

# The Singlet–Triplet Gap of Cyclobutadiene: The CIPSI-Driven CC( $P;Q$ ) Study

Swati S. Priyadarsini,<sup>1</sup> Karthik Gururangan,<sup>1</sup> Jun Shen,<sup>1</sup> and Piotr Piecuch<sup>1,2, a)</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Chemistry, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA*

(Dated: 28 May 2024)

An accurate determination of singlet–triplet gaps in biradicals, including cyclobutadiene in the automerization barrier region where one has to balance the substantial nondynamical many-electron correlation effects characterizing the singlet ground state with the predominantly dynamical correlations of the lowest-energy triplet, remains a challenge for many quantum chemistry methods. High-level coupled-cluster (CC) approaches, such as the CC method with a full treatment of singly, doubly, and triply excited clusters (CCSDT), are often capable of providing reliable results, but the routine application of such methods is hindered by their high computational costs. We have recently proposed a practical alternative to converging the CCSDT energetics at small fractions of the computational effort, even when electron correlations become stronger and connected triply excited clusters are larger and nonperturbative, by merging the CC( $P;Q$ ) moment expansions with the selected configuration interaction methodology abbreviated as CIPSI. We demonstrate that one can accurately approximate the highly accurate CCSDT potential surfaces characterizing the lowest singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene along the automerization coordinate and the gap between them using tiny fractions of triply excited cluster amplitudes identified with the help of relatively inexpensive CIPSI Hamiltonian diagonalizations.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Biradicals play a key role in chemistry as reaction intermediates in thermal and photochemical pathways<sup>1–7</sup> as well as functional materials used in molecular magnets,<sup>8–10</sup> battery electrodes,<sup>11</sup> and organic photovoltaics.<sup>12–15</sup> An important quantity characterizing the electronic structure of biradicals, especially in the context of designing molecules for magnetic, electrochemical, and photovoltaic applications, is the energy gap  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  separating the lowest-lying singlet and triplet states (throughout this work, we define  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  as  $E_S - E_T$ , where  $E_S$  and  $E_T$  are the electronic energies of the relevant singlet and triplet states, *i.e.*, when the singlet is lower than the triplet,  $\Delta E_{S-T} < 0$ ). Accurate computational determination of the  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  values in biradicals remains, however, a difficult task because it requires balancing the strong nondynamical many-electron correlation effects characterizing the low-spin singlet states with the predominantly dynamical correlations associated with their high-spin triplet counterparts.<sup>16–32</sup>

This challenge is exemplified by the cyclobutadiene molecule, which is the focus of the present study and which has fascinated experimental and theoretical chemists for decades with questions surrounding its low-lying electronic states, anti-aromaticity, and reactivity in cycloaddition and isomerization reactions. In the  $D_{4h}$ -symmetric square structure corresponding to the barrier along the automerization coordinate or the minimum on

the lowest triplet potential, cyclobutadiene is a biradical with its four valence  $\pi$  orbitals arranged in a network consisting of the nondegenerate  $a_{2u}$  orbital, the doubly degenerate  $e_g$  shell, and the nondegenerate  $b_{1u}$  orbital. The distribution of two of the four valence electrons among the pair of degenerate frontier  $e_g$  orbitals gives rise to three singlet states of the  $B_{1g}(D_{4h})$ ,  $A_{1g}(D_{4h})$ , and  $B_{2g}(D_{4h})$  symmetries and a  $A_{2g}(D_{4h})$ -symmetric triplet state, all involving the doubly occupied  $a_{2u}$  and unoccupied  $b_{1u}$  orbitals and the partially occupied  $e_g$  shell in their zeroth-order description.<sup>30,33–39</sup> As shown in the early *ab initio* calculations,<sup>33,34,40–42</sup> and as confirmed in many subsequent theoretical studies, such as those reported in Refs. 20, 26–28, 30–32, 35–39, the lowest singlet of the  $B_{1g}(D_{4h})$  symmetry, which has a substantial multiconfigurational character, is the ground state, whereas the predominantly single-reference  $A_{2g}(D_{4h})$ -symmetric triplet, in violation of Hund’s rule, is the first excited state. To be more specific, if one orients cyclobutadiene such that the two  $C_2$  axes bisect the carbon–carbon bonds, which is a convention adopted in the present study, the  ${}^1B_{1g}(D_{4h})$  ground state of the square structure is dominated by two closed-shell determinants in which one of the two degenerate  $e_g$  orbitals is occupied by two electrons and the other one is empty (see, *e.g.*, Refs. 35, 37, 39, and 42). This should be contrasted with the lowest-energy  ${}^3A_{2g}(D_{4h})$  state, which is characterized by single occupancy of each of the  $e_g$  orbitals.

While the lowest  ${}^3A_{2g}(D_{4h})$  state is stable in the square geometry, which is a minimum on the corresponding triplet surface, the  ${}^1B_{1g}(D_{4h})$  ground state is unstable with respect to the rectangular distortion of the carbon–carbon bonds that lifts the degeneracy of the valence  $e_g$

<sup>a)</sup>Corresponding author; e-mail: piecuch@chemistry.msu.edu.

orbitals and lowers its total electronic energy due to the pseudo-Jahn–Teller effect. This results in the formation of the  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric rectangular species characterized by the closed-shell, predominantly single-determinantal,  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  ground state, which represents a minimum on the lowest-energy singlet potential.<sup>30,31,35–37,39,42</sup> The distortion of the multiconfigurational  $^1B_{1g}(D_{4h})$  state into the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  state coincides with the automerization coordinate in cyclobutadiene, which describes the conversion of the rectangular,  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric, closed-shell reactant (R) into the equivalent product conformer by passing through the square,  $D_{4h}$ -symmetric, biradical transition state (TS). Obtaining an accurate description of the potential energy curves (PECs) characterizing the lowest singlet [ $^1A_g(D_{2h})$ ] and triplet [ $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$ ] states of cyclobutadiene along its  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric automerization coordinate, and the gap between them, particularly in the neighborhood of the square biradical species, remains a significant challenge for modern *ab initio* techniques as it requires a high-level treatment of many-electron correlation effects in order to accurately capture and balance the strong nondynamical correlations associated with the multiconfigurational singlet state with the largely dynamical correlations dominating the triplet state.

A traditional way of addressing this and similar challenges is to use multireference approaches,<sup>43–50</sup> but in this work we focus on the single-reference coupled-cluster (CC) methodology,<sup>51–57</sup> which employs the exponential wave function ansatz<sup>58,59</sup>

$$|\Psi\rangle = e^T|\Phi\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where  $|\Phi\rangle$  is the  $N$ -electron reference determinant that serves as a Fermi vacuum and  $T = \sum_{n=1}^N T_n$  is the cluster operator, with  $T_n$  designating the  $n$ -body component of  $T$  responsible for generating connected  $n$ -particle– $n$ -hole ( $np$ - $nh$ ) excitations out of  $|\Phi\rangle$ . It is well established that as long as the number of strongly correlated electrons is not too large, the standard hierarchy of CC approximations, including the CC method with singles and doubles (CCSD),<sup>60–63</sup> obtained by truncating  $T$  at  $T_2$ , the CC approach with singles, doubles, and triples (CCSDT),<sup>64–67</sup> in which  $T$  is truncated at  $T_3$ , the CC method with singles, doubles, triples, and quadruples (CCSDTQ),<sup>68–71</sup> where  $T$  is truncated at  $T_4$ , and so on, rapidly converges to the exact, full configuration interaction (CI) limit. As a result, the single-reference CC approaches with a full treatment of higher-rank  $T_n$  clusters with  $n > 2$ , such as CCSDT or CCSDTQ, are often capable of accurately describing multireference situations, including substantial bond rearrangements in the course of chemical reactions and, what is especially important for this study, singlet–triplet gaps in biradical species, by capturing the relevant dynamical and nondynamical correlation effects via particle–hole excitations from a single determinant, without having to involve genuine multireference concepts.

In particular, the calculations reported in Refs. 32, 36, and 39 show that the full treatment of  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ , and

$T_3$  clusters provided by CCSDT offers a highly accurate description of the total electronic energies of the lowest  $^1B_{1g}(D_{4h})$  and  $^3A_{2g}(D_{4h})$  states of the square cyclobutadiene and the gap between them. As demonstrated in Figure 1, this remains true when examining the PECs characterizing the lowest-energy singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene along the entire  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric automerization reaction path. In determining the lowest-energy  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  PECs shown in Figure 1 (for information about the electronic structure software used in our calculations, see Section II), we followed the procedure described in Ref. 38 in which one constructs an approximate,  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric, one-dimensional automerization pathway connecting the rectangular minima on the lowest singlet potential via the square TS species by linearly interpolating the carbon–carbon bond distances in cyclobutadiene using the formula

$$\ell_i(\lambda) = (1 - \lambda)\ell_i(\text{R}) + \lambda\ell_i(\text{TS}), \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (2)$$

where  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  are the C–C distances depicted in Figure 1 and  $\ell_i(\text{R})$  and  $\ell_i(\text{TS})$  are the carbon–carbon bond lengths characterizing the R and TS structures optimized (along with the C–H distances and H–C–C bond angles) in Ref. 38 with the multireference average quadratic CC (MR-AQCC) approach.<sup>72,73</sup> The dimensionless parameter  $\lambda$  defining the automerization coordinate varies between 0, corresponding to the R species, and 1, corresponding to the TS structure, going back to 0 (after replacing  $\ell_1$  by  $\ell_2$  and *vice versa*) when the automerization product equivalent to the R species is reached. In the absence of information about the C–H bond lengths and H–C–C bond angles characterizing the intermediate  $\lambda = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6,$  and  $0.8$  geometries in Ref. 38, in determining the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states of these structures, we fixed the C–H distances and H–C–C angles at their values corresponding to the R species.

As shown in Figure 1, the lowest singlet and triplet PECs computed as functions of the  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric automerization coordinate  $\lambda$  with full CCSDT are in very good agreement with their counterparts obtained with the CI method using perturbative selection made iteratively,<sup>74–76</sup> abbreviated as CIPSI, extrapolated to the full CI limit (see Section II for further details). The CCSDT energies are also very close to those determined using the double electron-attachment (DEA) equation-of-motion (EOM) CC methodology<sup>26,29,30,77–80</sup> with a full treatment of 2p and 3p-1h and an active-space treatment of 4p-2h correlations on top of the CCSD description of the underlying closed-shell  $(\text{C}_4\text{H}_4)^{2+}$  core,<sup>26,29,79,80</sup> denoted as DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h) $\{N_u\}$ , where  $N_u$  designates the number of active unoccupied orbitals of  $(\text{C}_4\text{H}_4)^{2+}$  included in the calculations to capture the leading 4p-2h effects in the target cyclobutadiene species (to accurately describe the 4p-2h effects associated with the valence orbitals of cyclobutadiene that correlate with the  $e_g$  and  $b_{1u}$  shells of the square TS structure, we set  $N_u$  to 3). To illustrate the agreement between

full CCSDT, perturbatively corrected and extrapolated CIPSI, and DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h) $\{N_u\}$ , which are three independent *ab initio* methodologies, we compare the vertical  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  values at the R and TS geometries. When using the cc-pVDZ<sup>81</sup> basis set, employed in the calculations reported in Figure 1 and the rest of this article, the CCSDT value of  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  at the TS geometry is  $-4.8$  kcal/mol. This is very close to  $-5.2$  kcal/mol resulting from the state-of-the-art DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h) $\{N_u\}$  calculations and  $-5.9$  kcal/mol obtained with CIPSI. The CCSDT, DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h) $\{N_u\}$ , and perturbatively corrected and extrapolated CIPSI values of  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  at the R geometry are  $-30.6$ ,  $-30.5$ , and  $-32.9$  kcal/mol, respectively, again in good agreement with one another.

Given the high accuracy of the lowest singlet and triplet potential surfaces of cyclobutadiene and  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  values along the  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric automerization pathway offered by full CCSDT, it may be tempting to turn to the approximate treatments of  $T_3$  correlations that replace the expensive iterative  $\mathcal{N}^8$  computational steps of CCSDT, where  $\mathcal{N}$  is a measure of the system size, by the more practical  $\mathcal{N}^6$  operations of CCSD combined with the noniterative  $\mathcal{N}^7$  steps needed to correct the CCSD energetics for the leading  $T_3$  correlations, as in the widely used CCSD(T) approach<sup>82,83</sup> or its more robust completely renormalized (CR) CC counterpart abbreviated as CR-CC(2,3).<sup>17,84–86</sup> Unfortunately, neither CCSD(T) and CR-CC(2,3) nor any of the other noniterative triples corrections to CCSD, such as CCSD(T) $_{\Lambda}$ ,<sup>87–89</sup> CCSD(2) $_T$ ,<sup>90–93</sup> CR-CCSD(T)<sup>94–97</sup> and its locally renormalized extension,<sup>98</sup>  $\Lambda$ -CCSD(T),<sup>99,100</sup> and CCSD(T- $n$ ),<sup>101,102</sup> are capable of providing accurate results when the coupling of the lower-order  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  components of the cluster operator with their higher-rank  $T_3$  counterpart becomes large. For example, even the most robust triples correction to CCSD defining CR-CC(2,3), which improves CCSD(T) and other similar approaches in situations involving electronic quasi-degeneracies, such as those present in single bond breaking,<sup>17,84–86,103–106</sup> struggles in describing the PEC of the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  state of cyclobutadiene in the neighborhood of the automerization barrier region, where  $T_3$  clusters become large, nonperturbative, and strongly coupled to  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ .<sup>107</sup> As a result, as shown in Ref. 32 and this study, the CR-CC(2,3)  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  value at the singlet TS structure, of  $4.4$  kcal/mol when the cc-pVDZ basis is used, is in large error (including incorrect sign) relative to its CCSDT  $-4.8$  kcal/mol counterpart [CCSD(T) gives  $3.9$  kcal/mol, which is similarly inaccurate].

Problems with applying noniterative corrections to CCSD in situations where  $T_n$  components with  $n > 2$ , such as  $T_3$ , are not only large and nonperturbative, but also strongly coupled to their lower-rank  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  counterparts, have motivated us to develop the generalization of the biorthogonal moment expansions, which in the past resulted in the CR-CC approaches, such as CR-CC(2,3) and its excited-state and higher-order extensions,<sup>17,84–86,104,108–114</sup> to unconventional trunca-

tions in the cluster and EOMCC<sup>115–118</sup> excitation operators, designated as  $CC(P;Q)$ .<sup>22,32,103,107,113,114,119–124</sup> By incorporating the dominant contributions to the higher-than-two-body clusters into the iterative steps, so that  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  amplitudes can relax compared to their CCSD values when  $T_n$  components with  $n > 2$  become more substantial, and correcting the results for the remaining many-electron correlation effects of interest using suitably defined moment expansions, the  $CC(P;Q)$  formalism provides us with the opportunity to converge or accurately approximate the parent high-level CCSDT, CCSDTQ, and similar energetics at small fractions of the computational costs, even when noniterative corrections to CCSD fail or struggle. Focusing on full CCSDT, which provides the parent data for the lowest singlet and triplet PECs of cyclobutadiene examined in this work, a few different  $CC(P;Q)$  approaches designed to converge CCSDT energetics have been developed. In the initial, active-orbital-based, variant of  $CC(P;Q)$ , abbreviated as  $CC(t;3)$ , which is part of the larger  $CC(t;3)$ ,  $CC(t,q;3)$ ,  $CC(t,q;3,4)$ ,  $CC(q;4)$ , *etc.* hierarchy,<sup>22,103,107,113,114,119</sup> the leading  $T_3$  amplitudes that enter the iterative steps preceding the determination of the  $CC(P;Q)$  corrections are obtained using the active-space CCSDt approach.<sup>71,125–133</sup> In the more black-box semi-stochastic<sup>32,120–122</sup> and CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$ <sup>123</sup> approaches aimed at converging CCSDT, the dominant triply excited cluster amplitudes are identified with the help of CI<sup>134–138</sup> or CC<sup>139–142</sup> Quantum Monte Carlo wave function propagations in the many-electron Hilbert space, in the former case, and the sequences of Hamiltonian diagonalizations constructed in the CIPSI algorithm<sup>74–76</sup> in the case of the latter method. In the recently introduced adaptive  $CC(P;Q)$  formalism,<sup>124</sup> the triply excited determinants and amplitudes defining the leading  $T_3$  contributions in the iterative steps of  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations are identified using the intrinsic structure of the  $CC(P;Q)$  energy corrections.

In this study, we focus on the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  methodology of Ref. 123. Our main goal is to answer the question how efficient this methodology is in converging the lowest singlet and triplet potentials of cyclobutadiene along the  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric automerization coordinate resulting from the highly accurate CCSDT computations shown in Figure 1. As demonstrated in our initial study,<sup>123</sup> the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  approach is capable of producing the near-CCSDT energetics for singlet electronic states using tiny fractions of triply excited cluster amplitudes in the iterative parts of the  $CC(P;Q)$  algorithm that are considerably smaller than those used in the analogous semi-stochastic and active-orbital-based  $CC(P;Q)$  considerations. One of the key objectives of this work is to determine if similar observations apply to the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations for the lowest singlet and triplet potentials of cyclobutadiene along its automerization coordinate and the gap between them. The role of the  $CC(P;Q)$  moment corrections in improving the resulting energetics is discussed as well.

## II. THEORY AND COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

We begin by summarizing the key ingredients of the CC( $P$ ;  $Q$ ) formalism, as applied to the ground-state problem or, in general, to the lowest state of a given symmetry for which a suitable single-determinantal reference can be found. Each CC( $P$ ;  $Q$ ) calculation requires defining two disjoint subspaces of the many-electron Hilbert space, called the  $P$  and  $Q$  spaces, designated as  $\mathcal{H}^{(P)}$  and  $\mathcal{H}^{(Q)}$ , respectively. The former space consists of the excited determinants  $|\Phi_K\rangle = E_K|\Phi\rangle$  which, together with the reference function  $|\Phi\rangle$ , dominate the electronic state of interest ( $E_K$  is the elementary particle-hole excitation operator that generates  $|\Phi_K\rangle$  from  $|\Phi\rangle$ ). The determinants spanning the complementary  $Q$  space  $\mathcal{H}^{(Q)}$  are used to form the noniterative correction  $\delta(P; Q)$  which captures higher-order correlation effects the CC calculations in the  $P$  space do not describe.

All CC( $P$ ;  $Q$ ) computations consist of two stages. In the first, iterative, stage, denoted as CC( $P$ ), we solve the CC amplitude equations in  $\mathcal{H}^{(P)}$  to determine amplitudes  $t_K$  that define the  $P$ -space cluster operator

$$T^{(P)} = \sum_{|\Phi_K\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(P)}} t_K E_K. \quad (3)$$

This is done by employing the conventional projective technique adopted in the majority of single-reference CC calculations, *i.e.*, by solving the system

$$\mathfrak{M}_K(P) = 0, \quad |\Phi_K\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(P)}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{M}_K(P) = \langle \Phi_K | \bar{H}^{(P)} | \Phi \rangle, \quad (5)$$

with  $\bar{H}^{(P)} = e^{-T^{(P)}} H e^{T^{(P)}}$  representing the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian, are generalized moments of the CC( $P$ ) equations.<sup>94,95,143</sup> Once the cluster amplitudes  $t_K$  defining  $T^{(P)}$  are determined, the CC( $P$ ) energy is calculated in a usual way as

$$E^{(P)} = \langle \Phi | \bar{H}^{(P)} | \Phi \rangle. \quad (6)$$

In the second stage of the CC( $P$ ;  $Q$ ) procedure, we construct the aforementioned noniterative correction  $\delta(P; Q)$  using the expression

$$\delta(P; Q) = \sum_{|\Phi_K\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(Q)}} \ell_K(P) \mathfrak{M}_K(P), \quad (7)$$

where coefficients  $\ell_K(P)$  multiplying moments  $\mathfrak{M}_K(P)$  are defined as

$$\ell_K(P) = \langle \Phi | (1 + \Lambda^{(P)}) \bar{H}^{(P)} | \Phi_K \rangle / D_K^{(P)}, \quad (8)$$

with  $D_K^{(P)} = E^{(P)} - \langle \Phi_K | \bar{H}^{(P)} | \Phi_K \rangle$  designating the relevant Epstein-Nesbet-like denominators. The hole-

particle deexcitation operator

$$\Lambda^{(P)} = \sum_{|\Phi_K\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(P)}} \lambda_K (E_K)^\dagger \quad (9)$$

in Eq. (8), which defines the bra state  $\langle \tilde{\Psi}^{(P)} | = \langle \Phi | (1 + \Lambda^{(P)}) e^{-T^{(P)}}$  matching the CC( $P$ ) ket state  $|\Psi^{(P)}\rangle = e^{T^{(P)}} |\Phi\rangle$ , is obtained by solving the linear system

$$\langle \Phi | (1 + \Lambda^{(P)}) \bar{H}^{(P)} | \Phi_K \rangle = E^{(P)} \lambda_K, \quad |\Phi_K\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(P)}. \quad (10)$$

The final CC( $P$ ;  $Q$ ) energy is obtained using the formula

$$E^{(P+Q)} = E^{(P)} + \delta(P; Q). \quad (11)$$

One of the main advantages of the CC( $P$ ;  $Q$ ) methodology is its flexibility. In particular, we can make a wide variety of conventional as well as unconventional choices of the  $P$  and  $Q$  spaces, adjusting them to the nature of the electronic states of interest and adopting different numerical procedures in their construction. Conventional choices for the  $P$  and  $Q$  spaces, based on the many-body ranks of the determinants included in them, result in the left-eigenstate CR-CC methods, such as the CR-CC(2,3) approach discussed in the Introduction, in which the former space consists of all singly and doubly excited determinants and the latter space is spanned by all triples. We can, however, also make unconventional choices, including those adopted in the CC(t;3), CC(t,q;3), CC(t,q;3,4), CC(q;4), *etc.* hierarchy<sup>22,103,107,113,114,119</sup> and the semistochastic,<sup>32,120–122</sup> adaptive,<sup>124</sup> and CIPSI-driven<sup>123</sup> CC( $P$ ;  $Q$ ) methods, mentioned in the Introduction as well, in which the suitably chosen subsets of higher-than-doubly excited determinants are incorporated into the underlying  $P$  spaces, in addition to all singles and doubles, to relax the lower-rank  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  clusters in the presence of their higher-rank counterparts, such as the leading  $T_3$  contributions, which the CCSD(T), CR-CC(2,3),  $\Lambda$ -CCSD(T), and similar approaches are not designed to do. Having some higher-than-doubly excited determinants in the  $P$  space provides us with a straightforward and computationally efficient mechanism to account for the coupling between the lower- and higher-order components of the cluster operator, which cannot be neglected when  $T_n$  contributions with  $n > 2$ , such as  $T_3$ , become large and nonperturbative, as is the case when the automerization barrier region of the lowest-energy singlet potential of cyclobutadiene is examined. This, in turn, allows us to recover the full CCSDT, CCSDTQ, and similar energetics without running into the very expensive, often prohibitive, computational costs associated with the high-level CC methods of this type.

In the case of the CIPSI-driven CC( $P$ ;  $Q$ ) approach, introduced in Ref. 123 and investigated in this study, the desired subsets of higher-than-doubly excited determinants incorporated into the underlying  $P$  spaces are identified with the help of sequences of relatively inexpensive Hamiltonian diagonalizations in systematic

cally grown, recursively defined, subspaces of the many-electron Hilbert space, denoted as  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k)}$ , where  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  enumerates the consecutive CIPSI iterations. In doing so, we follow the CIPSI algorithm, originally proposed in Ref. 74, further developed in Refs. 75 and 76, and available in the Quantum Package 2.0 software.<sup>76</sup> Given our interest in using CIPSI, which is one of the selected CI approaches<sup>74,144–146</sup> (see Refs. 147–155 for other examples), within the single-reference  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  framework, the initial subspaces  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(0)}$  adopted in our work are always spanned by the restricted Hartree–Fock (RHF) or restricted open-shell Hartree–Fock (ROHF) determinants. Once  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(0)}$  is defined, each subsequent subspace  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k+1)}$  with  $k \geq 0$  is constructed by enlarging its  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k)}$  predecessor with the subset of the leading singly and doubly excited determinants generated out of it, identified with the help of the many-body perturbation theory (MBPT). Thus, if  $|\Psi_k^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle = \sum_{|\Phi_I\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k)}} c_I |\Phi_I\rangle$  and  $E_{\text{var},k}$  are the CI wave function and energy obtained in  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k)}$ , and if the space of all singles and doubles out of  $|\Psi_k^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  is designated as  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{ext}}^{(k)}$ , the subset of determinants  $|\Phi_\alpha\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{ext}}^{(k)}$  selected for inclusion in  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k+1)}$  consists of those that have the largest  $e_{\alpha,k}^{(2)} = |\langle \Phi_\alpha | H | \Psi_k^{(\text{CIPSI})} \rangle|^2 / (E_{\text{var},k} - \langle \Phi_\alpha | H | \Phi_\alpha \rangle)$  contributions to the perturbative correction  $\Delta E_k^{(2)} = \sum_{|\Phi_\alpha\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{ext}}^{(k)}} e_{\alpha,k}^{(2)}$  to  $E_{\text{var},k}$ . Their selection is accomplished by arranging the sampled determinants  $|\Phi_\alpha\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{ext}}^{(k)}$  in descending order according to their  $|e_{\alpha,k}^{(2)}|$  values and enlarging  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k)}$ , determinant by determinant, starting with the  $|\Phi_\alpha\rangle$ s associated with the largest  $|e_{\alpha,k}^{(2)}|$  contributions and moving toward those characterized by smaller values of  $|e_{\alpha,k}^{(2)}|$ , until the dimension of  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k+1)}$  exceeds that of its  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k)}$  predecessor by a user-defined factor  $f > 1$ , which in all the calculations performed in this study was set to its default value of 2 [the actual number of determinants included in  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k+1)}$  is usually slightly larger than  $f$  times the dimension of  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k)}$  since one may have to add extra determinants in  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k+1)}$  to make sure that the corresponding CI wave function  $|\Psi_{k+1}^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  is an eigenstate of the total spin  $S^2$  and  $S_z$  operators]. To reduce the computational costs associated with the above procedure of enlarging the  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k)}$  space to obtain  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k+1)}$ , in all the CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  computations reported in this work, we relied on a semi-stochastic version of the above determinant selection algorithm implemented in Quantum Package 2.0, in which one stochastically filters out the most important singly and doubly excited determinants out of  $|\Psi_k^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$ , so that only a small subset of singles and doubles ends up in the  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{ext}}^{(k)}$  space prior to determining and analyzing the  $e_{\alpha,k}^{(2)}$  contributions. The  $e_{\alpha,k}^{(2)}$  values, in addition to guiding the process of enlarging diagonalization spaces  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(k)}$

and allowing us to evaluate the perturbatively corrected CIPSI energies  $E_{\text{var},k} + \Delta E_k^{(2)}$ , can be used to calculate the renormalized second-order corrections  $\Delta E_{r,k}^{(2)}$  introduced in Ref. 76 and the  $E_{\text{var},k} + \Delta E_{r,k}^{(2)}$  energies.

To produce the final wave function  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$ , needed to construct the list of higher-than-doubly excited determinants to be included in the  $P$  space of a given CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  calculation, and determine the associated variational ( $E_{\text{var}}$ ) and perturbatively corrected [ $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$  or  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$ ] CIPSI energies, the sequence of Hamiltonian diagonalizations defining the underlying CIPSI run must be terminated. This could be done by stopping at the first iteration  $k$  for which the absolute value of the second-order MBPT correction  $\Delta E_k^{(2)}$  falls below a user-defined threshold  $\eta$ , but, given our interest in examining the convergence of the CIPSI-based  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  calculations toward the desired high-level CC energetics, represented in this study by CCSDT, using systematically grown  $P$  spaces obtained with the help of CIPSI, in this work we follow Ref. 123 and stop when the number of determinants in the diagonalization space equalizes or exceeds the user-defined parameter  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ . To ensure that the CIPSI sequences preceding our  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  calculations did not terminate too soon, before the dimensions of terminal diagonalization spaces became greater than or equal to  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ , we set the aforementioned parameter  $\eta$  to 1 microhartree. As a result [putting aside the convergence threshold used in the  $\text{CC}(P)$  iterations, which we set to  $10^{-8}$  hartree], all CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  computations reported in this article, along with the underlying  $P$  spaces, were controlled by a single input variable  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ . In addition to  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ , in presenting our  $\text{CC}(P)$  and  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  results for the lowest singlet and triplet potentials of cyclobutadiene, we also provide information about the numbers of determinants included in the terminal CIPSI wave functions  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  obtained for various values of  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ , designated as  $N_{\text{det(out)}}$ . Given our choice of the subspace enlargement parameter  $f$ , the  $N_{\text{det(out)}}$  values characterizing the  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  states used to identify the triply excited determinants for inclusion in the  $P$  spaces employed in our CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  computations were always between  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  and  $2N_{\text{det(in)}}$ . With all of this in mind, the algorithm used in the CIPSI-enabled  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  calculations reported in this study, aimed at converging the CCSDT energetics, can be summarized as follows:<sup>123</sup>

1. Choose a wave function termination parameter  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  and execute a CIPSI diagonalization sequence starting from the one-dimensional subspace  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{int}}^{(0)}$  spanned by the RHF or ROHF reference determinant  $|\Phi\rangle$  to obtain the  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  state.
2. Extract the list of triply excited determinants included in  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  and combine it with all singly and doubly excited determinants relative to  $|\Phi\rangle$  to obtain the  $P$  space for  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  calculations.

3. Solve the  $CC(P)$  amplitude equations, Eq. (4), to determine the cluster operator  $T^{(P)} = T_1 + T_2 + T_3^{(\text{CIPSI})}$ , where  $T_3^{(\text{CIPSI})}$  is the three-body component of  $T^{(P)}$  defined using the list of triply excited determinants extracted from  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$ , and energy  $E^{(P)}$ , Eq. (6). Solve the left-eigenstate  $CC(P)$  system given by Eq. (10) to obtain the companion hole-particle deexcitation operator  $\Lambda^{(P)} = \Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2 + \Lambda_3^{(\text{CIPSI})}$  in which the triples entering  $\Lambda_3^{(\text{CIPSI})}$  are the same as those included in  $T_3^{(\text{CIPSI})}$ .
4. Calculate the noniterative correction  $\delta(P;Q)$ , Eq. (7), in which the  $Q$  space is defined as the remaining triply excited determinants absent in  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$ , and add it to  $E^{(P)}$  to obtain the  $CC(P;Q)$  energy  $E^{(P+Q)}$ , Eq. (11).

The above steps 1–4 can be repeated by increasing  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ . The entire process can be stopped when the difference between consecutive  $E^{(P+Q)}$  values falls below some small, user-specified, convergence threshold.

In order to perform the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations for the singlet and triplet PECs of cyclobutadiene along the automerization coordinate investigated in this work and examine their convergence toward the CCSDT potentials shown in Figure 1, we used the computer programs described in Ref. 123, interfaced with the RHF, ROHF, and integral transformation routines in GAMESS,<sup>156–158</sup> which take advantage of our highly efficient, automatically generated, Fortran CC codes that were previously exploited in implementing the active-orbital-based<sup>22,103,107,113,114</sup> and semi-stochastic<sup>120–122</sup>  $CC(P;Q)$  approaches. We also used our group’s computer-generated CC codes interfaced with GAMESS to produce the parent CCSDT data. The results of the DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h) $\{N_u\}$  calculations discussed in the Introduction, reported in Figure 1 as well, were carried out with the highly efficient DEA-EOMCC routines developed in Ref. 29, which became part of the official GAMESS distribution last year.

As already alluded to above, the lists of triply excited determinants that were needed to construct the  $P$  spaces for the  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations corresponding to the various values of the input parameter  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  were extracted from the terminal CIPSI wave functions  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  obtained with Quantum Package 2.0, whereas the complementary  $Q$  spaces, used to determine the  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections, consisted of the remaining triples absent in the  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  states. We also used Quantum Package 2.0 to obtain the  $E_{\text{var}}$ ,  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$ , and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  energies associated with the CIPSI runs that provided the lists of triples for the  $CC(P)$  iterations. Our CIPSI-driven  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  methods targeting CCSDT that rely on the triples lists extracted from the CIPSI calculations performed with Quantum Package 2.0 have recently been incorporated in our open-source CCpy package available on GitHub,<sup>159</sup> implemented using a hybrid Python-Fortran programming approach.

To obtain the desired insights into the convergence of the singlet and triplet potentials of cyclobutadiene toward their CCSDT counterparts, we adopted the strategy used in Ref. 123. Thus, for each nuclear geometry along the automerization pathway considered in this work, we carried out a series of CIPSI-driven  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations using the  $P$  and  $Q$  spaces derived from the increasingly large CIPSI wave functions obtained by varying  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  in an approximately semi-logarithmic manner. We started with  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 1$ , where the CIPSI wave functions  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  are the single determinants defining the reference states  $|\Phi\rangle$  used in our CC computations (RHF in the case of the singlet and ROHF in the triplet case) and the resulting  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  energies become identical to those obtained with CCSD and CR-CC(2,3), respectively, and went all the way to  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 10,000,000$ , to reflect on the fact that as the input variable  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  becomes increasingly large and the CIPSI wave functions capture more and more triply excited determinants, the  $CC(P;Q)$  energies  $E^{(P+Q)}$  approach their CCSDT parents (becoming identical to them when all triply excited determinants are captured by the  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  states). The energies obtained in the  $CC(P)$  computations approach their CCSDT counterparts as well, but, as discussed in the next section, their convergence toward CCSDT is much slower than that observed in the  $CC(P;Q)$  runs. The ability of the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  methodology to generate the CCSDT-level energetics using tiny fractions of triply excited determinants in the underlying  $P$  spaces captured by the relatively small Hamiltonian diagonalizations, observed in the calculations for the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  potentials of cyclobutadiene reported in this study, results in enormous savings in the computational effort compared to CCSDT. Indeed, as explained in Ref. 123, the CIPSI runs using smaller  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  values are much faster than those needed to reach convergence, the  $CC(P)$  calculations using tiny fractions of triples in the  $P$  space are orders of magnitude faster than the corresponding CCSDT computations (*cf.* Ref. 124 for the examples of timings), and the effort involved in obtaining the noniterative  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections is similar to the determination of the triples corrections of CR-CC(2,3) or CCSD(T).

While our numerical evidence clearly demonstrates that the CIPSI computations characterized by  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 10,000,000$  result in the  $P$  spaces which are unnecessarily large for accurately approximating the CCSDT energetics using the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  approach, we include them in our analysis since they also allowed us to extrapolate the near-full-CI  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  potentials shown in Figure 1 by following the procedure described in Refs. 39, 76, and 160 (see, also, Ref. 123). In this procedure, the  $E_{\text{var},k} + \Delta E_{r,k}^{(2)}$  energies extracted from the last four to six Hamiltonian diagonalizations of the CIPSI sequence leading to the final  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$  state are plotted against the corresponding  $\Delta E_{r,k}^{(2)}$  corrections and the resulting data, fit to a line, are extrapolated to the

$\Delta E_r^{(2)} = 0$  limit. In the case of the CIPSI calculations performed in this work, to extrapolate the reasonably smooth PECs for the lowest singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene out of our largest CIPSI runs corresponding to  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})} = 10,000,000$ , shown in Figure 1, we had to use the last six  $E_{\text{var},k} + \Delta E_{r,k}^{(2)}$  and  $\Delta E_{r,k}^{(2)}$  values of each of these runs. Using fewer than six values resulted in unphysical bumps in the extrapolated potentials. In addition to allowing us to comment on the quality of the CCSDT energetics in the Introduction, the extrapolated CIPSI PECs shown in Figure 1 serve in this study as reference potentials for assessing the accuracy of the  $E_{\text{var}}$ ,  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$ , and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  energies obtained in the CIPSI calculations using various values of  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})}$  from a 1–10,000,000 range.

In generating the results of the CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  computations for the lowest singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene along its automerization coordinate at different values of the wave function terminating parameter  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})}$ , discussed in the next section, we adopted the same philosophy as that used in the case of the DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h) $\{N_u\}$ , extrapolated  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$ , and parent CCSDT potentials shown in Figure 1. Thus, we used Eq. (2), in which the geometries of the R and TS structures on the singlet potential obtained with MR-AQCC were taken from Ref. 38, to set up a one-dimensional,  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric, automerization pathway parameterized by dimensionless variable  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . In analogy to the PECs shown in Figure 1, we carried out our CIPSI-based  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  and the underlying  $\text{CC}(P)$  calculations for the lowest  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  ${}^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states of cyclobutadiene and determined the corresponding  $E_{\text{var}}$ ,  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$ , and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  CIPSI energies for  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, \text{ and } 1$ , reflecting the resulting PEC segments about  $\lambda = 1$  to obtain the potentials that connect the rectangular reactant and product minima via the square TS. As in the case of the full CCSDT, perturbatively corrected and extrapolated CIPSI, and DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h) $\{N_u\}$  calculations reported in Figure 1, all of our CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P)$  and  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  computations were performed using the cc-pVDZ basis set and the four core molecular orbitals correlating with the 1s shells of the carbon atoms were frozen in the post-RHF/ROHF steps. Consistent with the overall symmetry of the automerization pathway examined in this work, the  $D_{2h}$  point group was adopted throughout. In particular, the  $P$  and  $Q$  spaces used in our  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  calculations for the lowest-energy singlet PEC consisted of the  $S_z = 0$  determinants of the  $A_g(D_{2h})$  symmetry. In the case of the lowest-energy triplet potential, they consisted of the  $S_z = 1$   $B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  determinants.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As explained in the Introduction, the primary objective of this study is to examine efficiency of the

CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  methodology in converging the full CCSDT data for the lowest singlet and triplet potentials of cyclobutadiene along its automerization coordinate and the gap between them. We are especially interested in investigating how effective the CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  approach is in balancing the substantial nondynamical many-electron correlation effects characterizing the lowest  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  state in the neighborhood of the automerization barrier region, where  $T_3$  clusters become large, nonperturbative, and strongly coupled to their lower-rank  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  counterparts, with the predominantly dynamical correlations characterizing the lowest  ${}^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  state. As pointed out in the Introduction, using comparisons with the DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h) $\{N_u\}$  and perturbatively corrected and extrapolated CIPSI results, the CCSDT approach, despite its intrinsically single-reference character, captures essentially all relevant many-electron correlation effects needed to accurately describe the lowest singlet and triplet potentials of cyclobutadiene and the separation between them. The question is if the CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  computations using compact wave functions  $|\Psi^{(\text{CIPSI})}\rangle$ , resulting from the relatively inexpensive CIPSI diagonalization sequences characterized by the  $N_{\text{det}(\text{out})}$  values that are much smaller than the numbers of all  $T_3$  amplitudes, and tiny fractions of the triply excited determinants in the underlying  $P$  spaces are capable of accomplishing the same. We also examine how effective the noniterative  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections are in accelerating convergence of the  $\text{CC}(P)$  energetics toward their CCSDT parents and how the rate of convergence of the CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  calculations toward CCSDT with  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})}$  compares to the analogous convergence of the perturbatively corrected CIPSI energies toward their extrapolated  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  values. The results of our CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P)$  and  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  calculations for the lowest  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  ${}^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  potentials and  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  gaps of cyclobutadiene, along with the associated  $E_{\text{var}}$ ,  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$ , and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  data, can be found in Tables 1–3. The  $\text{CC}(P)$  and  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  potentials and  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  values are also shown in Figure 2.

We begin by commenting on the calculations using  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})} = 1$ , which help us appreciate the need for including the leading triply excited determinants in the  $P$  spaces employed in the  $\text{CC}(P)$  and  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  computations, especially when  $T_3$  effects and the coupling between  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  clusters and their higher-rank  $T_3$  counterpart become significant. As explained in Section II, when  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})} = 1$ , the CIPSI-driven  $\text{CC}(P)$  and  $\text{CC}(P;Q)$  approaches become equivalent to CCSD and CR-CC(2,3), respectively, *i.e.*, one solves the CCSD equations for  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  clusters, as if they were decoupled from their higher-rank  $T_3$  counterpart, and corrects the resulting CCSD energies for the effects of connected triples using the CR-CC(2,3) method. Upon examining the  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})} = 1$   $\text{CC}(P)$  values in Table 1, we observe that the  $T_3$  correlation effects characterizing the lowest-energy  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential, estimated by forming differences between the CCSDT and CCSD energies, are not

only large, but also dramatically changing along the automerization coordinate, from  $-26.827$  millihartree for the  $\lambda = 0$  R species to  $-47.979$  millihartree when the square TS structure corresponding to  $\lambda = 1$  is considered. As indicated by the  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 1$  CC( $P$ ;Q) results shown in Table 1, the incorporation of  $T_3$  correlations using the noniterative CR-CC(2,3) corrections to the CCSD energies helps, reducing the 26.827, 27.964, 29.667, 32.473, 37.662, and 47.979 millihartree errors relative to CCSDT obtained at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8,$  and 1 with CCSD to 0.848, 1.253, 2.021, 3.582, 7.008, and 14.636 millihartree, respectively, but substantial discrepancies between the CR-CC(2,3) and CCSDT data, especially in the neighborhood of the barrier region, where they are as large as 7–15 millihartree when  $\lambda \in [0.8, 1]$ , remain. As a result, the quality of the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential obtained in the CR-CC(2,3) calculations, which is characterized by a large, 13.788 millihartree, nonparallelity error (NPE) relative to its CCSDT parent and which is shown in Figure 2 (b), is poor. Failure of CR-CC(2,3) and, as demonstrated, for example, in Refs. 107 and 161, of other noniterative triples corrections to CCSD, including CCSD(T)<sup>107,161</sup> and CCSD(2)<sub>T</sub>,<sup>107</sup> to accurately describe the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  state of cyclobutadiene in the automerization barrier region is, in significant part, a consequence of the inability of all such methods to capture the coupling of the lower-rank  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  clusters with  $T_3$ , which in the vicinity of the TS geometry, where  $T_3$  effects are large and nonperturbative, is big enough to substantially alter  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  amplitudes compared to their CCSD values. This means that to improve the quality of the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential obtained with CR-CC(2,3), one should relax  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  clusters, adjusting them to the presence of  $T_3$  correlations, prior to determining noniterative triples corrections. The CIPSI-driven CC( $P$ ;Q) methodology allows us to do it in a computationally efficient manner, avoiding expensive CCSDT iterations, by incorporating the leading triply excited determinants identified with the help of the CIPSI runs using sufficiently large  $N_{\text{det(in)}} > 1$  values into the underlying  $P$  spaces and correcting the resulting CC( $P$ ) energies for the remaining  $T_3$  effects using the  $\delta(P$ ;Q) corrections.

The situation with the lowest-energy  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  potential is different. In this case, as shown in Table 2, the  $T_3$  correlation effects, estimated, after subtracting the CCSD energies from their CCSDT counterparts, at about  $(-25) - (-24)$  millihartree, barely vary with the automerization coordinate  $\lambda$  and are accurately described by the CR-CC(2,3) approach, which reproduces the parent CCSDT energetics to within 60 microhartree across the entire  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  PEC. Because of this very different behavior of CR-CC(2,3) compared to the lowest-energy singlet potential, which can be seen by comparing the  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 1$  CC( $P$ ;Q) PECs in the (b) and (d) panels of Figure 2, one ends up with a highly unbalanced description of the lowest singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene by the CR-CC(2,3) method, especially in vicinity of the barrier on the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential. This is re-

flected in the errors characterizing the singlet–triplet gap values obtained with CR-CC(2,3), relative to CCSDT, which grow from 0.553 kcal/mol at  $\lambda = 0$  to 9.222 kcal/mol when the  $\lambda = 1$  square TS structure is considered [see the  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 1$  CC( $P$ ;Q) values of  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  in Table 3; *cf.*, also, Figure 2 (f)]. Once again, the main problem resides in the neglect of the coupling between  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  clusters and their higher-rank  $T_3$  counterpart in the CR-CC(2,3) approach, which results in a poor description of the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential in the vicinity of the TS geometry that propagates into the similarly poor  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  gap values. To bring the results closer to those obtained with CCSDT, the input variable  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  that controls the CIPSI runs preceding the CC( $P$ ) and CC( $P$ ;Q) steps must be increased. The results of the CIPSI-driven CC( $P$ ) and CC( $P$ ;Q) computations for the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  potentials of cyclobutadiene and the gap between them using representative  $N_{\text{det(in)}} > 1$  values are discussed next.

As shown in Table 1 and Figure 2 (b), the CC( $P$ ;Q) computations for the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  state, using CIPSI Hamiltonian diagonalizations to identify the leading triply excited determinants for inclusion in the underlying  $P$  spaces, display fast convergence toward CCSDT with  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ , independent of the value of  $\lambda$ . With as little as 101, 361–196, 965  $S_z = 0$  determinants of the  $A_g(D_{2h})$  symmetry in the terminal  $|\Psi^{\text{CIPSI}}\rangle$  wave functions generated by the inexpensive CIPSI runs using  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 100,000$ , which capture tiny fractions, on the order of 0.1–0.2%, of the 14, 483, 876  $A_g(D_{2h})$ -symmetric  $S_z = 0$  triples, the CC( $P$ ;Q) method reduces the 0.848, 1.253, 2.021, 3.582, 7.008, and 14.636 millihartree errors relative to CCSDT obtained at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8,$  and 1 with CR-CC(2,3) to 0.431, 0.552, 0.776, 1.235, 0.628, and 3.539 millihartree, respectively. With the relatively small additional effort corresponding to  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 250,000$ , which results in 394, 080–449, 753  $S_z = 0$  determinants of the  $A_g(D_{2h})$  symmetry in the final CIPSI diagonalization spaces and only 0.5–0.6% of all triples in the underlying  $P$  spaces, the differences between the CC( $P$ ;Q) and CCSDT energies of the lowest singlet state of cyclobutadiene at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8,$  and 1 decrease to 0.278, 0.272, 0.271, 0.300, 0.336, and 0.458 millihartree, respectively. Clearly, these are massive error reductions compared to the CR-CC(2,3) computations, especially in the barrier region, which highlight the effectiveness of our CIPSI-driven CC( $P$ ;Q) strategy and the importance of relaxing  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  amplitudes in the presence of the leading  $T_3$  contributions compared to their CCSD values prior to determining the noniterative corrections for the remaining  $T_3$  effects. Similar comments apply to the improvements in the troublesome 13.788 millihartree NPE relative to CCSDT characterizing the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential obtained in the CR-CC(2,3) calculations offered by the CIPSI-driven CC( $P$ ;Q) runs. When the CC( $P$ ;Q) approach using  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 100,000$  is employed, the NPE relative to CCSDT characterizing the resulting  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential becomes 3.108 millihartree, which is a reduc-



tion of the CR-CC(2,3) NPE value by a factor of 4.4. The  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 250,000$  CC( $P;Q$ ) computations, which extract the lists of triples from the relatively inexpensive Hamiltonian diagonalizations in spaces that are 32–37 times smaller than the number of  $T_3$  amplitudes used by CCSDT, reduce the 13.788 millihartree NPE characterizing the lowest-energy  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential obtained with CR-CC(2,3), relative to its CCSDT counterpart, to an impressively small value of 0.187 millihartree. This is a 74-fold reduction in NPE compared to CR-CC(2,3).

It is clear from Table 1 and Figure 2 (b) that the convergence of the lowest-energy  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potentials resulting from the CIPSI-driven CC( $P;Q$ ) calculations toward their CCSDT parent, including the challenging barrier region, with the CIPSI wave function termination parameter  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ , with the number of determinants in the final Hamiltonian diagonalization space used to determine  $|\Psi^{\text{CIPSI}}\rangle [N_{\text{det(out)}}]$ , and with the fraction of triply excited determinants in the  $P$  space captured by CIPSI is very fast, but one cannot say the same about the uncorrected CC( $P$ ) energies. As shown in Table 1 and Figure 2 (a), and in line with the formal analysis in Section II, the CC( $P$ ) energies improve the CCSD results and converge toward CCSDT, but they do it at a much slower rate than their  $\delta(P;Q)$ -corrected CC( $P;Q$ ) counterparts. For instance, the CIPSI-driven CC( $P$ ) computations for the lowest singlet state of cyclobutadiene using  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 100,000$  reduce the 26.827, 27.964, 29.667, 32.473, 37.662, and 47.979 millihartree errors relative to CCSDT obtained at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8,$  and  $1$  with CCSD and the associated NPE value of 21.152 millihartree to 22.183, 23.029, 23.947, 30.198, 21.842, 32.125, and 10.283 millihartree, respectively. This should be compared to the much smaller error and NPE values characterizing the corresponding CC( $P;Q$ ) calculations, which are 0.431–3.539 and 3.108 millihartree, respectively. The analogous CC( $P$ ) calculations using  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 250,000$ , where the errors characterizing the  $\delta(P;Q)$ -corrected CC( $P;Q$ ) energies in the entire  $\lambda = 0$ – $1$  region and the overall NPE relative to CCSDT are already at the level of 0.2–0.5 millihartree, produce the 17.137–25.279 millihartree errors and the NPE of 8.142 millihartree. Even with the largest  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  value considered in this study, of 10,000,000, the 7.252–10.238 millihartree differences between the CC( $P$ ) and CCSDT energies of the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  state of cyclobutadiene in the  $\lambda = 0$ – $1$  region and the NPE of 2.986 millihartree that characterizes the resulting CC( $P$ ) potential relative to its CCSDT parent remain. All of this implies that while relaxing  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  amplitudes in the presence of the leading triples is important, correcting the CC( $P$ ) energies for the remaining  $T_3$  effects, which the CC( $P$ ) computations using the  $P$  spaces generated with the help of CIPSI do not describe, is critical to reach submillihartree accuracy levels relative to CCSDT with small fractions of triples in these spaces. We observed a similar behavior in the semi-stochastic, CIQMC- and CCMC-driven,<sup>32,120–122</sup> and adaptive<sup>124</sup> CC( $P$ ) and CC( $P;Q$ ) calculations, although based on the numeri-

cal evidence that we have generated to date, the CIPSI-driven CC( $P;Q$ ) methodology investigated in this study and its recently formulated adaptive analog seem to be more effective in converging the target CC (in most of our work to date, CCSDT) energetics than their semi-stochastic counterparts. This suggests that the sequences of Hamiltonian diagonalizations utilized in the CIPSI-driven CC( $P$ ) and CC( $P;Q$ ) computations and the moment expansions defining the  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections that are used to construct excitation spaces in the adaptive CC( $P$ ) and CC( $P;Q$ ) runs are more efficient in identifying the leading higher-than-doubly excited determinants for inclusion of the underlying  $P$  spaces than the CIQMC/CCMC wave function propagations, although this topic needs to be explored further and we will return to it in the future.

As shown in Table 2 and Figure 2 (c) and (d), many of the above observations apply to the CIPSI-driven CC( $P$ ) and CC( $P;Q$ ) calculations for the lowest-energy  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  potential, but, given the fact that the CR-CC(2,3) approach is already very accurate in this case, producing errors relative to CCSDT that in absolute value do not exceed 60 microhartree, the CC( $P;Q$ ) computations using  $N_{\text{det(in)}} > 1$  offer no obvious advantages over CR-CC(2,3). Nonetheless, it is reassuring that, in analogy to the  $A_g(D_{2h})$ -symmetric singlet ground state, the differences between the energies of the  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  state obtained in the CC( $P$ ) computations using CIPSI Hamiltonian diagonalizations to create lists of the leading triply excited determinants for inclusion in the underlying  $P$  spaces and their CCSDT counterparts decrease as  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  increases, independent of  $\lambda$ . It is also encouraging that the  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections are as effective in bringing the CC( $P$ ) energies to a virtually perfect agreement with the parent CCSDT data as in the case of the CIPSI-driven CC( $P;Q$ ) calculations for the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential using  $N_{\text{det(in)}} \geq 250,000$ . By inspecting the CC( $P;Q$ ) column in Table 2, one may get the impression that the incorporation of the triply excited determinants identified by the CIPSI runs using increasingly large  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  values in the preceding CC( $P$ ) steps worsens the CR-CC(2,3) results for the lowest  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  state, which correspond to  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 1$ , but reading Table 2 in this way would be misleading. Indeed, in single-reference situations, such as that created by the lowest  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  state of cyclobutadiene, where many-electron correlation effects are essentially only dynamical, the triples correction of CR-CC(2,3) [similarly to CCSD(T)] often overshoots the parent CCSDT energies (slightly). Once one starts adding triply excited determinants to the  $P$  space, the CC( $P;Q$ ) energies initially go up, becoming upper bounds to their CCSDT counterparts, but when the fraction of triples in the  $P$  space is large enough, the differences between the CC( $P;Q$ ) and CCSDT energies decrease, steadily approaching 0. We see some of this behavior in Table 2, but we have to keep in mind that the  $P$  spaces used in our CIPSI-driven CC( $P;Q$ ) calculations use small fractions of triples, so that the residual,  $\sim 0.1$

millihartree, errors relative to CCSDT remain. What is most important here is that the  $CC(P;Q)$  computations for the lowest triplet potential of cyclobutadiene using  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})} > 1$  reported in Table 2 and Figure 2 (d) do not substantially alter the already excellent CR-CC(2,3) energetics. This allows us to conclude that the coupling of the lower-rank  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  clusters with their higher-rank  $T_3$  counterpart is negligible in this case and the relaxation of the CCSD values of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  amplitudes by including some triples in the iterative  $CC(P)$  steps is not necessary for obtaining high-accuracy  $CC(P;Q)$  results.

Having demonstrated the excellent performance of the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  approach in accurately approximating the lowest-energy  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  ${}^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  potentials of cyclobutadiene along its automerization coordinate obtained with CCSDT, in the final part of our discussion, we turn to the  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  singlet–triplet gaps and their dependence on  $\lambda$  and  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})}$  examined in Table 3 and Figure 2 (e) [the uncorrected  $CC(P)$  energetics] and (f) [the  $CC(P;Q)$  results]. As pointed out above, to obtain accurate  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  values for cyclobutadiene in the vicinity of the barrier region, one has to balance significant nondynamical correlations associated with the multiconfigurational singlet state, which manifest themselves in massive  $T_3$  clusters that are strongly coupled to the one- and two-body components of  $T$ , with predominantly dynamical correlations characterizing the lowest triplet state that result in the generally smaller  $T_3$  contributions having minimal effect on  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  amplitudes. The singlet–triplet gap values reported in Table 3 and Figure 2 (e) and (f) clearly show that neither the CCSD approach nor the CR-CC(2,3) triples correction to CCSD, which are equivalent to the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations using  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})} = 1$ , can do this. Both of these methods struggle with achieving a balanced description of the  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  ${}^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states of cyclobutadiene as  $\lambda$  approaches 1, producing errors relative to CCSDT that are as large as 5.261 and 2.282 kcal/mol, respectively, at  $\lambda = 0.6$ , where the CCSDT value of  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  is  $-10.295$  kcal/mol, 8.589 and 4.434 kcal/mol, respectively, at  $\lambda = 0.8$ , where  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  obtained with CCSDT is  $-5.804$  kcal/mol, and 15.120 and 9.222 kcal/mol at  $\lambda = 1$ , where the CCSDT result for  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  is  $-4.783$  kcal/mol. These large error values in the singlet–triplet gaps resulting from the CCSD and CR-CC(2,3) computations in the barrier region are a consequence of the dramatic increase in the magnitude of  $T_3$  effects characterizing the  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  state and a rapidly deteriorating description of this state by both CCSD and CR-CC(2,3) as  $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ , seen in Table 1 and Figure 2 (a) and (b), as opposed to the nearly constant  $T_3$  contributions and a virtually perfect agreement between the CR-CC(2,3) and CCSDT  ${}^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  potentials in the entire  $\lambda = 0-1$  region shown in Table 2 and Figure 2 (d) [while quantitatively inaccurate, the shape of the  ${}^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  potential obtained with CCSD, shown in Figure 2 (c), is qualitatively correct too]. In analogy to the previously discussed calculations for the lowest-energy  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential, in

order to bring the above errors down, the input parameter  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})}$ , which controls the CIPSI diagonalization sequences preceding the  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  computations, must be increased, so that the  $P$  spaces used in these computations are augmented with the leading triply excited determinants, the CCSD values of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  amplitudes, used in CR-CC(2,3), are properly relaxed, and the quality of the  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections that capture the remaining  $T_3$  effects improves.

This is precisely what we observe in the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations of the singlet–triplet gaps, especially the latter ones, reported in Table 3 and Figure 2 (e) and (f). Indeed, the  $CC(P;Q)$  approach using  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})} = 100,000$ , which relies on small CIPSI diagonalization spaces [small  $N_{\text{det}(\text{out})}$  values], whose dimensionalities are about 1% of the 14, 483, 876  $A_g(D_{2h})$ -symmetric  $S_z = 0$  and 14, 339, 992  $B_{1g}(D_{2h})$ -symmetric  $S_z = 1$  triply excited amplitudes involved in the parent full CCSDT computations, and which employs even smaller  $P$  spaces having only 0.1–0.6% of all triples, reduces the 0.553, 0.813, 1.300, 2.282, 4.434, and 9.222 kcal/mol differences between the CR-CC(2,3) and CCSDT  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  values at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$ , and 1 to 0.253, 0.301, 0.485, 0.784, 0.398, and 2.227 kcal/mol, respectively. When  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})}$  is increased to 250,000, where the numbers of determinants included in the final CIPSI diagonalizations preceding the  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  steps are still only  $\sim 2-3\%$  of all  $T_3$  amplitudes used in the CCSDT calculations for the  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  ${}^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states and where the resulting  $P$  spaces contain only 0.5–0.9% of all triples, the errors in the  $CC(P;Q)$   $\Delta E_{S-T}$  gaps relative to their CCSDT counterparts at the above values of  $\lambda$  decrease even more, to 0.112, 0.108, 0.128, 0.128, 0.152, and 0.263 kcal/mol, respectively, bringing the  $CC(P;Q)$  and CCSDT results to a virtually perfect agreement, while reducing a computational effort compared to the CCSDT runs by orders of magnitude. As in the previously discussed results for the lowest singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene, especially for the challenging,  $A_g(D_{2h})$ -symmetric, singlet ground state, the  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections play a major role in the observed error reductions, substantially improving the  $CC(P)$   $\Delta E_{S-T}$  values, but, unlike in the  $CC(P)$  calculations of the  ${}^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  ${}^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  potentials, the singlet–triplet gaps obtained with the uncorrected  $CC(P)$  approach using relatively small CIPSI diagonalization spaces and tiny fractions of all triples in the associated  $P$  spaces can be quite accurate in their own right, reproducing the CCSDT values of  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  across the entire  $\lambda = 0-1$  region to within  $\sim 1-2$  kcal/mol when  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})} \gtrsim 250,000$ . Clearly, this is a lot better than the 5.261, 8.589, and 15.120 kcal/mol errors relative to CCSDT obtained at  $\lambda = 0.6, 0.8$ , and 1, respectively, with CCSD, demonstrating that the relaxation of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  amplitudes in the presence of the leading  $T_3$  contributions in the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P)$  computations using sufficiently large  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})}$  values results in a more balanced description of the many-electron correla-

tion effects in the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states, especially when  $\lambda$  approaches 1, although, by inspecting Tables 1–3, we can also see that much of the improvement in the CCSD  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  data offered by the  $CC(P)$  approach originates from error cancellations between the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$   $CC(P)$  energies. In the case of the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  computations, we do not have to count on error cancellations, since both the total electronic energies of the lowest singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene at various values of  $\lambda$  and the gaps between them rapidly converge toward their CCSDT parents with  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ . The  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections, in addition to being highly effective in improving the  $CC(P)$  energies of the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states and the associated  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  values, are also very helpful in curing the nonsystematic error patterns in the singlet–triplet gaps observed in the  $CC(P)$  calculations in Table 3 as  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  increases, where the differences between the  $CC(P)$  and CCSDT values of  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  go up and down or oscillate. This does not happen in the  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations, where the resulting singlet–triplet gaps approach their CCSDT parents systematically and very fast as  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  is made larger, independent of  $\lambda$ . This is yet another demonstration of the ability of the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  approach to provide a highly accurate and well-balanced description of the many-electron correlation effects characterizing the lowest-energy singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene along its automerization coordinate, which the conventional CC methods, such as CCSD, CR-CC(2,3), and other noniterative triples corrections to CCSD, cannot provide as one approaches the barrier region.

We conclude this section by noticing that the results reported in Tables 1–3 also show that the convergence of the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  energies of the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states of cyclobutadiene and the gap between them toward their respective CCSDT parents with  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  or  $N_{\text{det(out)}}$  is faster than that characterizing the associated variational and perturbatively corrected CIPSI energetics toward the extrapolated  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  values. This observation is consistent with our initial study announcing the CIPSI-based  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  methodologies<sup>123</sup> and the fact that the  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations are capable of accurately approximating the parent CCSDT energetics out of the unconverged CIPSI runs using relatively small Hamiltonian diagonalization spaces, even when  $T_3$  correlations are large and nonperturbative and electronic quasi-degeneracies become substantial, as is the case in the barrier region of the ground-state  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  potential. While this may not be a general remark, we also observe that perturbatively corrected  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  energies of the lowest singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene and the gap between them converge toward their extrapolated limits at a rate similar to that characterizing our uncorrected  $CC(P)$  calculations toward CCSDT. The  $\delta(P;Q)$ -corrected  $CC(P;Q)$  energetics converge to CCSDT much faster. This might be yet another way of looking at the effectiveness of the  $\delta(P;Q)$  moment correc-

tions in improving the underlying  $CC(P)$  results. That being said, we should keep in mind that the algorithms used to obtain the CCSDT and the perturbatively corrected and extrapolated CIPSI energies are fundamentally different procedures. Furthermore, and more importantly given the objectives of this study, where we are interested in exploring the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  methodologies, not the CIPSI approach itself, the CIPSI wave function growth in the calculations reported in Tables 1–3 was terminated long before our CIPSI runs were well converged, as we only needed information about the leading triply excited determinants and were not interested in saturating the triply excited manifolds of the relevant many-electron Hilbert spaces. Last but not least, to highlight the robustness of our  $CC(P;Q)$  framework, all of the calculations reported in this work relied on the RHF and ROHF orbitals, *i.e.*, we made no attempt to further optimize orbitals to make them consistent with correlated computations, which would improve CIPSI’s performance and which might also help our  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  results using smaller  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  values, especially in the vicinity of the square TS geometry. We intend to look into potential benefits that might be offered by orbital optimizations in the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations in a future study.

#### IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

An accurate determination of singlet–triplet gaps in biradicals represents a formidable test for *ab initio* electronic structure methodologies, as it requires balancing strong nondynamical many-electron correlation effects, needed for a reliable description of the low-spin singlet states that have a manifestly multiconfigurational nature, with the generally weaker, largely dynamical, correlations characterizing the high-spin triplet states. Although high-level CC methods with a full treatment of higher-than-two-body clusters, such as CCSDT or CCSDTQ, are often powerful enough to capture the dynamical and nondynamical correlation effects relevant in such studies, their applications are hindered by the demanding computational steps and memory requirements, which are prohibitively expensive when larger many-electron systems are examined. One of the promising ideas aimed at addressing this situation within the single-reference CC framework is the  $CC(P;Q)$  formalism, in which one solves the CC amplitude equations in a suitably defined subspace of the many-electron Hilbert space, referred to as the  $P$  space, and improves the resulting  $CC(P)$  energies using the *a posteriori* moment corrections, designated as  $\delta(P;Q)$ , calculated with the help of the complementary  $Q$  space.<sup>22,32,103,107,113,114,119–124</sup> Among the most attractive features of the  $CC(P;Q)$  methodology is its flexibility, so that in addition to conventional choices of the  $P$  and  $Q$  spaces using truncations based on excitation ranks, which in the past resulted in the development of the biorthogonal CR-CC methods, such as the

CR-CC(2,3) triples correction to CCSD,<sup>17,84–86</sup> one can consider various unconventional ways of setting up these spaces that can improve the CR-CC(2,3), CCSD(T), and similar energetics for systems with substantial electronic quasi-degeneracies by relaxing the  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  components of the cluster operator  $T$  in the presence of their higher-rank  $T_n$  counterparts with  $n > 2$ , such as  $T_3$ , which become large, nonperturbative, and strongly coupled to  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  in such situations. This can be done without major increases in the computational effort by incorporating the leading higher-than-doubly excited determinants in the  $P$  spaces and using corrections  $\delta(P;Q)$  to capture the remaining correlations of interest.

In this work, we have examined the hybrid variant of the  $CC(P;Q)$  methodology introduced in Ref. 123, in which the leading higher-than-doubly excited determinants in the  $P$  space are identified, in an automated fashion, using the sequences of Hamiltonian diagonalizations generated with the CIPSI algorithm.<sup>74–76</sup> In order to thoroughly test the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  formalism and obtain useful insights into its performance, we have focused on recovering the lowest-energy singlet and triplet potentials of cyclobutadiene along its automerization coordinate and the gap between them resulting from the full CCSDT computations which, based on comparisons with the perturbatively corrected and extrapolated CIPSI and DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h)-level data, obtained in this study as well, provide reliable information. To do so, we have constructed an approximate,  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric, one-dimensional automerization pathway connecting the rectangular reactant and product species via the square TS structure on the ground-state singlet potential using the information taken from Ref. 38 and performed a large number of  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations for the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states of cyclobutadiene at the selected nuclear geometries along the resulting path, where for each state and for each geometry, we have explored a wide range of values of the CIPSI wave function termination parameter  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  that controls the Hamiltonian diagonalization sequences preceding the  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  runs. We have demonstrated that the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations are capable of accurately approximating the high-level CCSDT energetics of the lowest singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene across the entire automerization pathway, to within small fractions of a millihartree for total energies and 0.1–0.2 kcal/mol for the singlet–triplet gaps, using tiny fractions of the triply excited determinants, on the order of 1% of all triples, in the underlying  $P$  spaces extracted from the relatively inexpensive CIPSI diagonalizations in spaces that are orders of magnitude smaller than the numbers of cluster amplitudes used by CCSDT. This extraordinary performance of the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  approach applies to both the less demanding reactant/product region, where the lowest singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene are largely single-configurational and the absolute values of the singlet–triplet gap exceed 30 kcal/mol, and the vicinity of the TS structure on the ground-state singlet poten-

tial, where the high-spin triplet state retains its weakly correlated, single-determinantal, nature, but the singlet state, separated from its triplet counterpart by only  $\sim 5$  kcal/mol, becomes multiconfigurational, strongly correlated, and characterized by large and highly nonperturbative  $T_3$  correlations, which are strongly coupled to the one- and two-body components of  $T$  and which result in failure of CR-CC(2,3) and other noniterative triples corrections to CCSD. Interestingly, the uncorrected  $CC(P)$  computations using similarly compact excitation spaces can be accurate as well, reproducing the CCSDT values of the singlet–triplet gap across the entire automerization pathway to within  $\sim 1$ – $2$  kcal/mol, improving the poor CCSD and CR-CC(2,3) results in the vicinity of the TS geometry, and reaffirming the usefulness of incorporating the leading triply excited determinants into the underlying  $P$  spaces, but the total energies of the lowest  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states of cyclobutadiene obtained with the  $CC(P)$  approach converge to their CCSDT parents with  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  very slowly, so one has to rely on error cancellations to obtain accurate singlet–triplet gaps with  $CC(P)$ . The  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections are very helpful in this regard. They reduce errors in the total  $CC(P)$  energies of the  $^1A_g(D_{2h})$  and  $^3B_{1g}(D_{2h})$  states of cyclobutadiene by orders of magnitude while substantially improving the resulting singlet–triplet gaps, making their convergence toward CCSDT smoother and more systematic. Given the relatively low costs of determining the  $\delta(P;Q)$  corrections compared to the preceding CIPSI and  $CC(P)$  steps and the enormous benefits resulting from their application in the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations, we recommend using  $CC(P;Q)$ .

The excellent performance of the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  approach in converging the lowest-energy singlet and triplet potentials of cyclobutadiene obtained with CCSDT, observed in this study, along with the promising initial results reported in Ref. 123, motivate us to pursue the hybrid CC methodologies combining the  $CC(P;Q)$  framework with selected CI even further. We will, for example, investigate how much the  $CC(P;Q)$  singlet and triplet potentials reported in this work, especially the ground-state singlet potential in the vicinity of the TS geometry, can benefit from replacing the RHF and ROHF orbitals exploited in the calculations reported in this work by the suitably optimized orbitals consistent with the  $CC(P)$  or CIPSI wave functions. We will also examine how much each of the singlet and triplet potentials of cyclobutadiene obtained with the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  approach using a given value of  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$ , especially its smoothness, can improve by consolidating the  $P$  spaces corresponding to the different geometries along the automerization path or, to be more precise in the context of the  $CC(P;Q)$  calculations aimed at recovering the CCSDT energetics performed in this study, by merging the triple excitation manifolds incorporated in those spaces. Among other topics worth exploring, it will be interesting to examine if anything substantial can be gained by replacing the CIPSI algorithm in

our  $CC(P;Q)$  considerations by other selected CI techniques, such as heat-bath CI,<sup>153–155</sup> adaptive CI,<sup>147,148</sup> or adaptive sampling CI.<sup>149,150</sup> Last but not least, following the strategy adopted in our previous work on the semi-stochastic, CIQMC-driven,  $CC(P;Q)$  approaches,<sup>120–122</sup> we are planning to extend the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  methodology investigated in this study and Ref. 123, to higher CC levels, especially CCSDTQ, and excited electronic states, with an initial focus on converging the EOMCCSDT<sup>162–164</sup> energetics, while seeking additional savings in the computational effort by replacing the unconstrained CIPSI algorithm, which is allowed to explore the entire many-electron Hilbert space, by its truncated analogs consistent with the determinantal spaces needed in the target CC calculations (*e.g.*, the CISDT or CISDTQ analogs of CIPSI when attempting to use the CIPSI-driven  $CC(P;Q)$  framework to converge the CCSDT or CCSDTQ energetics).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by the Chemical Sciences, Geosciences and Biosciences Division, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Office of Science, U.S. Department of Energy (Grant No. DE-FG02-01ER15228 to P.P.).

## NOTES

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

## REFERENCES

- Myers, A. G.; Dragovich, P. S.; Kuo, E. Y. Studies on the Thermal Generation and Reactivity of a Class of  $(\sigma, \pi)$ -1,4-Biradicals. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, *114*, 9369–9386.
- Pedersen, S.; Herek, J. L.; Zewail, A. H. The Validity of the “Diradical” Hypothesis: Direct Femtosecond Studies of the Transition-State Structures. *Science* **1994**, *266*, 1359–1364.
- Berson, J. A. The Chemistry of Trimethylenemethanes, A New Class of Biradical Reactive Intermediates. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1978**, *11*, 446–453.
- Zgierski, M. Z.; Patchkovskii, S.; Lim, E. C. *Ab Initio* Study of a Biradical Radiationless Decay Channel of the Lowest Excited Electronic State of Cytosine and Its Derivatives. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *123*, 081101.
- Zgierski, M. Z.; Patchkovskii, S.; Fujiwara, T.; Lim, E. C. On the Origin of the Ultrafast Internal Conversion of Electronically Excited Pyrimidine Bases. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2005**, *109*, 9384–9387.
- Park, W.; Shen, J.; Lee, S.; Piecuch, P.; Filatov, M.; Choi, C. H. Internal Conversion between Bright ( $1^1B_u^+$ ) and Dark ( $2^1A_g^-$ ) States in *s-trans*-Butadiene and *s-trans*-Hexatriene. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2021**, *12*, 9720–9729.
- Abe, M.; Ye, J.; Mishima, M. The Chemistry of Localized Singlet 1,3-Diradicals (Biradicals): From Putative Intermediates to Persistent Species and Unusual Molecules with a  $\pi$ -Single Bonded Character. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2012**, *41*, 3808–3820.
- Dougherty, D. A. Spin Control in Organic Molecules. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1991**, *24*, 88–94.
- Malrieu, J. P.; Caballol, R.; Caldazo, C. J.; de Graaf, C.; Guih ery, N. Magnetic Interactions in Molecules and Highly Correlated Materials: Physical Content, Analytical Derivation, and Rigorous Extraction of Magnetic Hamiltonians. *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114*, 429–492.
- Cho, D.; Ko, K. C.; Lee, J. Y. Quantum Chemical Approaches for Controlling and Evaluating Intramolecular Magnetic Interactions in Organic Diradicals. *Int. J. Quant. Chem.* **2016**, *116*, 578–597.
- Sun, Z.; Zeng, Z.; Wu, J. Zethrenes, Extended *p*-Quinodimethanes, and Periacenes with a Singlet Biradical Ground State. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2014**, *47*, 2582–2591.
- Minami, T.; Nakano, M. Diradical Character View of Singlet Fission. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2012**, *3*, 145–150.
- Hedley, G. J.; Ruseckas, A.; Samuel, I. D. W. Light Harvesting for Organic Photovoltaics. *Chem. Rev.* **2017**, *117*, 796–837.
- Niklas, J.; Poluektov, O. G. Charge Transfer Processes in OPV Materials as Revealed by EPR Spectroscopy. *Adv. Energy Mater.* **2017**, *7*, 1602226.
- Smith, M. B.; Michl, J. Singlet Fission. *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 6891–6936.
- Slipchenko, L. V.; Krylov, A. I. Singlet-Triplet Gaps in Diradicals by the Spin-Flip Approach: A Benchmark Study. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *117*, 4694–4708.
- Wloch, M.; Gour, J. R.; Piecuch, P. Extension of the Renormalized Coupled-Cluster Methods Exploiting Left Eigenstates of the Similarity-Transformed Hamiltonian to Open-Shell Systems: A Benchmark Study. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2007**, *111*, 11359–11382.
- Li, X.; Paldus, J. Electronic Structure of Organic Diradicals: Evaluation of the Performance of Coupled-Cluster Methods. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *129*, 174101.
- Demel, O.; Shamasundar, K. R.; Kong, L.; Nooijen, M. Application of Double Ionization State-Specific Equation of Motion Coupled Cluster Method to Organic Diradicals. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2008**, *112*, 11895–11902.
- Saito, T.; Nishihara, S.; Yamanaka, S.; Kitagawa, Y.; Kawakami, T.; Yamada, S.; Isobe, H.; Okumura, M.; Yamaguchi, K. Symmetry and Broken Symmetry in Molecular Orbital Description of Unstable Molecules IV: Comparison Between Single- and Multi-Reference Computational Results for Antiaromatic Molecules. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2011**, *130*, 749–763.
- Ess, D. H.; Johnson, E. R.; Hu, X.; Yang, W. Singlet-Triplet Energy Gaps for Diradicals from Fractional-Spin Density-Functional Theory. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2011**, *115*, 76–83.
- Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Merging Active-Space and Renormalized Coupled-Cluster Methods via the  $CC(P;Q)$  Formalism, with Benchmark Calculations for Singlet-Triplet Gaps in Biradical Systems. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2012**, *8*, 4968–4988.
- Abe, M. Diradicals. *Chem. Rev.* **2013**, *113*, 7011–7088.
- Garza, A. J.; Jim enez-Hoyos, C. A.; Scuseria, G. E. Electronic Correlation Without Double Counting via a Combination of Spin Projected Hartree-Fock and Density Functional Theories. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *140*, 244102.
- Ibeji, C. U.; Ghosh, D. Singlet-Triplet Gaps in Polyacenes: A Delicate Balance Between Dynamic and Static Correlations Investigated by Spin-Flip Methods. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2015**, *17*, 9849–9856.
- Ajala, A. O.; Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Economical Doubly Electron-Attached Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Methods with an Active-Space Treatment of Three-Particle-One-Hole and Four-Particle-Two-Hole Excitations. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2017**, *121*, 3469–3485.
- Stoneburner, S. J.; Shen, J.; Ajala, A. O.; Piecuch, P.; Truhlar, D. G.; Gagliardi, L. Systematic Design of Active Spaces for Multi-Reference Calculations of Singlet-Triplet Gaps of Organic Diradicals, with Benchmarks Against Doubly Electron-Attached Coupled-Cluster Data. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *147*, 164120.

- <sup>28</sup>Zimmerman, P. M. Singlet–Triplet Gaps Through Incremental Full Configuration Interaction. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2017**, *121*, 4712–4720.
- <sup>29</sup>Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Double Electron-Attachment Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Methods with up to 4-Particle–2-Hole Excitations: Improved Implementation and Application to Singlet–Triplet Gaps in *ortho*-, *meta*-, and *para*-Benzynes Isomers. *Mol. Phys.* **2021**, *119*, e1966534.
- <sup>30</sup>Gulania, S.; Kjønstad, E. F.; Stanton, J. F.; Koch, H.; Krylov, A. I. Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Method with Double Electron-Attaching Operators: Theory, Implementation, and Benchmarks. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2021**, *154*, 114115.
- <sup>31</sup>Boyn, J.-N.; Mazziotti, D. A. Accurate Singlet–Triplet Gaps in Biradicals via the Spin Averaged Anti-Hermitian Contracted Schrödinger Equation. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2021**, *154*, 134103.
- <sup>32</sup>Chakraborty, A.; Yuwono, S. H.; Deustua, J. E.; Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Benchmarking the Semi-Stochastic CC(*P*; *Q*) Approach for Singlet–Triplet Gaps in Biradicals. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2022**, *157*, 134101.
- <sup>33</sup>Craig, D. P. Electronic Levels in Simple Conjugated Systems, I. Configuration Interaction in Cyclobutadiene. *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **1950**, *202*, 498–506.
- <sup>34</sup>Buenker, R. J.; Peyerimhoff, S. D. *Ab Initio* Study on the Stability and Geometry of Cyclobutadiene. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1968**, *48*, 354–373.
- <sup>35</sup>Nakamura, K.; Osamura, Y.; Iwata, S. Second-Order Jahn-Teller Effect of Cyclobutadiene in Low-Lying States. An MC-SCF Study. *Chem. Phys.* **1989**, *136*, 67–77.
- <sup>36</sup>Balková, A.; Bartlett, R. J. A Multireference Coupled-Cluster Study of the Ground State and Lowest Excited States of Cyclobutadiene. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, *101*, 8972–8987.
- <sup>37</sup>Levchenko, S. V.; Krylov, A. I. Equation-of-Motion Spin-Flip Coupled-Cluster Model with Single and Double Substitutions: Theory and Application to Cyclobutadiene. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *120*, 175–185.
- <sup>38</sup>Eckert-Maksić, M.; Vazdar, M.; Barbatti, M.; Lischka, H.; Maksić, Z. B. Automerization Reaction of Cyclobutadiene and Its Barrier Height: An *Ab Initio* Benchmark Multireference Average-Quadratic Coupled Cluster Study. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2006**, *125*, 064310.
- <sup>39</sup>Monino, E.; Boggio-Pasqua, M.; Scemama, A.; Jacquemin, D.; Loos, P.-F. Reference Energies for Cyclobutadiene: Automerization and Excited States. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2022**, *126*, 4664–4679.
- <sup>40</sup>Borden, W. T. Can a Square or Effectively Square Singlet be the Ground State of Cyclobutadiene? *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1975**, *97*, 5968–5970.
- <sup>41</sup>Kollmar, H.; Staemmler, V. A Theoretical Study of the Structure of Cyclobutadiene. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1977**, *99*, 3583–3587.
- <sup>42</sup>Borden, W. T.; Davidson, E. R.; Hart, P. The Potential Surfaces for the Lowest Singlet and Triplet States of Cyclobutadiene. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1978**, *100*, 388–392.
- <sup>43</sup>Roos, B. O. The Complete Active Space Self-Consistent Field Method and Its Applications in Electronic Structure Calculations. *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **1987**, *69*, 399–445.
- <sup>44</sup>Schmidt, M. W.; Gordon, M. S. The Construction and Interpretation of MCSCF Wavefunctions. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **1998**, *49*, 233–266.
- <sup>45</sup>Szalay, P. G.; Müller, T.; Gidofalvi, G.; Lischka, H.; Shepard, R. Multiconfiguration Self-Consistent Field and Multireference Configuration Interaction Methods and Applications. *Chem. Rev.* **2012**, *112*, 108–181.
- <sup>46</sup>Roca-Sanjuán, D.; Aquilante, F.; Lindh, R. Muticonfiguration Second-Order Perturbation Theory Approach to Strong Electron Correlation in Chemistry and Photochemistry. *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2012**, *2*, 585–603.
- <sup>47</sup>Chattopadhyay, S.; Chaudhuri, R. K.; Mahapatra, U. S.; Ghosh, A.; Ray, S. S. State-Specific Multireference Perturbation Theory: Development and Present Status. *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2016**, *6*, 266–291.
- <sup>48</sup>Lyakh, D. I.; Musiał, M.; Lotrich, V. F.; Bartlett, R. J. Multireference Nature of Chemistry: The Coupled-Cluster View. *Chem. Rev.* **2012**, *112*, 182–243.
- <sup>49</sup>Piecuch, P.; Kowalski, K. The State-Universal Multi-Reference Coupled-Cluster Theory: An Overview of Some Recent Advances. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **2002**, *3*, 676–709.
- <sup>50</sup>Evangelista, F. A. Perspective: Multireference Coupled Cluster Theories of Dynamical Electron Correlation. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2018**, *149*, 030901.
- <sup>51</sup>Coester, F. Bound States of a Many-Particle System. *Nucl. Phys.* **1958**, *7*, 421–424.
- <sup>52</sup>Coester, F.; Kümmel, H. Short-Range Correlations in Nuclear Wave Functions. *Nucl. Phys.* **1960**, *17*, 477–485.
- <sup>53</sup>Čížek, J. On the Correlation Problem in Atomic and Molecular Systems. Calculation of Wavefunction Components in Ursell-Type Expansion Using Quantum-Field Theoretical Methods. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1966**, *45*, 4256–4266.
- <sup>54</sup>Čížek, J. On the Use of the Cluster Expansion and the Technique of Diagrams in Calculations of Correlation Effects in Atoms and Molecules. *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **1969**, *14*, 35–89.
- <sup>55</sup>Paldus, J.; Čížek, J.; Shavitt, I. Correlation Problems in Atomic and Molecular Systems. IV. Extended Coupled-Pair Many-Electron Theory and Its Application to the BH<sub>3</sub> Molecule. *Phys. Rev. A* **1972**, *5*, 50–67.
- <sup>56</sup>Paldus, J.; Li, X. A Critical Assessment of Coupled Cluster Method in Quantum Chemistry. *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *110*, 1–175.
- <sup>57</sup>Bartlett, R. J.; Musiał, M. Coupled-Cluster Theory in Quantum Chemistry. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **2007**, *79*, 291–352.
- <sup>58</sup>Hubbard, J. The Description of Collective Motions in Terms of Many-Body Perturbation Theory. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A* **1957**, *240*, 539–560.
- <sup>59</sup>Hugenholtz, N. M. Perturbation Theory of Large Quantum Systems. *Physica* **1957**, *23*, 481–532.
- <sup>60</sup>Purvis, G. D., III; Bartlett, R. J. A Full Coupled-Cluster Singles and Doubles Model: The Inclusion of Disconnected Triples. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1982**, *76*, 1910–1918.
- <sup>61</sup>Cullen, J. M.; Zerner, M. C. The Linked Singles and Doubles Model: An Approximate Theory of Electron Correlation Based on the Coupled-Cluster Ansatz. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1982**, *77*, 4088–4109.
- <sup>62</sup>Scuseria, G. E.; Scheiner, A. C.; Lee, T. J.; Rice, J. E.; Schaefer, H. F., III The Closed-Shell Coupled Cluster Single and Double Excitation (CCSD) Model for the Description of Electron Correlation. A Comparison with Configuration Interaction (CISD) Results. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1987**, *86*, 2881–2890.
- <sup>63</sup>Piecuch, P.; Paldus, J. Orthogonally Spin-Adapted Coupled-Cluster Equations Involving Singly and Doubly Excited Clusters. Comparison of Different Procedures for Spin-Adaptation. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1989**, *36*, 429–453.
- <sup>64</sup>Hoffmann, M. R.; Schaefer, H. F., III A Full Coupled-Cluster Singles, Doubles, and Triples Model for the Description of Electron Correlation. *Adv. Quantum Chem.* **1986**, *18*, 207–279.
- <sup>65</sup>Noga, J.; Bartlett, R. J. The Full CCSDT Model for Molecular Electronic Structure. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1987**, *86*, 7041–7050, **1988**, *89*, 3401 [Erratum].
- <sup>66</sup>Scuseria, G. E.; Schaefer, H. F., III A New Implementation of the Full CCSDT Model for Molecular Electronic Structure. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1988**, *152*, 382–386.
- <sup>67</sup>Watts, J. D.; Bartlett, R. J. The Coupled-Cluster Single, Double, and Triple Excitation Model for Open-Shell Single Reference Functions. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1990**, *93*, 6104–6105.
- <sup>68</sup>Oliphant, N.; Adamowicz, L. Coupled-Cluster Method Truncated at Quadruples. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1991**, *95*, 6645–6651.
- <sup>69</sup>Kucharski, S. A.; Bartlett, R. J. Recursive Intermediate Factorization and Complete Computational Linearization of the Coupled-Cluster Single, Double, Triple, and Quadruple Excitation Equations. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1991**, *80*, 387–405.

- <sup>70</sup>Kucharski, S. A.; Bartlett, R. J. The Coupled-Cluster Single, Double, Triple, and Quadruple Excitation Method. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *97*, 4282–4288.
- <sup>71</sup>Piecuch, P.; Adamowicz, L. State-Selective Multireference Coupled-Cluster Theory Employing the Single-Reference Formalism: Implementation and Application to the H<sub>8</sub> Model System. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, *100*, 5792–5809.
- <sup>72</sup>Szalay, P. G.; Bartlett, R. J. Multi-Reference Averaged Quadratic Coupled-Cluster Method: A Size-Extensive Modification of Multi-Reference CI. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1993**, *214*, 481–488.
- <sup>73</sup>Szalay, P. G.; Bartlett, R. J. Approximately Extensive Modifications of the Multireference Configuration Interaction Method: A Theoretical and Practical Analysis. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *103*, 3600–3612.
- <sup>74</sup>Huron, B.; Malrieu, J. P.; Rancurel, P. Iterative Perturbative Calculations of Ground and Excited State Energies from Multiconfigurational Zeroth-Order Wavefunctions. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1973**, *58*, 5745–5759.
- <sup>75</sup>Garniron, Y.; Scemama, A.; Loos, P.-F.; Caffarel, M. Hybrid Stochastic-Deterministic Calculation of the Second-Order Perturbative Contribution of Multireference Perturbation Theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *147*, 034101.
- <sup>76</sup>Garniron, Y. et al. Quantum Package 2.0: An Open-Source Determinant-Driven Suite of Programs. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2019**, *15*, 3591–3609.
- <sup>77</sup>Musiał, M.; Perera, A.; Bartlett, R. J. Multireference Coupled-Cluster Theory: The Easy Way. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2011**, *134*, 114108.
- <sup>78</sup>Musiał, M.; Kucharski, S. A.; Bartlett, R. J. Multireference Double Electron Attached Coupled Cluster Method with Full Inclusion of the Connected Triple Excitations: MR-DA-CCSDT. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2011**, *7*, 3088–3096.
- <sup>79</sup>Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Doubly Electron-Attached and Doubly Ionized Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Methods with 4-Particle–2-Hole and 4-Hole–2-Particle Excitations and Their Active-Space Extensions. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2013**, *138*, 194102.
- <sup>80</sup>Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Doubly Electron-Attached and Doubly Ionized Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Methods with Full and Active-Space Treatments of 4-Particle–2-Hole and 4-Hole–2-Particle Excitations: The Role of Orbital Choices. *Mol. Phys.* **2014**, *112*, 868–885.
- <sup>81</sup>Dunning, T. H., Jr. Gaussian Basis Sets for Use in Correlated Molecular Calculations. I. The Atoms Boron Through Neon and Hydrogen. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1989**, *90*, 1007–1023.
- <sup>82</sup>Raghavachari, K.; Trucks, G. W.; Pople, J. A.; Head-Gordon, M. A Fifth-Order Perturbation Comparison of Electron Correlation Theories. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1989**, *157*, 479–483.
- <sup>83</sup>Watts, J. D.; Gauss, J.; Bartlett, R. J. Coupled-Cluster Methods with Noniterative Triple Excitations for Restricted Open-Shell Hartree–Fock and Other General Single Determinant Reference Functions. Energies and Analytical Gradients. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 8718–8733.
- <sup>84</sup>Piecuch, P.; Włoch, M. Renormalized Coupled-Cluster Methods Exploiting Left Eigenstates of the Similarity-Transformed Hamiltonian. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *123*, 224105.
- <sup>85</sup>Piecuch, P.; Włoch, M.; Gour, J. R.; Kinal, A. Single-Reference, Size-Extensive, Non-Iterative Coupled-Cluster Approaches to Bond Breaking and Biradicals. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2006**, *418*, 467–474.
- <sup>86</sup>Włoch, M.; Lodriguito, M. D.; Piecuch, P.; Gour, J. R. Two New Classes of Non-Iterative Coupled-Cluster Methods Derived from the Method of Moments of Coupled-Cluster Equations. *Mol. Phys.* **2006**, *104*, 2149–2172, **2006**, *104*, 2991 [Erratum].
- <sup>87</sup>Stanton, J. F. Why CCSD(T) Works: A Different Perspective. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1997**, *281*, 130–134.
- <sup>88</sup>Crawford, T. D.; Stanton, J. F. Investigation of an Asymmetric Triple-Excitation Correction for Coupled-Cluster Energies. *Int. J. Quant. Chem.* **1998**, *70*, 601–611.
- <sup>89</sup>Kucharski, S. A.; Bartlett, R. J. Noniterative Energy Corrections Through Fifth-Order to The Coupled Cluster Singles and Doubles Method. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1998**, *108*, 5243–5254.
- <sup>90</sup>Hirata, S.; Nooijen, M.; Grabowski, I.; Bartlett, R. J. Perturbative Corrections to Coupled-Cluster and Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Energies: A Determinantal Analysis. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *114*, 3919–3928, **2001** *115*, 3967 [Erratum].
- <sup>91</sup>Hirata, S.; Fan, P.-D.; Auer, A. A.; Nooijen, M.; Piecuch, P. Combined Coupled-Cluster and Many-Body Perturbation Theories. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *121*, 12197–12207.
- <sup>92</sup>Gwaltney, S. R.; Head-Gordon, M. A Second-Order Correction to Singles and Doubles Coupled-Cluster Methods Based on a Perturbative Expansion of a Similarity-Transformed Hamiltonian. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2000**, *323*, 21–28.
- <sup>93</sup>Gwaltney, S. R.; Head-Gordon, M. A Second-Order Perturbative Correction to the Coupled-Cluster Singles and Doubles Method: CCSD(2). *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *115*, 2014–2021.
- <sup>94</sup>Piecuch, P.; Kowalski, K. In *Computational Chemistry: Reviews of Current Trends*; Leszczyński, J., Ed.; World Scientific: Singapore, 2000; Vol. 5; pp 1–104.
- <sup>95</sup>Kowalski, K.; Piecuch, P. The Method of Moments of Coupled-Cluster Equations and the Renormalized CCSD[T], CCSD(T), CCSD(TQ), and CCSDT(Q) Approaches. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *113*, 18–35.
- <sup>96</sup>Piecuch, P.; Kowalski, K.; Pimienta, I. S. O.; McGuire, M. J. Recent Advances in Electronic Structure Theory: Method of Moments of Coupled-Cluster Equations and Renormalized Coupled-Cluster Approaches. *Int. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **2002**, *21*, 527–655.
- <sup>97</sup>Piecuch, P.; Kowalski, K.; Pimienta, I. S. O.; Fan, P.-D.; Lodriguito, M.; McGuire, M. J.; Kucharski, S. A.; Kuś, T.; Musiał, M. Method of Moments of Coupled-Cluster Equations: A New Formalism for Designing Accurate Electronic Structure Methods for Ground and Excited States. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2004**, *112*, 349–393.
- <sup>98</sup>Kowalski, K.; Piecuch, P. Extensive Generalization of Renormalized Coupled-Cluster Methods. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *122*, 074107.
- <sup>99</sup>Taube, A. G.; Bartlett, R. J. Improving Upon CCSD(T): ACCSD(T). I. Potential Energy Surfaces. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *128*, 044110.
- <sup>100</sup>Taube, A. G.; Bartlett, R. J. Improving Upon CCSD(T): ACCSD(T). II. Stationary Formulation and Derivatives. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *128*, 044111.
- <sup>101</sup>Eriksen, J. J.; Kristensen, K.; Kjærgaard, T.; Jørgensen, P.; Gauss, J. A Lagrangian Framework for Deriving Triples and Quadruples Corrections to the CCSD Energy. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *140*, 064108.
- <sup>102</sup>Eriksen, J. J.; Jørgensen, P.; Olsen, J.; Gauss, J. Equation-of-Motion Coupled Cluster Perturbation Theory Revisited. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *140*, 174114.
- <sup>103</sup>Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Biorthogonal Moment Expansions in Coupled-Cluster Theory: Review of Key Concepts and Merging the Renormalized and Active-Space Coupled-Cluster Methods. *Chem. Phys.* **2012**, *401*, 180–202.
- <sup>104</sup>Piecuch, P.; Włoch, M.; Varandas, A. J. C. In *Topics in the Theory of Chemical and Physical Systems*; Lahmar, S., Maruani, J., Wilson, S., Delgado-Barrio, G., Eds.; Progress in Theoretical Chemistry and Physics; Springer: Dordrecht, 2007; Vol. 16; pp 63–121.
- <sup>105</sup>Ge, Y.; Gordon, M. S.; Piecuch, P. Breaking Bonds with the Left Eigenstate Completely Renormalized Coupled-Cluster Method. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2007**, *127*, 174106.
- <sup>106</sup>Ge, Y.; Gordon, M. S.; Piecuch, P.; Włoch, M.; Gour, J. R. Breaking Bonds of Open-Shell Species with the Restricted Open-Shell Size Extensive Left Eigenstate Completely Renormalized Coupled-Cluster Method. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2008**, *112*, 11873–11884.
- <sup>107</sup>Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Combining Active-Space Coupled-Cluster Methods with Moment Energy Corrections via the CC(P;Q)

- Methodology, with Benchmark Calculations for Biradical Transition States. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2012**, *136*, 144104.
- <sup>108</sup>Piecuch, P.; Włoch, M.; Lodriguito, M.; Gour, J. R. In *Recent Advances in the Theory of Chemical and Physical Systems*; Wilson, S., Julien, J.-P., Maruani, J., Brändas, E., Delgado-Barrio, G., Eds.; Progress in Theoretical Chemistry and Physics; Springer: Dordrecht, 2006; Vol. 15; pp 45–106.
- <sup>109</sup>Piecuch, P.; Gour, J. R.; Włoch, M. Left-Eigenstate Completely Renormalized Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Methods: Review of Key Concepts, Extension to Excited States of Open-Shell Systems, and Comparison with Electron-Attached and Ionized Approaches. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **2009**, *109*, 3268–3304.
- <sup>110</sup>Fradelos, G.; Lutz, J. J.; Wesolowski, T. A.; Piecuch, P.; Włoch, M. Embedding vs Supermolecular Strategies in Evaluating the Hydrogen-Bonding-Induced Shifts of Excitation Energies. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2011**, *7*, 1647–1666.
- <sup>111</sup>Piecuch, P.; Włoch, M.; Varandas, A. J. C. Application of Renormalized Coupled-Cluster Methods to Potential Function of Water. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2008**, *120*, 59–78.
- <sup>112</sup>Horoï, M.; Gour, J. R.; Włoch, M.; Lodriguito, M. D.; Brown, B. A.; Piecuch, P. Coupled-Cluster and Configuration-Interaction Calculations for Heavy Nuclei. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2007**, *98*, 112501.
- <sup>113</sup>Bauman, N. P.; Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Combining Active-Space Coupled-Cluster Approaches with Moment Energy Corrections via the CC( $P;Q$ ) Methodology: Connected Quadruple Excitations. *Mol. Phys.* **2017**, *115*, 2860–2891.
- <sup>114</sup>Magoulas, I.; Bauman, N. P.; Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Application of the CC( $P;Q$ ) Hierarchy of Coupled-Cluster Methods to the Beryllium Dimer. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2018**, *122*, 1350–1368.
- <sup>115</sup>Emrich, K. An Extension of the Coupled Cluster Formalism to Excited States (I). *Nucl. Phys. A* **1981**, *351*, 379–396.
- <sup>116</sup>Emrich, K. An Extension of the Coupled Cluster Formalism to Excited States: (II). Approximations and Tests. *Nucl. Phys. A* **1981**, *351*, 397–438.
- <sup>117</sup>Geertsen, J.; Rittby, M.; Bartlett, R. J. The Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Method: Excitation Energies of Be and CO. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1989**, *164*, 57–62.
- <sup>118</sup>Stanton, J. F.; Bartlett, R. J. The Equation of Motion Coupled-Cluster Method. A Systematic Biorthogonal Approach to Molecular Excitation Energies, Transition Probabilities, and Excited State Properties. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 7029–7039.
- <sup>119</sup>Yuwono, S. H.; Magoulas, I.; Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Application of the Coupled-Cluster CC( $P;Q$ ) Approaches to the Magnesium Dimer. *Mol. Phys.* **2019**, *117*, 1486–1506.
- <sup>120</sup>Deustua, J. E.; Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Converging High-Level Coupled-Cluster Energetics by Monte Carlo Sampling and Moment Expansions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2017**, *119*, 223003.
- <sup>121</sup>Yuwono, S. H.; Chakraborty, A.; Deustua, J. E.; Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. Accelerating Convergence of Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Computations Using the Semi-Stochastic CC( $P;Q$ ) Formalism. *Mol. Phys.* **2020**, *118*, e1817592.
- <sup>122</sup>Deustua, J. E.; Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. High-Level Coupled-Cluster Energetics by Monte Carlo Sampling and Moment Expansions: Further Details and Comparisons. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2021**, *154*, 124103.
- <sup>123</sup>Gururangan, K.; Deustua, J. E.; Shen, J.; Piecuch, P. High-Level Coupled-Cluster Energetics by Merging Moment Expansions with Selected Configuration Interaction. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2021**, *155*, 174114.
- <sup>124</sup>Gururangan, K.; Piecuch, P. Converging High-Level Coupled-Cluster Energetics via Adaptive Selection of Excitation Manifolds Driven by Moment Expansions. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2023**, *159*, 084108.
- <sup>125</sup>Oliphant, N.; Adamowicz, L. The Implementation of the Multireference Coupled-Cluster Method Based on the Single-Reference Formalism. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *96*, 3739–3744.
- <sup>126</sup>Oliphant, N.; Adamowicz, L. Multireference Coupled Cluster Method for Electronic Structure of Molecules. *Int. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, *12*, 339–362.
- <sup>127</sup>Piecuch, P.; Oliphant, N.; Adamowicz, L. A State-Selective Multireference Coupled-Cluster Theory Employing the Single-Reference Formalism. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *99*, 1875–1900.
- <sup>128</sup>Piecuch, P.; Adamowicz, L. Breaking Bonds with the State-Selective Multireference Coupled-Cluster Method Employing the Single-Reference Formalism. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *102*, 898–904.
- <sup>129</sup>Ghose, K. B.; Piecuch, P.; Adamowicz, L. Improved Computational Strategy for the State-Selective Coupled-Cluster Theory with Semi-Internal Triexcited Clusters: Potential Energy Surface of the HF Molecule. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *103*, 9331–9346.
- <sup>130</sup>Adamowicz, L.; Piecuch, P.; Ghose, K. B. The State-Selective Coupled Cluster Method for Quasi-Degenerate Electronic States. *Mol. Phys.* **1998**, *94*, 225–234.
- <sup>131</sup>Piecuch, P.; Kucharski, S. A.; Bartlett, R. J. Coupled-Cluster Methods with Internal and Semi-Internal Triply and Quadruply Excited Clusters: CCSDt and CCSDtq Approaches. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *110*, 6103–6122.
- <sup>132</sup>Piecuch, P.; Kucharski, S. A.; Špirko, V. Coupled-Cluster Methods with Internal and Semi-Internal Triply Excited Clusters: Vibrational Spectrum of the HF Molecule. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *111*, 6679–6692.
- <sup>133</sup>Piecuch, P. Active-Space Coupled-Cluster Methods. *Mol. Phys.* **2010**, *108*, 2987–3015.
- <sup>134</sup>Booth, G. H.; Thom, A. J. W.; Alavi, A. Fermion Monte Carlo Without Fixed Nodes: A Game of Life, Death, and Annihilation in Slater Determinant Space. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2009**, *131*, 054106.
- <sup>135</sup>Cleland, D.; Booth, G. H.; Alavi, A. Communications: Survival of the Fittest: Accelerating Convergence in Full Configuration-Interaction Quantum Monte Carlo. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *132*, 041103.
- <sup>136</sup>Dobrazt, W.; Smart, S. D.; Alavi, A. Efficient Formulation of Full Configuration Interaction Quantum Monte Carlo in a Spin Eigenbasis via the Graphical Unitary Group Approach. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *151*, 094104.
- <sup>137</sup>Ghanem, K.; Lozovoi, A. Y.; Alavi, A. Unbiasing the Initiator Approximation in Full Configuration Interaction Quantum Monte Carlo. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *151*, 224108.
- <sup>138</sup>Ghanem, K.; Guther, K.; Alavi, A. The Adaptive Shift Method in Full Configuration Interaction Quantum Monte Carlo: Development and Applications. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2020**, *153*, 224115.
- <sup>139</sup>Thom, A. J. W. Stochastic Coupled Cluster Theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2010**, *105*, 263004.
- <sup>140</sup>Franklin, R. S. T.; Spencer, J. S.; Zocante, A.; Thom, A. J. W. Linked Coupled Cluster Monte Carlo. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *144*, 044111.
- <sup>141</sup>Spencer, J. S.; Thom, A. J. W. Developments in Stochastic Coupled Cluster Theory: The Initiator Approximation and Application to the Uniform Electron Gas. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *144*, 084108.
- <sup>142</sup>Scott, C. J. C.; Thom, A. J. W. Stochastic Coupled Cluster Theory: Efficient Sampling of the Coupled Cluster Expansion. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *147*, 124105.
- <sup>143</sup>Jankowski, K.; Paldus, J.; Piecuch, P. Method of Moments Approach and Coupled Cluster Theory. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1991**, *80*, 223–243.
- <sup>144</sup>Whitten, J. L.; Hackmeyer, M. Configuration Interaction Studies of Ground and Excited States of Polyatomic Molecules. I. The CI Formulation and Studies of Formaldehyde. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1969**, *51*, 5584–5596.
- <sup>145</sup>Bender, C. F.; Davidson, E. R. Studies in Configuration Interaction: The First-Row Diatomic Hydrides. *Phys. Rev.* **1969**, *183*, 23–30.
- <sup>146</sup>Buenker, R. J.; Peyerimhoff, S. D. Individualized Configuration Selection in CI Calculations with Subsequent Energy Extrapolation. *Theor. Chim. Acta.* **1974**, *35*, 33–58.
- <sup>147</sup>Schriber, J. B.; Evangelista, F. A. Communication: An Adaptive Configuration Interaction Approach for Strongly Correlated Electrons with Tunable Accuracy. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *144*,



- 161106.
- <sup>148</sup>Schriber, J. B.; Evangelista, F. A. Adaptive Configuration Interaction for Computing Challenging Electronic Excited States with Tunable Accuracy. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2017**, *13*, 5354–5366.
- <sup>149</sup>Tubman, N. M.; Lee, J.; Takeshita, T. Y.; Head-Gordon, M.; Whaley, K. B. A Deterministic Alternative to the Full Configuration Interaction Quantum Monte Carlo Method. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *145*, 044112.
- <sup>150</sup>Tubman, N. M.; Freeman, C. D.; Levine, D. S.; Hait, D.; Head-Gordon, M.; Whaley, K. B. Modern Approaches to Exact Diagonalization and Selected Configuration Interaction with the Adaptive Sampling CI Method. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2020**, *16*, 2139–2159.
- <sup>151</sup>Liu, W.; Hoffmann, M. R. iCI: Iterative CI Toward Full CI. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2016**, *12*, 1169–1178, **2016**, *12*, 3000 [Erratum].
- <sup>152</sup>Zhang, N.; Liu, W.; Hoffmann, M. R. Iterative Configuration Interaction with Selection. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2020**, *16*, 2296–2316.
- <sup>153</sup>Holmes, A. A.; Tubman, N. M.; Umrigar, C. J. Heat-Bath Configuration Interaction: An Efficient Selected Configuration Interaction Algorithm Inspired by Heat-Bath Sampling. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2016**, *12*, 3674–3680.
- <sup>154</sup>Sharma, S.; Holmes, A. A.; Jeanmairet, G.; Alavi, A.; Umrigar, C. J. Semistochastic Heat-Bath Configuration Interaction Method: Selected Configuration Interaction with Semistochastic Perturbation Theory. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2017**, *13*, 1595–1604.
- <sup>155</sup>Li, J.; Otten, M.; Holmes, A. A.; Sharma, S.; Umrigar, C. J. Fast Semistochastic Heat-Bath Configuration Interaction. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2018**, *149*, 214110.
- <sup>156</sup>Schmidt, M. W.; Baldrige, K. K.; Boatz, J. A.; Elbert, S. T.; Gordon, M. S.; Jensen, J. H.; Koseki, S.; Matsunaga, N.; Nguyen, K. A.; Su, S.; Windus, T. L.; Dupuis, M.; Montgomery, J. A. General Atomic and Molecular Electronic Structure System. *J. Comput. Chem.* **1993**, *14*, 1347–1363.
- <sup>157</sup>Barca, G. M. J. et al. Recent Developments in the General Atomic and Molecular Electronic Structure System. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2020**, *152*, 154102.
- <sup>158</sup>Zahariev, F. et al. The General Atomic and Molecular Electronic Structure System (GAMESS): Novel Methods on Novel Architectures. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2023**, *19*, 7031–7055.
- <sup>159</sup>K. Gururangan and P. Piecuch, “CCpy: A Coupled-Cluster Package Written in Python,” see <https://github.com/piecuch-group/ccpy>.
- <sup>160</sup>Loos, P.-F.; Damour, Y.; Scemama, A. The Performance of CIPSI on the Ground State Electronic Energy of Benzene. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2020**, *153*, 176101.
- <sup>161</sup>Lyakh, D. I.; Lotrich, V. F.; Bartlett, R. J. The ‘Tailored’ CCSD(T) Description of the Automerization of Cyclobutadiene. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2011**, *501*, 166–171.
- <sup>162</sup>Kowalski, K.; Piecuch, P. The Active-Space Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Methods for Excited Electronic States: Full EOMCCSDt. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *115*, 643–651.
- <sup>163</sup>Kowalski, K.; Piecuch, P. Excited-State Potential Energy Curves of CH<sup>+</sup>: A Comparison of the EOMCCSDt and Full EOMCCSDT Results. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2001**, *347*, 237–246.
- <sup>164</sup>Kucharski, S. A.; Wloch, M.; Musiał, M.; Bartlett, R. J. Coupled-Cluster Theory for Excited Electronic States: The Full Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Single, Double, and Triple Excitation Method. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *115*, 8263–8266.

TABLE 1. Convergence of the  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  Energies of the Lowest Singlet State of Cyclobutadiene, as Described by the cc-pVDZ Basis Set, Toward CCSDT at Selected Values of Parameter  $\lambda$  Defining the Automerization Coordinate via the Interpolation Formula Given by Eq. (2), Alongside the Associated Variational and Perturbatively Corrected CIPSI Energies

$\lambda$	$N_{\text{det(in)}} / N_{\text{det(out)}}$	% of triples	$E_{\text{var}}^{\text{a}}$	$E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)\text{a}}$	$E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)\text{a}}$	$CC(P)^{\text{b}}$	$CC(P;Q)^{\text{b}}$
0	1/1	0	596.966 <sup>c</sup>	-84.890 <sup>d</sup>	119.654	26.827 <sup>e</sup>	0.848 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/55,651	0.0	120.631	25.127(179)	27.145(175)	25.481	0.676
	100,000/111,316	0.1	107.950	22.116(146)	23.686(143)	22.183	0.431
	250,000/445,296	0.6	95.932	18.756(144)	19.974(141)	17.706	0.278
	500,000/890,920	1.1	91.033	17.669(142)	18.752(140)	16.258	0.268
	1,000,000/1,781,339	2.2	86.494	16.576(139)	17.543(137)	14.608	0.254
	5,000,000/7,127,768	7.7	75.839	14.895(121)	15.604(119)	10.733	0.145
	10,000,000/14,258,080	15.1	67.232	13.219(108)	13.759(107)	7.252	0.093
0.2	1/1	0	601.559 <sup>c</sup>	-87.141 <sup>d</sup>	129.221	27.964 <sup>e</sup>	1.253 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/51,630	0.0	126.605	27.112(167)	29.321(164)	26.641	1.012
	100,000/103,165	0.1	111.522	24.556(150)	26.178(147)	23.029	0.552
	250,000/412,603	0.5	98.105	19.604(152)	20.870(149)	17.911	0.272
	500,000/825,242	1.1	92.595	18.791(145)	19.889(143)	16.130	0.270
	1,000,000/1,651,057	2.0	87.874	17.728(135)	18.703(133)	14.653	0.264
	5,000,000/6,602,235	7.3	77.378	15.889(122)	16.612(121)	10.783	0.148
	10,000,000/13,223,732	13.9	68.937	14.333(109)	14.887(107)	7.524	0.101
0.4	1/1	0	605.168 <sup>c</sup>	-91.486 <sup>d</sup>	141.934	29.667 <sup>e</sup>	2.021 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/50,677	0.0	129.124	28.480(178)	30.760(174)	28.021	1.563
	100,000/101,361	0.1	113.415	24.995(166)	26.686(163)	23.947	0.776
	250,000/405,591	0.5	98.290	19.122(156)	20.416(153)	18.165	0.271
	500,000/811,227	1.1	92.053	17.563(147)	18.682(145)	15.984	0.292
	1,000,000/1,621,981	2.0	87.558	17.149(139)	18.133(137)	14.611	0.274
	5,000,000/6,488,516	7.2	76.901	15.082(123)	15.813(122)	10.710	0.160
	10,000,000/12,976,521	10.7	73.466	14.493(118)	15.156(116)	10.238	0.115
0.6	1/1	0	610.659 <sup>c</sup>	-95.640 <sup>d</sup>	164.690	32.473 <sup>e</sup>	3.582 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/53,206	0.0	130.859	30.784(188)	33.041(184)	32.473	2.679
	100,000/106,413	0.1	115.914	26.643(175)	28.371(171)	30.198	1.235
	250,000/425,835	0.5	98.110	18.561(152)	19.866(150)	25.279	0.300
	500,000/851,740	1.1	91.503	17.269(143)	18.381(140)	17.781	0.304
	1,000,000/1,703,867	2.0	87.073	16.711(139)	17.693(137)	14.282	0.284
	5,000,000/6,812,598	7.5	75.664	14.470(122)	15.183(121)	9.967	0.167
	10,000,000/13,627,034	13.9	68.381	13.315(108)	13.878(107)	7.311	0.109
0.8	1/1	0	619.744 <sup>c</sup>	-98.958 <sup>d</sup>	207.413	37.662 <sup>e</sup>	7.008 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/98,465	0.1	123.879	32.073(170)	33.919(167)	28.703	2.505
	100,000/196,965	0.2	112.359	24.572(171)	26.222(168)	21.842	0.628
	250,000/394,080	0.5	100.961	19.800(151)	21.171(148)	17.926	0.336
	500,000/787,924	1.0	93.638	18.350(149)	19.500(147)	15.451	0.360
	1,000,000/1,575,423	1.9	88.146	17.491(137)	18.484(135)	13.731	0.327
	5,000,000/6,300,768	6.0	78.214	15.623(125)	16.375(123)	10.615	0.211
	10,000,000/12,604,257	10.7	71.699	14.195(115)	14.816(113)	8.367	0.150
1	1/1	0	632.766 <sup>c</sup>	-102.757 <sup>d</sup>	282.305	47.979 <sup>e</sup>	14.636 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/56,219	0.0	146.883	45.172(210)	47.519(205)	42.119	9.569
	100,000/112,432	0.1	130.721	36.708(182)	38.658(178)	32.125	3.539
	250,000/449,753	0.5	99.218	19.367(152)	20.688(150)	17.137	0.458
	500,000/899,464	0.9	92.482	17.938(148)	19.059(145)	14.685	0.435
	1,000,000/1,799,702	1.7	87.614	17.261(140)	18.243(138)	13.223	0.375
	5,000,000/7,196,961	5.5	77.242	15.348(125)	16.078(123)	9.969	0.246
	10,000,000/14,391,011	9.6	71.571	14.183(114)	14.800(113)	8.486	0.167

<sup>a</sup> For each value of  $\lambda$ , the  $E_{\text{var}}$ ,  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$ , and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energies are reported as errors, in millihartree, relative to the extrapolated  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energy found using a linear fit based on the last six  $E_{\text{var},k} + \Delta E_{\text{r},k}^{(2)}$  values leading to the largest CIPSI wave function obtained with  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 10,000,000$ , plotted against the corresponding  $\Delta E_{\text{r},k}^{(2)}$  corrections, following the procedure described in Refs. 39, 76, and 160. The extrapolated  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energies at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$ , and  $1$  are  $-154.248137(398)$ ,  $-154.247883(480)$ ,  $-154.244213(872)$ ,  $-154.239997(642)$ ,  $-154.236928(616)$ , and  $-154.235401(1043)$  hartree, respectively, where the error bounds in parentheses correspond to the uncertainty associated with the linear fit. The error bounds for the  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$  and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energies obtained at the various values of  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  reflect on the semi-stochastic design of the  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{ext}}^{(k)}$  spaces discussed in the main text, but they ignore the uncertainties characterizing the reference  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energies obtained in the above extrapolation procedure.

<sup>b</sup> The  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  energies are reported as errors relative to CCSDT, in millihartree. The total CCSDT energies at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$ , and  $1$  are  $-154.244157$ ,  $-154.242922$ ,  $-154.240027$ ,  $-154.236079$ ,  $-154.232439$ , and  $-154.232002$  hartree, respectively.

<sup>c</sup> Equivalent to RHF.

<sup>d</sup> Equivalent to the result obtained with the second-order MBPT approach using the Epstein–Nesbet denominator.

<sup>e</sup> Equivalent to CCSD.

<sup>f</sup> Equivalent to CR-CC(2,3).

TABLE 2. Convergence of the  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  Energies of the Lowest Triplet State of Cyclobutadiene, as Described by the cc-pVDZ Basis Set, Toward CCSDT at Selected Values of Parameter  $\lambda$  Defining the Automerization Coordinate via the Interpolation Formula Given by Eq. (2), Alongside the Associated Variational and Perturbatively Corrected CIPSI Energies

$\lambda$	$N_{\text{det(in)}} / N_{\text{det(out)}}$	% of triples	$E_{\text{var}}^{\text{a}}$	$E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)\text{a}}$	$E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)\text{a}}$	$CC(P)^{\text{b}}$	$CC(P;Q)^{\text{b}}$
0	1/1	0	572.232 <sup>c</sup>	-97.167 <sup>d</sup>	94.195	24.646 <sup>e</sup>	-0.033 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/84,925	0.3	126.216	17.881(210)	20.609(205)	22.589	0.016
	100,000/169,861	0.5	100.010	14.692(155)	16.283(152)	20.446	0.028
	250,000/339,721	0.8	90.992	13.111(144)	14.389(142)	18.341	0.100
	500,000/679,710	1.2	85.449	12.584(139)	13.672(137)	16.737	0.154
	1,000,000/1,359,265	1.8	81.995	12.345(137)	13.324(135)	15.567	0.173
	5,000,000/5,436,202	4.6	74.316	11.275(126)	12.053(124)	12.474	0.167
	10,000,000/10,871,115	7.7	69.341	10.222(118)	10.896(117)	10.637	0.134
0.2	1/1	0	571.775 <sup>c</sup>	-95.504 <sup>d</sup>	93.218	24.424 <sup>e</sup>	-0.043 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/95,659	0.3	119.164	17.033(194)	19.415(189)	22.170	0.015
	100,000/191,346	0.6	97.554	14.541(153)	16.027(151)	19.833	0.072
	250,000/382,772	0.8	90.002	12.999(155)	14.237(152)	17.991	0.100
	500,000/765,329	1.3	84.848	12.854(143)	13.912(141)	16.326	0.155
	1,000,000/1,532,203	2.0	80.932	12.414(135)	13.356(133)	14.846	0.173
	5,000,000/6,122,654	5.1	72.919	11.032(121)	11.776(120)	11.898	0.152
	10,000,000/12,246,843	8.5	67.669	10.147(114)	10.778(113)	9.840	0.126
0.4	1/1	0	572.339 <sup>c</sup>	-93.175 <sup>d</sup>	93.387	24.239 <sup>e</sup>	-0.050 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/68,315	0.2	138.142	20.184(191)	23.481(186)	22.835	-0.028
	100,000/136,635	0.4	105.157	16.968(158)	18.675(155)	20.901	0.003
	250,000/273,285	0.7	94.039	14.997(147)	16.319(145)	18.707	0.068
	500,000/546,881	1.0	88.089	14.172(147)	15.295(144)	17.028	0.130
	1,000,000/1,093,480	1.6	84.427	13.398(141)	14.420(139)	15.794	0.154
	5,000,000/8,746,894	6.6	71.913	12.125(119)	12.815(118)	10.994	0.138
	10,000,000/17,483,610	12.1	62.833	10.294(105)	10.813(104)	8.130	0.084
0.6	1/1	0	570.893 <sup>c</sup>	-93.217 <sup>d</sup>	91.663	24.089 <sup>e</sup>	-0.055 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/55,070	0.2	150.423	19.777(414)	23.900(401)	23.037	-0.034
	100,000/110,142	0.4	110.889	18.391(125)	20.292(122)	21.542	-0.015
	250,000/440,697	0.9	88.802	13.367(142)	14.547(140)	17.540	0.096
	500,000/881,321	1.3	84.455	13.032(131)	14.069(129)	16.110	0.143
	1,000,000/1,762,363	2.1	80.638	12.620(131)	13.546(130)	14.705	0.162
	5,000,000/7,051,421	5.5	73.209	11.431(124)	12.173(122)	11.869	0.132
	10,000,000/14,099,214	9.1	67.881	10.554(114)	11.183(113)	9.951	0.117
0.8	1/1	0	570.863 <sup>c</sup>	-92.204 <sup>d</sup>	91.469	23.974 <sup>e</sup>	-0.058 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/59,298	0.2	144.443	20.389(241)	24.065(234)	22.846	-0.040
	100,000/118,602	0.4	107.656	17.516(184)	19.303(180)	21.062	-0.006
	250,000/474,464	0.9	88.836	14.143(145)	15.297(143)	17.489	0.094
	500,000/949,394	1.4	85.025	13.589(140)	14.628(138)	16.201	0.131
	1,000,000/1,898,021	2.2	81.984	13.095(133)	14.049(131)	15.224	0.131
	5,000,000/7,591,707	5.5	73.852	11.863(123)	12.613(122)	12.110	0.125
	10,000,000/15,188,890	9.1	68.485	11.085(113)	11.716(112)	10.195	0.099
1	1/1	0	570.406 <sup>c</sup>	-91.860 <sup>d</sup>	90.994	23.884 <sup>e</sup>	-0.060 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/65,391	0.2	137.892	20.022(218)	23.305(212)	22.617	-0.047
	100,000/130,810	0.4	103.950	16.288(153)	17.965(150)	20.624	-0.010
	250,000/261,626	0.6	93.518	14.821(148)	16.127(145)	18.665	0.039
	500,000/523,285	0.9	87.775	13.661(137)	14.792(134)	17.237	0.109
	1,000,000/1,046,443	1.4	84.673	13.507(140)	14.536(137)	16.189	0.127
	5,000,000/8,373,419	5.8	74.128	11.775(124)	12.535(122)	12.371	0.117
	10,000,000/16,741,696	9.3	68.611	11.074(115)	11.711(114)	10.435	0.101

<sup>a</sup> For each value of  $\lambda$ , the  $E_{\text{var}}$ ,  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$ , and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energies are reported as errors, in millihartree, relative to the extrapolated  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energy found using a linear fit based on the last six  $E_{\text{var},k} + \Delta E_{\text{r},k}^{(2)}$  values leading to the largest CIPSI wave function obtained with  $N_{\text{det(in)}} = 10,000,000$ , plotted against the corresponding  $\Delta E_{\text{r},k}^{(2)}$  corrections, following the procedure described in Refs. 39, 76, and 160. The extrapolated  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energies at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$ , and  $1$  are  $-154.195674(1195)$ ,  $-154.206430(1047)$ ,  $-154.215793(862)$ ,  $-154.220754(582)$ ,  $-154.224733(1124)$ , and  $-154.225942(668)$  hartree, respectively, where the error bounds in parentheses correspond to the uncertainty associated with the linear fit. The error bounds for the  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$  and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energies obtained at the various values of  $N_{\text{det(in)}}$  reflect on the semi-stochastic design of the  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{ext}}^{(k)}$  spaces discussed in the main text, but they ignore the uncertainties characterizing the reference  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_{\text{r}}^{(2)}$  energies obtained in the above extrapolation procedure.

<sup>b</sup> The  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  energies are reported as errors relative to CCSDT, in millihartree. The total CCSDT energies at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$ , and  $1$  are  $-154.195389$ ,  $-154.205779$ ,  $-154.213867$ ,  $-154.219672$ ,  $-154.223190$ , and  $-154.224380$  hartree, respectively.

<sup>c</sup> Equivalent to ROHF.

<sup>d</sup> Equivalent to the result obtained with the second-order MBPT approach using the Epstein–Nesbet denominator.

<sup>e</sup> Equivalent to CCSD.

<sup>f</sup> Equivalent to CR-CC(2,3).

TABLE 3. Convergence of the  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  Singlet–Triplet Gaps  $\Delta E_{S-T} = E_S - E_T$  Characterizing Cyclobutadiene, as Described by the cc-pVDZ Basis Set, Toward Their CCSDT Parents at Selected Values of Parameter  $\lambda$  Defining the Automerization Coordinate via the Interpolation Formula Given by Eq. (2), Along With the  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  Data Resulting From the Associated Variational and Perturbatively Corrected CIPSI Computations

$\lambda$	$N_{\text{det(in)}} / N_{\text{det(out)}}$	% of triples	$E_{\text{var}}^a$	$E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)a}$	$E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)a}$	$CC(P)^b$	$CC(P;Q)^b$
0	1/1; 1	0; 0	15.521 <sup>c</sup>	7.704 <sup>d</sup>	15.976	1.368 <sup>e</sup>	0.553 <sup>f</sup>
	50,000/55,651; 84,925	0.0; 0.3	-3.504	4.546(173)	4.101(169)	1.815	0.414
	100,000/111,316; 169,861	0.1; 0.5	4.982	4.658(133)	4.645(131)	1.090	0.253
	250,000/445,296; 339,721	0.6; 0.8	3.100	3.542(128)	3.505(126)	-0.398	0.112
	500,000/890,920; 679,710	1.1; 1.2	3.504	3.191(125)	3.188(123)	-0.300	0.071
	1,000,000/1,781,339; 1,359,265	2.2; 1.8	2.823	2.655(122)	2.647(121)	-0.602	0.051
	5,000,000/7,127,768; 5,436,202	7.7; 4.6	0.956	2.272(110)	2.228(108)	-1.092	-0.014
	10,000,000/14,258,080; 10,871,115	15.1; 7.7	-1.324	1.881(100)	1.797(099)	-2.124	-0.025
	0.2	1/1; 1	0; 0	18.690 <sup>c</sup>	5.248 <sup>d</sup>	22.592	2.221 <sup>e</sup>
50,000/51,630; 95,659		0.0; 0.3	4.670	6.325(161)	6.216(157)	2.805	0.626
100,000/103,165; 191,346		0.1; 0.6	8.765	6.284(135)	6.370(132)	2.006	0.301
250,000/412,603; 382,772		0.5; 0.8	5.085	4.145(136)	4.162(134)	-0.050	0.108
500,000/825,242; 765,329		1.1; 1.3	4.861	3.726(128)	3.751(126)	-0.123	0.072
1,000,000/1,651,057; 1,532,203		2.0; 2.0	4.357	3.334(120)	3.355(118)	-0.121	0.057
5,000,000/6,602,235; 6,122,654		7.3; 5.1	2.798	3.048(108)	3.035(107)	-0.700	-0.003
10,000,000/13,223,732; 12,246,843		13.9; 8.5	0.796	2.627(099)	2.578(098)	-1.453	-0.015
0.4		1/1; 1	0; 0	20.600 <sup>c</sup>	1.060 <sup>d</sup>	30.464	3.406 <sup>e</sup>
	50,000/50,677; 68,315	0.0; 0.2	-5.659	5.205(164)	4.567(160)	3.254	0.998
	100,000/101,361; 136,635	0.1; 0.4	5.182	5.037(144)	5.027(141)	1.911	0.485
	250,000/405,591; 273,285	0.5; 0.7	2.667	2.589(135)	2.570(132)	-0.340	0.128
	500,000/811,227; 546,881	1.1; 1.0	2.488	2.128(130)	2.125(128)	-0.655	0.102
	1,000,000/1,621,981; 1,093,480	2.0; 1.6	1.965	2.354(125)	2.330(123)	-0.743	0.076
	5,000,000/6,488,516; 8,746,894	7.2; 6.6	3.130	1.855(108)	1.881(106)	-0.178	0.014
	10,000,000/12,976,521; 17,483,610	10.7; 12.1	6.672	2.635(099)	2.725(098)	1.323	0.020
	0.6	1/1; 1	0; 0	24.953 <sup>c</sup>	-1.520 <sup>d</sup>	45.826	5.261 <sup>e</sup>
50,000/53,206; 55,070		0.0; 0.2	-12.277	6.907(285)	5.736(277)	4.493	1.703
100,000/106,413; 110,142		0.1; 0.4	3.154	5.179(135)	5.070(132)	2.345	0.784
250,000/425,835; 440,697		0.5; 0.9	5.841	3.259(131)	3.338(128)	0.040	0.128
500,000/851,740; 881,321		1.1; 1.3	4.423	2.659(121)	2.706(120)	-0.207	0.101
1,000,000/1,703,867; 1,762,363		2.0; 2.1	4.038	2.567(120)	2.602(119)	-0.266	0.077
5,000,000/6,812,598; 7,051,421		7.5; 5.5	1.541	1.907(109)	1.889(108)	-1.193	0.022
10,000,000/13,627,034; 14,099,214		13.9; 9.1	0.314	1.732(099)	1.691(098)	-1.657	-0.005
0.8		1/1; 1	0; 0	30.673 <sup>c</sup>	-4.238 <sup>d</sup>	72.756	8.589 <sup>e</sup>
	50,000/98,465; 59,298	0.1; 0.2	-12.905	7.332(151)	6.184(180)	3.676	1.597
	100,000/196,965; 118,602	0.2; 0.4	2.951	4.428(152)	4.342(154)	0.490	0.398
	250,000/394,080; 474,464	0.5; 0.9	7.609	3.550(134)	3.685(129)	0.274	0.152
	500,000/787,924; 949,394	1.0; 1.4	5.404	2.987(132)	3.057(126)	-0.471	0.143
	1,000,000/1,575,423; 1,898,021	1.9; 2.2	3.867	2.759(121)	2.783(118)	-0.937	0.123
	5,000,000/6,300,768; 7,591,707	6.0; 5.5	2.737	2.359(111)	2.360(109)	-0.938	0.054
	10,000,000/12,604,257; 15,188,890	10.7; 9.1	2.016	1.952(102)	1.945(100)	-1.147	0.032
	1	1/1; 1	0; 0	39.131 <sup>c</sup>	-6.838 <sup>d</sup>	120.049	15.120 <sup>e</sup>
50,000/56,219; 65,391		0.0; 0.2	5.642	15.782(190)	15.195(185)	12.238	6.035
100,000/112,432; 130,810		0.1; 0.4	16.799	12.814(149)	12.985(146)	7.217	2.227
250,000/449,753; 261,626		0.5; 0.6	3.577	2.853(133)	2.862(131)	-0.959	0.263
500,000/899,464; 523,285		0.9; 0.9	2.954	2.683(126)	2.678(124)	-1.601	0.205
1,000,000/1,799,702; 1,046,443		1.7; 1.4	1.845	2.356(124)	2.326(122)	-1.861	0.156
5,000,000/7,196,961; 8,373,419		5.5; 5.8	1.954	2.243(110)	2.223(109)	-1.507	0.081
10,000,000/14,391,011; 16,741,696		9.6; 9.3	1.857	1.951(101)	1.938(100)	-1.223	0.042

<sup>a</sup> For each value of  $\lambda$ , the  $E_{\text{var}}$ ,  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E^{(2)}$ , and  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  singlet–triplet gaps are reported as errors, in kcal/mol, relative to the parent CIPSI data obtained by forming the differences between the extrapolated  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  energies of the lowest singlet and triplet states given in footnotes ‘a’ of Tables 1 and 2. The resulting reference  $E_{\text{var}} + \Delta E_r^{(2)}$  singlet–triplet gap values at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8,$  and  $1$  are  $-32.921(790), -26.013(723), -17.833(769), -12.076(544), -7.653(804),$  and  $-5.936(777)$  kcal/mol, respectively.

<sup>b</sup> The  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  singlet–triplet gaps are reported as errors relative to CCSDT, in kcal/mol. The CCSDT singlet–triplet gap values at  $\lambda = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8,$  and  $1$  are  $-30.603, -23.308, -16.416, -10.295, -5.804,$  and  $-4.783$  kcal/mol, respectively.

<sup>c</sup> Equivalent to RHF/ROHF.

<sup>d</sup> Equivalent to the result obtained with the second-order MBPT approach using the Epstein–Nesbet denominator.

<sup>e</sup> Equivalent to CCSD.

<sup>f</sup> Equivalent to CR-CC(2,3).




FIG. 1. The PECs (in kcal/mol) characterizing the lowest-energy singlet and triplet states of cyclobutadiene along the  $D_{2h}$ -symmetric automerization pathway, defined using the interpolation formula given by Eq. (2) and parametrized by dimensionless variable  $\lambda$ , resulting from the full CCSDT (red solid circles and lines), active-space DEA-EOMCC(4p-2h) $\{N_u\}$  (green solid diamonds and lines), and perturbatively corrected and extrapolated CIPSI (blue solid squares and lines) calculations using the cc-pVDZ basis set described in the main text. For each of the three methods, the energy of the singlet ground state at the reactant (R,  $\lambda = 0$ ) geometry is set to 0. The numbers in the middle, colored in the same way as the corresponding PECs, are the unsigned values of the singlet–triplet gaps determined at the  $\lambda = 1$  TS structure.




FIG. 2. Convergence of the  $CC(P)$  and  $CC(P;Q)$  energies  $E$ , reported as  $(E + 154.0)$  hartree, of the lowest singlet [panels (a) and (b)] and triplet [panels (c) and (d)] states of cyclobutadiene, as described by the cc-pVDZ basis set, and the  $\Delta E_{S-T}$  gaps between them [panels (e) and (f)] toward their CCSDT counterparts with the CIPSI wave function termination parameter  $N_{\text{det}(\text{in})}$  at selected values of the dimensionless variable  $\lambda$  defining the automerization coordinate via the interpolation formula given by Eq. (2). The  $CC(P)$  results are reported in panels (a), (c), and (e). Panels (b), (d), and (f) show the corresponding  $CC(P;Q)$  data.