Unexpected Strengthening of the H-Bond Complexes in a Polar Solvent Due to a More Efficient Solvation of the Complex Compared to Isolated Monomers
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ABSTRACT: It is generally assumed that hydrogen-bonded complexes are less stable in solvents than in the gas phase and that their stability decreases with increasing solvent polarity. This assumption is based on the size of the area available to the solvent, which is always smaller in the complex compared to the subsystems, thereby reducing the solvation energy. This reduction prevails over the amplification of the electrostatic hydrogen bond by the polar solvent. In this work, we show, using experimental IR spectroscopy and DFT calculations, that there are hydrogen-bonded complexes whose stability becomes greater with increasing solvent polarity. The explanation for this surprising stabilization is based on the analysis of the charge redistribution in the complex leading to increase of its dipole moment and solvation energy. Constrained DFT calculations have shown a dominant role of charge transfer over polarization effects for dipole moment and solvation energy.

INTRODUCTION

Solvation effects play an essential role in almost all chemical processes, including the formation and stability of supramolecular complexes. It is generally assumed that the stability of covalent complexes is only minimally affected by the character of a solvent. Contrary to these expectations, we found a surprising stabilization of complexes with a dative-character of a solvent. In particular, the stability of the complexes with solvents compared to stabilities in the gas phase. This observation was made by Reed et al., using NBO orbital analyses. These analyses, performed on several H-bond complexes, revealed a stabilization of the H-bond complexes due to the elongation of the X—H bond, which increases the X—H dipole moment and thus the dipole—dipole interaction between the proton donor and acceptor. The electrostatic interactions are thus responsible for the geometrical, energetic, and vibrational properties of the complex. As discussed by Coulson, it is necessary to include charge transfer (or delocalization effect) in the description of the complex. Although the concept of charge transfer (CT) in hydrogen bonding is somewhat unclear, its contribution to hydrogen bonding has been demonstrated by NBO orbital analyses. These analyses, performed on several H-bond complexes by Reed et al., revealed charge transfer from the lone pair of Y to the X—H antibonding orbital. The increase in electron density on the antibonding orbital weakens the X—H covalent bond and lowers the X—H stretching frequency. The insufficiency of the description of H-bonding (and other noncovalent interactions) using only electrostatic contributions and the importance of including contributions describing charge transfer/electron
delocalization has also been highlighted in recent papers of Murray and Politzer,22 and van der Lubbe and Guerra.23

Despite the ambiguity of the concept of CT in the H-bonding and in view of previous demonstrations of its applicability in the description of H-bonded complexes, we use the relative CT values for the explanation of H-bonded complex stabilities in various solvents. The effect of CT is further discussed based on the results of calculations in which its contribution is eliminated (see below for the constrained DFT calculations). Finally, the correlation/dispersion energy also has a non-negligible contribution to stabilizing H-bonded complexes.16 The solvent plays a dual role in the resulting stability of the complexes: it modifies the structure of all systems and also CT between electron and proton donors. Besides H-bond strength, modified CT also affects the electrostatic properties of a complex and thus its solvation energy. The overall stability of the complex in a solvent provided by association (equilibrium) constants or binding free energies comprises two contributions, H-bonding modified by solvent and changes in solvation energy. Our goal is to investigate the role of bulk solvents, not the specific interaction of the H-bonded complex with one or more solvent molecules. These so-called cooperative hydrogen bonding effects have been attributed to polarization, not charge transfer, and have been extensively studied in the past.24

In this work, we aim to study in detail, using experimental and computational methods, the effects of solvents on the stability of H-bonded complexes. First, we investigate the origin of the stability of H-bonded complexes in nonpolar and polar solvents. To avoid cooperative effects, only aprotic solvents were considered. Besides spectroscopic characteristics describing H-bonding, we also discuss the binding free energies or association constants. Two H-bonded complexes, 4-(phenylazo)phenol (PAP)···tetramethylurea (TMU) and FH···ethyamine (EA) (Figure 1), are considered in this study. In the case of the former complex, experimental association constants previously determined with UV/vis absorption titration25 and observed IR frequencies measured in different solvents are supplemented by us with the corresponding calculated values. Agreement between experimental and calculated binding free energies found for this complex justifies using calculated binding free energies for the FH···EA complex which cannot be prepared in the required 1:1 stoichiometry.

Methods

Experimental Section. 4-(Phenylazo)phenol was added to deuterated chloroform (CDCl₃) and tetrachloromethane (CCl₄) in 0.1 M concentration. The compound did not dissolve completely and a milky suspension was obtained. For the complex, tetramethylurea was added to the solution to the same (0.1 M) concentration, which resulted in a transparent solution. FTIR spectra were recorded on the Biotools ChiralIR spectrometer at 4 cm⁻¹ resolution, at room temperature, in a CaF₂ cell, using a 100 μm spacer. Spectra of pure solvents were subtracted as a baseline.

Calculations. The structures were optimized at the DFT-D level using the PBE0-D326,27 functional with zero damping and def2-TZVPP basis set.28 Using the same level, the Gibbs binding free energies (ΔG_cal₂₉) at 298 K were evaluated with the ideal gas approximation of the rigid rotor–harmonic oscillator. Effects of solvents were modeled with the COSMO solvation model.29 Solvent environments were characterized by their corresponding dielectric constants ε, gas phase (ε = 1), n-octane (ε = 1.9), tetrachloromethane (ε = 2.2), toluene (ε = 2.4), chloroform (ε = 4.8), dibromomethane (ε = 7.2), dichloromethane (ε = 8.9), and acetone (ε = 20.7). The validity of the implicit solvent model was verified using the explicit solvent model. The contribution of solvent to the overall stability was determined by the change of solvation energy (ΔE_solv), which corresponds to the difference between the solvation energies of the complex and separated subsystems, respectively. The solvation energy (E_solv) of the system in a particular solvent is determined as a difference between the energy of the optimized system in that solvent and the energy of that geometry in the gas phase. A negative value of ΔE_solv indicates that the complex is more stabilized by a solvent than the subsystems. Charge transfers were evaluated using the NBO analyses.30 All calculations were performed using Gaussian 16 program package.31

Charge transfer based on NBO atomic charges plays an essential role in the complex's characterization in the present paper. Although the whole concept of charge transfer in NBO analyses is not well-defined and its value depends on a computation strategy, we rely on our previous experience gained in the calculations performed on noncovalent complexes from S20, S66, and X40 data sets.15 In this study, we used the CT values determined by a Rezáč and de la Lande technique32 based on the spatial definition of molecular fragments using the superimposed electron density of isolated noninteracting fragments as a reference state. These benchmark CT values were closely correlated with the CT values based on NBO charges, justifying the use of the latter approach in the present paper.

Dipole moments of FH···NH₂Et and PAP···TMU complexes were calculated with and without CT. The latter dipole moment was obtained via constrained DFT calculations in which intermolecular CT is eliminated. The constrained DFT (cDFT) calculations33 were performed at PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP level using NWChem version 7.0.2.34 cDFT takes account of the effects of polarization and orbital relaxation using many-body wave functions describing localized charges. Such wave functions are achieved within DFT by revising the Kohn–Sham equations comprising a spatially dependent potential, whose strength is varied self-consistently to fulfill the constraint of the desired number of electrons localized on a given fragment.35

Explicit Solvent Models. We simulated the molecular dynamics trajectories using ORCA 4.2.1 code35 and visualized them using VMD 1.9.2 visualization software.36 All the simulations were performed at the PBE0-D3BJ/6-31G* level of theory. The simulations were performed up to 20 ps time scale. The step size was set to 1 fs, a Berendsen thermostat37 with a time constant of 20 fs was employed to control the temperatures. The temperature for all the simulations was set

![Figure 1. Optimized structures of PAP···TMU and FH···EA. Color code: C, gray; N, blue; H, white; F, cyan.](https://example.com/figure1.png)
at 300 K. Selected frames from the trajectories for both the solvents were then optimized at PBE0-D3/6-31G* level.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The IR spectra of PAP and the PAP···TMU complex in CDCl$_3$ and CCl$_4$ are shown in Figure 2. The spectra show a significant red shift of OH stretching frequency ($\Delta \nu$) in the PAP···TMU complex compared to isolated PAP. The increased values of the red shift, 434 cm$^{-1}$ in CCl$_4$ ($\epsilon = 2.2$) and 450 cm$^{-1}$ in CDCl$_3$ ($\epsilon = 4.8$), indicate a weakening of the intramolecular O···H bond, which increases with the increasing polarity of the solvent. Table 1 summarizes the optimized O···H bond lengths and calculated O···H stretching frequencies in the gas phase and various solvents. In addition, the frequency shifts due to the complex formation are also presented. A comparison of the calculated and observed frequency shifts shows a sizable overestimation of calculated values. However, the observed trend is well reproduced in calculations, justifying their use for discussion in our selection of solvents.

In the gas phase, the formation of the PAP···TMU complex with O···H···O motif lengthens the intramolecular O···H bond by 0.02 Å, further increased by up to 0.038 Å when switching to more polar solvents ($\epsilon > 7$, Table 1). The complexation is accompanied by the red shift of the OH stretching frequency, whose values gradually increase with increasing solvent polarity (see Table 1).

Simultaneously, the intermolecular H···O bond decreases from 1.700 to 1.597 Å, with $\epsilon$ values ranging from 1 (gas phase) to 20.7 (acetone). The corresponding stretching frequency shifts from 163 to 185 cm$^{-1}$. These findings indicate an enhancement of H-bonding in the complex in more polarized solvents.

Despite the above observations, the association constants determined by UV/vis absorption or $^1$H NMR show a decrease of more than 3 orders of magnitude with increasing solvent polarity$^2$ ($K_a$ ($\epsilon = 1.9$) = 2400 M$^{-1}$, $K_a$ ($\epsilon = 2.4$) = 230 M$^{-1}$, $K_a$ ($\epsilon = 4.8$) = 52 M$^{-1}$ and $K_a$ ($\epsilon = 20.7$) = 2 M$^{-1}$).

Table 1 and Table S1 also report the results of calculations of interaction energies ($\Delta E$), binding free energies ($\Delta G_{calc}$), and solvation energies ($\Delta E_{solv}$) obtained for various solvents. A good agreement between the experimental binding free energies ($\Delta G_{exp}$), determined from the reported association constants, with $\Delta G_{calc}$ values, shown in Figure 3, justifies their use to discuss the stability of the FH···NH$_2$Et complex in solvents (see below) for which the experimental studies are nonfeasible.

The values of the interaction energies of the complex decrease with increasing solvent polarity, from $\Delta E = -14.2$ kcal/mol in the gas phase ($\epsilon = 1.0$) to $\Delta E = -9.8$ kcal/mol in acetone ($\epsilon = 20.7$) in the COSMO model. The other solvation models also follow the same trend (Table S2). The values of $\Delta E_{solv}$ show that while the system is stable at room temperature in the gas phase, it becomes unstable in more polar solvents. The trend in solvation energies shows similar behavior, i.e., as the destabilization of the complex increases, the $\Delta E_{solv}$ decreases (see Table 1 and Figure S1). These changes correlate with a decrease in the SASA of the complex compared to the isolated subsystems, specifically by 25.0, 24.5, 22.7, 22.2, 22.0, and 21.9 Å$^2$ for solvents with increasing dielectric constant, i.e., in the range of 1 for the gas phase to 20.7 in acetone (Table S3). The other characteristics listed in Table 1, the CT in the complex and the values of intermolecular $r$(O···H) distances, explain these changes in solvation energies and the resulting destabilization of the complex as follows: With increasing hydrogen bond strength in polar solvents, demonstrated by the elongation of the intramolecular O···H bond and shortening of the intermolecular O···H bond, the charge transfer in the complex increases (cf. the CT values in Table 1 for optimized geometries (CT) and those in the gas phase (CT(G))). At the same time, SASA decreases (for the correlation between CT and $\Delta E_{solv}$; see Supporting Information, Figure S2) with the lengthening of the intermolecular O···H bond and so does the solvent stabilization of the complex as compared to results for the isolated subsystems. As a result, the stability of the complex decreases with increasing solvent polarity.

The intramolecular F···H and intermolecular FH···N hydrogen bonds in the FH···NH$_2$Et complex (see Figure 1 and Table 1) show the same trends as in the case of the PAP···TMU complex, but the solvent effect is much greater. The F···H bond lengths by 0.047 and 0.129 Å in the gas phase and acetone, respectively, and the FH···N bond shortens by 0.233 Å in the acetone solvent compared to the gas phase. The formation of the H-bond is reflected by a very large red shift of the F···H stretching frequency (1000 cm$^{-1}$) which further increases in acetone solvent (2402 cm$^{-1}$). The strengthening of the H-bond is also reflected by the large blue shift of intermolecular H···N stretching frequency (by 47 cm$^{-1}$) in acetone solvent. The interaction energies of both complexes are comparable in the gas phase. Unlike the PAP···TMU complex, the interaction in FH···NH$_2$Et strengthens with the increasing polarity of the solvent (cf. $\Delta E$ values of $-15.8$ kcal/mol in the gas phase to $-17.4$ kcal/mol in acetone and $\Delta G_{calc}$ of $-5.9$ kcal/mol in the gas phase and $-7.6$ kcal/mol in acetone, respectively, Table 1 and Table S1). Although the SASA of the FH···NH$_2$Et decreases compared to the isolated subsystems, as in the case of the PAP···TMU, the changes in the solvation energies demonstrate a larger contribution to the overall FH···NH$_2$Et stability in a solvent. Thus, in the case of the FH···NH$_2$Et, the polarity of the solvent affects the stability of the hydrogen-bonded complex in a way not previously reported: the stability of the complex becomes greater with increasing solvent polarity. The explanation for this surprising
behavior lies in the dipole moment and CT values (Table 1), which are significantly larger than those of PAP--TMU already in the gas and increase much more significantly in solvents. Table 1 also displays the values of F--H distances and stretching frequencies calculated using constrained DFT, showing that when the CT is suppressed, the changes upon complexation are about an order of magnitude smaller in all cases. In addition, the calculated dipole moment values obtained through nonconstrained and constrained DFT calculations indicate that CT has a major contribution to the transition from the complex, and this effect increases by 3.8 kcal/mol in the more illustrative: In the first calculations, solvation stabilizes the complex, and this destabilization increases to 4.0 kcal/mol when CT is neglected (constrained DFT). The calculations modeling the solvent control were based on a continuous solvent model, where the solvent is characterized by 3.3 kcal/mol more in acetone than in n-octane. Similar for the PAP--TMU complex, the transition from n-octane to acetone solvation destabilizes the complex (by 2.2 kcal/mol), and this destabilization increases to 4.0 kcal/mol when CT is neglected (constrained DFT).

The calculated values using constrained DFT method are given in italics. The dielectric constant (ε) of each solvent is given in parentheses.

**Figure 3.** Correlation between ΔG_{exp} (calculated from the reported association constants) and ΔG_{calc} for PAP--TMU. The values are in kcal/mol.

---

Table 1. Interaction Energies (ΔE), Free Energies (ΔG_{calc}), and Solvation Energies (ΔE_{solv}) in kcal/mol, Charge Transfer in Corresponding Medium (CT) and Charge Transfer of Gas-Phase Geometry in Corresponding Medium (CT(G)) in electrons, Frequency of the Intramolecular O--H and F--H Bonds in the Monomer (ν_{str}(O--H), ν_{str}(F--H)), Difference in Frequency of the Intramolecular O--H and F--H Bonds in the Monomer and Complex (Δν), Frequency of the Intermolecular H--O Bond (ν(H--O)) and Intermolecular H···N Bond (ν(H···N)) in cm⁻¹, Intramolecular O--H and F--H Bond Lengths for Monomer (r(O--H), r(F--H)), Difference in Distance of the Intramolecular O--H and F--H Bonds in Monomer and Complex (Δr), and Intermolecular r(H···O) and r(H···N) bond lengths in Å.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>ΔE</th>
<th>ΔG_{calc}</th>
<th>ΔE_{solv}</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>CT(G)</th>
<th>Δν</th>
<th>ν_{str}(O--H)/Δν</th>
<th>ν_{str}(H···N)/Δr</th>
<th>ν_{str}(H···N)/Δr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gas</td>
<td>−14.2</td>
<td>−2.2</td>
<td>−0.048</td>
<td>−0.048</td>
<td>3877/488</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.959/0.024</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-octane (ε = 1.9)</td>
<td>−12.2</td>
<td>−0.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>−0.058</td>
<td>3857/633</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.961/0.030</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCl₄ (ε = 2.2)</td>
<td>−11.9</td>
<td>−0.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>−0.060</td>
<td>3854/659</td>
<td>3605/434</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.961/0.031</td>
<td>1.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toluene (ε = 2.4)</td>
<td>−11.8</td>
<td>−0.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>−0.061</td>
<td>3852/661</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.961/0.032</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDCl₃ (ε = 4.8)</td>
<td>−10.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>−0.066</td>
<td>3840/727</td>
<td>3590/449</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0.962/0.034</td>
<td>1.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dibromomethane (ε = 7.2)</td>
<td>−10.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>−0.069</td>
<td>3835/756</td>
<td>3590/449</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.962/0.036</td>
<td>1.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dichloromethane (ε = 8.9)</td>
<td>−10.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>−0.070</td>
<td>3834/765</td>
<td>3590/449</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0.963/0.038</td>
<td>1.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acetone (ε = 20.7)</td>
<td>−9.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>−0.072</td>
<td>3829/785</td>
<td>3590/449</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.963/0.037</td>
<td>1.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gas</td>
<td>−15.8</td>
<td>−5.9</td>
<td>−0.084</td>
<td>−0.084</td>
<td>4155/1000</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0.918/0.047</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-octane (ε = 1.9)</td>
<td>−16.2</td>
<td>−6.2</td>
<td>−0.6</td>
<td>−0.117</td>
<td>4112/1418</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>0.920/0.068</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCl₄ (ε = 2.2)</td>
<td>−16.3</td>
<td>−6.3</td>
<td>−0.9</td>
<td>−0.124</td>
<td>4105/1501</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>0.921/0.072</td>
<td>1.522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toluene (ε = 2.4)</td>
<td>−16.3</td>
<td>−6.3</td>
<td>−1.0</td>
<td>−0.126</td>
<td>4102/1538</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>0.921/0.074</td>
<td>1.516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chloroform (ε = 4.8)</td>
<td>−16.8</td>
<td>−6.8</td>
<td>−2.2</td>
<td>−0.155</td>
<td>4078/1915</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.922/0.097</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dibromomethane (ε = 7.2)</td>
<td>−17.0</td>
<td>−7.1</td>
<td>−2.9</td>
<td>−0.169</td>
<td>4069/2100</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>0.923/0.108</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dichloromethane (ε = 8.9)</td>
<td>−17.1</td>
<td>−7.3</td>
<td>−3.2</td>
<td>−0.175</td>
<td>4065/2178</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>0.923/0.113</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acetone (ε = 20.7)</td>
<td>−17.4</td>
<td>−7.6</td>
<td>−4.2</td>
<td>−0.192</td>
<td>4057/2402</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0.924/0.129</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ΔG_{calc} (kcal/mol) and ΔG_{solv} (kcal/mol) for PAP--TMU. The values are in kcal/mol.
by its dielectric constant. A more reliable explicit solvent model provided similar results, as shown by the results obtained for the implicit model and the results of molecular dynamics (MD) simulations FH···NH$_3$ complex (Figure S3). The intermolecular CT $\Delta$E$_{\text{CT}}$ = -0.072 e predicted in the gas phase increased to $\sim$0.116 and $\sim$0.154 e in CS$_2$ and CCl$_2$H$_2$, respectively, using implicit solvent calculations. MD simulations, performed in vacuo and embedded in a cluster of 20 molecules of CS$_2$ and 20 molecules of CCl$_2$H$_2$ provided very similar values of $\sim$0.090 and $\sim$0.144 e. Similarly, the intermolecular N···H distance decreased from 1.666 Å (gas phase) to 1.549 Å (CS$_2$) and 1.470 Å (CCl$_2$H$_2$), respectively, in the calculations with implicit solvent. By comparison, the explicit model provided qualitatively comparable values of 1.695, 1.530, and 1.230 Å, respectively.

### CONCLUSIONS

The increasing polarity of the solvent results in the well-known enhancement of intermolecular bond strength in hydrogen-bonded complexes, demonstrated in the IR spectra by the increased red shift of OH stretching and blue shift of intermolecular H···Y stretching frequency. Simultaneously, with the strengthening of the hydrogen bond, the surface area reachable by the solvent decreases, resulting in changes in the stability of the complex. In this work, we have shown that in addition to the expected destabilization in solvents, a surprising stabilization can be observed even though the SASA decreases.

This surprising observation can be explained based on the charge transferred during complex formation. This magnitude always increases as the solvent becomes more polar. In the case of PAP···TMU, in the formation of which charge transfer occurs only marginally, the destabilization due to the lower SASA value prevails. In the case of FH···NH$_3$Et, the charge transfer due to complexation is already significant in the gas phase and further increases in the solvent. This leads to a relatively large dipole moment in the complex, which results in its stabilization in a solvent. Constrained DFT calculations have shown that the significant increase in the solvation energy of the complex in polar solvents is due to CT and not polarization. Our results indicate that there exists some borderline (estimated in the present study ranging approximately $\sim$0.05 to $\sim$0.08 e, based on DFT-D3/PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP NBO charges) at which the solvent stabilizes/destabilizes a hydrogen-bonded complex, providing a 2-fold role of the solvent. The present study provides an additional piece of information on the complex role of the solvent on the stability of covalent/dative and noncovalent systems.
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