An antiadiabatic view of fast environmental effects on optical spectra
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The effect of the medium refractive index on optical spectra of molecular systems in condensed phases is attacked in an antiadiabatic approach that solves some of the issues affecting current implementation of continuum solvation models and more generally of mixed quantum-classical treatments of environmental effects.

The definition of reliable and practical models to simulate how a dielectric environment affects the properties and spectra of molecular materials represents a theoretical and computational challenge with an enormous practical implications: environmental effects can be detrimental to the performance of molecular materials for advanced applications, including OLED and solar cells, but, if properly understood, they can be exploited towards optimized materials in a smart-matrix approach. An enormous body of literature, dating back to the 50’s with the works of Mc Rae[1] and Liptay[2] and going on up to these days,[3] can be found addressing environmental effects in optical spectra of molecular systems.

Two different timescales must be considered for the interaction between a dye (the solute) and its local environment (the solvent).[4] The electronic degrees of freedom of the medium have a faster dynamics than relevant solute dynamics. In polar media, the orientational motion of the polar solvent molecules is frozen in solid matrices (polymers, glasses, etc) and, even in liquid solvents, it is much slower than the (electronic and vibrational) degrees of freedom of the solute. The different timescale of the electronic and orientational solvation components has important spectroscopic implications, recognized since date: the fast solvation component readjusts during the absorption and emission processes, so that it is always equilibrated with the actual solute state. On the opposite, the orientational solvation component stays frozen to the situation relevant to the equilibrated ground state for the absorption process, and, in liquid solvents it equilibrates to the excited state before fluorescence. In any case both absorption and fluorescence occur vertically, i.e. without the concomitant rearrangement of the slow solvation component.[5] But there is another implication of the different timescales:[6–8] the kinetic energy associated with polar solvation can be safely disregarded when addressing the solute properties and dynamics, so that an adiabatic molecular Hamiltonian can be diagonalized for each fixed solvent configuration. This approximation however is not suitable for fast solvation. An antiadiabatic (AA) approach[9] is more appropriate, where the fast solvation component is instantaneously equilibrated with the solute charge distribution, leading to a single effective AA Hamiltonian,[6–8] Here a model for fast solvation is introduced that, amenable to a numerically exact solution, is used to address the limits of the adiabatic approximation when applied to fast solvation and to validate the AA approach. On this basis we critically review current implementations of continuum solvation models, including the polarizable continuum model (PCM) and the conductor-like screening model (COSMO).[3, 10–15]

In the simplest solvation model the solute is a point-dipole that polarizes the surrounding solvent, generating an electric reaction field at the solute location. The solute is in turn affected by the reaction field, leading to a self-consistent problem. This model set the basis for the classical theory of solvatochromism,[2, 16] was adopted in parametric models,[8, 17–19] and was used as a toy model to discuss PCM implementations.[10, 11] At the equilibrium, both the fast and slow components of the reaction field are proportional to the expectation value of the solute dipole moment in the state of interest: \( (\vec{F}_{el/or})_{eq} = r_{el/or}(\vec{\mu}) \). If the solute occupies a spherical cavity of radius \( a \), one gets:[1, 16]

\[
r_{el} = \frac{2}{4\pi\epsilon_{0}a^{3}}f(\epsilon_{opt}), \quad r_{or} = \frac{2}{4\pi\epsilon_{0}a^{3}}[f(\epsilon_{st}) - f(\epsilon_{opt})]
\]

where \( \epsilon_{0} \) is the vacuum permittivity, \( f(\epsilon) = (\epsilon - 1)/(2\epsilon + 1) \), \( \epsilon_{st} \) is the static dielectric constant and \( \epsilon_{opt} \) is the dielectric constant at optical frequency (the squared refractive index). Modeling the solvent as an elastic medium, the potential energy associated to either \( \vec{F}_{or} \) or \( \vec{F}_{el} \) is quadratic in the fields, and enforcing the equilibrium condition, the relevant force constants are fixed to the inverse of the corresponding \( r \).[8] The Hamiltonian of the solvated molecule then reads:

\[
H = H_{gas} + \left[ \frac{\vec{F}_{el}^{2}}{2r_{el}} + T_{el} - \vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{F}_{el} \right] + \left[ \frac{\vec{F}_{or}^{2}}{2r_{or}} - \vec{\mu} \cdot \vec{F}_{or} \right]
\]

where \( H_{gas} \) is the gas phase molecular Hamiltonian and the two parentheses group terms relevant to the electronic and orientational solvation. \( T_{el} \) is the kinetic energy associated with the electronic reaction field. The corresponding term in the second parenthesis is missing since the adiabatic approximation is safely applied to the orientational field. In the following we only address electronic solvation, shortly addressing polar solvation in the concluding section. Moreover we will consider quasi-linear molecules, whose dipole moment has sizable
FIG. 1. The molecules considered in this work. The long arrow marks the direction of the main component of the dipole moment operator. **DANS**: dimethylamino-nitrostylylene; **DT**: 9,9-dimethyl-9,10-dihydroacridine-2,4,6-triphenyl-1,3,5-triazine; **RD**: the Reichardt dye; **QD** (quadrupolar dye): a fluorinated bis-alkylaminostyryl derivative.

matrix elements only along a special molecular axis (Fig. 1), at least as long as low energy states are of interest. $F_{el}$ and $\mu$ denote the main components of the reaction field and of the dipole moment operator, respectively.

In second-quantization we set $F_{el} = g(\hat{b}^\dagger + \hat{b})$, where $\hat{b}$ ($\hat{b}^\dagger$) is the boson annihilation (creation) operator, $g = \sqrt{\hbar \omega_{el} r_{el}/2}$ and $\omega_{el}$ is the frequency associated with the solvent electronic polarization (typically in the ultraviolet). With these definitions, the Hamiltonian of a dye coupled to $F_{el}$ reads:

$$H = H_{gas} - g\mu(\hat{b}^\dagger + \hat{b}) + \hbar \omega_{el}(\hat{b}^\dagger \hat{b} + \frac{1}{2})$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

If $H_{gas}$ is defined on a finite basis set ($|f_1\rangle, |f_2\rangle, ..., |f_N\rangle$), a numerically exact non-adiabatic solution of the Hamiltonian in Eq. 3 is obtained diagonalizing the Hamiltonian matrix written on the direct product basis: $(|f_1\rangle, |f_2\rangle, ..., |f_N\rangle)^\dagger \times (|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle, ...)$, where $|n\rangle$ are the eigenstates of the harmonic oscillator in the last term of Eq. 3 (see Fig.2).[20] Of course, the infinite oscillator basis must be truncated to large enough $n$ as not to affect the properties of interest. Since $\omega_{el}$ is large, only few oscillator quanta are needed, so that the non-adiabatic basis is just a few times larger than the molecular basis.

The exact solution of the Hamiltonian in Eq.3 can be obtained irrespective of the precise values of $\omega_{el}$ and of the molecular energies, however, the model only applies in the hypothesis that the frequency of the molecular excitations of interest are much lower than $\omega_{el}$. More generally, continuum solvation models only apply when the solvent and solute dynamics are characterized by largely different timescales as to make the details of the solvent excitation spectrum irrelevant. In the spirit of continuum models we then adopt an AA approach setting $\omega_{el} \rightarrow \infty$.[6–8] In this limit, a perturbative expansion leads to the following Hamiltonian:[20]

$$H_{AA} = H_{gas} - \frac{r_{el}}{2} \mu^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

This equation applies to quasi-linear molecules, its analogous for 3D structures has $\mu^2$ substituted by $\tilde{\mu}^2$.

To validate our view, following a similar strategy as in ref. 21, a few state model (FSM) is defined for the molecules in Fig. 1. We run gas phase TD-DFT (CAM-B3LYP, 6-31G(d)) calculations[20] and select the first three singlets as the molecular basis $|f_1\rangle, |f_2\rangle, |f_3\rangle$ (different choices give similar results[20]). The matrix elements of the dipole moment operator are calculated by Multiwfn software, [22] and we set $\hbar \omega_{el} = 20$ eV. Results are plotted against $f(\epsilon_{opt})$, extracted for each dye from $r_{el}$ in Eq.1, setting a to the Onsager radius.[23]

Fig. 3 collects results for **DANS**, a polar dye showing positive solvatochromism.[24] AA results are practically superimposed with non-adiabatic results obtained via exact diagonalization (ED). Polar states are stabilized in solution, and the **DANS** dipole moment smoothly increases with $f(\epsilon_{opt})$. This implies an increase of the transition dipole moment and a decrease of the transition frequency[17, 24]. We now compare non-adiabatic ED and AA results with adiabatic results (middle panels of Fig. 3) obtained in FSM following the three approaches currently implemented in Gaussian package: linear response (LR), corrected LR (cLR), external iteration (EI). The first step is the diagonalization of the adiabatic FSM Hamiltonian fixing $F_{el}$ to the ground state equilibrium. The calculated ground state dipole moment increases with $f(\epsilon_{opt})$ much less than in the non-adiabatic approaches demonstrating that the adiabatic approximation fails already in the calculation of the ground state. Indeed, **DANS** has a small permanent dipole moment, so that the ground state reaction field is small. Therefore states with a polar nature are less stabilized in the adiabatic approximation than in non-adiabatic and AA ap-
Indeed, RD has a large ground state dipole moment, resulting in large solvation potentials whose FSM description of the electronic molecular structure and of the solute-solvent interaction. Moreover, the FSM values of \( \mu \) (D) do not compare directly with PCM TD-DFT values. With these caveats in mind, the similarity of adiabatic results obtained in FSM and TD-DFT calculations is not expected since FSM offer a simplified description of the electronic molecular structure and of the solute-solvent interaction. Moreover, the FSM values of \( \mu \) (D) do not compare directly with PCM TD-DFT values. With these caveats in mind, the similarity of adiabatic results obtained in FSM and TD-DFT calculations confirms that FSM captures the main physics of DANS.

The same analysis is performed on three more molecules (fig. 1): (a) DT, a dye of interest for thermally activated delayed fluorescence;[25] (b) RD, a zwitterionic dye showing inverse solvatochromism;[26] (c) QD, a quadrupolar dye, with negligible polarity but sizable transition dipole moments.[19] Fig. 4 summarizes results on transition energies, ref. 20 collects additional results. AA approximates well ED results for all molecules, a marginal discrepancy being observed for QD. Indeed in this case an important involvement of the third excited state \( f_{3} \) is expected,[19] while this high-energy state is only marginally relevant in polar dyes.[20] For DT, a molecule with negligible transition dipole moments, adiabatic FSM and PCM compare well, with vanishing LR corrections and largely underestimated EI transition energies. On the other hand, cLR is close to the exact result. For RD, adiabatic FSM results deviate from PCM. Indeed RD has a large ground state dipole moment, resulting in large solvation potentials whose FSM descrip-
tion in terms of a reaction field may lead to an FSM adiabatic ground state very different from the corresponding TD-DFT state, with effects that propagate in all adiabatic results. We can however compare adiabatic and non adiabatic results obtained in FSM: the LR correction lowers the transition energy but not enough to hit the exact result. Similarly, EI overestimates transition energies. cLR again offers reasonable estimates for the transition energies. For QD, a non-polar dye, cLR and EI corrections fully vanish in the FSM description. LR, making reference to transition dipole moments rather than to permanent dipole moments (Fig.2), performs better. So cLR, leading to reasonable transition energies for polar dyes, turns out inadequate for non-polar dyes. Indeed for dyes with vanishing polarity in both ground and (vertical) excited states, cLR leads in FSM to vanishing solvation corrections. In a non-adiabatic or AA picture instead, the solvent (quasi)-instantaneously responds to the charge fluctuations in the solute lowering their energy. Accordingly, even adopting the dipolar approximation for the solute-solvent interaction, fast solvation does affect the properties of non-polar dyes. Adiabatic TD-DFT results are qualitatively in line with corresponding FSM results. Indeed cLR fails to predict the large corrections to the excitation energy due to the dipolar contribution, but accounts for marginal corrections due to higher order (quadrupolar) corrections in the solute-solvent interaction.

The limits of current implementations of continuum solvation models are known,[3, 11, 13] here we demonstrate that they are rooted in the adiabatic treatment of fast solvation. Adopting different approximation schemes (LR, cLR, EI, etc) for the calculation of transition energies cannot cure the basic problem: the adiabatic approximation, not accounting for the response of the medium electronic degrees of freedom to the solute charge fluctuations, cannot provide a reliable description of the molecular systems. Indeed the very same ground state is not properly described in the adiabatic approximation. This problem, addressed here with specific reference to continuum solvation models, affects more generally quantum mechanical models where the medium is described in a classical way, including e.g. quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics QM-MM approaches, where, even when accounting for a polarizable force field, the QM Hamiltonian is defined and diagonalized in the presence of the potential generated by the environment as equilibrated to a specific state.

An exact treatment of environmental effect, requiring a detailed knowledge of the excitation spectrum of the medium, is far too complex and, in the spirit of continuum models, we propose here an AA approach that qualitatively improves on the adiabatic approximation. Specifically, a single renormalized AA Hamiltonian is defined that describes the solute interacting with the fast component of environmental fields. The eigenstates of the AA Hamiltonian directly enter the calculation of optical spectra, without the need to invoke state-specific Hamiltonians, quite naturally solving the conundrum of calculating transitions between states obtained upon diagonalizing different Hamiltonians.

Once fast (electronic) solvation is accounted for in the AA Hamiltonian, polar solvation can be safely dealt with in the adiabatic approximation. For this application EI,[12] leading to formally exact results, is more accurate than LR and cLR approaches, based on perturbative expansions.[3, 13] Since optical transitions occur vertically, the eigenstates involved in the absorption process can all be obtained diagonalizing the adiabatic Hamiltonian with the potential due to slow solvation fixed to the ground state equilibrium value. Similarly, the states involved in fluorescence are obtained diagonalizing the adiabatic Hamiltonian with the slow-solvation potential equilibrated to the lowest excited singlet. Accordingly, in either case, transitions are calculated between states that are obtained from the diagonalization of the same Hamiltonian. The issue of incongruent eigenstates, affecting EI when applied to fast solvation, does not show up in dealing with polar solvation, demonstrating again that the adiabatic approximation, physically relevant to describe polar solvation, cannot be applied to fast solvation.

Extending the model to multipolar terms in the solute-solvent interaction is certainly feasible, but we believe that, having properly framed the problem of fast solvation, reliable AA effective Hamiltonians will be developed towards realistic and detailed descriptions of the molecular systems. The GW-Bethe-Salpeter Equation formalism coupled to continuum solvation models[27–29] is promising in this respect, but the development of reliable approaches to fast solvation to be implemented into popular TD-DFT computational codes is highly desirable.
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I. THE MODEL AND THE ANTIADIABATIC APPROXIMATION

For the sake of clarity we consider a molecular system that can be described in terms of 3 electronic states \((f_1, f_2, f_3)\) whose gas-phase Hamiltonian reads:

\[
H_{\text{gas}} = \begin{pmatrix}
h_{11} & h_{12} & h_{13} \\
h_{21} & h_{22} & h_{23} \\
h_{31} & h_{32} & h_{33}
\end{pmatrix}
\]  

(1)

We define on the same basis the matrix elements of the dipole moment operator:

\[
\mu_{ij} = \langle f_i | \hat{\mu} | f_j \rangle
\]  

(2)

To define the non-adiabatic basis we take the direct product of the electronic basis \((f_1, f_2, f_3)\) time the first three eigenstates of the harmonic oscillator describing fast solvation \(|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle\) (the calculation can be easily generalized to an arbitrary number of electronic and bosonic states). The nine basis functions are:

\[
|f_1\rangle|0\rangle, |f_2\rangle|0\rangle, |f_3\rangle|0\rangle, |f_1\rangle|1\rangle, |f_2\rangle|1\rangle, |f_3\rangle|1\rangle, |f_1\rangle|2\rangle, |f_2\rangle|2\rangle, |f_3\rangle|2\rangle
\]  

(3)

On this basis the Hamiltonian describing the solute-solvent system (Eq. 6 in the main text) reads:

\[
H = \begin{pmatrix}
h_{11} & h_{12} & h_{13} & -g\mu_{11} & -g\mu_{12} & -g\mu_{13} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
h_{21} & h_{22} & h_{23} & -g\mu_{21} & -g\mu_{22} & -g\mu_{23} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
h_{31} & h_{32} & h_{33} & -g\mu_{31} & -g\mu_{32} & -g\mu_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & h_{11} + \hbar \omega & h_{12} & h_{13} & -\sqrt{2}g\mu_{11} & -\sqrt{2}g\mu_{12} & -\sqrt{2}g\mu_{13} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & h_{21} & h_{22} + \hbar \omega & h_{23} & -\sqrt{2}g\mu_{21} & -\sqrt{2}g\mu_{22} & -\sqrt{2}g\mu_{23} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & h_{31} & h_{32} & h_{33} + \hbar \omega & -\sqrt{2}g\mu_{31} & -\sqrt{2}g\mu_{32} & -\sqrt{2}g\mu_{33} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & h_{11} + 2\hbar \omega & h_{12} & h_{13} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & h_{21} & h_{22} + 2\hbar \omega & h_{23} \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & h_{31} & h_{32} & h_{33} + 2\hbar \omega
\end{pmatrix}
\]  

(4)

where we took advantage of the hermiticity of the Hamiltonian matrix to only write its upper triangle. This Hamiltonian can be diagonalized numerically to get the exact non-adiabatic eigenstates.
To proceed towards the antiadiabatic (AA) Hamiltonian we use first order perturbation theory to write the effective electronic states as:

$$|\tilde{f}_i\rangle = |f_i\rangle |0\rangle - \frac{g}{\hbar \omega} \sum_{k=1}^{3} \mu_{ik} |f_k\rangle |1\rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where we have imposed the AA approximation neglecting molecular energies vs $\hbar \omega$. We can now calculate the matrix elements of the AA Hamiltonian as the matrix elements of the non-adiabatic Hamiltonian on the effective AA states:

$$\langle \tilde{f}_i | H | \tilde{f}_j \rangle = h_{ij} - 2 \frac{g^2}{\hbar \omega} \sum_k \mu_{ik} \mu_{kj} + \frac{g^2}{(h\omega)^2} \sum_{km} \mu_{ik} \mu_{jm} \langle 1 | \langle f_m | H | f_k \rangle | 1 \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

The delicate term is $\langle 1 | \langle f_m | H | f_k \rangle | 1 \rangle$. In it the contribution from the interaction $H$ goes high order, so it will not be considered. The only relevant contribution is $\langle 1 | \langle f_m | H_{gas} | f_k \rangle | 1 \rangle$. Off-diagonal elements are $\langle 1 | \langle f_m | H_{gas} | f_k \rangle | 1 \rangle = h_{ij}$ so that resulting corrections to the renormalized Hamiltonian are proportional to $\frac{g^2}{(h\omega)^2}$ and are therefore negligible. Diagonal elements instead are $\langle 1 | \langle f_m | H_{gas} | f_k \rangle | 1 \rangle = h_{ii} + \hbar \omega \sim \hbar \omega$. So that corresponding terms turn out $\propto \frac{g^2}{h\omega}$ and must be retained, leading to

$$\langle \tilde{f}_i | H | \tilde{f}_j \rangle = h_{ij} - \frac{g^2}{\hbar \omega} \sum_k \mu_{ik} \mu_{kj}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

Having defined $g = \sqrt{\hbar \omega r_{el}/2}$, the above equation reduces to Eq. 7 in the main text.

For the sake of comparison, we implemented in FSM the same approximate approaches as implemented in Gaussian16. The first step is the diagonalization of the adiabatic Hamiltonian with $F_{el}$ fixed at the value relevant for the equilibrated ground state. The corresponding vertical transition energy $\Delta E_{12}^{(0)}$ (see Fig. 2, main text) is plotted in our figures as a dotted red line. The LR transition energy (red continuous lines) is calculated as:

$$\Delta E_{21}^{LR} = \Delta E_{21}^{(0)} - r_{el} |\mu_{21}|^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

The cLR transition energy (green continuous lines) is:

$$\Delta E_{21}^{CLR} = \Delta E_{21}^{(0)} - \frac{r_{el}}{2} (\mu_{22} - \mu_{11})^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Both LR and cLR approaches are based on a lowest order perturbation theory, with uncorrected wavefunctions. Accordingly, permanent and transition dipole moments (red continuous lines in our figures) are calculated using the eigenstates of the adiabatic Hamiltonian and are the same for both approaches.
The EI approach instead diagonalizes the adiabatic Hamiltonian with the solvent equili-
brated at the excited state to calculate the excited state energy and eigenstate. The tran-
sition energy (blue curves) is calculated as the difference between the equilibrated excited
state and the ground state (calculated based on the adiabatic Hamiltonian with the reaction
field equilibrated at the ground state, see Fig. 2 main text). Permanent dipole moments
(blue curves) can be calculated in EI but the transition dipole moment is not defined.

II. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

Quantum chemical calculations have been performed for the four molecules (see main text)
in gas phase using the Gaussian16 program suite. Specifically we have performed TD-DFT
calculation using the CAM-B3LYP functional and the 6-31G(d) basis set. Vertical energies
and eigenstates are calculated at the equilibrium geometry estimated for the ground state
(same functional and basis set). The first 3 eigenstates (the ground state and the lowest two
singlet excited states) are typically used to construct the few-state model. On this basis the
gas-phase Hamiltonian is clearly diagonal. The matrix elements of the main component of
the dipole moment operator are calculated on the same basis using the program Multiwfn
(http://sobereva.com/multiwfn/), feeded with the Gaussian output. For the non-adiabatic
calculation we account for three boson states, having checked that the inclusion of additional
states does not appreciably affects the results.

Table I in this document shows all molecular parameters entering the FSM for the four
considered molecules. Only the main component of the dipole moment operator is consid-
ered. The largest values of the matrix elements of $\hat{\mu}$ directed along orthogonal directions and
hence neglected in the calculation are: $\textbf{DANS } \mu_{22} = 0.57 \text{ D}, \textbf{DT } \mu_{23} = 0.13 \text{ D}; \textbf{RD } \mu_{23} = 2.59$
D; $\textbf{QD } \mu_{12} = 0.25 \text{ D}$. In the worst case (RD) the largest neglected matrix element of the
dipole moment operator is more than 5 times smaller than the leading term.

The LR transition energies and dipole moments are obtained as default results in PCM
TD-DFT calculation. The cLR transition energies were obtained following the approach
proposed by C. Guido and S. Caprasecca (How to perform corrected Linear Response calcu-
lations in G09, 10.13140/RG.2.1.1903.7845). The vertical transition energy in the adiabatic
calculation, $\Delta E_{12}^{(0)}$, is obtained by running a cLR calculations asking for extra information
in the log file. The EI transition energies are obtained following the procedure suggested in
TABLE I. Molecular parameters entering the FSM. Dipole moment matrix elements and transition energies are obtained from gas phase calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DANS</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>QD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta E_{21}$ (eV)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta E_{31}$ (eV)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_{11}$ (D)</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_{22}$ (D)</td>
<td>25.95</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_{33}$ (D)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>31.83</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_{12}$ (D)</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>14.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_{13}$ (D)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_{23}$ (D)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_0$ (Å)</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


III. ADDITIONAL RESULTS

Fig. 1 in this document shows the energies calculated for the four molecules either in the NA or AA approaches selecting a smaller (2) or a larger (4) basis of electronic states. Indeed for the quadrupolar dye, three states are the minimum needed to obtain sensible results and in this specific case only results for 3 and 4 states are compared.

Figs. 3-7 in this document show complete results (permanent and transition dipole moments and transition energies) for the four molecules, **DANS, DT, RD** and **QD**.
FIG. 1. Comparing NA and AA transition energies calculated in the few-state model accounting for 2, and 4 states (see legend). The 2-state results are not reported for the QD, since at least three states are needed to capture the physics of quadrupolar dyes.
FIG. 2. Complete data on DANS. From top to bottom: ground state dipole moment, excited state dipole moment, transition dipole moment, transition energy. Permanent and transition dipole moment coincide in LR and cLR (red lines). In EI the ground state dipole moment is the same as for LR and cLR. The EI transition dipole moment is not defined. The EI excited state dipole moment is shown as a blue line. Adiabatic FSM and TD-DFT results compare well, apart from the excited state dipole, a discrepancy ascribed to the failure of FSM in addressing the excited state polarizability.
FIG. 3. The same as in Fig. 2, for DT molecule
FIG. 4. The same as in Fig. 2 for RD molecule
FIG. 5. The same in Fig. 2 for QD molecule