Intermolecular Interactions Between Serine and C60, C59Si, and C59Ge: A DFT Study

Mohsen Doust Mohammadi

Tehran University: University of Tehran

Hewa Y. Abdullah (✉ hewayaseen@gmail.com)

Tishk International University <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5766-3858>

Research Article

Keywords: Boron Nitride, C3H7NO3, Density Functional Theory, Serine, Wave function analysis

Posted Date: August 4th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-770749/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Intermolecular Interactions between Serine and C₆₀, C₅₉Si, and C₅₉Ge: A DFT Study

Mohsen Doust Mohammadi^a, Hewa Y. Abdullah^{b,*}

^a School of Chemistry, College of Science, University of Tehran, Tehran 14176, Iran

^b Physics Education Department, Faculty of Education, Tishk International University, Erbil, 44001, Iraq

*corresponding author Email: hewayaseen@gmail.com

Abstract

The study of intermolecular interactions is of great importance. This study attempted to quantitatively examine the interactions between Serine (C₃H₇NO₃) and fullerene nanocages, C₆₀, in vacuum. As the frequent introduction of elements as impurities into the structure of nanomaterials can increase the intensity of intermolecular interactions, nanocages doped with silicon and germanium have also been studied as adsorbents, C₅₉Si and C₅₉Ge. Quantum mechanical studies of such systems are possible in the density functional theory (DFT) framework. For this purpose, various functionals, such as B3LYP-D3, ωB97XD, and M062X, have been used. One of the most suitable basis functionals for the systems studied in this research is 6-311G (d), which has been used in both optimization calculations and calculations related to wave function analyses. The main part of this work is the study of various analyses that reveal the nature of the intermolecular interactions between the two components introduced above. The results of conceptual DFT, natural bond orbital, non-covalent interactions, and quantum theory of atoms in molecules were consistent and in favor of physical adsorption in all systems. Germanium had more adsorption energy than other dopants. The HOMO–LUMO energy gaps were as follows: C₆₀: 5.996, C₅₉Si: 5.309, and C₅₉Ge: 5.188 eV at B3LYP-D3/6-311G (d) model chemistry. The sensitivity of the adsorption increased when an amino acid molecule interacted with doped C₆₀, and this capability could be used to design nanocarrier to detect Serine amino acid.

Keyword: Boron Nitride; C₃H₇NO₃; Density Functional Theory; Serine; Wave function analysis.

1. Introduction

The first attempts to come up with the concept of intermolecular interactions were made by Clausius [1], van der Waals [2], and London [3,4]. Intermolecular interactions can be divided into long-range and short-range classes. The long-range class includes electrostatic, induction, and dispersion forces, and it varies with the inverse powers of the distance r^{-n} , which is the reciprocal of the intermolecular distance. Conversely, the short-range class includes exchange and repulsion forces that decrease exponentially with distance, as in e^{-ar} . Both repulsive and attractive electrostatic forces arise from classical Coulombic interactions between the charge distributions of two molecules. These forces are also pairwise additive and anisotropic. The interacting molecules cause instantaneous fluctuations in the electron distribution, and such a disruption creates dispersion forces that are pairwise additive and always attractive. Induction forces, which are non-additive and attractive, are created by the distortion of the distribution of molecular charges resulting from the influence of the electric fields of other molecules. Exchange and repulsion are both non-additive and of opposite signs [5].

Ab initio calculations are a reliable method for obtaining polarizabilities (i.e., a set of constants to show the charge redistribution when a molecule is exposed to an electric field) and electric multipole moments used to explain the long-range forces [6]. In the case of short-range forces, the theory is rather more complicated [7] due to the overlap of electron densities between molecules. The previous long-range theory should be modified in terms of short-range penetration [8-10], charge transfer [11], and damping effects [12-14]. Generally, full quantum methods can only be well implemented in small systems, but there are technical problems with large molecules [15]. The development of wave function analysis methods has helped predict the nature of intermolecular interactions, even in the case of large systems. Although the ab initio

62 methods are few, neat, and classifiable, there are countless wave function analysis methods that
63 have not yet been systematically categorized in the scientific literature.

64 After Feynman's famous "*There's Plenty of Room at the Bottom*" speech in 1959 in Caltech,
65 the history of nanoscience has seen a dramatic expansion. Early works on carbon-based
66 nanomaterials by Iijima [16,17] and Novoselov [18-21] paved the way for the development of
67 nanotechnology in the use of inorganic nanomaterials. Among these, the structures of boron
68 nitride are of special importance due to their extraordinary physical and chemical properties [22-
69 24]. Studies on the optoelectrical, mechanical, and thermal properties [25] of such structures are
70 still under consideration [26,27]. Furthermore, these nanomaterials are widely used, for example,
71 as nanocarrier [28-39] or nanocarriers of drugs [40-42]. These processes occur through
72 adsorption (adhesion of a particle to a surface), and they are primarily related to the
73 intermolecular interactions between the adsorbent and the adsorbate.

74 This study examined the adsorption of Serine amino acid molecule onto the surface of
75 pristine, silicon-, and germanium-doped fullerene nanocages, C_{60} , $C_{59}Si$, and $C_{59}Ge$,
76 respectively. All structures, such as isolated species and complex systems, were optimized using
77 various functionals, including B3LYP-D3, ω B97XD, M062X, and 6-311G(d) basis set. The most
78 stable structure in terms of electronic energy was chosen for further wave function analyses
79 using the B3LYP-D3/6-311G(d) model chemistry. We referred to the conceptual density
80 functional theory (DFT), natural bond orbital (NBO), non-covalent interactions (NCI), and
81 quantum theory of atoms in molecules (QTAIM) from among the most important and reliable
82 wave function analyses ever developed. In this study, they were used to understand the nature of
83 intermolecular interactions. All studies were performed in vacuum; therefore, the sensitivity and
84 reactivity of the adsorbent were appreciated. The main ideas of each analysis were explained in

the shortest possible way, as these materials are scattered in the available resources, and it is a little difficult for beginners to have them together.

2. Computational details

The Kohn–Sham DFT framework was implemented in this study. Each structure, including amino acid and nanocages, was geometrically optimized in a vacuum using the so-called Berny geometry optimization algorithm developed by H. B. Schlegel in 1982 [43]. The PBE0 functional [44,45], which is the hybrid–exchange correlation form of the Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof generalized gradient approximation (GGA) [46], meta-hybrid GGA functional M06-2X developed by the Truhlar group [47,48], the Head–Gordon group functional ω B97XD [49], which includes dispersion and long-range corrections, and the Becke 3-parameter Lee–Yang–Parr functional with Grimme dispersion correction B3LYP-D3 [50-52] were employed. The MC-311 or 6-311G (split-valence triple-zeta) basis set in the Gaussian package [53] has been developed by many individuals [54-62]. In the current work, the 6-311(d) basis set was used (i.e., d-type Cartesian–Gaussian polarization functions). Split-valence basis sets allow orbitals to alter the size but not the shape. When polarized functions are added to the basis sets, this limitation is removed by including orbitals with an angular momentum greater than what is needed for the ground state to depict each atom. This basis set is large enough and well able to simulate molecular orbitals. Data from benchmark studies also confirm this fact [63-67]. GaussView 6.0.16 [68] and ChemCraft [69] packages were used for building molecules. Linux-based Gaussian 16 software Rev. C.01 [53] was used for self-consistent field (SCF) calculations (as link 502). The default convergence criteria remained intact during the calculations. The SCF convergence was considered by comparing the maximum force and maximum displacement with the threshold values (0.00045 Hartree/Bohr and 0.0018 Bohr). Moreover, no symmetry

limitations were imposed on the optimization process. Wave function stability, frequency checks, and zero-point energy corrections (ZPECs) were considered to ensure the accuracy of the calculations. Stability calculations guarantee that this optimized electronic wave function may be minimal in the wave function space rather than a saddle point and that it is completely different from finding minima or saddle points on a nuclear potential energy surface. As the Gaussian software includes the NBO version 3.1 software [70-72] (as link 607), it is used to perform population analysis studies. The Multiwfn [73] package developed by Tian Lu is fed by formatted Gaussian checkpoint files for various wave function analyses. In this work, Multiwfn was used for NBO, NCI, and QTAIM studies. O'Boyle et al. developed the cclib and GaussSum [74] package to obtain the DOS diagrams.

To calculate the adsorption energy (E_{ads}) of the two molecules (nanocage and SERINE), the following underlying relation is applied:

$$E_{ads} = E_{cage/amino} - E_{cage} - E_{amino} + \Delta E_{(BSSE)} + \Delta E_{(ZPE)} \quad (1)$$

where $E_{cage/amino}$ is the energy of the cluster, and E_{amino} and E_{cage} are the energies of the isolated amino acid and nanocage, respectively. The negative values of E_{ads} (i.e., exothermic adsorptions) show that the formed amino acid/nanocage cluster is stable. The electron density of each nucleus can be determined using a function centred on another nucleus. Therefore, in all structures, the quality of the basis set is not the same. This means that the basis set of one molecule can be effective in compensating for the violation of the basis set of another molecule. This effect is called the basis set superposition error (BSSE). There are two well-known methods for the BSSE correction, (1) chemical Hamiltonian approach (CHA) [75] and Boys and Bernardi's counterpoise (CP) correction procedure [76,77,15] which CP method is employed in this work:

$$\Delta E_{(BSSE)} = \Delta E_{cluster} - \Delta E_{cage}^{cluster} - \Delta E_{amino}^{cluster} \quad (2)$$

The ZPECs are calculated using Eq. 3:

$$\Delta E_{(ZPE)} = \Delta E_{cluster(ZPE)} - \Delta E_{cage(ZPE)} - \Delta E_{amino(ZPE)} \quad (3)$$

3. Result and discussion

3.1 Methodology

The DFT concept was initiated by Thomas [78], Fermi [79], and Dirac [80] in 1927–1930 using uniform electron amino acid energy densities. In 1951, Slater [81] opened a new horizon, which Hohenberg, Kohn, and Sham [82,83] turned into a complete theory in 1964–1965. In DFT, the overall energy is shown in terms of the full electron density instead of the complicated N electron wave function. DFT is considered an exact theory (not a *model* like the Hartree–Fock model), but the approximations that are applied have caused it to fail; nevertheless, it is an efficient and usable tool [84]. The Hartree–Fock model and Kohn–Sham DFT are presented as follows [85,84]:

$$E_{HF} = V + \langle h\rho \rangle + 1/2 \langle \rho J(\rho) \rangle - 1/2 \langle \rho K(\rho) \rangle \quad (4)$$

$$E_{KS} = V + \langle h\rho \rangle + 1/2 \langle \rho J(\rho) \rangle + E_x[\rho] + E_c[\rho] \quad (5)$$

where V is the nuclear repulsion energy, ρ is the density matrix, $\langle h\rho \rangle$ is the one-electron (kinetic plus potential) energy, $1/2 \langle \rho J(\rho) \rangle$ is the classical electron repulsion, $-1/2 \langle \rho K(\rho) \rangle$ is the exchange energy, $E_x[\rho]$ is the exchange functional, and $E_c[\rho]$ is the correlation functional. By comparing relations 4 and 5, in Kohn–Sham formalism, the Hartree–Fock model is essentially a special case of DFT, where $E_x[\rho] = -1/2 \langle \rho K(\rho) \rangle$ and $E_c[\rho] = 0$. Accordingly, in DFT, the methods differ in having different functionals E_x and E_c .

Unfortunately, exact functionals for exchange and correlation are not known; therefore, approximations have historically been developed to approach the real values of physical quantities, such as local-density approximation (LDA), generalized gradient approximations (GGA) [86,46], meta-GGA, and hyper-GGA. In this respect, a number of functionals include only the exchange part, such as Becke 88 (B88) [86] and Gill96 (G96) [87], and some of them include a pure correlation part, such as Vosko–Wilk–Nusair (VWN5) [88], Perdew 86 (P86) [89], Lee–Yang–Parr (LYP) [90], Perdew–Zunger (PZ81) [91], Cole–Perdew (CP) [92], and Perdew–Wang (PW92) [93]. Conversely, Becke 97 (B97) [94], Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof (PBE) [44], and Perdew–Wang 91 (PW91) [95] are examples of exchange–correlation functionals (see Head-Gordon et al. article for a general overview of the types of functionals to a climb of Jacob’s ladder [64]). The origine of the differences among the $E_{XC}[\rho]$ arise from exchange–correlation holes (i.e. an exclusion area around electron or a “no-fly zone” which prevents other electron to penetrate, each functional has its own XC fingerprint).

In the present study, the hybrid functionals PBE0 and B3LYP-D3 were used. Note that the D3 in B3LYP-D3 refers to the D3 version of Grimme’s dispersion with Becke–Johnson damping (GD3BJ) [52]. In hybrid functions, the exchange energy is divided into two parts to improve performance. The first part is the result of accurate calculations obtained from Hartree–Fock calculations, and the next part of the exchange energy is calculated using the DFT method. B3LYP uses three mixing parameters:

$$E_{XC} = A * E_X(\text{LSDA}) + (1-A) * E_X(\text{HF}) + B * \Delta E_X(\text{B88}) + E_C(\text{VWN}) + C * E_C(\text{LYP}) \quad (6)$$

and PBE0 consists of a 1:3 mixture of Hartree–Fock (HF) and DFT exchange energies:

$$E_{XC} = 0.25 * E_X(\text{HF}) + 0.75 * E_X(\text{PBE}) + E_C(\text{PW91}) \quad (7)$$

B3LYP has a weakness in considering charge transfer excitations, as it is not a long-range corrected functional [96]. This means that it uses a constant of 20% HF exchange for both short and long ranges. CAM-B3LYP [97] and ω B97XD are range-separated hybrid functionals [98] that are suitable for excitation energy calculations and conjugated systems [99]. ω B97XD is a range-separated version of the B97 functional with Grimme's D2 dispersion model (addition of an empirical $C_6 \cdot R^{-6}$ dispersion term). In short-range interactions, it comprises 22% HF exchange contributions and 100% HF in the long-range. A standard error function is implemented to describe the intermediate region using a range separation parameter (i.e., $\omega = 0.2\text{--}0.3 \text{ Bohr}^{-1}$) [100]. The range-separated term consists of two parts which splits the DFT exchange interaction as follows:

$$\frac{1}{r_{12}} = \frac{\alpha + \beta^* \operatorname{erfc}(\omega r_{12})}{r_{12}} + \frac{\alpha + \beta^* \operatorname{erf}(\omega r_{12})}{r_{12}} \quad ; \quad \operatorname{erfc} \equiv 1 - \operatorname{erf} \quad (8)$$

The first term in Eq. 8 shows short-range contribution which is singular and decays to zero on a length scale of $\sim 1/\omega$ and the second term is related to non-singular long-range part. The α and β parameters allow HF-exchange and DFT exchange incorporate over whole range. M06-2X, a meta-hybrid GGA functional with double non-local exchange (2X) amounts, belongs to the M06 suite of functionals with 54% HF contributions, in which the non-interacting kinetic energy density is used as input to the functional and the electron density and its gradient [101]. This functional is well defined for systems with dispersion forces.

3.2 Geometric surveys

In the first step, molecular geometries were constructed using GussView software. The method of making nanocages is explained fully in the Help section of the software. Creating a Serine amino acid molecule does not take much effort, but for more certainty, geometry related

to amino acid molecules was prepared using the PubChem online database [102]. At the beginning of the research, we chose models that were faster and less expensive. All structures, including isolated molecules and clusters, were initially examined using PBE0/6-311G(d) model. As our ultimate goal was to examine intermolecular forces, we used models that calculated intermolecular interactions more accurately. The optimization process was repeated with the same basis set and functionals M06-2X, B3LYP-D3, and ω B97XD. The chemistry of the different models varied within the trade-offs made between computational cost and accuracy.

Once geometric optimization was completed, the presence or absence of imaginary frequencies (i.e., frequencies that have negative values do not represent the minimum and actually represent a transition state) was examined. Thus, in each optimized structure, frequency calculations were performed. In the output file of the Gaussian software, the keyword Nimag was assigned for this purpose. A value of zero (Nimag = 0) means that there are no negative frequencies according to the number of negative eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix. Frequency calculations were performed to determine the ZPEC, which must be added to the total energy.

To study the interactions between nanocages and a amino acid molecule, a C₆₀ cage with 1.45 Å bond length was selected. The optimized C₆₀ structure was used to prepare a doped nanocage. For this purpose, doped nanocages were obtained by substituting silicon and germanium instead of carbon atom and they were re-optimized in the same optimization process.

Each nanocage is illustrated in Fig. 1, which shows the position of the doped elements compared with the pure nanocage. The injection of the doped elements slightly changed the length of the bonds, indicating that the electronic structure was altered. These changes in the electronic structure led to differences in properties. Doping is a critical and successful strategy for detecting the properties of a nanomaterial as an adsorbent [103]. The dopants alter the

sensing properties by changing the HOMO-LUMO gap and morphology, creating more centres for amino acid interaction on the adsorbent surface.

As shown in Fig. 2, there are five sites on the nanocage that have the potential to absorb the amino acid molecule. The top of the carbon atom is represented by T_1 . The position of T_2 is related to the placement of the amino acid molecule on top of the bond between two hexagonal rings. The T_3 position is the placement of the amino acid molecule on top of the bond between hexagonal and pentagonal rings. The T_4 position is located above the hexagonal ring. And T_5 is on top of the pentagonal ring. Structurally, the Serine molecule has four heads, each of which can be placed on any of the five adsorption sites in C60 (Fig. 3).

The starting point of the study is placing the amino acid molecule on the adsorbent surface in different positions with different angles and distances and with different orientations and optimizing the whole cluster system. Finding the global minimum is the most challenging step of the study. Although we may never get it right away in the computing process, various strategies can be used to find many local minima and choose the most stable mode based on their quantitative value. If we have the full potential energy surface (PES) of two fragments, we can easily report the global minimum. However, having the PES requires thousands of calculations, which are practically impossible. The approach followed in this research is based on placing the amino acid molecule on the adsorbent surface at different distances and orientations. For this purpose, a low-cost method, such as PM6, was used. Dozens of initial orientations were selected to achieve the most stable structure in terms of energy content. The PEB0/6-311G(d) model chemistry was used to optimize the obtained stable structure and repeat the process using the abovementioned functionals.

(a)

(b)

(c)

248
 249 **Fig. 1.** The values of bond length for (a) C₆₀, (b) C₅₉Si, and (c) C₅₉Ge. The optimization process has been done using
 250 the B3LYP-D3/6-311G (d) level of theory.

The relaxed cluster structures obtained from B3LYP-D3/6-311G (d) are illustrated in Fig. 4. When the value of the energy of adsorption is below the range of chemical interest (i.e., from the third decimal place onwards following the decimal point), the results are identical [104]. Table 1 lists the values obtained from the calculations of the four different methods for optimizing complex structures. The quantitative amounts of adsorption energies obtained from the ω B97XD and B3LYP-D3 models were similar. Moreover, PBE0 data showed how different the data would be if the dispersion effect was not considered. Among the four different models, the values obtained from the B3LYP-D3/6-311G (d) model showed the highest stability, based on the absolute value of the highest absorption energy. As indicated in Table 1, among the doped elements, germanium produced the highest absorption energy (-1.975 eV).

To understand the nature of intermolecular forces, whether they are strong or weak or are the result of van der Waals or electrostatic effects, the wave function is analyzed in the following sections. According to Table 1 and based on our previous experience [105,106], the B3LYP-D3 functional is a better match to the systems studied in this paper. Thus, it was used for the wave function analysis calculations.

Table1

The interaction energy (E_{ads}) for C_{60} , C_{59}Si , and C_{59}Ge with Serine molecule. All values are in (eV).

Systems	PBE0	B3LYP-D3	M06-2X	ω B97XD
Serine/ C_{60}	-0.824	-1.342	-1.108	-1.231
Serine/ C_{59}Si	-1.113	-1.600	-1.760	-1.658
Serine/ C_{59}Ge	-1.289	-1.788	-1.975	-1.843

Fig. 2. The (T_x) positions including on top of carbon atom (T_1), on top of the bond between two hexagonal rings (T_2), on top of the bond between hexagonal and pentagonal rings (T_3), on top of the hexagonal ring (T_4), and top of the pentagonal ring (T_5).

Fig. 3. The values of bond length for Serine molecule. The optimization process has been done using the B3LYP-D3/6-311G (d) level of theory.

(a)

(b)

(c)

Fig. 4. The most stable form of (a) Serine/C₆₀, (b) Serine/C₅₉Si, and (c) Serine/C₅₉Ge. All clusters have been optimized using the B3LYP-D3 functional and 6-311G(d) basis set.

3.3 Conceptual DFT descriptors

The conceptual DFT descriptors, including chemical potential (μ), chemical hardness (η), electronegativity (χ), electrophilicity (ω), and nucleophilicity ($1/\omega$), are implemented to consider the chemical reactivity/stability of certain atomic sites of molecules, the charge transfer through nucleophilic or electrophilic attacks, and the analysis of chemical reactions [107-109]. According to the basic principles of DFT, energy is a functional of the wave function (a functional can be used to turn a function into a number [110]), and the changes in the number of particles, ΔN , and external potential, $\Delta v(\mathbf{r})$, can describe a typical process. Therefore, if we have the ground state energy, $E[N, v(\mathbf{r})]$, of an N electron system, the energy of the perturbed system can be obtained as follows [111]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta E &\equiv E[N + \Delta N, v(\mathbf{r}) + \Delta v(\mathbf{r})] - E[N, v(\mathbf{r})] \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial N} \right)_v \Delta N + \int \left(\frac{\delta E}{\delta v(\mathbf{r})} \right)_N \delta v(\mathbf{r}) d(\mathbf{r}) + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2!} \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial N^2} \right)_v \Delta N^2 + 2 \int \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial N} \left(\frac{\delta E}{\delta v(\mathbf{r})} \right) \right)_N \Delta N \delta v(\mathbf{r}) + \iint \left(\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial v^2(\mathbf{r})} \right)_N \delta v(\mathbf{r}) \delta v(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}' \right\} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The above Taylor expansion is usually truncated in the second order. The coefficients of the expansion have specific meanings in chemical language. For example, for non-degenerate states, perturbation theory describes electron density, $\rho(\mathbf{r})$, as follows [112,113]:

$$\left(\frac{\delta E}{\delta v(\mathbf{r})} \right)_N = \rho(\mathbf{r}) \quad (10)$$

Parr et al. [114] proved that μ is a quantitative measure of the tendency of an electron to pull out a system. The direction is from high to low μ values. The electronic chemical potential (μ) and electronegativity (χ) relation are expressed as Eq. 10

$$-\chi = \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial N} \right)_{v(r)} = \mu \cong \frac{(\varepsilon_{LUMO} + \varepsilon_{HOMO})}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(IP + EA) \quad (11)$$

Pearson [115] showed hardness (η) as a measure of resistance of a system to a change in the electronic cloud as follows:

$$\eta = \left(\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial N} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial N^2} \right)_{v(r)} = \frac{1}{2} (IP - EA) \quad (12)$$

Similarly, the Fukui function (which shows the change of $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ at a given position by changing of the number of electron, N) [116,117], $f(\mathbf{r})$, and the dual descriptor [118], $\Delta f(\mathbf{r})$ are defined as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{r}) = \left(\frac{\delta^2 E}{\delta v(\mathbf{r}) \delta N} \right) = \left(\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{r})}{\partial N} \right)_{v(\mathbf{r})} = \left(\frac{\partial \mu}{\delta v(\mathbf{r})} \right)_N \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta f(\mathbf{r}) = \left(\frac{\delta^3 E}{\delta v(\mathbf{r}) \delta^2 N} \right) = \left(\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{r})}{\partial N} \right)_{v(\mathbf{r})} = \left(\frac{\partial \eta}{\delta v(\mathbf{r})} \right)_N \quad (14)$$

Electrophilicity (ω) [119] is not the coefficient of the above-mentioned expansion. At the equilibrium point ($\mu = 0$), ω is the stabilization energy gained by a system (i.e., ω is the capacity to accept an arbitrary number of electrons). In addition, a maximum number of electrons gained by the system $\Delta N_{\max}$ [120] prove that a typical system can be stabilized by gaining electrons when $\mu < 0$ and $\eta > 0$. Electrophilicity (ω) and $\Delta N_{\max}$ are defined as

$$\omega = \frac{\mu^2}{2\eta} \approx \frac{(IP + EA)^2}{4(IP - EA)} \quad (15)$$

$$\Delta N_{\max} = -\frac{\mu}{\eta} \quad (16)$$

As shown in the above equations, the HOMO–LUMO energy gap (HLG) [121] is related to ionization potential (IP) and electron affinity (EA). Theoretically, based on the Koopmans' [122] and Janak's [123] approximations, the ionization potential is equal to the negative value of HOMO, ($\epsilon_{HOMO} = -IP$), and the electron affinity is equal to the negative value of LUMO, ($\epsilon_{LUMO} = -EA$). It should be noted that HOMO and LUMO can only be obtained from HF or DFT (i.e single determinant methods) and the LUMO has no contribution to the total energy of

the system. In addition, calculating the LUMO values is basis set sensitive; however, methods have been developed that can eliminate the LUMO dependence on the basis set [124].

The values of these descriptors are presented in Table 2. The energy gap (E_g) of C₆₀ was 5.996 eV using the B3LYP-D3/6-311G (d) model chemistry, and the adsorption of Serine on it reduced the energy gap to 5.855 eV. The silicon- and germanium-doped nanocages also reduced the HLG values. Molecules with large HLG had high values of η , whereas those with low HLG had low η . Table 2 shows that the LUMO values became more negative after the adsorption of Serine onto the nanocages; therefore, HLG was reduced. Reactivity of species was obvious due to the values of the descriptors η and μ . Conductivity arose from a high level of reactivity, and the charge transfer between the cages and adsorbate could be implemented through an chemical device as a carrier. To obtain a visual image of how the energy levels, especially HOMO and LUMO, are positioned, the total density of state maps is used in Fig. 5.

Table 2

HOMO energy (ϵ_H), LUMO energy (ϵ_L), HOMO–LUMO energy gap (HLG), chemical potential (μ), chemical hardness (η), and electrophilicity (ω). All values are in eV and were obtained using the B3LYP-D3/6-311G (d) level of theory.

Systems	ϵ_H	ϵ_L	HLG	μ	η	ω
C ₆₀	-8.176	-2.179	5.996	-5.177	2.998	40.183
C ₅₉ Si	-7.848	-2.540	5.309	-5.194	2.654	35.805
C ₅₉ Ge	-7.954	-2.766	5.188	-5.360	2.594	37.266
Serine/C ₆₀	-8.043	-2.188	5.855	-5.116	2.928	38.308
Serine/C ₅₉ Si	-7.024	-1.760	5.264	-4.392	2.632	25.382
Serine/C ₅₉ Ge	-7.023	-1.907	5.117	-4.465	2.558	25.503

Fig. 5. Density of state maps for (a) C_{60} and Serine/ C_{60} , (b) $C_{59}Si$ and Serine/ $C_{59}Si$, and (c) $C_{59}Ge$ and Serine/ $C_{59}Ge$. Data were obtained from the B3LYP-D3/6-311G (d) model chemistry.

3.4 NBO analysis

Canonical molecular orbitals (MO) lead to delocalized descriptions of electrons derived directly from SCF methods [125]. Delocalization means that the MO obtained from several electrons belongs to adjacent atoms. As this is physically difficult to imagine, to create physical intuition, we had to use a method that would give us an understanding. As the wave function is invariant under unitary transformations, localization is possible. The NBO [70] method, developed by Weinhold et al., is an intuitive method used to reach localized and understandable orbitals (i.e., localized Lewis-like electronic structures) using the first-order reduced density matrix of the wave function.

Various types of NBO analyses offer tremendous power to display bond order, Lewis structures, donor–acceptor interactions, charge transfer, resonance weights, bond type, and hybridization. The validity of NBO analysis extends from atoms to supermolecules, spanning the entire periodic table. The term “natural” was introduced by Löwdin [126]. NBO analysis uses natural orbitals, as NBOs are obtained as local block eigenfunctions of the density matrix. “Bond orbital” means that the NBO algorithm calculates the distribution of electron density in bonds between atoms. Generally, NBO methods serve as a bridge between wave function and elementary valency and bonding concepts.

Providing a complete orthogonal set of natural atomic orbitals (NAOs), localized one-centre orbitals from the atom-centred basis set are the most fundamental parts of the NBO algorithm. To perform a natural population analysis, natural hybrid orbitals (NHOs), NBOs, and natural localized molecular orbitals (NLMOs) must be obtained from NAOs to transform a given wave function into localized orbitals that correspond to the one-centre (“lone pair”) and two-centre (“bond”) elements of the Lewis structure picture:

For a (σ) bond located between atoms A and B, the NBO is defined as follows:

$$\sigma_{AB} = C_A h_A + C_B h_B \quad (17)$$

where C_A and C_B are the corresponding polarization coefficients (for covalent bonds $C_A = C_B$; if the electronegative A is assumed to be greater than B, we have: $C_A \gg C_B$). The h_A and h_B are natural hybrid valence orbitals. To complete the span of valence space, an antibonding NBO (σ^*) is also defined as follows:

$$\sigma_{AB}^* = C_A h_A - C_B h_B \quad (18)$$

In this study, NBO methods were utilized to measure the bond order. Coulson's definition of chemical bonding has paved the way for many chemical bond analyses [127]. The most popular methods used to find the bond order are the Mulliken bond order analysis [128] (Equation 19), the Mayer bond order [129-131] (Equation 20), and the Wiberg bond index (WBI) in Löwdin orthogonalized basis [132,133] (Equation 21). Therefore,

$$I_{AB} = \sum_i \eta_i \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{b \in B} 2C_{a,i} C_{b,i} S_{a,b} = 2 \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{b \in B} P_{a,b} S_{a,b} \quad (19)$$

$$I_{AB} = I_{AB}^\alpha + I_{AB}^\beta = 2 \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{b \in B} \left[\left(P^\alpha S \right)_{ba} \left(P^\alpha S \right)_{ab} + \left(P^\beta S \right)_{ba} \left(P^\beta S \right)_{ab} \right] \quad (20)$$

$$I_{AB} = \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{b \in B} P_{ab}^2 \quad (21)$$

where P is the density matrix, and S is the overlap matrix. Compared with Mulliken and Mayer's bond orders, WBI has less basis set dependence, especially the basis set that includes diffuse functions, and it provides more accurate results. The WBI values are reported in Table 3. Accordingly, we can conclude that C₅₉Si and C₅₉Ge adsorbents are more active materials in this

study in adsorbing Serine compared with pristine C₆₀. The WBI values show that the interaction of the amino acid molecule with C₆₀ can be classified as a weak interaction. Conversely, the interactions between silicon- and germanium-doped C₆₀ with the Serine molecule are stronger than the van der Waals interactions. The results of the WBI are in good agreement with the adsorption energies reported in Table 1.

Table 3

The, Mayer, Mulliken, and Wiberg bond index obtained for atomic bonds and intermolecular interactions between Serine molecule and C₆₀, C₅₉Si, and C₅₉Ge. All calculations were performed using the B3LYP-D3/6-311G(d) level of theory.

Systems	Mulliken	Mayer	Wiberg
Serine/C ₆₀	0.066	0.099	0.201
Serine/C ₅₉ Si	0.136	0.162	0.469
Serine/C ₅₉ Ge	0.188	0.268	0.582

3.5 QTAIM analysis

The idea that a molecule is a collection of atoms linked by a network of bonds is not directly related to quantum mechanics and is beyond theoretical definition. Bader's topological quantum theory of atoms in molecules (QTAIM) analysis [134,135] was developed to answer the question, “*What is an atom in a molecule and how does one predict its properties?*” Based on the topology of the electron density, the structure of a molecule is revealed by the stationary points of the electron density and the gradient paths that originate and terminate at these points. In the AIM method, electrons are distributed in space in the gravitational field of the nucleus. This means that the nucleus exists as a point in a cloud of negative charge with an electron density distribution. Electron density $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is a measurable property that determines the shape and properties of atoms and materials in general.

In this theory, a critical point is a minimum or a maximum of electron density ($\nabla\rho(\mathbf{r})=0$). A chemical bond is defined as a line between two atoms, in which the electron density is the maximum along with. There are trajectories that both originate and terminate at critical points and are related to each other by a saddle point. The nature of a critical point is defined by a Hessian matrix:

$$H_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 \rho(r)}{\partial X_i \partial X_j} \quad (22)$$

$$\nabla^2 \rho(r) = \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial z^2} \quad (23)$$

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^3 \text{Sign}(\lambda_i) \quad (24)$$

where λ_i is the eigenvalue of the Hessian matrix. Critical points are identified by two characteristics: rank ($\lambda_i > 0$ or $\lambda_i < 0$) and signature ($\lambda_i \neq 0$). Critical points with a rank less than 3 are topologically unstable; thus, they become a number of critical points with a rank of 3. Using (R, S) coordinates, there are four types of critical points: *atomic critical point* (3,-3), *bond critical point* (BCP) (3, -1), *ring critical point* (RCP) (3,1), and *cage critical point* (CCP) (3,3) [136]. The following (Poincaré-Hopf) relation should be satisfied between critical points:

$$n - b + r - c = 1 \quad (25)$$

where n , b , r , and c denote the number of nuclei, BCP, RCP, and CCP, respectively. The Laplacian of electron density ($\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{r}) = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3$) and that of electron density $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ at any BCP provide useful information about the different types of chemical interactions. The amount of $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ in BCP determines the bond strength and the bond order. In the case of the covalent bond, the Laplacian is less than zero ($\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{r}) < 0$), and the values of $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ are large, indicating that the charges are concentrated between two nuclei. The positive values of the Laplacian ($\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{r}) > 0$)

and the low values of $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ indicate that the charge dissipates in the distance between the two nuclei and that the interactions can be classified as a closed-shell type, which is related to ionic bonds, hydrogen bonds, and van der Waals bonds [137]. In particular, in the case of hydrogen bonding, if the electron density is in the range of 0.035–0.002 and if the Laplacian of electron density is in the range of 0.0139–0.002, the bond can be a hydrogen type.

The values of the Lagrangian kinetic energy $G(\mathbf{r})$, potential energy density $V(\mathbf{r})$, and energy density $H(\mathbf{r}) = G(\mathbf{r}) + V(\mathbf{r})$ can also be helpful in identifying the type of interactions. For a covalent bond, $H(\mathbf{r}) < 0$; $H(\mathbf{r})/\rho(\mathbf{r}) \gg 0$; and $G(\mathbf{r})/|V(\mathbf{r})| < 0.5$. For non-covalent interactions, $H(\mathbf{r}) > 0$; $H(\mathbf{r})/\rho(\mathbf{r}) > 0$; and $G(\mathbf{r})/|V(\mathbf{r})| > 1$. The virial theorem [138] suggests a relationship between $G(\mathbf{r})$, $V(\mathbf{r})$, and $\nabla^2\rho(\mathbf{r})$,

$$\frac{1}{4}\nabla^2\rho(\mathbf{r}) = 2G(\mathbf{r}) + V(\mathbf{r}) \quad (26)$$

Another descriptor is the bond elliptical index (ε), which is a good criterion for detecting conjugation and hyperconjugation. When ε is large, we have an elliptical structure that indicates that the π character is large. If $\varepsilon = 0$, the bond is cylindrical (double or triple) and very stable. Here, ε can be used to refer to the stability of the interactions and is defined as follows [139]:

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} - 1 ; \quad \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < 0; \text{ and } \lambda_3 > 0 \quad (27)$$

Table 4

The AIM topological parameters, including electron density ($\rho(r)$), Laplacian of electron density ($\nabla^2\rho(r)$), the kinetic electron density $G(r)$, potential electron density $V(r)$, eigenvalues of Hessian matrix (λ), and bond ellipticity index (ε) at BCPs of the Serine molecule and C₆₀, C₅₉Si, and C₅₉Ge. All values have been calculated using the B3LYP-D3/6-311G(d) level of theory from NBO analysis.

Systems	ρ	∇^2r	$G(\mathbf{r})$	$V(\mathbf{r})$	$G(\mathbf{r})/V(\mathbf{r})$	λ_1	λ_2	λ_3	ε
Serine/C60	0.0341	0.1339	0.0320	-0.0306	1.0472	-0.0107	0.1757	-0.0311	1.8966
Serine/C59Si	0.0638	0.1974	0.0721	-0.0948	0.7604	-0.0503	0.3038	-0.0562	0.1171
Serine/C59Ge	0.0633	0.1410	0.0532	-0.0711	0.7478	-0.0606	0.2582	-0.0566	0.0709

470
471
472 Considering the values shown in Table 4, the Laplacian electron density $\nabla^2\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is positive
473 for all interactions between the Serine amino acid molecule and all nanocages. Therefore, the
474 interaction between amino acid and nanocages is detected as non-covalent. Fig. 6 shows the BCP
475 position. The presence of critical points between the amino acid molecule and the nanocages
476 emphasizes the strong interactions between the two components. Among the nanocages, C₅₉Si
477 and C₅₉Ge are more capable of adsorbing the amino acid molecule, as the values of $G(\mathbf{r})/|V(\mathbf{r})|$ for
478 both of them are between 0.5 and 1. This means that the interaction tends to be strong in van der
479 Waals. The other descriptors, $H(\mathbf{r})$ and $H(\mathbf{r})/\rho(\mathbf{r})$, agree with these results. The values obtained
480 from ε show stable intermolecular interactions.

(a)

(b)

(c)

Fig. 6. AIM molecular graphs for (a) Serine/C₆₀, (b) Serine/C₅₉Si, and (c) Serine/C₅₉Ge systems. Orange dots represent the boundary critical points (BCPs).

3.6 NCI analysis

The results obtained from the previous sections show that the interactions between the amino acid molecule and pure and doped nanocages are non-covalent. Therefore, to verify this, these interactions were examined in terms of NCI analysis to determine the accuracy of the results. NCI analysis uses two functions: (1) $\text{sign}\lambda_2(r)\rho(r)$ (product of electron density and the sign of the second Hessian eigenvector) and (2) reduced density gradient (RDG), which is a dimensionless form of a gradient of electron density [140]. The values of these two functions are displayed on a two-dimensional coordinate plane: the $\text{sign}\lambda_2(r)\rho(r)$ is placed on the x-axis, and the RDGs are displayed on the vertical axis. The following equation is used to obtain the RDG values [140,141]:

$$RDG = \frac{1}{2(3\pi^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}} \frac{|\overline{\Delta\rho(\mathbf{r})}|}{\rho(\mathbf{r})^{\frac{4}{3}}} \quad (28)$$

Depending on the position of the second function in the diagram, three areas are created, indicating the type of interactions. In the $\text{sign}\lambda_2(\mathbf{r})\rho(\mathbf{r}) < 0$ region, strong non-covalent interactions are found; in the $\text{sign}\lambda_2(\mathbf{r})\rho(\mathbf{r}) \approx 0$ region, relatively weak van der Waals interactions are defined; in the $\text{sign}\lambda_2(\mathbf{r})\rho(\mathbf{r}) > 0$ region, repulsion forces are dominant [140,141]. Fig. 7 compares the NCI plots for both isolated nanocages and amino acid/nanocages clusters. Repetitive results from previous analyses are also shown in the NCI analysis. That is, in the case of C_{59}Si and C_{59}Ge adsorbents, the adsorption intensity is stronger than in others. To reference this, $\text{sign}\lambda_2(r)\rho(r) \approx 0$ and $RDG \approx 0.5$ should be considered.

Fig. 7. Plots for the reduced density gradient (RDG) vs. $\text{sign}(\lambda_2)\rho(r)$ values of (a) C_{60} and Serine/ C_{60} , (b) C_{59}Si and Serine/ C_{59}Si , and (c) C_{59}Ge and Serine/ C_{59}Ge . The data were obtained from B3LYP-D3 /6-311G (d) level of theory. The left side diagrams are isolated nanocages and the right side diagrams are BCF/nanosheet clusters.

4. Conclusion

Various wave function analyses were performed to study the intermolecular interactions between the Serine amino acid and fullerene nanosorbents. The standard model chemistry in this study was B3LYP-D3/6-311G(d), which was implemented for the geometry optimization process and NBO calculations. The PBE0, ω B97XD, and M06-2X functionals and the 6-311G(d) basis set were also used for geometry optimization. Considering the dispersion in these functionals was a factor that completely changed the results of these calculations. In the optimization process, the spatial orientations of the two monomers relative to each other were the determining factors that led to the finding of the local minima. Spanning the entire potential energy surface for such interactions could not be attained. Therefore, it is important to use an appropriate algorithm to find the local minima. The comparison of the adsorption energy of different clusters showed that the adsorbents C₅₉Si and C₅₉Ge trapped the amino acid molecule more intensely. The results of QTAIM and NCI analysis identified the intermolecular interactions of the type of strong van der Waals interaction for these nanocages. As the amino acid and the mentioned adsorbents interacted well, these nanomaterials could be used in the design a nanocarrier for Serine molecule.

537 **Declarations**

- 538 * Ethics approval and consent to participate **All authors agree**
 539 * Consent for publication **All authors agree**
 540 * Availability of data and materials **Not applicable**
 541 * Competing interests **The authors declare no conflict of interest**
 542 * Funding **No Fund**
 543 * Authors' contributions **Mohsen Doust Mohammadi: Investigation, Writing - original**
 544 **draft. Hewa Y. Abdullah: Conceptualization, Writing - review & editing, Resources,**
 545 **Supervision.**
 546 * Acknowledgements **We would like to thank the Solid-State Theory Group at the Physics**
 547 **Department at the Universita' Degli Studi di Milano-Italy for providing computational**
 548 **facilities.**
 549 * Authors' information (optional).
 550 Please include the sub-sections below of Compliance with Ethical Standards section.
 551
 552 * Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest: **The authors declare that they have no known**
 553 **competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to**
 554 **influence the work reported in this paper.**
 555 * Research involving Human Participants and/or Animals **Not applicable**
 556 * Informed consent **All authors agree**
 557

558 **Reference**

- 559 1. Clausius R (1857). Annalen der Physik 176 (3):353-380
 560 2. Van der Waals JD (1873) Over de Continuïteit van den Gas-en Vloeistofoestand, vol 1. Sijthoff,
 561 3. London F (1930). Zeitschrift für Physik 63 (3-4):245-279
 562 4. London F (1937). Transactions of the Faraday Society 33:8b-26
 563 5. Spencer ND, Moore JH (2001) Encyclopedia of chemical physics and physical chemistry: Applications,
 564 vol 3. Taylor & Francis,
 565 6. Dykstra CE (1988). Studies in physical and theoretical chemistry (58)
 566 7. Elrod MJ, Saykally RJ (1994). Chemical reviews 94 (7):1975-1997
 567 8. Stone AJ (1996). Oxford Stone AJ, Alderton M (1985) Distributed multipole analysis—methods and
 568 applications Mol Phys 56:1047-1064
 569 9. Hayes I, Stone A (1984). Molecular Physics 53 (1):83-105
 570 10. Jeziorski B, Moszynski R, Szalewicz K (1994). Chemical Reviews 94 (7):1887-1930
 571 11. Stone AJ (1993). Chemical physics letters 211 (1):101-109
 572 12. Kreek H, Meath WJ (1969). The Journal of Chemical Physics 50 (6):2289-2302
 573 13. Knowles PJ, Meath WJ (1986). Molecular Physics 59 (5):965-984
 574 14. Wheatley RJ, Meath WJ (1994). Chemical physics 179 (3):341-364
 575 15. Van Duijneveldt FB, van Duijneveldt-van de Rijdt JG, van Lenthe JH (1994). Chemical Reviews 94
 576 (7):1873-1885
 577 16. Iijima S (1991). nature 354 (6348):56-58
 578 17. Iijima S, Ichihashi T (1993). nature 363 (6430):603-605
 579 18. Geim AK, Novoselov KS (2010) The rise of graphene. In: Nanoscience and technology: a collection of
 580 reviews from nature journals. World Scientific, pp 11-19

581 19. Novoselov KS, Geim AK, Morozov SV, Jiang D, Katsnelson MI, Grigorieva I, Dubonos S, Firsov, AA
 582 (2005). *nature* 438 (7065):197-200
 583 20. Novoselov KS, Geim AK, Morozov SV, Jiang D, Zhang Y, Dubonos SV, Grigorieva IV, Firsov AA (2004).
 584 *science* 306 (5696):666-669
 585 21. Novoselov KS, Jiang D, Schedin F, Booth T, Khotkevich V, Morozov S, Geim AK (2005). *Proceedings of*
 586 *the National Academy of Sciences* 102 (30):10451-10453
 587 22. Guerra V, Wan C, McNally T (2019). *Progress in Materials Science* 100:170-186
 588 23. Li J-l, Yin J-h, Ji T, Feng Y, Liu Y-y, Zhao H, Li Y-p, Zhu C-c, Yue D, Su B (2019). *Materials Letters* 234:74-
 589 78
 590 24. Yang X, Guo Y, Han Y, Li Y, Ma T, Chen M, Kong J, Zhu J, Gu J (2019). *Composites Part B: Engineering*
 591 175:107070
 592 25. Zhi C, Bando Y, Tang C, Kuwahara H, Golberg D (2009). *Advanced Materials* 21 (28):2889-2893
 593 26. Watanabe K, Taniguchi T, Kanda H (2004). *Nature materials* 3 (6):404-409
 594 27. Lin Y, Connell JW (2012). *Nanoscale* 4 (22):6908-6939
 595 28. Doust Mohammadi M, Abdullah HY (2020). *ChemistrySelect* 5 (39):12115-12124
 596 29. Doust Mohammadi M, Abdullah HY (2020). *Canadian Journal of Chemistry* (999):1-12
 597 30. Mohammadi MD, Abdullah HY (2020). *Journal of Molecular Modeling* 26 (10):1-15
 598 31. Mohammadi MD, Abdullah HY (2020). *Theoretical Chemistry Accounts* 139 (10):1-17
 599 32. Mohammadi MD, Abdullah HY (2020). *Structural Chemistry*:1-14
 600 33. Mohammadi MD, Abdullah HY (2020). *Computational and Theoretical Chemistry*:113047
 601 34. Mohammadi MD, Salih IH, Abdullah HY (2020). *Journal of Theoretical and Computational Chemistry*
 602 35. Mohammadi MD, Salih IH, Abdullah HY (2020). *Molecular Simulation*:1-12
 603 36. Nemati-Kande E, Abbasi M, Mohammadi MD (2020). *Journal of Molecular Structure* 1199:126962
 604 37. Mohammadi MD, Abdullah HY, Bhowmick S, Biskos G (2021). *Computational and Theoretical*
 605 *Chemistry* 1198:113168
 606 38. Mohammadi MD, Abdullah HY, Bhowmick S, Biskos G (2021). *Canadian Journal of Chemistry* 0 (0):1-
 607 9. doi:10.1139/cjc-2020-0473
 608 39. Mohammadi MD, Abdullah HY (2021). *Solid State Communications*:114440
 609 40. Peer D, Karp JM, Hong S, Farokhzad OC, Margalit R, Langer R (2020). *Nano-Enabled Medical*
 610 *Applications*:61-91
 611 41. Rad AS, Aghaei SM (2018). *Current Applied Physics* 18 (2):133-140
 612 42. Torchilin VP (2012). *Advanced drug delivery reviews* 64:302-315
 613 43. Schlegel HB (1982). *Journal of computational chemistry* 3 (2):214-218
 614 44. Perdew JP, Ernzerhof M, Burke K (1996). *The Journal of chemical physics* 105 (22):9982-9985
 615 45. Adamo C, Barone V (1999). *The Journal of chemical physics* 110 (13):6158-6170
 616 46. Perdew JP, Burke K, Ernzerhof M (1996). *Physical review letters* 77 (18):3865
 617 47. Zhao Y, Truhlar DG (2008). *Theoretical chemistry accounts* 120 (1):215-241
 618 48. Zhao Y, Truhlar DG (2006). *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* 110 (49):13126-13130
 619 49. Chai J-D, Head-Gordon M (2008). *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* 10 (44):6615-6620
 620 50. Grimme S (2006). *Journal of computational chemistry* 27 (15):1787-1799
 621 51. Grimme S, Antony J, Ehrlich S, Krieg H (2010). *The Journal of chemical physics* 132 (15):154104
 622 52. Grimme S, Ehrlich S, Goerigk L (2011). *Journal of computational chemistry* 32 (7):1456-1465
 623 53. Frisch MJ, Trucks GW, Schlegel HB, Scuseria GE, Robb MA, Cheeseman JR, Scalmani G, Barone V,
 624 Petersson GA, Nakatsuji H, Li X, Caricato M, Marenich AV, Bloino J, Janesko BG, Gomperts R, Mennucci
 625 B, Hratchian HP, Ortiz JV, Izmaylov AF, Sonnenberg JL, Williams, Ding F, Lipparini F, Egidi F, Goings J,
 626 Peng B, Petrone A, Henderson T, Ranasinghe D, Zakrzewski VG, Gao J, Rega N, Zheng G, Liang W, Hada
 627 M, Ehara M, Toyota K, Fukuda R, Hasegawa J, Ishida M, Nakajima T, Honda Y, Kitao O, Nakai H, Vreven T,
 628 Throssell K, Montgomery Jr. JA, Peralta JE, Ogliaro F, Bearpark MJ, Heyd JJ, Brothers EN, Kudin KN,

629 Staroverov VN, Keith TA, Kobayashi R, Normand J, Raghavachari K, Rendell AP, Burant JC, Iyengar SS,
 630 Tomasi J, Cossi M, Millam JM, Klene M, Adamo C, Cammi R, Ochterski JW, Martin RL, Morokuma K,
 631 Farkas O, Foresman JB, Fox DJ (2016) Gaussian 16 Rev. C.01. Wallingford, CT
 632 54. Binning Jr R, Curtiss L (1990). Journal of Computational Chemistry 11 (10):1206-1216
 633 55. Curtiss LA, McGrath MP, Blaudeau JP, Davis NE, Binning Jr RC, Radom L (1995). The Journal of
 634 Chemical Physics 103 (14):6104-6113
 635 56. Frisch MJ, Pople JA, Binkley JS (1984). The Journal of chemical physics 80 (7):3265-3269
 636 57. Hay PJ (1977). The Journal of Chemical Physics 66 (10):4377-4384
 637 58. J.-P. Blaudeau MPM, L. A. Curtiss, and L. Radom (1997). J Chem Phys 107:5016-5021
 638 59. K. Raghavachari JSB, R. Seeger, and J. A. Pople (1980). J Chem Phys 72 650-654
 639 60. McGrath MP, Radom L (1991). The Journal of Chemical Physics 94 (1):511-516
 640 61. Raghavachari K, Trucks GW (1989). The Journal of chemical physics 91 (2):1062-1065
 641 62. Russo TV, Martin RL, Hay PJ (1994). The Journal of chemical physics 101 (9):7729-7737
 642 63. Goerigk L, Grimme S (2011). Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics 13 (14):6670-6688
 643 64. Mardirossian N, Head-Gordon M (2017). Molecular Physics 115 (19):2315-2372
 644 65. Brakestad A, Jensen SR, Wind P, D'Alessandro M, Genovese L, Hopmann KH, Frediani L (2020).
 645 Journal of chemical theory and computation 16 (8):4874-4882
 646 66. Mitra H, Roy TK (2020). The Journal of Physical Chemistry A 124 (44):9203-9221
 647 67. Goerigk L, Hansen A, Bauer C, Ehrlich S, Najibi A, Grimme S (2017). Physical Chemistry Chemical
 648 Physics 19 (48):32184-32215
 649 68. Dennington R, Keith TA, Millam JM (2016). Semichem Inc Shawnee Mission KS
 650 69. Andrienko G (2010) Chemcraft. Graphical Software for Visualization of Quantum Chemistry
 651 Computations. <https://www.chemcraftprog.com>,
 652 70. Foster AJ, Weinhold F (1980). Journal of the American Chemical Society 102 (24):7211-7218
 653 71. Reed AE, Weinhold F (1983). The Journal of chemical physics 78 (6):4066-4073
 654 72. Carpenter J, Weinhold F (1988). Journal of Molecular Structure: THEOCHEM 169:41-62
 655 73. Lu T, Chen F (2012). Journal of computational chemistry 33 (5):580-592
 656 74. O'boyle NM, Tenderholt AL, Langner KM (2008). Journal of computational chemistry 29 (5):839-845
 657 75. Mayer I, Valiron P (1998). The Journal of chemical physics 109 (9):3360-3373
 658 76. Boys SF, Bernardi F (1970). Molecular Physics 19 (4):553-566
 659 77. Alkorta I, Trujillo C, Elguero J, Solimannejad M (2011). Computational and Theoretical Chemistry 967
 660 (1):147-151
 661 78. Thomas LH The calculation of atomic fields. In: Mathematical proceedings of the Cambridge
 662 philosophical society, 1927. vol 5. Cambridge University Press, pp 542-548
 663 79. Fermi E (1927). Rend Accad Naz Lincei 6 (602-607):5
 664 80. Dirac PA Note on exchange phenomena in the Thomas atom. In: Mathematical proceedings of the
 665 Cambridge philosophical society, 1930. vol 3. Cambridge University Press, pp 376-385
 666 81. Slater JC (1951). Physical review 81 (3):385
 667 82. Hohenberg P, Kohn W (1964). Physical review 136 (3B):B864
 668 83. Kohn W, Sham LJ (1965). Physical review 140 (4A):A1133
 669 84. Becke AD (2014). The Journal of chemical physics 140 (18):18A301
 670 85. Burke K, Wagner LO (2013). International Journal of Quantum Chemistry 113 (2):96-101
 671 86. Becke AD (1988). Physical review A 38 (6):3098
 672 87. Gill PM (1996). Molecular Physics 89 (2):433-445
 673 88. Vosko SH, Wilk L, Nusair M (1980). Canadian Journal of physics 58 (8):1200-1211
 674 89. Perdew JP (1986). Physical Review B 33 (12):8822
 675 90. Lee C, Yang W, Parr RG (1988). Physical review B 37 (2):785
 676 91. Perdew JP, Zunger A (1981). Physical Review B 23 (10):5048

677 92. Cole LA, Perdew J (1982). Physical Review A 25 (3):1265
 678 93. Perdew JP, Wang Y (1992). Physical review B 45 (23):13244
 679 94. Becke AD (1997). The Journal of chemical physics 107 (20):8554-8560
 680 95. Perdew JP, Chevary JA, Vosko SH, Jackson KA, Pederson MR, Singh DJ, Fiolhais C (1992). Physical
 681 review B 46 (11):6671
 682 96. Paier J, Marsman M, Kresse G (2007). The Journal of chemical physics 127 (2):024103
 683 97. Yanai T, Tew DP, Handy NC (2004). Chemical physics letters 393 (1-3):51-57
 684 98. Leininger T, Stoll H, Werner H-J, Savin A (1997). Chemical physics letters 275 (3-4):151-160
 685 99. Bhatta RS, Pellicane G, Tsige M (2015). Computational and Theoretical Chemistry 1070:14-20
 686 100. Sekar N, Katariya S, Rhyman L, Alswaidan IA, Ramasami P (2019). Journal of fluorescence 29
 687 (1):241-253
 688 101. Tao J, Perdew JP, Staroverov VN, Scuseria GE (2003). Physical Review Letters 91 (14):146401
 689 102. PubChem database, <https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>, 2021.
 690 103. Kohl D (1990). Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical 1 (1-6):158-165
 691 104. Foresman JB, Frisch A (1996).
 692 105. MOHAMMADI MD, ABDULLAH HY, BISKOS G, BHOWMICK S (2021). Bulletin of Materials Science 44
 693 106. Mohammadi MD, Abdullah HY, Suvitha A (2021). Iranian Journal of Science and Technology,
 694 Transactions A: Science. doi:10.1007/s40995-021-01117-0
 695 107. Geerlings P, De Proft F, Langenaeker W (2003). Chemical reviews 103 (5):1793-1874
 696 108. Islam N, Kaya S (2018) Conceptual density functional theory and its application in the chemical
 697 domain. CRC Press,
 698 109. Chermette H (1999). Journal of computational chemistry 20 (1):129-154
 699 110. Pearson RG (2005). Journal of Chemical Sciences 117 (5):369-377
 700 111. Ayers PW, Anderson JS, Bartolotti LJ (2005). International Journal of Quantum Chemistry 101
 701 (5):520-534
 702 112. Bultinck P, Cardenas C, Fuentealba P, Johnson PA, Ayers PW (2013). Journal of chemical theory and
 703 computation 9 (11):4779-4788
 704 113. Bultinck P, Cardenas C, Fuentealba P, Johnson PA, Ayers PW (2014). Journal of chemical theory and
 705 computation 10 (1):202-210
 706 114. Parr RG, Donnelly RA, Levy M, Palke WE (1978). The Journal of Chemical Physics 68 (8):3801-3807
 707 115. Parr RG, Pearson RG (1983). Journal of the American chemical society 105 (26):7512-7516
 708 116. Parr RG, Yang W (1984). Journal of the American Chemical Society 106 (14):4049-4050
 709 117. Yang W, Parr RG, Pucci R (1984). The Journal of Chemical Physics 81 (6):2862-2863
 710 118. Morell C, Grand A, Toro-Labbe A (2005). The Journal of Physical Chemistry A 109 (1):205-212
 711 119. Levy M (1982). Physical Review A 26 (3):1200
 712 120. Parr RG, Szentpály Lv, Liu S (1999). Journal of the American Chemical Society 121 (9):1922-1924
 713 121. Bredas J-L (2014). Materials Horizons 1 (1):17-19
 714 122. Koopmans T (1934). physica 1 (1-6):104-113
 715 123. Janak J (1978). Physical Review B 18 (12):7165
 716 124. Schmidt MW, Hull EA, Windus TL (2015). The Journal of Physical Chemistry A 119 (41):10408-10427
 717 125. Mulliken RS (1932). Physical Review 41 (1):49
 718 126. Löwdin P-O (1955). Physical Review 97 (6):1474
 719 127. Coulson CA (1939). Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series A Mathematical and Physical
 720 Sciences 169 (938):413-428
 721 128. Mulliken RS (1955). The Journal of Chemical Physics 23 (10):1833-1840
 722 129. Mayer I (1983). Chemical Physics Letters 97 (3):270-274
 723 130. Mayer I (2012). Chemical Physics Letters 544:83-86

724 131. Bridgeman AJ, Cavigliasso G, Ireland LR, Rothery J (2001). Journal of the Chemical Society, Dalton
 725 Transactions (14):2095-2108
 726 132. Wiberg KB (1968). Tetrahedron 24 (3):1083-1096
 727 133. Sizova OV, Skripnikov LV, Sokolov AY (2008). Journal of Molecular Structure: THEOCHEM 870 (1-
 728 3):1-9
 729 134. Bader RF (1985). Accounts of Chemical Research 18 (1):9-15
 730 135. Bader R (1990) A Quantum Theory, Clarendon. Oxford,
 731 136. Bader RFW, Popelier PLA, Keith TA (1994). Angewandte Chemie International Edition in English 33
 732 (6):620-631
 733 137. Matta CF (2006) Hydrogen–hydrogen bonding: the non-electrostatic limit of closed-shell interaction
 734 between two hydro. In: Hydrogen Bonding—New Insights. Springer, pp 337-375
 735 138. Grabowski SJ (2012). The Journal of Physical Chemistry A 116 (7):1838-1845
 736 139. Bohórquez HJ, Boyd RJ, Matta CF (2011). The Journal of Physical Chemistry A 115 (45):12991-12997
 737 140. Johnson ER, Keinan S, Mori-Sánchez P, Contreras-García J, Cohen AJ, Yang W (2010). Journal of the
 738 American Chemical Society 132 (18):6498-6506
 739 141. Contreras-García J, Johnson ER, Keinan S, Chaudret R, Piquemal J-P, Beratan DN, Yang W (2011).
 740 Journal of chemical theory and computation 7 (3):625-632
 741