

Automatic Algorithm Switching for Accurate Quantum Chemical Calculations

Satoshi Imamura
s-imamura@fujitsu.com

Akihiko Kasagi
kasagi.akhiko@fujitsu.com

Eiji Yoshida
yoshida.eiji-01@fujitsu.com

Computing Laboratory, Fujitsu Limited, Kawasaki, Japan

Abstract—Quantum chemical calculations (QCC) are computational techniques to analyze the characteristics of molecules. The variational quantum eigensolver (VQE) designed for noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) computers can be used to calculate the ground-state energies of molecules, while coupled-cluster with singles, doubles, and perturbative triples [CCSD(T)] is regarded as a traditional gold standard algorithm in QCC. The advantage between CCSD(T) and VQE in terms of the accuracy of ground-state energy calculation differs depending on molecular structures.

In this work, we propose an automatic algorithm switching (AAS) technique to accurately calculate the ground-state energies of a target molecule with different bond distances. It automatically switches CCSD(T) and VQE by identifying a bond distance where the accuracy of CCSD(T) begins to drop for a target molecule. Our evaluation using a noise-less quantum computer simulator demonstrates that AAS improves the accuracy to describe the bond breaking processes of molecules compared to CCSD(T) and VQE.

Index Terms—quantum chemical calculations, variational quantum eigensolver, quantum computing

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum chemical calculations (QCC) are computational techniques to analyze the characteristics and structures of molecules, which have been applied in drug discovery and material development [1], [2]. It is a basis task in QCC to calculate the ground-state energies of molecules based on the electronic *Schrödinger* equation, because the characteristic of a target molecule can be analyzed based on the ground-state energies with its different structures.

Coupled-cluster with singles, doubles, and perturbative triples [CCSD(T)] is well known as a traditional gold standard algorithm in QCC because of its high accuracy with moderate computational cost [3]. It calculates an electron correlation energy by explicitly treating single and double excitations through an iterative process [4] and adding the approximate treatment of triple excitations based on the perturbation theory.

Recently, noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) computers have been developed intensively [5], [6], and variational quantum eigensolver (VQE) is regarded as one of the most promising algorithms operating on NISQ computers. VQE is a variational hybrid quantum-classical eigensolver and can be used to calculate the ground-state energies of molecules [7], [8]. It iteratively executes a parameterized quantum circuit on a quantum device and updates its parameters using a classical optimizer until the energy calculated from the measurement




Fig. 1: The overview of our proposed automatic algorithm switching (AAS) technique.

result of the quantum circuit converges. The accuracy of VQE strongly depends on an *ansatz*; especially, the unitary coupled-cluster singles and doubles (UCCSD) is a well-known chemistry-inspired *ansatz* which can achieve a high accuracy in QCC [3], [9].

The advantage between CCSD(T) and VQE in terms of the accuracy of ground-state energy calculation differs depending on molecular structures. CCSD(T) is basically accurate for stable structures where electron correlation is weak, but not for unstable structures where electron correlation is strong [10]. In contrast, VQE with the UCCSD *ansatz* (UCCSD-VQE) can represent strong electron correlation accurately [11].

In this work, we propose an *automatic algorithm switching* (AAS) technique to accurately calculate the ground-state energies of a target molecule with different bond distances. As shown in Figure 1, it automatically switches CCSD(T) and VQE according to bond distances by identifying a bond distance where the accuracy of CCSD(T) begins to drop for a target molecule. For this, we devise a novel method to detect the accuracy drop of CCSD(T) based on its number of iterations.

Our evaluation using a noise-less quantum computer simulator demonstrates that AAS improves the accuracy to describe the bond breaking processes of four molecules, compared to the cases where CCSD(T) or VQE is solely used. Moreover, AAS reduces the error to calculate bond dissociation energy (BDE) by up to over an order of magnitude.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section II, we first explain QCC, CCSD(T), and VQE. Then, we investigate




Fig. 2: An example to describe the bond breaking process of the H₂ molecule.

the accuracy of CCSD(T) and VQE. Section III describes the concept and implementation of our proposed AAS technique. Section IV shows the evaluation results of AAS for the bond breaking processes of four molecules. Finally, Section V introduces related work, and Section VI concludes this work.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Quantum Chemical Calculations (QCC)

QCC are computational techniques to analyze the characteristics and structures of molecules such as stability and chemical reactions. As shown in the upper left part of Figure 2, the input is a molecular structure represented by the coordinates of multiple atoms. The Hamiltonian operator \hat{H} of a target molecule is determined from its structure, and the potential energy E can be calculated by solving the Schrödinger equation, $\hat{H}\psi = E\psi$, where ψ is a wave function representing an electron state. However, since exactly solving the equation is not practical, a wide variety of approximate methods with different accuracy levels and computational costs have been developed [12]–[15].

The right graph in Figure 2 shows an example to describe the bond breaking process of the H₂ molecule. A potential energy curve (PEC), constructed by calculating potential energies with different bond distances, represents the change from a stable state at a minimum point to a transition state at a saddle point. The energy difference between saddle and minimum points corresponds to a *bond dissociation energy* (BDE), which is an energy required to break a bond.

B. CCSD(T)

Coupled cluster with singles, doubles, and perturbative triples [CCSD(T)] is regarded as a gold standard algorithm in QCC, because it can achieve a high accuracy with moderate computational cost [3]. Coupled cluster is a *post-Hartree-Fock* method that represents electron correlation by constructing a multi-electron wave function with cluster operators [16]. CCSD explicitly treats single and double excitations with two cluster operators and calculates an electron correlation energy through an iterative process, where the amplitudes are updated repeatedly until the energy difference converges to a threshold [4]. CCSD(T) further adds the approximate treatment of triple excitations to the energy calculated by CCSD based on the perturbation theory. It is known that CCSD(T) is accurate




Fig. 3: The overview of VQE.

for stable molecular structures where electron correlation is weak, but not for describing the process of breaking multiple bonds where electron correlation is strong [10].

C. VQE

With the advent of NISQ computers, variational quantum eigensolver (VQE) is regarded as one of the most promising applications operating on them. It is a variational hybrid quantum-classical eigensolver and can be used to calculate an approximate ground-state energy of a molecule [7]. Figure 3 illustrates the overview of VQE. It iteratively executes a parameterized quantum circuit on a quantum device and updates its parameters using a classical optimizer until the energy calculated from the measurement result of the quantum circuit converges. The combination of using a shallow parameterized quantum circuit and using a classical optimizer enables VQE to be executed on NISQ computers where coherent time is short. With a well-known mapping method called *Jordan-Wigner* [17], the number of qubits of a quantum circuit used in VQE corresponds to the number of spin orbitals of a target molecule, and the measurement value of each qubit ($|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$) represents whether an electron occupies the corresponding spin orbital or not.

A parameterized quantum circuit used in VQE is constructed based on a trial wave function called *ansatz*. The accuracy and computational cost of VQE heavily depend on an ansatz; thus, various types of ansätze have been proposed [18]–[22]. In particular, *unitary coupled-cluster singles and doubles* (UCCSD) is a chemistry-inspired ansatz which can achieve a high accuracy in QCC [3], [9]. In addition, the type of a classical optimizer also significantly affects the accuracy and the number of iterations required until convergence; thus, various types of classical optimizers have been evaluated [23], [24]. *Sequential least squares programming* (SLSQP) is a representative optimizer in the absence of noise, while *simultaneous perturbation stochastic approximation* (SPSA) is a well-known optimizer robust to noise [24].

D. Accuracy of CCSD(T) and VQE

We investigate the accuracy of CCSD(T) implemented in PySCF [25] and UCCSD-VQE executed using a quantum




Fig. 4: The energy error from FCI for N2/STO-3G with different bond distances.


computer simulator, *AerSimulator*, in Qiskit [26] without a noise model (see Section IV-A for the detailed experimental setup). Figure 4 shows the energy error of CCSD(T) and UCCSD-VQE from the exact energy calculated with the *full configuration interaction (FCI)* method for the N2 molecule within the STO-3G basis set (denoted as N2/STO-3G) according to different bond distances. We can see that the accuracy advantage between CCSD(T) and UCCSD-VQE differs depending on bond distances. CCSD(T) achieves a lower error than UCCSD-VQE at 0.8 to 1.1 Å, whereas UCCSD-VQE is more accurate at longer bond distances except 1.7 Å. For the N2 molecule having a triple bond, it is known that CCSD(T) is not accurate at long bond distances because it cannot accurately represent strong electron correlation [10]. In contrast, UCCSD-VQE represents it more accurately than CCSD(T).

III. AUTOMATIC ALGORITHM SWITCHING


In this work, we propose an *automatic algorithm switching (AAS)* technique for accurate ground-state energy calculation with the different bond distances of a target molecule. As shown in Figure 1, AAS automatically switches CCSD(T) and VQE according to bond distances by identifying a bond distance where the accuracy of CCSD(T) begins to drop for a target molecule.

A. Switch Point Identification

The key of our proposed technique is to appropriately identify a switch point between CCSD(T) and VQE. It is desirable to switch from CCSD(T) to VQE at a bond distance where the accuracy of CCSD(T) begins to drop, although this is not a trivial task because such a bond distance is different depending on the characteristics of molecules. The accuracy of CCSD(T) can be known exactly by comparing the energy calculated with CCSD(T) and the exact energy calculated with FCI. However, FCI is not available for practical molecules due to its exponential computational and memory requirements [27].



(a) LiH/STO-3G



(b) N2/STO-3G

Fig. 5: The energy error (upper) and number of iterations (lower) of CCSD(T) with different bond distances. The orange and green dotted lines are fitted to the number of iterations with piecewise linear regression, where the points over 50 iterations are excluded.

Since CCSD(T) performs an iterative process to calculate an electron correlation energy, we focus on the relationship between the accuracy and number of iterations of CCSD(T). Figure 5 shows the energy error from FCI and number of iterations of CCSD(T) for LiH and N2 molecules within the STO-3G basis set with different bond distances. For LiH/STO-3G in Figure 5a, the energy error is always very low regardless of bond distances, and the number of iterations is almost constant. On the other hand, for N2/STO-3G in Figure 5b, the energy error increases sharply from 1.8 Å, and the number of iterations also does so from 1.7 Å. The iterative process of CCSD(T) converges with around ten iterations when the energy error is low, whereas the number of iterations increases linearly as the energy error increases. These results demonstrate that the sharp increase in the number of iterations appropriately represents the accuracy drop of CCSD(T).

To identify a switch point from CCSD(T) to VQE for a target molecule, we fit the number of iterations of CCSD(T) according to bond distances with piecewise linear regression

Algorithm 1 Switch point identification

Input: mol, distances, niters_thr
1: niters \leftarrow runall_ccsd_t(mol, distances)
2: break_point, slopes
 \leftarrow pwlr_fit(distances, niters, niters_thr)
3: **if** $0 < \text{slopes}[0] < \text{slopes}[1]$ **then**
4: switch_point \leftarrow break_point
5: **else**
6: switch_point \leftarrow -1
7: **end if**
8: **return** switch_point

(PWLR) [28]. In the lower graphs of Figure 5, the orange and green dotted lines represent the two fitted lines. For LiH/STO-3G in Figure 5a, the slopes of both the lines are almost zero. On the other hand, for N2/STO-3G in Figure 5b, their slopes are both positive and the right green line has a higher slope than the left orange line. We regard a break point between the two lines as a switch point from CCSD(T) to VQE, because the break point corresponds to a bond distance where the accuracy of CCSD(T) may begin to drop.

B. Implementation

On the basis of the above finding, we implement a function to identify a switch point between CCSD(T) and VQE as shown in Algorithm 1. The inputs are the information of a target molecule such as its geometry and basis set (mol), the range of bond distances (distances), and a threshold of the number of iterations (niters_thr). At first, CCSD(T) is executed for the target molecule at all the bond distances included in distances, and the numbers of iterations are recorded (line 1). Then, the break point and slopes of two fitted lines are obtained by applying PWLR to the recorded numbers of iterations according to the bond distances (line 2). PWLR only fits the numbers of iterations less than niters_thr. In this work, niters_thr is set to 50, which is the default maximum iterations of CCSD(T) in PySCF. If the slopes of the two fitted lines are both positive and the second slope is higher than the first one, the switch point is set to the break point (lines 3-4). Otherwise, the switch point is set to “-1” for disabling the automatic algorithm switching (lines 5-6). Finally, the switch point is returned (line 8).

Our proposed AAS technique switches CCSD(T) and VQE based on the switch point obtained from Algorithm 1 and a target bond distance. CCSD(T) is selected if a target bond distance is shorter than the switch point; otherwise VQE is selected. If the switch point is “-1”, CCSD(T) is always selected (i.e., VQE is never selected).

IV. EVALUATION

In this section, we compare the accuracy to describe the bond breaking processes of four molecules between CCSD(T), VQE, and our proposed AAS technique. We first explain the experimental setup and then show evaluation results.

TABLE I: The parameter settings of VQE.

Parameter	Setting
Ansatz	UCCSD
Classical optimizer	SLSQP
Maximum iterations	100
Core freezing	Enabled
Qubit converter	Jordan Wigner
Z2 symmetry reduction	Enabled
Noise	None

A. Experimental Setup

In this work, we target four molecules within the STO-3G basis set: LiH, N2, C2, and CO. The three molecules except LiH have double or triple bonds, leading to the low accuracy of CCSD(T) at long bond distances. The bond breaking process of each molecule is described by constructing a potential energy curve (PEC) across bond distances from 0.8 to 3.0 Å at the step of 0.1 Å. The accuracy of CCSD(T), VQE, and AAS is evaluated by comparing an energy calculated with each method to an exact energy calculated with FCI. For all experiments in this work, we use a server containing two Xeon® Gold 6240M processors and 384 GB of DRAM.

PySCF [25] is used to run CCSD(T) and FCI, while Qiskit [26] is used to run VQE. PySCF is a Python-based open-source QCC framework that supports various classical algorithms. We set the maximum number of iterations of CCSD(T) to 10,000. Qiskit is an open-source quantum computing framework developed by IBM Research. In this work, we run VQE using a quantum computer simulator, *AerSimulator*, in Qiskit without a noise model (i.e., noise-less simulation). Table I summarizes the parameter settings of VQE. We select the UCCSD ansatz and SLSQP optimizer to achieve high accuracy in the noise-less simulation. Core freezing is applied for each molecule to reduce the number of qubits without degrading the VQE accuracy significantly. The Hamiltonian of each molecule is converted to qubits with the Jordan Wigner method [17] and tapered with the Z2 symmetry reduction method [29]. Consequently, the numbers of qubits are 6, 12, 12, and 13 for LiH, N2, C2, and CO, respectively. Moreover, we use the *pwlf* Python library [28] to apply piecewise linear regression in Algorithm 1.

B. Evaluation Results

First, we evaluate the accuracy to describe bond breaking processes by comparing PECs constructed with CCSD(T), UCCSD-VQE, and AAS. Figure 6 plots the PECs and energy errors from FCI for the four molecules. The black line in each upper graph shows the exact PEC constructed with FCI as an accuracy criterion. The gray shade in each lower graph represents the *chemical accuracy* (i.e., energy error within 1.6E-3 Hartree), which is an important accuracy criterion to reproduce chemical experimental results.

For LiH having a single bond, all the three methods successfully construct accurate PECs and always achieve the chemical accuracy. In this case, CCSD(T) always achieves much lower errors than UCCSD-VQE. Since the number of iterations of




Fig. 6: The potential energy curve (upper) and energy error from FCI (lower) for four molecules within the STO-3G basis set. The gray shade in each lower graph represents the chemical accuracy.

CCSD(T) is almost constant as shown in Figure 5a, AAS selects only CCSD(T), and thus the energy errors of CCSD(T) and AAS (the blue and red lines) completely overlap in the lower graph. In contrast, for the other three molecules having double or triple bonds, CCSD(T) achieves lower errors than UCCSD-VQE at short bond distances, but it becomes less accurate than UCCSD-VQE and fails to construct accurate PECs at long bond distances. This is because CCSD(T) cannot represent strong electron correlation accurately [10]. On the other hand, UCCSD-VQE successfully constructs accurate PECs even at long bond distances because of the UCCSD ansatz and its variational property [30]. For the three molecules, AAS takes the accuracy advantages of both CCSD(T) and UCCSD-VQE by identifying an appropriate switching point and switching them according to bond distances.

Only in terms of the accuracy to describe bond breaking processes, we may be able to achieve the comparable accuracy to AAS just by switching from CCSD(T) to UCCSD-VQE at

a fixed point (e.g., at 1.8 Å for the four molecules targeted in this work). However, this simple approach wastes the scarce resources of current quantum computers. For instance, it needs 52 runs of UCCSD-VQE in total to construct the PECs of the four molecules (13 runs across 1.8 Å to 3.0 Å for each molecule). In contrast, AAS reduces the total runs of UCCSD-VQE to 33 (= 0 + 14 + 6 + 13 for LiH, N₂, C₂, and CO). The saving of scarce quantum computing resources by the hybrid use of classical algorithms like CCSD(T) and emerging quantum algorithms like VQE is another important aspect of AAS.

Next, we evaluate the accuracy to calculate the bond dissociation energy (*BDE*) of each molecule. As shown in the right graph of Figure 2, *BDE* is calculated as the energy difference between the saddle and minimum points on a PEC. Figure 7 plots the error of *BDE* calculated with CCSD(T), UCCSD-VQE, and AAS from the exact *BDE* calculated with FCI. For LiH, CCSD(T) achieves a much lower error than




Fig. 7: The error of bond dissociation energy (BDE) from FCI for four molecules within the STO-3G basis set.

UCCSD-VQE because it constructs a more accurate PEC. Since AAS selects only CCSD(T) in this case, it achieves the same accuracy to CCSD(T). For N2, UCCSD-VQE outperforms CCSD(T) because CCSD(T) is not accurate at long bond distances. AAS is comparable to UCCSD-VQE in this case, because the errors of CCSD(T) and UCCSD-VQE at the minimum point is comparable. More interestingly, AAS achieves an order of magnitude lower errors than CCSD(T) and/or UCCSD-VQE for C2 and CO. This is because the accuracy advantage between CCSD(T) and UCCSD-VQE differs significantly depending on bond distances, and AAS takes the advantages of both of them by appropriately switching them.

V. RELATED WORK

To our knowledge, this work is the first to present an algorithm switching technique for the accurate calculation of molecular ground-state energy with different bond distances. In this section, we introduce prior work regarding accurate ground-state energy calculation.

Classical algorithms have been improved in terms of accuracy and/or computational costs. Kowalski and Piecuch show the low accuracy of CCSD(T) for the bond breaking process of the N2 molecule due to strong electron correlation [10]. CCSD(T) has an $O(N^7)$ computational cost, where N is a problem size; thus, it cannot be used for large-scale molecules. *Domain-based local pair natural orbital* CCSD(T) [DLPNO-CCSD(T)] is a promising algorithm to reduce the computational cost of CCSD(T) while sustaining its potential accuracy [31]–[33]. *Selected CI (SCI)* is a well-known approach to reduce the computational costs of configuration interaction methods including FCI by selecting only critical electron configurations. Coe applies an artificial neural network model to SCI [34], while Li et al. combine SCI with the perturbation theory [35]. Aroeira et al. augment CCSD(T) with an adaptive SCI method to represent strong electron correlation [36]. These DLPNO-CCSD(T) and SCI methods can be used as candidates selected in AAS.

Since VQE is a promising algorithm for accurate ground-state energy calculation, a wide variety of approaches have

been proposed to improve its accuracy and/or computational cost. Although the UCCSD ansatz can achieve a high accuracy in the noise-less simulation as we have shown in this paper, UCCSD-based quantum circuits have the impractical depth for current NISQ computers and suffer from significant noise errors. Therefore, the various types of more light-weight ansatz have been proposed: *QCC* [18], *k-UpCCGSD* [20], *CHC* [37], and *ADAPT* [19], [21], [22]. In addition, quantum circuit pruning techniques have been proposed to reduce the number of gates and depth of quantum circuits used in VQE [38]–[40]. While we evaluate UCCSD-VQE using a noise-less quantum computer simulator in this work, we need to thoughtfully consider the applications of the above approaches to achieve accurate VQE calculation on real NISQ computers.

The *density matrix embedding theory (DMET)* can be used to divide molecules into multiple smaller fragments and combined with VQE to calculate the energy of each fragment [41]. Shang et al. combine DMET with VQE executed using a tensor network-based quantum computer simulator to calculate the energies of large-scale molecules on a supercomputer [42]. The number of gates and depth of quantum circuits used in VQE become higher for larger molecules, leading to larger noise errors to VQE calculation on real NISQ computers. DMET should be effective to mitigate noise errors because it can reduce a problem size for VQE.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose an automatic algorithm switching (AAS) technique to accurately calculate the ground-state energies of a target molecule with different bond distances. We focus on the relationship between the accuracy and number of iterations of CCSD(T) and present a novel approach that identifies an appropriate switching point between CCSD(T) and VQE based on the number of iterations of CCSD(T). Our evaluation in terms of the accuracy to describe the bond breaking processes of four molecules demonstrates that compared to CCSD(T) and UCCSD-VQE, our proposed AAS technique successfully constructs more accurate potential energy curves and reduces the error of bond dissociation energy by up to over an order of magnitude.

As our future work, we will evaluate the accuracy of VQE on real NISQ computers and try to achieve accurate ground-state energy calculation by applying AAS to switch CCSD(T) and such noisy VQE. This is a challenging task due to the significant noise errors on VQE calculation. To minimize the noise errors, we need to thoughtfully construct an accurate and light-weight ansatz, select a noise-robust classical optimizer, and apply various noise mitigation methods.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. F. Matta, R. J. Boyd, and A. Becke, *The Quantum Theory of Atoms in Molecules: From Solid State to DNA and Drug Design*. Wiley, 2007.
- [2] A. D. Bochevarov, E. Harder, T. F. Hughes, J. R. Greenwood, D. A. Braden, D. M. Philipp, D. Rinaldo, M. D. Halls, J. Zhang, and R. A. Friesner, “Jaguar: A high-performance quantum chemistry software program with strengths in life and materials sciences,” *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, vol. 113, no. 18, pp. 2110–2142, 2013.

- [3] M. Kühn, S. Zanker, P. Deglmann, M. Marthaler, and H. Weiß, “Accuracy and Resource Estimations for Quantum Chemistry on a Near-Term Quantum Computer,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, vol. 15, pp. 4764–4780, 2019.
- [4] E. Solomonik, D. Matthews, J. R. Hammond, J. F. Stanton, and J. Demmel, “A massively parallel tensor contraction framework for coupled-cluster computations,” *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, vol. 74, pp. 3176–3190, 12 2014.
- [5] IBM, “Quantum Roadmap,” last checked: January, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ibm.com/roadmaps/quantum/>
- [6] Regetti Computing, “Scalable quantum systems built from the chip up to power practical applications,” last checked: January, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.rigetti.com/what-we-build>
- [7] A. Peruzzo, J. McClean, P. Shadbolt, M. H. Yung, X. Q. Zhou, P. J. Love, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and J. L. O’Brien, “A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor,” *Nature Communications* 2014 5:1, vol. 5, pp. 1–7, 7 2014.
- [8] J. Tilly, H. Chen, S. Cao, D. Picozzi, K. Setia, Y. Li, E. Grant, L. Wossnig, I. Rungger, G. H. Booth, and J. Tennyson, “The Variational Quantum Eigensolver: a review of methods and best practices,” *Physics Reports*, vol. 986, pp. 1–128, 11 2022.
- [9] J. F. Gonthier, M. D. Radin, C. Buda, E. J. Dorskocil, C. M. Abuan, and J. Romero, “Measurements as a roadblock to near-term practical quantum advantage in chemistry: Resource analysis,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 4, p. 033154, 8 2022.
- [10] K. Kowalski and P. Piecuch, “Renormalized CCSD(T) and CCSD(TQ) approaches: Dissociation of the N₂ triple bond,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, vol. 113, p. 5644, 2000.
- [11] T. Culpitt, E. I. Tellgren, and F. Pavošević, “Unitary coupled-cluster for quantum computation of molecular properties in a strong magnetic field,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, vol. 159, p. 204101, 12 2023.
- [12] E. J. Baerends, D. E. Ellis, and P. Ros, “Self-consistent molecular Hartree—Fock—Slater calculations I. The computational procedure,” *Chemical Physics*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 41–51, 1973.
- [13] W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, “Self-Consistent Equations Including Exchange and Correlation Effects,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. 140, pp. A1133–A1138, Nov 1965.
- [14] C. Møller and M. S. Plesset, “Note on an Approximation Treatment for Many-Electron Systems,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. 46, pp. 618–622, Oct 1934.
- [15] C. David Sherrill and H. F. Schaefer, “The Configuration Interaction Method: Advances in Highly Correlated Approaches,” in *Advances in Quantum Chemistry*. Academic Press, 1999, vol. 34, pp. 143–269.
- [16] R. J. Bartlett and M. Musial, “Coupled-cluster theory in quantum chemistry,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 79, pp. 291–352, Feb 2007.
- [17] E. Fradkin, “Jordan-wigner transformation for quantum-spin systems in two dimensions and fractional statistics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 63, pp. 322–325, Jul 1989.
- [18] I. G. Ryabinkin, T.-C. Yen, S. N. Genin, and A. F. Izmaylov, “Qubit Coupled Cluster Method: A Systematic Approach to Quantum Chemistry on a Quantum Computer,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, vol. 14, pp. 6317–6326, 2018.
- [19] H. R. Grimsley, S. E. Economou, E. Barnes, and N. J. Mayhall, “An adaptive variational algorithm for exact molecular simulations on a quantum computer,” *Nature Communications* 2019 10:1, vol. 10, pp. 1–9, 7 2019.
- [20] J. Lee, W. J. Huggins, M. Head-Gordon, and K. B. Whaley, “Generalized Unitary Coupled Cluster Wave functions for Quantum Computation,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 311–324, 2019.
- [21] Y. Fan, C. Cao, X. Xu, Z. Li, D. Lv, and M.-H. Yung, “Circuit-Depth Reduction of Unitary-Coupled-Cluster Ansatz by Energy Sorting,” 6 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.15210>
- [22] Z. Lan and W. Liang, “Amplitude Reordering Accelerates the Adaptive Variational Quantum Eigensolver Algorithms,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, vol. 18, no. 9, pp. 5267–5275, 2022.
- [23] X. Bonet-Monroig, H. Wang, D. Vermetten, B. Senjean, C. Moussa, T. Bäck, V. Dunjko, and T. E. O’Brien, “Performance comparison of optimization methods on variational quantum algorithms,” *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 107, p. 32407, 3 2023.
- [24] M. Skogh, O. Leinonen, P. Lolur, and M. Rahm, “Accelerating variational quantum eigensolver convergence using parameter transfer,” *Electronic Structure*, vol. 5, p. 035002, 9 2023.
- [25] Q. Sun, T. C. Berkelbach, N. S. Blunt, G. H. Booth, S. Guo, Z. Li, J. Liu, J. D. McClain, E. R. Sayfutyarova, S. Sharma, S. Wouters, and G. K.-L. Chan, “PySCF: the Python-based simulations of chemistry framework,” *WIREs Computational Molecular Science*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. e1340, 2018.
- [26] Qiskit contributors, “Qiskit: An Open-source Framework for Quantum Computing,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://zenodo.org/records/8190968>
- [27] K. Sugisaki, C. Sakai, K. Toyota, K. Sato, D. Shiomi, and T. Takui, “Quantum Algorithm for Full Configuration Interaction Calculations without Controlled Time Evolutions,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters*, vol. 12, no. 45, pp. 11 085–11 089, 2021.
- [28] C. F. Jekel and G. Venter, “pwlfit: A Python Library for Fitting 1D Continuous Piecewise Linear Functions,” 2019. [Online]. Available: https://github.com/cjekel/piecewise_linear_fit_py
- [29] S. Bravyi, J. M. Gambetta, A. Mezzacapo, and K. Temme, “Tapering off qubits to simulate fermionic Hamiltonians,” January 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.08213>
- [30] W. Mizukami, K. Mitarai, Y. O. Nakagawa, T. Yamamoto, T. Yan, and Y. ya Ohnishi, “Orbital optimized unitary coupled cluster theory for quantum computer,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 2, p. 033421, 9 2020.
- [31] C. Riplinger and F. Neese, “An efficient and near linear scaling pair natural orbital based local coupled cluster method,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, vol. 138, p. 34106, 11 2013.
- [32] Y. Minenkov, E. Chermak, and L. Cavallo, “Accuracy of DLPNO-CCSD(T) Method for Noncovalent Bond Dissociation Enthalpies from Coinage Metal Cation Complexes,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, vol. 11, pp. 4664–4676, 2015.
- [33] I. Sandler, J. Chen, M. Taylor, S. Sharma, and J. Ho, “Accuracy of DLPNO-CCSD(T): Effect of Basis Set and System Size,” *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, vol. 125, pp. 1553–1563, 2 2021.
- [34] J. P. Coe, “Machine Learning Configuration Interaction for ab Initio Potential Energy Curves,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, vol. 15, pp. 6179–6189, 2019.
- [35] J. Li, Y. Yao, A. A. Holmes, M. Otten, Q. Sun, S. Sharma, and C. J. Umrigar, “Accurate many-body electronic structure near the basis set limit: Application to the chromium dimer,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 2, p. 012015, 1 2020.
- [36] G. J. R. Aroeira, M. M. Davis, J. M. Turney, and H. F. Schaefer, “Coupled Cluster Externally Corrected by Adaptive Configuration Interaction,” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, vol. 17, p. 182, 2021.
- [37] P. J. Ollitrault, A. Baiardi, M. Reiher, and I. Tavernelli, “Hardware efficient quantum algorithms for vibrational structure calculations,” *Chem. Sci.*, vol. 11, pp. 6842–6855, 2020.
- [38] S. Sim, J. Romero, J. F. Gonthier, and A. A. Kunita, “Adaptive pruning-based optimization of parameterized quantum circuits,” *Quantum Science and Technology*, vol. 6, p. 025019, March 2021.
- [39] H. Wang, Y. Ding, J. Gu, Y. Lin, D. Z. Pan, F. T. Chong, and S. Han, “QuantumNAS: Noise-Adaptive Search for Robust Quantum Circuits,” in *Proceeding of the 2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture*, 2022, pp. 692–708.
- [40] S. Imamura, A. Kasagi, and E. Yoshida, “Offline Quantum Circuit Pruning for Quantum Chemical Calculations,” *Proceedings of 2023 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)*, pp. 349–355, 2023.
- [41] Y. Kawashima, E. Lloyd, M. P. Coons, Y. Nam, S. Matsuura, A. J. Garza, S. Johri, L. Huntington, V. Senicourt, A. O. Maksymov, J. H. V. Nguyen, J. Kim, N. Alidoust, A. Zaribafiyani, and T. Yamazaki, “Optimizing electronic structure simulations on a trapped-ion quantum computer using problem decomposition,” *Communications Physics*, vol. 4, p. 245, 2021.
- [42] H. Shang, L. Shen, Y. Fan, Z. Xu, C. Guo, J. Liu, W. Zhou, H. Ma, R. Lin, Y. Yang, F. Li, Z. Wang, Y. Zhang, and Z. Li, “Large-Scale Simulation of Quantum Computational Chemistry on a New Sunway Supercomputer,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. IEEE Computer Society, 11 2022, pp. 1–14.