Accurate Analytical Self-Consistent Field Functions for Atoms. IV. Ground States and Several Excited States for Atoms and Ions of Al and Cu[†]‡

MIROSLAV SYNEK*

Laboratory of Molecular Structure and Spectra, Department of Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois (Received 4 April 1963)

Self-consistent field calculations by the expansion method were carried out for the ground states and several excited states of atoms and ions of Al and Cu. The results for the total energies of the states computed represent very accurately the absolute Hartree-Fock solutions. The wave functions were calculated with the requirement to satisfy identically the cusp condition so that they can be considered to be particularly accurate in the immediate vicinity of the nucleus. Comparison with experiment is carried out in particular for the calculated energy levels.

INTRODUCTION

QUANTUM-MECHANICAL laws of nature permit the calculation of all properties of atoms and molecules from their wave functions. Therefore, the calculation of such wave functions has become of great importance. However, approximate methods are necessary for many-particle systems.

An important method which has wide applicability is the self-consistent field (SCF) method using the factorization of the total wave function into one-electron wave functions. This method was originally developed for atoms by Hartree and Fock using the numerical integration procedure.¹ In this paper we shall use the name Hartree-Fock orbitals for the solutions of the numerical Hartree-Fock equations. More recently another method has proved very successful, namely, the SCF expansion method.²⁻⁴

The present paper is the fourth in a series of applications of this method aimed at obtaining high accuracy.⁵⁻⁷ The calculations were carried out with a program written for the IBM 7090 computer.⁴

THEORETICAL REMARKS

The *n*-electron wave functions are constructed from antisymmetrized products, which are built from oneelectron wave functions called orbitals. For closed-shell configurations one antisymmetrized product is sufficient to represent the total wave function. For open-shell

Chicago, Illinois.

Chicago, Illinois.
¹D. R. Hartree, *The Calculation of Atomic Structures* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1957).
²C. C. J. Roothaan, Rev. Mod. Phys. 23, 69 (1951).
³C. C. J. Roothaan, Rev. Mod. Phys. 32, 179 (1960).
⁴C. C. J. Roothaan and P. S. Bagus, *Methods in Computational Physics* (Pergamon Press, Inc., New York), Vol. 1 (to be publicled). lished).

⁶C. C. J. Roothaan, L. M. Sachs and A. W. Weiss, Rev. Mod. Phys. **32**, 186 (1960). ⁶E. Clementi, C. C. J. Roothaan, and M. Yoshimine, Phys.

Rev. 127, 1618 (1962). ⁷C. C. J. Roothaan and P. S. Kelley, Phys. Rev. 131, 1177

(1963).

configurations the total wave functions are, in general, represented by linear combinations of antisymmetrized products. To a total wave function constructed in this way, the variational principle is applied and the selfconsistent field equations for the orbitals are obtained.

The orbitals are denoted by $\varphi_{i\lambda\alpha}(r,\vartheta,\varphi)$, where λ and α stand for the symmetry species and subspecies, respectively, and i distinguishes occupied orbitals of the same symmetry. Each orbital $\varphi_{i\lambda\alpha}$ is expanded in terms of basis functions of the same symmetry. The expansion then reads

$$\varphi_{i\lambda\alpha} = \sum_{n} \chi_{p\lambda\alpha} C_{i\lambda p}, \qquad (1)$$

where $C_{i\lambda p}$ are coefficients of the expansion. The basis functions used are given by

$$\chi_{p\lambda\alpha}(r,\vartheta,\varphi) = R_{\lambda\,p}(r) Y_{\lambda\alpha}(\vartheta,\varphi) , \qquad (2)$$

where $R_{\lambda p}$ is a normalized Slater-type function

$$R_{\lambda p}(r) = \left[(2n_{\lambda p})! \right]^{-1/2} (2\zeta_{\lambda p})^{n_{\lambda p} + \frac{1}{2}} r^{n_{\lambda p} - 1} e^{-\zeta_{\lambda p} r}; \quad (3)$$

 $n_{\lambda p}$ is the principal quantum number, $\zeta_{\lambda p}$ is the orbital exponent, and $Y_{\lambda\alpha}$ is the usual normalized spherical harmonic. One can use other functions for the radial parts of the basis functions; however, Slater-type functions are sufficiently flexible and at the same time computationally manageable, and we see no merit in using more complicated radial functions.

It is well known that the Hartree-Fock orbitals satisfy the cusp condition⁵

$$(\lambda+1)\left(\frac{1}{f_{\lambda}}\frac{df_{\lambda}}{dr}\right)_{r=0} = -Z; \qquad (4)$$

TABLE I. Comparison with other calculations.

Source calcu Quantity	of lation	Other authors	This work
	$E[au] \\ E[au] \\ E[au] \\ R^{2}_{4s, 3p} \\ R^{2}_{3p, 3d}$	241.8692 • 1638.7049 ^b 1638.9310° 5.17 ^d 10.85 ^d	$\begin{array}{r} -241.8762\\ -1638.7215\\ -1638.9438\\ 5.27\\ 6.43\end{array}$

^a See Ref. 12. ^b See Ref. 16. º See Ref. 18. d See Ref. 15.

[†] This work was submitted to the Department of Physics, University of Chicago, as a thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

[‡] This work was assisted by the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, under contract No. AF 33(657)-8891, with the University of Chicago. * Present address: Department of Physics, De Paul University,

Atom and state							x			- · · ·	
Basis	Al+	Al	Al	Al	Al	Al	Al	Al	Al	Al	Al
function	3s², 1S	$3s^2 3p, ^2P$	3s²3d, ²D	3s24s, 2S	$3s^{2}4p, {}^{2}P$	$3s^24f, {}^2F$	$3s3p^2, ^4P$	$3s3p^2, ^2D$	$3s3p^2, ^2P$	3s3p², ²S	3p³, 4S
1s	13.00000	13.00000	13.00000	13.00000	13.00000	13.00000	13.00000	13.00000	13.00000	13.00000	13.00000
3s	14.81882	14.81882	14.81882	14.81882	14.81882	14.81882	14.81882	14.81882	14.81882	14.81882	14.81882
3s	10.95967	10.95967	10.95967	10.95967	10.95967	10.95967	10.95967	10.95967	10.95967	10.95967	10.95967
3s 3s 3s	7.03850	7.03975	7.03975	7.03975	7.03850	7.03850	6.84073	6.84073	6.84073	6.84073	6.94000
3s	4.45427	4.45008	4.45008	4.45008	4.45427	4.45427	4.34600	4.34600	4.34600	4.34600	4.38000
33	1.73891	1.74739	1.75275	1.75723	1.73891	1.73891	1.69500	1.72801	1.79372	1.74000	1.80276
3s 3s	1.24151	1.09143	1.22688	1.22423	1.22988	1.22365	1.13585	1.12451	1.19261	1.13000	
3s	0.68000	0.44922	0.67199	0.86184ª	0.68566	0.67841	0.47000	0.46000	0.49000	0.47000	
4 <i>s</i>				0.56059							
4s				0.30586							
2 <i>p</i>	6.50000	6.50000	6.50000	6.50000	6.50000	6.50000	6.50000	6.50000	6.50000	6.50000	6.50000
4p	15.62221	15.71772	15.62737	15.60893	15.62221	15.62221	15.80000	15.80000	15.80000	15.80000	15.80000
4p	7.01039	7.34587	7.01267	7.00440	7.01039	7.01039	7.38884	7.38884	7.38884	7.38884	7.43962
4p	4.36248	4.62878	4.36365	4.35712	4.36248	4.36248	4.65954	4.65954	4.65954	4.65954	4.77264
$4\bar{p}$	1.70240	2.01378	1.70286	1.70031	2.92882	1.70240	2.04374	1.99006	1.96055	1.95787	2.27957
4p		1.52000			1.49395		1.57000	1.50000	1.45000	1.44000	1.56017
4p		1.05599			0.96361		1.14302	1.03570	0.97133	0.96276	1.04478
$4\dot{p}$		0.50615			0.42256		0.55000	0.50000	0.47000	0.46000	0.53740
4 <i>p</i>					0.21400						
3d			4.33333								
5d			2.78673								
5 <i>d</i>			1.24807								
5d			0.61618								
5d			0.39284								
4s 2p 4p 4p 4p 4p 4p 4p 3d 5d 5d 5d 5d			0.21000								
4 f						3.25000					
$\overline{6}f$						1.50759					
6 <i>f</i>						0.60985	•				
$\begin{array}{c} 4f\\ 6f\\ 6f\\ 6f\\ 6f\end{array}$						0.33227					

TABLE II. Optimized exponents ζ of the basis functions for Al⁺, Al and its excited states.

^a Corresponds to basis function 4s.

where $r^{\lambda} f_{\lambda}(r)$ is the radial part of the orbital, and Z is the nuclear charge. However, if we expand the orbitals $\varphi_{i\lambda\alpha}$ in terms of known basis functions, they would generally not satisfy the cusp condition. Nevertheless, for a special choice⁷ of basis functions the cusp condition can be identically satisfied, namely, if

$$\zeta_{\lambda 1} = Z/(\lambda + 1),$$

$$n_{\lambda 1} = \lambda + 1,$$

$$n_{\lambda n} \ge \lambda + 3, \quad p > 1.$$
(5)

It is also well known that for the Hartree-Fock solution the virial theorem is satisfied, namely,

$$E_p/E_k = -2, \qquad (6)$$

where E_p and E_k are the potential and kinetic energies, respectively. The total energy E is, of course, given by

$$E = E_p + E_k. \tag{7}$$

When the orbitals $\varphi_{i\lambda\alpha}$ are given by Eqs. (1)-(3), it can be shown that there exists a common scale factor by which all the orbital exponents can be multiplied so that the virial theorem (6) is identically satisfied.

Clearly the identical satisfaction of the cusp conditions by imposing the restrictions (5) is incompatible with adjusting the exponents by a common scale factor to satisfy the virial theorem. In this work we enforce the cusp conditions so that we can use the value of E_p/E_k as compared with -2 as a guide for the accuracy of the results obtained by the expansion method with respect to the Hartree-Fock solutions.

TABLE III. Optimized exponents ζ of the basis functions for Cu⁺, Cu, and its excited states.

Atom and state Basis	Cu+	Cu	Cu	Cu
function	$3d^{10}, {}^{1}S$	3d ¹⁰ 4s, ² S	$3d^{10}4p$, ^{2}P	3d ⁹ 4s ² , ² D
1s	29.00000	29.00000	29.00000	29.00000
35	35.96083	35.96083	35,96083	35.96083
35	24.96766	24.96766	24.96766	24.96766
35	16.50784	16.50784	16.50784	16.50784
35	11.89243	11.89243	11.89243	11.89243
35	6.40248	6.40248	6.40248	6.40248
35	4.12887	4.12887	4.12887	4.12887
4s		2.10931		2.19823
4s		1.11020		1.17860
$\tilde{2p}$	14.50000	14.50000	14.50000	14.50000
$\bar{4}_{p}^{r}$	33.47662	33,47662	33.47662	33.47662
$\tilde{4}_p^r$	15.81620	15.81620	15.81620	15.81620
$\bar{4}p$	10.75110	10.75110	10.75110	10.75110
$\tilde{4}_{p}^{r}$	6.82655	6.82655	6.82655	6.82655
-4p	4.07204	4.06941	4.07204	4.07204
$\tilde{4}_p^P$			1.42000	
$\bar{4}p$			0.70134	
$\tilde{3}d$	9.66667	9.66667	9.66667	9.66667
5d	13.93533	13.88335	13.93533	14.23703
$\overline{5d}$	7.87939	7.85000	7.87939	8.05000
5d	4.28000	4.25312	4.28000	4.42710
5d	3.68321	3.72000	3.68321	3.91000
5d	2.28675	2.18421	2.28675	2.42755

574 St, ⁴⁴ E Sz			80 0.03183 276 0.01685				03	01			25		I		50 U.SU9U8 00 0 10805				R	o s							16 E	K			76 0.00405				FK 0.00780	1		3\$	2¢ -	44		44 -	44	44	26 45 044550
AI 353 <i>p</i> ² , 2S	15		0.03180				0.00003	0.00001			25	-0.25100	-0.01314	0.09925	0.2220		0.00011	-0.00001		3.6	0.06153	0.00513	-0.03095	-0.13032	-0.16975	0.44385	0.00116		i		0.00376	0.21304	0.37439	0.03165	04070.0-	-0.00075		34	2 <i>p</i> -0.09651			I		47 0.00120	
Al 353\$2, 2P	1 <i>s</i>	0.96743	0.03188	0.00145	0.00018	0.00002	-0.00005	0.00001			25	-0.25100	-0.01311	0.09917	0.52220	0.00366	0.00095	-0.00010		38	0.06649	0.00655	-0.03634	-0.13490	-0.19548	0.00001	-0.01173		č	2.P	0.00377	0.21308	0.37424	0.03203	0.0020.00	-0.00075		34	2p - 0.08440	•	•	1	4 <i>p</i> 0.35966	44 0.00123	
Al 353 <i>p</i> ² , 2 <i>D</i>	15	0.96742	0.03180	0.00144	0.00018	0.00003	-0.0003	0.00001			25	-0.25097	-0.01315	0.09926	0.22220	0.00354	0.00001	0.00000		35	0.06100	0.00459	-0.02935	-0.13168	-0.16438	0.04001	0.00110		č	2.p 0 53077	0.00375	0.21322	0.37402	0.03248	0.00200	-0.00057		34			•	1	4p 0.44019	45 0.03241 45 0.50011	
Al 3s3\$ ² , 4P	15	0.96741	0.03180	0.00143	0.00018	0.0004	-0.00002	0.00001			25	-0.25096	-0.01317	0.09932	0.22200	0.00348	-0.00063	0.00002		35	0.05901	0.00408	-0.02734	-0.12967	-0.15390	0.46461	0.00041		ė	2p 0 53060	0.00374	0.21339	0.37372	0.03169	0.00435	-0.00022		34				1	4p 0.43003	44 0.00000	
$\stackrel{\mathrm{AI}}{_{3s^24f,\ ^2F}}$	1 <i>s</i>	0.96745	0.03190	0.00149	0.00021	0.00008	-0.00007	0.00002			25	-0.25149	-0.01037	0.08626	0.51906	0.00914	-0.00491	0.00087		35	0.06254	0.00365	-0.02589	-0.12715	-0.17629	0.47633	-0.00435		ġ	2P 0 52781	0.00624	0.27219	0.32703	0.00558						6f 0.00973		6f 0.86057			
Al 35 ²⁴ <i>p</i> , 2 <i>P</i>	1 <i>s</i>	0.96745	0.03190	0.00149	0.00021	0.00008	-0.00007	0.00002			25	-0.25146	-0.01038	0.08629	0.51925	0.00926	-0.00495	0.00085		35	0.06219	0.00336	-0.02497	-0.12775	-0.17338	0.20209	-0.00260		č	262232 052872	0.00623	0.27008	0.33292	-0.00674	-0.00683	0.00179	-0.00068	4\$					4p -0.00157		
Al 3s ² 4s, ² S	15	0.96745	0.01648	0.00151	0.00020	0.00011	-0.00011	0.00006ª	-0.00003	0.00001	25	-0.25150	-0.0100/	0.08533	0.51800	0.00916	-0.00519	0.00158 ^a	-0.00062 0.00012	35	0.06241	0.00391	-0.02654	-0.12564	-0.17826	0.49968	-0.00730^{a}	0.00521	1.0	2772 0 53772	0.00629	0.27315	0.32628	0.00556					•	1		3s 0.03535 3- 0.04677	35 0.048// 35 -0.15745		
Al 3s ² 3d, 2D	15	0.96745	0.01650	0.00149	0.00021	0.00008	-0.00006	0.00002			25	-0.25149	-0.01012	0.08549	0.51844	0.00831	-0.00416	0.00069		35	0.06234	0.00376	-0.02613	-0.12616	-0.17707	0.49330	0.00094		;	2P 0 53785	0.00622	0.27191	0.32730	0.00561								54 0.59782	54 0.00052		
Al 3\$ ² 3 <i>p</i> , 2 <i>P</i>	1s	0.90/44	0.01658	0.00147	0.00023	0.00004	-0.00003	0.00001			25	-0.25130	-0.01031	0.08597	0.51986	0.00743	-0.00265	0.00043		35	0.05799	0.00361	-0.02459	-0.11661	-0.10482 0 56870	0.52051	0.00095		40	2P 0 53007	0.00400	0.21919	0.36920	0.03045	0.00418	-0.00031					<u>۱</u>	1	4p 0.3980/ 4A 0.06282		
A1 ⁺ 3s ² , 1S	15	0.90/45	0.01650	0.00149	0.00021	0.00008	-0.00007	0.00002			25	-0.25149	-0.01030	0.00014	0.51903	0.00935	-0.00506	0.00083		35	0.06254	0.00340	-0.02517	-0.12841	-0.1/45/ 0 58538	0.48636	0.00078		34	2P 0.53784	0.00624	0.27219	0.32703	80000											
Basis function		15	ŝ	35	35	35	35	35	4s	4 <i>s</i>		15		35 35	35	35	3s 2	35	45 45		15	35	35	35	35 35	35	35	45 45	1	2.0	44	4p	4 <i>p</i>	44 44	40	44	44								

TABLE IV. Eigenvectors of coefficients $C_{i\lambda p}$ for Al⁺, Al, and its excited states.

Corresponds to basis function 4s.

For an open-shell configuration of an atom, the total energy E depends upon so-called vector-coupling coefficients $J_{\lambda\mu\nu}$ and $K_{\lambda\mu\nu}$ which characterize the particular state.^{4,8} For all the states treated in this paper $J_{\lambda\mu\nu} \equiv 0$.

COMPUTATIONAL PROCEDURE

The radial part of an SCF orbital is characterized by $i-\lambda-1$ nodes; the $i-\lambda$ regions separated by the nodes we call loops. Usually two to three basis functions are adequate to describe such a loop, *if the exponents are properly adjusted*. For a particular orbital we shall call the loop closest to the origin the first one, and continue numbering them in outward direction. For two functions of the same symmetry, the *n*th loops cover approximately the same region of *r*, and can usually be described by the same basis functions. In view of these facts the total number of basis functions necessary is about two to three times the number of occupied orbitals.

The optimum values of the exponents are, of course, dependent on the electron occupation, that is, on the configuration, and to a lesser extent, on the state. For instance, the optimum exponents for the states of the configuration $1s^22s^22p^2$ of C are significantly different from those for the configuration $1s^22s^22p$ of C⁺, while the best exponents for the 3P , 1D , and 1S states of the first configuration do not differ significantly.

It is, of course, desirable to subject *all* the exponents of a basis set to a simultaneous optimization. Such a procedure, however, would be very time consuming even for the fastest computers currently available. Furthermore, it was found that strong "coupling" exists only between those basis functions which cover the same region of r, and which have also sizeable expansion coefficients for at least one of the occupied orbitals. Therefore, it is usually possible to reach optimization of the basis set by optimizing only two or three exponents simultaneously.

When the Hartree-Fock energy has been approached within a few units in the last significant figure of the computation, further optimization would be meaningless because of masking by the round-off error. Further improvements can be obtained by using additional basis functions. These additional functions are inserted one at a time, and are retained if they yield a small improvement. A final saturation computation is performed with all those additional functions which gave a contribution. This procedure works well for ground states and such excited states where orbitals have no more nodes than required by orthogonality.

The initial vectors should always describe orbitals which are reasonable approximations to the orbitals sought, and in particular they should have the required number of nodes. Even so, the program we used did not prevent a highly excited orbital from "plunging down" to an orbital with less nodes, and often rather accurate

TABLE V.	Eigenvectors	of coefficien	ts $C_{i\lambda p}$ f	for C	u+,	Cu,
	and its	s excited stat	es.		,	

Atom and state	Cu+	C	<u> </u>	6
Basis Inction	Cu ⁺ 3d ¹⁰ , 1S	Cu 3d ¹⁰ 4s, 2S	Cu 3d ¹⁰ 4p, ² P	3d ⁹ 4s ² ,
	15	15	15	15
15	0.98283	0.98283	0.98283	0.982
35	0.00970	0.00967	0.00970	0.009
35	0.01990	0.02000	0.01991	0.020
35	-0.00517	-0.00537	-0.00518	-0.005
35	0.00279	0.00298	0.00279	0.003
35	-0.00079	-0.00095	-0.00079	-0.000
35	0.00025	0.00038	0.00025	0,000
4 <i>s</i>		-0.00008		-0.000
45		0.00003		0.000
	25	2 <i>s</i>	2s	25
15	-0.30216	-0.30218	-0.30216	-0.302
35	-0.00553	-0.00547	-0.00553	-0.005
35	0,10201	0.10180	0.10200	0.101
35	0.58900	0.58952	0.58900	0.589
35	0.38813	0.38758	0.38813	0.387
35	0.01014	0.01060	0.01014	0.010
35	-0.00048	0.00090	-0.00048	-0.001
	-0.00048		0.00048	
4s 4s		0.00029 0.00011		0.000 -0.000
	35	35	35	35
15	0.11288	0.11302	0.11291	0.113
35	0.00259	0.00263	0.00260	0.003
35	-0.04277	-0.04301	-0.04285	-0.045
35	-0.23336	-0.23304	-0.23319	-0.229
35	-0.31494	-0.31635	-0.31533	-0.325
3 s	0.69371	0.69708	0.69445	0.714
35	0.51423	0.51178	0.51367	0.500
4 <i>s</i>		-0.00079		-0.006
4 <i>s</i>		0.00129		0.002
	2 <i>p</i>	2 <i>p</i>	2 <i>p</i>	2 <i>p</i>
2 <i>p</i>	0.76443	0.76441	0.76443	0.764
4p	0.00314	0.00314	0.00315	0.003
4p	0.20244	0.20248	0.20233	0.202
4p	0.10609	0.10606	0.10636	0.106
4p	-0.00869	-0.00869	-0,00906	-0.008
4p	0.00321	0.00319	0.00353	0.003
-	0.00321	0.00319		0.003
4p 4p			-0.00047 0.00020	
	3 <i>p</i>	3 <i>p</i>	3 <i>p</i>	3p
2.6				
2p	-0.28156	-0.28176	-0.28162	-0.283
4 <i>p</i>	-0.00035	-0.00034	-0.00037	-0.000
4 <i>p</i>	-0.06730	-0.06739	-0.06699	-0.066
4p	0.12789	0.12799	0.12704	0.124
4 <i>p</i>	0.63988	0.64119	0.64163	0.656
4 <i>p</i>	0.36590	0.36458	0.36383	0.349
4p			0.00370	
4 <i>p</i>			-0.00072	
	3 <i>d</i>	3d	3d	3d
3d	0.19927	0.19852	0.19900	0,208
5 <i>d</i>	0.05283	0.05390	0.05302	0.047
5d	0.43087	0.43272	0.42980	0.431
5d	0.44391	0.43276	0.45224	0.101
5d	-0.00859	0.00697	-0.02102	-0.040
5d	0.19472	0.19726	0.20192	0.168
		4 <i>s</i>	4 <i>p</i>	4 <i>s</i>
		1s -0.01960	2p 0.02610	1s -0.023
		3s - 0.00095	4p 0.00022	3s - 0.000
		3s = 0.00093 3s = 0.00963		3s = 0.000 3s = 0.010
			-	
		3s 0.03413	4p - 0.00685	3s 0.043
		3s 0.06984	4p -0.07911	3s 0.078
		3s - 0.16445	4p - 0.00216	3s -0.188
		3s -0.06445	4 <i>p</i> 0.38918	3s -0.087
		4s 0.42003	4p 0.72314	4s 0.509
				4s 0.613

⁸ G. L. Malli and C. C. J. Roothaan (to be published).

TABLE VI. Comparison of calculated energies with experimental energies.^a

			Energies	relative to	ground state
Atom or ion	State	Calculated total energy	Calcu- lated	Experi- mental	Calculated minus experimental
Al+	3s ² , 1S	-241.67379	0.20244	0.21972	-0.01728
Al	3s23p, 2P	-241.87623	0	0	0
	3s23d, 2D	-241.73174	0.14449	0.14753	-0.00304
	3s24s, 2S	-241.77080	0.10543	0.11524	-0.00981
	3s24p, 2P	-241.73947	0.13676	0.14991	-0.01315
	3s24f, 2F	-241,70504	0.17119	0.18801	-0.01682
	3s3p2, 4P	-241.79037	0.08586	0.13223	-0.04637
	3s3⊉², 2D	-241.69111	0.18512		
	$3s3p^2$, 2P	-241.60543	0.27080	0.25802 ^b	0.01278 ^b
	3s3p2, 2S	-241.64455	0.23168	0.23555 ^b	-0.00387b
	3p3, 4S	-241.52175	0.35448	•••	••••
Cu+	3d10, 1S	-1638.7215	0.2347	0.2839	-0.0492
Cu	3d104s, 2S	-1638.9562	0	0	0
	3d104p, 2P	-1638.8445	0.1117	0.1397	-0.0280
	3d94s2, 2D	-1638.9438	0.0124	0.0557	-0.0433

^a See Ref. 19.
^b Experimental energies are not certain.

approximations to the answers sought were necessary in order to make the run converge.

As an example, let us consider the excited configuration $3s^24p$ of Al. We constructed a trial 4p orbital by selecting basis functions and expansion coefficients as follows:

(1) For the first two loops: (a) the same basis functions and ratios of vector components as they were found for the 3p orbital in the ground state; (b) the magnitudes of vector components reduced by a factor of 3 or 4 with respect to those for the 3p orbital.

(2) For the outer loop: only one basis function with initial exponent 0.25, and expansion coefficient unity. The initial exponent is taken 0.25 because the outer loop of the excited 4p orbital is expected to be hydrogenlike. Further refinement may be obtained by adding one additional basis function at a time for the outer loop of such an excited orbital.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The units used are the atomic units of Hartree.¹ According to Cohen, Crowe, and DuMond,⁹ our atomic units for length and energy are 0.529172 Å and 27.20976 eV, respectively.

Some of the important results are presented in Tables I-VIII of this article. Some other results are deposited elsewhere.¹⁰ The eigenvalues, sometimes called orbital energies, are denoted by ϵ . The radial

/m	X7TT	01111	• .	
ABLE	VII.	Orbital	energies	€.

	Al ⁺ $3s^2$, ¹ S	Al 3s ² 3p, ² P	Al $3s^23d$, 2D	Al 3s ² 4s, ² S	Al 3s ² 4p, ² P	
1 <i>s</i>	- 58.81417	- 58.50242	- 58.69293	- 58.66459	- 58.69726	
2s 3s	-5.21853 -0.65231	-4.91139 -0.39347	-5.09697 -0.53100	-5.07045 -0.51208	$ -5.10301 \\ -0.54317 $	
4s 2p	-3.52340	$-3.21890 \\ -0.20991$	-3.40194	-0.09704 - 3.37481	-3.40840	
2p 3p 4p 3d		-0.20991	0.05805		-0.06558	
3d			-0.05797			
	Al $3s^24f$, 2F	Al 3s3p ² , 4P	$\operatorname{Al}_{3s3p^2, \ ^2D}$	$\operatorname{Al}_{3s3p^2, \ ^2P}$	Al 3s3p ² , ² S	Al 3p ³ , ⁴ S
1 <i>s</i>	- 58.75153	- 58.53783	- 58.57792	- 58.62849	- 58.60015	- 58.62686
2s 3s 2p 3p 4f	-5.15591 -0.58970	-4.94320 -0.51928	-4.98043 -0.47296	-5.02798 -0.40245	-5.00161 -0.48656	-5.02400
$\frac{33}{2\phi}$	-3.46078	-3.25808	-3.28483	-3.34103	-3.31582	-3.34678
3p		-0.25995	-0.20142	-0.18182	-0.16129	-0.25250
4f	-0.03124					
	Cu^+ $3d^{10}$, 1S	Cu 3d ¹⁰ 4s, ² S	Cu 3d ¹⁰ 4p, ² P	Cu 3d ⁹ 4s ² , ² D		
1 <i>s</i>	- 329.10962	- 328.79186	- 328.88714	- 329.03747		
2s	-41.12940	-40.81754	-40.90846	-41.08758		
3s	-5.32560	-5.00999	-5.10331	-5.26250		
4s	25 02074	-0.23774	25 70965	-0.28499		
2p 3p 4p 3d	$-35.92971 \\ -3.64229$	$-35.61628 \\ -3.32286$	$-35.70865 \\ -3.41975$	$-35.88168 \\ -3.55875$		
эр 4-ь	- 5.04229	-3.32280	-0.12302	- 3.33873		
$\hat{3}d$	-0.81002	-0.48885	-0.58692	-0.74196		

⁹ E. R. Cohen, K. M. Crowe, J. W. M. DuMond, *Fundamental Constants of Physics* (Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, 1957). ¹⁰ Tables IX-XIII and Figs. 1-5 are deposited as Document No. 7583 with the American Documentation Institute, Auxiliary Publications Project, Photoduplication Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. These tables and figures contain some numerical tabulations and graphs of the orbital wave functions.

part of the orbital $\varphi_{i\lambda\alpha}(r,\vartheta,\varphi)$ multiplied by r is denoted by $P_{i\lambda}(r)$. For each orbital of the states computed, the cusp condition is exactly satisfied so that it is not necessary to present the cusp values in the tables. In the numerical tabulations¹⁰ of the orbital wave functions only representative cases are included, although such tables were computed for all the states considered in this work.

As to the accuracy of the results, it is believed that the values computed represent the Hartree-Fock values to six significant figures for total energies, and to three decimal places for the radial functions $P_{i\lambda}(r)$.

We compared our results with other SCF calculations wherever possible; the comparisons are summarized in Table I.

The ground state of Al⁺ was calculated by Biermann and Harting¹¹ using a numerical procedure. Their orbitals disagree with ours in the second decimal place. Clearly, their numerical scheme must have been quite different from the customary Hartree-Fock method.

Analytic (i.e., expansion method) Hartree-Fock wave functions for the ground state of Al were calculated by Watson and Freeman.¹² These authors used approximations based upon the methods of Nesbet¹³ for treating open shells.

Some excited orbitals and the 3p orbital of Al were calculated by Biermann,¹⁴ and Biermann and Lübeck,¹⁵ who used a numerical procedure. Comparing the tabulation, e.g., for 3p, 4s, and 3d, presented by these authors¹⁵ with ours, considerable differences were found. The squares of some transition integrals

$$R_{i\lambda,j\mu} = \int_0^\infty P_{i\lambda}(r) \ r \ P_{j\mu}(r) dr , \qquad (9)$$

also yielded considerable discrepancies (see Table I).

Analytic Hartree-Fock functions for the ground state of Cu⁺ were computed by Watson.¹⁶ We recalculated Watson's results with our program, so that we obtained numerically tabulated functions to compare with ours. Generally, the orbitals agreed to about three

L. Biermann and H. Harting, Z. Astrophys. 22, 81 (1943).
 R. E. Watson and A. J. Freeman, Phys. Rev. 123, 521 (1961).
 R. K. Nesbet, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A230, 312 (1955);

TABLE	VIII.	Virial	theorem.	(Values of	E_p/E_k .)
Atom		St	ate		$E_{\rm r}/E_{\rm r}$

Atom or ion	State	E_p/E_k
Al+	3s ² , ¹ S	-2.0001377
Al	$\begin{array}{c} 3s^23p,^2P\\ 3s^23d,^2D\\ 3s^24s,^2S\\ 3s^24p,^2P\\ 3s^24f,^2F\\ 3s3p^2,^4P\\ 3s3p^2,^2D\\ 3s3p^2,^2P\\ 3s3p^2,^2P\\ 3s3p^2,^2S\\ 3p^3,^4S\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} -2.0001188\\ -2.0001375\\ -2.0001375\\ -2.0001351\\ -2.0001363\\ -2.0001363\\ -2.0001323\\ -2.0001212\\ -2.0001212\\ -2.0001282\\ -2.0000611 \end{array}$
Cu+	3d ¹⁰ , ¹ S	-2.0000744
Cu	${3d^{10}4_s, {}^2S} \over {3d^{10}4_p, {}^2P} \over {3d^94s^2, {}^2D}$	2.0000667 2.0000763 2.0000719

decimal places, except for the 3d orbitals, which agreed to about two decimal places.

Numerical Hartree-Fock procedure for Cu+ was carried out by Piper.¹⁷ His orbitals agree to about three decimal places with the orbitals of this work.

Analytic Hartree-Fock functions for the excited state $3d^94s^2$, ²D of Cu were calculated by Watson.¹⁸ The author used approximation by Nesbet¹³ for treating open shells.

Finally, our computed energies are compared with experimental energies in Table VI. Since total experimental energies are not available, we have compared energy differences between excited states and ground states. Since we neglected spin-orbit interaction in the calculations, we averaged the experimental energies as obtained from Moore's tables¹⁹ over the multiplet components.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses his indebtedness to Professor C. C. J. Roothaan, who sponsored this research, for many stimulating suggestions and discussions.

The author also appreciates the cooperation of the staff of the Laboratory of Molecular Structure and Spectra, and the personnel of the IBM 7090 computing facilities at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

 ¹⁷ W. W. Piper, Phys. Rev. **123**, 1281 (1961).
 ¹⁸ R. E. Watson, Phys. Rev. **119**, 1934 (1960).
 ¹⁹ C. E. Moore, U. S. Nat. Bur. Std. Circular No. 467 (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1949).

and subsequent articles. ¹⁴ L. Biermann, Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen, Math. Physik.
 Kl. IIa, H.2, 116 (1946).
 ¹⁵ L. Biermann and K. Lübeck, Z. Astrophys. 25, 325 (1948).

¹⁶ For review and further reference see R. E. Watson, Phys. Rev. 118, 1036 (1960).