Workshop: "Environmental Redox: Fundamental Aspects of Electron and Atom Transfer in Solution" PNNL, 21-22 Sept 1998

Chemistry and Metal Ions in Water: Calculations and 'Quasi-Chemical Theories' of Solution Chemistry

R. L. Martin, P. J. Hay, and L. R. Pratt

See: R. L. Martin, P. J. Hay, and L. R. Pratt, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **102**, 3565-3573 (1998): "Hydrolysis of ferric ion in water and conformational equilibrium."



Theory:

- Electronic structure: metal ions + inner solvation shell
- Hydration: inner solvation shell + dielectric
 - → "quasi-chemical" theories.

Some examples:

- Hydration and hydrolysis of hexa-aquoferric ion
- Water self-ionization (used everywhere)
- Standard electrode potentials, ferrous-ferric, and actinyl ions

Hydration theory and electronic structure calculations

- Status of dielectric approaches
- Quasi-chemical approximation

Dielectric Model Output to electronic structure calculatons



 $\nabla \bullet \mathbf{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{r}) = -4\pi \rho(\mathbf{r})$



calibration: pK_W











- calculated free energy change +2 kcal/mol (3 kcal/mol experiment) ... <u>up</u>hill.
- the gas phase reaction is <u>down</u>hill about 148 kcal/mol., the liquid effects favor the reactants by about 150 kcal/mol.

 $Fe(H_2O)_6^{3+} + H_2O \iff Fe(H_2O)_5(OH)^{2+} + H_3O^+$

second hydrolysis

- several isomers (pictures next!), outer-sphere complex has a low energy
- calculated free energy 16-18 kcal/mol (experiment: 5 kcal/mol)
- conformational entropy?

 $Fe(H_2O)_5(OH)^{2+} + H_2O \Longleftrightarrow Fe(H_2O)_4(OH)_2^+ + H_3O^+$

isomeric structures for Fe(H₂O)₄(OH)₂⁺





Uranyl hydrolysis



$OUO_2(H_2O)_5^{2+}$

- actinide ECP's have been generated: P. J.
 Hay, R. L. Martin, J. Chem. Phys. 109, 3875 (1998)
- similar (rough) agreement with experiment,
 i.e., within about 15 kcal/mol.
- experimentalists are willing to entertain some argument whether the hydration number (5 above) is perfectly known.
- uncertainties begin to pile-up here on the theoretical side too.



Hydration structures and actinides



Other antinide structures have been studied,[†] e.g., NpO₂⁺ ... 18-crown-6



 [†] other actinide complexes: G. Schreckenbach, R. L. Martin, P. J. Hay, *Inorg. Chem.* 37, 4442 (1998).

Standard electrode potentials

Set-up consistent with formulation for proton transfer, i.e., for ferricferrous:

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)H_2(g) + Fe\left(H_2O\right)_6^{3+} + H_2O \iff Fe\left(H_2O\right)_6^{2+} + H_3O^+$$

 $\mathbf{E}^{(0)} = -\Delta \mathbf{G}^{(0)}/\mathbf{n}F$

Fe³⁺ - Fe²⁺: 0.76 V (vs. 0.77 V, experiment[†])

† Chemical Analysis, Laitinen, p. 280

For actinyls, AnO₂²⁺





experimental values are volts lower (0.1V for UO₂²⁺); remember that the hydration number (5) deserves further consideration and no spinorbit effects have been included





- As we move away from that wellknown case, the agreement with experimental thermochemistry appears to deteriorate. Several reasons for this deterioration are available, assessment of the various possiblities is preliminary only.
- Maybe we need a definition of a next test case for theoretical and experimental study.
- Next topic here is hydration theory ...

Dielectric Model

 "Everything should be made as simple as possible, but no simpler." A. Einstein



$$\nabla \bullet \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{r}) = -4\pi \boldsymbol{\rho}(\mathbf{r})$$

Dielectric Model



- physical can be derived from a Hamiltonian. (in more than one way!)
- practical reasonably treats huge effects that can't be ignored
- chemical can simultaneously include reasonable chemistry
- empirical parameterizations (radii) are not unreasonable

con:

- careful, molecular scale validation is MIXED
- often 100% empirical parameters (radii) must be reconsidered for EVERY new result; results are sensitive to parameters and any physical result (correct or not) can be reproduced

Hydration theory

Hydrophilic (electrostatic)

- "Molecular theories and simulation of ions and polar molecules in water," Hummer, Pratt, & Garcia, LA-UR-98-1947, feature article J. Phys. Chem. A (in press 1998).
 - » electrostatic interactions & the thermodynamic limit: "Ewald is an easy way to get it right."
 - » physical conclusions: how, where do dielectric models really fail.
 - » theories: perturbation theory, multigaussian, quasi-chemical.
- "Quasi-chemical theories of associated liquids," Pratt & LaViolette, *Molec. Phys.* 94, 909 (1998).
 - » genesis: Guggenheim, Bethe (1935) and cooperative phenomena.
 - » theoretical scheme for inclusion of molecular chemistry in hydration problems.

Physical conclusions from simulations

Dielectric models of hydration fail on a molecular scale when proton (H) structures near the solute lead to non-gaussian fluctuations of electrostatic potentials

easiest examples to get "right" are classic cations, e.g. Na⁺

- neutral, polar, H-bonding molecules, e.g. H₂O or imidazole are more difficult cases for dielectric models when tested on a molecular scale. However, hydration free energies are smaller than for ions.
- negative ions are again a problem and the hydration free energies will be large.
 But here chemistry will be more important also for negative ions of first importance, *e.g.* HCO₃⁻.





How to test?

• Dielectric models are simplified ...

- second order perturbation theory,
- or (equivalently) linear response,
- or (equivalently) gaussian fluctuation of electrostatic potentials.

For a spherical ion

– Born model

$$\Delta \mu = -\frac{q^2}{2R} \left(\frac{\varepsilon - 1}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

second order perturbation theory

$$\Delta \mu = \Delta \mu_0 + q \langle \Phi \rangle_0 - \frac{\beta q^2}{2} \langle \delta \Phi^2 \rangle_0$$

 Test those approaches and avoid the issue of empirical adjustment of radii.





 "One of the principal objects of theoretical research in my department of knowledge is to find the point of view from which the subject appears in its greatest simplicity." J. W. Gibbs

Quasi-chemical formulation

$$X^{z-} + W \stackrel{K_1}{\Leftrightarrow} XW^{z-}$$

$$XW^{z-} + W \stackrel{K_2/K_1}{\Leftrightarrow} XW_2^{z-}$$

$$XW_2^{z-} + W \stackrel{K_3/K_2}{\Leftrightarrow} XW_3^{z-}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$XW_{n-1}^{z-} + W \stackrel{K_n/K_{n-1}}{\Leftrightarrow} XW_n^{z-}$$

$$\mu_{X^{Z^{-}}} = RT \ln \left[\frac{\rho_{X^{Z^{-}}}}{(q_{X^{Z^{-}}} / V)} \right]$$

$$-RT \ln p_{0}$$

$$-RT \ln \left[\sum_{n=0} k_{n}^{f} \rho_{W}^{n} \right]$$

electrostatics,
entropy.

 p₀=probability of an open cavity for the cluster volume, *e.g.* (1-ρv), entropy too.

extended molecules?





Conclusions: hydration theory and chemistry

- Dielectric models for hydration breakdown first because of near neighbor protons that lead to nongaussian fluctuations of electrostatic potentials.
- Explicit consideration of near neighbor water molecules as in multigaussian models[†] repairs (not for negative ions) this primary failure of dielectric models.
 - G. Hummer, L. R. Pratt, and A. E. Garcia, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 118, 8523 (1997): "Multistate gaussian model for polar and ionic hydration ."
- Quasi-chemical approaches again treat near neighbor water molecules specially but permit straightforward application of electronic structure calculations on inner solvation shells. This should also fix problems with negative ions.