#### Supplementary Information for

# The photoelectron spectrum of CCl<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>: The convergence of theory and experiment after a decade of debate

## Scott W. Wren, <sup>a</sup> Kristen M. Vogelhuber, <sup>a</sup> Kent M. Ervin, <sup>b</sup> W. Carl Lineberger\*<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> JILA and Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Colorado, 440 UCB, Boulder, CO 80309, USA. E-mail: <u>wcl@jila.colorado.edu</u>

<sup>b</sup>JILA Visiting Fellow, 2008; Permanent Address: Department of Chemistry and Chemical Physics Program, University of Nevada, Reno, NV 89557-0216, USA.

## I. Geometries, frequencies, and normal mode vectors used in simulations.

 
 Table S1
 Spectroscopic quantities and molecular constants used in the simulation of the
photoelectron spectrum of CCl<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>. All calculations for CCl<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> and CCl<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> used the Gaussian 03 software package and the CCSD(T)/aug-cc-pVTZ method and basis set.

		<i>r</i> /Å	$oldsymbol{ heta}$ /°	$v_1 / \text{cm}^{-1}$	$x_{11}$ /cm <sup>-1</sup>	$v_2$ /cm <sup>-1</sup>	$x_{22}/\text{cm}^{-1}$	$v_{3}/cm^{-1}$
CCb-	Calculated	1.892	103.75	547.612		243.338		463.312
$X^2 \mathbf{B}_1$	Best Fit	1.90(2) <sup><i>a</i></sup>	104(2) <sup><i>a</i></sup>	547.612	0.0	243.338	0.0	463.312
CCl <sub>2</sub>	Calculated	1.729	109.02	728.652		333.692		758.091
$X^{1}A_{1}$	Experimental	1.714(1) <sup>b</sup>	109.3(1) <sup>b</sup>	731.14(22) <sup><i>c</i></sup>	-3.34(3) <sup>c</sup>	335.80(1) <sup>c</sup>	-0.305(8) <sup>c</sup>	745 <sup>d</sup>
CCl <sub>2</sub>	Calculated	1.684	127.40	681.635		296.845		992.617
$a^{3}B_{1}$	Best Fit	1.69(10)	127(10)	681.635	2.8	296.845	0.5	992.617

<sup>*a*</sup> The "best fit" geometry reflects the geometry change between anion and neutral that yields the best agreement between the simulated and experimental spectra. Changing the anion harmonic frequencies has little effect on the simulated spectra; thus, the DFT computed frequencies were used.

 $^{b}$ LIF<sup>1</sup>

<sup>*c*</sup> Dispersed fluorescence<sup>2</sup> <sup>*d*</sup> Excitation matrix<sup>3</sup>

Table S2    J-Matrices and K-vectors extracted from the CCSD(T)/aug-cc-pVTZ output from
Gaussian 03 used in the simulation of $CCl_2^-$ computed with PESCAL.

Oddb								
	J-Matrix				$\text{CCl}_2^-/\text{cm}^{-1}$	CCl <sub>2</sub> /cm <sup>-1</sup>	K-Vector/(g/mol) <sup>-1/2</sup> Å	
CCl <sub>2</sub>	0.993	-0.114	0.000	<i>v</i> <sub>1</sub>	547.612	728.651	-0.660613	
$X^{1}\overline{A_{1}}$	0.141	0.993	0.000	$v_2$	243.337	333.692	-0.539615	
	0.000	0.000	0.996	$v_3$	463.312	758.090	0.000000	
CCl <sub>2</sub>	0.952	305	0.000	<i>v</i> <sub>1</sub>	547.612	681.634	-1.275341	
$a^{3}B_{1}$	0.305	0.952	0.000	$v_2$	243.337	296.844	0.476681	
	0.000	0.000	0.994	$v_3$	463.312	992.616	0.000000	

Table S3	Normal Mode	· Vectors of CCl2	extracted from t	he CCSD(T)	/aug-cc-pVTZ	output
from Gau	ssian 03.					

	$\boldsymbol{v}_1$	$v_2$	$v_3$
CC <sup>1</sup>	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\mathbf{Y}^{2}\mathbf{B}$	0.000	0.000	0.956
	0.963	-0.335	0.000
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	0.098	0.664	-0.164
	-0.165	0.057	0.129
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	-0.098	-0.664	-0.164
	-0.165	0.057	-0.129
CCh	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\mathbf{X}^{1}\mathbf{\Delta}$	0.000	0.000	0.958
	0.950	-0.480	0.000
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	0.149	0.615	-0.164
	-0.163	0.082	0.117
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	-0.149	-0.615	-0.164
	-0.163	0.082	-0.117
CCl <sub>2</sub>	0.000	0.000	0.000
$a^{3}\mathbf{R}_{1}$	0.000	0.000	0.965
	0.913	-0.672	0.000
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	0.241	0.511	-0.166
	-0.157	0.115	0.082
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	-0.241	-0.511	-0.166
	-0.157	0.115	-0.082

**Table S4** Spectroscopic quantities and molecular constants used in the simulation of the photoelectron spectrum of  $CBr_2^-$ .

		<i>r</i> /Å	$oldsymbol{ heta}$ /°	$v_1/\text{cm}^{-1}$	$x_{11}$ /cm <sup>-1</sup>	$v_2$ /cm <sup>-1</sup>	$x_{22}/\text{cm}^{-1}$	$v_3$ /cm <sup>-1</sup>
$CBr_2^-$ $V^2P$	Calculated Best Fit	2.100 $2.09(2)^{a}$	106.36 105(4) <sup>a</sup>	455.786 455.786	0.0	129.655 129.655	0.0	365.775 365.775
$\frac{\mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}_1}{\mathbf{CBr}_2}$ $X^1 \mathbf{A}_1$	Calculated Experimental	1.911 1.865 <sup>b</sup>	110.68 110.7 <sup>b</sup>	589.1 606.6(4) <sup>c</sup>	-2.01(4) <sup>c</sup>	190.082 199.5 <sup>c</sup>	 -1.49(1) <sup>c</sup>	616.314 679.8(7) <sup>c</sup>
$CBr_2$	Calculated	1.839	129.5	533.6		185.4		878.7

a <sup>3</sup> $\mathbf{B}_1$ 

<sup>*a*</sup> The "best fit" geometry reflects the geometry change between anion and neutral that yields the best agreement between the simulated and experimental spectra. Absolute geometries are determined using as reference the experimental LIF geometrical parameters<sup>4</sup> of  $CBr_2 X {}^1A_1$ . Changing the anion harmonic frequencies has little effect on the simulated spectra; thus, the DFT computed frequencies were used.

<sup>b</sup> Combined LIF<sup>4</sup> and Theory<sup>5</sup>

<sup>c</sup> Single Vibronic Level Emission<sup>6</sup>

		J-Matrix			$CBr_2^-/cm^{-1}$	CBr <sub>2</sub> /cm <sup>-1</sup>	K-Vector/(g/mol) <sup>-1/2</sup> Å
CBr <sub>2</sub>	0.999	-0.044	0.000	<i>v</i> <sub>1</sub>	455.786	589.135	-0.797633
$X^{1}A_{1}$	0.044	0.999	0.000	$v_2$	129.655	190.081	-1.262737
	0.000	0.000	1.000	$v_3$	365.775	616.313	0.000000
CBr <sub>2</sub>	0.982	-0.188	0.000	$v_1$	455.786	509.051	-1.583948
$a^{3}B_{1}$	0.188	0.982	0.000	$v_2$	129.655	183.106	0.195075
<i>w D</i> <sub>1</sub>	0.000	0.000	0.997	$v_3$	365.775	830.998	0.000000

**Table S5** J-Matrices and K-vectors extracted from the B3LYP/6-311++G\*\* output from Gaussian 03 used in the simulation of  $CBr_2^-$  computed with PESCAL.

**Table S6** Normal Mode Vectors of  $CBr_2^-$  computed with PESCAL using B3LYP/6-311++G\*\* output.

	<i>v</i> <sub>1</sub>	$v_2$	<i>v</i> <sub>3</sub>
CBr <sub>2</sub>	0.000	0.000	0.000
$X^2 B_1$	0.000	0.000	0.991
	0.992	-0.388	0.000
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	0.048	0.651	-0.075
	-0.075	0.029	0.056
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	-0.048	-0.651	-0.075
	-0.075	0.029	-0.056
CBr <sub>2</sub>	0.000	0.000	0.000
$X^{1}A_{1}$	0.000	0.000	0.992
	0.991	-0.471	0.000
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	0.061	0.623	-0.075
	-0.075	0.036	0.052
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	-0.061	-0.623	-0.075
	-0.075	0.036	-0.052
CBr <sub>2</sub>	0.000	0.000	0.000
$a^{3}B_{1}$	0.000	0.000	0.993
	0.983	-0.677	0.000
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	0.105	0.518	-0.075
	-0.075	0.051	0.035
	0.000	0.000	0.000
	-0.105	-0.518	-0.075
	-0.075	0.051	-0.035

## II. Expanded and enhanced figures.



Expanded view of CCl<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> contaminated photoelectron spectrum

Fig S1 Expanded view of the overlapping spectral features in the contaminated  $CCl_2^-$  and the authentic  $CDCl_2^-$  photoelectron spectra. The  $CDCl_2^-$  spectrum was normalized to match the peak intensities of several common peaks in both spectra, which can be seen in the top portion of Fig. S1.

Expanded view of  $CCl_2^- X^1A_1$  photoelectron spectrum



**Fig. S2** Expanded view of  $X^{1}A_{1}$  CCl<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>. All the resolved features are identified based on peak position, progression spacing, and agreement with the simulated spectrum. The inset is an expanded view of the cooled photoelectron spectrum with the corresponding simulation. The peak labels in red designate hot bands, and the solid arrows indicate the origin for  $X^{1}A_{1}$  CCl<sub>2</sub>.

CBr<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> photoelectron spectrum



**Fig. S3** Comparison of the best fit simulation and the corrected  $CBr_2^-$  spectrum, showing both the  $a {}^{3}B_{1}$  and  $X {}^{1}A_{1}$  states of  $CBr_2$ . The  $a {}^{3}B_{1}$  state is simulated using the electron affinity and vibrational frequencies calculated by Dyke *et al.*<sup>7</sup> The Franck-Condon factors for both the singlet and triplet states are calculated in the Morse oscillator, parallel mode approximation using numerically integrated Laguerre polynomial wavefunctions.

#### References

- <sup>1</sup> D. J. Clouthier and J. Karolczak, J. Chem. Phys., 1991, **94**, 1.
- <sup>2</sup> M. L. Liu, C. L. Lee, A. Bezant, G. Tarczay, R. J. Clark, T. A. Miller, and B. C. Chang, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2003, **5**, 1352.
- <sup>3</sup> V. E. Bondybey, *J. Mol. Spec.*, 1977, **64**, 180.
- <sup>4</sup> S. L. Xu and M. D. Harmony, J. Phys. Chem., 1993, **97**, 7465.
- <sup>5</sup> C. W. Bauschlicher, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1980, **102**, 5492.
- <sup>6</sup> C. Tao, C. Mukarakate, and S. A. Reid, *J. Mol. Spec.*, 2007, **246**, 113.
- <sup>7</sup> E. P. F. Lee, J. M. Dyke, and T. G. Wright, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 2000, **326**, 143.