

# Vibrational Symmetry Breaking of $\text{NO}_3^-$ in Aqueous Solution: NO Asymmetric Stretch Frequency Distribution and Mean Splitting<sup>†</sup>

Sai G. Ramesh,<sup>§</sup> Suyong Re,<sup>§||</sup> Jean Boisson,<sup>§</sup> and James T. Hynes<sup>\*,§,‡</sup>

Chemistry Department, École Normale Supérieure, and Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Unité Mixte de Recherche 8640, 24 rue Lhomond, 75005 Paris, France, and Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0215

Received: April 20, 2009; Revised Manuscript Received: July 13, 2009

We apply a solute–solvent approach to a theoretical study of vibrational symmetry breaking in aqueous  $\text{NO}_3^-$  solution. Experimental infrared and Raman spectra have shown that the NO asymmetric stretches, which are degenerate for the isolated anion, are split by 35–60  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  in dilute solution. As an initial step to calculating the spectra, we have computed the distribution of energies, or the “static spectrum”, and the resulting mean splitting of the two NO asymmetric stretch eigenstates in an aqueous milieu. These have been obtained in a two-mode treatment that considers only the NO asymmetric stretch mode pair as well as a full six-mode treatment. In both sets of calculations, six eigenstates, namely, the ground state, the two NO asymmetric stretch fundamentals, and its three overtones, were determined to suffice for converged energy distributions and mean splittings. The couplings between these six states are driven by the solvent forces on the anion’s modes, which were extracted from molecular dynamics simulations. The solvent forces on the two central modes were found to give rise to a majority of the computed mean splitting of 21.7  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ . The distribution of NO asymmetric stretch excitation energies with these two modes alone was found to have a Maxwell–Boltzmann shape. The solvent forces on the in-plane bends were found to modestly reduce the splitting size and slightly alter the width of the parent distribution. The symmetric stretch force was found to have no effect on the splitting but instead resulted in a widening on the distribution shape. The force gradients were found to have a weak effect on both the eigenvalue distribution and the mean splitting.

## 1. Introduction

The nitrate anion,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , is a key species in the atmospheric sciences. Its mineral salts are very hygroscopic, so that aerosols containing them are able to seed cloud formation.<sup>1</sup> Important heterogeneous chemistry, including stratospheric ozone depletion,<sup>2</sup> occurs on nitrate aerosols.  $\text{NO}_3^-$  is relevant in various other atmospheric contexts,<sup>3–5</sup> often in connection with the issue of its production via acid dissociation of nitric acid  $\text{HNO}_3$  at aqueous aerosol surfaces, a topic of much recent experimental<sup>7</sup> and theoretical<sup>6</sup> research; for an extensive discussion, see ref 6a.

The anion is also important in its own right in the solution chemistry context.  $\text{NO}_3^-$  can function as a probe of its local environment via, say, the spectroscopy of its six vibrational modes. Conversely, the solvent effect on the intramolecular dynamics has attracted considerable interest. For example, Waterland et al. have considered the photodynamics of the  $\text{NO}_3^-$  in hydrogen bonding and polar solvents using resonance Raman spectroscopy.<sup>8</sup> In connection with the anion as a probe, many infrared (IR) and Raman spectral investigations were published in the late 1960s and early 1970s for several nitrate salts and a range of concentrations, tending toward the high end.<sup>9</sup> These works drew inferences on the nature of the anion hydration and specific cation effects based upon the changes in the positions

and widths of  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ’s vibrational bands. More recent results along these lines are due to Zhang et al.,<sup>10</sup> Grassian and co-workers,<sup>1</sup> and Liu et al.<sup>11</sup>

Of the vibrational bands observed in the above studies, the NO asymmetric stretch band ( $\nu_3$ ,  $\sim 1370 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) features prominently. It is the most intense infrared band. The underlying pair of NO asymmetric stretch vibrations is degenerate for the  $D_{3h}$ -symmetric isolated anion. The absence of spatial symmetry in solution lifts the degeneracy of the NO asymmetric stretches, resulting in a doublet in both IR and Raman spectra. This effect has been referred to as “symmetry breaking” and is the focus of this article.<sup>12</sup> While this band splitting increasing with concentration, a splitting of 35–60  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  has been reported in dilute solutions.<sup>1,8–11</sup> On this basis, it has been suggested that the symmetry breaking can arise from the nitrate–water interaction alone; it does not require a cation’s presence, though the effect is clearly enhanced by it. Keeping to this dilute limit, this article presents an initial theoretical study on the  $\nu_3$  symmetry breaking in aqueous  $\text{NO}_3^-$ .

Theoretical studies of nitrate symmetry breaking are few in number, including ab initio computations on nitrate–water clusters<sup>1,8,11</sup> as well as mixed quantum  $\text{NO}_3^-$ –classical  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  (QM/MM) simulations.<sup>13</sup> The former have been typically coupled with experimental work. Among them, Waterland et al. have combined ab initio data with neutron scattering and Raman spectral data on several crystalline nitrates to relate the root-mean-square NO bond length distortion to the NO asymmetric stretch frequency splitting.<sup>8</sup> QM/MM simulations by Lebrero et al. showed periods of time, lasting about 100–200 fs, where a NO bond length and its oxygen’s negative charge are both larger or smaller than those for the other two NO bonds.<sup>13</sup> More

<sup>†</sup> Part of the “W. Carl Lineberger Festschrift”.

\* To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: hynes@spot.colorado.edu.

<sup>§</sup> École Normale Supérieure, and Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

<sup>‡</sup> University of Colorado.

<sup>||</sup> Present address: Theoretical Biochemistry Laboratory, RIKEN Advanced Science Institute 2-1, Hirosawa, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan.

**TABLE 1: Vibrational Modes and Harmonic Frequencies (in  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) of  $D_{3h}$ -Symmetric  $\text{NO}_3^-$** 

label	mode	symm.	$\omega_i^a$
1	NO sym. stretch	$A_1'$	1056.7
2	out-of-plane (OOP) bend	$A_2''$	830.8
(3x, 3y)	NO asym. stretch	$E'$	1407.0
(4x, 4y)	ONO in-plane bends	$E'$	734.0

<sup>a</sup> The  $\omega_i$  have been adjusted for a better match with available aqueous-phase fundamental energies. See Appendix A.2.

recently, Boisson et al. have shown through QM/MM simulations that two interleaved sets of such bond length asymmetric structures can be defined.<sup>14,15</sup> One set is only slightly more populated than the other, and the anion switches between them with a fast, 100 fs time scale. However, these valuable previous efforts have not provided a theoretical framework for the interpretation of the spectrum and the splitting; we take a first step in that provision here.

The present work, as part of our ongoing studies on nitrate hydration,<sup>14–16</sup> attempts a more complete quantum treatment of  $\text{NO}_3^-$ 's vibrations, and thereby the symmetry breaking, by employing the perturbative solute–solvent coupling method. We focus upon the manner in which water solvent forces on the anion, derived from molecular dynamics simulations, influence the distribution of excitation energies and the resulting mean splitting of the NO asymmetric stretch ( $\nu_3$ ) band. The question of whether the forces on the two central NO asymmetric stretch modes alone suffice to explain the observed effect is addressed. Further, the effects of including the solvent forces on the remaining four modes are also analyzed. We shall be primarily concerned with average measures in this article, postponing to the future a study of the dynamics in the system, including the aqueous-phase infrared spectrum of  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , and the origin of the solvent forces on its vibrations.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. We start in section 2 with definitions of a few essential quantities and outline the scheme of our calculations using them. A simplification of the symmetry breaking problem to the two core NO asymmetric stretch modes is attempted in section 3, where we compare classical and quantum treatments. Section 4 describes a progressive advance from the two-mode to the full, six-mode treatment of the problem. We summarize our findings and conclude in section 5.


## 2. Preliminaries

Table 1 shows the vibrational modes of nitrate, numbered as per spectroscopic convention. The  $x$ ,  $y$  tags for the doubly degenerate  $E'$  modes come from the axis along which the N atom motion points. The relative atomic displacements for our target modes, the NO asymmetric stretches, are depicted in Figure 1.

The Hamiltonian for the reference  $D_{3h}$ -symmetric anion is written as

$$H_0 = \sum_i \frac{1}{2} \omega_i (P_i^2 + Q_i^2) + V_{\text{anh}}(\mathbf{Q}) \quad (1)$$

This form implies that we use a single reference  $\text{NO}_3^-$  structure to treat symmetry breaking, as opposed to (multiple) in-plane distorted ones. Since it is not immediately obvious that our choice suffices, we give our reasoning in Appendix A.1. As the harmonic part of  $H_0$  shows, the  $\mathbf{Q}$  are rectilinear normal coordinates in unitless form. The harmonic frequencies,  $\omega_i$ , that we use in this article have been adjusted to better suit the mean



**Figure 1.** The degenerate NO asymmetric stretch normal modes.

vibrational data in the aqueous milieu; these numbers are shown in Table 1. The anharmonic vibrational potential is developed as a Taylor series to sixth order. The details of the computation of the  $\omega_i$  and  $V_{\text{anh}}$  are presented in Appendix A.2.

The solvent influence on these vibrations is contained in the interaction potential

$$\delta V(t) = - \sum_i F_i Q_i - \sum_{i \leq j} G_{ij} Q_i Q_j \quad (2)$$

As its notation signifies,  $\delta V(t)$  is the fluctuating part of the solute–solvent interaction,  $\langle \delta V(t) \rangle = \langle F_i \rangle = \langle G_{ij} \rangle = 0$ . The average, constant part that we have subtracted usually provides the gas-to-solution-phase frequency shifts.<sup>17</sup> We have effectively absorbed it into  $H_0$  by the adjustment of the  $\omega_i$ . The time evolution of the forces ( $F_i$ ) and force gradients ( $G_{ij}$ ) on the  $\text{NO}_3^-$ 's modes, which are evaluated at the equilibrium geometry of the anion, is governed by the solvent dynamics. For the present calculations, we carry out molecular dynamics simulations with the  $\text{NO}_3^-$ – $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  force field developed by Thomas et al.;<sup>18</sup> Appendix B gives the specifics of the simulations. An important result is that the simulation forces and force gradients have Gaussian distributions, with  $\sigma(F_i) \approx 100 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  ( $\sim 180 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  for  $F_2$ ) and  $\sigma(G_{ij}) \approx 1–10 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .

We analyze symmetry breaking in aqueous nitrate through the solution of

$$H(t) = H_0 + \delta V(t) \quad (3)$$

Its quantum treatment, the solute–solvent coupling approach, shall occupy most of this article, and it involves the following scheme.  $H_0$  is cast as a matrix in a basis of multimode harmonic product functions. Diagonalization of this matrix gives the eigenstates  $\psi_i$ , and eigenvalues  $E_{0,i}$ . These are then used to construct matrix elements for eq 3

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ij}(t) &= E_{0,i} \delta_{ij} + \delta V_{ij}(t) \\ \delta V_{ij}(t) &= \langle \psi_i | \delta V(t) | \psi_j \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We identify the eigenfunctions with sizable NO asymmetric stretch character in the solution of  $H(t)$ . The description of these eigenfunctions and their eigenvalues are the pieces of information that we shall need in this partial study of the symmetry breaking in aqueous  $\text{NO}_3^-$ . The quantum treatment will be interspersed with a simpler, classical approach as needed.

The role of the solvent forces,  $F_i$ , in the title phenomenon is the primary focus of this article. We eschew a cumbersome notational distinction between forms of  $\delta V(t)$  with and without

the force gradients,  $G_{ij}$ . Unless explicitly indicated otherwise,  $\delta V(t)$  henceforth means only the linear part of eq 2.

### 3. Two-Mode Analysis

Instead of directly plunging into a full six-mode treatment of symmetry breaking, we first examine only the two NO asymmetric stretches,  $Q_{3x}$  and  $Q_{3y}$ . This two-mode simplification is of intrinsic value as it is apt to be transparent, and its results can serve as a reference for the more complex six-mode problem. For this section alone, the 3 in the mode subscripts is dropped.

The Hamiltonian for this two-mode (2m) subproblem is

$$\begin{aligned} H^{2m}(t) &= H_0^{2m} + \delta V^{2m}(t) \\ H_0^{2m} &= \frac{1}{2}\omega(P_x^2 + P_y^2) + \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q_x^2 + Q_y^2) + f(Q_x^3 - 3Q_xQ_y^2) \\ \delta V^{2m}(t) &= -F_xQ_x - F_yQ_y \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where we have retained only the cubic anharmonicity. Its particular form reflects the three-fold symmetry of the anion. The anharmonicity constant,  $f$ , is a negative number, and our ab initio computations, described in Appendix A.2, yield a value of  $-49.4 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .  $\delta V(t)$  has been limited to just the solvent forces, assuming their dominance in the solvent influence; these will be checked by including the force gradients at the end of the analyses.

**3.1. Classical Treatment.** With only a few terms present,  $H^{2m}(t)$  lends itself to a simple classical treatment. The starting point is the observation that  $Q_x = Q_y = 0$  is not the equilibrium position for the two-mode potential. A completion-of-squares step

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\omega(Q_x^2 + Q_y^2) - F_xQ_x - F_yQ_y = \\ \frac{1}{2}\omega\left[Q_x - \frac{F_x}{\omega}\right]^2 + \frac{1}{2}\omega\left[Q_y - \frac{F_y}{\omega}\right]^2 - \frac{F_x^2 + F_y^2}{2\omega} \end{aligned}$$

eliminates the linear terms and yields  $(F_x/\omega, F_y/\omega)$  as the instantaneous potential minimum. The above equation signals for a change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} Q'_x &= Q_x - \frac{F_x}{\omega} & P'_x &= P_x \\ Q'_y &= Q_y - \frac{F_y}{\omega} & P'_y &= P_y \end{aligned}$$

Upon re-expressing the cubic anharmonicity in the new variables, additional quadratic terms are generated. The new Hamiltonian now reads

$$\begin{aligned} H^{2m}(t) &= \frac{1}{2}\omega(P_x'^2 + P_y'^2) + \frac{1}{2}[Q'_x Q'_y] \times \\ &\begin{bmatrix} \omega - 2\alpha F_x & 2\alpha F_y \\ 2\alpha F_y & \omega + 2\alpha F_x \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q'_x \\ Q'_y \end{bmatrix} + f(Q_x'^3 - 3Q'_x Q_y'^2) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the coefficient gauging the nitrate–solvent coupling is

$$\alpha = -\frac{3f}{\omega} \quad (7)$$

This coefficient will be important throughout this paper. With the values of  $f$  and  $\omega$  quoted above,  $\alpha \approx 0.1$ . The ellipsis in eq 6 represents dropped constant and linear terms. The prefactors for the latter contain  $\alpha^n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , that lead to weak secondary effects.

Our focus is the modified quadratic portion of eq 6, from which we wish to extract new frequencies. To this end, we define the polar form of the forces

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \sqrt{F_x^2 + F_y^2} & \theta(t) &= \tan^{-1}(F_y/F_x) \\ \mathbf{R}(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{1}{2}\theta & \sin \frac{1}{2}\theta \\ -\sin \frac{1}{2}\theta & \cos \frac{1}{2}\theta \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Applying a coordinate rotation  $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{R}(t)\mathbf{Q}''$ , the  $2 \times 2$  matrix of force constants is transformed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}(t)^T \begin{bmatrix} \omega - 2\alpha F_x & 2\alpha F_y \\ 2\alpha F_y & \omega + 2\alpha F_x \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}(t) \\ = \begin{bmatrix} \omega - 2\alpha F & 0 \\ 0 & \omega + 2\alpha F \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The quadratic part of two-mode Hamiltonian simplifies to


$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}[\omega P_x''^2 + (\omega - 2\alpha F)Q_x''^2] + \\ \frac{1}{2}[\omega P_y''^2 + (\omega + 2\alpha F)Q_y''^2] \end{aligned}$$

for which

$$\omega'' = \sqrt{\omega(\omega \pm 2\alpha F)} \approx \omega \pm \alpha F \quad (10)$$

are the new frequencies.

The two variable changes above express the modification of the character of the degenerate pair of NO asymmetric modes due to the solvent. It is particularly clear that  $F_x$  and  $F_y$  have no effect without the intramolecular anharmonicity. The most conspicuous change is, of course, that the harmonic



**Figure 2.** Distribution of split harmonic frequencies of the NO asymmetric stretches based on the distribution of the solvent force magnitude,  $\rho(F)$ , on them. See text around eq 11.

frequencies of the new modes are split by  $2\alpha F$  ( $= -6fF/\omega$ ). To leading order, this is the extent of symmetry breaking within the two-mode framework.

For any given distribution of  $F_x$  and  $F_y$ ,  $\langle F \rangle > 0$ , resulting in some nonzero mean splitting of harmonic frequencies. The simulations described in Appendix B yield  $F_x$  and  $F_y$  as uncorrelated quantities, both with a Gaussian spread of the same width  $\sigma$ . The distribution for  $F$  is therefore the product of these Gaussians with the angle integrated out,  $\rho(F) = F/\sigma^2 \exp(-F^2/2\sigma^2)$ . With this, and the estimates  $\alpha \approx 0.1$  and  $\sigma(F) \approx 95 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , we depict the distribution of the split frequencies  $\omega \pm \alpha F$  in Figure 2. The mean splitting for this distribution will be

$$2\alpha\langle F \rangle = \sqrt{2\pi}\alpha\sigma \quad (11)$$

whose numerical value is  $23.8 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . This compares reasonably well to the  $35 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  experimental estimate by Hudson et al.; see Figure 3 of ref 1b.

We now introduce the force gradients from eq 2

$$-G_{xx}Q_x^2 - G_{xy}Q_xQ_y - G_{yy}Q_y^2$$

into  $\delta V^{2m}(t)$ . Clearly, these directly affect the quadratic potential. Working through the coordinate transformations, we obtain the modified frequencies as

$$\omega'' \approx \omega \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{[2\alpha F_x + (G_{xx} - G_{yy})]^2 + [2\alpha F_y - G_{xy}]^2} \quad (12)$$

This equation and eq 10 are the two-mode analogues of the solvent-induced frequency change formula for a single oscillator that has been severally employed in the literature.<sup>19</sup>

To estimate the size of the splitting with the force gradients, we employ the simulation results (Appendix B) that the  $G_{ij}$ 's also have a Gaussian distribution. The ones we need have the widths  $\sigma(G_{xx} - G_{yy}) = \sigma(G_{xy}) \approx 3.3 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Taking four terms under the square root in eq 12 to have mutually uncorrelated Gaussian distributions, we randomly sample values for them. This procedure yields a splitting of  $24.1 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , a value which hardly differs from the estimate with  $F_x$  and  $F_y$  alone.<sup>20</sup>

**3.2. Two-Mode Quantum Treatment: Identification of a Core-State Sextet.** Turning now to a quantum analysis, our first task is to obtain eigenstates and eigenvalues of  $H_0^{2m}$  in eq 5. We choose a rather small basis, consisting of only the harmonic product functions with a total of 0, 1, and 2 quanta of vibrational excitation in the NO asymmetric stretch modes,  $Q_x$  and  $Q_y$ . This makes for a basis size of 6, and we shall demonstrate its sufficiency a few lines below. The notation  $3_m^x 3_n^y$  refers to a product basis function with  $m$  and  $n$  vibrational quanta in  $Q_x$  and  $Q_y$ , respectively. (The 3 comes, of course, from the spectroscopic numbering scheme in Table 1.)

When symmetrized, the basis is partitioned into three pairs, namely,  $A_1'$ :  $0_0$  and  $[1/2^{1/2}](3_2^x + 3_2^y)$ ;  $E_x'$ :  $3_1^x$  and  $[1/2^{1/2}](3_2^x - 3_2^y)$ ; and  $E_y'$ :  $3_1^y$  and  $-3_1^y 3_1^x$ . (The minus sign on  $-3_1^y 3_1^x$  is required for correct "orientation".) Being of  $A_1'$  symmetry,  $H_0^{2m}$  only permits intrapair couplings. The  $H_0^{2m}$  matrix is therefore composed of three  $2 \times 2$  matrices, the eigenvectors for which are trivially obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} E_{o,gs}^{2m} &= 0.0 & \nu_{gs} &= 0_0 \\ E_{o,x}^{2m} &= 1399.2 & \nu_x &= c_1 3_1^x + c_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[3_2^x - 3_2^y] \\ E_{o,y}^{2m} &= 1399.2 & \nu_y &= c_1 3_1^y - c_2 3_1^x 3_1^y \\ E_{o,2x}^{2m} &= 2821.7 & 2\nu_x &= -c_2 3_1^x + c_1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[3_2^x - 3_2^y] \\ E_{o,2y}^{2m} &= 2821.7 & 2\nu_y &= -c_2 3_1^y - c_1 3_1^x 3_1^y \\ E_{o,2A}^{2m} &= 2813.9 & 2\nu_A &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[3_2^x + 3_2^y] \\ & & c_1 &= 0.9973, \quad c_2 = 0.0739 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

We use  $\nu$ 's to refer to eigenstates henceforth;  $2\nu_x$  refers to an overtone state of  $E_x'$  symmetry. The expansion coefficients,  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , are the same for the  $E_x'$  and  $E_y'$  states, as per symmetry requirements. Note that  $c_2$  depends on  $f$ , the cubic anharmonicity constant

$$c_2 \approx -\frac{3f}{\sqrt{2}\omega} \quad f < 0 \quad (14)$$

The states in eq 13 form our core sextet of eigenstates upon which much of our analysis is based; we shall consider their all-mode versions in section 4.

The simple structure of the sextet of eigenvectors in eq 13 affords an easy, rapid computation of the time-dependent two-mode Hamiltonian with them

$$\mathbf{H}^{2m}(t) \approx \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_1F_x & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_1F_y & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2F_x & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2F_y & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_1F_x & E_{o,x}^{2m} - \sqrt{2}c_1c_2F_x & \sqrt{2}c_1c_2F_y & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^2 - c_2^2)F_x & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^2 - c_2^2)F_y & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_1F_x \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_1F_y & \sqrt{2}c_1c_2F_y & E_{o,y}^{2m} + \sqrt{2}c_1c_2F_x & +\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^2 - c_2^2)F_y & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^2 - c_2^2)F_x & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_1F_y \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2F_x & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^2 - c_2^2)F_x & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^2 - c_2^2)F_y & E_{o,2x}^{2m} + \sqrt{2}c_1c_2F_x & -\sqrt{2}c_1c_2F_y & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2F_x \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2F_y & +\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^2 - c_2^2)F_y & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^2 - c_2^2)F_x & -\sqrt{2}c_1c_2F_y & E_{o,2y}^{2m} - \sqrt{2}c_1c_2F_x & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2F_y \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_1F_x & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_1F_y & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2F_x & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2F_y & E_{o,2A}^{2m} \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

The row/column ordering employed is the same as the order of states in eq 13. Of interest here are the excitation energies of the fundamentals that arise from the solution of this matrix. Showing that the  $H^{2m}(t)$  matrix elements are adequate for this purpose is equivalent to stating that the sextet in eq 13 suffices. A key aspect in our rationalization is that the linear terms that make up  $\delta V^{2m}(t)$  can couple harmonic basis functions that differ by only one quantum of excitation, which we will call  $\Delta\nu = 1$  coupling.

The boxed  $\nu_x - \nu_y$  block of  $\mathbf{H}^{2m}(t)$  in eq 15 shows the solvent-induced coupling between these two states. We shall soon see that the mean eigenvalue splitting is mainly due to this block. All four terms involve a common prefactor of  $2^{1/2}c_1c_2$ , which, using the states' expansions, is seen to arise from the couplings between one and two quantum basis functions. Since only such  $\Delta\nu = 1$  couplings are permitted by the form of  $\delta V^{2m}(t)$  (eq 5), the involvement of three and higher quantum functions, when included, will be weak.<sup>21</sup>

Further, the  $2^{1/2}c_1c_2$  prefactor itself will remain essentially constant regardless of the length of the eigenfunction expansions. From a perturbation theoretic viewpoint,  $c_1 \approx 1$ , and  $c_2$  would be nearly unchanged even if a larger harmonic basis were used to diagonalize  $H_0^{2m}$ . Put together, one sees that the small, six-function basis captures the main contributions in the intrafundamental matrix elements.

These arguments may be extended to state that, in eq 15, the rest of the second and third rows/columns, and even the first row/column for the ground state's couplings, are practically converged for the chosen solute-solvent coupling,  $\delta V(t)$ . (Since we desire excitation energies, the ground state must be given due attention.) We point out that the lack of higher anharmonicities in  $H_0^{2m}$ , or the small energy differences between truly converged states and those used here, cause only minor numerical changes.

By the same token, for the bottom-right,  $3 \times 3$  overtone block in eq 15, it will take the second overtone to incorporate all of the key solvent effects. While we shall err in the energies of the overtones, this will not be an impediment to our targets. The imprecision will be much smaller than the fundamental-overtone energy gap; moreover, this gap is also at least 10 times larger than the couplings between the two state sets.

**3.3. Two-Mode Quantum Treatment: Asymmetric Stretch Excitation Energies, Their Distributions, and Splitting.** We now move on to solving  $\mathbf{H}^{2m}(t)$  for the fundamental energies. To reduce the clutter of coefficients in the following, all off-block diagonal occurrences of  $c_1$  and  $c_1^2 - c_2^2$  in eq 15 are set to unity. The  $2^{1/2}c_1c_2$  prefactor common to the  $\nu_x - \nu_y$ , as well as the  $2\nu_x - 2\nu_y$ , blocks cannot be reduced. However, with  $c_1 \approx 1$

$$\sqrt{2}c_1c_2 \approx -\frac{3f}{\omega} = \alpha \quad (16)$$

where we have used eq 7. We thus replace the force prefactors of both  $2 \times 2$  blocks by  $\alpha$ , so that they have the structure

$$\pm \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha F_x & \alpha F_y \\ \alpha F_y & \alpha F_x \end{bmatrix}$$

We have already encountered this matrix in the classical treatment of section 3.1. We reuse the rotation matrix,  $\mathbf{R}(t)$ , eq 8, to define a larger matrix

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}(t) & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}(t) & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (17)$$

Applying this to eq 15, we obtain

$$\mathbf{U}(t)^T \mathbf{H}^{2m}(t) \mathbf{U}(t) \approx \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F \cos \frac{3}{2}\theta & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F \sin \frac{3}{2}\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F \cos \frac{3}{2}\theta & \omega - \alpha F & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F \cos \frac{3}{2}\theta \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F \sin \frac{3}{2}\theta & 0 & \omega + \alpha F & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F \sin \frac{3}{2}\theta \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F & 0 & 2\omega + \alpha F & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2 F \cos \frac{3}{2}\theta \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F & 0 & 2\omega - \alpha F & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2 F \sin \frac{3}{2}\theta \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F \cos \frac{3}{2}\theta & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}F \sin \frac{3}{2}\theta & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2 F \cos \frac{3}{2}\theta & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_2 F \sin \frac{3}{2}\theta & 2\omega \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

We have made two unannounced changes in this matrix. First, the ground state–overtone coupling ( $1/2^{1/2}c_2F_{x(y)}$ ) is set to 0 as it is much smaller than their energy gap. Second, we have replaced all diagonal fundamental and overtone energies by their respective harmonic counterparts,  $\omega$  and  $2\omega$ . This latter approximation is in keeping with our assertion at the end of section 3.2 that we need neither exact overtone energies nor exact energy gaps between the three sets of states that make up  $\mathbf{H}^{2m}(t)$ . In the same vein, we now neglect the intraovertone couplings in the last row and column in eq 18.

That done, the remaining structure of the transformed matrix permits us to treat the couplings of the fundamentals to the ground and overtone states in a pairwise perturbative manner. We thereby write down for the upper ( $E_u$ ) and lower ( $E_l$ ) state energies

$$E_l \approx \left( \begin{array}{c} \omega - \alpha F + \frac{1}{2}F^2 \cos^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta - \frac{1}{2}F^2 \\ \frac{1}{2}F^2 \cos^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta - \frac{1}{2}F^2 \cos^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta + \frac{1}{2}F^2 \sin^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta \\ -\frac{1}{2}F^2 \cos^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta + \frac{1}{2}F^2 \cos^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta + \frac{1}{2}F^2 \sin^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta \end{array} \right) \\ \approx \omega - \alpha F + \frac{\alpha F^3 [1 + \cos^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta]}{\omega^2} + \frac{\frac{1}{2}\alpha F^3 \cos 3\theta}{\omega^2} \\ E_u \approx \left( \begin{array}{c} \omega + \alpha F + \frac{1}{2}F^2 \sin^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta - \frac{1}{2}F^2 \\ \frac{1}{2}F^2 \sin^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta - \frac{1}{2}F^2 \cos^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta + \frac{1}{2}F^2 \sin^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta \\ -\frac{1}{2}F^2 \sin^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta + \frac{1}{2}F^2 \cos^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta + \frac{1}{2}F^2 \sin^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta \end{array} \right) \\ \approx \omega + \alpha F - \frac{\alpha F^3 [1 + \sin^2 \frac{3}{2}\theta]}{\omega^2} + \frac{\frac{1}{2}\alpha F^3 \cos 3\theta}{\omega^2} \quad (19)$$

The last two terms of the bracketed expressions for  $E_l$  and  $E_u$  are simply the subtracted value of the ground-state energy. Note that, to zeroth order in  $\alpha$ , the downward “push” of the  $A'_1$  overtone cancels the upward “push” of the fundamentals by the ground state (first two  $\sin^2$  terms in  $E_u$ , first two  $\cos^2$  terms in  $E_l$ ). The resulting splitting to first order in the anion–solvent coupling coefficient,  $\alpha$  (eq 16), is

$$\Delta E_{sp} = E_u - E_l \approx 2\alpha F - 3\alpha \frac{F^3}{\omega^2} \quad (20)$$

With the harmonic frequency,  $\omega$ , typically being an order of magnitude larger than  $F$ , the second term here contributes

only slightly to the splitting. In fact, this also allows us to state that

$$E_u \approx \omega + \alpha F \quad E_l \approx \omega - \alpha F \quad (21)$$

The dominant contribution to the fundamental excitation energies and the splitting therefore comes from the  $\nu_x$ – $\nu_y$  block of  $\mathbf{H}^{2m}(t)$  in eq 15.


Equation 21 is essentially eq 10 of the previous classical analysis. This indicates that the distributions of the  $E_u$  and  $E_l$  from the above quantum treatment of  $H^{2m}(t)$ , which we will call  $\rho(E_{u,l})$ , will be rather similar to the spread of harmonic frequencies in the classical analysis. We make this comparison in Figure 3. The red curve for the binned distribution of  $E_u$  and  $E_l$  was directly obtained from the diagonalization of the  $H^{2m}(t)$  matrix in eq 15. The water solvent forces were taken from the simulations. Note that this Hamiltonian matrix uses the actual fundamental energies of the two-mode eigenstates ( $1399.2 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ), rather than approximating them as  $\omega$  ( $= 1407.0 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ). The black curve is that in Figure 2 and represents the spread of values for either the classical harmonic frequencies or the ( $E_u$ ,  $E_l$ ) pair of eq 21. (The center of the black curve has been shifted by  $1399.2 - 1407.0 = -7.8 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .) As expected, the two distributions are very much alike. The mean value of the splitting for the red curve,  $\Delta E_{sp} = \langle E_u - E_l \rangle$ , is  $24.4 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , which is very close to  $23.8 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  for the black curve.<sup>22</sup>

To complete the two-mode analysis, we consider the influence of the force gradients,  $G_{ij}$ , that have been so far ignored in the quantum treatment. Upon their inclusion in the 2m Hamiltonian, the fundamental excitation energies are found distributed as in the gray curve of Figure 3. The change in shape from the red curve is small, and the new mean splitting is only augmented by 0.8 to  $25.2 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Yet again, we find little gain from the force gradients for the state energies and their distribution.

We will now turn to a more detailed and accurate description of the eigenvalue distribution and mean splitting. Remarkably, and contrary to our initial expectations, the numerical impact on the splitting estimation above is minimal, with some modest distortions to the distribution shapes in the more sophisticated analyses.

#### 4. Six-Mode Analysis

We have demonstrated thus far that the treatment of the two NO asymmetric stretch modes alone is a quite useful approach to nitrate symmetry breaking. We now begin an examination of the effect of the other four modes of the anion. All intramolecular couplings in  $V_{\text{anh}}$  need to be introduced into the problem, which requires the computation of the all-mode eigenstates of the molecular Hamiltonian,  $H_0$ . This is the subject of section 4.1. With these eigenvectors in hand, we now have two variables to control in the solute–solvent coupling approach,



**Figure 3.** Distribution of NO asymmetric stretch fundamental excitation energies obtained from a direct solution of the two-mode matrix in eq 15 using simulation NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-H<sub>2</sub>O forces (red) and from an expanded form of the same matrix with nitrate-water force gradients included (gray). In black is the curve from Figure 2, which is the plot of the spread of the split frequencies in eq 10 or, equally, the split energies of eq 21. Its center has been shifted by  $-7.8 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  to align it with the other curves.

namely, the size of the eigenbasis used for the full time-dependent Hamiltonian,  $H(t)$ , and the set of anion-water solvent forces,  $F_i$ , included. Our approach will be that of a progressive switch from a two-mode-like to a six-mode analysis, which we present in sections 4.2 and 4.3. We shall present the distributions of excitation energies,  $\rho(E_{u,l})$ , and mean splittings,  $\Delta E_{\text{sp}}$ , for the NO asymmetric stretch fundamentals at each stage.

**4.1. Six-Mode Eigenstates.** The first task at hand is the diagonalization of  $H_0$  of eq 1. As in the two-mode case, we employ a harmonic basis. We will use the notation  $a_m^x b_n$  to mean a basis function with  $m$  quanta of vibrational excitation in mode  $Q_{ax}$  and  $n$  in  $Q_b$ . Of course, the unindicated modes are at their zero-point levels. The  $x$  or  $y$  superscripts apply to the asymmetric stretches and in-plane bends alone (modes 3 and 4). A raw basis composed of such functions is symmetrized via linear combinations and is sorted into eight subsets, one for each of the eight  $D_{3h}$  symmetry species. Since  $H_0$  can only couple basis functions within a given subset, the task of diagonalization is greatly simplified.<sup>23</sup> It remains only to choose an adequately large basis of each symmetry type to converge the necessary eigenstates. We find that a harmonic energy cutoff of  $10000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  (relative to the ground-state function,  $0_0$ ) is sufficient to converge all states below about  $4000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Attesting to this are the mean absolute differences of 0.9 and  $0.2 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  of the energies of these states from those computed with a basis cutoff of 9000 and  $12000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The energies and description of the ground, fundamental, and some overtone states are shown in Table 2. The label  $m\nu_a$  refers to an eigenstate that is predominantly like a symmetrized basis function with  $m$  quanta in mode  $Q_a$ . Additional tags or subscripts serve to specify the symmetry.

Some aspects of these state expansions deserve mention. Note, first, that the NO symmetric stretch permeates all of them. Functions like  $1_1$  or  $1_1 m_n$  are the second most important in the lists. Their presence can be traced back to potential terms of the form  $Q_1 Q_2^2$ ,  $Q_1(Q_{3x}^2 + Q_{3y}^2)$ , and  $Q_1(Q_{4x}^2 + Q_{4y}^2)$ . (The last ones for the in-plane bends can be thought of as a Fermi coupling.) Changing  $Q_1$  means uniformly changing all three NO bond lengths, and such cubic terms simply express the dependence of the harmonic frequencies and, thereby, other computed properties on the bond length.

Placed only about  $75 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  above the asymmetric stretch fundamentals,  $\nu_{3x}$  and  $\nu_{3y}$ , are the bend overtone states,  $2\nu_{4x}$  and  $2\nu_{4y}$ . The two pairs are not strongly coupled, despite the proximity;  $3_1^+$  and  $3_1^-$  have a coefficient of 0.034 in the expansions of the bend overtones and vice versa. This weak intermolecular coupling is corroborated by the absence of an “intensity shared” peak in the vicinity of  $1450 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .<sup>24</sup>

**4.2. Progressive Inclusion of Water Solvent-Induced Effects on the Core Sextet.** In the two-mode quantum treatment in sections 3.2 and 3.3, we saw that applying the solute-solvent coupling scheme with the sextet

$$\{\nu_{gs}, \nu_{3x}, \nu_{3y}, 2\nu_{3x}, 2\nu_{3y}, 2\nu_{3A}\} \quad (22)$$

was sufficient to capture the solvent effects on the two NO asymmetric stretch fundamentals,  $\nu_{3x}$  and  $\nu_{3y}$ . We restart from that very point, only switching to the six-mode (6m) versions of these eigenstates. In the next three subsections, we study the changes to the energies of the  $\nu_3$  fundamentals as we introduce, stepwise, the solvent forces on the six modes.

The following dissection of the solvent-induced coupling will be useful in the analyses. Writing the eigenstates as  $|\psi_i\rangle = \sum_k c_{ki} |\phi_k\rangle$ , where  $|\phi_k\rangle$  are the symmetrized harmonic basis functions, we obtain

$$\delta V_{ij}(t) = - \sum_m F_m \sum_{kl} c_{ki} c_{lj} (Q_m)_{kl} \quad (23)$$

Here,  $(Q_m)_{kl} = \langle \phi_k | Q_m | \phi_l \rangle$ , which are trivially evaluated. The coefficient products are, of course, a reflection of the intramolecular couplings. For a given force,  $F_m$ , usually only a few terms of the bracketed sum need to be considered. This is profitable in two ways. (1) We can make estimates of the coupling sizes between a state pair. Whether the two states affect each other significantly or not may be judged in a perturbative fashion. If they do, (2) we try to identify, through the  $|\phi_k\rangle, |\phi_l\rangle$  pairs involved, the terms in  $V_{\text{anh}}$  that gave rise to the key summands. We thereby gain a clearer, physical understanding of the effect of each  $F_m$  on the state pair under investigation.

**4.2.1. Effect of the Solvent Forces on the Asymmetric Stretches.** We start with a check. If we were to retain the two-mode form of the solute-solvent coupling

$$\delta V(t) \equiv \delta V^{2m}(t) = -F_{3x} Q_{3x} - F_{3y} Q_{3y} \quad (24)$$

the presence of the other modes and the larger size of the expansions of the sextet (eq 22) should not matter. The reason for this is that we effectively return to the 2m case of section 3.2. The expansion functions  $3_1^+$ ,  $3_1^-$ ,  $(1/2)^{1/2}(3_2^+ - 3_2^-)$  and  $-3_1^+ 3_1^-$ , which made up the 2d eigenstates in eq 13, remain the major role players in generating the solvent-induced couplings. Furthermore, the coefficients of these four basis functions in the new, all-mode expansions of  $\nu_{3x}$  and  $\nu_{3y}$  (Table 2) are only slightly different from their 2m counterparts.

In summary, we expect the  $H(t)$  matrix to be essentially unchanged from its 2m form in eq 15.<sup>25</sup> This would, in turn, generate nearly the same excitation energy distribution,  $\rho(E_{u,l})$ , and mean eigenvalue splitting,  $\Delta E_{\text{sp}}$ , that we obtained in the 2m treatment. Figure 4 compares the two distributions. The red line is the 2m result that has been carried over from Figure 3, while the black line is for the 6m counterpart. (Note that the red curve has been shifted to account for the 2m to 6m

**TABLE 2: A Few Eigenvectors<sup>a</sup> of the Full Six-Mode NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> Hamiltonian,  $H_0$ , and Their Energies in cm<sup>-1</sup>**

0.0	$v_{gs}$	726.1	$v_{4x}$	$v_{4y}$
0.9912	$0_0$	0.9883	$4_1^x$	$4_1^y$
0.1266	$1_1$	0.1442	$1_1 4_1^x$	$1_1 4_1^y$
0.0217	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 3_2^x + 1_1 3_2^y)$	0.0183	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(4_2^x - 4_2^y)$	$-4_1^x 4_1^y$
0.0113	$1_2$	-0.0135	$1_1 3_1^x$	$1_1 3_1^y$
		-0.0116	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_2^x - 3_2^y)$	$-3_1^x 3_1^y$
821.4	$v_2(A_2')$			
0.9918	$2_1$	1376.5	$v_{3x}$	$v_{3y}$
0.1216	$1_1 2_1$	0.9720	$3_1^x$	$3_1^y$
		0.1991	$1_1 3_1^x$	$1_1 3_1^y$
1046.9	$v_1(A_1')$	0.0699	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_2^x - 3_2^y)$	$-3_1^x 3_1^y$
0.9634	$1_1$	-0.0525	$1_1 4_1^x$	$1_1 4_1^y$
0.2173	$1_2$	-0.0456	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_1^x 4_1^x - 3_1^y 4_1^y)$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(4_1^x 3_1^y + 3_1^x 4_1^y)$
-0.1267	$0_0$	0.0343	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(4_2^x - 4_2^y)$	$-4_1^x 4_1^y$
0.0462	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(4_2^x + 4_2^y)$	0.0153	$4_1^x$	$4_1^y$
0.0461	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_2^x + 3_2^y)$			
-0.0291	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_1^x 4_1^x + 3_1^y 4_1^y)$	1452.0	$2v_{4x}$	$2v_{4y}$
		0.9842	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(4_2^x - 4_2^y)$	$-4_1^x 4_1^y$
1451.8	$2v_4(A_1') \equiv 2v_{4A}$	0.1615	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 4_2^x - 1_1 4_2^y)$	$-1_1 4_1^x 4_1^y$
0.9832	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(4_2^x + 4_2^y)$	-0.0344	$3_1^x$	$3_1^y$
0.1610	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 4_2^x + 1_1 4_2^y)$	0.0256	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} 4_3^x + \frac{1}{2} 4_1^x 4_2^y$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} 4_3^y + \frac{1}{2} 4_2^x 4_1^y$
-0.0473	$1_1$	-0.0191	$4_1^x$	$4_1^y$
0.0444	$\frac{1}{2} 4_3^x - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} 4_1^x 4_2^y$	-0.0188	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 3_1^x 4_1^x - 1_1 3_1^y 4_1^y)$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 4_1^x 3_1^y + 1_1 3_1^x 4_1^y)$
-0.0187	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 3_1^x 4_1^x + 1_1 3_1^y 4_1^y)$	-0.0164	$\frac{1}{2}(3_2^x 4_1^x - 4_1^x 3_2^y) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} 3_1^x 3_1^y 4_1^y$	$-\frac{1}{2}(3_2^x 4_1^y - 3_2^y 4_1^x) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} 3_1^y 4_1^x 3_1^y$
-0.0165	$\frac{1}{2}(3_2^x 4_1^x - 4_1^x 3_2^y) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} 3_1^x 3_1^y 4_1^y$			
-0.0103	$1_2$	2752.2	$2v_{3x}$	$2v_{3y}$
		0.9442	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_2^x - 3_2^y)$	$-3_1^x 3_1^y$
2725.6	$2v_3(A_1') \equiv 2v_{3A}$	0.2626	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 3_2^x - 1_1 3_2^y)$	$-1_1 3_1^x 3_1^y$
0.9366	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_2^x + 3_2^y)$	0.0941	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} 3_3^x + \frac{1}{2} 3_1^x 3_2^y$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} 3_3^y + \frac{1}{2} 3_2^x 3_1^y$
0.2590	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 3_2^x + 1_1 3_2^y)$	-0.0672	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 3_1^x 4_1^x - 1_1 3_1^y 4_1^y)$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 4_1^x 3_1^y + 1_1 3_1^x 4_1^y)$
0.1616	$\frac{1}{2} 3_3^x - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} 3_1^x 3_2^y$	-0.0655	$3_1^x$	$3_1^y$
-0.0815	$\frac{1}{2}(3_2^x 4_1^x - 4_1^x 3_2^y) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} 3_1^x 3_1^y 4_1^y$	0.0650	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(4_1^x 3_1^y 4_1^y + \frac{1}{2}(3_1^x 4_2^x - 3_1^y 4_2^y))$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_1^x 4_1^y 4_1^y - \frac{1}{2}(4_2^x 3_1^y - 3_1^x 4_2^y))$
-0.0596	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1_1 3_1^x 4_1^x + 1_1 3_1^y 4_1^y)$	-0.0642	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_2^x 4_1^x + 4_1^x 3_2^y)$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_2^x 4_1^y + 3_2^y 4_1^x)$
0.0489	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_1^x 4_1^x + 3_1^y 4_1^y)$	-0.0428	$1_1 3_1^x$	$1_1 3_1^y$
-0.0453	$1_1$	0.0267	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(3_1^x 4_1^x - 3_1^y 4_1^y)$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(4_1^x 3_1^y + 3_1^x 4_1^y)$
0.0324	$\frac{1}{2}(3_1^x 4_2^x - 3_1^y 4_2^y) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} 4_1^x 3_1^y 4_1^y$	-0.0135	$1_2 3_1^x$	$1_2 3_1^y$
-0.0215	$1_2$	0.0112	$4_1^x$	$4_1^y$
		0.0100	$1_2 4_1^x$	$1_2 4_1^y$

<sup>a</sup> The expansions have been restricted to one quantum of excitation higher than the leading basis function, even if higher basis functions have coefficients larger than 0.01.

reference eigenvalue change for  $\nu_3$ .) The agreement of the two curves depicts our assertion. The  $\nu_3$  splitting,  $\Delta E_{sp}$ , is 24.5 cm<sup>-1</sup>, while that for the black curve is 24.4 cm<sup>-1</sup>.

**4.2.2. Effect of the Solvent Forces on the In-Plane Bends.** Next, we update  $\delta V(t)$  in eq 24 by including also the solvent forces on the in-plane bends, that is,  $-F_{4x}Q_{4x} - F_{4y}Q_{4y}$ . Recomputing the  $H(t)$  matrix with the core sextet, the spreads of the  $E_u$  and  $E_l$  now appear as the green curve in Figure 4. It has a smaller width than the red curve of the previous step. Though not dramatic, an analysis of the effect of the  $F_4$ 's shall prove insightful.

These new additions to  $\delta V(t)$  can couple basis functions that differ by one quantum in the in-plane bends. Using eq 23 with the core sextet's expansions in Table 2, we estimate that the existing coupling between the fundamentals and the other four states is revised by 1–2 cm<sup>-1</sup>. The change is not significant compared to the energy gap between the states in question. It will therefore suffice to focus on how the two in-plane bend forces affect the  $\nu_{3x}$ – $\nu_{3y}$  pair alone.

Sifting through the basis functions of the fundamental state pair, one finds that  $-F_{4x}Q_{4x} - F_{4y}Q_{4y}$  can couple  $3_1^x$  and  $3_1^y$  to  $(1/2^{1/2})(3_1^x 4_1^x - 3_1^y 4_1^y)$  and  $(-1/2^{1/2})(4_1^x 3_1^x + 3_1^y 4_1^y)$  and that these give rise to the dominant additions to the  $\nu_{3x}$ – $\nu_{3y}$  couplings.

The latter two basis functions, which we label as  $|a_x\rangle$  and  $|a_y\rangle$ , appear in the  $\nu_{3x}$  and  $\nu_{3y}$  expansions with the same coefficients  $c_b = -0.0456$ . The coupling structure that results adds the following to the  $2 \times 2$  fundamental block of eq 15


$$-2c_1 |c_b| \begin{bmatrix} \langle 3_1^x | \delta V | a_x \rangle & \langle 3_1^x | \delta V | a_y \rangle \\ \langle 3_1^y | \delta V | a_x \rangle & \langle 3_1^y | \delta V | a_y \rangle \end{bmatrix} = -c_1 |c_b| \begin{bmatrix} -F_{4x} & F_{4y} \\ F_{4y} & F_{4x} \end{bmatrix} \quad (25)$$

We have already encountered a coupling matrix of this structure in the two-mode subproblem; see eq 9. At that point, the matrix afforded the classical interpretation that the solvent forces, working through the anharmonicity, altered the NO asymmetric stretch harmonic frequencies,  $\omega_3$ . Looking for a similar explanation in the current instance, we trace back the presence of  $|a_{x(y)}\rangle$  in the  $\nu_{3x(y)}$  expansions to the cubic potential term

$$f[(Q_{3x}^2 - Q_{3y}^2)Q_{4x} - 2Q_{3x}Q_{3y}Q_{4y}] \quad (26)$$

This term is a reflection, in part, of the fact that the in-plane bend and asymmetric stretch normal modes are both admixtures





**Figure 4.** Distribution of NO asymmetric stretch excitation energies obtained from the core sextet of 6m eigenstates. The red curve is a 2m result, and is a repeat of the trace of the same color in Figure 3. Its center has been shifted by the difference between the 2m and 6m  $\nu_3$  reference eigenvalues, which aligns it with the other curves in the plot. The black curve was obtained with the solvent forces limited to only the forces on the title mode pair. Adding the effect of the in-plane bend forces yielded the green curve. Using all six forces yielded the blue curve.

of the bond angle and bond length changes. Following the same completion-of-squares pathway of section 3.1, but now applied to the in-plane bends, we find the additions to the asymmetric stretch harmonic potential to be proportional to eq 25 above. In this manner, the solvent forces on the in-plane bends contribute to the modulation of  $\omega_3$ .

In the quantum treatment, the total coupling at this stage between  $\nu_{3x}$  and  $\nu_{3y}$  is equal to the sum of eq 25 and the boxed  $2 \times 2$  matrix in eq 15. The new excitation energies are then

$$E_{u,l} = E_o(\nu_3) + \sqrt{(\alpha F_{3x} - c_1 |c_b| F_{4x})^2 + (\alpha F_{3y} - c_1 |c_b| F_{4y})^2} \quad (27)$$

where  $E_o(\nu_3)$  is the unperturbed  $\nu_{3(x/y)}$  energy. Given the form of this expression, it is difficult to make a prediction about the direction in which the mean splitting changes due to the in-plane bend forces. Simulation data comes to our aid. As noted in Appendix B,  $(F_{3x}, F_{4x})$  and  $(F_{3y}, F_{4y})$  have a normalized covariance of 0.475. With this information and the relative sign of  $F_3$  and  $F_4$  terms under the square root in eq 27, a reduction of the splitting is expected. Indeed, the new splitting is 21.6  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  for the green curve in Figure 4, a notable change from 24.5  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  without the in-plane bends (red curve in the figure).

**4.2.3. Effect of the Solvent Force on the Symmetric Stretch.** Finally, we include in the anion–solvent interaction the forces on the symmetric stretch ( $Q_1$ ) and out-of-plane ( $Q_2$ ) modes. Since  $Q_2$  is of  $A_2'$  symmetry,  $-F_2 Q_2$  cannot couple any pair in the core sextet (eq 22). On the other hand,  $-F_1 Q_1$  can only affect those of the same symmetry. This keeps the couplings largely diagonal; the off-diagonal couplings are perturbatively weak within the sextet. For the diagonal couplings,  $\delta V_{ii}(t)$ , the main expansion term in each of them is of the form

$$-\beta \langle 1_i a_m | (F_1 Q_1) | a_m \rangle = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \beta F_1 \quad (28)$$

with  $a_m$  being the leading basis function for the  $i$ th state of the sextet, and  $\beta \approx c(1_i a_m)$ , the coefficient of  $1_i a_m$  in the same

expansion. The shift magnitude and direction is the same for the two  $\nu_3$  fundamentals. With the absence of a differential effect, there should be no further change in the mean splitting. Indeed, its computed value is 21.6  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ . The new energy spread,  $\rho(E_{u,l})$ , plotted in blue in Figure 4, is rather flattened compared to the green curve of the previous step, though the peak positions are roughly the same.

In view of the other three curves of Figure 4, the breadth of this new one is a bit odd. We have just stated that the symmetric stretch force does not add to the splitting of the  $\nu_3$  states, but it certainly moves their absolute positions together. What we have forgotten is the ground state, the reference level relative to which  $E_u$  and  $E_l$  are measured. If  $-F_1 Q_1$  moves the position of the ground state to a lesser (or larger) extent than the fundamentals, an increase of width may be expected.

To begin checking on this explanation, we identify  $V_{\text{anh}}$  terms through which the symmetric stretch force can act on the  $\nu_{\text{gs}}$  and the  $\nu_3$ 's. These are


$$f_1 Q_1^3 \quad f_2 Q_1 Q_2^2 \quad f_3 Q_1 (Q_{3x}^2 + Q_{3y}^2) \quad f_4 Q_1 (Q_{4x}^2 + Q_{4y}^2) \quad (29)$$

where  $f_1 \approx -32$ ,  $f_2 \approx 6$ ,  $f_3 \approx -123$ , and  $f_4 \approx -28 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . These terms briefly appeared at the end of section 4.1. Physically, each of these express the NO bond length dependence for the harmonic frequencies of all of the nitrate modes. This can be expressed as  $\omega'_i \approx \omega_i + f_i Q_1$ , where we have reused the procedure of eq 10.<sup>26</sup> The energy of a harmonic level is thereby changed from  $\sum_i \omega_i (v_i + 1/2)$  by an amount  $\sum_i f_i (v_i + 1/2) Q_1$ , while excitation energies are changed by  $\sum_i f_i v_i Q_1$ . In words, the energy of a mode is more affected by a bond length change if it is already excited. Thus, for the  $Q_3$  modes, the (harmonic) one quantum level varies by  $f_3 Q_1$  more than the (harmonic) ground level. Given that  $f_3 \approx -123 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , this will be an important difference.<sup>27</sup>

Returning to the quantum picture of eq 28, the  $f_3 Q_1$  difference would be reflected in a larger coefficient for  $1_1 3_1^{(y)}$  in  $\nu_{3(x/y)}$  than for  $1_1$  in the ground state. Indeed, their values in Table 2 are 0.2 and 0.127, respectively. This would, in turn, cause a larger shift of the diagonal matrix element for the fundamentals than that for the ground state, resulting in a larger  $\rho(E_{u,l})$  width. This is just what Figure 4 shows. The root of the effect is the cubic term with  $f_3$  in eq 29. To numerically verify the above arguments, we have rerun the whole series of calculations with  $f_3 = 0$ . Though not shown, the distribution so obtained is no longer broadened and is quite close to the green curve in the figure.

**4.3. Couplings to States beyond the Sextet.** In implementing the switch from a two-mode to a full six-mode treatment of aqueous NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, we have so far restricted the number of eigenstates that we employ in the solute–solvent approach to the core sextet, eq 22. The investigation of the solvent-force-induced couplings among this set of states has led us to a result analogous to the two-mode one. The solvent forces on the anion's modes, through various intramolecular (cubic) anharmonicities, modulate the harmonic frequencies of the NO asymmetric stretches and hence their excitation energy distributions [ $\rho(E_{u,l})$ ] and/or their mean splitting [ $\Delta E_{\text{sp}}$ ]. It remains to be discovered whether other eigenstates of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> could lead to any additional effects on these average quantities. We now address this final task.

Apart from the sextet, eq 22, states whose leading basis functions have up to 2 quanta of excitation are added. A few with 3 quanta are also included, limiting the state list to those



**Figure 5.** A plot comparing the  $\nu_3$  excitation energy distributions computed with the core 6m sextet of NO asymmetric stretch states (in blue) and with a much larger set of 6m eigenstates (in orange). The solid curves are for results obtained with a solute–solvent coupling that contains only solvent forces on the  $\text{NO}_3^-$ 's modes, while the dotted ones are for when we included the force gradients as well. See section 4.3 for details.

that have at least 2 quanta in the in-plane and out-of-plane modes together. The states that fit this bill are 56 in number. For the moment, we do not attempt to organize them into rungs of importance.


Using this large set of eigenstates, we compute and diagonalize the matrix of  $H(t)$  (eq 4). Out of the eigenvectors obtained at a given instance, we identify the pair that has the highest  $\nu_{3x}$ ,  $\nu_{3y}$  character using a best match procedure.<sup>28</sup> Binning the energies ( $E_u$ ,  $E_l$ ) of this vector pair, we obtain the distributions in solid orange in Figure 5. The blue curve has been carried over from the previous figure (Figure 4) and represents the energy spread of the pure  $\nu_3$  vectors. The two curves hardly differ. (The noisiness of the orange curve is due to lower sampling.) The splitting,  $\Delta E_{sp}$ , for the orange curve is  $21.7 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , hardly different from the  $21.6 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  value for the blue curve. The dashed curves are obtained with the force gradients as well as the forces and are only slightly shorter and broader than their solid colored counterparts.

Apparently, all of the extra states do not cause any differential solvent-induced effect on the  $\nu_3$  fundamentals beyond what was already captured by the sextet. This is a curious result, which suggests either that the extra couplings are small and/or ineffectual or that they equally affect  $\nu_{gs}$ ,  $\nu_{3x}$ , and  $\nu_{3y}$ . Indeed, various extra-sextet states fall into one of these two categories, further details of which are presented in Appendix C.

These findings about the extra-sextet states motivate the statement that they have no new effect on the dynamics of the  $\nu_3$  excitation energies,  $E_u(t)$  and  $E_l(t)$ , beyond what the core sextet generates in all-mode space. This is echoed in the time traces of the above two energies in Figure 6 computed with (orange) and without (blue) the states added in this section. Therefore, further analysis of symmetry breaking that deals explicitly with the time dependence of the NO asymmetric stretch fundamentals should be possible with just the core sextet,  $\{\nu_{gs}, \nu_{3x}, \nu_{3y}, 2\nu_{3x}, 2\nu_{3y}, 2\nu_{3A}\}$ . Our current efforts are in this direction.

## 5. Summary and Concluding Remarks

We have presented a first systematic, albeit initial, theoretical investigation into vibrational symmetry breaking of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  in aqueous solution. This effect arises from the degeneracy of the



**Figure 6.** Trajectory plot of the excitation energies,  $E_u(t)$  and  $E_l(t)$ , using the core 6m sextet (blue) and the expanded 6m eigenbasis (orange) with all solvent forces,  $F_i$ , included in the calculation.

two NO asymmetric stretches of the anion being lost in solution. It is spectrally manifested in the appearance of two bands separated by about  $35\text{--}60 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  in the experimental infrared and Raman spectra in the  $1350\text{--}1400 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  region.<sup>1,8–11</sup> On the path to a direct comparison of theoretical spectra with experiments, this article has examined the dependence of the excitation energies of the two asymmetric stretch fundamentals on the forces exerted by the solvent on the anion's modes, with internal anion charge fluctuations,<sup>13–15</sup> among other aspects, left for future investigation.

Our analyses were carried out via the perturbative solute–solvent coupling approach. A reference Hamiltonian for the vibrations of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was developed, and forces and force gradients that represent the solvent influence were then added to obtain a time-dependent Hamiltonian,  $H(t)$ . The time evolution of these added quantities were obtained from rigid molecular dynamics simulations, employing a  $\text{NO}_3^-$ – $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  force field recently developed by Thomas et al.<sup>18</sup> By treating  $H(t)$  at various levels of complexity, we have elucidated the role of the various solvent forces. In each of the analyses, the upper and lower NO asymmetric stretch states and their excitation energies,  $E_u$  and  $E_l$ , were extracted from the solution of  $H(t)$ . The distribution of the excitation energies,  $\rho(E_{u,l})$ , and their mean splitting,  $\Delta E_{sp}$ , were used as quantitative measures. Throughout the work, we found a classical viewpoint to aid our conclusions in no small measure.

The simplest model for the time-dependent Hamiltonian that we consider comprises only the two NO asymmetric stretch modes perturbed by the solvent forces. The mode pair defines an  $xy$ -like planar space, and they are also intramolecularly coupled through a cubic anharmonic term of strength  $f$ . Within this framework, we find that a core sextet of states suffices to capture the solvent effects on the fundamentals. This sextet consists of the ground state, the two fundamentals, and the three first overtones in the two-mode space. Through such a scheme, we find  $E_{u,l} \approx \pm fF$ . Here,  $F$  is the magnitude of the instantaneous, in-plane solvent force,  $\mathbf{F}$ , whose appropriate orthogonal projections,  $F_x$  and  $F_y$ , are the forces on the NO asymmetric stretches.

A two-mode classical treatment also yields the very same variation for the harmonic frequencies of the two modes. The solvent forces act through the cubic anharmonicity to affect the quadratic potential of the NO asymmetric stretches and hence their frequencies. This is also seen as the root cause of the effect in the above quantum approach. The simulations yield water

solvent forces on the mode pair,  $F_x$  and  $F_y$ , that have a Gaussian spread with  $\sigma(F_{x,y}) \approx 100 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Thereby,  $F$ 's distribution takes a Maxwell–Boltzmann form and so does  $\rho(E_{u,l})$ . The mean splitting,  $\Delta E_{\text{sp}} \propto f(F)$ , is computed to be  $24.4 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .

Upon moving to a full, six-mode treatment that includes solvent forces on all modes, we find that (the six-mode version of) the core sextet still suffices to obtain a converged  $\rho(E_{u,l})$ . Inclusion of several other states was found to have no significant effect on the distribution or the mean splitting. Dissecting the nature of their couplings to the NO asymmetric stretches, these extra states were seen to either have too weak of a perturbative energy shift effect or (as a group) to simply provide an energy offset.

The six-mode  $E_u$  and  $E_l$  distributions are, however, broader than the two-mode ones and have a slightly smaller mean splitting. The cause of the latter effect is identified as the in-plane bend forces. Their effect on the  $E_u$  and  $E_l$  values is similar to that of the NO asymmetric stretch forces, though weaker and in the opposite direction. The final mean splitting obtained in our treatment is  $21.7 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The solvent force on the symmetric stretch adds significantly to the breadth of  $\rho(E_{u,l})$  without changing the splitting. The NO symmetric stretch, by its very nature, affects the harmonic frequencies of all of the other modes with a strength depending on the latter's excitation level. In our specific case, it shifts both of the NO asymmetric stretches to a greater extent than the ground state, though synchronously. In both the classical and quantum approaches, this translates to the observed broadening.

Most of the analysis presented in this article neglects the force gradients on the modes. When included in either the two-mode or six-mode time-dependent Hamiltonians, they have only a slight effect on the mean splittings and eigenvalue distributions. The sizes of the force gradients are an order of magnitude smaller than the forces, and their effect is further reduced in some cases by small prefactors arising from weak intramolecular couplings.

A striking feature of the present results is the a priori unexpected validity of the two-mode description of sections 3.2 and 3.3 (and even the classical description of section 3.1) for the nitrate ion in aqueous solution. The much more sophisticated analysis of section 4 hardly changes the splitting predicted by the two-mode treatments and only modestly distorts the eigenvalue distributions. The reasons for this outcome are given in detail in section 4. It is worth pointing out that this simplicity (if maintained with dynamical effects included) provides a useful perspective for thinking about the infrared spectrum and the band splitting.

On the other hand, it is quite possible that other situations for nitrate at higher concentrations with significant ionic effects, including cation influence, and for environmentally important molecular anions, such as  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ,<sup>29</sup> and  $\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ ,<sup>30</sup> with potentially stronger anion–water interactions<sup>16</sup> would not display the same few-mode simplification. Our sequence of analysis, appropriately adapted, may nonetheless provide a useful approach here.

An interesting aspect of our results is the absence of a noticeable dependence on the in-plane orientation,  $\theta$ , of the NO asymmetric stretch forces (see eq 8). This angle may be perceived as one of the collective, in-plane markers of the solvent influence. In the two-mode treatment, although  $\theta$  is formally present in expressions for the excitation energies, its numerical contribution is weak. This is reflected in the invariance of the distributions of these energies with  $\theta$  (not shown in a figure) as well as the instantaneous and mean splittings. We have numerically checked that these trends for the distributions

extend to the six-mode analyses as well, indicating that  $\theta$  will not have a significant imprint on the observed symmetry breaking. This feature may not persist at high concentrations where ionic effects may have a significant effect on the nitrate charge localization; this might be true of dilute solutions of multiply charged planar anions that exhibit stronger anion–water interaction.<sup>16</sup>

In the present work, we have ignored Coriolis and centrifugal coupling effects. Our estimates<sup>31</sup> of these indicate that they have only a minor effect on the splitting. The lowest order Coriolis couplings increase the eigenvalue splitting by  $\sim 5 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , while the centrifugal couplings (through the second-order expansion term of the inverse moment of inertia) add  $\sim 2 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . These rotational coupling effects will be addressed elsewhere in connection with the spectrum and relaxation dynamics. In particular, the first-order centrifugal coupling may prove important for vibrational energy relaxation via a 2:1 Fermi coupling involving water librations.<sup>32</sup>

In this article, our analyses have been based upon ensemble-averaged quantities, namely, energy distributions and mean splittings. Several dynamical properties remain to be considered, the first of which is the spectrum. Its computation will be an extension of results of this article wherein the time dependence of the NO asymmetric stretch states' descriptions and energies will play a role. Underlying the dynamics of these states are the solvent forces, which, in turn, arise from the relative motion of the nitrate and the neighboring waters. The nature of the relevant solvent motions, local or collective, and the connections to the dynamics of the anion–water and neighboring water–water hydrogen bond motions are interesting avenues that we are presently exploring.

**Acknowledgment.** This work was supported in part by ANR Grant NT05-4-43154 and by NSF Grant CHE-0750477. S.R. acknowledges the support of a JSPS Postdoctoral Fellowship for Research Abroad. JTH expresses his appreciation of Carl Lineberger as a long-time colleague and friend.

## Appendix A. Vibrational Potential Surface

**A.1. Choice of Single Reference Geometry.** The central premise of this article is that it suffices to treat symmetry breaking in  $\text{NO}_3^-$  based upon a single,  $D_{3h}$ -symmetric reference structure of the anion. One simple support is that the symmetry of the anion's average internal geometry in solution is also  $D_{3h}$ . A stronger rationale is that the NO bond length distortions that lead to the observed symmetry breaking are smaller than what the anion already samples in the course of a vibration. We provide some evidence of this claim below.

The mean of the two NO asymmetric stretch band centers is about  $1370 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The experimental splitting of  $35\text{--}60 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,<sup>1,9,11</sup> or individual shifts of about  $18\text{--}30 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  of each mode, is quite small compared to band positions. A slight bond length asymmetry would be sufficient to produce this effect. For instance, Waterland et al. have reported the largest  $|\Delta r_{ij}| = |r(\text{NO}_i) - r(\text{NO}_j)|$  values in optimal (HF/6-311++G\*\*) one- and two-water complexes to be about  $0.015 \text{ \AA}$ , for which the harmonic frequency splittings are  $\sim 40 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . For the three one-water complexes reported in our previous work,  $|\Delta r_{ij}|$  are  $0.017\text{--}0.019 \text{ \AA}$  (MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ), with the corresponding harmonic splittings in the range of  $65\text{--}85 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .<sup>16</sup> A complex with one water molecule each on two of the  $\text{NO}_3^-$  oxygens has  $|\Delta r_{ij}| = 0.011 \text{ \AA}$  and a harmonic splitting of  $80 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Owing to the small size of these complexes, the cited numbers are likely to be somewhat exaggerated compared to those in aqueous solution but provide a useful reference nonetheless.

**TABLE 3: Harmonic Frequencies and Fundamentals, in  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ , before and after Adjustment**

mode	harm. freqs.		fundamentals		exp. <sup>a</sup>
	unadj.	adj.	unadj.	adj.	
1	1066.7	1056.7	1058.8	1046.9	1045
2	830.8	830.8	822.3	821.4	823
3	1486.8	1407.0	1461.0	1376.5	1370
4	706.5	734.0	700.0	726.1	725

<sup>a</sup> These are estimates based on refs 1, 9–11.

We contrast the above  $\Delta r_{ij}$ 's with that for the  $\text{NO}_3^-$  structure at the turning points of the NO asymmetric stretch vibration. Using the quadratic force constants, we estimate that  $|\Delta r_{ij}| = 0.075 \text{ \AA}$  for a zero-point vibration, while that for a room-temperature  $kT$  vibration is roughly  $0.04 \text{ \AA}$ . Clearly, the bond length changes noted above for the one- and two-water complexes are smaller than even the thermal vibrational amplitude. This is also true of data for several asymmetric 1–8 water structures from Wang et al.,<sup>33</sup> Ebner et al.,<sup>34</sup> as well as our own computations. The optimal  $\Delta r_{ij}$  are typically less than  $0.02 \text{ \AA}$ , with some exceptions in the  $0.03$ – $0.035 \text{ \AA}$  range.

**A. 2. Computation of the  $\omega$ 's and Taylor-Expanded  $V_{\text{anh}}$ .** It is convenient to use internal coordinates to define vibrational potentials. Here, we use symmetrized combinations of bond length extension ( $\Delta r_i$ ) and angle changes ( $\Delta\phi_{ij}$ ), namely

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\Delta r_1 + \Delta r_2 + \Delta r_3) \\
 S_2 &= \pm \frac{1}{3^{1/4}}\sqrt{-\Delta\phi_{12} - \Delta\phi_{13} - \Delta\phi_{23}} \\
 S_{3x} &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}(-\Delta r_1 - \Delta r_2 + 2\Delta r_3) \\
 S_{4x} &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}(-\Delta\phi_{23} - \Delta\phi_{13} + 2\Delta\phi_{12}) \\
 S_{3y} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\Delta r_1 - \Delta r_2) \\
 S_{4y} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\Delta\phi_{23} - \Delta\phi_{13})
 \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

The numbering and description of these symmetry coordinates match those in Table 1. (The subscripts for the  $\Delta r$ 's and  $\Delta\phi$ 's are oxygen atom labels.) The form of  $S_2$ , the out-of-plane bend, was taken from Pesonen et al., who employed it as a robust coordinate for the  $\text{NH}_3$  inversion problem.<sup>35</sup> Its sign,  $\mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r}_2 \times \mathbf{r}_3 / |\mathbf{r}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r}_2 \times \mathbf{r}_3|$ , signals whether the N atom is above or below the oxygen plane.

A full quartic Taylor expansion was developed in  $\mathbf{S}$ . For this, ab initio computations at the MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ level were carried out using Gaussian 03.<sup>36</sup> The optimal equilibrium bond length at this theory level is  $1.2687 \text{ \AA}$ . Distorted nitrate geometries were generated by displacement along one ( $S_i = n\delta$ ) or two ( $S_i = n\delta$ ,  $S_j = m\delta$ ,  $i \neq j$ ) coordinates. For each structure, Cartesian first and second potential derivatives are extracted and transformed to symmetry coordinate derivatives as follows

$$\frac{\partial^2 V(\mathbf{S})}{\partial S_i \partial S_j} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_k(\mathbf{S})}{\partial S_i} \cdot \frac{\partial^2 V(\mathbf{S})}{\partial \mathbf{x}_k \partial \mathbf{x}_l} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_l(\mathbf{S})}{\partial S_j} + \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{S})}{\partial \mathbf{x}_k} \cdot \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{x}_k(\mathbf{S})}{\partial S_i \partial S_j} \tag{31}$$

This is a generally valid equation that accounts for the nonlinear relation between the Cartesian and the symmetry coordinates. Of course, the bracketed  $\mathbf{S}$ 's in the numerators describe the geometry at which the derivatives are evaluated. For  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{0}$ , we obtain the quadratic force field. Numerical differentiations of these transformed derivatives at  $\mathbf{S} \neq \mathbf{0}$  yield the third- and fourth-order potential terms. A uniform step size of 0.02 units for all six  $S_i$ 's was found to give converged derivatives with a five-point numerical difference formula. The symmetry within each expansion order was verified and coefficients of related terms averaged to eliminate any small numerical differences. As such, given a random distorted  $\text{NO}_3^-$  structure with an ab initio energy under  $5000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  (relative to the potential minimum), this quartic potential has an absolute error of  $\sim 8 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The discrepancy increases to  $\sim 35 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  for the  $5000$ – $10000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  range.

At each geometry used above, we also automatically obtain the ab initio dipole moment, its derivatives in Cartesian space, as well as the polarizability tensor. These can be numerically differentiated as well to obtain the dipole moment surface and polarizability surface up to second order for future use in the spectrum calculations.

Before we proceed, we take cognizance of two practical issues. First, only aqueous-phase frequencies are available for nitrate; therefore, the above ab initio potential  $V(\mathbf{S})$  cannot be independently tested. Second, it would be rather fortuitous for a solute–solvent interaction, when ensemble-averaged and added to an appropriate vacuum potential, to yield near-correct gas-to-solution-phase frequencies shifts. Given the need for reasonably well-positioned states suited to the aqueous-phase problem, we employ the common, minimalistic procedure of adjusting the diagonal terms of the quadratic portion of  $V(\mathbf{S})$ . The harmonic frequencies are thereby altered, and Table 3 summarizes the changes affected. We show the expansion of  $V(\mathbf{S})$  in Table 4.

In order to facilitate the computation of eigenstates, we switch to rectilinear normal coordinates in their unitless form,  $\mathbf{Q}$ . (The regular form is given as  $q_i = (\hbar/\omega_i)^{1/2} Q_i$ .) Their main advantage is the uncomplicated kinetic energy operator,  $\hat{K} = -\sum_i (1/2)\omega_i^2 (\partial^2/\partial Q_i^2)$ , assuming negligible vibrational angular momentum. Computing  $V(\mathbf{Q})$  is straightforwardly done via a fifth-order expansion of  $\mathbf{S}$  in terms of  $\mathbf{Q}$ . With the minimum order of  $V(\mathbf{S})$  being 2, this generates a sixth-order normal coordinate potential,  $\sum_i (1/2)\omega_i^2 Q_i^2 + V_{\text{anh}}$  of eq 1.

## Appendix B. Simulation Details


The nitrate–water system has been simulated using the standard NVE molecular dynamics protocols. We use an interaction potential (set B) constructed by Thomas et al.,<sup>18</sup> which defines polarization parameters for nitrate and uses POL3 as the water model. The setup consists of a single  $\text{NO}_3^-$  ion in a cubic box of 255 water molecules, with no counterion included. The box size is computed assuming pure water solution density ( $0.997 \text{ g/cm}^3$ ). We have used the shifted-force form of the Lennard-Jones interaction and the Ewald summation method for long-range electrostatics.<sup>37</sup> For the induced atomic dipoles, the convergence threshold was set to  $10^{-6}$  Debye.

All species in the box were held rigid during the simulations; the internal structure of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was that employed in building the reference Hamiltonian (Appendix A.2). Using a time step of 0.5 fs, several production runs of 250 ps length were executed. The trajectory was written out every 4 fs. The force gradients on the anion atoms were numerically computed at the same frequency and saved along with the forces.

**TABLE 4: Symmetry Coordinate Potential for Isolated NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> <sup>a</sup>**

5.26161	$S_1^2$	1.18260	$S_2^2$	3.37284	$S_{3x}^2, S_{3y}^2$	0.89537	$S_{4x}^2, S_{4y}^2$	-0.77559	$S_{3x}S_{4x}, S_{3y}S_{4y}$
-7.14223	$S_1^3$	1.05412	$S_{3x}S_{3y}, S_{4y}$	-1.31538	$S_2^2S_{3x}S_{4x}$	8.38301	$S_{3x}^2S_{3y}^2$	1.53623	$S_1^2S_{4y}^2$
-2.35832	$S_1S_2^2$	-1.20529	$S_{4x}S_{3y}, S_{4y}$	2.11783	$S_1S_{3x}^2S_{4x}$	-2.11783	$S_1S_{4x}S_{3y}^2$	0.98347	$S_2^2S_{4y}^2$
-15.59518	$S_1S_{3x}^2$	-1.42644	$S_1S_2^2S_{4y}$	-0.12548	$S_{3x}^2S_{4x}$	-0.12548	$S_{3x}S_{4x}S_{3y}^2$	1.25771	$S_1S_{3x}S_{4y}^2$
-3.62179	$S_{3x}^3$	-0.60265	$S_{3x}S_{4y}^2$	1.53623	$S_1^2S_{4x}^2$	-0.01845	$S_{4x}^2S_{3y}^2$	-0.01845	$S_{3x}^2S_{4y}^2$
2.27464	$S_1S_{3x}S_{4x}$	0.63071	$S_{4x}S_{4y}^2$	0.98347	$S_2^2S_{4x}^2$	4.19151	$S_{4y}^3$	-1.26642	$S_1S_{4x}S_{4y}^2$
-0.52706	$S_{3x}^2S_{4x}$	7.60674	$S_1^4$	-1.25771	$S_1S_{3x}S_{4x}^2$	-3.20876	$S_1^2S_{3y}S_{4y}$	-0.51484	$S_{3x}S_{4x}S_{4y}^2$
-1.42644	$S_1S_{4x}^2$	2.32547	$S_1^2S_2^2$	0.64085	$S_{3x}^2S_{4x}^2$	-1.31538	$S_2^2S_{3y}S_{4y}$	0.41681	$S_{4x}^2S_{4y}^2$
0.60265	$S_{3x}S_{4x}^2$	0.67221	$S_2^4$	0.42214	$S_1S_{3x}^3$	-4.23567	$S_1S_{3x}S_{3y}S_{4y}$	0.64085	$S_{3y}^2S_{4y}^2$
-0.21024	$S_{4x}^3$	37.16155	$S_1^2S_{3x}^2$	-0.51484	$S_{3x}S_{4x}^3$	-0.12548	$S_{3x}^2S_{3y}S_{4y}$	-0.51484	$S_{3y}S_{4y}^3$
-15.59518	$S_1S_{3y}^2$	0.76278	$S_2^2S_{3x}^2$	0.20841	$S_{4x}^4$	2.51542	$S_1S_{4x}S_{3y}S_{4y}$	0.20841	$S_{4y}^4$
10.86536	$S_{3x}S_{3y}^2$	12.96590	$S_1S_{3x}^3$	37.16155	$S_1^2S_{3y}^2$	1.31860	$S_{3x}S_{4x}S_{3y}S_{4y}$		
0.52706	$S_{4x}S_{3y}^2$	4.19151	$S_{3x}^4$	0.76278	$S_2^2S_{3y}^2$	-0.51484	$S_{4x}^2S_{3y}S_{4y}$		
2.27464	$S_1S_{3y}S_{4y}$	-3.20876	$S_1^2S_{3x}S_{4x}$	-38.89769	$S_1S_{3x}S_{3y}^2$	-0.12548	$S_{3y}^3S_{4y}$		

<sup>a</sup> The expansion has the form  $\sum_{i \leq j} f_{ij} S_i S_j + \sum_{i \leq j < k} f_{ijk} S_i S_j S_k + \sum_{i \leq j < k < l} f_{ijkl} S_i S_j S_k S_l$  with all factorials absorbed into the unique coefficients. The potential constants are in  $\text{aJ}/\text{\AA}^n$ , ( $n = \text{atto}$ ) where  $n$  is the number of nonangular symmetry coordinates in a given term. The quadratic terms (first line) have been adjusted (see Appendix A.2), while the cubic and quartic terms are directly from ab initio calculations.



**Figure 7.** Comparison of the distribution of forces from the simulation and a Gaussian fit to them. Shown are the plots for the symmetric and asymmetric stretches. See the text in Appendix B for details.

Postsimulation processing involved extracting the solute–solvent interaction potential,  $\delta V(t)$ , from these saved Cartesian forces and force gradients. They were first rotated to the body frame of the anion and then linearly transformed into unitless rectilinear normal coordinates,  $\mathbf{Q}$ . The averages of these quantities over the trajectory length were subtracted since we needed only the fluctuating part of the solvent influence on the anion’s modes, that is, eq 2.

The final forces,  $F_i$ , and force gradients,  $G_{ij}$ , were found to have Gaussian distributions. The  $\sigma$  values of the normalized distributions for the forces on modes 1–4 are about 86, 180, 95, and 117  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ , respectively. A comparison of the distribution shapes having these widths and the simulation data is provided in Figure 7. Evidently,  $F_1$ ’s from the simulation have a slightly lopsided spread. Since the associated coordinate,  $Q_1$ , is a key coordinate, this feature will be worth analysis, a task we leave for the future. The other five mode forces, however, straightforwardly follow a Gaussian distribution, as exemplified by the plot for  $F_{3x}$ . This greatly simplifies analyses of distributions of quantities based upon these forces; particularly, those for  $F_{3x}$  and  $F_{3y}$  are directly used in section 3.

The  $\sigma$ ’s for the  $G_{ij}$  are in the 1–10  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  range. Among the forces, only pairs  $(F_{3x}, F_{4x})$  and  $(F_{3y}, F_{4y})$  have a nonzero normalized covariance of 0.475 each. Several  $F$ – $G$  and  $G$ – $G$  pairs of the same symmetry also exhibit non-negligible covariance.

### Appendix C. Explanation of the Weak Effect of the Extra-Sextet States

In this Appendix, we consider the states that could potentially produce a sizable solvent-induced influence on the  $\nu_3$  energy splitting and distribution. The list comprises states with 1 or 2 quanta of excitation in their leading basis functions.

The first ones that we target are the in-plane bend overtones,  $2\nu_4$  ( $A_1, E_x, E_y$ ), which lie only  $\sim 75 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  above the  $\nu_3$  fundamentals. The leading basis functions of  $\nu_{3x}$  and  $\nu_{3y}$  are  $3\ddagger_1$ ,  $3\ddagger_1$ ,  $1_13\ddagger_1$ , and  $1_13\ddagger_1$ . The first two cannot couple, through the linear terms in  $\delta V(t)$ , to an important expansion term for any of the three bend overtones; see Table 2. The latter two do have coupling partners (e.g.,  $3\ddagger_1$  in  $2\nu_{4x}$ ,  $3\ddagger_1$  in  $2\nu_{4y}$ , and  $1_1$  in  $2\nu_{4A}$ ). The magnitudes of these interactions are estimated to be typically under 1  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ , which, in themselves, cause a negligible perturbative  $\nu_{3(x/y)}$  energy shift. Scanning through all five eigenfunction expansions in this manner, we estimate that the combined solvent-induced coupling magnitude for each bend overtone–stretch fundamental pair is roughly 1–2  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  and thus small enough compared to the energy separation to be ineffectual on the  $\nu_3$  energies. The above statements assume the dynamical gap between the state sets to be at least a few 10’s of wavenumbers. Support for this comes from our simulation result that the time-varying energy gap between the

upper  $\nu_3$  state and lowest bend overtone is rarely and briefly below  $20\text{ cm}^{-1}$ .

We now examine the role of states  $\nu_2 + \nu_{3x}$  and  $\nu_2 + \nu_{3y}$ . Through  $-F_2Q_2$ , the two couple to  $\nu_{3x}$  and  $\nu_{3y}$ , respectively. Through the same solvent force term,  $\nu_2$  couples to the ground state as well. These couplings are largely  $-F_2\langle a_m | Q_2 | 2_1 a_m \rangle$ ,  $a_m = 0_0, 3_1^x, 3_1^y$ . All three have the same value of  $-F_2/2^{1/2}$ . In perturbation theory language, this means that  $\nu_2$  pushes the ground state down by  $F_2^2/2\omega_2$ , which is just as much as the  $\nu_{3x(y)}$  push-down due to  $\nu_2 + \nu_{3x(y)}$ . Clearly, the trio examined here does not cause any net effect to the  $\nu_3$  excitation energies. The magnitude of the shift betrays the root cause of the lack of change, namely a shift in the potential minimum for  $Q_2$ . The harmonic potential for  $Q_2$  with the solvent force is rewritten as follows

$$\frac{1}{2}\omega_2 Q_2^2 - F_2 Q_2 = \frac{1}{2}\omega_2 \left( Q_2 - \frac{F_2}{\omega_2} \right)^2 - \frac{F_2^2}{2\omega_2}$$

The couplings appear in the quantum treatment due to the use of functions and states centered at the reference geometry rather than the shifted one. We chose  $Q_2$ -related states in this paragraph solely for the ease of arguments with them. The reader will easily see that the same applies to the  $\nu_{4x}$ ,  $\nu_{4y}$ , and the four  $\nu_3 + \nu_4$  combinations, as well as to  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_1 + \nu_{3x(y)}$ .

It remains for us to address the coupling  $\nu_{3x(y)}$  to all of the other fundamentals as well as a few overtones that do not involve  $\nu_3$ . In principle, these could add to the  $\nu_3$  splitting and/or give the pair an extra energy shift relative to the ground state (leading to a wider distribution). We quickly find that  $\nu_2$ ,  $\nu_{4x(y)}$ , their overtones, their 1:1 combination with  $\nu_1$ , as well as  $\nu_2 + \nu_{4x(y)}$  (most of these are not shown in Table 2) have a weak perturbative influence on the  $\nu_3$  energies. For  $\nu_1$  and  $2\nu_1$ , however, a more careful look is warranted. Apropos the former, note that its leading function,  $1_1$ , can couple to  $1_1 3_1^{(y)}$ , which are the second most important terms of the  $\nu_{3x(y)}$  expansions, with a coefficient as high as 0.2. We estimate  $|\langle \nu_1 | \delta V(r) | \nu_{3x(y)} \rangle|$  to be in the  $10\text{--}20\text{ cm}^{-1}$  range. This is a largish value, though not large enough to prevail over the  $\sim 330\text{ cm}^{-1}$  energy gap denominator. The resulting upward energy shifts of  $\nu_{3x}$  and  $\nu_{3y}$  are expected to be both under  $1\text{--}2\text{ cm}^{-1}$  but different in value. These sizes are not insignificant yet are apparently subdued in Figure 5. This could be due to partial cancellation with the effect of  $2\nu_1$ . This overtone's expansion (not shown) contains  $0.32 \cdot (1/2^{1/2})(3_1^x 4_1^x + 3_1^y 4_1^y)$ . The resulting coupling size is expected to be  $15\text{--}20\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . With a  $\nu_3 - 2\nu_1$  energy gap of  $\sim 700\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , a downward shift of  $0.5\text{--}1\text{ cm}^{-1}$  may be estimated.

## References and Notes

- (1) (a) Gibson, E. R.; Hudson, P. K.; Grassian, V. H. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2006**, *110*, 11785–11799. (b) Hudson, P. K.; Schwarz, J.; Baltursaitis, J.; Gibson, E. R.; Grassian, V. H. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2007**, *111*, 544–548.
- (2) Solomon, S. *Rev. Geophys.* **1999**, *37*, 275–316.
- (3) (a) Guimbaud, C.; Arens, F.; Gutzwiller, L.; Gäggeler, H. W.; Ammann, M. *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.* **2002**, *2*, 739–763. (b) Davies, J. A.; Cox, R. A. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **1998**, *102*, 7631–7642. (c) Beichert, P.; Finlayson-Pitts, B. J. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **1996**, *100*, 15218–15228. (d) Ghosal, S.; Hemminger, H. C. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2004**, *108*, 14102–14108.
- (4) (a) Rivera-Figueroa, A. M.; Sumner, A. L.; Finlayson-Pitts, B. J. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2003**, *37*, 548. (b) Mochida, M.; Finlayson-Pitts, B. J. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2000**, *104*, 9705–9711. (c) Saliba, N. A.; Yang, H.; Finlayson-Pitts, B. J. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2001**, *105*, 10339–10346.
- (5) Abbatt, J. P. D. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **1997**, *24*, 1497.
- (6) (a) Wang, S.; Bianco, R.; Hynes, J. T. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2009**, *113*, 1295–1307. (b) Bianco, R.; Wang, S.; Hynes, J. T. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2008**, *112*, 9467–9476. (c) Bianco, R.; Wang, S.; Hynes, J. T. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2007**, *111*, 11033–11042. (d) Shamay, E. S.; Buch, V.; Parrinello, M.; Richmond, G. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 12910–12911. (e) Ardura, D.; Donaldson, D. *J. Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2009**, *11*, 857–863.
- (7) (a) Schnitzer, C.; Baldelli, S.; Shultz, M. J. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2000**, *104*, 585–590. (b) Kido Soule, M. C.; Blower, P. G.; Richmond, G. L. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2007**, *111*, 3349–3357.
- (8) (a) Waterland, M. R.; Kelley, A. M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *113*, 6760–6773. (b) Waterland, M. R.; Stockwell, D.; Kelley, A. M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *114*, 6249–6258.
- (9) (a) Irish, D. E.; Walrafen, G. E. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1967**, *46*, 378–384. (b) Irish, D. E.; Davis, A. R. *Can. J. Chem.* **1968**, *46*, 943–951. (c) Irish, D. E.; Davis, A. R.; Plane, R. A. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1969**, *50*, 2262–2263. (d) Davis, A. R.; Macklin, J. W.; Plane, R. A. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1969**, *50*, 1478–1479. (e) Chang, T. G.; Irish, D. E. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1973**, *77*, 52–57. (f) Peleg, M. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1972**, *76*, 1019–1025. (g) Findlay, T. J.; Symons, M. C. *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 2* **1976**, *72*, 820–826.
- (10) Zhang, Y.-H.; Choi, M. Y.; Chan, C. K. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2004**, *108*, 1712–1718.
- (11) Liu, J.-H.; Zhang, Y.-H.; Wang, L.-Y.; Wei, Z.-F. *Spectrochim. Acta, Part A* **2005**, *61*, 893–899.
- (12) While this  $\nu_3$  doublet is perhaps the most easily noted spectral feature, other bands of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  also reflect the lowered symmetry in solution. The  $\text{ONO}$  in-plane bend mode pair, degenerate in vacuum, also splits in solution ( $\nu_4$ ,  $\sim 725\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ), though only noted at high concentrations. The symmetric stretch ( $\nu_1$ ,  $\sim 1045\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) is IR-disallowed for the isolated anion but is visible in aqueous solution.
- (13) Lebrero, M. C. G.; Bikiel, D. E.; Elola, M. D.; Estrin, D. A.; Roitberg, A. D. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *117*, 2718–2725.
- (14) Boisson, J. Ph.D. Thesis, UPMC (Paris 6) and ENS-Paris, 2008.
- (15) Boisson, J.; Laage, D.; Hynes, J. T. In preparation.
- (16) Ramesh, S. G.; Re, S.; Hynes, J. T. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2007**, *112*, 3391–3398.
- (17) It has been shown previously that the constant part of these average force gradients could result in blue shifting relative to the vacuum: Rey, R.; Hynes, J. T. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1998**, *108*, 142–153.
- (18) Thomas, J. L.; Roeselová, M.; Dang, L. X.; Tobias, D. J. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2007**, *111*, 3091–3098. The reference, and articles cited therein, may be consulted for work on the issue of  $\text{NO}_3^-$ 's preference (or lack thereof) for an aqueous surface location.
- (19) (a) Oxtoby, D. W.; Levesque, D.; Weis, J. J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1978**, *68*, 5528. (b) Rey, R.; Hynes, J. T. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1996**, *104*, 2356–2368. (c) Rey, R.; Moller, K. B.; Hynes, J. T. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2002**, *106*, 11993–11996. (d) Lawrence, C. P.; Skinner, J. L. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2003**, *369*, 472–477. (e) Li, S.; Shepard, T. D.; Thompson, W. H. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2004**, *108*, 7347–7355.
- (20) We point out that the force gradients can themselves lead to a nonzero splitting, even if the  $F$ 's were turned off by setting  $\alpha = 0$ . The splitting in such a case is about  $4.1\text{ cm}^{-1}$ .
- (21) Had the eigenfunctions of the two fundamentals contained a  $\nu = 3$  function, each with a coefficient of  $c_3$ , their contribution to the diagonal block would have been proportional to  $c_2 c_3 F_{3x(y)}$ . However, since  $|c_3| < |c_2|$  and  $c_2$  is already small (see eq 13), these additions can be ignored.
- (22) Note that the splitting values in all cases are a bit larger than the gap between the peak positions of  $\sim 22\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , owing to the Maxwell–Boltzmann shape of the distribution.
- (23) Apropos the basis set, we actually use a “polar” version that is related to the traditional set by a complex linear transformation. This alternate basis is well suited for the treatment of degenerate vibrations and renders the identification and application of symmetry properties very simple; see: Cohen-Tannoudji, C.; Diu, B.; Laloë, F. *Quantum Mechanics*; Wiley: New York, 1977; Vol. 1. In particular, each polar basis function is either already of a defined symmetry type or requires only a pair combination. Once the eigenstates are computed in this basis, we switch back to the traditional basis at a suitable stage.
- (24) We remark parenthetically that while these two states do not strongly affect each others' energies, the mixing is nevertheless important in the context of energy flow. With no other intramolecular states in the vicinity, it could well be that  $\nu_3$  excitation decay to the water solvent is via the  $2\nu_4$  states as the doorway.
- (25) Note, however, that the  $2m$  reference eigenvalues,  $E_{0,m}^{2m}$ , that occur along the diagonal in eq 15 will be replaced by their all-mode values. The latter are given in Table 2.
- (26) This frequency shift is incorrect for  $Q_1$  itself. The appropriate treatment may be found, for instance, in: Goldstein, H. *Classical Mechanics*, 2nd ed.; Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA, 1980. However, we do not need such refinement to make our case presently.
- (27) The cubic terms that we have considered here are formally no different from that in the previous section on the in-plane bends (few lines

below eq 25). However, we saw no ground-state effect there. At a classical level, this is because the mode 3 harmonic frequencies are split,  $\omega'_3 \approx \omega_3 \pm c_1 c_b |F_4, F_4 = (F_{4x}^2 + F_{4y}^2)^{1/2}$ . This shows that neither is the energy of the harmonic ground state shifted due to a cubic term nor is the midpoint of the two fundamental energies. Regarding  $Q_2$ , the anharmonic term  $Q_2(Q_{3x}^2 + Q_{3y}^2)$  is symmetry-disallowed.

(28) These are identified as the states that overlap best with "pure"  $\nu_3$  vectors, the latter being provided by a second diagonalization of  $\hat{H}(t)$  with the core sextet as the basis. We had no numerical difficulty in implementing this scheme, and the average of the squared overlap was found to be 0.94. This high value tells us that, though there is some important state mixing caused by the solvent, the matched states are still predominantly  $\nu_3$  in character.

(29) (a) Rudolph, W. W.; Brooker, M. H.; Tremaine, P. Z. *Phys. Chem.* **1999**, *209*, 181–207. (b) Zhou, J.; Santambrogio, G.; Brümmer, M.; Moore, D. T.; Wöste, L.; Meijer, G.; Neumark, D. M.; Asmis, K. R. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2006**, *125*, 111102. (c) Bush, M. F.; Saykally, R. J.; Williams, E. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 2220–2221. (d) Saito, Y.; Hamaguchi, H. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2001**, *339*, 351–356.

(30) Rudolph, W. W.; Fischer, D.; Irmer, G. *Appl. Spectrosc.* **2006**, *60*, 130–144.

(31) Ramesh, S. G.; Re, S.; Boisson J.; Hynes, J. T. Unpublished.

(32) (a) Ingrosso, F.; Rey, R.; Elsaesser, T.; Hynes, J. T. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2009**, *113*, 6657–6665. (b) Rey, R.; Ingrosso, F.; Elsaesser, T.; Hynes, J. T. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2009**, *113*, 8949–8962.

(33) Wang, X.-B.; Yang, X.; Wang, L.-S.; Nicholas, J. B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *116*, 561–570.

(34) Ebner, C.; Sansone, R.; Probst, M. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* **1998**, *70*, 877–886.

(35) Pesonen, J.; Miani, A.; Halonen, L. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *115*, 1243–1450.

(36) Frisch, M. J.; et al. *Gaussian 03*, revision C.02; Gaussian, Inc.: Wallingford, CT, 2004.

(37) Frenkel, D.; Smit, B. *Understanding molecular simulation: From algorithms to applications*; Academic Press: San Diego, CA, 2002.

JP903626T