

# **Virginia Commonwealth University [VCU Scholars Compass](http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu?utm_source=scholarscompass.vcu.edu%2Fphys_pubs%2F113&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)**

[Physics Publications](http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/phys_pubs?utm_source=scholarscompass.vcu.edu%2Fphys_pubs%2F113&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) [Dept. of Physics](http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/phys?utm_source=scholarscompass.vcu.edu%2Fphys_pubs%2F113&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

2010

# Negative ions of transition metal-halogen clusters

Kalpataru Pradhan *Virginia Commonwealth University*, kpradhan@vcu.edu

Gennady L. Gutsev *Florida A&M University*

Purusottam Jena *Virginia Commonwealth University*, pjena@vcu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/phys\\_pubs](http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/phys_pubs?utm_source=scholarscompass.vcu.edu%2Fphys_pubs%2F113&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) Part of the [Physics Commons](http://network.bepress.com/hgg/discipline/193?utm_source=scholarscompass.vcu.edu%2Fphys_pubs%2F113&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Pradhan, K., Gutsev, G.L., & Purusottam, J. Negative ions of transition metal-halogen clusters. The Journal of Chemical Physics, 133, 144301 (2010). Copyright © 2010 AIP Publishing LLC.

### Downloaded from

[http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/phys\\_pubs/113](http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/phys_pubs/113?utm_source=scholarscompass.vcu.edu%2Fphys_pubs%2F113&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Dept. of Physics at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Physics Publications by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact [libcompass@vcu.edu](mailto:libcompass@vcu.edu).

## **[Negative ions of transition metal-halogen clusters](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3489117)**

Kalpataru Pradhan,<sup>1</sup> Gennady L. Gutsev,<sup>2</sup> and Purusottam Jena<sup>1[,a](#page-1-0))</sup> 1 *Department of Physics, Virginia Commonwealth University, 701 W Grace Street, Richmond, Virginia 23284-2000, USA* 2 *Department of Physics, Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida 32307, USA*

(Received 30 June 2010; accepted 24 August 2010; published online 8 October 2010)

A systematic density functional theory based study of the structure and spectroscopic properties of neutral and negatively charged  $MX_n$  clusters formed by a transition metal atom  $M$  ( $M = Sc$ , Ti, V) and up to seven halogen atoms  $X(X=F, Cl, Br)$  has revealed a number of interesting features: (1) Halogen atoms are bound chemically to Sc, Ti, and V for  $n \le n_{\text{max}}$ , where the maximal valence  $n_{\text{max}}$ equals to 3, 4, and 5 for Sc, Ti, and V, respectively. For  $n > n_{\text{max}}$ , two halogen atoms became dimerized in the neutral species, while dimerization begins at *n*= 5, 6, and 7 for negatively charged clusters containing Sc, Ti, and V. (2) Magnetic moments of the transition metal atoms depend strongly on the number of halogen atoms in a cluster and the cluster charge. (3) The number of halogen atoms that can be attached to a metal atom exceeds the maximal formal valence of the metal atom. (4) The electron affinities of the neutral clusters abruptly rise at  $n = n_{\text{max}}$ , reaching values as high as 7 eV. The corresponding anions could be used in the synthesis of new salts, once appropriate counterions are identified. © *2010 American Institute of Physics*. doi[:10.1063/1.3489117](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3489117)

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

There is considerable interest in studying negative ions not only because they are among the best known oxidizing agents, $\frac{1}{x}$  but also they play an important role in atmospheric chemistry by acting as nucleation centers. $\frac{2}{3}$  Among the elements in the Periodic Table, halogen atoms are the most electronegative because they possess a hole in the outermost  $p$ -shell  $(ns^2np^5)$  electronic configuration), which can readily accommodate an electron in order to close the *np* shell. An extra electron attachment to a halogen atom results in the negatively charged ion whose total energy is significantly lower than that of the corresponding neutral. Consequently, the halogen atoms possess the highest electron affinities<sup>3</sup> (3.0–3.6 eV) among all the elements. It has been demonstrated that molecules consisting of a metal atom at the core surrounded by halogen atoms possess electron affinities that can be higher than those of the halogen atoms. $4-6$  $4-6$  This was first brought into the focus by the pioneering experiments<sup>7[,8](#page-7-6)</sup> of Bartlett half a century ago when he succeeded in synthesizing the  $XePtF_6$  salt. The ability to ionize noble gas atoms by highly electronegative  $PtF_6$  moiety ushered a new era in noble gas compounds and highlighted the importance of negative ions such as transition metal hexafluorides. $5,9$  $5,9$ 

In 1981, Gutsev and Boldyrev<sup>10[,11](#page-7-10)</sup> introduced the term "superhalogen" to characterize the species with high electron affinities. A conventional superhalogen contains an atom  $(M)$ surrounded by electronegative ligand atoms  $(X)$  and has the formula  $MX_{(n+1)/m}$  where *n* is the maximal formal valence of *M* and *m* is the normal valence of *X*. In 1999, the smallest superhalogen anions  $MX_2^-$  ( $M = Li$ , Na;  $X = Cl$ , Br, I) were first experimentally studied using photoelectron spectroscopy. The experimental findings were interpreted on the basis of *ab initio* calculations.<sup>12</sup> Larger superhalogen anions  $MX_3^-$  (*M* = Be, Mg, Ca; *X* = Cl, Br, F),  $^{13-15}$  $^{13-15}$  $^{13-15}$   $MX_4^-$  (*M* = B, Al;  $X = F$ , Cl, Br) (Refs. [16](#page-7-14) and [17](#page-7-15)) were studied along with  $\text{Na}_x\text{Cl}_{x+1}$  ( $x=1-4$ ).<sup>[18](#page-7-16)</sup> Examples of other superhalogens include  $\text{LiF}_2$ ,<sup>[19](#page-7-17)</sup> MnO<sub>4</sub>,<sup>[6](#page-7-4)</sup> and CrO<sub>4</sub> (Ref. [20](#page-7-18)) whose electron affinities are, respectively, 5.45, 5.0, and 4.96 eV. While several molecules involving transition metal atoms are known to possess high electron affinities,  $23,29,30$  $23,29,30$  $23,29,30$  many more are waiting to be discovered. Superhalogens to be found are expected to serve as building blocks of new energetic materials. $21-23$ 

In this paper, we have carried out a systematic study of the structure and electron affinities of  $MX_n$  clusters  $(M = Sc,$ Ti, V;  $X = F$ , Cl, Br;  $n=1-7$ ). We have selected transition metal atoms as the core due to the following reasons:  $(1)$ Since *d* electrons of a transition metal atom are localized while outer *s* electrons are delocalized, it is not clear which maximal formal valence can be assigned to a particular transition metal atom and how many halogen atoms this metal atom can bind? For example, Mn with its outer electron configuration of  $3d^54s^2$  exhibits oxidation states ranging from  $-3$  to  $+7$ . In MnO<sub>4</sub>, the maximal valence of Mn is 7 and consequently  $MnO<sub>4</sub>$  behaves as a superhalogen possessing the EA of 5 eV. $\frac{6}{2}$  Due to their unfilled *d*-shells, the transition metal atoms carry magnetic moments. For example, the magnetic moments of Sc, Ti, and V are 1, 2, and 3  $\mu_B$ , respectively. It is interesting to know how these moments change as halogen atoms are successively attached to these metal atoms and as the corresponding cluster charge state is altered.

Using hybrid density functional theory,  $24.25$  $24.25$  we have calculated the equilibrium geometries, electronic structure, and preferred spin states of both neutral and negatively charged  $MX_n$  clusters ( $M = Sc$ , Ti, V and  $X = F$ , Cl, Br and  $n = 1 - 7$ ). In negatively charged clusters, we found that the maximum number  $n$  of halogen atoms that can be attached to these

<span id="page-1-0"></span>a)Electronic mail: pjena@vcu.edu.

early transition metal atoms can be at most six. Electron affinities are calculated as the differences between the total energies of the anions and their corresponding neutral parents at their respective ground state geometries. The vertical detachment energies, on the other hand, correspond to the difference in the total energy between the anion ground state and the neutral having the anion geometry. The results are compared with available experiments. In Sec. II we provide a brief description of our theoretical procedure. In Sec. III the role of different halogens F, Cl, and Br on the structure and spectroscopic properties of  $ScX_n$  clusters is studied. Interactions of Ti and V with F atoms are discussed in Sec. IV and the results are summarized in Sec. V.

#### **II. COMPUTATIONAL METHOD**

Our calculations are carried out using density functional theory and the Becke's three parameter hybrid exchange functional combined with the Lee–Yang–Par correlation functional  $(B3LYP)$ .<sup>[24](#page-7-21)</sup> The atomic orbitals are represented by Gaussian basis sets  $6-311+G^*$ <sup>[26](#page-8-3)</sup>. The geometries are optimized without any symmetry constraint using GAUSSIAN 03 code. The effect of basis sets and hybrid exchangecorrelation energy functional on calculated electron affinities is examined by using larger basis sets and outer valence greens function (OVGF) method. Different initial geometries with halogen atoms bound to the transition metal atoms both molecularly and chemically were used to determine the ground state geometries. All allowable spin multiplicities are tried to determine the total spin of the ground state. The convergence for total energy and force was set to 0.000 001 eV and 0.001 eV/Å, respectively. The vibrational frequencies of all the clusters studied are positive and the states at the corresponding geometries belong to minima at the potential energy surface. Calculations for all neutral  $SCCl<sub>n</sub>$  as well as  $MX<sub>2</sub>$  ( $M = Sc$ , Ti, V) clusters were repeated using Vienna Ab initio simulation package (VASP) (Ref. [27](#page-8-4)) and the PW91 (Ref. [28](#page-8-5)) form for the generalized gradient approximation for the exchange and correlation potential to confirm their geometries. The optimized geometries were same as those obtained using the GAUSSIAN 03 code. These results can be obtained from the authors.

#### **III.** Sc $X_n$  ( $X = F$ , CI, Br; AND  $n = 1-5$ )

#### **A. Equilibrium geometries**

We first discuss our results on Sc decorated with F, Cl, and Br to determine how the geometries, electronic structure, and spectroscopic properties of metal halide clusters depend on the type of halogen atoms. We display the ground state geometries of neutral and anion  $\text{ScF}_n$  ( $n=1-5$ ) clusters in Fig. [1.](#page-2-0) The geometries of neutral clusters are similar to those of their corresponding anions for  $n \leq 3$  where all F atoms are bound chemically. This is consistent with the maximal valence  $(n_{\text{max}})$  of Sc of three. However, there are significant differences between the geometries of neutral and anion clusters for  $n \ge 4$ . While ScF<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup> has a perfect tetrahedral geometry, in neutral  $ScF_4$  two of F atoms are closer to each other and form a quasimolecular structure with a bond length of 2.02 Å. Note that the bond length of a  $F_2$  molecule calculated

<span id="page-2-0"></span>

FIG. 1. Optimized geometries of the anionic and neutral of ScF*<sup>n</sup>* and ScCl*<sup>n</sup>* clusters. The corresponding symmetries are listed.

at the same level theory used in this work is 1.41 Å. This is again consistent with the maximal valence of Sc of three. In the neutral  $\text{ScF}_4$ , four F atoms require four electrons to close their outermost electronic shells while Sc atom can only afford three electrons. Consequently, the second  $F_2$  molecule does not split and the bond between the F atoms only stretch. A similar adduct-type structure was found for  $\text{AlF}_4$  where Al has the valence of three.<sup>17</sup> In ScF<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup>, on the other hand, the fourth electron required to fill in the shells of four F atoms is supplied by the added electron. In neutral  $\text{ScF}_5$  clusters, we find two pairs of F atoms are bound to Sc in a quasimolecular form with the distance of 2.00 Å between them. In contrast, only one pair of F atoms binds quasimolecularly to Sc atom in  $\text{ScF}_5^-$  and the distance between these two F atoms is 1.96 Å. For  $n=6$ , our calculations show that the anionic  $\text{ScF}_6$ cluster dissociates into  $ScF_4$  cluster and a  $F_2$  molecule during optimization.

The ground state equilibrium geometries of neutral and anion  $ScCl_n$  clusters are also given in Fig. [1.](#page-2-0) These geometries are very similar to those of  $ScF<sub>n</sub>$  clusters with the exception of  $n=2$  and 5. Anionic ScCl<sub>2</sub> is linear while ScF<sub>2</sub> has a bent structure. In neutral  $ScCl<sub>5</sub>$ , two Cl atoms bind quasimolecularly with only one of them bound to the Sc atom. The geometries of neutral and anionic ScBr*<sup>n</sup>* clusters are similar to those of ScCl*<sup>n</sup>* clusters and hence not shown in Fig. [1.](#page-2-0) The bond lengths between Cl and that between Br atoms in quasimolecular structures of  $ScCl<sub>4</sub>$  and  $ScBr<sub>4</sub>$  are 2.80 and 3.03 Å, respectively. Note that the calculated bond lengths of  $Cl_2$  and  $Br_2$  molecules are 2.05 and 2.33 Å, respectively. In both anion and neutral  $ScCl<sub>5</sub>$  clusters, the bond lengths between the Cl atoms forming quasimolecular structure are 2.68 and 2.09 Å, respectively, while in the anion and neutral ScBr*<sup>n</sup>* clusters, the corresponding bond lengths are 2.90 and 2.39 Å, respectively.

In Fig.  $2(a)$  $2(a)$  we display the average bond lengths,  $\langle R \rangle$ , between Sc and F atoms in neutral and anionic ScF*<sup>n</sup>* clusters. In all cases, the average bond lengths of the anionic clusters are larger than those in the neutral clusters with the exception for  $n=4$  where the two average bond lengths are nearly equal. The average bond lengths between Sc and Cl atoms in the neutral and charged ScCl*<sup>n</sup>* clusters and between Sc and Br in the  $\text{ScBr}_n$  clusters are given in Figs. [2](#page-3-0)(b) and 2(c), respectively. The results are similar to those shown in Fig.  $2(a)$  $2(a)$  for ScF<sub>n</sub> clusters.

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

FIG. 2. The average Sc-F, Sc-Cl, and Sc-Br bond lengths (in angstrom) in the neutral and anionic clusters.

#### **B. Stability and fragmentation energies**

We define the fragmentation energies as

$$
\Delta E_{\text{neutral}} = E(\text{Sc}X_n) - E(\text{Sc}X_{n-m}) - E(X_m), \quad m = 1, 2, (1)
$$

$$
\Delta E_{\text{anion}}^1 = E(\text{ScX}_n^-) - E(\text{ScX}_{n-m}^-) - E(X_m), \quad m = 1, 2,
$$
\n(2)

$$
\Delta E_{\text{anion}}^2 = E(\text{Sc}X_n^-) - E(\text{Sc}X_{n-m}) - E(X_m^-), \quad m = 1, 2. \tag{3}
$$

In Fig.  $3(a)$  $3(a)$  we display the fragmentation energies of neutral  $\text{ScF}_n$  clusters where F atom is a product. As is seen, the fragmentation energies increase slowly from  $n=1$  to 3, but decreases abruptly at  $n=4$ . This is not surprising because  $n=4$  exceeds the maximal formal valence of Sc by one. Fragmentation energies of the channels where  $F_2$  is a product are shown in Fig.  $3(b)$  $3(b)$ . Comparing Figs.  $3(a)$  and  $3(b)$ , one notes that the preferable dissociation channel of the neutral  $\text{SCF}_5$  is  $ScF_3 + F_2$ .

Fragmentation energies of ScF*<sup>n</sup>* <sup>−</sup> clusters are shown in Figs.  $3(c)$  $3(c)$  and  $3(d)$ . As is seen from Fig.  $3(c)$ , the fragmentation energies increase slowly with *n* and drop sharply for  $n=$  5. The preferred dissociation channel yields a F atom for all values of *n*. The extra charge is carried by the F atoms for  $n \leq 4$  and by ScF<sub>4</sub> for  $n = 5$ . As will be discussed later, this is because the EA of F is larger than the electron affinities of

<span id="page-3-1"></span>

FIG. 3. Fragmentation energies (in eV) of  $\text{ScF}_n$ ,  $\text{ScCl}_n$ , and  $\text{ScBr}_n$  clusters with respect to halogen atoms and molecules.

 $\text{ScF}_n$  clusters for  $n \leq 3$  while the EA of  $\text{ScF}_4$  is larger than that of the F atom. The  $SCF_6^-$  anion does not exist and dissociates into  $\text{SCF}_4^-$  and  $\text{F}_2$  molecule during optimization. The larger fragmentation energy for *n*= 4 indicates an enhanced stability of the  $\text{ScF}_4^-$  anion.

We also display the corresponding fragmentation energies for  $ScCl_n$  and  $ScBr_n$  clusters in Fig. [3.](#page-3-1) The trend is same as that in  $\text{ScF}_n$  clusters. The only difference is that the fragmentation energies of  $ScBr_n$  clusters are smaller than in the  $ScCl<sub>n</sub>$  clusters which, in turn, are smaller than in the  $ScF<sub>n</sub>$ clusters. The decreasing stability of  $ScX_n$  clusters as *X* varies from F to Br is due to the increasing size of these halogen atoms that gives rise to a larger bond distance between Sc and the halogen atoms.

#### **C. Magnetic moments**

The magnetic moment of Sc atom in its ground state configuration  $(3d<sup>1</sup>4s<sup>2</sup>)$  is 1  $\mu_B$ . Thus, the ground state spin multiplicities of neutral ScF*<sup>n</sup>* clusters are expected to be either a singlet or a doublet depending upon whether *n* is odd or even. While this is the case for  $ScF_2$ ,  $ScF_3$ , and  $ScF_4$ , the ground state spin multiplicities for neutral ScF and  $ScF<sub>5</sub>$  are both three. The reason why the ground state of ScF is a triplet is related to the fact that F is monovalent. The neutral  $\text{ScF}_5$  cluster has two pairs of quasimolecular  $\text{F}_2$  and possesses the same spin multiplicity as ScF. On the contrary, all charged  $\text{ScF}_n^-$  clusters have either singlet or doublet ground state. Except for  $n=1$  the ground states of ScCl<sub>n</sub>, ScCl<sub>n</sub><sup>-</sup>,  $\text{ScBr}_n$ , and  $\text{ScBr}_n^-$  clusters are also either singlets or doublets depending upon whether *n* is odd or even. The spin multiplicity of the neutral  $ScCl<sub>5</sub>$  or  $SeBr<sub>5</sub>$  clusters is different from that of  $\text{ScF}_5$ . This is consistent with the difference in their ground state geometries in Fig. [1.](#page-2-0) The ground state geometrical configurations of  $ScCl<sub>5</sub> (ScBr<sub>5</sub>)$  clusters contain quasimolecular  $Cl_2$  (Br<sub>2</sub>) attached to the ScCl<sub>3</sub> (ScBr<sub>3</sub>) cluster and the corresponding state has the same spin multiplicity as  $ScCl<sub>3</sub>$  (ScBr<sub>3</sub>).

In all neutral  $MX_2$  clusters, the transition metal atom retains its magnetic moment. As long as the 3*d* electrons are not participating in the interaction, valence shell electron pair repulsion (VSEPR) theory can be used to analyze the geometries. According to this theory, the geometries are bent when the central atom has one or two lone pairs of electrons while it is linear when there are three lone pairs of electrons in the central atom. Consequently, geometries of ScX<sub>2</sub> clusters are bent. In anionic  $MX_2$  clusters, much of the extra electron goes to the transition metal (discussed later in the section) and the magnetic moment decreases by one in each case. Thus, the VSEPR theory does not hold good. Anionic  $ScF<sub>2</sub>$  is bent while  $ScCl_2^-$  and  $ScBr_2^-$  are linear. Since Cl is larger than F,  $ScCl<sub>2</sub>$ <sup>-</sup> becomes linear to minimize the repulsive force between Cl atoms. Similar is the case with  $\text{ScBr}_2^$ cluster.

#### **D. Vertical detachment energies and electron affinity**

The calculated vertical detachment energies (VDE) of an extra electron from the  $ScX_n^-$  anions and electron affinities (EAs) of the neutral  $ScX_n$  clusters are given in Table [I](#page-4-0) and

<span id="page-4-0"></span>TABLE I. The EA and VDE (in eV) for Sc halide clusters together with the ground state magnetic moments of the neutral and anion clusters obtained at the B3LYP level of theory.

Cluster	Neutral $\mu$ $(\mu_B)$	Anion $\mu$ $(\mu_B)$	EA (eV)	<b>VDE</b> (eV)
ScF	$\overline{2}$	1	1.02	1.05
ScF <sub>2</sub>	1	$\theta$	1.18	1.22
ScF <sub>3</sub>	$\Omega$	1	1.28	1.49
ScF <sub>4</sub>	1	$\theta$	7.16	7.74
ScF <sub>5</sub>	$\overline{2}$	1	7.05	7.95
ScCl	$\overline{c}$	1	1.19	1.24
ScCl <sub>2</sub>	1	$\overline{0}$	1.50	1.61
ScCl <sub>3</sub>	$\theta$	1	2.15	2.43
ScCl <sub>4</sub>	1	$\overline{0}$	6.11	6.35
ScCl <sub>5</sub>	$\theta$	1	5.35	6.29
ScBr	$\overline{2}$	1	1.23	1.30
ScBr <sub>2</sub>	1	$\theta$	1.55	1.64
ScBr <sub>3</sub>	$\theta$	1	2.30	2.70
ScBr <sub>4</sub>	1	$\overline{0}$	5.59	5.83
ScBr <sub>5</sub>	$\theta$	$\mathbf{1}$	4.80	5.71

Fig. [4.](#page-4-1) While the EA values of ScF,  $ScF_2$ , and  $ScF_3$  are relatively small,  $\text{ScF}_4$  has the EA of 7.16 eV and is a superhalogen. The EA and VDE values are rather close to each other in ScF, ScF<sub>2</sub>, and ScF<sub>3</sub> which is consistent with small changes in the neutral geometries following an attachment of the extra electron (see Fig. [1](#page-2-0)). On the contrary, the VDE and EA values are very different in  $ScF_4$  and  $ScF_5$  due to dramatic differences between the corresponding neutral and anionic geometries.

The EA values of  $ScCl_n$  and  $ScBr_n$  are displayed in Figs.  $4(b)$  $4(b)$  and  $4(c)$ , respectively. There are significant differences with respect to the previous case of ScF*n*. The EA values of  $ScCl<sub>4</sub>$  and  $ScBr<sub>4</sub>$  are less steep. [I](#page-4-0)t is seen from Table I that the EA values of  $SCF_n$  for  $n \le n_{\text{max}}$  are smaller than those of ScCl*<sup>n</sup>* which in turn are smaller than those of ScBr*n*. Reverse is the case for  $n \ge n_{\text{max}}$ . This behavior is due to the combination of two effects: electronegativity and size of halogen atoms. We will discuss this in more detail in the following

<span id="page-4-1"></span>

section. The experimental EA is available only for  $\text{ScCl}_4$ <sup>[29](#page-8-0)[,30](#page-8-1)</sup> Our calculated EA value for  $ScCl<sub>4</sub>$  is approximately 0.7 eV smaller than the experimental value. In view of good agreement with experiment for other superhalogens mentioned in Sec. I, it is unclear what is the reason of this mismatch. To see if this difference is caused by limitations in the basis sets we calculated the EA for  $ScCl<sub>4</sub>$  using a larger basis set, namely,  $6-311+G(3df).$  $6-311+G(3df).$  $6-311+G(3df).$ <sup>31</sup> The EA of ScCl<sub>4</sub> and VDE of  $ScCl<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup>$  are calculated to be 5.96 and 6.31 eV, respectively, using  $6-311+G(3df)$  basis set. These compare well with corresponding values of 6.11 and 6.38 eV obtained using  $6-311+G^*$  basis sets. Clearly, basis sets are not the cause for the large discrepancy between theory and experiment. In order to see if the disagreement is due to deficiency in the density functional theory, we used the OVGF/6-311 +G(3df) (Refs. [32](#page-8-7) and [33](#page-8-8)) method with the anionic  $ScCl_4$ geometry obtained using the larger basis sets to calculate VDE. This yielded a value of 7.26 eV which is much closer to the experimental value of 7.14 eV. Recall that calculations using  $B3LYP+6-311+G^*$  underestimated the VDE value by  $\sim$ 0.7 eV. However, the VDE values for ScCl<sub>n</sub><sup>-</sup> (n=1,2,3) obtained using the OVGF/6-311+G(3df) method are 1.15, 1.44, and 2.46 eV, respectively, for *n*= 1, 2, 3 and match well with the VDE values in Table [I.](#page-4-0) In a similar way, the VDE for anionic  $\text{ScF}_4$  and  $\text{ScBr}_4$  are calculated to be 9.74 and 6.60 eV, respectively, using the OVGF/6-311+G(3df) method.

#### **E. Charge distribution**

In order to understand the nature of bonding of halogen atoms to Sc, we analyzed charges on Sc and halogen atoms as a function of *n* for both neutral and anionic species using natural bond orbital analysis[.34](#page-8-9) The results are displayed in Fig. [4.](#page-4-1) In all  $ScX_n$  clusters, the total charges on Sc atom are positive indicating charge transfer from Sc to the halogen atoms. The charges on the Sc atom for  $n \leq n_{\text{max}}$  steadily rise in both neutral and anionic clusters and the charge on Sc is

FIG. 4. Top panels: EA of ScF*n*, ScCl*n*, and ScBr*<sup>n</sup>* clusters. Bottom panels: the charge on Sc atom [in (e)] for anionic and neutral clusters.

 This article is copyrighted as indicated in the article. Reuse of AIP content is subject to the terms at: http://scitation.aip.org/termsconditions. Downloaded to IP: 128.172.48.58 On: Mon, 12 Oct 2015 18:22:56

smaller in the anions than in the neutral clusters. For *n*  $\geq n_{\text{max}}$ , the charge on Sc is same irrespective of whether it is an anion or a neutral cluster.

Results in Figs.  $4(d) - 4(f)$  $4(d) - 4(f)$  illustrate the nature of bonding between Sc and halogen atoms. In neutral  $ScX_n$  clusters for  $n \leq n_{\text{max}}$  Sc atom continues to transfer charge to *X* atoms since *X* atoms are electronegative. When the number of *X* atoms reaches the maximal valence of Sc, this transfer is no longer possible and subsequent *X* atoms bind to Sc in quasimolecular form. When the extra electron is added to Sc*Xn* clusters, it prefers to go to the Sc atom which is already positively charged for  $n \le n_{\text{max}}$ . Hence the total charge on Sc reduces in  $ScX_n^-$  compared to that in  $ScX_n$  clusters. At *n*  $>n_{\text{max}}$ , the extra electron in Sc $X_n$ <sup>-</sup> goes to the *X* atoms and this causes the EA to rise sharply as seen in Table [I](#page-4-0) and Fig. [4.](#page-4-1)

Electron counting shows that the neutral  $ScX_4$  cluster has one electron less than what is necessary to satisfy the octet rule. Both factors, one electron less than necessary to close electronic shell in  $ScX_4$  and the extra electron being distributed among all *X* atoms, give rise to large EA for Sc*X*4. Hence,  $ScX_4$  is a superhalogen. When one more X atom is added and we move from  $n=4$  to 5, we find the same charge on Sc, in both anionic and neutral clusters. Since two electrons are needed to close the shells in  $ScX_5^-$ , EA does not increase further.

We see from Table [I](#page-4-0) and Fig. [4](#page-4-1) that the EAs of  $ScX_n$  for  $n \leq n_{\text{max}}$  increase as one *X* goes from F to Br, but reverse happens for  $n \ge n_{\text{max}}$ . To explain the former we note that the charge on Sc in  $\text{SCF}_n$  clusters is larger than that in  $\text{SCCI}_n$ clusters which in turn is larger than that in  $ScBr_n$  clusters as shown in Figs.  $4(d) - 4(f)$  $4(d) - 4(f)$ . This is a reflection of the size of the *X* atoms: as the size increases from F to Br, the distance between Sc and *X* becomes larger and the bonding gets weaker. Correspondingly, the EAs of  $ScX_n$  increase from  $X$  $=F$  to  $X=Br$  for  $n \leq 3$ .

For  $n \ge n_{\text{max}}$ , the extra charge in the anion clusters goes to the halogen atoms. Since the electronegativity increases from Br to Cl to F, the EA of  $ScX_n$  for  $n \geq 4$  increases from  $X = Br$  to  $X = F$ .

<span id="page-5-0"></span>

FIG. 5. Optimized geometries of the neutral and charged clusters of TiF*<sup>n</sup>* and VF*<sup>n</sup>* clusters. The corresponding symmetries are listed.

<span id="page-5-1"></span>

FIG. 6. The Sc-F, Ti-F, and V-F average bond lengths (in angstrom) in neutral and anionic clusters.

#### **IV. TiF***<sup>n</sup>* **AND VF***<sup>n</sup>*

#### **A. Equilibrium geometries**

In order to understand how the spectroscopic properties will change as the occupancy of the 3*d* orbitals changes, we studied  $\text{TiF}_n$  and  $\text{VF}_n$  clusters. Since the electronic configurations of Ti and V atoms are  $3d^2 4s^2$  and  $3d^3 4s^2$ , respectively, the maximal valence  $n_{\text{max}}$  of Ti and V is four and five, respectively. The geometries of neutral and anionic TiF*<sup>n</sup>* and VF*<sup>n</sup>* clusters were optimized following the same procedure as outlined before. The optimized geometries are given in Fig. [5.](#page-5-0) The ground state optimized geometries of the neutral and anionic clusters of TiF<sub>n</sub> are similar to those for  $\text{SCF}_n$  for  $n \leq 4$  with the exception that the neutral TiF<sub>4</sub> is a perfect tetrahedron because it is isoelectronic to  $\text{ScF}_4^-$ . Neutral  $\text{ScF}_2$ is linear due to the presence one lone pair of electrons while  $TiF<sub>2</sub>$  is linear due to presence of two lone pairs of electrons. This is in accordance with the VSEPR theory discussed earlier. The equilibrium geometry of  $\text{TiF}_2^-$  is a bent structure which can be explained similar to the bent structure of  $SCF_2$ <sup>-</sup> cluster. The ground state geometry of the neutral  $\text{TiF}_5$  cluster is also similar to that of the  $\text{ScF}_5^-$  cluster. The bond length in the quasimolecular  $F_2$  in neutral TiF<sub>5</sub> is 1.96 A. For  $n=6$ , we also found a pair of quasimolecular  $F_2$ 's in the anion cluster with the same bond length. The neutral  $TiF_6$  cluster has an adduct type geometry  $\text{TiF}_4^* \text{F}_2$ , with positive vibrational frequencies. A similar adduct-type structure  $\text{Aut}_{5}^* \mathbf{F}_2$  was found for a AuF<sub>7</sub> species.<sup>35</sup> The average bond lengths for the neutral and charged clusters are given in Fig.  $6$ . For  $n=5$  we find that the average bond lengths for both the species are essentially the same.

Optimized ground state geometries in the  $VF<sub>n</sub>$  clusters are similar to those in TiF<sub>n</sub> for  $n=1$ , 3, and 4 (see Fig. [5](#page-5-0)), while we found linear geometries for both  $VF_2$  and  $VF_2^-$ .  $VF<sub>2</sub> cluster is linear due to the presence of three long pairs of$ electrons according to the VSEPR theory and the addition of an electron keeps the structure intact. The geometries of  $VF<sub>5</sub>$ are  $TiF_5^-$  are very similar since they are isoelectronic. The  $VF_7^-$  cluster dissociates into  $VF_6^-$  and F while neutral  $VF_7$ cluster dissociates into  $VF_5$  and  $F_2$ . We found all frequencies to be positive. The average bond lengths for neutral and anion  $VF<sub>n</sub>$  clusters are displayed in Fig. [6.](#page-5-1) The average bond lengths for anion geometries are larger than for the corresponding neutral geometries except for  $n=5$  and 6 when they are essentially the same for both the species.

#### **B. Stability and fragmentation energies**

The fragmentation energies are displayed in Fig. [7.](#page-6-0) The neutral TiF<sub>n</sub> clusters are very stable for  $n \leq 4$  while the an-

 This article is copyrighted as indicated in the article. Reuse of AIP content is subject to the terms at: http://scitation.aip.org/termsconditions. Downloaded to IP: 128.172.48.58 On: Mon, 12 Oct 2015 18:22:56

<span id="page-6-0"></span>

FIG. 7. Fragmentation energies (in eV) of TiF<sub>n</sub> and VF<sub>n</sub> clusters with respect to F and  $F_2$ . Fragmentation energies of  $ScF_n$  are shown for comparison.

ionic clusters are stable up to  $n=5$ . We did not find any noticeable peak at  $n=5$  similar to the peak at  $n=4$  for anionic  $\text{ScF}_n$  clusters in Fig. [3.](#page-3-1) The fragmentation energy decreases for  $n>2$  in both neutral and anionic  $VF<sub>n</sub>$  clusters. The stability for anionic cluster at  $n=6$  is less than that at  $n=5$ although it was expected to have a peak at  $n=6$ . So the fragmentation energies of  $VF<sub>n</sub>$  clusters indicate that the F atoms are weakly attached to V atom even when the number of F atoms is smaller than the maximal formal valence of V atom.

#### **C. Magnetic moments**

The magnetic moments of TiF and VF are larger than that of Ti  $(V)$  atom by one. For larger  $n$ , the magnetic moments exhibit oscillations between 1 and 0 depending on whether the total number of electrons is odd or even. For the anion clusters, the magnetic moments of TiF and VF are same as those of the corresponding metal atoms and decrease by one as subsequent F atoms are attached. This trend continues up top  $n \leq 4$  beyond which the magnetic moments oscillate between 0 and 1.

<span id="page-6-1"></span>TABLE II. The EA and VDE (in eV) for Ti and V fluoride clusters along with the ground state magnetic moments of the neutral and anion clusters obtained at the B3LYP level of theory.

Cluster	Neutral $\mu$ $(\mu_B)$	Anion $\mu$ $(\mu_B)$	EA (eV)	<b>VDE</b> (eV)
TiF	3	$\overline{c}$	0.98	1.01
TiF <sub>2</sub>	$\overline{2}$	1	1.11	1.18
TiF <sub>3</sub>	1	$\overline{2}$	1.22	1.72
TiF <sub>4</sub>	$\Omega$	1	1.99	2.32
TiF <sub>5</sub>	1	$\theta$	6.87	7.89
TiF <sub>6</sub>	$\Omega$	1	6.22	7.50
VF	4	3	0.98	1.01
VF <sub>2</sub>	3	$\overline{2}$	1.01	1.03
VF <sub>3</sub>	$\overline{2}$	3	2.08	2.62
VF <sub>4</sub>		$\overline{c}$	3.41	4.22
$VF_5$	$\theta$	1	4.55	5.06
$VF_{6}$		$\overline{0}$	7.26	8.29

#### **D. VDE and EA**

The calculated EA and VDE values of  $TiF_n$  and  $VF_n$  are given in Table [II](#page-6-1) and Fig. [8.](#page-7-22) We found the EA and VDE values to be very close to each other for  $n \leq 4$  and  $n \leq 5$  in  $TiF<sub>n</sub>$  and  $VF<sub>n</sub>$  series, respectively, due to similarity in the corresponding neutral and anionic geometries. By analogy with  $\text{SCF}_n$ , we expect a jump in the EA for TiF<sub>5</sub> and VF<sub>6</sub> clusters. As seen from Fig. [8,](#page-7-22) there is a sharp rise in the EA value for TiF<sub>5</sub> but the rise in EA value for  $VF<sub>6</sub>$  is much less pronounced. The VDE values for anionic TiF<sub>5</sub> and VF<sub>6</sub> are calculated to be 9.63 and 9.83 eV, respectively, using the  $OVGF/6-311+G(3df)$  method.

#### **E. Charge distribution**

The charges on Ti atom for both neutral and anionic clusters are given in Fig.  $8(e)$  $8(e)$ . As is seen, they increase steadily with the number of F atoms for both the neutral and anionic TiF<sub>n</sub>. However, they assume the same value at  $n=5$ , the maximal valence of Ti. In the anionic  $\text{TiF}_5^-$  cluster, the extra electron is distributed among five F atoms and hence, there is a sharp increase in EA between  $n=4$  and 5 as shown in Fig.  $8(b)$  $8(b)$ . There is a drop in EA at  $n=6$  which is expected because it has two electrons less than that required for the closed shell. For VF*<sup>n</sup>* clusters, we expected a jump in the EA when we go from  $n=5$  to  $n=6$ . But we see a completely different behavior in Fig.  $8(c)$  $8(c)$ , though the EA for VF<sub>6</sub> is very high. We found the same charge on Ti in  $\text{TiF}_n$  clusters for  $n \geq 5$  as on Sc in ScF<sub>n</sub> clusters for  $n \geq 4$ . This is not a coincidence but reflects the fact that the valence of Ti is one more than that of Sc. The charges on V for neutral and anion clusters are very close to each other for  $n \geq 4$  since the extra electron in  $VF<sub>n</sub>$  is delocalized over F atoms for  $n \ge 4$ . Hence, all these clusters should have high EAs. In fact the EA for  $VF<sub>4</sub>$  is 3.41 eV which is close to the EA of F atom. But the electron counting indicates that  $VF<sub>4</sub>$  is three electrons less than what is required for closed shell. Therefore, the EAs continue to increase for  $n=5$  and 6 as shown in Fig. [8](#page-7-22)(c). As  $VF<sub>6</sub>$  behaves like a superhalogen with one electron less than required for the closed shell, its EA is the largest.  $VF<sub>7</sub>$ , on the other hand requires two electrons to close its shell and hence its EA falls below that of  $VF<sub>6</sub>$ .

#### **V. CONCLUSIONS**

A systematic study based on density functional theory was carried out to understand the electronic structure and spectroscopic properties of early transition metal atoms *M*  $(Sc, Ti, and V)$  interacting with halogen atoms  $X$   $(F, Cl, and V)$ Br). Several interesting observations are made:

 $(1)$ 1 Transition metal atoms can bind more halogen atoms than their maximal formal valence  $n_{\text{max}}$  would allow. The number of halogen atoms that can bind chemically to the metal atom is  $n_{\text{max}}$ . Once the number of halogen atoms is larger than  $n_{\text{max}}$ , halogen atoms begin to bind in a quasimolecular  $X_2$  form. The transition metal atoms can bind one more halogen atom chemically in the

 This article is copyrighted as indicated in the article. Reuse of AIP content is subject to the terms at: http://scitation.aip.org/termsconditions. Downloaded to IP: 128.172.48.58 On: Mon, 12 Oct 2015 18:22:56

<span id="page-7-22"></span>

FIG. 8. EA (in eV), charges on Ti and V atoms in the neutral and charged  $\text{TiF}_n$  and  $\text{VF}_n$  clusters. The values of ScF*<sup>n</sup>* are presented for comparison.

anion than in the neutral cluster. That is, the extra electron serves as an additional valence for the central atom.

- $(2)$ The fragmentation energies of  $ScX_n$  increase slowly up to  $n=3$  and decrease as *n* grows farther. A Sc $X_4$  cluster behaves as a superhalogen since it has one electron less than required to close the valence shell. The binding energy in the  $ScX_4^-$  anion exceeds 4 eV and very high energy is required for the detachment of the extra electron. The electron affinities of a transition metal halide can be higher than 7 eV.
- $(3)$ 3) The behavior of the TiF<sub>n</sub>  $(n_{\text{max}}=4)$  clusters and their anions is similar to that found for the  $ScX_n$  series. The fragmentation energies of TiF<sub>n</sub> are large for  $n \leq 4$  and decreases suddenly at  $n=5$ . Neutral TiF<sub>5</sub> has EA of 6.87 eV and satisfies the formula for a conventional superhalogen.
- (4)  $VF_n$  clusters behave slightly different from  $ScF_n$  and TiF<sub>n</sub> clusters. The binding energy of  $VF<sub>n</sub>$  decreases beginning with  $n=2$ . This is in contrast to what one would have naively expected, namely, the binding energies to be large until the number of halogen atoms reaches  $n_{\text{max}}$ . Consequently, the F atoms are weakly attached to V atom as compared to Sc or Ti atom. The EAs for  $\text{SCF}_n$  and  $\text{TiF}_n$  clusters are larger than the EA of F atom only if *n* is more than  $n_{\text{max}}$ . On the contrary, the EAs of several  $VF<sub>n</sub>$  clusters are larger than the EA of F even if the number of F atoms attached is less than  $n_{\text{max}}$ . The same charge on V for neutral and anion VF<sub>4</sub> clusters also confirms that the participation of *d* electrons decreases as we go from Sc to V. It will be interesting to study the interaction of F atoms with the transition metals having larger *d* electron occupancy than V.
- $\overline{(}$ Experimental result of the VDE only exists for  $ScCl<sub>4</sub>$ . We noted that B3LYP level of theory cannot quantitatively account for this experimental result. However, VDE calculation using OVGF method agrees very well with experiment. For  $n \leq n_{\text{max}}$ , OVGF level of theory provides no significant improvement. It will be interest-

ing to compare our results with experimental data on  $ScF_4$  and  $ScBr_4$  when available.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This work was partially supported by a grant from the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (Grant No. HDTRA1-09-1-0025).

- <span id="page-7-0"></span><sup>1</sup>D. F. Hunt, G. C. Stafford, Jr., F. W. Crow, and J. W. Russell, [Anal.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ac50008a014) **[Chem.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ac50008a014) 48**, 2098 (1976).
- <span id="page-7-1"></span><sup>2</sup>F. Arnold, Nature ([London](http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/284610a0)) 284, 610 (1980).
- <span id="page-7-2"></span><sup>3</sup>H. Hotop and W. C. Lineberger, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 14, 731  $(1985)$ . (1985).<br><sup>4</sup>G. L. Gutsev and A. I. Boldyrev, [Chem. Phys. Lett.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0009-2614(84)87059-1) **108**, 250 (1984).<br><sup>5</sup>M. *K*. Scholler, B. N. Compton, and J. S. Coderbourn, Science, 270, 11
- <span id="page-7-3"></span>
- <span id="page-7-7"></span>M. K. Scheller, R. N. Compton, and L. S. Cederbaum, [Science](http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.270.5239.1160) **270**, 1160  $^{(1995)}_{6}$
- <span id="page-7-4"></span> ${}^{6}$ G. L. Gutsev, B. K. Rao, P. Jena, X.-B. Wang, and L.-S. Wang, [Chem.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2614(99)00976-8) **[Phys. Lett.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2614(99)00976-8) 312, 598 (1999).**<br> $^{7}$ N. Pertlett. Proc. Cham. So:
- <span id="page-7-5"></span><sup>N</sup>N. Barttlett, Proc. Chem. Soc., London **6**, 218 (1962).
- <span id="page-7-6"></span>N. Barttlett and D. H. Lohmann, Proc. Chem. Soc., London **3**, 115  $(1962)$ . <sup>1962</sup>. <sup>9</sup> T. Drews, J. Supel, A. Hagenbach, and K. Seppelt, [Inorg. Chem.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ic052029f) **45**,
- <span id="page-7-8"></span>3782 (2006).
- <span id="page-7-9"></span> $^{10}$ G. L. Gutsev and A. I. Boldyrev, [Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0301-0104(81)80150-4) **56**, 277 (1981).
- <span id="page-7-10"></span> $11$ <sup>G.</sup> L. Gutsev and A. I. Boldyrev, [Adv. Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470142851.ch3) **61**, 169 (1985).
- <span id="page-7-11"></span> $12$ X.-B. Wang, C.-F. Ding, L.-S. Wang, A. I. Boldyrev, and [J.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.478386) Simons, J. [Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.478386) 110, 4763 (1999).
- <span id="page-7-12"></span><sup>13</sup>B. M. Elliott, E. Koyle, A. I. Boldyrev, X.-B. Wang, and L.-S. Wang, [J.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/jp054036v) [Phys. Chem. A](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/jp054036v) 109, 11560 (2005).
- $14$  I. Anusiewicz and P. Skurski, [Chem. Phys. Lett.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2614(02)00666-8) **358**, 426 (2002).
- <span id="page-7-13"></span><sup>15</sup> I. Anusiewicz, M. Sobczyk, I. Dabkowska, and P. Skurski, [Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0301-0104(03)00208-8) **291**, 171 (2003).
- <span id="page-7-14"></span> $16$ C. Sikorska, S. Smuczynska, P. Skurski, and I. Anusiewicz, [Inorg. Chem.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ic800863z) 47, 7348 (2008).
- <span id="page-7-15"></span><sup>17</sup>G. L. Gutsev, P. Jena, and R. J. Bartlett, [Chem. Phys. Lett.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2614(98)00716-7) **292**, 289  $(1998).$
- <span id="page-7-16"></span><sup>18</sup> A. N. Alexandrova, A. I. Boldyrev, Y.-J. Fu, X. Yang, X.-B. Wang, and L.-S. Wang, [J. Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1783276) 121, 5709 (2004).
- <span id="page-7-17"></span><sup>19</sup>G. L. Gutsev, R. J. Barttlett, A. I. Boldyrev, and J. Simons, [J. Chem.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.474764) [Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.474764) 107, 3867 (1997).
- <span id="page-7-18"></span><sup>20</sup>G. L. Gutsev, P. Jena, H.-J. Zhai, and L.-S. Wang, [J. Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1405438) 115, 7935 (2001).
- <span id="page-7-20"></span> $21$  J. C. Champarnaud-Mesjard and B. Frit, Eur. J. Solid State Inorg. Chem. **29**, 161 (1992).
- $12$ <sup>22</sup>N. Bartlett, G. Lucier, C. Shen, W. J. Casteel, L. Chacon, J. Munzenberg, and B. Zemva, [J. Fluorine Chem.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1139(94)06005-7) **71**, 163 (1995).
- and B. Zemva, J. Fluorine Chem. **71**, 163 (1995).<br><sup>23</sup>Q. Wang, Q. Sun, and P. Jena, [J. Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3236576) **131**, 124301 ( <sup>23</sup> Q. Wang, Q. Sun, and P. Jena, [J. Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.464913) **131**, 124301 (2009). <sup>24</sup> B. D. Becke, J. Chem. Phys. **98**, 5648 (1993).
- <span id="page-7-21"></span><span id="page-7-19"></span> $^{24}$ B. D. Becke, J. Chem. Phys. 98, 5648 (1993).
- <span id="page-8-3"></span><span id="page-8-2"></span>B.04, Gaussian, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, 2003. 26R. Krishnan, J. S. Binkley, R. Seeger, and J. A. Pople, [J. Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.438955) **<sup>72</sup>**, 650 (1980).
- <span id="page-8-4"></span><sup>27</sup>G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *[Phys. Rev. B](http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.47.558)* 47, 558 (1993).
- <span id="page-8-5"></span><sup>28</sup> J. P. Perdew, in *Electronic Structure of Solids*, edited by P. Ziesche and H. Eschrig (Akademie, Berlin, 1991).
- <span id="page-8-0"></span><sup>29</sup> J. Yang, X.-B. Wang, X.-P. Xing, and L.-S. Wang, [J. Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.2938390) 128, 201102 (2008).
- <span id="page-8-1"></span>30X. Yang, X.-B. Wang, L.-S. Wang, S. Q. Niu, and T. Ichiye, [J. Chem.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1610431) [Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1610431) 119, 8311 (2003).
- <span id="page-8-6"></span> $31$  A. D. McLean and G. S. Chandler, [J. Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.438980) **72**, 5639 (1980).
- <span id="page-8-7"></span><sup>32</sup> J. V. Ortiz, [J. Chem. Phys.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.455401) **89**, 6348 (1988).
- <span id="page-8-8"></span><sup>33</sup> L. S. Cederbaum, [J. Phys. B](http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0022-3700/8/2/018) 8, 290 (1975).
- <span id="page-8-9"></span><sup>34</sup> A. E. Reed, L. A. Curtiss, and F. Weinhold, Chem. Rev. ([Washington,](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/cr00088a005) [D.C.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/cr00088a005)) 88, 899 (1988).
- <span id="page-8-10"></span><sup>35</sup> D. Himmel and S. Riedel, *[Inorg. Chem.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ic700431s)* **46**, 5338 (2007).