

PCCP

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/xxxxxxxxxx

New Insights on Aromatic Pathways of Carbachlorins and Carbaporphyrins Based on Calculations of Magnetically Induced Current Densities

Isaac Benkyi,^{*a} Heike Fliegl,^{*b} Rashid R. Valiev,^{*c} and Dage Sundholm,^{*a}

Received Date

Accepted Date

DOI: 10.1039/xxxxxxxxxx

www.rsc.org/journalname

Magnetically induced current densities have been calculated and analyzed for a number of synthesized carbachlorins and carbaporphyrins using density functional theory and the gauge including magnetically induced current method (GIMIC). Aromatic properties have been determined by using accurate numerical integration of the current flow yielding reliable current strengths and pathways that are related to the degree of aromaticity and the aromatic character of the studied molecules. All investigated compounds are found to be aromatic. However, the obtained aromatic pathways differ from those previously deduced from spectroscopical data and magnetic shielding calculations. For all studied compounds, the ring current divides into an outer and inner branch at each pyrrolic subring, showing that all π electrons of the pyrrolic rings take part in the delocalization pathway. The calculations do not support the common notion that the main share of the current takes the inner route at the pyrrolic rings without an inner hydrogen and follows an 18π aromatic pathway. The aromatic pathways of the investigated carbaporphyrins and carbachlorins are very similar, since the current strength via the $C_{\beta}=C_{\beta'}$ bond of the cyclopentadienyl ring of the carbaporphyrins is almost as weak as the current density passing the corresponding saturated $C_{\beta}-C_{\beta'}$ bond of the carbachlorins.

1 Introduction

Carbaporphyrinoids are porphyrin analogues in which one of the nitrogen atoms of the porphyrin macroring is replaced by an iso-electronic CH moiety.^{1–6} Carbachlorins are similar molecules with a saturated $C_{\beta}-C_{\beta'}$ bond of the cyclopentadienyl ring. This class of organic compounds is interesting for chemists due to their potential use in catalysis as they are able to bind metals in unusual oxidation states^{1,6}. In particular carbaporphyrinoids compounds such as carbachlorins with strong absorption bands around 650 nm or even at longer wave lengths have the potential to be used as photosensitizer in photodynamic therapy⁷.

A clear picture of the full utilization of these compounds cannot be obtained without elucidating their aromatic properties. In spite of their unusual structure and chemistry, carbaporphyrinoids

can be expected to be aromatic like most planar organic (heterocyclic) compounds that exhibit conjugation pathways fulfilling the Hückel $4n + 2\pi$ rule for aromaticity. However, very little is known about their aromatic character and electron delocalization pathways,^{8,9} mainly because it is challenging to experimentally quantify electron delocalization of complicated multiring molecules and computational studies of the aromatic character of porphyrinoids are also demanding. By using the gauge-including magnetically induced current (GIMIC) method,^{10–12} it is though possible to determine current strength susceptibilities and current pathways by explicitly calculating the susceptibility of the magnetically induced current density passing selected chemical bonds. A careful analysis of the current density provides information about how electronic charge can be transported around molecular rings of fused multiring molecules.^{10,12–19} Comprehensive and detailed current-density studies have proven to be very helpful for elucidating the aromatic properties of porphyrinoids.^{20–28} Current density calculations using the GIMIC program are an invaluable computational means for designing carbaporphyrinoids or other compounds with distinct aromaticity and electron delocalization features, since they can accurately predict aromatic pathways and ring-current strengths along different routes in the molecule.^{10–12,29} The GIMIC program, which is a stand alone

^a University of Helsinki, Department of Chemistry, P.O. Box 55 (A.I. Virtanens plats 1), FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland, Dage.Sundholm@helsinki.fi

^b Centre for Theoretical and Computational Chemistry (CTCC), Department of Chemistry, University of Oslo, P.O.Box 1033 Blindern, 0315 Oslo, Norway, Heike.Fliegl@kjemi.uio.no

^c Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk 634050, 43a Lenin Avenue, Building 2, Russian Federation; Tomsk State University, Tomsk, Lenina Avenue 36, valievrashid@mail.ru

† Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: See DOI: 10.1039/b000000x/

code, has been employed in a number of aromaticity studies of porphyrinoids.^{10,22–28} The studies have shown that numerical integration of the current strength susceptibilities passing selected chemical bonds is a reliable tool for quantifying molecular aromaticity according to the magnetic criterion.^{30–32} By calculating current strength susceptibilities of selected chemical bonds one obtains information about the electron-delocalization pathways. The approach has proven to be very useful for determining current pathways in multiring molecules, where many other approaches are prone to fail.^{22,33–47}

In this work, we have employed the GIMIC method at the density functional theory (DFT) level to investigate the aromatic character of a number of traditional carbaporphyrinoids and modified carbaporphyrinoids such as oxybenzporphyrin^{48–50}, benzocarporphyrin^{51,52}, azuliporphyrin^{51,53,54} and tropiporphyrin^{55,56}. In addition, we have also studied a number of carbachlorins that have been synthesized and characterized.⁹ The proton nuclear magnetic resonance (¹H NMR) and ultra-violet visible (UV-Vis) spectra have been measured to assess the aromatic properties of the synthesized carbachlorins and carbaporphyrins.⁹ Calculated values for nucleus independent chemical shifts (NICS)⁵⁷ have previously been used for assessing the aromatic character and delocalization pathways of carbaporphyrinoids,⁹ concluding that all the investigated carbaporphyrinoids are aromatic with a similar 18 π aromatic pathway as the classical aromatic pathway of free-base porphyrin.⁹ It is nowadays well known that the NICS approach has difficulties to accurately determine the degree of aromaticity of single molecular rings^{33–43} Furthermore, NICS has even larger problems to provide reliable current pathways in multiring molecules such as free-base porphyrin.^{22,58–62} We aim here at providing novel insights regarding the aromatic pathways and electron delocalization pathways of the investigated compounds using the reliable current-density integration technique for analyzing the current flow.

The computational methods are described in Section 2. The molecular structures of the carbaporphyrinoids are discussed in Section 3, whereas the results of the current density calculations are presented in detail for all studied molecules in Section 4. The results of the study are summarized in Section 5 where the main conclusions are also drawn.

2 Computational methods

The optimization of the molecular structures as well as the calculations of the NMR shieldings were performed at the density functional theory (DFT) level using the Becke-three-parameter functional combined with the Lee-Yang-Parr exchange-correlation functional (B3LYP)^{63,64} as implemented in Turbomole 6.6^{65,66}. The Karlsruhe triple- ζ quality basis set (def2-TZVP) was used for all atoms.^{67,68} The NMR shielding calculations were performed with the MPSHIFT module of Turbomole.^{69,70} Benchmark calculations have shown that B3LYP/def2-TZVP calculations of ¹H NMR and ¹³C NMR chemical shifts are close to the basis-set limit and agree qualitatively with experimental data for organic molecules.⁷¹

The magnetically induced current densities were calculated at the B3LYP/def2-TZVP level using the GIMIC program.^{10–12}

GIMIC is an independent program that uses the atomic orbital density matrix as well as the corresponding first-order magnetically perturbed density matrices from the NMR shielding calculations and basis-set information as input data.^{10,11} GIMIC employs gauge-including atomic orbitals (GIAO), which implies that the basis set convergence faster than with magnetic-field independent basis functions.^{10,72,73} When GIAOs are employed, the obtained gauge-origin independent current densities are close to the complete basis-set limit already when standard basis sets are used.^{72,73} The current densities can be analyzed by determining the current pathways, which are obtained by numerical integration of the current-strength susceptibilities (in nAT⁻¹) flowing along chosen chemical bonds. The current pathways are visualized using the XMakeMol⁷⁴ and paint.net⁷⁵ programs. The pictures of the molecules have been drawn using the Marvin program⁷⁶. The streamline representations of the current density have been obtained with PyNgl⁷⁷ and the schematic ring labeling displayed in Figure 15 has been done with ChemBioDraw⁷⁸ and Gimp.⁷⁹

The effect of dispersion corrections⁸⁰ on the geometry and current strength was investigated for oxybenzporphyrin. No significant changes in the molecular structure nor in the ring-current strength were obtained. See supplementary information.

3 Molecular structures and nomenclature

A number of recently synthesized carbaporphyrins and carbachlorins⁹ has been investigated computationally. The alkyl substituents have been omitted to save computational effort, since previous current density studies have shown that alkyl substituents do not significantly influence the current pathways and current strengths of aromatic porphyrinoids,²⁵ whereas for antiaromatic porphyrinoids substituents such as ethylformate or pentafluorophenyl may significantly reduce the strength of the ring current.^{24–26} The labeling of the investigated molecules follows the one in Ref. 9, which inspired us to perform the present study. The common notation enables easier comparisons of the present results with previously published ones.^{9,50}

Carbaporphyrin **20** (Figure 1) is the most simple carbaporphyrin without any substituents. The carbaporphyrin cation **20H⁺** (Figure 2) is the protonated form of **20** with one extra inner hydrogen and a positive charge. The doubly protonated carbaporphyrin dication **20H₂²⁺** (Figure 3) has five inner hydrogen of which two saturate the inner carbon of the cyclopentadienyl ring. Carbaporphyrin **14** (Figure 4) has an aldehyde group substituted to one of the C $_{\beta}$ positions of the cyclopentadienyl ring of the carbaporphyrin.

Carbachlorin **19** is the most simple carbachlorin with a saturated C $_{\beta}$ -C $_{\beta'}$ bond of the cyclopentadienyl ring and without any substituents. Carbachlorin **19** (Figure 5) lacks the inner hydrogen in the trans position to the cyclopentadienyl ring, whereas carbachlorin **19'** (Figure 6) is the corresponding cis tautomer. The carbachlorin cation **19H⁺** (Figure 7) is the protonated form of **19** and **19'** with four inner hydrogens.

In compound **6b**, a propene moiety is fused to the cyclopentadienyl ring forming a fused nonaromatic cyclopentene ring. The two ends of the propene moiety can bind to the cyclopentadienyl

ring in the cis **6b** (Figure 8) or trans **6b** (Figure 9) position. Compounds **6b** are propencarbachlorins, because the C_{β} - $C_{\beta'}$ bond of the cyclopentadienyl ring becomes saturated when binding the propene moiety to the cyclopentadienyl. Carbaporphyrins like compound **9** (Figure 10) could in principle be obtained by oxidizing the corresponding carbachlorin. However, experimentally this is not straight forward since Li and Lash reported that they were not able to oxidize **6b**,⁹ which would have yielded the corresponding carbaporphyrin **9**.

Compounds **1**, **2**, **3** and **4** are modified carbaporphyrinoids. In oxybenzporphyrin **1** (Figure 11), the cyclopentadienyl ring is replaced by a cyclohexadienone moiety. In benzocarbaporphyrin **2** (Figure 12), a benzoic ring is fused to the cyclopentadienyl ring. In azuliporphyrin **3** (Figure 13), a cycloheptatriene ring is fused to the cyclopentadienyl ring, and in tropiporphyrin **4** (Figure 14), the cyclopentadienyl ring is replaced by a cycloheptatrienyl ring.

4 Current-density calculations

All investigated compounds are found to be aromatic according to the magnetic criterion. Streamline representations of the current densities obtained in a plane placed 1 bohr above the molecular plane and the calculated current density pathways that are obtained through explicit integration of the current flow across several chemical bonds are given in Figures 1 - 14. An overview of the calculated results is given in Table 1 and the respective labeling of the pyrrolic rings is shown in Figure 15.

The current density calculations show that the aromatic pathway of the studied carbaporphyrinoids does not follow the classical 18π aromaticity route of porphyrinoids as suggested by Li and Lash.⁹ This is not surprising, since the classical 18π aromatic pathway of porphin and chlorin might not even be correct.^{10,22,59,81} The aromatic pathways of the studied carbaporphyrins and carbachlorins are indeed very reminiscent of the aromatic pathway of porphin and chlorin as previously obtained in current density calculations.²² Similar current pathways as obtained for the carbaporphyrinoids have also been obtained in a number of current density studies on porphyrinoids.²⁰⁻²⁸

For all studied compounds, the ring current divides into an outer and inner pathway at each pyrrolic subring. Thus, all π electrons of the pyrrolic rings take part in the delocalization pathways. The calculations show that the resistance of the inner NH group is generally larger than for the inner nitrogen without a hydrogen. Thus, a stronger current passes the inner N than the inner NH moiety of the pyrrolic rings. For the pyrrolic rings without an inner hydrogen, the current strengths via the outer and inner pathways are almost the same, whereas for the pyrrolic rings with an inner hydrogen roughly 25% of the current takes the inner route. Thus, the common notion that the main part of the current takes the inner route at the pyrrolic rings without an inner hydrogen is incorrect. One of the main conclusions of this work is that all current pathways for the carbaporphyrinoids suggested by Li and Lash are not completely correct.⁹ Comparison of the diatropic and paratropic contributions to the net current strength passing the meso carbon with the ones passing via the inner and outer routes of the pyrrolic rings show that the pyrrolic rings do not sustain any strong local ring currents. In the following, we discuss

in more detail the current pathways at the all-carbon subrings of the studied carbaporphyrinoids.

4.1 Carbaporphyrin 20, $20H^+$ and $20H_2^{2+}$

Molecule **20** is the unsubstituted trans-carbaporphyrin lacking inner hydrogen in the trans position relative to the cyclopentadienyl ring. The Calculations of the current density for **20** have recently been reported,²⁷ whereas we have in this work also studied the current densities of the protonated $20H^+$ and diprotonated $20H_2^{2+}$ forms of **20**. The current pathways are shown in Figures 1 - 3. At the cyclopentadienyl ring the inner pathway dominates for **20** and $20H^+$. For **20**, only 6.3 nA T^{-1} of the total ring current of 26.8 nA T^{-1} takes the outer route.²⁷ For the protonated form, the current strength of 1.8 nA T^{-1} along the outer pathway is even weaker, whereas the total ring-current strength of 25.7 nA T^{-1} is practically the same as for the unprotonated **20**. The doubly protonated $20H_2^{2+}$ has five inner hydrogens implying that the inner carbon of the all-carbon five-membered subring is saturated. For $20H_2^{2+}$, the ring current of 27.8 nA T^{-1} is slightly larger than for **20** and takes mainly the outer route, whose current strength is 27.0 nA T^{-1} as compared to the tiny 0.9 nA T^{-1} along the inner pathway. For these molecules, Li and Lash suggested an 18π aromaticity, where the inner NH groups and the C_{β} atoms of the pyrrolic ring without an inner hydrogen do not belong to the aromatic pathway.⁹ Proton and carbon NMR spectroscopy suggests that **20** is planar,⁹ whereas according to the calculations the planar form is a transition state. The small barrier of $1.9 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ does not prevent thermal motion across the barrier implying that the molecule is on the average planar. The ring-current strength of planar **20** is 26.2 nA T^{-1} showing that the small nonplanarity of **20** does not significantly affect the aromatic properties.




Fig. 1 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbaporphyrin **20** molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 26.8 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbaporphyrin **20**.

4.2 Carbaporphyrin 14

Substituent effects were studied by adding an aldehyde group to one of the C_{β} positions of the cyclopentadienyl ring. Carbaporphyrin **14** with an aldehyde group in the C_{β} position as shown in Figure 4 sustains a net ring-current whose strength is 24.8 nA T^{-1} .




Fig. 2 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbaporphyrin 20H^+ molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 25.7 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbaporphyrin 20H^+ .




Fig. 3 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbaporphyrin 20H_2^+ molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 27.8 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbaporphyrin 20H_2^+ .

T^{-1} . The net ring-current is 2.0 nA T^{-1} smaller than the one obtained for **20**,²⁷ whereas the current strength of 20.3 nA T^{-1} along the inner pathway at the cyclopentadienyl ring is almost same for **14** and **20**. Substitution of the aldehyde group to the C_β position of the cyclopentadienyl ring decreases the current strength along the outer pathway by 1.5 nA T^{-1} , which is probably due to the electron withdrawing effect of the aldehyde group. However, the substitution does not influence the current pattern of the rest of the molecule.

4.3 Carbachlorin **19**, **19'** and 19H^+

The studied carbachlorins **19**, **19'** and 19H^+ are identical to **11**, **11'** and 11H^+ that were synthesized by Li and Lash,⁹ when the alkyl substituents in the C_β positions are omitted. The calculated ring-current strength of **19** is 24.6 nA T^{-1} . As expected, most of the ring current (23.8 nA T^{-1}) passes on the inside of cyclopentadienyl ring, whereas only 1.5 nA T^{-1} takes the outer route via the saturated C_β carbons. A current-density plot and the current strengths are shown in Figure 5. The current-density analysis re-




Fig. 4 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbaporphyrin **14** molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 24.6 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbaporphyrin **14**.

veals that the current pathway of **19** is very similar to the ones obtained for the other carbachlorin compounds. However, the ring current is somewhat stronger along the outer route at the pyrrolic rings than for the carbaporphyrins. For example, 56% of the ring current passes the C_β carbons of the pyrrolic ring without an inner hydrogen. Li and Lash suggested that the ring current takes the outer pathway at the pyrrolic rings with inner hydrogens and the inner one at the pyrrolic ring without the inner hydrogen,⁹ which is the traditional but incorrect aromatic pathway of porphin and chlorin. Thus, their suggested aromatic pathway of carbachlorin **19** is not completely correct.⁹

The current pathway of tautomer **19'** is very similar to that of **19**. The largest difference in the current pattern is obtained for the pyrrolic ring without the inner hydrogen, where current strengths along the outer and inner route are in this case almost equal. The net current strength of 26.1 nA T^{-1} is about 1.5 nA T^{-1} larger than for **19**. The current strengths are shown in Figure 6. The aromatic pathway at each of the pyrrolic rings looks like the aromatic pathway for **19** and **19'** at the pyrrolic rings with an inner hydrogen. Thus, the ring current flows mainly along the outer bonds of the protonated carbachlorin 19H^+ . The current pathways are shown in Figure 7. Li and Lash suggested that the aromatic pathway for 19H^+ can be considered as a superposition of three pathways because the NICS values in the three pyrrolic rings are practically the same.⁹ Since the total ring-current strength is 26.5 nA T^{-1} , each of these pathways would have a current strength of almost 9 nA T^{-1} . The superposed current pattern would then be 17.7 nA T^{-1} along the outer pathway and 8.8 nA T^{-1} via the inner route, which can be compared to the calculated combined current of $20.3\text{--}20.9 \text{ nA T}^{-1}$ along the outer route and $5.6\text{--}6.4 \text{ nA T}^{-1}$ takes the inner one. When applying the superposition principle, the current flow of 1.4 nA T^{-1} passing the saturated C_β atoms of the all-carbon five-membered ring introduces uncertainties of 0.5 nA T^{-1} and 1.0 nA T^{-1} in the current strengths of the inner and outer pathways, respectively. Thus, the ratio between the current strengths of the outer and inner pathways is too large for validating the superposition prin-

Figure 5




Fig. 5 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbachlorin 19 molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 24.6 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbachlorin 19.




Fig. 6 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbachlorin 19' molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 26.1 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbachlorin 19'.

4.4 Carbachlorin 6b

Carbachlorin **6b** (cis) sustains a net current strength of 25.5 nA T^{-1} of which 24.5 nA T^{-1} takes the inner pathway at the all-carbon five-membered ring. At the pyrrolic rings, the ring current follows largely the same pattern as in the corresponding unsubstituted carbachlorin **19**. The calculated current pattern at the pyrrolic rings of compound **6b** (trans) is very similar to the one obtained for **6b** (cis). The net current strength is 25.7 nA T^{-1} . The current flow at the propene substituted all-carbon five-membered ring of 1.3 nA T^{-1} takes the outermost route. In addition the fused cyclopentene ring due to the propene substitution sustains a tiny local ring current of 0.5 nA T^{-1} .

4.5 Carbaporphyrin 9

Carbaporphyrin **9** can in principle be obtained by oxidizing carbachlorin **6**. However, that reaction step was unsuccessful.⁹




Fig. 7 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbachlorin 19H^+ molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 26.5 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbachlorin 19H^+ .




Fig. 8 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbachlorin **6b** (cis) molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 25.5 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbachlorin **6b** (cis).

Current-density calculations show that carbaporphyrin **9** is expected to have similar ring-current pathways as obtained for the unsubstituted carbaporphyrin **20**. The net ring-current strength is 25.9 nA T^{-1} as compared to 26.8 nA T^{-1} for **20** and $25.5\text{--}25.7$ for **6b**. A small current of 1.0 nA T^{-1} passes the saturated CH_2 group of the cyclopentene ring fused to the cyclopentadienyl ring of the carbaporphyrin, whereas a current strength of 2.4 nA T^{-1} passes the common bond of the two five-membered rings.

4.6 Oxybenzporphyrin 1

Oxybenzporphyrin **1** is a carbaporphyrinoid where the cyclopentadienyl ring is replaced by a cyclohexadienone ring.⁵² **1** sustains a net ring-current strength of 24.4 nA T^{-1} around the macrocycle, which is 3 nA T^{-1} (10%) smaller than for porphin.²² The current pattern at the pyrrolic rings is the same as for porphin and the other carbaporphyrinoids studied in this work. The current strengths along the different routes are shown in Figure 11. The carbonyl group of the cyclohexadienone ring prevents the ring-current to take the outer route. Thus, only 0.7 nA T^{-1} flows on the outside of the cyclohexadienone ring and 23.4 nA T^{-1} takes in




Fig. 9 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbachlorin **6b** (trans) molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 25.7 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbachlorin **6b** (trans).




Fig. 11 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the oxybenzporphyrin **1** molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 24.4 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for oxybenzporphyrin **1**.




Fig. 10 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the carbaporphyrin **9** molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 25.9 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for carbaporphyrin **9**.

inner pathway. The net ring-current strength calculated for the molecular structure of **1** optimized at the same level of theory using also the D3 correction differs by only 0.3 nA/T from the value of 24.4 nA/T as obtained without the D3 correction. Thus, the use of the D3 correction has almost no effect on the ring current strengths of the investigated class of molecules.

4.7 Benzocarbaporphyrin 2

Benzocarbaporphyrin **2** is a carbaporphyrin with a benzoic ring fused to the C_β bond of the cyclopentadienyl ring.⁴⁹ The current pattern at the pyrrolic rings is very similar to that of the other carbaporphyrinoids of this work. The ring-current strength around the macrocycle of 26.5 nA T^{-1} is almost as large as for unsubstituted carbaporphyrin **20**. At the cyclopentadienyl ring, the current prefers the inner route whose strength is 22.5 nA T^{-1} , whereas a current of 3.8 nA T^{-1} flows outwards passing on the outside of the benzoic ring. The benzoic ring sustains a local ring current of 5.6 nA T^{-1} . The current pathway and current strengths are shown in Figure 12. The current density calculation

show that the proposed 18π aromatic pathway is not completely correct.^{49,52}




Fig. 12 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the benzocarbaporphyrin **2** molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 26.5 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for benzocarbaporphyrin **2**.

4.8 Azuliporphyrin 3

Azuliporphyrin **3** consists of a cycloheptatriene ring fused to the cyclopentadienyl ring of carbaporphyrin **20**. Lash *et al.* proposed that it has some aromatic character, because the structure can formally be described with two resonance structures.^{49,52} The zwitterionic form is thought to sustain a ring current around the carbaporphyrin macrocycle, whereas in the other form the ring current circles only around the azulene moiety.⁴⁹ However, the current density calculations yield a somewhat different picture of the aromatic character. The strength of the ring current circling around the carbaporphyrin macroring is 15.1 nA T^{-1} , which is about 55% of the ring-current strength of porphyrin. At the azulene moiety the main current of 18.7 nA T^{-1} takes the outer route

around the cyclopentadienyl ring, whereas a weaker current of 4.6 nA T^{-1} passes on the outside of the cycloheptatrienyl ring. The cyclopentadienyl ring sustains a weak local ring current of 3.2 nA T^{-1} . At the pyrrolic rings, the main current flow passes the C_β carbons. At the pyrrolic rings without an inner hydrogen, 40% of the current takes the inner route, whereas at the pyrrolic ring with an inner hydrogen only 20% of the current passes the NH moiety. The current pathways and current strengths are shown in Figure 13.




Fig. 13 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the azulporphyrin 3 molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 15.1 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for azulporphyrin 3.

4.9 Tropiporphyrin 4

The calculated structure of tropiporphyrin 4, which is obtained from carbaporphyrin by replacing the cyclopentadienyl ring with a cycloheptatrienyl ring,⁵⁵ is found to be almost planar with the largest out-of-plane torsional angle of 3° at the cycloheptatrienyl ring. The current strength of tropiporphyrin is 22.1 nA T^{-1} , which is 82% of the ring-current strength of carbaporphyrin 20. The ring current around the macrocycle mainly passes along the outer routes at the pyrrolic rings. The pattern of the current flow around the carbaporphyrin ring is similar to the one for the other carbaporphyrins with about 20% of the ring current passing the NH moiety of the two pyrrolic rings with an inner hydrogen, whereas 43% of the ring current passes the nitrogen of the pyrrolic ring without an inner hydrogen. The cycloheptatrienyl ring is antiaromatic sustaining a strong local paratropic ring current of -15.9 nA T^{-1} , thus forming a strongly antiaromatic ring fused to the aromatic one. Fused rings with opposite tropicity have previously been found for thienopyrrole modified 20 π -electron porphyrinoids and in thieno-bridged porphyrins.^{23,25} The current pathways and current strengths in Figure 14 show that the calculations yield a different aromatic character as compared to the one deduced from measured NMR chemical shifts.⁵⁵

5 Summary and conclusions

Magnetically induced current densities of a number of synthesized as well as spectroscopically and theoretically characterized carbachlorins and carbaporphyrins⁹ have been studied computa-




Fig. 14 (a) A streamline plot of the current density 1 bohr above the tropiporphyrin 4 molecule that sustains a net ring-current strength of 21.9 nA T^{-1} around the porphyrinoid macroring. (b) The calculated net current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) passing selected bonds are given for tropiporphyrin 4.




Fig. 15 The numbering of the current pathways of the carbaporphyrinoids. Odd numbers indicate outer routes.

tionally at the DFT level and analyzed using the gauge including magnetically induced current method (GIMIC). The investigated compounds are found to be aromatic with calculated ring-current strength susceptibilities ranging from 15 nA T^{-1} to 27 nA T^{-1} . Thus, they can be considered aromatic according to the magnetic criterion. Tropiporphyrin 3 has the weakest aromaticity among the studied molecules with a ring-current strength of 15.1 nA T^{-1} , which can be compared to the ring-current strength of 12.0 nA T^{-1} for benzene.²⁹ The calculated ring-current strengths and the current strengths of different pathways are summarized in Table 1 and the numbering of the bonds and rings are shown in Figure 15

Table 1 The total ring-current strength (in nA T^{-1}) and the current strengths (in nA T^{-1}) of the outer and inner pathways of the studied carbaporphyrinoids. The numbering of the currents are shown in Figure 15

Ring → Molecule	Total	A		B		C		D	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
20	26.8	6.3	20.5	17.7	7.3	13.0	13.8	17.7	7.3
20H ⁺	25.7	1.8	23.9	19.2	6.5	19.8	6.0	19.2	6.5
20H ₂ ²⁺	27.8	27.0	0.9	19.6	8.1	21.1	6.4	19.7	8.2
14	24.8	4.8	20.3	17.8	6.8	12.8	12.3	17.8	6.8
19	24.6	1.5	23.8	18.5	5.9	13.5	10.8	18.5	5.9
19'	26.1	1.6	24.3	13.6	12.7	20.0	6.2	20.4	5.6
19H ⁺	26.5	1.4	24.7	20.3	6.4	20.9	5.6	20.3	6.4
6b (cis)	25.5	1.4	24.5	19.0	6.5	13.7	11.5	19.0	6.5
6b (trans)	25.7	1.3	24.3	19.5	6.3	14.1	11.3	19.5	6.3
9	25.9	3.4	23.0	18.4	7.2	13.1	12.8	18.4	7.2
1	24.4	0.7	23.4	18.0	6.5	12.4	12.0	18.7	5.8
2	26.5	3.8	22.5	19.1	6.9	13.9	12.6	19.1	6.9
3	15.1	18.7	-3.2	8.9	5.9	12.0	3.2	8.9	5.9
4	22.1	-15.9	38.0	17.8	4.2	12.8	9.6	17.8	4.2

15.

For most of the investigated carbaporphyrinoids, the inner pathway at the five membered all-carbon ring (A) is the preferred route and only a small current of 0.7 nA T^{-1} to 4.2 nA T^{-1} passes on the outer side of the ring, regardless whether the bond is saturated or not. The only exceptions are 2OH_2^{2+} , **3** and **4**, where the inner pathway is blocked by the saturated CH_2 , a cycloheptatriene ring is fused to the cyclopentadienyl ring, and a cycloheptatrienyl ring replaces the cyclopentadienyl ring, respectively. Previous studies on aromatic molecules have also shown how the insertion of CH_2 moieties leads to changes in the current flow around porphyrinoids.^{22,27,28} Insertion of an aldehyde group to the cyclopentadienyl ring of carbaporphyrin **14** did not significantly affect in the current density pattern and current strengths as compared to the unsubstituted carbaporphyrin **20**. For azuliporphyrin **3** with a cycloheptatriene ring is fused to the cyclopentadienyl ring, the ring current prefers the outer route. The current even splits in to one branch passing around the cycloheptatrienyl ring, whereas the main current streams along the common bond between the cycloheptatrienyl and cyclopentadienyl rings. Tropiporphyrin **4** consist of an antiaromatic cycloheptatrienyl ring fused into the aromatic porphyrinoid macroring leading to a weaker ring-current strength of 21.9 nA T^{-1} as compared to 26.8 nA T^{-1} for carbaporphyrin **20**. Similar current-strength trends were obtained for the pyrrolic rings as previously reported for other porphyrinoid compounds.^{22,27,28} For the investigated compounds the ring current divides at the pyrrolic rings into the inner and outer branches showing that all π electrons of the pyrrolic rings participate in the current pathway. For pyrrolic rings B and D with an inner hydrogen, the main share of the current flows on the outside of the ring, whereas at the pyrrolic rings without an inner hydrogen. At ring C without an inner hydrogen, the current is almost equally split into the inner and outer branches or the main current pathway is along the outer route.

In conclusion, for the investigated compounds the calculated current pathways disagree with previously proposed ones. Lash *et al.* have proposed that the aromatic pathway of the studied carbaporphyrinoids follow an 18π -electron aromaticity route that excludes the $\text{C}_\beta = \text{C}_{\beta'}$ bond of ring C, whereas the explicit current-density calculations of this work shows that the ring current is generally stronger along the outer pathway of ring C than for the inner route.^{9,49,52,55} Furthermore, we show that all π -electrons of the pyrrolic rings participate in the electron delocalization pathway. For tropiporphyrin **4**, the current-density analysis shows that the fused cycloheptatrienyl ring is antiaromatic. In general, the integration based current-density analysis provides accurate and reliable information about the aromatic character and the aromatic pathways of the studied multiring molecules. We suggest that one should not merely use spectroscopic data in combination with magnetic shielding calculations when aiming at information about the aromatic character of porphyrinoids, because the approaches do not provide very accurate information about molecular aromaticity for more complex molecules. Instead it is recommended to use current-density calculations in combination with numerical integration of current strengths, because this yields electron-delocalization pathways that show how electrons

move around the molecular rings, when they are exposed to an external magnetic field.

6 Acknowledgements

This research has been supported by the Academy of Finland through projects (137460 and 266227) and its Computational Science Research Programme (LASTU/258258). DS thanks Magnus Ehrnrooth Foundation, Swedish Cultural Foundation in Finland, Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and Fulbright Foundation for financial support during his sabbatical leave. CSC – the Finnish IT Center for Science – is acknowledged for computer time. H. F. thanks the Norwegian Research Council through the CoE Centre for Theoretical and Computational Chemistry (Grant No. 179568/V30 and 231571/F20) for support. This work has received support from the Norwegian Supercomputing Program (NOTUR) through a grant of computer time (Grant No. NN4654K).

References

- 1 A. Berlicka, P. Dutka, L. Szterenber and L. Latos-Grażyński, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2014, **53**, 4885–4889.
- 2 S. Aronoff and M. Calvin, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1943, **8**, 205–223.
- 3 M. O. Senge, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2011, **50**, 4272–4277.
- 4 Berlin K., *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 1996, **35**, 1820–1822.
- 5 T. D. Lash and S. T. Chaney, *Chem. Eur. J.*, 1996, **2**, 944–948.
- 6 M. Pawlicki and L. Latos-Grażyński, *Chem. Rec.*, 2006, **6**, 64–78.
- 7 R. K. Pandey and G. Zheng, *Porphyrin Handbook*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, 2000, vol. 6, pp. 157–230.
- 8 T. D. Lash, *Eur. J. Org. Chem.*, 2007, **135**, 5461–5481.
- 9 D. Li and T. D. Lash, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2014, **79**, 7112–7121.
- 10 J. Jusélius, D. Sundholm and J. Gauss, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **121**, 3952–3963.
- 11 S. Taubert, D. Sundholm and J. Jusélius, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **134**, 054123:1–12.
- 12 H. Fliegl, S. Taubert, O. Lehtonen and D. Sundholm, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **13**, 20500–20518.
- 13 M. P. Johansson, J. Jusélius and D. Sundholm, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2005, **44**, 1843–1846.
- 14 J. Jusélius and D. Sundholm, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2008, **10**, 6630–6634.
- 15 S. Taubert, J. Jusélius, D. Sundholm, W. Klopper and H. Fliegl, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2008, **112**, 13584–13592.
- 16 S. Taubert, D. Sundholm and F. Pichierri, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2010, **75**, 5867–5874.
- 17 H. Fliegl, O. Lehtonen, D. Sundholm and V. R. I. Kaila, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **13**, 434–437.
- 18 M. Kaipio, M. Patzschke, H. Fliegl, F. Pichierri and D. Sundholm, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2012, **116**, 10257–10268.
- 19 D. Sundholm, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2013, **15**, 9025–9028.
- 20 H. Fliegl, D. Sundholm, S. Taubert and F. Pichierri, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2010, **114**, 7153–7161.
- 21 H. Fliegl, D. Sundholm and F. Pichierri, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **13**, 20659–20665.

- 22 H. Fliegl and D. Sundholm, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2012, **77**, 3408–3414.
- 23 H. Fliegl, N. Özcan, R. Mera-Adasme, F. Pichierri, J. Jusélius and D. Sundholm, *Mol. Phys.*, 2013, **111**, 1364–1372.
- 24 R. R. Valiev, H. Fliegl and D. Sundholm, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2013, **117**, 9062–9068.
- 25 R. R. Valiev, H. Fliegl and D. Sundholm, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2014, **16**, 11010–11016.
- 26 H. Fliegl, F. Pichierri and D. Sundholm, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2015, **119**, 2344–2350.
- 27 R. R. Valiev, H. Fliegl and D. Sundholm, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2015, **119**, 1201–1207.
- 28 R. R. Valiev, H. Fliegl and D. Sundholm, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, **17**, 14215–14222.
- 29 H. Fliegl, D. Sundholm, S. Taubert, J. Jusélius and W. Klopper, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2009, **113**, 8668–8676.
- 30 A. Balaban, P. von Ragué Schleyer and H. S. Rzepa, *Chem. Rev.*, 2005, **105**, 3436–3447.
- 31 T. Heine, C. Corminboeuf and G. Seifert, *Chem. Rev.*, 2005, **105**, 3889–3910.
- 32 Z. Chen, C. S. Wannere, C. Corminboeuf, R. Puchta and P. von Ragué Schleyer, *Chem. Rev.*, 2005, **105**, 3842–3888.
- 33 P. Lazzeretti, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **6**, 217–223.
- 34 S. Pelloni, G. Monaco, P. Lazzeretti and R. Zanasi, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **13**, 20666–20672.
- 35 P. Lazzeretti, *Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc.*, 2000, **36**, 1–88.
- 36 I. Morao, B. Lecea and F. P. Cossío, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1997, **62**, 7033–7036.
- 37 J. Jusélius and D. Sundholm, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 1999, **1**, 3429–3435.
- 38 J. O. C. Jiménez-Halla, E. Matito, J. Robles and M. Solá, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 2006, **691**, 4359–4366.
- 39 S. Pelloni and P. Lazzeretti, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2013, **117**, 9083–9092.
- 40 Z. Badri, S. Pathak, H. Fliegl, P. Rashidi-Ranjbar, R. Bast, R. Marek, C. Foroutan-Nejad and K. Ruud, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2013, **9**, 4789–4796.
- 41 G. Monaco and R. Zanasi, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2014, **118**, 1673–1683.
- 42 D. Du, H. Fliegl and D. Sundholm, *J. Chin. Chem. Soc.*, 2015, **null**, doi: 10.1002/jccs.201500027.
- 43 Y. C. Lin, D. Sundholm and J. Jusélius, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2006, **2**, 761–764.
- 44 S. Taubert, D. Sundholm and F. Pichierri, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2009, **74**, 6495–6502.
- 45 R. Islas, G. Martínez-Guajardo, J. O. C. Jiménez-Halla, M. Solá and G. Merino, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2010, **6**, 1131–1135.
- 46 A. C. Castro, E. Osorio, J. O. Jiménez-Halla, E. Matito, W. Tiznado and G. Merino, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2010, **6**, 2701–2750.
- 47 J. J. Torres, R. Islas, E. Osorio, J. G. Harrison, W. Tiznado and G. Merino, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2013, **117**, 5529–5533.
- 48 T. D. Lash, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 1995, **34**, 2533–2535.
- 49 T. D. Lash, M. J. Hayes, J. D. Spence, M. A. Muckey, G. M. Ferrence and L. F. Szczepura, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2002, **67**, 4860–4874.
- 50 D. I. AbuSalim and T. D. Lash, *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, 2014, **12**, 8719–8736.
- 51 T. D. Lash and M. J. J. Hayes, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 1997, **36**, 840–842.
- 52 T. D. Lash, S. T. Chaney and D. T. Richter, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1998, **63**, 9076–9088.
- 53 S. R. Graham, D. A. Colby and T. D. Lash, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2002, **41**, 1371–1374.
- 54 T. D. Lash, D. A. Colby, S. R. Graham and S. T. Chaney, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2004, **69**, 8851–8864.
- 55 K. M. Bergman, G. M. Ferrence and T. D. Lash, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2004, **69**, 7888–7897.
- 56 T. D. Lash and S. T. Chaney, *Tetrahedron Letters*, 1996, **37**, 8825–8828.
- 57 P. von Ragué Schleyer, C. Maerker, A. Dransfeld, H. Jiao and N. J. R. van Eikema Hommes, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1996, **118**, 6317–6318.
- 58 M. K. Cyrański, T. M. Krygowski, M. Wisiorowski, N. J. R. van Eikema Hommes and P. von Ragué Schleyer, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 1998, **37**, 177–180.
- 59 J. Jusélius and D. Sundholm, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2000, **2**, 2145–2151.
- 60 E. Steiner and P. W. Fowler, *Chem. Phys. Chem.*, 2002, **3**, 114–116.
- 61 E. Steiner, A. Soncini and P. W. Fowler, *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, 2005, **4**, 4053–4059.
- 62 J. I. Wu, I. Fernández and P. von Ragué Schleyer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2013, **135**, 315–321.
- 63 A. D. Becke, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1993, **98**, 5648–5652.
- 64 C. Lee, W. Yang and R. G. Parr, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1988, **37**, 785–789.
- 65 R. Ahlrichs, M. Bär, M. Häser, H. Horn and C. Kölmel, *Chem. Phys. Letters*, 1989, **162**, 165–169.
- 66 F. Furche, R. Ahlrichs, C. Hättig, W. Klopper, M. Sierka and F. Weigend, *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.*, 2014, **4**, 91–100.
- 67 A. Schäfer, H. Horn and R. Ahlrichs, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1992, **97**, 2571–2577.
- 68 F. Weigend and R. Ahlrichs, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **7**, 3297–3305.
- 69 M. Häser, R. Ahlrichs, H. P. Baron, P. Weis and H. Horn, *Theoret. Chim. Acta*, 1992, **83**, 455–470.
- 70 M. Kollwitz, M. Häser and J. Gauss, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1998, **108**, 8295–8301.
- 71 S. Taubert, H. Konschin and D. Sundholm, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **7**, 2561–2569.
- 72 R. Ditchfield, *Mol. Phys.*, 1974, **27**, 789–807.
- 73 K. Wolinski, J. F. Hinton and P. Pulay, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1990, **112**, 8251–8260.
- 74 XMAKEMOL, <http://www.nongnu.org/xmakemol/>.

- 75 PAINT.NET 4.0.6, <http://www.getpaint.net/>.
- 76 MARVIN 15.9.28, 2015, ChemAxon, <http://www.chemaxon.com>.
- 77 PyNgl: Scientific visualization Python program package, <http://www.pyngl.ucar.edu>.
- 78 ChemBioDraw Ultra 14.0 by PerkinElmer, <http://scistore.cambridgesoft.com>.
- 79 GIMP: GNU Image Manipulation Program, <http://www.gimp.org>.
- 80 S. Grimme, J. Antony, S. Ehrlich and H. Krieg, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **132**, 154104.
- 81 J. Jusélius and D. Sundholm, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2000, **65**, 5233–5237.