Published in final edited form as:

Appl Magn Reson. 2020 October ; 51(9-10): 977–991. doi:10.1007/s00723-020-01252-8.

One Electron Multiple Proton Transfer in Model Organic Donor-Acceptor Systems: Implications for High Frequency EPR

Kristy L. Mardis[‡], Jens Niklas[‡], Harriet Omodayo[‡], Emmanuel Odella[#], Thomas A. Moore[#], Ana L. Moore[#], Oleg G. Poluektov[†]

[†]Chemical Sciences and Engineering Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Illinois 60439, USA

[‡]Department of Chemistry, Physics, and Engineering Studies, Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois 60628, USA

[#]School of Molecular Sciences, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, 85287, USA

Abstract

EPR spectroscopy is an important spectroscopic method for identification and characterization of radical species involved in many biological reactions. The tyrosyl radical is one of the most studied amino acid radical intermediates in biology. Often in conjunction with histidine residues, it is involved in many fundamental biological electron and proton transfer processes, such as in the water oxidation in photosystem II. As biological processes are typically extremely complicated and hard to control, molecular bio-mimetic model complexes are often used to clarify the mechanisms of the biological reactions. Here we present theoretical calculations to investigate the sensitivity of magnetic resonance parameters to proton-coupled electron transfer events, as well as conformational substates of the molecular constructs which mimic the tyrosine-histidine (Tyr-His) pairs found in a large variety of proteins. Upon oxidation of the phenol, the Tyr analogue, these complexes can perform not only one-electron one-proton transfer (EPT), but also one-electron two-proton transfers (E2PT). It is shown that in aprotic environment the g_X -components of the electronic g -tensor are extremely sensitive to the first proton transfer from the phenoxyl oxygen to the imidazole nitrogen (EPT product), leading to a significant increase of the g_X -value of up to 0.003, but are not sensitive to the second proton transfer (E2PT product). In the latter case the change of the g_X -value is much smaller (*ca.* 0.0001), which is too small to be distinguished even by high frequency EPR. The ^{14}N hyperfine values are also too similar to allow differentiation between the different protonation states in EPT and E2PT. The magnetic resonance parameters were also calculated as a function of the rotation angles around single bonds. It was demonstrated that rotation of the phenoxyl group results in large positive changes (>0.001) in the g_X -values. Analysis of the data reveals that the main source of these changes is related to the strength of the H-bond between phenoxyl oxygen and the proton(s) on N_1 and N_2 positions of the imidazole.

Introduction

In the last decades EPR spectroscopy experienced extensive development of its instrumentation and methodology as well as a rapid growth in applications.^{1–11} Part of these efforts was focused on the increase of information which can be extracted from EPR spectra. In contrast to modern NMR spectroscopy, EPR cannot currently be considered a

truly analytical technique in the sense that in most cases spectra alone don't allow quick conclusions about molecular structures or easy quantification of several species in a mixture. This predominantly relates to the low specificity of the EPR spectra, *i.e.* only in a few cases can EPR spectral data be directly related to the structure of the paramagnetic center under study. The analysis of EPR data is usually carried out by time-intensive interactive computer simulation of the experimental spectra. In the simplest cases, like small organic radicals in liquid solutions, where all anisotropic interactions are averaged out due to fast tumbling, the data extraction can often be done quite accurately, and the molecular structure may be directly identified.¹² However, once the molecule becomes larger and possesses more magnetic nuclei, more sophisticated multiple resonance methods like Electron Nuclear Double Resonance (ENDOR) are required to determine the structure.^{12–15} In cases of frozen solution, where typically many anisotropic interactions are present, the analysis becomes considerably more complex. If molecules containing atoms with large spin-orbit coupling (like transition metals) are involved, or several unpaired electrons are present, data analysis quickly becomes very challenging as for any ill-defined problem with a large parameter space. To simplify this problem and make the analysis reliable, some of the parameters must be determined from independent experiments using different and often more advanced techniques.

A number of these advanced approaches, which effectively increase spectral resolution of the EPR technique, were recently developed. Among them are: high frequency (HF) EPR to resolve g-tensor components and separate overlapping spectra from different species; multi-frequency EPR to increase reliability of the extracted EPR parameters; time-resolved and pulsed technique to characterize transient species and relaxation properties of the paramagnetic species; pulsed ENDOR, ESEEM and HYSCORE to gain information on hyperfine interaction (HFI) not resolved in the EPR spectra, pulsed ELDOR to determine distance and mutual orientation of spin centers.^{1, 5–6, 8–9, 11, 16–20} Prof. Lebedev and his co-workers were among the first to realize the power of HF EPR for applications in chemistry and biology, and pioneered the instrumental and methodological development of HF EPR.^{21–25}

While extraction of spectroscopic parameters from EPR spectra has become more reliable, there is still a fundamental problem in determining the geometric and electronic structure of the paramagnetic center based on the parameters of the spin Hamiltonian used in EPR spectroscopy.^{1, 8–9, 26} Therefore, computational approaches are essential to provide the spin Hamiltonian parameters for particular molecular and electronic structures.^{27–29} Depending on the accuracy required and the complexity of the system, different levels of theory can be used. For systems of interest in the fields of catalysis and biological active sites, simple and computationally efficient semi-empirical analysis would be attractive except it often fails for the open shell transition metals in many of those systems. On the other end, high level *ab initio* wave-function based methods cannot be applied in most cases for biology and catalysis due to the enormous computational demands for treating large systems. Thus, using Density Functional Theory (DFT) for the calculation of the molecular structure (geometry), electronic structure, and magnetic resonance parameters of EPR-active centers is often an excellent compromise of accuracy and computational demands.^{28, 30–32} The validation and identification of the “real” geometric and electronic structure of paramagnetic centers in this

case has to be done by careful comparison of the experimental and theoretically calculated parameters.

One prominent example where the combination of (HF) EPR and DFT calculations can be applied is the identification of the mechanism of light-induced proton-coupled electron transfer (PCET) process in the tyrosine-histidine (Tyr-His) pair (Scheme 1) in photosystem II (PS II).^{33–38} PS II is a very large transmembrane protein responsible for water oxidation and oxygen production.^{39–41} A Tyr-His pair serves as a charge mediator for electron transfer from the oxygen-evolving Mn-containing complex to the oxidized primary donor, which is a chlorophyll dimer. Upon oxidation, Tyr donates a proton to its H-bonded His partner, thus forming a tyrosyl radical. HF EPR studies at low temperature clearly point to the complexity of this PCET process in PSII.^{38, 42–43} The low temperature mechanism of PCET on the molecular level was understood based on the combination of HF EPR experiments and extensive theoretical modeling of EPR parameters for Tyr-His mimic, designed by the ASU group (Scheme 1).^{44–45} The displacement of the proton from the tyrosine oxygen to the nearest nitrogen of a histidine, takes place upon light-induced Tyr oxidation.⁴⁵ At very low temperatures, below 10 K, this is a stable configuration. But upon annealing, the nearest environment of the tyrosyl radical relaxes and rearranges the H-bond to the tyrosyl oxygen. As a consequence, the g_X component of the g-tensor increases by about 0.001, which was confirmed by computational modeling.^{45–46}

Besides its importance for PSII, tyrosyl radicals are the most frequently reported free radical in proteins.^{36, 47–51} They are involved in many important enzymatic reactions in biology. While the dependence of the tyrosyl radical g-tensor on the strength and number of the H-bonds to oxygen is well studied in many biological systems and their synthetic analogs, there are still several important unanswered questions. In particular, in aprotic environments where external protons are not available to form hydrogen bonds with the oxygen or nitrogen atoms in the tyrosyl radicals or Tyr-His pairs, the extent of the influence of hydrogen bonding to remote nitrogen or conformation changes in the second and third coordination spheres on the magnetic resonance parameters is unknown. Recently, the ASU group developed more complex PCET model systems based on Tyr-His couples which can demonstrate not only one-electron one-proton transfer (EPT) but also one-electron two-proton (E2PT) and one-electron three-proton (E3PT) transfer, upon oxidation of the phenol, which operates as the tyrosine analogue.^{44, 52–55} Thus, for the Tyr-His mimics shown in Figure 1, the first proton transfer from phenoxyl oxygen to imidazole nitrogen N₁ takes place upon oxidation (EPT product). The second proton transfer occurs from imidazole nitrogen N₂ to N₃ (E2PT product). While the first proton transfer takes place in the vicinity of the phenoxyl oxygen atom (which carries the highest amount of unpaired spin), the second proton transfer follows at more remote sites (see Figure 1). In this work we use these unique systems to carry out computational studies to investigate the sensitivity of the magnetic resonance parameters to EPT and E2PT, as well as conformational substates of the model molecular complexes in aprotic environment.

Methods

Initial structures for BIP-OCH₃, BIP-CN, and BIP-PYR (Figure 1) were built and optimized in PQSMol using DFT with B3LYP||6-31G*.^{56–58} After initial optimization, structures were then re-optimized in Turbomole using B3LYP||def2-TZVPP with the D3BJ correction(Becke-Johnson damping) to account for dispersion effects.^{59–61} Geometry optimizations were performed both for the neutral parent molecule (singlet, diamagnetic) as well as +1 cation radical (doublet, paramagnetic, EPR-active). Optimized N₁N₃ (only N₁ and N₃ nitrogen atoms are protonated), N₁N₂ (only N₁ and N₂ nitrogen atoms are protonated), ON₂ (phenol oxygen and N₂ nitrogen atom are protonated), and ON₃ (phenol oxygen and N₃ nitrogen atom are protonated) structures for all three compounds were then checked for absence of imaginary frequencies at the same level of theory and found to be energetic minima. Magnetic resonance parameters (g-tensors and hyperfine coupling tensors) were calculated with Orca v. 4.2.1^{62–63} using DFT B3LYP||EPRII. While the majority of calculations were performed in vacuum, the +1 cation BIP-CN in all protonation states was also optimized with the CPCM solvation model with dichloromethane parameters (Orca keyword: CH2Cl2) and water parameters (Orca keyword: water). Kristy new data and comments. These test calculations yielded magnetic resonance parameters and energy rankings very similar to the vacuum results. (see discussion below and Supporting Information). To investigate the effect of dihedral rotation on the EPR parameters, torsional scans of both Θ_1 and Θ_2 (see Figure 1) were performed in Turbomole for multiple protonation states for the +1 cations using DFT with B3LYP||def2-TZVP with D3BJ dispersion correction fixing only the rotated dihedral angle and allowing all other coordinates to relax to obtain the torsional scan data.

Result and Discussion

The three BIP derivatives shown in Figure 1 (BIP-OCH₃, BIP-CN, and BIP-PYR) present models for Tyr-His pairs and thus provide the possibility to study both EPT (ON₂→N₁N₂) and E2PT (ON₂→N₁N₃). The structures are labeled with reference to where the two “mobile” protons are located (Figure 1). Proton transfer/s occur after single oxidation of the neutral diamagnetic parent complex, yielding an EPR-active radical cation. In agreement with prior work^{44, 52–54} the neutral parent molecule is stable in the ON₂ protonation state (see Supporting Information for energies). For the radical cation, calculated g-values, HFI, and energies relative to the lowest energy state are shown in Table 1. Geometries and energies for BIP-CN and BIP-OCH₃ are in good agreement with previous computational studies.^{52, 54} All three molecules in all investigated protonation states show only minimal deviations from planarity. For all three molecules, the N₁N₃ protonation state has the lowest energy, the N₁N₂ protonation state is a few kcal higher in energy, and protonation states with the phenoxyl oxygen protonated (ON₂ and ON₃) are much higher (>9 kcal/mol) in energy. When BIP-OCH₃ is electrochemically oxidized only the E2PT (N₁N₃) can be detected and when the BIP-CN is electrochemically oxidized a mixture of EPT (N₁N₂) and E2PT (N₁N₃) products is generated, with the EPT being the majority product. This is in agreement with our DFT calculation where the N₁N₂-N₁N₂ energy difference is 3.5 kcal/mol larger for BIP-OCH₃ than for BIP-CN. The energy difference between N₁N₃ and N₁N₂ protonation states for BIP-PYR is also only a few kcal/mol, but preliminary electrochemical studies

have not demonstrated the presence of the EPT product. In any case, the energy difference calculated here between N_1N_3 and N_1N_2 protonation states lies within the accuracy range of DFT, which is several kcal/mol for this type of molecule.^{54, 64}

For all molecules, the orientation of main g-tensor axes were as following: g_z was perpendicular to the plane of the molecule while g_y is parallel to a vector running between N_3 and carbon ortho to the phenoxyl carbon and g_x is approximately 45 degrees rotated from the line connecting N_1 and N_2 (see Supporting Information, Figure S3). For the EPT product the largest principal g-value g_x is sensitive to the location of the proton since the g-values change substantially, around 0.003 from 2.004 to 2.007, as the proton is transferred from the oxygen to the nitrogen N_1 (the other mobile proton remains at N_2). The middle g-value g_y is less sensitive, but shows the same trend, while the lowest g-value g_z is insensitive to the proton location and remains close to the free electron value. This is a well-known effect of the g-value dependence on the presence and strength of the O-H bond.^{65–67} The magnitude of changes in g_x are easily experimentally detectable by HF EPR and have been recorded for number of tyrosyl/phenoxyl/nitroxide/semiquinone type systems.^{37–38, 68–78}

On the other hand, the g-values are not influenced by the position of the second proton with respect to N_2 or N_3 . Due to the limited accuracy under typical conditions (g-strain, different glass conditions, and other broadening mechanisms) of experimental EPR data and the DFT calculations, the structures N_1N_2 and N_1N_3 are not distinguishable based on the g-value differences, which differ by only 0.0001. Thus, even EPR spectroscopy at very high frequencies cannot directly discriminate if the system has undergone the EPT or E2PT process. The spin density plots also do not show apparent differences between N_1N_2 and N_1N_3 , which means that ^{14}N hyperfine values are too similar to allow distinction of the two protonation states (Table 1). For N_1N_3 and N_1N_2 the spin density is primarily located on the phenoxyl group. In contrast, if the oxygen is protonated as for ON_2 and ON_3 configurations, the spin density is more delocalized extending to the benzimidazole group of BIP-PYR (Figure 2). Comparable results were obtained for the two other complexes (see Supporting Information, Figures S1 & S2). In fact, in not a single case does the spin density extend past the benzimidazole group onto the imine or pyridine moiety indicating that further substitution of these groups, while it might change redox potentials, is unlikely to influence the magnetic resonance parameters of these complexes to any significant degree.

As a group, these constructs represent a versatile model system to understand complex proton transfer processes found in biological systems.⁴⁴ In proteins and model systems containing a redox-active tyrosine residue, a significant spread of g_x -values was experimentally observed, while the g_y and g_z -values were essentially unchanged.^{65–67} Experimentally detected Tyr cation radical g_x -values vary between 2.009 to 2.006.^{66–67} The upper range is even higher than the calculated g_x -values for ON_2 and ON_3 in the current work. Taking into account that structures like ON_2 and ON_3 are not stable for the oxidized Tyr and have not been observed experimentally, this extreme variation cannot be explained on the basis of different protonation states of remote nitrogen atoms (see Table 1). Furthermore, the spread is too large to be attributed only to the strength of the hydrogen bonds to the oxygen of Tyr, which is less than 0.002 for the extreme variation of the H-bond distance.⁶⁵ However, nature is typically very efficient in modifying the electronic

properties of a protein-cofactor system to fulfill the required specific catalytic needs often by forcing cofactor molecules or residues into conformations significantly different from what are observed in isotropic solutions. This raises the question whether this applies to the current examples: Could the conformational state rather than the protonation state modulate magnetic resonance parameters of the radical complexes? To answer this question, we undertook additional conformational studies.

Rotation around several single bonds are possible for these complexes and leads to their conformation change, as shown in Figure 1. The rotation around Θ_2 , with Θ_1 fixed in its energy minimized value near 0° , has a barrier ranging from 13–35 kcal/mol (Figure 3 & S3 & S4), and exhibits two low local minima differing by 8.5–11.7 kcal/mol. As shown in those figures, the g_X -values remain nearly constant and change by less than 0.0001 for all three systems, despite the substantial change in energy. This is not surprising since the imine moiety does not contain significant spin density (Figure 2). In contrast, rotation around Θ_1 with Θ_2 remaining in its lowest energy conformation near 0° is shown in Figure 4 for the BIP-PYR molecule. This rotation of the phenol group results in large increases in the g_X -values, by more than 0.001. The maximum energy changes for this rotation are on the order of 10 kcal/mol, although the actual differences in energies between the $\Theta_1 = 0^\circ$ and $\Theta_1 = 180^\circ$ conformations are approximately 6–8 kcal/mol. Similar changes in both energies and g_X -values are present for all three molecules (see Supporting Information). It can clearly be seen that when the oxygen atom is unable to form a hydrogen bond (note the $\Theta_1 = 180^\circ$ structure for N_1N_3 and the middle structure in N_1N_2 where $\Theta_1 = 80^\circ$), the g_X value increases by measurable amount, *ca.* 0.0012. The rotational profile of Θ_1 for N_1N_2 is, as expected, more symmetric than N_1N_3 , since a 180° rotation for N_1N_2 restores an H-bond to the phenoxyl oxygen.

Note, that all calculations discussed above were done in vacuum, and thus imitate an aprotic environment, *i.e.* lack of external protons to make intermolecular H-bonds. For BIP-CN, we have explored the effect of changing solvent polarity, without adding explicit hydrogen bonds, through implicit solvent models. Calculations were performed with CPCM, an implicit solvent model, mimicking intermediate polarity (CH_2Cl_2) and a very polar environment (H_2O). The changes in g -values were minor, at maximum deviating 0.0002 from the values obtained for calculations in vacuum. This demonstrates that explicit hydrogen bonds are needed to significantly alter magnetic resonance parameters and that absent conformational changes resulting in new or different hydrogen bonds, even large changes in polarity have only minor effects on those parameters.

Altogether, these calculations combined allow us to distinguish between changes to the g -values due to conformational effects and changes caused by additional hydrogen bonding to the oxygen. Analysis of the data reveals that the calculated changes in the g_X -values for different conformation states are directly related to the distance of the spin density carrying oxygen from the proton on the N_1 and N_2 positions. If the conformation itself is additionally contributing to the modulation of the g_X , this effect is minor and cannot be decisively confirmed due to the current accuracy of the experimental and theoretical approaches. Thus, the presence of lower g -values in many proteins cannot simply be explained with the rotation of the phenoxyl group. The best candidate for lowering g_X is the introduction of

additional, weaker H-bonds from proton donating molecules, which was not addressed in the current calculations. One of the best studied protein cofactors in the protic environment are quinones. It was shown in prior work^{68, 70–72, 79–80} that the addition of extra H-bonds can lead to a substantial lowering of g_X .

To summarize, in this work we presented theoretical calculations to investigate the sensitivity of the magnetic resonance parameters to the one-electron one-proton and one-electron multiple proton transfers, as well as conformational substates of a model molecular complex in an aprotic environment. As model compounds we used recently developed systems which mimic PCET in biologically relevant Tyr-His couples.^{44, 52–54} Upon oxidation of the phenol, which operates as the tyrosine analogue (Figure 1), these complexes can perform not only one-electron one-proton transfer, EPT, but also one-electron two-proton transfer, E2PT. While the first proton transfer takes place in the vicinity of the phenoxyl oxygen, a second proton transfer occurs at a more remote site (Figure 1). It was shown that while g_X components of the g -tensors are very sensitive to EPT, which leads to the change of g_X -value up to 0.003, it is not sensitive to the second proton transfer. In the last case the change of the g_X -value is only *ca.* 0.0001, which is too small to be definitely assigned by HF EPR taking into account the typical accuracy of the experiment, broad EPR line width of the tyrosyl type radical, and the accuracy of the DFT calculations. As for ¹⁴N hyperfine couplings, they are also too similar to allow distinction of the EPT from E2PT configuration. We also tested the hypothesis that conformational changes of the model complexes can lead to the modulation of the g -values. For this reason, we calculated magnetic resonance parameters as a function of the rotation angles around single bonds, Θ_1 and Θ_2 (Figure 1). It was demonstrated that while rotation around Θ_2 has only a negligible effect on g -values, less than 0.0001, rotation of the phenol group around Θ_1 results in large positive changes in the g_X -values, by more than 0.001. Analysis of the data reveals that the main source of these changes is related to the strength of the H-bond between the phenoxyl oxygen and the proton in the N_1 and N_2 positions. Calculations with solvent environment of different polarity showed that explicit hydrogen bonds are needed to significantly alter magnetic resonance parameters and even large changes in polarity have only minor effects on those parameters.

These findings decrease the likelihood of misinterpretation of the high frequency EPR data of electron transfer in the tyrosine containing systems and permit more robust mechanistic studies in biological as well as bio-inspired model systems.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgement

This study is based upon work supported by U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Chemical Sciences, Geosciences, and Biosciences, under contract number DE-AC02-06CH11357 at Argonne National Laboratory (J.N. & O.G.P.) and DE-FG02-03ER15393 (A.L.M. & T.A.M). The work was supported by the Illinois Space Grant Consortium and National Institutes of Health (SC3 GM122614) (H.O. & K.L.M). We gratefully acknowledge the computing resources provided on Blues and Bebop,

high-performance computing clusters operated by the Laboratory Computing Resource Center at Argonne National Laboratory.

References

- (1). Goldfarb D; Stoll S, Eds. EPR Spectroscopy: Fundamentals and Methods Wiley: 2018.
- (2). Dinse K-P; Jeschke G EPR–ESR–EMR, an Ongoing Success Story. In Methods in Physical Chemistry, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA: 2012; pp 159–189.
- (3). Misra SK; Möbius K; Savitsky A Multifrequency EPR on Photosynthetic Systems. In Multifrequency Electron Paramagnetic Resonance, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA: 2011; pp 875–911.
- (4). Smirnov A EPR Studies of Nanomaterials. In Multifrequency Electron Paramagnetic Resonance, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA: 2011; pp 825–843.
- (5). Möbius K; Savitsky A High-Field EPR Spectroscopy on Proteins and their Model Systems: Characterization of Transient Paramagnetic States; The Royal Society of Chemistry: Cambridge, UK; 2009.
- (6). Lund A; Shiotani M; Shimada S Principles and Applications of ESR Spectroscopy; Springer: Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York; 2011.
- (7). Niklas J; Poluektov OG Charge Transfer Processes in OPV Materials as Revealed by EPR Spectroscopy. Adv. Energy Mater 2017, 7, 1602226.
- (8). Schweiger A; Jeschke G Principles of pulse electron paramagnetic resonance; Oxford University Press: New York; 2001.
- (9). Weil JA; Bolton JR; Weil JA; Bolton JR; Wertz JE Electron Paramagnetic Resonance: Elementary Theory and Practical Applications; John Wiley & Sons: New York; 2007.
- (10). Drescher M; Jeschke G, Eds. EPR Spectroscopy: Applications in Chemistry and Biology Springer: Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012.
- (11). Möbius K; Lubitz W; Cox N; Savitsky A Biomolecular EPR Meets NMR at High Magnetic Fields. Magnetochemistry 2018, 4, 85.
- (12). Gerson F; Huber W Electron Spin Resonance Spectroscopy of Organic Radicals; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim; 2003.
- (13). Kurreck H; Kirste B; Lubitz W ENDOR spectroscopy - a promising technique for investigating the structure of organic radicals. Angew. Chem.-Int. Edit 1984, 23, 173–194.
- (14). Kurreck H; Kirste B; Lubitz W Electron nuclear double resonance spectroscopy of radicals in solution - applications to organic and biological chemistry; VCH Publishers, Inc.: Deerfield Beach, Florida; 1988.
- (15). Möbius K; Fröhling W; Lendzian F; Lubitz W; Plato M; Winscom CJ Multiple magnetic-resonance studies on organic-molecules in their ground and excited-states. J. Phys. Chem 1982, 86, 4491–4507.
- (16). Jeschke G Distance measurements in the nanometer range by pulse EPR. ChemPhysChem 2002, 3, 927–932. [PubMed: 12503132]
- (17). Gemperle C; Schweiger A Pulsed Electron-Nuclear Double Resonance Methodology. Chem. Rev 1991, 91, 1481–1505.
- (18). Savitsky A; Möbius K High-field EPR. Photosynth. Res 2009, 102, 311–333. [PubMed: 19468856]
- (19). Grinberg O; Berliner LJ, Eds. Very High Frequency (VHF) ESR/EPR Springer: New York, 2004; Vol. 22.
- (20). Kulik L; Lubitz W Electron-nuclear double resonance. Photosynth. Res 2009, 102, 391–401. [PubMed: 19184518]
- (21). Lebedev YS Very High-Field EPR and its Applications. Appl. Magn. Reson 1994, 7, 339–362.
- (22). Grinberg OY; Dubinskii AA The Early Years. In Very High Frequency (VHF) ESR/EPR, Grinberg O; Berliner LJ, Eds., Springer: New York, 2004; Vol. 22, pp 1–5.

- (23). Galkin AA; Grinberg OY; Dubinskii AA; Kabdin NN; Krymov VN; Kurochkin VI; Lebedev YS; Oranskii LF; Shuvalov VF EPR Spectrometer in 2 mm Range for Chemical Research. *Instrum. Exp. Tech* 1977, 20, 1229–1229.
- (24). Bresgunov AY; Dubinskii AA; Krimov VN; Petrov YG; Poluektov OG; Lebedev YS Pulsed EPR in 2-mm Band. *Appl. Magn. Reson* 1991, 2, 715–728.
- (25). Grinberg OY; Dubinskii AA; Lebedev YS Electron Paramagnetic Resonance of Free Radicals in a 2 Millimeter Range of Wavelength. *Uspekhi Khimii* 1983, 52, 1490–1513.
- (26). Rudowicz C; Misra SK Spin-Hamiltonian formalisms in electron magnetic resonance (EMR) and related spectroscopies. *Appl. Spectrosc. Rev* 2001, 36, 11–63.
- (27). Neese F First Principles Approach to Spin-Hamiltonian Parameters. In *Multifrequency Electron Paramagnetic Resonance*, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA: 2011; pp 295–326.
- (28). Kaupp M; Bühl M; Malkin VG, Eds. *Calculation of NMR and EPR Parameters: Theory and Applications* Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 2004.
- (29). Neese F Spin-Hamiltonian Parameters from First Principle Calculations: Theory and Application. In *High Resolution EPR: Applications to Metalloenzymes and Metals in Medicine*, Berliner L; Hanson G, Eds., Springer New York: New York, NY, 2009; pp 175–229.
- (30). Neese F Prediction of molecular properties and molecular spectroscopy with density functional theory: From fundamental theory to exchange-coupling. *Coord. Chem. Rev* 2009, 253, 526–563.
- (31). Munzarova ML; Kubacek P; Kaupp M Mechanisms of EPR hyperfine coupling in transition metal complexes. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000, 122, 11900–11913.
- (32). Munzarova M; Kaupp M A critical validation of density functional and coupled-cluster approaches for the calculation of EPR hyperfine coupling constants in transition metal complexes. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 1999, 103, 9966–9983.
- (33). Retegan M; Cox N; Lubitz W; Neese F; Pantazis DA The first tyrosyl radical intermediate formed in the S-2-S-3 transition of photosystem II. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys* 2014, 16, 11901–11910. [PubMed: 24760184]
- (34). Babcock GT; Espe M; Hoganson C; LydakisSimantiris N; McCracken J; Shi WJ; Styring S; Tommos C; Warncke K Tyrosyl radicals in enzyme catalysis: Some properties and a focus on photosynthetic water oxidation. *Acta Chem. Scand* 1997, 51, 533–540. [PubMed: 9190041]
- (35). Jenson DL; Barry BA Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer in Photosystem II: Proton Inventory of a Redox Active Tyrosine. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2009, 131, 10567–10573. [PubMed: 19586025]
- (36). Barry BA Reaction dynamics and proton coupled electron transfer: Studies of tyrosine-based charge transfer in natural and biomimetic systems. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta-Bioenerg* 2015, 1847, 46–54.
- (37). Un S; Dorlet P; Rutherford AW A high-field EPR tour of radicals in photosystems I and II. *Appl. Magn. Reson* 2001, 21, 341–361.
- (38). Faller P; Goussias C; Rutherford AW; Un S Resolving intermediates in biological proton-coupled electron transfer: A tyrosyl radical prior to proton movement. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A* 2003, 100, 8732–8735. [PubMed: 12855767]
- (39). Blankenship RE *Molecular Mechanisms of Photosynthesis*; Blackwell Science Limited: Oxford; 2002.
- (40). Wydrzynski TJ; Satoh K, Eds. *Photosystem II - The Light-Driven Water:Plastoquinone Oxidoreductase* Springer: Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2005; Vol. 22.
- (41). Umena Y; Kawakami K; Shen JR; Kamiya N Crystal structure of oxygen-evolving photosystem II at a resolution of 1.9 Ångstrom. *Nature* 2011, 473, 55–U65. [PubMed: 21499260]
- (42). Faller P; Debus RJ; Brettel K; Sugiura M; Rutherford AW; Boussac A Rapid formation of the stable tyrosyl radical in photosystem II. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A* 2001, 98, 14368–14373. [PubMed: 11762431]
- (43). Chatterjee R; Coates CS; Milikisiyants S; Lee CI; Wagner A; Poluektov OG; Lakshmi KV High-Frequency Electron Nuclear Double-Resonance Spectroscopy Studies of the Mechanism of Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer at the Tyrosine-D Residue of Photosystem II. *Biochemistry* 2013, 52, 4781–4790. [PubMed: 23773007]
- (44). Mora SJ; Odella E; Moore GF; Gust D; Moore TA; Moore AL Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer in Artificial Photosynthetic Systems. *Accounts Chem. Res* 2018, 51, 445–453.

- (45). Megiatto JD; Mendez-Hernandez DD; Tejeda-Ferrari ME; Teillout AL; Llansola-Portoles MJ; Kodis G; Poluektov OG; Rajh T; Mujica V; Groy TL, et al. A bioinspired redox relay that mimics radical interactions of the Tyr-His pairs of photosystem II. *Nat. Chem* 2014, 6, 423–428. [PubMed: 24755594]
- (46). Svistunenko DA Reaction of haem containing proteins and enzymes with hydroperoxides: The radical view. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta-Bioenerg* 2005, 1707, 127–155.
- (47). Migliore A; Polizzi NF; Therien MJ; Beratan DN Biochemistry and Theory of Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer. *Chem. Rev* 2014, 114, 3381–3465. [PubMed: 24684625]
- (48). Stubbe J; van der Donk WA Protein radicals in enzyme catalysis. *Chem. Rev* 1998, 98, 705–762. [PubMed: 11848913]
- (49). Hammarström L; Styring S Proton-coupled electron transfer of tyrosines in Photosystem II and model systems for artificial photosynthesis: the role of a redox-active link between catalyst and photosensitizer. *Energy Environ. Sci* 2011, 4, 2379–2388.
- (50). Gray HB; Winkler JR Living with Oxygen. *Accounts Chem. Res* 2018, 51, 1850–1857.
- (51). Reece SY; Nocera DG Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer in Biology: Results from Synergistic Studies in Natural and Model Systems. *Annu. Rev. Biochem* 2009, 78, 673–699. [PubMed: 19344235]
- (52). Odella E; Mora SJ; Wadsworth BL; Goings JJ; Gervaldo MA; Sereno LE; Groy TL; Gust D; Moore TA; Moore GF, et al. Proton-coupled electron transfer across benzimidazole bridges in bioinspired proton wires. *Chem. Sci* 2020, 11, 3820–3828. [PubMed: 34122850]
- (53). Odella E; Wadsworth BL; Mora SJ; Goings JJ; Huynh MT; Gust D; Moore TA; Moore GF; Hammes-Schiffer S; Moore AL Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer Drives Long-Range Proton Translocation in Bioinspired Systems. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2019, 141, 14057–14061. [PubMed: 31390197]
- (54). Odella E; Mora SJ; Wadsworth BL; Huynh MT; Goings JJ; Liddell PA; Groy TL; Gervaldo M; Sereno LE; Gust D, et al. Controlling Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer in Bioinspired Artificial Photosynthetic Relays. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2018, 140, 15450–15460. [PubMed: 30379075]
- (55). Huynh MT; Mora SJ; Villalba M; Tejeda-Ferrari ME; Liddell PA; Cherry BR; Teillout AL; Machan CW; Kubiak CP; Gust D, et al. Concerted One-Electron Two-Proton Transfer Processes in Models Inspired by the Tyr-His Couple of Photosystem II. *ACS Central Sci* 2017, 3, 372–380.
- (56). Stephens PJ; Devlin FJ; Chabalowski CF; Frisch MJ Ab Initio Calculation of Vibrational Absorption and Circular Dichroism Spectra Using Density Functional Force Fields. *J. Phys. Chem* 1994, 98, 11623–11627.
- (57). Becke AD Density-Functional Thermochemistry. III. The Role of Exact Exchange. *J. Chem. Phys* 1993, 98, 5648–5652.
- (58). Baker J; Janowski T; Wolinski K; Pulay P Recent developments in the PQS program. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.-Comput. Mol. Sci* 2012, 2, 63–72.
- (59). Balasubramani SG; Chen GP; Coriani S; Diedenhofen M; Frank MS; Franzke YJ; Furche F; Grotjahn R; Harding ME; Hattig C, et al. TURBOMOLE: Modular program suite for ab initio quantum-chemical and condensed-matter simulations. *J. Chem. Phys* 2020, 152, 36.
- (60). Weigend F; Ahlrichs R Balanced Basis Sets of Split Valence, Triple Zeta Valence and Quadruple Zeta Valence Quality for H to Rn: Design and Assessment of Accuracy. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys* 2005, 7, 3297–3305. [PubMed: 16240044]
- (61). Furche F; Ahlrichs R; Hattig C; Klopper W; Sierka M; Weigend F Turbomole. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.-Comput. Mol. Sci* 2014, 4, 91–100.
- (62). Neese F Software update: the ORCA program system, version 4.0. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.-Comput. Mol. Sci* 2018, 8, 6.
- (63). Neese F The ORCA program system. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.-Comput. Mol. Sci* 2012, 2, 73–78.
- (64). Steinmetz M; Hansen A; Ehrlich S; Risthaus T; Grimme S Accurate Thermochemistry for Large Molecules with Modern Density Functionals. In *Density Functionals: Thermochemistry*, Johnson ER, Ed., Springer International Publishing: Cham, 2015; pp 1–23.
- (65). Svistunenko D; Adelusi M; Dawson M; Robinson P; Bernini C; Sinicropi A; Basosi R Computation informed selection of parameters for protein radical EPR spectra simulation. *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai Chemia* 2011, 56, 135–146.

- (66). Svistunenko DA; Cooper CE A new method of identifying the site of tyrosyl radicals in proteins (vol 87, pg 582, 2004). *Biophys. J* 2004, 87, 3614–3616.
- (67). Svistunenko DA; Cooper CE A new method of identifying the site of tyrosyl radicals in proteins. *Biophys. J* 2004, 87, 582–595. [PubMed: 15240491]
- (68). Sinnecker S; Reijerse E; Neese F; Lubitz W Hydrogen bond geometries from electron paramagnetic resonance and electron-nuclear double resonance parameters: Density functional study of quinone radical anion-solvent interactions. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004, 126, 3280–3290. [PubMed: 15012159]
- (69). Gerfen GJ; Bellew BF; Un S; Bollinger JM; Stubbe J; Griffin RG; Singel DJ High-Frequency (139.5 GHz) EPR Spectroscopy of the Tyrosyl Radical in *Escherichia coli* Ribonucleotide Reductase. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1993, 115, 6420–6421.
- (70). Asher JR; Kaupp M Car-Parrinello molecular dynamics simulations and EPR property calculations on aqueous ubisemiquinone radical anion. *Theor. Chem. Acc* 2008, 119, 477–487.
- (71). Asher JR; Doltsinis NL; Kaupp M Extended Car-Parrinello molecular dynamics and electronic g-tensors study of benzosemiquinone radical anion. *Magn. Reson. Chem* 2005, 43, S237–S247. [PubMed: 16235202]
- (72). Asher JR; Doltsinis NL; Kaupp M Ab initio molecular dynamics simulations and g-tensor calculations of aqueous benzosemiquinone radical anion: Effects of regular and “T-stacked” hydrogen bonds. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004, 126, 9854–9861. [PubMed: 15291590]
- (73). Un S; Atta M; Fontecave M; Rutherford AW g-values as a Probe of the Local Protein Environment - High-Field EPR of Tyrosyl Radicals in Ribonucleotide Reductase and Photosystem II *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1995, 117, 10713–10719.
- (74). Benisvy L; Bittl R; Bothe E; Garner CD; McMaster J; Ross S; Teutloff C; Neese F Phenoxyl radicals hydrogen-bonded to imidazolium: Analogues of tyrosyl D of photosystem II: High-field EPR and DFT studies. *Angew. Chem.-Int. Edit* 2005, 44, 5314–5317.
- (75). Smirnova TI; Smirnov AI; Paschenko SV; Poluektov OG Geometry of hydrogen bonds formed by lipid bilayer nitroxide probes: A high-frequency pulsed ENDOR/EPR study. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2007, 129, 3476–3477. [PubMed: 17341078]
- (76). Smirnova TI; Chadwick TG; Voinov MA; Poluektov O; van Tol J; Ozarowski A; Schaaf G; Ryan MM; Bankaitis VA Local polarity and hydrogen bonding inside the Sec14p phospholipid-binding cavity: High-field multi-frequency electron paramagnetic resonance studies. *Biophys. J* 2007, 92, 3686–3695. [PubMed: 17325006]
- (77). Mobius K; Savitsky A; Wegener C; Rato M; Fuchs M; Schnegg A; Dubinskii AA; Grishin YA; Grigor'ev IA; Kuhn M, et al. Combining high-field EPR with site-directed spin labeling reveals unique information on proteins in action. *Magn. Reson. Chem* 2005, 43, S4–S19. [PubMed: 16235212]
- (78). Plato M; Steinhoff HJ; Wegener C; Topping JT; Savitsky A; Möbius K Molecular Orbital Study of Polarity and Hydrogen Bonding Effects on the g and Hyperfine Tensors of Site Directed NO Spin Labelled Bacteriorhodopsin. *Mol. Phys* 2002, 100, 3711–3721.
- (79). Sinnecker S; Rajendran A; Klamt A; Diedenhofen M; Neese F Calculation of solvent shifts on electronic g-tensors with the conductor-like screening model (COSMO) and its self-consistent generalization to real solvents (Direct COSMO-RS). *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2006, 110, 2235–2245. [PubMed: 16466261]
- (80). Witwicki M; Jezierska J; Ozarowski A Solvent effect on EPR, molecular and electronic properties of semiquinone radical derived from 3,4-dihydroxybenzoic acid as model for humic acid transient radicals: High-field EPR and DFT studies. *Chem. Phys. Lett* 2009, 473, 160–166.

Figure 1.

Top. Molecular structures of the three studied benzimidazole-phenol (BIP) derivatives. The dihedral angles Θ_1 and Θ_2 are defined as shown for BIP-PYR. All depicted structures have angles Θ_1 and Θ_2 both at 0 degrees. **Bottom.** Electrochemical oxidation of the diamagnetic neutral BIP-PYR molecule yields one-proton transfer product (EPT; protonation state N_1N_2) and two-proton transfer product (E2PT; protonation state N_1N_3), both of which are paramagnetic (EPR-active) cation radicals. Analogous PCET and PT reactions occur for BIP-OCH₃ and BIP-CN.

Figure 2. Optimized structures and spin densities at an isosurface of 0.002 e/a_0^3 for +1 cations of the BIP-PYR structure. Structures were optimized using DFT (B3LYP||def2-TZVPP with D3BJ). Four possible hydrogen positions are shown: a) N_1N_3 , b) N_1N_2 , c) ON_2 , and d) ON_3 .

Figure 3.

Effect of rotation around Θ_2 on g_x -values for three molecules in the N_1N_3 structure with $\Theta_1 = 0$ (the lowest energy structure). EPR g_x -values (B3LYP||EPRII) were calculated from the constrained optimizations (B3LYP||def2-TZVP) with all degrees of freedom except the constrained dihedral allowed to relax.

Figure 4. Effect of rotation around Θ_1 angle on the energy and the g_x -value for N_1N_3 (top) and N_1N_2 (bottom) for BIP-PYR. The energies are measured relative to the lowest energy N_1N_3 conformation. The inset structures show conformations that correspond to the given g -values and energies.

Tyr/His Pair

BIP Derivative

Scheme 1.

Structures of a neutral tyrosine-histidine (Tyr-His) pair and a Benzimidazole-phenol (BIP) derivative mimicking the Tyr-His pair. Upon electron transfer of the tyrosine or phenol to the neighboring imidazole ring, proton transfer and changes in H-bonding take place. The dihedral angles Θ_1 and Θ_2 are defined as shown for the BIP derivative.

Table 1.

Calculated energies relative to the lowest energy structure and calculated EPR parameters for the +1 cations of BIP-OCH₃, BIP-CN, and BIP-PYR (Figure 1) in multiple protonation states. Structures were optimized using DFT with B3LYP-D3BJ||def2-TZVPP. EPR parameters were calculated using DFT with B3LYP||EPRII. Principal components of the hyperfine coupling (HFC) tensor are listed. Protonation states like N₁N₃ indicate that both N₁ and N₃ are bonded to a hydrogen atom.

Molecule/Protonation State		E (kcal/mol)	g-values	HFC ¹⁴ N ₁ (MHz)	HFC ¹⁴ N ₂ (MHz)	HFC ¹⁴ N ₃ (MHz)
BIP-OCH ₃	N ₁ N ₃	0.0	2.0023, 2.0044, 2.0073	-0.10, -0.32, +6.14	-0.40, -0.77, +2.54	-0.04, -0.10, +0.77
	N ₁ N ₂	+5.2	2.0023, 2.0043, 2.0072	-0.37, -0.72, +3.59	-0.08, +0.08, +5.22	-0.05, -0.10, +0.36
	ON ₂	+11.8	2.0023, 2.0036, 2.0044	+0.19, -0.64, -0.86	-0.95, -1.04, +5.54	-0.06, +0.51, +6.18
	ON ₃	+10.2	2.0023, 2.0038, 2.0043	-0.67, -0.77, +6.55	-1.22, -1.54, +4.37	-0.08, -0.18, +0.41
BIP-CN	N ₁ N ₃	0.0	2.0023, 2.0044, 2.0072	-0.00, -0.23, +5.17	-0.16, -0.52, +3.14	-0.07, -0.12, +0.56
	N ₁ N ₂	+1.7	2.0023, 2.0043, 2.0071	-0.19, -0.53, +4.05	-0.03, +0.16, +4.59	-0.04, +0.04, -0.07
	ON ₂	+9.1	2.0023, 2.0037, 2.0043	-1.03, -1.40, +6.83	-0.03, +0.03, -1.17	-0.00, +0.01, -0.03
	ON ₃	+9.7	2.0023, 2.0038, 2.0045	-0.45, -0.57, +5.15	-1.11, -1.48, +5.56	-0.08, -0.15, -0.16
BIP-PYR	N ₁ N ₃	0.0	2.0023, 2.0044, 2.0072	-0.04, -0.10, -0.15	-0.44, -0.81, +1.55	-0.08, -0.27, +5.44
	N ₁ N ₂	+3.0	2.0023, 2.0043, 2.0071	-0.04, -0.09, -0.09	-0.41, -0.77, +2.71	+0.07, -0.08, +4.05
	ON ₂	+11.9	2.0023, 2.0037, 2.0043	-0.01, -0.08, -0.41	-1.14, -1.52, +5.89	-0.87, -0.87, +0.97
	ON ₃	+11.2	2.0023, 2.0038, 2.0044	-0.14, -0.23, -0.24	-1.29, -1.63, +3.17	-0.64, -0.72, +5.98