Nanoscale

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the **Information for Authors**.

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard <u>Terms & Conditions</u> and the <u>Ethical guidelines</u> still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



www.rsc.org/nanoscale

Nanoscale

Nanoscale

COMMENT

Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

Comment on "B₃₈: an all-boron fullerene analogue" by J. Lv, Y. Wang, L. Zhu and Y. Ma, *Nanoscale*, 2014, 6, 11692

Truong Ba Tai^{*} and Minh Tho Nguyen^{*}

Received 00th January 2014, Accepted 00th January 2014

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/nanoscale

In a recent paper (*Nanoscale*, 2014, **6**, 11692), based on the results computed using DFT and MP2 methods, the all-boron fullerene **I** was reported to be the global minimum of the cluster B_{38} and much more stable than the quasi-planar **II**. In this comment, we showed that at higher level of theory CCSD(T), both structures **I** and quasi-planar **II** are almost degenerate in energy and the B_{38} can be considered as a transition size between 2D and 3D boron clusters. While the MP2 method favours the 3D structure **I**, the CCSD method tends to overestimate the relative stability of the 2D structure **II**.

In a recent paper, Ma and co-authors¹ reported theoretical results on the boron cluster B_{38} . They showed that B_{38} is an allboron fullerene containing 4 hexagonal holes and 56 triangles. Since the clusters B_{30}^{2} and B_{36}^{3} were recently found to have bowled structures that contain pentagonal and hexagonal holes, respectively, the existence of a three-dimensional fullerene as the most stable isomer of B_{38} is interesting. However, the computed results¹ should be reconsidered since the MP2 method was known to give unrealistic results for boron clusters.^{4,5} In this comment, we show that both isomers, including caged-like structure I and quasi-planar structure II, are almost degenerate in energy (cf. Figure 1), and the B_{38} can be considered as a transition size between 2D and 3D boron clusters.

Ma and co-workers¹ performed a search for the local minima of B₃₈ using a particle swarm optimization algorithm. Based on relative energies (REs) calculated using the methods and PBE/6-311G(d), PBE0/6-311G(d) MP2/6-311G(d)//PBE0/6-311G(d), these authors concluded that the 3D fullerene I is the most stable isomer of the B_{38} . While both isomers I and II are almost degenerate in energy at the PBE/6-311G(d) level, I is much more stable than II when the MP2 method was used. It is however known that the MP2 method tends to overestimate relative stability for 3D structures of boron clusters, whereas the DFT functionals such as PBE, TPSSh, PBE0 can produce more realistic RE values that are comparable with those obtained at CCSD(T) level.^{4,5} Thus a re-examination of structural stability of the B_{38} isomers is necessary.

The lowest-lying isomers reported by Ma *et al.*¹ are thus reoptimized by using the DFT functionals TPSSh,⁶ PBE and PBE0^{7,8} in conjunction with the 6-311+G(d) basis set that are implemented in Gaussian 09 package.⁹ Our PBE and PBE0 energy values agree well with Ma et al.¹ that the fullerene I is more stable than the form II. However, the functional TPSSh gives a reversed ordering of energy where the form II is now 0.34 eV more stable than I. To confirm the relative stability of both isomers, their single point electronic energies are calculated by using the MP2,¹⁰ CCSD¹¹ and CCSD(T)¹² methods with TPSSh/6-311+G(d) and PBE0/6-311+G(d) geometries. These calculations are performed using the Molpro 09 package.¹³ At the higher level CCSD(T)/6-311G(d), both structures are almost degenerate in energy with a tiny energy gap (Fig. 1). Structure I is slightly more stable than structure II when the TPSSh/6-311+G(d) geometries are used. The quasi-planar structure II becomes somewhat more stable when the PBE0/6-311+G(d) geometries are used.

RSCPublishing

Top view		
Side view		white the
	I $(D_{2h}, {}^{1}A_{g})$	$\mathbf{II}(C_1, {}^{1}\mathrm{A})$
PBE0/6-311G(d) ^a	0.00 eV	0.21 eV
PBE/6-311G(d) ^a	0.00	0.02
MP2/6-311G(d)//PBE0 ^a	0.00	3.25
PBE0/6-311+G(d)	0.00	0.38
PBE/6-311+G(d)	0.00	0.18
TPSSh/6-311+G(d)	0.34	0.00
MP2/6-311G(d)//PBE0	0.00	4.26
MP2/6-311G(d)//TPSSh	0.00	3.20
CCSD/6-311G(d)//TPSSh	0.41	0.00
CCSD/6-311G(d)//PBE0	0.50	0.00
CCSD(T)/6-311G(d)//TPSSh	0.00	0.12
CCSD(T)/6-311G(d)//PBE0	0.02	0.00

Fig.1 Shapes and relative energies (eV) of isomer I and II obtained at various computational methods. a)The values obtained at ref. 1.

It is more important to note that the MP2 method was confirmed to overestimate the relative stability of threedimensional fullerene I and provides unrealistic computed results for boron clusters. At the MP2/6-311G(d), the 3D structure I is much more stable than the structure II with energy gap of 3.20 - 4.26 eV. Oppositely, the CCSD method tends to favour the planar structure II. Our CCSD results show that II is more stable than I with relative energy of 0.41 - 0.50 eV.

In conclusion, we re-examined the relative stability of the isomers B_{38} using the different quantum chemical methods, including DFT, MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T). At the highest level considered CCSD(T), we found that the B_{38} is not completely a 3D fullerene, and both isomers I and II are almost degenerate in energy and likely coexist in the energy landscape of B_{38} . This size can be considered as a transition size between 2D and 3D boron clusters since the cluster B_{36}^3 is quasi-planar structure, whereas the $B_{40}^{14,15}$ was recently found to be a stable fullerene. While the MP2 method favours the 3D structure I, the CCSD method overestimates the stability of the quasi-planar structure II.

These findings not only give more insight into the structural characteristics of the boron cluster B_{38} , but they also provide a benchmark for the computational methods for this intriguing system.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to the KU Leuven research council (GOA) and Vlaams Supercomputer Centrum (VSC), KU Leuven, Belgium. TBT would like to thank the Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek-FWO for a postdoctoral fellowship.

Notes and references

^a Department of Chemistry, University of Leuven, Celestijnenlaan 200F, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium. E-mail: <u>minh.nguyen@chem.kuleuven.be</u> and <u>truong.batai@chem.kuleuven.be</u>.

^b MTN is also at Institute for Computational Science and Technology (ICST), Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

- 1 J. Lv, Y. Wang, L. Zhu and Y. Ma, *Nanoscale*, 2014 (10.1039/C4NR01846J).
- 2 T. B. Tai, L. V. Duong, H. T. Pham, D. T. T. Mai and M. T. Nguyen, *Chem. Commun.*, 2014, **50**, 1558.
- 3 Z. A. Piazza, H-S. Hu, W-L. Li, Y-F. Zhao, J. Li and L-S. Wang, *Nature Commun.*, 2014, **5**, 3113.
- 4 F. Li, P. Jin, D. Jiang, L. Wang, S. B. Zhang, J. Zhao and Z. Chen, J. Chem. Phys., 2012, 136, 074302.
- 5 T. B. Tai, N. M. Tam and M. T. Nguyen, *Theor. Chem. Acc.*, 2012, **131**, 1241.
- 6 J. Tao, J. P. Perdew, V. N. Staroverov and G. E. Scuseria, *Phys. Rev. Lett*, 2003, **91**, 146401.
- 7 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, **77**, 3865
- 8 J. P. Perdew, K. Burk and Y. Wang, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1996, 54, 16533
- 9 M. J. Frisch et al., 2009, Gaussian 09, Gaussian Inc, Wallingford
- 10 C. Moller and M. S. Plesset, Phys. Rev., 1934, 46, 618.
- 11 M. Rittby and R. J. Bartlett, J. Phys. Chem., 1988, 92, 3033
- 12 P. J. Knowles, C. Hampel C and H. J. Werner, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1994, **99**, 5219.
- 13 H. J. Werner, et al., 2009, MOLPRO, version 2009, a package of *Ab initio* program.
- 14 H-J. Zhai, Y-F. Zhao, W-L. Li, Q, Chen, H. Bai, H-S. Hu, Z. A. Piazza, W-J. Tian, H-G. Lu, Y-B. Wu, Y-W. Mu, G-F. Wei, Z-P. Liu, J. Li, S-D. Li and L-S. Wang, *Nature Chemistry*, 2014, 6, 727.
- 15 H. T. Pham, L. V. Duong, N. M. Tam, M. P. Pham-Ho and M. T. Nguyen, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 2014, **608**, 295.