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**Abstract**

**Motivation.** The recent theoretical study of the present authors revealed that the butterfly structure of Ga₂H₂ subhydride was an additional dibridged minimum on the singlet potential energy surface. Here, the existence of this kind of isomer is studied for the lighter Al₂H₂ analog in terms of thermodynamic and kinetic stabilities using high level *ab initio* calculations.

**Method.** Geometry optimization of the key dibridged structures were performed using *ab initio* coupled–cluster singles and doubles method incorporating a perturbative correction for triples (CCSD(T)) with all the electrons correlated (FU) and in conjunction with the aug–cc–pVTZ basis set. Better energetics were evaluated at the CCSD(T)(FU) level and employing aug–cc–pVrZ (r = Q, 5Z) basis sets.

**Results.** The calculated thermodynamic and kinetic stabilities and IR spectra of the five Al₂H₂ structural isomers 1–5, including a new type nonplanar dibridged (butterfly) species 5 not reported before, have been compared.

**Conclusions.** The butterfly isomer 5 has been found to be the lowest energy structure of Al₂H₂, although lying only about 1 kcal/mol below the “previously most preferred” planar dibridged isomer 1 at the ZPE corrected CCSD(T)(FU)/aug–cc–pV5Z computational level.

**Keywords.** Aluminum subhydride Al₂H₂; three bridged and two non–bridged isomers; isomerization mechanisms; kinetic stabilities; vibrational frequencies and IR intensities.

**Abbreviations and notations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augmented correlation–consistent polarized valence r–zeta (r = T (triple), Q (quadruple), 5Z (quintuple))</td>
<td>Aug–cc–pVrZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupled–cluster singles and doubles</td>
<td>CCSD, CCSD(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a perturbative correction for triples</td>
<td>with a perturbative correction for triples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PES, Potential energy surface</td>
<td>PES, Potential energy surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS, Transition state</td>
<td>TS, Transition state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPE, Zero point energy</td>
<td>ZPE, Zero point energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1 INTRODUCTION**

Simple binary hydrides still present a challenge for synthetic chemists as exemplified by hydride compounds containing the Group 13 atoms [1]. There is a dramatic difference between the hydride chemistry of boron with a large number of boron hydrides identified and characterized and the hydride chemistry of its heavier congeners for which only a few binary hydrides are known [1–3].
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For instance, the recent matrix isolation infrared (IR) studies of Downs et al. have shown that the dibridged $M(\mu-H)\text{H}_2M$ species are formed in low temperature argon matrices for $M = \text{Ga}$ and In [4,5]. Interestingly, these species have been found to photoisomerize to the other $M_2\text{H}_2$ ($M = \text{Ga, In}$) structures [4,5]. As far as the binary aluminum hydrides are concerned, the recent IR identification of $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_4$ and $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_6$ compounds in solid hydrogen as reported by Andrews and co-workers is an important contribution in the field [2,6]. These authors studied the reaction of laser-ablated Al atoms with pure H$_2$ during codeposition at 3.5 K followed by UV photolysis at 6.5 K and isotopic substitution with the aim to isolate and assign the target hydride compounds. The other binary hydrides of aluminum, including dialuminum subhydride $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$, were also detected in these experiments [6]. The first experimental evidence of the presence of $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$ isomers came from the IR spectra of the matrices containing the products of reactions of laser-ablated Al atoms with H$_2$ in excess argon by Chertihin and Andrews [7]. In addition to the major reaction products, AlH, AlH$_2$ and AlH$_3$, the distinct $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$ species were also observed. With the help of the subsequent high level \textit{ab initio} calculations [8] it was concluded that the $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$ species detected in solid Ar [7] were the planar dibridged $\text{Al}(\mu-H)\text{Al}$ and monobridged $\text{HAl}(\mu-H)\text{Al}$ isomers.

Computationally, dialuminum subhydride $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$ has been studied by using \textit{ab initio} [8–11] and DFT [12] quantum mechanical methods. In 1985 Baird [9] performed SCF and MP2 calculations with modest size basis sets for the singlet planar dibridged $\text{Al}(\mu-H)\text{Al}$, branched $\text{AlAlH}_2$ and trans–bent HAlAlH structures. More recently, Schaefer and co–workers [8,10] employed SCF, single and double excitation configuration interaction (CISD) and coupled cluster (CCSD and CCSD(T)) methods in conjunction with double–zeta plus polarization (DZP) and triple–zeta plus single and double polarization (TZP, TZ2P) plus f functions on Al basis sets in the latter case (TZ2Pf). They calculated structures, relative energies and vibrational frequencies of the four $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$ singlet isomers: planar dibridged $\text{Al}(\mu-H)\text{Al}$ (D$_{2h}$) 1, branched $\text{AlAlH}_2$ (C$_{2v}$) 2, trans–bent HAlAlH (C$_{2h}$) 3 and planar monobridged $\text{HAl}(\mu-H)\text{Al}$ (C$_s$) 4. By using effective–core potential (ECP) on heavy atoms and valence DZP basis sets, Treboux and Barthelat [11] performed SCF and CI calculations of the 1–4 isomer types for the $X_2\text{H}_2$ series with $X$ belonging to Group 13. Jursic [12] carried out DFT calculations using B3LYP, BLYP and SVWN functionals and the 6–311G(2d,2p) basis set to assess the quality of the DFT predictions for relative stabilities and frequencies of the 1–4 $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$ isomers. To aid in experimentally characterizing $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$, Chertihin and Andrews [7] performed many–body perturbation theory (MBPT(2)) calculations with DZP basis set for the singlet 1, 3, 4 and triplet 1, 3 $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$ isomers including partially and fully deuterated forms. All the previous computational studies of $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$ [8–12] found consistently the singlet planar dibridged $\text{Al}(\mu-H)\text{Al}$ species 1 to be of the lowest energy.

Apparently, an experimental detection of the nonplanar dibridged (butterfly) isomer of $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$, designated here as the structural type 5, has not been reported. Similarly, the butterfly structure has not been located in the previous computational studies of $\text{Al}_2\text{H}_2$ [8–12]. By contrast, this kind of
structure corresponds to the minimum on the potential energy surface (PES) of the $X_2H_2$ hydrides with $X$ belonging to Group 14 [13–17] and it was actually detected and characterized in the gas phase for $X = Si$ [18] and in the solid matrices for $X = Si$, Ge and Sn [16,17,19]. Furthermore, we located recently the butterfly minimum on the singlet PES of $Ga_2H_2$ using the correlated $ab$ initio and DFT methods and large 6–311++G(3df,3pd) basis set [20]. The present results for $Al_2H_2$ show that the butterfly isomer 5 is the lowest energy structure, lying however only about 1 kcal/mol below the planar dibridged structure 1 at our best computational level. Another issue addressed for the first time in this work is that of kinetic stability of all the $Al_2H_2$ singlet isomers.

2 COMPUTATIONAL METHODS

Optimized structures and corresponding energy second derivatives with respect to the nuclear coordinates (hessians) were found to provide harmonic vibrational frequencies and zero–point energy (ZPE) corrections. The aug–cc–pVTZ (augmented correlation–consistent polarized valence triple–zeta) basis set [21–23] was used for this purpose. The structures and Hessians were calculated with second–order Møller–Plesset perturbation theory (MP2) [24] that correlates all electrons (technically designated FULL, abbreviated FU) and, for both dibridged isomers, with coupled–cluster singles and doubles method including a perturbative estimate of triples (CCSD(T)(FU)) [25]. The latter calculations have been performed numerically. Minima were connected to each transition state (TS) by tracing the MP2(FU) intrinsic reaction coordinate (IRC) [26]. The CCSD(T)(FU) energy calculations at the MP2(FU) structures using the aug–cc–pVrZ basis sets with $r = T, Q$ [21–23] were performed next. For the thermodynamically most stable dibridged structures 1 and 5, the aug–cc–pV5Z basis [21–23] was also employed in the CCSD(T)(FU) calculations. The Gaussian 98 code was used throughout [27].

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In Figure 1, the MP2(FU) and CCSD(T)(FU) structures of the 1–5 isomers of $Al_2H_2$ and the located isomerization transition states are displayed, and in Figure 2 the potential energy diagram for the singlet $Al_2H_2$ is shown. The relative energies of all the species calculated at CCSD(T)(FU) using aug–cc–pVrZ ($r = T, Q$) basis sets at the MP2(FU) geometries are presented in Table 1. For both dibridged isomers 1 and 5 and transition state linking them TS1–5, Table 1 also contains the CCSD(T)(FU) results obtained with the larger aug–cc–pV5Z basis. In the next sections, the ZPE corrected CCSD(T)(FU)/aug–cc–pVQZ relative energies will be used for the purpose of discussion, unless otherwise indicated.
Figure 1. Minima and transition states found on the singlet potential energy surface of Al₂H₂ using MP2(FU) and CCSD(T)(FU) methods in conjunction with the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set (bond lengths in angstroms, bond angles in degrees); the reaction coordinate vector and the corresponding imaginary frequency are included for each transition state and, for SOSP (second-order saddle point), the A imaginary mode is shown together with both A and B imaginary frequencies. CCSD(T)(FU) results are given in square brackets.
3.1 Bridged vs. Non–bridged Type Isomers

Previously, only the Al$_2$H$_2$ isomers 1–4 were treated computationally [8–12]. Our optimized structures of these isomers are in agreement with the earlier results. The reported high level ZPE corrected CCSD(T) results obtained using large atomic natural orbital (ANO) basis set within the frozen–core approximation (the values denoted by Schaefer et al as “best” in Ref. [10]) place the energies of 2, 3, 4 at 7.6, 13.5 and 8.5 kcal/mol relative to 1. This can be compared with our CCSD(T)(FU) assessment of 9.4, 14.6 and 9.1 kcal/mol, respectively. In both cases a tight stability competition is predicted between the branched AlAlH$_2$ (C$_2v$) 2 and monobridged HAl(P–H)Al (Cs) 4. The findings of Schaefer [10] indicate the isomer 2 to be more stable than 4 by 0.9 kcal/mol, whereas our results favor the isomer 4 over 2 by 0.3 kcal/mol. The two CCSD(T) calculations agree that all the structures lie within a narrow energy interval of 13.5 (Schaefer) and 14.6 (this work) kcal/mol. On the basis of CCSD(T)/TZ2Pf frequency calculations [8] complementing the earlier matrix isolation IR study of Chertihin and Andrews it was concluded that the Al$_2$H$_2$ species actually detected [7] were the planar dibridged 1 and monobridged 4.

Table 1. Relative energies (kcal/mol) of the singlet Al$_2$H$_2$ isomers and isomerization transition states calculated at the CCSD(T)(FU) level $^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(D$_{2h}$) ($^{1}A_g$)</td>
<td>1.4 (1.4)$^b$</td>
<td>0.7 (0.7)$^{bc}$</td>
<td>2.3 (2.2)$^b$</td>
<td>1.5 (1.5)$^{bc}$</td>
<td>1.7 (1.7)$^b$</td>
<td>0.9 (0.9)$^{bc}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(C$_{2v}$) ($^{1}A_1$)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(C$_{2h}$) ($^{2}A_g$)</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(C$_s$) ($^{1}A'$)</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(C$_{2v}$) ($^{1}A_1$)</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)$^b$</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)$^{bc}$</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)$^b$</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)$^{bc}$</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)$^b$</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)$^{bc}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS1–2(C$_{2v}$) ($^{1}A_1$)</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS1–3(D$_{2h}$) ($^{1}A_g$)</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS1–4(C$_s$) ($^{1}A'$)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS1–5(C$_{2v}$) ($^{1}A_1$)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS2–4(C$_s$) ($^{1}A'$)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS3–4(C$_s$) ($^{1}A'$)</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AIH ($^{1}X'$)</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ At the MP2(FU)/aug–cc–pVTZ geometries, unless indicated otherwise

$^b$ At the CCSD(T)(FU)/aug–cc–pVTZ geometry

$^c$ Result corrected for the unscaled CCSD(T)(FU) ZPE

$^d$ At 298.15K, the respective $\Delta H [\Delta G]$ values for 1, 5, TS1–5 are: (r = T) 0.9 [0.7], 0.0 [0.0], 0.5 [0.8], (r = Q) 1.8 [1.6], 0.0 [0.0], 1.2 [1.5], (r = 5Z) 1.2 [1.0], 0.0 [0.0], 0.7 [0.9] kcal/mol

Consistent with the recent finding for the Ga$_2$H$_2$ congener [20], an additional dibridged minimum 5 corresponding to the non–planar C$_{2v}$ structure has been located on the singlet PES of Al$_2$H$_2$. Using the aug–cc–pVTZ basis set, the butterfly minimum was first found at MP2(FU) and the viability of this stationary point was substantiated with the follow–up geometry optimization and frequency calculation at the CCSD(T)(FU) level (Figure 1). As seen previously for Ga$_2$H$_2$ [20], 5 exhibits a relatively short Al–Al distance of 2.474 and 2.501 Å at MP2(FU) and CCSD(T)(FU), respectively, with the HAlAlH dihedral angle of 106.0 and 108.3°. Also, similar to Ga$_2$H$_2$, the two
dibridged Al$_2$H$_2$ structures 1 and 5 are found to be very close in terms of thermodynamic stability, with an energy separation of only 2.3 (1.5) kcal/mol at the CCSD(T)(FU)/aug–cc–pVQZ (+ZPE) level. This energy difference decreases to 1.7 (0.9) kcal/mol when the augmented valence quintuple–zeta quality aug–cc–pV5Z basis set is used. However, unlike the Ga$_2$H$_2$ case, this is the isomer 5 which is predicted to be the more stable structure (Table 1).

To examine the effect of the optimized geometry on the stability order of the two dibridged isomers, further CCSD(T)(FU) calculations using the aug–cc–pVrZ basis sets (r = Q, 5Z) were also performed at the CCSD(T)(FU)/aug–cc–pVTZ optimized structures (cf. the values in parentheses in Table 1). It is seen that the latter calculations changed neither the energy separation obtained with each basis set at the MP2(FU) optimized structures nor the preference for the butterfly form. Note that in the next section we also discuss the influence of the thermal correction (T = 298.15 K) on the relative stability of 1 and 5 (as suggested by the reviewer) and the issue of the kinetic stability of the two species.

### 3.2 Rearrangement Paths and Kinetic Stabilities

The PES profile for the interconversion of the 1–5 singlet Al$_2$H$_2$ isomers (Figure 2) parallels that found previously for Ga$_2$H$_2$ [20]. There is also a large degree of resemblance between the corresponding isomerization transition state structures of the two molecular systems. Therefore, we shall summarize the Al$_2$H$_2$ results only briefly with the underlining distinct features revealed in this work. (i) The planar dibridged isomer 1 rearranges preferably to the branched 2 or trans 3 species via a two–step mechanism with the monobridged isomer 4 serving as the intermediate. Both paths can be written as follows: 1 → TS1–4 → 4 → TS2–4 → 2 and 1 → TS1–4 → 4 → TS3–4 → 3, respectively, where the single hydrogen bridge is broken in each reaction step. (ii) The rearrangement of the branched species 2 into trans 3 can also be accomplished in two steps if one follows the path: 2 → TS2–4 → 4 → TS3–4 → 3. (iii) The transition states involved in the two–step mechanisms are found to lie about 10–19 kcal/mol above 1. (iv) The highest calculated isomerization barrier (53 kcal/mol) is for the one step rearrangement of 1 into 2 via TS1–2. However, these results should be seen together with the calculated kinetic stability of 1 discussed below.

The planar 1 and nonplanar 5 dibridged minima are connected through the TS1–5 transition state (note that we have not pursued TS1–5 at CCSD(T)(FU)). The imaginary mode of TS1–5 corresponds to the butterfly motion of the hydrogens combined with the Al–Al stretching (Figure 1). The calculated CCSD(T)(FU)/aug–cc–pVrZ barrier separating the lowest energy isomer 5 from the second lowest isomer 1 (5 → 1 rearrangement) is found to be 1.4, 2.1 and 1.6 kcal/mol for r =T, Q and 5Z, respectively. After the inclusion of ZPE, this barrier decreases to 0.7, 1.4 and 0.9 kcal/mol (Table 1). For the reverse isomerization 1 → 5, the calculated barrier is not existent being 0.0, −0.2, −0.1 kcal/mol for r = T, Q and 5Z, respectively, and 0.0, −0.1 and 0.0 kcal/mol when the
ZPE correction is included. These results indicate that in the gas phase the isomer 1 rearranges to 5 with no barrier. Apparently, the PES of Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} is quite flat along the butterfly mode: the decrease of the H–Al–Al–H dihedral angle from 180.0° (1) to 149.8° (TS\textsubscript{1–5}) to 106.0° (5) is accompanied by the energy change of ca. 1 kcal/mol at the ZPE corrected CCSD(T)(FU)/aug–cc–pV5Z level (Table 1). An additional check of the relative stability of 1 and 5 is based on the enthalpy (\(\Delta H\)) and Gibbs free energy (\(\Delta G\)) values, the latter two calculated at T = 298.15 K (p = 1atm) using vibrational frequencies evaluated at MP2(FU) (see footnote d) under Table 1). The respective \(\Delta H\) [\(\Delta G\)] values for 1 and 5 are found to be 0.9 [0.7] and 0.0 [0.0] (r = T), 1.8 [1.6] and 0.0 [0.0] (r = Q), and 1.2 [1.0] and 0.0 [0.0] (r = 5Z) kcal/mol. In terms of \(\Delta H\) [\(\Delta G\)], the barrier separating 5 from 1 (5 \(\rightarrow\) TS\textsubscript{1–5} \(\rightarrow\) 1) is calculated to be 0.5 [0.8], 1.2 [1.5] and 0.7 [0.9] kcal/mol for r = T, Q and 5Z, respectively. Again, for the reverse (1 \(\rightarrow\) 5) barrier disappears as the calculated \(\Delta H\) [\(\Delta G\)] are −0.4 [−0.1], −0.6 [−0.1] and −0.5 [−0.1] kcal/mol for r = T, Q and 5Z. These results support the stability predictions discussed in the previous section.

![Figure 2. The potential energy diagram for the singlet Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} calculated at the CCSD(T)(FU)/aug–cc–pVQZ + ZPE level. All energies are in kcal/mol.](image)

### 3.3 Vibrational Frequencies and IR Intensities

Table 2 summarizes the vibrational frequencies and IR intensities calculated here at MP2(FU) and CCSD(T)(FU) for the 1–5 singlet Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} isomers and those reported from the argon matrix experiment [7]. For comparison, the previous CCSD(T) results [8,10] are also included. Consistent with the earlier experience [8,10], the experimental frequencies of Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} are rather poorly reproduced with the large basis set correlated \textit{ab initio} calculations unless a proper scaling factor is used [8]. One reason of this discrepancy is of course the anharmonicity of the modes involved. On the other hand, one notices a good correlation between the predicted infrared intensities and the presence of the corresponding bands for the 1, 3 and 4 species [7,8]. Indeed, the only absorptions detected [7] were those with the highest calculated intensity unless they were beyond the range of...
the detector used.

Table 2. Comparison of IR spectra calculated and observed for Al₂H₂ isomers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isomer</th>
<th>Calculations</th>
<th>Ar matrix</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MP2(FU)</td>
<td>CCSD(T)(FU)</td>
<td>CCSD(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1411 (0)</td>
<td>1384 (0)</td>
<td>1384 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1312 (2363)</td>
<td>1295 (0)</td>
<td>1272 (2182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1213 (0)</td>
<td>1184 (0)</td>
<td>1128 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1016 (94)</td>
<td>1003 (0)</td>
<td>1007 (109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>334 (0)</td>
<td>330 (0)</td>
<td>326 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166 (206)</td>
<td>138 (0)</td>
<td>137 (165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1881 (339)</td>
<td>1862 (298)</td>
<td>1853 (373)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1877 (429)</td>
<td>1853 (373)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>793 (497)</td>
<td>795 (455)</td>
<td>790 (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>416 (159)</td>
<td>390 (150)</td>
<td>387 (182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>297 (33)</td>
<td>291 (28)</td>
<td>284 (144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>205 (47)</td>
<td>206 (20)</td>
<td>194 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1847 (865)</td>
<td>1806 (870)</td>
<td>1646.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1842 (0)</td>
<td>1802 (0)</td>
<td>1792 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>507 (0)</td>
<td>510 (0)</td>
<td>500 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>288 (0)</td>
<td>246 (0)</td>
<td>244 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>237 (62)</td>
<td>251 (45)</td>
<td>240 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>243 (41)</td>
<td>249 (39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1872 (599)</td>
<td>1823 (501)</td>
<td>1668.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1262 (297)</td>
<td>1213 (311)</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>982 (548)</td>
<td>1009 (508)</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>426 (21)</td>
<td>430 (17)</td>
<td>410 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287 (27)</td>
<td>276 (25)</td>
<td>270 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225 (34)</td>
<td>124 (29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1419 (63)</td>
<td>1395 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1288 (319)</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1108 (565)</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1029 (0)</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>872 (236)</td>
<td>838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249 (9)</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Frequencies are in cm⁻¹, intensities (in parentheses) in kcalmol⁻¹
b This work. CCSD(T)(FU) results obtained by numerical second differentiation
c For 1, 2, 4 from Ref. [8]; CCSD(T)/TZ2Pf results obtained by numerical first differentiation of analytical gradients. For 3, from Ref. [10]; CCSD/TZ2P results obtained by numerical first differentiation of analytical gradients. The frozen–core (FC) approximation was used in Refs. [8,10]
d Data from Ref. [7]

According to the presented interpretation [7,8], the experimental IR spectra gave no evidence for the branched isomer 2 despite the fact that the three modes with the relatively high intensity were found for this species (Table 2). On the basis of the results in Table 2 we suggest that the butterfly species 5, found here to be the lowest energy isomer, might be present in the low temperature matrices in addition to the other Al₂H₂ species [7,8].

Isomer 5 shows five infrared active modes, three of them being relatively intense, and thus should in principle be observable. Also, a proximity of the calculated frequencies for 5 to the
observed features does not allow to exclude the presence of this isomer in the studied matrices [7]. Further experimental work on the possible photo–equilibrium between the different Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} species, similar to this reported recently for Ga\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} and In\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} [4,5], might be helpful in clarifying this issue.

4 CONCLUSIONS

In the present contribution we have shown that the non–planar dibridged (butterfly) isomer 5 of Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} corresponds to an additional minimum on the singlet PES. Both Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} dibridged structures, planar 1 and non–planar 5, compete to be the lowest energy isomer, with the latter species found to be thermodynamically more stable by ca. 1 kcal/mol as based on the $\Delta E + \Delta ZPE$, $\Delta H$(298.15K) and $\Delta G$(298.15K) results derived from the CCSD(T)(FU) calculations with large aug–cc–pV5Z basis set. The calculated PES of Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} is rather flat along the butterfly mode. The revealed isomerization PES profile and transition state structures for the interconversion of the five 1–5 Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} isomers bear a large resemblance to those found earlier for the gallium analog [20]. The presented \textit{ab initio} results are believed to be useful in further experimental studies aiming at isolation of various Al\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} species.
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