

Using Koopmans' theorem for constructing basis sets: Approaching high Rydberg excited states of lithium with a compact Gaussian basis

Jan Šmydke^{1, a)}

*Department of Radiation and Chemical Physics, Institute of Physics CAS,
Na Slovance 1999/2, 18221 Praha 8, Czech Republic*

(Dated: 5 October 2022)

For accurate *ab initio* description of Rydberg excited states the study suggests generating the appropriate diffuse basis functions by a cheap variational optimization of virtual orbitals of the corresponding ion core. By following this approach, dozens of converged correlated lithium Rydberg states, namely all the states up to 24S, 25P, 14D, 16F and 16G, not yet achieved by other *ab initio* approaches, could be obtained at the EOM-CCSD level of theory with compact and mostly state-selective contracted Gaussian basis sets. Despite its small size and Gaussian character, the optimized basis leads to highly accurate excitation energies that differ merely in the order of meV from the reference state-of-the-art explicitly correlated Gaussian method and even surpass Full-CI results on Slater basis by an order of magnitude.

^{a)}jan.smydke@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Investigation of Rydberg excited states of atomic and molecular systems is mostly the domain of the quantum defect theory (QDT),¹ in which a motion of the highly excited electron is modeled by an effective one-electron approach. It is assumed the average distance between the highly excited electron and the positively charged ion core is sufficiently large that the electron experiences a Coulombic field of the ion core analogous to the field in the hydrogen atom, though effectively shielded by the other electrons. The energy spectrum of such a model necessarily differs from the spectrum of hydrogen, introducing characteristic quantum defects δ of the principal quantum number n in the energy level formula

$$E_n = -\frac{Ry}{(n - \delta)^2} \quad (1)$$

where Ry stands for the Rydberg constant. By providing accurate quantum defects of a system (*e.g.* from experimental transitions), the asymptotic wave functions can be expressed analytically and the properties further evaluated. Although the QDT proved to be robust and capable, it represents an one-electron approach, not an *ab initio* theory and depends on the externally supplied energy spectrum. Its applicability is also limited to rather highly excited states, in which the true Rydberg character of the system is sufficiently retained.

By contrast, the *ab initio* theories for excited states either suffer from overall poor accuracy of the computed energy spectrum or they provide only the few lowest excited states in high precision. This stems from the inherent complexity of the *ab initio* methods, which deal with many-body systems and balance between scalability and an accurate description of the electronic correlation.

The sharp contrast between the ability of the advanced quantum chemical methods to describe highly correlated ground electronic states even in difficult electronic structures on the one hand and their failure to reliably describe the higher excited states on the other hand grows out of the insufficiency of the commonly used basis sets to reach and mimic the diffuse and structurally more complicated excited state wave functions. The standard Gaussian basis sets (GTO) tend to be extensively optimized for the ground state to describe enough electronic correlation while keeping the number of basis functions low. The exponential-type basis functions (ETO) like the Slater-type-orbitals (STO) and Coulomb-Sturmians (CS) are, of course, of higher quality than the Gaussians due to the correct cusp at nuclei and their natural diffuse characteristics. Despite the superiority of the ETOs and in particular of the

CS functions, which constitute a complete orthogonal set, the ETOs (as well as the GTOs) are by no other means optimal for excited states description of many-electron systems.

Hence, a common way of building custom basis sets for excited states is to extend a standard GTO basis with a large set of primitive diffuse functions. The primitives are often put in the form of the even tempered Gaussians (ETG), in which the exponents are given by a simple formula

$$\log \zeta_k = \log \zeta_0 + k \log \alpha; \log \alpha < 0, k = 0 \dots (N - 1) \quad (2)$$

where ζ_0 and α are the ETG series parameters and N is the size of the set. Such a series can provide many diffuse functions with just a few variable parameters. However, the drawback of adding extra functions to a basis is that they tend to cause near linear dependencies, leading to serious numerical issues. A disadvantage of the ETG sets, in particular, is that they do not consistently cover a larger portion of the spectrum and are hardly applicable to problems with excessive demands on precision and flexibility like in dynamical studies of electronic resonances under complex scaled representation.² By extending a basis with extra diffuse functions it is practically sufficient that the resulting set is not linearly dependent and satisfactorily describes a particular feature of interest.

The aim of the present study is a tailored optimization of the diffuse basis rather than a mere inclusion of a large number of functions. The intention is to systematically generate such a basis that would approximate at least a few Rydberg orbitals. Such orbitals could then serve as the optimal functions for a correlated treatment of the corresponding Rydberg states. The ultimate outcome, although beyond the scope of this work, might lead to a specific diffuse basis suitable for a complex scaling treatment of related resonance states, which is highly sensitive to the basis set quality.² In order to employ standard quantum chemistry codes this study exclusively uses Gaussian basis sets. Nevertheless, the investigated approach is universal and applicable to any basis set type.

This study focuses on systems that can be modeled as a closed-shell ion core with an odd electron moving around. For such systems a simple trick can be used to describe the Rydberg orbitals that can be the target of the basis set optimization. As is well known from the Koopmans' theorem,³ the canonical virtual orbitals of a closed-shell system describe an electron captured by the system (*i.e.* the Rydberg electron captured by the ion core). For lithium atom (Li), which is the subject of this work, it means that by a variational

minimization of the Li^+ virtual orbital energies, while varying the basis set parameters, one should end up with such Li^+ virtual orbitals that could serve as the appropriate basis functions for the description of the Rydberg excited electron in the neutral Li atom.

Although the suggested approach is based on the Hartree–Fock model only, it can be anticipated that due to the Rydberg character of the excited electron, the model can be satisfactory at least for higher excited states. In our earlier studies of helium (He) resonances,^{2,4} we used an analogous approach to obtain a basis for He excited states by appropriately modifying the Fock operator so that the virtual orbitals describe excited electrons rather than the captured ones. The quality of the optimized basis was outstanding, leading not only to good transition energies, but also to a wide interval of resonance energy stability along the complex scaling parameter ϑ . Such a basis enabled an extensive non-Hermitian dynamical propagation of He under extremely intense laser radiation.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. Sect. II describes the basis set optimization and other computational details. Sect. III discusses important properties of the optimized basis and compares the resulting Rydberg excitation energies to other highly accurate values known in the literature. Summary of the results and conclusions are drawn in Sect. IV.

II. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

The whole basis set optimization process can be summarized in the following. First, a standard basis set is included for a proper description of the electronic correlation. That should suffice for the ground as well as for the Rydberg states since the part of the wave function, in which the correlation plays role, is spatially distributed similarly; only the Rydberg electron occupies distant areas where it does not significantly contribute to the dynamical electronic correlation. To describe the Rydberg electron attracted by a closed-shell ion core, diffuse functions are appended to the basis and the virtual orbital energies of the ion core are minimized. This is achieved by varying the diffuse functions while keeping the optimal Hartree–Fock energy and avoiding near linear dependencies. In accord with Koopmans’ theorem, such optimal virtual orbitals are just the Rydberg orbitals. Since their shape is controlled solely by the Hartree–Fock field of the ion core, it is advantageous to improve the field quality before the actual virtual orbital optimization by an additional high exponent function to mimic the wave-function cusp. Eventually, contracted basis functions are formed

from the optimal Rydberg orbitals using their expansion coefficients (LCAO) in the primitive diffuse basis. The final basis set for productive computations of the Rydberg states then consists of the standard basis together with the high exponent function and appropriate subsets of the contracted optimized Rydberg functions as discussed in Section III A.

Practically, for lithium, the well established aug-ano-pVQZ⁵ basis of Neese and Valeev has been chosen as the standard basis set. To improve the Hartree–Fock wave function of the Li^+ ion core an additional ETG series of high exponent S functions was used to minimize the Hartree–Fock energy. From the resulting 1S orbital an auxiliary contracted function was formed, consisting of the ETG primitives only, which was used further instead of the high exponent series. Independently for each angular momentum $L \in \{\text{S, P, D, F, G}\}$, a diffuse ETG set of the given L was added to the basis and by varying its parameters the energy of the first Li^+ virtual orbital of that L symmetry was minimized. With such optimized ETG parameters only the number (N) of the ETG primitive functions was further gradually increased until a satisfactorily large number of virtual orbital energies were no longer changing by more than 10^{-9} a.u.. In the end, all the optimized virtual orbitals, namely 25 S, 28 P, 22 D, 21 F and 14 G, were contracted in the diffuse ETG subspace and put together in a final huge basis denoted as [25S-28P-22D-21F-14G]. This notation specifies how many optimal contracted Rydberg functions are added to the aug-ano-pVQZ basis together with the high exponent contracted S function.

During the basis set optimization process the Hartree–Fock orbital energies were calculated using the MRCC^{6,7} program package while the multidimensional minimization itself was driven by the mdoptcli⁸ utility, which uses procedures from the GNU Scientific Library (GSL)⁹. All the correlated computations using the coupled cluster (CCSD) and equation of motion coupled cluster (EOM-CCSD) methods employed the GAMESS 2021 R1¹⁰ package, recompiled to allow large number of primitive basis functions.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Properties of the optimized basis

It was found that the [7S-6P-5D] subset of the huge [25S-28P-22D-21F-14G] basis exhibits already converged CCSD ionization potential (IP) with respect to the basis set size and

TABLE I. Comparison of correlated ground and bound state excitation energies of neutral doublet Li resulting from three contracted basis sets. The ground state 2S energy (ROHF and CCSD) is given in a.u. while the excitation energies (EOM-CCSD) as well as the ionization potential (CCSD) are in eV.

state	[7S-6P-5D]	[7S-6P-5D-4F-3G]	[10S-9P-8D]
2S ROHF	-7.432,726,827,6	-7.432,726,827,6	-7.432,726,828,0
2S CCSD	-7.474,434,973,0	-7.474,434,975,9	-7.474,435,349,2
IP CCSD	5.3877	5.3877	5.3877
2P	1.8472	1.8472	1.8472
3S	3.3704	3.3704	3.3704
3P	3.8317	3.8317	3.8317
3D	3.8754	3.8753	3.8754
4S	4.3378	4.3378	4.3378
4P	4.5186	4.5186	4.5186
4D	4.5373	4.5373	4.5373
4F		4.5379	
5S	4.7456	4.7456	4.7456
5P	4.8341	4.8341	4.8341
5D	4.8437	4.8437	4.8437
5F		4.8440	
5G		4.8441	

similarly also all the Li bound state excitation energies computed at the EOM-CCSD level (up to the state 8S). This is apparent in Table I, which shows that by adding more of the optimized diffuse S, P or D functions (basis [10S-9P-8D]) or by including F and G functions (basis [7S-6P-5D-4F-3G]) to the [7S-6P-5D] basis, the IP as well as the excitation energy values were no longer affected. The [7S-6P-5D] basis can thus be considered as a minimal saturated set that can safely be extended to achieve higher Li Rydberg states.

It should be stressed that the obtained diffuse basis was optimized for Li Rydberg states and not for Li^+ , although it was the virtual orbitals of the cation that determined the Li Rydberg functions. Therefore, Li^+ excited states are not converged with respect to the basis. That can be seen from Table II, where the not yet converged Li^+ states are described by

TABLE II. Comparison of correlated ground and excitation energies of singlet Li^+ resulting from three contracted basis sets. The ground state 1S energy (RHF and CCSD) is given in a.u. while the excitation energies (EOM-CCSD) are in eV.

state	[7S-6P-5D]	[7S-6P-5D-4F-3G]	[10S-9P-8D]
1S RHF	-7.236,415,117,9	-7.236,415,117,9	-7.236,415,117,9
1S CCSD	-7.276,442,000,8	-7.276,442,002,0	-7.276,442,304,5
2S	60.8448	60.8448	60.8446
2P	62.2642	62.2642	62.2610
3S	69.2199	69.2199	69.2194
3D	69.7706	69.7706	69.7474
3P	69.8285	69.8285	69.8204
4S	72.0843	72.0843	72.0826
4D	72.3562	72.3561	72.3458
4P	72.3774	72.3774	72.3753

the very same basis sets as the converged states of the neutral Li in Table I.

As anticipated above, to achieve higher Li Rydberg states of a particular angular momentum L , just more of the optimized Rydberg functions of the given L can be added to the minimal [7S-6P-5D] basis (schematically as [7S-6P-5D + kL]), since the resulting correlated states are no longer affected by the functions of other L . Truly, Table III shows that by gradually increasing the number of Rydberg S functions included to the minimal basis, the correlated bound states remain intact, only new S states emerge as the basis grows. This, as well as a strong dominance of the appropriate R1 EOM-CCSD amplitudes in these states confirm their Rydberg character and hence also suitability of the presented basis set optimization scheme. Analogous results were obtained also for P, F and G states. Only the D states computed with [7S-6P-5D + kD] basis exhibited unsaturated behavior, as shown in Table IV. Although the states below 7D (regardless of their symmetry) were unaffected by the additional D functions, none of the higher D states could achieve a converged excitation energy. That could mean the D states higher than 6D may still need more robust basis for better electronic correlation description than similarly excited S, P, F or G states and thus the D states may not yet have the true Rydberg nature.

TABLE III. Comparison of correlated ground and bound state excitation energies of a neutral doublet Li above the state 7S for three contracted [7S-6P-5D + kL, $L = S$] basis sets. The ground state 2S energy (ROHF and CCSD) is given in a.u. while the excitation energies (EOM-CCSD) as well as the ionization potential (CCSD) are in eV.

state	[7S-6P-5D]	[16S-6P-5D]	[25S-6P-5D]
2S ROHF	-7.432,726,827,6	-7.432,726,828,0	-7.432,726,828,0
2S CCSD	-7.474,434,973,0	-7.474,434,980,6	-7.474,434,980,5
IP CCSD	5.3877	5.3877	5.3877
7P	5.1070	5.1070	5.1070
7D	5.1097	5.1097	5.1097
8S		5.1540	5.1540
9S		5.2116	5.2116
10S		5.2610	5.2610
11S		5.2990	5.2990
12S		5.3264	5.3264
13S		5.3457	5.3457
14S		5.3592	5.3592
15S		5.3684	5.3684
16S		5.3747	5.3747
17S			5.3790

Moreover, for all states with the principal quantum number n larger than 7, the optimized Rydberg functions are state selective. That means, only a single specific Rydberg function needs to be added to the [7S-6P-5D] basis to achieve the appropriate correlated Rydberg state, reducing the necessary basis set size dramatically. Except for D states, again, where the differences between the state selective basis and the [7S-6P-14D] basis reached even 0.1 eV, all the other L states exhibited negligible errors, from 3×10^{-9} eV for state 14G, to 2×10^{-6} eV for state 10S.

TABLE IV. Comparison of correlated ground and bound state excitation energies of a neutral doublet Li above the state 7S for three contracted [7S-6P-5D +kL, $L = D$] basis sets. The ground state 2S energy (ROHF and CCSD) is given in a.u. while the excitation energies (EOM-CCSD) as well as the ionization potential (CCSD) are in eV.

state	[7S-6P-5D]	[7S-6P-10D]	[7S-6P-14D]
2S ROHF	-7.432,726,827,6	-7.432,726,827,6	-7.432,726,827,6
2S CCSD	-7.474,434,973,0	-7.474,435,037,8	-7.474,435,042,6
IP CCSD	5.3877	5.3877	5.3877
7P	5.1070	5.1070	5.1070
7D	5.1097	5.1106	5.1088
8D		5.1745	5.1655
9D		5.2165	5.1750
10D		5.2582	5.2159
11D		5.2719	5.2618
12D		5.2828	5.2733
13D			5.3004
14D			5.3559

B. Li bound excited states

In this section the computed bound Li Rydberg states are presented and compared with the best non-relativistic results known in the literature. The most appropriate data come from the systematic studies of Li 2S , 2P and 2D states that employ the explicitly correlated Gaussians (ECG) and consider also the effect of the finite nuclear mass as well as the leading relativistic and QED corrections.^{11–13} These state-of-the-art studies provide highly accurate results for most Li excited states that had ever been computed. In this work the comparison is made only to the non-relativistic ECG results, which practically reach the estimates of the exact non-relativistic energies.^{14–18} Another comparison is made to the Hylleraas-CI (Hy-CI) study,¹⁹ which provides considerably fewer 2S , 2P and 2D states. Nevertheless, the same study also presents Full-CI energies in optimal Slater-type-orbital (STO) basis that fully cover the principal quantum number $n = 7$, covering all the states from 2S to 7S and

up to 7I. The results for the individual angular momenta are compared in Table V (S), VI (P), VII (D), VIII (F) and IX (G). The state energies are presented in a.u., while the excitation energies with respect to the ground 2S state are in eV rounded to 10^{-4} eV, for convenience. When appropriate, values corresponding to the estimates of the exact non-relativistic energies are labeled with a related bibliographic reference.

Table V shows the 2S states computed with the [25S-6P-5D] basis. We can see the ground state energy of the present study is still more than 3 milihartree above the highly precise computations. This is well understandable due to the Gaussian character of the basis, lack of any explicit electronic correlation, only the CCSD level of theory describing the three-electron system and also due to the relatively small basis size. Nevertheless, when we compare the excitation energies, we can see that the present Gaussian basis results are consistently only a few meV off the ECG values up to the state 8S. From the state 9S the differences increase (even change the sign) and we might only estimate the error to reach up to tens or even a hundred meV for the highest achieved state 24S. Such a sudden drop in accuracy may be put down to the higher D orbital space insufficiency, as discussed with the Table IV, since the D functions contribute to the S states correlation energy via double excitations. The results are consistent within a few meV also with the Hy-CI and with the STO Full-CI excitation energies except that the latter exhibits an order of magnitude error jump for its highest 7S and 8S states with respect to the precise computations, while the Gaussian basis results of the present study remained consistent with the ECG values.

In Table VI, we can see that the 2P results in the basis [7S-24P-5D] are remarkably close to the ECG values within meV accuracy while the STO Full-CI excitation energies are shifted by an order of magnitude. It can also be noticed that the present Gaussian excitation energies are all closer to the ECG results and with a very consistent difference than the Hy-CI values. From this trend we might speculate that the accuracy of the highest achieved 25P state could be in units or at maximum in tens of meV.

Similarly in Table VII, the 2D states obtained from the [7S-6P-14D] basis are closest to the ECG results with consistent differences in meV, while the differences from the Hy-CI values are slightly less regular. The STO Full-CI excitation energies are again shifted by an order of magnitude. The excitation to the state 7D (the highest D state achieved by all three comparative studies) exhibits sudden deviation from the three reference results. This, again, matches with the observed difficulties of the higher D states as in Table IV.

TABLE V. Comparison of ^2S EOM-CCSD excitation energies of Li bound states obtained from the [25S-6P-5D] basis with the extensive non-relativistic ECG computations¹¹, the Full-CI in an optimized STO basis¹⁹ and the results of the Hylleraas-CI computations.¹⁹ Energy levels (E) are given in a.u. while the excitation energies (EE) as well as their differences (ΔEE) are in eV. ΔEE is defined as $EE^{[25\text{S-6P-5D}]} - EE^{\text{ref.}}$. The reference 2S energy values in a.u. are put in parentheses for convenience. Values corresponding also to the exact non-relativistic estimate are marked with an asterisk and the bibliographic reference.

state	[25S-6P-5D]		ECG ¹¹		STO Full-CI ¹⁹		Hy-CI ¹⁹	
	E	EE	EE	ΔEE	EE	ΔEE	EE	ΔEE
2S	-7.4744350		(-7.4780603)*, ¹⁴		(-7.477192)		(-7.478058969)	
3S	-7.3505733	3.3704	3.3732*, ¹⁴	-0.0027	3.3727	-0.0022	3.3733	-0.0028
4S	-7.3150230	4.3378	4.3410*, ¹⁵	-0.0032	4.3406	-0.0027	4.3413	-0.0035
5S	-7.3000352	4.7456	4.7486*, ¹⁵	-0.0030	4.7486	-0.0030	4.7496	-0.0040
6S	-7.2923000	4.9561	4.9579*, ¹⁵	-0.0018	4.9595	-0.0033	4.9612	-0.0050
7S	-7.2878069	5.0784	5.0795*, ¹⁵	-0.0011	5.1047	-0.0263	5.0878	-0.0094
8S	-7.2850298	5.1540	5.1563	-0.0023	5.2109	-0.0569	5.1611	-0.0071
9S	-7.2829112	5.2116	5.2079	0.0037				
10S	-7.2810981	5.2610	5.2442	0.0167				
11S	-7.2797011	5.2990	5.2708	0.0282				
12S	-7.2786917	5.3264	5.2907	0.0357				
13S	-7.2779819	5.3457	5.3062	0.0396				
14S	-7.2774894	5.3592						
15S	-7.2771501	5.3684						
16S	-7.2769175	5.3747						
17S	-7.2767584	5.3790						
18S	-7.2766498	5.3820						
19S	-7.2765758	5.3840						
20S	-7.2765254	5.3854						
21S	-7.2764911	5.3863						
22S	-7.2764676	5.3870						
23S	-7.2764516	5.3874						
24S	-7.2764405	5.3877						

TABLE VI. Comparison of ^2P EOM-CCSD excitation energies of Li bound states with respect to the ground 2^2S state obtained from the $[7\text{S-}24\text{P-}5\text{D}]$ basis with the extensive non-relativistic ECG computations¹², the Full-CI in an optimized STO basis¹⁹ and the results of the Hylleraas-CI computations.¹⁹ Energy levels (E) are given in a.u. while the excitation energies (EE) as well as their differences (ΔEE) are in eV. ΔEE is defined as $EE^{[7\text{S-}24\text{P-}5\text{D}]} - EE^{\text{ref.}}$. The reference 2S energy values in a.u. are put in parentheses for convenience. Values corresponding also to the exact non-relativistic estimate are marked with an asterisk and the bibliographic reference.

state	[7S-24P-5D]		ECG ¹²		STO Full-CI ¹⁹		Hy-CI ¹⁹	
	E	EE	EE	ΔEE	EE	ΔEE	EE	ΔEE
2S	-7.4744358		(-7.4780603)*, ^{14,16}		(-7.477192)		(-7.478058969)	
2P	-7.4065515	1.8472	1.8478*, ¹⁷	-0.0005	1.8660	-0.0187	1.8479	-0.0007
3P	-7.3336219	3.8317	3.8343	-0.0026	3.8513	-0.0196	3.8353	-0.0036
4P	-7.3083789	4.5186	4.5217	-0.0031	4.5391	-0.0205	4.5238	-0.0052
5P	-7.2967853	4.8341	4.8374	-0.0033	4.8542	-0.0201	4.8415	-0.0074
6P	-7.2905206	5.0046	5.0080	-0.0034	5.0245	-0.0199	5.0094	-0.0048
7P	-7.2867570	5.1070	5.1104	-0.0034	5.1278	-0.0208	5.1224	-0.0154
8P	-7.2843201	5.1733	5.1767	-0.0034				
9P	-7.2826463	5.2188	5.2221	-0.0033				
10P	-7.2814198	5.2522	5.2545	-0.0023				
11P	-7.2804485	5.2787						
12P	-7.2796394	5.3007						
13P	-7.2789788	5.3186						
14P	-7.2785302	5.3309						
15P	-7.2782993	5.3371						
16P	-7.2779292	5.3472						
17P	-7.2775941	5.3563						
18P	-7.2773332	5.3634						
19P	-7.2771260	5.3691						
20P	-7.2769625	5.3735						
21P	-7.2768372	5.3769						
22P	-7.2767405	5.3796						
23P	-7.2766658	5.3816						
24P	-7.2766082	5.3832						
25P	-7.2765638	5.3844						

TABLE VII. Comparison of ^2D EOM-CCSD excitation energies of Li bound states with respect to the ground 2^2S state obtained from the [7S-6P-14D] basis with the extensive non-relativistic ECG computations¹³, the Full-CI in an optimized STO basis¹⁹ and the results of the Hylleraas-CI computations.¹⁹ Energy levels (E) are given in a.u. while the excitation energies (EE) as well as their differences (ΔEE) are in eV. ΔEE is defined as $EE^{[7\text{S-6P-14D}]} - EE^{\text{ref.}}$. The reference 2S energy values in a.u. are put in parentheses for convenience. Values corresponding also to the exact non-relativistic estimate are marked with an asterisk and the bibliographic reference.

state	[7S-6P-14D]		ECG ¹³		STO Full-CI ¹⁹		Hy-CI ¹⁹	
	E	EE	EE	ΔEE	EE	ΔEE	EE	ΔEE
2S	-7.4744350		(-7.4780603)*, ^{14,16}		(-7.477192)		(-7.478058969)	
3D	-7.3320162	3.8754	3.8786*, ¹⁷	-0.0032	3.8937	-0.0183	3.8789	-0.0035
4D	-7.3076902	4.5373	4.5408	-0.0034	4.5560	-0.0187	4.5402	-0.0028
5D	-7.2964306	4.8437	4.8472	-0.0035	4.8624	-0.0187	4.8482	-0.0045
6D	-7.2903160	5.0101	5.0137	-0.0036	5.0288	-0.0187	5.0167	-0.0066
7D	-7.2866912	5.1088	5.1140	-0.0053	5.1291	-0.0204	5.1226	-0.0138
8D	-7.2846058	5.1655						
9D	-7.2842566	5.1750						
10D	-7.2827529	5.2159						
11D	-7.2810660	5.2618						
12D	-7.2806438	5.2733						
13D	-7.2796484	5.3004						
14D	-7.2776090	5.3559						

As for the ^2F states (Table VIII), computed in the [7S-6P-5D-13F] basis, there are not many studies to compare with. The estimates of the exact non-relativistic values are taken from a relatively old review article by King.¹⁸ The differences between the estimates and the present results are within a few meV, that is still on par with the precise ECG studies of Adamowicz *et al.*^{11–13} for the ^2S , ^2P and ^2D states. The STO Full-CI results also differ by only a few meV, although with the opposite sign. The reason why the ^2F excitation energies are this close to the STO Full-CI results in contrast to the ^2S , ^2P or ^2D states may arise

TABLE VIII. Comparison of ^2F EOM-CCSD excitation energies of Li bound states with respect to the ground 2^2S state obtained from the [7S-6P-5D-13F] basis with estimate of the exact non-relativistic values¹⁸ and the Full-CI results in an optimized STO basis.¹⁹ Energy levels (E) are given in a.u. while the excitation energies (EE) as well as their differences (ΔEE) are in eV. ΔEE is defined as $EE^{[7\text{S-6P-5D-13F}]} - EE^{\text{ref.}}$. The reference 2S energy values in a.u. are put in parentheses for convenience. Values corresponding to the exact non-relativistic estimate are marked with an asterisk and the bibliographic reference.

state	[7S-6P-5D-13F]		Exact non-rel. est. ¹⁸		STO Full-CI ¹⁹	
	E	EE	EE	ΔEE	EE	ΔEE
2S	-7.4744350		(-7.4780603)*, ¹⁴		(-7.477192)	
4F	-7.3076701	4.5379	4.5414*, ¹⁸	-0.0035	4.5329	0.0050
5F	-7.2964194	4.8440	4.8475*, ¹⁸	-0.0035	4.8396	0.0045
6F	-7.2903080	5.0103			5.0064	0.0040
7F	-7.2866230	5.1106			5.1100	0.0006
8F	-7.2842313	5.1757				
9F	-7.2825915	5.2203				
10F	-7.2814185	5.2522				
11F	-7.2805499	5.2759				
12F	-7.2798861	5.2939				
13F	-7.2793602	5.3082				
14F	-7.2789311	5.3199				
15F	-7.2785961	5.3290				
16F	-7.2783444	5.3359				

from the true Rydberg character of the ^2F states.

The only reference data for the ^2G states in Table IX that we can compare to are those from the STO Full-CI computations. Similarly like for the ^2F states, the results differ in the order of meV, although there are only three excited states available for comparison.

TABLE IX. Comparison of ${}^2\text{G}$ EOM-CCSD excitation energies of Li bound states with respect to the ground 2^2S state obtained from the $[7\text{S-6P-5D-12G}]$ basis with the Full-CI results in an optimized STO basis.¹⁹ Energy levels (E) are given in a.u. while the excitation energies (EE) as well as their differences (ΔEE) are in eV. ΔEE is defined as $EE^{[7\text{S-6P-5D-12G}]} - EE^{\text{ref.}}$. The reference 2S energy value in a.u. is put in parentheses for convenience.

state	[7S-6P-5D-12G]		STO Full-CI ¹⁹	
	E	EE	EE	ΔEE
2S	-7.4744350		(-7.477192)	
5G	-7.2964303	4.8437	4.8371	0.0066
6G	-7.2903074	5.0104	5.0041	0.0062
7G	-7.2866226	5.1106	5.1045	0.0061
8G	-7.2842310	5.1757		
9G	-7.2825914	5.2203		
10G	-7.2814184	5.2522		
11G	-7.2805500	5.2759		
12G	-7.2798892	5.2938		
13G	-7.2793766	5.3078		
14G	-7.2789649	5.3190		
15G	-7.2785953	5.3291		
16G	-7.2782391	5.3388		

IV. CONCLUSIONS

For an *ab initio* quantum chemical description of Li Rydberg states an appropriate diffuse Gaussian basis was developed by a variational optimization of virtual orbitals of the corresponding Li^+ ion core. The approach is based on Koopmans' theorem, which says that a virtual orbital of a closed shell system describes a captured electron, which actually means a Rydberg state. The resulting basis consists of the standard aug-ano-pVQZ set for sufficient description of the electronic correlation, an extra high exponent contracted function to achieve a high quality Hartree–Fock field and a set of optimal diffuse Rydberg functions.

At the EOM-CCSD level of theory a minimal subset of the optimized basis could be

found for which the ionization potential as well as the excitation energies were converged with respect to the number of the Rydberg functions used. Higher Rydberg states could be effectively achieved by a state selective inclusion of the corresponding Rydberg function, dramatically reducing the demands on the basis set size.

Dozens of states at high accuracy could be achieved by the present approach, namely up to the states 24S, 25P, 14D, 16F and 16G, that is many more than by competitive *ab initio* methods. Compared to the state-of-the-art ECG approach, the computed excitation energies consistently differed mostly in the order of meV. Only the D states above 6D could not achieve convergence, which might be due to their supposedly weak Rydberg character. The results were also comparable to Hylleraas-CI energies, however, the differences were less regular than with the ECG values. Nevertheless, the presented excitation energies even surpassed accuracy of Full-CI results computed in an optimal STO basis by an order of magnitude.

Regardless of the excellent quality of the presented basis, a plenty of room for improvement remains. The number of primitive functions is still too large for practical use in standard quantum chemistry codes, which typically impose various restrictions on the basis set size. The optimization process could also be more sophisticated, involve directly more virtual orbitals and the basis could use more flexible parameterization than ETG, *e.g.* ExTG². On the other hand, not all chemical systems would require this high accuracy for the excited states so the optimization criteria might appropriately loosen.

Although the study was performed on a lithium atom, the approach is universal for any chemical system with a closed-shell ion core, including molecules. Similarly, it is not limited to Gaussian basis sets, but can be applied to any basis set types. Once the presented tailored basis set generation process becomes sufficiently tuned so that it is feasible for common quantum chemistry codes, it could promise an affordable highly accurate approach to *ab initio* state-selective investigation of molecular Rydberg states and possibly also of their related resonances.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work was financially supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic (Grant 20-21179S). Computational resources were supplied by the project "e-Infrastruktura CZ"

(e-INFRA CZ LM2018140) supported by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic.

REFERENCES

- ¹M. J. Seaton, Rep. Prog. Phys. **46**, 167 (1983).
- ²P. R. Kaprálová-Žďánská and J. Šmydke, J. Chem. Phys. **138**, 024105 (2013).
- ³A. Szabo and N. S. Ostlund, *Modern Quantum Chemistry* (Mineola, N.Y. : Dover Publications, New York, 1996).
- ⁴P. R. Kaprálová-Žďánská, J. Šmydke, and S. Civiš, J. Chem. Phys. **139**, 104314 (2013).
- ⁵F. Neese and E. F. Valeev, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **7**, 33 (2011).
- ⁶MRCC, a quantum chemical program suite written by M. Kállay, P. R. Nagy, D. Mester, L. Gyevi-Nagy, J. Csóka, P. B. Szabó, Z. Rolik, G. Samu, J. Csontos, B. Hégyely, Á. Ganyecz, I. Ladjánszki, L. Szegedy, B. Ladóczki, K. Petrov, M. Farkas, P. D. Mezei, and R. A. Horváth. See www.mrcc.hu.
- ⁷M. Kállay, P. R. Nagy, D. Mester, Z. Rolik, G. Samu, J. Csontos, J. Csóka, P. B. Szabó, L. Gyevi-Nagy, B. Hégyely, I. Ladjánszki, L. Szegedy, B. Ladóczki, K. Petrov, M. Farkas, P. D. Mezei, and A. Ganyecz, J. Chem. Phys. **152**, 074107 (2020).
- ⁸“mdoptcli,” Multidimensional Optimizer for Command Line. See <http://mdoptcli.sf.net>.
- ⁹M. Galassi, J. Davies, J. Theiler, B. Cough, G. Jungman, P. Alken, M. Booth, and F. Rossi, *GNU Scientific Library Reference Manual, 3rd Ed.* (Network Theory Ltd., 2009).
- ¹⁰G. M. J. Barca, C. Bertoni, L. Carrington, D. Datta, N. De Silva, J. E. Deustua, D. G. Fedorov, J. R. Gour, A. O. Gunina, E. Guidez, T. Harville, S. Irle, J. Ivanic, K. Kowalski, S. S. Leang, H. Li, W. Li, J. J. Lutz, I. Magoulas, J. Mato, V. Mironov, H. Nakata, B. Q. Pham, P. Piecuch, D. Poole, S. R. Pruitt, A. P. Rendell, L. B. Roskop, K. Ruedenberg, T. Sattasathuchana, M. W. Schmidt, J. Shen, L. Slipchenko, M. Sosonkina, V. Sundriyal, A. Tiwari, J. L. Galvez Vallejo, B. Westheimer, M. Włoch, P. Xu, F. Zahariev, and M. S. Gordon, J. Chem. Phys. **152**, 154102 (2020).
- ¹¹A. Bralin, S. Bubin, M. Stanke, and L. Adamowicz, Chem. Phys. Lett. **730**, 497 (2019).
- ¹²S. Bubin and L. Adamowicz, J. Chem. Phys. **136**, 134305 (2012).
- ¹³K. L. Sharkey, S. Bubin, and L. Adamowicz, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 012506 (2011).
- ¹⁴M. Puchalski and K. Pachucki, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 052511 (2008).

- ¹⁵J. S. Sims and S. A. Hagstrom, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 052507 (2009).
- ¹⁶S. Bubin, J. Komasa, M. Stanke, and L. Adamowicz, J. Chem. Phys. **131**, 234112 (2009).
- ¹⁷L. M. Wang, Z.-C. Yan, H. X. Qiao, and G. W. F. Drake, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 052513 (2012).
- ¹⁸F. W. King, “High-precision calculations for the ground and excited states of the lithium atom,” (1999), in Advances In Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics, ed. B. Bederson and H. Walther, vol. 40, pp. 57-112, Academic Press.
- ¹⁹M. B. Ruiz, J. T. Margraf, and A. M. Frolov, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 012505 (2013).