

# Internet Electronic Journal of Molecular Design

July 2004, Volume 3, Number 7, Pages 387–399

Editor: Ovidiu Ivanciuc

Proceedings of the Internet Electronic Conference of Molecular Design, IECMD 2003  
November 23 – December 6, 2003  
Part 1

## The Effects of Substituents and Solvents on the Conformation of Benzophenones

Athena Mantas,<sup>1</sup> Sonia E. Blanco,<sup>2</sup> and Ferdinando H. Ferretti<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 3H6

<sup>2</sup> Area de Química–Física, Facultad de Química, Bioquímica y Farmacia, Universidad Nacional de San Luis, Chacabuco y Pedernera, 5700 San Luis, Argentina

Received: October 18, 2003; Revised: March 6, 2004; Accepted: March 23, 2004; Published: July 31, 2004

### Citation of the article:

A. Mantas, S. E. Blanco, and F. H. Ferretti, The Effects of Substituents and Solvents on the Conformation of Benzophenones, *Internet Electron. J. Mol. Des.* **2004**, *3*, 387–399, <http://www.biochempress.com>.

## The Effects of Substituents and Solvents on the Conformation of Benzophenones<sup>#</sup>

Athena Mantas,<sup>1</sup> Sonia E. Blanco,<sup>2</sup> and Ferdinando H. Ferretti<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 3H6

<sup>2</sup> Area de Química-Física, Facultad de Química, Bioquímica y Farmacia, Universidad Nacional de San Luis, Chacabuco y Pedernera, 5700 San Luis, Argentina

Received: October 18, 2003; Revised: March 6, 2004; Accepted: March 23, 2004; Published: July 31, 2004

---

*Internet Electron. J. Mol. Des.* 2004, 3 (7), 387–399

### Abstract

**Motivation.** Natural and synthetic benzophenones are compounds of great scientific and applied interest due to the varied biological and physicochemical properties that they possess. As part of a program aimed at investigating new physicochemical properties of substituted benzophenones, we carry out a study on the influence of the substituents and solvents upon the molecular conformations of these compounds. In the future, we expect to propose relationships between the molecular structural parameters with diverse experimental properties of the compounds that are currently being determined in our laboratory.

**Method.** The HF/6–31G(d) and B3LYP/6–31G(d) methods were used for calculations. Onsager's and Tomasi's models were used to analyze the solvent effects on the nine benzophenones studied.

**Results.** A conformational equilibrium was proposed between the two conformers of benzophenones with the greatest thermodynamic stability. The total energies, torsional angles, dipole moments, structural and reactivity molecular parameters, and conformational equilibrium constants were calculated in vacuum, ethanol, methanol and water. The calculated magnitudes were correlated with Hammett's substituent constants and parameters of solvating solvents.

**Conclusions.** The benzophenones investigated have non-planar structures. Very good linear relationships between the molecular dihedral angles and Hammett's *p*-substituent constants were obtained. Electron-donating substituents increase the planarity of the substituted benzoyl group that involves phenyl ring A of the molecules, as well as the folding of phenyl ring B. The conformational equilibrium constants of *o*-hydroxy-benzophenones ranged approximately between  $10^{-7}$ – $10^{-6}$ . On the other hand, it was concluded that greater hydrogen-bond donor capability of a solvent increases the polarization of the compounds and consequently, increases their dipole moments. It was further concluded that the electron-donating groups increase the strength of the intramolecular hydrogen bond and that in the solvents used the *o*-hydroxy-benzophenones possess an important intramolecular hydrogen bond of the moderate class.

**Keywords.** Substituted benzophenones; effects of substituents and solvents; conformational equilibrium; hydrogen bonding; *ab initio* and DFT methods.

---

<sup>#</sup> Presented in part at the Internet Electronic Conference of Molecular Design, IECMD 2003.

\* Correspondence author; phone: 54-2652-423789; fax: 54-2652-430224; E-mail: fferret@unsl.edu.ar.

### Abbreviations and notations

BPs, benzophenones	DM, dipole moment
DFT, density functional methods	$\sigma_p$ , Hammett's <i>p</i> -substituent constants
Conf <sub>1</sub> and Conf <sub>2</sub> , conformers of benzophenones	<i>D</i> , dihedral angle
PEC, potential energy curve	<i>A</i> , bond angle
IHB, intramolecular hydrogen bond	HBD, hydrogen–bond donor capability

---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Benzophenones (BPs) are obtained naturally from shafts, flowers and fruits of plants [1], and by synthesis methods [2]. These compounds are object of continuous investigations due to the varied biological and physicochemical properties that they possess. Thus, they are used for their bacteriostatic [3], tuberculostatic [4] and antimicrobial [5] activity. On the other hand, some polyhydroxylated BPs act as antithrombic agents and as inhibitors of the aggregation of platelets [6]. One of the most important properties of BPs is their capability to absorb UV radiation. These compounds absorb a wide range of UVA and UVB radiation (200–350nm). For this reason, they are widely used in commercial sunscreen formulations [7], which avoid the photosensitization, phototoxicity or allergic reactions of patients under different medical treatments [8].

It is known that the structural characteristics of a compound are fundamental in the determination of their biological and physicochemical properties. This fact has constituted the focus of a number of investigations, which explain some stereochemical properties of BPs [9]. Nevertheless, it should be noticed that several structural characteristics of substituted BPs of great medical and scientific importance have not been completely defined yet.


As part of a program aimed at investigating new physicochemical properties of BPs, the UV solvatochromic shifts [10], the metal complexing capability [11] and acid–base constants [12] of *o*-hydroxy–BPs were recently studied. Now, we carry out a study on the influence of the substituents and solvents upon the molecular conformations of substituted BPs, by means of *ab initio* and density functional (DFT) methods. In the future, we wish to propose relationships between the obtained molecular structural parameters and several experimental properties of the compounds that are currently being determined in our laboratory.

## 2 MATERIALS AND METHODS


### 2.1 Calculations

The structures and chemical numbering system of the BPs studied are shown in Figure 1. Figure 2 shows the practical numbering system adopted for carrying out the calculations, which were performed with known procedures [13]. For the determination of the potential energy surface minima of BPs in vacuum and water at HF/6–31G(d), energetic magnitudes of molecular structures were calculated as a function of dihedral angles ( $\omega$ ,  $\phi$ ) using increments of 10° in the 0–180°

interval, and sometimes in the 0–360° interval. It was proposed that dihedral angle  $\omega$  (or angle  $\phi$ ) is formed by the plane containing the substituted or unsubstituted ring A (or ring B) and the plane containing the rest of the molecule. The two planes intersect along the single bond C<sub>1</sub>–CO (or single bond OC–C<sub>1</sub>). The potential energy surface minima obtained by the scan of BPs were optimized with the Gaussian 98 [14] program packages, using the HF/6–31G(d) and B3LYP/6–31G(d) methods, and the default convergence criteria.




**Figure 1.** Structure of the benzophenones studied.



**Figure 2.** Practical numbering system adopted in the calculations.

Onsager's [15] and Tomasi's [16] methods were used to analyze the solvent effect on the rotamers of BPs. On the other hand, the equilibrium constant between molecules that have intramolecular hydrogen bondings (IHBs) and those that lack this type of bonds were calculated to analyze the strength of the IHB of *o*-hydroxy-benzophenones (compounds **6** to **9**), which involves the hydrogen of the OH group at position 2 and the carbonyl oxygen. It must be noted that, when performing the calculations in solution, possible solute-solvent interactions, such as the intermolecular hydrogen bonds involving molecules of the BPs and of the hydroxylic solvents, were not considered. This should be taken into account to set the limitations of the results, discussions and conclusions derived from the present work.



**Figure 3.** Minima and rotation barriers of the potential energy curve for phenyl-ring A of unsubstituted benzophenone computed at HF/6–31G(d) in vacuum and water, at 298 K.

### 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to Wilson *et al.* [17], Eq. (1) permits to estimate the number of conformers obtained in the scan of a compound, according to the number of rotatable bonds it possesses and the increment value adopted for rotating the involved dihedral angles.

$$\text{Number of conformers} = (360/\text{angle increment})^{\text{No. rotatable bonds}} \quad (1)$$

The problem that follows is to determine which of all the obtained conformations is the one with the lowest energy. In the analyzed BPs, by rotating the planes that involve the phenyl rings A and B with respect to the plane containing the rest of the molecule around the single bonds C<sub>1</sub>–CO and OC–C<sub>1</sub> (Figure 1), respectively, the existence of two principal conformers (Conf<sub>1</sub> and Conf<sub>2</sub>) with


highest thermodynamic stability was detected. To analyze more easily the stereochemical characteristics of the investigated BPs, it is convenient to separate them into two groups.

**Table 1.** Calculated dihedral angles for conformer 1 of benzophenones in vacuum and water (Onsager's model) at 298 K, and Hammett's *p*-substituent constants ( $\omega_1$ ,  $\phi_1$  = torsional angles ( $^\circ$ )  $DO_1C_2C_3C_4$  and  $DO_1C_2C_9C_{10}$ , respectively;  $\theta_1$  = inclination angle ( $DC_7C_4C_{10}C_{13}$ ) formed by the planes containing the aromatic rings A and B with each other;  $\sigma_p$  = Hammett's *p*-substituent constants)

Optimization B3LYP/6–31G(d).				
Compound	Conformer 1 (vacuum)			$\sigma_p$
	$\omega_1$	$\phi_1$	$\theta_1$	
<b>1</b>	26.2	26.2	51.1	0.00
<b>2</b>	25.2	26.4	50.6	0.24
<b>3</b>	24.3	27.2	50.5	0.07
<b>4</b>	22.1	28.4	49.7	–0.38
<b>5</b>	22.4	28.3	49.8	–0.28
<b>6</b>	12.3	36.3	46.4	0.00
<b>7</b>	11.7	36.3	46.0	–0.14
<b>8</b>	10.6	37.2	45.7	–0.28
<b>9</b>	10.7	37.2	45.9	–0.38
Conformer 1 (water). Onsager's method.				
Compound	Conformer 1 (water). Onsager's method.			$\sigma_p$
	$\omega_1$	$\phi_1$	$\theta_1$	
<b>1</b>	26.2	26.2	51.2	0.00
<b>2</b>	25.9	25.8	50.6	0.24
<b>3</b>	24.9	26.7	50.5	0.07
<b>4</b>	22.1	28.4	49.7	–0.38
<b>5</b>	22.4	29.1	50.0	–0.28
<b>6</b>	12.5	36.1	46.0	0.00
<b>7</b>	11.8	36.5	45.8	–0.14
<b>8</b>	10.6	37.7	45.8	–0.28
<b>9</b>	10.8	37.4	45.9	–0.38

### 3.1 Group 1

This group is formed by the *p*-substituted BPs, this is to say, by compounds **1** to **5**. Conf<sub>1</sub> and Conf<sub>2</sub> of each BP of this group have the same thermodynamic stability. As an example, Figure 3 shows the energy differences ( $\Delta E$ , kcal mol<sup>–1</sup>) computed at HF/6–31G(d) in vacuum and water at 298 K, for the two conformers of BP **1**. The conformer with the lowest energy, *i.e.*, Conf<sub>1</sub> in aqueous medium, was taken as reference. It can be observed that Conf<sub>1</sub>(**1**) and Conf<sub>2</sub>(**1**) are characterized by the dihedral angles  $\omega=30^\circ$  and  $\omega=210^\circ$ , and have practically the same energy. The energy difference between Conf<sub>1</sub>(**1**) in vacuum and in aqueous medium is smaller than 1 kcal mol<sup>–1</sup>. Conf<sub>2</sub>(**1**) exhibited a similar behavior. Obviously, when these symmetrical structures are optimized at the HF/6–31G(d) or B3LYP/6–31G(d) levels, they show identical energies. On the other hand, the rotation barrier involved in the conformational reaction Conf<sub>1</sub>(**1**)  $\rightarrow$  Conf<sub>2</sub>(**1**) is 37.9 kcal mol<sup>–1</sup>. This implies that Conf<sub>1</sub>(**1**) is the predominant form of BP **1**. Consequently, in this group we will refer mainly to Conf<sub>1</sub>. Table 1 reports the calculated dihedral angles at the B3LYP/6–31G(d) level in vacuum and water (Onsager's method) for Conf<sub>1</sub> of BPs, and Hammett's *p*-substituent constants ( $\sigma_p$ ) [18,19].



**Figure 4.** Changes of the  $\omega$  torsional angles of *p*-substituted benzophenones computed at B3LYP/6–31G(d) with the Hammett's *p*-substituent constants.


The torsional angles  $\omega_1$  calculated at B3LYP/6–31G(d) for Conf<sub>1</sub> of **2–5** were plotted against  $\sigma_p$  as shown in Figure 4. It is observed that the effect of the substituents on the structure of the compounds is more marked in aqueous medium than in vacuum. The linear equations of Figure 4 show that the coefficients of  $\sigma_p$  are positive, which means that the electron-donating groups favor the decrease of dihedral angle  $\omega_1$ . This fact implies that a higher coplanarity of the carbonyl group with the aromatic ring A increases the  $\pi$ -electronic delocalization of the substituted benzoyl group. Obviously, the simple bond nature of the C=O group and the electronic density of the carbonyl oxygen atom increase.

In general, it can be concluded that the introduction of electron-withdrawing or electron-donating substituents in compound **1** increases the molecular planarity of Conf<sub>1</sub>. Also, that the variations of  $\theta_1$  indicate that the planes containing the aromatic rings A and B are inclined by approximately 49.7–51.1° (vacuum) and 49.7–51.2° (water) with respect to one another. These results are coherent with the value given ( $\theta_1 \cong 54.4^\circ$ ) by Cox *et al.* [20] for 2(CH<sub>3</sub>–NH),5(Cl)–BP.


### 3.2 Group 2

This group includes all the *o*-hydroxy-benzophenones, *i.e.*, compounds **6** to **9**. The BPs of this group, besides having symmetrical conformers exhibit non-symmetrical conformers with different energies. The conformers of BPs **6** to **9** obtained by the rotation of ring B (Figure 1 and Figure 2, dihedral angle  $\phi \equiv DO_1C_2C_9C_{10}$ ) are symmetrical but the rotamers that result from the complete

rotation of ring A (Figure 1 and Figure 2, dihedral angle  $\omega \equiv DO_1C_2C_3C_4$ ), which implies the rupture of a significant IHB [21], are not symmetrical.




**Figure 5.** Minima and rotation barrier of the potential energy curve for phenyl–ring A of 2–hydroxy–benzophenone computed at HF/6–31G(d) level of theory in water, at 298 K.



**Figure 6.** Non–symmetrical conformers of 2–hydroxy–benzophenone optimized at B3LYP/6–31G(d). (a) Conformer 1 (with IHB); (b) Conformer 2 (without IHB).

Figure 5 shows the  $\Delta E$  computed at HF/6–31G(d) in water at 298 K, for the two conformers of BP 6. Conf<sub>1</sub>(6), which has the lowest energy and is characterized by the dihedral angle  $\omega = 15^\circ$ , was taken as reference. Conf<sub>2</sub>(6) can be observed when  $\omega$  is  $210^\circ$  and its energy is higher than that of

Conf<sub>1</sub>(**6**) by 16 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>. Furthermore, the rotation barrier involved in the conformational reaction Conf<sub>1</sub>(**6**) → Conf<sub>2</sub>(**6**) is 293 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>. As observed for BP **1**, Conf<sub>1</sub> is the predominant form of BP **6**. As an example, Figure 6 shows the two non-symmetrical conformers with the highest thermodynamic stability optimized at B3LYP/6–31G(d) for BP **6**, in water at 25°C. On the other hand, the total free energy in solution ( $G_{sol}^{\circ}$ ), the dipole moment (DM) and the interaction distances ( $d_{O_1-oHO}$ ) between the carbonyl oxygen atom and hydrogen atom of *o*-hydroxyl group of the conformers of group 2, calculated at B3LYP/6–31G(d) with Tomasi's method in water, methanol and ethanol, are summarized in Tables 2–4, respectively.



(b)

Figure 6. (Continued).

**Table 2.** Calculated molecular magnitudes for the species involved in the conformational equilibrium of *o*-hydroxybenzophenones in water at 298 K ( $G_{sol}^{\circ}$  = total free energy in solution, kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>; DM= dipole moment, Debye;  $d_{O_1-oHO}$  = interaction distance between the carbonyl oxygen and the hydrogen of OH group at position 2 of aromatic ring A, Å;  $K_C$ : conformational equilibrium constant (Eq. (2)).

Optimization B3LYP/6–31G(d) with Tomasi's method (water)				
Benzophenone	Conformer 1 (with IHB)			$K_C$
	$G_{sol}^{\circ}$	DM <sub>1</sub>	$d_{O_1-oHO}$	
6	-409050	5.21	1.666	$3.79 \times 10^{-6}$
7	-433722	5.28	1.664	$2.62 \times 10^{-6}$
8	-480916	3.95	1.655	$1.03 \times 10^{-6}$
9	-456256	3.60	1.652	$9.44 \times 10^{-7}$
Benzophenone	Conformer 2 (without IHB)			
	$G_{sol}^{\circ}$	DM <sub>2</sub>	$d_{O_1-oHO}$	
6	-409043	3.84	—	
7	-433714	3.82	—	
8	-480908	5.06	—	
9	-456248	5.11	—	

**Table 3.** Calculated molecular magnitudes for the species involved in the conformational equilibrium of *o*-hydroxybenzophenones in methanol at 298 K ( $G_{sol}^{\circ}$  = total free energy in solution, kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>; DM = dipole moment, Debye;  $dO_1-oHO$  = interaction distance between the carbonyl oxygen and the hydrogen of OH group at position 2 of aromatic ring A, Å;  $K_C$ : conformational equilibrium constant (Eq. (2)).


Optimization B3LYP/6–31G(d) with Tomasi's method (methanol)				
Benzophenone	Conformer 1 (with IHB)			$K_C$
	$G_{sol}^{\circ}$	DM <sub>1</sub>	$dO_1-oHO$	
6	-409054	5.13	1.666	$3.87 \times 10^{-6}$
7	-433726	5.21	1.664	$2.64 \times 10^{-6}$
8	-480921	3.89	1.655	$1.14 \times 10^{-6}$
9	-456260	3.54	1.652	$1.06 \times 10^{-6}$
Benzophenone	Conformer 2 (without IHB)			$K_C$
	$G_{sol}^{\circ}$	DM <sub>2</sub>	$dO_1-oHO$	
6	-409047	3.79	—	—
7	-433719	3.54	—	—
8	-480913	4.99	—	—
9	-456252	5.03	—	—

**Table 4.** Calculated molecular magnitudes for the species involved in the conformational equilibrium of *o*-hydroxybenzophenones in ethanol at 298 K ( $G_{sol}^{\circ}$  = total free energy in solution, kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>; DM = dipole moment, Debye;  $dO_1-oHO$  = interaction distance between the carbonyl oxygen and the hydrogen of OH group at position 2 of aromatic ring A, Å;  $K_C$ : conformational equilibrium constant (Eq. (2)).


Optimization B3LYP/6–31G(d) with Tomasi's method (ethanol)				
Benzophenone	Conformer 1 (with IHB)			$K_C$
	$G_{sol}^{\circ}$	DM <sub>1</sub>	$dO_1-oHO$	
6	-409050	5.09	1.666	$3.80 \times 10^{-6}$
7	-433722	5.18	1.664	$2.57 \times 10^{-6}$
8	-480917	3.87	1.655	$1.26 \times 10^{-6}$
9	-456256	3.51	1.652	$1.01 \times 10^{-6}$
Benzophenone	Conformer 2 (without IHB)			$K_C$
	$G_{sol}^{\circ}$	DM <sub>2</sub>	$dO_1-oHO$	
6	-409043	3.76	—	—
7	-433715	3.51	—	—
8	-480909	5.02	—	—
9	-456248	4.98	—	—

From Tables 2–4 it can be observed that the thermodynamic stability of Conf<sub>1</sub> is higher than that of Conf<sub>2</sub>, in the three solvents used. It must be noted that the important IHB [21] characteristic of BPs 6 to 9 intensely affects the geometry of their molecules. From Table 1 it can be observed that in vacuum and water, the values of dihedral angles  $\omega_1$  and  $\theta_1$  of Conf<sub>1</sub> of BPs group 2 are lower than those exhibited by Conf<sub>1</sub> of group 1. On the other hand, the variations of torsional angle  $\phi_1$  are exactly opposite those of  $\omega_1$  and  $\theta_1$ . These facts indicate that the electron-donating groups increase the planarity of the substituted aromatic ring A and the folding of ring B. Nevertheless, the values of  $\theta_1$  ( $\cong 46^\circ$ ) for the BPs of group 2 reveal that these compounds possess a higher coplanarity between their rings A and B with respect to BPs 1 to 5 ( $\theta_1 \cong 51^\circ$ ).

On the other hand, it was proposed that Conf<sub>1</sub> and Conf<sub>2</sub> of BPs 6 to 9 are related by the conformational equilibrium,



which is characterized by the equilibrium constant  $K_C$ . Eq. (2) describes an equilibrium between intramolecularly hydrogen bonded molecules and molecules lacking the internal hydrogen bond. The values of  $K_C$  calculated at B3LYP/6–31G(d) are also given in Tables 2–4. It is clear that when  $\text{Conf}_1$  and  $\text{Conf}_2$  of a BP have the same energy, the corresponding  $K_C$  is equal to one. This means that in this case there is 50% of each conformer. This is the behavior observed for the BPs of group 1. However, for the BPs of group 2 the calculated  $K_C$  in water, methanol and ethanol ranged between  $9.44 \times 10^{-7}$ – $3.79 \times 10^{-6}$ ,  $1.06$ – $3.87 \times 10^{-6}$  and  $1.01$ – $3.80 \times 10^{-6}$ , respectively. Since  $K_C \ll 1$ , these BPs are almost completely under the  $\text{Conf}_1$  form; for example, for the  $\text{Conf}_1$  (6)  $\rightleftharpoons$   $\text{Conf}_2$  (6) equilibrium in water at 298 K,  $K_C = 3.79 \times 10^{-6}$ . In this way, the theoretical calculations predict 99.99962% of  $\text{Conf}_1$  (6) and 0.00038% of  $\text{Conf}_2$  (6) in the equilibrium. Lamola *et al.* [22], in a study of the environmental effects on the excited states of *o*-hydroxy aromatic carbonyl compounds, suggested that the molecules of 2-hydroxy-benzophenones in ethanol solutions exhibit two different structural forms, with and without IHBs. Recently, based on UV spectroscopic determinations and semiempirical MO calculations, Blanco *et al.* [10] formulated similar proposals for *o*-hydroxy-benzophenones dissolved in primary alcohols.




**Figure 7.** Relationships between the dipolar moments of *o*-hydroxy-benzophenones and *Acity* parameter of the solvating solvents.

From Tables 2–4 it can be observed that the  $K_C$  constants do not change significantly with the solvent. For the conformers of 6 the following total energies (TE) were obtained in vacuum and water: in vacuum,  $\text{TE Conf}_1$  (6) =  $-409049 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  and  $\text{TE Conf}_2$  (6) =  $-409041 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ ; in

water: TE Conf<sub>1</sub> (**6**) = −409050 kcal mol<sup>−1</sup> and TE Conf<sub>2</sub> (**6**) = −409043 kcal mol<sup>−1</sup>. These data reveal that the thermodynamic stability of the conformers in aqueous medium increases by 1 kcal mol<sup>−1</sup> with respect to those in vacuum, an increase that is obviously insignificant. Similar thermodynamic properties were observed in all the BPs of group 2. Consequently, it is concluded that the solvents used practically do not affect the K<sub>C</sub> constants of the BPs in this group and, also, that Conf<sub>1</sub> constitute their predominant form.

The DM of the compounds proved to be highly dependent on the solvents. Figure 7 shows the changes of DM<sub>1</sub> of BPs group 2 with the solvation parameter *Acity* [23] of the solvents used. The parameter *Acity* is very useful for measuring the hydrogen bond donating ability (HBD capability) of a solvent, this is to say, the capability of the solvent to provide a proton. The values of *Acity* determined for ethanol, methanol and water are 0.66, 0.75 and 1.00 [24], respectively. From Figure 7, it is observed that the linear equations obtained have very good correlation coefficients ( $r > 0.98$ ) and low values for the standard deviations (*sd*) of slopes. These equations indicate that the greater HBD capability of a solvent increases the polarization of the BPs and consequently, increases their DM.



**Figure 8.** Change of the conformational equilibrium constant of *o*-hydroxy-benzophenones with the Hammett's *p*-substituent constants.

The *p*-substituents exert a strong influence on the K<sub>C</sub> constants. Figure 8 shows the change of K<sub>C</sub> with Hammett's  $\sigma_p$  constants. The slopes of lineal equations included in Figure 8 indicate that the effect of *p*-substituents increases with the medium permittivity. Moreover, the  $dO_1$ -*o*HO

interaction distances in water of *o*-hydroxy-benzophenones were related with the  $\sigma_p$  constants by means of the following equation,

$$d_{O_1-oHO} = 0.0379 \sigma_p + 1.6672 \quad (r=0.9412) \quad (sd=0.001) \quad (3)$$

The above equation suggests that the electron donating groups, by decreasing the  $d_{O_1-oHO}$  distance, increase the corresponding H-Bond angle  $A-O_1H_2O_{15}$  (Figure 6a) and, consequently, the strength of the IHB. Eq. (3) also permits to infer that the acid dissociation constant ( $K_a$ ) of BP **6** should be greater than the  $K_a$  of BP **8**. This prediction agrees with the experimental values  $pK_a(\mathbf{6}) = 9.44$  and  $pK_a(\mathbf{8}) = 9.54$  [12]. On the other hand, considering that in BPs group 2 the  $d_{O_1-oHO}$  distances vary in the 1.652–1.666 Å range, the  $A-O_1H_2O_{15}$  angles vary in the 144.4–148.9° range and the involved energies vary between –7.4 and –8.2 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>, it is concluded that in the solvents used these compounds possess an important IHB of the moderate class [25].

## 4 CONCLUSIONS

The BPs investigated possesses non-planar structures and each of them has two principal conformers in equilibrium. The symmetrical conformers of mono-substituted BPs have a more flexible structure than the conformational structures of *o*-hydroxy-BPs. For the compounds of group 1 the  $K_C$  constants are equal to one, while those of group 2 ranged between approximately  $10^{-7}$ – $10^{-6}$ . Also, it was determined that the planes containing the aromatic rings A and B of the two principal conformers of groups 1 and 2 are inclined by approximately 51° and 46° with respect to one another, respectively. Very good linear relationships between the molecular dihedral angles and Hammett's *p*-substituent constants were obtained. Firstly, it was concluded that the electron-donating substituents increase the planarity of the substituted benzoyl group that involves the phenyl ring A of the molecules as well as the folding of phenyl ring B. These effects are higher in the BPs of group 2, due to their important IHB. On the other hand, the  $DM_1$  of BPs group 2 were related with the solvation parameter *Acity* of the solvents used. The equations obtained indicate that the greater HBD capability of a solvent increases the polarization of these BPs and consequently, increases their DM. Also it was determined that the *p*-substituents exert a strong influence on the  $K_C$  constants and it was demonstrated that their effect increases with the medium permittivity. Moreover, the interaction distances between the carbonyl oxygen atom and hydrogen atom of *o*-hydroxyl group of BPs of group 2 were related with Hammett's constants. It was concluded that the electron donating groups, by decreasing these interaction distances, increase the corresponding H-bond angle and, therefore, the strength of the IHB. It was also concluded that in the solvents used the BPs of group 2 possess an important IHB of the moderate class.

### Acknowledgment

This work was supported by grants from National University of San Luis (Argentine Republic).

## 5 REFERENCES

- [1] G. E. Henry, H. Jacobs, C. M. S. Carrington, S. McLean and W. F. Reynolds, *Tetrahedron*, **1999**, *55*, 1581–1596.
- [2] F. Karrer, H. Meier and A. Pascual, *J. Fluorine Chem.* **2000**, *103*, 81–84.
- [3] F. Fujikawa, K. Nakajima, A. Tokuova, Y. Hitosa, S. Nakazawa, T. Omatsu and T. Sumiyama, *J. Pharm. Soc. Japan.* **1953**, *73*, 740–743.
- [4] B. L. Freedlander, *Am. Rev. Tuberc.* **1944**, *49*, 543–548.
- [5] H. Kato, A. Takashashi, H. Tamuya, M. Kono and M. Shimo, *Shokuhin Eiseigaku Zasshi.* **1966**, *7*, 60–66, Japan.
- [6] J. Elks and C. R. Ganellin, *Dictionary of Drugs*, London, Chapman & Hall, 1990, pp. 413, 569, 628, 1238.
- [7] P. Collins and J. Ferguson, *British J. Dermat.* **1994**, *131*, 124–129.
- [8] A. M. Kadry, C. S. Okereke, M. S. Abdel–Rahman, M. A. Friedman and R. A. Davis, *J. App. Toxicol.* **1995**, *15*, 97–102.
- [9] T. M. Kolev and B. A. Stamboliyska, *Spectrochim. Acta Part A–Mol. Biomol. Spectrosc.* **2000**, *56*, 119–126.
- [10] S. E. Blanco, J. J. Silber and F. H. Ferretti, *J. Molec. Struct. (Theochem).* **2002**, *582*, 91–105.
- [11] G. T. Castro, S. E. Blanco, S. L. Arce and F. H. Ferretti, *Spectrochimica Acta Part A: Mol. & Biomol. Spectroscopy.* **2003**, *59*, 2685–2696.
- [12] G. T. Castro, O. S. Giordano and S. E. Blanco, *J. Molec. Struct. (Theochem).* **2003**, *626*, 167–178.
- [13] K. S. Lau, A. Mantas, G. A. Chass, F. H. Ferretti, M. R. Estrada, G. Zamarbide and I. G. Csizmadia, *Can. J. Chem.* **2002**, *80*, 845–855.
- [14] Gaussian 98, Revision A.9, M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, V. G. Zakrzewski, J. A. Montgomery, Jr., R. E. Stratmann, J. C. Burant, S. Dapprich, J. M. Millam, A. D. Daniels, K. N. Kudin, M. C. Strain, O. Farkas, J. Tomasi, V. Barone, M. Cossi, R. Cammi, B. Mennucci, C. Pomelli, C. Adamo, S. Clifford, J. Ochterski, G. A. Petersson, P. Y. Ayala, Q. Cui, K. Morokuma, D. K. Malick, A. D. Rabuck, K. Raghavachari, J. B. Foresman, J. Cioslowski, J. V. Ortiz, A. G. Baboul, B. B. Stefanov, G. Liu, A. Liashenko, P. Piskorz, I. Komaromi, R. Gomperts, R. L. Martin, D. J. Fox, T. Keith, M. A. Al–Laham, C. Y. Peng, A. Nanayakkara, M. Challacombe, P. M. W. Gill, B. Johnson, W. Chen, M. W. Wong, J. L. Andres, C. Gonzalez, M. Head–Gordon, E. S. Replogle, and J. A. Pople, Gaussian, Inc., Pittsburgh PA, 1998.
- [15] M. W. Wong, K. B. Wiberg and M. J. Frisch, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, *114*, 1645.
- [16] S. Miertus, E. Scrocco and J. Tomasi, *Chem. Phys.* **1982**, *65*, 239.
- [17] C. O. Wilson and O. Gisvold's, *Textbook of Organic Medicinal and Pharmaceutical Chemistry*, 10th ed, Edit. J. N. Delgado and W. A. Remers, Lippincott–Raven Publishers, N.Y., 1998, pp. 3–42.
- [18] F. Ruff and I. G. Csizmadia, *Organic Reactions. Equilibria, Kinetics and Mechanism*, Elsevier, London, 1994, pp. 161–168.
- [19] N. Isaacs, *Physical Organic Chemistry*, 2nd ed., Longman, England, 1996, pp. 151–152.
- [20] P. J. Cox, A. T. Anisuzzaman, G. G. Skellern, R. H. Pryce Jones, A. J. Florence and N. Shankland, *Acta Cryst. Sec. C–Crystal. Struct. Comm.* **1997**, *53*, 476–477.
- [21] A. C. Bhasikuttan, A. K. Singh, D. K. Palit, A. V. Sapre and J. P. Mittal, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, **1998**, *102*, 3470–3480.
- [22] A. A. Lamola and L. J. Sharp, *J. Phys. Chem.* **1966**, *73*, 2634–2638.
- [23] C. G. Swain, M. S. Swain, A. L. Powell and S. Alunni, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1983**, *105*, 502.
- [24] Y. Marcus, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **1993**, *22*, 409–416.
- [25] G. A. Jeffrey, *An Introduction to Hydrogen Bonding*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997, pp. 11–12.