The Incremental Description of Host-Guest Complexes: Free Energy Increments Derived from Hydrogen Bonds Applied to Crown Ethers and Cryptandsl

Hans-Jörg Schneider,^{*,†} Volker Rüdiger,[†] and Oleg A. Raevsky^{*,†}

FR Organische Chemie der Uniuersitat des Saarlandes, D W 6600 Saarbriicken, Germany, and Institute of Physiologically Active Compounds, Russian Academy of Science, 142432 ChernogolovkalMoscow, Russia

Received December *29, 1992*

The analysis of literature data for crown ether and cryptand-cation complexes with the principle of additive pairwise interactions yield excellent linear correlations between observed and calculated complex stabilities as long as geometric fit between ligand site and cation is present and no substantial strain is built up during complexation. These conditions are controlled partially by molecular mechanics simulations and partially by comparison to X-ray data. The cornerstone values used for each single ligand-cation interaction are taken from the electron donor parameters ED/Ci which have been derived earlier from over 900 hydrogen bond associations in carbon tetrachloride. The observed electron acceptor abilities EA of the different cations (alkali metal and ammonium ions) are a linear function of, e.g., hydration energies of these ions. Thus, a simple procedure is provided to calculate the stability of over 120 complexes on the basis of one EA parameter for each cation and only 11 ligand ED parameters (same for crowns and cryptands) which moreover are derived from independent sources and do not need to be adjusted.

Intermolecular associations are based on a bewildering number of noncovalent binding mechanisms which complicates quantitative structure-activity correlations. Although macrocyclic ionophores represent the oldest and most developed class of host-guest complexes, **also** in terms of practical applications,² a quantitative understanding of such complexes, or the ability to predict complexation energies for given structures as a prequesite for the rational design of ligands, is still in the state of infancy. Although force field, molecular dynamics, as well as free energy pertubation calculations for crown ethers and related hosts were greatly advanced recently? reliable computations of corresponding complexation energies are essentially limited to associations with electroneutral guests.⁴ Thus,

t Saarbroken.

Rev. 1989, 89, 1875.
(3) (a) Wipff, G.; Kollman, P. J. A*m. Chem. Soc.* 1982, 104, 3249. (b)
Wipff, G.; Kollman, P. *Nouv. J. Chem.* 1985, 9, 457. (c) Wipff, G. J.
Coord. Chem., in press. Boudon, S.; Wipff, G. J. *Chim.* D.; Kollman, P. A.; Wipff, G. Ibid. **1989,111,3011.** (These and earlier papers emphasize **also** the role of water and the preorganization of ionophore ligand **as** well **as** asymmetries in energy minimized structures. We thank Prof. Wipff for pre- and reprints.) (d) Grootenhuis, P. D. J.; Kollman, P. A. J. Am. **Chem.** SOC. **1989,111,2152** and earlier papers. (e) Strantema, T. P.; McCammon, J. A. J. Chem.Phys. **1989,91,3631.** Mazor, STRAGEMER, 1.1; MCCammon, J. A.J.Chem. Phys. 1983, 91, 3051. Nd207, MCCammon, J. A.; Lybrand, T. P. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1990, 112, 4411 (one example of relatively satisfactory results with FEP methods).
(f) Van Eerden, J.; H **1990,50,3129.** (i) Fukushima, **K.** Bull. Chem. SOC. Jpn. **1990,63,2104.** (j) Dang, L. **X.;** Kollman, P. A. J. Am. Chem. SOC. **1990,112,5716.** (k) Zomppa, Inorg. Chem. **1986, 25, 1527** and references cited in ref **2a-e.**

Table I. ED* and Ik+* Increments

Electron Donor parameters, derived from hydrogen bond **asso**ciations in CC4; see text; the asterisk denotes the binding element. ^b Increments for potassium complexation (kJ/mol) (for other cations, see Table III). \in R = alkyl.

Kollman, Wippf, and others have, e.g., demonstrated early the dependence of calculated complex stabilities on the

t Chernogolovka/Moecow.

⁽¹⁾ Saarbrücken Series on Supramolecular Chemistry. **36.** For part **35**, see ref 15.

⁽²⁾ (a) Cation Binding by **Macrocycles/Complexation** of Cationic Species by Crown Ethers; Inoue, Y., Gokel, G. W., Eds.; Marcell Dekker, Inc.: New York, Basel, **1990.** (b) Crown Ethers and Analogs; Patai, S., Rappoport, **Z., Eds.;** Wiley: Chichester, **1989.** (c) Izatt, R. M.; Pawlak, K.; Bradshaw, I. S.; Bruening, R. L. Chem. *Reu.* **1991,91,1721-2085.** (d) Solov'ev, V. P.; Vnuk, E. A.; Strahova, N. N.; Raevsky, 0. A. Thermodynamics of Complexation of Metals with Cyclic Polyethers (Russ.); Vinity: Moscow, **1991;pp 1-379.** (e) Hancock, R. D.; Martell, A. E. Chem.

^{(4) (}a) Damewood, J. R.; Anderson, W. P.; Urban, J. J. J. Comput.
Chem. 1988, 9, 111. (b) Grootenhuis, P. D. J.; Kollman, P. A. J. Am.
Chem. Soc. 1989, 111, 4046. (c) Grootenhuis, P. D. J.; van Eerden, J.; Dijkstra, P. J.; Harkema, S.; Reinhoudt, D. N. *Zbid.* **1987, 109, 8044.**

Scheme I

IV

 \mathbf{v}

VI

CН,

Xlll XIV

XVll XVlll

chosen permanent and induced charges.^{3a} We calculate, e.g., up to 10% changes of the potassium-oxygen distances by rather arbitrary choices of the used dielectric constant between 1 and 3 D (see below).

It would be of considerable advantage if the noncovalent forces in ionophore complexes could be predicted by simple additive schemes reminiscent of the long-standing LFERtype description for covalent bond making and breaking. Such attempts were made many years ago by Cram et al.,⁵ but with eight parameters for the description of nine complexes the results of this early attempt were not very encouraging. The Saarbriicken group hae recently shown that the free complexation energy ΔG_t in many supramolecular complexes can be partitioned in single contributions by linear correlations between ΔG_t and the sum of single interactions.6 In a typical ionophore complex we may encounter, e.g., three different interactions of a metal cation **M+** and binding sites **A,** B, and C (representing, e.g., alkyl-0, aryl-0, and N). For such a complex (Chart

^{(5) (}a) Timko, J. M.; Moore, S. S.; Walba, D. M.; Hiberty, P. S.; Cram, D. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1977, 99, 4207. For related approaches see also ref 2e and: (b) Fyles, T. M. In ref 2a, pp 203 ff. (c) Behr, J. P.; Lehn, J.-M

^{(6) (}a) Schneider, H.-J. *Angew. Chem.* **1991,103,1419;** *Angew. Chem.,* Int. Ed. Engl. 1991, 30, 1417. (b) Schneider, H.-J.; Theis, I. Ibid. 1989, 101, 757; Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl. 1989, 28, 753. (c) Schneider, H.-J.; Blatter, T. Angew. Chem., 1992, 104. (d) Schneider, H.-J.; Schiestel, T

I) the total ΔG_t would be the sum of the individual increments:

$$
\Delta G_{\rm t} = n_{\rm A} \, \Delta G_{\rm A} + n_{\rm B} \, \Delta G_{\rm B} + n_{\rm C} \Delta G_{\rm C} + \dots \tag{1}
$$

In our earlier analyses we have obtained the individual increments ΔG_A etc. directly from the correlations, leading, e.g., to a surprisingly constant value of $\Delta G = 5 \pm 1$ kJ/mol per single salt bridge in now more than 50 different ion pair complexes,⁶ which range from zinc sulfate^{6d} to DNA/ polyammonium interactions.^{6c} In the present analysis of ionophores we choose another approach and set out to use increments for the different binding sites from independent sources.

These increments which should quantify the interaction of a single ligand site and a cation obviously must reflect primarily the ligand electron donor capacity. Such numbers-referring, however, to Lewis base complexes with ΔH instead of ΔG values—are available from the extensive studies by Gutmann et al.? as well as by Drago et **al.,8** the latter approach being based on three terms accounting for electrostatic, covalent, and CT interactions. In related attempts Abraham, Kamlet, Taft et al. have correlated hydrogen bond complex free energies with acidities and basicities of the components.⁹ The Chernogolovka/Moscow group of the present authors, starting from earlier proposals by Iogansen et al., ¹⁰ has derived ΔH and ΔG increments from a large body of thermodynamic data for single hydrogen bond complexes based on eq 2 which allows to extract electron-withdrawing and -donating energy factors C_a and C_b from many 1:1 equilibria in carbon tetrachloride.^{11,12}

$$
\Delta G_{\rm t} = 2.43 C_{\rm a} C_{\rm b} + 5.70\tag{2}
$$

The electron-donating increments to be used for the ionophores, later called ED factors, are listed in Table I; they have been found to represent on a uniform scale the minimum set of parameters for good correlations (coefficients $r \ge 0.980$ usually) for more than 900 hydrogen bond complexes.^{11,12} One incentive of this study was to see whether parameters derived, e.g., from such hydrogen bond complexes in **carbontetrachloride,11J2** are of sufficient fundamental significance for the prediction of ionophorecation complex stabilities in protic solvents.

Complexation energies for a large and representative series of ionophores (Scheme I) with alkali metal cations and tentatively also with ammonium ions were assembled

(10) (a) Iogansen, A. V. *Dokl. Acad. Nauk SSSR* **1965,164,610 (Russ.);** *Chem. Abstr.* **1966, 64, 2868h. (b) Iogansen, A. V.** *Teor. Eksp. Khim.* **1971, 7,302,312 (Russ.);** *Chem. Abstr.* **1971, 75,101848m, 101824a. (11) (a) Raevsky, 0. A.; Novikov, V. P.** *Khim.-Farm. Zh.* **1982,16,583;**

Figure 1. Plots for the 18-crown-6/+NH₄ complex from energy $minimized$ **structures, showing the** D_{3d} **symmetry. Shaded circles indicate oxygen atoms.**

from the literature2 (Table I*, supplementary material). Taking into consideration the dependence of the complexation free energy ΔG_t also on cation, anion, and ligand $desolvation/solvation$ as well as on the solvent. $2,13$ only complexes with the same anion (mostly chloride) and the same solvent (mostly methanol) were used for the correlations. The application of pairwise interaction increments rested until now on the presence of sufficient contacts between the individual binding sites in host and guest.6 Therefore, the complex structures used in the correlations were checked to meet this condition (e.g., mismatch of distances between metal and ligand atoms <20 %), partially on the basis of corresponding X -ray analyses¹³ and also partially by molecular modeling with the aid of the CHARMm14 force field (see below).

Furthermore, it must be shown that the required fit between host and guest is accompanied by strain energy changes of the ionophore which are small compared to the overall complexation energy. Ligand reorganization by induced fit is expected to be particularly important for ionophores which require simultaneous interactions between convergent host functionalities in a crowded environment and an usually small ion. Whereas accomodation of organic molecules in larger host cavities is often characterized by small strain energy variations¹⁵ larger conformational changes in the ligand are more typical for metal complexes2e and can be approximated by molecular mechanics calculations.16 In order to circumvent some of the arbitrariness of the complex energy calculations we apply the following procedure: ligand structures are simulated without ion, **as** well as after ion complexation; by taking out the ion after obtaining the energy-minimized ligand structure we obtain the ligand strain changes $\Delta H_{\rm L}$ accompanying the complexation. The results (Table V*, supplementary material) indicate that, e.g., 18-crown-6 $(I, n = 3)$ builds up strain energies below 1.5 kJ/mol upon complexation of Na⁺, K⁺, or RNH₃⁺, although a highly symmetrical (D_{3d}) structure with very constant $O^{-1}M^+$ distances is observed (Figure 1). With 15-crown-5 $(I, n =$ 2) slightly higher strain changes were obtained (Table V*, supplementary material). Obviously strain changes of, e.g., 2 kJ/mol must lead to ΔG_t deviations of corresponding size; they would be as small as approximately $\pm 10\%$, e.g., for K^+ + crown ethers, and $\pm 5\%$ for K^+ + cryptands.

With more than 120 ionophore complexes which meet the above-mentioned criteria and represent the most often used crown ethers and cryptands we now observe gratifying

^{(7) (}a) Gutman, V. *The Donor-Acceptor Approach to Molecular 1nteraction.s;* **Plenum Press: New York, 1978. (b) Gutman, V.; Resch, G.** *Stud. Phys. Theor. Chem.* **1983,27 (Ions and Molecules in Solution), 203.**

^{(8) (}a) Drago, R. S. *Structure and Bonding;* **Springer-Verlag: Heidelberg, 1973; pp 73-139. (b) Drago, R. S.; Vogel, G. C.; Needham, I. E.** *J. Am. Chem. SOC.* **1971,93,6014. (c) Kroeger, M. K.; Drago, R. S.** *J. Am. Chem. SOC.* **1981,103,3250.**

^{(9) (}a) Kamlet, H.-J.; Taft, R. W. *J. Am. Chem. SOC.* **1976, 98, 377, 2886. (b) Abraham, M. M.; Duce, P. P.; Schulz, R. A., et al.** *J. Chem. SOC., Perkin Trans.* **1 1986,1501. (c) Abraham, M. M.; Grellier, P. L.; Prior, D. V.; Taft, R. W.; Morris, J.** J.; **Taylor, P.** J.; **Laurence, C.; Berthelot, M.; Doherty, R. M.; Kamlet, M.** J.; **Abbound, J.-L. M.; Sraidi, K.; Guihheuf, G.** *J. Am. Chem. SOC.* **1988,110,8534.**

^{(11) (}a) Naevsky, O. A.; Novikov, V. F. Niem. Abstr. 1982, 197, 33128d. (b) Raevsky, O. A.; Grigor'ev, V. Yn.;
Solov'ev, V. Khim.-Farm. Zh. 1984, 18, 578; Chem. Abstr. 1985, 103,
83807n. (c) Raevsky, O. A.; Grigor'ev, V. Y *Zn.* **1989,12,1294 (Russ.);** *Chem. Abstr.* **1990,112,115266g. (d) Raevsky, 0. A.** *Russ. Rev., Eng. Ed.* **1990,59,219-233.**

^{(12) (}a) Raevsky, 0. A.; Grigor'ev, V. Yn.; Kireev, D. B.; Zefirov, N. S. *Bunt. Struct.-Act. Relat.* **1992,11, 49. (b) Raevsky, 0. A.; Grigor'ev, V. Yn.; Kireev, D. B.; Zefirov, N. S.** *J. Chem. Phys. Chem. Biol.* **1992,89, 1747.**

⁽¹³⁾ Bajaj, A. V.; Poonia, N. S. *Coord. Chem. Reu.* **1988,87, 55-213. (14) Brooks, C. L.; Karplus, M.** *Methods Enzymol.* **1986, 127, 369. Briinger, A. T.; Karplus, M.** *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1991,24,54 and references cited therein.**

⁽¹⁵⁾ Schneider, H.-J.; Blatter, T.; Palm, B.; Pfimgstag, U.; Riidiger, V.; Theis, I. *J. Am. Chem. SOC.* **1992, 114, 7704.**

⁽¹⁶⁾ Hancock, R. D. *Pure Appl. Chem.* **1986,58,1445.**

^aFrom plots of Gt (in kJ/mol, see supplementary material, Table I*] w ZED, unless noted otherwise. Anion chloride unless noted otherwise: a, abscissa; *b,* **slope; n, number of complexes included in correlation; R, linear correlation coefficient;** SD, **standard deviation in Gt; F, Fisher10 parameter.** *b* **Picrate anion. Isocyanate anions.**

linear correlations between the free complexation energy ΔG_t and the sum Σ ED of the contributing binding site increments (Table 11, Figure 2, and supplementary material) even if ligands are included which violate the holesize concept, such **as** 18C6 or the 222 cryptand **(I, VI,** respectively, with all $R = H$) for Na⁺ (Table II). We illustrate the calculation with structure **VI1** (compound 55): $4 \text{ CH}_2\text{OCH}_2$ fragments (Σ ED = $4(1.7) + 2 \text{ R}_3\text{N}$ fragments $(2(3.5) + 2 = CHOCH₂$ fragments $(2(1.1), total)$ Σ ED = 16.0. Closer inspection of correlations observed with single classes reveals the increasing quality of the postulated dependence on Σ ED with the goodness of the geometric fit between host and guests (Figure 2, containing representative potassium complexes; for others see supplementary material). If *all* macrocycles including those with unsatisfactory geometric fit are included a poor correlation is found (Figure 2a), particularly with ligands too large for a simultaneous contact of all binding sites to the ion (Figure 2g). Open-chain ligands also deviate substantially (supplementary material) which is rationalized by the considerable strain which must built up by the bending of the open-chain all-transoid conformation to the cyclic one needed for complexation: the CHARMm calculated strain increase amounts **to,** e.g., 15 kJ/mol in the case of the pentaglyme-sodium complex (Table **V*,** supplementary material).

The cavities of 15C5 and 221 **(I, VI,** $n = 2$ and $m = 1$, respectively, all R = H) are **known** to provide almost ideal cavity sizes for Na+, **as** does 18C6 and cryptand 222 (I, **VI,** $n = 3$ or $n = m = 2$, respectively, all $R = H$) for K^+ , and, to a lesser degree, for Rb+ and Cs+. This is visible in the superior correlations obtained for these classes (Figure 2b,d, Table 11, cases 2-4), whereas the 222 cryptand is already too small for Cs+ (case 19). It is remarkable that ammonium ions also obey the correlations, indicating

similar binding mechanisms **as** for the metal ions without large contributions of special hydrogen bond interactions which were assumed until now to play **an** important role here. $2,5$

In water instead of methanol **as** solvent we find in the one series for which sufficient data were available again a linear dependence of ΔG_t on Σ ED (case 9 in Table II). The slope b, however, is significantly smaller than with methanol. In view of the often large entropy contributions to metal complexations¹⁷ it is of particular interest that in the case of sufficient fit between ligand and cation the available data (Table 111) show that the complexation *enthalpies* ΔH_t also depend linearly on Σ ED, which is of course a consequence of the observed linear $\Delta H/\Delta G$ correlation observed, however, only in these cases (Figure 2c).

Finally, we address the question of the cation influence on the complexation free energies. From the ΔG_t correlations with Σ ED in the various systems one can derive EA values characterizing now the electron acceptor power of the different cations. It is gratifying, that these EA parameters on the other hand show a linear correlation with known hydration energies of the cations (Figure 3). This now allows us, on the basis of eq 3, to calculate complexation energies for different cations with the whole series of the crown ethers **and** cryptands **as** soon **as** hydration energies, or of course EA values, are known for the ion.

$$
\Delta G_{\rm t} = k_{\rm o} + 2.43 \sum \rm EA(\sum ED)
$$
 (3)

Conclusions. The incremental approach based on the analysis of pairwise interactions allows to our knowledge for the first time a comprehensive and simple evaluation

⁽¹⁷⁾ Inoue, Y.; Hakuehi, T. In ref *2a,* **p 1.**

Figure 2. Complexation energy correlations for potassium in methanol (cases $6-12$ in Table II): (a) with all ligand types; (b) with 18C6 crown and 222-cryptand derivatives; (c) ΔG vs ΔH for K⁺ with ligands as in b; (d) with ligands as in b, but in water; (e) with 18C5-crown

and 221-cryptand derivatives; (f) with 12C4-crown and 221-cryptand derivatives; (g) with too large macrocycles.

Table III. Electron Acceptor Increments EA^s for Cations

cation	anion	solvent	EA	k.
Na ⁺	C1	CH ₃ OH	-1.91	17.43
K+	Cl	CH ₃ OH	-1.34	-1.30
		H,0	-1.00	11.02
$Rb+$	Сl	CH₃OH	-1.16	-0.70
$Ce+$	Сl	CH _a OH	-1.13	1.47
NH_4 ⁺	picrate	CDCl ₃	-2.83	17.83
		$\mathbf{D}_2\mathbf{O}$	-1.78	-3.80
$H_3N^+.t$ -Bu	NCS	CHCls	-1.56	3.92

^{*a*} Obtained from the equation $\Delta G_t = k_o + 2.43EA(\Sigma ED)$ (ΔG_t in (kJ/mol)).

Figure 3. Correlation between free enthalpy of hydration and EA parameters.

of ionophore complexation energies **as** a function of structure for systems which due to their large charges are particularly difficult to assess by theoretical calculations. Complexation constants with crown ethers and cryptands independent of their size and flexibility become predictable **as** long as the geometric conditions with respect to negligible mismatch and strain changes are given. The successful use of the ED incrementa derived from hydrogen bonds in carbontetrachloride demonstrates the vast potential of these empirical factors for the prediction of all kinds of polar noncovalent interactions. It should be stressed that we did *not* need to treat the increments used **as** *adjustable* parameters. The results show that substituent effects on the electron donor or acceptor ability of coordination sites are quantitatively described *both* for hydrogen bonds *and* cation-ligand interactions in quite different solvents including water on the basis of the *same* incremental approach. In line with long standing observations^{2e,11,12} the variation of electron donor and acceptor can be described by *multiplicative* combination of the independent factors ED and EA, the latter being a direct function of hydration energy. The availability of these increments will in the future allow the design of new ionophores with optimal binding capacities.

As with other LFER these analyses **also** help to further the understanding of noncovalent binding mechanisms: the observation of a common dependence of binding strength on general parameters ED and EA indicates a common dominating mechanism of mostly electrostatic nature for metal ion, ammonium ion, and hydrogen bond associations. Earlier analyses, based partially on X-rayderived solid-state structures, have led to the conclusion of significantly different distances and binding contributions, e.g., between the different oxygen host atoms and

the $+NH$ guest groups in 18C6,^{5,18} with hydrogen bonding contributions assumed to be three times larger than the three electrostatic interactions.6 Recent MD and MC calculations have even for cryptands emphasized the asymmetry, **as** well **as** the special role of solvent induced ligand preorganization in the energy minimized single complex structures.% Our results indicate that these asymmetries which also occur with respect to lone pair orientations and special solvation factors-which are expected to differ, e.g., between crowns and cryptands-are essentially wiped out by time averaging. Also, **as** consequence of the "soft" geometry dependencies of the dominating electrostatic potentials the asymmetries are of little importance when it comes to the actual performance of these ligands in solution: namely to ion-specific complexation free energies, and-with regard to their selectivity-to the corresponding energy differences. Further efforts toward the extraction of generalizable factors from experimental data will be directed toward the role of anions and solvents, toward the factorization of other binding mechanisms, and toward the quantification of cases with less satisfactory geometric fit. It is hoped that the effectiveness and inherent simplicity of the applied energy partitioning strategy will help to open up the use of free-energy-type correlations for noncovalent bonds in supramolecular structures, including biopolymers.

Computational Details

Regression analyses were performed with standard programs yielding the statistical criteria such **as** correlation coefficients R, student factors F, and standard deviations SD besides slopes and abscissas, the latter being close to zero within statistical error in most cases. Experimental data and their sourcestogether with the identification of points used in the correlations are given in the supplementary material.

CHARMm simulations were performed for selected crown ethers using QUANTA, version **3.2** (Polygen **/MSI)** on Silicon changes for the basic ethylene glycol unit the dielectric constant was set to **3.0** D (constant) with point charges of **+1.0** at the cation and -0.36 eu at 0 ,^{3a} which furnished for dimethoxyethane a gauche-trans energy difference of $\Delta H_{\text{strain}} = 1.76 \text{ kJ/mol}$ in acceptable agreement with the literature.^{3a} DC values of, e.g., 1.0 D yielded unrealistic ΔH_{strain} differences of 4.8 kJ/mol. The dependence of complex energies and structures on the chosen local densities is illustrated by selected simulations (supplementary material). The overall geometries and symmetries which were partially checked by conformational searches using restricted rotation were in general agreement with the more extensive literature investigations³ (supplementary material).

Acknowledgment. The work in Saarbrücken was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn, which also provided a grant for the stay of O.A.R. in Saarbrücken.

Supplementary Material Available: Tables I*-VI* (literature data for complexation energies, identification of compounds **used** in the correlations, selected enthalpy values, and internal coordinates with schematic representations from CHARMm simulations) andFigures **1*-4*** (complexation energy This material is contained in libraries on microfiche, immediately follows this article in the microfilm version of the journal, and can be ordered from the ACS; see any current masthead page for ordering information.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Goldberg, **1. In** ref **2b,** pp **358, 385, 399. (19)** For **the** Fisher parameter **see: Mi,** A. A.; hen, S. P. Statistical *Analysis;* Academic Press: New York, **1979.**