

Double Ionization Potential Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Approach with Full Inclusion of 4-Hole–2-Particle Excitations and Three-Body Clusters

Karthik Gururangan,^{1, a)} Achintya Kumar Dutta,^{2, b)} and Piotr Piecuch^{1, 3, c)}

¹⁾Department of Chemistry, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

²⁾Department of Chemistry, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Powai, Mumbai 400076, India

³⁾Department of Physics and Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

The double ionization potential (DIP) equation-of-motion (EOM) coupled-cluster (CC) method with a full treatment of 4-hole–2-particle ($4h-2p$) correlations and triply excited clusters, abbreviated as DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$), and its approximate form called DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) have been formulated and implemented in the open-source CCpy package available on GitHub. The resulting codes work with both nonrelativistic and spin-free scalar-relativistic Hamiltonians. By examining the DIPs of Cl₂, Br₂, and HBr, for which accurate experimental data are available, we demonstrate that the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) and DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) approaches improve the results obtained using the DIP-EOMCC methods truncated at $3h-1p$ or $4h-2p$ excitations on top of the CC calculations with singles and doubles.

The single-reference coupled-cluster (CC) theory^{1–5} and its equation-of-motion (EOM) extensions to electronically excited^{6–10} and electron attached and ionized states^{11–40} have become preeminent methods of quantum chemistry. In this Communication, we focus on the double ionization potential (DIP) EOMCC framework, which allows one to directly determine the ground and excited states of doubly ionized molecular species and which is useful in many applications, such as Auger electron spectroscopy,^{41–44} singlet–triplet gaps in biradicals,^{33–36} and strong-field-induced chemical reactivity.⁴⁵

In the DIP-EOMCC formalism, the ground ($\mu = 0$) and excited ($\mu > 0$) states of the target ($N - 2$)-electron system are expressed as

$$|\Psi_{\mu}^{(N-2)}\rangle = R_{\mu}^{(-2)}|\Psi^{(N)}\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where the doubly ionizing operator

$$R_{\mu}^{(-2)} = \sum_{n=0}^{M_R} R_{\mu, (n+2)h-np}, \quad (2)$$

with $R_{\mu, (n+2)h-np}$ representing its $(n+2)$ -hole– n -particle [$(n+2)h-np$] components, removes two electrons from the CC ground state

$$|\Psi^{(N)}\rangle = e^T|\Phi\rangle \quad (3)$$

of the underlying N -electron species, in which

$$T = \sum_{n=1}^{M_T} T_n \quad (4)$$

is the cluster operator and $|\Phi\rangle$ is the reference determinant that serves as a Fermi vacuum. The many-body components of the T and $R_{\mu}^{(-2)}$ operators are given by

$$T_n = \sum_{\substack{i_1 < \dots < i_n \\ a_1 < \dots < a_n}} t_{a_1 \dots a_n}^{i_1 \dots i_n} a^{a_1} \dots a^{a_n} a_{i_n} \dots a_{i_1} \quad (5)$$

and

$$R_{\mu, (n+2)h-np} = \sum_{\substack{k_1 < \dots < k_n < i < j \\ c_1 < \dots < c_n}} r_{c_1 \dots c_n}^{ijk_1 \dots k_n}(\mu) \times a^{c_1} \dots a^{c_n} a_{k_n} \dots a_{k_1} a_j a_i, \quad (6)$$

respectively, where, as usual, indices i, j, \dots (a, b, \dots) denote the spinorbitals that are occupied (unoccupied) in $|\Phi\rangle$ and a^p (a_p) represents the fermionic creation (annihilation) operator associated with the spinorbital $|p\rangle$. M_R and M_T control the DIP-EOMCC theory level, with $M_R = N - 2$ defining exact calculations and $M_R < N - 2$ and $M_T \leq N$ leading to DIP-EOMCC approximations.

The DIP-EOMCC approaches that have been implemented so far include the basic DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) method,^{28,29,31,33–36} defined by $M_R = 1$ and $M_T = 2$, which describes $2h$ and $3h-1p$ correlations on top of the CC calculations with singles and doubles (CCSD),^{46–49} its higher-level DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) extension^{35,36} corresponding to $M_R = 2$ and $M_T = 2$, which also describes $4h-2p$ correlations on top of CCSD, and the DIP-EOMCCSDT scheme³¹ corresponding to $M_R = 1$ and $M_T = 3$, which accounts for $2h$ and $3h-1p$ correlations on top of the CC calculations with singles, doubles, and triples (CCSDT).^{50,51} While all of these methods and the various approximations to them aimed at reducing computational costs are useful tools for determining DIP energies in molecular systems and singlet–triplet gaps in certain biradicals, our recent numerical tests, including the DIPs of Cl₂, Br₂, and HBr examined in this Communication, indicate that the explicit incorporation

^{a)}e-mail: gururang@msu.edu

^{b)}e-mail: achintya@chem.iitb.ac.in

^{c)}Corresponding author; e-mail: piecuch@chemistry.msu.edu

of $4h-2p$ correlations, needed to achieve a highly accurate description,^{35,36} may not be well balanced with the CCSD treatment of the underlying N -electron species, resulting in some cases in loss of accuracy compared to the basic DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) level.

The main goal of this work is to enrich the existing arsenal of DIP-EOMCC methods and, in particular, address the above concerns by examining the high-level DIP-EOMCC approach with a full treatment of both $4h-2p$ and T_3 correlations, corresponding to $M_R = 2$ and $M_T = 3$ and abbreviated as DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$). The present study describes the efficient formulation and computer implementation of full DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) and its less expensive DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) approximation, including the factorized and programmable expressions that define them. We illustrate the performance of both methods, as coded for nonrelativistic and spin-free scalar-relativistic Hamiltonians in the open-source CCpy package⁵² available on GitHub, by calculating the vertical DIPs of Cl_2 , Br_2 , and HBr and comparing the results with those obtained using the DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) and DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) approaches and the available experimental data.

The key step of any DIP-EOMCC calculation is a diagonalization of the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian $\overline{H}_N = e^{-T} H_N e^T = (H_N e^T)_C$ associated with the N -electron CC ground state in the relevant $(N-2)$ -electron subspace of the Fock space corresponding to the content of the ionizing operator $R_\mu^{(-2)}$. Here, subscript C designates the connected operator product and $H_N = H - \langle \Phi | H | \Phi \rangle = F_N + V_N$ is the electronic Hamiltonian in the normal-ordered form relative to $|\Phi\rangle$, with F_N and V_N representing its Fock and two-electron interaction

components. In the case of the cluster and ionizing operators defined by Eqs. (4) and (2), respectively, the basis states that span the $(N-2)$ -electron subspace of the Fock space used in the DIP-EOMCC calculations are $|\Phi_{ij}\rangle = a_j a_i |\Phi\rangle$ and $|\Phi_{ijk_1 \dots k_n}^{c_1 \dots c_n}\rangle = a^{c_1} \dots a^{c_n} a_{k_n} \dots a_{k_1} a_j a_i |\Phi\rangle$, $n = 1, \dots, M_R$. Assuming that $M_R \leq M_T$ (a condition required for retaining size intensity of the resulting double ionization energies^{35,36,38}), the DIP-EOMCC eigenvalue problem is given by

$$(\overline{H}_{N,\text{open}} R_\mu^{(-2)})_C |\Phi\rangle = \omega_\mu^{(N-2)} R_\mu^{(-2)} |\Phi\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $\overline{H}_{N,\text{open}}$ refers to the diagrams of \overline{H}_N containing external fermion lines and $\omega_\mu^{(N-2)} = E_\mu^{(N-2)} - E_0^{(N)}$ is the vertical DIP energy representing the difference between the total energy of the ground ($\mu = 0$) or excited ($\mu > 0$) state of the $(N-2)$ -electron target system, denoted as $E_\mu^{(N-2)}$, and the ground-state CC energy of the underlying N -electron species, $E_0^{(N)} = \langle \Phi | H | \Phi \rangle + \langle \Phi | \overline{H}_N | \Phi \rangle$. In practice, including this work, the solutions of Eq. (7) are obtained using the Hirao–Nakatsuji generalization⁵³ of the Davidson diagonalization algorithm⁵⁴ to non-Hermitian Hamiltonians.

In the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) approach developed in this work, the CCSDT similarity-transformed Hamiltonian, designated as $\overline{H}_N^{(\text{CCSDT})}$, is diagonalized in the $(N-2)$ -electron subspace of the Fock space spanned by $|\Phi_{ij}\rangle$, $|\Phi_{ijk}^c\rangle$, and $|\Phi_{ijkl}^{cd}\rangle$. The programmable factorized expressions for the required projections of the left-hand-side of Eq. (7), with T truncated at T_3 and $R_\mu^{(-2)}$ truncated at $R_{\mu,4h-2p}$, as implemented in CCpy, are

$$\langle \Phi_{ij} | (\overline{H}_{N,\text{open}}^{(\text{CCSDT})} R_\mu^{(-2)})_C |\Phi\rangle = \mathcal{A}^{ij} [-\bar{h}_m^i r^{mj}(\mu) + \frac{1}{4} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ij} r^{mn}(\mu) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_m^e r_e^{ijm}(\mu) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{mn}^{if} r_f^{mjn}(\mu) + \frac{1}{8} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ef} r_{ef}^{ijmn}(\mu)], \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_{ijk}^c | (\overline{H}_{N,\text{open}}^{(\text{CCSDT})} R_\mu^{(-2)})_C |\Phi\rangle = & \mathcal{A}^{ijk} [\frac{1}{2} I^{ie}(\mu) t_{ec}^{jk} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{cm}^{ki} r^{mj}(\mu) + \frac{1}{6} \bar{h}_c^e r_e^{ijk}(\mu) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_m^k r_c^{ijm}(\mu) + \frac{1}{4} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ij} r^{mnk}(\mu) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{cm}^{ke} r_e^{ijm}(\mu) + \frac{1}{6} \bar{h}_m^e r_{ce}^{ijkm}(\mu) - \frac{1}{4} \bar{h}_{mn}^{kf} r_{cf}^{ijmn}(\mu) + \frac{1}{12} \bar{h}_{cn}^{ef} r_{ef}^{ijkn}(\mu) \\ & + \frac{1}{12} I^{ef} t_{efc}^{ijk}], \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_{ijkl}^{cd} | (\overline{H}_{N,\text{open}}^{(\text{CCSDT})} R_\mu^{(-2)})_C |\Phi\rangle = & \mathcal{A}^{ijkl} \mathcal{A}_{cd} [\frac{1}{12} \bar{h}_{dc}^{le} r_e^{ijk}(\mu) - \frac{1}{4} \bar{h}_{dm}^{lk} r_c^{ijm}(\mu) - \frac{1}{12} I_m^{ijk}(\mu) t_{cd}^{ml} + \frac{1}{4} I_c^{ije}(\mu) t_{ed}^{kl} + \frac{1}{24} \bar{h}_d^e r_{ce}^{ijkl}(\mu) \\ & - \frac{1}{12} \bar{h}_m^i r_{cd}^{mjkl}(\mu) + \frac{1}{16} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ij} r^{mnkl}(\mu) + \frac{1}{96} \bar{h}_{cd}^{ef} r_{ef}^{ijkl}(\mu) + \frac{1}{6} \bar{h}_{dm}^{le} r_{ce}^{ijkm}(\mu) \\ & + \frac{1}{12} I^{ie}(\mu) t_{ecd}^{jkl} + \frac{1}{8} I_e^{ijm}(\mu) t_{cde}^{klm} + \frac{1}{12} I_c^{efk}(\mu) t_{efd}^{ijl}], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where we use the Einstein summation convention over repeated upper and lower indices and $\mathcal{A}^{pq} = \mathcal{A}_{pq} = 1 - (pq)$, $\mathcal{A}^{pqr} = \mathcal{A}^{p/qr} \mathcal{A}^{qr}$, and $\mathcal{A}^{pqrs} = \mathcal{A}^{p/qrs} \mathcal{A}^{qs}$, with $\mathcal{A}^{p/qr} = 1 - (pq) - (pr)$ and $\mathcal{A}^{p/qrs} = 1 - (pq) - (pr) - (ps)$, are index antisymmetrizers. The expressions for the

one-body (\bar{h}_p^q) and two-body (\bar{h}_{pq}^{rs}) components of the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian as well as the additional intermediates entering Eqs. (9) and (10) are provided in Tables I and II. Equations (8)–(10) imply that the diagonalization step of DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-$

$2p$) has computational costs identical to those characterizing DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$), which scale as $n_o^4 n_u^4$ or \mathcal{N}^8 , where n_o (n_u) is the number of occupied (unoccupied) orbitals in $|\Phi\rangle$ and \mathcal{N} is a measure of the system size. However, the overall computational effort associated with the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) approach is considerably higher than that of DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) since in the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) case, one also has to solve the CCSDT equations for the underlying N -electron species, which involve $n_o^3 n_u^5$ steps, as opposed to the much less expensive $n_o^2 n_u^4$ (\mathcal{N}^6) steps of CCSD.

Given the high computational costs of the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) method, we also consider the more practical DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) scheme, in which we adopt the Møller-Plesset (MP) partitioning of the Hamiltonian and, following Ref. 55, incorporate the leading T_3 correlation effects by correcting the T_1 and T_2 clusters obtained with CCSD using the formulas

$$\tilde{T}_1|\Phi\rangle = T_1|\Phi\rangle + D_1^{-1}(V_N\tilde{T}_3)_C|\Phi\rangle \quad (11)$$

and

$$\tilde{T}_2|\Phi\rangle = T_2|\Phi\rangle + D_2^{-1}(H_N\tilde{T}_3)_C|\Phi\rangle, \quad (12)$$

where D_1 and D_2 are the usual MP denominators for singles and doubles and

$$\tilde{T}_3|\Phi\rangle = D_3^{-1}(V_N T_2)_C|\Phi\rangle \quad (13)$$

is the lowest-order approximation to T_3 , with D_3 representing the MP denominator for triples. Once T_1 , \tilde{T}_2 , and \tilde{T}_3 are determined via Eqs. (11)–(13), the resulting CCSD(T)(a) similarity-transformed Hamiltonian, constructed using the recipe described in Ref. 55, is diagonalized in the same way as $\overline{H}_N^{(\text{CCSDT})}$ in DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) with the help of Eqs. (8)–(10). By eliminating the need for performing CCSDT calculations, the most expensive steps of DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) scale as $n_o^4 n_u^4$ rather than $n_o^3 n_u^5$.

To illustrate the performance of the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) and DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) methods, as implemented for nonrelativistic and spin-free scalar-relativistic Hamiltonians in the open-source CCpy package,⁵² we applied them, along with their DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) and DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) counterparts, available in CCpy as well, to the vertical DIPs of the Cl_2 , Br_2 , and HBr molecules. We considered the triplet ground states and low-lying singlet states of the $(\text{Cl}_2)^{2+}$, $(\text{Br}_2)^{2+}$, and $(\text{HBr})^{2+}$ dications, for which accurate experimental data can be found in Refs. 56–58. The equilibrium bond lengths in the ground-state Cl_2 , Br_2 , and HBr molecules were taken from Ref. 59. In setting up and solving the DIP-EOMCC eigenvalue problems for the $(\text{Cl}_2)^{2+}$, $(\text{Br}_2)^{2+}$, and $(\text{HBr})^{2+}$ target species and executing the preceding CC computations for the neutral Cl_2 , Br_2 , and HBr molecules, we used the restricted Hartree-Fock (RHF) orbitals of Cl_2 , Br_2 , and HBr . The relevant RHF reference determinants

and transformed one- and two-electron integrals were generated with the PySCF code,^{60,61} with which CCpy is interfaced. The scalar-relativistic effects included in all of our calculations were handled using the SFX2C-1e spin-free exact two-component approach of Ref. 62, as implemented in PySCF, and the lowest-energy orbitals correlating with the chemical cores of Cl and Br were frozen in post-RHF steps. To obtain insights into the basis set convergence of our results, we performed calculations using the cc-pVTZ and cc-pVQZ bases.^{63–65}

The DIP values corresponding to the ground and low-lying excited states of the $(\text{Cl}_2)^{2+}$, $(\text{Br}_2)^{2+}$, and $(\text{HBr})^{2+}$ dications obtained in our DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$), DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$), DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$), and DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) calculations are reported in Table III. As shown in this table, the vertical DIPs obtained in the DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$)/cc-pVTZ calculations are characterized by small errors relative to experiment, which are 0.04–0.25 eV for Cl_2 , 0.02–0.37 eV for Br_2 , and 0.08–0.12 eV for HBr . This might suggest that the basic DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) approximation provides an accurate description, but drawing such a conclusion would be misleading since the DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) results for Cl_2 and HBr and two of the four DIPs of Br_2 considered in this study substantially worsen when the larger cc-pVQZ basis set is employed. Indeed, the 0.04–0.25 and 0.08–0.12 eV errors obtained with DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$)/cc-pVTZ for Cl_2 and HBr increase to 0.32–0.55 and 0.30–0.31 eV, respectively, when the cc-pVTZ basis is replaced by cc-pVQZ. Similarly, the tiny, 0.06 and 0.02 eV errors, resulting from the DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$)/cc-pVTZ calculations for the $X^3\Sigma_g^-$ and $a^1\Delta_g$ states of $(\text{Br}_2)^{2+}$ increase to 0.15 and 0.19 eV, respectively, when the DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$)/cc-pVQZ approach is used. This deterioration in the performance of the DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) method as we go from cc-pVTZ to cc-pVQZ seems to be a consequence of neglecting the $4h-2p$ component of $R_\mu^{(-2)}$. Indeed, when $R_{\mu,4h-2p}$ is included in $R_\mu^{(-2)}$ via the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) approach, the 0.41–0.62, 0.53–0.87, and 0.24–0.33 eV differences between the DIPs of Cl_2 , Br_2 , and HBr computed with DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$)/cc-pVTZ and their experimental counterparts reduce in the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ calculations to 0.15–0.39, 0.35–0.67, and 0.07–0.11 eV, respectively, curing the nonsystematic behavior of the DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) method with respect to the basis set size, but the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) approach does not necessarily improve the DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) results. On the contrary, the DIP values obtained in the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ calculations for Br_2 are less accurate than their DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$)/cc-pVQZ counterparts, increasing the 0.04–0.19 eV errors in the DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$)/cc-pVQZ data to 0.35–0.67 eV when DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) is replaced by DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$). Generally, most of the DIPs of Cl_2 , Br_2 , and HBr resulting from the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) calculations reported in Table III lie substantially

below the corresponding experimental values. We believe that this behavior of DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) can be attributed to the imbalance between the high-level $4h-2p$ treatment of double ionization and the relatively low-level CCSD description of the neutral species.

The results of our DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) calculations, in which the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian of CCSD is replaced by its CCSDT counterpart, allowing us to treat the N - and $(N - 2)$ -electron species in a more accurate and balanced manner, confirm our belief. In the case of the cc-pVTZ basis set, the description of all DIPs shown in Table III substantially improves when the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) approach is replaced by its higher-level DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) counterpart. The 0.41–0.62, 0.53–0.87, and 0.24–0.33 eV errors relative to experiment characterizing the DIPs of Cl₂, Br₂, and HBr obtained in the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$)/cc-pVTZ computations reduce to 0.17–0.37, 0.33–0.68, and 0.10–0.19 eV, respectively, when the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$)/cc-pVTZ method is employed. With an exception of the $c^1\Sigma_u^-$ state of (Cl₂)²⁺ and three states of (HBr)²⁺ considered in Table III, for which the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ results are already very accurate, we observe similar improvements in the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) data offered by the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) method when using the cc-pVQZ basis set. The 0.31, 0.39, and 0.38 eV differences between the DIPs of Cl₂ associated with the $X^3\Sigma_g^-$, $a^1\Delta_g$, and $b^1\Sigma_g^+$ states of (Cl₂)²⁺ and their experimentally determined counterparts obtained with the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ approach reduce in the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) calculations using the same basis set to 0.00, 0.08, and 0.07 eV, respectively. The 0.41, 0.35, and 0.48 eV errors relative to experiment obtained for the analogous three states of (Br₂)²⁺ with DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ reduce to 0.16, 0.10, and 0.24 eV, respectively, when we use DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ. The DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ calculations for the $c^1\Sigma_u^-$ state of (Br₂)²⁺ are not as accurate, but the 0.43 eV error for the corresponding DIP obtained with the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ approach is significantly lower than the 0.67 eV error for the same state produced by DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ. As shown in Table III, in analogy to DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$), the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) method also cures the nonsystematic behavior of DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) with respect to the basis set size, reducing the 0.17–0.37, 0.33–0.68, and 0.10–0.19 eV errors relative to experiment characterizing the DIPs of Cl₂, Br₂, and HBr obtained using DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$)/cc-pVTZ to 0.00–0.14, 0.10–0.43, and 0.07–0.09 eV, respectively, when the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ approach is employed. We conclude by pointing out that the DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) method, which offers significant savings in the computational effort compared to full DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$), reproduces the DIPs of Cl₂, Br₂, and HBr considered in Table III resulting from the parent DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) calcula-

tions to within 0.02 eV. While we will continue testing the DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) approach against the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) and other high-accuracy data, its excellent performance in Table III is encouraging.

In summary, we presented the fully factorized and programmable equations defining the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) approach and the perturbative approximation to it abbreviated as DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$). We incorporated the resulting computer codes, which can work with nonrelativistic and spin-free scalar-relativistic Hamiltonians, into the open-source CCpy package available on GitHub. We applied the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) and DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) methods and their DIP-EOMCCSD($3h-1p$) and DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) predecessors to the vertical DIPs of the Cl₂, Br₂, and HBr molecules, as described by the cc-pVTZ and cc-pVQZ basis sets, using the spin-free two-component SFX2C-1e treatment of the scalar-relativistic effects. We demonstrated that with the exception of the higher-lying $c^1\Sigma_u^-$ state of (Br₂)²⁺, the DIP values computed with DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$)/cc-pVQZ are not only in generally good agreement with the available experimental data, but also more accurate than those obtained with the cc-pVTZ basis and the DIP-EOMCCSD($4h-2p$) predecessor of DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$), which uses CCSD instead of CCSDT to construct the underlying similarity-transformed Hamiltonian. The DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)($4h-2p$) method, which avoids the most expensive steps of DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$), turned out to be similarly effective, recovering the vertical DIPs of Cl₂, Br₂, and HBr obtained with its DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) parent to within 0.02 eV. Our future plans include the development of nonperturbative ways of reducing costs of the DIP-EOMCCSDT($4h-2p$) calculations through the active-space treatments of CCSDT^{66–68} and $4h-2p$ amplitudes^{35,36} and the use of frozen natural orbitals, combined with Cholesky decomposition and density fitting techniques, which will also be useful in improving our description of relativistic effects following the four-component methodology of Ref. 69.

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). A.K.D. acknowledges support from SERB-India under the CRG (Project No. CRG/2022/005672) and MATRICS (Project No. MTR/2021/000420) schemes. We thank Dr. Jun Shen for inspecting Eqs. (8)–(10).

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are available within the article.

REFERENCES

- ¹F. Coester, Nucl. Phys. **7**, 421 (1958).
- ²F. Coester and H. Kümmel, Nucl. Phys. **17**, 477 (1960).
- ³J. Čížek, J. Chem. Phys. **45**, 4256 (1966).
- ⁴J. Čížek, Adv. Chem. Phys. **14**, 35 (1969).
- ⁵J. Paldus, J. Čížek, and I. Shavitt, Phys. Rev. A **5**, 50 (1972).
- ⁶K. Emrich, Nucl. Phys. A **351**, 379 (1981).
- ⁷K. Emrich, Nucl. Phys. A **351**, 397 (1981).
- ⁸J. Geertsen, M. Rittby, and R. J. Bartlett, Chem. Phys. Lett. **164**, 57 (1989).
- ⁹D. C. Comeau and R. J. Bartlett, Chem. Phys. Lett. **207**, 414 (1993).
- ¹⁰J. F. Stanton and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **98**, 7029 (1993).
- ¹¹M. Nooijen and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **102**, 3629 (1995).
- ¹²M. Nooijen and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **102**, 6735 (1995).
- ¹³S. Hirata, M. Nooijen, and R. J. Bartlett, Chem. Phys. Lett. **328**, 459 (2000).
- ¹⁴M. Musiał and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **119**, 1901 (2003).
- ¹⁵J. R. Gour, P. Piecuch, and M. Wloch, J. Chem. Phys. **123**, 134113 (2005).
- ¹⁶J. R. Gour, P. Piecuch, and M. Wloch, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **106**, 2854 (2006).
- ¹⁷J. R. Gour and P. Piecuch, J. Chem. Phys. **125**, 234107 (2006).
- ¹⁸M. Nooijen and J. G. Snijders, Int. J. Quantum Chem. Symp. **26**, 55 (1992).
- ¹⁹M. Nooijen and J. G. Snijders, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **48**, 15 (1993).
- ²⁰J. F. Stanton and J. Gauss, J. Chem. Phys. **101**, 8938 (1994).
- ²¹R. J. Bartlett and J. F. Stanton, in *Reviews in Computational Chemistry*, Vol. 5, edited by K. B. Lipkowitz and D. B. Boyd (VCH Publishers, New York, 1994) pp. 65–169.
- ²²M. Musiał, S. A. Kucharski, and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 1128 (2003).
- ²³M. Musiał and R. J. Bartlett, Chem. Phys. Lett. **384**, 210 (2004).
- ²⁴Y. J. Bomble, J. C. Saeh, J. F. Stanton, P. G. Szalay, M. Kállay, and J. Gauss, J. Chem. Phys. **122**, 154107 (2005).
- ²⁵M. Kamiya and S. Hirata, J. Chem. Phys. **125**, 074111 (2006).
- ²⁶M. Nooijen and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 6441 (1997).
- ²⁷M. Nooijen and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **107**, 6812 (1997).
- ²⁸M. Władysławski and M. Nooijen, in *Low-Lying Potential Energy Surfaces*, ACS Symposium Series, Vol. 828, edited by M. R. Hoffmann and K. G. Dyall (American Chemical Society, Washington, D.C., 2002) pp. 65–92.
- ²⁹M. Nooijen, Int. J. Mol. Sci. **3**, 656 (2002).
- ³⁰K. W. Sattelmeyer, H. F. Schaefer, III, and J. F. Stanton, Chem. Phys. Lett. **378**, 42 (2003).
- ³¹M. Musiał, A. Perera, and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **134**, 114108 (2011).
- ³²M. Musiał, S. A. Kucharski, and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **7**, 3088 (2011).
- ³³T. Kuś and A. I. Krylov, J. Chem. Phys. **135**, 084109 (2011).
- ³⁴T. Kuś and A. I. Krylov, J. Chem. Phys. **136**, 244109 (2012).
- ³⁵J. Shen and P. Piecuch, J. Chem. Phys. **138**, 194102 (2013).
- ³⁶J. Shen and P. Piecuch, Mol. Phys. **112**, 868 (2014).
- ³⁷A. O. Ajala, J. Shen, and P. Piecuch, J. Phys. Chem. A **121**, 3469 (2017).
- ³⁸J. Shen and P. Piecuch, Mol. Phys. **119**, e1966534 (2021).
- ³⁹S. Gulania, E. F. Kjønstad, J. F. Stanton, H. Koch, and A. I. Krylov, J. Chem. Phys. **154**, 114115 (2021).
- ⁴⁰M. Musiał, M. Olszówka, D. I. Lyakh, and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **137**, 174102 (2012).
- ⁴¹A. Ghosh, N. Valal, and S. Pal, Chem. Phys. **482**, 160 (2017).
- ⁴²W. Skomorowski and A. I. Krylov, J. Chem. Phys. **154**, 084124 (2021).
- ⁴³W. Skomorowski and A. I. Krylov, J. Chem. Phys. **154**, 084125 (2021).
- ⁴⁴N. K. Jayadev, A. Ferino-Pérez, F. Matz, A. I. Krylov, and T.-C. Jagau, J. Chem. Phys. **158**, 064109 (2023).
- ⁴⁵J. Stamm, S. S. Priyadarsini, S. Sandhu, A. Chakraborty, J. Shen, S. Kwon, J. Sandhu, C. Wicka, A. Mehmood, B. G. Levine, P. Piecuch, and M. Dantus, Nat. Commun. **XX**, XXXXX (2024), in press.
- ⁴⁶G. D. Purvis, III and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **76**, 1910 (1982).
- ⁴⁷J. M. Cullen and M. C. Zerner, J. Chem. Phys. **77**, 4088 (1982).
- ⁴⁸G. E. Scuseria, A. C. Scheiner, T. J. Lee, J. E. Rice, and H. F. Schaefer, III, J. Chem. Phys. **86**, 2881 (1987).
- ⁴⁹P. Piecuch and J. Paldus, Int. J. Quantum Chem. **36**, 429 (1989).
- ⁵⁰J. Noga and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **86**, 7041 (1987), **89**, 3401 (1988) [Erratum].
- ⁵¹G. E. Scuseria and H. F. Schaefer, III, Chem. Phys. Lett. **152**, 382 (1988).
- ⁵²K. Gururangan and P. Piecuch, “CCpy: A Coupled-Cluster Package Written in Python,” see <https://github.com/piecuch-group/ccpy>.
- ⁵³K. Hirao and H. Nakatsuji, J. Comput. Phys. **45**, 246 (1982).
- ⁵⁴E. R. Davidson, J. Comput. Phys. **17**, 87 (1975).
- ⁵⁵D. A. Matthews and J. F. Stanton, J. Chem. Phys. **145**, 124102 (2016).
- ⁵⁶A. G. McConkey, G. Dawber, L. Avaldi, M. A. MacDonald, G. C. King, and R. I. Hall, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **27**, 271 (1994).
- ⁵⁷T. Fleig, D. Edvardsson, S. T. Banks, and J. H. Eland, Chem. Phys. **343**, 270 (2008).
- ⁵⁸J. H. Eland, Chem. Phys. **294**, 171 (2003).
- ⁵⁹K. P. Huber and G. Herzberg, *Molecular Spectra and Molecular Structure: Constants of Diatomic Molecules* (Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1979).
- ⁶⁰Q. Sun, T. C. Berkelbach, N. S. Blunt, G. H. Booth, S. Guo, Z. Li, J. Liu, J. D. McClain, E. R. Sayfutyarova, S. Sharma, S. Wouters, and G. K.-L. Chan, WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci. **8**, e1340 (2018).
- ⁶¹Q. Sun, X. Zhang, S. Banerjee, P. Bao, M. Barbry, N. S. Blunt, N. A. Bogdanov, G. H. Booth, J. Chen, Z.-H. Cui, J. J. Eriksen, Y. Gao, S. Guo, J. Hermann, M. R. Hermes, K. Koh, P. Koval, S. Lehtola, Z. Li, J. Liu, N. Mardirossian, J. D. McClain, M. Motta, B. Mussard, H. Q. Pham, A. Pulkin, W. Purwanto, P. J. Robinson, E. Ronca, E. R. Sayfutyarova, M. Scheurer, H. F. Schurkus, J. E. T. Smith, C. Sun, S.-N. Sun, S. Upadhyay, L. K. Wagner, X. Wang, A. White, J. D. Whitfield, M. J. Williamson, S. Wouters, J. Yang, J. M. Yu, T. Zhu, T. C. Berkelbach, S. Sharma, A. Y. Sokolov, and G. K.-L. Chan, J. Chem. Phys. **153**, 024109 (2020).
- ⁶²L. Cheng and J. Gauss, J. Chem. Phys. **135**, 084114 (2011).
- ⁶³T. H. Dunning, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **90**, 1007 (1989).
- ⁶⁴D. E. Woon and T. H. Dunning, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **98**, 1358 (1993).
- ⁶⁵A. K. Wilson, D. E. Woon, K. A. Peterson, and T. H. Dunning, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **110**, 7667 (1999).
- ⁶⁶N. Oliphant and L. Adamowicz, J. Chem. Phys. **96**, 3739 (1992).
- ⁶⁷P. Piecuch, N. Oliphant, and L. Adamowicz, J. Chem. Phys. **99**, 1875 (1993).
- ⁶⁸P. Piecuch, S. A. Kucharski, and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **110**, 6103 (1999).
- ⁶⁹K. Surjuse, S. Chamoli, M. K. Nayak, and A. K. Dutta, J. Chem. Phys. **157**, 204106 (2022).

TABLE I. The one- and two-body components of the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian expressed in terms of the one-, two-, and three-body cluster amplitudes, t_a^i , t_{ab}^{ij} , and t_{abc}^{ijk} , respectively, and matrix elements of the Fock and two-electron interaction operators, denoted as $f_p^q \equiv \langle p|f|q \rangle$ and $v_{pq}^{rs} \equiv \langle pq|v|rs \rangle - \langle pq|v|sr \rangle$. In the case of the DIP-EOMCCSDT(4h-2p) method, the t_a^i , t_{ab}^{ij} , and t_{abc}^{ijk} values are obtained with CCSDT. In the case of the DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)(4h-2p) approach, they are replaced by their \tilde{t}_a^i , \tilde{t}_{ab}^{ij} , and \tilde{t}_{abc}^{ijk} counterparts corresponding to the \tilde{T}_1 , \tilde{T}_2 , and \tilde{T}_3 operators defined by Eqs. (11)–(13).

Component of \overline{H}_N	Expression ^a
\bar{h}_m^e	$f_m^e + v_{im}^{ae} t_e^m$
\bar{h}_j^i	$f_j^i + \bar{h}_j^e t_e^i + v_{jm}^{ie} t_e^m + \frac{1}{2} v_{jn}^{ef} t_{ef}^{in}$
\bar{h}_a^b	$f_a^b - \bar{h}_m^b t_a^m + v_{am}^{be} t_e^m - \frac{1}{2} v_{mn}^{bf} t_{af}^{mn}$
\bar{h}_{mn}^{ef}	v_{mn}^{ef}
\bar{h}_{am}^{ef}	$v_{am}^{ef} - v_{mn}^{fe} t_a^m$
\bar{h}_{mn}^{ie}	$v_{mn}^{ie} + v_{mf}^{fe} t_f^i$
\bar{h}_{ab}^{ef}	$v_{ab}^{ef} + \frac{1}{2} v_{mn}^{ef} \tau_{ab}^{mn} - \mathcal{A}_{ab} v_{am}^{ef} t_b^m$
\bar{h}_{mn}^{ij}	$v_{mn}^{ij} + \frac{1}{2} v_{mn}^{ef} \tau_{ef}^{ij} + \mathcal{A}^{ij} v_{nm}^{je} t_e^i$
\bar{h}_{am}^{ie}	$v_{am}^{ie} + v_{am}^{fe} t_f^i - \bar{h}_{nm}^{ie} t_a^m + v_{mn}^{ef} t_{af}^{in}$
\bar{h}_{am}^{ij}	$v_{am}^{ij} + \bar{h}_m^e t_{ae}^{ij} - \bar{h}_{nm}^{ij} t_a^m + \frac{1}{2} v_{am}^{ef} t_{ef}^{ij} + \mathcal{A}^{ij} (\bar{h}_{mn}^{jf} t_{af}^{in} + \chi_{am}^{ie} t_e^m) + v_{mn}^{ef} t_{ae}^{ijn}$
\bar{h}_{ab}^{ie}	$v_{ab}^{ie} - \bar{h}_m^e t_{ab}^{im} + v_{ab}^{ef} t_f^i + \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ie} t_{ab}^{mn} - \mathcal{A}_{ab} (\chi_{am}^{ie} t_b^m - v_{bn}^{ef} t_{af}^{in}) - v_{mn}^{ef} t_{abf}^{imn}$
χ_{am}^{ie}	$v_{am}^{ie} + \frac{1}{2} v_{am}^{ef} t_e^i$
χ_{am}^{ie}	$\bar{h}_{am}^{ie} + \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{nm}^{ie} t_a^m$
τ_{ab}^{ij}	$t_{ab}^{ij} + \mathcal{A}^{ij} t_a^i t_b^j$

^a In each expression, summation is carried out over repeated upper and lower indices.

TABLE II. The intermediates entering Eqs. (9) and (10) that are introduced in order to evaluate the contributions to the DIP-EOMCCSDT(4h-2p) and DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)(4h-2p) equations due to the three- and four-body components of the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian.

Intermediate	Expression ^a
$I^{ie}(\mu)$	$\frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ie} r^{mn}(\mu) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{mn}^{fe} r^{inm}(\mu)$
$I^{ie}(\mu)^b$	$\frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ie} r^{mn}(\mu) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{mn}^{fe} r^{inm}(\mu) - \bar{h}_m^e r^{im}(\mu)$
$I^{ef}(\mu)$	$\frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ef} r^{mn}(\mu)$
$I_m^{ijk}(\mu)$	$\mathcal{A}^{ijk} [\frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{nm}^{ke} r_e^{ijm}(\mu) - \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{nm}^{ik} r^{nj}(\mu) + \frac{1}{12} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ef} r_{ef}^{ijkn}(\mu)]$
$I_c^{ije}(\mu)$	$\bar{h}_{cm}^{fe} r_e^{ijm}(\mu) + \frac{1}{2} I^{fe}(\mu) t_{cf}^{ij} + \mathcal{A}^{ij} [\bar{h}_{cm}^{ie} r^{mj}(\mu) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{nm}^{ie} r^{njm}(\mu)] - \frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ef} r_{cf}^{ijmn}(\mu)$
$I_e^{ijm}(\mu)^c$	$\bar{h}_{mn}^{ef} r_f^{ijn}(\mu) - \mathcal{A}^{ij} \bar{h}_{nm}^{je} r^{in}(\mu)$
$I_c^{efk}(\mu)^d$	$\frac{1}{2} \bar{h}_{mn}^{ef} r_c^{mnk}(\mu) + \bar{h}_{cm}^{ef} r^{km}(\mu)$

^a In each expression, summation is carried out over repeated upper and lower indices.

^b In the expression for $I^{ie}(\mu)$ used in DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)(4h-2p), \bar{h}_{mn}^{ie} and \bar{h}_m^e are replaced by v_{mn}^{ie} and f_m^e , respectively.

^c In the expression for $I_e^{ijm}(\mu)$ used in DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)(4h-2p), \bar{h}_{mn}^{je} is replaced by v_{mn}^{je} .

^d In the expression for $I_c^{efk}(\mu)$ used in DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)(4h-2p), \bar{h}_{cm}^{ef} is replaced by v_{cm}^{ef} .

TABLE III. The vertical DIP energies, in eV, of Cl₂, Br₂, and HBr corresponding to the experimental data reported in Refs. 56–58 obtained in the DIP-EOMCCSD(3*h*-1*p*), DIP-EOMCCSD(4*h*-2*p*), DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)(4*h*-2*p*), and DIP-EOMCCSDT(4*h*-2*p*) calculations using the cc-pVTZ and cc-pVQZ basis sets. Scalar-relativistic effects were incorporated using the SFX2C-1e methodology of Ref. 62. All DIP-EOMCC calculations used the RHF orbitals of the respective neutral diatomics and the frozen-core approximation was assumed in all post-RHF steps.

Molecule	Dication State	CCSD(3 <i>h</i> -1 <i>p</i>) ^a		CCSD(4 <i>h</i> -2 <i>p</i>) ^b		CCSD(T)(a)(4 <i>h</i> -2 <i>p</i>) ^c		CCSDT(4 <i>h</i> -2 <i>p</i>) ^d		Experiment ^e
		TZ	QZ	TZ	QZ	TZ	QZ	TZ	QZ	
Cl ₂ ^f	<i>X</i> ³ Σ _g ⁻	31.28	31.57	30.58	30.82	30.82	31.12	30.84	31.13	31.13
	<i>a</i> ¹ Δ _g	31.78	32.06	31.12	31.35	31.36	31.64	31.37	31.66	31.74
	<i>b</i> ¹ Σ _g ⁺	32.16	32.45	31.51	31.74	31.74	32.03	31.76	32.05	32.12
	<i>c</i> ¹ Σ _u ⁻	33.22	33.52	32.56	32.82	32.79	33.09	32.80	33.11	32.97
Br ₂ ^g	<i>X</i> ³ Σ _g ⁻	28.47	28.68	27.92	28.12	28.12	28.35	28.13	28.37	28.53
	<i>a</i> ¹ Δ _g	28.89	29.10	28.38	28.56	28.57	28.79	28.58	28.81	28.91
	<i>b</i> ¹ Σ _g ⁺	29.21	29.42	28.71	28.90	28.90	29.13	28.91	29.14	29.38
	<i>c</i> ¹ Σ _u ⁻	29.93	30.16	29.43	29.63	29.61	29.85	29.62	29.87	30.3
HBr ^h	<i>X</i> ³ Σ _g ⁻	32.70	32.93	32.29	32.51	32.42	32.67	32.43	32.69	32.62
	<i>a</i> ¹ Δ	34.06	34.25	33.69	33.86	33.82	34.02	33.83	34.04	33.95
	<i>b</i> ¹ Σ _g ⁺	35.31	35.50	34.95	35.12	35.07	35.27	35.09	35.28	35.19

^a The DIP-EOMCCSD(3*h*-1*p*) approach.

^b The DIP-EOMCCSD(4*h*-2*p*) approach.

^c The DIP-EOMCCSD(T)(a)(4*h*-2*p*) approach.

^d The DIP-EOMCCSDT(4*h*-2*p*) approach.

^e The experimentally determined DIP values taken from Ref. 56 for Cl₂, Ref. 57 for Br₂, and Ref. 58 for HBr.

^f The equilibrium Cl–Cl bond length in the ground-state Cl₂, taken from Ref. 59, is 1.987 Å.

^g The equilibrium Br–Br bond length in the ground-state Br₂, taken from Ref. 59, is 2.281 Å.

^h The equilibrium H–Br bond length in the ground-state HBr, taken from Ref. 59, is 1.414 Å.