

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Fernández-Ramos, A. (2013). Correct Interpretation of How Tunneling Proceeds at Low Temperatures in the Proton Transfer Reactions Involving Thiotropolone: A Comment. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 52(32), 8204-8205. doi: 10.1002/anie.201303206,

which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201303206>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions

Comment on “Tunneling Governs Intramolecular Proton Transfer in Thiotropolone at Room Temperature”

Antonio Fernández-Ramos*

In their recent Communication,^[1] Jose and Datta have performed canonical variational transition state theory calculations with small-curvature tunneling corrections for tunneling (CVT/SCT)^[2] to describe the intramolecular proton transfer processes in thiotropolone (reaction **1**) and tropolone (reaction **3**). These authors conclude that at temperatures below $T = 240$ K proton transfer is faster in thiotropolone than in tropolone, and that for the former molecule tunneling represents about 99% of the total process even at room temperature. The present Correspondence shows that their CVT/SCT calculations are incorrect, and that the conclusions derived from those calculations are erroneous and easily refuted by basic arguments of how tunneling proceeds in a chemical reaction. The Correspondence also provides the correct interpretation of tunneling effects in reactions **1** and **3**. The same arguments are also valid for the deuterium transfer in the two compounds, and therefore they are not discussed here. Details about the CVT/SCT calculations are given in the Supporting Information.

In the SCT approximation quantum effects are calculated over the vibrational adiabatic potential. The profile of this potential is that of the free energy at $T = 0$ K. At this temperature the MPWIK/6-31+G(d,p)^[3] calculations yield activation free energies for tropolone and thiotropolone of 3.5 and 5.4 kcal·mol⁻¹, respectively, and those values remain almost unchanged with temperature. The calculated free energy of activation of **1** is compatible with the value obtained from NMR experiments of Machiguchi *et al.*,^[4] who estimated that 6 kcal·mol⁻¹ is the high limit for the free energy of activation at $T = 143$ K (solid state) and at $T = 333$ K (molten state). These authors also indicated that reaction **1** is very fast and with very little temperature dependence. However, Machiguchi *et al.* also noticed that the initial and final tautomeric species in thiotropolone are in the ratio of 58:42 with no temperature dependence. This ratio leads to a free energy of reaction of about 0.1 kcal·mol⁻¹ (almost a thermoneutral reaction). This result is not reproduced by the MPWIK calculations, which yield a practically temperature independent free energy of reaction of about 3.1 kcal·mol⁻¹ (the percentage of the reactants tautomer in thiotropolone is close to 100% even at $T = 333$ K). It should be noticed that the relative stability of the two wells has important consequences for the way the reaction proceeds at low temperatures, an issue I discuss below.

Reaction **3** is thermoneutral and tropolone is one of the typical examples for which the role played by quantum mechanical effects in the proton transfer process at low temperatures is well-known.

There is experimental evidence that this system exhibits splitting of the ground-state vibrational level. This is common for molecules with a symmetric double-well potential for which the wave function of the vibrational ground state is delocalized between the two wells. The wave function can penetrate in classically forbidden regions of the potential (tunneling effect) appearing at the products well. This resonance between the two wells caused by tunneling leads to splitting in the vibrational ground-state. For tropolone, the ground-state tunnelling splitting is $\Delta_0 = 0.97$ cm⁻¹.^[5] At the limiting case of $T = 0$ K, the thermal rate constant, k_0 , has a value which is proportional to the square of Δ_0 .^[6] For tropolone, the low-temperature limit CVT/SCT thermal rate constant^[7] predicts a value of $4.90 \cdot 10^9$ s⁻¹.^[8]

In this context, as shown in Figure 1, the Arrhenius plot of **3** consists of a low-temperature plateau at which most of the molecules undergo proton transfer from the zero-point energy level. At these temperatures the process is completely dominated by tunneling.^[9] As temperature increases, higher energy levels start to have substantial population, the regime of thermally-activated tunneling is reached and the Arrhenius plot curves. If temperature raises even more, both classical over-the-barrier and non-classical reflection start to take over. At high enough temperatures the classical transfer completely dominates and the Arrhenius plot straightens.




Figure 1. Arrhenius plots of the CVT/SCT thermal rate constants for reactions **1** and **3**.

In contrast with this picture, the MPWIK calculations predict that reaction **1** is quite endoergic, which is *incompatible with a low temperature plateau*. The reason is that at very low temperatures the molecules do not have enough energy to reach a level from which to tunnel to products and, certainly, *tunneling cannot proceed from the lowest vibrational level of reactants*, as claimed by Jose and Datta. It should be noticed that reaction **1** is different from the reactions described by Scheiner and coworkers^[10] and by Zuev *et al.*,^[11] since all those processes are exoergic and the molecules can tunnel from the ground-state vibrational level showing a low temperature plateau. However, for reaction **1** the calculated thermal rate constants go to zero as temperature decreases (Figure 1), and therefore reaction **1**

[*] Dr. A. Fernández-Ramos
Department of Physical Chemistry and Center for Research in Biological Chemistry and Molecular Materials (CIQUS)
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela
c/ Jenaro de la Fuente s/n, Campus Vida, 15782 Santiago de Compostela (Spain)
Fax: (+)34 881815704
E-mail: qf.ramos@usc.es



Supporting Information for this Correspondence includes the energetics of the studied reactions, as well as the CVT/SCT thermal rate constants and the SCT transmission coefficients for tunneling.

cannot be faster than reaction **3**. In fact, as expected, reaction **3** is *always faster* than reaction **1** in the range of temperatures from 0 to 333 K, and the Arrhenius plot of reaction **1** shows a pronounced temperature dependence, even at low temperatures. Thus, the correctly calculated CVT/SCT activation energies for reaction **1** at 143 and 333 K are 4.0 and 4.9 kcal·mol⁻¹, respectively, and the thermal rate constants are $5.12 \cdot 10^5$ and $3.07 \cdot 10^9$ s⁻¹, respectively. In any case these values show that the MPW1K level cannot mimic the experimental conditions.

The calculations do not support either the title claim that tunneling governs intramolecular proton transfer at room temperature in reaction **1**. The SCT transmission coefficient is 2.67 at $T = 298$ K and includes contributions of both tunneling (1.96) and non-classical reflection (0.71). Therefore, for reaction **1** tunneling contributes about 50% to the total forward flux to products. For reaction **3**, however, tunneling does dominate the proton transfer process, its contribution at room temperature being 82%.

In summary, the MPW1K electronic structure calculations fail to reproduce the relative stability of the two tautomers in reaction **1**, under which conditions the thermal rate constant goes to zero as temperature decreases. At the same time the Arrhenius plot calculated by CVT/SCT shows a strong temperature dependence which is at odds with the experimental interpretation. The calculations also show that reaction **3** is faster than reaction **1** at least till $T = 333$ K, and that the latter reaction is not dominated by tunneling at room temperature.


Received: ((will be filled in by the editorial staff))
Published online on ((will be filled in by the editorial staff))

-
- [1] D. Jose, A. Datta, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, 51, 9389.
 - [2] A. Fernández-Ramos, B. A. Ellingson, B. C. Garrett, D. G. Truhlar in *Reviews in Computational Chemistry*, Vol. 23 (Eds: K. B. Lipkowitz, T. R. Cundari), Wiley-VCH, Hoboken, NJ, **2007**, pp. 125-232.
 - [3] B. J. Lynch, P. L. Fast, M. Harris, D. G. Truhlar, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2000**, 104, 4811.
 - [4] T. Machiguchi, T. Hasegawa, H. Saitoh, S. Yamabe, S. Yamazaki, *J. Org. Chem.* **2011**, 76, 5457.
 - [5] K. Tanaka, H. Honjo, T. Tanaka, H. Kohguchi, Y. Oshima, Y. Endo, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, 110, 1969.
 - [6] V. A. Benderskii, D. E. Makarov, C. H. Wright, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, 88, 1.
 - [7] S. E. Wonchoba, W.-P. Hu, D. G. Truhlar in *Theoretical and Computational Approaches to Interface Phenomena*, (Eds: H. L. Sellers, J. T. Golab), Plenum, NY, **1994**, pp. 1-33.
 - [8] This value was obtained by using $k_0^{\text{CVT/SCT}} = \omega_0 P(E_0)$ (see Ref. [7]), where $P(E_0) = 4.7 \cdot 10^{-4}$ is the SCT tunneling probability at the vibrational ground-state and $\omega_0 = 351$ cm⁻¹ is the frequency of the reaction coordinate at reactants, taken as the lowest in-plane normal mode frequency of reactants.
 - [9] V. I. Goldanskii, M. D. Frank-Kamenetskii, I. M. Barkalov, *Science* **1973**, 182, 1344.
 - [10] D. Gerbig, D. Ley, P. R. Schreiner *Org. Lett.* **2011**, 13, 3526.
 - [11] P. S. Zuev, R. S. Sheridan, T. V. Albu, D. G. Truhlar, D. A. Hrovat, W. T. Borden, *Science* **2003**, 299, 867.

Quantum effects

A. Fernández Ramos _____
Page – Page

Comment on “Tunneling Governs Intramolecular Proton Transfer in Thiotropolone at Room Temperature”



This Correspondence provides the correct interpretation of how tunneling proceeds at low temperatures in the proton transfer reactions involving thiotropolone (reaction 1) and tropolone (reaction 3) (see figure). It also shows that the variational transition state theory calculations carried out by Jose and Datta (*Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2012**, 51, 9389), as well as their conclusions regarding these two processes are erroneous.

Supporting Information for the Comment on “Tunneling Governs Intramolecular Proton Transfer in Thiotropolone at Room Temperature”

Table of Contents:

- 1) Electronic structure calculations
- 2) Details on the CVT/SCT calculations

1) Electronic structure calculations

All the MPW1K/6-31+G(d,p) calculations for the proton transfer reactions **1** and **3** as well as the deuterium transfer reactions for thiotropolone (reaction **2**) and tropolone (reaction **4**) have been performed with Gaussian09.^[S1] These calculation results coincide with the ones reported by Jose and Datta with the exception that in the present work the harmonic frequencies have been scaled by the recommended factor of 0.962.^[S2]

Table S1. Some energetics parameters (in kcal/mol) for the proton transfer in thiotropolone and tropolone and their isotopically substituted species; V_R^\ddagger and V_P^\ddagger are the forward and reverse barrier heights, respectively, and $\Delta V_R^{AG,\ddagger}$ and $\Delta V_P^{AG,\ddagger}$ represent the relative energies between the vibrationally adiabatic ground-state potential at the transition state and the zero-point energy of reactants and products, respectively. The enthalpy of reaction at $T = 0$ K, $\Delta H_{R,0}^o$, is also listed.

	1	2	3	4
V_R^\ddagger	8.69	8.69	5.85	5.85
V_P^\ddagger	3.33	3.33	5.85	5.85
$\Delta V_R^{AG,\ddagger}$	5.41	6.37	3.48	4.23
$\Delta V_P^{AG,\ddagger}$	2.04	2.47	3.48	4.23
$\Delta H_{R,0}^o$	3.37	3.90	0.00	0.00

2) Details on the CVT/SCT calculations

All the CVT/SCT calculations have been performed with PolyRate version 9.7.^[S3] Although Table S2 lists the CVT/SCT thermal rate constants, it should be noticed that neither of the four reactions exhibit variational effects, so that the CVT/SCT and the TST/SCT thermal rate constants are equal.

Table S2. Calculated CVT/SCT thermal rate constants (in s⁻¹) for the proton transfer in thiotropolone and tropolone and their isotopically substituted species.

T(K)	1	2	3	4
143	$5.12 \cdot 10^5$	$1.2 \cdot 10^4$	$7.51 \cdot 10^9$	$3.07 \cdot 10^8$
173	$6.09 \cdot 10^6$	$2.5 \cdot 10^5$	$1.29 \cdot 10^{10}$	$7.22 \cdot 10^8$
240	$2.01 \cdot 10^8$	$1.9 \cdot 10^7$	$3.50 \cdot 10^{10}$	$3.64 \cdot 10^9$
298	$1.32 \cdot 10^9$	$2.0 \cdot 10^8$	$6.80 \cdot 10^{10}$	$1.06 \cdot 10^{10}$
333	$3.09 \cdot 10^9$	$5.6 \cdot 10^8$	$9.49 \cdot 10^{10}$	$1.79 \cdot 10^{10}$

Table S3. Transmission coefficients calculated within the SCT approximation for tunneling for the reactions listed in Table S2. The contribution of reflection to the SCT transmission coefficient is given in brackets.

T(K)	1	2	3	4
143 ^[a]	$3.70 \cdot 10^1(0.62)$	$2.48 \cdot 10^1(0.64)$	$6.54 \cdot 10^2(0.59)$	$3.74 \cdot 10^2(0.62)$
173	$1.38 \cdot 10^1(0.64)$	$9.07(0.67)$	$1.17 \cdot 10^2(0.60)$	$5.86 \cdot 10^1(0.64)$
240	$4.34(0.68)$	$3.12(0.71)$	$1.51 \cdot 10^1(0.64)$	$7.88(0.68)$
298	$2.67(0.71)$	$2.08(0.74)$	$6.28(0.66)$	$3.70(0.71)$
333	$2.22(0.72)$	$1.79(0.75)$	$4.47(0.68)$	$2.82(0.72)$

[a] For reactions 1 and 2 below $T \approx 140$ K the conventional way for calculating the transmission coefficient (as an integral) is no longer valid, and Eq. (24) of Ref. (7) of the Correspondence should be used instead.

References

- [S1] Gaussian 09, Revision B.01, M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, B. Mennucci, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, M. Caricato, X. Li, H. P. Hratchian, A. F. Izmaylov, J. Bloino, G. Zheng, J. L. Sonnenberg, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, T. Vreven, J. A. Montgomery, Jr., J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, J. Tomasi, M. Cossi, N. Rega, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, J. E. Knox, J. B. Cross, V. Bakken, C. Adamo, J. Jaramillo, R. Gomperts, R. E. Stratmann, O. Yazyev, A. J. Austin, R. Cammi, C. Pomelli, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K. Morokuma, V. G. Zakrzewski, G. A. Voth, P. Salvador, J. J. Dannenberg, S. Dapprich, A. D. Daniels, Ö. Farkas, J. B. Foresman, J. V. Ortiz, J. Cioslowski, and D. J. Fox, Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2009.
- [S2] I. M. Alecu, J. Zheng, Y. Zhao, and D. G. Truhlar, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2010**, *6*, 2872.
- [S3] Polyrate versión 9.7, J. C. Corchado, Y.-Y. Chuang, P. L. Fast, W.-P. Hu, Y.-P. Liu, G. C. Lynch, K. A. Nguyen, C. F. Jackels, A. Fernandez Ramos, B. A. Ellingson, B. J. Lynch, J. Zheng, V. S. Melissas, J. Villà, I. Rossi, E. L. Coitiño, J. Pu, T. V. Albu, R. Steckler, B. C. Garrett, A. D. Isaacson, and D. G. Truhlar, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 2007.