

Communication: Systematic shifts of the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital peak in x-ray absorption for a series of 3d metal porphyrins

J. M. García-Lastra,^{1,2,a)} P. L. Cook,³ F. J. Himpsel,³ and A. Rubio^{1,4}

¹*Dpto. Física de Materiales, Nano-Bio Spectroscopy Group and ETSF Scientific Development Centre, Centro de Física de Materiales CSIC-UPV-MPC and DIPC, Universidad del País Vasco, Av. Tolosa 72, E-20018 San Sebastián, Spain*

²*Department of Physics, Center for Atomic-scale Materials Design, Technical University of Denmark, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark*

³*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin Madison, 1150 University Ave., Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA*

⁴*Fritz-Haber-Institut der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Faradayweg 4-6, D-14195, Berlin, Germany*

(Received 21 July 2010; accepted 15 September 2010; published online 20 October 2010)

Porphyrins are widely used as dye molecules in solar cells. Knowing the energies of their frontier orbitals is crucial for optimizing the energy level structure of solar cells. We use near edge x-ray absorption fine structure (NEXAFS) spectroscopy to obtain the energy of the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) with respect to the N_{1s} core level of the molecule. A systematic energy shift of the N_{1s} to LUMO transition is found along a series of 3d metal octaethylporphyrins and explained by density functional theory. It is mainly due to a shift of the N_{1s} level rather than a shift of the LUMO or a change in the electron-hole interaction of the core exciton. © 2010 American Institute of Physics. [doi:10.1063/1.3497188]

Metalloporphyrins form an important class of conjugated chromophores in which a central 3d metal atom is surrounded by ligands with nitrogen atoms as nearest neighbors.¹ They play a major role in many biological processes such as oxygen binding (hemoglobin) and photosynthesis (chlorophyll). Furthermore, there is a growing interest in developing dye-sensitized photovoltaic devices using porphyrins due to their relative low cost and tunable properties.^{2–6} The idea is to reproduce the light-harvesting and charge transfer properties of biomolecules in simpler organic molecules. The frontier orbitals of the porphyrins (particularly their energies and wave functions) are critical for an optimum efficiency of the photochemical reactions.

The lowest unoccupied orbital (LUMO) is accessible experimentally by near edge x-ray absorption fine structure (NEXAFS) spectroscopy, which detects optical transitions from a core level to unoccupied valence orbitals. In an organic solar cell the LUMO influences the band gap that determines the optical absorption of the dye molecule. It also affects the energy drop from the LUMO of the dye to the LUMO of the acceptor, which is critical for separating the electron-hole pair created by the absorption process. In this work we present NEXAFS spectroscopy results for the transition from the N 1s core level (N_{1s}) to the LUMO for a series of metal octaethylporphyrins (OEPs), namely, MnOEP, FeClOEP, CoOEP, NiOEP, CuOEP, and ZnOEP.⁷ A systematic shift of the transition energy is observed when varying the central metal atom [see Fig. 1(a)]. Our aim is to understand the origin of this shift by density functional theory (DFT) and to extract the position of the LUMO. This requires the calculation of the energy of the transition from the

N_{1s} level to the LUMO through a methodology that takes into account the core electron-hole interaction. As a by-product, we obtain the wave functions of the frontier orbitals. These provide a deeper understanding of the chemical bonding that helps in designing new molecules with optimized energy levels.

Metal OEPs were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and purified by selective sublimation during the deposition process in ultrahigh vacuum. This method produced well-ordered thin film samples as judged from the strong polarization-dependence of the NEXAFS spectra⁸ and the narrow line width (substantially less than for powder samples). Specifically, a tantalum Knudsen cell containing the metal OEP was heated to ~ 275 °C for ~ 30 s with closed shutters to block out the volatile impurities. The metal OEP then was deposited for 60–90 s onto a Si(111) wafer passivated by its native oxide. For the MnOEP sample we started with MnClOEP and sublimated it at ~ 455 °C where Cl is desorbed. The change in oxidation state from Mn^{3+} to Mn^{2+} was confirmed by the change in multiplet structure at the Mn 2p edge [see Fig. 5a in Ref. 8]. The films were thick enough to be visible, and the resulting spectra were independent of film thickness after normalizing the overall intensity.

Total electron yield (TEY) measurements were taken at the VLS-PGM beamline at the Synchrotron Radiation Center (SRC) in Madison. The data were first normalized to the incoming photon spectrum using the TEY spectrum of a gold mesh in the beamline. Then a linear background from the C 1s and valence absorption was subtracted. Lastly, a constant factor equalized the height of the jump from the pre-edge at 397 eV to the post-edge continuum above 415 eV, thereby normalizing the spectra to the number of N atoms sampled. The photon energy for each sample was calibrated using a

^{a)}Electronic mail: juanmaria.garcia@ehu.es.




FIG. 1. (a) NEXAFS spectra for a series of 3d metal OEPs sorted by their atomic number Z . The lowest energy peaks correspond to the N_{1s} to LUMO transition. The structure of an OEP is shown in the inset. (b) Comparison between experimental (left axis) and calculated (right axis) values for the maximum of the N_{1s} to LUMO transition peak of the series of OEPs. Notice that the axis is shifted 3.5 eV between calculated and experimental values. The systematic shift of the LUMO peak with the atomic number Z is reproduced by the calculation.

constant wavelength shift determined by the first 2p-to-3d peak at 458.2 eV of TiO_2 rutile powder. The absolute accuracy of the photon energies is about ± 0.1 eV, and the relative accuracy within a spectrum about ± 0.05 eV.

DFT calculations were carried out by means of the Amsterdam density functional (ADF) code.⁹ All atoms were described through basis sets of TZP quality (triple- ζ Slater-Type orbitals plus one polarization function) given in the program database, including all the core electrons in the calculation (i.e., with no frozen core approximation). The exchange-correlation energy was computed according to the local density approximation (LDA) by means of the Vosko–Wilk–Nussair¹⁰ functional. The results were checked using the generalized gradient approximation by means of the Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof (PBE) (Ref. 11) functional and a hybrid functional (PBE0).¹² The first step of the calculations consists of obtaining the structures of the different OEPs in their ground state. In a second step the N_{1s} to LUMO transition was calculated using the Δ SCF method.¹³ Δ SCF method uses to show energies shifted with respect to the experimental NEXAFS ones. We performed the calculations for isolated molecules, neglecting the weak van der Waals interactions between the molecules in a crystal.

In the geometry optimizations, we have imposed a C_{4v} symmetry with all the ethyl groups above the molecule [see

inset Fig. 1(a)]. It has been previously shown that the outlying groups (and their arrangement) do not influence the electronic structure of the inner orbitals (3d metal, N and first C) in porphyrins,¹⁴ which are relevant for the present study. In all degenerate ground states (the E states for Mn, FeCl, and Co), we took into account the Jahn–Teller (JT) effect and the symmetry of the system was reduced from C_{4v} to C_{2v} (this implies that two of the N atoms are slightly closer to the metal than the other two). We found very small JT distortions (less than 2 pm of deviation from the C_{4v} symmetry). In those systems with an open shell configuration, we performed spin-polarized calculations for the geometry optimizations. By contrast, the Δ SCF calculations were non spin-polarized for all systems.

From previous work,^{14,15} it is clear that the ground states for ZnOEP, CuOEP, NiOEP, and FeClOEP are $^1A_1[(b_2)^2(e)^4(a_1)^2(b_1)^2]$, $^2B_1[(b_2)^2(e)^4(a_1)^2(b_1)^1]$, $^1A_1[(b_2)^2(e)^4(a_1)^2(b_1)^0]$, and $^2E[(b_2)^2(e)^3(a_1)^0(b_1)^0]$, respectively (see Fig. 2). In the case of CoOEP,¹⁴ there are two possible ground states: $^2A_1[(b_2)^2(e)^4(a_1)^1(b_1)^0]$ and $^2E[(b_2)^2(e)^3(a_1)^2(b_1)^0]$. Finally, there are three possible ground states for MnOEP:¹⁵ $^6A_1[(b_2)^1(e)^2(a_1)^1(b_1)^1]$, $^4A_2[(b_2)^2(e)^2(a_1)^1(b_1)^0]$, and $^4E[(b_2)^1(e)^3(a_1)^1(b_1)^0]$. In the case of CoOEP we found the two states almost degenerate (2A_1 is more stable than 2E by 0.03 eV), in good agreement with the results of Liao *et al.*¹⁴ On the other hand, the $N_{1s} \rightarrow$ LUMO transition energy is almost independent of the considered ground state for CoOEP (less than 0.01 eV of difference). Thus, in the following we will only consider the 2A_1 state for CoOEP. We found that the ground state of the MnOEP *in vacuo* (gas phase) is the 4E (it is 0.21 and 0.86 eV more stable than 4A_2 and 6A_1 states, respectively). This is again in good agreement with the results by Liao *et al.*¹⁵ for other Mn porphyrins. However, in a crystal structure the ground state should be most likely the 6A_1 one for the following three reasons, namely: (i) Liao *et al.* predicted for other Mn porphyrins that the 6A_1 state becomes the most stable when the molecules are not *in vacuo*, but forming a crystal structure.¹⁵ (ii) A magnetic susceptibility indicative of a high spin configuration has been measured for manganese tetraphenylporphyrin in solid samples.^{16,17} (iii) There is a noticeable difference in the calculated N_{1s} to LUMO transition energy for the three states (402.66 eV for 4E , 402.54 eV for 4A_2 , and 402.21 eV for 6A_1). The only one that follows the experimental trend is the 6A_1 one [see Fig. 1(b)].

Figure 1(b) summarizes the results obtained for the N_{1s} to LUMO transition in the different OEPs. The trend in the experimental results, i.e., the variation of the peak position along the series is well reproduced by the calculations despite the average shift of 3.5 eV between the calculated and the experimental values. The same variation is observed using PBE and PBE0 functionals. The only difference between the results of LDA and PBE and PBE0 is a constant shift with respect to the experiment, which is smaller in case of LDA. This shift could be due to screening by neighbor molecules in the crystal, which is not considered in the calculations. These shifts between experimental and theoretical results are also typical of time-dependent DFT (TDDFT)




FIG. 2. Frontier orbitals of the OEPs. The orbitals are labeled according to the C_{4v} symmetry group. The order of the orbitals from HOMO to HOMO-3 corresponds to MnOEP. This order varies depending on the considered OEP (Ref. 7). The LUMO is mainly determined by the π^* orbitals of the aromatic rings, while the HOMOs are dominated by the 3d orbitals of the metal.

calculations.^{18–20} In the case of NEXAFS transitions from the N_{1s} level, it has been shown recently that the magnitude of this shift can be minimized (down to less than 0.6 eV) by using TDDFT calculations²⁰ with the BHandH-LYP hybrid functional.²¹

Since DFT is able to reproduce the experimental trends for the variation in the position of the N_{1s} to LUMO transition peak, we feel confident to answer our original question: what is the origin of the variation? In order to do that, we have performed DFT calculations using the transition state (TS) theory proposed by Slater.²² The TS theory states that the energy of an electronic transition from orbital A (the orbital N_{1s} in our case) to orbital B (the LUMO in our case) can be approximated as the difference of energies of the orbitals A and B when orbital A is populated with 1.5 electrons and orbital B with 0.5 electrons in a non spin-polarized calculation.^{22,23} We have checked that the difference for the N_{1s} to LUMO transition using the Δ SCF methodology and the TS is always smaller than 0.1 eV. Although TS is less rigorous than Δ SCF methodology, it presents a big advantage: it is possible to follow the variation in the position of the N_{1s} and LUMO energies independently. Therefore we can determine with the TS calculations what orbital is responsible for the variation of the N_{1s} to LUMO transition peak.

Figure 3(a) shows the calculated variation of the positions of the LUMO and the N_{1s} orbital along the OEP series. The LUMO varies along the series by about 0.1 eV, whereas the N_{1s} core level varies by more than 0.5 eV. Thus it is clear that the N_{1s} level is responsible for the variation of the LUMO peak in NEXAFS. The N_{1s} level is shifted by the

charge localized at the N atom. A more negative charge destabilizes the N_{1s} level. This explanation is supported by the correlation between the position of the N_{1s} level and the calculated charge at the N atom according to Bader's criterion,²⁴ as shown in Fig. 3(b).

While the LUMO changes little with the metal atom, the highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) shifts significantly (not shown). This is because the occupied frontier orbitals of the OEP have a strong d metal character (see Fig. 2). Depending on the occupancy of these d levels in each OEP, the nature of the HOMO and its energy varies considerably. This is in agreement with the calculations of Liao *et al.*^{14,15} Thus, it is possible to tailor the HOMO and the HOMO-LUMO gap of the dye by varying the metal atom.

Finally, we analyze the variation of the core electron-hole interaction along the 3d metal OEP series. The core electron-hole interaction energy is defined as the difference between the photoemission gap (i.e., the difference between the energy corresponding to remove an electron from the N_{1s} level and the electron affinity of the LUMO level) and the optical gap observed in NEXAFS (studied here by Δ SCF). We find the core electron-hole interaction to be very large for all the OEPs studied [above 3 eV, see Fig. 3(a)]. However, it varies along the series by only 0.2 eV and is not correlated with the position of the absorption peaks [see Fig. 3(a)].

These results show that there is a synergy between NEXAFS experiments and DFT calculations. The capability of first-principles calculations to reproduce the experimental energy shifts validates the theoretical approach, and the individual energy levels can only be extracted from the data by




FIG. 3. (a) Plot of the three energies contributing to the N_{1s} to LUMO transition observed in NEXAFS, i.e., the LUMO (blue diamonds, left axis), the N_{1s} core level (red squares, right axis), and the core electron-hole interaction (with negative sign, green circles, left axis). These energies are plotted for a series of 3d metal OEPs, sorted by their atomic number Z . They are obtained by a LDA calculation for the optimized geometry with $1.5e$ in the N_{1s} core level and $0.5e$ in the LUMO [following the transition state model proposed by Slater (Ref. 23)]. The N_{1s} core level shift dominates the shift of the N_{1s} to LUMO transition. (b) Bader charge on the nitrogen atoms vs the position of the N_{1s} level for the series of 3d metal OEPs. A turnaround of the charge transfer near the middle of the series scrambles the sequence of atomic numbers in this plot. The different charges on the N atoms along the OEP series cause a shift of the N_{1s} core levels and thus explain the shift of the N_{1s} to LUMO transitions in NEXAFS (see Fig. 1).

using the calculation. Furthermore, the wave functions of the relevant orbitals can be calculated. Their localization on the metal atom versus the surrounding ring of N atoms determines how one needs to modify a porphyrin molecule to control its HOMO and LUMO, respectively.

In summary, we use a combination of NEXAFS spectroscopy with DFT calculations to show that the position of the LUMO level in OEPs (the nitrogen π^* orbital¹) is nearly independent of the central 3d metal ion of the porphyrin. The observed energy shift of the N_{1s} to LUMO transition along the OEPs series is due to a shift of the N_{1s} level, not the LUMO. It is caused by a variation of the charge localized on the N atoms. We also show that even though the core electron-hole interaction in this transition is very strong (>3 eV), it does not vary with the metal. Such a combination of experiment with theory is able to extract energy level shifts from NEXAFS data that cannot be obtained from the experimental results alone. This is crucial information for optimizing the energy level structure of solar cells by tailoring the dye molecules.

J.M.G.L. and A.R. acknowledge financial support from Spanish MEC (Contract No. FIS2007-65702-C02-01), ACI-Promociona (Contract No. ACI2009-1036), “Grupos Consolidados UPV/EHU del Gobierno Vasco” (Grant No. IT-319-07), the European Union through the FP7 e-I3 ETSF (Contract No. 211956), and THEMA (Contract No. 228539) projects. They also acknowledge support by the Barcelona Supercomputing Center, “Red Española de Supercomputación,” ARINA, and NABIIT. P.L.C. and F.J.H. acknowledge financial support from by the NSF under Award Nos. CHE-1026245, DMR-0520527 (MRSEC) and DMR-0537588 (SRC) and by the DOE under Contract Nos. DE-FG02-01ER45917 and DE-AC03-76SF00098 (ALS).

- ¹ *The Porphyrin Handbook*, edited by K. M. Kadish, K. M. Smith, and R. Guilard (Academic, San Diego, 2000).
- ² J. E. Kroeze, T. J. Savenije, and J. M. Warman, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **126**, 7608 (2004).
- ³ Y. Bai, Y. M. Cao, J. Zhang, M. Wang, R. Z. Li, P. Wang, S. M. Zakeeruddin, and M. Gratzel, *Nature Mater.* **7**, 626 (2008).
- ⁴ A. J. Lee, A. A. Ensign, T. D. Krauss, and K. L. Bren, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **132**, 1752 (2010).
- ⁵ P. Wang, S. M. Zakeeruddin, J. E. Moser, M. K. Nazeeruddin, T. Sekiguchi, and M. Gratzel, *Nature Mater.* **2**, 402 (2003).
- ⁶ A. J. Mozer, M. J. Griffith, G. Tsekouras, P. Wagner, G. G. Wallace, S. Mori, K. Sunahara, M. Miyashita, J. C. Earles, K. C. Gordon, L. Du, R. Katoh, A. Furube, and D. L. Officer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **131**, 15621 (2009).
- ⁷ With LUMO we always mean the π^* orbital shown in Fig. 2. Strictly speaking, this is not always the LUMO orbital in the OEPs series, because in some cases, such as CoOEP or NiOEP, one of the d-like levels of the transition metal is unoccupied.
- ⁸ P. L. Cook, X. S. Liu, W. L. Yang, and F. J. Himpsel, *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 194701 (2009).
- ⁹ G. te Velde, F. M. Bickelhaupt, E. J. Baerends, C. F. Guerra, S. J. A. Van Gisbergen, J. G. Snijders, and T. Ziegler, *J. Comput. Chem.* **22**, 931 (2001).
- ¹⁰ S. H. Vosko, L. Wilk, and M. Nusair, *Can. J. Phys.* **58**, 1200 (1980).
- ¹¹ J. P. Perdew, K. Burke, and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3865 (1996).
- ¹² C. Adamo and V. Barone, *J. Chem. Phys.* **110**, 6158 (1999).
- ¹³ The Δ SCF method consists of a geometry optimization for the ground state, yielding the corresponding E_1 energy. At the same geometry the electronic configuration of an excited state is imposed (in this case the excited state corresponds to move one electron from the $1s$ orbital of one of the N atoms to the LUMO of the OEP), and the SCF procedure is performed again, to obtain the corresponding E_2 energy. The energy difference $E_2 - E_1$ is taken as the electronic transition energy. This methodology describes the Franck-Condon transition (i.e. same geometry in the ground and the excited state) and thus the obtained results are compared with the maximum of intensity of the experimental absorption peaks. Δ SCF methodology describes correctly the electron-hole interaction.
- ¹⁴ M. S. Liao and S. Scheiner, *J. Chem. Phys.* **114**, 9780 (2001).
- ¹⁵ M. S. Liao, J. D. Watts, and M. J. Huang, *Inorg. Chem.* **44**, 1941 (2005).
- ¹⁶ B. Gonzalez, J. Kouba, S. Yee, and C. A. Reed, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **97**, 3247 (1975).
- ¹⁷ J. F. Kirner, C. A. Reed, and W. R. Scheidt, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **99**, 1093 (1977).
- ¹⁸ M. Stener, G. Fronzoni, and M. de Simone, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **373**, 115 (2003).
- ¹⁹ Y. Imamura, T. Otsuka, and H. Nakai, *J. Comput. Chem.* **28**, 2067 (2007).
- ²⁰ N. Schmidt, R. Fink, and W. Hieringer, *J. Chem. Phys.* **133**, 054703 (2010).
- ²¹ A. D. Becke, *J. Chem. Phys.* **98**, 1372 (1993).
- ²² J. C. Slater, *Adv. Quantum Chem.* **6**, 1 (1972).
- ²³ J. F. Janak, *Phys. Rev. B* **18**, 7165 (1978).
- ²⁴ J. I. Rodriguez, R. F. W. Bader, P. W. Ayers, C. Michel, A. W. Gotz, and C. Bo, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **472**, 149 (2009).