



## The Chemical Bond between Transition Metals and Oxygen: Electronegativity, d-Orbital Effects, and Oxophilicity as Descriptors of Metal–Oxygen Interactions

**Moltved, Klaus A.; Kepp, Kasper Planeta**

*Published in:*  
Journal of Physical Chemistry C

*Link to article, DOI:*  
[10.1021/acs.jpcc.9b04317](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcc.9b04317)

*Publication date:*  
2019

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*  
Moltved, K. A., & Kepp, K. P. (2019). The Chemical Bond between Transition Metals and Oxygen: Electronegativity, d-Orbital Effects, and Oxophilicity as Descriptors of Metal–Oxygen Interactions. *Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 123(30), 18432-18444. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcc.9b04317>

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## C: Surfaces, Interfaces, Porous Materials, and Catalysis

**The Chemical Bond between Transition Metals and Oxygen: Electronegativity, d-Orbital Effects, and Oxophilicity as Descriptors of Metal-Oxygen Interactions**

Klaus August Moltved, and Kasper P. Kepp

*J. Phys. Chem. C*, **Just Accepted Manuscript** • DOI: 10.1021/acs.jpcc.9b04317 • Publication Date (Web): 08 Jul 2019Downloaded from [pubs.acs.org](https://pubs.acs.org) on July 14, 2019**Just Accepted**

“Just Accepted” manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides “Just Accepted” as a service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. “Just Accepted” manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. “Just Accepted” manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). “Just Accepted” is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the “Just Accepted” Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the “Just Accepted” Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these “Just Accepted” manuscripts.

1  
2 **The Chemical Bond between Transition Metals and Oxygen: Electronegativity, d-Orbital**  
3  
4 **Effects, and Oxophilicity as Descriptors of Metal-Oxygen Interactions**  
5

6  
7 Klaus A. Moltved and Kasper P. Kepp\*  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 *Technical University of Denmark, DTU Chemistry, Building 206, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, DK –*  
14  
15 *Denmark.*  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 \* Corresponding author: Phone: +045 45 25 24 09. E-mail: [kpj@kemi.dtu.dk](mailto:kpj@kemi.dtu.dk)  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 **Abstract.** The chemical bonds between a transition metal (M) and oxygen (O) are of major  
3  
4 importance in catalysis, mineralogy, biology and astrophysics, and adequate theoretical  
5  
6 description of these bonds is thus highly needed. This paper establishes that, despite recent debate  
7  
8 on its accuracy for transition metal systems, CCSD(T) is an excellent benchmark standard for  
9  
10 transition metal oxide interactions, with errors approaching those of experiment. We conclude this  
11  
12 from a study of all 60 M-O and M<sup>+</sup>-O BDEs of the 3d, 4d, and 5d metals, constituting a balanced  
13  
14 dataset in terms of d<sup>q</sup> configurations that also enable an assessment of the trend chemistry in  
15  
16 oxygen's ability to bind to transition metals. The BDEs decrease towards the right of the transition  
17  
18 metal series, with humps at groups 4-5 and 8-9. The linear trend follows the increasing  
19  
20 electronegativity when going from the left to the right, whereas the humps are caused by  
21  
22 differential occupation of bonding  $\delta$ -orbitals and antibonding  $\pi$ -orbitals. We show that the BDEs  
23  
24 correlate strongly with oxophilicity and energies of metal surface chemisorption ( $R^2 = 0.81-0.89$ ),  
25  
26 i.e. the local M-O bond dominates the energetics of transition metals reacting with oxygen.  
27  
28 Therefore, theoretical studies of oxygen-involving transition metal chemistry should emphasize  
29  
30 the accuracy of the local M-O bonds. A "bottom-up" approach to theoretical catalysis may thus  
31  
32 produce more accurate trend predictions of relevance to e.g. catalyst design. Finally, our analysis  
33  
34 explains the large differences in chemisorption of oxygen on metal surfaces as primarily caused  
35  
36 by the metal electronegativity relative to oxygen, defining the strength of the polar covalent  
37  
38 bonding, and secondarily to d-orbital net bonding.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

The chemical bond between a transition metal and oxygen (M-O) plays a central role in many important chemical processes, e.g. catalytic water splitting and conversion of methane to methanol, and many catalytic processes involving oxygen reduction.<sup>1-4</sup> In the mineral world, the main ores of a large number of metals are in the form of oxides held together by M-O bonds, and metal oxides have very many useful technological applications.<sup>5-8</sup> In biology, many enzymes utilize the bonding of oxygen to transition metals such as copper or iron to activate the O-O bond for further reactions.<sup>9-11</sup> The simple diatomic M-O systems are very important in astrochemistry, high-temperature inorganic chemistry and in order to understand transition metal spectroscopy and bonding more fundamentally.<sup>12</sup> In particular, the intense current interest in increasingly small catalyst systems, with highly effective single-atom catalysts as the ultimate limit, puts a renewed focus on understanding single-metal atom ligand interactions as the minimal catalytic unit<sup>13,14</sup>.

The M-O bond in its pure form describes the tendency of a metal to bind to oxygen, without any modulating effects of other metals or ligands. Understanding the intrinsic tendency of metals to associate with oxygen is an important starting point for understanding the role of the metal in many reactions, as presented mainly by the metal's oxophilicity.<sup>15</sup> The fact that this simple, generic tendency explains both ore composition and chemical reactions of much more complicated systems<sup>15</sup> indicates that the local M-O bond dominates the energetics and thus trend chemistry of real systems relative to the modulating atoms. Many studies use approximate density functional methods to study catalysis on metal surfaces.<sup>16,17</sup> These studies tacitly assume that the modulating catalyst effects are more important to describe with a low-accuracy methods than it is to describe the directly involved chemical bonds at high accuracy, and thus some accuracy in the M-O bonds (and other bonds) is sacrificed to study a larger catalytic system. It is of both fundamental and practical interest to understand the relative importance to the trend chemistry of the local M-O

1  
2 bond and the modulating effects of the remaining catalyst. Furthermore, the main features that  
3  
4 drive trends in M-O bonding, i.e. electronegativity vs. d-orbital effects, need to be quantified.  
5  
6

7 To understand the electronic structure of the M-O bond in detail, we studied in  
8  
9 completeness all the 30 neutral MO molecules and the 30 cationic MO<sup>+</sup> systems of the 3d, 4d, and  
10  
11 5d transition series that define the intrinsic bonding of d-transition metals to oxygen and for which  
12  
13 experimental bond dissociation enthalpies (BDEs) are available in most cases.<sup>18</sup> The 60 diatomic  
14  
15 systems constitute a balanced data set that allows us to assess the M-O bonding systematically  
16  
17 across all electronic configurations of the 3d, 4d, and 5d transition series. Balanced data sets avoid  
18  
19 the risk of conclusions being system-dependent and biased by over-represented d<sup>9</sup> electronic  
20  
21 configurations or ligand types.<sup>19,20</sup>  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Given their importance to inorganic chemistry and catalysis, there is an ongoing debate on  
27  
28 the accuracy of both experimental and computed BDEs for metal-ligand (M-L) bonds<sup>19-26</sup>. Both  
29  
30 experiments and computations suffer much larger uncertainties for M-L bonds than for bonds  
31  
32 composed only of organic chemistry elements of the p-block; some of the uncertainty relates to  
33  
34 close-lying electronic configurations in the d-block. The accuracy of the “golden standard”  
35  
36 CCSD(T) has received considerable recent focus in terms of its accuracy for transition metal  
37  
38 chemistry, with various views in the debate.<sup>22-24,27</sup> Methods that account explicitly for static  
39  
40 correlation (e.g. CASPT2<sup>28</sup>) are in principle suited for transition metals systems but are ambiguous  
41  
42 in their choice of active spaces preventing systematic use for many compounds and carry biases  
43  
44 from the HF reference causing excessive spin polarization, which makes them somewhat spin-  
45  
46 unbalanced.<sup>29-31</sup> Instead, we show that CCSD(T) is a golden standard for the M-O bonds with  
47  
48 accuracy approaching that of experiment. Thus, coupled-cluster theory, aided by developments  
49  
50 enabling the study of larger systems,<sup>32</sup> can adequately guide the choice and development of density  
51  
52 functionals for d-transition metal-oxygen chemistry when experimental data are scarce.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 Previous studies<sup>5,19,39,40,22,23,33–38</sup> have considered some of the 60 diatomic systems at  
3  
4 various levels of theory but there is no previous study of all the 60 transition metal oxides and the  
5  
6 associated trend chemistry deduced from CCSD(T). In particular, van Santen and Tranca have  
7  
8 studied many of these systems using DFT with a similar aim to understand trend chemistry of  
9  
10 metal-ligand binding<sup>40</sup>.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

## 16 **Methods**

17  
18  
19 We used the Turbomole software, version 7.0<sup>41</sup> for all computations in this work. We applied the  
20  
21 resolution of identity approximation<sup>42</sup> to speed up calculations. The BDEs were calculated for all  
22  
23 the 30 neutral M-O and 30 cationic M<sup>+</sup>-O systems of the 3d, 4d and 5d transition metals.  
24  
25

26 **Geometry optimizations.** Geometries were optimized for the 60 diatomic systems using  
27  
28 the BP86<sup>43,44</sup> functional and the def2-TZVPP<sup>45</sup> basis, with energy convergence set to 10<sup>-6</sup> au. The  
29  
30 computed bond lengths are compiled in **Table S1**. For 14 of these systems experimental bond  
31  
32 lengths are available as shown in **Table S2**. The average signed error in the computed bond lengths  
33  
34 was 0.003 Å and the mean absolute error (MAE) was 0.02 Å. This agrees well with the commonly  
35  
36 cited 0.02 Å average uncertainty in M-L bonds using this geometry optimization protocol, with  
37  
38 other density functionals giving larger errors.<sup>46</sup> The excellent agreement between CCSD(T)-  
39  
40 computed and experimental BDEs using these geometries as input gives us further reassurance  
41  
42 that the employed geometries are adequate.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 **Single point energies.** Single point energies were computed using CCSD(T) from a  
49  
50 converged HF reference state, using a density and energy convergence of 10<sup>-7</sup> au. For the single-  
51  
52 point energies the def2-QZVPPD<sup>45</sup> basis set was used for the metals (Sc-Zn, Y-Cd and La-Hg)  
53  
54 and aug-cc-pV5Z<sup>47</sup> with diffuse basis functions was used for oxygen because it is very  
55  
56 electronegative and thus harbors a large surplus of negative net charge, causing a looser electron  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 density at the oxygen atom. This basis set in combination with CCSD(T) is close to the basis set  
3  
4 limit, as seen from the fact that this protocol gives chemical accuracy ( $< 4$  kJ/mol errors) for the  
5  
6 strong p-block element bonds such as C-O, O-O, and N-N, where experimental errors are much  
7  
8 smaller and chemical accuracy can thus be confirmed positively.<sup>48</sup>  
9

10  
11 **Spin states.** Identifying the correct HF reference with lowest-possible energy after final  
12 calculation is critical to all post-HF methods including CCSD(T). To determine the spin states of  
13  
14 lowest energy, single point energy calculations were performed for the spin states predicted by  
15  
16 experiment compiled in **Table S3** and states of  $M_S \pm 1$  (-1 only if  $M_S$  was 1 or higher). For systems  
17  
18 with unknown spin state, single point energy CCSD(T) calculations for the spin states predicted  
19  
20 from the geometry calculations and all states of  $M_S \pm 1$  were performed on the fully geometry  
21  
22 optimized spin states. **Table S4** summarizes the spin multiplicity predicted by CCSD(T). By  
23  
24 comparing **Table S3** and **Table S4** it can be seen that CCSD(T) predicts the experimental spin  
25  
26 state in 31 of the 33 cases where experimental spin states are available. The two exceptions are ZrO  
27  
28 and HfO<sup>+</sup>. For ZrO it has already been noted that the energy difference between the assigned  
29  
30 ground state of  $^1\Sigma^+$  and the  $^3\Delta$  state is very small ( $\approx 13$  kJ/mol)<sup>5</sup>. The CCSD(T) energy of the  
31  
32 triplet state was 22 kJ/mol lower in energy than the singlet. Since the two reported experimental  
33  
34 BDE values are 766 kJ/mol and 801 kJ/mol this will not affect the accuracy very much even in  
35  
36 this special case. For HfO<sup>+</sup> the experimentally predicted ground state is  $^4\Sigma^-$ , but CCSD(T)  
37  
38 predicts a doublet ground state to be 426 kJ/mol lower in energy than the state with spin  
39  
40 multiplicity four. The CCSD(T) method however predicts the BDE with an error of 21 kJ/mol  
41  
42 using this energy and we are thus confident that our doublet state for HfO<sup>+</sup> is close to the real  
43  
44 energy even if we cannot rule out a close-lying alternative state.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 In four systems CCSD(T) identified another spin state within 20 kJ/mol of the ground state  
55  
56 as summarized in **Table S5**. For these systems, there is some uncertainty about the assignment of  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2 the spin state, but the effect on the calculated BDEs is maximally 19 kJ/mol and thus a potential  
3  
4 error in these four systems has a worst-possible effect on our trends and error analysis of ~1 kJ/mol.  
5  
6

7 **Table S6** shows the experimental spin states from NIST<sup>49</sup> used in the calculation of the  
8  
9 energy of atoms and ions of the transition metals. Adequate convergence to the established ground  
10  
11 states was ensured by using “spin annealing”, i.e. starting single point energy calculations from  
12  
13 higher spin multiplicities than the ground state (for most systems  $M_S + 2$ ) and decreasing the spin  
14  
15 multiplicity in steps of 2. Calculations started directly from the expected spin state frequently leads  
16  
17 to meta-stable configurations that are not completely spin polarized, because of very approximate  
18  
19 start orbitals and thus we find that spin annealing is generally required when studying diverse  
20  
21 transition metal systems.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 **Zero-point vibrational and relativistic corrections to the electronic energies.** Zero  
27  
28 point energies (ZPE) were computed from frequency analysis using the optimized geometry and  
29  
30 the same level of theory as used for geometry optimizations, as summarized in **Table S7**. Scalar-  
31  
32 relativistic effects of the 3d transition metal oxides were estimated using the sum of the Darwin  
33  
34 term and the expectation value of  $P^4$  from a B3LYP single point energy calculation; the BDE  
35  
36 corrections computed in this way can be seen in **Table S8**. The scalar-relativistic effects of the 4d  
37  
38 and 5d transition metal oxides were estimated by using effective core potentials. The influence of  
39  
40 spin-orbit coupling (SOC) was estimated by a Douglas-Kroll-Hess<sup>50,51</sup> B3LYP energy calculation  
41  
42 of 4th order for the 3d metal oxides using the dhf-QZVPP-2c basis set.<sup>52</sup> For the 4d and 5d metal  
43  
44 oxides the effect of SOC was estimated by a two-component calculation including ECP calling the  
45  
46 Turbomole keyword `soghf` with the dhf-QZVPP-2c basis set. The SOC corrections to the BDE are  
47  
48 available in **Table S9**. This treatment of the SOC is somewhat unbalanced probably overestimating  
49  
50 the effect for the SOC for the 3d metals and slightly underestimating the SOC for the 4d and 5d  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 metals.<sup>50,51</sup> For some heavy metals the SOC correction to the BDE reaches 30 kJ/mol (largest for  
3  
4 AuO<sup>+</sup>: 34.1 kJ/mol) but mostly it is below 10 kJ/mol.  
5  
6

7 **Calculation of BDEs and errors.** The BDEs of the MO and MO<sup>+</sup> molecules were  
8  
9 calculated according to Equation 1:

$$12 \quad BDE(M - O) = E(M) + E(O) - E(MO) - E_{ZPE} + E_{scalar} + E_{SOC} + 3.7 \text{ kJ/mol} \quad (1)$$

13  
14  
15  
16  $E(M)$ ,  $E(O)$  and  $E(MO)$  are the single point energies of the metal, O and MO or MO<sup>+</sup> molecule,  
17  
18 and are available in **Tables S10-S11**.  $E_{ZPE}$  is the computed zero-point energy of the molecule.  
19  
20  
21  $E_{scalar}$  is the scalar relativistic energy correction, and  $E_{SOC}$  is the computed SOC correction, and  
22  
23 3.7 kJ/mol corresponds to 3/2 RT at 298 K which is used to convert the BDE from 0 K to 298 K.  
24  
25 The 60 BDEs calculated for HF, MP2, CCSD and CCSD(T) are compiled in **Table S12**.  
26  
27

28 The signed errors (SE) discussed in this work were calculated according to Equation 2:

$$29 \quad SE = BDE(MO)_{comput} - BDE(MO)_{exp} \quad (2)$$

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  $BDE(MO)_{comput}$  are the BDEs calculated from Equation 1, and  $BDE(MO)_{exp}$  are the experimental  
35  
36 BDE. The absolute errors (AE) reported in this work is the absolute value of Equation 2, the mean  
37  
38 signed errors (MSE) and mean absolute errors (MAE) discussed below are the means of the SE  
39  
40 and AE, respectively.  
41  
42  
43

44 **Experimental data.** For 29 of the neutral M-O systems and 28 of the cationic M<sup>+</sup>-O  
45  
46 systems, experimental BDEs were available from the CRC Comprehensive Handbook of Chemical  
47  
48 Bond Energies<sup>18</sup> and from additional literature, sometimes with multiple values for the same bond  
49  
50 that can vary significantly. All the BDEs found are compiled in **Table S13**, with reported  
51  
52 experimental errors. The recommended values of the CRC Comprehensive Handbook of Chemical  
53  
54 Bond Energies<sup>18</sup> are highlighted in green in **Table S13**. In cases with no recommended value, the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

value with the smallest uncertainty and best trend agreement was selected, giving the data set in **Table S14**. Subsequently, a few problematic cases discussed below were curated by choosing the alternative experimental numbers reflecting a consistent trend chemistry as seen in **Figure S1** showing the variation of the BDE vs. period for neutral or cationic oxides, for the default experimental values of **Table S14** and for the CCSD(T) computed values. According to this trend analysis, the final recommended experimental data used for all analysis can be seen in **Table 1**.

**Table 1.** Experimental BDEs at 298 K (kJ/mol) used in this work. Data are from the CRC Comprehensive Handbook of Chemical Bond Energies<sup>18</sup> except three cases with reference and bold font.  $\pm$  indicates the reported experimental uncertainty. ? indicates no reported uncertainty.

<b>ScO</b>	<b>TiO</b>	<b>VO</b>	<b>CrO</b>	<b>MnO</b>	<b>FeO</b>	<b>CoO</b>	<b>NiO</b>	<b>CuO</b>	<b>ZnO</b>
<b>671 <math>\pm</math> 1</b>	667 $\pm$ 6	637 $\pm$ ?	461 $\pm$ 9	362 $\pm$ 25	407 $\pm$ 1	397 $\pm$ 9	366 $\pm$ 30	287 $\pm$ 12	159 $\pm$ 4
<b>YO</b>	<b>ZrO</b>	<b>NbO</b>	<b>MoO</b>	<b>TcO</b>	<b>RuO</b>	<b>RhO</b>	<b>PdO</b>	<b>AgO</b>	<b>CdO</b>
<b>714 <math>\pm</math> 10</b>	766 $\pm$ 11	727 $\pm$ 10	525 $\pm$ 4	548 $\pm$ ?	528 $\pm$ 42	405 $\pm$ 42	238 $\pm$ 13	221 $\pm$ 21	<b>98<sup>53</sup> <math>\pm</math> 4</b>
<b>LaO</b>	<b>HfO</b>	<b>TaO</b>	<b>WO</b>	<b>ReO</b>	<b>OsO</b>	<b>IrO</b>	<b>PtO</b>	<b>AuO</b>	<b>HgO</b>
<b>798 <math>\pm</math> ?</b>	801 $\pm$ 13	839 $\pm$ ?	720 $\pm$ 71	NA	575 $\pm$ ?	414 $\pm$ 42	391 $\pm$ 42	223 $\pm$ 21	NA
<b>ScO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>TiO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>VO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>CrO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>MnO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>FeO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>CoO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>NiO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>CuO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>ZnO<sup>+</sup></b>
<b>689 <math>\pm</math> 5</b>	667 $\pm$ 7	582 $\pm$ 10	359 $\pm$ ?	285 $\pm$ 13	343 $\pm$ 2	317 $\pm$ 5	192 $\pm$ 10	134 $\pm$ 12	161 $\pm$ 5
<b>YO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>ZrO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>NbO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>MoO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>TcO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>RuO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>RhO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>PdO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>AgO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>CdO<sup>+</sup></b>
<b>718 <math>\pm</math> 25</b>	753 $\pm$ 11	688 $\pm$ 11	488 $\pm$ 2	NA	372 $\pm$ 5	295 $\pm$ 6	145 $\pm$ 11	123 $\pm$ 5	NA
<b>LaO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>HfO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>TaO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>WO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>ReO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>OsO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>IrO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>PtO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>AuO<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>HgO<sup>+</sup></b>
<b>851 <math>\pm</math> 15</b>	724 $\pm$ 21	761 $\pm$ ?	695 $\pm$ 42	435 $\pm$ 59	418 $\pm$ 50	<b>411<sup>54</sup> <math>\pm</math> 9</b>	318 $\pm$ 7	<b>112<sup>54</sup> <math>\pm</math> 8</b>	NA

The most notable anomalies in the trend chemistry for the experimental data of **Table S14** occur for NiO<sup>+</sup>, CdO, ReO, HgO, LaO<sup>+</sup> and IrO<sup>+</sup>. Not surprisingly, these six species also exhibit very large errors compared to CCSD(T) when compared to the remaining data set. The recommended<sup>18</sup> experimental value of 276 kJ/mol for NiO<sup>+</sup> deviates significantly from the

1  
2 CCSD(T) computed value of 153 kJ/mol. The availability of an alternative experimental value of  
3  
4 192 kJ/mol<sup>18,55</sup> with a reported uncertainty of 10 kJ/mol shows that one experimental number must  
5  
6 be wrong. Both from **Figure S1** and from the general agreement with experiment in other cases,  
7  
8 the value of 192 kJ/mol seems to be the most accurate experimental value and was thus used for  
9  
10 NiO<sup>+</sup> in our dataset (**Table 1**).

11  
12  
13 The experimental BDE values of CdO and HgO also deviate significantly from the  
14  
15 CCSD(T) computed value by 143 and 233 kJ/mol, respectively. For ZnO, a decrease of 137 kJ/mol  
16  
17 in the BDE compared to CuO is observed. This would indicate that a decrease when going from  
18  
19 group 11 to 12 could be expected as also predicted by the computed values for CdO and HgO. An  
20  
21 alternative experimental value of CdO of 98 kJ/mol<sup>53</sup> (reported uncertainty of 4 kJ/mol) is in  
22  
23 agreement with this trend. For HgO no alternative experimental values could be found, and the  
24  
25 predicted CCSD(T) value of 36 kJ/mol also seems low. It would thus appear that for both  
26  
27 experiment and computations, the BDEs of group-12 metal oxides are particularly challenging, as  
28  
29 has already been established for ZnO previously<sup>19,22</sup> and seen in other DFT calculations.<sup>56</sup> Because  
30  
31 of the required trend consistency, the value of CdO of 98 kJ/mol was used and the value of HgO  
32  
33 was not used.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 For ReO there is a discrepancy between experiment and CCSD(T) of 119 kJ/mol. The  
40  
41 reported experimental uncertainty is 84 kJ/mol, showing that the value is not precise. The  
42  
43 experimental trends of **Figure S1** further indicate that the BDE of ReO should be lower than the  
44  
45 reported 627 kJ/mol. Since no alternative value for ReO could be found, it was excluded from the  
46  
47 data set due to the very large uncertainty and lack of trend consistency.  
48  
49

50  
51 The value of 875 for LaO<sup>+</sup> is high compared to the values of HfO<sup>+</sup> and TaO<sup>+</sup> when looking  
52  
53 at the trend for the other early transition metal oxides (**Figures S1A-S1E**). Since there was an  
54  
55 alternative value of 851 kJ/mol with a lower reported experimental uncertainty<sup>18,55</sup> we chose to  
56  
57 use the value of 851 kJ/mol. Finally, **Figure S1F** shows a sudden drop in the BDE for IrO<sup>+</sup>  
58  
59

1 compared to experimental values of OsO<sup>+</sup> and PtO<sup>+</sup>. The reported experimental BDE of 247 kJ/mol  
2  
3  
4 (with no reported uncertainty) is significantly lower by 171 kJ/mol compared to the neighboring  
5  
6 OsO<sup>+</sup>. Since an alternative value of 411 kJ/mol<sup>54</sup> with a good reported uncertainty of 9 kJ/mol is  
7  
8 available in much better agreement with the experimental trends of **Figures S1A-S1E**, this value  
9  
10 for IrO<sup>+</sup> of 411 kJ/mol was used as our recommended experimental data point.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Results and Discussion

### Accuracy and precision of CCSD(T) for M-O bonds

**Table 2** summarizes the accuracy of CCSD(T) and CCSD for comparison, using our recommended experimental data set in **Table 1**. CCSD(T) has an overall MAE of 24.8 kJ/mol and a MSE of 3.0 kJ/mol. The MAE of 24.8 kJ/mol is far from “chemical accuracy” of 4 kJ/mol, while the MSE is within this range. However, the average reported error in the experimental numbers is 17 kJ/mol, and thus a perfect method is expected to have an MAE of perhaps ~20 kJ/mol, considering the relativistic and vibrational approximations. The small MSE shows that the systematic error of CCSD(T) towards over-binding or under-binding is nearly zero. The MAE is also small considering that the absolute BDEs vary from approximately 100 to 800 kJ/mol, and thus the trend chemistry will be excellent, as confirmed below.

An important issue is not just the accuracy (MAE and MSE) but also the precision. We measure the precision of a method by the standard deviation of its error. This standard deviation is 31.5 kJ/mol for CCSD(T) indicating that the BDE computed by CCSD(T) can be expected to vary by this amount from the experimental number in a majority of the cases if the data are normally distributed (between -60 and +66 kJ/mol for the 95% confidence interval). The largest errors found for the 60 systems are +63.7 kJ/mol and -75.5 kJ/mol, respectively. While these results seem discouraging, they are significantly better than for M-H bonds which are particularly challenging.<sup>20,57</sup> In light of the experimental errors, it will be hard to find a computational method that outperforms CCSD(T) at a realistic computational cost; the precision and accuracy are, roughly, within 5% of the typical total BDE and justifies using CCSD(T) to analyze the drivers of M-O bonding for the entire 3d, 4d, and 5d transition series in systemic comparison.

We also note from **Table 2** that CCSD performs much worse than CCSD(T). The importance of including (by perturbation approximation) the triplet excitations is massive, leading to a halving of the MAE and essential removal of the large systematic under-binding tendency of

CCSD. In accordance with this, it was found previously that the description of splitting parameters for some of the 3d metals improves by  $\approx 0.2$  eV when going from CCSD to CCSD(T).<sup>58</sup>

**Table 2.** Mean absolute error (MAE), mean signed error (MSE), standard deviation (STD) of the SE, STD of the AE, and the largest positive SE and negative SE for CCSD and CCSD(T).

Method	MAE	MSE	STD of SE	STD of AE	Largest positive error	Largest negative error
CCSD	50.2	-49.0	31.2	29.2	33.8 (AuO <sup>+</sup> )	-123.9 (OsO)
CCSD(T)	24.8	3.0	31.5	19.4	63.7 (AuO <sup>+</sup> )	-75.5 (AgO <sup>+</sup> )

A radar plot such as **Figure 1A-1B** as previously used<sup>59</sup> is a convenient way to visualize systems with errors larger than average (tabulated errors are in **Table S15**). An error of 30 kJ/mol is highlighted by the red line in **Figure 1A-1B**. Systems with errors exceeding this threshold are TiO, NbO, TcO, RuO, LaO, TaO, WO, OsO, IrO, PtO, TiO<sup>+</sup>, MnO<sup>+</sup>, NiO<sup>+</sup>, NbO<sup>+</sup>, PdO<sup>+</sup>, AgO<sup>+</sup>, LaO<sup>+</sup>, TaO<sup>+</sup>, OsO<sup>+</sup> and AuO<sup>+</sup>. The average reported experimental uncertainty for these 20 systems is 23 kJ/mol and includes five cases with no listed experimental uncertainty. Thus the average experimental uncertainty for this group is larger than for the whole dataset (17 kJ/mol). The difficult cases include four 3d systems, six 4d systems and 10 5d systems. Thus, the 5d metals are slightly more challenging to describe, possibly due to the relativistic effects not being perfectly described by the applied methodology; we estimate a possible error of  $\sim 5$ -10 kJ/mol for the 5d systems where the SOC correction typically has its largest magnitude. This error would largely explain the slightly larger errors of the 5d systems.

To test the trend chemistry of our protocol, **Figure 1C** shows the linear relationship between the experimental BDEs from **Table 1** and the BDEs computed using CCSD(T). The trend prediction of CCSD(T) is excellent, with a R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.98. The trend chemistry is the most

1  
2 important feature of computational chemistry as it enables the relative comparison of chemical  
3 systems as required e.g. for judging the relative performance of two metal catalysts. Thus  
4  
5  
6 CCSD(T) is perfectly suited for understanding complete trend chemistry of the d-transition metals.  
7  
8  
9 The slope of 0.97 and intercept of 12.18 also shows that CCSD(T) interpolates well across all  
10  
11 binding strength regimes and down to the zero bonding regime, and that the computed bond  
12  
13 strengths are well-balanced across the whole range of BDEs studied.  
14

15  
16 **Figure 1D** shows the linear correlation between experimental ionization potentials (IP) and  
17  
18 CCSD(T)-computed IPs (tabulated values are in **Table S16**). The correlation is very strong with  
19  
20  $R^2 = 0.99$  and shows that any computational difficulty in describing the M-O BDEs is not caused  
21  
22 by the atomic M or  $M^+$  states but rather the M-O or  $M-O^+$  states. This conclusion is also supported  
23  
24 by **Figure S2** showing no correlation between the errors of the IPs and the errors of the BDEs.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 **Trend chemistry of M-O bonds: Net d-Bonding**

31  
32 The trend agreement of **Figure 1C** relates to the overall data set, without any consideration of the  
33  
34 important variations specific to the 3d, 4d, and 5d transition series. In order test the performance  
35  
36 of CCSD(T) for these periodic trends, **Figure 2** shows the variation of the BDE for the transition  
37  
38 metal oxides divided by transition period for both the neutral and cationic systems, using the  
39  
40 experimental values of **Table 1** and the CCSD(T)-computed values of **Table S12**. Computations  
41  
42 and experiment agree on the same general trends; regardless of being 3d, 4d or 5d metals the  
43  
44 strongest metal oxygen bonds are seen for the early transition metals as expected, with a tendency  
45  
46 to decrease towards the right, but with a hump at group 4-5 and a less pronounced hump at group  
47  
48 8-9, and a local minimum relative to the diagonal background trend at group 7 for the 3d and 4d  
49  
50 metals and at group 8 for the 5d metals. This behavior is characteristic for all three periods and for  
51  
52 both MO and  $MO^+$  systems and has as its most important feature a rapid drop in BDE towards the  
53  
54 middle of the series. The general two-hump structure is also well-reproduced by DFT (PBE).<sup>40</sup>  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2 The structure resembles that of the hydration free energies of the transition metals which  
3  
4 is caused by a combination of an underlying left-right linear trend of effective nuclear charge and  
5  
6 an hump structure caused by orbital effects, specifically occupation of the antibonding d-orbitals  
7  
8 ( $e_g$  orbitals in  $O_h$  symmetry) in high-spin hexaqua metal complexes.<sup>60</sup> Since the M-O BDE pattern  
9  
10 emerges already in the experimental data it has been noted before.<sup>61</sup> In the case of the M-O BDEs,  
11  
12 the humps are also orbital effects on a linear background trend to be analyzed further below.  
13  
14

15  
16 The explanations for the relative M-O BDEs differ substantially in the literature<sup>12,61,62</sup>, yet  
17  
18 these relative BDEs are the basis of the oxophilicity of the metals and thus their general activity  
19  
20 towards oxygen.<sup>15</sup> It has been suggested that oxygen lone pairs can donate electron density to  
21  
22 empty d orbitals on the transition metal<sup>34</sup> to strengthen the bonds, which would make bonding  
23  
24 stronger for early metals since they have relatively more empty d orbitals. However, we can see  
25  
26 that the pattern in **Figure 2** can be constructed from a linear non-orbital background effect that is,  
27  
28 importantly, reverse that of the hydration free energies but arising from a similar monotonous left-  
29  
30 right trend in the periodic table, combined with an d-orbital effect that is not determined by having  
31  
32 empty d-orbitals available for oxygen lone pairs. On the contrary, this is a net orbital bonding  
33  
34 effect resembling that of the ligand field stabilization effect of complexes.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 To understand the orbital hump effect first, the MO species are characterized by gradual  
40  
41 high-spin aufbau of the five valence orbitals, the  $\sigma$ -orbital, the two-fold degenerate  $\delta_d$  orbital level,  
42  
43 and the two-fold degenerate  $\pi_d$  orbital level.<sup>12</sup> Thus, the spin state increases monotonically from  
44  
45  $^2\Sigma^+$  for ScO with  $\sigma^1$  occupation, to MnO with a  $^6\Sigma^+$  state i.e. one electron in each of the five orbitals.  
46  
47 The  $\delta$ -level is bonding as inferred from the equilibrium bond lengths,<sup>12</sup> whereas a consistent  
48  
49 explanation for the data is that the  $\pi$ -level is antibonding with respect to the M-O bond. This is not  
50  
51 surprising considering that these two orbitals are higher in energy than the  $\delta$ -orbitals, probably  
52  
53 because the  $\pi$ -orbitals point directly towards the two oxygen lone pairs in a double bond model of  
54  
55 M-O bonding. This simple explanation explains the two humps in **Figure 2** well, as group 4 (TiO)  
56  
57  
58

1 reaches maximal bond order, which then decreases with occupation of  $\pi$ -orbitals, and increases  
2  
3 again with the occupation of the second electron in each of the bonding  $\delta$ -orbitals, and finally  
4  
5 decreases again towards very small bond order in the group 11 and 12 metal oxides.  
6  
7

8  
9 The involvement of d-orbital energies in metal-ligand bonding is a common rationale for  
10 reduced chemisorption on metal surfaces. On surfaces, the net-d-bonding effect is reduced because  
11 the symmetry is changed and the spin states coupled, such that trends in chemisorption energies  
12 have less pronounced humps. This effect explains a substantial part of the difference between the  
13 molecular and surface states, as shown previously<sup>40</sup>. In the molecular bonding regime of **Figure**  
14 **2**, the antibonding d-orbital occupation explains the humps, whereas the dominating trend in M-O  
15 BDEs is the periodic linear trend caused by the effective nuclear charge, which correlates with the  
16 filling of the d-orbitals (hence the success of models that simply assume reactivity based on d-  
17 orbital filling). Both the net-d-bonding (producing the humps) and the total d-occupation  
18 (producing the linear background trend) are important as is also the case for hydration free energies  
19 of the transition metal ions. Because the CCSD(T) captures these trends excellently (**Figure 2**),  
20 we can use the computed electronic structures to rationalize the main drivers of M-O bonding.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

### 40 **Charge and Spin as Descriptors of M-O Bonding**

41  
42 After having established the accuracy of CCSD(T) for the M-O bonds, we now turn to the second  
43 aim of the study, to identify suitable descriptors of the strength of the metal-oxygen interaction.  
44  
45 **Figure 3A-3F** shows the atomic charges on oxygen and the metal and the spin densities on oxygen  
46 and the metal for the 60 transition metal oxides from a DFT-based natural population analysis<sup>63-  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60</sup> (B3LYP/aug-cc-pV5Z/def2-QZVPPD) using the same states as for the ground state CCSD(T)  
60 computations. A notable linear trend is seen in the less negative oxygen charge and corresponding  
61 loss of positive metal charge towards the right of the periodic table, with the group 12 metals partly

1  
2 breaking the trend. Accordingly, the polarity of the M-O bonds decreases towards the right, with  
3  
4 the dipole moments explicitly shown in **Figure S3**. The trend is more pronounced for the 4d and  
5  
6 5d metals and for the cationic molecules and largely follows the electronegativity difference  
7  
8 between the metal and oxygen (**Figure S4**,  $R^2 = 0.68$ ).

9  
10  
11 **Figure 3** also shows humps in the spin densities on the metal in the middle of the d-blocks,  
12  
13 caused by the high-spin aufbau. Interestingly, despite this the spin density on oxygen stays nearly  
14  
15 constant up to group 6 and then grows monotonically until group 11 (the coinage metals), and then  
16  
17 the trend is again broken in group 12 cations and the 3d neutral diatomics. For the early d-transition  
18  
19 metals the spin density on oxygen is nearly zero, i.e. the electrons of oxygen are paired because  
20  
21 they are involved in forming bonding orbitals to the metal centers. The trend of spin density on  
22  
23 oxygen correlates with the BDE (**Figure S5**), such that a larger spin density on oxygen gives a  
24  
25 lower BDE, and approaches almost 2, that of free oxygen, in the weakly binding coinage metals  
26  
27 (tabulated values available in **Tables S17-S22**). These findings are not sensitive to method choice,  
28  
29 as functionals B3LYP, PBE<sup>66</sup> and BLYP<sup>67,68</sup> and both NPA and Mulliken analysis produce similar  
30  
31 trends. The six different methods produce  $R^2$  values of 0.64-0.70.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

### 40 **Electronegativity drives M-O bond strengths**

41  
42 Whereas the orbital effect causing the hump structure was analyzed and explained above, we still  
43  
44 need to discuss the dominating linear periodic trend in **Figure 2**. The figure reflects the general  
45  
46 knowledge that early transition metals bind more strongly to oxygen. This is also the case however  
47  
48 for e.g. sulfur such that the M-O or M-S bond strength alone is not enough to separate oxophilic  
49  
50 and thiophilic elements; the relative strength is required<sup>15</sup>. It is notable that the trend in **Figure 2**  
51  
52 is reverse of that expected from metal ion hydration, where more favorable hydration (stronger  
53  
54 M-O bonding) occurs to the right due to stronger effective nuclear charge as the diffuse d-orbitals  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 become occupied, with a modulating influence of the ligand field stabilization due to d-orbital  
3 occupation.<sup>60</sup> This is curiously opposite to the periodic linear trend in M-O BDEs. However, the  
4 difference emerges directly from the picture of M-O bonding advanced by the oxophilicity scale<sup>15</sup>  
5 which is dominated not by the hardness, orbital effects, or effective nuclear charge of the metal  
6 but by the electronegativity difference between M and O, which determines the bond strength of a  
7 strong polar covalent bond viz. the original definition of electronegativity by Pauling.<sup>69,70</sup>  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 To show that this is indeed the case, **Figure 4A** and **4B** presents the linear relationship  
16 between the experimental Mulliken electronegativity of the transition metal and the experimental  
17 and CCSD(T)-computed BDEs.  $R^2$  is 0.47 and 0.49, respectively, showing that electronegativity  
18 drives a substantial part of the total trend in M-O bond strength. For the individual 3d, 4d, and 5d  
19 series, correlation is stronger with  $R^2$  ranging from 0.75 to 0.90, because the covalency of the M-  
20 O bond increases more down through the periods than within each period. The  $R^2$ -values show  
21 that a dominating contribution to the relative M-O BDE in **Figure 2** is the electronegativity, giving  
22 the linear trend. The remaining feature is the antibonding d-orbital effect; both effects are clearly  
23 required to rationalize the M-O bond strengths.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 In the model that we emphasize here, electronegativity plays the central role for the trend  
37 in ligand and adsorbate binding to the d-transition metals. Models emphasizing the filling of d-  
38 orbitals and d-bands, such as the powerful d-band center model by Varma and Wilson<sup>71</sup>, can also  
39 account for ionic and covalent contributions to metal-ligand binding. The reason both models work  
40 is that these bonds are polar covalent, and the ionic stabilization decreases with effective nuclear  
41 charge of the metals because it reduces the difference in electronegativity such that the ionic  
42 stabilization contribution disappears towards the right of the d-transition series, producing the  
43 weakest M-L bonds. The energy of the d-band, as other orbital levels, decreases with effective  
44 nuclear charge and thus correlates with this trend, making it a decent descriptor. The  
45 electronegativity model predicts that the metal with the lowest electronegativity should have the  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 largest interaction with oxygen, and vice versa. As seen from **Figure 4A** the experimental trend is  
3  
4 in excellent agreement with this hypothesis showing that a lower electronegativity on the metal  
5  
6 leads to a stronger BDE. The physical reason is that oxygen, being the second-most electronegative  
7  
8 element of the periodic table, enforces an oxide-like character in the covalent bonding, making the  
9  
10 ionic component extremely important for the trend chemistry, as the ability to satisfy oxygen's  
11  
12 electron demand grows rapidly towards the left of the periodic table where electronegativity is  
13  
14 low, and the effect amounts to many hundreds of kJ/mol, and thus dominates the trends in binding.  
15  
16

17  
18 The strength of the metal-oxygen bond is of major catalytic interest since a stronger M-O  
19  
20 bond is associated with a more favorable chemisorption and O-O bond activation<sup>3</sup>. A very  
21  
22 important question raised by van Santen and Tranca<sup>40</sup> is how much of the experimentally observed  
23  
24 trend chemistry of different catalysts is due to the M-O bonds and how much is due to modulating  
25  
26 effects of the remaining catalyst (e.g. metal-metal bonding). One could imagine that the trend  
27  
28 accuracy for the M-O bonding is more important than including other modulating effects of the  
29  
30 catalyst at the cost of worse M-O trend accuracy. If this is the case, it is more important to study  
31  
32 relative M-O bond strengths of small systems with an accurate method such as CCSD(T) or a very  
33  
34 good density functional than including the smaller modulating effects of the other atoms of the  
35  
36 catalysts. Suitably performing functionals have been established for the 3d metal oxides<sup>19</sup>,  
37  
38 although the universality for all data in **Table 1** remains unclear. The very large values and very  
39  
40 large spread in M-O BDEs from 100-800 kJ/mol support this hypothesis.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 **Figure 4C** and **Figure 4D** show the linear correlation between the oxophilicity<sup>15</sup> and the  
47  
48 experimental and computed BDEs, respectively. **Figure 4C** shows that the oxophilicity of the  
49  
50 transition metals correlates strongly with the experimental diatomic BDE, which is not surprising  
51  
52 as they feature as part of the definition of the scale. However, the oxophilicity correlates strongly  
53  
54 with a chemical reactivity across the d-transition metals and rationalize both ore mineralization  
55  
56 and catalytic activity in a wide range of reactions.<sup>15</sup> Similarly, the periodic and orbital trends of  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 the first coordination sphere defines the chemical reactivity and free energies of hydration of the  
3 transition metal ions in water<sup>60,72</sup>, which reflect condense systems. Finally, **Figure 4D** shows that  
4 CCSD(T) BDEs also correlate highly significantly with the oxophilicity ( $p = 2.6 \cdot 10^{-10}$ ).  
5  
6

7  
8 To further confirm our hypothesis that the local M-O bond has a major influence on the  
9 chemistry of real systems, we plotted the chemisorption energies computed recently by DFT for  
10 pure metal surfaces where metal-metal modulation and long-range effects are included<sup>73</sup> as seen  
11 in **Figure 5**. Despite reflecting surfaces with high-coverage, which might weaken correlation,  
12 **Figure 5A** shows excellent correlation ( $R^2 = 0.84$ ) between random-phase approximation (RPA)  
13 computed chemisorption energies, which accurately reproduce experimental adsorption energies<sup>73</sup>  
14 and the experimental M-O BDEs of **Table 1**. This supports our hypothesis that the local M-O BDE  
15 is the major driver of energetic trends of real systems, and that oxophilicity (the best descriptor of  
16 M-O BDEs) can accordingly be used as a descriptor for larger transition metals systems reacting  
17 with oxygen. The inverse relationship arises from the stronger M-O bonding leading to more  
18 exothermic chemisorption due to back-bonding to  $\pi^*$  that weakens the O-O bond.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 **Figure 5B** shows the correlation between PBE-computed adsorption energies<sup>73</sup> and the  
35 experimental M-O BDEs ( $R^2$  of 0.82), and **Figure 5C** shows the correlation between PBE-  
36 computed chemisorption energies<sup>73</sup> and PBE-computed M-O BDEs (using the same basis set as  
37 for CCSD(T), ZPE and relativistic corrections). The correlation is very strong with  $R^2 = 0.89$   
38 indicating that metal-metal modulating influences explain very little of the variation in the  
39 chemisorption energies, the majority being described by the local M-O BDE, consistent with its  
40 large variation of hundreds of kJ/mol (average BDE = 472 kJ/mol and standard deviation = 221  
41 kJ/mol). Finally **Figure 5D** shows the correlation between RPA-computed adsorption energies and  
42 the CCSD(T)-computed M-O BDEs ( $R^2 = 0.84$ ). The regressions of **Figures 5A-5D** are highly  
43 significant with p-values in all cases smaller than  $10^{-8}$  and have standard residual errors of 56, 63,  
44 48, and 54 kJ/mol, respectively, or about 10% of the typical M-O BDE. The 48 kJ/mol for PBE  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 reflects the expected error of predicting the surface adsorption energy from the pure M-O BDE  
3  
4 without accounting for surface effects. Because the local point group symmetry of the metal  
5  
6 surface on-top M-O bond is  $C_{4v}$  rather than  $C_{\infty v}$  as for the diatomics, the orbital effect causes the  
7  
8 main hump at group 5 in the surface trend instead of 4 as in the M-O trend, but the overall  
9  
10 characteristics, energy and error drivers are otherwise the same.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 When comparing the diatomic metal oxides with transition metal surfaces one should note  
17  
18 the potential changes in spin states, which may affect the difference between the molecular and  
19  
20 surface systems<sup>40</sup>. As seen from **Table S4** and **Table S6**, many of the metals and metal oxides  
21  
22 have high spin multiplicities, whereas surfaces may be both spin-paired (diamagnetic) and locally  
23  
24 unpaired (paramagnetic), and spin pairing will thus affect the comparison to the metal states<sup>74</sup>. To  
25  
26 examine whether spin state effects weaken the correlations in **Figure 5**, we calculated the BDEs  
27  
28 of all systems using either the metals in their lowest possible spin state, the diatomic molecule in  
29  
30 its lowest possible spin state, or both metal and molecule in their lowest possible spin state. The  
31  
32 results in **Figure S6** and **Tables S23-S25** show that enforcing a low-spin state on the metal  
33  
34 produces a higher BDE and making MO low spin gives a lower BDE, as the two states are  
35  
36 destabilized relative to their high-spin ground states. The case of low spin for both M and MO thus  
37  
38 lies between these two extremes (gray lines in **Figure S6**), and closest to the experimental M-O  
39  
40 BDEs (blue in **Figure S6**). The cancellation of energy shifts due to d-orbital occupations in the  
41  
42 metal and metal-ligand states may partly explain the ability of the M-O BDE to describe surface  
43  
44 energetics despite potentially different d-orbital occupations, as discussed before<sup>40</sup>. However, the  
45  
46 bump structure caused by enforcing low-spin in any of the states (**Figure S6**) is very exaggerated  
47  
48 relative to surface energetics<sup>73</sup>, showing that local high-spin aufbau of d-orbitals is a good basis  
49  
50 for molecular descriptors of most surface states (i.e. local weak-field environment of metal atoms  
51  
52 in the surface), which is also the reason paramagnetic metals exist in the first place. The main  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 reason for the descriptor qualities of the molecular BDE is however still the dominance of the  
3  
4 linear trend due to effective nuclear charge, which is similar for the two types of systems.  
5

6 In conclusion, diatomic M-O BDEs computed using CCSD(T) are an excellent descriptor  
7  
8 of the reactivity of full-size transition metal systems reacting with oxygen. Because of this, the  
9  
10 conclusions on trend chemistry explained above and the drivers of M-O bonding are transferable  
11  
12 to real systems and thus our analysis explains the large differences in chemisorption of oxygen on  
13  
14 metal surfaces as due to primarily the effect of electronegativity, which drives oxophilicity, and  
15  
16 secondarily to d-orbital net bonding. Both effects are important in describing the precise relative  
17  
18 reactivity towards oxygen as required for e.g. catalyst design.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 **Conclusions**

26  
27  
28 The chemical bonds between a d-transition metal and oxygen are immensely important in catalysis,  
29  
30 biology, astrophysics and mineralogy. To identify an adequate benchmark for the entire 3d, 4d,  
31  
32 and 5d transition series and understand the trends in the bonding of the transition metal oxides, a  
33  
34 complete data set of the diatomic transition metal oxides was studied using CCSD(T) with  
35  
36 adequate basis sets and corrections for vibrational and relativistic effects.  
37  
38  
39

40 The main findings of this work are: (1) By curating and comparing experimental data  
41  
42 against CCSD(T) and the experimental trend chemistry, we define a recommended benchmark  
43  
44 data set for the diatomic transition metal oxide BDEs (**Table 1**). (2) We show that CCSD(T) has  
45  
46 excellent trend prediction compared with experiment and is able to produce BDEs at almost the  
47  
48 same level of accuracy as experiment. We can therefore recommend its use to guide the choice  
49  
50 and development of density functionals for d-transition metal-oxygen chemistry when  
51  
52 experimental data are not accessible. This tendency will be accelerated by developments that  
53  
54 enable the study of larger molecular systems by coupled-cluster theories.<sup>32</sup> (3) The BDEs of the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2 diatomic transition metal oxides decrease linearly towards the right in all three transition metal  
3  
4 series, modulated by a hump structure at groups 4-5 and a less pronounced hump at groups 8-9  
5  
6 **(Figure 2)**. (4) The trend in BDE is explained by two effects: The linear trend is caused by the  
7  
8 increasing electronegativity towards right in the transition metal series, which reduces the strength  
9  
10 of the polar covalent bonding with oxygen. The hump structure is in contrast caused by occupation  
11  
12 of bonding  $\delta$ -orbitals or antibonding  $\pi$ -orbitals; the electronegativity effect dominates over the d-  
13  
14 orbital effect. (5) The diatomic MO BDE correlates strongly with oxophilicity and energies of  
15  
16 chemisorption on pure metal surfaces, showing that the local M-O bond directs the energetics and  
17  
18 chemistry of real transition metal systems, and thus the M-O BDE may be used as a descriptor for  
19  
20 the reactivity. (6) It follows that theoretical models should describe the local M-O bonding with  
21  
22 particularly high accuracy when oxygen is the major species of interest in larger systems e.g. for  
23  
24 the catalytic cycle of water splitting. The importance of the local M-O bond justifies the study of  
25  
26 the diatomic systems and substantially qualifies their importance for understanding larger systems  
27  
28 in a “bottom-up” approach to theoretical catalysis.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **Acknowledgments**

37  
38  
39 We acknowledge the use of the High-Performance Computing Cluster at DTU.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Supporting Information available**

46  
47  
48 The Supporting information file contains the experimental data set for the 29 M-O systems and 28  
49  
50  $M^+$ -O systems, bond lengths used, computed electronic energies, BDEs, linear correlation plots  
51  
52 and various other figures and tables referenced in the text. This information is available free of  
53  
54 charge at <https://pubs.acs.org/>  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- (1) Liu, L.; Corma, A. Metal Catalysts for Heterogeneous Catalysis: From Single Atoms to Nanoclusters and Nanoparticles. *Chem. Rev.* **2018**, *118*, 4981–5079.
- (2) Periana, R. A.; Taube, D. J.; Gamble, S.; Taube, H.; Satoh, T.; Fujii, H. Platinum Catalysts for the High-Yield Oxidation of Methane to a Methanol Derivative. *Science* **1998**, *280*, 560–564.
- (3) Kulkarni, A.; Siahrostami, S.; Patel, A.; Nørskov, J. K. Understanding Catalytic Activity Trends in the Oxygen Reduction Reaction. *Chem. Rev.* **2018**, *118*, 2302–2312.
- (4) Liang, Q.; Wu, X.; Weng, D.; Xu, H. Oxygen Activation on Cu/Mn–Ce Mixed Oxides and the Role in Diesel Soot Oxidation. *Catal. Today* **2008**, *139*, 113–118.
- (5) Gong, Y.; Zhou, M.; Andrews, L. Spectroscopic and Theoretical Studies of Transition Metal Oxides and Dioxygen Complexes. *Chem. Rev.* **2009**, *109*, 6765–6808.
- (6) Sawa, A. Resistive Switching in Transition Metal Oxides. *Mater. today* **2008**, *11*, 28–36.
- (7) Post, J. E. Manganese Oxide Minerals: Crystal Structures and Economic and Environmental Significance. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **1999**, *96*, 3447–3454.
- (8) Buddington, A. F.; Lindsley, D. H. Iron-Titanium Oxide Minerals and Synthetic Equivalents. *J. Petrol.* **1964**, *5*, 310–357.
- (9) Collman, J. P.; Boulatov, R.; Sunderland, C. J.; Fu, L. Functional Analogues of Cytochrome c Oxidase, Myoglobin, and Hemoglobin. *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *104*, 561–588.
- (10) Solomon, E. I.; Heppner, D. E.; Johnston, E. M.; Ginsbach, J. W.; Cirera, J.; Qayyum, M.; Kieber-Emmons, M. T.; Kjaergaard, C. H.; Hadt, R. G.; Tian, L. Copper Active Sites in

- 1  
2 Biology. *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *114*, 3659–3853.  
3  
4  
5 (11) De Montellano, P. R. O. *Cytochrome P450: Structure, Mechanism, and Biochemistry*;  
6 Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, 2005.  
7  
8  
9  
10 (12) Merer, A. J. Spectroscopy of the Diatomic 3d Transition Metal Oxides. *Annu. Rev. Phys.*  
11 *Chem.* **1989**, *40*, 407–438.  
12  
13  
14  
15 (13) Yang, X.-F.; Wang, A.; Qiao, B.; Li, J.; Liu, J.; Zhang, T. Single-Atom Catalysts: A New  
16 Frontier in Heterogeneous Catalysis. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2013**, *46*, 1740–1748.  
17  
18  
19  
20 (14) Sun, S.; Zhang, G.; Gauquelin, N.; Chen, N.; Zhou, J.; Yang, S.; Chen, W.; Meng, X.; Geng,  
21 D.; Banis, M. N. Single-Atom Catalysis Using Pt/Graphene Achieved through Atomic  
22 Layer Deposition. *Sci. Rep.* **2013**, *3*, 1775.  
23  
24  
25  
26 (15) Kepp, K. P. A Quantitative Scale of Oxophilicity and Thiophilicity. *Inorg. Chem.* **2016**, *55*,  
27 9461–9470.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 (16) Lejaeghere, K.; Bihlmayer, G.; Björkman, T.; Blaha, P.; Blügel, S.; Blum, V.; Caliste, D.;  
34 Castelli, I. E.; Clark, S. J.; Dal Corso, A. Reproducibility in Density Functional Theory  
35 Calculations of Solids. *Science* **2016**, *351*, aad3000.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 (17) Hammer, B.; Nørskov, J. K. Theoretical Surface Science and Catalysis—calculations and  
41 Concepts. In *Impact of Surface Science on Catalysis*; Academic Press, 2000; Vol. 45, pp  
42 71–129.  
43  
44  
45  
46 (18) Luo, Y.-R. *Comprehensive Handbook of Chemical Bond Energies*, 1st ed., CRC Press,  
47 2007.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53 (19) Moltved, K. A.; Kepp, K. P. Chemical Bond Energies of 3d Transition Metals Studied by  
54 Density Functional Theory. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2018**, *14*, 3479–3492.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2 (20) Moltved, K. A.; Kepp, K. P. The Metal Hydride Problem of Computational Chemistry:  
3  
4 Origins and Consequences. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2019**, *123*, 2888–2900.  
5  
6  
7 (21) Aoto, Y. A.; de Lima Batista, A. P.; Köhn, A.; de Oliveira-Filho, A. G. S. How to Arrive at  
8  
9 Accurate Benchmark Values for Transition Metal Compounds: Computation or  
10  
11 Experiment? *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2017**, *13*, 5291–5316.  
12  
13  
14 (22) Xu, X.; Zhang, W.; Tang, M.; Truhlar, D. G. Do Practical Standard Coupled Cluster  
15  
16 Calculations Agree Better than Kohn-Sham Calculations with Currently Available  
17  
18 Functionals When Compared to the Best Available Experimental Data for Dissociation  
19  
20 Energies of Bonds to 3d Transition Metals? *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2015**, *11*, 2036–2052.  
21  
22  
23 (23) Shee, J.; Rudshiteyn, B.; Arthur, E. J.; Zhang, S.; Reichman, D. R.; Friesner, R. A. On  
24  
25 Achieving High Accuracy in Quantum Chemical Calculations of 3d Transition Metal-  
26  
27 Containing Systems: A Comparison of Auxiliary-Field Quantum Monte Carlo with  
28  
29 Coupled Cluster, Density Functional Theory, and Experiment for Diatomic Molecules. *J.*  
30  
31 *Chem. Theory Comput.* **2019**, *15*, 2346–2358.  
32  
33  
34 (24) Fang, Z.; Vasiliu, M.; Peterson, K. A.; Dixon, D. A. Prediction of Bond Dissociation  
35  
36 Energies/Heats of Formation for Diatomic Transition Metal Compounds: CCSD(T) Works.  
37  
38 *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2017**, *13*, 1057–1066.  
39  
40  
41 (25) Cheng, L.; Gauss, J.; Ruscic, B.; Armentrout, P. B.; Stanton, J. F. Bond Dissociation  
42  
43 Energies for Diatomic Molecules Containing 3d Transition Metals: Benchmark Scalar-  
44  
45 Relativistic Coupled-Cluster Calculations for 20 Molecules. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*  
46  
47 **2017**, *13*, 1044–1056.  
48  
49  
50 (26) Morse, M. D. Predissociation Measurements of Bond Dissociation Energies. *Acc. Chem.*  
51  
52 *Res.* **2019**, *52*, 119–126.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2 (27) Jiang, W.; DeYonker, N. J.; Wilson, A. K. Multireference Character for 3d Transition-  
3 Metal-Containing Molecules. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2012**, *8*, 460–468.  
4  
5  
6  
7 (28) Finley, J.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Roos, B. O.; Serrano-Andrés, L. The Multi-State CASPT2  
8 Method. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1998**, *288*, 299–306.  
9  
10  
11  
12 (29) Phung, Q. M.; Feldt, M.; Harvey, J. N.; Pierloot, K. Toward Highly Accurate Spin State  
13 Energetics in First-Row Transition Metal Complexes: A Combined CASPT2/CC Approach.  
14 *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2018**, *14*, 2446–2455.  
15  
16  
17  
18 (30) Radoń, M. Benchmarking Quantum Chemistry Methods for Spin-State Energetics of Iron  
19 Complexes against Quantitative Experimental Data. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *21*,  
20 4854–4870.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 (31) Zobel, J. P.; Nogueira, J. J.; González, L. The IPEA Dilemma in CASPT2. *Chem. Sci.* **2017**,  
28 *8*, 1482–1499.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 (32) Liakos, D. G.; Sparta, M.; Kesharwani, M. K.; Martin, J. M. L.; Neese, F. Exploring the  
34 Accuracy Limits of Local Pair Natural Orbital Coupled-Cluster Theory. *J. Chem. Theory*  
35 *Comput.* **2015**, *11*, 1525–1539.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 (33) Nakao, Y.; Hirao, K.; Taketsugu, T. Theoretical Study of First-Row Transition Metal Oxide  
41 Cations. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *114*, 7935–7940.  
42  
43  
44  
45 (34) Bauschlicher, C. W.; Maitre, P. Theoretical Study of the First Transition Row Oxides and  
46 Sulfides. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1995**, *90*, 189–203.  
47  
48  
49  
50 (35) Siegbahn, P. E. M. A Comparison of the Bonding in the Second-Row Transition-Metal  
51 Oxides and Carbenes. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1993**, *201*, 15–23.  
52  
53  
54  
55 (36) Nakajima, Y.; Seino, J.; Nakai, H. Relativistic Effect on Enthalpy of Formation for  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2 Transition-Metal Complexes. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2017**, *673*, 24–29.  
3  
4  
5 (37) Zhao, Y.; Truhlar, D. G. Comparative Assessment of Density Functional Methods for 3 d  
6 Transition-Metal Chemistry. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2006**, *124*, 224105.  
7  
8  
9  
10 (38) Rinaldo, D.; Tian, L.; Harvey, J. N.; Friesner, R. A. Density Functional Localized Orbital  
11 Corrections for Transition Metals. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2008**, *129*, 164108.  
12  
13  
14  
15 (39) Siegbahn, P. E. M.; Blomberg, M. R. A. Transition-Metal Systems in Biochemistry Studied  
16 by High-Accuracy Quantum Chemical Methods. *Chem. Rev.* **2000**, *100*, 421–438.  
17  
18  
19  
20 (40) Van Santen, R. A.; Tranca, I. How Molecular Is the Chemisorptive Bond? *Phys. Chem.*  
21 *Chem. Phys.* **2016**, *18*, 20868–20894.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 (41) Turbomole software, version 7.0. University of Karlsruhe and Forschungszentrum  
27 Karlsruhe GmbH, 2012, available from <http://www.turbomole.com>.  
28  
29  
30  
31 (42) Sierka, M.; Hoge Kamp, A.; Ahlrichs, R. Fast Evaluation of the Coulomb Potential for  
32 Electron Densities Using Multipole Accelerated Resolution of Identity Approximation. *J.*  
33 *Chem. Phys.* **2003**, *118*, 9136–9148.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 (43) Perdew, J. Density-Functional Approximation for the Correlation Energy of the  
39 Inhomogenous Electron Gas. *Phys. Rev. B* **1986**, *33*, 8822–8824.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 (44) Becke, A. D. Density-Functional Exchange-Energy Approximation with Correct  
45 Asymptotic-Behavior. *Phys. Rev. A* **1988**, *38*, 3098–3100.  
46  
47  
48  
49 (45) Weigend, F.; Ahlrichs, R. Balanced Basis Sets of Split Valence, Triple Zeta Valence and  
50 Quadruple Zeta Valence Quality for H to Rn: Design and Assessment of Accuracy. *Phys.*  
51 *Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *7*, 3297–3305.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 (46) Jensen, K. P.; Roos, B. O.; Ryde, U. Performance of Density Functionals for First Row  
57  
58  
59  
60


- 1  
2 Transition Metal Systems. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2007**, *126*, 014103.  
3  
4  
5 (47) Dunning, T. H. Gaussian Basis Sets for Use in Correlated Molecular Calculations. I. The  
6  
7 Atoms Boron through Neon and Hydrogen. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1989**, *90*, 1007–1023.  
8  
9  
10 (48) Kepp, K. P. Trends in Strong Chemical Bonding in C<sub>2</sub>, CN, CN<sup>-</sup>, CO, N<sub>2</sub>, NO, NO<sup>+</sup>, and  
11  
12 O<sub>2</sub>. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2017**, *121*, 9092–9098.  
13  
14  
15 (49) Kramida, A.; Ralchenko, Y.; Reader, J.; NIST ASD Team (2018). NIST Atomic Spectra  
16  
17 Database (ver. 5.5.6).  
18  
19  
20 (50) Wolf, A.; Reiher, M.; Hess, B. A. The Generalized Douglas–Kroll Transformation. *J. Chem.*  
21  
22 *Phys.* **2002**, *117*, 9215–9226.  
23  
24  
25 (51) Reiher, M. Douglas–Kroll–Hess Theory: A Relativistic Electrons-Only Theory for  
26  
27 Chemistry. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2006**, *116*, 241–252.  
28  
29  
30 (52) Weigend, F.; Baldes, A. Segmented Contracted Basis Sets for One- and Two-Component  
31  
32 Dirac–Fock Effective Core Potentials. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *133*, 174102.  
33  
34  
35 (53) von Szentpály, L. Atom-Based Thermochemistry: Predictions of the Sublimation  
36  
37 Enthalpies of Group 12 Chalcogenides and the Formation Enthalpies of Their Polonides. *J.*  
38  
39 *Phys. Chem. A* **2008**, *112*, 12695–12701.  
40  
41  
42 (54) Rumble, J. R. *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 99th Edition*; CRC Handbook of  
43  
44 Chemistry and Physics; CRC Press LLC, 2018.  
45  
46  
47 (55) Luo, Y.-R. *Handbook of Bond Dissociation Energies in Organic Compounds*, 1st ed.; CRC  
48  
49 Press, 2002.  
50  
51  
52 (56) Johnson, E. R.; Becke, A. D. Communication: DFT Treatment of Strong Correlation in 3d  
53  
54 Transition-Metal Diatomics. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *146*, 211105.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2 (57) Kepp, K. P. Accuracy of Theoretical Catalysis from a Model of Iron-Catalyzed Ammonia  
3 Synthesis. *Commun. Chem.* **2018**, *1*, 63.  
4  
5  
6  
7 (58) Rishi, V.; Perera, A.; Bartlett, R. Transition Metal Atomic Multiplet States through the Lens  
8 of Single-Reference Coupled-Cluster and the Equation-of-Motion Coupled-Cluster  
9 Methods. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2014**, *133*, 1515.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 (59) Siig, O. S.; Kepp, K. P. Iron (II) and Iron (III) Spin Crossover: Toward an Optimal Density  
15 Functional. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2018**, *122*, 4208–4217.  
16  
17  
18  
19 (60) Kepp, K. P. Thermochemically Consistent Free Energies of Hydration for Di- and Trivalent  
20 Metal Ions. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2018**, *122*, 7464–7471.  
21  
22  
23  
24 (61) Bakalbassis, E. G.; Stiakaki, M.-A. D.; Tsipis, A. C.; Tsipis, C. A. Ground and Low-Lying  
25 Excited State Properties of the First-Row Transition-Metal Oxide Diatomics Calculated by  
26 an Improved ASED-MO Model. *Chem. Phys.* **1996**, *205*, 389–399.  
27  
28  
29  
30 (62) Fiedler, A.; Schroeder, D.; Shaik, S.; Schwarz, H. Electronic Structures and Gas-Phase  
31 Reactivities of Cationic Late-Transition-Metal Oxides. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*,  
32 10734–10741.  
33  
34  
35  
36 (63) Stephens, P. J.; Devlin, F. J.; Chabalowski, C. F.; Frisch, M. J. Ab Initio Calculation of  
37 Vibrational Absorption and Circular Dichroism Spectra Using Density Functional Force  
38 Fields. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, *98*, 11623–11627.  
39  
40  
41  
42 (64) Lee, C.; Yang, W.; Parr, R. G. Development of the Colle-Salvetti Correlation-Energy  
43 Formula into a Functional of the Electron Density. *Phys. Rev. B* **1988**, *37*, 785–789.  
44  
45  
46  
47 (65) Becke, A. D. Density-functional Thermochemistry. III. The Role of Exact Exchange. *J.*  
48 *Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 5648–5652.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2 (66) Perdew, J. P.; Burke, K.; Ernzerhof, M. Generalized Gradient Approximation Made Simple.  
3  
4 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1996**, *77*, 3865.  
5  
6  
7 (67) Perdew, J. P. Density-Functional Approximation for the Correlation Energy of the  
8  
9 Inhomogeneous Electron Gas. *Phys. Rev. B* **1986**, *33*, 8822–8824.  
10  
11  
12 (68) Becke, A. D. Density-Functional Exchange-Energy Approximation with Correct  
13  
14 Asymptotic Behavior. *Phys. Rev. A* **1988**, *38*, 3098–3100.  
15  
16  
17 (69) Pauling, L. The Nature of the Chemical Bond. III. The Transition from One Extreme Bond  
18  
19 Type to Another. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1932**, *54*, 988–1003.  
20  
21  
22 (70) Pauling, L. The Nature of the Chemical Bond. IV. The Energy of Single Bonds and the  
23  
24 Relative Electronegativity of Atoms. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1932**, *54*, 3570–3582.  
25  
26  
27 (71) Varma, C. M.; Wilson, A. J. Systematics of the Binding Energy of Oxygen and Hydrogen  
28  
29 on Transition-Metal Surfaces. I. *Phys. Rev. B* **1980**, *22*, 3795–3804.  
30  
31  
32 (72) Nielsen, M. T.; Moltved, K. A.; Kepp, K. P. Electron Transfer of Hydrated Transition-Metal  
33  
34 Ions and the Electronic State of  $\text{Co}^{3+}(\text{Aq})$ . *Inorg. Chem.* **2018**, *57*, 7914–7924.  
35  
36  
37 (73) Schmidt, P. S.; Thygesen, K. S. Benchmark Database of Transition Metal Surface and  
38  
39 Adsorption Energies from Many-Body Perturbation Theory. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2018**, *122*,  
40  
41 4381–4390.  
42  
43  
44 (74) Carter, E. A.; Goddard, W. A. Relationships between Bond Energies in Coordinatively  
45  
46 Unsaturated and Coordinatively Saturated Transition-Metal Complexes: A Quantitative  
47  
48 Guide for Single, Double, and Triple Bonds. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1988**, *92*, 5679–5683.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Table of Content Graphic



**Figure legends**

**Figure 1.** **A)** Absolute error of M-O systems for CCSD(T). **B)** Absolute error of M-O<sup>+</sup> systems for CCSD(T). A threshold of 30 kJ/mol (red color) is used to identify difficult cases, values are tabulated in **Table S15**. **C)** Linear relation between experimental (**Table 1**) and CCSD(T)-computed BDEs (**Table S12**). **D)** Relation between experimental ionization potentials (IP) and CCSD(T)-computed IPs (**Table S16**).

**Figure 2.** **A)** Experimental (**Table 1**) and CCSD(T) computed BDEs (**Table S12**) for the 3d transition metaloxides. **B)** For the 4d transition metaloxides. **C)** For the 5d transition metaloxides. **D)** For the cationic 3d transition metaloxides. **E)** For the cationic 4d transition metaloxides. **F)** For the cationic 5d transition metaloxides.

**Figure 3.** Metal charge, oxygen charge, spin density on oxygen and spin density on the metal, from natural population analysis using B3LYP/aug-cc-pV5Z/def2-QZVPP (tabulated values in **Table S17**). **A)** Neutral 3d metal oxides. **B)** Cationic 3d metal oxides. **C)** Neutral 4d metal oxides. **D)** Cationic 4d metal oxides. **E)** Neutral 5d metal oxides. **F)** Cationic 5d metal oxides.

**Figure 4.** **A)** Linear relation between experimental BDE (**Table 1**) and Mulliken electronegativity (**Table S16**) of the transition metals. **B)** Relation between CCSD(T)-computed BDEs (**Table S12**) and Mulliken electronegativity. **C)** Relation between experimental M-O BDE and oxophilicity<sup>15</sup> (**Table S16**). **D)** Relation between CCSD(T)-computed BDE and oxophilicity.

1  
2 **Figure 5. A)** Linear relation between experimental M-O BDEs (**Table 1**) and previously computed  
3 random phase approximation (RPA) adsorption energies.<sup>73</sup> **B)** Relation between experimental  
4 BDEs and previously computed PBE-computed adsorption energies<sup>73</sup>. **C)** Relation between PBE-  
5 computed BDEs (this work, **Table S12**) and previously computed PBE-computed adsorption  
6 energies<sup>73</sup> **D).** Relation between CCSD(T)-computed BDEs (this work, **Table S12**) and RPA-  
7 computed adsorption energies<sup>73</sup>.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 1

600x600mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Figure 2

299x299mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3

300x300mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Figure 4

299x299mm (300 x 300 DPI)






Figure 5

299x299mm (300 x 300 DPI)

