

# Computational Quantum Chemistry for Multiple-Site Heisenberg Spin Couplings Made Simple: Still Only One Spin–Flip Required


Nicholas J. Mayhall<sup>†</sup> and Martin Head-Gordon<sup>\*,†,‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Kenneth S. Pitzer Center for Theoretical Chemistry, Department of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, United States

<sup>‡</sup>Chemical Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, United States

## S Supporting Information

**ABSTRACT:** We provide a simple procedure for using inexpensive ab initio calculations to compute exchange coupling constants,  $J_{AB}$ , for multiradical molecules containing both an arbitrary number of radical sites and an arbitrary number of unpaired electrons. For a system comprised of  $2M$  unpaired electrons, one needs only to compute states having the  $\hat{S}_z$  quantum number  $M - 1$ . Conveniently, these are precisely the states that are accessed by the family of single spin–flip methods. Building an effective Hamiltonian with these states allows one to extract all of the  $J_{AB}$  constants in the molecule. Unlike approaches based on density functional theory, this procedure relies on neither spin-contaminated states nor nonunique spin-projection formulas. A key benefit is that it is possible to obtain completely spin-pure exchange coupling constants with inexpensive ab initio calculations. A couple of examples are provided to illustrate the approach, including a 4-nickel cubane complex and a 6-chromium horseshoe complex with 18 entangled electrons.



Molecules and complexes containing multiple radical sites are important for a variety of current and future applications, including molecular magnetism,<sup>1,2</sup> redox non-innocent ligand chemistry,<sup>3–5</sup> and artificial photosynthesis.<sup>6–9</sup> Multiradical molecules are often characterized by electronic structures involving spatially separated regions of localized spin density. Because the exchange interactions coupling the distant unpaired electrons decay exponentially with distance, different alignments of the local spins give rise to many low-energy and quasidegenerate electronic configurations. Computationally, this renders conventional (or single-reference) electronic structure methods generally unsuitable for modeling such systems, and thus, multireference methods are often needed to obtain meaningful results.<sup>10</sup> However, multireference methods are typically too computationally demanding for application to multiradical complexes due to the relatively large size. Formally, multireference methods scale exponentially with the number of strongly correlated electrons. As a result, broken symmetry density functional theory (BS-DFT) has become the most widely used approach for studying this class of strongly correlated molecules.<sup>11</sup>

In BS-DFT, a shortcut is taken by mapping the ab initio Hamiltonian to the phenomenological Heisenberg–Dirac–Van Vleck (HDvV) spin Hamiltonian<sup>12–14</sup>

$$\hat{H}^{\text{HDvV}} = -2 \sum_{AB} J_{AB} \hat{S}_A \hat{S}_B \quad (1)$$

where  $J_{AB}$  is the effective exchange coupling constant between radical sites A and B, and  $\hat{S}_A$  ( $\hat{S}_B$ ) is the local spin operator acting on site A (B). The sign of  $J_{AB}$  determines the nature of the

coupling;  $J_{AB} > 0$  indicates high spin or ferromagnetic coupling, and  $J_{AB} < 0$  indicates low spin or antiferromagnetic coupling. It is thus  $J_{AB}$  that usually acts as the point-of-contact between theory and experiment.

By assuming that the energies of the broken-symmetry DFT solutions correspond to the diagonal elements of the Heisenberg Hamiltonian matrix, the exchange coupling constants between all pairs of radical sites can be obtained by solving a generally overdetermined set of linear equations.<sup>15</sup> (The broken-symmetry DFT solutions are obtained by allowing  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  spin densities to localize independently on different regions of the molecule. These solutions correspond to the neutral configuration space in which  $\hat{H}^{\text{HDvV}}$  is represented, with the ionic configurations being treated implicitly by the delocalization of the magnetic orbitals in the BS-DFT solutions.) While BS-DFT is arguably the most effective computational tool currently available, it has several deficiencies. Not only are approximate spin projections needed to partially remove the spin contamination of the broken-symmetry solutions,<sup>16–21</sup> but also the projection formula needed to obtain  $J_{AB}$  is not unique, and multiple expressions have been put forth, all leading to different results.<sup>11,22–25</sup> Furthermore, there is a strong dependence on the density functional used. The fraction of exact exchange strongly affects the relative energies of the high-spin and broken-symmetry solutions, and different functionals can give qualitatively different results.<sup>26–28</sup>

**Received:** April 8, 2015

**Accepted:** May 11, 2015

**Published:** May 11, 2015



Another source of ambiguity that is directly relevant to the topic of this Letter can arise when large multiradical systems are studied. Because the number of unique broken-symmetry solutions ( $2^{N-1}$ ) grows quickly with the number of radical sites ( $N$ ), computing all BS-DFT solutions quickly becomes intractable. Thus, only a subset of the possible solutions is used, with the resulting  $J_{AB}$  values depending on the composition of the subset.<sup>15,19,29</sup>

In light of the computational complexities of multireference electronic structure methods and the stated deficiencies of BS-DFT, an alternative ab initio approach is desirable. In a recent paper,<sup>30</sup> we demonstrated how the spin-flip family of single-reference electronic structure methods can be used in a very simple way to obtain exchange coupling constants for bimetallic complexes that follow Heisenberg Hamiltonian physics.

Spin-flip methods are single-reference electronic structure methods designed for describing strongly correlated systems and that have been extensively developed in the context of configuration interaction (CI) methods,<sup>31–37</sup> coupled cluster (CC) theory,<sup>38,39</sup> spin-pure active-space approaches,<sup>34,36,37,40–44</sup> and DFT.<sup>45,46</sup> The spin-flip strategy operates under the assumption that for many multiconfigurational (or strongly correlated) electronic states, there exists a higher spin state that may be higher in energy but that is well described with a single electronic configuration. By taking this high-spin configuration as a reference determinant, spin-flipping excitations can be applied to simultaneously excite and flip the spin of the electrons, providing a suitable configuration basis for describing the strongly correlated low-spin states of interest.

In our recent paper, which focused on bimetallic complexes,<sup>30</sup> we highlighted the simple realization that because spin-flip CI methods are well suited for studying intermediate (or partially spin-flipped) spin states, one can focus exclusively on the two highest  $M_s$  manifolds, which have much smaller Hilbert spaces than the lower  $M_s$  manifolds. By using a single spin-flip (1SF) method, the energies of the highest spin state,  $E(S)$ , and second-highest spin state,  $E(S-1)$ , can be obtained directly and in a much smaller configuration space than that of the lower spin (or fully spin-flipped) configuration space. Thus, for antiferromagnetically coupled molecules, this means that the ground state is never explicitly computed. The  $J_{AB}$  value is simply taken from the Landé interval rule<sup>47</sup>

$$E(S) - E(S-1) = -2SJ_{AB} \quad (2)$$

using only the highest two spin states. Because only one spin-flip is needed, any of the already implemented (1SF) methods can be used. This is an extremely efficient alternative to the straightforward approach taken previously in which the maximum number of spin-flips were performed to obtain the ground state and the complete low-energy spectrum.<sup>37,40,42,48</sup> However, as the Landé interval rule only relates to a two-site Heisenberg model, the described strategy only relates to bimetallic complexes.

In this work, we extend this 1SF approach to multiradical systems (molecules with more than two metals or radical sites). Instead of obtaining  $J_{AB}$  from only the eigenvalues of the 1SF calculation, we use both the 1SF eigenvalues and the eigenvectors to construct an effective Hamiltonian that maps directly to the Heisenberg Hamiltonian. From this effective Hamiltonian, the exchange coupling constants can be pulled directly from the off-diagonal elements.

The procedure for obtaining the effective Hamiltonian was first established by Bloch<sup>49,50</sup> and has since been used extensively

by Malrieu and co-workers for extracting effective Hamiltonian parameters from multireference CI calculations (see ref 10 and references therein). The detailed procedure is described below for a generic system comprised of  $M$  radical sites with  $N_x$  unpaired electrons on site  $x$ :

(1) Converge the  $M$  lowest-energy eigenvalues,  $E$ , and eigenvectors,  $b$ , using any 1SF method (i.e., SF-CIS, SF-DFT, EOM-SF-CCSD, 1SF-CAS, etc.). Thus, the number of 1SF states required equals the number of radical sites.

(2) Localize the molecular orbitals so that fractionally occupied orbitals are now assigned to specific radical sites. In this Letter, we have used Boys localization, although any localization scheme should work well for spin-coupled molecules for which the Heisenberg Hamiltonian is relevant. For spin-pure methods based on high-spin restricted open-shell Hartree–Fock (ROHF) references, only the singly occupied orbitals need to be localized. For methods based on unrestricted Hartree–Fock (UHF) orbitals, a transformation to the corresponding orbital basis is first performed to identify a subset of “primarily singly occupied orbitals”. (These orbitals can be obtained by performing occupied–occupied and virtual–virtual rotations of the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  orbitals, respectively. The transformation matrices used are the singular vectors of the matrix  $P_{ia}^{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{\mu\nu} C_{i\mu}^{\alpha} S_{\mu\nu} C_{a\nu}^{\beta}$ , where  $C^{\alpha/\beta}$  are the molecular orbital coefficient matrices and  $S$  is the atomic orbital overlap matrix.) It is then only these primarily singly occupied orbitals that need to be localized.

(3) Transform the 1SF eigenvectors,  $b$ , into the localized orbital basis and project onto the neutral determinant basis. In the localized orbital basis, the 1SF configurations can be partitioned into distinct neutral,  $b_N$ , and ionic,  $b_I$ , configurations

$$b^T = b_N^T \| b_I^T \quad (3)$$

This projection simply amounts to deleting the ionic wave function components coming from spin-flipping excitations between different radical sites (i.e.,  $b_{i\bar{a}s}$ , where  $i$  and  $\bar{a}$  are localized on different radical sites). These ionic contributions must be small for validity of the  $\hat{H}^{\text{HDVV}}$  model.

(4) Orthogonalize the projected 1SF eigenvectors. The 1SF eigenvectors projected onto the neutral determinant basis,  $b_N$ , are not generally orthogonal. Thus, to ensure a Hermitian effective Hamiltonian, we symmetrically orthogonalize the projected vectors<sup>50</sup>

$$\tilde{b}_N = b_N (b_N^T b_N)^{-1/2} \quad (4)$$


(5) Build an effective Hamiltonian in the symmetrically orthogonalized neutral determinant basis, using the ab initio 1SF excitation energies

$$H^{\text{eff}} = \tilde{b}_N E \tilde{b}_N^T \quad (5)$$

(6) Block diagonalize  $H^{\text{eff}}$  site-by-site and project  $\tilde{b}_N$  onto the local high-spin ground state. If any of the  $M$  radical sites have more than one unpaired electron, then  $H^{\text{eff}}$  is rank-deficient. This is because  $H^{\text{eff}}$  has a rank of  $M$  (only  $M$  energies were used in eq 5) but a dimension equal to the total number of unpaired electrons ( $\sum_x N_x$ ).

(7) Form a new effective Hamiltonian,  $\tilde{H}^{\text{eff}}$ , in this local ground-state basis and obtain the exchange coupling constants via

$$J_{AB} = -\frac{\tilde{H}_{AB}^{\text{eff}}}{2\sqrt{S_A S_B}} \quad (6)$$



**Figure 1.** Schematic representation of the procedure for extracting exchange coupling constants from 1SF calculations for a molecule. (a) Start with the Boys localized ROHF orbitals. (b) After projection onto  $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_N$ , the three original 1SF eigenstates are now linear combinations of nine electronic configurations. (c) After block-diagonalization, the three original 1SF eigenstates are now linear combinations of three  $M_s$  configurations of local quartet states,  $|\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\rangle$ ,  $|\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\rangle$ , and  $|\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle$ . The tilted red arrows indicate the  $M_s = 1/2$  microstate of the local quartet spin states. (d) In the local eigenstate basis, the effective Hamiltonian is now full-rank and contains the exchange coupling constants,  $J_{AB}$ , as off-diagonal elements divided by  $-2\sqrt{S_A S_B} = -3$ .


where  $S_A$  is the total spin (half of the number of unpaired electrons) on site A.

Note that because each  $J_{AB}$  parameter is obtained from a distinct effective Hamiltonian matrix element, the sign can be either positive or negative, permitting application to ferromagnetic, antiferromagnetic, or mixed ferro/antiferromagnetic systems. In Figure 1, a schematic representation is provided for the steps described above. An Octave<sup>51</sup> script that takes the raw data provided by the ab initio calculations to extract the  $J_{AB}$  values is provided in the Supporting Information (along with two sets of data files). All ab initio spin-flip calculations have been performed using a development version of QChem.<sup>52</sup> BS-DFT calculations have been performed starting from the molecular orbital guesses provided by the “Fragmo” guess in QChem.<sup>53</sup> As the goal of this Letter is to demonstrate the efficient description of static correlation and not dynamical correlation, which is known to converge slowly with one-electron basis set size, we have used the relatively small Ahlrich’s VDZ basis set for the results in this Letter.<sup>54</sup>

In a recent experimental study investigating the synthesis and characterization of molecular examples of finite one-dimensional spin segments, Baker et al.<sup>55</sup> measured the exchange coupling constants of a family of molecular chains. These systems involve a quasi-one-dimensional curved chain of Cr(III) atoms, taking the shape of a “horseshoe”.

As depicted in Figure 2, there are six Cr(III) atoms, each with three unpaired electrons. Thus, a direct ab initio calculation of the ground state would be extremely expensive, requiring nine spin-flips to treat 18 strongly correlated electrons. Alternatively, following the procedure demonstrated above and in Figure 1, we can obtain  $J_{AB}$  values from only a simple 1SF calculation and starting from the single configurational high-spin (19-et) Hartree–Fock reference.

As mentioned above, the strategy being described is general for any 1SF method. For demonstrative purposes, we will use our recently developed active-space-based spin-flip methods, SF-CAS, SF-CAS(h,p), and SF-CAS(S).<sup>41,42</sup> The first method,



**Figure 2.** Molecular structure for the Cr(III) horseshoe complex. Chromium atoms are numbered clockwise starting from the bottom left.

spin-flip complete active space (SF-CAS), is simply an  $n$ SF-CI method (where  $n$  is the number of spin-flips) for which all excitations occur only in an orbital active space (i.e., the singly occupied ROHF orbitals). The second and third methods, SF-CAS(h,p) and SF-CAS(S), are methods that include perturbative corrections to SF-CAS. SF-CAS(h,p) includes single excitations into (hole excitations) and out of (particle excitations) the active-space.<sup>41</sup> SF-CAS(S) includes these as well as all possible single excitations including the direct promotions from doubly occupied orbitals to virtual orbitals.<sup>42</sup> Although the SF-CAS-based methods are capable of performing  $n$  spin-flips, our present implementation would not be tractable for nine spin-flips. Therefore, the 1SF strategy introduced here is vital to permit this application.



Table 1. Exchange Coupling Constants for the Horseshoe Complex Shown in Figure 2<sup>a</sup>

	spin-pure			NC-SF-TDDFT			BS-DFT			exp.
	SF-CAS	SF-CAS(h,p)	SF-CAS(S)	PBE0	S0S0	B3LYP	PBE0	S0S0	B3LYP	
$J_{12}$	0.51	−0.64	−2.30	−4.43	−2.28	−8.74	−5.74(−5.76)	−2.56(−2.57)	−7.99(−8.01)	
$J_{23}$	0.52	−0.59	−2.20	−4.38	−2.35	−8.17	−5.82(−5.80)	−2.69(−2.68)	−7.88(−7.86)	
$J_{34}$	0.57	−0.64	−2.37	−4.17	−2.39	−8.33	−5.69(−5.72)	−2.63(−2.64)	−7.93(−7.96)	
$J_{45}$	0.42	−0.53	−1.90	−5.02	−2.71	−9.27	−6.48(−6.47)	−8.27(−8.26)	−8.73(−8.72)	
$J_{56}$	0.43	−0.54	−1.94	−4.33	−2.27	−8.19	−5.67(−5.68)	−3.62(−3.62)	−7.68(−7.69)	
$J_{\text{Outside}}$	0.47	−0.59	−2.12	−4.38	−2.28	−8.47	−5.87(−5.81) <sup>b</sup>	−4.12(−3.83) <sup>b</sup>	−7.97(−7.96) <sup>b</sup>	−5.65
$J_{\text{Inside}}$	0.50	−0.59	−2.15	−4.52	−2.48	−8.59	−5.98(−5.99) <sup>b</sup>	−4.44(−4.47) <sup>b</sup>	−8.17(−8.18) <sup>b</sup>	−5.89

<sup>a</sup>Experimental values reported are  $-5.65 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  for  $J_{\text{Outside}}$  ( $J_{12}$ ,  $J_{56}$ ) and  $-5.89 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  for  $J_{\text{Inside}}$  ( $J_{23}$ ,  $J_{34}$ ,  $J_{45}$ ). While the effective Hamiltonian provides all  $J_{\text{AB}}$  values, the quasi-one-dimensional structure ensures that the coupling between non-nearest-neighbor Cr(III) atoms is negligible. Thus, only the nearest-neighbor coupling constants are reported. For the BS-DFT results, seven (nine) solutions were used, as described in the Supporting Information. <sup>b</sup>Values are not the average of the individual couplings but rather solutions obtained by directly fitting the BS-DFT energies to a 2J model.

One benefit of using these methods is that, by construction, they are free from any spin- contamination. By using ROHF orbitals, there is no orbital spin contamination. By restricting the spin-flipping excitations to occur within the singly occupied orbitals, there is no “configurational spin contamination” (or spin contamination arising from the neglect of spin-complementing configurations).

We have also performed SF-TDDFT calculations using the noncollinear kernel of Ziegler and co-workers (NC-SF-TDDFT).<sup>46,56,57</sup> These methods are based on unrestricted Kohn–Sham (UKS) orbitals and do not restrict spin-flipping excitations to an active space. Thus, the NC-SF-TDDFT results suffer from both orbital and configurational spin contamination, in addition to the deficiencies inherent in the underlying density functional. Nonetheless, the effective Hamiltonian strategy described in this Letter still admits input from a NC-SF-TDDFT calculation. The results are tabulated in Table 1.

From Table 1, one immediately can recognize the well-documented underestimation of the antiferromagnetic contributions to the SF-CAS exchange coupling constants.<sup>42,43</sup> Here, SF-CAS incorrectly predicts the Cr(III) atoms to be coupled ferromagnetically ( $J_{\text{AB}} > 0$ ). By including state-specific orbital relaxation effects perturbatively via hole and particle excitations, SF-CAS(h,p) corrects the SF-CAS results and yields antiferromagnetic coupling constants ( $J_{\text{AB}} < 0$ ). By adding the complete set of single excitations, SF-CAS(S) further improves the  $J_{\text{AB}}$  values, bringing them closer to the experimental values, although a more complete treatment of dynamical correlation would be needed to obtain more quantitative agreement.

Looking at the NC-SF-TDDFT results in Table 1, one quickly recognizes one of the most problematic aspects of using DFT; different functionals can provide very different results. However, even with this variance, the results for the three tested functionals do not fall too far from the experimental values. (These three density functionals are not chosen to be broadly representative or even necessarily recommended. They simply act as demonstration that the effective Hamiltonian strategy can extract  $J_{\text{AB}}$  constants from DFT calculations as well, without relying on the broken-symmetry approach.) Comparing the NC-SF-TDDFT results to the values obtained from BS-DFT, one finds that the spin-flip approach provides similar results as the BS-DFT method but without the previously described problems of arbitrary projection formulas and configuration selection. (In Table 1, the BS-DFT results have two values reported. The first value is obtained using only seven configurations, the high spin state,  $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle$ , and all six single site-flipped configurations, for


example,  $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} 3 & -3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle$ ). The second value in parentheses was obtained by adding two more double site-flipped configurations, namely,  $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} -3 & -3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle$  and  $\left| \begin{smallmatrix} -3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & -3 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle$ .) We note that although we have used Ziegler’s noncollinear kernel for the NC-SF-DFT here, the effective Hamiltonian procedure describe in this Letter should also be possible for other types of SF-DFT, some of which are designed with general spin-flip excitation operators.<sup>58,59</sup>

Qualitatively, it is interesting to note that while Baker et al. obtained a good fit using only two  $J_{\text{AB}}$  values ( $J_{\text{Outside}}$  for the couplings on the tips and  $J_{\text{Inside}}$  for the couplings inside), our calculations indicate that the coupling between the tips ( $J_{12}$  and  $J_{56}$ ) may differ by 10–15%. Even though NC-SF-DFT and BS-DFT seem to accurately reproduce the gap between the two model parameters,  $J_{\text{Inside}}$  and  $J_{\text{Outside}}$ , the variance among the individual parameters suggests that none of the theoretical methods actually support a two  $J_{\text{AB}}$  model. Furthermore, although we are only reporting the five nearest-neighbor  $J_{\text{AB}}$  values, the single spin-flip results provide us with all possible (including non-nearest-neighbor) pairwise couplings. The  $J_{\text{AB}}$  values for non-nearest-neighbor couplings were all near zero, thus suggesting the intuitive five  $J_{\text{AB}}$  model. Many more BS-DFT configurations would need to be obtained to yield this same information.

Overall, SF-CAS(h,p), SF-CAS(S), and all of the density functionals provide the correct sign of the exchange coupling constants for this molecule.

Obtaining  $J_{\text{AB}}$  constants from 1SF calculations provides a dramatic simplification compared to the direct ab initio calculation where the maximum number of spins are flipped. Of course, this strategy is only useful insofar as the extracted  $J_{\text{AB}}$  constants are reliable. While the best way to test this is to simply compare against experimentally obtained  $J_{\text{AB}}$  constants, this comparison is actually quite difficult to make. The reason is that most of the currently implemented spin-flip methods are not yet capable of reliably providing quantitative accuracy. Although SF-EOM-CCSD might well be sufficiently accurate, it is too computationally demanding to treat the large molecules in this Letter. This means that any observed error in  $J_{\text{AB}}$  could be due to either the  $J_{\text{AB}}$  extraction procedure or the underlying ab initio spin-flip method. Thus, in order to test the reliability of the extracted  $J_{\text{AB}}$  constants, one should make a comparison between the fully spin-flipped ab initio results and the 1SF parametrized Heisenberg Hamiltonian results. In other words, if we diagonalize  $\hat{H}^{\text{HD}+\text{V}}$ , do we obtain a spectrum similar to the low-energy spectrum of the fully spin-flipped ab initio Hamiltonian?

To answer this question, we consider a relatively simple system for which the full ab initio calculation can be performed. In Figure 3a, an organometallic complex is shown that has a nickel–cubane



**Figure 3.** (a) Structure of the nickel complex. (b) Nickel–cubane core. (c) Comparison of the low-energy spectrum taken from direct ab initio 4SF-CAS(S) calculations (gray) and the 1SF-CAS(S) + Heisenberg diagonalization (black). The y-axis is the  $\Delta$  energy from ground state in cm<sup>-1</sup>. The x-axis is the  $\langle S^2 \rangle$  for each state.

core consisting of four Ni(II) centers, each with two unpaired electrons (3b). Because there are eight unpaired electrons, the high-spin ROHF reference state is the single-configuration nonet state. In order to access the full ab initio low-energy spectrum, a four spin–flip calculation (4SF-CI) is necessary. To diagonalize the 1SF parametrized  $\hat{H}^{\text{HDV}}$  Hamiltonian, we used the open-source Fit-Mart software, which was downloaded from ref 60.

In Figure 3c, a comparison is made between the state energies of the fully ab initio 4SF-CAS(S) calculation and the diagonalization of the 1SF-CAS(S) parametrized  $\hat{H}^{\text{HDV}}$  Hamiltonian. No discernible difference can be seen between the two data sets. This tells us two things:

- (1) The procedure for extracting the  $J_{\text{AB}}$  constants is reliable.
- (2) This particular complex is well-described by a  $\hat{H}^{\text{HDV}}$  Hamiltonian.

While the approach outlined in this Letter has been demonstrated to provide an extremely efficient alternative to the direct multiple spin–flip calculation, a number of limitations exist. First and foremost, the current approach is clearly only applicable for systems that are well described by a Heisenberg Hamiltonian. As a result, only molecules containing well-defined oxidation states and highly localized spin densities can be studied. Furthermore, because the Heisenberg model assumes that each site has only a single electronic configuration that contributes to the complete electronic structure (each radical site is in its local ground state), if any radical site has low-lying local excited states, the simple Heisenberg model becomes suspect, and a biquadratic

form must be considered.<sup>61–63</sup> Finally, as with any model Hamiltonian, any physical processes lying outside of the model will not be described and could lead to qualitative failures. A detailed analysis of many-body effects in magnetic systems has been conducted by Malrieu and co-workers and is nicely summarized in ref 10. However, as the effective Hamiltonians are constructed by projecting ab initio wave functions onto a model space, one can monitor the relevance of the Heisenberg Hamiltonian by ensuring that the norms of the projected wave functions are close to one. Small norms act as a useful diagnostic, indicating that the model space is insufficient.

A second limitation is not related to the  $J_{\text{AB}}$  extraction procedure but rather to the underlying ab initio method. First, for any 1SF method to be useful, the high-spin reference state must be well described. While this is very often true, Hartree–Fock sometimes does not provide a suitable set of orbitals for performing the subsequent SF-CI calculations. (Because the essence of the spin–flip approach assumes that a high-spin reference exists that is well described by a single configuration, a heavily spin-contaminated high-spin reference or the presence of low-energy higher spin states are both harbingers of a poor reference state.) DFT can be used to improve the situation because the dynamical correlation provides a better set of high-spin orbitals. However, SF-DFT (both in the original<sup>45</sup> and noncollinear<sup>46,57</sup> variants) is sensitive to the chosen functional.

In conclusion, this Letter serves to illustrate a very simple procedure for calculating exchange coupling constants for complexes containing several metal centers (or, more generally, several radical sites). It is shown that even with only single spin–flipping excitations, 1SF methods can be used to compute all exchange coupling constants in a molecule, regardless of both the total number of radical sites and total number of unpaired electrons per radical site. Thus, using rather inexpensive ab initio calculations, it is possible to obtain completely spin-pure exchange coupling constants for molecules following Heisenberg physics. Diagonalizing the resulting Heisenberg Hamiltonian gives explicit expressions for the energy levels (and their properties) of all lower spin states. The results obtained in this Letter provide fresh motivation for a new class of spin–flip methods that are spin-pure, permit arbitrary numbers of unpaired electrons, and include dynamical correlation. Work in this direction is currently underway.

## ■ ASSOCIATED CONTENT

### ● Supporting Information

A simple Octave<sup>51</sup> script is provided that extracts the exchange coupling constants from the ab initio 1SF data (eigenvectors represented in a Boys localized orbital basis and the state energies). Also, Cartesian coordinates are provided for both complexes in this Letter. As BS-DFT calculations on multi-radical complexes require some choice about the configurations used, we have included (in a second Octave script) the data used for computing the BS-DFT exchange coupling constants in this Letter. The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.jpclett.5b00733.

## ■ AUTHOR INFORMATION

### Corresponding Author

\*E-mail: mhg@cchem.berkeley.edu.

### Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

## ■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Support for this work was provided through the Scientific Discovery through Advanced Computing (SciDAC) program funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Advanced Scientific Computing Research, and Basic Energy Sciences.

## ■ REFERENCES

- (1) Kaltsoyannis, N.; McGrady, J. *Principles and Applications of Density Functional Theory in Inorganic Chemistry II*; Structure and Bonding; Springer: Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany, 2004; Vol. 113.
- (2) Pederson, M. R. Magnetic anisotropy barrier for spin tunneling in  $\text{Mn}_{12}\text{O}_{12}$  molecules. *Phys. Rev. B* **1999**, *60*, 9566–9572.
- (3) Jørgensen, C. Differences between the four halide ligands, and discussion remarks on trigonal–bipyramidal complexes, on oxidation states, and on diagonal elements of one-electron energy. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1966**, *1*, 164–178.
- (4) Kaim, W.; Moscherosch, M. The coordination chemistry of TCNE, TCNQ and related polynitrile  $\pi$  acceptors. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1994**, *129*, 157–193.
- (5) Ward, M. D.; McCleverty, J. A. Non-innocent behaviour in mononuclear and polynuclear complexes: Consequences for redox and electronic spectroscopic properties. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **2002**, 275–288.
- (6) Yachandra, V. K.; Sauer, K.; Klein, M. P. Manganese cluster in photosynthesis: Where plants oxidize water to dioxygen. *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, *96*, 2927–2950.
- (7) Sauer, K.; Yano, J.; Yachandra, V. K. X-ray spectroscopy of the photosynthetic oxygen-evolving complex. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2008**, *252*, 318–335.
- (8) Pantazis, D. A.; Orio, M.; Petrenko, T.; Zein, S.; Lubitz, W.; Messinger, J.; Neese, F. Structure of the oxygen-evolving complex of photosystem II: Information on the  $\text{S}_2$  state through quantum chemical calculation of its magnetic properties. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2009**, *11*, 6788–98.
- (9) Kurashige, Y.; Chan, G. K.-L.; Yanai, T. Entangled quantum electronic wavefunctions of the  $\text{Mn}_4\text{CaO}_5$  cluster in photosystem II. *Nat. Chem.* **2013**, *5*, 660–6.
- (10) Malrieu, J. P.; Caballol, R.; Calzado, C. J.; de Graaf, C.; Guihéry, N. Magnetic interactions in molecules and highly correlated materials: Physical content, analytical derivation, and rigorous extraction of magnetic Hamiltonians. *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114*, 429–492.
- (11) Noodleman, L. Valence bond description of antiferromagnetic coupling in transition metal dimers. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1981**, *74*, 5737.
- (12) Dirac, P. A. M. On the theory of quantum mechanics. *Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A* **1926**, *112*, 661.
- (13) Heisenberg, W. Zur theorie des ferromagnetismus. *Z. Phys.* **1928**, *49*, 619–636.
- (14) van Vleck, J. H. *The Theory of Electric and Magnetic Susceptibilities*; Clarendon Press: Oxford, U.K., 1932.
- (15) Pantazis, D. A.; Orio, M.; Petrenko, T.; Zein, S.; Bill, E.; Lubitz, W.; Messinger, J.; Neese, F. A new quantum chemical approach to the magnetic properties of oligonuclear transition-metal complexes: Application to a model for the tetranuclear manganese cluster of photosystem II. *Chemistry* **2009**, *15*, 5108–23.
- (16) Yamanaka, S.; Kawakami, T.; Nagao, H.; Yamaguchi, K. Effective exchange integrals for open-shell species by density functional methods. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1994**, *231*, 25–33.
- (17) Noodleman, L.; Peng, C.; Case, D.; Mouesca, J.-M. Orbital interactions, electron delocalization and spin coupling in iron–sulfur clusters. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1995**, *144*, 199–244.
- (18) Gräfenstein, J.; Kraka, E.; Filatov, M.; Cremer, D. Can unrestricted density-functional theory describe open shell singlet biradicals? *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **2002**, *3*, 360–394.
- (19) Shoji, M.; Koizumi, K.; Kitagawa, Y.; Kawakami, T.; Yamanaka, S.; Okumura, M.; Yamaguchi, K. A general algorithm for calculation of Heisenberg exchange integrals  $J$ , in multispin systems. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2006**, *432*, 343–347.
- (20) Saito, T.; Thiel, W. Analytical gradients for density functional calculations with approximate spin projection. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2012**, *116*, 10864–9.
- (21) Thompson, L. M.; Hratchian, H. P. Second derivatives for approximate spin projection methods. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2015**, *142*, 054106.
- (22) Mouesca, J.-M.; Chen, J. L.; Noodleman, L.; Bashford, D.; Case, D. A. Density functional/Poisson-Boltzmann calculations of redox potentials for iron–sulfur clusters. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 11898–11914.
- (23) Nishino, M.; Yamanaka, S.; Yoshioka, Y.; Yamaguchi, K. Theoretical approaches to direct dx exchange couplings between divalent chromium ions in naked dimers, tetramers, and clusters. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **1997**, *101*, 705–712.
- (24) Ruiz, E.; Cano, J.; Alvarez, S.; Alemany, P. Broken symmetry approach to calculation of exchange coupling constants for homobinuclear and heterobinuclear transition metal complexes. *J. Comput. Chem.* **1999**, *20*, 1391–1400.
- (25) Soda, T.; Kitagawa, Y.; Onishi, T.; Takano, Y.; Shigeta, Y.; Nagao, H.; Yoshioka, Y.; Yamaguchi, K. Ab initio computations of effective exchange integrals for H–H, H–He–H and  $\text{Mn}_2\text{O}_2$  complex: Comparison of broken-symmetry approaches. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2000**, *319*, 223–230.
- (26) Illas, F.; de P.R. Moreira, I.; Bofill, J.; Filatov, M. Extent and limitations of density-functional theory in describing magnetic systems. *Phys. Rev. B* **2004**, *70*, 132414.
- (27) de P.R. Moreira, I.; Illas, F.; Martin, R. Effect of Fock exchange on the electronic structure and magnetic coupling in NiO. *Phys. Rev. B* **2002**, *65*, 155102.
- (28) Cramer, C. J.; Truhlar, D. G. Density functional theory for transition metals and transition metal chemistry. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2009**, *11*, 10757–816.
- (29) Rudra, I.; Wu, Q.; Van Voorhis, T. Predicting exchange coupling constants in frustrated molecular magnets using density functional theory. *Inorg. Chem.* **2007**, *46*, 10539–48.
- (30) Mayhall, N. J.; Head-Gordon, M. Computational quantum chemistry for single Heisenberg spin couplings made simple: Just one spin flip required. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *141*, 134111.
- (31) Krylov, A. Spin–flip configuration interaction: An electronic structure model that is both variational and size-consistent. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2001**, *350*, 522–530.
- (32) Krylov, A. I.; Sherrill, C. D. Perturbative corrections to the equation-of-motion spin–flip self-consistent field model: Application to bond-breaking and equilibrium properties of diradicals. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *116*, 3194.
- (33) Krylov, A. I. Size-consistent wave functions for bond-breaking: The equation-of-motion spin–flip model. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2001**, *338*, 375–384.
- (34) Sears, J. S.; Sherrill, C. D.; Krylov, A. I. A spin-complete version of the spin–flip approach to bond breaking: What is the impact of obtaining spin eigenfunctions? *J. Chem. Phys.* **2003**, *118*, 9084.
- (35) Casanova, D.; Head-Gordon, M. The spin–flip extended single excitation configuration interaction method. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *129*, 064104.
- (36) Casanova, D.; Head-Gordon, M. Restricted active space spin–flip configuration interaction approach: theory, implementation and examples. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2009**, *11*, 9779–90.
- (37) Bell, F.; Zimmerman, P.; Casanova, D.; Goldey, M.; Head-Gordon, M. Restricted Active Space Spin-Flip (RAS-SF) with Arbitrary Number of Spin–Flips. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2013**, *15*, 358–366.
- (38) Levchenko, S. V.; Krylov, A. I. Equation-of-motion spin–flip coupled-cluster model with single and double substitutions: Theory and application to cyclobutadiene. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *120*, 175–85.
- (39) Casanova, D.; Slipchenko, L. V.; Krylov, A. I.; Head-Gordon, M. Double spin–flip approach within equation-of-motion coupled cluster and configuration interaction formalisms: Theory, implementation, and examples. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2009**, *130*, 044103.
- (40) Zimmerman, P. M.; Bell, F.; Goldey, M.; Bell, A. T.; Head-Gordon, M. Restricted active space spin–flip configuration interaction:



Theory and examples for multiple spin flips with odd numbers of electrons. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2012**, *137*, 164110.

(41) Mayhall, N. J.; Goldey, M.; Head-Gordon, M. A quasidegenerate second-order perturbation theory approximation to RAS-*n*SF for excited states and strong correlations. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2014**, *10*, 589–599.

(42) Mayhall, N. J.; Head-Gordon, M. Increasing spin-flips and decreasing cost: Perturbative corrections for external singles to the complete active space spin flip model for low-lying excited states and strong correlation. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *141*, 044112.

(43) Mayhall, N. J.; Horn, P. R.; Sundstrom, E. J.; Head-Gordon, M. Spin-flip non-orthogonal configuration interaction: A variational and almost black-box method for describing strongly correlated molecules. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *16*, 22694–22705.

(44) Casanova, D. Second-order perturbative corrections to the restricted active space configuration interaction with the hole and particle approach. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2014**, *140*, 144111.

(45) Shao, Y.; Head-Gordon, M.; Krylov, A. I. The spin-flip approach within time-dependent density functional theory: Theory and applications to diradicals. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2003**, *118*, 4807.

(46) Bernard, Y. A.; Shao, Y.; Krylov, A. I. General formulation of spin-flip time-dependent density functional theory using non-collinear kernels: Theory, implementation, and benchmarks. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2012**, *136*, 204103.

(47) Landé, A. Termstruktur und zeemaneffekt der multipletts. *Z. Phys.* **1923**, *15*, 189–205.

(48) Bell, F.; Casanova, D.; Head-Gordon, M. Theoretical study of substituted PBPB dimers: Structural analysis, tetradical character, and excited states. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 11314–22.

(49) Bloch, C. Sur la théorie des perturbations des états liés. *Nucl. Phys.* **1958**, *6*, 329–347.

(50) des Cloizeaux, J. Extension d'une formule de Lagrange à des problèmes de valeurs propres. *Nucl. Phys.* **1960**, *20*, 321–346.

(51) Eaton, J. W.; Bateman, D.; Hauberg, S. *GNU Octave version 3.0.1 manual: a high-level interactive language for numerical computations*; CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2009.

(52) Shao, Y.; Gan, Z.; Epifanovsky, E.; Gilbert, A. T.; Wormit, M.; Kussmann, J.; Lange, A. W.; Behn, A.; Deng, J.; Feng, X.; et al. Advances in molecular quantum chemistry contained in the Q-Chem 4 program package. *Mol. Phys.* **2014**, *113*, 184–215.

(53) Khaliullin, R. Z.; Head-Gordon, M.; Bell, A. T. An efficient self-consistent field method for large systems of weakly interacting components. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2006**, *124*, 204105.

(54) Schäfer, A.; Horn, H.; Ahlrichs, R. Fully optimized contracted Gaussian basis sets for atoms Li to Kr. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *97*, 2571.

(55) Baker, M. L.; Bianchi, A.; Carretta, S.; Collison, D.; Docherty, R. J.; McLnnes, E. J. L.; McRobbie, A.; Murn, C. A.; Mutka, H.; Piligkos, S.; et al. Varying spin state composition by the choice of capping ligand in a family of molecular chains: Detailed analysis of magnetic properties of chromium(III) horseshoes. *Dalton Trans* **2011**, *40*, 2725–34.

(56) Wang, F.; Ziegler, T. The performance of time-dependent density functional theory based on a noncollinear exchange–correlation potential in the calculations of excitation energies. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *122*, 074109.

(57) Wang, F.; Ziegler, T. Time-dependent density functional theory based on a noncollinear formulation of the exchange–correlation potential. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *121*, 12191–6.

(58) Vahtras, O.; Rinkevicius, Z. General excitations in time-dependent density functional theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2007**, *126*, 114101.

(59) Rinkevicius, Z.; Vahtras, O.; Agren, H. Spin-flip time dependent density functional theory applied to excited states with single, double, or mixed electron excitation character. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *133*, 114104.

(60) Engelhardt, L.; Garland, S. C.; Rainey, C.; Freeman, R. A. FIT-MART: Quantum magnetism with a gentle learning curve. *Phys. Procedia* **2014**, *53*, 39–43.

(61) Huang, N.; Orbach, R. Biquadratic superexchange. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1964**, *12*, 275–276.

(62) Harris, E.; Owen, J. Biquadratic exchange between  $\text{Mn}^{2+}$  ions in  $\text{MgO}$ . *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1963**, *11*, 9–10.

(63) Rodbell, D.; Jacobs, I.; Owen, J.; Harris, E. Biquadratic exchange and the behavior of some antiferromagnetic substances. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1963**, *11*, 10–12.