# Supplementary Information

## Molecular Electrostatic Potential as a General and Versatile Indicator for Electronic Substituent Effects: Statistical Analysis and Applications

## Donghan Shin and YounJoon Jung\*

Department of Chemistry, Seoul National University, 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Republic of Korea

> E-mail: <u>yjjung@snu.ac.kr</u> Phone: +82 (2) 880-4369

### **Table of Contents**

Functional Groups Used in This Research: Description of Supplementary_Data.xlsx	S2
Linear Regressions Not Shown in The Main Text	S6
Corrected Parameters from Ref. 1	S27
Excluded Functional Groups for Calculations with LanL2DZ	S28
Linear Regression on Gasteiger Charge Shifts with Hammett Parameters	S29
References	530

## Functional Groups Used in This Research: Description of Supplementary\_Data.xlsx

Essentially, we use 423 substituent constants from the Hammett equation ( $\sigma$ ) as well as from the Swain-Lupton equation (F and R) well-organised in Ref 1. All of the information concerning them is described in the "Supplementary\_Data.xlsx" file. We list key quantities and abbreviations used in the .xlsx file. If there is no additional description for Pr and Bu, they will refer to n-propyl group and n-butyl group respectively.

 $\sigma_m$ :  $\sigma$  value which describes *meta*-directing effect of a functional group

 $\sigma_p$ :  $\sigma$  value which describes *para*-directing effect of a functional group

F: inductive parameters from the Swain-Lupton equation

R: resonance parameters the Swain-Lupton equation

 $\Delta q_{C,m}$ : averages of (unless there are additional marks) HPA (Hirshfeld population analysis) charge shifts of carbons on two meta positions.

 $\Delta q_{C,p}$ : HPA charge shifts of carbons on para positions.

 $\Delta V_{m}$ : averages of electrostatic potential shifts on two meta positions.

 $\Delta V_{p}$ : electrostatic potential shifts on para positions.

(All of the reference values of the shifts come from an unsubstituted benzene)

Functional Group Names	Structures	Functional Group Names	Structures
5-chloro-1-tetrazolyl	N~N II N~N N~N	1-(1H)-tetrazolyl	N~N N~N N~N
5-(1H)-tetrazolyl	N N N N N	5-hydroxy-1- tetrazolyl	N <sup>∽</sup> N <sup>N</sup> ∽N N∼N N∼N
C2N8S2H			
oxiranyl		2-thiacylopropyl	∽ S
1-aziridinyl	<sup>sof</sup> Z	2-aziridinyl	NH
N-methyl-3- oxaziridinyl	MeN	1-pyrroline-2,5- dione	0
3-chloro-1- pyrrolidine-2,5-dione		1-pyrrolidine-2,5- dione	0 0

2-benzoxazolyl	NO	2-benzthiazolyl	NS
2-benzo-4-thiopyronyl	o s	2- benzothiopyronyl	s o o o o o o o o o o o o o o
2-(benzo-1,4-pyronyl)		1-dibenzarsenyl	As
1-dibenzoarsoxyl	As=O	1-dibenzoarsazinyl	As
pyron-comp1		pyron-comp2	
imidazole-comp1		As-comp1	As N Me
1-(1,2(BH)10-C2H)	HB HB HB HB HB HB HB HB HB HB HB HB HB H	1-(1,7(BH)10-C2H)	H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H H
2-(1,7(BH)10-C2H)	HC HB HB HB BH BH BH BH BH BH BH BH BH BH	4-(1,7(BH)10-C2H)	HB, CH HB, BH HB, CH HB, BH HB, CH HB, BH HB, CH HB, BH HB, CH HB, BH HB, CH HB, BH HB, BH HB, BH



 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,NPA}$ : Charge shifts from natural population analysis<sup>2,3</sup>

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,AIM}$ : Charge shifts from AIM (atoms-in-molecules) population analysis proposed by Bader, R. W. F. (implemented in Multiwfn 3.7<sup>4,5</sup>)

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,LPA}$ : Charge shifts from Löwdin population analysis (LPA) <sup>6,7</sup>

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,VDD}$ : Charge shifts from Voronoi deformation density<sup>8,9</sup> (Multiwfn 3.7<sup>5</sup>)

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,CM5}$ : Charge shifts from CM5 (Charge Model 5), one of the variations of HPA to reproduce the reference dipole moments, proposed by Marenich, A. V. et al.

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,HPA-I}$ : Charge shifts from HPA-I (Iterative), a method to make weighing factors from HPA adjust the molecular environment via iterative self-consistent field scheme<sup>11-13</sup> (Multiwfn 3.7<sup>5</sup>)

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,ADCH}$ : Charge shifts from ADCH (atomic dipole moment corrected Hirshfeld population method<sup>14</sup>) (Multiwfn 3.7<sup>5</sup>)

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,Becke}$ : Charge shifts from Becke population analysis<sup>15</sup> (Multiwfn 3.7<sup>5</sup>)

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,MPA}$ : Charge shifts from Mulliken population analysis (MPA)<sup>16,17</sup>

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,PEOE}$ : Charge shifts from PEOE<sup>18–19</sup> (partial equalisation of orbital electronegativity, also known as Gasteiger charges, Multiwfn 3.7<sup>5</sup>)

 $\Delta q_{C,p/m,CHELPG}$ : Charge shifts from CHELPG<sup>20</sup> (CHarges from ELectrostatic Potentials using a Grid-based method)

Δq\_{C,p/m,CHELP}: Charge shifts from CHELP<sup>21</sup> (CHarges from ELectrostatic Potentials)

 $\Delta q_{c,p/m,MK}$ : Charge shifts from MK scheme<sup>22,23</sup>

 $\Delta q_{C,m,GC}$ : shifts of Gasteiger charge<sup>24</sup>

### Linear Regressions Not Shown in the Main Text

In the main text, we show  $R^2$  values and, for some particular cases, p values of being normal distribution obtained by Shapiro-Wilk test of linear regressions of representative values on experimental constants (Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4).

In this section, we will show all of figures of linear regressions used in the main text.

§ Plots for Shifts of HPA Charges







Shifts of HPA Charges ( $\Delta q_C$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) without Solvation)



Figure S2: Shifts of Charges from HPA in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) Calculation (No Solvation)



Figure S3: Shifts of Charges from HPA in MN15/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation

Shifts of HPA Charges ( $\Delta q_C$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (MN15/6-311++g(d,p) without Solvation)



Figure S4: Shifts of Charges from HPA in MN15/6-311++g(d,p) Calculation (No Solvation)

#### § Plots for Table 2



Shifts of MESP ( $\Delta$ V) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))





 $\begin{array}{l} \Delta V = (0.0526 \pm 0.0007)\sigma + (0.0009 \pm 0.0003) \\ (R^2 = 0.884) \end{array}$ 0.06 0.04 Shifts of MESP ( $\Delta V$ ) 0.02 0 -0.02 -0.04 -0.06 -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 1.5 Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ )

Figure S8: Shifts of MESP in B3LYP/6-311++g(3df,2pd) and SMD Calculation



Shifts of MESP ( $\Delta V$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ )



Shifts of MESP ( $\Delta V$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (MN15/6-311++q(d p) with Solvation (SMD))

Figure S12: Shifts of MESP in MN15/6-311++g(d,p) Calculation (No Solvation)



# Shifts of MESP ( $\Delta$ V) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (MN15/6-311++g(3df,2pd) with Solvation (SMD))

Figure S14: Shifts of MESP in MN15/LanL2DZ and SMD Calculation

Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ )



#### Shifts of MESP ( $\Delta V$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (MN15/aug-cc-pVTZ with Solvation (SMD))

Figure S16: Shifts of MESP in CAM-B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation



Figure S18: Shifts of MESP in PBE/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation

Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ )

0.5

1

1.5

0

-0.02

-0.04

-1

-0.5



Figure S19: Shifts of MESP in PBE0/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation



Shifts of NPA Charges ( $\Delta q_{C, NPA}$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))

Figure S20: Shifts of Charges from NPA in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation

Shifts of AIM Charges ( $\Delta q_{C, AIM}$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))





Figure S22: Shifts of Charges from LPA in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation

Shifts of VDD Charges ( $\Delta q_{C, VDD}$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S23: Shifts of Charges from VDD in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation





Figure S24: Shifts of Charges from CM5 in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation

Shifts of HPA-I Charges ( $\Delta q_{C, HPA-I}$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S25: Shifts of Charges from HPA-I in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation

Shifts of ADCH Charges ( $\Delta q_{C, ADCH}$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S26: Shifts of Charges from ADCH in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation

Shifts of Becke Charges ( $\Delta q_{C, Becke}$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S27: Shifts of Charges from Becke Population Analysis in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation



Shifts of MPA Charges ( $\Delta q_{C, MPA}$ ) vs. Substituent Parameters ( $\sigma$ ) (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))





Figure S29: Shifts of Charges from CHELPG in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation



Figure S30: Shifts of Charges from CHELP in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation





Figure S31: Shifts of Charges from MK Scheme in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation



 $\Delta q_{C, m}$  vs. F and R (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))

Figure S32: Double Linear Regression of Shifts of HPA Charges (of *meta* carbons,  $\Delta q_{C, m}$ ) on Swain-Lupton parameters (F and R) in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation Equation:  $\Delta q_{C, m} = (0.0307 \pm 0.0007) * F + (0.0132 \pm 0.0008) * R + (0.0004 \pm 0.0003) (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.894)$ 

 $\Delta q_{C, p}$  vs. F and R (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S33: Double Linear Regression of Shifts of HPA Charges (of *para* carbons,  $\Delta q_{c, p}$ ) on Swain-Lupton parameters (F and R) in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation Equation:  $\Delta q_{c, p} = (0.037_9 \pm 0.001_2) * F + (0.046_0 \pm 0.001_3) * R + (0.000_1 \pm 0.000_4) (R^2 = 0.897)$ 

 $\Delta V_m$  vs. F and R (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S34: Double Linear Regression of Shifts of MESP (of *meta* carbons,  $\Delta V_m$ ) on Swain-Lupton parameters (F and R) in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation Equation:  $\Delta V_m = (0.059_1 \pm 0.001_3) * F + (0.025_2 \pm 0.001_4) * R - (0.000_9 \pm 0.000_5) (R^2 = 0.896)$ 

 $\Delta V_p$  vs. F and R (B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S35: Double Linear Regression of Shifts of MESP (of *para* carbons,  $\Delta V_p$ ) on Swain-Lupton parameters (F and R) in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation Equation:  $\Delta V_p = (0.060_5 \pm 0.001_3) * F + (0.039_5 \pm 0.001_5) * R - (0.000_7 \pm 0.000_5) (R^2 = 0.913)$ 

 $\Delta q_{C, m}$  vs. F and R (MN15/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S36: Double Linear Regression of Shifts of HPA Charges (of *meta* carbons,  $\Delta q_{c, m}$ ) on Swain-Lupton parameters (F and R) in MN15/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation Equation:  $\Delta q_{c, m} = (0.0292 \pm 0.0007) * F + (0.0118 \pm 0.0007) * R + (0.0017 \pm 0.0002) (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.896)$ 

 $\Delta q_{C, p}$  vs. F and R (MN15/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S37: Double Linear Regression of Shifts of HPA Charges (of *para* carbons,  $\Delta q_{c, p}$ ) on Swain-Lupton parameters (F and R) in MN15/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation Equation:  $\Delta q_{c, p} = (0.037_3 \pm 0.001_1) * F + (0.045_0 \pm 0.001_2) * R + (0.000_9 \pm 0.000_4) (R^2 = 0.904)$ 

 $\Delta V_m$  vs. F and R (MN15/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S38: Double Linear Regression of Shifts of MESP (of *meta* carbons,  $\Delta V_m$ ) on Swain-Lupton parameters (F and R) in MN15/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation Equation:  $\Delta V_m = (0.057_4 \pm 0.001_2) * F + (0.023_7 \pm 0.001_4) * R - (0.000_0 \pm 0.000_5) (R^2 = 0.895)$ 

 $\Delta V_p$  vs. F and R (MN15/6-311++g(d,p) with Solvation (SMD))



Figure S39: Double Linear Regression of Shifts of MESP (of *para* carbons,  $\Delta V_p$ ) on Swain-Lupton parameters (F and R) in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation Equation:  $\Delta V_p = (0.059_3 \pm 0.001_3) * F + (0.038_3 \pm 0.001_4) * R - (0.000_0 \pm 0.000_5) (R^2 = 0.917)$ 



Figure S40: Distributions of Residuals from One-Parameter Plot and Two-Parameter Plots of HPA Charges (in B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation)



Figure S41: Distributions of Residuals from One-Parameter Plot and Two-Parameter Plots of HPA Charges (in MN15/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation)



Figure S42: Distributions of Residuals from One-Parameter Plot and Two-Parameter Plots of HPA Charges (in MN15/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation)

### **Corrected Parameters from Ref 1**

During the work, we found that some values from the Ref 1 should be replaced with values from other references<sup>25–27</sup>, which better explicate the chemistry of corresponding functional groups. Hence, we list replaced values from the Ref 1 in "Replaced\_Values" tab of the excel file, "Supplementary\_Data.xlsx".

### **Excluded Functional Groups for Calculations with LanL2DZ**

During the study, we find that LanL2DZ basis set cannot generate appropriate structures for some (particularly, hypervalent) compounds. Therefore, it is inevitable to exclude some functional groups depicted below for the regression.

§ SF<sub>5</sub>: compared to structures optimised with B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p), C–S bond length (1.97 Å vs. 1.85 Å) and S–F bond lengths (1.80 Å vs. 1.65 Å) are much exaggerated so that it implies much weaker bonds rather than expected.



Figure S43: Structure of PhSF₅ optimised using B3LYP/LanL2DZ

§ OSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>, NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>, N(SO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> and N(Me)SO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>: disruption of structures when attempt to make them optimised. LanL2DZ basis set has a fatal flaw that it cannot stably form structure of sulfonyl group.



Figure S44: Structures of PhOSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> before optimisation (Left) and after the optimisation using B3LYP/LanL2DZ (Right)



Figure S45: Structure of PhNHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> optimised using B3LYP/LanL2DZ



Figure S46: Structure of PhN(SO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> optimised using B3LYP/LanL2DZ



Figure S47: Structure of PhCH<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> optimised using B3LYP/LanL2DZ



Figure S48: Structure of PhN(Me)SO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> optimised using B3LYP/LanL2DZ

§ N=C(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>: According to a previous study investigating IR spectrum of PhN=C(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>, this kind of N-phenylimine structure should be strongly twisted at Ph–N bond<sup>28</sup> whilst another paper with MP2 calculation also suggested the dihedral angle of about 73 degrees at Ph–N bond.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, optimised structure with LanL2DZ in Figure S48 is not a feasible one so that we cannot obtain proper MESP shifts from the calculation with LanL2DZ.



Figure S49: Structures of PhN=C(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> optimised using B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) (Left) and optimised using B3LYP/LanL2DZ (Right)

## Linear Regression on Gasteiger Charge Shifts with Hammett Parameters

Since parameters required to compute Gasteiger charges have been defined only for some cases, namely carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen, oxygen, sulfur and halogens, it is not possible to obtain them from the majority of the functional groups used in our manuscript, such as  $-SF_5$ . Therefore, we tried to calculate the shifts of Gasteiger charges from 45 selected functional groups listed in the Supplementary\_Data.xlsx file with B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) along with SMD solvation model of ethanol. Figure S50 clearly shows that there is no linear relationship between the charge shifts and the Hammett parameters.



Figure S50 Shifts of Gasteiger charges for 45 selected functional groups using B3LYP/6-311++g(d,p) and SMD Calculation

### References

- (1) Hansch, C.; Leo, A.; Taft, R. Chem. Rev. 1991, 91, 165–195.
- (2) Foster, J.; Weinhold, F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1980, 102, 7211-7218.
- (3) Reed, A. E.; Weinstock, R. B.; Weinhold, F. J. Chem. Phys. 1985, 83, 735-746.
- (4) Bader, R. Atoms in Molecules: A Quantum Theory; International series of monographs on chemistry; Clarendon Press, 1990.
- (5) Lu, T.; Chen, F. J. Comput. Chem. 2012, 33, 580–592
- (6) Löwdin, P.-O. J. Chem. Phys. 1950, 18, 365-375
- (7) Löwdin, P.-O. Advances in quantum chemistry; Elsevier, **1970**; Vol. 5; pp 185–199.
- (8) Bickelhaupt, F. M.; van Eikema Hommes, N. J.; Fonseca Guerra, C.; Baerends, E. J. Organometallics. 1996, 15, 2923–2931.
- (9) Fonseca Guerra, C.; Handgraaf, J.-W.; Baerends, E. J.; Bickelhaupt, F. M. J. Comput. Chem. 2004, 25, 189-210.
- (10) Marenich, A. V.; Jerome, S. V.; Cramer, C. J.; Truhlar, D. G. J. Chem. Theory Comput. 2012, 8, 527-541
- (11) Bultinck, P.; Van Alsenoy, C.; Ayers, P. W.; Carbó-Dorca, R. J. Chem. Phys. 2007, 126, 144111.

- (12) Bultinck, P.; Ayers, P. W.; Fias, S.; Tiels, K.; Van Alsenoy, C. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2007**, 444, 205–208.
- (13) Van Damme, S.; Bultinck, P.; Fias, S. J. Chem. Theory Comput. 2009, 5, 334–340.
- (14) Lu, T.; Chen, F. J. Theor. Comput. Chem. 2012, 11, 163-183.
- (15) Becke, A. D. J. Chem. Phys. 1988, 88, 2547-2553.
- (16) Mulliken, R. S. J. Chem. Phys. 1955, 23, 1833-1840.
- (17) Mulliken, R. S. J. Chem. Phys. 1955, 23, 1841–1846.
- (18) Gasteiger, J.; Marsili, M. Tetrahedron. 1978, 34, 3181–3184.
- (19) Gasteiger, J.; Marsili, M. Tetrahedron. 1980, 36, 3219–3228.
- (20) Breneman, C. M.; Wiberg, K. B. J. Comput. Chem. 1990, 11, 361–373.
- (21) Chirlian, L. E.; Francl, M. M. J. Comput. Chem. 1987, 8, 894–905.
- (22) Singh, U. C.; Kollman, P. A. J. Comput. Chem. 1984, 5, 129–145.
- (23) Besler, B. H.; Merz Jr, K. M.; Kollman, P. A. J. Comput. Chem. 1990, 11, 431–439.
- (24) Gasteiger, J.; Marsili, M. Tetrahedron, 1980, 36, 3219–3228.
- (25) Jaffe, H. H. Chem. Rev. 1953, 53, 191–261
- (26) Romanenko, V. D.; Kalibabchuk, N. N.; Rositskii, A. A.; Zalesskaya, V. G.; Didkovskii, V. E.; Iksanova, S. V. *Chem Heterocycl Compd*, **1976**, 12, 753–757.
- (27) Exner, O.; Lakomý, J. Collect. Czechoslov. Chem. Commun., 1970, 35, 1371–1386.
- (28) Krauss, W.; Wagner-Bartak, C. Tetrahedron Lett., 1968, 9, 4799-4800.
- (29) Afonin, A. V.; Pavlov, D. V.; Ushakov, I. A.; Levanova, E. P.; Levkovskaya, G. G. Russ. J. Org. *Chem.*, **2013**, 49, 1117-1121.