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#### Abstract

A theoretical study of acid acetylation of dimethylamine from the analysis of intermediate of the reaction was carried out. Geometries of all species involved in the reaction were made and identified. All of the geometry optimizations were performed by the method at the DFT with B3LYP level of theory and was adopted the $6-31+G^{*}$ basis set. Energies were calculated using the MP2. The energy of activation for the reaction was $8.05 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$.


## INTRODUCTION

The acetylation of amines is one of the most frequently used transformations in organic synthesis as it provides an efficient and inexpensive means for protecting amino groups in a multistep synthetic process.

Acetylation of amine is a nucleophilic substitution reaction. This reaction can be catalyzed by Brönsted acid. In the mechanism, the acetic anhydride first accepts a proton at the carbonyl oxygen and this change enhances the positive charge on the carbonyl carbon. This protonation facilitates the successive addition of amine at the position to form a tetrahedral intermediate, determining step of the rate of the reaction.

Computational method to study the reaction using acid catalysis [1] and an experimental work [2], agreed that this reaction takes place with the formation of a tetrahedral intermediate.

A theoretical study of acid acetylation of dimethylamine from the analysis of intermediate of the reaction was carried out. The reaction and the compounds studied are shown in Figure1.


Figure 1. General Scheme of Acid Acetylation of Dimethylamine

## THEORETICAL

Geometries of all species involved in the acetylation were made and identified. All of the geometry optimizations were performed by the method at the DFT - Density Functional Theory [3] with B3LYP level of theory and was adopted the $6-31+\mathrm{G}^{*}$ basis set.

Energies of all reactants and products and the energy of activation for the reaction were calculated using the MP2- $2^{\text {nd }}$ order Mo/ller-Plesset method. Following the same procedure it was identified the geometric parameters and energy of intermediate. All the calculations were executed using Gaussian 09 [4] software package.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 lists the geometric parameters, lengths and binding angles values, and energies of the reactants, obtained.

Table 1. Geometric Parameters Reactants

| Reactants | Lengths ( ${ }_{\text {( }}$ ) | Angles ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | Energies kcal/mol |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}=1.12 \\ & \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{N}=1.44 \\ & \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{H}=1.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{C}=114.38 \\ & \mathrm{H}_{3}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{N}=108.78 \\ & \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{C}=110.58 \end{aligned}$ | -5.69 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O}_{2}=1.22 \\ & \mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{4}=1.49 \\ & \mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O}_{3}=1.39 \\ & \mathrm{C}_{4}-\mathrm{H}_{5}=1.12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{C}_{8}=121.83 \\ & \mathrm{O}_{2}-\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{4}=129.78 \\ & \mathrm{O}_{2}-\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O}_{3}=118.05 \\ & \mathrm{C}_{5}-\mathrm{C}_{4}-\mathrm{H}_{5}=109.37 \end{aligned}$ | -131.71 |

Table 2 lists the geometric parameters, lengths and binding angles values, and energies of the products, obtained.

Table 2. Geometric Parameters Products

| Products | Lengths (A) | Angles ( $\left.{ }^{( }\right)$ | Energies kcal/mol |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N,N Dimethylacetamide | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{8} & =1.51 \\ \mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O} & =1.25 \\ \mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{N} & =1.39 \\ \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{C}_{12} & =1.43 \\ \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{C}_{4} & =1.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{8}-\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{N}=118.56 \\ & \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{N}=120.48 \\ & \mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{C}_{12}=120.86 \\ & \mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{C}_{4}=120.93 \end{aligned}$ | -41.47 |
| Acetic Acid | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}_{2} & =1.23 \\ \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C} & =1.49 \\ \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}_{3} & =1.36 \\ \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{O}_{3} & =0.97 \\ \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H} & =1.12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{H}=109.76 \\ & \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}=116.53 \\ & \mathrm{O}_{2}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}=129.27 \\ & \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}=114.20 \\ & \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}_{7}=108.94 \end{aligned}$ | -103.8 |

Figure 2 show the optimized structure of the intermediate and the Table 3 lists the geometric parameters, lengths and binding angles values, obtained. The calculations show $26.29 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ of energy for the tetrahedral intermediate and the activation energy was $8.05 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$.


Figure 2. Tetrahedral Intermediate Structure

Table 3. Geometric Parameters Intermediate

| Lengths | $\AA$ | Angles | $\boldsymbol{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{r}\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)$ | 1.41 | $\theta\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O}_{2}-\mathrm{H}_{14}\right)$ | 118.74 |
| $\mathrm{r}\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | 1.50 | $\theta\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{C}_{16}\right)$ | 116.74 |
| $\mathrm{r}\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}-\mathrm{H}_{14}\right)$ | 0.97 | $\theta\left(\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O}_{3}\right)$ | 113.26 |
| $\mathrm{r}\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{C}_{6}\right)$ | 1.53 | $\theta\left(\mathrm{C}_{6}-\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | 116.22 |
| $\mathrm{r}\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O}_{3}\right)$ | 1.47 | $\theta\left(\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{C}_{20}\right)$ | 115.93 |
| $\mathrm{r}\left(\mathrm{N}_{2}-\mathrm{H}_{24}\right)$ | 0.99 | $\theta\left(\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{C}_{1}-\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)$ | 112.02 |
| $\mathrm{r}\left(\mathrm{C}_{20}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | 1.50 | $\theta\left(\mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{C}_{16}-\mathrm{H}_{17}\right)$ | 108.98 |
| $\mathrm{r}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6}-\mathrm{H}_{8}\right)$ | 1.11 | $\theta\left(\mathrm{H}_{7}-\mathrm{C}_{6}-\mathrm{C}_{1}\right)$ | 108.15 |

## CONCLUSION

It was observed a marked consistency between the theoretical results and bibliographic data, which validates the use of theoretical methods DFT and MP2 as tools for kinetic studying the reaction of acetylation of dimethylamine
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