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Abstract: We have quantum chemically studied the effect of various polar and apolar solvents on the shape of the potential energy surface (PES) of a diverse collection of archetypal nucleophilic substitution reactions at carbon, silicon, phosphorus, and arsenic by using density functional theory at the OLYP/TZ2P level. In the gas phase, all our model $S_2$ reactions have single-well PESs, except for the nucleophilic substitution reaction at carbon ($S_2@C$), which has a double-well energy profile. The presence of the solvent can have a significant effect on the shape of the PES and, thus, on the nature of the $S_2$ process. Solvation energies, charges on the nucleophile or leaving group, and structural features are compared for the various $S_2$ reactions in a spectrum of solvents. We demonstrate how solvation can change the shape of the PES, depending not only on the polarity of the solvent, but also on how the charge is distributed over the interacting molecular moieties during different stages of the reaction. In the case of a nucleophilic substitution at three-coordinate phosphorus, the reaction can be made to proceed through a single-well (no transition state (TS)), bimodal barrier (two TSs), and then through a unimodal transition state (one TS) simply by increasing the polarity of the solvent.

Introduction

The bimolecular nucleophilic substitution ($S_2$) is one of the most studied and widely recognized elementary chemical reactions in organic chemistry; a typical example is shown in Scheme 1 for A = carbon, with chloride as nucleophile and leaving group.[1] This reaction type has recently been reviewed[2] and has been the subject of an exceptional number of experimental[3] and theoretical[4] studies over the past 70 years. In archetype $S_2$ processes, at least one charged species is present before and/or after the elementary reaction step. Often, such species react in a very different manner in the gas phase when compared to the solution phase, due to substantial stabilization of the charged species by the solvent. Hence, the behavior and rate of this reaction is contingent on the medium in which the reaction is conducted.[5, 6]

The bimolecular nucleophilic substitution at carbon ($S_2@C$; see Scheme 1, A = C) proceeds through a backside attack of the Cl$^-$ nucleophile at the carbon atom, followed by a concerted expulsion of the Cl$^-$ leaving group. In the gas phase, this process occurs through a double-well potential energy surface (PES) and a reactant and product complex (RC and PC, respectively) are separated by a pentacoordinate transition state (TS) (see Figure 1b).[3, 4] Solvation in aqueous solution transforms this double-well PES to a unimodal PES (see Figure 1c).[3, 6] The mechanism behind this drastic solvent effect on the reaction profile is explained by differential solvation of the reactants, products, intermediates, and transition states.[6]

The overall structural transformation for a bimolecular nucleophilic substitution at silicon[7] and phosphorus[8] ($S_2@Si$ and $S_2@P$, respectively; see Scheme 1, A = Si and A = P, respectively) is equivalent to that of $S_2@C$, however, the potential energy surface is noticeably different. Our understanding of the effect of solvation on these reactions is much less explored and as a result less concrete. What we do know is that in the gas phase, $S_2@Si$ and $S_2@P$ reactions proceed through a single-well PES associated with a $D_3h$ symmetric transition complex (TC), thereby proceeding without encountering a first-order saddle point (see Figure 1a). Aqueous solvation destabil-
izes the transition complex for $S_2\text{Si}$ and $S_2\text{P}$ reactions and turns the PESs into unimodal reaction profiles, with central transition states (see Figure 1c)."
from the interplay between the strain energy \((\Delta E_{\text{strain}})\) and the interaction energy \((\Delta E_{\text{int}})\) [Eq. (1)].

\[
\Delta E = \Delta E_{\text{strain}} + \Delta E_{\text{int}} \tag{1}
\]

The transition structure is separated into two fragments (the distorted substrate and the chloride ion), followed by single-point energy calculations on each fragment. The difference in energy between the optimized ground-state structure and the distorted structures is the strain energy \((\Delta E_{\text{strain}})\), whereas \(\Delta E_{\text{int}}\) refers to the interaction between the deformed reactants.

Furthermore, the ASM model has been extended to account for solvation, which is in line with previous work by De Cozar and coworkers.\[^4\] In this framework, the \(\Delta E_{\text{solute}}\) (PES in solution) is decomposed into the energy of the solute \((\Delta E_{\text{solute}})\), specifically the reaction system in vacuum with the solution-phase geometry, plus the solvation energy \((\Delta E_{\text{solvation}})\) [Eq. (2)].

\[
\Delta E_{\text{solution}} = \Delta E_{\text{solute}} + \Delta E_{\text{solvation}} \tag{2}
\]

\(\Delta E_{\text{strain}}\) and \(\Delta E_{\text{int}}\) make up the intrinsic energy of the solute \((\Delta E_{\text{solute}})\) and are augmented by the solvation term \((\Delta E_{\text{solvation}})\) as shown in Equation (3).

\[
\Delta E_{\text{solution}} = \Delta E_{\text{strain}} + \Delta E_{\text{int}} + \Delta E_{\text{solvation}} \tag{3}
\]

Notably, \(\Delta E_{\text{strain}}\) and \(\Delta E_{\text{int}}\) refer to the strain of, and mutual interaction between, the solute reactant molecules in their solution geometries, but in the absence of the solvent. As such, the strain is computed as the energy difference between the solute reaction system relative to the solute reactants in vacuum. The \(\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}\) term accounts for interaction of the solute with both the solvent and the cavitation, that is, the formation of a cavity in the solvent by the presence of the solute. This approach to extending upon the ASM differs from a prior approach,\[^5\] in which all solvent effects were incorporated in either the strain or interaction terms.

Results and Discussion

The results of our OLYP/TZ2P calculations in the gas phase and seven selected solvents are presented in Tables 1 and 2 as well as in Figure 2. Reaction profiles for the \(S_2\) reactions in ammonia, water, and dichloromethane are presented here are, where available, in line with previous studies.\[^7\] Driven to assess the effect of solvation on the shape of the PES and to provide new insights into the backside \(S_2\) reaction mechanism, we systematically screened solvents of varying polarity. We observe dramatic variation in the shape of the PES in the range of vacuum to ammonia, followed by minimal deviations for polar solvents with dielectric constants greater than \(e_i = 16.9\) (ammonia). In addition, we find that an increase in the solvent polarity results in destabilization of the transition zone and rising of energy barriers. Under strongly polar conditions, the PES eventually becomes unimodal for \(S_2\), \(S_2\) and \(S_2\) reactions and bimodal for \(S_2\) and \(S_2\) reactions.

Nucleophilic substitution at carbon

The first reaction we discuss is \(\text{Cl}^- + \text{CH}_3\text{Cl} (S_2\), Table 1, entries 1a–h, Figure 2a). The PES for \(S_2\) shifts from a double-well in the gas phase, as well as in non-polar solvents, to unimodal as the solvent polarity increases. Specifically, the PES is characterized by a double-well in vacuum, toluene, and chloroform, having a reactant complex that becomes less stabilized relative to the reactants as the polarity increases, which is in line with previous observations by Chandrasekhar et al.\[^4\] Thus, the energy of the reactant and product complexes (RC and PC, respectively) at the bottom of the double-well relative to the separate reactants and products (R and P, respectively) increases from \(-9.1\) to \(-10.1\) kcal mol\(^{-1}\) (Table 1, entries 1a–c). The central barrier associated with reaching the \(D_1\)-symmetric transition state (TS) rises significantly as the polarity increases. Initially, there is a slightly negative barrier of \(-0.1\) kcal mol\(^{-1}\) in the gas phase and the barrier rises to \(-22.7\) kcal mol\(^{-1}\) in the most polar solvent, that is, methylformamide. A significant change in the PES is observed in ammonia, as the double-well transforms to a unimodal barrier with the reactant complex (RC) disappearing. This unimodal barrier persists in ammonia and more polar solvents and it coalesces with the \(\Delta E_{\text{TS}}\) varying only by \(-1.2\) kcal mol\(^{-1}\). The \(\Delta E_{\text{TS}}\) is greatest (\(-13.3\) kcal mol\(^{-1}\)) when changing from vacuum to toluene despite the fact that the \(\Delta E\) between vacuum and toluene is only 2.4. This reveals that a modest change in the solvent polarity compared to vacuum has a drastic effect on the shape of the PES, which indeed appears to be the case for all \(S_2\) reactions studied herein.

Nucleophilic substitution at phosphorus

The energetics of the reaction \(\text{Cl}^- + \text{SiH}_3\text{Cl} (S_2\), Table 1, entries 2a–h, Figure 2b) are discussed next. The pentavalent \([\text{Cl}^- + \text{SiH}_3\text{Cl}]\) is a stable energy minimum, referred to as transition complex (TC), at variance with the labile transition state (TS) discussed for \(S_2\) above. As the polarity increases from the gas phase to chloroform, the single-well PES becomes increasingly shallow (Table 1, entries 2a–c). Unlike for \(S_2\), the PES for \(S_2\) in ammonia, turns into a bimodal barrier with a \(C_{2v}\)-symmetric pre-transition state (pre-TS) that is slightly higher (\(-0.1\) to \(-0.2\) kcal mol\(^{-1}\)) in energy than the \(D_1\)-symmetric TC (Table 1, entries 2d–h). In a previous communication from our group, it was reported that \(S_2\) in water proceeds through a unimodal barrier, which, because of a numerical artifact, experienced a shift in the transition vector to a slightly positive value (38 cm\(^{-1}\)).\[^7\] This may be an incomplete view of the surface topology because when using the highest quality numerical integration scheme and careful analysis, a bimodal barrier emerges. Note, however, that the PES around the transition complex is extremely shallow and locating the pre-TS complexes proved non-trivial. The activation barrier for \(S_2\) is significantly lower than for \(S_2\), by approximately 18 kcal mol\(^{-1}\), and increases monotonically from 3.1 to 4.5 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) when moving from ammonia to methylformamide (Table 1, entries 2d–h).
a systematic manner, ranging from −26.0 to −4.0 kcal mol$^{-1}$ (Table 1, entries 3a–c, Figure 2c). In ammonia and methanol, the shape of the PES transforms into a bimodal barrier (Table 1, entries 3d and e). Gilheany and co-workers also observed a bimodal barrier for S$_2$@P depending on the solvent polarity by using NMR spectroscopy and computational techniques.\cite{8c}

Extremely low barriers of 0.9–1.4 kcal mol$^{-1}$ associated with this pre-TS lead to a slightly more stable (0.3–0.6 kcal mol$^{-1}$) pentacoordinate TC, similar to the case of S$_2$@Si in solution when $r_s \geq 16.9$. Solvation in water and more polar solvents results in a unimodal PES (Table 1, entries 3f–h). The pre-TS no longer exists in these solvents and instead, a C$_2v$-symmetric TS associated with very low activation barriers ranging from 1.2 to 1.7 and 1.8 kcal mol$^{-1}$ is observed, in water, formamide, and methylformamide, respectively (Figure 2c). In short, by increasing the polarity of the solvent for S$_2$@P, we recover both the shift from single-well PES to unimodal PES that was observed for S$_2$@Si, and, continuing along the spectrum, the shift from unimodal PES to a unimodal PES, similar to S$_2$@C.

### Table 1. Energies (in [kcal mol$^{-1}$]) relative to the reactants of stationary points along the PES of the symmetric S$_2$2 reactions in the gas phase and in solution.$^a$

| No. | Medium$^b$ | Reaction$^c$ | Shape of the PES$^d$ | Reactant complex/pre-transitions state | Transition state/transition complex |
|-----|------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|     |            |              |                      | $\Delta E_R$ ($\Delta E_{p-TS}$) | $\Delta E_T$ ($\Delta E_{TS}$) |
| 1a  | gas        | Cl + CH$_3$Cl | double-well          | −9.1                                 | −0.1                              |
| 1b  | toluene    | double-well   | −2.6                 | 13.2                                 |
| 1c  | chloroform | double-well   | −1.0                 | 18.0                                 |
| 1d  | ammonia    | unimodal     | −21.5                | 22.1                                 |
| 1e  | methanol   | unimodal     | −22.6                | 22.6                                 |
| 1f  | water      | unimodal     | −1.8                 | 1.7                                  |
| 1g  | formamide  | unimodal     | −0.3                 | 0.3                                  |
| 1h  | methylformamide | unimodal | −0.4                 | 0.6                                  |
| 2a  | gas        | Cl$^-$ + SiH$_3$Cl | single-well | −24.3                             |
| 2b  | toluene    | single-well   | −7.7                 | −1.6                                 |
| 2c  | chloroform | single-well   | − (4.4)               | (4.4)                               |
| 2d  | ammonia    | bimodal (3.1) | (2.9)                |
| 2e  | methanol   | bimodal (3.8) | (3.7)                |
| 2f  | water      | bimodal (3.9) | (3.8)                |
| 2g  | formamide  | bimodal (4.4) | (4.3)                |
| 2h  | methylformamide | bimodal | (4.5)               | (4.4)                               |
| 3a  | gas        | Cl$^-$ + PH$_2$Cl | single-well | −26.0                             |
| 3b  | toluene    | single-well   | −9.9                 | −4.0                                 |
| 3c  | chloroform | single-well   | − (1.4)               | (1.1)                               |
| 3d  | ammonia    | unimodal     | −1.2                 | 1.2                                  |
| 3e  | methanol   | unimodal     | −1.7                 | 1.7                                  |
| 3f  | water      | unimodal     | −1.8                 | 1.8                                  |
| 3g  | formamide  | unimodal     | −9.6                 | 9.6                                  |
| 3h  | methylformamide | unimodal | −9.7                 |
| 4a  | gas        | Cl$^-$ + AsH$_2$Cl | single-well | −29.6                             |
| 4b  | toluene    | single-well   | −13.2                | −7.1                                 |
| 4c  | chloroform | single-well   | − (1.4)               | (1.1)                               |
| 4d  | ammonia    | single-well   | − (2.6)               | −2.6                                 |
| 4e  | methanol   | single-well   | − (1.8)               | −1.8                                 |
| 4f  | water      | single-well   | − (1.7)               | −1.7                                 |
| 4g  | formamide  | single-well   | − (1.2)               | −1.2                                 |
| 4h  | methylformamide | single-well | − (1.1)               | −1.1                                 |
| 5a  | gas        | Cl$^-$ + AsO$_2$H$_2$Cl | single-well | −29.6                             |
| 5b  | toluene    | single-well   | −28.6                | −3.6                                 |
| 5c  | chloroform | single-well   | − (2.7)               | (2.6)                               |
| 5d  | ammonia    | single-well   | − (2.9)               | (2.7)                               |
| 5e  | methanol   | single-well   | − (3.2)               | (3.3)                               |
| 5f  | water      | single-well   | − (3.5)               | (3.5)                               |

$^a$ Computed at the OLYP/TZ2P level. $^b$ Solvent modeled with COSMO. $^c$ See the Supporting Information for structures and Cartesian coordinates. $^d$ See Figure 2 for PESs.
In the case of the $S_N2@P4$ reaction $\text{Cl}^- + \text{POH}_2\text{Cl}$, we find that the transition structures (either transition state or transition complex) are destabilized by 4–8 kcal mol$^{-1}$ compared to the $S_N2@P3$ reaction $\text{Cl}^- + \text{PH}_2\text{Cl}$, due to an increased coordination at the electrophilic center.\textsuperscript{[7b]} We discuss the effect of increased coordination and the resulting effects it has on both the interaction and the strain energy below in the Activation Strain Analysis section. In vacuum and toluene, $S_N2@P4$ occurs through a single-well (Table 1, entries 4 a and b, Figure 2d). Moving to chloroform and the other polar solvents, the PES shifts directly to a unimodal barrier, with a $C_{2v}$-symmetric TS (Table 1, entries 4 c–h). The bimodal PES is bypassed in this oxide system compared to the non-oxide substrate (compare Figures 2c and d). The barriers for $S_N2@P4$ rise incrementally in ammonia and more polar solvents and vary from 7.9 to 9.7 kcal mol$^{-1}$ (Table 1, entries 4 d–h).

**Figure 2.** Reaction profiles of six $S_N2$ reactions. a) $S_N2@C$, b) $S_N2@Si$, c) $S_N2@P3$, d) $S_N2@P4$, e) $S_N2@As3$, and f) $S_N2@As4$, computed at the OLYP/TZ2P level by using COSMO to simulate the effect of solvation. In each case, the order of the solvents remains the same, varying systematically from least polar to most polar.

Nucleophilic substitution at arsenic

The PES associated with the $S_N2@As3$ reactions deviates significantly from the PES for $S_N2@P3$ in ammonia and more polar solvents. This is the only $S_N2$ reaction included in the present study that does not have a barrier even in the most polar of solvents. A single-well PES is observed for $S_N2@As3$ in every solvent (Table 1, entries 5 a–h) and is steepest for the reaction in the gas phase ($-29.6$ kcal mol$^{-1}$). From the gas phase to solvation, and going to more polar solvents, we recover the same trend of a decreasing stability of the transition complex as we found for the other reactions, that is, the single-well becomes increasingly shallow in a monotonic fashion as the solvent polarity increases, to a final $\Delta E_{TC}$ of $-1.1$ kcal mol$^{-1}$ in methylformamide (Table 1, entry 5 h).

The PES for $S_N2@As4$ is a single-well in the gas phase and in the non-polar solvents, toluene and chloroform, with the stabi-
zation of the TC relative to the reactants R varying greatly from $-29.6$ to $-10.7$ to $-3.6$ kcal mol$^{-1}$, respectively (Table 1, entries 6a–c). When transitioning to ammonia and increasingly polar solvents, the PES shifts to a bimodal barrier with a $C_{3v}$-symmetric TC (Table 1, entries 6d–h). The bimodal PES has a $C_{3v}$-symmetric pre-TS and post-TS that connect the separated reagents/products and the TC. The pre-TS and post-TS are similar in shape to those occurring in the $S_{n}2@$Si reaction. The transition structures (pre-TS, TC, TS, and post-TS) for $S_{n}2@$As4 are all destabilized compared to the non-oxide ($S_{n}2@$As3) variants by 0–4 kcal mol$^{-1}$. This relative destabilization caused by the oxide functionality is less extreme than was the case for $S_{n}2@$P.

**Solvent effects on the reaction PES**

Now, we examine how solvation affects the shape of the PES of each reaction by decomposing the solution phase PES ($\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$) into two terms, namely, $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ and $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ (see the Theoretical Methods section for details).\(^{[46]}\) The term $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ refers to the energy of the solute (computed in the gas phase, but with its solution-phase geometry), whereas $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ is the stabilization provided by the solvent. Overall changes in the shape of the PES can be explained in terms of differential solvation of the various stationary points (i.e., R, RC, PC, pre-TS, post-TS, TS, and TC).\(^{[46]}\) For nucleophilic substitutions involving an anionic nucleophile, such as the reactions studied in this work, it is known that a polar solvent stabilizes the reactants and products more strongly than the intermediate complexes that occur as the reaction progresses.\(^{[7b,d]}\) Solvation, therefore, generally results in a destabilization of the region around the central transition state or transition complex.

This can be understood already from the classical electrostatic Born equation for spherical ions in a dielectric continuum [Eq. (4)] in combination with a simplified model of our $S_{n}2$ reaction systems.\(^{[28]}\)

$$\Delta E_{\text{solution}} = - \frac{Q^2}{8\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_r} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_r} \right)$$

In Equation (4), $Q$ is the charge of the ion, $\alpha$ is the radius of the ion, $\varepsilon_r$ is the dielectric constant in vacuum, and $\varepsilon_r$ is the relative dielectric constant of the solvent. The simplification involves the notion that the reaction systems consist of a relatively neutral central moiety (e.g., CH$_3$) between a (partially) negatively charged nucleophile Cl$^{-}$ and leaving group Cl$^{2+}$. The latter two groups have charges $Q_1$ and $Q_2$ that, in the course of the $S_{n}2$ reaction, go from $Q_1 = -1$ and $Q_2 \geq 0$ to $Q_1 = 0$ and $Q_2 = -1$. This leads to the following Equation (5).

$$\Delta E_{\text{solution}} = \frac{Q_1^2 + Q_2^2}{8\pi\varepsilon_0\varepsilon_r} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_r} \right)$$

Equation (5) is, in fact, a crude approximation to the solvation energy as computed in our more sophisticated COSMO computations, but it catches the essence of the physics: solvation stabilization is strongest when the excess negative charge is localized mainly on one of the two ionic groups, that is, $Q_1 = -1$ or $Q_2 = -1$, and it is the least stabilizing in intermediate situations in which the charge is delocalized over both sides, that is, $Q_1 = Q_2 \geq -1/2$ [Eq. (5)]. As a result, the central part of the PES is less strongly stabilized compared to the reactant and product sides.

Striving to go one step beyond this general observation and explain how, and when, solvation can lead to PES shapes with different qualitative features (i.e., a labile TS or a stable TC, or the appearance of pre- and post-TSs), we have numerically re-created all occurring PES shapes by using generic Gaussian functions $f(x) = e^{-x^2/\sigma}$ (Figure 3). In each of the four graphs in Figure 3, an identical single-well $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ profile is represented by the solid black line. In addition, various $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ profiles are modeled (colored dotted lines in Figure 3), by varying the peak width and peak height of the Gaussian functions. The colored solid lines are the sum of the modeled $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ profile and the $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ model curves of the corresponding color, and represent the overall solution-phase PES profiles $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$.

First, we discuss the effect of varying the peak width for the $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ profiles. Our analysis reveals that when the $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ and $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ profiles have roughly the same width, the resulting $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ PES will feature no stationary points other than the central TC or TS (red lines in Figure 3a). Due to the maximum of the $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ curve in the middle, where it is the least stabilizing, the central point along the solution-phase PES $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ is destabilized relative to the central point along the solute PES $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ in vacuum. Whether this central point is a labile TS or stable TC also depends on the peak height, which will be addressed hereafter. When the profile of $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ is much wider than that of $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$, the solution-phase PES $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ [Eq. (2)] will develop pre-TS and post-TS barriers separating a central minimum or transition complex (TC) from the reactants and products. The reason is that near the reactants and products, the derivative $|\Delta E_{\text{solution}}/\delta z| > |\Delta E_{\text{solute}}/\delta z|$, but nearer the central point $|\Delta E_{\text{solution}}/\delta z| < |\Delta E_{\text{solute}}/\delta z|$. In other words, in early and late stages of the $S_{n}2$ reaction, $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ follows the destabilization of $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ relative to the reactants and products, whereas, in the central region, it follows the stabilization, that is, the drop in energy stemming from $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$. This leads to the appearance of the aforementioned pre-TS and post-TS at points where the derivatives of $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ and $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ are equal but of opposite sign: $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}/\delta z = -\Delta E_{\text{solute}}/\delta z$ (yellow lines in Figure 3a). A narrower $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ profile, on the other hand, provides a labile central TS, with stable RC and PC (green lines in Figure 3a).

Now, turning to variation of the peak heights of the modeled $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ profiles, we provide in Figure 3 a series of solvation energy profiles that have the same width as $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ (Figure 3b), are narrower than $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ (Figure 3c), or are wider than $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ (Figure 3d). For each situation, a small peak height does not lead to any change in the qualitative features of the solution phase $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ PES: the single well remains a single well (red lines in Figure 3b–d). A sufficiently large $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ curve, does, however, change the single-well $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$ PES to a unimodal profile with a central barrier (green lines in Figure 3b–d). When the peak heights of the $\Delta E_{\text{solute}}$ and $\Delta E_{\text{solution}}$
curves are comparable, the final reaction profile can contain stable RC and PC structures, separated by a TS (yellow lines in Figure 3c, D E solvation peak width narrower than D E solute), or the inverse situation can occur: the central point can be as table minimum, with maxima appearing before and after, resembling a pre-TS and post-TS (yellow lines in Figure 3d, D E solvation peak width broader than D E solute peak width).

We now return to the actual chemical reactions that are investigated in this work. First, we recall that solvation raises the transition zone relative to the solvated reactants, for every S N 2 reaction included in this study. The total solvation energy for the reactants is dominated by the chloride ion with its localized charge: D E solvation for this anion ranges from -45.3 to -77.9 kcal mol⁻¹ from toluene to methylformamide, respectively (see Table 2, footnote [b]). The increased degree of stabilization (i.e., a more negative D E solvation) is directly correlated with the polarity of the solvent, with more polar solvent systems leading to amplified charge stabilization. Due to their lack of net charge, the neutral reactants are weakly solvated compared to Cl⁻, ranging from -1.0 to -2.8 kcal mol⁻¹ for non-oxide-based reactants (Table 2, entries 1a–h, 2a–h, 3a–h, 5a–h) and -5.1 to -12.8 kcal mol⁻¹ for the more polar and moderately solvated tetracoordinate phosphorus and arsenic compounds (Table 2, Entries 4a–h, 6a–h). The RCs, pre-TSSs, and central TCs/TSSs display less strong solvation than the two separate reactants, with solvation energies ranging from -30.0 to -61.6 kcal mol⁻¹, and always becoming more stabilizing as the polarity of the solvent increases (Table 2). Overall, the difference in the stabilization between the reactants and the intermediate structures becomes greater for more polar solvents, thus leading to larger changes in the PES shapes. This is graphically shown in Figure 4a–c, where the D E solute, D E solvation, and D E solution terms are indicated for S N 2@P3 in toluene, ammonia, and methylformamide. For the apolar solvent toluene, we only find a minor change from the single-well PES for D E solute to a shallower single-well PES for D E solution (Figure 4a). Increasing the solvent polarity, as in the case of ammonia, we find that the single-well D E solute curve is changed to a bimodal PES and even to a unimodal PES for the most polar solvent methylformamide (Figures 4b and c, respectively).

Next, we move to the effect of varying the central atom in the reaction system. We limit our discussion here to the results for the most polar solvent, namely methylformamide. For each reaction, we find a favorable solvation for the reactants, in all cases predominantly due to the Cl⁻ ion, which varies from -80.0 to -91.5 kcal mol⁻¹ (Table 3). For S N 2@C, the D E solution
term becomes smaller during the reaction (−57.0 kcal mol⁻¹ in the TS), combined with the high intrinsic barrier caused by steric congestion around the small carbon atom, this is enough to transform the double-well PES to a unimodal PES with a central barrier of +22.8 kcal mol⁻¹.

For $S_2@Si$ and $S_2@As4$, solvation in methylformamide results in a bimodal PES (Figures 2b and f). From our results, we find a correlation between the slope of the solvation energy ($\partial \Delta E_{\text{solvation}} / \partial Q_c$; see Figure S2 in the Supporting Information) and the nature of the central atom: $\partial \Delta E_{\text{solvation}} / \partial Q_c$ becomes smaller, that is, the curve becomes less steep, as one moves down in the periodic table. This leads to a wider $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ profile and consequently, the appearance of a pre-TS and post-TS (see Figure 3d). Why the $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ profile becomes broader for larger central atoms, can be understood from an examination of the various AR,CI fragments (see Figures S3 and S4 in the Supporting Information). The LUMO of AR,CI grows progressively more diffuse as one moves down in the periodic table.

### Table 2. Solvation energies ($\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ in [kcal mol⁻¹]), chlorine atomic charges ($Q_c$ in [a.u.]), and A–Cl distances (in [Å]) of the reactants, reactant complexes, pre-transition states, transition complexes, and transition states.\(^{[a]}\)

| No. | Medium\(^{[a]}\) | Reaction | $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ | $Q_c$ | A–Cl | $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ | $Q_c$ | A–Cl | $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ | $Q_c$ | A–Cl |
|-----|----------------|-----------|--------------------------|------|-------|--------------------------|------|-------|--------------------------|------|-------|
| 1a  | gas            | $\text{Cl} + \text{CH}_2\text{Cl}$ | −0.128 1.79             | −0.225 1.83 | −0.543 2.35 |
| 1b  | toluene        | −1.0 −0.149 1.80 −40.6 | −0.184 1.81 | −3.0 −0.562 2.35 |
| 1c  | chloroform     | −1.5 −0.160 1.80 −56.9 | −0.175 1.80 | −45.2 −0.570 2.35 |
| 1d  | ammonia        | −1.8 −0.168 1.80 | −0.539 −0.577 2.35 |
| 1e  | methanol       | −1.6 −0.169 1.80 | −0.556 −0.578 2.35 |
| 1f  | water          | −1.8 −0.170 1.80 | −0.562 -0.579 2.35 |
| 1g  | formamide      | −2.0 −0.170 1.80 | −0.568 −0.579 2.35 |
| 1h  | methylformamide| −2.0 −0.171 1.80 | −0.570 −0.579 2.35 |
| 2a  | gas            | $\text{Cl} + \text{SiH}_2\text{Cl}$ | −0.156 0.27 | −0.409 −0.501 2.37 |
| 2b  | toluene        | −1.1 −0.178 2.08 | −0.300 −0.492 2.36 |
| 2c  | chloroform     | −1.6 −0.191 2.08 | −0.409 −0.501 2.37 |
| 2d  | ammonia        | −2.2 −0.202 2.09 (−51.7) | −0.370 (2.21) | −0.488 (−0.507 2.38) |
| 2e  | methanol       | −2.3 −0.204 2.09 (−52.3) | −0.393 (2.23) | −0.504 (−0.509 2.38) |
| 2f  | water          | −2.2 −0.205 2.09 (−52.5) | −0.403 (2.25) | −0.508 (−0.509 2.38) |
| 2g  | formamide      | −2.3 −0.205 2.09 (−52.9) | −0.410 (2.26) | −0.514 (−0.510 2.38) |
| 2h  | methylformamide| −2.3 −0.206 2.09 (−53.1) | −0.410 (2.26) | −0.517 (−0.510 2.38) |
| 3a  | gas            | $\text{Cl} + \text{PH}_2\text{Cl}$ | −0.140 2.08 | −0.227 (2.13) | −0.522 (−0.522 2.42) |
| 3b  | toluene        | −1.1 −0.163 2.09 | −0.304 (−0.511 2.42) |
| 3c  | chloroform     | −1.7 −0.175 2.09 | −0.416 (−0.517 2.42) |
| 3d  | ammonia        | −2.1 −0.184 2.10 (−61.3) | −0.215 (2.12) | −0.495 (−0.522 2.42) |
| 3e  | methanol       | −2.2 −0.187 2.10 (−61.6) | −0.227 (2.13) | −0.511 (−0.522 2.42) |
| 3f  | water          | −2.1 −0.188 2.10 | −0.515 −0.523 2.42 |
| 3g  | formamide      | −2.3 −0.188 2.10 | −0.522 −0.523 2.42 |
| 3h  | methylformamide| −2.3 −0.188 2.10 | −0.524 −0.523 2.42 |
| 4a  | gas            | $\text{Cl} + \text{PH}_2\text{Cl}$ | −0.094 2.04 | −0.447 (2.37) |
| 4b  | toluene        | −5.1 −0.096 2.04 | −0.321 (−0.468 2.36) |
| 4c  | chloroform     | −7.4 −0.097 2.04 | −0.444 −0.471 2.36 |
| 4d  | ammonia        | −9.4 −0.098 2.04 | −0.534 −0.474 2.36 |
| 4e  | methanol       | −9.8 −0.098 2.04 | −0.551 −0.474 2.36 |
| 4f  | water          | −9.9 −0.098 2.04 | −0.558 −0.474 2.36 |
| 4g  | formamide      | −10.1 −0.098 2.04 | −0.566 −0.474 2.36 |
| 4h  | methylformamide| −10.1 −0.098 2.04 | −0.566 −0.474 2.36 |
| 5a  | gas            | $\text{Cl} + \text{AsH}_2\text{Cl}$ | −0.180 2.21 | −0.517 (2.53) |
| 5b  | toluene        | −1.3 −0.212 2.23 | −0.302 (−0.534 2.54) |
| 5c  | chloroform     | −2.0 −0.228 2.24 | −0.414 (−0.541 2.54) |
| 5d  | ammonia        | −2.6 −0.243 2.24 | −0.493 (−0.547 2.54) |
| 5e  | methanol       | −2.7 −0.246 2.25 | −0.509 (−0.548 2.55) |
| 5f  | water          | −2.6 −0.248 2.25 | −0.513 (−0.548 2.55) |
| 5g  | formamide      | −2.6 −0.248 2.25 | −0.520 (−0.549 2.55) |
| 5h  | methylformamide| −2.8 −0.249 2.25 | −0.523 (−0.549 2.55) |
This trend in the size of the LUMO coincides nicely with the electronegativity of the central atoms, with the larger, less electronegative ones (Si and As) displaying relatively diffuse LUMO. A more diffuse LUMO (i.e., a relatively large amplitude at large distance from the central atom) allows for both charge transfer and HOMO/LUMO overlap to develop in a more gradual fashion along the reaction coordinate $\zeta$, and thus, a wider $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ profile. This situation is schematically indicated by the red lines in Figure 5: an earlier, more gradual charge transfer from the nucleophile to the substrate leads to smaller values of $\Sigma(Q_{\text{Cl}})$ at an earlier stage during the reaction, and, as also follows from an approximation based on the Born equation [Eq. (4)],[27] to an earlier rise (i.e., becoming less stabilizing) of the solvation energy profile $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$. Analysis of the chloride Voronoi deformation density (VDD) charges ($Q_{\text{Cl}}$) along the various PESs confirms that as the LUMO becomes larger, the chloride charge delocalizes indeed in a more gradual manner (similar trends emerge if instead we use, e.g., Hirshfeld charges, see Figure S5 in the Supporting Information).
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| No. | Medium | Reaction | Reactants$^{[b]}$ | Reactant complex (or pre-transition state) | Transition state (or transition complex) |
|-----|--------|----------|-------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 6a  | gas    | Cl$^-$ + AsOH$_2$Cl | $-1.142$ 2.19 | $-0.475$ (2.48) |
| 6b  | toluene | $-6.2$ 2.19 | $-3.28$ (2.45) |
| 6c  | chloroform | $-9.3$ 2.19 | $-4.56$ (2.46) |
| 6d  | ammonia | $-11.8$ 2.19 | $-5.50$ (2.46) |
| 6e  | methanol | $-12.2$ 2.19 | $-5.68$ (2.47) |
| 6f  | water | $-12.6$ 2.19 | $-5.76$ (2.47) |
| 6g  | formamide | $-12.8$ 2.19 | $-5.82$ (2.47) |
| 6h  | methylformamide | $-12.8$ 2.19 | $-5.85$ (2.49) |

(a) Computed at the OLYP/TZ2P level. $Q_{\text{Cl}}$ values obtained in the corresponding medium with the Voronoi deformation density (VDD) method presented in [a.u.$^{[27]}$ (when two values are given, the top and bottom values are for the LG and the Nu, respectively). (b) Values refer to the substrate. $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ for Cl$^-$ is $-45.3$, $-61.9$, $-73.7$, $-76.0$, $-76.6$, $-77.7$, and $-77.9$ kcal mol$^{-1}$, in toluene, chloroform, ammonia, methanol, water, formamide, and methylformamide, respectively. (c) Modeled with COSMO.
Table 3. Relative energies in solution ($\Delta E_{solution}$), solvation energies ($\Delta E_{solvation}$), and solute energies ($\Delta E_{solute}$) (all in [$\text{kcal mol}^{-1}$]), relative to the gas-phase reactants in methylformamide.$^{[a]}$

| No. | Reaction | No. Reactions a) | $\Delta E_{solute}$ | $\Delta E_{solvation}$ | $\Delta E_{solute}$ | $\Delta E_{transition}$ | $\Delta E_{transition}$ | $\Delta E_{transition}$ | $\Delta E_{transition}$ |
|-----|----------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1   | Cl$^-$+CH$_3$Cl | 1h                  | $-80.0$             | $-80.0$              | 0.0               | $-76.0$          | $-53.1$          | $-22.9$          | $-76.1$          |
| 2   | Cl$^-$+SiH$_3$Cl | 2h                  | $-80.5$             | $-80.5$              | 0.0               | $-76.4$          | $-52.3$          | $-26.1$          | $-24.4$          |
| 3   | Cl$^-$+PH$_3$Cl | 3h                  | $-80.3$             | $-80.3$              | 0.0               | $-78.4$          | $-52.3$          | $-22.2$          | $-29.8$          |
| 4   | Cl$^-$+POH$_3$Cl | 4h                  | $-88.5$             | $-88.5$              | 0.0               | $-78.8$          | $-56.6$          | $-22.2$          | $-29.8$          |
| 5   | Cl$^-$+AsH$_3$Cl | 5h                  | $-81.0$             | $-81.0$              | 0.0               | $-82.1$          | $-52.3$          | $-29.8$          | $-29.8$          |
| 6   | Cl$^-$+AsOH$_2$Cl | 6h                  | $-91.5$             | $-91.5$              | 0.0               | $-88.0$          | $-58.5$          | $-29.5$          | $-29.5$          |

[a] Energies computed at the OLYP/TZ2P level. [b] Comprises both Cl$^-$ and the substrate. [c] Value set to 0.0 kcal mol$^{-1}$. 

Figure 5. Qualitative relationship between the rate at which the charges of the chlorides ($Q_{Cl}$, nucleophile = dashed curve, leaving group = solid curve) change along the reaction coordinate and, through the sum of $Q_{Cl}$, effect on the solvation energy term.

Table 4. Activation strain analysis (in [$\text{kcal mol}^{-1}$]) of the solute (optimized in methylformamide) in the gas phase for all studied S$_2$2 reactions.

| No. | Reaction | Transition State | $\Delta E_{transition}$ | $\Delta E_{solute}$ | $\Delta E_{nucleophile}$ |
|-----|----------|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1   | Cl$^-$+CH$_3$Cl | 1                  | 31.6                     | 31.8                | 0.2                      |
| 2   | Cl$^-$+SiH$_3$Cl | 2                  | 25.2                     | 49.5                | 24.4                     |
| 3   | Cl$^-$+PH$_3$Cl | 3                  | 13.4                     | 39.4                | 26.1                     |
| 4   | Cl$^-$+POH$_3$Cl | 4                  | 26.9                     | 49.1                | 22.3                     |
| 5   | Cl$^-$+AsH$_3$Cl | 5                  | 11.0                     | 40.8                | 29.8                     |
| 6   | Cl$^-$+AsOH$_2$Cl | 6                  | 20.4                     | 50.0                | 29.6                     |

[a] Computed at the OLYP/TZ2P level.

First, we analyze the S$_2$2@C reaction Cl$^-$+CH$_3$Cl (Table 4, entry 1). The transition state marks the top of a central barrier that connects reactant and product complexes. Note, however, that $\Delta E_{transition}$ is below the separate reactants by $-0.2$ kcal mol$^{-1}$. This is because the initial interaction energy is very favorable. This leads to the occurrence of rather stable reactant complexes from which the actual substitution process proceeds. In general, this can but does not have to lead to pronouncedly negative overall barriers.$^{[4]}$ In the present case, there is near cancellation of the favorable interaction energy between the nucleophile and the substrate by the strain energy required to distort the CH$_3$Cl to the geometry it adopts in the TS.

The stabilizing nucleophile–substrate interaction is much stronger for S$_2$2@As (\(\Delta E_{nucleophile} = -17.7$ kcal mol$^{-1}\)), whereas the strain energy is decreased compared to S$_2$2@C (\(\Delta E_{strain} = -6.4$ kcal mol$^{-1}\)). These are direct results of the decreased steric congestion at the silicon atom (i.e., all bonds are elongated in SiH$_3$Cl compared to CH$_3$Cl).$^{[7]}$ The combination of a greater $\Delta E_{nucleophile}$ and a reduced $\Delta E_{strain}$ result in a single-well, with a pronouncedly stable TC instead of a central barrier for S$_2$2@Si (Table 4, entry 2).

The $\Delta E_{strain}$ for S$_2$2@P3 amounts to $+13.4$ kcal mol$^{-1}$ and is thus lower compared to S$_2$2@C (+31.6 kcal mol$^{-1}$) and S$_2$2@Si (+25.2 kcal mol$^{-1}$) reactions. This is due to the decreased coordination of the phosphorus atom.$^{[8]}$ The $\Delta E_{nucleophile}$ ($-39.4$ kcal mol$^{-1}$) is three times greater (in absolute terms) than $\Delta E_{transition}$, thus resulting in a deep single-well PES ($\Delta E_{solute} = -26.1$ kcal mol$^{-1}$). Increasing the coordination at the phosphorus (POH$_2$Cl) for S$_2$2@P4 directly doubles the strain energy ($+26.9$ kcal mol$^{-1}$).
The above analyses demonstrate how the interplay of strain and interaction energies determines the course and barrier height/well depth of the solute in these $\text{Sn}_2$ reactions. They suggest that by either decreasing the steric congestion at the central atom, or by strengthening the nucleophile–substrate interaction in the solute, the $\text{Sn}_2$ barrier can disappear. This is what happens when moving from $\text{Cl}^-+\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}$ to $\text{Sn}_2@\text{Si}$, $\text{Sn}_2@\text{P}3$, $\text{Sn}_2@\text{P}4$, $\text{Sn}_2@\text{As}3$, and $\text{Sn}_2@\text{As}4$ reactions. The solute TS turns into a stable TC because the strain energy associated with reaching the transition structure is decreased and the interaction energy is enhanced significantly. Furthermore, by comparing $\text{Sn}_2@\text{P}3$ with $\text{Sn}_2@\text{P}4$ and $\text{Sn}_2@\text{As}3$ with $\text{Sn}_2@\text{As}4$, we see that the extra oxygen substituent results in extra steric congestion, yet the penalty associated with strain is compensated by increased favorable interactions.

Conclusion

Solvation can dramatically modify not only the rate of $\text{Sn}_2$ substitutions, but also the shape of their reaction potential energy surface and, thus, the nature of this reaction mechanism. The effect strongly depends on the polarity of the solvent and the type of the $\text{Sn}_2$ system, as follows from our DFT study of six anionic model $\text{Sn}_2$ reactions, $\text{Cl}^-+\text{AR}^-\text{Cl}$ at various Group 14 (C, Si) and Group 15 (P, As) electrophilic centers, each modeled in the gas phase as well as seven solvents of varying polarity.

General trends can be gleaned from our results, in that all barriers increase in a monotonic fashion as the solvent polarity increases. In the gas phase, all but the $\text{Sn}_2@\text{C}$ model substitutions proceed through a single-well PES without a TS, whereas the former, that is, $\text{Sn}_2@\text{C}$ shows the known double-well potential. In the limit of strong solvation, the PES becomes eventually unimodal for the $\text{Sn}_2@\text{C}$, $\text{Sn}_2@\text{P}3$, and $\text{Sn}_2@\text{P}4$ reactions and bimodal for the $\text{Sn}_2@\text{Si}$ and $\text{Sn}_2@\text{As}4$ reactions. The gas-phase single-well PES for $\text{Sn}_2@\text{P}3$ transforms into a bimodal reaction profile in ammonia, before it shifts to a unimodal barrier in methanol and increasingly polar solvents. All solvent effects, not only the raise in the barrier but also the transformation of the PES shapes can be understood in terms of differential solvation, that is, the stronger solvation stabilization of reactants and products (especially $\text{Cl}^-$, but also reactant and product complexes) and weaker solvation stabilization of hypercoordinated intermediates (e.g., $[\text{Cl-AsH}_2\text{-Cl}^-]$) or transition states (e.g., $[\text{Cl-CH}_2\text{-Cl}^-]$).

The size or spatial distribution of the LUMO on the AR$^-\text{Cl}$ substrate controls the width (and shallowness) of the solvation energy profile $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$: this orbital determines how early and gradual, or late and abrupt, charge flows from the nucleophile to the leaving group. Diffuse LUMOs, as present on substrates with heavier central atoms, allow for an earlier and more gradual charge delocalization. Delocalization of charge at an early stage of the reaction, results, in accordance with the Born equation, in a wide $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ profile, whereas more abrupt delocalization, occurring only closely around the central point of the reaction, results in a narrow $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ profile. These principles can lead to the following situations for a single-well $\Delta E_{\text{solvalue}}$ a curve with one minimum, and the unimodal $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ a curve with one maximum: 1) a combination of a narrow $\Delta E_{\text{solvalue}}$ profile and a broad $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ profile is likely to provide a PES with a pre-TS and post-TS surrounding a stable minimum; 2) a combination of a broad $\Delta E_{\text{solvalue}}$ profile and a narrow $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ profile more often leads to a central TS; and 3) when the $\Delta E_{\text{solvalue}}$ and $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ profiles have similar widths, the transition region contains either a TS or a TS (no other stationary points), determined by the height of the $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ curve. For example, solvation of $\text{Sn}_2@\text{C}$ and $\text{Sn}_2@\text{P}$ (relatively compact LUMOs on the central atom) is more likely to result in a solvation-phase PES with a central TS. On the other hand, solvation of $\text{Sn}_2@\text{Si}$ and $\text{Sn}_2@\text{As}$ (relatively diffuse LUMOs on the central atom) tends to provide a stable central TC, which may be flanked by a pre- and post-TS depending on the height of the $\Delta E_{\text{solvation}}$ profile.
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