

Analytical Self-Consistent Field Functions for the Atomic Configurations $1s^2$, $1s^2 2s$, and $1s^2 2s^2$ *

C. C. J. ROOTHAAN†

Solid State Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Illinois

LESTER M. SACHS

*Solid State Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Illinois, and
Department of Physics, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois*

AND

A. W. WEISS

*Laboratory for Molecular Structure and Spectra, Department of Physics,
University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Illinois*

INTRODUCTION

THE generalized SCF formalism developed in a recent paper¹ (hereafter called I), was applied to atomic configurations. We present in this paper the results obtained for the configurations $1s^2$, $1s^2 2s$, and $1s^2 2s^2$ for atoms and ions up to $Z=10$. For these cases we do not need the formalism in its full generality dealing with degenerate orbitals. However, in view of the applications to configurations including p and d orbitals to be presented in subsequent papers, we give here the formulas for the general case.

Our treatment is similar to Watson's² calculations on the iron group, and calculations by Allen^{2a} on F, F⁻, and Ne. These calculations are based on Nesbet's³ analysis, which differs from our analysis in the treatment of the off-diagonal Lagrangian multipliers coupling the inner and outer shells; namely, Nesbet's treatment involves certain approximations in the manipulation of these multipliers, whereas our formalism solves the variational problem without any such approximations.

When using the expansion method to obtain SCF orbitals, we do want to know how accurately these orbitals satisfy the Hartree-Fock integro-differential equation. A straightforward test for this is to tabulate (1) $F\phi_i - \epsilon_i\phi_i$ and (2) $F\phi_i/\epsilon_i\phi_i$ as functions of r , where F is the Hartree-Fock operator in differential form, and ϕ_i and ϵ_i are the orbitals and orbital energies found by the expansion method. The expression $F\phi_i - \epsilon_i\phi_i$ should vanish to the number of *decimal places* to which the function ϕ_i represents the Hartree-Fock function. For

large values of r the deviation of the expression $F\phi_i/\epsilon_i\phi_i$ from unity should be a measure for the number of *significant figures* given correctly by ϕ_i . A sensitive test for the region $r \rightarrow 0$ is the *cusp value*.⁴ Namely, for an exact solution of the Hartree-Fock equation,

$$(\lambda+1)(1/f_\lambda)(df_\lambda/dr)_{r=0} = -Z, \quad (1)$$

where λ is the angular momentum and $r^\lambda f_\lambda(r)$ the radial part of the orbital. For an orbital obtained by the expansion method, the deviation of the left-hand side of Eq. (1) from $-Z$ is a measure for the accuracy of that orbital in the region $r \rightarrow 0$.

EVALUATION OF THE MATRIX AND SUPERMATRIX ELEMENTS

The basis functions used are

$$\chi_{p\lambda\alpha} = R_{\lambda p}(r)Y_{\lambda\alpha}(\theta, \phi), \quad (2)$$

where $Y_{\lambda\alpha}(\theta, \phi)$ are the normalized spherical harmonics in complex form, and the radial functions $R_{\lambda p}(r)$ are given by

$$R_{\lambda p}(r) = [(2n_{\lambda p})!]^{-\frac{1}{2}} (2\zeta_{\lambda p})^{n_{\lambda p} + \frac{1}{2}} r^{n_{\lambda p} - 1} e^{-\zeta_{\lambda p} r}. \quad (3)$$

The functions (2) are the usual normalized nodeless Slater-type functions; we envisage the SCF functions as linear combinations of Slater-type functions with flexible orbital exponents ζ_p and integer values ($\geq \lambda$) for $n_{\lambda p}$.

The matrix elements and supermatrix elements, as defined in Eqs. (45)-(47) of I,¹ can be expressed in terms of integrals over the radial functions only. Before doing so, we introduce separate symbols for the kinetic and potential energy, so that

$$H_{\lambda pq} = -ZU_{\lambda pq} + T_{\lambda pq}. \quad (4)$$

* Based on work performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

† Permanent address: Laboratory for Molecular Structure and Spectra, Department of Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Illinois.

¹ C. C. J. Roothaan, *Revs. Modern Phys.* **32**, 179 (1960), this issue.

² R. E. Watson, *Tech. Rept. No. 12*, Solid State and Molecular Theory Group, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1959); (a) A. M. Karo and L. C. Allen, *J. Chem. Phys.* **31**, 968 (1959).

³ R. K. Nesbet, *Proc. Roy. Soc. (London)* **A230**, 312 (1955).

⁴ For a discussion of the cusp for s orbitals, see C. C. J. Roothaan and A. W. Weiss, *Revs. Modern Phys.* **32**, 194 (1960), this issue. For $\lambda \neq 0$, see P. O. Löwdin, *Phys. Rev.* **94**, 1600 (1954).

The expressions in terms of radial integrals are

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\lambda pq} &= \int_0^\infty du \cdot u^2 R_{\lambda p}(u) R_{\lambda q}(u), \\ U_{\lambda pq} &= \int_0^\infty du \cdot u R_{\lambda p}(u) R_{\lambda q}(u), \\ T_{\lambda pq} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty du [u^2 R_{\lambda p}'(u) R_{\lambda q}'(u) \\ &\quad + \lambda(\lambda+1) R_{\lambda p}(u) R_{\lambda q}(u)], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} &= \int_0^\infty du \cdot u \int_0^u dv \cdot v^2 \\ &\quad \times [R_{\lambda p}(u) R_{\lambda q}(u) R_{\mu r}(v) R_{\mu s}(v) \\ &\quad + R_{\mu r}(u) R_{\mu s}(u) R_{\lambda p}(v) R_{\lambda q}(v)], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} = \sum_{\nu=|\lambda-\mu|}^{\lambda+\mu} A_{\lambda\mu\nu} \mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs}^\nu, \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs}^\nu &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty du \cdot u^{-\nu+1} \int_0^u dv \cdot v^{\nu+2} \\ &\quad \times [R_{\lambda p}(u) R_{\mu r}(u) R_{\lambda q}(v) R_{\mu s}(v) \\ &\quad + R_{\lambda q}(u) R_{\mu s}(u) R_{\lambda p}(v) R_{\mu r}(v) \\ &\quad + R_{\lambda p}(u) R_{\mu s}(u) R_{\lambda q}(v) R_{\mu r}(v) \\ &\quad + R_{\lambda q}(u) R_{\mu r}(u) R_{\lambda p}(v) R_{\mu s}(v)]. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In Eq. (7), the summation over ν is to be carried out in steps of 2. The coefficients $A_{\lambda\mu\nu}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\lambda\mu\nu} &= [(\lambda+\mu+\nu+1)A_{\lambda+\mu+\nu}]^{-1} A_{\lambda+\mu-\nu} A_{\lambda-\mu+\nu} A_{\mu-\lambda+\nu}, \\ A_\rho &= [(\frac{1}{2}\rho)!]^{-2} \rho!; \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

ρ is always an even integer.

The expressions for the one-electron integrals, Eqs. (5), are well known⁵ and need no further comment. The expressions for the two-electron integrals, Eqs. (6)–(8), however, are much simpler than those commonly used. This is because the supermatrices \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{R} refer to shells rather than orbitals, and sums over subspecies are included in their definitions, Eqs. (47) of I.¹ As a result, the general vector coupling coefficients do not occur in this formulation, but only the much simpler set $A_{\lambda\mu\nu}$ defined by Eqs. (9). As mentioned in I,¹ this relatively simple formulation holds for certain general classes of states, for which the total energy is expressible by Eq. (17) of I. For other cases, a slight generalization is necessary, e.g., for open d , f , etc. shells. The modification for the latter cases requires only new definitions for the coefficients $A_{\lambda\mu\nu}$ in lieu of Eqs. (9), which *do* require the use of the general vector coupling coefficients. We postpone such generalizations to a future publication.

⁵ D. R. Hartree, Repts. Progr. Phys. **11**, 113 (1958); *The Calculation of Atomic Structures* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1957).

For proofs of Eqs. (6)–(9), we use the addition theorem for spherical harmonics,

$$P_\lambda(\cos\theta_{12}) = 4\pi(2\lambda+1)^{-1} \sum_{\alpha=-\lambda}^{\lambda} Y_{\lambda\alpha}^*(\theta_1, \phi_1) Y_{\lambda\alpha}(\theta_2, \phi_2), \quad (10)$$

and the expansion of r_{12}^{-1} in terms of Legendre polynomials

$$r_{12}^{-1} = \sum_{\lambda=0}^{\infty} r_{>}^{-\lambda-1} r_{<}^{\lambda} P_\lambda(\cos\theta_{12}), \quad (11)$$

where

$$r_{>} = (r_1, r_2)_{\max}, \quad r_{<} = (r_1, r_2)_{\min}, \quad \cos\theta_{12} = (\mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r}_2) / r_1 r_2.$$

The Coulomb supermatrix element $\mathcal{J}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs}$ represents the electrostatic repulsion of two charge distributions $\Omega_{\lambda pq}$ and $\Omega_{\mu rs}$, defined by [see Eqs. (47) of I]

$$\Omega_{\lambda pq} = (2\lambda+1)^{-1} \sum_{\alpha=-\lambda}^{\lambda} \bar{\chi}_{p\lambda\alpha} \chi_{q\lambda\alpha}; \quad (12)$$

using Eqs. (2) and (10) with $\theta_{12}=0$, $P_\lambda(\cos\theta_{12})=P_\lambda(1)=1$, this becomes

$$\Omega_{\lambda pq} = (4\pi)^{-1} R_{\lambda p}(r) R_{\lambda q}(r). \quad (13)$$

Hence we find, using (11),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} &= (4\pi)^{-2} \int_0^\infty dr_1 \cdot r_1^2 R_{\lambda p}(r_1) R_{\lambda q}(r_1) \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\infty dr_2 \cdot r_2^2 R_{\mu r}(r_2) R_{\mu s}(r_2) \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} r_{>}^{-\nu-1} r_{<}^{\nu} \\ &\quad \times \int \int d\omega_1 d\omega_2 P_\nu(\cos\theta_{12}), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $d\omega_1$ and $d\omega_2$ are infinitesimal solid angles. Carrying out the angular integrations, only the term with $\nu=0$ survives, yielding $(4\pi)^2$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} &= \int_0^\infty dr_1 \cdot r_1^2 R_{\lambda p}(r_1) R_{\lambda q}(r_1) \\ &\quad \times \int_0^\infty dr_2 \cdot r_2^2 R_{\mu r}(r_2) R_{\mu s}(r_2) r_{>}^{-1} \\ &= \int_0^\infty dr_1 \cdot r_1 R_{\lambda p}(r_1) R_{\lambda q}(r_1) \\ &\quad \times \int_0^{r_1} dr_2 \cdot r_2^2 R_{\mu r}(r_2) R_{\mu s}(r_2) \\ &\quad + \int_0^\infty dr_1 \cdot r_1^2 R_{\lambda p}(r_1) R_{\lambda q}(r_1) \\ &\quad \times \int_{r_1}^\infty dr_2 \cdot r_2 R_{\mu r}(r_2) R_{\mu s}(r_2); \end{aligned}$$

TABLE I. Structure of the supermatrices for three s functions and two p functions.

$\lambda pq \setminus \mu rs$	011	021	022	031	032	033	111	121	122
011	×								
021	×	×							
022	×	×	×						
031	×	×	×	×					
032	×	×	×	×	×				
033	×	×	×	×	×	×			
111	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		
121	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	
122	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×

if we reverse the order of integration in the last double integral, Eq. (6) results.

Before we turn to the derivation of the formulas for the exchange supermatrix elements, Eqs. (7)–(9), we discuss the symmetry properties of the matrices and supermatrices which enter the SCF scheme. All our *matrices* are real and symmetrical. Say we deal with a basis set of three s functions ($\lambda=0$) and two p functions ($\lambda=1$); the necessary and sufficient matrix elements of, for instance, the one-electron operator H are collected in the supervector

$$\mathbf{H} = (H_{011}, H_{021}, H_{022}, H_{031}, H_{032}, H_{033}, H_{111}, H_{121}, H_{122}). \quad (15)$$

In \mathbb{I}^1 it was noted that the supermatrices were *symmetrical* for the exchange $\lambda pq \leftrightarrow \mu rs$, and *Hermitian* for the *simultaneous* exchange $p \leftrightarrow q$, $r \leftrightarrow s$. In the present case, as may be seen from Eq. (6), $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs}$ is *symmetrical* for the *independent* exchanges $p \leftrightarrow q$ and $r \leftrightarrow s$. This stronger symmetry is due to the fact that our basis set is chosen so that we need to consider only *real* orbital coefficient vectors, density matrices, etc. The necessary and sufficient set of elements $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs}$ is indicated in Table I; it is the triangular part of a *real symmetrical* matrix, the rows and columns of which are labeled with the supervector indices.

If we use the definition for the exchange supermatrix \mathfrak{R} given by the second Eq. (47) of I, then $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs}$ is again symmetrical for the exchange $\lambda pq \leftrightarrow \mu rs$, but symmetrical for the *simultaneous* exchange $p \leftrightarrow q$, $r \leftrightarrow s$ only, in contrast to $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs}$. Hence we would need, for instance, both $\mathcal{K}_{031, 021}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{031, 012}$, whereas $\mathcal{G}_{031, 021}$ was sufficient. We can, however, use a symmetrized definition for \mathfrak{R} which has the same properties as \mathfrak{S} . Namely, the exchange term in the total energy may be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_T^\dagger \mathfrak{R} \mathbf{D}_T &= \sum_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} D_{T\lambda pq} \mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} D_{T\mu rs} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} D_{T\lambda pq} (\mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} + \mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu sr}) D_{T\mu rs}; \end{aligned}$$

this is permissible because $D_{T\lambda pq}$ is symmetrical for $p \leftrightarrow q$. The expression

$$\frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} + \mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu sr})$$

has the required symmetry; throughout his paper, it is *this* combination which is meant by \mathfrak{R} .

To derive Eqs. (7)–(9) we take the second Eq. (47) of I,¹ symmetrize it as just discussed, substitute into it the expression for the basis functions, Eq. (2), and use Eqs. (10) and (11); the result is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{\lambda pq, \mu rs} &= \frac{1}{2} (4\pi)^{-2} \int_0^\infty dr_1 \cdot r_1^2 \int_0^\infty dr_2 \cdot r_2^2 \\ &\quad \times [R_{\lambda p}(r_1) R_{\mu s}(r_1) R_{\lambda q}(r_2) R_{\mu r}(r_2) \\ &\quad + R_{\lambda p}(r_1) R_{\mu r}(r_1) R_{\lambda q}(r_2) R_{\mu s}(r_2)] \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\nu=0}^\infty r_>^{-\nu-1} r_<^\nu \int \int d\omega_1 d\omega_2 P_\lambda(\cos\theta_{12}) \\ &\quad \times P_\mu(\cos\theta_{12}) P_\nu(\cos\theta_{12}). \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

Now, the *product* of two Legendre functions may be written as a *sum* of Legendre functions according to⁶

$$P_\lambda(x) P_\mu(x) = \sum_{\nu=|\lambda-\mu|}^{\lambda+\mu} (2\nu+1) A_{\lambda\mu\nu} P_\nu(x), \quad (17)$$

where the summation over ν is to be carried out in steps of 2, and the $A_{\lambda\mu\nu}$ are given by Eqs. (9). By substituting the expression (17) into the angular integral in (16) and carrying out the integrations in the usual fashion, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int \int d\omega_1 d\omega_2 P_\lambda(\cos\theta_{12}) P_\mu(\cos\theta_{12}) P_\nu(\cos\theta_{12}) &= (4\pi)^2 A_{\lambda\mu\nu} \\ \text{for } \nu &= |\lambda-\mu|, |\lambda-\mu|+2, \dots, \lambda+\mu, \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

all other integrals vanishing. By using this result in Eq. (16), and manipulating the resulting expression in analogous fashion as for the Coulomb supermatrix elements, we obtain the final result expressed by Eqs. (7) and (8).

We now proceed to express the integrals (5), (6), and (8) in terms of elementary functions. By substituting the explicit expression for the radial functions, Eq. (3), into the one-electron integrals (5), we obtain, after some manipulation,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\lambda pq} &= [V_{2n\lambda p}(\zeta_{\lambda p}) V_{2n\lambda q}(\zeta_{\lambda q})]^{-\frac{1}{2}} V_{n\lambda p+n\lambda q}[\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda p}+\zeta_{\lambda q})], \\ U_{\lambda pq} &= 2[V_{2n\lambda p}(\zeta_{\lambda p}) V_{2n\lambda q}(\zeta_{\lambda q})]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times V_{n\lambda p+n\lambda q-1}[\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda p}+\zeta_{\lambda q})], \\ T_{\lambda pq} &= \frac{1}{2} \zeta_{\lambda p} \zeta_{\lambda q} [V_{2n\lambda p}(\zeta_{\lambda p}) V_{2n\lambda q}(\zeta_{\lambda q})]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times \{ V_{n\lambda p+n\lambda q}[\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda p}+\zeta_{\lambda q})] \\ &\quad - [W_{\lambda, n\lambda p}(\zeta_{\lambda p}) + W_{\lambda, n\lambda q}(\zeta_{\lambda q})] \\ &\quad \times V_{n\lambda p+n\lambda q-1}[\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda p}+\zeta_{\lambda q})] \\ &\quad + W_{\lambda, n\lambda p}(\zeta_{\lambda p}) W_{\lambda, n\lambda q}(\zeta_{\lambda q}) \\ &\quad \times V_{n\lambda p+n\lambda q-2}[\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda p}+\zeta_{\lambda q})] \}, \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$V_i(x) = x^{-i-1} i!, \quad W_{ij}(x) = 2x^{-1}(j-i-1). \quad (20)$$

⁶ E. T. Whittaker and G. N. Watson, *Modern Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1952), fourth edition, p. 331, example 11.

Similarly, we find for the two-electron integrals (6), and (8),

$$\mathcal{J}_{\lambda p q, \mu r s} = U_{\lambda p q} S_{\mu r s} C_{n_{\lambda p} + n_{\lambda q} - 1, n_{\mu r} + n_{\mu s}} [(\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\lambda q}) / (\zeta_{\mu r} + \zeta_{\mu s})] \\ + U_{\mu r s} S_{\lambda p q} C_{n_{\mu r} + n_{\mu s} - 1, n_{\lambda p} + n_{\lambda q}} [(\zeta_{\mu r} + \zeta_{\mu s}) / (\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\lambda q})],$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\lambda p q, \mu r s}^{\nu} = [V_{2n_{\lambda p}}(\zeta_{\lambda p}) V_{2n_{\lambda q}}(\zeta_{\lambda q}) V_{2n_{\mu r}}(\zeta_{\mu r}) V_{2n_{\mu s}}(\zeta_{\mu s})]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ \times \{ V_{n_{\lambda p} + n_{\mu r} - \nu - 1} [\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\mu r})] V_{n_{\lambda q} + n_{\mu s} + \nu} [\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda q} + \zeta_{\mu s})] \cdot C_{n_{\lambda p} + n_{\mu r} - \nu - 1, n_{\lambda q} + n_{\mu s} + \nu} [(\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\mu r}) / (\zeta_{\lambda q} + \zeta_{\mu s})] \\ + V_{n_{\lambda q} + n_{\mu s} - \nu - 1} [\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda q} + \zeta_{\mu s})] V_{n_{\lambda p} + n_{\mu r} + \nu} [\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\mu r})] \cdot C_{n_{\lambda q} + n_{\mu s} - \nu - 1, n_{\lambda p} + n_{\mu r} + \nu} [(\zeta_{\lambda q} + \zeta_{\mu s}) / (\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\mu r})] \\ + V_{n_{\lambda p} + n_{\mu s} - \nu - 1} [\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\mu s})] V_{n_{\lambda q} + n_{\mu r} + \nu} [\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda q} + \zeta_{\mu r})] \cdot C_{n_{\lambda p} + n_{\mu s} - \nu - 1, n_{\lambda q} + n_{\mu r} + \nu} [(\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\mu s}) / (\zeta_{\lambda q} + \zeta_{\mu r})] \\ + V_{n_{\lambda q} + n_{\mu r} - \nu - 1} [\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda q} + \zeta_{\mu r})] V_{n_{\lambda p} + n_{\mu s} + \nu} [\frac{1}{2}(\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\mu s})] \cdot C_{n_{\lambda q} + n_{\mu r} - \nu - 1, n_{\lambda p} + n_{\mu s} + \nu} [(\zeta_{\lambda q} + \zeta_{\mu r}) / (\zeta_{\lambda p} + \zeta_{\mu s})] \}, \quad (21)$$

where

$$C_{\alpha\beta}(t) = (\alpha! \beta!)^{-1} t^{\alpha+1} \int_0^\infty du \cdot u^\alpha e^{-tu} \int_0^u dv \cdot v^\beta e^{-v}. \quad (22)$$

The functions $C_{\alpha\beta}(t)$ can be computed from the recurrence relation

$$C_{\alpha\beta}(t) = (1+t)^{-1} [t C_{\alpha-1, \beta}(t) + C_{\alpha, \beta-1}(t) + \delta_{\beta 0}]. \quad (23)$$

This recurrence relation holds for $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$, interpreting terms with a negative index as zero. When using this relation numerically for raising the indices, no serious loss of significant figures can occur, since all the $C_{\alpha\beta}(t)$ are positive, which is obvious from Eq. (22). The proof of Eq. (23) is given in the Appendix.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A digital computer program was written for the IBM 704 at Argonne National Laboratory, which could handle the configurations with s orbitals only. A more general program capable of handling configurations with orbitals with $\lambda \neq 0$ was written for the Remington Rand Univac Scientific 1103A at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Although some preliminary results have been obtained with the latter program, we postpone the discussion of those results to a subsequent paper; the results discussed here were all obtained on the IBM 704 at the Argonne National Laboratory. The results for the $1s^2$ configuration presented here had also been obtained earlier with a special two-electron program for the Remington-Rand Univac Scientific 1103 at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The program uses the following input data: (1) m , the number of orbital exponents ζ ; (2) p , the number of powers of r for each ζ , the powers themselves being $0, 1, \dots, p-1$; (3) n_α, n_β , the numbers of occupied

TABLE II. Variation of ζ_1, ζ_2 for Li^+ , $p=2$. The entries in the Table are the last four significant figures in the energy: $E_{\min} = -7.2364122$ a.u.

$\zeta_2 \setminus \zeta_1$	2.0	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.8
4.0	2937	3896	4080	4060	3846
4.2	2813	3936	4110	4079	3815
4.4	2560	3935	4119	4087	3767
4.6	2168	3902	4122	4085	3690
4.8	1620	3840	4118	4074	3592
5.0	0895	3738	4107	4054	3462

orbitals with α and β spin, respectively; (4) Z , the actual nuclear charge; (5) the numerical values of the ζ 's; (6) approximate eigenvectors for the occupied orbitals. The program was designed to operate with all the matrix and supermatrix elements in the magnetic core storage of 8192 words. This limited the basis set to 12 functions, which gives rise to 3081 supermatrix elements for both \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{R} , and much smaller sets for $\mathfrak{S}, \mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{T}$, and other assorted quantities. In addition,

TABLE III. Variation of ζ_2 for Li , $\zeta_1=2.4, \zeta_2=4.4, p=2$. $E_{\min} = -7.4327224$.

ζ_3	0.65	0.66	0.67	0.68	0.69
E	7020	7168	7224	7182	7037

there was a limitation due to the number of functions $C_{\alpha\beta}(t)$ necessary for the construction of \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{R} ; as a result, the program can handle the following combinations of m and p : 1, 6; 2, 6; 3, 4; 4, 2; 5, 1; 6, 1. A single run with a 12-function basis set requires three to 10 minutes, depending on the guess for the eigenvectors, and much less for, say, a 6-function basis set.

After some experimentation for the $1s^2 2s$ and $1s^2 2s^2$ configurations, we found that $m=3, p=2$ could yield the SCF total energy to six significant figures or better,⁷

TABLE IV. Variation of ζ_3 for Li^- , $\zeta_1=2.4, \zeta_2=4.4, p=2$. $E_{\min} = -7.4279965$.

ζ_3	0.27	0.28	0.285	0.29	0.30
E	9836	9949	9965	9956	9880

provided we optimized the ζ 's. Two of these ζ 's apparently represent primarily the $1s$ orbital and the inner loop of the $2s$ orbital; the third ζ is needed to represent the outer loop of the $2s$ orbital. From Hartree's extensive experience,⁵ it is known that the $1s$ orbitals are practically independent of whether the $2s$ orbital is absent, singly, or doubly occupied. Armed with these facts, we proceeded as follows:

(1) For the configuration $1s^2$, keeping $m=p=2$, we varied ζ_1 and ζ_2 on a rectangular grid until an energy

⁷ The only exception to this occurs for Li^- , for which $m=3, p=2$ yields only four significant figures in the total energy.

SCF FUNCTIONS FOR THE $1s^2$, $1s^2 2s$, AND $1s^2 2s^2$ CONFIGURATIONS 191

 TABLE VI. Best SCF functions for $2 \leq Z \leq 10$.

$Z=2$				$1s^2$		$Z=5$							
ζ	n	$1s$	$1s$	ζ	n	$1s$	$1s$	$2s$	$1s^2$	$2s$	$1s^2 2s^2$	$1s$	$2s$
3.00	0		0.457418	0	0	0.461639	0.448595	0.112567	0.460775	0.117108			
	1		0.244272	1	1	0.258029	0.205013	0.027197	0.199242	0.054041			
	2		0.136571	2	2	0.176207	0.074763	0.000091	0.069294	0.017384			
	3		0.094513	3	3	0.137810	0.030916	-0.000003	0.028164	0.007737			
	4		0.008192	4	4	0.037801			
1.40	0		0.027670	0	0	0.000000	-0.000001	0.000000	0.000000	-0.000000			
	1		0.129851	1	1	0.187874	0.351849	0.300086	0.443290	0.207201			
	2		0.113403	2	2	-0.453636	-0.081477	-0.080195	-0.123551	0.012615			
	3		-0.086860	3	3	0.462170	-0.013877	0.071064	0.017767	0.010206			
	4		0.025460	4	4	-0.213482			
	5		-0.002674	5	5	0.040873			
$-\epsilon$ (a.u.)			0.917956	$-\epsilon$ (a.u.)			0.125970	0.024729			
I (a.u.)			0.917956	I (a.u.)			-0.089925	-1.105348			
Cusp			2.0019	Cusp			0.035185	-0.062447			
$-E$ (a.u.)			2.861680	$-E$ (a.u.)			-0.006166	0.005804			
$Z=3$				$1s^2 2s$		$1s^2 2s^2$		$Z=6$					
ζ	n	$1s$	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$	ζ	n	$1s$	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$
4.40	0	-0.000000	0.499766	0.028196	0.501848	0.075238	9.50	0	0.474400	0.533313	0.108615	0.459555	0.105788
	1	-0.220023	0.201689	0.007319	0.189087	-0.021164	1	1	0.195068	0.159594	0.030937	0.223948	0.070123
	2	-0.126397	0.083451	0.002902	0.074281	-0.025592	2	2	0.071333	0.032675	0.003923	0.085812	0.029392
	3	-0.021018	0.037370	0.004082	0.032005	-0.013139	3	3	0.038714	0.008289	0.002561	0.034333	0.013314
	4	-0.028489	4	4	0.001165
2.40	0	1.246497	-0.000000	0.122442	-0.000000	0.000000	5	5	0.008981
	1	0.459177	0.322165	0.025246	0.391039	0.382450	5.40	0	-0.000000	0.017451	-0.000699	-0.000000	-0.000000
	2	-0.675516	-0.049361	0.026322	-0.102103	-0.203580	1	1	0.441249	0.880749	0.233813	0.249534	0.050414
	3	0.408814	-0.011512	0.011259	0.012513	0.128352	2	2	-0.195623	-0.312327	-0.042908	-0.008724	0.085275
	4	-0.135526	3	3	0.077636	0.152329	0.046757	-0.039459	-0.041610
0.67	0	...	0.033911	0.014681	4	4	-0.021630
	1	...	-0.032212	-1.101788	5	5	0.002943
	2	...	0.016441	0.078367	2.22	0	...	-0.593017	0.170852
	3	...	-0.003635	-0.035526	1	1	...	0.402856	-1.212283
	4	0.000733	-1.266294	2	2	...	-0.145966	-0.050951
0.285	0	0.000964	-0.237092	3	3	...	0.024388	0.003938
	1	-0.000314	-0.004595	1.93	0	0.152639	0.120917
	2	1	1	-0.121390	-1.241777
	3	2	2	0.051224	0.119930
	4	3	3	-0.009813	-0.033566
$-\epsilon$ (a.u.)		2.792365	2.463447	0.079318	2.322789	0.014534	$-\epsilon$ (a.u.)	14.41689	13.40033	2.012297	12.65062	1.694049	
I (a.u.)		2.792365	2.470594	0.196323	2.322789	0.014534	I (a.u.)	14.41689	13.44021	2.365003	12.65062	1.694049	
Cusp		3.0027	3.0070	3.0062	3.0078	3.0227	Cusp	6.0020	6.0103	6.0064	6.0047	5.9994	
$-E$ (a.u.)		7.236415	7.432727	7.428232			$-E$ (a.u.)	32.36119	34.72606	36.40850			
$Z=4$				$1s^2 2s$		$1s^2 2s^2$		$Z=7$					
ζ	n	$1s$	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$	ζ	n	$1s$	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$
6.50	0	0.443327	0.440586	0.081689	0.442306	-0.106320	11.00	0	0.483726	0.486051	0.173324	0.510710	0.076037
	1	0.189357	0.195205	0.035570	0.196025	-0.036690	1	1	0.329658	0.187465	-0.043641	0.160686	0.093292
	2	0.059425	0.068732	0.010554	0.069198	-0.006877	2	2	0.181329	0.057554	-0.051667	0.038083	0.047377
	3	0.025014	0.029457	0.005376	0.029984	-0.001767	3	3	0.097099	0.019405	-0.022463	0.011162	0.020769
	4	-0.004885	4	4	0.022800
3.40	0	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	-0.000000	0.000171	5	5	0.018714
	1	0.533882	0.487708	0.130829	0.494810	-0.303518	6.40	0	-0.000000	-0.000023	-0.000000	-0.000000	0.000000
	2	-0.168932	-0.161563	-0.011894	-0.161936	0.058670	1	1	-0.097140	0.463619	0.797662	0.680141	-0.183050
	3	0.003107	0.022777	0.015755	0.026115	-0.061146	2	2	0.102628	-0.137653	-0.328748	-0.246970	0.182797
	4	0.019426	3	3	0.010245	0.029486	0.206778	0.097086	-0.105663
1.20	0	...	0.027352	0.182542	4	4	-0.021758
	1	...	-0.022703	-1.224015	5	5	0.005334
	2	...	0.010766	0.031685	2.72	0	...	-0.023679	-0.297734
	3	...	-0.002141	-0.016516	1	1	...	0.009050	-0.956271
	4	0.006644	0.496479	2	2	...	0.000519	-0.138574
0.90	0	-0.007953	0.694577	3	3	...	-0.000683	0.016855
	1	0.004735	-0.050554	2.44	0	-0.266102	0.490948
	2	-0.001211	0.044122	1	1	0.195151	-1.504400
	3	2	2	-0.076294	0.174334
	4	3	3	0.013598	-0.040179
$-\epsilon$ (a.u.)		5.667116	5.102764	0.467873	4.732670	0.309270	$-\epsilon$ (a.u.)	20.29183	19.05186	3.162022	18.12011	2.766736	
I (a.u.)		5.667116	5.120553	0.666146	4.732670	0.309270	I (a.u.)	20.29183	19.10281	3.590855	18.12011	2.766736	
Cusp		4.0028	4.0043	4.0032	4.0041	4.0080	Cusp	7.0012	7.0085	7.0275	7.0105	6.9950	
$-E$ (a.u.)		13.61130	14.27740	14.57302			$-E$ (a.u.)	44.73616	48.32685	51.08231			

determined the 2s orbital for Li using the Li^+ 1s orbital. Indeed, a numerical table we obtained for our best Li^+ orbital confirmed this. For Be, our orbitals differed from Hartree's⁹ by a few units in the last figure he gave.

Generally speaking, we are confident that our SCF orbitals are equivalent to the solutions of the integro-differential Hartree-Fock equations to four decimal places. This is confirmed by the behavior of the fifth figure in the 1s orbitals; their tails cross the r axis, decrease to -1×10^{-5} , and then die out as they should. Further confirmation of this accuracy will be obtained when a program for the computation and tabulation of $F\phi_i - \epsilon_i\phi_i$ and $F\phi_i/\epsilon_i\phi_i$, now under construction, is completed. The accuracy of our orbital energies should be at least 4 figures, our total energies 7-8 figures.

⁹ D. R. Hartree, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) **A150**, 9 (1935).

APPENDIX

We put in Eq. (22) $e^{-v} = -(d/dv)e^{-v}$ and perform a partial integration with respect to v ; the result is

$$C_{\alpha\beta}(t) = C_{\alpha,\beta-1}(t) - (\alpha!\beta!)^{-1}t^{\alpha+1} \int_0^\infty du \cdot u^{\alpha+\beta} e^{-(1+t)u} + \delta_{\beta 0},$$

where the term $C_{\alpha,\beta-1}(t)$ is absent if $\beta=0$. Next, we multiply Eq. (22) by t , put the $te^{-ut} = -(d/du)e^{-ut}$, and perform a partial integration with respect to u ; the result is

$$tC_{\alpha\beta}(t) = tC_{\alpha-1,\beta}(t) + (\alpha!\beta!)^{-1}t^{\alpha+1} \int_0^\infty du \cdot u^{\alpha+\beta} e^{-(1+t)u},$$

where the term $tC_{\alpha-1,\beta}(t)$ is absent if $\alpha=0$. Addition of these two equations and division by $1+t$ yields Eq. (23).

Correlated Orbitals for the Ground State of Heliumlike Systems*

C. C. J. ROOTHAAN AND A. W. WEISS

Laboratory of Molecular Structure and Spectra, Department of Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Illinois

INTRODUCTION

FOR the ground state of atoms, molecules, and solids, the explicit solution of the Schrödinger equation to obtain an accurate wave function is virtually a hopeless task. Instead, one usually chooses a convenient function with adjustable parameters, and determines the best wave function within this class by minimizing the expectation value of the energy, computed from that wave function, with respect to these parameters. The form of the function chosen represents a certain restriction, and it is essential to use physical arguments in choosing such a form; in doing so, we essentially choose a model. The success of such a wave function can, to a certain extent, be judged by comparing the calculated energy with the experimental total energy.

One of the most successful models is the Hartree-Fock approximation,¹⁻⁴ in which there occur, instead of adjustable parameters, wholly adjustable undetermined one-electron functions or orbitals. The

condition for minimizing the energy leads to nonlinear integro-differential equations for the orbitals, which can be solved by the iterative self-consistent field procedure.¹⁻⁴ The total energies obtained by this method are rather good, namely, about 99% of the experimental values or better; also, the lower ionization potentials and electron densities are calculated rather reliably. However, many other physical properties, calculated by the Hartree-Fock function, do not agree nearly as well with experimental data, notably dissociation (or cohesive) energies.

It is well known that the shortcomings of the Hartree-Fock method are due to neglect of the details of the electronic repulsions; the wave function for each individual electron is determined by the potential of the nuclei and that due to the probability density of the other electrons (we ignore the exchange potential, which does not alter this picture materially). On the whole, this allows electrons to come close together more often than is actually the case. The energy correction which would result if this effect is properly taken into account is commonly called the correlation energy.⁵ The correlation energy is especially large be-

* Work assisted by a grant from the National Science Foundation and by Wright Air Development Center, under contract with the University of Chicago.

¹ D. R. Hartree, Repts. Progr. Phys. **11**, 113 (1948).

² D. R. Hartree, *The Calculation of Atomic Structures* (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1957).

³ C. C. J. Roothaan, Revs. Modern Phys. **23**, 69 (1951).

⁴ C. C. J. Roothaan, Revs. Modern Phys. **32**, 179 (1960), this issue.

⁵ More precisely, the correlation energy is defined as the difference between the expectation value of the energy of the Hartree-Fock approximation and the correct eigenvalue of the non-relativistic spin-independent infinite nuclear mass Hamiltonian.