

Preliminary communication

MOLECULAR ORBITAL CALCULATIONS FOR *f*-ORBITAL COMPLEXES: THE DICYCLOOCTATETRAENYLCELIUM(III) ANION

DENIS W. CLACK and KEITH D. WARREN

Department of Chemistry, University College, Cardiff, Wales (Great Britain)

(Received September 9th, 1976)

Summary

INDO SCF calculations on the title complex indicate that, although the single *f*-electron is essentially localised on the metal, the metal 5*d* (e_{1g} and e_{2g}) orbitals interact significantly with the ligands and play a major role in determining the total energy.

INDO type SCF-MO calculations [1—3] have proved to give a good description of the bonding in the 3*d* metallocenes and to show good accord with the ligand field treatment [4] of such species. Recently this latter approach was extended to the dicyclooctatetraenyl complexes of the lanthanides and actinides [5], in which some *f*-orbital—ligand interaction is thought to be involved, but the bonding scheme suggested could then only be based on a one-electron picture. It therefore seemed appropriate to adapt the INDO scheme to treat such *f*-orbital complexes, and as a first step we outline our results for the dicyclooctatetraenylcerium(III) anion.

Chemically this system behaves as a dominantly ionic, Ce^{3+} ($4f^1$) system, but unlike halo or oxo species, in which the metal H^{core} terms will lie well above the corresponding ligand quantities, the H_M and H_L terms will here be of comparable magnitude and the results will therefore be highly sensitive to the parameterisation used. We have therefore utilised this system to obtain a parameter scheme which will correctly reproduce the f^1 ground state and thus provide the basis for a general method for MO calculations on compounds of the early lanthanides.

The calculations were made using INDO type approximations [6] to the electronic Hamiltonian, considering 4*f*, 5*d*, and 6*s* orbitals as a basis set for cerium with the usual valence orbital set of 2*s* and 2*p* for the first row atoms. Orbital exponents for cerium were obtained by fitting a single exponential function to the numerical values of Herman and Skillman [7], whilst empirical

ionisation energies, electron affinities, and Slater—Condon F_k and G_k integrals were derived from spectroscopic data and will be discussed in more detail later. The parameters used are given in Table 1, and the F_0 terms were calculated theoretically assuming spherical charge distributions [6]. The neutral cerium atom configuration $4f^1 5d^1 6s^2$ was taken for the evaluation of the $U_{\mu\mu}$ terms. For the off-diagonal $H_{\mu\nu}$ terms the values of Pople [6] were used for the rings, whilst for the metal—ligand interactions the approximation $\beta = \frac{1}{2}(I_M + I_L)$ was adopted. The appropriate bond lengths were taken according to Hodgson and Raymond [8], but for simplicity the D_{8h} geometry was assumed.

Since the cerium atom positive charge is unknown and the $(I + A)$ values are moreover highly dependent thereon, we have treated these $(I + A)$ terms as parameters which may be varied within limits to reproduce the experimentally indicated $4f^1$ ground state. The results are however not very sensitive to changes in the orbital exponents. The calculated one-electron ordering using the parameters of Table 1 nevertheless implied complete filling of all the cerium f -orbitals, but on the basis of total energy, which includes the large two-electron γ_{df} and γ_{ff} terms, the single occupancy of the f -orbital set is found to be most favourable. Furthermore, raising the one-electron f -levels, so as to accord with semi-empirical calculations [5,9], yields $\pi_{e_{2u}}^1$ as the ground state on a total energy basis, whilst conversely a lowering of these levels gives rise to a $\pi_{e_{1g}}^3 f^2$ electronic arrangement.

All the calculations indicated that the $4f$ orbitals were essentially localised, presumably due to their small overlaps with the ligands, whereas the $5d$ orbitals were extensively mixed into the formally ligand e_{1g} and e_{2g} molecular orbitals, the extent of this mixing being very sensitive to the choice of $(I + A)$ value. However, although the $5d_{z^2}$ and $6s$ orbitals (a_{1g}) are significantly mixed together, neither of these orbitals is involved to any great extent in the bonding. The $5d$ populations have though a marked effect in determining the total energy because of the large one-centre γ_{df} integrals.

The parameters of Table 1 correspond to $(I + A)$ terms appropriate for the formal charges $4f (+1.6)$, $5d (+0.4)$, and $6s (0.0)$, and lead to the energetic order $\pi_{e_{1g}}^4 4f^1 < \pi_{e_{1g}}^4 \pi_{e_{2u}}^1 < \pi_{e_{1g}}^3 4f^2$, with $E(\pi_{e_{1g}}^4 \pi_{e_{2u}}^1) - E(\pi_{e_{1g}}^4 4f^1) = 1.6$ eV. With our present parameterisation the d -orbital admixtures are found to be 3, 27, and 29% for the a_{1g} , e_{1g} , and e_{2g} levels respectively, whilst the ionisation potentials for electron loss from the $4f^1$ and the $\pi_{e_{1g}}$ levels are found by total energy difference to be almost identical at a little over 3.5 eV. The overall one-electron splitting of the $4f$ orbitals is less than 500 cm^{-1} and we are currently extending our calculations in double precision to examine the

TABLE 1

PARAMETERISATION FOR THE DICYCLOOCTATETRAENYLCELIUM(III) ANION

	$\frac{1}{2}(I + A)$ (eV)	μ , orbital exponent
$4f$	19.10	3.65
$5d$	3.75	2.12
$6s$	3.23	1.40

influence of two-electron terms on this quantity and to investigate the related praeceodymium complex.

References

- 1 D.W. Clack, *Mol. Phys.*, **27** (1974) 1513.
- 2 D.W. Clack, *Theoret. Chim. Acta*, **35** (1974) 157.
- 3 D.W. Clack and M. Monshi, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, **116** (1976) C41.
- 4 K.D. Warren, *Structure and Bonding*, **27** (1976) 45.
- 5 K.D. Warren, *Inorg. Chem.*, **14** (1975) 3095.
- 6 J.A. Pople and D.L. Beveridge, *Approximate Molecular Orbital Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.
- 7 F. Herman and S. Skillman, *Atomic Structure Calculations*, Prentice-Hall, New York, 1963.
- 8 K.O. Hodgson and K.N. Raymond, *Inorg. Chem.*, **11** (1974) 3030.
- 9 R.G. Hayes and N. Edelstein, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **92** (1970) 4841.