

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/8100490>

# The Electronic Spectrum of the UO<sub>2</sub> Molecule

ARTICLE *in* JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY · FEBRUARY 2005

Impact Factor: 12.11 · DOI: 10.1021/ja044940l · Source: PubMed

---

CITATIONS

77

---

READS

19

4 AUTHORS, INCLUDING:



Michael Heaven

Emory University

327 PUBLICATIONS 4,346 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

The Electronic Spectrum of the  $\text{UO}_2$  MoleculeLaura Gagliardi,<sup>\*,†</sup> Michael C. Heaven,<sup>‡</sup> Jesper Wisborg Krogh,<sup>§</sup> and Björn O. Roos<sup>§</sup>

Contribution from the Dipartimento di Chimica Fisica "F. Accascina", Viale delle Scienze - Parco d'Orleans II, I-90128 Palermo, Italy, Department of Chemistry, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia 30322, and Department of Theoretical Chemistry, Chemical Center, University of Lund, P.O. Box 124, S-221 00 Lund, Sweden

Received August 21, 2004; E-mail: laura.gagliardi@unipa.it

**Abstract:** The electronic spectrum of the  $\text{UO}_2$  molecule has been determined using multiconfigurational wave functions together with the inclusion spin-orbit coupling. The molecule has been found to have a  $(5f\phi)(7s)$ ,  ${}^3\Phi_{2u}$ , ground state. The lowest state of gerade symmetry,  ${}^3H_{4g}$ , corresponding to the electronic configuration  $(5f)^2$  was found  $3330\text{ cm}^{-1}$  above the ground state. The computed energy levels and oscillator strengths were used for the assignment of the experimental spectrum in the energy range  $17\,000\text{--}19\,000$  and  $27\,000\text{--}32\,000\text{ cm}^{-1}$ .

## 1. Introduction

The calculation of excited-state properties for heavy element compounds poses a formidable theoretical challenge. This is particularly true for actinide compounds, where the large number of electrons, open f- and d-shells, and strong relativistic effects must be taken into account. Development of the necessary theoretical tools is hampered by the fact that there are few spectroscopic observations for actinide compounds that are suitable for direct comparison with properties calculated for isolated molecules. Ideally, gas phase data are required for such comparisons. It has been found that even the data for molecules isolated in cryogenic rare gas matrixes, a medium usually considered to be minimally perturbing, can be influenced by the host to a degree that seriously complicates the relationship between the matrix data and calculations for free molecules. As a convenient model compound, molecular  $\text{UO}_2$  has been the subject of several recent theoretical and experimental studies. High-level theoretical calculations have been carried out for the ground and low-lying excited states. In parallel with these efforts, gas phase electronic spectra have been recorded and partially analyzed. Additional motivation for the studies of  $\text{UO}_2$  was provided by reports of anomalously large interactions between  $\text{UO}_2$  and the heavier rare gas atoms in matrixes.

Andrews and co-workers<sup>1–4</sup> have studied the  $\text{UO}$ ,  $\text{UO}_2$ , and  $\text{CUO}$  molecules trapped in rare gas matrixes. The antisymmetric stretch of  $\text{UO}_2$  was observed at  $914\text{ cm}^{-1}$  in a Ne matrix and  $776\text{ cm}^{-1}$  in an Ar matrix.<sup>1,4</sup> Density functional theory (DFT) calculations by Zhou et al.<sup>1</sup> indicated that  $\text{UO}_2$  has a  ${}^3\Phi_u$  ground state derived from the  $\text{U}(5f7s)$  configuration. They also found

that the calculated vibrational frequencies for the  ${}^3\Phi_u$  state corresponded to the Ne matrix result, while the frequency for the  ${}^3H_g$  state, derived from the  $\text{U}(5f^5)$  configuration, corresponded to the Ar matrix data. Consequently, they proposed that guest–host interaction in Ar reversed the energy ordering of the  ${}^3\Phi_u$  and  ${}^3H_g$  states. Similarly, Andrews, Bursten, and co-workers<sup>5,6</sup> have suggested that the interaction between  $\text{CUO}$  and Ar reorders the low-lying electronic states of  $\text{CUO}$ , and they concluded that the rare gas atoms Ar, Kr, and Xe form weak chemical bonds with  $\text{CUO}$ . More recently, they have also studied  $\text{UO}_2$  in the presence of Ar atoms<sup>7</sup> at the DFT and coupled-cluster  $\text{CCSD(T)}$  level of theory, providing direct evidence of a significant U–Ar bonding interaction when  $\text{UO}_2$  is in an argon matrix.

Han et al. have investigated the electronic spectroscopy of  $\text{UO}_2$  in the gas phase by using resonantly enhanced multiphoton ionization (REMPI) with mass-selected ion detection.<sup>8</sup> The observed transitions were found to originate from the ground state and an electronically excited state that was just  $360\text{ cm}^{-1}$  above the latter. This result was in agreement with the most recent theoretical calculations<sup>9,10</sup> that predict a  $X\text{ }{}^3\Phi_{2u}$  ground state with the first excited state (formally  ${}^3\Phi_{3u}$ ) lying about  $400\text{ cm}^{-1}$  higher. Lue et al.<sup>11</sup> subsequently have examined the electronic emission spectrum of  $\text{UO}_2$  trapped in solid Ar and characterized the low-lying electronic states. They have obtained the same ordering of the lowest energy  $\text{UO}_2$  states as in the gas

<sup>†</sup> Dipartimento di Chimica Fisica "F. Accascina".<sup>‡</sup> Emory University.<sup>§</sup> University of Lund.

- (1) Zhou, M.; Andrews, L.; Ismail, N.; Marsden, C. J. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2000**, *104*, 5495.
- (2) Zhou, M.; Andrews, L.; Li, J.; Bursten, B. E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1999**, *121*, 9712.
- (3) Tauge, J. T.; Andrews, L.; Hunt, R. D. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, *97*, 10920.
- (4) Hunt, R. D.; Andrews, L. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 3690.

- (5) Andrews, L.; Liang, B.; Li, J.; Bursten, B. E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 3126.
- (6) Li, J.; Bursten, B. E.; Liang, B.; Andrews, L. *Science* **2002**, *259*, 2242.
- (7) Li, J.; Bursten, B. E.; Andrews, L.; Marsden, C. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 3424.
- (8) Han, J.; Goncharov, V.; Kaledin, L. A.; Komissarov, A. V.; Heaven, M. C. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *120*, 5155.
- (9) Gagliardi, L.; Roos, B. O.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Dyke, J. M. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2001**, *105*, 10602.
- (10) Chang, Q. Ab initio Calculations on  $\text{UO}_2$ . M.S. Thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 2002.
- (11) Lue, C. J.; Jin, J.; Ortiz, M. J.; Rienstra-Kiracofe, J. C.; Heaven, M. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 1812.

phase study, in contrast to the results of the vibrational analysis by Andrews et al. and supported by DFT calculations.<sup>1</sup>

Among the theoretical studies, the thesis by Chang<sup>10</sup> and our previous work<sup>9</sup> are the most extensive studies of the low-lying electronic states of  $\text{UO}_2$  to date. They both predict a  $^3\Phi_{2u}$  ground state.

Han et al.<sup>8</sup> used the results from the calculation of Chang to propose assignments for the more intense features of the electronic spectrum. The correlation between the observed and calculated energies was not sufficient to permit the unambiguous determination of assignments. Chang<sup>10</sup> has also calculated oscillator strengths for transitions from the  $X\ ^3\Phi_{2u}$  state, and this information was used to restrict the possible range of assignments. Further refinement was achieved by considering the  $\Delta\Omega = 0, \pm 1$  selection rule. Most upper levels were accessed from either the  $2_u$  or the  $3_u$  lower levels. If the second transition was excluded because of the  $\Delta\Omega$ -selection rule, this information could be used to fix the  $\Omega$ -value of the upper state. For example, the state at  $17\,499\text{ cm}^{-1}$  that could only be accessed from the  $3_u$  level was assigned as  $\Omega = 4_g$ . As oscillator strengths for the transitions originating from  $3_u$  were not available, the assignments were guided by applying the  $\Omega$ -selection rule. The obvious limitation for this approach is that transitions that obey the selection rule may still not be observed because of low oscillator strengths.

In an attempt to place the assignment of the  $\text{UO}_2$  spectrum on a firmer footing, we have calculated excited-state energies using high-level theoretical methods. This study is more comprehensive than our previous work,<sup>9</sup> since a larger number of excited states have been considered. Oscillator strengths for transitions from both the  $3_u$  and  $2_u$  states have been calculated.

## 2. Method and Details of the Calculations

All calculations were carried out with the software MOLCAS-6.0.<sup>12</sup> The complete active space (CAS) SCF method<sup>13</sup> was used to generate molecular orbitals and reference functions for subsequent multi-configurational second-order perturbation calculations of the dynamic correlation energy (CASPT2).<sup>14–16</sup>

Scalar relativistic effects were included using a Douglas–Kroll (DK) Hamiltonian.<sup>17,18</sup> We shall refer to results obtained including only the scalar relativistic effect, as spin–orbit free (SOF). The effects of spin–orbit coupling (SOC) were introduced using a newly developed method based on the CASSCF state interaction approach (CASSI).<sup>19,20</sup> Here, the CASSCF wave functions generated for a number of electronic states are allowed to mix under the influence of a spin–orbit Hamiltonian,

CASSI–SOC.<sup>21</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the theoretical model and the computational approach used, we refer to the recent article cited in ref 22 and articles cited in there.

ANO-type basis sets were used for U and O. The U exponents were optimized using the DK Hamiltonian. The primitive set 26s23p17d-13f5g2h was contracted to 9s8p7d5f2g,<sup>23</sup> and this was combined with the ANO-L basis of the MOLCAS library for O,<sup>24</sup> contracted to 4s3p2d1f.

All calculations were performed at the ground-state equilibrium geometry of  $\text{UO}_2$  previously optimized<sup>9</sup> at the CASPT2 level of theory, which corresponds to a linear molecule with a uranium–oxygen bond distance of 1.8268 Å. The  $C_{2h}$  point group was used in the calculations to be able to average between the components of degenerate representations (angular momentum larger than zero), thus keeping the linear symmetry intact. This is especially important when SOC is included.

In our previous studies of the U(IV), U(V), and U(VI) systems XUY (X,Y = C,N,O),<sup>9,25</sup> we found that it was important to include in the active space the oxygen 2p orbitals and the corresponding UO antibonding orbitals of  $\sigma$ - and  $\pi$ -type. They are hybrid orbitals mixing 5f and 6d orbitals of uranium with the 2p orbitals of oxygen. This gives an active space of 12 electrons in 12 orbitals (12/12). For the ground state of  $\text{UO}_2$  one needs to add to these orbitals the 5f $\phi$  and 7s orbitals of uranium and two more electrons. If also the electronic spectrum is to be studied, one should add at least the uranium 5f $\delta$  and 7p orbitals. We now have 14 electrons in 20 orbitals, currently an impossible calculation. This illustrates the difficulty in performing excited-state calculations on actinide compounds where the active space requirements easily become excessive. A more simplified approach is necessary, which means that the results may be less accurate than one normally expects from a CASSCF/CASPT2 calculation. The need to include spin–orbit coupling also adds to the complexity both in the choice of the active space and the number of electronic states to be included in the calculation.

We have performed five sets of calculations of increasing complexity with the hope that computed excitation energies would converge to values that would be at least of semiquantitative value. The first attempt starts with an essentially Hartree–Fock (HF)-like ground state. The six occupied UO bonding orbitals are thus left inactive. The active space then comprises the orbitals that contribute to the ground-state open shell and to the most intense excited states corresponding to excitations from the 7s to the 7p orbitals. Thus, we need the active orbitals 5f $\phi$ , 5f $\delta$ , 7s, and 7p, which give two electrons in eight orbitals (labeled 1430/2, meaning 1 orbital (7s $\sigma_g$ ) in irrep 1 of  $C_{2h}$ , 4 in irrep 2 (5f $\phi_u$  and 7p $\pi_u$ ), and 3 in irrep 3 (5f $\delta_u$  and 7p $\sigma_u$ ). As it turns out, in the calculation, the 7p $\sigma_u$  orbital is replaced by 5f $\sigma_u$ , and thus this orbital has to be added to the active space: (1440/2). Fifty-two states were studied with this active space (24 triplets and 28 singlets). As we shall see in the next section, the results are not very impressive, yielding among other things the incorrect ground state.

The active space was first extended with two orbitals of  $\pi_u$  symmetry, of mainly 5f $\pi$  character, still with two active electrons, (1640/2) (both components of the  $\pi_u$  orbitals are in irrep 2). More states were also added (now 35 triplets). Singlets were not included with this active space. The SOF results changed considerably. All orbitals with 5f, 7s, and 7p character now had been included in the active space. We then started to add occupied orbitals. They were selected according to their orbital energies, which are for the six UO bonding orbitals (in au):  $-0.55$  ( $\sigma_g$ ),  $-0.54$  ( $\pi_g$ ),  $-0.50$  ( $\pi_u$ ), and  $-0.47$  ( $\sigma_u$ ). The energies are similar, and it would be preferable to include all of them, but this is impossible. Instead, we start with the highest occupied orbital, of  $\sigma_u$

- (12) Andersson, K.; Barysz, M.; Bernhardsson, A.; Blomberg, M. R. A.; Carissán, Y.; Cooper, D. L.; Fülscher, M. P.; Gagliardi, L.; de Graaf, C.; Hess, B. A.; Karlström, G.; Lindh, R.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Nakajima, T.; Neogrády, P.; Olsen, J.; Roos, B. O.; Schimmelpfennig, B.; Schütz, M.; Seijo, L.; Serrano-Andrés, L.; Siegbahn, P. E. M.; Ståhring, J.; Thorsteinsson, T.; Veryazov, V.; Widmark, P.-O. *MOLCAS*, version 6.0; Department of Theoretical Chemistry, Chemical Center, University of Lund: Lund, Sweden, 2003.
- (13) Roos, B. O. In *Advances in Chemical Physics; Ab Initio Methods in Quantum Chemistry-II*; Lawley, K. P., Ed.; John Wiley & Sons: Chichester, U.K., 1987; p 399.
- (14) Andersson, K.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Roos, B. O.; Sadlej, A. J.; Wolinski, K. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1990**, *94*, 5483.
- (15) Andersson, K.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Roos, B. O. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *96*, 1218.
- (16) Roos, B. O.; Andersson, K.; Fülscher, M. P.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Serrano-Andrés, L.; Pierloot, K.; Merchán, M. In *Advances in Chemical Physics: New Methods in Computational Quantum Mechanics*; Prigogine, I., Rice, S. A., Eds.; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1996; Vol. 43, pp 219–331.
- (17) Douglas, N.; Kroll, N. M. *Ann. Phys.* **1974**, *82*, 89.
- (18) Hess, B. *Phys. Rev. A* **1986**, *33*, 3742.
- (19) Malmqvist, P.-Å. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1986**, *30*, 479.
- (20) Malmqvist, P. A.; Roos, B. O. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1989**, *155*, 189.

- (21) Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Roos, B.; Schimmelpfennig, B. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2002**, *357*, 230.
- (22) Roos, B. O.; Malmqvist, P.-Å. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *6*, 2919.
- (23) Roos, B. O.; Widmark, P.-O. Personal communication.
- (24) Widmark, P.-O.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Roos, B. O. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1990**, *77*, 291.
- (25) Gagliardi, L.; Roos, B. O. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2000**, *331*, 229.





**Table 1.** Analysis of the (2850/10) Spin–Orbit Free Wave Functions for the Triplet and Singlet States in Terms of Main Configurations<sup>a</sup>

type <sup>b</sup>	state	$\Delta E$	osc. str.	type <sup>b</sup>	state	$\Delta E$
(5f)(7s)	$^3\Phi_u$	0		(5f)(7s)	$^1\Phi_u$	991
(5f)(7s)	$^3\Delta_u$	1990	0	(5f)(7s)	$^1\Delta_u$	2852
(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^3H_g$	5954	0	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^1\Sigma_g^+$	12164
(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^3\Sigma_g^-$	7271	0	(7s) <sup>2</sup>	$^1\Sigma_g^+$	22119
(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^3\Pi_g$	9076	0	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^1\Pi_g$	11921
(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^3\Gamma_g$	14262	0.0637	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^1\Gamma_g$	13106
(5f)(7s)	$^3\Pi_u$	12645	0	(5f)(7s)	$^1\Pi_u$	14320
(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^3\Delta_g$	14472	0.0748	(5f)(7p)	$^1\Delta_g$	17816
(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^3\Sigma_g^-$	15549	0	(5f)(7p)	$^1\Gamma_g$	20456
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Phi_g$	17625	0.0000	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^1H_g$	20949
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Pi_g$	20676	0	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^1F_g$	22337
(5f)(7s)	$^3\Sigma_u^-$	21695	0	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^1\Sigma_g^+$	30157
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Gamma_g$	25575	0.1417	(5f)(7p)	$^1\Pi_g$	22081
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Delta_g$	25701	0.1248	(5f)(7p)	$^1\Phi_g$	23117
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Phi_g$	27546	0.0003	(5f)(7p)	$^1\Delta_g$	28638
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Pi_g$	27846	0	(5f)(7p)	$^1\Gamma_g$	33688
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Sigma_g^-$	30561	0	(5f)(7p)	$^1\Pi_g$	29905
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Phi_g$	36917	0.0282	(5f)(7p)	$^1\Phi_g$	32119
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Delta_g$	38533	0.0028	(5f)(7p)	$^1\Phi_g$	37518
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Delta_g$	39416	0.0000	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^1\Phi_g$	52611
(5f)(7p)	$^3\Sigma_g^-$	39578	0			
(5f) <sup>2</sup>	$^3\Phi_g$	43574	0.0000			

<sup>a</sup> Excitation energies in  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  and oscillator strengths. <sup>b</sup> The type indicates the major occupation of the open shell.

this table we have restricted the presentation to states with energies below  $37\,000\text{ cm}^{-1}$  and oscillator strengths ( $f$ ) larger than 0.0001 with respect to excitations from one of the two lowest levels,  $2_u$  or  $3_u$ . Transitions from the  $3_u$  level can be called *electronically hot bands*. They are quite uncommon compared to vibrationally hot bands but are observed for molecules with low-lying electronically excited states (e.g., metal compounds with open f and/or d shells; see ref 26 and references therein). The spectra for  $\text{UO}_2$  were obtained by using pulsed laser vaporization to generate gas phase samples. The vapor was cooled by supersonic expansion, but this process does not always equilibrate the electronic, vibrational, and rotational degrees of freedom. It is not unusual to observe a very cold rotational distribution while a significant fraction of the population remains in electronically and/or vibrationally excited levels. This was the case for  $\text{UO}_2$ , where the supersonic expansion was unable to relax the population trapped in the  $3_u$  excited state.

The ground state has been found to be  $^3\Phi_{2u}$ , which is in agreement with earlier findings and is by now the established ground state for the isolated molecule. The corresponding  $3_u$  state is found  $378\text{ cm}^{-1}$  above the lowest level, which can be compared with the experimental excitation energy of  $360\text{ cm}^{-1}$ .<sup>8</sup> This agreement is important for the judging of the quality of the SOF energies. The amount of spin–orbit splitting is crucially dependent on the mixing between the  $^3\Phi_u$ ,  $^1\Phi_u$ , and  $^3\Delta_u$  states as seen in the last column of Table 2. The mixing depends strongly on the relative energy for the three interacting states. Thus, we can conclude that the energy difference between these states is correctly reproduced by the calculations. The experimental study of  $\text{UO}_2$  in a solid Ar matrix locates the  $1_u$  and  $2_u$  components of  $^3\Delta_u$  at  $1094$  and  $1401\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , respectively (it should be noted that the labels  $1_u$  and  $2_u$  in Table 1 of ref 11 have been reversed). The present results are  $2567$  and  $2908\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , respectively. The splitting is again correctly reproduced.

A direct comparison of the energies is difficult because of the effect of the matrix.

The lowest level,  $4_g$ , of the  $^3H_g$  state is found  $3330\text{ cm}^{-1}$  ( $0.41\text{ eV}$ ) above the ground level. This energy is not inconsistent with the suggestion that the ground state changes from  $^3\Phi_u$  to  $^3H_g$  when going from the gas phase to the matrix.<sup>7</sup> The spectroscopic measurements in Ar give, however, strong evidence that  $^3\Phi_u$  is still the ground state. One argument is the distribution of the low-lying odd states that fits well with the experimental emission spectrum. If  $^3H_g$  was the ground state, one would expect to see emission to the different levels of this state. The calculation gives the following splitting:  $4_g - 5_g$ :  $5357$ ,  $5_g - 6_g$ :  $4562\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , which does not fit the spectrum at all. The only other gerade states at energies below  $9000\text{ cm}^{-1}$  are a  $0_g(^3\Sigma_g^+)$  and  $1_g(^3\Pi_g)$  at  $5572$  and  $6823\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , respectively, none of which is suitable. We shall return to this issue later in a more detailed comparison between experiment and theory.

Turning now to the higher excited states, we find a first set of allowed transitions between  $12\,000$  and  $17\,000\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . This region has not yet been studied experimentally. A number of allowed transitions of the (5f)(7p) type are found in the energy range up to  $36\,000\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . We shall discuss possible assignments in the next section.

#### 4. Comparison with the Experimental Spectrum

The present calculation predicts that there are very few intense transitions from  $\text{UO}_2\text{ X}^3\Phi(2_u)$  and  $3_u$ , which would appear in the visible and near-UV spectral range. In principle, excited states of  $2_g$  or  $3_g$  type could be accessed from both lower states. However, inspection of the oscillator strengths in Table 2 shows that states that are optically connected to  $2_u$  have negligible oscillator strengths for  $3_u$ , and vice versa. These results indicate that both  $2_u$  and  $3_u$  must be considered as the lower state. In agreement with the results of Chang,<sup>10</sup> we find that the most intense transitions correspond to the  $5f7p \leftarrow 5f7s$  electron promotion. Furthermore, the calculations are in agreement concerning the molecular upper states that are accessed. For transitions from  $2_u$  the leading eigenvectors of the upper states are  $^3\Gamma_{3g}$ ,  $^3\Delta_{1g}$ , and  $^3\Phi_{2g}$ . Here we consider the correlation between transitions that are predicted to have large oscillator strengths and the dominant features of the spectrum. To facilitate comparison with the experimental data, we list the states that have oscillator strengths  $>0.01$  for transitions originating from  $2_u$  or  $3_u$  in Table 3. Proposed assignments for the observed transitions are also indicated.

Transitions observed at  $31\,838$  and  $31\,478\text{ cm}^{-1}$  were previously assigned to a common upper level because the ionization energy of the excited state was the same for both bands (note that the energy of the  $31\,478$  band is also  $31\,838\text{ cm}^{-1}$  when related to the  $2_u$  zero level). However, as the ionization thresholds were determined with an uncertainty of  $20\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , it is also possible that the transitions accessed two nearby excited states. The present calculations support the latter interpretation. On the basis of Chang's calculations,<sup>10</sup> the transition at  $31\,838\text{ cm}^{-1}$  was previously attributed to  $2_g(^3\Phi) - 2_u$ . This assignment is supported by the present calculation, which yields an excitation energy of  $36\,783\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The transition at  $31\,478\text{ cm}^{-1}$  was previously attributed to  $2_g(^3\Phi) - 3_u$ . The present calculations predict that the oscillator strength for the  $2_g(^3\Phi) - 3_u$  band is 2 orders of magnitude smaller than that of

(26) Chang, A.; Pitzer, R. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1989**, *111*, 2500.

**Table 2.** Analysis of the Spin–Orbit Wave Functions in Terms of Contributing SOF States<sup>a</sup> with the 2850/10 Active Space<sup>b</sup>

state	type <sup>c</sup>	$\Delta E$	$f(2u)$	$f(3u)$	composition(weight in %)
2 <sub>u</sub>	(5f)(7s)	0			<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>u</sub> (91), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (05), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (03)
3 <sub>u</sub>	(5f)(7s)	378	0.0000		<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>u</sub> (53), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>u</sub> (37), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (10)
1 <sub>u</sub>	(5f)(7s)	2567	0.0000	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (96), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>u</sub> (02), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>u</sub> (02)
2 <sub>u</sub>	(5f)(7s)	2908	0.0000	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (54), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (42), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>u</sub> (04)
4 <sub>g</sub>	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	3330	0.0000	0.0001	<sup>3</sup> H <sub>g</sub> (91), <sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (06), <sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (02)
1 <sub>g</sub>	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	6823	0.0007	0.0003	<sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (32), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (48), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (12), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (02)
1 <sub>g</sub>	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	11390	0.0012	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (64), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (17), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (12), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (02)
2 <sub>g</sub>	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	12073	0.0000	0.0095	<sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (84), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (14)
3 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	13182	0.0595	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (96), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (03)
4 <sub>g</sub>	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	14790	0.0000	0.0194	<sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (79), <sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (05), <sup>3</sup> H <sub>g</sub> (07), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (04)
2 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	15452	0.0000	0.0681	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (49), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (35), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (13)
1 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	16725	0.0777	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (75), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (14), <sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (08), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (02)
4 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	17274	0.0000	0.0466	<sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (87), <sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (08), <sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (02)
2 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	17625	0.0001	0.0014	<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (98)
1 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	17645	0.0102	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (55), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (20), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (07), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (06)
1 <sub>g</sub>	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	19948	0.0006	0.0000	<sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (37), <sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (27), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (29)
3 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	20610	0.0010	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (92), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (04), <sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (02)
1 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	21290	0.0048	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (47), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (34), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (06), <sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (08)
2 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	23073	0.0000	0.0091	<sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (39), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (34), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (24)
4 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	23277	0.0000	0.0687	<sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (85), <sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (07), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (04)
4 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	24600	0.0000	0.0004	<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (86), <sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (12)
3 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	24859	0.1298	0.0002	<sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (81), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (11), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (03), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (021)
2 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	24964	0.0000	0.0338	<sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (54), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (26), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (15)
1 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	26349	0.1026	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (70), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (16), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (07)
2 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	26617	0.0000	0.0762	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (44), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (23), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (22)
3 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	26622	0.0066	0.0000	<sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (76), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (07), <sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (10)
4 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	28121	0.0000	0.0740	<sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (85), <sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (09), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (06)
1 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	28124	0.0108	0.0000	<sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (40), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (33), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (21)
1 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	29098	0.0001	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (61), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (35), <sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (02)
3 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	30540	0.0000	0.0005	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (93), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (05)
3 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	30677	0.0001	0.0001	<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (77), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (09), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (06)
2 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	32412	0.0003	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (70), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (24), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (05)
4 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	33840	0.0000	0.0006	<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (87), <sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (09), <sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (03)
2 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	34027	0.0001	0.0024	<sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (63), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (13), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (18), <sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (05)
3 <sub>g</sub>	(5f) <sup>2</sup>	35727	0.0000	0.0004	<sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (88), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (06), <sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (03)
3 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	36770	0.0009	0.1676	<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (48), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (41), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (10)
2 <sub>g</sub>	(5f)(7p)	36783	0.1816	0.0014	<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (90), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (09)

<sup>a</sup> Only states with an oscillator strength larger than 0.0001 from either the <sup>3</sup>Φ<sub>u</sub>(2<sub>u</sub>) or the <sup>3</sup>Φ<sub>u</sub>(3<sub>u</sub>) state, and energies <37 000 cm<sup>−1</sup> are included. <sup>b</sup> Excitation energies in cm<sup>−1</sup>. Oscillator strengths, *f*, are given for excitations from the lowest 2<sub>u</sub> and 3<sub>u</sub> levels. <sup>c</sup> The type indicates the major occupation of the open shell.

**Table 3.** Possible Assignment of the Electronic Spectrum of UO<sub>2</sub><sup>a</sup>

state	calcd	exptl	$f(2_u)^b$	$f(3_u)^b$	composition(weight in %)
2 <sub>u</sub>	0	0			<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>u</sub> (91), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (05), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (03)
3 <sub>u</sub>	378	360	0.0000		<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>u</sub> (53), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>u</sub> (37), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (10)
1 <sub>u</sub>	2567	1094 <sup>c</sup>	0.0000	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (96), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>u</sub> (02), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>u</sub> (02)
2 <sub>u</sub>	2908	1401 <sup>c</sup>	0.0000	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (54), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>u</sub> (42), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>u</sub> (04)
2 <sub>g</sub>	15452	17859 <sup>d</sup>	0.0000	0.0681	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (49), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (35), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (13)
1 <sub>g</sub>	16725	18159	0.0777	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (75), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (14), <sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (08), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (02)
4 <sub>g</sub>	17274	18587 <sup>d</sup>	0.0000	0.0466	<sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (87), <sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (08), <sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (02)
1 <sub>g</sub>	17645	18423	0.0102	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Σ <sub>g</sub> <sup>−</sup> (55), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (20), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (07), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (06)
4 <sub>g</sub>	23277		0.0000	0.0687	<sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (85), <sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (07), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (04)
3 <sub>g</sub>	24859		0.1298	0.0002	<sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (81), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (11), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (03), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (021)
2 <sub>g</sub>	24964		0.0000	0.0338	<sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (54), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (26), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (15)
1 <sub>g</sub>	26349	27259 <sup>d</sup>	0.1026	0.0000	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (70), <sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (16), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (07)
2 <sub>g</sub>	26617	28700	0.0000	0.0762	<sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (44), <sup>1</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (23), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (22)
4 <sub>g</sub>	28121		0.0000	0.0740	<sup>3</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (85), <sup>1</sup> Γ <sub>g</sub> (09), <sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (06)
1 <sub>g</sub>	28124	29700 <sup>d</sup>	0.0108	0.0000	<sup>1</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (40), <sup>3</sup> Π <sub>g</sub> (33), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (21)
3 <sub>g</sub>	36770	31838 <sup>d</sup>	0.0009	0.1676	<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (48), <sup>1</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (41), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (10)
2 <sub>g</sub>	36783	31838	0.1816	0.0014	<sup>3</sup> Φ <sub>g</sub> (90), <sup>3</sup> Δ <sub>g</sub> (09)

<sup>a</sup> Energies in cm<sup>−1</sup> relative to the 2<sub>u</sub> zero energy level. <sup>b</sup> Only states with an oscillator strength larger than 0.01 from either the <sup>3</sup>Φ<sub>u</sub>(2<sub>u</sub>) or the <sup>3</sup>Φ<sub>u</sub>(3<sub>u</sub>) state, and energies <37 000 cm<sup>−1</sup> are included. <sup>c</sup> Results obtained in an Ar matrix; ref 11. <sup>d</sup> Assignment differs from that proposed in ref 8.

2<sub>g</sub>(<sup>3</sup>Φ) – 2<sub>u</sub>, whereas the observed intensities indicate comparable oscillator strengths. The results in Table 3 suggest that the 31 478 cm<sup>−1</sup> band should be assigned to the 3<sub>g</sub>(<sup>3</sup>Φ) – 3<sub>u</sub>, which has a calculated transition energy of 36 770 – 378 = 36 392 cm<sup>−1</sup>. As the calculated spacing between 2<sub>g</sub>(<sup>3</sup>Φ) and 3<sub>g</sub>(<sup>3</sup>Φ) is only 13 cm<sup>−1</sup>, this assignment is compatible with the experimental results.

The transition at 29 700 cm<sup>−1</sup> was previously assigned to 2<sub>g</sub>(<sup>1</sup>Δ<sub>g</sub>) – 2<sub>u</sub>, but the present calculations yield very poor agreement for the energy and relative intensity with this choice. Reassignment to the 1<sub>g</sub>(<sup>1</sup>Π<sub>g</sub>) upper state is indicated (cf., Table 3).

The dominant transition in the visible range terminated on a level at 18 159 cm<sup>−1</sup>. This was previously assigned to a 1<sub>g</sub>(<sup>3</sup>Δ)

excited state, despite the fact that Chang's calculation did not predict this  $1_g - 2_u$  transition to be the strongest feature near this energy. The transition to the  $3_g(^3\Gamma)$  state was predicted to be a better fit in terms of both energy and intensity. However, as a transition from  $3_u$  was not observed, this assignment was rejected ( $\Omega$ -selection rule). The  $3_g$  state in question has an energy of  $24\,859\text{ cm}^{-1}$  in Table 3. Here it can be seen that the oscillator strength of the  $3_g - 3_u$  transition is predicted to be lower than that of  $3_g - 2_u$  by several orders of magnitude. Consequently, reassignment of the state at  $18\,159\text{ cm}^{-1}$  to  $3_g(^3\Gamma)$  is possible, although this would imply an error of  $6700\text{ cm}^{-1}$  in the calculated energy. Alternatively, the next most intense transition in this energy range is  $1_g(^3\Delta) - 2_u$ , predicted to occur at  $16\,725\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . This assignment yields a more acceptable error of  $1434\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Given that we expect the energies to be predicted more reliably than the oscillator strengths, we favor the latter assignment.

A transition from  $2_u$  to a state at  $18\,423\text{ cm}^{-1}$  was another prominent feature in the visible spectrum. Chang's<sup>10</sup> calculation indicated that the upper level was  $1_g(^3\Delta)$ , but, as this state had already been assigned, the next best choice of  $1_g(^3\Sigma^-)$  was proposed. The present calculation confirms this assignment.

Below  $20\,000\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , the calculations predict two relatively strong transitions that originate from the  $3_u$  level. The upper levels for these transitions are  $2_g(^3\Delta)$  at  $15\,452$  and  $4_g(^3\Gamma)$  at  $17\,274\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The upper states observed via transition from  $3_u$  have term energies of  $17\,859$  and  $18\,587\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , and it seems reasonable to correlate these with  $2_g(^3\Delta)$  and  $4_g(^3\Gamma)$ . Previously, the  $17\,859\text{ cm}^{-1}$  level had been assigned to a  $4_g$  state on the basis of the  $\Omega$ -selection rule. Reassignment to the  $2_g(^3\Delta)$  state does not cause a problem as the oscillator strength for the  $2_g(^3\Delta) - 2_u$  transition is predicted to be insignificant.

The calculations predict that there should be additional transitions from  $3_u$  with observable intensities at  $23\,277$ ,  $24\,964$ ,

and  $28\,121\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The spectrum shows a congested group of bands in the  $28\,660$ – $28\,810\text{ cm}^{-1}$  range, and these transitions may well be contained in this cluster (unfortunately, the lower states were not identified). The  $1_g(^1\Pi) - 2_u$  transition, predicted to occur at  $28\,124\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , may also be in this group.

## 5. Conclusions

The electronic spectrum of the  $\text{UO}_2$  molecule up to ca.  $40\,000\text{ cm}^{-1}$  has been calculated, and excitation energies and oscillator strengths have been used to assign the experimental spectrum. The results show that the most intense transitions from the two lowest levels,  $2_u$  and  $3_u$  states, correspond to excitations from the U 7s to U 7p orbitals. The lowest  $4_g$  level of the  $^3\text{H}_g$  state is found  $3330\text{ cm}^{-1}$  ( $0.41\text{ eV}$ ) above the ground level. This energy is not inconsistent with the suggestion that the ground state changes from  $^3\Phi_u$  to  $^3\text{H}_g$  when going for the gas phase to the matrix, as previously suggested,<sup>7</sup> although the electronic spectrum measured in an Ar matrix is very difficult to understand with a  $^3\text{H}_g$  ground state. The present study gives, however, a consistent assignment of the lowest electronic levels based on the assumption of a  $^3\Phi_u$  ground state and thus does not confirm the change of ground state when the molecule is dispersed in an Ar matrix. At present, we have no explanation for the different results.

**Acknowledgment.** We thank Professors Bruce E. Bursten and Russell M. Pitzer, The Ohio State University, for useful discussions. This work was partially supported by Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca, (MIUR), and the Swedish Natural Science Research Council (NFR). M.C.H. is grateful to the U.S. Department of Energy for support of the research at Emory University through Grant DE-FG02-01ER15153-A001.

JA044940L