

1 Real-Time Dynamics and Conical Intersections

M.E. Casida, B. Natarajan, and T. Deutsch

Mark E. Casida

*Laboratoire de Chimie Théorique,
Département de Chimie Moléculaire (DCM, UMR CNRS/UJF 5250),
Institut de Chimie Moléculaire de Grenoble (ICMG, FR2607),
Université Joseph Fourier (Grenoble I),
301 rue de la Chimie, BP 53,
F-38041 Grenoble Cedex 9, FRANCE*
Mark.Casida@UJF-Grenoble.Fr

Bhaarathi Natarajan

*Laboratoire de Chimie Théorique,
Département de Chimie Moléculaire (DCM, UMR CNRS/UJF 5250),
Institut de Chimie Moléculaire de Grenoble (ICMG, FR2607),
Université Joseph Fourier (Grenoble I),
301 rue de la Chimie, BP 53,
F-38041 Grenoble Cedex 9, FRANCE*

and

*CEA, INAC, SP2M, L_Sim,
38054 Grenoble Cedex 9, FRANCE*
bhaarathi.natarajan@UJF-Grenoble.FR

Thierry Deutsch

*CEA, INAC, SP2M, L_Sim,
38054 Grenoble Cedex 9, FRANCE*
thierry.deutsch@cea.fr

1.1 Introduction

The area of excited-state dynamics is receiving increasing attention for a number of reasons, including the importance of photochemical processes in basic energy sciences, improved theoretical methods and the associated theoretical understanding of photochemical processes, and the advent of femtosecond (and now attosecond) spectroscopy allowing access to more detailed experimental information about photochemical processes. Since photophysical and chemical processes are more complex than thermal (i.e., ground state) processes, simulations quickly become expensive and even unmanageable as the




Fig. 1.1. Schematic representation of potential energy surfaces for photophysical and photochemical processes: S_0 , ground singlet state; S_1 , lowest excited singlet state; T_1 , lowest triplet state; ABS, absorption; FLUO, fluorescence; PHOS, phosphorescence; ISX, intersystem crossing; CX, conical intersection; TS, transition state.

model system becomes increasingly realistic. With its combination of simplicity and yet relatively good accuracy, TDDFT has been finding an increasingly important role to play in this rapidly developing field. After reviewing some basic ideas from photophysics and photochemistry, this chapter will cover some of the strengths and weaknesses of TDDFT for modeling photoprocesses. The emphasis will be on going beyond the Born-Oppenheimer approximation.

There are distinct differences between how solid-state physicists and chemical physicists view photoprocesses. We believe that some of this is due to fundamental differences in the underlying phenomena being studied but that much is due to the use of different approximations and the associated language. Ultimately anyone who wants to work at the nanointerface between molecules and solids must come to terms with these differences, but that is not our objective here. Instead we will adapt the point of view of a chemical physicist (or physical chemist)—see e.g., Ref. [Michl 1990].

The usual way to think about molecular dynamics is in terms of the potential energy surfaces that come out of the Born-Oppenheimer separation. In thermal processes, vibrations are associated with small motions around potential energy surface minima. Chemical reactions are usually described as going over passes (transition states) on these hypersurfaces as the system moves from one valley (reactants) to another (products). Photoprocesses are

much more complicated (Fig. 1.1). Traditionally they include not only processes that begin by absorption of a photon, but also any process involving electronically excited states, such as chemiluminescence (e.g., in fireflies and glow worms) where the initial excitation energy is provided by a chemical reaction. The Frank-Condon approximation tells us that the initial absorption of a photon will take us from one vibronic state to another without much change of molecular geometry, thus defining a Frank-Condon region on the excited-state potential energy surfaces. The molecule can return to the ground state by emitting a photon of the initial wave length or, depending upon vibronic coupling and perturbations from surrounding molecules, the molecule may undergo radiationless relaxation to a lower energy excited state before emitting or it may even decay all the way to the ground state without emitting. If emission takes place from a long-lived excited state of the same spin as the ground state, then we speak of fluorescence. If emission takes place from an excited-state with a different spin due to intersystem crossing, then we speak of phosphorescence. If it is unsure whether the emission is fluorescence or phosphorescence, then we just say the molecule luminesces. Because of the large variety of de-excitation processes, excited molecules usually return too quickly to their ground state for the molecular geometry to change much. We then speak of a photophysical process because no chemical reaction has taken place. Thus fluorescence is usually described as an excited molecule relaxing slightly to a nearby minimum on the excited-state potential energy surface where it is momentarily trapped before it emits to the ground state. It follows that the photon emitted during fluorescence is Stokes shifted to a lower energy than the photon initially absorbed.

Photochemical reactions occur when the excited molecule decays to a new minimum on the ground state surface, leading to a new chemical species (product). This may have positive value as a way for synthesizing new molecules or negative value because of photodegradation of materials or because of photochemically-induced cancers. Either way the photochemical reaction must occur quickly enough that it can compete with other decay processes. Photochemical reactions almost always occur via photochemical funnels where excited-state and ground-state surfaces come together, either almost touching (avoided crossing) or crossing (conical intersection). These funnels play a role in photochemical reactions similar to transition states for thermal reactions. However it must be kept in mind that these funnels may be far from the Frank-Condon region on the excited-state potential energy surface, either because there is an easy energetically-“downhill” process or because, unless the absorption wavelength can be carefully tuned to a known vertical excitation energy, the system will typically arrive in an electronically-excited state with excess dynamical energy which can be used to move from one excited-state potential energy surface valley over a transition state to funnels in another basin of the excited-state potential energy surface. While conical intersections are forbidden in diatomic molecules, they are now believed to

be omnipresent in the photochemistry of polyatomic molecules where the presence of an avoided crossing in potential energy surface cross-sections obtained from oversimplified models (e.g., those making simplifying symmetry assumptions) usually indicates a nearby conical intersection. A particularly striking example is provided by experimental and theoretical evidence that the fundamental photochemical reaction involved in vision passes through a conical intersection [Polli 2010]. For these reasons, modern photochemical modeling often involves some type of dynamics and, when this is not possible, at least focuses on finding conical intersections that can explain the reaction.

While a single-reference electronic structure method may be adequate for describing photophysical processes, the usual standard for describing photochemical processes is a multireference electronic structure method such as the complete active space self-consistent field (CASSCF) method. (See Ref. [Helgaker 2000] for a review of modern quantum chemical methods.) This is because the first approximation to the wave function along a reaction pathway is as a linear combination of the wave functions of the initial reactants and the final products. Since CASSCF is both computationally heavy and requires a high-level of user intervention, a simpler method such as TDDFT would be very much welcome. Early work in TDDFT in quantum chemistry foresaw increasing applications of TDDFT in photochemical modeling. For example, avoided crossings between cross-sections of excited-state potential energy surfaces may be described with TDDFT because of the multireference-like nature of TDDFT excited states [Casida 1998]. However great attention must also be paid to problems arising from the use of approximate functionals [Casida 2002]. In particular, the TDDFT Tamm-Dancoff approximation (TDA) [Hirata 1999] was found to give improved shapes of excited-state potential energy surfaces [Casida 2000, Cordova 2007], albeit at the price of losing oscillator strength sum rules. A major advance towards serious investigations of TDDFT for describing photoprocesses came with the implementation of analytical derivatives for photochemical excited states in many electronic structure programs [Van Caillie 1999, Van Caillie 2000, Furche 2002, Hutter 2003, Rappoport 2005, Doltsinis 2005, Scalmani 2006]. This made it possible to relax excited-state geometries and to calculate Stokes shifts within the framework of TDDFT. In fact, TDDFT has become a standard part of the photochemical modeler's toolbox. It is typically used for calculating absorption spectra and exploring excited-state potential energy surfaces around the Frank-Condon region. TDDFT also serves as a rapid way to gain the chemical information needed to carry out subsequent CASSCF calculations. (See e.g., Refs. [Diau 2001a, Diau 2001b, Diau 2002, Sølling 2002, Diau 2003] for some combined femtosecond spectroscopy/theoretical studies of photochemical reactions which make good use of TDDFT.) It would be nice to be able to use a single method to model entire photochemical processes. The advent of mixed TDDFT/classical surface-hopping Tully-type dynamics [Tapavicza 2007, Werner 2008, Tapavicza 2008, Tavernelli 2009, Tavernelli

2009, Barbatti 2010] is giving us a way to extend the power of TDDFT to the exploration of increasingly complicated photochemical processes.

The rest of this chapter is organized as follows: The next section reviews non-Born-Oppenheimer phenomena from a wave-function point of view, with an emphasis on mixed quantum/classical dynamics. This sets the stage for our discussion of TDDFT for real-time dynamics and conical intersections in Sec. 1.3. We sum up in Sec. 1.4.

1.2 Wave-Function Theory

Most likely anyone who has made it this far into this chapter has seen the Born-Oppenheimer approximation at least once, if not many times. However it is relatively rare to find good discussions that go beyond the Born-Oppenheimer approximation [Doltsinis 2002, Cederbaum 2004]. This section tries to do just this from a wave-function point of view, in preparation for a discussion of TDDFT approaches to the same problems in the following section. We first begin by reviewing (again!) the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, but this time with the point of view of identifying the missing terms. We then discuss mixed quantum/classical approximations, and end with a discussion of the pathway method and ways to find and characterize conical intersections. *We shall use Hartree atomic units ($\hbar = m_e = e = 1$) throughout and adapt the convention in this section that electronic states are labeled by small Latin letters, while nuclear degrees of freedom are labeled by capital Latin letters.*

Born-Oppenheimer Approximation and Beyond

As is well-known, the Born-Oppenheimer approximation relies on a separation of time scales: Since electrons are so much lighter and so move so much faster than nuclei, the electrons may be thought of as moving in the field of nuclei which are “clamped” in place and the nuclei move in a field which is determined by the mean field of the electrons. The Born-Oppenheimer approximation provides a precise mathematical formulation of this physical picture. Our interest here is in where the Born-Oppenheimer approximation breaks down and what terms are needed to describe this breakdown.

Consider a molecule composed of M nuclei and N electrons. Denote the nuclear coordinates by $\mathbf{R} = (\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \dots, \mathbf{R}_M)$ and electronic coordinates by $\mathbf{r} = (\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N)$. The full Hamiltonian, $\hat{H}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r}) = \hat{T}_n(\mathbf{R}) + \hat{H}_e(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}) + V_{nn}(\mathbf{R})$, is the sum of an electronic Hamiltonian, $\hat{H}_e(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}) = \hat{T}_e(\mathbf{r}) + V_{en}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}) + V_{ee}(\mathbf{r})$, with its electron kinetic energy, \hat{T}_e , electron-nuclear attraction, V_{en} , and electron-electron repulsion, V_{ee} , with the missing nuclear terms—namely the nuclear kinetic energy, \hat{T}_n , and the nuclear-nuclear repulsion, V_{nn} . Solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation,

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{r})\Phi(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{x}, t) = i\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{x}, t), \quad (1.1)$$

is a formidable $(N + M)$ -body problem. (\mathbf{x} denotes inclusion of electron spin. We have decided to omit nuclear spin, though this should be included in principle when identical nuclei with spin are present, such as in the case of *ortho*- and *para*-hydrogen.) That is why the Born-Oppenheimer expansion (which is not yet the Born-Oppenheimer approximation!),

$$\Phi(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_j \Psi_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{R}) \chi_j(\mathbf{R}, t), \quad (1.2)$$

is used, where the electronic wave functions are solutions of the time-independent electronic problem in the field of clamped nuclei, $\hat{H}_e(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R})\Psi_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{R}) = E_j^e(\mathbf{R})\Psi_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{R})$. Inserting the Born-Oppenheimer expansion [Eq. (1.2)] into the full Schrödinger equation [Eq. (1.1)], left multiplying by $\Psi_i^*(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{R})$, and integrating over \mathbf{x} gives the time-dependent Schrödinger equation for the nuclear degrees of freedom,

$$\left(\hat{T}_n(\mathbf{R}) + V_i(\mathbf{R})\right) \chi_i(\mathbf{R}, t) + \sum_j \hat{V}_{i,j}(\mathbf{R}) \chi_j(\mathbf{R}, t) = i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \chi_i(\mathbf{R}, t). \quad (1.3)$$

Here, $V_i(\mathbf{R}) = E_i^e(\mathbf{R}) + V_{nn}(\mathbf{R})$, is the *adiabatic* potential energy surface for the i th electronic state. [Notice that this is a different use of the term “adiabatic” than in the TDDFT “adiabatic approximation” for the exchange-correlation (xc) functional.] The remaining part, $\hat{V}_{i,j}(\mathbf{R})$, is the hopping term which couples the I th and J th PESs together. As is well known, the Born-Oppenheimer approximation neglects the hopping terms, $\left(\hat{T}_n(\mathbf{R}) + V_i(\mathbf{R})\right) \chi_i(\mathbf{R}, t) = i(\partial/\partial t)\chi_i(\mathbf{R}, t)$.

We, on the other hand, are interested in precisely the terms neglected by the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. The hopping term is given by, $\hat{V}_{i,j}(\mathbf{R})\chi_j(\mathbf{R}, t) = -\sum_I (1/2m_I) \left(G_{i,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) + 2\mathbf{F}_{i,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) \cdot \nabla_I\right) \chi_j(\mathbf{R}, t)$, where, $G_{i,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) = \int \Psi_i^*(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{R}) (\nabla_I^2 \Psi_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{R})) d\mathbf{x} = \langle i | \nabla_I^2 | j \rangle$, is the scalar coupling matrix and, $\mathbf{F}_{i,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) = \int \Psi_i^*(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{R}) (\nabla_I \Psi_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{R})) d\mathbf{x} = \langle i | \nabla_I | j \rangle$, is the derivative coupling matrix [Cederbaum 2004]. Note that the derivative coupling matrix is also often denoted $\mathbf{d}_{i,j}^I$ and called the nonadiabatic coupling vector [Doltsinis 2002]. Here we have introduced a compact notation for some complicated objects: The scalar coupling matrix is simultaneously a function of the nuclear coordinates, a matrix in the electronic degrees of freedom, and a vector in the nuclear degrees of freedom, and a matrix in the electronic degrees of freedom. The derivative coupling matrix is simultaneously a function of the nuclear coordinates, a matrix in the electronic degrees of freedom, a vector in the nuclear degrees of freedom *and* a vector in the three spatial coordinates of the I th nucleus.

Interestingly the scalar coupling matrix and derivative coupling matrix are not independent objects. Rather, making use of the resolution of the identity for the electronic states, it is straightforward to show that,

$\sum_k \left(\delta_{i,k} \nabla_I + \mathbf{F}_{i,k}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) \right) \cdot \left(\delta_{k,j} + \nabla_I \mathbf{F}_{k,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) \right) = \nabla_I^2 + G_{i,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) + 2\mathbf{F}_{i,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) \cdot \nabla_I$. We may then rewrite the time-dependent nuclear equation (1.3) as,

$$- \left\{ \sum_I \frac{1}{2m_I} \left[\sum_k \left(\delta_{i,j} \nabla_I + \mathbf{F}_{i,k}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) \right) \cdot \left(\delta_{k,j} \nabla_I + \mathbf{F}_{k,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) \right) \right] \right\} \chi_j(\mathbf{R}, t) + V_i(\mathbf{R}) \chi_i(\mathbf{R}, t) = i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \chi_j(\mathbf{R}, t), \quad (1.4)$$

which is known as the group Born-Oppenheimer equation [Cederbaum 2004]. Evidently this is an equation which can be solved within a truncated manifold of a few electronic states in order to find fully quantum mechanical solutions beyond the Born-Oppenheimer approximation.

More importantly for present purposes is that Eq. (1.4) brings out the importance of the derivative coupling matrix. The derivative coupling matrix can be rewritten as,

$$\mathbf{F}_{i,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) = \frac{\langle i | \left(\nabla_I \hat{H}_e(\mathbf{R}) \right) | j \rangle - \delta_{i,j} \nabla_I E_i^e(\mathbf{R})}{E_j^e(\mathbf{R}) - E_i^e(\mathbf{R})}. \quad (1.5)$$

Since this equation is basically a force-like term, divided by an energy difference, we see that we can neglect coupling between adiabatic potential energy surfaces when (i) the force on the nuclei is sufficiently small (i.e., the nuclei are not moving too quickly) and (ii) when the energy difference between potential energy surfaces is not too large. These conditions often break down in funnel regions of photochemical reactions. There is then a tendency to follow diabatic surfaces, which may be defined rigorously by a unitary transformation of electronic states (when it exists) to a new representation satisfying the condition, $\mathbf{F}_{i,j}^{(I)}(\mathbf{R}) \approx \mathbf{0}$. The advantage of the diabatic representation (when it exists, which is not always the case) is that it eliminates the off-diagonal elements of the derivative coupling matrix in the group Born-Oppenheimer equation [Eq. (1.4)], hence eliminating the need to describe surface hopping. At a more intuitive level, the character of electronic states tends to be preserved along diabatic surfaces because $\langle i | dj/dt \rangle = \dot{\mathbf{R}} \cdot \langle i | \nabla j \rangle = \dot{\mathbf{R}} \cdot \mathbf{F}_{i,j} \approx 0$ in this representation. For this reason, it is usual to trace diabatic surfaces informally in funnel regions by analyzing electronic state character, rather than seeking to minimize the nonadiabatic coupling vector. Avoided crossings of adiabatic surfaces are then described as due to configuration mixing of electronic configurations belonging to different diabatic surfaces.

Mixed Quantum/Classical Dynamics

Solving the fully quantum-mechanical dynamics problem of coupled electrons and nuclei is a challenge for small molecules and intractable for larger molecules. Instead it is usual to use mixed quantum/classical methods in

which the nuclei are described by Newtonian classical mechanics while the electrons are described by quantum mechanics. Dividing any quantum system into two parts and then approximating one using classical mechanics is the subject of on-going research [Kapral 2006]. In general, no rigorous derivation is possible and wave-function phase information (e.g., the Berry phase) is lost which may be important in some instances. Nevertheless mixed quantum/classical approximations are intuitive: Most nuclei (except perhaps hydrogen) are heavy enough that tunneling and other quantum mechanical effects are minor, so that classical dynamics is often an *a priori* reasonable first approximation. Of course, rather than thinking of a single classical trajectory for the nuclear degree of freedom, we must expect to think in terms of ensembles (or “swarms”) of trajectories which are built to incorporate either finite temperature effects or to try to represent quantum mechanical probability distributions or both. The purpose of this subsection is to introduce some common mixed quantum/classical methods.

The most elementary mixed quantum/classical approximation is Ehrenfest dynamics. According to Ehrenfest’s theorem [Ehrenfest 1927], Newton’s equations are satisfied for mean values in quantum systems, $d\langle\hat{\mathbf{r}}\rangle/dt = \langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle/m$ and $d\langle\hat{\mathbf{p}}\rangle/dt = -\langle\nabla V\rangle$. Identifying the position of the nuclei with their mean value, we can then write an equation, $m_I\ddot{\mathbf{R}}_I(t) = -\nabla_I V(\mathbf{R}(t))$, whose physical interpretation is that the nuclei are moving in the mean field of the electrons. Here

$$V(\mathbf{R}(t)) = \langle\Psi(\mathbf{R}, t)|\hat{H}_e(\mathbf{R}(t))|\Psi(\mathbf{R}, t)\rangle + V_{nn}(\mathbf{R}(t)), \quad (1.6)$$

where the electronic wave function is found by solving the time-dependent equation, $\hat{H}_e(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{R}(t))\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{R}, t) = i(\partial/\partial t)\Psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{R}, t)$. While Ehrenfest dynamics has been widely and often successfully applied, it suffers from some important drawbacks. The first drawback is that the nuclei always move on average potential energy surfaces, rather than adiabatic or diabatic surfaces, even when far from funnel regions where the nuclei would be expected to move on the surface of a single electronic state. While this is serious enough, since it suggests errors in calculating branching ratios (i.e., relative yields of different products in a photoreaction), a more serious drawback is a loss of microscopic reversibility. That is, the temporal variation of the mean potential energy surface depends upon past history and can easily be different for forward and reverse processes.

A very much improved scheme is the fewest switches method of Tully [Tully 1990, Hammes-Schiffer 1994]. Here the nuclei move on well-defined adiabatic potential energy surfaces, $m_I\ddot{\mathbf{R}}_I(t) = -\nabla_I V_i(\mathbf{R}(t))$, and the electrons move in the field of the moving nuclei, $\hat{H}_e(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}(t))\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = i(d/dt)\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$. To determine the probability that a classical trajectory describing nuclear motion hops from one electronic potential energy surface to another, we expand $\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = \sum_m \Psi_m(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}(t))C_m(t)$, in solutions of the time-independent Schrödinger equation, $\hat{H}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}(t))\Psi_m(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}(t)) = E_m(\mathbf{R}(t))\Psi_m(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}(t))$. The

probability of finding the system on surface m is then given by, $P_m(t) = |C_m(t)|^2$. The coefficients may be obtained in a dynamics calculation by integrating the first-order equation, $\dot{C}_m(t) = -iE_m(t)C_m(t) - \sum_n \langle m | (dn/dt) \rangle \times C_n(t)$. A not unimportant detail is that the nonadiabatic coupling elements need not be calculated explicitly, but instead can be calculated using the finite difference formula, $\langle m(t + \Delta t/2) | \dot{n}(t + \Delta t/2) \rangle = [\langle m(t) | n(t + \delta t) \rangle - \langle m(t + \Delta t) | n(t) \rangle] / (2\Delta t)$. In practice, it is also important to minimize the number of surface hops or switches in order to keep the cost of the dynamics calculation manageable. Tully accomplished this by introducing his fewest-switches algorithm which is a type of Monte Carlo procedure designed to correctly populate the different PESs with a minimum of surface hopping. Briefly, the probability of jumping from surface m to surface n in the interval $(t, t + \Delta t)$ is given by $g_{m \rightarrow n}(t, \Delta t) = \dot{P}_{m,n}(t)\Delta t / P_{m,m}(t)$ where $P_{m,n}(t) = C_m(t)C_n^*(t)$. A random number ξ is generated with uniform probability on the interval $(0, 1)$ and compared with $g_{m \rightarrow n}(t, \Delta t)$. The transition $m \rightarrow n$ occurs only if $P_n^{(m-1)} < \xi < P_n^{(m)}$ where $P_n^{(m)} = \sum_{l=1, m} P_{n,l}$ is the sum of the transition probabilities for the first m states. Additional details of the algorithm, beyond the scope of this chapter, involve readjustment of nuclear kinetic energies and the fineness of the numerical integration grid for the electronic part of the calculation with respect to that of the grid for the nuclear degrees of freedom.

It is occasionally useful to have a simpler theory for calculating the probability of potential energy surface hops which depends only on the potential energy surfaces and not on the wave functions. Such a theory was suggested by Landau [Landau 1932] and Zener [Zener 1932] (see also Wittig [Wittig 2005]). Their work predates the modern appreciation of the importance of conical intersections and so focused on surface hopping at avoided crossings. The Landau-Zener model assumes that surface hopping occurs only on the surface where the two diabatic surfaces cross that give rise to the avoided crossing where the surface hopping occurs. After some linearizations and an asymptotic limit, it is possible to arrive at a very simple final formula,

$$P = \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2 \Delta E_{adia}^2}{h(d|\Delta E_{dia}|/dt)}\right), \quad (1.7)$$

for the probability of hopping between two potential energy surfaces. This formula is to be applied at the point of closest approach of the two potential energy surfaces where the energy difference is ΔE_{adia} . However $d|\Delta E_{dia}|/dt$ is evaluated as the maximum of the rate of change of the *adiabatic* energy difference as the avoided crossing is approached. While not intended to be applied to conical intersections, it is still quite applicable in photodynamics calculations since trajectories rarely go exactly through a conical intersection.

Pathway Method

Dynamics calculations provide a swarm of reaction trajectories. The “pathway method” provides an alternative when dynamics calculations are too ex-

pensive or a simplified picture is otherwise desired, say, for interpretational reasons. The pathway method consists of mapping out minimum energy pathways between the initial Franck-Condon points obtained by vertical excitations and excited-state minima or conical intersections. Although analogous to the usual way of finding thermal reaction paths, it is less likely to be a realistic representation of true photoprocesses except in the limit of threshold excitation energies since excess energy is often enough to open up alternative pathways over excited-state transition states. While the necessary ingredients for the photochemical pathway method are similar to those for thermal reactions, conical intersections are a new feature which is quite different from a thermal transition state. This section provides a brief review for finding and characterizing conical intersections.

The notion of a conical intersection arises from a relatively simple argument [Yarkony 2001]. The potential energy surface of a molecule with f internal degrees of freedom is an f -dimensional hypersurface in an $(f + 1)$ -dimensional space (the extra dimension is the energy axis). If two potential energy surfaces simply cross “without seeing each other”, then the crossing space is characterized by the constraint,

$$E_i(\mathbf{R}) = E_j(\mathbf{R}), \quad (1.8)$$

makes the crossing space $(f-1)$ -dimensional. However in quantum mechanics, we also have the additional constraint,

$$H_{i,j}(\mathbf{R}) = 0. \quad (1.9)$$

This makes the crossing space $(f - 2)$ -dimensional. This means that there will be two independent directions in hyperspace in which the two potential energy surfaces will separate. These two directions define a branching plane. Within the 3-dimensional space defined by the energy and the branching plane, the conical intersection appears to be a double cone (Fig. 1.6), the point of which represents an entire $(f - 1)$ -dimensional space. Of course, $f = 1$ for a diatomic and no conical intersection is possible. This is the origin of the well-known avoided crossing rule for diatomics. Here we are interested in larger molecules where the low dimensionality of the branching space in comparison with the dimensionality of the parent hyperspace can make the conical intersection hard to locate and characterize.

In the pathway method, the system simply goes energetically downhill until two potential energy surfaces have the same energy [Eq. (1.8)]. The resultant intersection space must be analyzed and the branching plane extracted so that the surface crossing region can be properly visualized and interpreted. In order to do so, let us recall a result from first-year calculus. Imagine a trajectory, $\mathbf{R}(\tau)$, depending upon some parameter τ within the conical intersection surface. Then $\nabla\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{R})$ must be perpendicular to the conical intersection for any constraint function $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{R}) = 0$ because, $0 = d\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{R}(\tau))/d\tau =$

$\nabla\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{R}) \cdot (d\mathbf{R}/d\tau)$. and we can always choose $d\mathbf{R}/d\tau \neq 0$. Taking the gradient of Eq. (1.9) defines the derivative coupling vector, $\mathbf{f}_{i,j} = \nabla H_{i,j}(\mathbf{R})$, while taking the gradient of Eq. (1.8) defines the gradient difference vector, $\mathbf{g}_{i,j} = \nabla E_i(\mathbf{R}) - \nabla E_j(\mathbf{R})$. Together the derivative coupling vector and gradient difference vector are referred to as the branching vectors which characterize the branching plane. [Note that the derivative coupling vector is essentially the numerator of the derivative coupling matrix expression given in Eq. (1.5). This confusion of nomenclature is unfortunate but present in the literature.]

These branching plane conditions are needed as constraints in the exploration of the conical intersection hyperspace when seeking the minimum energy conical intersection or the first-order saddle point in conical intersection. In particular, there has been considerable effort devoted to the problem of developing efficient algorithms for finding minimum energy points within the conical intersection space [Koga 1985, Atchity 1991, Ragazos 1992, Yarkony 1996, Domcke 1997, Izzo 2000]. Furthermore, an automated systematic exploration method for finding minimum energy conical intersections has very recently developed [Maeda 2009]. First-order saddle points and the corresponding minimum energy pathways both within the conical intersection hypersurface have been proposed to be important in dynamical trajectory simulations, and an optimization method was developed for such high-energy points within the conical intersection hypersurface [Sicilia 2008]. Some of the minimum energy conical intersection optimizers use the branching plane conditions explicitly to keep the degeneracy of the two adiabatic states during optimizations [Manaa 1993, Bearpark 1994, Anglada 1997], making explicit use of both the derivative coupling vector and gradient difference vector at every step. Most well-established optimization algorithms assume smoothness of the function to be optimized. Since the potential energy surface necessarily has a discontinuous first derivative in the vicinity of a conical intersection, the above-mentioned algorithms for finding minimum energy conical intersections have required access to the gradient difference vector and derivative coupling vectors. The gradient difference vector can easily be obtained from analytical gradients, if available, or by numerical energy differentiation if analytical gradients are not yet available. However methods for finding the derivative coupling vector are not yet available for all methods since implementation of an analytical derivative method is often regarded as a prerequisite [Ciminelli 2004, Maeda 2010]. Some approaches make use of a penalty function to get around the need to calculate the derivative coupling vector and these have proven very useful for finding minimum energy conical intersection regions without the need for the derivative coupling vector [Levine 2008]. This is especially important for methods such as renormalized coupled-cluster theories and TDDFT or free-energy methods for which the electronic wave function is not completely defined, considerably complicating the problem of how to calculate derivative coupling vector matrix elements.

However, convergence of penalty function methods is in general slower than methods which make explicit use of the branching plane constraints, especially if tight optimization of the energy difference, $(E_i - E_j)$, is desired [Keal 2007].

1.3 TDDFT

The last section discussed the basic theory of non-Born-Oppenheimer dynamics and conical intersections from a wave-function point of view. We now wish to see to what extent we can replace wave-function theory with what we hope will be a simpler DFT approach. As usual in DFT, we seek both the guiding light of formal rigor and pragmatic approximations that work. We will take a more or less historical approach to presenting this material. *In this section, upper case Latin indices designate electronic states, while lower case Latin indices designate orbitals.*

One of the early objectives of TDDFT was to allow simulations of the behavior of atoms and clusters in intense laser fields, well beyond the linear-response regime and too complex to be handled by comparable wave-function methods. The closely related topic of ion-cluster collisions was studied early on using TDDFT in a very simplified form [Yabana 1998]. The Ehrenfest method was the method of choice for TDDFT simulations coupling electronic and nuclear degrees of freedom in this area. The main problem is how to take the expectation value in Eq. (1.6). This is solved pragmatically by using, $V[\rho(t)](\mathbf{R}(t)) = T_s[\Phi_s(t)] + \int (v_{en}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}(t)) + v_{appl}(\mathbf{r}, t)) \rho(\mathbf{r}, t) d\mathbf{r} + (1/2) \int \int (\rho(\mathbf{r}_1, t)\rho(\mathbf{r}_2, t)/r_{12}) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 + E_{xc}[\rho(t)] + V_{nn}(\mathbf{R}(t))$, where T_s is the usual Kohn-Sham noninteracting kinetic energy evaluated using the (now time-dependent) Kohn-Sham determinant Φ_s , v_{en} is the electron-nuclear attraction potential, v_{appl} is the potential for any applied electric field, and E_{xc} is the usual Hohenberg-Kohn-Sham xc-energy. Note that the presence of E_{xc} is highly reminiscent of the TDDFT adiabatic approximation that the xc-potential should react instantaneously and without memory to any temporal change in the time-dependent charge density. Among the notable work done with this approximation is early studies of the dynamics of sodium clusters in intense laser fields [Calvayrac 1998], the development of the time-dependent electron localization function [Burnus 2005], and (more recently) the study of electron-ion dynamics in molecules under intense laser pulses [Kawashita 2009]. Besides limitations associated with the TDDFT adiabatic approximation, the TDDFT Ehrenfest method suffers from the same intrinsic problems as its wave-function brother—namely that it is implicitly based on an average potential energy surface and so does not provide state-specific information, and also suffers from problems with microscopic irreversibility.

To our knowledge, the first DFT dynamics on a well-defined excited-state potential energy surface was not based upon TDDFT but rather on the older multiplet sum method of Ziegler, Rauk, and Baerends [Ziegler 1977, Daul

1994]. This was the work of restricted open-shell Kohn-Sham (ROKS) formalism of Irmgard Frank *et al.* [Frank 1997] who carried out Carr-Parinello dynamics for the open-shell singlet excited state $^1(i, a)$ using the multiplet sum method energy expression, $E_s = 2E[\Phi_{i\uparrow}^{a\uparrow}] - E[\Phi_{i\downarrow}^{a\uparrow}]$, where $\Phi_{i\sigma}^{a\tau}$ is the Kohn-Sham determinant with the $i\sigma$ spin-orbital replaced with the $a\tau$ spin-orbital. Such a formalism suffers from all the formal difficulties of the multiplet sum method, namely that it is just a first-order estimate of the energy using a symmetry-motivated zero-order guess for the excited-state wave function and assumes that DFT works best for states which are well-described by single determinants. Nevertheless appropriate use of the multiplet sum method can yield results similar to TDDFT. A recent application of this method is to the study of the mechanism of the electrocyclic ring opening of diphenyloxirane [Friedrichs 2009].

The implementation of TDDFT excited-state derivatives in a wide variety of programs not only means that excited-state geometry optimizations may be implemented, allowing the calculation of the Stokes shift between absorption and fluorescence spectra, but that the pathway method can be implemented to search for conical intersections in TDDFT. Unless nonadiabatic coupling matrix elements can be calculated within TDDFT (*vide infra*), then a penalty method should be employed as described in the previous section under the pathway method. This has been done by Levine, Ko, Quenneville, and Martinez using conventional TDDFT [Levine 2006] and by Minezawa and Gordon using spin-flip TDDFT [Minezawa 2009]. We will come back to these calculations later in this section.

The most recent approach to DFT dynamics on a well-defined excited-state potential energy surface is Tully-type dynamics [Tully 1990, Hammes-Schiffer 1994, Tully 1998] applied within a mixed TDDFT/classical trajectory surface-hopping approach. Surface-hopping probabilities can be calculated from potential energy surfaces alone within the Landau-Zener method [Eq. (1.7)], however a strict application of Tully's method requires nonadiabatic coupling matrix elements as input. Thus a key problem to be addressed is how to calculate nonadiabatic coupling matrix elements within TDDFT. Initial work by Craig, Duncan, and Prezhdo used a simple approximation which neglected the xc-kernel [Craig 2005]. A further approximation, criticized by Maitra [Maitra 2006], has been made by Craig and co-workers [Craig 2005, Habenicht 2006] who treated the electronic states as determinants of Kohn-Sham orbitals which are propagated according to the time-dependent Kohn-Sham equation. This means that neither the excitation energies nor the associated forces could be considered to be accurate. The first complete mixed TDDFT/classical trajectory surface-hopping photodynamics method was proposed and implemented by Tapavicza, Tavernelli, and R othlisberger [Tapavicza 2007] in a development version of the CPMD code. It was proposed that the nonadiabatic coupling matrix elements be evaluated within Casida's *ansatz* [Casida 1995] which

was originally intended to aid with the problem of assigning excited states by considering a specific functional form for an approximate excited-state wave function. For the TDA, the Casida *ansatz* takes the familiar form, $\Psi_I = \sum_{ia\sigma} \Phi_{i\sigma}^{a\sigma} X_{ia\sigma}$. In fact, matrix elements between ground and excited states may be calculated exactly in a Casida-like formalism because of the response theory nature of Eq. (1.5) [Chernyak 2000, Hu 2007, Send 2010]. Test results show reasonable accuracy for nonadiabatic coupling matrix elements as long as conical intersections are not approached too closely [Baer 2002, Hu 2007, Tavernelli 2009, Tavernelli 2009, Send 2010]. One likely reason for this is the divergence of Eq. (1.5) when $E_I = E_J$. Hu and Sugino attempted to further improve the accuracy of nonadiabatic coupling matrix elements by using average excitation energies [Hu 2007]. The problem of calculating nonadiabatic coupling matrix elements between two excited states is an open problem in TDDFT, though the ability to calculate excited-state densities [Furche 2002] suggests that such matrix elements could be calculated from double response theory using Eq. (1.5). Soon after the implementation of mixed TDDFT/classical trajectory surface-hopping photodynamics in CPMD, a very similar method was implemented in TURBOMOL and applied [Werner 2008, Mirić 2008, Barbatti 2010]. A version of TURBOMOL capable of doing mixed TDDFT/classical trajectory surface-hopping photodynamics using analytic nonadiabatic coupling matrix elements has recently appeared [Send 2010] and has been applied used to study the photochemistry of vitamin-D [Tapavicza 2011]. Time-dependent density-functional tight-binding (TDDFTB) may be regarded as the next step in a multiscale approach to the photodynamics of larger systems. From this point of view, it is interesting to note that mixed TDDFTB/classical trajectory surface-hopping photodynamics is also a reality [Mirić 2009]. Given the increasingly wide-spread nature of implementations of mixed TDDFT classical trajectory surface-hopping photodynamics, we can only expect the method to be increasingly available to and used by the global community of computational chemists.

Before going further, let us illustrate the state-of-the-art for TDDFT when applied to non-Born-Oppenheimer dynamics and conical intersections. We will take the example of the photochemical ring opening of oxirane (structure I in Fig. 1.2). While this is not the “sexy application” modeling of some biochemical photoprocess, the photochemistry of oxiranes is not unimportant in synthetic photochemistry and, above all, this is a molecule where it was felt that TDDFT “ought to work” [Cordova 2007]. A first study showed that a main obstacle to photodynamics is the presence of triplet and near singlet instabilities which lead to highly underestimated and even imaginary excitation energies as funnel regions are approached. This is illustrated in Fig. 1.3 for C_{2v} ring opening. While the real photochemical process involves asymmetric CO ring-opening rather than the symmetric C_{2v} CC ring-opening, results for the symmetric pathway have the advantage of being easier to analyze.




Fig. 1.2. Mechanism proposed by Gomer and Noyes in 1950 for the photochemical ring opening of oxirane. Reprinted with permission from E. Tapavicza, I. Tavernelli, U. Rothlisberger, C. Filippi, and M. E. Casida, *J. Chem. Phys.* **129**, 124108 (2008). Copyright 2008, American Institute of Physics.

The figure shows that applying the TDA strongly attenuates the instability problem, putting most curves in the right energy range. Perhaps the best way to understand this is to realize that, whereas time-dependent Hartree-Fock (TDHF), is a nonvariational method and hence allows variational collapse of excited states, TDA TDHF is the same as configuration interaction singles (CIS) which is variational. There is however still a cusp in the ground state curve as the ground state configuration changes from σ^2 to $(\sigma^*)^2$. According to a traditional wave-function picture, these two states, which are each double excitations relative to each other should be included in configuration mixing in order to obtain a proper description of the ground state potential energy surface in the funnel region [Cordova 2007, Huix-Rotllant 2010].

Figure 1.4 shows an example of mixed TDA TDPBE/classical trajectory surface-hopping calculations for the photochemical ring-opening of oxirane with the initial photoexcitation prepared in the $^1(n, 3p_z)$ state. Part (b) of the figure clearly shows that more than one potential energy surface is populated after about 10 fs. The Landau-Zener process is typical of the dominant physical process which involves an excitation from the HOMO nonbonding lone pair on the oxygen initially to a $3p_z$ Rydberg orbital. As the reaction proceeds, the ring opens and the target Rydberg orbital rapidly changes character to become a CO σ^* antibonding orbital (Fig. 1.5). Actual calculations were run on a swarm of 30 trajectories, confirming the mechanism previously proposed Gomer-Noyes mechanism [Gomer 1950] (Fig. 1.2), but also confirming other experimental by-products and giving unprecedented state-specific reaction details such as the orbital description briefly described above.

The oxirane photochemical ring-opening passes through a conical intersection, providing a concrete example of a conical intersection to study with TDDFT. We now return to the study by Levine, Ko, Quenneville, and Martinez of conical intersections using conventional TDDFT [Levine 2006] who




Fig. 1.3. Comparison of TDA TDLDA and diffusion Monte Carlo curves for C_{2v} ring opening of oxirane. Reprinted with permission from F. Cordova, L. Joubert Doriol, A. Ipatov, M. E. Casida, C. Filippi, and A. Vela, *J. Chem. Phys.* **127**, 164111 (2007). Copyright 2007, American Institute of Physics.

noted that strict conical intersections are forbidden by the TDDFT adiabatic approximation for the simple reason that there is no coupling matrix element [Eq. 1.9] to zero out between the ground and excited states. Figure 1.6 shows a CASSCF conical intersection close to the oxirane photochemical funnel. Also shown are the TDA TDDFT surfaces calculated with the same CASSCF branching coordinates. Interestingly the CASSCF and TDDFT conical intersections look remarkably similar. However closer examination shows that the TDDFT “conical intersection” is actually two *intersecting* cones rather than a true conical intersection, confirming the observation of Levine *et al.* This was analyzed in detail in Ref. [Tapavicza 2008] where it was concluded that the problem is that we are encountering effective noninteracting v -representability. True noninteracting v -representability means that there is no noninteracting system whose ground state gives the ground state density of the interacting system. This only means that there is some excited state of the noninteracting system with integer occupation number which gives the ground state density of the interacting system. What we call effective noninteracting v -representability is when the LUMO falls below the HOMO (or, in the language of solid-state physics, there is a “hole below the Fermi level”). This is exactly what frequently happens in the funnel region.

Spin-flip (SF) TDDFT [Slipchenko 2003, Shao 2003, Wang 2004] offers one way to circumvent some of the problems of effective noninteracting v -representability in funnel regions. This is because we can start from the lowest triplet state which has fewer effective noninteracting v -representability problems and then use SFs to obtain both the ground state and a doubly-excited state. Analytic derivatives are now available for some types of SF-




Fig. 1.4. (a) Cut of potential energy surfaces along reaction path of an Landau-Zener (dashed line) and a fewest-switches (solid line) trajectory (black, S_0 ; blue, S_1 ; green, S_2 ; magenta, S_3). Both trajectories were started by excitation into the $^1(n, 3p_z)$ state, with the same geometry and same initial nuclear velocities. The running states of the Landau-Zener and the fewest-switches trajectory are indicated by the red crosses and circles, respectively. The geometries of the Landau-Zener trajectory are shown at time a) 0, b) 10, and c) 30 fs. (b) State populations (black, S_0 ; blue, S_1 ; green, S_2 ; magenta, S_3) as a function of the fewest-switches trajectory in (a). Reprinted with permission from E. Tapavicza, I. Tavernelli, U. Rothlisberger, C. Filippi, and M. E. Casida, *J. Chem. Phys.* **129**, 124108 (2008). Copyright 2008, American Institute of Physics.

TDDFT [Seth 2010]. Figure 1.7 shows that SF-TDDFT works fairly well for treating the avoided crossing in the C_{2v} ring-opening pathway of oxirane. Minezawa and Gordon also used SF-TDDFT to locate a conical intersection in ethylene [Minezawa 2009]. However Huix-Rotllant, Natrajan, Ipatov, Wawire, Deutsch, and Casida found that, although SF-TDDFT does give a true conical intersection in the photochemical ring opening of oxirane, the funnel is significantly shifted from the position of the CASSCF conical intersection [Huix-Rotllant 2010]. The reason is that the key funnel region involves an active space of over two orbitals which is too large to be described accurately by SF-TDDFT.




Fig. 1.5. Change of character of the active state along the reactive Landau-Zener trajectory, shown in Fig. 1.4. Snapshots were taken at times (a) 2.6, (b) 7.4, (c) 12.2, and (d) 19.4 fs. For (a) and (b), the running state is characterized by a transition from the highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) to the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) plus one (LUMO+1), while for (c) and (d) it is characterized by a HOMO-LUMO transition due to orbital crossing. Note that the HOMO remains the same oxygen nonbonding orbital throughout the simulation. Reprinted with permission from E. Tapvicza, I. Tavernelli, U. Rothlisberger, C. Filippi, and M. E. Casida, *J. Chem. Phys.* **129**, 124108 (2008). Copyright 2008, American Institute of Physics.




Fig. 1.6. Comparison of the S_0 and S_1 potential energy surfaces calculated using different methods for the CASSCF branching coordinate space. M. Huix-Rotllant, B. Natarajan, A. Ipatov, C. M. Wawire, T. Deutsch, and M. E. Casida, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **12**, 12811 (2010) — Reproduced by permission of the PCCP Owner Societies.




Fig. 1.7. C_{2v} potential energy curves: full calculation (solid lines), two-orbital model (dashed lines). M. Huix-Rotllant, B. Natarajan, A. Ipatov, C. M. Wawire, T. Deutsch, and M. E. Casida, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **12**, 12811 (2010) — Reproduced by permission of the PCCP Owner Societies.

There are other ways to try to build two- and higher-excitation character into a DFT treatment of excited states. Let us mention here only multireference configuration interaction (MRCI)/DFT [Grimme 1999], constrained density functional theory-configuration interaction (CDFT-CI) [Wu 2007], and mixed TDDFT/many-body theory methods based upon the Bethe-Salpeter equation [Romaniello 2009] or the related polarization propagator approach [Casida 2005, Huix-Rotllant 2010] or the simpler dressed TDDFT [Maitra 2004, Cave 2004, Gritsenko 2009, Mazur 2009, Mazur 2010, Huix-Rotllant 2011] approach.

All of these may have the potential to improve the DFT-based description of funnel regions in photochemical reactions. Here however we must be aware that we may be in the process of building a theory which is less automatic and requires the high amount of user intervention typical of present day CASSCF calculations. This is certainly the case with CDFT-CI which has already achieved some success in describing conical intersections [Kaduk 2010].

1.4 Perspectives

Perhaps the essence of dynamics can be captured in a simple sentence: “You should from whence you are coming and to where you are going.” Of course

this rather deterministic statement must be interpreted differently in classical and quantum mechanics. Here however we would like to think about its meaning in terms of the development of DFT for applications in photoprocesses. Theoretical developments in this area have been remarkable in recent years, opening up the possibility for a more detailed understanding of femtosecond (and now also attosecond) spectroscopy. In this chapter we have tried to discuss the past, the present, and a bit of the future.

The past treated here has been the vast area of static investigation and dynamic simulations of photophysical and photochemical processes. We have first described more traditional wave-function techniques. We have also mentioned and made appropriate references to important work on early DFT work involving Ehrenfest TDDFT and restricted open-shell Kohn-Sham DFT dynamics. Our emphasis has been on photochemical processes involving several PESs, partly because of our own personal experiences, but also because photochemical processes start out as *photophysical* processes in the Franck-Condon region and then rapidly become more complicated to handle.

The present-day status of DFT photodynamics is perhaps best represented by the recent availability of mixed TDDFT and TDDFTB/classical surface-hopping dynamics codes as well as serious efforts to investigate and improve the quality of the TDDFT description of photochemical funnel regions. First applications have already shown the utility of this theory and we feel sure that other applications will follow as programs are made broadly available to computational scientists. Finally we have ended the last section with some speculations about the future concerning the need for explicit double- and higher-excitations to correctly describe funnel regions.

As expected, we could not treat everything of relevance to the chapter title. Roi Baer's recent work indicating that Berry phase information is somehow included in the ground-state charge density is most intriguing [Baer 2010]. Also on-going work on multicomponent DFT capable of treating electrons and nuclei on more or less the same footing [Kreibich 2001, Kreibich 2008] would seem to open up new possibilities for developing useful non-Born-Oppenheimer approximations within a DFT framework. We are sure that still other potentially relevant work has been unfortunately omitted either because of space limitations or for other reasons.

Do we know where this field is going? Certainly non-Born-Oppenheimer photodynamics using some form of DFT is currently a hot and rapidly evolving area. Exactly what lies in store may not yet be clear, but what we do know is that we are going to have fun getting there!

Acknowledgments

B. N. would like to acknowledge a scholarship from the *Fondation Nanoscience*. M. E. C. would like to acknowledge profitable especially discussions with Lorenz Cederbaum, Felipe Cordova, Ingrid Frank, Todd Martinez, Mike

Robb, Enrico Tapavicza, and Ivano Tavernelli. This work has been carried out in the context of the French Rhône-Alpes *Réseau thématique de recherche avancée (RTRA): Nanosciences aux limites de la nanoélectronique* and the Rhône-Alpes Associated Node of the European Theoretical Spectroscopy Facility (ETSF).

References

- Michl, J., and V. Bonačić-Koutecký, *Electronic Aspects of Organic Photochemistry* (Wiley: New York, 1990).
- Polli, D., P. Altoè, O. Weingart, K. M. Spillane, C. Manzoni, D. Brida, G. Tomasello, G. Orlandi, P. Kurkura, R. A. Mathies, M. Garavelli, and G. Cerullo, “Conical Intersection Dynamics in the Primary Photoisomerization Event in Vision”, *Nature* **467**, pp. 440–443 (2010).
- Helgaker, T., P. Jørgensen, and J. Olsen *Molecular Electronic Structure Theory*, (Wiley: England, 2000).
- Casida, M. E., K. C. Casida, and D. R. Salahub, “Excited-state potential energy curves from time-dependent density-functional theory: A cross-section of formaldehyde’s 1A_1 manifold”, *Int. J. Quant. Chem.*, vol. 70, pp. 933–941 (1998).
- Casida, M. E., “Jacob’s Ladder for Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory: Some Rungs on the Way to Photochemical Heaven”, in *Accurate Description of Low-Lying Molecular Excited States and Potential Energy Surfaces*, M. R. Hoffmann and K. G. Dyall, Eds., ACS Symposium Series, vol. 828 (ACS Press: Washington, D.C., 2002), pp. 199–220.
- Hirata, A. and M. Head-Gordon, “Time-dependent density functional theory within the Tamm-Dancoff approximation”, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 314, pp. 291–299 (1999).
- Casida, M. E., F. Gutierrez, J. Guan, F.-X. Gadea, D. R. Salahub, and J.-P. Daudey, “Charge-transfer correction for improved time-dependent local density approximation excited-state potential energy curves: Analysis within the two-level model with illustration for H_2 and LiH ”, *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 113, pp. 7062–7071 (2000).
- Cordova, F., L. Joubert Doriol, A. Ipatov, and M. E. Casida, “Troubleshooting Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory for Photochemical Applications: Oxirane”, *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 127, art. 164111 (2007).
- Van Caillie, C., and R. E. Amos, “Geometric Derivatives of Excitation Energies using SCF and DFT”, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 308, pp. 249–255 (1999).
- Van Caillie, C., and R. D. Amos, “Geometric Derivatives of Density Functional Theory Excitation Energies Using Gradient-Corrected Functionals”, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 317, pp. 159–164 (2000).
- Furche, F., and R. Ahlrichs, “Adiabatic Time-Dependent Density Functional Methods for Excited State Properties”, *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 117, pp. 7433–7447 (2002).
- Hutter, J., “Excited State Nuclear Forces from the Tamm-Dancoff Approximation to Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory within the Plane Wave Basis Set Framework”, *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 118, pp. 3928–3934 (2003).

- Rappoport, D., and F. Furche, "Analytical Time-Dependent Density Functional Derivatives Within the RI-J Approximation, An Approach to Excited States of large Molecules", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 122, art. 064105 (2005).
- Doltsinis, N. L., and D. S. Kosov, "Plane Wave/Pseudopotential Implementation of Excited State Gradients in Density Functional Linear Response Theory: A New Route Via Implicit Differentiation", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 122, art. 144101 (2005).
- Scalmani, G., M. J. Frisch, B. Mennucci, J. Tomasi, R. Cammi, and V. Barone, "Geometries and Properties of Excited States in the Gas Phase and in Solution: Theory and Application of a Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory Polarizable Continuum Model", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 124, art. 094107 (2006).
- Diau, E. W.-G., C. Kötting, and A. H. Zewail, "Femtochemistry of Norrish Type-I Reactions: I. Experimental and Theoretical Studies of Acetone and Related Ketones on the S_1 Surface", *ChemPhysChem*, vol. 2, pp. 273–293 (2001).
- Diau, E. W.-G., C. Kötting, and A. H. Zewail, "Femtochemistry of Norrish Type-I Reactions: II. The Anomalous Predissociation Dynamics of Cyclobutanone on the S_1 Surface", *ChemPhysChem*, vol. 2, pp. 294–309 (2001).
- Diau, E. W.-G., C. Kötting, T. I. Sølling, and A. H. Zewail, "Femtochemistry of Norrish Type-I Reactions: III. Highly Excited Ketones – Theoretical", *ChemPhysChem*, vol. 3, pp. 57–78 (2002).
- Sølling, T. I., E. W.-G. Diau, C. Kötting, S. De Feyter and A. H. Zewail, "Femtochemistry of Norrish Type-I Reactions: IV. Highly Excited Ketones – Experimental", *ChemPhysChem*, vol. 3, pp. 79–97 (2002).
- Diau, E. W.-G. and A. H. Zewail, "Femtochemistry of trans-azomethane: A combined experimental and theoretical study", *ChemPhysChem*, vol. 4, pp. 445–456 (2003).
- Tapavicza, E., I. Tavernelli, and U. Röthlisberger, "Trajectory Surface Hopping Within Linear Response Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory", *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 98, art. 023001 (2007).
- Werner, U., R. Mitrić, T. Suzuki, and V. Bonačić-Koutecký, "Nonadiabatic Dynamics Within the Time Dependent Density Functional Theory: Ultrafast Photo-dynamics in Pyrazine", *Chem. Phys.*, vol. 349, pp. 319–324 (2008).
- Tapavicza, E., I. Tavernelli, U. Röthlisberger, C. Filippi, and M. E. Casida, "Mixed Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory/Classical Trajectory Surface Hopping Study of Oxirane Photochemistry", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 129, art. 124108 (2008).
- Tavernelli, I., and E. Tapavicza and U. Rothlisberger, "Non-Adiabatic Dynamics Using Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory: Assessing the Coupling Strengths", *J. Molec. Struct. (Theochem)*, vol. 914, pp. 22–29 (2009).
- Tavernelli, I., and E. Tapavicza and U. Rothlisberger, "Nonadiabatic Coupling Vectors Within Linear Response Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 130, art. 124107. (2009).
- Barbatti, M., J. Pitner, M. Pederzoli, U. Werner, R. Mitrić, V. Bonačić-Koutecký, and H. Lischka, "Non-adiabatic Dynamics of Pyrrole: Dependence of Deactivation Mechanisms on the Excitation Energy", *Chem. Phys.*, vol. 375, pp. 26–34 (2010).
- Doltsinis, N. L., and D. Marx, "First Principles Molecular Dynamics Involving Excited States and Nonadiabatic Transitions", *J. Theo. Comput. Chem.*, vol. 1, pp. 319–349 (2002).

- Cederbaum, L., "Born-Oppenheimer Approximation and Beyond", in *Conical Intersections: Electronic Structure, Dynamics and Spectroscopy*, W. Domcke, D.R. Yarkony, and H. Köppel, Eds. (World Scientific: Singapore, 2004), pp. 3-40 (2004).
- Kapral, R., "Progress in the Theory of Mixed Quantum-Classical Dynamics", *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, vol. 57, pp. 129-157 (2006).
- Ehrenfest, P., "Bemerkung über die angenäherte Gültigkeit der klassischen Mechanik innerhalb der Quantenmechanik", *Z. Physik*, vol. 45, pp. 455-457 (1927).
- Tully, J. C., "Molecular Dynamics with Electronic Transitions", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 93, pp. 1061-1071 (1990).
- Hammes-Schiffer, S., and J. C. Tully, "Proton transfer in solution: Molecular dynamics with quantum transitions", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 101, pp. 4657-4667 (1994).
- Landau, L. D., "On the theory of transfer of energy at collisions II" *Phys. Z. Sowjetunion*, vol. 2, pp. 46-51 (1932).
- Zener, C., "Non-adiabatic crossing of energy levels", *Proc. R. Soc. London A*, vol. 137, pp. 696-702 (1932).
- Wittig, C., "The Landau-Zener formula", *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 109, 8428-8430 (2005).
- Yarkony, D. R., "Conical intersections: The new conventional wisdom" *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 105, pp. 6277-6293 (2001).
- Koga, N., and K. Morokuma, "Determination of the Lowest Energy Point on the Crossing Seam Between Two Potential Surfaces Using the Energy Gradient", *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 119, pp. 371-374 (1985).
- Atchity, G. J., S. S. Xantheas, and K. Ruedenberg, "Potential energy surfaces near intersections", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 95, pp. 1862-1876 (1991).
- Ragazos, I. N., M. A. Robb, F. Bernardi, and M. Olivucci "Optimization and Characterization of the Lowest Energy Point on a Conical Intersection Using an MC-SCF Lagrangian", *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 197, pp. 217-223 (1992).
- Yarkony, D. R., "Diabolical Conical Intersections", *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 68, pp. 985-1013 (1996).
- Domcke, W., and G. Stock, "Theory of Ultrafast Nonadiabatic Excited-State Processes and Their Spectroscopic Detection in Real Time", *Adv. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 100, pp. 1-169 (1997).
- Izzo, R., and M. Klessinger, "Optimization of Conical Intersections Using the Semiempirical MNDOCCI Method With Analytic Gradients", *J. Comp. Chem.*, vol. 21, pp. 52-62 (2000).
- Maeda, S., K. Ohna and K. Morokuma, "Automated Global Mapping of Minimal Energy Points on Seams of Crossing by the Anharmonic Downward Distortion Following Method: A Case Study of H₂CO", *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 113, pp. 1704-1710 (2009).
- Sicilia, F., L. Blancafort, M. J. Bearpark, and M. A. Robb, "New Algorithms for Optimizing and Linking Conical Intersection Points", *J. Chem. Theor. Comput.*, vol. 4, pp. 257-266 (2008).
- Manaa, M. R., and D. R. Yarkony, "On the Intersection of Two Potential Energy Surfaces of the Same Symmetry. Systematic Characterization Using a Lagrange Multiplier Constrained Procedure", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 99, pp. 5251-5256 (1993).

- Bearpark, M. J., M. A. Robb, and H. B. Schlegel, "Direct Method for the Location of the Lowest Energy Point on a Potential Surface Crossing", *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 223, pp. 269–274 (1994).
- Anglada, J. M., and J. M. Bofill, "Reduced-Restricted-Quasi-Newton-Raphson Method for Locating and Optimizing Energy Crossing Points between Two Potential Energy Surfaces", *J. Comput. Chem.*, vol. 18, pp. 992–1003 (1997).
- Ciminelli, C., G. Granucci and M. Persico, "The Photoisomerization Mechanism of Azobenzene: A semiclassical Simulation of Nonadiabatic Dynamics", *Chem. Eur. J.*, vol. 10, pp. 2327–2341 (2004).
- Maeda, S., K. Ohno, and K. Morokuma, "Updated Branching Plane for Finding Conical Intersections without Coupling Derivative Vectors", *J. Chem. Theo. Comput.*, vol. 6, pp. 1538–1545 (2010).
- Levine, B. G., J. D. Coe, and T. J. Martínez, "Optimizing Conical Intersections without Derivative Coupling Vectors: Application to Multistate Multireference Second-Order Perturbation Theory (MS-CASPT2)", *J. Phys. Chem. B*, vol. 112, pp. 405–413 (2008).
- Keal, T. W., A. Koslowski, and W. Thiel, "Comparison of Algorithms for Conical Intersection Optimization Using Semiempirical Methods", *Theor. Chem. Acc.*, vol. 118, pp. 837–844 (2007).
- Yabana, K., T. Tazawa, Y. Abe, and P. Bozek, "Time-dependent mean-field description for multiple electron transfer in slow ion-cluster collisions", *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 57, pp. R3165–R3168 (1998).
- Calvayrac, F., P.-G. Reinhard, and E. Suraud, "Coulomb explosion of an Na_{12} cluster in a diabatic electronion dynamical picture", *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.*, vol. 31, pp. 5023–5030 (1998).
- Burnus, T., M. A. L. Marques, and E. K. U. Gross, "Time-dependent electron localization function", *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 71, art. 010501(R) (2005).
- Kawashita, Y., T. Nakatsukasa, and K. Yabana, "Time-dependent density-functional theory simulation for electronion dynamics in molecules under intense laser pulses", *J. Phys. Condens. Matter*, vol. 21, art. 064222 (2009).
- Ziegler, T., A. Rauk, and E. J. Baerends, "Calculation of Multiplet Energies by Hartree-Fock-Slater Method", *Theor. Chim. Acta*, vol. 43, pp. 261–271 (1977).
- C. Daul, "Density-Functional Theory Applied to Excited-States of Coordination Compounds", *Int. J. Quant. Chem.*, vol. 52, pp. 867–877 (1994).
- Frank, I., J. Hutter, D. Marx, and M. Parinello, "Molecular Dynamics in Low-Spin Excited States" *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 108, pp. 4060–4069 (1998).
- Friedrichs, J., and I. Frank, "Mechanism of Electrocyclic Ring Opening of Diphenyl Oxirane: 40 Years after Woodward and Hoffmann", *Chem.–Eur. J.*, vol. 15, pp. 10825–10829 (2009).
- Levine, B. G., C. Ko, J. Quenneville, and T. J. Martinez, "Conical Intersections and Double Excitations in Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory", *Mol. Phys.*, vol. 104, pp. 1039–1051 (2006).
- Minezawa, N., and M. S. Gordon, "Optimizing Conical Intersections by Spin-Flip Density Functional Theory: Application to Ethylene", *Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 113, pp. 12749–12753 (2009).
- Tully, J. C., "Nonadiabatic Dynamics", in *Modern Methods in Multidimensional Dynamics Computations in Chemistry*, D. L. Thompson, Ed., (World Scientific: Singapore, 1998), pp. 34–72 (1998).

- Craig, C.F., W.R. Duncan, and O.V. Prezhdo, "Trajectory Surface Hopping in the Time-Dependent Kohn-Sham Approach for Electron-Nuclear Dynamics", *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 95, art. 163001 (2005).
- Maitra, N. T., "On Correlated Electron-Nuclear Dynamics Using Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 125, art. 014110 (2006).
- Habenicht, B.F., C.F. Craig, and O.V. Prezhdo, "Time-Domain *Ab Initio* Simulation of Electron and Hole Relaxation Dynamics in a Single-Walled Semiconducting Carbon Nanotube", *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 96, art. 187401 (2006).
- Casida, M.E., "Time-Dependent Density-Functional Response Theory for Molecules", in *Recent Advances in Density Functional Methods, Part I*, D.P. Chong, Ed. (World Scientific: Singapore, 1995), pp. 155–192 (1995).
- Chernyak, V., and S. Mukamel, "Density-Matrix Representation of Nonadiabatic Couplings in Time-Dependent Density Functional (TDDFT) Theories", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 112, pp. 3572–3579 (2000).
- Hu, C., H. Hirai, and O. Sugino, "Nonadiabatic Couplings from Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory: Formulation in the Casida Formalism and Practical Scheme Within Modified Linear Response", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 127, art. 064103 (2007).
- Send, R., and F. Furche, "First-order nonadiabatic couplings from time-dependent hybrid density functional response theory: Consistent formalism, implementation, and performance", *J. Chem. Phys.*, art. 044107 (2010).
- Baer, R., "Non-Adiabatic Couplings by Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory", *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 364, pp. 75-79 (2002).
- Hu, C., and O. Sugino, "Average Excitation Energies from Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 126, pp. 074112 (2007).
- Mirić, R., U. Werner, and V. Bonačić-Koutecký, "Nonadiabatic Dynamics and Simulation of Time Resolved Photoelectron Spectra Within Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory: Ultrafast Photoswitching in Benzylideneaniline", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 129, art. 164118 (2008).
- Tapavicza, E., and F. Furche, "Photoinduced electrocyclic reactions investigated by non-adiabatic time-dependent density-functional dynamics", Talk presented at Pacificchem, Honolulu, 15 December 2010.
- Mitrić, R., U. Werner, M. Wohlgenuth, G. Seifert, and V. Bonačić-Koutecký, "Nonadiabatic Dynamics within Time-Dependent Density Functional Tight Binding Method", *J. Phys. Chem. A*, vol. 113, pp. 12700–12705 (2009).
- Huix-Rotllant, M., B. Natarajan, A. Ipatov, C.M. Wawire, and M.E. Casida, "Assessment of Noncollinear Spin-Flip Tamm-Dancoff Approximation Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory for the Photochemical Ring-Opening of Oxirane", *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 12, pp. 12811–12825 (2010).
- Gomer, E., and W. A. Noyes, "Photochemical Studies. XLII. Ethylene Oxide", *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, vol. 72, pp. 101–108 (1950).
- Slipchenko, L.V., and A.I. Krylov, "Electronic Structure of the Trimethylenemethane Diradical in its Ground and Electronically Excited States: Bonding, Equilibrium Geometries, and Vibrational Frequencies", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 118, pp. 6874-6883 (2003).
- Shao, Y., M. Head-Gordon, and A. I. Krylov, "The SpinFlip Approach within Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory: Theory and Applications to Diradicals", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 118, pp. 4807-4818 (2003).

- Wang, F., and T. Ziegler, "Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory Based on a Noncollinear Formulation of the Exchange-Correlation Potential", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 121, pp. 12191-12196 (2004).
- Seth, M., G. Mazur, and T. Ziegler, "Time-dependent density functional theory gradients in the Amsterdam density functional package: Geometry optimizations of spin-flip excitations", *Theor. Chem. Acc.*, published online 2010.
- Grimme, S., and M. Waletzke, "A combination of Kohn-Sham density functional theory and multi-reference configuration interaction methods", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 111, pp. 5645-5655 (1999).
- Wu, Q., C. L. Cheng, and T. Van Voorhis, "Configuration interaction based on constrained density functional theory: A multireference method", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 127, art. 164119 (2007).
- Romaniello, P., D. Sangalli, J. A. Berger, F. Sottile, L. G. Molinari, L. Reining, and G. Onida, "Double excitations in finite systems", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 130, art. 044108 (2009).
- Casida, M. E., "Propagator Corrections to Adiabatic Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory Linear Response Theory", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 122, art. 054111 (2005).
- Huix-Rotllant, M. and M. E. Casida, "Formal Foundations of Dressed Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory for Many-Electron Excitations", Condensed Matter arXiv, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1008.1478>
- Maitra, N. T., F. Zhang, F. J. Cave, and K. Burke, "Double Excitations Within Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory Linear Response", *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 120, pp. 5932-5937 (2004).
- Cave, R. J., F. Zhang, N. T. Maitra, and K. Burke, "A Dressed TDDFT Treatment of the 2^1A_g States of Butadiene and Hexatriene", *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 389, pp. 39-42 (2004).
- Gritsenko, O. V. and E. J. Baerends, "Double Excitation Effect in Non-Adiabatic Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory With an Analytic Construction of the Exchange-Correlation Kernel in the Common Energy Denominator Approximation", *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 11, pp. 4640-4646 (2009).
- Mazur, G. and R. Włodarczyk, "Application of the Dressed Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory for the Excited States of Linear Polyenes", *J. Comput. Chem.*, vol. 30, pp. 811-817 (2009).
- Mazur, G., M. Marcin, R. Włodarczyk, and Y. Aoki, "Dressed TDDFT Study of Low-Lying Electronic Excited States in Selected Linear Polyenes and Diphenylpolyenes", *Int. J. Quant. Chem.*, Vol. 111, pp. 810-825 (2011).
- Huix-Rotllant, M., A. Ipatov, A. Rubio, and M. E. Casida, "Assessment of Dressed Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory for the Low-Lying Valence States of 28 Organic Chromophores", to be submitted to *Chem. Phys.*
- Kaduk, B., and T. Van Voorhis, "Communication: Conical intersections using constrained density functional theory-configuration interaction" *J. Chem. Phys.*, vol. 133, art. 061102 (2010).
- Baer, R., "Ground-State Degeneracies Leave Recognizable Topological Scars in the Electronic Density", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, art. 073001 (2010).
- Kreibich, T. and E. K. U. Gross, "Multicomponent Density-Functional Theory for Electrons and Nuclei", *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 86, pp. 2984-2987 (2001).
- Kreibich, T., R. van Leeuwen, and E. K. U. Gross, "Multicomponent Density-Functional Theory for Electrons and Nuclei", *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 78, art. 022501 (2008).