


The nature of the quadruple bond in the dicarbon molecule

Claudio Genovese* and Sandro Sorella

SISSA – International School for Advanced Studies, Via Bonomea 265, 34136 Trieste, Italy;

(Dated: April 9, 2024)

The molecular dissociation energy has often been explained and discussed in terms of singlet bonds, formed by bounded pairs of valence electrons. In this work we use a highly correlated resonating valence bond ansatz, providing a consistent paradigm for the chemical bond, where spin fluctuations are shown to play a crucial role. Spin fluctuations are known to be important in magnetic systems and correspond to the zero point motion of the spin waves emerging from a magnetic broken symmetry state. Recently, in order to explain the excitation spectrum of the carbon dimer, an unusual quadruple bond has been proposed. Within our ansatz, a satisfactory description of the carbon dimer is driven by the spin fluctuations corresponding to two Carbon atoms with antiferromagnetically ordered $S = 1$ magnetic moments, a picture that provide also a natural and much simpler explanation of the fourth bond.



In a non-relativistic Hamiltonian, that do not contain explicit spin interactions, the chemical interaction is, in a conventional picture, mostly determined by covalent bonds where electrons prefer to form singlet pairs across neighbouring atoms, in this way preserving the total spin of the molecule. In this work we will show that, rather unexpectedly, the spin interaction plays a crucial role and a faithful description of the chemical bond can be obtained by allowing local spin triplet excitations in some of the electron pairs. With standard techniques based on molecular orbitals [1], it is difficult to detect this effect, and therefore we adopt the Resonating Valence Bond (RVB) paradigm [2], that has been successfully applied even when standard single reference molecular orbital theory fails. Our approach generalises the standard "frozen singlet" RVB picture, thus leading to a compact and accurate description of the electron correlation, at the prize of a very small spin contamination.

We consider a very small molecule, but nevertheless very important and challenging: the carbon dimer. Its ground state is a perfect singlet, while the isolated atoms have two unpaired electrons, and any type of mean field approach, such as HF or DFT, is completely off with errors of the order of eV. Also highly correlated methods, such as coupled cluster [3–5], face severe difficulties in describing its ground state properties, so that highly involved multi-configuration expansions [5–7] are often adopted.

In a recent study, based on a correlated valence bond approach [8], Shaik *et al.* have proposed that a fourth bond is necessary to explain the C_2 spectrum at low energy. Within a correlated resonating valence bond approach, they have found that the 2σ and 3σ molecular orbitals, as a consequence of the atomic s-p hybridisation, change their nature as compared to

standard molecular orbital theory and show a corresponding bonding character. By taking into account the remaining two π orbitals, obviously bonding, they argued that an unexpected quadruple bond should be a more appropriate description of the C_2 molecule. This result was rather surprising, especially considering that quadruple bonds should very rarely occur [9–13].

In this work, we also adopt a RVB approach, but with the help of a powerful statistical technique, named quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) [14, 15], we are able to work with a very compact and accurate ansatz, that is as easy to visualise and understand as a mean field ansatz. We consider first the most general two electron pairing function:

$$g(\vec{r}_1\sigma_1, \vec{r}_2\sigma_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)\phi_+(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)\phi_-(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) + |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle\phi_\uparrow(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) + |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\phi_\downarrow(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) \quad (1)$$

where, in order to satisfy the Pauli principle $g(\vec{r}_1\sigma_1, \vec{r}_2\sigma_2) = -g(\vec{r}_2\sigma_2, \vec{r}_1\sigma_1)$, yielding $\phi_\pm(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) = \pm\phi_\pm(\vec{r}_2, \vec{r}_1)$ and $\phi_\sigma(\vec{r}_2, \vec{r}_1) = -\phi_\sigma(\vec{r}_2, \vec{r}_1)$ for $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$. When considering a generic (even) number N of electrons of given spin σ_i and positions $\vec{r}_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$), we antisymmetrise the product over all the electron pairs that are determined, in this case, by the *same* pairing function. The corresponding wave function (WF) represents the most general mean-field state, namely the ground state of a mean-field Hamiltonian containing also BCS anomalous terms projected onto a given number N of particles and total spin projection $S_{tot}^z = \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i$ along the z-quantization axis. This WF is known as the Antisymmetrised Geminal Product (AGP). There are three important cases: i) when no triplet correlations are allowed, we have a perfect singlet and we denote it by AGPs; ii) when only the parallel spin term of the triplet component are omitted (namely the last line in Eq. (1), the WF can break the spin symmetry but the magnetic order parameter can be directed only in the z-quantization axis, and in this case we will refer to AGPu; iii) the most important case is the most general one that contains all triplet contributions. Henceforth it will be indicated with AGP, as we believe it represents the most powerful description of the




FIG. 1. (1) Restoring the singlet state for the Jastrow correlated broken symmetry ansatz. The Jastrow factor cannot change the broken symmetry ansatz if it is oriented in the same quantization axis (z -axis) of the electron basis. If we rotate the spins of the broken symmetry ansatz by 90 degrees around the y -axis, the state becomes a quite general linear combination of spin configurations in the original basis. By carefully tuning the weights of each configuration with an appropriate spin-dependent Jastrow factor, we can recover the exact expansion of the singlet state in this basis. (2) Cartoon picture of a typical valence bond generated by the Jastrow correlated AGP WFs used in this work limited to only singlet bonds (JAGPs defined in main text) and (3) containing both singlet and triplet bonds (JAGP). The balls indicate the electrons, singlet and triplet bonds are displayed with cyan and orange colours, respectively. The main effect of the Jastrow factor is to reduce the probability that different electron bond pairs overlap on the same atom, in this way avoiding the effect of the strong Coulomb repulsion, and dramatically improving the quality of the simpler AGP ansatz.

chemical bond within the paradigm developed in this work. Its practical implementation requires the use of Pfaffian's algebra, as already described in Ref. 16.

Originally the AGPs was found to be very poor, violating size consistency even in cases where the HF was size consistent. The important ingredient, solving the above issues [17, 18], by dramatically improving the accuracy of this WF, is the introduction of a correlated term named Jastrow factor, that can weight the energetically too expensive configurations where electrons are too close and feel the large Coulomb repulsion. In this simplified picture, introduced by P.W. Anderson long time ago [19], one can consider with a *single pairing function* all the valence bond (VB) configurations (see Figure 1.1), in practice with almost optimal weights. This has been shown for instance in strongly correlated lattice models [20].

The Jastrow factor is an explicitly symmetric function of the N coordinates and spins:

$$J(\vec{r}_1\sigma_1, \vec{r}_2\sigma_2, \dots, \vec{r}_N\sigma_N) = \prod_{i \neq j} [f_{\sigma_i\sigma_j}(\vec{r}_i, \vec{r}_j)], \quad (2)$$

where f , at variance of g , is the most general two-particle bosonic (and positive) WF. This form of the Jastrow is more general than the conventional one because, usually, a simplified or even absent spin dependency in the f function is adopted, denoted in the following with the symbol J_s . Without including spin dependency a perfect singlet remains such after multiplication of the Jastrow. However the spin dependency

is necessary if we want to recover the singlet from a spin contaminated broken symmetry ansatz. Though this feature is obviously approximate, it generalises in a rather convenient way the so called “symmetry restoring after projection” [21, 22]. As shown in Figure 1.1 a simple way to understand this effect is to consider two atoms with opposite spins. If the spins are oriented in the direction of the electronic basis, defining our Jastrow in Eq. (2), the latter one cannot have any effect in the total WF. Conversely, it turns out energetically convenient to orient the spins of the atoms in a direction perpendicular to the previous one. In this way (see Figure 1.1) the Jastrow can suppress the unfavored triplet configurations with parallel spins. This optimal spin-orientation is rigorously valid within the well known spin-wave theory of a quantum antiferromagnet, and the Jastrow in this case allows the description of the quantum fluctuations and the corresponding zero point energy, even for a finite (as is our case) number of atoms [23].

Before going in more details we summarise in Figure 1.2-3 the physical picture of our WF in the realistic case when the Coulomb repulsion is strong and, in a given atom, it is unlikely to have doubly occupied orbitals. In this way the expansion of the many body WF, can be seen as a liquid “soup” of mainly non-overlapping singlet and triplet bonds. Our findings indicate that, despite this picture was introduced long time ago, the important role of fluctuating triplet bonds has not been fully appreciated so far.

I. METHOD

In order to employ the energy optimization of our WF, both the function g and f are expanded in a standard GTO localized basis, because in this way the number of variational parameters becomes affordable [24]. For all calculations we use five hybrid orbitals [25, 26] per atom and improved the basis from ccpVDZ to ccpVQZ until convergence in the total energy within 1mH accuracy has been achieved [27]. The definition of the hybrid orbitals is given in the SI together with




FIG. 2. Energy and spin S^2 for different WFs.

TABLE I. Spin measures with the different WFs.

	S^2			$2\mu_B$
	Atom	Molecule	Half Molecule	Moment $\parallel z$
JsAGPs	2.00	0.00	1.529(4)	0.0005(4)
JAGPu	2.00534(3)	0.1743(5)	1.760(2)	0.5833(4)
JsAGP	2.00418(5)	0.2880(4)	2.0185(5)	0.7194(4)
JAGP	2.00542(1)	0.0327(1)	2.0649(3)	0.0013(5)
Exact	2.00	0.00	-	-

the detailed description of the WF. After the optimization we have computed not only the total energy, but also the total spin square [28], that can be efficiently evaluated by QMC. The first quantity can be further improved by the so called Fixed Node projection (FN), that basically allows the lowest possible energy with a Jastrow J not limited only to two electron correlation. In order to avoid cumbersome notations, in the following we report only FN energy results obtained with this very accurate technique, whereas all the other quantities refer just to the bare variational WF with the explicit Jastrow written in Eq. (2). Within this technique it is also possible to consider the spin square value restricted in a given region of space Λ , namely

$$\tilde{S}^2(\Lambda) = \left[\int_{\vec{x} \in \Lambda} d^3x \sum_{i=1}^N \vec{S}_i \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{r}_i) \right]^2, \quad (3)$$

by extending the calculation described in Ref. 29 only within the region Λ . Here $\vec{S}_i$ is the spin operator acting on the electron at the position $\vec{r}_i$. Unless otherwise specified, in all molecular diatomic calculations, Λ is determined by dividing the whole space into two regions separated by a plane cutting the molecule into two equivalent ones containing only one atom.

II. RESULTS

In the following we report detailed calculations by using the setup and the methodology described in the previous section and in the supporting information (SI). As it is shown in Tab. I, in the broken symmetry ansatz JsAGPu the total spin value is rather large, implying a large spin contamination, that is not present in the atom. By turning on the triplet correlations in the pairing function g and restricting the Jastrow factor to depend only on the electronic densities, i.e. the JsAGP case in Tab. I, the contamination is even worse with an increase of the total spin. Remarkably, by using the proposed spin-dependent Jastrow factor J in Eq. (2), it is possible to recover an almost exact singlet WF. This confirms the picture that the C_2 molecule can be considered as the simplest anti-ferromagnet made of two atoms with opposite spins. Indeed, when we go from the broken symmetry ansatz and include correctly the quantum fluctuations in JAGP the WF becomes almost exact, because, as it is shown in Figure 2, it is not only an almost perfect singlet but recovers almost all the molecular binding. The energy associated with spin fluctuations can




FIG. 3. Size consistency of carbon and nitrogen dimers: both the systems at large distance recover the energy and the expectation value of the S^2 operator of two isolated atoms. At bond distance however the carbon atoms maintain a large localized S^2 , while the spin of the nitrogen atoms is much smaller than the corresponding atomic value. Lines are guides to the eye. In the inset the spin square [Eq. (3) in the text] of the C_2 molecule at equilibrium computed as a function of Λ . The semi-infinite region contains one or no atom as a function of the distance between the plane perpendicular to the molecular axis, defining this region, and the center of the molecule.

be quantified in analogy with the simple model of two $S = 1$ spins interacting with an Heisenberg antiferromagnetic coupling $J\vec{S}_1 \cdot \vec{S}_2$ [30]. Here the singlet ground state with energy $-2J$ is below the classical energy $-J$ of two antiparallel spin along a chosen direction. Analogously the JAGP ansatz has a spin fluctuation energy gain referenced to the corresponding JAGPu one (see Fig. 1.1). As it is shown in the in Figure (2) and in SI Tab.I this energy gain represents a large fraction of the estimated energy ($\simeq 0.5eV$ [8]) to break the fourth bond, i.e. $\simeq 0.30eV$.

When the two atoms are placed at large distance it is clear that their spins have to be equal to the corresponding isolated $S = 1$ atomic value. What is really surprising in this small molecule, is that (see Figure 3) the spin $S^2(\Lambda)$ around a single atom remains almost the same ($S^2(\Lambda) = 2$) even when we arrive at bond distance, showing that the local spin moment is large even in this regime. This effect is very robust (see the inset in Fig. 3) as we have found that almost all the atomic spin is extremely localized around the nuclear positions, and its value can be measured with no ambiguities. This is a special feature of the C_2 molecule, and contrasts with the behaviour of other molecules. For comparison we report in Fig. 3 also the corresponding JAGP results for the N_2 molecule: in a standard triple bond, the spin around each atom is substantially screened and therefore much below the free atomic value, fully recovered only at large distance. Note that also the N_2 molecule is very well represented by our ansatz, e.g. with an estimated well depth of 229.2(5) kcal/mol in very good agreement with the estimated exact one of 228.48(6) kcal/mol [31].




FIG. 4. Left panel: after breaking the spin symmetry, each spin-independent orbital of an unrestricted Slater determinant ansatz splits into a pair of single occupied ones with no definite spin projection. The histograms represent the corresponding spin component weights: the height of the blue (red) rectangle indicates the percentage of the majority (minority) spin. Notice that the occupation order is different in DFT calculations where the order is $1\sigma_g/1\sigma_u/2\sigma_g/2\sigma_u/2 \times (2\pi_g)$ and where the orbitals have a single spin component. Right panel: majority and minority spin orbitals with the most relevant spin contamination. The orbitals (a) and (b) come from the $2\pi_g$ and have the same weight, the orbitals (c) and (d) are the last occupied ones (indicated as $2\sigma_u/3\sigma_g$), in this case the (c) orbital has a 65% and the (d) one a 35% weight.

As shown in the supporting information, our variational estimate is essentially the state of the art for an all-electron calculation.

III. CONCLUSION

We have studied in details the simple C_2 molecule and found, rather unexpectedly over previous expectations, that a large fraction of the chemical bond can be attributed to spin fluctuations. Indeed, when we allow our WF for triplet corre-

lations both in the Jastrow and in the mean field part, we obtain a remarkable improvement in the description of the bond, in this way explaining the highly debated nature of the quadruple bond in this molecule.

It is particularly instructive to see the role of correlation in modifying the molecular orbitals, by taking as a reference the ones corresponding to a simple DFT double bond picture. The AGP part of our WF, after full optimization of the energy in presence of the Jastrow factor, can be also recasted in terms of molecular orbitals by an almost standard diagonalization[29]. The spin character of the resulting orbitals are displayed in Fig.4, where it is shown that i) at variance of the DFT mean-field ansatz, the $3\sigma_g$ bonding orbital is eventually present as the minority spin component of the HOMO, in partial agreement with the quadruple bond picture. ii) in our ansatz however the main effect that mostly determines the chemical bond is the spin contamination of the most important occupied orbitals $2\sigma_u, 3\sigma_g$ and $2\pi_g'$ s. In this way they can contribute to the bonding by means of the corresponding spin-fluctuation energy gain, that is instead vanishing for the inner core orbitals (this is because they have a definite spin in the same quantization axis chosen for the Jastrow factor, see explanation in Fig. 1.1).

We have shown therefore that the bonding in C_2 cannot be explained with charge electrostatic, and instead the large atomic spin value confirms that the energy is intimately due to correlation, the same that allows, by means of our Jastrow factor, the evaluation of the spin-wave zero point energy of a quantum antiferromagnet.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank A. Zen and K. Jordan for useful discussion and for carefully reading the manuscript before submission. We acknowledge PRIN-2017 for financial support and CINECA PRACE-2019 for computational resources.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

In the supporting information file we describe in details the JAGP WF.

- [1] L. Salem and R. Colin, *Angewandte Chemie* **11**, 92 (1972).
- [2] L. Pauling, *The nature of the Chemical Bond* (3rd ed. Cornell University Press, Itaca, New York, 1960).
- [3] J. D. Watts and R. J. Bartlett, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **96**, 6073 (1992), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.462649>.
- [4] A. Karton, A. Tarnopolsky, and J. M. L. Martin, *Mol. Phys.* **107**, 977 (2008).
- [5] W. Zou and D. Cremer, *Chemistry - A European Journal* **22**, 4087 (2016), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/chem.201503750>.
- [6] J. Toulouse and C. J. Umrigar, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **128**, 174101 (2008), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2908237>.
- [7] G. H. Booth, D. Cleland, A. J. W. Thom, and A. Alavi, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **135**, 084104 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3624383>.
- [8] S. Shaik, D. Danovich, W. Wu, P. Su, H. S. Rzepa, and P. C. Hiberty, *Nature chemistry* **4**, 195 (2012).
- [9] R. Zhong, M. Zhang, H. Xu, and Z. Su, *Chemical science* **7**, 1028 (2016).
- [10] G. Frenking and M. Hermann, *Chemistry - A European Journal* **22**, 18975 (2016), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/chem.201601382>.
- [11] S. Shaik, D. Danovich, B. Braida, and P. C. Hiberty, *Chemistry - A European Journal* **22**, 4116 (2016),

- <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/chem.201600011>.
- [12] D. W. O. de Sousa and M. A. C. Nascimento, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **12**, 2234 (2016), pMID: 27045682, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.6b00055>.
 - [13] B. Brařda, J. Toulouse, M. Caffarel, and C. J. Umrigar, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **134**, 084108 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3555821>.
 - [14] W. M. C. Foulkes, L. Mitas, R. J. Needs, and G. Rajagopal, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 33 (2001).
 - [15] S. Sorella and A. Zen, “The new resonating valence bond method for ab-initio electronic simulations,” in *Many-Electron Approaches in Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics: A Multidisciplinary View*, edited by V. Bach and L. Delle Site (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2014) pp. 377–392.
 - [16] M. Bajdich, L. Mitas, G. Drobný, L. K. Wagner, and K. E. Schmidt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 130201 (2006).
 - [17] E. Neuscamman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 203001 (2012).
 - [18] M. Marchi, S. Azadi, M. Casula, and S. Sorella, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **131**, 154116 (2009), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3249966>.
 - [19] J. B. Anderson, *J. Chem. Phys.* **63**, 1499 (1975).
 - [20] F. Becca, M. Capone, and S. Sorella, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 12700 (2000).
 - [21] G. E. Scuseria, C. A. Jimenez-Hoyos, T. M. Henderson, K. Samanta, and J. K. Ellis, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **135**, 124108 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3643338>.
 - [22] H. Shi, C. A. Jiménez-Hoyos, R. Rodríguez-Guzmán, G. E. Scuseria, and S. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 125129 (2014).
 - [23] F. Franić and S. Sorella, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **97**, 399 (1997), <http://oup.prod.sis.lan/ptp/article-pdf/97/3/399/5205290/97-3-399.pdf>.
 - [24] A. Zen, Y. Luo, S. Sorella, and L. Guidoni, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **9**, 4332 (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1021/ct400382m>.
 - [25] M. Casula, C. Attaccalite, and S. Sorella, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **121**, 7110 (2004), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1794632>.
 - [26] M. Casula and S. Sorella, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **119**, 6500 (2003), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1604379>.
 - [27] K. Nakano, R. Maezono, and S. Sorella, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **15**, 4044 (2019), pMID: 31117480, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.9b00295>.
 - [28] A. Zen, E. Coccia, Y. Luo, S. Sorella, and L. Guidoni, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **10**, 1048 (2014), pMID: 26580182, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ct401008s>.
 - [29] C. Genovese, T. Shirakawa, K. Nakano, and S. Sorella, “General correlated geminal ansatz for electronic structure calculations: exploiting pfaffians in place of determinants,” (2020), arXiv:2002.03347 [physics.chem-ph].
 - [30] A. Szabo and N. S. Ostlund, *Modern Quantum Chemistry* (McGraw Hill, New York, 1989).
 - [31] L. Bytautas and K. Ruedenberg, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **122**, 154110 (2005), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1869493>.