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#### Abstract

Employing ab initio multireference and coupled-cluster methods along with correlation consistent basis sets we have studied three geometrical isomers of the (hydro)borane $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ molecule, namely, the highly symmetric geometrical configuration $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (regular tetrahedron) and two isomers of planar $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}$ geometries tagged $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}(\mathrm{II}), \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{I})$, and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{III})$, respectively. Mostly for reasons of consistency the species $\mathrm{BH}\left(X^{1} \Sigma^{+}, a^{3} \Pi\right)$, $\mathrm{BH}_{2}\left(\tilde{X}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right)$, and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{BBH}_{2}\left(\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}, \mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~d}}\right)$ have also been examined at the same level of theory. It was reconfirmed that the global minimum of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ is the planar $\mathrm{C}_{5}(\mathrm{I})$ lower by $6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ than $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}(\mathrm{II})$, while $\mathrm{C}_{5}(\mathrm{III})$ is $13 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ above $\mathrm{Cs}(\mathrm{I})$. With an emphasis on the concept of chemical bond particularly for the three $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ isomers I, II, and III, we offer quantitative geometric and energetic results for all species studied.


© 2017 Published by Elsevier B.V.

## 1. Introduction

Despite its biological 'absence', boron is one of the most interesting and versatile elements of the periodic table [1]. Its ability to form boron hydrides, neutral or negatively charged, that is compounds of the general form $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{y}}$ or $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{y}}^{\mathrm{n}-}$ is indeed staggering $[2,3]$. As a matter of fact the study of $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{y}}$ or $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{y}}^{\mathrm{n}-}$ (boranes) opened a whole new field of chemistry whereas the bonding of boranes is still a challenge; see Ref. [2] and references therein. The comparison with the corresponding carbon hydrides $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{y}}$ (hydrocarbons) is inevitable at this point. Recall that the ground state of carbon is ${ }^{3} \mathrm{P}\left(2 s^{2} 2 \mathrm{p}^{2}\right)$ with a third excited state of symmetry ${ }^{5} \mathrm{~S}\left(2 \mathrm{~s}^{1} 2 \mathrm{p}^{3}\right) 4.183 \mathrm{eV}(=96.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$ higher [4], the ${ }^{5} \mathrm{~S}$ term being responsible for the immense field of organic chemistry, of course with the hydrocarbons included. It is interesting here to think that even $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ is a "hypervalent" molecule correlating directly to the ${ }^{5} \mathrm{~S}$ carbon term [5].

The boron atom has a ${ }^{2} \mathrm{P}\left(2 s^{2} 2 \mathrm{p}^{1}\right)$ ground state with the first excited state ${ }^{4} \mathrm{P} 3.571 \mathrm{eV}$ ( $=82.3 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ) higher [4]. Now, the boron monohydride, $\mathrm{BH}\left(X^{1} \Sigma^{+}\right)$, is isoelectronic to carbon with a first excited state of $a^{3} \Pi$ symmetry located $10,588 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ( $30.3 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ) above its $X$ state [6,7]. Take into account that there is no experimental $a^{3} \Pi-X^{1} \Sigma^{+}$energy distance, the value given above is a very accurate ab initio result [7]. We would like as well to point out that the $a^{3} \Pi$ state of BH is analogous to the ${ }^{3} \mathrm{P}$ of carbon, the symmetry of the former, however, being cylindrical instead of spherical. The valence bond-Lewis (vbL) diagram of BH ( $a^{3} \Pi$ ) shown below explains pictorially what is meant; see also Ref. [7] (see Scheme 1).

Although the focus of the present study is the elusive deltahedral $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ molecule (regular tetrahedron), it is more than useful to emphasize that the incredible variety of boranes ("hydroborons") emanates from the motif $\mathrm{BH}\left(a^{3} \Pi\right)$, in direct analogy to the hydrocarbons related to the ${ }^{5} \mathrm{~S}$ term of carbon, or equivalently to the ${ }^{4} \Sigma^{-}$state of CH about $17 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ above its $X^{2} \Pi$ state [6,8].

Twenty-three years ago we published a theoretical ab initio study on the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ system [9]. Till then the ground state of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ was thought to be of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\left(\tilde{X}^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right)$ symmetry ([9] and references therein). Indeed the $T_{d}$ configuration is well bound with respect to the four $\mathrm{BH}\left(a^{3} \Pi\right.$ or $\left.X^{1} \Sigma^{+}\right)$moieties and with no imaginary frequencies [9]. Yet, despite all efforts $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ has never been experimentally observed till now, whereas the tetrahedral derivatives $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{4}, \mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{Br}_{4}$, and $\mathrm{B}_{4}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{4}$ are well established, Refs. [10-13]. To our surprise it was found that the ground state of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ was not of $T_{d}$ configuration but rather of $C_{s}$-planar symmetry ( ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}^{\prime}$ ), about $6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ lower than the $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ symmetry. Notice that the zero point energy (ZPE) had not been taken into account.

In 2011 Olson and Boldyrev through ab initio calculations confirmed beyond doubt that the ground state of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ is a planar low symmetry $C_{s}$ structure [14], the same one as in Ref. [9], confirmed as well by Böyükata et al. albeit at the DFT/B3LYP level [15]. It is surprising, however, that quantitative theoretical results on $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ (a "black sheep" molecule according to Ref. [14]) and $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}{ }^{-}$ $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}$ (planar) are lacking from the literature. It was then decided to revisit the very interesting system $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ with the purpose of obtaining quantitative numerical results and to provide some new insights. To this end we performed multireference (MRCI) and single reference coupled-cluster $(\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}))$ calculations
employing correlation consistent basis sets. The following two Sections refer to some insights and computational details, respectively, Section 4 concerns results and discussion and we close with a summary in Section 5.

## 2. Insights

$\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ in a $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$-geometrical configuration is the simplest closoborane, highly symmetric and aesthetically appealing. Recall that a regular tetrahedron, symmetry group $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$, is composed of four equilateral triangles and has six edges of equal length, the simplest of the five (convex) Platonic polyhedrons. In our case it means six B-B bonds of equal length and four B-H bonds of equal length, each $H$ atom attached to a $B$ apex. Chemically, however, there is a snag: the BH moiety in its $a^{3} \Pi$ state can form two single bona fide $1 / \sqrt{2}(\alpha \beta-\beta \alpha) B-B$ bonds, not three. The high symmetry of the $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ configuration comes to rescue, however, with the diagrams below clarifying our position.

In Fig. 1 dotted lines between pairs of B atoms in the structures (a), (b), and (c) represent absence of bonding, while dashed lines in the structure (d), a more realistic representation of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$, shows


Scheme 1.
partial bonding (see below). We have three "resonance configurations" (a), (b), and (c) by symmetry, or adhering to the divalency of $\mathrm{BH}\left(a^{3} \Pi\right)$ motif no more than one dotted line should originate from each $B$ atom, that is $\binom{6}{2}-4 \times\binom{ 3}{2}=15-4 \times 3=3$ allowed "resonances".

Clearly $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$, structure (d) of Fig. 1, is electron deficient. Exempting the four well localized B-H covalent bonds, 8 electrons are shared among six $B-B$ (partial) bonds, meaning in turn that each dashed line in Fig. 1(d) has a "bond index" of $2 / 3$ ( $=8 \mathrm{e}^{-} / 2 \times 6 \mathrm{e}^{-}$) instead of 1 , or that every B-B interaction is represented by $2 \times 2 / 3=4 / 3$ electrons instead of 2 . Therefore it is safe to predict that $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}$ bonds in $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ would be significantly longer and weaker as compared to a single covalent $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}$ bond; and this is exactly what our calculations show (see below). Of course the voracity of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ for electrons [14] and in fact the bewildering variety of boranes [2], traces its ancestry to the first excited state of $\mathrm{BH}, a^{3} \Pi$. The $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ planar configuration (global minimum) and another one firstly mentioned in Ref. [14] will be discussed in Section 4.

## 3. Computational details

For both $B$ and $H$ the cc-pVnZ, $n=T, Q, 5,(=n \zeta)$ correlation consistent basis sets of Dunning were used through the whole study [16]. The most extensive basis set employed (5弓) is (14s8p4d3f2g1h/в 8s4p3d2f1g/н) generally contracted to [6s5p4d3f2g1h/в $5 \mathrm{~s} 4 \mathrm{p} 3 \mathrm{~d} 2 \mathrm{f} 1 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{H}$ ] of order 91 and 55 for B and H atoms, respectively. Two calculational approaches were followed, the variational internally contracted MRCI (= CASSCF + single + double replacements), and the single reference $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T})$ (= restricted coupled-cluster single + double + perturbative connected triples) method [17-19]. The MRCI approach was used only to the highly symmetric $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ structure, whereas the coupledcluster methodology was employed for both $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ geometries, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}$-planar (but see below). The reference CASSCF space was
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Fig. 1. "Resonance" structures (a), (b), (c) of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$; see text.

Table 1
Methods, total equilibrium energies $E\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$, equilibrium bond distances $r_{\mathrm{e}}(\AA)$, and dissociation energies $D_{\mathrm{e}}$ and $D_{0}(\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$ with respect to four $\mathrm{BH}\left(X^{1} \Sigma^{+}, a^{3} \Pi\right)$ species of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II, regular tetrahedron) molecule.

| Method | -E | $r_{\text {e }}(\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{H})$ | $r_{\mathrm{e}}(\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B})$ | $D_{e}^{X^{1} \Sigma^{+} \mathrm{a}}$ | $D_{e}^{a^{3}}{ }^{\text {п }}$ | $D_{0}^{X^{1} \Sigma^{+} \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{c}}$ | $D_{0}^{a^{3} \Pi \text { b, }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MRCI/Q弓 | 101.40016 | 1.185 | 1.685 | 322.9 | 443.9 | 305.2 | 427.7 |
| $\mathrm{MRCI}+\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{Q} \zeta^{\text {d }}$ | 101.4526 | - | - | 331.6 | 452.6 | 313.9 | 436.4 |
| RCCSD(T)/Q 5 | 101.47226 | 1.184 | 1.685 | 333.8 | 456.0 | 316.1 | 439.8 |
| $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / 5 \zeta^{\mathrm{e}}$ | 101.47932 | - | - | 335.4 | 457.7 | 317.7 | 441.5 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ With repect to the $X^{1} \Sigma^{+}$state of BH.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ With repect to the $a^{3} \Pi$ state of BH.
${ }^{\text {c }} D_{0}=D_{\mathrm{e}}-\mathrm{ZPE}$; see text.
${ }^{d}+Q$ refers to the Davidson correction.
${ }^{e}$ Geometry at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(T) / T \zeta$ level.


Fig. 2. MRCI + Q/Q $\zeta$ potential energy profile of tetrahedral $B_{4} H_{4}$ with respect to four BH units, G is the center of mass.
constructed by allotting the 16 valence electrons to 12 orbitals resulting to a CASSCF wavefunction of 18,153 configuration functions (CF). The ensuing configuration interaction uncontracted MRCI expansion contains $6 \times 10^{9} \mathrm{CFs}$ reduced by three orders of magnitude after the internal contraction, namely $17 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{CFs}$. The 18 normal modes of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}\left\{\omega_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{18}$ were determined as usual by diagonalizing the corresponding Hessian matrix. The size nonextensivity error of the MRCI calculations was ameliorated by applying the Davidson correction (+Q) [20].

Henceforth, and for reasons of easy comparison and clarity, we adopt the symbolism of Olson and Boldyrev [14]: $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (I), $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II), $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}$ (III), refer to the global minimum ( $\tilde{X}^{1} \mathrm{~A}^{\prime}$ ) [9], to the tetrahedral $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ configuration $\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right)$, and to a new isomer of planar- $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}^{\prime}\right)$ geometry higher in energy than $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) discovered by the authors of Ref. [14], respectively. All three structures were optimized at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level. During all calculations and for all chemical species examined the core $1 \mathrm{~s}^{2}$-boron electrons were kept doubly occupied.

Finally the basis set superposition error (BSSE) for the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) isomer is about $1 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ at the $\mathrm{Q} \zeta$ level, thus was not taken into consideration any further.

All computations were performed by the MOLPRO2015.1 code [21].

## 4. Results and discussion

Table 1 lists total energies, geometries, and dissociation energies ( $D_{\mathrm{e}}$ and $D_{0}$ ) of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) with respect to the ground ( $X^{1} \Sigma^{+}$) and first excited state ( $a^{3} \Pi$ ), of four BH fragments, $D_{e / 0}^{X^{1} \Sigma^{+}}$and

Table 2
Normal modes $\omega_{\mathrm{i}}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ symmetries $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{i}}$, and zero point energies ZPE $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ of the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) and $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (I) species at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level.

| $\underline{\mathrm{T}_{\text {d }} \text { (II) }}$ |  | $\underline{C_{s}(\mathrm{I})}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\omega_{i}$ | $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\omega_{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{i}}$ |
| 605.7 | E | 231.6 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 660.4 | T2 | 480.7 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
| 788.9 | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 562.4 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 869.3 | T2 | 599.8 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
| 901.5 | E | 704.3 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1062.8 | $\mathrm{A}_{1}$ | 761.6 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
| 2692.3 | $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 764.0 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 2723.8 | $\mathrm{A}_{1}$ | 802.7 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime \prime}$ |
|  |  | 811.6 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
| $\mathrm{ZPE}^{\mathrm{a}}=10916.8 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ |  | 868.3 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
| ( $=31.21 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ ) |  | 924.1 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
|  |  | 1083.4 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
|  |  | 1280.6 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
|  |  | 1434.5 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
|  |  | 2258.0 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
|  |  | 2703.6 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
|  |  | 2757.4 | $A^{\prime}$ |
|  |  | 2760.8 | $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{ZPE}^{\mathrm{a}}=10894.7 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \\ & (=31.15 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}) \end{aligned}$ |  |

${ }^{\text {a }} \mathrm{ZPE}=\sum_{i} \frac{\omega_{i}}{2} d_{i}$, where $d_{i}$ is the degeneracy of the mode $i, d_{i}=1,2$, and 3 for $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{E}$, and $T$, respectively.
$D_{e / 0}^{a^{3} \Pi}$ respectively, at the MRCI/Q $\zeta$ and $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta, 5 \zeta$ levels of theory. The MRCI (or MRCI +Q ) $D_{e}^{\text {K1 }^{1} \Sigma^{+}}$value has been obtained by pulling in $T_{d}$ fashion to infinity ( 20 bohr) the four BH units, maintaining the B-H bond distances fixed at $1.185 \AA$. The potential energy profile (PEP) of this process is shown in Fig. 2. The hump of $13.9 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ with respect to the asymptote ( $\mathrm{MRCI}+\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$ ) on the PEP at $2.2 \AA$ is a result of an avoided crossing between the repulsive (not shown) PEP $4 \times \mathrm{BH}\left(X^{1} \Sigma^{+}\right) \rightarrow \mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) and the strongly attractive (not shown) $4 \times \mathrm{BH}\left(a^{3} \Pi\right) \rightarrow \mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) PEPs. Clearly the four BH units within the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) species are in the $a^{3} \Pi$ state, meaning that diabatically the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) correlates to four $\mathrm{BH}\left(a^{3} \Pi\right)$ moieties coupled into a singlet $\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right)$, thus (internal bond strength) $D_{e}^{a^{3} \Pi}=D_{e}^{X^{1} \Sigma^{+}}+4 \times T_{\mathrm{e}}\left(a^{3} \Pi-X^{1} \Sigma^{+}\right)=443.9 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, where $T_{\mathrm{e}}=10,581 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}(=30.25 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$ [7]. Corresponding $D_{0}^{X^{1} \Sigma^{+}}$and $D_{0}^{a^{3} \Pi}$ values are calculated through the relation $D_{0}^{X^{1} \Sigma^{+}}=D_{e}^{X^{1} \Sigma^{+}}-Z P E=D_{e}^{X^{1} \Sigma^{+}}+\left[4 \times \frac{\omega_{e}}{2}\left(\mathrm{BH} ; X^{1} \Sigma^{+}\right)-\sum_{i} \frac{\omega_{i}}{2} d_{i}\left(\mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-T_{d}\right)\right]=$ $322.9+13.52-31.2=305.2 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, and similarly $D_{0}^{a^{3} \Pi}=452.6+$ $15.01-31.2=436.4 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, where the $\omega_{e}$ of $X$ - and $a$-states of BH are 2366.7 and $2631 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, respectively [6,7], and the ZPE of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) along the normal modes $\left\{\omega_{\mathrm{i}}\right\}$ is given in Table 2 at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level; $d_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the degeneracy of the $\omega_{\mathrm{i}}$ mode. The $D_{\mathrm{e}}$ or $D_{0}$, values corrected by the Davidson correction ( +Q ), are practically the same as obtained at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta, 5 \zeta$ level, Table 1, but using $T_{\mathrm{e}}\left(a^{3} \Pi-X^{1} \Sigma^{+}\right)$values 10,685 ( $\mathrm{Q}_{\zeta}$ ) and 10,698
(5弓) $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ as shown in Table 3. Therefore the mean binding energy $\bar{D}_{e}$ per formal B-B single bond (not per BH unit), say at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$ level, is $\bar{D}_{e}^{x^{1} \Sigma^{+}}=333.8 / 6=55.6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ and $\bar{D}_{e}^{a^{3} \Pi}=456.0 / 6=76.0 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. The same results are obtained within $3 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ using the $\mathrm{MRCI}+\mathrm{Q}$ values. Corresponding $\bar{D}_{0}$ values are $\bar{D}_{0}^{x^{1} \Sigma^{+}}=52.7$ and $\bar{D}_{0}^{a^{3} \Pi}=73.3 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$.

Recall, however, that $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) is electron deficient (Lewis acid) the "bond order" of B-B being 2/3 instead of 1 ; see Section 2. Thus it would be of interest to calculate the binding energy of a "genuine" single $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}$ bond as contrasted to a $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}$ binding energy of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II).

Table 3 gives the total energy and geometry of the $\tilde{X}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{1}$ state of the $\mathrm{BH}_{2}$ radical at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$ level including experimental results [22]. Small discrepancies from experiment, $\delta r_{e} \approx+0.01 \AA$ and $\delta(\angle \mathrm{HBH}) \approx-2^{\circ}$ are rather due to core effects not included to our calculations (vide infra). The vbL diagram of the $\tilde{X}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{1}$ state of $\mathrm{BH}_{2}$ (Scheme 2) is predicting clearly a bent structure of $\mathrm{C}_{2 \mathrm{v}}$ symmetry and the possibility to form the $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{BH}_{2}$ molecule through a single B-B bond. Indeed, the $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{BH}_{2}$ molecule has been observed in 1989 [23]. An ethylene-like $\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}$ configuration and a $\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~d}}$ staggered one, both completely optimized at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$ level, are shown in Fig. 3.

The most stable configuration is the staggered $D_{2 d}$ with an astonishing large barrier-to-rotation of $12.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. Our results are in agreement with previous calculations; for details see Ref. [23] and references therein. The unexpected and capricious behavior of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{BH}_{2}$ can be understood by referring to the vbL diagram of the $\mathrm{BH}_{2}\left(\tilde{X}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right)$ electron deficient radical. Notice the significant $B-B$ bond shortening by $0.10 \AA$ of $D_{2 d}$ as compared to the $D_{2 h}$ ethylene-like configuration.

Now, the binding energy of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{BH}_{2}$ with respect to two $\mathrm{BH}_{2}\left(\tilde{X}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right)$ radicals at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$ level (see also Table 3 and

Table 3
Total equilibrium energies $E\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$, geometries $r_{\mathrm{e}}(\AA)$ and the angle $\angle \mathrm{HBH}$ (degrees), and energy separation $T_{\mathrm{e}}\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ of the BH and $\mathrm{BH}_{2}$ species at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T})$ level.

| State/Basis set | $-E$ | $r_{\mathrm{e}}(\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{H})$ | $\angle \mathrm{HBH}$ | $T_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $B H$ |  |  |  |  |
| $X^{1} \Sigma^{+} / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$ | 25.235064 | 1.233 |  | 0.0 |
| $X^{1} \Sigma^{+} / 5 \zeta$ | 25.236212 | 1.233 |  | 0.0 |
| $a^{3} \Pi / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$ | 25.186380 | 1.192 |  | 10685 |
| $a^{3} \Pi / 5 \zeta$ | 25.187469 | 1.191 |  | 10698 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $B H_{2}$ | 25.868894 | 1.188 | 128.9 | 0.0 |
| $\tilde{X}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{1} / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$ |  | $1.18_{1}$ | 131 | 0.0 |
| Expt. $^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Experimental spectroscopic results, Ref. [22].
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$$
E_{\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}}=-51.89087 \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{h}}
$$



$$
E_{\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~d}}}=-51.91086 \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{h}}
$$

Fig. 3. Equilibrium geometries and total energies of the $D_{2 h}$ and $D_{2 d}$ structures of the $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{BBH}_{2}$ molecule.

Fig. 3) is $D_{e}^{0}(B-B)=108.6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$, a remarkably strong single bond equal to $D_{e}^{0}\left(X^{1} \Sigma^{+}\right)=109.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ [6]. As was reported before the mean binding B-B bond energy of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) at the same level of theory is $\bar{D}_{e}^{a^{3} \Pi}=76.0 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. Therefore the ratio $\frac{D_{e}^{D^{3}} \Pi}{D_{e}^{D}(B-B)}=\frac{76.0}{108.6}=0.70 \approx \frac{2}{3}$ is in complete agreement with the "bond order" of $2 / 3$ deduced in Section 2 by a completely different, non-energetic, way of reasoning.

We turn now to the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}$ (I) low symmetry configuration, suggested to be the global minimum of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ more than twenty years ago [9]. As was already mentioned this rather surprising result was confirmed recently by Olson and Boldyrev who used an "unbiased search for the global minimum of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}^{-}$" [14]. It was found at the highest level of theory, $\operatorname{CCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \operatorname{CBS}$ limit, that the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (I) structure is $6.6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ lower than $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II); the corresponding value found in Ref. [9] lies between 5 and $6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. Unfortunately, besides energy differences among the three isomers of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$, I, II, and III, numerical details like geometries or bond energies are not given in Ref. [14].

In the present work it was reconfirmed that the global minimum of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ has a $\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (I) planar configuration as shown in Fig. 4. The equilibrium geometrical parameters displayed in Table 4 were obtained by complete optimization at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level, using as an initial guess the geometry of Ref. [9]. Total energies and energy differences $\Delta E_{\mathrm{II}, \mathrm{I}}=E_{\mathrm{Td}(\mathrm{II})}-E_{\mathrm{CS}(\mathrm{I})}$ are given in Table 5. At the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / 5 \zeta / / \operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level $\Delta E_{\mathrm{II}, \mathrm{I}}=5.9 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ in good agreement with the results of Ref. [14] and those of Ref. [9]. Note that the ZPE being the same for both structures, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{I})$ and $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}(\mathrm{II})$, Table 2, has a null effect to the energy difference $\Delta E_{I I I}$ given above.

At the Hartree-Fock/T $\zeta$ level the permanent electric dipole moment of the global minimum $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (I) is $\mu_{\mathrm{CS}(I)}=\left(\mu_{y}^{2}+\mu_{z}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}=\left[(-0.456)^{2}+(1.600)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}=1.63 D$, obtained as an expectation value. The corresponding finite field value at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level is $\mu_{\mathrm{CS}(l)}^{\mathrm{FF}}=\left[(-0.447)^{2}+(1.375)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}=1.45 \mathrm{D}$; field strength $5 \times 10^{-5}$ a.u.

We have also examined the structure $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (III) discovered by Olson and Boldyrev [14] and shown in Fig. 4. Although $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (I) and $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (III) are deceptively similar they are not the same, Fig. 4 clearly depicts the difference. Table 6 lists equilibrium bond lengths and angles at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level, while Table 5 gives total energies and energy differences $\Delta E$ at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta, 5 \zeta$ levels. Observe that at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta / / \operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}$ (III) structure is located $11.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ above the global minimum, becoming $12.8 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ at the quintuple basis set as contrasted to $7.0 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ of Olson and Boldyrev [14]. Take into consideration that at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ the ZPE of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (III) isomer is $31.2 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ identical to the ZPEs of Cs (I) and Td (II), thereby its effect to energy differences $\Delta E_{\text {IIII, }}$ or $\Delta E_{\text {III,I }}$ is none. The dipole moment of the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (III) isomer is
$\mu_{\mathrm{CS}(I I I)}=\left(\mu_{y}^{2}+\mu_{z}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}=\left[(1.585)^{2}+(0.213)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}=1.60 \mathrm{D}$, and
$\mu_{\mathrm{Cs}(I I I)}^{\mathrm{FF}}=\left[(1.569)^{2}+(0.153)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2}=1.58 \mathrm{D}$


Fig. 4. Geometric configurations of the Cs structures $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{Cs}$ (I) (global minimum) and of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{Cs}$ (III).

Table 4
Equilibrium bond lengths $r_{\mathrm{e}}(\AA)$ and angles $\theta$ (degrees) of the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{Cs}$ (I) molecule at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Bond | $r_{\mathrm{e}}$ | Angle | $\theta$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 1.654 | $\mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 113.2 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 1.599 | $\mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 60.0 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 1.537 | $\mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 126.8 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{1}$ | 1.704 | $\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{1}$ | 140.0 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 1.627 | $\mathrm{H}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 130.1 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{H}_{1}$ | 1.183 | $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{1}$ | 143.6 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ | 1.177 | $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{3}$ | 106.1 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ | 1.177 | $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 55.6 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{3}$ | 1.370 | $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 177.7 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}$ | 1.280 | $\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 160.0 |

${ }^{a}$ The numbering of the B and H atoms refers to Fig. 4.

## Table 5

Total $E\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$ of the $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{I}), \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}(\mathrm{II}), \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{III})$ and energy differences $\Delta E_{\mathrm{III}, \mathrm{I}}\left(=E_{\mathrm{Td}(\mathrm{II})}-E_{\mathrm{CS}(\mathrm{I})}\right)$, $\Delta E_{\text {III,I }}\left(=E_{\mathrm{CS}(\mathrm{III})}-E_{\mathrm{CS}(\mathrm{I})}\right)$ in $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta, \mathrm{Q} \zeta, 5 \zeta$ level.

| Basis set | $-E_{\mathrm{CS}(\mathrm{I})^{\mathrm{a}}}$ | $-E_{\mathrm{Td}(\mathrm{II})}{ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $-E_{\mathrm{CS}(\mathrm{III})^{\mathrm{a}}}$ | $\Delta E_{\mathrm{II}, \mathrm{I}}$ | $\Delta E_{\mathrm{IIIII}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{T} \zeta$ | 101.45481 | 101.44675 | 101.44453 | 5.1 | 6.5 |
| $\mathrm{Q} \zeta$ | $101.48146^{\mathrm{c}}$ | 101.47226 | $101.46308^{\mathrm{c}}$ | 5.8 | 11.5 |
| $5 \zeta$ | $101.48869^{\mathrm{c}}$ | $101.47932^{\mathrm{d}}$ | $101.46837^{\mathrm{c}}$ | 5.9 | 12.8 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Geometry optimization at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ only.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Geometry optimization at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ and $\mathrm{Q} \zeta$; see Table 1.
${ }^{\text {c }} \operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$ or $5 \zeta / / \operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$.
${ }^{d} \operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{~T}) / 5 \zeta / / \operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{Q} \zeta$.

Table 6
Equilibrium bond lengths $r_{\mathrm{e}}(\AA)$ and angle $\theta$ (degrees) of the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$-Cs (III) molecule at the $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level. ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$.

| Bond | $r_{\mathrm{e}}$ | Angle | $\theta$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{2}$ | 1.509 | $\mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 60.0 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 1.800 | $\mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{1}$ | 51.3 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 1.721 | $\mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 55.1 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{1}$ | 1.571 | $\mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{4}$ | 63.9 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 1.675 | $\mathrm{~B}_{1} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ | 175.6 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ | 1.180 | $\mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}$ | 109.1 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}$ | 1.180 | $\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ | 95.7 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{H}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{3}$ | 49.8 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{5}{ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 1.180 | $\mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ | 151.6 |
| $\mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{5}{ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $\mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{1}$ | 147.5 |  |

${ }^{a}$ The numbering of the B and H atoms refers to Fig. 4.
${ }^{b} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ is the bridging H atom; there is no $\mathrm{H}_{1}$.
at the $\mathrm{HF} / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ and $\operatorname{RCCSD}(\mathrm{T}) / \mathrm{T} \zeta$ level, respectively; field strength $5 \times 10^{-5}$ a.u. Although the total dipole moments for both isomers, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{I})$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}$ (III) are almost the same, their individual components, $\mu_{\mathrm{y}}$ and $\mu_{\mathrm{z}}$, are entirely different. As a result the dipole vector lies practically along the $z$ axis in $C_{S}(I)$ but along the $y$ axis in $C_{S}$ (III), see Fig. 4.

A last observation: despite the fact that both the "unicorn" molecule of organic chemistry $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ (tetrahedrane) and $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) are regular tetrahedrons and both are composed of four excited state units $\mathrm{CH}\left(a^{4} \Sigma^{-}\right)$and $\mathrm{BH}\left(a^{3} \Pi\right)$, respectively, the reason for their non-observation (or very short lifetimes) is entirely different. For one thing $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) is strongly electron deficient by 4 electrons, but this is not the case for $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$. Nevertheless their Platonic aesthetic attraction remains the same over the years galvanizing the minds of researchers. Needless to say that aside from the BH diatomic species, the rest of the molecules examined in the present work are hypervalent: The B atom (or the BH motif) in $\mathrm{BH}_{2}\left(\tilde{X}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right), \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{BBH}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~B}_{2 \mathrm{~d}}\right.$ or $\left.\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}\right)$, in the three isomers of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ (I, II, III) and of course in the vast variety of boranes $B_{x} H_{y}$, is in its first excited ${ }^{4} \mathrm{P}$ (or $\mathrm{a}^{3} \Pi$ ) state. For details see Ref. [5] and references therein.

## 5. Conclusions

From the vast field of boranes $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{y}}$ we have investigated by ab initio MRCI and $\operatorname{RCCSD}(T)$ methods three isomers of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$, namely $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}$ (I) [planar, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}^{\prime}$ ], $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) [regular tetrahedron, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1}$ ], and $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (III) [planar, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}^{\prime}$ ]. The geometrical arrangements of the two planar $C_{s}$ species (I and III) are shown in Fig. 4. For reasons of necessity and/or completeness we have also examined the species $\mathrm{BH}\left(X^{1} \Sigma^{+}, a^{3} \Pi\right), \mathrm{BH}_{2}\left(\tilde{X}^{2} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right)$, and the two conformers of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{BBH}_{2}\left(\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}, \mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~d}}\right)$. Our findings are summarized below.
(i) It has been reconfirmed that the global minimum of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ has a $C_{s}(I)$ geometry (Fig. 4). This is indeed significant as to the conceptual development and meaning of the chemical bond.
(ii) Our results leave no doubt that isomer $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) (regular tetrahedron) is located $6 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ above $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{I})$ and certainly no more than $6.5 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol} . \mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) is a singlet $\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right)$ energetically stable geometrical arrangement in the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ potential energy hypersurface, more or less of the same binding energy with respect to four $\mathrm{BH}\left(a^{3} \Pi\right)$ units as the $C_{s}(I)$, yet never observed. It has six $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B}$ equivalent (by symmetry) bonds but of "order" $2 / 3$ instead of 1 and certainly is strongly electron deficient. This is perhaps the reason of its "chemical instability" that prohibits its observation. Alternatively, if the energy barrier between $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{S}}(\mathrm{I})$ is low, the former can "slip" to the latter which in turn can polymerize due to its $2-\mathrm{e}^{-} \pi_{\mathrm{x}}$ system (see iii).
(iii) The binding mode of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (I) can be rationalized through a vbL diagram diagram shown on p .472 of Ref. [9] composed of four $\mathrm{BH}\left(a^{3} \Pi\right)$ moieties, indicating a $2-\mathrm{e}^{-} \pi_{\mathrm{x}}$ system carried by the $B_{2}$ and $B_{3}$ atoms bridged by $H_{3}$; see Fig. 4 .
(iv) The isomer $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{5}$ (III), Fig. 4, is located about $13 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ above the global minimum $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{I})$. It is a stable local minimum on the $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ hypersurface and of course never observed experimentally.
(v) The normal modes of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{S}}$ (I) and $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}$ (II) as well as their electrical dipole moments have been reported for the first time, whereas zero point energies are identical for all three $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ isomers, $\mathrm{ZPE}=31.2 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$.

## References

[1] E.J. Corey, Boron, Chem. Eng. News 81 (36) (2003), 40-40.
[2] N.N. Greenwood, A. Earnshaw, Chemistry of the Elements, second ed., Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1998.
[3] C.E. Housecroft, A.G. Sharpe, Inorganic Chemistry, third ed., Pearson Education Limited, Essex, 2008.
[4] A. Kramida, Y. Ralchenko, J. Reader, and NIST ASD Team, NIST Atomic Spectra Database (ver. 5.1), 2013 (http://physics.nist.gov/asd).
[5] A. Kalemos, A. Mavridis, Myths and reality of hypervalent molecules. The electronic structure of $\mathrm{FCl}_{\mathrm{x}}, \mathrm{x}=1,2,3, \mathrm{Cl}_{3} \mathrm{PO}, \mathrm{Cl}_{3} \mathrm{PCH}_{2}, \mathrm{Cl}_{3} \mathrm{CClO}$, and $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{ClO})_{4}, \mathrm{~J}$. Phys. Chem. A 115 (2011) 2378-2384.
[6] K.P. Huber, G. Herzberg, Molecular spectra and molecular structure, vol. 4, Constants of Diatomic Molecules, Van Nostrand, New York, 1979.
[7] E. Miliordos A. Mavridis Ab initio investigation of the electronic structure and bonding of BH, BH-, and HBBH, J. Chem. Phys. 128 (2008) pp. 144308(1)144308(15).
[8] A. Kalemos, A. Mavridis, An accurate description of the ground and excited states of CH, J. Chem. Phys. 111 (1999) 9536-9548.
[9] P. Mach, I. Hubač, A. Mavridis, Ab initio structural study of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ molecule: asymmetric structure for a "symmetric" system, Chem. Phys. Lett. 226 (1994) 469-474.
[10] G. Urry, T. Wartik, H. Schlesinger, A new subchloride of boron, $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{4}$, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 74 (1952), 58095809.
[11] L. Ahmed, J. Costillo, J.A. Morrison, Chemistry of tetraboron tetrachloride. Synthesis and characterization of tetraboron tetrabromide $\left(\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{Br} 4\right)$ and observation of ${ }_{\mathrm{B}} 4 \mathrm{BrC}_{1} 3$, ${ }_{\mathrm{B}} 4 \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{r}} 2 \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{l}} 2$, and ${ }_{\mathrm{B}} 4 \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{r}} 3 \mathrm{Cl}$, Inorg. Chem. 31 (1992) 18581860.
[12] M. Atoji, W.N. Lipscomb, The crystal and molecular structure of $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}_{4}$, Acta Cryst. 6 (1953) 547-550.
[13] T. Dovan, J.A. Morrison, Tetrakis(t-butyl)tetraborane(4), Bu ${ }_{4}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{B}_{4}$; synthesis of the first peralkyl derivative of a $2 \boldsymbol{N}$ framework electron count deltahedral borane Tetrakis(t-butyl)tetraborane(4), $\mathrm{Bu}_{4}^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{B}_{4}$; synthesis of the first peralkyl derivative of a $2 \boldsymbol{N}$ framework electron count deltahedral borane, J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun. 5 (1981) 250-251.
[14] J.K. Olson, A. Boldyrev, Ab initio search for global minimum structures of neutral and ionic $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ clusters, Chem. Phys. 379 (2011) 1-5, and references therein.
[15] M. Böyükata, C. Özdoğan, Z.B. Güvenç, An investigation of hydrogen bonded neutral $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{n}(n=1-11)$ and anionic $\mathrm{B}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{11}^{(-1)}$ clusters: Density functional study, J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem) 805 (2007) 91-100.
[16] T.H. Dunning Jr., Gaussian basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. III. The atoms boron through neon and hydrogen, J. Chem. Phys. 90 (1989) 1007-1023.
[17] K. Raghavachari, G.W. Trucks, J.A. Pople, M. Head-Gordon, A fifth-order perturbation comparison of electron correlation theories, Chem. Phys. Lett. 157 (1989) 479-483.
[18] J.D. Watts, J. Gauss, R.J. Bartlett, Coupled cluster methods with non-iterative triple excitations for restricted open-shell Hartree-Fock and other general single determinant reference functions. Energies and analytical gradients, J. Chem. Phys. 98 (1993) 8718-8733.
[19] P. J. Knowles, C. Hampel, H.-J. Werner, Coupled cluster theory for high spin open-shell reference wave functions, J. Chem. Phys. 99 (1993) 5219-5227; 112 (2000) 3116 E .
[20] S.R. Langhoff, E.R. Davidson, Configuration interaction calculations on the nitrogen molecule, Int. J. Quantum Chem. 8 (1974) 61-72.
[21] H.-J. Werner, P. J. Knowles, G. Knizia, F. R. Manby, M. Schütz, P. Celani, T. Korona, R. Lindh, A. Mitrushenkov, G. Rauhut, K. R. Shamasundar, T. B. Adler, R. D. Amos, A. Bernhardsson, A. Berning, D. L. Cooper, M. J. O. Deegan, A. J. Dobbyn, F. Eckert, E. Goll, C. Hampel, A. Hesselmann, G. Hetzer, T. Hrenar, G. Jansen, C. Köppl, Y. Liu, A. W. Lloyd, R. A. Mata, A. J. May, S. J. McNicholas, W. Meyer, M. E. Mura, A. Nicklaß, D. P. O'Neill, P. Palmieri, D. Peng, K. Pflüger, R. Pitzer, M. Reiher, T. Shiozaki, H. Stoll, A. J. Stone, R. Tarroni, T. Thorsteinsson, M. Wang, MOLPRO version 2015.1, a package of ab initio programs see http:// www.molpro.net.
[22] G. Herzberg, J.W.C. Johns, The spectrum and structure of the free $\mathrm{BH}_{2}$ radical, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 298 (1967) 142-159.
[23] B. Ruščic, M. Schwarz, J. Berkowitz, Molecular structure and thermal stability of $\mathrm{B}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{B}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}^{+}$species 47564581 J. Chem. Phys. 91 (1989), and references therein.

