The calculations have been performed by using projector augmented wave pseudopotential plane wave method\textsuperscript{10} with spin-polarized generalized gradient approximation\textsuperscript{11} (GGA) for the exchange-correlation energy. The cluster was placed in a large cubic cell and the Brillouin zone integrations were done using only the Γ point. The electronic energy and ionic forces were converged within 0.0001 eV and 0.005 eV/Å without imposing any symmetry constraint and for the calculation of the vibrational spectrum, further convergence was achieved within 10\textsuperscript{−5} eV and 0.001 eV/Å, respectively. For Au we considered 11 valence electrons while for Gd, the valence configuration is taken to be 5s\textsuperscript{2}5p\textsuperscript{6}4f\textsuperscript{7}5d\textsuperscript{6}s\textsuperscript{2} with 18 electrons. The cutoff energy for the plane wave expansion is taken to be 400 eV.

Figures 1(a) and 1(b) (different view) show the lowest energy optimized structure of Gd@Au\textsubscript{15} in which a Gd atom is encapsulated in the cage of Au\textsubscript{15}. Gd atom is bigger than a gold atom and 15 Au atoms are optimal around it. Gd interacts with all the 15 Au atoms with small variation in the Au–Au bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.94–3.18 Å. However, there is a larger variation in Au–Gd bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.72–3.37 Å. This result suggests a preference to optimize Au–Gd bonding in Gd@Au\textsubscript{15}. It is because of the fact that the binding energy of an Au–Gd dimer is 3.54 eV as compared to 2.34 eV for an Au–Au dimer. The Au\textsubscript{2} (Au–Gd) bond acts with all the 15 Au atoms with small variation in the Au–Au bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.94–3.18 Å. However, there is a larger variation in Au–Gd bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.72–3.37 Å. This result suggests a preference to optimize Au–Gd bonding in Gd@Au\textsubscript{15}. It is because of the fact that the binding energy of an Au–Gd dimer is 3.54 eV as compared to 2.34 eV for an Au–Au dimer. The Au\textsubscript{2} (Au–Gd) bond acts with all the 15 Au atoms with small variation in the Au–Au bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.94–3.18 Å. However, there is a larger variation in Au–Gd bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.72–3.37 Å. This result suggests a preference to optimize Au–Gd bonding in Gd@Au\textsubscript{15}. It is because of the fact that the binding energy of an Au–Gd dimer is 3.54 eV as compared to 2.34 eV for an Au–Au dimer. The Au\textsubscript{2} (Au–Gd) bond acts with all the 15 Au atoms with small variation in the Au–Au bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.94–3.18 Å. However, there is a larger variation in Au–Gd bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.72–3.37 Å. This result suggests a preference to optimize Au–Gd bonding in Gd@Au\textsubscript{15}. It is because of the fact that the binding energy of an Au–Gd dimer is 3.54 eV as compared to 2.34 eV for an Au–Au dimer. The Au\textsubscript{2} (Au–Gd) bond acts with all the 15 Au atoms with small variation in the Au–Au bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.94–3.18 Å. However, there is a larger variation in Au–Gd bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.72–3.37 Å. This result suggests a preference to optimize Au–Gd bonding in Gd@Au\textsubscript{15}. It is because of the fact that the binding energy of an Au–Gd dimer is 3.54 eV as compared to 2.34 eV for an Au–Au dimer. The Au\textsubscript{2} (Au–Gd) bond acts with all the 15 Au atoms with small variation in the Au–Au bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.94–3.18 Å. However, there is a larger variation in Au–Gd bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.72–3.37 Å. This result suggests a preference to optimize Au–Gd bonding in Gd@Au\textsubscript{15}. It is because of the fact that the binding energy of an Au–Gd dimer is 3.54 eV as compared to 2.34 eV for an Au–Au dimer. The Au\textsubscript{2} (Au–Gd) bond acts with all the 15 Au atoms with small variation in the Au–Au bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.94–3.18 Å. However, there is a larger variation in Au–Gd bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.72–3.37 Å. This result suggests a preference to optimize Au–Gd bonding in Gd@Au\textsubscript{15}. It is because of the fact that the binding energy of an Au–Gd dimer is 3.54 eV as compared to 2.34 eV for an Au–Au dimer. The Au\textsubscript{2} (Au–Gd) bond acts with all the 15 Au atoms with small variation in the Au–Au bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.94–3.18 Å. However, there is a larger variation in Au–Gd bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.72–3.37 Å. This result suggests a preference to optimize Au–Gd bonding in Gd@Au\textsubscript{15}. It is because of the fact that the binding energy of an Au–Gd dimer is 3.54 eV as compared to 2.34 eV for an Au–Au dimer. The Au\textsubscript{2} (Au–Gd) bond acts with all the 15 Au atoms with small variation in the Au–Au bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.94–3.18 Å. However, there is a larger variation in Au–Gd bond lengths that lie in the range of 2.72–3.37 Å. This result suggests a preference to optimize Au–Gd bonding in Gd@Au\textsubscript{15}. It is because of the fact that the binding energy of an Au–Gd dimer is 3.54 eV as compared to 2.34 eV for an Au–Au dimer.
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\caption{(Color online) (a) Atomic structure of Gd@Au\textsubscript{15} with Gd atom inside Au\textsubscript{15} cage. (b) is another view of the same structure. Gold and Gd atoms are shown in golden (light grey in print) and blue (dark grey in print) colors. (c) The lowest energy structure (nearby planar) of GdAu\textsubscript{n}. (d) FK isomer of Gd@Au\textsubscript{15} and (e) a planar isomer of GdAu\textsubscript{15} with a capped hexagon.}
\end{figure}
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The Au–Gd dimer also has a magnetic moment of 7 \( \mu_B \). Therefore, Au–Gd bond is much stronger as compared to Au–Au bond. A similar behavior was obtained\(^{12}\) for metal encapsulated Si clusters in which the interaction between a TM atom and Si is much stronger as compared to Si–Si and this leads to cage structures of Si clusters. In our case the structure of the Au\(_{15}\) cage in Gd@Au\(_{15}\) is very different from the lowest energy structure of neutral Au\(_{15}\) which is planar as well as a low lying 3D isomer which lies only 0.13 eV higher in energy than the planar structure.\(^{13}\) Therefore, Gd doping affects the structure of Au clusters very significantly.

The electronic structure of Gd@Au\(_{15}\) as well as Au\(_{15}\) was obtained (1) by optimizing a Frank–Kasper (FK) isomer\(^{12}\) of TM@Si\(_{15}\) and (2) by adding two atoms to the structure of Au\(_{15}\)Gd obtained in the growth behavior of Gd doped Au clusters. The FK isomer [Fig. 1(d)] is stable at lower convergence of force but finally goes to the same structure [Fig. 1(a)] when accuracy of convergence is increased. The bucked structure of GdAu\(_{13}\) also converges to the lowest energy isomer [Fig. 1(a)] that has a central buckled ring of seven Au atoms and a Gd atom at the center [see Fig. 1(b)]. There are two slightly distorted squares, one on each side of this ring and rotated with respect to each other by about 45°. Interestingly the lowest energy atomic structure of Au\(_{2}\)Gd is nearly planar with a ring of Au\(_{7}\) and Gd at the center [Fig. 1(c)]. Gd atom being larger than a gold atom, favors seven Au atoms to form a ring around it. It is another magic cluster with a large HOMO–LUMO gap. Buckling of this ring provides better interaction with the two squarelike units of Au atoms in Gd@Au\(_{15}\). The gain in energy by doping a Gd atom in Au\(_{15}\) cage is about 9.5 eV. We also optimized the Au\(_{15}\) cage of Gd@Au\(_{15}\) to find if it is favorable for Au\(_{15}\). The optimized cage structure is a FK polyhedron and it lies 0.5 eV higher in energy compared with the planar structure.\(^{15}\) Further, doping of a Gd atom in planar structures [Fig. 1(e)] with a capped heptagon as well as a structure based on Au heptagon) leads to isomers that are about 3 eV higher in energy than the isomer in Fig. 1(a). Vibrational spectrum of the lowest energy isomer\(^{15}\) has all positive frequencies suggesting the stability of this cluster.

The binding energy of Gd@Au\(_{15}\), defined with respect to free atoms, is 2.641 eV/atom. It is higher than 2.222 eV/atom and 2.196 eV/atom for Au\(_{15}\) planar and a FK cage isomer of Au\(_{16}\) respectively. Therefore, Gd@Au\(_{15}\) is energetically much more stable than pure Au clusters of similar sizes. Also it has a high magnetic moment of 7 \( \mu_B \) and a large HOMO–LUMO gap of 1.31 eV within GGA that make it useful for multifunctional biomedical applications. The large magnetic moment in Gd@Au\(_{15}\) is nearly localized on Gd atom with only a small polarization around Au atoms as shown in Fig. 2. The localized nature of the magnetic moments and the fact that Gd atom is encapsulated in Au cage, make it very interesting for applications at the nanoscale.

The electronic structure of Gd@Au\(_{15}\) as well as Au\(_{15}\) cage in which the positions of the Au atoms have been kept the same as in Gd@Au\(_{15}\) and only the Gd atom has been removed is shown in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3(a) Gd 5s and 5p levels are not shown. The electronic structure of Au\(_{15}\) cage shows [Fig. 3(b)] a large energy gap after 18 electron counting, excluding the 5d electrons of Au atoms. Accordingly, the stability of Gd@Au\(_{15}\) cluster can be understood by considering a spherical jellium model in which fifteen 6s electrons of Au atoms occupy 1s and 1p states fully while the 1d states near Gd atom are only partially occupied leaving three holes. As Gd atom is trivalent, doping of a Gd atom leads to the stability of this cluster within 18 valence electron rule. The 4f electrons on Gd atom remain unpaired and contribute to the net magnetic moment of 7 \( \mu_B \) on Gd@Au\(_{15}\). The
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**FIG. 2.** (Color online) (a) Isosurface (value 0.148 e/Å\(^3\)) of the total electronic charge density. [(b) and (c)] spin-polarization isosurfaces (values per Å\(^3\)), respectively, for up- and down-spins of Gd@Au\(_{15}\). In (b) down-spin polarization [mustard color (light grey in print)] is seen around Au atoms but in (c) there is absence of down-spin polarization [viole-
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**FIG. 3.** (Color online) (a) Gaussian broadened (half width 0.05 eV) electronic levels of Gd@Au\(_{15}\). The 4f levels of Gd are marked. The red (dark grey in print) and green (light grey in print) curves are for up and down spin states, respectively. Notice a large HOMO–LUMO gap. (b) The Gaussian broadened electronic levels of Au\(_{15}\) cage with the Au atoms placed at the same positions as in Gd@Au\(_{15}\). There is a large gap after 18 valence electrons excluding the 5d electrons on Au atoms. The vertical line shows the HOMO. One can see some holes in the states just above the HOMO. Also there is redistribution of the Au 5d states after encapsulation of a Gd.
up-spin $4f$ levels of Gd lie in the energy range of the $5d$ levels of gold and hybridize significantly with the latter. In the spherical jellium model, the $1d$ orbitals of the $\text{Au}_{15}$ cage hybridize with the $5d$ orbitals of Gd while the $1s$ electrons get transferred to the unoccupied $1d$ states of the $\text{Au}_{15}$ cage as inferred from a state in the unoccupied region with predominantly $s$ character of Gd atom.

In Fig. 2 we have shown the electronic charge density as well as the difference in the electronic charge densities of Gd@Au$_{15}$ and the sum of the charge densities of Au$_{15}$ cage and an isolated Gd atom at the same positions as in the Gd encapsulated cage. From these results, we find a charge transfer from near the top of Au atoms and around the Gd atom to regions in between the gold atoms as well as between gold cage and the Gd atom—a reflection of some covalent bonding character in the cluster. These features of the bonding are seen in the electronic density of states. The up-spin $4f$ states lie in the energy range of $-10$ to around $-8$ eV while the unoccupied $4f$ down-spin states lie at around the energy of $-3.5$ eV within the HOMO-LUMO gap of the Au$_{15}$ cage as it can be seen in Fig. 3(b). The electronic states near the HOMO arise from Au atoms and are of $1d$ character in the jellium model. One can see a shift in some states in this region to higher binding energy in going from Au$_{15}$ cage to Gd@Au$_{15}$. Also the density of states corresponding to Au $5d$ levels gets affected after interaction with Gd showing significant Au $5d$–Gd $4f$ hybridization.

The HOMO-LUMO gap of Gd@Au$_{15}$ is underestimated within GGA and we expect the true value to lie in the red to infrared region and this makes Gd@Au$_{15}$ cluster interesting for cancer therapy. We also explored Gd@Ag$_{15}$ but the HOMO-LUMO gap is only 0.57 eV in GGA. Further other trivalent atoms such as La, Y, and Sc stabilize the cage structure of Au$_{15}$ but these clusters are nonmagnetic and have large HOMO-LUMO gap of about 2 eV within GGA. The presence of the down-spin $4f$ states of Gd within the HOMO-LUMO gap is significant and it makes Gd@Au$_{15}$ particularly attractive. The large magnetic moment can have dual advantage of potential application for MRI also.

In summary we have obtained from ab initio calculations a magic magnetic cluster of gold, Gd@Au$_{15}$ with a large HOMO-LUMO gap of 1.31 eV that can be useful for phototherapy of cancer cells. Furthermore there are large magnetic moments localized on Gd atom and this makes Gd@Au$_{15}$ also attractive for bioimaging. The magnetic moments in Gd doped gold clusters are only weakly sensitive to the local environment as both Au$_{15}$-Gd and Gd@Au$_{15}$ with very different structures, have $7 \mu_B$ magnetic moments. Therefore doping of rare earths and particularly Gd is better as compared to TM atoms to form magnetic nanostructures of gold. We hope our work would stimulate experimental realization of Gd@Au$_{15}$ cluster and exploration of its biomedical applications.
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13See supplementary material at http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.3491269 for Fig. S1 for the structures and Fig. S2 for the spectrum.