

## Electron propagator theory and application

Ricardo Longo, Benoît Champagne\*, Yngve Öhrn

Quantum Theory Project, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA

Received March 24 1994/Final revision received September 9, 1994/Accepted September 1994

**Summary.** The electron propagator theory is presented with somewhat of a historical perspective and the working equations are developed with the aim of taking advantage of molecular point group symmetry. A new electron propagator code, the vectorized electron propagator program (VEP), is introduced without full details about its structure and capabilities (such details are being published elsewhere). Applications to the (UV) photoelectron spectra of some donor–acceptor complexes of borane with carbon monoxide and water are presented at the level of second-order theory as an illustration of the theory and the VEP code.

**Key words:** Electron propagator theory – Vectorized electron propagator program

### 1. Introduction

Propagators gained early prominence in formal many-body theory of fermion systems (see e.g. [1] and references therein). Concerns about the elimination of unlinked terms in perturbation expansions and the associated correct scaling with system size naturally led to the propagator concept. Treatment of double-time Green's functions [2] or, equivalently, propagators established that they provide a useful link between quantum mechanical treatments of pure state systems at the absolute zero and that of ensembles at finite temperature. Condensed matter theory employed the propagator concept to great advantage (see e.g. the review by Hedin and Lundqvist [3]) and propagator theory for finite systems [4–6] led to new ideas for the treatment of molecular systems. A detailed treatment by Lindenberg and Öhrn [7] of a variety of spectroscopies for molecular systems further developed and applied propagators. Analyses in terms of perturbation theory of the electron binding energies defined by the poles of the electron propagator were done by Pickup and Goscinski [8]. The development of the electron propagator theory was given a pedagogical treatment in the book by Jørgensen and Simons [9]. Schirmer et al. [10] introduced the so-called algebraic diagrammatic construction (ADC) of the perturbation expansions for the electron propagator. Many have

---

\* Senior Research Assistant of the National Fund for Scientific Research, Belgium

contributed to the theoretical and computational advances of the electron propagator and there is much current work going on, particularly in the study of polymeric systems by Deleuze et al. [11], and it is impossible to give proper credit to all here. This paper focuses on the electron propagator theory and its application to molecular systems and gives some of the key references often forgotten in recent work.

The electron propagator is naturally described in Fock space in terms of field operators. Depending on only two electron position and spin coordinates and a time or energy parameter it is in many ways the optimal theoretical quantity with a dynamical equation from which it can be determined in various approximations. It contains a wealth of information. Not only vertical electron binding energies (ionization potentials and electron affinities) [12–14], but also electron scattering amplitudes [15], photoionization intensities [13, 16], total energies [17, 18], one-electron reduced density matrices [7, 19] and therefore permitting the calculation of one-electron properties [20]. Derivatives of molecular electron binding energies with respect to nuclear displacements [21, 22] have also been determined within the electron propagator theory. Basically all properties of a molecule are contained in the propagator. Thus electronic and rovibrational spectra [14] and the particulars of chemical bonding can be treated in terms of the electron propagator [23, 24].

Given a set of orthonormal spin orbitals  $\{\phi_p(\xi)\}$  and the associated set of electron field operators  $\{a_p, a_p^\dagger\}$  satisfying the anticommutation relations (at equal times)

$$[a_p, a_q]_+ = [a_p^\dagger, a_q^\dagger]_+ = [a_p, a_q^\dagger]_+ - \delta_{pq} = 0 \quad (1)$$

the electron propagator matrix is defined with elements

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle a_p(t); a_q^\dagger(t') \rangle\rangle &= -i\theta(t-t') \langle 0 | a_p(t) a_q^\dagger(t') | 0 \rangle \\ &+ i\theta(t'-t) \langle 0 | a_q^\dagger(t') a_p(t) | 0 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here

$$\theta(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t \delta(\tau) d\tau \quad (3)$$

is the Heaviside step function expressed in terms of the Dirac delta function, and  $|0\rangle$  is the  $N$ -electron ground state. Atomic units are used throughout so for instance  $\bullet = 1$  and the Heisenberg equation of motion for the field operators is

$$i \frac{d}{dt} a_p(t) = [a_p(t), H]_-, \quad (4)$$

where the commutator on the right contains the many-electron Hamiltonian expressed in the basis electron field operators

$$H = \sum_{p,q} h_{pq} a_p^\dagger a_q + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{p,q,r,s} \langle pq || rs \rangle a_p^\dagger a_q^\dagger a_s a_r. \quad (5)$$

The one-electron integrals involving the electron kinetic energy and the electron–nuclear attraction terms are

$$h_{pq} = \int \phi_p^*(\xi) \left( -\frac{1}{2} \nabla^2 - \sum_{\kappa=1}^{N_n} \frac{Z_\kappa}{|\vec{r} - \vec{R}_\kappa|} \right) \phi_q(\xi) d\xi \quad (6)$$

and the antisymmetric two-electron integrals are  $\langle pq||rs\rangle = \langle pq|rs\rangle - \langle pq|sr\rangle$  with

$$\langle pq|rs\rangle = \int d\xi_1 \int d\xi_2 \phi_p^*(\xi_1) \phi_q^*(\xi_2) \frac{1}{|\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|} \phi_r(\xi_1) \phi_s(\xi_2). \quad (7)$$

The electron propagator is most commonly studied via its Fourier transform

$$\langle\langle a_p; a_q^\dagger \rangle\rangle_E = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \langle\langle a_p(t); a_q^\dagger(t') \rangle\rangle \exp[-iE(t-t')] d(t-t'), \quad (8)$$

which has the spectral representation [25, 7]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle a_p; a_q^\dagger \rangle\rangle_E = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow +0} \sum_m \left[ \frac{\langle 0|a_p|m\rangle \langle m|a_q^\dagger|0\rangle}{E + E_0(N) - E_m(N+1) + i\eta} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\langle 0|a_q^\dagger|m\rangle \langle m|a_p|0\rangle}{E - E_0(N) + E_m(N-1) - i\eta} \right], \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

showing the typical pole structure, when the energies are discrete as they always are in a finite basis set. The energy eigenstates are used in this formal expression, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} H|0\rangle &= E_0(N)|0\rangle, \\ H|m\rangle &= E_m(N \pm 1)|m\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and only the  $N+1$  and  $N-1$  electron states are involved as intermediates in the spectral representation.

It is obvious from the spectral representation that the electron propagator has a special significance for photoelectron spectroscopy and other processes where electron binding energies are measured. The numerator contains the so-called Feynman-Dyson amplitudes

$$\begin{aligned} f_p(m) &= \langle 0|a_p|m\rangle, \\ g_p(m) &= \langle m|a_p|0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which are obtained as residues at the particular poles of interest. These amplitudes are important in the theoretical determination of transition probabilities for electron attachment or detachment processes. For instance, the intensity of a particular structure corresponding to the final positive ion state  $m$  in a photoelectron spectrum of a neutral species is proportional to the pole strength [12, 13]  $\Gamma_m = \sum_p |g_p(m)|^2$ .

The propagator in Eq. (9) satisfies the equation of motion

$$\begin{aligned} E \langle\langle a_p; a_q^\dagger \rangle\rangle_E &= \langle 0|[a_p, a_q^\dagger]_+ |0\rangle + \langle\langle [a_p, H]_-; a_q^\dagger \rangle\rangle_E \\ &= \langle 0|[a_p, a_q^\dagger]_+ |0\rangle + \langle\langle a_p; [H, a_q^\dagger]_- \rangle\rangle_E \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

which can be readily shown by using the identity

$$E(E-x)^{-1} = 1 + x(E-x)^{-1} \quad (13)$$

with  $x = E_m(N+1) - E_0(N)$  or  $x = E_0(N) - E_m(N-1)$  in the spectral representation and utilizing the properties (10) of the energy eigenstates. The two equivalent forms of the equation of motion (12) are useful in manipulating the chain of equations that obviously results when the corresponding equation of motion is written for the propagator on the right, which involves the commutator

with the Hamiltonian, yielding an even more involved propagator on the right with, say, a double commutator  $[[a_p, H]_-, H]_-$ , and so on. Approximate treatments of the propagator equations include the termination of this chain of equations at some suitable level or assumptions that permit the summation of the expansions. This so-called decoupling problem was addressed in its generality by Linderberg and Öhrn [6] by linearizing the equation of motion. There has also appeared discussions of truncation schemes expressed in terms of diagrammatic expansions by Cederbaum and Domcke [14], the moment conserving decoupling using Padé approximants as well as various renormalization schemes discussed by Öhrn and Born [26], and decoupling procedures expressed in terms of superoperators [27].

Although equivalent to other procedures the superoperator formulation provides a particularly attractive shorthand notation. It proceeds by introducing a linear space  $L$  of fermion-like field operators

$$L = \{a_p^\dagger, a_p^\dagger a_q^\dagger a_r, (p < q), a_p^\dagger a_q^\dagger a_r^\dagger a_s a_t, (p < q < r; t < s), \dots\}, \quad (14)$$

which supports a scalar product

$$\langle\langle X | Y \rangle\rangle = \langle 0 | [X^\dagger, Y]_+ | 0 \rangle, \quad X, Y \in L. \quad (15)$$

The superoperator identify  $\hat{I}$  and superoperator Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  are defined on  $L$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}X &= X, \\ \hat{H}X &= [H, X]_-. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Iterating the second form of Eq. (12) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle a_p; a_q^\dagger \rangle\rangle_E &= \frac{(a_p^\dagger | a_q^\dagger)}{E} + \frac{(a_p^\dagger | \hat{H} a_q^\dagger)}{E^2} + \frac{(a_p^\dagger | \hat{H}^2 a_q^\dagger)}{E^3} + \dots \\ &= (a_p^\dagger | (E\hat{I} - \hat{H})^{-1} a_q^\dagger), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

i.e. a matrix element of the superoperator resolvent. The full matrix can be expressed as

$$G(E) = (a^\dagger | (E\hat{I} - \hat{H})^{-1} a^\dagger) \quad (18)$$

with the field operators arranged in a suitable row array on the right and column array on the left.

Using an inner projection [28] manifold  $h \in L$  the superoperator inverse can be transformed to a matrix inverse

$$G(E) = (a^\dagger | h) (h | (E\hat{I} - \hat{H}) h)^{-1} (h | a^\dagger). \quad (19)$$

This expression is the starting point for the approximate treatments of the electron propagator.

## 2 Approximations to the electron propagator

### *Partitioning of inner projection manifold*

The simplest decoupling of Eq. (12) is to consider the so-called moment expansion in Eq. (17) and make the assumption that higher moments are powers of the first moment

$$F = (a^\dagger | \hat{H} a^\dagger). \quad (20)$$

This is often referred to as the geometric approximation. Denoting  $(\mathbf{a}^\dagger|\mathbf{a}^\dagger) = \mathbf{S}$  the moment expansion (17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}(E) &\approx E^{-1}\mathbf{S}[1 + E^{-1}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{F} + E^{-2}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{F}\mathbf{S}^{-1}\mathbf{F} + \dots] \\ &= \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{E}\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{F})^{-1}\mathbf{S} = (\mathbf{a}^\dagger|(E\hat{\mathbf{T}} - \hat{\mathbf{H}})\mathbf{a}^\dagger)^{-1} = \mathbf{G}_0(E). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The anticommutation relations (1) yielding

$$S_{pq} = (a_p^\dagger|a_q^\dagger) = \langle 0|[a_p, a_q^\dagger]_+|0\rangle = \delta_{pq}, \quad (22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} F_{pq} &= (a_p^\dagger|\hat{\mathbf{H}}a_q^\dagger) = \langle 0|[a_p, [H, a_q^\dagger]_-]|0\rangle \\ &= h_{pq} + \sum_{r,s} \langle pr||qs\rangle \langle 0|a_r^\dagger a_s|0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

have been employed, where in the last expression  $F_{pq}$  is a matrix element of the Fock operator in the spin orbital basis. The single-particle reduced density matrix has the elements

$$\gamma_{sr} = \langle 0|a_r^\dagger a_s|0\rangle \quad (24)$$

and can be diagonalized simultaneously with  $\mathbf{F}$  to give occupation numbers  $\langle n_r \rangle$ , i.e.  $\gamma_{sr} = \langle n_r \rangle \delta_{sr}$  and  $\mathbf{x}^\dagger \mathbf{F} \mathbf{x} = \varepsilon$  for some suitable unitary transformation  $\mathbf{x}$ . Comparing Eq. (21) with the formal spectral representation (9) it is possible to write

$$G_{0pq}(E) = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow +0} \sum_r x_{pr} \left[ \frac{\langle n_r \rangle}{E - \varepsilon_r - i\eta} + \frac{1 - \langle n_r \rangle}{E - \varepsilon_r + i\eta} \right] x_{qr}^*. \quad (25)$$

For the case that the occupation numbers are 0 or 1 the reference state  $|0\rangle$  must be a single determinant in terms of the self-consistent field (SCF) spin orbitals

$$\chi_r = \sum_p \phi_p x_{pr} \quad (26)$$

or equivalently expressed in terms of the field operators and the vacuum state as

$$|0\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^N a_i^\dagger |vac\rangle \equiv \prod_i i^\dagger |vac\rangle. \quad (27)$$

In the following the electron field operators  $\{a_r \equiv r\}$  refer to the SCF spin orbitals  $\{\chi_r\}$ . It then follows through Eq. (25) that at this level of approximation, the occupied spin orbital energies must be identified with ionization potentials and the unoccupied ones with electron affinities as is done through Koopmans' theorem.

This is considered the lowest level of approximation and used as a starting point for all higher-level treatments of the electron propagator. The SCF spin orbitals and then also the corresponding electron field operators naturally separate into an occupied set labeled by  $i, j, k, \dots$ , and an unoccupied set labeled by  $a, b, c, \dots$ . The labels  $p, q, r, \dots$  refer to either set.

The inner projection manifold  $\mathbf{h}$  used in the expression (19) need only contain fermion-like operators [29], i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathbf{h}\} &= \{\mathbf{h}_1\} \cup \{\mathbf{h}_3\} \cup \{\mathbf{h}_5\} \cup \dots \\ &= \{a^\dagger, i^\dagger\} \cup \{a^\dagger b^\dagger i, i^\dagger j^\dagger a\} \cup \{a^\dagger b^\dagger c^\dagger ij, i^\dagger j^\dagger k^\dagger ab\} \cup \dots \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

and truncations of this manifold corresponds to various approximation schemes. It is convenient to use an orthonormal set of inner projection basis elements [29] so that  $(\mathbf{h}_i|\mathbf{h}_i) = \mathbf{1}$ , and  $(\mathbf{h}_i|\mathbf{h}_j) = \mathbf{0}$  for  $i \neq j$ .

A first step in seeking adequate approximation schemes for the electron propagator is a partitioning of the inner projection manifold. When the aim is to obtain a theoretical photoelectron spectrum it is convenient to choose the partitioning

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h} &= \{\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{f}\}, \\ \mathbf{f} &= \{\mathbf{h}_3\} \cup \{\mathbf{h}_5\} \cup \dots \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

such that Eq. (19) becomes

$$\mathbf{G}(E) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} E\mathbf{1} - (\mathbf{a}^\dagger|\hat{H}\mathbf{a}^\dagger) & -(\mathbf{a}^\dagger|\hat{H}\mathbf{f}) \\ -(\mathbf{f}|\hat{H}\mathbf{a}^\dagger) & E\mathbf{1} - (\mathbf{f}|\hat{H}\mathbf{f}) \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

The partitioned form of the inverse matrix yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}^{-1}(E) &= E\mathbf{1} - (\mathbf{a}^\dagger|\hat{H}\mathbf{a}^\dagger) - (\mathbf{a}^\dagger|\hat{H}\mathbf{f})[E\mathbf{1} - (\mathbf{f}|\hat{H}\mathbf{f})]^{-1}(\mathbf{f}|\hat{H}\mathbf{a}^\dagger) \\ &= \mathbf{G}_0^{-1}(E) - \Sigma(E), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the unperturbed propagator and the self-energy term have been defined to show the relation to the so-called Dyson-like equation for the propagator [1]. An untruncated manifold  $\mathbf{f}$  means no approximation, only a reformulation of the propagator equations. In order to arrive at a definite approximation and provide algorithms for the calculation of the matrix elements defining the propagator, a reference state and a truncation of the inner projection field operator manifold must be chosen.

### *Choice of reference state*

The Hartree–Fock or SCF single determinantal state  $|0\rangle = |\text{HF}\rangle$  provides the natural starting point for the choice of reference state at various levels of approximation. Although the electron propagator theory can be fully developed within a perturbation theory framework with only the SCF single determinantal reference state and choice of inner projection manifold [26] it is desirable to keep a balance between the level of description of the reference state  $|0\rangle$  and that of the inner projection manifold  $\mathbf{f}$ . Such a balance kept through various orders of perturbation theory guarantees hermiticity of the superoperator Hamiltonian matrix and the elimination of spurious terms [29]. Starting from a partitioning of the Hamiltonian and thus also of the superoperator Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H_0 + \delta H, \\ H_0 &= \sum_p \varepsilon_p p^\dagger p, \\ \delta H &= \sum_{p,q,r,s} \langle pq||rs\rangle [\tfrac{1}{4} p^\dagger q^\dagger sr - \delta_{qs} \langle n_s \rangle p^\dagger r], \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

the reference state can be expressed in terms of Rayleigh–Schrödinger perturbation theory (RSPT) [30, 9] or coupled-cluster (CC) theory. Also multiconfigurational SCF (MCSCF) theory has been implemented [31] for the electron propagator reference state. This treatise employs reference states based on RSPT and CC theory.

The hermiticity problem consists of the equation

$$(X|\hat{H}Y) = (Y|\hat{H}X)^* \quad (33)$$

not being satisfied for an approximate reference state or more generally for a density operator

$$\rho = \rho_0 + \delta\rho + \delta^2\rho + \dots + \delta^n\rho \quad (34)$$

correct through order  $n$  in perturbation theory. The average defining the propagator matrices is then a trace, i.e.

$$\langle \dots \rangle \equiv \text{Tr}\{\rho \dots\}. \quad (35)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [X^\dagger, [H, Y]_-]_+ \rangle - \langle [Y^\dagger, [H, X]_-]_+ \rangle^* &= \langle [H, [X^\dagger, Y]_+]_- \rangle \\ &= \text{Tr}\{\rho [H, [X^\dagger, Y]_+]_-\} \\ &= \text{Tr}\{[\rho, H]_- [X^\dagger, Y]_+ \} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

and since

$$[\rho_0, H_0]_- = 0 \quad (37)$$

and

$$[\delta^k\rho, H_0]_- + [\delta^{k-1}\rho, \delta H]_- = 0 \quad (38)$$

are assumed to hold for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , the error term is of order  $n + 1$ , i.e.

$$(X|\hat{H}Y) - (Y|\hat{H}X)^* = \text{Tr}\{[\delta^n\rho, \delta H]_- - [X^\dagger, Y]_+\}. \quad (39)$$

The Rayleigh–Schrödinger perturbation expansion for the reference state,

$$|0\rangle_{\text{RSPT}} = (1 + K_1 + K_2 + K_3 + \dots)|\text{HF}\rangle, \quad (40)$$

is defined by

$$K_1 = \sum_i \sum_a k_i^a a^\dagger i, \quad (41)$$

$$K_2 = \sum_{i>j} \sum_{a>b} k_{ij}^{ab} a^\dagger i b^\dagger j, \quad (42)$$

and

$$K_3 = \sum_{i>j>k} \sum_{a>b>c} k_{ijk}^{abc} a^\dagger i b^\dagger j c^\dagger k, \quad (43)$$

with, in particular,

$$k_{ij}^{ab} = \frac{\langle ij || ab \rangle}{D_{ij}^{ab}} \quad (44)$$

and

$$k_i^a = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{jbc} \frac{\langle bc || aj \rangle}{D_i^a} k_{ij}^{bc} - \sum_{jkb} \frac{\langle ib || jk \rangle}{D_i^a} k_{jk}^{ab} \right]. \quad (45)$$

The denominators are defined as

$$D_i^a = \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_a \quad (46)$$

and

$$D_{ij}^{ab} = \varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b. \quad (47)$$

The concept of order in the perturbation expansion of the electron propagator ultimately means order in terms of the electron–electron interaction or equivalently two-electron integrals. The inclusion of electron correlation through first order in the reference state is achieved with the double excitation terms  $K_2$  whereas also the  $K_1$  terms are needed for second-order corrections.

### *Coupled-cluster renormalization of the reference state*

The coupled-cluster (CC) expression [32] for the reference state

$$|0\rangle_{\text{CC}} = e^T |\text{HF}\rangle \quad (48)$$

is defined by

$$T = T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + \dots + T_N, \quad (49)$$

with  $N$  being the number of electrons of the system and

$$T_1 = \sum_i \sum_a t_i^a a^\dagger i, \quad (50)$$

$$T_2 = \sum_{i>j} \sum_{a>b} t_{ij}^{ab} a^\dagger i b^\dagger j, \quad (51)$$

$$T_3 = \sum_{i>j>k} \sum_{a>b>c} t_{ijk}^{abc} a^\dagger i b^\dagger j c^\dagger k, \quad (52)$$

and so on.

The  $T$  amplitudes contain infinite-order contributions to each excitation level from the HF state. Thus, replacing the RSPT  $K$  amplitudes with the CC  $T$  amplitudes may be considered a renormalization procedure since certain classes of perturbation terms or diagrams are summed to infinite order [33, 34]. This idea has already been employed in work on the polarization propagator [35, 36].

### *Details of the coupled-cluster approach*

Expansion of the exponential in the CC method gives

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle_{\text{CC}} &= [1 + T_1 + (T_2 + \frac{1}{2}T_1^2) + \dots] |\text{HF}\rangle \\ &= \left[ 1 + \sum_i \sum_a t_i^a a^\dagger i + \sum_{i>j} \sum_{a>b} t_{ij}^{ab} a^\dagger i b^\dagger j \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_i \sum_a t_i^a a^\dagger i \right) \left( \sum_j \sum_b t_j^b b^\dagger j \right) + \dots \right] |\text{HF}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$



where the last term can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_i \sum_a t_i^a a^\dagger i \right) \left( \sum_j \sum_b t_j^b b^\dagger j \right) &= \sum_{i>j} \left[ \left( \sum_a t_i^a a^\dagger i \right) \left( \sum_b t_j^b b^\dagger j \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i>j} \sum_{a>b} [(t_i^a t_j^b a^\dagger i b^\dagger j) + (t_j^b t_i^a b^\dagger j a^\dagger i)], \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

and since for the orthonormal basis of SCF spin orbitals,

$$b^\dagger i a^\dagger j = -a^\dagger i b^\dagger j, \quad (55)$$

the CC reference state becomes

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle_{\text{CC}} &= [1 + T_1 + (T_2 + \frac{1}{2}T_1^2) + \dots] |\text{HF}\rangle \\ &= \left[ 1 + \sum_i \sum_a t_i^a a^\dagger i + \sum_{i>j} \sum_{a>b} \tau_{ij}^{ab} a^\dagger i b^\dagger j + \dots \right] |\text{HF}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where

$$\tau_{ij}^{ab} = t_{ij}^{ab} + t_i^a t_j^b - t_i^b t_j^a. \quad (57)$$

Restricting the coupled-cluster expansion to single and double (CCSD) excitations, i.e.

$$|0\rangle_{\text{CC}} \approx |0\rangle_{\text{CCSD}} = e^{(T_1 + T_2)} |\text{HF}\rangle, \quad (58)$$

the equations for the  $T$  amplitudes become [37]

$T_1$  equation:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{ij}^a t_i^a &= \sum_b t_i^b F_{ab} - \sum_j t_j^a F_{ji} + \sum_{jb} t_{ij}^{ab} F_{jb} \\ &\quad - \sum_{jb} t_j^b \langle ja \| ib \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ibc} t_{ij}^{bc} \langle ja \| bc \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{jkb} t_{jk}^{ab} \langle kj \| bi \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

$T_2$  equation:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{ij}^{ab} t_{ij}^{ab} &= \langle ij \| ab \rangle + P(ab) \sum_c t_{ij}^{ac} \left( F_{bc} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k t_k^b F_{kc} \right) \\ &\quad - P(ij) \sum_k t_{ik}^{ab} \left( F_{kj} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_c t_j^c F_{kc} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{kl} \tau_{kl}^{ab} W_{klij} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{cd} \tau_{ij}^{cd} W_{abcd} + P(ij) P(ab) \sum_{kc} (t_{ik}^{ac} W_{kbcj} - t_i^a t_k^c \langle kb \| cj \rangle) \\ &\quad + P(ij) \sum_c t_i^c \langle ab \| cj \rangle - P(ab) \sum_k t_k^c \langle kb \| ij \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where

$$F_{ab} = \sum_{kc} t_k^c \langle ka \| cb \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{klc} \tilde{\tau}_{kl}^{ac} \langle kl \| bc \rangle, \quad (61)$$

$$F_{ji} = \sum_{ak} t_k^a \langle jk \| ia \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{kab} \tilde{\tau}_{ik}^{ab} \langle jk \| ab \rangle, \quad (62)$$

$$F_{jb} = \sum_{ia} t_i^a \langle ij \| ba \rangle, \quad (63)$$

$$W_{kl ij} = \langle kl \| ij \rangle + P(ij) \sum_a t_j^a \langle kl \| ia \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ab} \tau_{ij}^{ab} \langle kl \| ab \rangle, \quad (64)$$

$$W_{abcd} = \langle ab \| cd \rangle - P(ab) \sum_i t_i^b \langle ai \| cd \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ij} \tau_{ij}^{ab} \langle ij \| cd \rangle, \quad (65)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} W_{kbcj} &= \langle kb \| cj \rangle + \sum_a t_j^a \langle kb \| ca \rangle - \sum_i t_i^b \langle ki \| cj \rangle \\ &\quad - \sum_{ia} \left( \frac{1}{2} t_{ji}^{ab} + t_j^a t_i^b \right) \langle ki \| ca \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

The effective two-particle excitation operators  $\tau$  and  $\tilde{\tau}$  are

$$\tau_{ij}^{ab} = t_{ij}^{ab} + t_i^a t_j^b - t_i^b t_j^a \quad (67)$$

and

$$\tilde{\tau}_{ij}^{ab} = t_{ij}^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} (t_i^a t_j^b - t_i^b t_j^a), \quad (68)$$

respectively. In the above equations,  $P(ij)$  and  $P(ab)$  denote the permutational interchange operations.

The  $k$  coefficients in the RSPT expansion can be obtained from the couple-cluster *ansatz* through iteration of the  $T$  equations. For instance, the first iteration of the  $T_2$  equation gives  $K_2$ , that is,

$$k_{ij}^{ab} = t_{ij}^{ab}(1) = \frac{\langle ij \| ab \rangle}{D_{ij}^{ab}}, \quad (69)$$

which, when applied in the  $T_1$  equation, yields

$$k_i^a = t_i^a(1) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{jbc} \frac{\langle aj \| bc \rangle}{D_i^a} t_{ij}^{bc}(1) - \sum_{jkb} \frac{\langle jk \| ib \rangle}{D_i^a} t_{jk}^{ab}(1) \right]. \quad (70)$$

Consequently, it is possible to write reference states for the electron propagator approach as expansion coefficients of the perturbation theory or as converged  $T$  amplitudes from the solution of the couple-cluster equations.

Also, in comparing the RSPT and CC wave functions, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} |0\rangle_{\text{RSPT}} &= (1 + K_1 + K_2 + \dots)|\text{HF}\rangle \\ &\Downarrow \\ |0\rangle_{\text{CCSD}} &= (1 + T_1 + (T_2 + T_1^2/2) + \dots)|\text{HF}\rangle \\ &\Downarrow \\ \text{CC} - \text{EP} &\leftrightarrow \text{RSPT} - \text{EP} \\ &\Uparrow \\ t_i^a &\leftrightarrow k_i^a \\ \tau_{ij}^{ab} &\leftrightarrow k_{ij}^{ab}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

From the definition of the spectral representation (9) it follows that the elements of the electron propagator matrix  $G(E)$  become infinite when  $E$  equals an electron binding energy. Then, the elements of the inverse  $G^{-1}(E)$  vanish at such an energy. This result can be used to devise iterative methods to find the electron propagator poles and residues at a given level of perturbation expansion.

### Order analysis

Truncation of the inner projection operator manifold  $f$  and the use of RSPT for the reference state based on the so-called Møller-Plesset partitioning of the Hamiltonian as expressed in Eq. (32) facilitates an order analysis of the electron propagator. In particular, the self-energy (see [30]) and consequently properties as e.g. electron binding energies and the one-electron reduced density matrix can be calculated to a given desired order of electron correlation or electron interaction. Starting from the inverse propagator matrix as given in Eq. (31) and using a shorthand notation the following expression is obtained:

$$G^{-1}(E) = R_{aa}(E) - R_{af}R_{ff}^{-1}(E)R_{fa}, \quad (72)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{aa}(E) &= (a^\dagger | (E\hat{I} - \hat{H}) a^\dagger) = E1 - H_{aa}, \\ R_{af} &= (a^\dagger | (E\hat{I} - \hat{H}) f) = -H_{af}, \\ R_{fa} &= (f | (E\hat{I} - \hat{H}) a^\dagger) = -H_{fa} = -H_{af}^\dagger, \\ R_{faf}(E) &= (f | (E\hat{I} - \hat{H}) f) = E1 - H_{ff}. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

The RSPT expression for the reference state then permits the expansion

$$R_{af} = - \sum_{i=1}^n H_{af}^{(i)} \quad (74)$$

where the fact that  $H_{af}^{(0)} = 0$  has been used. Together with corresponding expansions for the other matrices this gives an expression for the inverse electron propagator matrix through order  $n$  as

$$G_n^{-1}(E) = R_{aa}^{(0)} + \sum_{i=1}^n R_{aa}^{(i)} - \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} H_{af}^{(i)} \right) \left( \sum_{i=0}^{n_2} R_{ff}^{(i)} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} H_{af}^{\dagger(i)} \right) \right]^{(n)}. \quad (75)$$

The first-order propagator vanishes and the lowest-order expressions are obtained by calculating the various matrices to specific orders and by choosing the operator manifold  $f$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} n = 2 &\Rightarrow n_1 = 1, \quad n_2 = 0; \quad f = h_3, \\ n = 3 &\Rightarrow n_1 = 2, \quad n_2 = 1; \quad f = h_3, \\ n = 4 &\Rightarrow n_1 = 3, \quad n_2 = 2; \quad f = h_3 \cup h_5, \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

which will be further elaborated in the following sections.

Obviously the inversion of the very large matrix  $R_{ff}(E)$  is one of the difficult problems that has to be addressed. An inversion could be performed by employing a reduced linear equation (RLE) scheme [38] but rapidly becomes impractical with increasing basis sets. A number of approximate treatments have been proposed

[12, 39, 40] with varying success. The order concept can be preserved with the identity

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ff}^{-1}(E) &\equiv \left( R_{ff}^{(0)} + \sum_{i=1}^n R_{ff}^{(i)} \right)^{-1} \\ &\equiv (R_{ff}^{(0)})^{-1} - (R_{ff}^{(0)})^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n R_{ff}^{(i)} \right) \left( R_{ff}^{(0)} + \sum_{i=1}^n R_{ff}^{(i)} \right)^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

which can be iterated and truncated [41, 42, 12].

### Method of solution

The general expression for the element

$$G_{pq}(E) = (a_p | (E\hat{I} - \hat{H})^{-1} a_q) \quad (78)$$

of the electron propagator matrix  $G(E)$  is symmetry blocked, where each block is formed by the spin orbital indices  $p$  and  $q$  belonging to the same irreducible representation of the orbitals. In addition, the electron propagator matrix  $G(E)$  is spin blocked. Therefore, it is sufficient to solve separately the electron propagator equations for each symmetry and spin block  $pq$ .

For a given block and energy  $E$  it is possible to construct the matrix

$$\begin{aligned} W(E) &= E\mathbf{1} - G^{-1}(E) = E\mathbf{1} - (R_{aa}(E) - H_{af} R_{ff}^{-1}(E) H_{af}^\dagger) \\ &= E\mathbf{1} - ((a^\dagger | (E\hat{I} - \hat{H}) | a^\dagger) - H_{af} R_{ff}^{-1}(E) H_{af}^\dagger) \\ &= E\mathbf{1} - ((E\mathbf{1} - H_{aa} - H_{af} R_{ff}^{-1}(E) H_{af}^\dagger) \\ &= H_{aa} + H_{af} R_{ff}^{-1}(E) H_{af}^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

which allows the expression

$$(\mathbf{1}E - W(E))G(E) = \mathbf{1}. \quad (80)$$

This shows that the diagonalization

$$\begin{aligned} U^\dagger W(E)U = \Lambda(E) &= \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1(E) & & \cdots & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & \\ \vdots & & \lambda_p(E) & & \vdots \\ & & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & \cdots & & \lambda_n(E) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= U^\dagger (H_{aa} + R_{ab}^\dagger R_{bb}^{-1}(E) R_{ab}) U, \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

is important, with  $n$  being the dimension of the symmetry  $pq$  block, and the eigenvalue corresponding to the spin orbital of interest ( $p$ ) should be the  $p$ th pole ( $E_p$ ) of the electron propagator matrix. This eigenvalue can be used as the next guess for an iterative search of the  $p$ th pole or used to obtain a guess for a Newton–Raphson procedure. Since the derivatives of  $W(E)$  with respect to  $E$  can be evaluated analytically, a Newton–Raphson procedure can be efficiently employed to calculate the next guess for  $E$ , so that, usually, after three or four

iterations the difference between the input  $E$  and the eigenvalue is less than  $10^{-5}$  Hartree.

Layzer [43] treated such (in general non-hermitian) eigenvalue problems. When

$$U_r(E) = \{U_{pr}\}, \quad p = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (82)$$

is the eigenvector of  $W(E)$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_r(E)$  and  $U_r^*(E)$  is the eigenvector of  $W^\dagger$  corresponding to eigenvalue  $\lambda_r^*(E)$  the expansion

$$G_{pq}(E) = \sum_r \frac{U_{pr}(E)U_{qr}^*(E)}{E - \lambda_r(E)} \quad (83)$$

follows. The types of possible solutions have been discussed by Csanak et al. [15] and details have been explored by Purvis and Öhrn [12]. The pole of interest  $E_r$  is found when

$$E_r = \lambda_r(E_r) \quad (84)$$

and within a finite basis the  $E_r$  are real and discrete. Elementary residue calculus gives

$$\lim_{E \rightarrow E_r} [(E - E_r)G_{pq}(E)] = \Gamma_r U_{pr}(E_r)U_{qr}^*(E_r), \quad (85)$$

where

$$\Gamma_r = \left[ 1 - \frac{d\lambda_r(E)}{dE} \right]_{E=E_r} \quad (86)$$

is the pole strength introduced earlier. The resulting expression

$$G_{pq}(E) = \sum_r \frac{\Gamma_r U_{pr}(E_r)U_{qr}^*(E_r)}{E - E_r} \quad (87)$$

can then be compared to the spectral representation (9) to find

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0|a_p|r\rangle &= \Gamma_r^{1/2} U_{pr}(E_r(N+1) - E_0(N)), \\ \langle r|a_p|0\rangle &= \Gamma_r^{1/2} U_{pr}(E_0(N) - E_r(N-1)). \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

The Feynman–Dyson amplitudes directly associated with the various electron binding energies are then

$$\chi^{\text{FDA}}(\xi) = \sum_p \chi_p(\xi) U_{pr}(E_r) \Gamma_r^{1/2} \quad (89)$$

in terms of the canonical molecular SCF spin orbitals.

The relationship of these amplitudes to the electron propagator

$$\begin{aligned} G(\xi, \xi'; E) &= \langle\langle \psi(\xi); \psi^\dagger(\xi') \rangle\rangle_E \\ &= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow +0} \sum_r \left[ \frac{f_r(\xi) f_r^*(\xi')}{E + E_0(N) - E_r(N+1) + i\eta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{g_r(\xi) g_r(\xi')}{E - E_0(N) + E_r(N-1) - i\eta} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

defined in position and spin coordinate space becomes obvious from the expansion

$$\psi(\xi, t) = \sum_p \chi_p(\xi) a_p(t) \quad (91)$$

of the fundamental electron field operators  $\psi(\xi, t)$  and their adjoints in the basis. The Feynman–Dyson amplitudes then are of two kinds associated with the electron attachment processes and with electron detachment processes, respectively (compare Eq. (11)):

$$\begin{aligned} f_r(\xi) &= \sum_p \chi_p(\xi) \langle 0 | a_p | r \rangle = \sum_p \chi_p(\xi) U_{pr} \Gamma_r^{1/2}, \\ g_r(\xi) &= \sum_p \chi_p(\xi) \langle r | a_p | 0 \rangle = \sum_p \chi_p(\xi) U_{pr} \Gamma_r^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

### Solution scheme

1. Choose  $r$ .
2. Get block  $pq$ .
3. Get guess for  $E_r$ .
4. Construct  $W(E) = H_{aa} + H_{af} R_{ff}^{-1}(E_r) H_{af}^\dagger$ .
5. Diagonalize  $UW(E_r) = \lambda(E_r) \mathbf{1}$ .
6. Get the eigenvalue  $\lambda_r$  associated with  $r$ .
7. Set  $E_{\text{new}}^{(i)} = \lambda_r$ .
8. Get new guess (Newton–Raphson):

$$E_{i+1} = E_i - \mathbf{G}^{-1}(E_i) \left/ \left( \frac{\partial \mathbf{G}^{-1}(E)}{\partial E} \right)_{E=E_i} \right. \quad (93)$$

9.  $|E_i - E_{i-1}| < 10^{-5}$  ?
  - a. ? yes  $\Rightarrow$  Pole =  $E_i$
  - b. ? no  $\Rightarrow$  go to step 3.

### Order analysis of the propagator matrices

*Second-order electron propagator.* In the following, subscript 1 refers to the  $\mathbf{h}_1 = \mathbf{a}^\dagger$  part of the field operator manifold and subscript 3 to the  $\mathbf{h}_3$  part and so on. Through second order the inverse of the electron propagator matrix then becomes

$$\mathbf{G}_{(2)}^{-1}(E) = \mathbf{R}_{11}^{(0)} - \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)} (\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1} (\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)})^\dagger, \quad (94)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{R}_{11}^{(0)}(E))_{pq} &= (E - \varepsilon_p) \delta_{pq}, \\ (\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)})_{p,abi} &= (pi \| ab \rangle, \\ (\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)})_{p,ija} &= \langle pa \| ij \rangle, \\ (\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))_{abi,cdj} &= (E + \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b) \delta_{ac} \delta_{bd} \delta_{ij}, \\ (\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))_{ija,klb} &= (E + \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j) \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} \delta_{ab}. \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

The second-order self-energy matrix then has the elements

$$(\Sigma^{(2)}(E))_{pq} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,a,b} \frac{\langle pi \| ab \rangle \langle ab \| qi \rangle}{E + \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_b} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,a} \frac{\langle pa \| ij \rangle \langle ij \| qa \rangle}{E + \varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j}, \quad (96)$$

where the factor of 1/2 comes from the relaxation of the ordered indices.

*Third-order electron propagator.* A similar treatment through third order yields [41, 44, 30]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_{(3)}^{-1}(E) &= \mathbf{G}_{(2)}^{-1}(E) \\ &+ \mathbf{H}_{11}^{(3)} - \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{33}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}(\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)})^\dagger \\ &- \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}(\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(2)})^\dagger - \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(2)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}(\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)})^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

where

$$(\mathbf{H}_{11}^{(3)})_{pq} = \sum_{a,b} \langle pa \| bq \rangle \kappa_{ab} - \sum_{i,j} \langle pi \| qj \rangle \kappa_{ij} + \sum_{i,a} (1 + P(ia)) \langle pi \| qa \rangle k_i^a, \quad (98)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{ab} &= \sum_c \sum_{i>j} k_{ij}^{ac} k_{ij}^{bc}, \\ \kappa_{ij} &= \sum_l \sum_{a>b} k_{il}^{ab} k_{jl}^{ab} \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

and where  $P(ia)$  is the permutational interchange operation. The second-order matrices are

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(2)})_{abi,p} &= \sum_{m>n} \langle ip \| mn \rangle k_{mn}^{ab} + (1 - P(ab)) \sum_{m,c} \langle pc \| ma \rangle k_{im}^{bc}, \\ (\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(2)})_{ija,p} &= \sum_{b>c} \langle ap \| bc \rangle k_{ij}^{bc} + (1 - P(ij)) \sum_{m,c} \langle pm \| ci \rangle k_{jm}^{ac}, \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

and the first-order diagonal terms are

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{H}_{33}^{(1)})_{abi,cdj} &= \delta_{ij} \langle ab \| cd \rangle - \delta_{ac} \langle bj \| di \rangle + \delta_{ad} \langle bj \| ci \rangle \\ &+ \delta_{bc} \langle aj \| di \rangle - \delta_{ba} \langle aj \| ci \rangle, \\ (\mathbf{H}_{33}^{(1)})_{ija,klb} &= \delta_{ab} \langle ij \| kl \rangle + \delta_{ik} \langle jb \| la \rangle - \delta_{il} \langle jb \| ka \rangle \\ &- \delta_{jk} \langle ib \| la \rangle + \delta_{jl} \langle ib \| ka \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

*Fourth-order and partial fourth-order electron propagator.* Without including the operator manifold  $\mathbf{h}_5$  the full fourth-order propagator matrix can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_{(4)}^{-1}(E) &= \mathbf{G}_{(3)}^{-1}(E) + \mathbf{H}_{11}^{(4)} - \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(2)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(2)\dagger} \\ &- \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(3)\dagger} - \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(3)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)\dagger} \\ &- \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{33}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(2)\dagger} \\ &- \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(2)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{33}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)\dagger} \\ &- \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{33}^{(2)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)\dagger} \\ &- \mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{33}^{(1)}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)\dagger}(\mathbf{R}_{33}^{(0)}(E))^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{13}^{(1)\dagger}. \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

It is generally more important to include the contributions from the  $h_5$  manifold before increasing the order of the expansion [39] and one therefore finds it justifiable to study the electron propagator through what has been coined the “partial fourth-order” [23, 40], where only the terms formed from the matrices already obtained in third order are retained.

### Density matrices and many-electron wavefunction

The first-order reduced density matrix or the one-matrix can be calculated from Eq. (90) as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\xi|\xi') &= \langle 0|\psi^\dagger(\xi')\psi(\xi)|0\rangle = -i \lim_{t' \rightarrow t+0} \langle\langle \psi(\xi, t); \psi^\dagger(\xi', t') \rangle\rangle \\ &= (2\pi i)^{-1} \int_C \langle\langle \psi(\xi); \psi^\dagger(\xi') \rangle\rangle_E dE, \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where the contour  $C$  consists of the real axis and a semicircle in the upper half of the complex  $E$ -plane (see [7]). Residue calculus yields

$$\gamma(\xi|\xi') = \sum_r g_r(\xi) g_r^*(\xi'), \quad (104)$$

which can be compared to the equivalent definition

$$\gamma(\xi|\xi') = N \int \Phi_0(\xi, \xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{N-1}) \Phi_0^*(\xi', \xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{N-1}) d\xi_1 d\xi_2 \dots d\xi_{N-1} \quad (105)$$

in terms of the ground state  $N$ -electron wavefunction  $\Phi_0$ . Introducing the complete set of  $(N-1)$ -electron states  $\Phi_r$ , satisfying

$$\sum_r \Phi_r(X) \Phi_r^*(X') = \delta(X - X') \quad (106)$$

with the compound coordinate  $X = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{N-1})$ . Then

$$\gamma(\xi|\xi') = N \sum_r \int \Phi_0(\xi, X) \Phi_r^*(X) \Phi_0^*(\xi', X') \Phi_r(X') dX dX' \quad (107)$$

and we can identify the Feynman–Dyson amplitudes with the so-called overlap amplitudes

$$g_r(\xi) = N^{1/2} \int \Phi_0(\xi, X) \Phi_r^*(X) dX. \quad (108)$$

Obviously, if both wavefunctions in Eq. (108) are single determinants differing in one spin orbital, that spin orbital will correspond to the Feynman–Dyson amplitude, while for correlated wavefunctions the amplitudes are more general. In addition to being important for describing intensities in photoelectron spectra Feynman–Dyson amplitudes are also relevant for  $(e, 2e)$  experiments (see e.g. [45]).



*Photoionization intensities*

The electron propagator can be used to calculate total energies, excitation energies, and one-electron properties in general. However, it is perhaps most useful in the study of photoelectron spectroscopy. In addition to the electron binding energies it can also be used to obtain estimates of photoelectron intensities.

The differential photoionization cross section, i.e. the probability that the systems absorbs one photon causing a transition from the ground state with wavefunction  $|0\rangle = \Phi_0$  to an excited state  $|r\rangle$  consisting of a bound ion state with wavefunction  $|N-1, r\rangle = \Phi_r$  and an electron escaping into the solid angle  $d\Omega$  with wave vector  $\vec{k}_f$ , is

$$\frac{d\sigma_r}{d\Omega} = \frac{k_f}{2\pi c|A_0|^2\omega} \left| \langle r | \sum_{j=1}^N \vec{A}(\vec{r}_j) \cdot \vec{\nabla}_j | 0 \rangle \right|^2. \quad (109)$$

The vector potential of the monochromatic radiation field is  $\vec{A}(\vec{r}) = A_0 \vec{n} e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{r}}$  with polarization vector  $\vec{n}$  and frequency  $\omega$ . The approximate form of final (antisymmetric) state wavefunction,

$$|r\rangle = O_{AS} N^{1/2} v(\vec{k}_f, \xi_N) \Phi_r(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{N-1}) \equiv O_{AS} N^{1/2} v(\vec{k}_f, \xi_N) \Phi_r(X), \quad (110)$$

contains a photoelectron amplitude  $v$ , which should be a Feynman–Dyson continuum amplitude, but for a molecular system one usually has to settle for an assumed form. The antisymmetric projector is

$$O_{AS} = N^{-1} \left[ 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} P_{kN} \right] \quad (111)$$

with the simple interchange permutations  $P_{kN}$  of electron labels. This form of final wavefunction permits us to write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle r | \sum_{j=1}^N \vec{A}(\vec{r}_j) \cdot \vec{\nabla}_j | 0 \rangle &= \int v^*(\vec{k}_f, \xi) \vec{A} \cdot \vec{\nabla} g_r(\xi) d\xi \\ &+ \int v^*(\vec{k}_f, \xi) p_r(\xi) d\xi, \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

with

$$p_r(\xi) = (N-1) N^{1/2} \int \Phi_r^*(X) \vec{A}(\vec{r}_1) \cdot \vec{\nabla}_1 \Phi_0(X, \xi) dX. \quad (113)$$

The second term vanishes if  $v(\vec{k}_f, \xi)$  is strongly orthogonal to  $\Phi_0$ , which can be accomplished by making  $v(\vec{k}_f, \xi)$  orthogonal to the bound state basis. But even when strong orthogonality does not exist the second term is small for photoelectron energies far from threshold.

Retaining only the first term on the right of Eq. (112) and averaging over all incident photon directions relative to the fixed molecular frame and over the polarization directions assuming a random orientation of the molecules as in a gaseous sample and for unpolarized light, Eq. (109) becomes

$$\frac{d\sigma_r}{d\Omega} = \frac{k_f}{3\pi c\omega} \left| \int v^*(\vec{k}_f, \vec{r}) \vec{\nabla} g_r(\vec{r}) d\vec{r} \right|^2. \quad (114)$$

To obtain this result also the dipole approximation was invoked, i.e.  $e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{r}} \approx 1$  and multiplication by a factor 2 done to account for the two possible spin states of the

ejected electron. The choice of a plane wave, an orthogonalized plane wave, or a Coulomb wave for  $v(\vec{k}_f, \xi)$  has been tried with varying success depending on the system and the photon energy [16, 46]. The orthogonalized plane wave choice seems to work reasonably well for the detachment of an electron from a negative ion leaving a neutral species. A plane wave is convenient, but not particularly good under any conditions. It results in [26]

$$\frac{d\sigma_r}{d\Omega} = \frac{k_f}{3\pi c\omega} |\bar{P}_r|^2,$$

$$\bar{P}_r = -i\vec{k}_f (2\pi)^{-3/2} \sum_{p,q} c_{pr} e^{-i\vec{k}_f \cdot \vec{R}_q} \int e^{-i\vec{k}_f \cdot \vec{r}} \phi_p(\vec{r}) d\vec{r}, \quad (115)$$

where the Feynman–Dyson amplitude has been expressed as a linear combination of atomic orbitals (GTOs)  $\{\phi_p\}$

$$g_r(\vec{r}) = \sum_{p,q} \phi_p(\vec{r} - \vec{R}_q) c_{pr}. \quad (116)$$

The total cross section is given by integrating over all photoelectron directions

$$\sigma_r = \frac{k_f}{3\pi c\omega} \int |\bar{P}_r|^2 d\Omega. \quad (117)$$

Sometimes the ratios of pole strengths are used to predict relative intensities of structures in a photoelectron spectrum and that can work for peaks of not too disparate photoelectron energy.

### *The Vectorized Electron Propagator (VEP) program*

Approximations to various orders in perturbation theory of the electron propagator have been implemented in the Vectorized Electron Propagator (VEP) program. Poles and associated pole strengths are computed. This code is designed to be efficient by minimizing the number of floating point operations and by exploiting vector and parallel features of modern hardware. This is accomplished by avoiding redundant calculations through the definition of appropriate intermediates and by using symmetry wherever suitable.

The VEP code exploits the spin and point group symmetry to block the matrices from which the propagator matrix is built. Direct product decomposition (DPD) is used with a scheme that avoids redundant symmetry checks before each contraction. This procedure makes the code adapted to take advantage of parallel architectures.

Another feature of the VEP program is the possibility of a renormalized treatment of the reference state of the propagator via the use of CC amplitudes as well as the standard MBPT amplitudes. This is accomplished by interfacing the VEP code with the ACESII program system.

*The DPD scheme.* Efficient evaluation of matrix products necessary for the electron propagator calculations can be exemplified by a contraction

$$Q = T \times W. \quad (118)$$

The indices of the matrices can be divided into two categories, on the one hand the “target indices”  $t_1, t_2, \dots$ , which label the matrix  $Q$  and the “common” indices  $c_1, c_2, \dots$  over which the contraction is performed. The target indices can further be divided into those which  $Q$  shares with  $T$  and those which it shares with  $W$ , such that

$$Q_{t_1(T), t_2(T), \dots, t_1(W), t_2(W) \dots} = \sum_{c_1, c_2, \dots} T_{t_1(T), c} W_{c, t_1(W)} \dots \quad (119)$$

Each element of  $Q$ ,  $T$ , and  $W$  vanishes unless the direct product of the irreducible representations of all indices labelling the quantity in question contains the totally symmetric representation. For Abelian (sub)groups this requires only the following conditions to be fulfilled:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(t_1(T)) \otimes \Gamma(t_2(T)) \otimes \dots &= \Gamma(t_1(W)) \otimes \Gamma(t_2(W)) \otimes \dots \\ \Gamma(t_1(T)) \otimes \Gamma(t_2(T)) \otimes \dots &= \Gamma(c_1) \otimes \Gamma(c_2) \otimes \dots \\ \Gamma(c_1) \otimes \Gamma(c_2) \otimes \dots &= \Gamma(t_1(W)) \otimes \Gamma(t_2(W)) \otimes \dots \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

The details of the computational strategy as to storage of the data structures, the manipulation in core memory, the functionality of various subroutines, etc. are reported in a separate publication [47].

### 3. Results

The photoelectron spectroscopy (PES) offers techniques to study the electronic structure of atoms and molecules including transient and unstable species. This makes it a powerful tool to study reaction mechanisms in gas phase and on surfaces. PES has been used, for instance, to elucidate the electronic structure of donor–acceptor (DA) complexes.

As an illustration the electron propagator program VEP is used to calculate the main peaks of borane ( $\text{BH}_3$ ) with donors such as  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{CO}$ . These simple applications are limited to a second-order treatment of the electron propagator (EP2).

Monomeric borane has a very short lifetime, but is a strong Lewis acid and may be stabilized by forming complexes with Lewis bases [48].  $\text{BH}_3$  resembles a transition metal atom in a low oxidation state, in the sense that it can form complexes with, say, carbon monoxide and phosphorous trifluoride having negligible basicity. It has been suggested that the complexes of  $\text{BH}_3$  with  $\text{CO}$  or  $\text{PF}_3$  are formed via a  $\pi$ -type delocalization of the  $\text{BH}_3$   $e$ -orbitals into unoccupied  $\text{CO}$  and  $\text{PF}_3$  orbitals. The study of systems such as  $\text{BH}_3 \cdot \text{CO}$  and  $\text{BH}_3 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  may provide experience as to the reliability and suitability of the electron propagator as a tool for analyzing PES experiments on heterogeneous catalysis, for instance,  $\text{CO}$  chemisorption and reactions (methanol synthesis) on low oxidation state  $d^{10}$  transition metal oxide surfaces, such as  $\text{ZnO}(10\bar{1}0)$  and also  $\text{CuCl}(111)$  [49].

#### *Molecular geometries*

The electron propagator program is implemented in the ACES II program system [50]. All calculations presented were performed on an IBM RS/6000–580. The

**Table 1.** Optimized geometries at the MBPT [2] level with pVDZ bases. The notation  $H_s$  means that the proton lies in the symmetry plane of the  $C_s$  point group

Complex	Point group	Geometrical parameter	MBPT [2]/pVDZ	Experimental
$H_3B \cdot CO$	$C_{3v}$	BC	1.565 Å	1.540 Å
		CO	1.144 Å	1.131 Å
		BH	1.217 Å	1.194 Å
		CBH	103.8°	104.2°
$H_3B \cdot OC$	$C_{3v}$	BO	2.585 Å	
		CO	1.147 Å	
		BH	1.203 Å	
		OBH	90.9°	
$H_3B \cdot OH_2$	$C_s$	BO	1.730 Å	
		OH	0.963 Å	
		BH and BH <sub>s</sub>	1.214	
		OBH	100.6°	
		OBH <sub>s</sub>	103.7°	
$H_3B$	$D_{3h}$	BH	1.203 Å	
CO	$C_{\infty v}$	CO	1.147 Å	1.128 Å
$H_2O$	$C_{2v}$	OH	0.964 Å	0.958 Å
		HOH	102.0°	104.5°

**Table 2.** An FRS is a “factor of reduction due to symmetry” of cpu time used. The VEP code in the ACES II program system achieves for this case a factor of more than 10 speed-up in the execution of the code

Molecule	Size of basis	Point group	Achieved FRS
$BH_3$	72	$C_1$	1.0
		$C_{2v}$	10.3

basis sets are correlated consistent pVDZ [51], which consist of  $(9s4p1d/[3s2p1d])$  for first row elements and  $(4s1p)/[2s1p]$  for hydrogen. All structures are optimized at the RHF/MBPT [2] level of theory. The results are listed in Table 1.

### Symmetry

The effects of molecular symmetry on the performance of the code is illustrated by calculating the PES of  $BH_3$  at the EP2 level in the pVTZ basis, i.e.  $(10s5p2d1f)/[4s3p2d1f]/[(5s2p1d)/[3s2p1d])$  in the maximal Abelian subgroup  $C_{2v}$  and in  $C_1$ . The theoretical factors of reduction (in computing time or total number of floating point operations) due to symmetry (FRS) have been defined [37] and is found in many cases for total energy calculations using the CCSD (coupled-cluster singles and doubles) level of theory to be close to the symmetry group order square. As displayed in Table 2 the present calculation does not quite reach that efficiency improvement with the symmetry treatment, but still a respectable reduction in computing time is achieved.

*Donor-acceptor PES*

The photoelectron spectrum with a UV source (UPS) of  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{OH}_2$  calculated at the SCF (Koopmans' theorem) and the EP2 levels are compared to experimental results [52] in Table 3.

Due to the hydrolysis of diborane the experimental investigation of the  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{OH}_2$  complex is difficult [48] and introduces some uncertainty about whether the observed features in the He I spectrum really is due to  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{OH}_2$  or something else. The agreement between the calculated (EP2) peaks and the UPS spectrum is as expected except for the observed feature at 14.4 eV. This is not consistent with the theoretical result, but before suggesting that this feature might not be due to  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{OH}_2$  the electron propagator calculations have to be carried to the third or partial fourth order and also a larger basis used.

Comparison of Koopmans' theorem and the EP2 results with experiment for the  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{CO}$  complex is presented in Table 4.

Similar calculations are carried out for the  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{OC}$  complex and are reported in Table 5.

There is definitely a better agreement between the calculated and the observed PES for  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{CO}$  than for  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{OC}$  indicating the discriminatory power of the electron propagator theory even at this primitive level.

In conclusion one can again reaffirm what has already been established by many workers in the field, namely that the propagator theory is an appropriate and practical approach to the interpretation and prediction of spectra. The results presented here also show that in order to contain truly quantitative agreement with experiment it is necessary to consider electron propagator theory at the third and partial fourth order and to also be able to accommodate larger basis sets.

**Table 3.** Electron propagator poles at the SCF at the SCF level (Koopmans) and at the EP2 level are compared with experiment for the  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{OH}_2$  complex

Assignment	Koopmans (eV)	EP2 (eV) (pole strength)	Experiment UPS (eV)
$\pi(\text{B-H}) 7a'$	11.3	10.5 (0.93)	9.7
$\pi(\text{B-H}) 7a'$	11.8	11.1 (0.94)	10.6
$\sigma(\text{B-O}) 6a'$	15.6	13.5 (0.91)	11.8
$n(\text{O}) 5a'$	16.4	14.2 (0.90)	13.2
$n(\text{O}) + \sigma(\text{B-O}) 4a'$	20.7	18.6 (0.89)	14.4

**Table 4.** Electron propagator poles at the SCF (Koopmans) level and at the EP2 level compared with experiment for the  $\text{H}_3\text{B}\cdot\text{CO}$  complex

Assignment	Koopmans (eV)	EP2 (eV) (pole strength)	Experiment UPS (eV)
$2e(\text{B-H})$	12.8	11.9 (0.92)	11.9
$6a_1(\text{B-C})$	15.1	13.9 (0.91)	14.1
$1e(\text{C-O})$	18.6	17.1 (0.87)	17.0
$5a_1(\text{CO})$	21.6	18.1 (0.85)	18.5 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Adiabatic ionization energy

**Table 5.** Comparison of the electron propagator poles at the SCF (Koopmans) level and at the EP2 level with the same UPS spectrum as in Table 4

Assignment	Koopmans (eV)	EP2 (eV) (pole strength)	Experiment UPS (eV)
2e (B-H)	13.2	12.6 (0.94)	11.9
6a <sub>1</sub> (B-C)	15.3	14.0 (0.92)	14.1
1e (C-O)	17.5	16.3 (0.89)	17.0
5a <sub>1</sub> (B-H)	18.7	17.5 (0.92)	18.5 <sup>a</sup>
4a <sub>1</sub> (C-O)	22.5	19.0 (0.86)	

<sup>a</sup> Adiabatic ionization energy

*Acknowledgments.* This work is supported by the Office of Naval Research (ONR). We gratefully acknowledge the support for one of us (B. C.) from the Belgian Fund for Scientific Research. The use of Vincent Ortiz' EPT90 code for verification of the VEP code is gratefully acknowledged. One of us (Y. Ö.) would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge more than thirty years of professional collaboration and personal friendship with Jan Linderberg.

## References

- Nozière P (1964) Theory of interacting fermi systems. W. A. Benjamin Inc., New York
- Zubarev DN (1960) Sov Phys Uspekhi 3:320
- Hedin L, Lundqvist S. (1969) Solid State Phys. 23:1
- Linderberg J, Öhrn Y (1965) Proc Roy Soc (London) A285:445
- Öhrn Y, Linderberg J (1965) Phys Rev 139:A1063
- Linderberg J, Öhrn Y (1967) Chem Phys Lett 1:295
- Linderberg J, Öhrn (1973) Propagators in quantum chemistry. Academic Press, New York
- Pickup B, Goscinski O (1973) Mol Phys 26:1013
- Jørgensen P, Simons J (1981) Second quantization-based methods in quantum chemistry. Academic Press, New York
- Schirmer J, Cederbaum LS, Walter O (1983) Phys Rev A 28:1237
- Deleuze M, Delhalle J, Pickup BT, Calais JL (1992) Phys Rev B 46:15668
- Purvis GD, Öhrn Y (1974) J Chem Phys 60:4063
- Purvis GD, Öhrn Y (1975) J Chem Phys 62:2045
- Cederbaum LS, Domcke W (1977) In: Prigogine I, Rice SA (eds). Advances in chemical physics, Vol 36. Wiley, New York, p 205
- Csanak G, Taylor HS, Yaris R (1971) In: Bates DR, Esterman I (eds) Advances in atomic and molecular physics, Vol 7. Academic Press, New York, p 287
- Mishra M, Öhrn Y (1980) Int J Quantum Chem Quantum Chem Symp 14:335
- Caravetta V, Moccia R (1978) Mol Phys 35:129
- Holleboom LJ, Snijders JG, Baerends EJ, Buijse MA (1988) J Chem Phys 89:3638
- Simons J (1973) Chem Phys 59:2436
- Pickup BT (1992) Int J Quantum Chem Quantum Chem Symp 26:13
- Ortiz JV (1992) Int J Quantum Chem Quantum Chem Symp 26:1
- Cioslowski J, Ortiz JV (1992) J Chem Phys 96:8379
- Ortiz JV (1988) Int J Quantum Chem Quantum Chem Symp 22:431
- Ortiz JV (1989) Int J Quantum Chem Quantum Chem Symp 23:321
- Lehmann H (1954) Nuovo Cimento 11:342
- Öhrn Y, Born G (1981) Adv Quantum Chem 13:1
- Goscinski O, Lukman B (1970) Chem Phys Lett 7:573

28. Löwdin PO (1965) *Phys Rev* 139:A357
29. Nehr Korn C, Purvis GD, Öhrn Y (1976) *J Chem Phys* 64:1752
30. Born G, Kurtz HA, Öhrn Y (1978) *J Chem Phys* 68:74
31. Graham RL, Golab JT, Yeager DL (1988) *J Chem Phys* 88:2572
32. Bartlett RJ (1989) *J Phys Chem* 93:1697
33. Ortiz JV (1991) *Int J Quantum Chem Quantum Chem Symp* 25:35
34. Ortiz JV (1992) *Chem Phys Lett* 530
35. Geertsen J, Oddershede J (1986) *J Chem Phys* 85:211
36. Geertsen J, Eriksen S, Oddershede J *Adv Quantum Chem* 22:167
37. Stanton JF, Gauss J, Watts JD, Bartlett RJ (1991) *J Chem Phys* 94:4334
38. Purvis III GD, Bartlett RJ (1981) *J Chem Phys* 75:1284
39. Redmon LT, Purvis GD, Öhrn Y (1975) *J Chem Phys* 63:5011
40. Purvis GD, Öhrn Y (1977) *Int J Quantum Chem Quantum Chem Symp* 11:359
41. Cederbaum LS (1973) *Theor Chim Acta* 31:239
42. Cederbaum LS (1973) *Mol Phys* 26:1405
43. Layzer AJ (1963) *Phys Rev* 129:897
44. Jørgensen P, Simons J (1975) *J Chem Phys* 63:5302
45. McCarthy IE, Weigold E (1976) *Phys Reports* 27C:275
46. Mishra M, Öhrn Y (1980) *Chem Phys Lett* 71:549
47. Longo R, Champagne B, Öhrn Y (1994) *J Comp Chem*, to be submitted
48. Lloyd DR, Lynaugh N (1972) *J Chem Soc Faraday Trans II* 68:947
49. Solomon EI, Jones PM, May JA (1993) *Chem Rev* 93:2623
50. Stanton JF, Gauss J, Watts JD, Lauderdale WJ, Bartlett RJ (1992) *Int J Quantum Chem Quantum Chem Symp* 26:879
51. Dunning TH, (1989) *J Chem Phys* 90:1007
52. Pradeep T, Rao CNR (1989) *J Mol Struct (Theochem)* 200:339