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**Abstract**

The hitherto elusive monobridged Ge(*µ*-H)GeH (X1A') molecule was prepared in gas phase through bimolecular reaction of atomic germanium (Ge) with germane (GeH4). Merged with electronic structure calculations, this reaction was revealed to commence on the triplet surface with the formation of a van der Waals complex, followed by insertion of germanium into a germanium-hydrogen bond via a submerged barrier forming the triplet digermanylidene intermediate (HGeGeH3); the latter underwent intersystem crossing from the triplet to singlet surface. On the singlet surface, HGeGeH3 predominantly isomerized via two successive hydrogen shifts prior to unimolecular decomposition to Ge(*µ*-H)GeH isomer, which is in equilibrium with the vinylidene-type (H2GeGe) and di-bridged (Ge(*µ*-H2)Ge) isomers. This reaction leads to the formation of the cyclic dinuclear germanium molecules, which do not exist on the isovalent C2H2 surface, deepening our understanding of the role of nonadiabatic reaction dynamics in preparing non-classical, hydrogen-bridged isomers carrying main group XIV elements.

**Introduction.**

Despite sharing the same number of valence electrons, the chemical bonding and structures of silicon- and germanium-bearing compounds strongly differ from their carbon counterparts leading to new views on the concept of isoelectronicity.[[1](#_ENREF_1)] Four structural isomers of Ge2H2 were located computationally on the ground state singlet surface; these include a doubly bridged butterfly structure (Ge(*µ*-H2)Ge; **7**), a *cis* monobridged form (Ge(*µ*-H)GeH; **8**), a vinylidene-type isomer (H2GeGe; **9**), and a *trans*-bent form (HGeGeH; **10**) (Scheme 1). Among these four isomers, the
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**Scheme 1**. Structures, point groups, electronic states, and relative energies (kJ mol-1) of homonuclear dihydrides: C2H2 (**1**, **2**), Si2H2 (**3**-**6**), and Ge2H2 (**7**-**10**). Atoms are color coded in green (germanium), purple (silicon), gray (carbon), and white (hydrogen).

butterfly structure (**7**), where both germanium atoms are connected via a σ-bond with the hydrogen atoms attached to the heavy atoms by three-center-two-electron (3c-2e) bonds, represents the thermodynamically most stable Ge2H2isomer with the *cis* monobridged structure (**8**) being the second most stable isomer.[[2](#_ENREF_5)] The vinylidene-type digermenylidene structure (**9**) is predicted to lie 9 kJ mol-1 above *cis* monobridged Ge(*µ*-H)GeH. The structures and relative stabilities of these Ge2H2 isomers reveal overall similarity to the Si2H2 system (**3 - 6**).[[3](#_ENREF_8)] However, carbon analogues of the hydrogen-bridged equilibrium structures Ge(*µ*-H2)Ge (**7**) and Ge(*µ*-H)GeH (**8**) do not exist; the linear acetylene molecule (**1**) exemplifies the lowest lying isomer in the C2H2 system.[[4](#_ENREF_9)] The existence of unusual, non-classical hydrogen bridged equilibrium structures in Ge2H2 system can be explained through the interaction between two GeH moieties resulting into a dibridged structure.[[2c](#_ENREF_7), [5](#_ENREF_11)] Moreover, the length of the Ge−Ge double bond in digermylidene (**9**) is longer than the *trans*-bent bond values in digermene (H2GeGeH2);[[6](#_ENREF_12)] this contrasts the carbon analog structures, where the ethylene isomer holds the longer C−C bond distance of 1.339 Å compared to 1.316 Å.[[7](#_ENREF_14)] This can be rationalized by the fact that the bonds of Ge2H2 are polarized strongly toward the more electronegative hydrogen atoms resulting in a less effective hyperconjugation.[[6a](#_ENREF_12)]

Homo- and heteronuclear dihydrides of main group XIV have been the subject of extensive experimental attention. Among the SiCH2 isomers, the simplest unsaturated silylene (H2CSi) represents the global minima and was first identified in 1979 by flash photolysis of a mixture of methylsilanes and helium.[[8](#_ENREF_16)] Subsequently, this isomer was explored via laser induced fluores-cence (LIF) along with wavelength-resolved fluorescence and stimulated emission pumping (SEP).[[9](#_ENREF_17)] In 2008, the H2CSi isomer was also proposed to be prepared under single collision conditions.[[10](#_ENREF_22)] Considering the GeCH2 system, germavinylidene (H2CGe), the lowest lying isomer and the simplest unsaturated germylene, was identified experimentally as well. The first laser spectroscopic detection of germavinylidene was reported in 1997;[[9b](#_ENREF_18)] a series of follow up experimental studies were conducted investigating both ground and excited electronic states of germavinylidene.[[11](#_ENREF_23)] These studies verified the reduced overlap of the valence s and p orbitals of the heavy main group XIV elements as compared to carbon.[[12](#_ENREF_26)] Recently, two crossed molecular beam studies involving the simplest open-shell species and the prototype closed shell molecules of atomic germanium with silane and of atomic silicon with germane shed light on the hetero-nuclear SiGeH2 system.[[13](#_ENREF_27)] In both systems, the thermodynamically most stable SiGeH2 isomer, the doubly bridged butterfly structure (Si(*µ*-H2)Ge), was prepared in the gas phase. As for the Si2H2 analogs, the butterfly structure (**3**)[[14](#_ENREF_29)] and the *cis* monobridged isomer (**4**)[[15](#_ENREF_33)] have been prepared as well; a gas-phase crossed beam study also revealed the formation of the vinylidene-type disilavinylidene isomer (**5**).[[3](#_ENREF_8)] However, compared to the isovalent systems, the Ge2H2 system has received little attention despite the potential to explore unusual, hydrogen-bridged molecules. Until recently, only the di-bridged Ge(*µ*-H2)Ge isomer (**7**) has been detected experimentally via matrix isolation coupled with infrared spectroscopy, but no gas phase studies have been explored to prepare distinct Ge2H2 isomers under single collision conditions in the gas phase.[[16](#_ENREF_35)]

Here, we report the *directed* gas-phase preparation of the previously elusive monobridged Ge(*µ*-H)GeH isomer (**8**) exploiting a crossed molecular beam machine via bimolecular reactions of ground state open-shell atomic germanium (Ge; 3Pj) with closed-shell germane (GeH4; X1A1). By merging experimental results with electronic structure and statistical calculations, the unusual structures and exotic chemical bonding of dinuclear germanium compounds is revealed. The reaction is predicted to be initiated on the triplet surface with the formation of a van der Waals complex, followed by insertion of germanium into germanium-hydrogen bond with a submerged barrier and intersystem crossing (ISC) from the triplet to the singlet surface thus deepening our understanding of the non-adiabatic reaction dynamics in dinuclear systems of various degrees of hydrogenation incorporating main group XIV elements.

**Results and Discussion**

**Laboratory frame**

Reactive scattering signal of the reaction of germanium (Ge; 3Pj) with germane (GeH4; X1A1) was probed from mass-to-charge (*m/z*) 156 (76Ge2H4+) to 140 (70Ge2+) accounting for the natural isotope abundances of germanium [70Ge (20.5%), 72Ge (27.4%), 73Ge (7.8%), 74Ge (36.7%), 76Ge (7.8%)]. No definite signal could be detected from *m/z* 153 to 156 suggesting that no Ge2H4 adducts were produced. The signal at *m/z* 150 (73Ge74GeH3+/74Ge2H2+/72Ge76GeH2+/73Ge76GeH+/74Ge76Ge+) was found to depict the best signal-to-noise ratio (Supporting Information; Table S2) with TOFs at the remaining *m/z* ratios superimposable after scaling. These findings suggest that the Ge−GeH4 reaction proceeds through a single reaction channel, i.e. a molecular hydrogen loss channel forming 74Ge2H2 (150 amu) along with molecular hydrogen (2 amu) (reaction 2). The Ge + GeH4 → 2 GeH2 channel leading to the formation of GeH2 radical is closed under our experimental conditions considering the endoergicity of 39 kJ mol-1 (Supporting Information). Ion counts collected at *m/z* 140-149 originate from dissociative electron impact ionization of the 74Ge2H2 (*m/z* = 150) parent along with the isotopically substituted counterparts. Note that the atomic hydrogen loss channel leading to the formation of any Ge2H3 isomers (reaction 1) is endoergic by at least 118 kJ mol-1 and is therefore closed considering our collision energy of 24.3 ± 0.4 kJ mol-1.[[17](#_ENREF_37)] The angular resolved TOF spectra were therefore collected in 2.5° intervals at *m/z* 150 (74Ge2H2+) and

图表, 折线图

描述已自动生成

**Figure 1**. Laboratory angular distribution (a) and time-of-flight spectra (b) collected at m/z = 150 (74Ge2H2+) in the reaction of ground-state atomic germanium with germane. The circles represent the experimental results, and the red lines depict the best fits.

scaled to the TOF taken at the CM angle yielding the laboratory angular distribution (LAD). The LAD spread over 35° and is nearly forward-backward symmetric with respect to the CM angle, also holds a maximum at the CM angle (Figure 1). These findings suggests that the Ge−GeH4 reaction involves likely indirect reaction dynamics involving the formation of Ge2H4 interme-diates.[[18](#_ENREF_38)]

1. Ge + GeH4 → Ge2H3 (151 amu) + H (1 amu)
2. Ge + GeH4 → Ge2H2 (150 amu) + H2 (2 amu)

**Center-of-mass frame**

While the laboratory data alone identify the germanium versus molecular hydrogen pathway, the nature of the Ge2H2 product isomer(s) and the underlying reaction mechanism(s) have to be
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**Figure 2**. CM translational energy (a), angular (b) flux distributions and the associated flux contour map (c) for the reaction of atomic germanium with germane forming Ge2H2 isomer(s) through molecular hydrogen elimination. The red lines indicate the best-fit; shaded areas representthe error limits.

exposed. This information can be derived by transforming the laboratory data into the CM reference frame.[[19](#_ENREF_39)] The laboratory data were fit with a single channel, i.e., a molecular hydrogen loss channel with a mass combination of 150 amu (74Ge2H2, hereafter Ge2H2) plus 2 amu (H2). The best fit CM translational energy *P(E*T*)* and angular *T(θ)* flux distributions are depicted in Figure 2. Inspecting the *P(E*T*)* distribution, the maximum translational energy *E*max of 108 ± 18 kJ mol-1 characterizes the sum of the collision energy (24.3 ± 0.4 kJ mol-1) and the reaction exoergicity for those products formed without internal excitation. Hence, the experimental reaction energy is suggested to be -84 ± 18 kJ mol-1. However, considering that germanium was produced in the *j* = 0, 1, and 2 states with *j* = 1 and 2 higher in energy by 7 and 17 kJ mol-1 than *j* = 0, the aforementioned energy of -84 ± 18 kJ mol-1 has to be reduced by 17 kJ mol-1 to reveal the true reaction energy to be -67 ± 18 kJ mol-1. Further, the off-zero peaking of the *P(E*T*)* distribution (26 ± 4 kJ mol-1) indicating a tight exit transition state forming Ge2H2 plus molecular hydrogen. Finally, the forward-backward symmetric *T(θ)* distribution shows non-zero intensity from 0o to 180o implying indirect scattering dynamics via long-lived (lifetime longer than the rotational period) Ge2H4 complex(es).[[18](#_ENREF_38), [20](#_ENREF_40)]

**Discussion**

In case of complex potential energy surfaces (PES), It is always beneficial to merge the experimental data with electronic structure calculations. Our calculations identified nine Ge2H2 product isomers on the singlet (**p1**−**p4**) and triplet surface (**3p1**−**3p3**, *trans/cis*-**3p4**). On the singlet surface, the di-bridged di-*µ*-hydrodigermanium butterfly molecule (**p1**, −105 ± 7 kJ mol-1, Ge(*µ*-H2)Ge, C2ν, X1A1) represents the thermodynamically most stable isomer followed by a monobridged isomer (**p2**, −70 ± 7 kJ mol-1, Ge(*µ*-H)GeH, *C*s, X1A'), digermenylidene (**p3**, −61 ± 7 kJ mol-1, H2GeGe, C2ν, X1A1), and singlet *trans*-bent digermyne (**p4**, −39 ± 7 kJ mol-1, HGeGeH, C2h, X1Ag). The computed relative energies of these products agree very well with the previous results.[[2a](#_ENREF_5), [2b](#_ENREF_6), [6b](#_ENREF_13)] The triplet structures are consistently higher in energy than their singlet counterparts: triplet digermenylidene (**3p3**, −17 ± 7 kJ mol-1, H2GeGe, C2ν, a3A2), triplet *trans*-bent digermyne (*trans*-**3p4**, −11 ± 7 kJ mol-1, HGeGeH, C2h, a3Au), triplet *cis* digermyne (*cis*-**3p4**, 17 ± 7 kJ mol-1, HGeGeH, Cs, a3A''), triplet monobridged isomer (**3p2**, 22 ± 7 kJ mol-1, Ge(*µ*-H)GeH, C1, a3A), and triplet di-bridged butterfly molecule (**3p1**, 64 ± 7 kJ mol-1, Ge(*µ*-H2)Ge, Cs, a3A''). A comparison of the experimentally determined reaction energy of -67 ± 18 kJ mol-1 with the computed data suggest that for those molecules born without internal excitation, at least the monobridged isomer (**p2**, −70 ± 7 kJ mol-1, Ge(*µ*-H)GeH, *C*s, X1A') represents a viable product on the singlet surface. Considering that the reaction starts on the triplet surface, but both products are formed in their singlet ground state, non-adiabatic reaction dynamics drive the outcome of the bimolecular gas phase reaction of atomic germanium with germane. Note that singlet **p3** and **p4** cannot be excluded at the present stage since their contributions might be hidden in the low energy section of the *P(E*T*)*. It is important to note that on the triplet surface, the formation of **3p1** and **3p2** is endoergic; these endoergicities cannot be compensated by the collision energy of 24.3 ± 0.4 kJ

mol-1. Nevertheless, based on the energetics alone, **3p3** and **3p4** might contribute to reactive scattering signal.

Based on these findings, both the triplet and singlet Ge2H4 PESs along with intersystem crossing (ISC) from the triplet to the singlet manifold are explored (Figure3, Figure S1). The computations predict that the atomic germanium (3P0) − germane (X1A1) reaction is initiated on the triplet surface through a de-facto barrierless insertion of germanium into one of the germanium–hydrogen bonds of germane. When the ground state germanium atom approaches the germane molecule, the PES is attractive resulting in a van der Waals (vdW) complex bound by 30 kJ mol-1 relative to the separated reactants. Through insertion of the germanium atom into the germane germanium−hydrogen bond, the vdW complex can isomerize to the covalently bound intermediate **3i1** (HGeGeH3, digermanylidene, C*s*, 3A'') via a barrier of 25 kJ mol-1. It is important to stress that the overall reaction from the separated reactants to **3i1** is still barrierless since the vdW complex and **3i1** are connected via a transition state located 5 kJ mol-1 *below* the separated reactants, i.e., a submerged barrier.[[21](#_ENREF_41)] **3i1** can emit molecular hydrogen forming triplet **3p3** and ***trans*-3p4**, or isomerize to **3i3** (H2GeGeH2; digermene, *C*1, 3A) via a hydrogen shift followed by molecular hydrogen emission leading to **3p3** and **3p4**. However, the transition states connecting **3i1** to **3p3** and ***trans*-3p4** and **3i3** are located 49, 96 and 29 kJ mol-1 above the separated reactants respectively; thus these pathways should be closed considering our collision energy of 24.3 ± 0.4 kJ mol-1. Based on these considerations, no triplet Ge2H2 isomers can be formed in the Ge−GeH4 reaction since the tight exit transition states cannot be surpassed energetically under our experimental conditions.

How are the singlet Ge2H2 product isomers formed? The calculations predict the possibility of ISC from the triplet to singlet manifolds. In detail, intermediate **3i1** undergoes ISC to intermediate **i1** (HGeGeH3; digermanylidene, Cs, 1A'), which lies 75 kJ mol-1 below **3i1**. The seam of crossing (MSX) residing 89 kJ mol-1 below the separated reactants is identified with a similar geometry to
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**Figure 3.** Potential energy surface (PES) for the reaction of the atomic germanium with germane. A complete PES is presented in Figure S1 (Supporting Information). Germanium and hydrogen atoms are color coded in green and white, respectively.

that of **3i1**. One notable difference between **3i1** and MSX is the change of the H−Ge−Ge angle, i.e., an increase from 122.6o in **3i1** to 126.9o in MSX. On the singlet surface, intermediate **i1** can undergo unimolecular decomposition to **p3**, but the tight transition state connecting **i1** and **p3** is located 63 kJ mol-1 above the separated reactants and cannot be overcome under our experimental conditions considering a collision energy of only 24.3 ± 0.4 kJ mol-1. Alternatively, **i1** can undergo isomerization yielding dibridged *trans*-HGe(*µ*-H2)GeH intermediate ***trans*-i4** (*C*2h, X1Ag) via a transition state located 117 kJ mol-1 above **i1** or may isomerize to the monobridged structure **i2** (H2Ge(*µ*-H)GeH, C1, X1A) with a barrier of 8 kJ mol-1. Considering the isomerization barriers, the formation of **i2** is suggested to be preferred. What’s the fate of **i2**? Our computations reveal that six energetically accessible channels are open: (i) isomerization to **i6** (C1, X1A) via a transition state located 145 kJ mol-1 above **i2**, (ii) unimolecular decomposition to **p1** through a transition state located 143 kJ mol-1 above **i2** (iii) formation of intermediate ***trans*-i4** through hydrogen atom migration and a barrier of 130 kJ mol-1, (iv) hydrogen atom migration leading to a dibridged structure, *cis*-HGe(*µ*-H2)GeH (***cis*-i4,** C2v, 1A1) via a transition state residing 118 kJ mol-1 above **i2**, (v) isomerization to **i5** (C*s*, X1A') by passing a transition state 57 kJ mol-1 below the reactants and 105 kJ mol-1 above **i2,** and (vi)isomerization to **i3**. However, our calculations identified that **i3** can only eliminate molecular hydrogen via **i3**→**i2**→**i5**→**p3**+H2 pathway. The barriers might suggest that the formation of **i5** is favored considering the transition states to isomerization (**i3**→**i2**→**i5, i2**→**i5** versus **i2**→***cis*-i4**, **i2**→***trans*-i4**, **i2**→**p1**, and **i2**→**i6**).
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**Figure 4.** Relative energies of singlet products and the transition states connecting these products.

Intermediate **i5** may undergo unimolecular decomposition via tight exit transition states to Ge(*µ*-H)GeH(**p2**) and/or H2GeGe (**p3**) via a barrierless pathway; the latter contradicts our experimental findings of a tight exit transition state. **p2** can alsobe formed from **i6** via molecular hydrogen loss and a tight exit transition state. Moreover, decomposition of ***cis*-** and ***trans*-i4** could lead to **p1**, which might represent the minor contributor in the experiment. Note that according to the calculation, if the monobridged isomer **p2** is formed with sufficient internal energy, it can isomerize to **p1** or **p3** by overcoming barriers of 13 and 18 kJ mol-1, respectively (Figure 4). Therefore, although **p2** represents the initial reaction product under single collision condition, it can be in equilibrium with the isomers **p1** and **p3**. In multi collision environments, all three isomers can be stabilized by three-body collision thus making the available for spectroscopic detection by transferring (parts of) the internal energy to the three-body collider.

**Conclusions.**

Overall, merging the experimental findings with the computational results suggests that ground state atomic germanium reacts with germane on the triplet surface forming a van-der-Waals complex, which isomerizes via germanium atom insertion into a germanium–hydrogen bond to **3i1**. The latter undergoes ISC to intermediate **i1** (HGeGeH3; digermanylidene, Cs, 1A'), which then undergoes hydrogen shift to the hydrogen bridged intermediate **i2** on the singlet surface. The latter undergoes yet another hydrogen shift forming **i5**, in which the molecule hydrogen moiety is already formed. This intermediate undergoes molecular hydrogen loss through a tight exit transition state forming the monobridged isomer (**p2**, Ge(*µ*-H)GeH, *Cs*, X1A') in an overall exoergic reaction (theoretical: −70 ± 7 kJ mol-1, experimental: -67 ± 18 kJ mol-1) via non-adiabatic reaction dynamics. These conclusions are in line with energy dependent RRKM (Rice-Ramsperger-Kassel-Marcus) calculations (Supporting Information), which predict that **p2** is predominantly formed at a level of 91% along with **p1** and **p3** contributing only 6% and 3% at our collision energy of 24.3 ± 0.4 kJ mol-1 thus supporting the first gas phase identification of the previously elusive monobridged Ge(*µ*-H)GeH (X1A') molecule. Those **p2** formedwith sufficient internal energy can isomerize to **p1** and **p3** via hydrogen shifts.

The chemical dynamics of Ge (3P) − GeH4 (X1A1) system are quite distinct from the dynamics of the isovalent E−EH4 (E = C, Si) reactions. For the carbon (C; 3P) − methane (CH4; 1A1) system, the molecular hydrogen elimination pathway to acetylene and vinylidene is closed considering the inherent barrier of about 51 kJ mol-1 in the insertion of atomic carbon into the carbon−hydrogen bond of methane.[[22](#_ENREF_42)] Further, carbon analogues of the unusual mono- and dibridged intermediates formed in germanium−germane reaction do not even exist. The study by Yang et al. revealed that silicon (Si; 3P) – silane (SiH4; X1A1) reaction is initiated with the barrierless formation of a van der Waals complex, which can isomerize to triplet disilamethylcarbene (HSiSiH3) through insertion of the silicon into a silicon−hydrogen bond. The triplet HSiSiH3 intermediate undergoes ISC to singlet HSiSiH3.[[3](#_ENREF_8)] Up to here, the reaction dynamics depict a strong analogy to the Ge (3P) − GeH4 (X1A1) system. However, singlet HSiSiH3 isomerizes to a long-lived disilaethylene intermediate via hydrogen shift and finally eliminates molecular hydrogen forming initially singlet disilavinylidene (H2SiSi). The internal energy of singlet disilavinylidene (H2SiSi) supports isomerization to the monobridged Si(*µ*-H)SiH (X1A') isomer. Overall, the insights from isovalent carbon and silicon systems are not readily leveraged to interpret isovalent gas phase reactions of germanium. The findings of our present study provide new evidence on the difference of the reaction dynamics of isovalent systems, especially those involving main group XIV elements. Considering that the hydrogen atoms in germane can be substituted by side groups, the extracted reaction dynamics might be helpful to predict and to eventually explore the formation of the largely obscure group of substituted germanium−bearing hydrogen bridged structures on the molecular level in the gas phase.

**Experimental Section**

The gas phase reaction of ground-state atomic germanium (Ge; 3P) with germane (GeH4; X1A1) was studied in a crossed molecular beam machine.[[23](#_ENREF_43)] The supersonic beam of the primary reactant - atomic germanium - was generated *in situ* exploiting laser ablation using 266 nm laser (Nd:YAG; 30 Hz; 3 ± 1 mJ pulse-1) of a germanium rod, which was kept in helical motion (optical-grade; Alfa Aesar).[[13a](#_ENREF_27)] The ablated germanium atoms were seeded in neon (Ne; 99.9999%; Matheson) as released by a pulsed valve operated at 60 Hz with 4 atm backing pressure. After being skimmed, the atomic germanium beam was velocity-selected by a four-slot chopper wheel operating at 120 Hz to a well-defined *v*p (peak velocity) of 998 ± 12 m s-1 and S (speed ratio) of 5.6 ± 0.2 (Table S1). No higher germanium clusters were detected in the experiment. In the scattering chamber, the primary beam crossed a section of a pulsed molecular beam of pure germane (GeH4) (Air Liquide; 99.999%; 60 Hz; 550 Torr) defined by *v*p = 529 ± 5 m s-1 and S = 9.0 ± 0.7 perpendicularly. The corresponding collision energy (Ec) and center of mass angle (ΘCM) were then determined to be 24.3 ± 0.4 kJ mol-1 and 29.4 ± 0.4°, respectively, for the 74Ge and 74GeH4 reactants. Laser induced fluorescence (LIF) reveals that atomic germanium is produced not only in the 3P0 state, but also in the 3P1 and 3P2 states with *j* = 1 and 2 lying 7 and 17 kJ mol-1 higher in energy than *j* = 0.[[24](#_ENREF_49)] The neutral reactive-scattering products were ionized utilizing an electron impact ionizer (80 eV; 2 mA) operating at ultrahigh-vacuum conditions of 610-12 Torr and mass filtered by a quadrupole mass spectrometer (QMS). The detection system recorded the products flight time from the interaction region via the ionizer to the Daly target in the time-of-flight (TOF) mode. The laboratory data, i.e. the laboratory angular distribution (LAD) and the TOF spectra, were transformed using a forward-convolution routine from the laboratory into the CM reference frame to extract information of the reaction dynamics.[[25](#_ENREF_50)] This approach provides the CM translational energy *P(E*T*)* and the angular *T(θ)* flux distributions along with the contour flux map of the product molecule, *I(u, θ) ≈ P(u) × T(θ)*, with the CM velocity *u* and angle *θ*. A reactive scattering cross section of an *E*T-1/3 energy dependence was utilized in the fitting procedure within the line-of-center model considering the barrierless reaction.[[18](#_ENREF_38), [26](#_ENREF_52)]

**Computational Details**

The H2 loss channels of the atomic germanium (Ge, 3P) and germane (GeH4, 1A1) reaction on both Ge2H4 adiabatic triplet and singlet ground-state potential energy surfaces are characterized. The coupled cluster[[27](#_ENREF_53)] CCSD/cc-pVTZ calculations are employed in the optimization for the geometries of collision complexes, intermediates, transition states, and H2 dissociation products, with the exception of **i6**, **tsi2i6**, and **tsi6p2**, which are found via MP2/cc-pVTZ. Their CCSD(T)/CBS (complete basis set limits[[28](#_ENREF_57)]) energies with CCSD/cc-pVTZ zero-point energy corrections are obtained by extrapolating the CCSD(T)/cc-pVDZ, CCSD- (T)/cc-pVTZ, and CCSD(T)/cc-pVQZ energies, with an expected accuracy within 7 kJ mol−1.[[29](#_ENREF_58)] The 1-D CCSD(T)/CBS barrierless potential energy curve for **i5** → **p3** along the reaction coordinate is likewise evaluated at CCSD/cc-pVTZ optimized structures with CCSD/cc-pVTZ zero-point energy corrections. CPMCSCF[[30](#_ENREF_59)]/TZVPP calculations are carried out for location of the minimum energy crossing point between **3i1** and **1i1**, with CCSD(T)/CBS energy then obtained. GAUSSIAN16 programs[[31](#_ENREF_60)] and MOLPRO[[30](#_ENREF_59)] programs were used for the coupled cluster and the surface-crossing computations, respectively.

On singlet potential energy surface, the Rice−Ramsperger−Kassel−Marcus (RRKM) rate constants[[32](#_ENREF_61)] are computed at collision energies of 0.0, 5.0, 10.0, 20.0, 24.3, 30.0, and 40.0 kJ mol-1. The density of states for the intermediates and the number of states for the transition states are evaluated by the saddle-point method[[32-33](#_ENREF_61)] with the CCSD(T)/CBS energies and CCSD/cc-pVTZ harmonic frequencies. All species are treated as a collection of harmonic oscillators. The variational transition state (**tsi5p3**) on the barrierless potential curve is characterized via variational RRKM theory.[[34](#_ENREF_63)] Finally, with the aid of RRKM rate constants, the energy-dependent product branching ratio is obtained by solving the rate equations based on reaction mechanism (derived from *ab initio* reaction paths), utilizing the Runge−Kutta method.

In addition to primary reactions, the secondary reactions: **p1**, **p2**, **p3**, and **p4** isomerizations are also considered at 0.0 and 24.3 kJ mol-1collision energies. Presumably, only the vibrational energy in primary products, **p1**, **p2**, and **p3**, could participate inthe secondary reactions. To estimate the vibrational energies of primary **p1**, **p2**, and **p3**, the theoretical energy-partition model[[34c](#_ENREF_65)] that accounts for the statistical nature of the energy above transition state and the impulsiveness of the exit barrier is adapted. Simply, at 0.0 collision energy, the available energy (**Eava)** for **p2** + H2 is 70 kJ/mol as seen in Figure 3 and Figure 4; however only vibrational energy in **p2** wouldtake part in secondary reactions, isomerization. The exit barrier (**Eimp**) 15 kJ/mol (-55 – (-70) kJ/mol) for **i5** → **p2** +H2 channel contributes only to translational and rotational energies of **p2** + H2. The energy (**Estat**) above the transition state (**tsi5p2**), 55 kJ/mol is partitioned among the translational, rotational, and vibrational energies of two fragments, **p2** and H2. Thus, only the vibrational energy of **p2** contributed from **Estat** would make **p2** isomerization possible, which is estimated to be 25 kJ/mol, or meaning 70 – 15 – 30 = 25 kJ/mol. (25 kJ/mol is obtained by assuming similar partitions as the H2 loss channels of O (1D) + CH4 reaction.[[35](#_ENREF_66)]) Among all the primary product (**p1**, **p2**, **p3**) channels, only **p2** produced from **i5** → **p2** +H2 channel has enough vibrational energy to proceed secondary reactions. The corresponding RRKM rate constants with corrected available energies are computed. Accordingly, reaction mechanism including secondary reactions are devised to solve rate equations and obtain product branching ratios.
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The hitherto elusive monobridged Ge(*µ*-H)GeH molecule was prepared in gas phase through bimolecular reaction of atomic germanium (Ge) with germane (GeH4). The divergent chemistries of germanium versus carbon are reflected when comparing the acetylene isomers with the isovalent germanium analogues. This reaction deepens our understanding of the role of nonadiabatic reaction dynamics in preparing non-classical, hydrogen-bridged isomers carrying main group XIV elements.
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