Reaction dynamics of \(C(3P) + Si_2(X^3Σ^-_g) \rightarrow Si(3P) + SiC(X^3Π)\) on a global CHIPPR potential energy surface of the ground state \(Si_2C(X^1A_1)\)
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ABSTRACT
The dynamics of \(C(3P) + Si_2(X^3Σ^-_g) \rightarrow Si(3P) + SiC(X^3Π)\) on its ground state \(Si_2C(X^1A_1)\) are of great significance in carbon-rich interstellar chemistry. Using the combined-hyperbolic-inverse-power-representation method, we construct the first global potential energy surface (PES) for the electronic ground state \(Si_2C(X^1A_1)\) based on a total of 4080 ab initio energy points, which are obtained at the Davidson-corrected internally contracted multireference configuration interaction level of theory. The topographical features of the newly constructed PES are examined in detail and show good agreement with previous theoretical and experimental studies. Finally, we investigate the \(C(3P) + Si_2(X^3Σ^-_g) \rightarrow Si(3P) + SiC(X^3Π)\) reaction using the quasi-classical trajectory and time-dependent wave packet calculations, yielding reasonable integral cross sections and rate constants, which are expected to be useful for astrochemical modelling in carbon-rich interstellar environments.
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1 INTRODUCTION
The interstellar dust, consisting of carbon and silicon, is the intellectual driver for studying the physics and chemistry of the carbon-rich asymptotic giant branch (AGB) stars (Frenklach, Carmer & Feigelson 1989; Gobrecht et al. 2017; McCarthy, Gottlieb & Cernicharo 2019). As the simplest diatomic molecule composed solely of the silicon and carbon atoms, SiC is believed to be an important component in the chemical evolution of the carbon-star IRC+10216 (Cernicharo et al. 1989, 2018; Witsch et al. 2019). Although several efforts have been devoted to understand the reaction processes involved in SiC chemistry, including the dissociative recombination (Prasad & Huntress 1980; Zhu et al. 2022), neutral-neutral interaction (Smith, Herbst & Chang 2004), and photodissociation (McElroy et al. 2013), many possible reaction paths are still poorly understood.

The silicon carbide (SiC), one of the prominent species in the carbon-rich stars such as IRC+10216 (Cernicharo et al. 2015, 2018), is thought to be an important constituent of the interstellar dust. \(Si_2C\) is involved in the chemistry of evolved carbon-rich stars and plays an important role in molecular astronomy (Mauron & Huggins 2000; Cordiner & Millar 2009; McCarthy et al. 2015). The mass spectrometric studies (Verhaegen, Stafford & Drowart 1964; Schmude & Gingerich 1997; Pellarin et al. 1999) also indicate it is the common gas-phase polynatomic fragment in the evaporation of bulk silicon carbide below about 2000 K, which provides indirect evidence for the importance of \(Si_2C\). In addition, \(Si_2C\) is thought to be an important intermediate in the production of SiC dust grains (Cernicharo et al. 2015). Hence, the study of the ground state \(Si_2C(X^1A_1)\) system and its associated reaction of \(C(3P) + Si_2(X^3Σ^-_g) \rightarrow Si(3P) + SiC(X^3Π)\) can be helpful to characterize the chemical evolution for the formation of SiC dust grains in interstellar space.

Previous experimental studies mainly focused on the structure and spectrum of the ground state \(Si_2C(X^1A_1)\). The spectrum of \(Si_2C\) was first tentatively identified by Weltner & McLeod (1964) in the numerous molecules vapourising from silicon carbide. Then, Kafafi et al. (1983) reported the infrared spectra of \(Si_2C^2\) and \(Si_2C^3\) in the 400–4000 cm\(^{-1}\) and concluded that the molecule had a \(C_2\) equilibrium structure. Presilla-Márquez & Graham (1991) recorded the spectra of \(Si_2C\) and assigned the symmetric (\(v_1\)), bending (\(v_2\)), and antisymmetric (\(v_3\)) modes of \(Si_2C\) to 833.5, 266, and 1188 cm\(^{-1}\) respectively. Later, Cernicharo et al. (2015) reported the discovery of \(Si_2C\) in interstellar space in 2015. In the same year, Steglich & Maier (2015) reported the UV- and optical gas-phase spectrum of \(Si_2C\) for the first time. Subsequently, Reilly et al. (2015) investigated the ground state vibrational structure of \(Si_2C\) using mass-resolved and fluorescence spectroscopy and variational calculations performed on a high-level ab initio potential energy surface (PES). They derived the barrier to the linearity of 783(48) cm\(^{-1}\) from the Dixon-dip plot of the \(Si_2C\) bending wavenumbers with the value in parentheses being an estimated uncertainty. They also determined the experimental \(v_1\) and \(v_3\) fundamental frequencies of 832 and 142 cm\(^{-1}\), respectively, and the computational \(v_3\) fundamental band of 1198 cm\(^{-1}\). McCarthy et al. (2015) investigated the rotational spectrum using sensitive microwave techniques aided by high-level ab initio methods and accurately determined the equilibrium structure using isotopic substitution and vibrational corrections. The \(C_2\) equilibrium structure of \(Si_2C\) was shown to be the Si–C bond length of 1.693 Å and \(\angle[Si-C-Si]\) of 114.87°. In 2018, Cernicharo et al. (2018) observed 30 additional rotational lines of \(Si_2C\) towards IRC+10216. Later,
Witsch et al. (2019) studied the $v_3$ antisymmetric stretching mode of Si$_2$C using a narrow line width infrared quantum cascade laser spectrometer and determined $v_3$ of Si$_2$C at 1202.21 cm$^{-1}$.

Theoretically, several studies were done to calculate the equilibrium geometry and spectrum of Si$_2$C (Diercksen et al. 1985; Greu & Schaefer 1985; So 1985; Sabin et al. 1986; Largo-Cabrero & Flores 1988; Ritby 1991; Bolton et al. 1992). In particular, Greu & Schaefer (1985) calculated the equilibrium geometry of the ground state Si$_2$C at the self-consistent-field (SCF) level of theory with a double zeta plus polarization basis set and showed that the global minimum (GM) structure located at 2.1 kcal mol$^{-1}$ below the $D_{2h}$ transition state. Ritby (1991) investigated the ground state Si$_2$C using various basis sets at the Hartree–Fock level and many-body perturbation theory to second order. Vibrational frequencies, infrared intensities, and isotopic shifts were also presented and agreed well with previous theoretical investigations (Diercksen et al. 1985; Greu & Schaefer 1985; So 1985; Sabin et al. 1986; Largo-Cabrero & Flores 1988). Sharma & Chandra (2022) solved a set of 200 statistical equilibrium equations coupled with 867 radiative transfer equations of para-Si$_2$C. Their obtained transitions can play important role in the identification of Si$_2$C in the cosmic objects. However, the above-mentioned studies have not covered the analytical PES for the ground state of Si$_2$C.

The analytical PES for Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$) was reported by several attempts (Barone, Jensen & Minichino 1992; Gabriel et al. 1992; Spielfiedel et al. 1996; Reilly et al. 2015; Koput 2017). (Barone et al. 1992) computed ab initio potential energy points by the MP2 method using a large basis set including $f$ functions and fitted them to an internal-coordinate polynomial function up to the fourth degree. Their calculated vibrational frequencies are compared well with the experimental values of Presilla–Márquez & Graham (1991). Gabriel et al. (1992) reported a PES for the ground state of Si$_2$C obtained from multireference configuration interaction (MRCI) calculations and used it to evaluate the vibration-rotation energy levels. Their PES determined the height of the barrier to linearity to be 310 cm$^{-1}$, Spielfiedel et al. (1996) constructed different potential energy functions of the ground state and electronically excited singlet and triplet states of Si$_2$C using ab initio potential energy points from different levels of theory. The potential energy function of the ground state Si$_2$C yielded a barrier to the linearity of 859 cm$^{-1}$. Recently, Koput (2017) reported an analytical PES for the ground state Si$_2$C using ab initio potential energy points obtained by the coupled-cluster calculations, in which the core-electron correlation, high-order valence-electron correlation, scalar relativistic, and adiabatic effects were considered. Based on this PES, the $v_1$, $v_2$, and $v_3$ were predicted to be 832.8, 140.1, and 1203.6 cm$^{-1}$, respectively, and the $v_2$ was reproduced to the experimental uncertainty of ±2 cm$^{-1}$.

All analytical PESs mentioned earlier only focused on the specific geometries near the equilibrium regions for the electronic states of the Si$_2$C and were mainly concerned with energy, equilibrium geometry, and vibrational frequencies. However, an analytically global PES can exhibit detailed topographical features, including the dissociation limits and barriers on the entrance channel, which are the key to studying the reaction dynamics of the Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$) system. Due to the lack of the global PES for Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$), its associated dynamics have not been studied yet. In this work, we aim to construct a global PES of the ground state Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$) and carry out a tentative study of the dynamics of the C($^3P$) + Si$_2$(X $^3Σ$) → Si($^3P$) + SiC(X $^3Π$) reaction. All ab initio potential energy points of the Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$) system were calculated at the MRCI (Knowles & Werner 1988; Werner & Knowles 1988) level of theory with the Davidson correction (± Q). The potential energy points were then employed to construct the PES using the combined-hyperbolic-inverse-power-representation (CHIPR) method (Varandas 2013, 2014; Rocha & Varandas 2020, 2021), which was widely used in previous studies (Chen et al. 2022; Li et al. 2022; Rocha, Linnartz & Varandas 2022; Ding, Qin & Liu 2023). The rms deviation (rmsd) of this novel PES from the ab initio results is 0.769 kcal mol$^{-1}$. For a better understanding of the C($^3P$) + Si$_2$(X $^3Σ$) → Si($^3P$) + SiC(X $^3Π$) reaction, the quasi-classical trajectory (QCT) and quantum mechanical (QM) methods were both employed to compute the integral cross sections (ICSs) and rate constants based on the obtained CHIPR Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$) PES.

This work is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the details of the ab initio calculations for Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$). The CHIPR method for fitting the Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$) PES is described in Section 3. Section 4 discusses the topographical characteristics of the Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$) PES. The QCT and QM dynamic calculations for C($^3P$) + Si$_2$(X $^3Σ$) → Si($^3P$) + SiC(X $^3Π$) reaction are given in Section 5. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

2 AB INITIO CALCULATIONS

In this work, ab initio calculations were performed with the MOLPRO 2015 package (Werner et al. 2015, 2020). The ab initio energy points for mapping the PES were computed at the MRCI (Knowles & Werner 1988; Werner & Knowles 1988) level of theory with the Davidson correction [MRCI(Q)] based on the complete active space self-consistent-field (CASSCF) (Knowles & Werner 1985; Werner & Knowles 1985) wave function. 12 electrons in the outermost shell were put into the active space distributed among twelve orbitals (9α + 3α). The Dunning’s correlation consistent quadrupole-zeta basis augmented by diffuse functions, aug-cc-pVQ+dZ [AV(Q + dZ) (Dunning 1989) and aug-cc-pVQZ (AVQZ) were employed for the Si and C atoms, respectively. Our calculations of potential energies were based on a finite basis set, the complete basis set (CBS) extrapolation method may enhance the accuracy as suggested in previous studies (Varandas 2018a, b). A total of 4080 grid points were defined in Jacobi coordinates ($R$, $r$, and $θ$). For the C + Si$_2$ channel, the grids were set as $4.2 ≤ r_{CS}/a_0 ≤ 6.0$, $1.0 ≤ R_{CS}/a_0 ≤ 15.0$, and $0 ≤ \theta/d_{eq} ≤ 180.0$. For the C + SiC channel, the ranges were defined as $3.0 ≤ r_{CS}/a_0 ≤ 6.0$, $1.5 ≤ R_{CS}/a_0 ≤ 15.0$, and $0 ≤ \theta/d_{eq} ≤ 180.0$. In addition, ab initio potential energy points of the Si$_2$(X $^3Σ^−$) and SiC(X $^3Π$) were calculated using the same level of theory and basis sets as Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$).

3 THE CHIPR PES

According to the spin-spatial Wigner–Witmer correlation rules, the dissociation scheme for the ground state Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$) can be described as follows:

$$\text{Si}_2\text{C}(X^1A_1) \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{C}(^3P) + \text{Si}_2(X^3Σ^−) \\ \text{Si}(^3P) + \text{CSi}(X^3Π) \\ \text{C}(^3P) + \text{Si}(^3P) + \text{Si}(^3P) \end{cases}$$

(1)

According to the CHIPR method (Varandas 2013, 2014; Rocha & Varandas 2020, 2021), the global PES of Si$_2$C(X $^1A_1$) assumes the following many-body expansion (MBE) form (Murrell et al. 1984)

$$V_{\text{tot}}(R_1, R_2, R_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} V_{ij}^{(1)} + V_{ij}^{(2)}(R_1) + V_{ij}^{(3)}(R_2) + V_{ij}^{(4)}(R_3) + V_{ij}^{(5)}(R_1, R_2, R_3),$$

(2)
where $V_{\text{tot}}$ is the calculated MRCl(Q) potential energy for any geometry of SiC, $V^{(1)}$ is the one-body energy of each atom, $V^{(2)}$ are the two-body (diatomic) potential energies of Si$_2$(X $^3\Sigma_g^-$) and SiC(X $^3\Pi$) corresponding to two dissociation schemes, and $V^{(3)}$ is the three-body term. As the zero-point of the potential energy corresponds to the three isolated ground-state atoms, the $V^{(1)}$ equals zero.

The CHIPR n-body term ($n \geq 2$) assumes the following form (Varandas 2014; Rocha & Varandas 2020, 2021):

$$V^{(n)} = \sum_{\tau=0}^{L} C_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} \left( \prod_{p=1}^{\tau} y_{p,a} \right),$$

(3)

where $C_{i_1,\ldots,i_n}$ is the expansion coefficient of the $L$th-order polynomial, $y_{p,a}$ is the basis set of $p = 1, 2, \ldots, \tau$ ($\tau$ is the number of internal degrees of freedom for the n-atom molecule) coordinate for the reference geometry, and can be expanded in terms of the distributed-origin contracted basis sets (Varandas 2014; Rocha & Varandas 2020, 2021):

$$y_{p,a} = \sum_{u=1}^{M-1} c_u \phi_{p,a} + c_M \phi_{p,M},$$

(4)

where $c_u$ and $c_M$ are contraction coefficients and $\alpha$ denotes each primitive function $\phi_{p,a}$. The primitive functions $\phi_{p,a}$ and $\phi_{p,M}$ form the functions as follows:

$$\phi_{p,a} = \text{sech}^{a_0} \left[ y_{p,a} \left( R_p - R_{\text{ref}} \right) \right],$$

(5)

$$\phi_{p,M} = \left[ \frac{\text{tanh} \left( 0.2 R_p \right)}{R_p} \right]^b \text{sech} \left[ y_{p,M} \left( R_p - R_{\text{ref}} \right) \right],$$

(6)

where $y_{p,a}$ and $y_{p,M}$ are non-linear parameters. It is noted that equation (5) is used when ignoring the long-range terms. Otherwise, equation (6) should be utilized. Here, both primitive functions are used in equation (4). The $R_p - R_{\text{ref}}$ means the deviation of the coordinate $R_p$ from the primitive origin $R_{\text{ref}}$, and the distributed origin $R_{\text{ref}}$ assumes the following form:

$$R_{\text{ref}} = \xi \left( R_p \right)^{a_0 - 1},$$

(7)

where $\xi$ and $R_{\text{ref}}$ are two constants that should be chosen reasonably during the fitting.

In equation (2), the CHIPR two-body terms are given by

$$V^{(2)}(R) = \frac{Z_A Z_B}{R} \sum_{k=1}^{L} C_k y_k^2,$$

(8)

where $Z_A$ and $Z_B$ represent the nuclear charges of A and B, respectively. $C_k$ is the coefficient of the $k$th-order polynomial. In addition, the three-body term in equation (2) assumes the form (Rocha & Varandas 2020, 2021):

$$V^{(3)} = \sum_{i,j,k=0}^{L} C_{i,j,k} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} P_{g}^{(i,j,k)} \left[ y_{l,1} y_{l,2} y_{l,3} \right] \right\},$$

(9)

where $C_{i,j,k}$ is the expansion coefficient, $y_{p}$ ($p = 1, 2, 3; 1$ for Si$_2$, 2, 3 for SiC, respectively) has the form of equation (4) and $P_{g}^{(i,j,k)}$ is the operator that reflects the permutation symmetry of atoms in a subgroup $G$ of the $S_3$ symmetric group. Further details of the CHIPR method are fully described in previous studies (Rocha & Varandas 2020, 2021).

Figure 1. (a) The PECs of Si$_2$(X $^3\Sigma_g^-$) and SiC(X $^3\Pi$). The solid lines are the PECs fitted by equation (8), and the close circles are the ab initio energy points. (b) The deviations between fitted and ab initio potential energies.

Table 1. Equilibrium geometries ($R_e$), dissociation energies ($D_x$), and harmonic vibrational frequencies ($\omega_v$) of Si$_2$(X $^3\Sigma_g^-$) and SiC(X $^3\Pi$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R_e/\text{a}_0$</th>
<th>$D_x/\text{eV}$</th>
<th>$\omega_v/\text{cm}^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si$_2$(X $^3\Sigma_g^-$)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.237</td>
<td>506.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.209</td>
<td>510.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.c</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>509 $\pm$ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo.d</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>512.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo.e</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>516.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiC(X $^3\Pi$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>4.339</td>
<td>951.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>965.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.c</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo.d</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>965.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo.e</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.470</td>
<td>967.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4 FEATURES OF THE PES

The potential energy curves (PECs) of Si$_2$(X $^3\Sigma_g^-$) and SiC(X $^3\Pi$) are respectively obtained by fitting 89 and 70 ab initio MRCl(Q) potential energy points using equation (8). The fitting parameters $M$ in equation (4) and $L$ in equation (8) were chosen to be 4 and 8 for each two-body term, respectively. As shown in Fig. 1(a), the obtained CHIPR PECs reproduce accurately the calculated ab initio potential energies with rmsds of 1.3 and 3.4 cm$^{-1}$ for Si$_2$(X $^3\Sigma_g^-$) and SiC(X $^3\Pi$), respectively. The deviations between ab initio potential energies and fitted energies are presented in Fig. 1(b) and are within $\pm$10 cm$^{-1}$. The equilibrium geometries ($R_e$), dissociation energies ($D_x$), and harmonic vibrational frequencies ($\omega_v$) of Si$_2$(X $^3\Sigma_g^-$) and SiC(X $^3\Pi$) are shown in Table 1.
Table 2. The stratified rmsd of Si₂C(X ¹A₁) CHIPR PES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy (eV)</th>
<th>Nb</th>
<th>Max_error (Å)</th>
<th>Rmsd (Å)</th>
<th>N-&gt;rmsd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3149</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3633</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>4080</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a Energy in kcal mol⁻¹. b The number of calculated potential energy points up to the indicated energy range. c Maximum error (in kcal mol⁻¹) up to the indicated energy range. d Energy in kcal mol⁻¹. e The number of calculated points with an energy deviation larger than the rmsd.

Figure 2. A scatter plot of deviation between fitted and calculated ab initio energies as a function of the total energy. In the x-axis, the zero is set relative to the GM of Si₂C.

The partial and accumulated rmsd of the CHIPR PES are listed in Table 2. A total of 4080 ab initio points were utilized in the CHIPR 4.0 program, covering an energy range up to 1000 kcal mol⁻¹ above the GM of Si₂C(X ¹A₁). In addition, Fig. 2 shows the distribution of deviations between the fitted and ab initio data. The total rmsd of the fitting PES is 0.769 kcal mol⁻¹, showing the high fitting precision of the present PES.

Table 3 displays the properties of the stationary points on the PES of Si₂C(X ¹A₁), including the bond lengths for SiSi (R₁) and SiC (R₂, R₃), potential energies (E) relative to the C(³P) + Si(³P) + Si(³P) asymptote, and harmonic frequencies wᵢ (i = 1 for symmetrical stretching, 2 for bending stretching and 3 for antisymmetrical stretching). The predicted bond lengths and harmonic frequencies of the GM on the CHIPR PES show good agreement with previous theoretical and experimental results (Grev & Schaefer 1985; Presilla-Márquez & Graham 1991; Barone et al. 1992; McCarthy et al. 2015; Reilly et al. 2015; Koput 2017; Witsch et al. 2019).

The major features of the Si₂C(X ¹A₁) PES are illustrated in Figs 3 and 4. Fig. 3(a) shows a 2D PES for the bending angle of the Si–C–Si fixed at 113.25°. As can be seen, the GM is the unique Cₓₓ symmetric conformation located at R₁ = 5.378 a₀ and R₂ = R₃ = 3.220 a₀. As shown in Table 3, the predicted harmonic frequencies are in good agreement with the theoretical results calculated at the CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ level (Koput 2017) and the experimental values (McCarthy et al. 2015; Witsch et al. 2019). Figs 3(b) and (c) illustrate the contour plots for linear [Si–C–Si] and [C–Si–Si] geometries, respectively. As shown in Fig. 3(b) and Table 3, the linear Dₓₓ transition state (TS) locates at R₁ = 5.378 a₀, with a well depth of −0.3951 Eh relative to the C(³P) + Si(³P) + Si(³P) asymptote and 1.44 kcal mol⁻¹ relative to the GM structure. Earlier experimental (Reilly et al. 2015) Dₓₓ TS has a barrier of 2.24 kcal mol⁻¹ relative to the GM structure, which is closer to our predicted value given in Table 3. The attributions of the Dₓₓ TS are similar to those from our geometry optimization (OPTG) result at the MRCI(Q)/AVQZ level and previous theoretical calculations (Grev & Schaefer 1985; Barone et al. 1992). Fig. 3(c) and Table 3 show that the linear Cₓₓ TS has a bond length of R₁ = 4.156 a₀ and R₂ = 3.359 a₀. Figs 3 and 4 show smooth and reasonable behaviours in the whole space, warranting good performance of the present PES.

To better view all major topographical features, the relaxed triangular plot (Varandas 1987) is displayed in Fig. 5, which uses the scaled hyperspherical coordinates (β = β/γ; γ = γ/γ):

\[
(\beta, \gamma) = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \omega - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}, -1\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \omega + 1\right)
\]

(10)

As shown in Fig. 5, all stationary points of the ground-state Si₂C(X ¹A₁) are visible and well reproduced. Based on Fig. 5, the connection of each stationary point can be established more comprehensively.

5 REACTION DYNAMIC CALCULATIONS

Based on the ground state CHIPR PES of Si₂C(X ¹A₁), the dynamics of the C(³P) + Si₂(X ¹Σ⁺) → Si(³P) + SiC(³Π) reaction were investigated by using the QCT (Hase et al. 1996) and time-dependent wave packet (TDWP) methods.

The QCT simulations were carried out following the earlier work (Li et al. 2022). We ran the calculations with 10⁵ trajectories at each collision energy for ensuring convergence and accuracy. To warrant the conservation of the total energy within 10⁻⁴ Eh or smaller, a time-step of 0.1 fs is utilized in the integration of Hamilton’s motion equations. The distance between the C atom and the Si₂ molecule was initially separated by 15 Å. The ICS of C + Si₂ (v = 0−3, j = 0) → Si + SiC were calculated by (Li, Caridade & Varandas 2014)

\[
\sigma(r, v, j) = \pi b_{\max}^2 \frac{N_p}{N_r}
\]

(11)

where \(N_r\) is the total number of the trajectories, \(N_p\) is the number of the reactive trajectories, and \(b_{\max}\) is the maximum impact parameter which is optimized by trial and error. The thermal rate coefficient is
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Table 3. The characteristics of the stationary points on the CHIPR PES of $\text{Si}_2\text{C}(X^1\text{A}_1)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>$R_1a_0$</th>
<th>$R_2a_0$</th>
<th>$R_3a_0$</th>
<th>$E^a$</th>
<th>$\omega_1$ /cm$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$\omega_2$ /cm$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$\omega_3$ /cm$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work</td>
<td>5.378</td>
<td>3.220</td>
<td>3.220</td>
<td>−0.3974</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theor.$^b$</td>
<td>5.529</td>
<td>3.186</td>
<td>3.186</td>
<td>−0.3950</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theor.$^c$</td>
<td>5.392</td>
<td>3.209</td>
<td>3.209</td>
<td>−0.3974</td>
<td>833$^c$</td>
<td>140$^c$</td>
<td>1203$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.$^d$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.$^{e,f}$</td>
<td>5.392$^e$</td>
<td>3.199$^e$</td>
<td>3.199$^e$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>832$^f$</td>
<td>142$^f$</td>
<td>1202$^f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.$^g$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_{\infty\chi}$ transition state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>−0.3951</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>102i</td>
<td>1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVQZ$^h$</td>
<td>6.422</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>−0.3950</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>84i</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theor.$^i$</td>
<td>6.312</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>75i</td>
<td>1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theor.$^j$</td>
<td>6.426</td>
<td>3.213</td>
<td>3.213</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>84i</td>
<td>1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{\infty\chi}$ transition state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work</td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>3.359</td>
<td>7.515</td>
<td>−0.2563</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>115i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVQZ$^k$</td>
<td>4.180</td>
<td>3.361</td>
<td>7.541</td>
<td>−0.2568</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>107i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.$^a$ Energy (in $E_h$) relative to the C($^3\text{P}$) + Si($^3\text{P}$) + Si($^3\text{P}$) asymptote. $^b$ (Grev & Schaefer 1985). $^c$ Theoretical fundamental frequencies reported in Koput (2017). $^d$ (Presilla-Márquez & Graham 1991). $^e$ Experimental equilibrium parameters reported in McCarthy et al. (2015). $^f$ Experimental fundamental frequencies reported in Reilly et al. (2015). $^g$ (Witsch et al. 2019). $^h$ Results from the geometry optimization. $^i$ (Barone et al. 1992).

Figure 3. The contour plots (a) at the fixed included angle $\angle[\text{SiC}]=114.87^\circ$, (b) for the linear [Si–C–Si], (c) for the linear [C–Si–Si], and (d) for the $C_2\chi$ insertion of the C atom into the $\text{Si}_2$ fragment. Contours are equally spaced by 0.015 $E_h$ for panel (b) and 0.02 $E_h$ for the others, starting at −0.4 $E_h$ for panels (a), (b), and (d), and −0.25 $E_h$ for panel (c).
where $k$ is the Boltzmann constant, $\mu_{C \text{SiSi}}$ is the reduced mass of the reactants, and $g_{c}(T)$ is the electronic degeneracy factor (Graff & Wagner 1990), which is defined as

$$g_{c}(T) = q_{SiC}\frac{1}{q_{Si}\times q_{C}}(T),$$

where the degeneracy of the ground state $Si_{2}(X \ 1\ A_{1})$ is 1, and the electronic degeneracy factors which account for the fine structures of the $Si_{2}(X \ 1\ \Sigma_{g}^{+})$ and $C(2\ P)$ assume the expression (Graff & Wagner 1990)

$$q_{SiC}(T) = 3$$

$$q_{Si}(T) = 1 + 3\ exp(-23.62/T) + 5\ exp(-62.46/T)$$

The TDWP method utilized here was widely used in previous works (Zhang & Zhang 1993; Zhang et al. 2003, 2004; Li et al. 2022). The Hamiltonian of the $C + Si_{2}(X \ 1\ \Sigma_{g}^{+})$ system in the reactants’ Jacobi coordinates takes this form:

$$H = -\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2\mu_{R}} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial R^{2}} + \frac{(J - \jmath)^{2}}{2\mu_{R}R^{2}} + \frac{\jmath^{2}}{2\mu_{r}r^{2}} + V(R, r) + h(r),$$

where $R$ is the distance between the $C$ atom and the centre-of-mass of $Si_{2}$, $r$ indicates the diatomic distance of $Si_{2}$, $\mu_{R}$ is the reduced mass between $C$ and $Si_{2}$, $\mu_{r}$ is the mass of $Si_{2}$, $J$ and $\jmath$ are the total angular momentum, and the rotational angular momentum of $Si_{2}$, respectively. $V(R, r)$ is the CHIRP PES for the $Si_{2}(X \ 1\ A_{1})$ system. The diatomic reference Hamiltonian $h(r)$ can be written as

$$h(r) = -\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2\mu_{r}} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial r^{2}} + V(r),$$

where $V(r)$ is the potential function of $Si_{2}$.

After providing the initial wave packet, it was propagated on the PES using the following split-operator scheme:

$$\psi^{\text{final}}(\vec{R}, \vec{r}, t + \Delta) = e^{-i\mu_{0}h\Delta^{2}/2}e^{-i\jmath_{0}h\Delta^{2}/2}\psi(\vec{R}, \vec{r}, t),$$

where $\psi$ is the wave packet, $H_{0}$ is the reference Hamiltonian, and $U$ is the effective potential operator, $H_{0}$ and $U$ are given by

$$H_{0} = -\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2\mu_{R}} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial R^{2}} + h(r)$$

$$U = \frac{(J - \jmath)^{2}}{2\mu_{R}R^{2}} + \frac{\jmath^{2}}{2\mu_{r}r^{2}} + V(\vec{R}, \vec{r})$$

After a sufficiently long period of propagation, the reaction probability can be extracted from the final wave packet using the standard TD reactive flux method:

$$P_{j0,j0,0}(E) = \frac{\hbar}{\mu_{r}} \text{Im} \left[ \psi(E) \frac{\delta}{\delta r} \right] \left| \frac{\delta}{\delta r} \right| \psi(E),$$

where $r_{0}$, $j_{0}$, and $k_{0}$ (projection quantum number of $j_{0}$) are the initial state quantum numbers and $r_{0}$ represents the position where the flux analysis is carried out. The total reaction ICS and temperature-dependent rate constant are then calculated by

$$\sigma_{j0,j0,k_{0}}(E) = \frac{\pi}{k^{2}} \sum_{j} (2J + 1) P_{j0,j0,k_{0}}(E)$$

$$\sigma_{j0,j0}(E) = \frac{1}{2J_{0} + 1} \sum_{k_{0}} \sigma_{j0,j0,k_{0}}(E)$$

$$k_{j0}(E) = \frac{8k_{B}T}{\pi\mu_{R}}(k_{B}T)^{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} E\sigma_{j0,j0}(E) \exp \left( -\frac{E}{k_{B}T} \right) dE,$$

where $k_{B}$ is the Boltzmann constant and $k$ is the wavenumber corresponding to the initial state at a fixed collision energy $E$.

Fig. 6 shows the insertion reaction path for the $C(2\ P) + Si_{2}(X \ 1\ \Sigma_{g}^{+}) \rightarrow Si(3\ P) + SiC(3\ \Pi)$ reaction and the energies of related stationary
points on this novel PES. Without activation barriers, the insertion of the C atom may approach along the mid-perpendicular of Si2, leading directly to the GM. The GM structure is subsequently converted to the reaction intermediate, namely linear D_{coh} TS, with R_2 and R_3 increasing and ∠[Si–C–Si] opening progressively, as shown in Fig. 3(d). Finally, the D_{coh} TS dissociates and converts into the Si(3P) and SiC(X^3Π) products. As Fig. 6 shows, the C(3P) + Si2(X^3Σ_g^-) → Si(3P) + SiC(X^3Π) reaction is a highly exoergic reaction (0.0405 eV), so we can conclude that this reaction can play an important role in the formation of gas-phase SiC and solid SiC dust.

For barrierless exoergic reactions with deep wells, the quantum dynamics calculations can be expensive (Lin et al. 2008; Bulut et al. 2011; Rao et al. 2013; Goswami et al. 2022). Here we only consider the dynamics of the C + Si2 (v = 0, j = 0) → Si + SiC reaction. Through many tests for the convergence of the total angular momentum J = 0, the obtained parameters are listed in Table 4.

The total ICSs for the C(3P) + Si2(X^3Σ_g^-) → Si(3P) + SiC(X^3Π) reactions as a function of the collision energy of 0.1 – 1.0 eV are displayed in Fig. 7. As shown, the ICSs obtained from the QCT and QM calculations have the same varying trend. Since there is no barrier on the minimum energy path, the ICSs obtained from both the QCT and QM calculations decrease rapidly with the increase of the collision energy and gradually level off at high collision energies. Meanwhile, the oscillation characteristics of the QM results are shown over the whole range of collision energy considered here, and the amplitude of oscillation decreases with the increase of the collision energy, which are similar to previous studies (Sundaram, Manivannan & Padmanabhan 2017; Gao et al. 2019). Moreover, the quantum ICSs for v = 0, j = 0 are typically larger than the QCT counterparts, showing the importance of quantum effects in this reaction.

As shown in Fig. 7, the vibrational excitation of the diatomic reactant Si2 has a significantly negative effect on the ICSs. When j = 0, all ICSs decrease with the increase of the vibrational quantum numbers v in the collision energy range from 0.1 to 0.9 eV. This phenomenon might indicate that the vibrational excitations of the reactant Si2 restrain the reaction and reduces the ICSs at this collision energy range. With the further increase of the collision energy, the ICSs tend to be identical.

Fig. 8 shows the rate constants versus temperatures from 150 to 3000 K for C(3P) + Si2(X^3Σ_g^-) → Si(3P) + SiC(X^3Π) obtained by QCT and QM methods. As shown, the rate constants obtained by QCT and QM calculations have the same trend which elevates gradually with the increasing temperature and then reach a plateau at high temperatures. Because the quantum tunneling effect and the zero-point energy leakage problem are not considered, the QCT results are systematically lower than the QM values. Then, the rate constants obtained by QCT and QM calculations are fitted using the three-parameter kooij function (Laidler 1996), which is defined as

\[ k(T) = A \left( \frac{T}{300} \right)^m \text{e}^{-\beta_k/T}. \]  

For QCT, A, m, and \( \beta_k \) are 4.51789 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}, 0.08535, and 89.76252 K, respectively. For QM, the parameters A, m, and \( \beta_k \) have the values of 4.64706 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}, 0.12203, and 26.91122 K, respectively.

6 CONCLUSIONS

For the first time, we have reported a global CHIPR PES of the ground state Si2C(X^1A_2) system based on a total of 4080 ab initio points calculated at the MRCI(Q) level with AV(Q + d)Z and AVQZ basis set. The equilibrium geometries, dissociation energies, and harmonic vibrational frequencies of Si2C(X^3Σ_g^-) and SiC(X^3Π) obtained from

---

**Table 4.** Parameters used in the TDWP calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scattering coordinate (R) range</td>
<td>0.01 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of grid points in R</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diatomic coordinate (r) range</td>
<td>2.5 – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of grid points in r</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption region length in R (r)</td>
<td>3.0 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption strength in R (r)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre of initial wave packet R_0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial translational energy (eV)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-step for propagation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total propagation time</td>
<td>150 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All parameters are given in atomic units, except for the numbers of quantities or indicated otherwise.

---

**Figure 6.** The energy diagram for the insertion reaction pathway and relative stationary points of C(3P) + Si2(X^3Σ_g^-) → Si(3P) + SiC(X^3Π) reaction. Energies in E_h are given relative to the C(3P) + Si2(X^3Σ_g^-) asymptote.

**Figure 7.** The ICSs (Å^2) for the C(3P) + Si2(X^3Σ_g^-); v = 0–3, j = 0) reaction as a function of the collision energy for several vibrational quantum numbers v = 0, 1, 2, 3 with the rotational quantum number j = 0.

**Figure 8.** The rate constants versus temperatures from 150 to 3000 K for C(3P) + Si2(X^3Σ_g^-) → Si(3P) + SiC(X^3Π) obtained by QCT and QM methods.
the CHIPR PESs show good agreement with the experimental values. Topographical characteristics including the equilibrium geometries, energies, and vibrational frequencies of the stationary points obtained from the CHIPR PES are discussed in detail and compared well with available theoretical and experimental values. Based on the CHIPR PES, ICSs, and rate constants for the $\text{C}(\Pi) + \text{Si}_2(\Sigma^1_g)$ reaction are calculated using the QCT and QM methods. For the lack of available experimental and theoretical values, our results are made an analogy with the other barrierless exothermic reactions and show reasonable order of magnitude and variation tendency. The ICSs for the reaction show that the vibrational excitation has a significantly negative effect on reactivity.

The obtained CHIPR PES for ground state $\text{Si}_2\text{C}(\Sigma^1_a)$ shows reasonable and smooth behaviour over the whole configuration space and can be used to construct PES for larger molecular systems, such as the $\text{Si}_2\text{C} + \text{H}_2$ system (Cabrera-González et al. 2023). Our computed ICSs and rate constants can be useful for modelling chemical evolution towards AGB carbon star IRC+10216.
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