

Basis set extrapolation from the vanishing counterpoise correction condition

Vladimir Fishman,¹ Emmanouil Semidalas,¹ and Jan M.L. Martin^{*1,2}

¹*Department of Molecular Chemistry and Materials Science, Weizmann Institute of Science, 7610001 Rehovot, Israel*

²*On sabbatical at: Quantum Theory Project, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA.*

(*Electronic mail: gershom@weizmann.ac.il)

(Dated: 9 May 2024)

Basis set extrapolations are typically rationalized either from analytical arguments involving the partial-wave or principal expansions of the correlation energy in helium-like systems, or from fitting extrapolation parameters to reference energetics for a small(ish) training set. Seeking to avoid both, we explore a third alternative: extracting extrapolation parameters from the requirement that the BSSE (basis set superposition error) should vanish at the complete basis set limit. We find this to be a viable approach provided that the underlying basis sets are not too small and reasonably well balanced. For basis sets not augmented by diffuse functions, BSSE minimization and energy fitting yield quite similar parameters.

I. INTRODUCTION

Despite great recent progress in density functional theory, wavefunction ab initio methods such as coupled cluster theory can still routinely exceed the accuracy of the best DFT calculations by an order of magnitude, provided they are close enough to the one-particle basis set limit.

For atom-centered orbital basis sets, basis set convergence of the correlation energy is excruciatingly slow. Schwartz^{1,2} showed in the early 1960s that for the second-order correlation energy of helium-like atoms, the contributions of successive angular momenta (the ‘partial waves’) converge as

$$E_l^{(2)} = A/(l+1/2)^4 + B/(l+1/2)^6 + \dots \quad (1)$$

Then if the basis set is truncated at angular momentum L , the total residual error is

$$E_\infty^{(2)} - E_L^{(2)} = \sum_{l=L+1}^{\infty} A/(l+1/2)^4 + B/(l+1/2)^6 + \dots \quad (2)$$

$$= \frac{A\psi^{(3)}(L+3/2)}{6} + \frac{B\psi^{(5)}(L+3/2)}{120} + \dots \quad (3)$$

where ψ is the polygamma function. For large L , this function can be approximated by the asymptotic series

$$\psi^{(3)}(L+3/2) = 2/(L+1)^3 + O(L^5) \quad (4)$$

and

$$\psi^{(5)}(L+3/2) = 24/(L+1)^5 + O(L^7) \quad (5)$$

Hill³ generalized this result to configuration interaction, while Kutzelnigg and Morgan⁴ showed a general leading L^{-3} dependence for singlet-coupled, and L^{-5} for triplet-coupled, pair correlation energies. The latter authors also showed that in the presence of explicit R_{12} terms in the basis set, convergence will asymptotically be accelerated to L^{-7} .

A similar leading $\propto L^{-3}$ dependence is obtained from two different sets of considerations. Carroll, Silverstone, and Metzger in 1979 showed⁵ that the basis set convergence in the principal expansion asymptotically converges as $\delta E_{nlm} = -A/(n-\frac{1}{2})^6$. For a given principal quantum number n , however, the angular quantum number l runs from 0 to $n-1$, and the magnetic quantum number m from $-l$ to $+l$. This leads to $\sum_{l=0}^{n-1} (2l+1) = n^2$ approximately equal contributions, and hence an overall $\propto n^{-4}$ leading dependence. Summing over all missing shells, from $n_{\max}+1$ to infinity, again leads us to a leading inverse-cubic $\propto n^{-3}$ dependence of Eq.4.

Later, Petersson and coworkers⁷⁻¹⁰ considered the convergence of the correlation energy in a natural orbital expansion, and found it to converge as $\propto N^{-1}$ (with N the number of natural orbitals retained) for opposite-spin correlation, and $\propto N^{5/3}$ for same-spin correlation. As the number of natural orbitals in a basis set series such as the correlation consistent¹¹ cc-pVnZ or atomic natural orbital¹² ANO-n will converge with the cardinal number n as

$$N = (n+1)(n+3/2)(n+2)/3 = (n+\frac{3}{2})^3 - \frac{1}{12}(n+\frac{3}{2}) \quad (6)$$

we once again recover an inverse-cubic dependence. (See also Klopper.¹³ For an illustration with natural orbitals in neon atom, see Fig.1 in the present work.)

Applying such a formula (or similar ones) to the basis set convergence in *molecules* entails a major leap of faith. In the mid-nineties, Helgaker and coworkers^{14,15} and Martin¹⁶ found that this works well enough in practice; Klopper¹⁷ introduced the additional refinement that the correlation energy is partitioned between same-spin (strictly: ‘triplet-coupled pair’) and opposite-spin (strictly speaking: ‘singlet-coupled pair’) contributions, and that these contributions are extrapolated separately assuming L^{-5} and L^{-3} behavior, respectively. (The partitioning is not unique for open-shell systems: see Ref.¹⁸)

Several variants have been introduced, such as those with variable exponents α of the form $E(L) = E_\infty + A/L^\alpha$ (e.g., Ref.¹⁹), variable L-shift $E_\infty + A/(L+a)^{-$




FIG. 1. Convergence of CCSD(T) correlation energy of neon atom as a function of the number of natural orbitals included. Natural orbitals obtained from the *spdfghi* part of the cc-pV10Z basis set of Feller et al.⁶




FIG. 2. Median BSSE (cm^{-1}) for TAEcorrCCSD over the W4-11 dataset for different basis set sequences

(Petersson^{20,21}), variable cardinal numbers $X(L)$ for the basis sets (Varandas²²), etc. have been introduced. As explained in Ref.²³, all of them can be related to the same linear two-point extrapolation of Schwenke:²⁴

$$E_{\infty} \approx E_L + A_L(E_L - E_{L-1}) \quad (7)$$

where we will refer to A_L as a "Schwenke coefficient", which is specific to the level of theory and the basis set pair.

Further work by Schwenke²⁵ going up to $L=12$ appears to indicate that after initial rapid convergence, a 'diminishing returns' regime quickly sets in.




FIG. 3. Median BSSE (cm^{-1}) for TAE[(T)] over the W4-11 dataset for different basis set sequences

A. Basis set superposition error

BSSE (basis set superposition error) results when an interaction energy between monomers A and B is evaluated in a finite basis as $E(AB) - E(A) - E(B)$, where A only carries the basis functions of monomer A, and likewise for B. If the basis set on A is far from the CBS (complete basis set) limit, the availability in the dimer of the additional basis functions from the other monomer lead to an artifactual stabilization of the dimer known as BSSE.

Particularly in calculations on noncovalent interactions, BSSE can rival the interaction energy itself unless well-saturated and balanced basis sets are used.

The classic remedy is the counterpoise method²⁶, in which the monomer energies are effectively evaluated in the whole dimer basis set. BSSE can then be defined operationally as the difference between ‘raw’ and corrected interaction energies.

$$BSSE = E[A] + E[B] - E[A(B)] - E[B(A)] \quad (8)$$

At the complete basis set limit, BSSE should be zero — and hence if an extrapolation works correctly, then the ‘raw’ and counterpoise answers should be the same. Discrepancies thus indicate either a flaw in the extrapolation formula, or inadequate basis sets, or both.

We now propose to invert this observation — by using the requirement that BSSE should be zero, or minimized, as a means of obtaining basis set extrapolations.

This has the advantage that it relies neither on the theoretical behavior for an idealized system, nor on fitting (possibly themselves flawed) reference interaction energies for some training data set.

To the best of our knowledge, the concept of deriving a basis set extrapolation from the BSSE limiting condition has never been explored. However, the NASA Ames team, in

the late 1980s, did advocate using a negative multiple of the calculated BSSE as a correction for basis set incompleteness (e.g.,^{27,28}. Quoting Taylor²⁸:

Since BSSE is in some sense a measure of basis set incompleteness, one can contemplate increasing the bond energy by some fraction of the counterpoise correction to correct for this residual incompleteness, rather than decreasing it to correct the computed result for BSSE. This is a completely empirical approach, but we have found (for strong interactions) that in large basis sets (up to g functions, say) increasing the computed values by 150% of the calculated BSSE gives a good approximation to the best extrapolations to the basis set limit that we can perform from very large basis set studies.

II. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

All quantum chemical calculations were performed using either MOLPRO 2024.1²⁹ or Gaussian 16 rev. C.01³⁰ running on the CHEMFARM cluster of the Faculty of Chemistry at Weizmann.

Three basis set sequences were considered:

1. the nZaPa sequence ($n=2-7$) of Ranasinghe and Petersson (RP)²¹
2. the augmented correlation consistent sequence of Dunning:
 - aug-cc-pVnZ for first row: Ref.³¹
 - aug-cc-pV(n+d)Z for second-row elements^{32,33} (concerning why 2nd-row elements in high oxi-

dation states need tight 3d functions added, see Ref.³⁴ and references therein)

- cc-pV7Z hydrogen, aug-cc-pV7Z carbon through fluorine: Refs.^{35,36}
- sulfur aug-cc-pV(7+d)Z from ESI of Refs.³⁷ (see also Ref.³⁸)
- others: a 2013 personal communication by Dr. David A. Feller³⁹

3. the core-valence correlation versions^{40,41} of the above, but used for valence correlation only. It has previously been shown⁴² that this practice considerably reduces BSSE.

The CCSD(T)^{43,44} electronic structure method was used throughout. For open-shell systems, we adopted the Watts-Gauss-Bartlett definition⁴⁴ of restricted open-shell CCSD(T).

The molecules considered in the present work were all taken from the W4-17 thermochemical benchmark⁴⁵. Reference geometries given in its supporting information, each optimized at the CCSD(T)/cc-pV(Q+d)Z level, were used as-is without reoptimization.

Throughout the paper, notation like cc-pV{T,Q}Z refers to extrapolation, in the given example from cc-pVTZ and cc-pVQZ basis sets. The shorthands pVTZ+d, haVTZ+d, CVTZ, and haCVTZ refer, respectively, to cc-pV(T+d)Z, heavy-aug-cc-pV(T+d)Z, cc-pCVTZ, and heavy-aug-cc-pCVTZ. (The common practice of omitting diffuse functions on hydrogen, while placing them on more electronegative elements, goes by several names in the literature: aug'-cc-pVnZ by Del Bene,⁴⁶ heavy-aug-cc-pVnZ by Hobza,⁴⁷ and jul-cc-pVnZ in "calendar sets" notation.⁴⁸)

For BSSE evaluation in polyatomics, we exclusively use the SSFC (site-site function counterpoise) of Wells and Wilson⁴⁹, as implemented in MOLPRO's scripting language by one of us. Operationally, SSFC entails evaluating all monomer energies in the full oligomer basis set: the unmodified procedure may be inefficient for large clusters (where some sort of screening is called for⁵⁰) but this is not an issue in small-molecule systems of the W4-17 type.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Initial exploration with 24 heavy-atom diatomics

At first, we started out with a sample consisting of the 24 nonhydrogen diatomics in the W4-17 dataset. For these, we were able to carry out calculations through cc-pV(7+d)Z, heavy-aug-cc-pV(7+d)Z, and 7ZaPa with relative ease; these employed Gaussian, as the largest basis sets entail k functions and MOLPRO can handle i functions at most.

For energetic comparisons near the one-particle basis set limit, we employed explicitly correlated data using the rigorous CCSD(F12*) method⁵² with the aug-cc-pwCV5Z basis set and, in the F12 geminal, an exponent of 1.4. These data were extracted from the Supporting Information of

Ref.⁵³; in previous work,⁵⁴ they were found to be in agreement with the effectively saturated 'Reference- h ' basis set to 0.013 kcal·mol⁻¹ RMS. We believe that a conservative error bar would be about twice that, rounded upward, or 0.03 kcal·mol⁻¹.

As one can see in Table I, while the Schwenke extrapolation parameters obtained through BSSE minimization are slightly different from those from the literature, they largely follow the same trend. Moreover, the difference between the RMSDs using both approaches is within the uncertainty of the reference values. In fact, for the {5,6}Z pair, the RMSD fit yields a lower RMSD than the energy optimization from Ref.²³.

The remaining BSSE upon extrapolation is still somewhat significant (0.12 kcal·mol⁻¹) for {3,4}ZaPa, but dwindles to 0.05 kcal·mol⁻¹ for {4,5}ZaPa and to essentially nil beyond that (0.02 and 0.01 kcal·mol⁻¹, respectively, for {5,6}ZaPa and {6,7}ZaPa).

We also obtained a different set of parameters by minimizing the RMSD with respect to CCSD(F12*)/awCV5Z for this sample of 24 molecules. Unsurprisingly, this yields the lowest RMSDs of the three parameter sets, but the differences with BSSE-minimizing extrapolation, except possibly for the {4,5}ZaPa basis set pair, are within the uncertainty of the reference values.

Using the counterpoise, rather than raw, TAEs leads to marginally different Schwenke coefficients, except for the haV{T,Q}Z+d pair where also TAE(BSSE) differs significantly.

For the connected triple excitations, BSSE-minimization in the n ZaPa series yields parameters fairly similar to those published by Ranasinghe and Petersson²¹. In Ref.⁵⁵, their {6,7}ZaPa extrapolation was found to essentially represent basis set limits: our BSSE minimization has an RMSD of 0.05 kcal·mol⁻¹ for the smallest basis set pair considered ({3,4}ZaPa), but for {4,5}ZaPa this already drops down to 0.01 kcal·mol⁻¹, and for {5,6}ZaPa to 0.004. The RMSD(TAE) based minimizations lead to 0.02, 0.01, and 0.003 kcal·mol⁻¹, hence only for the smallest basis set pair could the difference even remotely be considered significant. For the cc-pV(n+d)Z sequence, {T,Q}, {Q,5}, and {5,6} pairs all have essentially the same errors for the two sets of parameters: only for the {6,7} pair where the two procedures yield Schwenke parameters differing by 0.3 (!) is there even a 0.01 kcal·mol⁻¹ difference. The practical relevance of this is dubious, given that the {5,6} and even {Q,5} basis set pairs yields similar-quality (T) contributions at much lower cost.

Finally, we considered if the old 'NASA recipe'²⁸ of using a coefficient times the negative BSSE as a basis set incompleteness correction has any practical merit. We thus obtained coefficients more similar to 5/2 than to 3/2, but more importantly, the RMSD are 3-5 times larger than what can be obtained by two-point extrapolation.

TABLE I. Schwenke extrapolation coefficients A_L and RMS deviations ($\text{kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$) for $\{n-1, n\}$ ZaPa basis set sequences.

Schwenke parameters A_L		RMS(BSSE) or RMSD(TAE)				TAE with BSSE parameter and vice versa								
{T,Q} {Q,5} {5,6} {6,7}		{T,Q} {Q,5} {5,6} {6,7}				{T,Q} {Q,5} {5,6} {6,7}								
CCSD raw	cc-pV($n+d$)Z	0.762	0.927	1.166	1.400	TAE RAW	0.205	0.080	0.046	0.040	0.227	0.095	0.064	0.106
CCSD CP	cc-pV($n+d$)Z	0.754	0.922	1.142	1.479	TAE CP	0.233	0.058	0.041	0.044	0.253	0.085	0.060	0.107
CCSD BSSE	cc-pV($n+d$)Z	0.726	0.881	1.074	1.794	BSSE	0.076	0.056	0.029	0.034	0.086	0.060	0.034	0.039
	Schwenke ²⁴	0.700	0.900	1.238										
	Varandas ⁵¹	0.635	0.849	1.142										
CCSD raw	nZaPa	0.708	0.890	1.126	1.463	TAE RAW	0.183	0.080	0.053	0.037	0.185	0.111	0.055	0.059
CCSD CP	nZaPa	0.712	0.871	1.133	1.505	TAE CP	0.236	0.094	0.043	0.035	0.236	0.121	0.046	0.058
CCSD BSSE	nZaPa	0.716	0.815	1.156	1.674	BSSE	0.116	0.048	0.020	0.008	0.116	0.057	0.020	0.015
CCSD raw	haV($n+d$)Z	0.649	0.898	1.233	1.470	TAE RAW	0.128	0.095	0.041	0.041	0.383	0.097	0.069	0.083
CCSD CP	haV($n+d$)Z	0.678	0.907	1.192	1.547	TAE CP	0.153	0.056	0.043	0.031	0.394	0.057	0.071	0.079
CCSD BSSE	haV($n+d$)Z	0.784	0.910	1.076	1.853	BSSE	0.106	0.060	0.014	0.025	0.147	0.059	0.028	0.031
	Varandas ⁵¹	0.665	0.912	1.295	[1.592]									
	Schwenke ²⁴	0.700	0.930	1.266	[1.621]									
	Ref. ²³	N/A	0.932	1.283	1.602									
(T) RAW	cc-pV($n+d$)Z	0.757	0.836	1.091	1.473	TAE RAW	0.032	0.013	0.005	0.004	0.035	0.014	0.008	0.011
(T) CP	cc-pV($n+d$)Z	0.770	0.835	1.112	1.413	TAE CP	0.038	0.010	0.004	0.003	0.041	0.011	0.008	0.011
BSSE (T)	cc-pV($n+d$)Z	0.727	0.806	1.007	1.746	BSSE	0.015	0.007	0.002	0.003	0.016	0.007	0.003	0.003
	Schwenke ²⁴	0.695	0.741	1.102										
(T) RAW	nZaPa	0.679	0.842	1.098	1.562	TAE RAW	0.020	0.007	0.003	0.001	0.054	0.014	0.004	0.003
(T) CP	nZaPa	0.706	0.831	1.111	1.583	TAE CP	0.022	0.007	0.003	0.001	0.055	0.014	0.004	0.003
BSSE (T)	nZaPa	0.564	0.914	1.050	1.470	BSSE	0.004	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.011	0.003	0.002	0.001
RP, ²¹ eq.12	nZaPa	0.604	0.891	1.199	1.517									
RP, ²¹ optimized	nZaPa	0.600	0.849	1.164	1.580									
(T) RAW	haV($n+d$)Z	0.763	0.825	1.167	1.563	(T) RAW	0.030	0.009	0.003	0.003	0.063	0.022	0.013	0.007
(T) CP	haV($n+d$)Z	0.734	0.807	1.211	1.530	(T) CP	0.032	0.007	0.003	0.003	0.067	0.021	0.013	0.007
BSSE (T)	haV($n+d$)Z	0.909	0.955	0.945	1.800	BSSE (T)	0.014	0.005	0.001	0.001	0.014	0.005	0.003	0.002
	Schwenke ²⁴	0.700	0.810	1.248										

B. Further exploration with (most of) W4-17 for the CCSD correlation energy

Table II presents extrapolation parameters, RMS(BSSE) (root mean square BSSE), and RMSD(TAE) (root mean square deviations in the total atomization energy) for several basis set sequences, obtained from nearly all of the W4-17 dataset for the CCSD correlation component. (For the largest basis sets, some of the largest species had to be omitted for reasons of resource constraints or, in the case of benzene, near-linear dependence of the basis set.) Once again, for RMSD(TAE), CCSD(F12*)/awCV5Z correlation energies extracted from the ESI of Ref.⁵³ were used as the reference.

For the cc-pV($n+d$)Z family, the agreement between BSSE-minimizing and RMSD(TAE)-minimizing Schwenke parameters can only be described as remarkable: fitted to the W4-

08 subset, we have 0.717 vs 0.690 for V{T,Q}Z+d, 0.879 vs 0.883 for V{Q,5}Z+d, and 1.063 vs. 1.094 for V{5,6}Z. These differences are well within overlapping 2σ uncertainties on the fitted linear regression parameters. The RMSDs in both BSSEs and TAEs are statistically equivalent between the two basis set sequences. Only for {6,7} (Table I) do we find a significant discrepancy of 1.794 vs. 1.400: the RMSD(TAE) if we substitute the former Schwenke parameter for the latter rises from 0.04 to 0.1 $\text{kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ — still, not much larger than the estimated uncertainty in the reference values. For the RMS(BSSE), there is no appreciable difference between the two extrapolation parameters.

It is well known (and standard practice in high-accuracy thermochemistry protocols like W4 theory^{56,57} and HEAT^{58–61}) that adding diffuse functions speeds up basis set convergence especially if highly electronegative elements

TABLE II. Schwenke extrapolation parameters and RMS deviations (kcal·mol⁻¹) in the CCSD correlation component of the TAE for various basis set sequences. 'LR' refers to linear regression with slope (dimensionless) and intercept (kcal·mol⁻¹)

		BSSE-fitted			TAE-fitted		
		TQ	Q5	56	TQ	Q5	56
VnZ+d	A _L 24diatom	0.721	0.874	1.063	0.748	0.896	1.094
	A _L W4-08	0.719	0.881	1.081	0.689	0.883	1.109
	A _L W4-11	0.724	0.845	1.076	0.678	0.902	1.120
	A _L W4-17most	0.718	0.870	1.082	0.689	0.899	1.119
	RMSD BSSE(TAE)	0.103	0.079	0.046	0.232	0.114	0.048
	RMSD TAE	0.514	0.119	0.064	0.495	0.119	0.060
	LR slope	0.698	0.815	0.989	0.700	0.878	1.127
	2σ(slope)	0.024	0.046	0.063	0.046	0.028	0.034
	LR intercept (kcal·mol ⁻¹)	0.041	0.049	0.029	-0.058	0.010	-0.015
	R ²	0.973	0.932	0.914	0.908	0.976	0.979
aVnZ+d	A _L 24diatom	0.774	0.893	1.084	0.634	0.855	1.133
	A _L W4-08	0.783	0.884	1.121	0.602	0.867	1.149
	A _L W4-11	0.820	0.840	1.145	0.590	0.907	1.166
	A _L W4-17most	0.777	0.875	1.133	0.593	0.908	1.171
	RMSD BSSE(TAE)	0.163	0.086	0.022	0.282	0.087	0.023
	RMSD TAE	0.797	0.128	0.060	0.279	0.126	0.058
	LR slope	0.724	0.824	1.078	0.632	0.829	1.149
	2σ(slope)	0.048	0.062	0.038	0.028	0.036	0.044
	LR intercept (kcal·mol ⁻¹)	0.088	0.038	0.011	-0.139	0.059	0.000
	R ²	0.908	0.882	0.972	0.955	0.957	0.967
nZaPa	A _L 24diatom	0.730	0.798	1.148	0.693	0.856	1.045
	A _L W4-08	0.717	0.826	1.169	0.642	0.850	1.071
	A _L W4-11	0.720	0.820	1.139	0.635	0.863	1.103
	A _L W4-17most	0.735	0.807	1.151	0.633	0.858	1.096
	RMSD BSSE(TAE)	0.141	0.064	0.031	0.181	0.066	0.039
	RMSD TAE	0.572	0.106	0.096	0.466	0.099	0.072
	LR slope	0.666	0.769	1.109	0.665	0.861	1.069
	2σ(slope)	0.055	0.017	0.028	0.036	0.035	0.019
	LR intercept	0.093	0.041	0.016	-0.114	-0.020	0.001
	R ²	0.860	0.989	0.986	0.934	0.962	0.993
CVnZ	A _L 24diatom	0.685	0.863	1.217	0.758	0.875	1.058
	A _L W4-08	0.686	0.883	1.217	0.699	0.857	1.078
	A _L W4-11	0.692	0.856	1.194	0.688	0.871	1.090
	A _L W4-17most	0.686	0.872	1.194	0.676	0.866	1.090
	RMSD BSSE(TAE)	0.076	0.066	0.026	0.078	0.068	0.040
	RMSD TAE	0.511	0.113	0.119	0.507	0.103	0.059
	LR slope	0.661	0.825	1.181	0.708	0.854	1.100
	2σ(slope)	0.017	0.042	0.043	0.047	0.024	0.033
	LR intercept	0.046	0.039	0.010	-0.044	0.007	-0.018
	R ²	0.984	0.943	0.969	0.906	0.982	0.979
haCVnZ	A _L 24diatom	0.733	0.877	1.290	0.648	0.837	1.058
	A _L W4-08	0.736	0.886	1.309	0.622	0.843	1.091
	A _L W4-11	0.770	0.871	1.289	0.612	0.866	1.112
	A _L W4-17most	0.741	0.877	1.288	0.616	0.866	1.112
	RMSD BSSE(TAE)	0.127	0.031	0.032	0.177	0.036	0.048
	RMSD TAE	0.560	0.101	0.138	0.281	0.081	0.055
	LR slope	0.669	0.861	1.277	0.647	0.824	1.109
	2σ(slope)	0.040	0.028	0.076	0.029	0.023	0.040
	LR intercept (kcal·mol ⁻¹)	0.087	0.013	0.006	-0.121	0.032	-0.012
	R ²	0.922	0.977	0.923	0.956	0.982	0.970

like O and F are involved. For the haVnZ+d sequence, the Schwenke parameters obtained by BSSE(CBS) minimization and by energy error minimization are again quite similar for the haV{Q,5}Z+d and haV{5,6}Z+d basis set pairs, and

the parameters yield statistically equivalent RMS(BSSE) and RMSD(TAE) values. There is, however, a more pronounced difference for haV{T,Q}Z+d, 0.782 vs. 0.603 when fitted to the W4-08 subset. The RMSD for TAEs with the BSSE-

minimizing $A_L=0.782$ is quite poor at $0.83 \text{ kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$, almost three times the value obtained with 0.603.

The difference between the A_L values obtained from W4-08, W4-11, and (most of) W4-17 are indicative of the stability of the fits, especially for the smaller basis sets where we were able to complete nearly every species.

As a further sanity check, instead of adjusting a single scaling factor, we carried out linear regression including an intercept that amounts to correcting for a putative constant bias in the atomization energies. Here, we used the W4-08 subset throughout as we were able to run all its species for all basis sets through $n = 6$, and hence we can make a fair comparison between the basis set families. In the BSSE fit, the intercept amounts to $0.10 \text{ kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ for the $\text{haV}\{\text{T},\text{Q}\}\text{Z}+\text{d}$ pair, but drops to insignificant values of 0.04 and $0.013 \text{ kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ for $\{\text{Q},5\}$ and $\{5,6\}$, respectively.

When fitted to $\text{RMSD}(\text{TAE})$ instead, both $\{\text{T},\text{Q}\}$ at -0.13 and $\{\text{Q},5\}$ at $0.09 \text{ kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ are significant. Likewise, for $n\text{ZaPa}$ there is a significant intercept for $\{\text{T},\text{Q}\}$ but not for the larger basis set pairs, and concomitantly with that, the Pearson coefficients of determination R^2 for the BSSE fits increase sharply from 0.86 to 0.99 and 0.98, respectively. R^2 for the $\text{RMSD}(\text{TAE})$ cases jump from 0.86 for the $\{\text{T},\text{Q}\}$ pair to 0.99 and 0.98 for the two next pairs while those for the TAE-fits are 0.93, 0.96, and 0.99, respectively.

Figure 2 presents the median BSSE across the W4-11 subset for various basis set sequences. The BSSE approximately halves with each step in n across all the basis set sequences surveyed in Figure 2.

The $n\text{ZaPa}$ series, for smaller n , actually seems slightly more prone to BSSE than heavy-aug-pV($n+\text{d}$)Z. Replacing $\text{haV}(\text{T}+\text{d})\text{Z}$ by the *spdf* part of $\text{haV}(\text{Q}+\text{d})\text{Z}$; $\text{haV}(\text{Q}+\text{d})\text{Z}$ by the *spdfg* part of $\text{haV}(5+\text{d})\text{Z}$; and so forth — i.e., the next basis set up with the top angular momentum deleted — drives down the BSSE to the same range as $\text{haV}(n+1)\text{Z}+\text{d}$.

If (for additional radial flexibility) we apply the cc-pCV $n\text{Z}$ core-valence basis set sequence to valence correlation, we find that it behaves essentially like the underlying cc-pV $n\text{Z}(\text{+d})$ series. (There is no need to add tight d functions on second-row elements to a core-valence basis set, as the latter already will include tight d function for core-valence correlation.) Only for the cc-pCV $\{5,6\}\text{Z}$ basis set pair is there a semi-significant discrepancy between BSSE- and TAE-based extrapolation coefficients — and in fact, when doing linear regression with an intercept, that goes away. In contrast, for the $\text{haCV}n\text{Z}$ sequence, there is a significant difference (also in RMSD) for the $\{\text{T},\text{Q}\}$ basis set pair: interestingly, here too it disappears when an intercept is allowed in the fit. The said intercept, at $+0.1 \text{ kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ for the BSSE fit and $-0.1 \text{ kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ for the TAE fit, is however a bit large for comfort. By comparison with the V $n\text{Z}+\text{d}$ and $\text{haV}n\text{Z}+\text{d}$ findings, we infer that the ‘destabilizing’ factor here are the diffuse functions.

As shown earlier in Ref.⁴², using the $\text{haCV}n\text{Z}$ core-valence basis sets (Fig.2) for the valence correlation energy does drive down BSSE considerably. Interestingly, combining the *dfg*... functions from $\text{haV}n\text{Z}+\text{d}$ with the *sp* set from the next basis set up — which we denote $\text{haV}n\text{Z}+\text{spd}$ — seems to be about equally more effective in that regard.

For the $\{5,6\}$ pair and energy-optimized extrapolations, the differences between the various basis set families are too small to make meaningful distinctions.

C. Further consideration of (T)

It has been shown in great detail (see Ref.⁵⁵ and references therein) that basis set convergence of (T) is considerably faster than for the correlation energy overall; specifically, it was found there that for the W4-08 subset of W4-17, $\{4,5\}\text{ZaPa}$ extrapolation of (T) with the Ranasinghe-Petersson formula²¹ causes an RMSD error in $\text{TAE}[(\text{T})]$ of just $0.01 \text{ kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ compared to $(\text{T})\{6,7\}\text{ZaPa}$. Even for the $\{\text{T},\text{Q}\}$ pair this only rose to $0.05 \text{ kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$. Hence, over-analysis of results with $\{\text{Q},5\}$, let alone $\{5,6\}$ basis set pairs is definitely contraindicated.

Optimized parameters and performance statistics for the connected triples contribution to TAE can be found in Table III. Here we used $(\text{T})/\{5,6\}\text{ZaPa}$ or, for the species where available, $(\text{T})\{6,7\}\text{ZaPa}$ from the ESI of Ref.⁵⁵ as the reference.

For the pV $n\text{Z}+\text{d}$ and CV $n\text{Z}$ basis set sequences, the BSSE-fitted and TAE-fitted Schwenke parameters are quite similar, as are their statistics. For $n\text{ZaPa}$, $\text{haV}n\text{Z}+\text{d}$ and $\text{haCV}n\text{Z}$ there is a more pronounced difference for the smaller basis set pairs; comparison for the $\{5,6\}$ pair is a somewhat vapid exercise, as all sets of parameters except $\text{haV}n\text{Z}+\text{d}$ have RMSDs of $0.01 \text{ kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ or below for the (T) component.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In response to our research question, whether basis set extrapolation can viably be obtained from the condition that the extrapolated basis set superposition error should approach zero, we can conclude the following:

1. For cc-pV($n+\text{d}$)Z basis sets, fitting to reference TAEs or fitting to minimize extrapolated BSSE yield similar extrapolation parameters for $\{\text{T},\text{Q}\}$, $\{\text{Q},5\}$ and $\{5,6\}$ basis set pairs.
2. for other basis set sequences, this is consistently the case for the $\{\text{Q},5\}$ pair.
3. for the $\text{haV}\{\text{T},\text{Q}\}\text{Z}+\text{d}$ and $\text{haCV}\{\text{T},\text{Q}\}\text{Z}+\text{d}$ pair there appears to be a basis set imbalance in terms of BSSE. This is much less the case for $\{3,4\}\text{ZaPa}$.
4. for 5Z and 6Z basis sets, the two approaches may still lead to different extrapolation parameters. However, owing to the smaller basis set incompleteness, the predicted basis set limits are of comparable quality considering the uncertainty in the reference values.
5. This recipe becomes less workable for angular momenta beyond i functions, as the BSSEs become too small to form a reliable foundation for fitting.

TABLE III. Schwenke extrapolation coefficients A_L and RMSD deviations ($\text{kcal}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$) for the connected triples contribution (T) to the total atomization energy

		BSSE-fitted			TAE-fitted		
		TQ	Q5	56	TQ	Q5	56
VnZ+d	A_L W4-11	0.730	0.754	0.985	0.721	0.804	1.085
	A_L W4-08	0.696	0.795	1.001	0.744	0.802	1.069
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-11	0.049	0.013	0.010	0.049	0.013	0.007
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-08	0.052	0.014	0.009	0.044	0.014	0.007
nZaPa	A_L W4-11	0.571	0.894	1.021	0.661	0.796	1.096
	A_L W4-08	0.565	0.906	1.056	0.673	0.797	1.065
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-11	0.057	0.022	0.006	0.029	0.008	0.006
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-08	0.060	0.022	0.005	0.029	0.009	0.005
CVnZ	A_L W4-11	0.672	0.815	1.008	0.700	0.813	1.066
	A_L W4-08	0.649	0.878	1.014	0.726	0.812	1.059
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-11	0.051	0.020	0.008	0.045	0.014	0.007
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-08	0.057	0.021	0.008	0.041	0.016	0.007
haVnZ+d	A_L W4-11	0.927	0.838	1.009	0.678	0.820	1.224
	A_L W4-08	0.838	0.899	0.989	0.706	0.798	1.190
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-11	0.085	0.017	0.016	0.041	0.010	0.005
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-08	0.069	0.019	0.013	0.038	0.008	0.004
haCVnZ	A_L W4-11	0.754	0.969	1.152	0.643	0.830	1.208
	A_L W4-08	0.715	0.976	1.167	0.664	0.819	1.168
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-11	0.044	0.023	0.005	0.032	0.007	0.005
	RMSD BSSE(TAE) W4-08	0.037	0.024	0.004	0.031	0.007	0.004

Thus basis set extrapolation can be rationalized through BSSE minimization eliminates the need to rely on either analytical archetypes about the partial-wave or principal expansions, or on fitting against any sort of external reference energetics. Moreover, since no explicit connection with either the partial-wave or principal expansions exists, it may be applicable to basis set sequences that are not tied to increasing L .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant 1969/20) and by the Uriel Arnon Memorial Center for AI research into smart materials. JMLM thanks the Quantum Theory Project at the University of Florida and its head, Prof. John F. Stanton, for their hospitality, and Dr. Nisha Mehta for discussions on BSSE in chalcogen bonding that provided some inspiration for the present work. All calculations were carried out on the ChemFarm HPC cluster of the Weizmann Institute Faculty of Chemistry.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Raw data can be obtained upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

- ¹C. Schwartz, Phys. Rev. **126**, 1015 (1962).
- ²C. Schwartz, Phys. Rev. **128**, 1146 (1962).
- ³R. N. Hill, J. Chem. Phys. **83**, 1173 (1985).
- ⁴W. Kutzelnigg and J. D. Morgan, J. Chem. Phys. **96**, 4484 (1992).
- ⁵D. P. Carroll, H. J. Silverstone, and R. M. Metzger, J. Chem. Phys. **71**, 4142 (1979).
- ⁶D. Feller, K. A. Peterson, and T. D. Crawford, J. Chem. Phys. **124**, 054107 (2006).
- ⁷G. a. Petersson and S. L. Licht, J. Chem. Phys. **75**, 4556 (1981).
- ⁸G. A. Petersson, A. K. Yee, and A. Bennett, J. Chem. Phys. **83**, 5105 (1985).
- ⁹G. A. Petersson, A. Bennett, T. G. Tensfeldt, M. A. Al-Laham, W. A. Shirley, and J. Mantzaris, J. Chem. Phys. **89**, 2193 (1988).
- ¹⁰G. A. Petersson and M. A. Al-Laham, J. Chem. Phys. **94**, 6081 (1991).
- ¹¹T. H. Dunning Jr, The Journal of Chemical Physics **90**, 1007 (1989).
- ¹²J. Almlöf and P. R. Taylor, J. Chem. Phys. **86**, 4070 (1987).
- ¹³W. Klopper, M. Schütz, H. P. Lüthi, and S. Leutwyler, J. Chem. Phys. **103**, 1085 (1995).
- ¹⁴T. Helgaker, W. Klopper, H. Koch, and J. Noga, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 9639 (1997).
- ¹⁵A. Halkier, T. Helgaker, P. Jørgensen, W. Klopper, H. Koch, J. Olsen, and A. K. Wilson, Chem. Phys. Lett. **286**, 243 (1998).
- ¹⁶J. M. Martin, Chem. Phys. Lett. **259**, 669 (1996).
- ¹⁷W. Klopper, Mol. Phys. **99**, 481 (2001).
- ¹⁸A. D. Boese, M. Oren, O. Atasoylu, J. M. L. Martin, M. Kállay, and J. Gauss, J. Chem. Phys. **120**, 4129 (2004).
- ¹⁹J. M. L. Martin and P. R. Taylor, The Journal of Chemical Physics **106**, 8620 (1997).
- ²⁰E. C. Barnes, G. A. Petersson, D. Feller, and K. A. Peterson, The Journal of chemical physics **129**, 194115 (2008).
- ²¹D. S. Ranasinghe and G. A. Petersson, J. Chem. Phys. **138**, 144104 (2013).
- ²²A. J. C. Varandas, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **23**, 9571 (2021).
- ²³J. M. L. Martin, AIP Conf. Proc. **2040**, 020008 (2018), arXiv:1804.08844.
- ²⁴D. W. Schwenke, J. Chem. Phys. **122**, 014107 (2005).
- ²⁵D. W. Schwenke, Mol. Phys. **110**, 2557 (2012).
- ²⁶S. Boys and F. Bernardi, Mol. Phys. **19**, 553 (1970).
- ²⁷C. W. Bauschlicher, S. R. Langhoff, and P. R. Taylor, J. Chem. Phys. **93**, 502 (1990).
- ²⁸P. R. Taylor, in *Lect. Notes Chem.* 58, edited by B. O. Roos (Springer, Berlin, 1992) pp. 325–412.
- ²⁹H.-J. Werner, P. J. Knowles, F. R. Manby, J. A. Black, K. Doll, A. Heßelmann, D. Kats, A. Köhn, T. Korona, D. A. Kreplin, Q. Ma, T. F. Miller,

- A. Mitrushchenkov, K. A. Peterson, I. Polyak, G. Rauhut, and M. Sibaev, *J. Chem. Phys.* **152**, 144107 (2020).
- ³⁰M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, X. Li, M. Caricato, A. V. Marenich, J. Bloino, B. G. Janesko, R. Gomperts, B. Mennucci, H. P. Hratchian, J. V. Ortiz, A. F. Izmaylov, J. L. Sonnenberg, D. Williams-Young, F. Ding, F. Lipparini, F. Egidi, J. Goings, B. Peng, A. Petrone, T. Henderson, D. Ranasinghe, V. G. Zakrzewski, J. Gao, N. Rega, G. Zheng, W. Liang, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, T. Vreven, K. Throssell, J. Montgomery, J. A., J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. J. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. N. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, T. A. Keith, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. P. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, C. Tomasi, J., M. Cossi, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, C. Adamo, R. Cammi, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K. Morokuma, O. Farkas, J. B. Foresman, and D. J. Fox, “Gaussian 16, Rev. C.01,” (2016).
- ³¹A. K. Wilson, T. van Mourik, and T. H. Dunning, *J. Mol. Struct. THEOCHEM* **388**, 339 (1996).
- ³²T. Van Mourik and T. H. Dunning, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **76**, 205 (2000).
- ³³T. H. Dunning, K. A. Peterson, and A. K. Wilson, *J. Chem. Phys.* **114**, 9244 (2001).
- ³⁴J. M. Martin, *J. Mol. Struct. THEOCHEM* **771**, 19 (2006).
- ³⁵D. Feller and K. A. Peterson, *J. Chem. Phys.* **110**, 8384 (1999).
- ³⁶D. Feller and J. A. Sordo, *J. Chem. Phys.* **113**, 485 (2000).
- ³⁷D. Feller, K. A. Peterson, and J. G. Hill, *J. Chem. Phys.* **135**, 044102 (2011).
- ³⁸D. Feller, *J. Chem. Phys.* **138**, 074103 (2013).
- ³⁹D. A. Feller, “personal communication, March 30,” (2013).
- ⁴⁰K. A. Peterson and T. H. Dunning, *J. Chem. Phys.* **117**, 10548 (2002).
- ⁴¹J. G. Hill, S. Mazumder, and K. A. Peterson, *J. Chem. Phys.* **132**, 054108 (2010).
- ⁴²N. Sylvetsky, K. A. Peterson, A. Karton, and J. M. L. Martin, *J. Chem. Phys.* **144**, 214101 (2016), 1605.03398.
- ⁴³K. Raghavachari, G. W. Trucks, J. A. Pople, and M. Head-Gordon, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **157**, 479 (1989).
- ⁴⁴J. D. Watts, J. Gauss, and R. J. Bartlett, *J. Chem. Phys.* **98**, 8718 (1993).
- ⁴⁵A. Karton, N. Sylvetsky, and J. M. L. Martin, *J. Comput. Chem.* **38**, 2063 (2017).
- ⁴⁶J. E. Del Bene, *J. Phys. Chem.* **97**, 107 (1993).
- ⁴⁷J. Řezáč and P. Hobza, *Chem. Rev.* **116**, 5038 (2016).
- ⁴⁸E. Papajak, J. Zheng, X. Xu, H. R. Leverentz, and D. G. Truhlar, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **7**, 3027 (2011).
- ⁴⁹B. H. Wells and S. Wilson, *Chemical physics letters* **101**, 429 (1983).
- ⁵⁰R. M. Richard, K. U. Lao, and J. M. Herbert, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **4**, 2674–2680 (2013).
- ⁵¹A. J. C. Varandas, *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **121**, e26598 (2021).
- ⁵²C. Hättig, D. P. Tew, and A. Köhn, *J. Chem. Phys.* **132**, 231102 (2010).
- ⁵³M. K. Kesharwani, N. Sylvetsky, A. Köhn, D. P. Tew, and J. M. L. Martin, *J. Chem. Phys.* **149**, 154109 (2018), arXiv:1807.06058.
- ⁵⁴K. A. Peterson, M. K. Kesharwani, and J. M. Martin, *Mol. Phys.* **113**, 1551 (2015).
- ⁵⁵J. M. L. Martin, in *Quantum Sci.*, edited by T. Onishi (Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore, 2022) pp. 467–496.
- ⁵⁶A. Karton, E. Rabinovich, J. M. L. Martin, and B. Ruscic, *J. Chem. Phys.* **125**, 144108 (2006).
- ⁵⁷A. Karton, P. R. Taylor, and J. M. L. Martin, *J. Chem. Phys.* **127**, 064104 (2007).
- ⁵⁸A. Tajti, P. G. Szalay, A. G. Császár, M. Kállay, J. Gauss, E. F. Valeev, B. A. Flowers, J. Vázquez, and J. F. Stanton, *The Journal of chemical physics* **121**, 11599 (2004).
- ⁵⁹Y. J. Bomble, J. Vázquez, M. Kállay, C. Michauk, P. G. Szalay, A. G. Császár, J. Gauss, and J. F. Stanton, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **125**, 064108 (2006).
- ⁶⁰M. E. Harding, J. Vázquez, B. Ruscic, A. K. Wilson, J. Gauss, and J. F. Stanton, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **128**, 114111 (2008).
- ⁶¹J. H. Thorpe, C. A. Lopez, T. L. Nguyen, J. H. Baraban, D. H. Bross, B. Ruscic, and J. F. Stanton, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **150**, 224102 (2019).