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> Abstract: In order to characterize and classify quantitatively the local topological structure of traditional fullerene graphs a new method has been developed. The concept is based on the introduction of a finite set of novel topological invarians called pentagon arm indices. The definition of pentagon arm indices is similar to that of well known pentagon adjacency indices, and their common features is that both of them characterize the local topological neighborhood of pentagons included in traditional fullerenes. It will be demonstrated that pentagon adjacency indices and pentagon arm indices together can be successfully applicable for preselecting the stable candidates of lower fullerene isomers $C_{n}$ with $n \leq 70$.
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## 1 Introduction

Fullerenes are defined as 3-valent (3-regular) polyhedral graphs having only pentagonal and hexagonal faces.

Methods for topological characterization of fullerene isomers have made a steady progress over the past decade and many calculations of stabilities of traditional and non-traditional fullerenes have been reported [1-14]. A promising trend in fullerene science is the employment of graph theoretical invariants for the characterization of combinatorial structure and prediction of their stabilities.

Several topological descriptors have been proposed to evaluate and classify the topological structure of fullerene isomers: the pentagon adjacency index $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ [1-4], the Wiener index $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{I}}$ [5], the resistance distance $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{T}}[5]$, the Kekulé structure count [6], the graph independence number [7], the number of spanning trees [8], the combinatorial curvature [9], the bipartivity measure of fullerene graphs [10], the occurrence number of different structural motifs in fullerenes [12-14].

In the majority of cases, for the stability prediction of lower fullerene isomers $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}}$ with $\mathrm{n} \leq 70$ the pentagon adjacency index $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ (the so-called minimal- $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ criterion) is used $[1,3,4]$. Determination of the pentagon adjacency index $N_{P}$ is based on the pentagon-neighbor signature $\left\{\mathrm{p}_{0}, \mathrm{p}_{1}, \mathrm{p}_{2}, \mathrm{p}_{3}, \mathrm{p}_{4}, \mathrm{p}_{5}\right\}$, where each entry $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}}$ $(\mathrm{k}=0,1,2, \ldots 5)$ counts those pentagons that have exactly k pentagonal edgeneighbors. From these data the pentagon adjacency index $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ can be simply computed:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}=\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{kp}_{\mathrm{k}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sum \mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}}=12$. It is obvious that $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ is also equal to the number of edges between adjacent pentagons, in other words $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ is identical to the total number of fused pentagon pairs in an isomer.

According to the minimal- $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ rule it is supposed that fullerenes which minimize $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ are more likely to be stable than those that do not [3-5]. Consequently, it is believed that the buckminsterfullerene is the most stable $\mathrm{C}_{60}$ fullerene, because this is the only one for which $N_{P}$ has a minimum value $\left(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}=0\right)$.

However in some cases the discriminating power (i.e. the efficiency of prediction) of $N_{P}$ index is limited. (The minimal- $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ criterion does not suffice to uniquely characterize the structure of fullerene graphs with identical pentagon adjacency indices.) Even some lower fullerene isomers $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}}$ with $\mathrm{n} \leq 70$ are characterized by the same pentagon adjacency index $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$. In such cases, using $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$, the accuracy of stability prediction is problematic. For example, among $\mathrm{C}_{66}$ fullerenes there are three isomers with the same lowest pentagon adjacency index ( $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}=2$ ), moreover, among $\mathrm{C}_{68}$ fullerenes there exist 11 isomers with $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}=2$.

In order to improve the efficiency of stability prediction, a novel three-variable topological descriptor denoted by $\Psi$ has been constructed. This includes the $N_{P}$ index, and additionally two other independent topological graph invariants as well. The construction of this novel descriptor $\Psi$ is based on the introduction of the socalled pentagon arm signature vector, whose components can be simply computed from Schlegel diagrams of fullerenes.

## 2 Pentagon Arm Indices as Graph Invariants

In a fullerene a pentagonal face $F_{p}$ has 5 vertices, and each vertex is incident to an edge not belonging to the pentagon under consideration. An edge E incident to a vertex of $F_{P}$ is called an arm of $F_{P}$ if i) both end-vertices of edge $E$ are incident to pentagons, and ii) E shares two neighbor hexagons. This definition implies that any pentagonal face may have $\mathrm{q}=0,1,2, \ldots 5$ arms. Let us denote by $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{q}}$ the number of pentagons having $q$ arms in a fullerene. It follows that each fullerene can be characterized by a pentagon arm signature vector $\left\{\mathrm{n}_{0}, \mathrm{n}_{1}, \mathrm{n}_{2}, \mathrm{n}_{3}, \mathrm{n}_{4}, \mathrm{n}_{5}\right\}$, where each entry $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{q}}(\mathrm{k}=0,1,2, \ldots 5)$ counts those pentagons that have exactly q arms. Starting with this concept, for an arbitrary fullerene we define a pentagon arm index $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}}=\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{qn}_{\mathrm{q}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sum \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{q}}=12$.
From this concept it follows that parameter $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}}$ is identical to the total number of edges whose end-vertices are incident to pentagons, and share two neighbor hexagons, exactly. It can be verified that for topological invariant $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{PA}}$ defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{PA}}=\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}+\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

the inequality $0 \leq \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{PA}} \leq 30$ holds [15]. Concerning the upper bound, it follows that for fullerene $\mathrm{C}_{20}$ (represented by the dodecahedron) $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{PA}}=30+0=30$, and for the buckminsterfullerene $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{PA}}=0+30=30$ holds. It is conjectured that for any other fullerenes the inequality $0 \leq N_{P A} \leq 25$ is valid. (For fullerene isomers $C_{30}: 1\left(D_{5 h}\right)$ and $\mathrm{C}_{50}: 271\left(\mathrm{D}_{5 \mathrm{~h}}\right)$ we have $\left.\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{PA}}=\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}+\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}}=25\right)$.

In order to construct the topological descriptor $\Psi$ and classify the fullerene isomers into disjoint subsets, we used the first and second moments $\left(M_{1}\right.$ and $\left.M_{2}\right)$ of pentagon arm signatures $\left\{\mathrm{n}_{0}, \mathrm{n}_{1}, \mathrm{n}_{2}, \mathrm{n}_{3}, \mathrm{n}_{4}, \mathrm{n}_{5}\right\}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{k}}=\frac{1}{12} \sum_{\mathrm{q}=0}^{5} \mathrm{q}^{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{q}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{k}=1$ and $\mathrm{k}=2$, respectively. From the previous consideration it follows that $M_{1}=N_{A} / 6$. By means of moments $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$, the variance of $q$ can be calculated as VAR $=\mathrm{M}_{2}-\mathrm{M}_{1} * \mathrm{M}_{1}$. It is easy to see that VAR $=0$ if and only if there exists a positive integer $0 \leq \mathrm{q} \leq 5$ among the components of pentagon arm signature vector for which $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{q}}=12$ holds. Starting with this concept, a fullerene is called balanced (more exactly $q$-balanced) if there exists a non-negative integer $q$ for which $n_{q}=12$ valid. This means that a fullerene is balanced if and only if, $\mathrm{VAR}=0$ holds. In Fig. 1 some examples are given for balanced fullerenes.


Figure 1
Schlegel diagrams of balanced fullerenes: a) 0-balanced $\mathrm{C}_{28}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ isomer, b) 5-balanced $\mathrm{C}_{60}\left(\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$ isomer (buckminsterfullerene) and c) 4-balanced $\mathrm{C}_{72}\left(\mathrm{D}_{6 \mathrm{~d}}\right)$ isomer

The 5-balanced and 4-balanced isomers illustrated in Fig. 1 belong to the family of IPR (isolated-pentagon rule) fullerenes. It is known that the number of IPR fullerenes (fullerenes with $N_{P}=0$ ) is infinite. Fullerenes with $N_{P A}=N_{P}+N_{A}=0$ are called strongly isolated fullerenes. This definition implies that strongly isolated fullerenes represent a subset of IPR fullerenes. The number of strongly isolated fullerenes is also infinite. In Fig. 2 the Schlegel diagram of a strongly isolated fullerene is shown.


Figure 2
Schlegel diagram of the strongly isolated fullerene isomer $\mathrm{C}_{80}\left(\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$
It can be verified that $\mathrm{C}_{80}\left(\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$ with vertex number 80 is the smallest strongly isolated fullerene. (See Fig. 2)

## 3 A Novel Graph-Theoretic Invariant for the Characterization of Fullerene Structures

In order to characterize the local combinatorial structure of fullerenes more efficiently, we defined the topological descriptor $\Psi$ as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi=\frac{30+6 \mathrm{M}_{1}}{1+4.5 \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{P}}+\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{M}_{1}, \mathrm{M}_{2}\right)}=\frac{30+\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}}}{1+4.5 \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{P}}+\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{M}_{1}, \mathrm{M}_{2}\right)} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{M}_{1}, \mathrm{M}_{2}\right)=\frac{\sqrt{\frac{120 \mathrm{M}_{2}}{1+7 \mathrm{M}_{1}}}}{1+0.9\left(\mathrm{M}_{2}-\mathrm{M}_{1}^{2}\right)^{1 / 5}}=\frac{\sqrt{\frac{120\left(\mathrm{VAR}+\mathrm{M}_{1}^{2}\right)}{1+7 \mathrm{M}_{1}}}}{1+0.9 \mathrm{VAR}^{1 / 5}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

For balanced fullerenes, (where VAR $=0$ ), coefficient $C\left(M_{1}, M_{2}\right)$ can be rewritten it the following simplified form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{M}_{1}, \mathrm{M}_{2}\right)=\mathrm{M}_{1} \sqrt{\frac{120}{1+7 \mathrm{M}_{1}}}=\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{A}} \sqrt{\frac{20}{6+7 \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{A}}}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

As can be seen, $\Psi$ is defined as a function of 3 algebraically independent graph invariants: the pentagon neighbor index $N_{P}$ and the moments $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$. It follows that for strongly isolated fullerenes $N_{P}=N_{A}=C\left(M_{1}, M_{2}\right)=0$, consequently in this case $\Psi=30$. The constants included in Eqs. (6 and 7) were estimated using numerical methods, as a result of analyzing the possible combinatorial structures and the energetic parameters of $\mathrm{C}_{40}$ isomers. This choice is explained by the fact that several topological descriptors have been already calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{40}$ fullerene isomers.

As it is known isomer C40:38 is predicted to be the $\mathrm{C}_{40}$ fullerene of lowest energy by many methods [3-5], this is followed by C40:39 and C40:31 isomers. It has been also shown that C40:38 fullerene has the lowest resistance-distance in the set ( $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{T}}=920,27$ ). Two $\mathrm{C}_{40}$ isomers (C40:38 and C40:39) have the smallest pentagon adjacency indices ( $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}=10$ ). Among the 40 isomers of $\mathrm{C}_{40}$, fullerene $\mathrm{C} 40: 1$ is the least stable isomer having the highest pentagon adjacency index ( $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}=20$ ) and the highest resistance distance ( $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{T}}=955.15$ ). In Table 1 we summarized the computed values of pentagon arm signatures $\left\{\mathrm{n}_{0}, \mathrm{n}_{1}, \mathrm{n}_{2}, \mathrm{n}_{3}, \mathrm{n}_{4}, \mathrm{n}_{5}\right\}$, the pentagon adjacency indices $N_{P}$ and the topological descriptors $\Psi$, for the forty $C_{40}$ isomers. (Each of isomers is labeled according Fowler and Manolopoulos [1]). Simultaneously, using Density Functional Tight-Binding (DFTB) method [16] we calculated the total energy values $Q_{C}$ characterizing the relative stability of isomers.

Table 1
Topological parameters and relative energies of the forty $\mathrm{C}_{40}$ isomers

| Isomer | Topological parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Energy, $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{C}}$ <br> $\mathbf{( e V )}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{n}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{P}}$ | $\mathbf{\Psi}$ |  |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 38$ | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0.8140 | $-342,031$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 39$ | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0.8106 | $-341,631$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 31$ | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0.7631 | $-341,438$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 29$ | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0.7628 | $-341,345$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 26$ | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0.7108 | $-341,094$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 24$ | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0.7102 | $-341,022$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 37$ | 4 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0.6744 | $-340,636$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 40$ | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.6924 | $-340,580$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 14$ | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.6715 | $-340,476$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 36$ | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0.6597 | $-340,431$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 30$ | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.6711 | $-340,304$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 25$ | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.6382 | $-340,277$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 22$ | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.6219 | $-340,230$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 35$ | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0.6597 | $-340,196$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 21$ | 6 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.6358 | $-340,151$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 27$ | 4 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.6219 | $-340,126$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 15$ | 2 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.6250 | $-339,943$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 17$ | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.5943 | $-339,884$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 34$ | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.5923 | $-339,827$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 28$ | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0.6358 | $-339,777$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 16$ | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.5943 | $-339,645$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 20$ | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.5772 | $-339,627$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 9$ | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.6075 | $-339,614$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 10$ | 6 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.5622 | $-339,558$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 12$ | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.5641 | $-339,370$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 13$ | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.5467 | $-339,347$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 19$ | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.5933 | $-339,292$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 23$ | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0.5313 | $-338,690$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 6$ | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0.4970 | $-338,624$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 18$ | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0.4987 | $-338,341$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 5$ | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0.5497 | $-338,332$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 32$ | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0.4843 | $-338,270$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 8$ | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0.4785 | $-338,113$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 33$ | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0.5132 | $-337,922$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 4$ | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0.4654 | $-337,348$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 7$ | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0.4670 | $-337,330$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 11$ | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0.4404 | $-336,642$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 2$ | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0.4262 | $-336,489$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 3$ | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0.3659 | $-335,193$ |
| $\mathrm{C} 40: 1$ | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0.3297 | $-333,806$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

These energies are also given in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, using the topological descriptor $\Psi$ we get the following trends of relative stability: C40:38 > $\mathrm{C} 40: 39>\mathrm{C} 40: 31>\mathrm{C} 40: 29$. This corresponds to the theoretical results based on ab initio calculations [3-5]. This finding confirms that topological descriptor $\Psi$ correlates highly with the computed total energy value $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{c}}$. Moreover, from Table 1 it can be seen that in the set of $\mathrm{C}_{40}$ fullerenes, there are three balanced isomers: C40:40 is 2-balanced, while C40:1 and C40:3 are 0-balanced isomers.

## 4 Comparative Tests Performed on a Set of $C_{66}$ Isomers

In order to test the discriminating power of topological descriptor $\Psi$, we used the sets of $\mathrm{C}_{66}$ isomers. The number of topologically different $\mathrm{C}_{66}$ isomers is 4478 . All of them were generated and sorted in terms of the calculated total energy values. Among $\mathrm{C}_{66}$ fullerenes there are 3 isomers with lowest pentagon adjacency index 2, and 26 isomers with $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}=3$.

Table 2
Topological parameters and relative energies of the forty lowest energy $\mathrm{C}_{66}$ isomers

| Isomer | Topological parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Energy,QQ } \\ (\mathrm{eV}) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{n}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{n}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{n}_{2}$ | $\mathbf{n}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{n}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{n}_{5}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{P}}$ | $\Psi$ |  |
| C66:4169 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3.4756 | -583.0067 |
| C66:4348 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.4214 | -582.8916 |
| C66:4466 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3.4214 | -582.7047 |
| C66:4007 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2.4369 | -582.3229 |
| C66:3764 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2.3537 | -582.3027 |
| C66:4456 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.3537 | -582.1878 |
| C66:4462 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.3557 | -582.1816 |
| C66:4060 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2.3479 | -582.1267 |
| C66:4141 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2.4423 | -582.1118 |
| C66:4312 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2.4871 | -582.0754 |
| C66:4439 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.3126 | -582.0316 |
| C66:3765 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2.3954 | -582.0278 |
| C66:3538 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2.3954 | -582.022 |
| C66:4447 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2.3982 | -581.9169 |
| C66:4458 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2.3937 | -5819087 |
| C66:4331 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2.3995 | -581.8906 |
| C66:4454 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.2279 | -581.8632 |
| C66:3824 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2.4783 | -581.8594 |
| C66:4434 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2.3937 | -581.8251 |
| C66:4369 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2.3479 | -581.8133 |
| C66:4388 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2.4862 | -581.8098 |
| C66:4410 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.2254 | -581.8034 |
| C66:4444 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2.3558 | -581.7878 |
| C66:4398 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2.2054 | -581.7731 |
| C66:4409 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2.3056 | -581.7640 |
| C66:4455 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2.3537 | -581.6897 |
| C66:3473 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2.5324 | -581.5661 |
| C66:4449 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2.4423 | -581.5501 |
| C66:4433 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.7236 | -581.4675 |
| C66:3961 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.7707 | -581.4670 |
| C66:4441 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2.4430 | -581.4669 |
| C66:4316 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.9179 | -581.4382 |
| C66:4297 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.8054 | -581.3990 |
| C66:4346 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1.8429 | -581.3902 |
| C66:4244 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.7303 | -581.3872 |
| C66:4313 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.8427 | -581.3737 |
| C66:4430 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.7236 | -581.3698 |
| C66:4381 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.7358 | -581.3404 |
| C66:4008 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.8415 | -581.3177 |
| C66:4349 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1.7698 | -581.2652 |

Table 2 shows the pentagon arm index signature, the pentagon adjacency index $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$, the topological descriptor $\Psi$, and the calculated total energy values $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{C}}$ for the 40 lowest-energy isomers. According to our results, and considering the computed values of $\Psi$, the most stable isomer is C66:4169, while the next two isomers with minimal energies are C66:4348 and C66:4466.

In these two latter cases the topological descriptor $\Psi$ is identical $(\Psi=3.4214)$. The calculated energies of top 5 isomers are in agreement with the results published in Refs. [17, 18].

In ranking the isomers, due to the larger amount of information included in $\Psi$ it was reasonable to expect that $\Psi$ performs better than $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{p}}$. According to experiments the discriminating ability of $\Psi$ is more efficient than that of $N_{P}$.

## Summary and Conclusions

In order to characterize and classify quantitatively the local topological structure of lower fullerenes $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}}$ with $\mathrm{n} \leq 70$ a simple method has been suggested. The concept is based on the computation of a finite set of topological invarians called pentagon arm indices.

For stability prediction purposes, a novel three-variable topological descriptor ( $\Psi$ ) has been defined. This includes not only the $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{P}}$ index, but additionally two other independent topological graph invariants $\left(\mathrm{M}_{1}\right.$ and $\left.\mathrm{M}_{2}\right)$ derived from the components of the pentagon arm signature vector.

To test and evaluate the discriminating power of $\Psi$ the sets of $\mathrm{C}_{40}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{66}$ fullerene isomers have been chosen. It was demonstrated that the proposed topological descriptor $\Psi$ is able not only to characterize the combinatorial structure of different fullerene isomers, but also to rank them in the order of decreasing stability.
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