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#### Abstract

Recently published theoretical results concerning the $\mathrm{NO}^{+}$and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+}$gas-phase affinities of a few selected molecules, as well as the correlation between the above quantities and the corresponding proton affinities, are examined in the context of the much larger body of experimental and theoretical data already reported in the literature. © 2000 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.
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Recently, one of the authors (G.C.), as part of a group including Torday, Santillán, Ciuffo, Jáuregui, Pataricza, Papp and Csizmadia, has reported a theoretical study of the $\mathrm{NO}^{+}$and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+}$affinities of selected bases aimed at evaluating the Lewis acidity of the cations [1]. Unfortunately, in that article no adequate reference, actually no reference at all, was given to the large body of experimental [2-17] and theoretical [4,17-26] studies published on the same subject. It appears that such an omission requires a brief comment aimed at presenting a more complete picture of the current status of the field.

In essence, in Ref. [1] the proton affinity (PA), the $\mathrm{NO}^{+}$affinity $\left(\mathrm{NO}^{+} \mathrm{A}\right)$ and the $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+}$affinity $\left(\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}\right)$ of six molecules, i.e. $\mathrm{RNH}_{2}, \mathrm{ROH}$ and RSH ( $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{CH}_{3}$ ) have been computed at the HF/3-31G

[^0]and $\mathrm{HF} / 6-31+\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{d})$ levels of theory. The results computed in Ref. [1] at the higher level of theory, $\mathrm{HF} / 6-31+\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{d})$, are compared in Table 1 with those of previous experimental and theoretical studies. Let us consider first the PA values. Inspection of Table 1 shows that all the computed values reported in Ref. [1] were available in the literature, being included in the comprehensive NIST database of gas-phase PA [27]. The agreement between the results of Ref. [1] and the currently accepted experimental PA is moderate, the discrepancies ranging from ca. $4-10 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, which is somewhat larger than those typical of current state-of-the-art theoretical methods [28].

The situation is nearly the same as regards the computed $\mathrm{NO}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ reported in Ref. [1]. In the first place, $\mathrm{NO}^{+}$A scales that extend to 28 [2] and 52 [5] bases, including biologically important molecules, such as thymine [5], and a $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ scale, including 18 bases [15] are available in the literature. Even

Table 1
Comparison of $\mathrm{H}^{+}, \mathrm{NO}^{+}$and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+}$affinities (kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$ )

| Species | PA |  |  | $\mathrm{NO}^{+}$A |  |  | $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\text { Reference }[1]^{a}$ | Experimental ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Theoretical ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\text { Reference }[1]^{a}$ | Experimental ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Theoretical | $\text { Reference [1] }{ }^{\text {a }}$ | Experimental ${ }^{e}$ | Theoretical |
| $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ | 214.47 | 204.1 | 204.0 | 26.31 | 33.2 | $36.3{ }^{\text {f }}, 30.7^{\text {g }}$ | 30.73 | 27.2 | $27.0^{\text {h }}$ |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 171.22 | 165.1 | 164.5 | 21.08 | 18.5 | $19.5{ }^{\text {i }}$ | 24.01 | 19.6 | $17.3{ }^{\text {j }}$ |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$ | 172.33 | 168.5 | 169.1 | 11.99 | 20.1 |  | 3.67 | 20.0 |  |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{NH}_{2}$ | 225.89 | 214.9 | 215.3 | 30.51 | 37.2 |  | 47.68 | 30.7 |  |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$ | 188.06 | 180.3 | 180.3 | 23.26 | 23.3 | $25.3{ }^{\text {k }}$ | 25.18 | 21.5 | $19.6{ }^{1}$ |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{SH}$ | 190.94 | 184.8 | 185.6 | 20.24 | 26.1 |  | 18.54 | 23.8 |  |

${ }^{a}$ Values computed at the HF/6-31+G (d) level of theory.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ From Ref. [27].
${ }^{\text {c }}$ From Ref. [28].
${ }^{d}$ From Ref. [5]. The data in bold characters are direct experimental measurements, those in italics from the $\mathrm{PA}^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{NO}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ correlation.
${ }^{e}$ From Ref. [15]. The data in bold characters are direct experimental measurements, those in italics from the $\mathrm{PA} / \mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ correlation.
${ }^{\text {f }}$ From Ref. [19].
${ }^{\mathrm{g}}$ From Ref. [20].
${ }^{\text {h }}$ From Ref. [17].
${ }^{i}$ From Ref. [4].
${ }^{\mathrm{j}}$ From Ref. [21].
${ }^{\mathrm{k}}$ From Ref. [18].
${ }^{1}$ From Ref. [22].
the $\mathrm{PA} / \mathrm{NO}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ and $\mathrm{PA} / \mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ correlations of Ref. [1] that include no more than 6 bases are not unprecedented, since, analogous correlations extended to some 50 [5] and 18 bases [15], respectively, are available in the literature. With regards to the accuracy of the computed $\mathrm{NO}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ reported in Ref. [1], inspection of Table 1 shows discrepancies from the published experimental and theoretical value that are smaller than in the case of PA, owing to the much smaller size of the quantities compared. Nevertheless, in certain cases, discrepancies do exist e.g. the $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$, computed in Ref. [1] at the HF/6-31+G(d) level of theory, amounts to $3.67 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, which is lower than the $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ of $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, computed to be 4.7 and $7.9 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, respectively, at higher levels of theory [25]. In view of the much higher PA of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$ than of $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, such a result can hardly fit $\mathrm{PA} / \mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ correlations, and contrasts with the much higher value, ca. 20 kcal -$\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, estimated from the available experimental $\mathrm{PA} / \mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+}$A correlation [15].

In summary, from a survey of the pertinent literature it seems fair to conclude that the current status of the problem related to the Lewis acidity of $\mathrm{NO}^{+}$and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+}$is far more advanced than outlined in Ref. [1]. Furthermore, it appears that accurate theoretical evaluation of $\mathrm{PA}, \mathrm{NO}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}$ calls for higher level methods than those currently available and that are conveniently applicable to relatively simple species, as those reported in Ref. [1].

## Acknowledgements

The financial support of Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR), and Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca Scientifica e Tecnologica (MURST) is gratefully acknowledged.

## References

[1] L.L. Torday, M.B. Santillán, G.M. Ciuffo, E.A. Jáuregui, J.

Pataricza, T.J. Papp, I.G. Csizmadia, J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem) 465 (1999) 69-78.
[2] W.D. Reents, B.S. Freiser, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 103 (1980) 2791-2797.
[3] M.A. French, L.P. Hills, P. Kebarle, Can. J. Chem. 51 (1973) 456-461.
[4] G. de Petris, A. Di Marzio, F. Grandinetti, J. Phys. Chem. 95 (1991) 9782-9787.
[5] F. Cacace, G. de Petris, F. Pepi, Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 94 (1997) 3507-3512.
[6] R. Farid, T.B. Mc, Mahon, Int. J. Mass Spectrom. Ion Phys. 27 (1978) 163-183.
[7] G. de Petris, F. Pepi, Chem. Phys. Lett. 285 (1998) 366-372.
[8] J.-P. Cheng, M. Xian, K. Wang, X. Zhu, Z. Yin, P.G. Wang, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 120 (1998) 10266-10267.
[9] L. Angel, A.J. Stace, J. Phys. Chem. A 10 (1998) 3037-3041.
[10] V. Ryzhov, S.J. Klippenstein, R.C. Dunbar, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 118 (1996) 5462-5468.
[11] L.S. Sunderlin, R.R. Squires, Chem. Phys. Lett. 212 (1993) 307-311.
[12] F. Cacace, M. Attinà, G. de Petris, M. Speranza, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 112 (1990) 1014-1018.
[13] G. de Petris, Org. Mass Spectrom. 25 (1990) 83-86.
[14] F. Cacace, M. Attinà, G. de Petris, M. Speranza, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 116 (1994) 6413-6417.
[15] F. Cacace, G. de Petris, F. Pepi, F. Angelelli, Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 92 (1995) 8635-8639.
[16] A. Ricci, Org. Mass Spectrom. 29 (1994) 55-56.
[17] M. Attinà, F. Ciliberto, G. de Petris, F. Grandinetti, F. Pepi, A. Ricci, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 115 (1993) 12398-12404.
[18] M. Aschi, F. Grandinetti, Chem. Phys. Lett. 258 (1996) 123128.
[19] S. Kulkarni, S.S. Pundlik, Chem. Phys. Lett. 245 (1995) 143149.
[20] M. Aschi, F. Grandinetti, Chem. Phys. Lett. 267 (1997) 98104.
[21] T.J. Lee, J.E. Rice, J. Phys. Chem. 96 (1992) 650-662.
[22] T.J. Lee, J.E. Rice, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 114 (1992) 8247-8257.
[23] M.-T. Nguyen, A.F. Hegarty, J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 2 (1984) 2043-2051.
[24] F. Bernardi, F. Cacace, F. Grandinetti, J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 2 (1989) 413-420.
[25] A.M. Bush, J.M. Dyke, T.G. Wright, J. Chem. Phys. 106 (1997) 6031-6038.
[26] K. Hiraoka, S. Yamabe, J. Chem. Phys. 90 (1989) 3268-3273.
[27] E.P.L. Hunter, S.G. Lias, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 27 (1998) 413-656.
[28] B.J. Smith, L. Radom, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 115 (1993) 48854898.


[^0]:    * Corresponding author. Fax: +39-06-4991-3602.

    E-mail address: cacace@uniromal.it (F. Cacace).

