Short Communication

Electronegativities and the Bonding Character of Molecular Orbitals: A Remark

Alberto Onofre de Amorim*

Departamento de Física, UFPE, 50.000 Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil

Ricardo Ferreira

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Av. Wenceslau Braz, 71 - fundos, 22.290 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

From the density functional theory of Hohenberg-Kohn it is possible to prove that a molecular orbital is bonding (antibonding) if its electronegativity is larger (smaller) than the electronegativities of the corresponding atomic orbitals.

Key words: Electronegativity – Bonding MO – Antibonding MO.

Introduction

We have recently proposed [1] that the bonding or antibonding character of a molecular orbital [2–4] depends on the difference in the electronegativities of the MO ($\chi_{\rm M}$) and of the atomic orbital ($\chi_{\rm at}$) which correlates with the molecular orbital¹: if $\chi_{\rm M}-\chi_{\rm at}>0$ the MO is bonding; if $\chi_{\rm M}-\chi_{\rm at}<0$, it is antibonding. In the present communication we give a direct proof of this proposal, starting from the density functional theory of Hohenberg–Kohn [5].

According to this very general theory the electronic chemical potential is given by:

$$\mu = \nu(1) + \frac{\delta F[\rho']}{\delta \rho'(1)} \Big|_{\rho' = \rho} \tag{1}$$

^{*} Present address: Chemistry Department, King's College, London WC2R 2LS, England In heteroatomic molecules χ_{at} refers to the most electronegative AO

where $\nu(1)$ is the one-electron potential, $\nu(1) = -\sum_{\alpha} E_{\alpha}/r_{\alpha 1}$, and $F[\rho']$ is a functional given by the sum of the kinetic and the inter-electronic potential energies:

$$F[\rho'] = T[\rho'] + V[\rho'], \tag{2}$$

 $\rho'(1)$ is a variational approximation to the exact electron density,

$$\rho(1) = N \int |\psi(1, 2, \ldots, N)|^2 d\sigma_1 d\tau_2 d\tau_3 \ldots d\tau_n$$

 $(d\tau_i = d\sigma_i dx_i; d\sigma_i)$ are spin coordinates and dx_i are space coordinates). The ground-state electronic energy of a system being given by $E[\rho] = \int \rho(1)\nu(1) dx_1 + F[\rho]$, it is possible to show [6] that $\mu = [dE/dN]_{\nu} = -\chi$, that is, to identify the orbital electronegativity with the negative of the electronic chemical potential. This result can also be reached independently of the density functional theory [7–9]. The difference of the chemical potentials of an electron in a molecule and in an atom is:

$$\mu_{\rm M} - \mu_{\rm at} = \nu_{\rm M}(1) - \nu_{\rm at}(1) + \frac{\delta F[\rho_{\rm M}]}{\delta \rho_{\rm M}} - \frac{\delta F[\rho_{\rm at}]}{\delta \rho_{\rm at}}.$$
 (3)

The Virial theorem, applied to atoms and molecules, respectively, is:

$$T[\rho_{\rm at}] = -E[\rho_{\rm at}] \tag{4}$$

$$T[\rho_{\rm M}] = -E[\rho_{\rm M}] - R \frac{dE[\rho_{\rm M}]}{dR}.$$
 (5)

Hence:

$$F[\rho_{\rm at}] = -\int \nu_{\rm at}(1)\rho_{\rm at}(1) \, d\tau_1 - T[\rho_{\rm at}] \tag{6}$$

$$F[\rho_{\rm M}] = -\int \nu_{\rm M}(1)\rho_{\rm M}(1) d\tau_1 - T[\rho_{\rm M}] - R \frac{dE[\rho_{\rm M}]}{dR}.$$
 (7)

Substituting (6) and (7) in (3), and recalling that $\partial/\partial\rho(1)\int\nu(1)\rho(1)\,d\tau_1=\nu(1)$, one obtains:

$$\mu_{\rm M} - \mu_{\rm at} = -\frac{\delta T[\rho_{\rm M}]}{\delta \rho_{\rm M}} + \frac{\delta T[\rho_{\rm at}]}{\delta \rho_{\rm at}} - \frac{\delta}{\delta \rho_{\rm M}} \left(R \frac{dE[\rho_{\rm M}]}{dR} \right). \tag{8}$$

From the electrostatic Hellmann-Feynman theorem [10, 11] the force which the electrons exert on the nuclei is $F_e = -dE[\rho_M]/dR$. Therefore:

$$\mu_{\rm M} - \mu_{\rm at} = -\frac{\delta T[\rho_{\rm M}]}{\delta \rho_{\rm M}} + \frac{\delta T[\rho_{\rm at}]}{\delta \rho_{\rm at}} + \frac{\delta (R \cdot F_{\rm e})}{\delta \rho_{\rm M}}.$$
 (9)

Eq. (9) is exact; following Parr et al. [6] we will assume that $T[\rho]$ is a functional of the *local* electron density of the form $T_L[\rho] \sim \int \rho^{5/3} d\tau$. This permits us to write (9) as:

$$\mu_{\rm M} - \mu_{\rm at} = A \left[\rho_{\rm at}^{2/3} - \rho_{\rm M}^{2/3} \right] + \frac{\delta (R \cdot F_{\rm e})}{\delta \rho_{\rm M}}$$
 (10)

or

$$\chi_{\rm M} - \chi_{\rm at} = A \left[\rho_{\rm M}^{2/3} - \rho_{\rm at}^{2/3} \right] - \frac{\delta (R \cdot F_{\rm e})}{\delta \rho_{\rm M}}.$$
 (11)

Suppose an electron moves from an atomic orbital to a bonding MO. Its energy becomes more negative and, from the Virial theorem, its kinetic energy increases. Therefore, $\rho_{\rm M}^{2/3} - \rho_{\rm at}^{2/3} > 0$. The product $(R \cdot F_{\rm e})$ is the energy term caused by the nuclei moving as $\rho_{\rm at} \rightarrow \rho_{\rm M}$. Since the MO is bonding, the energy term is stabilizing, that is $(R \cdot F_{\rm e}) < 0$; besides, $(R \cdot F_{\rm e})$ becomes more negative as $\rho_{\rm M}$ increases, which means that $\delta(R \cdot F_{\rm e}/\delta\rho_{\rm M} < 0$. From Eq. (11) we conclude that if a MO is bonding, $\chi_{\rm M} > \chi_{\rm at}$. By the same argument we can show that a MO is antibonding if $\chi_{\rm M} < \chi_{\rm at}$ (in heteroatomic molecules $\chi_{\rm at}$ should refer to the more electronegative atom) [12].

Acknowledgement. We are pleased to acknowledge financial support from CNPq (Brazilian Agency).

References

- 1. Ferreira, R., Amorim, A. O.: Theoret. Chim. Acta (Berl.), 58, 131 (1981)
- 2. Hund, F.: Z. Physik 51, 788, 793 (1928)
- 3. Mulliken, R. S.: Phys. Rev. 32, 196 (1928)
- 4. Herzberg, G.: Z. Physik 57, 616 (1929)
- 5. Hohenberg, P., Kohn, W.: Phys. Rev. B136, 864 (1964)
- Parr, R. G., Donnelly, R. A., Levy, M., Palk Jr., W. E.: J. Chem. Phys. 68, 3801 (1978) Parr,
 R. G., Gadre, S. R., Bartolotti, L. J.: Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 76, 2522 (1979); Bartolotti, L. J.,
 Gadre, S. R., Parr, R. G.: J. Am. Chem. Soc. 102, 2945 (1980)
- 7. Iczkowski, R. P., Margrave, J. L.: J. Am. Chem. Soc. 83, 3547 (1961)
- 8. Gyftopoulos, E. P., Hatsopoulos, G. N.: Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 60, 786 (1968)
- 9. March, N. H.: Self-consistent fields in atoms, pp. 44-45. Oxford: Pergamon Press 1975
- 10. Hellmann, H.: Einführung in die Quantenchemie, p. 285. Leipzig: Deuticke 1937
- 11. Feynman, R.: Phys. Rev. 56, 340 (1939)
- 12. Starting with the separate AOs, the energy of each bonding (antibonding) MO lowers (increases) monotonically as R decreases, the MOs transforming into united-atom orbitals. Hence $R \cdot F_e < 0$ $(R \cdot F_e > 0)$ as an electron moves from an isolated atomic orbital to a bonding (antibonding) MO. For the equilibrium molecular geometry, $R_e \cdot F_e = 0$; this energy minimum at R_e is the result of a sum over the bonding and antibonding electrons (plus the internuclear repulsion). We wish to thank the referee for calling our attention to this problem.

Received February 24, 1981/April 10, 1981