Challenges in Predicting $\Delta_{rxn} G$ in Solution: The Mechanism of Ether-Catalyzed Hydroboration of Alkenes

Daniel J. S. Sandbeck,† Colin M. Kuntz,‡ Christine Luu,† Rachelle A. Mondor,† John G. Ottaviano,† Aravind V. Rayer,‡ Kazi Z. Sumon,† and Allan L. L. East†,*

†Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Regina, 3737 Wascana Parkway, Regina, SK S4S 0A2, Canada
‡Department of Industrial Systems Engineering, University of Regina, 3737 Wascana Parkway, Regina, SK S4S 0A2, Canada

ABSTRACT: Ab initio (coupled-cluster and density-functional) calculations of Gibbs reaction energies in solution, with new entropy-of-solvation damping terms, were performed for the ether-catalyzed hydroboration of alkenes. The goal was to test the accuracy of continuum-solvation models for reactions of neutral species in nonaqueous solvents, and the hope was to achieve an accuracy sufficient to address the mechanism in the "Pasto case": $\text{B}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{alkene}$ in THF solvent. Brown’s $S_N2/S_N1$ "dissociative" mechanism, of $S_N2$ formation of borane–ether adducts followed by $S_N1$ alkene attack, was at odds with Pasto’s original $S_N2/S_N2$ hypothesis, and while Brown could prove his mechanism for a variety of cases, he could not perform the experimental test with THF adducts in THF solvent, where the higher THF concentrations might favor an $S_N2$ second step. Two diboranes were tested: $\text{B}_2\text{H}_6$, used by Pasto, and $(\text{9BBN})_2$ ($\text{9BBN} = 9\text{-borabicyclo}[3.3.1]\text{nonane}$, $\text{C}_8\text{H}_{15}\text{B}$), used by Brown. The new entropy terms resulted in improved accuracy vs traditional techniques ($\sim 2$ kcal mol$^{-1}$), but this accuracy was not sufficient to resolve the mechanism in the Pasto case.

1. INTRODUCTION

Hydroboration is the addition of a B—H bond of a borane or organoborane across an unsaturated multiple bond. It is an important tool in organic synthesis, particularly for the regioselective functionalization of C=C bonds.$^1$ In the gas phase and in noncomplexing hydrocarbon solvents, boranes generally appear as H-bridged dimers, (BR$_2$H)$_2$ (denoted more simply as "B$_2" in this paper). Their dissociation equilibria lie heavily to the left. Switching to complexing solvents, particularly ethers such as tetrahydrofuran (THF, $\text{C}_4\text{H}_{10}$O), the rate of hydroboration of alkenes by boranes is significantly increased.$^2$ To explain the catalytic effect of ethers, Nobel prize winner H. C. Brown demonstrated the existence of an intermediate (here denoted SB) involving an adduct of nucleophilic solvent S to borane monomer B.$^3$ In the case of ($\text{BH}_3$)$_2$ + THF, the adduct intermediate is even more stable than the diborane.$^2$ The catalytic effect required Brown to take the view that the initial adduct-forming stage (solvolysis of diboranes) must be bimolecular ($S_N2$, dimer + solvent), but he felt the ensuing alkene-addition stage (hydroboration of alkene) would involve $S_N1$ dissociation of the adduct before addition of organoborane monomer to alkene. In this regard he questioned the conclusions of Pasto,$^3$ who for the case of THF-BH$_3$ argued that the second stage was also bimolecular ($S_N2$, adduct + alkene). Brown demonstrated the $S_N1$ nature of alkene addition with two different BH$_3$ adducts (with Et$_3$N and $\text{Me}_2\text{S}$) in toluene,$^3$ but not with ethers in ether. Since an increase in ether concentration would improve the $S_N2$ rate vis-à-vis the $S_N1$ rate, it may be an open question whether the mechanism of alkene addition is still $S_N1$ in THF solvent. We wished to test both of Brown’s claims ($S_N2$ solvolysis and $S_N1$ alkene-addition) for THF-solvated systems, using quantum chemistry methods.

Computationally, the first stage (solvolysis of diboranes) has been studied, but not with THF. Studies of $\text{B}_2\text{H}_6$ reacting with several small molecules (NH$_3$, H$_2$S, and H$_2$O)$^6$ have predicted a two-step reaction with a singly H-bridged dimer adduct intermediate, e.g. $\text{H}_2\text{NBH}_2(\text{H})\text{BH}_3$. The equivalent intermediate with THF solvent has apparently not been investigated. The solvolysis stage is also useful for calibrating the accuracy of $\Delta G$ computation methods, as Brown provided both rate and equilibrium constant data for it.$^2$ The second stage (alkene addition) has drawn interest from computational chemists$^9$–$^11$ mainly because this step determines the anti-Markovnikov product distributions. These works have predicted a minor intermediate in this stage as well: a π complex of alkene to the borane (via the empty p orbital on boron). Regarding the Brown vs Pasto issue in the second stage, in 1983 Schleyer and co-workers$^9$ argued for a Pasto $S_N2$ alkene addition, but based on a Hartree–Fock-optimized $S_N2$ transition state that is rather loose, and a later computational study reported by Houk and co-workers$^{10}$ in 1990 seemed inconclusive on this issue. As recently as 2008, Oyola and Singleton$^{11}$ (in a paper concerned with the anti-Markovnikov product distribution) commented...
on the lingering doubt in THF solution, tentatively siding with Brown; they performed a side calculation that showed the $S_{2,2}$ free energy barrier to be 2.3 kcal mol$^{-1}$ larger than the $S_{0,1}$ dimer-dissociation free energy barrier, but they placed more weight on experimental results in siding with Brown.

We were curious to know if 2.3 kcal mol$^{-1}$ accuracy could be achieved from quantum chemistry methods in predicting $S_{0,1}$ vs $S_{2,2}$ barriers in THF solution, and thus obtain a more definitive answer regarding the mechanism in the Pasto case. We set this as the main goal of our project. A secondary goal was to confirm, via ab initio prediction, the utility of the spectral signatures Brown used in identifying intermediates. In the computations, THF (C$_4$H$_8$O) was the solvent, isobutene (C$_4$H$_8$) was the alkene, and two different choices were made for the borane BR$_3$H: the simple borane BH$_3$ (used by Pasto$^{3,4}$) and B$_3$LYP); the energies of the for (9BBN)$_2$ the optimal form (dd,dd) puckered, but its symmetry was dependent on the level of approximation (see the next section), and although the target accuracy of $\pm 0.1$ kcal mol$^{-1}$ for these reactions was achieved in the three quantitative “comparisons” presented here, this accuracy was not sufficient to resolve all mechanism issues.

2. COMPUTATIONAL METHODS

Using Gaussian03 and Gaussian09,$^{14}$ three density-functional theory (DFT) methods (B3LYP,$^{15,16}$ PBE,$^{17,18}$ and OLYP$^{19}$) and three basis sets (6-31G(d), 6-31G(d,p), and cc-pVDZ)$^{14}$ were tested with geometry optimization calculations. After testing, the B3LYP/6-31G(d) structures were used in all ensuing calculations.

Only the lowest-energy forms were used; this required conformer studies for 9BBN, (9BBN)$_2$, and THF (Figure 1). For 9BBN all levels of theory produced the same lowest-energy form (dd C$_2$) with a mild distortion from ideal C$_2$ symmetry. For (9BBN)$_2$, the optimal form (dd,dd D$_{2d}$) was fully symmetric at all levels of theory. For THF, the lowest-energy form was puckered,$^{20}$ but its symmetry was dependent on the level of theory used (C$_2$ with PBEPBE, C$_2$ with OLYP, and C$_2$ with B3LYP); the energies of the C$_2$, C$_4$, and C$_2$ puckered structures all lie within 0.15 kcal mol$^{-1}$ of each other along a low-frequency pseudorotation mode. The INT=ULTRAFINE integration grid$^{14}$ was used for THF only.

For $^{11}$B-NMR calculations, single-point B3LYP/6-311+G(d,p)//B3LYP/6-31G(d) calculations using the gauge-including atomic orbital (GIAO) method$^{21,22}$ were employed. The absolute chemical shifts were converted to shifts relative to that of the lowest-energy conformer of the BF$_3$OEt$_2$ adduct, which (in a conformer search) turned out to be the one having dihedral BOCC angles of $\approx 95.5^\circ$ and $\approx 72.0^\circ$.

The Gibbs energies used in this paper were generated as follows. For each compound, the routine gas-phase ideal-gas rigid-rotor/harmonic-oscillator (RRHO) value was calculated, based on B3LYP/6-31G(d) electronic energies, vibrational frequencies, and rotational moments of inertia. Call this $G_{\text{gas,int}}$:

$$G_{\text{gas,int}} = E_{\text{elec}} + \delta_{\text{ZPE},E} + \delta_T E + PV - TS$$

where $\delta_{\text{ZPE},E}$ is half the sum of (unscaled) B3LYP/6-31G(d) vibrational harmonic frequencies, $\delta_T E$ is the RRHO thermal correction for internal energy $E$ at $p = 1$ atm and $T = 298.15$ K, $PV$ is taken as $RT$, and $S$ is the RRHO computation of entropy. To convert $G_{\text{gas,int}}$ into a free energy of a mole of solute in solution ($G_{\text{solution}}$), several additive corrections could be considered (Table 1), in the same spirit as the focal-point method for improved $E_{\text{elec}}$ values.$^{23,24}$

In Table 1, the first eight terms are corrections for a more accurate gas-phase Gibbs energy value. For $\delta_{\text{corr}}, E$ the correction $E_{\text{corr}}(\text{CCSD(T)})$ (coupled-cluster) calculations were performed with MOLPRO2008.$^{26}$ For $\delta_{\text{alt},E}$ the correction $E_{\text{alt}}(\text{B3LYP/aug-cc-pVTZ})$ was used. For terms 3 and 4, $\delta_{\text{alt},E}$ might be important for reactions which break several bonds (e.g., atomization) and can be treated by frequency scaling$^{27}$ while $\delta_{\text{alt},E}$ might be important for internal-rotation modes of molecules displaying particularly low harmonic frequencies (indicating high-entropy nearly free internal rotation) and can be treated by the E1, E2, or E3 methods published by East and Radom in 1997.$^{28}$ Here we computed E1 corrections for term 4 but the results were negligible and were not used (see Appendix A). For terms 5 and 6, relevant to large floppy molecules with many internal rotation modes, $\delta_{\text{alt},E}$ could be handled by Boltzmann weighting, while $\delta_{\text{alt},E}$ could be handled by statistical counting.$^{29,30}$

Terms 7 and 8 ($\delta_{\text{FFG}}$E and $\delta_{\text{FFG}}$TS) correct for errors due to computing $G$ at stationary points on the potential energy surface (PES) instead of the free energy surface (FES). They are probably negligible terms except for the Gibbs energy of transition states ($G^\ddagger$) of bond breaking/forming reactions. Consideration of this proper Gibbs maximum is termed variation-of-transition-state theory (vTST), and improves agreement

Figure 1. Conformers of THF, 9BBN, and (9BBN)$_2$ with B3LYP/6-31G(d) relative energies in kcal mol$^{-1}$. Asterisks indicate the number of imaginary frequencies according to B3LYP/6-31G(d).
with data from experimental rate constants.\textsuperscript{31} (For the alkene-association direction of a locations where the entropy is more restricted (3 terms employed (II, VII, VIII, IX), we used Gaussian a counterexample, the hydrophobic e reordering terms would be minor because the THF cannot exist between these solutes and THF, and that the solvent-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>term$^{a}$</th>
<th>label</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>used in this work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\delta_{\text{cont}} E$</td>
<td>electron correlation correction to $E_{\text{elec}}$</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\delta_{\text{bas}} E$</td>
<td>basis set correction to $E_{\text{elec}}$</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\delta_{\text{anharm}} E$</td>
<td>anharmonic correction to $E$</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\delta_{\text{anharm}} TS$</td>
<td>anharmonic correction to $TS$</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\delta_{\text{cont}} E$</td>
<td>correction to $E$ for multiple conformers</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$\delta_{\text{cont}} TS$</td>
<td>correction to $TS$ for multiple conformers</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$\delta_{\text{disp}} TS$</td>
<td>free-energy-surface geometry-shift correction to $TS$</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\delta_{\text{ES}} TS$</td>
<td>free-energy-surface geometry-shift correction to $TS$</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Solvent terms listed with Roman numerals. $^b$Normally only important for certain transition states (variational transition-state theory). $^c$Tested but not used due to negligible results.

association in solution that correspond better to experimentally derived values than the usual use of the “molecule-frame” (MF) convention. He states that the MF convention, of assigning unhindered “concentrated-gas” entropies to solutes, is the approach taken by theories based on continuum-solvation models. Since continuum-solvation models appear to be aiming to produce solvation Gibbs energies directly, and no distinction between $\Delta H_{\text{sol}}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{sol}}$ is made, problems in estimating either $\Delta H_{\text{sol}}$ or $\Delta G_{\text{sol}}$ may occur. Hence, when we first tested “concentrated-gas” entropies in the MF convention and began to see inaccuracies when comparing to experimental results, we switched to an SF convention and desired a damping method. There is a “one-factor-fits-all” entropy damping method published by Wertz in 1980:\textsuperscript{36} $\delta_{\text{damp}} S = \Delta S_{\text{solvation}} = -0.46(S^*_{\text{gas}} - 14.3)$

but, as he noted, certain classes of molecules revealed systematic errors (for instance, the method damped too much for molecules with nearly free internal rotation). We developed a more sophisticated method for more accuracy.

To calibrate a new entropy damping method, we wanted a method that, in the limit of mole fraction $= 1$, would reproduce the condensation thermochemistry of “Trouton” solvents, i.e. solvents whose $\Delta S_{\text{solvation}}$ is roughly 21 eu (cal mol$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$) at their boiling points.\textsuperscript{32,38} For Trouton solvents, which include THF, hexane, diethyl ether, benzene, neopentane, dichloromethane, and acetone, a perusal of standard enthalpies of formation and standard entropies at 298 K (i.e., not at boiling points) gives values for $\Delta H_{\text{cond}}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{cond}}$ of $\sim -8$, $\sim -7$, and $\sim -1$ kcal mol$^{-1}$ (which puts $\Delta S_{\text{cond}}(298 K)$ at $\sim -23$ eu instead of $\sim 21$ eu). Attempts to reproduce these values with current continuum-solvation models will poorly predict the $\Delta H$ value, the $\Delta G$ value, or both, due to ignoring or mistreating the damping of entropy that is inherent in forcing molecules into condensed phases.

The entropy-damping terms introduced below, when applied to $\Delta S_{\text{cond}}$ for THF, reproduced the correct $\sim -7$ kcal mol$^{-1}$. We went on to try to reproduce $\Delta H_{\text{cond}}$ and/or $\Delta G_{\text{cond}}$ for THF using the PCM model in Gaussian09, but obtained energy values of $\sim -2$, $\sim -12$, $\sim 4$, and $\sim -4$, depending on whether we included terms II, II + III, II + III + IV, or “SMD” II + III + IV (using the alternative PCM parameters from SCRF = SMD).\textsuperscript{34,39} None of these compare well to the value of $\sim -8$ for $\Delta H_{\text{cond}}$. The first and last values agree well with the value of $\sim -1$ for $\Delta G_{\text{cond}}$ but arise from different decisions regarding terms III and IV (which should be in a condensation calculation?). This disagreement, combined with our past concerns with the sensitivity of $\delta_{\text{disp}} E$ (III) and $\delta_{\text{cav}} E$ (IV) to cavity size in the PCM model,\textsuperscript{40} and the belief that terms III and IV are less important in $\Delta S_{\text{cond}}$ than for $\Delta G_{\text{cond}}$ or $\Delta G_{\text{solution}}$, led us to abandon these terms in the current project. (We did test $\delta_{\text{disp}} E$ and $\delta_{\text{cav}} E$ effects but only for the dissociation of the adduct 9BBN-THF, and found reasonable cancellation: $\Delta S_{\text{cond}}$ was 12.4 with only II, 13.4 with II + III + IV, and 12.8 with “SMD” II + III + IV.)

The four solvation terms used were as follows:

**Solvation II—Polarization of $E_{\text{elec}}$.** Add $E[\text{PCM/B3LYP/6-31G(d)}/\text{B3LYP/6-31G(d)} - E[\text{B3LYP/6-31G(d)}]$ for each compound, using the Gaussian09 polarizable-continuum model (PCM, keyword SCRF=(solvent=thf)). $^{32,33}$ which by default in Gaussian09 includes $\delta_{\text{disp}} E$ but neither $\delta_{\text{cav}} E$ nor $\delta_{\text{disp}} E$.

**Solvation VII—Damping of $PV$.** Subtract $RT = 0.592$ kcal mol$^{-1}$ for each compound. This removes the $PV = RT$ term added in $G_{\text{sol}}$. In solution, $PV$ should be closer to zero than to its gas-phase value.
Add three terms:

\[ \delta_{\text{damp}} T S_{\text{trans}} = T (\Delta S_{\text{solv}} + \Delta S_{\text{comp}} + \Delta S_{\text{hind}}) \]

\[ \Delta S_{\text{solv}} = \left( \frac{c_{\text{liq}} - c}{c} \right) \ln \left( \frac{c^{\text{gas}}}{c^{\text{liq}}} \right) \quad (\text{solvent expansion}) \]

\[ \Delta S_{\text{comp}} = R \ln \left( \frac{V^{\text{gas}}}{V^{\text{liq}}} \right) \quad (\text{solute compression}) \]

\[ \Delta S_{\text{hind}} = R \ln \left( \frac{V^{\text{eff}}}{c_{\text{liq}}} \right) \quad (\text{solute hindrance}) \]

where \( c \) is the desired concentration of solute (here 1 M), \( c_{\text{liq}} \) is the concentration of pure solvent (here 12.3 M for THF), \( V^{\text{gas}}/V^{\text{liq}} \) is the standard molar volume of an ideal gas (24.466 L mol\(^{-1}\) at 298.15 K and 1 atm), and \( V^{\text{eff}} \) is an effective molar free volume of (1.5 Å)\(^3\) \( N_{\text{AVO}} = 0.002032 \) L per mole of solute molecules. This formula comes from the following arguments.

All three terms were derived from the basic concentration-change formula \( nR \ln (V^{\text{gas}}/V^{\text{liq}}) \). The first comes from expanding the solvent to make room for incoming solute, a term commonly ignored. Per mole of solute dissolved, this is an expansion of \( (c_{\text{liq}} - c)/c \) mols of solvent; for expansion of THF for 1 M solutes we expand \( (c_{\text{liq}} - c)/c = 11.3 \) mol THF from \( V^{\text{liq}} = 0.919 \) L to \( V^{\text{gas}} = 1 \) L, obtaining \( \Delta S_{\text{solv}} = +1.90 \) eu (cal mol\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\)). The second term \( \Delta S_{\text{comp}} \) is the compression of 1 mol gaseous solute from standard gas volume \( V^{\text{gas}} = 24.466 \) L to the volume appropriate for the desired solution concentration (here \( V^{\text{gas}} = 1 \) L), and hence \( \Delta S_{\text{comp}} = -6.35 \) eu. Note that this value gives rise to \( T \Delta S_{\text{comp}} = -1.9 \) kcal mol\(^{-1}\), the common standard-state shift applied to \( G^{\text{gas}} \) before considering the act of solvation under the constant-\( \rho \) convention described by Ben-Naim. \(^{41}\)

The third term \( \Delta S_{\text{hind}} \) is the damping term due to translations being hindered in the liquid state due to the presence of other molecules. We suppose that a solute-molecule translation hindrance is roughly equal to a solvent-molecule translation hindrance when conceptually changing from “concentrated gas” (a gas at solvent concentration \( c_{\text{liq}} \)) to pure liquid. Hence we consider 1 mol of solvent, use \( V^{\text{gas}} = c_{\text{liq}}^{-1} \) (i.e., each molecule freely translates in the molar volume, which for THF is 0.081 L), and for \( V^{\text{gas}} \) we restrict each molecule to a solvent cage allowing rattling motions equivalent to a collapsed-point solute molecule undergoing free translation in a (1.5 Å)\(^3\) volume. Support for this idea comes from Ewing, who in the 1960s noted that quantized translational energy spacings of ~100 cm\(^{-1}\) were determined from the band envelope of rotational spectral bands from a solution of \( H_2 \) in liquid \( Ar \) and further pointed out that a particle-in-a-box model with a box width of ~1 Å reproduces this spacing. \(^{32}\) Since the solutes here have atoms of wider electron distributions than \( H_2 \), we increased the box width to an arbitrary value of 1.5 Å. Hence, \( V^{\text{gas}} = (1.5 \text{ Å})^3 N_{\text{AVO}} = 0.002032 \) L, producing \( \Delta S_{\text{hind}} = -7.33 \) eu. While \( \Delta S_{\text{hind}} \) is independent of solute concentration, \( \Delta S_{\text{solv}} \) and \( \Delta S_{\text{comp}} \) are not. Note that Henchman treats this damping with a more laborious procedure, by assuming harmonic oscillations (rather than free translations) in the solvent cage, and running dynamics simulations to obtain the relevant force constants. \(^{35}\)

The sum of the three corrections for 1 M solute in THF is \( \delta_{\text{damp}} T S_{\text{trans}} = -11.8 \) eu. Note that in the limit as \( c \to c_{\text{liq}} \) our \( \delta_{\text{damp}} T S_{\text{trans}} \) method extrapolates properly to the case of the solute becoming a pure liquid of concentration \( c_{\text{liq}} \) and thus can be used to compare to Trouton’s rule. Considering THF as the solute, and removing arbitrary solvent by extrapolating \( c \to c_{\text{liq}} \), the three terms \( \Delta S_{\text{solv}} + \Delta S_{\text{comp}} + \Delta S_{\text{hind}} \) extrapolate to \( -11.3 - 7.3 = -18.6 \) eu. With further damping of \( S_{\text{rot}} \) (below) of ~4 eu, we achieve the Trouton 298 K value of ~23 eu.

Add three terms:

\[ \delta_{\text{damp}} T S_{\text{rot}} = T (\delta S_1 + \delta S_2 + \delta S_3) \]

\[ \delta S_1 = -d S_{\text{gas}} \]

\[ d = 0.3 + (0.4/\pi) \tan^{-1}[2S(t_1 - 0.5)] \]

\[ t_1 = \frac{(L_b - L_c)}{\langle L_{\text{solvent}} \rangle} \quad t_b = \frac{(L_a - L_b)}{\langle L_{\text{solvent}} \rangle} \]

\[ L_a = \sqrt{\frac{8(I_a + I_c - I_b)}{M}} \quad L_b = \sqrt{\frac{8(I_b + I_a - I_c)}{M}} \]

We refer to \( d \) as the rotational entropy damping term, a value between 0.1 (minimal damping of rotation) and 0.5 (strong damping). It depends on a dimensionless “bumping parameter” \( t_i \) which itself depends on the lengths of the solute molecule along each principal axis \( (L_a, L_b, L_c) \) and the average of the same three lengths of the solvent molecule, \( \langle L_{\text{solvent}} \rangle \). These lengths are obtained in a crude approximation from the mass \( M \) and moments of inertia \( (I_a, I_b, I_c) \) of the molecule. Thus, the \( d \) terms require only the \( M \) and \( I \) which are commonly output in quantum chemistry programs.

The tumbling parameter \( t_i \) was designed so that \( t_i > 0.5 \) would denote tumbling that would be significantly hindered in solution; large \( t_i \) would result from large \( L_{\text{solvent}}/L_{\text{solvent}} \) ratios, and large \( L_a - L_c \) differences (i.e., spherical solutes regardless of size would have \( t_1 = 0 \) and be minimally hindered). The \( \tan^{-1} \) function in \( d \) was chosen for an intuitively sudden but smooth transition from minimally hindered rotation to a seesaw-like wobbling vibration as \( t_1 \) crosses 0.5 (Figure 2).

**Figure 2.** Plot of the rotational entropy damping term \( d \) as a function of tumbling metric \( t_i \).
The square-root formulas for the effective molecule lengths \( L_i \) arise as follows. Assume that the mass distribution about a given axis (say, z-axis) is a uniform solid ellipse bound by the curve \((y/y_0)^2 + (x/x_0)^2 = 1\), i.e., \( y_{\text{bound}} = y_0 \sqrt{1 - (x/x_0)^2} \), where \( y_0 = L_z/2 \) and \( x_0 = L_x/2 \). Then, if \( r \) is the radial distance of a point of mass from the z-axis,

\[
<r^2> = \frac{\int_{x=0}^{x_0} \int_{y=0}^{y_0} r^2 \, dy \, dx}{\int_{x=0}^{x_0} \int_{y=0}^{y_0} dy \, dx} = \frac{(\pi/4)(y_0^2 x_0^2 + y_0^3 x_0)}{(\pi/16)(x_0^3 + y_0^3)} \]

\[
= \frac{1}{4} \left( x_0^2 + y_0^2 \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{16} \left( L_x^2 + L_y^2 \right)
\]

This expression can be substituted into

\[
I_z = \sum_{i=1}^{\text{atoms}} m_i r_i^2 \approx M(<r^2>) = \frac{M}{16} \left( L_x^2 + L_y^2 \right)
\]

from which the square-root expressions for the lengths \( L_i \) follow.

As a last detail, the gas-phase rotational entropy \( S_{\text{rot}} \) was divided into components \( S_a, S_b, and S_c \) according to

\[
S_a = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{8\pi^2 k T}{h^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{x^{1/6}}{\sigma^{1/2}}
\]

where \( \sigma \) is the overall rotational symmetry number.

Computed data for this solvation IX correction appear in Supporting Information, and were based on B3LYP/6-31G(d) molecular geometries.

The Concentrated-Gas (cg) Approximation. We will compare the results of our method to results obtained with a more common procedure that we term a “concentrated-gas” or cg method. In this method, the damping terms \( \text{VII} \) (Table 1) are ignored except for the gas-compression term \( \Delta S_{\text{comp}} \) of term \( \text{VIII} \).

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### Spectral Signatures.

The \(^{11}B\)-NMR spectrum was used by Wang and Brown \(^2\) to identify the presence of the 9BBN-THF adduct. They attributed observed signals to the \((9BBN)_2\) dimer. They attributed observed signals to the \((9BBN)_2\) dimer and \((9BBN)_3\) complex (Table 1) are ignored except for the gas-compression term \( \Delta S_{\text{comp}} \) of term \( \text{VIII} \).

Table 2. \(^{11}B\)-NMR Chemical Shifts, GIAO B3LYP/6-311+G(d,p)//B3LYP/6-31G(d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>species</th>
<th>DFT ( \delta ) absolute</th>
<th>DFT ( \delta ) relative (^a)</th>
<th>exp ( \delta ) relative (^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BF₃-OEt₂</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9BBN-THF</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((9BBN)_2)</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9BBN</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Wang and Brown \(^2\), \(^b\)Relative to BF₃-OEt₂.

Infrared spectra were also used by Wang and Brown \(^2\) to identify the presence of the 9BBN-THF adduct. In the B—H stretch region, they attributed a small peak at 2300 cm\(^{-1}\) to be due to the adduct, and a strong peak at 1570 cm\(^{-1}\) to be due to BH bridge bonds of the \((9BBN)_2\) dimer. Our results confirm this also (Table 3): by converting our computed harmonic frequencies \( \omega \) to fundamentals \( r \) using a recommended scaling factor \(^2\) of 0.9613, we obtain computed values only 2\% larger than the experimental values (a scaling factor of 0.94 would have been ideal). The corresponding absorption for a monomer would be near 2460–2520 cm\(^{-1}\), which was apparently not observed. The relevant B3LYP/6-31G(d) predicted spectra appear in the Supporting Information (Figure S1). The intense peak of the dimer is due to the normal mode involving the bridging hydrogens moving parallel to the B—B axis.

Mechanism of Solvolysis Stage. Ignored to date has been the possibility that THF solvolysis of borane dimers might feature an intermediate in which one of the two BHB hydride bridges remains in place. We have computationally found such intermediates for both \( B_3H_4 \) and \((9BBN)_2 \) (Supporting Information, Figure S2). Hence, the mechanism possibilities for overall solvolysis reaction \( R1 \) could be \( S_{N1} + S_{N2} \) (2R + R3), \( S_{N2} + S_{N1} \) (R2 + R5 + R6), or \( S_{N1} + S_{N1} \) (R4 + R6 + R6) (Scheme 1).

First, we wish to point out large errors in B3LYP binding energies when using the secondary borane 9BBN: binding energies for reactions R4, R5, and –R6 are all underestimated by 9–13 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) relative to CCSD(T) results (Table 4). No such problem exists when using BH₃ (Table 5). Some side tests on methylboranes indicate that the problems might be general with secondary boranes, which have a more electropositive boron atom than BH₃. We tried two other double-cg basis sets with no improvement (very little effect, at most 1.4 kcal mol\(^{-1}\)). We tried two other DFTs, but OLYP was much worse (errors of >15 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) for the overall reaction R1, due to poor adduct binding energies), and PBE was inconsistent (a poor reaction R4 binding energy for BH₃ dimer but not 9BBN dimer).

Second, the computed Gibbs energy profiles for the solvolysis stage are plotted in Figure 3 for both \( B_3H_4 \) and \( (9BBN)_2 \): they include the three \( S_{N2} \) transition states found. Values of \( \Delta H \) and \( \Delta G \) for each step, including \( \Delta G \) with the cg approximation, are tabulated in the Supporting Information. There are large differences in profile between the two diboranes. For \( B_3H_4 \), the mechanism is \( S_{N2} + S_{N1} \), i.e., \( S_{N2} \) conversion to the SBB intermediate, followed by \( S_{N1} \) rupture of the remaining H-bridge bond. For \( (9BBN)_2 \), the mechanism might appear to be \( S_{N1} + S_{N1} \), which would disagree with Brown, but the \( S_{N2} \) barrier for step R2 is within 3 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) of the \( S_{N1} \) in this figure, and a closer inspection of minor effects is warranted. We first perform four comparisons with experimental data to support the accuracy of the results.

Comparison 1: K for Reaction R1, \( B = BH_3 \). Solutions of \( B_3H_4 \) in THF are known to be dominated by the adduct BH₃-THF and not BH₃-THF \(^3\). Figure 3 appears to show that adduct formation is not favored (\( \Delta_{\text{add}}G = +1.1 \) kcal mol\(^{-1}\)), but this simple check is incorrect, due to concentration and \( \Delta_{\text{add}}n \) effects. One first must take this standard (1 M) result, convert...
it to an equilibrium constant ($K^\circ = e^{-\Delta G^\circ/RT} = 0.2$), invoke its expression as a ratio of molarity products:

$$K = \frac{[BS]^2}{[B_2][S]^2} = 0.2 \text{ M}^{-1}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{[BS]^2}{[B_2]} = K[S]^2 \approx (0.2 \text{ M}^{-1})(12.3 \text{ M}^2) = 30 \text{ M}$$

and realize that this produces $[BS] \gg [B_2]$ at typical concentrations, for instance if $[BS] = 0.3 \text{ M}$ then $[B_2] = 0.003 \text{ M}$. The cg approximation in our hands (see Methods) gives $\Delta_{\text{r,x}} G^\circ = -0.2 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$, which also results in $[BS] \gg [B_2]$.

**Comparison 2:** $\Delta G^\circ$ for Reaction R1, $B = 9\text{BBN}$. For this Brown derived an equilibrium constant value of $8.05 \times 10^{-5} \text{ M}^{-1}$, corresponding to $\Delta_{\text{r,x}} G^\circ = +5.6 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ (his eq 11). Our method obtains +5.0 kcal mol$^{-1}$ (in THF; our gas-phase result is +9.7). The cg value in our hands gives +4.9 kcal mol$^{-1}$, also in very good agreement with experiment.

**Comparison 3:** $\Delta^{\circ} G^\circ$ for Reaction R4, $B = 9\text{BBN}$. Brown reported rate constants of $k_1 = 1.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for dimer loss ($d[B_2]/dt = -k_1[B_2]$) when performing $(9\text{BBN})_2$ hydroborations.

**Table 4. Results for $\Delta E_{\text{elec}}$ for Reactions R1–R6 for 9BBN Dimer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reaction</th>
<th>OLYP/6-31G(d)</th>
<th>PBEPBE/6-31G(d)</th>
<th>B3LYP/6-31G(d)</th>
<th>B3LYP/6-31G(dp)</th>
<th>B3LYP/cc-pVDZ</th>
<th>CCSD(T)/cc-pVDZ$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1: $B_2 + 2S \rightarrow 2SB$</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2: $B_2 + S \rightarrow SBB$</td>
<td>DNE$^b$</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3: $SBB + S \rightarrow 2SB$</td>
<td>DNE</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4: $B_2 \rightarrow 2B$</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: $SBB \rightarrow SB + B$</td>
<td>DNE</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6: $B + S \rightarrow SB$</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-15.2</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
<td>-22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Single-point calculations at B3LYP/6-31G(d) geometries. $^b$DNE: does not exist.

**Table 5. Results for $\Delta E_{\text{elec}}$ (kcal mol$^{-1}$) for Reactions R1–R6 for $B_2H_6$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reaction</th>
<th>OLYP/6-31G(d)</th>
<th>PBEPBE/6-31G(d)</th>
<th>B3LYP/6-31G(d)</th>
<th>B3LYP/6-31G(dp)</th>
<th>B3LYP/cc-pVDZ</th>
<th>CCSD(T)/cc-pVDZ$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1: $B_2 + 2S \rightarrow 2SB$</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2: $B_2 + S \rightarrow SBB$</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3: $SBB + S \rightarrow 2SB$</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4: $B_2 \rightarrow 2B$</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5: $SBB \rightarrow SB + B$</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6: $B + S \rightarrow SB$</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>-25.7</td>
<td>-21.2</td>
<td>-21.2</td>
<td>-21.5</td>
<td>-23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Single-point calculations at B3LYP/6-31G(d) geometries.

Figure 3. Gibbs energy profiles of the solvolysis reaction R1 and its elementary reactions R2–R6, from our composite method applied to THF solutions (298 K, 1 mol L$^{-1}$).
of “fast” alkenes in noncomplexing nonpolar solvents like CCl₄ or cyclohexane (his Table 1). From the Eyring equation (Appendix B) one derives $\Delta^G^\circ(\text{expt}) = 22.7$ kcal mol⁻¹. Taking our computed value for $\Delta^G^\circ$ for (9BBN)₂ dissociation in THF (20.8), removing the THF polarization effect (adding 0.4), and adding a vTST $\delta_{\text{PST}}$ correction (1.8, see Methods), we obtain $\Delta^G^\circ = 23.0$ kcal mol⁻¹. The cg method produces 18.8 kcal mol⁻¹, which is outside our goal of 2 kcal mol⁻¹ accuracy.

**Comparison 4: $\Delta^G^\circ$ for Reaction R2 in THF, B = 9BBN.** Brown² reported a 10× faster rate of dimer loss ($k_{\text{eff}} = 1.42 \times 10^{-3}$ s⁻¹) when performing (9BBN)₂ hydroborations of “fast” alkenes in THF, instead of in noncomplexing nonpolar solvents (his Table 1). He proposed that this is due to a solvolysis stage in THF, the rate being governed by an $S_N2$ step, $R_2(B = 9BBN)$. Note that solvolysis of (9BBN)₂ involves only one $S_N2$ step (Figure 3, right), unlike that of B₄H₁₀ which requires two (Figure 3, left). In an $S_N2$ step, the rate of dimer loss is $\frac{d[B_2]}{dt} = -k_{\text{eff}}[B_2]$, so $k_{\text{eff}} = \frac{k_s}{[S]}$. With the optimized $S_N2$ transition-state geometry, i.e. straight chain from Figure 3) gives 24.0, while the cg method gives 24.6. Again our method appears to improve upon the cg method.

**Application 1: $S_N1$ vs $S_N2$ Rate for Reaction R1 in THF, B = 9BBN.** Since Figure 3 (right) shows that the reaction $R_2$ $S_N2$ Gibbs barrier is only 3 kcal mol⁻¹ higher than the reaction $R_4$ $S_N1$ dissociation Gibbs energy, it is better to focus on the rate law ratio $v(S_N2)/v(S_N1)$, where other factors that need be considered are (i) rate law complexity, (ii) [THF] effects, and (iii) a vTST correction for $\Delta^G^\circ(S_N1)$.

We start with factor i. While the rate law for $S_N2$ step dimer loss in (9BBN)₂ solvolysis is elementary, the general $S_N1$ steady-state rate expression (from reactions R4, R-4, and R6) is

$$\frac{d[B_2]}{dt} = -k_{\text{eff}}[B_2][S]$$

but for “fast” alkenes $k_{\text{eff}}[B_2] \ll (1/2)k_s[S]$, so the rate law collapses to

$$\frac{d[B_2]}{dt} = -k_s[B_2]$$

which is an elementary step. This $k_s$ is the $k_0$ of Brown,² just as it was for noncomplexing solvents (comparison 3). Since the $S_N2$ rate law was $\frac{d[B_2]}{dt} = -k_s[B_2]$ (comparison 4), the rate ratio is

$$\frac{v_{S_N2}}{v_{S_N1}} = \frac{\frac{d[B_2]}{dt}(S_N2)}{\frac{d[B_2]}{dt}(S_N1)} = \frac{k_{\text{eff}}(S_N2)}{k_s(S_N1)} \frac{k_s(S_N1)}{k_{\text{eff}}(S_N1)} = \frac{k_s(S_N1)}{k_{\text{eff}}(S_N1)}$$

where we see effect ii: the $S_N2$ rate depends on THF concentration [S]. Effect iii, the vTST correction, is inside $k_{\text{eff}}(S_N1)$ to convert $\Delta^G^\circ(B \rightarrow 2B)$ to $\Delta^G^\circ$. With the vTST and [THF] effects incorporated, the predicted rate ratio is 1.1, indicating that the $S_N2$ pathway leads to a faster rate (in agreement with Brown, and the reverse of the conclusion from the naïve curve comparison in Figure 3). The cg method produces a rate ratio of 0.0013, which erroneously predicts an $S_N1$ pathway for 9BBN-THF adduct formation. The correct prediction from our method is somewhat fortuitous, as we are expecting an accuracy of only a factor of 30 in a rate constant (see Appendix B); however, this is a vast improvement from the cg result, whose rate ratio must be in error by three orders of magnitude.

We can also use the above results to predict the catalytic speedup of using THF as solvent. This would be the rate ratio $k_{\text{eff}}(S_N2, THF)/k_s(S_N1,CCl₄)$, which from Brown’s data² is 0.0014/0.00015 = 9.5. Using our $\Delta^G^\circ$ values, our method gives a rate ratio of 2.3, while the cg method gives 0.0027. The cg method predicts no catalytic speedup; our method is again fortuitous with its correct qualitative prediction.

Our first conclusion is that one should not venture to make a conclusion regarding $S_N1$ vs $S_N2$ mechanisms if our method gives their ab initio rates to be within a factor of 30. Our second conclusion is that the cg method is likely to be less reliable than ours for such rate comparisons.

**Mechanism of the Alkene-Addition Stage.** We pursued this step only as far as the monoalkylborane Me₂CHCH₂BR₃, since ensuing exothermic steps (complexation to solvent or addition of another alkene) would then be straightforward extensions. Given the (computationally) known π-complex intermediate BH₃-alkene, which undergoes a fast 4-electron rearrangement to the monoalkylborane, the mechanism possibilities for overall alkene-addition reaction R7 are then $S_N1 + 4e$ (reactions R8 + R11), or $S_N1 + 4e$ (reactions R9 + R10 + R11) (Scheme 2).

For reaction energetics, again B3LYP performed poorly for B = 9BBN but well for B = BH₃ (Tables 6 and 7), due again to the poorly predicted 9BBN-THF binding energy. OLYP and PBE are rated worse because they do not produce the BH₃- C₄H₈ π-complex.

Second, the computed Gibbs energy profiles for this alkene-addition stage are plotted in Figure 4 for both B₄H₁₀ and (9BBN)₂; they include the three $S_N2$ transition states found. Values of $\Delta H$ and $\Delta G$ for each step, including $\Delta G(\text{cg})$, are tabulated in the Supporting Information. For (9BBN)₂ (right plot) the mechanism is $S_N1 + 4e$, i.e. $S_N1$ dissociation of the adducts, followed by 4e rearrangement without any 9BBN-C₄H₈ π-complex involved. For B₄H₁₀ the mechanism might appear to be $S_N1 + 4e$, but the $S_N2$ barrier for step R8 is within 3 kcal mol⁻¹ of the $S_N1$ in this figure, and hence a closer inspection of minor effects is warranted once again.

**Application 2: $S_N1$ vs $S_N2$ Rate for Reaction R7 in THF, B = BH₃.** Again as in application 1 it is better to focus on the rate law ratio $v(S_N2)/v(S_N1)$ than a simple free energy comparison, and consider (i) rate law complexity, (ii) [THF] effects, and (iii) a vTST correction for $\Delta^G^\circ(S_N1)$. Although Singleton did factor in effects ii and iii in his recent comparison,¹⁴ he used the less reliable cg method (and it is not clear to us how the THF concentration was used).

Pasto³ reported a rate constant of $k_0 = 1.6$ M⁻¹ s⁻¹ for alkylborane production $\frac{d[BA]}{dt} = k_0[SB][A]$ when performing hydroboration of tetramethylethylene with BH₃-THF adducts in THF at 25 °C (his Table 1). He thought the mechanism was $S_N2$ (reaction R8); at that time the ensuing instantaneous reaction R11 step was not known, from second order kinetics. However, Brown² demonstrated that second order kinetics for product formation can also be achieved by an $S_N1$ mechanism (with monomeric borane as intermediate) as long as the rate for the B + S back-reaction (reaction R-9) was faster than the B + A step (reaction R10), because the $S_N1$ steady-state rate law for product formation is
Scheme 2. Overall Alkene-Addition Reaction (R7), Its Possible Elementary Steps (R8–R11), and Depiction of the R8 + R11 Hypothesis for Reaction R7

\[
\text{R7: } \text{SB} + \text{A} \rightarrow \text{S} + \text{BA} \quad (\text{overall})
\]
\[
\text{R8: } \text{SB} + \text{A} \rightarrow \text{S} + \text{BA} \quad (\text{SN2})
\]
\[
\text{R9: } \text{SB} \rightarrow \text{S} + \text{B} \quad (\text{SN1})
\]
\[
\text{R10: } \text{B} + \text{A} \rightarrow \text{BA} \quad (\text{SN1})
\]
\[
\text{R11: } \text{B} + \text{A} \rightarrow \text{BA} \quad (4\text{e rearr.})
\]

“S = OR₂ (solvent), B = BR₃H (borane), A = C₆H₆ (alkene).”

which can be written

\[
\frac{\text{d}[\text{BA}]}{\text{d}t} = k_2^{\text{eff}}[\text{BS}][\text{A}],
\]

\[
k_2^{\text{eff}} = \frac{k_{10}}{k_{-10}(\text{S}) + k_{10}(\text{A})} \approx \frac{k_{10}}{k_{-10}(\text{S})}
\]

if \( k_{-10}(\text{S}) \gg k_{10}(\text{A}) \). The rate law ratio \( v(\text{SN2})/v(\text{SN1}) \) in this case becomes

\[
\frac{v_{\text{SN2}}}{v_{\text{SN1}}} = \frac{\frac{\text{d}[\text{BA}]}{\text{d}t}(\text{SN2})}{\frac{\text{d}[\text{BA}]}{\text{d}t}(\text{SN1})} = \frac{k_2^{\text{eff}}(\text{SN2})}{k_2^{\text{eff}}(\text{SN1})} \approx \frac{k_2(\text{SN2})k_{-10}(\text{S})}{k_2(\text{SN1})k_{-10}(\text{A})} \approx \frac{k_2(\text{SN2})[\text{S}]}{k_2(\text{SN1})[\text{S}]}
\]

but note that we compute the full \( k_2^{\text{eff}} \) for the ratio and do not make the approximations indicated.

Brown further went on to prove that the \( \text{SN1} \) mechanism for BH₃ adducts was operating in some non-THF systems in which [S] was neither THF nor solvent, but alternative complexing Lewis bases (Me₂S, Et₃N) at solute concentrations (<1 M) in toluene solvent.⁵ Thus, in Brown’s cases, it must be true that \( k_2^{\text{eff}}(\text{SN1}) > k_2(\text{SN2}) \). However, there may be lingering doubt about the mechanism in THF solvent, because (a) ethers may have different binding energies than amines or sulfides, and (b) in THF [S] ≈ 12.3 M, which reduces \( k_2^{\text{eff}} \) (and thus the \( \text{SN1} \) rate) by a factor of 12.3.

From our \( \Delta^\circ \text{G}^\circ \) value for the \( \text{SN2} \) path (reaction R8(TS), 16.5 kcal mol⁻¹), the Eyring equation gives \( k_2(\text{SN2}) = 4.6 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \), in close agreement with \( k_2(\text{expt}) = 1.6 \). However, we compute \( k_2^{\text{eff}}(\text{SN1}) = 8.0 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \), which is faster. Hence our predicted rate ratio is \( v(\text{SN2})/v(\text{SN1}) \approx 0.6 \), i.e. for every

| Table 6. Results for \( \Delta^\circ \text{E} \) (kcal mol⁻¹) for Reactions R7–R11 for 9BBN Dimer |
| reaction | OLYP/6-31G(d) | PBE06-31G(d) | B3LYP/6-31G(d) | B3LYP/6-31G(dp) | B3LYP/cc-pVDZ | CCSD(T)/cc-pVDZ |
| R7: SB + A → S + BA | -59.3 | -16.2 | -15.6 | -16.1 | -15.2 | -11.2 |
| R8: SB + A → S + B + A | DNE | DNE | DNE | DNE | DNE | DNE |
| R9: SB → S + B | 2.9 | 15.2 | 11.2 | 11.3 | 11.7 | 22.6 |
| R10: B + A → B + A | DNE | DNE | DNE | DNE | DNE | DNE |
| R11: B + A → BA | DNE | DNE | DNE | DNE | DNE | DNE |

“Single-point calculations at B3LYP/6-31G(d) geometries. "DNE: does not exist.”

| Table 7. Results for \( \Delta^\circ \text{E} \) (kcal mol⁻¹) for Reactions R7–R11 for B₂H₆ |
| reaction | OLYP/6-31G(d) | PBE06-31G(d) | B3LYP/6-31G(d) | B3LYP/6-31G(dp) | B3LYP/cc-pVDZ | CCSD(T)/cc-pVDZ |
| R7: SB + A → S + BA | -10.2 | -7.8 | -7.6 | -8.2 | -7.8 | -7.5 |
| R8: SB + A → S + B + A | DNE | DNE | 9.8 | 9.6 | 10.0 | 11.3 |
| R9: SB → S + B | 16.3 | 25.7 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.5 | 23.9 |
| R10: B + A → B + A | DNE | DNE | -11.4 | -11.6 | -11.5 | -12.6 |
| R11: B + A → BA | DNE | DNE | -17.5 | -17.8 | -17.8 | -18.8 |

“Single-point calculations at B3LYP/6-31G(d) geometries. "DNE: does not exist.”

Figure 4. Gibbs energy profiles of the alkene-addition reaction R7 and its elementary reactions R8–R11, from our composite method applied to THF solutions (298 K, 1 mol L⁻¹). In the right-hand plot, reaction R11 (4e⁻ rearrangement) starts from fully dissociated reactants because the \( \pi \)-complex 9BBN-C₆H₆ does not exist.
8 product molecules, came from an S_{1,2} mechanism. This predicted S_{1,2} dominance agrees with Brown and not Pasto, but the results are within an order of magnitude, which cannot be considered conclusive since our accuracy is worse than that. (The less accurate eq approximation in our hands gave \( k_1(S_2, \ell) = 0.33 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \), \( k_{2(S_1)} = 4.3 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \), and hence a rate ratio of 0.077, which from application 1 we know to be an equally inconclusive result.)

Comparison 5: \( E_g \) for Reaction R7 in THF, \( B = BH_3 \). We make one final comparison to experiment. Pasto used temperature-dependent results for rate constants to compute an activation energy \( E_R = \Delta^H + RT = 9 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1} \), and activation entropy \( \Delta S^\ddagger = -27 \text{ eu} \), for the reaction of BH_3 + THF with tetramethylethene.\(^3\) His \( E_R \) disagrees substantially with ours (14.7 or 21.8 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) for \( S_{1,2} \) or \( S_{1,1} \) mechanisms, respectively). Since the comparisons so far suggest that our accuracy is within 2 kcal mol\(^{-1}\), we conclude that something is wrong in the experimental value. Singleton suspected problems with the temperatures reported for the rate constants.\(^11\) However, there might be problems with the temperature dependence of the Eyring equation itself; we had problems reproducing an Eyring-determined \( \Delta^S \) value for a permanganate reaction,\(^44\) and Brown noted historical problems in using Eyring-determined \( \Delta^S \) values for understanding mechanism.\(^2\)

4. CONCLUSIONS

The nature of boranes in solution (monomer, dimer, or solvent adduct) can be monitored with \(^11^B\)-NMR or infrared measurements, as the Brown group\(^9\) did. Our calculations confirm that monomer peaks would appear in noticeably different locations in both spectra.

The entropy-damping (system-frame) procedures introduced here appear to improve upon the concentrated-gas (molecule-frame) method (comparisons 3 and 4 and application 1, \( (9BBN)_2 \) dissociation vs solvolysis). Based only on the tests performed here, we appear to have achieved 2 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) accuracy in these systems, but for rate constants this still allows for errors of a factor of 30. Because of this, our improvements were not sufficient to verify all of Brown’s hypotheses for hydroboration in THF solvent. The calculations showed that the solvolysis stage is \( S_{2,2} \) (to SBB intermediate) + \( S_{1,1} \) (to 2 SBB) for BH_3, but could not confirm this for \((9BBN)_2\) and showed that the alkene addition stage is \( S_{1,1} + 4e \) rearrangement for 9BBN-THF, but could not confirm this for BH_3-THF.

Differences between \( \Delta_{\text{gas}} H \) and \( \Delta_{\text{gas}} G \) in THF solution are significant (see the Supporting Information), and continuum-solvation methodologies could be improved to address this.

APPENDIX A: INTERNAL ROTATION ENTROPY TESTS

We tested the harmonic-oscillator (HO) entropy estimate for the nine internal rotation modes that we thought might be least hindered. E1 theory\(^28\) required us to compute MP2/6-31G(d) internal-rotation barrier heights, and to replace \( S^\text{HO} \) with \( S^\text{free} \) free-rotor results if the MP2/6-31G(d) barriers were less than 1.4RT = 3.5 kcal mol\(^{-1}\). Table 8 shows that the \( S^\text{HO} \) value is sufficiently accurate, even in the cases where E1 theory recommends replacement with \( S^\text{free} \) and so no replacements were done. The largest error we made by keeping \( S^\text{HO} \) values would be in the first case of Table 8: by keeping (16.6 + 11.3)/2 instead of using 16.1, we make an error of 2.1 J mol\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\) in \( S \), or an error of 0.2 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) in TS or \( G \).

APPENDIX B: VARIATIONAL TRANSITION-STATE EFFECTS

Accurate computation of activation free energies \( \Delta^i G \) (\( G^i = G_{\text{reactant}} \)) are needed to predict rates via Eyring-equation rate constants \( k \):

\[
k = k_B k_B \exp \left( -\frac{\Delta^i G}{RT} \right)
\]

where \( k_B \) is Boltzmann’s constant, \( h \) is Planck’s constant, \( \kappa \) is the recrossings factor, and \( Q^i \) is the reaction quotient of standard concentrations, \( \{ \text{transition state} \}/\{ \text{reactant(s)} \} \), i.e., in solution normally \( Q^i \) is 1 for unimolecular reactions and 1 M\(^{-1}\) for bimolecular reactions. The challenging goal of reducing uncertainty in \( \Delta^i G \) prediction in solution to 2 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) would reduce inaccuracies in \( k \) to a factor of 30. Due to this limited accuracy, \( i \) we set \( \kappa = 1 \), because the error in neglecting recrossings is likely to be swamped by the error in \( \Delta^i G \), and \( ii \) we focused on determining values for \( \delta_{\text{gas}} G \) (the sum of terms 7 and 8 in Table 1) only for the free energy of transition states of barrierless reactions (for which the terms might be largest).

We first computed gas-phase values for \( \delta_{\text{gas}} G \) with the intent of adding solvation corrections later. The gas-phase values were determined by performing partial geometry optimizations at various fixed values of interfragment distance (\( R_{\text{g-g}} \) for adduct dissociation, \( R_{\text{d-d}} \) for diborane dissociation), computing an ideal-gas RRHO-based Gibbs energy after each optimization, plotting these \( G_{\text{gas,init}} (R) \) values, and taking the maximum value to be \( G^i \). Table 9 shows some results.

Before adding solvation corrections to these, we first compared to an experimental value for the gas-phase reaction \( 2BH_3 \rightarrow B_2H_6 \) derived as follows. Mappes and co-workers\(^45\) performed experiments and used a Slater extrapolation to determine a high-pressure-limit second-order rate constant of \( k_2 = 10^{10.6 \pm 0.4} \text{ at } T = 545 \text{ K} \). Using \( k = A e^{E_R/RT} \) and a plot of ln \( k \) vs 1/\( T \) they determined that \( E_R = -1 \pm 2 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1} \). This gives \( A = 10^{10.3} \); using this \( A \) and \( E_R \) but with \( T = 298 \text{ K} \) one finds \( k_2(298 \text{ K}) = 10^{11.0} \). Equating this with the Eyring equation above, one derives \( \Delta^i G^1 = 2.4 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1} \). (Since \( \Delta^i H^1 = E_R - 2RT \) for a bimolecular reaction, \( \Delta^i H^2 = -2.2 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1} \), leaving \( \Delta^i S^0 = -4.6 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1} \). The uncertainties in \( \Delta^i G^1 \)

\( \Delta^i H^1 \), and \( \Delta^i S^0 \) are slightly greater than 2 kcal mol\(^{-1}\).) In comparison to this experimental result for BH_3 dimerization, we overpredict \( \Delta^i G^1 \) (5.8, versus 2.4 \pm 2). This could be due to an overly low HO-based estimate of \( S^i \), causing our \( \Delta^i S^0 \)

\( \text{gas} \) (−7.0, versus −4.6 \pm 2) to be too large a drop; anharmonic effects should bring this value into better agreement with experiment. (A more elaborate prediction of \( \Delta^i G^1 \), for the 2CH_3 → C_2H_6 reaction, gave \( \Delta^i G^1 = 3 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1} \), matching this value for BH_3 from experiment, but this procedure may not be possible for our largest molecule.)

The poor agreement in the gas phase led us to discard Table 9 results and instead add solvation corrections to the experimental gas-phase values of \{+2.4, −2.2, −4.6\} kcal mol\(^{-1}\) for \( \{ \Delta^i G^1, \Delta^i H^1, \Delta^i S^0 \} \) for barrierless associations. For solvation corrections (terms I–IX in Table 1), we assumed that term II (polarization) does not appreciably change during the approach of two molecules to the loose variational transition state, and focused on damping terms. Damping PV (by −RT on the transition state and −2RT on the fragments) adds +0.6 to \( \Delta^i H \), while damping TS (by 25% of \( TS_{\text{gas}} \) for both the transition state and the fragments, since this reproduces the computed damping on the fragments) will
add \(-0.25\, T\Delta^3S_{\text{gas}} = +1.2\) to \(T\Delta^3S\). This resulted in solution-phase values of \(+1.8, -1.6, -3.4\) kcal mol\(^{-1}\) for \(\Delta^3G^0, \Delta^3H^0, T\Delta^3S^0\) for barrierless associations in THF. Hence, these values were used as \(\delta_{\text{FES}}G^0, \delta_{\text{FES}}H^0, \delta_{\text{FES}}TS\) for \(\text{S}_\text{N}1\) barrierless dissociations in THF solution.

### Table 9. Results from Variational Transition-State Partial Optimizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reaction</th>
<th>method</th>
<th>basis set</th>
<th>(R/\text{Å})</th>
<th>(\Delta^3G^0/\text{gas}/\text{kcal mol}^{-1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{BH}_3) spin</td>
<td>B3LYP</td>
<td>6-31G(d)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>110.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{BH}_3) (ratchet)</td>
<td>MP2</td>
<td>6-31G(d)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{BH}_3) + (\text{THF})</td>
<td>B3LYP</td>
<td>aug-cc-pVDZ</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{BH}_3) + (\text{NH}_3)</td>
<td>B3LYP</td>
<td>aug-cc-pVDZ</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{BH}_3) + (\text{NH}_3)</td>
<td>B3LYP</td>
<td>6-31G(d)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reduced moment of inertia for internal rotation.\(^{28}\) Two normal modes share internal rotation character; in such a case one might consider replacing their average contribution with a free-rotor contribution. \(^{*}\)Fine*: The harmonic oscillator prediction would not need replacing according to E1 theory.\(^{21-24}\) B3LYP/6-31G(d) result.

---
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