

A new computational framework for spinor-based relativistic exact two-component calculations using contracted basis functions

Chaoqun Zhang,¹ Kirk A. Peterson,² Kenneth G. Dyall,³ and Lan Cheng¹

¹*Department of Chemistry, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA*

²*Department of Chemistry, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164, USA*

³*Dirac Solutions, Portland, OR 97229, USA*

(*Electronic mail: bbzhchq@gmail.com)

A new computational framework for spinor-based relativistic exact two-component (X2C) calculations is developed using contracted basis sets with a spin-orbit contraction scheme. Generally contracted j-adapted basis sets using primitive functions in the correlation-consistent basis sets are constructed for the X2C Hamiltonian with atomic mean-field spin-orbit integrals (the X2CAMF scheme). The contraction coefficients are taken from atomic X2CAMF Hartree-Fock spinors, hereby following the simple concept of linear combination of atomic orbitals (LCAOs). Benchmark calculations of spin-orbit splittings, equilibrium bond lengths, and harmonic vibrational frequencies demonstrate the accuracy and efficacy of the j-adapted spin-orbit contraction scheme.

I. INTRODUCTION

Relativistic effects¹⁻⁹, including scalar relativistic and spin-dependent effects, play important roles in chemistry and molecular physics involving heavy atoms. The most rigorous but computationally expensive treatments of relativistic effects in quantum chemistry are offered by four-component methodologies^{5,10-24} based on and the Dirac-Coulomb (-Breit) Hamiltonian. To alleviate the computational cost, two-component methods²⁵⁻³² have been developed by decoupling the electronic and positronic degrees of freedom and using the resulting “electrons-only” Hamiltonian. Further reduction of computational costs can be achieved via spin separation³³⁻³⁵ to include only the scalar-relativistic terms. Variational treatment of scalar-relativistic effects, for its simplicity and compatibility with non-relativistic quantum chemistry programs, has become the standard practice for calculations involving heavy elements. In contrast, calculations with a variational treatment of spin-orbit coupling at the orbital level, i.e., calculations in the spinor representation, are less used in practical calculations because of higher computational costs. Apart from spin-symmetry breaking, an important reason for the computational overheads in spinor-based relativistic two-component calculations is the significant increase of the number of basis functions due to the use of uncontracted basis sets. For example, the uncontracted cc-pVTZ basis set for a 6p-block element³⁶ has 270 basis functions, to be compared with 68 basis functions in the standard, contracted cc-pVTZ set. Therefore, it is of importance to enable spinor-based relativistic quantum-chemical calculations using contracted basis sets.

Four-component theories that treat electronic and positronic degrees of freedom on an equal footing have intrinsic difficulty³⁷ using contracted Gaussian-type orbitals (GTOs).^{38,39} Using contracted basis functions for the large component and basis functions generated using the kinetic balance condition⁴⁰ for the small component leads to significant deviations in orbital energies from those obtained using uncontracted basis functions⁴¹. Contraction coefficients for Dyall’s correlation-consistent basis sets⁴²⁻⁴⁴ have been developed for four-component calculations based on the atomic balance condition. However, variational instability has still been observed when the contracted large and small-component basis functions are used separately. On the other hand, two-component theories possess only electronic degrees of freedom and are compatible with the use of contracted basis sets. Scalar-relativistic contracted basis sets for spin-free two-component calculations have the same structure as the corresponding non-relativistic ones, i.e., contracted

basis functions representing atomic orbitals with the same principal quantum number n and orbital angular momentum l share the same contraction coefficients. Scalar-relativistic contracted basis sets^{42,44–57} have been developed and widely used for a variety of spin-free relativistic two-component approaches, including the scalar-relativistic effective core potentials (ECPs)^{58–60}, spin-free Douglas–Kroll–Hess (DKH) approach^{61,62}, spin-free zeroth-order regular approximation (ZORA)²⁶, and spin-free exact two-component theory in its one-electron variant (the SFX2C-1e scheme)^{32,63}.

In spinor-based relativistic two-component calculations, atomic spinors with the same n, l values but different total angular momentum j values are energetically and spatially distinct. The use of scalar-relativistic contracted basis functions thus could lead to significant errors⁶⁴ due to this mismatch between basis functions and actual atomic spinors. Weigend and collaborators⁶⁴ have shown that the errors can be mitigated by adding steep functions to the basis sets. They have constructed contracted basis sets for two-component calculations using spin-orbit ECPs (the XZVP-2c basis sets)⁶⁵ and all-electron X2C-1e Hamiltonian (the XZVPall-2c basis sets)^{64,66}. These basis sets have the same structure as scalar-relativistic ones and can exploit the available computational framework for the evaluation of integrals and construction of Fock matrices. On the other hand, the exponents for the additional steep functions need to be optimized. The inclusion of these functions also increases the number of virtual spinors and hence the cost of electron-correlation calculations. Furthermore, the segmented contraction scheme adopted in the work by Weigend and collaborators may potentially suffer from linear dependencies when one aims at approaching the basis-set limit in treatments of electron correlation, since X2C calculations involve solution of four-component eigenvalue equations in the matrix representation of uncontracted basis functions.

The recent development of spinor-based relativistic exact two-component wavefunction-based methods^{67–75} call for development of the corresponding generally contracted basis sets. In this paper, we develop a “j-adapted” spin-orbit contraction scheme using separate contraction coefficients for spinors with the same n and l values but different j values. We report the construction of j-adapted contracted basis sets for the X2C Hamiltonian^{27,31,32} with atomic mean-field⁷⁶ spin-orbit integrals (the X2CAMF scheme)^{77,78}. We have adopted the primitive GTOs in the correlation-consistent basis sets developed by Dyal^{42,44,79}, by Dunning and co-workers^{80–82}, and by Bross and Peterson³⁶, and have taken coefficients of X2CAMF-HF atomic spinors as the contraction co-

efficient. This j -adapted contraction scheme represents a faithful implementation of the generic idea of linear combination of atomic orbitals (LCAOs) and also eliminates the need to optimize additional steep functions. The use of a j -adapted contracted basis set increases the number of scalar basis functions, but the number of total molecular spinors remains only twice that of the corresponding spin-free contracted basis set. This scheme thus enhances the computational efficiency for electron-correlation calculations. In the following we will present the computational scheme to construct and use j -adapted spin-orbit contracted basis sets together with benchmark calculations to demonstrate its accuracy.

II. CONSTRUCTION OF CONTRACTED BASIS SETS AND COMPUTATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION

In a relativistic two-component calculation, a Gaussian-type function with angular momentum $l > 0$ in general falls into one of three categories. It may contribute $2l$ spinor basis functions with $j = l - \frac{1}{2}$ or $2l + 2$ spinor basis functions with $j = l + \frac{1}{2}$. Or it may provide $4l + 2$ spinor basis functions of both types with $j = l \pm \frac{1}{2}$. In an uncontracted or spin-free contracted basis set, all basis functions belong to the third category. In the present j -adapted spin-orbit contraction scheme, the contracted basis functions that represent atomic spinors within the minimum basis (MB) belong to the first or second category. The remaining uncontracted basis functions including polarization and correlating functions belong to the third category.

Take the cc-pVTZ sets for Bi as an example. We use “cc-pVTZ-SF” and “cc-pVTZ-SO” to denote the spin-free and j -adapted spin-orbit contracted sets. The primitive set (30s26p17d11f) has 270 scalar basis functions. The cc-pVTZ-SF set is an [8s7p5d2f] set, and has 68 scalar basis functions. It is obtained by augmenting the MB [6s5p3d1f] with a set of uncontracted functions (2s2p2d1f). In the j -adapted contraction scheme, the MB consists of 6 contracted s functions, 5 contracted $p_{1/2}$ functions, 5 contracted $p_{3/2}$ functions, 3 contracted $d_{3/2}$ functions, 3 contracted $d_{5/2}$ functions, 1 contracted $f_{5/2}$ function, and 1 contracted $f_{7/2}$ function. The MB thus has a size of [6s10p6d2f] in terms of scalar basis functions. Namely, the number of scalar p , d , and f functions within the MB is doubled in the j -adapted contraction scheme. All uncontracted functions belong to the third category. Altogether, the cc-pVTZ-SO set is an [8s12p8d3f] set with 105 scalar basis functions. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the spin-orbit contraction scheme in general




FIG. 1. Number of scalar basis functions in spin-free (SF), spin-orbit (SO), and uncontracted (unc) basis sets of triple-zeta quality.

significantly reduces the number of basis functions compared to the uncontracted basis sets. We should emphasize that, although the cc-pVTZ-SO set has 37 more scalar basis functions than the cc-pVTZ-SF set, the cc-pVTZ-SO set generates 136 spinors, which is exactly twice the number of scalar basis functions in the cc-pVTZ-SF set.

For comparison, let us look at the the x2c-SVPall-SO [7s11p7d2f] set, which is obtained by augmenting the corresponding spin-free relativistic contracted basis set x2c-SVPall [7s7p4d2f] with 4 additional p and 3 additional d steep functions. The x2c-TZVPall-SO set has 89 scalar basis functions and generates 178 spinor basis functions. As mentioned above, the cc-pVTZ-SO set has 105 scalar basis functions and generates 136 spinor basis functions. Although it has a smaller number of scalar basis functions, the x2c-SVPall-SO set generates 42 more virtual spinors than the cc-pVTZ-SO set, and the extra virtual spinors generated from the additional tight functions do not improve the correlating space for valence correlation. This example demonstrates that the j -adapted spin-orbit contraction scheme is more efficient for electron-correlation calculations than augmenting spin-free contracted sets with additional steep functions.

Two-component X2CAMF calculations involve only non-relativistic molecular two-electron integrals. As explained above, each contracted function with $l > 0$ within the MB has two scalar basis functions, while each uncontracted function or contracted s functions corresponds to one scalar basis function. If we have n_c contracted functions with $l > 0$ and the number of the rest of the functions is n_u , the number of scalar basis functions is $2n_c + n_u$. Our implementation

within the CFOUR program package^{83,84} evaluates the atomic-orbital (AO) one- and two-electron integrals and constructs the Fock matrix in the representation of the scalar basis functions. The dimension of this Fock matrix is $2(2n_c + n_u)$. Then we transform the Fock matrix into the spinor representation, i.e., the representation of j -adapted spin-orbit contracted basis functions. The dimension of the Fock matrix in the spinor representation is $2(n_c + n_u)$. The Fock matrix in the spinor representation is then diagonalized to obtain molecular spinors. This procedure enhances the computational efficiency by avoiding the transformation of AO two-electron integrals into the spinor representation. We note that, even if the atomic spinors with the same n and l values but different j values have similar radial parts (e.g., for the $p_{1/2}$ and $p_{3/2}$ spinors of light elements), these atomic spinors are mutually orthogonal because of the orthogonality of their spin-angular parts. As a consequence, solving the generalized eigenvalue equations in the spinor representation is free from the linear dependency problems resulting from similar radial functions.

The present work is focused on the spin-orbit contracted basis sets of p -block elements for the X2CAMF scheme.^{77,78} The primitive Gaussian functions are taken from the double-zeta (DZ), triple-zeta (TZ), and quadruple-zeta (QZ) correlation-consistent basis sets developed by Dunning and co-workers,^{80–82} by Bross and Peterson,³⁶ and by Dyall^{42,44,79}. We have adopted the X2CAMF scheme based on the Dirac-Coulomb Hamiltonian in this work. Atomic X2CAMF Hartree-Fock (HF) calculations using these primitive basis functions have been performed with the atomic spherical symmetry enforced using the average-of-configuration approach⁸⁵ for open-shell p -block atoms, that is, the electronic occupations involving open-shell p -orbitals are equally weighted in these calculations. We have used the point nuclear model for calculations using the primitive functions developed by Dunning and co-workers and by Bross and Peterson, and the Gaussian nuclear model⁸⁶ for calculations using Dyall’s basis sets, to ensure that the nuclear model matches that used for the basis set optimization in each case.

The atomic HF calculations have been performed using the X2CAMF program reported previously⁷⁸, which is available at <https://github.com/Warlocat/x2camf>.

The contraction coefficients for the spin-orbit contracted basis sets are obtained as the X2CAMF-HF atomic spinor coefficients. In the spin-orbit contracted basis sets, for contracted basis functions with orbital angular momentum $l > 0$, two sets of contraction coefficients are obtained as X2CAMF-HF coefficients of atomic spinors with orbital angular momentum l and total angular momentum $j = l + 1/2$ or $j = l - 1/2$. The uncontracted primitive GTOs, including the valence

correlating and polarization functions, are taken as the primitive GTOs recommended in the original basis sets. For comparison, we also construct spin-free contracted basis sets for the SFX2C-1e scheme using the SFX2C-1e-HF atomic orbital coefficients. The spin-free and spin-orbit contracted correlation-consistent basis sets using the primitive functions of Dunning’s basis sets and Bross and Peterson’s basis sets are denoted as “cc-pVXZ-SF” and “cc-pVXZ-SO” basis sets, respectively. The corresponding basis sets using primitive functions of Dyal’s basis sets are denoted as “dy-VXZ-SF” and “dy-VXZ-SO” basis sets. The exponents and coefficients for these basis sets are summarized in the supplementary materials. Note that, while the present spin-free contraction scheme uses AOC SFX2C-1e-HF atomic orbitals, the standard spin-free contraction scheme uses atomic coefficients for the atomic ground-state configuration. The present cc-pVXZ-SF basis sets thus differ slightly from the standard SFX2C-1e recontracted basis sets⁸⁷.

III. BENCHMARK CALCULATIONS OF ATOMIC AND MOLECULAR PROPERTIES

Benchmark HF and coupled-cluster singles and doubles (CCSD)⁸⁸ augmented with a non-iterative triples correction [CCSD(T)]⁸⁹ calculations have been carried out for the spin-orbit splittings of 2P atoms and $^2\Pi$ diatomic molecules as well as structural parameters for representative diatomic molecules, to assess the quality of the contracted basis sets. For spinor-based calculations, the X2CAMF scheme based on the Dirac-Coulomb Hamiltonian has been adopted. The CC calculations have only correlated the valence electrons (the ns and np electrons for the np -block elements). For calculations using uncontracted basis sets, the unoccupied molecular spinors with energies higher than 100 hartree have been frozen in the CC calculations. The CFOUR program package^{69,77,78,83,84,90,91} has been used throughout the calculations.

A. Spin-orbit splittings of 2P atomic states

The atomic spin-orbit splittings (SOSs) between $^2P_{1/2}$ and $^2P_{3/2}$ states of Ga, In, Tl, Br, I, and At atoms have been calculated with uncontracted, spin-free contracted, and spin-orbit contracted triple-zeta basis sets at X2CAMF-HF and X2CAMF-CCSD(T) levels. The absolute deviations of SOSs obtained using contracted basis sets from those using uncontracted basis sets are plotted in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2. Absolute deviations (in cm^{-1}) for calculated atomic spin-orbit splittings between $^2P_{1/2}$ and $^2P_{3/2}$ states of Ga, In, Tl, Br, I, and At atoms with contracted triple-zeta basis sets at X2CAMF-HF and X2CAMF-CCSD(T) level, respectively, from those obtained using uncontracted basis sets.

Calculations using spin-orbit contracted basis sets consistently recover more than 99.5% of the atomic spin-orbit splittings computed using uncontracted basis sets. In contrast, the deviations of the results obtained using spin-free contracted basis sets from those obtained using the uncontracted basis sets are in general one or two orders of magnitude greater. For example, X2CAMF calculations using spin-free contracted basis sets underestimate the atomic SOSs by around 10% for $4p$ -elements Ga and Br and by around 25% for $6p$ -elements Tl and At. The largest absolute deviations of X2CAMF-CCSD(T) atomic SOSs obtained using spin-orbit contracted basis sets compared to those obtained using uncontracted basis sets amount to 16 cm^{-1} for Bross and Peterson’s basis sets and 75 cm^{-1} for Dyall’s basis sets both in the case of the At atom. For comparison, the corresponding errors of the results obtained using spin-free contracted basis sets amount to more than 5000 cm^{-1} .

B. Spin-orbit splittings of $^2\Pi$ diatomic molecules

Benchmark calculations for spin-orbit splittings of $^2\Pi$ radicals including XO ($X = \text{N, P, As, Sb, and Bi}$) and XF ($X = \text{C, Si, Ge, Sn and Pb}$) series have been carried out at the X2CAMF-CCSD(T) level using cc-pVXZ and dy-VXZ ($X = \text{D, T, Q}$) basis sets. Here we also adopt a hybrid scheme, which uses the spin-free contracted basis sets for $2p$ elements (C, N, O, F) and spin-orbit contracted basis sets for the heavier elements. The calculated spin-orbit splittings using this hybrid scheme are essentially indistinguishable from the results obtained using j -adapted contracted

TABLE I. Calculated spin-orbit splittings (in cm^{-1}) of $^2\Pi$ radicals XO ($X = \text{N, P, As, Sb, and Bi}$) and XF ($X = \text{C, Si, Ge, Sn and Pb}$) series at X2CAMF-CCSD(T) level with contracted and uncontracted (unc-) basis sets. Spin-free contracted basis sets have been used for 2p elements (C, N, O, F) while spin-orbit contracted basis sets have been used for other elements.

	NO	PO	AsO	SbO	BiO	CF	SiF	GeF	SnF	PbF
cc-pVDZ	124.5	238.1	969.7	-	-	82.2	169.4	849.1	-	-
unc-cc-pVDZ	126.9	241.7	980.3	-	-	83.8	170.5	855.2	-	-
cc-pVTZ	131.6	234.9	1004.5	2256.1	7261.4	85.9	167.6	828.8	2203.0	7807.4
unc-cc-pVTZ	131.4	234.9	1006.0	2259.5	7311.1	85.7	167.7	828.1	2207.6	7832.7
cc-pVQZ	133.3	233.9	1018.8	2310.5	7444.4	86.5	166.7	819.7	2211.5	7878.2
unc-cc-pVQZ	133.0	234.5	1018.1	2310.4	7439.6	86.3	166.9	819.4	2209.7	7874.5
dy-VDZ	130.7	235.0	975.1	2205.6	7004.7	85.4	168.5	855.3	2200.7	7829.2
unc-dy-VDZ	133.0	238.3	992.8	2216.8	7068.0	87.1	169.7	853.9	2219.5	7881.2
dy-VTZ	132.2	233.2	1001.8	2275.0	7305.2	85.4	166.5	825.1	2196.5	7820.5
unc-dy-VTZ	134.0	234.1	1009.4	2284.2	7352.2	86.8	166.8	823.4	2206.3	7854.6
dy-VQZ	134.1	233.8	1013.0	2314.4	7432.9	86.2	166.5	819.9	2206.7	7866.2
unc-dy-VQZ	134.3	234.1	1018.6	2322.4	7450.9	86.7	166.5	817.6	2210.3	7868.5

basis sets for all elements (see the supporting information for details). Therefore, for simplicity, this combination of contracted basis sets are referred to as cc-pVXZ and dy-VXZ basis sets in the following discussions. Experimental equilibrium bond lengths⁹² (1.15077 Å for NO, 1.476 Å for PO, 1.6236 Å for AsO, 1.825 Å for SbO, 1.934 Å for BiO, 1.272 Å for CF, 1.601 Å for SiF, 1.745 Å for GeF, 1.944 Å for SnF, 2.0575 Å for PbF) have been used in these calculations. The calculated SOSs at X2CAMF-CCSD(T) level are summarized in Table I. The X2CAMF-HF results can be found in the supporting information.

The calculated spin-orbit splittings using the hybrid scheme agree well with the splittings obtained using the uncontracted basis sets. The agreement in general becomes better with the increase of the size of the basis sets. Take the calculated SOSs of AsO using Dyall’s basis sets as an example. The results obtained using spin-orbit contracted basis sets differ from those obtained

using the uncontracted basis sets by 18, 8, and 6 cm^{-1} for DZ, TZ, QZ basis sets, respectively. The spin-orbit contracted basis sets show similar convergence patterns with respect to the cardinal number of the basis sets as the uncontracted basis sets. The basis sets of Dunning and co-workers and of Bross and Peterson show similar performance to the corresponding Dyall basis sets in these calculations.

While the use of the spin-free contracted basis sets for $2p$ elements works well in calculations of SOSs, the use of spin-free contracted basis sets for heavier atoms introduce significant errors. For example, we have performed calculations for PO and SiF using spin-free contracted basis sets for P and Si. The corresponding calculated SOSs amount to 219.9 cm^{-1} for PO and 153.3 cm^{-1} for SiF using the cc-pVQZ-SF sets and to 221.4 cm^{-1} for PO and 155.5 cm^{-1} for SiF using the dy-cc-VQZ-SF sets. Similar to the atomic calculations, these SOSs are underestimated by 5-10% compared to the results obtained using uncontracted or spin-orbit contracted basis sets. The use of spin-orbit contracted basis sets is thus required for accurate calculations of SOSs for molecules containing $3p$ and heavier elements.

C. Structural parameters for diatomic molecules

Benchmark calculations of equilibrium bond lengths and harmonic frequencies for the closed-shell diatomic molecules F_2 , Cl_2 , Br_2 , I_2 , At_2 , N_2 , P_2 , As_2 , Sb_2 , Bi_2 , AsN , BiN , BrCl , GaCl have been performed at the SFX2C-1e-HF, SFX2C-1e-CCSD(T), X2CAMF-HF, and X2CAMF-CCSD(T) levels of theory with cc-pVTZ basis sets. The uncontracted and spin-free contracted basis sets have been used in the SFX2C-1e calculations, while the uncontracted, spin-free contracted, and spin-orbit contracted basis sets have been used for X2CAMF calculations. The calculated structural parameters are summarized in Tables II and III, together with the errors of the contraction schemes obtained as the difference between the calculations using uncontracted and contracted basis sets.

The differences between the results obtained using spin-free contracted and uncontracted basis sets in SFX2C-1e calculations correspond to the errors in the basis-set contraction. These errors are in general small. As shown in Tables II and III, the largest basis-set contraction errors in SFX2C-1e-CCSD(T) calculations amount to 0.0137 Å for bond lengths in the case of At_2

TABLE II. Calculated equilibrium bond lengths (in Å) and harmonic frequencies (in cm^{-1}) for diatomic molecules at SFX2C-1e- and X2CAMF-HF level with uncontracted cc-pVTZ basis sets (UNC), as well as the errors for the spin-free (ΔSF) and spin-orbit (ΔSO) contraction schemes.

	Bond lengths (in Å)					Harmonic frequencies (in cm^{-1})				
	SFX2C-1e		X2CAMF			SFX2C-1e		X2CAMF		
	UNC	ΔSF	UNC	ΔSF	ΔSO	UNC	ΔSF	UNC	ΔSF	ΔSO
F_2	1.3288	0.0006	1.3288	0.0006	0.0006	1268.7	-2.6	1268.7	-2.6	-2.6
Cl_2	1.9842	0.0005	1.9843	0.0004	0.0005	613.6	-1.1	613.4	-1.1	-1.1
Br_2	2.2720	0.0004	2.2742	-0.0004	0.0005	355.5	-0.3	353.1	0.5	-0.3
I_2	2.6665	0.0002	2.6799	-0.0057	0.0002	237.0	-0.1	228.8	3.1	-0.1
At_2	2.8399	0.0073	2.9667	-0.0732	0.0094	169.3	-0.1	131.0	16.8	-0.7
N_2	1.0660	0.0009	1.0660	0.0009	0.0009	2730.3	0.5	2730.2	0.5	0.5
P_2	1.8563	0.0002	1.8563	0.0002	0.0002	910.1	0.1	910.1	0.1	0.1
As_2	2.0523	0.0004	2.0529	0.0004	0.0004	510.8	0.1	509.5	0.3	0.0
Sb_2	2.4369	0.0001	2.4432	-0.0001	0.0001	328.9	0.0	321.2	1.6	-0.1
Bi_2	2.5714	0.0050	2.6671	-0.0176	0.0061	230.0	0.4	171.2	20.8	0.3
AsN	1.5661	0.0010	1.5666	0.0009	0.0010	1309.7	0.5	1302.9	1.6	0.3
BiN	1.8414	0.0081	1.9760	-0.0109	0.0123	1007.8	-2.1	594.8	18.5	-2.7
GaCl	2.2336	0.0002	2.2335	0.0004	0.0002	356.8	0.1	356.8	0.1	0.1
BrCl	2.1279	0.0004	2.1294	0.0001	0.0004	486.6	-0.6	484.4	0.1	-0.6

and -4.6 cm^{-1} for harmonic frequencies in the case of N_2 . The basis-set contraction errors in X2CAMF calculations can be defined as the difference between X2CAMF results obtained using spin-orbit contracted basis functions and uncontracted basis functions. They take similar values to the basis-set contraction errors in SFX2C-1e calculations. This indicates the consistency in the spin-free and spin-orbit contraction schemes. In contrast, the deviations of X2CAMF results obtained using spin-free contracted basis sets arise not only from the basis-set contraction but also from the mismatch between contracted basis functions and the relativistic Hamiltonian. The largest errors in X2CAMF-CCSD(T) calculations using spin-free contracted basis sets amount to as large as -0.0952 Å for bond lengths and 23.6 cm^{-1} for harmonic frequencies, both in the case

TABLE III. Calculated equilibrium bond lengths (in Å) and harmonic frequencies (in cm^{-1}) for diatomic molecules at SFX2C-1e- and X2CAMF-CCSD(T) level with uncontracted cc-pVTZ basis sets (UNC), as well as the errors for spin-free (ΔSF) and spin-orbit (ΔSO) contractions.

	Bond lengths (in Å)					Harmonic frequencies (in cm^{-1})				
	SFX2C-1e		X2CAMF			SFX2C-1e		X2CAMF		
	UNC	ΔSF	UNC	ΔSF	ΔSO	UNC	ΔSF	UNC	ΔSF	ΔSO
F_2	1.4151	0.0010	1.4152	0.0010	0.0010	923.4	-3.9	923.4	-3.9	-3.9
Cl_2	2.0175	0.0009	2.0176	0.0009	0.0009	545.5	-0.7	545.3	-0.7	-0.7
Br_2	2.3058	0.0025	2.3086	0.0013	0.0025	318.8	-0.5	315.8	0.5	-0.5
I_2	2.6970	0.0036	2.7135	-0.0042	0.0038	215.9	-0.7	205.9	3.3	-0.8
At_2	2.8712	0.0137	3.0286	-0.0952	0.0186	155.1	-1.3	107.8	23.6	-1.8
N_2	1.1021	0.0015	1.1021	0.0015	0.0015	2349.2	-4.6	2349.2	-4.5	-4.5
P_2	1.9143	0.0011	1.9143	0.0011	0.0011	769.0	-0.5	769.0	-0.6	-0.6
As_2	2.1262	0.0017	2.1264	0.0017	0.0017	424.1	-1.2	423.6	-0.8	-1.1
Sb_2	2.5313	0.0019	2.5337	0.0022	0.0019	267.5	-1.0	264.9	-0.1	-0.9
Bi_2	2.6792	0.0091	2.7103	0.0000	0.0104	183.4	-1.1	167.3	11.7	-1.4
AsN	1.6323	0.0016	1.6322	0.0015	0.0016	1061.6	0.4	1062.3	0.6	0.3
BiN	1.9579	0.0122	1.9818	0.0077	0.0133	758.8	-4.4	717.9	-6.5	-1.3
GaCl	2.1606	0.0018	2.1624	0.0013	0.0018	435.5	-0.8	433.0	0.0	-0.8
BrCl	2.2653	0.0012	2.2657	0.0011	0.0012	384.6	0.4	385.1	0.2	0.4

of At_2 . Therefore, it is necessary to use spin-orbit contracted basis sets rather than the spin-free contracted basis sets to obtain accurate X2CAMF results.

We note that, for molecules containing elements from the first two long rows, e.g., F_2 , Cl_2 , N_2 , and P_2 , the difference between an X2CAMF bond length or harmonic frequency obtained using the spin-free contraction scheme and the corresponding value obtained using the spin-orbit contraction scheme is insignificant. It appears sufficient to use spin-free contracted basis functions for these elements in calculations of structural parameters. We have performed further calculations for the AsN , BiN , GaCl , and BrCl molecules using a hybrid scheme, in which the spin-free contracted

TABLE IV. Calculated equilibrium bond lengths (in Å) and harmonic frequencies (in cm^{-1}) for diatomic molecules AsN, BiN, GaCl, and BrCl at X2CAMF-HF and X2CAMF-CCSD(T) levels with spin-orbit contracted basis sets and the hybrid contracted basis sets. The hybrid contraction scheme uses cc-pVTZ-SF basis sets for N and Cl and cc-pVTZ-SO basis sets for As, Bi, Ga, and Br.

		Bond lengths (in Å)		Harmonic frequencies (in cm^{-1})	
		cc-pVTZ-SO	Hybrid	cc-pVTZ-SO	Hybrid
X2CAMF-HF	AsN	1.5676	1.5676	1303.2	1303.2
	BiN	1.9882	1.9882	592.1	592.2
	GaCl	2.2337	2.2337	356.9	356.9
	BrCl	2.1298	2.1298	483.8	483.8
X2CAMF-CCSD(T)	AsN	1.6338	1.6338	1062.6	1062.6
	BiN	1.9950	1.9950	716.6	716.6
	GaCl	2.2669	2.2669	385.5	385.5
	BrCl	2.1642	2.1642	432.1	432.1

basis sets are used for N and Cl and the spin-orbit contracted basis sets are used for the heavier elements. The comparison between hybrid and spin-orbit contracted basis sets are given in Table IV. The calculated bond lengths and harmonic frequencies with the hybrid basis sets are almost indistinguishable from those obtained using spin-orbit contracted basis sets. The hybrid contracted basis sets using spin-free contracted basis sets for $2p$ and $3p$ elements are thus recommended for relativistic two-component calculations of structural parameters. We emphasize that, as we have shown in the last subsection, accurate calculations of spin-orbit splittings requires the use of spin-orbit contracted basis sets for $3p$ elements.

IV. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

We have developed a j -adapted spin-orbit contraction scheme and constructed generally contracted basis sets for p -block elements for spinor-based relativistic two-component calculations based on the exact two-component Hamiltonian with atomic mean-field spin-orbit integrals (the X2CAMF scheme). The contraction coefficients have been obtained as the coefficients of the

atomic X2CAMF-HF spinors. Calculated atomic and molecular spin-orbit splittings using the spin-orbit contracted basis sets exhibit excellent agreement with the corresponding results obtained using uncontracted basis sets, showcasing the robust performance of the spin-orbit contraction scheme and the new basis sets. Benchmark calculations of structural parameters including equilibrium bond lengths and harmonic frequencies show that the basis-set contraction errors in X2CAMF calculations using spin-orbit contracted basis sets are consistent with those in scalar-relativistic calculations using spin-free contracted basis sets. In contrast, the use of spin-free contracted basis sets in X2CAMF calculations leads to significant errors due to the mismatch between basis functions and the relativistic Hamiltonian. Future work will be focused on expanding the new basis sets to incorporate (semi-)core-correlating functions, as well as constructing spin-orbit contracted basis sets for a broader range of elements, especially the *d*- and *f*-block elements.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Calculated atomic and molecular spin-orbit splittings using contracted and uncontracted basis sets.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work at the Johns Hopkins University (C. Z. and L. C.) has been supported by the Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences under Award Number DE-SC0020317. The computations at the Johns Hopkins University were carried out at Advanced Research Computing at Hopkins (ARCH) core facility (rockfish.jhu.edu), which is supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant number OAC-1920103. K .A. P. gratefully acknowledges the support of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Heavy Element Chemistry program, Grant No. DE-SC0008501.

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

Author Contributions

Chaoqun Zhang: Conceptualization (supporting); Methodology (equal); Software (lead); Writing – original draft (lead); Writing – review & editing (equal). Kirk A. Peterson: Methodology (supporting); Writing – review & editing (equal). Kenneth G. Dyall: Methodology (supporting); Writing – review & editing (equal). Lan Cheng: Conceptualization (lead); Methodology (equal); Software (supporting); Writing – original draft (supporting); Writing – review & editing (equal).

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data available in article or supplementary material.

REFERENCES

- ¹P. Pyykkö and J.-P. Desclaux, “Relativity and the periodic system of elements,” *Acc. Chem. Res.* **12**, 276–281 (1979).
- ²K. S. Pitzer, “Relativistic effects on chemical properties,” *Acc. Chem. Res.* **12**, 271–276 (1979).
- ³P. Pyykkö, “Relativistic effects in structural chemistry,” *Chem. Rev.* **88**, 563–594 (1988).
- ⁴R. M. Pitzer and N. W. Winter, “Electronic-structure methods for heavy-atom molecules,” *J. Phys. Chem.* **92**, 3061–3063 (1988).
- ⁵K. Dyall and K. J. Faegri, *Introduction to Relativistic Quantum* (Oxford University Press, 2007).
- ⁶W. Liu, “Ideas of relativistic quantum chemistry,” *Mol. Phys.* **108**, 1679–1706 (2010).
- ⁷T. Saue, “Relativistic hamiltonians for chemistry: A primer,” *ChemPhysChem* **12**, 3077–3094 (2011).
- ⁸J. Autschbach, “Perspective: Relativistic effects,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **136**, 150902 (2012).
- ⁹M. Reiher and A. Wolf, *Relativistic Quantum Chemistry: The Fundamental Theory of Molecular Science* (John Wiley & Sons, 2014).
- ¹⁰I. P. Grant, “Relativistic self-consistent fields,” *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., A. Math. Phys. Sci.* **262**, 555–576 (1961).
- ¹¹I. P. Grant and H. M. Quiney, “Foundations of the relativistic theory of atomic and molecular structure,” (Academic Press, 1988) pp. 37–86.

- ¹²E. Eliav, U. Kaldor, and Y. Ishikawa, “Open-shell relativistic coupled-cluster method with Dirac-Fock-Breit wave functions: Energies of the gold atom and its cation,” *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 1724–1729 (1994).
- ¹³L. Visscher, O. Visser, P. J. C. Aerts, H. Merenga, and W. C. Nieuwpoort, “Relativistic quantum chemistry: The MOLFDIR program package,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **81**, 120–144 (1994).
- ¹⁴W. Liu, G. Hong, D. Dai, L. Li, and M. Dolg, “The Beijing four-component density functional program package (BDF) and its application to EuO, EuS, YbO and YbS,” *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **96**, 75–83 (1997).
- ¹⁵T. Saue, K. Faegri, T. U. Helgaker, and O. Gropen, “Principles of direct 4-component relativistic SCF: Application to caesium auride,” *Mol. Phys.* **91**, 937 (1997).
- ¹⁶T. Yanai, T. Nakajima, Y. Ishikawa, and K. Hirao, “A new computational scheme for the Dirac-Hartree-Fock method employing an efficient integral algorithm,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **114**, 6526 (2001).
- ¹⁷T. Yanai, H. Likura, T. Nakajima, Y. Ishikawa, and K. Hirao, “A new implementation of four-component relativistic density functional method for heavy-atom polyatomic systems,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **115**, 8267 (2001).
- ¹⁸T. Saue and T. Helgaker, “Four-component relativistic Kohn–Sham theory,” *J. Comput. Chem.* **23**, 814–823 (2002).
- ¹⁹W. Liu, F. Wang, and L. Li, “The beijing density functional (BDF) program package: Methodologies and applications,” *J. Theor. Comput. Chem.* **02**, 257–272 (2003).
- ²⁰L. Storchi, L. Belpassi, F. Tarantelli, A. Sgamellotti, and H. M. Quiney, “An efficient parallel all-electron four-component dirac-kohn-sham program using a distributed matrix approach,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **6**, 384–394 (2010).
- ²¹S. Komorovsky, M. Repisky, O. L. Malkina, and V. G. Malkin, “Fully relativistic calculations of NMR shielding tensors using restricted magnetically balanced basis and gauge including atomic orbitals,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **132**, 154101 (2010).
- ²²M. S. Kelley and T. Shiozaki, “Large-scale Dirac–Fock–Breit method using density fitting and 2-spinor basis functions,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **138**, 204113 (2013).
- ²³M. Kadek, M. Repisky, and K. Ruud, “All-electron fully relativistic Kohn-Sham theory for solids based on the Dirac-Coulomb Hamiltonian and Gaussian-type functions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 205103 (2019), arxiv:1902.02828.

- ²⁴S. Sun, T. F. Stetina, T. Zhang, H. Hu, E. F. Valeev, Q. Sun, and X. Li, “Efficient four-component Dirac–Coulomb–Gaunt Hartree–Fock in the pauli spinor representation,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **17**, 3388–3402 (2021).
- ²⁵B. A. Heß, “Relativistic electronic-structure calculations employing a two-component no-pair formalism with external-field projection operators,” *Phys. Rev. A: At., Mol., Opt. Phys.* **33**, 3742–3748 (1986).
- ²⁶E. Van Lenthe, R. Van Leeuwen, E. J. Baerends, and J. G. Snijders, “Relativistic regular two-component Hamiltonians,” *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **57**, 281–293 (1996).
- ²⁷K. G. Dyall, “Interfacing relativistic and nonrelativistic methods. I. Normalized elimination of the small component in the modified Dirac equation,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 9618–9626 (1997).
- ²⁸T. Nakajima and K. Hirao, “A new relativistic theory: A relativistic scheme by eliminating small components (RESC),” *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **302**, 383–391 (1999).
- ²⁹M. Barysz and A. J. Sadlej, “Two-component methods of relativistic quantum chemistry: From the Douglas–Kroll approximation to the exact two-component formalism,” *J. Mol. Struct.* **573**, 181–200 (2001).
- ³⁰W. Kutzelnigg and W. Liu, “Quasirelativistic theory equivalent to fully relativistic theory,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **123**, 241102 (2005).
- ³¹M. Iliaš and T. Saue, “An infinite-order two-component relativistic Hamiltonian by a simple one-step transformation,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 064102 (2007).
- ³²W. Liu and D. Peng, “Exact two-component Hamiltonians revisited,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 031104 (2009).
- ³³K. G. Dyall, “An exact separation of the spin-free and spin-dependent terms of the Dirac–Coulomb–Breit Hamiltonian,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **100**, 2118–2127 (1994).
- ³⁴L. Visscher and E. van Lenthe, “On the distinction between scalar and spin-orbit relativistic effects,” *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **306**, 357 (1999).
- ³⁵S. Sun, J. Ehrman, T. Zhang, Q. Sun, K. G. Dyall, and X. Li, “Scalar Breit interaction for molecular calculations,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **158**, 171101 (2023).
- ³⁶D. H. Bross and K. A. Peterson, “Correlation consistent, Douglas–Kroll–Hess relativistic basis sets for the 5p and 6p elements,” *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **133**, 1434 (2014).
- ³⁷K. G. Dyall, “Basis Sets for Relativistic Calculations,” in *Comprehensive Computational Chemistry (First Edition)*, edited by M. Yáñez and R. J. Boyd (Elsevier, Oxford, 2024) pp. 4–34.

- ³⁸S. F. Boys, "Electronic wave functions - I. A general method of calculation for the stationary states of any molecular system," *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., A. Math. Phys. Sci.* **200**, 542–554 (1950).
- ³⁹E. Clementi and D. Davis, "Electronic structure of large molecular systems," *J. Comput. Phys.* **1**, 223–244 (1966).
- ⁴⁰R. E. Stanton and S. Havriliak, "Kinetic balance: A partial solution to the problem of variational safety in Dirac calculations," *J. Chem. Phys.* **81**, 1910–1918 (1984).
- ⁴¹L. Visscher, P. J. C. Aerts, O. Visser, and W. C. Nieuwpoort, "Kinetic balance in contracted basis sets for relativistic calculations," *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **40**, 131–139 (1991).
- ⁴²K. G. Dyall, "Relativistic and nonrelativistic finite nucleus optimized double zeta basis sets for the 4p, 5p and 6p elements," *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **99**, 366–371 (1998).
- ⁴³K. G. Dyall, "Relativistic double-zeta, triple-zeta, and quadruple-zeta basis sets for the actinides Ac–Lr," *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **117**, 491–500 (2007).
- ⁴⁴K. G. Dyall, "Relativistic Quadruple-Zeta and Revised Triple-Zeta and Double-Zeta Basis Sets for the 4p, 5p, and 6p Elements," *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **115**, 441–447 (2006).
- ⁴⁵B. O. Roos, V. Veryazov, and P.-O. Widmark, "Relativistic atomic natural orbital type basis sets for the alkaline and alkaline-earth atoms applied to the ground-state potentials for the corresponding dimers," *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **111**, 345–351 (2004).
- ⁴⁶B. O. Roos, R. Lindh, P.-Å. Malmqvist, V. Veryazov, and P.-O. Widmark, "Main group atoms and dimers studied with a new relativistic ANO basis set," *J. Phys. Chem. A* **108**, 2851–2858 (2004).
- ⁴⁷W. A. De Jong, R. J. Harrison, and D. A. Dixon, "Parallel Douglas-Kroll energy and gradients in NWChem: Estimating scalar relativistic effects using Douglas-Kroll contracted basis sets," *J. Chem. Phys.* **114**, 48 (2001).
- ⁴⁸K. A. Peterson, "Correlation consistent basis sets for actinides. I. the Th and U atoms," *J. Chem. Phys.* **142**, 074105 (2015).
- ⁴⁹R. Feng and K. A. Peterson, "Correlation consistent basis sets for actinides. II. The atoms Ac and Np–Lr," *J. Chem. Phys.* **147**, 084108 (2017).
- ⁵⁰D. A. Pantazis, X.-Y. Chen, C. R. Landis, and F. Neese, "All-Electron Scalar Relativistic Basis Sets for Third-Row Transition Metal Atoms," *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **4**, 908–919 (2008).
- ⁵¹D. A. Pantazis and F. Neese, "All-Electron Scalar Relativistic Basis Sets for the Actinides," *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **7**, 677–684 (2011).

- ⁵²T. Noro, M. Sekiya, Y. Osanai, T. Koga, and H. Matsuyama, “Relativistic correlating basis sets for actinide atoms from 90Th to 103Lr,” *J. Comput. Chem.* **28**, 2511–2516 (2007).
- ⁵³J. M. L. Martin and A. Sundermann, “Correlation consistent valence basis sets for use with the Stuttgart–Dresden–Bonn relativistic effective core potentials: The atoms Ga–Kr and In–Xe,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **114**, 3408–3420 (2001).
- ⁵⁴K. A. Peterson, “Systematically convergent basis sets with relativistic pseudopotentials. I. Correlation consistent basis sets for the post-d group 13–15 elements,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **119**, 11099–11112 (2003).
- ⁵⁵F. Weigend and R. Ahlrichs, “Balanced basis sets of split valence, triple zeta valence and quadruple zeta valence quality for H to Rn: Design and assessment of accuracy,” *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **7**, 3297 (2005).
- ⁵⁶R. Gulde, P. Pollak, and F. Weigend, “Error-Balanced Segmented Contracted Basis Sets of Double- ζ to Quadruple- ζ Valence Quality for the Lanthanides,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **8**, 4062–4068 (2012).
- ⁵⁷J. G. Hill and K. A. Peterson, “Gaussian basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. XI. Pseudopotential-based and all-electron relativistic basis sets for alkali metal (K–Fr) and alkaline earth (Ca–Ra) elements,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **147**, 244106 (2017).
- ⁵⁸A. Bergner, M. Dolg, W. Küchle, H. Stoll, and H. Preuß, “Ab initio energy-adjusted pseudopotentials for elements of groups 13–17,” *Mol. Phys.* **80**, 1431–1441 (1993).
- ⁵⁹B. Metz, H. Stoll, and M. Dolg, “Small-core multiconfiguration-Dirac–Hartree–Fock-adjusted pseudopotentials for post-d main group elements: Application to PbH and PbO,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **113**, 2563–2569 (2000).
- ⁶⁰A. Weigand, X. Cao, T. Hangele, and M. Dolg, “Relativistic small-core pseudopotentials for actinium, thorium, and protactinium.” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **118**, 2519–2530 (2014).
- ⁶¹M. Douglas and N. M. Kroll, “Quantum electrodynamical corrections to the fine structure of helium,” *Ann. Physics* **82**, 89–155 (1974).
- ⁶²B. A. Hess, “Relativistic electronic-structure calculations employing a two-component no-pair formalism with external-field projection operators,” *Phys. Rev. A* **33**, 3742–3748 (1986).
- ⁶³K. G. Dyall, “Interfacing relativistic and nonrelativistic methods. IV. One- and two-electron scalar approximations,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **115**, 9136–9143 (2001).

- ⁶⁴M. K. Armbruster, W. Klopper, and F. Weigend, “Basis-set extensions for two-component spin-orbit treatments of heavy elements,” *Phys. Chem, Chem, Phys*, **8**, 4862–4865 (2006).
- ⁶⁵M. Dolg, “Chapter 14 - Relativistic Effective Core Potentials,” in *Theoretical and Computational Chemistry, Relativistic Electronic Structure Theory*, Vol. 11, edited by P. Schwerdtfeger (Elsevier, 2002) pp. 793–862.
- ⁶⁶P. Pollak and F. Weigend, “Segmented Contracted Error-Consistent Basis Sets of Double- and Triple- ζ Valence Quality for One- and Two-Component Relativistic All-Electron Calculations,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **13**, 3696–3705 (2017).
- ⁶⁷J. Sikkema, L. Visscher, T. Saue, and M. Iliaš, “The molecular mean-field approach for correlated relativistic calculations,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 1–10 (2009).
- ⁶⁸H. S. Nataraj, M. Kállay, and L. Visscher, “General implementation of the relativistic coupled-cluster method,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **133**, 234109 (2010).
- ⁶⁹J. Liu, Y. Shen, A. Asthana, and L. Cheng, “Two-component relativistic coupled-cluster methods using mean-field spin-orbit integrals,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **148**, 034106 (2018).
- ⁷⁰A. Asthana, J. Liu, and L. Cheng, “Exact two-component equation-of-motion coupled-cluster singles and doubles method using atomic mean-field spin-orbit integrals,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **150**, 074102 (2019).
- ⁷¹S. Knecht, H. J. A. Jensen, and T. Fleig, “Large-scale parallel configuration interaction. II. Two- and four-component double-group general active space implementation with application to BiH,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **132**, 014108 (2010).
- ⁷²A. J. Jenkins, H. Liu, J. M. Kasper, M. J. Frisch, and X. Li, “Variational Relativistic Two-Component Complete-Active-Space Self-Consistent Field Method,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **15**, 2974–2982 (2019).
- ⁷³L. Lu, H. Hu, A. J. Jenkins, and X. Li, “Exact-Two-Component Relativistic Multireference Second-Order Perturbation Theory,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **18**, 2983–2992 (2022).
- ⁷⁴X. Wang and S. Sharma, “Relativistic Semistochastic Heat-Bath Configuration Interaction,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **19**, 848–855 (2023).
- ⁷⁵C.-N. Yeh, A. Shee, Q. Sun, E. Gull, and D. Zgid, “Relativistic self-consistent \$GW\$: Exact two-component formalism with one-electron approximation for solids,” *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 085121 (2022).
- ⁷⁶B. A. Heß, C. M. Marian, U. Wahlgren, and O. Gropen, “A mean-field spin-orbit method applicable to correlated wavefunctions,” *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **251**, 365–371 (1996).

- ⁷⁷J. Liu and L. Cheng, “An atomic mean-field spin-orbit approach within exact two-component theory for a non-perturbative treatment of spin-orbit coupling,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **148**, 144108 (2018).
- ⁷⁸C. Zhang and L. Cheng, “Atomic mean-field approach within exact two-component theory based on the Dirac–Coulomb–Breit hamiltonian,” *J. Phys. Chem. A* **126**, 4537–4553 (2022).
- ⁷⁹K. G. Dyall, “Relativistic double-zeta, triple-zeta, and quadruple-zeta basis sets for the light elements H–Ar,” *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **135**, 128 (2016).
- ⁸⁰T. H. Dunning Jr, “Gaussian basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. I. The atoms boron through neon and hydrogen,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **90**, 1007–1023 (1989).
- ⁸¹D. E. Woon and T. H. Dunning, Jr., “Gaussian basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. III. The atoms aluminum through argon,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **98**, 1358–1371 (1993).
- ⁸²A. K. Wilson, D. E. Woon, K. A. Peterson, and T. H. Dunning Jr, “Gaussian basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. IX. The atoms gallium through krypton,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **110**, 7667–7676 (1999).
- ⁸³J. F. Stanton, J. Gauss, L. Cheng, M. E. Harding, D. A. Matthews, and P. G. Szalay, “CFOUR, coupled-cluster techniques for computational chemistry, a quantum-chemical program package,” With contributions from A. A. Auer, A. Asthana, R. J. Bartlett, U. Benedikt, C. Berger, D. E. Bernholdt, S. Blaschke, Y. J. Bomble, S. Burger, O. Christiansen, D. Datta, F. Engel, R. Faber, J. Greiner, M. Heckert, O. Heun, M. Hilgenberg, C. Huber, T.-C. Jagau, D. Jonsson, J. Jusélius, T. Kirsch, K. Klein, G. M. Kopper, W. J. Lauderdale, F. Lipparini, J. Liu, T. Metzroth, L. A. Mück, D. P. O’Neill, T. Nottoli, D. R. Price, E. Prochnow, C. Puzzarini, K. Ruud, F. Schiffmann, W. Schwalbach, C. Simmons, S. Stopkowicz, A. Tajti, T. Uhlírova, J. Vázquez, F. Wang, J. D. Watts, P. Yergün, C. Zhang, X. Zheng, and the integral packages MOLECULE (J. Almlöf and P. R. Taylor), PROPS (P. R. Taylor), ABACUS (T. Helgaker, H. J. Aa. Jensen, P. Jørgensen, and J. Olsen), and ECP routines by A. V. Mitin and C. van Wüllen. For the current version, see <http://www.cfour.de>. (accessed April 1, 2024).
- ⁸⁴D. A. Matthews, L. Cheng, M. E. Harding, F. Lipparini, S. Stopkowicz, T.-C. Jagau, P. G. Szalay, J. Gauss, and J. F. Stanton, “Coupled-cluster techniques for computational chemistry: The CFOUR program package,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **152**, 214108 (2020).
- ⁸⁵J. Thyssen, T. Fleig, and H. J. A. Jensen, “A direct relativistic four-component multiconfiguration self-consistent-field method for molecules,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **129**, 034109 (2008).

- ⁸⁶L. Visscher and K. G. Dyall, “Dirac-fock atomic electronic structure calculations using different nuclear charge distributions,” *At. Data. Nucl. Data Tables* **67**, 207–224 (1997).
- ⁸⁷“Recontracted Correlation-consistent Basis Functions for SFX2C-1e Scheme,” Available at <http://www.grant-hill.group.shef.ac.uk/ccrepo/> and <https://cfour.uni-mainz.de/cfour/index.php?n=Main.RecontractedCorrelation-consistentBasisFunctions>. (accessed April 3, 2024).
- ⁸⁸G. D. Purvis III and R. J. Bartlett, “A full coupled-cluster singles and doubles model: The inclusion of disconnected triples,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **76**, 1910–1918 (1982).
- ⁸⁹K. Raghavachari, G. W. Trucks, J. A. Pople, and M. Head-Gordon, “A fifth-order perturbation comparison of electron correlation theories,” *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **157**, 479–483 (1989).
- ⁹⁰J. F. Stanton, J. Gauss, J. D. Watts, and R. J. Bartlett, “A direct product decomposition approach for symmetry exploitation in many-body methods. I. Energy calculations,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **94**, 4334–4345 (1991).
- ⁹¹L. Cheng and J. Gauss, “Analytic energy gradients for the spin-free exact two-component theory using an exact block diagonalization for the one-electron Dirac Hamiltonian,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **135**, 084114 (2011).
- ⁹²K. P. Huber and G. Herzberg, *Molecular spectra and molecular structure: IV. Constants of diatomic molecules* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).