Lowest-Energy Structures of Water Clusters (H 2 O) 11 and (H 2 O) 13

5 AUTHORS, INCLUDING:

Edoardo Aprà
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
97 PUBLICATIONS **4,109** CITATIONS

Sotiris S Xantheas
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
178 PUBLICATIONS **7,768** CITATIONS

Zeng Cheng
University of Science and Technology of China
379 PUBLICATIONS **6,801** CITATIONS

Lowest-Energy Structures of Water Clusters (H₂O)₁₁ and (H₂O)₁₃

Satya Bulusu,[†] Soohaeng Yoo,[†] Edo Aprà,[‡] Sotiris Xantheas,*,[‡] and Xiao Cheng Zeng*,[†]

*Department of Chemistry, University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588, and Chemical Sciences
Division, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington 99352*

Received: August 28, 2006

We employed a four-step searching/screening approach to determine best candidates for the global minima
of (H₂O)₁₁ and (H₂O)₁₃. This approach can be useful when there exist a large number of low-lying and near-
isoenergetic isomers, many of which have the same oxygen-skeleton structure. On the two new candidates
for the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₁, one isomer can be viewed as placing the 11th molecule onto the side of
the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₀ and the other can be viewed as removing the 12th molecule from the middle
layer of the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₂. The three leading lowest-energy clusters of (H₂O)₁₃ can all be built
starting from the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₂, with the difference being in the location of the 13th water
molecule.

Study of growth patterns of small-to-medium sized water clusters can provide insight into the structural evolution from a single water molecule to micro-ice particles (e.g., in clouds) and eventually to bulk ice. Water clusters play an important role in understanding biological systems (water molecules around enzymes and/or proteins)[1] and in atmospheric/space chemistry.[2] Over the past two decades water clusters have received considerable attention.[3,4] In particular, small-sized water clusters (H₂O)$_n$ ($3 \leq n \leq 10$) have been extensively studied, and their global-minimum structures have been well established from both experiments and ab initio calculations.[3−18] Since the early 90s, the search for the global minima of medium-sized water clusters in the size range $11 \leq n \leq 20$ has received much theoretical attention,[19−34] particularly for the clusters with even-numbered molecules ($n = 12, 14, 16, 18,$ and 20).[19,21,25] Besides unbiased global searches based on empirical interaction potentials[22,25,31−33] much insight has also been gained from ab initio and density-functional theory (DFT) calculations.[19,21,25−31,35] There now exists a general consensus as the result of high-level ab initio calculations that the global minima of (H₂O)₁₂ and (H₂O)₁₆ are stacked-cube structures, those of (H₂O)₁₄ and (H₂O)₁₈ are fused square-pentagonal prism structures, and that of (H₂O)₂₀ is a three fused-pentagonal prism structure.[35] However, except for (H₂O)₁₅ (whose global minimum is a stacked pentagonal prism), fewer ab initio studies have been devoted to clusters with odd-numbered molecules, e.g., $n = 11$[27−30] and $n = 13, 17,$[36] and 19.[29,36] For (H₂O)₁₁, previous ab initio studies[27−29] suggested that the lowest-energy structure is a pentagonal prism with the 11th water molecule bonded with a pentagon at the top (isomer **551**, see Figure 1); for (H₂O)₁₃, the lowest-energy structure was constructed simply by placing the 13th molecule on top of the stacked-cube (H₂O)₁₂ (isomer **4441**). In both cases, the global minima of (H₂O)₁₀ and (H₂O)₁₂

were used as building blocks. Because a global search based on high-level ab initio calculations is impractical for this size regime, the motif-based local search is a practical alternative to probe low-lying candidate structures.

In this work we engaged a four-step approach to determine the best candidates for the global minima of (H₂O)₁₁ and (H₂O)₁₃. In light of a large number of low-lying isomers, our strategy is to first identify major low-lying structural families of isomers (characterized by the oxygen positions),[35] followed by locating the lowest-lying candidate within each family by high-level ab initio calculations. Specifically, (i) we employed the minima-hopping (MH) global optimization method[37] together with four empirical water potentials, namely SPC/E,[38] TIP3P, TIP4P,[39] and POL3,[40] to create a database of low-lying isomers. Typically, 50 000 MH trials are sufficient to obtain all possible low-lying isomers. (ii) We then used the density-functional tight-binding (DFTB) method[41] as a prescreening tool to identify distinct structural families in which isomers have the same oxygen skeletons but different hydrogen arrangements. Specifically, the first 100 lowest-lying minima obtained from every water model were re-optimized using the DFTB method. Distinct (with regards to the oxygen positions) low-lying structural families (whose leading lowest-lying member is within 0.002 au from the lowest-lying isomer in the DFTB calculation) were then identified among the 400 isomers. We display *eight* such distinct structural families for (H₂O)₁₁ and *seven* for (H₂O)₁₃ in Figure 1. For example, **55′1** denotes the family with an oxygen skeleton comprising two five-member rings with an additional molecule on the top (the *prime* in **55′1** indicates that one five-member ring is not closed by hydrogen bonds). Clearly, the **55′1** family is built from the stacked pentagon (**55**) family to which the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₀ belongs. (iii) The candidate low-lying isomers within each family were determined by full geometry optimization of the top three (or five) lowest-energy isomers at the B3LYP/6-311+G(d,p) level.[42] The DFT calculations are mainly used as a screening tool because DFT can yield quite reliable energy ranking (typically with error-

* Corresponding authors. E-mail: S.X., sotiris.xantheas@pnl.gov; X.C.Z., xczeng@phase2.unl.edu.
† University of Nebraska–Lincoln.
‡ Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Figure 1. Lowest-lying isomer in each of the eight (H₂O)₁₁ and seven (H₂O)₁₃ families of isomers. Red spheres represent oxygen atoms and dotted lines hydrogen bonds (with R(O−O) < 2.9 Å). The global minima based on the five empirical water models (SPC/E, TIP3P, TIP4P, POL3, and TTM2-F[32]) are also labeled.

TABLE 1: Total Energies (au) and Relative Energies (kcal/mol) of the Lowest-Lying Clusters within Each Family of (H₂O)₁₁ and (H₂O)₁₃

(H₂O)₁₁	MP4(SDQ)/ 6-311++G(2d,2p)	ΔE^a	(H₂O)₁₃	MP4(SDQ)/ 6-311++G(2d,2p)	ΔE
515-a	−839.477474	**0.000**	**4414**	−992.119885	**0.000**
43′4	−839.477481	**0.272**	**454-a**	−992.119785	**0.162**
55′1	−839.477210	**0.282**	**445**	−992.119588	**0.204**
44′3′	−839.477246	0.561	454-b	−992.119254	0.735
44′12	−839.475595	1.019	515+2	−992.117384	1.223
bow-tie	−839.474129	1.777	43′4+2	−992.116031	1.757
41114	−839.473167	1.899	41141+2	−992.114366	2.414
41141	−839.472596	2.224	616-a	−992.113847	2.827

a The zero-point energy (ZPE) based on DFT optimized structures are included in the relative energies. Boldface energies denote the top-3 candidates for the global minima.

bars <1 kcal/mol) for isomers within each family, but DFT is much less reliable in determining the relative stability between isomers from different structural families, especially when their energy differences are less than 3 kcal/mol (Supporting Information Table S1). (iv) The global minima were determined from the previous set by single-point energy calculations at the second- and fourth-order Møller−Plesset (MP2, MP4) perturbation levels of theory[43] with the 6-311++G(2d,2p) basis set. The results of the MP4(SDQ) calculations (step iv) based on the DFT optimized structures (step iii) are listed in Table 1.

For (H₂O)₁₁, the two leading candidates for the global minimum are the lowest-lying isomers in families **515** and **43′4**

(Figure 1 and Table S2). The **515-a** isomer can be viewed as placing the 11th molecule at the side of the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₀ whereas the latter candidate as removing the 12th molecule from the middle layer of the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₂. To confirm that **515-a** or **43′4** is new global minimum for (H₂O)₁₁, we performed additional high-level ab initio calculations for the lowest three isomers: (a) geometry optimization at the MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ[44] level and (b) single-point energy calculation at the MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ optimal geometries with the aug-cc-pVQZ and aug-cc-pV5Z basis sets. These calculations were performed with the NWCHEM suite of codes.[45] The **515-a** and **43′4** isomers are very close in energy. We found that their energy ranking depends on the size of the basis set (Table 2). Using zero-point energy corrections at the MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ level of theory, the global minimum switches between the **515-a** (MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ and MP2/aug-cc-pVQZ) and **43′4** (MP2/aug-cc-pV5Z) isomers. This result further justifies the use of the largest basis sets used in this study.

In contrast, the three three-site potentials (SPC/E, TIP3P and POL3) all yield the leading isomer in family **55′1** as the global minimum, whereas the four-site one (TIP4P) yields the leading isomer in family **44′3′** as the global minimum. Note that another four-site potential (TTM2-F[46]) also yields the leading isomer in family **44′3′** as the global minimum.[32] The four other major low-lying families of (H₂O)₁₁ are denoted by **44′12**, **bow-tie, 41114**, and **41141**. Because the leading isomer in **41114** and **41141** families are nearly 2 kcal/mol higher in MP4 energy than that in **515-a**, they are unlikely candidates for the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₁. Note also that the **515-b** isomer shown in Figure 1 also belongs to the **515** family and this isomer was identified as the lowest-energy structure (**11a**) by Lenz and Ojamae.[30] We found that **515-b** isomer is about 0.922 kcal/mol higher in energy than the **515-a** isomer at the B3LYP level of theory (Table S1). The second-lowest energy isomer (**11b**) reported by Lenz and Ojamae also belongs to the **43′4** family. However, we found that after geometric optimization at the B3LYP level, it evolves into the isomer (**Pr56−14**) previously identified by Lee et. al,[27] which belongs to the **55′1** family.

For (H₂O)₁₃, the leading candidates for the global minimum are the lowest-lying isomers in families **4414**, **454**, and **445**. In Figure 1 we display both the first and second low-lying isomers of the family **454** (**454-a** and **454-b**), as the **454-b** isomer is also the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₃ with the TIP4P model. Clusters in all three leading families can be built upon the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₂, with the difference in the location of the 13th water molecule. Interestingly, all four empirical models (including the TTM2-F[32,46]) yield the lowest-lying structures in the **454** or **445** families as the global minimum, suggesting that these models are quite successful in describing structures of medium-sized water clusters. The lowest-lying isomer in the next two families, **515+2** and **43′4+2** (here the notation "+" means "plus"), can be viewed as built upon the two leading candidates (**515-a** and **43′4**) of the global minimum of (H₂O)₁₁. Although these two isomers are energetically quite comparable, they are less likely to be the true global minimum due to the 1−2 kcal/mol energy difference from the lowest-energy isomer. The leading isomer in the last two families, **41141+2** and **616**, can be built starting from the **41141** isomer of (H₂O)₁₁ and the stacked hexamer isomer of (H₂O)₁₂, respectively. However, because of the ∼2 kcal/mol energy difference from the lowest-energy structures, both clusters are unlikely to be the global minimum. We note that DFT calculations predict the **616-a** to be the lowest-energy isomer among the isomers shown in Figure 1 (Table S1). However, MP4(SDQ) calculations show that **616-a**

Letters

J. Phys. Chem. A, Vol. 110, No. 42, 2006 **11783**

TABLE 2: Electronic Energies Calculated on the Basis of the Optimized Geometries at the MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ Level of Theory and Single-Point Energies at the MP2/aug-cc-pVQZ and MP2/aug-cc-pV5Z Levels for the Low-Lying Clusters of $(H_2O)_{11}$[a]

	electronic energies (E_e), au			
isomer	MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ (opt)	MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ (opt)	MP2/aug-cc-pVQZ// MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ	MP2/aug-cc-pV5Z// MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ
43′4	**−839.04424019**	**−839.79040799**	**−840.03855886**	**−840.13079444**
515	−839.04374322	−839.79020710	−840.03844712	−840.12994123
55′1	−839.04326503	−839.78986502	−840.03821997	−840.12952335
44′3′	−839.04364997	−839.78964782	−840.03791999	
44′12	−839.04193693	−839.78810992	−840.03666220	
(H₂O)	(−76.26090977)	(−76.32899240)	(−76.35190653)	(−76.36021090)

	binding energies (ΔE_e), kcal/mol			
isomer	MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ	MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ	MP2/aug-cc-pVQZ// MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ	MP2/aug-cc-pV5Z// MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ
43′4	**−109.331**	**−107.611**	**−105.161**	**−105.718**
515	−109.019	−107.485	−105.091	−105.182
55′1	−108.719	−107.270	−104.948	−104.920
44′3′	−108.961	−107.134	−104.760	
44′12	−107.886	−106.169	−103.971	

	zero-point energies (D_0), kcal/mol	
isomer		MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ
43′4		175.384
515		175.040
55′1		175.073
44′3′		175.283
44′12		174.964
(H₂O)		(13.386)

	zero-point corrected binding energies (ΔE_0), kcal/mol			
isomer	MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ	MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ	MP2/aug-cc-pVQZ// MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ	MP2/aug-cc-pV5Z// MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ
43′4	−81.193	−79.473	−77.023	**−77.580**
515	**−81.225**	**−79.691**	**−77.297**	−77.388
55′1	−80.892	−79.443	−77.121	−77.093
44′3′	−80.924	−79.097	−76.723	
44′12	−80.168	−78.451	−76.253	

[a] Zero-point energies (ZPE) are obtained for optimized geometries at the MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ level. Final zero-point-corrected binding energies are also tabulated. The bold values correspond to the lowest-energy isomers at the MP2 level of theory.

is at least 2 kcal/mol higher in energy than the three other candidates. We note that the **616-b** isomer shown in Figure 1 belongs to the **616** family, which was identified as the lowest-energy structure (**13a**) by Lenz and Ojamae.[30] We found that **616-b** isomer is about 0.199 kcal/mol higher in energy than the **616-a** isomer at B3LYP level of theory.

In summary, we identified the global minima of the $(H_2O)_{11}$ and $(H_2O)_{13}$ clusters following a four-step searching/screening approach. This strategy can be useful when there exists a large number of low-lying/near-isoenergetic isomers, many of which have the same oxygen network (same family) such as in medium-sized water clusters with odd-numbered molecules. On the two new candidates for the global minimum of $(H_2O)_{11}$, one isomer can be viewed as placing the 11th molecule onto the side of the global minimum of $(H_2O)_{10}$ and the other can be viewed as removing the 12th molecule from the middle layer of the global minimum of $(H_2O)_{12}$. The three leading lowest-energy clusters of $(H_2O)_{13}$ can all be built upon the global minimum of $(H_2O)_{12}$, with the difference in the location of the 13th water molecule.

Supporting Information Available: Data of total energies, zero-point energies, relative energies, and binding energies, coordinates of lowest-energy isomers, and the complete set obtained with refs 42 and 45 are collected. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

References and Notes

(1) Bizzarri, A. R.; Cannistraro, S. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2002**, *106*, 6617.
(2) Zondlo, M. A.; Hudson, P. K.; Prenni, A. J.; Tolbert, M. A. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **2000**, *51*, 473.
(3) Shin, J.-W.; Hammer, N.I.; Diken, E. G.; Johnson M. A.; Walters, R. S.; Jaeger, T. D.; Duncan, M. A.; Christie, R. A.; Jordan, K. D. *Science* **2004,** *304*, 1137.
(4) Keutsch, N.; Saykally, R. J. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **2001**, *98*, 10533.
(5) Vernon, M. F.; Krajnovich, D. J.; Kwok, H. S.; Lisy, J. M.; Shen, Y. R.; Lee, Y. T. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1982**, *77*, 47.
(6) Pugliano, N.; Saykally, R. J. *Science* **1992**, *257*, 1937.
(7) Xantheas, S. S.; Dunning, T. H., Jr. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *99*, 8774. Xantheas, S. S *J. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, *100*, 7523. Xantheas, S. S. *Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *258*, 225.
(8) Laasonen, K.; Parinello, M.; Car, R.; Lee, C.; Vanderbilt, D. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1993**, *207*, 208.
(9) Kim, K.; Jordan, K. D.; Zwier, T. S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 11568.

(10) Cruzan, J. D.; Braly, L. B.; Liu, K.; Brown, M. G.; Loeser, J. G.; Saykally, R. J. *Science* **1996**, *271*, 59.

(11) Huisken, F.; Kaloudis, M.; Kulcke, A. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1996**, *104*, 17.

(12) Gregory, J. K.; Clary, D. C. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1996**, *100*, 18014.

(13) Gruenloh, C. J.; Carney, J. R.; Arrington, C. A.; Zwier, T. S.; Fredericks, S. Y.; Jordan, K. D. *Science* **1997**, *276*, 1678.

(14) Buck, U.; Ettischer, I.; Melzer, M.; Buch, V.; Sadlej, J. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1998**, *80*, 2578.

(15) Rodriguez, J.; Laria, D.; Marceca, E. J.; Estrin, D. A. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *110*, 9039.

(16) Nauta, K.; Miller, R. E. *Nature* **2000**, *287*, 293.

(17) Lee, H. M.; Suh, S. B.; Lee, J. Y.; Tarakeshwar, P.; Kim, K. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *112*, 9759.

(18) Ugalde, J. M.; Alkorta, I.; Elguero, J. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2000**, *39*, 717.

(19) Tsai, C. J.; Jordan, K. D. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, *97*, 5208.

(20) Wales, D. J.; Ohmine, I. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 7245.

(21) Lee, C.; Chen, H.; Fitzgerald, G. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *122*, 1266.

(22) Wales, D. J.; Hodges, M. P. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1998**, *286*, 65.

(23) Nigra, P.; Kais, S. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1999**, *305*, 433.

(24) Massella, M.; Flament, J.-P. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *111*, 5081.

(25) Day, P. N.; Pachter, R.; Gordon, M. S.; Merrill, G. N. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *112*, 2063.

(26) Koga, K.; Parra, R. D.; Tanaka, H.; Zeng, X. C. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *113*, 5037.

(27) Lee, H. M.; Suh, S. B.; Kim, K. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *114*, 10749.

(28) Sadlej, J. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2001**, *333*, 485.

(29) Maheshwary, S.; Patel, N; Sathyamurthy, N.; Kulkarni, A. D.; Gadre, S. R. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2001**, *105*, 10525.

(30) Lenz, A.; Ojamae, L. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *7*, 1905.

(31) Guimares, F. F.; Belchior, J. C.; Johnston, R. L.; Robert, C. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *116*, 8327.

(32) Hartke, B. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2003**, *5*, 275.

(33) Kabrede, H.; Hentschke, R. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2003**, *107*, 3914.

(34) Kazimirski, J. K.; Buch, V. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2003**, *107*, 9762.

(35) Fanourgakis, G. S.; Aprà, E.; Xantheas, S. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *121*, 2655. Fanourgakis, G. S.; Aprà, E.; deJong, W. A.; Xantheas, S. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *122*, 134304.

(36) Lagutschenkov, A.; Fanourgakis, G. S.; Niedner-Schatteburg, G.; Xantheas, S. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *122*, 194310.

(37) Goedecker, S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *120*, 9911.

(38) Berendsen, H. J. C.; Grigera, J. R.; Straatsma, T. P. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1987**, *91*, 6269.

(39) Jorgensen, W. L.; Chandrasekhar, J.; Madura, J. D.; Impey, R. W.; Klein, M. L. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1983**, *79*, 926.

(40) Caldwell, J. W.; Kollman, P. A. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1995**, *99*, 6208−6219.

(41) Elstner, M.; Porezag, D.; Jungnickel, G.; Frauenheim, Th.; Suhai, S.; Seifert, G. *Mater. Res. Soc. Proc.* **1998**, *491*, 131.

(42) Frisch, M. J. et al. *Gaussian 03*, Revision C.02; Gaussian, Inc.: Wallingford, CT, 2004.

(43) Møller, C.; Plesset, M. S. *Phys. Rev.* **1934**, *46*, 618.

(44) Dunning, T. H., Jr. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1989**, *90*, 1007.

(45) Kendall, R. A.; et al. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **2000**, *128*, 260.

(46) Burnham, C. J.; Xantheas, S. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *116*, 5115.