# Quantum Mechanics/ Molecular Mechanics (QM/MM)

Todd J. Martinez

# The QM/MM Idea



Monard, et. al, Acc. Chem. Res., 32, 904 (1999)

#### **QM/MM** Partitioning

 $E = E_{QM} + E_{MM} + E_{QM/MM}$ 

The tough part – how do QM and MM interact?

Energy of MM subsystem



Warshel and Levitt, J. Mol. Biol. Field, Bash and Karplus, J. Comp. Chem.

# **QM** Region

What should be used in the QM region?

- Ab Initio
- DFT
- Semiempirical
- Usually, the answer to this is dictated by cost. Most QM/MM simulations to date have used semiempirical QM regions

Why? QM/MM interaction term can be problematic – it is not good to have this boundary close to the chemistry of interest...

#### Pitfalls in QM/MM



Not clear which force fields to use – much experience with expected accuracy of *ab initio* methods alone and MM methods alone, but not much with QM/MM No direct map from wavefunction to parameters

### **Mechanical Embedding**

Crudest level of QM/MM
Include only Van der Waals in E<sub>QM/MM</sub>
Useful to impose only steric constraints
Can take advantage of this to isolate effects...

 $H_{QM/MM} = \sum_{i \in MM} V_{ij}^{VdW}(r_i, r_j)$ j∈OM

#### **Electrostatic Embedding**

Include electrostatic interaction in H<sub>QM/MM</sub>
Many possible implementations – best is to evaluate integrals over continuous QM charge density and discrete MM charge density

$$H_{QM/MM} = H_{QM/MM}^{mechanical} + \sum_{i \in MM} q_i \int \frac{\rho_{QM}(r)}{|r - r_i|} dr$$

Oft-used approximation (questionable):

 $H_{QM/MM} = H_{QM/MM}^{mechanical} + \sum q_i q_j (\rho_{QM})$  $i \in MM$ j∈OM

#### **Atomic Charge Schemes**

- \* "Atoms" are not well-defined in molecules there is no quantum mechanical operator corresponding to an atom.
- This leads to ambiguity in the definition of an atomic charge
- Population Analysis Schemes
  - Basically, sum over all electrons using the basis functions of a given atom
  - Depends on the atom-centered nature of the basis set
  - Breaks down as the basis functions become more delocalized – results do not usually converge with increasing basis set!

## **Charge Schemes**

- Atoms-in-molecules
  - Atoms are defined by "critical points" of the charge density
  - More stable than Mulliken/Lowdin schemes with respect to basis set expansion
  - Implemented in Gaussian
  - Not clear whether stable="correct"



## Charge Schemes 2

#### ESP-Fitting

- Determine charges which reproduce the electrostatic potential generated by the molecule
- If using charges in an MM potential, this appears to be the right way
- But, equations have many solutions, especially when molecule has an "interior"



Charge for solvated ion will be essentially undetermined

#### Charge Schemes 3

Restricted ESP-Fitting (RESP)

- Attempts to avoid unphysical solutions of ESPcharges
- Requires user guidance in imposing "reasonable" values of charges

Most difficult embedding – cutting across covalent bonds
Almost always required in biological context
Many strategies; still not clear which is best or whether any of

them "work"

#### Singh & <u>Kollman</u> (1986)



Potential Problems with Link Atom Idea

- Extra degrees of freedom which somehow need to be removed; i.e. the link atom somehow needs to be connected to the MM part of the simulation
- Electronic structure at boundary will be very different if H and the atom it replaces do not have similar electronegativities

#### Thiel

- Adjust electronegativity of link atom to be equivalent to target atom. Also adjust size of atom
- Can only do this easily with semiempirical models
- Still can cause problems, especially with electronically excited states – the 2s-3s transition of H-like atom is much lower than the 1s-2s transition!

Frozen orbital ideas:

#### Rivail & co-workers (1994)

 $E_{QM}: AM1 \qquad E_{MM}: AMBER \qquad \qquad E_{QM/MM}: Hybrid MO$ 



#### Summary of current approaches

Karplus & co-workers

 $E_{QM}$ : DFT, HF, AM1  $E_{MM}$ : CHARMM  $E_{QM/MM}$ : Link atoms CHARMM interface with GAMESS or CADPAC

#### Friesner & co-workers

 $E_{QM}$ : DFT, HF  $E_{MM}$ : OPLS-AA  $E_{QM/MM}$ : Hybrid Orbital Qsite (Macromodel interface with Jaguar)

#### Gao & co-workers

 $E_{QM}$ : AM1  $E_{MM}$ : CHARMM  $E_{QM/MM}$ : Hybrid Orbital\*

#### Yang & co-workers

E<sub>QM</sub>: HF, DFT E<sub>MM</sub>: CHARMM E<sub>QM/MM</sub>: Link atom\*

\*Specific parameterization allows bond length change

#### Cautions

- Most force fields do not include polarizability, but QM region will
- This can lead to imbalance and amplification of errors
- All covalent embedding schemes should be treated with caution – it is surely possible to break almost every implemented scheme
- One needs to test carefully the dependence of the results on the QM/MM partitioning

# Coarser than QM/MM?

 Continuum solvation models – treat solvent as a dielectric continuum (PCM=Polarizable Continuum Model; SCRF=Self-Consistent Reaction Field)





## **Continuum Solvation**

#### Algorithm:

- Compute "reaction field" polarization of dielectric continuum which generates electric field acting on solute
- Compute electronic wavefunction in presence of new solvent-generated field
- Loop until reaction field does not change
- Issues:
  - Shape of cavity (spherical and ellipsoidal are rarely acceptable at present)
  - Dielectric of solvent zero vs infinite frequency?
  - H-bonding between solvent and solute will not be properly represented
  - Atomic radii used to generate cavity

# Supermolecule Approach

Explicit solvent molecules in first solvation shell
Surround with dielectric continuum
Expensive, but can be very accurate
Not feasible if solute is very large

Related approach – QM/MM/PCM

