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Abstract

We present synchrotron-based I4d photoelectron spectroscopy experiments of solutions from LiI and LiI$_3$ in water, ethanol and acetonitrile. The experimentally determined solvent-induced binding energy shifts (SIBES) for the monoatomic I$^-$ anion are compared to predictions from simple Born theory, PCM calculations, as well as multiconfigurational quantum chemical spectral calculations from geometries obtained through molecular dynamics of solvated clusters. We show that the SIBES for I$^-$ explicitly depends on the details of the hydrogen bonding configurations of the solvent to the I$^-$ and that static continuum models such as the Born model cannot capture the trends in the SIBES observed both in experiments and higher-level calculations. To extend the discussion to more complex polyatomic anions we also performed experiments on I$_3^-$ and I$^-$/I$_5^-$ mixtures in different solvents and the results are analyzed in the perspective of SIBES. The experimental SIBES values indicate that the solvation effects even for such similar anions as I$^-$ and I$_3^-$ can be rather different in nature.
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1. Introduction

The use of iodine and its ions has many applications and was recently reviewed, as a celebration of the 200 years anniversary of its discovery.\textsuperscript{1} Iodine and iodide can exist in many forms such as different ions, polymerized chains and of course molecular I\textsubscript{2}.\textsuperscript{2–4} Here we will focus on the simplest iodine ions namely iodide and triiodide which together form a well known redox couple, I\textsuperscript{−}/I\textsubscript{3}. One specific example of the practical use of this redox couple is as the classic electrolyte for hole-transport in dye-sensitized solar cells.\textsuperscript{5–7} In such systems a fundamental understanding of the solvation phenomena and energies involved are of great importance as a part of delineating the redox reaction mechanisms. Achieving this inevitably requires studies of the interaction between materials on the atomic length scales. Prime tools for such studies are methodologies based on X-ray techniques and advanced modeling.

There are plenty of studies in the literature dealing with solvation of iodide (and other halides) species both concerning electronic binding energies and segregation/migration at the surface and especially how the solvent molecules arrange around the ions as solvation shells\textsuperscript{8–13} Previous EXAFS studies of iodide in solution show differences in solvation due to hydrogen bonding ability and coordination numbers\textsuperscript{14} and another new EXAFS investigation discuss how I\textsubscript{3} is distorted in aqueous solution.\textsuperscript{15} Also photoelectron spectroscopy studies (PES) of I\textsubscript{3} in ethanol have been reported and focus mainly on the fundamental spectroscopic details.\textsuperscript{16} Moreover, PES studies of iodide in water clusters have been shown to be a suitable method for studies of solvation structures.\textsuperscript{17} Previous theoretical studies of I\textsubscript{3} in water and acetonitrile have also discussed the influence of hydrogen bonding and polarity of the solvent contra the symmetry of the I\textsubscript{3} ion.\textsuperscript{18,19} The microscopic physical properties of the solvent such as the dipole moment and the ability to form hydrogen bonds, but also the resulting macroscopic dielectric constant will affect the solvation of the ions. It is therefore of interest to compare different solvents and investigate how these parameters affect e.g the solvation energies.\textsuperscript{20} Obviously, one of the most studied solvents is water. Recently, we have used synchrotron based PES and advanced modeling to investigate the I\textsubscript{3} ion in aqueous solution, where the solvent interactions tend to break the symmetry in the linear I\textsubscript{3} ion
due to extreme I-I bond length fluctuations coupled to the solvent hydrogen bonding dynamics. In aqueous solution, the geometric distortion of the $\text{I}_3^-$ ion is a consequence of charge localization correlated with polarization in the solvent. To extend this study the present investigation includes other solvents besides water, namely ethanol and acetonitrile. In more polar solvents without hydrogen bonds (e.g. acetonitrile), the triiodide ion has been shown to be linear and symmetric. Ethanol is a polar solvent with significantly lower density of hydrogen bonds than water. In that respect, it is an intermediate between water and acetonitrile.

In this paper, we specifically probe the I4d electronic energy levels in I$^-$ and I$_3^-$ and investigate solvent-induced effects using core-level PES in combination with electronic structure calculations and molecular dynamics (MD) simulations. The I4d core-levels in the I$^-$ ions are probed in three solvents; water, ethanol, and acetonitrile while the core levels in I$_3^-$ are studied in ethanol and acetonitrile and the solvent-induced binding energy shifts (SIBES) are analyzed.

2. Methods

2.1 Photoelectron spectroscopy

X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (PES) measurements of LiI/LiI$_3$ solutions in water, ethanol, and acetonitrile were performed using synchrotron radiation at the undulator beamline I411 at the Swedish national laboratory MAX IV in Lund. The liquid samples were injected into the evacuated experimental chamber ($\sim 10^{-5}$ mbar) as a liquid micro-jet with a diameter of approximately 20 $\mu$m, by means of backing pressure from a HPLC pump. The Poynting vector of the X-ray radiation was perpendicular to the propagation of the liquid jet. The kinetic energy of the emitted photoelectrons was measured using a Scienta R4000WAL-analyzer mounted at 54.7° (the magic angle) relative to the polarization plane of the linearly polarized radiation. The temperatures of the samples were estimated to be approximately 5 ± 5 °C. After passing the interaction region with the ionizing radiation, the liquid solutions were frozen in a cold trap cooled by liquid nitrogen. The experiment and the setup have been described in detail elsewhere. The electrolyte solutions were prepared
fresh before each experiment, mixing chemicals with highly demineralized water, ethanol (99.5 %) or acetonitrile (99.8 %). All chemicals were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (purity > 99%) and were used without further purification.

The I4d core-levels of the I\(^-\) and I\(_3^-\) ions were studied using a photon energy of 100 eV leading to a kinetic energy of the emitted electrons of around 50 eV. The spectrum of the I\(_3^-\) ion is partially overlapping with that of the 1s emission from the Li\(^+\) ion. This overlap limits an accurate determination of the Li1s core-level binding energy as well as a detailed analysis of the shake-up feature\(^{16}\) of I\(_3^-\), which arises from simultaneously valence-excited core-ionized states. The binding energy calibration of the I4d region was performed by simultaneously measuring the photoemission from the corresponding evaporated solvent molecules and referencing the BE of the latter to literature data.\(^{25}\) In recent publications dealing with liquid-XPS experiments in water the energy calibrations have been done using the HOMO peak of the liquid water instead of the gas line, as we have done here. However, one should notice that by dissolving ions the chemical potential for the solvent will be affected due to solvent rearrangements and therefore the solvent peak can be shifted with respect to the gas peak when concentrations (redox potentials) of the dissolved ions are changed.\(^8\) The use of an internal reference in solutions of a single solvent partly remove effects from charge accumulation and thus gives internal energy calibration with high accuracy and reproducibility\(^{26}\) but may lack information on specific surface charges. The use of the gas line is accompanied with an estimated uncertainty in the reported binding energies of I4d from I\(^-\) in the pure form and in the mixture with I\(_3^-\) of $\pm$0.1 eV. The uncertainty is most likely related to variations in surface charge of the jet due to frictional charging and varying photoionization density,\(^{26}\) which influences the energy loss of electrons leaving the sample. In any case, the relative difference in binding energy between core-levels from I\(^-\) and I\(_3^-\) in mixed solutions have the accuracy of internal referencing and can hence be obtained with higher accuracy (i.e. $<$0.1 eV).

The binding energies are extracted from the experimental data by fitting to a Voigt profile. In the fitting, the core-hole lifetime broadening of the I4d state is assumed to be Lorentzian in nature, with a width of 0.175 eV taken from the literature.\(^{27}\)
The I4d core-levels are atomic in character and we assume a constant spin-orbit splitting between the I4d\( _{5/2} \) and I4d\( _{3/2} \) lines, which is set to 1.70 eV both in I\(^-\), I\(_3^+\) and the corresponding shake-up. The intensity ratios between the I4d\( _{3/2} \) and I4d\( _{5/2} \) fixed to 0.75 taken from experimental data of pure LiI. This deviation of the branching ratio from the ideal statistical value of 2/3 has been observed also for the isoelectronic species xenon and can be explained by simultaneous electronic transitions to higher unoccupied states or to a continuum leading to lower intensity of the I4d\( _{5/2} \) as compared to the I4d\( _{3/2} \) line. The branching ratio depends on the photon energy used.\(^{28}\)

In this study three different electrolytes were prepared by mixing LiI and molecular I\(_2\) in different solvents and concentrations. In the first set of samples, equal concentrations of I\(^-\) and Li\(^+\) in water, ethanol and acetonitrile are compared by preparing 0.5 M LiI solutions. Electrolytes with a 1:1 final ratio of I\(^-\) and I\(_3^-\) were also investigated with ethanol and acetonitrile as solvents by mixing 0.5 M LiI and 0.25 M I\(_2\). Since the equilibrium between I\(^-\), I\(_2\) and I\(_3^-\) is strongly shifted towards I\(_3^-\) in organic solvents, it is assumed that all I\(_2\) is consumed to form I\(_3^-\) when both I\(^-\) and I\(_2\) are used in the preparation. Finally a solution containing mainly LiI\(_3\) was made by mixing equal amounts of LiI and I\(_2\) in ethanol giving a 0.50 M LiI\(_3\) solution, with negligible I\(^-\) and I\(_2\) concentrations. Experimentally it was not possible to obtain a stable jet for the acetonitrile and water solutions containing only LiI\(_3\).

### 2.2 Computational details

In order to aid the interpretation of the experimental data and to shed light on the core-ionization process, we have calculated I4d binding energies for gas phase geometries and for configurations sampled in molecular dynamics (MD) simulations at different levels of approximation. The binding energies in the computed photoemission spectra were calculated as the vertical transition energies from the initial ground state to an electronically relaxed final ionized state, including relativistic effects, but neglecting the zero-point energy. Electronic structure calculations within multi-configurational self-consistent field (SCF) theory were performed with the MOLCAS version 7 program suite,\(^ {29,30}\) using wave functions constructed in the state-averaged complete active
space (SA-CAS)\textsuperscript{31,32} framework and an all-electron basis set, adapted to relativistic calculations (ANO-RCC)\textsuperscript{33–36} and contracted to VTZP quality. Through a second order perturbative treatment of these CASSCF wave functions, we also computed spectra including dynamic electron correlation (CASPT2)\textsuperscript{37} for the gas-phase anions. The electronic structure was analyzed using the LoProp scheme\textsuperscript{38} for charge analysis.

Relativistic effects are important in heavy elements like iodine and for the calculation of binding energies of core-levels. The relativistic effects were introduced in two steps, using the scheme implemented in MOLCAS. First, the set of multi-configurational states were calculated in a spin-free approach, using the scalar terms of the second order Douglas-Kroll transformation of the relativistic Hamiltonian.\textsuperscript{39,40} Subsequently, the spin-orbit coupling matrix elements were computed, using the CASSCF (CASPT2) energies, as the interaction between the spin-free CASSCF (CASPT2) wave functions.\textsuperscript{41,42} To obtain accurate spectra, it is necessary to design an active space that spans all states that couple strongly to each other.

In the electronic ground state and in the absence of solvent interactions, the I\textsubscript{3} ion is linear with equidistant bond lengths.\textsuperscript{22} The geometry was optimized (I–I = 2.91 Å) with the CASPT2 method including spin-orbit coupling, with the active space consisting of the 8 highest occupied valence orbitals and the LUMO, i.e. all 9 orbitals of nominal I5p character.

In the calculations of gas-phase I\textsuperscript{−} and I\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{−} 4d spectra, we could evaluate the performance of a CASSCF wave function, involving only 4d orbitals in the active space, against calculations with an active space comprising the 4d orbitals and all occupied valence orbitals. (In both cases, the ground-state wave function of the anion, which is a closed shell singlet, was exactly equivalent to a Hartree-Fock calculation.) The (five/fifteen) highest roots of the final doublet states, corresponding to ionization from the 4d orbitals of I\textsuperscript{−}/I\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{−} were computed in state-averaged calculations. For comparison to the experimental spectra, all transitions were given equal weight and a Gaussian broadening with a 1.0 eV full width at half maximum (FWHM) was applied to the computed binding energies.

Solute-solvent interactions were treated using two different models: An explicit cluster model,
with the ANO-RCC-VDZP basis set on the solvent, and an implicit polarizable continuum model (PCM).\textsuperscript{43} In the latter, the response of the dielectric medium to the presence of the solute was calculated in equilibrium with the initial, singlet ground state. We neglect solvent relaxation in the final state, and the reaction field from the ground state calculations was added as a constant perturbation to the doublet states at the CASPT2 level in $C_i$ symmetry. For $I_3^-$, the gas phase geometry was employed. The cavity sizes around the ion was obtained with the united atom topological model\textsuperscript{44} using a radius around iodide of 2.05 Å. The default values of the dielectric constants in MOLCAS were used: $\varepsilon = 78.39$ (water), $\varepsilon = 24.55$ (ethanol) and $\varepsilon = 36.64$ (acetonitrile).

In order to sample solvation configurations with explicit solvent molecules, we performed classical MD simulations of LiI in acetonitrile, ethanol, and water solutions. For each solvent, 10 small clusters (containing the closest and most strongly interacting 6-9 water, 2-7 ethanol, and 11-15 acetonitrile molecules respectively) around $I^-$ were extracted from MD simulations (evenly distributed over 100-200 ps long trajectories) and treated quantum mechanically. The solvent sphere radii for the selection of cluster sizes in the explicit solvent models were determined from the distance to the first minimum in the solute-solvent (I-O in water and ethanol and I – CH$_3$ in acetonitrile) radial distribution functions, which corresponds to the outer boundary of the first solvation shell. The results from the single-shell water cluster calculations were also compared with the binding energies obtained when adding a second solvation layer around $I^-$ (32-41 water molecules).

We simulated the solvents using existing flexible force fields: the SPC water model,\textsuperscript{45} OPLS-AA parameters for ethanol\textsuperscript{46} and a six-site acetonitrile model,\textsuperscript{47} and Li$^+$, Na$^+$ and I$^-$ with the intermolecular parameters by Heinzinger.\textsuperscript{48} Each simulation cell consisted of 100-300 solvent molecules, 1-2 anions and Li$^+$ or Na$^+$ as counterion for overall charge neutrality. The simulations used periodic boundary conditions in all directions and were carried out at constant volume and temperature. The time step of the MD algorithm was 2 fs, with a double time-step procedure (10*0.2 fs) for accurate integration of the fast vibrational motion based on fluctuations of intramolecular interactions.

In the presence of explicit solvent molecules, we were restricted to the CASSCF level of ap-
proximation for the quantum chemistry calculations and to an active space in which only the core orbitals were included. In order to guarantee that core-hole states were obtained, and avoid falling down into valence-hole states, the orbital rotations were constrained. This was done in a two-step procedure in which (1) the core-orbitals were optimized, freezing all other occupied orbitals to their respective shape from a previous Hartree-Fock calculation, and (2) the core-orbitals were kept fixed when optimizing the remaining electronic structure. Even though this freeze/thaw approach prevents direct mixing between the 4d orbitals and the valence, the two separate orbital spaces communicate through the virtual (unoccupied) orbitals. The procedure was evaluated at the CASSCF level for the isolated species in which we reproduce (within 5 meV) the results from calculations (without orbital constraints) that include both valence and core orbitals.

3. Results and discussion

In the following presentation of the core-level photoelectron spectra and the calculated binding energies, we will concentrate on effects from solute-solvent interactions and how the element specificity in X-ray based investigations can be used to understand electronic structures and associated geometrical effects. Initially the discussion focuses on solvation effects for the monoatomic I\(^{-}\) anion and in the end the investigation is broadened to contain the polyatomic I\(_3\) and some results on the mixed I\(^{-}/I_3\) electrolyte.

3.1. Solvation effects of I\(^{-}\) in different polar solvents

Spectra of the I4d core-levels, obtained by measuring 0.5 M solutions of LiI in water, ethanol, and acetonitrile, are presented in Figure 1. The observed doublet in the I4d spectrum is the result of a spin-orbit coupling in the partially filled core-levels in the core-ionized states. The energy splitting of the I4d\(_{5/2}\) and I4d\(_{3/2}\) levels in the experimental spectra is 1.7 eV, which can be compared to 1.64 eV for the calculated transitions.

Values of the core-level binding energies were extracted from the spectra in Figure 1 and col-
Figure 1: Top: Three different solutions with 0.5 M LiI in different solvents were measured. The spectra show the spin-orbit split I4d levels between 52 and 56 eV and contain information on the solvent-solute interactions. Bottom: The corresponding core-level binding energies of the isolated I⁻ ion, calculated with the CASPT2(+SO) method. The solvent-induced core-level binding energy shift (SIBES) indicated in the figure is calculated as the difference between the gas position and experimental solvated energies for I4d.
lected in Table 1. It is clear that the positions of the I4d peaks vary with the solvent. In comparison to the calculated gas phase binding energies, the binding energies of the I4d core-levels in solution are blue-shifted. The blue-shift is here analyzed as the SIBES. As far as we know, there are no published data on the 4d binding energies of gas-phase I\(^-\). The I\(^-\) photoionization cross section has been measured in a merged beam experiment.\(^49\) Unfortunately, the lack of sharp resonances in the I\(^-\) 4d excitation spectrum makes it difficult to exactly determine the ionization potential of the 4d levels, but the onset of increased photoionization cross section lies close to 50 eV, in good agreement with our calculated value. Assuming the same binding energy difference between I3d and I4d in the gas and solution phase a value of 49.3 eV can be estimated from experimental gas phase data and is close to our calculated value.\(^50,51\)

In the interpretations it is important to note that the core-ionization processes discussed in the present work are very fast and the final state can be considered to be in the initial state nuclear geometry with a relaxed electronic structure in the presence of a core-hole. The dominant part of this electronic relaxation occurs inside the solute. However, effects from the surrounding solvent molecules will also contribute; in the comparison between the solution and gas phase binding energies, the solute electron relaxation will be similar and the difference can therefore be primarily ascribed to a change in the solvent polarization and solvent-induced polarization upon photoionization. Conceptually, the binding energies and specifically the SIBES can thus be considered to be the contribution of electronic interactions to the solvation energy without nuclear relaxation. Taking this reasoning one step further we note that the variations in the experimental values in Table 1 can be used to understand the solvation effects in electrochemical reactions where energy matching is of great importance. The SIBES values for I\(^-\) increase in the order acetonitrile (3.4 eV), ethanol (3.6 eV) and water (4.2 eV). In an attempt to shed some light on the origin of such variations in SIBES, both continuum solvation models and models based on specific intermolecular interaction are discussed below.
Table 1: The experimental data (in eV) for LiI water, ethanol, and acetonitrile solutions. The calculated theoretical value (CASPT2+SO) for I$^-$ is used as a reference. The solvent-induced electron binding energy shifts (SIBES) are derived from the difference of experiments and calculations, derived from the Born model and calculated by sampling cluster calculations over configurations from MD simulations of LiI in water.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Ethanol</th>
<th>Acetonitrile</th>
<th>Gas (theory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I$^-$ (I4d$_{5/2}$)</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>49.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$^-$ SIBES (Experimental)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$^-$ SIBES (Born model with r=2.30 Å)</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$^-$ SIBES (Born model with r=2.05 Å)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$^-$ SIBES (PCM)</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$^-$ SIBES (1 solvation shell)</td>
<td>2.80 $\pm$ 0.40</td>
<td>1.47 $\pm$ 0.37</td>
<td>1.36 $\pm$ 0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I$^-$ SIBES (2 solvation shells)</td>
<td>4.03 $\pm$ 0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1. Continuum solvation models

To a first approximation solvation can be understood as the polarization of a dielectric (the solvent) by an ion (the solute) and described by the qualitative values obtained in the Born model. The Born model treats the solvated ion as a point charge $Z_i$ and $Z_f$ (initial and final states), placed inside a spherical cavity in a static continuum with the dielectric constant $\varepsilon$, and gives an estimate of SIBES when the ion is dissolved:

$$\text{SIBES}_\text{BORN} = (Z_i^2 - Z_f^2) \frac{(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 1)e^2}{8\pi\varepsilon_0},$$

(1)

where $\varepsilon_0$ is the vacuum permittivity and $r$ the cavity radius. The model contains only the ion-solvent interaction, neglecting the contribution from ion-ion and solvent-solvent interactions within the solvation shell. This simple model has previously been used to qualitatively rationalize trends observed in photoemission spectroscopy measurements. Estimated SIBES derived from the Born model are presented in Table 1 where $r$ is set to 2.30 and 2.05 Å. As seen in Equation 1 an anion with -1 charge will have 0 contribution from the final state, hence we only have initial state effects contributing to the SIBES. For a cation, however, both the initial and final states will affect the SIBES and for a neutral species final state effects will dominate, as described in.

The magnitude of the experimental SIBES for I$^-$ is in general similar to that obtained from the Born solvation model (see Table 1) and are also similar to what has been reported previously.
This supports the notion that SIBES can be considered to be the contribution of electronic interactions to the solvation energy without nuclear relaxation. However, when comparing the experimental SIBES in detail with those from the Born model, clear differences in the values are observed. The estimations derived from the Born model deviate by 0.4 to 1.1 eV from the experimental values and the relative order of the $\text{SIBES}_{\text{Born}}$ and the experimental values is different. The Born model is approximate, hence it is not unexpected that the details in the SIBES from the experiments do not follow the variations in the dielectric constant as suggested by the Born model. For example, the SIBES is clearly smallest for $\text{I}^-$ in acetonitrile, and we would therefore expect the dielectric constant ($\varepsilon = 36.64$) to be small compared to water and ethanol. This is true in the case of water ($\varepsilon = 78.39$) but not for ethanol ($\varepsilon = 24.55$). Thus, the simple Born solvation model (as used here for the initial and final states in the ionization process) which neglects effects of cavity shape, higher order electrostatic solute-solvent interactions and hydrogen bonding, and not captures the finer details in the solvation determining the binding energies for LiI in different solvents. For a more direct comparison to the results in the PCM model, described below, we also calculated the Born values for $r$ set to 2.05 Å, which is the radius used for the iodide ion in the PCM calculations. The radius dependence in the Born model highlights the sensitivity and arbitrariness in the choice of cavity radii.

The fact that the Born-model cannot even qualitatively explain the experimentally observed SIBES serves as a motivation for the effort to perform ab initio calculations. In this way we hope to achieve a better understanding for the discrepancy by deriving the binding energies from the energies of the initial and final electronic states in the ionization process. Below, we present results from quantum chemical calculations on both implicit and explicit solvation models, and we begin with calculations performed using the polarizable continuum model (PCM). In Table 1, we present simulated SIBES derived from quantum chemical based PCM calculations, in which the solution is represented by a single solute in a cavity in an infinite solvent, characterized by its macroscopic dielectric constant. The solute in the PCM model was modeled by quantum chemical CASPT2+SO calculations, which give accurate initial and final state energies of the solute, while
the solvent is only implicitly represented. The polarizable continuum model (PCM) can be viewed as an extension of the Born model, which takes the shapes of the cavity and the molecular charge distribution into consideration and lets the solute and solvent be mutually polarized.

We observe that the calculated SIBES in Table 1 of the $\Gamma^-$ anion is slightly overestimated compared to the experimental data in Table 1. Considering the accuracy of the CASPT2+SO method for gas phase applications the discrepancy can be ascribed to the crudeness of the PCM continuum approximation. This crudeness is further manifested by a weak variation in the solvent dependence and specifically in the inadequacy to model relative changes in the SIBES when changing solvent.

3.1.2. Explicit intermolecular interaction - influence of hydrogen bonding

Since the continuum models discussed above lack the description of the local structure of the solvent, they are not able to give insights into the details in the solvent response. In particular, since the $\Gamma^-$ ion is highly polarizable, it is important to consider explicit intermolecular interactions as well as charge-transfer contributions. For an anion, the solute-solvent interactions are more pronounced in the initial charged ground state than in the neutral core-ionized state, whereas for a neutral molecules the charged final state has stronger solute-solvent interactions than the initial neutral ground state. Therefore, we also performed theoretical modeling by sampling solvation structures from molecular dynamics (MD) simulations and by using a cluster approach.

In order to capture the short-range solvation interactions, the ion-solvent cluster should at least comprise the first solvation shell around the solute. We based the cluster sizes on ion-solvent radial distribution functions (RDFs), calculated from the MD trajectories (each in total 1-2 ns, after equilibration). Since the RDF gives the probability of finding two different atom types separated by the distance $r$, relative to a uniform distribution, the RDF maxima in Figure 2 are directly related to the solvation shells of $\Gamma^-$ in the different solutions.

The $\Gamma^-$–solvent RDFs in water and ethanol display a well-defined maximum in the $\Gamma^-$–H RDF, a clear signature of hydrogen bonds coordinating the $\Gamma^-$ ion. Due to the large dipole moment of the acetonitrile molecule, its positive end is also likely to point towards the $\Gamma^-$ ion, but since the
acetonitrile dipoles tend to align in an antiparallel fashion, the structure is more disordered.

The first minima in the RDFs in Figure 2 were used to define the first solvation spheres, thus creating fixed-radius clusters. The resulting water clusters included all solvent molecules for which the oxygen and the solute were located no more than 4.2 Å apart. In ethanol, the I-O distance (5.0 Å) set the cluster size. The I\(^-\)-acetonitrile clusters contained all solvent molecules with either carbon atom situated within 6.25 Å from the I\(^-\) ion. For I\(^-\) in aqueous solution, the cluster size was also extended up to the second ion-oxygen minimum (I–O: 6.6 Å), i.e. forming on average two hydration shells.

![Radial distribution functions](image)

Figure 2: Radial distribution functions of water (bottom), ethanol (middle), and acetonitrile (top) about I\(^-\) from classical MD simulations of the solutions. The RDF minima are used to define solvation spheres and cluster sizes for the spectral sampling. CY denotes the RDF between I\(^-\) and the cyanide carbon atoms, and CT the RDF between I\(^-\) and the methyl carbon atoms in acetonitrile. C1 is the carbon bonded to the hydroxyl group and C2 the carbon of the methyl group in ethanol.

Based on the results from this quantum chemical level description (CASSCF+SO, i.e. neglecting dynamical correlation) in Table 1, we will in the following refer to the observed directed
electrostatic interaction between the negative I\(^-\) ions and the OH-group as hydrogen(H)-bonding, since this weak chemical bond have similar structure and origin as the H-bonding between the solvent molecules.

Attractive solvent interactions, in particular hydrogen bonding in water and ethanol solutions, are important for the structure in the solvation cage. In the cluster calculations, solvent molecules around the ion in the first and second solvation shells were included. The experimental I4d peak widths increase from 0.9 eV to 1.0 and 1.1 eV in the series acetonitrile, ethanol, and water. Theoretically the sampled structures give larger variations in binding energy for water and ethanol compared to acetonitrile. The higher sensitivity of the binding energy to the geometry of the water and ethanol clusters is ascribed to the hydrogen-bonding interactions in these solvents, which result in short-range solute-solvent interactions.\(^{54}\)

The short-range interactions are easily observed in the SIBES from the quantum chemical cluster calculations. Although the discrepancy in the magnitude in the SIBES indicates some general weakness of using a limited cluster size we note that only when including specific I\(^-\) solvent interactions in the theoretical modeling we observe substantial variation in the SIBES values for different solvents as well as a trend showing the largest SIBES for the water solution and the smallest SIBES for acetonitrile. This result clearly illustrates the importance of differences in explicit hydrogen bond formation in order to understand SIBES for the I\(^-\) ions in different solvents. In water the ions are dissolved in an extended three-dimensional network of hydrogen bonds. The close interactions and strong hydrogen bonding between the ions and the water molecules lead to large solvation energies. Ethanol exhibits tendencies to form chains and clusters of hydrogen bonds in the solution whereas in acetonitrile the solvent structure is determined by dipolar interactions. These interactions are reflected in the radial distribution functions from the MD simulations in Figure 2, which reveal a less ordered acetonitrile structure around I\(^-\) in comparison to the distinct solvation shells of water and ethanol. Again, this implies that the differences in SIBES can be ascribed to the characteristics of the attractive intermolecular interactions for the respective solvents.
It could be noted that the limited cluster size yields too small solvent-induced binding energy shifts, since the model does not capture all the long-range effects: solvent polarization and distribution of the solvent dipoles by the solute, which are adapted to and stabilize the electronic ground state. In the case of water an estimate of the limitations in the cluster calculations was made by including a second solvent shell around $\Gamma^-$. In this case the SIBES increased from 2.8 eV to 4.0 eV for $\Gamma^-$ as seen in Table 1. A single solvation layer is clearly insufficient to account for the experimental SIBES, but we observe a clear improvement in comparison to experiment and a reduction in the fluctuations when adding the second solvation shell. The importance of including both the closest solvent molecules and the long-range solvent response to ionic solutes has been described previously.\textsuperscript{57} Unfortunately, for increased cluster size the multi-configurational SCF calculations became too demanding and we were unable to evaluate the convergence of the theoretical SIBES with respect to cluster size. We aim in future investigations to evaluate an alternative computational framework, employing QM/MM or density functional theory (DFT), which are applicable to larger models. Finally, we calculated the SIBES for a single $\Gamma^-$–water cluster (including the first layer of water molecules) surrounded by a polarizable continuum (PCM), which increased the SIBES for the specific geometry from 2.8 eV (QM cluster) to 5.61 eV (QM+PCM), i.e. almost 0.3 eV higher than the SIBES obtained with PCM without explicit solvent molecules.

### 3.2 Solvent effects for $I^-_3$ in solution

To obtain further information on how solvent-ion interactions develop from a monoatomic to a polyatomic ion, the $I^-_3$ ion in the different solvents were investigated. As discussed in a previous paper, the effects from hydrogen bonding in water solution were specifically important and induced large asymmetries in the $I^-_3$ ion.\textsuperscript{21} In the following we turn to compare the solvation in acetonitrile, a strongly polar but non-hydrogen bonding solvent, and ethanol, in which hydrogen bonds are present. Before analyzing the experimental spectra of $I^-_3$ in solution, the results from the quantum chemical calculations of the isolated $I^-_3$ ion are presented as a basis for the following discussions.
3.2.1. Calculations on the isolated I\textsubscript{3}^-

The geometry optimization of the isolated I\textsubscript{3}^- ion (yielding a linear and symmetric structure) and the I4d PES spectrum simulation of the the I\textsubscript{3}^- ion were performed within the CASPT2+SO framework. The population analysis shows that the central atom in the I\textsubscript{3}^- ion is close to net neutral, the negative charge being equally distributed between the atoms at both ends (the terminal atoms). Valence charge transfer from the central to the terminal iodine results in more tightly bound 4d electrons on the central site. From calculations with no symmetry restrictions we see that the core-holes are localized on individual I atoms in the different core-ionized states, and that spin-orbit coupling essentially does not mix electronic configurations with the core hole on different nuclei. Each state can therefore be said to have a definite terminal and center character, depending on the orbital from which ionization occurred. The calculated (CASPT2+SO) difference in binding energy between the terminal and central atoms in I\textsubscript{3}(g) is 2.0 eV.

The theoretical energies of the final core-ionized states (including spin-orbit coupling), relative to the initial state of the I\textsubscript{3}^- are shown as discrete lines in the spectrum in panel b in Figure 3. In panel a in Figure 3, we give the detailed assignment of each line and compare the core-ionized state before and after spin-orbit coupling is introduced, which is essential to describe the experimental spectrum. We also notice that the interaction between electrons in the 4d orbitals on the central iodine and the adjacent nuclei depends on the $m_l$ quantum number of the orbital: it is the largest for orbitals spatially oriented along the molecular axis ($m_l = 0$) and the smallest for orbitals perpendicular to it ($m_l = \pm 2$). This gives an additional contribution to the width of the central peak (at most 0.5 eV) in the spectrum in panel b in Figure 3, but does not contribute to the broadening of the peaks from the terminal atoms.

However, generally the gas-phase lines in experimental spectrum can often be broadened by vibrational effects and the core-hole life-time. In terms of lifetime the Lorentzian contribution is about 0.175 eV.\textsuperscript{27} In terms of vibrational effects the largest vibrational broadening is expected for the terminal component of the spectrum, which we also observe in the experimental data. In an attempt to estimate the contributions from intramolecular vibrational broadening to the line
Figure 3: Calculated energies of the core-ionized states of I$_3^-$, relative to the initial state energy (in eV). The 15 possible states, corresponding to a core hole in each of the I4d orbitals respectively, are shown in panel a. Due to the excess charge on the terminal sites, electrons have lower binding energy (red states) than core electrons localized in orbitals at the central iodine (blue states). The spin-orbit coupled states (CASPT2+SO) which form the photoemission spectrum in panel b are calculated from the interaction between the spin-free states (CASPT2).

width, we performed scans along the harmonic vibrational normal modes in the I$_3^-$ molecule (at the CASSCF+SO level, i.e. without inclusion of dynamical electron correlation). The resulting potential energy surfaces are shown in Figure 4. We can obtain a line width by projecting the ground state distribution, which for each mode is modeled as the square of the lowest vibrational wave function, onto each core-ionized state and monitoring the resulting binding energy distribution. The analysis shows that the major source of vibrational broadening of the terminal peaks (FWHM = 0.6 eV) is the asymmetric stretching of the molecule, while this mode does not cause any significant broadening of states with the core hole located on the central site. As Figure 4 indicates, this is due to that the shape of the energy surfaces of the terminal core-ionized states is considerably different from the harmonic ground state potential along the asymmetric stretching coordinate, whereas the curvature of the energy surfaces of the central core-ionized states is similar to that of the ground state. In the same sense, we observe that the central core-hole line width broadening
Figure 4: Potential energy surfaces of the 4d core-hole states of the neutral I$_3$ molecule relative to the ground state potential minimum of I$_3^-$, calculated (CASSCF+SO) along the vibrational coordinates of the system. (The bending mode is doubly degenerate.) Red curves correspond to core-ionized states with the hole localized on the terminal iodine and blue to states with a center site core hole. The contribution to the line width from each mode depends on the shape of the final state surface with respect to the initial state and the width of the ground state wave packet.

due to symmetric stretching (0.07 eV) is larger than the corresponding broadening of the terminal peaks (0.03 eV). The calculation shows that the two degenerate bending modes essentially do not contribute to the vibrational broadening of any of the lines in the I$_3^-$ spectrum.

3.2.2 Experimental spectra of the I$_3^-$ ion

By mixing equal amounts of LiI and I$_2$ in ethanol it was possible to measure experimental spectra on a liquid jet containing the anion I$_3^-$ only and thus without I$^-$. The experimental spectrum of the I4d levels in panel b in Figure 5 contains a main structure between 52-58 eV, originating from the 4d levels in I$_3^-$. At binding energies over 58 eV in Figure 5 the Li1s peak is found just as in the case of pure LiI. Between the peaks from ionization of the I4d and Li1s core-levels additional features
appear compared to a spectrum containing only LiI. These features (one of which is at roughly the same position as Li1s) are due to simultaneous core ionization and valence excitation, known as a shake-up process. Previous studies on I3d photoemission spectra of I$_3^-$ propose that the satellite is likely to originate from a shake-up excitation of the highest occupied orbital (HOMO), which is a $\sigma_g$ orbital, to the lowest unoccupied (LUMO), of $\sigma_u$ type. Since all orbitals on the central atom are symmetric with respect to the inversion center of the molecule ($g$ symmetry), this ($g \rightarrow u$) excitation is symmetry forbidden in ionization from the central iodine. Therefore, only core ionization from the terminal sites, where symmetry is broken due to the core hole localization, can be accompanied by a shake-up. Note that the shake-up features observed in the experimental spectrum are not modeled in the theoretical spectrum in this study.

Figure 5: The I4d photoemission spectra of only I$_3^-$ as measured in LiI$_3$ in ethanol and the CASPT2+SO calculated spectrum of I$_3^-(g)$. The experimental spectrum is adapted from our previous paper. The decomposition into different contributions is discussed in the text.
Motivated by the theoretical calculations above and as described in the experimental section, the main structure was decomposed into contributions from the center and the terminal iodine in the fitting and the resulting excellent fit quality upon such a spectrum deconvolution suggests that the I$_3^-$ ion in ethanol is indeed symmetric. As in the case of I$^-$ (discussed above) the SIBES for I$_3^-$ can be estimated by comparing the peak position of the dissolved ions with the theoretical calculated position of the gas form of the ion.

**Table 2: Experimental data of the binding energies and derived solvent-induced binding energy shifts (in eV) extracted from the spectrum of the ethanol solution containing LiI$_3$, presented in Figure 5. The theoretical binding energies are calculated at the CASPT2+SO level.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethanol</th>
<th>Gas (theory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Binding energy I$_3^-$ (terminal I4d$^{5/2}$)</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>51.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding energy I$_3^-$ (center I4d$^{5/2}$)</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>53.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBES I$_3^-$ (terminal I4d$^{5/2}$)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBES I$_3^-$ (center I4d$^{5/2}$)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 2 the different binding energies and SIBES for I$_3^-$ are summarized and the following can be noted: Although the absolute binding energies for I$_3^-$ are higher than for I$^-$, the SIBES values derived with relation to the gas phase calculations indicate a weaker solvation for the atoms in I$_3^-$. Both the center and the terminal I atoms are affected by the solvation although the values are clearly stronger (almost 1 eV) for the terminal atoms. Generally the smaller SIBES observed for I$_3^-$ compared to I$^-$ can be accounted for in the Born framework by just assuming a cavity radius somewhere between the length and width of the I$_3^-$ anion. However, it is equally clear that the large difference between the SIBES values for the terminal and center requires a microscopic understanding and that the specific interaction with the solvent such as hydrogen bonding will be important. Before discussing this further we will also consider the results from mixed solutions containing I$^-$ and I$_3^-$. 
Figure 6: Experimental PES spectra of solutions with mixed $\text{I}^-$ and $\text{I}_3^-$ electrolytes. At the top is the ethanol based solution and at the bottom the same electrolyte but in acetonitrile. The spectrum from the solution in acetonitrile is adapted from our previous paper. The measured spectra are compared to a fit in which $\text{Li}^+$, $\text{I}^-$ and $\text{I}_3^-$ species contribute.
3.2.3 Experimental results from mixed I⁻/I₃⁻ electrolytes

Ethanol and acetonitrile solutions containing a 1:1 mixture of I⁻ and I₃⁻ were measured successfully and the spectra and results are shown in Figure 6 and Table 3. The spectra are clearly different indicating important differences in the SIBES values in the two different solvents. In the spectra of mixed anion solutions the I4d spectra contain overlapping contributions from I⁻ and I₃⁻, including the signature of the shake-up. Before extracting the details of the binding energies of the I₃⁻ anion, a reliable scheme for the decomposition of the photoemission spectra into contributions from different species is needed. Based on the results of the pure anions presented in Table 1 and 2 the peak fitting were performed and is presented in Figure 6 and Table 3. Some significant differences in the spectra were observed in the different solvents concerning the SIBES.

3.2.4 Solvation of the polyatomic I₃⁻ anion

Table 3: Experimental binding energies and derived solvent-induced binding energy shifts (in eV) extracted from the spectrum of the mixed solutions presented in Figure 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethanol</th>
<th>Acetonitrile</th>
<th>Gas (theory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Binding energy I⁻ (I4d⁵/₂)</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>49.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding energy I₃⁻ (terminal)</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>51.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding energy I₃⁻ (center)</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>53.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference I⁻ vs. I₃⁻ (terminal)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBES I⁻</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBES I₃⁻ (terminal)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBES I₃⁻ (center)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also in the mixed solutions the SIBES for terminal-I₃⁻ is 1.5-2 eV lower than the SIBES for I⁻ indicating that there are no interactions between the different anions in the mixture. The peaks originating from I⁻ are found at slightly lower binding energies in acetonitrile compared to ethanol in both the mixed solution as well as the solution containing only the I⁻ anion and is explained by the hydrogen bonding as discussed above. Interestingly, however, the SIBES for the I4d core levels of I⁻ and terminal-I₃⁻ are clearly different in the different solvents: the I₃⁻ peaks are located at lower binding energy in ethanol than in acetonitrile. More specifically, the relative I4d binding
energy difference between I4d core levels for I\(^{-}\) and terminal-I\(_3\) is 0.3 eV in ethanol and 0.8 eV in acetonitrile. What is the origin of the SIBES variations for the different anion species, and specifically for the variation in ethanol and acetonitrile? To disentangle this, the SIBES for the different ions need to be investigated separately. From these data we conclude that I\(_3\) is less strongly solvated than I\(^{-}\) and that this effect in the difference in solvation between the monoatomic and polyatomic ion is even more pronounced in ethanol. Based on the Born solvation model and comparing the charges of the different ions, one would expect that I\(_3\) would be less solvated compared to I\(^{-}\) since the net charge per atom is less in I\(_3\). Such reasoning is in accordance with the experiments, see Table 3. At this point we yet again point out that the relative experimental binding energies have various origins and that the SIBES is derived from the theoretical gas phase reference, which have different values for the two anions. From the discussion of the SIBES for the single ions we found that hydrogen bonding gives an important contribution to the variation in SIBES for the two solutions. For I\(_3\) in ethanol one may therefore expect that donating hydrogen bonds with the charged terminal iodine atoms will be formed, which thus give a larger SIBES compared to I\(_3\) in acetonitrile. On the contrary, Table 3 shows that the SIBES for I\(_3\) are smaller in ethanol than in acetonitrile. This result thus indicate that for I\(_3\) the influence from hydrogen bonding in ethanol is not as important as it is for the simple I\(^{-}\)anion. Due to the less localized charge in the I\(_3\) anion, we expect the effect from hydrogen bonding on the SIBES to be significantly different than for I\(^{-}\). The ordering of the I\(_3\) 4d SIBES in Table 3 in the different solvents rather reflects its macroscopic properties, as it agrees with the value of the dielectric constants associated with the respective solvent, with the smallest SIBES for ethanol (smallest \(\varepsilon\)).

The experimental value of the relative binding energy of the terminal and center contributions is fixed to be 1.1 eV in the fitting taken from the shift in pure LiI\(_3\). As mentioned above, this value is smaller than the theoretical value for the isolated I\(_3\) ion, which is an indication of stronger solvation of the terminal atoms. The SIBES of the terminal peaks is hence larger than the corresponding SIBES for the central peaks, reducing the relative shift between the terminal and center contributions in the experimental spectra. If one formulates this result using the Born model and
together with the calculated charge distribution over the different atoms in I$_3^-$ one can conclude that the SIBES should be at least twice as large for the terminal atoms compared to the central atom, see Table 3.

The solvent dependence for both I$_3^-$ and I$^-$ in acetonitrile and ethanol can not be easily explained neither in terms of the microscopic H-bonding interaction nor the macroscopic dielectric constants. In aqueous solution both the I$^-$ and I$_3^-$ ions are solvated by hydrogen-bonding,\textsuperscript{21} strong enough to partially localize that charge and distort the geometry of the I$_3^-$ ion. The shapes of the experimental I4d spectra in acetonitrile and ethanol strongly indicate that the charge is delocalized at the I$_3^-$. That explains the overall differences in SIBES for I$^-$ and the terminal and center iodine atoms in I$_3^-$. The difference in charge distribution implies differences in the solvation strength and hence in the measured SIBES in Table 3: Both in ethanol and acetonitrile the highest SIBES is observed for the I$^-$ anion and the lowest for the center iodine in I$_3^-$. Simulations of the SIBES within the DFT framework are in progress in order to rationalize the finer details in the solvent dependence in terms of explicit microscopic models of the spectra of the I$_3^-$ ion in solution.

4. Conclusions

Due to hydrogen bonding in water and ethanol, these solvents stabilize dissolved anions differently from acetonitrile. We have shown that the presence of hydrogen bonding leads to larger solvation energies which was quantified by higher core-level binding energies for the I$^-$ anions. We have also shown that the solvation energies for the polyatomic I$_3^-$ is substantially smaller and that the core level shift between I$^-$ and to I$_3^-$ is clearly different in ethanol and acetonitrile. The variations in the binding energies reflect the differences in solvation, which is important in the understanding of the mechanism for the redox-mechanisms for the I$^-$/I$_3^-$ electrolytes in different solvents. The study clearly shows the complexity in modeling solvation energies and thus specifically the difficulty in explaining and quantifying solvation for a redox couple with a simple measure parameter such as the dielectric constant.
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