

4-component Relativistic Calculations in a Multiwavelet Basis with Improved Convergence

Christian Tantardini^{1,2*}, Roberto Di Remigio Eikås³ and Luca
Frediani^{1*}

¹Hylleraas center, Department of Chemistry, UiT The Arctic University
of Norway, PO Box 6050 Langnes, N-9037 Tromsø, Norway..

²Department of Materials Science and NanoEngineering, Rice
University, Houston, Texas 77005, United States of America..

³Algorithmiq Ltd., Kanavakatu 3C, FI-00160, Helsinki, Finland..

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): christiantantardini@gmail.com;
luca.frediani@uit.no;

Abstract

The many-body wave function of an N -electron system within a relativistic framework can be described by the Dirac equation. Unfortunately, the Dirac operator $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ is unbounded. Thus, anions show the variational collapse of $N + 1$ electron wavefunction making impossible to extend the $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ operator to such systems. Thus, it is necessary to avoid it and an alternative approach is based on applying the square of the Dirac operator $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$. This approach is especially suitable for a multiwavelet framework: its implementation in an integral equation form is readily available and the completeness of the multiwavelet basis affords tight error control. The use of the $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ operator within a multiwavelet (MW) framework is able to achieve higher precision compared to the $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$, consistent with the quadratic nature of the error estimates in a variational framework.

Keywords: , multiwavelets, Dirac equation, variational collapse, squared-Dirac operator

1 Introduction

Dirac’s equation describes the relativistic motion of electrons and still today represents the most accurate physical model, short of quantum electrodynamics, for the inclusion of relativistic effects in molecular calculations. Paul Dirac formulated his equation by aiming for a quantum mechanical equation that satisfied Lorentz covariance, while guaranteeing a positive semi-definite probability density.[1]

In its original formulation, the Dirac equation suffers from some drawbacks and the most important one is called *variational collapse*, a term coined by Schwarz and Wallmeier [2], because the Dirac operator $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$, in contrast to the Schrödinger Hamiltonian \hat{H} , is not bounded from below giving spurious unphysical solutions as the kinetic energy tends to zero. Therefore, the application of variational methods is not justified. Schwarz and Wallmeier [2] were the first to observe: (i) the collapsing of two neighboring exponents of basis sets to the same value during optimization; (ii) no systematic variation of the eigenvalues with increasing basis size (*n.b.* eigenvalues change with basis set). During the years the same was observed by others [3–5], and recently with contracted Dyllal basis sets [6–10] and atomic-balanced basis sets [11–13].

Such effects were attenuated by expanding the basis sets through a Legendre parameterization which provides an efficient way of systematically approaching the basis set limit and by using the restricted kinetic balance (RKB) to generate the small components of the spinorbitals [14–16]. However, the presence of uncontracted basis sets with the RKB could generate the *prolapse* due to the lack of kinetic balance in the description of the negative-energy states [11, 14, 17–19].

Nowadays, the *variational collapse* can be considered largely mitigated by the use of appropriate atomic basis sets in conjunction with the RKB prescription, but the problem continues to exist for electronic metastable anions, where the four-component Dirac wavefunction of $N + 1$ electron will collapse in an orbital that is infinitely removed from the parent plus forming a continuum function [20].

There are essentially four strategies to deal with the *variational collapse*:

1. accepting *variational collapse* and trying to minimize its effects by suppressing the small components and introducing $c \rightarrow \infty$ [3, 21, 22] or special choice of basis set [23];
2. transforming the Dirac operator (e.g., Foldy-Wouthuysen (FW) transformation [24, 25]) to achieve a matrix representation that incorporates the correct non-relativistic limit;
3. manipulating the matrix representation of the Dirac operator (e.g., by modifying $\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{p}$ [5], by the stabilization method [26, 27] or the rotation method [28]) without transforming the operator itself;
4. replacing the Dirac operator by a related operator which has the same eigenfunctions, but which is bounded from below such that the variation principle can be applied (e.g., squared Dirac operator [4] or projection of the Dirac operator to positive energy states [29, 30]).

Here, we will pursue the latter option in the field of adaptive multiwavelet basis. The use of $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ was originally presented by Wallmeier and Kutzelnigg [4] for one-electron calculations and later extended to molecular calculations [31]. We first review the theory of $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ for one- and many-electron systems. For the latter, we introduce the unretarded Coulombic interaction to describe the repulsion between electrons, leading to the direct (\hat{J}) and exchange (\hat{K}) interactions in the mean-field case. We then apply this method to simple one- and two-electron systems to show the viability of the approach and the precision which can be attained compared to the standard Dirac equation.

2 Theoretical Background

In the following, we will use Hartree atomic units. However, for clarity, we will keep the electron mass m explicit in the equations. The free-space Dirac operator is given as:

$$\hat{h}_D = c\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p} + \beta mc^2 \quad (1)$$

where \vec{p} collects the Cartesian components of the momentum operator:

$$\vec{p} = -i \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

and $\vec{\alpha}$ is a Cartesian vector whose components are 4×4 anti-diagonal block matrices:

$$\alpha_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_u \\ \sigma_u & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

We use indices $u, w \in \{x, y, z\}$ for Cartesian components. The 2×2 matrices σ_u , $u \in \{x, y, z\}$ appearing as anti-diagonal blocks are the Pauli matrices. The 4×4 matrix β is defined as:

$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix} I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -I_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

The eigenfunctions of the free-space Dirac operator are vectors with four complex components:

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi^1 \\ \varphi^2 \\ \varphi^3 \\ \varphi^4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

the upper (lower) two components of the orbital can equivalently be referred to as *large* (*small*) components and indexed accordingly as:

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi^{L_\alpha} \\ \varphi^{L_\beta} \\ \varphi^{S_\alpha} \\ \varphi^{S_\beta} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

The large and small components can be transformed into each other. Practically, the exact relationship is only applicable for the free-particle problem. In atomic and molecular applications, one initializes the small components by applying the *kinetic balance* condition, i.e. the nonrelativistic limit of the exact large-small relationship, to the large components [32]. In the following, the four-component molecular orbitals will further be indexed with a subscript Latin letters, *e.g.* $p, q, i, j, \dots \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, with N the number of such orbitals.

2.1 Adaptive Multiwavelets Basis

Multiresolution analysis (MRA) is a numerical framework devised to solve integral and differential equations with arbitrary, predefined precision.[33] Standard quantum chemical methods expand the unknown molecular orbitals (MOs) into *fixed* atom-centered bases and recast the solution of the Hartree–Fock equations as a matrix eigenvalue problem to determine the expansion coefficients [34]. MRA-based methods instead solve directly for the occupied MOs, through adaptive refinement of the expansion basis. The mathematical framework enabling such adaptive algorithms relies on the construction of a sequence of orthogonal subspaces which is dense in the space of square-integrable functions for a user-defined simulation box.

As an example, consider the unit interval and a set of orthonormal k -th order polynomials, $\phi_i(x)$, which we call *scaling* functions. The basis can be refined by *dyadic*

subdivisions of the interval: at any subdivision *scale*, n , the original unit interval is subdivided into 2^n sub-intervals. Each interval supports a *fixed* number of scaling functions, which are obtained by dilation and translation of the same functions at scale $n = 0$:

$$\phi_{il}^n = 2^{n/2} \phi_i(2^n x - l), \quad (7)$$

where $l = 0, \dots, 2^n - 1$ is the translation index, identifying functions in the sub-interval $[l/2^n, (l+1)/2^n]$. This construction defines a *telescopic* series of scaling spaces:

$$V_0^k \subset V_1^k \subset \dots \subset V_n^k \subset \dots \subset L^2([0, 1]), \quad (8)$$

The limit of this series is dense in $L^2([0, 1])$ and can thus represent *any* $f \in L^2([0, 1])$. The orthogonal complement between two successive scaling spaces constitutes a wavelet space:

$$S_n^k \oplus W_n^k = S_{n+1}^k, \quad W_n^k \perp S_n^k, \quad (9)$$

The crucial property of wavelet functions is constituted by their vanishing moments, which are a straightforward consequence of their construction as orthogonal complement of a set of polynomial functions. This is the key feature that leads to sparse representations of functions, enabling both precision control on the one hand and fast algorithms on the other. The k parameter is the order of the Legendre polynomials used in each refinement box, which is regardless of the number of electrons in the system and, in principle, a given a user-defined tolerance, ϵ , which is used both as requested precision in the adaptive refinement and operator application algorithms, and as convergence tolerance of the self-consistent field (SCF) cycle. Convergence is achieved once the norm of the orbital update drops below ϵ . This means that if the error on the orbital is 10^{-N} the error on the energy will be 10^{-2N} .

We note that the MRA construction is dense in L^2 not because of the high polynomial order, but because of the telescopic construction of subspaces by dyadic

subdivision. In principle, one could achieve completeness of the representation basis even using $k = 1$, the telescopic series of spaces would however be impractically large. In practice, as we showed in our previous work on the full Breit Hamiltonian [35], requesting tighter precision in a relativistic setting demands a higher polynomial order than what provided by default by MRCPP, our MRA library. The interested reader is referred to the available literature for details about MRA and its practical realization for quantum chemistry applications.[36–40]

2.2 Integral equation formulation for the Dirac operator

The Dirac-Fock equations are the 4-component, relativistic counterpart of the Hartree-Fock equations:

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}\Phi_i = (\hat{h}_D + \hat{V})\Phi_i = (c\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p} + \beta mc^2 + \hat{V})\Phi_i = \sum_j D_{ij}\Phi_j, \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{h}_D = c\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p} + \beta mc^2$ is the free-particle Dirac operator and $\hat{V} = \hat{J} - \hat{K} + \hat{V}_{\text{nuc}}$ is the SCF one-body potential. The matrix $D_{ij} = \langle \Phi_i | \hat{\mathcal{D}} | \Phi_j \rangle$ is the projection of the mean-field Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ in the occupied subspace spanned by N orthonormal spinors. These are a set of coupled first-order differential equations. Its solutions are 4-component spinors; each component is a complex function and the set of solutions describes both positive and negative energy states. We rearrange Eq. (10) as:

$$(\hat{h}_D - D_{ii})\Phi_i = -\hat{V}\Phi_i + \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j. \quad (11)$$

The nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation, and its mean-field equivalents, can be solved by iterative convolution with the Green’s function for the shifted Laplacian [41]. Following Blackledge and Babajanov [42], we formulate a similar iterative convolution

for Eq. (11). First, we introduce the identity on the left-hand side:

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{h}_D - D_{ii})(\hat{h}_D + D_{ii})(\hat{h}_D + D_{ii})^{-1}\Phi_i &= \left[\hat{h}_D^2 - D_{ii}^2 \right] (\hat{h}_D + D_{ii})^{-1}\Phi_i \\ &= -\hat{V}\phi_i + \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The term in square brackets, thanks to Dirac's identity $(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{p})(\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{p}) = p^2$, is diagonal in the four components:

$$\hat{h}_D^2 - D_{ii}^2 = [-c^2\nabla^2 + m^2c^4 - D_{ii}^2] I_4. \quad (13)$$

This yields:

$$\left[-\nabla^2 + \frac{m^2c^4 - D_{ii}^2}{c^2} \right] I_4 (\hat{h}_D + D_{ii})^{-1}\Phi_i = -\frac{1}{c^2}\hat{V}\Phi_i + \frac{1}{c^2} \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j, \quad (14)$$

which can be formally inverted to give:[43]

$$\Phi_i = -\frac{1}{c^2} \left[(\hat{h}_D + D_{ii})G_i \right] \star \left[\hat{V}\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right], \quad (15)$$

where G_i is the Helmholtz kernel:

$$G_i \equiv \left[-\nabla^2 + \frac{m^2c^4 - D_{ii}^2}{c^2} \right]^{-1} I_4 = I_4 \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\exp(-\mu_i |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} \quad (16)$$

with exponent:

$$\mu_i = \sqrt{\frac{m^2c^4 - D_{ii}^2}{c^2}} > 0, \quad (17)$$

since we are seeking bound states, *i.e.* $D_{ii} < mc^2$. As noted by Anderson et al. [40], one can use the properties of the convolution product to rearrange Eq. (15) as:

$$\Phi_i = -\frac{1}{c^2} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left[(\hat{h}_D + D_{ii})G_i \right] \star \left[\hat{V}\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right] \quad (18a) \\ \left(\hat{h}_D + D_{ii} \right) \left[G_i \star \left(\hat{V}\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right) \right] \quad (18b) \\ G_i \star \left[(\hat{h}_D + D_{ii}) \left(\hat{V}\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right) \right] \quad (18c) \end{array} \right.$$

See also Appendix A for a detailed derivation of these equivalences. As we show in Appendix B, the iterative convolution of Eq. (18a) uses the inverse-distance-cube kernel, which also appears in the context of the relativistic two-electron gauge potential [44]. As shown by us in Ref. [35], application of this kernel is computationally intensive and not numerically robust. The second form, Eq. (18b), is computationally more efficient: we apply the same convolution kernel used in the nonrelativistic case first, smoothing out any sharp features introduced by multiplication with the potential, and then we compute its derivatives [45]. The final form in Eq. (18c) requires application of the derivative operator on $V\phi_i$, which might have non-smooth features and thus introduce numerical errors, convergence slowdown or excessive memory demands.

3 Developing of Squared Dirac Operator within Multiwavelets Field

Following Wallmeier and Kutzelnigg [4], the square of the Dirac operator is positive and bounded from below, while obviously sharing eigenfunctions and eigenvalues with

the original operator:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathfrak{D}}^2\Phi_i &= \left\{c^2p^2I_4 + c[\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p}, \hat{V}]_+ + m^2c^4 + mc^2[\beta, \hat{V}]_+ + \hat{V}^2I_4\right\}\Phi_i \\ &= \sum_j (\hat{\mathfrak{D}}^2)_{ij}\Phi_j.\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

Shifting by m^2c^4 and rescaling by $2mc^2$ yields:

$$\left\{\frac{p^2}{2m}I_4 + \hat{\mathcal{V}}\right\}\Phi_i = \frac{1}{2mc^2}\sum_j \left[(\hat{\mathfrak{D}}^2)_{ij} - \delta_{ij}m^2c^4\right]\Phi_j,\tag{20}$$

where, for brevity, we define the *generalized* mean-field potential:

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}} = \frac{[\beta, \hat{V}]_+}{2} + \frac{[\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p}, \hat{V}]_+}{2mc} + \frac{\hat{V}^2}{2mc^2}I_4.\tag{21}$$

At convergence, the positive-energy orbital energies of $\hat{\mathfrak{D}}$ are $\epsilon_i = -mc^2 + \sqrt{m^2c^4 + 2mc^2\omega_i}$, where ω_i are the eigenvalues of the shifted-and-scaled SCF equations above. Eq. (20) is close to the nonrelativistic Hartree-Fock (HF) equations, despite the appearance of more complicated potential-like terms. Similarly to Eq. (10) it can be recast as an integral equation and solved by iterative convolution:

$$\Phi_i = -2mG_i \star \left[\mathcal{V}\Phi_i + \frac{1}{2mc^2}\sum_{j \neq i} (\hat{\mathfrak{D}}^2)_{ij}\Phi_j \right],\tag{22}$$

We choose to approximate the matrix elements of the $\hat{\mathfrak{D}}^2$ operator as:

$$(\hat{\mathfrak{D}}^2)_{ij} \simeq \sum_k D_{ik}D_{kj},\tag{23}$$

in the *converged* occupied subspace and for a complete basis (MWs are to be regarded as a complete basis to within their predefined precision), this relation would be exact.¹

The exponent μ_i in Eq. (17) is now:

$$\mu_i = \sqrt{\frac{m^2 c^4 - (D^2)_{ii}}{c^2}} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{m^2 c^4 - \sum_k D_{ik} D_{ki}}{c^2}}. \quad (24)$$

For the positive-energy states of interest, it always holds that $\mu_i > 0$.

3.1 The generalized mean-field potential

The iterative solution of the integral equation (22) requires the repeated application of the generalized mean-field potential in Eq. (21). For general operators in a spinor basis it holds:

$$[\beta, M]_+ = 2 \begin{pmatrix} M^{L_\alpha L_\alpha} & M^{L_\alpha L_\beta} & 0 & 0 \\ M^{L_\beta L_\alpha} & M^{L_\beta L_\beta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -M^{S_\alpha S_\alpha} & -M^{S_\alpha S_\beta} \\ 0 & 0 & -M^{S_\beta S_\alpha} & -M^{S_\beta S_\beta} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

In a MW framework, we work directly with the MO basis: thus the potential operator V is *diagonal* in the spinor components and its anticommutator with β is simply:

$$[\beta, \hat{V}]_+ = 2\beta\hat{V}. \quad (26)$$

¹The MRA construction only explicitly refines the occupied orbital space and the SCF procedure iteratively block-diagonalizes the matrix representation of the Fock operator. Away from convergence, the off-diagonal blocks will be nonzero:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{A}^\dagger & \mathbf{V} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Forming the square of the Fock operator as the product gives:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{O}^2 + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^\dagger & \mathbf{O}\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{V} \\ \mathbf{A}^\dagger\mathbf{O} + \mathbf{V}\mathbf{A}^\dagger & \mathbf{V}^2 + \mathbf{A}^\dagger\mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix}$$

showing that only when $\mathbf{A} = 0$ (at convergence) the representation in the occupied basis of \mathbf{F}^2 will be equal to the product of the basis representation of \mathbf{F} with itself.

Application of $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ involves the, potentially demanding, construction of the squared mean-field potential. Formally, its application on a test spinor is:

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}}^2\Phi_k = \hat{J}^2\Phi_k + \hat{K}^2\Phi_k + \hat{V}_{\text{nuc}}^2\Phi_k + [\hat{J} - \hat{K}, \hat{V}_{\text{nuc}}]_+\Phi_k - [\hat{J}, \hat{K}]_+\Phi_k, \quad (27)$$

however, since we are working in a first-quantization setting, these operators can be applied as:

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}}^2\Phi_k = \hat{V} \left(\hat{V}\Phi_k \right). \quad (28)$$

The three terms in Eq. (21) enter at different orders in $\frac{1}{c}$. A possible performance gain, especially when working with larger molecular systems, would be to apply them with a threshold obtained by scaling the user-defined one with their respective denominators.

For the one- and two-electron systems we consider in this work, the generalized potential is greatly simplified. For one-electron systems, we have:

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}} = \beta\hat{V}_{\text{nuc}} + \frac{[\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p}, \hat{V}_{\text{nuc}}]_+}{2mc} + \frac{\hat{V}_{\text{nuc}}^2}{2mc^2}I_4, \quad (29)$$

For closed-shell, two-electron systems, we can explicitly exploit Kramers' time-reversal symmetry (TRS) and remove the exchange terms:[46]

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}} = \beta(\hat{J} + \hat{V}_{\text{nuc}}) + \frac{[\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p}, \hat{J} + \hat{V}_{\text{nuc}}]_+}{2mc} + \frac{(\hat{J} + \hat{V}_{\text{nuc}})^2}{2mc^2}I_4, \quad (30)$$

4 Results and Discussion

All MW results presented were obtained with our Python implementation in the ReMRChem project, whose source code is freely available through GitHub.² Our implementation uses the MRCPP library [47] and its Python interface provided by

²<https://github.com/MRChemSoft/ReMRChem>.

the VAMPyR package [48, 49]. We have set up our calculations choosing the smeared nuclear point-like charge, which replaces the nuclear $1/r$ potential with a smoothed approximation[50]. This smoothing has no physical meaning and it must not be misunderstood with the physical models introduced by Visscher [51], which are common in relativistic methods. The value of the speed of light was chosen equal to 137.03599913900001 *a.u.* and for the calculation of the derivative we used the B-spline method introduced by Anderson et al.[52].

The current implementation uses the VAMPyR package (Python code) and is a proof-of-concept implementation to validate the use of the squared Dirac operator within the multiwavelets framework. This implementation can only deal with at most two-electron systems since it relies, as already stated, on Kramers' TRS [46, 53] to reduce memory footprint and computational load. This is the ideal starting point to consider inter-electronic interactions in the SCF setting for the validation of the developed theory. However, as it is known from the nonrelativistic MW implementation in the MRChem package (written in C++), increasing the number of electrons will not pose additional theoretical challenges, but only increase the required computational resources (memory in particular) as tested by our group and extensively discussed in Ref. 54.

For the one-electron case we have considered the Hydrogen atom and the H_2^+ ion. For the former the analytical solution is available [55]. For the latter, a recent, very precise numerical study is available from Ref. 56. For the two-electron case we have considered the He and Ne^{8+} atoms, using GRASP to obtain reference results as we have done in a previous study [35].

The results for H and H_2^+ are summarized in Table 1. We have performed calculations by increasing precision, both by making use of the integral formulations presented in Sec. 2 for the operators $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$. The MRA results were obtained with increasing requested precision settings: $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$ ($k = 6$), $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ ($k = 8$), and

$\epsilon = 10^{-8}$ ($k = 10$). The k parameter is the order of the Legendre polynomials used in each refinement box.

Our results show that at low precision the two implementations are equivalent, when precision is increased, the $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ implementation leads to slightly lower errors (up to one order of magnitude) than the $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ implementation.

Table 1: Comparison between *VAMPyR* results obtained with Dirac $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ and square-Dirac $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ operators for one-electron systems H and H_2^+ with the hydrogen analytical solution and fully relativistic numerical solution for H_2^+ (bond length 2 Bohr) from Ref. 56. We underline the digits that *differ* from the reference result.

Operator	H <i>VAMPyR</i> / (Ha)	H Abs Rel. Error	H_2^+ <i>VAMPyR</i> / (Ha)	H_2^+ Abs Rel. Error
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\epsilon = 10^{-4})$	-0.50000 <u>7467791874</u>	$ 1.62236 \cdot 10^{-06}$	-1.10264 <u>0862147382</u>	$ 6.51808 \cdot 10^{-07}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\epsilon = 10^{-4})$	-0.50000 <u>7785136819</u>	$ 2.25705 \cdot 10^{-06}$	-1.10264 <u>0727757642</u>	$ 7.73929 \cdot 10^{-07}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\epsilon = 10^{-6})$	-0.50000665 <u>3182936</u>	$ 6.83203 \cdot 10^{-09}$	-1.10264151 <u>4193238</u>	$ 6.06142 \cdot 10^{-08}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\epsilon = 10^{-6})$	-0.50000665 <u>5675723</u>	$ 1.84653 \cdot 10^{-09}$	-1.102641581 <u>857073</u>	$ 7.47750 \cdot 10^{-10}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\epsilon = 10^{-8})$	-0.50000665 <u>6217010</u>	$ 7.63966 \cdot 10^{-10}$	-1.102641581 <u>459466</u>	$ 3.77258 \cdot 10^{-10}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\epsilon = 10^{-8})$	-0.50000665 <u>59709</u>	$ 7.85770 \cdot 10^{-11}$	-1.10264158 <u>0981426</u>	$ 4.63886 \cdot 10^{-11}$
Exact result	-0.500006656598998		-1.102641581032577	

Legendre polynomial order $k = 10$ and tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$, Legendre polynomial order $k = 8$ and tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$, Legendre polynomial order $k = 6$ and tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$.

The implementation has been also tested for He (see Tab. 2) and Ne^{8+} (see Tab. 3) atoms, to verify its validity also in the presence of the Coulomb interactions: the core $1s$ -orbital is doubly occupied and our code explicitly enforces Kramers' TRS [46, 53], such that the 4-component $1s^\alpha$ is related to $1s^\beta$ by a quaternionic unitary transformation [32]. The *exchange* term in both the $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ formulations is absent because it exactly cancels out with its *direct* counterpart in this simple case. Our current implementation is only a pilot code which has limited performance and can at present not be employed on larger systems.

We report the comparison of our results with radial numerical results previously obtained using *GRASP* Ref. 35 in Tab. 2. Also in this case we have performed calculations by increasing requested precision both for the $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ formulations. We observe

that both implementations are able to achieve the requested precision. However, there is no noticeable difference between them.

Table 2: Comparison between *VAMPyR* results obtained with Dirac $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ and square-Dirac $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ operators for two electron system He with radial numerical results previously obtained by *GRASP* from Ref. 35. We underline the digits that *differ* from the reference result.

Operator	orbital energy <i>VAMPyR</i> / (Ha)	Abs Rel. Error	Total energy <i>VAMPyR</i> / (Ha)	Abs Rel. Error
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\epsilon = 10^{-4})$	-0.918040748	$ 5.45383 \cdot 10^{-05}$	-2.861854359	$ 1.43330 \cdot 10^{-05}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\epsilon = 10^{-4})$	-0.918032833	$ 4.59170 \cdot 10^{-05}$	-2.861828187	$ 5.18788 \cdot 10^{-06}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\epsilon = 10^{-6})$	-0.918008207	$ 1.90908 \cdot 10^{-05}$	-2.861833848	$ 7.16586 \cdot 10^{-06}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\epsilon = 10^{-6})$	-0.918008259	$ 1.91475 \cdot 10^{-05}$	-2.861833976	$ 7.21072 \cdot 10^{-06}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\epsilon = 10^{-8})$	-0.917990690	$ 8.78784 \cdot 10^{-09}$	-2.861813340	$ 1.93716 \cdot 10^{-10}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\epsilon = 10^{-8})$	-0.917990691	$ 9.69563 \cdot 10^{-09}$	-2.861813342	$ 5.19185 \cdot 10^{-10}$
GRASP Reference	-0.917990682		-2.861813340	

Legendre polynomial order $k = 10$ and tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$, Legendre polynomial order $k = 8$ and tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$, Legendre polynomial order $k = 6$ and tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$.

Table 3: Comparison between *VAMPyR* results obtained with Dirac $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ and square-Dirac $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ operators for two electron system Ne^{8+} with radial numerical results previously obtained by *GRASP* from Ref. 35. We underline the digits that *differ* from the reference result.

Operator	orbital energy <i>VAMPyR</i> / (Ha)	Abs Rel. Error	Total energy <i>VAMPyR</i> / (Ha)	Abs Rel. Error
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\epsilon = 10^{-4})$	-44.094786197	$ 2.794189 \cdot 10^{-03}$	-94.108543063	$ 1.337941 \cdot 10^{-03}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\epsilon = 10^{-4})$	-43.978792210	$ 1.562788 \cdot 10^{-04}$	-93.990113164	$ 7.781809 \cdot 10^{-05}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\epsilon = 10^{-6})$	-43.976907059	$ 1.134071 \cdot 10^{-04}$	-93.987884382	$ 5.410330 \cdot 10^{-05}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\epsilon = 10^{-6})$	-43.971930116	$ 2.224998 \cdot 10^{-07}$	-93.982819929	$ 2.162733 \cdot 10^{-07}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\epsilon = 10^{-8})$	-43.971921492	$ 2.638859 \cdot 10^{-08}$	-93.982804435	$ 5.142152 \cdot 10^{-08}$
$\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\epsilon = 10^{-8})$	-43.971921513	$ 2.686178 \cdot 10^{-08}$	-93.982804554	$ 5.268882 \cdot 10^{-08}$
GRASP Reference	-43.971920332		-93.982799603	

Legendre polynomial order $k = 10$ and tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$, Legendre polynomial order $k = 8$ and tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$, Legendre polynomial order $k = 6$ and tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$.

As we have seen in our previous work [35], the convergence rate when increasing nuclear charge Z requires a higher k and a correspondingly lower ϵ to correctly describe electron density close to the nucleus, where the contributions of the small components

is more significant. At high Z the different nuclear charge models could attenuate the numerical difficulties to describe the electron density around the nucleus. However, even with a more physical nuclear charge model, a high value of k and correspondingly lower ϵ might still be necessary to achieve convergence. For example, we have previously succeeded in describing Pu^{92+} using $k = 10$ and $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$.

5 Conclusions

The implementation of the squared Dirac operator $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ within a MW framework allows the use of the same integral equation formalism which has been widely tested in the context of non-relativistic theory. The original papers reporting the use of such operators [4, 31], indicated the importance of making use of a large (by practical means complete) basis set to achieve valid results with this method. The main reason is to make sure that the matrix representation of the squared operator is equivalent to the matrix product in Eq. (23). Such a requirement was challenging to satisfy in an atom-centered basis with the limited computational resources available in the early 1980s, and to some extent it is not trivial to achieve for Gaussian Type Orbitals. On the other hand, MWs have by and large demonstrated that they can be regarded as a complete basis set.

In the present work, we have shown that the use of the $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2$ operator with MWs is possible and it provides results with an error with respect to radial numerical approach (i.e., *GRASP*) of the same order of magnitude as using the $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ operator.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Prof. Dr. Trond Saue from the CNRS/Université de Toulouse, France. We acknowledge support from the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence scheme (262695), through the FRIPRO grant ReMRChem

(324590), and from NOTUR – The Norwegian Metacenter for Computational Science through grant of computer time (nn4654k).

Declarations

We use the CRediT taxonomy of contributor roles.[57, 58] The “Investigation” role also includes the “Methodology”, “Software”, and “Validation” roles. The “Analysis” role also includes the “Formal analysis” and “Visualization” roles. The “Funding acquisition” role also includes the “Resources” role. We visualize contributor roles in the following authorship attribution matrix, as suggested in Ref. 59.

Table 4: Levels of contribution: [major](#), [minor](#).

	CT	RDRE	LF
Conceptualization	Major	Major	Major
Investigation	Major	Major	Major
Data curation	Major	Major	Major
Analysis	Major	Major	Major
Supervision	Major	Major	Major
Writing – original draft	Major	Major	Major
Writing – revisions	Major	Major	Major
Funding acquisition	Major	Major	Major
Project administration	Major	Major	Major

Appendix A Equivalence of integral operator iterations

The equivalence of the integral operator iterations in Eqs. (18a), (18b), and (18c) rests on the relation between differentiation and convolution products:

$$(f \star g)' = f \star g'. \quad (\text{A1})$$

We use square brackets to delimit the operands in the convolution. Expanding Eq. (18a):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_i = & -\frac{1}{c^2} [c(\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p})G_i] \star \left[V\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right] \\
& -\frac{1}{c^2} \beta mc^2 [G_i] \star \left[V\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right] \\
& -\frac{D_{ii}}{c^2} [G_i] \star \left[V\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

where both the scalar and βmc^2 terms have been moved outside of the convolution, *i.e.* outside of the square brackets, the latter since $\beta I_4 = I_4 \beta$. The first term in the convolution contains the derivative of G_i , thus we can use property (A1) to move it outside of the convolution:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_i = & -\frac{1}{c^2} c(\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p}) [G_i] \star \left[V\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right] \\
& -\frac{1}{c^2} \beta mc^2 [G_i] \star \left[V\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right] \\
& -\frac{D_{ii}}{c^2} [G_i] \star \left[V\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

obtaining Eq. (18b), after rearrangement. From this form, we can use property (A1) once more to move the derivative application on the $V\phi_i$ convolution partner,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_i = & -\frac{1}{c^2} [G_i] \star \left[c(\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p}) \left(V\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right) \right] \\
& -\frac{1}{c^2} \beta mc^2 [G_i] \star \left[V\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right] \\
& -\frac{D_{ii}}{c^2} [G_i] \star \left[V\Phi_i - \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}\Phi_j \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

Eq. (18c) follows, since the corresponding rearrangement for the additional two terms in the convolution is trivial.

Appendix B Explicit form of the convolution kernel in Eq. (16a)

Whereas the iterative integral operator application in Eqs. (18b) and (18c) uses the (diagonal) matrix form of the nonrelativistic bound-state Helmholtz kernel, the iteration in Eq. (18a) requires the use of a new convolution kernel: $c(\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p})G_i$. This is a 4×4 matrix convolution kernel:

$$c(\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p})G_i = c \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \partial_z g_i & (\partial_x - i\partial_y)g_i \\ 0 & 0 & (\partial_x + i\partial_y)g_i & -\partial_z g_i \\ \partial_z g_i & (\partial_x - i\partial_y)g_i & 0 & 0 \\ (\partial_x + i\partial_y)g_i & -\partial_z g_i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B5})$$

with $g_i = \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\exp(-\mu_i |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|}$. The derivatives of the bound-state Helmholtz kernel are:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_u g_i &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\mu_i \frac{(r_u - r'_u) \exp(-\mu_i |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|^2} + \frac{(r_u - r'_u) \exp(-\mu_i |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|^3} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[\left(\mu_i + \frac{1}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} \right) \frac{1}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|^2} \right] (r_u - r'_u) \exp(-\mu_i |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|), \quad u \in \{x, y, z\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B6})$$

leading to a 4×4 , anisotropic convolution kernel:

$$c(\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p})G_i = \frac{c}{4\pi} \left[\left(\mu_i + \frac{1}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} \right) \frac{1}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|^2} \right] \exp(-\mu_i |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|) \times$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & (r_z - r'_z) & (r_x - ir_y) - (r'_x - ir'_y) \\ 0 & 0 & (r_x + ir_y) - (r'_x + ir'_y) & -(r_z - r'_z) \\ (r_z - r'_z) & (r_x - ir_y) - (r'_x - ir'_y) & 0 & 0 \\ (r_x + ir_y) - (r'_x + ir'_y) & -(r_z - r'_z) & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

(B7)

References

- [1] Dirac, P.A.M.: The quantum theory of the electron. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character **117**(778), 610–624 (1928)
- [2] Schwarz, W.H.E., Wallmeier, H.: Basis set expansions of relativistic molecular wave equations. Molecular Physics **46**(5), 1045–1061 (1982)
- [3] Mark, F., Rosicky, F.: Analytical relativistic hartree-fock equations within scalar basis sets. Chem. Phys. Lett. **74**(3), 562–567 (1980)
- [4] Wallmeier, H., Kutzelnigg, W.: Use of the squared dirac operator in variational relativistic calculations. Chemical Physics Letters **78**(2), 341–346 (1981)
- [5] Mark, F., Schwarz, W.H.E.: New representation of the $\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{p}$ operator in the solution of dirac-type equations by the linear-expansion method. Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 673–676 (1982)
- [6] Dyall, K.G.: Relativistic double-zeta, triple-zeta, and quadruple-zeta basis sets for the 7p elements, with atomic and molecular applications. Theoretical Chemistry Accounts **131**, 1–20 (2012)

- [7] Dyall, K.G.: Relativistic double-zeta, triple-zeta, and quadruple-zeta basis sets for the 4s, 5s, 6s, and 7s elements. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **113**(45), 12638–12644 (2009)
- [8] Dyall, K.G.: Relativistic double-zeta, triple-zeta, and quadruple-zeta basis sets for the actinides ac–lr. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* **117**(4), 491–500 (2007)
- [9] Gomes, A.S., Dyall, K.G., Visscher, L.: Relativistic double-zeta, triple-zeta, and quadruple-zeta basis sets for the lanthanides la–lu. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* **127**, 369–381 (2010)
- [10] Dyall, K.G.: Relativistic quadruple-zeta and revised triple-zeta and double-zeta basis sets for the 4p, 5p, and 6p elements. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* **115**, 441–447 (2006)
- [11] Visscher, L., Aerts, P., Visser, O., Nieuwpoort, W.: Kinetic balance in contracted basis sets for relativistic calculations. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **40**(S25), 131–139 (1991)
- [12] Gianturco, F., Guidotti, C.: Some notes on k-electron energies in molecular systems. *Chemical Physics Letters* **9**(6), 539–543 (1971)
- [13] Liu, W.: Ideas of relativistic quantum chemistry. *Molecular Physics* **108**(13), 1679–1706 (2010)
- [14] Stanton, R.E., Havriliak, S.: Kinetic balance: A partial solution to the problem of variational safety in dirac calculations. *The Journal of chemical physics* **81**(4), 1910–1918 (1984)
- [15] Ishikawa, Y., Binning Jr, R., Sando, K.: Dirac-fock discrete-basis calculations on the beryllium atom. *Chemical physics letters* **101**(1), 111–114 (1983)

- [16] Dyall, K.G., Fægri Jr, K.: Kinetic balance and variational bounds failure in the solution of the dirac equation in a finite gaussian basis set. *Chemical physics letters* **174**(1), 25–32 (1990)
- [17] Sun, S., Stetina, T.F., Zhang, T., Li, X.: On the finite nuclear effect and gaussian basis sets for four-component dirac hartree- fock calculations. In: *Rare Earth Elements and Actinides: Progress in Computational Science Applications*, pp. 207–218. ACS Publications, ??? (2021)
- [18] Faegri Jr, K.: Relativistic gaussian basis sets for the elements k–uuo. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* **105**, 252–258 (2001)
- [19] Tatewaki, H., Koga, T., Mochizuki, Y.: Prolapses in four-component relativistic gaussian basis sets. *Chemical physics letters* **375**(3-4), 399–405 (2003)
- [20] Simons, J.: Theoretical study of negative molecular ions. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* **62**, 107–128 (2011)
- [21] Aoyama, T., Yamakawa, H., Matsuoka, O.: Relativistic self-consistent-field methods for molecules. ii. a single-determinant dirac–fock self-consistent-field method for closed-shell polyatomic molecules. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **73**(3), 1329–1333 (1980)
- [22] Lee, Y.S., McLean, A.D.: Relativistic effects on Re and De in AgH and AuH from all-electron Dirac–Hartree–Fock calculations. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **76**(1), 735–736 (1982)
- [23] Kutzelnigg, W.: Basis set expansion of the dirac operator without variational collapse. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **25**(1), 107–129 (1984)
- [24] Foldy, L.L., Wouthuysen, S.A.: On the dirac theory of spin 1/2 particles and its

- non-relativistic limit. *Phys. Rev.* **78**, 29–36 (1950)
- [25] Foldy, L.L.: The electromagnetic properties of dirac particles. *Phys. Rev.* **87**, 688–693 (1952)
- [26] Taylor, H.S.: Models, interpretations, and calculations concerning resonant electron scattering processes in atoms and molecules. *Advances in Chemical Physics*, 91–147 (1970)
- [27] Hazi, A.U., Taylor, H.S.: Stabilization method of calculating resonance energies: Model problem. *Physical Review A* **1**(4), 1109 (1970)
- [28] Moiseyev, N., Certain, P., Weinhold, F.: Complex-coordinate studies of helium autoionizing resonances. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **14**(6), 727–736 (1978)
- [29] Datta, S.N.: Variational stability in dirac-hartree-fock theory. *Chemical Physics Letters* **74**(3), 568–572 (1980)
- [30] Ishikawa, Y., Malli, G.: Effective hamiltonian in the dirac-fock-roothaan scf theory. *Chemical Physics Letters* **80**(1), 111–113 (1981)
- [31] Wallmeier, H.: Relativistic self-consistent-field calculations with the squared dirac operator. *Phys. Rev. A Gen. Phys.* **29**(6), 2993–3006 (1984)
- [32] Sun, Q., Liu, W., Kutzelnigg, W.: Comparison of restricted, unrestricted, inverse, and dual kinetic balances for four-component relativistic calculations. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* **129**, 423–436 (2011)
- [33] Alpert, B., Beylkin, G., Gines, D., Vozovoi, L.: Adaptive Solution of Partial Differential Equations in Multiwavelet Bases. *Journal of Computational Physics* **182**(1), 149–190 (2002)

- [34] Jensen, F.: Introduction to Computational Chemistry, 2nd edn. Wiley, ??? (2007)
- [35] Tantardini, C., Di Remigio Eikås, R., Bjørgve, M., Jensen, S.R., Frediani, L.: Full breit hamiltonian in the multiwavelets framework. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **20**(2), 882–890 (2024)
- [36] Alpert, B., Beylkin, G., Coifman, R., Rokhlin, V.: Wavelet-like bases for the fast solution of second-kind integral equations. *SIAM journal on Scientific Computing* **14**(1), 159–184 (1993)
- [37] Beylkin, G., Mohlenkamp, M.J.: Algorithms for Numerical Analysis in High Dimensions. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **26**(6), 2133–2159 (2005)
- [38] Frediani, L., Fossgaard, E., Flå, T., Ruud, K.: Fully adaptive algorithms for multivariate integral equations using the non-standard form and multiwavelets with applications to the poisson and bound-state helmholtz kernels in three dimensions. *Molecular Physics* **111**(9-11), 1143–1160 (2013)
- [39] Harrison, R.J., Fann, G.I., Yanai, T., Beylkin, G.: Multiresolution quantum chemistry in multiwavelet bases. In: Sloot, P.M.A., Abramson, D., Bogdanov, A.V., Gorbachev, Y.E., Dongarra, J.J., Zomaya, A.Y. (eds.) *Computational Science — ICCS 2003*, pp. 103–110. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2003)
- [40] Anderson, J., Sundahl, B., Harrison, R., Beylkin, G.: Dirac-fock calculations on molecules in an adaptive multiwavelet basis. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **151**(23), 234112 (2019)
- [41] Kalos, M.H.: Monte Carlo Calculations of the Ground State of Three- and Four-Body Nuclei. *Phys. Rev.* **128**(4), 1791–1795 (1962)
- [42] Blackledge, J., Babajanov, B.: On the Dirac Scattering Problem. *Math. Aeterna*

- [43] Beylkin, G., Anderson, J., Harrison, R.J.: On computing bound states of the Dirac and Schrödinger Equations (2021)
- [44] Saue, T.: Relativistic Hamiltonians for chemistry: a primer. *Chemphyschem* **12**(17), 3077–3094 (2011)
- [45] Anderson, J., Harrison, R.J., Sekino, H., Sundahl, B., Beylkin, G., Fann, G.I., Jensen, S.R., Sagert, I.: On derivatives of smooth functions represented in multiwavelet bases. *Journal of Computational Physics: X* **4**, 100033 (2019)
- [46] Kramers, H.A.: Théorie générale de la rotation paramagnétique dans les. *Proc. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie Wetenschappen* **33**, 959–972 (1930)
- [47] Bast, R., Bjorgve, M., Di Remigio, R., Durdek, A., Frediani, L., Fossgaard, E., Gerez, G., Jensen, S.R., Juselius, J., Lehtola, S., Monstad, R., Wind, P.: MRCPP: MultiResolution Computation Program Package. Zenodo (2023). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7967323>
- [48] Battistella, E., Bjorgve, M., Di Remigio, R., Frediani, L., Gerez, G., Jensen, S.R.: VAMPyR: Very Accurate Multiresolution Python Routines. Zenodo (2023). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10290360>
- [49] Bjørgve, M., Tantardini, C., Jensen, S.R., Gerez S., G.A., Wind, P., Di Remigio Eikås, R., Dinvay, E., Frediani, L.: VAMPyR – A High-Level Python Library for Mathematical Operations in a Multiwavelets Representation (2024) [2402.08377](https://doi.org/10.26434/chemrxiv-2024-2402.08377)
- [50] Harrison, R.J., Fann, G.I., Yanai, T., Gan, Z., Beylkin, G.: Multiresolution quantum chemistry: Basic theory and initial applications. *The Journal of Chemical*

- Physics **121**(23), 11587–11598 (2004)
- [51] Visscher, L., Dylla, K.G.: DIRAC–FOCK ATOMIC ELECTRONIC STRUCTURE CALCULATIONS USING DIFFERENT NUCLEAR CHARGE DISTRIBUTIONS. *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables* **67**(2), 207–224 (1997)
- [52] Anderson, J., Harrison, R.J., Sekino, H., Sundahl, B., Beylkin, G., Fann, G.I., Jensen, S.R., Sagert, I.: On derivatives of smooth functions represented in multiwavelet bases. *Journal of Computational Physics: X* **4**, 100033 (2019)
- [53] Wigner, E.: Über die Operation der Zeitumkehr in der Quantenmechanik, *Gott. Nachr* (1932)
- [54] Wind, P., Bjørgve, M., Brakestad, A., Gerez S., G.A., Jensen, S.R., Eikås, R.D.R., Frediani, L.: Mrchem multiresolution analysis code for molecular electronic structure calculations: Performance and scaling properties. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **19**(1), 137–146 (2023)
- [55] Bethe, H.A., Salpeter, E.E.: *Quantum Mechanics of One- and Two-Electron Atoms*. Springer, Berlin, Germany (1977)
- [56] Kullie, O., Schiller, S.: Solution of the two-center dirac equation with 20-digit precision using the finite-element technique. *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 052801 (2022)
- [57] Allen, L., Scott, J., Brand, A., Hlava, M., Altman, M.: Publishing: Credit where credit is due. *Nature* **508**, 312–313 (2014)
- [58] Brand, A., Allen, L., Altman, M., Hlava, M., Scott, J.: Beyond authorship: attribution, contribution, collaboration, and credit. *Learn. Publ.* **28**, 151–155 (2015)
- [59] Researchers are embracing visual tools to give fair credit for work on papers.

<https://www.natureindex.com/news-blog/researchers-embracing-visual-tools-contribution-matrix-give-fair-credit-authors-scientific-papers>. Accessed: 2021-5-

3. <https://www.natureindex.com/news-blog/researchers-embracing-visual-tools-contribution-matrix-give-fair-credit-authors-scientific-papers>