

Relativistic selfconsistentfield methods for molecules. II. A singledeterminant Dirac-Fock selfconsistentfield method for closedshell polyatomic molecules

T. Aoyama, H. Yamakawa, and O. Matsuoka

Citation: The Journal of Chemical Physics 73, 1329 (1980); doi: 10.1063/1.440246

View online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.440246

View Table of Contents: http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/journal/jcp/73/3?ver=pdfcov

Published by the AIP Publishing



Re-register for Table of Content Alerts

Create a profile.



Sign up today!



Relativistic self-consistent-field methods for molecules. II. A single-determinant Dirac-Fock self-consistent-field method for closed-shell polyatomic molecules^{a)}

T. Aoyama, H. Yamakawa, and O. Matsuoka

Department of Physics, The University of Electro-Communications, Chofu, Tokyo 182, Japan (Received 3 March 1980; accepted 22 April 1980)

The single-determinant Dirac-Fock self-consistent-field method is applied to closed-shell polyatomic molecules and numerical calculations are performed on H₂, LiH, Li₂, HF, F₂, and H₂CO. The Gaussian-type functions are employed to express the molecular spinors. Nonrelativistic calculations are also made using the equation of the nonrelativistic limit of the Dirac-Fock equation.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the preceding paper, ¹ which will be referred to as I, a general Dirac-Fock multiconfiguration self-consistent field (SCF) theory is presented. As a special case of the general theory, the single-determinant Dirac-Fock SCF method is applied to closed-shell linear molecules and preliminary calculations on H₂ and LiH are given using the Slater-type basis functions.

In the present paper, the single-determinant Dirac-Fock SCF method for linear molecules in I is extended for closed-shell polyatomic molecules of general shapes. For linear molecules the matrix elements in the Dirac-Fock equations are evaluated in terms of Slater-type functions without undue difficulty. However, for general polyatomic molecules the integrals over Slater-type functions are not easily computed. Thus, in the present paper, the Gaussian-type functions are employed as basis functions and numerical calculations have been performed.

In Sec. II, the SCF method relevant to the present calculations is given, of which the large part is developed in I. In Sec. III, the numerical results are reported on H_2 , LiH, Li₂, HF, F_2 , and H_2 CO and a discussion of the method and the results is also given.

II. DIRAC-FOCK MATRIX SCF EQUATION AND ITS NONRELATIVISTIC LIMIT

We consider an N-electron molecular system whose wave functions are described by single antisymmetrized products of four-component molecular spinors. The molecular spinors $\{\phi_i; i=1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ are expanded in terms of four-component basis spinors $\{\chi_p, p=1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ as

$$\phi_{i} = \sum_{b=1}^{n} \chi_{b} C_{ib} , \qquad (2.1)$$

where the expansion coefficients $\{C_{ip}\}$ are assumed to be scalars.

The Dirac-Fock matrix SCF equation take the form as

$$\mathbf{Fc}_{i} = \epsilon_{i} \mathbf{Sc}_{i} . \tag{2.2}$$

The matrix elements in Eq. (2.2) are defined in Eqs. (2.34)–(2.38) of I. For general polyatomic molecules the matrix elements takes complex values as do the expansion coefficients. The relativistic total energy is written in Eq. (2.39) of I.

If we write the molecular spinors as

$$\phi_{i} = \sum_{p=1}^{nL} C_{ip}^{L} \begin{bmatrix} \chi_{p}^{L} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{q=1}^{nS} C_{iq}^{S} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ i\chi_{q}^{S} \end{bmatrix} , \qquad (2.3)$$

where $\{C_{ip}^L\}$ and $\{C_{iq}^S\}$ are assumed to be scalars and χ_p^L and $i\chi_p^S$ are upper and lower two components of the four-

TABLE I. Gaussian expansions for H.

Basis set	_	Orbital	18470		
	nl	exponent	1s _{1/2} Coefficient		
	Α.	Large component			
1	1s	3.24402	0.103895		
	1s	0.529693	0.479599		
	1s	0.128260	0.549774		
2	1s	7.97926	0.0346569		
	1s	1.34977	0.195086		
	1s	0.337963	0.524235		
	1s	0.102017	0.387015		
3	1s	82.0488	0.00210511		
	1s	11.8864	0.0164180		
	1s	2.65518	0.0821548		
	1s	0.741502	0.276136		
	1s	0.240217	0.502504		
	1s	0.0848211	0.264642		
	в.	Small component			
4	2 p	2.89791	~0.138651		
	2p	0.347991	-0.292294		
5	2p	9.00942	-0.0602107		
	2p	1.24197	-0.174972		
	2p	0.233258	-0.229994		
6	2p	25.1484	-0.0282674		
	2p	3.65279	-0.0847722		
	2p	0.747307	-0.187394		
	2p	0.178307	-0.177489		
7	2p	57.5813	-0.0150671		
	2p	8.68862	-0.0445343		
	2p	1.90735	-0.108299		
	2p	0.494054	-0.186488		
	2 p	0.140357	-0.12 9 508		

a)Presented at the Third International Congress of Quantum Chemistry held in Kyoto, Japan, during Oct. 28-Nov. 3, 1979:

TABLE II. Gaussian expansions for Li.

Basis set <i>nl</i>		Orbital exponent	$1s_{1/2}$ Coefficient	2s _{1/2} Coefficient	
	Α.	Large compone	ent		
1	1s	55.9765	0.0414807	-0.00517174	
	1s	9.64437	0.206042	-0.0398047	
	1s	2.39935	0.498173	-0.0765397	
	1s	0.689496	0.405889	-0.186995	
	1s	0.0567299	0.0114492	1.02110	
2	1s	55 .9 765	0.0415569	-0.00658178	
	1s	9.64437	0.205719	-0.0337631	
	1s	2.39935	0.499135	-0.0943716	
	1s	0.689496	0.404145	-0.155676	
	1s	0.0601244	0.0178133	0.796261	
	1s	0.0195522	-0.00813790	0.288962	
	в.	Small compone	ents		
3	2₽	16.6707	-0.461165	0.0706360	
	2p	2.16942	-0.708004	0.156057	
	2 p	0.0401664	-0.122006	-0.127005	
4	2 p	51.8075	-0.218064	0.0355370	
	2p	7.54085	-0.509069	0.0798258	
	2 p	1.45812	-0.541187	0.136221	
	2 p	0.0446874	-0.0598867	-0.132321	

component basis spinors $\chi_{\mathfrak{p}}$, respectively, and retain the terms of c^0 , the zeroth order of the speed of light, in the Dirac-Fock Eq. (2.2), we obtain the equation for the nonrelativistic limit as

$$[\mathbf{F}^{LL} + \mathbf{X}]\mathbf{c}_{i}^{L} = \epsilon_{i}\mathbf{S}^{L}\mathbf{c}_{i}^{L} , \qquad (2.4)$$

where

$$X = -T^{LS}(S^S)^{-1}T^{SL}/2. (2.5)$$

The matrix elements in Eqs. (2.4) and (2.5) are defined by Eqs. (3.8)-(3.19) in I. The total energy of the system in this approximation, the nonrelativistic energy, is written as

$$E = H_0 + \sum_{pq} (U_{pq}^L + X_{pq}^{SL}) D_{pq}^{LL} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{pqrs} D_{pq}^{LL} (J_{pq,rs}^{LL} - K_{pq,rs}^{LL}) D_{rs}^{LL},$$
(2. 6)

where the repulsive energy between nuclei in the system H_0 is written as Eq. (2.2) of I, the nuclear potential terms U_{pq} are defined by Eq. (3.16) of I, and the density matrices D_{pq} by Eq. (3.20) of I. Equation (2.4) is an extension from the one derived by Kim, who assumed that $n^L = n^S$. [See also Eq. (4.6) in I.] If we use a complete set of two-component basis spinors $\{\chi_p^S\}$ to express the molecular spinors in Eq. (2.3), the matrix elements defined by Eq. (2.5) are reduced to the ones over the kinetic energy operator

$$(\mathbf{X})_{pq} = \langle \chi_p^L | - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 | \chi_q^L \rangle$$
,

since

$$\sum_{rs} \left| \chi_r^S \right\rangle (\mathbf{S}^{S-1})_{rs} \left\langle \chi_s^S \right| = 1$$

and $(\sigma \cdot \nabla)^2 = \nabla^2 \mathbf{I}$, where \mathbf{I} is 2×2 unit matrix. Hence, Eq. (2.4) is reduced to the nonrelativistic Hartree-Fock equation. If we use a complete or a near complete set of two components basis spinors for the small components of the molecular spinors, the energy calculated by Eq. (2.6) gives the nonrelativistic Hartree-Fock energy. However, even if the basis set used is complete, the "nonrelativistic" wave functions obtained by Eq. (2.4) consist of the four-component spinors and the states are labeled by the double group.

TABLE III. Relativistic and nonrelativistic energies of H2.

Basis functions						
Large	Small	Relativistic calc.		Nonrelativistic calc.		Relativistic
comp.	comp.	– T E ^a	- € b	- T F ^a	- € b	energy (eV)
Minimal bas	is sets					
(3)°	(2) ^d	1.109268	0.62893	1.109262	0.62892	-1.5×10^{-4}
(3)	(3)	1.096739	0.62266	1.096733	0.62266	-1.6×10^{-4}
(3)	(4)	1.090456	0.61952	1.090449	0.61952	-1.6×10^{-4}
(3)	(5)	1.089336	0.61896	1.089329	0.61896	-1.6×10^{-4}
Semidouble b	oasis sets					
(3, 1)	(2)	1.134549	0.59749	1.134540	0.59748	-2.5×10^{-4}
(3, 1)	(3)	1.138426	0.57772	1.138415	0.57771	-2.8×10^{-4}
(3, 1)	(4)	1.150566	0.57442	1.150555	0.57443	-2.9×10^{-4}
Extended bas	sis sets					
(3, 1)	(1, 1)	1.132063	0.60040	1.132054	0.60041	-2.5×10^{-4}
(3, 1)	(1, 2)	1.134804	0.57986	1.134791	0.57984	-3.3×10^{-4}
(4, 1, 1)	(2, 1, 1)	1.119366	0.59169	1.119353	0.59168	-3.7×10^{-4}
(3, 1, 1, 1)	(2, 1, 1, 1)	1.117704	0.58996	1.117690	0.58995	-3.7×10^{-4}

^aTotal energy in a.u.

Spinor energy in a.u.

Gaussian expansions for large components of $1s_{1/2}$. 1s-type Gaussians are used. (See Table IA.)

^dGaussian expansions for small components of $1s_{1/2}$. 2p-type Gaussians are used. (See Table IB.)

TABLE IV. Relativistic and nonrelativistic energies of LiH, Li₂, HF, F_2 , and H_2CO .

Basis functions		Relativistic calc.			Nonrelativistic calc.		Relativistic
Large comp.	Small comp.	- TE ^a	- € p		- TE ^a	− € p	energy (eV)
LiH							
Li (5, 5) ^c H (3) ^f	(3.3) ^d (2) ^g	8.181743	$(E_{1/2})^{ullet} \ (E_{1/2})$	2.56044 0.30225	8.181141	2,56066 0,31365	-0.016
Li (6, 6) H (3)	(4, 4) (3)	7.984371	$(E_{1/2}) \ (E_{1/2})$	2.47454 0.29614	7.983637	2.47420 0.29632	-0.020
Li(6,4,2) H(3,1)	(4, 4) (2)	8.060037	$(E_{1/2}) \\ (E_{1/2})$	2.57561 0.31272	8.05921	2.57531 0.31272	-0.023
Li_2							
Li (6, 4, 2)	(4, 4)	15,518358	$(E_{1/2\mathbf{z}}) \ (E_{1/2\mathbf{z}}) \ (E_{1/2\mathbf{z}}) \ (E_{1/2\mathbf{z}})$	2.60737 0.76822 0.49238	15.515984	2.60715 0.76794 0.49213	-0.065
HF							
H(3) F(6,6/6,6) ^h	(3) (6, 6/6/3) ¹	100.31257	$(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{3/2})$ $(E_{3/2})$	26.18709 1.56555 0.73356 0.67456 0.62483	100.22568	26.15307 1.56217 0.73363 0.67490 0.62326	~2,4
$\mathbf{F_2}$							
F (6, 6/6, 6)	(6,6/6/3)	199.37822	$\begin{array}{c} (E_{1/2\mathbf{g}}) \\ (E_{1/2\mathbf{u}}) \\ (E_{1/2\mathbf{u}}) \\ (E_{1/2\mathbf{u}}) \\ (E_{1/2\mathbf{u}}) \\ (E_{3/2\mathbf{u}}) \\ (E_{1/2\mathbf{u}}) \\ (E_{1/2\mathbf{g}}) \\ (E_{1/2\mathbf{g}}) \end{array}$	26.49962 26.49077 1.77679 1.51695 0.88329 0.84709 0.81207 0.75281 0.68110	199. 20545	26.46412 26.45516 1.77309 1.51242 0.88315 0.84595 0.81250 0.75257 0.67795	-4.7
H ₂ CO							
H (3) C (6, 6/6, 6) ^h O (6, 6/6, 6) ^h	(3) (6,6/6/2) ⁱ (6,6/6/2) ⁱ	113.8641	$(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{1/2})$ $(E_{1/2})$	20.61280 11.58757 1.47080 0.91469 0.78357 0.70420 0.63284 0.51138	113.7970	20.593 11.580 1.470 0.914 0.7843 0.7049 0.6335 0.5110	-1.8

^aTotal energy in a.u.

III. NUMERICAL CALCULATIONS

Preliminary calculations have been performed on H_2 , LiH, Li₂, HF, F_2 , and H_2 CO. This section gives the details of the calculations and results.

A. Basis functions

For general polyatomic molecules, the multicenter integrals, which appear in the matrix SCF Eq. (2.2), cannot be easily evaluated if we use Slater-type func-

bSpinor energy in a.u.

^cGaussian expansions for large components (GL) of $1s_{1/2}$ and $2s_{1/2}$. 1s-type Gaussians are used. (See Table IIA.)

^dGaussian expansions for small components (GS) of $1s_{1/2}$ and $2s_{1/2}$. 2p-type Gaussians are used. (See Table IIB.)

Double group symmetry in Herzberg's notation (Ref. 10 in the text).

^fSee footnote a of Table III.

See footnote d of Table III.

 $^{^{\}rm h}$ GL of $1s_{1/2}$, $2s_{1/2}$, $2p_{1/2}$, and $2p_{3/2}$. 1s- and 2p-type Gaussians are used.

 $^{^{1}}$ GS of $1s_{1/2}$, $2s_{1/2}$, $2p_{1/2}$, and $2p_{3/2}$. $2p_{-}$, $1s_{-}$, and 3d-type Gaussians are used.

tions employed in I. We have adopted Gaussian-type functions for which we can calculate the integrals analytically. Thus, the basis functions employed in Eq. (2.3) are

$$\eta(\mathbf{r};n,l,m) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} c_{i} R_{ni}(r;\alpha_{i})\right] Y_{lm}(\theta,\varphi) , \qquad (3.1)$$

where

$$R_{ni}(\alpha_i) = N_n(\alpha_i)r^{n-1} \exp(-\alpha_i r^2)$$
,
$$N_n(\alpha) = 2^{n+1} [(2n-1)!!]^{-1/2} (2\pi)^{-1/4} \alpha^{(2n+1)/4}$$
, and $Y_{lm}(\theta, \varphi)$ is spherical harmonic. ³

We have generated the Dirac-Fock atomic wave functions for the generalized average of configurations using Desclaux's program⁴ and fitted them in terms of Gaussians [Eq. (3.1)] by the method of least squares.⁵ As shown in I, we need the basis functions having n=l quantum numbers to represent the small components of the atomic wave functions with quantum numbers j=l+1/2. However, since the analyses on the Gaussians having n=l quantum numbers have not yet been done, we have approximated them by the Gaussians having n=l+1 quantum numbers. The Gaussian expansions of H and Li are shown in Tables I and II.

B. Organization of program

The program consists of two parts. In the first part, we calculate the integrals over the basis spinors and store them on files. Then, in the second part, we solve the Dirac-Fock Eq. (2.2) and its nonrelativistic limit [Eq. (2.4)].

Although there exist the integral analyses over spherical Gaussians defined in Eq. (3.1), the computer programs we have are based on the one for Cartesian Gaussians. In the first part, we compute the nonzero and nonredundant integrals over Cartesian Gaussians and transform them directly to those over basis spinors, bypassing the transformation from the Cartesian to the spherical Gaussians. In the second part, we construct the Dirac-Fock matrix in Eq. (2.2) using the integrals calculated in the first part and solve the eigenvalue problems following the usual iterative procedure. Since the matrix elements take complex values, we have to solve general Hermitian eigenvalue problems. Initial input vectors in the iterative process were guessed by the nonrelativistic ab initio wave functions. We also solve the nonrelativistic limit of the Dirac-Fock Eq. (2.4) and calculate the nonrelativistic total energy using Eq. (2.6).

C. Calculated results and discussion

We have solved the Dirac-Fock Eq. (2.2) and its non-relativistic limit [Eq. (2.4)] and computed the total energies of the systems using Eqs. (2.39) of I and Eq. (2.6) of this paper. The following constants are employed: the velocity of light c=137.0388 a.u., 1 bohr =0.5291672 Å, and 1 hartree =27.21 eV. The relativistic energies have been obtained by subtracting the non-relativistic total energies [Eq. (2.6)] from the relativistic total energies [Eq. (2.39) of I]. In the course of this

work, we found that when the nonrelativistic *ab initio* Hartree-Fock energy is used as the above nonrelativistic total energy, the calculated relativistic energy turns out to be unreasonably large. Hence, we have not adopted this scheme of calculating the relativistic energies; as we have seen in Sec. II, it would be preferable to use Eq. (2.6) as the nonrelativistic energy if we employ an incomplete set of basis spinors.

We have performed several calculations on $\rm H_2$ mole-cule whose bond distance is assumed to be 0.74 Å. ⁹ Table III shows the calculated energies. With the improvement of the basis sets, the calculated relativistic energies converge to -3.7×10^{-4} eV. This value is reasonable if we consider that the atomic relativistic energy of H atom is -1.8×10^{-4} eV. ⁸

We have also carried out the calculations on LiH, Li2, HF, F₂, and H₂CO using minimal and semi-double-zeta basis sets. The following bond lengths are adopted 9,10: Li-H=1.5949 Å, Li-Li=2.672 Å, H-F=0.9171 Å,F-F = 1.435 Å, C-O = 1.210 Å, and H-C = 1.102 Å. For H_2CO (formaldehyde) we have assumed $C_{2\nu}$ geometry and the bond angle ∠HCH adopted in the calculations is 121.1°. The calculated results are shown in Table IV. Even if the minimal basis sets are adopted, reasonable values are obtained for the relativistic energies; the atomic relativistic energies of Li, C, O, and F are -0.022, -0.444, -1.518, and -2.509eV, 11 respectively. Some of the π -orbital energies of HF and F₂ calculated by the nonrelativistic Eq. (2.4) have turned out nondegenerate. This is due to the incomplete basis sets employed.

Finally, we mention some difficulties in performing the Dirac-Fock calculations in the framework of the basis set expansion method, which we have encountered in the preceding¹ and the present works. The biggest, and only one, difficulty is associated with the fact that we need about four times as many basis functions in comparison to the nonrelativistic calculations. Hence, we need a lot of computer time to compute the molecular integrals and need large file spaces to store intermediate data. We need some sophistication in the programming. Other difficulties we have had are those minors as the diagonalization of the Dirac-Fock matrices of complex values, the increased number of SCF iterations, etc.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their gratitude to Professor G. Malli and Dr. N. Suzuki for their interest in this work. All computations have been done on HITAC 8800/8700 at the Computer Centre, University of Tokyo and HITAC M-180 at the Institute of Molecular Science.

 Matsuoka, N. Suzuki, T. Aoyama, A. D. McLean, and G. Malli, J. Chem. Phys. 73, 1320 (1980), preceding paper.
 K. Kim, Phys. Rev. 154, 17 (1967).

³E. U. Condon and G. H. Shortly, *Theory of Atomic Spectra* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, England, 1935).

⁴J. P. Desclaux, Comput. Phys. Comm. 9, 31 (1975).
 ⁵Programs sals in the Computer Centre, University of Tokyo, have been employed.

- ⁶F. E. Harris, Rev. Mod. Phys. 35, 558 (1963); M. Krauss, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. Sect. B 68, 35 (1964); K. O-ohata, Mem. Fac. Sci. Kyushu Univ. Ser. B 5, 7 (1974); G. Fieck, J. Phys. B 12, 1063 (1979).
- ⁷H. Taketa, S. Huzinaga, and K. O-ohata, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 21, 2313 (1966).
- ⁸H. A. Bethe and E. E. Salpeter, Quantum Mechanics of Oneand Two-Electron Atoms (Springer, Berlin, 1957).
- ⁹G. Herzberg, Molecular Spectra and Molecular Structure I. Spectra of Diatomic Molecules (Van Nostrand, New York, 1950).
- ¹⁰G. Herzberg, Molecular Spectra and Molecular Structure III. Electronic Spectra and Electronic Structure of Polyatomic Molecules (Van Nostrand, New York, 1966).
- ¹¹J. P. Desclaux, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables 12, 311 (1973).