

# Equation-of-motion Coupled-cluster singles, doubles and (full) triples for doubly ionized and two-electron-attached states: A Computational implementation

Manisha,<sup>a</sup> Prashant Uday Manohar<sup>a</sup> and Anna.I.Krylov,<sup>b‡</sup>

Received Date

Accepted Date

DOI:00.0000/xxxxxxxxxx

We present our computational implementation of the equation-of-motion (EOM) coupled-cluster (CC) singles, doubles, and triples (SDT) method for computing doubly ionized (DIP) and two-electron attached (DEA) states within *Q-CHEM*<sup>1</sup>. These variants have been implemented within both the (conventional) double precision (DP) and the single precision (SP) algorithms and will be available in the upcoming major release of *Q-CHEM*. We present here the programmable expressions and some pilot application of *CH*<sub>2</sub> for DIP and DEA EOM-CCSDT.

## 1 Introduction

In the past few decades, the EOM-CC<sup>2-8</sup> suite of methods have gained popularity due to their ability to accurately study the open-shell and excited states, offering an adaptable and efficient alternative to the multi-reference (MR) CC<sup>9-17</sup> approaches. Amongst them, the so-called EOM-CCSD variants (SD for singles and doubles) are very common now-a-days, and are obtained when the CC vectors as well as the EOM eigenvectors are truncated so as to include the one-body and two-body amplitudes and provide size-intensive excitation/ionization/electron-attachment energies in, respectively the electronic excitation (EE), ionization potential (IP), electron-attachment (EA) variants. In these variants, the CC Hamiltonian spans over the singly and doubly occupied configurations in respectively, the excited, ionized and electron-attached subspaces. The eigenvalues of the CC Hamiltonian would give the energies of the respective target states. If electronic excitation is associated with flipping of one (and only one) electron, then it leads to spin-flip SF variant of EOM-CC and provides an efficient variant to target excited states of different multiplicities starting from a high-spin reference wavefunction. On the similar lines, double ionization potential (DIP)<sup>18-24</sup> and double/two-electron-attachment (DEA)<sup>21,25-27</sup> variants are obtained when the CC Hamiltonian is formed in the subspace of doubly ionized/electron-attached configurations.

The EOM-CCSD provides an accuracy of 0.1 – 0.3eV. This means that for systems with strongly degenerate electronic states (energy gaps of 0.3 or less), EOM-CCSD may not be adequate

and one needs to incorporate higher-body corrections at both CC as well as EOM levels. The perturbative approaches such as CCSD(T)<sup>28</sup> improve the total energies and energy derivatives, however, the uneven amount of corrections in reference and target states often leads to poorer description of energy-gaps. A balanced improvement in EOM-CCSD, is thus, only possible when full triples are included at CC as well as EOM level resulting in the EOM-CCSDT method.

In this article, we focus our discussion to DIP and DEA variants of EOM-CCSDT. In these methods, the occupancy of the target state configurations is different from that of the reference configuration by 2. As a result, the smallest EOM vector is actually, the two-electron operator. Thus, while we have single, double and triple substitution at CC level, the EOM level has a double, triple and quadruple substitution. Thus, rigorously speaking, the DIP/DEA-EOM-CCSDT may actually be named as DIP/DEA-EOM-CC(3,4). We have implemented these methods both within the (conventional) double-precision (DP) as well as within the single-precision (SP)<sup>29-31</sup> algorithms. SP reduces both the storage and memory requirements in CC as well as EOM parts of the computations almost by 50%, thereby widening the applicability of the methods to larger systems. The reduction in accuracy due to use of SP instead of DP is highly insignificant ( $O(10^{-4})eV$ ).

We present very brief theory of EOM-CCSDT in the context of DIP and DEA variants in Section 2. Using methylene diradical as the model system, we discuss the excitation energies of various target states computed using our methods and some other available methods, in Section 3, followed by conclusions.

## 2 Theory

The DEA and DIP EOM-CC methods have been thoroughly explored in existing research. In this work, we aim to present a simplified and clear formulation of our DEA and DIP-EOM(3,4) methods for better understanding. The m-state wavefunction  $\Psi_m$  is obtained by operating the  $R(m)$  operator on the reference wavefunction.

$$|\Psi_m\rangle = \hat{R}|\Psi_0\rangle \quad (1)$$

$$|\Psi_m\rangle = \hat{R}e^{\hat{T}}|\Phi_0\rangle$$

<sup>a</sup> Department of Chemistry, Birla Institute of Technology & Science-Pilani, Pilani, Rajasthan 333031, India; E-mail: pumanohar@pilani.bits-pilani.ac.in

<sup>b</sup> Department of Chemistry, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0482, USA, E-mail: krylov@usc.edu

where the  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  is the ground state coupled-cluster wavefunction and  $R(m)$  is the linear operator which operates on ground state CC wavefunction. In case of DIP  $R_m$  operator remove two electron from the CC ground state whereas for DEA  $R_m$  operator add two electrons to ground state.

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = e^{\hat{T}}|\Phi_0\rangle \quad (2)$$

Now substituting the equation 2 to the schrodinger wave equation

$$e^{-\hat{T}}\hat{H}e^{\hat{T}}|\Phi_0\rangle = (\hat{H}e^{\hat{T}})_C|\Phi_0\rangle = \bar{H}|\Phi_0\rangle = E_0|\Phi_0\rangle \quad (3)$$

$$E_{CC} = E_0 = \langle\Phi_0|\bar{H}|\Phi_0\rangle \quad (4)$$

$$0 = \langle\Phi^*|\bar{H}|\Phi_0\rangle \quad (5)$$

where we are truncating the  $\hat{T}$  upto triples, ( $\hat{T} = \hat{T}_1 + \hat{T}_2 + \hat{T}_3$ ). For DEA and DIP state the  $R(m)$  operator is the sum of one body, two body and three body DEA or DIP operator.

$$\hat{R}_m = \hat{R}_2(m) + \hat{R}_3(m) + \hat{R}_4(m), \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_m(DEA) = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ab} r^{ab}(m) a^\dagger b^\dagger \\ & + \frac{1}{6} \sum_{abc} \sum_i r_i^{abc}(m) a^\dagger b^\dagger c^\dagger i \\ & + \frac{1}{48} \sum_{abcd} \sum_{ij} r_{ij}^{abcd}(m) a^\dagger b^\dagger c^\dagger d^\dagger ji. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_m(DIP) = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} r_{ij}(m) ij \\ & + \frac{1}{6} \sum_{ijk} \sum_a r_{ijk}^a(m) a^\dagger k ji \\ & + \frac{1}{48} \sum_{ijkl} \sum_{ab} r_{ijkl}^{ab}(m) a^\dagger b^\dagger lk ji. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $i, j, k, l, \dots$  belongs to the occupied orbitals whereas  $a, b, c, d, \dots$  to the virtual orbitals. substituting the equation 2 to Schrödinger wave equation:

$$\hat{H}|\Psi_m\rangle = H\hat{R}e^{\hat{T}}|\Phi_0\rangle = \hat{H}e^{\hat{T}}\hat{R}|\Phi_0\rangle = E_m\hat{R}e^{\hat{T}}|\Phi_0\rangle. \quad (9)$$

$$\bar{H}\hat{R}|\Phi_0\rangle = E_m\hat{R}|\Phi_0\rangle$$

$$\bar{H} = e^{-\hat{T}}\hat{H}e^{\hat{T}} \quad (10)$$

where  $\bar{H}$  is the similarity transformed hamiltonian. Action of  $\hat{R}$  on  $\bar{H}$  in equation 8 would give

$$\hat{R}\bar{H}|\Phi_0\rangle = E_{CC}\hat{R}|\Phi_0\rangle \quad (11)$$

The above equation can be transformed into matrix eigenvalue equation.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bar{H}_{DD} - E_{CC} & \bar{H}_{DT} & \bar{H}_{DQ} \\ \bar{H}_{TD} & \bar{H}_{TT} - E_{CC} & \bar{H}_{TQ} \\ \bar{H}_{QD} & \bar{H}_{QT} & \bar{H}_{QQ} - E_{CC} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} R_2 \\ R_3 \\ R_4 \end{pmatrix} = \omega \begin{pmatrix} R_2 \\ R_3 \\ R_4 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

Table 1 Total energies of ground state ( $\bar{X}^3B_1$ ) and Total excitation energies (eV) of  $CH_2$

Method	$\bar{X}^3B_1$	$\bar{a}^1A_1$	$\bar{b}^1B_1$	$\bar{c}^1A_1$
SF-EOM-CCSD	-39.03913	1.077	1.694	3.520
SF-EOM-CCSDT	-39.04159	1.072	1.685	3.495
SF-EOM-CCSDT(SP)	-39.04159	1.072	1.685	3.495
DEA-EOM-CCSD	-39.02832	1.004	1.613	3.391
DEA-EOM-CCSDT	-39.04170	1.073	1.682	3.494
DEA-EOM-CCSDT(SP)	-39.04171	1.073	1.682	3.494
DIP-EOM-CCSD	-39.02494	1.045	1.640	3.384
DIP-EOM-CCSDT	-39.04145	1.070	1.685	3.495
DIP-EOM-CCSDT(SP)	-39.04147	1.070	1.685	3.495

where, the roots,  $\omega = E - E_{CC}$ , would give the DEA and DIP energies of the respective target states. Left eigenvectors are required only when calculating gradients or properties. Fully diagonalizing the CC Hamiltonian matrix in equation 12 is computationally unfeasible, as the focus is typically on a limited number of electronic states. Davidson's iterative diagonalization<sup>32,33</sup> method provides an efficient alternative, avoiding the need for full diagonalization while enabling the targeted computation of specific roots of the matrix. The corresponding programmable expressions within the (DEA,DIP) EOM-CCSDT framework are detailed in the Appendix.

### 3 Results and Discussion

#### Vertical excitation energies of methylene diradical

All the computations have been performed using the development version of *Q-CHEM* with core orbitals frozen in the post-Hartree-Fock methods. The FCI/TZ2P<sup>34</sup> optimized ground state geometry of methylene diradical was used. The Table 1 summarizes the results. The results obtained by SP algorithm are labeled as (SP) in the table and differ from the corresponding DP values by  $10^{-4}eV$  or less. The DIP/DEA computed excitation energies (EEs) differ from the SF computed EEs by  $0.0025eV$  or less at CCSDT level using both SP and DP algorithms. This is very small compared to the differences at the CCSD level. At CCSD level, the absolute difference between the EEs computed by DEA versus SF methods is as large as  $0.13eV$ , whereas for DIP versus SF, it is  $0.14eV$ . The DEA versus DIP max absolute error in EEs is reduced from  $0.04eV$  at CCSD level to  $0.0035eV$  at CCSDT level.

### 4 Conclusion

We have presented our implementation of DIP-EOM-CCSDT (or DIP-EOM-CC(3,4)) and DEA-EOM-CCSDT (or DEA-EOM-CC(3,4)) methods within *Q-CHEM*. Inclusion of full corrections from six-index quantities (triples at CC level and quadruples at DIP/DEA-EOM level) results in increased agreement in the energy-gaps between same set of states computed by the two methods by an order of magnitude, thereby reducing the maximum absolute error from  $0.004eV$  at CCSD level to  $0.0035eV$  at CCSDT level. Errors due to use of SP algorithm versus DP seldom affects the accuracy of computed energy gaps.

## Notes and references

- 1 E. Epifanovsky, A. T. Gilbert, X. Feng, J. Lee, Y. Mao, N. Mardirossian, P. Pokhilko, A. F. White, M. P. Coons, A. L. Dempwolff *et al.*, *The Journal of chemical physics*, 2021, **155**, 084801–(1–59).
- 2 J. Čížek, *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 1966, **45**, 4256–4266.
- 3 D. Rowe, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 1968, **40**, 153.
- 4 O. Sinanoğlu and K. A. Brueckner, Three approaches to electron correlation in atoms, 1970.
- 5 H. G. Kümmel, *International Journal of Modern Physics B*, 2003, **17**, 5311–5325.
- 6 P. U. Manohar and S. Pal, *Chemical physics letters*, 2007, **438**, 321–325.
- 7 P. U. Manohar, K. R. Shamasundar, A. Bag, N. Valav and S. Pal, *Recent Progress in Coupled Cluster Methods: Theory and Applications*, 2010, 375–393.
- 8 P. U. Manohar *et al.*, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2024, **26**, 21204–21212.
- 9 D. Mukherjee, R. K. Moitra and A. Mukhopadhyay, *Molecular Physics*, 1977, **33**, 955–969.
- 10 I. Lindgren, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, 1978, **14**, 33–58.
- 11 S. Pal, M. Rittby, R. J. Bartlett, D. Sinha and D. Mukherjee, *Chemical physics letters*, 1987, **137**, 273–278.
- 12 S. Pal, M. Rittby, R. J. Bartlett, D. Sinha and D. Mukherjee, *The Journal of chemical physics*, 1988, **88**, 4357–4366.
- 13 B. Jeziorski and H. J. Monkhorst, *Physical Review A*, 1981, **24**, 1668.
- 14 I. Lindgren and D. Mukherjee, *Physics Reports*, 1987, **151**, 93–127.
- 15 J. Malrieu, P. Durand and J. Daudey, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 1985, **18**, 809.
- 16 D. Mukherjee and S. A. Pal, *Advances in Quantum Chemistry*, 1989, **20**, 291–373.
- 17 D. Kumar and P. U. Manohar, *Chemical Physics Letters*, 2019, **730**, 234–238.
- 18 M. Nooijen and R. J. Bartlett, *The Journal of chemical physics*, 1997, **106**, 6441–6448.
- 19 M. Nooijen, *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 2002, **3**, 656–675.
- 20 K. W. Sattelmeyer, H. F. Schaefer III and J. F. Stanton, *Chemical physics letters*, 2003, **378**, 42–46.
- 21 M. Musiał, S. A. Kucharski and R. J. Bartlett, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 2011, **7**, 3088–3096.
- 22 M. Musiał, S. A. Kucharski and R. J. Bartlett, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 2011, **7**, 3088–3096.
- 23 T. Kuś and A. I. Krylov, *The Journal of chemical physics*, 2011, **135**, 084109.
- 24 T. Kuś and A. I. Krylov, *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2012, **136**, 44109.
- 25 J. Shen and P. Piecuch, *The Journal of chemical physics*, 2013, **138**, 194102.
- 26 A. Perera, R. W. Molt, V. F. Lotrich and R. J. Bartlett, *Isaiah Shavitt: A Memorial Festschrift from Theoretical Chemistry Accounts*, 2016, 153–165.
- 27 M. Nooijen and R. J. Bartlett, *The Journal of chemical physics*, 1995, **102**, 3629–3647.
- 28 K. Raghavachari, G. W. Trucks, J. A. Pople and M. Head-Gordon, *Chemical Physics Letters*, 1989, **157**, 479–483.
- 29 P. Pokhilko, E. Epifanovsky and A. I. Krylov, *Journal of chemical theory and computation*, 2018, **14**, 4088–4096.
- 30 ANSI/IEEE Std 754-1985, 1985, 1–20.
- 31 IEEE Std 754-2008 (Revision of IEEE Std 754-1985) - Redline, 2008, 1–82.
- 32 C. Davidson, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 1975, **17**, 87–94.
- 33 K. Hirao and H. Nakatsuji, *Journal of Computational Physics*, 1982, **45**, 246–254.
- 34 C. D. Sherrill, M. L. Leininger, T. J. Van Huis and H. F. Schaefer III, *The Journal of chemical physics*, 1998, **108**, 1040–1049.
- 35 S. V. Levchenko and A. I. Krylov, *The Journal of chemical physics*, 2004, **120**, 175–185.

## Appendix

The programmable expressions of DEA-EOM-CCSDT within the Davidson's iterative diagonalization algorithm are presented below:

$$\sigma^{ab} = ((\bar{H}_{SS} - E_{CC})R_1)^{ab} + (\bar{H}_{SD}R_2)^{ab} + (\bar{H}_{ST}R_3)^{ab}$$

$$\sigma_i^{abc} = (\bar{H}_{DS}R_1)_i^{abc} + ((\bar{H}_{DD} - E_{CC})R_2)_i^{abc} + (\bar{H}_{DT}R_3)_i^{abc}$$

$$\sigma_{ij}^{abcd} = (\bar{H}_{TS}R_1)_{ij}^{abcd} + (\bar{H}_{TD}R_2)_{ij}^{abcd} + ((\bar{H}_{TT} - E_{CC})R_3)_{ij}^{abcd}$$

For computational convenience, we express the  $\sigma^{ab}$ ,  $\sigma_i^{abc}$ , and  $\sigma_{ij}^{abcd}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{ab} &= \langle \Phi^{ab} | \bar{H} | R_1 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi^{ab} | \bar{H} | R_2 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi^{ab} | \bar{H} | R_3 \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= P(ab) \sum_c F_{bc} r_{ac} - \frac{1}{2} P(ab) \sum_{icd} I_{abcd}^7 r_i^{acd} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{cd} I_{abcd}^5 r_{cd} \\ &\quad - \sum_{ic} F_{ic} r_i^{bac} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ijcd} \langle ij || dc \rangle r_{ij}^{dcab} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i^{abc} &= \langle \Phi_i^{abc} | \bar{H} | R_1 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_i^{abc} | \bar{H} | R_2 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_i^{abc} | \bar{H} | R_3 \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= P(c/ab) \left[ \sum_d F_{cd} r_i^{abd} - \sum_{jcd} I_{idj}^1 r_j^{abd} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{de} I_{abde}^5 r_i^{dec} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_j H_{jc}^8 r_{ij}^{ab} + \sum_d I_{idab}^3 r_{dc} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{nme} I_{mnie}^6 r_{nm}^{eabc} + \frac{1}{2} P(a/bc) \sum_{mef} I_{mafe}^7 r_{mi}^{efbc} \\ &\quad + \sum_{ke} F_{ke} r_{ki}^{eabc} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jk} I_{jk}^4 r_{ijk}^{abc} - \sum_j F_{ij} r_j^{abc} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{ij}^{abcd} &= \langle \Phi_{ij}^{abcd} | \bar{H} | R_1 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_{ij}^{abcd} | \bar{H} | R_2 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_{ij}^{abcd} | \bar{H} | R_3 \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= -P(ij) \sum_k F_{jk} r_{ik}^{abcd} + P(a/bcd) \sum_e F_{ae} r_{ij}^{ebcd} \\ &\quad - P(a/bcd) \sum_m I_{jima}^2 r_m^{abcd} + P(ij)P(ab|cd) \sum_e I_{ieab}^3 r_j^{ecd} \\ &\quad - P(ij)P(b|acd) \sum_{me} I_{iemb}^1 r_{mj}^{aeed} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ik} I_{ijk}^4 r_{ik}^{abcd} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} P(ab|cd) \sum_{ef} I_{cdef}^5 r_{ij}^{abef} + P(a/bcd) \sum_e H_{ebcd}^5 r_{ij}^{ae} \\ &\quad - P(ij)P(ab|cd) \sum_m H_{jmcd}^5 r_{im}^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} P(ij)P(d|abc) \sum_{nl} H_{jntd}^7 r_{nl}^{abcd} \\ &\quad - P(ad|bc) \sum_{el} H_{ebcl}^6 r_{ij}^{aed} - P(d|abc) \sum_k H_{kad}^8 r_{ijk}^{abc} \end{aligned}$$

Intermediates used for DEA:

$$I_{ij}^{Ar} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{cb} \langle ij || cb \rangle r_{cb}$$

$$H_{ia}^8 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{bc} I_{abc}^7 r_{bc} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jbc} \langle ji || bc \rangle r_j^{abc}$$

$$H_{ia}^8 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{bc} I_{abc}^7 r_{bc} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jbc} \langle ji || bc \rangle r_j^{abc} + \sum_b F_{ib} r_{ba}$$

$$H_{edcb}^5 = \sum_{mf} I_{mdfe}^7 r_m^{fcb} - \sum_f I_{dcef}^5 r_{bf} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{mf} \langle nm || fe \rangle r_{nm}^{fdbc}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_{kmba}^5 &= P(ab) \sum_e I_{kemb}^1 r_{ea} + \sum_{ne} I_{mnke}^6 r_n^{eba} - \frac{1}{2} P(ab) \sum_{ef} I_{mafe}^7 r_k^{feb} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{nef} \langle nm || fe \rangle r_{nk}^{feba} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{nfe} \langle nm || fe \rangle r_{fe} r_{nk}^{ba} \end{aligned}$$

$$H_{bacm}^6 = -P(ac) \sum_d I_{madb}^7 r_{dc} - \sum_{ne} \langle nm || be \rangle r_n^{ace}$$

$$H_{ijkb}^7 = \sum_d I_{jkid}^6 r_{db} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{da} \langle ik || da \rangle r_{jd}^{dab}$$

The programmable expressions of DIP-EOM-CCSDT within the Davidson's iterative diagonalization algorithm are presented below:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{ij} &= ((\bar{H}_{SS} - ECC)R_1)_{ij} + (\bar{H}_{SD}R_2)_{ij} + (\bar{H}_{ST}R_3)_{ij} \\ \sigma_{ijk}^a &= (\bar{H}_{DS}R_1)_{ijk}^a + ((\bar{H}_{DD} - ECC)R_2)_{ijk}^a + (\bar{H}_{DT}R_3)_{ijk}^a \\ \sigma_{ijkl}^{ab} &= (\bar{H}_{TS}R_1)_{ijkl}^a + (\bar{H}_{TD}R_2)_{ijkl}^{ab} + ((\bar{H}_{TT} - ECC)R_3)_{ijkl}^{ab}\end{aligned}$$

For computational convenience, we express the  $\sigma^{ij}$ ,  $\sigma_{ijk}^a$ , and  $\sigma_{ijkl}^{ab}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{ij} &= \langle \Phi_{ij} | \bar{H} | R_1 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_{ij} | \bar{H} | R_2 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_{ij} | \bar{H} | R_3 \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= P(ij) \sum_k F_{ik} r_{jk} + \frac{1}{2} P(ij) \sum_{kla} I_{klia}^6 r_{klj}^a + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{kl} I_{ijkl}^4 r_{kl} \\ &\quad + \sum_{ka} F_{ka} r_{ijk}^a + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{klcd} \langle kl || cd \rangle r_{ijkl}^{cd}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{ijk}^a &= \langle \Phi_{ijk}^a | \bar{H} | R_1 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_{ijk}^a | \bar{H} | R_2 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_{ijk}^a | \bar{H} | R_3 \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= P(k/ij) \left[ - \sum_l F_{kl} r_{ijl}^a + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{lm} I_{ijlm}^4 r_{lmk}^a + \sum_b I_{kb}^{9r'} r_{ij}^{ab} \right. \\ &\quad - \sum_l I_{ijla}^2 r_{kl} - P(i/jk) \sum_{bl} I_{ibla}^1 r_{ijk}^b + \sum_b F_{ab} r_{ijk}^b \\ &\quad + \sum_{lb} F_{lb} r_{ijk}^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{lcb} I_{abc}^7 r_{ijkl}^{cb} - \frac{1}{2} P(k/ij) \sum_{lmb} I_{lmkb}^6 r_{ijlm} \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{dc} I_{dc}^{5r} r_{ijk}^{dca} \right]\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{ijkl}^{ab} &= \langle \Phi_{ijkl}^{ab} | \bar{H} | R_1 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_{ijkl}^{ab} | \bar{H} | R_2 \Phi_0 \rangle + \langle \Phi_{ijkl}^{ab} | \bar{H} | R_3 \Phi_0 \rangle \\ &= P(ab) \sum_c F_{bc} r_{ijkl}^{ac} - P(l/ijk) F_{lm} r_{ijkm}^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{cd} I_{abcd}^5 r_{ijkl}^{cd} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} P(ij/kl) \sum_{mn} I_{klmn}^4 r_{ijmn}^{ab} + P(l/ijk) \sum_c I_{lcba}^2 r_{ijk}^c \\ &\quad - P(ab) P(ij/kl) \sum_m I_{klmb}^2 r_{ijm}^a - P(ab) P(l/ijk) \sum_{mc} I_{lcma}^1 r_{ijkm}^{cb} \\ &\quad - P(l/ijk) \sum_m H_{ijkm}^{4r} r_{ml}^{ab} + P(ab) P(ij/kl) \sum_e H_{ijea}^{5r} r_{kl}^{eb} \\ &\quad + P(ij/kl) \sum_d H_{id}^{9r} r_{ijkl}^{dab} - P(ikjl) \sum_{nd} H_{idkn}^{6r} r_{jnl}^{dab} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} P(ij/kl) P(ab) \sum_{cd} H_{idca}^{7r} r_{ijkl}^{dcb}.\end{aligned}$$

Intermediates used for DIP:

$$\begin{aligned}I_{cb}^{5r} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \langle ij || cb \rangle r_{ij} \\ H_{ia}^{9r'} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jk} I_{jkia}^6 r_{jk} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jkb} \langle jk || ba \rangle r_{jkb}^b \\ H_{ia}^{9r} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jk} I_{jkia}^6 r_{jk} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jkb} \langle jk || ba \rangle r_{jkb}^b - \sum_k F_{ka} r_{ik} \\ H_{jklm}^{4r} &= P(l/jk) \sum_{ne} I_{mnle}^6 r_{jkn}^e - P(j/kl) \sum_n I_{klmn}^4 r_{jn} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{nef} \langle nm || fe \rangle r_{jknl}^{fe} \\ H_{iec}^{5r} &= -P(ij) \sum_m I_{iemc}^1 r_{mj} - \frac{1}{2} P(ij) \sum_{mn} I_{mnie}^6 r_{jmn}^c \\ &\quad + \sum_{mf} I_{mcf}^7 r_{ijm}^f - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{mnf} \langle mn || ef \rangle r_{ijmn}^{cf} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{mnf} \langle nm || fe \rangle r_{mnf}^{cf} \\ H_{jdn}^{6r} &= -P(kj) \sum_m I_{mndk}^6 r_{jm} - \sum_{mf} \langle mn || df \rangle r_{jmk}^f \\ H_{idca}^{7r} &= - \sum_m I_{madc}^7 r_{im} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{nm} \langle mn || cd \rangle r_{imn}^a\end{aligned}$$

For the intermediates one can refer to Levchenko et al.<sup>35</sup> for ( $F_{ij}$ ,  $F_{ab}$ ,  $F_{ia}$ ,  $I^1$ ,  $I^4$ ,  $I^5$ ,  $I^6$  and  $I^7$  and Manisha et al.<sup>8</sup> for ( $I^2$  and  $I^3$ ))