

Benchmarks and reliable DFT results for spin-crossover complexes

Suhwan Song,[†] Min-Cheol Kim,[†] Eunji Sim,^{*,†} Anouar Benali,[‡] Olle Heinonen,[¶]
and Kieron Burke[§]

[†]*Department of Chemistry, Yonsei University, 50 Yonsei-ro Seodaemun-gu, Seoul 03722, Korea*

[‡]*Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 S. Cass Ave,
Argonne, IL 60439, USA*

[¶]*Material Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 S. Cass Ave, Argonne, IL 60439,
USA*

[§]*Departments of Chemistry and of Physics, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, USA*

E-mail: esim@yonsei.ac.kr

Density Functional Theory (DFT) calculations are used throughout nanoscience,¹⁻⁶ but their primary purpose is to yield accurate relative energetics and geometries.^{7,8} Spin and magnetic properties are also ubiquitous, but the reliability of magnetic moments and other spin-dependent properties from DFT is far less well-established.⁹⁻¹² In the case of molecular transport, the well-known inaccuracies of DFT orbital energies have been linked to the typical overestimate of calculated conductances.¹³⁻¹⁶ Thus spintronics DFT calculations have numerous sources of uncertainty,¹⁷ but for many applications, only DFT calculations are feasible.¹⁸

Spin-crossover complexes (SCO) provide an ideal setting for examining the reliability of DFT for spin-dependent properties.¹⁹ These have been modeled in spintronics studies, both for the isolated molecule and coupled to the leads.²⁰⁻²⁴ The energy difference between the high- (HS) and low-spin (LS) states is relatively small, and their spin-state can be flipped by entropic effects, even at room temperature.²⁵⁻²⁷ Because it is very difficult to isolate such complexes experimentally,^{28,29} DFT calculations must be benchmarked against high-accuracy quantum chemical calculations. If DFT is unable to predict the lowest energy spin-state accurately, spintronic calculations will certainly fail.

Here we carefully analyze DFT calculations of the spin adiabatic energy difference (SA), $E^{SA} = E_{HS} - E_{LS}$, of four well-studied SCOs.³⁰⁻³³ These SAs are all within a few eV, due to *d*-type orbitals being close in energy. Standard DFT calculations give surprisingly large variations, including predicting the incorrect ground state. *Ab initio* calculations, including CCSD(T), are notoriously difficult and fickle for such SCO systems.^{12,34} Many of the central results of the current work are illustrated in Fig. 1. The horizontal dashed lines are extremely expensive but converged diffusion Monte Carlo (DMC) results, showing the errors in large-basis CCSD(T) calculations which are represented as dot-dashed line. Red points show approximate DFT results, ranging from Localized Density Approximation (LDA) on the left to PBE0 on the right, with increasing fraction of Hartree Fock (HF) exchange, and decreasing E^{SA} . In particular, the CO ligand results have the largest spread,

about 4 eV. The highly accurate DMC results show that the DFT results all overstabilize the LS state relative to HS. The hybrids do best,^{32,35,36} as SA decreases with increasing fraction of exact exchange portion. But we also include the blue points, which are the results from the various DFT approximations evaluated on HF densities, (HF-DFT) a simple procedure suggested by the theory of density-corrected DFT (DC-DFT).³⁷⁻⁴¹ The figures clearly show that HF-DFT is both much more accurate and has much less variation than standard self-consistent DFT. The rest of this paper explains how this can be.

Begin with *ab initio* calculations, CCSD and CCSD(T) on a TZVP basis yielded seemingly reasonable results, running about one day on a moderate cluster. But they have two important flaws. When a cc-pVTZ basis was used instead, requiring about a week to run, the results shift by up to 1.0 eV, showing that even this basis is insufficient. Moreover D1, a diagnostic available in Turbomole,⁴² is above 0.04 for all cases, whereas perturbative triples are only reliable when D1 is order 0.02 or less,⁴³ suggesting neither CCSD nor CCSD(T) is reliable for these problems.⁴⁴ (See Table S14 of the supporting information).

What to do? In recent decades, Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) methods, and particularly fixed-node diffusion Monte Carlo, (FN-DMC)⁴⁵ have proven successful at accurately describing the properties of many solids⁴⁵⁻⁵⁰ and molecules.⁵¹⁻⁵⁷ In DMC we minimize the expectation value of the many-body Hamiltonian when propagating a convolution of the many-body wavefunction with the Green's function in imaginary time using many random walkers. In the fixed node (FN) approximation, the positive and negative regions of an initial trial wavefunction are maintained and the walkers, which sample electrons' positions, do not cross nodal lines. The accuracy of the wavefunction and the obtained upper bound for the ground state energy are limited by the quality of the nodal surface of the trial wavefunction. A trial wavefunction (Ψ_T) is often the product of a determinant of orbitals (Ψ_{AS}) (fixing the nodes) and a Jastrow function whose parameters are found by minimizing the energy through an initial variational MC scheme. The accuracy of the FN-DMC wavefunction depends solely on the quality of the nodal surface of Ψ_{AS} , whose

orbitals are usually taken from an effective single-particle theory, such as HF or DFT. Single-determinant FN-DMC yields errors below 1 kcal/mol for van der Waals molecules,⁵²⁻⁵⁴ transition metal molecules^{58,59} and strongly correlated solids.^{47-49,60-63} Moreover, any such DMC result can be systematically improved by increasing the complexity of Ψ_{AS} by including more determinants. Essentially exact results for the H₂O molecule⁶⁴ were obtained from a selected Configuration Interaction method, and for the G1 test set⁵⁷ using a Complete Active-Space Self-Consistent Field construct, and is showing promising results for solids.⁶⁵ QMC also has only a weak dependence on the basis set^{57,66} and costs scale as N^3 with the number of electrons N , allowing the study of large systems, as the FN-DMC algorithm can efficiently use millions of processors, including both CPUs and GPUs.⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹

As pseudopotentials for Fe can hold large locality errors in DMC,⁷⁰ we perform all-electron DMC. We use a single-determinant B3LYP trial wavefunction for our DMC calculations, and use cc-pVNZ basis sets, where N=D,T,Q. We use the most challenging case, CO, to test convergence. We used a time step of 0.005 and 32k walkers. To reduce the variance we used 1-, 2- and 3-body Jastrow functions applied on all atoms and optimized for each individual spin state. For the largest basis sets, (cc-pVTZ and cc-pVQZ), we used 200k-400k core hours on 512 Intel Knight's Landing nodes to reach a DMC accuracy of about 25meV per compound. Figure 2 shows that when using a *single-determinant* B3LYP trial wavefunction, SA energies converge within 20 ± 20 meV with the size of the basis-set, and are already converged at the cc-pVTZ level. The HF reference recovers the same result, but requires the larger basis set.

Despite the failure of CCSD(T), a single Slater determinant provides sufficiently accurate nodes for DMC. Thus a system having multireference character in traditional quantum chemical language does not necessarily imply a nodal surface that requires more than one Slater determinant. The 2- and 3-body Jastrow factors account for considerable correlation. This is consistent with claims of the weak dependence on basis-sets size in QMC. For all remaining compounds, we chose to carry all calculations with all electrons, a cc-pVTZ

basis set, a B3LYP trial wavefunction and spin-compound optimized 1-3 Body Jastrows.

In contrast with quantum chemical methods, DFT calculations converge more rapidly with basis set. All calculations here were done in cc-pVTZ and many were compared with the Fritz Haber Institute molecular simulations package (FHI-aims), yielding agreement to within 0.01 eV in all cases. (See Table S2 in the supporting Information.) We next explain the difference between the red and blue lines in Fig. 1.

Ground-state Kohn-Sham (KS) DFT is mostly used to extract approximate ground-state energies of electronic systems as a function of nuclear positions.⁷¹ But every practical calculation uses an approximation to the unknown exchange-correlation (XC) energy, and the self-consistent cycle of a KS solver finds the density that minimizes the approximate energy for the given system.⁷² Thus both the density and energy are approximated.³⁸ It is trivial to separate out the energetic consequences of these two approximations. The energy error in such a calculation may be defined as

$$\Delta E = \tilde{E}[\tilde{n}] - E[n], \tag{1}$$

where the tilde indicates the approximation. We define the functional (ΔE_F) and density-driven (ΔE_D) errors as³⁸

$$\Delta E_F = \tilde{E}[n] - E[n], \quad \Delta E_D = \tilde{E}[\tilde{n}] - \tilde{E}[n], \tag{2}$$

so they sum to the total energy error. For a KS calculation, $\Delta E_F = \Delta \tilde{E}_{xc}[n]$, the error in the approximation to exchange-correlation, while $\Delta E_D \leq 0$ by the variational principle. In normal KS-DFT calculations, the density is so good that $|\Delta E_D| \ll \Delta E_F$. But semilocal and hybrid functionals suffer from self-interaction (or delocalization) error.⁷³ In many cases, this error is density-driven, and $|\Delta E_D|$ becomes comparable to ΔE_F . We call such calculations *abnormal*, and the error can be significantly reduced by using a more accurate density. For atoms and molecules, the HF density is often sufficient, so that HF-DFT yields

much better results. This has been shown to reduce errors for anions,³⁷ transition state barriers,⁷⁴ ions and radicals in solution,³⁹ and dissociating heterogeneous diatomics,⁴⁰ as discussed in a recent review.⁴¹

To demonstrate sensitivity to the density, in Fig. 3 we show SA for several different approximations on different densities. We consider here simple, commonly-used DFT approximations. LDA uses only the density at a point, generalized gradient approximations (GGAs) use both the density and its gradient, while (global) hybrids mix some exact exchange with GGA:¹³

$$E_{xc}^{hyb}[n] = E_{xc}^{GGA}[n] + a(E_x^{HF}[n] - E_x^{GGA}[n]), \quad (3)$$

where a is the amount of exchange mixing. In addition, we include metaGGAs (mGGAs), which also depend on a local kinetic energy density, in the generic term GGA. In practice, all approximations are spin-density functionals, so $n(\mathbf{r})$ represents spin-densities here. For a given energy approximation, there is little difference between evaluation on LDA, GGA or mGGA densities. However, the result changes with the amount of exchange mixing. TPSSh has 10% and B3LYP and PBE0 have 20% and 25%, respectively, while Becke’s half-and-half (HH) has 50%. The SA decreases with increasing a in the density and even becomes correctly negative with a HF density (100% exact exchange). Similar results are found for all four complexes. The strong dependence on a for the density demonstrates that these DFT calculations are *abnormal*, i.e., a significant fraction of the error in such calculations is density-driven. We recommend the use of such 2D *rainbow* plots, Fig. 3, as a check for density-driven errors, as they do not require knowledge of the accurate result.

Knowing that there is a strong-density-driven error does not guarantee that a HF density is sufficiently close to the exact density to improve the DFT results, but Fig. 1 strongly suggests that this is the case here. Table 1 reports the errors in that figure. (Results of cc-pVTZ can be found in Tables S1-S4 of the supporting information and Tables S11 and

Table 1: Errors in SA in eV relative to DMC. Note that DMC values in eV are -1.17 for NCH, -1.23 for NH₃, -1.78 for H₂O and 0.59 for CO. The column MAE is mean absolute errors over all 4 molecules. Rows AVG average over all GGA and hybrid energies, while RMSD gives their root-mean square deviation.

Method	NCH	NH ₃	H ₂ O	CO	MAE
Ab initio					
HF	-2.45	-2.04	-1.79	-5.24	2.88
CCSD	0.28	0.13	-0.19	-0.20	0.20
CCSD(T)	0.74	0.45	0.03	0.74	0.49
SC-DFT					
<i>GGA</i>					
SVWN	3.31	2.10	1.32	4.51	2.81
BP86	2.07	1.25	0.69	2.71	1.68
BLYP	1.94	1.28	0.83	2.16	1.55
PBE	2.08	1.25	0.65	2.80	1.69
TPSS	2.10	1.37	0.86	2.48	1.70
<i>Hybrid</i>					
TPSSh	1.55	1.00	0.58	1.67	1.20
B3LYP	1.00	0.65	0.37	0.68	0.68
PBE0	0.77	0.37	0.02	0.75	0.48
AVG	1.64	1.02	0.57	1.89	1.28
RMSD	0.52	0.35	0.27	0.82	0.49
HF-DFT					
<i>GGA</i>					
SVWN	1.15	0.62	0.28	1.45	0.88
BP86	0.21	0.00	-0.17	-0.05	0.11
BLYP	0.30	0.21	0.12	-0.33	0.24
PBE	0.17	-0.03	-0.22	-0.06	0.12
TPSS	0.49	0.30	0.12	0.03	0.24
<i>Hybrid</i>					
TPSSh	0.31	0.15	-0.01	-0.30	0.19
B3LYP	0.07	0.01	-0.06	-0.86	0.25
PBE0	-0.17	-0.30	-0.45	-0.84	0.44
AVG	0.25	0.15	0.16	0.35	0.23
RMSD	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.34	0.23

S12 are those of TZVP.) The first few rows show the results of *ab initio* quantum chemical methods. HF is very poor, with typical errors of about 3 eV. CCSD does much better, but inclusion of perturbative triples doubles the errors, unlike in main-group chemistry, suggesting a multi-reference nature, corroborated by the high D1 values. To check the reliability of our DMC with just a single Slater determinant trial wavefunction, for the CO complex, we constructed a multi-determinant trial wavefunction consisting of 135 k determinants using the perturbatively selected configuration interaction method (CIPSI) as described in Ref. 76. In order to make the calculation tractable, and only for this test, we used a pseudopotential for the Fe atom. We compared the variational energies from this multideterminant expansion with the energies obtained from DMC with the B3LYP nodal surface using the same pseudopotential and basis set. The calculations yielded the same E^{SA} to within a ± 0.005 a.u. error bar. More details of this calculation will appear elsewhere.

Another signal that a self-consistent DFT calculation might suffer from a density-driven error is an abnormally small HOMO-LUMO gap, often less than 1 eV.³⁸ The gaps for all molecules and functionals are listed in the supporting Information, table S10, for both HS and LS states. For the HS states, all gaps are below 1 eV, with some as small as 0.4 eV.

In self-consistent DFT, typical LDA errors are similar in magnitude but opposite in sign to those of HF. All DFT approximations overstabilize the LS state relative to the HS state in a very systematic way. Typical GGAs are about 1.7 eV too high. The best functional is the hybrid PBE0 with a mean absolute error of 0.5 eV, and the performance of other hybrids depend on the amount of mixing. Averaging over all 4 GGAs and 3 hybrids yields 1.3 eV error, and the root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) from this value is about 0.5 eV. But when evaluated on HF densities, the typical LDA error is reduced by a factor of 3, while GGA errors are below 0.25 eV and are now comparable to hybrids. The average HF-DFT error is now within 0.25 eV, with RMSD deviations of 0.23 eV. Clearly, both the accuracy of the typical functional is substantially higher, and the variations among functionals much

lower than in self-consistent DFT. Moreover, the most accurate results are from either BP86 or PBE, both simple GGAs, with no exchange mixing. BP86 was previously identified as (at the time of testing) the most accurate for transition metal complexes.³⁵ Thus HF-DFT yields much more reliable and accurate estimates of SA for these molecules.

To relate density differences to density-driven errors, we focus on LS $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_6]^{2+}$ as an example, comparing densities using DMC with the GAMESS B3LYP all electron trial wavefunction with PBE and HF densities obtained with FHI-aims. The left panel of Fig. 4 shows isosurfaces of the HF and PBE electron number density difference at $\pm 0.1 \text{ \AA}^{-3}$, with gold (blue) positive (negative) values. The HF density polarizes the oxygen more, shifting density towards the Fe ion at the center. This is visible as gold (positive density difference) regions closer to the Fe ion. Also, the PBE density shows much more pronounced lobes from the $3d_{z^2}$ and the $3d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbitals, visible as blue (negative density difference) lobes near the center. The middle panel shows the DMC and PBE density difference. This is *qualitatively* similar to the HF and PBE density difference in that the oxygen is more polarized in DMC than PBE, and also by the less pronounced $3d$ orbital lobes at Fe ion (visible as dimples with blue centers in the gold cuboid). Finally, the right panel shows the DMC and HF density difference. This figure shows that DMC polarizes the oxygen more than does HF, and also that the Fe $3d$ lobes are somewhat more extended in DMC than HF. We speculate that the key reason the HF-DFT scheme yields quantitatively more accurate energies than DFT is that the HF Fe $3d$ lobes, like in DMC, are less pronounced than in DFT.

Now, we analyze the effect of the exchange mixing parameter a for NCH, assuming that the HF density is exact. To do this, we run both self-consistent and HF-DFT calculations for $a\text{PBE}$, which is the PBE functional with a variable fraction a of exact exchange. If we assume that the self-consistent density of 1.0PBE (i.e., 100% exact exchange) is negligibly different from the exact density, all components are easy to calculate within HF-DFT, and are plotted in Fig. 5. The functional error is almost perfectly linear, reflecting the linear

dependence on the exact exchange energy. The density-driven error vanishes for $a = 1$, based on our assumptions. The plot shows that, for the pure GGA ($a = 0$), the error is almost entirely density-driven. Turning on a reduces the density-driven error, but increases the functional error (the parameter dilemma). For some intermediate value of a , here about 0.45, the two contributions cancel, but there's no reason that this amount of mixing won't change from molecule to molecule. The parameter dilemma most often arises when the position of the HOMO or the size of the gap is important for some property or prediction. Then often increasing a improves the positions of the orbitals or the gap, but worsens the underlying energetics. HF-DFT avoids this Procrustean dilemma, as the HF density is typically very similar to a KS calculation with the exact exchange, whose potential has excellent orbital properties.

Lastly, we show DFT calculations on the Fe-Porphyrin complex. This is too large to perform either CCSD(T) or DMC in the basis sets used throughout this paper. But Fig. 6 shows the results of self-consistent and HF-DFT calculations. Fig. 6 clearly demonstrates the tremendous reduction in variation among approximate energies when the HF density is consistently used, and the unambiguous prediction that the LS state is lower by about 0.8 eV, in contradiction to self-consistent B3LYP or PBE0. Fe(P)NO complex is known to be strongly correlated³⁴ and, furthermore, requires a multi-reference treatment for accurate description.^{77,78} Nevertheless, HF-DFT successfully eliminates the chronic problem of its variational counterpart, the functional dependency.

We have shown that standard quantum chemical methods fail for the SA of Fe(II) SCOs. Semilocal DFT calculations give wildly different results and suffer from the parameter dilemma, while even with a decent basis set, CCSD(T) calculations are both unconverged and unreliable. But extremely demanding DMC methods can be converged to provide benchmarks for these systems. All-electron calculations using up to 3-body Jastrow factors converge in cc-pVQZ. Surprisingly, the B3LYP single Slater determinant is a sufficiently accurate trial wavefunction, and converges more rapidly than the HF wavefunction.

We have also shown that HF-DFT yields much better results (errors reduced by a factor of 3 or more) for these calculations, and do not suffer from a parameter dilemma. This is because these calculations are *abnormal*:⁴¹ Semilocal DFT calculations of the SA of these compounds are contaminated by density-driven errors. Their small HOMO-LUMO gap for the HS state is consistent with this hypothesis. In such cases, and when a HF calculation does not suffer from spin-contamination, often using a HF density greatly reduces the DFT error, as is the case here. This does not mean that the HF density is generally ‘better’ than the self-consistent DFT density. It simply means that the semilocal DFT SA is more accurate on the HF density, as it does not suffer from the delocalization error in the density of semilocal DFT. This is a property of the type of DFT approximation, the specific energy calculated, and the specific system under study.⁴¹ We caution against overgeneralization of these results.

Methods

All HF, CCSD(T) and DFT calculations presented in Figs. 1 and 3 as well as in Table 1 were carried out with TURBOMOLE v7.0.2⁴² and LDA (SVWN5), GGA (PBE, BP86, BLYP), mGGA (TPSS), and hybrid (TPSSH, B3LYP, PBE0) functionals were used for the DFT and HF-DFT calculations. The scripts for performing HF-DFT energy calculations are available.⁷⁹ The geometries used were B3LYP with TZVP basis set. Geometry information can be found in Tables S5-S8 of the supporting information. We also performed fixed-spin HF and DFT calculations using FHI-aims 160328.3.⁸⁰ All FN-DMC (QMC) calculations used the QMCPACK code.⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹ Relativistic corrections were ignored as Fe is rather light and relativistic effects are usually not important. Adding zero order scalar relativistic corrections within FHI-aims (control keywords “relativistic atomic zora”) for CO and H₂O changed the E_{SA} results by at most 0.2 eV, worsening agreement with DMC.

Acknowledgement

This work at Yonsei University (2016-22-0121) was supported by the grants from the Korean Research Foundation (2017R1A2B2003552, 2014R1A1A3049671) and the Ministry of Trade, Industry & Energy, Rep. of Korea (No.10062161). K.B. acknowledges DOE grant DE-FG02-08ER46496. AB and OH were supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Sciences and Engineering Division, as part of the Computational Materials Sciences Program and Center for Predictive Simulation of Functional Materials. Diffusion Monte Carlo calculations were carried through an award of computer time provided by the Innovative and Novel Computational Impact on Theory and Experiment (INCITE) program. This research has used resources of the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, which is a DOE Office of Science User Facility supported under Contract DE-AC02-06CH11357. We thank to Professor Frederick R. Manby and Professor Filipp Furche for stimulating discussions.

Supporting Information Available

The following files are available free of charge.

The following files are available free of charge.

- Computational details
- Master data with cc-pVTZ basis set
- Data with TZVP basis set




Figure 1: Spin adiabatic energy differences of Fe(II) complexes for various DFT calculations and CCSD(T) (gray, unconverged) and diffusion Monte Carlo (black).




Figure 2: SA of $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_6]^{2+}$ evaluated with DMC with two different trial Slater determinants and three different basis sets.




Figure 3: Spin adiabatic energy difference of $[\text{Fe}(\text{NCH})_6]^{2+}$ evaluated with different DFT approximations on several different self-consistent (red dots) and HF (blue) densities. (Dark green bar is the self-consistent density of Becke's half-and-half functional (HH), with 50% exact exchange.)




Figure 4: Isosurface plots of difference densities at $\pm 0.1 \text{ \AA}^{-3}$ for the LS $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_6]^{2+}$ complex, with gold (blue) $+0.1$ (-0.1) \AA^{-3} . Left panel: $n^{\text{HF}} - n^{\text{PBE}}$. Middle panel: $n^{\text{DMC}} - n^{\text{PBE}}$. Right panel: $n^{\text{DMC}} - n^{\text{HF}}$.




Figure 5: Error in spin adiabatic energy difference of $[\text{Fe}(\text{NCH})_6]^{2+}$ complex from $a\text{PBE}$, decomposed into functional and density-driven components.




Figure 6: Spin adiabatic energy difference of Fe(P)NO where P denotes porphyrin.

References

- (1) Maassen, J.; Ji, W.; Guo, H. *Nano Letters* **2011**, *11*, 151–155.
- (2) Beljakov, I.; Meded, V.; Symalla, F.; Fink, K.; Shallcross, S.; Ruben, M.; Wenzel, W. *Nano Letters* **2014**, *14*, 3364–3368.
- (3) Pronschinske, A.; Chen, Y.; Lewis, G. F.; Shultz, D. A.; Calzolari, A.; Buongiorno Nardelli, M.; Dougherty, D. B. *Nano Letters* **2013**, *13*, 1429–1434.
- (4) Aragons, A. C.; Aravena, D.; Cerd, J. I.; Acs-Castillo, Z.; Li, H.; Real, J. A.; Sanz, F.; Hihath, J.; Ruiz, E.; Dez-Prez, I. *Nano Letters* **2016**, *16*, 218–226.
- (5) Zhou, P.; Sun, C. Q.; Sun, L. Z. *Nano Letters* **2016**, *16*, 6325–6330.
- (6) Liu, X.; Liu, J.; Antipina, L. Y.; Hu, J.; Yue, C.; Sanchez, A. M.; Sorokin, P. B.; Mao, Z.; Wei, J. *Nano Letters* **2016**, *16*, 6188–6195.
- (7) Frisenda, R.; Harzmann, G. D.; Celis Gil, J. A.; Thijssen, J. M.; Mayor, M.; van der Zant, H. S. J. *Nano Letters* **2016**, *16*, 4733–4737.
- (8) Gaudenzi, R.; Burzur, E.; Reta, D.; Moreira, I. d. P. R.; Bromley, S. T.; Rovira, C.; Veciana, J.; van der Zant, H. S. J. *Nano Letters* **2016**, *16*, 2066–2071.
- (9) Perdew, J. P.; Ernzerhof, M.; Burke, K.; Savin, A. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **1997**, *61*, 197–205.
- (10) Harvey, J. *Principles and applications of density functional theory in inorganic chemistry I* **2004**, 81–102.
- (11) Harvey, J. N. *Annual Reports Section "C" (Physical Chemistry)* **2006**, *102*, 203–226.
- (12) Kepp, K. P. *Coordination Chemistry Reviews* **2013**, *257*, 196–209.
- (13) Toher, C.; Filippetti, A.; Sanvito, S.; Burke, K. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2005**, *95*, 146402.

- (14) Quek, S. Y.; Venkataraman, L.; Choi, H. J.; Louie, S. G.; Hybertsen, M. S.; Neaton, J. B. *Nano Letters* **2007**, *7*, 3477–3482, PMID: 17900162.
- (15) Burke, K.; Angulo, J. C.; Perdew, J. P. *Physical Review A* **1994**, *50*, 297–304.
- (16) Ruiz, E. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **2014**, *16*, 14–22.
- (17) Reiher, M.; Salomon, O.; Artur Hess, B. *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* **2001**, *107*, 48–55.
- (18) Lefter, C.; Davesne, V.; Salmon, L.; Molnar, G.; Demont, P.; Rotaru, A.; Bousseksou, A. *Magnetochemistry* **2016**, *2*, 18.
- (19) Paulsen, H.; Trautwein, A. X. *Spin Crossover in Transition Metal Compounds III*; Springer Berlin Heidelberg: Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004; pp 197–219.
- (20) Reiher, M. *Inorganic Chemistry* **2002**, *41*, 6928–6935.
- (21) Ganzenmüller, G.; Berkane, N.; Fouqueau, A.; Casida, M. E.; Reiher, M. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2005**, *122*.
- (22) Pierloot, K.; Vancoillie, S. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2008**, *128*.
- (23) Gani, T. Z.; Kulik, H. J. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2016**, *12*, 5931–5945.
- (24) Ioannidis, E. I.; Kulik, H. J. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* **2017**, *121*, 874–884.
- (25) Gütlich, P.; Hauser, A.; Spiering, H. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition in English* **1994**, *33*, 2024–2054.
- (26) Reiher, M. *CHIMIA International Journal for Chemistry* **2009**, *63*, 140–145.
- (27) Ye, S.; Neese, F. *Inorganic Chemistry* **2010**, *49*, 772–774.
- (28) Meded, V.; Bagrets, A.; Fink, K.; Chandrasekar, R.; Ruben, M.; Evers, F.; Bernard-Mantel, A.; Seldenthuis, J. S.; Beukman, A.; van der Zant, H. S. J. *Physical Review B* **2011**, *83*, 245415.

- (29) Matar, S. F.; Guionneau, P.; Chastanet, G. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* **2015**, *16*, 4007–4027.
- (30) Fouqueau, A.; Mer, S.; Casida, M. E.; Lawson Daku, L. M.; Hauser, A.; Mineva, T.; Neese, F. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2004**, *120*, 9473–9486.
- (31) Fouqueau, A.; Casida, M. E.; Daku, L. M. L.; Hauser, A.; Neese, F. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2005**, *122*.
- (32) Droghetti, A.; Alfè, D.; Sanvito, S. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2012**, *137*, 124303.
- (33) Lawson Daku, L. M.; Aquilante, F.; Robinson, T. W.; Hauser, A. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2012**, *8*, 4216–4231.
- (34) Radon, M.; Broclawik, E.; Pierloot, K. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **2010**, *114*, 1518–1528.
- (35) Furche, F.; Perdew, J. P. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2006**, *124*, 044103.
- (36) Droghetti, A.; Alfè, D.; Sanvito, S. *Phys. Rev. B* **2013**, *87*, 205114.
- (37) Kim, M.-C.; Sim, E.; Burke, K. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2011**, *134*, 171103.
- (38) Kim, M.-C.; Sim, E.; Burke, K. *Physical Review Letters* **2013**, *111*, 073003.
- (39) Kim, M.-C.; Sim, E.; Burke, K. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2014**, *140*, 18A528.
- (40) Kim, M.-C.; Park, H.; Son, S.; Sim, E.; Burke, K. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters* **2015**, *6*, 3802–3807.
- (41) Wasserman, A.; Nafziger, J.; Jiang, K.; Kim, M.-C.; Sim, E.; Burke, K. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* **2017**, *68*, 555–581.
- (42) TURBOMOLE V7.0 2015, a development of University of Karlsruhe and Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe GmbH, 1989-2007, TURBOMOLE GmbH, since 2007; available from <http://www.turbomole.com>.

- (43) Janssen, C. L.; Nielsen, I. M. *Chemical Physics Letters* **1998**, *290*, 423 – 430.
- (44) Paldus, J.; Li, X. *Advances in Chemical Physics* **1999**, *110*, 1–176.
- (45) Foulkes, W. M.; Mitas, L.; Needs, R. J.; Rajagopal, G. *Reviews of Modern Physics* **2001**, *73*, 33–83.
- (46) Shulenburger, L.; Mattsson, T. R. *Physical Review B* **2013**, *88*, 1–8.
- (47) Santana, J. A.; Krogel, J. T.; Kent, P. R. C.; Reboredo, F. A. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2016**, *144*, 174707.
- (48) Krogel, J. T.; Santana, J. A.; Reboredo, F. A. *Physical Review B* **2016**, *93*, 075143.
- (49) Zheng, H.; Wagner, L. K. *Physical Review Letters* **2015**, *114*, 176401.
- (50) Schiller, J. A.; Wagner, L. K.; Ertekin, E. *Physical Review B* **2015**, *92*, 235209.
- (51) Petruzielo, F. R.; Toulouse, J.; Umrigar, C. J. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2012**, *136*, 124116.
- (52) Benali, A.; Shulenburger, L.; Romero, N. A.; Kim, J.; von Lilienfeld, O. A. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2014**, *10*, 3417–3422.
- (53) Dubecky, M.; Jurecka, P.; Derian, R.; Hobza, P.; Otyepka, M.; Mitas, L. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2013**, *9*, 4287–4292.
- (54) Dubecky, M.; Derian, R.; Jurecka, P.; Mitas, L.; Hobza, P.; Otyepka, M. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **2014**, *16*, 20915–20923.
- (55) Mitas, L.; Shirley, E. L.; Ceperley, D. M. *Journal of Chemical Physics* **1991**, *95*, 3467.
- (56) Scemama, A.; Applencourt, T.; Giner, E.; Caffarel, M. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2014**, *141*, 244110.

- (57) Morales, M. A.; McMinis, J.; Clark, B. K.; Kim, J.; Scuseria, G. E. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2012**, *8*, 2181–2188.
- (58) Wagner, L. K.; Ceperley, D. M. *Reports on Progress in Physics* **2016**, *79*, 094501.
- (59) Doblhoff-Dier, K.; Meyer, J.; Hoggan, P. E.; Kroes, G.-J.; Wagner, L. K. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2016**, *12*, 2583–2597, PMID: 27175914.
- (60) Benali, A.; Shulenburger, L.; Krogel, J. T.; Zhong, X.; Kent, P. R. C.; Heinonen, O. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **2016**, *18*, 18323–18335.
- (61) Luo, Y.; Benali, A.; Shulenburger, L.; Krogel, J. T.; Heinonen, O.; Kent, P. R. C. *New Journal of Physics* **2016**, *18*, 113049.
- (62) Santana, J. A.; Krogel, J. T.; Kim, J.; Kent, P. R. C.; Reboredo, F. A. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2015**, *142*, 164705.
- (63) Wagner, L. K. *Physical Review B* **2015**, *92*, 161116.
- (64) Caffarel, M.; Applencourt, T.; Giner, E.; Scemama, A. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2016**, *144*, 151103.
- (65) Booth, G. H.; Gruneis, A.; Kresse, G.; Alavi, A. *Nature* **2013**, *493*, 365–370.
- (66) Tsatsoulis, T.; Hummel, F.; Usvyat, D.; Schütz, M.; Booth, G. H.; Binnie, S. S.; Gillan, M. J.; Alfè, D.; Michaelides, A.; Grüneis, A. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2017**, *146*, 204108.
- (67) Kim, J.; Esler, K. P.; McMinis, J.; Morales, M. A.; Clark, B. K.; Shulenburger, L.; Ceperley, D. M. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **2012**, *402*, 012008.
- (68) Kim, J.; Esler, K.; McMinis, J.; Ceperley, D. M. Quantum Monte Carlo algorithms: making most of large-scale multi-/many-core clusters. Chattanooga, TN, 2010.

- (69) Mathuriya, A.; Luo, Y.; Benali, A.; Shulenburger, L.; Kim, J. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02665* **2016**,
- (70) Mitáš, L. *Physical Review A* **1994**, *49*, 4411.
- (71) Kohn, W.; Sham, L. J. *Physical Review* **1965**, *140*, A1133.
- (72) Perdew, J. P. *MRS Bulletin* **2013**, *38*, 743–750.
- (73) Cohen, A. J.; Mori-Sánchez, P.; Yang, W. *Science* **2008**, *321*, 792–794.
- (74) Verma, P.; Perera, A.; Bartlett, R. J. *Chemical Physics Letters* **2012**, *524*, 10 – 15.
- (13) Becke, A. D. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1993**, *98*, 5648–5652.
- (76) Giner, E.; Scemama, A.; Caffarel, M. *Canadian Journal of Chemistry* **2013**, *91*, 879–885.
- (77) Boguslawski, K.; Jacob, C. R.; Reiher, M. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2011**, *7*, 2740–2752.
- (78) Boguslawski, K.; Marti, K. H.; Legeza, O.; Reiher, M. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **2012**, *8*, 1970–1982.
- (79) <http://tccl.yonsei.ac.kr/mediawiki/index.php/DC-DFT>.
- (80) Blum, V.; Scheffler, M.; Gehrke, R.; Hanke, F.; Havu, P.; Havu, V.; Ren, X.; Reuter, K.; Scheffler, M. The Fritz Haber Institute ab initio molecular simulations package (FHI-aims). <http://www.fhi-berlin.mpg.de/aims>, 2009.

Supporting Information

All HF, DFT, HF-DFT, and CCSD(T) calculations were carried out with TURBOMOLE v7.0.2.¹ We used the LDA, GGA (PBE, BP86, BLYP), mGGA (TPSS), Hybrid (TPSSh, B3LYP, PBE0, HH) functions to investigate the functional dependency across the various stages of "Jacob's ladder".² When optimizing the structure using LDA, GGA, and mGGA functions, it has well-known energetic issues, such as the LS over-stabilization and/or the over-binding molecular bonding.^{3,4} For instance, in the HS spin state of octahedral geometry, it is experimentally well known that an axial metal-ligand bond distance is 10-20% larger than that of an equatorial bond, but GGA often predicts all metal-ligand bonds to be equivalent. Such a characteristic is, in fact, a representative feature of the LS structure. Therefore, for each spin state of the $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ complex, we used the optimized structure using B3LYP, regardless of the method used for energy calculations. In order to reduce the self-interaction error while maintaining the DFT level of computational efficiency, the corrected density was obtained from the HF calculation and the improved HF-DFT energy was obtained by applying the HF density to the approximate density functional. HF often results in a poor density when small basis set is used,⁵ thus, we employed cc-pVTZ basis set^{6,7} for all HF, DFT, HF-DFT, and CCSD(T) calculations. For all HF and DFT calculation, we adopted 10^{-8} self-consistent energy and 10^{-6} for one-electron density matrix convergence criteria. Lebedev's spherical grid integration was used for the DFT spherical integration and gridsize 6, i.e. 974 gridpoints were used. Multipole accelerated RI-J was used for the fast evaluation of the Coulomb potential.⁸ All calculations on open-shell complexes were performed in C_1 symmetry.

We found agreement for self-consistent DFT and HF to within less than 0.1 eV on all SA energies when cc-pVTZ basis was used in TURBOMOLE and compared with the "really tight" default basis set and mesh in FHI-aims. The HF and PBE densities in Fig. 3 were generated using the default "really tight" setting for meshes and basis sets. Total electronic densities were collected from these calculations for comparison with DMC and GAMESS

densities on a 10 \AA^3 Cartesian grid with a spacing of 0.1 \AA along the x - y , and z -directions.

A three-body Jastrow function reduced significantly the variance of the systems, and its parameters were carefully converged within variational MC. Both HF and DFT Ψ_{AS} were used. They were generated and converged using the GAMESS package^{9,10} with a Gaussian basis set and an Effective Core Potential (ECP) developed specifically for many-body theory by Burkatzki, Filippi and Dolg.^{11,12} The ECP introduces errors below the FN-DMC error bar while reducing significantly the computation time. For each atom, we use the basis set for which the ECP was developed: ANO-ccpVTZ¹² for Fe and a cc-pVTZ¹¹ for the remaining atoms, respectively. (Increasing to quintuple zeta produced changes smaller than the error bars of FN-DMC, confirming previous observations of weak basis-set dependence. Initial $\Psi_{AS}(\text{DFT})$ wavefunctions were generated using B3LYP,^{13,14} as its energies were about $0.13 \pm 0.03 \text{ eV}$ below those from LDA wavefunction.¹⁵ To reach a statistical error bar below 0.03 eV per molecule and to avoid any correlated sampling or population bias, we used 8192 walkers. A time step of 0.001 a.u. introduced negligible error.

Raw data with cc-pVTZ basis set

Table S1: Raw data of $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ where L is CO, and H₂O. HF-DFT indicates DC-DFT with HF density.¹⁶

	CO		H ₂ O	
	HS	LS	HS	LS
	AB INITIO			
HF	-1938.596688	-1938.425659	-1718.487158	-1718.355787
CCSD	-1941.486969	-1941.501497	-1720.712183	-1720.639633
CCSD(T)	-1941.61279	-1941.661758	-1720.774355	-1720.7099
	SC-DFT			
SVWN	-1935.562476	-1935.75007	-1716.324658	-1716.307699
BP86	-1943.524592	-1943.645874	-1722.303555	-1722.263269
BLYP	-1943.282952	-1943.383951	-1722.036727	-1722.001664
PBE	-1942.315225	-1942.439855	-1721.33526	-1721.293755
TPSS	-1943.431767	-1943.544462	-1722.135513	-1722.101699
TPSSh	-1943.318874	-1943.401835	-1722.071487	-1722.027418
B3LYP	-1942.918583	-1942.965452	-1721.807611	-1721.755856
PBE0	-1942.307023	-1942.356275	-1721.373081	-1721.308412
HH	-1942.925932	-1942.898408	-1721.836892	-1721.764887
	HF-DFT			
SVWN(HF)	-1935.324969	-1935.400057	-1716.179002	-1716.123761
BP86(HF)	-1943.359619	-1943.379374	-1722.205822	-1722.133963
BLYP(HF)	-1943.098747	-1943.108379	-1721.922532	-1721.861337
PBE(HF)	-1942.149806	-1942.169324	-1721.240425	-1721.166759
TPSS(HF)	-1943.300547	-1943.323445	-1722.05761	-1721.996494
TPSSh(HF)	-1943.216065	-1943.226898	-1722.011766	-1721.945904
B3LYP(HF)	-1942.803829	-1942.7941	-1721.737777	-1721.670029
PBE0(HF)	-1942.221245	-1942.212253	-1721.326427	-1721.244492
HH(HF)	-1942.88147	-1942.835129	-1721.810121	-1721.732972

Table S2: Raw data of $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ where L is CO and H₂O. "aimsRT2" indicates FHI-aims¹⁷ with the default "really tight" settings for basis set, mesh, and angular momentum expansion of the Hartree potential; "aimsRT3+2" indicates the "really tight" default setting for mesh and expansion of the Hartree potential and the Tier 3 basis set with added two Tier 4 basis functions for Fe (hydro 5 f 12 and hydro g 10.4). Relativistic corrections were turned off with the setting "override_relativity .true."

	CO		H ₂ O	
	HS	LS	HS	LS
FHI-aims				
HF(aimsRT2)	-1938.59753	-1938.43178	-1718.494936	-1718.366256
HF(aimsRT3+2)	-1938.63999	-1938.46939	-1718.520974	-1718.391508
B3LYP(aimsRT2)	-1943.40144	-1943.44917	-1722.185538	-1722.13375
B3LYP(aimsRT3+2)	-1943.406195	-1943.453468	-1722.188232	-1722.136102
GAMESS (cc-pVTZ)				
HF(gam)		-1938.589781	-1938.425386	
B3LYP(gam)	-1942.914743	-1942.965171	-1721.803708	-1721.754757
DMC				
DMC(B3LYP)	-1943.323152	-1943.344858	-1722.234695	-1722.169160
Error	0.000713	0.000669	0.000546	0.000598

Table S3: Raw data of $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ where L is NCH and NH_3 .

	NCH		NH_3	
	HS	LS	HS	LS
	AB INITIO			
HF	-1819.620374	-1819.487347	-1599.491142	-1599.371166
CCSD	-1822.423771	-1822.390926	-1601.621124	-1601.58094
CCSD(T)	-1822.547794	-1822.531749	-1601.685784	-1601.657385
	SC-DFT			
SVWN	-1816.857548	-1816.93601	-1597.590343	-1597.622558
BP86	-1824.320552	-1824.353601	-1603.094831	-1603.095664
BLYP	-1824.044252	-1824.072593	-1602.780882	-1602.782754
PBE	-1823.179736	-1823.212964	-1602.195969	-1602.196691
TPSS	-1824.237428	-1824.271398	-1602.943456	-1602.948892
TPSSh	-1824.142661	-1824.15655	-1602.892938	-1602.884685
B3LYP	-1823.74587	-1823.739341	-1602.608817	-1602.58767
PBE0	-1823.202688	-1823.187878	-1602.255415	-1602.224025
HH	-1823.765913	-1823.719894	-1602.643047	-1602.594119
	HF-DFT			
SVWN(HF)	-1816.63952	-1816.638734	-1597.442603	-1597.420226
BP86(HF)	-1824.171878	-1824.136674	-1602.995131	-1602.950198
BLYP(HF)	-1823.875086	-1823.842955	-1602.665414	-1602.62815
PBE(HF)	-1823.032117	-1822.995094	-1602.099135	-1602.052967
TPSS(HF)	-1824.121705	-1824.09658	-1602.865679	-1602.831769
TPSSh(HF)	-1824.051686	-1824.02009	-1602.832908	-1602.793536
B3LYP(HF)	-1823.639404	-1823.598725	-1602.537834	-1602.49317
PBE0(HF)	-1823.125538	-1823.076015	-1602.206621	-1602.150437
HH(HF)	-1823.723703	-1823.667414	-1602.615548	-1602.559095

Table S4: Raw data of $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ where L is NCH and NH_3 .

	NCH		NH_3	
	HS	LS	HS	LS
	GAMES/ECP			
B3LYP(gam)	-1823.742016	-1823.738646	-1602.604559	-1602.586481
	DMC			
DMC(B3LYP)	-1824.201405	-1824.158306	-1603.025729	-1602.980673
Error	0.000968	0.000738	0.000565	0.000773

Table S5: $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_6]^{2+}$ xyz data.

CO_HS				CO_LS			
13				13			
Fe	0.0000013	-0.0000001	-0.0000001	Fe	0.0000002	0.0000002	0.0000001
C	0.0000037	-0.0072194	2.3405884	C	0.0000001	0.0000002	1.9494602
O	-0.0000299	-0.0415619	3.4549199	O	-0.0000002	-0.0000001	3.0656647
C	2.3029923	-0.0000137	-0.0000135	C	1.9494601	0.0000000	-0.0000001
O	3.4182461	-0.0000170	-0.0000168	O	3.0656646	-0.0000003	-0.0000005
C	-2.3029877	0.0000133	0.0000131	C	-1.9494597	0.0000000	-0.0000001
O	-3.4182415	0.0000167	0.0000165	O	-3.0656642	-0.0000003	-0.0000005
C	-0.0000019	0.0072196	-2.3405883	C	0.0000001	-0.0000001	-1.9494600
O	0.0000250	0.0415622	-3.4549197	O	-0.0000003	-0.0000004	-3.0656645
C	-0.0000028	-2.3369861	0.0065791	C	0.0000000	-1.9494597	0.0000002
O	0.0000240	-3.4513475	0.0412328	O	-0.0000003	-3.0656642	-0.0000001
C	0.0000037	2.3369862	-0.0065788	C	0.0000000	1.9494600	0.0000001
O	-0.0000326	3.4513476	-0.0412324	O	-0.0000003	3.0656646	0.0000004

Table S6: $[\text{Fe}(\text{NCH})_6]^{2+}$ xyz data.

NCH_HS				NCH_LS			
19				19			
Fe	0.0000000	0.0000005	-0.0000008	Fe	0.0000000	0.0000000	0.0000003
N	0.0000002	2.2062681	-0.0000002	N	0.0000000	1.9756648	0.0000002
N	-2.2009845	0.0000002	-0.0000003	N	-1.9756648	0.0000000	0.0000002
N	-0.0000004	-0.0000004	-2.2009794	N	-0.0000001	0.0000001	-1.9756664
N	-0.0000004	-0.0000004	2.2009781	N	0.0000000	0.0000001	1.9756669
N	2.2009844	0.0000010	-0.0000003	N	1.9756648	-0.0000001	0.0000002
N	0.0000007	-2.2062673	-0.0000003	N	0.0000000	-1.9756648	0.0000002
C	0.0000012	-3.3493502	0.0000003	C	0.0000004	-3.1177203	-0.0000002
H	0.0000016	-4.4237178	0.0000007	H	0.0000007	-4.1914191	-0.0000004
C	-3.3446088	0.0000009	0.0000007	C	-3.1177203	-0.0000005	-0.0000002
H	-4.4184325	0.0000014	0.0000013	H	-4.1914191	-0.0000008	-0.0000005
C	-0.0000010	-0.0000013	-3.3446039	C	-0.0000004	0.0000004	-3.1177221
H	-0.0000013	-0.0000020	-4.4184276	H	-0.0000007	0.0000007	-4.1914211
C	3.3446087	0.0000005	0.0000006	C	3.1177203	-0.0000005	-0.0000002
H	4.4184324	0.0000002	0.0000013	H	4.1914191	-0.0000008	-0.0000005
C	-0.0000010	-0.0000013	3.3446025	C	-0.0000005	0.0000004	3.1177226
H	-0.0000014	-0.0000020	4.4184262	H	-0.0000008	0.0000007	4.1914216
C	0.0000007	3.3493510	0.0000003	C	0.0000004	3.1177203	-0.0000002
H	0.0000011	4.4237186	0.0000007	H	0.0000007	4.1914191	-0.0000004

Table S7: $[\text{Fe}(\text{NH}_3)_6]^{2+}$ xyz data.

NH3_HS				NH3_LS			
25				25			
Fe	-1.6827629	-0.5620638	0.0006858	Fe	-1.6825128	-0.5610153	-0.0006961
N	-1.7654701	1.7386430	-0.0155915	N	-1.7424118	1.5552120	0.0158045
H	-2.3091690	2.1062136	0.7643967	H	-2.4036875	1.9339858	0.6938915
H	-0.8575605	2.1961896	0.0569999	H	-0.8559216	2.0036953	0.2471666
H	-2.1985074	2.1444062	-0.8446345	H	-2.0193966	1.9820701	-0.8682401
N	0.6370910	-0.4829211	0.0198374	N	0.4336893	-0.5015161	0.0181596
H	1.0410909	-0.1381987	0.8898340	H	0.8440623	-0.2468840	0.9166699
H	1.0933299	-1.3794527	-0.1444124	H	0.8887488	-1.3803696	-0.2288050
H	1.0148101	0.1305669	-0.7014791	H	0.8222226	0.1746500	-0.6393939
N	-4.0024708	-0.5711646	-0.0821798	N	-3.7986910	-0.5778442	-0.0617939
H	-4.4120209	-1.4547568	-0.3829660	H	-4.2102994	-1.4780144	-0.3084425
H	-4.4588691	-0.3582133	0.8039661	H	-4.2539588	-0.3220773	0.8144309
H	-4.3743783	0.1202099	-0.7325748	H	-4.1858156	0.0740192	-0.7442454
N	-1.6769265	-2.8574940	0.0683045	N	-1.6610569	-2.6779301	0.0242933
H	-2.4248044	-3.2491480	0.6399273	H	-2.3903796	-3.0814636	0.6123051
H	-1.8046273	-3.2785580	-0.8511997	H	-1.7968348	-3.1174279	-0.8861569
H	-0.8224786	-3.2773553	0.4326991	H	-0.7980809	-3.0901543	0.3789793
N	-1.6947644	-0.6233020	2.2950899	N	-1.7053421	-0.5825425	2.1162469
H	-0.9567299	-1.2059553	2.6891561	H	-0.9813845	-1.1763493	2.5209486
H	-1.5535805	0.2946430	2.7152532	H	-1.5616171	0.3273586	2.5543575
H	-2.5558826	-0.9737822	2.7131764	H	-2.5715855	-0.9289025	2.5286917
N	-1.5929695	-0.5620411	-2.2999504	N	-1.6210680	-0.5813637	-2.1168366
H	-1.0185358	-1.3236265	-2.6592866	H	-0.9545040	-1.2553296	-2.4936978
H	-2.4963312	-0.6738135	-2.7585987	H	-2.5055538	-0.8204390	-2.5652371
H	-1.1916622	0.2796750	-2.7122128	H	-1.3505210	0.3037723	-2.5455600

Table S8: $[\text{Fe}(\text{H}_2\text{O})_6]^{2+}$ xyz data.

H2O_HS				H2O_LS			
19				19			
Fe	-1.6845392	-0.7206701	-0.1386922	Fe	-1.6845545	-0.7208248	-0.1387753
O	-1.7225165	1.4435451	-0.0788233	O	-1.8371609	1.3103074	-0.2366417
H	-2.2327347	2.0721657	-0.6081837	H	-2.7248031	1.6951387	-0.1781363
H	-1.1836565	1.9689883	0.5299181	H	-1.2260721	1.9506903	0.1550818
O	0.4742655	-0.5541733	-0.1258573	O	0.3478431	-0.6860383	0.0239942
H	1.1321101	-1.0258989	0.4036902	H	0.8167239	-1.5311871	-0.0487537
H	0.9645036	0.0562592	-0.6951254	H	0.9394100	-0.0045677	-0.3261609
O	-3.8432628	-0.8879805	-0.1526380	O	-3.7191775	-0.7293063	-0.2749855
H	-4.3335551	-1.4967341	0.4183794	H	-4.3343364	-1.1264790	0.3580976
H	-4.5012426	-0.4156202	-0.6814497	H	-4.1078491	-0.8432878	-1.1555310
O	-1.6468488	-2.8848921	-0.1975952	O	-1.5049607	-2.7508363	-0.0662374
H	-2.1866691	-3.4101261	-0.8056683	H	-1.8213499	-3.3785131	-0.7317227
H	-1.1337667	-3.5136153	0.3288629	H	-1.6098710	-3.1783680	0.7972597
O	-1.8336924	-0.6522882	2.0203864	O	-1.6955636	-0.7997349	1.8988762
H	-1.3324137	-1.1313887	2.6948456	H	-0.8512825	-0.6664715	2.3558853
H	-2.4655514	-0.0913583	2.4927695	H	-2.3885668	-0.4582020	2.4820276
O	-1.5352491	-0.7884118	-2.2977680	O	-1.6983650	-0.6692265	-2.1773196
H	-0.9010307	-1.3468668	-2.7699235	H	-1.2754814	-1.3071697	-2.7698947
H	-2.0404799	-0.3138537	-2.9724876	H	-1.6308724	0.1989462	-2.6029238

Table S9: Fe^{2+} atomic charge of $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ with various Metal-Ligand distance. DFT shows insufficient atomic charge due to the self-interaction error while HF does not.

	RM-L	HF	PBE	LS	HF	PBE
CO_HS	Req=2.3	1.08	0.57	CO_LS	Req=1.9	0.33
	Rinf=5.0	1.94	1.16		Rinf=5.0	1.93
NCH_HS	Req=2.2	1.70	1.04	NCH_LS	Req=2.0	1.37
	Rinf=5.0	1.95	1.21		Rinf=5.0	1.95
NH3_HS	Req=2.3	1.46	0.72	NH3_LS	Req=2.1	1.32
					Rinf=5.0	
H2O_HS	Req=2.2	1.43	0.79	H2O_LS	Req=2.0	1.31
	Rinf=5.0	1.95	1.02		Rinf=5.0	1.94

Table S10: $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ HOMO-LUMO gap of HF and PBE. Note that all units are eV.

	HF	PBE
CO_HS	15.33	0.45
CO_LS	17.99	3.98
NCH_HS	15.04	0.43
NCH_LS	16.38	2.44
NH3_HS	13.82	0.47
NH3_LS	15.40	1.91
H2O_HS	14.57	0.66
H2O_LS	16.25	1.38

Data with TZVP basis set

Table S11: Raw data of $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ where L is CO, and H₂O, TZVP basis set.

	CO		H2O	
	HS	LS	HS	LS
	AB INITIO			
HF	-1938.544195	-1938.368443	-1718.45312	-1718.315537
CCSD	-1940.931932	-1940.919423	-1720.182227	-1720.098026
CCSD(T)	-1941.026375	-1941.038878	-1720.220097	-1720.141748
	SC-DFT			
SVWN_TZVP	-1935.562476	-1935.75007	-1716.324658	-1716.307699
BP86_TZVP	-1943.490062	-1943.609566	-1722.272681	-1722.230268
BLYP_TZVP	-1943.245756	-1943.345428	-1722.004401	-1721.967074
PBE_TZVP	-1942.28028	-1942.403351	-1721.304821	-1721.261134
TPSS_TZVP	-1943.39643	-1943.507391	-1722.107634	-1722.072356
TPSSh_TZVP	-1943.282565	-1943.36364	-1722.043473	-1721.998094
B3LYP_TZVP	-1942.879188	-1942.924235	-1721.775629	-1721.721931
PBE0_TZVP	-1942.269433	-1942.316757	-1721.343075	-1721.276812
HH_TZVP	-1942.883119	-1942.853297	-1721.805249	-1721.730594
	HF-DFT			
SVWN(HF)_TZVP	-1935.299796	-1935.378935	-1716.15509	-1716.105853
BP86(HF)_TZVP	-1943.333361	-1943.356739	-1722.1811	-1722.114554
BLYP(HF)_TZVP	-1943.071378	-1943.084017	-1721.897645	-1721.840542
PBE(HF)_TZVP	-1942.122074	-1942.145724	-1721.215951	-1721.147715
TPSS(HF)_TZVP	-1943.270719	-1943.296682	-1722.034244	-1721.977504
TPSSh(HF)_TZVP	-1943.184032	-1943.197198	-1721.987336	-1721.924908
B3LYP(HF)_TZVP	-1942.771561	-1942.763296	-1721.711073	-1721.645457
PBE0(HF)_TZVP	-1942.187458	-1942.180504	-1721.299684	-1721.220548
HH(HF)_TZVP	-1942.841231	-1942.79396	-1721.780398	-1721.702109

Table S12: Raw data of $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ where L is NCH and NH_3 , TZVP basis set.

	NCH		NH_3	
	HS	LS	HS	LS
AB INITIO				
HF	-1819.575158	-1819.435748	-1599.452665	-1599.327687
CCSD	-1821.896763	-1821.846661	-1601.123217	-1601.069463
CCSD(T)	-1821.990379	-1821.952622	-1601.165067	-1601.119688
SC-DFT				
SVWN_TZVP	-1816.857548	-1816.93601	-1597.590343	-1597.622558
BP86_TZVP	-1824.284226	-1824.315432	-1603.057978	-1603.056034
BLYP_TZVP	-1824.005452	-1824.032018	-1602.741823	-1602.741127
PBE_TZVP	-1823.14398	-1823.175345	-1602.159974	-1602.157843
TPSS_TZVP	-1824.201308	-1824.234426	-1602.909479	-1602.913085
TPSSh_TZVP	-1824.106194	-1824.119101	-1602.85921	-1602.849486
B3LYP_TZVP	-1823.706825	-1823.698327	-1602.571109	-1602.548127
PBE0_TZVP	-1823.166204	-1823.149511	-1602.2208	-1602.187785
HH_TZVP	-1823.726392	-1823.67743	-1602.606373	-1602.555522
HF-DFT				
SVWN(HF)_TZVP	-1816.613916	-1816.618223	-1597.415187	-1597.399208
BP86(HF)_TZVP	-1824.143582	-1824.112787	-1602.966054	-1602.926874
BLYP(HF)_TZVP	-1823.846515	-1823.817712	-1602.635138	-1602.602517
PBE(HF)_TZVP	-1823.003816	-1822.971334	-1602.070621	-1602.03038
TPSS(HF)_TZVP	-1824.090705	-1824.069565	-1602.83662	-1602.80771
TPSSh(HF)_TZVP	-1824.019271	-1823.990722	-1602.80304	-1602.767774
B3LYP(HF)_TZVP	-1823.607715	-1823.568499	-1602.50611	-1602.464246
PBE0(HF)_TZVP	-1823.093083	-1823.045631	-1602.176074	-1602.123345
HH(HF)_TZVP	-1823.687019	-1823.629106	-1602.5811	-1602.524398

Table S13: Raw data of $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$, cc-pVDZ basis where L is CO, H₂O, NCH and NH₃

	cc-pVDZ	
	CCSD(T)	CCSD
CO_HS	-1940.683472	-1940.601943
CO_LS	-1940.718958	-1940.608786
H2O_HS	-1720.005539	-1719.974971
H2O_LS	-1719.933587	-1719.896417
NCH_HS	-1821.683798	-1821.600966
NCH_LS	-1821.655531	-1821.559138
NH3_HS	-1601.02068	-1600.983348
NH3_LS	-1600.984901	-1600.937788

Table S14: $[\text{Fe}(\text{L})_6]^{2+}$ D1 diagnostics (CCSD) of cc-pVDZ, cc-pVTZ and TZVP basis sets.

	cc-pVDZ	cc-pVTZ	TZVP
CO_HS	0.0598	0.0602	0.0538
CO_LS	0.1419	0.1438	0.1305
H2O_HS	0.0374	0.0381	0.0339
H2O_LS	0.059	0.0604	0.0536
NCH_HS	0.0591	0.0508	0.0503
NCH_LS	0.0866	0.0874	0.0853
NH3_HS	0.0562	0.0575	0.0494
NH3_LS	0.0865	0.0872	0.076

List of Figures

Figure 1. Spin adiabatic energy differences in eV of Fe complexes for various DFT calculations and CCSD(T). All DFT and HF-DFT used TZVP basis set.

Figure 2. SA rainbow plot of NCH complex evaluated with several different XC approximations on different self-consistent densities (red dots) and the HF density (blue bar) using TZVP basis set. The x-axis labels the energy functional, the colored bars indicate which density (grey is LDA, yellow is GGA/mGGA, green is hybrid, and blue is HF). The dark green bar uses the self-consistent density of Becke's half-and-half functional (HH), which contains 50% exact exchange.

Figure 3. *a*PBE and HF-*a*PBE of $[\text{Fe}(\text{NCH})_6]^{2+}$, TZVP basis set.




Figure S1: Spin adiabatic energy differences in eV of Fe complexes for various DFT calculations and CCSD(T). All DFT and HF-DFT used TZVP basis set.




Figure S2: SA rainbow plot of NCH complex evaluated with several different XC approximations on different self-consistent densities (red dots) and the HF density (blue bar) using TZVP basis set. The x-axis labels the energy functional, the colored bars indicate which density (grey is LDA, yellow is GGA/mGGA, green is hybrid, and blue is HF). The dark green bar uses the self-consistent density of Becke's half-and-half functional (HH), which contains 50% exact exchange.




Figure S3: *a*PBE and HF-*a*PBE of $[\text{Fe}(\text{NCH})_6]^{2+}$, TZVP basis set.

References

- (1) TURBOMOLE V7.0 2015, a development of University of Karlsruhe and Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe GmbH, 1989-2007, TURBOMOLE GmbH, since 2007; available from <http://www.turbomole.com>.
- (2) Perdew, J. P. *MRS Bulletin* **2013**, *38*, 743–750.
- (3) Droghetti, A.; Alfè, D.; Sanvito, S. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2012**, *137*, 124303.
- (4) Kepp, K. P. *Coordination Chemistry Reviews* **2013**, *257*, 196–209.
- (5) Ning, C.; Hajgató, B.; Huang, Y.; Zhang, S.; Liu, K.; Luo, Z.; Knippenberg, S.; Deng, J.; Deleuze, M. *Chemical Physics* **2008**, *343*, 19–30.
- (6) Dunning Jr, T. H. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1989**, *90*, 1007–1023.
- (7) Balabanov, N. B.; Peterson, K. A. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2005**, *123*, 064107.
- (8) Treutler, O.; Ahlrichs, R. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1995**, *102*, 346–354.
- (9) Schmidt, M. W.; Baldridge, K. K.; Boatz, J. A.; Elbert, S. T.; Gordon, M. S.; Jensen, J. H.; Koseki, S.; Matsunaga, N.; Nguyen, K. A.; Su, S.; Windus, T. L.; Dupuis, M.; Montgomery, J. A. *Journal of Computational Chemistry* **1993**, *14*, 1347–1363.
- (10) Dykstra, C.; Frenking, G.; Kim, K.; Scuseria, G. *Theory and Applications of Computational Chemistry: the first forty years*; Elsevier, 2011.
- (11) Burkatzki, M.; Filippi, C.; Dolg, M. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2007**, *126*, 234105.
- (12) Burkatzki, M.; Filippi, C.; Dolg, M. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **2008**, *129*, 164115.
- (13) Becke, A. D. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **1993**, *98*, 5648–5652.
- (14) Stephens, P.; Devlin, F.; Chabalowski, C.; Frisch, M. J. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry* **1994**, *98*, 11623–11627.

(15) Perdew, J. P.; Zunger, A. *Physical Review B* **1981**, *23*, 5048.

(16) <http://tccl.yonsei.ac.kr/mediawiki/index.php/DC-DFT>.

(17) available at <https://aimsclub.fhi-berlin.mpg.de>.