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Prediction of the true ground state of $\mathrm{Sc}_{2}$ with multiconfigurational perturbation theory requires a balanced active space in building the reference wave function.

In a recent communication, Camacho et al. ${ }^{1}$ have questioned the reliability of multiconfigurational perturbation theory (MCPT). The authors arrive at this conclusion by studying the behavior of the potential energy surfaces of $\mathrm{Sc}_{2}$. To be specific, they found that MCPT as implemented in the CASPT2 method ${ }^{2,3}$ of MOLCAS and MOLPRO as well as the MCPT calculations done with GAMESS predicts that the ground state of $\mathrm{Sc}_{2}$ is a triplet $\left({ }^{3} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}\right)$, which is in contradiction with the accepted symmetry of the lowest energy state that is a quintet $\left({ }^{5} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}\right)$. They argue that this erroneous prediction of the calculations is due to the presence of the intruder state problem.

This comment shows that a suitable active space for the CASSCF reference wave function predicts correctly the ${ }^{5} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}$ground state of $\mathrm{Sc}_{2}$ with the CASPT2 method. The ground state of the Sc atom has a $4 \mathrm{~s}^{2} 3 \mathrm{~d}^{1}$ configuration. Therefore, to study $\mathrm{Sc}_{2}$, a reasonable choice of the active space should include six electrons $\left(4 s^{2} 3 d^{1} \times 2\right)$ distributed in twelve molecular orbitals $[1(4 \mathrm{~s})+5(3 \mathrm{~d})] \times 2$. This is the active space chosen in ref. 1. However, we have found a very remarkable difficulty concerning such an active space: it is impossible to span the ten d-type orbitals given that two unoccupied $4 \mathrm{p}_{z}$ type orbitals replace the two $\mathrm{d}_{x^{2}-y^{2}}$ type orbitals. As a consequence, the multiconfigurational perturbation treatment of the problem predicts that the triplet state is lower in energy than the quintet state. In contrast, if we enlarge the active space by including $[3(4 p)] \times 2$ orbitals, that is, six electrons distributed in eighteen orbitals, ${ }^{5} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}$is computed as the ground state at the MCPT level.

The wave function is converged under $D_{2 \mathrm{~h}}$ symmetry constraints. The multi-state extension of the second-order multiconfigurational perturbation theory (MS-CASPT2) has been applied to all of our calculations, which have been performed with the MOLCAS program. ${ }^{4}$ The standard IPEA shift has been applied. The inner 3 s and 3 p orbitals have been

[^0]correlated in the perturbation calculation. The basis set consisted of atomic natural orbital type, in particular, the ANO-RCC basis set ${ }^{5}$ with the $\operatorname{Sc}(5 \mathrm{~s} 4 \mathrm{p} 3 \mathrm{~d} 2 \mathrm{f} 1 \mathrm{~g})$ contraction scheme. In addition, the scalar relativistic effect is included by adding the corresponding terms of the Douglas-Kroll-Hess Hamiltonian. ${ }^{6,7}$ It must be remarked that the weight of the reference wave function was higher than 0.8 along the whole path and for the three states shown in Fig. 1; consequently, the application of imaginary or real shift techniques, to avoid the intruder state problem, was unnecessary.

Fig. 1 shows the potential energy curves obtained with the six electrons-eighteen orbitals active space for the ${ }^{3} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}$and ${ }^{5} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}$states ( ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{u}}$ and ${ }^{5} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{u}}$ under $D_{2 \mathrm{~h}}$ symmetry). Three states were optimized in each symmetry block. The quintet state has the lowest energy and its minimum is 0.14 eV under the minimum of the triplet state. Moreover, the calculations with the reduced six electrons twelve orbitals active space predict


Fig. 1 MS-CASPT2/CAS(6,18) potential energy surfaces of the $X^{5} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}, l^{3} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}$and $2^{3} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}$states of $\mathrm{Sc}_{2}$.
that the triplet is the ground state $(0.12 \mathrm{eV}$ under the quintet minimum). The computed MS-CASPT2 harmonic frequency of ${ }^{5} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}}^{-}$amounts to $226 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ which compares well with the experimentally determined ${ }^{8}$ harmonic frequency of $238.9 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The calculated equilibrium internuclear distance is $2.624 \AA$. The dissociation energy $E_{\mathrm{d}}$ of ${ }^{5} \Sigma_{\mathrm{u}_{\circ}}^{-}$is 2.63 eV , computed at an internuclear separation of $66 \AA$ and leading to $\operatorname{Sc}\left({ }^{2} D_{g}\right)+\operatorname{Sc}\left(\mathrm{z}^{4} \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$. Our results agree completely with the multireference configuration interaction (MRCI) calculations applied to $\mathrm{Sc}_{2}$ by Kalemos et al., ${ }^{9}$ which used the same active space as this comment.

In summary, to properly apply multiconfigurational perturbation theory to the $\mathrm{Sc}_{2}$ molecule, an active space of six electrons distributed in eighteen orbitals is required. Otherwise, reduced active spaces lead to false conclusions.
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