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Summary Observable consequences of tunnelling are reproduced by calculating kinetic parameters as a function of barrier width and limiting values are predicted.

Since theoretical prediction on tunnelling ${ }^{1}$ are now well supported by experimental evidence ${ }^{2,3}$ making semi-classical treatments ${ }^{4}$ of primary kinetic isotope effects (PKIE) insufficient, we have lost the convenience of having predicted maximum values for $k_{\mathrm{H}} / k_{\mathrm{D}}, E_{\mathrm{D}}-E_{\mathrm{H}}$ and $A_{\mathrm{D}} / A_{\mathrm{H}}$. In the light of experiments which have yielded anomalously large PKIE and anomalous isotopic Arrhenius parameters ${ }^{3,5}$ we now need new upper limits for these quantities.

Considering the one-dimensional penetration of potential barriers by a Boltzmann incident flux of particles, rate constants have been calculated according to equation (1)

$$
\begin{equation*}
k=\frac{1}{k T} \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{f}(\epsilon) \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\epsilon}{k T}} \mathrm{~d} \epsilon \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

by numerical integration. The energy dependent probability of transmission, $f(\epsilon)$ was chosen using the following assumptions. (i) The reduced mass was taken as equal to one, two or three times the mass of the proton. (ii) The barrier height, $V_{\mathrm{H}}=10.00 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for the hydrogen isotope. (iii) The barrier height for both heavier isotopes, $V_{\mathrm{D}}$ and $V_{\mathrm{T}}=10.00 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ (neglecting zero-point-energy differences, $\Delta Z \mathrm{ZPE}$ ), and $V_{\mathbf{D}}=11.26 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}, V_{\mathbf{T}}=11.81$ $\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$ (allowing for $\triangle \mathrm{ZPE}$ ). (iv) The barrier width at base ( $2 a$ ) was varied within the limits of $0.3-2 \cdot 0 \AA$. (v) Calculations have been performed for both parabolic ${ }^{6}$ and symmetrical Eckart ${ }^{7}$ barriers. Some of the results are shown in the Table and the Figure.

Using the results obtained we can make the following conclusions. (i) Experimental indications on the importance of tunnelling can be reproduced by the calculations without


Figure. PKIE ( $k_{\mathrm{H}} / k_{\mathrm{D}}$ ) and the Swain-Schaad exponent ${ }^{8}(r)$ as functions of barrier width calculated for parabolic barri $T 300 \mathrm{~K}$. (a) $V_{\mathrm{H}}=10.0 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}, V_{\mathrm{D}}=11.26 \mathrm{kcal}_{\mathrm{mol}}{ }^{-1}$, $V_{\mathrm{T}}=11.81 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}{ }^{-1}$; (b) $V_{\mathrm{H}}=V_{\mathrm{D}}=V_{\mathrm{T}}=10.0 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. The horizontal arrows indicate the positions of the extrema, the vertical ones the limiting values for $2 a \rightarrow \infty$.
making assumptions on the properties of the transition state (except the dimensions of the barrier). (ii) The type of dependence of observable indicators on barrier width is due to tunnelling and $\triangle Z P E$ give only quantitative contributions. ${ }^{11}$ (iii) Predicted limiting values of PKIE for both barriers are larger than experimental data published so far. Predicted Arrhenius parameters are consistent with experi-

Table. Observable indicators of tunnelling calculated ${ }^{\mathbf{a}}$ as functions of barrier width (2a)

| Observable | Type of | Limiting values ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  | Classical limit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| indicator | dependence | Parabolic barrier | Eckart barrier ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | $(2 a \rightarrow \infty)$ |
| $k_{\mathrm{H}} / k_{\mathrm{D}}$ | maximum | $\begin{gathered} 200 \text { at } 0.52 \AA \\ (28.5 \text { at } 0.49 \AA) \end{gathered}$ | $85 \cdot 1$ at $0.35 \AA$ (14.1 at $0.32 \AA$ ) | $\begin{gathered} 8 \cdot 2 \\ (1 \cdot 0) \end{gathered}$ |
| $k_{\text {H }} / k_{\text {T }}$ | maximum | $\begin{gathered} 3095 \text { at } 0.45 \AA \\ (>163 ; 0.40<2 \mathrm{a}<0.45) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} >907 ; 2 \mathrm{a} & <0.3 \AA \\ (>61.3 ; 2 \mathrm{a} & <0.3 \AA) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \cdot 0 \\ (1 \cdot 0) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\left(E_{\mathrm{D}}-E_{\mathrm{H}}\right)^{\text {d }}$ | maximum | $\begin{aligned} & \geqslant 5.8 ; 0.65<2 \mathrm{a}<0.70 \\ & (\geqslant 4.7 ; 0.65<2 \mathrm{a}<0.70) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.5 \text { at } 0.5 \AA \\ (2.5 \text { at } 0.48 \AA) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \cdot 26 \\ (0 \cdot 0) \end{gathered}$ |
| $A_{\text {D }} / A_{\text {H }}$ | maximum ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \geqslant 270 ; 0.65<2 \mathrm{a}<0.70 \\ (\geqslant 280 ; 0.65<2 \mathrm{a}<0.70) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.5 \text { at } 0.55 \AA \\ & (9.0 \text { at } 0.55 \AA) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0 \\ (1.0) \end{array}$ |
| $\left(E_{\mathrm{T}}-E_{\mathrm{D}}\right)^{\text {d }}$ | maximum | $\begin{gathered} 4 \cdot 2 \text { at } 0.51 \AA \\ (3 \cdot 0 \text { at } 0.51 \AA) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.2 \text { at } 0.4 \AA \\ (1.5 \text { at } 0.4 \AA) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.55 \\ (0 \cdot 0) \end{gathered}$ |
| $A_{\text {T }} / A_{\mathrm{D}}$ | maximum ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 102 \text { at } 0.52 \AA \\ & (41 \text { at } 0.52 \AA) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.5 \text { at } 0.4 \AA \\ & (3.8 \text { at } 0.4 \AA) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ (1.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| $r^{2}$ | minimum | $\begin{aligned} & 1.33 \mathrm{~g} \text { at } 0.65 \AA \\ & (1.22 \text { at } 0.70 \AA) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.40 \text { at } 0.7 \AA \\ (1.3165 \text { at } 0.8 \AA) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \cdot 443 \\ \left(1.330^{\mathrm{g}}\right) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\ln \mathrm{A}=\mathrm{f}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon})$ | isokinetic plot ${ }^{10}$ | $T_{1}=410 \mathrm{~K} ; 2 \mathrm{a}>0 \cdot 7 \AA$ | $T_{1}=540 \mathrm{~K} ; 2 \mathrm{a}>0.5$ | $\ln \mathrm{A}=0$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ PKIE at 300 K ; Arrhenius parameters from rate constants relating to 290 and 310 K . b For values in parentheses, $V_{H}=V_{\mathrm{D}}$ $=V_{\mathrm{T}}=10.00 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Other values imply $\triangle Z \mathrm{PE}$. c The width of an Eclart barrier is defined as the width at the base of the parabola having the same curvature at the top. d In kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$. e For extra narrow barriers $(2 a<0 \cdot 3 \AA) A_{\mathrm{T}}<A_{\mathrm{D}}<A_{\mathrm{H}}$ in agreement with Stern and Weston ${ }^{7}$ indicating that tunnelling correction factors, $\Gamma_{H}$ and $\Gamma_{D}^{*}$ may have crossover at certain low tempeature. ${ }^{\mathrm{t}}$ The Swain-Schaad exponent. ${ }^{8}$ g Cf. Ref. 9.
ment only in the case of the parabolic barrier. (iv) Compensation phenomena (isokinetic relationships ${ }^{10}$ ) can be reasonably explained by tunnelling ${ }^{12}$ in contrast with ideas that isokinetic plots are artefacts. ${ }^{13}$
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