Published in final edited form as:

J Phys Chem A. 2009 May 21; 113(20): 5993–5997. doi:10.1021/jp9001324.

Deciphering the NMR fingerprints of the Disordered System with Quantum Chemical Studies

Yan Ling and Yong Zhang

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5043, Hattiesburg, MS 39406, USA

Abstract

Recent developments in solid-state NMR techniques helped acquire high-resolution NMR spectra for solid systems with structural disorder. But the structural origin of the observed chemical shift nonequivalence in these systems has not been revealed. We report a quantum chemical investigation of the solid-state NMR spectrum in *N,N*-bis-(diphenylphosphino)-*N*-((*S*)- α -methylbenzyl)amine, where eight nonequivalent ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts were resolved with a range of 13.0 ppm. Results from using different quantum chemical methods, computational algorithms, intermolecular effects, and structures indicate that for the disordered system, geometry optimization give the best accord with experimental NMR chemical shifts, which has a theory-versus-experiment correlation $R^2=0.949$ and $\text{SD}=1.1$ ppm, or $R^2=0.994$ and $\text{SD}=0.4$ ppm when the average of two unassigned NMR shifts for each molecule is used. In addition, these calculations indicate that the experimental chemical shift nonequivalence in this system is mainly a consequence of the different geometries around the phosphorus atoms due to disordered environments. The experimental ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts are well correlated ($R^2=0.981$) with two conformation angles and one bond length, each associated with one of the three bonding interactions around the phosphorus atoms. These results will facilitate the use of quantum chemical techniques in structural characterization of disordered solids and elucidation of NMR properties.

Introduction

NMR spectroscopy is a powerful technique that can provide fingerprints of molecular and biomolecular structures as well as the associated structural changes. Recent developments in solid-state NMR spectroscopy have advanced these studies to many disordered solid systems, such as fibrils of proteins,^{1, 2} protein-peptidoglycan complexes,³ cellulose,^{4, 5} silicates,⁶ polymers,⁷ glasses,⁸ as well as structural disorder in crystalline solids.^{4, 5} Different NMR chemical shifts were observed for the same molecules in the different environments in the disordered systems, producing the so-called chemical shift nonequivalence. Previous investigations of proteins and relevant peptides indicate that numerous specific structural information can be extracted from the NMR chemical shift nonequivalence when quantum chemical methods were used.^{9–12} However, little work has been done in the quantum chemical investigations of NMR chemical shifts in disordered solids.⁶ In particular, there are no quantum chemical investigations reported to disclose the structural origins of the NMR chemical shift nonequivalence in disordered solids. Since many chemical and biochemical systems have disordered structures and high-resolution NMR spectra can now be acquired for these systems, it will be useful to decipher these NMR fingerprints to obtain specific structural information

Supporting Information Available: The computed NMR chemical shieldings and optimized geometric parameters from using the B3LYP/6-31G(d), B3LYP/6-311G(d), mPW1PW91/6-31G(d), and BVWN5/6-311G(2d) methods (Tables S1 and S2) are available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

through the assistance of quantum chemical investigations, which should facilitate structural characterizations of these systems.

In this paper, we report a quantum chemical investigation of the solid-state ^{31}P NMR spectrum of *N,N*-bis-(diphenylphosphino)-*N*-((*S*)- α -methylbenzyl)amine.^{4, 5} As shown in Figure 1A, there are four molecules in a crystal structural unit and each molecule has two different phosphorus atoms.¹³ It is interesting to note that all of these eight phosphorus atoms experience different environments, which can now be resolved by using advanced solid-state NMR techniques developed recently.^{4, 5} These NMR shifts exhibit an experimental range of 13.0 ppm in the high resolution spectrum. This range is comparable to those seen with solid-state ^{13}C NMR shifts of amino acids in peptides and proteins investigated previously by using quantum chemical methods,¹⁰⁻¹² which suggests that a quantum chemical investigation of these ^{31}P NMR experimental data may also be able to find out the structural origin of this observed chemical shift nonequivalence. Results from a comprehensive set of calculations using a variety of quantum chemical methods, NMR computational formalisms, and approaches to account for intermolecular interactions, suggest that geometry optimization is required to enable best accord with experiment (the theory-versus-experiment correlation coefficient is $R^2=0.95$ with $\text{SD}=1.1$ ppm). In addition, excellent correlations between the experimental NMR chemical shifts and local geometric parameters were found with $R^2=0.98$.

Computational Details

Each of the four molecules in the crystal structural unit (Figure 1A) was calculated and in all calculations, the complete molecular structure of *N,N*-bis-(diphenylphosphino)-*N*-((*S*)- α -methylbenzyl)amine consisting of 64 atoms was used, as shown in Figure 1B. The 6-311++G (2d,2p) basis for all atoms was employed based on previous investigations of ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts,^{14, 15} resulting in 1251 basis functions for each molecule. To calculate ^{31}P NMR chemical shielding properties, both *ab initio* Hartree-Fock (HF) and density functional theory (DFT-B3LYP17,¹⁸) methods were used, together with two NMR computational formalisms: gauge independent atomic orbitals (GIAO)¹⁹ and continuous set of gauge transformations (CSGT)²⁰ as implemented in *Gaussian 03* and *Gaussian 98* programs.^{21, 22} Additional calculations incorporating a large range of intermolecular effects were also carried out using two different theoretical treatments. One uses the charge field perturbation (CFP) approach^{23, 24} as described in Ref. 14, which basically employs a large charge lattice placed in positions based on crystal structure symmetry to simulate the environment around the central molecule of interest. This CFP approach was found to effectively improve the predictions of ^{31}P NMR shifts in some compounds.^{14, 15} The other way to account for the environmental effect is to use a "solvent" model with the self-consistent reaction field (SCRF) method using the PCM formalism²⁵⁻²⁹ in the *Gaussian 03* program, as used previously in NMR chemical shift predictions.¹²

In addition to above calculations using the experimental x-ray structure for *N,N*-bis-(diphenylphosphino)-*N*-((*S*)- α -methylbenzyl)amine,¹³ another set of calculations were also done with partial geometry optimizations of phosphorus atoms and their directly bonded atoms. To facilitate the geometry optimization calculations, a locally dense basis set scheme was used, with the 6-31G(d), 6-311G(d), and 6-311G(2d) basis sets used for the phosphorus atoms and their directly bonded atoms in respective calculations, while the remaining atoms in the molecules were treated with a 6-31G(d) basis. This is basically the approach used previously to evaluate ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts in some other phosphorus-containing compounds.¹⁵ Regarding the geometry optimization methods, in addition to the hybrid HF-DFT method B3LYP and mPW1PW91,^{30, 31} we also investigated a couple of pure DFT methods in the *Gaussian 03* program. One is BVWN5 with the Becke exchange functional³² and VWN5

correlation functional,³³ and the other is mPWVWN with the modified Perdew-Wang 1991 (mPW) exchange functional³⁰ and VWN correlation functional.³³

Since the absolute values of experimental ^{31}P NMR chemical shieldings cannot be well reproduced directly from the calculated ^{31}P NMR chemical shieldings (σ^{calc}),^{14, 15} the predicted ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts (δ^{calc}) were computed from the linear regression between the calculated ^{31}P NMR chemical shieldings (σ^{calc}) and the experimental NMR chemical shifts (δ^{expt}), as done before.^{14, 15}

Results and Discussion

The computed ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts (δ^{calc}) together with the corresponding experimentally⁵ measured chemical shifts (δ^{expt}) are listed in Table 1, while the computed ^{31}P NMR chemical shieldings (σ^{calc}) are presented in Table S1. Consistent with the experimental observation of eight different ^{31}P NMR shifts for the eight phosphorus atoms in the crystal structural unit, all our computational results showed eight distinguishable shifts, as shown in Table 1. The assignment of these shifts is based on both experimental NMR investigations showing four pairs of peaks in the spectrum for the four different molecules in the crystal unit (**1**, **1'**, **2**, **2'**, **3**, **3'**, **4**, **4'**) and the computational results to match lower chemical shielding with higher chemical shift.^{14, 15}

The first series of NMR calculations for this disordered system were performed using the x-ray structure, as done previously in the quantum chemical investigations of ^{13}C and ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts in some ordered systems.^{11, 12, 14, 15} As shown in Table 1, using the GIAO NMR computational approach, the calculated ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts for these eight nonequivalent sites have a good correlation ($R^2=0.899$) with experimental values, when the previously used HF/6-311++G(2d,2p) method was used. The standard deviation is 1.6 ppm, which is not large, indicating that generally these calculations are good. This suggests that the x-ray structure is able to provide a good estimate of the experimental chemical shift non-equivalence. As shown in Table 2, the local bond lengths and angles around the phosphorus atoms are of small ranges, while the conformation angles of the phenyl rings that are attached to the phosphorus atoms ($\angle\text{N-P-C-C}_A$ and $\angle\text{N-P-C-C}_B$, see an example in Figure 1B and definitions in the footnote of Table 2) have a large variation of $\sim 200^\circ$, showing a large disorder in this solid system. Consistent with this observation, no correlations between the experimental ^{31}P NMR shifts and local bond lengths/angles can be found, while there is a good correlation between the absolute sine values of these two angles and δ^{expt} values, with $R^2=0.880$.

However, these NMR shift predictions are still inferior to previous calculations of experimental ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts in other solid systems, which has a better correlation of $R^2=0.95$.¹⁴ Additional calculations were also done using this x-ray structure with the use of B3LYP method that incorporates the electron correlation effect compared to the above used HF method, a couple of computational measures that take into account of environmental intermolecular effect using the charge field perturbation (CFP) approach^{14, 15, 23, 24} and a continuum model (SCRF)¹², and another NMR property computational algorithm CSGT method. But as shown in Table 1, no improvements were obtained. These results indicate that with this x-ray crystal structure, there is hardly any improvement can be made. In addition, as shown in Table 3, there is basically no improvement in the shift-geometry correlations when either P-N bond length or the average P-C bond length were added in the regression. In contrast, local bond lengths around the phosphorus atoms were found to have important effects on the calculated NMR chemical shieldings/shifts in previous investigations of other phosphorus-containing systems.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ These results suggest that while the overall conformations in this x-ray structure are good to reproduce the major part of experimentally observed chemical shift

non-equivalence ($R^2=0.880$), the local bond lengths around the phosphorus atoms may need to be further refined. Previous investigations indicate that in some solid systems partial geometry optimization of the x-ray structure for the sites of interest is required to enable excellent predictions of spectroscopic properties including NMR shifts.^{16, 34-38}

Therefore, the next series of NMR calculations were performed with the structures of the phosphorus sites (phosphorus plus directly bonded atoms) being optimized while the remaining atoms in the molecule were fixed in their original crystal structural positions, to maintain the disordered environments (e.g. large variations of phenyl ring conformations) seen in the experiment. Indeed, as shown in the following section, this partial geometry optimization is able to recover the experimental chemical shift non-equivalence to an excellent level with $R^2=0.98$. Several computational methods were investigated on the geometry optimization, with the NMR shift predictions done using the same, best method, GIAO-HF/6-311++G(2d,2p), from above NMR calculations (Table 1).

We first used B3LYP/6-31G(d) for geometry optimization and indeed, as shown in Table 1, the R^2 is now improved to 0.945, a value similar to our previous calculations of ^{31}P chemical shifts in ordered solid molecular systems.¹⁴ The SD is now dropped to 1.15 ppm, from 1.60 ppm when the original x-ray structure was used. This supports the hypothesis that the relatively poor performance of the calculations in the previous section is due to the poor structure for the phosphorus sites in this disordered system. It is interesting to note that with this optimized structure (Table S2), the correlation between δ^{expt} and two conformation angle terms plus the P-N bond length was significantly improved with $R^2 = 0.963$, from 0.880 with the x-ray structure alone. This again supports the above hypothesis and the use of geometry optimization. The correlation result in Table 3 suggests that adding the P-C bond length information does not improve the correlation. This could be a result of the relatively longer bond lengths compared to P-N bonds (see Tables 2 and S2) and thus a smaller impact on the phosphorus electron shielding effect, and/or that the P-C bond lengths (distances between the phosphorus atom and its attached phenyl rings) and both phenyl conformation angles are affected by the disorder in a very similar way and thus do not provide major new information. Regressions using more than three geometric parameters were abandoned due to over-parameterization.

The same trends of improvement in NMR shift predictions and shift-geometry correlations were also observed with the optimizations using several other methods, as shown in Tables 1 and 3. These results further support the use of geometry optimization to interpret the experimental ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts in this disordered system. Comparisons among the data from using different quantum chemical methods nevertheless indicate different effects. Compared to the B3LYP method which contains a 20% Hartree-Fock exchange component,¹⁷ the use of more Hartree-Fock exchange (25%) in another hybrid HF-DFT method mPW1PW91 which were found to yield good results of optimized geometries in other molecular systems^{30, 39-42} actually results in reduction in performance in both NMR shift predictions (Table 1) and shift-geometry correlations (Table 3). Consistent with this observation of the effect of the HF exchange, the pure DFT methods (BVWN5 and mPWVWN) without any Hartree-Fock exchange produced better results. The best NMR shift predictions are from using the new pure DFT method mPWVWN which is made by combining the modified Perdew-Wang 1991 (mPW) exchange functional³⁰ and VWN correlation functional.³³ This method results in $R^2=0.949$ and $\text{SD}=1.1$ ppm, as illustrated in Figure 2 by square points. When the average of the two unassigned NMR shifts for each molecule is used (since the NMR experiment cannot give a definitive assignment for the two phosphorus atoms within the same molecule), the theory-versus-experiment correlation is even better, with $R^2=0.994$ and $\text{SD}=0.4$ ppm. This is illustrated by the star points in Figure 2. Given the small range of experimental NMR data (13.0 ppm), this performance is quite good and similar to previous studies of ordered solids.¹⁴

The optimized structure from using the mPWVWN method also yields the best correlations between the experimental NMR chemical shifts and the geometric parameters. As illustrated in Figure 3, the predicted NMR chemical shifts from the following regression

δ^{pred} (ppm) = 3.540 |sin∠N-PC-C_A| + 14.06 |sin∠N-PC-C_B| + 227.2 R_{P-N} - 353.8 (1) have an excellent linear correlation ($R^2=0.981$) with the experimental data. The statistical p value for this regression is 0.00064. In contrast, the R^2 and p values for the regression of the two conformation terms alone are 0.866 and 0.0065, respectively. Therefore, both R^2 and p values indicate that the above three parameter regression is better. This is consistent with the fact that each phosphorus atom is bonded to three groups: one nitrogen atom and two phenyl rings. This also suggests that all the three bonding interactions around the phosphorus atoms are important in affecting the ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts.

Conclusions

The results we have described above are of interest for a number of reasons. First, these calculations give the first accurate predictions of the ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts in a disordered solid system with $R^2=0.95$ and $\text{SD}=1.1$ ppm for an experimental range of 13.0 ppm, or with $R^2=0.994$ and $\text{SD}=0.4$ ppm when the average of the two unassigned NMR shifts for each molecule is used. This is of interest in the context of structural elucidation for disordered solids of various chemical and biochemical systems. Second, our results indicate that geometry optimization gives the best accord with experiment for the structural investigation of NMR chemical shifts in the disordered system. Third, the structural origin of the experimentally observed NMR chemical shift nonequivalence in a disordered system was uncovered. The experimental ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts are mostly affected by the conformations of the two phenyl rings that are attached to the phosphorus atoms. In addition, with the improved bond length from geometry optimization, the experimental NMR shifts can now be well correlated ($R^2=0.981$) with the three geometric parameters that reflect the interactions between each phosphorus atom and all of its three bonded groups. Taken together, these results should facilitate the use of quantum chemical methods for the structural characterization of the disordered solids and elucidation of NMR properties.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the NSF EPSCoR grant OIA-0556308 and NIH grant GM-085774. We are also grateful to the Mississippi Center of Supercomputing Research and USM Vislab for generous use of their computing facilities. We thank Eric Oldfield and reviewers for helpful comments.

References

1. Wasmer C, Lange A, Van Melckebeke H, Siemer AB, Riek R, Meier BH. Science 2008;319:1523–1526. [PubMed: 18339938]
2. Petkova AT, Ishii Y, Balbach JJ, Antzutkin ON, Leapman RD, Delaglio F, Tycko R. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 2002;99:16742–16747. [PubMed: 12481027]
3. Kern T, Hediger S, Muller P, Giustini C, Joris B, Bougault C, Vollmer W, Simorre JP. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2008;130:5618–5619. [PubMed: 18393418]
4. Cadars S, Lesage A, Emsley L. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2005;127:4466–4476. [PubMed: 15783229]
5. Sakellariou D, Brown SP, Lesage A, Hediger S, Bardet M, Meriles CA, Pines A, Emsley L. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2003;125:4376–4380. [PubMed: 12670262]

6. Hedin N, Graf R, Christiansen SC, Gervais C, Hayward RC, Eckert J, Chmelka BF. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004;126:9425–9432. [PubMed: 15281835]
7. Kaji H, Schmidt-Rohr K. *Macromolecules* 2002;35:7993–8004.
8. Clark TM, Grandinetti PJ. *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* 2003;15:S2387–S2395.
9. de Dios AC, Pearson JG, Oldfield E. *Science* 1993;260:1491–1496. [PubMed: 8502992]
10. Sun HH, Sanders LK, Oldfield E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2002;124:5486–5495. [PubMed: 11996591]
11. Cheng F, Sun HH, Zhang Y, Mukkamala D, Oldfield E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2005;127:12544–12554. [PubMed: 16144402]
12. Mukkamala D, Zhang Y, Oldfield E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2007;129:7385–7392. [PubMed: 17506558]
13. Robert F, Gimbert Y, Averbuch-Pouchot MT, Greene AEZ. *Kristallogr.-New Cryst. Struct* 2000;215:233–236.
14. Zhang Y, Oldfield E. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 2004;108:19533–19540.
15. Zhang Y, Oldfield E. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 2006;110:579–586. [PubMed: 16471570]
16. Mao JH, Mukherjee S, Zhang Y, Cao R, Sanders JM, Song YC, Zhang YH, Meints GA, Gao YG, Mukkamala D, Hudock MP, Oldfield E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2006;128:14485–14497. [PubMed: 17090032]
17. Becke AD. *J. Chem. Phys* 1993;98:5648–5652.
18. Lee C, Yang W, Parr RG. *Phys. Rev. B* 1988;37:785–789.
19. Ditchfield R. *Mol. Phys* 1974;27:789–807.
20. Cheeseman JR, Trucks GW, Keith TA, Frisch MJ. *J. Chem. Phys* 1996;104:5497–5509.
21. Frisch, MJ.; Trucks, GW.; Schlegel, HB.; Scuseria, GE.; Robb, MA.; Cheeseman, JR.; Montgomery, JA., Jr.; Vreven, T.; Kudin, KN.; Burant, JC.; Millam, JM.; Iyengar, SS.; Tomasi, J.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Cossi, M.; Scalmani, G.; Rega, N.; Petersson, GA.; Nakatsuji, H.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Klene, M.; Li, X.; Knox, JE.; Hratchian, HP.; Cross, JB.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, RE.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, AJ.; Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, JW.; Ayala, PY.; Morokuma, K.; Voth, GA.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, JJ.; Zakrzewski, VG.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, AD.; Strain, MC.; Farkas, O.; Malick, DK.; Rabuck, AD.; Raghavachari, K.; Foresman, JB.; Ortiz, JV.; Cui, Q.; Baboul, AG.; Clifford, S.; Cioslowski, J.; Stefanov, BB.; Liu, G.; Liashenko, A.; Piskorz, P.; Komaromi, I.; Martin, RL.; Fox, DJ.; Keith, T.; Al-Laham, MA.; Peng, CY.; Nanayakkara, A.; Challacombe, M.; Gill, PMW.; Johnson, B.; Chen, W.; Wong, MW.; Gonzalez, C.; Pople, JA. *Gaussian 03, Revision D.01*. Gaussian, Inc.; Wallingford CT: 2004.
22. Frisch, MJ.; Trucks, GW.; Schlegel, HB.; Scuseria, GE.; Robb, MA.; Cheeseman, JR.; Zakrzewski, VG.; Montgomery, JA., Jr.; Stratmann, RE.; Burant, JC.; Dapprich, S.; Millam, JM.; Daniels, AD.; Kudin, KN.; Strain, MC.; Farkas, O.; Tomasi, J.; Barone, V.; Cossi, M.; Cammi, R.; Mennucci, B.; Pomelli, C.; Adamo, C.; Clifford, S.; Ochterski, J.; Petersson, GA.; Ayala, PY.; Cui, Q.; Morokuma, K.; Malick, DK.; Rabuck, AD.; Raghavachari, K.; Foresman, JB.; Cioslowski, J.; Ortiz, JV.; Baboul, AG.; Stefanov, BB.; Liu, G.; Liashenko, A.; Piskorz, P.; Komaromi, I.; Gomperts, R.; Martin, RL.; Fox, DJ.; Keith, T.; Al-Laham, MA.; Peng, CY.; Nanayakkara, A.; Challacombe, M.; Gill, PMW.; Johnson, B.; Chen, W.; Wong, MW.; Andres, JL.; Gonzalez, C.; Head-Gordon, M.; Replogle, ES.; Pople, JA. *Gaussian 98, Revision A.9*. Gaussian, Inc.; Pittsburgh PA: 1998.
23. de Dios AC, Oldfield E. *Chem. Phys. Lett* 1993;205:108–116.
24. Dedios AC, Laws DD, Oldfield E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1994;116:7784–7786.
25. Cossi M, Barone V, Cammi R, Tomasi J. *Chem. Phys. Lett* 1996;255:327–335.
26. Cossi M, Scalmani G, Rega N, Barone V. *J. Chem. Phys* 2002;117:43–54.
27. Cancès E, Mennucci B, Tomasi J. *J. Chem. Phys* 1997;107:3032–3041.
28. Mennucci B, Tomasi J. *J. Chem. Phys* 1997;106:5151–5158.
29. Cossi M, Barone V, Mennucci B, Tomasi J. *Chem. Phys. Lett* 1998;286:253–260.
30. Adamo C, Barone V. *J. Chem. Phys* 1998;108:664–675.
31. Perdew JP, Burke K, Wang Y. *Phys. Rev. B* 1996;54:16533–16539.
32. Becke AD. *Phys. Rev. A* 1988;38:3098–3100. [PubMed: 9900728]
33. Vosko SH, Wilk L, Nusair M. *Can. J. Phys* 1980;58:1200–1211.

34. McMahon MT, deDios AC, Godbout N, Salzmänn R, Laws DD, Le HB, Havlin RH, Oldfield E. J. Am. Chem. Soc 1998;120:4784–4797.
35. Zhang Y, Gossman W, Oldfield E. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2003;125:16387–16396. [PubMed: 14692781]
36. Zhang Y, Oldfield E. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2004;126:9494–9495. [PubMed: 15291525]
37. Zhang Y, Oldfield E. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2004;126:4470–4471. [PubMed: 15070336]
38. Zhang Y, Oldfield E. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2008;130:3814–3823. [PubMed: 18314973]
39. Yang J, Huang SX, Zhao QS. J. Phys. Chem. A 2008;112:12132–12139. [PubMed: 18983131]
40. Xu B, Li QS, Xie YM, King RB, Schaefer HF. Inorg. Chem 2008;47:6779–6790. [PubMed: 18597417]
41. Zhang Y, Lewis JC, Bergman RG, Ellman JA, Oldfield E. Organometallics 2006;25:3515–3519.
42. Zhang Y, Guo ZJ, You XZ. J. Am. Chem. Soc 2001;123:9378–9387. [PubMed: 11562220]

Figure 1.

A) The crystal structure of *N,N*-bis-(diphenylphosphino)-*N*-((*S*)- α -methylbenzyl)amine (P- orange ball; C- grey; N- blue; H- white). B) Its molecular structure with hydrogen atoms omitted for clarity.

figure 2.
Plot of the calculated versus experimental ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts for the structure partially optimized by using the mPWVWN/6-311G(2d) method.

Figure 3. Plot of the predicted versus experimental ^{31}P NMR chemical shifts for the structure partially optimized by using mPWVWN/6-311G(2d) calculations. The predicted values were obtained from the regression equation (1).

Table 1
Experimental and Computed ³¹P NMR Chemical Shifts (ppm)^a

Structure	Method	1	1'	2	2'	3	3'	4	4'	R ²	SD
X-ray	GIAO	δ ^{expt}	47.3	50.5	51.0	56.7	60.3	57.0	57.5		
		δ ^{scale}	47.2	48.8	52.9	57.2	60.2	54.5	58.7	0.899	1.60
		δ ^{scale}	48.2	48.3	51.7	58.7	60.3	54.8	57.5	0.896	1.62
		δ ^{scale}	47.3	48.2	53.3	57.5	60.1	54.4	58.8	0.871	1.83
		δ ^{scale}	47.2	48.8	52.9	57.4	60.3	54.2	58.8	0.889	1.68
	CSGT	δ ^{scale}	47.3	48.6	53.1	57.0	60.4	54.3	58.9	0.883	1.73
		δ ^{scale}	46.8	48.8	53.3	57.5	60.0	54.4	58.5	0.884	1.73
		δ ^{scale}	47.5	47.9	53.5	57.4	60.3	54.2	59.1	0.849	2.01
		δ ^{scale}	48.4	49.5	51.2	56.4	61.5	55.3	58.5	0.945	1.15
		δ ^{scale}	48.3	49.6	51.4	56.3	61.7	55.2	58.6	0.938	1.23
Opt: B3LYP/6-311G(d)	GIAO	δ ^{scale}	48.0	49.8	51.8	55.9	62.0	54.8	58.9	0.916	1.45
		Opt: mPW/PW91/6-31G(d)	δ ^{scale}	48.8	49.2	50.5	61.2	55.6	58.1	0.948	1.12
		Opt: BVWN5/6-311G(2d)	δ ^{scale}	48.7	49.3	50.7	61.3	55.5	58.2	0.949	1.11
		Opt: mPW/VWN/6-311G(2d)	δ ^{scale}								

^aThe experimental NMR shifts and x-ray structure are from Refs. 5 and 13, respectively.

Table 2
³¹P NMR Chemical Shieldings and Geometric Parameters ^a

Structure		σ^{calc} (ppm)	$R_{\text{P-A}}$ (Å)	$R_{\text{P-C}}$ (Å)	$R_{\text{P-C'}}$ (Å)	$R_{\text{P-C}}$ (Å)	$\angle \text{C-P-C}$ (°)	$\text{av } \angle \text{N-P-C}$ (°)	$\angle \text{N-P-C-C}_A$ (°)	$\angle \text{N-P-C-C}_B$ (°)
X-ray	1	325.2	1.729	1.827	1.827	1.827	100.6	104.7	-82.6	-11.2
	1'	323.4	1.708	1.835	1.840	1.838	100.7	106.0	83.2	-11.2
	2	318.7	1.716	1.831	1.845	1.838	100.9	105.8	-87.7	-30.5
	2'	313.9	1.719	1.823	1.825	1.824	103.7	105.2	49.9	-118.2
Optimized	3	314.4	1.709	1.827	1.842	1.835	101.7	105.2	7.2	-76.5
	3'	310.5	1.727	1.830	1.841	1.836	100.8	103.2	25.5	79.3
	4	316.9	1.705	1.835	1.841	1.838	99.8	105.3	2.8	-74.7
	4'	312.1	1.732	1.823	1.838	1.831	101.4	104.9	24.3	84.2
By mPWVWN/6-311G(2d)	1	321.9	1.735	1.847	1.829	1.838	104.2	105.1	84.2	-11.6
	1'	321.2	1.752	1.843	1.827	1.835	104.0	103.8	-81.3	-10.5
	2	319.5	1.739	1.817	1.832	1.825	103.0	103.7	-86.0	-31.2
	2'	312.0	1.739	1.855	1.838	1.847	99.8	104.9	50.3	-118.9
	3	313.6	1.739	1.851	1.830	1.841	100.7	103.7	8.3	-77.5
	3'	306.6	1.753	1.849	1.829	1.839	100.2	104.1	25.4	77.7
	4	313.6	1.750	1.843	1.825	1.834	100.7	104.2	3.4	-75.5
	4'	310.4	1.742	1.834	1.854	1.844	99.3	103.7	24.6	82.6

^aX-ray results are from Ref. 13. $\angle \text{N-P-C-C}_A$ and $\angle \text{N-P-C-C}_B$ are the dihedral angles of the two phenyl rings attached to each phosphorus atom. With respect to the other phosphorus atom, C_A and C_B are on the same sides of the N-P-C plane. But regarding the methyl/benzyl group, C_A is on the same side, while C_B is on the opposite side. See Figure 1B for an example.

Table 3R² values for Correlations between Experimental NMR Chemical Shifts and Geometric Parameters

Structure	δ^{expt} VS.	δ^{expt} VS.	δ^{expt} VS.
	$ \sin\angle\text{N-P-C-C}_A $ $ \sin\angle\text{N-P-C-C}_B $	$ \sin\angle\text{N-P-C-C}_A $ $ \sin\angle\text{N-P-C-C}_B $ $R_{\text{P-N}}$	$ \sin\angle\text{N-P-C-C}_A $ $ \sin\angle\text{N-P-C-C}_B $ ${}^{\text{av}}R_{\text{P-C}}$
X-ray	0.880	0.880	0.894
Opt: B3LYP/6-31G(d)	0.867	0.963	0.884
Opt: B3LYP/6-311G(d)	0.867	0.967	0.882
Opt: mPW1PW91/6-31G(d)	0.869	0.957	0.901
Opt: BVWN5/6-311G(2d)	0.865	0.971	0.869
Opt: mPWVWN/6-311G(2d)	0.866	0.981	0.869