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#### Abstract

In the thrive for higher efficiency of solar panels, the use of singlet fission materials could be one of the solutions. Research on such materials has confirmed the existence of the singlet fission process in combination with energy transfer afterwards, for certain acceptor materials.

In this master thesis, the first aim was to computationally reproduce this experimentally observed energy transfer from tetracene, the singlet fission material, to a lead sulphide quantum dot, the acceptor material, using density functional theory, molecular dynamics and surface hopping algorithms. The second aim is to answer the question if and how the orientation of the tetracene with respect to the quantum dot influences the energy transfer.

The accuracy of the functionals used in this work was determined to be rough, especially for charge transfer states. After adjusting the (charge transfer) state energies, the energy transfer of triplet excitons from tetracene to quantum dots was successfully reproduced using the GFSH algorithm, with transfer times that are not contradicting the experimentally determined time frame. Analysis of the behaviour of the coupling during the simulated trajectory suggests that the distance between tetracene and the closest atom of the quantum dot ligands has a significant influence on the coupling. Finally, no clear dependencies are found between coupling and one of the other variables.
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## Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Introduction

Solar panels are increasingly used for generating electricity all over the world. Despite this rising usage of solar panels, their efficiency is still rather limited, with energy efficiency values around $20 \%$ for panels on the market, and of $28.8 \%[52,25]$ as a maximum obtained under lab conditions. There are promising processes within a range of materials that can potentially improve the efficiency of solar energy systems, such as carrier multiplication. In organic materials, carrier multiplication's equivalent is called singlet exciton fission, which has experimentally been observed in certain materials. To use the benefits of singlet fission, one needs to eliminate or significantly reduce the losses that necessary processes, such as energy transfer, cause. By computationally reproducing experimentally observed energy transfer of excitons generated by singlet fission, the aim of this thesis is to find out how energy transfer can be made more efficient. To do so, question how the ideal placement of the donor with respect to the acceptor is, needs to be answered.

### 1.2 Context

Global warming is almost generally accepted as a big problem, for which solutions have to be found with an increasing urgency. Hence, one of the currently interesting fields of research is finding full-fledged alternatives to fossil energy. Solar panels are one of the alternatives that are already on the market. Although the usage of solar panels is increasing rapidly, their efficiency is still relatively low, since roughly $20 \%$ of the energy of light reaching the panel is converted into energy. In lab situations, higher efficiencies are obtained, up to $28.8 \%$ [52, 25].

A big part of the loss of efficiency is caused by the fixed band gap, or HOMO-LUMO gap for the case of organic molecules. The loss is caused by the spectrum of the sun, which is well spread over a big range of wavelengths. Photons with an energy equal to the band gap can provide excitations without loss of energy. Photons with lower energy will not be absorbed. Hence, all energy of these photons can be considered as losses. The photons with higher energy than the band gap can be absorbed, but will reduce in energy to the lowest excited state. Hence, the difference between the energy of the photon and the energy of the lowest excited state is also lost energy. Combining this calculation of losses with the solar spectrum results in the Shockley-Queisser limit, describing the maximum efficiency for monocrystalline materials. Under these conditions, the optimal band gap is at 1.34 eV , with a theoretical maximum energy efficiency of $33.7 \%[52]$.

One of the solutions that might help overcoming the Shockley-Queisser limit and hence might help improving the efficiency of future solar panels, is the use of materials with carrier multiplication capabilities. In organic materials, this process is called singlet fission. Herein, an electron is excited to form an excited state called the singlet exciton, which converts into two triplet excitons. Hence, one of the requirements for a material to allow singlet fission to take place, is that the singlet excitation is roughly two times higher in energy than the triplet excitation, compared to the ground state energy.

A singlet fission material on its own will not be able to exceed the Shockley-Queisser limit, but in combination with other materials it might. For useful solar applications it is therefore important that the energy transfer from singlet fission materials to the second, acceptor, material
is as efficient as possible. An important aspect herein is the energy transfer time. If the energy is transferred faster, there is less time and hence less probability for processes causing losses, such as recombination, to take place.

This research focusses on the energy transfer from singlet fission materials into quantum dots. This has experimentally been observed for setups from tetracene to lead sulphide quantum dots[64], as well as from pentacene to lead selenide quantum dots[59]. In the experiment with tetracene, the quantum dot ligand length is varied to show an exponential decrease in transfer efficiency. This indicates that the transfer mechanism is Dexter energy transfer[?]. Knowing that the energy transfer does occur, the next challenge is to optimise the transfer. Using computational techniques, we aim to give insights in the ideal positioning of a singlet fission material, represented by a single tetracene molecule, with respect to the acceptor, a lead sulphide quantum dot. To do so, the focus is solely on the energy transfer process. Hence, the singlet fission process is ignored, which leads to an initial situation where the triplet exciton is located at the tetracene molecule. Using density functional theory, molecular dynamics and surface hopping algorithms, the electron transfer from tetracene to the quantum dot is simulated and analysed.

### 1.3 Problem

In the experiments performed in labs, the energy transfer from tetracene and pentacene to quantum dots has been confirmed to take place. However, it is hard to determine the exact microscopic distance and orientation between donor and acceptor. With simulations of the situation, it can easily be seen how the donor is orientated with respect to the acceptor. Using computational techniques, we want to find out how the setup influences the energy transfer. The first target of the research is to computationally reproduce the energy transfer from tetracene to lead sulphide quantum dots. As a next step, we want to know how the different angles influence the energy transfer: how should the tetracene molecule be rotated around its longest and its smallest axis, to observe optimal energy transfer? Furthermore, we also want to obtain information on the role of the intermolecular distance. Should the distance be as small as possible? And does the positioning and length of the ligand influence the energy
transfer?

### 1.4 Outline

In the remainder of this thesis, the aim is to find answers to the posed research questions. This research covers various parts of different fields of science. Therefore, Chapter 2 describes the theory and background behind the relevant parts of chemistry, physics and informatics. This includes a short explanation of quantum physics and the photovoltaic effect, as well as a brief description of singlet and triplet states and the singlet fission process. Furthermore, density functional theory, the computational technique that is the basis of the majority of the computations performed for this thesis, is explained in this chapter.

Hereafter, the research is described, divided into two different parts. In the first part, Chapter 3, exploratory density functional theory computations are performed on tetracene monomers and dimers. Pentacene monomers and dimers were also analysed in the same way, as a reliability check. For both materials, different types of functionals are used to give insights in the accuracy and speed of calculating the excited states of the setups.
In Chapter 4, the second research part, molecular dynamics algorithms are used to simulate the dynamics of a setup in which a tetracene molecule is placed close to a lead sulphide quantum dot. The setups are analysed for two different ligands with both thousands of unique time steps.
The final chapter, Chapter 5, summarises the conclusions that can be drawn from the results. Furthermore, this chapter describes if, how, and to which extent, the results and conclusions are able to provide answers to the research questions.

## Chapter 2

## Background Theory

## Background Theory Statement

In this section, we take a deeper look into the theory behind the occurring phenomena. The two main parts of this section are 'Quantum Physics and Quantum Chemistry' (2.1) and 'Computational Theory' (2.2). The symbols that are used are as much as possible in line with the corresponding references, and are only altered in case of duplicate symbols or meanings.

### 2.1 Quantum Physics and Quantum Chemistry

### 2.1.1 Wave functions

In classical mechanics, $x(t)$ would describe the position of an object, e.g. a particle, over time $t$. In quantum mechanics, the same particle is described by its wave function, $\Psi[27]$. The wave function is related to the probability to find the particle between $a$ and $b p_{a<x<b}$, as

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{a<x<b}=\int_{a}^{b}\|\Psi(x, t)\|^{2} d x . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this case, $\Psi$ is dependent of time $(t)$ and a one-dimensional space coordinate $(x)$.

### 2.1.2 The Schrödinger equation and the Hamiltonian

The wave function obeys the Schrödinger equation[54], which can be denoted as[27]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{H} \Psi=E \Psi \quad \text { or } \quad \hat{H} \Psi=i \hbar \frac{\delta}{\delta t} \Psi \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

depending on $\Psi$ being time-independent or time-dependent, respectively. Herein, $\hat{H}$ is the Hamiltonian operator, and $E$ are the allowed energies. Furthermore, the values $E$ can be seen as the eigenvalues and expectation values of $\hat{H}$, with the $\Psi$-functions being the corresponding eigenfunctions.

The Hamiltonian operator for a single particle can be described as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{H}=-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2 m} \nabla^{2}+V \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which $m$ is the mass of the particle, $\hbar$ is Planck's constant divided by $2 \pi, \nabla$ is the nabla operator and $V$ describes the potential.

### 2.1.3 Quantum numbers

The state of a particle, say an electron, is defined by quantum numbers. There are two numbers that determine the energy of the electron. These are the principal quantum number $n$ and the azimuthal quantum number $l$. The number $n$ is restricted to be a positive integer, whereas $l$ can have all values from 0 to $n-1$, thus $l=0,1,2, \ldots n-1$.

The other two quantum numbers defining the state of a particle, are the magnetic quantum number $m_{l}$ and the secondary spin quantum number $m_{s}$. These quantum numbers are restricted to the values $m_{l}=-l,-l+1,-l+2, \ldots, l-1, l$ and $m_{s}=-s,-s+1, \ldots, s-1, s$, where $s$ is the (primary) spin quantum number, which is $s=\frac{1}{2}$ for a single electron.

### 2.1.4 Photovoltaic Effect

The $n$ and $l$ numbers indicate the orbital that the electrons are in. The Pauli exclusion principle states that two identical fermions (electrons, for example) cannot occupy the same state. Hence, the orbital with the lowest energy ( $n=1 \rightarrow l=0$ ) can only hold two electrons, since $m_{l}$ has to be zero and the spin can be either $\uparrow\left(m_{s}=\frac{1}{2}\right)$ or $\downarrow\left(m_{s}=-\frac{1}{2}\right)$. The bands with low energy, which have a higher probability to be filled, are called valance bands, the higher energy band is called the conduction band. The band gap energy $E_{g}$ is the difference in energy between the valence and the conduction band.

A photon may be absorbed and excite an electron from the valance to the conduction band. This process is called photoconductivity and the energy of the photon evidently has to satisfy[68]

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{\text {photon }} \geq E_{g} . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using $\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{n}$ junction, the positive side ( p , with a lack of electrons) is connected to the negative side ( n , with an excess of electrons), creating a potential difference, which, upon photo excitation can generate a current. This process is called the photovoltaic effect.

### 2.1.5 Singlet and Triplet States

In a system consisting of two electrons such as an exciton, multiple spin configurations are possible. For the singlet state, the quantum number $s$ is zero, resulting in the configuration:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\uparrow \downarrow-\downarrow \uparrow), \text { with } m_{s}=0 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The triplet states are the three possible configurations for the spin quantum number $s=1[27]$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
\uparrow \uparrow, \text { with } m_{s} & =1 ; \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\uparrow \downarrow+\downarrow \uparrow), \text { with } m_{s} & =0 ;  \tag{2.6}\\
\downarrow \downarrow, \text { with } m_{s} & =-1 .
\end{align*}
$$

The ground and first excited singlet state are denoted as $S_{0}$ and $S_{1}$, whereas the energetically lowest triplet state is denoted as $T_{1}$. There are multiple ways to generate triplet states and the generation method that is studied in this thesis is fission of singlet excitons.

### 2.1.6 Singlet Fission

An organic chromophore that is excited to a higher singlet state is able to share its excitation energy with a neighbouring organic chromophore in the ground state. This results in two neighbouring chromophores in excited triplet states. The process is called singlet fission and a schematic representation is included in figure 2.1[56]. For singlet fission to take place rapidly,

Figure 2.1: a schematic representation of singlet fission; at step 1, chromophore A is excited to state $S_{1}$, denoted as $A\left(S_{1}\right)$; at step 2 the singlet fission takes place, converting $A\left(S_{1}\right)+B\left(S_{0}\right)$ to
 $A\left(T_{1}\right)+B\left(T_{1}\right)$.
there several of conditions that need to be satisfied; not all of them are well known.[56] The biggest requirement is the presence of two organic molecules for which the energy of the excited singlet state is approximately twice the energy of the triplet state $\left(E\left(S_{1}\right) \gtrsim 2 E\left(T_{1}\right)\right)$.

The most direct description of the singlet fission process is based on the reverse triplet-triplet annihilation from Merrifield's theory [13, 32]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{1} \Leftrightarrow{ }^{1}(\mathrm{TT}) \Leftrightarrow T_{1}+T_{1} \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Herein, ${ }^{1}(\mathrm{TT})$ is an intermediate state of two correlated triplets, which from now on is called multiple exciton state (ME). Although some researchers supported this direct mechanism[76], the estimated direct coupling matrix element was about two orders of magnitude too small to explain the singlet fission timescale in pentacene[8, 14]. To explain the rapid fission, the
existence of quantum superposition between $S_{1}$ and ME was suggested[14]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{0} \rightarrow\left[S_{1} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{ME}\right] \rightarrow \mathrm{ME}^{\prime} \rightarrow T_{1}+T_{1} \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which $\left[S_{1} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{ME}\right]$ is the superposition, and $\mathrm{ME}^{\prime}$ is the multiple exciton state that is no longer coupled to $S_{1}$. However, this equation does not include charge transfer states (CT), which are believed to play a role in the fission mechanism in tetracene crystallites, pentacene dimers and pentacene crystallites $[13,8,9]$. Charge transfer states are the result of an electron that is


Figure 2.2: a simplified schematic representation of the allowed spin configurations and transitions of the states $S_{1}$ (one molecule in $S_{1}$ and the other in $S_{0}$ ), CT (the charge transfer state) and TT (the triplettriplet state)[26]. In every square, the top lines are the LUMO and the bottom lines the HOMO; the horizontal separation distinguishes the two molecules.
excited to a neighbouring molecule, as schematically shown in figure 2.2. With the inclusion of charge transfer states, the fission mechanism could be written as[39]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{0} \rightarrow\left[S_{1} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{CT} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{ME}\right] \rightarrow \mathrm{ME}^{\prime} \rightarrow T_{1}+T_{1}, \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left[S_{1} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{CT} \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{ME}\right]$ is a quantum superposition state between the Frenkel exciton $\left(S_{1}\right)$, the charge transfer state and the multiple exciton state. This is a rather general notation, whereas some studies indicate that the process might be material and/or structure dependent. In pentacene dimer, charge transfer states behave as high-lying virtual states in a super-exchange
mechanism engendering ultra-fast fission[39, 8]. In pentacene crystallites on the other hand, ultra-fast fission requires the involvement of charge transfer states, which are in this case lowerlying due to the polarizability of the surrounding molecules, mixing with the adiabatic singlet exciton $S_{1}[9]$. Efficient singlet fission has only been found in a select number of molecules, including, as already mentioned, pentacene and tetracene[39, 77, 3].

### 2.1.7 Tetracene

Tetracene consists of four alkene rings, see figure 2.3 (a). Singlet fission in tetracene is an uphill process, since excitation energy of the $S_{1}$ state is lower that the sum of the excitation energy of two triplet states, $E\left(S_{1}\right)<E\left(2 T_{1}\right)$. The excitation energy of $S_{1}$ and $T_{1}$ are 2.32 eV and 1.25 eV for a tetracene crystal at room temperature[66].

(a)

(b)

Figure 2.3: tetracene (a) and pentacene (b) molecular structure

### 2.1.8 Pentacene

The pentacene molecule is shown in figure 2.3 (b). The excitation energies in pentacene are favorable for singlet fission. For a monomer, the excitation energies are 2.3 eV for $S_{1}$ and 0.86 eV for $T_{1}[77,29,11]$. In crystal structure, the excited-state energy of $S_{1}$ is $1.83 \mathrm{eV}[65]$.

### 2.2 Computational Theory

### 2.2.1 Introduction

As already mentioned in the introduction, this is a theoretical research zoomed in to very small scales. Hence, the computations are performed with software and algorithms developed in the theoretical chemistry research field. Albeit multiple techniques are to be used, the majority of the computations is based on one method, called Density Functional Theory (DFT). This section describes the background of DFT, as well as the differences between a couple of the relevant functionals.

Since this is the only general method, no other computational methods are described at this point. The remaining methods and algorithms that are used are described specifically in theory sections in the chapters they are used in.

This section is based on, and uses the notations of, an article written by Cramer and Truhlar[15].

### 2.2.2 Density Functional Theory in general

Density functional theory provides a method for the computation of energies, charge distributions and wave functions. The electronic energy of the computed system can be approximated as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
E=T_{n}+\varepsilon_{n e}+\varepsilon_{e e}+\varepsilon_{x c} . \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Herein, $T_{n}$ is the kinetic energy of non-interacting electrons, $\varepsilon_{n e}$ the interaction between the electron distribution and the nuclei, $\varepsilon_{e e}$ contains the interaction energy of the spin densities with each others and with themselves, described by the classical Coulomb energy.

The remaining energies and energetic corrections are described by the exchange-correlation energy, $\varepsilon_{x c}$. This $\varepsilon_{x c}$ corrects for the lack of interactions in $T_{n}$, and the unphysical interactions of the electrons with themselves, which are included in $\varepsilon_{e e}$. Also, $\varepsilon_{x c}$ includes exchange energy, taking into account the exchange of electron variables due to indistinguishability, and correlation energy, taking into account that multiple single-electron spin densities put together are not equal
to one many-electron spin density. $\varepsilon_{x c}$ is written as a functional of the spin-density and it is called the spin-density functional[15] or exchange-correlation functional[73].

These densities of a system can be calculated using the occupied Kohn-Sham spin-orbitals, $\psi_{j \sigma}$, as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{\sigma}=\sum_{j}^{\mathrm{occ}}\left|\psi_{j \sigma}\right|^{2} . \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

The Kohn-Sham spin-orbitals can be computed with self-consistent field calculations, and the $\sigma$ and $j$ represent the spin number and other quantum numbers, respectively. With the usage of Kohn-Sham theory comes one of the limitations of DFT. Kohn-Sham theory is not able to treat all open-shell systems or excited states well. Still, Kohn-Sham theory remains the most accurate available approach for most cases. Furthermore, there are functionals that can overcome these disadvantages.

The existence of the density functional is confirmed by the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem[30]. However, there is no closed-form expression for the functional, and improving the approximations of the functional can not be done by a systematic route. This does not mean that no useful approximations exist. In the next subsection, 2.2.3, the different type of functionals are described.

### 2.2.3 Different Functionals

The first approximation to a density functional is the Dirac-Slater approximation, which is an approximation to exchange[16, 55]. Taking correlation into account by calculations on uniform electron gas, results in the local spin density approximation (LSDA), depending only on spin densities and not on derivatives of the density, nor on orbitals[12, 70, 47].

As a next step, a dependence on the gradients of the spin densities can be added. These type of functionals are called generalised gradient approximations (GGAs). One of the numerous GGAs was developed by and named after Perdew, Burke, and Ernzerhof, hence called PBE[45]. Both of the two thusfar mentioned types of functionals, LSDA and GGAs, include self-exchange and self-correlation. As a result of these unphysical and hence unwanted additions, calculations with such functions turn out to calculate too small HOMO-LUMO gaps.

Self-exchange and self-correlation can be eliminated by including respectively Hartree-Fock exchange and kinetic energy density $[46,6,75]$. The addition of Hartree-Fock exchange results in functionals called hybrid GGAs or hybrid functionals. If kinetic energy density is added, the functionals are called meta functionals. The combination of the two results in hybrid meta functionals. The hybrid functional that is by far the most popular, is called B3LYP[57]. Hybrid functionals, such as B3LYP, have the advantage that they overcome the problems with open-shell systems and excited states as caused by Kohn-Sham theory.

Out of all the available functionals, new functionals are created that combine multiple functionals to a curtain extent. The last group of functionals worth mentioning is called the range-separated functionals. These functionals combine different methods for calculating shortrange and long-range exchange. CAM-B3LYP is such a range-separated functional, combining the B3LYP functional with a long-range correction called Coulomb-attenuating method (CAM) [73, 60].

### 2.3 List of Symbols

CT charge transfer state
$E \quad$ total energy
$\varepsilon_{e e} \quad$ interaction energy between electrons
$\varepsilon_{n e} \quad$ interaction energy of electrons with nuclear framework
$\varepsilon_{x c} \quad$ exchange-correlation energy/functional
$\hat{H} \quad$ hamiltonian operator
$h \quad$ original Planck's constant
$\hbar \quad$ Planck's constant $h$ divided by $2 \pi$, i.e. $\hbar=1.054572 \times 10^{-34} \mathrm{Js}[27]$
HOMO highest occupied molecular orbital
$i \quad$ complex component
$j \quad$ collection of all quantum numbers, except spin
$l \quad$ azimutal quantum number
LUMO lowest unoccupied molecular orbital
$m_{l} \quad$ magnetic quantum number
$m_{s} \quad$ secondary spin quantum number
ME multiple exciton state of two combined triplets
$n \quad$ principal quantum number
$\Psi \quad$ wave function, mostly unrestrained
$\psi \quad$ wave function, mostly restrained to specific variables, dimensions and/or conditions
$\rho \quad$ spin density
$\sigma \quad$ spin quantum number
$S_{n} \quad$ n'th excited singlet state, with $S_{0}$ the ground state
$T_{n} \quad$ kinetic energy
$T_{1} \quad$ the lowest excited triplet state
${ }^{1}$ (TT) combined state of two triplets, mostly depicted as ME
$V \quad$ total potential energy
$v$ local potential function
$W \quad$ interaction compontent of E
$w \quad$ interaction function
$\nabla^{2} \quad$ Laplacian, which depends on the used coordinate system; for cartesian coordinates, it is defined as: $\left(\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial x^{2}}+\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial y^{2}}+\frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial z^{2}}\right)$
$\uparrow \quad$ spin up, i.e. $m_{s}=\frac{1}{2}$
$\downarrow \quad$ spin down, i.e. $m_{s}=-\frac{1}{2}$

## Chapter 3

## Research Part I: Exploratory simulations using DFT

### 3.1 Introduction

### 3.1.1 Background

In this chapter, DFT calculations are performed on the singlet fission materials. Since there are many different functionals that all have certain qualities and downsides, it is needed to get an impression of the results that the different functionals deliver, as well as the computational time it takes to use them.

In the research performed for this chapter, the focus is mostly on the ground states and excited states, the excitation energies and for the acceptor materials on the band gap.

### 3.1.2 Materials

The exploratory DFT calculations are performed on two different singlet fission materials: tetracene and pentacene. Both are studied as a monomer and as a dimer. The monomer is interesting, since it provides a good insight in all the locally excited states. The dimer is
complementary to the monomer, because it allows the existence of charge transfer states, as well as delocalised states.

For tetracene, the first excited singlet state is 2.35 eV higher than the ground state, measured in crystal structure with emission spectra for prompt fluorescence. The first excited triplet state is 1.25 eV , determined with emission spectra for delayed fluorescence.[66]

In the crystal structure, the first excited singlet state of pentacene is determined to be 1.83 eV higher than the ground state, where the first excited triplet state is 0.73 eV higher than the groundstate[38].

### 3.1.3 Geometry of the Materials

For the monomers, a geometry optimisation is performed with the PBE functional in the ADF software package $[62,19,5]$. For the dimers, the structures are build by ADF-BAND[61, 72, 21, 20, 48] using lattice parameters taken from literature[40, 41]. Geometry optimisations are run with the PBE functional.

### 3.1.4 Outline

The remainder of this chapter starts with a section that describes how software package TheoDORE is able to determine electron-hole localisation variables quantitatively. Thereafter, the method section describes the two methods used for calculating the relevant data. The results and analysis section is split into multiple subsections for tetracene and pentacene. The last two sections of this chapter are the Discussion and Conclusion parts.

### 3.2 Theory

### 3.2.1 Introduction

In this section, the software and its underlying theory that are specifically needed for this chapter, are described. In this chapter, a package called TheoDORE is the only used software that is not covered by Chapter 2. Descriptions of TheoDORE and the theory behind TheoDORE are provided in the next subsection[50].

### 3.2.2 TheoDORE

TheoDORE can be used to calculate quantitative information on the localisation of, and distance between, the electron and the hole. To do so, TheoDORE starts with the transition density matrix (1TDM), denoted as

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{\mu \nu}^{O I}=\left\langle\Phi^{O}\right| \hat{a}_{\mu}^{\dagger} \hat{a}_{\nu}\left|\Phi^{I}\right\rangle \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a^{\dagger}$ and $a$ are the creation and annihilation operators, respectively. Then, the charge transfer number of fragments A and B is written as[51]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega_{A B}=\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu \in A} \sum_{\nu \in B}\left[\left(\mathbf{D}^{0 I} \mathbf{S}\right)_{\mu \nu}\left(\mathbf{S D}^{0 I}\right)_{\mu \nu}+D_{\mu \nu}^{0 I}\left(\mathbf{S D}^{0 I} \mathbf{S}\right)\right] \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which the summation runs over all atomic basis functions $\mu$ and $\nu$ of A and B , respectively. Now, the total amount of charge separation [50] can be calculated by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega_{C T}=\frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{B \neq A} \Omega_{A B}, \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

resulting in a value between 0 and 1 , due to scaling by $\Omega$. A value of $\omega_{C T}=0$ indicates a local excitation, and a complete charge transfer state results in $\omega_{C T}=1 . \Omega$ can be physically interpret as a measure of the single-excitation character of an excitation, and it can be calculated
as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Omega=\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{D}^{I 0} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{D}^{0 I} \mathbf{S}\right) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Herein, $\mathbf{D}^{I 0}$ is the transpose of $\mathbf{D}^{0 I}$.
TheoDORE can furthermore be used for giving an expectation value of exciton size, which is defined as the distance between the electron and hole,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{e x c}=\sqrt{\left.\langle | \vec{x}_{h}-\left.\vec{x}_{e}\right|^{2}\right\rangle_{e x c}} . \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This distance can be calculated from the output of computations using

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{e x c}^{2}=\frac{1}{\Omega} \sum_{\xi \in\{x, y, z\}}\left(\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{D}^{I 0} \mathbf{M}_{\xi}^{(2)} \mathbf{D}^{0 I} \mathbf{S}\right)-2 \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{D}^{I 0} \mathbf{M}_{\xi}^{(1)} \mathbf{D}^{0 I} \mathbf{M}_{\xi}^{(1)}\right)+\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{D}^{I 0} \mathbf{S D}^{0 I} \mathbf{M}_{\xi}^{(2)}\right)\right) . \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $M_{x, \mu \nu}^{(k)}$ can be calculated using the atomic orbitals $\chi_{\mu}$ and $\chi_{\nu}$, as

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{x, \mu \nu}^{(k)}=\int \chi_{\mu}(r) x^{k} \chi_{\nu}(r) d r \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 3.3 Method

### 3.3.1 Method 1: DFT with Different Functionals using ADF

This subsection describes the time-dependent density functional theory simulations that are performed with the ADF software [62, 19, 5]. Within ADF, one needs to define a number of computational properties. These properties include the basis set, the integration accuracy, a frozen core option and a relativity option. Furthermore, the Tamm-Dancoff Approximation (TDA) can be turned on or off. Any other options are kept at default.

In general, increasing the accuracy, the basis set functions and turning on the other options results in better results, but also in a significantly longer computation time. For most simulations, not too high quality properties are chosen, to keep the computational time convenient. As a benchmark, a couple of simulations with higher quality are performed on tetracene, to see
if the lower quality simulations are appropriate or not.

## Tetracene

All the functionals, with the corresponding properties, that were used for tetracene, are listed in table 3.1.

|  | PBE | PBE <br> (high <br> qual. $)$ | B3LYP | B3LYP <br> (high <br> qual.) | CAM- <br> B3LYP | CAMY- <br> B3LYP | MO6-2X |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| mon/dim | both | both | both | both | both | both | both |
| sing/trip | both | both | both | both | both | sing | both |
| Basis Set | DZP | TZ2P | DZP | TZ2P | DZP | DZP | DZP |
| Integ. Acc. | normal | verygood | normal | verygood | normal | normal | good |
| Frozen C. | small | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| Relativity | none | none | none | none | none | none | none |
| TDA | off | off | off | off | both | off | on |
| ADF | 2014.08 | 2014.08 | 2014.08 | 2014.08 | 2016.01 | 2014.08 | 2014.08 |

Table 3.1: the functionals with their corresponding properties as used during the calculation of the excitation energies of tetracene. The row labels stand for monomer/dimer; singlet/triplet excitations; basis set; integration accuracy; frozen core; relativity; Tamm-Dancoff Approximation turned on or off; and the ADF version used.

## Pentacene

All the functionals, with the corresponding properties, that were used for pentacene, are listed in table 3.2.

From the results of these computations, the excitation energies are obtained. Furthermore, information about the exciton can be determined with additional software, as described in the next subsection.

|  | PBE | B3LYP | CAM- <br> B3LYP | CAMY- <br> B3LYP | MO6-2X |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| mon/dim | both | both | both | both | both |
| sing/trip | both | both | both | sing | both |
| Basis Set | DZP | DZP | DZP | DZP | DZP |
| Integ. Acc. | normal | normal | normal | normal | good |
| Frozen C. | small | none | none | none | none |
| Relativity | none | none | none | none | none |
| TDA | off | off | both | off | on |
| ADF | 2014.08 | 2014.08 | 2016.01 | 2014.08 | 2014.08 |

Table 3.2: the functionals with their corresponding properties as used during the calculation of the excitation energies of pentacene. The row labels stand for monomer/dimer; singlet/triplet excitations; basis set; integration accuracy; frozen core; relativity; Tamm-Dancoff Approximation turned on or off; and the ADF version used.

### 3.3.2 Method 2: DFT with Different Functionals using Orca and TheoDORE

In the excited states of the tetracene dimer, it is interesting to know where the electron and the hole are located. The software package TheoDORE (Theoretical Density, Orbital Relaxation and Exciton analysis) provides a method to give a quantitative description of the electron-hole distribution over the molecules/segments, as well as a expectation value for the distance between the electron and the hole. Since the output from ADF cannot be parsed to be used with TheoDORE, a different DFT program is used to obtain the analysis.

ORCA is used to do comparable calculations to the previous ADF calculations, but has the additional benefit that its output can be analysed by TheoDORE. To do so, the Orca output is parsed into compatible data by cclib[42].

### 3.4 Results and Analysis

### 3.4.1 Tetracene Results

From the literature, we know what the energies of the first excited triplet and singlet state ( $T_{1}$ and $S_{1}$ ) are. The triplet state is 1.25 eV , the singlet state is 2.32 eV in crystal structure and 2.88 eV for the monomer[66]. All three values are relative to the ground state energy.

The $T_{1}$ and $S_{1}$ states for the different functionals are displayed in table 3.3.

|  | PBE | PBE <br> (hq) |  | B3LYP | B3LYP <br> (hq) | CAMY- <br> B3LYP | CAM- <br> B3LYP | CAM- <br> B3LYP <br> (TDA) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 3.3: the excitation energies of the corresponding states as calculated for the corresponding functionals with the settings as described in the method section of tetracene, section 3.3.1. All values for the excitation energies are in eV and are relative to the ground state energy. The excitation energies of the remaining four triplet and four singlet states are enclosed in Appendix B.1.

The data from TheoDORE for tetracene is enclosed in figure 3.1.

### 3.4.2 Tetracene Analysis

## Monomer

For the monomer, the calculated energetic values for $T_{1}$ are stable and accurate. The values never differ by more than 0.2 eV from the reference value. The range-separated functionals are also delivering stable and accurate values for $S_{1}$, again not differing by more than 0.2 eV from the literature value. The non range-separated functionals are having a more trouble determining $S_{1}$, underestimating the values by $0.4-0.7 \mathrm{eV}$.


Figure 3.1: Electron and hole localisation for tetracene, obtained by TheoDORE. The $2 \times 2$ squares display where the electron and the hole are. The bottom/top squares indicate that the electron is located at molecule $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}$, whereas the left/right squares indicate that the hole is located at molecule $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}$. Hence, $\operatorname{PBE}\left(S_{1}\right)$ is a charge-transfer state, where the electron is at molecule B and the hole is at molecule A. Likewise, CAM-B3LYP $\left(S_{2}\right)$ is mostly a local excitation at molecule B and $\operatorname{PBE}\left(S_{3}\right)$ is delocalised over the two atoms (molecule B is slightly more populated).

## Dimer

The values for $T_{1}$ are comparable to the values obtained for the monomer. Again, the difference with the reference value is never bigger than 0.2 eV . We can now determine further, how the electron and hole are distributed.

For the singlet states, one can decide how the electrons and holes are distributed over the two molecules using the TheoDORE software. Due to limitations in (combining multiple types of) software, TheoDORE can only be used on the PBE, B3LYP and CAM-B3LYP functionals. For PBE, the first two singlet excitations are charge transfer (CT) states. They are too low,
compared to the literature value. However, the first non-CT state, where the exciton is delocalised over the two molecules, is calculated to be at 2.37 eV . For B3LYP and CAM-B3LYP, the first non-CT states are at 2.66 eV and 3.02 eV , respectively. Further differences in the results are the localisation of the exciton. In PBE's results, it is almost evenly delocalised over the two molecules. For the results of CAM-B3LYP, the exciton is localised at one of the molecules for roughly $80 \%$.

The analysis as performed by TheoDORE makes clear that the energetically lowest singlet states for the dimer are solely CT-states. However, one expects the CT-states to be higher in energy than the excited states without charge-transfer properties. For tetracene, this idea is backed by theoretical computations[76].

TheoDORE limits the possibilities of analysis to the singlet states. For these singlet states, the energy of the lowest non CT-states are underestimated by the PBE functional and also, albeit to a lesser extent, by the B3LYP functional. The CAM-B3LYP functional, on the other hand, slightly overestimates the energy of this non-CT singlet state. With values of respectively 1.30 eV and 1.88 eV , the PBE and B3LYP functionals are not even close to finding the right energies for the CT-states. The CAM-B3LYP functional however, gets a lot closer to a realistic value, with a CT-state energy of 2.87 eV . The exact energetic value to compare with is hard to determine, although it is likely that it is slightly higher than the $S_{1}$ excitation. For instance, for pentacene the CT-state energy on a dimer is estimated to be 0.23 eV higher compared to the energy of the normal $S_{1}$ state[38].

### 3.4.3 Pentacene Results

For pentacene, the excitation energies for a monomer are 0.86 eV for $T_{1}$ and 2.3 eV for $S_{1}$ [77, 29, 11]. In crystal structure, the excitation energy for $S_{1}$ is $1.83 \mathrm{eV}[65]$. The results for the first singlet and triplet excited states for the monomer and the dimer are listed in table 3.4.

The TheoDORE analysis on the electron and hole makes clear that all of these three $S_{1}$ states are CT-states. The first non CT-states are at $1.84 \mathrm{eV}, 2.11 \mathrm{eV}$ and 2.49 eV , for PBE, B3LYP

|  | PBE | B3LYP | CAMY- <br> B3LYP | CAM- <br> B3LYP | CAM-B3LYP <br> (TDA) | M06-2X |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $T_{1}$ (mon) | 0.93 | 0.71 | N.A. | -0.90 | 0.95 | N.A. |
| $S_{1}$ (mon) | 1.62 | 1.89 | 2.14 | 2.20 | 2.50 | N.A. |
| $T_{1}$ (dim) | 0.72 | 0.62 | N.A. | -0.96 | 0.89 | 0.70 |
| $S_{1}(\operatorname{dim})$ | 0.78 | 1.28 | 1.89 | 2.06 | 2.17 | 2.04 |

Table 3.4: the excitation energies of the corresponding states as calculated for the corresponding functionals with the settings as described in the method section of pentacene, section 3.3.1. All values for the excitation energies are in eV and are relative to the ground state energy. The excitation energies of the remaining four triplet and four singlet states are enclosed in Appendix B.2.
and CAM-B3LYP, respectively.
All the useful data that are provided by Orca and TheoDORE, are enclosed in figure 3.2.

### 3.4.4 Pentacene Analysis

## Monomer

The calculated values for the energy of the first excited triplet states are relatively stable, except for CAM-B3LYP when the TDA is not used. For the remaining functionals, $T_{1}$ for B3LYP is the most inaccurate, but only 0.24 eV away from the literature value.

The energies of the monomer's $S_{1}$ states tend to be underestimated by the software, with the PBE functional deviating the most, by 0.7 eV .

## Dimer

For the dimer, things get more complicated. From literature, we know that the energies for the CT-state and first non-CT $S_{1}$ excitation for a pentacene dimer are estimated to be 2.03 eV and 1.80 eV , respectively[38]. It is hard to tell how accurate these values are, but it does confirm the idea that the CT-state should not be the lowest in energy. Due to technical limitations by the TheoDORE package, only the singlet states can be analysed properly. For the singlet excitations, it becomes clear that the lowest calculated states are CT-states, just like we have seen with tetracene. The CT-states that are the lowest excitations according to PBE and


Figure 3.2: Electron and hole distribution for pentacene, obtained by TheoDORE. The $2 \times 2$ squares display where the electron and the hole are. The bottom/top squares indicate that the electron is located at molecule $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}$, whereas the left/right squares indicate that the hole is located at molecule $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}$. Hence, $\operatorname{PBE}\left(S_{1}\right)$ is a charge-transfer state, where the electron is at molecule A and the hole is at molecule B. Likewise, $\operatorname{B3LYP}\left(S_{3}\right)$ is mostly a local excitation at molecule A and CAM-B3LYP $\left(S_{2}\right)$ is delocalised over the two atoms (molecule B is slightly more populated).

B3LYP, are far too low. The question remains however, whether all the states are too low in energy, or if it is only the CT-states energies that are underestimated.

If we only take a look at the non CT-states, the $S_{1}$ energy from the PBE functional, i.e. 1.84 eV , is closest to our reference values of 1.83 eV and 1.80 eV , obtained on crystal and dimers, respectively [65, 38]. The B3LYP and CAM-B3LYP functionals tend to overestimate the excitation energies for the $S_{1}$ state in a pentacene dimer, while all three functionals are underestimating the energy of the CT-state.

### 3.5 Discussion

The results make clear that there are high error margins. However, due to the way the functionals are built, i.e. with trial and error, it is hard to specify the exact error that should be taken into account. The determined values for the energy in combination with the information that TheoDORE provides, suggests that especially the computed CT-states are quite unreliable. Nonetheless, one should also be careful with the interpretation of the non-CT states. The energies of these states differ less than the CT-state energies, but the localisation of the hole and the electron are not consistent over the results from the three different functionals.

### 3.6 Conclusion

For all the four situations, the calculations of the energetic value of $T_{1}$ is relatively stable, with the error being 0.24 eV at most. For $S_{1}$, the calculations are less accurate. The rangeseparated functionals are doing well on the monomers, with $\mathrm{dE}<0.2 \mathrm{eV}$. For the dimers, the range-separated functionals are also doing relatively well, since the error is never bigger than 0.41 eV . The non range-separated functionals however, have big errors for both the monomers (up to 0.73 eV ) and the dimers (up to 1.6 eV ).

Analysis makes clear that the errors of the energy of the dimers are mostly caused by underestimations of the energy of the charge transfer states. Since the systems in the next chapter are bigger, the range-separated functionals are, in most occasions, computationally too expensive. Hence, one has to take the potential errors into account, especially in the charge-transfer state situations.

## Chapter 4

## Research Part II: Energy Transfer from Tetracene to Quantum Dot with Non-Adiabatic Molecular Dynamics

### 4.1 Introduction

### 4.1.1 Description

In this chapter we study the process of energy transfer of a triplet exciton located at tetracene, to a lead-sulphide quantum dot ( PbS QD ). In this introduction, we start by explaining what a quantum dot is. Thereafter, a summary is given of experimental research that has been done on this matter. Lastly, I describe what the objectives and outline of this chapter are.

### 4.1.2 Quantum Dot

Quantum dots (QD) are colloidal particles that are very interesting for fields with optoelectric purposes or applications. The first reason why QDs are interesting is that the optical and electronic properties, such as the band gap, are dependent of the particle size and can hence
accurately be tuned $[23,33]$.
The surfaces of the QDs are terminated by ligands that guarantee the solution processability of the QDs. Research has shown that these ligands also influence the optoelectric properties of the QDs. Experiments make clear that the energy levels of the quantum dots can be shifted significantly by changing the ligands[10]. Furthermore, the light absorption can be increased significantly by shortening the ligands[23]. QDs can be used as light-harvesting materials, but they have also succesfully been used as emissive acceptor materials, for energy transfer from singlet fission materials [64, 59].

### 4.1.3 Literature

The energy transfer process from triplet excitations to quantum dots has been observed in multiple experimental articles $[64,59]$. In this research, the aim is to computationally reproduce the triplet transfer from tetracene to PbS QDs, as observed in MIT's experiments[64]. A summary of the relevant parts of the article is provided, just after this introduction.

### 4.1.4 Objective

From the experimental results, we know that the energy transfer occurs within 10ns. In the research described in this chapter, the first aim is to reproduce the energy transfer observed in the described experiments. After this, the next step is to provide useful insights in the properties of, and the influences on the transfer process. Different methods of analysis are used to obtain information about the possible occurrence of quantum tunnelling, the adiabaticity of the process, the role of the charge-transfer states, the influence of the position of the tetracene with respect to the QD and the influence of the ligand.

### 4.1.5 Outline

In the next section, 4.2, the already mentioned experimentally observed energy transfer from tetracene to PbS QDs is summarised.

Hereafter, section 4.3 describes the theory behind the steps and algorithms that are specifically used in this chapter for the determination of the trajectories (molecular dynamics) and the surface hopping (FSSH, CPA and GFSH).

After this theory section, the method section, 4.4, gives an in-depth description of al the steps performed for obtaining the geometries, the trajectories and the surface hopping results.

In the next section, 4.5, the two used setups are described, as well as their behaviour over time. Thereafter, the results and analysis are enclosed (4.6). This includes an analysis of the coupling between tetracene and the quantum dot, and the influences of their mutual orientation hereon, as well as the simulations of the surface hopping process.

Naturally, this section is followed by a discussion (4.7) and a conclusion (4.8).

### 4.2 Experimental Research

The described process of singlet fission has been observed in multiple molecules. For the purpose of converting light into useable energy, the excited electrons need to be extracted from the singlet fission material. This chapter describes an overview of an experimental research performed at MIT by Thompson et al[64]. Herein, it is experimentally shown that energy transfer of triplet excitons from tetracene (the singlet fission material) to lead sulphide ( PbS ) quantum dots (the acceptor material) is possible, and dependent of ligand and/or intermolecular distance. All mentioned data, formulas and figures of this chapter refer to the cited MIT article.

In the first part of the research, the excitation spectrum of a thin film of PbS nanocrystals coated with a 20 -nm-thick film of tetracene is measured. Near-infrared emission is detected after exciting the tetracene layer. The presence of energy transfer from tetracene to PbS can be confirmed, since the peaks in the PbS excitation spectra appear at the same energies as in the absorption spectra of tetracene.

For the next step, the wavelength-dependent quantum yield of photons from the nanocrystal is used,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{QY}(\lambda)=\operatorname{QY}_{\mathrm{NC}}\left(\frac{\operatorname{ABS}_{\mathrm{NC}}(\lambda)+\eta_{\mathrm{fis}} \eta_{\mathrm{ET}} \mathrm{ABS}_{\mathrm{Tc}}(\lambda)}{\operatorname{ABS}_{\mathrm{NC}}(\lambda)+\mathrm{ABS}_{\mathrm{Tc}}(\lambda)}\right) \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Herein, $\mathrm{ABS}_{\mathrm{NC}}$ is the absorption of the nanocrystal, $\mathrm{QY} \mathrm{NC}_{\mathrm{NC}}$ is the intrinsic quantum yield of the nanocrystal, $\mathrm{ABS}_{\text {Tc }}$ is the absorption of the tetracene, $\eta_{\text {fis }}$ is the yield of excitons in tetracene after singlet exciton fission and $\eta_{\text {ET }}$ is the exciton transfer efficiency from tetracene to the nanocrystal. Fitting this function to the measured curve provides a value for $\eta_{\mathrm{fis}} \eta_{\mathrm{ET}}=$ $1.80 \pm 0.26$. The fact that $\eta_{\text {fis }} \eta_{\text {ET }}$ is greater than one proofs that the energy transfer is dominated by triplet excitons, since efficient triplet generation by singlet fission is the only explanation if more excitons are transferred than there are photons absorbed.

During the process, multiple ligands are used to passivate the surface of the nanocrystal. The


Figure 4.1: MIT's figure, showing a distinct correlation between the energy transfer efficiency and number of carbon-carbon single bonds in the nanocrystal ligand. The diagonal line is an exponential fit on the data, and the vertical bars represent the estimated uncertainty.
ligands vary in length, from oleic acid (OA, the longest), to caprylic (octanoic) acid (CA, the shortest). Figure 4.1 shows the energy transfer efficiency as a function of the ligand length, measured in terms of the number of single carbon-carbon bonds. This figure makes clear that there is a direct correlation between the length of the ligand on the quantum dot, and the efficiency of the energy transfer. The question remains however, whether it is the ligand itself, the increased intermolecular distance, or a combination of the two, which causes the decrease
of efficiency.

### 4.3 Theory

### 4.3.1 Introduction

In this section, all the theoretical approaches and background that have not yet been mentioned but are relevant for this chapter, are written out in detail. This section is divided into subsections describing (the background of) the different methods that were used.

The subsections are in the same order as in the research. Hence, first the process of molecular dynamics is explained. The next step is the simulation of energy transfer over time, of which the theory is described in three subsections.

The first of these last three subsections describes the general theory behind the fewest-switches surface hopping method (FSSH). The next subsection explains what the classical path approximation is, which can be used in combination with FSSH. The last subsection describes a method called global flux surface hopping, which is a modification of FSSH that allows transitions trough higher-lying states.

### 4.3.2 Molecular Dynamics

If one wants to simulate the movement of atoms over time, molecular dynamics (MD) is a relatively simple but reliable method to do so.

The most basic system of MD is purely mechanical and contains $N$ atoms, in a fixed volume $V$, with an energy $E=T+E_{p}$. Herein, the kinetic energy $T$ is the sum of the classical kinetic energy of all individual atoms $\left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i} m_{i} v_{i}^{2}\right)$ and $E_{p}$ is the interatomic potential energy. Such a system with fixed volume is called a microcanonical ensemble, or NVE.

The equation of motion can be determined by the Verlet algorithm, as[22, 17]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{R}_{i}(t+\delta t)=2 \mathbf{R}_{i}(t)-\mathbf{R}_{i}(t-\delta t)+\frac{\delta t^{2}}{M_{i}} \mathbf{f}_{i}(t)+\mathcal{O}\left(\delta t^{4}\right) \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{V}_{i}(t)=\frac{1}{2 \delta t}\left[\mathbf{R}_{i}(t+\delta t)-\mathbf{R}_{i}(t-\delta t)+\right]+\mathcal{O}\left(\delta t^{3}\right) \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Alongside of the Verlet algorithm, there is an other algorithm that is equivalent to it, which is called Velocity Verlet[22, 17]:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{V}_{i}(t+\delta t) & =\mathbf{V}_{i}(t)+\frac{\delta t^{2}}{2 M_{i}}\left[\mathbf{f}_{i}(t)+\mathbf{f}_{i}(t+\delta t)\right]  \tag{4.4}\\
\mathbf{R}_{i}(t+\delta t) & =\mathbf{R}_{i}(t)+\delta t \mathbf{V}_{i}(t)+\frac{\delta t^{2}}{2 M_{i}} \mathbf{f}_{i}(t) \tag{4.5}
\end{align*}
$$

In the four above-mentioned equations, $\mathbf{R}_{i}$ denotes the place of atom $i, \mathbf{V}_{i}=\dot{\mathbf{R}}_{i}$ the velocity of atom $i, \mathbf{f}_{i}$ the forces on atom $i$ and $M_{i}$ the mass of atom $i$. These algorithms are, despite its simplicity, efficient, numerically stable and furthermore conserve energy quite well.

For systems that keep the energy constant, instead of the volume, there are some slight adaptions needed in the algorithms. Such a system, called Canonical ensemble or $N V T$, obeys a relation between temperature and the expectation value of the kinetic energy[22, 17]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\mathbf{P}_{i}^{2}}{2 M_{i}}\right\rangle_{N V T}=\frac{3}{2} N k_{B} T \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $k_{B}$ the Boltzmann constant. To obey this formula, and hence keep the system at a constant temperature, one can add velocity rescaling to the algorithm. Herein, the velocities are rescaled every time the temperature deviates from the correct value by more than the threshold value. There are alternatives to velocity rescaling, such as adding a thermostat at the edges simulating a thermal bath, but they are not discussed in this thesis since they are not used.

### 4.3.3 Fewest-switches surface hopping

This section gives an overview of the fewest-switches surface hopping method (FSSH), and is, unless stated otherwise, citing to the Supporting Information of the main PYXAID article, [1]. In FSSH, the influences of deterministic (TD-SE) and stochastic factors are combined to simulate a time-evolving electron-nuclear system over multiple trajectories.

At every time step, the probability for the electron to hop from a certain state $i$ to another
state $j$ is calculated. This probability can be written out as

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{i \rightarrow j}(t, d t)=\int_{t}^{t+d t} \frac{2}{c_{i}^{*}(t) c_{i}(t)} \operatorname{Re}\left[\left(\frac{i H_{i j}}{\hbar}\right) c_{i}^{*}(t) c_{j}(t)\right] d t=\frac{2}{\hbar} \int_{t}^{t+d t} \frac{R e\left[d_{i j} c_{i}^{*}(t) c_{j}(t)\right]}{c_{i}^{*}(t) c_{i}(t)} d t \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Herein, $c_{i}$ and $c_{j}$ and their conjugates are part of the density matrix, as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{i j}(t)=c_{i}^{*}(t) c_{j}(t) \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the case that the computed probability $P_{i \rightarrow j}$ is negative, it is changed to zero. The probability of staying in the same state $i$ can hence be denoted as

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{i \rightarrow i}(t)=1-\sum_{j \neq i} g_{i \rightarrow j}(t), \text { where } g_{i \rightarrow j}(t)=\max \left(0, P_{i \rightarrow j}(t)\right) . \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first part of the name FSSH, "fewest switches", thanks its name to the fact that the number of hops is minimised. This is due to the FSSH probabilities being related to the flux of the populations of states, and not to the actual state populations, resulting in a minimisation of switches.[67]

So far, all factors were deterministic. In the last step, the stochastic factor is introduced by a random number $\xi \in[0,1]$. This $\xi$ is compared to the probabilities to determine the next state $j$, which meets the requirement

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{k=0}^{j-1} g_{i \rightarrow k}(t)<\xi \leq \sum_{k=0}^{j} g_{i \rightarrow k}(t) . \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 4.3.4 Classical path approximation

The FSSH method can be updated to work within the Classical Path Approximation (CPA). CPA is valid under the assumption that the electronic dynamics are driven by the nuclear dynamics, and the nuclear dynamics are unaffected by the dynamics of the electronic degrees of freedom. Hence, this requires an absence of reorganisation, fragmentation, isomerisation and other significant structural changes under electronic excitations.[1]

In original FSSH, conservation of the total energy of the system is obtained by rescaling the velocity vectors of all atoms. Within FSSH-CPA, a different rescaling technique is used. Instead of the velocity, the transition probabilities are scaled, but only for energetically unfavourable transitions:

$$
\begin{gather*}
g_{i \rightarrow j}(t) \rightarrow g_{i \rightarrow j}(t) b_{i \rightarrow j}(t)  \tag{4.11}\\
b_{i \rightarrow j}(t)= \begin{cases}\exp \left(-\frac{E_{j}-E_{i}}{k_{B} T}\right) & E_{j}>E_{i} \\
1 & E_{j} \leq E_{i}\end{cases} \tag{4.12}
\end{gather*}
$$

For these energetically unfavourable transitions, the scaling correction is the Boltzmann factor, in which $k_{B}$ is the Boltzmann constant and $T$ is the temperature.[1]

### 4.3.5 GFSH

In the previously described sections, the mechanism of FSSH is explained. An alternative for the simulation of surface hopping is an algorithm called global flux surface hopping (GFSH) [71]. This method is based on the same principles as FSSH, but it handles the hopping probability for classically forbidden transitions differently. These classically forbidden transitions cannot and should not be fully avoided, since the avoidance would create an unrealistic unbalance in the surface hopping simulations[43, 44]. The difference between FSSH and GFSH can be found in dynamical processes such as superexchange, where two states are indirectly coupled trough an intermediate state with higher energy. An example hereof is the singlet fission process as described in section 2.1.6, where the higher-lying charge transfer states play a key role, but are hardly populated[56, 8, 2, 7]. Hence, these hops would be forbidden in FSSH, but GFSH allows these transitions by altering the hopping probability[71]. Although singlet fission is not the process that is simulated in this research, GFSH will turn out to be useful. After all, the process to be simulated is a dexter energy transfer, between two states that are not directly coupled.

The major difference between FSSH and GFSH lies in the surface hopping probabilities. The entire set of quantum states is divided into two subgroups of states. This results in groups A
and B , i.e. one with reduced population and the other with increased population, respectively. Then, the hopping probability can be written as[71]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{i \rightarrow j}=\frac{\Delta \rho_{j j}}{\rho_{i i}} \frac{\Delta \rho_{i i}}{\sum_{k \in A} \rho_{k k}}(\text { if } i \in A \text { and } j \in B), \tag{4.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

herein, the population change of a quantum state is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta \rho_{i i}=\rho_{i i}(t+\Delta t)-\rho_{i i}(t) . \tag{4.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

After a surface hop, the energy is conserved in the same way as in FSSH.

### 4.4 Method

### 4.4.1 Introduction

For this part of the research, two different setups are analysed. For both setups, the same method is used. The order of the steps as performed in the research are

1. Starting geometry determination with CP2K (4.4.2)
2. Trajectory Calculation using MD by CP2K (4.4.3)
3. Recalculation of Hamiltonians and coupling with QMWorks (4.4.4)
4. Simulation of the Energy Transfer with PYXAID. (4.4.5)

The next subsections each describe a part of the method.

### 4.4.2 Starting geometry determination with CP2K

As a first step in the process, the starting geometry of the setup is determined. The facets of the PbS QD are terminated for fifty percent with hydrogen atoms and for the other fifty
percent with ligands. The ligands are distributed over the facets in a realistic and natural, and thus irregular, way, determined by in-house calculations for different research topics[23]. For efficiency reasons, the actual ligands are only placed on the facet close to the tetracene, the other ligands are kept as short as possible, i.e. a COOH termination. For different setups, the same ligand placement is used, to make sure that the ligand length is the only variable changing.

After the placement of the ligands, the tetracene is placed close to the facet with the actual ligands. The distance of the tetracene is chosen arbitrarily, in such a way that the distance is big enough to prevent bondings between the ligand and the tetracene, and at the same time small enough to encourage the transfer of the electrons.

After each described step, a geometry optimisation is run within CP2K, with the PBE functional. The last geometry optimisation furthermore checks, and possibly corrects, whether the intermolecular distance was chosen properly.

### 4.4.3 Trajectory Calculation using MD by CP2K

The geometry of the first point in time is determined in the previous subsection. For calculation of the remainder of the trajectory, the MD method as described in 4.3.2 is used. The computations are performed by the CP2K package, where the temperature is fixed at 300 K , and multiple picoseconds are simulated, in steps of 1 fs .

In the trajectory, the starting point comes from a geometry optimised situation, and hence represents 0K. Therefore, the energy of the system starts low, and increases to a height where it stabilises. This 'warming up'-part, where the energy is not constant, is removed and thus not used in any of the remaining steps.

### 4.4.4 Recalculation of Hamiltonians and coupling with QMWorks

After the determination of the trajectory, the Hamiltonians need to be recalculated, due to technical incompatibilities. For this purpose, a python package called QMWorks-NAMD is
developed within the research group. Herein, the implementation of the computations of the non-adiabatic coupling is based on a method as used by Plasser et al[49].

### 4.4.5 Simulation of the Energy Transfer with PYXAID

The PYXAID package, which theory is described in sections 4.3.3-4.3.5, is used for the energy transfer simulation, using FSSH or GFSH. In this part, the relevant states are included, forming the active space. The energy levels of the states can be adjusted, to be closer to reality. The shifting of the energy happens in groups. The local excitation (LE) at tetracene is one group. The LE's on the PbS QD together form another group, and the last group contains al the CT-states. The energies of these groups are shifted relatively to each other.

The number of HOMO's and LUMO's that are included in the active space is determined by the alignment of the energy of the orbitals over time, which gives an indication for the relevant orbitals for the energy transfer process.

The simulations starts with a local excitation at the tetracene molecule. From there on, a thousand runs are performed over the longest available reliable part of the trajectory. The population of the states is averaged over these one thousand runs.

There are multiple settings that can manually be adjusted. One of them is the energy of the states. For both setups, eight different simulations are run, with the following settings:

1. FSSH with unchanged energy levels
2. FSSH with Tc LE lowered to 1.25 eV , and PbS band gap lowered to 1.0 eV , not changing the energy of the CT-states
3. FSSH with Tc LE lowered to 1.25 eV , and PbS band gap lowered to 1.0 eV , increasing the energy of the CT-states with 0.2 eV
4. FSSH with Tc LE lowered to 1.25 eV , and PbS band gap lowered to 1.0 eV , increasing the energy of the CT-states with 0.4 eV
5. GFSH with unchanged energy levels
6. GFSH with Tc LE lowered to 1.25 eV , and PbS band gap lowered to 1.0 eV , not changing the energy of the CT-states
7. GFSH with Tc LE lowered to 1.25 eV , and PbS band gap lowered to 1.0 eV , increasing the energy of the CT-states with 0.2 eV
8. GFSH with Tc LE lowered to 1.25 eV , and PbS band gap lowered to 1.0 eV , increasing the energy of the CT-states with 0.4 eV

### 4.5 Setups

### 4.5.1 Preparation: approximating the charge-transfer state energies

As a preparation to the main research, the tetracene and the QD have already been investigated in previous chapters. This led to useful results, providing insight in the orbitals and the energy of certain states. Furthermore, multiple experimental studies provide benchmarks for energies of excitations localised at tetracene, as well as the band gap of the PbS QD.

However, there is one type of state of which we do not know the energy beforehand. These are the charge-transfer states, in which only one electron has transferred, resulting in charged setups, i.e. $\mathrm{Tc}^{+} \mathrm{PbS}^{-}$or $\mathrm{Tc}^{-} \mathrm{PbS}^{+}$.

A simple but rough approximation for the CT-state energy, can be calculated by[69]

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{C T}=E_{c a t}+E_{a n}-\frac{k e^{2}}{\epsilon r} \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

The last term describes a coulombic correction for the attraction between the charges. Herein, $k$ is the coulomb constant, $e$ is the charge that is separated and $r$ is the separation distance. $E_{C T}, E_{c a t}$ and $E_{a n}$ are the energies of the CT, cationic and anionic system, with respect to the ground state energy, respectively. For the $\mathrm{PbS}-\mathrm{Tc}$ system, this separation distance should have a value ranging from the shortest surface-to-surface QD-Tc distance (as a minimum) and the centre-to-centre QD-Tc distance (as a maximum distance).

For the initial geometry of the tetracene and PbS QD terminated by the shortest ligand, the CT-state energy is approximated to be 3.31-3.71 eV above the ground state energy, depending on chosen separation distance. The calculations of $E_{a n}$ and $E_{c a t}$ are performed with CP2K DFT/PBE/DZVP.

One should be aware of the roughness of such an approximation. In comparable calculations on smaller systems with reference CT-state energies, the approximated CT-state was on the low side. For the QD-Tc system however, the CT-state energy appears to be quite high, compared to the local excitations. Consequently, the energy of the CT-state is confirmed to be reasonably higher than the local excitation energies, but the precise CT-state energy remains rather indefinite.

### 4.5.2 Different ligands

One of the aims was to get insights in the possible influences of the ligand used on the PbS QD . Hence, the ligand length is varied in the same way as the experimental article. The consequence is that for every ligand, a unique path has to be determined with an MD simulation. Since an MD simulation for such a setup is very time-consuming, time limited the number of setups to two. In the first setup, the QD is terminated for $50 \%$ with heptane ( 7 carbon atoms). The second setup is terminated with nonane ( 9 carbon atoms) at the same positions. The other $50 \%$ are terminated with formic acid. The positions of the ligands were determined by a simulation run within the Theoretical Chemistry group of the VU.

## Setup I

The first setup is for $50 \%$ terminated by ligands containing 7 carbon atoms. This setup is from now on referred to as 'Setup 7C'. An image of the initial setup is shown in figure 4.2. During the dynamics, the tetracene molecule slowly drifts away from the QD. For the entire simulated period, the distance, angles and curvature of the tetracene are determined. There are two distances determined, the center-to-center QD-Tc distance and the center-to-closest-facet


Figure 4.2: the geometry of the PbS QD with the heptane ligands at the relevant facet and the tetracene chromophore close to this facet. Picture taken at the first useful point in time.

QD-Tc distance. Out of the possible three angles, two are determined to be relevant. The first one represents the angle between the normal of the QD top facet and the longest axis of the Tc molecule (between the center of the two outer rings, through the two inner rings). This angle will from now on be referred to in figures as 'angle'. Since this angle is between the normal of the facet and the tetracene axis, when the tetracene is perpendicular to the QD facet, the angle is $0^{\circ}$ and it is $90^{\circ}$ when the two are parallel.

The second angle, which from now on we will call 'rotation', describes the rotation of the tetracene around its longest axis, oriented with respect to the QD. Hence this rotation is the angle between the normal of the QD top facet and the line through the C-C bond that unites the second and third carbon ring of tetracene. Again, the normal of the plane is taken, which means that a parallel tetracene molecule and QD top facet results in $90^{\circ}$, whereas $0^{\circ}$ stands for a perpendicular situation.

The remaining third angle describes the rotation of Tc around the normal vector of the QD top facet. For symmetry reasons, this angle is not analysed.

The curvature of the Tc molecule is described by the parabolicity of the curve fitted trough tetracene surface, over the longest axis. Thus, this is the $a$ in $y=a x^{2}+b x+c$, which is zero for a straight line.

The distances, angles and curvature for the trajectory of the setup with the shorter ligand are displayed in figure 4.3.


Figure 4.3: the behaviour of the orientation of the tetracene molecule with respect to the quantum dot (terminated with the 7 C -ligand), for the entire trajectory.

## Setup II

The second setup has the same initial coordinates as Setup I, with the addition of extra H and C atoms at the ligand ends, to extend the ligands from 7 C to 9 C . The results of the MD simulation are displayed in figure 4.4, using the same variables as for the first setup (figure 4.3).


Figure 4.4: the behaviour of the orientation of the tetracene molecule with respect to the quantum dot (terminated with the 9C-ligand), for the entire trajectory.

## Setup I vs Setup II

The most obvious difference between the trajectories of the two setups, is the separation between the QD and Tc . In the second setup, the Tc molecule moves away faster from the PbS QD. The most reasonable explanation is that the longer ligand results in a bigger expected value for the intermolecular distance. This behaviour is in line with the assumption of a relation between ligand length and intermolecular distance, made in the article describing the experimental research on the same matter[64].

In the two setups, the tetracene chromophores do not rotate in the same way, but this should not be of any influence for the results or analysis.

Furthermore, there is a slight difference in the way the tetracene bows over time. The curvature of the chromophore reaches higher values for the setup with the longer ligand. We have not found a clear explanation or cause for this difference.

### 4.6 Results and analysis

### 4.6.1 Hamiltonian Results

## Real part: energy eigenvalues

After the calculation of the trajectories, the Hamiltonian files are known. The data of these files provides some insights in the behaviour of the orbitals over time. The real part of the Hamiltonian represents the energetic eigenvalues of the molecular orbitals. Herein, the alignment of the orbitals belonging to tetracene with respect to the PbS -orbitals can be seen. Figure 4.5 displays the real part of the Hamiltonians of 30 HOMOs and 30 LUMOs for Setup 7C, over time.


Figure 4.5: the molecular orbitals ( 30 HOMOs and 30 LUMOs ) over time for Setup 7C. Due to computational difficulties, the program sometimes has problems following the same state, causing incorrect jumps between orbitals.

In this graph, the top HOMO, that starts black and ends purple, represents tetracene's HOMO. However, it should clearly not change color. The reason that this happens is that the software is not (always) able to keep track of which orbital is which, when they cross. At this moment, there is no solution to avoid this jumping.

The LUMO that belongs to tetracene switches even more often. It starts as the fifth LUMO in purple, then switches to cyan at 527 , to purple at 1397 , to blue at 2147 and back to purple at 3875.

These jumps cause trouble for the simulations of the energy transfer. Therefore, we have to stick to the parts of the trajectory where there are no jumps between the orbitals of interest.

For the surface hopping simulations, the chosen trajectory is between 2980fs and 3860fs.
In the same way, the energy of the orbitals for Setup 9C are determined. Figure 4.6 shows the
behaviour of the energy of the orbitals over time.


Figure 4.6: the molecular orbitals ( 50 HOMOs and 50 LUMOs ) over time for Setup 9C. Due to computational difficulties, the program sometimes has problems following the same state, causing incorrect jumps between orbitals.

This figure makes clear that the Tc HOMO is most of the time not close to the PbS HOMOs, whereas the Tc LUMO is well within the conduction band of the QD. For an unknown reason, there is a number of inexplicable transitions between the orbitals that should not be there. Luckily, the number of time points with inexplicable transitions is lower than for Setup 7C. For the surface hopping calculations of Setup 9C, the timeframe from 1150fs to 3000fs is used.

## Imaginary part: coupling

The complex parts of the Hamiltonian represent the coupling. This coupling defines how well two molecular orbitals are coupled with respect to each other. The complex Hamiltonian array
consists of the coupling of all the orbitals with all the other orbitals. For energy transfer, the electron on the Tc LUMO has to hop to one of the PbS LUMOs, and the hole on the Tc HOMO has to hop to one of the PbS HOMO's, which is equivalent to an electron hopping from one of the PbS HOMO's to the Tc HOMO. These Dexter energy transfer obeying combinations of coupling are the coupling values that are relevant. Hence, in figure 4.7, two (sums of) couplings are visualised. The first one is the sum of the coupling of the Tc LUMO with all of the PbS LUMOs. The second line represents the sum of the coupling of the Tc HOMO with all of the PbS HOMOs. At the time points where two orbitals were mixing, it is sometimes hard to determine exactly which is the orbital corresponding to tetracene. One does not want to accidentally include the coupling between two PbS-orbitals, since it is relatively high. To make sure that there is no $\mathrm{PbS}-\mathrm{PbS}$ coupling in the sum, the sum at the switching points is simplified to solely include the coupling between the two states that are switching. Hence, even at the switching time point, one of those two orbitals belongs to the tetracene molecule. In figure


Figure 4.7: the coupling of the Tc LUMO with all the PbS LUMOs (in black) and the coupling of the Tc HOMO with all the PbS HOMOs in red for Setup 7C.
4.8, the coupling is visualised over time in the same way as for Setup 7C. Hence, one line
corresponds to the sum of the coupling between the Tc HOMO and all the PbS HOMOs and the other line corresponds to the sum of the coupling between the Tc LUMO and all the PbS LUMOs.


Figure 4.8: the coupling of the Tc LUMO with all the PbS LUMOs (in black) and the coupling of the Tc HOMO with all the PbS HOMOs in red for Setup 9C.

Apart from the summing, these coupling values are unmodified. Both coupling figures are bumpy. There are narrow peaks at the points where the coupling is high, but there is hardly any average coupling values; it is either maximum coupling or (almost) no coupling. This makes it hard to easily find a correlation between the coupling and one or more of the trajectory variables. In the next subsection, 4.6.2, a closer look is taken at the coupling in combination with these variables.

In figure 4.7 of Setup 7C, the coupling is relatively steady over time. The density of the peaks changes somewhat, but the height of the peaks stays the same. There is one outlier in the HOMO-HOMO coupling at the start of the trajectory, reaching a value of 578 meV . We could not find a clear explanation for this coupling being so high.

Furthermore, there are more coupling peaks for the LUMO-LUMO coupling than for the HOMO-HOMO coupling. The most likely explanation for this difference is that the Tc LUMO is in the band of the PbS , whereas the Tc HOMO is slightly above the PbS HOMOs.

Figure 4.8 of Setup 9C, makes clear that the coupling is a lot weaker. In the beginning the LUMO-LUMO coupling has clear peaks, but they vanish over time. The reason behind this disappearance of coupling could be the rapidly increasing distance over time (figure 4.4), which will be analysed in the next subsection (4.6.2).

The coupling of the Tc HOMO with the PbS HOMOs stays rather low for the entire trajectory. This is likely caused by the energetic gap between the Tc HOMO and the PbS HOMOs.

### 4.6.2 Hamiltonian analysis

## General

The Hamiltonians contain a lot of valuable information. It is interesting to find out whether a certain angle or distance between the Tc and PbS QD provides a higher coupling. Since the complexity of the coupling data, caused by the peaks as well as by the number of (potential) variables having influence, the structure of the data is modified. Each variable is divided into 10 or 20 bins over the range of the corresponding variable. This is done linearly, so that all bins have the same size. After this, the coupling values are appointed to the bin where they belong, based on this single variable. For every bin, the containing coupling values are averaged. This forms a dataset for each orientational variable: distance, rotation, curvature.

This analysis of the orientational variables combined with the coupling is followed by a spectral density analysis of the orbitals. This is calculated as the Fourier transform of the normalised autocorrelation function of a pair of molecular orbitals over a reliable range of time in the MD trajectory.

## Distance

The first variable to be analysed is the distance between the two molecules. For Setup 7C, figure 4.9 suggests that the closest intermolecular distance influences the coupling. Even though the range of the distance, i.e. the range of the x -axis, is rather small, there is a negative trend visible. To keep the figure clear, a line is used instead of a histogram type of figure.


Figure 4.9: the coupling of setup 7C averaged per closest intermolecular distance bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins) and bottom (for 10 bins ) of the figure.

The above figure is based on the smallest distance between atoms of PbS and Tc . In figure 4.10, the averaged coupling is plotted against the distance between the center of Tc and the center of the PbS facet that is terminated with ligands.


Figure 4.10: the coupling of setup 7C averaged per distance bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins ) and bottom (for 10 bins) of the figure.

In this figure, it is hard to find a trend between the distance and the coupling. The combination of the two above graphs suggests that it is not the distance from the tetracene to the quantum dot self that is important, but the distance between the tetracene and the closest ligand on the quantum dot. For Setup 9C, the same type of analysis can be done. However, due to the absence of a variety of coupling peaks, the bin-sorted data for Setup 9C does not make any sense. For completeness, these figures for Setup 9C are included in Appendix C, but one should be aware that the analysed signal might be closer to noise than to reliable data.

## Rotation

The next interesting variable is the orientation, in terms of rotation of the tetracene molecule with respect to the QD. In figure 4.11, the bins for the variable 'rotation' are plotted. The rotation describes the rotation of the tetracene around its longest axis, where a rotational value of $0^{\circ}$ describes a perpendicular situation, and hence $90^{\circ}$ means the facet and tetracene are parallel.


Figure 4.11: the coupling of setup 7C averaged per rotational bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins) and bottom (for 10 bins) of the figure.

Based on the shape of the curves in figure 4.11, it is hard to find a relation between the coupling and the rotation. There is no clear trend visible, and the curve is unexplainable bumpy.

Next to the rotation around the longest tetracene axis, there is another rotational variable which I denote as angle. It is the angle between the longest axis of the tetracene and the normal of the closest QD facet. A first look at figure 4.12 makes clear that the left half of the figure has a higher averaged coupling than the right side of the figure. Hence, one could conclude that the coupling is better in a diagonal situation $\left(45-65^{\circ}\right)$ than in a parallel position $\left(80-90^{\circ}\right)$. However, one has to be cautious. The trajectory results in an enormous sample over spacial variables. However, these variables, such as distance and angle might be entangled, in such a way that for instance the parallel/perpendicular angle only occurs at small/big distance. Taking a look at the average intermolecular distance per angular bin, the distance is roughly equal for the bins in the range of $55^{\circ}$ to $90^{\circ}$, with values between $4.8 \AA$ and $5.8 \AA$. However, the average intermolecular distance when the angle is between $45^{\circ}$ and $52^{\circ}$, is $2.6 \AA$. This could be a reason for the most left bins having higher average coupling, but it does not explain the average coupling peaks around $60^{\circ}-65^{\circ}$.


Figure 4.12: the coupling of setup 7C averaged per angular bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins ) and bottom (for 10 bins) of the figure.

Again, for the data of Setup 9C, the graphs are enclosed in Appendix C, but they are considered irrelevant due to the lack of coupling during the trajectory.

## Curvature of tetracene

As a last variable that might play a role in the coupling, is the curvature of the tetracene. Tetracene's parabolicity is determined as the measure for the curvature of the molecule. Hence, a value of 0 means an entirely flat molecule, whereas values of higher absolute values correspond to a highly bowed molecule. The bins for different values of parabolicity are displayed in figure 4.13. In figure 4.13, the absolute values of the parabolicity are used, since there is no difference between positive and negative values due to symmetry. The figure has two or three peaks for the coupling between the LUMOs. The first peak is close to zero, which corresponds to a straight, unbowed, tetracene molecule. The second peak is roughly at a parabolicity of 0.010 , which is 2 to 3 meV higher than the lowest average couplings between the LUMOs. The average intermolecular distance does not differ significantly between the bins, i.e. between 2.65 and $3.45 \AA$. Furthermore, the bins with the highest average intermolecular distance do not have the


Figure 4.13: the coupling of setup 7C averaged per parabolicity-bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins) and bottom (for 10 bins) of the figure.
lowest average coupling. Hence, the peaks are not caused by a difference in distance. However, this does not mean that the conclusion is that at certain curvatures of the molecule, the coupling is significantly higher. The differences in average coupling are relatively small. The difference in range is less than 5 meV and combining this knowledge with the number of datapoints, we can not rule out that the differences are caused by coincidence.

## Spectral Density

Besides the coupling, the energy of the molecular orbitals also contains valuable information. The spectral density can be determined from these energy values. The spectral density for the LUMO of tetracene and the PbS LUMO is displayed in figure 4.14. The peeks in the region $200-400 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ make clear that slow vibrations with low frequency play an important role of the correlation between the orbitals of the tetracene and the quantum dot. Since these vibrations are really slow, they likely take place in the quantum dot. Over the relevant combinations of orbitals, the height, energy and number of these low energy peeks varies slightly, but they never leave the energetic region between 200 and $400 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.


Figure 4.14: The energy levels of the Tc LUMO and PbS LUMO (top, red and blue respectively), the normalised autocorrelation function between these two (middle), and the spectral density (bottom). The last is calculated as the Fourier transform of the Normalised AUF.

The other peek, at $1385 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, is the same for all relevant combinations of orbitals. This peek is more interesting, since it describes which phonon plays an important role in the correlation between the donor and acceptor states. With frequency calculations in $\operatorname{ADF}[62,19,5]$ on the tetracene molecule and the ligand, it can be determined which vibration belongs to the frequency of $1385 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The momentum of the vibration is drawn in figure 4.15.


Figure 4.15: the direction of movement of the vibration that plays a role in the correlation between the tetracene and quantum dot states. The movement goes back and forth over the yellow arrows, starting in the directions drawn.

### 4.6.3 Energy transfer results

Setup 7C: FSSH

For Setup 7C, the chosen timeframe is from 2980fs and 3860fs. The simulation of the surface hopping with the FSSH algorithm and no changes to the energy level, is enclosed in figure 4.16.


Figure 4.16: the surface hopping simulated over time for Setup 7C. The FSSH-algorithm is used, with unaltered energy levels, i.e. $E_{L E(T c)}=1.595 \mathrm{eV}$ and the bandgap of PbS is 1.459 eV . The energy of the lowest charge transfer state is 1.318 eV . All energetic values are averaged over the time of the relevant trajectory.

Figure 4.16 makes clear that the CT-states are populated over time, but none of the states localised at PbS are populated. The most obvious reason is that the CT-states are the lowest in energy, which therewith makes it the most likely state to be populated.

As a logical next step, the energy levels are altered to more realistic values. The average PbS bandgap is lowered to 1.0 eV and the average energy of the excited state at tetracene is lowered to 1.25 eV . As described in section 4.5.1, it is hard to determine the energy of the CT-states, but it is save to conclude that they are reasonably higher than the locally excited states. Therefore, multiple simulations are performed, with different energies for the CT-states. The energy of the CT-states is increased with $0 \mathrm{eV}, 0.2 \mathrm{eV}, 0.4 \mathrm{eV}$.

Of those three energy configurations, only the first ( PbS 1.0 eV ; Tc 1.25 eV ; CT 1.3 eV ) shows some energy transfer, albeit very little. In 1000 simulations, only one run shows energy transfer. Hence, assuming continuation at the same pace, this would mean that $90 \%$ of the energy transfer is completed after 1.2 ns. One has to note that the CT-state energy is still likely to be smaller than in reality.

The other two of the three energy configurations (PbS 1.0 eV ; Tc 1.25 eV ; CT 1.5 or 1.7 eV ),
are probably closer to reality. However, no CT is observed at all in the 2000 runs that these two simulations jointly performed. Hence, it is a logical next step to change the SH-algorithm to GFSH, since it relies less on CT-states.

## Setup 7C: GFSH

For the GFSH method, simulations are performed for the same energetic configurations, which can be listed as:

1. Tc: 1.595 eV ; PbS: 1.459; CT: 1.318 eV ;
2. Tc: $1.250 \mathrm{eV} ;$ PbS: 1.000 ; CT: 1.318 eV ;
3. Tc: 1.250 eV ; PbS: 1.000; CT: 1.518 eV ;
4. Tc: 1.250 eV ; PbS: 1.000; CT: 1.718 eV .

Just like the first configuration with FSSH, the same energetic configuration only causes population of the CT-states when GFSH is used.

For configuration 2, in 12 of the one thousand runs the exciton is transferred. This would mean that $90 \%$ of the initial energy is transferred after 0.17 ns , if the transfer continues at a similar rate. However, the transfer might be too fast since the energy of the CT-state is at some points still lower than the energy of the exciton at tetracene.

Hence, it is interesting to look at configurations 3 and 4, where the CT-state energy is higher.
Figure 4.17 shows the transfer for configuration 3.


Figure 4.17: the surface hopping simulated over time for Setup 7C. The GFSH-algorithm is used, with more realistic energy levels, i.e. $E_{L E(T c)}=1.25 \mathrm{eV}$ and the bandgap of PbS is 1.0 eV . The energy of the lowest charge transfer state is 1.518 eV . All energetic values are averaged over the time of the relevant trajectory.

It is hard to see by eye, but after 1000 runs, 2 excitons are transferred to the PbS QD. This means that $90 \%$ of the initial excitons will be transferred after 1.0 ns , under the assumption that the transfer rate is the same.

Figure 4.18 shows that the transfer for configuration 4 happens more quickly than for configuration 3. At the end of the simulation, 6 out of the 1000 runs showed energy transfer. Hence, this would result in a transfer time of 0.3 ns for $90 \%$ of the initial excitons, assuming the transfer rate does not change.


Figure 4.18: the surface hopping simulated over time for Setup 7C. The GFSH-algorithm is used, with more realistic energy levels, i.e. $E_{L E(T c)}=1.25 \mathrm{eV}$ and the bandgap of PbS is 1.0 eV . The energy of the lowest charge transfer state is 1.718 eV . All energetic values are averaged over the time of the relevant trajectory.

## Setup 9C: FSSH

As we have seen for Setup 7C in combination with FSSH, FSSH does not show energy transfer when the CT-states are energetically unfavourable to populate. For Setup 9C, the same modifications are made to the energy levels, resulting in these 4 configurations:

1. Tc: 1.592 eV ; PbS: 1.415; CT: 1.228 eV ;
2. Tc: 1.250 eV ; PbS: 1.000; CT: 1.228 eV ;
3. Tc: 1.250 eV ; PbS: 1.000; CT: 1.428 eV ;
4. Tc: $1.250 \mathrm{eV} ; \mathrm{PbS}: 1.000 ; \mathrm{CT}: 1.628 \mathrm{eV}$.

Even though the unaltered CT-state energy is lower than for Setup 7C, no energy transfer nor charge transfer is observed at all for any of the four configurations. The energy levels are the same or even more CT-favourable compared to the energy levels of Setup 7C. Hence, the reason for the absence of CT is likely to be something else than the energy differences. The most likely
reason for the lack of CT is that the coupling between the relevant orbitals is very low. Herein, the bigger distance between tetracene and PbS is likely to play a role.

## Setup 9C: GFSH

For the same four configurations, the GFSH algorithms is also used. Figure 4.19 contains the surface hopping simulation of the first, energetically unaltered, configuration.


Figure 4.19: the surface hopping simulated over time for Setup 9C. The GFSH-algorithm is used, with unaltered energy levels, i.e. $E_{L E(T c)}=1.529 \mathrm{eV}$ and the bandgap of PbS is 1.415 eV . The energy of the lowest charge transfer state is 1.228 eV . All energetic values are averaged over the time of the relevant trajectory.

This figure shows that some of the CT-states are temporarily populated, before the electron hops back to the excitonic state at Tc. There is no energy transfer from Tc to PbS. For the remainder of the configurations, there is no CT, and thus no energy transfer, at all.

The explanation is likely to be, as mentioned for the FSSH part of Setup 9C, that the coupling for this setup is remarkably low.

### 4.7 Discussion

### 4.7.1 Error Margins

During computational analysis and/or simulations, it is very important to clarify the error margins for the results obtained. Due to the nature of the majority of the used algorithms, it is hard to determine clear error margins. But we can be sure that the error margins are more than significant.

During the process:

- the geometry is optimised (with DFT);
- which is used as a starting point for the remainder of the trajectory calculated with MD (with DFT);
- the resulting trajectory is used for recalculation of the Hamiltonians (with DFT);
- which are used for the simulation of surface hopping.

Due to the nature of the development of the DFT functionals, which can well be described as a method of trial and error, it is almost impossible to determine a good guideline for the possible size of errors, especially if there is very little reference data. From chapter 3, we already know that the error for the energy levels could reasonably be more than ten percent. The error for non-quantitative data, such as wave functions is even harder to determine. Nonetheless, knowing that the final data is the result of computations performed on DFT-computed data based on DFT-data based on DFT-data, it is fair to say that one has to be extremely careful drawing conclusions from the data.

### 4.7.2 Further uncertainty

Next to the errors caused by the computational imperfections, there are also differences between the experimental setup and the computational setup. In the computational setup, there is only
one tetracene molecule. However, in the experimental reality there is an entire nanocrystal of tetracene. This not only has an influence on the energy, but also on the wave function, which is believed to be delocalised over multiple molecules[9]. Within PYXAID, the energy can be corrected for, but possible differences in wave functions and coupling values can not be corrected for. Furthermore, there are multiple QDs in the experiment, whereas the simulation only allowed the presence of one QD. For PbS QDs, the number also plays a role, but it is likely to be a smaller role than for tetracene.

### 4.7.3 Surface hopping

Within the surface hopping computations, there is two fields in which changes can be made after the determination of the trajectory to achieve as realistic as possible energy transfer. The first is by changing the SH-algorithm, and the second is by shifting the energy levels.

Taking a closer look at the energy levels, in combination with the previously analysed CT-state energies(4.5.1), it is most likely that the configurations with the highest and second-highest CT-state energies are the most reliable configurations. Four the other configurations, the CTstate energies are not increased, resulting in CT-states that are at some times energetically favourable to populate. As far as we can decide, this is an unphysical phenomenon.

Continuing with the configurations with increased CT-state energies, there is a clear difference between FSSH and GFSH. In GFSH there is still energy transfer visible for these configurations, whereas there is no CT when FSSH is used. Since the energy levels are close to reality and since the energy transfer has experimentally been observed, it is clear that GFSH results in a surface hopping simulation that it closer to reality.

Due to described inaccuracies in the behaviour of the orbitals over time, only small parts of the trajectory were used. This limits the observed energy transfer, and the only method to determine the transfer time for the entire energy is to "extrapolate" the energy transfer in an exponential way.

This extrapolation resulted in transfer times of 0.3 and 1.0 ns for $90 \%$ of the initial excitons. Literature reports that the energy transfer happens within $<10 \mathrm{~ns}[64]$. Hence, the results of
the calculated transfer times are not contradicting the experiments.
However, since there is only one starting point of the trajectory for each setup, and since the total time of the trajectory was limited, it is impossible to obtain any new insights from the surface hopping data, other that the transfer time is in line with the experiment. Hence, this is one of the reasons why it was interesting look at the coupling.

### 4.7.4 Coupling

In an ideal alignment between the QD and the tetracene, the Tc HOMO would be slightly in the QD valence band, and likewise the LUMO would be slightly in the conduction band. In the obtained orbitals, the HOMO is higher in energy than the HOMO of the QD, whereas the LUMO is probably further in the conduction band than an ideal practical setup would demand. Therefore, the Tc LUMO - QD LUMOs coupling is on average likely to be overestimated, while the Tc HOMO - QD HOMOs coupling is on average likely to be underestimated.

Furthermore, the coupling signal itself is hard to analyse due to its nature of being either maximal or minimal. Therefore, it was more interesting to analyse modified data, that might be best described as 'coupling density', in which the coupling is averaged over a certain range of a variable.

The creation of the coupling density bins make the data rather rough, since multiple thousands of data points are converted into averaged values for a limited number of bins, which represent the new data. Hence, it is not possible to draw rock-solid conclusions from this data. However, the data clearly indicates that the coupling depends on the distance between tetracene and the acceptor's (including ligand) closest atom, rather than the distance between tetracene and the closest acceptor facet (excluding ligand). Further research will be needed to confirm or reject this suggested dependence.

### 4.8 Conclusions

After the analysis of the data and a closer look at the reliability of the obtained results, it is necessary to determine which conclusions can be drawn.

For the surface hopping simulations, it has become clear that it is very important to choose suitable values for the parameters, in particular the value of the energies. When the correct energy levels are chosen, energy transfer, albeit little, is observed for Setup 7C in the simulations when GFSH is used. The timeframe is far too short to simulate complete energy transfer. Using exponential extrapolation, an indication of the transfer time can be determined at values of 0.3 ns and 1.0 ns . These transfer times are in line with the time frame as described in the literature (i.e. $<10 \mathrm{~ns}$ ). For Setup 9C, there is no energy transfer observed. This is possibly caused by an unrealistically large distance for the majority of the trajectory, resulting in low coupling between the orbitals of the donor and acceptor.

For the analysis of the coupling, no clear conclusions can be drawn due to the roughness of the modified data as well as the presence of unknown but significant errors. Taking this into consideration, the data for Setup 7C still suggests that the distance between tetracene and the closest atom of the ligand is the biggest influence on the coupling, whereas the distance between the tetracene and the closest acceptor facet seems to be less important. However, for confirmation of this hypothesis, it needs to be backed by further research. For the relation between the angle/rotation and coupling, no clear correlation can be observed.

For Setup 9C, there was no analysis possible since the density of the coupling peaks was too low.

## Chapter 5

## Conclusion

### 5.1 Summary of Thesis Achievements

During the process of the research and the analysis of its results, a number of interesting results, relations and conclusions have become clear. The first part of the research determines the performances of different functionals. The conclusion that is most relevant for the remainder of the calculations is that the PBE functional is not accurate for local states and the same functional struggles determining the charge transfer states and their energies.

The second part of the research, the surface hopping simulation, makes clear that the transfer of energy from tetracene to PbS quantum dots can be reproduced using the GFSH algorithm in combination with the correct energy levels, resulting in energy transfer times that are within the experimentally determined timeframe (i.e. $<10 n s$ ). Besides this confirmation, no new information can be deducted from the surface hopping results.

Analysis of the Hamiltonians on which the surface hopping calculations are based, indicates that the coupling at least depends on the distance between tetracene and the closest ligand atom. In the same simulated period of time, the distance between tetracene and the closest PbS facet does not change the coupling significantly. Hence, this indicates that the coupling is more dependent of the distance of tetracene with the closest ligand, than that it is dependent of the distance between tetracene and the closest PbS facet. Due to the roughness of the modified data
and the error margins in the prior calculations, this relation can not be definitively concluded until it is backed by further research.

For the rotation and angle of the tetracene molecule with respect to the quantum dot, it was not possible to determine if and how it affects the coupling.

### 5.2 Applications

This research was performed entirely computationally. However, the actual application that we are interested in, i.e. solar panels, also has to work in reality, and preferably with an optimal efficiency. Hence, for the practical experiments regarding the same matter, it is useful to get a better insight into the energy transfer process. One of the questions for which it is hard to derive the answer from the experimental results, is what the optimal placement of the tetracene molecule with respect to the quantum dot and its ligands is. This research can be considered as a first step towards unveiling the ideal placement.

### 5.3 Future Work

There are a couple of questions that could not be answered by the research performed for this thesis. These questions could be answered in future work on the same two materials. A first suggestion for future work could be to improve the size of the quantum dot, hopefully resulting in a better alignment of the tetracene HOMO with the HOMOs of the quantum dot. This should overcome the low HOMO-HOMO coupling. Also, one could create more and/or longer trajectories. If the number of different points in time is increased greatly, that would solve a number of problems: the averaged data (the bins) would be less rough and also less prone to irregularities caused by entanglement of multiple variables. Also, this would increase the range of angles and rotations observed, which for this research were not fully utilised.

With these improvements applied, resulting in more than enough datapoints and a better HOMO-HOMO coupling, one can solidly determine for each variable what its influence on the
coupling is.

## Appendix A

## Coordinates

## A. 1 Tetracene Monomer

| Atom | X | Y | Z |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 C | -2.215320214 | -0.642978562 | 0.079949647 |
| 2 C | -2.006654312 | 0.709639415 | 0.095730478 |
| 3 C | -0.684101596 | 1.238613393 | 0.031010992 |
| 4 C | 0.395798352 | 0.401375856 | -0.047826168 |
| 5 C | 0.226827512 | -1.016901219 | -0.067219313 |
| 6 C | -1.119143868 | -1.555241828 | -0.001353828 |
| 7 H | 3.770225791 | -8.507336923 | -0.423042593 |
| 8 C | -1.302380481 | -2.935308136 | -0.019149476 |
| 9 C | -0.21648739 | -3.826542902 | -0.099434849 |
| 10 C | 1.131176099 | -3.28752551 | -0.165383138 |
| 11 C | 1.307122416 | -1.891599928 | -0.146846228 |
| 12 C | 2.217069191 | -4.178760277 | -0.245668511 |
| 13 C | 2.033832578 | -5.558826585 | -0.263464159 |
| 14 C | 0.687861198 | -6.097167193 | -0.197598674 |
| 15 C | -0.392433706 | -5.222468485 | -0.117971759 |


| 16 C | 0.518890358 | -7.515444269 | -0.216991819 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 17 C | 1.598790305 | -8.352681805 | -0.295828979 |
| 18 C | 2.921343022 | -7.823707828 | -0.360548465 |
| 19 C | 3.130008924 | -6.47108985 | -0.344767634 |
| 20 H | -3.228866348 | -1.048532858 | 0.129544288 |
| 21 H | -2.855537081 | 1.39326851 | 0.158224606 |
| 22 H | -0.537577468 | 2.32036979 | 0.044794606 |
| 23 H | 1.40946252 | 0.806633472 | -0.097433628 |
| 24 H | 4.143555058 | -6.065535554 | -0.394362275 |
| 25 H | -2.316744761 | -3.340271467 | 0.030504005 |
| 26 H | 2.320974421 | -1.48534899 | -0.196444076 |
| 27 H | 3.231433471 | -3.773796945 | -0.295321992 |
| 28 H | -1.406285712 | -5.628719423 | -0.068373911 |
| 29 H | -0.494773811 | -7.920701885 | -0.167384359 |
| 30 H | 1.452266177 | -9.434438203 | -0.309612593 |

Table A.1: the optimised coordinates of a tetracene monomer, as used in the calculations.

## A. 2 Tetracene Dimer

| Atom | X | Y | Z |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 C | -1.090614808 | -1.224294788 | 2.243515193 |
| 2 C | -1.854750323 | -1.913408852 | 3.236440827 |
| 3 C | -2.000827406 | -1.38302288 | 4.495973741 |
| 4 C | 0.434906516 | 0.217658 | 0.320812707 |
| 5 C | 1.188042053 | 0.902606 | -0.656558403 |
| 6 C | 1.345470465 | 0.386055516 | -1.947224687 |
| 7 C | 2.106783128 | 1.075298422 | -2.942460256 |


| 8 C | 2.24468757 | 0.54782424 | -4.20436544 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 C | 0.897086064 | -1.392 588082 | -3.621 051457 |
| 10 C | 0.731008469 | -0.883 316641 | -2.291181 048 |
| 11 C | -0.930 264053 | -1.741289 939 | 0.953775215 |
| 12 C | 1.641313091 | -0.698 233974 | -4.545315998 |
| 13 C | -1.401713259 | -0.135017178 | 4.836694761 |
| 14 C | $-0.65168157$ | 0.557103562 | 3.915483449 |
| 15 C | -0.477 691566 | 0.045944456 | 2.58786373 |
| 16 C | 0.272180431 | 0.731102812 | 1.627500592 |
| 17 C | -0.016 040214 | $-1.56887481$ | -1.329 365361 |
| 18 C | -0.176914793 | -1.055 82295 | -0.022 310529 |
| 19 H | -2.333687239 | $-2.853543378$ | 2.97056478 |
| 20 H | -2.589 869429 | -1.919 241195 | 5.235231324 |
| 21 H | 1.673660812 | 1.84077052 | -0.392 819338 |
| 22 H | 2.588413568 | 2.01441089 | -2.677863 431 |
| 23 H | 2.829781024 | 1.08518072 | -4.946132084 |
| 24 H | 0.405893249 | $-2.328760122$ | -3.878 245496 |
| 25 H | -1.415314534 | -2.679 428393 | 0.688948701 |
| 26 H | -0.505 802494 | -2.504 46417 | -1.595 241291 |
| 27 H | 1.771538116 | -1.098651761 | -5.549 397925 |
| 28 H | 0.761045953 | 1.666959604 | 1.894550168 |
| 29 H | -1.539 291751 | 0.269177096 | 5.838007601 |
| 30 H | -0.164130 018 | 1.495215122 | 4.172808572 |
| 31 C | 5.769742256 | 3.448231145 | -4.571164907 |
| 32 C | 5.089394039 | 4.062246585 | -3.547031359 |
| 33 C | 4.899588568 | 3.391040749 | -2.295877136 |
| 34 C | 4.194210522 | 3.984544482 | -1.243882341 |
| 35 C | 4.544593765 | 1.975341435 | 0.150772406 |
| 36 C | 5.259450994 | 1.385042834 | -0.915661864 |

37 C
38 C 39 C 40 C 41 C 42 C 43 C 44 C 45 C 46 C 47 C 48 C 49 H 50 H 51 H 52 H 53 H 54 H 55 H 56 H 57 H 58 H 59 H 60 H

| 5.443438979 | 2.055805919 | -2.129616444 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 6.152210386 | 1.458688394 | -3.222513658 |
| 6.293900699 | 2.130904933 | -4.414283842 |
| 2.274521651 | 3.16728133 | 4.557801576 |
| 2.408159087 | 3.836817311 | 3.363550952 |
| 3.110168991 | 3.236237253 | 2.267540692 |
| 3.289340494 | 3.904133477 | 1.051332351 |
| 4.002989215 | 3.313168392 | -0.015459459 |
| 4.354644554 | 1.305126536 | 1.379972694 |
| 3.654225017 | 1.901107919 | 2.433634064 |
| 3.471868689 | 1.233229153 | 3.687772134 |
| 2.79913836 | 1.850373521 | 4.714975251 |
| 5.914911194 | 3.970736851 | -5.514623469 |
| 4.664034616 | 5.055250156 | -3.673219236 |
| 3.758871514 | 4.972628729 | -1.382196696 |
| 2.659146364 | 1.329723718 | 5.660345711 |
| 5.691213839 | 0.395335751 | -0.778695403 |
| 6.585379716 | 0.470896913 | -3.084028909 |
| 6.820296855 | 1.662391051 | -5.244198713 |
| 1.753960262 | 3.637220279 | 5.390575918 |
| 1.976165218 | 4.825625934 | 3.226264233 |
| 2.856367107 | 4.893049855 | 0.913821302 |
| 4.789565463 | 0.316875319 | 1.518340071 |
| 3.89775405 | 0.240759136 | 3.814594817 |

Table A.2: the optimised coordinates of a tetracene dimer, as used in the calculations.

## A. 3 Pentacene Monomer

| Atom | X | Y | Z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 C | -4.434544461 | 2.79057895 | 0.222565069 |
| 2 C | -4.357266828 | 5.605422447 | 0.224108507 |
| 3 C | -5.585 702234 | 4.95797194 | 0.180019232 |
| 4 C | -5.625 692035 | 3.504222177 | 0.179562952 |
| 5 C | -0.734 623252 | 3.369089305 | 0.354872134 |
| 6 C | -0.694501836 | 4.826107019 | 0.355510396 |
| 7 C | -1.899 028545 | 5.539163943 | 0.3124007 |
| 8 C | -3.140 782144 | 4.892911045 | 0.268020919 |
| 9 C | -3.180 920715 | 3.435903335 | 0.267393904 |
| 10 C | -1.976 398894 | 2.722853392 | 0.310633492 |
| 11 C | -6.822 842971 | 5.673488258 | 0.134987554 |
| 12 C | -6.900 217467 | 2.857598718 | 0.134063651 |
| 13 H | 5.147255446 | 5.187996121 | 0.564947082 |
| 14 H | 5.078355199 | 2.687210498 | 0.56513943 |
| 15 H | -1.869 367799 | 6.632125599 | 0.312789526 |
| 16 C | -8.018 876703 | 5.011470577 | 0.091876284 |
| 17 C | -8.058 02309 | 3.584303967 | 0.091793041 |
| 18 H | -8.953827831 | 5.574354228 | 0.057088344 |
| 19 H | -9.022 606935 | 3.073484666 | 0.057351845 |
| 20 H | -4.329 410522 | 6.698535259 | 0.224286427 |
| 21 H | -6.794897754 | 6.766076627 | 0.134703234 |
| 22 H | -6.932 025823 | 1.765120204 | 0.13355724 |
| 23 H | -2.006 066749 | 1.629886962 | 0.310134922 |
| 24 C | 3.024899709 | 5.404132737 | 0.48870354 |
| 25 C | 1.750339752 | 4.757464088 | 0.443158636 |
| 26 C | 1.710207168 | 3.303717435 | 0.442638649 |
| 27 C | 2.947338648 | 2.588177973 | 0.48767883 |


| 28 C | 4.143419838 | 3.25014125 | 0.530623206 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 29 C | 4.182608988 | 4.67726617 | 0.530747193 |
| 30 C | 0.559245578 | 5.471267559 | 0.400208991 |
| 31 C | 0.481740528 | 2.656252515 | 0.398553583 |
| 32 H | 2.91938998 | 1.495582528 | 0.487831093 |
| 33 H | -4.465799096 | 1.697680577 | 0.222001066 |
| 34 H | 3.056278027 | 6.496517102 | 0.489207822 |
| 35 H | 0.590628557 | 6.564169904 | 0.400834635 |
| 36 H | 0.453640443 | 1.563266731 | 0.398391895 |

Table A.3: the optimised coordinates of a pentacene monomer, as used in the calculations.

## A. 4 Pentacene Dimer

| Atom | X | Y | Z |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 1 C | -0.980021978 | 0.520163923 | -5.2092666 |
| 2 C | -0.370735876 | 0.154420715 | -6.386905655 |
| 3 C | 0.878044883 | -0.534510619 | -6.378074445 |
| 4 C | 1.510544699 | -0.832401619 | -5.194863858 |
| 5 C | 0.918552307 | -0.463275174 | -3.942076462 |
| 6 H | -1.918897585 | 1.070681673 | -5.2142469 |
| 7 H | -0.844406294 | 0.386531332 | -7.339601246 |
| 8 H | 1.333230368 | -0.827837435 | -7.321829337 |
| 9 H | 2.450297151 | -1.380435644 | -5.188820813 |
| 10 C | 1.573791826 | -0.685412281 | -0.261866212 |
| 11 C | 0.979420287 | -0.330321022 | 0.963760689 |
| 12 C | 1.601602533 | -0.620910412 | 2.203657305 |
| 13 C | 1.005801349 | -0.264758787 | 3.416927623 |


| 14 C | 1.622270056 | -0.565 736185 | 4.67762682 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 C | $-0.278610282$ | 0.413804786 | 3.410969881 |
| 16 C | -0.903 538801 | 0.702108836 | 2.19487486 |
| 17 C | $-0.31206638$ | 0.342386718 | 0.959147993 |
| 18 H | 2.520049688 | -1.224 19021 | -0.259 17868 |
| 19 H | 2.546895016 | -1.161570 666 | 2.208196516 |
| 20 H | 2.562340902 | -1.114 203609 | 4.682638501 |
| 21 H | -1.848 342539 | 1.243371063 | 2.192652907 |
| 22 H | -1.809 933151 | 1.331588012 | 4.657848505 |
| 23 C | -0.935964 421 | 0.632622492 | -0.269 21792 |
| 24 C | -0.341216094 | 0.278447326 | -1.494964961 |
| 25 C | -0.962 249197 | 0.570754295 | -2.735018317 |
| 26 C | 1.542417107 | -0.753571676 | -2.725 93655 |
| 27 C | 0.950284399 | -0.394 639355 | -1.490 294307 |
| 28 H | -1.882 3927 | 1.171114444 | $-0.271735295$ |
| 29 H | -1.907149 176 | 1.112197202 | -2.739 700789 |
| 30 H | 2.486905829 | $-1.295358277$ | -2.723658003 |
| 31 C | 1.01362281 | -0.199 031981 | 5.855291597 |
| 32 C | -0.236132 166 | 0.488047651 | 5.84685056 |
| 33 C | -0.869 960855 | 0.78404667 | 4.66372777 |
| 34 H | 1.489157288 | -0.428305316 | 6.807794548 |
| 35 H | -0.690 438827 | 0.7822499 | 6.790796125 |
| 36 C | -0.365 309621 | 0.21638983 | -3.948281237 |
| 37 H | 5.460415428 | 4.898306514 | -2.807094546 |
| 38 C | 2.057503261 | 3.12149349 | -0.211972611 |
| 39 C | 2.639610402 | 3.408116855 | -1.461 172659 |
| 40 C | 2.00103675 | 3.054583688 | $-2.674678553$ |
| 41 C | 2.581488594 | 3.345914382 | -3.911952452 |
| 42 C | 1.929090409 | 3.010378545 | -5.143907612 |


| 43 C | 2.513635719 | 3.324982725 | -6.346941261 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44 C | 3.788072968 | 3.96185361 | -6.395379 05 |
| 45 C | 4.449911482 | 4.304645158 | -5.239 91748 |
| 46 C | 3.871926768 | 4.011161001 | -3.960 305171 |
| 47 C | 4.513121813 | 4.362343859 | -2.769 447049 |
| 48 C | 4.570243746 | 4.430905749 | -0.306172 455 |
| 49 C | 3.988557752 | 4.143934548 | 0.942770963 |
| 50 C | 4.627241718 | 4.497892244 | 2.155918234 |
| 51 C | 4.048563504 | 4.205701948 | 3.393287887 |
| 52 C | 4.70211758 | 4.542685748 | 4.624287801 |
| 53 C | 4.119183305 | 4.227976131 | 5.828086575 |
| 54 C | 2.846128131 | 3.58854921 | 5.878035615 |
| 55 C | 2.183766146 | 3.243164189 | 4.723457292 |
| 56 C | 2.759083694 | 3.538420168 | 3.442770823 |
| 57 C | 2.116991198 | 3.187922256 | 2.251893661 |
| 58 C | 2.695743306 | 3.475896336 | 0.991101152 |
| 59 C | 3.93286975 | 4.075569197 | -1.509 325529 |
| 60 H | 1.108835511 | 2.587918657 | -0.175990 879 |
| 61 H | 1.051999689 | 2.521919232 | -2.639 311108 |
| 62 H | 0.974779246 | 2.489009464 | -5.108324364 |
| 63 H | 2.000185554 | 3.09024178 | -7.276919794 |
| 64 H | 4.234779076 | 4.175299972 | -7.363 728853 |
| 65 H | 5.402892188 | 4.82923874 | -5.274667237 |
| 66 H | 5.517927263 | 4.965757598 | -0.341833403 |
| 67 H | 5.57585269 | 5.031088802 | 2.120153463 |
| 68 H | 5.655396324 | 5.066121026 | 4.586875021 |
| 69 H | 4.632992634 | 4.464568117 | 6.757265983 |
| 70 H | 2.401835923 | 3.374466274 | 6.847245893 |
| 71 H | 1.233325382 | 2.714090159 | 4.759786507 |

Table A.4: the optimised coordinates of a pentacene dimer, as used in the calculations.

## A. $5 \mathrm{PbS}+7 \mathrm{C}$ and Tetracene

| Atom | X | Y | Z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Pb | 26.04325716 | 19.38905969 | 14.52529647 |
| 2 Pb | 17.71986062 | 26.45281952 | 22.91888526 |
| 3 Pb | 26.36353817 | 17.20758394 | 29.64248058 |
| 4 Pb | 27.89106737 | 23.38363577 | 20.52089404 |
| 5 Pb | 26.01996125 | 10.22903762 | 20.98919502 |
| 6 Pb | 22.92602089 | 19.12180838 | 29.49173187 |
| 7 Pb | 29.10438786 | 20.60896417 | 17.49787786 |
| 8 Pb | 30.40094941 | 24.72563411 | 23.2319806 |
| 9 Pb | 26.94095171 | 26.69696741 | 22.81829571 |
| 10 Pb | 26.91960768 | 16.55003871 | 17.51448177 |
| 11 Pb | 23.2501546 | 18.29140219 | 17.13331083 |
| 12 Pb | 27.8869895 | 23.7646878 | 26.52397986 |
| 13 Pb | 24.6352887 | 13.22139978 | 29.31373478 |
| 14 Pb | 14.59160918 | 15.77076301 | 20.06447965 |
| 15 Pb | 24.14250977 | 15.7497712 | 20.68772981 |
| 16 Pb | 27.9012837 | 13.94522342 | 20.78726085 |
| 17 Pb | 15.54920938 | 12.89803244 | 23.27696316 |
| 18 Pb | 20.57247107 | 27.4414331 | 26.07739166 |
| 19 Pb | 14.71757115 | 15.94575045 | 25.75355695 |
| 20 Pb | 26.0374183 | 19.35502948 | 20.23271103 |
| 21 Pb | 24.54301388 | 15.41593202 | 14.53710071 |
| 22 Pb | 23.38914627 | 16.27421528 | 32.45222157 |
| 23 Pb | 24.04821095 | 16.08430202 | 26.43360037 |
| 24 Pb | 28.17739655 | 14.06346455 | 27.31106694 |
| 25 Pb | 24.17627306 | 25.6325361 | 26.2584079 |
| 26 Pb | 13.65085116 | 18.88261357 | 23.16227741 |
| 27 Pb | 25.12001724 | 22.49140624 | 17.27006329 |
| 28 Pb | 21.47471655 | 24.1951023 | 17.12497031 |
| 29 Pb | 20.64915584 | 27.37003393 | 19.65437951 |
| 30 Pb | 29.67287757 | 17.7188376 | 21.0020344 |
| 31 Pb | 31.18048722 | 14.69651617 | 23.34878516 |
| 32 Pb | 32.24381903 | 18.79521336 | 23.47139244 |
| 33 Pb | 31.22686789 | 21.52091439 | 20.54502639 |
| 34 Pb | 28.74225514 | 20.77323028 | 23.66534793 |
| 35 Pb | 26.82557998 | 16.59854127 | 23.72287578 |
| 36 Pb | 25.7646743 | 19.81608241 | 26.50176305 |
| 37 Pb | 25.70224714 | 20.18265057 | 32.88288993 |
| 38 Pb | 24.93674608 | 22.90589184 | 29.17411854 |
| 39 Pb | 25.16520622 | 22.50522056 | 23.36693315 |
| 40 Pb | 20.85146877 | 24.61564103 | 29.38813728 |
| 41 Pb | 21.52709707 | 21.89653399 | 32.27974586 |
| 42 Pb | 21.18519105 | 24.72254561 | 23.08022787 |
| 43 Pb | 23.11911273 | 18.77898748 | 23.29444121 |
| 44 Pb | 30.04281256 | 17.83610148 | 27.30339341 |
| 45 Pb | 31.61932459 | 21.73773506 | 26.40368202 |
| 46 Pb | 21.86531351 | 11.97817085 | 20.26710528 |
| 47 Pb | 22.90461795 | 9.300760499 | 23.67406307 |
| 48 Pb | 19.1245904 | 11.03517015 | 23.42062939 |
| 49 Pb | 21.75383594 | 12.41105256 | 26.47922683 |
| 50 Pb | 22.97207492 | 28.0619241 | 22.9618386 |
| 51 Pb | 22.01671731 | 21.98363346 | 26.04215887 |
| 52 Pb | 24.45146529 | 25.40493647 | 19.93985305 |
| 53 Pb | 20.4656572 | 17.61673692 | 14.19797095 |
| 54 Pb | 20.95048459 | 14.29118908 | 17.1457014 |
| 55 Pb | 17.38329564 | 16.65572833 | 17.01795807 |
| 56 Pb | 18.43839553 | 13.89236398 | 20.18215776 |
| 57 Pb | 20.16903498 | 17.7667189 | 20.27101721 |
| 58 Pb | 20.79016483 | 14.90051115 | 23.35475649 |
| 59 Pb | 17.26988801 | 17.18893514 | 22.91505999 |
| 60 Pb | 18.18254412 | 13.83259756 | 26.20019715 |
| 61 Pb | 20.01955042 | 18.17693582 | 26.24821147 |
| 62 Pb | 20.63049497 | 15.11712617 | 29.50930871 |
| 63 Pb | 16.74616193 | 16.92466884 | 29.39454493 |
| 64 Pb | 19.91575207 | 18.14861477 | 32.04496828 |


| 65 Pb | 28.77833821 | 21.02472775 | 29.66290461 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66 Pb | 22.64904158 | 21.16149116 | 14.24501259 |
| 67 Pb | 28.4018546 | 11.10381515 | 23.97569484 |
| 68 Pb | 24.83250034 | 12.99806954 | 23.43419755 |
| 69 Pb | 22.02585316 | 21.66077884 | 20.13084872 |
| 70 Pb | 25.4883267 | 10.2128689 | 27.04009233 |
| 71 Pb | 19.46757552 | 20.35279482 | 17.04444235 |
| 72 Pb | 25.70923838 | 12.39864635 | 17.30283884 |
| 73 Pb | 16.55026032 | 19.67357843 | 19.85443771 |
| 74 Pb | 18.12554839 | 23.52566491 | 19.72284113 |
| 75 Pb | 19.27349348 | 20.74488898 | 23.17313282 |
| 76 Pb | 15.06427931 | 22.80462837 | 23.3505587 |
| 77 Pb | 16.15343005 | 19.68890923 | 25.96654897 |
| 78 Pb | 17.94412292 | 23.80934401 | 26.02570329 |
| 79 Pb | 18.99336305 | 21.15681645 | 29.29189357 |
| 80 S | 22.05711556 | 21.89148809 | 29.48068613 |
| 81 S | 21.11219418 | 24.62866321 | 26.17961229 |
| 82 S | 29.54996356 | 18.02624478 | 23.87381836 |
| 83 S | 24.030378 | 15.62700228 | 17.08886265 |
| 84 S | 26.27257407 | 19.33699493 | 17.48219989 |
| 85 S | 24.96891662 | 12.95479032 | 20.59727422 |
| 86 S | 22.24121402 | 21.52682042 | 16.84115265 |
| 87 S | 27.71620476 | 23.8350136 | 23.51851114 |
| 88 S | 23.30554774 | 18.55607448 | 14.32128873 |
| 89 S | 27.0801724 | 16.7185447 | 20.73660906 |
| 90 S | 24.73816999 | 12.8945045 | 26.66805262 |
| 91 S | 23.21249591 | 18.90577697 | 20.50415778 |
| 92 S | 31.47538739 | 21.90655157 | 23.50134862 |
| 93 S | 14.40743786 | 16.0037833 | 23.07815601 |
| 94 S | 23.82770205 | 15.90812093 | 23.3979545 |
| 95 S | 25.81535524 | 19.49727026 | 23.71854614 |
| 96 S | 21.66306597 | 24.63896091 | 20.22298147 |
| 97 S | 26.79465714 | 16.79756044 | 26.67903901 |
| 98 S | 25.28175009 | 22.58556686 | 19.99034179 |
| 99 S | 29.11414686 | 20.91427218 | 26.53699377 |
| 100 S | 22.62331936 | 18.98981552 | 32.52621345 |
| 101 S | 20.30961012 | 27.40928036 | 22.73330967 |
| 102 S | 23.15852769 | 18.97275376 | 26.61769366 |
| 103 S | 21.9447799 | 11.95716826 | 23.44971177 |
| 104 S | 23.60590496 | 16.02667664 | 29.70034608 |
| 105 S | 25.8039898 | 20.08196674 | 29.77094645 |
| 106 S | 28.53040318 | 20.46951486 | 20.48376578 |
| 107 S | 22.05226756 | 21.94671763 | 23.00576453 |
| 108 S | 24.18556479 | 25.45637157 | 22.65048244 |
| 109 S | 24.98517052 | 22.59149786 | 26.09269537 |
| 110 S | 25.87790157 | 10.40749524 | 23.65262679 |
| 111 S | 20.23942679 | 17.79078525 | 16.92953635 |
| 112 S | 21.33822528 | 14.84588033 | 20.38436602 |
| 113 S | 17.4209583 | 16.66464904 | 19.84977502 |
| 114 S | 18.17356817 | 14.01432 | 23.3858659 |
| 115 S | 20.18215503 | 17.78644646 | 23.26896895 |
| 116 S | 20.8912544 | 15.03247699 | 26.26934111 |
| 117 S | 17.35223346 | 17.18732007 | 25.95836486 |
| 118 S | 19.72750484 | 17.98548625 | 29.17307329 |
| 119 S | 19.48215291 | 20.57547255 | 20.25906878 |
| 120 S | 16.41795706 | 19.9359977 | 23.03921945 |
| 121 S | 18.36646355 | 23.78633051 | 23.23818238 |
| 122 S | 19.1749591 | 20.8086531 | 26.0236284 |
| 123 S | 27.88911249 | 13.74377528 | 23.71518423 |
| 124 H | 18.26366507 | 23.42859933 | 16.94921877 |
| 125 O | 18.97535138 | 23.18491387 | 17.61444229 |
| 126 O | 17.83437935 | 26.43741996 | 25.49497323 |
| 127 H | 19.10389807 | 11.12132555 | 20.34700386 |
| 128 C | 28.2860328 | 21.46299139 | 13.96514212 |
| 129 O | 28.06107159 | 20.68570899 | 15.00999427 |
| 130 O | 27.47445003 | 21.90654604 | 13.16771318 |
| 131 H | 29.29434795 | 21.85159694 | 13.85441955 |
| 132 H | 21.60519445 | 12.37265139 | 29.65142282 |
| 133 O | 22.18921069 | 12.85826419 | 29.07523386 |
| 134 O | 22.19982243 | 14.65145166 | 14.38231215 |
| 135 C | 21.27122024 | 13.85218067 | 14.05109916 |
| 136 C | 22.73367354 | 29.34968112 | 19.64479755 |
| 137 O | 22.64063097 | 28.39253368 | 20.49285699 |
| 138 O | 21.82796498 | 29.63556926 | 18.83177565 |
| 139 H | 23.7533809 | 29.83070227 | 19.74652844 |
| 140 C | 18.13101767 | 13.65974873 | 29.97602631 |
| 141 O | 18.02375693 | 14.53895663 | 29.04248112 |
| 142 O | 19.23804263 | 13.4115769 | 30.55421562 |
| 143 H | 17.19895537 | 13.14985788 | 30.24255753 |
| 144 C | 20.14156677 | 28.67950715 | 28.87075129 |
| 145 O | 20.12751684 | 29.50024736 | 27.90918893 |
| 146 O | 20.65594674 | 27.51616335 | 28.77054476 |
| 147 H | 19.57239393 | 28.9078626 | 29.79092162 |
| 148 H | 22.86921861 | 28.85032035 | 25.91691236 |
| 149 O | 22.85186092 | 28.01757068 | 25.46993425 |
| 150 H | 15.93311103 | 27.67539311 | 17.8871084 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  | 26.05181608 27.2179626 25.29596309 25.65115178 25.81565911 25.03962729 30.00917843 29.29460909 27.25717997 26.64790835 15.72712785 15.17099591 22.69850153 23.42779376 21.95521831 22.51605823 18.81813902 19.51558648 18.99885049 20.1163573 18.34232662 18.92982706 20.56951446 21.05085564 32.38952635 31.15493206 32.93166932 33.05833238 28.55669114 28.0736243 27.95396592 29.61325501 15.53460953 16.24070457 16.2598385 19.55455716 20.22943383 20.41138124 21.06575904 19.33167014 30.67622957 29.91229114 31.03153882 29.60009309 18.10520691 18.61556143 13.16824791 11.93037733 29.61807475 29.25804887 27.772062 28.41428589 32.14314485 31.65177437 31.47219841 33.29781875 15.88480961 16.57125298 32.45045629 34.22095454 30.35003808 30.54720362 29.26916662 31.25713529 33.63529588 32.64856594 26.77307862 27.22404933 14.36550302 14.47880012 14.37497899 14.20037709 20.73193791 20.54129357 26.9520513 27.73756738 29.27300346 28.3166742 29.60279063 29.6943971 16.01977624 16.87362367 13.70470692 14.98953483 18.18614386

$25.41422955 \quad 18.65985006$ $29.33655729 \quad 21.56221221$ $28.9297152 \quad 21.27903238$ $28.90515663 \quad 22.52024613$ $30.22148019 \quad 21.03084426$ $21.95882403 \quad 13.96274786$ $21.53365 \quad 14.71343284$ $17.34227935 \quad 17.42287917$ $18.26644775 \quad 17.99607919$ $26.48824203 \quad 26.7651055$ $25.89900505 \quad 26.26054852$ $22.72944071 \quad 25.53541057$ $23.36447955 \quad 26.01703602$ $8.935936821 \quad 20.17755236$ $9.50860636 \quad 21.051019$ $9.480336346 \quad 19.27468215$ $7.825027226 \quad 20.13953285$ $21.38133829 \quad 32.20189797$ $20.96838478 \quad 31.66217997$ $20.0309619 \quad 13.5840974$ $20.09845614 \quad 14.25884201$ $11.13792371 \quad 26.44370898$ $11.67144911 \quad 25.93917316$ $13.22168808 \quad 14.87349304$ $13.63604054 \quad 12.96303818$ $12.01329895 \quad 22.76085733$ $11.70754685 \quad 22.78112439$ $13.1728669 \quad 22.69895912$ $11.11108821 \quad 22.62820914$ $21.29162961 \quad 33.25616837$ $21.00644818 \quad 32.0865568$ $21.21508371 \quad 34.32285399$ $21.69240352 \quad 33.19700678$ $22.36897702 \quad 19.45079709$ $22.01861936 \quad 20.07155062$ $27.61792279 \quad 26.06157769$ $11.55475791 \quad 21.02330065$ $7.463935299 \quad 24.16955313$ $8.737109183 \quad 24.32648046$ $6.70743296 \quad 23.65818428$ $7.096973336 \quad 24.50434718$ $14.91495318 \quad 28.04830515$ $15.49103322 \quad 27.98184356$ $17.63968636 \quad 17.23531246$ $16.20731164 \quad 17.22876269$ $13.49302195 \quad 17.31455588$ $14.31579482 \quad 17.67050437$ $24.36233209 \quad 23.84527499$ $26.72884748 \quad 23.07765421$ $27.29133642 \quad 22.15043458$ $26.38058825 \quad 22.08560485$ $10.95529929 \quad 16.42389745$ $9.212957029 \quad 17.38633738$ $20.48571064 \quad 16.791405$ $20.92162563 \quad 17.91339505$ $20.2622847 \quad 15.7950676$ $20.4824995 \quad 16.73081193$ $\begin{array}{ll}10.3654355 & 23.13756164 \\ 10.89707632 & 23.63926967\end{array}$ $10.89707632 \quad 23.63926967$ $\begin{array}{ll}18.64008079 & 28.09695373 \\ 18.49702517 & 27.6794\end{array}$ $25.26318837 \quad 27.11161622$ $24.36166508 \quad 26.19551498$ $25.51928412 \quad 27.71201603$ $25.98986576 \quad 27.27071483$ $\begin{array}{ll}16.40547464 & 23.02570928\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}16.59842493 & 23.08285415 \\ 25.57270705 & 20.79753052\end{array}$ $25.57270705 \quad 20.79753052$ $26.30109632 \quad 20.33029749$ $14.57762076 \quad 28.78418575$ $\begin{array}{ll}15.87363378 & 28.79897612 \\ 13.89574582 & 27.79734851\end{array}$ $13.89574582 \quad 27.79734851$ $14.17853528 \quad 29.77489696$ $24.6974729 \quad 32.24414242$ $23.94798949 \quad 31.68431878$ $10.07350079 \quad 18.36389066$ $10.071439 \quad 17.33118463$ $11.03811585 \quad 27.42168765$ $11.0275464 \quad 26.56980459$ $\begin{array}{ll}11.99902962 & 28.16478304 \\ 10.01493195 & 27.66677856\end{array}$ $19.79326991 \quad 17.14945681$ $19.38860855 \quad 17.37215001$ $\begin{array}{ll}25.48141119 & 23.54348867 \\ 25.54053175 & 23.26272307\end{array}$ $23.90684165 \quad 29.75329831$

| 237 O | 18.77373658 | 23.50099535 | 29.08536069 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 238 H | 26.6214375 | 10.27666033 | 31.13109359 |
| 239 O | 26.44620627 | 9.025093007 | 29.57921276 |
| 240 H | 21.16693826 | 11.30030531 | 17.63245619 |
| 241 O | 21.04149342 | 12.1985121 | 18.07179825 |
| 242 H | 28.06180512 | 23.61608421 | 29.55713603 |
| 243 O | 27.54439827 | 23.0254085 | 28.91889896 |
| 244 H | 28.1603931 | 13.4985469 | 17.8328121 |
| 245 O | 27.28662554 | 13.60725238 | 18.25975171 |
| 246 O | 23.99022381 | 25.11330962 | 28.4341997 |
| 247 H | 24.41098974 | 25.80325303 | 28.9678667 |
| 248 H | 24.01311437 | 24.97832948 | 16.36859837 |
| 249 O | 23.87785832 | 24.4467388 | 17.17224471 |
| 250 C | 16.71148181 | 26.65177597 | 26.12398487 |
| 251 O | 16.20077454 | 25.77240804 | 26.85510719 |
| 252 H | 29.50498761 | 17.76257844 | 30.03032886 |
| 253 O | 28.82666282 | 18.14447233 | 29.37151933 |
| 254 O | 26.08051304 | 11.23893294 | 29.36339197 |
| 255 C | 26.3895692 | 10.16615865 | 30.04205521 |
| 256 H | 12.63617453 | 21.76982325 | 24.20436421 |
| 257 O | 13.36058305 | 21.22499395 | 23.79991534 |
| 258 O | 32.73237248 | 19.38051381 | 26.58644224 |
| 259 C | 33.11590535 | 18.51613858 | 27.39406962 |
| 260 C | 31.18139179 | 22.94691453 | 29.70685384 |
| 261 O | 31.40466575 | 21.96521771 | 28.86251514 |
| 262 O | 30.08349719 | 23.14986697 | 30.22804916 |
| 263 H | 32.0159902 | 23.62031075 | 29.95801857 |
| 264 H | 13.32307952 | 19.0127979 | 25.99372617 |
| 265 O | 14.01101383 | 18.57038517 | 25.39367365 |
| 266 O | 18.77454782 | 19.18950528 | 12.69182276 |
| 267 H | 18.02592903 | 21.561961 | 14.77676598 |
| 268 C | 25.19335412 | 23.45634471 | 32.35547884 |
| 269 O | 25.62981483 | 24.01783407 | 31.32043528 |
| 270 O | 24.4854595 | 22.43042774 | 32.46347598 |
| 271 H | 25.52090777 | 24.01864372 | 33.25041174 |
| 272 C | 27.96698556 | 23.85324652 | 16.84462111 |
| 273 O | 28.1864943 | 23.22176664 | 17.94117331 |
| 274 O | 26.87325685 | 23.93904137 | 16.24063506 |
| 275 H | 28.79048063 | 24.47056202 | 16.40236271 |
| 276 C | 13.63540559 | 18.93877059 | 19.04050372 |
| 277 O | 14.35273022 | 19.88240616 | 18.64889072 |
| 278 O | 14.00414569 | 18.15707485 | 20.03259841 |
| 279 H | 12.44552768 | 17.4337217 | 18.13533485 |
| 280 H | 15.19355254 | 13.46819544 | 26.20227251 |
| 281 O | 15.71379121 | 13.89315437 | 25.51639148 |
| 282 O | 17.57197007 | 16.13346415 | 31.9536221 |
| 283 H | 16.02195238 | 16.64619551 | 33.21131271 |
| 284 H | 30.99246727 | 14.70970743 | 20.61042862 |
| 285 O | 30.41078185 | 15.19437672 | 21.22951704 |
| 286 H | 26.30655374 | 12.85844863 | 14.59768968 |
| 287 O | 25.83702636 | 13.51007373 | 15.17058779 |
| 288 C | 29.55592833 | 11.11095324 | 20.79525847 |
| 289 O | 28.49792222 | 10.86831791 | 21.53689225 |
| 290 O | 29.68412301 | 12.0332398 | 20.00669457 |
| 291 H | 30.44676939 | 10.44857439 | 21.0060653 |
| 292 H | 20.64683385 | 15.09414679 | 32.49568791 |
| 293 O | 21.08806354 | 15.86405007 | 32.11806935 |
| 294 O | 15.91323766 | 17.56810337 | 31.43425296 |
| 295 C | 16.55929252 | 16.85476734 | 32.31535844 |
| 296 H | 32.51318326 | 18.78619534 | 20.59293281 |
| 297 O | 31.92889569 | 19.24695577 | 21.16077355 |
| 298 H | 27.70251873 | 17.15637029 | 33.43316122 |
| 299 O | 26.35655977 | 15.57806 | 33.38787109 |
| 300 H | 27.6225454 | 16.36867581 | 14.87505481 |
| 301 O | 26.74132758 | 16.61832787 | 15.13242523 |
| 302 O | 25.88407859 | 17.61009442 | 32.54521034 |
| 303 C | 26.69749431 | 16.76695273 | 33.11359574 |
| 304 C | 13.78392272 | 15.01346698 | 17.19679538 |
| 305 O | 14.8417197 | 15.80683325 | 17.31537234 |
| 306 O | 13.06112512 | 14.83996845 | 18.2565936 |
| 307 H | 13.17998253 | 14.79364288 | 15.26151501 |
| 308 C | 20.84748095 | 27.01120886 | 15.97379381 |
| 309 O | 20.67380226 | 25.95793514 | 15.29230796 |
| 310 O | 21.28171928 | 26.97138781 | 17.21077996 |
| 311 H | 19.52501355 | 28.52982447 | 15.25918637 |
| 312 C | 16.00086564 | 12.11903029 | 19.24676432 |
| 313 O | 15.6652824 | 12.9028132 | 20.296814 |
| 314 O | 17.16692235 | 11.98562686 | 18.86094088 |
| 315 H | 15.18124765 | 11.5483468 | 18.82720307 |
| 316 C | 22.46291831 | 9.310366175 | 27.1795422 |
| 317 O | 23.18427646 | 9.498523187 | 28.20605782 |
| 318 O | 22.81877751 | 9.487532629 | 25.96762756 |
| 319 H | 21.3971438 | 9.120369991 | 27.43414099 |
| 320 C | 16.00048195 | 20.51725674 | 30.06227681 |
| 321 O | 16.77037704 | 21.49951928 | 30.41396699 |
| 322 O | 16.23292991 | 19.61789515 | 29.18121387 |


| 323 H | 15.06317775 | 20.45310535 | 30.67809749 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 324 C | 17.54377957 | 15.81626123 | 13.96852099 |
| 325 O | 18.62010092 | 16.01200853 | 14.60167652 |
| 326 O | 16.45849008 | 15.61453304 | 14.63058891 |
| 327 H | 18.49448712 | 15.70943871 | 12.00824359 |
| 328 H | 27.61277948 | 14.46164695 | 30.0936617 |
| 329 O | 27.03009142 | 14.5466135 | 29.33643278 |
| 330 H | 31.03269548 | 24.5810636 | 20.5816385 |
| 331 O | 30.53016421 | 23.87729728 | 21.06545032 |
| 332 C | 16.90532873 | 26.47912124 | 19.35124802 |
| 333 O | 17.78879456 | 26.62100706 | 20.30116947 |
| 334 C | 20.27775201 | 18.91083592 | 9.578877211 |
| 335 C | 19.06037148 | 19.09374878 | 8.591928813 |
| 336 C | 17.7242722 | 18.59287125 | 9.352043107 |
| 337 C | 17.5792404 | 17.06878588 | 9.60810402 |
| 338 C | 16.29735878 | 16.74572141 | 10.46212664 |
| 339 C | 16.49366788 | 16.68859201 | 12.00890822 |
| 340 C | 17.48858896 | 15.65203696 | 12.46076657 |
| 341 H | 21.19514073 | 18.96781842 | 9.000567897 |
| 342 H | 20.07786935 | 17.96400348 | 10.09131787 |
| 343 H | 20.32888289 | 19.59449334 | 10.38205995 |
| 344 H | 19.12337329 | 18.3749783 | 7.677146011 |
| 345 H | 18.93250929 | 20.11087324 | 8.274708467 |
| 346 H | 16.91635621 | 18.87965711 | 8.727196929 |
| 347 H | 17.629965 | 19.15614244 | 10.28696714 |
| 348 H | 18.37376132 | 16.64826324 | 10.22273107 |
| 349 H | 17.52545227 | 16.59598773 | 8.618309981 |
| 350 H | 15.99662891 | 15.74727266 | 10.19271953 |
| 351 H | 15.36407099 | 17.27809436 | 10.16540136 |
| 352 H | 15.44537742 | 16.41274541 | 12.35032527 |
| 353 H | 16.78063211 | 17.71823665 | 12.29208239 |
| 354 H | 17.04409745 | 14.67484873 | 12.34920331 |
| 355 C | 22.53882832 | 29.94249502 | 9.441106964 |
| 356 C | 22.00679692 | 29.13258267 | 10.65186871 |
| 357 C | 22.70150119 | 27.78907368 | 10.81937994 |
| 358 C | 22.35640368 | 27.01725379 | 12.19924854 |
| 359 C | 22.47211478 | 27.873954 | 13.50652856 |
| 360 C | 21.11908088 | 28.55972161 | 13.90294873 |
| 361 C | 20.58519143 | 28.39570629 | 15.31105051 |
| 362 H | 23.65842921 | 30.02273159 | 9.611001526 |
| 363 H | 22.13464734 | 30.92589267 | 9.395859002 |
| 364 H | 22.35282195 | 29.47361331 | 8.508255679 |
| 365 H | 20.88970748 | 29.00483817 | 10.42312837 |
| 366 H | 22.06910642 | 29.66930586 | 11.61000619 |
| 367 H | 23.69935328 | 27.85314181 | 10.7225708 |
| 368 H | 22.34737798 | 27.18864118 | 9.985008227 |
| 369 H | 22.98365057 | 26.14717716 | 12.2608195 |
| 370 H | 21.27627622 | 26.72340218 | 12.21083364 |
| 371 H | 23.25473918 | 28.69919409 | 13.42324893 |
| 372 H | 22.74227905 | 27.24237232 | 14.32022236 |
| 373 H | 20.34084277 | 28.15002576 | 13.24572579 |
| 374 H | 21.12423555 | 29.65597669 | 13.65323401 |
| 375 H | 21.09584173 | 29.15211585 | 15.82503067 |
| 376 C | 11.75190498 | 7.365089338 | 13.1410874 |
| 377 C | 11.00586972 | 8.534622396 | 13.82057192 |
| 378 C | 11.92698954 | 9.68780122 | 14.02983308 |
| 379 C | 11.63130641 | 10.83816592 | 15.16194871 |
| 380 C | 12.75051009 | 11.91232896 | 15.05049846 |
| 381 C | 12.77896652 | 12.92798356 | 16.26698795 |
| 382 C | 13.67184513 | 14.15393073 | 15.93501204 |
| 383 H | 12.2295234 | 7.679331014 | 12.17875637 |
| 384 H | 11.11176072 | 6.463998068 | 13.08204842 |
| 385 H | 12.63908122 | 7.152961826 | 13.79900732 |
| 386 H | 10.63210982 | 8.212983082 | 14.82908037 |
| 387 H | 10.12378348 | 8.792005293 | 13.27118326 |
| 388 H | 12.1532373 | 10.14056961 | 13.05043844 |
| 389 H | 12.90196782 | 9.274113682 | 14.25108597 |
| 390 H | 11.62052924 | 10.38118016 | 16.13105652 |
| 391 H | 10.63084159 | 11.26614348 | 15.06867746 |
| 392 H | 12.71090968 | 12.44126734 | 14.12120624 |
| 393 H | 13.6928846 | 11.3364268 | 15.04893763 |
| 394 H | 13.26461562 | 12.43524441 | 17.10221776 |
| 395 H | 11.74175595 | 13.07308775 | 16.69177953 |
| 396 H | 14.65025443 | 13.89398985 | 15.59170363 |
| 397 C | 8.452695572 | 17.82184456 | 11.89264262 |
| 398 C | 9.542184332 | 18.77252809 | 12.44394644 |
| 399 C | 9.878547167 | 18.27509269 | 13.87399476 |
| 400 C | 10.76628647 | 19.09820428 | 14.70574876 |
| 401 C | 11.1099072 | 18.60875173 | 16.10957058 |
| 402 C | 12.20720711 | 19.33714247 | 16.91774475 |
| 403 C | 12.41936351 | 18.58040197 | 18.22326725 |
| 404 H | 7.803009213 | 17.55360756 | 12.74351262 |
| 405 H | 8.891884789 | 16.88527688 | 11.5503056 |
| 406 H | 7.779045456 | 18.27407932 | 11.20606135 |
| 407 H | 9.262865135 | 19.88355624 | 12.43477636 |
| 408 H | 10.4000832 | 18.68305361 | 11.748721 |


| 409 H | 10.29131068 | 17.22859286 | 13.78524519 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 410 H | 8.957369092 | 18.14533685 | 14.41063895 |
| 411 H | 10.26864503 | 20.09699655 | 14.76954066 |
| 412 H | 11.66814877 | 19.47727191 | 14.20070346 |
| 413 H | 11.44922744 | 17.53378705 | 16.09188428 |
| 414 H | 10.17014709 | 18.54868819 | 16.69938283 |
| 415 H | 11.90779156 | 20.43481366 | 17.11054067 |
| 416 H | 13.1269528 | 19.38795319 | 16.3118014 |
| 417 H | 11.50926192 | 18.70734628 | 18.767959 |
| 418 C | 13.44846826 | 23.75468249 | 9.643919564 |
| 419 C | 14.02664167 | 24.03994785 | 11.03038873 |
| 420 C | 13.46227985 | 23.02857475 | 12.0171347 |
| 421 C | 14.38783966 | 21.8228662 | 12.30224626 |
| 422 C | 15.7916725 | 22.11150016 | 12.97500674 |
| 423 C | 16.59274719 | 20.80587968 | 13.29548375 |
| 424 C | 17.99279537 | 21.13935207 | 13.7538329 |
| 425 H | 13.58302463 | 22.68419801 | 9.33871287 |
| 426 H | 13.77652794 | 24.58585187 | 9.00915142 |
| 427 H | 12.33056662 | 23.92784062 | 9.735662494 |
| 428 H | 13.82107415 | 25.08868361 | 11.27240615 |
| 429 H | 15.1036796 | 24.12178247 | 11.16627388 |
| 430 H | 12.49144893 | 22.63230349 | 11.5714157 |
| 431 H | 13.26029876 | 23.54411701 | 13.02209859 |
| 432 H | 14.59163676 | 21.40374003 | 11.32298322 |
| 433 H | 13.75421816 | 21.24575791 | 12.97463958 |
| 434 H | 15.78158568 | 22.56885961 | 13.94508389 |
| 435 H | 16.36664895 | 22.68933264 | 12.25368134 |
| 436 H | 16.58374905 | 20.21216815 | 12.33735046 |
| 437 H | 15.98566902 | 20.20419566 | 14.01176468 |
| 438 H | 18.35284997 | 22.00660475 | 13.13910527 |
| 439 C | 14.63082797 | 34.36089889 | 24.11047587 |
| 440 C | 14.96002072 | 32.99329878 | 23.38677292 |
| 441 C | 14.01845202 | 31.87340256 | 23.63987402 |
| 442 C | 14.37443573 | 30.50872938 | 23.16518536 |
| 443 C | 13.44011938 | 29.38636718 | 23.69491834 |
| 444 C | 13.76928214 | 28.03208052 | 23.01484718 |
| 445 C | 12.92034624 | 26.83547253 | 23.55361076 |
| 446 H | 13.51067728 | 34.68011531 | 24.22579321 |
| 447 H | 14.88920359 | 35.11846934 | 23.35793407 |
| 448 H | 15.14704506 | 34.7000158 | 25.04565408 |
| 449 H | 15.94574293 | 32.69244666 | 23.77705017 |
| 450 H | 15.06670125 | 33.1699402 | 22.3008477 |
| 451 H | 13.04952245 | 32.11286892 | 23.30907145 |
| 452 H | 13.84133056 | 31.85577565 | 24.69294738 |
| 453 H | 15.35437032 | 30.38706368 | 23.71717333 |
| 454 H | 14.56421836 | 30.51767437 | 22.07716317 |
| 455 H | 12.29857016 | 29.49821514 | 23.62621488 |
| 456 H | 13.5944606 | 29.28924599 | 24.80478565 |
| 457 H | 14.87376095 | 27.80290766 | 22.97231139 |
| 458 H | 13.6671689 | 28.21638049 | 21.91252223 |
| 459 H | 12.75368201 | 27.08988397 | 24.67055485 |
| 460 C | 19.47729512 | 34.41734264 | 18.13734141 |
| 461 C | 18.65837903 | 33.52350334 | 19.07765563 |
| 462 C | 18.37215908 | 32.09231012 | 18.55662642 |
| 463 C | 17.76545169 | 31.06259448 | 19.56230523 |
| 464 C | 17.4126962 | 29.71829487 | 18.91377722 |
| 465 C | 16.24426903 | 28.91390397 | 19.6370941 |
| 466 C | 15.9534665 | 27.56116208 | 18.97204508 |
| 467 H | 20.56370353 | 34.13626442 | 18.1582322 |
| 468 H | 19.37424575 | 35.53600193 | 18.44579586 |
| 469 H | 19.09610037 | 34.34406667 | 17.07962261 |
| 470 H | 17.68522365 | 34.05412131 | 19.2748242 |
| 471 H | 19.16535214 | 33.56668007 | 20.10629423 |
| 472 H | 19.27652678 | 31.61731441 | 18.18000659 |
| 473 H | 17.65045583 | 32.29428714 | 17.7397443 |
| 474 H | 16.8500603 | 31.50949551 | 19.98438254 |
| 475 H | 18.35534211 | 30.8735288 | 20.47345015 |
| 476 H | 18.27682065 | 28.98087503 | 18.96462815 |
| 477 H | 17.06643819 | 29.8443447 | 17.87211095 |
| 478 H | 15.45710704 | 29.6665628 | 19.59242586 |
| 479 H | 16.45056591 | 28.78486065 | 20.68879755 |
| 480 H | 14.98576611 | 27.09378733 | 19.15895019 |
| 481 C | 8.748859228 | 29.29707688 | 10.44620807 |
| 482 C | 8.580935436 | 29.95047483 | 11.61071638 |
| 483 C | 9.012582823 | 29.44147139 | 12.87644625 |
| 484 C | 8.874197313 | 30.06843281 | 14.0792613 |
| 485 C | 10.06092906 | 28.32223872 | 15.28699375 |
| 486 C | 10.26069699 | 27.66215442 | 14.06105124 |
| 487 C | 9.697729228 | 28.1594145 | 12.88582486 |
| 488 C | 9.913135339 | 27.52591414 | 11.58057389 |
| 489 C | 9.416330731 | 28.04921354 | 10.41123791 |
| 490 C | 10.10999762 | 29.94898561 | 20.23460576 |
| 491 C | 9.620799091 | 30.50616782 | 19.0374917 |
| 492 C | 9.690810065 | 29.75273756 | 17.80127738 |
| 493 C | 9.225395052 | 30.2266355 | 16.57971106 |
| 494 C | 9.314637254 | 29.5402764 | 15.3317719 |


| 495 C | 10.5525297 | 27.8248795 | 16.5279095 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 496 C | 10.35587517 | 28.48843379 | 17.77668508 |
| 497 C | 10.82294087 | 27.91168725 | 19.01169304 |
| 498 C | 10.6694477 | 28.62079217 | 20.19306505 |
| 499 H | 8.408511027 | 29.73551456 | 9.482158715 |
| 500 H | 8.191038898 | 30.98283945 | 11.53535681 |
| 501 H | 8.388208841 | 31.02953255 | 14.14419452 |
| 502 H | 11.00879202 | 28.18569863 | 21.11019986 |
| 503 H | 10.90007469 | 26.80431901 | 13.99453052 |
| 504 H | 10.49932259 | 26.65222812 | 11.53766441 |
| 505 H | 9.649772372 | 27.49504704 | 9.536647578 |
| 506 H | 10.0723925 | 30.55074274 | 21.14489832 |
| 507 H | 9.174233809 | 31.5104089 | 18.98440894 |
| 508 H | 8.774205225 | 31.16863349 | 16.53110772 |
| 509 H | 11.13917092 | 26.94395548 | 16.49517429 |
| 510 H | 11.29043243 | 26.89723375 | 19.04412602 |

Table A.5: the coordinates of the first time step in the MD simulation for the PbS QD
with the 7 C -ligand, used as the starting setup in the MD simulation.
A. $6 \quad \mathrm{PbS}+9 \mathrm{C}$ and Tetracene

| Atom | X | Y | Z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Pb | 27.09139027 | 19.72181427 | 14.69924322 |
| 2 Pb | 17.30954459 | 26.09293036 | 22.18611119 |
| 3 Pb | 27.43246883 | 18.2790461 | 29.68379212 |
| 4 Pb | 28.04793652 | 24.16786227 | 20.3856889 |
| 5 Pb | 27.59644139 | 10.85806474 | 21.48720196 |
| 6 Pb | 23.09403898 | 19.41017348 | 29.2624994 |
| 7 Pb | 29.73746233 | 21.52252516 | 17.23366545 |
| 8 Pb | 30.40785389 | 25.53063882 | 23.51039742 |
| 9 Pb | 27.14786412 | 27.77591832 | 22.67914234 |
| 10 Pb | 27.95733565 | 17.21628003 | 17.53350888 |
| 11 Pb | 24.02676951 | 18.67610489 | 17.37692625 |
| 12 Pb | 27.36200424 | 24.58234866 | 26.18123295 |
| 13 Pb | 25.50870507 | 14.28379422 | 30.07599018 |
| 14 Pb | 15.38877213 | 15.86634675 | 19.86290314 |
| 15 Pb | 25.12471466 | 16.02618357 | 20.32761298 |
| 16 Pb | 29.13078339 | 14.7813287 | 21.18637604 |
| 17 Pb | 16.79831776 | 12.60680254 | 23.1362925 |
| 18 Pb | 19.83266402 | 27.312721 | 25.5693368 |
| 19 Pb | 15.36175662 | 15.70122544 | 25.70878702 |
| 20 Pb | 26.62675376 | 20.03932256 | 20.29654646 |
| 21 Pb | 25.49631562 | 15.54319712 | 14.84699255 |
| 22 Pb | 23.80580526 | 17.14445293 | 32.45842467 |
| 23 Pb | 24.82700644 | 16.69232126 | 26.81795389 |
| 24 Pb | 28.74788612 | 15.40479603 | 27.54703805 |
| 25 Pb | 23.7757275 | 26.04485447 | 26.08105442 |
| 26 Pb | 14.54949061 | 18.59657121 | 22.64349273 |
| 27 Pb | 25.81055445 | 22.99688163 | 17.19902169 |
| 28 Pb | 21.89865167 | 24.15834057 | 16.78774069 |
| 29 Pb | 20.33793286 | 27.21870939 | 19.43809434 |
| 30 Pb | 30.72985328 | 18.70774247 | 20.9067234 |
| 31 Pb | 32.35691241 | 15.99218554 | 23.80388935 |
| 32 Pb | 33.05622339 | 20.10993142 | 23.60777296 |
| 33 Pb | 31.84073481 | 22.93818975 | 20.84223222 |
| 34 Pb | 29.19196678 | 21.66364408 | 23.460282 |
| 35 Pb | 27.71636442 | 17.66391245 | 23.64964219 |
| 36 Pb | 26.29865913 | 20.8100709 | 26.62765675 |
| 37 Pb | 25.70872795 | 21.04269143 | 32.37423643 |
| 38 Pb | 24.48486393 | 23.70911748 | 29.08860667 |
| 39 Pb | 25.03731183 | 23.02512853 | 23.12183165 |
| 40 Pb | 20.59339123 | 24.8462086 | 28.9017657 |
| 41 Pb | 21.42308097 | 22.38991037 | 31.83518561 |
| 42 Pb | 21.22955117 | 24.80550305 | 22.76608901 |
| 43 Pb | 23.84513811 | 19.03224232 | 23.21955063 |
| 44 Pb | 30.35877534 | 19.0606656 | 26.99328018 |
| 45 Pb | 31.85201579 | 22.81538739 | 26.59123048 |
| 46 Pb | 23.01936977 | 11.99252534 | 20.46727971 |
| 47 Pb | 24.56353042 | 9.910637038 | 24.01594668 |
| 48 Pb | 20.40424379 | 11.13865698 | 23.57537861 |
| 49 Pb | 22.85389645 | 12.70012744 | 26.72029598 |
| 50 Pb | 22.704928 | 28.43901091 | 23.02736769 |
| 51 Pb | 22.25218087 | 21.8074804 | 25.93466455 |
| 52 Pb | 24.73247497 | 25.90470875 | 20.28411324 |
| 53 Pb | 21.60307269 | 17.6659549 | 14.24005003 |
| 54 Pb | 22.45146045 | 14.56388502 | 17.65862399 |
| 55 Pb | 18.47638521 | 16.10475914 | 16.83967559 |


| 56 Pb | 19.42427771 | 13.95577756 | 20.06916288 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 57 Pb | 20.89404895 | 17.78253531 | 20.09234859 |
| 58 Pb | 22.40303769 | 15.23289554 | 23.50102183 |
| 59 Pb | 18.1306802 | 16.60335373 | 22.92580627 |
| 60 Pb | 18.84357675 | 14.01901384 | 26.10106945 |
| 61 Pb | 20.73801454 | 17.89113232 | 25.97187477 |
| 62 Pb | 21.792889 | 15.45372743 | 29.65057415 |
| 63 Pb | 17.50023221 | 17.12169574 | 29.12757284 |
| 64 Pb | 20.26289478 | 18.65888681 | 31.97213382 |
| 65 Pb | 28.71439497 | 22.07211532 | 29.41476525 |
| 66 Pb | 23.62513656 | 21.26564868 | 14.37243501 |
| 67 Pb | 29.9868066 | 12.43990464 | 24.74485183 |
| 68 Pb | 26.23692561 | 13.54417671 | 24.16693075 |
| 69 Pb | 22.67739437 | 21.7714045 | 19.93341028 |
| 70 Pb | 27.05600888 | 11.17512698 | 27.568852 |
| 71 Pb | 20.0239523 | 20.45509853 | 16.9250618 |
| 72 Pb | 26.78423491 | 13.1931655 | 17.80445035 |
| 73 Pb | 16.9376511 | 19.64751199 | 19.00088426 |
| 74 Pb | 18.79619938 | 23.40938679 | 19.3446484 |
| 75 Pb | 19.80906994 | 20.74064009 | 22.87686224 |
| 76 Pb | 15.88703127 | 22.11730013 | 22.35869131 |
| 77 Pb | 16.76603497 | 19.72705328 | 25.46860096 |
| 78 Pb | 18.35512363 | 23.44204943 | 25.65809932 |
| 79 Pb | 18.97824758 | 21.03186788 | 28.78906312 |
| 80 S | 21.94952401 | 22.37835252 | 29.23747954 |
| 81 S | 21.06242423 | 24.8789747 | 25.70362314 |
| 82 S | 30.43163005 | 19.01090234 | 23.63946155 |
| 83 S | 25.23389319 | 15.94863733 | 17.45071503 |
| 84 S | 26.81534556 | 19.81160339 | 17.36299671 |
| 85 S | 26.35136851 | 13.25522553 | 21.14890096 |
| 86 S | 23.02930103 | 21.40371728 | 16.96467464 |
| 87 S | 27.84858034 | 24.41927456 | 23.1813482 |
| 88 S | 24.17527005 | 18.45814915 | 14.41352822 |
| 89 S | 27.82971272 | 17.56026179 | 20.67880917 |
| 90 S | 25.82371348 | 14.06589808 | 27.27173394 |
| 91 S | 23.97525026 | 19.06225456 | 20.31681314 |
| 92 S | 31.90562947 | 22.56793061 | 23.67477553 |
| 93 S | 15.73044341 | 15.33268315 | 23.05708424 |
| 94 S | 25.06681215 | 16.36899868 | 23.76652512 |
| 95 S | 26.50735907 | 20.44928429 | 23.36877723 |
| 96 S | 21.95251339 | 24.61550173 | 19.85803675 |
| 97 S | 27.41162105 | 18.13029233 | 26.82360851 |
| 98 S | 25.58239762 | 23.09284508 | 20.11338149 |
| 99 S | 29.20949799 | 22.07872465 | 26.30819999 |
| 100 S | 22.76155766 | 19.59975493 | 32.27664292 |
| 101 S | 20.11447052 | 27.3271262 | 22.4172333 |
| 102 S | 23.64916841 | 19.48345683 | 26.25762395 |
| 103 S | 23.47766245 | 12.59549859 | 24.02388045 |
| 104 S | 24.46870157 | 16.87931931 | 29.88039302 |
| 105 S | 25.75265402 | 20.81764658 | 29.39265782 |
| 106 S | 29.41553428 | 21.51355279 | 20.6633843 |
| 107 S | 22.5384801 | 21.74647035 | 23.05381812 |
| 108 S | 24.0915602 | 26.13514816 | 22.94243419 |
| 109 S | 24.79615589 | 23.27633234 | 25.97723984 |
| 110 S | 27.49583787 | 10.9206587 | 24.47084457 |
| 111 S | 21.07616143 | 17.77858595 | 16.99152302 |
| 112 S | 22.46895966 | 15.34798736 | 20.33175282 |
| 113 S | 18.22522177 | 16.67508783 | 19.69025773 |
| 114 S | 19.32421114 | 13.95546046 | 23.25455231 |
| 115 S | 21.07869367 | 17.95881482 | 23.18814062 |
| 116 S | 22.06789946 | 15.37542386 | 26.49533662 |
| 117 S | 18.00694259 | 16.91577914 | 26.17046422 |
| 118 S | 20.29182375 | 18.39308266 | 29.33150599 |
| 119 S | 20.0746528 | 20.71882384 | 19.82427477 |
| 120 S | 17.22683027 | 19.52849542 | 22.7030136 |
| 121 S | 18.54801274 | 23.76821044 | 22.48357027 |
| 122 S | 19.38499057 | 20.52315563 | 25.68130329 |
| 123 S | 28.99239097 | 14.91662757 | 24.18803404 |
| 124 H | 19.34405407 | 23.66195334 | 16.43741048 |
| 125 O | 19.73686543 | 23.14408609 | 17.15516201 |
| 126 O | 17.03239575 | 25.96460038 | 24.91996446 |
| 127 H | 20.45657695 | 10.98516047 | 20.12783191 |
| 128 C | 29.11091585 | 22.11668327 | 13.87928627 |
| 129 O | 29.01915134 | 21.21162345 | 14.83924461 |
| 130 O | 28.41441413 | 22.1627108 | 12.87347452 |
| 131 H | 29.90545193 | 22.81232059 | 14.05826008 |
| 132 H | 22.99200627 | 12.89412302 | 30.23959446 |
| 133 O | 23.26154181 | 13.40451248 | 29.47613532 |
| 134 O | 22.81710941 | 15.1233759 | 14.04164326 |
| 135 C | 22.25026519 | 14.00371176 | 14.25477775 |
| 136 C | 22.56200264 | 29.09033264 | 19.32568412 |
| 137 O | 22.6628123 | 28.0203058 | 20.0524165 |
| 138 O | 21.49685377 | 29.42626848 | 18.81519039 |
| 139 H | 23.47089355 | 29.69681577 | 19.263354 |
| 140 C | 19.49908929 | 13.73198216 | 30.49673607 |
| 141 O | 19.05318148 | 14.53889955 | 29.64388982 |


| 142 O | 20.69440703 | 13.56532971 | 30.87629074 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 143 H | 18.74845997 | 13.04897315 | 30.96104349 |
| 144 C | 20.07557216 | 28.40136121 | 28.33183856 |
| 145 O | 20.50868056 | 29.14558293 | 27.39897239 |
| 146 O | 19.39744272 | 27.31531996 | 28.14905904 |
| 147 H | 20.34866523 | 28.60835794 | 29.4113855 |
| 148 H | 21.96717007 | 28.80911004 | 25.75687059 |
| 149 O | 22.04066213 | 28.04489627 | 25.20605186 |
| 150 H | 15.03001067 | 26.20306171 | 17.38055624 |
| 151 O | 17.04548581 | 24.76771229 | 17.96719593 |
| 152 C | 26.18663033 | 30.30181541 | 21.33094948 |
| 153 O | 27.42801802 | 29.87199603 | 21.45474625 |
| 154 O | 25.16898647 | 29.67890151 | 21.61421327 |
| 155 H | 26.02688089 | 31.42644578 | 21.05281821 |
| 156 H | 26.47474859 | 22.25738273 | 14.11296904 |
| 157 O | 25.93523999 | 21.87706843 | 14.74368455 |
| 158 C | 30.9496115 | 18.19539772 | 17.37139319 |
| 159 O | 29.97372698 | 18.78766172 | 16.80779634 |
| 160 H | 26.3321403 | 27.34151931 | 26.14244869 |
| 161 O | 26.29188069 | 26.56128682 | 26.74061451 |
| 162 O | 16.43912467 | 22.33604227 | 24.62152648 |
| 163 H | 15.62373288 | 22.80148207 | 24.84215575 |
| 164 C | 24.47196496 | 9.193026226 | 20.01876905 |
| 165 O | 25.13955031 | 9.674814077 | 20.99387113 |
| 166 O | 23.41833375 | 9.756411786 | 19.53800975 |
| 167 H | 24.68530057 | 8.196444299 | 19.65400703 |
| 168 H | 18.77033546 | 21.15780323 | 31.98080838 |
| 169 O | 19.52248012 | 20.91463536 | 31.41076633 |
| 170 C | 20.49214061 | 20.44855281 | 13.02363562 |
| 171 O | 20.57037106 | 20.00062131 | 14.31885873 |
| 172 H | 19.96846486 | 11.35531854 | 26.23812101 |
| 173 O | 20.42125249 | 12.01244337 | 25.77668774 |
| 174 O | 22.09232917 | 13.45932479 | 15.37761108 |
| 175 H | 21.71478963 | 13.37160292 | 13.5022576 |
| 176 C | 33.42530791 | 13.16251774 | 23.10955121 |
| 177 O | 32.4960782 | 13.05067463 | 23.95001177 |
| 178 O | 33.98518322 | 14.2300236 | 22.7449851 |
| 179 H | 33.84617661 | 12.14035584 | 22.67600669 |
| 180 C | 28.22736172 | 22.03106849 | 33.05133211 |
| 181 O | 28.04832219 | 21.48719682 | 31.8972848 |
| 182 O | 27.37321661 | 22.14308702 | 33.94719669 |
| 183 H | 29.24042149 | 22.42905289 | 33.18584114 |
| 184 H | 16.3001398 | 22.39245181 | 18.39124235 |
| 185 O | 16.89136246 | 21.97265794 | 19.00618448 |
| 186 H | 15.21257458 | 26.19784916 | 25.71485502 |
| 187 O | 20.72520946 | 11.81943123 | 20.68048559 |
| 188 C | 22.23488139 | 8.04248599 | 23.93400952 |
| 189 O | 22.01672089 | 9.29736465 | 23.79489182 |
| 190 O | 23.24171238 | 7.580262726 | 24.51840424 |
| 191 H | 21.45965651 | 7.28748824 | 23.625893 |
| 192 H | 31.04948455 | 16.64602903 | 28.71317812 |
| 193 O | 30.33402579 | 16.93016713 | 28.09283842 |
| 194 H | 31.99743404 | 18.59690156 | 17.37563866 |
| 195 O | 30.70089072 | 17.20656796 | 18.17093611 |
| 196 H | 19.75871319 | 13.49324119 | 17.25209492 |
| 197 O | 19.8476548 | 14.26760923 | 17.79343731 |
| 198 O | 14.04136968 | 23.60770649 | 23.19669219 |
| 199 H | 11.93644437 | 24.83455841 | 22.3008278 |
| 200 H | 30.04667209 | 28.28572849 | 23.35837008 |
| 201 O | 29.56205128 | 27.59456484 | 22.86562966 |
| 202 O | 28.0606564 | 11.29908107 | 17.01405689 |
| 203 H | 28.50329734 | 9.391126197 | 17.45210181 |
| 204 C | 32.21322886 | 23.03156086 | 17.0827666 |
| 205 O | 31.93966592 | 22.21093527 | 16.09281107 |
| 206 O | 31.52612701 | 23.20532108 | 18.16746621 |
| 207 H | 33.20962943 | 23.45237397 | 17.05934874 |
| 208 H | 17.93149774 | 9.898850045 | 24.3643242 |
| 209 O | 18.10805254 | 10.73047549 | 23.99984242 |
| 210 O | 32.65361915 | 18.86320032 | 27.88308806 |
| 211 H | 34.46935065 | 19.82955301 | 27.7496925 |
| 212 C | 30.50594391 | 26.05727914 | 26.75984984 |
| 213 O | 31.60857784 | 25.45719836 | 26.75547015 |
| 214 O | 29.55512809 | 25.81993965 | 25.93886249 |
| 215 H | 30.32880055 | 26.84474403 | 27.46759267 |
| 216 H | 34.56600897 | 17.19012731 | 22.69655598 |
| 217 O | 33.79808785 | 17.48356895 | 23.21448606 |
| 218 O | 27.00432391 | 26.79658713 | 20.55494941 |
| 219 H | 27.27138827 | 27.33363843 | 19.79531285 |
| 220 C | 15.65359877 | 14.04886173 | 28.73769475 |
| 221 O | 16.06570976 | 15.20583329 | 28.22364377 |
| 222 O | 15.59228298 | 12.94804148 | 28.06710162 |
| 223 H | 15.45468265 | 14.00728712 | 29.83950916 |
| 224 H | 19.69219925 | 24.82698343 | 31.62099006 |
| 225 O | 20.01023458 | 24.08515973 | 31.0141372 |
| 226 O | 28.38146652 | 10.60537461 | 19.1711576 |
| 227 C | 28.30532165 | 10.40886857 | 17.90616421 |


| 228 C | 30.20222123 | 12.75023861 | 28.30638989 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 229 O | 29.44458355 | 12.60473476 | 27.27922129 |
| 230 O | 30.3173967 | 13.7885244 | 28.93564688 |
| 231 H | 30.79728905 | 11.85513672 | 28.61837127 |
| 232 H | 17.25636291 | 19.56704809 | 16.26717925 |
| 233 O | 17.70395969 | 19.11367083 | 16.99977704 |
| 234 C | 14.0731884 | 24.74355315 | 22.65936225 |
| 235 O | 15.00900413 | 25.25473583 | 21.97809865 |
| 236 H | 17.80784379 | 23.79913919 | 28.51283162 |
| 237 O | 18.66828521 | 23.48747918 | 28.14659662 |
| 238 H | 28.2476347 | 10.62799222 | 31.31682129 |
| 239 O | 28.39881768 | 10.28015746 | 29.40080036 |
| 240 H | 22.80727363 | 11.84614344 | 17.57832746 |
| 241 O | 23.21994698 | 12.52276177 | 18.17635891 |
| 242 H | 27.06680612 | 24.97242965 | 28.71236293 |
| 243 O | 26.98995491 | 24.03693469 | 28.37850773 |
| 244 H | 29.21848429 | 14.79347967 | 18.22171655 |
| 245 O | 28.30049744 | 14.81880493 | 18.53252861 |
| 246 O | 23.0481369 | 25.73430995 | 28.49469365 |
| 247 H | 23.31604398 | 26.55758859 | 28.95999309 |
| 248 H | 25.2305752 | 25.53042629 | 16.8642347 |
| 249 O | 24.57440715 | 24.84326513 | 17.10866435 |
| 250 C | 16.12056052 | 25.70772553 | 25.77039992 |
| 251 O | 16.22546369 | 24.83226214 | 26.68790334 |
| 252 H | 30.48780634 | 19.63719543 | 29.79033469 |
| 253 O | 29.78351176 | 19.82698859 | 29.15790035 |
| 254 O | 26.591697 | 11.42965243 | 30.26170092 |
| 255 C | 27.73215739 | 10.79834879 | 30.3696859 |
| 256 H | 12.98788572 | 21.14571806 | 23.15387342 |
| 257 O | 13.71024662 | 20.67161746 | 22.69988047 |
| 258 O | 33.06788932 | 20.66495056 | 26.58711657 |
| 259 C | 33.38210624 | 19.79757166 | 27.51417975 |
| 260 C | 31.19583693 | 23.73964909 | 29.77243535 |
| 261 O | 31.28480793 | 22.70499005 | 29.06334995 |
| 262 O | 30.08287634 | 24.06231056 | 30.36112555 |
| 263 H | 32.04207778 | 24.41342339 | 29.79155082 |
| 264 H | 13.70389695 | 18.01022159 | 25.32443349 |
| 265 O | 14.5753828 | 17.91990953 | 24.94318115 |
| 266 O | 21.50025642 | 20.73719734 | 12.41516628 |
| 267 H | 19.00582495 | 21.90468254 | 12.91463613 |
| 268 C | 24.74959925 | 24.24703724 | 32.21210981 |
| 269 O | 25.04274356 | 25.01100586 | 31.22719367 |
| 270 O | 24.30053551 | 23.03707584 | 32.10527912 |
| 271 H | 24.7531309 | 24.68596833 | 33.23042335 |
| 272 C | 28.43451918 | 25.00215446 | 16.8128991 |
| 273 O | 29.14675136 | 24.08227222 | 16.34071379 |
| 274 O | 27.5193534 | 24.90953763 | 17.68123537 |
| 275 H | 28.60411868 | 25.98689276 | 16.39392424 |
| 276 C | 13.957483 | 19.00568588 | 18.71945297 |
| 277 O | 14.63795703 | 19.79809927 | 17.98871597 |
| 278 O | 14.54290828 | 18.26290599 | 19.60228905 |
| 279 H | 12.22583462 | 17.98449015 | 17.92413933 |
| 280 H | 16.17216148 | 13.08455443 | 26.27808752 |
| 281 O | 16.56911679 | 13.47359676 | 25.4411852 |
| 282 O | 17.51193862 | 18.08376103 | 31.44333977 |
| 283 H | 15.8625042 | 18.68154584 | 32.46600268 |
| 284 H | 31.63764567 | 15.7759904 | 20.90404957 |
| 285 O | 31.09162993 | 16.20228747 | 21.6609911 |
| 286 H | 27.36194902 | 12.98177961 | 15.23223741 |
| 287 O | 27.09645715 | 13.84329056 | 15.60985769 |
| 288 C | 30.90391908 | 12.19835556 | 21.36060657 |
| 289 O | 29.7662628 | 12.01623053 | 21.89935064 |
| 290 O | 31.31666473 | 13.23913635 | 20.76845848 |
| 291 H | 31.70314298 | 11.36137154 | 21.45449781 |
| 292 H | 21.3564252 | 15.64035078 | 32.34028322 |
| 293 O | 21.63198564 | 16.41669283 | 31.81979017 |
| 294 O | 15.451374 | 17.62988202 | 30.74522747 |
| 295 C | 16.23964963 | 18.07988041 | 31.58304164 |
| 296 H | 33.4657177 | 19.77270897 | 20.96453022 |
| 297 O | 32.71654886 | 20.20819747 | 21.39938422 |
| 298 H | 27.46318657 | 17.94647278 | 34.07487152 |
| 299 O | 28.49304165 | 17.99437642 | 32.33465084 |
| 300 H | 27.89067399 | 16.68255604 | 14.35995559 |
| 301 O | 27.22026142 | 17.08454384 | 14.94359021 |
| 302 O | 26.31636446 | 18.60035435 | 32.58627422 |
| 303 C | 27.48962078 | 18.14456333 | 32.99789247 |
| 304 C | 14.40901786 | 15.71642591 | 17.16252303 |
| 305 O | 15.70214932 | 15.79431895 | 17.51264652 |
| 306 O | 13.45323681 | 15.40215849 | 17.89791636 |
| 307 H | 13.90856735 | 17.45126129 | 16.17461565 |
| 308 C | 20.09305654 | 26.5077799 | 15.65927947 |
| 309 O | 20.14640361 | 25.33414377 | 15.16289486 |
| 310 O | 20.43603894 | 26.64341983 | 16.88057047 |
| 311 H | 18.6844841 | 27.65595829 | 14.67624265 |
| 312 C | 16.8309496 | 12.22724789 | 19.57091952 |
| 313 O | 16.61005192 | 13.3291851 | 20.155391 |


| 314 O | 17.97148447 | 11.85457419 | 19.15004224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 315 H | 16.02964509 | 11.4661654 | 19.39222727 |
| 316 C | 24.71423228 | 9.104332594 | 27.32977822 |
| 317 O | 25.71074317 | 9.217803545 | 28.0956725 |
| 318 O | 24.31886319 | 9.933949171 | 26.45864941 |
| 319 H | 24.23018617 | 8.132920051 | 27.33538758 |
| 320 C | 16.0158696 | 20.23914702 | 28.92726342 |
| 321 O | 16.49269917 | 21.35127316 | 29.25873943 |
| 322 O | 16.66313034 | 19.29407753 | 28.30313597 |
| 323 H | 14.99491352 | 19.89734439 | 29.40209024 |
| 324 C | 18.52716683 | 15.59677095 | 13.88908497 |
| 325 O | 19.29275413 | 16.51571846 | 14.45320719 |
| 326 O | 17.81095366 | 14.81077242 | 14.56277788 |
| 327 H | 19.13990072 | 16.44273267 | 12.05295105 |
| 328 H | 28.29061401 | 15.64232 | 30.55521071 |
| 329 O | 27.61422737 | 15.77723493 | 29.82327592 |
| 330 H | 30.93517502 | 25.90421278 | 20.80763771 |
| 331 O | 30.72576967 | 25.02630299 | 21.28875843 |
| 332 C | 16.68955396 | 25.64022183 | 18.75016603 |
| 333 O | 17.41526893 | 26.01618661 | 19.77814563 |
| 334 C | 19.41244282 | 13.79035887 | 7.110040331 |
| 335 C | 17.88229165 | 13.53336366 | 7.414142708 |
| 336 C | 17.38656846 | 14.16908323 | 8.667982279 |
| 337 C | 17.81817937 | 13.40414859 | 9.944347947 |
| 338 C | 16.96016271 | 13.80136904 | 11.21322191 |
| 339 C | 17.15699851 | 15.29214181 | 11.75703372 |
| 340 C | 18.55051886 | 15.58354338 | 12.36650962 |
| 341 H | 19.30357539 | 13.48071501 | 4.881433332 |
| 342 H | 20.07493118 | 13.41771732 | 7.944448237 |
| 343 H | 19.56412468 | 14.89332188 | 7.171733483 |
| 344 H | 17.52648005 | 12.52702754 | 7.406110825 |
| 345 H | 17.35606467 | 13.95936361 | 6.634790578 |
| 346 H | 16.30163651 | 14.23282588 | 8.546984544 |
| 347 H | 17.67369288 | 15.22005116 | 8.75979451 |
| 348 H | 18.8775964 | 13.61284595 | 10.2299747 |
| 349 H | 17.65423941 | 12.30164239 | 9.865611992 |
| 350 H | 17.20445225 | 13.0348262 | 12.10505163 |
| 351 H | 15.87187095 | 13.7598705 | 11.07594612 |
| 352 H | 16.54827327 | 15.41894921 | 12.60067657 |
| 353 H | 16.89889396 | 16.07519641 | 11.10511438 |
| 354 H | 19.25317647 | 14.82131678 | 12.04633493 |
| 355 C | 17.08059139 | 31.52859283 | 9.943895274 |
| 356 C | 18.25545383 | 30.6670679 | 10.53927948 |
| 357 C | 18.16097884 | 30.6496667 | 12.07332354 |
| 358 C | 19.34382666 | 29.94088347 | 12.76477768 |
| 359 C | 19.50272997 | 28.45875887 | 12.34367569 |
| 360 C | 20.45261096 | 27.6397437 | 13.32125415 |
| 361 C | 19.76632674 | 27.65670366 | 14.72845923 |
| 362 H | 16.25943673 | 30.90326924 | 9.552382747 |
| 363 H | 16.92106266 | 32.57274732 | 7.946141594 |
| 364 H | 16.58993306 | 32.3365218 | 10.55508861 |
| 365 H | 19.21666166 | 31.15787419 | 10.21369272 |
| 366 H | 18.18495936 | 29.71933871 | 10.03316267 |
| 367 H | 17.21728144 | 30.29846407 | 12.41565137 |
| 368 H | 18.30624093 | 31.70760613 | 12.37476007 |
| 369 H | 19.28959514 | 30.15833808 | 13.82775089 |
| 370 H | 20.33216837 | 30.38350971 | 12.47964286 |
| 371 H | 19.87200804 | 28.39094853 | 11.31774307 |
| 372 H | 18.48659487 | 28.01513255 | 12.30825111 |
| 373 H | 21.53190909 | 27.94504834 | 13.37527666 |
| 374 H | 20.44347894 | 26.6261478 | 13.0239263 |
| 375 H | 20.02544065 | 28.53249947 | 15.30044678 |
| 376 C | 8.256116686 | 16.86601662 | 11.84413434 |
| 377 C | 9.616521113 | 16.72812898 | 11.18012008 |
| 378 C | 10.84671947 | 17.21995764 | 12.00499718 |
| 379 C | 11.25066873 | 16.28939901 | 13.2004421 |
| 380 C | 12.73738811 | 16.431155 | 13.75250667 |
| 381 C | 12.98530706 | 15.70949534 | 15.06345727 |
| 382 C | 14.1424003 | 16.35441617 | 15.83916765 |
| 383 H | 8.317954908 | 16.44228727 | 12.87261247 |
| 384 H | 7.462690061 | 15.0256926 | 10.96711998 |
| 385 H | 7.974866 | 17.92035986 | 11.91185185 |
| 386 H | 9.636159999 | 17.29563587 | 10.22709011 |
| 387 H | 9.710336623 | 15.70958622 | 10.84969624 |
| 388 H | 10.61047768 | 18.19275671 | 12.38689079 |
| 389 H | 11.67416436 | 17.2821791 | 11.27052732 |
| 390 H | 11.16038978 | 15.21693482 | 12.92884901 |
| 391 H | 10.6074798 | 16.41890527 | 14.07265411 |
| 392 H | 12.97830489 | 17.54190505 | 13.95727439 |
| 393 H | 13.45316646 | 16.09775272 | 13.01499005 |
| 394 H | 13.17072567 | 14.68206731 | 14.87801787 |
| 395 H | 12.06220739 | 15.74154742 | 15.7048015 |
| 396 H | 15.03098662 | 16.3953771 | 15.16631298 |
| 397 C | 5.844135119 | 21.99789538 | 16.60617633 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 398 \text { C } \\ & 399 \text { C } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.30058907 \\ & 8.049733096 \end{aligned}$ | 22.21197477 20.92735589 | $17.08778207$ |


| 400 C | 9.57379343 | 21.14626061 | 17.41498394 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 401 C | 10.29844927 | 19.81022739 | 17.72476665 |
| 402 C | 11.84862531 | 20.10626566 | 17.88823253 |
| 403 C | 12.50112499 | 18.87895334 | 18.5713376 |
| 404 H | 5.459329264 | 21.22605785 | 17.3048633 |
| 405 H | 5.809770628 | 21.53002111 | 15.63531886 |
| 406 H | 5.314765744 | 23.83309212 | 17.60340372 |
| 407 H | 7.339855459 | 22.75331373 | 18.05085227 |
| 408 H | 7.827945978 | 22.88666047 | 16.48253367 |
| 409 H | 7.968915936 | 20.30117497 | 16.24424583 |
| 410 H | 7.716915868 | 20.17548289 | 17.95125339 |
| 411 H | 9.837869387 | 21.81654191 | 18.1680312 |
| 412 H | 10.00264094 | 21.55267652 | 16.53430097 |
| 413 H | 10.27063583 | 19.12343334 | 16.91345216 |
| 414 H | 9.892008562 | 19.3785795 | 18.66671319 |
| 415 H | 12.08903929 | 21.04250373 | 18.48317603 |
| 416 H | 12.29681984 | 20.25305805 | 16.89667283 |
| 417 H | 12.06183086 | 18.74296703 | 19.56101345 |
| 418 C | 14.04458101 | 19.26766814 | 10.97035887 |
| 419 C | 14.40412027 | 20.75013564 | 11.28455571 |
| 420 C | 14.20879919 | 21.06595476 | 12.82471703 |
| 421 C | 15.32831762 | 20.44489902 | 13.79397857 |
| 422 C | 16.69253316 | 21.13338719 | 13.58896266 |
| 423 C | 17.90769587 | 20.15747767 | 13.29285609 |
| 424 C | 19.09582515 | 20.88650064 | 12.61314136 |
| 425 H | 14.76132814 | 18.59518514 | 11.50362556 |
| 426 H | 13.22425728 | 19.56958076 | 9.091459044 |
| 427 H | 13.13119913 | 19.20758618 | 11.55035571 |
| 428 H | 13.75242019 | 21.31807954 | 10.59839954 |
| 429 H | 15.35818632 | 20.93221577 | 10.97166288 |
| 430 H | 13.21174533 | 20.80283557 | 13.15496864 |
| 431 H | 14.27594771 | 22.12224621 | 12.86605086 |
| 432 H | 15.46511967 | 19.38193734 | 13.50379486 |
| 433 H | 14.99888355 | 20.47215317 | 14.8052088 |
| 434 H | 17.00522395 | 21.71292105 | 14.45295794 |
| 435 H | 16.59079108 | 21.85913551 | 12.79859169 |
| 436 H | 17.71711219 | 19.31809984 | 12.62998997 |
| 437 H | 18.2840045 | 19.71874114 | 14.26201611 |
| 438 H | 18.99162483 | 21.01331406 | 11.54204781 |
| 439 C | 8.1032796 | 31.4864184 | 20.56962314 |
| 440 C | 9.455999643 | 30.98580758 | 21.14236114 |
| 441 C | 9.549403571 | 29.46153557 | 21.19916056 |
| 442 C | 10.96615363 | 28.98466703 | 21.6934096 |
| 443 C | 11.07048907 | 27.482546 | 22.1471026 |
| 444 C | 12.60171639 | 26.94420945 | 22.13457197 |
| 445 C | 12.64705011 | 25.52403444 | 22.79448283 |
| 446 H | 8.169993197 | 31.57412573 | 19.47851773 |
| 447 H | 7.245522137 | 33.45445785 | 20.33731635 |
| 448 H | 7.340355437 | 30.74787051 | 20.83871875 |
| 449 H | 9.650280224 | 31.43038159 | 22.09494812 |
| 450 H | 10.31489611 | 31.30858253 | 20.46342437 |
| 451 H | 9.405008676 | 28.88629906 | 20.21907539 |
| 452 H | 8.694684705 | 29.08763032 | 21.8219346 |
| 453 H | 11.27798211 | 29.75688365 | 22.44349077 |
| 454 H | 11.73862447 | 29.08026115 | 20.88218828 |
| 455 H | 10.44458182 | 26.90919924 | 21.41794275 |
| 456 H | 10.66728708 | 27.33625146 | 23.15212653 |
| 457 H | 13.30145177 | 27.48865144 | 22.82380473 |
| 458 H | 13.03170836 | 26.91598976 | 21.15450182 |
| 459 H | 12.44997457 | 25.61498761 | 23.88582295 |
| 460 C | 18.39659309 | 33.25529258 | 18.64748442 |
| 461 C | 17.11487738 | 32.45842154 | 18.68584466 |
| 462 C | 17.25950517 | 30.90232603 | 18.51644959 |
| 463 C | 15.91713577 | 30.16681289 | 18.28571741 |
| 464 C | 16.24178632 | 28.63592783 | 18.27988258 |
| 465 C | 15.16390833 | 27.77492931 | 18.92034814 |
| 466 C | 15.26595155 | 26.32842946 | 18.45635807 |
| 467 H | 19.29133272 | 32.75164331 | 18.98994603 |
| 468 H | 17.27427362 | 34.99307898 | 19.47773723 |
| 469 H | 18.60826846 | 33.43249786 | 17.5559169 |
| 470 H | 16.40685389 | 32.74721421 | 17.87862338 |
| 471 H | 16.50699299 | 32.65182043 | 19.60258269 |
| 472 H | 17.66937679 | 30.53595843 | 19.45682547 |
| 473 H | 17.91278429 | 30.67293711 | 17.62583267 |
| 474 H | 15.46201304 | 30.48392273 | 17.33302592 |
| 475 H | 15.1964775 | 30.42670891 | 19.06383044 |
| 476 H | 17.11778247 | 28.41440708 | 18.9309228 |
| 477 H | 16.51301123 | 28.34257021 | 17.27750429 |
| 478 H | 14.12310263 | 28.21544731 | 18.76522807 |
| 479 H | 15.31125642 | 27.83458217 | 19.97362512 |
| 480 H | 14.60769048 | 25.63388231 | 19.01712897 |
| 481 C | 12.65463142 | 24.41871238 | 12.65265379 |
| 482 C | 11.66486515 | 24.92272253 | 11.83336455 |
| 483 C | 10.50175885 | 25.54636892 | 12.45038728 |
| 484 C | 9.573706572 | 26.26321484 | 11.60988629 |
| 485 C | 8.58263705 | 27.22402364 | 13.7060766 |


| 486 C | 9.361201105 | 26.30792021 | 14.49175525 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 487 C | 10.41617882 | 25.61632458 | 13.90626182 |
| 488 C | 11.41791073 | 24.94664475 | 14.67101348 |
| 489 C | 12.50498755 | 24.36482473 | 14.08177932 |
| 490 C | 5.590232933 | 31.10301943 | 12.33753739 |
| 491 C | 6.365255718 | 30.14667184 | 11.64384228 |
| 492 C | 7.099985575 | 29.11012549 | 12.2799361 |
| 493 C | 7.959224641 | 28.25230039 | 11.5792041 |
| 494 C | 8.702036613 | 27.25092107 | 12.25154291 |
| 495 C | 7.652599777 | 28.03680721 | 14.43130678 |
| 496 C | 6.917923857 | 28.98227181 | 13.74836544 |
| 497 C | 5.889248998 | 29.81467435 | 14.42250719 |
| 498 C | 5.305786014 | 30.82356854 | 13.70778741 |
| 499 H | 13.54139039 | 24.11018683 | 12.19359912 |
| 500 H | 11.65646645 | 24.99009791 | 10.77350961 |
| 501 H | 9.669394629 | 26.20958241 | 10.48268307 |
| 502 H | 4.519459911 | 31.43048059 | 14.03829953 |
| 503 H | 9.232574176 | 26.17295352 | 15.54944082 |
| 504 H | 11.50754402 | 25.03121361 | 15.75505685 |
| 505 H | 13.34720073 | 23.87319236 | 14.67012416 |
| 506 H | 5.120200227 | 31.94944798 | 11.81968348 |
| 507 H | 6.440084984 | 30.30616425 | 10.59307425 |
| 508 H | 8.038476414 | 28.45643149 | 10.43602903 |
| 509 H | 7.622774058 | 27.9147178 | 15.53332624 |
| 510 H | 5.560755781 | 29.57736743 | 15.41540869 |
| 511 C | 18.26062456 | 34.58080107 | 19.48543693 |
| 512 C | 18.59947435 | 34.18568487 | 20.97232573 |
| 513 H | 19.72906033 | 34.04122767 | 21.0116006 |
| 514 H | 18.03202244 | 33.27815853 | 21.19029378 |
| 515 H | 18.27302309 | 34.96577777 | 21.62237774 |
| 516 H | 18.9361639 | 35.32282093 | 19.17161391 |
| 517 C | 7.665765221 | 32.84654667 | 21.16066301 |
| 518 C | 6.599453458 | 32.78214976 | 22.26708629 |
| 519 H | 6.847802569 | 32.15460852 | 23.18240662 |
| 520 H | 5.637880953 | 32.50470465 | 21.8463018 |
| 521 H | 6.481071903 | 33.79757834 | 22.71595296 |
| 522 H | 8.515557258 | 33.39632267 | 21.62117019 |
| 523 C | 13.93598452 | 18.84031569 | 9.499477541 |
| 524 C | 15.31155658 | 18.82847712 | 8.795204316 |
| 525 H | 15.96007841 | 17.93550966 | 9.082828391 |
| 526 H | 15.89585632 | 19.70258649 | 9.013937222 |
| 527 H | 15.17110132 | 18.69386618 | 7.714223715 |
| 528 H | 13.46971815 | 17.85971984 | 9.392160109 |
| 529 C | 5.03339581 | 23.28627165 | 16.68927643 |
| 530 C | 5.303256775 | 24.21209503 | 15.47463486 |
| 531 H | 4.745078673 | 23.78097032 | 14.65392444 |
| 532 H | 6.37905962 | 24.19517254 | 15.04984318 |
| 533 H | 5.034746067 | 25.24256436 | 15.7226683 |
| 534 H | 3.977661135 | 23.00566292 | 16.60220672 |
| 535 C | 7.086062994 | 16.02897988 | 11.24293875 |
| 536 C | 5.890736625 | 16.03380538 | 12.20953138 |
| 537 H | 5.616360901 | 17.07955058 | 12.41814819 |
| 538 H | 6.076563423 | 15.614831 | 13.23115163 |
| 539 H | 5.033845678 | 15.44452505 | 11.81135764 |
| 540 H | 6.79245995 | 16.38390855 | 10.24200179 |
| 541 C | 17.65917568 | 32.19453226 | 8.633033312 |
| 542 C | 18.80195001 | 33.30859187 | 8.792946904 |
| 543 H | 19.7725351 | 32.92995091 | 9.248450343 |
| 544 H | 18.57821711 | 34.16673403 | 9.501747636 |
| 545 H | 19.0192453 | 33.59165923 | 7.792566906 |
| 546 H | 18.04436572 | 31.35946316 | 8.100197168 |
| 547 C | 19.94809497 | 13.25225684 | 5.766196016 |
| 548 C | 21.42798549 | 13.69292648 | 5.386071135 |
| 549 H | 22.10198372 | 13.47790994 | 6.195775153 |
| 550 H | 21.54208547 | 14.7763495 | 5.117300937 |
| 551 H | 21.63493675 | 13.08509757 | 4.468670805 |
| 552 H | 19.90454645 | 12.1352161 | 5.823904751 |

Table A.6: the coordinates of the first time step in the MD simulation for the PbS QD
with the 9C-ligand, used as the starting setup in the MD simulation.

## Appendix B

## Excitation energy results

## B. 1 Tetracene

|  | PBE | PBE <br> (hq) |  | B3LYP | B3LYP <br> (hq) | CAMY- <br> B3LYP | CAM- <br> B3LYP | CAM- <br> B3LYP <br> (TDA) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table B.1: the excitation energies of the corresponding states as calculated for the corresponding functionals with the settings as described in the method section of tetracene, section 3.3.1. All values for the excitation energies are in eV and are relative to the ground state energy.

## B. 2 Pentacene

|  | PBE | B3LYP | CAMY- <br> B3LYP | CAM- <br> B3LYP | CAM-B3LYP <br> (TDA) | M06-2X |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S1 (mon) | 1.62 | 1.89 | 2.14 | 2.20 | 2.50 | 2.11 |
| S2 (mon) | 2.37 | 2.92 | 3.38 | 3.39 | 3.46 | 3.33 |
| S3 (mon) | 2.93 | 3.22 | 3.42 | 3.49 | 3.71 | 3.40 |
| S4 (mon) | 2.97 | 3.24 | 3.62 | 3.83 | 3.88 | 3.73 |
| S5 (mon) | 3.99 | 3.96 | 4.50 | 4.55 | 4.86 | 4.48 |
| T1 (mon) | 0.93 | 0.71 | N.A. | -0.90 | 0.95 | -1.47 |
| T2 (mon) | 2.07 | 1.98 | N.A. | 1.55 | 2.08 | 0.66 |
| T3 (mon) | 2.38 | 2.92 | N.A. | 2.69 | 3.06 | 2.17 |
| T4 (mon) | 2.80 | 2.98 | N.A. | 3.10 | 3.19 | 2.95 |
| T5 (mon) | 2.93 | 3.00 | N.A. | 3.23 | 3.33 | 3.01 |
| S1 (dim) | 0.78 | 1.28 | 1.89 | 2.06 | 2.17 | 2.04 |
| S2 (dim) | 1.44 | 1.81 | 2.09 | 2.15 | 2.44 | 2.33 |
| S3 (dim) | 1.59 | 1.85 | 2.15 | 2.31 | 2.49 | 2.38 |
| S4 (dim) | 1.66 | 2.06 | 2.71 | 2.97 | 2.98 | 2.85 |
| S5 (dim) | 1.88 | 2.56 | 3.23 | 3.37 | 3.43 | 3.38 |
| T1 (dim) | 0.72 | 0.62 | N.A. | -0.96 | 0.89 | 0.70 |
| T2 (dim) | 0.90 | 0.66 | N.A. | -0.94 | 0.91 | 0.72 |
| T3 (dim) | 0.94 | 1.31 | N.A. | 1.46 | 2.01 | 1.80 |
| T4 (dim) | 1.51 | 1.90 | N.A. | 1.47 | 2.03 | 1.82 |
| T5 (dim) | 1.85 | 1.92 | N.A. | 2.22 | 2.23 | 2.10 |

Table B.2: the excitation energies of the corresponding states as calculated for the corresponding functionals with the settings as described in the method section of pentacene, section 3.3.1. All values for the excitation energies are in eV and are relative to the ground state energy.

## Appendix C

## Coupling of Setup 9C versus variables



Figure C.1: the coupling of setup 9C averaged per closest intermolecular distance bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins) and bottom (for 10 bins) of the figure.


Figure C.2: the coupling of setup 9C averaged per distance bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins ) and bottom (for 10 bins) of the figure.


Figure C.3: the coupling of setup 9C averaged per rotational bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins) and bottom (for 10 bins) of the figure.


Figure C.4: the coupling of setup 9C averaged per angular bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins) and bottom (for 10 bins) of the figure.


Figure C.5: the coupling of setup 9C averaged per parabolicity-bin, one set of 10 bins (solid lines) and one set of 20 bins (dashed lines); the number of coupling values belonging to a bin is displayed at the top (for 20 bins ) and bottom (for 10 bins) of the figure.
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