

# Density-Functional Study of the Geometries, Stabilities, and Bond Energies of Group III–V (13–15) Four-Membered-Ring Compounds

Haihong Ni,<sup>†</sup> Darrin M. York,<sup>†,‡</sup> Lee Bartolotti,<sup>‡</sup> Richard L. Wells,<sup>†</sup> and Weitao Yang<sup>\*,†</sup>

Contribution from the Department of Chemistry, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708-0354, and North Carolina Supercomputing Center, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709-12889

Received May 25, 1995. Revised Manuscript Received April 26, 1996<sup>®</sup>

**Abstract:** A theoretical investigation has been carried out on several group III–V (13–15) four-membered-ring compounds which, if experimentally attainable, are potentially useful as precursors to nanocrystalline electronic and semiconductor materials. Four-membered-ring compounds considered in this study have core structures of the following form:  $\overline{\text{MEM'E'}}$  and  $\overline{\text{MEMX}}$  (M, M' = In, Ga, Al; E, E' = P, As; X = Cl, Br). Equilibrium geometries, binding energies, and bond energies were determined based on local density approximation (LDA) and gradient-corrected density-functional methods. Optimized ring geometries obtained with LDA agree closely with single-crystal X-ray crystallographic structures of known compounds with the same four-membered-ring cores. The following trends in bond energies are observed:  $\text{M-Cl} \gg \text{M-P} > \text{M-As} \gg \text{M-Br}$  (M = In, Ga, Al), and  $\text{Al-Y} > \text{Ga-Y} > \text{In-Y}$  (Y = P, As, Cl, Br). Although only one M–Br-containing mixed-bridge four-membered-ring compound has been reported and no such Al–Cl-containing mixed-bridge species have yet been synthesized, our calculations suggest that compounds containing these two ring systems are stable.

## Introduction

During the past decade, there has been considerable effort centered on the preparation of potential single-source precursors to various group III–V (13–15) semiconductor and electronic materials.<sup>1–18</sup> As a result, four-membered-ring compounds containing cores of the form  $\overline{\text{MEME}}$  (M = Al, Ga, or In; E =

P or As),<sup>1–12,14–15,18</sup>  $\overline{\text{MEME'}}$  (M = Al, Ga, or In; E = As; E' = P),<sup>19–21</sup> and  $\overline{\text{MEMX}}$  (M = Ga or In; E = P or As; X = Cl) (M = Ga; E = As; X = Br)<sup>4,12–17</sup> have been synthesized. Of particular interest are nanometer-size crystallites of semiconductor materials which have interesting properties as a result of quantum confinement effects not observed in bulk material.<sup>22–24</sup> Among such materials, group III–V semiconductors are especially important because of their utility in high-speed digital circuits, microwave devices, and optoelectronics.<sup>25,26</sup> One avenue of synthesis for group III–V nanocrystals involves the thermal decomposition of suitable single-source precursors and, to this end, it has been recently demonstrated that the compounds  $[\text{X}_2\text{GaP}(\text{SiMe}_3)_2]_2$  (X = Cl, Br, or I) undergo thermolysis at relatively low temperatures to yield nanocrystalline gallium phosphide (GaP)<sup>5</sup>. Consequently, there is considerable interest in understanding the structural and energetic properties of the various mentioned four-membered-ring compounds in order to stimulate the synthesis and exploitation of new nanocrystalline materials.

Density-functional theory (DFT)<sup>27–31</sup> has been shown to be a powerful theoretical tool for studying molecular structure and

<sup>†</sup> Duke University.

<sup>‡</sup> North Carolina Supercomputing Center.

<sup>®</sup> Abstract published in *Advance ACS Abstracts*, June 1, 1996.

(1) Cowley, A. H.; Jones, R. A. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.* **1989**, *28*, 1208.

(2) Heaton, D. E.; Jones, R. A.; Kidd, K. B.; Cowley, A. H.; Nunn, C. M. *Polyhedron* **1988**, *7*, 1901.

(3) Pitt, C. G.; Higa, K. T.; McPhail, A. T.; Wells, R. L. *Organometallics* **1986**, *5*, 1266.

(4) Wells, R. L. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1992**, *112*, 273.

(5) Aubuchon, S. R.; McPhail, A. T.; Wells, R. L.; Giambra, J. A.; Bowser, J. R. *Chem. Mater.* **1994**, *6*, 82.

(6) Wells, R. L.; Self, M. F.; McPhail, A. T.; Aubuchon, S. R. *Organometallics* **1993**, *12*, 2832.

(7) Wells, R. L.; McPhail, A. T.; Speer, T. M. *Organometallics* **1992**, *11*, 960.

(8) Wells, R. L.; McPhail, A. T.; Self, M. F.; Laske, J. A. *Organometallics* **1993**, *12*, 3333.

(9) Wells, R. L.; McPhail, A. T.; Speer, T. M. *Eur. J. Solid State Inorg. Chem.* **1992**, *29*, 63.

(10) Wells, R. L.; McPhail, A. T.; Jones, L. J.; Self, M. F. *Polyhedron* **1993**, *12*, 141.

(11) Arif, A. M.; Menac, B. L.; Cowley, A. H.; Jones, R. A.; Kidd, K. B.; Nunn, C. M. *New J. Chem.* **1988**, *12*, 553.

(12) Wells, R. L.; Jones, L. J.; McPhail, A. T.; Alvanipour, A. *Organometallics* **1991**, *10*, 2345.

(13) Wells, R. L.; Aubuchon, S. R.; Self, M. F.; Jasinski, J. P.; Woudenberg, R. C.; Butcher, R. J. *Organometallics* **1992**, *11*, 3370.

(14) Wells, R. L.; McPhail, A. T.; Self, M. F. *Organometallics* **1992**, *11*, 221.

(15) Wells, R. L.; McPhail, A. T.; Self, M. F. *Organometallics* **1993**, *12*, 3363.

(16) Wells, R. L.; McPhail, A. T.; Pasterczk, J. W.; Alvanipour, A. *Organometallics* **1992**, *11*, 226.

(17) Holley, W. K.; Wells, R. L.; Shafieezad, S.; McPhail, A. T.; Pitt, C. G. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1990**, *381*, 15.

(18) Banks, M. A.; Beachley, O. T., Jr.; Buttrey, L. A.; Churchill, M. R.; Fettingner, J. C. *Organometallics* **1991**, *10*, 1901.

(19) Jones, L. J.; McPhail, A. T.; Wells, R. L. *Organometallics* **1994**, *13*, 2504.

(20) Wells, R. L.; Aubuchon, S. R.; Lube, M. S.; White, P. S. *Main Group Chem.* **1995**, *1*, 81.

(21) Cooke, J. A. L.; Wells, R. L.; White, P. S. *Organometallics* **1995**, *14*, 3562.

(22) Stucky, G. D.; MacDougall, J. E. *Science* **1990**, *247*, 669.

(23) Steigerwald, M. L.; Brus, L. E. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1990**, *23*, 183.

(24) Henglein, A. *Top. Curr. Chem.* **1988**, *143*, 113.

(25) Glass, A. M. *Science* **1987**, *235*, 1003.


(26) Stucky, G. D. *Prog. Inorg. Chem.* **1992**, *40*, 99.

(27) Sterling, A.; Papai, I.; Mink, J. J. *Chem. Phys.* **1994**, *100*, 2910.


(28) Versluis, Ziegler, T. J. *Chem. Phys.* **1988**, *88*, 322.

(29) (a) Labanowski, J. K.; Andzelm, J. W., Eds.; *Density-Functional Methods in Chemistry*; Springer-Verlag: New York, 1991. (b) Parr, R. G.; Yang, W. *Density-Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules*; Oxford University Press: New York, 1989.

(30) Ziegler, T. *Chem. Rev.* **1991**, *91*, 651.



**Figure 1.** Structures of  $\text{H}_2\text{ME}(\text{H})_2\text{M}'(\text{H})_2\text{E}'(\text{H})_2$  ( $\text{M}, \text{M}' = \text{In}, \text{Ga}, \text{Al}$ ;  $\text{E}, \text{E}' = \text{P}, \text{As}$ ).



**Figure 2.** Structure of  $\text{H}_2\text{ME}(\text{H})_2\text{M}(\text{H})_2\text{X}$  ( $\text{M} = \text{In}, \text{Ga}, \text{Al}$ ;  $\text{E} = \text{P}, \text{As}$ ;  $\text{X} = \text{Cl}, \text{Br}$ ).

energetics, particularly for organotransition metal compounds.<sup>32,33</sup> Herein, we describe a theoretical investigation of group III–V four-membered-ring compounds using DFT. Optimized geometries, binding energies, and bond energies have been calculated in order to give insight into the structural features and bonding properties of these ring species.

Four-membered-ring compounds containing several different ligands ( $\text{R}, \text{R}'$ ) have been synthesized and characterized by single-crystal X-ray crystallography.<sup>1–21</sup> The four-membered-ring compounds studied here are divided into two groups: compounds containing two pnictogens of the general form  $\text{R}_2\text{ME}(\text{R}')_2\text{M}(\text{R})_2\text{E}'(\text{R}')_2$  ( $\text{M} = \text{In},^{1,4,10–12,14,15,18,19} \text{Ga},^{1–6,11,18,20} \text{Al};^{1,4,7–9,11,21} \text{E}, \text{E}' = \text{P}, \text{As}$ ) and compounds containing one halogen and one pnictogen of the general form  $\text{R}_2\text{ME}(\text{R}')_2\text{M}(\text{R})_2\text{X}$  ( $\text{M} = \text{In},^{12,14,15} \text{Ga},^{16,17} \text{E} = \text{P}, \text{As}$ ;  $\text{X} = \text{Cl}, \text{Br}$ ). In our theoretical investigation we consider the case of  $\text{R}, \text{R}' = \text{H}$  (Figures 1 and 2). These model compounds are intended to capture the essential electronic bonding interactions of the four-membered-ring core and neglect mainly the steric effect of more bulky (and computationally demanding) ligands.

### Computational Details

Density-functional calculations were performed using the Dmol software package.<sup>35,36</sup> Optimized geometries, vibrational frequencies, and zero-point energy corrections employed the Vosko–Wilk–Nussair local density approximation (LDA) to treat electron exchange and correlation effects. It is well-known that LDA gives reasonable geometries although it generally overestimates binding energies.<sup>30,33</sup> Binding energies were calculated at the LDA optimized geometries using the gradient-corrected exchange functional of Becke<sup>37</sup> in conjunction with the Lee–Yang–Parr<sup>38</sup> correlation functional (BLYP). Vibrational frequencies were computed from force constant matrices calculated by mass-weighted finite differences of the energy gradients. It has been demonstrated that the gradient corrections typically have a minor influence on the calculated frequencies at a given reference geometry,<sup>39,40</sup> consequently, BLYP binding energies with LDA zero-point energy corrections were used to calculate M–H, E–H, and M–E bond energies. A double numerical basis set with polarization functions was used in all calculations.<sup>36</sup> This basis set has been designed to give bond lengths converged to the accuracy of 0.01 Å.<sup>36</sup> Mesh points for numerical integrations were chosen to give a precision of  $10^{-5}$  au in

(31) Sosa, C.; Andzelm, J.; Elkin, B. C.; Wimmer, E.; Dobbs, K. D.; Dixon, D. A. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1992**, *96*, 6630.

(32) Ziegler, T. *Pure Appl. Chem.* **1991**, *63*, 871.

(33) Folga, E.; Ziegler, T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 5169.

(34) Reference deleted in review.

(35) Delley, B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1990**, *92*, 508.

(36) Delley, B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1991**, *94*, 7245.

(37) Becke, A. D. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1988**, *88*, 2547.

(38) Lee, C.; Yang, W.; Parr, R. G. *Phys. Rev. B* **1988**, *37*, 785.

(39) Qin, Y.; Wheeler, R. A. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *102*, 1689.

(40) Berces, A.; Ziegler, T.; Fan, L. J. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, *98*, 1584.

**Table 1.** Gradient-Corrected Density-Functional Binding Energies ( $E_b$ ) and Zero-Point Corrected Binding Energies ( $E_b'$ ) for Dipnictogen-Containing Four-Membered-Ring Compounds

compd	$E_b$ (kca/mol)	$E_b'$ (kcal/mol)
$\text{H}_2\text{InP}(\text{H})_2\text{In}(\text{H})_2\text{PH}_2$	−752.3	−715.6
$\text{H}_2\text{InP}(\text{H})_2\text{In}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−736.8	−701.5
$\text{H}_2\text{InAs}(\text{H})_2\text{In}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−721.3	−686.9
$\text{H}_2\text{InP}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{PH}_2$	−770.7	−732.6
$\text{H}_2\text{InP}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−754.2	−717.5
$\text{H}_2\text{InAs}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−737.7	−701.7
$\text{H}_2\text{InP}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{PH}_2$	−776.6	−738.8
$\text{H}_2\text{InP}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−760.2	−723.3
$\text{H}_2\text{InAs}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−743.7	−708.5
$\text{H}_2\text{GaP}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{PH}_2$	−789.5	−750.2
$\text{H}_2\text{GaP}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−772.1	−734.4
$\text{H}_2\text{GaAs}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−751.9	−714.8
$\text{H}_2\text{GaP}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{PH}_2$	−795.2	−755.9
$\text{H}_2\text{GaP}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−778.0	−740.0
$\text{H}_2\text{GaAs}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−760.6	−723.2
$\text{H}_2\text{AlP}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{PH}_2$	−801.2	−763.5
$\text{H}_2\text{AlP}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−783.7	−745.4
$\text{H}_2\text{AlAs}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{AsH}_2$	−766.6	−730.0

computation of the matrix elements. Geometry optimizations were performed without symmetry constraints and terminated when the norm of the gradient fell below  $10^{-3}$  au.

Throughout this paper, we have ignored relativistic effects; this may affect our prediction of the bond lengths and bond energies for the In compounds to at most a few percent.<sup>41</sup> For example, relativistic effect reduces the In–H bond length in  $\text{InH}_3$  from 1.762 Å to 1.739 Å.<sup>41</sup>

### Results and Discussion

In the discussion of the relative binding energies of the various four-membered-ring compounds, it is useful to make reference to *bond energies*. The bond energy  $D(\text{A}–\text{B})$  describes the stabilization energy associated with formation of a single A–B bond. We define the binding energy of a molecule as the sum of bond energies:<sup>42</sup>

$$E_b \equiv E_{\text{molecule}} - E_{\text{atoms}} = - \sum_{\substack{\text{bonds} \\ \text{A}–\text{B}}} D(\text{A}–\text{B}) \quad (1)$$

where  $E_b$  is binding energy and  $D(\text{A}–\text{B})$  is the A–B bond energy. For related compounds, the bond energies for each bond type are expected to be similar. In this case a single set of transferable bond energies can be determined, and subsequently applied to new compounds to obtain approximate binding energies (via eq 1). In this way bond energies can be used as a predictive tool and provide qualitative insight into the energetics of bond formation for a host of related compounds. For a detailed discussion of bond energies refer to the work of Pauling.<sup>42</sup>

**(a) Geometric and Energetic Properties of Dipnictogen Four-Membered-Ring Compounds.** We have calculated optimized geometries and zero-point energy corrected binding energies for 18 ring compounds of the form  $\text{H}_2\text{ME}(\text{H})_2\text{M}'(\text{H})_2\text{E}'(\text{H})_2$  ( $\text{M}, \text{M}' = \text{In}, \text{Ga}, \text{Al}$ ;  $\text{E}, \text{E}' = \text{P}, \text{As}$ ) (Figure 1). Binding energies of the optimized structures are listed in Table 1.

(41) Pyykko, P. *Chem. Rev.* **1988**, *88*, 563–594.

(42) Pauling, L. *The Nature of The Chemical Bond*; Cornell University Press: Ithaca, NY, 1960; p 87.


**Table 2.** Calculated and Experimental Bond Lengths and Angles for Dimeric Compounds  $R_2ME(R')_2M(R)_2E(R')_2$ 

M	E	R	R'	M–E (Å)	M <sub>1</sub> –E–M <sub>2</sub> (deg)	E <sub>1</sub> –M–E <sub>2</sub> (deg)	R'–E–R' (deg)
In	P	H	H	2.618	99.1	80.9	97.9 <sup>a</sup>
In	P	Me <sub>3</sub> SiCH <sub>2</sub>	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.655	93.6	86.3	105.7 <sup>b,14</sup>
In	As	H	H	2.710	99.8	80.2	94.4 <sup>a</sup>
In	As	Me <sub>3</sub> SiCH <sub>2</sub>	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.727	94.6	85.6	105.4 <sup>b,12</sup>
Ga	P	H	H	2.401	97.6	82.4	98.5 <sup>a</sup>
Ga	P	Cl	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.379	86.4	93.6	112.1 <sup>b,6</sup>
Ga	As	H	H	2.503	100.7	79.2	95.7 <sup>a</sup>
Ga	As	Me <sub>3</sub> CCH <sub>2</sub>	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.584	95.1	85.0	102.3 <sup>b,16</sup>
Al	P	H	H	2.426	96.7	83.3	100.3 <sup>a</sup>
Al	P	Et	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.460	90.2	89.8	107.4 <sup>b,8</sup>
Al	As	H	H	2.514	97.3	82.7	97.8 <sup>a</sup>
Al	As	Et	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.539	91.0	89.0	101.6 <sup>b,7</sup>

<sup>a</sup> LDA optimized geometries. <sup>b</sup> Related X-ray crystal structures (having the same core four-membered ring, but different R and R' ligands). Geometrical parameters listed are the following: M–E bond length, M<sub>1</sub>–E–M<sub>2</sub> angle, E<sub>1</sub>–M–E<sub>2</sub> angle, and R'–E–R' angle. All calculated structures have *D*<sub>2h</sub> symmetry.

Six of the 18 dipnicogen ring compounds are dimers (M = M'; E = E'). The structures of several similar dimer compounds with the same (M, E) four-membered-ring core, but with the hydrogen atoms replaced by bulky (R, R') ligands, have been determined by X-ray diffraction.<sup>7–12,14–17</sup> A comparison of geometric parameters for the calculated and experimental structures is summarized in Table 2. The structures obtained through optimization (in the absence of symmetry constraints) preserve the planarity and symmetry of the four-membered-ring compounds observed experimentally.

The following trends in bond lengths and bond angles are observed (M = In, Ga, Al; E = As, P):



An analysis of structural deviations between the calculated and experimental dimer compounds gives insight into the effects of different ligands. Almost all the calculated M–E bond lengths are shorter than the corresponding experimental values. The difference most likely arises from steric effects associated with the bulky R and R' ligands in the experimental compounds. A notable exception occurs when the R ligand is an electron-withdrawing group. For instance, the Ga–P bond length is shorter in the experimental [Cl<sub>2</sub>GaP(SiMe<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub> structure (2.379 Å)<sup>6</sup> than in the calculated [H<sub>2</sub>GaPH<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub> structure (2.401 Å). In general, the calculated M–E–M bond angles are larger than the corresponding experimental values, and conversely, the E–M–E bond angles are correspondingly smaller.

The other 12 calculated mixed-metal and mixed-pnicogen structures are similar to the dimeric structures (the largest deviation in M–E bond length from the corresponding dimeric value is less than 0.01 Å). The four-membered rings are all planar, and reveal the same geometrical trends described previously for the dimeric structures.

Bond energies were computed via eq 1 for the series of four-membered-ring compounds from the binding energy data. In order for these energies to correspond to thermodynamic quantities, corrections to the binding energies are required to account for finite vibrational energy even at 0 K. These zero-point energy corrections are proportional to the normal mode vibrational frequencies (inversely proportional to the square root of the reduced mass) and hence most significant for chemical bonds involving hydrogen.

M–H and E–H bond energies were obtained directly from the binding energies of MH<sub>3</sub> and EH<sub>3</sub> compounds, respectively (Table 3). These bond energies were subsequently applied to

**Table 3.** Bond Energies and Bond Lengths for M–H and E–H Bonds

bond type	bond energy <sup>a</sup> (kJ/mol)	bond length <sup>b</sup> (Å)	bond length <sup>c</sup> (Å)
In–H	247.1 (261.8)	1.754	1.747
Ga–H	271.3 (285.8)	1.563	1.556
Al–H	276.8 (291.9)	1.596	1.597
P–H	339.2 (359.5)	1.436	1.426
As–H	314.2 (336.0)	1.535	1.519

<sup>a</sup> M–H and E–H bond energies with zero-point energy correction for MH<sub>3</sub> and EH<sub>3</sub> compounds are listed and those before correction are listed in parentheses. <sup>b</sup> M–H bond lengths in MH<sub>3</sub> and EH<sub>3</sub> compounds. <sup>c</sup> Average M–H bond lengths in the calculated four-membered-ring compounds.

**Table 4.** Bond Energies and Bond Lengths for M–E Bonds

	bond energy <sup>a</sup> (kJ/mol)	bond energy <sup>b</sup> (kJ/mol)	bond length <sup>c</sup> (Å)	bond length <sup>d</sup> (Å)
In–P	162.0 (165.5)	162.2 (165.6)	2.624	2.618
In–As	157.4 (156.8)	157.2 (156.7)	2.707	2.710
Ga–P	174.5 (180.8)	174.2 (180.5)	2.404	2.401
Ga–As	163.3 (165.8)	162.2 (164.7)	2.496	2.503
Al–P	181.7 (186.5)	182.6 (186.7)	2.426	2.426
Al–As	172.4 (174.1)	172.6 (174.0)	2.517	2.514

<sup>a</sup> The M–E bond energies with zero-point energy correction are calculated from least-squares fitting and the bond energy without zero-point energy correction are listed in parentheses. <sup>b</sup> The M–E bond energies with zero-point energy correction are calculated from six dimer compounds and the bond energies without zero-point energy correction are listed in parentheses. <sup>c</sup> The M–E bond lengths are averaged over all 18 compounds. <sup>d</sup> The M–E bond lengths are calculated from six dimeric compounds.

the four-membered-ring compounds. The assumption of transferability of the M–H and E–H bond energies to the four-membered-ring compounds is supported by the fact that the corresponding bond lengths are very similar for these structures (overall standard deviation 0.01 Å, Table 3).



Bond energies for M–E bonds in the four-membered-ring compounds were computed in two ways by using two different data sets. The first data set consisted only of the six dimer compounds (the “minimal” set). These compounds have only three types of bonds: M–E bonds and M–H and E–H bonds. The M–H and E–H bond energies were computed previously from the MH<sub>3</sub> and EH<sub>3</sub> compounds. Consequently, the bond energies (and bond lengths) for each M–E bond can be determined directly and uniquely from the binding energy of the corresponding dimer. In this case, the sum of the bond energies is defined to be exactly the calculated binding energy. Alternatively, a second data set consisting of all 18 mixed-bridge compounds (including the dimers) can be used to obtain bond energies and bond lengths (the “full” set). For this set, bond energies were obtained by a fitting procedure so as to best reproduce (in a least-squares sense) the calculated binding energies of the compounds. Similarly, bond lengths were determined by simple averaging over all M–E bonds of the same type.

Comparison of bond lengths and energies obtained from the “minimal” and “full” sets provides an assessment of the assumption that these quantities are transferable. The M–E bond energies calculated from both sets are shown in Table 4 along with the corresponding bond lengths. Binding energies predicted from the bond energies (eq 1) are in excellent agreement with the DFT calculated binding energies (the standard deviations using bond energies obtained from the minimal set and full set are 0.571 and 0.417 kcal/mol, respectively). The close agreement of the bond lengths and bond energies derived from the two sets strongly supports the assumption of transferability of these quantities, and the validity of the bond energy model (eq 1).

**Table 5.** Gradient-Corrected Density-Functional Binding Energies for Twelve Halogen-Containing Mixed-Bridge Compounds

compd	binding energy (kcal/mol)	compd	binding energy (kcal/mol)
$\text{H}_2\text{InP}(\text{H})_2\text{In}(\text{H})_2\text{Cl}$	-622.3	$\text{H}_2\text{GaP}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{Br}$	-556.7
$\text{H}_2\text{InAs}(\text{H})_2\text{In}(\text{H})_2\text{Cl}$	-606.1	$\text{H}_2\text{GaAs}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{Br}$	-537.5
$\text{H}_2\text{InP}(\text{H})_2\text{In}(\text{H})_2\text{Br}$	-522.0	$\text{H}_2\text{AlP}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{Cl}$	-676.7
$\text{H}_2\text{InAs}(\text{H})_2\text{In}(\text{H})_2\text{Br}$	-506.1	$\text{H}_2\text{InAs}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{Cl}$	-658.8
$\text{H}_2\text{GaP}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{Cl}$	-657.2	$\text{H}_2\text{AlP}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{Br}$	-573.4
$\text{H}_2\text{GaAs}(\text{H})_2\text{Ga}(\text{H})_2\text{Cl}$	-638.9	$\text{H}_2\text{AlAs}(\text{H})_2\text{Al}(\text{H})_2\text{Br}$	-555.4

From Table 4, the following trends in bond energies are apparent:




The bond energy trends are correlated with the bond length trends described earlier (large bond energies generally corresponding to shorter bond lengths; the exception being that Al-E bonds are predicted to be stronger than Ga-E bonds, although somewhat longer).

**(b) Geometric and Energetic Properties of Halogen-Containing Mixed-Bridge Four-Membered-Ring Compounds.** Optimized geometries and binding energies have been calculated for 12 halogen-containing mixed-bridge compounds of the form  $\text{H}_2\text{ME}(\text{H})_2\text{M}(\text{H})_2\text{X}$  (M = In, Ga, Al; E = P, As; X = Cl, Br) (Figure 2). Binding energies without zero-point energy corrections are listed in Table 5.

Halogen-containing mixed-bridge compounds with four-membered rings  $\text{InPInCl}$ ,  $\text{InAsInCl}$ ,  $\text{GaPGaCl}$ , and  $\text{GaAsGaCl}$  with several bulky R and R' ligands have been synthesized and their structures determined by X-ray diffraction.<sup>13-17</sup> In some instances the four-membered-ring cores are puckered (Table 6). In contrast, all the optimized geometries of compounds with R, R' = H result in planar ring structures, even though optimizations were performed using several puckered starting geometries.

The following trends in bond lengths and bond angles are observed (M = In, Ga, Al; E = As, P; X = Br, Cl):



All the calculated M-E and M-X bond lengths are slightly shorter than the corresponding experimental values. The calculated M-E-M and M-X-M bond angles are larger than the corresponding experimental values, whereas the X-M-E bond angles are smaller. As stated previously for the dipnicogen-containing four-membered-ring compounds, these differences are most likely attributed to steric effects of the bulky ligands in the experimental structures. Our results also indicate that Al-E bonds are longer than Ga-E bonds. This order of bond length agrees with the experimental observation. The experimental data (Table 2) show that the Ga-E bond is shorter than the Al-E bond when both have the same ligand, and the order can be reversed when they have different ligands.

The M-X bond energies were computed with eq 1 from the binding energy data in conjunction with the M-E and M-H bond energy results presented in the previous section. The M-E bond lengths in the halogen-containing mixed-bridge compounds are similar to the M-E bond lengths in the dipnicogen-containing four-membered-ring compounds, lending support to the assumption that the M-E bond energies will likewise be similar (transferable). As indicated in Table 6, the zero-point energy corrections are small for bonds involving two heavy atoms, and have an almost negligible affect on their relative values. Hence, zero-point energy corrections have not been included in the determination of the M-Br and M-Cl bond energies (Table 7).

From Table 7 the following trends in bond energies are observed:



Our theoretical calculations indicate that for Cl- or Br-containing mixed-bridge compounds, the Cl-containing compounds will be considerably more stable. The most stable compounds involve Al-Cl bonds (bond energy 285.6 kJ/mol). The least stable compounds are those containing In-Br bonds (bond energy 43.5 kJ/mol). Although several In-Cl- and Ga-Cl-containing mixed-bridge compounds have been reported,<sup>13-17</sup> attempts to synthesize Al-Cl-containing mixed-bridge compounds have not been successful to date. The difficulty in synthesis of Al-Cl-containing mixed-

**Table 6.** Calculated and Experimental Bond Lengths and Angles for Mixed-Bridge Compounds  $\text{R}_2\text{ME}(\text{R}')_2\text{M}(\text{R})_2\text{X}$ 

M	E	X	R	R'	M-E (Å)	M-X (Å)	M-X-M (deg)	M-E-M (deg)	X-M-E (deg)	torsion
In	P	Cl	H	H	2.589	2.579	97.8	96.9	82.6	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
In	P	Cl	Me <sub>3</sub> SiCH <sub>2</sub>	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.603	2.620	89.8	90.6	85.3	22.9 <sup>b,14</sup>
In	As	Cl	H	H	2.682	2.580	99.7	94.7	82.8	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
In	As	Cl	Me <sub>3</sub> SiCH <sub>2</sub>	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.677	2.619	99.7	94.7	82.8	0.0 <sup>b,12</sup>
Ga	P	Cl	H	H	2.372	2.376	94.1	94.3	85.8	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
Ga	P	Cl	Ph	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.389	2.414	89.4	90.4	89.8	6.4 <sup>b,13</sup>
Ga	As	Cl	H	H	2.465	2.376	96.6	92.1	85.6	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
Ga	As	Cl	Me <sub>3</sub> CCH <sub>2</sub>	Me <sub>3</sub> Si	2.528	2.422	94.4	89.8	88.0	pucker <sup>b,16</sup>
Al	P	Cl	H	H	2.396	2.330	95.0	91.5	86.7	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
Al	As	Cl	H	H	2.488	2.333	96.9	89.1	87.0	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
In	P	Br	H	H	2.610	2.719	92.3	97.4	85.2	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
In	As	Br	H	H	2.671	2.727	94.1	96.7	84.6	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
Ga	P	Br	H	H	2.377	2.517	89.8	96.4	86.8	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
Ga	As	Br	H	H	2.469	2.528	93.2	96.1	85.3	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
Al	P	Br	H	H	2.403	2.448	89.4	93.5	88.5	0.0 <sup>a</sup>
Al	As	Br	H	H	2.481	2.488	91.8	92.1	88.0	0.0 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Calculated LDA optimized geometries. <sup>b</sup> Related X-ray crystal structures having the same core four-membered ring, but different R and R' ligands. Geometrical parameters listed are as follows: M-E bond length, M-X bond length, M-X-M angle, M-E-M angle, X-M-E angle, and endocyclic torsion angle.

**Table 7.** Bond Energies and Bond Lengths for M–X Bonds

	bond energy (kJ/mol)	bond length (Å)
In–Cl	253.2	2.579
Ga–Cl	263.3	2.376
Al–Cl	285.6	2.331
In–Br	43.5	2.723
Ga–Br	53.1	2.522
Al–Br	69.3	2.488

bridge compounds may be related to the unusual stability of the Al–Cl bonds which favors the reactants.<sup>7</sup> In addition, only one Br-containing mixed-bridge compound has been reported. Our calculations suggest that the M–Br bonds are weak compared to either the M–Cl or M–E bond. Based on these data, we suggest that Br-containing mixed-bridge compounds have potential as precursors in the synthesis of group III–V nanocrystals.

### Conclusion

We have calculated equilibrium geometries, binding energies, and bond energies for several group III–V four-membered-ring compounds used as precursors in the synthesis of semiconductor nanocrystals. Ring structures obtained using LDA density-functional methods agree well with structures of similar compounds determined by X-ray crystallography. The following trends are observed in the calculated bond energies: M–Br

$\ll$  M–As < M–P  $\ll$  M–Cl (M = In, Ga, Al), and In–Y < Ga–Y < Al–Y [Y = E, X, where E = P, As (group V) and X = Cl, Br (halogen)]. The bond energies accurately reproduce the density-functional (gradient-corrected) binding energies and are demonstrated to be transferable among the compounds studied. Consequently, the theoretical bond energy data reported here provide a tool to predict the stability of new four-membered-ring compounds. From these data, we predict that Al–Cl-containing mixed-bridge compounds are stable; hence synthesis from reactants rich in Al–Cl bonds may be energetically unfavorable. We further suggest that weakly bonded Br-containing mixed-bridge compounds may make attractive targets for synthetic precursors to nanocrystalline materials.

**Acknowledgment.** D.M.Y. is an NSF Postdoctoral Fellow jointly funded by the North Carolina Supercomputing Center, MCNC, and the National Science Foundation. W.Y. is an Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellow. This work has been supported by the National Science Foundation, the Duke University Arts and Science Council (W.Y.) and the North Carolina Supercomputing Center (D.M.Y. and W.Y.). The experimental data were taken from the work supported by Office of Naval Research, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, and the Lords Foundation of North Carolina (R.L.W.).

JA951706+