

Convergence of Møller–Plesset perturbation theory for excited reference states

Diana-Gabriela Oprea^{1,2} and Hugh G. A. Burton^{1, a)}

¹⁾Physical and Theoretical Chemistry Laboratory, Department of Chemistry, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3QZ, U.K.

²⁾Current address: Max Planck Institute for Chemical Physics of Solids, 01187 Dresden, Germany

(Dated: 26 January 2023)

Excited states in molecules can be difficult to investigate and generally require methods that are either computationally expensive or are not universally accurate. Recent research has focused on using higher-energy Slater determinants as mean-field representations of excited states, which can then be used to define reference states for electron correlation techniques such as Møller–Plesset theory. However, the convergence behaviour of these excited-state perturbation series has not yet been explored, limiting our understanding into the systematic improvability and reliability of such methods. Here, we present a systematic analysis of the Møller–Plesset perturbation series for closed-shell excited states using higher-energy reference determinants identified with, and without, state-specific orbital optimisation. We combine numerical calculations with complex analysis to show that the excited-state Møller–Plesset theory diverges almost universally for the stereotypical H₂, H₂O, and CH₂ molecules. Our results cast doubt on the suitability of higher-energy Slater determinants as reference states for perturbative treatments of electron correlation.

I. Introduction

Excited states are essential for understanding photochemical processes, ranging from photosynthesis and biological mechanisms of vision, to photocatalytic reactions and optoelectronics.¹ Single reference *ab initio* methods have been extensively developed to predict these excited states, including time-dependent density functional theory^{2–4} (TD-DFT), equation-of-motion coupled-cluster^{5,6} (EOM-CC), or the algebraic diagrammatic construction^{7,8} (ADC) approach. While TD-DFT works well for single excitations, it cannot necessarily describe double excitations or the orbital relaxation that occurs in charge transfer processes.^{9,10} Furthermore, describing double excitations with the EOM-CC and ADC approach requires high excitation orders that increase the computational scaling. The multiconfigurational complete active space self-consistent field^{11,12} approach with second-order perturbation theory^{13,14} (CASPT2) can provide more accurate results, but has a computational cost that grows exponentially with the active space.

To overcome these challenges, the idea of describing excitations using higher-energy stationary points that are present in wave function methods has seen renewed interest. These excited state solutions correspond to local minima, saddle points, or local maxima of the parameterised electronic energy landscape.^{15,16} In particular, it has been recognised that higher-energy self-consistent field (SCF) solutions from Hartree–Fock (HF) theory or Kohn–Sham DFT can provide qualitative representations of double excitations, and can incorporate essential orbital relaxation effects.^{17,18} The development of optimisation algorithms to prevent variational collapse to the ground state now enables routine calculations to be performed using this state-specific philosophy.^{17,19–26}

While excited-state SCF stationary points can qualitatively describe double excitations, they do not capture any of the dynamic correlation that is generally required for quantitative accuracy. Therefore, it has been suggested that these higher-energy Slater determinants can be used as a reference state for standard post-HF correlation techniques, including Møller–Plesset (MP) perturbation theory^{27,28} and coupled-cluster (CC)

theory.^{29–34} Recent studies have demonstrated that excited state-specific CC (Δ CC) calculations can give very accurate energies, but can also exhibit multiple solutions representing each excitation and amplitude equations that are difficult to converge.³⁵ On the other hand, excited-state second-order MP perturbation theory (Δ MP2) appears to provide relatively accurate results for double excitations, particularly when an orbitally-optimised reference determinant is employed.²⁸

In the absence of exact results, electronic structure theory benefits from a systematically improvable hierarchy of methods that allows the error of low-order approximations to be reliably assessed. Therefore, the MP n perturbation series should ideally be convergent. Satisfying this condition justifies the use of low-order approximations, such as second-order MP2, and provides confidence that the corresponding energies are reliable. Since the series convergence clearly cannot be tested on each occasion, we must rely on benchmark studies to understand which chemical scenarios correspond to convergent perturbation expansions. Extensive research, reviewed in Ref. 36, has shown that ground-state perturbation theory converges when only one configuration is dominant and there are no low-lying excited states.³⁷ On the other hand, divergent series are created by interactions with nearly degenerate states (known as intruder states),^{38–40} or critical points associated with dense electron clusters in systems like Ne, HF, or F⁻.^{41–45} Furthermore, spin-contamination in unrestricted reference states⁴⁶ is known to give particularly slow convergence for the corresponding unrestricted MP series.^{37,47–49}

Excited states do not appear to satisfy these general conditions for a convergent MP series. They often have open-shell multi-configurational character and occupy dense regions of the energy spectrum with many near degeneracies. Therefore, we expect the issues associated with divergent ground-state perturbation theory to be even more prevalent, casting doubt on the general suitability of excited-state perturbation methods such as Δ MP2. In this work, we test this hypothesis by performing a systematic analysis of the MP series convergence for excited states in stereotypical small molecules using a combination of complex analysis and numerical calculations. We investigate how the convergence depends on the molecular geometry and the inclusion of orbital relaxation in the reference determinant.

^{a)}Electronic mail: hgaburton@gmail.com

To avoid spin contamination and degenerate open-shell reference states, we limit ourselves to the double excitations in H_2 , H_2O , and CH_2 using a minimal basis set.

II. Theory

A. Møller–Plesset perturbation theory

Rayleigh–Schrödinger perturbation theory proceeds by recasting the time-independent Schrödinger equation as

$$\hat{H}(\lambda)\Psi_k(\lambda) = (\hat{H}^{(0)} + \lambda\hat{V})\Psi_k(\lambda) = E_k(\lambda)\Psi_k(\lambda), \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{H}^{(0)}$ is a zeroth-order Hamiltonian with known eigenfunctions $\Psi_k^{(0)}$ satisfying

$$\hat{H}^{(0)}\Psi_k^{(0)} = E_k^{(0)}\Psi_k^{(0)}, \quad (2)$$

and $\hat{V} = \hat{H} - \hat{H}^{(0)}$ represents the perturbation. These reference solutions correspond to the eigenstates of $\hat{H}(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = 0$ while the physically exact states arise for $\lambda = 1$. Assuming a small perturbation, the wave function and energy can be expanded as an infinite power series around $\lambda = 0$ to give

$$E_k = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} E_k^{(j)} \lambda^j, \quad (3a)$$

$$\Psi_k = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_k^{(j)} \lambda^j, \quad (3b)$$

where $E_k^{(j)}$ and $\Psi_k^{(j)}$ are the j^{th} order corrections to the wave function and energy, respectively, and are formally given by the derivatives

$$E_k^{(j)} = \frac{1}{j!} \left. \frac{\partial^j E_k(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda^j} \right|_{\lambda=0} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_k^{(j)} = \frac{1}{j!} \left. \frac{\partial^j \Psi_k(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda^j} \right|_{\lambda=0}. \quad (4)$$

In practice, the wave function and energy corrections can be obtained using the iterative expressions⁵⁰

$$E_k^{(j)} = \langle \Phi_k^{(0)} | \hat{V} | \Phi_k^{(j-1)} \rangle \quad (5a)$$

$$\Psi_k^{(j)} = \hat{Q} (\hat{H}^{(0)} - E_k^{(0)})^{-1} \hat{Q} \left(-\hat{V} \Psi_k^{(j-1)} + \sum_{i=1}^j E_k^{(i)} \Psi_k^{(j-i)} \right), \quad (5b)$$

where $\hat{Q} = \hat{I} - |\Psi_k^{(0)}\rangle \langle \Psi_k^{(0)}|$ projects out the reference state to ensure that the operator $(\hat{H}^{(0)} - E_k^{(0)})$ is invertible (for a non-degenerate $\Psi_k^{(0)}$).

The most common electronic perturbation expansion is Møller–Plesset (MP) theory.⁵¹ Within MP theory, the unperturbed Hamiltonian for an N_e electron system is defined as the sum of one-particle Fock operators

$$\hat{H}^{(0)} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_e} \hat{F}(\mathbf{r}_i) \quad (6)$$

and the reference state corresponds to a single Slater determinant.⁴⁶ The Fock operator and reference determinant are usually identified as a mean-field solution to the HF equations, although the use of alternative orbitals can improve the

accuracy in certain cases.^{52,53} If the reference state is a SCF solution of the Fock operator, then every possible Slater determinant is an eigenstate of $\hat{H}^{(0)}$ with the eigenvalue corresponding to the sum of the occupied orbital energies.

The MP n approximant truncates Eq. (3a) at n^{th} order, giving

$$E_k^n = \sum_{j=0}^n E_k^{(j)} \quad (7)$$

where $\lambda = 1$ has been applied to obtain an estimate of the physical energy. The MP1 approximant corresponds to the total energy of the reference state. In practice, most calculations stop at the MP2 level, which gives the lowest-order correction to the energy and is generally more accurate than the MP3 approximation. Furthermore, standard MP2 implementations retain a relatively low $O(N^5)$ computational scaling, arising from the two-electron integral transformation, while lower $O(N^4)$ scaling can be achieved by working directly in the atomic orbital basis.^{54–56}

B. Choice of reference state and Hamiltonian partitioning

In principle, the MP perturbation expansion can be applied to any ground or excited state Ψ_k using a suitable reference wave function and Hamiltonian. There are two options for targeting excited states with single-determinant approximations. The first is Δ SCF, which constructs an excited-state Slater determinant by occupying the relevant higher-energy orbitals obtained from a ground-state calculation. Alternatively, the Δ SCF orbitals can be used as a starting point for a higher-energy state-specific HF calculation. Algorithms such as the Maximum Overlap Method¹⁷ (MOM) prevent variational collapse to the ground state by altering the orbital selection step in the self-consistent field approach. Instead of selecting the orbitals with the lowest energy, the orbitals are chosen as those that have the largest overlap with the occupied orbitals on the previous iteration. As long as a suitable initial guess can be found, this strategy self-consistently optimises the orbitals such that the final determinant corresponds to a higher-energy stationary point on the HF energy landscape.¹⁵ Therefore, we might expect that MOM-SCF will give a more accurate reference for excited-state perturbation theory.

Choosing Δ SCF or MOM-SCF affects the reference Fock operator in addition to the reference wave function and orbitals. For Δ SCF, the zeroth-order Hamiltonian corresponds to the ground-state Fock operator such that the excited Slater determinant is an eigenfunction of the reference problem. In contrast, the reference Hamiltonian for MOM-SCF is the optimal Fock matrix identified in the higher-energy HF calculation. This redefinition of the Fock matrix, and thus the orbital energies, has the potential to change the convergence behaviour of the perturbation series in an unpredictable manner.

C. Assessing the convergence using complex analysis

While the eigenvalues of $\hat{H}(\lambda)$ at $\lambda = 1$ must correspond to the exact ground and excited state energies, there is no guarantee that the perturbation series in Eq. (3a) is convergent. Divergent expansions mean that the energy approximants E_k^n become increasingly inaccurate for large n . Therefore, the corresponding perturbation series is not systematically improvable and it is difficult to assess the reliability of the low-order approximations that are generally applied in practice (e.g. MP2).




FIG. 1: **(A)** The ground and excited eigenstates of $\hat{H}(\lambda)$ in the complex- λ plane are connected at a square-root exceptional point, shown here for the Δ SCF reference Hamiltonian at $R(\text{H-H}) = 0.76 \text{ \AA}$. **(B)** Comparison of the radius of convergence for the Δ SCF and MOM-SCF strategies. **(C)** The MP_n corrections for the σ_u^2 excited state of H_2 at the equilibrium and stretched bond lengths.

The radius of convergence r_c defines the values of λ for which the expansion (3a) gives a convergent series. In particular, a convergent series occurs when $|\lambda| < r_c$. Mathematically, the radius of convergence is determined by the distance of the closest singularity of the energy $E_k(\lambda)$ from the origin in the complex- λ plane, known as the ‘dominant’ singularity λ_c .³⁶ This singularity corresponds to a point where the energy function $E_k(\lambda)$ is non-analytic such that the function is not infinitely differentiable with respect to λ . These points may correspond to a pole or a branch point (exceptional point) of a complex-valued function. Therefore, we require $r_c > 1$ for the perturbation expansion to be convergent at the physically relevant value $\lambda = 1$.

In the context of perturbation theory, the energy surfaces $E_k(\lambda)$ correspond to the eigenvalues of $\hat{H}(\lambda)$. Since this Hamiltonian becomes non-Hermitian for complex λ values, the different energy levels can be considered as individual sheets of a Riemann surface that represents the one-to-many mapping between λ and the quantised energy levels.^{36,57} Exceptional points (EPs) are the most common type of singularities on these Riemann surfaces. An EP is a square-root branch point that occurs when two energy levels become identical.^{58,59} As a non-Hermitian (complex-symmetric) eigenvalue problem, two eigenfunctions $\Psi_+(\lambda)$ and $\Psi_-(\lambda)$ coalesce at the EP such that $\Psi_+(\lambda) = \Psi_-(\lambda)$.⁶⁰ When these points occur in the complex plane, an associated avoided crossing between two energy levels will exist on the real axis. The sharpness of this avoided crossing is associated with the distance of the EP from the real axis, and thus a quantum phase transition will occur when an EP lies *on* the real axis.^{59,61}

Applying these concepts allows us to investigate whether excited-state perturbation series are convergent by assessing the complex-analytic properties of the k^{th} sheet of the λ -dependent Riemann surface. Locating EPs by inspection is difficult for anything beyond the simplest two- or three-level systems. Instead, we use quadratic Padé approximants to numerically estimate the position of the dominant singularity λ_c .^{62–64} A

quadratic approximant is defined as

$$E_{[d_P/d_Q, d_R]}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2Q(\lambda)} \left[P(\lambda) \pm \sqrt{P^2(\lambda) - 4Q(\lambda)R(\lambda)} \right], \quad (8)$$

with the polynomials

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{d_P} p_j \lambda^j, \quad Q(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{d_Q} q_j \lambda^j, \quad R(\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{d_R} r_j \lambda^j. \quad (9)$$

This structure is designed to model the presence of square-root branch points in a function and matches the truncated Taylor series expansion to n^{th} order when $d_P + d_Q + d_R + 1 = n$. Therefore, computing the $[d_P/d_Q, d_R]$ approximant requires the first $d_P + d_Q + d_R + 2$ terms in the corresponding Taylor series. The approximate EPs are given by the roots of the polynomial $P^2(\lambda) - 4Q(\lambda)R(\lambda)$ and provide an estimate for the singularities on the true MP energy function $E(\lambda)$.

D. Computational details

All HF calculations were performed using the standard SCF solver and the MOM extension available in the PySCF package,⁶⁵ from which molecular orbital coefficients, and one- and two-electron integrals were computed. MP_n calculations were evaluated using an in-house computational implementation represented in the full Hilbert space. Parameters for the quadratic approximants were computed by solving the corresponding system of linear equations, as described in Ref. 66. Due to the limitations of our computational implementation, all calculations were performed in the minimal STO-3G basis.⁶⁷

III. Results and Discussion

A. Molecular H_2

We first consider molecular H_2 , for which it is well known that the ground-state MP_n series becomes divergent for large bond lengths as a result of the near-degeneracy in the molecular orbitals.³⁷ The closed-shell excitation in this system is the $2^1\Sigma_g^+$




FIG. 2: Orbital energies for H_2 using the Δ SCF or MOM-SCF reference Fock matrices (top panel). Comparison of the MP2 and MP3 total energies for the state using the Δ SCF or MOM-SCF strategies (bottom panel).

state corresponding to the doubly-excited σ_u^2 configuration. The only Hamiltonian coupling term is between this configuration and the σ_g^2 ground state, creating an effective two-level system. The simplicity of this example ensures that all the energy surfaces can be plotted and visualised in the complex- λ plane.

The Δ SCF strategy employs the reference Hamiltonian using the orbitals and Fock matrix identified from a ground-state Hartree–Fock solution, giving the two-sheeted Riemann surface in Fig. 1A. When the σ_u^2 configuration is used as the reference determinant, the MP perturbation series corresponds to the Taylor series expansion evaluated on the upper sheet of this Riemann surface. Only one complex-conjugate pair of EPs exists, connecting the ground and excited $^1\Sigma_g^+$ states in a direct analogy to the two-site Hubbard model considered in Ref. 36. Therefore, the radius of convergence for the excited-state perturbation expansion is identical to the ground-state approximation. Numerically calculating r_c using a $[2/2, 2]$ quadratic approximant (Fig. 1B) reveals that divergent perturbation expansions occur for $R > 2.06 \text{\AA}$, as illustrated for two internuclear distances either side of this point in Fig. 1C. The domain where the Δ SCF perturbation series diverges is reflected in the regions where the MP3 total energy provides a poor approximation to the total excited-state energy (Fig. 2, bottom panel). Notably, the MP2 total energy remains a relatively good approximation up to $R = 4 \text{\AA}$, although this is a numerical coincidence rather than a systematically improvable result.

The MOM-SCF strategy optimises the orbitals for the ex-




FIG. 3: Riemann surface representing the ground and excited states using the MOM-SCF excited reference state in H_2 (STO-3G) at the equilibrium geometry $R(\text{H}–\text{H}) = 0.76 \text{\AA}$. The EP moves closer to the origin compared to the Δ SCF reference state (Fig. 1A).

cited $2^1\Sigma_g^+$ state and constructs the Fock matrix using the corresponding excited-state density. Since both the reference state and Hamiltonian change, the energy surface $E(\lambda)$ is different to Δ SCF (Fig. 3). While we would expect the MOM procedure to improve the accuracy of the perturbation expansion, it actually leads to a divergent series at almost every bond length. Furthermore, the radius of convergence becomes zero (Fig. 1B) around $R \approx 1.28 \text{\AA}$, leading to a singularity in the binding curve (Fig. 2, bottom panel). While the dominant singularity moves continuously through the origin, its magnitude $|\lambda|$ (and thus r_c) exhibits a cusp at $\lambda = 0$. This divergence is particularly surprising because the minimal basis set does not permit any orbital relaxation; the molecular orbitals are fixed by symmetry and are the same in the ground and excited state. Therefore, the only difference between the MOM-SCF and Δ SCF strategies is the definition of the reference Fock matrix.

The failure of the MOM-SCF strategy can be understood by looking at the corresponding effect on the orbital energies (Fig. 2, top panel), which determine the zeroth-order energy. The anti-bonding σ_u orbital is occupied in the excited state and provides the excited-state density used to define the Fock matrix, while the bonding σ_g orbital is empty. This change in the reference density raises and lowers the σ_g and σ_u orbital energies, respectively. An artificial crossing in the orbital energies occurs at $R = 1.28 \text{\AA}$, at which point the σ_g^2 and the σ_u^2 configurations become degenerate and $r_c = 0$ (Fig. 1B). Since the σ_u orbital remains the lowest energy for all longer bond lengths, the σ_u^2 configuration is the ground state of the reference Hamiltonian and no longer provides a suitable reference state for the excited-state perturbation series. Consequently, defining the Fock matrix from the excited-state density, as occurs in the MOM-SCF approach, leads to artificial changes in the energetic ordering of states that results in a divergent excited-state perturbation series.

B. Closed-shell H_2O excitations

The excitations of H_2O are frequently used to test excited-state methods and are generally considered to have Rydberg

TABLE I: Analysis of the excited-state total energies for H₂O (STO-3G) at the ground state equilibrium geometry. Quadratic approximants of order [5/5, 5] are used to identify the dominant singularity, and thus the radius of convergence.

State	Method	MP1 / E _h	MP2 / E _h	MP3 / E _h	λ_c	r_c
(1b ₁) ² → (4a ₁) ²	ΔSCF	-73.771	-73.880	-73.678	0.250 ± 0.096 i	0.267
	MOM-SCF	-73.849	-73.907	-73.944	0.547 ± 0.012 i	0.547
(1b ₁) ² → (2b ₂) ²	ΔSCF	-73.648	-73.688	-73.615	0.500 ± 0.000 i	0.500
	MOM-SCF	-73.682	-73.754	-73.821	0.561 ± 0.007 i	0.561
(3a ₁) ² → (4a ₁) ²	ΔSCF	-73.525	-73.733	-73.940	-0.440 ± 0.324 i	0.547
	MOM-SCF	-73.614	-73.673	-73.742	-0.600 ± 0.105 i	0.609
(3a ₁) ² → (2b ₂) ²	ΔSCF	-73.465	-73.743	-71.966	-0.082 ± 0.081 i	0.116
	MOM-SCF ^a	-73.488	-74.976	-190.630	0.011 ± 0.003 i	0.012
(1b ₂) ² → (4a ₁) ²	ΔSCF	-73.430	-73.228	-71.314	0.083 ± 0.072 i	0.110
	MOM-SCF	-73.430	-73.588	-74.396	0.071 ± 0.008 i	0.072
(1b ₂) ² → (2b ₂) ²	ΔSCF	-73.128	-73.093	-73.116	-0.314 ± 0.792 i	0.852
	MOM-SCF	-73.133	-73.220	-73.387	0.059 ± 0.000 i	0.059
(2a ₁) ² → (4a ₁) ²	ΔSCF	-72.143	-72.152	-72.243	0.074 ± 0.000 i	0.074
	MOM-SCF	-72.154	-72.144	-72.934	0.083 ± 0.000 i	0.083
(2a ₁) ² → (2b ₂) ²	ΔSCF	-71.967	-71.927	-72.044	0.290 ± 0.130 i	0.318
	MOM-SCF	-71.968	-72.003	-73.398	-0.003 ± 0.000 i	0.003

a. A [2/2, 2] approximant is used to identify λ_c for the MOM-SCF (3a₁)² → (2b₂)² excitation as higher-order approximants could not be solved numerically.

character that should favour the MOM-SCF strategy. Here, we consider the closed-shell double valence excitations at the equilibrium geometry⁶⁸ [$R(\text{O}-\text{H}) = 0.9572 \text{ \AA}$; $\angle\text{HOH} = 104.5^\circ$]. These excitations correspond to transferring a pair of electrons from one of the occupied orbitals (2a₁, 1b₂, 3a₁, 1b₁) into either the 4a₁ or 2b₂ virtual orbitals, giving eight excited states.




FIG. 4: Divergence of the excited-state MP series for the closed-shell valence double excitations in H₂O (STO-3G) at the equilibrium geometry.

As each state has ¹A₁ symmetry and corresponds to a double excitation, they are all coupled with the ground state through the Hamiltonian. Furthermore, each pair of excited states corresponding to an excitation from the same occupied orbital or into the same virtual orbital are also coupled through the Hamiltonian.

The ΔSCF strategy gives a divergent MP series for every excitation (Fig. 4), often at a very large rate. Quadratic approximants of order [5/5, 5] were used to identify the dominant singularity for each excitation, providing an approximation to the radius of convergence (Table I). The most rapidly divergent expansions, corresponding to the (3a₁)² → (1b₂)², (1b₂)² → (4a₁)², and (2a₁)² → (4a₁)² excitations, have $r_c \approx 0.1$ and give erratic low-order approximations to the total energy. In these cases, the presence of an EP close to $\lambda = 0$ indicates a near degeneracy in the reference Hamiltonian, which is supported by the small differences between the total energies of the ΔSCF reference determinants (given by the MP1 energy). Hence, the more complex orbital spectrum for H₂O leads to more near-degeneracies between excited states that result in divergent series.

For the three lowest-energy excited-states considered, adding orbital optimisation through MOM-SCF marginally increases the radius of convergence, but not enough to prevent the divergence at $\lambda = 1$. However, the same approach significantly worsens the divergence for the remaining five excitations, giving $r_c < 0.1$ with an EP very close to $\lambda = 0$. For the (3a₁)² → (1b₂)² with $r_c \approx 0.01$, we experience numerical instabilities in the quadratic approximants at higher orders, and thus we are limited to the [2/2, 2] approximant. These data support the conclusion from the H₂ excited state: the MOM-SCF reference can reduce the energy gap between the newly occupied and unoccupied orbitals involved in the excitation, increasing the severity of near degeneracies between the reference configurations. In the worst case, the (3a₁)² → (2b₂)² excitation, the divergence is so rapid that even the MP3 total energy is completely meaningless (Table I).

From a qualitative perspective, the eight excited states con-




FIG. 5: (A) Both Δ SCF and MOM-SCF give a divergent series for the 2^1A_1 excited state of CH_2 (STO-3G) at the singlet ground state geometry. (B) State-specific orbital optimisation provides more consistent low-order approximations to the excitation energy. (C) The $[5/5, 5]$ quadratic approximant reveals that orbital optimisation shifts the dominant singularities away from the origin in the complex- λ plane.

considered are obtained by exciting electrons from orbitals of decreasing energy, and the total energies are expected to increase in the same order. The Δ SCF reference energies preserve this ordering, but it is lost at higher orders of the perturbation series. Furthermore, while the total energy of a MOM-SCF reference state is always lower than the corresponding Δ SCF configurations, as expected with orbital optimisation, this ordering is not necessarily preserved for the MP2 and MP3 energies. The erratic behaviour of these low-order approximations, and the high density of exact excited states, complicates the physical interpretation and assignment to exact excitations. Consequently, it is very difficult to extract reliable physical excitation energies for H_2O from low-order perturbation theory using excited-state reference determinants.

C. Singlet excitation in methylene

Finally, we consider the methylene CH_2 molecule. The ground state has triplet 3B_2 symmetry due to the small orbital energy gap between the in-plane $3a_1$ (carbon sp^2) and out-of-plane $1b_2$ (carbon $2p_y$) orbitals. The two lowest-energy closed-shell states correspond to the 1^1A_1 ground state and the 2^1A_1 doubly-excited state. We consider the vertical excitation at the singlet equilibrium geometry [$R(\text{C}-\text{H}) = 1.111 \text{ \AA}$; $\angle\text{HCH} = 102.4^\circ$] given in Ref. 69. Previous calculations by Lee *et al.* have shown that orbital optimisation can significantly improve the accuracy of this excitation energy computed using MP2,²⁸ although the series convergence was not considered.

The ground-state 1^1A_1 series converges rapidly, with the MP5 approximant providing an accuracy of 4 mE_h (Fig. 5A). As the 2^1A_1 is the lowest excited state with this symmetry, we expect it to be less affected by the near-degeneracy issues seen in the H_2O excitations. However, the 2^1A_1 excited-state energies still diverge for both the Δ SCF and the MOM-SCF reference states, although the MOM-SCF series diverges at a slower rate. The corresponding MP2 excitation energies are remarkably accurate for both cases, although the Δ SCF excitation energies deteriorate rapidly beyond MP3 (Fig. 5B). However, the slower divergence in the MOM-SCF excitation energy means that the lack of systematic improvability is less

noticeable at low orders, obscuring the reliability of practical calculations.

In contrast to H_2O , the MOM-SCF perturbation series in CH_2 diverges at a slower rate than Δ SCF. This convergence behaviour is elucidated by the singularity structure of the λ -dependent Hamiltonian in the complex- λ plane (Fig. 5C). The Δ SCF series shows fast and erratic divergence due to singularities close to the origin. Orbital optimisation using MOM-SCF shifts these singularities away from the origin along the real- λ axis, although they remain within the unit circle and the series still diverges at $\lambda = 1$ (with a slower rate). We believe that the improved performance of MOM-SCF for this system arises because we are targeting the lowest excited state with 1^1A_1 symmetry. Therefore, lowering the energy of the occupied excited orbitals through orbital optimisation increases the energy gap to the higher excited states with this symmetry, while the energy gap to the ground state remains sufficiently large. Consequently, this orbital optimisation reduces the severity of near-degeneracies with other excited states, leading to a more convergent series.

In addition to elucidating the singularity structure, quadratic approximants to the MP energy function $E(\lambda)$ can provide more accurate approximations to the physical energy at $\lambda = 1$.^{62,63} By modelling the square-root singularity structure of $E(\lambda)$, the sequence of $[n/n, n]$ approximants with increasing order can

TABLE II: The $[n/n, n]$ sequence of quadratic approximants gives more accurate total energies for the 2^1A_2 excited state in CH_2 (STO-3G). Energies are given in E_h.

Order	1^1A_1	2^1A_1	
		Δ SCF	MOM-SCF
[1/1, 1]	-38.429 641	-38.206 797	-38.182 250
[2/2, 2]	-38.432 314	-38.193 280	-38.217 375
[3/3, 3]	-38.432 546	-38.215 900	-38.217 005
[4/4, 4]	-38.432 558	-38.218 599	-38.217 094
[5/5, 5]	-38.432 495	-38.218 620	-38.217 098
Exact	-38.432 495	-38.217 100	-38.217 100

turn a divergent MP expansion into a convergent series.⁷⁰ Table II suggests that these approximants give a rapidly converging series for the ground state and MOM-SCF excited-state energies evaluated at $\lambda = 1$, giving an error within 0.002 mE_h for the [5/5, 5] term. The Δ SCF approximants are more stable than the MP series, but are less accurate than MOM-SCF. Consequently, while orbital optimisation does not turn the divergent excited-state series into a convergent one, the transformed MP energy function is better suited to low-order quadratic approximants that give very accurate total energies.

IV. Concluding Remarks

Second-order MP perturbation theory is widely used as the first approximation to the correlation energy due to its relatively modest computational scaling. However, systematic improvability of the MP perturbation theory relies on the series convergence, which requires states that are accurately described by a single Slater determinant and a lack of near-degeneracies in the reference configurations. We have investigated the convergence behaviour of the single-determinant MP series for stereotypical closed-shell doubly-excited states using higher-energy reference Slater determinants, both with and without orbital optimisation. Our results suggest that excited reference states are very unlikely to give a convergent perturbation series. While low-order approximations can give physically meaningful energies for some states, others show such rapid divergence that even MP3 is unreliable.

Orbital optimisation of the reference state, using methods such as MOM-SCF,¹⁷ generally lowers the energies of the occupied orbitals involved in the excitation and the total energy of the Slater determinant. This optimisation, combined with an alternative reference Fock operator built using the excited-state density, can either improve or worsen the divergence of the perturbation series. When the target excited state lies in the middle of a dense region of the excited-state spectrum, orbital optimisation appears to worsen the degeneracies that can cause very rapid series divergence. On the contrary, when the target state is lower than other excitations with the same symmetry, orbital optimisation can increase the energetic gap to other excited states and reduce the rate of divergence. It is therefore feasible that orbital optimisation may turn a divergent Δ SCF series into a convergent one, although we have not found any examples with this behaviour, and it may be difficult to predict which excited states are most suitable for MP theory. Furthermore, even if orbital optimisation does not give a convergent series, it can still provide more accurate total energies using resummation techniques such as quadratic approximants, although the lack of a corresponding wave function means that other system properties cannot be computed through these approaches. A variety of different resummation techniques have been developed to obtain meaningful results for ground-state calculations,^{36,70–76} which may improve the accuracy of excited state-specific perturbation theory.

The current study only considered small basis sets and closed-shell excitations. While increasing the basis set may increase the flexibility of the excited-state optimisation, and enlarge the radius of convergence, it is also well known that adding more diffuse functions can lead to divergences associated with Møller–Plesset critical points.^{39,45,77} It remains to

be seen whether these effects will further exacerbate the divergences of excited-state perturbation expansions. On the other hand, extending the study to open-shell excitations would require minimal multiconfigurational reference states to account for the degenerate configurations and avoid spin contamination (e.g. Refs. 78–82). Subsequent low-order perturbation theory can provide more accurate excitation energies, but intruder state problems are still observed in some cases.^{78,83} Without rigorous testing, it is hard to predict whether these multiconfigurational perturbation expansions will converge, although one might expect the lowest state of each symmetry to behave in a similar way to ground-state perturbation theory.

The use of higher-energy SCF solutions as reference states for perturbation theory has proven to be a highly delicate task, and is likely to become more difficult in larger systems with a higher spectral density of excited states. Since these divergent expansions result from near degeneracies in the excited states, it is unlikely that this situation can be improved using an alternative Hamiltonian partitioning, or with level-shifted approaches. Instead, we believe that research into post-mean-field correlation corrections for excited state-specific Slater determinants should focus on non-perturbative methods such as coupled cluster theory, for which recent studies have shown very promising results.^{28,33–35} Alternatively, many excited states fundamentally require a multi-configurational state-specific approach.^{82,84–87} Second-order perturbation corrections to complete-active-space methods^{13,14} (CAS-PT2) or nonorthogonal configuration interaction⁸⁸ (NOCI-PT2) remain the most promising candidates for capturing dynamic correlation, although these methods often require empirical level shifts or the IPEA approach to avoid divergences.

Acknowledgements

H.G.A.B. was supported by New College, Oxford through the Astor Junior Research Fellowship. The authors thank Antoine Marie for useful discussions, and David Tew for support and computing resources.

Data availability

The data that supports the findings of this study are available within the article.

References

- ¹González, L., Lindh, R., Eds. *Quantum Chemistry and Dynamics of Excited States: Methods and Applications*; John Wiley and Sons, Ltd, 2021.
- ²Runge, E.; Gross, E. K. U. Density-Functional Theory for Time-Dependent Systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1984**, *52*, 997.
- ³Dreuw, A.; Head-Gordon, M. Single-Reference ab Initio Methods for the Calculation of Excited States of Large Molecules. *Chem. Rev.* **2005**, *105*, 4009.
- ⁴Burke, K.; Werschnik, J.; Gross, E. K. U. Time-dependent density functional theory: Past, present, and future. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *123*, 062206.
- ⁵Stanton, J. F.; Bartlett, R. J. The equation of motion coupled-cluster method. A systematic biorthogonal approach to molecular excitation energies, transition probabilities, and excited state properties. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 7029.
- ⁶Krylov, A. I. Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster Methods for Open-Shell and Electronically Excited Species: The Hitchhiker’s Guide to Fock Space. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **2008**, *59*, 433.
- ⁷Schirmer, J. Beyond the random-phase approximation: A new approximation scheme for the polarization propagator. *Phys. Rev. A* **1982**, *26*, 2395.

- ⁸Dreuw, A.; Wormit, M. The algebraic diagrammatic construction scheme for the polarization propagator for the calculation of excited states. *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2015**, *5*, 82.
- ⁹Tozer, D. J. Relationship between Long-Range Charge-Transfer Excitation Energy Error and Integer Discontinuity in Kohn–Sham Theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2003**, *119*, 12697.
- ¹⁰Dreuw, A.; Head-Gordon, M. Failure of Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory for Long-Range Charge-Transfer Excited States: The Zincbateriochlorin–Bacteriochlorin and Bacteriochlorophyll—Spheroidene Complexes. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 4007.
- ¹¹Roos, B. O.; Taylor, P. R.; Sigbahn, P. E. M. A complete active space SCF method (CASSCF) using a density matrix formulated super-CI. *Chem. Phys.* **1980**, *48*, 157.
- ¹²Roos, B. O. The Complete Active Space SCF method in a Fock-Matrix-Based Super-CI Formulation. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1980**, *18*, 175.
- ¹³Andersson, K.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Roos, B. O.; Sadlej, A. J.; Wolinski, K. Second-order perturbation theory with a CASSCF reference function. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1990**, *93*, 5483.
- ¹⁴Andersson, K.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Roos, B. O. Second-order perturbation theory with a complete active space self-consistent field reference function. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *96*, 1218.
- ¹⁵Burton, H. G. A.; Wales, D. J. Energy Landscapes for Electronic Structure. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2021**, *17*, 151.
- ¹⁶Burton, H. G. A. Energy Landscape of State-Specific Electronic Structure Theory. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2022**, *18*, 1512.
- ¹⁷Gilbert, A. T. B.; Besley, N. A.; Gill, P. M. W. Self-Consistent Field Calculations of Excited States Using the Maximum Overlap Method (MOM). *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2008**, *112*, 13164.
- ¹⁸Barca, G. M. J.; Gilbert, A. T. B.; Gill, P. M. W. Simple Models for Difficult Electronic Excitations. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2018**, *14*, 1501.
- ¹⁹Ye, H.-Z.; Welborn, M.; Rieke, N. D.; Van Voorhis, T. σ -SCF: A direct energy-targeting method to mean-field excited states. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *147*, 214104.
- ²⁰Ye, H.-Z.; Van Voorhis, T. Half-Projected σ Self-Consistent Field For Electronic Excited States. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2019**, *15*, 2954.
- ²¹Hait, D.; Head-Gordon, M. Orbital Optimized Density Functional Theory for Electronic Excited States. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2021**, *12*, 4517.
- ²²Carter-Fenk, K.; Herbert, J. M. State-Targeted Energy Projection: A Simple and Robust Approach to Orbital Relaxation of Non-Aufbau Self-Consistent Field Solutions. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2020**, *16*, 5067.
- ²³Levi, G.; Ivanov, A. V.; Jónsson, H. Variational Density Functional Calculations of Excited States via Direct Optimization. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2020**, *16*, 6968.
- ²⁴Levi, G.; Ivanov, A. V.; Jónsson, H. Variational calculations of excited states via direct optimization of the orbitals in DFT. *Faraday Discuss.* **2020**, *224*, 448.
- ²⁵Ivanov, A. V.; Gianluca Levi, E. O. J.; Jónsson, H. Method for Calculating Excited Electronic States Using Density Functionals and Direct Orbital Optimization with Real Space Grid or Plane-Wave Basis Set. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2021**, *17*, 5034.
- ²⁶Schmerwitz, Y. L. A.; Ivanov, A. V.; Jónsson, E. O.; Jónsson, H.; Levi, G. Variational Density Functional Calculations of Excited States: Conical Intersection and Avoided Crossing in Ethylene Bond Twisting. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2022**, *13*, 3990.
- ²⁷Warren, M. Perturbation theory for electronic excited states: The low lying Rydberg states of water. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *103*, 5554.
- ²⁸Lee, J.; Small, D. W.; Head-Gordon, M. Excited states via coupled cluster theory without equation-of-motion methods: Seeking higher roots with application to doubly excited states and double core hole states. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *151*, 214103.
- ²⁹Meissner, L.; Balková, A.; Bartlett, R. J. Multiple solutions of the single-reference coupled-cluster method. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1993**, *212*, 177.
- ³⁰Jankowski, K.; Kowalski, K.; Jankowski, P. Applicability of single-reference coupled-cluster methods to excited states. A model study. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1994**, *222*, 608.
- ³¹Jankowski, K.; Kowalski, K.; Jankowski, P. Multiple Solutions of the Single-Reference Coupled-Cluster Equations. II. Alternative Reference States. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1994**, *53*, 501.
- ³²Kowalski, K.; Jankowski, K. Towards Complete Solutions to Systems of Nonlinear Equations in Many-Electron Theories. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1998**, *81*, 1195.
- ³³Marie, A.; Kossoski, F.; Loos, P.-F. Variational coupled cluster for ground and excited states. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2021**, *155*, 104105.
- ³⁴Kossoski, F.; Marie, A.; Scemama, A.; Caffarel, M.; Loos, P.-F. Excited States from State-Specific Orbital-Optimized Pair Coupled Cluster. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2021**, *17*, 4756.
- ³⁵Mayhall, N. J.; Raghavachari, K. Multiple Solutions to the Single-Reference CCSD Equations for NiH. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2010**, *6*, 2714.
- ³⁶Marie, A.; Burton, H. G. A.; Loos, P.-F. Perturbation Theory in the Complex Plane: Exceptional Points and Where to Find Them. *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **2021**, *33*, 283001.
- ³⁷Gill, P. M. W.; Pople, J. A.; Radom, L.; Nobes, R. H. Why does unrestricted Møller–Plesset perturbation theory converge so slowly for spin-contaminated wave functions? *J. Chem. Phys.* **1988**, *89*, 7307.
- ³⁸Christiansen, O.; Olsen, J.; Jørgensen, P.; Koch, H.; Malmqvist, P.-Å. On the inherent divergence in the Møller–Plesset series: The neon atom — a test case. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1996**, *261*, 369.
- ³⁹Olsen, J.; Jørgensen, P.; Helgaker, T.; Christiansen, O. Divergence in Møller–Plesset theory: A simple explanation based on a two-state model. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *112*, 9735.
- ⁴⁰Olsen, J.; Jørgensen, P. Convergence patterns and rates in two-state perturbation expansions. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *151*, 084108.
- ⁴¹Olsen, J.; Christiansen, O.; Koch, H.; Jørgensen, P. Surprising cases of divergent behaviour in Møller–Plesset perturbation theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1996**, *105*, 5082.
- ⁴²Cremer, D.; He, Z. Sixth-Order Møller–Plesset Perturbation Theory On the Convergence of the MPn Series. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1996**, *100*, 6173.
- ⁴³Stillinger, F. H. Møller–Plesset convergence issues in computational quantum chemistry. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *112*, 9711.
- ⁴⁴Goodson, D. Z.; Sergeev, A. V. Singularity Structure of Møller–Plesset Perturbation Theory. In *Adv. Quantum Chem.*; Academic Press, 2004; Vol. 47; p 193.
- ⁴⁵Sergeev, A. V.; Goodson, D. Z.; Wheeler, S. E.; Allen, W. D. On the nature of the Møller–Plesset critical point. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *123*, 064105.
- ⁴⁶Szabo, A.; Ostlund, N. S. *Modern Quantum Chemistry*; Dover Publications Inc., 1989.
- ⁴⁷Laidig, W. D.; Fitzgerald, G.; Bartlett, R. J. Is Fifth-Order MBPT Enough? *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1985**, *113*, 151.
- ⁴⁸Knowles, P. J.; Somasundram, K.; Handy, N. C.; Hirao, K. The Calculation of High-Order Energies in the Many-Body Perturbation Theory Series. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1985**, *113*, 8.
- ⁴⁹Handy, N. C.; Knowles, P. J.; Somasundram, K. On the convergence of the Møller–Plesset perturbation series. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1985**, *68*, 87–100.
- ⁵⁰Helgaker, T.; Jørgensen, P.; Olsen, J. *Molecular Electronic-Structure Theory*; John Wiley & Sons, 2000.
- ⁵¹Møller, C.; Plesset, M. S. Note on an Approximation Treatment for Many-Electron Systems. *Phys. Rev.* **1934**, *46*, 618.
- ⁵²Bertels, L. W.; Lee, J.; Head-Gordon, M. Third-Order Møller–Plesset Perturbation Theory Made Useful? Choice of Orbitals and Scaling Greatly Improves Accuracy for Thermochemistry, Kinetics, and Intermolecular Interactions. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2019**, *10*, 4170.
- ⁵³Rettig, A.; Hait, D.; Bertels, L. W.; Head-Gordon, M. Third-Order Møller–Plesset Theory Made More Useful? The Role of Density Functional Theory Orbitals. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2020**, *16*, 7473.
- ⁵⁴Häser, M.; Almlöf, J. Laplace transform techniques in Møller–Plesset perturbation theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *96*, 489.
- ⁵⁵Ayala, P. Y.; Scuseria, G. E. Linear scaling second-order Møller–Plesset theory in the atomic orbital basis for large molecular systems. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1998**, *110*, 3660.
- ⁵⁶Surján, P. R. The MP2 energy as a functional of the Hartree–Fock density matrix. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2005**, *406*, 318.
- ⁵⁷Burton, H. G. A.; Thom, A. J. W.; Loos, P.-F. Complex adiabatic connection: A hidden non-Hermitian path from ground to excited states. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *150*, 041103.
- ⁵⁸Heiss, W. D.; Scholtz, F. G.; Geyer, H. B. The large N behaviour of the Lipkin model and exceptional points. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **2005**, *38*, 1843.
- ⁵⁹Heiss, W. D. The physics of exceptional points. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **2012**, *45*, 444016.
- ⁶⁰Moiseyev, N. *Non-Hermitian Quantum Mechanics*; Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- ⁶¹Sun, Y.; Burton, H. G. A. Complex analysis of divergent perturbation theory at finite temperature. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2022**, *156*, 171101.

- ⁶²Goodson, D. Z. Resummation methods. *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2012**, *2*, 743.
- ⁶³Goodson, D. Z. Chapter 9 - Singularity analysis in quantum chemistry. In *Mathematical Physics in Theoretical Chemistry*; Blinder, S., House, J., Eds.; Developments in Physical & Theoretical Chemistry; Elsevier, 2019; p 295.
- ⁶⁴Mayer, I. L.; Tong, B. Y. The quadratic Pade approximant method and its application for calculating densities of states. *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **1985**, *18*, 3297.
- ⁶⁵Sun, Q. et al. Recent developments in the PySCF program package. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2020**, *153*, 024109.
- ⁶⁶Fasondini, M.; Hale, N.; Spoerer, R.; Weideman, J. Quadratic Padé Approximation: Numerical Aspects and Applications. *Comput. Res. Model.* **2019**, *11*, 1017.
- ⁶⁷Hehre, W. J.; Stewart, R. F.; Pople, J. A. Self-Consistent Molecular-Orbital Methods. I. Use of Gaussian Expansions of Slater-Type Atomic Orbitals. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1969**, *51*, 2657.
- ⁶⁸Császár, A. G.; Czakó, G.; Furtenbacher, T.; Tennyson, J.; Szalay, V.; Shirin, S. V.; Zobov, N. F.; Polyansky, O. L. On equilibrium structures of the water molecule. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *122*, 214305.
- ⁶⁹Minaev, B. F.; Larsson, M. MCSCF linear response study of the three-body dissociative recombination $\text{CH}_2^+ + e \longrightarrow \text{C} + 2\text{H}$. *Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *280*, 15–30.
- ⁷⁰Goodson, D. Z. Convergent summation of Møller–Plesset perturbation theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *112*, 4901.
- ⁷¹Mihálka, Z. E.; Surján, P. R. Analytic-continuation approach to the resummation of divergent series in Rayleigh–Schrödinger perturbation theory. *Phys. Rev. A* **2017**, *96*, 062106.
- ⁷²Mihálka, Z. E.; Ágnes Szabados.; Surján, P. R. Application of the Cauchy integral formula as a tool of analytic continuation for the resummation of divergent perturbation series. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *150*, 0331101.
- ⁷³Surján, P. R.; Mihálka, Z. E.; Ágnes Szabados, The inverse boundary value problem: application in many-body perturbation theory. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **2018**, *137*, 149.
- ⁷⁴Čížek, J.; Špirko, V.; Bludský, O. On the use of divergent series in vibrational spectroscopy. Two- and three-dimensional oscillators. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *99*, 7331.
- ⁷⁵Goodson, D. Z. A summation procedure that improves the accuracy of the fourth-order Møller–Plesset perturbation theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *113*, 6461.
- ⁷⁶Čížek, J.; Weniger, E. J.; Bracken, P.; Špirko, V. Effective characteristic polynomials and two-point Padé approximants as summation techniques for the strongly divergent perturbation expansions of the ground state energies of anharmonic oscillators. *Phys. Rev. E* **1996**, *53*, 2925.
- ⁷⁷Sergeev, A. V.; Goodson, D. Z. Singularities of Møller–Plesset energy functions. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2006**, *124*, 094111.
- ⁷⁸Kossoski, F.; Loos, P.-F. “State-Specific Configuration Interaction for Excited States” **2022**.
- ⁷⁹Shea, J. A. R.; Gwin, E.; Neuscamman, E. A Generalized Variational Principle with Applications to Excited State Mean Field Theory. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2020**, *16*, 1526.
- ⁸⁰Zhao, L.; Neuscamman, E. Excited state mean-field theory without automatic differentiation. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2020**, *152*, 204112.
- ⁸¹Hardikar, T. S.; Neuscamman, E. A self-consistent field formulation of excited state mean field theory. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2020**, *153*, 164108.
- ⁸²Shea, J. A. R.; Neuscamman, E. A mean field platform for excited state quantum chemistry. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2018**, *149*, 081101.
- ⁸³Clune, R.; Shea, J. A. R.; Neuscamman, E. N^5 -Scaling Excited-State-Specific Perturbation Theory. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2020**, *16*, 6132.
- ⁸⁴Olsen, J.; Yeager, D. L.; Jørgensen, P. Optimization and Characterization of a Multiconfigurational Self-Consistent Field (MCSCF) State. In *Adv. Chem. Phys.*; John Wiley and Sons, Ltd, 1983; pp 1–176.
- ⁸⁵Tran, L. N.; Shea, J. A. R.; Neuscamman, E. Tracking Excited States in Wave Function Optimization Using Density Matrices and Variational Principles. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2019**, *15*, 4790.
- ⁸⁶Tran, L. N.; Neuscamman, E. Improving Excited-State Potential Energy Surfaces via Optimal Orbital Shapes. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2020**, *124*, 8273.
- ⁸⁷Marie, A.; Burton, H. G. A. “Exploring the CASSCF energy landscape: Excited states, symmetry breaking, and unphysical solutions” (In preparation).
- ⁸⁸Burton, H. G. A.; Thom, A. J. W. Reaching Full Correlation through Nonorthogonal Configuration Interaction: A Second-Order Perturbative Approach. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2020**, *16*, 5586.