New Mechanistic Insights: Why Do Plants Produce Isoprene?
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ABSTRACT: In this article, we argue that the primary role of isoprene is to remove the singlet delta oxygen ($O_2 \cdot \Delta g$) that forms inside plants by ultraviolet excitation rather than to provide heat protection or scavenge ozone, OH, or other reactive oxygen species (ROS) in the gas phase. By deploying a quantum chemical framework, we address for the first time the exact mode of isoprene reactions with $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$, the most prominent ROS that causes damage to leaves. Initial reactions of isoprene with $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$ comprise its addition at the two terminal carbon atoms. The two primary open-shell adducts that appear in these reactions undergo 1,2-cycloaddition to generate methyl vinyl ketone and methacrolein, the sole products detected from in-house (i.e., inside of plants) oxidation of isoprene. Formation of other products, comprising the peroxyl O–O bonds, is kinetically insignificant. Furthermore, these adducts are thermodynamically too unstable to diffuse outside of plants. Oxidation of isoprene with $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$ does not produce new ROS (such as OH or HO$_2$), supporting the well-documented role of isoprene as an effective ROS scavenger. Deploying a solvation model reduces the energy requirements for the primary pathways in the range of 10–56 kJ/mol. The present results indicate that plants attach significant value to the in-home protection against $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$ by investing carbon and energy into the formation of isoprene, in spite of the appearance of the cytotoxic methyl vinyl ketone as one of the reaction products. (The same chemical species also form in unrelated gas-phase reactions involving isoprene and other ROS.) This finding explains the primary reason for the appearance of the dynamic biosphere–atmosphere exchange of methyl vinyl ketone.

1. INTRODUCTION

Emission of isoprene (2-methyl-1,3-butadiene) from many terrestrial plants accounts for nearly one-third of the annual global budget of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from all biogenic and anthropogenic sources combined.$^1$ Owing to its high chemical reactivity, once emitted to the atmosphere, isoprene plays a crucial role in many atmospheric phenomena.$^2$ This includes modifying the mechanisms of the atmospheric removal of other VOCs, influencing the formation of secondary organic aerosol and affecting the production of ozone. Although isoprene exerts no greenhouse gas (GHG) effect on its own right, its fast reaction with OH radicals can change the atmospheric oxidation capacity and the atmospheric lifetime of methane (the third most important GHG). But this is not the reason why plants invest their carbon and energy resources to synthesize isoprene.

A significant debate has been sweeping the field on reasons for plants to produce isoprene in an operation that is both biochemically expensive and energy dependent.$^3$ Mounting experimental evidence demonstrates that isoprene undergoes complex heat-tolerant mechanisms in plants. The direct production of isoprene from light-dependent photosynthesis indicates a plausible thermoslike protection of leaves from certain types of heat shocks.$^4$ However, the most discussed role of isoprene is the mitigation of the effect of reactive oxygen species (ROS) in plants.$^5$ By acting as an ROS scavenger, isoprene can prevent visible damage caused by exposure of leaves to ozone or OH radicals and reduce the loss in their photosynthetic capacity. Nonetheless, isoprene–ROS reactions remain to be elucidated, especially those occurring inside plants.

The lowest excited state of singlet delta oxygen ($O_2 \cdot \Delta g$) constitutes the most prominent ROS causing damage to leaves$^6$ in such a way that this exotic species accounts for over 80% of lipid oxidation within leaf tissues.$^7$ Photo-induced activation produces $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$ in plants, mainly mediated by the excited state of the triplet chlorophyll ($^3$Chl$^*$).$^8$ The literature has documented well the $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$ scavenging properties of isoprene.$^9$ Isoprene acts as an effective quenching agent for many ROS, including the $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$.$^3b$ Through the use of rose bengal as a photo-sensitizer, experiments$^3b$ have demonstrated that isoprene protects plants against the damaging effect of $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$. In fact, ultraviolet (UV) excitation of an isoprene/ground state oxygen mixture results in the formation of $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$.$^{10}$ Because the biochemical synthesis of isoprene displays light-dependency, the resistance to $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$ correlates positively with the light intensity.$^{10}$ However, the exact mode of isoprene attacks on $O_2 \cdot \Delta g$ remains largely unclear. Jardine et al.$^{11}$ have experimentally simulated a “within-plant” oxidation process of isoprene to report methyl vinyl ketone and methacrolein as the sole oxidation products. The authors linked the formation of...
these two compounds with the functionality of isoprene as an ROS scavenger but without pointing to O$_2$ $^1$$\Delta_g$ in particular.

Here, we suggest that the main role of isoprene is to remove O$_2$ $^1$$\Delta_g$ that forms inside of plants by the photo-induced activation process. From this perspective, by deploying quantum chemical calculations, this article provides a detailed mechanistic account of the reactions of O$_2$ $^1$$\Delta_g$ with isoprene. Because of the highly transient nature of O$_2$ $^1$$\Delta_g$ (lifetime of a few microseconds), the reaction chemistry of O$_2$ $^1$$\Delta_g$ constitutes an excellent candidate for a purely theoretical scrutiny. The reaction mechanism and the kinetic parameters developed herein will assist in formulating an atomic-scale understanding of the protective functions of isoprene in plants against ROS, particularly O$_2$ $^1$$\Delta_g$.

2. METHODOLOGY

Normally, treatment of the biradical character exhibited by the adduct of isoprene and O$_2$ $^1$$\Delta_g$ would require the application of multireference wave function methods such as CASSCF and CASSTP2.13 The pioneering work by the Yamaguchi group has demonstrated that the energies of the biradical systems computed by any single-determinant method can be significantly improved by the application of a simple approximate spin-projection (AP) scheme. In this scheme, an approximate spin-projected energy ($E_{AP}$) can be derived from the energies of the broken-symmetry ($E^{BS}$) and pure high-spin ($E^{HS}$) states

$$E_{AP} = f_{AP}E^{BS} - (1 - f)E^{HS}$$

where $f_{AP}$ denotes the spin-projection factor,

$$f_{AP} = \frac{(S^2)^{HS} - s(s + 1)}{(S^2)^{HS} - (S^2)^{BS}}$$

and $(S^2)^{HS}$ and $(S^2)^{BS}$ signify the expectation values of spin contamination pertinent to the pure high-spin and broken-symmetry states, respectively. Application of the AP methodology to various biradical systems yields B3LYP-derived energies to within 4.2–12.6 kJ/mol of the corresponding values obtained with more expensive multireference methods.15

In a series of contributions, Cremer and co-workers showed that unrestricted density functional theory (UDFT) methods perform surprisingly well in deriving energies and geometries of singlet biradicals.

Accordingly, we deploy the density functional theory (DFT) functional of B3LYP with the extended 6-311+G(d,p) basis set to investigate the biradical system of isoprene and O$_2$ $^1$$\Delta_g$. Final energies are corrected using the AP approach as described above, whenever the reacting species (including reactants, products, and transition states) attain a biradical character. As an initial accuracy benchmark, we calculate the triplet—singlet delta enthalpic gap of the oxygen molecule to be 85.4 kJ/mol, in a relatively good agreement with the corresponding experimental value at 94.1 kJ/mol.12 Standard UB3LYP calculations result in a significantly larger enthalpy gap of 161.5 kJ/mol, demonstrating the necessity of applying the AP approach. Table S1 enlists the calculated thermal enthalpies and the expected spin contamination values, that is, values required in calculations based on the AP methodology. We carry out all structural optimizations and energy calculations using the Gaussian 09 suite of programs.18 We have carefully confirmed the identity of each transition structure by performing intrinsic reaction coordinate (IRC) calculations.

The ChemRate code facilitates the calculation of the reaction rate constants, in the temperature range of 300–600 K.19 We obtain the Fukui indices for electrophilic attack ($f^+$) and the electronic Hirshfeld charges with the aid of DMol3 code.22 The Fukui $f^-$ indices serve as a molecular descriptor, reflecting the tendency of a certain site in a chemical species to undergo an electrophilic addition.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The structure of isoprene features a conjugated $\pi$ system, where the digits 1 and 2 denote two sites for the addition of O$_2$ $^1$$\Delta_g$.

![Figure 1. Isoprene chemical structure.](Image 407x572 to 482x615)
the basis of AP-corrected enthalpies (298.15 K), the reaction barrier of TS12 (99 kJ/mol) overshoots that of TS1 by 51 kJ/mol. To elucidate the different reactivities for the addition of O$_2$ at sites 1 and 2, Figure 3 displays the calculated Fukui indices and electronic charges on isoprene. The higher electron densities and $f^{-1}$ values at site 2 in comparison with the analogous estimates at site 1 concur with the lower activation barrier of TS1 with reference to TS12.

The two initial adducts, M$_1$ and M$_{14}$, reside at a similar level above the entrance channel. As Figure 2 depicts, the initial adduct M$_1$ branches into seven exit routes, whereas M$_{14}$ launches six channels. In the main channel, a 1,2-cycloaddition occurs via TS$_7$ overcoming a modest enthalpic barrier of 46 kJ/mol and forms the M$_7$ adduct. A very exothermic C−C bond fission (−376 kJ/mol) in M$_7$ provides the experimental product for in-house oxidation of isoprene, the methyl vinyl ketone molecule. This process takes place through a barrier of 92 kJ/mol embedded in TS$_8$.

The transition states TS$_2$, TS$_4$, and TS$_6$ from the main channel, along with TS$_{13}$ and TS$_{14}$ signify H-migration reactions, in which the outer oxygen atom abstracts a hydrogen atom from the neighboring carbon atoms through sizable reaction barriers amounting to 151, 166, 80, 86, and 143 kJ/mol, respectively. Fission of the relatively weak O−OH bond in the structure of hydroperoxide intermediates (such as M$_5$ and M$_{16}$) requires modest bond dissociation enthalpies in the range of 141−147 kJ/mol. Nonetheless, significantly higher barriers for the formation of allylic hydroperoxide (80−166 kJ/mol) with reference to the barrier of the main route (46 kJ/mol)
indicate that the formation of the propagating OH radical from the unimolecular rearrangement of M1 is highly unlikely. All our attempts to find transition states connecting M1 directly with M3 and M5 have led to TS2 and TS4, respectively. This interpretation has been guided by detailed IRC calculations and vibration analysis. The formation of hydroperoxide M6 from M1, as well as M15 from M14, occurs via H abstraction from the CH3 site by the terminal oxygen atom of the peroxy group, with modest reaction barriers of 80 kJ/mol (TS7) and 86 kJ/mol (TS14), respectively.

Transition structures TS9 (137 kJ/mol) and TS10 (67 kJ/mol) engender 1,3- and 1,4-cycloadditions commencing from M1. Formation of the six-membered ring, M11 structure, from M1 and M14 proceeds via similar reaction barriers through TS10 and TS18. The peroxy O−O bonds in the molecules are typically very weak, that is, 150 kJ/mol.26 This explains the absence of M10, M11, and M19 from the products of isoprene oxidations initiated by O2 \( ^1 \Delta_g \).

Both M1 and M14 are capable of forming short-lived dioxirane species M13 and M21 via a two-step pathway, initiated by 1,2-hydrogen transfer characterized by the TS11 (115 kJ/mol) and TS19 (117 kJ/mol) transition states. The corresponding biradical intermediates of M12 and M20 then pass through a barrierless unimolecular cyclization to form the highly stable heterocyclic peroxides M13 and M21. Because the reaction barriers associated with TS11 and TS19 significantly overshoot the barriers of the primary channels (TS7 and TS15), synthesis of dioxiranes from the reaction of isoprene with O2 \( ^1 \Delta_g \) is largely negligible.

On the basis of the reaction and activation barriers displayed in Figure 2, the channel associated with the attack of O2 \( ^1 \Delta_g \) molecule on the double bond at site 2 produces methyl vinyl ketone predominantly. Likewise, addition of oxygen at site 1 preferentially forms the second experimentally detected product of methacrolein. The kinetic parameters listed in Table 1 reveal that the overall isoprene + O2 \( ^1 \Delta_g \) reaction proceeds mainly by the addition of O2 \( ^1 \Delta_g \) to site 2 (M1) and forms methyl vinyl ketone molecule in a three-step mechanism.

| reaction | \( A \) (s\(^{-1}\) or cm\(^3\) molecule\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\)) | \( E_a \) (kJ/mol) |
|----------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| isoprene + O2 \( ^1 \Delta_g \) \( \rightarrow \) M1 | \( 2.60 \times 10^{-12} \) | 55 |
| M1 \( \rightarrow \) M2 | \( 2.36 \times 10^{12} \) | 132 |
| M2 \( \rightarrow \) M3 | \( 4.55 \times 10^{15} \) | 22 |
| M1 \( \rightarrow \) M4 | \( 1.22 \times 10^{15} \) | 147 |
| M4 \( \rightarrow \) M6 | \( 1.80 \times 10^{15} \) | 26 |
| M1 \( \rightarrow \) M5 | \( 1.17 \times 10^{15} \) | 61 |
| M1 \( \rightarrow \) M7 | \( 2.58 \times 10^{12} \) | 27 |
| M6 \( \rightarrow \) M8 + M9 | \( 3.51 \times 10^{15} \) | 180 |
| M1 \( \rightarrow \) M10 | \( 1.24 \times 10^{15} \) | 118 |
| M1 \( \rightarrow \) M11 | \( 8.17 \times 10^{15} \) | 48 |
| M1 \( \rightarrow \) M12 | \( 1.37 \times 10^{15} \) | 96 |
| isoprene + O2 \( ^1 \Delta_g \) \( \rightarrow \) M14 | \( 1.16 \times 10^{-12} \) | 105 |
| M14 \( \rightarrow \) M15 | \( 1.39 \times 10^{15} \) | 66 |
| M14 \( \rightarrow \) M16 | \( 1.69 \times 10^{15} \) | 122 |
| M14 \( \rightarrow \) M17 | \( 4.88 \times 10^{15} \) | 29 |
| M14 \( \rightarrow \) M18 + M9 | \( 2.55 \times 10^{15} \) | 143 |
| M14 \( \rightarrow \) M19 | \( 1.31 \times 10^{15} \) | 108 |
| M14 \( \rightarrow \) M20 | \( 2.47 \times 10^{15} \) | 39 |
| M14 \( \rightarrow \) M21 | \( 1.88 \times 10^{15} \) | 97 |

Figure 4. Potential energy diagram of isoprene + O2 \( ^1 \Delta_g \) reaction with (red) and without (black) solvent (water) effects.
(M₁ → M₂ → M₃ + M₄). All other channels display negligible importance, including isomerization of M₁ into the six-membered cyclic peroxide M₁₁.

To investigate the solvent effect on the reaction energetics for the two main pathways (i.e., formation of M₄ and M₄₁ from M₁ and M₁₁, respectively), we deploy a polarizable continuum model (PCM)²⁷ at the B3LYP/6-311g+(d,p) level of theory. Figure 4 contrasts the energies obtained in the gaseous and aqueous media. The PCM approach simulates the solvent effect by generating multiple overlapping spheres inside of a dielectric continuum, around the atoms within the molecule. The PCM predicts a systematic energy reduction in the range of 10 kJ/mol (TS₁) to 56 kJ/mol (TS₂) for transition states, intermediates, and final products along the two primary channels. Overall, the effect of the solvent is limited to reducing the energy penalties whereas the product distribution (i.e., based on kinetic values in Table 1) remains unchanged with reference to the gas-phase system.

Methyl vinyl ketone also constitutes a major product from the OH-initiated atmospheric oxidation of isoprene.²⁸ However, in accordance with the experimental finding of Jardine et al.,¹¹ we have shown that methyl vinyl ketone also appears from a within-plant oxidation of isoprene with O₂ , ¹Δ₂⁰. As Jardine et al.¹¹ have indicated, this calls for a reconsideration of the biogenic life cycle of isoprene and its oxidation products. Clearly, plants devote a significant effort into their protection against O₂ , ¹Δ₂⁰ by producing isoprene in a diurnal cycle⁷ that reflects the formation of O₂ , ¹Δ₂⁰ in spite of the appearance of the cytotoxic methyl vinyl ketone as the reaction product.
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