

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Letters to the Editor section is divided into three categories entitled Notes, Comments, and Errata. Letters to the Editor are limited to one and three-fourths journal pages as described in the Announcement in the 1 July 2001 issue.

NOTES

Test of variational transition state theory with multidimensional tunneling contributions against an accurate full-dimensional rate constant calculation for a six-atom system

Jingzhi Pu

Department of Chemistry and Supercomputing Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455-0431

José C. Corchado

Departamento de Química-Física, Universidad de Extremadura, Facultad de Ciencias, 06071 Badajoz, Spain

Donald G. Truhlar^{a)}

Department of Chemistry and Supercomputing Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455-0431

(Received 21 May 2001; accepted 11 July 2001)

[DOI: 10.1063/1.1398581]

Benchmark dynamics calculations have played a critical role in assessing the validity of approximation schemes. A benchmark dynamics calculation is one in which the nuclear-motion Schrödinger equation is solved accurately (to within some specific numerical tolerance) for a given potential energy surface (or surfaces, if non-Born–Oppenheimer effects are involved). The potential energy surface should be realistic, although it need not be quantitatively accurate. By carrying out calculations employing an approximate dynamical scheme with the same potential energy surface, one can test the dynamical scheme itself more definitively than by comparison to experiment, where uncertainties in the potential energy surface usually cloud the interpretation.

One dynamical scheme that has been widely tested^{1–3} against benchmark rate constants is variational transition state theory with optimized multidimensional tunneling (VTST/OMT) contributions. VTST has its origins in classical mechanics,^{4,5} but when applied with quantized vibrations⁶ and optimized multidimensional tunneling contributions,⁷ it has been shown to be capable of high accuracy, although there is always a question of whether anharmonicity,^{8,9} and mode–mode coupling effects^{9,10} are handled adequately in actual practical applications. Some, but not all, inadequacies in the treatment of these effects at transition states may be cancelled by a consistent treatment of transition states and reactants, and it is important to gauge how successful this can be in quantitative terms (just as, in an analogous situation for comparison, one wants to test how well electronic structure calculations can predict energies without treating the correlation energy of core electrons, which largely cancels out). Furthermore, there is also some

question of how well multidimensional tunneling calculations will perform as one increases the number of dimensions.¹¹ VTST/OMT has been well tested for atom–diatom reactions,³ which involve six degrees of freedom in a center-of-mass coordinate system, but a recent report of benchmark dynamics calculations¹² for $\text{H} + \text{CH}_4 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CH}_3$, a six-body system with 15 degrees of freedom in the center-of-mass coordinate system, provides an opportunity for dramatically increases the size of the test system. In the present paper we report VTST/OMT calculations for a comparison to their results. As explained in the first paragraph, the essence of such a comparison is to employ the same potential energy surface for the accurate and approximate dynamics calculations, and we therefore employ the same Jordan–Gilbert (JG) surface,¹³ as used in Ref. 12. We note that the JG surface may be considered to be a modified version of an older surface by Joseph *et al.*¹⁴

The version of VTST/OMT that we will test is CVT/ μ OMT, which is the standard form that has emerged as a widely available tool¹⁵ for polyatomic reaction rate theory. CVT denotes canonical variational theory⁵ in which VTST is optimized for a canonical ensemble, and μ OMT denotes microcanonical OMT⁷ in which the tunneling mechanism is optimized for each total energy. The optimization consists of choosing either the small-curvature tunneling^{16,17} (SCT) approximation or the large-curvature tunneling^{18,19} (LCT) approximation, whichever yields more tunneling (which corresponds to a practically applicable version of the least-action²⁰ tunneling method). The SCT calculations are based on the centrifugal-dominant small-curvature semiclassical adiabatic ground-state model,¹⁷ and the LCT calcula-

TABLE I. A comparison of approximate and benchmark rate constants ($\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$) for $\text{H} + \text{CH}_4 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CH}_3$.

T(K)	TST	CVT	CVT/ μOMT	Accurate
200	8.2(-22)	3.8(-22)	7.1(-21)	9.0(-21)
250	1.2(-19)	6.8(-20)	4.3(-19)	5.5(-19)
300	3.6(-18)	2.2(-18)	7.7(-18)	9.8(-18)
400	2.5(-16)	1.8(-16)	3.6(-16)	4.0(-16)
500	3.4(-15)	2.7(-15)	4.1(-15)	3.8(-15)

tions are based on version 4¹⁹ of the “large-curvature ground-state” model which is based on microscopic reversibility and a calculation of tunneling from the ground state of $\text{CH}_3 + \text{H}_2$ into the ground and vibrationally excited states of CH_4 . In order to test the method in its most widely applicable form, all vibrations are treated as harmonic using curvilinear vibrational coordinates.²¹ A critical issue is that we use the harmonic approximation for both the reactants and the generalized transition states; consistency in the treatment of these species is expected to be more important than inclusion of anharmonicity.

Table I presents the results, including, for comparison, conventional transition state theory (TST) and CVT without tunneling. We note that, for the present reaction, improved canonical variational theory²² in the form of ICVT/ μOMT agrees with CVT/ μOMT to within 1%. Furthermore CVT/ μOMT agrees with CVT/SCT to within 1% for the present case (the CVT/LCT rate constants are 7%–26% lower).

Table I shows an average absolute deviation between the CVT/ μOMT and accurate rate constants of only 17% over the five temperatures, with a maximum deviation of only 23%. This is extremely encouraging for two reasons. First, this is a difficult test because of the large amount of tunneling; the transmission coefficient increases from 1.55 at 500 K to 18.7 at 200 K, and the dynamical bottleneck is not located at the saddle point, as illustrated by the significant differences (factors of 1.28 to 2.17) between CVT and TST. Second, the CVT/ μOMT theory applied here is quite practical even for large systems, having recently been applied to the hydride transfer between benzyl alcoholate anion and nicotine adenine dinucleotide catalyzed by liver alcohol dehydrogenase (the system treated has 5560 atoms, and quantum effects were included on the nuclear motion of up to 31 of them).²³ The CVT/SCT theory has also been applied to hydrogen site hopping on Cu(100) with up to 57 atoms quantum mechanical.²⁴

The accuracy attained in this study, 17% is actually better than we would expect in general. A recent systematic comparison of harmonic VTST/ μOMT to 231 benchmark rate constants for 53 colinear and three-dimensional atom–diatom reactions over the temperature range 200–600 K showed an average absolute deviation of 25%. A summary of the situation then is that harmonic CVT/ μOMT appears to be at least as accurate for $\text{H} + \text{CH}_4$ as for typical atom–diatom reactions.

Reference 12(c) concludes with a statement that the rate constant differs significantly from experiment. That is a separate issue related to the inaccuracy of the JG potential energy

surface. The JG potential energy surface has a classical barrier height of 10.9 kcal/mol and an imaginary frequency at the saddle point of $1094i \text{ cm}^{-1}$. However, on the basis of published²⁵ and unpublished²⁶ work, we estimate that a more accurate surface would have a classical barrier height closer to 14–15 kcal/mol and an imaginary frequency closer to $1400i \text{ cm}^{-1}$.

The authors are grateful to Joel Bowman for providing a preprint of Ref. 12(c) and numerical values of the rate constants presented graphically in that paper. This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences.

^{a1}Electronic mail: truhlar@umn.edu

- ¹B. C. Garrett and D. G. Truhlar, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **76**, 4755 (1979).
- ²B. C. Garrett, D. G. Truhlar, and G. C. Schatz, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **108**, 2876 (1986).
- ³T. C. Allison and D. G. Truhlar, in *Modern Methods for Multidimensional Dynamics Computations in Chemistry* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998), p. 618.
- ⁴E. Wigner, J. Chem. Phys. **5**, 720 (1937); J. Horiuti, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn. **13**, 210 (1938); J. Keck, Adv. Chem. Phys. **13**, 85 (1967).
- ⁵B. C. Garrett and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **70**, 1593 (1979); D. G. Truhlar and B. C. Garrett, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **35**, 159 (1984).
- ⁶B. C. Garrett and D. G. Truhlar, J. Phys. Chem. **83**, 1079 (1983); D. G. Truhlar, A. D. Isaacson, R. T. Skodje, and B. C. Garrett, *ibid.* **85**, 2252 (1982).
- ⁷Y.-P. Liu, D.-h. Lu, A. Gonzalez-Lafont, D. G. Truhlar, and B. C. Garrett, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **115**, 7806 (1993).
- ⁸B. C. Garrett and D. G. Truhlar, J. Phys. Chem. **83**, 1915 (1979); B. C. Garrett and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **81**, 309 (1984).
- ⁹A. D. Isaacson, D. G. Truhlar, K. Scanlon, and J. Overend, J. Chem. Phys. **75**, 3017 (1981); D. G. Truhlar, F. B. Brown, R. Steckler, and A. D. Isaacson, in *The Theory of Chemical Reaction Dynamics*, edited by D. C. Clary (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1986), p. 285; Y.-Y. Chuang and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 1221 (2000).
- ¹⁰D. G. Truhlar and B. C. Garrett, J. Phys. Chem. **104**, 1069 (2000).
- ¹¹D. G. Truhlar, B. C. Garrett, and S. J. Klippenstein, J. Phys. Chem. **100**, 12771 (1996).
- ¹²(a) F. Huarte-Larrañaga and U. Manthe, J. Chem. Phys. **113**, 5115 (2000); (b) F. Huarte-Larrañaga and U. Manthe, J. Phys. Chem. A **105**, 2522 (2001); (c) J. M. Bowman, D. Wang, X. Huang, F. Huarte-Larrañaga, and U. Manthe, J. Chem. Phys. (in press).
- ¹³M. J. T. Jordan and R. G. Gilbert, J. Chem. Phys. **102**, 5669 (1995).
- ¹⁴T. Joseph, R. Steckler, and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **87**, 7036 (1987).
- ¹⁵J. C. Corchado, Y.-Y. Chuang, P. L. Fast *et al.* POLYRATE—version 8.6, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 2001.
- ¹⁶R. T. Skodje, D. G. Truhlar, and B. C. Garrett, J. Phys. Chem. **85**, 3019 (1981).
- ¹⁷Y.-P. Liu, G. C. Lynch, T. N. Truong, D.-h. Lu, D. G. Truhlar, and B. C. Garrett, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **115**, 2408 (1993).
- ¹⁸B. C. Garrett, D. G. Truhlar, A. F. Wagner, and T. H. Dunning, J. Chem. Phys. **78**, 4400 (1983); B. C. Garrett, T. Joseph, T. N. Truong, and D. G. Truhlar, Chem. Phys. **136**, 271 (1989); T. N. Truong, D.-h. Lu, G. C. Lynch *et al.*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **75**, 143 (1993).
- ¹⁹A. Fernandez-Ramos and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **114**, 1491 (2001).
- ²⁰B. C. Garrett and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **79**, 4931 (1983).
- ²¹C. F. Jackels, Z. Gu, and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **102**, 3188 (1995).
- ²²(a) B. C. Garrett, D. G. Truhlar, R. S. Grev, and A. W. Magnuson, J. Phys. Chem. **84**, 1730 (1980); (b) D. G. Truhlar, A. D. Isaacson, and B. C. Garrett, in *Theory of Chemical Reaction Dynamics*, edited by M. Baer (CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1985), Vol. 4, p. 65.
- ²³C. Alhambra, J. C. Corchado, M. L. Sanchez, J. Gao, and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **122**, 8197 (2000).
- ²⁴S. E. Wonchoba and D. G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **99**, 9637 (1993).
- ²⁵B. L. Lynch, P. L. Fast, M. Harris, and D. G. Truhlar, J. Phys. Chem. **104**, 4811 (2000).
- ²⁶J. Pu and D. G. Truhlar (work in progress).