0.0230
LiF	106.93418	0.1976	0.2777	0.1902	0.1681	0.1726
C ₂ H ₂	76.81560	0.2874	0.3946	0.2625	0.2569	0.2589
C ₂ H ₄	78.03107	0.3001	0.4317	0.2860	0.2869	0.2900
C ₂ H ₆	79.22854	0.3150	0.4314	0.3118	0.3038	0.3182
CN radical	92.19013	0.2963	0.4362	0.2738	0.2542	0.2582
HCN	92.87019	0.3159	0.4313	0.2783	0.2805	0.2839
CO	112.73448	0.3104	0.4524	0.3226	0.2931	0.3023
HCO radical	113.24033	0.3199	0.5100	0.2852	0.3175	0.3230
H ₂ CO	113.86371	0.3339	0.5375	0.3640	0.3411	0.3489
H ₃ COH	115.03419	0.3474	0.5379	0.3782	0.3542	0.3644
N ₂	108.93540	0.3388	0.4781	0.2493	0.3086	0.3206
H ₂ NNH ₂	111.16800	0.3668	0.5762	0.4027	0.3770	0.3957
NO radical	129.24050	0.3431	0.5929	0.2999	0.3513	0.3629
O ₂	149.58560	0.3800	0.6101	0.3619	0.3814	0.3901
HOOH	150.76011	0.3955	0.6729	0.4397	0.4217	0.4426
F ₂	198.67283	0.3818	0.6925	0.4304	0.4150	0.4471
CO ₂	187.62841	0.5032	0.7321	0.5140	0.5084	0.5290
Na ₂	323.68169	0.0312	0.0808	0.0438	0.0361	0.0362
Si ₂	577.69210	0.2044	0.4507	0.2719	0.2786	0.2808
P ₂	681.42041	0.2729	0.5286	0.3648	0.3464	0.3549
S ₂	795.00558	0.2885	0.6032	0.3636	0.4031	0.4115
Cl ₂	918.91256	0.3112	0.6721	0.4446	0.4544	0.4704
NaCl	621.39961	0.1612	0.3246	0.2227	0.2054	0.2097
SiO	363.77506	0.2987	0.4877	0.3175	0.3116	0.3226
CS	435.30360	0.2847	0.5075	0.3341	0.3201	0.3260
SO	472.30865	0.3378	0.6018	0.3635	0.3946	0.3994
ClO radical	534.22659	0.3275	0.6872	0.3872	0.4311	0.4455
ClF	558.81813	0.3432	0.6596	0.4408	0.4355	0.4560
Si ₂ H ₆	581.30488	0.2286	0.4445	0.3151	0.3025	0.3289
CH ₃ Cl	499.09290	0.3106	0.5496	0.3898	0.3753	0.3862
H ₃ C-SH	437.70000	0.3077	0.5567	0.3925	0.3762	0.3805

System	$-E_{\text{tot}}$ RHF	$-E_c$ CCSD(T)	$-E_c$ BBC1	$-E_c$ BBC3	$-E_c$ PNOF0	$-E_c$ PNOF
HOCl	534.84018	0.3549	0.6763	0.4458	0.4477	0.4620
SO ₂	547.15790	0.5562	0.9288	0.6249	0.6521	0.6890
BF ₃	323.19407	0.6133	0.8385	0.6169	0.6238	0.6779
BCl ₃	1403.25416	0.5543	1.0356	0.7339	0.7708	0.8128
AlF ₃	540.44920	0.6014	0.8175	0.6039	0.6109	0.6886
AlCl ₃	1620.57601	0.5195	0.9946	0.7154	0.7490	0.8018
CF ₄	435.64152	0.8440	1.2196	0.8742	0.8950	1.0098
CCl ₄	1875.74481	0.7721	1.4797	1.0231	1.0794	1.1659
O=C=S	510.25587	0.4725	0.7867	0.5531	0.5489	0.5627
CS ₂	832.88348	0.4425	0.8240	0.5687	0.5798	0.5917
COF ₂	311.61034	0.6744	1.0000	0.7292	0.7064	0.7777
SiF ₄	686.94780	0.8092	1.1123	0.8257	0.8401	0.9679
SiCl ₄	2127.04685	0.7071	1.3695	0.9798	1.0279	1.1252
N ₂ O	183.66310	0.5569	0.8539	0.5872	0.5772	0.5907
ClNO	588.67097	0.5418	0.9989	0.6571	0.6766	0.6953
NF ₃	352.53192	0.7329	1.2001	0.8089	0.8346	0.9132
PF ₃	639.12725	0.6675	1.0267	0.7519	0.7705	0.8337
O ₃	224.23806	0.6459	1.1124	0.5865	0.7192	0.7762
F ₂ O	273.44465	0.5796	1.0466	0.6707	0.6779	0.7274
ClF ₃	757.47982	0.7485	1.2977	0.8695	0.9099	1.0476
C ₂ F ₄	473.41166	0.9863	1.4781	1.0433	1.0943	1.1753
C ₂ Cl ₄	1913.60266	0.9114	1.6591	1.1556	1.0961	1.3067
CF ₃ CN	428.47216	0.9793	1.3702	0.9630	0.9863	1.1229
CH ₃ CCH (propyne)	115.86191	0.4364	0.6169	0.4477	0.4233	0.4349
CH ₂ =C=CH ₂ (allene)	115.86012	0.4371	0.6340	0.3925	0.4360	0.4482
C ₃ H ₄ (cyclopropene)	115.82178	0.4407	0.6384	0.4568	0.4402	0.4466
CH ₃ CH=CH ₂ (propylene)	117.07068	0.4512	0.6511	0.4439	0.4523	0.4618
C ₃ H ₆ (cyclopropane)	117.05853	0.4518	0.6440	0.4637	0.4445	0.4598
C ₃ H ₈ (propane)	118.26328	0.4668	0.6428	0.4581	0.4589	0.4862
CH ₂ CHCHCH ₂ (Trans-1,3-butadiene)	154.91815	0.5878	0.8490	0.6006	0.5986	0.6106
C ₄ H ₆ (2-butyne)	154.90663	0.5858	0.8340	0.5997	0.5818	0.6018
C ₄ H ₆ (methylene cyclopropane)	154.88650	0.5895	0.8370	0.6077	0.5855	0.6081
C ₄ H ₆ (bicyclobutane)	154.87081	0.5931	0.8525	0.6114	0.6030	0.6127
C ₄ H ₆ (cyclobutene)	154.89853	0.5907	0.8365	0.5725	0.5883	0.6023
C ₄ H ₈ (cyclobutane)	156.09645	0.6050	0.8414	0.5884	0.5923	0.6272
C ₄ H ₈ (isobutene)	156.10979	0.6041	0.8554	0.6245	0.6047	0.6219
C ₄ H ₁₀ (trans-butane)	157.29791	0.6188	0.8422	0.5943	0.6037	0.6468
C ₄ H ₁₀ (isobutane)	157.29841	0.6207	0.8438	0.5941	0.6020	0.6448
C ₅ H ₈ (spiropentane)	193.91719	0.7428	1.0339	0.7131	0.7314	0.7629
C ₆ H ₆ (benzene)	230.70204	0.8579	1.1510	0.8076	0.8205	0.8440
H ₂ CF ₂	237.89483	0.5026	0.7506	0.5123	0.5139	0.5675
HCf ₃	336.76920	0.6734	0.9854	0.6811	0.7150	0.7888
H ₂ CCl ₂	957.98494	0.4606	0.8580	0.6005	0.6145	0.6454
HCCl ₃	1416.86955	0.6147	1.1725	0.8103	0.8556	0.9198
H ₃ C-NH ₂ (methylamine)	95.20912	0.3398	0.5236	0.3744	0.3463	0.3551
CH ₃ -CN (acetonitrile)	131.92248	0.4634	0.6507	0.4690	0.4455	0.4666
CH ₃ -NO ₂ (nitromethane)	243.65373	0.7246	1.1502	0.7714	0.7844	0.8438
CH ₃ ONO (methylnitrite)	243.65962	0.7203	1.1650	0.7821	0.7891	0.8306
CH ₃ -SiH ₃ (methylsilane)	330.27223	0.2707	0.4371	0.3134	0.2956	0.3206
HCOOH (formic acid)	188.75863	0.5178	0.7936	0.5591	0.5292	0.5608
HCOOCH ₃ (methyl formate)	227.78570	0.6677	1.0141	0.7131	0.7012	0.7475
CH ₃ CONH ₂ (acetamide)	207.97351	0.6580	1.0018	0.7057	0.6905	0.7270
C ₂ H ₄ NH (aziridine)	133.03730	0.4790	0.7179	0.5155	0.4915	0.5035
NCCN (cyanogen)	184.57786	0.6233	0.8564	0.5981	0.5710	0.6297
(CH ₃) ₂ NH (dimethylamine)	134.23800	0.4909	0.7533	0.5396	0.5136	0.5261
CH ₃ CH ₂ NH ₂ (trans-ethylamine)	134.24677	0.4920	0.7403	0.5339	0.5068	0.5223
H ₂ CCO (ketene)	151.72173	0.4685	0.7296	0.5144	0.4995	0.5081
C ₂ H ₄ O (oxirane)	152.86540	0.4873	0.7475	0.5301	0.4905	0.5182
CH ₃ CHO (acetaldehyde)	152.91350	0.4837	0.7557	0.5259	0.5050	0.5212
OCHCHO (glyoxal)	226.58645	0.6543	1.0334	0.6923	0.6448	0.7629
CH ₃ CH ₂ OH (ethanol)	154.07437	0.4989	0.7473	0.5349	0.4988	0.5397
CH ₃ -O-CH ₃ (dimethylether)	154.06337	0.4975	0.7694	0.5424	0.5233	0.5399

System	$-E_{\text{tot}}$ RHF	$-E_c$ CCSD(T)	$-E_c$ BBC1	$-E_c$ BBC3	$-E_c$ PNOF0	$-E_c$ PNOF
C ₂ H ₄ S (thiooxirane)	475.54647	0.4494	0.7605	0.5466	0.5268	0.5354
(CH ₃) ₂ SO (dimethylsulfoxide)	551.53596	0.6580	1.0980	0.7725	0.7719	0.7959
C ₂ H ₅ SH (ethanethiol)	476.73523	0.4600	0.7652	0.5526	0.5368	0.5558
CH ₃ -S-CH ₃ (dimethyl sulfide)	476.73487	0.4615	0.7863	0.5614	0.5480	0.5591
H ₂ C=CHF (vinylfluoride)	176.88072	0.4711	0.7073	0.5060	0.4918	0.5049
C ₂ H ₅ Cl (ethylchloride)	538.13118	0.4624	0.7625	0.5425	0.5340	0.5604
CH ₂ =CHCl (vinylchloride)	536.93293	0.4498	0.7563	0.5383	0.5316	0.5438
H ₂ C=CHCN (acrylonitrile)	169.76199	0.6007	0.8470	0.5996	0.5962	0.6140
CH ₃ -CO-CH ₃ (acetone)	191.95987	0.6349	0.9647	0.6771	0.6635	0.6871
CH ₃ COOH (acetic acid)	227.80703	0.6675	1.0068	0.7119	0.6984	0.7394
CH ₃ COF (acetyl fluoride)	251.79498	0.6549	0.9765	0.6987	0.6848	0.7344
CH ₃ COCl (acetyl chloride)	611.82872	0.6368	1.0434	0.7335	0.7117	0.7792
CH ₃ CH ₂ CH ₂ Cl (propyl chloride)	577.16609	0.6145	0.9589	0.6794	0.6827	0.7245
(CH ₃) ₂ CHOH (isopropanol)	193.11389	0.6528	0.9504	0.6771	0.6643	0.7036
C ₂ H ₅ -O-CH ₃ (methyl-ethyl ether)	193.10336	0.6494	0.9651	0.6845	0.6500	0.7085
(CH ₃) ₃ N (trimethylamine)	173.26829	0.6448	0.9659	0.6905	0.6698	0.6879
C ₄ H ₄ O (furan)	228.62241	0.7636	1.1039	0.7917	0.7879	0.8007
C ₄ H ₄ S (thiophene)	551.28822	0.7297	1.1178	0.7936	0.7983	0.8178
C ₄ H ₄ NH (pyrrole)	208.80589	0.7548	1.0905	0.7773	0.7743	0.7852
C ₅ H ₅ N (pyridine)	246.69375	0.8846	1.2240	0.8461	0.8549	0.8980
H ₂	1.12679	0.0249	0.0262	0.0251	0.0150	0.0150
SH radical	398.06041	0.1338	0.3247	0.1861	0.1858	0.1872
CCH radical	76.13413	0.2619	0.3899	0.2574	0.2309	0.2329
C ₂ H ₃ radical (² A')	77.38072	0.2757	0.4276	0.2605	0.2649	0.2668
CH ₃ CO radical (² A')	152.29117	0.4677	0.7365	0.4427	0.4802	0.5011
H ₂ COH radical (² A)	114.40397	0.3268	0.5256	0.3487	0.3355	0.3428
CH ₃ O radical (Cs)	114.41185	0.3163	0.5554	0.3346	0.3348	0.3451
CH ₃ CH ₂ O radical (² A'')	153.45188	0.4665	0.7641	0.4872	0.4943	0.5181
CH ₃ S radical (² A')	437.09727	0.2866	0.5559	0.3446	0.3563	0.3620
C ₂ H ₅ radical (² A')	78.59242	0.2913	0.4383	0.3026	0.2891	0.2951
(CH ₃) ₂ CH radical (² A')	117.63116	0.4437	0.6640	0.4575	0.4462	0.4616
(CH ₃) ₃ C (t-butyl radical)	156.66989	0.5975	0.8760	0.6006	0.5954	0.6181
NO ₂ radical	204.01248	0.5703	0.9422	0.4991	0.6231	0.6416

TABLE I: Correlation energies E_c for the full G2/97 test set calculated with the 6-31G* basis. All quantities are in a.u.

B. G2-1 set, cc-pVDZ basis

System	$-E_{\text{tot}}$ RHF	$-E_c$ CCSD(T)	$-E_c$ BBC1	$-E_c$ BBC3	$-E_c$ PNOF0	$-E_c$ PNOF
LiH	7.98367	0.0324	0.0506	0.0354	0.0241	0.0241
BeH	15.14952	0.0409	0.0790	0.0524	0.0405	0.0406
CH radical	38.26903	0.1146	0.2511	0.1207	0.1087	0.1097
CH ₂ (³ B ₁)	38.92170	0.1216	0.1898	0.1303	0.1188	0.1200
CH ₂ (¹ A ₁)	38.88109	0.1429	0.2709	0.1534	0.1336	0.1345
CH ₃ radical	39.55963	0.1585	0.2266	0.1579	0.1448	0.1469
CH ₄	40.19871	0.1912	0.2381	0.1795	0.1639	0.1710
NH	54.95987	0.1363	0.2413	0.1447	0.1343	0.1363
NH ₂ radical	55.56301	0.1750	0.2863	0.1791	0.1628	0.1650
NH ₃	56.19561	0.2123	0.3050	0.2205	0.1930	0.1939
OH radical	75.39003	0.1747	0.3270	0.1882	0.1711	0.1725
H ₂ O	76.02638	0.2206	0.3140	0.2267	0.2000	0.2015
HF	100.01888	0.2151	0.2867	0.2160	0.1932	0.1962
SiH ₂ (¹ A ₁)	290.01863	0.1282	0.2562	0.1655	0.1492	0.1511
SiH ₂ (³ B ₁)	290.00997	0.1068	0.2107	0.1393	0.1306	0.1323
SiH ₃ radical	290.62377	0.1342	0.2370	0.1622	0.1495	0.1527
SiH ₄	291.24305	0.1600	0.2461	0.1843	0.1681	0.1809
PH ₂ radical	341.86779	0.1513	0.2891	0.1835	0.1793	0.1806

System	$-E_{\text{tot}}$ RHF	$-E_c$ CCSD(T)	$-E_c$ BBC1	$-E_c$ BBC3	$-E_c$ PNOF0	$-E_c$ PNOF
PH ₃	342.47073	0.1780	0.3088	0.2230	0.2039	0.2055
H ₂ S	398.69486	0.1808	0.3386	0.2406	0.2203	0.2214
HCl	460.08973	0.1745	0.3207	0.2305	0.2133	0.2164
Li ₂	14.87012	0.0337	0.0666	0.0400	0.0289	0.0289
LiF	106.94528	0.2172	0.2958	0.2089	0.1879	0.1917
C ₂ H ₂	76.82493	0.2957	0.3984	0.2876	0.2601	0.2622
C ₂ H ₄	78.04004	0.3255	0.4457	0.2970	0.2987	0.3024
C ₂ H ₆	79.23511	0.3582	0.4599	0.3335	0.3252	0.3409
CN radical	92.19910	0.2936	0.4327	0.2708	0.2475	0.2546
HCN	92.88003	0.3202	0.4330	0.3108	0.2815	0.2859
CO	112.74650	0.3185	0.4563	0.3270	0.2981	0.3072
HCO radical	113.25228	0.3345	0.5194	0.2943	0.3274	0.3330
H ₂ CO	113.87497	0.3547	0.5536	0.3787	0.3553	0.3635
H ₃ COH	115.04900	0.3825	0.5629	0.4008	0.3765	0.3886
N ₂	108.94735	0.3397	0.4810	0.2511	0.3110	0.3230
H ₂ NNH ₂	111.18640	0.3953	0.5959	0.4199	0.3953	0.4130
NO radical	129.25550	0.3530	0.6025	0.3104	0.3640	0.3734
O ₂	149.60042	0.3962	0.6263	0.3256	0.4008	0.4097
HOOH	150.78276	0.4229	0.6899	0.4600	0.4418	0.4622
F ₂	198.68544	0.4242	0.7306	0.4713	0.4571	0.4886
CO ₂	187.64687	0.5185	0.7456	0.5225	0.5215	0.5421
Na ₂	323.70499	0.0330	0.0927	0.0557	0.0477	0.0477
Si ₂	577.73197	0.2121	0.4450	0.2683	0.2744	0.2767
P ₂	681.46368	0.2825	0.5230	0.3634	0.3461	0.3541
S ₂	795.05045	0.3017	0.6109	0.3291	0.4113	0.4184
Cl ₂	918.96282	0.3209	0.6699	0.4573	0.4616	0.4797
NaCl	621.43420	0.1669	0.3308	0.2296	0.2115	0.2161
SiO	363.78893	0.3085	0.4943	0.3319	0.3185	0.3293
CS	435.33022	0.2896	0.5030	0.3305	0.3174	0.3254
SO	472.33136	0.3488	0.6098	0.3688	0.4019	0.4083
ClO radical	534.25352	0.3372	0.6934	0.4046	0.4371	0.4526
ClF	558.84497	0.3658	0.6775	0.4563	0.4526	0.4735
Si ₂ H ₆	581.33931	0.2929	0.4797	0.3460	0.3332	0.3622
CH ₃ Cl	499.11859	0.3366	0.5649	0.4021	0.3870	0.3997
H ₃ C-SH	437.72609	0.3449	0.5803	0.4132	0.3957	0.4029
HOCl	534.87324	0.3717	0.6835	0.4631	0.4559	0.4721

TABLE II: Correlation energies E_c for the G2-1 test set (the first 55 systems of Table I) calculated with the cc-pVDZ basis set. All quantities are in a.u.

II. ATOMIZATION ENERGIES

A. Atomic total energies

Atom	R(O)HF	MP2	B3LYP	CCSD(T)	Müller	BBC3	PNOF0	PNOF
6-31G* basis								
H	0.49823	0.49823	0.50027	0.49823	0.50473	0.50473	0.50212	0.50212
Li	7.43137	7.43186	7.49098	7.43188	7.47526	7.45242	7.44091	7.44091
Be	14.56694	14.59645	14.66844	14.61662	14.69850	14.62789	14.60215	14.60216
B	24.51942	24.56246	24.65435	24.58340	24.77254	24.58811	24.58161	24.58201
C	37.67713	37.73651	37.84628	37.75620	37.95462	37.78778	37.76187	37.76309
N	54.38231	54.45945	54.58449	54.47611	54.57641	54.50031	54.48117	54.48305
O	74.77897	74.88200	75.06061	74.89844	75.16162	74.91413	74.90752	74.90883
F	99.36179	99.48904	99.71553	99.50049	99.73506	99.53559	99.50004	99.50278
Na	161.84140	161.84364	162.27988	161.84381	161.89473	161.85968	161.85578	161.85581
Al	241.85478	241.89500	242.36823	241.91007	242.11458	241.93738	241.93492	241.93527
Si	288.82915	288.88207	289.37173	288.89898	289.11896	288.93167	288.93008	288.93124
P	340.68999	340.75727	341.25808	340.77373	340.93201	340.81077	340.80642	340.80842
S	397.47233	397.56340	398.10500	397.58177	397.88756	397.61995	397.63510	397.63667
Cl	459.44422	459.56206	460.13626	459.57946	459.87582	459.63524	459.63100	459.63410
cc-pVDZ basis								
H	0.49928	0.49928	0.50126	0.49928	0.51544	0.50834	0.50855	0.50855
Li	7.43242	7.43341	7.49202	7.43346	7.48348	7.45963	7.44376	7.44376
Be	14.57236	14.59996	14.67205	14.61856	14.69657	14.64292	14.60429	14.60429
B	24.52663	24.56885	24.66165	24.59153	24.76772	24.64675	24.58406	24.58445
C	37.68247	37.74148	37.85290	37.76333	37.95395	37.81797	37.76365	37.76489
N	54.38847	54.46585	54.59024	54.48234	54.58388	54.51316	54.48844	54.49030
O	74.78758	74.89891	75.06961	74.91450	75.18168	75.01424	74.92679	74.92806
F	99.37193	99.52152	99.72778	99.53291	99.76946	99.59147	99.53453	99.53720
Na	161.85307	161.85551	162.29148	161.85567	161.91068	161.88600	161.86980	161.86987
Al	241.87030	241.91125	242.38415	241.92832	242.12521	241.99711	241.94758	241.94792
Si	288.84662	288.90373	289.39012	288.92356	289.13801	288.99332	288.94759	288.94878
P	340.70920	340.78227	341.27813	340.80065	340.95621	340.86882	340.82851	340.83080
S	397.49304	397.59045	398.12672	397.60987	397.91093	397.73842	397.65771	397.65927
Cl	459.46739	459.59050	460.16014	459.60779	459.89575	459.71057	459.65314	459.65632

TABLE III: Absolute value of the atomic total energies, calculated both with the 6-31G* and the cc-pVDZ basis sets. These were the values used for the calculation of the atomization energies presented in the following tables. All quantities are in a.u.

B. G2/97 set, 6-31G* basis

System	$-E_a$ CCSD(T)	$-E_a$ MP2	$-E_a$ B3LYP	$-E_a$ BBC3	$-E_a$ PNOF0	$-E_a$ PNOF
LiH	0.0734	0.0664	0.0906	0.0503	0.0539	0.0539
BeH	0.0660	0.0767	0.0923	0.0617	0.0807	0.0807
CH radical	0.1132	0.1077	0.1325	0.0898	0.1043	0.1046
CH ₂ (³ B ₁)	0.2740	0.2745	0.3031	0.2417	0.2623	0.2631
CH ₂ (¹ A ₁)	0.2494	0.2410	0.2813	0.2239	0.2323	0.2327
CH ₃ radical	0.4444	0.4418	0.4912	0.3994	0.4214	0.4207
CH ₄	0.6112	0.6076	0.6710	0.5520	0.5790	0.5737
NH	0.1075	0.1037	0.1346	0.0881	0.0985	0.0985
NH ₂ radical	0.2417	0.2378	0.2875	0.2143	0.2224	0.2225
NH ₃	0.4042	0.4032	0.4626	0.3771	0.3764	0.3774
OH radical	0.1424	0.1430	0.1626	0.1370	0.1276	0.1275
H ₂ O	0.3151	0.3208	0.3478	0.2993	0.2825	0.2842

System	$-E_a$ CCSD(T)	$-E_a$ MP2	$-E_a$ B3LYP	$-E_a$ BBC3	$-E_a$ PNOF0	$-E_a$ PNOF
HF	0.1914	0.1969	0.2044	0.1541	0.1690	0.1687
SiH ₂ (¹ A ₁)	0.2080	0.1987	0.2407	0.2131	0.2043	0.2036
SiH ₂ (³ B ₁)	0.1811	0.1776	0.2087	0.1789	0.1779	0.1776
SiH ₃ radical	0.3145	0.3074	0.3596	0.3054	0.3047	0.3031
SiH ₄	0.4520	0.4419	0.5108	0.4356	0.4439	0.4333
PH ₂ radical	0.2014	0.1921	0.2455	0.2001	0.2009	0.2014
PH ₃	0.3223	0.3103	0.3812	0.3264	0.3191	0.3198
H ₂ S	0.2448	0.2388	0.2798	0.2647	0.2330	0.2334
HCl	0.1429	0.1419	0.1591	0.1461	0.1348	0.1349
Li ₂	0.0342	0.0231	0.0320	-0.0040	0.0081	0.0081
LiF	0.1994	0.2086	0.2110	0.1363	0.1631	0.1613
C ₂ H ₂	0.5942	0.6067	0.6323	0.4931	0.5441	0.5445
C ₂ H ₄	0.8258	0.8283	0.8937	0.7225	0.7864	0.7858
C ₂ H ₆	1.0418	1.0416	1.1361	0.9364	1.0078	0.9959
CN radical	0.2541	0.2460	0.2776	0.1758	0.2021	0.2013
HCN	0.4555	0.4728	0.4908	0.3557	0.4058	0.4055
CO	0.3902	0.4097	0.4022	0.3551	0.3649	0.3582
HCO radical	0.4073	0.4236	0.4429	0.3189	0.3893	0.3863
H ₂ CO	0.5465	0.5600	0.5927	0.5164	0.5364	0.5312
H ₃ COH	0.7340	0.7419	0.8064	0.6916	0.7182	0.7105
N ₂	0.3219	0.3427	0.3535	0.1841	0.2899	0.2817
H ₂ NNH ₂	0.5897	0.5926	0.6864	0.5511	0.5891	0.5741
NO radical	0.2091	0.2230	0.2425	0.1260	0.2115	0.2031
O ₂	0.1687	0.1903	0.1975	0.1193	0.1580	0.1520
HOOH	0.3622	0.3745	0.4114	0.3621	0.3808	0.3625
F ₂	0.0537	0.0607	0.0669	0.0321	0.1144	0.0878
CO ₂	0.5785	0.6179	0.6131	0.5263	0.5766	0.5599
Na ₂	0.0252	0.0167	0.0269	0.0062	0.0062	0.0063
Si ₂	0.0985	0.0965	0.1060	0.1007	0.1105	0.1106
P ₂	0.1459	0.1502	0.1723	0.1636	0.1585	0.1539
S ₂	0.1305	0.1360	0.1529	0.1293	0.1438	0.1384
Cl ₂	0.0649	0.0671	0.0770	0.0867	0.1147	0.1050
NaCl	0.1376	0.1406	0.1442	0.1274	0.1194	0.1182
SiO	0.2763	0.2953	0.2873	0.2467	0.2576	0.2491
CS	0.2503	0.2578	0.2580	0.2299	0.2298	0.2268
SO	0.1662	0.1813	0.1869	0.1381	0.1625	0.1606
ClO radical	0.0762	0.0746	0.0954	0.0644	0.1292	0.1192
ClF	0.0813	0.0882	0.0907	0.0881	0.1373	0.1226
Si ₂ H ₆	0.7461	0.7316	0.8374	0.7283	0.7585	0.7344
CH ₃ Cl	0.5731	0.5758	0.6249	0.5455	0.5756	0.5690
H ₃ C-SH	0.6768	0.6750	0.7457	0.6658	0.6722	0.6707
HOCl	0.2189	0.2272	0.2463	0.2319	0.2571	0.2472
SO ₂	0.3354	0.3727	0.3608	0.3346	0.3926	0.3599
BF ₃	0.7225	0.7620	0.7522	0.6161	0.7816	0.7361
BCl ₃	0.4866	0.5110	0.4991	0.4942	0.5827	0.5504
AlF ₃	0.6391	0.6776	0.6554	0.5090	0.6942	0.6251
AlCl ₃	0.4471	0.4672	0.4559	0.4483	0.5403	0.4971
CF ₄	0.7274	0.7696	0.7679	0.5856	0.8771	0.7745
CCl ₄	0.4429	0.4681	0.4615	0.4392	0.6112	0.5384
O=C=S	0.4920	0.5225	0.5232	0.4872	0.5100	0.5003
CS ₂	0.4062	0.4284	0.4325	0.4245	0.4388	0.4312
COF ₂	0.6291	0.6686	0.6698	0.5664	0.7106	0.6472
SiF ₄	0.8561	0.9024	0.8745	0.6994	0.9733	0.8576
SiCl ₄	0.5371	0.5613	0.5551	0.5540	0.7045	0.6207
N ₂ O	0.3693	0.4128	0.4279	0.3356	0.3788	0.3704
CINO	0.2587	0.2799	0.3032	0.2783	0.3403	0.3278
NF ₃	0.2872	0.3100	0.3402	0.2337	0.4537	0.3852
PF ₃	0.5195	0.5482	0.5516	0.4616	0.6442	0.5912
O ₃	0.1886	0.2308	0.2221	0.0821	0.2877	0.2347
F ₂ O	0.1248	0.1397	0.1578	0.1300	0.2577	0.2150
ClF ₃	0.1473	0.1726	0.1820	0.1073	0.3850	0.2586
C ₂ F ₄	0.8836	0.9315	0.9448	0.7371	1.0496	0.9821

System	$-E_a$ CCSD(T)	$-E_a$ MP2	$-E_a$ B3LYP	$-E_a$ BBC3	$-E_a$ PNOF0	$-E_a$ PNOF
C ₂ Cl ₄	0.6838	0.7185	0.7113	0.6418	0.8468	0.6510
CF ₃ CN	0.9615	1.0175	1.0219	0.7525	1.0775	0.9535
CH ₃ CCH (propyne)	1.0368	1.0538	1.1131	0.9274	0.9990	0.9911
CH ₂ =C=CH ₂ (allene)	1.0357	1.0461	1.1176	0.8703	1.0106	1.0020
C ₃ H ₄ (cyclopropene)	1.0010	1.0171	1.0790	0.8963	0.9706	0.9679
CH ₃ CH=CH ₂ (propylene)	1.2639	1.2707	1.3670	1.1229	1.2305	1.2246
C ₃ H ₆ (cyclopropane)	1.2524	1.2639	1.3546	1.1305	1.2163	1.2047
C ₃ H ₈ (propane)	1.4756	1.4790	1.6030	1.3202	1.4432	1.4196
CH ₂ CHCHCH ₂ (Trans-1,3-butadiene)	1.4918	1.5063	1.6053	1.3392	1.4637	1.4565
C ₄ H ₆ (2-butyne)	1.4783	1.4997	1.5919	1.3268	1.4433	1.4282
C ₄ H ₆ (methylene cyclopropane)	1.4618	1.4806	1.5758	1.3147	1.4295	1.4118
C ₄ H ₆ (bicyclobutane)	1.4497	1.4741	1.5611	1.3027	1.4185	1.4136
C ₄ H ₆ (cyclobutene)	1.4750	1.4939	1.5864	1.2915	1.4357	1.4267
C ₄ H ₈ (cyclobutane)	1.6908	1.7052	1.8254	1.4959	1.6543	1.6243
C ₄ H ₈ (isobutene)	1.7032	1.7145	1.8398	1.5453	1.6624	1.6500
C ₄ H ₁₀ (trans-butane)	1.9096	1.9166	2.0699	1.6938	1.8711	1.8329
C ₄ H ₁₀ (isobutane)	1.9120	1.9194	2.0707	1.6941	1.8696	1.8317
C ₅ H ₈ (spiropentane)	1.8931	1.9208	2.0378	1.6535	1.8477	1.8222
C ₆ H ₆ (benzene)	2.0333	2.0788	2.1694	1.7546	1.9548	1.9386
H ₂ CF ₂	0.6438	0.6623	0.6952	0.5387	0.6894	0.6425
HCF ₃	0.6867	0.7171	0.7328	0.5510	0.7845	0.7201
H ₂ CCl ₂	0.5340	0.5436	0.5765	0.5177	0.5949	0.5713
HCCl ₃	0.4914	0.5085	0.5230	0.4816	0.6218	0.5682
H ₃ C-NH ₂ (methylamine)	0.8254	0.8273	0.9210	0.7718	0.8075	0.8018
CH ₃ -CN (acetonitrile)	0.9027	0.9241	0.9763	0.8014	0.8735	0.8567
CH ₃ -NO ₂ (nitromethane)	0.8544	0.8907	0.9559	0.7945	0.9274	0.8736
CH ₃ ONO (methylnitrite)	0.8560	0.8845	0.9546	0.8111	0.9201	0.8842
CH ₃ -SiH ₃ (methylsilane)	0.8983	0.8924	0.9911	0.8378	0.8858	0.8631
HCOOH (formic acid)	0.7269	0.7549	0.7873	0.6922	0.7344	0.7067
HCOOCH ₃ (methyl formate)	1.1512	1.1817	1.2479	1.0761	1.1808	1.1396
CH ₃ CONH ₂ (acetamide)	1.2534	1.2794	1.3729	1.1655	1.2719	1.2409
C ₂ H ₄ NH (aziridine)	1.0366	1.0495	1.1409	0.9533	1.0209	1.0133
NCCN (cyanogen)	0.7366	0.7827	0.7912	0.5998	0.7153	0.6628
(CH ₃) ₂ NH (dimethylamine)	1.2528	1.2580	1.3838	1.1686	1.2400	1.2318
CH ₃ CH ₂ NH ₂ (trans-ethylamine)	1.2627	1.2682	1.3916	1.1716	1.2450	1.2338
H ₂ CCO (ketene)	0.7829	0.8086	0.8446	0.7370	0.7906	0.7857
C ₂ H ₄ O (oxirane)	0.9490	0.9678	1.0319	0.8869	0.9401	0.9162
CH ₃ CHO (acetaldehyde)	0.9934	1.0110	1.0756	0.9308	0.9912	0.9787
OCHCHO (glyoxal)	0.9350	0.9703	1.0037	0.8655	1.0013	0.8882
CH ₃ CH ₂ OH (ethanol)	1.1730	1.1845	1.2788	1.0912	1.1663	1.1291
CH ₃ -O-CH ₃ (dimethylether)	1.1606	1.1711	1.2701	1.0877	1.1555	1.1426
C ₂ H ₄ S (thiooxirane)	0.9088	0.9203	0.9845	0.8786	0.9105	0.9060
(CH ₃) ₂ SO (dimethylsulfoxide)	1.2119	1.2285	1.3264	1.1704	1.2474	1.2287
C ₂ H ₅ SH (ethanethiol)	1.1117	1.1139	1.2134	1.0639	1.1154	1.1005
CH ₃ -S-CH ₃ (dimethyl sulfide)	1.1128	1.1155	1.2142	1.0724	1.1183	1.1113
H ₂ C=CHF (vinylfluoride)	0.8442	0.8584	0.9106	0.7614	0.8503	0.8424
C ₂ H ₅ Cl (ethylchloride)	1.0106	1.0172	1.0957	0.9392	1.0207	0.9999
CH ₂ =CHCl (vinylchloride)	0.7962	0.8063	0.8555	0.7462	0.8101	0.8034
H ₂ C=CHCN (acrylonitrile)	1.1233	1.1524	1.2067	0.9837	1.0973	1.0850
CH ₃ -CO-CH ₃ (acetone)	1.4383	1.4600	1.5543	1.3311	1.4361	1.4175
CH ₃ COOH (acetic acid)	1.1723	1.2040	1.2668	1.0962	1.1941	1.1582
CH ₃ COF (acetyl fluoride)	1.0438	1.0746	1.1226	0.9542	1.0853	1.0421
CH ₃ COCl (acetyl chloride)	0.9805	1.0069	1.0551	0.9231	1.0324	0.9718
CH ₃ CH ₂ CH ₂ Cl (propyl chloride)	1.4449	1.4552	1.5627	1.3138	1.4524	1.4173
(CH ₃) ₂ CHOH (isopropanol)	1.6138	1.6292	1.7515	1.4757	1.6025	1.5680
C ₂ H ₅ -O-CH ₃ (methyl-ethyl ether)	1.5999	1.6141	1.7425	1.4725	1.5968	1.5432
(CH ₃) ₃ N (trimethylamine)	1.6843	1.6934	1.8483	1.5525	1.6648	1.6522
C ₄ H ₄ O (furan)	1.4699	1.5118	1.5736	1.3299	1.4535	1.4468
C ₄ H ₄ S (thiophene)	1.4184	1.4536	1.5110	1.2918	1.4085	1.3955
C ₄ H ₄ NH (pyrrole)	1.5686	1.6075	1.6948	1.4081	1.5450	1.5409
C ₅ H ₅ N (pyridine)	1.8301	1.8775	1.9677	1.5770	1.7827	1.7476
H ₂	0.1552	0.1477	0.1749	0.1425	0.1375	0.1375

System	$-E_a$ CCSD(T)	$-E_a$ MP2	$-E_a$ B3LYP	$-E_a$ BBC3	$-E_a$ PNOF0	$-E_a$ PNOF
SH radical	0.1142	0.1105	0.1347	0.1218	0.1088	0.1090
CCH radical	0.3854	0.3822	0.4097	0.3112	0.3388	0.3392
C ₂ H ₃ radical (² A')	0.6494	0.6455	0.7071	0.5515	0.6150	0.6155
CH ₃ CO radical (² A')	0.8534	0.8729	0.9257	0.7300	0.8509	0.8337
H ₂ COH radical (² A)	0.5814	0.5902	0.6443	0.5366	0.5685	0.5637
CH ₃ O radical (Cs)	0.5788	0.5799	0.6424	0.5304	0.5786	0.5709
CH ₃ CH ₂ O radical (² A'')	1.0164	1.0209	1.1140	0.9257	1.0244	1.0043
CH ₃ S radical (² A')	0.5512	0.5514	0.6075	0.5199	0.5531	0.5502
C ₂ H ₅ radical (² A')	0.8802	0.8805	0.9638	0.7958	0.8508	0.8471
(CH ₃) ₂ CH radical (² A')	1.3186	1.3221	1.4372	1.1922	1.2886	1.2769
(CH ₃) ₃ C (t-butyl radical)	1.7585	1.7657	1.9102	1.5768	1.7166	1.6987
NO ₂ radical	0.3098	0.3452	0.3660	0.1830	0.3533	0.3393

TABLE IV: Atomization energies E_a for the full G2/97 test set calculated with the 6-31G* basis. All quantities are in a.u.

C. G2-1 set, cc-pVDZ basis

System	$-E_a$ CCSD(T)	$-E_a$ MP2	$-E_a$ B3LYP	$-E_a$ BBC3	$-E_a$ PNOF0	$-E_a$ PNOF
LiH	0.0833	0.0749	0.0908	0.0512	0.0554	0.0554
BeH	0.0726	0.0802	0.0892	0.0612	0.0772	0.0772
CH radical	0.1211	0.1155	0.1315	0.0890	0.1056	0.1053
CH ₂ (³ B ₁)	0.2814	0.2815	0.2977	0.2391	0.2597	0.2597
CH ₂ (¹ A ₁)	0.2621	0.2532	0.2781	0.2215	0.2340	0.2336
CH ₃ radical	0.4570	0.4536	0.4821	0.3925	0.4152	0.4160
CH ₄	0.6294	0.6242	0.6582	0.5410	0.5647	0.5706
NH	0.1146	0.1101	0.1330	0.0952	0.0972	0.0973
NH ₂ radical	0.2571	0.2518	0.2858	0.2207	0.2202	0.2206
NH ₃	0.4277	0.4244	0.4609	0.3825	0.3745	0.3735
OH radical	0.1509	0.1503	0.1625	0.1442	0.1258	0.1259
H ₂ O	0.3339	0.3372	0.3497	0.3069	0.2825	0.2827
HF	0.2018	0.2066	0.2079	0.1621	0.1690	0.1693
SiH ₂ (¹ A ₁)	0.2248	0.2141	0.2385	0.2122	0.2031	0.2038
SiH ₂ (³ B ₁)	0.1947	0.1907	0.2064	0.1773	0.1758	0.1764
SiH ₃ radical	0.3365	0.3276	0.3552	0.3019	0.3000	0.3020
SiH ₄	0.4824	0.4689	0.5039	0.4312	0.4294	0.4409
PH ₂ radical	0.2199	0.2097	0.2448	0.1919	0.2015	0.2005
PH ₃	0.3502	0.3367	0.3789	0.3221	0.3205	0.3197
H ₂ S	0.2672	0.2615	0.2816	0.2667	0.2403	0.2399
HCl	0.1571	0.1564	0.1622	0.1559	0.1414	0.1413
Li ₂	0.0369	0.0255	0.0326	-0.0013	0.0115	0.0115
LiF	0.1961	0.2050	0.2122	0.1377	0.1549	0.1560
C ₂ H ₂	0.5954	0.6113	0.6265	0.5109	0.5406	0.5403
C ₂ H ₄	0.8418	0.8459	0.8818	0.7112	0.7772	0.7784
C ₂ H ₆	1.0709	1.0697	1.1169	0.9185	0.9817	0.9950
CN radical	0.2471	0.2414	0.2744	0.1840	0.1945	0.1985
HCN	0.4553	0.4738	0.4870	0.3928	0.4009	0.4022
CO	0.3872	0.4071	0.4002	0.3628	0.3541	0.3608
HCO radical	0.4097	0.4257	0.4384	0.3239	0.3807	0.3838
H ₂ CO	0.5533	0.5656	0.5839	0.5187	0.5227	0.5285
H ₃ COH	0.7566	0.7619	0.7966	0.6906	0.7009	0.7104
N ₂	0.3224	0.3427	0.3536	0.2041	0.2815	0.2898
H ₂ NNH ₂	0.6199	0.6196	0.6828	0.5633	0.5706	0.5846
NO radical	0.2117	0.2242	0.2432	0.1467	0.2043	0.2106
O ₂	0.1676	0.1875	0.1962	0.0822	0.1476	0.1540
HOOH	0.3782	0.3866	0.4113	0.3746	0.3538	0.3717
F ₂	0.0438	0.0493	0.0602	0.0354	0.0735	0.0996
CO ₂	0.5731	0.6123	0.6084	0.5368	0.5511	0.5680

System	$-E_a$ CCSD(T)	$-E_a$ MP2	$-E_a$ B3LYP	$-E_a$ BBC3	$-E_a$ PNOF0	$-E_a$ PNOF
Na ₂	0.0266	0.0174	0.0270	0.0104	0.0131	0.0130
Si ₂	0.0969	0.0979	0.1069	0.1050	0.1112	0.1111
P ₂	0.1449	0.1511	0.1739	0.1568	0.1528	0.1562
S ₂	0.1324	0.1406	0.1554	0.0905	0.1463	0.1504
Cl ₂	0.0681	0.0723	0.0801	0.1158	0.1181	0.1299
NaCl	0.1376	0.1418	0.1445	0.1365	0.1228	0.1241
SiO	0.2594	0.2784	0.2772	0.2513	0.2331	0.2414
CS	0.2467	0.2574	0.2576	0.2275	0.2263	0.2314
SO	0.1558	0.1703	0.1820	0.1337	0.1488	0.1523
ClO radical	0.0685	0.0672	0.0924	0.0840	0.1107	0.1217
ClF	0.0701	0.0767	0.0862	0.0884	0.1099	0.1250
Si ₂ H ₆	0.7894	0.7715	0.8259	0.7172	0.7260	0.7527
CH ₃ Cl	0.5862	0.5893	0.6137	0.5434	0.5632	0.5714
H ₃ C-SH	0.7007	0.6995	0.7358	0.6576	0.6663	0.6706
HOCl	0.2234	0.2304	0.2459	0.2501	0.2407	0.2524

TABLE V: Atomization energies E_a for the G2-1 test set (the first 55 systems of Table IV) calculated with the cc-pVDZ basis set. All quantities are in a.u.