Published in final edited form as:

J Chem Theory Comput. 2013 December 10; 9(12): . doi:10.1021/ct400856g.

Calculation of Heats of Formation for Zn Complexes: Comparison of Density Functional Theory, Second Order Perturbation Theory, Coupled-Cluster and Complete Active Space Methods

Michael N. Weaver^a, Kenneth M. Merz Jr.^{a,b}, Dongxia Ma, Hyun Jung Kim, and Laura Gagliardi

Kenneth M. Merz: kmerz1@gmail.com; Laura Gagliardi: gagliardi@umn.edu

^aDepartment of Chemistry, Quantum Theory Project, 2328 New Physics Building, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-8435

^bDepartment of Chemistry, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Michigan State University, 578 S. Shaw Lane, East Lansing, MI 48824-1322, 517-355-9715

Department of Chemistry Supercomputing Institute, and Chemical Theory Center, University of Minnesota, 207 Pleasant Street SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455-0431

Abstract

Heats of formation were predicted for nine ZnX complexes (X= Zn, H, O, F₂, S, Cl, Cl₂, CH₃, (CH₃)₂) using fourteen density functionals, MP2 calculations and the CCSD and CCSD(T) coupled-cluster methods. Calculations utilized the correlation consistent cc-pVTZ and aug-cc-pVTZ basis sets. Heats of formation were most accurately predicted by the TPSSSTPSS and TPSSKCIS density functionals, and the BLYP, B3LYP, MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T) levels were among the poorest performing methods based on accuracy. A wide range of Zn₂ equilibrium bond distances were predicted, indicating that many of the studied levels of theory may be unable to adequately describe this transition metal dimer. To further benchmark the accuracy of the density functional methods, high-level CASSCF and CASPT2 calculations were performed to estimate bond dissociation energies, equilibrium bond lengths and heats of formation for the diatomic Zn complexes and the latter two quantities were compared with the results of DFT, MP2 and coupled-cluster calculations as well as experimental values.

Introduction

Heats of formation are an experimentally determinable physical property of molecules used in the benchmarking of computational methodologies. Recently, we have assessed the abilities of various approaches in the prediction of heats of formation for transition metal complexes using the 6-31G** and TZVP basis sets on all atoms, as well as the LANL2DZ basis set/pseudopotential on zinc (with both 6-31G** and TZVP on the nonmetal atoms) using both density functional and coupled-cluster methods.¹⁻³

Correspondence to: Kenneth M. Merz, Jr., kmerz1@gmail.com; Laura Gagliardi, gagliardi@umn.edu.

Supporting Information Available: Spreadsheets detailing atom energies, complex energies, ground state multiplicities and heat of formation calculations for all Zn complexes at each investigated level of theory. This information is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

Considerable attention has been given recently to theoretical studies on the properties of transition metals and their systems. Given its rich chemistry, zinc has received more than its fair share of attention. For example, Balabanov and Peterson have used nonrelativistic and Douglas-Kroll-Hess relativistic cc-pVnZ basis sets that converge to the CBS limit to accurately obtain atomic excitation energies, ionization potentials and electron affinities for third row metal atoms and several metal hydrides.⁴ Eger et al., used density functional study to study the mechanism of the zinc carbenoid-mediated homologation of β -keto esters.⁵ In 2009, van Gastel et al., complemented their EPR/ENDOR study of bis(a-aminopyridinato)zinc with B3LYP/TZV calculations used to support experimental determination of the proton hyperfine coupling constants.⁶ In yet another application, Govind and coworkers utilized TDDFT calculations in order to probe the excitation energies of zinc porphyrin in aqueous solution.⁷ Jenovine and Spezia used density functional theory, as well as MP2 and CCSD(T) calculations, to study binding in transition metal chalcogen-chalcogen bridges, noting in these instances the seemingly consistent failure of DFT in its overestimation of the binding energy.⁸ Schmidt et al., have used computations to aid in the characterization of new zinc amidinate complexes.⁹ Some validation work in the area has been recently published; Sorkin et al., benchmarked the performance of four density functionals and six semiempirical methods against experimental bond distances, angles, dipole moments and dissociation energies.¹⁰

Despite the amount of attention given to calculations on zinc systems, comparably little attention has been given to benchmarking the performance of a wide range of levels, particularly with larger basis sets over a range of metal-ligand bond types. Jiang et al. used DFT methods in combination with correlation consistent basis sets to evaluate heats of formation for transition metal complexes although the overlap in their selected functionals and those incorporated in the study herein is limited.¹¹ An earlier study by Tekarli et al. incorporated 44 density functionals and the cc-pVTZ and cc-pVQZ basis sets to compute heats of formation, however this work investigated only four zinc-containing complexes.¹²

Heats of formation have been calculated using a variety of computational strategies over the last two decades, with the level of complexity in the methods employed increasing as new protocols are developed and computing power has increased. One of the more popular approaches is the geometry optimization/complete basis set (CBS) extrapolation method. Pollack et al used this strategy to very accurately produce the enthalpies of formation for several alkanes using B3LYP/TZVP and MP2/aug-cc-pVTZ geometries.¹³ While it is generally accepted that B3LYP offers exceptional performance for organic compounds, this level of confidence cannot be carried over to transition metal complexes, hence the need for further validation in the arena of computational chemistry regarding the transition metal elements.

In furthering our studies on the calculation of heats of formation for ZnX complexes, we have conducted calculations using the correlation consistent, triple- ζ quality cc-pVTZ and aug-cc-pVTZ basis sets with density functional methods, as well as the MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T) methods and compared the results against experimentally determined values. The DFT methods utilized include functionals of the GGA (BLYP^{14,15}, MPWPW91¹⁶⁻¹⁸, PBEPBE¹⁹), hybrid-GGA (B3LYP^{14,15,20,21}, PBE1PBE^{19,22,23}, B98²⁴), meta-GGA (TPSSSTPSS^{25,26}, TPSSKCIS²⁵⁻²⁹, BB95^{14,30}) and hybrid-meta-GGA (B1B95^{14,30}, TPSS1KCIS^{25-29,31}, BB1K^{14,30,32}) classes (occupying rungs two through four of Perdew's "Jacob's Ladder" of density functionals)^{33,34} as in our previous studies. Additionally, we have selected for comparison the M06-L³⁵ (meta-GGA) and M06-2X³⁶ (hybrid-meta-GGA) functionals of Truhlar, et al., as these functionals have become available in the Gaussian suite since our previous work. Zinc complexes considered in this study are Zn₂, ZnH, ZnO, ZnF₂, ZnS, ZnCl, ZnCl₂, ZnCH₃ and Zn(CH₃)₂. The aims of this work are twofold; one, to

evaluate the ability of different models to accurately and cost-effectively predict heats of formation and reproduce geometries and two, to identify appropriate levels of theory for the determination of zinc force field parameters.³⁷ In the simplest of terms, we wish to explore the generality of various levels of theory applied to Zn systems with different ligating atoms using calculated bond lengths and predicted heats of formation as our evaluation criteria. Finally, for the dimeric species, we compare the results to CASPT2 derived bond lengths and heats of formation as a further benchmark.

Computational Methodology

All DFT, MP2 and coupled-cluster calculations were carried out on a SUN cluster featuring dual 2.5 GHz Opteron nodes or twin node cluster featuring 2.6 GHz CPUs using the Gaussian 09³⁸ suite of programs. Calculations utilized up to 12 processors for some of the larger calculations. All geometry optimizations incorporated standard gradient methods. For all single point calculations, the SCF=TIGHT keyword was used. The SCF=XQC keyword was applied in all instances, as SCF convergence was often problematic in the initial stages of geometry optimization. The CCSD and CCSD(T) methods were used as implemented in Gaussian 09.³⁹⁻⁴⁴ Frequency calculations were conducted on all optimized geometries (at the minimum energy multiplicity) to insure all calculated lowest energy structures resided at local minima on their respective potential energy surfaces. The correlation consistent cc-pVTZ and aug-cc-pVTZ basis sets were used as implemented in Gaussian 09 for Zn and all nonmetal atoms.^{4,45,46}

The lowest energy conformations for all complexes as determined in our previous work were submitted for geometry optimization. The singlet and triplet states for ZnO and ZnS were both optimized, as these states were found to possess close energies and different theory levels were found to result in the prediction of either multiplicity as the ground state. CCSD(T) calculations on ZnMe₂ were cost prohibitive, and these optimizations were not conducted using either the cc-pVTZ or aug-cc-pVTZ basis sets.

Additionally, all dimers were optimized using both the CASSCF and CASPT2 methods. All CASSCF/PT2 calculations were performed using the MOLCAS-7.7 package.⁴⁷ Basis sets of the atomic natural orbitals (ANO-RCC)^{48,49} type from the MOLCAS library were employed for all elements. The basis set employed for the zinc atom is derived from 21s15p10d6f4g2h primitive basis sets. Atomic natural orbital (ANO) type contractions were performed with 10s9p8d6f4g2h. For the oxygen atom, the primitive set of 14s9p4d3f2g functions was contracted to 8s7p4d3f2g. The hydrogen atom has the primitive basis set of 8s4p3d1f with a contraction of 6s4p3d1f. For the chlorine and sulfur atom the primitive set of 17s12p5d4f2g was contracted to 8s7p5d4f2g.

The following active spaces were employed. For ZnH an active space of three electrons in nine orbitals (3,9) was employed. These orbitals are linear combinations of Zn 4s 4p and H 1s 2s 2p orbitals. For Zn₂ an active space of (4,10), which arises from Zn 4s 4p 5s orbitals, was selected. For ZnO an active space of (8,17), arising from linear combinations of Zn 4s4p and O 2s2p3s3p3d orbitals, was employed. For ZnS an active space of (8,17), arising from Zn 4s4p and S 3s3p3d4s4p orbitals, was used and for ZnCl an active space of (7,12) was used, which is linear combinations of Zn 4s4p and Cl 3p3d orbitals. At the CASPT2 level, an imaginary level shift of 0.1 was used.⁵⁰

The default ionization potential electron affinity (IPEA)-corrected zeroth-order Hamiltonian⁵¹ was used in CASPT2, corresponding to a IPEA shift of 0.25, unless otherwise specified (see the section on Zn₂). The orbitals correlated in the CASPT2 calculations for each species are reported in the results section.

D_{2h} symmetry was imposed upon the metal dimer, whereas C_{2v} symmetry was applied to the other diatomic molecules. The spectroscopic constants for the ground states of the investigated complexes were obtained using the MOLCAS program VIBROT fitting the potentials to the vibrational Schrödinger equation numerically. In subsequent heat of formation determinations the CASPT2 energies were augmented by adding the thermal enthalpy correction from the corresponding CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ calculation.

As in our previous studies, heats of formation (ΔH_f) for all complexes were computed with the method outlined in the Gaussian white paper on Thermochemistry available in the Gaussian 09 online manual.⁵² For convenience, we show equation (1), which is the more general form, and equation (2), which expresses quantities in terms of the Gaussian output. The 'M' and 'X' designations in equation (1) correspond to the molecule and individual atoms, respectively.

$$\Delta H_f(M, 298K) = \Delta H_f(M, 0K) + ((H_M(298K) - H_M(0K)) - \sum x(H_x(298K) - H_x(0K))) \quad (1)$$

$$\Delta H_f(298K) = 627.5095(E_{\text{CORR}}) + 31.17 - 627.5095(E_{\text{Zn}}) + \Delta H_f(\text{atom}, 298K) - 627.5095(E_{\text{atom}}) \quad (2)$$

E_{CORR} is identified as the sum of electronic and thermal enthalpies from the output of the Gaussian frequency calculation (which includes thermal and ZPE corrections to the energy). E_{Zn} and E_{atom} are the energies of the Zn and nonmetal atoms at a given level of theory. The constant 31.17 (kcal/mol) in equation (2) is the $\Delta H_f(\text{Zn}, 298K)$ taken from the NIST chemistry WebBook⁵³ and the respective $\Delta H_f(\text{atom}, 298K)$ values for the nonmetals are contained there as well. Finally, equation (3) was implemented in the calculation of root mean squared deviations (RMSD). RMSD values calculated for the ΔH_f error at each level of theory are available in the supporting information.

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \quad (3)$$

Results and Discussion

Heats of Formation

Calculated heats of formation for all methods with the cc-pVTZ basis set are shown in Table 1, with the average error associated with each method displayed in Figure 1. The CCSD(T) entries for Zn(CH₃)₂ are blank, as these calculations became cost-prohibitive. All other ΔH_f values were successfully calculated at each level of theory for each ZnX complex. The TPSSKCIS and TPSSTPSS density functionals were the two best overall methods for predicting heats of formation based on the average unsigned error. Of the DFT methods, BLYP and B3LYP functionals were the two poorest overall choices, with average unsigned errors over 10 kcal/mol. The MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T) methods produced some of the poorer overall results, with the CCSD/cc-pVTZ level of theory providing the worst overall results.

ZnH was the most consistently well-calculated species, with most methods producing results within two kcal/mol of the experimental value. Two of the greatest deviations from the experimental heat of formation for the hydride were observed with the TPSSTPSS and TPSSKCIS density functionals, the two methods producing the best overall results based on

average unsigned error. For all other non-methyl species, the TPSSTPSS and TPSSKCIS functionals were among the best performing methods.

The heat of formation for ZnCH_3 was consistently very poorly calculated by all methods using the cc-pVTZ basis set. The TPSSTPSS/cc-pVTZ level of theory came the closest to the experimental value, but still deviated by 17.4 kcal/mol, a 66.9 percent error. $\text{Zn}(\text{CH}_3)_2$ fared slightly better, with the PBEPBE, PBE1PBE and TPSS1KCIS density functionals all producing results within 1 kcal/mol of the experimental value. However, most deviations were significantly large, and the CCSD(T) calculations could not be performed as the computational cost was prohibitive.

Table 2 and Figure 2 contain results for all methods using the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set. These calculations were naturally more costly than those using the cc-pVTZ basis set, and calculations utilizing both coupled cluster methods proved to be cost prohibitive for $\text{Zn}(\text{CH}_3)_2$. The CCSD/aug-cc-pVTZ level of theory was the poorest overall level of theory for predicting ΔH_f values, and the MP2 level outperformed only BLYP and CCSD. The CCSD(T)/aug-cc-pVTZ level of theory yielded a low average unsigned error and outperformed all but four of the density functional methods, however the fact that the calculations on $\text{Zn}(\text{CH}_3)_2$ were not completed needs to be taken into consideration when evaluating the overall efficacy of this level.

Bond Lengths

Tables 3 and 4 contain the calculated Zn—X bond lengths for the studied ZnX systems using the cc-pVTZ and aug-cc-pVTZ basis sets, respectively. The Zn—F bond length for $^1\text{ZnF}_2$ was very accurately calculated by all methods, with the largest deviation from the experimental observed at the BB1K/cc-pVTZ and MP2/cc-pVTZ levels of theory (0.020 and 0.022 Ångstrom underestimations, respectively). The largest overestimation was observed at the BLYP/aug-cc-pVTZ level of theory, at 0.012 Ångstroms. The deviations from the experimental Zn—F length spanned a 0.034 Ångstrom range, the lowest span of the four entries for which experimental bond distances were available.

Greater discrepancies were observed in the predicted bond lengths for ^2ZnH . The variation for ^2ZnH ranged from an underestimation of 0.028 Ångstroms at the MP2/cc-pVTZ level of theory to a 0.051 Ångstrom overestimation at the M062X/cc-pVTZ level. The addition of diffuse functions did not significantly reduce the latter overestimation, as M06-2X/aug-cc-pVTZ calculations predicted a 0.050 Ångstrom overestimation of the Zn—H bond length. Hence, predicted values for the Zn—H bond length cover a 0.079 Ångstrom range, supporting the argument that improper consideration of the employed level of theory can have significant geometric consequences.

Only the MP2 method underestimated the Zn—Cl distance for $^1\text{ZnCl}_2$; by 0.002 Ångstroms with the cc-pVTZ basis set and 0.004 Ångstroms with the inclusion of diffuse functions. The M06-2X functional overestimated the Zn—Cl distance by the greatest amount, 0.038 Ångstroms with both basis sets. Overall, the deviations from the experimental distance spanned a 0.042 Ångstrom range, however the majority of the methods employed adequately predict the observed bond length for $^1\text{ZnCl}_2$.

Finally, we consider $^1\text{Zn}(\text{CH}_3)_2$, which was incalculable for CCSD(T) using both basis sets and at the CCSD/aug-cc-pVTZ level of theory. For the remaining methods, MP2 calculations using both basis sets underestimated the Zn—C bond length, and the DFT methods overestimated this value. Additionally, there is the issue of conformation. We previously addressed conformations in $\text{Zn}(\text{CH}_3)_2$ using smaller basis sets, and found that typically at those levels this species adopts a “pseudo-eclipsed” conformation.² In this study,

the minimum energy conformations varied among the employed methods, with “pseudo-eclipsed,” “pseudo-gauche,” and offset minima predicted.

For Zn_2 , the calculated bond lengths using the cc-pVTZ basis set spanned a 1.776 Ångstrom range, an incredibly large value and reflective of the broad, flat nature of the potential energy surface. The shortest predicted bond length was 3.080 Ångstroms at the TPSSTPSS/cc-pVTZ level of theory and the largest distance calculated was 4.856 Ångstroms at the CCSD/cc-pVTZ level. Addition of diffuse functions caused a contraction in the span between minimum and maximum predicted Zn—Zn distance to 1.357 Ångstroms, which is still significantly large. As with the cc-pVTZ calculations, the shortest calculated bond length with the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set was predicted with the TPSSTPSS density functional (3.113 Ångstroms) and the largest with the CCSD method (4.470 Ångstroms). There is no strong correlation observed between the calculated bond length and the deviation from the experimental heat of formation, however the most general of trends is that shorter bond lengths give decreased errors. These data are plotted in Figure 3 and separated by basis set. Given the wide range of calculated Zn—Zn bond lengths and the lack of available experimental data for this parameter, it is difficult to assess which methods are more appropriate for this transition metal dimer. It should be noted that an experimental value obtained for this distance using spectroscopic methods yields an equilibrium separation of 4.19 Å.⁵⁶ Earlier efforts at estimating this bond length yielded 4.8 and 4.67 Å using the Morse approximation and London dispersion relation, respectively.⁵⁷ Ellingsen et al. point out that all of these experimentally derived values are likely to be overestimates as each method fails to account for the covalent character of the bond, instead assuming a purely van der Waals interaction.⁵⁸ Furthermore, there is little direct correlation observed between calculated bond length and heat of formation error for either basis set, as evidenced by R^2 values of 0.472 and 0.508 for the cc-pVTZ and aug-cc-pVTZ basis sets, respectively. Despite the lack of a strong correlation it is, however, observed that theory levels yielding shorter Zn—Zn distances predict heats of formation closer to the experimental value.

The calculated bond distances for the remaining four entries (ZnO , ZnS , ZnCl and ZnCH_3) spanned a much more reasonable range of values. For zinc oxide, different levels of theory predicted ^1ZnO and ^3ZnO ground states; the singlet ground state was predicted the majority of the time for the 34 investigated theory levels. For methods where the triplet ground state was predicted, the optimized Zn—O bond length was noticeably longer than for those methods that predicted the singlet ground state. The addition of diffuse functions aided in predicting the singlet ground state. The B3LYP density functional incorrectly predicted the triplet ground state with both basis sets.

Multi-reference Character and Comparison with CASPT2 Calculations

Although CCSD(T) is considered a gold-standard for single-reference methods, it is important to check how it behaves in the presence of multi-reference systems. For this reason we report T_1 diagnostic values (Table 5) using the cc-pVTZ basis sets. The standard at which multi-reference effects are considered negligible is a T_1 value of 0.02 or less.^{59,60} As these values are dependent only upon the single excitations, the computed values will be the same regardless of whether the CCSD or CCSD(T) methods is implemented.⁵⁹ Jiang et al. computed the T_1 diagnostic of the Zn dimer using coupled cluster methods (cc-pVTZ-DK basis set) and our results with the non-relativistic cc-pVTZ basis set are consistent.^{61,62} The computed T_1 diagnostics using the cc-pVTZ basis set indicate that multireference functions are necessary for ZnH , ZnO and ZnS . Furthermore, these values for Zn_2 and ZnF_2 are near the 0.02 threshold as well.

In order to check the degree of multi-reference character in these species, we report the following results obtained at the CASPT2 level of theory. Table 6 contains CASPT2

calculated equilibrium bond lengths, bond dissociation energies (D_e), harmonic vibrational frequencies (ω_e) and heats of formation for the zinc-containing dimers, together with the corresponding CCSD(T) values. The bond length predicted for the Zn dimer using 4s3d correlated electrons was lower than the experimental value listed and higher with only 4s correlated electrons. Since the reported experimental value is most likely an overestimation, the former calculated distance is likely more representative of the true value, and this length falls in line with the DFT methods employed. The calculated ZnH, ZnCl and ZnS bond lengths show excellent agreement with experiment. The D_e values predicted by both Zn₂ calculations were in excellent agreement with the experimental value. Similar agreement was observed between calculated and experimental bond dissociation energy for ZnO and ZnH whereas the calculated ZnCl and ZnS D_e values were significant underestimations. The ω_e value calculated for ZnH showed excellent agreement with the experimental frequency, with a 2.6% deviation. The ZnCl and ZnS calculated ω_e values showed moderate agreement with experiment, with respective 4.9 and 6.8% errors. The 63 wavenumber error between computed and observed ω_e for ZnO represents a -7.8% deviation. Finally, while the absolute error in the Zn₂ calculated values was small, the percentage errors were significant, regardless of the selected correlated electrons (-11.6% with 3s3p3d4s and -8.9% with 3p3d4s). In Table 6 we have also reported the CCSD(T) values for r_e and ΔH_f for comparison. As far as ΔH_f is concerned, CASPT2 and CCSD(T) yield similar results for the Zn complexes investigated, with the CASPT2 values offering slight improvements over the CCSD(T) values for Zn₂, ZnO and ZnS. The predicted value for ZnH is outside the experimental error range, and poorer than the values predicted with both basis sets using the CCSD(T) method. Finally, in the case of ZnCl, the CASPT2 predicted heat of formation lies between the values predicted at the CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ and CCSD(T)/aug-cc-pVTZ levels of theory.

Conclusions

Heats of formation were calculated for nine ZnX complexes using fourteen density functionals, and the MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T) methods with both the cc-pVTZ and aug-cc-pVTZ basis sets. CASPT2 energies were used to predict heats of formation for all dimeric Zn complexes. Among the poorest performing levels of theory were BLYP, B3LYP, MP2 and CCSD. CCSD(T) proved acceptable in conjunction with the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set, besting all but four of the density functional methods employed, however, the calculations on Zn(CH₃)₂ proved to be cost prohibitive (for both basis sets), which limits the overall efficacy of the method. The TPSSKCIS/cc-pVTZ level of theory produced the lowest unsigned average error for predicted heats of formation. Other low error theory levels include TPSS1KCIS/aug-cc-pVTZ and TPSSTPSS, MPWPW91, PBEPBE and PBE1PBE with the cc-pVTZ basis set (identical or slightly larger average unsigned errors were observed with the inclusion of diffuse functions).

Additionally, the calculated distances at the various levels of theory employed were compared to experimental values. An exceptionally large range of Zn—Zn bond lengths were calculated for Zn₂, with the coupled cluster values by far the largest. The bond lengths calculated using the TPSSTPSS density functional with both basis sets were the smallest values and the CCSD/cc-pVTZ distance the largest. In general some of the largest deviations from experimental bond lengths were observed with the B3LYP functional.

These results support our previous conclusions^{2,3} that for studying systems employing zinc centers, careful consideration should be paid to the chosen density functional method even with these larger basis sets and that properly selected density functionals clearly outperform MP2 and coupled-cluster calculations. CASPT2 energies with CCSD/cc-pVTZ thermal

corrections produced experimentally accurate heats of formation for ZnH, ZnO and ZnCl, although clearly this theory level is not plausible for biologically relevant systems.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank the NIH (GM066859 and GM044974) for supporting this research. The CASPT2 results (DM, HJK and LG) are based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant number CHE-1212575. MNW wishes to thank the NIH for support in the form of an NRSA postdoctoral fellowship (F32GM079968). Finally, we thank the members of the Merz group for useful discussions during the course of this research.

References

1. Riley KE, Merz KM. *J Phys Chem A*. 2007; 111:6044. [PubMed: 17571862]
2. Weaver MN, Yang Y, Merz KM. *J Phys Chem A*. 2009; 113:10081. [PubMed: 19691272]
3. Yang Y, Weaver MN, Merz KM. *J Phys Chem A*. 2009; 113:9843. [PubMed: 19691271]
4. Balabanov NB, Peterson KA. *J Chem Phys*. 2005; 123
5. Eger WA, Zercher CK, Williams CM. *J Org Chem*. 2010; 75:7322. [PubMed: 20879758]
6. van Gastel M, Lu CC, Wieghardt K, Lubitz W. *Inorg Chem*. 2009; 48:2626. [PubMed: 19267507]
7. Govind N, Valiev M, Jensen L, Kowalski K. *J Phys Chem A*. 2009; 113:6041. [PubMed: 19405520]
8. Jeanvoine Y, Spezia R. *J Phys Chem A*. 2009; 113:7878. [PubMed: 19522520]
9. Schmidt S, Schulz S, Blaser D, Boese R, Bolte M. *Organometallics*. 2010; 29:6097.
10. Sorkin A, Truhlar DG, Amin EA. *J Chem Theory Comput*. 2009; 5:1254.
11. Jiang WY, DeYonker NJ, Determan JJ, Wilson AK. *J Phys Chem A*. 2012; 116:870. [PubMed: 22107449]
12. Tekarli SM, Drummond ML, Williams TG, Cundari TR, Wilson AK. *J Phys Chem A*. 2009; 113:8607. [PubMed: 19572689]
13. Pollack L, Windus TL, de Jong WA, Dixon DA. *J Phys Chem A*. 2005; 109:6934. [PubMed: 16834051]
14. Becke AD. *Phys Rev A*. 1988; 38:3098. [PubMed: 9900728]
15. Lee CT, Yang WT, Parr RG. *Phys Rev B*. 1988; 37:785.
16. Perdew JP, Chevary JA, Vosko SH, Jackson KA, Pederson MR, Singh DJ, Fiolhais C. *Phys Rev B*. 1992; 46:6671.
17. Perdew JP, Wang Y. *Phys Rev B*. 1992; 45:13244.
18. Adamo C, Barone V. *J Chem Phys*. 1998; 108:664.
19. Perdew JP, Burke K, Ernzerhof M. *Phys Rev Lett*. 1996; 77:3865. [PubMed: 10062328]
20. Stephens PJ, Devlin FJ, Chabalowski CF, Frisch MJ. *J Phys Chem-U.S.* 1994; 98:11623.
21. Hertwig RH, Koch W. *Chem Phys Lett*. 1997; 268:345.
22. Adamo C, Barone V. *Chem Phys Lett*. 1998; 298:113.
23. Adamo C, Barone V. *J Chem Phys*. 1999; 110:6158.
24. Schmider HL, Becke AD. *J Chem Phys*. 1998; 108:9624.
25. Staroverov VN, Scuseria GE, Tao JM, Perdew JP. *J Chem Phys*. 2003; 119:12129.
26. Tao JM, Perdew JP, Staroverov VN, Scuseria GE. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2003; 91
27. Rey J, Savin A. *Int J Quantum Chem*. 1998; 69:581.
28. Toulouse J, Savin A, Adamo C. *J Chem Phys*. 2002; 117:10465.
29. Gonis, A.; Kioussis, N.; Ciftan, M. *Electron correlations and materials properties*. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers; New York: 1999.
30. Becke AD. *J Chem Phys*. 1996; 104:1040.
31. Zhao Y, Lynch BJ, Truhlar DG. *Phys Chem Chem Phys*. 2005; 7:43.

32. Zhao Y, Lynch BJ, Truhlar DG. *J Phys Chem A*. 2004; 108:2715.
33. Perdew JP, Ruzsinszky A, Tao JM, Staroverov VN, Scuseria GE, Csonka GI. *J Chem Phys*. 2005; 123
34. Van Doren, VE.; Van Alsenoy, C.; Geerlings, P. Density functional theory and its application to materials : Antwerp, Belgium, 8–10 June 2000. American Institute of Physics; Melville, N.Y: 2001.
35. Zhao Y, Truhlar DG. *J Chem Phys*. 2006; 125
36. Zhao Y, Truhlar DG. *Theor Chem Acc*. 2008; 120:215.
37. Peters MB, Yang Y, Wang B, Fusti-Molnar L, Weaver MN, Merz KM. *J Chem Theory Comput*. 2010; 6:2935. [PubMed: 20856692]
38. Frisch, MJ.; Trucks, GW.; Schlegel, HB.; Scuseria, GE.; Robb, MA.; Cheeseman, JR.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Petersson, GA.; Nakatsuji, H.; Caricato, M.; Li, X.; Hratchian, HP.; Izmaylov, AF.; Bloino, J.; Zheng, G.; Sonnenberg, JL.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Vreven, T.; Montgomery, JA., Jr; Peralta, JE.; Ogliaro, F.; Bearpark, M.; Heyd, JJ.; Brothers, E.; Kudin, KN.; Staroverov, VN.; Kobayashi, R.; Normand, J.; Raghavachari, K.; Rendell, A.; Burant, JC.; Iyengar, SS.; Tomasi, J.; Cossi, M.; Rega, N.; Millam, JM.; Klene, M.; Knox, JE.; Cross, JB.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, RE.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, AJ.; Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, JW.; Martin, RL.; Morokuma, K.; Zakrzewski, VG.; Voth, GA.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, JJ.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, AD.; Farkas, O.; Foresman, JB.; Ortiz, JV.; Cioslowski, J.; Fox, DJ. Gaussian.
39. Pople JA, Headgordon M, Raghavachari K. *J Chem Phys*. 1987; 87:5968.
40. Scuseria GE, Janssen CL, Schaefer HF. *J Chem Phys*. 1988; 89:7382.
41. Scuseria GE, Schaefer HF. *J Chem Phys*. 1989; 90:3700.
42. Purvis GD, Bartlett RJ. *J Chem Phys*. 1982; 76:1910.
43. Cizek J. *Advances in Chemical Physics*. 1969; 14:35.
44. Bartlett RJ. *J Phys Chem-Us*. 1989; 93:1697.
45. Dunning TH. *J Chem Phys*. 1989; 90:1007.
46. Davidson ER. *Chem Phys Lett*. 1996; 260:514.
47. Aquilante F, De Vico L, Ferre N, Ghigo G, Malmqvist PA, Neogrady P, Pedersen TB, Pitonak M, Reiher M, Roos BO, Serrano-Andres L, Urban M, Veryazov V, Lindh R. *J Comput Chem*. 2010; 31:224. [PubMed: 19499541]
48. Roos BO, Lindh R, Malmqvist PA, Veryazov V, Widmark PO. *J Phys Chem A*. 2004; 108:2851.
49. Roos BO, Lindh R, Malmqvist PA, Veryazov V, Widmark PO. *J Phys Chem A*. 2005; 109:6575. [PubMed: 16834004]
50. Forsberg N, Malmqvist PA. *Chem Phys Lett*. 1997; 274:196.
51. Ghigo G, Roos BO, Malmqvist PA. *Chem Phys Lett*. 2004; 396:142.
52. http://www.gaussian.com/g_whitepap/thermo.htm.
53. <http://webbook.nist.gov/chemistry/>.
54. Yungman, VS. Vol. 4–6. Wiley; New York: 1999.
55. Bredow T, Geudtner G, Jug K. *J Comput Chem*. 2001; 22:861.
56. Czajkowski MA, Koperski J. *Spectrochim Acta A*. 1999; 55:2221.
57. Czajkowski M, Bobkowski R, Krause L. *Phys Rev A*. 1990; 41:277. [PubMed: 9902868]
58. Ellingsen K, Saue T, Pouchan C, Gropen O. *Chem Phys*. 2005; 311:35.
59. Lee TJ, Taylor PR. *Int J Quantum Chem*. 1989; 199
60. Korth M, Grimme S. *J Chem Theory Comput*. 2009; 5:993.
61. Jiang WY, Laury ML, Powell M, Wilson AK. *J Chem Theory Comput*. 2012; 8:4102.
62. Jiang WY, Wilson AK. *J Chem Phys*. 2011; 134
63. Fancher CA, de Clercq HL, Thomas OC, Robinson DW, Bowen KH. *J Chem Phys*. 1998; 109:8426.
64. Aldridge S, Downs AJ. *Chem Rev*. 2001; 101:3305. [PubMed: 11840988]

65. Zack LN, Ziurys LM. J Mol Spectrosc. 2009; 257:213.
66. Tenenbaum ED, Flory MA, Pulliam RL, Ziurys LM. J Mol Spectrosc. 2007; 244:153.

Figure 1.

Average unsigned error (kcal/mol) for all methods using the cc-pVTZ basis set. The CCSD(T) errors are an average of the 8 calculable complexes.

Figure 2. Average unsigned error (kcal/mol) for all methods using the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set. The CCSD and CCSD(T) errors are an average of the eight calculable complexes.

Figure 3.
Zn—Zn bond length versus ΔH_f for all levels of theory investigated.

Experimental⁵⁴, DFT, MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T) heats of formation for Zn complexes. All calculations use the cc-pVTZ basis set. All values are in kcal mol⁻¹.

Table 1

Method	ΔH_f											
	Zn ₂	ZnH	ZnO	ZnF ₂	ZnS	ZnCl	ZnCl ₂	ZnCH ₃	Zn(CH ₃) ₂			
Expt.	57.7	62.9	52.8	-118.9	48.7	6.5	-63.5	26	12.9			
Expt. Error	1.5	0.5	0.9	1.1	3.0	1.0	0.4	2.5	2.0			
BLYP	65.0	64.2	51.5	-116.2	67.1	16.7	-48.9	55.9	26.1			
MPWPW91	63.5	62.7	48.2	-122.9	61.0	9.3	-61.2	48.7	12.5			
PBEPBE	62.9	62.9	46.4	-125.1	59.5	8.5	-63.7	46.2	7.0			
B3LYP	64.9	62.6	61.3	-111.2	69.4	14.2	-53.0	52.9	19.9			
PBE1PBE	63.6	61.4	58.7	-114.1	64.4	6.8	-64.7	49.0	13.8			
B98	64.0	64.3	61.5	-114.7	64.5	11.6	-61.3	53.8	19.5			
TPSSTPSS	63.1	56.8	51.9	-122.2	59.8	6.6	-64.7	43.4	4.0			
TPSSKCIS	63.6	60.3	50.3	-121.6	60.3	8.1	-62.1	47.2	11.2			
BB95	64.5	64.2	45.3	-125.5	59.0	11.0	-61.1	51.2	14.9			
B1B95	64.7	62.8	61.4	-114.7	63.8	8.7	-63.6	52.9	19.2			
TPSSI1KCIS	64.0	59.9	57.7	-116.0	62.9	7.6	-62.3	48.0	13.1			
BB1K	64.8	61.8	72.8	-110.6	65.7	7.1	-65.4	53.2	20.5			
M06-L	62.8	62.3	49.6	-133.5	55.7	5.3	-76.0	42.6	-6.5			
M06-2X	64.3	62.4	68.5	-117.3	66.0	6.3	-65.5	50.8	18.8			
MP2	64.4	63.7	45.1	-129.1	62.2	5.3	-69.0	55.3	23.2			
CCSD	64.9	62.4	71.8	-107.6	74.9	13.2	-54.0	61.9	37.2			
CCSD(T)	64.8	62.9	61.4	-111.7	69.2	12.3	-57.1	58.4	---			

Experimental⁵⁴, DFT, MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T) heats of formation for Zn complexes. All calculations use the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set. All values are in kcal mol⁻¹.

Table 2

Method	ΔH_f											
	Zn ₂	ZnH	ZnO	ZnF ₂	ZnS	ZnCl	ZnCl ₂	ZnCH ₃	Zn(CH ₃) ₂			
Expt.	57.7	62.9	52.8	-118.9	48.7	6.5	-63.5	26	12.9			
Expt. Error	1.5	0.5	0.9	1.1	3.0	1.0	0.4	2.5	2.0			
BLYP	65.2	64.4	50.6	-118.4	67.1	16.6	-49.0	56.4	26.8			
MPWPW91	63.7	62.8	47.2	-125.3	61.0	9.2	-61.5	49.1	13.2			
PBEPBE	63.2	63.0	45.4	-127.6	59.5	8.3	-64.0	46.7	7.8			
B3LYP	65.0	62.7	60.4	-114.4	30.7	13.9	-53.5	53.1	20.2			
PBE1PBE	63.7	61.5	62.2	-117.7	64.1	6.3	-65.5	49.1	14.1			
B98	64.1	64.4	60.4	-118.2	64.2	11.1	-62.1	54.0	19.9			
TPSSTPSS	63.4	56.9	50.8	-125.1	59.7	6.4	-65.2	43.8	4.7			
TPSSKCIS	63.9	60.4	49.2	-124.4	60.2	7.9	-62.4	47.6	12.0			
BB95	64.7	64.4	44.4	-127.9	58.9	10.8	-61.4	51.7	15.7			
B1B95	64.8	62.8	62.4	-118.3	63.4	8.2	-64.4	53.0	19.4			
TPSSI1KCIS	64.1	60.0	56.7	-119.3	62.6	7.2	-62.9	48.2	13.6			
BB1K	64.8	61.8	70.6	-114.7	65.2	6.6	-66.4	53.2	20.5			
M06-L	63.2	65.8	58.4	-118.5	61.7	8.9	-69.4	54.4	17.0			
M06-2X	64.3	62.2	65.7	-121.6	65.2	5.5	-66.7	50.6	18.1			
MP2	64.0	64.8	40.2	-137.4	60.6	4.8	-71.6	54.8	20.4			
CCSD	64.7	62.6	67.8	-115.8	73.2	11.9	-57.0	60.5	---			
CCSD(T)	64.6	63.2	57.3	-120.4	67.4	11.0	-60.3	38.9	---			

Table 3

Experimental⁵⁵, DFT, MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T) Zn—X bond lengths (Ångstroms) for Zn complexes; cc-pVTZ basis set.

Method	Zn ₂	ZnH	ZnO	ZnF ₂	ZnS	ZnCl	ZnCl ₂	ZnCH ₃	Zn(CH ₃) ₂
Expt.	4.19 ⁵⁶	1.594	---	1.742	2.046	2.130	2.072	---	1.930
BLYP	3.628	1.635	1.713	1.749	2.084	2.202	2.108	2.079	1.968 ^o
MPWPW91	3.161	1.615	1.699	1.739	2.060	2.168	2.088	2.033	1.948 ^e
PBEPBE	3.148	1.618	1.698	1.739	2.059	2.167	2.087	2.031	1.947 ^e
B3LYP	3.740	1.621	1.880 ^f	1.736	2.073	2.179	2.096	2.054	1.958 ^e
PBE1PBE	3.290	1.609	1.857 ^f	1.727	2.052	2.152	2.081	2.015	1.942 ^g
B98	3.544	1.622	1.881 ^f	1.735	2.071	2.176	2.095	2.051	1.958 ^e
TPSSTPSS	3.080	1.609	1.696	1.736	2.053	2.164	2.086	2.032	1.950 ^e
TPSSKClS	3.200	1.609	1.701	1.740	2.059	2.172	2.091	2.040	1.954 ^g
BB95	3.267	1.623	1.701	1.741	2.059	2.173	2.088	2.040	1.948 ^e
B1B95	3.529	1.611	1.863 ^f	1.727	2.050	2.153	2.079	2.020	1.942 ^g
TPSS1KClS	3.303	1.606	1.867 ^f	1.734	2.056	2.164	2.088	2.032	1.951 ^g
BB1K	3.632	1.607	1.692	1.722	2.045	2.146	2.076	2.010	1.940 ^g
M06-L	3.202	1.618	1.699	1.730	2.045	2.157	2.075	2.036	1.945 ^e
M06-2X	3.967	1.645	1.723	1.741	2.099	2.184	2.110	2.057	1.978 ^e
MP2	3.904	1.566	1.665	1.720	2.043	2.129	2.070	1.975	1.924 ^g
CCSD	4.856	1.597	1.718	1.726	2.071	2.150	2.090	2.013	1.949 ^g
CCSD(T)	4.488	1.594	1.711	1.727	2.070	2.148	2.088	2.010	---

^a Calculation required OPT=CalcAll

^e Eclipsed

^g Gauche

^o Offset

^f Indicates those methods predicting a ground state triplet for ZnO, as opposed to the singlet state.

Table 4

Experimental⁵⁵, DFT, MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T) Zn—X bond lengths (Å) for Zn complexes; aug-cc-pVTZ basis set.

Method	Zn ₂	ZnH	ZnO	ZnF ₂	ZnS	ZnCl	ZnCl ₂	ZnCH ₃	Zn(CH ₃) ₂
Expt.	4.19 ⁵⁶	1.594	---	1.742	2.046	2.130	2.072	---	1.930
BLYP	3.985	1.635	1.719	1.754	2.086	2.204	2.109	2.079	1.930
MPWPW91	3.187	1.615	1.703	1.743	2.061	2.089	2.089	2.032	1.967 ^o
PBEPBE	3.174	1.619	1.703	1.743	2.061	2.169	2.088	2.030	1.946 ^g
B3LYP	3.940	1.621	1.884 ^t	1.740	2.074	2.181	2.097	2.054	1.946 ^o
PBE1PBE	3.309	1.609	1.697	1.731	2.053	2.153	2.082	2.014	1.957 ^g
B98	3.577	1.622	1.706	1.739	2.072	2.178	2.096	2.050	1.942 ^g
TPSSTPSS	3.113	1.610	1.700	1.739	2.054	2.165	2.087	2.032	1.957 ^g
TPSSKCIS	3.228	1.609	1.706	1.743	2.060	2.173	2.092	2.040	1.950 ^g
BB95	3.317	1.623	1.706	1.745 ^a	2.061	2.174	2.089	2.039	1.954 ^g
B1B95	3.562	1.612	1.699	1.730	2.052	2.154	2.080	2.019	1.948 ^e
TPSS1KCIS	3.334	1.607	1.871 ^t	1.738	2.057	2.165	2.089	2.031	1.942 ^g
BB1K	3.681	1.607	1.696	1.725	2.047	2.147	2.077	2.010	1.951 ^g
M06-L	3.246	1.618	1.701	1.733	2.045	2.157	2.075	2.035	1.940 ^g
M06-2X	3.988	1.644	1.730	1.744	2.101	2.185	2.110	2.055	1.944 ^e
MP2	3.716	1.572	1.678	1.725	2.046	2.131	2.068	1.982	1.977 ^g
CCSD	4.470	1.604	1.723	1.730	2.072	1.152	2.088	2.018	1.925 ^g
CCSD(T)	4.126	1.603	1.719	1.732	2.072	2.151	2.086	2.018	---

^e Eclipsed

^g Gauche

^o Offset

^t Indicates those methods predicting a ground state triplet for ZnO, as opposed to the singlet state.

Table 5CCSD/cc-pVTZ computed T_1 diagnostics for the nine Zn complexes.

Entry	CCSD/cc-pVTZ
$^1\text{Zn}_2$	0.0184
^2ZnH	0.0211
^1ZnO	0.0333
$^1\text{ZnF}_2$	0.0180
^1ZnS	0.0241
$^2\text{ZnCl}$	0.0167
$^1\text{ZnCl}_2$	0.0132
$^2\text{ZnCH}_3$	0.0174
$^1\text{Zn}(\text{CH}_3)_2$	0.0128

Table 6

Bond lengths, spectroscopic constants and heats of formation from CASPT2 calculations on Zn containing dimers. Correlated electrons in the CASPT2 calculations are indicated in parenthesis. The corresponding CCSD(T) values are also included for comparison.

Entry	State	r_e (Å)	D_e (eV)	D_0 (eV)	ω_e (cm ⁻¹)	ΔH_f
Zn ₂ (3s3p3d4s)	$1\Sigma_g^+$	3.695	0.034	0.033	22.9	63.1
Zn ₂ (3p3d4s)	$1\Sigma_g^+$	4.704	0.034	0.032	23.6	63.1
Zn ₂ expt. ⁵⁸		4.19	0.035	---	25.9	57.7
CCSD(T) cc-pVTZ		4.488	0.010	0.009		64.8
CCSD(T) aug-cc-pVTZ		4.126	0.020	0.019		64.6
<hr/>						
ZnO (Zn 3s3p3d4s) (O 2s2p)	$1\Sigma^+$	1.700	1.54	1.45	742	56.6
ZnO expt. ⁶³		---	1.61	---	805	52.8
CCSD(T) cc-pVTZ		1.711	1.34	1.29		61.4
CCSD(T) aug-cc-pVTZ		1.719	1.52	1.47		57.3
<hr/>						
ZnH (Zn 3s3p3d4s)	$2\Sigma^+$	1.576	0.97	0.87	1644	63.8
ZnH expt. ⁶⁴		1.594	1.01	---	1603	62.9
CCSD(T) cc-pVTZ		1.594	1.01	0.91		62.9
CCSD(T) aug-cc-pVTZ		1.603	0.99	0.90		63.2
<hr/>						
ZnS (Zn 3s3p3d4s) (S 2s2p3s3p)	$1\Sigma^+$	2.047	2.59	2.54	488	65.0
ZnS expt. ⁶⁵		2.046	3.12	---	457	48.7
CCSD(T) cc-pVTZ		2.070	1.28	1.25		69.2
CCSD(T) aug-cc-pVTZ		2.072	1.36	1.33		67.4
<hr/>						
ZnCl (Zn 3s3p3d4s) (S 2s2p3s3p)	$2\Sigma^+$	2.113	2.17	2.32	404	11.5
ZnCl expt. ⁶⁶		2.130	2.73	---	385.2	6.5
CCSD(T) cc-pVTZ		2.148	2.13	2.11		12.3
CCSD(T) aug-cc-pVTZ		2.151	2.19	2.17		11.0