

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{x_1 x_2 \dots \\ y_1 y_2 \dots \\ \dots}} X_{x_1 x_2 \dots} Y_{y_1 y_2 \dots} \dots \sum_I \sum_J \langle I | \hat{E}_\Omega^\dagger a_{x_1}^\dagger a_{x_2}^\dagger \dots a_{y_1}^\dagger a_{y_2}^\dagger \dots | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N \\
&= \sum_{\substack{x_1 x_2 \dots \\ y_1 y_2 \dots \\ \dots}} X_{x_1 x_2 \dots} Y_{y_1 y_2 \dots} \dots \sum_I \sum_J \langle I | a_{\omega_1} a_{\omega_2} \dots a_{x_1}^\dagger a_{x_2}^\dagger \dots a_{y_1}^\dagger a_{y_2}^\dagger \dots | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the \hat{E}_Ω^\dagger is an operator which excites electrons from orbitals in the space used to represent the reference wavefunctions, $\{|N\rangle\}$, and into some virtual space.

An illustrative example is provided by the XMS-CASPT2 amplitude equation:

$$\sum_{\Omega'} \langle \tilde{M} | \hat{E}_\Omega^\dagger (\hat{H} - \epsilon_L) \hat{T}_{\Omega'}^{LM} | \tilde{N} \rangle + \langle \tilde{M} | \hat{E}_\Omega^\dagger \hat{H} | \tilde{L} \rangle$$

For now we can just consider the second the second term, which written out with all summations over orbitals and ci-indexes made explicit is

$$X_{\omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 \omega_4} = \sum_{H_1 H_2 H_3 H_4} \sum_I \sum_J \langle I | \hat{a}_{\omega_4} \hat{a}_{\omega_3} \hat{a}_{\omega_2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\omega_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_3} \hat{a}_{h_4} | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N H_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} \tag{2}$$

This cannot be solved using the same techniques as where all the orbital indexes are summed over; rearranging all the terms into normal order would cause contractions with the ω indexes of X . Still, we want a method of evaluation which only involves contraction of the operator tensors with a reduced density matrix (or similar) with only active indexes.

To accomplish this, imagine splitting the term up into two subsections using the resolution of identity¹.

$$X_{\omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 \omega_4} = \sum_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} \sum_{IJK} \langle I | \hat{a}_{\omega_4} \hat{a}_{\omega_3} \hat{a}_{\omega_2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\omega_1}^\dagger | K \rangle \langle K | \hat{a}_{h_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_3} \hat{a}_{h_4} | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N h_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} \tag{3}$$

We can now rearrange this so that the second BraKet $\langle K | \dots | J \rangle$ is a sum of *anti*-normal ordered terms, e.g.,

$$\sum_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} \sum_{IKJ} \langle I | \hat{a}_{\omega_4} \hat{a}_{\omega_3} \hat{a}_{\omega_2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\omega_1}^\dagger | K \rangle \langle K | \hat{a}_{h_3} \hat{a}_{h_4} \hat{a}_{h_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_2}^\dagger | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N h_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} \tag{4}$$

It is apparent that

$$|K\rangle = \hat{a}_{\omega_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\omega_2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\omega_3} \hat{a}_{\omega_4} |I\rangle \tag{5}$$

$$|K\rangle = \hat{a}_{h_3} \hat{a}_{h_4} \hat{a}_{h_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_2}^\dagger |J\rangle \tag{6}$$

Now we split the \mathbf{X} into three kinds of blocks. Blocks of the first kind are such that no creation

¹This is to illustrate the rationale behind the algorithm; such a resolution of identity is not required in the final procedure.

index is in the same range as any annihilation index. In blocks of the second kind, one pair of creation and annihilation indexes may exist in the same space. In blocks of the final kind, all indexes are in active indexes².

If we consider blocks where all indexes are different, and in the special case where $|I\rangle$ and $|K\rangle$ are defined within the same space, then it is apparent from (5) and (6) that every non-active creation ω index must cancel with a non-active annihilation h index. Suppose we are dealing with the block of \mathbf{X} such that

$\omega_1 = \text{core},$

$\omega_2 = \text{core},$

$\omega_3 = \text{virtual},$

$\omega_4 = \text{virtual}.$

This leads to contributions to the block $X_{\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3\omega_4}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} \sum_{IJK} \langle I | \hat{a}_{\omega_4} \hat{a}_{\omega_3} \hat{a}_{\omega_2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\omega_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_3} \hat{a}_{h_4} \hat{a}_{h_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_2}^\dagger | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N h_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} (\delta_{h_3, \omega_1} \delta_{h_4, \omega_2} + \delta_{h_3, \omega_2} \delta_{h_4, \omega_1}). \\ &= \sum_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} \sum_{IJK} \langle I | \hat{a}_{\omega_4} \hat{a}_{\omega_3} \hat{a}_{h_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_2}^\dagger | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N h_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} (\delta_{h_3, \omega_1} \delta_{h_4, \omega_2} + \delta_{h_3, \omega_2} \delta_{h_4, \omega_1}). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We can now reorder the h indexes into normal-ordering, and repeat the process, only this time pairing every non-active annihilation ω index with a non-active creation h index of the same range:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} \sum_{IJK} \langle I | \hat{a}_{\omega_4} \hat{a}_{\omega_3} \hat{a}_{h_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{h_2}^\dagger | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N h_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} (\delta_{h_3, \omega_1} \delta_{h_4, \omega_2} + \delta_{h_3, \omega_2} \delta_{h_4, \omega_1}) (\delta_{h_1, \omega_3} \delta_{h_2, \omega_4} + \delta_{h_1, \omega_4} \delta_{h_2, \omega_3}). \\ & \sum_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} \sum_{IJK} \langle I | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N h_{h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4} (\delta_{h_3, \omega_1} \delta_{h_4, \omega_2} + \delta_{h_3, \omega_2} \delta_{h_4, \omega_1}) (\delta_{h_1, \omega_3} \delta_{h_2, \omega_4} + \delta_{h_1, \omega_4} \delta_{h_2, \omega_3}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This process is then repeated for all the different blocks of \mathbf{X} . As is apparent from the above the dimension of the density matrix can be reduced substantially, but this is at the cost of extensive reordering of the tensor \mathbf{h} . However, provided symmetry of \mathbf{h} is properly taken into account many of these reorderings are equivalent or closely related, enabling many of the terms in the reordering to be merged. It should be noted that $\langle I | J \rangle$ may never equal 1 in the relativistic case, as the $|I\rangle$ and $|J\rangle$ may be from different spin sectors.

This method can be applied to more complicated terms, e.g.,

$$\sum_{\substack{t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4 \\ f_1 f_2}} \sum_{IKJ} \langle I | \hat{a}_{\omega_4} \hat{a}_{\omega_3} \hat{a}_{\omega_2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\omega_1}^\dagger | K \rangle \langle K | \hat{a}_{f_2} \hat{a}_{t_3} \hat{a}_{t_4} \hat{a}_{f_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{t_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{t_2}^\dagger | J \rangle c_I^{M\dagger} c_J^N T_{t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4} f_{f_1 f_2} \quad (9)$$

²Typically, the CASPT2 amplitudes have no such block.

Which for the block $X_{\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3\omega_4}$ with ω_1 and ω_2 virtual, and ω_3 and ω_4 active would yield

$$\sum_{\substack{t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4 \\ f_1 f_2}} \sum_{IKJ} \langle I | \hat{a}_w \hat{a}_x \hat{a}_y \hat{a}_z^\dagger \hat{a}_{t_1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{t_2}^\dagger | J \rangle c_I^{M^\dagger} c_J^N T_{t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4} f_{f_1 f_2} (\delta_{t_1, \omega_1} \delta_{t_2, \omega_2} + \delta_{t_1, \omega_2} \delta_{t_2, \omega_1} + \dots), \quad (10)$$

where the w , x , y , and z indexes are in the non-contracted active indexes. Note that as all the ω destructors are active, none of the f or t indexes are contracted with them, resulting in only one bracket. More importantly, there is a reduced density matrix, however as all the indexes on X are now paired up. This results in a contraction between a two index reduced density matrix, and a six index tensor, formed from $\mathbf{T} \otimes \mathbf{f}$, with a sum over all the appropriate reordering relations specified by the δ functions.

As a rule, if the projector has n different indexes, and the total number of indexes on the operator is m , e.g., $m = 6$ for $T_{t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4} f_{f_1 f_2}$, then we will need to contract several different orderings of an m rank tensor with and $m - n$ rank reduced density matrix.