J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data. 2017

Critical Evaluation of Thermodynamic Properties for Halobenzoic Acids Through Consistency Analyses for Results from Experiment and Computational Chemistry

Robert D. Chirico, Andrei Kazakov, Ala Bazyleva, Vladimir Diky, Kenneth Kroenlein^a

Applied Chemicals and Materials Division 647, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 325 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80305-3328, USA

Vladimir N. Emel´yanenko, and Sergey P. Verevkin^b

Department of Physical Chemistry and Department "Science and Technology of Life, Light and Matter," University of Rostock, D-18059, Rostock, Germany

Abstract: Thermodynamic properties of the twelve monohalobenzoic acids are critically evaluated through application of computational chemistry methods for the ideal-gas phase and thermodynamic consistency assessment of properties determined experimentally and reported in the literature, including enthalpies of combustion, enthalpies of sublimation, and enthalpies of fusion. The compounds of interest are the 2-, 3-, and 4-halo isomers of fluoro, chloro-, bromo-, and iodobenzoic acids. Computations were validated by comparison with critically evaluated entropies and heat capacities in the ideal-gas state for benzoic acid, benzene, and some halobenzenes. Experimental enthalpies of formation for 2- and 3-bromobenzoic acid, measured by wellestablished research groups, are mutually inconsistent, and further, are shown to be inconsistent with the computations and assessment in this work. Origins of the discrepancies are unknown, and recommended values for these compounds are based on computations and enthalpies of sublimation validated, in part, by structure-property (i.e., group-additivity) analysis. Lesser, but significant, inconsistencies between experimental and computed results are demonstrated also for 3- and 4iodobenzoic acid. Comparison of enthalpies of formation based on experiment and computation for the ideal-gas state of 1- and 2-chloro-, bromo-, and iodo-naphthalenes provides additional support for the findings for the halobenzoic acids, and also reveals some anomalous results in the experimental literature for the chloronaphthalenes. Computations are discussed in detail to demonstrate the approach required to obtain optimal results with modern quantum chemical methods.

Key words: enthalpy of formation; enthalpy of sublimation; enthalpy of vaporization; enthalpy of fusion; group additivity; halobenzoic acids; structure-property relationship; quantum-chemical methods.

^a Electronic mail: <u>kenneth.kroenlein@nist.gov</u> ^b Electronic mail: sergey.verevkin@uni-rostock.de

CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Thermodynamic relationships used in the evaluation process
- 3. Thermodynamic properties for the ideal-gas state by computation
 - 3.1. Overview of the computational method
 - 3.2 Validation of computations for benzoic acid
 - 3.2.1. Benchmark thermodynamic properties of benzoic acid from experiment
 - 3.2.2. Comparisons of computations with benchmark thermodynamic properties
 - 3.3. Computation of thermodynamic properties for the halobenzoic acids in the ideal-gas state
- 4. Enthalpies of formation for the crystalline state of the halobenzoic acids from experiment
 - 4.1. Enthalpies of combustion and formation
 - 4.1.1. Fluorobenzoic acids: $\Delta_c H_m^0$ (cr) and $\Delta_f H_m^0$ (cr)
 - 4.1.2. Chlorobenzoic acids: $\Delta_c H_m^o$ (cr) and $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr)
 - 4.1.3. Bromobenzoic acids: $\Delta_c H_m^o(cr)$ and $\Delta_f H_m^o(cr)$
 - 4.1.4. Iodobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{c}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$ and $\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$
- 5. Enthalpies of sublimation for the halobenzoic acids from experiment
 - 5.1. Experimental sources of enthalpies of sublimation
 - 5.1.1. Fluorobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$
 - 5.1.2. Chlorobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$
 - 5.1.3. Bromobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$
 - 5.1.4. Iodobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$
- 6. Enthalpies of formation for the ideal-gas state derived from experiment for the halobenzoic acids
- 7. Comparison of computational and experimental and results
 - 7.1. Selection of the homodesmic reactions for the halobenzoic acids
 - 7.2. Experimental enthalpies of formation for participants in the homodesmic reactions
 - 7.3. Enthalpies for the homodesmic reactions by computation
 - 7.4. Enthalpies for the homodesmic reactions by experiment
- 8. Validation of computations through comparison with results for halonaphthalenes
- 9. Validation of results through trend analysis for estimated enthalpies of vaporization
- 10. Evaluated enthalpies of formation for the halobenzoic acids for the crystal, liquid, and gas phase
- 11. Conclusions

List of Tables

- 1. Benchmark thermodynamic properties of benzoic acid from experiment: the enthalpy of combustion $\Delta_c H^o_m$ (cr, 298.15 K) and enthalpy of formation for the crystal $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr, 298.15 K), standard entropies for the crystal S^o (cr, 298.15 K and 375 K), enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta^g_{cr} H^o_m$ (298.15 K and 375 K), and the derived standard enthalpy of formation for the ideal gas $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (g, 298.15 K) and standard entropies for the ideal gas S^o (g, 298.15 K and 375 K)
- 2. Comparison of experimental and computed ideal-gas entropies S_m^o and heat capacities $C_{p,m}^o$ for fluorobenzene and the ideal-gas entropies S_m^o at temperature T = 298.15 K for bromobenzene $(p^\circ = 100 \text{ kPa})$
- Computed conformer energies and barriers (both are in kJ·mol⁻¹) for COOH internal rotation (relative to the syn conformer) for benzoic acid and the 4-halobenzoic acids
- Computed conformer energies and barriers (both are in kJ·mol⁻¹) for COOH internal rotation (relative to the anti-syn conformer) for 3-halobenzoic acids
- Computed conformer energies and barriers (both are in kJ·mol⁻¹) for COOH internal rotation (relative to the anti-syn conformer) for 2-halobenzoic acids
- 6. Experimental standard enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_c H^o_m$ (cr) and derived standard enthalpies of formation $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr) for crystalline fluorobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)
- 7. Experimental standard enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_c H_m^o$ (cr) and derived standard enthalpies of formation $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr) for crystalline chlorobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)
- 8. Experimental standard enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_c H_m^o$ (cr) and derived standard enthalpies of formation $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr) for crystalline bromobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)
- 9. Experimental standard enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_c H_m^o$ (cr) and derived standard enthalpies of formation $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr) for crystalline iodobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)

- 10. Experimental enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}$ (T_{mid}) and derived standard enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}^{o}$ at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K for fluorobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)
- 11. Experimental enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}$ (T_{mid}) and derived standard enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}^{o}$ at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K for chlorobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)
- 12. Experimental enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}$ (T_{mid}) and derived standard enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}^{o}$ at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K for bromobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)
- 13. Experimental enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}$ (T_{mid}) and derived standard enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}^{o}$ at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K for iodobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)
- 14. Standard enthalpies of formation for the ideal-gas state $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (g) derived with averaged experimental standard enthalpies of formation for the crystal $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr) and experimental standard enthalpies of sublimation at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K
- 15. Standard enthalpies of formation for the ideal gas $\Delta_f H_m^o(g)$ derived with experimental standard enthalpies of formation for the liquid phase $\Delta_f H_m^o(l)$ and experimental standard enthalpies of vaporization for benzene and the halobenzenes at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K
- 16. Enthalpy of homodesmic reaction (8) (halobenzene + benzoic acid = benzene + halobenzoic acid) at temperature T = 298.15 K and its individual contributions (units of energy are kJ·mol⁻¹)
- 17. Comparison of enthalpies of reaction for the homodesmic reaction (8) (halobenzene + benzoic acid = benzene + halobenzoic acid) in the ideal-gas state at temperature T = 298.15 K and pressure $p^{\circ} = 100$ kPa derived from experiment $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, expt) and computed $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, comp)
- 18. Standard enthalpies of formation for the ideal-gas state $\Delta_f H_m^o(g)$ derived with experimental standard enthalpies of formation for the condensed phase $\Delta_f H_m^o(cr \text{ or } l)$ and experimental standard enthalpies of sublimation (or vaporization) for naphthalene and the halonaphthalenes at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K

- 19. Comparison of enthalpies of reaction for the homodesmic reaction (9) (halobenzene + naphthalene = benzene + halonaphthalene) in the ideal-gas state at temperature T = 298.15 K and pressure $p^{\circ} = 100$ kPa derived from experiment $\Delta_{\rm r} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (g, expt) and computed $\Delta_{\rm r} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (g, comp)
- 20. Normal melting temperatures T_m , enthalpies of fusion $\Delta_{cr}^l H_m^o(T_m)$, enthalpies of fusion adjusted to the reference temperature $\Delta_{cr}^l H_m^o(T_{ref})$, enthalpies of sublimation adjusted to the reference temperature $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$, derived enthalpies of vaporization at the reference temperature $\Delta_1^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$, and the difference in enthalpy of vaporization at the reference temperature between that for the particular halobenzoic acid and that for benzoic acid $\Delta_1^g H_{inc}^o(T_{ref})$, where $T_{ref} =$ 298.15 K (uncertainties represent 0.95 level of confidence)
- 21. Normal melting temperatures T_m , enthalpies of fusion $\Delta_{cr}^l H_m^o(T_m)$, enthalpies of fusion adjusted to the reference temperature $\Delta_{cr}^l H_m^o(T_{ref})$, enthalpies of sublimation adjusted to the reference temperature $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$, derived enthalpies of vaporization at the reference temperature $\Delta_l^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$, and the difference in enthalpy of vaporization at the reference temperature between that for the particular halonaphthalene and that for naphthalene $\Delta_l^g H_{inc}^o(T_{ref})$, where $T_{ref} =$ 298.15 K (uncertainties represent 0.95 level of confidence)
- 22. Standard enthalpies of formation for the crystal $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr), ideal-gas $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (g), and liquid $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (l) evaluated in this research for the halobenzoic acids at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K and pressure p = 100 kPa
- A1. Heat capacities, standard entropies, and enthalpy increments of benzoic acid in the ideal-gas state computed with the methods described in the text ($p^\circ = 100$ kPa)
- A2. Comparison of experimental and computed molecular rotational constants (GHz)
- A3. Heat capacities, standard entropies, and enthalpy increments for the halobenzoic acids in the ideal-gas state computed with the methods described in the text ($p^\circ = 100$ kPa)

List of Figures

- 1. Difference plot of experimental and computed ideal-gas entropies S_m^o for benzene and benzoic acid
- 2. Conformers of the halobenzoic acids, where R represents the halogen

- 3. Rotational potentials and rotational constants for benzoic acid and the halobenzoic acids as a function of torsion angle
- 4. Enthalpy increments for change in enthalpy of vaporization on replacement of one hydrogen in the parent aromatic compound (benzene, benzoic acid, or naphthalene) with one halogen
- A1.Deviations relative to computed heat capacities of this research for the ideal-gas state of benzoic acid

1. Introduction

Critical evaluation of thermodynamic properties involves a demonstration of consistency among properties for a given compound based on enforced thermodynamic identities and well-established correlations (*cf.*, the series of articles describing the NIST ThermoData Engine¹⁻⁸). In addition, evaluation involves assessment of trends in property values within families of related compounds, such as trends in properties for homologous series, such as normal alkanes, which have remained a topic of interest to the research community for decades (*cf.*, references 9-11).

In recent years, the methods of modern computational chemistry have been increasingly applied in the critical evaluation process, as these provide pathways to properties for the ideal-gas state (specifically, standard entropies and enthalpies of formation) that are independent of calorimetric methods (*cf.*, references 12-14). Demonstration of consistency between the computations and experiment provides a mutual validation of the two methods, together with an increase in confidence in the overall critical evaluation. Simultaneous application of the two methods to families of compounds provides an important path for validation and quantification of uncertainties for the computational methods. These, in turn, can be used with confidence to resolve discrepancies in the experimental literature or provide essential data that are, otherwise, unobtainable, such as those for materials of extreme expense, high toxicity, low chemical stability, or that cannot be synthesized in adequate quantity or purity for experimental investigation.

In the present work, thermodynamic properties of the monohalobenzoic acids are critically evaluated, including the 2-, 3-, and 4- isomers (*i.e.*, ortho, meta, and para isomers) of fluoro-, chloro-, bromo-, and iodobenzoic acid. Properties for many of these compounds have been reported by multiple independent research groups with low uncertainty and good consistency between the reported values, thus providing a check on the quality of the computed values. Conversely, for some compounds – particularly the bromo derivatives – consistency of experimental results in the

literature is poor, and the computations provide essential information to distinguish reliable and anomalous results. In addition to the demonstration of consistency for ideal-gas properties, trend analysis for condensed phase properties (specifically, enthalpies of vaporization estimated from experimental enthalpies of fusion and sublimation) is used to lend additional confidence to the evaluations.

2. Thermodynamic relationships used in the evaluation process

The key thermodynamic identity used in the present work is

$$\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}({\rm cr}, 298.15 \text{ K}) + \Delta^{\rm g}_{\rm cr} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}(298.15 \text{ K}) = \Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}({\rm g}, 298.15 \text{ K})$$
(1)

where $\Delta_f H_m^o(cr)$ and $\Delta_f H_m^o(g)$ are the standard molar enthalpy of formation of the crystal and gas, respectively, and $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o$ is the enthalpy of sublimation. The reference temperature T = 298.15 K is that chosen for nearly all experimental determinations of the enthalpy of formation for condensed states, and the reference pressure is 100 kPa.

Experimental determination of $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (cr, 298.15 K) involves measurement of the enthalpy of combustion of the compound of interest in oxygen and algebraic combination of the results with well established enthalpies of formation for the combustion products; water, carbon dioxide, and other combustion products specific to the combusted compound. For the halobenzoic acids, additional products are HF(aq), HCI(aq), HBr(aq), and I₂(cr).

For substances that are solid near the reference temperature T = 298.15 K, enthalpies of sublimation have been determined by direct calorimetry and through measurement of the temperature dependence of the sublimation pressure and application of the Clausius-Clapeyron equation:

$$\frac{d\ln p}{dT} = \frac{\Delta_{\rm Cr}^{\rm g} H_{\rm m}}{RT^2},\tag{2}$$

where p is the sublimation pressure, T is temperature, and R is the gas constant. In this formulation, it is assumed that the vapor is ideal, which is valid at the low pressures considered here for the halobenzoic acids.

Values of enthalpies of formation for compounds in the ideal-gas state have been reported for decades based on the results of computational chemistry, though early results had large uncertainties (*cf.*, references 15 and 16). The quality of such computations has improved such that uncertainties for some modern computations on selected systems are comparable to the best experimental results, and these can be used as a check on experimentally derived values of $\Delta_f H_m^o(g)$,¹² and this approach is used in the present work with application to the twelve monohalogenated (F, Cl, Br, and I) benzoic acids. Direct computation of thermodynamic properties in condensed states is an active area of research today, but has not reached the threshold of uncertainty necessary for use in critical evaluation of experimental results.

3. Thermodynamic properties for the ideal-gas state by computation

3.1 Overview of the computational methods

The initial conformer mappings, molecular geometries, and vibrational frequencies for the halobenzoic acids were evaluated using the hybrid Density Functional Theory (DFT) B3LYP methods and the density-fitted (sometimes also referred to as "Resolution-of-Identity", RI) approximation of the second-order Møller-Plesset perturbation theory, DF-MP2. B3LYP calculations for conformers, rotational barriers, and vibrational frequencies were performed with Gaussian 09.¹⁷ Rotational potentials at the B3LYP level and vibrational frequencies at the DF-MP2 level for the fluoro-, chloro- and bromo- compounds were computed with the Psi4 package¹⁸ v1.0, taking advantage of its efficient density-fitted implementations. For iodine-containing compounds, the canonical B3LYP implementation in Gaussian 09¹⁷ was used. Thermodynamic functions for

the COOH torsion were obtained with the one-dimensional hindered rotor approximation by direct numerical solution of the Schrödinger equation.¹⁹ Reduced rotational constants for the torsion were evaluated with the model of Pitzer.²⁰ The Karlsruhe "def2" basis sets²¹ of quadruple-zeta quality (def2-QZVP and def2-QZVPP) and their augmented versions²²(def2-QZVPD) were used in these calculations. The Karlsruhe basis sets support all elements considered in this study with the relativistic effects for iodine being accounted for using the effective core potentials. It should also be noted that def2-QZVP and def2-QZVPP are equivalent for all elements considered except bromine and iodine. Atomic masses for the most abundant isotope were utilized (Gaussian 09 default settings).

High-level single-point energy calculations were performed with the recently proposed Domain Based Local Pair-Natural Orbital Coupled Cluster with Single, Double, and perturbative Triple excitations, DLPNO-CCSD(T), approach.²³ DF-MP2 and DLPNO-CCSD(T) calculations for energy minima and rotational barriers were carried out with ORCA²⁴ v3.03. For comparison, energy calculations with G4 theory²⁵ that approximates the CCSD(T) result with the triple-zeta quality basis set were carried out for the fluorine-, chlorine-, and bromine-containing compounds. Iodine-containing compounds are unsupported in G4, so no comparison computations could be made. G4 calculations were performed with the Gaussian 09 package.¹⁷

3.2 Validation of computations for benzoic acid

3.2.1. Benchmark thermodynamic properties for benzoic acid from experiment

Thermodynamic properties of benzoic acid have been reported extensively in the literature, as the compound is the calibration standard for measurement of enthalpies of combustion, and it is a reference material for measurement of condensed-phase heat capacities for temperatures below T = 400 K and measurement of sublimation pressures for the range (298.15 < (T/K) < 383).²⁶ The enthalpy of combustion for benzoic acid has been determined by multiple national metrology

laboratories with electrically-calibrated combustion calorimeters (Table 1).^{27–32} Enthalpies of formation for the crystal phase from these sources were re-evaluated by Cox and Pilcher, with uncertainties expressed on a consistent basis with 0.95 level of confidence. The value reported by Jessup in 1934²⁷ was superseded in a later publication from the same laboratory in 1942,²⁸ so we have included only the latter value in the averaged results. The weighted average for the enthalpy of formation for crystalline benzoic acid $\Delta_f H_m^0$ (cr) is given in the top section of Table 1.

The standard entropy for crystalline benzoic acid is determined experimentally through appropriate integration of heat capacities measured from near T = 0 K (typically from below T = 20 K) to a temperature between T = 298.15 K and the melting temperature ($T_m \approx 395.5$ K). As benzoic acid is a recommended reference material for testing of adiabatic calorimeters, a large number of high quality data sets have been published.³³⁻⁴⁰ A summary of the standard entropies derived from these measurements is given in Table 1, together with the selected average value. Entropy increments between T = 0 K and the lowest temperature reported for each study were estimated by assuming a T^3 dependence for the heat capacities in this region, as per the Debye model.⁴¹

Derivation of properties for the gas phase from the experimental values for the crystal phase requires evaluated enthalpies and entropies of sublimation. For benzoic acid, these values have been reported based on direct calorimetry⁴²⁻⁴⁶ and studies of the temperature dependence of sublimation pressures.⁴⁷⁻⁵⁹ The calorimetric results are difficult to assess, because reported uncertainties are often repeatabilities only (*cf.*, reference 42), and as such, are an incomplete representation of the standard uncertainty. We estimate the uncertainties in the direct calorimetric results to be, at minimum, 1 percent of the measured enthalpy of sublimation, and as such, these would add little to the analysis here. In this work, we have evaluated the enthalpy of sublimation for benzoic acid using only results from studies of sublimation pressure as a function of temperature

that are consistent with \sim 3 percent in pressure.⁵⁰⁻⁵⁹ Even this restricted set includes ten independent and consistent determinations.

Enthalpies of sublimation were derived through application of the Clausius-Clapeyron equation (Eq. (2)). A straight line was fitted to the experimental data plotted as $\ln(p)$ against $(T/K)^{-1}$. The slope of the line was used to calculate the enthalpy of sublimation for the temperature at the middle of the experimental range. Adjustment of this value to the temperatures T = 298.15 K and T = 375 K was accomplished with heat capacities for the gas computed in this research (Section 3.2.2 and listed in Table A1) and heat capacities for the crystals reported by Furukawa et al.³³

Murata et al.⁴³ considered association of benzoic acid in the gas phase and concluded that the vapor composition was, at least, 99.7 percent monomer. Any error associated with the failure to consider association in the gas phase was found to be less than 0.2 kJmol⁻¹.⁴³ We ignore any contribution from gas-phase association here.

Uncertainties for enthalpies of sublimation derived from the measurement of sublimation pressures are directly related to uncertainties in slope for plots of $\ln(p)$ against $(T/K)^{-1}$ based Eq. (2). To account for possible systematic errors in pressures, this uncertainty for each data source was calculated as follows: a straight line was fitted to plots of $\ln(p)$ against $(T/K)^{-1}$, average percent standard deviations for the experimental pressures were calculated, and the expanded uncertainty (0.95 level of confidence) for the slope was taken as the change in slope, calculated with values at the temperature extremes with pressures fractionally shifted with opposite sign by twice the percent standard deviation of the experimental values from the fit. Uncertainties in the heat capacities for the gas (this research, section 3.2.2) and crystals³³ used to adjust the enthalpies of sublimation from the mid-temperature of the experimental range to T = 298.15 and T = 375 K were considered, but their contributions are very small in comparison to those arising from uncertainty in the slope. All

uncertainties for enthalpies of sublimation derived from studies of sublimation pressures were calculated with this method, and resulting uncertainties are listed in Table 1.

The standard enthalpy of formation for benzoic acid in the ideal-gas state is calculated as the sum of the standard enthalpy of formation of the crystal $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr) and the enthalpy of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o$ at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K according to Eq. (1).

The value derived for benzoic acid in this research is given at the bottom of Table 1. The standard entropy $S^{\circ}(g)$ for benzoic acid in the ideal-gas state at reference pressure $p^{\circ} = 100$ kPa is calculated as the sum of the standard entropy of the crystal, the entropy of vaporization, and the entropy of compression from the saturation pressure to $p^{\circ} = 100$ kPa. Because the gas is assumed to be ideal, the entropy of compression is $R \cdot \ln(p/p^{\circ})$, where *R* is the gas constant. Values for the standard entropy of benzoic acid in the ideal-gas phase $S^{\circ}(g)$ for the temperatures T = 298.15 K and T = 375 K are listed at the bottom of Table 1.

Heat capacities for the gas phase of benzoic acid were determined by Santos et al.⁶⁰ with the "vacuum sublimation/vaporization Calvet microcalorimetry drop method". This method requires knowledge of the enthalpy of sublimation to convert the measured quantities to heat capacities. We have recalculated the results of Santos et al.⁶⁰, using the enthalpy of sublimation for benzoic acid at T = 298.15 K determined in this work (Table 1), and have included the uncertainty in this value in the calculations. Values are 3 percent lower than those reported by Santos et al.⁶⁰ In addition, the expanded uncertainty (0.95 level of confidence) is ~8 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹, rather than 5 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹, as reported by of Santos et al.,⁶⁰ who chose to ignore the uncertainty in the enthalpy of sublimation.

3.2.2. Comparisons of computations with benchmark thermodynamic properties

To select the best model for computation of thermodynamic properties for the systems considered here, a range of methods (B3LYP, B3LYP with empirical dispersion correction,⁶¹ and DF-MP2) with the def2-QZVPD basis set were tested. In addition, treatment of the COOH torsion

was addressed both as a regular vibration and as a hindered one-dimensional quantum rotor. In the latter case, the rotational potentials and reduced rotational constants computed at the corresponding levels of theory were used, and the potentials were scaled to match the barriers computed at the DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVP//DF-MP2/def2-QZVP level of theory. In each case, the scaling factors for vibrational frequencies were optimized against the ideal-gas entropy derived from the experimental data for benzoic acid (given in the previous section) and for benzene as evaluated by Chirico and Steele.⁶² Consideration of benzene was included to better constrain the optimization procedure due to the limited experimental data available for benzoic acid. Experimental uncertainties were used as weights in the optimization procedure. The combination of B3LYP/def2-QZVPD with the hindered rotor treatment of the COOH torsion yielded the lowest Root-Mean-Square Deviation (RMSD) from the experimental ideal-gas entropies. This observation is consistent with prior reports on B3LYP performance with the basis sets augmented to optimize the prediction of electrical properties.⁶³ The optimal vibrational frequency scaling factor was found to be 0.9689±0.0070, consistent with results reported for basis sets of similar size.⁶⁴ The deviations between the gas-phase entropies derived from experiment and those computed with the optimal model are shown in Fig. 1. This model was adopted for computation of the thermodynamic properties for all molecules considered in this research.

Molecular vibrations at high frequencies, corresponding to highly localized hydrogen stretches, have essentially no influence on the thermodynamic properties at practical temperatures, and therefore, were effectively not considered in the model optimization. Nonetheless, these vibrational modes do affect the zero-point vibrational energy (ZPVE) needed in calculation of the enthalpies of formation. Therefore, the dual scaling factor approach was adopted, with the vibrational frequencies corresponding to C-H and O-H stretches scaled with the factor (0.9601 \pm 0.0038) obtained from the fits to experimentally-measured vibration frequencies for benzoic acid⁶⁵ and benzene.⁶⁶

Heat capacities, standard entropies, and enthalpy increments for benzoic acid in the ideal gas state, computed with the adopted model, are given in Table A1 of the Appendix. The heat capacities for the ideal gas are in agreement with those derived recently with isodesmic reaction schemas by Santos et al.⁶⁰ A graphical comparison is shown in Fig. A1 of the Appendix. This result supports the conclusion by Santos et al.⁶⁰ that several often-used sources of ideal-gas heat capacities for benzoic acid^{67,68} are in error by ~20 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹ between T = 300 K and T = 1000 K, which corresponds to (6 to 18) percent of the heat capacity. Burcat and Ruscic⁶⁹ maintain a database⁷⁰ of ideal-gas and condensed-phase thermodynamic properties for species involved in combustion processes that is used extensively within the combustion research community. Heat capacities for benzoic acid in the ideal-gas state given there are ~5 percent lower than those evaluated in this research. Differences are also shown in Fig. A1 of the Appendix.

Finally, additional validations were performed against experimental ideal-gas properties for fluorobenzene⁷¹ (S_m^o and $C_{p,m}^o$) and bromobenzene⁷²⁻⁷⁴ (S_m^o), as the optimization procedure did not include halogenated compounds; which are the main subject of this study. Comparisons with the experimental values are given in Table 2. Uncertainties for the experimental values are very small, yet excellent agreement between the experimental and computed values is obtained. Experimental molecular rotational constants can be obtained from the molecular geometry reported by Aarset et al.⁷⁵ for benzoic acid and direct measurements by Daly et al.⁷⁶ for 2-, 3-, and 4-fluorobenzoic acids. A comparison of experimental and computed molecular rotational constants is provided in the Appendix (Table A2).

3.3 Computation of thermodynamic properties for the halobenzoic acids in the ideal-gas state

As noted earlier, the initial conformer mapping for the halobenzoic acids was performed at the B3LYP/def2-QZVPD level. The 4-halobenzoic acids exhibit the same symmetry as the parent compound (benzoic acid) with two distinct conformers (syn and anti), due to rotation of the C-O bond (Fig. 2). The conformer energies, computed at several levels of theory, are given in Table 3. The anti conformer was computed to be ~27 kJ·mol⁻¹ higher in energy than the syn counterpart for all of the 4-halobenzoic acids and was ignored in further analysis. The barrier to internal COOH rotation that connects syn conformations was computed to be 27.9 kJ·mol⁻¹ for 4-fluorobenzoic acid at the highest level of theory; DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP//DF-MP2/ def2-QZVPP. The barrier decreases slightly with the size of the halogen, reaching 26.3 kJ·mol⁻¹ for 4-iodobenzoic acid. All conformations for 4-halobenzoic acids were predicted to have planar (Cs) structures.

For 3- and 2-halobenzoic acids, four distinct conformations exist, due to rotation of both the COOH and OH groups (Fig. 2). The computed conformer energies and barriers for COOH internal rotation are given in Tables 4 and 5 for the 3- and 2-halobenzoic acids, respectively. For the 3-halobenzoic acids, the anti-syn conformer was generally computed to have the lowest energy (Table 4). For the 3-chloro, 3-bromo, and 3-iodo derivatives, the energy of the anti-syn conformer is (0.2 to 0.4) kJ·mol⁻¹ lower than that of the syn-syn conformer, while for 3-fluorobenzoic acid, the anti-syn and syn-syn conformers are energetically equivalent within 0.01 kJ·mol⁻¹. The anti-anti and syn-anti conformations for all 3-halobenzoic acids are in excess of 26 kJ·mol⁻¹ higher in energy and were not considered in further analysis. As was found for the 4-halobenzoic acids, all computed conformations of the 3-halobenzoic acids have planar geometries.

For 2-halobenzoic acids, the ortho interactions play an important role, and the conformer mappings become more complicated. For 2-fluorobenzoic acid, the anti-syn conformer remains the

most energetically favoured, followed by the syn-syn conformer with a computed energy $\sim 3 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$ higher than the anti-syn configuration (Table 5). In addition, the strong F-H interaction in the anti-anti configuration (Fig. 2) lowers the energy of this conformer close to the two most favoured conformers, with only $\sim 5 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$ separating this conformer from the most stable anti-syn conformation. The syn-anti conformer, without the benefit of F-H interactions, remains $\sim 27 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$ above the most energetically-favoured configuration. All conformations of 2-fluorobenzoic acid remain planar.

For the 2-chloro, 2-bromo, and 2-iodo derivatives, the situation changes in two ways. First, the lowest energy is exhibited by the syn-syn conformation, which is (0.6 to 2.8) kJ·mol⁻¹ below that for the anti-syn conformation that favoured previously (Table 5). Secondly, the anti-syn and syn-syn conformations are no longer planar, and the planar anti-syn and syn-syn configurations correspond to very small rotational barriers between the corresponding non-planar stationary points (Fig. 3). All 2-halobenzoic acids exhibit a drastic reduction in the main COOH torsion barrier in comparison to those for the 4- and 3-halobenzoic acids, as seen in Fig. 3. The importance of the anti-anti conformation decreases with the halogen size. Its energy above the most stable conformer gradually increases from 5 kJ·mol⁻¹ for 2-fluorobenzoic acid to 12 kJ·mol⁻¹ for 2-iodobenzoic acids, and non-planar for the 2-bromo- and 2-iodo- derivatives.

As seen in Tables 4 and 5, the computed conformational energies for the 2- and 3-fluorobenzoic acids are in good agreement (with 2.6 kJ·mol⁻¹) with recent results by Daly et al.⁷⁶ based on analysis of microwave spectra. The present work represents the most complete conformational analysis of halobenzoic acids to-date, as previous efforts were typically confined to a single - and not always lowest energy – conformer.^{77,78,79}

The above computational results allow evaluation of thermodynamic properties for the idealgas state of the halobenzoic acids as follows. The geometries and vibrational frequencies, except for the COOH torsion, were taken from B3LYP/def2-QZVPD calculations with the vibrational scaling factors established earlier. The COOH torsion was treated as a one-dimensional hindered quantum rotor using rotational constants and potentials also obtained at the B3LYP/def2-QZVPD level. Rotational potentials were further scaled to match the barriers predicted at the DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP//DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP level. This approach rigorously accounts for the most stable conformers; syn for 4-halobenzoic acids, and anti-syn and syn-syn for 3- and 2halobenzoic acids. For 2-fluorobenzoic and 2-chlorobenzoic acids, the importance of minor contributions of the anti-anti conformations was tested by computing the properties of the equilibrium mixture of conformations (anti-syn + syn-syn + anti-anti) in which the properties of the anti-anti conformation were approximated with the conventional rigid-rotor harmonic-oscillator approximation without special treatment of the COOH torsion. The addition of anti-anti conformations resulted in the differences under 0.4 % and 0.2 % for the entropy and heat capacity, respectively. For 2-bromobenzoic and 2-iodobenzoic acids, the computed energies of anti-anti conformations were higher, 9 kJ·mol⁻¹ and 12 kJ·mol⁻¹ above the most stable conformation, with the added complexity of non-planar geometries (resulting in two equivalent anti-anti conformers connected via a barrier at planar configuration). Considering that the contributions of anti-anti conformations very small in the tests for 2-fluorobenzoic and 2-chlorobenzoic acids, more detailed and complex analysis for 2-bromobenzoic and 2-iodobenzoic acids was not justified, and the contributions of anti-anti conformations were neglected for these two cases. Heat capacities, standard entropies, and enthlapy increments for the ideal-gas state for all of the halobenzoic acids are given in the Appendix (Table A3). Based on the quality of the computations, validated through rigorous comparison with experimental ideal-gas entropies and heat capacities for benzoic acid,

benzene, and halobenzenes, we estimate the relative expanded uncertainty (0.95 level of confidence) of the computed thermodynamic properties to be 0.2 percent for the temperature range considered (up to ~500 K). At higher temperatures, the adopted approximations (*i.e.*, not taking into account the higher-energy conformations and anharmonicity of associated torsions) will lead to larger errors, up to ~2 percent at 1000 K.

4. Enthalpies of formation for the crystalline state of the halobenzoic acids from experiment

4.1. Enthalpies of combustion and formation

Rotating bomb combustion calorimetry has been long established as the primary method for determination of enthalpies of combustion for the lighter (F, Cl, and Br) halogen-containing compounds.⁸⁰ This is due to the highly energetic dissolution of combustion product gases {HF(g), HCl(g), or HBr(g)} in water that is present in the reaction chamber. Complete dissolution of the gas to a known and reproducible final state is achieved by rotation (or rocking¹⁴) of the bomb after ignition of the sample. Combustion of iodine-containing compounds have been treated with less complexity because I₂(cr), rather than an acid, is the primary halogen product, and use of static bomb calorimetry yields results similar to measurements involving bomb rotation, as shown by Ribeiro da Silva et. al.⁸¹ In that study, both static and rotating bomb calorimetry was used, and results were within the combined uncertainties.

Enthalpies of combustion have been determined experimentally for all of the monohalogenated benzoic acids. The idealized combustion reactions associated with the standard molar enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_c H_m^o$ are as follows.

$$C_7H_5O_2F(cr) + 7O_2(g) + (n-2)H_2O(l) = 7CO_2(g) + HF \cdot nH_2O(aq)$$
 (3)

$$C_7H_5O_2Cl(cr) + 7 O_2(g) + (n - 2) H_2O(l) = 7 CO_2(g) + HCl \cdot n H_2O(aq)$$
(4)

$$C_7H_5O_2Br(cr) + 7 O_2(g) + (n - 2) H_2O(l) = 7 CO_2(g) + HBr \cdot n H_2O(aq)$$
(5)

$$C_7H_5O_2Br(cr) + 7.25 O_2(g) = 7 CO_2(g) + 2.5 H_2O(l) + 0.5 Br_2(l)$$
 (6)

$$C_7H_5O_2I(cr) + 7.25 O_2(g) = 7 CO_2(g) + 2.5 H_2O(l) + 0.5 I_2(cr)$$
 (7)

Combustion of halogen-containing compounds, generally, yields a mixture of halogenated products. For organofluorine compounds, products include HF(g) and $CF_4(g)$, while for organochlorine and bromine compounds, products include $Cl_2(g)$ and HCl(g), and $Br_2(l)$ and HBr(g), respectively. In practice, all chloro and bromo products are converted to HCl(aq) and HBr(aq) through addition of water and a reducing agent (As₂O₃), coupled with bomb rotation at the end of the combustion.

Although the combustion reaction for bromobenzoic acids is well represented by Eq. (5), results are traditionally reported as Eq. (6), with Br₂(1) as the halogen-containing product. As noted by Cox and Pilcher,⁸² this leads to "hidden" calculations for the conversion of measured enthalpies for Eq. (5) to those of Eq. (6), as details of this computation are rarely, if ever, reported. For example, Ferrao and Pilcher⁸³ report the size of the adjustment for a single sample combustion, without giving the concentration of HBr or the source of the literature data used. Ribeiro da Silva et al.⁸⁴ report that enthalpies of formation for the "appropriate" concentration of HBr were taken from the NBS Tables of Chemical Thermodynamic Properties without providing the concentrations, and Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar⁸⁵ discuss the necessity of conversion of HBr(aq) to Br₂(1), but report results only for the reaction involving Br₂(1) without information about the underlying calculations. Consequently, the conversions cannot be checked nor can they be updated if improved values of $\Delta_f H_m^0$ for HBr(aq) become available.

Enthalpies of combustion for fluorobenzoic acids (Eq. (3)) are typically adjusted to a value of n = 50, but values as a low as n = 10 have been reported.⁸⁶ For the chlorobenzoic acids, *n* is typically

600, but some key results predate this convention, and values as low as n = 74 have been reported.⁸⁰ As noted above, *n* for combustion of bromobenzoic acids is not reported.

Enthalpies of formation were calculated in the present work using standard molar enthalpies of formation of $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (l, H₂O, 298.15 K) = –(285.83 ± 0.04) kJ·mol⁻¹ and $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (g, CO₂, 298.15 K) = –(393.51 ± 0.13) kJ·mol⁻¹ recommended by CODATA.⁸⁷ Enthalpies of formation for HCl(aq) were those reported in the NBS tables,⁸⁸ while those for HF(aq) were those evaluated at Argonne National Laboratory by Johnson et al.⁸⁹ Uncertainties for the enthalpies of formation of the acid solutions are dominated by those for HCl(g) (U = 0.07 kJ·mol⁻¹) and HF(g) (U = 0.31 kJ·mol⁻¹) with 0.95 level of confidence. These uncertainties were applied for all acid concentrations. For the bromobenzoic acids, all reported enthalpies of combustion were reported in terms of Eq. (6) (*i.e.*, with Br₂(1) as a product), and we necessarily assumed that adjustments leading to the reported combustion enthalpies were done consistently and correctly.

In this work, uncertainties for combustion experiments were evaluated, where possible, on a consistent basis, according to the guidelines of Olofsson.⁹⁰ Uncertainties for the standard molar enthalpy of combustion and formation are expanded uncertainties (0.95 level of confidence) and include contributions from the calibration with benzoic acid and from the values of the auxiliary quantities used. Uncertainties assigned to $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (cr) include uncertainties of the enthalpies of formation of the reaction products; H₂O(1), CO₂(g), and aqueous acid solutions. Reported enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_{\rm c} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ and enthalpies of formation $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ for the halobenzoic acids are compiled in Tables 6 through 9. Results for each halide group are reviewed briefly in the following sections. Except for the bromobenzoic acids, results are generally consistent, and in most cases, results have been reported by multiple research groups with extensive experience. In particular, the para-substituted halobenzoic acids have been measured repeatedly, and their combustion energies

have been recommended as reference compounds for testing of rotating combustion bomb calorimeters.(^{80,82,91-93})

4.1.1. Fluorobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{c}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$ and $\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$

Standard enthalpies of combustion and derived standard enthalpies of formation for the fluorobenzoic acids are compiled in Table 6. Results for compounds for which multiple independent studies have been done are in good accord, with all values within the combined uncertainties. Combustion experiments on 2-, 3- and 4-fluorobenzoic acids were first performed at the Bartlesville Thermodynamics Laboratory (Bartlesville, Oklahoma, U. S. A.) by Good et al.⁹² as part of development of general methods for combustion calorimetry of organic fluorine compounds. In that work they proposed 4-fluorobenzoic acid as a reference substance for intercomparison of bomb-calorimetric data for fluorine compounds. Subsequently, Cox et al.⁹¹ at the National Chemistry Laboratory (Teddington, U. K.) reported confirming results for 4-fluorobenzoic acid and Johnson and Prosen⁹⁴ at the National Bureau of Standards (Washington, DC) reported confirming enthalpies of combustion for 2- and 4-fluorobenzoic acid. Further confirmation of the enthalpy of combustion for 4-fluorobenzoic is provided through later measurements by Schaffer et al.⁹⁵ (Freiburg, Germany) and Ribeiro da Silva et al.⁸⁶ (Porto, Portugal). 4-Fluorobenzoic acid was formally recommended as a reference material for combustion of fluorine compounds by the International Confederation for Thermal Analysis and Calorimetry (ICTAC) in 1999.²⁶

4.1.2. Chlorobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{c}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$ and $\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$

Standard enthalpies of combustion and derived standard enthalpies of formation for the chlorobenzoic acids are compiled in Table 7. With few exceptions, agreement amongst the independent determinations is within the combined uncertainties. An exception is the result

reported for 2-chlorobenzoic acid by Holdiness,⁹⁶ who used a commercial calorimeter (Parr Instrument Company) with the static bomb (instead of commonly required rotating bomb) and determined an enthalpy of combustion that is ~0.5 percent more positive than those reported by other researchers⁹⁷⁻⁹⁹ (as expected because of incomplete reaction or dissolution of gases). The most recent version of the Parr Bomb Calorimeter¹⁰⁰ has an associated expanded uncertainty for measured enthalpy of, at least, 0.6 percent, which corresponds to an expanded uncertainty of ~20 kJ·mol⁻¹, rather than 4 kJ·mol⁻¹, as reported by Holdiness.⁹⁶ Furthermore, Holdiness⁹⁶ reports a standard deviation of 3 percent between his values and those in the literature, which is characterized as "excellent". It is clear that the uncertainties reported by Holdiness⁹⁶ are much too small and must be increased to, at least, 20 kJ·mol⁻¹, making them of little value in the present review.

The value of $\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (cr) reported by Smith et al.⁹⁷ for 2-chlorobenzoic acid is ~6 kJ·mol⁻¹ more positive than values reported by Johnson and Prosen⁹⁸ and Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar.⁹⁹ In their careful review of the combustion literature (published in 1970), Cox and Pilcher⁸² estimated the uncertainties for the values given by Smith et al.⁹⁷ to be ~8 kJ·mol⁻¹ due to a lack sufficient detail in the reported results, which were obtained with the "quartz wool" method, rather than with bomb rotation. Nonetheless, results reported by Smith et al.⁹⁷ for 3- and 4-chlorobenzoic acid are in agreement with later reliable results for these compounds (*e.g.*, Johnson and Prosen⁹⁸ and Ribeiro da Silva and Ferreira¹⁰¹). The large number of combustion studies for 4-chlorobenzoic acid reflects its development and long acceptance as a reference material for combustion of organic chlorine compounds.^{97-99,101-114} The agreement amongst nearly twenty measurement results is excellent, as seen in the Table 7.

4.1.3. Bromobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{c}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$ and $\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$

Standard enthalpies of combustion and derived standard enthalpies of formation for the bromobenzoic acids are compiled in Table 8. The enthalpy of combustion for 4-bromobenzoic acid

has been reported four times with excellent agreement amongst the studies.^{83,93,115,116} In contrast, results for 2- and 3-bromobenzoic show large inconsistencies between the reported values. As discussed earlier, all results by Holdiness⁹⁶ have very large uncertainties and can be discounted. The disagreement between the results of Ferrao and Pilcher⁸³ (1987) and Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar¹¹⁵ (1996) is surprising in that both laboratories have been the source of numerous data of demonstrated good quality. Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar¹¹⁵ were sufficiently surprised by the discrepancies that they undertook additional measurements using a traditional rotating bomb calorimeter to confirm their initial results obtained using a rocking micro-calorimeter that required less than 10 mg of sample. Because of the large magnitude of the discrepancies, we suspected an algebraic error of some type by the authors, but could find no evidence for this in any of the reported results.

4.1.4. Iodobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{c}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$ and $\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$

Standard enthalpies of combustion and derived standard enthalpies of formation for the iodobenzoic acids are compiled in Table 9. Here, except for the extraneous value reported by Holdiness,⁹⁶ all reported values are mutually consistent. The value of $\Delta_c H_m^0$ (cr) reported by Holdiness deviates by 2 percent from all other values, and this deviation converts to a 60 kJ·mol⁻¹ difference in enthalpy of formation. A variety of calorimeters were used in the consistent results, including static bomb calorimetry,^{81,117,118} rotating-bomb calorimetry,^{81,118} and rocking micro-calorimetry.^{115,119} Values reported by Smith¹¹⁷ in 1956 were recalculations of those reported in the thesis by Karlsson.¹²⁰

5. Enthalpies of sublimation for the halobenzoic acids from experiment

5.1. Experimental sources of enthalpies of sublimation

All monohalobenzoic acids are solid compounds at ambient conditions with melting temperatures in the range T = (396 to 544) K. Enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}$ for these compounds at various temperatures have been determined calorimetrically with a Tian-Calvet microcalorimeter equipped with a Knudsen cell (C)¹²¹⁻¹²³ and with the "vacuum-sublimation drop-calorimetric method" (DC),^{83,124} as well as indirectly through determination of the temperature dependence of sublimation pressures measured by Knudsen effusion (K)^{125,126} or the transpiration method (T).^{79,127-130}

Enthalpies of sublimation with remarkably small relative uncertainties (less than 1 percent) were also reported by Holdiness¹³¹ based on sublimation from a cell in a differential scanning calorimeter (DSC), using a method developed by Beech and Lintonbon.¹³² Beech and Lintonbon estimated a relative uncertainty of 15 percent for their method, which is in accord with the very large deviations of results reported by Holdiness¹³¹ from all others. Torsion-effusion measurements (TE) by Wolf and Weghofer⁴⁸ (1938) are included in the tables for completeness, however, these are systematically low.

Derivation of standard molar enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o$ at the reference temperature T_{ref} = 298.15 K from the experimentally determined values at higher temperatures (T^E) involves measurement or estimation of enthalpy increments for the crystal and gas phases between the temperatures T^E and T_{ref} . The "vacuum-sublimation drop-calorimetric method" involves measurement of the enthalpy increment between the crystal at T = 298.15 K and the gas at a higher temperature T^E . In this case, only the enthalpy increment between T^E and T^o for the gas is needed. The size of the adjustment is typically on the order of a few kilojoules per mole, which is only a few percent of the measured enthalpy of sublimation. Consequently, authors use various estimation methods for the crystal and gas states with little consideration for the uncertainties in these values; however, as T^{E} increases, the size of the adjustment is larger, and uncertainty in this value must be considered.

For derivation of $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}(298.15 \text{ K})$ from $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}(T^{E})$ in the present review, we used heat capacities for the gas phase computed with the methods described in section 3 and validated with results for benzoic acid. Heat capacities for the solid state were estimated based on those for benzoic acid³³ incremented by 15 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹, based on observed differences between heat capacities computed for the gas phase of the halobenzoic acids and benzoic acid. The average increment, when summed over all of the halobenzoic acids for the temperature range (300 < *T*/K <500), is (15 ± 4) J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹, where the uncertainty is twice the standard deviation of the increment. The magnitude of the increment was confirmed based on comparisons of solid-state heat capacities for halogenated and non-halogenated aromatic pairs, such as (fluorobenzene⁷¹ and benzene¹³³), (4-halotoluene¹³⁴ and toluene¹³⁵), and (4-chlorobenzoic acid¹³⁶ and benzoic acid³³).

In this review, we have re-evaluated uncertainties for all experimental determinations of the enthalpy of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}$ (T^{E}). As noted earlier, uncertainties for direct calorimetric determinations are difficult to assess beyond those provided by the authors. However, in further thermodynamic-consistency analyses, we will show that reported uncertainties are generally too small for these measurements. Uncertainties for enthalpies of sublimation for the halobenzoic acids derived from Knudsen-effusion or transpiration studies were derived in this research with the method described in Section 3.2.1 for benzoic acid. The derived enthalpies of sublimation and uncertainties are given in Tables 10 through 13. In general, the property values are consistently larger.

5.1.1. Fluorobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$

Enthalpies of sublimation at the temperatures of the experiments and derived standard enthalpies of sublimation for the temperature $T_{ref} = 298.15$ K are compiled in Table 10 for the fluorobenzoic acids. Results from transpiration (T) and Knudsen effusion methods (K) are seen to be in excellent agreement.

5.1.2. Chlorobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$

Enthalpies of sublimation and derived values for temperature $T_{ref} = 298.15$ K are compiled in Table 11 for the chlorobenzoic acids. Results from transpiration studies^{79,128} and Knudsen effusion methods¹²⁵ are seen to be in excellent agreement. The calorimetric measurements by Sabbah and Hirtz¹²³ are reported with low uncertainties and agreement with results from transpiration and Knudsen effusion studies is fair, as seen in the table. Agreement, here, may be serendipitous, however, as later measurements from the same laboratory on the bromobenzoic acids¹²¹ and iodobenzoic acids¹²² are quite low in comparison with other results.

The value reported by Adedeji et al.¹²⁴ for 2-chlorobenzoic was determined at 413 K, which is very near the normal melting temperature for this compound. The value reported (72.4 kJ·mol⁻¹) is apparently the enthalpy of vaporization, rather than the enthalpy of sublimation. Augmenting this value with the enthalpy of fusion (evaluated later in this report) yields 104.1 kJ·mol⁻¹, in excellent agreement with the values determined by Knudsen effusion¹²⁵ and transpiration.⁷⁹

Wolf and Weghofer⁴⁸ reported enthalpies of sublimation based on torsion effusion measurements for a large number of compounds, but, unfortunately, the reported values are systematically low. In addition to the results seen here (Table 11) for the chlorobenzoic acids, this conclusion is based on comparisons with critically evaluated values for naphthalene ¹³⁷ and biphenyl,¹³⁸ where values reported by Wolf and Weghofer⁴⁸ are low by 6 kJ·mol⁻¹ and 13 kJ·mol⁻¹,

respectively. The value reported by Holdiness¹³¹ has very large uncertainty and is included here for completeness only.

5.1.3. Bromobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$

Enthalpies of sublimation and derived values for the temperature $T_{ref} = 298.15$ K are compiled in Table 12 for the bromobenzoic acids. Results from transpiration studies¹³⁰ and Knudsen effusion methods¹²⁵ are in excellent agreement, as are the vacuum drop-calorimetric (DC) results by Ferrao and Pilcher,⁸³ though the uncertainties stated by the authors for the DC results are probably too small. Uncertainties given in Table 12 for values derived from the Knudsen effusion and transpiration studies are those estimated in the present work, as described earlier. For the DC measurements, we estimate the expanded uncertainty to be ~3 kJ·mol⁻¹, based on the uncertainty in the measured enthalpy increment (~2 kJ·mol⁻¹), plus uncertainty associated with the adjustment of results to T = 298.15 K (~1 kJ·mol⁻¹). Results reported by Tan and Sabbah¹²¹ are (6 to 12) kJ·mol⁻¹ lower than those derived from temperature dependence of the sublimation pressures (method = K and T) or vacuum drop calorimetry. The origin of this discrepancy is not known. Values reported by Tan and Sabbah¹²² for the iodobenzoic acids show yet larger deviations from multiple consistent data sources. The single value determined with DSC by Holdiness¹³¹ is anomalously low and is included for completeness only.

5.1.4. Iodobenzoic acids: $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$

Enthalpies of sublimation and derived values for the temperature $T_{ref} = 298.15$ K are compiled in Table 13 for the iodobenzoic acids. Again, results from transpiration studies¹²⁹ and Knudsen effusion methods¹²⁶ are in excellent agreement. Enthalpies of sublimation derived from the direct calorimetric methods of Tan and Sabbah¹²² are lower by (10 to 15) kJ·mol⁻¹, while that determined by Holdiness for 2-iodobenzoic acid is nearly 30 kJ·mol⁻¹ lower.

6. Enthalpies of formation for the ideal-gas state derived from experiment for the halobenzoic acids

Standard enthalpies of formation for the ideal-gas state $\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(g)$ of the halobenzoic acids can be evaluated with Eq. (1), as the sum of standard molar enthalpies of formation for the crystal $\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$ (Tables 6 through 9) and standard molar enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}^{o}(298.15 \text{ K})$ (Tables 10 through 13). Results of evaluation of the standard enthalpies of formation for the idealgas state, based entirely on experimental thermochemical and thermophysical properties of the halobenzoic acids, are summarized in Table 14. Values represent a weighted average of results for $\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$ and $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}^{o}(298.15 \text{ K})$ from Tables 6 through 13 that are consistent within the evaluated uncertainties. Data sources used in the weighted average for each property are indicated.

For the fluoro, chloro, and iodo benzoic acids, all results for $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr) are consistent, with the obvious exception of the results reported by Holdiness,⁹⁶ who used relatively crude experimental methods. For 2-chlorobenzoic, the results of Smith et al.⁹⁷ are only slightly low relative to those of Johnson and Prosen⁹⁴ and Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar.⁹⁹ Nonetheless, we have removed the results of Smith et al.⁹⁷ from the average for this compound. In the case of $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr) the bromobenzoic acids, good consistency is seen for 4-bromobenzoic acid, while values reported by Ferrao and Pilcher⁸³ and Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar¹¹⁵ for 2- and 3-bromobenzoic acid are very inconsistent, and $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (g) is calculated with results from both studies. For the iodobenzoic acids, results from the various research groups are consistent, except for the enthalpy of formation for the crystal $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr) reported by Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar¹¹⁵ for 2-iodobenzoic acid (Table 9), which is slightly higher than those by Smith¹¹⁷ and Ribeiro da Silva et al.¹¹⁸ and was not included in the weighted average.

For enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}(298.15 \text{ K})$, good consistency is seen between results from Knudsen effusion and transpiration studies for all compounds (Tables 10 through 13). In addition,

the vacuum drop-calorimetry of Ferrao and Pilcher⁸³ for the bromobenzoic acids (Table 12) and Adedeji et al.¹²⁴ for the chlorobenzoic acids (Table 11) are seen to be consistent with the Knudsen effusion and transpiration results. Results reported from the laboratory of Sabbah¹²³ for the chlorobenzoic acids are only slightly lower than the results from Knudsen effusion and transpiration; however, these values were not included in the average, as results from the same laboratory^{121,122} for the bromobenzoic acids and iodobenzoic acids are low by (6 to 20) kJ·mol⁻¹.

7. Comparison of computational and experimental results

7.1. Selection of the homodesmic reactions for the halobenzoic acids

Comparison of computational and experimental results for the enthalpies of formation involves comparison of results for homodesmic or isodesmic reactions. Ideally, a reaction is chosen for which enthalpies of formation are known with high confidence for all participants other than the compound of interest. In this research, the following homodesmic reaction was chosen:



The structure at the far right represents the three isomers of the halobenzoic acids. Derivation of the properties of benzoic acid was discussed earlier. A discussion of the sources of the required properties for benzene and the halobenzenes follows.

7.2. Experimental enthalpies of formation from experiment for participants in the homodesmic reactions

Properties leading to the enthalpy of formation of benzene and the halobenzenes in the idealgas state are listed in Table 15. Reliable enthalpies of combustion have been reported for benzene,^{139,140} 1-fluorobenzene,⁹² and 1-chlorobenzene.^{97,141,142} The enthalpy of formation of bromobenzene recommended by Cox and Pilcher⁸² is based on an enthalpy of reaction involving diphenylmercury, as reported by Hartley et al.¹⁴³ and Chernick et al.¹⁴⁴ For iodobenzene, an analogous reaction was investigated by Hartley et al.¹⁴³ and Chernick et al.¹⁴⁴, and this was used by Cox and Pilcher,⁸² in combination with an enthalpy of combustion reported by Smith,¹¹⁷ to derived a recommended enthalpy of formation for the liquid.

Enthalpies of vaporization for benzene and the halobenzenes are, generally, well established. Direct measurements of the enthalpy of vaporization for benzene have been reported by Osborne and Ginnings,¹⁴⁵ Svoboda et al.,¹⁴⁶ and Todd et al.¹⁴⁷, and these are mutually consistent, as well as being consistent with the high quality equation of state for benzene.¹⁴⁸ The enthalpy of vaporization for fluorobenzene was measured calorimetrically by Scott et al.,⁷¹ and these are consistent with vapor pressures reported in the same article and with those determined with transpiration by Verevkin et al.¹⁴⁹ For chlorobenzene and bromobenzene, the enthalpy of vaporization at T = 298.15 K was measured calorimetrically by Wadsö.⁷³ Vapor pressures measured by Verevkin et al.¹⁴⁹ (chlorobenzene) and Verevkin et al.⁷⁴ (bromobenzene) are consistent with the direct measurements. Enthalpies of vaporization for iodobenzene are based on the vapor pressures determined with transpiration by Verevkin et al.⁷⁴

Enthalpies of formation for the ideal-gas state for benzene and the halobenzenes (Table 15, column 6) were calculated as the sum of the enthalpy of formation for the liquid $\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (1) (column 2) and enthalpy of vaporization $\Delta_{\rm l}^{\rm g} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ at T = 298.15 K (column 4). These values are in agreement

with those evaluated within the *Active Thermochemical Tables* maintained by Ruscic and coworkers,¹⁵⁰⁻¹⁵² as seen in the Table 15 (columns 6 and 7).

The *Active Thermochemical Tables* are based on thermodynamic consistency enforcement for a network of reaction properties derived from experiment and computation for 1058 chemical species, including radicals and ions, as well as some common chemical compounds. The number of chemical compounds with more than a few atoms is small (*i.e.*, ~75 compounds have more than 5 atoms), and, of these, ~10 have six or more carbon atoms. Nonetheless, this group includes benzene and the four monohalobenzenes, and the enthalpies of formation for the gas phase evaluated in the *Active Thermochemical Tables* (version 1.118) were used in all further calculations here. For $\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (g) of benzene and the halobenzenes, use of the value derived here (Table 15, column 6) or that from the *Active Thermochemical Tables*¹⁵⁰ (column 7) would not alter the conclusions of this research. The values of $\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (g) for bromobenzene and iodobenzene (Table 15, column 6) derived in this research have relatively large uncertainties, which are reduced considerably in the more extensive analysis of the thermochemical network by Ruscic and coworkers.¹⁵⁰

7.3. Enthalpies for the homodesmic reactions by computation

Enthalpies for the homodesmic reaction $\Delta_{\rm r} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (g) (Eq. 8) from computation are evaluated as the sum of three terms involving differences between products and reactants for the zero point vibrational energy $\Delta ZPVE$, thermal correction $\Delta H_{\rm T}$ (*i.e.*, the enthalpy change from temperature T =0 K to T = 298.15 K of the gas computed with the models described in Section 3.3), and electronic energy ΔE . Details of these contributions for each halobenzoic acid are summarized in Table 16. Contributions from the first two terms ($\Delta ZPVE$ and $\Delta H_{\rm T}$) are small for all cases (Table 16, columns 3 and 4), and the computed enthalpy of reaction is dominated by the difference in electronic energies Δ*E*. Energy differences computed at five different levels of theory are shown (columns 5 through 9). The accuracy of this term is determined by the level of theory used and – likely, to a larger extent – by, "balancing energetic effects and canceling electronic structure errors".¹⁵³ This is most apparent in the results for the 4- and 3-halobenzoic acids where energy differences computed at the B3LYP, DF-MP2, G4, and DLPNO-CCSD(T) levels agree within ~1 kJ·mol⁻¹. The difference is even smaller (~0.2 kJ·mol⁻¹) when only the high-level methods (G4 and DLPNO-CCSD(T)) are considered. For the 2-halobenzoic acids, the balancing is less effective due to ortho interactions that are not present in the reactants, yet the agreement amongst the high-level methods for Δ*E* remains within 1 kJ·mol⁻¹. This level of consistency is in accord with the extensive benchmark studies of Wheeler et al.¹⁵³ For comparison with experiment, the results at the highest level of theory, DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP//DF-MP2/ def2-QZVPP were used, and we estimate the expanded uncertainty of computed enthalpies of reaction to be 2 kJ·mol⁻¹ (0.95 level of confidence).

7.4. Enthalpies for the homodesmic reactions by experiment

Enthalpies of reaction for the homodesmic reaction (Eq. 8) derived based on experiment $\Delta_r H_m^0$ (g, expt) and computation $\Delta_r H_m^0$ (g, comp) are given in columns 6 and 7 of Table 17. All values of $\Delta_f H_m^0$ (g, expt) used for the reaction participants in calculation of $\Delta_r H_m^0$ (g, expt) are given in the table. The agreement between the experimental and computed enthalpies of reaction for all fluoro- and chlorobenzoic acids is excellent, with deviations between $\Delta_r H_m^0$ (g, expt) and $\Delta_r H_m^0$ (g, comp) never exceeding the uncertainty in $\Delta_r H_m^0$ (g, expt). This result contrasts sharply with that for the 2- and 3-bromobenzoic acids, where deviations range from 9 to 18 kJ·mol⁻¹. The experimental results of Ferrao and Pilcher⁸³ and Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar¹¹⁵ are both mutually inconsistent and inconsistent with the computations. We are unable to explain such diverse results,

but the good agreement between experiment and computation seen for other compounds, plus the consistent results observed for computations for halogens at the 2-, 3-, and 4-positions, give high confidence in the computed values. We estimate the expanded uncertainty in the computed values of $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g) to be 2 kJ·mol⁻¹ (0.95 level of confidence). In contrast with the results for 2- and 3- bromobenzoic acids, agreement between the experimental and computed value of $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g) for 4- bromobenzoic acid is within the experimental uncertainty.

For 2-iodobenzoic acid, the enthalpies of reaction for the gas phase based on experiment and computation are in excellent agreement, while differences near 10 kJ·mol⁻¹ are seen for 3- and 4-iodobenzoic acid. The inconsistency for the 3- and 4-iodobenzoic acids is surprising, given the general agreement of the combustion results reported by Smith,¹¹⁷ Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar,¹¹⁹ and Ribeiro da Silva et al.⁸¹ Initial checks of group-additivity increments for iodine on the aromatic ring of benzoic acid relative to that on benzene were concluded to be successful by Ribeiro da Silva et al.⁸¹ Unfortunately, this conclusion was based, in part, on the enthalpies of sublimation reported by Tan and Sabbah,¹²² which are now seen to be (14 to 20) kJ·mol⁻¹ lower than mutually consistent values determined with Knudsen effusion¹²⁶ and transpiration,¹²⁹ and reported subsequently.

As seen in Tables 12 and 13, all enthalpies of sublimation reported by Tan and Sabbah,^{121,122} are consistently low relative to those from other sources. If all other sources are ignored, use of the enthalpies of sublimation reported by Tan and Sabbah^{121,122} to calculate $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (g) for the bromoand iodobenzoic acids does not yield an interpretable trend in the resultant enthalpies of reaction $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, expt) calculated as in Table 17. We conclude that the results of Tan and Sabbah^{121,122} are systematically in error, or equivalently, their uncertainties are underestimated by (14 to 20) kJ·mol⁻¹.

8. Validation of computations through comparison with results for halonaphthalenes

In comparison to that for the halobenzoic acids, the literature of experimental results for thermophysical and thermochemical properties of the 1- and 2-halonaphthalenes is relatively sparse. Nonetheless, adequate experimental information does exist to aid in validation of the computational results, particularly for the aromatic bromo compounds, which show the most extensive inconsistency amongst the halobenzoic acids.

For the fluoronaphthalenes, the enthalpy of combustion of 1-fluoronaphthalene has been determined experimentally;¹⁵⁴ however, a commercial combustion calorimeter was used without the possibility of rotation, so these results must be considered unreliable. (In fact, the combustion reaction was not defined,¹⁵⁴ so derivation of an enthalpy of formation is impossible from this work.) In addition to the absence of reliable enthalpies of formation, the few available vapor-pressure values ^{155, 156} for the fluoronaphthalenes are inadequate for evaluation of the enthalpy of vaporization with any certainty.

Enthalpies of combustion for 1- and 2-chloronaphthalene were reported by Smith et al.⁹⁷ in 1953, based on measurements using "quartz wool" to increase the surface area of the product acid solution, rather than bomb rotation, as used in later measurements.⁹⁴ The "quartz wool" method was shown earlier to be somewhat successful for combustion of the three chlorobenzoic acids. Nonetheless, Cox and Pilcher⁸² estimated the uncertainties for the enthalpies of combustion for the chloronaphthalenes to be quite large (8.4 kJ·mol⁻¹), due to inadequate reporting of uncertainty information. We have used the uncertainty estimates of Cox and Pilcher⁸² in further calculations. Verevkin ¹⁵⁷ reported results of transpiration vapor/sublimation pressures for 1- and 2- choronaphthalene, allowing evaluation of the enthalpies of vaporization for these compounds.

Thermodynamic properties for halonaphthalenes are most well established for 1- and 2-bromonaphthalene, where Ribeiro da Silva et al.⁸⁴ have determined enthalpies of combustion, and Verevkin¹⁵⁷ has reported transpiration studies. This is fortuitous within the context of the present review, as results are most inconsistent for the bromobenzoic acids, and the demonstration of consistency for the bromonaphthalenes can support the conclusion that the inconsistency for the bromobenzoic acids lies with the experimental combustion enthalpies.

For the iodonaphthalenes, Smith¹¹⁷ reported the enthalpy of combustion for both 1- and 2-iodonaphthalene. Uncertainties for these values were estimated by Cox and Pilcher⁸² to be near 6 kJ·mol⁻¹ (*i.e.*, 1.5 kcal·mol⁻¹), due to a lack of reported uncertainty information. Verevkin¹⁵⁷ reported vapor pressures for 1-iodonaphthalene determined by transpiration, from which the enthalpy of vaporization can be derived. For 2-iodonaphthalene, Verevkin¹⁵⁷ derived the enthalpy of sublimation at T = 298.15 K by combining the enthalpy of vaporization, determined with correlation gas chromatography, with the enthalpy of fusion reported by Khanna et al.¹⁵⁸ The normal melting temperature for 2-iodonaphthalene is near T = 330 K, so adjustment to the reference temperature adds little uncertainty to the derived enthalpy of sublimation.

Properties leading to the enthalpy of formation of naphthalene in the ideal-gas state are given in Table 18. The enthalpy of combustion of naphthalene has been measured many times, and the enthalpy of formation for the crystal given in Table 18 is the weighted average of results of highprecision combustion calorimetry reported by Speros and Rossini¹⁵⁹ and Coleman and Pilcher,¹⁶⁰ as compiled by Cox and Pilcher.⁸² The independent values are in excellent agreement. Similarly, there have been many determinations of the enthalpy of sublimation of naphthalene. The value used here (72.7 ± 0.4) kJ.mol⁻¹ is that evaluated by Chirico et al.¹³⁷ through thermodynamic consistency enforcement for ideal-gas and condensed-phase properties. A more recent evaluation by Ruzicka
et al., ¹⁶¹ done without consideration of consistency enforcement with ideal-gas properties, recommended a statistically indistinguishable value of 72.4 kJ.mol⁻¹, with no indicated uncertainty.

Standard enthalpies of formation of the halonaphthalenes for the ideal-gas state $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (g) derived with experimental standard enthalpies of formation for the condensed phase $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr or l) and experimental standard enthalpies of sublimation (or vaporization) for naphthalene and the halonaphthalenes at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K are listed in Table 18. No calculation can be made for the fluoronaphthalenes. The large difference (~16 kJ·mol⁻¹) between the values of $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (g) for 1- and 2-chloronaphthalene is unexpected, and it is tempting to ascribe this difference to possible combustion of a supercooled liquid sample of 2-chloronaphthalene, as the enthalpy of fusion is ~14 kJ·mol⁻¹.^{158, 162} A report of the heat capacity of 2-chloronaphthalene by van Miltenburg and Verdonk¹⁶² for the temperature range (5 to 370) K did not indicate any supercooling of the sample, which melted near T = 331.2 K, so we conclude that there is no support for this explanation in the literature.

Experimental and computed thermodynamic properties for the halonaphthalenes are assessed through the following homodesmic reaction.



Gas-phase enthalpies of reaction $\Delta_r H^o_m(g)$ for this reaction based on experiment $\Delta_r H^o_m(g, expt)$ and computation $\Delta_r H^o_m(g, comp)$ are given in Table 19. The computations for the naphthalenes were identical to those for the halobenzoic acids, without the added complexity of internal rotation of the COOH group. The content of the table is analogous to that of Table 17 with naphthalene

substituted for benzoic acid. No comparison can be made for the reactions involving fluoronaphthalenes. Agreement between $\Delta_r H_m^0$ (g, expt) and $\Delta_r H_m^0$ (g, comp) is within the uncertainty for the experiment-based values for all of the remaining halonaphthalenes, with the exception of 2-chloronaphthalene, which was discussed above. Results for 1-chloronaphthalene and 1- and 2-iodonaphthalene are based on enthalpies of combustion recalculated by Cox and Pilcher,⁸² using values published by Smith et al.^{97,117}, which are corrected values from the Thesis of K. J. Karlsson¹²⁰. Uncertainty estimates by Cox and Pilcher⁸² are approximately twice as large as those reported by Smith et al.^{97,117} Uncertainties for enthalpies of reaction evaluated with both uncertainty estimates are included in Table 19, where it is seen that, even with the smaller uncertainties reported by Smith et al.,^{97,117} agreement with the computed enthalpy of reaction remains within the experimental uncertainty.

Experimental results for 1- and 2-bromonaphthalene given in Table 19 are based on enthalpies of combustion reported by Ribeiro da Silva et al.⁸⁴ in 1993 and transpiration studies by Verevkin¹⁵⁷ in 2003. The good agreement between the experimental and computed values of $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g) add confidence for the computational results obtained for the bromobenzoic acids, where large inconsistencies are seen for the experimental values.

9. Validation of results through trend analysis for estimated enthalpies of vaporization

Correlation of thermophysical properties with molecular structure is most successful for gasphase properties, though some success has been achieved for the liquid phase; *e.g.*, the predictive method of Chickos et al.¹⁶³ for liquid heat capacity and correlations of enthalpy of vaporization by Verevkin and coworkers.¹² Correlation of properties involving solids are typically of limited application and have large uncertainties, because the property values are strongly dependent on the nature of the crystal packing and intermolecular associations in the solid state. For example, the group-additivity method of Domalski and Hearing¹⁶⁴ for heat capacities at T = 298.15 K is valid for hydrocarbons only, while the more widely applicable method of Chickos et al.¹⁶³ has a reported uncertainty of ~50 J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹ (twice the standard error), which for benzoic acid, is 35 percent of the heat capacity of the crystal at T = 298.15 K.³³ For these reasons, we have chosen not to attempt correlation of enthalpies of sublimation for the halobenzoic acids, but instead we derive enthalpies of vaporization with the purpose of demonstrating trends for compound families.

The enthalpies of vaporization $\Delta_l^{g} H_m^{o}$ for the halobenzoic acids were derived by combining the evaluated enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_m^{o}$ (Table 14) and enthalpies of fusion $\Delta_{cr}^{l} H_m^{o}$ at a reference temperature T_{ref} with the thermodynamic relationship:

$$\Delta_{\rm l}^{\rm g} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(T_{\rm ref}) = \Delta_{\rm cr}^{\rm g} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(T_{\rm ref}) - \Delta_{\rm cr}^{\rm l} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(T_{\rm ref}), \tag{10}$$

where the reference temperature $T_{\rm ref}$ is 298.15 K. Enthalpies of fusion $\Delta_{\rm cr}^{\rm l} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(T_{\rm m})$ measured at the normal melting temperature $T_{\rm m}$ were adjusted to $\Delta_{\rm cr}^{\rm l} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(T_{\rm ref})$ with the assumption that the difference between the heat capacity of the crystal and liquid was the same as that for benzoic acid $(58.9 \text{ J} \cdot \text{K}^{-1} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1})^{33}$ and was independent of temperature. The relative expanded uncertainty $U_{\rm r}$ (~0.95 level of confidence) for these enthalpy increments $H_{\rm adj}$ was estimated conservatively to be $U_{\rm r}(H_{\rm adj}) = 0.2$.

Normal melting temperatures $T_{\rm m}$ and enthalpies of fusion $\Delta_{\rm cr}^{\rm l} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(T_{\rm m})$ have been reported for the fluoro-,^{129, 165}, ¹⁶⁶ chloro-,^{123,125,131,136, 167}, ¹⁶⁸ bromo-,^{121,125,130,131} and iodobenzoic acids.^{122,129,131,169} Most of these results were obtained with a differential scanning calorimeter (DSC). Authors of such studies often report uncertainties of an undefined nature that are as small as a few hundredths of a Kelvin for $T_{\rm m}$ and less than 0.5 percent for $\Delta_{\rm cr}^{\rm l} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$. Based on our experience, such uncertainties are much too small, and, here, we have assigned an expanded uncertainty of $U(T_m) = 0.5$ K and relative expanded uncertainty $U_r(\Delta_{cr}^1 H_m^0)$ equal to 5 percent for values obtained with DSC (0.95 level of confidence). A scan of the reported values given in Table 20 shows that these uncertainties roughly represent the variation in results obtained by different research groups. Experimental values listed for benzoic acid are those of Furukawa et al.,³³ whose values were determined with high-precision adiabatic calorimetry and were later confirmed by Andon and Connett.¹⁷⁰

Literature values for the normal melting temperature T_m and corresponding enthalpy of fusion $\Delta_{cr}^l H_m^o(T_m)$, the enthalpy of fusion adjusted to T = 298.15 K, the enthalpy of sublimation at T = 298.15 K (repeated from Table 14) $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o$ (298.15 K), and the derived enthalpy of vaporization at T = 298.15 K for benzoic acid and the halobenzoic acids are given in Table 20. Values shown in brackets are inconsistent with other studies and were not used in calculation of the average. Column 8 of Table 20 represents the increments in enthalpy of vaporization observed on replacement of one hydrogen in the aromatic ring of benzoic acid with a halogen. An analogous evaluation can be made for the halonaphthalenes, as described in the following paragraphs.

The enthalpy of fusion and heat capacities for the condensed phases of naphthalene have been measured with high-precision adiabatic calorimetry by McCullough et al.¹⁷¹ and Chirico et al.,¹⁷² and adjustment of the enthalpy of fusion to T = 298.15 K is achieved readily with heat capacities for the crystal and liquid reported there. The enthalpy of sublimation for naphthalene at T = 298.15 K was evaluated by Chirico et al.¹³⁷ through enforcement of thermodynamic consistency for the ideal-gas and condensed states. All of the 1-halonaphthalenes are liquids at T = 298.15 K and vapor pressures in this region for 1-fluoro, 1-chloro, and 1-bromonaphthalene have been measured with the transpiration method by Verevkin.¹⁵⁷ Enthalpies of vaporization were derived here, as described earlier for enthalpies of sublimation for the halobenzoic acids.

All of the 2-halonaphthalenes are solids at T = 298.15 K, and conversion of measured enthalpies of sublimation to enthalpies of vaporization is complicated by the presence of complex phase behavior between the melting temperatures ($T_m \sim 330$ K) and T = 298.15 K in 2chloronaphthalene¹⁶² and 2-bromonaphthalene.¹⁷³ 2-Chloronaphthalene was studied with adiabatic calorimetry by van Miltenburg and Verdonk, and these results were used to adjust the enthalpy of sublimation, derived with results of the transpiration study by Verevkin,¹⁵⁷ to yield the enthalpy of vaporization at T = 298.15 K. Phase changes in 2-bromonaphthalene between the melting temperature ($T_m \approx 330$ K) and T = 298.15 K were studied by Chanh et al.¹⁷³ with DSC, and they report an enthalpy of fusion (14.4 kJ·mol⁻¹) and excess enthalpy of ~3.5 kJ·mol⁻¹ for the temperature range (290 to 320 K). We combined these values to estimate the crystal-to-liquid enthalpy change at T = 298.15 K {(18 ± 2) kJ·mol⁻¹}. The enthalpy of sublimation of 2bromonaphthalene was determined with vacuum drop calorimetry by Ribeiro da Silva et al.⁸⁴ and transpiration measurements by Verevkin,¹⁵⁷ and these are seen to be in good agreement (Table 21, column 6).

Details of the evaluation of the enthalpy of vaporization at T = 298.15 K for naphthalene and the halonaphthalenes are given in Table 21. Column 8 of Table 21 lists the increments in enthalpy of vaporization observed on replacement of a hydrogen in naphthalene with a halogen. There is insufficient experimental data available to complete a similar analysis for 1- and 2fluoronaphthalene and 2-iodonaphthalene, although Monte et al.¹⁷⁴ refer to unpublished results from a Master's thesis at their university that may eventually become available.

The trend in the derived enthalpies of vaporization at T = 298.15 K with halogen substitution of aromatic ring for halobenzoic acids (Table 20, column 7), halobenzenes (Table 15, column 4), and halonaphthalenes (Table 21, column 7) is shown graphically in Fig. 4. Each of the four families of halogen compounds (F, Cl, Br, I) is grouped on the horizontal axis. The vertical axis represents the difference between the enthalpy of vaporization at T = 298.15 K for the halogenated compound relative to that for the unsubstituted parent compound (benzoic acid, benzene, or naphthalene). The plotted differences for the halobenzoic acids and halonaphthalenes are listed in column 8 of Tables 20 and 21, respectively.

Fig. 4 shows a clear trend in the enthalpy of vaporization with increased size of the halogen atom, where the largest scatter ($\pm 3 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$) seen for the bromo compounds. It is also apparent from the plot that the position of the halogen on the ring of benzoic acid (*i.e.*, 2-, 3-, or 4-) does not affect the enthalpy of vaporization, as all values for a given halogen lie within a range of 2 kJ·mol⁻¹, which is within the experimental uncertainty (~2 kJ·mol⁻¹) for the increments listed in column 8 of Tables 20 and 21.

One of possible group-additivity methods for prediction of enthalpies of vaporization for haloaromatics was published recently by Monte et al.¹⁷⁴ The monotonic nature of the trend shown in Fig. 4 implies that any numerical attribute that varies smoothly with halogen size could be used to develop an empirical correlation. Monte et al.¹⁷⁴ used excess atomic volume and electron affinity, where the excess is relative to the hydrogen that is replaced. Application to a wide variety of species is limited by the needed for reliable results for parent (unsubstituted) compounds that are used to "anchor" the correlations. It can be inferred from Fig. 4 that the limit of uncertainty for any such correlation is near 3 kJ·mol⁻¹ (*i.e.*, the vertical data scatter for a given halogen) and this is what is seen in the tables provided by Monte et al.,¹⁷⁴ provided an experiment-based enthalpy of vaporization for the parent compound is available.

10. Evaluated enthalpies of formation for the halobenzoic acids for the crystal, liquid, and gas phase

Standard enthalpies of formation $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ for the crystal, liquid, and gas phase of the halobenzoic acids evaluated in this research are listed in Table 22. Values shown in normal type (2-, 3-, 4fluorobenzoic acid, 2-, 3-, 4-chlorobenzoic acid, 4-bromobenzoic acid, and 2-iodobenzoic acid) were derived entirely with the experimental thermodynamic properties, critically evaluated as described in the text, and validated with results of computational chemistry through the homodesmic reaction given in Eq. 8.

Values shown in bold (2- and 3-bromobenzoic acid, and 3- and 4-iodobenzoic acid) represent compounds for which inconsistencies are observed (Table 17) between $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, expt) and $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, comp) for the homodesmic reaction (Eq. 8). For these compounds, $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (g) was evaluated with the computed enthalpy of reaction of the homodesmic reaction (Table 17, column 7) and the critically evaluated values of $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (g) for the reaction components; a halobenzene, benzoic acid, and benzene (Table 17, columns 2, 3, and 4).

$$\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m} \text{ (halobenzoic acid, g)} = \Delta_{\rm r} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m} (g, \text{comp}) - \Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m} \text{ (benzene, g, expt)} + \Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m} \text{ (benzoic acid, g, expt)}$$
(11)

The enthalpy of formation of the crystal $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (cr) was calculated from this value by subtraction of the evaluated enthalpy of sublimation at T = 298.15 K (Table 14). As described earlier, values of $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (g) used for the halobenzenes in these calculations were those evaluated in the Active Thermochemical Tables.¹⁵⁰⁻¹⁵² If the $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (g) values for the halobenzenes evaluated by Cox and Pilcher were used (see Table 15), the uncertainties for $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (g) of the 2- and 3-bromobenzoic acid and 3- and 4-iodobenzoic acid would be only ~2 kJ·mol⁻¹ larger.

 $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (halobenzoic acid, cr) = $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (halobenzoic acid, g) - $\Delta^{\rm g}_{\rm cr} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (298.15 K) (12)

The enthalpy of formation of the liquid $\Delta_f H_m^o(1)$ was, in turn, calculated from this value by addition of the evaluated enthalpy of fusion at T = 298.15 K (Table 20, column 5).

In Table 22, the recommended values for the enthalpy of formation for the ideal-gas state of the halobenzoic acids show smoothly and consistently varying increments across each halogen series. The enthalpy increment between the 2- and 3- isomer is approximately 5 kJ·mol⁻¹ less for the fluoro series than for the other halobenzoic acids. The origin of this difference is now understood based on the computations and comformational analysis described in this article.

11. Conclusions

Thermodynamic properties for the twelve monohalobenzoic acids were critically evaluated. Properties included enthalpies of combustion for the crystal phase, enthalpies of formation for the crystal, liquid, and gas phase, enthalpies of sublimation at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K, enthalpies of vaporization at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K, normal melting temperatures, and enthalpies of fusion. As part of this work, thermodynamic properties were also critically evaluated for the 1- and 2-chloro-, bromo-, and iodohalonaphthalenes. Thermodynamic properties for homodesmic reactions for the ideal-gas phase involving all of the halobenzoic acids and halonaphthalenes were computed with the recently proposed DLPNO-CCSD(T) approach²³ optimized with critically evaluated experiment-based gas-phase properties for benzoic acid. COOH torsions were addressed as hindered one-dimensional quantum rotors.

Comparison of enthalpies of reaction based on experiment and computation for the homodesmic reactions revealed multiple inconsistencies in the experimental data, including large inconsistencies in reported enthalpies of combustion for the 2- and 3-bromobenzoic acids and smaller, but significant, inconsistencies for the 3- and 4-iodobenzoic acids. The reported enthalpy of combustion of 2-chloronaphthalene was also shown to be anomalous.

4-Iodobenzoic acid has been recommended as a reference material for the combustion of iodine containing compounds,²⁶ but the results of the present work indicate that more work in the field of organo-iodine compounds is needed. Most reported enthalpies of combustion for iodine-containing compounds are from a single source (Smith¹¹⁷), based on results originally reported in a thesis by K. J. Karlsson¹²⁰ in 1941. In the present work, we find these values to be in agreement (Table 9) with more modern experimental results for the iodobenzoic acids, as well as with the computations of this research for 1- and 2-iodonaphthalene (Table 19). Results from this source, however, are not universally consistent, as shown by Verevkin et al.,¹⁷⁵ who demonstrated that the enthalpies of combustion for 1,3- and 1,4-diiodobenzene reported by Smith¹¹⁷ are inconsistent by more than 20 kJ·mol⁻¹, which far exceeds the expected experimental uncertainty of a few kilojoules per mole. We concur with the recommendation of Ribeiro da Silva et al.,¹¹⁸ that additional research into the thermodynamics of iodine-containing compounds is needed.

In this work, computational chemistry is shown to be a valuable aid in the critical assessment of thermodynamic properties for organic compounds by providing an independent and validated path for evaluation of gas-phase properties. Enthalpies of reaction computed for the homodesmic reactions selected in this research were, generally, in excellent agreement (*i.e.*, within the experimental uncertainty) with results based entirely on experiment. This agreement and the observed smooth trends in reaction enthalpies with alternative halogen substitution, allowed confident identification of inconsistent experimental results. In future work, this type of analysis with be extended to other compound types, with the goal of developing an algorithm that can be applied across numerous compounds to highlight inconsistencies in evaluated thermodynamic properties with limited user (human) intervention, as per the goals set for the NIST ThermoData Engine.¹⁻⁸

This article is, in part, a contribution of NIST, and is not subject to copyright in the United States for the authors R.D.C., A.K., A.B., V.D., K.K. Trade names are provided only to specify procedures adequately and do not imply endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Similar products by other manufacturers may be found to work as well or better.

Table 1. Benchmark thermodynamic properties of benzoic acid from experiment; the enthalpy of combustion $\Delta_c H^o_m$ (cr, 298.15 K) and enthalpy of formation $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr, 298.15 K) for the crystal, standard entropies for the crystal S^o (cr, 298.15 K and 375 K), enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta^g_{cr} H^o_m$ (298.15 K and 375 K), and the derived standard enthalpy of formation for the ideal gas $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (g, 298.15 K) and standard entropies for the ideal gas S^o (g, 298.15 K and 375 K)^a

Authors	Year	$\Delta_{\rm c} H_{\rm c}$	^o n(cr)	$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{ m m}^{ m o} ({ m cr})$
Jessup ²⁸	1942	-3227	7.1 ± 0.2	-385.0 ± 0.9
Coops, et al. ³¹	1956	-3227	7.2 ± 0.5	-384.9 ± 1.1
Challoner, et al. ³⁰	1955	-3227	7.3 ± 0.3	-384.7 ± 1.0
Prosen and Rossini ²⁹	1944	-3227	7.2 ± 0.3	-384.9 ± 1.0
Gundry and Meetham ³²	1958	-3227	7.4 ± 0.3	-384.6 ± 1.0
Weighted average:		-3227	7.2 ± 0.3	-384.8 ± 0.9
Authors	Year	<i>S</i> ^o (cr, 2	98.15 K)	<i>S</i> °(cr, 375 K)
Furukawa, et al. ³³	1951	167.	6 ± 0.2	205.2 ± 0.2
Sklyankin, et al. ³⁴	1960	(167.)	$2 \pm 0.2)^{b}$	$(204.9 \pm 0.2)^{b}$
Tatsumi, et al. ³⁵	1975	167.	8 ± 0.2	
Arvidsson, et al. ³⁶	1976	167.	5 ± 0.2	
Moriya, et al. ³⁷	1982	167.	7 ± 0.2	
Sorai, et al. ³⁸	1992	167.	6 ± 0.2	
Kobashi, et al. ³⁹	1998	167.	4 ± 0.2	
Blokhin, et al. ⁴⁰	2006	167.	8 ± 0.2	205.4 ± 0.2
Weighted average:		167.	6 ± 0.1	205.3 ± 0.2
Authors	Year	Range/K	$\Delta^{g}_{cr}H^{o}_{m}(298.1)$	5 K) $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}(375 \text{ K})$
Van Ginkel, et al. ⁵⁰	1975	294 to 331	93.0 ± 2	91.2 ± 2.4
Colomina, et al. ⁵¹	1982	293 to 313	90.4 ± 0	88.6 ± 0.8
De Kruif and Blok ⁵²	1982	316 to 391	91.1 ± 0	89.3 ± 0.6
Ribeiro da Silva and Monte ⁵³	1990	307 to 314	88.9 ± 100	7 87.1 \pm 7
Bazyleva, et al. ⁵⁴	2005	318 to 333	90.9 ± 1	.2 89.0 ± 1.2
Bazyleva, et al. ⁵⁵	2006	303 to 338	89.4 ± 1	.4 87.6 ± 1.4
Monte, et al. ⁵⁶	2006	310 to 362	90.9 ± 0	89.1 ± 0.8
Ribeiro da Silva, et al. ⁵⁷	2006	299 to 317	90.2 ± 2	88.4 ± 2.6
Fonseca, et al. ⁵⁸	2014	293 to 317	90.0 ± 0	88.2 ± 0.9
Zaitsau, et al. ⁵⁹	2015	298 to 339	89.8 ± 0	88.0 ± 0.5
Weighted average:			90.3 ± 0	88.5 ± 0.3
Experimental values	0.01.1	<u>Com</u>	puted values	
$\Delta_{\rm f} m_{\rm m}^{\circ}$ (g, 298.15 K) = -294.5 ± S ^o (g, 298.15 K) ^c = 356.5 ± 0.9 S ^o (g, 375 K) ^c = 389.0 ± 0.9 J·	= 0.9 KJ·m() J·K·mol ⁻¹ K·mol ⁻¹	50 - S ⁰ (g, S ⁰ (g.	298.15 K) ^c = 356 375 K) ^c = 388.9	5.7 J·K·mol ⁻¹ J·K·mol ⁻¹

^a Units are $kJ \cdot mol^{-1}$ for all enthalpies and $J \cdot K \cdot mol^{-1}$ for all entropies. Uncertainties given in the table are the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence.

^b Values reported by Sklyankin, et al.³⁴ were not used in the calculation of the weighted average. ^c Sublimation pressures p used in the calculation of the entropy of compression to the reference pressure $p^{\circ} = 100$ kPa were $p = (0.110 \pm 0.003)$ Pa at T = 298.15 K and $p = (186 \pm 3)$ Pa at T = 375 K derived from the experimental sublimation pressure data listed in the tables.

	T/k	ζ δ ^o _m / J K	1^{-1} mol ⁻¹	T/K	С _{р,m} / Ј К	⁻¹ mol ⁻¹
		experiment	computed		experiment	computed
fluorobenzer	ne ^b					
	318.4	309.7 ± 0.6	309.8	343.2	108.7 ± 0.4	109.2
	336.8	315.5 ± 0.6	315.6	364.2	115.1 ± 0.5	115.6
	357.9	322.1 ± 0.6	322.3	389.2	122.3 ± 0.5	122.8
	382.4	329.5 ± 0.6	330.1	426.2	132.5 ± 0.5	133.0
				463.2	142.2 ± 0.6	142.4
				500.2	150.9 ± 0.6	151.0
bromobenze	ne ^c					
2	298.15	325.7 ± 1.8	327.0			

Table 2. Comparison of experimental and computed ideal-gas entropies S_m^o and heat capacities $C_{p,m}^o$ for fluorobenzene and the ideal-gas entropies S_m^o at temperature T = 298.15 K for bromobenzene $(p^\circ = 100 \text{ kPa})^a$

^a Computations were performed with the model optimized for benzoic acid and benzene (B3LYP/def2-QZVPD, with the low-frequency scaling factor of 0.9689).

^b Experimental values are based entirely on the work of Scott et al. (1956)⁷¹, who measured heat capacities by adiabatic calorimetry, vapor pressures by comparative ebulliometry, and enthalpies of vaporization by vapor-flow calorimetry.

^c The experimental value is based on heat capacities determined with adiabatic calorimetry by Masi and Scott (1975)⁷², the enthalpy of vaporization measured by direct calorimetry by Wadsö (1968)⁷³, and vapor pressures measured with the transpiration method by Verevkin et al. (2015)⁷⁴. Vapor pressures were used to derive the entropy of compression from the saturation pressure to the reference pressure $p^{\circ} = 100$ kPa.

Table 3. Computed conformer energies and barriers (both are in kJ·mol⁻¹) for COOH internal rotation (relative to the syn conformer) for benzoic acid and the 4-halobenzoic acids

Computation Method ^a	syn	anti	barrier (syn \rightarrow syn)
benzoic acid			
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	25.50 ^b	26.97
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	25.60
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP// DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	25.90
4-fluorobenzoic acid			
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	27.56 ^b	29.51
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	27.44
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP// DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	27.89
4-chlorobenzoic acid			
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	27.30 ^b	28.33
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	26.90
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP// DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	26.85
4-bromobenzoic acid			
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	27.26 ^b	28.00
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	26.81
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP// DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	26.64
4-iodobenzoic acid			
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	27.03 ^b	27.72
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	26.66
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP// DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-	26.30

^a The level of theory increases from top to bottom for each compound, with DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP//DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP being the highest.

^b This conformer was neglected in further analysis.

	barrier						
Method	anti-syn	syn-syn	$(anti-syn \rightarrow syn-syn)$	vn) anti-anti	syn-anti		
3-fluorobenzoic acid							
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	0.03	26.43	26.84 ^a	26.00 ^a		
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-0.03	25.97	-	-		
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP// DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-0.01	25.64	-	-		
experiment; Daly et al.(2015) ⁷⁶		0.1					
3-chlorobenzoic acid							
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	0.26	26.36	26.68 ^a	26.70 ^a		
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	0.23	25.31	-	-		
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP// DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	0.26	25.48	-	-		
3-bromobenzoic acid							
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	0.31	26.38	26.70 ^a	26.86 ^a		
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	0.29	25.14	-	-		
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP// DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	0.29	25.51	-	-		
3-iodobenzoic acid							
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	0.32	26.36	26.54 ^a	26.81 ^ª		
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	0.33	24.97	-	-		
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP// DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	0.38	25.58	-	-		

Table 4. Computed conformer energies and barriers (both are in $kJ \cdot mol^{-1}$) for COOH internal rotation (relative to the anti-syn conformer) for 3-halobenzoic acids

^a This conformer was neglected in further analysis.

Method ar	nti-syn	syn-syn	barrier (anti-syn→syn-syn)	anti-anti	syn-anti
2-fluorobenzoic acid					
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	3.05	15.96	5.79	26.91 ^a
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	2.47	13.27	5.14	-
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP//DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	2.72	13.92	5.06	-
experiment; Daly et al. (2015) ⁷⁶		2.8		7.7	
2-chlorobenzoic acid					
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	-0.52	6.55	6.47	20.11 ^a
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-1.02	5.17	7.09	-
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP//DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-0.63	5.47	7.34	-
2-bromobenzoic acid					
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	-1.21	5.17	8.01	19.01 ^a
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-1.65	3.91	8.72	-
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP//DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-1.28	4.08	8.83	-
2-iodobenzoic acid					
B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	0	-2.99	4.72	11.86	17.74 ^a
DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-3.02	3.27	11.85	-
DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP//DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP	0	-2.75	3.63	12.21	-

Table 5. Computed conformer energies and barriers (both are in $kJ \cdot mol^{-1}$) for COOH internal rotation (relative to the anti-syn conformer) for 2-halobenzoic acids

^a This conformer was neglected in further analysis.

Table 6. Experimental standard enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_c H^o_m$ (cr) and derived standard enthalpies of formation $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr) for crystalline fluorobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)

Authors	Year	n ^a	$-\Delta_{\rm c} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}({\rm cr})//{\rm kJ}\cdot{ m mol}^{-1}$	$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}({\rm cr})/{\rm kJ}\cdot{ m mol}^{-1}$
2-fluorobenzoic acid				
Good et al. ⁹²	1956	50	3080.6 ± 1.5	-567.9 ± 2.0
Johnson and Prosen94	1975	50	3080.0 ± 1.0	-568.5 ± 1.6
3-fluorobenzoic acid				
Good et al. ⁹²	1956	50	3066.1 ± 0.8	-582.5 ± 1.5
4-fluorobenzoic acid				
Good et al. ⁹²	1956	50	3061.5 ± 1.2	-587.1 ± 1.7
Cox et al. ⁹¹	1964	20	3063.2 ± 0.9	-585.2 ± 1.5
Johnson and Prosen ^{94,b}	1975	50	3063.0 ± 0.7	-585.6 ± 1.4
Johnson and Prosen ^{94,b}	1975	50	3063.8 ± 0.8	-584.7 ± 1.5
Schaffer et al.95	1997	50	3063.0 ± 0.6	-585.6 ± 1.4
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ⁸⁶	2007	10	3063.6 ± 0.5	-584.7 ± 1.3

^a The number of waters associated with the combustion product HF·*n* H₂O (1). See Eq. (3).

^b Measurements were made by Johnson and Prosen on two chemical samples.

Table 7. Experimental standard enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_c H^o_m$ (cr) and derived standard enthalpies of formation $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr) for crystalline chlorobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)

Authors	Year	n ^a	$-\Delta_{\rm c} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}({\rm cr})//{\rm kJ}\cdot{ m mol}^{-1}$	$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (cr)/kJ·mol ⁻¹
2-chlorobenzoic acid				
Smith et al. ⁹⁷	1953	600	3093.6 ± 8^{b}	-399.2 ± 8^{b}
Johnson and Prosen ⁹⁸	1974	200	3087.9 ± 0.7	-404.6 ± 1.4
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ⁹⁹	1995	600	3087.8 ± 0.5	-405.0 ± 1.4
Holdiness ⁹⁶	1983	600	$(3073.1 \pm 20)^{c}$	$(-419.7 \pm 20)^{c}$
3-chlorobenzoic acid				
Smith et al. ⁹⁷	1953	600	3068.8 ± 8	-424.1 ± 8^{b}
Johnson and Prosen ⁹⁸	1974	600	3068.1 ± 1.5	-424.8 ± 2.0
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ⁹⁹	1995	600	3069.7 ± 1.1	-423.2 ± 1.7
4-chlorobenzoic acid				
Smith et al. ⁹⁷	1953	600	3066.5 ± 8^{b}	-426.3 ± 8^{b}
Bjellrup and Smith ¹⁰²	1954	600	3065.5 ± 1.3	-427.3 ± 1.8
Hajiev and Agarunov ¹⁰³	1968	∞_{q}	3064.7 ± 1.6	-428.7 ± 2.0
Hu et al. ¹⁰⁴	1972	600	3063.0 ± 0.8	-429.9 ± 1.4
Hu et al. ¹⁰⁴	1972	600	3062.8 ± 1.0	-430.1 ± 1.6
Hu et al. ¹⁰⁴	1972	600	3062.9 ± 0.8	-429.9 ± 1.5
Kolesov et al. ¹⁰⁵	1972	600	3065.9 ± 1.2	-426.9 ± 1.7
Hajiev et al. ¹⁰⁶	1974	600	3062.7 ± 1.5	-430.1 ± 1.9
Johnson and Prosen ⁹⁸	1974	200	3064.4 ± 0.7	-428.1 ± 1.4
Lyubarskii et al. ¹⁰⁷	1975	600	3063.8 ± 1.0	-429.0 ± 1.6
Kamaguchi et al. ¹⁰⁸	1977	600	3062.6 ± 1.0	-430.2 ± 1.6
Erastov et al. ¹⁰⁹	1978	600	3063.9 ± 0.6	-428.9 ± 1.3
Platonov et al. ¹¹⁰	1981	600	3066.6 ± 0.5	-426.3 ± 1.3
An et al. ¹¹¹	1982	600	3062.0 ± 1.1	-430.8 ± 1.6
Gromova et al. ¹¹²	1989	600	3064.5 ± 0.8	-428.4 ± 1.4
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ⁹⁹	1995	600	3065.6 ± 1.0	-427.3 ± 1.6
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ¹¹³	1995	600	3063.5 ± 3.0	-429.3 ± 3.2
Santos et al. ¹¹⁴	1999	600	3063.0 ± 1.5	-429.9 ± 2.0
Ribeiro da Silva and Ferreira ¹⁰¹	2008	600	3063.8 ± 0.8	-429.1 ± 1.4

^a The number of waters associated with the combustion product $HCl \cdot n H_2O(l)$. See Eq. (4).

^b This uncertainty was assigned by Cox and Pilcher⁸² in 1970 as part of their extensive review of the combustion literature.

^c The expanded uncertainty for this value is, at least, 20 kJ·mol⁻¹, as explained in the text. This value is included here in the interest of completeness only.

^d The combustion reaction was reported with infinitely dilute HCl.

Table 8. Experimental standard enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_c H^o_m$ (cr) and derived standard enthalpies of formation $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr) for crystalline bromobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)

Authors	Year	$-\Delta_{\rm c} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}({\rm cr})//{\rm kJ}\cdot{ m mol}^{-1}$	$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (cr)/kJ·mol ⁻¹
2-bromobenzoic acid			
Ferrao and Pilcher ⁸³	1987	3100.8 ± 1.0	-368.3 ± 1.6
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ¹¹⁵	1996	3126.3 ± 4.2^{a}	-342.8 ± 4.4
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ¹¹⁵	1996	3128.7 ± 10.6^{b}	-340.4 ± 10.7
Holdiness ⁹⁶	1983	$(3084.9 \pm 20.0)^{c}$	$(-384.3 \pm 20.0)^{c}$
3-bromobenzoic acid			
Ferrao and Pilcher ⁸³	1987	3074.4 ± 0.8	-394.7 ± 1.6
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ¹¹⁵	1996	3101.6 ± 1.5^{a}	-367.5 ± 2.0
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ¹¹⁵	1996	3104.5 ± 2.0^{b}	-364.6 ± 2.4
4-bromobenzoic acid			
Bjellrup ⁹³	1959	3090.8 ± 2.1	-378.3 ± 2.5
Ferrao and Pilcher ⁸³	1987	3089.5 ± 0.9	-379.6 ± 1.6
Zhang et al. ¹¹⁶	1990	3091.8 ± 2.6	-377.3 ± 2.9
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ¹¹⁵	1996	3090.1 ± 2.6	-379.0 ± 2.9

^a Determined with a "micro-bomb" calorimeter with ~0.0075 g of sample.

^b Determined with a traditional bomb calorimeter with ~0.5 g of sample.

^c The expanded uncertainty for this value is, at least, 20 kJ·mol⁻¹, as explained in the text. This value is included here in the interest of completeness only.

Table 9. Experimental standard enthalpies of combustion $\Delta_c H^o_m$ (cr) and derived standard enthalpies of formation $\Delta_f H^o_m$ (cr) for crystalline iodobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)

Authors	Year	$-\Delta_{\rm c} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}({\rm cr})//{\rm kJ}\cdot{ m mol}^{-1}$	$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o} ({\rm cr})/{\rm kJ} \cdot {\rm mol}^{-1}$
2-iodobenzoic acid			
Smith ¹¹⁷	1956	3166.9 ± 4.2	-302.2 ± 4.4
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹¹⁸	1995	3167.4 ± 1.1^{a}	-301.8 ± 1.7
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹¹⁸	1995	3167.7 ± 0.8^a	-301.5 ± 1.6
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ¹¹⁵	1996	3173.7 ± 3.4	-295.4 ± 3.7
Holdiness ⁹⁶	1983	$(3228.8 \pm 20)^{b}$	(-240.4 ± 20)
3-iodobenzoic acid			
Smith ¹¹⁷	1956	3152.2 ± 4.2	-316.9 ± 4.4
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ¹¹⁵	1996	3153.8 ± 4.4	-315.3 ± 4.6
4-iodobenzoic acid			
Smith ¹¹⁷	1956	3153.1 ± 4.2	-316.1 ± 4.4
Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar ¹¹⁹	1996	3153.6 ± 2.6	-315.5 ± 2.9
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ⁸¹	1999	3151.4 ± 1.4^{a}	-317.7 ± 1.9
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ⁸¹	1999	$3153.2\pm1.4^{\rm a}$	-315.9 ± 1.9

^a The two values reported by Ribeiro da Silva et al.^{81,118} were determined with a static (first value) and rotating bomb calorimeter (second value), respectively. The difference between these values is $1.8 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$.

^b The expanded uncertainty for this value is, at least, 20 kJ·mol⁻¹, as explained in the text. This value is included here in the interest of completeness only. The deviation of 60 kJ·mol⁻¹ in the enthalpy of formation implies a 2 percent deviation in enthalpy of combustion.

Table 10. Experimental enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}$ (T_{mid}) and derived standard enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$ at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K for fluorobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)

Authors	Year	Method ^a	Temperature Range / K ^b	$\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}(T_{mid}) / kJ \cdot mol^{-1 c}$	Δ ^g _{cr} H ^o _m (298.15 K) / kJ·mol ⁻¹
2-fluorobenzoic acid					
Zherikova, et al. ¹²⁹	2016	Т	333.9-367.2	94.8 ± 2.4	96.0 ± 2.4
Monte and Hillesheim ¹²⁶	2000	Κ	309.1-323.2	93.6 ± 3.8	94.0 ± 3.8
3-fluorobenzoic acid					
Zherikova, et al. ¹²⁹	2016	Т	331.9-362.6	92.1 ± 2.0	93.2 ± 2.0
Monte and Hillesheim ¹²⁶	2000	Κ	303.2-317.2	93.3 ± 2.8	93.6 ± 2.8
4-fluorobenzoic acid					
Zherikova, et al. ¹²⁹	2016	Т	343.0-386.2	92.2 ± 1.6	93.7 ± 1.7
Cox et al. ¹²⁷	1969	Т	358.9-381.7	91.0 ± 1.4	92.7 ± 1.6

^a The methods are transpiration (T) and Knudsen effusion (K).

^b The temperature range indicates the lowest and highest temperatures, T_1 and T_h , respectively, of the study.

^c $T_{\rm mid} = (T_{\rm h} + T_{\rm l})/2$

Table 11. Experimental enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m$ (T_{mid}) and derived standard enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o$ at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K for chlorobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)

Authors	Year	Method ^a	Temperature Range / K ^b	$\Delta_{\rm cr}^{\rm g} H_{ m m}(T_{ m mid}) / kJ \cdot { m mol}^{-1 m c}$	$\Delta^{g}_{cr}H^{o}_{m}(298.15 \text{ K}) / kJ \cdot mol^{-1}$
2-chlorobenzoic acid					
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	2005	Κ	320.2-339.2	105.1 ± 2.4	105.8 ± 2.4
Emel'yanenko et al. ⁷⁹	2005	Т	338.1-402.6	100.0 ± 1.6	101.6 ± 1.6
Sabbah and Hirtz ¹²³	1991	С	323	100.0 ± 0.5^{d}	$100.5\pm0.5^{\rm d}$
Adedeji et al. ¹²⁴	1975	DC	413	72.4 (98.3) ^e	$78.2(101.1) \pm 5^{e}$
Wolf and Weghofer ⁴⁸	1938	TE	333.2	79.5	80.3 ^f
Holdiness ¹³¹	1983	DSC	420-480	90.7	94.7 ± 15
3-chlorobenzoic acid					
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	2005	Κ	320.1-340.1	101.2 ± 3.4	101.9 ± 3.4
Emel'yanenko et al. ⁷⁹	2005	Т	348.5-404.1	98.8 ± 3.0	100.6 ± 3.0
Sabbah and Hirtz ¹²³	1991	С	323	100.6 ± 0.4^{d}	101.0 ± 0.4^{d}
Adedeji et al. ¹²⁴	1975	DC	414	99.6	102.5 ± 5.1^{g}
Wolf and Weghofer ⁴⁸	1938	TE	328.2	80.8	81.4 ^f
4-chlorobenzoic acid					
Reschke et al. ¹²⁸	2016	Т	353.2-421.1	102.9 ± 1.4	105.0 ± 1.5
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	2005	Κ	333.2-356.1	103.4 ± 3.4	104.4 ± 3.4
Emel'yanenko et al. ⁷⁹	2005	Т	358.4-398.3	105.7 ± 3.2	107.6 ± 3.2
Sabbah and Hirtz ¹²³	1991	С	363	$99.3\pm0.4^{\rm d}$	$100.8\pm0.5^{\rm d}$
Adedeji et al. ¹²⁴	1975	DC	413	101.9	104.7 ± 5.2^{g}
Wolf and Weghofer ⁴⁸	1938	TE	333.2	87.9	88.6 ^f

^a The methods are transpiration (T), Knudsen effusion (K), Tian-Calvet calorimetry (C), torsion effusion (TE), vacuum-sublimation drop-calorimetry (DC), and differential scanning calorimetry (DSC).

^b The temperature range indicates the highest and lowest temperatures, T_h and T_l , respectively, of the studies of sublimation pressure, or the experimental temperature for the calorimetric or torsion effusion studies.

$^{\rm c} T_{\rm mid} = (T_{\rm h} + T_{\rm l})/2$

^d Uncertainties for results by Sabbah and Hirtz are those given by the authors. Based on analysis of other results from the same laboratory later in this report, we estimate expanded uncertainties for these values to be near 10 kJ·mol⁻¹.

^e The value in parentheses is the reported value augmented by the enthalpy of fusion, as described in the text. The uncertainty is that estimated by the authors.

^fAll results reported by Wolf and Weghofer⁴⁸ are systematically low, as described in the text.

^g The relative expanded uncertainty of 5 percent is that estimated by the authors. This value was accepted here.

Table 12. Experimental enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m$ (T_{mid}) and derived standard enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o$ at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K for bromobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)

Authors	Year	Method ^a	Temperature Range / K ^b	$\Delta_{\mathrm{cr}}^{\mathrm{g}} H_{\mathrm{m}}(T_{\mathrm{mid}}) / \mathrm{kJ \cdot mol^{-1 \mathrm{c}}}$	Δ ^g _{cr} H ^o _m (298.15 K) / kJ·mol ⁻¹
2-bromobenzoic acid					
Zherikova et al. ¹³⁰	2016	Т	347.2-407.6	105.7 ± 1.8	107.5 ± 1.9
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	2005	Κ	327.6-347.7	106.7 ± 3.6	107.5 ± 3.6
Ferrao and Pilcher ⁸³	1987	DC	423	NR^d	$110.9 \pm 1.1 \ (3)^{d}$
Tan and Sabbah ¹²¹	1994	С	333	94.6 ± 0.4^{e}	95.3 ± 0.4^{e}
Holdiness ¹³¹	1983	DSC	425-480	60.3	$64.3 \pm 10^{\mathrm{f}}$
3-bromobenzoic acid					
Zherikova et al. ¹³⁰	2016	Т	355.2-417.2	102.8 ± 1.8	104.8 ± 1.9
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	2005	Κ	327.7-347.6	104.2 ± 3.2	105.1 ± 3.2
Ferrao and Pilcher ⁸³	1987	DC	423	\mathbf{NR}^{d}	$105.0 \pm 1.1 \ (3)^{d}$
Tan and Sabbah ¹²¹	1994	С	348	$98.1\pm0.1^{\text{e}}$	99.2 ± 0.3^{e}
4-bromobenzoic acid					
Zherikova et al. ¹³⁰	2016	Т	379.0-455.8	103.2 ± 2.2	106.1 ± 2.3
Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	2005	Κ	348.7-366.7	107.4 ± 3.8	108.7 ± 3.8
Ferrao and Pilcher ⁸³	1987	DC	435	\mathbf{NR}^{d}	$107.6 \pm 1.1 \ (3)^{d}$
Tan and Sabbah ¹²¹	1994	С	363	$100.7\pm0.6^{\rm e}$	$102.2 \pm 0.7^{e^{-1}}$

^a The methods are transpiration (T), Knudsen effusion (K), Tian-Calvet calorimetry (C), vacuum-sublimation drop-calorimetry (DC), and differential scanning calorimetry (DSC).

^b The temperature range indicates the highest and lowest temperatures, T_h and T_l , respectively, of the studies of sublimation pressure, or the experimental temperature for the calorimetric or torsion effusion studies.

^c $T_{\rm mid} = (T_{\rm h} + T_{\rm l})/2$

^d Experimental enthalpy increments for the gas at T = 423 K and the crystal at T = 298.15 K were not reported. The authors estimated the uncertainty to be 1.1 kJ·mol⁻¹. The value in brackets is our estimate of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence.

^e Uncertainties listed for the work of Tan and Sabbah¹²¹ are those of the authors. These will later be shown to be much too small.

^f The uncertainty given for the results of Holdiness¹³¹ are those estimated by the developers of the method.¹³² The value of $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{0}$ is highly inconsistent with all other results.

Table 13. Experimental enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m$ (T_{mid}) and derived standard enthalpies of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o$ at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K for iodobenzoic acids (all uncertainties are estimates of the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence)

Authors	Year	Method ^a	Temperature Range / K ^b	$\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}(T_{mid}) / kJ \cdot mol^{-1 c}$	$\Delta_{ m cr}^{ m g} H_{ m m}^{ m o}(298.15~{ m K}) / $ kJ·mol ⁻¹
2-iodobenzoic acid					
Zherikova, et al. ¹²⁹	2016	Т	362.4-411.5	109.2 ± 2.2	111.2 ± 2.3
Monte and Hillesheim ¹²⁶	2000	K	345.2-359.2	111.4 ± 4.6	112.6 ± 4.6
Tan and Sabbah ¹²²	1994	С	363	$90.0\pm0.2^{\rm d}$	91.4 ± 0.4^{d}
Holdiness ¹³¹	1983	DSC	440-480	76.7	$80.8\pm12^{\text{e}}$
3-iodobenzoic acid					
Zherikova, et al. ¹²⁹	2016	Т	366.6-422.0	106.7 ± 1.6	109.0 ± 1.7
Monte and Hillesheim ¹²⁶	2000	K	347.2-363.2	109.6 ± 3.2	110.9 ± 3.2
Tan and Sabbah ¹²²	1994	С	363	94.2 ± 0.2^{d}	95.7 ± 0.4^{d}
4-iodobenzoic acid					
Zherikova, et al. ¹²⁹	2016	Т	388.9-433.5	108.3 ± 1.4	111.0 ± 1.6
Monte and Hillesheim ¹²⁶	2000	K	363.2-379.1	111.0 ± 2.8	112.7 ± 2.8
Tan and Sabbah ¹²²	1994	С	363	$97.7\pm0.3^{\rm e}$	99.1 ± 0.5^{e}

^a The methods are transpiration (T), Knudsen effusion (K), Tian-Calvet calorimetry (C), and differential scanning calorimetry (DSC).

^b The temperature range indicates the highest and lowest temperatures, T_h and T_l , respectively, of the studies of sublimation pressure, or the experimental temperature for the calorimetric or torsion effusion studies.

^c $T_{\rm mid} = (T_{\rm h} + T_{\rm l})/2$

^d Uncertainties listed for the work of Tan and Sabbah¹²² are those of the authors.

^e The uncertainty given for the results of Holdiness¹³¹ are those estimated by the developers of the method.¹³² The value of $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}$ is highly inconsistent with all other results.

Table 14. Standard enthalpies of formation for the ideal-gas state $\Delta_f H_m^o(g)$ derived with averaged experimental standard enthalpies of formation for the crystal $\Delta_f H_m^o(cr)$ and experimental standard enthalpies of sublimation at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K^a

Compound	$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}\left({\rm cr}\right)$	Sources ^b	$\Delta^{g}_{cr}H^{o}_{m}(298.15 \text{ K})$	Sources ^b	$\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m} \left({\rm g} \right)$
2-fluorobenzoic acid	-568.3 ± 1.2	92,94	95.4 ± 2.0	126,129	-472.9 ± 2.3
3-fluorobenzoic acid 4-fluorobenzoic acid	-582.5 ± 1.5 -585.4 ± 0.6	92 86,91,92,94	93.3 ± 1.6 93.1 ± 1.1	126,129 127,129	-489.2 ± 2.2 -492.3 ± 1.3
2-chlorobenzoic acid	-404.8 ± 1.0	98.99	102.8 ± 1.3	79,124,125	-302.0 ± 1.7
3-chlorobenzoic acid	-423.9 ± 1.2	97-99	101.4 ± 2.1	79,124,125	-322.5 ± 2.4
4-chlorobenzoic acid	-428.8 ± 0.4	97-99, 101-114	104.9 ± 1.3	79,124,125,128	-323.9 ± 1.5
2-bromobenzoic acid	-368.3 ± 1.6	83	108.3 ± 1.4	83,125,130	$-260.0 \pm 2.1^{\circ}$
2-bromobenzoic acid	-342.5 ± 4.2	115	108.3 ± 1.4	83,125,130	$-234.2\pm4.4^{\rm c}$
3-bromobenzoic acid	-394.7 ± 1.6	83	104.9 ± 1.4	83,125,130	$-289.8 \pm 2.1^{\circ}$
3-bromobenzoic acid	-366.5 ± 2.0	115	104.9 ± 1.4	83,125,130	-261.6 ± 2.4^{c}
4-bromobenzoic acid	-378.9 ± 1.1	83,93,116	107.1 ± 1.7	83,125,130	-271.8 ± 2.0
2-iodobenzoic acid	-301.6 ± 1.1	118,117	111.5 ± 2.0	126,129	-190.1 ± 2.3
3-iodobenzoic acid 4-iodobenzoic acid	-316.2 ± 3.2 -316.6 ± 1.2	115,117 81,117119	109.4 ± 1.5 111.4 ± 1.4	126,129 126,129	-206.8 ± 3.5 -205.2 ± 1.8
		, -		'	

^a All uncertainties in the table represent the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence. Units are $kJ \cdot mol^{-1}$ for all enthalpies.

^b Reference numbers of experimental data used in calculation of the weighted average. See Tables 6 through 13 for property values from each source and uncertainties.

^c Results of the combustion studies by Ferrao and Pilcher⁸³ and Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar¹¹⁵ are inconsistent, and $\Delta_f H_m^o(g)$ is calculated with results from both studies.

Table 15. Standard enthalpies of formation for the ideal gas $\Delta_f H_m^o(g)$ derived with experimental standard enthalpies of formation for the liquid phase $\Delta_f H_m^o(l)$ and experimental standard enthalpies of vaporization for benzene and the halobenzenes at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K^a

Compound	$\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}\left(l ight)$	Source ^b	$\Delta_{l}^{g} H_{m}^{o}(298.15 \text{ K})$	Source ^b	$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o} ({\rm g})^{\rm c}$	$\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m} \left({\rm g} ight)^{\rm d}$
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
benzene	49.0 ± 1.1	139,140	33.8 ± 0.2	145,146,147	82.8 ± 1.1	83.20 ± 0.26
fluorobenzene	-151.1 ± 1.7	92	34.6 ± 0.2	71,149	-116.5 ± 1.7	-115.3 ± 1.1
chlorobenzene	10.5 ± 0.9	97,141,142	41.0 ± 0.2	73,149	51.5 ± 1.2	52.23 ± 0.61
bromobenzene	60.7 ± 4.2	143,144 ^e	44.2 ± 0.3	73,74	104.9 ± 4.2	104.9 ± 1.3
iodobenzene	115.9 ± 2.9	117,143,144	48.5 ± 1.4	74	164.4 ± 3.2	161.9 ± 1.1

^a All uncertainties in the table represent the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence Units are $kJ \cdot mol^{-1}$ for all enthalpies.

^b Reference numbers of experimental data that support the property values and uncertainties.

^c Enthalpy of formation for the ideal gas $\Delta_f H_m^o(g)$ calculated as the sum of columns 2 and 4.

^d Enthalpy of formation for the ideal gas $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (g) reported in the Active Thermochemical Tables.¹⁵⁰⁻¹⁵²

^e Enthalpies of reaction reported in references 143 and 144 are summarized by Cox and Pilcher.⁸²

							ΔE^{a}			
haloge	n confor	mer ^b ΔΖΡVΕ ^c	ΔH_{T}^{d}	B3LYP/ def2-QZVPD	DF-MP2/ def2-QZVPP	G4	DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP //B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP // DF-MP2/ def2-QZVPP	$\Delta_{ m r} H_{ m m}^{ m o}$ (g) conformer $^{ m e}$	$\Delta_{ m r} H_{ m m}^{ m o}$ (g) total ^e
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
4-halo	benzoic ad	cids								
F	syn	-0.21	0.17	-0.40	0.29	0.25	0.33	0.14	0.10	0.10
Cl	syn	-0.37	0.25	1.08	1.00	1.28	1.34	1.44	1.31	1.31
Br	syn	-0.47	0.31	1.56	1.13	1.68	1.61	1.73	1.58	1.58
I	syn	-0.52	0.34	1.70	1.16	-	1.83	1.94	1.77	1.77
3-halo	benzoic ad	cids								
F	anti-syn	-0.37	0.19	3.55	2.41	3.46	3.17	3.22	3.05	3.05
Cl	anti-syn	-0.42	0.35	3.83	3.08	3.10	3.25	3.36	3.29	3.29
Br	anti-syn	-0.48	0.43	3.88	3.20	3.16	3.20	3.29	3.24	3.24
I	anti-syn	-0.47	0.45	3.64	3.09	-	2.97	3.01	2.99	2.99
2-halo	benzoic ad	cids								
F	anti-syn	-0.21	0.77	17.46	17.92	17.17	17.58	17.56	18.12	18.33 ^g
	anti-anti ^f	0.16	-0.10	23.25	23.06	-	-	22.62	22.69	
Cl	syn-syn	-0.73	0.14	27.86	22.53	24.30	24.70	24.77	24.17	24.31 ^g
	anti-anti ^f	-0.85	0.06	34.85	30.64	-	-	32.74	31.97	
Br	syn-syn	-0.86	0.46	29.34	22.90	24.61	25.55	25.64	25.24	25.24 ^h
	anti-anti			38.57	33.28	-	-	35.76		
I	syn-syn	-0.90	0.80	28.54	21.76	-	24.74	24.76	24.66	24.66 ^h
	anti-anti	-	-	43.39	36.65	-	-	39.72		

Table 16. Enthalpy of homodesmic reaction (8) (halobenzene + benzoic acid = benzene + halobenzoic acid) at temperature T = 298.15 K and its individual contributions (units of energy are kJ·mol⁻¹)

^a ΔE is the computed difference in electronic energy for the sum of the products minus the sum of the reactants for the homodesmic reaction.

^b For the lowest-energy conformers anti-syn or syn-syn, the contributions of syn-syn or anti-syn conformers, respectively, are included by application of the one-dimensional quantum hindered rotor treatment

^c ΔZPVE is the computed difference in zero point vibrational energy between the products and reactants of the homodesmic reaction.

^d ΔH_T is the computed difference in the enthalpy change between the temperatures T = 0 K and T = 298.15 K for the products and reactants of the homodesmic reaction.

^eBased on DLPNO-CCSD(T)/def2-QZVPP//DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP energy

^f The conformer is a minor contributor to the computed properties and was evaluated without the hindered rotor treatment

^g Based on equilibrium mixtrue of anti-syn, syn-syn, and anti-anti conformers

^hContribution of anti-anti conformer was neglected

 $\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (g, expt)^b / kJ·mol⁻¹ $\Delta_{\rm r} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}({\rm g}) / {\rm kJ} \cdot {\rm mol}^{-1}$ $\Delta_{\rm r} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (g, comp)^d isomer^c halobenzene benzoic acid $\Delta_{\rm r} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (g, expt) benzene halobenzoic acid 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 20.1 ± 3 2-F -115.3 ± 1.1 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 -472.9 ± 2.3 18.4 3-F -115.3 ± 1.1 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 3.8 ± 3 -489.2 ± 2.2 3.0 -115.3 ± 1.1 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 -492.3 ± 1.3 0.7 ± 2 4-F 0.1 2-C1 52.2 ± 0.6 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 -302.0 ± 1.7 23.5 ± 2 24.3 83.2 ± 0.3 52.2 ± 0.6 -294.5 ± 0.9 -322.5 ± 2.4 3-C1 3.0 ± 3 3.3 52.2 ± 0.6 83.2 ± 0.3 1.6 ± 2 4-C1 -294.5 ± 0.9 -323.9 ± 1.5 1.3 $-260.0 \pm 2.1^{\circ}$ $(12.8 \pm 3)^{\rm e}$ 2-Br 104.9 ± 1.3 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 25.2 104.9 ± 1.3 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 -234.2 ± 4.4^{d} $(38.6 \pm 5)^{\rm f}$ 25.2 2-Br 104.9 ± 1.3 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 $-289.8 \pm 2.1^{\circ}$ $(-17.0 \pm 3)^{\rm e}$ 3.2 3-Br -261.6 ± 2.4^{d} $(11.2 \pm 3)^{\rm f}$ 3.2 3-Br 104.9 ± 1.3 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 104.9 ± 1.3 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 -271.8 ± 2.0 1.0 ± 3 1.6 4-Br 2-I 161.9 ± 1.1 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 -190.1 ± 2.3 25.7 ± 3 24.7 3-I 161.9 ± 1.1 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 -206.8 ± 3.5 (9.0 ± 4) 3.0 4-I 161.9 ± 1.1 -294.5 ± 0.9 83.2 ± 0.3 -205.2 ± 1.8 (10.6 ± 2) 1.8

Table 17. Comparison of enthalpies of reaction for the homodesmic reaction (8) (halobenzene + benzoic acid = benzene + halobenzoic acid) in the ideal-gas state at temperature T = 298.15 K and pressure $p^{\circ} = 100$ kPa derived from experiment $\Delta_r H_m^{\circ}$ (g, expt) and computed $\Delta_r H_m^{\circ}$ (g, comp)^a

^a Values of $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, expt) shown in brackets in column 6 are inconsistent with the computed values $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, comp).

^b Enthalpy of formation for the ideal-gas state used in calculation of $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, expt).

^c The abbreviations represent the isomer of halobenzoic acid in the homodesmic reaction, e.g., 2-F indicates the reaction with 2-fluorobenzoic acid.

^d The estimated expanded uncertainty (0.95 level of confidence) for the computed values $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, comp) is 2 kJ·mol⁻¹, as discussed in the text.

^e This value was derived with the enthalpy of combustion reported by Ferrao and Pilcher.⁸³

^f This value was derived with the weighted average of the enthalpies of combustion reported by Sabbah and Rojas Aguilar.¹¹⁵

Table 18. Standard enthalpies of formation for the ideal-gas state $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (g) derived with experimental standard enthalpies of formation for the condensed phase $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr or 1) and experimental standard enthalpies of sublimation (or vaporization) for naphthalene and the halonaphthalenes at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K^a

Compound	Phase ^b	$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o} ({\rm cr \ or \ l})$	Source ^c Δ	$H_{(\rm crorl)}^{\rm g} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(298.15 \text{ K})$	Source ^c	$\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}\left(g\right)$
naphthalene	cr	$77.9\pm2.2^{\rm d}$	159,160	72.7 ± 0.4	137	150.6 ± 2.2
1-fluoronaphthalene 2-fluoronaphthalene	l cr	-	154 ^e	-	-	- -
1-chloronaphthalene 2-chloronaphthalene	l cr	$\begin{array}{c} 54.5\pm8.6~(5)^{\rm f} \\ 55.3\pm8.6~(4)^{\rm f} \end{array}$	97 97	61.4 ± 4.6 76.3 ± 0.6	157 157	$\begin{array}{c} 115.9 \pm 10 \ (5) \\ 131.6 \pm 9 \ (4) \end{array}$
1-bromonaphthalene 2-bromonaphthalene	l cr	$\begin{array}{c} 111.6 \pm 2.9 \\ 94.4 \pm 2.6 \end{array}$	84 84	$62.2 \pm 1.0 \\ 81.6 \pm 1.6$	157 157	173.8 ± 3.1 176.0 ± 3.1
1-iodonaphthalene 2-iodonaphthalene	l cr	$\begin{array}{c} 161.4 \pm 6.3 \; (2)^{\rm f} \\ 144.3 \pm 6.3 \; (2)^{\rm f} \end{array}$	117 117	$\begin{array}{c} 67.8\pm0.4\\ 85.8\pm3\end{array}$	157 157 with 15	$229.2 \pm 7 (4) \\ 8^{g} 230.1 \pm 7 (4)$

^a All uncertainties in the table represent the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence, and all enthalpies are expressed in units of $kJ \cdot mol^{-1}$.

^b The equilibrium phase of the compound at temperature T = 298.15 K.

^c Reference numbers of experimental data used in calculation of the property value.

^d The expanded uncertainty (0.95 level of confidence) for the standard enthalpy of combustion of naphthalene is $0.8 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$.

^e An enthalpy of combustion was reported by Balcan et al.,¹⁵⁴ using a commercial calorimeter, without rotation or analysis of products. The reported uncertainty for the enthalpy of combustion is $\sim 100 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$, so these results were not considered further.

^f Enthalpies of combustion reported by Smith et al.⁹⁷ and Smith¹¹⁷ were adjusted by Cox and Pilcher⁸² in their review. Cox and Pilcher also increased the uncertainties, due to inadequate reporting of supporting information. Uncertainties estimated by Cox and Pilcher are given first and the original uncertainties given by Smith et al. and Smith are given in brackets for the values of $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr or l) and $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (g).

^g The enthalpy of sublimation is the sum of the enthalpy of vaporization, determined with correlation gas chromatography,¹⁵⁷ and the enthalpy of fusion, determined with differential scanning calorimetry.¹⁵⁸

Table 19. Comparison of enthalpies of reaction for the homodesmic reaction (9) (halobenzene + naphthalene = benzene + halonaphthalene) in the ideal-gas state at temperature T = 298.15 K and pressure $p^{\circ} = 100$ kPa derived from experiment $\Delta_r H_m^{\circ}$ (g, expt) and computed $\Delta_r H_m^{\circ}$ (g, comp)

		$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}({\rm g,ex})$	$\Delta_{\mathbf{r}}H_{\mathbf{m}}^{\mathbf{o}}\left(\mathbf{g}\right)/\mathbf{kJ}\cdot\mathbf{mol}^{-1}$				
halogen	halobenzene	naphthalene	benzene	isomer ^b	halonaphthalene	$\Delta_{\rm r} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (g, expt)	$\Delta_{\rm r} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (g, comp)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
F F	-115.3 ± 1.1 -115.3 ± 1.1	$\begin{array}{c} 150.6 \pm 2.2 \\ 150.6 \pm 2.2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 83.2 \pm 0.3 \\ 83.2 \pm 0.3 \end{array}$	1 2	_c _d	_c _d	1.8 0.8
Cl Cl	$\begin{array}{c} 52.2 \pm 0.6 \\ 52.2 \pm 0.6 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 150.6 \pm 2.2 \\ 150.6 \pm 2.2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 83.2\pm0.3\\ 83.2\pm0.3\end{array}$	1 2	$\begin{array}{l} 115.9 \pm 10 \; (5)^{e} \\ 131.6 \pm 9 \; (4)^{e} \end{array}$	-3.7 ± 10 (5) 12.0 ± 9 (4)	1.3 0.1
Br Br	104.9 ± 1.3 104.9 ± 1.3	$\begin{array}{c} 150.6 \pm 2.2 \\ 150.6 \pm 2.2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 83.2 \pm 0.3 \\ 83.2 \pm 0.3 \end{array}$	1 2	173.8 ± 3 176.0 ± 3	1.5 ± 4 3.7 ± 4	1.5 -0.1
I I	161.9 ± 1.1 161.9 ± 1.1	$\begin{array}{c} 150.6 \pm 2.2 \\ 150.6 \pm 2.2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 83.2 \pm 0.3 \\ 83.2 \pm 0.3 \end{array}$	1 2	$229.2 \pm 7 (4)^{e}$ $230.1 \pm 7 (4)^{e}$	$-0.1 \pm 7 (5)$ $0.8 \pm 7 (5)$	1.9 -0.4

^a Enthalpy of formation for the ideal-gas state used in calculation of $\Delta_r H_m^o$ (g, expt).

^b The values 1 and 2 indicate the particular isomer of the halonaphthalene.

^c The enthalpy of combustion has been reported,¹⁵⁴ but the uncertainty is large and the combustion reaction was not reported. No evaluation of the enthalpy of formation is possible.

^d The enthalpy of combustion for this compound has not been reported, so the reaction enthalpy cannot be calculated from experiment.

^e Enthalpies of combustion reported by Smith et al.⁹⁷ and Smith¹¹⁷ were adjusted by Cox and Pilcher⁸² in their review. Cox and Pilcher also increased the uncertainties, due to inadequate reporting of supporting information. Uncertainties estimated by Cox and Pilcher⁸² are given first and the original uncertainties given by Smith et al.⁹⁷ and Smith¹¹⁷ are given in brackets for the values of $\Delta_f H_m^0$ (cr or l) and $\Delta_f H_m^0$ (g).

Table 20. Normal melting temperatures T_m , enthalpies of fusion $\Delta_{cr}^l H_m^o(T_m)$, enthalpies of fusion adjusted to the reference temperature $\Delta_{cr}^l H_m^o(T_{ref})$, enthalpies of sublimation adjusted to the reference temperature $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$, derived enthalpies of vaporization at the reference temperature $\Delta_l^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$, and the difference in enthalpy of vaporization at the reference temperature between that for the particular halobenzoic acid and that for benzoic acid $\Delta_l^g H_{inc}^o(T_{ref})$, where $T_{ref} = 298.15$ K (uncertainties represent 0.95 level of confidence)

Compound	Source	<i>T</i> _m / K	$\Delta_{ m cr}^{ m l} H_{ m m}^{ m o}(T_{ m m})/$ kJ·mol ⁻¹	$\Delta_{ m cr}^{ m l} H_{ m m}^{ m o}(T_{ m ref})/k{ m J}\cdot{ m mol}^{-1}$	$\Delta^{\mathbf{g}}_{\mathbf{cr}} H^{\mathbf{o}}_{\mathbf{m}}(T_{\mathrm{ref}})/ ^{\mathrm{a}} \ \mathrm{kJ}\cdot\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$	$\Delta^{\mathrm{g}}_{\mathrm{l}} H^{\mathrm{o}}_{\mathrm{m}}(T_{\mathrm{ref}})^{/\ \mathrm{b}} \ \mathrm{kJ}{\cdot}\mathrm{mol}^{\mathrm{-1}}$	$\Delta_{ m l}^{ m g} H_{ m inc}^{ m o}(T_{ m ref})/ ^{ m c}$ kJ·mol ⁻¹
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
benzoic acid	Furukawa et al. ³³	395.49	18.00 ± 0.05	12.4 ± 1.1	90.3 ± 0.3	77.9 ± 1.1	
2-fluorobenzoic acid	Umnahanant et al. ¹⁶⁵ Zherikova et al. ¹²⁹ average	397.4 396.7 397.1	$\begin{array}{c} 20.1 \pm 1.0 \\ 20.3 \pm 1.0 \\ \textbf{20.2 \pm 1.0} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 14.3 \pm 1.5 \\ 14.5 \pm 1.5 \\ \textbf{14.4} \pm \textbf{1.5} \end{array}$	95.4 ± 2.0	81.0 ± 2.5	3.1 ± 2.7
3-fluorobenzoic acid	Zherikova et al. ¹²⁹ average	395.9 395.9	$18.5 \pm 0.9 \\ 18.5 \pm 0.9$	12.7 ± 1.5 12.7 ± 1.5	93.3 ± 1.6	80.6 ± 2.2	2.7 ± 2.5
4-fluorobenzoic acid	Kang and Samulski ¹⁶⁶ Zherikova et al. ¹²⁹ average	451.0 456.1 453.6	$\begin{array}{c} 20.9 \pm 1.0 \\ 21.6 \pm 1.1 \\ \textbf{21.3 \pm 1.0} \end{array}$	$11.9 \pm 2.1 \\ 12.3 \pm 2.2 \\ 12.1 \pm 2.2$	93.1 ± 1.1	81.0 ± 2.5	3.1 ± 2.7
2-chlorobenzoic acid	Andrews et al. ¹³⁶ Holdiness ¹³¹ Sabbah and Hirtz ¹²³ Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵ Singh et al. ¹⁶⁷	413.4 _d 414.1 414.0 414.1 413.9	$25.7 \pm 1.3 25.5 \pm 1.3 26.3 \pm 1.3 25.3 \pm 1.3 27.5 \pm 1.4 26.1 \pm 1.4 26.1 \pm 1.4 26.1 \pm 1.4 27.5 \pm 1.4 \\ 27.$	$18.9 \pm 1.9 \\ 18.7 \pm 1.9 \\ 19.5 \pm 1.9 \\ 18.5 \pm 1.9 \\ 20.7 \pm 1.9 \\ 19.2 \pm 1.9 \\ 19.$	102.8 + 1.3	836+23	57+26
3-chlorobenzoic acid	Andrews et al. ¹³⁶ Sabbah and Hirtz ¹²³ Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵ average	427.4 427.8 427.9 427.7	23.8 ± 1.2 22.0 ± 1.1 23.7 ± 1.2 23.9 ± 1.2	$16.2 \pm 1.9 \\ 14.4 \pm 1.9 \\ 16.1 \pm 1.9 \\ 16.5 \pm 1.9$	102.0 ± 1.3 101.4 ± 2.1	84.9 ± 2.8	5.7 ± 2.0 7.0 ± 3.1
4-chlorobenzoic acid	Andrews et al. ¹³⁶ Sabbah and Hirtz ¹²³ Tan et al. ¹⁶⁸	512.9 513.5 512.3	32.3 ± 1.6 34.3 ± 1.7 $(13.5)^{e}$	$\begin{array}{c} 19.7\pm3.0\\ 21.6\pm3.1 \end{array}$			

	Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	512.5	30.9 ± 1.4	18.3 ± 3.0			
	average	512.8	32.5 ± 1.7	19.8 ± 3.1	104.9 ± 1.3	85.1 ± 3.4	7.2 ± 3.5
2-bromobenzoic acid	Holdiness ¹³¹	_d	23.0 ± 1.2	15.7 ± 1.9			
	Tan and Sabbah ¹²¹	422.4	24.5 ± 1.2	17.2 ± 1.9			
	Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	421.6	24.8 ± 1.2	17.5 ± 1.9			
	average	422.0	24.1 ± 1.2	16.8 ± 1.9	108.3 ± 1.4	91.5 ± 2.4	13.6 ± 2.6
3-bromobenzoic acid	Tan and Sabbah ¹²¹	429.7	21.3 ± 1.8	13.6 ± 2.4			
	Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	430.1	24.9 ± 1.8	17.1 ± 2.4			
	average	429.9	23.1 ± 1.8	15.3 ± 2.4	104.9 ± 1.4	89.6 ± 2.8	11.7 ± 3.0
4-bromobenzoic acid	Tan and Sabbah ¹²¹	527.6	28.7 ± 1.4	15.2 ± 3.1			
	Ribeiro da Silva et al. ¹²⁵	526.3	30.9 ± 1.5	17.5 ± 3.1			
	Zherikova et al. ¹³⁰	526.9	30.9 ± 1.5	17.4 ± 3.1			
	average	526.9	30.2 ± 1.5	16.7 ± 3.1	107.1 ± 1.7	90.4 ± 3.5	12.5 ± 3.7
2-iodobenzoic acid	Holdiness ¹³¹	_d	26.2 ± 1.3	18.2 ± 2.1			
	Tan and Sabbah ¹²²	435.1	(21.4) ^e				
	Zherikova et al. ¹²⁹	434.5	27.6 ± 1.4	19.6 ± 2.1			
	average	434.8	26.9 ± 1.4	18.9 ± 2.1	111.5 ± 2.0	92.6 ± 2.9	14.7 ± 3.1
3-iodobenzoic acid	Tan and Sabbah ¹²²	460.4	28.7 ± 1.4	19.1 ± 2.4			
	Zherikova et al.129	458.9	27.7 ± 1.4	18.2 ± 2.3			
	average	459.7	28.2 ± 1.4	18.7 ± 2.4	109.4 ± 1.5	90.7 ± 2.8	12.8 ± 3.1
4-iodobenzoic acid	Tan and Sabbah ¹²²	543.7	35.2 ± 1.8	20.7 ± 3.4			
	Sabbah and El Watik ¹⁶⁹	544.7	33.9 ± 1.7	19.4 ± 3.4			
	Sabbah and El Watik ¹⁶⁹ Zherikova et al. ¹²⁹	544.7 543.9	33.9 ± 1.7 33.7 ± 1.7	19.4 ± 3.4 19.2 ± 3.3			

^a Values of $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}(T_{ref})$ are repeated from Table 1 for benzoic acid and Table 14 for the halobenzoic acids.

^b Values of $\Delta_1^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$ (column 7) were derived as the difference between values in columns 6 and 5.

^c Values of $\Delta_l^g H_{inc}^o(T_{ref})$ (column 8) were calculated as the difference between $\Delta_l^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$ (column 7) for the particular halobenzoic acid and that for benzoic acid (row 1 of column 7).

^d Holdiness¹³¹ did not report a normal melting temperature with his results.

^e Highly inconsistent value not included in the average.

Table 21. Normal melting temperatures T_m , enthalpies of fusion $\Delta_{cr}^l H_m^o(T_m)$, enthalpies of fusion adjusted to the reference temperature $\Delta_{cr}^l H_m^o(T_{ref})$, enthalpies of sublimation adjusted to the reference temperature $\Delta_{cr}^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$, derived enthalpies of vaporization at the reference temperature $\Delta_l^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$, and the difference in enthalpy of vaporization at the reference temperature between that for the particular halonaphthalene and that for naphthalene $\Delta_l^g H_{inc}^o(T_{ref})$, where $T_{ref} = 298.15$ K (uncertainties represent 0.95 level of confidence)

Compound	Source	<i>T</i> _m / K	$\Delta^{ m l}_{ m cr} H^{ m o}_{ m m}(T_{ m m})/\ m kJ{\cdot}mol^{-1}$	$\Delta^{\rm l}_{ m cr} H^{\rm o}_{ m m}(T_{ m ref})/k{ m J}\cdot{ m mol}^{-1}$	$\Delta^{ m g}_{ m cr} H^{ m o}_{ m m}(T_{ m ref})/\ m kJ{\cdot}mol^{-1}$	$\Delta_{ m l}^{ m g} H_{ m m}^{ m o}(T_{ m ref})^{/ m a} \ m kJ{\cdot}mol^{-1}$	$\Delta_{\rm l}^{\rm g} H_{ m inc}^{ m o}(T_{ m ref})/{}^{ m b}$ kJ·mol ⁻¹
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
naphthalene	McCullough et al. ¹⁷¹	353.39	18.98 ± 0.02				
	Chirico et al. ¹⁷²	353.37	18.99 ± 0.02				
	Chirico et al. ¹³⁷				$72.7 \pm 0.4^{\circ}$		
	evaluated	353.38	18.99 ± 0.02	18.04 ± 0.04	72.7 ± 0.4	54.7 ± 0.4	
1-chloronaphthalene	Verevkin ¹⁵⁷	_ ^d	-	-	-	61.4 ± 4.6	
*	evaluated					61.4 ± 4.6	6.7 ± 4.6
2-chloronaphthalene	Khanna et al. ¹⁵⁸	332.0	14.7 ± 0.7				
•	Miltenburg and Verdonk ¹⁶²	331.2	14.0 ± 0.1	14.2 ± 0.1			
	Verevkin ¹⁵⁷				76.3 ± 0.6		
	evaluated	331.2	14.0 ± 0.1	14.2 ± 0.1	$\textbf{76.3} \pm \textbf{0.6}$	62.1 ± 0.6	7.4 ± 0.7
1-bromonaphthalene	Verevkin ¹⁵⁷	_d	-	-	-	62.2 ± 1.0	
*	evaluated					62.2 ± 1.0	7.5 ± 1.1
2-bromonaphthalene	Chanh et al. ¹⁷³	329	$(14.4 + 3.5) \pm 0.9^{e}$	18 ± 2			
	Khanna et al. ¹⁵⁸	332	$12^{\rm f}$				
	Ribeiro da Silva et al. ⁸⁴				81.2 ± 2.0		
	Verevkin ¹⁵⁷				81.6 ± 1.6		
	evaluated	330	17.9 ± 0.9	18 ± 2	81.4 ± 1.2	63.4 ± 2.3	8.7 ± 2.4
1-iodonaphthalene	Verevkin ¹⁵⁷	_ ^d	-	-	-	67.8 ± 0.3	
*	evaluated					67.8 ± 0.3	13.1 ± 0.5

^a Values of $\Delta_1^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$ (column 7) were derived as the difference between values in columns 6 and 5.

^b The value of $\Delta_{cr}^{g} H_{m}^{o}(T_{ref})$ for naphthalene is based on a thermodynamic consistency analysis.¹³⁷

 $^{\circ}$ The compound is a liquid at T = 298.15 K, so the measured enthalpy of vaporization

^d Values of $\Delta_l^g H_{inc}^o(T_{ref})$ (column 8) were calculated as the difference between $\Delta_l^g H_m^o(T_{ref})$ (column 7) for the particular halonaphthalene and that for naphthalene (row 1 of column 7).

^e Chanh et al.¹⁷³ reported an enthalpy of fusion, plus some additional excess enthalpy ($3.5 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$) in the temperature range ($298.15 \text{ K} < (T/K) < T_{\text{m}}$).

^f Khanna et al.¹⁵⁸ reported an enthalpy of fusion with no mention of additional excess enthalpy at lower temperatures. This result was not considered further in the evaluation.

Table 22. Standard enthalpies of formation for the crystal $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (cr), ideal-gas $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (g), and liquid $\Delta_f H_m^o$ (l) evaluated in this research for the halobenzoic acids at the reference temperature T = 298.15 K and pressure p = 100 kPa^a

Compound	$\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m} \left({\rm cr} \right)$	Source	$\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m} \left({\rm g} \right)$	Source	$\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}\left(l \right)$	Source
	1		2		3	
2-fluorobenzoic acid	-568.3 ± 1.2	b	-472.9 ± 2.3	с	-553.9 ± 1.9	d
3-fluorobenzoic acid	-582.5 ± 1.5	b	-489.2 ± 2.2	с	-569.8 ± 2.1	d
4-fluorobenzoic acid	-585.4 ± 0.6	b	-492.3 ± 1.3	с	-573.3 ± 2.3	d
2-chlorobenzoic acid	-404.8 ± 1.0	b	-302.0 ± 1.7	с	-385.6 ± 2.1	d
3-chlorobenzoic acid	-423.9 ± 1.2	b	-322.5 ± 2.4	с	-407.4 ± 2.2	d
4-chlorobenzoic acid	-428.8 ± 0.4	b	-323.9 ± 1.5	С	-409.0 ± 3.1	d
2-bromobenzoic acid	-355.9 ± 2.9	f	-247.6 ± 2.6	e	-339.1 ± 3.5	d
3-bromobenzoic acid	-374.5 ± 2.9	f	-269.6 ± 2.6	e	-359.2 ± 3.8	d
4-bromobenzoic acid	-378.9 ± 1.1	b	-271.8 ± 2.0	с	-362.2 ± 3.3	d
2-iodobenzoic acid	-301.6 ± 1.1	b	-190.1 ± 2.3	с	-282.7 ± 2.4	d
3-iodobenzoic acid	-322.2 ± 2.9	f	-212.8 ± 2.5	e	-303.5 ± 3.8	d
4-iodobenzoic acid	-325.4 ± 2.8	f	-214.0 ± 2.5	e	-305.6 ± 4.4	d

^a All uncertainties in the table represent the expanded uncertainty with 0.95 level of confidence. Values shown in bold represent compounds for which inconsistencies are observed between experimental and computed enthalpies of reaction described in Table 17.

^b $\Delta_{\rm f} H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (cr) derived as the weighted average of experimental enthalpies of combustion reported in sources listed in Table 14.

^c $\Delta_{\rm f} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ (g) derived as the sum of column 1 and the enthalpy of sublimation $\Delta_{\rm cr}^{\rm g} H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}$ at the temperature T = 298.15 K listed in Table 14 and based on the experimental data sources given there.

 $^{d}\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(1)$ derived as the sum of column 1 and the enthalpy of fusion $\Delta_{cr}^{l}H_{m}^{o}$ at the temperature T = 298.15 K listed in Table 20 (column 5) and based on the experimental data sources given there.

 $^{\rm e}\Delta_{\rm f}H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (g) calculated with the computed enthalpy of reaction of the homodesmic reaction (Table 17, column 7) and the evaluated values of $\Delta_{\rm f}H^{\rm o}_{\rm m}$ (g) for the reaction components; a halobenzene, benzoic acid, and benzene (Table 17, columns 2, 3, and 4).

 $^{f}\Delta_{f}H_{m}^{o}(cr)$ derived as column 2 minus the enthalpy of sublimation $\Delta_{cr}^{g}H_{m}^{o}$ at the temperature T = 298.15 K listed in Table 14 and based on the experimental data sources given there.


Fig. 1. Difference plot of experimental and computed ideal-gas entropies S_m^o for benzene and benzoic acid. Computations were performed with the model (B3LYP/def2-QZVPD, with the low-frequency scaling factor of 0.9689) optimized for benzoic acid and benzene. Results for **benzene** are shown in **blue** and those for **benzoic acid** are shown in **red**. The dashed curves represent the expanded uncertainty (0.95 level of confidence) for $\Delta_0^T S_m^\circ$ (g,expt) for benzene.⁶² Vertical solid lines represent the expanded uncertainty for $\Delta_0^T S_m^\circ$ (g,expt) for benzoic acid derived in this work. Circles and triangles represent differences calculated with $\Delta_0^T S_m^\circ$ (g,comp) derived with the optimized scaling factor (0.9689) for benzoic acid and benzene, respectively. Squares represent differences between $\Delta_0^T S_m^\circ$ (g,expt) for benzoic acid (Table 1) and values of $\Delta_0^T S_m^\circ$ (g,comp) reported by Santos et al.⁶⁰

Conformers of 4-halobenzoic acids



Conformers of 2- and 3-halobenzoic acids



Fig. 2. Conformers of the halobenzoic acids, where R represents the halogen. Arrows indicate the bonds for which the substituents are specified as "syn" or "anti". For the 2- and 3-halobenzoic acids, substituent orientations for two bonds must be specified, and the numbered arrows indicate the naming order. For example, "anti-syn" implies that bond (1) is in the "anti" orientation and bond (2) is "syn".



Fig. 3. Rotational potentials (top) and rotational constants (bottom) for benzoic acid and the halobenzoic acids as a function of torsion angle. —, benzoic acid; --, fluoro compound; \cdots , chloro compounds; --, bromo compounds; --, iodo compounds. For the 2- and 3-halobenzoic acids, the rotation proceeds from anti-syn to syn-syn conformation, and the portion from 180 to 360 degrees is omitted due to mirror symmetry. For benzoic acid and 4- halobenzoic acids, the portion from 90 to 180 degrees is also omitted due to mirror symmetry, while the portion from 180 to 360 degrees – due to periodicity.



Fig. 4. Enthalpy increments for change in enthalpy of vaporization on replacement of one hydrogen in the parent aromatic compound (benzene, benzoic acid, or naphthalene) with one halogen. Results for specific halogens are distributed evenly on the unitless horizontal axis. +, halobenzenes; **x**, halonaphthalenes; \bigcirc , 2-halobenzoic acids; \triangle , 3-halobenzoic acid; \bigtriangledown , 4halobenzoic acids.

Appendix

Table A1.	Heat	capacities,	standard	entropies,	and	enthalpy	increments	of	benzoic	acid	in	the	ideal	-gas	state
computed	with th	ne methods	described	d in the tex	t (p°	= 100 kP	a)								

T/K	$C_{p,\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{o}}/\mathrm{J}\cdot\mathrm{K}^{-1}\cdot\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$	$S_{\rm m}^{\rm o}/{\rm J}{\cdot}{\rm K}^{-1}{\cdot}{ m mol}^{-1}$	$[H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(T) - H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(0)]/{\rm kJ}\cdot{\rm mol}^{-1}$
150.0	69.03	292.5	7.331
200.0	86.94	314.8	11.22
250.0	106.6	336.3	16.05
298.2	126.0	356.7	21.66
300.0	126.8	357.5	21.89
350.0	146.2	378.5	28.72
400.0	164.2	399.2	36.49
450.0	180.6	419.5	45.11
500.0	195.2	439.3	54.52
600.0	219.7	477.2	75.31
700.0	239.2	512.5	98.29
800.0	254.7	545.5	123.0
900.0	267.5	576.3	149.1
1000.0	278.1	605.0	176.4

		model				
conformer	experimental ^a	B3LYP/def2-QZVPD	DF-MP2/def2-QZVPP			
benzoic acid						
syn	3.882	3.903	3.894			
	1.210	1.229	1.236			
	0.923	0.935	0.938			
2-fluorobenzoic acid						
anti-syn	2.294	2.301	2.299			
	1.213	1.216	1.220			
	0.794	0.794	0.796			
svn-svn	2.272	2.277	2.278			
	1.213	1.216	1.222			
	0.792	0.793	0.796			
anti-anti	2.285	2.293	2.292			
	1.211	1.214	1.220			
	0.792	0.794	0.796			
3-fluorobenzoic acid						
anti-syn	2.636	2.650	2.652			
	0.937	0.938	0.943			
	0.691	0.693	0.696			
syn-syn	2.685	2.699	2.696			
5 5	0.927	0.927	0.933			
	0.689	0.690	0.693			
4-fluorobenzoic acid						
syn	3.857	3.888	3.882			
	0.775	0.775	0.779			
	0.645	0.646	0.649			

Table A2. Comparison of experimental and computed molecular rotational constants (GHz)

^a For benzoic acid, values are computed from the geometry derived from gas-phase electron diffraction measurements reported by Aarset et al.⁷⁵ Values for the fluorobenzoic acids were reported by Daly et al.,⁷⁶ based on microwave spectra.

T/K	$C_{p,\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{o}}/\mathrm{J}\cdot\mathrm{K}^{-1}\cdot\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$	$S_{\rm m}^{\rm o}/{\rm J}{\cdot}{\rm K}^{-1}{\cdot}{ m mol}^{-1}$	$[H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(T) - H_{\rm m}^{\rm o}(298.15 \text{ K})]/\text{kJ}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$	$x_{\rm conformer}^{\rm b}$
2-fluoroben	zoic acid			
150.0	80.16	310.14	-16.23	0.993
200.0	99.68	336.15	-11.74	0.982
250.0	120.01	360.85	-6.25	0.969
298.15	139.36	383.87	0.00	0.956
300.0	140.09	384.74	0.26	0.956
350.0	159.07	407.95	7.74	0.943
400.0	176.45	430.48	16.14	0.932
450.0	192.05	452.29	25.35	0.922
500.0	205.90	473.33	35.31	0.913
600.0	228.99	513.12	57.10	0.898
700.0	247.17	549.92	80.94	0.886
800.0	261.74	583.97	106.41	0.876
900.0	273.64	615.56	133.20	0.867
1000.0	283.51	644.95	161.07	0.860
3-fluoroben	zoic acid			
150.0	77.47	309.51	-15.98	
200.0	97.71	334.54	-11.60	
250.0	118.67	358.59	-6.20	
298.15	138.53	381.20	0.00	
300.0	139.28	382.06	0.26	
350.0	158.74	405.01	7.71	
400.0	176.58	427.39	16.10	
450.0	192.61	449.13	25.34	
500.0	206.84	470.18	35.33	
600.0	230.53	510.07	57.25	
700.0	249.07	547.06	81.27	
800.0	263.80	581.32	106.94	
900.0	275.72	613.10	133.94	
1000.0	285.52	642.67	162.01	
4-fluoroben	zoic acid			
150.0	77.21	303.95	-15.94	
200.0	97.45	328.90	-11.58	
250.0	118.44	352.89	-6.18	
298.15	138.30	375.46	0.00	
300.0	139.04	376.32	0.26	
350.0	158.48	399.23	7.70	
400.0	176.29	421.58	16.08	
450.0	192.31	443.28	25.30	
500.0	206.54	464.30	35.28	
600.0	230.27	504.14	57.17	
700.0	248.88	541.09	81.16	
800.0	263.69	575.33	106.82	

Table A3. Heat capacities, standard entropies, and enthalpy increments for the halobenzoic acids in the ideal-gas state computed with the methods described in the text ($p^\circ = 100 \text{ kPa}$)^a

900.0	275.69	607.10	133.81	
1000.0	285.54	636.67	161.88	
2-chlorobenzo	oic acid			
150.0	80.79	325.05	-16.37	0.999
200.0	100.73	351.13	-11.84	0.996
250.0	121.06	375.99	-6.29	0.990
298.15	140.22	399.18	0.00	0.983
300.0	140.94	400.06	0.26	0.982
350.0	159.67	423.45	7.78	0.973
400.0	176.83	446.13	16.20	0.962
450.0	192.26	468.08	25.44	0.951
500.0	205.98	489.25	35.41	0.939
600.0	228.92	529.25	57.21	0.917
700.0	247.05	566.23	81.06	0.897
800.0	261.61	600.43	106.54	0.878
900.0	273.54	632.15	133.34	0.860
1000.0	283.44	661.66	161.24	0.844
3-chlorobenzo	oic acid			
150.0	82.11	318.28	-16.61	
200.0	102.17	344.63	-12.00	
250.0	122.75	369.63	-6.38	
298.15	142.22	392.93	0.00	
300.0	142.95	393.81	0.26	
350.0	162.05	417.30	7.89	
400.0	179.55	440.10	16.44	
450.0	195.28	462.17	25.82	
500.0	209.25	483.49	35.94	
600.0	232.47	523.78	58.07	
700.0	250.65	561.03	82.27	
800.0	265.10	595.48	108.08	
900.0	276.80	627.41	135.20	
1000.0	286.42	657.08	163.37	
4-chlorobenzo	oic acid			
150.0	81.73	312.90	-16.57	
200.0	101.87	339.15	-11.98	
250.0	122.52	364.10	-6.37	
298.15	142.04	387.36	0.00	
300.0	142.77	388.24	0.26	
350.0	161.87	411.70	7.89	
400.0	179.37	434.47	16.42	
450.0	195.10	456.53	25.79	
500.0	209.07	477.82	35.90	
600.0	232.32	518.08	58.02	
700.0	250.54	555.32	82.20	
800.0	265.04	589.75	108.01	
900.0	276.78	621.67	135.12	
1000.0	286.44	651.35	163.29	
2-bromobenzo	bic acid			
150.0	85.27	334.92	-16.80	
200.0	103.96	361.99	-12.07	

250.0	123.39	387.27	-6.39
298.15	141.96	410.60	0.00
300.0	142.66	411.48	0.26
350.0	160.97	434.86	7.86
400.0	177.82	457.47	16.34
450.0	193.02	479.31	25.61
500.0	206.56	500.36	35.61
600.0	229.21	540.10	57.44
700.0	247.11	576.83	81.29
800.0	261.51	610.80	106.75
900.0	273.28	642.31	133.51
1000.0	283.06	671.62	161.34
3-bromobenzo	bic acid	0,1102	10110
150.0	85.16	328.53	-16.96
200.0	104.74	355.69	-12.21
250.0	124.87	381.23	-6.48
298.15	143.99	404.86	0.00
300.0	144.71	405.76	0.27
350.0	163.51	429.49	7.98
400.0	180.79	452.47	16.59
450.0	196.34	474.68	26.03
500.0	210.16	496.10	36.20
600.0	233.17	536.53	58.41
700.0	251.20	573.89	82.67
800.0	265.54	608.40	108.53
900.0	277.16	640.37	135.68
1000.0	286.72	670.08	163.89
4-bromobenzo	nic acid	070100	100107
150.0	84.73	323.24	-16.92
200.0	104.43	350.30	-12.19
250.0	124.65	375.77	-6.47
298.15	143.82	399.37	0.00
300.0	144.54	400.26	0.27
350.0	163.36	423.98	7.97
400.0	180.64	446.94	16.58
450.0	196.19	469.13	26.00
500.0	210.01	490.53	36.17
600.0	233.04	530.94	58.37
700.0	251.10	568.28	82.61
800.0	265.49	602.78	108.47
900.0	277.14	634.74	135.62
1000.0	286.73	664.46	163.82
2-iodobenzoic	acid		
150.0	89.98	339.24	-17.37
200.0	108.27	367.62	-12.42
250.0	126.88	393.78	-6.54
298.15	144.76	417.66	0.00
300.0	145.43	418.56	0.27
350.0	163.19	442.32	7.99
400.0	179.63	465.20	16.57

194.51	487.23	25.93
207.81	508.43	35.99
230.13	548.37	57.93
247.82	585.23	81.86
262.07	619.28	107.38
273.74	650.84	134.19
283.44	680.20	162.06
e acid		
86.97	336.29	-17.15
106.16	363.91	-12.33
125.99	389.73	-6.52
144.91	413.54	0.00
145.62	414.44	0.27
164.26	438.31	8.02
181.42	461.38	16.67
196.88	483.66	26.14
210.63	505.13	36.33
233.54	545.64	58.59
251.49	583.04	82.87
265.79	617.59	108.76
277.37	649.59	135.94
286.90	679.32	164.17
e acid		
86.56	331.06	-17.11
105.88	358.58	-12.31
125.81	384.35	-6.52
144.78	408.14	0.00
145.49	409.03	0.27
164.16	432.88	8.02
181.32	455.94	16.66
196.78	478.20	26.12
210.53	499.66	36.31
233.45	540.16	58.55
251.42	577.55	82.83
265.74	612.09	108.72
277.34	644.09	135.89
286.90	673.82	164.12
	$ \begin{array}{r} 194.51 \\ 207.81 \\ 230.13 \\ 247.82 \\ 262.07 \\ 273.74 \\ 283.44 \\ e acid \\ $	194.51 487.23 207.81 508.43 230.13 548.37 247.82 585.23 262.07 619.28 273.74 650.84 283.44 680.20 c acid 86.97 336.29 106.16 363.91 125.99 125.99 389.73 144.91 413.54 145.62 414.44 164.26 438.31 181.42 461.38 196.88 483.66 210.63 505.13 233.54 545.64 251.49 583.04 265.79 617.59 277.37 649.59 286.90 679.32 c acid 86.56 331.06 105.88 358.58 125.81 384.35 144.78 408.14 145.49 409.03 164.16 432.88 181.32 455.94 196.78 478.20 210.53 499.66 233.45 540.16 251.42 577.55 265.74 612.09 277.34 644.09 286.90 673.82

^a Expanded uncertainties U (0.95 level of confidence) for all properties Φ are estimated to be $U(\Phi) = 0.002 \cdot \Phi$ up to ~500 K, and increasing up to $0.02 \cdot \Phi$ at 1000 K.

^b $x_{conformer}$ is the computed mole fraction of the most stable conformer for 2-fluorobenzoic and 2-chlorobenzoic acid. For all other compounds $x_{conformer} = 1$ at all temperatures.



Fig. A1. Deviations relative to computed heat capacities of this research for the ideal-gas state of benzoic acid. (B3LYP/def2-QZVPD with the selected dual scaling factors and hindered rotor treatment described in the text.) Blue dashed line (---), computed by Santos et al.⁶⁰ with an "isodesmic reaction schema"; black lines (—), estimated uncertainties $(0.01 \cdot C_{p,m}^{o})$ for values recommended by Santos et al.;⁶⁰dotted blue line (·--), computed statistically by Santos et al.⁶⁰ with experimental vibrational frequencies, when available, supplemented with frequencies predicted with (B3LYP/6-311++G(d,p)) theory; green dash-dot line (·----), NIST Web Thermo Tables (WTT), NIST Standard Reference Subscription Database 3 - Professional Edition, Version 2-2012-1-Pro (Accessed September 2, 2016); •, experimental values reported by Santos et al.⁶⁰ with uncertainties recalculated in this research, as described in the text; brown dash-double-dot line (·----·), Burcat and Ruscic.^{69,70} Deviations for values listed by Stull et al.⁶⁷ are large and exceed the range shown in the plot. Values listed by Stull et al.⁶⁸

9. References

- ¹ M. Frenkel, R. D. Chirico, V. Diky, X. Yan, Q. Dong, C. S. Muzny, J. Chem. Inf. Model. 45, 816 (2005).
- ² V. Diky, C. D. Muzny, E. W. Lemmon, R. D. Chirico, M. Frenkel, J. Chem. Inf. Model. 47, 1713 (2007).
- ³ V. Diky, R. D. Chirico A. F. Kazakov, C. D. Muzny, M. Frenkel, J. Chem. Inf. Model. 49, 503 (2009).
- ⁴ V. Diky, R. D. Chirico A. F. Kazakov, C. D. Muzny, M. Frenkel, J. Chem. Inf. Model. 49, 2883 (2009).
- ⁵ V. Diky, R. D. Chirico A. F. Kazakov, C. D. Muzny, J. W. Magee, I. Abdulagatov, J. W. Kang, K. Kroenlein, M. Frenkel, J. Chem. Inf. Model. 51, 181 (2011).
- ⁶ K. Kroenlein, C. D. Muzny, V. Diky, A. F. Kazakov, R. D. Chirico, J. W. Magee, I. Abdulagatov, M. Frenkel, J. Chem. Inf. Model. 51, 1506 (2011).
- ⁷ V. Diky, R. D. Chirico C. D. Muzny, A. F. Kazakov, K. Kroenlein, J. W. Magee, I. Abdulagatov, J. W. Kang, M. Frenkel, J. Chem. Inf. Model. 52, 260 (2012).
- ⁸ V. Diky, R. D. Chirico C. D. Muzny, A. F. Kazakov, K. Kroenlein, J. W. Magee, I. Abdulagatov, J. W. Kang, R. Gani, M. Frenkel, J. Chem. Inf. Model. 53, 249 (2013).
- ⁹ A. S. Teja, R. J. Lee, D. Rosenthal, M. Anselme, Fluid Phase Equilib. 56, 153 (1990).
- ¹⁰ F. Vejahati, M. B. Nikoo, S. Mokhatab, B. F. Towler, Pet. Sci. Technol. 25, 1115 (2007).
- ¹¹ D. Ambrose, C. Tsonopoulos, E. D. Nikitin, D. W. Morton, K. N. Marsh, J. Chem. Eng. Data 60, 3444 (2015).
- ¹² S. P. Verevkin, V. N. Emel'yanenko, V. A. Pozdeev, V. Diky, R. D. Chirico, K. Kroenlein, J. Chem. Eng. Data 61, 1811 (2016).
- ¹³ R. D. Chirico, A. F. Kazakov, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 86, 90 (2015).
- ¹⁴ R. D. Chirico, W. V. Steele, A. F. Kazakov, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 73, 241 (2014).
- ¹⁵ N. L. Allinger, H. Dodziuk, D. W. Rogers, S. N. Naik, Tetrahedron 38, 1593 (1982).
- ¹⁶ J. T. Sprague, J. C. Tai, Y. Yuh, N. L. Allinger, J. Comput. Chem. 8, 581 (1987).
- ¹⁷ M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, B. Mennucci, G. A. Petersson, et al. Gaussian 09 Revision D.01. Gaussian Inc., Wallingford, Connecticut (2013).
- ¹⁸ J. M. Turney, A. C. Simmonett, R. M. Parrish, E. G. Hohenstein, F. A. Evangelista, J. T. Fermann, B. J. Mintz, L. A. Burns, J. J. Wilke, M. L. Abrams, N. J. Russ, M. L. Leininger, C. L. Janssen, E. T. Seidl, W. D. Allen, H. F. Schaefer, R. A. King, E. F. Valeev, C. D. Sherrill, T. D. Crawford, Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.: Comput. Mol. Sci. 2, 556 (2012).
- ¹⁹ J. Li, A. Kazakov, F. L.Dryer, J. Phys. Chem. A 108, 7671 (2004).
- ²⁰ K. S. Pitzer, J. Chem. Phys. 14, 239 (1946).
- ²¹ F. Weigend, R. Ahlrichs, R. Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 7, 3297 (2005).
- ²² D. Rappoport, F. Furche, J. Chem. Phys. 133, 134105 (2010).
- ²³ C. Riplinger, F. Neese, J. Chem. Phys. 138, 034106 (2013).
- ²⁴ F. Neese, Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.: Comput. Mol. Sci. 2, 73 (2012).
- ²⁵ L. A. Curtiss, P. C. Redfern, K. Raghavachari, J. Chem. Phys. 126, 084108 (2007).
- ²⁶ R. Sabbah, A. Xu-Wu, J. S. Chickos, L. Planas, M. V. Roux, L. A. Torres, Thermochim. Acta 331, 93 (1999).

- ²⁷ R. S. Jessup, C. B. Green, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. 13, 469 (1934).
- ²⁸ R. S. Jessup, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. 29, 247 (1942).
- ²⁹ E. J. Prosen, F. D. Rossini, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. 33, 439 (1944).
- ³⁰ A. R. Challoner, H. A. Gundry, A. R. Meetham, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London A247, 553 (1955).
- ³¹ J. Coops, N. Adriaanse, K. Van Nes, Rec. Trav. Chim. 75, 237 (1956).
- ³² H. A. Gundry, A. R. Meetham, Trans. Faraday Soc. 54, 664 (1958).
- ³³ G. T. Furukawa, R. E. McCoskey, G. J. King, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. 47, 256 (1951).
- ³⁴ A. A. Sklyankin, P. G. Strelkov, Zhur. Priklad. Mekh. Tekh. Fiz. 2, 100 (1960).
- ³⁵ M. Tatsumi, T. Matsuo, H. Suga, S. Seki, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn. 48, 3060 (1975).
- ³⁶ K. Arvidsson, B. Falk, S. Sunner, Chem. Scr. 10, 193 (1976).
- ³⁷ K. Moriya, T. Matsuo, H. Suga, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 14, 1143 (1982).
- ³⁸ M. Sorai, K. Kaji, Y. Kaneko, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 24, 167 (1992).
- ³⁹ K. Kobashi, T. Kyomen, M. Oguni, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 59, 667 (1998).
- ⁴⁰ A. V. Blokhin, Y. U. Paulechka, G. J. Kabo, J. Chem. Eng. Data 51, 1377 (2006).
- ⁴¹ E. S. R. Gopal, Specific Heats at Low Temperatures; (Plenum Press: New York, 1966), Chap. 2.
- ⁴² E. Morawetz, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 4, 455 (1972).
- ⁴³ S. Murata, M. Sakiyama, S. Seki, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 14, 723 (1982).
- ⁴⁴ A. Rojas-Aguilar, E. Orozco-Guareno, M. Martinez-Herrera, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 33, 1405 (2001).
- ⁴⁵ L. M. N. B. F. Santos, B. Schroder, O. Fernandes, M. A. V. Ribeiro da Silva, Thermochim. Acta 415, 15 (2004).
- ⁴⁶ L. Malaspina, R. Gigli, G. Bardi, J. Chem. Phys. 59, 387 (1973).
- ⁴⁷ S. Klosky, L. P. L. Woo, R. J. Flanigan, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 49, 1280 (1927).
- ⁴⁸ K. L. Wolf, H. Weghofer, Z. Phys. Chem. Abt. B 39, 194 (1938).
- ⁴⁹ H. Hirsbrunner, Helv. Chim. Acta 17, 477 (1934).
- ⁵⁰ C. H. D. van Ginkel, C. G. de Kruif, F. E. B. de Waal, J. Phys. E: Sci. Instrum. 8, 490 (1975).
- ⁵¹ M. Colomina, P. Jimenez, C. Turrion, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 14, 779 (1982).
- ⁵² C. G. De Kruif, J. G. Blok, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 14, 201 (1982).
- ⁵³ M. A. V. Ribeiro da Silva, M. J. S. Monte, Thermochim. Acta 171, 169 (1990).
- ⁵⁴ A. B. Bazyleva, G. J. Kabo, Y. U. Paulechka, D. H. Zaitsau, A. V. Blokhin, V. M. Sevruk, Thermochim. Acta 436, 56 (2005).
- ⁵⁵ A. B. Bazyleva, A. V. Blokhin, A. V. Kabo, G. J. Kabo, A. G. Kabo, V. M. Sevruk, Thermochim. Acta 451, 65 (2006).
- ⁵⁶ M. J. S. Monte, L. M. N. B. F. Santos, M. Fulem, J. M. S. Fonseca, C. A. D. Sousa, J. Chem. Eng. Data 51, 757 (2006).
- ⁵⁷ M. A. V. Ribeiro da Silva, M. J. S. Monte, L. M. N. B. F.Santos, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 38, 778 (2006).
- ⁵⁸ J. M. S. Fonseca, N. Gushterov, R. Dohrn, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 73, 148 (2014).

- ⁵⁹ D. H. Zaitsau, S. P. Verevkin, A. Y. Sazonova, Fluid Phase Equilib. 386, 140 (2015).
- ⁶⁰ L. M. N. B. F. Santos, M. A. A. Rocha, L. R. Gomes, B. Schroder, J. A. P. Coutinho, J. Chem. Eng. Data 55, 2799 (2010).
- ⁶¹ S. Grimme, S. Ehrlich, L. Goerigk, J. Comput. Chem. 32, 1456 (2011).
- ⁶² R. D. Chirico and W. V. Steele, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 33, 157 (1994).
- ⁶³ M. Halls, J. Velkovski, H. Schlegel, Theor. Chem. Acc. 105, 413 (2001)
- ⁶⁴ J. P. Merrick, D. Moran, L. Radom, J. Phys. Chem. A 111, 11683 (2007).
- ⁶⁵ S. G. Stepanian, I. D. Reva, E. D. Radchenko, G. G. Sheina, Vib. Spectrosc. 11 123, (1996).
- ⁶⁶ T. Shimanouchi, Tables of Molecular Vibrational Frequencies Consolidated Volume I, National Bureau of Standards (1972), pp. 1-160.
- ⁶⁷ D. R. Stull, E. F. Westrum, Jr., G. C. Sinke, The Chemical Thermodynamics of Organic Compounds; Wiley: New York, 1969.
- ⁶⁸ M. Frenkel, G. J. Kabo, K. N. Marsh, G. N. Roganov, R. C. Wilhoit, Thermodynamics of organic compounds in the gas state. Thermodynamics Research Center, Texas A&M University: College Station, Texas, 1994.
- ⁶⁹ A. Burcat, B. Ruscic, "Third Millennium Ideal Gas and Condensed Phase Thermochemical Database for Combustion with updates from Active Thermochemical Tables" ANL-05/20 and TAE 960, Technion-IIT, Aerospace Engineering, and Argonne National Laboratory, Chemistry Division, September 2005.
- ⁷⁰ E. Goos, A. Burcat, B. Ruscic, Extended Third Millenium Ideal Gas Thermochemical Database with updates from Active Thermochemical Tables, http://burcat.burcat.burcat.technion.ac.il/dir. Mirrored at http://garfield.chem.elte.hu/Burcat/burcat.html. Accessed September 6, 2016.
- ⁷¹ D. W. Scott, J. P. McCullough, W. D. Good, J. F. Messerly, R. E. Pennington, T. C. Kincheloe, I. A. Hossenlopp, D. R. Douslin, G. Waddington, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 78, 5457 (1956).
- ⁷² J. F. Masi, R. B. Scott, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. Sect. A 79, 619 (1975).
- ⁷³ I. Wadsö, Acta Chem. Scand. 22, 2438 (1968)
- ⁷⁴ S. P. Verevkin, A. Sazonova, V. Emel'yanenko, D. Zaitsau, M. Varfolomeev, B. Solomonov, K. Zherikova, J. Chem. Eng. Data 60, 89 (2015)
- ⁷⁵ K. Aarset, E. M. Page, D. A. Rice, J. Phys. Chem. A 110, 9014 (2006).
- ⁷⁶ A. M. Daly, S. J. Carey, A. M. Pejlovas, K. Li, L. Kang, S. G. Kukolich, J. Chem. Phys. 142, 144303 (2015).
- ⁷⁷ N. Sundaraganesan, B. Dominic Joshua, T. Radjakoumar, Indian J. Pure. Appl. Phys. 47, 248 (2009).
- ⁷⁸ J. Swaminathan, M. Ramalingam, H. Saleem, V. Sethuraman, M.T. Noorul Ameen, Spectrochim. Acta A, 74, 1247 (2009).
- ⁷⁹ V. N. Emel'yanenko, A. Strutynska, S. P. Verevkin, J. Phys. Chem. A 109, 4375 (2005).
- ⁸⁰ W. N. Hubbard, D. W. Scott, G. Waddington, in Experimental Thermochemistry, edited by F. D. Rossini (Interscience Publishers, New York, 1956), pp. 75-127.
- ⁸¹ M. A. V. Ribeiro da Silva, M. L. C. C. H. Ferrao, I. M. S. Costa, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 31, 1635 (1999).
- ⁸² J. D. Cox and G. Pilcher, Thermochemistry of Organic and Organometallic Compounds (Academic, London, 1970).
- ⁸³ M. L. C. C. H. Ferrao, G. Pilcher, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 19, 543 (1987).
- ⁸⁴ M. A. V. Ribeiro da Silva, M. L. C. C. H. Ferrao, A. J. M. Lopes, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 25, 229 (1993).

- ⁸⁵ R. Sabbah, A. Rojas Aguilar, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 28, 221 (1996).
- ⁸⁶ M. A. V. Ribeiro da Silva, A. I. M. C. L. Ferreira, J. R. B. Gomes, J. Phys. Chem. B 111, 2052 (2007).
- ⁸⁷ J. D. Cox, D. D. Wagman, V. A. Medvedev, CODATA key values for thermodynamics, (Hemisphere, New York, 1989).
- ⁸⁸ D. D. Wagman, W. H. Evans, V. B. Parker, R. H. Schumm, I. Halow, S. M. Bailey, K. L. Churney, R. L. Nuttall, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 1982, 11, Supplement no. 2.
- ⁸⁹ G. K. Johnson, P. N. Smith, W. N. Hubbard, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 5, 793 (1973).
- ⁹⁰ G. Olofsson, Assignment of Uncertainties, in Combustion calorimetry, edited by S. Sunner, M. Månsson, (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1979), pp. 137-159.
- ⁹¹ J. D. Cox, H. A. Gundry, A. J. Head, Trans. Faraday Soc. 60, 653 (1964).
- ⁹² W. D. Good, D. W. Scott, G. Waddington, J. Phys. Chem. 60, 1080 (1956).
- 93 L. Bjellerup, Acta Chem. Scand. 13, 1511 (1959).
- ⁹⁴ W. H. Johnson, E. J. Prosen, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. 79, 481 (1975).
- ⁹⁵ F. Schaffer, S. P. Verevkin, S. P., H. J. Rieger, H. D. Beckhaus, C. Ruchardt, Liebigs Ann. 7, 1333 (1997).
- ⁹⁶ M. R. Holdiness, Thermochim. Acta 71, 257 (1983).
- ⁹⁷ L. Smith, L. Bjellerup, S. Krook, H. Westermark, Acta Chem. Scand. 7, 65 (1953).
- 98 W. H. Johnson, E. J. Prosen, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. Sect. A 78, 683 (1974).
- ⁹⁹ R. Sabbah, A. Rojas Aguilar, Can. J. Chem. 73, 1538 (1995).
- ¹⁰⁰ Parr Instrument Company. http://www.parrinst.com/products/oxygen-bomb-calorimeters/1341-plain-jacketbomb-calorimeter/. Accessed September 1, 2016.
- ¹⁰¹ M. A. V. Ribeiro da Silva, A. I. M. C. L. Ferreira, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 40, 362 (2008).
- ¹⁰² L. Bjellerup, L. Smith, K. Fysiogr. Saellsk. Lund, Foerh. 24, 21 (1954).
- ¹⁰³ S. N. Hajiev, M. J. Agarunov, J. Organomet. Chem. 11, 415 (1968).
- ¹⁰⁴ A. T. Hu, G. C. Sinke, M. Mansson, B. Ringner, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 4, 283 (1972).
- ¹⁰⁵ V. P. Kolesov, G. M. Slavutskaya, S. P. Alekhin, S. M. Skuratov, Zh. Fiz. Khim. 46, 2138 (1972).
- ¹⁰⁶ S. N. Hajiev, M. J. Agarunov, H. G. Nurullaev, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 6, 713 (1974).
- ¹⁰⁷ M. V. Lyubarskii, T. A. Rogovtsora, G. Z. Epshtein, V. D. Simonsov, Neftepererab. Neftekhim. (Moscow) 2, 51 (1975).
- ¹⁰⁸ A. Kamaguchi, T. Sato, M. Sakiyama, S. Seki, Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Thermal Analysis, edited by H. Chihara (Tokyo and Hayden & Son Ltd., London, 1977) pp. 243–246.
- ¹⁰⁹ P. A. Erastov, V. P. Kolesov, V. F. Yushkevich, Yu. I. Aleksandrov, Zh. Fiz. Khim. 52, 2223 (1978).
- ¹¹⁰ V. A. Platonov, Y. N. Simulin, R. V. Dzhagatspanyan, Russ. J. Phys. Chem. 55, 1209 (1981).
- ¹¹¹ X.-W.An, H. Yan, R.-H Hu, Acta Chim. Sinica 40, 713 (1982).
- ¹¹² T. I. Gromova, R. I. Smolyanets, S. V. Rudakova, M. V. Lyubarskii, Zh. Fiz. Khim. 63, 1784 (1989).
- ¹¹³ R. Sabbah, A. Rojas Aguilar, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 27, 685 (1995).
- ¹¹⁴ R. C. Santos, H. P. Diogo, M. E. Minas da Piedade, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 31, 1417 (1999).
- ¹¹⁵ R. Sabbah, A. Rojas Aguilar, Struct. Chem. 7, 383 (1996).

- ¹¹⁶ F. M. Zhang, G. D. Xu, S. S. Qu, Acta Chim. Sinica 48, 38 (1990).
- ¹¹⁷ L. Smith, Acta Chem. Scand. 10, 884 (1956).

¹¹⁸ M. A. V. Ribeiro da Silva, M. L. C. C. H. Ferrao, A. M. R. O. Alves da Silva, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 27, 633 (1995)

- ¹¹⁹ R. Sabbah, A. Rojas Aguilar, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 28, 1071 (1996).
- ¹²⁰ K. J. Karlsson, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Lund, Sweden (1941).
- ¹²¹ Z.-C Tan, R. Sabbah, Sci. China, Ser. B 37, 641 (1994).
- ¹²² Z.-C Tan, R. Sabbah, Thermochim. Acta 231, 109 (1994).
- ¹²³ R. Sabbah, H. Hirtz, Bull. Soc. Chim. Fr. 127, 26 (1991).
- ¹²⁴ F. A. Adedeji, D. L. S. Brown, J. A. Connor, M. L. Leung, I. M. Paz-Andrade, H. A. Skinner, J. Organomet. Chem. 97, 221 (1975).
- ¹²⁵ M. A. V. Ribeiro da Silva, J. M. S. Fonseca, R. P. B. M. Carvalho, M. J. S. Monte, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 37, 271, (2005).
- ¹²⁶ M. J. S. Monte, D. M. Hillesheim, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 32, 1727 (2000).
- ¹²⁷ J. D. Cox, H. A. Gundry, D. Harrop, A. J. Head, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 1, 77 (1969).
- ¹²⁸ T. Reschke, K. V. Zherikova, S. P. Verevkin, C. Held, J. Pharm. Sci. 105, 1050 (2016).
- ¹²⁹ K. V. Zherikova, A. A. Svetlov, M. A. Varfolomeev, S. P. Verevkin, C. Held, Fluid Phase Equilib. 409, 399 (2016).
- ¹³⁰ K. V. Zherikova, A. A. Svetlov, N. V. Kuratieva, S. P. Verevkin, Chemosphere 161, 157 (2016).
- ¹³¹ M. R. Holdiness, Thermochim. Acta 68, 375 (1983).
- ¹³² G. Beech, R.M. Lintonbon, Thermochim. Acta 2, 86 (1971).
- ¹³³ G. D. Oliver, M. Eaton, H. M. Huffman, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 70, 1502 (1948).
- ¹³⁴ J. C. van Miltenburg, A. Alvarez-Larena, M. Labrador, L. Palacios, J. Rodriguez-Romero, E. Tauler, E. Estop, Thermochim. Acta 273, 31 (1996).
- ¹³⁵ D. W. Scott, G. B. Guthrie, J. F. Messerly, S. S. Todd, W. T. Berg, I. A. Hossenlopp, J. P. McCullough, J. Phys. Chem. 66, 911 (1962).
- ¹³⁶ D. H. Andrews, G. Lynn, J. Johnston, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 48, 1274 (1926).
- ¹³⁷ R. D. Chirico, S. E. Knipmeyer, A. Nguyen, W. V. Steele, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 25, 1461 (1993).
- ¹³⁸ R. D. Chirico, S. E. Knipmeyer, A. Nguyen, W. V. Steele, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 21, 1307 (1989).
- ¹³⁹ E. J. Prosen, R. Gilmont, F. D. Rossini, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. 34, 65 (1945).
- ¹⁴⁰ W. D. Good, N. K. Smith, J. Chem. Eng. Data 14, 102 (1969).
- ¹⁴¹ W. N. Hubbard, J. W. Knowlton, H. M. Huffman, J. Phys. Chem. 58, 396 (1954).
- ¹⁴² V. P. Kolesov, E. M. Tomareva. S. M. Skuratov, S. P. Alekhin, Zh. Fiz. Khim. 41, 1528 (1967).
- ¹⁴³ K. Hartley, O. Pritchard, H. A. Skinner, Trans. Faraday Soc. 47, 254 (1951).
- ¹⁴⁴ C. L. Chernick, H. A. Skinner, I. Wadsö, Trans. Faraday Soc. 52, 1088 (1956).
- ¹⁴⁵ N. S. Osborne, D. C. Ginnings, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand. 39, 453 (1947).
- ¹⁴⁶ V. Svoboda, F. Vesely, R. Holub, J. Pick, Collect. Czech. Chem. Commun. 38, 3539 (1973).

- ¹⁴⁷ S. S. Todd, I. A. Hossenlopp, D. W. Scott, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 10, 641 (1978).
- ¹⁴⁸ E. W. Lemmon, M. L. Huber, M. O. McLinden, NIST Standard Reference Database 23: Reference Fluid Thermodynamic and Transport Properties-REFPROP, Version 9.1, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Standard Reference Data Program, Gaithersburg (2013).
- ¹⁴⁹ S. P. Verevkin, V. N. Emel'yanenko, M. A. Varfolomeev, B. N. Solomonov, K. V. Zherikova, Fluid Phase Equilib. 380, 67 (2014).
- ¹⁵⁰ B. Ruscic, Active Thermochemical Tables (ATcT) values based on ver. 1.118 of the Thermochemical Network (2015); available at ATcT.anl.gov.
- ¹⁵¹ B. Ruscic, R. E. Pinzon, M. L. Morton, G. von Laszewski, S. Bittner, S. G. Nijsure, K. A. Amin, M. Minkoff, A. F. Wagner, J. Phys. Chem. A 108, 9979 (2004).
- ¹⁵² B. Ruscic, R. E. Pinzon, G. von Laszewski, D. Kodeboyina, A. Burcat, D. Leahy, D. Montoya, A. F. Wagner, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. 16, 561 (2005).
- ¹⁵³ S. E. Wheeler, K. N. Houk, P. v. R. Schleyer, W. D. Allen, J. Am. Chem. Soc. (2009) 131, 2547 (2009).
- ¹⁵⁴ M. Balcan, S. Arzik, T. Altunata, Thermochim. Acta 278, 49 (1996).
- ¹⁵⁵ G. B. Arrowsmith, G. H. Jeffery, A. I. Vogel, J. Chem. Soc. 2072 (1965).
- ¹⁵⁶ A. I. Vogel, J. Chem. Soc. 644 (1948).
- ¹⁵⁷ S. P. Verevkin, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 35, 1237 (2003).
- ¹⁵⁸ M. S. Khanna, S. C. Khetarpal, K. Lal, H. L. Bhatnagar, Indian J. Chem., Sect A 20, 544 (1981).
- ¹⁵⁹ D. M. Speros, F. D. Rossini, J. Phys. Chem. 64, 1723 (1960).
- ¹⁶⁰ D. J. Coleman, G. Pilcher, Trans. Faraday Soc. 62, 821 (1966).
- ¹⁶¹ K. Ruzicka, M. Fulem, V. Ruzicka, J. Chem. Eng. Data 50, 1956 (2005).
- ¹⁶² J. C. van Miltenburg, M. L. Verdonk, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 23, 273 (1991).
- ¹⁶³ J. S. Chickos, D. G. Hesse, J. F. Liebman, Struct. Chem. 4, 261 (1993).
- ¹⁶⁴ E. S. Domalski, E. D. Hearing, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 17, 1637 (1988).
- ¹⁶⁵ P. Umnahanant, D. Hasty, J. Chickos, J. Pharm. Sci. 101, 2045 (2012).
- ¹⁶⁶ S. K. Kang, E. T. Samulski, Liq. Cryst. 27, 371 (2000).
- ¹⁶⁷ N. B. Singh, T. Agrawal, P. Gupta, S. S. Das, J. Chem. Eng. Data 54, 1529 (2009).
- ¹⁶⁸ Z.-C. Tan, L.-X. Sun, S.-H. Meng, L. Li, F. Xu, P. Yu, B. P.-P. Liu, J.-B.Zhang, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 34, 1417 (2002).
- ¹⁶⁹ R. Sabbah, L. El Watik, J. Therm. Anal. 38, 855 (1992).
- ¹⁷⁰ R. J. L. Andon, J. E. Connett, Thermochim. Acta 42, 241 (1980).
- ¹⁷¹ J. P. McCullough, H. L. Finke, J. F. Messerly, S. S. Todd, T. C. Kincheloe, G. Waddington, J. Phys. Chem. 61, 1105 (1957).
- ¹⁷² R. D. Chirico, S. E. Knipmeyer, W. V. Steele, J. Chem. Thermodyn. 34, 1873 (2002).
- ¹⁷³ N. B. Chanh, Y. Haget, A. Meresse, D. Louer, R. Shirley, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 42, 217 (1981).
- ¹⁷⁴ M. J. S. Monte, A. R. R. P. Almeida, J. F. Liebman, Chemosphere 138, 478 (2015).
- ¹⁷⁵ S. P. Verevkin, V. N. Emelyanenko, M. A. Varfolomeev, B. N. Solomonov, K. V. Zherikova, S. V. Melkhanova, J. Phys. Chem. B 118, 14479 (2014)₈₉