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#### Abstract

The application to the $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}$ system entailed the crucial task of transforming the calculated eigenvectors to the symmetryadapted molecular orbitals. Absent this step, one could be in a quandary to interpret the varying orbital coefficients generated by the three methods. Moreover, the application provides a good example of that well-known property regarding eigenfunctions belonging to degenerate eigenvalues. And while group theory may be used to generate symmetry-adapted orbitals for the other macrocyclic systems, it can be a lengthy exercise requiring the construction of the character tables for the rotational subgroups. In this case, algorithms such as those employed in this paper may be considered as useful alternatives.
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The study of molecular structure and similar problems in chemistry often ends up in solving eigenvalue equations. For example, in molecular orbital theory, a molecular orbital $\psi_{\mathrm{k}}$ is approximated by a linear combination of basis orbitals $\phi_{\mathrm{m}}$ centered on the constituent atoms of the molecule, i.e.,

$$
\psi_{k}=\sum_{m=1}^{n} \phi_{m} c_{m k}
$$

Using the linear variation method and assuming the overlap matrix elements are given by

$$
\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\int \phi_{\mathrm{i}} \phi_{\mathrm{j}} \mathrm{~d} \tau=\delta_{\mathrm{ij}}
$$

as in the Huckel approximation, the resulting eigenvalue equation is given by

$$
\mathrm{HC}=\mathbf{C E}
$$

where $\mathbf{H}$ is the hamiltonian matrix in the $\phi$ basis, $\mathbf{C}$ is the coefficient or eigenvector matrix and $\mathbf{E}$ contains the orbital energies along its diagonal. Written as a similarity transformation, the eigenvalue equation becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{H C}=\mathbf{E}, \quad \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{C}=\mathbf{I} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix. The solution of eq $\mathbf{1}$ entails finding the matrices $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{E}$. In an earlier paper [1], we introduced the $\mathbf{R} \sigma$ diagonalization methods precisely to solve problems of this type.

## Application

The diagonalization methods were employed to study the carbocyclic systems $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{n}=1,12$, within the Huckel framework. To a first approximation we consider them as belonging to the $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{nh}}$ point group. Using the usual $\alpha, \beta$ no-
tation, the non-zero elements of the hamiltonian matrix are $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\mathrm{H}_{1 \mathrm{n}}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n} 1}=\alpha$, and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ji}}=\beta$, where i and j refer to adjacent carbon atoms. We can further simplify the matrix by setting $\alpha=0$ and $\beta=1$. This is equivalent to having $\alpha=0$ as the zero of the energy axis and expressing the energies in units of $\beta$. Note that $n$, which denotes the number of pi electrons, also indicates the dimension of the hamiltonian matrix and hence the number of eigenvalues and corresponding molecular orbitals to be determined.

We illustrate the results for $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ in Tables 1 to 4 . The calculated energies agree to six decmal places. What appears alarming are the varying molecular orbital coefficients corresponding to the doubly degenerate levels. These observations also hold for all the other carbocyclic systems studied. It may be added that perhaps this fact, in addition to the absence of unifom correction factors mentioned earlier [1], provide the basis for suspecting the Jacobi method as unreliable when it comes to eigenvector calculation. This, of course, is not the case.

The varying coefficients may be explained by the fact that the diagonalization methods yield non-unique molecular orbitals, i.e., if $\psi_{1}$ and $\psi_{2}$ are molecular orbitals belonging to a degenerate eigenvalue, then the linear combinations

$$
\psi_{1}^{\prime}=\mathrm{c}_{1} \psi_{1}+\mathrm{c}_{2} \psi_{2}, \quad \psi_{2}^{\prime}=\mathrm{c}_{1} \psi_{1}-\mathrm{c}_{2} \psi_{2},
$$

are also molecular orbitals or eigenfunctions belonging to the same eigenvalue. The coefficient $c_{1}$ and $c_{2}$ are completely arbitrary but are usually chosen so that $\psi_{1}$ and $\psi_{2}$ are orthonormal. To demonstrate this well-known property and in order to evaluate the accuracy of the coefficients shown in Tables 1 to 3, we consider the symmetryadapted molecular orbitals for each carbocyclic system. These orbitals, including the energies, are given in Cot$\operatorname{ton}(2)$ for $\mathrm{n}=3$ to 8 . For $\mathrm{n}=9$ to 12 , the character tables for the corresponding rotational subgroups $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}}$ had to be

Table 1. Calculated molecular orbital energies and coefficients using the Ro/A method for $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$.

| E | 2 | .6180342 | .6180341 | -1.618034 | -1.618034 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\psi_{1}$ | $\psi_{2}$ | $\psi_{3}$ | $\psi_{4}$ | $\psi_{5}$ |
| $\mathrm{c}_{1}$ | .4472136 | -.6307411 | $4.653777 \mathrm{E}-02$ | -.512743 | -.370263 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | .4472136 | -.2391698 | -.5854891 | .6324529 | $-1.833721 \mathrm{E}-03$ |
| $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ | .4472137 | .482926 | -.4083902 | -.5105874 | .3732301 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | .4472136 | .5376343 | .3330904 | .1936947 | -.602065 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{5}$ | .4472136 | -.1506496 | .6142511 | .1971826 | .6009316 |

Table 2. Calculated molecular orbital energies and coefficients using the $\mathrm{Ro} / \mathrm{B}$ method for $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$.

| E | 2 | .6180343 | .6180341 | -1.618034 | -1.618034 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\psi_{1}$ | $\psi_{2}$ | $\psi_{3}$ | $\psi_{4}$ | $\psi_{5}$ |
| $\mathrm{c}_{1}$ | .4472136 | -.6279685 | $7.520549 \mathrm{E}-02$ | -.5598758 | -.2941753 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | .4472136 | -.1225282 | -.620473 | .6258609 | $-9.109385 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ | .4472136 | .5522418 | -.3082681 | -.4527887 | .4415483 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | .4472137 | .4638323 | .4299529 | .1067663 | -.6233785 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{5}$ | .4472136 | -.2655775 | .5739935 | .2800371 | .5670795 |

Table 3. Calculated molecular orbital energies and coefficients using the Jacobi method for $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$.

| E | 2 | .6180342 | .6180339 | -1.618034 | -1.618034 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\psi_{1}$ | $\psi_{2}$ | $\psi_{3}$ | $\psi_{4}$ | $\psi_{5}$ |
| $\mathrm{c}_{1}$ | .4472136 | .2289218 | -.5895717 | $9.904171 \mathrm{E}-02$ | .6246525 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | .4472137 | -.4899752 | -.3999051 | -.447288 | -.4471392 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ | .4472137 | -.5317431 | .3424167 | .6246855 | $9.883391 \mathrm{E}-02$ |
| $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | .4472136 | .1613401 | .6115304 | -.5634743 | -.2872225 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{5}$ | .4472135 | .6314568 | $3.552972 \mathrm{E}-02$ | .287035 | .5635697 |

Table 4. Symmetry-adapted molecular orbitals calculated from Table 1. The three methods yield indentical results (to six decimal places) in complete agreement with symmetry-adapted orbitals obtained using group theory.

| E | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ \psi \mathrm{~A} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} .6180342 \\ \psi \mathrm{E}_{1} \mathrm{a} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} .6180341 \\ \psi \mathrm{E}_{1} \mathrm{~b} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.618034 \\ \psi \mathrm{E}_{2} \mathrm{a} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.618034 \\ \psi \mathrm{E}_{2} \mathrm{~b} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{c}_{1}$ | . 4472136 | . 6324556 | 0 | . 6324556 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | . 4472136 | . 1954396 | -. 6015008 | -. 5116673 | -. 371748 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ | . 4472137 | -. 5116673 | -. 3717482 | . 1954395 | . 6015011 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | . 4472136 | -. 5116672 | . 371748 | . 1954395 | -. 601501 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{5}$ | . 4472137 | . 1954394 | . 6015008 | . 5116672 | . 371748 |

constructed. Only the molecular orbital energies and coefficient for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{10}$ are shown in Table 5 for purposes of brevity. The objective is to show that the figures in Tables 1 to 3 , as well as those for the other systems, lead to symme-try-adapted coefficients that are in complete agreement with those in Tables 4, 5 and the above-mentioned reference.

Inspection of the molecular orbitals of the type $\psi_{\mathrm{Ea}}$ and $\psi_{\mathrm{Eb}}$ reveals the following: the coefficient of the basis orbital $\varnothing_{1}$ in $\psi_{\text {Ea }}$ is equal to $\sqrt{2 / n}$; whereas it is equal to zero for molecular orbitals of the type $\psi_{\mathrm{Eb}}$. We may therefore do the following transformation: let $\psi_{\mathrm{k}}$ and $\psi_{i}$ be the orthonormal molecular orbitals corresponding to a doubly degenerate eigenvalue as calculated by any of the diagonalization methods.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{\mathrm{k}}=\sum_{\mathrm{m}} \phi_{\mathrm{m}} \mathbf{c}_{\mathrm{m} \mathbf{k}}, \quad \psi_{i}=\sum_{\mathrm{m}} \phi_{\mathrm{m}} \mathbf{c}_{\mathrm{m} \ell} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We then form the linear combinations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{\mathrm{Ea}}(\mathrm{k})=\frac{\mathrm{b} \psi_{\mathrm{k}}+\psi_{\ell}}{\sqrt{1+\mathrm{b}^{2}}}, \quad \psi_{\mathrm{Eb}}(\boldsymbol{\ell})=\frac{\psi_{\mathrm{k}}+\mathrm{b} \psi_{\ell}}{\sqrt{1+\mathrm{b}^{2}}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The constant b is chosen so that $\psi_{\mathrm{Ea}}$ and $\psi_{\mathrm{Eb}}$ orthonormal. Using eq 2 and considering only the coefficient of $\phi_{1}$ in $\psi_{\mathrm{Eb}}$, we obtain

$$
\mathrm{b}=\mathrm{c}_{1 \mathrm{k}} / \mathrm{c}_{1 c} .
$$

The coefficient of $\phi_{1}$ in $\psi_{\text {Ea }}$ is

$$
\frac{\mathrm{bc}_{1 \mathrm{k}}+\mathrm{c}_{1 \ell}}{\sqrt{1+\mathrm{b}^{2}}}=\sqrt{\frac{2}{\mathrm{n}}}
$$

which may be written as

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{c}_{1 \mathrm{k}}{ }^{2}+\mathrm{c}_{12}^{2}}}=\sqrt{\frac{2}{\mathrm{n}}}
$$

With these results, the symmetry-adapted molecular orbitals are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \psi_{\mathrm{Ea}}^{(\mathrm{k})}=\sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{n}}{2}} \quad\left(\mathrm{c}_{1 \mathrm{k}} \psi_{\mathrm{k}}+\mathrm{c}_{1 \ell} \psi_{\ell}\right)  \tag{4}\\
& \psi_{\mathrm{Eb}}^{(\ell)}=\sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{n}}{2}} \quad\left(\mathrm{c}_{1 \ell} \psi_{\mathrm{k}}+\mathrm{c}_{1 \mathrm{k}} \psi_{\ell}\right) \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

Substituting eq 2 into eqs $4-5$ yields the orbital coefficients for the $\psi_{\mathrm{Ea}}$ and $\psi_{\mathrm{Eb}}$-type molecular orbitals,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \psi_{\mathrm{Ea}}^{(\mathrm{k})}=\sum_{\mathrm{m}} \phi_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{mk}}, \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{mk}}=\sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{n}}{2}} \quad\left(\mathrm{c}_{1 \mathrm{k}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{mk}}+\mathrm{c}_{1 \ell} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{m} \ell}\right)  \tag{6}\\
& \psi_{\mathrm{Ea}}^{(\ell)}=\sum_{\mathrm{m}} \phi_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{m} \ell}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{m} \ell}=\sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{n}}{2}} \quad\left(\mathrm{c}_{1 \ell} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{mk}}-\mathrm{c}_{1 \mathrm{k}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{m} \ell}\right) \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

Table 4 gives the symmetry-adapted coefficients for $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ calculated according to eqs 6-7. Except for a multiplicative factor of -1 for some molecular orbitals, the fig-

Table 5. Symmetry-adapted molecular orbital energies and coefficients for $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{10}$ obtained using group theory.

| E | 2 | $\varepsilon_{1}{ }^{1}$ | $\varepsilon_{1}$ | $\varepsilon_{2}$ | $\varepsilon_{2}$ | $\varepsilon_{3}$ | $\varepsilon_{3}$ | $\varepsilon_{4}$ | $\varepsilon_{4}$ | -2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\psi_{\mathrm{A}}^{2}$ | $\psi_{\text {E1a }}$ | $\psi_{\text {E1b }}$ | $\psi_{\text {E2a }}$ | $\psi_{\text {E2b }}$ | $\psi_{\text {E3a }}$ | $\psi_{\text {E3b }}$ | $\psi_{\text {E4a }}$ | $\psi_{\text {E4b }}$ | $\psi_{\mathrm{B}}$ |
| $\mathrm{c}_{1}{ }^{3}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | 1 | $\mathrm{c}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{4}$ | -1 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ | 1 | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{2}$ | 1 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | 1 | $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{1}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ | -1 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{5}$ | 1 | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{4}$ | 1 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{6}$ | 1 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{7}$ | 1 | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{4}$ | 1 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{8}$ | 1 | $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{2}$ | -1 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{9}$ | 1 | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ | 1 |
| $\mathrm{c}_{10}$ | 1 | $\mathrm{c}_{1}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{2}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{3}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{c}_{4}$ | $-\mathrm{s}_{4}$ | -1 |

[^0]ures are in complete accord with the orbital coefficients obtained using group theory. The same agreement is obtained for all the carocyclic systems studied, including $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{10}$ as shown in Table 5. We may therefore conclude that the eigenvectors calculated by the R diagonalization methods, the Jacobi scheme as well, are accurate.

Examples of eqs 4-5, using results for $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ in Table 1, are given by the following equations,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \psi_{\mathrm{E} 1 \mathrm{a}}=-.9972892 \psi_{2}+7.358268 \mathrm{E}-02 \psi_{3} \\
& \psi_{\mathrm{E} 1 \mathrm{~b}}=7.358268 \mathrm{E}-02 \psi_{2}+.9972892 \psi_{3} \\
& \psi_{\mathrm{E} 2 \mathrm{a}}=-.8107179 \psi_{4}-.5854372 \psi_{5} \\
& \psi_{\mathrm{E} 2 \mathrm{~b}}=-.5854372 \psi_{4}+.8107179 \psi_{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Orbital, Total and Delocalization Energies

Figure 1 illustrates a summary of the orbital energies in units of $\beta$ for the $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}$ systems. The following observations are noted:

1. The lowest energy for any system is 2 . This is associated with a strongly bonding orbital $\psi_{\mathrm{A}}$.
2. For n odd, there are ( $\mathrm{n}-1$ ) /2 doubly degenerate energy levels.
3. For $n$ even, the highest energy is -2 , associated with a strongly anti-bonding orbital $\psi_{\mathrm{B}}$. There are ( $\mathrm{n}-2$ ) /2 doubly degenerate energy levels.
4. The energy levels are ordered as follows:

$$
\mathrm{A}<\mathrm{E}_{1}<\mathrm{E}_{2}<. .<\mathrm{B} .
$$

From group theory, it can be shown that the energy of a doubly degenerate level $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k}}$ is given by $[3,4]$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k}}\right)=2 \cos \mathrm{k} \omega, \omega=2 \pi / \mathrm{n} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The numerical results obtained from any of the diagonalization methods agree with eq 8 for all the $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}$ systems. This further establishes the accuracy of the $R$ and Jacobi algorithms.

The total and the delocalization energies are given in Table 6. The total energy $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{T}}$ is given by

$$
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{T}}=2 \varepsilon(\mathrm{~A})+\mathrm{n}_{1} \varepsilon\left(\mathrm{E}_{1}\right)+\mathrm{n}_{2} \varepsilon\left(\mathrm{E}_{2}\right)+\mathrm{n}_{3} \varepsilon\left(\mathrm{E}_{3}\right)
$$



Figure 1. Energy level diagrams for the $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}$ systems.


Figure 2. Total energy of the $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}$ systems including the molecular ions: + denotes $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}{ }^{+} ;-, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}} ; 0, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}$, 0 , refers to both cation and anion; $\oplus$, refers to molecular ions and neutral species together.
where $n_{k}$ is the population of the $\varepsilon\left(\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{k}}\right)$ energy level. Note that the highest occupied energy level is $\varepsilon\left(\mathrm{E}_{3}\right)$ for $\mathrm{n}=11$, 12. The delocalization energy is

$$
\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{D}}=\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{T}}-\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{L}}
$$

where $E_{L}$ is the total energy corresponding to a cyclic structure where no resonance is allowed to occur. The hamiltonian matrix corresponding to such a structure is block-diagonal with nonvanishing elements $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}, 1+1}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}+1, \mathrm{i}}=$ $1, i=1,3,5, \ldots$ For $n$ even, there are $n / 2$ block matrices of dimension 2 x 2 . For n odd, there are $(\mathrm{n}-1) / 2$ block 2 x 2 matrices, the remaining 1 x 1 matrix being the diagonal element $\mathrm{Hnn}=0$. The diagonalization of these matrices can be done by inspection as discussed in ref. 1 (Ro/A, case 1) since $H_{p p}=H_{q q}=0$. Thus, for $n$ odd, the energies are 1,0 and -1 with degeneracies ( $\mathrm{n}-1$ ) /2, 1 and ( $\mathrm{n}-1$ ) /2 respectively. For $n$ even, the energies are 1 and -1 , the degen-
eracy of each of which is $n / 2$. For $n$ odd, a pi electron occupies the zero energy level (a non-bonding orbital) while the rest are in the lowest ( $n-1$ ) / 2 degenerate levels. $E_{L}$ therefore for this case is $2 x((n-1) / 2) \times 1$ or $E_{L}=n-1$. For $n$ even, all the pi electrons are paired in the lowest $n / 2$ degenerate levels. This given $E_{L}=2 \times(n / 2) \times 1=n$.

It is instructive to plot the total energies $E_{T}$ as a function of the ring size as shown in Figure 2. It is immediately apparent that the carbocyclic systems group themselves according to what we may call an $n+4$ rule, $n=3,4$, $5, \ldots$ Thus, $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{7}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{11}$ have the same energy distribution among their neutral and ionic species. The same can be said about $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}, \mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{8}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12}$, the group $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{9}$, and still another group $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{10}$. That such grouping occur can be best understood by referring to Figure 1. It is clear that each group is characterized by similar energy level diagram. For instance, following the $\mathrm{n}+4$ rule with $\mathrm{n}=3$, a single pi electron occupies an anti-bonding orbital, while the rest are held in strongly bonding orbitals; this also obtains for $\mathrm{n}=7$ and 11. We

Table 6. Total and delocalization energies in units of .

| System | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{D}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}{ }^{+}$ | 4 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}$ | 3 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}$ | 2 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}{ }^{+}$ | 4 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$. | 4 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ | 4 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}{ }^{+}$ | 5.236 | 1.236 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$. | 5.854 | 1.854 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ | 6.472 | 2.472 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}{ }^{+}$ | 7 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$. | 8 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ | 7 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{7}{ }^{+}$ | 8.988 | 2.988 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{7}$ | 8.543 | 2.543 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{7}$ | 8.098 | 2.098 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{8}{ }^{+}$ | 9.657 | 1.657 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{8}$. | 9.657 | 1.657 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{8}$ | 9.657 | 1.657 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{9}{ }^{+}$ | 10.823 | 2.823 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{9}$. | 11.170 | 3.170 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{9}$ | 11.518 | 3.518 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{10}{ }^{+}$ | 12.326 | 2.326 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{10}$. | 12.944 | 2.944 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{10}$ | 12.326 | 2.326 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{11}{ }^{+}$ | ' 14.053 | 4.053 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{11}$. | 13.769 | 3.769 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{11}$. | 13.484 | 3.484 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12}{ }^{+}$ | 14.928 | 2.928 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12}{ }^{+}$ | 14.928 | 2.928 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12}$ | 14.928 | 2.928 |

also note the $n=4 x+2, x=1,2,3, .$. rule, where $x$ refers to the number of fully occupied $E_{k}$ levels, as indeed operative for the group that includes benzene. This indicates that carbocyclic systems with $n=6,10, \ldots$ possess aromatic character.

The more stable species of the various $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}$ systems are also clear from Figure 2. Because $E_{L}$ is the same for a given $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}}$ system, the species with the lowest energy is thus most stable. For $n$ odd, the stable species are $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}+$, $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}-, \mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{7}+, \mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{9}$ - and $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{11}+$. Note the alternating ionic forms. For $n$ even, the neutral species are the more stable structures. These results are also indicated by the values o $E_{D}$ in Table 6.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1} \varepsilon \mathrm{k}=2 \cos \mathrm{k} \omega, \omega=2 \pi / 10$.
    ${ }^{2}$ The normalization constant for $\psi_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\psi_{\mathrm{B}}$ is $\sqrt{ } 1 / 10$; it is equal to $\sqrt{ } 2 / 10$ for all the $\psi_{\mathrm{E}}$-type molecular orbitals.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{k}}$ in the first column refers to the expansion coefficients $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{m} i}$ in $\psi_{i}=\Sigma \phi_{\mathrm{m}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{m} i}$. In the inner columns, $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{k}}=\operatorname{cosk} \omega$ and $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{k}}=\operatorname{sink} \omega$. To obtain the numerical values of $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{m} i}$ multiply the entries in a given column by the appropriate normalization constant.

