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#### Abstract

The stable structures and 3D aromatic characters for four cationic $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and Te$)$ clusters are investigated at the DFT and post HF level of theory with the extended $6-311+\mathrm{G}^{*}$ basis set used for $\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}$, Se atoms and correlation consistent, effective-core potential (ECP) basis set ECP46MWB_AVTZ for the heavier Te atom.. Two optimized structures of tetrahedron $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ and rhombus $\left(\mathrm{D}_{2 h}\right)$ for four $\mathrm{X}_{4}^{4+}$ species have been obtained. The calculated results show that the tetrahedral $\left(T_{d}\right)$ structures are stable and correspond to energy minima, whereas the rhombic ( $\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}$ ) ones are unstable and have one or more saddle points on the potential energy surfaces. The calculated NICS values show that four tetrahedral $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ isomers have higher degree of 3D aromaticities. Whereas four rhombic $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ isomers can be regarded to possess 3D antiaromaticities. The molecular orbital analyses reveal that the tetrahedral $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ cations possess two-fold ( $\sigma$ and $\pi$ ) 3D aromaticity, conforming to the $2(\mathrm{~N}+1)^{2}$ electron counting rule for 3 D aromaticity
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## 1. Introduction

The concept of aromaticity is one of the most significant concepts in chemistry, generally used to describe cyclic, planar, and conjugated molecules with delocalized $\pi$-bonds and unusual stability, such as benzene and its derivatives [1,2]. In recent years the aromatic concept has been successfully extended from traditional organic compounds to pure all-metal clusters [3-13] due to the pioneering works done by Boldyrev's group[3]. In addition to the aromaticities for planar two-dimensional (2D) molecules, the aromaticities in three dimensional (3D) structures of clusters, including spherical aromaticity of organic clusters, such as fullerenes[14], and inorganic cage clusters, such as icosahedral $\mathrm{Sn}_{12}{ }^{2-}, \mathrm{Pb}_{12}{ }^{2-}$ with $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{h}}$ symmetries[15-17], have been intensively studied and many important progresses have been made in recent decades[14-21]. Advances and general principles in spherical aromatic clusters have been comprehensively reviewed by Zhong fang Chen et al. [20,21].Tetravalent anions $\mathrm{X}_{4}^{4}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{As}$, Sb , and Bi ) with Tetrahedral structures are one class of the smallest inorganic clusters possessing 3D aromaticities shown by Hirsch et al.[22].

For the 3D aromaticity, despite there exist a few limitations and controversial cases so far, some criteria have been formulated and often used now for identifying the 3D aromaticity, e.g. higher energetical stability, higher structural symmetry, higher negative values of Nucleus-Independent Chemical Shift (NICS)[23], and electron count rule, such as Wade's $2 \mathrm{n}+2$ rule[24], typically applied to closo boranes and carboranes, and Hirsch's $2(n+1)^{2}$ rule, for spherical clusters [21,25].

[^0]In this work, a new class of the inorganic tetravalent cations $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and Te$)$ are studied theoretically with four methods: two density functional theory (DFT) B3LYP, B3PW91 and two correlated ab initio MP2, CCSD(T). These clusters are corroborated to be another class of the smallest inorganic ones possessed 3D aromaticity using the criteria for 3D aromaticity above. This work will confirm further Hirsch's closed-shell electron gas model and $2(2 \mathrm{~N}+1)^{2}$ electron counting rule for 3D aromaticity.

## 2. Computational methods

The structural optimizations and vibrational frequency calculations for the inorganic cations $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and Te$)$ are carried out using four methods: B3LYP, B3PW91 and MP2, $\operatorname{CCSD}(\mathrm{T})$. B3LYP is a DFT method using Beck's three parameters functional (B3)[26] along with the Lee, Yang, and Parr correlation functional (LYP)[27]. B3PW91 uses B3 along with PerdewWang 1991 correlation functional [28]. MP2 is the second-order Møller-Plesset perturbation theory[29,30]. CCSD(T) is the coupled-cluster theory using singles and doubles level augmented by a perturbative correction for triple excitations[31-33]. The extended $6-311+G^{*}$ basis set is used for $O, S$, Se atoms and ECP46MWB_AVTZ for the heavier Te atom, which is the correlation consistent, effective-core potential (ECP) basis set with 46 core electrons ( $1 s^{2} 2 s^{2} 2 p^{6} 3 s^{2} 3 p^{6} 4 s^{2} 3 d^{10} 4 p^{6} 4 d^{10}$ ) for Te, including quasi-relativistic effect and triple-zeta [34]. The reason of using ECP46MWB_AVTZ basis set for Te atom is that Te atom is beyond the element range in which heavier atoms are able to use AUG-cc-pVnZ basis set to compute various physical and chemical quantities in Gaussian 03 program [35]. ECP46MWB_AVTZ basis set constructed by the Stuttgart/Cologne group is a good one for Te atom. The electron affinity (EA) of Te is $45.24 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ calculated with CCSD(T)/ECP46MWB_AVTZ, being in very well agreement with the experimental value of $45.45 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}[36]$.

NICS is still an efficient and simple method to probe aromaticitiy not only for planar clusters but also for 3D ones [20,21]. NICS is defined as the negative isotropic value of the Magnetic shielding tensor at the geometrical center of cluster. Aromaticity is characterized by negative NICS value, antiaromaticity by positive NICS value, and nonaromatic compounds by NICS value close to zero. In this study, the NICS values are calculated with GIAO-HF/6-311+G*, GIAO-B3LYP/6-311+G* methods based on the corresponding optimized structures with B3LYP/6-311+G* method except for $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{+}$species, for which the used basis set 6$311+\mathrm{G}^{*}$ in the methods above is replaced by ECP46MWB_AVTZ). GIAO is the gauge-independent atomic orbital method [37]. The NICS value calculated at the center of $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and Te$)$ clusters is denoted as NICS (0.0).

All calculations in this work are performed using the Gaussian 03 program. The MO pictures are drawn using the Gaussiview 3.0 program[38].

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1 Energetics and structural properties of $X_{4}^{4+}$ clusters

Two optimized structures of tetrahedron $\left(T_{d}\right)$ and rhombus $\left(D_{2 h}\right)$ for four cations $X_{4}^{4+}(X=O, S, S e$, and $T e)$ (Figure 1) have been obtained. Their bond lengths $R$, bond angles $A$, total electronic energies $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$ (including zero-point energies (ZPE)), relative energies $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{re}}$, number of imaginary frequencies (Nimag), and vibrational frequencies $v_{i}$ with four methods: B3LYP, B3PW91, MP2, and $\operatorname{CCSD}(\mathrm{T})$ are listed in Table 1.


Figure 1 Two optimized structures of the tetrahedron $\left(T_{d}\right)$ and rhombus $\left(D_{2 h}\right)$ for four cations $\mathrm{X}_{4}^{4+}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and Te$)$.

The calculated results in Table 1 show that the tetrahedron $\left(T_{d}\right)$ structures are stable with no imaginary frequencies to arise using all four methods, whereas the rhombus $\left(\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}\right)$ structures are unstable with one or more imaginary frequencies to arise using all four methods except for the rhombus $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ with MP2/ECP46MWB_AVTZ, in which there is no imaginary frequency to arise. The tetrahedral structures are energetically lower than the rhombic ones with all the four methods except for the case of $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ with B3LYP/6-311+G*, in which the $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$ of tetrahedron is slightly higher than that of rhombus by $2.07 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. The tetrahedral structures are lower in average $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$ with three methods(B3LYP, B3PW91, MP2) than the rhombic ones by 61.21 $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for $\mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}, 67.52 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for $\mathrm{Se}_{4}{ }^{4+}, 57.75 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ for $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ except for $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}$, for which the two isomers are almost equal in total energy $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$.

Table 1 Bond lengths $R(\AA)$, bond angles $A\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$, total electronic energies $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$ (including ZPE, hartree), relative energies $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{re}}(\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$, number of imaginary frequencies (Nimag), and vibrational frequencies $v_{i}\left(\mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$ of tetrahedral and rhombic structure for $\mathrm{X}_{4}^{4+}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and $\mathrm{Te})$ species.

| species $^{\text {a }}$ | tetrahedral $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}},{ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{1}\right)$ |  |  |  |  | rhombic ( $\left.\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}},{ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B3LYP | B3PW91 | MP2 | $\operatorname{CCSD}(\mathrm{T})$ |  | B3LYP | B3PW91 | MP2 | $\operatorname{CCSD}(\mathrm{T})$ |
| $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{\text {+ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R | 1.634 | 1.601 | --- ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | ---- ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  | 1.640 | 1.608 | 1.429 | ---b |
| A |  |  |  |  |  | 88.0 | 87.7 | 86.9 |  |
| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$ | -296.49870 | -296.37897 |  |  |  | -296.50188 | -296.37308 | -295.75368 |  |
| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {re }}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  | -2.07 | 3.69 |  |  |
| Nimag | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 4 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{1,2}(\mathrm{e})$ | 440 | 497 |  |  | $v_{1}\left(b_{2 u}\right)$ | 1491 | i458 | 11352 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{3,4,5}\left(\mathrm{t}_{2}\right)$ | 526 | 595 |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{u}}\right)$ | i243 | i102 | i1021 |  |
| $v_{6}\left(a_{1}\right)$ | 750 | 809 |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{3}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{3 \mathrm{u}}\right)$ | 63 | 186 | i242 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $v_{4}\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ | 531 | 572 | 882 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{5}\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ | 582 | 620 | 1209 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{6}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{3 \mathrm{~g}}\right)$ | 1313 | 1345 | i2239 |  |
| $\mathbf{S}_{4}{ }^{\text {+ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R | 2.238 | 2.211 | 2.227 | 2.266 |  | 2.260 | 2.229 | 2.173 | - ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| A |  |  |  |  |  | 86.7 | 86.3 | 84.6 |  |
| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$ | -1590.12254 | -1589.91433 | -1587.97285 | -1588.03906 |  | -1590.04804 | -1589.82603 | -1587.84293 |  |
| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {re }}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 46.83 | 55.37 | 81.44 |  |
| Nimag | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{1,2}(\mathrm{e})$ | 345 | 366 | 288 | 311 | $v_{1}\left(b_{2 u}\right)$ | 261 | 285 | 317 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{3,4,5}\left(\mathrm{t}_{2}\right)$ | 417 | 443 | 333 | 370 | $\mathrm{v}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\text {lu }}\right)$ | 345 | 375 | 511 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{6}\left(\mathrm{a}_{1}\right)$ | 540 | 571 | 423 | 475 | $\mathrm{v}_{3}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{3 \mathrm{u}}\right)$ | i98 | i121 | i219 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{4}\left(\mathrm{ag}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ | 249 | 251 | 264 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{5}\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ | 378 | 401 | 501 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{6}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{3 \mathrm{~g}}\right)$ | 670 | 711 | i3018 |  |
| $\mathrm{Se}_{4}{ }^{++}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R | 2.514 | 2.484 | 2.553 | 2.556 |  | 2.503 | 2.468 | 2.439 | b |
| A |  |  |  |  |  | 86.6 | 86.1 | 84.0 |  |
| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$ | -9603.79542 | -9603.71831 | -9597.32142 | -9597.37277 |  | -9603.72598 | -9603.63644 | -9597.20119 |  |
| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {re }}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 43.60 | 51.22 | 107.74 |  |
| Nimag | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{1,2}(\mathrm{e})$ | 190 | 202 | 170 | 172 | $\mathrm{v}_{1}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{u}}\right)$ | 185 | 199 | 225 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{3,4,5}\left(\mathrm{t}_{2}\right)$ | 236 | 250 | 205 | 211 | $\mathrm{v}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\text {lu }}\right)$ | 227 | 244 | 316 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{6}\left(\mathrm{a}_{1}\right)$ | 317 | 335 | 275 | 282 | $\mathrm{v}_{3}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{3 \mathrm{u}}\right)$ | i38 | 155 | i114 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{4}\left(\mathrm{ag}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ | 134 | 135 | 131 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $v_{5}\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ | 234 | 249 | 302 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $v_{6}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{3 \mathrm{~g}}\right)$ | 376 | 404 | 11522 |  |
| $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R | 2.876 | 2.857 | 2.886 | 2.901 |  | 2.856 | 2.835 | 2.854 | $2.857^{\text {c }}$ |
| A |  |  |  |  |  | 86.4 | 85.7 | 68.3 | 69.8 |
| $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$ | -30.26671 | -30.36544 | -30.02357 | -30.07229 |  | -30.19771 | -30.28463 | -29.897385 | $-29.93930^{\text {d }}$ |
| $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{re}}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 43.37 | 50.75 | 79.13 |  |
| Nimag | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{1,2}(\mathrm{e})$ | 131 | 138 | 127 | 125 | $v_{1}\left(b_{2 u}\right)$ | 137 | 147 | 228 |  |
| $\mathrm{v}_{3,4,5}\left(\mathrm{t}_{2}\right)$ | 165 | 173 | 157 | 156 | $\mathrm{v}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{\text {lu }}\right)$ | 164 | 175 | 431 |  |
| $v_{6}\left(a_{1}\right)$ | 221 | 231 | 212 | 208 | $\mathrm{v}_{3}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{3 \mathrm{u}}\right)$ | i24 | i35 | 186 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{4}\left(\mathrm{ag}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ | 84 | 82 | 114 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $v_{5}\left(\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ | 166 | 175 | 158 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{6}\left(\mathrm{~b}_{3 \mathrm{~g}}\right)$ | 260 | 272 | 155 |  |

[^1]${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ To succeed in the structural optimization but fail in frequency calculations.
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ The $\mathrm{E}_{\text {tot }}$ does not include the zero energy.

### 3.2 Magnetic characteristics of aromaticity for $X_{4}^{4+}(X=O, S, S e$, and $T e)$ cations

The calculated $\operatorname{NICS}(0.0)$ values ( ppm cgsu ) at the geometric center of the tetrahedron $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ and rhombus $\left(\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}\right)$ for $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}$, $\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and Te ) species are listed in Table 2 with method GIAO-HF, GIAO-B3LYP/6-311+G*//B3LYP/6-311+G* for $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}$, $\mathrm{Se}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ and GIAO-HF, GIAO-B3LYP/ECP46MWB_AVTZ//B3LYP/ ECP46MWB_AVTZ for $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$. For comparison, the NICS values for the neutral Tetrahedral $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ structures of $\mathrm{X}_{4}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{As}, \mathrm{Sb}$, and Bi$)$ species obtained by Hirsch et al.[22] are also listed in Table 2. Comparison among these NICS(0.0) data in Table 2 indicates that, except for the NICS $(0.0)$ values of $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ for the tetrahedron $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ isomer with HF method, which is negative, abnormally large and could be considered to be unreasonable, all other NICS $(0.0)$ values of four tetrahedral $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ isomers with two methods are significant negative and can be comparable with those of $\mathrm{X}_{4}$ isomers of the tetrahedron $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ structures used GIAO- B3LYP/6-311+G** for $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$, As and GIAOB3LYP/LANL2DZp for $\mathrm{Sb}, \mathrm{Bi}$. Moreover, from Table 1, these four tetrahedron structures of $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ are energy minima on potential energy surfaces. Therefore, we can draw a conclusion that four $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ species with tetrahedron structures possess higher degree of 3D aromaticities.

For the rhombic structures of $\mathrm{X}_{4}^{4+}$, except for the $\mathrm{NICS}(0.0)$ values of $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ with HF method, which is negative, abnormally large and could also be considered to be unreasonable., other NICS $(0.0)$ values of $\mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{Se}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ with HF method are all positive, The NICS(0.0) values of the rhombic $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ isomers with B3LYP method are positive for $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ and very small, negative for $\mathrm{Se}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$. Likewise, Considering their one or more saddle points on corresponding potential energy surface from Table 1, we can draw a conclusion that the rhombic $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ isomers can be regarded to have stronger 3D antiaromaticities.

Table 2 NICS values ( ppm cgsu ) at the geometric center of the tetrahedron $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ and rhombus $\left(\mathrm{D}_{2 \mathrm{~h}}\right)$ for the cation $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and Te$)$ and neutral $\mathrm{X}_{4}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{As}, \mathrm{Sb}$, and Bi$)$ species.

| structures | methods | $\mathrm{NICS}(0.0)$ |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ | $\mathrm{Se}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ | $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ |
| tetrahedron $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ |  | -179.50 | -47.38 | -49.52 | -35.02 |
|  | B 3 LYP | -66.17 | -46.80 | -46.98 | -32.78 |
|  | HF | -704.58 | 40.93 | 33.61 | 67.78 |
| tetrahedron $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)^{\mathrm{a}}$ | B 3 LYP | 25.94 | 3.58 | -3.89 | -5.15 |
|  | $\mathrm{~N}_{4}$ | -69.6 | -52.9 | -53.3 | -38.8 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ From reference [22]. The methods used by Hirsch are: GIAO-B3LYP/6-311+G** for N, P, As and GIAO-B3LYP/LANL2DZp for $\mathrm{Sb}, \mathrm{Bi}$.

### 3.3 MO analyses of 3 D aromaticity for $X_{4}^{4+}$ species

In this section, we will further explore the 3D aromaticty of the tetrahedral $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ cations through molecular orbital (MO) analyses. Four Group-VI elements $\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and Te each has six valence electrons: four p-AO electrons and two filled s-AO electrons. Each of $\mathrm{X}_{4}^{4+}$ species has 20 valence electrons and occupied ten valence MOs. Due to two basis sets used ( $6-311+\mathrm{G}^{*}$ for $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{Se}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ and ECP46MWB_AVTZ for $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ ) in all calculations, $\mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ (as a representative for $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}$, and $\mathrm{Se}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ ) and $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ species are chosed to draw their respective ten valence MO pictures (Figure 2). From Figure 2, one can see that these two sets of ten valence MO schemes for $\mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ and $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ are almost the same, regardless of the used basis sets. These ten valence MOs are denoted as two HOMO(1e, double degenerate), three HOMO-1( $2 \mathrm{t}_{2}$, triply degenerate), one HOMO-2( $2 \mathrm{a}_{1}$ ), three HOMO$3\left(1 \mathrm{t}_{2}\right.$,triply degenerate), one HOMO-4(1a $\left.\mathrm{a}_{1}\right)$. Two degenerate $\mathrm{HOMOs}(1 \mathrm{e})$ and three degenerate HOMO-1s(2t $\mathrm{t}_{2}$ ) are $\sigma$-MOs, consist of cluster d robitals respectively. The splitting into two $\sigma$-MO sets from the cluster $d$ orbitals is a consequence of symmetry lowering from spherical $\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$ to tetrahedral $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)[22,25]$. Another three degenerate HOMO-3s $\left(1 \mathrm{t}_{2}\right)$ are $\sigma$-MOs, consist of cluster p robitals. The HOMO- $4\left(1 a_{1}\right)$ is $\sigma-\mathrm{MO}$, consist of cluster s robitals. The HOMO- $2\left(2 a_{1}\right)$ is $\pi-\mathrm{MO}$, consist of cluster s robitals. So there are nine $\sigma-\mathrm{MOs}$ and one $\pi-\mathrm{MO}$, occupied 18 and 2 electrons respectively, each conforming to the $2(\mathrm{~N}+1)^{2}$
electron counting rule for 3 D aromaticity, with $\mathrm{N}_{\sigma}=2$ for $18 \sigma$ electrons and $\mathrm{N}_{\pi}=0$ for two $\pi$ electrons. Therefore, from MO analyses above one can see that the tetrahedral $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ cations possess two-fold ( $\sigma$ and $\pi$ ) 3D aromaticity.


Figure 2 Ten valence MO pictures for each of two tetrahedral $\mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ and $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ isomers with B3LYP/6-311+G* and B3lyp/ECP46MWB_AVTZ respectively.

## 4. Conclusion

Two optimized structures of tetrahedron $\left(T_{d}\right)$ and rhombus $\left(D_{2 h}\right)$ for four $X_{4}^{4+}$ species have been obtained through two DFT (B3LYP, B3PW91) and two post HF (MP2 and $\operatorname{CCSD}(\mathrm{T})$ ) methods with the extended $6-311+\mathrm{G}^{*}$ basis set used for O , S , Se atoms and ECP46MWB_AVTZ basis set for the heavier Te atom. The tetrahedron $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ structures are all energy minima on potential energy surfaces. Through the NICS calculations and MO analyses, according to several criteria for 3D aromaticity: higher energetical stability, higher structural symmetry, higher negative NICS values, and Hirsch's 2( $\mathrm{n}+1)^{2}$ electron counting rule, the tetrahedral $\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right) \mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{Se}$, and Te$)$ cations have been shown to possess higher two-fold ( $\sigma$ and $\pi$ ) 3D aromaticity, while the rhombic $\mathrm{X}_{4}{ }^{4+}$ isomers can be regarded to have stronger 3 D antiaromaticities.
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[^1]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Basis set 6-311+G* used for $\mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{S}_{4}{ }^{4+}, \mathrm{Se}_{4}{ }^{4+}$, and ECP46MWB_AVTZ for $\mathrm{Te}_{4}{ }^{4+}$.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ The dot line denotes the failure both in the structural optimization and frequency calculations.

