

A CONSISTENT COMPUTATIONAL TIME-DEPENDENT ELECTRON-EXCHANGE THEORY WITH NON-REDUNDANT TIME EVOLUTION

Charles A. Weatherford

Department of Physics

Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, FL 32307

Abstract

In the present work, a new time-dependent exchange theory is presented wherein the symmetry constraints, on a multi-electron wavefunction, are properly accounted for. In so doing, the equations of motion, incorporating the required symmetry, are derived and a solution algorithm employing an implicit split-operator procedure is described. A technique (using an orthonormalization transformation and a unitary rotation), for explicitly enforcing the required constraints, which render the computations tractible and provide for non-redundant time evolution, is also presented. This amounts to the calculation of the appropriate numerically determined gauge. The invariance of the derived orbital equations of motion with respect to the transformations is explicitly demonstrated.

PACS:34.10.+x; 31.25.-v; 31.15.NE; 31.70.Hq

Keywords:Electron-electron correlation; Two-electron systems; Time-dependent exchange

I. INTRODUCTION

The time-dependent Schrödinger equation (TDSE)

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\Psi = \hat{H}\Psi \quad (1)$$

describes the dynamics of quantum mechanical systems, and in particular is applicable to systems consisting of N -electrons. The present application is restricted to atomic and molecular systems with all nuclei fixed in space (assumed infinitely massive). Note that atomic units are used throughout this work.[1] In these units, $\hbar = m_e = e = 1$, where \hbar is Planck's constant divided by 2π , m_e is the electron mass, and e is the electron charge. Ψ is the system wavefunction and is a function of time (t) and of the coordinates of the particles making up the system. \hat{H} is the Hamiltonian operator and consists of the kinetic energy operators of all of the particles in the system, plus the interaction potential between the particles as well as any external potential. In general, \hat{H} might explicitly depend on time through the external interaction potential, and while this would present no fundamental complication, the present work assumes \hat{H} does not explicitly depend on time. Also, in order to make the essential points of the present work, the number of electrons will be restricted to two. This would seem at first to be a drastic reduction in complexity, which of course it is, but the essential points can be made most clearly for two electron systems, and indeed, two electron systems, such as the hydrogen molecule (H_2), electron-hydrogen atom ($e + H$) scattering, and the helium atom (He), are important systems.

The TDSE represents an initial value problem such that if the value of the wavefunction at $t = 0$ is specified, and if the TDSE can be accurately solved, then the quantum mechanical dynamics will be encoded in the solution (wavefunction) at $t = \infty$ or an approximation thereunto. In section II, the multiconfigurational time-dependent exchange theory will be presented in a form which is specialized to two-electron systems. In addition, since much of the present development is herein presented for the first time, only one orbital per particle will explicitly be considered. It should be noted that the present formulation can be viewed as a modification of the multiconfigurational time-dependent Hartree (MCTDH)

theory of Manthe, Meyer, and Cederbaum,[2,3] appropriate for fermions, and as such, it may be generalized to several fermions and multi-function representations of each one. But in addition, the present paper presents an explicit prescription for enforcing the required constraints on the time-dependent orbitals such that “non-redundant time evolution” is guaranteed—this appears to be a new contribution, along with the new explicit treatment of the exchange symmetry and the very compact form of the EOM. Section II.A derives the equations of motion (EOM) assuming orbital orthonormality and non-redundant time evolution; Section II.B presents the derivation of the transformations—(1) an orthonormalization matrix and (2) a unitary rotation matrix, which is the solution of a first order differential equation in time. The application of these two orbital transformations results in orbital orthonormality and non-redundant orbital time evolution; Section II.C demonstrates the invariance of the EOM with respect to the two transformations; Section III describes a solution algorithm using an implicit split-operator procedure (ISOP)[4,5]. Finally, section IV will present the conclusions.

II. TIME-DEPENDENT ELECTRON EXCHANGE THEORY

II.A Equations of Motion

As specified above, the present development is applied to two-electron systems and thus the TDSE is represented as

$$i \frac{d}{dt} \Psi(1, 2) = \hat{H}(1, 2) \Psi(1, 2) \tag{2}$$

where the notation for Ψ stands for $\Psi(1, 2) = \Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2; t)$, and $\hat{H}(1, 2) = \hat{H}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2)$ such that the time dependence is assumed for all wavefunctions and orbitals (to be defined below)—the Hamiltonian however is assumed to have no explicit time dependence. For a two-electron system, the wavefunction factors into a space part times a spin part and the total wavefunction must be completely antisymmetric with respect to electron exchange.[6] The spin states are either singlets or triplets. The Hamiltonian is spin independent at the

level of theory under consideration. More explicitly, the Hamiltonian is given by

$$\hat{H}(1, 2) = \hat{H}_0(1) + \hat{H}_0(2) + V(1, 2) = \hat{H}_0(1, 2) + V(1, 2) \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{H}_0(j) = \hat{T}_0(j) + V_0(j)$ and $\hat{T}_0(j) = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla_{\vec{r}_j}^2$. Note that if $V(1, 2)$ is symmetric, then $\hat{H}(1, 2)$ is also.

For a two-electron system, the spatial wavefunction, corresponding to a spin singlet ($\Psi^{(+)}$), is symmetric with respect to exchange, while the spatial part is antisymmetric for a spin triplet ($\Psi^{(-)}$). The spatial wavefunction then depends on the spatial parts of the two electrons and on time. It resides in a six dimensional ($6D$) coordinate space. If it were practical, the full six spatial dimensional wavefunction would be propagated in time. However, this is not practical at the present stage of computer technology—it may be in the near future however. Certainly, for systems composed of three or more electrons, the full dimensional solution is not available and will not be for the foreseeable future. Thus, a decomposition into a direct product of three dimensional ($3D$) subspaces (one for each electron) is the advisable procedure. Then, the spatial part of the two-electron wavefunction may then be expanded, at the minimal expansion length, in the manner of [2,3], as

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{(+)}(1, 2) &= \sum_{j=1}^3 A_j^{(\phi,+)} \Phi_j^{(\phi,+)}(1, 2) \\ \Psi^{(-)}(1, 2) &= A_1^{(\phi,-)} \Phi_1^{(\phi,-)}(1, 2) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The A 's are purely time-dependent coefficients multiplying each two-electron configuration function. The superscript (ϕ, \pm) indicates that the one-electron orbitals, labeled by ϕ , are used, and the permutation symmetry is singlet (+) or triplet (-). Thus, the singlet spatial wavefunction is a superposition of three two-electron configurations $\Phi_j^{(\phi,+)}$ and the triplet has one two-electron configuration function $\Phi_1^{(\phi,-)}$. The minimal length of these expansions is determined by the required invariance of $\Psi^{(\pm)}$ with respect to arbitrary rotations among the one-electron orbitals[2,3] comprising the $\Phi_1^{(\phi,\pm)}$'s (see below). $\Phi_j^{(\phi,+)} : j = 1, 2, 3$ is symmetric with respect to electron exchange and $\Phi^{(\phi,-)}$ is antisymmetric with respect to electron exchange. There are two one-electron orbitals required to describe the two-electron

configurations: they are labeled $\phi_j^{(\pm)} : j = 1, 2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_1^{(\phi,+)}(1, 2) &= \phi_1^{(+)}(1)\phi_1^{(+)}(2) \\
\Phi_2^{(\phi,+)}(1, 2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\phi_1^{(+)}(1)\phi_2^{(+)}(2) + \phi_1^{(+)}(2)\phi_2^{(+)}(1)] \\
\Phi_3^{(\phi,+)}(1, 2) &= \phi_2^{(+)}(1)\phi_2^{(+)}(2) \\
\Phi_1^{(\phi,-)}(1, 2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\phi_1^{(-)}(1)\phi_2^{(-)}(2) - \phi_1^{(-)}(2)\phi_2^{(-)}(1)]
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Consistent with the decomposition of the $6D$ space into a direct product of $3D$ subspaces, the objective is to derive two coupled time-dependent $3D$ equations for the one-electron orbitals. In addition, time-dependent equations for the purely time-dependent coefficients need to be derived (three for the singlet and one for the triplet—see Eq. (4)).

Now in general, the ϕ 's are not necessarily computationally orthonormal because of numerical inaccuracies. If Eqs. (5) are substituted into Eqs. (4), which are then substituted into Eq. (2), aside from nonzero off-diagonal, and non-unit diagonal, overlaps $S_{ij}^{(\phi,\pm)} = \langle \phi_i^{(\pm)} | \phi_j^{(\pm)} \rangle$, a set of nonzero “derivative overlaps” given by $D_{ij}^{(\phi,\pm)} = \langle \dot{\phi}_i^{(\pm)} | \phi_j^{(\pm)} \rangle$, where the ‘over-dot’ represents a time derivative, will appear in the equations. One of the principal distinctions of the MCTDH theory of [2,3] is the use of the purely time-dependent coefficients, as indicated in Eqs. (4), as contrasted with, for example, a time-dependent Hartree-Fock theory (TDHF) [7], wherein the time-dependence is described solely by the one-electron orbitals. As pointed out in [2,3], this additional set of time-dependent coefficients produces a redundant description which allows for the incorporation of certain constraints. To see this, consider a new set of one-electron orbitals, $\psi_j^{(\pm)}$, related to the old set by

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_1^{(\pm)} &= \phi_1^{(\pm)} b_{11}^{(\pm)} + \phi_2^{(\pm)} b_{21}^{(\pm)} \\
\psi_2^{(\pm)} &= \phi_1^{(\pm)} b_{12}^{(\pm)} + \phi_2^{(\pm)} b_{22}^{(\pm)}
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Assuming \mathbf{b} is unitary and purely time-dependent, ($\mathbf{b}\mathbf{b}^\dagger = \mathbf{b}^\dagger\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{1}$), this can be written

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\psi}^{(\pm)} &= \tilde{\phi}^{(\pm)} \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)} \\
\vec{\psi}^{(\pm)} &= \tilde{\mathbf{b}}^{(\pm)} \vec{\phi}^{(\pm)}
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where † indicates hermitian conjugate. Assuming Eq. (7) can be inverted (where the tilde indicates vector or matrix transpose) as per

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\phi}^{(\pm)} &= \tilde{\psi}^{(\pm)} \mathbf{b}^{\dagger(\pm)} \\ \vec{\phi}^{(\pm)} &= \mathbf{b}^{*(\pm)} \vec{\psi}^{(\pm)}\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

and inserted into Eqs. (5) and then into Eqs. (4), it will be seen that Eqs. (4) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^{(+)}(1, 2) &= \sum_{j=1}^3 A_j^{(\psi, +)} \Phi_j^{(\psi, +)}(1, 2) \\ \Psi^{(-)}(1, 2) &= A_1^{(\psi, -)} \Phi_1^{(\psi, -)}(1, 2)\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_1^{(\psi, +)}(1, 2) &= \psi_1^{(+)}(1) \psi_1^{(+)}(2) \\ \Phi_2^{(\psi, +)}(1, 2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\psi_1^{(+)}(1) \psi_2^{(+)}(2) + \psi_1^{(+)}(2) \psi_2^{(+)}(1)] \\ \Phi_3^{(\psi, +)}(1, 2) &= \psi_2^{(+)}(1) \psi_2^{(+)}(2) \\ \Phi_1^{(\psi, -)}(1, 2) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\psi_1^{(-)}(1) \psi_2^{(-)}(2) - \psi_1^{(-)}(2) \psi_2^{(-)}(1)]\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}A_1^{(\psi, +)} &= A_1^{(\phi, +)} b_{11}^{(+)*} b_{11}^{(+)*} + A_2^{(\phi, +)} \sqrt{2} b_{11}^{(+)*} b_{21}^{(+)*} + A_3^{(\phi, +)} b_{21}^{(+)*} b_{21}^{(+)*} \\ A_2^{(\psi, +)} &= A_1^{(\phi, +)} \sqrt{2} b_{11}^{(+)*} b_{12}^{(+)*} + A_2^{(\phi, +)} [b_{11}^{(+)*} b_{22}^{(+)*} + b_{21}^{(+)*} b_{12}^{(+)*}] + A_3^{(\phi, +)} b_{22}^{(+)*} b_{21}^{(+)*} \\ A_3^{(\psi, +)} &= A_1^{(\phi, +)} b_{12}^{(+)*} b_{12}^{(+)*} + A_2^{(\phi, +)} \sqrt{2} b_{12}^{(+)*} b_{22}^{(+)*} + A_3^{(\phi, +)} b_{22}^{(+)*} b_{22}^{(+)*} \\ A_1^{(\psi, -)} &= A_1^{(\phi, -)} [b_{11}^{(-)*} b_{22}^{(-)*} - b_{21}^{(-)*} b_{12}^{(-)*}]\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

The significant point is that the four purely time-dependent matrix elements defining $\mathbf{b}^{(\pm)}$ are completely arbitrary because of the invariance of Eqs. (9) and (10) with respect to the transformation described by Eq. (7).

The utility of the arbitrariness of $\mathbf{b}^{(\pm)}$ lies in its use to fix four matrix elements involving the ψ 's. As a rationale for this, consider that there are four overlaps $S_{ij}^{(\psi, \pm)} = \langle \psi_i^{(\pm)} | \psi_j^{(\pm)} \rangle$ and four derivative overlaps $D_{ij}^{(\psi, \pm)} = \langle \psi_i^{(\pm)} | \dot{\psi}_j^{(\pm)} \rangle$. Thus there are eight

such matrix elements. However, only four are independent. If the four choices are made corresponding to $D_{11}^{(\psi,\pm)} = 0$, $D_{21}^{(\psi,\pm)} = 0$, $D_{22}^{(\psi,\pm)} = 0$, and $S_{21}^{(\psi,\pm)} = 0$, then it can be easily shown that the other four matrix elements are fixed. Thus, $D_{i,j}^{(\psi,\pm)} = 0$, $S_{i,j}^{(\psi,\pm)} = \delta_{i,j}$ for all i, j . Actually, the diagonal overlaps are arbitrary constants which may be set to one. In section II.B below, a systematic way of implementing these constraints will be given. In so doing, it will be seen that the enforcement of orthonormality and non-redundant time-evolution, must be done in two different transformation steps, separated in sequence by the time propagation over the time interval Δt .

The derivation of the EOM proceeds by a projection method. A critical property in the derivation by projection of the EOM for the A 's is the orthonormality of the two-electron configuration functions such that

$$\langle\langle \Phi_i^{(\psi,\pm)} | \Phi_j^{(\psi,\pm)} \rangle\rangle = \delta_{ij}, \quad (12)$$

where the double brackets $\langle\langle | \rangle\rangle$ represents 6D integration over the coordinates of both particles, and the zero values of the derivative overlap matrix elements of the two-electron configuration functions

$$\langle\langle \Phi_i^{(\psi,\pm)} | \dot{\Phi}_j^{(\psi,\pm)} \rangle\rangle = 0. \quad (13)$$

These relations follow immediately from the orthonormality of the ψ 's and the zero values of the one-electron derivative overlap matrix elements. The procedure is thus to substitute Eqs. (10) into Eqs. (9), and then to use the result in Eq. (2). Then project from the left by $\Phi_k^{(\psi,\pm)*}$ and integrate over the coordinates of particles one and two. The result is

$$\dot{A}_k^{(\psi,\pm)} = -i \sum_{j=1}^{N^{(\pm)}} \langle\langle \Phi_k^{(\psi,\pm)} | \hat{H} | \Phi_j^{(\psi,\pm)} \rangle\rangle A_j^{(\psi,\pm)} \quad (14)$$

where $N^{(\pm)} = 3/1$. for the singlet case (+ sign), $j, k : 1, 2, 3$. For the triplet case, (- sign), $j, k : 1$.

In order to derive the EOM for the time-dependent one-electron orbitals, the singlet and triplet cases are considered separately. To derive EOM for the one-electron orbitals, a

similar projection (as above for the Φ 's) is employed, except now the one-electron orbitals are used. First, project from the left by $\psi_1^{(+)}(1)^*$ on Eq. (2) and integrate over the coordinates of particle one. Then use the overlap and derivative overlap constraints (in the ψ -basis) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^{(\psi,+)}\dot{\psi}_1^{(+)}(2) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}A_2^{(\psi,+)}\dot{\psi}_2^{(+)}(2) + \dot{A}_1^{(\psi,+)}\psi_1^{(+)}(2) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\dot{A}_2^{(\psi,+)}\psi_2^{(+)}(2) \\ = -i \sum_{j=1}^3 \langle \psi_1^{(+)}(1) | \hat{H} | \Phi_j^{(\psi,+)}(1,2) \rangle_1 A_j^{(\psi,+)} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\langle || \rangle_1$ indicates an integral over the coordinates of particle one.

Secondly, project from the left by $\psi_2^{(+)}(2)^*$ on Eq. (2) and integrate over the coordinates of particle two. Then use the overlap and derivative overlap constraints, again, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}A_2^{(\psi,+)}\dot{\psi}_1^{(+)}(1) + A_3^{(\psi,+)}\dot{\psi}_2^{(+)}(1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\dot{A}_2^{(\psi,+)}\psi_1^{(+)}(1) + \dot{A}_3^{(\psi,+)}\psi_2^{(+)}(1) \\ = -i \sum_{j=1}^3 \langle \psi_2^{(+)}(2) | \hat{H} | \Phi_j^{(\psi,+)}(1,2) \rangle_2 A_j^{(\psi,+)} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\langle || \rangle_2$ indicates an integral over the coordinates of particle two.

Exactly the same two projections are done for the triplet case as was done for the singlet case. The results are (in analogy to Eq. (15))

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}A_1^{(\psi,-)}\dot{\psi}_2^{(-)}(2) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\dot{A}_1^{(\psi,-)}\psi_2^{(-)}(2) = -i \langle \psi_1^{(-)}(1) | \hat{H} | \Phi_1^{(\psi,-)}(1,2) \rangle_1 A_1^{(\psi,-)} \quad (17)$$

and (in analogy to Eq. (16))

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}A_1^{(\psi,-)}\dot{\psi}_1^{(-)}(1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\dot{A}_1^{(\psi,-)}\psi_1^{(-)}(1) = -i \langle \psi_2^{(-)}(2) | \hat{H} | \Phi_1^{(\psi,-)}(1,2) \rangle_2 A_1^{(\psi,-)} \quad (18)$$

The three EOM are thus given by Eqs. (14),(15), and (16) for the singlet case, and by Eqs. (14),(17), and (18) for the triplet case.

Plugging Eqs. (10) into Eqs. (15) and (16), then plugging Eqs. (10) into Eqs. (17) and (18), and then reversing the coordinate labels in Eq. (15) and Eq. (17) (e.g. $1 \leftrightarrow 2$), and finally writing in matrix form, results in

$$\dot{\vec{\Psi}}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) = -i \hat{\mathbf{h}}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) \vec{\Psi}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) \quad (19)$$

where the symbols are defined differently for the singlet and triplet cases, and where

$$\vec{\Psi}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) = \mathbf{a}^{(\psi,\pm)} \vec{\psi}^{(\pm)}(1) \quad (20)$$

Now, the h and a -matrices are defined as

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{h}_{11}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) & \hat{h}_{12}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) \\ \hat{h}_{21}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) & \hat{h}_{22}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

and, for the singlet

$$\mathbf{a}^{(\psi,+)} = \begin{pmatrix} A_1^{(\psi,+)} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}A_2^{(\psi,+)} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}A_2^{(\psi,+)} & A_3^{(\psi,+)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

and for the triplet

$$\mathbf{a}^{(\psi,-)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_1^{(\psi,-)} \\ -A_1^{(\psi,-)} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Finally, the $h_{k,j}^{(\psi,\pm)}$ matrix elements are defined by

$$\hat{h}_{kj}^{(\psi,\pm)}(1) = \langle \psi_k^{(\pm)}(2) | \hat{H}(1,2) | \psi_j^{(\pm)}(2) \rangle_2 \quad (24)$$

From here on, the actual orbital coordinate labels will be dropped, except in several circumstances where it is convenient to exhibit them for clarity.

II.B Orbital Transformations

In the derivation of the EOM [Eqs. (14,19)] using the ψ -basis, it has been assumed that $\mathbf{S}^{(\psi,\pm)} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{D}^{(\psi,\pm)} = \mathbf{0}$. However, just because these two assumptions have been

made in the deriving the EOM, does not automatically result in the enforcement of the constraints expressed in the two assumptions. It is well known that if the multielectron time-dependent Schrödinger equation is solved exactly as an N -electron problem, without the orbital direct product ansatz, and if the wave function at $t = 0$ is orthonormal, then, in principle, the wave function should remain orthonormal for all time. However, computational errors will inevitably accrue and destroy this orthonormality. For an orbital direct product decomposition, this orthonormality assumption is in principal, still valid, subject to numerical inaccuracies. If this orbital orthonormality is lost because of numerical inaccuracies, it is not sufficient to just re-orthonormalize without appropriately modifying the other terms which appear in the EOM—in fact, the EOM should be invariant with respect to this orthonormalization transformation. It is one of the salient features of the present work, that this invariance is explicit for the EOM derived herein. This invariance is demonstrated below. Also, a procedure for enforcement is described.

It can be easily shown that if in some basis (ψ for example) $\mathbf{S}^{(\psi,\pm)} = \mathbf{1}$, then the D -matrix is anti-hermitian (e.g. $\mathbf{D}^{(\psi,\pm)} + \mathbf{D}^{(\psi,\pm)\dagger} = \mathbf{0}$). On the other hand, if $\mathbf{D}^{(\psi,\pm)} = \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{D}^{(\psi,\pm)\dagger} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{S}^{(\psi,\pm)} = \mathbf{C}^{(\psi,\pm)}$ where $\mathbf{C}^{(\psi,\pm)}$ is a constant matrix, not necessarily $\mathbf{1}$. As indicated above, however, orthonormality and a null D -matrix are consistent with each other.

II.B-1 Orthonormalization Transformation

This section is concerned with the following overlap matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}^{(\chi,\pm)} &= \langle \tilde{\chi}^{(\pm)} | \tilde{\chi}^{(\pm)} \rangle \\ \mathbf{S}^{(\phi,\pm)} &= \langle \tilde{\phi}^{(\pm)} | \tilde{\phi}^{(\pm)} \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

A symmetric orthonormalization procedure [8] is utilized, at the R-end of the Δt interval (note that the transformation matrix $\mathbf{X}^{(\pm)}$ is not unitary, however, note that $\mathbf{X}^{(\pm)} = \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)\dagger}$), to go from the χ -set to the ϕ -set:

$$\phi_{\mu}^{(\pm)} = \sum_{\nu} \chi_{\nu}^{(\pm)} X_{\nu,\mu}^{(\pm)} \tag{26}$$

or in matrix notation

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{\phi}^{(\pm)} &= \tilde{\chi}^{(\pm)} \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)} \\
\vec{\phi}^{(\pm)} &= \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(\pm)} \tilde{\chi}^{(\pm)}
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where

$$\mathbf{X}^{(\pm)} = \mathbf{U}^{(\pm)} [\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{(\chi, \pm)}]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}^{(\pm)\dagger} \tag{28}$$

and where $\mathbf{U}^{(\pm)}$ is the unitary matrix that diagonalizes $[\mathbf{S}^{(\chi, \pm)}]^{\pm 1}$ (the overlap matrix, or its inverse, in the χ -basis)

$$\mathbf{U}^{(\pm)\dagger} [\mathbf{S}^{(\chi, \pm)}]^{\pm 1} \mathbf{U}^{(\pm)} = [\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{(\chi, \pm)}]^{\pm 1} \tag{29}$$

such that $\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{(\chi, \pm)}$ is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues and $[\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{(\chi, \pm)}]^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is the diagonal matrix of one over the square root of the eigenvalues. Note that in Eq. (29), the ± 1 is independent of the \pm which appears in the superscript (χ, \pm) . Thus,

$$\mathbf{S}^{(\phi, \pm)} = \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)\dagger} \mathbf{S}^{(\chi, \pm)} \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)}; \tag{30a}$$

$$\mathbf{X}^{(\pm)\dagger} \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)} = \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)} \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)\dagger} = \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)} \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)} = [\mathbf{S}^{(\chi, \pm)}]^{-1}. \tag{30b}$$

It can easily be seen that

$$\mathbf{X}^{(\pm)-1} = \mathbf{U}^{(\pm)} [\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{(\chi, \pm)}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}^{(\pm)\dagger}; \tag{31a}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(\pm)-1} = \mathbf{U}^{(\pm)*} [\bar{\mathbf{s}}^{(\chi, \pm)}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^{(\pm)}. \tag{31b}$$

II.B-2 Unitary Rotation Transformation

In this section, it is assumed that the EOM in the ϕ -set has been solved over the interval Δt so that the D -matrix in the ϕ -set can be calculated at the R-end of the time interval. Thus, this section is concerned with the following derivative overlap matrices calculated at the R-end of the time interval:

$$\mathbf{D}^{(\phi, \pm)} = \langle \vec{\phi}^{(\pm)} | \vec{\phi}^{(\pm)} \rangle; \quad (32a)$$

$$\mathbf{D}^{(\psi, \pm)} = \langle \vec{\psi}^{(\pm)} | \vec{\psi}^{(\pm)} \rangle. \quad (32b)$$

The objective is to find a unitary transformation (at the R-end of the time interval) of the ϕ -set to the ψ -set, such that $\mathbf{D}^{(\psi, \pm)} = \mathbf{1}$. Thus the transformation is represented by

$$\psi_{\mu}^{(\pm)} = \sum_{\nu} \phi_{\nu}^{(\pm)} b_{\nu, \mu}^{(\pm)} \quad (33)$$

or in matrix notation, this is described by Eq. (7) above. Note that the overlaps, given by this transformation, are related by

$$\mathbf{S}^{(\psi, \pm)} = \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)\dagger} \mathbf{S}^{(\phi, \pm)} \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)} \quad (34)$$

Clearly, if the ϕ -set is orthonormal, and if \mathbf{b} is unitary, then the ψ -set is orthonormal.

Now, if Eq. (33) is used in Eq. (32), then

$$\mathbf{D}^{(\psi, \pm)} = \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)\dagger} \left[\mathbf{D}^{(\phi, \pm)} \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)} + \mathbf{S}^{(\psi, \pm)} \dot{\mathbf{b}}^{(\pm)} \right] \quad (35)$$

If we demand $\mathbf{D}^{(\psi, \pm)} = \mathbf{0}$, and assuming orthonormality of the ψ -set, then

$$\dot{\mathbf{b}}^{(\pm)} + \mathbf{D}^{(\phi, \pm)} \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)} = \mathbf{0} \quad (36)$$

Now $\mathbf{D}^{(\phi, \pm)}$ is anti-hermitian since the ψ -set is orthonormal, as can be seen from Eq. (34), given the orthonormality of the ϕ -set. It is then known [7] that use of the Cayley decomposition to propagate \mathbf{b}^{\pm} in time, will preserve unitarity. Therefore, if Eq. (36) is solved, using $\mathbf{D}^{(\phi, \pm)}$ at the R-end, then $\mathbf{b}^{(\pm)}$ will be calculated at the R-end such that $\mathbf{D}^{(\psi, \pm)} = \mathbf{0}$ at the R-end.

II.C EOM Invariance

The objective of this section is to show the invariance of the EOM with respect to the orthonormalization transformation (\mathbf{X}) and the rotation matrix (\mathbf{b}). This will be done

by first surmising a compact form for the full two-electron wave function (see Eq. (2)), and then deriving the EOM without assuming orthonormality or null D -matrices, for each of the three bases (χ, ϕ, ψ). It will then be shown that the resultant EOM are invariant in form with respect to the linear transformations given by \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{b} . Note that, from hereon, unless otherwise noted, the \pm notation will be dropped with the understanding that the distinction still applies. Collecting some pertinent formulas for reference, we show the following, which are inferred from Eqs. (4, 20, and 24) above:

χ - set

$$\Psi_{\chi}(1, 2) = \tilde{\chi}(1) \mathbf{a}^{(\chi)} \tilde{\chi}(2) ; \quad (37a)$$

$$\vec{\Psi}^{(\chi)} = \mathbf{a}^{(\chi)} \tilde{\chi}; \quad (37b)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}^{(\chi)} = \langle \tilde{\chi} | \hat{H} | \tilde{\chi} \rangle . \quad (37c)$$

ϕ - set

$$\Psi_{\phi}(1, 2) = \tilde{\phi}(1) \mathbf{a}^{(\phi)} \tilde{\phi}(2) ; \quad (38a)$$

$$\vec{\Psi}^{(\phi)} = \mathbf{a}^{(\phi)} \tilde{\phi}; \quad (38b)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}^{(\phi)} = \langle \tilde{\phi} | \hat{H} | \tilde{\phi} \rangle . \quad (38c)$$

ψ - set

$$\Psi_{\psi}(1, 2) = \tilde{\psi}(1) \mathbf{a}^{(\psi)} \tilde{\psi}(2) ; \quad (39a)$$

$$\vec{\Psi}^{(\psi)} = \mathbf{a}^{(\psi)} \tilde{\psi}; \quad (39b)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}^{(\psi)} = \langle \tilde{\psi} | \hat{H} | \tilde{\psi} \rangle . \quad (39c)$$

The actual orbital transformations have been given by Eqs. (7, 27). It must be shown that the EOM are invariant with respect to the two transformations. To this end, the EOM are derived below without assuming orthonormality or a null D -matrix.

Begin by substituting Eq. (37a) into Eq. (2), multiplying from the left by $\tilde{\chi}(1)$ and integrating over the coordinates of $\vec{r}(1)$ —the result is

$$\mathbf{D}^{(\chi)} \mathbf{a}^{(\chi)} \tilde{\chi} + \mathbf{S}^{(\chi)} \dot{\mathbf{a}}^{(\chi)} \tilde{\chi} + \mathbf{S}^{(\chi)} \mathbf{a}^{(\chi)} \dot{\tilde{\chi}} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}^{(\chi)} \mathbf{a}^{(\chi)} \tilde{\chi} \quad (40)$$

Now, define a transformation of orbitals

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\vec{\psi}} &\equiv \tilde{\vec{\chi}} \mathbf{C} \\ \vec{\psi} &= \tilde{\mathbf{C}} \tilde{\vec{\chi}}\end{aligned}\tag{41}$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}^{(\pm)} \equiv \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)} \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)};\tag{42a}$$

$$\mathbf{C}^{(\pm)*} = \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)*} \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)*};\tag{42b}$$

$$\mathbf{C}^{(\pm)\dagger} = \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)\dagger} \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)\dagger};\tag{42c}$$

$$\mathbf{C}^{(\pm)^{-1}} = \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)\dagger} \mathbf{X}^{(\pm)^{-1}};\tag{42d}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\pm)^{-1}} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(\pm)^{-1}} \mathbf{b}^{(\pm)*}.\tag{42e}$$

Thus the transformation defined by \mathbf{C} combines the orthonormalization transformation with the rotation transformation. In this manner, the ϕ -set of orbitals may be dispensed with. Inverting Eqs. (41) results in

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\vec{\chi}} &\equiv \tilde{\vec{\psi}} \mathbf{C}^{-1} \\ \vec{\chi} &= \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \vec{\psi}\end{aligned}\tag{43}$$

Then taking the time derivative of Eqs. (43), gives

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\tilde{\vec{\chi}}} &\equiv \dot{\tilde{\vec{\psi}}} \mathbf{C}^{-1} + \tilde{\vec{\psi}} \dot{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \\ \dot{\vec{\chi}} &= \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{C}}}^{-1} \vec{\psi} + \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \dot{\vec{\psi}}\end{aligned}\tag{44}$$

Substituting Eqs. (41), (43), and (44) into Eq. (40) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{C}^{\dagger^{-1}} \langle \tilde{\vec{\psi}} | [\dot{\tilde{\vec{\psi}}} \mathbf{C}^{-1} + \tilde{\vec{\psi}} \dot{\mathbf{C}}^{-1}] \rangle \mathbf{a}^{(x)} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \vec{\psi} + \mathbf{C}^{\dagger^{-1}} \langle \tilde{\vec{\psi}} | \tilde{\vec{\psi}} \rangle \mathbf{C}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{a}}^{(x)} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \vec{\psi} + \\ \mathbf{C}^{\dagger^{-1}} \langle \tilde{\vec{\psi}} | \tilde{\vec{\psi}} \rangle \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{a}^{(x)} [\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{C}}}^{-1} \vec{\psi} + \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \dot{\vec{\psi}}] = -i \mathbf{C}^{\dagger^{-1}} \langle \tilde{\vec{\psi}} | \hat{H} | \tilde{\vec{\psi}} \rangle \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{a}^{(x)} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \vec{\psi}.\end{aligned}\tag{45}$$

Now define

$$\mathbf{a}^{(\psi)} \equiv \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{a}^{(x)} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1}.\tag{46}$$

and then

$$\dot{\mathbf{a}}^{(\psi)} = \dot{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} \mathbf{a}^{(x)} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} + \mathbf{C}^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{a}}^{(x)} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1} + \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{a}^{(x)} \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{C}}}^{-1}. \quad (47)$$

Also, it is clear that

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}^{(\psi)} = \mathbf{C}^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{h}}^{(x)} \mathbf{C} \quad (48)$$

Then multiply Eq. (45) from the left by \mathbf{C}^\dagger and use Eqs. (46) and (47) to produce

$$\mathbf{D}^{(\psi)} \mathbf{a}^{(\psi)} \vec{\psi} + \mathbf{S}^{(\psi)} \dot{\mathbf{a}}^{(\psi)} \vec{\psi} + \mathbf{S}^{(\psi)} \mathbf{a}^{(\psi)} \dot{\vec{\psi}} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}^{(\psi)} \mathbf{a}^{(\psi)} \vec{\psi} \quad (49)$$

Note that

$$\mathbf{S}^{(\psi)} = \langle \tilde{\psi} | \tilde{\psi} \rangle; \quad (50a)$$

$$\mathbf{D}^{(\psi)} = \langle \tilde{\psi} | \dot{\tilde{\psi}} \rangle \quad (50b).$$

A comparison of Eq. (49) and (40) demonstrates the EOM invariance.

Now, using Eqs. (41) and (44), it is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{D}^{(\psi)} = \mathbf{C}^\dagger [\mathbf{D}^{(x)} \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{S}^{(x)} \dot{\mathbf{C}}] \quad (51)$$

Requiring that $\mathbf{D}^{(\psi)} = 0$ results in an equation which defines \mathbf{C}

$$\dot{\mathbf{C}} + \mathbf{\Gamma}^{(x)} \mathbf{C} = 0 \quad (52)$$

where

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(x)} \equiv \mathbf{S}^{(x)-1} \mathbf{D}^{(x)} \quad (53)$$

In principle, $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{(x)}$ is antihermitian since $\mathbf{S}^{(x)}$ is hermitian and $\mathbf{D}^{(x)}$ is antihermitian.

III. USE OF THE ISOP ALGORITHM

The ISOP algorithm[4] has been applied to several problems [4,5] including the integration of two coupled equations resulting from a time-dependent Hartree ansatz applied to H_2 . [5] The ISOP algorithm is a two-time-step algorithm and involves (as indicated above) a time interval Δt , the retarded time (R), at the R-end of Δt , and the advanced time at the A-end. The present equations are nonlinear equations—this presents no essential difficulty however. It is possible, as we demonstrate below, to decompose the solution into steps so as to in effect render the equations linear from a computational point of view. The basic computational tool used in taking time derivatives in the ISOP is the Cayley formula.[7] The superscripts labeling \pm and the orbital types are dropped in the following.

First, rewrite Eq. (14) in matrix form as

$$\dot{\vec{A}} = -i\mathbf{H}\vec{A} \quad (54)$$

Then, the analysis easily gives

$$\vec{A}_A \approx \left[\mathbf{1} + \frac{i}{2} dt \mathbf{H}_R \right]^{-1} \left[\mathbf{1} - \frac{i}{2} dt \mathbf{H}_R \right] \vec{A}_R \quad (55)$$

where the A -subscript stands for advanced (in time) and the R -subscript stands for retarded (in time), as has already been used above. Also,

$$H_{k,j} = \langle\langle \Phi_k | \hat{H} | \Phi_j \rangle\rangle \quad (56)$$

and then

$$\dot{\vec{A}} \approx [\vec{A}_A - \vec{A}_R] / \Delta t. \quad (57)$$

The time derivative of the orbitals is evaluated in this manner also; e.g. for the χ -set

$$\dot{\vec{\chi}} \approx [\vec{\chi}_A - \vec{\chi}_R] / \Delta t. \quad (58)$$

The time advance of the matrix \mathbf{C} may be evaluated (see Eq. (52)) in a similar manner (when needed) via

$$\mathbf{C}_A \approx \left[\vec{\mathbf{I}} + \frac{1}{2} dt \mathbf{\Gamma}_R \right]^{-1} \left[\vec{\mathbf{I}} - \frac{1}{2} dt \mathbf{\Gamma}_R \right] \mathbf{C}_R \quad (59)$$

It is useful to express the H -matrix elements (Eq. (55)) in terms of the \hat{h} -matrix elements. To do so, define

$$h_{p(qr)s} \equiv \langle \psi_p | \hat{h}_{qr} | \psi_s \rangle \quad (60)$$

Then, (with $H_{jk} = H_{kj}$),

$$\begin{aligned} H_{11} &= h_{1(11)1} ; \\ H_{12} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [h_{1(11)2} + h_{1(12)1}] ; \\ H_{13} &= h_{1(12)2} ; \\ H_{22} &= \frac{1}{2} [h_{2(11)2} + 2 h_{2(12)1} + h_{1(22)1}] ; \\ H_{23} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [h_{1(22)2} + h_{2(12)2}] ; \\ H_{33} &= h_{2(22)2} ; \\ H_{11} &= \frac{1}{2} [h_{2(11)2} - 2 h_{2(12)1} + h_{1(22)1}] . \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

In order to use the ISOP to integrate the orbital equations, the singlet and triplet cases are considered separately again. The ISOP may now be applied directly to Eq. (19). Using the definitions of $\hat{T}_0(j)$ and $V_0(j)$ immediately below Eq. (3), Eq. (19) may be written as (the explicit reference to particle coordinates is dropped)

$$\dot{\vec{\Psi}} = -i \hat{T}_0 \vec{\Psi} - i \hat{\mathbf{M}} \vec{\Psi} \quad (62)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}} = \vec{\mathbf{I}} V_0 + \hat{\mathbf{h}}_0 + \mathbf{V} \quad (63)$$

such that $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_0$ is the same as $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$ in Eq. (23), except with $\hat{H}(1, 2)$ replaced by $\hat{H}_0(1, 2)$ (see Eq. (3)). Also \mathbf{V} is the same as $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$ except $V(1, 2)$ replaces $\hat{H}(1, 2)$.

Then, finally, application of the ISOP results in

$$\vec{\Psi}_A = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{4}idt \hat{T}_0}{1 + \frac{1}{4}idt \hat{T}_0} [\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{bot}]^{-1} [\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{top}] \frac{1 - \frac{1}{4}idt \hat{T}_0}{1 + \frac{1}{4}idt \hat{T}_0} \vec{\Psi}_R \quad (64)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{bot} &\equiv +\frac{1}{2}idt \hat{\mathbf{M}} \\ \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{top} &\equiv -\frac{1}{2}idt \hat{\mathbf{M}} \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Assuming that the χ -set is orthonormal and that $\mathbf{D}^{(x)} = \mathbf{0}$, as would be the case for a completely accurate time propagation and spatial derivative and integral evaluation, the basic algorithm proceeds as follows (reintroduce the orbital labels):

Basic Algorithm

- Step 1: specify $\vec{\chi}_R(t=0)$, $\vec{A}_R^{(x)}(t=0) \equiv \mathbf{1}$;
- Step 2: calculate $\mathbf{a}_R^{(x)}$ using Eqs. (22,23);
- Step 3: calculate $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_R^{(x)}$ using Eq. (37c);
- Step 4: calculate $\mathbf{H}_R^{(x)}$ using Eqs. (59);
- Step 5: calculate $\vec{A}_A^{(x)}$ using Eq. (55);
- Step 6: calculate $\vec{\Psi}_R^{(x)}$ using Eq. (39b);
- Step 7: calculate $\vec{\Psi}_A^{(x)}$ using Eq. (62);
- Step 8: calculate $\mathbf{a}_A^{(x)}$ using Eqs. (22,23);
- Step 9: calculate $\vec{\chi}_A$ using Eqs. (37b) after having taken the inverse of $\mathbf{a}_A^{(\psi)}$;
- Step 10: calculate $\dot{\vec{\chi}}$ using Eqs. (58);
- Step 11: calculate $\mathbf{S}_R^{(x)}$ using Eq. (25);
- Step 12: calculate $\mathbf{D}^{(x)} \equiv \langle \tilde{\vec{\chi}} | \dot{\vec{\chi}} \rangle$;
- Step 13: if $\mathbf{S}_R^{(x)} \approx \mathbf{1}$ and if $\mathbf{D}^{(x)} \approx \mathbf{0}$, continue, otherwise, jump out of this algorithm;
- Step 14: let the advanced time become the retarded time for another time interval and then go to step 3 and continue.

If an exit of the basic algorithm occurs because of the lack of orbital orthonormality or

the lack of a null D -matrix, the ‘‘Correction Algorithm’’ is implemented, for the particular Δt in question, as follows:

Correction Algorithm

Step 1: assume $\mathbf{C}_R = \mathbf{1}$;

Step 2: calculate $\mathbf{\Gamma}_R$ using Eq. (53);

Step 3: calculate \mathbf{C}_A using Eq. (59);

Step 4: calculate $\vec{\psi}_A$ using Eqs. (41);

Step 5: calculate $\mathbf{a}_A^{(\psi)}$ using Eq. (46);

Step 6: calculate $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_A^{(\psi)}$ using Eq. (48);

Step 7: let the advanced time become the retarded time for another time interval and then go to step 4 of the ‘‘Basic Algorithm’’ and continue (letting $\psi \rightarrow \chi$).

Thus, the solution may be efficiently propagated in time in a way that guarantees orbital orthonormality and a null D -matrix (non-redundant time evolution).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Now returning to the TDHF[9], the one-electron orbitals are assumed orthonormal and the derivative matrix elements are set to zero. This is possible in the context of the TDHF because the EOM are derived using the Dirac-Frenkel variational principal (DFVP).[10,11] In fact, orthonormality of the one-electron orbitals and zero D -matrices are not restrictive in the context of the TDHF. This can be demonstrated by a set of gauge transformations in the manner of Refs. (5) and (9). The key idea of the TDHF derivation using the DFVP is the independent variation of the one-electron orbitals.[9] The authors of Refs. (2) and (3) also use the DFVP to derive their EOM for a Hartree-like ansatz which is used for distinguishable particles. The present derivation of a set of exchange equations proceeds in the manner of Ref. (5)—that is by projections. It is necessary to have a way of determining the D -matrices. This is so because the time derivative that appears inside the spatial integral is at the same time-step as the time-derivative of the Schrödinger equation itself.

This results in the necessity of a self-consistent procedure at each time-step—an operation that needs to be avoided if possible. If projections are used to derive the two coupled equations for the one-electron orbitals, the D -matrices can not be set to zero without a “hidden symmetry” analysis similar to that given above. This in fact has been done.[12] The equations that result from that procedure are distinctly different from the TDHF equations.

The present work is an alternative derivation of a set of time-dependent exchange equations (TDEEs), which follows immediately from the MCTDH theory of [2,3]. The present equations are derived by a projection procedure, but are exactly the same equations that would be produced by the DFVP. This all results from the redundancy which follows from the use of the purely time-dependent coefficients multiplying each two-electron configuration.

An algorithm for the solution of the new exchange equations has been given using the ISOP method and a procedure was described to enforce orbital orthonormality and a null D -matrix. This allows for a non-redundant time evolution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research was supported by the Army High Performance Computing Research Center and the US Army, Army Research Laboratory (DAAH04-95-2-0003/ contract number DAAH04-95-C-0008), by NSF CREST grant HRD-9707076, and by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Research Collaboration Program for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Institutions. The author would like to acknowledge useful conversations with H.-D. Meyer, Burke Ritchie, Merle Riley and Mario Encinosa.

REFERENCES

- [1] C.F. Barnett, "Atomic Collision Properties" in *A Physicist's Desk Reference : The Second Edition of Physics Vade Mecum*, American Institute of Physics, New York, N.Y., ed. H.L. Anderson (1989), p. 92.
- [2] H.-D. Meyer, U. Manthe, and L.S. Cederbaum, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **165**, 73 (1990).
- [3] U. Manthe, H.-D. Meyer, and L.S. Cederbaum, *J. Chem. Phys.* **97**, 3199 (1992).
- [4] B. Ritchie and M.E. Riley, Sandia Report Sand97-1205, UC-401 (1997).
- [5] B. Ritchie, C.A. Weatherford, *International J. Quant. Chem.* **S70**, 627 (1998).
- [6] E.K.U. Gross, E. Runge, and O. Heinonen, *Many – Particle Theory*, Adam Hilger, New York (1991).
- [7] M.D. Feit, J.A. Fleck, and A. Steiger, *J. Comput. Phys.* **47**, 412 (1982).
- [8] A. Szabo and N.S. Ostlund, *Modern Quantum Chemistry*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1989), pgs. 142-145.
- [9] A.K. Kerman and S.E. Koonin, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **100**, 332 (1976).
- [10] P.A.M. Dirac, *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **26**, 376 (1930).
- [11] J. Frenkel, *Wave Mechanics : Advanced General Theory*, Clarendon (Oxford) (1934).
- [12] M. Riley, B. Ritchie, and C.A. Weatherford, unpublished work.