## **REGULAR ARTICLE**

**Frank Jensen**

# **On the accuracy of numerical Hartree–Fock energies**

Received: 30 September 2004 / Accepted: 1 October 2004 / Published online: 28 January 2005 © Springer-Verlag 2005

**Abstract** It is demonstrated that numerical Hartree–Fock (HF) energies reported in the literature in some cases have errors in the milliHartree range. The main cause of these errors is due to the use of too small a value for the 'practical infinity' parameter in the finite difference method for generating the results. By systematically investigating the convergence with respect to the computational parameters, HF energies accurate to at least 1 microHartree are generated for 42 diatomic systems containing first and second row elements, encompassing both cationic, neutral and anionic systems.

## **1 Introduction**

The prediction of molecular stabilities by first-principle electronic structure methods is a subject that has attracted much attention over the last decade. The theoretical framework is conceptually simple: determine the minimum energy geometry, estimate the infinite-correlation infinite-basis-set limit for the electronic energy, and add vibrational zero-point energies and finite temperature corrections to give molecular heat of formation, which can be directly related to experimental results.A brute force approach for the second step, estimating the infinite-correlation infinite-basis-set limit, is not feasible, and composite methods are often used instead, as exemplified by the CBS-n [1],  $G_n$  [2],  $W_n$  [3] and focal point [4] methods. The computationally difficult part in these methods is estimating the correlation energy, but extrapolations [5] based on the correlation-consistent basis sets [6] or the use of explicitly correlated wave functions [7] have made a large step towards solving this problem. The basis set convergence of the Hartree–Fock (HF) energy is significantly faster than the correlation energy, and the HF basis set error is often assumed to be negligible, but as the effort towards higher accuracy continues, this error at some point must also be addressed.

F. Jensen

For atoms and diatomic systems, the limiting HF energy can be obtained by solving the integro-differential equations by finite difference or finite elements methods [8], and these results provide an absolute reference against which the results from finite basis sets can be evaluated. We have recently proposed a hierarchy of polarization-consistent basis sets [9,10], which, although optimized for density functional methods, should also be suitable for estimating the HF basis set limit. In connection with this work, we have in several cases obtained energies by (large) basis set calculations that were significantly different or even lower than the limiting HF energies reported in the literature, casting doubt on the accuracy of these results. In the present paper, we examine the cause of these discrepancies, and report HF energies for a selection of diatomic systems composed of first and second row elements, which should be accurate to at least 1 microHartree.

### **2 Results and discussion**

All calculations have been done using the *2dhf* program [11], which solves the integro-differential HF equations by a finite difference method [8]. The orbital densities are evaluated on a grid in the transformed prolate spheroidal coordinates ν and  $\mu$  used for representing the radial wave function, while the angular part is solved analytically. The method in addition employs a 'practical infinity' distance parameter  $(R_{\infty})$ for estimating the asymptotic behavior in the  $\mu$  coordinate. The accuracy of a finite difference HF calculation is thus determined by four parameters: the grid sizes for the  $\nu$  and  $\mu$ coordinates, the value for  $R_{\infty}$  and the convergence criteria for terminating the iterative procedure. If the increment between grid points in the  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  coordinates is chosen to be equal, the number of independent parameters is reduced to three, and this has been employed in the present case. A constant grid spacing determined by the number of  $\nu$  grid points has as the consequence that the number of  $\mu$  grid points increases with  $R_{\infty}$ , as reflected in Tables 1, 2 and 3. The convergence criterion has in all cases been set to 10−12, which is sufficient

Department of Chemistry, University of Southern Denmark, 5230 Odense, Denmark E-mail: frj@doii.dk

System	Grid	$R_{\infty}$	HF energy
$^1CH^+$	$169 \times 193$	30	$-37.9099113^a$
$R = 2.137$ au	$169 \times 229$	40	$-37.9099112$
	$175 \times 325$	200	$-37.9099112$
	$217\times 403$	200	$-37.9099112$
${}^{3}CH^{-}$	$169\times229$	40	$-38.2933200$
$R = 2.20$ au	$175 \times 325$	200	$-38.2933200$
	$217\times 403$	200	–38.2933200
3NH	$81\times105$		$-54.978429b$
$R = 1.9614$ au	$169 \times 235$	40	$-54.9784239$
	$175 \times 331$	200	–54.9784239
	217×409	200	-54.9784239
$1$ OH <sup>-</sup>	$211 \times 211$	45	$-75.4188033^a$
$R = 1.781$ au	$169 \times 241$	40	–75.4188031
	$175 \times 337$	200	–75.4188031
	$217\times 415$	200	$-75.4188031$
$1$ FH	$81\times161$		$-100.07082$ <sup>c</sup>
$R = 1.7328$ au	$169 \times 193$	30	$-100.0708028$ <sup>a</sup>
	$169 \times 253$	60	$-100.0708025$ <sup>d</sup>
	$169\times241$	40	$-100.0708025$
	$175 \times 337$	200	$-100.0708025$
	$217\times 421$	200	$-100.0708025$
${}^1C_2$			
			$-75.406565^{\circ}$ $-75.4065652$
$R = 2.358$ au	$169 \times 223$	40	
	$175 \times 319$	200	$-75.4065652$
	$217 \times 397$	200	–75.4065652
${}^{2}CN$	$319\times415$	40	$-92.2251341$ <sup>f</sup>
$R = 1.1718 \text{ Å}$	$169 \times 229$	40	$-92.2251382$
	$175 \times 325$	200	-92.2251382
	$217\times 403$	200	$-92.2251382$
${}^{1}CN^{-}$	$211 \times 211$	50	$-92.3489506^a$
$R = 2.214$ au	$169\times229$	40	-92.3489505
	$175 \times 325$	200	$-92.3489505$
	$217\times 403$	200	-92.3489506
${}^1N_2$	$57\times105$		$-108.99381c$
$R = 2.068$ au	229×229	25	$-108.9938257$ <sup>g</sup>
	$169 \times 193$	30	$-108.9938260$ ª
	$169\times229$	40	-108.9938256
	$175 \times 325$	200	–108.9938256
	$217\times 409$	200	$-108.9938256$
$11NO+$	$169 \times 193$	30	$-128.9780516^a$
$R = 2.007$ au	$169 \times 235$	40	-128.9780515
	$175 \times 331$	200	–128.9780515
	$217\times 409$	200	$-128.9780515$
$1 NO^-$	$169 \times 223$	40	$-129.2801373$
$R = 2.36$ au	$175 \times 319$	200	$-129.2801743$
	$175 \times 331$	250	–129.2801744
	$175 \times 343$	300	$-129.2801745$
	217×427	300	$-129.2801745$
${}^{1}CO$	$81\times113$		$-112.79095c$
$R = 2.132$ au	$169 \times 193$	25	$-112.790906$ g
	$169 \times 253$	60	$-112.7909072d$
	$169 \times 229$	40	-112.7909072
	$175 \times 325$		$-112.7909072$
		200	

Table 1 Convergence of the HF energy as a function of the grid size and  $R_{\infty}$  parameter for systems composed of first row elements. Grid is<br>the number of grid points in the u and u coordinates respectively.

Table 1 (Contd.)



function of the v grid size and the  $R_{\infty}$  parameter, and the last entry in each case should be within  $\sim 0.2$  microHartree of the limiting value. It should be noted that the energy does not vary monotonic with the  $R_{\infty}$  parameter. As a check of the accuracy of the final results, we have also estimated the HF limit by extrapolation of the results using the aug-pc-2, -3 and -4 basis sets, and these energies in each case agree with the numerical results to with a few tenths of a microHartree.

For the first row systems in Table 1, it is clear that a typical  $R_{\infty}$  value of 40 au is sufficient for species like C<sub>2</sub> and  $N_2$ , but inadequate for system like  $O_2$  and  $F_2$ , where a cutoff value of  $\sim$ 300 au is required for converging the results to a microHartree accuracy. We note that several literature values deviate by several tenths of a microHartree relative to the converged results. Furthermore, the employed  $R_{\infty}$  value

to ensure convergence to at least  $\sim 0.02$  microHartree for the present systems.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 list HF energies for 42 diatomic species composed of first and second row elements having wave functions of  $\sum$  symmetry. The total energy is given as a

Table 2 Convergence of the HF energy as a function of the grid size and  $R_{\infty}$  parameter for systems composed of first and second row elements. Grid is the number of grid points in the  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  coordinates,

	Table 2 (Contd.)
--	------------------





<sup>a</sup>Ref. [12] <sup>b</sup>Ref. [18]

 ${}^cR = 2.9006$  au. The corresponding converged value at this geometry is -435.3623913  ${}^d$ Ref. [19]

<sup>e</sup>Ref. [20]

and convergence criterion for terminating the iterative procedure is often not given, making it difficult to reproduce the reported values. For systems involving second row elements (Tables 2 and 3), the cutoff value must in some cases be even larger, and a significantly larger grid is also required in order to converge the results to within 1 microHartree. For some of the systems (SiN and  $P_2$ ), the converged results deviate from the literature value by several milliHartrees.

A priori, it might have been expected that anions with loosely bound electrons would require larger values for  $R_{\infty}$ in order to obtain converged results. The results in Tables 1, 2 and 3, however, only show a weakly trend in this direction. The  $R_{\infty}$  value required for systems like  $F_2$  and  $Cl_2$ is already so large that it also suffices for the corresponding anion. Cations are not expected to have requirements different from the neutral species, and only a few have been included for comparison with literature values.

**Table 3** Convergence of the HF energy as a function of the grid size and  $R_{\infty}$  parameter for systems composed of second row elements. Grid is the number of grid points in the  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  coordinates, respectively

Grid	$R_{\infty}$	HF energy
$121 \times 137$	30	$-686.516707$ <sup>a</sup>
		$-686.5162620$
$175\times295$	200	$-686.5162806$
$175 \times 307$	250	$-686.5162807$
$175 \times 319$	300	$-686.5162808$
259×475	300	$-686.5162842$
$277\times 505$	300	$-686.5162842$
$61\times 61$		$-681.508b$
$169 \times 199$	40	$-681.5000151$
$175\times295$	200	$-681.5002505$
$175 \times 331$	350	$-681.5002523$
$175 \times 337$	400	$-681.5002523$
$259\times 499$	400	$-681.5002552$
$295\times571$	400	$-681.5002553$
$169 \times 199$	40	$-738.3396168$
$175 \times 295$	200	-738.3397021
$175 \times 319$	300	$-738.3397027$
$175 \times 325$	350	$-738.3397026$
259×481	350	$-738.3397073$
$295 \times 553$	350	$-738.3397074$
$169 \times 199$	40	$-795.0911928$
$175\times295$	200	$-795.0915518$
$175 \times 319$	300	$-795.0915540$
$175 \times 325$	350	$-795.0915541$
$259\times 481$	350	-795.0915589
$295 \times 553$	350	$-795.0915590$
$169 \times 193$	40	-857.1042706
$175 \times 289$	200	$-857.1044078$
$175 \times 331$	400	$-857.1044093$
$175 \times 337$	450	$-857.1044093$
	400	$-857.1044184$
$295\times 559$	400	$-857.1044186$
$169 \times 199$	40	$-919.0083635$
$175 \times 295$	200	$-919.0089219$
$175 \times 325$	350	$-919.0089254$
$175 \times 331$	400	$-919.0089255$
259×493	400	-919.0089343
$295\times565$	400	-919.0089345
$169 \times 181$	40	$-919.0785465$
$175\times277$	200	$-919.0795182$
$175 \times 319$	400	$-919.0795280$
$175 \times 325$	450	$-919.0795279$
$259\times 469$	400	$-919.0795631$
$277\times 505$	400	-919.0795635
$295\times535$	400	$-919.0795637$
	$169 \times 199$ $259\times 487$	40

 $b$ Ref. [18]

#### **3 Summary**

Numerical Hartree–Fock energies with an accuracy of at least  $1\mu$  Hartree are reported for 42 diatomic species composed of first and second row elements. It is shown that literature values in some cases are in error by several microHartrees for first row systems and by several milliHartrees for second row systems.

190 F. Jensen

**Acknowledgements** This work was supported by grants from the Danish Center for Scientific Computation and the Danish Natural Science Research Council.

### **References**

- 1. Montgomery JA Jr, Ochterski JW, Petersson GA (1994) J Chem Phys 101:5900
- 2. (a) Curtiss, LA, Raghavachari K, Redfern PC, RassolovV, Pople JA (1998) J Chem Phys 109:7764; (b) Curtiss A, Redfern PC, Raghavachari K, Pople JA (2002) Chem Phys Lett 359:390
- 3. Boese DA, Oren M, Atasoylu O, Martin JML, Kallay G, Gauss J (2004) J Chem Phys 120:4129
- 4. Schuurman MS, Muir SR, Allen WD, Schaefer III HF (2004) J Chem Phys 120:11586
- 5. Halkier A, Helgaker T, Jorgensen P, Klopper W, Koch H, Olsen J, Wilson AK (1998) Chem Phys Lett 286:243
- 6. (a) Dunning TH Jr (1989) J Chem Phys 90:1007; (b) Peterson KA, Dunning TH Jr (2002) J Chem Phys 117:10548
- 7. (a) Noga J, Valiron P, Klopper W (2001) J Chem Phys 115:2022; (b) Noga J, Klopper W  $(2003)$  Chem Phys Chem 4:32
- 8. (a) Kobus J (1997) Adv Quant Chem 28:1; (b) McCullough EA Jr (1998) Encyclopedia of Comput Chem 3:1941
- 9. (a) Jensen F (2001) J Chem Phys 115:9113; (b) Jensen F (2002) J Chem Phys 116:3502
- 10. (a) Jensen F (2002) J Chem Phys 116:7372; (b) Jensen F (2002) J Chem Phys 117:9234; (c) Jensen F (2003) J Chem Phys 118:2459; (d) Jensen F, Helgaker T (2004) J Chem Phys 121:3462
- 11. Kobus J, Laaksonen L, Sundholm D (1996) Comp Phys Commun 98:346
- 12. Roy AK, Thakkar AJ (2002) Chem Phys Lett 362:428
- 13. Laaksonen L, Müller-Plathe F, Diercksen GHF (1988) J Chem Phys 89:4903
- 14. Sundholm D, Pyykkö P, Laaksonen L (1985) Mol Phys 56:1411
- 15. Halkier A, Helgaker T, Jørgensen P, Klopper W, Olsen J (1999) Chem Phys Lett 302:437
- 16. Kobus J, Moncrieff D, Wilson S (1999) Mol Phys 96:1559
- 17. (a) Moncrieff D, Wilson S (1993) Chem Phys Lett 209:423; (b) Kobus J (1993) Chem Phys Lett 202:7; (c) Moncrieff D, Kobus J, Wilson S (1995) J Phys B At Mol Opt Phys 28:4555
- 18. Pyykkö P, Diercksen GHF, Müller-Plathe F, Laaksonen L (1987) Chem Phys Lett 134:575
- 19. Kobus J, Moncrieff D, Wilson S (1994) J Phys B At Mol Opt Phys 27:2867
- 20. Müller-Plathe F, Laaksonen L (1989) Chem Phys Lett 160:175