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We present a machine learning (ML) method for predicting electronic structure correlation energies using Hartree-Fock input. The total correlation energy is expressed in terms of individual and pair contributions from occupied molecular orbitals, and Gaussian process regression is used to predict these contributions from a feature set that is based on molecular orbital properties, such as Fock, Coulomb, and exchange matrix elements. With the aim of maximizing transferability across chemical systems and compactness of the feature set, we avoid the usual specification of ML features in terms of atom- or geometry-specific information, such atom/element-types, bond-types, or local molecular structure. ML predictions of MP2 and CCSD energies are presented for a range of systems, demonstrating that the method maintains accuracy while providing transferability both within and across chemical families; this includes predictions for molecules with atom-types and elements that are not included in the training set. The method holds promise both in its current form and as a proof-of-principle for the use of ML in the design of generalized density-matrix functionals.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Recent interest in the use of machine learning (ML) for electronic structure has focused on models that are formulated in terms of atom- and geometry-specific features, such as atom-types and bonding connectivities. The advantage of this approach is that it can yield excellent accuracy with computational cost that is comparable to classical force fields. However, a disadvantage of this approach is that building a ML model to describe a diverse set of elements and chemistries requires training with respect to a number of features that grows quickly with the number of atom- and bond-types, and also requires vast amounts of reference data for the selection and training of those features; these issues have hindered the degree of chemical transferability of existing ML models for electronic structure.

In this work, we focus on the more modest goal of using ML to describe the post-Hartree-Fock (HF) correlation energy. Assuming willingness to incur the cost of a HF self-consistent field (SCF) calculation, we aim to describe the correlation energy associated with post-HF methods. Our approach focuses on training not with respect to atom-based features, but instead using features based on the HF molecular orbitals (MOs), which have no explicit dependence on the underlying atom-types and may thus be expected to provide greater chemical transferability.

For a general post-HF electronic structure method, the correlation energy may be expressed via Nesbet’s theorem as a sum over occupied MOs

$$E_c = \sum_{ij}^{\text{occ}} \epsilon_{ij}. \quad (1)$$

Our strategy is to use ML to describe the diagonal and off-diagonal contributions to this sum,

$$\epsilon_{ii} = \epsilon_d(f_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_{ij} = \epsilon_o(f_{ij}), \quad (2)$$

respectively, where $f_i$ is a vector of features associated with the $i^{th}$ occupied MO, and $f_{ij}$ is a vector of features associated with the $i, j$ pair of occupied MOs. Employing this strategy in the representation of localized MOs (LMOs), for which Eq. also holds, leads to a ML model that is compact with respect to the number of features and that is both chemically accurate and encouragingly transferable across chemical systems.

II. FEATURE DESIGN AND SELECTION

All ML features used in this study are elements of the Fock matrix $F$, Coulomb matrix $J$, or exchange matrix $K$. With the aim of maximizing transferability of the features, we represent the matrices in the LMO basis. Only matrix elements associated with the subset of valence occupied and virtual LMOs are included as ML features; occupied core orbitals are excluded, as the post-HF calculations employ the frozen core approximation, and the valence virtual orbitals are defined by projection onto a minimal basis.

For a given $i, j$ pair of occupied LMOs, the total feature vector $f_{ij}$ is comprised of feature vectors associated with elements of the Fock, Coulomb, and exchange matrices,

$$f_{ij} = (f_{ij}^{(F)}, f_{ij}^{(J)}, f_{ij}^{(K)}). \quad (3)$$

These composite vectors involve matrix elements from the occupied-occupied, occupied-virtual, and virtual-
virtual blocks of the matrices, such that
\[
\mathbf{f}^{(F)}_{ij} = (F_{ii}, F_{ij}, F_{jj}, F_{ij})
\]
\[
\mathbf{f}^{(J)}_{ij} = (J_{ii}, J_{ij}, J_{jj}, J_{ij}^\dagger, J_{jj}^\dagger)
\]
\[
\mathbf{f}^{(K)}_{ij} = (K_{ij}, K_{ij}^\dagger, K_{ij}^\dagger)
\]
where terms are sorted with respect to \(i\) and \(j\) such that \(F_{ii} < F_{jj}\). The vectors \(J^\dagger_i\), \(J^\dagger_j\), \(K^\dagger_i\), and \(K^\dagger_j\) include matrix elements associated with localized valence virtual orbitals (indexed \(a, b, c, \ldots\)) such that
\[
J^\dagger_i = (J_{ia}, J_{ib}, J_{ic}, \ldots)
\]
and likewise for \(J^\dagger_j\) and \(K^\dagger_j\). The localized valence virtual orbitals associated with the matrix elements in \(J^\dagger_i\) and \(K^\dagger_i\) are selected and sorted on the basis of having the largest off-diagonal Coulomb matrix elements, such that \(J_{ia} > J_{ib} > J_{ic}, \ldots\); likewise for \(J^\dagger_j\) and \(K^\dagger_j\). Note that the valence virtual LMO associated with \(J_{ia}\) is the same as for \(K_{ia}\), but it need not be the same as that associated with \(J_{ja}\). Finally, the matrices \(F^{ij}, J^{ij}, J^{ij}^\dagger, K^{ij}\) in Eq. 4 contain virtual-virtual matrix elements corresponding to localized valence virtual orbitals that are selected and sorted such that \(J_{ia} + J_{ja} > J_{ib} + J_{jb}, \ldots\); only the upper diagonal of these matrices comprise independent features and are included. Appropriate sorting of the LMOs was found to be important for achieving transferability.

For each occupied LMO used to describe the diagonal contributions to the correlation energy, \(\epsilon_d(\mathbf{f}_i)\) in Eq. 2, the total feature vector \(\mathbf{f}_i\) is obtained by keeping only the unique terms in \(\mathbf{f}_i\).

### III. Calculation Details

All HF, second-order Möller-Plesset perturbation theory (MP2)\(^{13}\) and coupled-cluster with singles and doubles (CCSD\(^{14}\)) calculations are performed using the Molpro 2018.0 software package\(^{17}\). Unless otherwise stated, calculations employ the cc-pVTZ basis set\(^{15}\). The frozen-core approximation is employed for correlated calculations. Valence occupied and virtual LMOs are generated using the Intrinsic Bond Orbital method\(^{16}\) with a localization threshold of 10\(^{-12}\); core orbitals are excluded from localization.

For the selected features, Gaussian process regression (GPR\(^{22}\)) of \(\epsilon_d\) and \(\epsilon_o\) in Eq. 2 is separately performed with the GPY software package\(^{23}\). The Matérn 5/2 kernel\(^{20}\) is employed with white-noise regularization. The scaled conjugate gradient method\(^{22}\) is used to optimize the negative log marginal likelihood objective. Kernel ridge regression\(^{23}\) was also explored but was not found to lead to more accurate predictions than GPR.

In all cases, training and test geometries are generated from an \textit{ab initio} molecular dynamics trajectory performed with the Q-Chem 5.0 software package\(^{24}\) using the B3LYP\(^{25,26}\)/6-31g\(^*\) level of theory and a Langevin thermostat\(^{30}\) at 350 K. Geometries are sampled from the trajectories at 50 fs intervals. For each training geometry, data associated with all occupied orbitals is employed for training, although results are unchanged if a consistent number of orbital pairs is randomly selected from training geometries.

To avoid overfitting, the total number of features should be reduced prior to training. We prioritize features based on the intuition that features involving two occupied LMOs (e.g., \(J_{ij}\)) are more important than features involving one occupied and one valence virtual LMO (e.g., \(J_{ia}\)), which in turn are more important than features involving two valence virtual LMOs (e.g., \(J_{aa}\)). This intuition largely agrees with feature importance rankings determined automatically via decision tree regression\(^{31}\) while avoiding pathologies found using naive application of the latter for some cases. Employed features sets used in this study are listed in Table I.

### IV. Results

#### A. Transferability among geometries

For the example of a single water molecule, we begin by training the ML model on a subset of geometries to predict the correlation energy at other geometries. For both the MP2 and CCSD levels of theory, the diagonal (\(\epsilon_d\)) and off-diagonal (\(\epsilon_o\)) contributions to the correlation energy are separately trained using Feature Set A (Tab. I) with 200 geometries, and the resulting ML predictions for a superset of 1000 geometries are presented in Fig. 1. Errors are summarized in terms of mean absolute error (Mean Error), maximum absolute error (Max Error), and Mean Error as a percentage of the mean total correlation energy (Rel. Mean Error); energies are reported in milliHartrees (mH) throughout the paper.

As illustrated for the diagonal contributions in Fig. 1, the individual contributions to the correlation energy exhibit clusters associated with common physical origins (i.e., \(\sigma\)-bonding vs. lone-pair orbitals). For both the diagonal and off-diagonal contributions, the agreement between the ML prediction and the reference result is ex-
FIG. 1. ML predictions of MP2 (a-c) and CCSD (d-f) results for a water molecule, training on 200 geometries and predicting for 1000 geometries, including $\epsilon_d$ (a,d) and $\epsilon_o$ (b,e) for the pairs of occupied orbitals, as well as the total correlation energies (c,f). Mean absolute errors (Mean), maximum absolute errors (Max), and Mean Errors as a fraction of total correlation energy (Rel. Mean) are reported; all energies in mH. The guideline indicates zero error, with the region of up to 2 mH error indicated via shading.

Table II summarizes the corresponding results for other small molecules, with $\epsilon_d$ and $\epsilon_o$ trained on a subset of geometries and used to predict the CCSD correlation energy for other geometries. The molecules range in size from H$_2$ to benzene. Feature Set A is used in all cases, except for ethane, for which Feature Set B was needed to achieve comparable accuracy. The number of geometries included in the training set and testing superset are indicated in the table. In general, the Mean Error for the correlation energy is much less than 1 mH, and the Max Error is also in the range of chemical accuracy. Note that we are predicting the correlation energy for these molecules with a Rel. Mean Error that is 0.1% or less for all cases.

Table II also illustrates the sensitivity of the ML predictions to changing the number of geometries in the training set (for ethane, formic acid, and difluoromethane) or the employed basis set (for water). Although the additional geometries for these cases lead to better ML prediction accuracy, further improvement with additional geometries eventually becomes limited by the baseline self-training error of the employed GPR method. The water results for basis sets ranging from double-zeta to quintuple-zeta make clear that the ML prediction is not sensitive to the employed basis set.

B. Transferability within a molecular family

We now explore the degree to which a ML model trained on one molecular system can be used to describe a different system, focusing first on transferability within a molecular family. Fig. 2 shows results for water clusters (tetramer, pentamer, and hexamer) based on training data that includes only the water monomer and dimer. The ML model is trained on 200 water monomer and 300 water dimer geometries, and predictions are made for 100 geometries of each of the larger clusters. To avoid overfitting based on the monomer and dimer input, we employ the smaller Feature Set C.

Figure 2 shows ML predictions of the CCSD energy of water (a) tetramers, (b) pentamers, and (c) and hexam-
TABLE II. ML predictions of CCSD correlation energies for a collection of small molecules, with the number of training and testing geometries indicated. A more detailed breakdown of the diagonal and off-diagonal contributions to the correlation energy errors is presented in Tab. S1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecule</th>
<th>Geometries</th>
<th>Error (mH)</th>
<th>Rel. Error(%)</th>
<th>Geometries</th>
<th>Error (mH)</th>
<th>Rel. Error(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₂</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₃</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCN</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₂</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₄</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₅⁺</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₃O</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCOOH</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₃OH</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂F₂⁺</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₆H₆</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O₁⁺</td>
<td>cc-pVDZ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cc-pVTZ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cc-pVQZ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cc-pV5Z</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hydrogen fluoride. †Two sizes of training sets are presented to illustrate error reduction. ‡Results for several basis sets provided.

ers. In these predictions, the absolute zero of energy is shifted to compare relative energies on the cluster potential energy surface (i.e. parallelity errors are removed); the sizes of these shifts are reported in the caption. For all three clusters, the observed Rel. Mean Errors of 0.06-0.07% are comparable to those reported in Tab. S1.

Although the results in Fig. 2 are encouraging in terms of accuracy, additional analysis suggests that more sophisticated regression methods will lead to further improvements. To illustrate this, each panel of the figure reports the calculated GPR baseline accuracy, determined via characterizing the self-training error with the employed GPR method. For each size of water cluster, a ML model is trained and tested on the same set of 100 geometries; this establishes the smallest error that can be expected of the predictions within the current ML framework. The fact that the prediction errors for the ML model for the water clusters are very similar to the GPR baseline error in Fig. 2 suggests that the prediction error is dominated by the self-training error of the GPR rather than from a lack of transferability of the ML model trained on water monomers and dimers to larger clusters. Further refinement of the employed regression method will potentially reduce the baseline error and therefore improve ML predictions.

As a second example, we examine transferability
within a family of covalently bonded molecules by predicting butane and isobutane CCSD energies from shorter alkane training data. The ML model is first trained on 100 methane and 300 ethane geometries using Feature Set B, and Fig. 3 presents the resulting ML predictions for 100 geometries of butane and isobutane. Although the Mean Errors are not large (1.2 and 1.4 mH), the Rel. Mean Errors are over twice those obtained for the water cluster series. Moreover, the Mean and Max errors associated with the baseline GPR accuracy (reported in caption) are smaller than the prediction errors, suggesting that additional training data would improve prediction accuracy.

The effect of including additional alkane training data is tested in Fig. 3, which presents results for which the ML model is retrained with the training data set expanded to include 50 propane geometries. The prediction errors for butane and isobutane are both substantially reduced upon inclusion of the propane data, with the butane prediction errors dropping to the GPR baseline while the isobutane prediction errors remain above the GPR baseline.

Comparison of the ML prediction errors in Figs. 3a and 3b is sensible from the perspective of the carbon atom-types that are included in the training data. The unbranched butane molecule includes only primary and secondary carbons, whereas isobutane includes a tertiary carbon atom. In Fig. 3a, the training data includes examples of neither secondary nor tertiary carbon atoms; it is thus notable how well the ML model predicts the energies for butane and isobutane, both of which include atom-types that are not included in the training data. In Fig. 3b, the propane training data provides information about secondary carbons to the particular benefit of the butane ML predictions, whereas the isobutane errors, while improved, remain slightly larger since tertiary carbon examples are still not included in the training data. Regardless, these results directly illustrate that the ML model exhibits encouraging transferability, providing good prediction accuracy even for molecules with atom-types that are not included in the training data.

C. Transferability across molecules and elements

Figure 4 explores ML predictions for methanol using a training set that contains methane, water, and formic acid. For this example, the training molecules include similar bond-types and the same elements as methanol, but different bonding connectivity. The ML model is trained on 50 geometries each of methane, water, and formic acid, using Feature Set A; the model is then used to predict CCSD energies for a superset of 100 geometries of each of the molecules in the training set (Fig. 4a) and for 100 geometries of the methanol molecule (Fig. 4b).

Fig. 4a first shows predictions for the molecules that are represented within the training set. The resulting errors are similar to those observed when separate models are trained for each of these molecules individually (Tab. II), indicating that the ML model has the flexibility to simultaneously describe this group of chemically distinct molecules.

In Fig. 4b, the same ML model is used to predict the CCSD energy of methanol, which is not represented in the training set. The resulting Mean and Max Errors for methanol are comparable to those for the molecules in the training set, and notably, these errors are only about twice as large as those obtained from training methanol on itself (Tab. II). These results demonstrate that the ML model successfully transfers information learned about pair correlation energies in methane, water, and formic acid toward the prediction of methanol, while preserving chemical accuracy.

Finally, as an extreme test of transferability of the ML model, we explore cases for which predictions are made on molecules with chemical elements that do not appear in the training set. Figure 5 shows the ML predictions...
We have introduced a ML method for predicting correlated electronic structure energies using input from an SCF calculation. With features formulated in terms of molecular orbitals – rather than atom-type or element specific features – the method is designed with the aim of providing a compact feature set for learning and good transferability across chemical systems.

The transferability of the method has been demonstrated in several examples, illustrating that it can be used for accurate MP2 and CCSD energy predictions for molecules with different bonding connectivities and different chemical elements than those included in the training set. Of the various applications of the ML method in this work, the relative mean error is at most 0.24% of the CCSD correlation energy. Furthermore, the method is shown to work equally well for the prediction of both MP2 and CCSD correlation energies, suggesting that it will be similarly effective in the prediction of other single-reference correlated electronic structure methods. The description of the ML features in terms of localized and thus transferable ML model.

In terms of compactness of the ML feature set, all calculations presented here employ between 11 and 26 unique features. Alternatively stated, we find that at most 26 matrix elements from a HF calculation are needed to predict the contribution to the correlation energy from any pair of occupied valence orbitals; the training data includes no meta-data about atom-types, bond-types, geometry, or about the chemical environment in which the orbital pair resides.

Although several avenues for development and application of the method are possible, two natural objectives

![Figure 4](image.png)

**FIG. 4.** Using a model trained on water, methane, and formic acid, ML predictions of CCSD total energy for (a) these same three molecules and (b) methanol. ML prediction errors are plotted versus the true CCSD total energy. In panel (b), parallelity error is removed via a global shift in the predicted energy by 3.5 mH. The true CCSD energies are plotted relative to their median. All energies reported in mH.
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**FIG. 5.** ML predictions of CCSD total energies for ammonia, methane, and hydrogen fluoride by 3.4, 16, and 5.6 mH, respectively. The true CCSD energies are plotted relative to their median. All energies are reported in mH.

for the CCSD energies of 100 geometries each of ammonia, methane, and hydrogen fluoride (HFI), using the ML model trained exclusively on 100 water geometries. As before, Feature Set C is used to avoid overfitting. For nine of the 100 HFI geometries, one pair of occupied LMOs energetically orders in a way that is not accounted for the feature sorting protocol described in Sec. [II] to address this, the i, j sorting of one pair of LMOs was done manually in these 9 HFI geometries.

The results in Fig. [5] clearly indicate that the CCSD energies for the NH3, CH4, and HFI molecules are accurately predicted by the ML model on the basis of training data that comes entirely from H2O. The Mean Errors fall within 0.5 mH, and Rel. Mean Errors remain below 0.24% in all cases. These results demonstrate that the ML model successfully transfers information about the fundamental components of the electronic structure of water – i.e., lone pairs and sigma bonds – for the prediction of similar components in other molecules, even when those molecules are composed of different elements.
for future work are to reduce the baseline self-training errors of the simple Gaussian process regression method employed here and to formulate the ML method in terms of input from low-cost SCF theories, such as density functional tight-binding.
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