

Resources

Computer

- Speed
 - Fast chips/IO
 - Parallel processors
- Memory use for optimization algorithm (D = degrees of freedom like bond length, bond angle, etc.)
 - Scales as D for Conjugate Gradient, Fletcher-Reeves, Polak-Ribiere
 - Scales as D^2 for Simplex, Powell, quasi-Newton, Fletcher-Powell

4

Expense

Time and Money

- Optimization
 - $t(\text{optimization}) \approx 5 \times D^2 \times t(\text{single point})$
- Basis Set (N = number of orbitals, M = number of atoms)
 - MM / MD scales as M^2
 - AM1 / PM3 scales as N^2 to N^4
 - HF scales as N^2 to N^4
 - DFT scales as N^3
 - MP2 scales as N^6
 - MP4 scales as N^7
 - Full CI scales as $M!$

5

Method

- For single point calculation of C_6H_6 using cc-pVTZ basis set on Cray SVI (Young):

PM3	11 s	11 Mb
HF	10 min	42 Mb
MP2	32 min	43 Mb
MP4	36 hr	2.1 Gb
G2	37 hr	2.5 Gb
CBS-APNO	63 hr	6.5 Gb
QCISD	10 hr	1.9 Gb
G3	20 hr	1.6 Gb

CBS is Complete Basis Set
QCISD is Quadratic Configuration Interaction

6

Accuracy

References

- J B Foresman and Æ Frisch, *Exploring Chemistry with Electronic Structure Methods*, 2nd ed, Gaussian (1996), ISBN 0-9636769-4-6, pp 147-148 and 157-158.
- D C Young, *Computational Chemistry*, Wiley (2001), ISBN 0-471-33368-9, pp 137-141.
- R Janoschek, *Pure Appl Chem*, **73** (9), 1521-1553 (2001).
- NIST Computational Chemistry Comparison and Benchmark Data Base at
 - ▶ <http://srdata.nist.gov/cccbdb>

7

Accuracy

Considerations

- Molecule Set
 - ▶ G2
 - Originally 125 calculations
 - 1st and 2nd row heavy atoms
 - ▶ Extended G2 sets
 - ▶ G3
 - 299 calculations from G2/97 set
- Parameters
 - ▶ Mean Absolute Deviation (MAD)
 - Average of deviations neglecting sign
 - ▶ Standard Deviation
 - ~2/3 results lie within StdDev of experimental value
 - ▶ Largest Errors
 - Worst case values

8

Accuracy

Energy Comparison for Basis Functions [MAD/(kcal mol⁻¹), Foresman/Frisch]

- HF
 - ▶ 93.3 for STO-3G
 - ▶ 58.4 for 3-21G(d)
 - ▶ 51.0 for 6-31G(d)
 - ▶ 46.7 for 6-31+G(d,p)
- B3LYP
 - ▶ 7.9 for 6-31G(d)
 - ▶ 3.9 for 6-31+G(d,p)
 - ▶ 3.1 for 6-311+G(2d,p)

9

Accuracy

Energy Comparison for Standard Methods
[MAD/(kcal mol⁻¹), Young]

- Mechanics
 - ▶ *E* not calculated in MM2 / MM3
- Semi-empirical
 - ▶ 18.8 for AM1
 - ▶ 17.2 for PM3
- *ab initio*
 - ▶ 51.0 for HF/6-31G(d)
 - ▶ 7.9 for B3LYP/6-31G(d)

10

Accuracy

Energy Comparison for "Mixed" Methods
[MAD/(kcal mol⁻¹), Foresman/Frisch]

- AM1 optimization followed by single point
 - ▶ 54.2 for HF/6-31G(d)
 - ▶ 18.8 for AM1
 - ▶ 10.5 for B3LYP/6-31G(d)
- B3LYP/6-31G(d) optimization followed by single point
 - ▶ 7.9 for B3LYP/6-31G(d)
 - ▶ 4.0 for B3LYP/6-31+G(d,p)
 - ▶ 3.2 for B3LYP/6-311+G(2d,p)
 - ▶ 2.7 for B3LYP/6-311+G(3df,2df,2p)

11

Accuracy

Observations (Foresman/Frisch)

- Semi-empirical energies are more accurate than HF
- DFT energies are rather insensitive to geometry optimization used
- DFT energies are more accurate using highly diffuse/polarized basis sets
- Additional basis sets are not as important for optimization as for predicting properties

12

Accuracy

Other Comparisons for Standard Methods (Young)

- $\Delta_r H$ [StdDev/(kcal mol⁻¹)]
 - ▶ 0.5 for MM2
 - ▶ 0.6 for MM3
 - ▶ 8 for AM1 / PM3
 - ▶ 4 for HF/6-31G(d)
- Bond Lengths (rms/Å)
 - ▶ 0.01(StdDev) for MM2 / MM3
 - ▶ 0.048 for AM1
 - ▶ 0.037 for PM3
 - ▶ 0.032 for HF/6-31G(d)
 - ▶ 0.048 for MP2/6-31G*
 - ▶ 0.020 for B3LYP/6-31G(d)

13

- Bond Angles (rms/°)
 - ▶ 1.0(StdDev) for MM2 / MM3
 - ▶ 3.3 for AM1
 - ▶ 3.9 for PM3
 - ▶ 1.4 for HF/6-31G(d)
 - ▶ 1.5 for MP2/6-31G*
 - ▶ 1.4 for B3LYP/6-31G(d)
- Dipole Moments (StdDev/D)
 - ▶ 0.1 for MM2
 - ▶ 0.07 for MM3
 - ▶ 0.5 for AM1
 - ▶ 0.6 for PM3
 - ▶ 0.2 for HF/6-31G(d)

14

Accuracy

Recommendations

- Use DFT with largest basis set for energy calculations following an optimization using
 - ▶ DFT with largest basis set
 - ▶ DFT with good basis set
 - ▶ HF with good basis set
 - ▶ HF with small basis set
 - ▶ Semi-empirical methods

15

■ Use “Multilevel” Methods

▶ G2

- Initial geometry optimization and zero point vibrational energy (E_1) using HF/6-31G(d)
- Final geometry optimization at MP2/6-31G(d)
- Diffuse energy term (E_2) using $E[\text{MP4/6-311+G(d,p)}] - E[\text{MP4/6-311G(d,p)}]$
- Polarization energy term on heavy atoms (E_3) using $E[\text{MP4/6-311G(2df,p)}] - E[\text{MP4/6-311G(d,p)}]$
- Residual correlation effect energy term (E_4) using $E[\text{QCISD(T)/6-311G(d)}] - E[\text{MP4/6-311G(d)}]$
- Additional correction for assumption that 2df and diffuse corrections are additive and for 3rd set of f functions on heavy atom and 2nd set of p functions on H atom (E_5) using $E[\text{MP2/6-311G+G(3df,2p)}] - E[\text{MP2/6-311G(2df,p)}] - E[\text{MP2/6-311+G(d,p)}] + E[\text{MP2/6-311G(d,p)}]$

16

- Empirical estimate of remaining correlation energy (E_6) using $(-0.00481) \times (\# \text{ valence electron pairs}) - (0.00019) \times (\# \text{ unpaired valence electrons})$
- $E = (0.8929)E_1 + E[\text{MP4/6-311G(d,p)}] + E_2 + E_3 + E_4 + E_5 + E_6$
- MAD for $E = 1.1 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$, $\Delta_r H = 1.6 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$
- Several flavors of G2

17

▶ G3

- E_2 using $E[\text{MP4/6-31+G(d)}] - E[\text{MP4/6-31G(d)}]$
- E_3 using $E[\text{MP4/6-31G(2df,p)}] - E[\text{MP4/6-31G(d)}]$
- E_4 using $E[\text{QCISD(T)/6-31G(d)}] - E[\text{MP4/6-31G(d)}]$
- E_5 using $E[\text{MP2/G3large}] - E[\text{MP2/6-31G(2df,p)}] - E[\text{MP2/6-31+G(d)}] + E[\text{MP2/6-31G(d)}]$
- E_6 using $(-0.006386) \times (\# \text{ valence electron pairs}) - (0.002977) \times (\# \text{ unpaired valence electrons})$
- $E = (0.8929)E_1 + E[\text{MP4/6-31G(d)}] + E_2 + E_3 + E_4 + E_5 + E_6$
- $t(\text{G3}) \approx t(\text{G2})/2$
- MAD for $\Delta_r H = 0.9 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$
- Several flavors of G3

18

