

# Accurate determination of excitation energy: An equation-of-motion approach over a bi-exponential Coupled Cluster theory

Anish Chakraborty,<sup>1</sup> Pradipta Kumar Samanta,<sup>2</sup> and Rahul Maitra<sup>1, a)</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Chemistry, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Powai, Mumbai 400076, India*

<sup>2</sup>*Max Planck Institute for Solid State Research, D-70569 Stuttgart, Germany*

The calculation of molecular excited states is critically important to decipher a plethora of molecular properties. In this manuscript, we develop an equation of motion formalism on top of a bi-exponentially parametrized ground state wavefunction towards the determination of excited states. While the ground state bi-exponential parametrization ensures an accurate description of the wavefunction through the inclusion of high-rank correlation effects, the excited state is parametrized by a novel linear response operator with an effective excitation rank beyond two. To treat the ground and the excited states in the same footings, in addition to the conventional one and two-body response operators, we introduced certain two-body "generalized" response operators with an effective excitation rank of one. We introduce a projective formulation towards the determination of the perturbed amplitudes for the set of "generalized" operators. Our formulation entails a significantly small number of unknown parameters and is shown to be highly accurate compared to allied methods for several difficult chemical systems.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Molecular properties play a pivotal role in understanding the nature of the chemical systems. These properties are commonly obtained by observing the response of chemical systems by an external field as a perturbation. Over the last few decades, several quantum chemical-based methods have been formulated to calculate the molecular energetics as well as the molecular properties in an effective manner to understand complicated chemical systems. Since its inception, Coupled Cluster (CC)<sup>1-4</sup> being a powerful tool for electronic structure correlation calculations, it is worthwhile to explore the efficacy of CC-based methods in calculating the molecular properties.

Calculation of the excited states is not always straightforward and one may often face difficulties that originate from the inadequate inclusion of ground-state correlation effects. Insufficient inclusion of these effects renders a deficient description of the excited states and hence, a balanced inclusion of the ground state correlation is important. Within the single reference (SR) framework with SD excitations, the desired precision of the ground state wavefunction is often not achievable. One also needs to account for the orbital relaxation effects which are not properly accounted for in many theories. In general, for the calculations of first-order molecular property i.e. excitation energy, one may resort to two approaches as follows:

1. The first approach involves the calculation of absolute energies of all relevant excited states and subsequently determining the excitation energies as the energy differences between these states and the correlated ground state.
2. The second approach entails the direct determination of excitation energy without explicitly determining the relevant excited state energies.

However, it is our contention that theories falling within the former category suffer from the insufficient treatment of orbital relaxation effects. Methods like multi-reference configuration interaction (MRCI)<sup>5</sup> or complete active space second-order perturbation theory (CASPT2)<sup>6</sup> represent prominent examples of the first category. While these methods are capable of handling the multi-reference static correlation in an accurate manner, often exhibit limitations in terms of accuracy in calculating dynamical correlation. In the context of this manuscript, our primary focus will be on the methods that fall in the second category. These methods aim to directly determine the excitation energy spectrum, which has been an active area of research over the past couple of decades. This particular approach treats the ground and excited states on equal footing stemming the possibility of expressing the concerned excited states in terms of the ground state. This makes the calculation of energy difference feasible by canceling out the common correlation terms. The working principle of this scheme can be realized in a couple of ways i.e. either through time-dependent Linear Response (LR) formulation where excitation energy is calculated from pole structure or through factorized ansatz, where the correlation effects are taken care of by the excited waveoperators. At the juncture of these two schemes, Malrieu *et al.* developed a configuration interaction (CI) based methodology known as difference dedicated CI (DD-CI)<sup>7,8</sup> which entails the construction of an effective Hamiltonian to determine the excitation energy in an efficient manner. One may note that, in the context of SRCC theory, there are several other methods that encapsulate the idea pertaining to the second scheme. Mukherjee *et al.*<sup>9</sup> invoked a time-dependent formulation to construct CC based linear response methodology to calculate spectroscopic properties. Along the same line, Monkhorst<sup>10</sup> and Dalgaard<sup>11</sup> introduced a time-dependent CC approach to calculate dynamic response properties. Later on, Christiansen *et al.*<sup>12</sup> applied Fourier component variational perturbation theory for calculating the response functions. Also, a similar development was carried out by Koch and Jorgensen.<sup>13</sup> Nakatsuji's formulation of symmetry-adapted cluster expansion based configuration

<sup>a)</sup>Electronic mail: r.maitra@chem.iitb.ac.in

interaction (SAC-CI)<sup>14,15</sup> towards the calculation of excited states is one important landmark in this avenue. Along a similar philosophy, Bartlett *et al.* introduced equation-of-motion CC (EOM-CC)<sup>16–19</sup> towards the calculation of excited state properties that have been extremely successful and widely used over the years. It has been extensively observed that EOM-CCSD captures singly dominated excited states with a high degree of precision, while often facing difficulties when the excited state is dominated by double excitations or the ground state is prone to degeneracy. One may invoke higher-rank dynamical correlation effects in both ground and excited states to circumvent the problem. The EOM formulation with CCSDT<sup>20,21</sup> and CCSDt<sup>22,23</sup> takes care of the high-rank correlation effects in both ground and excited states, although they suffer from an elevated computational cost of iterative ( $O(n^8)$ ) with a large number of unknown parameters ( $O(n_o^3 n_v^3)$ ). However, one may make judicious approximations towards an economical inclusion of high-rank excitations as done in several methods like EOM-CCSDT-n<sup>24,25</sup>, EOM-CCSD(T)<sup>24</sup>, EOM-CCSD( $\tilde{T}$ )<sup>25</sup>, EOM-CCSD(T')<sup>25</sup> and CCSDR(3)<sup>26</sup>. Piecuch and co-workers introduced left-eigenstate completely renormalized equation-of-motion coupled cluster singles, doubles, and non-iterative triples (CR-EOMCCSD(2,3)),<sup>27</sup> and its variants, known as  $\delta$ -CR-EOMCC(2,3).<sup>28,29</sup> through the calculation of the tri-excited moment of EOM-CCSD. Both of these methods have been extremely successful in studying the excited states which are dominated by double excitations. CC3<sup>30–32</sup> methods have also been widely used as an accurate tool to calculate excitation energy as they incorporate the effects of connected triples. Krylov<sup>33,34</sup> developed a spin-flip formulation of the EOM to extend the applicability towards the treatment of open-shell systems starting from a single reference state. There are several methods that employ similarity transformation to determine the quantities of spectroscopic interests like IP, EA, and EE. These methods rely on the solution of the ground state CC theory where the h-p and 2h-2p blocks of the effective Hamiltonian  $e^{-T} H e^T$  are iterated to zero. With the converged solution of the ground state wavefunction, one introduces a normal ordered exponential  $\{e^S\}$  where  $S$  is the two-body operator with an effective hole-particle (hhhp or hppp) rank of one. The Fock Space CC theory (FSCC)<sup>35–52</sup> introduces a second similarity transformation  $G = \{e^s\}^{-1} H e^S$  where each sub-block of  $G$  corresponds to a definite excitation level and can be diagonalized separately. This amounts to the fact that the single excitation can be decoupled from double excitation. Following the notion of FSCC formalism, Nooijen proposed another methodology based on the similarity transformation of Hamiltonian for the determination of the excited state, known as Similarity Transformed EOM (STEOM)<sup>53–55</sup>. The STEOM approach introduces a set of active orbitals where the entire diagonalization procedure is cast as an eigenvalue problem within the active sub-block. Note that, apart from the contribution of the connected triple excitations, STEOM also possesses an implicit contribution from the “disconnected” triples, and this is later verified by Meissner and Bartlett via the dressing of the EOM-CC matrix to incorporate the effects of triple excitations.<sup>56,57</sup> This compact diagonalization over a subspace enables STEOM to serve the

dual purpose of high efficiency and low computational overhead. It is worthwhile to mention here that Mukherjee *et al.* had shown that there is rigorous consanguinity between FSCC and IP/EA-EOM with STEOM<sup>58,59</sup>. A very interesting observation is that the solution of the ground state  $t$ -amplitudes and the  $s$ -amplitudes for the excited states are decoupled. An alternate approach can be introduced to solve a ground state with the inclusion of high-rank correlation through a coupled solution of  $s$ - and  $t$ - amplitudes. Such a strategy has been developed by the present authors via a bi-exponential parameterized wavefunction ansatz and it has been extremely successful in solving the ground state energetics of weakly to moderately strong correlated systems. The resulting method is termed as iterative n-body excitation inclusive CC (*iCCSDn*)<sup>60–62</sup>. One may ask a pertinent question: if the ground state is solved through the coupled set of equations between  $s$ - and  $t$ - amplitudes, whether one can determine the excited state with an equivalent parametrization. In this work, towards the determination of the excited states, we employ the same set of operators, akin to the ground state, within the EOM-CC framework where the linear response operator includes the effective triple excitations through a connected action over a certain *contractible set of orbitals (CSO)* between two low-rank operators. The expansion of the rank-three response operator thus constructed is chosen to be of overall first order. The contracted composite hole-particle structure of the response operator provide an ideal platform to formulate the theory with what may look like an EOM-CCSDT; however, instead of computing the perturbed  $T_3$  amplitudes which are ( $O(n_o^3 n_v^3)$ ), we invoke a perturbative expansion coupled with suitable decoupling conditions that lead us to bypass the redundancy towards the determination of perturbed  $s$  and  $t$  amplitudes which enter into the response vector. A similar approach was recently introduced by the present authors<sup>63</sup> where such parameter redundancy was bypassed with a bi-variational approach; however, we now extend our methodology towards the treatment of excited states where the coupling between the perturbed and the ground state vectors make it theoretically challenging. We will refer to our methodology as EOM-iCCSDn.

In the subsequent sections, we first go through some of the key attributes of the ground-state iCCSDn methodology. This will be followed by the formal development of EOM-iCCSDn where we will first cast the set of equations involving non-commuting operators in terms of commuting composite operators. We will then delineate our theoretical foundation to determine the perturbed amplitudes via the construction of a set of projection equations, followed by a physically motivated sufficiency condition. Towards the end of this section, we will also present the structure of the working equations and explain the terms that enter into it. Finally, we will present a series of numerical applications to benchmark the efficacy of our proposed methodology and will compare the results against some of the robust and state-of-the-art methods.

## II. THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

### A. A brief theoretical account of the ground state formulation:

In the iCCSDn theory, the effect of high-rank dynamical correlation is included via low-rank waveoperator ansatz and towards this, one introduces a set of *scattering operators*,  $S$  along with the standard cluster operators  $T$ . The scattering operators have two components: an excitation component from occupied (hole) orbitals to the unoccupied (virtual) orbitals and the other vertex contains scattering in either occupied or virtual space. The scattering vertex contains a single (quasi-) hole or (quasi-) particle type one-electron state destruction operator and that divides  $S$  into two parts i.e.  $S_h$  (with quasi-hole destruction operator) and  $S_p$  (with quasi-particle destruction operator), respectively. For instance, for a  $S_h$  operator labeled by the Hartree-Fock (HF) occupied orbitals  $i, j$  and  $m$  and virtual orbital  $a$  with the associated normal ordered (with respect to HF vacuum) operator string  $\{a^\dagger m^\dagger ji\}$  acts non-trivially on those selected set of determinants in which  $i$  and  $j$  are occupied while  $a$  and  $m$  are unoccupied. Similar analysis maybe done for the  $S_p$  operators as well. In that sense, each component of the  $S = S_h + S_p$  operators and their algebraic expressions are given as:

$$S_h = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{amij} s_{ij}^{am} \{a^\dagger m^\dagger ji\} \quad (1)$$

and

$$S_p = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{abie} s_{ie}^{ab} \{a^\dagger b^\dagger ei\} \quad (2)$$

Here,  $a, b, c, \dots, e, \dots$  etc. denote the set of particle orbitals and  $i, j, k, \dots, m, \dots$  etc. are the set of hole orbitals with respect to the HF vacuum. Note that, in the definition of  $S_h$  and  $S_p$ , ‘ $m$ ’ and ‘ $e$ ’ respectively, appear as quasi-hole and quasi-particle destruction operator and together, they will be said to form the CSO. We will demonstrate later that the accuracy of our results are somewhat sensitive to the dimensions of CSO. Note that due to the built-in projector in the definition of  $S$ , its action on HF reference is trivially zero. This may be referred to as the vacuum annihilating condition (VAC):  $S_h|\Phi\rangle = 0$ ;  $S_p|\Phi\rangle = 0$ . It is important to note here that the effect of higher-order excitations is subsumed by the selective action of  $S$  operators on doubly excited functions, which is realized via the contraction between  $S$  and  $T_2$  operators.

The destruction operator in  $S$  restricts them from commuting with the cluster operators,  $T$ , with which it shares at least one orbital index of CSO. Also, the various components of  $S$  do not commute among themselves. Additionally, the projector ensures that the operator acts non-trivially on selected excited determinants that are generated by the preceding action of a  $T$  operator. These cluster operators contain at least one orbital index of CSO and hence they are non-commutative with those  $S$  and this non-commutativity is the key to the genesis of the triply excited determinants which is conceptualized

to be generated by the action of the  $S$  operator on the doubly excited functions.

With the introduction of the scattering operators, one may write the waveoperator as a product of two separate exponential operators as:

$$\Omega = \{e^s\}e^T \quad (3)$$

For the details of the genesis of this particular waveoperator form, we refer to our earlier works<sup>60,62</sup> in this context.

In Eq. 3,  $\{\dots\}$  denotes the normal ordering with respect to HF reference which prevents the  $S-S$  contraction, resulting in a naturally truncating effective Hamiltonian (*vide infra*). Note that the cluster operator  $T$  consists of one and two-body operators ( $T = T_1 + T_2$ ) and thus in the iCCSDn theory, one mimics the connected higher body correlation effects by restricting oneself to one and two-body parametrization.

On an operational level, for the many-body implementation of the double exponential iCCSDn theory, the solutions for the optimized  $s-$  and  $t-$  amplitudes (corresponding to  $S$  and  $T$  operators, respectively) are determined in a coupled manner by working entirely in the operator space. Note that, due to the non-triviality of the similarity transformation of normal ordered operator, one can define the first similarity transformed effective Hamiltonian,  $W$  such that

$$\{e^S\}W = H\{e^S\} \quad (4)$$

is satisfied. Since the inverse operation of a normal ordered ansatz is not explicitly defined, one may determine  $W$  with a recursive substitution technique<sup>60</sup>. The resulting structure of  $W$  then takes the form:

$$W = \{He^S\} - \{(e^S - 1)He^S\} + \{(e^S - 1)(e^S - 1)He^S\} - \dots \quad (5)$$

Where  $W$  is an effective many-body operator and various truncation schemes upon this will give rise to certain approximations. Note that, in our scheme, we will truncate  $W$  after the second term on the right hand side of Eq.5. It is important to emphasize here that, irrespective of the truncation scheme, there is at least one destruction operator arising out of the contraction between the Hamiltonian and  $S$  from the right. Now, after this judicious truncation upon  $W$ , one can carry out the second similarity transformation on top of it resulting in the construction of effective Hamiltonian,  $R = e^{-T}We^T$ . Through the many-body expansion of this double similarity transformed Hamiltonian,  $R$  can be written as:

$$R = r_0 + r_p^q \{E_q^p\} + \frac{1}{4} r_{pq}^{st} \{E_{st}^{pq}\} + \frac{1}{36} r_{pqst}^{uv} \{E_{tuv}^{pqst}\} + \dots \quad (6)$$

where  $p, q, r, s, \dots$  are general (hole or particle) orbital indices. Clearly, the above many-body expansion contains all  $N$ -body terms with all possible hole-particle scattering structures. Following Nooijen<sup>64</sup>, the corresponding  $t-$  and  $s-$  amplitudes are obtained by demanding the associated amplitudes vanish:

$$r_i^a = r_{ij}^{ab} = r_{ij}^{am} = r_{ie}^{ab} = 0 \quad (7)$$

Where the first two terms are corresponding to the determination of one and two-body cluster amplitudes whereas the later two terms are for determination of amplitudes corresponding to  $S_h$  and  $S_p$  respectively. It is important to note here that, the construction of this effective Hamiltonian,  $R$  and optimization of  $t$ - and  $s$ - amplitudes are done in an iterative manner. The high-rank correlation effects are incorporated via the contraction of a few contractible orbitals between  $S$  and  $T_2$  instead of using explicit high rank  $T_3$  operator resulting in the decrease of the overall computational scaling comparable to CCSD. In the subsequent section, we will demonstrate the formal development of our EOM-iCCSDn methodology.

## B. EOM treatment of iCCSDn towards excitation energy:

In this section, we will proceed towards the conceptualization of a linear response operator in terms of the one and two-body excitation operators as well as the scattering operators. While the determination of the perturbed one and two-body operators can be done in a standard projective formulation, due to the vacuum annihilating condition, no such closed projective form of matrix equation can be derived for the scattering operators,  $S$ . In order to bypass the complications arising due to the VAC of  $S$ , we will form a composite through contraction of  $S$  and  $T$  such that the resulting effective operator having standard hole-particle excitation structure. This will help us do to mathematical manipulations towards the development of the EOM-iCCSDn theory in terms of a set of commuting effective operators.

### 1. Casting the problem in terms of commuting operators: the genesis of the EOM-iCCSDn ansatz

Towards the development of the EOM-iCCSDn ansatz, we first demonstrate that the ground state double exponential ansatz can be expressed in terms of hole-particle excitation like connected effective operators. This would also help us in the conceptualization of a linear response operator that can have a simple commutation property with the ground state excitation operators.

Noting the fact that the waveoperator consists of a product of two exponential operators in normal ordering, one may explicitly apply Wick's theorem to write Eq. 3 as

$$\Omega = \{e^S e^{\overline{ST}} e^T\} \quad (8)$$

Here the term  $\overline{ST}$  denotes all the possible single, double, triple, ... contractions between various powers of  $S$  and  $T$ . Note that the quantities  $e^S$  and  $e^T$  inside the normal ordering are the parts coming out of the operator which is not explicitly connected. Also, due to the normal ordering, there is no explicit contraction between two  $S$  operators. One may note that all these  $S$  operators which are not explicitly connected also forms an exponential series, owing to the property of an exponential operator.

The quantity  $\overline{ST}$ , by construction, has the hole-particle structure like an excitation operator, the lowest of which starts from rank three. Due to the similar hole-particle excitation structure between  $T$  and  $\overline{ST}$ , they commute. Thus Eq. 8 can equivalently be written as:

$$\Omega = \{e^S e^{\overline{ST+T}}\} \quad (9)$$

The  $e^S$  operator which is not explicitly connected has the free (uncontracted) destruction operator index that destroys the HF vacuum when the waveoperator acts upon it. Thus, the action of the waveoperator  $\Omega$  can be written in a simplified manner as:

$$\Omega|\phi_0\rangle = \{e^S e^{\overline{ST+T}}\}|\phi_0\rangle = \{e^{\overline{ST+T}}\}|\phi_0\rangle \quad (10)$$

Since  $(T + \overline{ST})$  forms a set of mutually commuting operators that have hole-particle excitation structure, one may remove the normal ordering such that Eq.10 may equivalently be written as:

$$|\psi_0\rangle = e^{\overline{ST+T}}|\phi_0\rangle \quad (11)$$

For notational simplicity, we would subsequently write  $\overline{ST} + T$  as  $Z$  which has the various ranks of hole-particle excitation structure.

In order to work with a commuting set of operators, we would now design the linear response operator for the  $k^{th}$  excited state,  $R^k$  in a similar manner such that it commutes with  $Z$ . Such an operator can be defined as:

$$R^k = R_1^k + R_2^k + R_S^k \overline{Y_2} \quad (12)$$

Here  $R_1^k$  and  $R_2^k$  have the one and two body hole-particle excitation structure. The term  $R_S^k \overline{Y_2}$  denotes a three-body linear response operator in terms of the first-order variation of  $S$  operators. All the operators employed in Eq.12 can be written explicitly as:  $R_1^k = r_1^k \hat{Y}_1$ ;  $R_2^k = r_2^k \hat{Y}_2$ ;  $R_S^k = r_s^k \hat{Y}_S$ , where  $\hat{Y}_\dots$  denotes the associated string of creation and annihilation operators, and  $r_{\dots}$  denotes the associated perturbed amplitudes corresponding to the operators. Note again that  $R_S^k \overline{Y_2}$  is a three-body hole particle excitation operator and hence  $R^k$  commutes with  $Z$ . This would help us write  $k^{th}$  excited state in terms of a set of commuting operators such that all the mathematical manipulations can be done in a simplified manner like that of a conventional EOMCC method.

$$|\psi_k\rangle = R^k e^Z |\phi_0\rangle \quad (13)$$

We reiterate here that due to working with the commuting operators  $R^k$  and  $Z$  with hole-particle excitation structure with respect to the HF reference, we have removed the explicit use of the normal ordering in  $e^Z$ .

## 2. Determination of perturbed amplitudes: projection formalism for excited state

We now proceed towards the development of EOM-iCCSDn formulation for the many-body excited states. We will derive the working equations for determining the perturbed  $T$  and  $S$  amplitudes. Note that the ground state is now described in terms of  $Z = \overline{ST} + T$  that has an excitation structure. Following the conventional methodology, we start with the Schrödinger equation for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  excited state,  $\psi_k$ :

$$HR^k e^Z |\phi_0\rangle = E_k R^k e^Z |\phi_0\rangle \quad (14)$$

Due to the inherent commutativity property between  $R^k$  and  $Z$ , one may rewrite Eq.14 in the following manner:

$$H e^Z R^k |\phi_0\rangle = E_k e^Z R^k |\phi_0\rangle \quad (15)$$

Upon multiplying both sides of Eq.15 by  $e^{-Z}$  we can get:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-Z} H e^Z R^k |\phi_0\rangle &= E_k e^{-Z} e^Z R^k |\phi_0\rangle \\ \implies H_{eff} R^k |\phi_0\rangle &= E_k R^k |\phi_0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here,  $H_{eff} = e^{-Z} H e^Z$  denotes the zeroth order effective Hamiltonian. Simultaneously, multiplication of  $R^k$  on the Schrödinger equation for the ground state yields:

$$R^k H e^Z |\phi_0\rangle = E_0 R^k e^Z |\phi_0\rangle \quad (17)$$

Subsequently, a few algebraic alterations upon Eq.17 generate the following discerning equation:

$$R^k H_{eff} |\phi_0\rangle = E_0 R^k |\phi_0\rangle \quad (18)$$

Subtracting Eq.18 from Eq.16, one may now write the EOM equation in terms of the matrix eigenvalue equation as follows:

$$[H_{eff}, R^k] |\phi_0\rangle = \Delta E_k R^k |\phi_0\rangle \quad (19)$$

Here,  $\Delta E_k = (E_k - E_0)$ , which denotes the excitation energies corresponding to  $k^{\text{th}}$  excited state. In order to determine the perturbed one body amplitudes ( $r_1^k$ ), we project Eq. 19 by the singly excited determinants,  $\chi_s$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \chi_s | [H_{eff}, R^k] | \phi_0 \rangle &= \Delta E^k \langle \chi_s | R^k | \phi_0 \rangle \\ \implies \langle \phi_0 | Y_1^\dagger [H_{eff}, R^k] | \phi_0 \rangle &= \Delta E_k r_1 \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Here  $\chi_s$  is the singly excited determinant which can be expressed as  $\langle \chi_s | = \langle \phi_0 | Y_1^\dagger$ . Note that, for the brevity of the notation, we will denote  $r_x^k$  as  $r_x$  from now onwards where  $x = 1, 2, s$ . Expanding  $R^k$ , one may further rewrite Eq.20 in a long hand notation as:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi_0 | Y_1^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_1] | \phi_0 \rangle r_1 + \langle \phi_0 | Y_1^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_2] | \phi_0 \rangle r_2 + \\ \langle \phi_0 | Y_1^\dagger [H_{eff}, \overline{Y_S Y_2}] | \phi_0 \rangle r_s = \Delta E_k r_1 \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

In a similar manner, the equation to determine  $r_2$  can be explicitly written by projecting Eq.19 by doubly excited determinants,  $\langle \chi_d | = \langle \phi_0 | Y_2^\dagger$  in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi_0 | Y_2^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_1] | \phi_0 \rangle r_1 + \langle \phi_0 | Y_2^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_2] | \phi_0 \rangle r_2 + \\ \langle \phi_0 | Y_2^\dagger [H_{eff}, \overline{Y_S Y_2}] | \phi_0 \rangle r_s = \Delta E_k r_2 \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The  $Y_1^\dagger$  and  $Y_2^\dagger$  are the one-body and two-body de-excitation operators. At this stage, we point to the non-trivial aspect of our EOM-iCCSDn formulation. While the one and two-body perturbed amplitudes can be computed in a straightforward manner, there is no such a closed form of equation possible to determine  $r_s$  due to the killer conditions (or VAC). This implies that there is no such bra projection by which one may get the  $r_s$  amplitudes directly. However, an equation for  $r_s$ -amplitudes can be constructed from three-body excitation blocks as we discuss below. One may project Eq. 19 by the triply excited determinants  $\langle \chi_{IJ} | = \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3I}^\dagger$  to arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \chi_{IJ} | [H_{eff}, R^k] | \phi_0 \rangle &= \Delta E_k \langle \chi_{IJ} | R^k | \phi_0 \rangle \\ \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3I}^\dagger [H_{eff}, R^k] | \phi_0 \rangle &= \Delta E_k \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3I}^\dagger R^k | \phi_0 \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where  $I$  denotes the collective three hole - three particle orbital labels. In a long-hand notation, Eq. 23 can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3I}^\dagger [H_{eff}, R_1] | \phi_0 \rangle + \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3I}^\dagger [H_{eff}, R_2] | \phi_0 \rangle \\ + \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3I}^\dagger [H_{eff}^J, \sum_{\alpha, M} (R_{S\alpha}^\dagger Y_{2M})_L] | \phi_0 \rangle \\ = \Delta E_k \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3I}^\dagger \sum_{\beta, M'} (R_{S\beta}^\dagger Y_{2M'})_I | \phi_0 \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Here  $\alpha$  is the combined orbital indices associated with operator  $S$ . The indices  $I, J, L, M$  are the combined indices for excitation-types orbital structures associated with various operators. In the left hand side, the summation over the indices  $\alpha$  and  $M$  is restricted to certain orbital index tuples which upon contraction gives rise to 3 hole - 3 particle excitation index tuple  $L$ , which subsequently gets contracted with  $H_{eff}^J$  to produce an excitation level  $I$ . It is worthwhile to mention here that while we formulated this equation by explicitly projecting against the triply excited determinants, our unknown parameters are amplitudes for perturbed  $S$  operators. Although the perturbed amplitudes for  $T_2$  operators can be determined via Eq.22, establishing a projective form of the equation for determining the perturbed  $s$ -amplitudes directly is not feasible. This limitation stems from the inability to compute the matrix elements (relative to  $\phi_{HF}$ ) of an effective Hamiltonian resembling the structure of  $S$  due to the VAC. Moreover, the number of such three-body projections is far too many than the number of  $S$  and  $T$  combined. This implies that several sets of  $Y_2$  and  $Y_S$  give rise to the same three-body excitation function. In other words, the three-body excitation manifold is redundant. To remove such a redundancy, we resort to a *physically motivated sufficiency condition* as explained below.

As previously mentioned, there are several pairs of indices  $J$  and  $L$  that give rise to an index tuple  $I$ . On the other hand, a

specific 3h-3p index  $L$  may be generated by several combinations of  $\alpha, M$ . Let us pick a specific  $\alpha$  that may get contracted with various  $Y_{2M}$  to generate the set of three-body excitation index tuple  $L$ . In other words, different  $L$ 's are generated through the variation of the index tuples solely in  $\alpha$ . Thus one may remove the summation over  $\alpha$  in Eq. 24 to arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3_I}^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_1]_I | \phi_0 \rangle r_1 + \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3_I}^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_2]_I | \phi_0 \rangle r_2 \\ & + \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3_I}^\dagger [H_{eff}^J, \sum_M (\overline{Y_S Y_{2M}})_L]_I | \phi_0 \rangle r_s \\ & = \Delta E_k \langle \phi_0 | Y_{3_I}^\dagger \sum_{M'} (\overline{Y_S Y_{2M'}})_I | \phi_0 \rangle r_s \\ & \quad \forall (\alpha, \beta) \in \{r_{s_h}, r_{s_p}\} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

This sufficiency condition thus removes the redundancy by ensuring each unique  $r_s$  amplitude is determined via a (weighted) sum of certain two-body operators. While The Eq.25 determines perturbed  $s$ -amplitudes, Eqs.21 and 22 effectively determines the perturbed  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ - amplitudes. One may note here that the sufficiency condition for determining the  $r_s$  amplitudes allows one to write the equations for determining the perturbed amplitudes ( $r_1, r_2$  and  $r_s$ ) in terms of a matrix eigenvalue equation as shown below:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{Y_1 r_1} & B_{Y_1 r_2} & C_{Y_1 r_s} \\ D_{Y_2 r_1} & E_{Y_2 r_2} & F_{Y_2 r_s} \\ G_{Y_3 r_1} & H_{Y_3 r_2} & I_{Y_3 r_s} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \\ r_s \end{pmatrix} = \Delta E_k \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \\ r_s \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

All the elements corresponding to the matrix are listed in table I in a detailed manner. One may note that the equations for  $r_s$

Abbreviations	Matrix Representation
$A_{Y_1 r_1}$	$\langle \phi_0   Y_1^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_1]   \phi_0 \rangle$
$B_{Y_1 r_2}$	$\langle \phi_0   Y_1^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_2]   \phi_0 \rangle$
$C_{Y_1 r_s}$	$\langle \phi_0   Y_1^\dagger [H_{eff}, \overline{Y_S Y_2}]   \phi_0 \rangle$
$D_{Y_2 r_1}$	$\langle \phi_0   Y_2^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_1]   \phi_0 \rangle$
$E_{Y_2 r_2}$	$\langle \phi_0   Y_2^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_2]   \phi_0 \rangle$
$F_{Y_2 r_s}$	$\langle \phi_0   Y_2^\dagger [H_{eff}, \overline{Y_S Y_2}]   \phi_0 \rangle$
$G_{Y_3 r_1}$	$\langle \phi_0   Y_{3_I}^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_1]_I   \phi_0 \rangle$
$H_{Y_3 r_2}$	$\langle \phi_0   Y_{3_I}^\dagger [H_{eff}, Y_2]_I   \phi_0 \rangle$
$I_{Y_3 r_s}$	$\langle \phi_0   Y_{3_I}^\dagger [H_{eff}^J, \sum_M (\overline{Y_S Y_{2M}})_L]_I   \phi_0 \rangle$

TABLE I: Detailed tensor expressions of all the matrix elements involved in the EOM-iCCSDn matrix eigenvalue equation

are determined through the three-body projection. However, the decoupling condition allows us to determine the  $r_s$  and

$r_2$  amplitudes separately, which together are orders of magnitude less than that the typical number of three-body equations, leading to enormous savings in the computational operation and memory. The matrix eigenvalue equation is implemented using our in-house code where we employed Davidson algorithm<sup>65,66</sup> to solve for the lowest eigen roots corresponding to each symmetry state.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we will discuss about the accuracy exhibited by our methodology and compare the results against EOM-CCSD as well as robust CC3 methodologies. Through several pilot numerical applications on several challenging systems, we will demonstrate the precision in predicting different single as well as double excitations dominated states and the effect of the contractible set of orbitals. All the calculations were done using an in-house software platform which is interfaced to PySCF<sup>67</sup> that generates the integrals and orbitals.

#### A. Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Carbon Monoxide (CO) is one of the most widely used molecules for assessing the performance of any excited state methodology. Although CO molecule belongs to  $C_{\infty v}$  point group, but on an operational level, we will take the highest abelian group i.e.  $C_{2v}$  and Owing to that, there are four irreducible representations of  $A_1, B_1, B_2$  and  $A_2$  which are used to generate  $\Sigma^+, \Pi, \Sigma^-$  and  $\Delta$  states in  $C_{\infty v}$  point group. We have calculated the excitation energy for CO in three different basis sets i.e. cc-pVDZ, cc-pCVDZ and TZVP and in all cases, all the electrons were correlated. The results of all the calculations are enlisted in table II. For all the states studied in this work using cc-pVDZ basis set, the EE values predicted by EOM-CCSD and CC3 vary between 0.008 eV (for  $1\Delta$ ) to 0.145 eV (for  $3\Sigma^+$ ). For almost all these roots, the EOM-iCCSDn results fall in between the corresponding EOM-CCSD and CC3 values; with the lowest EE difference (with respect to CC3) is of 0.004 eV for  $1\Delta(\pi - \pi^*)$  and the highest difference is 0.119 eV for  $3\Sigma^+(\sigma - \sigma^*)$ . However, their actual magnitudes have a non-monotonic dependence on the choice of the CSO. Note that, except for  $2\Pi(\sigma^* - \pi^*)$  which has a weakly double excitation dominated character, all other states exhibit single excitation character. While the  $3\Sigma^+$  root is purely dominated by single excitations as predicted by EOM-CCSD, interestingly, in EOM-iCCSDn, one finds a large component of  $S$  ( $S_p: 6b_2 9b_2 \rightarrow 8b_1 8b_1, 7a_1 10a_1 \rightarrow 8b_1 8b_1$  and  $S_h: 7a_1 7a_1 \rightarrow 9b_2 6b_2$ ). This along with a couple of large  $T_2$  ( $7a_1 7a_1 \rightarrow 9b_2 6b_2$ ) in turn, brings in a substantial effect of  $T_3$  which otherwise cannot be captured through CC3. A similar trend can be observed for cc-pCVDZ basis where the difference of the EE values predicted by EOM-CCSD and CC3 vary between 0.01 eV (for  $1\Delta$ ) to 0.153 eV (for  $3\Sigma^+$ ). EOM-iCCSDn further lowers the EE error with the lowest error being 0.006 eV (for  $1\Delta$ ) and the highest is 0.128 eV (for  $3\Sigma^+$ ). Note that, similar to the cc-pVDZ basis,

States	Basis Sets															
	cc-pVDZ			cc-pCVDZ			TZVP									
	EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn			EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn			EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn			
		(1,1)	(2,2)	(3,3)			(1,1)	(2,2)	(3,3)			(1,1)	(2,2)	(3,3)	(4,4)	
$2\Sigma^+$	15.922	15.806	15.925	15.908	15.880	15.916	15.792	15.920	15.904	15.876	13.214	13.176	13.188	13.188	13.202	13.206
$3\Sigma^+$	18.180	18.035	18.132	18.110	18.121	18.172	18.019	18.125	18.102	18.111	14.612	14.470	14.612	14.607	14.603	14.570
$1\Pi$	10.275	10.199	10.262	10.250	10.235	10.292	10.214	10.279	10.267	10.252	10.100	10.001	10.092	10.081	10.064	10.052
$2\Pi$	15.885	15.803	15.819	15.813	15.813	15.901	15.812	15.835	15.829	15.829	14.971	14.818	14.953	14.947	14.941	14.929
$1\Sigma^-$	13.259	13.251	13.255	13.266	13.279	13.260	13.250	13.256	13.267	13.280	13.110	13.104	13.105	13.115	13.131	13.139
$1\Delta$	13.386	13.349	13.359	13.357	13.367	13.390	13.348	13.362	13.361	13.371	13.214	13.176	13.188	13.188	13.201	13.205

TABLE II: Vertical excitation energies of  $CO$  in various basis sets i.e. cc-pVDZ, cc-pCVDZ and TZVP. While most of the roots are single excitations dominated,  $2B_1$  and  $2B_2$  roots exhibit weak double excitation character. Note that, all the values given in the table are in eV. The values in the parenthesis denotes the number of occupied and virtual orbitals considered to include in CSO.

in cc-pVDZ basis,  $3\Sigma^+$  root shows higher contribution of  $S$  operators which amounts to higher contribution from  $T_3$ .

The estimation of EE using a TZVP basis shows a somewhat different trend than the previous two cases. In this case, the lowest and highest EE difference for EOM-CCSD (with respect to CC3) is observed for  $1\Delta$  (0.006 eV) and  $2\Pi$  (0.153 eV), respectively. However, for EOM-iCCSDn, the highest error in EE is observed for  $3\Sigma^+$  ( $EE_{EOM-iCCSDn} - EE_{CC3} = 0.142$  eV). In this case (as well as for  $2\Sigma^+$  and  $2\Pi$ ), several  $S$  operators attain a significantly large magnitude.

## B. Formaldehyde

Formaldehyde, being one of the simplest carbonyl compounds, undergoes lots of theoretical studies in the domain of excited state calculations. The geometry of formaldehyde used in this calculation was taken from Thiel test set<sup>68</sup>. The ground state electronic configuration for formaldehyde is:

$$1a_1^2 2a_1^2 3a_1^2 4a_1^2 1b_2^2 5a_1^2 1b_1^2 2b_2^2 \quad (27)$$

Similar to  $CO$  molecule, owing to the  $C_{2v}$  point group, Formaldehyde has four irreducible representations namely  $A_1, B_1, B_2$  and  $A_2$ . The excitation energies for formaldehyde are calculated in different basis sets i.e. cc-pVDZ and TZVP and all the results are enlisted in table III. Note that, for all the calculations, all the electrons were correlated. For EOM-CCSD methodology, in the cc-pVDZ basis, the EE fluctuates between 0.018 eV (for  $1A_2$ ) and 0.236 eV (for  $2A_1$ ) with respect to CC3. For all the states, EE predicted by our EOM-iCCSDn methodology resides in between EOM-CCSD and CC3 values. The EE difference between the CC3 and the lowest  $1A_2(n - \pi^*)$  state is minimal, measuring at a mere 0.007 eV whereas the highest EE difference observed is for  $2A_1(n - \sigma^*)$  state, measuring at a somewhat larger value of 0.192 eV. However, similar to the previous case, the actual magnitude of the states does not exhibit a uniform pattern with respect to the number of CSO involved. It is important to mention here that all the roots calculated here are dominated by single excitations except  $1B_2$ . In this case, a large component of  $S$  can be found with ( $S_p: 8b_2 10a_1 \rightarrow 9b_1 9b_1$ ) resulting in a substantial influence from triples which is somewhat missing from the description of CC3. A similar kind of trend can be observed in TZVP basis set as well. The lowest and highest difference in EE between EOM-CCSD and CC3 is observed for  $1A_2$  (0.019 eV) and  $2A_1$  (0.239 eV) respectively. However, for EOM-iCCSDn methodology, the lowest and highest error in EE with respect to CC3 comes around 0.005 eV (for  $1A_2$ ) and 0.198 eV (for  $2A_1$ ) respectively. Note that, both  $2A_1$  and  $3A_1$  states exhibit  $\pi - \pi^*$  character, leading to an absence of a clearly defined  $\pi - \pi^*$  valance transition. It is also important to note here that, both  $2A_1$  and  $1B_1(\sigma - \pi^*)$  states are prone to Rydberg-valance mixing.<sup>69</sup> Thus the accurate characterization of these states can be challenging due to the limitations of using cc-pVDZ basis sets, which are inadequate for capturing the high-lying transitions. Consequently, the estimated energy of these states may fall short of the true value, as evidenced by the best estimation of 9.1 eV for  $1B_1$  state, accord-

ing to reference.<sup>68</sup> However, the utilization of TZVP basis set has shown some improvement in the accurate determination of these states compared to the cc-pVDZ basis set.

## C. Cis-diazene ( $N_2H_2$ )

The *cis* isomer of the diazene ( $N_2H_2$ ) molecule has been extensively studied in the field of excitation energy calculations. The optimized geometry used in these calculations was obtained from the Computational Chemistry Comparison and Benchmark Database (CCCBDB).<sup>70</sup> Similar to the formaldehyde molecule, the cis-diazene molecule also belongs to the  $C_{2v}$  point group and possesses four irreducible representations:  $A_1, B_1, B_2$ , and  $A_2$ . In our study, we employed two different basis sets, namely cc-pVDZ and TZVP, for the calculation of excitation energies. For the calculations, all the electrons were correlated. All the results for different basis sets are enlisted in table IV. Excitation energies predicted by EOM-CCSD and EOM-iCCSDn methodologies are compared against the robust CC3 method. For the EOM-CCSD method using the cc-pVDZ basis set, the excitation energies oscillate in the range from 0.023 eV (for  $1B_1$ ) to 0.574 eV (for the  $2A_1$  state) compared to the CC3 method. The excitation energies predicted by our EOM-iCCSDn method reside in between those of EOM-CCSD and CC3 for all states. Notably, for the  $1B_1$  state, which is primarily governed by a  $n - \pi^*$  excitation, our EOM-iCCSDn methodology provided highly accurate excitation energies with a negligible difference of only 0.003 eV compared to CC3, whereas the largest error in excitation energy was observed for the  $2A_1$  state ( $n - \sigma^*$ ) with a difference of 0.285 eV. It is important to mention here that all the states considered in our study are singlet in nature. In contrast to previous cases, the magnitudes of excitation energies displayed a monotonic pattern with respect to the number of CSO involved for both the cc-pVDZ and TZVP basis sets. EOM-iCCSDn exhibits slightly better excitation energies when employing the CSO-(3,3) compared to CSO-(2,2). A similar trend in the EE is observed for the TZVP basis set as well, where the lowest and highest differences in EE predicted by EOM-CCSD with respect to CC3 were observed for the  $1B_1$  state (0.023 eV) and the  $1A_2$  state (0.206 eV), respectively. However, our EOM-iCCSDn method showed even more accurate excitation energies, with the lowest and highest errors compared to CC3 found for the  $1B_1$  state ( $EE_{EOM-iCCSDn} - EE_{CC3} = 0.001$  eV) and the  $2A_1$  state (0.121 eV), respectively. Consequently, our EOM-iCCSDn method demonstrates superior accuracy in predicting excitation energies compared to EOM-CCSD with respect to robust CC3 method. This study highlights the potential of our methodology for accurate determination of excitation energies in theoretical investigations involving the *cis* isomer of the diazene molecule.



States	Basis Sets									
	cc-pVDZ					TZVP				
	EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn			EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn		
		(1,1)	(1,2)	(2,2)			(1,1)	(1,2)	(2,2)	
$2^1A_1$	9.947	9.711	9.875	9.871	9.903	9.769	9.530	9.701	9.698	9.728
$3^1A_1$	11.296	11.190	11.257	11.252	11.279	10.541	10.448	10.501	10.496	10.526
$1^1B_1$	9.353	9.291	9.323	9.324	9.360	9.257	9.183	9.229	9.229	9.266
$1^1B_2$	8.635	8.550	8.584	8.565	8.597	8.446	8.344	8.400	8.383	8.415
$1^1A_2$	4.012	3.994	3.948	3.949	3.987	3.966	3.947	3.903	3.905	3.942

TABLE III: Vertical excitation energies of Formaldehyde in different basis sets i.e. cc-pVDZ and TZVP. All the values given in the table are in eV. The values in the parenthesis denotes the number of occupied and virtual orbitals considered to be included in CSO.

States	Basis Sets							
	cc-pVDZ				TZVP			
	EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn		EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn	
		(2,2)	(3,3)			(2,2)	(3,3)	
$2^1A_1$	9.414	8.840	9.257	9.125	8.726	8.556	8.703	8.677
$1^1B_1$	3.840	3.817	3.847	3.820	3.744	3.721	3.750	3.722
$1^1B_2$	6.912	6.870	6.894	6.874	6.505	6.436	6.489	6.472
$1^1A_2$	6.748	6.564	6.548	6.549	6.643	6.437	6.435	6.434

TABLE IV: Vertical excitation energies of cis-Diazene in different basis sets i.e. cc-pVDZ and TZVP. All the values given in the table are in eV.

#### D. Trans-diazene ( $N_2H_2$ )

Similar to the *cis*-isomer, the *trans*-isomer of diazene molecule has also been studied in the realm of excitation energies. The geometry of the molecule used here was taken from CCCBDB database.<sup>70</sup> Owing to the  $C_{2h}$  point group, the irreducible representations are  $A_g, A_u, B_u$  and  $B_g$ . We have used cc-pVDZ and TZVP basis sets for the calculation of excitation energies and all the results corresponding to  $A_g, B_u$  and  $B_g$  symmetries are enlisted in table V. As previously, all the electrons were correlated for the calculations. We have compared and contrasted our EOM-iCCSDn methodology against EOM-CCSD and CC3. In case of cc-pVDZ basis, the difference of EE between EOM-CCSD and CC3 methods varies between 0.012 eV (for  $1B_g$ ) and 0.061 eV (for  $1A_g$ ). The excitation energies predicted by EOM-iCCSDn method follow the same overall trend and the values reside in between EOM-CCSD and CC3. Significantly, for  $1B_g$  state (primarily gov-

erned by  $\pi - \pi^*$  excitation), EOM-iCCSDn method predicts excitation energy quite accurately with an imperceptible difference of only 0.001 eV with respect to CC3. The largest error in EE compared to CC3 is 0.039 eV for  $1A_g$  (governed by  $n - \sigma^*$ ). It is important to note here that all the states are dictated by single excitations. From the values given in table V, it is imperative to demonstrate that the magnitudes of excitation energies exhibit a monotonic dependence on the CSO. In case of TZVP basis set, the highest and lowest error in EE for EOM-CCSD with respect to CC3 are 0.089 eV (for  $1B_u; n - \sigma^*$ ) and 0.014 eV (for  $1B_g$ ) respectively. However, our EOM-iCCSDn method is capable of predicting EE in a more accurate manner with the highest and lowest error in EE compared to CC3 comes around 0.072 eV (for  $1B_u$ ) and  $EE_{EOM-iCCSDn} - EE_{CC3} = 0.002$  eV (for  $1B_g$ ) respectively.

States	Basis Sets							
	cc-pVDZ				TZVP			
	EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn		EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn	
			(2,2)	(3,3)			(2,2)	(3,3)
$2^1A_g$	7.731	7.670	7.709	7.683	7.195	7.114	7.182	7.159
$1^1B_u$	7.750	7.692	7.729	7.707	7.401	7.312	7.384	7.367
$1^1B_g$	3.289	3.277	3.304	3.276	3.263	3.249	3.276	3.247

TABLE V: Vertical excitation energies of trans-Diazene in different basis sets i.e. cc-pVDZ and TZVP. All the values given in the table are in eV.

### E. Ethylene ( $C_2H_4$ )

Another molecule that we have studied is Ethylene or Ethene. The geometry used here for the calculation is taken from Thiel test set.<sup>68</sup> Ethene molecule belongs to the point group of  $D_{2h}$  and owing to that, there are 8 irreducible representations possible i.e.  $A_g, B_{3u}, B_{2u}, B_{1g}, B_{1u}, B_{2g}, B_{3g}$  and  $A_u$ . In table VI, we have enlisted the excitation energies corresponding to some of the symmetry states. We have employed cc-pVDZ basis for the calculation and the values predicted by our EOM-iCCSDn method is compared against EOM-CCSD and CC3. For all the states discussed here, the difference in EE between EOM-CCSD and CC3 vary between 0.048 eV (for  $1B_{2g}$ ) to 0.474 eV (for  $3A_g$ ). For all the states, the EE predicted by the EOM-iCCSDn methodology reside in between EOM-CCSD and CC3 values; with the lowest and highest EE differences with respect to CC3 are 0.015 eV (for  $1B_{2g}$ ) and 0.136 eV (for  $2B_{3g}$ ) respectively. However, the magnitudes of excitation energy follow monotonic dependence on the number of CSO. Note that, all the states considered here are dominated by single excitations. However, for a few states, contrary to the EOM-CCSD prediction, a large magnitude of  $S$  is observed. For example, in case of  $2A_g$  and  $3A_g$  states, one finds a large component of  $S$  ( $S_p : 8b_{3u}10a_g \rightarrow 12b_{2u}9b_{1g}$ ) along with a larger magnitude of  $T_2$  ( $8b_{3u}8b_{3u} \rightarrow 9b_{1g}9b_{1g}$ ) which in turn incorporates a substantial effect from higher-order  $T_3$  excitations which otherwise is missing from the CC3 calculations. Apart from that,  $2B_{3g}$  state also has a large contribution from  $S$  operator ( $S_p : 8b_{3u}11b_{1u} \rightarrow 10a_g9b_{1g}$ ) along with a large component from  $T_2$  ( $7b_{3g}8b_{3u} \rightarrow 12b_{2u}9b_{1g}$ ). It is also important to note here that this  $2B_{3g}$  state has a very high-lying excitation and may be prone to rydberg-valance mixing. Thus from table VI, it can be inferred that our EOM-iCCSDn methodology can predict the excitation energies in an accurate manner.

Roots	EOM-CCSD	CC3	EOM-iCCSDn	
			(2,2)	(4,4)
$2A_g$	13.606	13.480	13.590	13.568
$3A_g$	15.196	14.008	14.130	14.126
$4A_g$	15.572	15.098	15.184	15.158
$1B_{1u}$	12.777	12.702	12.766	12.745
$2B_{1u}$	14.051	13.946	14.048	14.023
$1B_{2g}$	8.902	8.854	8.892	8.869
$1B_{3g}$	11.548	11.487	11.533	11.514
$2B_{3g}$	15.824	15.634	15.770	15.736
$1A_u$	11.804	11.587	11.664	11.658

TABLE VI: Vertical excitation energy for ethylene in the cc-pVDZ basis set. All the values given in the table are in eV.

### F. Nitrogen ( $N_2$ )

Nitrogen ( $N_2$ ) molecule is another system that has been studied significantly in the area of excited state calculations. While the point group of  $N_2$  is  $D_{\infty h}$ , for the purpose of computational implementation, we will consider the highest abelian group,  $D_{2h}$  corresponding to the  $D_{\infty h}$  point group. In our application, we have considered only two symmetry states i.e.  $\Pi_u$  (corresponds to  $B_{3u}$  and governed by  $\sigma^* - \pi^*$  excitation) and  $\Pi_g$  (corresponds to  $B_{2g}$  and governed by  $\pi - \pi^*$ ) of  $N_2$  which are dominated by single excitations. We have calculated the excitation energies of these two states in several basis sets i.e. cc-pVDZ, cc-pVTZ, TZVP, cc-pCVDZ and cc-pCVTZ. For all the calculations, all the electrons were correlated. All the results for all the basis sets are enlisted in table VII. We have compared and contrasted the values of excitation energy predicted by EOM-iCCSDn methodology against EOM-CCSD and robust CC3 methods. We have also employed two different Sets of CSO. In all the basis sets, for  $\Pi_g$  state, EOM-iCCSDn values reside in between EOM-CCSD and CC3 values. It can be shown that the values can systematically be improved upon including a larger number of orbitals

Basis Sets	Methods	States	
		$\Pi_u$	$\Pi_g$
<b>cc-pVDZ</b>	CC3	13.820	9.680
	EOM-CCSD	14.039	9.727
	EOM-iCCSDn (2,2)	13.851	9.704
	EOM-iCCSDn (3,3)	13.754	9.701
<b>cc-pVTZ</b>	CC3	13.573	9.559
	EOM-CCSD	13.828	9.620
	EOM-iCCSDn (2,2)	13.637	9.592
	EOM-iCCSDn (3,3)	13.548	9.589
<b>TZVP</b>	CC3	13.644	9.629
	EOM-CCSD	13.865	9.692
	EOM-iCCSDn (2,2)	13.683	9.667
	EOM-iCCSDn (3,3)	13.586	9.664
<b>cc-pCVDZ</b>	CC3	13.834	9.689
	EOM-CCSD	14.061	9.740
	EOM-iCCSDn (2,2)	13.873	9.716
	EOM-iCCSDn (3,3)	13.777	9.714
<b>cc-pCVTZ</b>	CC3	13.577	9.554
	EOM-CCSD	13.844	9.620
	EOM-iCCSDn (2,2)	13.653	9.592
	EOM-iCCSDn (3,3)	13.564	9.589

TABLE VII: Vertical excitation energies of Nitrogen in different basis sets. All the values given in the table are in eV. The values in the parenthesis denote the number of occupied and virtual orbitals considered to be included in CSO.

in CSO.

#### IV. SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTION

We have therefore developed, implemented, and benchmarked our iCCSDn methodology that is capable of inducing effects of high-rank excitations in the EOM framework. We have developed a novel projective algorithm followed by a sufficiency condition towards the development of the working equations and demonstrated that the computational overhead is at par with the parent iCCSDn method. We have employed our methodology on a series of moderately to strongly correlated molecules in and compared the results against robust methods. Whereas for a number of molecules, we have shown that there is a non-monotonic dependence of excitation energy on the number of contractible orbitals, we have also shown a few examples where the excitation energy can systemati-

cally be improved upon the inclusion of a higher number of contractible orbitals. Through the series of pilot numerical applications, we have shown that our EOM-iCCSDn methodology can faithfully reproduce the correct qualitative as well as quantitative behavior compared to other allied methodologies, but at a much less computational scaling. Since we have tools for calculating ground state energetics of large chemical systems as well as excited state energetics, it would be straightforward to assimilate both methodologies in order to determine the local excitation energy of large embedded or extended systems.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Prof. Debashis Mukherjee, India for all the stimulating discussions during the development of the theory. AC thanks Industrial Research and Consultancy Cen-

ter (IRCC), IIT Bombay, for research fellowship. AC thanks Dibyendu Mondal for stimulating discussions and valuable insights.

## AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

### Conflict of Interest:

The authors have no conflict of interest to disclose.

## DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

- <sup>1</sup>F. Coester, "Bound states of a many-particle system," *Nucl. Phys.* **7**, 421–424 (1958).
- <sup>2</sup>F. Coester and H. Kummel, "Short-range correlations in nuclear wave functions," *Nucl. Phys.* **17**, 477–485 (1960).
- <sup>3</sup>J. Čížek, "On the correlation problem in atomic and molecular systems. calculation of wavefunction components in urself-type expansion using quantum-field theoretical methods," *J. Chem. Phys.* **45**, 4256–4266 (1966).
- <sup>4</sup>J. Čížek, "On the use of the cluster expansion and the technique of diagrams in calculations of correlation effects in atoms and molecules," *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **14**, 35–89 (1969).
- <sup>5</sup>Y. Yamamoto, T. Noro, and K. Ohno, "Ab initio ci calculations on free-base porphyrin," *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **42**, 1563 (1992).
- <sup>6</sup>péter G. Szalay, T. Müller, G. Gidofalvi, H. Lischka, and R. Shepard, "Multiconfiguration self-consistent field and multireference configuration interaction methods and applications," *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **112**, 108 (2012).
- <sup>7</sup>J. Miralles, O. Castell, R. Caballol, and J.-P. Malrieu, "Specific ci calculation of energy differences: Transition energies and bond energies," *Chem. Phys.* **172**, 33–43 (1993).
- <sup>8</sup>V. García, O. Castell, R. Caballol, and J. Malrieu, "An iterative difference-dedicated configuration interaction. proposal and test studies," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **238**, 222–229 (1995).
- <sup>9</sup>D. Mukherjee and P. Mukherjee, "A response-function approach to the direct calculation of the transition-energy in a multiple-cluster expansion formalism," *Chem. Phys.* **39**, 325 (1979).
- <sup>10</sup>H. J. Monkhorst, "Calculation of properties with the coupled-cluster method," *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **11**, 412 (1977).
- <sup>11</sup>E. Dalgaard and H. J. Monkhorst, "Some aspects of the time-dependent coupled-cluster approach to dynamic response functions," *Phys. Rev. A* **28**, 1217 (1983).
- <sup>12</sup>O. Christiansen, P. Jørgensen, and C. Hättig, "Response functions from fouriercomponent variational perturbationtheory applied to a time-averaged quasienergy," *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **68**, 1 (1998).
- <sup>13</sup>H. Koch and P. Jørgensen, "Coupled cluster response functions," *J. Chem. Phys.* **93**, 3333 (1990).
- <sup>14</sup>H. Nakatsuji, "Cluster expansion of the wavefunction. electron correlations in ground and excited states by sac (symmetry-adapted-cluster) and sac ci theories," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **67**, 329 (1979).
- <sup>15</sup>H. Nakatsuji, "Cluster expansion of the wavefunction. calculation of electron correlations in ground and excited states by sac and sac ci theories," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **67**, 334 (1979).
- <sup>16</sup>D. J. Rowe, "Equations-of-motion method and the extended shell model," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **40**, 153 (1968).
- <sup>17</sup>H. Sekino and R. J. Bartlett, "A linear response, coupled-cluster theory for excitation energy," *Int. J. Quantum Chem. Symp.* **18**, 255 (1984).
- <sup>18</sup>J. Geertsen, M. Rittby, and R. J. Bartlett, "The equation-of-motion coupled-cluster method: Excitation energies of be and co," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **164**, 57 (1989).
- <sup>19</sup>J. F. Stanton and R. J. Bartlett, "The equation of motion coupled-cluster method. a systematic biorthogonal approach to molecular excitation energies, transition probabilities, and excited state properties," *J. Chem. Phys.* **98**, 7029 (1993).
- <sup>20</sup>J. D. Watts and R. J. Bartlett, "The inclusion of connected triple excitations in the equation-of-motion coupled-cluster method," *J. Chem. Phys.* **101**, 3073 (1994).
- <sup>21</sup>S. A. Kucharski, M. Włoch, M. Musiał, and R. J. Bartlett, "Coupled-cluster theory for excited electronic states: The full equation-of-motion coupled-cluster single, double, and triple excitation method," *J. Chem. Phys.* **115**, 8263 (2001).
- <sup>22</sup>K. Kowalski and P. Piecuch, "The active-space equation-of-motion coupled-cluster methods for excited electronic states: The eomccsd approach," *J. Chem. Phys.* **113**, 8490 (2000).
- <sup>23</sup>K. Kowalski and P. Piecuch, "The active-space equation-of-motion coupled-cluster methods for excited electronic states: Full eomccsd," *J. Chem. Phys.* **115**, 643 (2001).
- <sup>24</sup>J. D. Watts and R. J. Bartlett, "Economical triple excitation equation-of-motion coupled-cluster methods for excitation energies," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **233**, 81–87 (1995).
- <sup>25</sup>J. D. Watts and R. J. Bartlett, "Iterative and non-iterative triple excitation corrections in coupled-cluster methods for excited electronic states: the eom-ccsd-3 and eom-ccsd( $\bar{T}$ ) methods," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **258**, 581–588 (1996).
- <sup>26</sup>O. Christiansen, H. Koch, and P. Jørgensen, "Perturbative triple excitation corrections to coupled cluster singles and doubles excitation energies," *J. Chem. Phys.* **105**, 1451 (1996).
- <sup>27</sup>P. Piecuch, J. R. Gour, and M. Włoch, "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.* **109**, 3268 (2009).
- <sup>28</sup>P. Piecuch, J. R. Gour, and M. Włoch, "Left-eigenstate completelyrenormalized equation-of-motioncoupled-cluster methods: Review of key concepts, extension to excitedstates of open-shell systems, andcomparison with electron-attachedand ionized approaches," *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **109**, 3268 (2009).
- <sup>29</sup>G. Fradelos, J. J. Lutz, T. A. Wesozowski, P. Piecuch, and M. Włoch, "Embedding vs supermolecular strategies in evaluating the hydrogen-bonding-induced shifts of excitation energies," *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **7**, 1647 (2011).
- <sup>30</sup>H. Koch, O. Christiansen, P. Jørgensen, A. M. S. de Merás, and T. Helgaker, "The cc3 model: An iterative coupled cluster approach including connected triples," *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 1808 (1997).
- <sup>31</sup>H. Koch, O. Christiansen, P. Jørgensen, and J. Olsen, "Excitation energies of bh, ch2 and ne in full configuration interaction and the hierarchy ccs, cc2, cc3 and cc3 of coupled cluster models," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **244**, 75–82 (1995).
- <sup>32</sup>O. Christiansen, H. Koch, and P. Jørgensen, "Response functions in the cc3 iterative triple excitation model," *J. Chem. Phys.* **103**, 7429 (1995).
- <sup>33</sup>A. I. Krylov, "Size-consistent wave functions for bond-breaking: the equation-of-motion spin-flip model," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **338**, 375–384 (2001).
- <sup>34</sup>S. V. Levchenko and A. I. Krylov, "Equation-of-motion spin-flip coupled-cluster model with single and double substitutions: Theory and application to cyclobutadiene," *J. Chem. Phys.* **120**, 175 (2004).
- <sup>35</sup>U. Kaldor, "The fock space coupled cluster method: theory and application," *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **80**, 427–439 (1991).
- <sup>36</sup>I. Lindgren, "A coupled-cluster approach to the many-body perturbation theory for open-shell systems," *Int. J. Quantum Chem. Symp.* **12**, 33–58 (1978).
- <sup>37</sup>I. Lindgren and D. Mukherjee, "On the connectivity criteria in the open-shell coupled-cluster theory for general model spaces," *Phys. Rep.* **151**, 93–127 (1987).
- <sup>38</sup>D. Mukherjee and S. Pal, "Use of cluster expansion methods in the open-shell correlation problem," *Adv. Quantum Chem.* **20**, 291–373 (1989).
- <sup>39</sup>B. Jeziorski and J. Paldus, "Valence universal exponential ansatz and the cluster structure of multireference configuration interaction wave function," *J. Chem. Phys.* **90**, 2714 (1989).

- <sup>40</sup>D. Mukherjee, R. K. Moitra, and A. Mukhopadhyay, "Applications of a non-perturbative many-body formalism to general open-shell atomic and molecular problems: calculation of the ground and the lowest  $\pi$ - $\pi^*$  singlet and triplet energies and the first ionization potential of trans-butadiene," *Mol. Phys.* **33**, 955 (1977).
- <sup>41</sup>A. Mukhopadhyay, R. K. Moitra, and D. Mukherjee, "A non-perturbative open-shell theory for ionisation potential and excitation energies using hf ground state as the vacuum," *J. Phys. B* **12**, 1 (1977).
- <sup>42</sup>M. A. Haque and D. Mukherjee, "Application of cluster expansion techniques to open shells: Calculation of difference energies," *J. Chem. Phys.* **80**, 5058 (1984).
- <sup>43</sup>I. Lindgren and J. Morrison, *Atomic Many-Body Theory* (Springer, Berlin, 1982).
- <sup>44</sup>L. Z. Stolarczyk and H. J. Monkhorst, "Coupled-cluster method in fock space. i. general formalism," *Phys. Rev. A* **32**, 725 (1985).
- <sup>45</sup>L. Z. Stolarczyk and H. J. Monkhorst, "Coupled-cluster method in fock space. ii. brueckner-hartree-fock," *Phys. Rev. A* **32**, 743 (1985).
- <sup>46</sup>L. Z. Stolarczyk and H. J. Monkhorst, "Coupled-cluster method in fock space. iii. on similarity transformation of operators in fock space," *Phys. Rev. A* **37**, 1908 (1988).
- <sup>47</sup>L. Z. Stolarczyk and H. J. Monkhorst, "Coupled-cluster method in fock space. iv. calculation of expectation values and transition moments," *Phys. Rev. A* **37**, 1926 (1988).
- <sup>48</sup>S. Pal, M. Rittby, R. J. Bartlett, D. Sinha, and D. Mukherjee, "Molecular applications of multireference coupled-cluster methods using an incomplete model space: Direct calculation of excitation energies," *J. Chem. Phys.* **88**, 4357 (1988).
- <sup>49</sup>U. Kaldor, "The ground state geometry of the no3 radical," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **166**, 599 (1990).
- <sup>50</sup>U. Kaldor, "Harmonic vibrational frequencies and geometry of  $no_2$  and  $no_2^{xxx}$  *Helloooo* by the multireference coupled-cluster method," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **170**, 17 (1990).
- <sup>51</sup>W. Kutzelnigg, "Quantum chemistry in fock space. i. the universal wave and energy operators," *J. Chem. Phys.* **77**, 3081 (1982).
- <sup>52</sup>J. F. Stanton, R. J. Bartlett, and C. M. L. Rittby, "Fock space multireference coupled-cluster theory for general single determinant reference functions," *J. Chem. Phys.* **97**, 5560 (1992).
- <sup>53</sup>M. Nooijen and R. J. Bartlett, "Similarity transformed equation-of-motion coupled-cluster theory: Details, examples, and comparisons," *J. Chem. Phys.* **107**, 6812 (1997).
- <sup>54</sup>M. Nooijen and R. J. Bartlett, "A new method for excited states: Similarity transformed equation-of-motion coupled-cluster theory," *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 6441–6448 (1997).
- <sup>55</sup>M. Nooijen and R. J. Bartlett, "Similarity transformed equation-of-motion coupled-cluster study of ionized, electron attached, and excited states of free base porphin," *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 6449–6455 (1997).
- <sup>56</sup>L. Meissner and R. J. Bartlett, "Transformation of the hamiltonian in excitation energy calculations: Comparison between fock-space multireference coupled-cluster and equation-of-motion coupled-cluster methods," *J. Chem. Phys.* **94**, 6670 (1991).
- <sup>57</sup>L. Meissner and R. J. Bartlett, "A dressing for the matrix elements of the singles and doubles equation-of-motion coupled-cluster method that recovers additive separability of excitation energies," *J. Chem. Phys.* **102**, 7490 (1994).
- <sup>58</sup>D. Sinha, S.K. Mukhopadhyay, R. Chaudhuri, and D. Mukherjee, "The eigenvalue-independent partitioning technique in fock space: An alternative route to open-shell coupled-cluster theory for incomplete model spaces," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **154**, 544 (1989).
- <sup>59</sup>D. Mukhopadhyay, S. Mukhopadhyay, R. Chaudhuri, and D. Mukherjee, "Aspects of separability in the coupled cluster based direct methods for energy differences," *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **80**, 483 (1991).
- <sup>60</sup>S. Tribedi, A. Chakraborty, and R. Maitra, "Formulation of a dressed coupled-cluster method with implicit triple excitations and benchmark application to hydrogen-bonded systems," *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **16**, 6317 (2020).
- <sup>61</sup>R. Maitra, Y. Akinaga, and T. Nakajima, "A coupled cluster theory with iterative inclusion of triple excitations and associated equation of motion formulation for excitation energy and ionization potential," *J. Chem. Phys.* **147**, 074103–1 – 074103–10 (2017).
- <sup>62</sup>R. Maitra and T. Nakajima, "Correlation effects beyond coupled cluster singles and doubles approximation through Fock matrix dressing," *J. Chem. Phys.* **147**, 204108–1 – 204108–8 (2017).
- <sup>63</sup>A. Chakraborty and R. Maitra, "Fixing the catastrophic breakdown of single reference coupled cluster theory for strongly correlated systems: Two paradigms toward the implicit inclusion of high-rank correlation with low-spin channels," *J. Chem. Phys.* **159**, 024106 (2023).
- <sup>64</sup>M. Nooijen and V. Lotrich, "Brueckner based generalized coupled cluster theory: Implicit inclusion of higher excitation effects," *J. Chem. Phys.* **113**, 4549–4557 (2000).
- <sup>65</sup>E. R. Davidson, *J. Chem. Phys.* **17**, 87 (1975).
- <sup>66</sup>C. W. Murray, S. C. Racine, and E. R. Davidson, "Improved algorithms for the lowest few eigenvalues and associated eigenvectors of large matrices," *J. Chem. Phys.* **103**, 382 (1992).
- <sup>67</sup>Q. 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. Chan, "Pyscf: the python-based simulations of chemistry framework," (2017), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/wcms.1340>.
- <sup>68</sup>M. Schreiber, M. R. Silva-Junior, S. P. A. Sauer, and W. Thiel, "Benchmarks for electronically excited states: Caspt2, cc2, ccsd, and cc3," *J. Chem. Phys.* **128**, 134110 (2008).
- <sup>69</sup>T. Müller and H. Lischka, "Simultaneous calculation of rydberg and valence excited states of formaldehyde," *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **106**, 369–378 (2001).
- <sup>70</sup>R. D. Johnson, "Nist 101. computational chemistry comparison and benchmark database," (1999).

This figure "sufficiency.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2308.15506v2>