

This article was downloaded by:

On: 28 January 2011

Access details: *Access Details: Free Access*

Publisher *Taylor & Francis*

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Phosphorus, Sulfur, and Silicon and the Related Elements

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713618290>

Ring Strain VS. Solvent Effects in Phosphate Base Hydrolysis

Carmay Lim

To cite this Article Lim, Carmay(1999) 'Ring Strain VS. Solvent Effects in Phosphate Base Hydrolysis', *Phosphorus, Sulfur, and Silicon and the Related Elements*, 144: 1, 769 — 773

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/10426509908546358

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10426509908546358>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Ring Strain VS. Solvent Effects in Phosphate Base Hydrolysis

CARMAY LIM

Institute of Biomedical Sciences, Academia Sinica, Taipei 11529 Taiwan, R.O.C.

To determine the factors governing the enhanced reactivity of 5-membered ring phosphates, the lowest activation free-energy profiles for the alkaline hydrolyses of methyl ethylene phosphate (5-MEP), its acyclic analog, trimethyl phosphate (a-TMP), and its 6-membered ring analog, methyl propylene phosphate (6-MPP), have been computed using *ab initio* and continuum dielectric methods. The calculations yield product distributions and activation free energy differences in accord with experiment. They show that solvent stabilization of the 5-membered ring transition state plays a key role in the million-fold enhanced rates of alkaline hydrolysis of 5-MEP relative to its acyclic or 6-membered ring analogs. Furthermore, strain energy calculations show that ring strain contributes partly to the observed rate enhancement of 5-MEP relative to 6-MPP but *not* to that of 5-MEP relative to a-TMP.

Keywords: phosphates; ring strain; solvation; continuum dielectric

INTRODUCTION

Five-membered cyclic phosphate esters hydrolyze in acid or base millions of times faster than their acyclic or 6/7-membered ring analogs^[1,2]. This rate acceleration was found to be due mainly to enthalpic rather than entropic effects^[3]. Several factors have been suggested to account (in all or partly) for the observed rate enhancement

of 5-membered ring phosphates: These include (i) ring strain in the 5-membered ring ground state^[4]; (ii) stereoelectronic effects in the cyclic transition state^[5]; (iii) steric crowding in the acyclic transition state^[6] and (iv) differential solvation of the cyclic and acyclic transition states^[7].

Our aim is to elucidate the driving forces behind the enhanced reactivity of 5-membered ring phospho-esters. To this end, *ab initio* and continuum dielectric methods were used to map out the lowest activation free-energy profiles for the alkaline hydrolyses of 5-MEP, its acyclic analog (a-TMP) and 6-membered ring counterpart (6-MPP)^[8,9]. Subsequently, the rate-limiting transition states for each of the three reactions were relocated in solution using two solvation models^[9]. Furthermore, strain energies of 5-membered ring species relative to their acyclic and 6-membered ring analogs have been computed to assess the role of ring strain in the observed enhanced rates of ring cleavage^[10]. Details of the calculations can be found in ref. 8 to 10.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Reaction Mechanism and Product Distribution

For the 3 reactions studied, the lowest free energy pathway in solution reflects that in the gas phase except that "long-range" ion-dipole intermediates found in the gas phase do not exist in solution (see ref. 9, Figures 1–3). For the alkaline hydrolysis of a-TMP, the lowest free-energy pathway is hydroxide attack at phosphorus, followed by pseudorotation and subsequent methoxide elimination with simultaneous intramolecular proton transfer to yield methanol and dimethyl phosphate (see ref. 9, Scheme 1). In contrast, cyclic 5-MEP and 6-MPP hydrolyze in base via hydroxide attack at phosphorus *concerted* with pseudorotation, followed by ring opening with simultaneous intramolecular proton transfer (see ref. 9, Schemes 2 and 3). The calculations predict product distributions for the base hydrolyses of a-TMP and 5-MEP that are in accord with experiment. However, they do not support previously proposed mechanisms for the two reactions, which result in products with *inversion* of configuration^[9] (as opposed to products with *retention* of configuration predicted by the calculations). Further experiments are needed to distinguish between the various proposed mechanisms.

Rate-limiting Transition State

The rate-limiting step for the alkaline hydrolyses of a-TMP, 5-MEP and 6-MPP is not pseudorotation or P–O cleavage but hydroxide attack at the phosphorus atom; i.e., formation of a “long-range” transition state. For all three reactions, there is a significant change in the transition state geometry due to solvent effects, which favor a “late” transition state as the magnitude of the solvation free energy increases with longer P–O^H separation. This trend is expected for other nucleophilic substitution reactions involving a neutral reactant and a small, anionic nucleophile.

The Enhanced Reactivity of 5-MEP relative to a-TMP

Table 1 shows that the activation free energy difference between the alkaline hydrolyses of a-TMP and 5-MEP (8.1 kcal/mol), which agrees with the measured value (7.8 ± 0.6 kcal/mol^[3]), stems from greater solvent stabilization of the cyclic transition state relative to its acyclic analog (by 10.7 kcal/mol). The latter is due to dihedral ring constraints yielding a more solvent-exposed hydroxyl group in the cyclic transition state compared to its acyclic counterpart^[7].

TABLE 1. Properties of the acyclic (a-TS) and 5-membered cyclic (5-TS) rate-limiting transition states relocated in solution by computing solvation free energies using continuum methods.^a

Species	P–O ^H	$\Delta H^\ddagger_{\text{gas}}$	$\Delta G^\ddagger_{\text{gas}}$	$\Delta G_s(\text{TS})$	$\Delta G_s(\text{GS})$	$\Delta G^\ddagger_{\text{soln}}$
a-TS	2.48	–19.5	–8.5	–58.3	–105.0	38.2
5-TS	2.67	–16.8	–7.2	–69.0	–106.2	30.1
a-TS – 5-TS	–0.2	–2.7	–1.3	10.7	1.2	8.1

^aThe zero of energy corresponds to the reactants separated at infinity in the gas-phase. Distance in angstroms and energies in kcal/mol.

The negative $\Delta \Delta H^\ddagger_{\text{gas}}$ (–2.7 kcal/mol, Table 1) and strain energy calculations indicate that ring strain does *not* account for the observed rate acceleration of 5-MEP relative to a-TMP. The strain energies of the 5-membered ring ground state, rate-limiting transition state and pseudorotated intermediate relative to their acyclic counterparts are 6.7, 10.7 and –1.0 kcal/mol, respectively. Thus, the strain energy in 5-MEP is *not* relieved upon forming the rate-limiting transition state, but is relieved instead in the pseudorotated intermediate.

The Enhanced Reactivity of 5-MEP relative to 6-MPP

The activation free energy difference between the alkaline hydrolyses of 6-MPP and 5-MEP (6.6 kcal/mol) is close to the experimental estimate (7.3 ± 0.6 kcal/mol)^[3,11]. Table 2 shows that about half of this difference stems from greater solvent stabilization of the 5-membered cyclic transition state relative to its 6-membered ring analog (by 3.5 kcal/mol), while the remaining difference results from more favorable solute-solute interactions in the 5-membered species compared to the respective six-membered ones.

TABLE 2. Properties of the 5-membered (5-TS) and 6-membered (6-TS) ring rate-limiting transition states relocated in solution by computing solvation free energies using the PSGVB^[12] program.^a

Species	P-O ^H	$\Delta H^\ddagger_{\text{gas}}$	$\Delta G^\ddagger_{\text{gas}}$	$\Delta G_s(\text{TS})$	$\Delta G_s(\text{GS})$	$\Delta G^\ddagger_{\text{sln}}$
6-TS	2.43	-16.5	-5.8	-73.9	-110.3	30.6
5-TS	2.54	-19.1	-9.6	-77.4	-111.0	24.0
6-TS - 5-TS	-0.1	2.6	3.8	3.5	0.7	6.6

^aSee footnote to Table 1.

Strain energy calculations suggest that ring strain relief provides part of the contribution to the observed rate difference between 5-MEP and 6-MPP. Relative to the 6-membered ring species, the strain energy in the five-membered ring transition state (1.5 kcal/mol) is less than that in the 5-MEP ground state (4.1 kcal/mol). The decrease in strain energy is not due in as much to the relief of OPO and COP angle strain in 5-MEP upon forming the 5-membered ring transition state but to the poorer ability of the 6-membered cyclic transition state to accommodate strain in the ring angles and dihedrals compared to the 6-MPP ground state. This is supported by the finding that the 6-membered cyclic intermediate has more strain than the corresponding 5-membered ring intermediate (by 2.6 kcal/mol).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Institute of Biomedical Sciences in Academia Sinica, the National Science Council, and the National Center for High-Performance Computing in Taiwan.

References

- [1] F.H. Westheimer, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, **1**, 70 (1968).

- [2] R. Kluger, F. Covitz, E. Dennis, L.D. Williams & F.H. Westheimer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **91**, 6066 (1969).
- [3] R. Kluger & S.D. Taylor, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **112**, 6669 (1990).
- [4] P.C. Haake & F.H. Westheimer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **83**, 1102 (1961).
- [5] D.G. Gorenstein, B.A. Luxon, J.B. Findlay & R. Momii, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **99**, 4170 (1977).
- [6] S.D. Taylor & R. Kluger, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **114**, 3067 (1992).
- [7] A. Dejaegere, X. Liang & M. Karplus, *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans.*, **90**, 1763 (1994).
- [8] N.Y. Chang & C. Lim, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **101**, 8706 (1997).
- [9] N.Y. Chang & C. Lim, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **120**, 2156 (1998).
- [10] T. Dudev & C. Lim, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **120**, 4450 (1998).
- [11] G. Aksnes & K. Bergesen, *Acta Chem. Scand.*, **20**, 2508 (1966).
- [12] M. Ringnalda, J.M. Langlois, R.B. Murphy, B.H. Greeley, C. Cortis, T.V. Russo, B. Marten Jr., R.E. Donnelly, W.T. Pollard, Y. Cao, R.P. Muller, D.T. Mainz, J.R. Wright, G.H. Miller, W.A. Goddard III & R.A. Friesner, *PSGVB, Schrodinger Inc.*, New York (1996).