

On the performance of HRP(A)(D) for NMR spin-spin coupling constants: Smaller molecules, aromatic and fluoroaromatic compounds

Louise Møller Jessen¹ and Stephan P. A. Sauer¹

Department of Chemistry, University of Copenhagen, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark.

(Dated: December 4, 2023)

In this study, the performance of the doubles-corrected higher random-phase approximation (HRP(A)(D)) has been investigated in calculations of NMR spin-spin coupling constants (SSCCs) for 58 molecules with the experimental values used as the reference values. HRP(A)(D) is an approximation to the second-order polarization propagator approximation (SOPPA), and is therefore computationally less expensive than SOPPA. HRP(A)(D) performs comparable and sometimes even better than SOPPA, and therefore when calculating SSCCs it should be considered as an alternative to SOPPA. Furthermore, it was investigated whether a CCSD(T) or MP2 geometry optimization was optimal for a SOPPA and a HRP(A)(D) SSCCs calculation for 8 smaller molecules. CCSD(T) is the optimal geometry optimization for the SOPPA calculation, and MP2 was optimal for the HRP(A)(D) SSCC calculations.

Keywords: HRP(A)(D), SOPPA, NMR spin-spin coupling constants

I. INTRODUCTION

For the calculation of molecular properties, like NMR spin-spin coupling constants (SSCCs), several methods are available such as CC3¹⁻⁴, CCSD⁵⁻⁹, and SOPPA¹⁰⁻¹⁴ that in general produce results in good agreement with experimental values. However, these methods are computationally costly for larger molecules, and therefore cheaper alternatives are wanted.

The polarization propagator methods, doubles-corrected random-phase approximation (RPA(D)) and the doubles-corrected higher random-phase approximation (HRP(A)(D)),^{15,16} are both approximations of the second-order polarization propagator approximation (SOPPA). Both RPA(D) and HRP(A)(D) lower the computational cost but at the same time slightly lower the accuracy compared to SOPPA. HRP(A)(D), in which the most computationally expensive terms from the $\mathbf{B}^{(2)}$ matrix have to be evaluated in every iteration, only lowers the cost with around 10%, however, the accuracy is comparable to SOPPA. RPA(D) on the other hand lowers the computationally cost by around 75%, however, the method has been found to be prone to have problems with triplet instabilities, which affect triplet properties such as the spin-spin coupling constant.^{16,17}

But how well do RPA(D) and HRP(A)(D) perform in the calculation of spin-spin coupling constants? So far it has not been tested extensively for SSCCs in contrast to polarizabilities.¹⁸⁻²⁰ The methods were implemented for SSCCs in 2018 by Schnack-Petersen et al.¹⁶ and their performance was tested on 20 smaller mostly inorganic molecules in comparison with CCSD results. In their work, SOPPA performs better than HRP(A)(D), which performs better than RPA(D). But compared with HRP(A) and RPA both methods perform significantly better. RPA(D) and HRP(A)(D) were then further studied in 2020 by Møller et al.¹⁷ for carbon-carbon SSCCs on 39 saturated cycloalkanes. The RPA(D) and HRP(A)(D) SSCCs were compared with the results of SOPPA SSCC calculations, where HRP(A)(D) performed better than RPA(D). In the article, the computational cost was checked compared to SOPPA. For these molecules, the cost of the

HRP(A)(D) SSCC calculations was reduced between 15 and 65 percent, and for RPA(D) the cost of running the SSCC calculations was reduced between 60 to 85 percent. In a recent study,²¹ the HRP(A)(D) method was combined with the polarizable continuum model for treating the effect of solvents and SSCCs calculations in solution were performed with the HRP(A)(D) and SOPPA models for 20 molecules. In general, the HRP(A)(D) SSCCs were closer to the experimental values than the SOPPA SSCC in both the vacuum and the solvent calculation.

In this study, it has now been investigated how well the HRP(A)(D) and SOPPA methods perform for the calculation of SSCCs of 58 molecules. The 58 molecules consist of two diverse groups: "smaller molecules" (31 molecules), and "aromatic and fluoro-aromatic molecules" (27 molecules). Some of the smaller molecules are taken from the set of molecules for which Faber et al.⁴ had calculated SSCCs at the CCSD and even CC3 level of theory at geometries optimized at the CCSD(T) level of theory. In the present study, SSCCs were then calculated with SOPPA and HRP(A)(D) at these CCSD(T) optimized geometries, which are then compared to the CCSD and CC3 results by Faber et al.⁴ Since the SSCCs for 7 of these molecules (CO, HCCH, FCCH, FCCF, F₂CO, H₂CO, and HCN) had been calculated for two different optimized geometries (CCSD(T) and MP2), it is furthermore possible to discuss, which geometry optimization leads to better results in the calculation of SSCCs.

II. COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

The spin-spin coupling constants have been divided into three different groups. Set I and set II both consist of smaller molecules, where the geometries have been calculated with two different methods, CCSD(T) and MP2, respectively. Set III consists of aromatic and fluoro-aromatic compounds.

RPA(D) calculations have been carried out for all the molecules and the results can be found in supplementary materials. However, due to frequent triplet instabilities the results will not be commented on further in this paper. Only a few of

the molecules did not show triplet instabilities, mostly consisting of organic molecules containing only single bonds.

Even though adding solvation to the calculation affects the SSCCs,^{21–23} a solvation model was not used in the present study, as the solvation effects were previously found to almost equal in SOPPA and HRP(A) calculations and thus cancel out in a comparison between the two methods. Similarly, vibrational contributions have not been included in this study, even though the molecular vibrations affect the SSCCs, which several authors have investigated.^{24–32}

Set I contains the 7 molecules CO, HCCH, FCCH, FCCF, F₂CO, H₂CO, and HCN taken from the previous CC3 and CCSDT study by Faber et al.⁴ The geometry optimizations were previously performed at the CCSD(T) level using the aug-cc-pCVQZ basis set except for the FCCF molecule, where the cc-pCVQZ basis set was used.⁴ The spin-spin coupling constants were calculated with the Dalton program.³³ For every molecule, the SSCCs were calculated with the SOPPA, HRP(A) and RPA(D) methods using the aug-cc-J-pVTZ³⁴ basis set.

Set II consists of 31 smaller molecules (see Figure 1). The geometry optimizations were carried out in this study with the Gaussian program³⁵ at the MP2 level^{36,37} using the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set.^{38,39} The calculations of the SSCCs were performed in the same way as for set I.




Figure 1. The 31 smaller molecules of set II

Set III consists of 27 aromatic and fluoro-aromatic compounds (see Figure 2). The geometry optimization and SSCCs calculations were carried out in this study in the same way as for set II.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

When calculating spin-spin coupling constants, one obtains results for all the components of the coupling tensor. However in this study, only the isotropic couplings are reported, since experimental values are mostly used as reference values. Some of the reported SSCCs are the mean value of several couplings that experimentally would be found to be indistinguishable due to e.g. rotation.




Figure 2. The 27 aromatic and fluoro-aromatic compounds of set III

A statistical analysis has been performed for every group, which includes the mean absolute deviation (mean abs dev), the mean deviation (mean dev), the standard deviation (std dev), and the maximum absolute deviation (max abs dev).

A. Set I

For the 7 molecules of set I: CO, HCCH, FCCH, FCCF, F₂CO, H₂CO, and HCN, Faber et al.⁴ have calculated spin-spin coupling constants at the CC3 and CCSD levels, which will be used as reference values. All the SOPPA and HRP(A) calculated SSCCs together with Faber et al.⁴ CC3 and CCSD values are presented in Table I. For some of the couplings, it was possible to find experimental values, which are included in the Table as well.

1. Experimental values as reference

For the 7 molecules, we are aware of experimental values for 14 SSCCs. A statistic analysis has been performed with the experimental values as the reference. The results from the statistical analyses are presented in Figure 3 and Table II.

From Figure 3 and Table II, it can be seen that all the methods mostly overestimate the experimental SSCCs and especially HRP(A) that only underestimates 2 SSCCs, while SOPPA, CCSD and CC3 underestimate 4, 5, and 5 SSCCs, respectively. By looking at the consistency (std dev) and accuracy (mean abs dev) of the calculated SSCCs, SOPPA seems to perform better than all the other methods followed by CC3. HRP(A) performs quite well, it manages to perform closely to CC3 and CCSD. The coupling constant deviating mostly from experimental values are for CC3, CCSD, and HRP(A) the ¹J_{CF} (FCCF) coupling, and for SOPPA it is the ¹J_{CC} (HCCH) coupling.

Even though CC3 is the most precise and expensive method of all the methods used in the present study, employing it in equilibrium geometry gas phase calculations results not necessarily in the best agreement with experimental SSCCs as al-

Table I. All the calculated SSCCs (in Hz) for set I including known experimental values.

	Coupling	CC3 ^a	CCSD ^a	SOPPA	HRPA(D)	exp ^b
CO	¹ J _{CO}	14.62	15.07	20.26	18.40	16.4 ⁴⁰
HCCH	¹ J _{CH}	240.44	243.83	261.67	260.45	248.29 ⁴¹
	¹ J _{CC}	180.96	187.61	190.66	188.56	169.82 ⁴¹
	³ J _{HH}	9.95	10.27	11.89	11.20	9.47 ⁴¹
	² J _{CH}	53.07	51.55	52.08	50.86	49.26 ⁴¹
FCCH	³ J _{FF}	14.45	12.72	11.61	10.28	21 ⁴²
	¹ J _{CF}	-277.68	-280.42	-305.21	-266.28	
	² J _{CF}	25.56	26.74	22.31	23.49	
	¹ J _{CC}	268.11	272.31	277.77	274.67	
	² J _{CH}	68.53	66.84	67.85	65.63	
	¹ J _{CH}	270.08	272.55	292.06	289.69	
FCCF	³ J _{FF}	2.56	7.26	-11.94	8.36	2.1 ⁴³
	¹ J _{CF}	-256.58	-260.83	-289.18	-248.55	(-287.3 ⁴³)
	² J _{CF}	45.54	45.14	39.85	38.24	28.7 ⁴⁴
	¹ J _{CC}	401.65	407.83	417.66	410.89	
F ₂ CO	¹ J _{CF}	-294.39	-292.43	-320.82	-279.61	(-308 ⁴⁵)
	² J _{FF}	-100.20	-105.05	-120.56	-85.35	
	² J _{OF}	39.78	38.65	41.81	32.38	
	¹ J _{CO}	12.08	12.32	18.90	12.50	
H ₂ CO	² J _{HH}	37.29	36.56	40.76	38.52	40.22 ⁴⁶
	² J _{OH}	-3.01	-2.82	-2.74	-3.08	
	¹ J _{CH}	167.89	169.12	178.42	178.38	
	¹ J _{CO}	26.98	27.18	32.34	25.49	
HCN	¹ J _{CH}	249.95	253.82	272.40	272.74	267.3 ⁴⁷
	¹ J _{C¹⁵N}	-18.19	-18.46	-15.30	-17.96	(-18.5 ⁴⁷)
	² J _{15NH}	-7.47	-7.56	-7.47	-8.31	(-8.7 ⁴⁸)

^a Calculation performed by Faber et al.⁴

^b Signs in parentheses are assumed.




Figure 3. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules in set I. The dots indicate the deviations of the individual couplings.

ready noted by Faber et al.⁴ This is both notable from the statistical analysis and when looking at every SSCC separately.

For 5 out of the 14 SSCCs, CC3 deviates more than 10 Hz from the experimental values, which are the coupling constants ¹J_{CC}(HCCH), ¹J_{CF}(FCCF), ²J_{CF}(FCCF), ¹J_{CF}(F₂CO), and ¹J_{CH}(HCN). For these (except ¹J_{CC}(HCCH)) either both SOPPA and HRP(A) or only SOPPA perform better than CC3.

Table II. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules in set I.

	CC3	CCSD	SOPPA	HRPA(D)
Count	14	14	14	14
Mean Abs Dev	8.21	8.30	7.34	9.86
Mean Dev	3.02	3.94	1.89	8.09
Std Dev	11.47	10.79	9.30	12.48
Max Abs Dev	30.72	26.47	20.84	38.75

For 4 out of 14 SSCCs, CC3 performs better than the other methods. The 4 coupling constants are ¹J_{CC}(HCCH), ³J_{HH}(HCCH), ³J_{FF}(FCCH) and ³J_{FF}(FCCF). For ¹J_{CC}(HCCH), all the methods overestimate the value with a deviation of 11.14 Hz for CC3 and deviations between 17.79 and 20.84 Hz for CCSD, HRP(A), and SOPPA. For 2 out of 14 SSCCs (¹J_{CH}(HCCH) and ¹J_{CN}(HCN)), CCSD performs best followed by CC3.

For the 4 SSCCs ³J_{FF}(FCCF), ¹J_{CF}(FCCF), ¹J_{CF}(F₂CO), and ²J_{HH}(H₂CO), the deviation from experimental values for SOPPA has the opposite signs than the other methods. For the ¹J_{CF}(FCCF) coupling, SOPPA performs much better than all the other methods in the present study, where SOPPA underestimates the value with 1.88 Hz and the other methods all overestimate it with 26 to 39 Hz.

For the 3 SSCCs ¹J_{CO}(CO), ¹J_{CH}(HCCH), and ¹J_{CH}(HCN), the deviation from experimental values for SOPPA and HRP(A) have the opposite signs than the ones for CC3 and CCSD, where SOPPA and HRP(A) overestimate and CC3 and CCSD underestimates the values. For ¹J_{CO}(CO), the absolute deviations from experimental values are within 3.86 Hz for all four methods.

For the ²J_{NH}(HCN) coupling, all the methods overestimate the value slightly with the deviations from experimental values lying within 0.84 Hz of each other with HRP(A) performing best with a deviation at 0.39 Hz.

When comparing SOPPA and HRP(A) to each other, 11 out of the 14 SSCCs are within 3 Hz of each other. The 3 coupling constants that differ more are ³J_{FF}(FCCF) (differ with 20.30 Hz), ¹J_{CF}(FCCF) (differ with 40.63 Hz), and ¹J_{CF}(F₂CO) (differ with 41.21 Hz). For these 3 coupling constants, SOPPA underestimates and HRP(A) overestimates the value.

The deviation from experimental values can be due to the calculation not including solvent effects and vibrational averaging. Therefore, it would make sense to try to use the CC3 values as references, since they should exhibit the same calculation error as with the other methods. This is investigated in the next section.

2. CC3 results as reference

For the 7 molecules, a total of 26 SSCCs have been calculated. A statistical analysis has been performed with the CC3 SSCCs as the reference. The results for the analyses are presented in Figure 4 and Table III.




Figure 4. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the CC3 values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules in set I. The dots indicated the deviations of the individual couplings.

Table III. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the CC3 values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules in set I.

	CCSD	SOPPA	HRPA(D)
Count	26	26	26
Mean Abs Dev	2.20	10.57	7.17
Mean Dev	0.71	0.20	4.99
Std Dev	2.84	14.31	8.29
Max Abs Dev	6.65	32.60	22.79

When using the CC3 values as references, CCSD does not surprisingly perform best with the lowest value of accuracy and consistency. Of SOPPA and HRP(A)D, HRP(A)D performs considerably better than SOPPA. The SSCCs which result in the largest deviation from CC3 are different for all the methods. For CCSD, the coupling constant $^1J_{CC}$ (HCCH) is overestimated with 6.65 Hz. For SOPPA, the coupling constant $^1J_{CF}$ (FCCF) is underestimated with 32.60 Hz. For HRP(A)D, the coupling constant $^1J_{CH}$ (HCN) is overestimated with 22.79 Hz.

For 8 out of 26 SSCCs, CCSD clearly performs better than both SOPPA and HRP(A)D with a difference between them being over 7 Hz and sometimes over 20 Hz. The coupling constants are $^1J_{CH}$ (HCCH), $^1J_{CF}$ (FCCH), $^1J_{CH}$ (FCCH), $^1J_{CF}$ (FCCF), $^1J_{CF}$ (F₂CO), $^2J_{FF}$ (F₂CO), $^1J_{CH}$ (H₂CO), and $^1J_{CH}$ (HCN). For the coupling constant $^3J_{FF}$ (FCCF), CCSD performs clearly better than SOPPA which underestimates the value with 14.50 Hz, whereas HRP(A)D overestimates the values with 1.10 Hz more than the CCSD SSCC which overestimates it with 4.70 Hz.

For most of the SSCCs, CCSD is closer to the CC3 values than SOPPA and HRP(A)D are. However, there are a few SSCCs where either SOPPA or HRP(A)D perform slightly better. For the 2 out of 26 SSCCs, $^2J_{CH}$ (HCCH) and $^2J_{CH}$ (FCCH), the SOPPA value are closer to CC3, and for $^2J_{NH}$ (HCN) they are identical. For the 2 out of 26 SSCCs, $^2J_{OH}$ (H₂CO) and $^1J_{CN}$ (HCN), HRP(A)D performs closer to the CC3 value than the other methods. Even though SOPPA or HRP(A)D are performing better for these coupling 5 couplings, the CCSD SSCCs are within 1 Hz of the SOPPA/HRP(A)D SSCCs.

When comparing the SSCCs of SOPPA and HRP(A)D, 21 out of 26 SSCCs are within 10 Hz of each other. The 5 SS-

CCs that differ more are $^1J_{CF}$ for FCCH, FCCF, and F₂CO that differ by 38.93 Hz, 40.63 Hz, and 41.21 Hz respectively, $^3J_{FF}$ (FCCF) that differ by 20.30 Hz, and $^2J_{FF}$ (F₂CO) that differ by 35.21 Hz. For most of the SSCCs (17 out of 26), SOPPA and HRP(A)D perform within 5 Hz of each other.

For four coupling constants, the deviation from CC3 for SOPPA and HRP(A)D have opposite signs. For two of these coupling constants ($^1J_{CF}$ (F₂CO) and $^2J_{FF}$ (F₂CO)), SOPPA largely underestimates the values with 26.43 Hz and 20.36 Hz, respectively, whereas HRP(A)D overestimates the values with 14.78 Hz and 14.85 Hz, respectively. For the last two coupling constants ($^2J_{OF}$ (F₂CO) and $^1J_{CO}$ (H₂CO)), HRP(A)D underestimates the values with 7.40 Hz and 1.49 Hz, respectively, and SOPPA overestimates them with 2.03 Hz and 5.36 Hz. However, the difference between SOPPA and HRP(A)D for these two coupling constants are 9.43 Hz and 6.85 Hz, and therefore not considered abnormal.

CCSD performs better than SOPPA and HRP(A)D when CC3 SSCCs are used as the reference values, however, the method is also more expensive. HRP(A)D performs significantly better than SOPPA and would be an adequate option since it is cheaper.

3. Effects of the geometry optimization for set I

Several authors have previously investigated how different geometries used for SSCC calculations affect the values. Helgaker et al.⁴⁹ investigated (among other things) how the geometry affected the SSCCs calculation for o-benzyne, where the calculations were performed from an experimental geometry and an optimized geometry. The SSCCs with an optimized geometry were closer to the experimental values. Most recently, Giovanetti et al.⁵⁰ investigated how a mix in level of theory for the geometry optimization and in SSCCs calculation affected the $^1J_{FC}$ SSCCs. The results show that the SSCCs, where the same functional was used in both the geometry optimization and the SSCC calculation, performed most of the time more accurately. The conclusion of these studies is that using the same level of theory in both the geometry optimization and the SSCCs calculation decreases the triplet instabilities, and therefore results in more precise SSCCs.

In the present study, we have therefore investigated whether a CCSD(T) or a MP2 geometry optimization performs best for SOPPA and HRP(A)D SSCC calculation compared with experimental values. This is possible since the 7 molecules of set I (CO, HCCH, FCCH, FCCF, F₂CO, H₂CO, and HCN) are part of set II as well, and therefore the molecules have been optimized with both CCSD(T) and MP2. These SSCCs calculated for set I at both MP2 and CCSD(T) geometries are presented together in Table IV.

In general, the differences between the SSCCs of the two geometry optimization are not large and mostly they are within 3 Hz from each other, except for the three coupling constants $^3J_{FF}$ (FCCF) (differ 7.68 Hz for SOPPA and 4.32 Hz for HRP(A)D), $^1J_{CF}$ (FCCF) (differ 10.26 Hz for SOPPA and 9.12 Hz for HRP(A)D), and $^1J_{CF}$ (F₂CO) (differ 9.46 Hz for SOPPA and 8.35 Hz for HRP(A)D).

Table IV. Comparison of the calculated SSCCs of set I at both CCSD(T) and MP2 optimized geometries.

Molecule	Coupling	Geo-opt	SOPPA	HRPA(D)	exp ^a
CO	¹ J _{CO}	CCSD(T)	20.26	18.40	16.4 ⁴⁰
		MP2	23.05	21.08	
HCCH	¹ J _{CH}	CCSD(T)	261.67	260.45	248.29 ⁴¹
		MP2	263.96	262.67	
	¹ J _{CC}	CCSD(T)	190.66	188.56	169.82 ⁴¹
		MP2	190.00	187.80	
	³ J _{HH}	CCSD(T)	11.89	11.20	9.47 ⁴¹
		MP2	12.24	11.52	
² J _{CH}	CCSD(T)	52.08	50.86	49.26 ⁴¹	
	MP2	51.80	50.59		
FCCH	² J _{FH}	CCSD(T)	11.61	10.28	21 ⁴²
		MP2	11.61	10.31	
FCCF	³ J _{FF}	CCSD(T)	-11.94	8.36	2.1 ⁴³
		MP2	-19.62	4.04	
	¹ J _{CF}	CCSD(T)	-289.18	-248.55	(-)287.3 ⁴³
		MP2	-299.44	-257.67	
	² J _{CF}	CCSD(T)	39.85	38.24	28.7 ⁴⁴
		MP2	39.49	37.64	
F ₂ CO	¹ J _{CF}	CCSD(T)	-320.82	-279.61	(-)308 ⁴⁵
		MP2	-330.28	-287.96	
H ₂ CO	² J _{HH}	CCSD(T)	40.76	38.52	40.22 ⁴⁶
		MP2	39.93	37.74	
HCN	¹ J _{CH}	CCSD(T)	272.40	272.74	267.3 ⁴⁷
		MP2	273.39	273.70	
	¹ J _{CN}	CCSD(T)	-15.30	-17.96	(-)18.5 ⁴⁷
		MP2	-13.83	-16.50	
² J _{NH}	CCSD(T)	-7.47	-8.31	(-)8.7 ⁴⁸	
	MP2	-7.03	-7.89		

^a Signs in parentheses are assumed.

A statistical analysis has been performed with the experimental values used as references. The results of the analysis are presented for the SSCCs calculation with both geometry optimizations in Table V.

Table V. Statistical analysis of the deviation from the experimental values (in Hz) for the 7 molecules (14 SSCCs) in set I calculated at CCSD(T) and MP2 optimized geometries.

	Mean Abs Dev	Mean Dev	Std Dev	Max Abs Dev
SOPPA//CCSD(T)	7.33	1.89	9.29	20.84
SOPPA//MP2	9.77	0.37	12.22	22.28
HRPA(D)//CCSD(T)	9.85	8.08	12.48	38.75
HRPA(D)//MP2	8.81	6.93	10.05	29.63

For the 7 molecules, the two methods SOPPA and HRP(A)D prefer different methods for the geometry optimization. For the SOPPA SSCCs, the CCSD(T) geometry optimization results in slightly better values than the MP2 geometry optimization. For HRP(A)D, a MP2 geometry results in slightly better SSCCs than the CCSD(T) geometry.

It was expected that the CCSD(T) geometry optimization would perform best since it is a more precise and expensive method. In general, a CCSD(T) geometry would be closer to the experimental geometry. However, it does not neces-

sarily mean that it gives the best geometry for the calculation of SSCCs, which is the case for the SSCCs calculated with HRP(A)D in the present study. Likewise, an optimized geometry performed best in the DFT study of Helgaker et al.⁴⁹ compared to an experimental geometry.

B. Set II: Smaller molecules

For the 31 molecules of set II, 72 different spin-spin coupling constants have been calculated with the methods SOPPA and HRP(A)D. All the SSCCs, including the experimental values, can be found in Table VI.

Table VI: The calculated SSCCs in set II including the experimental values given in Hz.

Molecule	SSCC	SOPPA	HRPA(D)	exp ^a
CO	¹ J _{CO}	23.05	21.08	16.4 ⁴⁰
H ₂	¹ J _{HH}	286.67	286.54	279.73 ^{b,51,52}
N ₂	¹ J _{14N15N}	3.81	3.33	1.8 ⁵³
N ₃ H	¹ J _{15N215N3}	-17.39	-14.52	(-)13.95 ⁵⁴
	¹ J _{15N115N2}	-10.60	-7.77	(-)7.2 ⁵⁴
	¹ J _{15NH}	-69.20	-72.45	-70.2 ⁵⁴
HCCH	¹ J _{CH}	263.96	262.67	248.29 ⁴¹
	¹ J _{CC}	190.00	187.80	169.82 ⁴¹
	³ J _{HH}	12.24	11.52	9.47 ⁴¹
	² J _{CH}	51.80	50.59	49.26 ⁴¹
FCCH	³ J _{FF}	11.61	10.31	21 ⁴²
FCCF	³ J _{FF}	-19.62	4.04	2.1 ⁴³
	¹ J _{CF}	-299.44	-257.67	(-)287.3 ⁴³
	² J _{CF}	39.49	37.64	28.7 ⁴⁴
F ₂ CO	¹ J _{CF}	-330.28	-287.96	(-)308 ⁴⁵
H ₂ CO	² J _{HH}	39.93	37.74	40.22 ⁴⁶
HCN	¹ J _{CH}	273.39	273.70	267.3 ⁴⁷
	¹ J _{C15N}	-13.83	-16.50	(-)18.5 ⁴⁷
	² J _{15NH}	-7.03	-7.89	(-)8.7 ⁴⁸
H ₃ CC≡N	¹ J _{CH}	136.35	136.01	136.27 ⁵⁵
	² J _{CH}	-11.88	-11.35	-9.74 ⁵⁵
	¹ J _{CC}	63.52	65.55	56.99 ⁵⁵
	¹ J _{C15N}	-12.73	-15.96	-17.55 ⁵⁵
	² J _{C15N}	3.61	2.51	2.81 ⁵⁵
	³ J _{15NH}	-1.74	-1.51	-1.70 ⁵⁵
H ₂ C=CH ₂	¹ J _{CC}	71.02	71.14	67.54 ⁴¹
	¹ J _{CH}	160.93	160.46	156.30 ⁴¹
	³ J _{HH} cis	12.74	12.13	11.62 ⁴¹
	³ J _{HH} trans	19.09	18.20	19.02 ⁴¹
F ₂ C=CF ₂	² J _{FF}	107.17	105.97	124 ⁵⁴
	³ J _{FF} cis	81.72	51.73	73.3 ⁵⁴
	³ J _{FF} trans	-117.33	-89.19	-114 ⁵⁴
F ₂ C=CH ₂	¹ J _{CF}	-301.28	-266.04	(-)287 ⁵⁶
	² J _{FF}	14.28	40.53	32.7 ⁵⁴
trans-FHC=CHF	³ J _{FF}	-139.49	-103.15	-132.7 ⁵⁴
cis-FHC=CHF	² J _{CF}	9.57	6.16	5.9 ⁵⁶
	³ J _{FF}	-14.42	-15.25	-18.7 ⁵⁴
trans-FNNF	¹ J _{15NF}	193.38	170.18	172.8 ⁵⁴
	² J _{15NF}	-58.93	-49.63	-62.8 ⁵⁴
cis-FNNF	¹ J _{15NF}	233.08	199.20	211.0 ⁵⁴
	² J _{15NF}	-13.37	-5.07	-25.4 ⁵⁴

Continued on next page

Table VI – Continued from previous page

Molecule	SSCC	SOPPA	HRPA(D)	exp ^a
F ₂ NNF ₂	¹ J _{15NF}	179.62	165.03	164 ⁵⁴
CF ₄	¹ J _{CF}	-272.51	-241.62	(-)259.2 ⁵⁶
F ₂ CNH	² J _{FF}	-69.29	-32.47	-54.6 ⁵⁴
H ₃ CC≡CH	¹ J _{CC}	73.73	74.37	67.4 ^{56,57}
	¹ J _{CC} (≡)	190.81	188.70	175.0 ⁵⁶
	² J _{CC}	12.50	12.48	11.8 ⁵⁷
	¹ J _{CH} (Me)	133.05	132.70	131.6 ⁵⁶
	¹ J _{CH} (CH)	263.14	261.70	248.1 ⁵⁶
H ₂ C=C=CH ₂	¹ J _{CH}	174.45	172.55	167.8 ⁵⁶
	¹ J _{CC}	104.95	104.72	98.7 ⁵⁶
H ₃ CCH ₃	¹ J _{CH}	126.37	126.41	125.19 ⁴¹
	¹ J _{CC}	36.25	36.89	34.56 ⁴¹
H ₂ C(CH ₃) ₂	¹ J _{CH} (Me)	125.76	125.79	124.4 ⁵⁶
	¹ J _{CH}	126.92	126.95	125.4 ⁵⁶
	¹ J _{CC}	36.61	37.30	34.6 ⁵⁶
HC(CH ₃) ₃	¹ J _{CH} (Me)	125.54	125.56	124.0 ⁵⁶
C(CH ₃) ₄	¹ J _{CH} (Me)	125.60	125.62	123.3 ⁵⁶
	¹ J _{CC}	37.37	38.17	36.9 ⁵⁷
NH ₂ (CH ₃)	¹ J _{15NH}	-66.66	-67.32	-64.5 ⁵⁴
	¹ J _{CH}	133.61	133.65	133 ⁵⁶
NH(CH ₃) ₂	¹ J _{15NH}	-69.34	-70.07	-67.0 ⁵⁴
N(CH ₃) ₃	¹ J _{CH}	135.91	135.80	133 ⁵⁶
	¹ J _{C¹⁴N}	11.25	12.38	10.57 ⁵⁸
H ₂ NCHO	¹ J _{CH}	193.66	192.96	193.11 ⁵⁸
	³ J _{HH}	0.79	0.88	2.28 ⁵⁹
	³ J _{HH}	12.73	12.30	12.92 ⁵⁹
	² J _{HH}	4.28	4.17	2.60 ⁵⁹
	¹ J _{15NH}	-94.68	-94.69	-87.80 ⁵⁹
	¹ J _{14NH}	67.50	67.50	63.23 ⁵⁸
	² J _{15NH}	-18.77	-17.09	-14.25 ⁵⁹
	² J _{14NH}	13.38	12.18	9.62 ⁵⁸

^a Signs in parentheses are assumed. ^b from ¹J_{HD} 42.94 Hz.

A statistical analysis has been performed with the experimental values as reference, the results of which are presented in Figure 5 and Table VII.




Figure 5. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for SOPPA and HRP(A)D and all molecules in set II. The dots indicated the deviations of the individual couplings.

From the analysis, it becomes clear that SOPPA performs in general slightly better than HRP(A)D. Both SOPPA and HRP(A)D mostly overestimate the values, which is notable in the mean deviation. The consistency (std dev) and the ac-

Table VII. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules in set II.

	SOPPA	HRP(A)D
Count	72	72
Mean Abs Dev	6.28	6.45
Mean Dev	1.27	3.91
Std Dev	8.82	9.20
Max Abs Dev	22.28	29.63

curacy (mean abs dev) for the two methods are close, but SOPPA performs also slightly better for these. The SSCCs with the largest deviation are ¹J_{CF}(F₂CO) for SOPPA and ¹J_{CF}(FCCF) for HRP(A)D.

By looking at the individual SSCCs, it notable that 55 out of 72 SSCCs deviate less than 10 Hz from the experimental values for both SOPPA and HRP(A)D. When the deviation limit is set to 5 Hz, 44 out of 72 SSCCs fall within this limit for SOPPA and 47 SSCCs of out 72 are within for HRP(A)D.

The data set contains the three simplest hydrocarbons with a C-C single, double and triple bond. We can therefore compare how well the methods perform when the bond changes from a single bond to a triple bond. The deviations from experimental values, (*J_{calc}* - *J_{exp}*), calculated for ethane, ethene, and ethyne are presented in Table VIII.

Table VIII. Deviation from experimental values (in Hz) for the SSCCs of ethane, ethene, and ethyne.

SSCC	Molecule	SOPPA	HRP(A)D
¹ J _{CC}	Ethyne	20.18	17.98
	Ethene	3.48	3.60
	Ethane	1.69	2.33
¹ J _{CH}	Ethyne	15.67	14.38
	Ethene	4.63	4.16
	Ethane	1.18	1.22
³ J _{HH}	Ethyne	2.77	2.05
	(trans) Ethene	0.07	-0.82
	(cis) Ethene	1.12	0.51
² J _{CH}	Ethyne	2.54	1.33

For these simple hydrocarbons, it is generally found that the deviations increase when going from a single bond to a triple bond for both methods. It is notable that SOPPA performs best for the coupling constants of ethane, HRP(A)D performs best for the coupling constants of ethyne, and for the coupling constants of ethene, they alternate to perform best.

It would be interesting to see, if this holds in general or whether this applies only for the simple hydrocarbons. Therefore in the following, all 31 molecules will be investigated. All the molecules have been divided into groups according to which bonds the molecule contains with the highest bond order counting. The statistical analyses is presented in Table IX.

For the 10 molecules only containing single bonds, HRP(A)D performs best. Both methods mostly overestimate the values of the SSCCs. In accuracy, the two methods are quite close with HRP(A)D being slightly better. In consistency, HRP(A)D performs considerably better than SOPPA. The coupling constants with the largest deviation

Table IX. Statistical analyses of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) of the molecules in set II, divided into groups of bond types.

	Single-bond		Double-bond		Triple-bond	
	SOPPA	HRPA(D)	SOPPA	HRPA(D)	SOPPA	HRPA(D)
Count	15	15	33	33	24	24
Mean Abs Dev	3.73	3.27	6.85	8.01	7.08	6.29
Mean Dev	1.36	2.49	-0.24	3.61	3.30	5.22
Std Dev	5.66	4.60	9.56	11.25	8.97	7.98
Max Abs Dev	15.62	17.58	22.28	29.55	21.72	29.63

from experimental values are $^1J_{NF}(F_2NNF_2)$ for SOPPA and $^1J_{CF}(CF_4)$ for HRP(A)D. 12 out of 15 SSCCs are within 3 Hz from the experimental values for both SOPPA and HRP(A)D. The outliers are the coupling constants $^1J_{HH}(H_2)$ and $^1J_{CF}(CF_4)$ for both methods, $^1J_{NF}(F_2NNF_2)$ for only SOPPA, and $^1J_{NH}(NH(CH_3)_2)$ for only HRP(A)D with the last one being within 5 Hz from experimental value. When comparing SOPPA and HRP(A)D for the individual SSCCs, the two methods perform closely to each other with 13 out of 15 SSCCs differing less than 1 Hz. The 2 SSCCs that differ more are $^1J_{NF}(F_2NNF_2)$ with a difference at 14.59 Hz and $^1J_{CF}(CF_4)$ with a difference at 30.89 Hz.

SOPPA performs best for the 33 coupling constants of the 13 molecules containing at least one double bond. SOPPA mostly underestimates the values whereas HRP(A)D mostly overestimates them. The SSCCs of SOPPA are more consistent and accurate than those of HRP(A)D. The coupling constants with the largest deviation from experimental values are $^1J_{CF}(F_2CO)$ for SOPPA and $^3J_{FF}(\text{trans-FHCCHF})$ for HRP(A)D.

For SOPPA, 30 out of 33 SSCCs are within 20 Hz from the experimental values, and 26 out of 33 SSCCs are within for HRP(A)D. The 3 SSCCs that deviate more than 20 Hz for SOPPA are $^1J_{CF}(F_2CO)$ (deviates -22.28 Hz), $^1J_{NF}(FNNF)$ for both cis and trans (deviate 22.08 Hz and 20.58 Hz, respectively). For HRP(A)D, 7 SSCCs deviate more than 20 Hz from experimental values, $^1J_{CF}$ for F_2CO and F_2CCH_2 (deviation of 20.04 Hz and 20.96 Hz, respectively), $^3J_{FF}$ for F_2CCF_2 for both cis and trans coupling, and trans-FHCCHF (deviation of 21.57 Hz, 24.81 Hz, and 29.55 Hz, respectively), $^2J_{NF}(\text{cis-FNNF})$ (deviation of 20.33 Hz), and $^2J_{FF}(F_2CNH)$ (deviates 22.13 Hz). 5 SSCCs for SOPPA deviate between 10 and 20 Hz from experimental values: $^2J_{FF}(F_2CCF_2)$ (deviates -16.83 Hz), $^1J_{CF}(F_2CCH_2)$ (deviates -14.28 Hz), $^2J_{FF}(F_2CCH_2)$ (deviates -18.42 Hz), $^2J_{NF}(\text{cis-FNNF})$ (deviates 12.03 Hz) and $^2J_{FF}(F_2CNH)$ (deviates -14.69 Hz). For HRP(A)D, 3 SSCCs fall within this range: $^2J_{FF}(F_2CCF_2)$ (deviates -18.03 Hz), $^2J_{NF}(\text{trans-FNNF})$ (deviates 13.17 Hz), and $^1J_{NF}(\text{cis-FNNF})$ (deviates -11.80 Hz). For the individual SSCCs, SOPPA and HRP(A)D perform similarly with 22 out of 33 SSCCs being within 4 Hz of each other. The coupling constants with a larger difference are $^1J_{CF}(F_2CO)$ (differ 42.32 Hz), $^3J_{FF}(F_2CCF_2)$ (differ 28.14 Hz and 29.99 Hz for trans and cis, respectively), $^1J_{CF}(F_2CCH_2)$ (differ 35.24 Hz), $^2J_{FF}(F_2CCH_2)$ (differ 26.25 Hz), $^3J_{FF}(\text{trans-FHCCHF})$ (differ 36.34 Hz), $^1J_{NF}(FNNF)$ (differ 23.20 Hz and 33.87 Hz for trans and cis, respectively), $^2J_{NF}(FNNF)$ (differ 9.29 Hz

and 8.30 Hz for trans and cis, respectively), and $^2J_{FF}(F_2CNH)$ (differ 36.82 Hz).

For the 24 coupling constant of the 8 molecules containing a triple bond, HRP(A)D performs best. HRP(A)D overestimates almost all the values, whereas SOPPA underestimates some of the values more. Both in consistency and accuracy HRP(A)D performs better than SOPPA. For SOPPA the coupling constant with the largest deviation from experimental values is $^3J_{FF}(FCCF)$ and for HRP(A)D it is $^1J_{CF}(FCCF)$. When checking the individual SSCCs, it is found that within a 10 Hz range from experimental values, SOPPA has 17 out of 24 SSCCs and HRP(A)D has 18 out of 24 SSCCs. The coupling constants which have a larger deviation are $^1J_{CH}(HCCH)$, $^1J_{CC}(HCCH)$, $^1J_{CF}(FCCF)$, $^1J_{CC(\equiv)}(H_3CCCH)$ and $^1J_{CC(CH)}(H_3CCCH)$ for both methods, $^3J_{FF}(FCCF)$ and $^2J_{CF}(FCCF)$ for only SOPPA, and $^3J_{FH}(FCCH)$ for only HRP(A)D. For 22 out of 24 SSCCs, SOPPA and HRP(A)D perform within 4 Hz of each other. The last two SSCCs are $^3J_{FF}(FCCF)$ and $^1J_{CF}(FCCF)$ with a difference of 23.66 Hz and 41.77 Hz, respectively.

C. Set III: Aromatic and fluoro-aromatic compounds

The 368 different spin-spin coupling constants of the 27 aromatic and fluoro-aromatic compounds have been calculated with the methods SOPPA and HRP(A)D. All the SSCCs including the experimental values^{54,56,57,60-74} can be found in Table S4 in supplementary materials.

A statistical analysis has been performed with the experimental values as the reference. The results are presented in Figure 6 and Table X. The one-bond coupling constants between carbon and fluorine ($^1J_{CF}$) are resulting in outliers, where SOPPA underestimates and HRP(A)D overestimates the values. The 25 $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants have a mean deviation at -11.29 Hz for SOPPA with deviations between -14.90 and -3.58, and for HRP(A)D the mean deviation is 18.30 Hz with deviations between 12.98 and 27.16. These coupling constants affect the statistical analysis and therefore a second analysis has been performed without them which can be found in Table X as well.

The two methods perform quite closely to each other both with and without the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants. When looking at all the SSCCs, SOPPA is performing slightly better than HRP(A)D. Both methods have low mean (abs.) Dev. with SOPPA having a slightly lower one. SOPPA has a better consistency than HRP(A)D, i.e. smaller Std. Dev.,




Figure 6. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules in set III. The dots indicated the deviations of the individual couplings.

Table X. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules in set III with and without the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants.

	All SSCCs		Without $^1J_{CF}$	
	SOPPA	HRP(A)	SOPPA	HRP(A)
Count	368	368	343	343
Mean Abs Dev	2.28	2.54	1.62	1.39
Mean Dev	-1.10	1.01	-0.36	-0.25
Std Dev	3.54	5.13	2.19	1.99
Max Abs Dev	14.90	27.16	7.01	9.10

which is not surprising since HRP(A) overestimates the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants more than SOPPA underestimates them. The SSCCs that deviate the most from experimental values are the $^1J_{CF}$ from the molecules 2,4,6-trifluoro-1,3,5-triazine and 3,4,5-trifluoropyridine for SOPPA and HRP(A), respectively. When the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants are ignored, both methods have an even smaller mean (abs) dev and Std. Dev. with HRP(A) performing slightly better.

Looking at the individual SSCCs, most of the SSCCs are within 5 Hz from the experimental values. For SOPPA, 331 out of 368 SSCCs are within 5 Hz for which 24 of the outliers are the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants. For HRP(A), 336 out of 368 SSCCs are within 5 Hz for which 25 of the outliers are the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants.

In the next sections, the 27 molecules have been divided into three groups: Aromatic (molecules without any fluorine), fluoro-aromatic (molecules with fluorine but no nitrogen), and fluoro-nitro-aromatic (molecules with both fluorine and nitrogen). For every group, a statistical analysis was performed with the experimental values used as references to see which type of method performs best for each type of molecule.

1. Aromatic

For the 7 aromatic molecules, furan, benzene, pyrrole, pyridine, pyrazine, 1,3,5-triazine, and 1,2,4,5-tetrazine, the statistical analysis is presented in Figure 7 and Table XI.

For the aromatic molecules, the two methods perform similarly well. HRP(A) performs slightly better in accuracy and




Figure 7. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules that do not contain fluorine in set III. The dots indicated the deviations of the individual couplings.

Table XI. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules that do not contain fluorine in set III.

	SOPPA	HRP(A)
Count	58	58
Mean Abs Dev	1.58	1.54
Mean Dev	0.74	0.51
Std Dev	2.14	2.17
Max Abs Dev	6.21	5.50

SOPPA performs slightly better in consistency with both being within 0.04 of each other, and therefore one would not be considered better than the other. However, since HRP(A) is less expensive than SOPPA, it would be the preferred choice. The largest deviation from experimental values originates from the same SSCC, the $^1J_{CH}$ from the molecule pyrrole.

For SOPPA, 54 out of 58 SSCCs are within 5 Hz from experimental values. The four which deviate more than 5 Hz, are all $^1J_{CH}$ coupling constants from the molecules furan (C2: 5.43 Hz), pyrrole (C2: 6.21 Hz, C3: 5.82 Hz) and pyridine (C2: 5.28 Hz). For HRP(A), 55 out of 58 SSCCs lie within 5 Hz from experimental values. The 3 outliers are two $^1J_{CH}$ coupling constants from pyrrole with deviations 5.50 Hz (C2) and 5.20 Hz (C3), and $^1J_{C2C3}$ coupling constant from pyridine with a deviation of 5.05 Hz.

By looking at the individual SSCCs, SOPPA and HRP(A) perform closely to each other with a difference not extending a few Hz (the largest difference is 2.77 Hz for $^3J_{CC}$ (pyridine)) and mostly within one Hz from each other (only 9 of the 58 SSCCs have a larger difference).

2. Fluoro-aromatic

For the 12 fluoro-aromatic molecules: fluorobenzene, 1,2-difluorobenzene, 1,3-difluorobenzene, 1,4-difluorobenzene, 1,2,3-trifluorobenzene, 1,2,4-trifluorobenzene, 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene, 1,2,3,4-tetrafluorobenzene, 1,2,3,5-tetrafluorobenzene, 1,2,4,5-tetra-fluorobenzene, 1,2,3,4,5-pentafluorobenzene, and hexafluorobenzene, the statistical

analysis is presented in Figure 8 and Table XII.




Figure 8. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules that do contain fluorine but no nitrogen in set III. The dots indicated the deviations of the individual couplings.

Table XII. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules that do contain fluorine but no nitrogen in set III with and without the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants.

	All SSCCs		Without $^1J_{CF}$	
	SOPPA	HRP(A)D	SOPPA	HRP(A)D
Count	288	288	270	270
Mean Abs Dev	2.29	2.32	1.63	1.33
Mean Dev	-1.30	0.66	-0.58	-0.44
Std Dev	3.49	4.65	2.15	1.86
Max Abs Dev	14.81	19.26	7.01	9.10

The parameters of the statistical analysis are close to each other for SOPPA and HRP(A)D both with and without $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants. For all the SSCCs, SOPPA performs slightly better with lower values in both mean (abs.) Dev. and Std. Dev. However, when excluding the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, HRP(A)D performs slightly better. Both methods have a tendency to mostly underestimate the values compared with the experimental values when excluding the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants. The largest deviations are different SSCCs for SOPPA and HRP(A)D. For all the SSCCs, the largest deviations are from the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants of the molecules 1,2,3,4,5-pentafluorobenzene and 1,4-difluorobenzene for SOPPA and HRP(A)D, respectively. Without the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, the largest deviation from experimental values are the coupling constants $^2J_{CC}$ (fluorobenzene) for SOPPA and $^3J_{CF}$ (1,2,3,4,5-pentafluorobenzene) for HRP(A)D.

When looking at a deviation for experimental values at 5 Hz, SOPPA has 261 out of 288 SSCCs and HRP(A)D has 266 out of 288 SSCCs within the range. 18 among the outliers are $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants for both methods meaning that SOPPA has 9 other outliers and HRP(A)D has 4 other outliers underestimating the values. The 9 outliers for SOPPA are of four different types, the $^2J_{C2C4}$ from the molecule fluorobenzene (deviates -7.01 Hz), $^4J_{FF}$ from the molecules 1,2,3,4-tetrafluorobenzene (F1F3:

-5.24 Hz), 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene (-5.44 Hz), 1,2,3,4,5-pentafluorobenzene (F1F3: -5.37 Hz, F1F5: -5.52 Hz, F2F4: -6.30 Hz), and hexafluorobenzene (-6.58 Hz), $^3J_{C1F5}$ and $^4J_{C1F4}$ from the molecule 1,2,3,4,5-pentafluorobenzene (-5.06 Hz and -5.80 Hz, respectively). For HRP(A)D the outliers are $^2J_{C2C4}$ from fluorobenzene (deviates -6.28 Hz), $^5J_{FF}$ from 1,4-difluorobenzene and 1,2,4-trifluorobenzene (deviate -7.22 Hz and -5.88 Hz, respectively), and $^3J_{C1F5}$ from 1,2,3,4,5-pentafluorobenzene (deviates -9.10 Hz).

The 18 $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants for the fluoro-aromatics have a mean deviation from experimental values for SOPPA of -12.08 Hz with individual deviations between -14.81 Hz and -9.61 Hz and for HRP(A)D the mean deviation of the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants is 17.19 Hz for a range of values from 14.35 Hz to 19.26 Hz. Earlier the mean deviations for all 25 $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants were calculated, comparing them to the 18 $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants in this set of molecules, the values are lower for both SOPPA and HRP(A)D which means that for the fluoro-aromatic, SOPPA underestimates the $^1J_{CF}$ SSCCs more and HRP(A)D overestimated the $^1J_{CF}$ SSCCs less.

For the individual SSCCs, SOPPA and HRP(A)D perform closely to each other except for 18 $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, where the mean difference is 29.27 Hz with differences between 27.93 Hz and 30.24 Hz. When excluding the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, only 10 SSCCs for SOPPA and HRP(A)D differ by more than 5 Hz from each other, which are some of the long-range couplings between two fluorine atoms ($^4J_{FF}$ and $^5J_{FF}$). The largest difference is 9.06 Hz for $^4J_{FF}$ from hexafluorobenzene. 58 out of 270 SSCCs have a larger than 2 Hz difference between the SOPPA and HRP(A)D calculation (which includes the 10 SSCCs above a difference at 5 Hz).

3. Fluoro-nitro-aromatic

For the 8 fluoro-nitro-aromatic molecules: 2-fluoropyridine, 3-fluoropyridine, 4-fluoropyridine, 2,6-difluoropyridine, 3,6-difluoropyridazine, 2,4,6-trifluoropyridine, 3,4,5-trifluoro-pyridine, and 2,4,6-trifluoro-1,3,5-triazine, the statistical analysis is presented in Figure 9 and Table XIII.




Figure 9. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules that do contain both fluorine and nitrogen in set III. The dots indicated the deviations of the individual couplings.

Table XIII. Statistical analysis of the deviations from the experimental values (in Hz) for all methods and all molecules that do contain both fluorine and nitrogen in set III with and without the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants.

	All SSCCs		Without $^1J_{CF}$	
	SOPPA	HRPA(D)	SOPPA	HRPA(D)
Count	22	22	15	15
Mean Abs Dev	3.99	7.99	1.53	1.85
Mean Dev	-3.40	6.97	-0.66	0.34
Std Dev	4.75	10.37	1.62	2.55
Max Abs Dev	14.90	27.16	3.55	4.82

When examining all the SSCCs, SOPPA performs significantly better than HRP(A) which is notable in the accuracy (mean (abs) dev) and the consistency (std dev) where the values for SOPPA are almost half of the values of HRP(A). SOPPA generally underestimates the SSCCs, while HRP(A) generally overestimates them. The largest deviations from experimental values are the same as for all 368 SSCCs, the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants from the molecules 2,4,6-trifluoro-1,3,5-triazine and 3,4,5-trifluoropyridine for SOPPA and HRP(A), respectively.

When not considering the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, SOPPA performs slightly better than HRP(A) in accuracy, whereas for consistency SOPPA performs noticeably better than HRP(A), however, it should be noted that the values both are in the lower end. The largest deviation from experimental values is the same coupling constant for both methods, the $^4J_{F_2F_4}$ from the molecule 2,4,6-trifluoropyridine.

Looking at the individual SSCCs, SOPPA has 14 out of 22 SSCCs within 3 Hz deviation from experimental values, whereas HRP(A) has 11 out of 22 SSCCs. Of these outliers, 7 arise from the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, which means when excluding the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, SOPPA has one SSCC and HRP(A) has four SSCCs that deviate more than 3 Hz. The outlier for SOPPA is the $^4J_{F_2F_4}$ coupling constant from 2,4,6-trifluoropyridine (deviates -3.55 Hz). The four outliers for HRP(A) are the $^2J_{NF}$ coupling constant from 2-fluoropyridine (deviates 4.67 Hz), the three $^4J_{FF}$ from the molecules 2,6-difluoropyridine (4.47 Hz) and 2,4,6-trifluoropyridine (F2F6: 4.63 Hz, F2F4: -4.82 Hz).

The mean deviation from experimental values for the 7 $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants for the fluoro-nitro-aromatics is for SOPPA -9.27 Hz with values between -14.90 Hz and -3.58 Hz and for HRP(A) it is 21.17 Hz with values between 12.98 Hz and 27.16 Hz. When comparing the mean deviation for the 7 $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants for the fluoro-nitro-aromatics to the 25 $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, the values for SOPPA and HRP(A) increase, meaning that SOPPA underestimates the values less and HRP(A) overestimates the values more.

For the individual SSCCs the difference between SOPPA and HRP(A) are not large. For the 7 $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants the mean difference is 30.43 with differences between 27.71 and 33.27. Without the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, for 7 out of 15 SSCCs the SOPPA and HRP(A) values differ by more than 2 Hz from each other, and for 2 SSCCs by more than 5 Hz: $^4J_{FF}$ in 2,6-difluoropyridine and 2,4,6-trifluoropyridine.

For the fluoro-nitro-aromatics, SOPPA would be the pre-

ferred method if the calculation includes the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constant, whereas if the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constant is not considered, both SOPPA and HRP(A) would be adequate methods with SOPPA performing slightly better and HRP(A) being a cheaper method.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study aimed to investigate how well the method HRP(A) performs for spin-spin coupling constants for smaller molecules, aromatic and fluoro-aromatic compounds compared with SOPPA in comparison to experimental data. Typical, the two methods perform closely to each other and alternate to perform best.

SSCC calculations were performed on three sets of molecules for both SOPPA and HRP(A). For set I (7 smaller molecules), two different values were used as references in the statistical analysis: experimental values and calculated CC3 values. SOPPA was closest to the experimental values and even performed better than CC3 and CCSD. HRP(A) performed closely to CC3 and CCSD. CCSD was closest to the CC3 values. Of SOPPA and HRP(A), HRP(A) performed better.

For set II (31 smaller molecules), SOPPA and HRP(A) perform closely with SOPPA performing slightly better when compared to the experimental values. When dividing the set, it was found that for molecules only containing single bonds and molecules having one triple bond, HRP(A) performs slightly better than SOPPA. However, for molecules containing double bond(s), SOPPA performs better than HRP(A).

For set III (27 aromatic and fluoro-aromatic compounds), one type of coupling constant accounted for the largest outliers, the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants. For this coupling constant, SOPPA underestimated less than HRP(A) overestimated the value compared to the experimental values. When excluding the $^1J_{CF}$ coupling constants, HRP(A) overall performs slightly better than SOPPA. Dividing this set into aromatics, fluoro-aromatics, and fluoro-nitro-aromatics, the methods alternate in performing best. For the aromatics, both methods perform similarly well. For the fluoro-aromatics, HRP(A) performs slightly better than SOPPA. For the fluoro-nitro-aromatics, SOPPA performs better than HRP(A).

HRP(A) is an approximation to SOPPA, however, it performs comparable and sometimes better, and with it being a computationally less expensive method, it should be considered when calculating spin-spin coupling constants.

In this study, it was further investigated which geometry optimization (CCSD(T) vs MP2) resulted in the best SSCCs compared with experimental values. For SOPPA, the more precise calculated SSCCs were obtained with a CCSD(T) geometry optimization. For HRP(A), the MP2 geometry optimization resulted in spin-spin coupling constants that are closer to the experimental values.

REFERENCES

- ¹A. A. Auer and J. Gauss, "Triple excitation effects in coupled-cluster calculations of indirect spin-spin coupling constants," *J. Chem. Phys.* **115**, 1619–1622 (2001).
- ²A. A. Auer, J. Gauss, and M. Pecul, "Full configuration-interaction and coupled-cluster calculations of the indirect spin-spin coupling constant of BH," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **368**, 172–176 (2003).
- ³A. A. Auer and J. Gauss, "Orbital instabilities and spin-symmetry breaking in coupled-cluster calculations of indirect nuclear spin-spin coupling constants," *Chem. Phys.* **356**, 7–13 (2009), moving *Frontiers in Quantum Chemistry*.
- ⁴R. Faber, S. P. A. Sauer, and J. Gauss, "Importance of Triples Contributions to NMR Spin-Spin Coupling Constants Computed at the CC3 and CCSDT Levels," *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **13**, 696–709 (2017).
- ⁵H. Sekino and R. J. Bartlett, "Nuclear spin-spin coupling constants evaluated using many body methods," *J. Chem. Phys.* **85**, 3945–3949 (1986).
- ⁶S. A. Perera, H. Sekino, and R. J. Bartlett, "Coupled-cluster calculations of indirect nuclear coupling constants: The importance of non-Fermi contact contributions," *J. Chem. Phys.* **101**, 2186–2191 (1994).
- ⁷S. A. Perera, M. Nooijen, and R. J. Bartlett, "Electron correlation effects on the theoretical calculation of nuclear magnetic resonance spin-spin coupling constants," *J. Chem. Phys.* **104**, 3290–3305 (1996).
- ⁸M. Nooijen, S. A. Perera, and R. J. Bartlett, "Partitioned equation-of-motion coupled cluster approach to indirect nuclear spin-spin coupling constants," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **266**, 456–464 (1997).
- ⁹A. Perera, "What made possible the accurate calculations of NMR spin-spin coupling constants?" *Mol. Phys.* **108**, 3017–3025 (2010).
- ¹⁰J. Geertsen and J. Oddershede, "Second order polarization propagator calculations of indirect nuclear spin spin coupling constants in the water molecule," *Chem. Phys.* **90**, 301–311 (1984).
- ¹¹M. J. Packer, E. K. Dalskov, T. Enevoldsen, H. J. A. Jensen, and J. Oddershede, "A new implementation of the second-order polarization propagator approximation (SOPPA): The excitation spectra of benzene and naphthalene," *J. Chem. Phys.* **105**, 5886–5900 (1996).
- ¹²T. Enevoldsen, J. Oddershede, and S. Sauer, "Correlated Calculations of Indirect Nuclear Spin-Spin Coupling Constants using Second Order Polarization Propagator Approximations: SOPPA and SOPPA(CCSD)," *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **100**, 275–284 (1998).
- ¹³K. L. Bak, H. Koch, J. Oddershede, O. Christiansen, and S. P. A. Sauer, "Atomic integral driven second order polarization propagator calculations of the excitation spectra of naphthalene and anthracene," *J. Chem. Phys.* **112**, 4173–4185 (2000).
- ¹⁴A. K. Schnack-Petersen, M. Simmermacher, E. Fasshauer, H. J. A. Jensen, and S. P. A. Sauer, "The Second-Order-Polarization-Propagator-Approximation (SOPPA) in a four-component spinor basis," *J. Chem. Phys.* **152** (2020), 10.1063/5.0002389.
- ¹⁵O. Christiansen, K. L. Bak, H. Koch, and S. P. A. Sauer, "A second-order doubles correction to excitation energies in the random-phase approximation," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **284**, 47–55 (1998).
- ¹⁶A. K. Schnack-Petersen, P. A. B. Haase, R. Faber, P. F. Provasi, and S. P. A. Sauer, "RPA(D) and HRP(A)D: Two new models for calculations of NMR indirect nuclear spin-spin coupling constants," *J. Comput. Chem.* **39**, 2647–2666 (2018).
- ¹⁷C. H. S. Møller, A. K. Schnack-Petersen, and S. P. A. Sauer, "RPA(D) and HRP(A)D: calculation of carbon-carbon spin-spin coupling constants for saturated cycloalkanes," *Mol. Phys.* **118** (2020).
- ¹⁸M. W. Jørgensen and S. P. A. Sauer, "Benchmarking doubles-corrected random-phase approximation methods for frequency dependent polarizabilities: Aromatic molecules calculated at the RPA, HRP(A), RPA(D), HRP(A)D, and SOPPA levels," *J. Chem. Phys.* **152**, 234101 (2020).
- ¹⁹M. W. Jørgensen and S. P. A. Sauer, "Benchmarking anisotropic polarizabilities for 14 (hetero)-aromatic molecules at RPA, RPA(D), HRP(A), HRP(A)D, SOPPA, SOPPA(CC2), SOPPA(CCSD), CC2, CCSD and CC3 levels," *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **121**, 1–11 (2021).
- ²⁰N. Beizaei and S. P. A. Sauer, "Benchmarking Correlated Methods for Static and Dynamic Polarizabilities: The T145 Data Set Evaluated with RPA, RPA(D), HRP(A), HRP(A)D, SOPPA, SOPPA(CC2), SOPPA(CCSD), CC2, and CCSD," *J. Phys. Chem. A* **125**, 3785–3792 (2021).
- ²¹L. M. Jessen, P. Reinholdt, J. Kongsted, and S. P. A. Sauer, "The Importance of Solvent Effects in Calculations of NMR Coupling Constants at the Doubles Corrected Higher Random-Phase Approximation," *Magnetochemistry* **9** (2023), 10.3390/magnetochemistry9040102.
- ²²K. Ruud, L. Frediani, R. Cammi, and B. Mennucci, "Solvent effects on the indirect spin-spin coupling constants of benzene: The dft-pcm approach," *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **4**, 119–134 (2003).
- ²³A. Møgelhøj, K. Aidas, K. V. Mikkelsen, S. P. A. Sauer, and J. Kongsted, "Prediction of spin-spin coupling constants in solution based on combined density functional theory/molecular mechanics," *J. Chem. Phys.* **130**, 134508 (2009).
- ²⁴P. Solomon and J. M. Schulman, "The effects of vibrational averaging on the calculated nuclear spin-spin coupling constants of ammonia," *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **99**, 7776–7779 (1977).
- ²⁵T. A. Ruden, O. B. Lutnæs, T. Helgaker, and K. Ruud, "Vibrational corrections to indirect nuclear spin-spin coupling constants calculated by density-functional theory," *J. Chem. Phys.* **118**, 9572–9581 (2003).
- ²⁶T. A. Ruden, T. Helgaker, and M. Jaszuński, "The NMR indirect nuclear spin-spin coupling constants for some small rigid hydrocarbons: molecular equilibrium values and vibrational corrections," *Chem. Phys.* **296**, 53–62 (2004).
- ²⁷T. A. Ruden and K. Ruud, "Ro-Vibrational Corrections to NMR Parameters," in *Calculation of NMR and EPR Parameters. Theory and Applications*, edited by M. Kaupp, V. G. Malkin, and M. Bühl (Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2004) Chap. 10, pp. 153–173.
- ²⁸M. Dračinský, J. Kaminský, and P. Bouř, "Relative importance of first and second derivatives of nuclear magnetic resonance chemical shifts and spin-spin coupling constants for vibrational averaging," *J. Chem. Phys.* **130**, 094106 (2009).
- ²⁹K. Sneskov and J. F. Stanton, "Effects of vibrational averaging on coupled cluster calculations of spin-spin coupling constants for hydrocarbons," *Mol. Phys.* **110**, 2321–2327 (2012).
- ³⁰R. Faber and S. P. A. Sauer, "SOPPA and CCSD vibrational corrections to NMR indirect spin-spin coupling constants of small hydrocarbons," *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1702**, 090035 (2015).
- ³¹R. Faber, J. Kaminsky, and S. P. A. Sauer, "Rovibrational and temperature effects in theoretical studies of NMR parameters," in *Gas Phase NMR*, edited by K. Jackowski and M. Jaszunski (Royal Society of Chemistry, London, 2016) Chap. 7, pp. 218–266.
- ³²R. Gleeson, P. A. Aggelund, F. C. Østergaard, K. F. Schaltz, and S. P. A. Sauer, "Exploring Alternate Methods to High-Level Vibrational Correction Calculations of NMR Spin-Spin Coupling Constants," *ChemRxiv* (2023), arXiv:chemrxiv-2023-jj5jl [10.26434].
- ³³K. Aidas, C. Angeli, K. L. Bak, V. Bakken, L. Boman, O. Christiansen, R. Cimbriglia, S. Coriani, P. Dahle, E. K. Dalskov, U. Ekstrøm, T. Enevoldsen, J. J. Eriksen, P. Ettenhuber, B. Fernandez, L. Ferrighi, H. Fliegl, L. Frediani, K. Hald, A. Halkier, C. Hättig, H. Heiberg, T. Helgaker, A. C. Hennum, H. Hettema, S. Høst, I.-M. Høyvik, M. F. Iozzi, B. Jansik, H. J. A. Jensen, D. Jonsson, P. Jørgensen, J. Kauczor, S. Kirpekar, T. Kjergaard, W. Klopper, S. Knecht, R. Kobayashi, H. Koch, J. Kongsted, A. Krapp, K. Kristensen, A. Ligabue, O. B. Lutnæs, J. I. Melo, K. V. Mikkelsen, R. H. Myhre, C. Neiss, C. B. Nielsen, P. Norman, J. Olsen, J. M. H. Olsen, A. Osted, M. J. Packer, F. Pawłowski, T. B. Pedersen, P. F. Provasi, S. Reine, Z. Rinkevicius, T. A. Ruden, K. Ruud, V. Rybkin, P. Salek, C. C. M. Samson, A. Sánchez de Merás, T. Saue, S. P. A. Sauer, B. Schimmelpfennig, K. Sneskov, A. H. Steindal, K. O. Sylvester-Hvid, P. R. Taylor, A. M. Teale, E. I. Tellgren, D. P. Tew, A. J. Thorvaldsen, L. Thøgersen, O. Vahtras, M. Watson, D. J. Wilson, M. Ziolkowski, and H. Ågren, "The DALTON quantum chemistry program system," *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **4**, 269–284 (2014).
- ³⁴U. Benedikt, A. A. Auer, and F. Jensen, "Optimization of augmentation functions for correlated calculations of spin-spin coupling constants and related properties," *J. Chem. Phys.* **129** (2008), 10.1063/1.2962973, 064111.
- ³⁵M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, X. Li, M. Caricato, A. V. Marenich, J. Bloino, B. G. Janesko, R. Gomperts, B. Mennucci, H. P. Hratchian, J. V. Ortiz, A. F. Izmaylov, J. L. Sonnenberg, D. Williams-Young, F. Ding, F. Lipparini, F. Egidi, J. Goings, B. Peng, A. Petrone, T. Henderson, D. Ranasinghe, V. G. Zakrzewski, J. Gao, N. Rega, G. Zheng, W. Liang, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao,

- H. Nakai, T. Vreven, K. Throssell, J. A. Montgomery, Jr., J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. J. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. N. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, T. A. Keith, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. P. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, J. Tomasi, M. Cossi, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, C. Adamo, R. Cammi, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K. Morokuma, O. Farkas, J. B. Foresman, and D. J. Fox, "Gaussian-16 Revision C.01," (2016), gaussian Inc. Wallingford CT.
- ³⁶C. Møller and M. S. Plesset, "Note on an Approximation Treatment for Many-Electron Systems," *Phys. Rev.* **46**, 618–622 (1934).
- ³⁷J. A. Pople, R. Krishnan, H. B. Schlegel, and J. S. Binkley, "Derivative studies in hartree-fock and møller-plesset theories," *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **16**, 225–241 (1979).
- ³⁸J. Dunning, T. H., "Gaussian basis sets for use in correlated molecular calculations. I. The atoms boron through neon and hydrogen," *J. Chem. Phys.* **90**, 1007–1023 (1989).
- ³⁹R. A. Kendall, J. Dunning, Thom H., and R. J. Harrison, "Electron affinities of the first-row atoms revisited. Systematic basis sets and wave functions," *J. Chem. Phys.* **96**, 6796–6806 (1992).
- ⁴⁰R. E. Wasylshen, J. O. Friedrich, S. Mooibroek, and J. B. Macdonald, "Isotope shifts and spin-spin coupling constants in the ¹³C and ¹⁷O NMR spectra of carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide," *Chem. Phys.* **83**, 548–551 (1985).
- ⁴¹J. Kaski, P. Lantto, J. Vaara, and J. Jokisaari, "Experimental and Theoretical ab Initio Study of the 13C-13C Spin-Spin Coupling and ¹H and ¹³C Shielding Tensors in Ethane, Ethene, and Ethyne," *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **120**, 3993–4005 (1998).
- ⁴²W. J. Middleton and W. H. Sharkey, "Fluoroacetylene," *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **81**, 803–804 (1959).
- ⁴³H. Bürger and S. Sommer, "Isolation, characterization and some properties of free difluoroethyne, FC≡CF," *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.*, 456–458 (1991).
- ⁴⁴J. E. Del Bene, P. F. Provasi, I. Alkorta, and J. Elguero, "Resolving an apparent discrepancy between theory and experiment: spin-spin coupling constants for FCCF," *Magn Reson Chem.* **46**, 1003–1006 (2008).
- ⁴⁵W. Gombler, "¹³C- und ¹⁹F-NMR-spektren von verbindungen des typs E=CXY (E = O, S, Se; X, Y = halogen, SCF₃)," *Spectrochim. Acta A Mol. Spectrosc.* **37**, 57–61 (1981).
- ⁴⁶B. L. Shapiro, R. M. Kopchik, and S. J. Ebersole, "Proton NMR Studies of CHDO and CH₂O," *J. Chem. Phys.* **39**, 3154–3155 (2004).
- ⁴⁷K. J. Friesen and R. E. Wasylshen, "Deuterium isotope effect on ¹J(¹⁵N, ¹³C) in hydrogen cyanide," *J. Magn. Reson.* (1969) **41**, 189–191 (1980).
- ⁴⁸G. Binsch and J. D. Roberts, "Nitrogen-15 magnetic resonance spectroscopy. Coupling constants in hydrogen cyanide," *J. Phys. Chem.* **72**, 4310–4311 (1968).
- ⁴⁹T. Helgaker, O. B. Lutnæs, and M. Jaszuński, "Density-Functional and Coupled-Cluster Singles-and-Doubles Calculations of the Nuclear Shielding and Indirect Nuclear Spin-Spin Coupling Constants of o-Benzene," *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **3**, 86–94 (2007).
- ⁵⁰M. Giovanetti, L. F. F. Bitencourt, R. Cormanich, and S. P. A. Sauer, "On the Unexpected Accuracy of the M06L Functional in the Calculation of ¹J_{FC} Spin-Spin Coupling Constants," *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **17**, 7712–7723 (2021).
- ⁵¹J. R. Beckett and H. Y. Carr, "NMR measurement of the nuclear shielding isotope shift in molecular hydrogen," *Phys. Rev. A* **24**, 144–148 (1981).
- ⁵²J. Oddershede, J. Geertsen, and G. E. Scuseria, "Nuclear spin-spin coupling constant of hydrogen molecule with deuterium (HD)," *J. Phys. Chem.* **92**, 3056–3059 (1988).
- ⁵³J. O. Friedrich and R. E. Wasylshen, "The nuclear shielding derivative and spin-spin coupling in nitrogen," *J. Chem. Phys.* **83**, 3707–3708 (1985).
- ⁵⁴S. Berger, S. Braun, and H. Kalinowski, *NMR spectroscopy of the non-metallic elements* (John Wiley & Sons, 1997) pp. 245–277, 386, 636, 646.
- ⁵⁵M. Wilczek, W. Koźmiński, and K. Jackowski, "¹⁵N, ¹³C and ¹H nuclear magnetic shielding and spin-spin coupling constants of 1-¹³C, ¹⁵N-enriched acetonitrile in gaseous mixtures with SF₆ and CO₂," *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **358**, 263–270 (2002).
- ⁵⁶H. Kalinowski, S. Berger, and S. Braun, *Carbon-13 NMR spectroscopy* (John Wiley & Sons, 1988) pp. 496–506, 549–585.
- ⁵⁷J. B. Stothers, *Carbon-13 NMR Spectroscopy: Organic Chemistry, A Series of Monographs*, Vol. 24 (Academic Press, 1972) pp. 370–373.
- ⁵⁸J. Vaara, J. Kaski, J. Jokisaari, and P. Diehl, "NMR Properties of Formamide: A First Principles and Experimental Study," *J. Phys. Chem. A* **101**, 5069–5081 (1997).
- ⁵⁹O. W. Sørensen, S. Scheibye, S.-O. Lawesson, and H. J. Jakobsen, "Proton polarization transfer in natural abundance ¹⁵N NMR studies of E- and Z-isomers of N-alkylformamides," *Org. Magn. Reson.* **16**, 322–324 (1981).
- ⁶⁰V. A. Roznyatovsky, N. M. Sergeev, and V. A. Chertkov, "¹³C, ¹³C coupling constants of isotopically perturbed molecular systems: Cyclohexane, benzene," *Magn. Reson. Chem.* **29**, 304–307 (1991).
- ⁶¹K. Kamińska-Trela, "One-Bond ¹³C-¹³C Spin-Spin Coupling Constants," (Academic Press, 1995) pp. 131–230.
- ⁶²K. Tori and T. Nakagawa, "Carbon-13 Proton Spin Coupling Constants in Heteroaromatic Molecules," *J. Phys. Chem.* **68**, 3163–3169 (1964).
- ⁶³V. Wray, L. Ernst, and E. Lustig, "The complete ¹³C ¹⁹F, and ¹H spectral analysis of the fluorobenzenes C₆H_nF_{6-n}. III. The remaining members of the series; INDO MO calculations of J_{FH}, J_{FF}, J_{CH}, and J_{CF}," *J. Magn. Reson.* (1969) **27**, 1–21 (1977).
- ⁶⁴C. D. Johnson, "5.01 - pyridines and their benzo derivatives: Structure," (Pergamon, Oxford, 1996) pp. 1–35.
- ⁶⁵M. H. Palmer, H. McNab, D. Reed, A. Pollacchi, I. C. Walker, M. F. Guest, and M. R. Siggel, "The molecular and electronic states of 1,2,4,5-tetrazine studied by VUV absorption, near-threshold electron energy-loss spectroscopy and ab initio multi-reference configuration interaction studies," *Chem. Phys.* **214**, 191–211 (1997).
- ⁶⁶L. Ernst, D. N. Lincoln, and L. Wray, "The complete ¹³C, ¹⁹F, and ¹H spectral analysis of the fluorobenzenes C₆H_nF_{6-n}. II. 1,2-Difluorobenzene. INDO MO calculations of J_{HH} in these fluorobenzenes and related molecules," *J. Magn. Reson.* (1969) **21**, 115–128 (1976).
- ⁶⁷L. Ernst, V. Wray, V. A. Chertkov, and N. M. Sergeev, "High-resolution proton-coupled ¹³C NMR spectra of monosubstituted benzenes. Theoretical and empirical correlations of J_{CH}," *J. Magn. Reson.* (1969) **25**, 123–139 (1977).
- ⁶⁸K. Kamińska-Trela, A. Dabrowski, and H. Januszewski, "Substituent effects on one-bond CC spin-spin coupling constants in aromatic compounds. Unusually small ¹J(CC) couplings in phenyllithium and phenylmagnesium bromide," *J. Mol. Struct.* **293**, 167–172 (1993).
- ⁶⁹R. J. Abraham, D. B. Macdonald, and E. S. Pepper, "The nuclear magnetic resonance spectra of fluorobenzenes. Part I. The analysis of the ABB'XX' and ABB'XX'R spectra of some 2-substituted 1,3-difluorobenzenes," *J. Chem. Soc. B*, 835–841 (1967).
- ⁷⁰R. J. Abraham and M. A. Cooper, "The nuclear magnetic resonance spectra of fluorobenzenes. Part III. o-Difluorobenzene and some 1-substituted 2,3-difluorobenzenes," *J. Chem. Soc. B*, 1094–1098 (1968).
- ⁷¹V. Wray and D. N. Lincoln, "The complete ¹³C, ¹⁹F and ¹H spectral analysis of the fluorobenzenes C₆H_nF_{6-n}. I. 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene," *J. Magn. Reson.* (1969) **18**, 374–382 (1975).
- ⁷²M. Darabantu, T. Lequeux, J. Pommelet, N. Plé, and A. Turck, "Selective fluorination by halogen exchange of chlorodiazines and chloropyridines promoted by the 'proton sponge'—triethylamine tris(hydrogen fluoride) system," *Tetrahedron* **57**, 739–750 (2001).
- ⁷³C. Bobbio, T. Rausis, and M. Schlosser, "Removal of Fluorine from and Introduction of Fluorine into Polyhalopyridines: An Exercise in Nucleophilic Heteroatomic Substitution," *Chem. Eur. J.* **11**, 1903–1910 (2005).
- ⁷⁴S. Groß, S. Laabs, A. Scherrmann, A. Sudau, N. Zhang, and U. Nubbe-meyer, "Improved Syntheses of Cyanuric Fluoride and Carboxylic Acid Fluorides," *J. Prakt. Chem.* **342**, 711–714 (2000).