

PCCP

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 [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) 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.



Journal Name

ARTICLE

The experimental equilibrium structure of acetylene

Filippo Tamassia, Elisabetta Cané, Luciano Fusina and Gianfranco Di Lonardo

Received 00th January 20xx,
Accepted 00th January 20xx

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/

The empirical equilibrium structure of acetylene has been derived by exploiting the very precise experimental rotational constants available in the literature for the 10 isotopologues relative to all the possible combinations of H, D, ^{12}C and ^{13}C atoms. The geometry obtained when data for all species are fitted together is: $r_e(\text{CH}) = 106.167(14)$ pm and $r_e(\text{CC}) = 120.2866(72)$ pm. This determination shows some systematic residuals due to the singly D-substituted isotopologues. If we exclude such species from the fit we obtain our most precise evaluation: $r_e(\text{CH}) = 106.1689(23)$ pm and $r_e(\text{CC}) = 120.2817(12)$ pm. The possibility of a breakdown of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation has also been tested.

1 Introduction

High-resolution spectroscopy provides very accurate information that can be exploited to derive the structures of molecules in the gas phase. Such structures, which describes a geometry calculated at the minimum of the potential energy surface in a hypothetical vibrationless state, are independent of the nuclear masses, within the Born-Oppenheimer (BO) approximation. They are generally difficult to derive from experiment because, for polyatomic molecules, a great deal of spectroscopic data about the parent species and its isotopologues are required. Even when their spectra are accessible and analyzable, the derivation of the molecular spectroscopic parameters can be complicated by the presence of vibrational and ro-vibrational resonances which, if not treated correctly, reduce the accuracy of the experimentally derived constants.

High-level *ab initio* calculations have played a major role in structure determinations and a number of purely theoretical and semi-experimental structures, where empirical constants are corrected by computed parameters, have been published (see next section for references).

Acetylene is a very basic organic molecule, the simplest containing triple bonds, and is of crucial importance in several fields of chemistry, physical chemistry¹ and combustion.² It is also a key species in molecular astrophysics.^{3,4} Because of its simplicity, it is a very good test molecule for theoretical calculations and for the derivation of its equilibrium geometry. It is linear and has only two structural parameters, $r_e(\text{CC})$ and $r_e(\text{CH})$. Considering ^{13}C and D substitutions, 10 isotopologues, and therefore 10 experimental equilibrium rotational constants, can be obtained.

A number of high-resolution infrared and microwave studies have been published on this species in recent years (see for example ref. 5). Very precise spectroscopic parameters were obtained and the rotational constants of the ground and the excited vibrational states of all 10 stable isotopologues of C_2H_2 are now available at a very high level of accuracy. All these data can be exploited to obtain an improved, purely empirical equilibrium structure of acetylene. After a careful review of the experimental data available in literature, several test fits have been performed and discussed. The results are examined to evaluate if the breakdown of a Born-Oppenheimer approximation may occur in acetylene.

2 Analysis

2.1 Theoretical background and previous work

The calculation of the empirical equilibrium structure of a molecule requires a number of experimental constants. The rotational parameter B_v can be expressed in terms of the vibration-rotation coupling constants α_i and γ_{ij} according to

$$B_v = B_e - \sum_i \alpha_i (v_i + d_i / 2) + \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \gamma_{ij} (v_i + d_i / 2)(v_j + d_j / 2) \quad (1)$$

where d_i is 1 for non-degenerate and 2 for doubly-degenerate vibrational modes. Using eqn (1) the equilibrium rotational constant can be calculated as

$$B_e = B_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \alpha_i d_i - \frac{1}{4} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \gamma_{ij} d_i d_j \quad (2)$$

In the case of acetylene, the geometry at equilibrium can be derived from the experimental B_e 's, which are inversely

Dipartimento di Chimica Industriale "Toso Montanari", Università di Bologna, Viale del Risorgimento 4, I-40136 Bologna, Italy. E-mail: filippo.tamassia@unibo.it

proportional to the principal moment of inertia I_e at the equilibrium geometry. They are calculated from the highly precise rotational constants in the ground state B_0 and the values of the five α_i 's for each isotopologue, neglecting the higher-order terms γ_{ij} in eqn (2). Their contribution will be discussed later. Several papers have been published where the equilibrium geometry of acetylene has been derived according to this procedure. Below, only the most recent and meaningful contributions are described.

In 2002, Pawlowski *et al.*⁶ applied the experimental/theoretical approach described by Pulay⁷ to the calculation of the equilibrium structures of many molecules, including C_2H_2 , within the Born-Oppenheimer approximation.

The experimental ground state rotational constants of many isotopologues were corrected by the sums over the vibrational modes (see eqn (1)) of the computed *ab initio* α_i . The significant advantage is that the sum of the α_i 's is free from Coriolis resonance terms. In fact, the Coriolis resonance contributions cancel each other and this is true for both theoretical and experimental sums. Also, the expression of the α_i 's does not contain Fermi resonance terms. Experimentally determined constants can, on the other hand, be affected by Fermi resonances. The most accurate $\sum \alpha_i$ for 5 isotopologues of acetylene, calculated at the CCSD(T)/cc-pVQZ level, were used to determine the semi-experimental equilibrium bond lengths, $r_e(CC)=120.356(57)$ pm and $r_e(CH)=106.166(50)$ pm.

Heckert *et al.*⁸ calculated a purely theoretical equilibrium geometry, showing that the basis set extrapolation technique (BSE) could be used in conjunction with coupled cluster theory in geometry optimizations. The calculated equilibrium structure was $r_e(CC)=120.304$ pm and $r_e(CH)=106.166$ pm.

Cazzoli *et al.*⁹ recorded pure rotational transitions for DCCH, $D^{13}CCH$ and $DC^{13}CH$ and a semi-experimental equilibrium structure was derived using ground state rotational constants for ten isotopologues. The $\sum \alpha_i$ were calculated at the CCSD(T)/cc-pwCVQZ level, higher than that adopted in ref. 6. Hence, improved values of the equilibrium geometry were obtained $r_e(CC)=120.289(1)$ pm and $r_e(CH)=106.176(2)$ pm.

In 2011, Liévin *et al.*¹⁰ determined the most accurate equilibrium structure of acetylene so far. They derived three types of equilibrium geometries: *ab initio*, semi-experimental and experimental. The *ab initio* calculations tested the contribution of relativistic effects, inner shell correlation, diffuse functions and diagonal Born-Oppenheimer corrections. The semi-experimental structure was determined following the procedure of ref. 9 combining the B_0 of ten isotopologues with the $\sum \alpha_i$ computed at a CCSD(T)/wCVQZ level. As for the experimental structure, empirical values of B_0 and $\sum \alpha_i$ of the five species $H^{12}C^{12}CH$, $H^{12}C^{13}CH$, $H^{13}C^{13}CH$, $D^{12}C^{12}CH$, $D^{12}C^{12}CD$, were used. The authors highlighted a systematic deviation in the semi-experimental fit performed on ten isotopologues. The contribution of the γ_{ij} constants was not considered in the expansion of B_0 because it was estimated to be about 400 kHz, too small to give a sizable contribution and to eliminate the residual correlation. Moreover, the importance of the BO breakdown was investigated by allowing the CH and CD bond

distances to be fitted simultaneously. The variation of these bond lengths appeared too big, if compared to the estimated diagonal Born-Oppenheimer corrections (DBOC), and the correlation still persisted. In conclusion, the systematic deviation found in the semi-experimental fit remained unexplained. Also, the derivation of the equilibrium structure from purely empiric constants was not free from irregularities. The CC and CH bond distances were fully correlated and anomalous deviations arose for $H^{12}C^{12}CH$ and $H^{12}C^{13}CH$.

2.2 Spectroscopic parameters used for the analysis

The choice of the experimental spectroscopic parameters of acetylene and its isotopologues, among all those present in literature, was made on the basis of their precision and homogeneity. For some isotopic species very large global fits including high energy vibrational states are available in the literature. However, the parameters obtained often are not comparable to those determined using restricted sets of data and are less precise. Indeed, the accuracy of the constants achieved through the introduction of rather extended Hamiltonians is sometimes reduced by the inevitable correlation among the fitted parameters and by the effects of perturbations, which increase in number and magnitude as the energy increases. So, we generally preferred data from more limited analyses, usually considering only the fundamentals and their first overtones and combination bands which mostly provide a better precision and high homogeneity among the parameters of different isotopic species. Only in the case of $^{12}C_2D_2$ and $^{12}C^{13}CD_2$ did all the required constants come from one single study for each molecule, while for the other isotopologues they were taken from several papers. An additional source of dissimilarity is that the very precise data derived from pure rotational spectroscopy are available only for the molecules of $C_{\infty v}$ symmetry. The B_0 , α_i^0 and γ_{ij}^0 constants for all isotopologues are collected in Tables 1 and 2. A global fit of the vibrational states up to 8600 cm^{-1} was performed by Amyay *et al.*¹¹ for $H^{12}C^{12}CH$ and by Robert *et al.*¹² for $H^{12}C^{13}CH$ resulting in complete sets of B_0 , α_i^0 and γ_{ij}^0 . However, the parameter values obtained are less precise than those we used. Similar conclusions can be drawn for the parameters of the global fit for $H^{13}C^{13}CH$.¹³

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Results

The first part of the analysis was performed by deriving the values of B_e from eqn (2) using the data in Table 1 and neglecting the contributions of γ_{ij} . These values are listed in Table 3. The error of B_e , that ranges from 189×10^{-9} to $680 \times 10^{-9}\text{ cm}^{-1}$, has been calculated from the statistical propagation of the B_0 and α_i^0 uncertainties. As expected, the errors of B_e are larger than those of B_0 since they reflect the α_i^0 statistical errors. It must be emphasized that for most isotopologues the vibration-rotation constants have been obtained from fitting procedures including the appropriate ℓ -type vibration and anharmonic resonance terms affecting the band systems

analyzed. Thus, these values do not contain those perturbation effects.

From the 10 values of the moment of inertia at equilibrium I_e , the $r_e(\text{CC})$ and $r_e(\text{CH})$ bond lengths were calculated by means of a least squares fit. For a general linear molecule with an arbitrary number of masses, I can be expressed by the equation:

$$I = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \sum_j \sum_i m_i m_j r_{ij}^2}{\sum_i m_i} \quad (3)$$

where r_{ij} is the distance between masses m_i and m_j .¹⁴ The weight attributed to each I_e is the inverse of the squared uncertainty of the moment of inertia.

It must be pointed out that the vibration-rotation interaction constants α_i^0 and γ_{ij}^0 were obtained from the analysis of the experimental data according to the equation^{15,16}

$$F(v, l, J) = [B_0 - \sum_i \alpha_i^0 v_i + \sum_{i \leq j} \gamma_{ij}^0 v_i v_j + \sum_{b \leq b' = 4, 5} \gamma^{b/b'} l_b l_{b'} + \sum_{i \leq j \leq m} \varepsilon_{ijm} v_i v_j v_m + \sum_{i, b \leq b' = 4, 5} \varepsilon_i^{b/b'} v_i l_b l_{b'}][M - k^2] - [D_0 + \sum_i \beta_i^0 v_i + \sum_{i \leq j} \delta_{ij}^0 v_i v_j + \sum_{b \leq b'} \delta^{b/b'} l_b l_{b'} + \sum_{i \leq j \leq m} \theta_{ijm} v_i v_j v_m + \sum_{i, b \leq b' = 4, 5} \theta_i^{b/b'} v_i l_b l_{b'}][M - k^2] + [H_0 + \sum_i h_i v_i][M - k^2] \quad (4)$$

with $M = J(J + 1)$, $k = l_a + l_s$, and l_a, l_s the vibrational angular momentum quantum numbers of the bending modes.

Unlike α_i in eqns (1) and (2), the α_i^0 values include the contribution of the higher order terms γ_{ij} according to

$$\alpha_i^0 = \alpha_i - \gamma_{ii} d_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} \gamma_{ij} d_j \quad (5)$$

and the γ_{ij}^0 values include, in principle, the contribution of higher order ε_{ijk} -type terms. However, we assumed that $\gamma_{ij}^0 = \gamma_{ij}$, neglecting the effects of ε_{ijk} , that generally are set to zero in the fitting procedures.

For our derivations we used atomic masses instead of nuclear masses, consistent with the calculations reported in the literature. These values are: 1.007825032231(93) u, 2.014101778120(122) u and 13.003354835071(227) u, for H, D and ¹³C respectively.¹⁷ The quoted errors of the masses have not been considered in the evaluations of the uncertainties of $r_e(\text{CC})$ and $r_e(\text{CH})$ because they are negligible with respect to the errors of I_e .

The results of the fits are reported in Table 4. The derived distances obtained with 10 isotopologues (fit 9 of Table 4) are comparable to those of Liévin *et al.*¹⁰ but less precise. A possible explanation could be that in ref. 10 they used only five

values of B_e with uncertainties which strongly reduce the contribution of the deuterated species in the least squares fit. The standard deviation of the fit is 8.21 u pm². The $r_e(\text{CC})$ and $r_e(\text{CH})$ distances are less correlated than those in ref. 10: 98% instead of 100%. A smaller correlation was indeed expected fitting ten values of I_e with similar weights, ranging from 0.4 x 10² to 0.5 x 10³ u⁻² pm⁻⁴. Moreover, the difference between observed and calculated values of I_e was positive for the four isotopologues containing both H and D and negative for the others. This systematic distribution of the residuals highlights that the analyzed data set could contain incongruent elements or that there are intrinsic inconsistencies. The same systematic deviation was observed also by Liévin *et al.*¹⁰ in the calculation of the semi-experimental geometry.

To verify if a contribution had not been accounted for properly in the structure calculation we evaluated first the influence of the higher order vibration rotation interaction constants γ_{ij} in the determination of B_e . These experimental parameters were collected from the literature, as specified in Section 2.2 and new values of B_e were obtained. However, taking into account the γ_{ij} constants presents severe problems. The number of known constants is not homogeneous for the 10 isotopologues and the values of the same constants obtained from different literature sources may differ in sign and/or order of magnitude, depending on the complexity of the data analysis, as in the case of ¹²C₂H₂ and ¹²CH¹³CH (see Table 2). Moreover, since the values of γ_{ij} are generally two orders of magnitude smaller than those of α_i , and have uncertainties of the same order of magnitude, the calculated B_e values are affected by larger errors. We also considered obtaining B_e of all the isotopologues by subtracting from B_0 the value of $(1/4) \sum \gamma_{ij} d_i d_j$ calculated for ¹²C₂H₂.

However,²¹ this treatment of the data is arbitrary since that sum is characteristic of each isotopologue being about 0.99 x 10⁻⁵ cm⁻¹ for ¹²C₂H₂, 0.95 x 10⁻⁵ cm⁻¹ for ¹²C¹³CH₂, 14.0 x 10⁻⁵ cm⁻¹ for ¹²C¹³CD₂, 3.2 x 10⁻⁵ cm⁻¹ for ¹²C₂D₂ and -38.2 x 10⁻⁵ cm⁻¹ for ¹³C₂HD (see Table 2). Lastly, the use of α_i^0 instead of α_i in equation (2) truncated as $B_e = B_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \alpha_i^0 d_i$

somehow includes implicitly the contribution of γ_{ij} on B_e , as can be easily verified by substitution of eqn (5) in the former expression. For all these reasons the γ_{ij} constants were not included explicitly in the calculation of B_e assuming that this approximation is not responsible for the trends of the residuals of the fit and of the high correlation between $r_e(\text{CC})$ and $r_e(\text{CH})$ in fit 9. To clarify these points we made several fits using different subgroups of I_e , formed by at least three data sets. The criteria adopted to group the isotopologues were the isotopes bonded to the carbons and the symmetry of the molecules. The results are reported in Table 4 and will be compared with those of fit 9 taken as reference.

Four different groups of three isotopologues were formed, one containing only hydrogen atoms bonded to the carbons (set1), one with only deuterium (set2) and the others with both H and D (set3 and set4). The resulting standard deviation of the fits is smaller than that of fit 9, whereas the statistical errors of the

bond lengths are smaller only for set1 and set3. This is due to the relative weights of the fitted I_e values in each subgroup. The length values change abruptly from set1 to set2, set3 and set4 following what was expected from isotopic substitution. The $r_e(\text{CH})$ value is longer in set1 (H atoms) than in set2 (D atoms), while in set3 and set4 (H and D atoms) it almost corresponds to the mean of the former values. The same trend is observed if we consider the sum of the CH and CC bonds, 226.472(3) pm, 226.43(3) pm and 226.45(2) pm in fits 1, 2 and 3/4. Since the two structural parameters are 100% correlated two additional fits were performed, keeping $r_e(\text{CC})$ fixed to the mean value 120.29 pm while refining $r_e(\text{CH})$ (see fits 1a and 2a in Table 4). This value changed by about 0.05 pm becoming more similar to that resulting from set3 and set4 and to the reference fit.

Set5 and set6 comprise four molecules: all the isotopologues containing both H and D atoms (set5), and those of $D_{\infty h}$ symmetry (set6). As expected, the results of set5 are almost midway between those of set3 and set4, as far as the standard deviation of the fit and the precision of the structure are concerned. However, the bond length correlation is still 100%. On the other hand, the $r_e(\text{CC})$ and $r_e(\text{CH})$ values from set6 are more precise than the previous ones and less correlated: 97% instead of 100%. Next, two further tests were performed: one adding $^{12}\text{C}^{13}\text{CH}_2$ and $^{12}\text{C}^{13}\text{CD}_2$ to the molecules of set6 (set7) and one grouping all the $C_{\infty v}$ isotopologues (set8). Fit 7 confirms the results of fit 6 with better standard deviation and precision while fit 8 is affected by a poor standard deviation, low precision and 100% correlation between the two bond lengths. The $r_e(\text{CC})$ and $r_e(\text{CH})$ values obtained in fit 7 and fit 8 overlap within 2σ and $r_e(\text{CH})$ in fit 8 lengthens to 106.188 pm at the expense of $r_e(\text{CC})$.

Among the listed results the more precise and less correlated values of equilibrium geometry are those from fit 7. They overlap within 1σ with those from the complete set of I_e . The distribution of residuals in the various tests is specified in the last column of Table 4 and does not show systematic trends, except in fits 8 and 9.

The fits described so far converge to slightly different bond lengths. Since the performed fits employ sets of data relative to different isotopic substitutions, we considered it appropriate to verify if any evidence of the breakdown of the BO approximation could be deduced. The equilibrium geometry was therefore obtained refining three parameters in the subgroups with at least four members and not all centre symmetric, fits 5b, 7b, 8b and 9b in Table 4. Only the results of fits 8b and 9b are truly meaningful since the structural parameters are much less correlated than in previous fits. The standard deviations of the fits are comparable and smaller than in fit 9. In both fits one CH distance is longer and one shorter than the values in fits 8 and 9, whereas the CC distances are practically identical. The structural parameters overlap within 1σ and in both cases have precisions close to those of fits 8 and 9. The mean values of the $r_e(\text{CH})$ of bond 1 and bond 2 are consistent with the corresponding value of $r_e(\text{CH})$ in fit 8 and in fit 9, respectively, and overlap each other within 1σ . The sign of the residuals does not change in fits 8b

and 9b with respect to fits 8 and 9. From these results, a decisive indication of the breakdown of the BO approximation in acetylene cannot be inferred. The most significant structures derived in this work, namely fits 7, 9 and 9b, are collected in Table 5, where the results obtained in ref. 10 are also listed for comparison.

4 Conclusions

The equilibrium geometry of acetylene has been evaluated entirely from experiment. The rotational constants B_e used for the calculations have been obtained from the most accurate experimental values of B_0 and α_i^0 available in the literature for acetylene and its stable isotopologues, i.e. for 10 molecular species. Several fits have been performed, with different selections of experimental data pertaining to congruent sets of isotopologues. Large differences between the values of $r_e(\text{CH})$ and $r_e(\text{CC})$ bond distances are observed fitting data of sets containing only H or only D isotopes (fit 1 and 2 in Table 4), which however overlap within 3σ . In all the other fits, which include both H and D isotopically substituted species, values of bond lengths intermediate between the extreme values of fits 1 and 2 were obtained. The only exception is fit 8. The equilibrium geometry obtained when the complete set of experimental data is analyzed is: $r_e(\text{CH}) = 106.167(14)$ pm and $r_e(\text{CC}) = 120.2866(72)$ pm. The most precise determination, obtained excluding the singly D-substituted isotopologues, is $r_e(\text{CH}) = 106.1689(23)$ pm and $r_e(\text{CC}) = 120.2817(12)$ pm, indistinguishable from the previous one within one standard deviation. Our results are in very good agreement with those calculated applying the semi-experimental approach on the data of 10 isotopologues.¹⁰

A systematic distribution of the residuals may suggest some effect not accounted for explicitly in our analysis. A possibility is the breakdown of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, which has been investigated fitting three parameters (two CH bonds and one CC bond). The introduction of an additional structural parameter did not give however a clear cut answer to the question. To date, there are no theoretical expressions that allow the derivation of BO bond lengths and correction parameters for tetraatomic species, analogously to diatomic¹⁸ and linear triatomic¹⁹ molecules. Liéven¹⁰ pointed out that calculated DBOC are unlikely to be responsible for the anomalies of the fit. About this, we remind the results obtained for CO_2 by Teffo, who showed that in carbon dioxide the nonadiabatic effects exceed the adiabatic ones.¹⁹ He calculated the nonadiabatic parameter for oxygen from which the rotational g-factor g_{II} , -0.052(7), could be determined. Its value is in good agreement with that measured from Zeeman experiments (-0.05508(5)).¹⁹ Concerning the CH bond, in the literature are reported the results for the CH radical which, however, differs from acetylene being an open shell species.

Two experimentally derived values are reported for the equilibrium bond length r_e for CH and CD, 111.9789(6) pm²⁰ and 111.8883(5) pm,²¹ respectively. The large difference between these distances has been attributed to non-adiabatic effects.²² From these values Martin calculated a BO bond distance r_e^{BO} , 111.774(4) pm in excellent agreement with the calculated *ab initio* value.²²

Acknowledgements

E. C. and F. T. acknowledge the Università di Bologna and the Ministero della Ricerca e dell'Università for financial support under the grant PRIN12 "STAR: Spectroscopic and computational Techniques for Astrophysical and Atmospheric Research". The authors also thank P. R. Bunker and J. Demaison for helpful discussions.

References

- 1 Y. Xiao, D. J. Jacob, and S. Turquety, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 2007, 112, D12305.
- 2 K. C. Utsav, E. F. Nasir and A. Farooq, *Appl. Phys. B*, 2015, 120, 223.
- 3 A. Coustenis, R. K. Achterberg, B. J. Conrath, D. E. Jennings, A. Marten, D. Gautier, C. A. Nixon, F. M. Flasar, N. A. Teanby, B. Bezard, R. E. Samuelson, R. C. Carlson, E. Lellouch, G. L. Bjoraker, P. N. Romani, F. W. Taylor, P. G. J. Irwin, T. Fouchet, A. Hubert, G. S. Orton, V. G. Kunde, S. Vinatier, J. Mondellini, M. M. Abbas, and R. Courtin, *Icarus*, 2007, 189, 35.
- 4 E. Herbst, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 1995, 46, 27.
- 5 M. Herman, *Handbook of High Resolution Spectroscopy*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2011, Vol. 3, 1993–2025.
- 6 F. Pawlowski, P. Jørgensen, J. Olsen, F. Hegelund, T. Helgaker, J. Gauss, K. L. Bak and J. F. Stanton, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2002, 116, 6482.
- 7 P. Pulay, W. Meyer, J. E. Boggs, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1978, 68, 5077.
- 8 M. Heckert, M. Kállay, D. P. Tew, W. Klopper and J. Gauss, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2006, 125, 044108.
- 9 G. Cazzoli, C. Puzzarini, L. Fusina and F. Tamassia, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 2008, 247, 115.
- 10 J. Liévin, J. Demaison, M. Herman, A. Fayt and C. Puzzarini, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, 134, 064119.
- 11 B. Amyay, S. Robert, M. Herman, A. Fayt, B. Raghavendra, A. Moudens, J. Thiévin, B. Rowe and R. Georges, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2009, 131, 114301.
- 12 S. Robert, B. Amyay, A. Fayt, G. Di Lonardo, L. Fusina, F. Tamassia and M. Herman, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2009, 113, 13251.
- 13 G. Di Lonardo, L. Fusina, E. Venuti, J. W. C. Johns, M. I. El Idrissi, J. Liévin and M. Herman, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1999, 111, 1008.
- 14 C. H. Townes and A. L. Schawlow, *Microwave Spectroscopy*, Mc Graw-Hill, New York, 1955, 2, 41.
- 15 L. Fusina, F. Ospitali, M. Villa and F. Tamassia, *Mol. Phys.*, 2011, 109, 257.
- 16 A. Fayt, S. Robert, G. Di Lonardo, L. Fusina, F. Tamassia and M. Herman, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2007, 126, 114303.
- 17 M. Wang, G. Audi, A.H. Wapstra, F.G. Kondev, M. MacCormick, X. Xu and B. Pfeiffer, *CPC (HEP & NP)*, 2012, 36, 1603.
- 18 J. K. G. Watson, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 1973, 45, 99.
- 19 J.-L. Teffo and J. F. Ogilvie, *Mol. Phys.*, 1993, 80, 1507.
- 20 P. F. Bernath, C. R. Brazier, T. Olsen, R. Hailey, W. T. M. L. Fernando, C. Woods and J. L. Hardwick, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 1991, 147, 16; Erratum: *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 1994, 165, 310.
- 21 I. Morino, K. Matsumura and K. Kawaguchi, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 1995, 174, 123.
- 22 J. M. L. Martin, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 1998, 292, 411.
- 23 S. Robert, M. Herman, J. Vander Auwera, G. Di Lonardo, L. Fusina, G. Blanquet, M. Lepère and A. Fayt, *Mol. Phys.*, 2007, 105, 559.
- 24 A.-M. Tolonen and S. Alanko, *Mol. Phys.*, 1992, 75, 1155.
- 25 J. Vander Auwera, D. Hurtmans, M. Carleer and M. Herman, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 1991, 157, 337.
- 26 Y. Kabbadj, M. Herman, G. Di Lonardo, L. Fusina and J.W.C. Johns, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 1991, 150, 535.
- 27 G. Di Lonardo, A. Baldan, G. Bramati and L. Fusina, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 2001, 213, 57.
- 28 R. Martínez, D. Bermejo, G. Di Lonardo and L. Fusina, *J. Raman Spectrosc.*, 2013, 44, 746.
- 29 A. Predoi-Cross, M. Herman, L. Fusina and G. Di Lonardo, *Mol. Phys.*, 2012, 110, 2621.
- 30 G. Di Lonardo, P. Ferracuti, L. Fusina and E. Venuti, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 1994, 164, 219.
- 31 F. Alboni, G. Di Lonardo, P. Ferracuti, L. Fusina, E. Venuti and K.A. Mohamed, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 1995, 169, 148.
- 32 M. Villa, E. Canè, F. Tamassia, G. Di Lonardo and L. Fusina, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2013, 138, 134312.
- 33 G. Di Lonardo, L. Fusina, E. Cané, F. Tamassia, R. Z. Martínez and D. Bermejo, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, 143, 094302.
- 34 E. Canè, G. Cazzoli, G. Di Lonardo, L. Dore, R. Escribano and L. Fusina, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 2002, 216, 447.
- 35 D. Bermejo, G. Di Lonardo, J. L. Doménech and L. Fusina, *Mol. Phys.*, 2002, 100, 3493.
- 36 D. Bermejo, G. Di Lonardo, J.L. Doménech and L. Fusina, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 2003, 219, 290.
- 37 D. Bermejo, G. Di Lonardo, J. L. Doménech and L. Fusina, *Mol. Phys.*, 2003, 101, 3493.
- 38 C. Degli Esposti, L. Dore, L. Fusina and F. Tamassia, *A. & A.*, 2013, 559, A125.
- 39 L. Fusina, F. Tamassia and G. Di Lonardo, *Mol. Phys.*, 2005, 103, 2613.
- 40 L. Fusina, E. Canè, F. Tamassia, A. Baldan, G. Di Lonardo, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.*, 2011, 268, 226.
- 41 L. Fusina, E. Cané, F. Tamassia and G. Di Lonardo, *Mol. Phys.*, 2007, 105, 2321.
- 42 C. Degli Esposti, L. Dore, L. Fusina and F. Tamassia, *Mol. Phys.*, 2013, 111, 896.
- 43 L. Fusina, F. Ospitali, M. Villa and F. Tamassia, *Mol. Phys.*, 2011, 109, 257.

Table 1 Experimental values (in cm^{-1}) of the rotational constants B_0 and vibration rotation interaction constants α_i^0 of acetylene and its isotopologues ^a

Parameter	$^{12}\text{CH}^{12}\text{CH}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CH}$	Ref.	$^{13}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CH}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CD}^{12}\text{CD}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CD}^{13}\text{CD}$	Ref.
B_0	1.1766461800(100)	23	1.148460772(435)	27	1.119574352(174)	29	0.8478734706(168)	32	0.833118683(474)	33
$\alpha_1^0 \times 10^3$	6.843000(69)	24	6.513611(617)	28	6.124486(638)	30	5.981994(285)	32	5.722665(324)	33
$\alpha_2^0 \times 10^3$	6.180580(21)	23	5.983216(427)	28	5.808371(170)	30	3.162298(170)	32	3.109181(366)	33
$\alpha_3^0 \times 10^3$	5.881760(89) ^b	25	5.573690(525)	28	5.311898(512) ^b	31	4.491143(178)	32	4.316416(387)	33
$\alpha_4^0 \times 10^3$	-1.3535350(860)	26	-1.187191(161)	27	-1.031341(141)	29	-2.08049802(902)	32	-1.946066(209)	33
$\alpha_5^0 \times 10^3$	-2.2320750(400)	26	-2.082555(193)	27	-1.9303064(945)	29	-2.16654528(895)	32	-2.075198(103)	33
Parameter	$^{13}\text{CD}^{13}\text{CD}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CH}^{12}\text{CD}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CD}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CD}^{13}\text{CH}$	Ref.	$^{13}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CD}$	Ref.
B_0	0.817872207(450)	34	0.99152746042(798)	38	0.9752708273(562)	40	0.9671933960(484)	40	0.9503316739(136)	42
$\alpha_1^0 \times 10^3$	5.383201(702)	35	4.859699(178)	39	4.765284(350) ^b	41	4.487067(412) ^b	41	4.389164(472)	43
$\alpha_2^0 \times 10^3$	3.058969(227)	36	4.293623(474)	39	4.229106(368) ^b	41	4.173194(356) ^b	41	4.097933(185)	43
$\alpha_3^0 \times 10^3$	4.161986(164)	37	6.699267(192)	39	6.295277(295) ^b	41	6.530547(235) ^b	41	6.090601(402)	43
$\alpha_4^0 \times 10^3$	-1.834228(100)	34	-2.6433354(162)	38	-2.409888(172)	40	-2.538037(147)	40	-2.3033996(292)	42
$\alpha_5^0 \times 10^3$	-1.9594838(788)	34	-1.4813042(109)	38	-1.452763(153)	40	-1.322326(135)	40	-1.2837290(264)	42

^a Estimated uncertainties (1σ) are given in parentheses in units of the last figure quoted. ^b The α_i value has been calculated as $B_0 - B_{v_i}$.

Table 2 Experimental values in cm^{-1} of the vibration-rotation interaction constants γ_{ij}^0 of acetylene and its isotopologues. For $^{12}\text{CH}^{12}\text{CH}$ and $^{12}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CH}$ the constants from the global fit are also reported.^a

Parameter	$^{12}\text{CH}^{12}\text{CH}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CH}^{12}\text{CH}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CH}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CH}$	Ref.
$\gamma_{11} \times 10^5$			-6.81(49)	11			-10.23(33)	12
$\gamma_{12} \times 10^5$			6.914(69)	11			5.812(45)	12
$\gamma_{13} \times 10^5$			-1.772(40)	11			-19.66(54)	12
$\gamma_{14} \times 10^5$			1.159(42)	11			8.95(11)	12
$\gamma_{15} \times 10^5$			3.754(66)	11			2.886(24)	12
$\gamma_{22} \times 10^5$			-1.035(40)	11	-1.3360(24)	28	-2.139(32)	12
$\gamma_{23} \times 10^5$			7.084(73)	11			6.362(79)	12
$\gamma_{24} \times 10^5$	-7.238(33)	23	-7.569(43)	11	-6.901(33)	28	-6.784(36)	12
$\gamma_{25} \times 10^5$	-5.814(34)	23	-5.552(18)	11	-5.374(38)	28	-5.301(18)	12
$\gamma_{33} \times 10^5$			2.21(51)	11			7.07(33)	12
$\gamma_{34} \times 10^5$			4.710(34)	11			6.264(98)	12
$\gamma_{35} \times 10^5$			2.550(37)	11			2.664(48)	12
$\gamma_{44} \times 10^5$	0.0900(48)	26	-0.4335(62)	11	0.2001(48)	27	-0.3901(13)	12
$\gamma_{45} \times 10^5$	-2.3716(20)	26	-2.185(12)	11	5.190(53)	27	-2.105(93)	12
$\gamma_{55} \times 10^5$	1.8699(19)	26	2.4383(62)	11	1.885(10)	27	2.2985(42)	12
$\sum_{ij} \gamma_{ij} \frac{d_i d_j}{4} \times 10^5$	-6.938(24)		0.99(19)		0.803(60)		0.95(17)	
Parameters	$^{13}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CH}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CD}^{12}\text{CD}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CD}^{13}\text{CD}$	Ref.	$^{13}\text{CD}^{13}\text{CD}$	Ref.
$\gamma_{11} \times 10^5$			8.208(23)	32	7.053(26)	33		
$\gamma_{12} \times 10^5$					15.11(37)	33		
$\gamma_{13} \times 10^5$			-7.620(23)	32	-13.976(42)	33		
$\gamma_{14} \times 10^5$			11.095(19)	32	11.000(21)	33		
$\gamma_{15} \times 10^5$			-0.579(11)	32	0.598(20)	33		
$\gamma_{22} \times 10^5$			-0.362(13)	32	-0.226(23)	33		
$\gamma_{23} \times 10^5$			8.520(23)	32	7.8014(77)	33		
$\gamma_{24} \times 10^5$	-5.602(28)	30	-9.233(76)	32	-7.239(79)	33	-5.807(14)	36
$\gamma_{25} \times 10^5$	-4.962(15)	30	-6.244(15)	32	-6.318(62)	33	-7.05(17)	36
$\gamma_{33} \times 10^5$			-9.28(14)	32	-0.591(45)	33		
$\gamma_{34} \times 10^5$			2.5660(65)	32	2.512(11)	33	2.3113(78)	37
$\gamma_{35} \times 10^5$			5.130(16)	32	4.3036(95)	33	3.733(16)	37
$\gamma_{44} \times 10^5$	0.2982(46)	29	-1.92991(81)	32	-1.2771(74)	33	-1.036(21)	34
$\gamma_{45} \times 10^5$	4.289(48)	29	-0.1908(30)	32	-0.154(13)	33	-0.3240(64)	34
$\gamma_{55} \times 10^5$	1.7782(46)	29	1.95915(84)	32	9.2462(38)	33	1.181(20)	34

$\sum_{ij} \gamma_{ij} \frac{d_i d_j}{4} \times 10^5$	1.083(51)		3.161(43)		14.04(11)		-3.583(91)	
Parameters	$^{12}\text{CH}^{12}\text{CD}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CD}$	Ref.	$^{12}\text{CD}^{13}\text{CH}$	Ref.	$^{13}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CD}$	Ref.
$\gamma_{11} \times 10^5$			-2.684(49)	42	-24.247(72)	42	-0.634(32)	43
$\gamma_{12} \times 10^5$								
$\gamma_{13} \times 10^5$							1.777(73)	43
$\gamma_{14} \times 10^5$	-2.683(31)	39					-1.890(83)	43
$\gamma_{15} \times 10^5$	13.330(51)	39					-77.07(15)	43
$\gamma_{22} \times 10^5$	-0.504(19)	39					-0.3269(85)	43
$\gamma_{23} \times 10^5$							6.209(63)	43
$\gamma_{24} \times 10^5$	-12.868(27)	39					-10.998(15)	43
$\gamma_{25} \times 10^5$	-8.739(87)	39					-1.8370(81)	43
$\gamma_{33} \times 10^5$			6.21(15)	41	-2.261(63)	41	-3.564(33)	43
$\gamma_{34} \times 10^5$	16.507(45)	39	36.2(11)	41	15.70(18)	41	13.209(37)	43
$\gamma_{35} \times 10^5$	-4.173(47)	39	-3.65(10)	41	-4.514(75)	41	-5.231(55)	43
$\gamma_{44} \times 10^5$	3.20827(11)	38	2.7660(78)	40	3.15131(64)	40	3.0314(21)	42
$\gamma_{45} \times 10^5$	-2.54007(77)	38	-2.41946(77)	40	-2.78384(69)	40	-2.4141(61)	42
$\gamma_{55} \times 10^5$	2.386750(33)	38	2.09485(58)	40	2.08408(50)	40	2.2348(20)	42
$\sum_{ij} \gamma_{ij} \frac{d_i d_j}{4} \times 10^5$	3.616(64)		19.60(55)		1.42(10)		-38.192(98)	

^a Estimated uncertainties (1σ) are given in parentheses in units of the last figure quoted.

Table 3 Ground state, equilibrium rotational constants and equilibrium moments of inertia of acetylene and its isotopologues.

Isotopologue	B_0 / cm^{-1}	$\sigma / 10^{-9} \text{cm}^{-1}$	B_e / cm^{-1}	$\sigma / 10^{-9} \text{cm}^{-1}$	$I_e / \text{u pm}^2{}^a$
$^{12}\text{CH}^{12}\text{CH}$	1.1766461800	10.0	1.182513240	581	142557.64(7)
$^{12}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CH}$	1.148460772	435	1.154226284	680	146051.34(9)
$^{13}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CH}$	1.119574352	174	1.125235082	483	149814.29(7)
$^{12}\text{CD}^{12}\text{CD}$	0.8478734706	16.8	0.850444145	189	198221.47(5)
$^{12}\text{CD}^{13}\text{CD}$	0.833118683	474	0.835671550	613	201725.54(15)
$^{13}\text{CD}^{13}\text{CD}$	0.817872207	450	0.820380573	606	205485.47(15)
$^{12}\text{CH}^{12}\text{CD}$	0.99152746042	7.98	0.995329115	272	169367.39(5)
$^{12}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CD}$	0.9752708273	56.2	0.979053011	377	172183.01(7)
$^{12}\text{CD}^{13}\text{CH}$	0.9671933960	48.4	0.970928437	361	173623.81(7)
$^{13}\text{CH}^{13}\text{CD}$	0.9503316739	13.6	0.954033394	326	176698.52(6)

^a Estimated uncertainties (1σ) are given in parentheses in units of the last figure quoted.

Table 4 Equilibrium structural parameters of acetylene from several fits using different sets of isotopologues ^a

Fit n ^o	Isotopologue	$r_e(\text{CH})$ bond 1 / pm	$r_e(\text{CC})$ / pm	$r_e(\text{CH})$ bond 2 / pm	Fit standard deviation / u pm ²	Correlation % ^b	Sign of residual
1	¹² CH ¹² CH	106.2024(25)	120.26955(92)		0.08	100	-
1a	¹³ CH ¹³ CH	106.1462(11)	120.29 ^c		1.32		-
	¹² CH ¹³ CH						+
2	¹² CD ¹² CD	106.103(28)	120.323(18)		1.11	100	+
2a	¹³ CD ¹³ CD	106.15571(72)	120.29 ^c		1.67		+
	¹² CD ¹³ CD						-
3	¹² CH ¹² CD	106.1620(92)	120.2926(46)		0.40	100	+
	¹³ CH ¹³ CD						+
	¹² CH ¹³ CD						-
4	¹² CH ¹² CD	106.163(21)	120.292(10)		0.91	100	+
	¹³ CH ¹³ CD						+
	¹³ CH ¹² CD						-
5	¹² CH ¹² CD	106.163(15)	120.2919(75)		0.68	100	+
5b	¹³ CH ¹³ CD	106.1597(90)	120.2926(44)	106.1633(88)	0.44	99;98;100	+
	¹² CH ¹³ CD						-
	¹³ CH ¹² CD						-
6	¹² CH ¹² CH	106.1690(36)	120.2817(19)		1.89	97	+
	¹³ CH ¹³ CH						-
	¹² CD ¹² CD						-
	¹³ CD ¹³ CD						+
7	¹² CH ¹² CH	106.1689(23)	120.2817(12)		1.49	97	+
7b	¹³ CH ¹³ CH	106.16(16)	120.2817(14)	106.17(16)	1.73	20;100;23	-
	¹² CD ¹² CD						-
	¹³ CD ¹³ CD						+
	¹² CH ¹³ CH						+
	¹² CD ¹³ CD						-
8	¹² CH ¹² CD	106.188(24)	120.279(12)		5.64	100	+
8b	¹³ CH ¹³ CD	106.180(30)	120.279(13)	106.192(28)	6.23	91;72;94	+
	¹² CH ¹³ CD						+
	¹³ CH ¹² CD						+
	¹² CH ¹³ CH						-
	¹² CD ¹³ CD						-
9	All	106.167(14)	120.2866(72)		8.21	98	see text
9b		106.149(18)	120.2856(68)	106.185(18)	7.76	64;10;77	

^a Estimated uncertainties (1 σ) are given in parentheses in units of the last figure quoted. ^b In case of three structural parameters the correlation refers to $r_e(\text{CH})$ bond 1 with $r_e(\text{CC})$; $r_e(\text{CH})$ bond 1 with $r_e(\text{CH})$ bond 2; and $r_e(\text{CC})$ with $r_e(\text{CH})$ bond 2, respectively. ^c Constrained value, see text.

Table 5 Equilibrium structural parameters of acetylene from significant fits of this work compared to the results of Ref. 10. ^a

Parameter	This work Fit 7	This work Fit 9	This work Fit 9b	Ref. 10 Exp.	Ref. 10 Semiexp.	Ref. 10 <i>ab initio</i>	Ref. 10 <i>ab initio</i> +DBOC
$r_e(\text{CH})$ bond 1/pm	106.1689(23)	106.167(14)	106.149(18)	106.168(8)	106.164(1)	106.149	106.152
$r_e(\text{CC})$ /pm	120.2817(12)	120.2866(72)	120.2856(68)	120.286(3)	120.2958(7)	120.265	120.280
$r_e(\text{CH})$ bond 2/pm			106.185(18)				
n. of isotopologues used in the fit	6	10	10	5	10		
St. dev. / μm^2	1.49	8.21	7.76				

^a Estimated uncertainties (1σ) are given in parentheses in units of the last figure quoted.