Frenkel/charge transfer Holstein Hamiltonian applied to energy transport in 2D layered metal-organic frameworks
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Optimizing energy and charge transport is key in design and implementation of efficient two-dimensional (2D) conductive metal-organic frameworks (MOFs) for practical applications. In this work, for the first time, we investigate the role of both long-range excitonic and short-range charge transfer (CT) coupling as well as their dependency on reorganization energy on through-space transport properties in 2D MOFs. A $\pi -$stacked model system is built based on the archetypal Ni$_2$(HITP)$_2$ 2D MOF and a Frenkel/CT Holstein Hamiltonian is developed that takes into account both electronic coupling and intramolecular vibrations. The dependency of the long and short-range couplings of both secondary building units (SBUs) and organic linkers to different dynamical motions in 2D MOFs are evaluated which predicts that photophysical properties of 2D MOFs critically depend on the degree of ordering between layers. Using the model system, we show that the impact of the two coupling sources in these materials can be discerned or enhanced by sliding of the SBU in a cofacial configuration along the long- or short molecular axis. The effects of vibronic spectral signatures are examined for integrated Frenkel/CT systems in both perturbative and resonance regimes. Although to the best of our knowledge sliding engineering in 2D MOFs currently remains beyond reach, the findings reported here offer new details on the photophysical structure-property relationships on 2D MOFs and provide suggestions into how to combine elements of molecular design and engineering to achieve desirable properties and functions for nano- and mesoscale optoelectronic applications.

I. Introduction

In recent years, $\pi -$stacked layered metal–organic frameworks (MOFs) have emerged as a new class of two-dimensional (2D) materials which offer record-breaking electrical conductivity along with permanent porosity and high surface area. As depicted in Figure 1, layers of 2D MOFs are generally built from tetra-coordinated metal nodes and electron-rich $\pi -$conjugated organic linkers extended in the ab plane. The bulk architecture is formed from stacking of these layers along the c direction via van der Waals interactions. The highly ordered and tunable structure of 2D MOFs by systematic substitution of metal nodes and organic linkers, which also allows compact device implementation, promotes their application not only as electrochemical but also photophysical properties in 2D MOFs as has been extensively probed for conventional 3D MOFs. Further progress in utilizing 2D MOFs for such applications requires a deeper understanding of the structure–function relationships. Fortunately, the well-defined modular structure of 2D MOFs and the possibility of linker–based luminescence provides a means to correlate structure and composition to photon capture, as has been extensively probed for conventional 3D MOFs. However, understanding charge and energy transport mechanisms in 2D MOFs can be much more complicated than their 3D counterparts due to the possibility of not only through–bond but also through–space transport mechanisms. Both of these transport pathways can be drastically affected by intrinsic dynamical motions of the layers. We have recently demonstrated that interlayer displacements and slipping of the $\pi -$stacked layers compared to each other may affect the metal–to–semiconductor transition in 2D MOFs. This is similar to observations in $\pi -$stacked molecular aggregates where inter–molecular displacements as small as 1.6 Å generate a dramatic impact on the photophysical properties of monomers and the interaction between individual electronically excited states which include both long–range and short–range interactions. Indeed, there are very recent experimental studies where photophysical behaviours of 2D MOFs, or 2D MOF included heterostructures, were an-

![FIG. 1. Representative layered architecture of a conductive 2D MOF highlighting the “secondary building unit (SBU, blue square) and organic linker unit (OLU, gray triangle)” belonging to the family of 2D MOFs based on triphenylene linkers with square planar metal centers. The inset figures highlight SBU on the bottom left and $\pi -$stacked linkers on the top right.](image-url)
alyzed with a focus on either long–range excitonic coupling \( (J)^{14,15} \) or short–range charge transfer coupling \( (T)^{6,16} \). However, in reality, the stacked architecture of 2D MOFs allows for both short– and long–range interactions to be simultaneously present, similar to the situation in \( \pi \)–stacked molecular aggregates\(^{17} \). Hence, instead of considering \( J \) and \( T \) separately, they have to be considered on equal footings.\(^{4} \) Most importantly, they should scale with reorganization energy \( (\lambda)^{18} \), defined as the energy changes associated with the geometry relaxation during charge/energy transfer. This aspect brings up the question of how the \( J/\lambda \) and \( T/\lambda \) ratios modulate the through–space\(^3 \) energy transport (ET)\(^{19} \) along the \( \pi–\pi \) stacking direction of 2D MOFs.

To answer such questions, in this work, we model through–space ET in 2D MOFs by projecting \( J \) and \( T \) on the organic linker and inorganic secondary building block subunits of the material, shortened as OLU and SBU, where the latter corresponds to a square planar metal center bonded to two adjacent organic linkers (see Figure 1). \( J \) and \( T \) are then evaluated according to the inter–molecular displacements and rotations. Given its high performing conductivity\(^{20} \), we model these parameters on the archetypal 2D MOF\(^{21} \) \( \text{Ni}_3(\text{HITP})_2 \), HITP=2,3,6,7,10,11–hexaiminotriphenylene\(^{10,21,22} \). The theoretical considerations for this modeling are discussed in the next section along with introducing the model. The practical results of these considerations are discussed in section 3. Finally, the obtained quantities are used to parameterize the Frenkel/charge transfer Holstein Hamiltonian and analyze absorption spectra. Concluding remarks are presented in section 4.

II. Energy Transport Modeling

The \( \pi–\pi \) stacking model

Figure 2 demonstrates the model for studying through–space ET in 2D MOFs. It is comprised of a linear array of \( n \) SBUs with periodic boundary conditions along the non–covalent stacking direction, invoking both long–range excitonic coupling \( (J) \) and short–range charge transfer coupling \( (T) \) (See the Supporting Information (SI), Table S1, for specifics of the optimized SBU monomers). Both \( J \) and \( T \) scale with reorganization energy \( (\lambda) \) and are affected by interlayer spacing \( (S) \) and displacement \( (D) \). Charge transport between nearest–neighbor SBUs potentially involves exciton transfer according to

\[
D^{\pi}_{n} + A^\ast_{n+1} \rightarrow D_{n} + A^{\ast}_{n+1}
\]

where \( D^{\pi}_{n} \) is the \( n \)th excited donor SBU and \( A^\ast_{n+1} \) is the nearest–neighbor acceptor SBU. According to the Bloch's theorem, the periodic function corresponds to the momentum state of a collective excitation and it is responsible for the pseudo particle behaviour. Hence, understanding the hybrid state of 2D MOFs requires an accurate evaluation of the excitonic coupling \( J \) between units, in which no wave function overlap is supposed to occur\(^{23} \). In our model, whenever \( J \) becomes sufficiently large, the reactive state \( |D^{\pi}_{n}A^\ast_{n+1}\rangle \) and the product state \( |D_{n}A^{\ast}_{n+1}\rangle \) may form a quantum mechanical superposition state \( c_1|D^{\pi}_{n}A^\ast_{n+1}\rangle + c_2|D_{n}A^{\ast}_{n+1}\rangle \). This state is conceived as a Frenkel exciton\(^{12} \), i.e., the Hamiltonian is generalized to an arbitrary set of SBUs along the non–covalent stacking direction of the 2D MOF and expressed in a multi–particle basis set\(^{24} \) consisting of one and two–particle states. The excitonic eigenfunctions are then described with a wave vector \( k \), which takes on the values:

\[
k = 0, \pm 2\pi/n, \pm 4\pi/n, \ldots \pi
\]

where \( k \) is in \( 1/\text{S} \) units. As shown in the next sections, this model allows us to differentiate the effects of long–range and short–range interactions on the spectral signatures of 2D MOFs. Such signatures are found to be sensitive not only to the relative phase of the intermolecular carrier transfer integrals, but also to the energy of the charge transfer state relative to the exciton state. The exciton delocalization energy can be evaluated as\(^{12} \)

\[
E_j(k) = E_{S_1} + 2J\cos(k)
\]

where \( E_j \) corresponds to the energy of the \( S_0 \rightarrow S_1 \) electronic transition. One can switch off the second term on the right hand side (RHS) of Eq. 3 (hence \( E_j = E_{S1} \)) to study the diabatic limit (i.e., no interaction between units) using this model.

When the electron/hole pair resides on the highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) and lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) of consecutive SBUs, the charge transfer energy \( E_T \) also needs to be taken into account. It can be estimated as follows\(^{25} \)

\[
E_T(S) \approx \frac{e^2}{S} + I_{D(A)} + A_{A(D)} + P
\]
where the first term on the RHS of Eq. (4) indicates the Coulomb binding energy between electron and hole separated by the distance $S$. Second and third terms measure, respectively, the energy to remove an electron from the donor (acceptor) (i.e., the ionization potential) and the electron affinity of the acceptor (donor). Finally, $P$ estimates the polarization energy of the unit.

The excitonic coupling: Atomic transition charges

Starting from the Förster’s dipole–dipole scheme, different methods have been developed to evaluate the long–range excitonic coupling $J$. It can be evaluated based on the electrostatic interactions between transition densities $\rho^{\alpha,i}$:

$$J_{\alpha\beta} = \iint \rho^{\alpha,i}(\mathbf{r})\rho^{\beta,i}(\mathbf{r}') \frac{d\mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r}'}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}$$

(5)

where $\rho^{\alpha,i}$ and $\rho^{\beta,i}$ are the transition densities of units $\alpha$ and $\beta$, respectively, between the initial and final electronic states. For clarity, Figure 3a shows a pictorial representation of these states between a pair of donor and acceptor SBUs. $\rho'$ can be thought of as the induced charge oscillations in the ground–state electronic density in response to a linear oscillating driving force at the transition frequency. Hence, these transition densities can be decomposed into atomic–centered partial charges or atomic transition charges (ATC) $q'_i$ which allows building the transition density from an ab initio calculation. Hence, $J$ simplifies to:

$$J_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{i,j} q'_i q'_j \frac{1}{|\mathbf{R}^\alpha_i - \mathbf{R}^\beta_j|}$$

(6)

where the indices $i, j$ run over the atomic positions of the corresponding unit, $\mathbf{R}^\alpha_i$ and $\mathbf{R}^\beta_j$ represent the spatial position of all atoms of units $\alpha$ and $\beta$, respectively, and $q'_i$ and $q'_j$ are the related partial charges:

$$q'_i = \sqrt{2} \sum_{\xi} \sum_{\eta} \sum_{q} \sum_{p} A_{pq} c^\alpha_p c^\beta_q S_{\xi\eta}$$

(7)

Here, the Greek indices run over the atomic orbital (AO) basis functions whereas the Latin indices run over the occupied and unoccupied molecular orbitals (MOs). The $A_{pq}$ is the coefficient obtained from configuration interaction singles (CIS) calculation and $S_{\xi\eta}$ corresponds to the overlap matrix of atomic orbitals at the AO level.

The Reorganization Energy: Huang-Rhys factor $\lambda$

Here, we apply Huang-Rhys theory to analyze the reorganization energy contributions which stem from OLU and SBU in Ni3(HITP)2. After optimizing the geometries of the ground and excited states, the normal vibrational modes are calculated by diagonalizing the mass weighted Hessian. Then, a factor $\lambda_{eff}$ for each normal mode $i$ is obtained by projecting the difference of the excited and ground state geometries onto the normal mode coordinates (see Figure 3b). The effective Huang-Rhys factor $\lambda_{eff}$ (in the harmonic approximation) can be written as:

$$\lambda_{eff} = \sum_i \lambda_i \quad \lambda_i = \frac{m_i \omega_i}{2\hbar} R_i^2$$

(8)

where $m_i$ represents the frequency of the normal mode $i$ while $R_i$ is the projection of the displacements between the equilibrium geometries of the neutral and radical–cation or radical–anion states. $\lambda_{eff}$ is a dimensionless parameter which if multiplied by $\hbar\omega$ returns the reorganization energy. More importantly, since $\lambda_{eff}$ characterizes the strength of the electron–phonon coupling, it affects the optical upward and downward transitions within 2D MOFs. For the sake of brevity, in the remainder of this manuscript we refer to $\lambda_{eff}$ simply as $\lambda$.

The charge transfer coupling: Transfer integrals

Transfer integrals $t$ express the ease of charge transfer between two SBUs, according to our model. They also indicate the strength of interactions between two consecutive units. Good insights into transfer integrals can be obtained by considering the simple case of a dimer made of two SBUs, for which $T$ can be estimated to a very good approximation for hole (electron) transport as half the splitting of HOMO (LUMO). Starting from a set of N non–orthogonal but linearly independent basis functions $\{\phi_i\}$, we look for a set of orthonormalized functions $\{\psi_i\}$. If the two sets span the same subspace and $S$ represents their overlap matrix with the elements $S_{ij} = \langle \phi_i | \phi_j \rangle$, then the orthogonal functions are expanded in terms of the original ones as:

$$\psi_i = \sum_k C_{ik} \phi_k$$

(9)

The orthonormalization of the orbitals $\psi_i$ means that

$$\langle \psi_i | \psi_j \rangle = \sum_k C_{ik} C_{jk} = \delta_{ij}$$

(10)

Assuming that the dimer HOMO and HOMO-1 result from the interaction of only HOMO monomers, the dimer
Hamiltonian is calculated in the atomic orbital basis from the Roothaan Equation:

\[ H_{AO} = SC^EC^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where matrix \( C \) corresponds to the supramolecular orbitals of the dimer. From the basis of monomer molecular orbitals \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \),

\[ C_{MO} = C_1 \bigoplus C_2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (12)

we project the Hamiltonian and overlap matrices onto the basis of monomer molecular orbitals:

\[ H_{MO} = C_{MO}^T H_{AO} C_{MO} \]  \hspace{1cm} (13)

\[ S_{MO} = C_{MO}^T C_{MO}^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (14)

Eqs 13 and 14 permit orthogonalizing the monomeric wave functions after Löwdin’s transformation\(^{41}\)

\[ H_{eff} = S_{MO}^{-1/2} H_{MO} S_{MO}^{-1/2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (15)

Site energies and transfer integrals can be obtained respectively as the diagonal and off–diagonal matrix elements of the system Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_{eff} \):

\[ \hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1 & t_{12} \\ t_{12} & \epsilon_2 \end{pmatrix} \]  \hspace{1cm} (16)

where the off–diagonal terms depend in turn on spacing \( S \) and displacement \( D \) between two consecutive SBUs.

**Interference between \( J \) and \( T \)**

As will be shown later in details, \( J \) and \( T \) have different spatial dependencies. While \( J \) is a long–range Coulomb coupling, the short–range coupling \( T \) depends on the interlayer wavefunction overlap between adjacent units. This overlap is governed by the nodal patterns of the frontier molecular orbitals from which the electron \( (t_e) \) and hole \( (t_h) \) transfer parameters are obtained, by solving Eqs. 15-16 for pairs of LUMO/LUMO or HOMO/LUMO orbitals, respectively. Hence, sliding SBUs compared to each other decides the phase of the \( t_e \times t_h \) product. The effective coupling provided by the interference of \( J \) with \( T \) can be either constructive or destructive, according to the expression\(^{42}\):

\[ J_{eff} = J + T \]  \hspace{1cm} (17)

\[ T = -2 \frac{t_e \times t_h}{E_T - E_S} \]  \hspace{1cm} (18)

Eq. 18 implies a two-step superexchange process\(^{43}\) in which the exciton moves from one SBU to its neighbour via a virtual charge transfer state. In our model we assume \( E_T > E_S \). Hence \( T \) can be positive or negative depending on the signs of \( t_e \times t_h \). Further, whenever \( t_e \) and \( t_h \) are in phase, long and short range couplings have opposite signs. Likewise to observations made for the uniaxial packing of organic molecules\(^{44}\), the relative sign between \( t_e \) and \( t_h \) controls the \( J \) and \( H \)-like\(^{45}\) photophysical properties in 2D MOF aggregates, a point that will be further explored in the next section.

**The Holstein Hamiltonian: Modeling the interrelation between \( J \) and \( T \)**

The Holstein Hamiltonian\(^{46-48}\) used in this study is comprised of three parts:

\[ H = H_J + H_T + H_{POL} \]  \hspace{1cm} (19)

the Frenkel term \( H_J \) includes the vibronic coupling:

\[ H_J = \hbar \omega_{\alpha_{ib}} \sum_n \left( b_n^\dagger b_n + \omega_{\alpha_{0}} \right) \sum_n \left| c_n, a_n \right\rangle \left\langle c_n, a_n \right| + \sum_{n,m} J_{nm} \left| c_n, a_n \right\rangle \left\langle c_m, a_m \right| \]  \hspace{1cm} (20)

where the first two sums correspond to pure vibrational energy contributions while the third term corresponds to contribution from the local vibronic coupling which is related to the Huang–Rhys factor via \( \lambda^2 \). The last term monitors the long–range Coulomb couplings between two monomers \( m \) and \( n \). Frequency \( \omega_{\alpha_{0}} \) corresponds to the 0–0 transition and \( b_n^\dagger (b_n) \) creates (annihilates) a vibrational excitation with energy \( \omega_{\alpha_{ib}} \) on the \( n^{th} \) monomer.

The second term of Eq. 19 accounts for electron and hole transfers:

\[ H_T = t_e \sum_{n,s} \left| c_n, a_{n+s} \right\rangle \left\langle c_n, a_{n+s+1} \right| + t_h \sum_{n,s} \left| c_n, a_{n+s} \right\rangle \left\langle c_{n+1}, a_{n+s} \right| + \left| c_n, a_{n+s+1} \right\rangle \left\langle c_{n-1}, a_{n+s} \right| \]  \hspace{1cm} (21)

where \( t_e \) and \( t_h \) represent the transfer integrals between nearest neighbour SBUs in our model, see Figure 2.

The last term in Eq. 19 includes the energies of the polaronic states and their associated vibronic couplings:

\[ H_{POL} = \sum_{n,s} \left( \hbar \omega_f (S) \left| c_n, a_{n+s} \right\rangle \left\langle c_n, a_{n+s} \right| + \hbar \omega_{\alpha_{ib}} \lambda_+ \sum_{n,s} \left( b_n^\dagger b_n + \omega_{\alpha_{0}} + \lambda_+ \right) \left| c_n, a_{n+s} \right\rangle \left\langle c_n, a_{n+s} \right| + \hbar \omega_{\alpha_{ib}} \lambda_- \sum_{n,s} \left( b_n^\dagger b_n + \omega_{\alpha_{0}} + \lambda_- \right) \left| c_n, a_{n+s} \right\rangle \left\langle c_n, a_{n+s} \right| \]  \hspace{1cm} (22)

where the \( \omega_f \) energy is a function of the separation \( S \) between the hole on monomer \( n \) and the electron on monomer \( n + s \), whereas the second and the third term of Eq. 22 monitor the local vibrational coupling quantified by the dimensionless \( \lambda_+/- \) factors. A comprehensive study of the effect of structural changes of SBU and OLU on these factors is provided in the SI, Section I.
Spectral analysis

The Hamiltonian in Eq. 19 is diagonalized numerically yielding eigenstates and energies from which the absorption spectra are generated. They consist of a series of lines spaced with separation of quanta vibrations $\hbar \omega_{\nu}$:

$$W(E) = W_0 \sum_n F^0_n f(E,n,\sigma), \quad (23)$$

where $W$ is the square of the transition moment of the electronic transition and $f$ describes the shape of each individual line, centered on $n$ with a width $\sigma$. The summation runs over the individual vibronic lines and describes the distribution of relative intensities according to the Franck-Condon factor $F^0_n$:

$$F^0_n = \left| \int \psi_0^* \psi_n dR \right|^2 = \frac{e^{-2\lambda_n}}{n!}, \quad (24)$$

where the ratio on the RHS indicates that the number of excited vibrational quanta is Poisson distributed around an average of $\lambda$. The square of the overlap of the vibrational wavefunctions indicates that the relative intensities of these lines correspond to transitions between initial state with vibrational quantum number $m = 0$ and final state with vibrational quantum number $n$, providing the number is a negligible thermal occupation of vibrationally excited states in the initial electronic state. Hence, the shape of the spectral line provides an estimate of the polaron localization and broader peaks indicate the involvement of larger radius polarons.

III. Results and Discussion

How $J$ is affected by in–plane twisting and rotations

It is known that the stacking of aromatic building blocks can turn $\text{Ni}_2(\text{HITP})_2$ into a semiconducting material with peculiar optoelectronic properties\(^{50}\). The reason behind it, as we have shown recently\(^{10}\), is the constant motions of the layers which is not only related to the change of interlayer distance in the stacking direction but also sliding and twisting of the layers compared to each other in the $ab$ plane. Recently, Tao et al.\(^{51}\) showed that the natural structure of 2D MOFs obtained by randomly stacking is the one where adjacent layers are twisted compared to each other, while untwisted mode is generated by an accurate procedure which consists of heating the twisted nanosheets. Although it is possible to control the stacking pattern and engineer optoelectronic properties by strong interlayer interactions and functional groups\(^{52}\), to the best of our knowledge the twisting and sliding control/engineering are still in their infancy. Chemical modification may permit to tune displacements of the layers compared to each other, for instance by substitution of the terminal groups\(^{53}\) or through lattice strain\(^{54}\). The central question here is to what degree the mutual twisting and sliding between building blocks in 2D MOFs may impact the ET along the $\pi - \pi$ stacking direction. In Figure 4 the ATC procedure, outlined in previous section, has been applied to calculate the excitonic couplings $J$ as a function of the in–plane rotational angle between two adjacent SBUs or OLUs, provided the center of mass fixed at a distance of 3.3 Å. (see SI, Table S2, for a list of the transition charge dipole values for triphenylene systems as a function of the rotation angle around the OLU center.) In particular, one unit of the dimer is kept fixed whereas the other unit undergoes a rotation around its center, starting from the native configuration (that is $0°$) until $45°$. In native configuration, the SBU shows a larger $J$ value compared to OLU. As the rotational angle increases, SBU and OLU demonstrate different angle dependency of their $J$ values. The $J$ profile of SBU spans $\sim 700$ cm$^{-1}$ while that of OLU spans only $\sim 300$ cm$^{-1}$. The excitonic coupling profile of OLU shows an almost plateau feature after rotational angle of $20°$ with a barely noticeable minimum at $30°$. On the other hand, excitonic coupling between the two SBUs constantly decreases by increasing the rotational angle. Overall, irrespective of the building block, we can notice a broad region around the native configuration where the coupling has a positive value. More importantly, the slope difference between the two profiles may provide a crucial information in designing frameworks with specific $J$ characteristics.

Our recent $ab$ initio molecular dynamics simulations\(^{10}\) at 293 K showed that the equilibrated layers of $\text{Ni}_2(\text{HITP})_2$ adopt a stepped geometry where the SBUs are tilted with respect to the $ab$ plane. This is opposed to fully planar layers that are normally obtained from static electronic structure calculations at 0 K. While engineering optoelectronic properties based on tilt angles in the stacking direction is still beyond reach, it is interesting to see the effect of this geometrical aspect of $\text{Ni}_2(\text{HITP})_2$ layers on the excitonic coupling. Figure 5 demonstrates the $J$ profile of two adjacent SBUs as a function of increasing the tilt angle along the stacking direction. Change of the tilt angle, which occurs...
at room temperature vs. 0 K, results in a drastic change of excitonic coupling. In contrast to the layer displacement case, here we notice a change in the sign of $J$. Indeed, at about 45° the dimer switches from a head–to–head to a head–to–tail configuration, according to Kasha’s theory. In contrast to the layer displacement between OLUs beyond the nearest-neighbour layer. While the splitting, and the resulted $T$ magnitude, is higher for SBU, one should remember that the intermolecular overlap of the electronic wavefunctions also depends delicately on the displacement of SBUs compared to each other. Sliding and twisting of layers in $\text{Ni}_3(\text{HITP})_2$, which is established through both experimental and theoretical studies, will drastically affect the energy splitting. We will further develop this concept by studying the photophysical properties of SBUs in the next section.

Energetic splittings of the frontier molecular orbitals

It has been shown that the conductivity in $\text{Ni}_3(\text{HITP})_2$ decreases with $S$ and increases with $D$. The latter is rather counter intuitive if we consider that the interlayer non–covalent interaction is based on $\pi – \pi$ stacking. Insights into the ET behaviour of $\text{Ni}_3(\text{HITP})_2$ can be obtained by analyzing the HOMO and LUMO energetic splittings as an estimate of the magnitude of transfer integrals in the building block dimers introduced in the previous section. Previous studies on triphenylene derivatives have shown that eclipsed configuration provides the largest electronic interactions between adjacent molecules/oligomers and highest value of transfer integrals. The splitting depends on the initial shapes of HOMO and LUMO wavefunctions, i.e. the number of nodes which determines the initial bonding/antibonding contributions. Hence, here we examine the energetic splitting profiles of SBU and OLU dimers as a function of $S$ starting from an eclipsed configuration as shown in Figure 6. SBU splittings decrease less rapidly than OLU because of the spatial extent (and the resulting wavefunction overlap) of the $d_z$ orbitals of Ni atoms in comparison to $p_z$ orbitals of C atoms in OLU. Since the wavefunction decays exponentially with $S$, these profiles show that the transfer integral between two OLUs should already be negligible at $S$ values larger than 4.1 Å. Remembering that the experimentally and theoretically evaluated interlayer distance of $\text{Ni}_3(\text{HITP})_2$ is ~3.3 Å, one can conclude that there is no charge transfer coupling between OLUs beyond the nearest-neighbour layer. While the splitting, and the resulted $T$ magnitude, is higher for SBU, one should remember that the intermolecular overlap of the electronic wavefunctions also depends delicately on the displacement of SBUs compared to each other. Sliding and twisting of layers in $\text{Ni}_3(\text{HITP})_2$, which is established through both experimental and theoretical studies, will drastically affect the energy splitting. We will further develop this concept by studying the photophysical properties of SBUs in the next section.

The vibronic signature: 2D MOF material screening for certain photoelectronic characteristics

As introduced in Section II, in order to correlate a nanoscopic $J/\lambda$ or $T/\lambda$ event to mesoscopic transport, exciton diffusion is modeled as an ensemble of self-carrier/energy transfer hopping events on a stack arrangement of SBUs accompanied by nuclear relaxation and rearrangement. The stack is composed of $n = 30$ SBU monomers since it is the value of $n$ by which the absorption spectra converge. As suggested by Eqs. 17-18, the spectral response relies on the competition between $J$ vs. $T$, the latter related to phase and magnitude of the transfer integrals. Figure 7 shows the absorption spectra of the stack of SBUs subject to sliding along the short molecular axis in plots (a) and (b) as well as sliding along the long molecular axis in plots (c) and (d). The full set of excitonic and charge transfer coupling parameters, obtained from electronic structure calculations as discussed in the previous sections, is reported in Table 1. For comparison, the spectra of the monomer and the completely eclipsed dimer are also displayed in each panel in Figure 7. The intensity difference between the first two vibronic peaks (0-0 and 0-1) in the monomer is due to a $\lambda$ value of 0.82 (i.e. they would have similar height if $\lambda$ were set to unity). Red profile corresponds to the eclipsed stack for which $\lambda_{+}$ and $\lambda_{-}$ values are 0.46 and 0.43, respectively. Energies are scaled with respect to the elongation of a symmetric stretching mode (subsequent to $S_0 \rightarrow S_1$ optical excitation) of SBU with energy 1568 cm$^{-1}$ and reported in vibrational quanta units. We monitor not only the shift in the position of the spectral lines but also how the ratio of the first two vibronic peaks (A1/A2) deviates from

FIG. 5. $J$ profile increasing the tilt angle between two SBUs along the $\pi – \pi$ stacking direction and separated by a distance of 3 Å.

FIG. 6. HOMO–LUMO splitting ($\Delta$) for SBU (black) and OLU (red) increasing the spacing $S$ along the stacking direction as represented in Figure 2.
FIG. 7. Short (a-b) and long (c-d) axis sliding effect on the photophysical properties of SBU. In each panel, the spectra for the monomer M (black, dash) and fully eclipsed (red) are reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$E_T$</th>
<th>$J$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eclipsed</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short axis sliding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7 Å</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Å</td>
<td>-605</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long axis sliding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Å</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>-689</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Å</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>-287</td>
<td>-105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 1. Full set of parameter values (in wavenumbers) used in Figure 7.

that of the monomer. As we are concerned with the limit in which transfer integrals and vibrational energies are small compared to the energetic separation between $T$ and $J$ states, the $E_T/E_S$ ratio (see Eqs. 3 and 4) is initially settled to a perturbative regime value of one order of magnitude.

Sliding as big as 0.7 Å along the short axis (Figure 7(a)) causes a blue shift in the absorption spectrum compared to the eclipsed units. The Coulomb coupling is H-like and the A1/A2 ratio drops below the 0-0/0-1 ratio of the monomer. $J$ and $T$ have a destructive phase in this case and the former, although it decreases by more than 25% compared to the eclipsed case, dominates over the latter. The nodal patterns of the frontier molecular orbitals (see the top of Figure 7 for a pictorial representation) impact the magnitude of the transfer integrals. In particular, $t_e$ decreases more noticeably than $t_h$ due to the LUMO contribution of the metal center. When the two units slide as big as 1.2 Å , the sign of $J$ becomes negative, Table 1, leading to a constructive interference between $J$ and $T$, Figure 7(b). This leads to a reinforced coupling and a pronounced J-like behaviour with A1/A2 becoming greater than that of a monomer. Hence, a slide along the short axis can lead to either H-like or J-like behaviour depending on the sign of $J$.

Now, let us examine the photophysical behaviour when sliding occurs along the long molecular axis. Due to the specific form of HOMO and LUMO orbitals (see the pictorial representation on top of Figure 7), every time that the dis-
placement exceeds a bond distance, a nodal plane forms between the two SBUs. After sliding as big as 2 Å, Figure 7(c), \(t_b\) becomes negative but not \(t_e\). \(J\) and \(T\) have constructive phase here, and the larger \(H\)-like long-range coupling dominates the photophysical response. This generates a blue shift similar to Figure 7(a) although a difference in the profiles is visible at \(\sim 2\) vibration quanta. Also, the blue shift in panel (c) shows a larger spacing between A1 and A2 peaks if compared to the blue shift of panel (a). Finally, Figure 7(d) shows the spectral response corresponding to the sliding limit along the long molecular axis during which \(J\) retains its sign, i.e. within 4 Å. Both \(t_e\) and \(t_b\) have negative signs therefore \(J\) and \(T\) present destructive phase and the overall spectrum shows a blue shift signature. The ratio of the first two vibronic peaks is further reduced increasing the slide, a clear departure from what is expected of conventional Kasha’s exciton model.

Next, we move to the case where the energetic difference between \(T\) and \(J\) states decreases. In Figure 8 we show the spectral consequence moving from a perturbative regime (i.e., \(E_T/E_{S_1} \approx 10\)) toward a resonance regime (\(E_T/E_{S_1} \approx 1\)). Departure from perturbative limit leads to an overall blueshift in absorption spectra. The A1/A2 ratio displays \(H\)-like characteristics only in quasi-resonance regime. At the energetic resonance this ratio becomes greater than one which is a \(J\)-like character. Further, novel spectral signatures arise, importantly a broad peak centered approximately at 5 vibrational quanta. This clearly indicates that the photophysical response over ET in 2D MOFs may be dramatically affected by not only the spatial dependence of the SBUs and their relative orientation but also by the energetic separation between charge transfer and Coulomb coupling.

Finally, in order to focus uniquely on the impact of charge transfer interactions, we examined the spectral lines in the diabatic limit, i.e. by switching off the second term on the RHS of Eq. 3, i.e., no Coulomb interactions between SBUs.

The two perturbative and resonance limits, i.e., \(E_T/E_{S_1} = 10\) and 1, are chosen to be compared in the case of a 0.7 Å slide along the short molecular axis. These two cases correspond to the blue and red profiles in Figure 8. The original spectrum (solid line) and the one after switching off \(J\) interactions (dashed line) are shown in Figure 9 for both cases. As can be inferred from the A1/A2 ratio exceeding unity, dash profiles show \(J\)-like features in both cases. Since the 0.7 Å slide nearly resembles eclipsed form, according to the understanding provided by Kasha’s model we would expect a decrease of the ratio of the two first vibronic peaks. Instead, this result illustrates that the system based on the interaction between SBUs may display photophysical behaviour opposite to what is expected based on the geometry. For engineering purposes, one may exploit the spatial dependencies of \(J\) and \(T\) to design 2D MOFs for specific optoelectronic applications in which (for instance) the Coulomb coupling is \(H\)-like, but the photophysics are \(J\)-like due to a dominant \(J\)-like \(T\) interaction between building units.

\[E_T/E_{S_1} = 10\]

\[\text{(Quasi-} \quad \text{Resonance)}\]

\[\text{(Resonance)}\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{Absorption} \\
0 & 0.2 & 0.4 & 0.6 & 0.8 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\omega - \omega_{0-0} / \omega_0 & \end{array}\]

\[\text{FIG. 8. Comparison between the absorption spectra obtained with a large } E_T/E_{S_1} \text{ ratio (solid blue line) as well as at the resonance value (solid red line). Dash, violet profiles correspond to intermediate } E_T/E_{S_1} \text{ values. For clarity, spectra are shifted of one vibration quanta decreasing the } E_T/E_{S_1} \text{ ratio.}\]

In the previous section we examined how the spectral response is related to the short and long-range interactions between SBUs. One should not forget that this response scales with the reorganization energy involved during an ET event, a factor which may potentially impact the transfer, especially when consecutive building units are displaced from an eclipsed arrangement. As introduced in section II, Huang–Rhys factor \(\lambda\) takes into account electron–phonon coupling strength due to lattice relaxation, where the latter refers to the change in equilibrium atomic positions between the initial and final state involved in the optical transition. The design or at least understanding the structure-function relationship of a new 2D scaffold may start by monitoring the spectral vibronic progression by applying slight variations in the electron-phonon coupling during the sliding motion. In such progression, the energies of the normal vibrational modes that take part in the nuclear reorganization determine the vibronic peak spacing. Starting with the eclipsed model introduced in the previous section, Figure 10(a-c) shows the changes in intensity and spacing of the vibronic peaks due to sliding and rotation subject to different values of \(\lambda\). Specifically, in these simulations we set \(\lambda\) near unity, i.e. it varies from \(\lambda_1 = 0.82\) to \(\lambda_2 = 0.86\). \(S\) is kept fixed while \(D\) is varied from completely eclipsed (i.e., \(D_0 = 0\) Å in Figure 10(a) and 10(d)) to a slide of \(D_1 = 1\) Å in Figure 10(b) and 10(e) while a rotation as big as \(\theta = 20^\circ\) between consecutive SBU units relative to one another, about the axis connecting their mass centers, is added to the sliding in Figure 10(c) and 10(f). The eclipsed formation in Figure 10(a) shows that the spectral centroid is slightly red-shifted by increasing \(\lambda\). Together with a broader spectrum, the red profile displays the emergence of a split of the central peak, leading to two peaks symmetrically positioned around zero. These are also the common observation in Figure 10b, except that now the ratio of the first two vibronic peaks in higher value of \(\lambda\) is
FIG. 9. Spectral study by switching off the Coulomb interaction $J$ in Eq. (3). Solid profiles are taken from Figure 9 whereas the dash lines are the ones obtained after switching off $J$.

FIG. 10. Absorption spectra obtained from the parametrization of the Hamiltonian, Eq. 19, increasing the electron-phonon coupling (i.e., $\lambda_1 \rightarrow \lambda_2$). (a)(d) eclipsed non-covalent aggregate in the stacking direction; (b)(e) sliding between consecutive units; (c)(f) sliding plus rotation between consecutive units. As in Figure 7, spectra are scaled with respect to the spectral frequency of the centroid $\omega_0$.

associated with a J-like aggregate form. This demonstrates how a small change in the electron-phonon coupling may be employed to engineer a dramatic variation in the spectral response. When the rotation is added to the sliding the interference scenery between $J$ and $T$ as a function of rotation angle is expected to be dependent on the nodal structures of the frontier orbitals. Figure 10(c) shows that the central vibronic peaks increase their spacing irregularity. Further, one may appreciate a modest redistribution of the relative areas of the peaks, which may suggest a reduced spread of the wavefunction. It can be suggested that for design purposes the effect of rotation on coupling sources may be fine-tuned by adjusting the denominator of Eq. 18.

Finally, in Figure 10(d,e,f) a random field to mimic a certain degree of thermally-induced disorder has been introduced. As previously proposed for perovskites, this was achieved by adding a small random fluctuation, uniformly distributed in an interval $[0, \varepsilon]$, to the onsite energy of every unit of the stacked model. Introduction of this fluctuation slightly increases the match between blue and red profiles in Figure 10(e) and 10(f) in comparison to Figure 10(b) and 10(c). Optimizing ET in operando conditions is crucial in the
design of efficient 2D MOF devices, which requires that the absorbed energy (i.e., the exciton) be carried to regions within the device that may enhance charge separation before it is lost via either radiative or non-radiative decay processes. On one hand, thermally-induced vibrations introduce an additional loss of coherence among the interacting units along the $\pi-\pi$ stacking which leads to the reduction of effective bandwidths (i.e., the transfer integrals). On the other hand, as previously shown on hybrid perovskites, it is possible that the molecular motions create defects and hence increase the exciton lifetime by localizing electrons and holes, i.e., reducing their recombination rate. Both of these effects should be taken into account in quantitative evaluation of ET in 2D MOFs.

IV. Conclusions

The high degree of module ordering achievable within crystalline 2D MOFs provides a basis for systematically relating structure and composition to photon capture and ET. In this work, we showed for the first time that one can model the through-space ET in 2D MOFs by evaluating the geometric dependencies of the short and long range couplings within a linear array of SBUs along the stacking direction. By developing a Frenkel/CT Holstein Hamiltonian, we showed that photophysical properties of 2D MOFs including their absorption spectra critically depend on the degree of ordering between layers. Findings in this direction not only advance our understanding of structure-transport-property relationships but can also help uncover new materials for nano and mesoscale optoelectronic applications.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL  Computational details and a comprehensive study on evaluating the effect of SBU’s and OLU’s structural changes on $\lambda$ are provided. Examples of input and output data for evaluating $\lambda$ are also provided.
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19 Throughout this manuscript, ET refers to both charge and energy transport along the $\pi-\pi$ stacking direction.
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TABLE S1: Optimization energies and equilibrium Ni-N distances (values are in a.u. Å) for the neutral (N), cationic (C) and anionic (A) SBU polarons in Ni$_3$(HITP)$_2$. Last column refers to the λ values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>$d_{Ni-N}$</th>
<th>λ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-2192.04</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-2190.34</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-2189.49</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE S2: Transition charge dipole values (in debye) for the triphenylene organic linker as a function of the rotation angle around the OLU center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotation(°)</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>-0.415</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>-0.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>-0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>-0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.226</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-0.383</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>-0.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. INSIGHTS ON THE OLU AND SBU RELAXATION ENERGIES

It is known that optical bandgaps in 2D MOFs can be controlled through appropriate chemical designs around the central metal atom$^7$ including organic linkers. To this aim, valuable information may be obtained by monitoring how the OLU relaxation energy scales...
with its size. As an example, Figure S1 shows the $\lambda$ evolution increasing the number of carbon atoms which constitute the backbone of OLU, following the tessellation of common linkers employed in 2D MOFs. Flexibility in 2D MOFs is determined not only by the

![Huang-Rhys Factor vs. number of C atoms](image)

**FIG. S1**: Neutral, positive and negative polaron profiles increasing the number of C atoms in a few common 2D MOF organic linkers. Polaron values for ethylene are also displayed for comparison.

linker, but also by the strength of the metal-ligand bonds. Since in triphenylene-derived MOF family the latter is weaker than the organic covalent bond, geometric alterations to the framework are more relevant at the metal-ligand interface. Table S1(a) shows neutral, positive and negative $\lambda$ values for the Ni$_2$(HITP)$_3$ SBU as employed in the model constructed in the main text. In this case, changes in $\lambda$ values are consistent with the collective Ni-N elongations of the square planar optimized SBUs. This can be compared and contrasted to a hypothetical SBU with amine substitution as shown in Table S2(b). Substitutions on the ring remove the uniformity around the Ni atom and introduce out-of-plane distortions along the molecular axis. In such cases, one may predict possible deformations of the 2D layers as defined in elastic regime, i.e. within the yield strain with a precursory analysis
of the deformation modes in the infrared spectra. This can be achieved by imposing some hypothetical deformations on the building blocks in the form of a mechanical constraint as schematically shown in Figure S2. For instance, in Figure S3 we monitor band displace-

![Image of a Hookean spring applied to OLU](image)

\[ \omega = \sqrt{\frac{k}{m}} \quad k'_{ij} = \left( \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial q_i \partial q_j} \right) \quad k_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_i m_j}} k'_{ij} \]

FIG. S2: (a) Pictorial representation of a Hookean spring applied to OLU to evaluate the effect of a constraint on the rings: the second derivative provides the value of the force constant.

ments as a function of the constraints on OLU, with increasing mass being added to each of its corners. The obtained spectra display the largest deformations found for the central OLU ring before and after substitution, the arrows pointing out the energy values associated with these deformations with red shifts spanning over 30 wave numbers. Once the reorganization energy and the convergence with respect to \( \lambda \) of the 2D building block has been carefully evaluated (see sections IV-?? below), one may engineer the structure-optical property relationship by analyzing the spectral response after slight structural alterations in the framework. Since the transfer integrals are hypersensitive to the short/long axis nodal \( \pi \) stack path between SBU units\(^7\) and sliding engineering in 2D MOFs is still in its infancy, the design or the understanding of a new 2D scaffold may start by monitoring the spectral vibronic progression by applying slight variations in the electron-phonon coupling during the slide.
FIG. S3: Study concerning the shift of the deformation modes increasing the mass of the functional substitutions on OLU. The red shift is measured increasing the mass of the constraints, i.e. with one oxygen atom (O) and one sulfur atom (S) at each corner of the triphenylene system.
II. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

Optimization and excitation energy calculations were carried out at the density functional theory (DFT) and time-dependent DFT (TD-DFT) levels using the M06-L density functional in conjunction with the cc-pVTZ basis set. Calculations for $T$ were performed at the M06-L/cc-pVTZ level of theory. Calculations for $J$ were performed at the CIS level in conjunction with the cc-pVTZ basis set. All computations were performed with Gaussian 16.

III. ETHYLENE: EXAMPLE CALCULATIONS OF $\lambda$ VALUES

Here, we provide the route for calculating $\lambda$ values for the interested reader using an example case of ethylene molecule. Starting from optimized geometry (left-side of Fig. S4) one can obtain frequencies of the normal modes and then use them to calculate the effective $\lambda$ values based on the procedure outlined in the main text.

![Initial Cartesian coordinates]

$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{C} & -0.00755 & -0.000186 \\
\text{C} & 1.316163 & 0.832365 \\
\text{H} & 1.908147 & -0.874028 \\
\text{H} & 1.862882 & 0.966759 \\
\text{H} & -0.554278 & -0.934580 \\
\text{H} & -0.599543 & 0.906207 \\
\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Frequency (cm}^{-1}\text{)} & \lambda \\
1382.1197965884 & 0.1245362436 \\
1478.8800450767 & -0.0000000000 \\
1692.7683730495 & 1.3968082615 \\
3125.5683099154 & 0.0000000000 \\
3139.3340111532 & -0.2791659199 \\
\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{cc}
\text{Frequency (cm}^{-1}\text{)} & \lambda_{+} \\
1382.1197965884 & -0.6214854712 \\
1478.8800450767 & -0.0000000000 \\
1692.7683730495 & 0.9267304423 \\
3125.5683099154 & -0.0000000000 \\
3139.3340111532 & 0.0465967631 \\
\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{cc}
\text{Frequency (cm}^{-1}\text{)} & \lambda_{-} \\
1382.1197965884 & -0.9817100766 \\
1478.8800450767 & -0.0000000000 \\
1692.7683730495 & 1.0280274941 \\
3125.5683099154 & -0.0000000000 \\
3139.3340111532 & 0.0566983313 \\
\end{array}$

FIG. S4: Calculated reorganization energies for neutral, cationic and anionic ethylene at M06-L/cc-pVTZ level of theory.
IV. CONVERGENCE OF λ VALUES

To check the convergence of λ values, here, we contrast the calculated values for ethylene in the previous section with the ones we obtained from the four-point scheme, see Figure S5. Table S3 shows how $\lambda_{+}^{HR}$ values are in good agreement with $\lambda_{+}^{4P}$ values for an exemplary benchmark of the basis set.

![Diagram](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

**FIG. S5:** Four points scheme to calculate the reorganization Energy.

**TABLE S3:** Convergence between the cationic λ calculated using the four points scheme and the Huang-Rhys Theory, increasing the basis set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis set</th>
<th>$\lambda_{+}^{4P}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{+}^{HR}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cc-pVDZ</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc-pVTZ</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc-pVQZ</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. TRANSFER INTEGRALS: ETHYLENE EXAMPLE BENCHMARK

Here, we provide input and output data for the interested reader to calculate transfer integrals with a focus on the exemplary ethylene molecule.

**FIG. S6:** Step 1 - Initial coordinates for each monomer.

**Alpha Orbital Energies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>124</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.01947555E+01</td>
<td>-1.01947546E+01</td>
<td>-1.01939450E+01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7.57524537E-01</td>
<td>-7.57524537E-01</td>
<td>-5.80592427E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.18817693E-01</td>
<td>-4.17858086E-01</td>
<td>-3.58727090E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.64088322E-01</td>
<td>-1.90586506E-02</td>
<td>3.39029059E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.38946164E-02</td>
<td>1.62052468E-02</td>
<td>3.79366138E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17787578E-02</td>
<td>7.25073713E-02</td>
<td>8.75580450E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.55890450E-02</td>
<td>7.55890450E-02</td>
<td>7.55890450E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.55890450E-02</td>
<td>7.55890450E-02</td>
<td>7.55890450E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.55890450E-02</td>
<td>7.55890450E-02</td>
<td>7.55890450E-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alpha MO coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>N=</th>
<th>15376</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.00000000E+00</td>
<td>0.00000000E+00</td>
<td>0.00000000E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.45173232E-02</td>
<td>2.09721495E-04</td>
<td>-6.5078241E-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.1931919E-03</td>
<td>-2.0025293E-04</td>
<td>1.5434052E-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.42680085E-04</td>
<td>6.31013426E-14</td>
<td>5.07011352E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.7734023E-03</td>
<td>9.0071997E-16</td>
<td>-6.1120136E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45173232E-02</td>
<td>-2.09721495E-04</td>
<td>2.06352879E-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initial Cartesian coordinates**

**Monomer 1**

| C   | 0.672913  | 0.000000  | 0.000000  |
| C   | -0.672913 | 0.000000  | 0.000000  |
| H   | 1.261977  | 0.783265  | 0.000000  |
| H   | -1.261977 | 0.783265  | 0.000000  |

**Monomer 2**

| C   | 0.672749  | 0.000000  | 3.000000  |
| C   | -0.672749 | 0.000000  | 3.000000  |
| H   | 1.261977  | 0.783265  | 3.000000  |
| H   | -1.261977 | 0.783265  | 3.000000  |

**FIG. S7:** Step 2 - Coefficient values obtained for the dimer.