

Quantum Electronic Structure

Double precision is not needed for many-body calculations: Emergent conventional wisdom

Pavel Pokhilko, Evgeny Epifanovsky, and Anna I. Krylov

J. Chem. Theory Comput., **Just Accepted Manuscript** • DOI: 10.1021/acs.jctc.8b00321 • Publication Date (Web): 03 Jul 2018

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on July 16, 2018

Just Accepted

"Just Accepted" manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides "Just Accepted" as a service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. "Just Accepted" manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. "Just Accepted" manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). "Just Accepted" is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the "Just Accepted" Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the "Just Accepted" Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these "Just Accepted" manuscripts.



ACS Publications

Double Precision Is not Needed for Many-Body Calculations: Emergent Conventional Wisdom

Pavel Pokhilko^a, Evgeny Epifanovsky^b, and Anna I. Krylov^a

^a Department of Chemistry, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089-0482

^b Q-Chem Inc., 6601 Owens Drive, Suite 105 Pleasanton, California 94588

July 3, 2018

Abstract

Using single-precision floating-point representation reduces the size of data and computation time by a factor of two relative to double precision conventionally used in electronic structure programs. For large-scale calculations, such as those encountered in many-body theories, reduced memory footprint alleviates memory and input/output bottlenecks. Reduced size of data can lead to additional gains due to improved parallel performance on CPUs and various accelerators. However, using single precision can potentially degrade the accuracy of the computed observables. Here we report an implementation of coupled-cluster and equation-of-motion coupled-cluster methods with single and double excitations in single precision. We consider both standard implementation and one using Cholesky decomposition or resolution-of-the-identity of electron-repulsion integrals. Numerical tests illustrate that when single precision is used in correlated calculations, the loss of accuracy is insignificant and pure single-precision implementation can be used for computing energies, analytic gradients, excited states, and molecular properties. In addition to pure single-precision calculations, our implementation allows one to follow a single-precision calculation by clean-up iterations, fully recovering double-precision results while retaining significant savings.

1 Introduction

Quantum chemistry is one of the most demanding fields in terms of computational resources. Standard formulations of many-body theories result in large amounts of data (wave-function parameters) and steep computational scaling. For example, storage and floating point operations requirements of the coupled-cluster method with single and double substitutions (CCSD) scale as N^4 and N^6 with the system size, respectively.¹ This steep scaling limits the applicability of these highly reliable methods. Large memory footprint, inherent to correlated theories, also creates a hurdle for efficient parallelization and utilization of accelerators (such as graphic processing units, GPUs). In this paper, we present a production-level implementation of CCSD and EOM-CCSD (equation-of-motion CCSD) methods²⁻⁸ and investigate the impact of using reduced precision on the computational efficiency and accuracy of the results.

Chemical accuracy, the minimal accuracy for quantum chemical calculations of thermochemical data, is defined as 1 kcal/mol (which equals 4.2 kJ/mol or $1.593 \cdot 10^{-3}$ hartree).⁹ However,

today’s standards for chemical kinetics call for a sub-kJ/mol accuracy.^{10,11} Typical desired accuracy for excitation and ionization energies is 0.01-0.1 eV. The errors in the calculations arise due to the intrinsic errors of the methods because of approximations made in many-electron and one-electron bases,¹ as well as finite convergence thresholds in employed iterative algorithms. Typically, convergence thresholds are much tighter than the methods’ error bars.

The IEEE 754 standard^{12,13} defines single and double precision floating-point arithmetic, which are almost universally used to represent numbers on most modern CPUs and GPUs. The numbers in this format are represented in the scientific notation

$$(-1)^s b_0.b_1b_2b_3 \dots b_{p-1}2^E, \quad (1)$$

where s is the sign bit, p is the precision of significand, E is the exponent, and bits b_i can take values 0 or 1 (see footnote 14). The exponent can take positive and negative values. The format specifies a *biased exponent* $e = E + \text{bias}$, allowing to encode exponent E by a non-negative value of e . Although the second revision of the standard¹³ generalizes base, or *radix*, here we consider only binary formats.¹⁵ The attributes of single- and double-precision floating-point numbers are summarized in Table 1, which shows that a single precision number takes half the space of a double precision number and for all practical purposes gives 7 significant figures, whereas double gives 15.

Table 1: Summary of single and double floating-point IEEE 754 standard.

	Single	Double
Total size, bits	32	64
Exponent size, bits	8	11
Exponent bias	127	1023
Sign, bits	1	1
Significant (explicit), bits	23	52
Decimal precision	$\log_{10}(2^{24}) \approx 7$	$\log_{10}(2^{53}) \approx 16$
Smallest normal number	2^{-126}	2^{-1022}

Typical implementations of most *ab initio* methods use double precision arithmetic. The single-precision format uses half the number of bits of double precision, thereby allowing to store twice as many values. Another benefit is proportionally faster memory access and disk input/output (in terms of the number of elements per second). This is important in practice because memory speed improves at a slower rate than CPUs. Furthermore, CPU caches can accommodate twice as many floating point numbers potentially leading to less frequent cache misses. In terms of computational time, single precision gives a twofold speedup on CPUs for most modern architectures and the gains on GPUs can be much larger. Thus, single-precision implementation of quantum-chemistry methods can extend the scope of systems amenable to these treatments, decrease time-to-solution, and reduce energy footprint. Using too much energy and power per calculation is recognized as one of the biggest challenges in high performance computing and using reduced precision or even entirely different representation of real numbers have been advocated.¹⁶

Although early electronic-structure codes, which were very mindful of effective resource usage, utilized mixed precision, today double precision is a *de facto* standard in quantum chemistry and other scientific calculations. However, many algorithms can be re-designed to

work in mixed precision, as was recently done in such diverse areas as lattice quantum chromodynamics,¹⁷ molecular dynamics,¹⁸ and general linear algebra algorithms with iterative refinements.¹⁹ The renewed interest in single precision computations has been largely driven by potential benefits offered by GPUs.^{20–26} In quantum chemistry mixed-precision algorithms have been explored in the context of integral calculations^{27,28} within Hartree-Fock (HF) and density functional theory (DFT).^{20–22,29} The main conclusion from these studies was that pure single precision is not sufficient for integral and HF/DFT calculations and one should only deploy it in a mixed-precision fashion, i.e., such that some operations are performed in single precision and others in double. The utility of single precision has not yet been thoroughly investigated in post-HF calculations. Previous studies^{30–32} focused on non-iterative methods, such as MP2 and triples correction for CCSD. Single-precision MP2 was tested within resolution-of-the-identity (RI)³⁰ and Cholesky decomposition (CD)³¹ schemes. These studies have shown that commonly used RI bases and CD thresholds (10^{-2} – 10^{-3}) yield much larger errors in total energies than errors due to using single-precision arithmetic. Within coupled-cluster theory, single-precision algorithms were analyzed within CCD²³ and perturbative triples, (T), correction³² calculations. GPU implementation of CCD²³ in single precision showed that the numerical error is 10^{-5} – 10^{-6} hartree. Numerical analysis of the (T) correction for CCSD³² has shown that the result is stable with respect to numerical noise, justifying a single-precision implementation.

Despite these encouraging findings, the extent of applicability of single precision in many-body theories is not fully understood. There are several open questions:

1. Does numerical error accumulate in iterative procedures such as those used to solve CCSD and EOM equations?
2. What is the impact of using single precision on molecular properties and excited states?
3. Can one reliably compute analytic nuclear gradients and optimize structures within pure single precision?

In this paper, we show that using pure single-precision implementation of post-HF methods is sufficient for most quantum-chemistry applications. Thus, one can reap the benefits of reduced costs without invoking more sophisticated mixed-precision algorithms, which can be reserved for more exotic situations when much higher numeric accuracy is desired.

As a standard practice in quantum chemistry, typical numerical convergence thresholds are tight enough to not affect the resulting accuracy. For example, Q-Chem’s default CCSD convergence criteria are 10^{-6} hartree for energies and 10^{-4} for amplitudes;³³ Molpro uses 10^{-6} hartree for energies and 10^{-5} for amplitudes.³⁴ Some packages use a single threshold, for example, GAMESS uses 10^{-7} for amplitudes³⁵ and ORCA uses 10^{-5} – 10^{-6} hartree for energies. Thus, it appears that 7 decimal digits is sufficient for correlation energy (we note that 10^{-7} hartree is three orders of magnitude tighter than chemical accuracy).

In this paper, we describe a general implementation of CC/EOM-CC methods that allows users to perform calculations in either single or double precision. We implemented both the standard variant and one using CD and RI representation of electron-repulsion integrals. In addition, our implementation allows one to follow up a single-precision calculation with clean-up iterations, in which the full double-precision accuracy can be recovered.²³ The code is based on the libtensor³⁶ and libxm³⁷ libraries for many-body electronic structure calculations. The production-level code is implemented in the Q-Chem electronic structure package.^{38,39}

2 Algorithms and implementation details

Libtensor³⁶ was developed to provide a high-level interface for tensor operations and to deliver efficient performance. The library has been used to implement a large number of CC,²⁻⁴ EOM-CC,^{6-8,40} and ADC (algebraic diagrammatic construction)⁴¹ methods for calculating energies, properties, and nuclear gradients in Q-Chem. Libtensor supports tensor symmetries, block-sparsity, several contraction algorithms, different BLAS implementations, and several computational backends.^{37,42} We extended the libtensor library to incorporate single-precision operations by generalizing all tensor operations for the general element type (Fig. S1 in SI gives an example of the code). The code is available in the original repository on GitHub.⁴³ The numerical tests presented in this paper were performed with a developer version of Q-Chem and the modified libtensor, compiled with the GCC-6.4.0 compiler using the '-O3' optimization flag and linked against the Intel MKL library (2017.0 version).

Fig. 1 shows an overview of the CCSD and EOM-CCSD workflows. In our implementation, we compute all integrals and solve HF equations in double precision; the integral transformation step is also performed in double precision. We then convert the tensors (integrals) to single precision and perform all tensor operations (contractions, additions, etc.) in the CCSD/EOM-CCSD calculations using single precision. In the RI/CD variants, we also employ the single-precision algorithm at the CCSD step. Once the CCSD equations converge in single precision, the procedure can switch to double precision to perform clean-up iterations to recover the double-precision result. We follow the same strategy for Λ -amplitudes. We also implemented single-precision calculations of various density matrices needed for property and nuclear gradient calculations.

The EOM workflow entails solving the CCSD equations and evaluating the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian (\bar{H}) intermediates followed by the computation of EOM energies and amplitudes by iterative diagonalization of the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian using the Davidson algorithm. We extended the routines⁴⁴ that compute the intermediates and σ -vectors (products of the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian acting on EOM trial states) for EOM-IP/EA/SF/EE-CCSD to support calculations in single precision.

It is expected that using single precision provides a speedup factor of two on CPUs (this estimate does not take into account reduced I/O, which can speed the calculation even further if single-precision tensors fit in RAM, while double-precision tensors do not). If the single-precision calculation is followed up by clean-up iterations to recover double-precision accuracy, the theoretical estimate for the overall speedup is:

$$\text{Theor. speedup} = \frac{N_{\text{dp}}}{0.5 \cdot N_{\text{sp}} + N_{\text{cleanup}}}, \quad (2)$$

where N_{dp} and N_{sp} are the number of iterations in double and single precisions, N_{cleanup} is the number of clean-up iterations in double precision.

3 Computational details

Benchmark calculations of water clusters were performed on a Dell server with four 8-core Intel Xeon E5-4640 processors using 4 threads. We used 4 threads to avoid bias for small jobs, which cannot be effectively parallelized using too large a number of threads. All other




Figure 1: Left: Implemented CCSD algorithm. Clean-up iterations in double precision are optional. Right: EOM algorithm.

Table 2: Convergence thresholds for CCSD calculations. Convergence for Λ equations is the same as for the T amplitudes.

System	E , sp, hartree	T , sp	E , dp, hartree	T , dp
Water clusters	10^{-5}	10^{-3}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
Water dimer (dipole moment run)	10^{-6}	10^{-4}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
Uracil	10^{-6}	10^{-4}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
CH ₂ O	10^{-6}	10^{-4}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
C ₂ H ₄ O	10^{-6}	10^{-4}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
ATT	10^{-6}	10^{-4}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
G2 set, pure sp or dp	10^{-6}	10^{-4}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
G2 set, sp with clean up	10^{-5}	10^{-3}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
G2 set, sp with energy in dp	10^{-5}	10^{-3}	—	—
G2 set, pure sp or dp, optimization	10^{-7}	10^{-5}	10^{-7}	10^{-5}
C ₆ H ₅ N	10^{-6}	10^{-4}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
benzene	10^{-10}	10^{-9}	10^{-7}	10^{-5}

calculations were performed on Dell servers with four 8-core Intel Xeon E5-4640, two 8-core Intel Xeon E5-2690, or two 10-core Intel Xeon E5-2689 v4 processors with the best settings, i.e., utilizing all cores and using maximum available memory. The benchmark set comprises diverse types of electronic structure, including water clusters of increasing size, the uracil molecule, the formaldehyde molecule, oxygen-ethylene adduct (C₂H₄O), a nucleobase trimer (ATT, adenine-thymine-thymine), an aromatic diradical (C₆H₅N), the benzene molecule, and the G2 set⁴⁵ containing 148 molecules. To assess numerical errors in very large systems, we used the taxol molecule (110 atoms, 446 electrons).

We tested basis sets of the double-, triple-, quadruple-, and pentuple-zeta quality, with and without diffuse functions, and including polarized-core variants. Frozen core was used for all

calculations, except water dimer and formaldehyde calculations with cc-pCVXZ basis sets. All Cartesian geometries are given in Supplementary Information (SI). The structure of taxol is from Ref. 31.

Convergence thresholds for CCSD equations are summarized in Table 2. Since single precision provides ~ 7 decimal digits of precision, the tightest threshold of convergence for energy in single precision is 10^{-7} hartree (assuming correlation energies of ~ 1 hartree). By numerical experimentation we found that single precision iterations converge smoothly with energy threshold of 10^{-5} – 10^{-6} hartree; therefore, we used this threshold for the single precision part of the calculation in most cases. In the double-precision calculations, we used default convergence except for the benzene benchmark. In properties calculations, we used the same convergence criteria for T and Λ amplitudes. Unrelaxed one-particle density matrices used in dipole moment calculations were computed in double and single precision from respective double and single precision intermediates and amplitudes. In all EOM calculations a 10^{-5} convergence threshold for EOM amplitudes⁴⁶ was used in the Davidson procedure. For geometry optimization (benzene) and finite-difference frequency analysis, much tighter convergence criteria were used: 10^{-10} for energies, 10^{-9} for T and Λ amplitudes in double precision; 10^{-7} for energies, 10^{-5} for T and Λ amplitudes in single precision. The criteria of convergence in geometry optimization were the same for the double and single precision calculations: $2 \cdot 10^{-5}$ a.u. for the maximum component of the gradient $5 \cdot 10^{-5}$ a.u. for the maximum atomic displacement, and $1 \cdot 10^{-7}$ a.u. for energy. Such tight criteria would reveal how different the “best” geometry from single-precision calculation is from the geometry from the “best” double-precision calculation.

For geometry optimization of the systems from G2 set, we used default Q-Chem convergence criteria on gradient, displacement and energy change; 10^{-7} a.u. for energies, 10^{-5} for T and Λ amplitudes for both precisions, which are the default for double precision.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Accuracy of ground-state energies and properties

We found that the CC amplitude convergence rate is not affected by using single precision and that the number of CCSD iterations in calculations with single-precision CCSD followed by clean-up iterations is the same as in reference double-precision calculations. The typical output of a single-precision calculation with clean-up iterations is shown in SI (Fig. S2).

Table 3 shows the results for water clusters. Pure single precision calculations (without clean-up iterations) do not introduce significant numerical errors in total energies, i.e. the typical difference between single and double precision energies is only several J/mol, which is three orders of magnitude below chemical accuracy. Moreover, double-precision numerical accuracy is fully recovered when clean-up iterations are performed. The single-precision calculation is twice as fast than the double-precision one. In calculations with clean-up iterations, observed speedup quickly approaches the theoretical maximum (about 1.6, for these parameters) with the increasing number of water molecules (see Fig. 2). For all water clusters only two clean-up iterations were needed to converge calculations within the convergence criteria (Table 2). At the first clean-up iteration the change in energy is small, but the net change of amplitudes is large (this is illustrated in Fig. S2 in SI). If only energy criterion of convergence is used, only one clean-up iteration is necessary in most cases. The explanation of the net change in the

amplitudes is simple: switching to double precision changes all amplitudes by a small amount (that is why it is “clean-up”) but because the number of amplitudes is large, the net change is large (this is also confirmed by the increase of this net change with the size of the cluster). The second clean-up iteration does not include change of precision and the calculation quickly converges. We observed similar performance and accuracy for RI/CD-CCSD calculations of these clusters.




Figure 2: Wall time speedup for SP scheme with clean-up iterations for the CCSD/cc-pVDZ energy calculations of water clusters. Theoretical estimate is given by Eq. (2).

To test whether numerical errors increase with system size, we compared single and double precision CCSD for an adenine-thymine-thymine system (ATT) and found that the difference between single and double precision total energies is 15 J/mol (again, full double precision accuracy can be recovered with one or two clean-up iterations). As an example of an even larger system, we carried out RI-MP2/cc-pVDZ calculations of taxol with double-precision amplitudes and with the amplitudes converted to single precision. The resulting single- and double-precision energies are -2918.93641306 and -2918.93643602 hartree, respectively. Although the error due to single precision is larger (60 J/mol), it is still well below 1 kJ/mol. The MP2 correlation energy is $-8.9646559 \approx 10$ hartree, thus, the tightest convergence criterion by energy for a corresponding single-precision CCSD calculation would be 10^{-6} hartree.

We investigated basis set effects on the error due to single precision by using uracil, formaldehyde, and the water dimer. Table 5 presents total energies and dipole moments for all species. The results show that the errors in energies are negligible and that the differences in dipole moments computed in single and double precision are less than the number of digits printed in the output. Increasing the basis set from cc-pVDZ to cc-pVTZ and aug-cc-pVTZ does not increase the errors. The results for formaldehyde and water dimer and for which larger set of basis sets were used (up to cc-pCV5Z) follow the same trend and the magnitude of errors due to single precision does not increase.

In order to meaningfully compare the differences between single and double precision, one should keep in mind that in these calculations the energy threshold for CCSD convergence was 10^{-6} hartree ≈ 2.6 J/mol. Within this threshold, the error of the calculations with the clean-up iterations is the same as in the single-precision calculation. Interestingly, calculation of double-precision energies from single-precision amplitudes gives larger errors, which can be explained by the convergence criteria used: the amplitudes are underoptimized in comparison with the amplitudes, used for other calculations (shown in Table 2).

To test the behavior of the single-precision algorithm in strongly correlated systems, we considered ethylene-oxygen adduct, an important intermediate in the reaction of atomic oxygen with ethylene. This molecule can be described as an oxirane ring with one broken C–O bond, which results in strong diradical character. This is a somewhat artificial example, because standard CCSD is expected to perform poorly in strongly correlated systems. These types of electronic structure should be described by, for example, spin-flip^{47,48} or double ionization potential⁴⁹ variants of EOM-CC. We performed CCSD calculations for the singlet and triplet states. The triplet solution is well-behaved, e.g., $\|T_1\|^2=0.0115$ and $\|T_2\|^2 = 0.1724$ in the cc-pVQZ basis, and for either precision CCSD converges in 10, 11, 11 iterations with cc-pVDZ, cc-pVTZ, and cc-pVQZ, respectively. As expected, the description of the singlet state is problematic ($\|T_1\|^2=1.1296$ and $\|T_2\|^2=0.5336$ in cc-pVQZ). Such large T_1 amplitudes are due to open-shell character of the state, which renders a closed-shell determinant to be a poor quality zero-order wave-function. This is a likely cause of the observed slow convergence of CCSD (31-35 iterations for T and 51-56 iterations for Λ), yet the number of iterations in single and double precision were the same, except for cc-pVQZ where the number of iterations in single and double precision differed by one. Importantly, the errors of pure single precision CCSD total energies are of the same magnitude as in the previous examples.

To confirm that these observations hold for other systems, we compared the CCSD total energies computed in single and double precision for the G2 set⁴⁵ using the 6-31G(d), cc-pVDZ, cc-pVTZ, and cc-pVQZ basis sets. In addition, we compared single-precision results with those obtained with clean-up iterations, as well as a calculation in which energy is computed in double precision using double-precision integrals and single-precision amplitudes. The results are summarized in Table 6. As one can see, the MAD (mean absolute deviation) in single-precision calculations is less than 4 J/mol. The MADs, STDs (standard deviation, unbiased estimate), and maximum errors in cc-pVQZ basis are only slightly larger than in cc-pVDZ.

Table 3: CCSD/cc-pVDZ total energies of water clusters. Differences between single- and double-precision energies are shown in the last column.

Cluster size	E_{sp} , a.u.	$E_{\text{sp+dp}}$, a.u.	E_{dp} , a.u.	$\Delta_{\text{dp,sp}}$, J/mol
2	-152.48710832	-152.48710752	-152.48710767	1.7
3	-228.74911206	-228.74911017	-228.74911059	3.9
4	-305.00868540	-305.00868416	-305.00868472	1.8
5	-381.26858576	-381.26858599	-381.26858585	-0.2
6	-457.51949116	-457.51949130	-457.51949145	-0.8
7	-533.78980571	-533.78980623	-533.78980640	-1.8

4.2 Accuracy of target-state energies in EOM-CCSD

To test the accuracy of single-precision calculations of excited states, we carried out EOM-EE-CCSD calculations for uracil (Table 7) and EOM-SF-CCSD calculations for $\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{N}$ (Table 8). We considered different types of states: singlets and triplets, states with different symmetry (symmetric and antisymmetric with respect to the symmetry plane), closed-shell and open-shell types, valence and Rydberg states. In all cases, the difference between total energies computed in double and single precision does not exceed 3 J/mol ($3 \cdot 10^{-5}$ eV), which is much smaller than the intrinsic error bars of EOM-CCSD (0.1-0.3 eV). This result is comparable to the differences

Table 4: CD-CCSD/cc-pVDZ total energies of water clusters. Cholesky threshold of 10^{-3} was used. Differences between single and double precision energies are shown in the last column.

Cluster size	E_{sp} , a.u.	$E_{\text{sp+dp}}$, a.u.	E_{dp} , a.u.	$\Delta_{\text{dp,sp}}$, J/mol
2	-152.48713650	-152.48713571	-152.48713586	1.7
3	-228.74916915	-228.74916737	-228.74916779	3.6
4	-305.00875903	-305.00875662	-305.00875717	4.9
5	-381.26864546	-381.26864554	-381.26864540	0.2
6	-457.51960841	-457.51960843	-457.51960858	-0.4
7	-533.78994271	-533.78994226	-533.78994243	0.7

Table 5: CCSD total energies (hartree) and dipole moments (μ , a.u.) of uracil, water dimer, formaldehyde, and ethylene-oxygen adduct in various basis sets^a.

Uracil/Basis set	E_{sp} , a.u.	E_{dp} , a.u.	$\Delta_{\text{dp,sp}}$, J/mol	μ , sp ^b	μ , dp ^c
cc-pVDZ	-413.72139806	-413.72139812	-0.2	1.550917	1.550917
cc-pVTZ	-414.10170402	-414.10170403	0.0	1.643366	1.643366
aug-cc-pVTZ	-414.13153216	-414.13153108	2.8	1.689405	1.689405
cc-pVQZ	-414.22039427	-414.22039569	-3.7	1.683603	1.683603
(H ₂ O) ₂ /Basis set ^d	E_{sp} , a.u.	E_{dp} , a.u.	$\Delta_{\text{dp,sp}}$, J/mol	μ , sp ^b	μ , dp ^c
cc-pCVTZ	-152.77124280	-152.77124301	-0.6	0.758536	0.758536
cc-pCVQZ	-152.83005083	-152.83005083	0	0.746618	0.746618
cc-pCV5Z	-152.84874263	-152.84874291	-0.7	0.740770	0.740770
CH ₂ O/Basis set ^d	E_{sp} , a.u.	E_{dp} , a.u.	$\Delta_{\text{dp,sp}}$, J/mol	μ , sp ^b	μ , dp ^c
cc-pCVTZ	-114.42374047	-114.42374037	0.3	0.912793	0.912793
cc-pCVQZ	-114.46445277	-114.46445284	-0.2	0.946294	0.946294
cc-pCV5Z	-114.47693774	-114.47693771	0.1	0.961034	0.961035
C ₂ H ₄ O (T ₁)/Basis set	E_{sp} , a.u.	E_{dp} , a.u.	$\Delta_{\text{dp,sp}}$, J/mol	μ , sp ^b	μ , dp ^c
cc-pVDZ	-153.28012439	-153.28012442	-0.1	0.713475	0.713475
cc-pVTZ	-153.42725145	-153.42725167	-0.6	0.752959	0.752959
cc-pVQZ	-153.47046520	-153.47046539	-0.5	0.778434	0.778434
C ₂ H ₄ O (S ₀)/Basis set	E_{sp} , a.u.	E_{dp} , a.u.	$\Delta_{\text{dp,sp}}$, J/mol	μ , sp ^b	μ , dp ^c
cc-pVDZ	-153.24187533	-153.24187486	1.2	0.930752	0.930749
cc-pVTZ	-153.39033087	-153.39033115	-0.7	1.155325	1.155318
cc-pVQZ	-153.43514375	-153.43514491	-3.0	1.272352	1.272339

^a Convergence thresholds for single and double precision are the same (see Table 2).
^b Equations for T and Λ equations are solved in single precision; intermediates and unrelaxed density matrices are evaluated in single precision.
^c Equations for T and Λ equations are solved in double precision; intermediates and unrelaxed density matrices are evaluated in double precision.
^d All electron were active in the cc-pCVTZ, cc-pCVQZ, and cc-pCV5Z calculations.

in the CCSD total energies. The respective excitation energies are the same within at least 4 decimal places.

Table 6: Mean average deviation (MAD) and standard deviation (STD), J/mol, from reference double-precision CCSD total energies for the G2 set.

Basis	sp		sp with dp energy		sp with cleanup	
	MAD	STD	MAD	STD	MAD	STD
6-31G(d)	0.12	0.2	3.7	6.6	1.5	1.4
cc-pVDZ	0.15	0.2	3.6	6.7	1.4	1.4
cc-pVTZ	0.30	0.5	3.4	5.3	1.5	1.4
cc-pVQZ	0.68	0.9	3.7	5.0	1.6	1.5

Table 7: EOM-EE-CCSD total energies (in a.u.) of excited singlet and triplet states of uracil in various basis sets. In each cell the first number is obtained from double-precision calculation, the second number is obtained from single-precision EOM calculation from double-precision reference, and the third number is single-precision EOM from single-precision reference. The fourth number is the difference between double- and single-precision energies (with double-precision reference).

Singlets				
Basis set	1A'	2A'	1A''	2A''
cc-pVDZ	-413.50624322	-413.46584035	-413.52849406	-413.47629005
	-413.50624315	-413.46584026	-413.52849409	-413.47628997
	-413.50624328	-413.46584041	-413.52849406	-413.47629005
	$-7 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$-9 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$3 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$-8 \cdot 10^{-8}$
cc-pVTZ	-413.89150482	-413.84840838	-413.90876266	-413.85792039
	-413.89150498	-413.84840792	-413.90876251	-413.85792058
	-413.89150563	-413.84840854	-413.90876290	-413.85792110
	$1.6 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$-4.6 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$-1.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$1.9 \cdot 10^{-7}$
aug-cc-pVTZ	-413.92599740	-413.88373275	-413.94000534	-413.90496469
	-413.92599743	-413.88373272	-413.94000543	-413.90496414
	-413.92599918	-413.88373397	-413.94000635	-413.90496581
	$3 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$-3 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$9 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$-5.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$
Triplets				
Basis set	1A'	2A'	1A''	2A''
cc-pVDZ	-413.57714822	-413.51667861	-413.53936723	-413.48574474
	-413.57714817	-413.51667858	-413.53936718	-413.48574485
	-413.57714827	-413.51667865	-413.53936732	-413.48574489
	$-5 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$-3 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$-5 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-7}$
cc-pVTZ	-413.95932894	-413.89779284	-413.91902233	-413.86657196
	-413.95932869	-413.89779281	-413.91902181	-413.86657206
	-413.95932945	-413.89779339	-413.91902247	-413.86657255
	$-2.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$-3 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$-5.2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$1.0 \cdot 10^{-7}$
aug-cc-pVTZ	-413.99008713	-413.92935022	-413.94969790	-413.90754309
	-413.99008666	-413.92935024	-413.94969820	-413.90754252
	-413.99008779	-413.92935158	-413.94969912	-413.90754422
	$-4.7 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$3.0 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$-5.7 \cdot 10^{-7}$

Table 8: EOM-SF-CCSD total energies (in a.u.) of several electronic states of C_6H_5N in various basis sets. Symmetry labels refer to state symmetries. In each cell the first number is from double-precision calculation, the second number is from single-precision EOM calculation, and the third number is the difference between double- and single-precision energies. CCSD equations were solved in double precision in all cases.

Basis set	1A ₂	2A ₂	1A ₁	2A ₁
cc-pVDZ	-285.46570954	-285.42658952	-285.40655223	-285.37250140
	-285.46570956	-285.42658954	-285.40655224	-285.37250139
	$2 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$2 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$1 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$-1 \cdot 10^{-9}$
cc-pVTZ	-285.79837285	-285.76114321	-285.74329035	-285.70728705
	-285.79837303	-285.76114343	-285.74328950	-285.70728629
	$1.8 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$2.2 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$-8.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$-7.6 \cdot 10^{-7}$

4.3 Accuracy of gradient evaluation in single precision

To test how the choice of precision affects the accuracy of the nuclear gradient and the resulting optimized structures, we first optimized the benzene molecule at the CCSD/cc-pVDZ level of theory using tight convergence criteria. In these calculations, density matrices were computed in the respective precisions; orbital response was computed in double precision. Geometry optimization was performed by gradient optimization (gradient was evaluated analytically). Starting from the same initial geometry (MP2/cc-pVDZ optimized structure), both optimizations converged in 6 iterations (single precision run converged by gradient and displacement). The resulting geometries (given in section 2 of SI) are nearly identical, with mean absolute error (computed for non-zero Cartesian coordinates) of $1.9 \cdot 10^{-9}$ Å.

To confirm this result for a larger set of systems, we carried out geometry optimizations the G2 set with cc-pVTZ in both precisions. The set includes 712 bonds. The bond lengths were extracted from the Cartesian geometries using the *Openbabel* package.⁵⁰ The errors with respect to double precision are small: MAD is $6.7 \cdot 10^{-5}$ Å, STD is $2.1 \cdot 10^{-4}$ Å, and maximal absolute deviation is $2.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ Å. Although the standard deviation is larger in comparison with the benzene result, we note that the shape of statistical distribution is very narrow with a sharp spike at zero. An error interval (-10^{-7} Å, 10^{-7} Å) contains about a half of the total number of bonds, explaining discrepancy with standard deviation. To put these differences in the context, we note that the CCSD/cc-pVTZ MAD relative to the experimental bond lengths is about 0.64 pm=0.006 Å,¹ which is by two orders of magnitude larger than the MAD due to using single precision.

4.4 Accuracy of finite-difference frequencies

To investigate whether finite-difference calculations of frequencies (using analytic gradients) can be carried out in single precision, we computed the frequencies and normal modes for benzene at the respective optimized geometries with the same convergence criteria as used for geometry optimizations with the step size of 0.001 Å. The resulting frequencies (given in section 3 of SI) are very different: real and imaginary frequencies of $\sim 15,000$ cm⁻¹ occur along with several imaginary frequencies. Thus, not surprisingly, single precision can cause problems in finite-difference calculations. However, finite-difference calculations using single-precision calculation

with the double-precision clean-up iterations fully recovers double precision frequencies, while affording $\sim \times 1.3$ speedup of the calculation.

We note that finite difference derivative evaluation is always a balance between the size of the step and the accuracy due to finite numerical precision. The default step size of 0.001 Å requires energies converged to 10^{-9} or so. Thus, an erratic behavior of single-precision finite-difference calculations can be remedied by using a larger step size. The calculation with 0.01 Å displacements yielded almost identical frequencies in double and single precision with maximal difference in frequencies of 0.64 cm^{-1} . The MAD between double precision frequencies computed with 0.001 and 0.01 Å steps is 0.21 cm^{-1} .

5 Conclusion

In this contribution, we report single- and mixed-precision implementation of the CCSD and EOM-CCSD energies, analytic gradients, and properties. Using single precision results in reduced memory footprint, considerable computation speed-up, and reduced energy-to-solution. That is, single precision calculations use half the memory (or disk) space and produce a speedup factor of 2 on CPUs. The main focus of this paper was on assessing the impact on accuracy of the resulting energies and properties in post-HF calculations, in particular in iterative schemes. The results show that the rate of error accumulation in single precision is sufficiently slow, and overall single precision introduces negligible errors for total energies, excitation energies, forces, and properties. Moreover, single precision can be used in geometry optimizations with analytical gradients. Thus, we conclude that for most type of calculations, straight single-precision implementation of post-HF methods can be used and one can reap the benefits of reduced costs without invoking more sophisticated mixed-precision algorithms, which can be reserved for more exotic situations when much higher numeric accuracy is desired. On the basis of these results, the default precision of the CC/EOM-CC calculations will be changed to single precision starting from the 5.1.1 release. If tight convergence is desired (e.g. in finite-difference calculations), single precision can be used to speedup iterations in the beginning, converging to the single-precision result first and continuing in double precision. In most cases the total number of iterations is not affected and the speedup is close to the theoretical estimate.

6 Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the U.S. Air Force of Scientific Research (AFOSR) under contractor number FA9550-16-1-0051. P.P. is a grateful recipient of the internship fellowship from Q-Chem, Inc. The authors acknowledge Dr. Jeff R. Hammond who presented the basic idea at the MolSSI workshop in Asilomar (May 2017). The MolSSI initiative is supported by the National Science Foundation (molssi.org).

Supporting information is available: Details of computer implementation, relevant Cartesian geometries, optimized structures, and frequencies and normal modes.

References

- [1] Helgaker, T.; Jørgensen, P.; Olsen, J. *Molecular Electronic Structure Theory*; Wiley & Sons, 2000.
- [2] Bartlett, R.J.; Shavitt, I. *Many-Body Methods in Chemistry and Physics: MBPT and Coupled-Cluster Theory*; Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [3] Bartlett, R.J. The Coupled-Cluster Revolution *Mol. Phys.* **2010**, *108*, 2905–2920.
- [4] Bartlett, R.J. In *Theory and Applications of Computational Chemistry*; Dykstra, C., Frenking, G., Scuseria, G., Eds.; Elsevier, 2005.
- [5] Bartlett, R.J. To Multireference or Not to Multireference: That Is the Question? *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **2002**, *3*, 579–603.
- [6] Krylov, A. I. Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Methods for Open-Shell and Electronically Excited Species: The Hitchhiker’s Guide to Fock Space *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **2008**, *59*, 433–462.
- [7] Sneskov, K.; Christiansen, O. Excited State Coupled Cluster Methods *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2012**, *2*, 566–584.
- [8] Bartlett, R.J. Coupled-Cluster Theory and Its Equation-of-Motion Extensions *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2012**, *2*, 126–138.
- [9] Pople, J.A. Nobel Lecture: Quantum Chemical Models *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **1999**, *71*, 1267–1274.
- [10] Ruscic, B.; Pinzon, R. E; von Laszewski, G.; Kodeboyina, D.; Burcat, A.; Leahy, D.; Montoy, D.; Wagner, A. F. Active Thermochemical Tables: Thermochemistry for the 21st Century *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **2005**, *16*, 561.
- [11] Tajti, A.; Szalay, P.G.; Császár, A.G.; Kállay, M.; Gauss, J.; Valeev, E.F.; Flowers, B.A.; Vázquez, J.; Stanton, J.F. HEAT: High Accuracy Extrapolated Ab Initio Thermochemistry *J. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *121*, 11599–11613.
- [12] *IEEE Standard for Binary Floating-Point Arithmetic*; ANSI/IEEE Std 754-1985, 1985.
- [13] *IEEE Standard for Floating-Point Arithmetic - Redline*; IEEE Std 754-2008 - Redline, 1985.
- [14] Although b_0 value is implicit and encoded by the exponent, one should consider both implicitly and explicitly stored bits when discussing decimal precision shown in Table 1.
- [15] The number is called *normal* if b_0 is 1 and *subnormal* otherwise. Subnormal numbers fill the gap between the smallest positive normal number and zero.
- [16] Gustafson, G. J. Right-Sizing Precision: Unleashed Computing: The Need to Right-Size Precision to Save Energy, Bandwidth, Storage, and Electrical Power. <https://web.archive.org/web/20160606203112/http://www.johngustafson.net/presentations/Right-SizingPrecision1.pdf>, **2015**; Presentation from web archive.

- [17] Clark, M.A.; Babich, R.; Barros, K.; Brower, R.C.; Rebhi, C. Solving Lattice QCD Systems of Equations Using Mixed Precision Solvers on GPUs *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **2010**, *181*, 1517–1528.
- [18] Grand, S. L.; Gtz, A. W.; Walker, R. C. SPFP: Speed Without Compromise — a Mixed Precision Model for GPU Accelerated Molecular Dynamics Simulations *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **2013**, *184*, 374–380.
- [19] Baboulin, M.; Buttari, A.; Dongarra, J.; Kurzak, J.; Langou, J.; Langou, J.; Luszczek, P.; Tomov, S. Accelerating Scientific Computations with Mixed Precision Algorithms *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **2009**, *180*, 2526 – 2533; 40 YEARS OF CPC: A celebratory issue focused on quality software for high performance, grid and novel computing architectures.
- [20] Ufimtsev, I. S.; Martínez, T. J. Quantum Chemistry on Graphical Processing Units. 1. Strategies for Two-Electron Integral Evaluation *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2008**, *4*, 222–231.
- [21] Ufimtsev, I. S.; Martínez, T. J. Quantum Chemistry on Graphical Processing Units. 2. Direct Self-Consistent-Field Implementation *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2009**, *5*, 1004–1015.
- [22] Ufimtsev, I. S.; Martínez, T. J. Quantum Chemistry on Graphical Processing Units. 3. Analytical Energy Gradients, Geometry Optimization, and First Principles Molecular Dynamics *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2009**, *5*, 2619–2628.
- [23] DePrince, A. E.; Hammond, J. R. Coupled Cluster Theory on Graphics Processing Units I. The Coupled Cluster Doubles Method *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2011**, *7*, 1287–1295.
- [24] DePrince, A. E.; Kennedy, Matthew R.; Sumpter, Bobby G.; Sherrill, C. David Density-Fitted Singles and Doubles Coupled-Cluster on Graphics Processing Units *Mol. Phys.* **2014**, *112*, 844–852.
- [25] Eriksen, J. J. In *Parallel Programming with OpenACC*; Farber, R., Ed.; Morgan Kaufmann, 2017; p. 241.
- [26] Eriksen, J. J. Efficient and Portable Acceleration of Quantum Chemical Many-Body Methods in Mixed Floating Point Precision Using OpenACC Compiler Directives *Mol. Phys.* **2017**, *115*, 2086–2101.
- [27] Asadchev, A.; Gordon, M. S. Mixed-Precision Evaluation of Two-Electron Integrals by Rys Quadrature *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **2012**, *183*, 1563–1567.
- [28] Rák, Á.; Cserey, G. The BRUSH Algorithm for Two-Electron Integrals on GPU *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2015**, *622*, 92–98.
- [29] Luehr, N.; Ufimtsev, I. S.; Martínez, T. J. Dynamic Precision For Electron Repulsion Integral Evaluation on Graphical Processing Units (GPUs) *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2011**, *7*, 949–954.

- [30] Vogt, L.; Olivares-Amaya, R.; Kermes, S.; Shao, Y.; Amador-Bedolla, C.; Aspuru-Guzik, A. Accelerating Resolution-of-the-Identity Second-Order Möller-Plesset Quantum Chemistry Calculations with Graphical Processing Units *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2008**, *112*, 2049–2057.
- [31] Vysotskiy, V. P.; Cederbaum, L. S. Accurate Quantum Chemistry in Single Precision Arithmetic: Correlation Energy *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2011**, *7*, 320–326.
- [32] Knizia, G.; Li, W.; Simon, S.; Werner, H.-J. Determining the Numerical Stability of Quantum Chemistry Algorithms *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2011**, *7*, 2387–2398.
- [33] The metric for the amplitude convergence is the norm of the difference between the amplitudes from the successive iterations, i.e., $\|T^{(i)} - T^{i-1}\|$.
- [34] The actual metric used in Molpro is the square of the norm of the difference between the amplitudes from the successive iterations, with the respective default threshold of 10^{-10} .
- [35] The metric for the amplitude convergence in GAMESS is the absolute value of the largest element of the difference between the amplitudes from the successive iterations, i.e., $\max|T^{(i)} - T^{i-1}|$.
- [36] Epifanovsky, E.; Wormit, M.; Kuś, T.; Landau, A.; Zuev, D.; Khistyayev, K.; Manohar, P. U.; Kaliman, I.; Dreuw, A.; Krylov, A. I. New Implementation of High-Level Correlated Methods Using a General Block-Tensor Library for High-Performance Electronic Structure Calculations *J. Comput. Chem.* **2013**, *34*, 2293–2309.
- [37] Kaliman, I.; Krylov, A. I. New Algorithm for Tensor Contractions on Multi-Core CPUs, GPUs, and Accelerators Enables CCSD and EOM-CCSD Calculations with over 1000 Basis Functions on a Single Compute Node *J. Comput. Chem.* **2017**, *38*, 842–853.
- [38] Krylov, A. I.; Gill, P. M. W. Q-Chem: An Engine for Innovation *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2013**, *3*, 317–326.
- [39] Y. Shao, Z. Gan, E. Epifanovsky, A.T.B. Gilbert, M. Wormit, J. Kussmann, A.W. Lange, A. Behn, J. Deng, X. Feng, D. Ghosh, M. Goldey, P.R. Horn, L.D. Jacobson, I. Kaliman, R.Z. Khaliullin, T. Kus, A. Landau, J. Liu, E.I. Proynov, Y.M. Rhee, R.M. Richard, M.A. Rohrdanz, R.P. Steele, E.J. Sundstrom, H.L. Woodcock III, P.M. Zimmerman, D. Zuev, B. Albrecht, E. Alguire, B. Austin, G.J.O. Beran, Y.A. Bernard, E. Berquist, K. Brandhorst, K.B. Bravaya, S.T. Brown, D. Casanova, C.-M. Chang, Y. Chen, S.H. Chien, K.D. Closser, D.L. Crittenden, M. Diedenhofen, R.A. DiStasio Jr., H. Do, A.D. Dutoi, R.G. Edgar, S. Fatehi, L. Fusti-Molnar, A. Ghysels, A. Golubeva-Zadorozhnaya, J. Gomes, M.W.D. Hanson-Heine, P.H.P. Harbach, A.W. Hauser, E.G. Hohenstein, Z.C. Holden, T.-C. Jagau, H. Ji, B. Kaduk, K. Khistyayev, J. Kim, J. Kim, R.A. King, P. Klunzinger, D. Kosenkov, T. Kowalczyk, C.M. Krauter, K.U. Laog, A. Laurent, K.V. Lawler, S.V. Levchenko, C.Y. Lin, F. Liu, E. Livshits, R.C. Lochan, A. Luenser, P. Manohar, S.F. Manzer, S.-P. Mao, N. Mardirossian, A.V. Marenich, S.A. Maurer, N.J. Mayhall, C.M. Oana, R. Olivares-Amaya, D.P. O'Neill, J.A. Parkhill, T.M. Perrine, R. Peverati, P.A. Pieniazek, A. Prociuk, D.R. Rehn, E. Rosta, N.J. Russ, N. Sergueev, S.M. Sharada, S. Sharma, D.W. Small, A. Sodt, T. Stein, D. Stuck, Y.-C. Su, A.J.W. Thom, T. Tsuchimochi, L. Vogt, O. Vydrov, T. Wang,

- M.A. Watson, J. Wenzel, A. White, C.F. Williams, V. Vanovschi, S. Yeganeh, S.R. Yost, Z.-Q. You, I.Y. Zhang, X. Zhang, Y. Zhou, B.R. Brooks, G.K.L. Chan, D.M. Chipman, C.J. Cramer, W.A. Goddard III, M.S. Gordon, W.J. Hehre, A. Klamt, H.F. Schaefer III, M.W. Schmidt, C.D. Sherrill, D.G. Truhlar, A. Warshel, X. Xu, A. Aspuru-Guzik, R. Baer, A.T. Bell, N.A. Besley, J.-D. Chai, A. Dreuw, B.D. Dunietz, T.R. Furlani, S.R. Gwaltney, C.-P. Hsu, Y. Jung, J. Kong, D.S. Lambrecht, W.Z. Liang, C. Ochsenfeld, V.A. Rassolov, L.V. Slipchenko, J.E. Subotnik, T. Van Voorhis, J.M. Herbert, A.I. Krylov, P.M.W. Gill, and M. Head-Gordon Advances in molecular quantum chemistry contained in the Q-Chem 4 program package *Mol. Phys.* **2015**, *113*, 184–215.
- [40] Jagau, T.-C.; Bravaya, K. B.; Krylov, A. I. Extending Quantum Chemistry of Bound States to Electronic Resonances *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **2017**, *68*, 525–553.
- [41] Dreuw, A.; Wormit, M. The Algebraic Diagrammatic Construction Scheme for the Polarization Propagator for the Calculation of Excited States *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2015**, *5*, 82–95.
- [42] Ibrahim, K. Z.; Epifanovsky, E.; Williams, S.; Krylov, A. I. Cross-Scale Efficient Tensor Contractions for Coupled Cluster Computations Through Multiple Programming Model Backends *J. Parallel Distrib. Comput.* **2017**, *106*, 92–105.
- [43] The templated libtensor code enabling both single- and double-precision calculations is available in the *sp* branch at <https://github.com/epifanovsky/libtensor>.
- [44] 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*, 175–185.
- [45] Curtiss, L. A.; Raghavachari, K.; Pople, J. A. Assessment of Gaussian-2 and Density Functional Theories for the Computation of Enthalpies of Formation *J. Chem. Phys.* **1997**, *106*, 1063–1079.
- [46] The metric for the EOM amplitude convergence is the norm of the residual vector, $||\bar{H}R_k - \omega_k R_k||$, where R_k and ω_k are EOM amplitudes and energies at a given iteration.
- [47] Krylov, A. I. The Spin-Flip Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Electronic Structure Method for a Description of Excited States, Bond-Breaking, Diradicals, and Driradicals *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2006**, *39*, 83–91.
- [48] Slipchenko, L. V.; Krylov, A. I. Singlet-Triplet Gaps in Diradicals by the Spin-Flip Approach: A Benchmark Study *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *117*, 4694–4708.
- [49] Sattelmeyer, K.W.; Schaefer, H.F.; Stanton, J.F. Use of 2h and 3h-p Like Coupled-Cluster Tamm-Dancoff Approaches for the Equilibrium Properties of Ozone *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2003**, *378*, 42–46.
- [50] O’Boyle, N. M.; Banck, M.; James, C. A.; Morley, C.; Vandermeersch, T.; Hutchison, G. R. Open Babel: An Open Chemical Toolbox *J. Cheminform.* **2011**, *3*, 33.

TOC graphics

