

# Dipole Moments using Dirac–Coulomb–Breit Molecular Mean-Field Coupled Cluster Theory

Luca Murg,<sup>\*,†,‡</sup> Christopher Lane,<sup>†</sup> and Roxanne M. Tutchton<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545,  
USA*

<sup>‡</sup>*Department of Nuclear, Plasma, and Radiological Engineering, University of Illinois at  
Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, USA*

E-mail: rtutchton@lanl.gov

## Abstract

Materials utilized by novel energy systems are often studied using weakly correlated mean-field theories. However, if these systems incorporate heavy elements or strongly correlated topological materials, relativistic effects must be included. Therefore, we present an unrestricted coupled-cluster with single and double excitation formalism (CCSD) within a molecular mean-field exact-two component framework (X2C<sub>mmf</sub>) using a restricted Dirac-Hartree-Fock (DHF) reference state. Our mean-field transformation utilizes the one-electron, Dirac-Coulomb, Dirac-Coulomb-Gaunt and Dirac-Coulomb-Breit Hamiltonian. The code was bench-marked against DIRAC which also uses DHF-X2C<sub>mmf</sub> accounting for the Dirac-Coulomb and Dirac-Coulomb-Gaunt Hamiltonian. The dipole moments of Li-H, and Cl-F were calculated using an approximate molecular to atomic basis transformation and compared to experiment. The CCSD energy showed agreement with DIRAC to around  $10^{-4}$  Hartree and exhibited a small variation of the dipole moment with the introduction of higher order electron-electron

interactions. This paper allows for study of relativistic processes within this mean-field approach and lays the foundation for future theoretical development of relativistic Coupled-Cluster Theory using a DHF reference state within this framework.

## Introduction

Materials utilized by novel energy systems, e.g., Generation IV nuclear reactors, are often studied using weakly correlated mean-field theories. In weakly correlated electron systems, the direct Coulomb interaction can be modeled by an effective single-particle potential, e.g., Density Functional Theory. When strong correlations dominate, these mean-field theories can be used as a reference state for various strongly correlated approaches.<sup>1-4</sup> Relativistic effects are typically added perturbatively,<sup>5-7</sup> but this is not adequate for systems composed of heavy elements<sup>8-14</sup> and the vast unexplored space of strongly correlated topological materials. This requires us to adjust existing theories to account for a Dirac reference state by carefully re-evaluating current methodologies to account for four component spinors and additional electron-electron interactions, e.g., Breit and Gaunt terms. This need has given rise to a class of relativistic mean-field approaches utilizing an exact-two-component transformation based off an atomic mean-field<sup>15-18</sup> or more accurate molecular mean-field.<sup>17-19</sup> One such relativistic approach is the Coupled Cluster method<sup>20-23</sup> utilizing the four component Dirac-Hartree-Fock (DHF) ground state<sup>24</sup> equation and the exact two component molecular mean field ( $X2C_{mmf}$ ) transformation.<sup>19</sup> Previous similar work has focused on utilizing four component DHF reference state to perform an  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation utilizing the one-electron, Dirac-Coulomb (DC) and Dirac-Coulomb-Gaunt (DCG) Hamiltonian in-conjunction with the two-electron, transformed Coulomb interaction in a code called DIRAC.<sup>19,25</sup> Others have focussed on the  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation of the one-electron, DC and Dirac-Coulomb-Breit (DCB) Hamiltonian in-conjunction with the two-electron, untransformed Coulomb interaction.<sup>26,27</sup> All mentioned works further apply electron correlation corrections to the mean-fields including the coupled-cluster with single and double excitation formalism (CCSD).<sup>25,26</sup>

This work similarly focuses on utilizing four component DHF reference state, to perform an  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation. However, here we utilize the one-electron, DC, DCG, and DCB Hamiltonian in-conjunction with the two-electron, transformed Coulomb interaction after which the coupled-cluster with single and double excitation formalism is applied. The developed code was benchmarked against DIRAC. Furthermore, using this code, the dipole moments of Li-H and Cl-F were calculated using an approximate molecular to atomic basis transformation and compared to experiment.

## Methods

Beginning with the Python 3.9.13 and PySCF 2.6.2<sup>28,29</sup> implementation of four component DHF, a code of relativistic unrestricted CCSD (using NumPy 1.22.4)<sup>30,31</sup> is created employing DIIS<sup>32</sup> following standard CCSD methods. The basis used for this work are obtained from Basis Set Exchange.<sup>33</sup> A variety of basis are used to ensure the code works independent of basis choice. The basis used are the 3-21g, 4-31g, and 6-31g basis;<sup>34,35</sup> the cc-PVDZ and augmented cc-PVDZ (aug-cc-PVDZ) basis;<sup>36,37</sup> and the Dyal-V2Z basis.<sup>38</sup> After converging the DHF calculation, an  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation is applied resulting in the following two-component DHF Hamiltonian:<sup>17,19</sup>

$$\hat{H} = E^{core} + \sum_{P,Q}^{valence} h_{PQ}^{core} a_P^\dagger a_Q + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{P,Q,R,S}^{valence} V_{RS}^{PQ} a_P^\dagger a_R^\dagger a_S a_Q, \quad (1)$$

with  $h_{PQ}^{core}$  representing the one-electron contributions and  $V_{RS}^{PQ} = \langle PR | \hat{g} | QS \rangle - \langle PR | \hat{g} | SQ \rangle$  representing the anti-symmetrized two-electron contributions.

Having obtained the relativistic mean-field, Coupled Cluster theory is now used to approximate the true wavefunction by systematically mixing in excited configurations. The wavefunction in Coupled Cluster theory is defined as  $|\Psi\rangle = e^{\hat{T}} |\Phi_0\rangle$  where  $|\Phi_0\rangle$  is the single determinant wave function.<sup>17,39</sup> For this work, the cluster operator  $\hat{T}$  was truncated to the single and double hole-particle excitations  $\hat{T} = \hat{T}_1 + \hat{T}_2$  where  $\hat{T}_1 = \sum_i \sum_a t_a^i a_a^\dagger a_i$  and

$\hat{T}_2 = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ij} \sum_{ab} t_{ab}^{ij} a_a^\dagger a_b^\dagger a_j a_i$ . Using the similarity transform  $\hat{H} = e^{-\hat{T}} \hat{H} e^T$  with  $\hat{\tau}_l$  denoting a generic excitation operation (singly, doubly, etc.), one can solve for the energy and cluster amplitudes:<sup>17,30,31,40–43</sup>

$$\langle \Phi_0 | \hat{H} | \Phi_0 \rangle = E, \quad (2)$$

$$\langle \Phi_l | \hat{H} | \Phi_0 \rangle = 0; |\Phi_l\rangle = \hat{\tau} |\Phi_0\rangle. \quad (3)$$

It is important to note that the asymmetric CCSD equations do not satisfy the variational principle due to the truncation of the cluster operators. This means that the calculated energy will not necessarily be an upper bound for the exact energy.<sup>44</sup>

## Benchmarking Coupled Cluster Dirac-Hartree-Fock

In order to assess the accuracy of this implementation of CCSD-DHF, three important tests are performed. These test check the accuracy of the  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation,<sup>19</sup> the CCSD implementation,<sup>30,31,41–43</sup> and the introduction of the spin-orbit contributions to the electron-electron integrals.<sup>45,46</sup>

An  $X2C$  transformation at its core decouples the positive and negative energy solution of the Dirac-Hamiltonian by re-expression of the four component spinors into a two-component picture. There are multiple variations to this type of procedure ( $X2C_{1e}$ ,  $X2C_{amfi}$ ,  $X2C_{mmf}$ ), with the most accurate being the  $X2C_{mmf}$ . This is because while  $X2C_{1e}$  and  $X2C_{amfi}$  are carried out before the relativistic HF SCF cycle, the  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation is carried out after. The advantage to this is that it yields results that are close to the full four component treatment<sup>17</sup> and the disadvantage is the need to run a four component DHF calculation rather than two component. To test the accuracy of the  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation we note that the spectrum of the  $X2C$  matrix equation, should be identical to the positive energy

branch of the four component Dirac matrix equation.<sup>19</sup> Let us write the X2C transformed Hamiltonian for the valence electrons in normal-ordered form:

$$H = \sum_{PQ} F_P^Q \{a_P^\dagger a_Q\} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{PQRS} V_{PR}^{QS} \{a_P^\dagger a_R^\dagger a_S a_Q\}, \quad (4)$$

where brackets indicate normal ordering with respect to occupied (hole) and virtual (particle) orbitals,  $F_P^Q$  are elements of the Fock matrix, and  $V_{PR}^{QS}$  once again represents the anti-symmetrized two-electron integrals. In this form, we observe that the matrix elements  $F_P^Q$  can be obtained from exact decoupling of the corresponding converged four component molecular Fock matrix. As the basis chosen for the correlation calculation is taken to be the canonical HF orbitals, the list of nonzero matrix elements reduces to the orbital energies  $F_P^Q = \epsilon_P \delta_{PQ}$ .<sup>19</sup> This allows us check if positive energy branch of the four component Dirac matrix is reproduced. After DHF calculations using Coulomb, Gaunt, and Breit interactions, an  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation is performed. The positive eigenvalues of the four component DHF and the eigenvalues of the Fock matrix after the  $X2C_{mmf}$  are compared to ensure that the spectrum of the X2C matrix equation, is identical to the positive energy branch of the four component Dirac matrix equations. The results of these calculations are shown in Figure 1 for the DC, DCG, and DGB Hamiltonian respectively. Observing that all the  $\epsilon_+^{X2C}$  equal  $\epsilon_+^{DHF}$  shows that the  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation replicates the the positive-energy of the four component DHF for Coulomb, Coulomb-Gaunt, and Coulomb-Breit calculations ensuring a proper transformation is achieved.




Figure 1: Positive energy spectrum after  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation versus positive energy spectrum from four component DHF using one-electron, Coulomb, Coulomb-Gaunt, and Coulomb-Breit Hamiltonian.

The second test performed in order to benchmark the code was to check the accuracy of the CCSD implementation. This was accomplished by setting up CCSD- $X2C_{mmf}$ -DHF calculations in the code and the DIRAC code.<sup>25</sup> We note there are a few subtle difference between our implementation and Dirac. By default Dirac code uses a finite-size nuclear model while PySCF uses a point nuclear model. Additionally, DIRAC code uses the unrestricted kinetic balance while PySCF uses the restricted kinetic balance. Finally, light speed between the two codes may be different at the 5th or 6th decimal place. In general, the expectation is that the larger the variation between the ground-states, the larger the variation in the CCSD correction. To mitigate floating-point error and limit approximation-induced variations in the ground states, smaller molecules such as He,  $H_2$ , Li-H, etc., were chosen.

Results in Figure 2-a shows on the y-axis the absolute difference of ground-state energy for four component DHF obtained using PySCF and the DIRAC code. The x-axis shows different basis where basis from left to right are generally considered better and larger (though this statement is not absolute as some molecule may respond better to some basis). This same type of figure is replicated in Figure 2-b but where now the y-axis shows the absolute difference of CCSD energy correction obtained using code and PySCF ground-state (labeled *This Work*) and the CCSD energy correction obtained using the DIRAC code for a variety

of basis.




Figure 2: (a) Absolute difference of ground-state energy for four component DHF obtained using PySCF and the DIRAC code and (b) absolute difference of CCSD energy correction obtained using the code and PySCF ground-state (labeled *This Work*) and the CCSD energy correction obtained using the DIRAC code.

From these figures it is observed that the ground-state calculation differ around  $10^{-5}$  Hartree while the CCSD energy corrections differ around  $10^{-4}$  Hartree. Since the ground-state energies differ by about  $10^{-5}$  Hartree between two calculations using the same geometry and basis set, we expect the corresponding CCSD total energies to differ by at least that much and potentially a little more. This is because CCSD builds on the DHF reference wavefunction, so even small differences in the HF energy typically reflect slight differences in the orbitals or orbital energies, which influence the CCSD amplitude equations and the resulting correlation energy. Therefore these variations are normal and expected, particularly when SCF convergence thresholds, orbital choices, or numerical details differ slightly between implementations. It is further observed that with increasing basis size the difference in the CCSD energy correction decreases. Finally, it is observed that roughly molecules with smaller ionic number show smaller differences in the CCSD energy correction (around  $10^{-6}$

Hartree) compared to larger molecules (as expected with a decrease in difference of ground-state). Considering the differences in codes mentioned above, these results can be reasonably expected.




Figure 3: (a) Absolute difference of ground-state energy using Coulomb operator versus Coulomb-Gaunt operator with calculation performed using PySCF and using the DIRAC code and (b) absolute difference of CCSD energy correction using Coulomb operator versus Coulomb-Gaunt operator with calculation performed using PySCF (labeled *This Work*) and using the DIRAC code.

The final test was initiated to check if the introduction of the spin-orbit coupling transformations were properly implemented. As previously mentioned, the DHF calculations (using Coulomb, Gaunt, and Breit interactions) were run after which an  $X2C_{mmf}$  transformation was applied. Currently the DIRAC code allows for the same calculation but only for Coulomb or Coulomb-Gaunt contributions.<sup>25</sup> Figure 3-a shows on the y-axis the absolute difference of ground-state energy using Coulomb operator versus Coulomb-Gaunt operator with calculation performed using PySCF and using the DIRAC code. The x-axis shows different basis sets and the the legend indicates the molecule. Similarly, Figure 3-b shows the absolute difference of the CCSD energy correction using Coulomb operator versus Coulomb-



Gaunt operator with calculation performed (labeled *This Work*) and using the DIRAC code for a variety of basis and molecules. From these figures, it is observed that the change in energy with the introduction of the Gaunt terms is very similar for all cases tested using the PySCF and DIRAC code reference except for Cl-F. However given the excellent agreement of the other test cases and considering that Cl-F also exhibited the largest difference in ground-state (see Figure 2-a), these results seem reasonable and correct.

The total dipole moment of a molecule is defined as<sup>47-49</sup>

$$\mu_{\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{nuc}} Z_i \mathbf{R}_{i\alpha} - \int \rho(r) \mathbf{r}_{\alpha} dr, \quad (5)$$

where the first term accounts nuclear contributions and the second term accounts for electronic contributions. In Eq. 5,  $\alpha$  denotes the axial direction,  $Z_i$  charge of the  $i$ -th nucleus,  $N_{nuc}$  the number of nuclei in the molecular structure, and  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\mathbf{r}$  correspond to the nuclear and electronic coordinates respectively. This operator governs key intermolecular interactions—such as dipole–dipole forces, and thus influences physical properties like phase behavior. Moreover, dipole moments are central to interpreting spectroscopic data and predicting molecular responses to external electric fields, making them indispensable in both theoretical and applied research. For some systems, the inclusion of relativistic effects becomes essential as when the nuclear charge increases, inner-shell electrons approach velocities where relativistic corrections significantly alter orbital contraction, electron distribution, and thus molecular properties—including the dipole moment. Ignoring these effects can lead to inaccurate predictions of molecular structure, bonding, and reactivity. To gain some insight into the effect of incorporating higher order corrections to the dipole moment the dipole moments of Li-H and Cl-F were calculated. Li-H is of particular interest as it remains theoretically the most efficient neutron shield material, showing great promise for use in reactors<sup>50-52</sup> while Cl-F is most often used as fluorinating reagent.<sup>53</sup> The results of these calculation were compared to experiment.<sup>54,55</sup>

To calculate the dipole moment at the CCSD-HF level, one typically evaluates

$$\mu_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{nuc}} Z_i \mathbf{R}_{i\alpha} - \sum_{\mu} \sum_{\nu} \gamma_{\nu}^{\mu} \langle \nu | \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\alpha} | \mu \rangle \quad (6)$$

where  $\gamma_{\nu}^{\mu} = \langle \Psi | a_P^{\dagger} a_Q | \Psi \rangle$  is the 1-electron density matrix (1-RDM) in the atomic-orbitals (AO) and  $\langle \nu | \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\alpha} | \mu \rangle = \int \chi_{\nu}^{\dagger} \mathbf{r}_{\alpha} \chi_{\mu}$  are the dipole moment integrals expressed in the AO basis. As the CCSD method work in the molecular orbital (MO) basis, the corresponding 1-RDMs are defined in the MO basis and must be transformed to the AO basis.<sup>50,56,57</sup> This same procedure was used for the relativistic case except that the 1-RDM was now calculated<sup>28,29,56,57</sup> from the singles amplitude, doubles amplitude, Fock matrix, and electron-electron tensor after the X2C<sub>mmf</sub> method was applied. Then the large components of the DHF coefficients were used to approximate the MO to AO basis transformation. This therefore only allows us to approximate the dipole moment as the transformation is no longer exact as in the non-relativistic case. By applying this approximation it was observed that with each molecule, increasing the fidelity of the basis initially caused the calculation to converge to the experimental dipole moment after which it began to diverge. This divergence might be attributed to the fact that as the basis increased in fidelity, the finer electronic structure of the system come into focus, and is no longer properly captured in the approximate MO to AO basis transformations. Therefore even though the basis used in the reported results were specifically chosen to help minimize the observed divergent behavior while keeping the basis as large as possible, these calculated dipole values are most suited for use in observing trends as higher order corrections to the electron-electron are added (e.g. Coulomb, Gaunt, Breit). The results of these calculations are shown in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

Table 1: Dipole moment of Li-H calculated using the presented CCSD-X2C<sub>mmf</sub>-DHF<sup>28,58</sup> and aug-cc-PVDZ basis compared to experiment.<sup>54</sup> Note that the bond distance was set to 1.5949 Å

Data Type	$E_{Total}$ [Ha]	Dipole Moment [D]	CPU Time [s]
Experimental	-	5.88	-
CCSD-X2C <sub>mmf</sub> -DHF <sub>DC</sub>	-8.02198	5.77718	76.65
CCSD-X2C <sub>mmf</sub> -DHF <sub>DCG</sub>	-8.02171	5.77728	96.66
CCSD-X2C <sub>mmf</sub> -DHF <sub>DCB</sub>	-8.01528	5.44186	222.9163

Table 2: Dipole moment of Cl-F calculated using the presented CCSD-X2C<sub>mmf</sub>-DHF<sup>28,58</sup> and uncontracted Dyall-V2Z basis compared to experiment.<sup>54</sup> Note that the bond distance was set to 1.6280 Å

Data Type	$E_{Total}$ [Ha]	Dipole Moment [D]	CPU Time [s]
Experimental	-	0.88	-
CCSD-X2C <sub>mmf</sub> -DHF <sub>DC</sub>	-561.00880	0.89997	36468.39
CCSD-X2C <sub>mmf</sub> -DHF <sub>DCG</sub>	-560.87968	0.90023	36248.68
CCSD-X2C <sub>mmf</sub> -DHF <sub>DCB</sub>	-560.88.902	0.90015	37961.83

From Table 1 and 2, it is observed that with the introduction of higher order relativistic corrections (Gaunt and Breit) to the calculation for CCSD-X2C<sub>mmf</sub>-DHF, the diatomic molecules, increase in their dipole moment with the introduction of the Gaunt term and then decrease slightly with the introduction of the retardation effects.

## Conclusion

As higher fidelity electronic structure is needed, the introduction of relativistic theories are become increasingly important to characterize certain systems. In order to address this issue, a code of CCSD was developed using the four component DHF ground state with Coulomb, Gaunt, and Breit contributions and an X2C<sub>mmf</sub> transformation. The CCSD-X2C-DHF code was benchmarked against an existing similar implementation of CCSD-X2C-DHF called DIRAC<sup>25</sup> and found to be in good agreement with DIRAC. Using the implementation CCSD-X2C-DHF code, the dipole moment of Li-H and Cl-F were calculated using an approximate MO to AO basis conversion. Using this framework, we have shown that the

the Coulomb, Gaunt, and Breit operator in-conjunction with a transformed Coulomb interaction for electron-electron interactions is consistent with other methods already developed and that the dipole moments approximated using the large DHF coefficient provides insight into how polarizability is effected through used of higher order electron-electron interaction terms providing insight to the effect of relativistic interactions. Overall, this work allows for study of relativistic processes within this mean-field approach and lays the foundation for future theoretical development of relativistic Coupled-Cluster Theory using a DHF reference state within this framework

## Acknowledgement

This work was carried out under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) under Contract No. 89233218CNA000001. It was supported by the G.T Seaborg Institute for Transactium Science at Los Alamos National Laboratory (L.M.), the LANL LDRD program (C.L. and R.M.T), and in part by the Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies, a DOE BES user facility, in partnership with the LANL Institutional Computing Program for computational resources.

## References

- (1) Himmetoglu, B.; Floris, A.; De Gironcoli, S.; Cococcioni, M. Hubbard-corrected DFT energy functionals: The LDA+ U description of correlated systems. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **2014**, *114*, 14–49.
- (2) Georges, A.; Kotliar, G.; Krauth, W.; Rozenberg, M. J. Dynamical mean-field theory of strongly correlated fermion systems and the limit of infinite dimensions. *Reviews of modern physics* **1996**, *68*, 13.

- (3) Wodynski, A.; Kaupp, M. Local hybrid functional applicable to weakly and strongly correlated systems. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2022**, *18*, 6111–6123.
- (4) Rivero, P.; Moreira, I. d. P.; Scuseria, G. E.; Illas, F. Description of magnetic interactions in strongly correlated solids via range-separated hybrid functionals. *Physical Review B—Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* **2009**, *79*, 245129.
- (5) Heß, B. A.; Marian, C. M.; Wahlgren, U.; Gropen, O. A mean-field spin-orbit method applicable to correlated wavefunctions. *Chemical Physics Letters* **1996**, *251*, 365–371.
- (6) Schwerdtfeger, P. *Relativistic Electronic Structure Theory, Part 1: Fundamentals*; Elsevier Science, 2002.
- (7) Klein, K.; Gauss, J. Perturbative calculation of spin-orbit splittings using the equation-of-motion ionization-potential coupled-cluster ansatz. *The Journal of chemical physics* **2008**, *129*.
- (8) Tutchton, R. M.; Chiu, W.-t.; Albers, R. C.; Kotliar, G.; Zhu, J.-X. Electronic correlation induced expansion of Fermi pockets in  $\delta$ -plutonium. *Physical Review B* **2020**, *101*, 245156.
- (9) Pyykko, P. Relativistic effects in structural chemistry. *Chemical Reviews* **1988**, *88*, 563–594.
- (10) Saue, T. Relativistic Hamiltonians for chemistry: A primer. *ChemPhysChem* **2011**, *12*, 3077–3094.
- (11) Autschbach, J. Perspective: relativistic effects. *The Journal of chemical physics* **2012**, *136*.
- (12) Pyykkö, P. Relativistic effects in chemistry: more common than you thought. *Annual review of physical chemistry* **2012**, *63*, 45–64.

- (13) Liu, W. Advances in relativistic molecular quantum mechanics. *Physics Reports* **2014**, *537*, 59–89.
- (14) Jayatilaka, D.; Lee, T. J. The form of spin orbitals for open-shell restricted Hartree–Fock reference functions. *Chemical physics letters* **1992**, *199*, 211–219.
- (15) Liu, J.; Shen, Y.; Asthana, A.; Cheng, L. Two-component relativistic coupled-cluster methods using mean-field spin-orbit integrals. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2018**, *148*.
- (16) Asthana, A.; Liu, J.; Cheng, L. Exact two-component equation-of-motion coupled-cluster singles and doubles method using atomic mean-field spin-orbit integrals. *The Journal of chemical physics* **2019**, *150*.
- (17) Pototschnig, J. V.; Papadopoulos, A.; Lyakh, D. I.; Repisky, M.; Halbert, L.; Severo Pereira Gomes, A.; Jensen, H. J. A.; Visscher, L. Implementation of relativistic coupled cluster theory for massively parallel GPU-accelerated computing architectures. *Journal of chemical theory and computation* **2021**, *17*, 5509–5529.
- (18) Tecmer, P.; Severo Pereira Gomes, A.; Knecht, S.; Visscher, L. Communication: Relativistic Fock-space coupled cluster study of small building blocks of larger uranium complexes. *The Journal of chemical physics* **2014**, *141*.
- (19) Sikkema, J.; Visscher, L.; Saue, T.; Iliáš, M. The molecular mean-field approach for correlated relativistic calculations. *The Journal of chemical physics* **2009**, *131*.
- (20) Čížek, J. On the correlation problem in atomic and molecular systems. Calculation of wavefunction components in Ursell-type expansion using quantum-field theoretical methods. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1966**, *45*, 4256–4266.
- (21) Čížek, J. On the use of the cluster expansion and the technique of diagrams in calcula-

- tions of correlation effects in atoms and molecules. *Advances in chemical physics* **1969**, *14*, 35–89.
- (22) Čížek, J.; Paldus, J. Correlation problems in atomic and molecular systems III. Red-  
erivation of the coupled-pair many-electron theory using the traditional quantum chem-  
ical methodst. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **1971**, *5*, 359–379.
- (23) Bartlett, R. J.; Musiał, M. Coupled-cluster theory in quantum chemistry. *Reviews of  
Modern Physics* **2007**, *79*, 291–352.
- (24) Swirles, B. The relativistic self-consistent field. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of  
London. Series A-Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **1935**, *152*, 625–649.
- (25) Saue, T.; Bast, R.; Gomes, A. S. P.; Jensen, H. J. A.; Visscher, L.; Aucar, I. A.;  
Di Remigio, R.; Dyall, K. G.; Eliav, E.; Fasshauer, E.; others The DIRAC code for  
relativistic molecular calculations. *The Journal of chemical physics* **2020**, *152*.
- (26) Zhang, T.; Banerjee, S.; Koulias, L. N.; Valeev, E. F.; DePrince III, A. E.; Li, X. Dirac–  
Coulomb–Breit Molecular Mean-Field Exact-Two-Component Relativistic Equation-  
of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Theory. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **2024**, *128*,  
3408–3418.
- (27) Yuwono, S. H.; Li, R. R.; Zhang, T.; Li, X.; DePrince, A. E. Two-component relativistic  
equation-of-motion coupled cluster for electron ionization. *The Journal of Chemical  
Physics* **2025**, *162*.
- (28) Sun, Q.; Berkelbach, T. C.; Blunt, N. S.; Booth, G. H.; Guo, S.; Li, Z.; Liu, J.;  
McClain, J. D.; Sayfutyarova, E. R.; Sharma, S.; others PySCF: the Python-based  
simulations of chemistry framework. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational  
Molecular Science* **2018**, *8*, e1340.

- (29) Sun, Q.; Zhang, X.; Banerjee, S.; Bao, P.; Barbry, M.; Blunt, N. S.; Bogdanov, N. A.; Booth, G. H.; Chen, J.; Cui, Z.-H.; others Recent developments in the PySCF program package. *The Journal of chemical physics* **2020**, *153*.
- (30) Visscher, L.; Dyall, K. G.; Lee, T. J. Kramers-restricted closed-shell CCSD theory. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **1995**, *56*, 411–419.
- (31) Visscher, L.; Lee, T. J.; Dyall, K. G. Formulation and implementation of a relativistic unrestricted coupled-cluster method including noniterative connected triples. *The Journal of chemical physics* **1996**, *105*, 8769–8776.
- (32) Császár, P.; Pulay, P. Geometry optimization by direct inversion in the iterative subspace. *Journal of Molecular Structure* **1984**, *114*, 31–34.
- (33) Pritchard, B. P.; Altarawy, D.; Didier, B.; Gibson, T. D.; Windus, T. L. New basis set exchange: An open, up-to-date resource for the molecular sciences community. *Journal of chemical information and modeling* **2019**, *59*, 4814–4820.
- (34) Hehre, W. J.; Ditchfield, R.; Pople, J. A. Self-consistent molecular orbital methods. XII. Further extensions of Gaussian-type basis sets for use in molecular orbital studies of organic molecules. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1972**, *56*, 2257–2261.
- (35) Hariharan, P. C.; Pople, J. A. The influence of polarization functions on molecular orbital hydrogenation energies. *Theoretica chimica acta* **1973**, *28*, 213–222.
- (36) Dunning Jr, T. H. Gaussian basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. I. The atoms boron through neon and hydrogen. *The Journal of chemical physics* **1989**, *90*, 1007–1023.
- (37) Kendall, R. A.; Dunning Jr, T. H.; Harrison, R. J. Electron affinities of the first-row atoms revisited. Systematic basis sets and wave functions. *The Journal of chemical physics* **1992**, *96*, 6796–6806.



- (38) Dyall, K. G. Relativistic double-zeta, triple-zeta, and quadruple-zeta basis sets for the actinides Ac–Lr. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* **2007**, *117*, 491–500.
- (39) Shavitt, I.; Bartlett, R. J. *Many-body methods in chemistry and physics: MBPT and coupled-cluster theory*; Cambridge university press, 2009.
- (40) Bartlett, R. J. Coupled-cluster theory and its equation-of-motion extensions. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Molecular Science* **2012**, *2*, 126–138.
- (41) Cizek, J. J<sup>^</sup> - Chem. Phy3., 5, 4256 (1966); b) *Advan. Chem. Phys* **1969**, *14*, 35.
- (42) Purvis, G. D.; Bartlett, R. J. A full coupled-cluster singles and doubles model: The inclusion of disconnected triples. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1982**, *76*, 1910–1918.
- (43) Bartlett, R. J. Coupled-cluster approach to molecular structure and spectra: a step toward predictive quantum chemistry. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry* **1989**, *93*, 1697–1708.
- (44) Crawford, T. D.; Schaefer III, H. F. An introduction to coupled cluster theory for computational chemists. *Reviews in computational chemistry* **2007**, *14*, 33–136.
- (45) Grant, I. P. *Relativistic quantum theory of atoms and molecules: theory and computation*; Springer, 2007.
- (46) Hoyer, C. E.; Lu, L.; Hu, H.; Shumilov, K. D.; Sun, S.; Knecht, S.; Li, X. Correlated Dirac–Coulomb–Breit multiconfigurational self-consistent-field methods. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2023**, *158*.
- (47) Chakraborty, R.; de Moraes, M. M. F.; Boguslawski, K.; Nowak, A.; Swierczynski, J.; Tecmer, P. Toward Reliable Dipole Moments without Single Excitations: The Role of Orbital Rotations and Dynamical Correlation. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2024**, *20*, 4689–4702.

- (48) Karne, A. S.; Vaval, N.; Pal, S.; Vásquez-Pérez, J. M.; Köster, A. M.; Calaminici, P. Systematic comparison of DFT and CCSD dipole moments, polarizabilities and hyperpolarizabilities. *Chemical Physics Letters* **2015**, *635*, 168–173.
- (49) Helgaker, T.; Jorgensen, P.; Olsen, J. *Molecular electronic-structure theory*; John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- (50) Welch, F. H. Lithium hydride: a space age shielding material. *Nuclear Engineering and Design* **1974**, *26*, 444–460.
- (51) Wang, W.; Li, Q.; Li, Q.; Yang, X.; Le, G. A review of irradiation stability of lithium hydride neutron shielding material. *Materials Science and Technology* **2016**, *32*, 434–437.
- (52) Craft, A. E.; King, J. C. Radiation shielding options for a nuclear reactor power system landed on the lunar surface. *Nuclear technology* **2010**, *172*, 255–272.
- (53) Lewis, R. A. *Hawley’s condensed chemical dictionary*; John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- (54) Nelson, R. D.; Lide, D. R.; Maryott, A. A. Selected values of electric dipole moments for molecules in the gas phase. **1967**,
- (55) Shostak, S. L.; Ebenstein, W. L.; Muenter, J. S. The dipole moment of water. I. Dipole moments and hyperfine properties of H<sub>2</sub>O and HDO in the ground and excited vibrational states. *The Journal of chemical physics* **1991**, *94*, 5875–5882.
- (56) Gauss, J.; Stanton, J. F.; Bartlett, R. J. Coupled-cluster open-shell analytic gradients: Implementation of the direct product decomposition approach in energy gradient calculations. *The Journal of chemical physics* **1991**, *95*, 2623–2638.
- (57) Gauss, J.; Stanton, J. F.; Bartlett, R. J. Analytic evaluation of energy gradients at the coupled-cluster singles and doubles level using quasi-restricted Hartree–Fock open-shell reference functions. *The Journal of chemical physics* **1991**, *95*, 2639–2645.

- (58) Paier, J.; Hirschl, R.; Marsman, M.; Kresse, G. The Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof exchange–correlation functional applied to the G2-1 test set using a plane-wave basis set. *The Journal of chemical physics* **2005**, *122*.