

A Big Data Framework to Validate Thermodynamic Data for Chemical Species

Philipp Buerger¹, Jethro Akroyd^{1,2},

Jacob W. Martin¹, Markus Kraft^{1,2}

released: 11 July 2016

¹ Department of Chemical Engineering
and Biotechnology
University of Cambridge
New Museums Site
Pembroke Street
Cambridge, CB2 3RA
United Kingdom
E-mail: mk306@cam.ac.uk

² Cambridge Centre for Carbon Reduction
in Chemical Technologies (CARES C4T),
#05-05 CREATE Tower,
1 CREATE Way,
Singapore 1386029

Preprint No. 171



Keywords: enthalpy of formation, heat of formation, error-cancelling balanced reactions, big data, validation

Edited by

Computational Modelling Group
Department of Chemical Engineering and Biotechnology
University of Cambridge
New Museums Site
Pembroke Street
Cambridge CB2 3RA
United Kingdom

Fax: + 44 (0)1223 334796


E-Mail: c4e@cam.ac.uk

World Wide Web: <http://como.cheng.cam.ac.uk/>



Abstract

The advent of large sets of chemical and thermodynamic data has enabled the rapid investigation of increasingly complex systems. The challenge, however, is how to validate such large databases. We propose an automated framework to solve this problem by identifying which data are reliable and recommending what future experiments or calculations are required. The framework is applied to validate data for the standard enthalpy of formation for 920 gas-phase hydrocarbon species retrieved from the NIST Chemistry WebBook. The concept of error-cancelling balanced reactions is used to calculate a distribution of possible values for the standard enthalpy of formation of each species. The method automates the identification and exclusion of unreliable data. We find that this enables the rapid convergence of the calculations towards chemical accuracy. The method can exploit knowledge of the structural similarities between species and the reliability of the data to identify which species introduce the most error and recommend what future experiments and calculations should be considered.



Highlights:

- Automated global cross-validation of large data sets of thermodynamic data.
- Evaluated reliability of the standard enthalpies of formation for 920 gas-phase hydrocarbon-based species.
- Informed estimate of the standard enthalpy of formation is calculated using error-cancelling-balanced reactions.
- Automated identification and exclusion of unreliable data.
- Rapid convergence of the calculations towards chemical accuracy.
- Recommend future experiments and calculations for unreliable species.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Methodology	4
3	Results	6
3.1	Selection of error-cancelling balanced reactions by constrained optimization	6
3.2	Global cross-validation	6
3.3	Discussion	8
4	Conclusions	10
A	Appendix	12
A.1	Literature data	12
A.2	Reference data and validation status	13
	References	29

1 Introduction

The availability of large sets of chemical and thermodynamic data has enabled the investigation of increasingly complex reaction systems. For example, the Reaction Mechanism Generator [24, 30] automates the generation of chemical mechanisms for gas-phase systems containing carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, sulfur and nitrogen. Other approaches have been used to develop models for the gas-phase chemistry of common precursors for the formation of various nanoparticles [16, 17, 43, 44].

The data sets associated with such tools are widely available via the internet. Some are based on data collated from the literature, for example, Nano [7] and the NIST WebBook [1]. Others are designed to enable benchmarking and comparison of computational methods, for example, the NIST Computational Chemistry Comparison and Benchmark Database [2]. Others exist as repositories for computational and experimental data, for example, the Active Thermochemical Tables [3], PrIME database [8], ReSpecTh information system [9] and MolHub [6, 47].

The availability of so much data presents opportunities and challenges. For example, how do we check which data are reliable? Previous validation has typically been performed at a single-point level, where increasingly accurate methods are applied one-species-at-a-time. This is expensive and becomes intractable for large systems. Methods that exploit the data at a global level, on the other hand, leverage existing knowledge to provide cheaper and potentially more accurate estimates.

This paper considers a global method for the calculation and validation of the standard enthalpies of formation for a large set of gas-phase species. The standard enthalpy of formation is chosen to illustrate the method because it is used in many thermodynamic calculations, and is a key parameter in the development of kinetic mechanisms and understanding the chemistry of novel systems. Any problems in the data could lead to significant errors in the resulting mechanisms.

The estimation of enthalpies of formation using high level electronic structure calculations is computationally demanding. To compound the problem, care must be taken to choose the right level of theory [35, 56, 65], the errors in the method scale with the size of the species [66, 71] and various correction terms are needed to achieve reliable estimates [57]. The calculations become intractable for large molecules [35, 51] and such methods are not suitable for large scale analysis.

Fortunately the errors in electronic structure calculations are systematic. Methods such as bond additivity correction (BAC) [10, 32, 39, 40] and atom additivity correction (AAC) [54] seek to exploit this to cancel the systematic component of the error. Both rely on pre-determined parameters associated with the level of theory used for the electronic structure calculation.

Similarly, error-cancelling balanced reactions (EBRs) seek to exploit structural and electronic similarities between species to cancel the systematic error introduced when using electronic structure calculations to estimate the enthalpy of a species. The method does not introduce any additional parameters and has been applied to a wide variety of systems [see for example 16, 46, 50, 55, 59, 67].

The use of EBRs requires the calculated total electronic energies for all species in the reaction and the enthalpies of formation to be known (either experimentally or otherwise) for all except one species in the reaction, for which the unknown enthalpy of formation is to be estimated. The method requires the identification of suitable balanced reaction(s), given the set of species with known enthalpies of formation. A number of different types of EBRs have been proposed [26–28, 31, 48–50, 68, 70] and shown to be able to estimate the enthalpy of formation on the back of affordable electronic structure calculations.

The purpose of this paper is to present a framework for the systematic calculation and validation of enthalpies of formation using EBRs. The framework is applied to a set of 920 hydrocarbons, including species with oxygen. Reference data for the enthalpy of formation were taken from the NIST Chemistry WebBook [1]. The framework was able to assess the reliability of the reference data. The automatic exclusion of problematic data was shown to reduce significantly the uncertainty in the estimates of the enthalpies of formation, in many cases exceeding chemical accuracy (error ≤ 1.0 kcal mol⁻¹). We demonstrate how the information generated within the framework may be used to suggest what future experiments or computations might be considered to improve the quality of the data, and which methods may be most suitable.

2 Methodology

The framework is outlined in Figure 1. A species set is provided to an automated validation module. The module uses a cheap method, in this case error-cancelling balanced reactions (EBRs), to estimate a thermodynamic property of interest. It differs from traditional validation methods because it uses multiple overlapping subsets of the data, in this case multiple EBRs, to calculate a distribution of values for each species and performs a global cross-validation of the data.




Figure 1: An automated data validation procedure to assess the reliability of experimental, computational and theoretical species data.

In order to demonstrate the framework, we validate data for the standard enthalpy of for-

mation $\Delta_f H_{298.15\text{ K}}^\circ$ of 920 gas-phase hydrocarbons, including species with oxygen, taken from the NIST Chemistry WebBook [1]. We used the 3D geometries provided by NIST as an initial guess and recalculated the ground state geometry, scaled frequencies [41] and total electronic energy of each species using density functional theory (DFT) at the B97-1/6-311+G(d,p) level of theory [14] using Gaussian09 [23]. A simple rigid-rotor harmonic-oscillator approximation was assumed [38].

The EBRs were identified using constrained optimization techniques [20, 29, 60] to find combinations of reactant and product species that conserved structural and electronic similarities across each reaction. The set of species available to the constrained optimization was recursively adjusted to exclude species that had been used in other reactions to ensure the identification of a set of unique EBRs. The constrained optimization was performed using the open-source GNU Linear Programming Kit [5] software library. This has been shown to perform well compared to other open-source solvers [25].

Each EBR is used to calculate the standard enthalpy of formation of a species based on the application of Hess’s Law to the reaction. This is analogous to methods for calculating the enthalpy of formation from experimental measurements of reaction enthalpy. The principle of the method is that systematic components of the error in the electronic structure calculations cancel out across the EBR. The extent to which the errors cancel depends on what properties are being conserved by the choice of EBR [see for example 68]. For ease of presentation, only *isodesmic* reactions [31, 48] are considered in this paper. These conserve the number of each type of bond on each side of the reaction. However, the method is general in the sense that it can be used with any type of EBR [see for example 26–28, 49, 50, 68, 70].

The global cross-validation adapts techniques developed for data mining and statistical analysis [33, 52] to validate the data set. It uses the difference between the calculated data (in this case the standard enthalpies of formation) from multiple EBRs and the corresponding quantity in the reference data to isolate the error contribution from each species in the reference data set. The species with the largest error contributions are iteratively excluded from the calculation, and the cross-validation is repeated to analyse the impact of the excluded species. The algorithm converges rapidly and the exclusion of unreliable data has a strong beneficial impact on the accuracy of the calculated data.

The framework is able to quantify the reliability of data and classify them according to whether or not they are reliable, or whether there is some ambiguity that merits closer examination. The framework is not limited to a single database or data set, and could, in principle, be applied to validate data spread over multiple data sets and multiple locations. The information generated during the validation may be used to suggest what future experiments or computations might be considered to improve the quality of the data, and which methods may be most suitable.

3 Results

3.1 Selection of error-cancelling balanced reactions by constrained optimization

Figure 2 shows example results for the standard enthalpy of formation of butanoic acid calculated using EBRs. The use of constrained optimization to automate the identification of multiple EBRs enables the construction of a histogram. It is clear that methods that rely on a single EBR are extremely risky.




Figure 2: Histogram of the estimated values of the standard enthalpy of formation for butanoic acid ($C_4H_8O_2$). 143 distinct isodesmic reactions were identified. The reference value of $-113.74 \pm 0.96 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ (dashed line) for butanoic acid was taken from the NIST Chemistry WebBook [1]. Outliers giving particular poor estimates are highlighted.

The distribution of values in Figure 2 enables the calculation of a central measure to provide a more accurate estimate of the standard enthalpy of formation. The width of the distribution provides some information about the uncertainty in the estimate. A further improvement can be achieved using techniques such as the Thompson-Tau or modified z-score method to identify and exclude outliers. This is valuable because the species in the reactions that contribute to the outliers are also potentially sources of unreliable reference data. The identification and exclusion of species that contribute to the outliers is automated and exploited by the cross-validation.

3.2 Global cross-validation

Figure 3 (top panel) shows the decrease in the mean absolute error (defined over the full set of reference data) that is achieved by iteratively identifying and excluding unreliable species. The bottom panel shows the number of excluded species at each iteration. The

cross-validation requires the specification of a rejection threshold parameter, x_{rej} . This is the magnitude of the maximum acceptable error for each species. The error is the difference between the calculated data (in this case enthalpy of formation) and the corresponding quantity in the reference data.

The mean absolute error is observed to converge rapidly to an asymptotic value, and the results are shown to be repeatable between independent runs. The asymptotic values of the mean absolute error are significantly less than the rejection threshold for the cases where $x_{\text{rej}} \geq 2.0 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$. However, there are diminishing returns as the rejection threshold is decreased. This is because we reduce the number of possible EBRs as we reject more species, such that we start to lose the statistical benefits of using multiple EBRs. A mean absolute error of $\approx 1.2 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ is achieved for a rejection threshold of $x_{\text{rej}} = 1.0 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$.




Figure 3: The mean absolute error (top panel) and the number of excluded species (bottom panel) for rejection thresholds of $x_{\text{rej}} = 3.0, 2.0,$ and $1.0 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$. The results were averaged over ten independent runs. The lines show the mean values. The shaded areas show the standard deviation. An example of a reliable species (styrene), a potentially unreliable species (ethyl cyclopentane) and an unreliable species (3-benzylphenol) identified by the cross-validation are shown.

There is an analogous trade-off when choosing the class of EBR. A more restrictive class should give more accurate results for each individual EBR [68, 69]. However, the more restrictive the class, the fewer EBRs are available and the less we benefit from the statistics of using multiple EBRs.

The panels at the side of Figure 3 shows example output from the cross-validation. Styrene

is classified as reliable because there is only $0.21 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ error between the calculated and reference values of the standard enthalpy of formation. Ethyl cyclopentane is classified as potentially unreliable because the $1.99 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ error is similar to the error that might be expected from the B97-1/6-311+G(d,p) level of theory used in the calculation. It cannot be determined whether the discrepancy is due to the level of theory or an issue with the reference data. 3-benzylphenol is classified as unreliable because the $14.57 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ error exceeds what might be expected from the level of theory. It is likely that there is an issue with the reference data, and in fact, Verevkin [61] and Miranda et al. [42] showed some evidence of discrepancies for related phenols from the same original experiment [12].

Detailed results for styrene, ethyl cyclopentane and 3-benzylphenol are shown in Figure 4. In each case, the standard deviation of the estimated standard enthalpy of formation is observed to decrease significantly as we exclude outliers and unreliable species. The histograms show tight distributions, and good agreement with the reference data for styrene. The reference data for ethyl cyclopentane is just within one standard deviation of the median when using the full data set, but falls outside this criteria as the outliers and unreliable species are removed, again suggesting that ethyl cyclopentane is worthy of further scrutiny. The reference data for 3-benzylphenol is nowhere close to the calculated values, and is considered to be unreliable as discussed above.


The scatter plots in Figure 4 (bottom panel) show that there is often significant scatter in the literature data. This is of course expected. The availability of the distribution of estimated values enables an assessment of the reference data. The framework automates this process and is able to select the reference data that it deems most likely to be accurate, and allows the identification of data that may be less reliable and that merit further consideration. The analysis can be taken further and used to identify which methods may be appropriate for a particular species. For example, the clustering of the data imply that composite methods should be considered over DFT methods for styrene, and that group additivity methods¹ may be a suitable choice for 3-benzylphenol.

3.3 Discussion

A critical element of the framework is the method used to calculate the quantity of interest. In this paper, we use EBRs to exploit the similarities between a set of species to calculate the standard enthalpy of formation of one species from the set. The fact that we use multiple EBRs and that each EBR uses a set of species enables the framework to isolate and quantify the error due to each species. In principle, the framework is general and is not limited to EBRs. It could be used with any calculation that shares these properties. In abstract terms, it could be used with any calculation that permits the ability to use multiple overlapping subsets of the reference data to calculate a given quantity of interest.

It is proposed to make the framework available as a web application. The concept is

¹The group additivity calculations were performed *post hoc*. The data did not form part of the original reference data. The calculations were performed using the methods proposed by Benson and Buss [11] and Joback and Reid [34] as currently implemented by the NIST Chemistry WebBook [1] and Cheméo [4].



Error cancelling balanced reactions method using a full reference data set

35.20 ± **4.18** kcal mol⁻¹ -32.71 ± **2.57** kcal mol⁻¹ -3.35 ± **3.77** kcal mol⁻¹

Revised estimate having excluded outliers

35.36 ± **0.82** kcal mol⁻¹ -32.66 ± **1.32** kcal mol⁻¹ -3.27 ± **1.53** kcal mol⁻¹

Revised estimate having excluded unreliable reference species

35.32 ± **0.57** kcal mol⁻¹ -32.36 ± **1.14** kcal mol⁻¹ -2.89 ± **0.70** kcal mol⁻¹




Figure 4: Detailed results for styrene, ethyl cyclopentane and 3-benzylphenol. The text gives the median and standard deviation of the estimated standard enthalpies of formation using the full reference data set, after excluding outliers and after excluding unreliable species. The histograms show the distributions of the estimated values of the standard enthalpy of formation using the full reference data set. The scatter plots compare the results (after excluding unreliable species) with literature data [1, 4, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 34, 36, 37, 45, 51, 53, 54, 54, 58, 62–64, 71]. Full details are provided as Supplementary Material.

illustrated in Figure 5. The application would allow users to upload and validate their data, and would be linked to databases, for example MolHub [6], that allow the easy

storage and retrieval of computational chemistry data.




Figure 5: Conceptual illustration of the cross-validation web application. Each tile shows a species. The tiles are grouped according to the degree of similarity with neighbouring species and are coloured to indicate the results of the validation. Pop-up windows provide detailed information about the validation and reference data, and recommended methods to improve the quality of the data.

A colour code is used to indicate the results of the validation. Species are organised based on structural similarity, with species showing the highest degree of similarity appearing closest to each other. For each species, users are able to access the results of the cross-validation as per Figure 2 and see an overview of the available experimental and theoretical data, together with links to view the data in more detail.

In the case of unreliable species, for example 3-benzylphenol in this case, it is envisaged that the ability to identify which methods worked well for reliable species (as per the scatter plots in Figure 4) and knowledge of the structural similarities between species could be combined to recommend what methods may be most suitable for similar unreliable species. This could be to suggest what future experiments or computations might be considered to improve the quality of the data.

4 Conclusions

This paper demonstrates the application of a new framework to validate large sets of thermochemical data for chemical species. The framework implements a global cross-validation method that compares calculated values to corresponding quantities from a reference data set. The cross-validation enables the framework to assess the reliability of the reference data.

The framework may be used with any calculation that uses multiple overlapping subsets of the reference data to calculate the quantity of interest. The demonstration in this paper uses error-cancelling balanced reactions (EBRs) to validate data for the standard enthalpy of formation of 920 gas-phase hydrocarbons, including species containing oxygen, from the NIST Chemistry WebBook [1].

The EBRs were systematically identified using constrained optimization and the electronic structures of all species calculated using DFT at the B97-1/6-311+G(d,p) level of theory. There is a trade-off between the rejection threshold required by the global cross-validation and the accuracy of the calculated standard enthalpies of formation. The accuracy of calculations improves asymptotically at the expense of excluding more data as being unreliable as the rejection threshold is tightened.

The framework offers many important advantages. Firstly, it calculates a distribution of estimates for each species. The width of the distribution provides a measure of the uncertainty in the estimate, whilst the median provides a better estimate than would be obtained from a single sample from the distribution. Secondly, it identifies outliers and unreliable reference data, and significantly improves the estimate by excluding these data. Thirdly, it is able to quantify the reliability of the species and recommend which ones should be investigated to most improve the data set.

It is proposed to make the cross-validation framework available as a web application. The application would allow users to upload and validate their data, and should be linked to databases that enable the easy storage and retrieval of computational chemistry data. This paper shows how the web application would recommend which *species* should be investigated to most improve the data set, and also how the structural similarities between species might be exploited to suggest which *methods* should be considered for these investigations. Full details of the methods used by the framework will be published in future work.

Acknowledgements

This project is partly funded by the National Research Foundation (NRF), Prime Minister's Office, Singapore under its Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise (CREATE) programme. The authors thank Huntsman Pigments and Additives for financial support.

A Appendix

A.1 Literature data

Table 1: Standard enthalpy of formation data reported on the scatter plots in Figure 4.

Index	$\Delta_f H_{298.15\text{ K}}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	Reference
<i>Styrene</i>		
1	35.11 ± 0.24	[1]
2	36.21	[1]
3	31.43 ± 0.96	[1]
4	-3.61	[1]
5	35.35	[37]
6	35.64 ± 1.91	[18]
7	35.35 ± 0.36	[45]
8	35.30 ± 0.2	[36]
9	35.33 ± 0.41	[19, 54]
10	35.22	[62]
11	35.92	[51]
12	35.31	[71]
13	35.85	[58]
14	33.07	[13]
15	32.53	[54]
16	35.47	[54]
17	46.01	[71]
18	37.51	[71]
19	40.41	[71]
20	28.71	[71]
21	23.09	[54]
22	14.99	[54]
23	36.04	[54]
24	35.47	[54]
25	35.13	This work
26	36.69	This work
27	34.90	[64]
28	33.20	[63]
29	34.25	[22]
30	34.29	[22]
31	38.72	[53]
32	34.56	[53]
33	39.19	[53]
34	35.36	[53]
35	39.04	[53]
36	35.50	[53]
37	68.26	[62]
<i>Ethyl cyclopentane</i>		
1	-30.37 ± 0.25	[1]
2	-30.93	[1]
3	-30.33	[37]
4	-30.37	[62]
5	-30.34	[53]
6	-30.33	[21]
7	-30.37	[21]
8	-30.30 ± 0.2	[36]
9	-30.38	[15]
10	-30.11	[15]
11	-29.64	This work
12	-30.43	This work
13	-37.94	[21]
14	-40.31	[53]
15	-32.46	[53]
16	-34.89	[53]
17	-32.03	[53]

Table 2 Continued:

Index	$\Delta_f H_{298.15\text{ K}}^\circ$ kcal mol ⁻¹	Reference
18	-36.59	[53]
19	-32.30	[53]
20	-37.08	[62]
<i>3-Benzylphenol</i>		
1	11.68	[1]
2	-3.11	This work
3	-3.80	This work

A.2 Reference data and validation status

Table 2: Reference data and validation status. The calculations were performed using a rejection threshold of $x_{rej} = 1.0$ kcal mol⁻¹ and were set to exclude unreliable species. The reliability is assessed using the absolute error for each species, ϵ .

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15\text{ K}}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
<i>Reliable ($\epsilon \leq 1.0$ kcal mol⁻¹)</i>		
637-92-3	-75.05	-75.07 ± 0.59
15269-17-7	-61.42	-60.57 ± 0.56
776-35-2	36.95	35.98 ± 0.77
1779-19-7	-111.66	-111.06 ± 1.21
513-35-9	-9.92	-9.96 ± 0.5
2175-91-9	34.42	34.16 ± 0.46
287-13-8	45.65	46.03 ± 1.09
129-00-0	53.94	54.09 ± 1.34
2913-24-8	30.93	31.54 ± 1.27
105-67-9	-38.96	-38.12 ± 0.54
109-99-9	-44.02	-44.56 ± 0.62
590-18-1	-1.84	-2.07 ± 0.47
700-12-9	-13.79	-13.93 ± 0.83
619-99-8	-50.41	-49.58 ± 1.32
54105-66-7	-85.42	-85.83 ± 2.87
38451-18-2	26.1	26.52 ± 0.46
92-51-3	-51.46	-51.81 ± 1.58
20184-89-8	10.04	9.91 ± 0.39
589-55-9	-84.8	-84.87 ± 0.86
71-36-3	-66.2	-65.85 ± 0.46
612-71-5	88.86	89.04 ± 2.13
27805-84-1	-94.41	-95.26 ± 0.85
98-83-9	28.27	28.39 ± 0.82
590-73-8	-53.7	-52.9 ± 1.19
97-99-4	-88.19	-88.82 ± 0.72
592-13-2	-53.2	-54.18 ± 1.07
115-11-7	-4.28	-3.82 ± 0.48
1125-88-8	-59.5	-58.63 ± 1.44
142-29-0	7.79	6.99 ± 0.42
208-96-8	61.66	61.49 ± 0.72
28375-86-2	-37.6	-38.26 ± 2.8
1795-27-3	-51.48	-51.4 ± 0.96
821-07-8	40.15	39.72 ± 0.93
101-81-5	38.79	38.94 ± 0.99
75-65-0	-74.02	-73.26 ± 0.34
57595-39-8	3.11	4.02 ± 0.66
20184-91-2	10.04	9.8 ± 0.78
463-82-1	-39.67	-39.65 ± 0.61
21145-79-9	25.33	26.2 ± 0.45
931-87-3	-5.43	-5.93 ± 0.49

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
71-43-2	19.1	18.51 ± 0.47
108-87-2	-38.22	-38.05 ± 0.98
691-37-2	-11.82	-11.53 ± 0.57
115-10-6	-44	-44.72 ± 0.51
271-89-6	3.25	2.42 ± 0.79
5194-51-4	10.52	10.04 ± 0.56
542-92-7	31.88	31.93 ± 0.45
111-84-2	-54.57	-55.36 ± 1.06
544-25-2	44.69	44.49 ± 0.5
111-29-5	-106.24	-106.36 ± 0.92
21962-24-3	-72.42	-72.48 ± 0.13
694-35-9	-2.96	-3.5 ± 0.82
563-16-6	-52.61	-51.67 ± 1.29
527-53-7	-10.33	-9.96 ± 0.69
7688-21-3	-11.23	-11.14 ± 0.23
5019-82-9	-52.1	-52.44 ± 0.95
109-67-1	-5.26	-4.63 ± 0.48
643-58-3	36.52	36.63 ± 0.94
616-12-6	-15.18	-14.52 ± 0.52
108-46-3	-65.73	-65.04 ± 1.14
14686-14-7	-17.5	-17.47 ± 0.75
460-12-8	110.9	111.57 ± 2.01
71-23-8	-61.19	-61.23 ± 0.3
1942-46-7	4.47	4.12 ± 0.29
2628-57-1	24.62	24 ± 0.82
20379-99-1	-65.77	-65.03 ± 0.12
628-28-4	-61.69	-62.2 ± 0.3
112-95-8	-108.94	-109.17 ± 1.84
110-83-8	-1.7	-2.49 ± 0.77
873-49-4	36.02	36.84 ± 0.59
195-19-7	69.6	69.42 ± 1.13
2384-70-5	5.64	5.36 ± 0.44
497-38-1	-40.77	-40.64 ± 1.71
91-64-5	-42.26	-42.23 ± 1.04
592-57-4	25	25.27 ± 0.45
544-76-3	-89.6	-90.4 ± 2.16
4096-95-1	37.76	37.81 ± 0.62
488-23-3	-8.6	-8.4 ± 0.99
6443-92-1	-16.9	-17.57 ± 0.65
646-06-0	-72.11	-71.39 ± 0.31
78-84-2	-51.72	-51.88 ± 0.34
1119-65-9	20.27	19.51 ± 0.46
569-41-5	26	26.15 ± 0.79
71-41-0	-71.22	-71.96 ± 0.44
86-73-7	42.23	42.88 ± 0.97
111869-26-2	56.41	55.66 ± 0.39
104-51-8	-3.3	-3.96 ± 0.56
67-63-0	-65.08	-65.05 ± 0.34
142-96-1	-79.83	-80.34 ± 0.97
112-05-0	-138.5	-139.17 ± 0.67
33415-52-0	-63.38	-63.09 ± 1.29
120-12-7	53.3	53 ± 0.81
503-74-2	-120.1	-120.2 ± 1.39
108-10-1	-69.6	-69.17 ± 0.35
592-41-6	-10.04	-10.66 ± 0.56
111-70-6	-81.26	-81.03 ± 0.65
7319-00-8	17.69	18.31 ± 0.75
3170-83-0	0.5	0.17 ± 71.97
142-68-7	-53.49	-53.96 ± 0.68
592-76-7	-15.22	-16.11 ± 0.75
2612-46-6	41.11	41.34 ± 0.85
95-93-2	-11.21	-11.21 ± 0.73
285-67-6	-23.21	-23.76 ± 1.09

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
1079-71-6	-8.89	-9.6 ± 1.21
628-41-1	26.05	25.76 ± 0.42
689-97-4	70.51	71.34 ± 0.85
764-35-2	25.74	25.03 ± 0.34
646-04-8	-7.65	-8.15 ± 0.5
35946-91-9	-57.6	-57.94 ± 0.86
87-66-1	-103.78	-102.86 ± 1.64
82834-02-4	37.05	37.14 ± 0.53
536-66-3	-91.47	-90.68 ± 1.4
95-63-6	-3.32	-3.84 ± 0.75
100-51-6	-22.61	-22.39 ± 0.4
123-72-8	-50.62	-50.3 ± 0.49
21145-78-8	25.57	25.8 ± 0.64
111-43-3	-71.46	-70.96 ± 0.51
627-20-3	-6.69	-6.8 ± 0.56
5194-50-3	11.47	11.37 ± 0.5
832-64-4	46.8	46.55 ± 0.53
3463-81-8	45.41	44.7 ± 1.01
92-94-4	66.68	66.2 ± 1.35
131-11-3	-144.86	-144.83 ± 2.75
103-73-1	-24.28	-24.8 ± 0.96
108-39-4	-31.62	-30.98 ± 0.69
1487-15-6	-31.12	-31.03 ± 0.9
64-18-6	-90.42	-90.39 ± 1.47
593-45-3	-99.09	-99.56 ± 1.56
629-62-9	-84.8	-85.35 ± 1.22
111-66-0	-19.82	-19.37 ± 0.49
141-32-2	-91.09	-90.97 ± 1.11
1459-93-4	-150.57	-151.17 ± 2.1
563-80-4	-62.76	-63.38 ± 0.36
2097470	-11.52	-11.92 ± 0.54
105-37-3	-111.5	-112.43 ± 0.94
135-98-8	-4.16	-3.98 ± 0.79
673-32-5	64.1	64.85 ± 1.57
280-33-1	-23.67	-23.44 ± 1.04
116-53-0	-118.4	-118.99 ± 1.19
106-99-0	26.74	26.96 ± 0.49
3146-39-2	-12.88	-12.39 ± 1.44
100-66-3	-17.95	-17.7 ± 1.16
75-07-0	-40.8	-40.73 ± 0.11
18362-97-5	-130.26	-129.54 ± 1.07
75-56-9	-22.63	-23.38 ± 0.18
609-26-7	-50.48	-49.64 ± 1.09
84194-54-7	55.45	54.86 ± 0.55
10100-95-5	-90.97	-89.99 ± 0.97
6032-29-7	-74.74	-74.09 ± 0.48
85-01-8	48.09	47.96 ± 0.73
114546-62-2	134.27	134.6 ± 4.13
13757-43-2	-7.46	-6.94 ± 1.04
123-07-9	-34.49	-35.13 ± 0.72
112-47-0	-128.54	-129.21 ± 1.66
107-21-1	-92.61	-91.75 ± 0.71
5661-80-3	-31.09	-30.18 ± 1.03
79-10-7	-77.61	-77.51 ± 0.25
136630-10-9	23.11	23.58 ± 1.28
64-17-5	-55.93	-56.45 ± 0.66
14686-13-6	-18.02	-18.25 ± 0.68
2586-89-2	19.79	19.79 ± 0.73
959-02-4	53.75	53.39 ± 0.6
135-19-3	-7.17	-8.02 ± 0.63
281-23-2	-31.93	-31.57 ± 1.01
53-70-3	78.39	79.33 ± 2.49
108-94-1	-53.94	-53.36 ± 0.4

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
109-52-4	-117.35	-117.71 ± 0.52
4170-30-3	-25.55	-25.68 ± 0.67
2809-67-8	15.25	14.42 ± 0.25
96-22-0	-62.26	-62.5 ± 0.34
110-00-9	-8.29	-8.37 ± 1.29
50861-26-2	88.43	87.55 ± 1.99
22292-76-8	-61.9	-62.7 ± 0.61
2529-39-7	-95.29	-95.15 ± 1.12
15232-76-5	14.94	14.56 ± 0
19693-75-5	-115.49	-115.87 ± 1.65
822-35-5	37.52	36.52 ± 0.4
4912-92-9	-0.38	-0.23 ± 0.71
16456-33-0	0.86	0.61 ± 0.75
57-55-6	-102.72	-101.74 ± 1.03
78-93-3	-57.05	-57.33 ± 0.39
15706-73-7	-133.58	-132.6 ± 0.99
2384-86-3	4.76	4.8 ± 0.37
922-62-3	-14.79	-14.52 ± 0.52
107-88-0	-103.49	-104.26 ± 1.32
14803-42-0	-0.24	0.01 ± 0.4
931-64-6	4.88	5.53 ± 0.45
4125-18-2	20.7	21.03 ± 0.76
106-98-9	-0.15	-0.21 ± 0.26
628-71-7	24.81	24.97 ± 0.04
3741-00-2	-45.15	-45.28 ± 1.5
23057-36-5	17.59	18.15 ± 0.35
2443-46-1	75.29	75.42 ± 0.7
108-95-2	-23.05	-23.38 ± 0.48
1462-03-9	-67.95	-67.49 ± 0.74
96-14-0	-41.01	-41.15 ± 0.97
142-62-1	-122.37	-122.98 ± 1.65
1795-22-8	-89.48	-89.57 ± 2.99
598-75-4	-75.62	-75.39 ± 0.43
567104	14.89	15.5 ± 0.13
136846-72-5	85.8	84.99 ± 0.67
16782-44-8	36.81	36.18 ± 1.29
108055-42-1	-150.72	-150 ± 2.15
14596-92-0	14.1	14.84 ± 0.72
60-29-7	-60.4	-60.34 ± 0.15
22791-95-3	-57.6	-57.42 ± 0.86
14252-05-2	-52.82	-52.16 ± 0.15
106623-85-2	-5.5	-5.45 ± 1.07
584-94-1	-51.12	-50.9 ± 1.2
1574-40-9	61.66	61.58 ± 0.55
98-82-8	0.93	0.86 ± 0.99
629-73-2	-59.58	-59.94 ± 1.52
111-14-8	-128.23	-128.4 ± 1.18
4050-45-7	-13.34	-13.25 ± 0.52
99-06-9	-112.12	-113.06 ± 1.39
198-55-0	76.08	75.72 ± 2.17
111-27-3	-75.53	-76.12 ± 0.59
502-44-3	-94.65	-94.79 ± 0.04
110-49-6	-136.85	-136.14 ± 1.94
107-87-9	-61.93	-62.5 ± 0.36
106-42-3	4.28	3.37 ± 0.64
6921-35-3	-35.42	-36.16 ± 0.27
563-46-2	-8.32	-8.1 ± 0.5
557-17-5	-56.89	-56.99 ± 0.22
118-90-1	-76.63	-76.78 ± 1.49
50-00-0	-25.96	-25.32 ± 0.58
5502-88-5	-26.48	-26.21 ± 0.29
124-07-2	-133.03	-133.47 ± 0.75
6746-94-7	69.79	70.36 ± 1.61

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
292-64-8	-30.14	-29.58 ± 1.45
91-57-6	25.38	25.52 ± 0.43
872-05-9	-29.78	-29.82 ± 0.78
3404-63-5	15.2	15.3 ± 0.85
2146-38-5	-5.98	-6.9 ± 0.75
6108-61-8	12.43	12.56 ± 0.45
591-76-4	-46.89	-47.15 ± 1.06
107-92-6	-113.74	-113.31 ± 0.64
123-31-9	-63.79	-63.55 ± 0.57
100-42-5	35.11	35.32 ± 0.57
538-93-2	-5.14	-5.78 ± 0.69
10588-10-0	-135.99	-135.07 ± 1.83
488-17-5	-71.53	-72.38 ± 1.14
620-14-4	-0.45	-0.76 ± 0.52
19074-25-0	36.33	36.47 ± 1.1
503-17-3	35.37	35.22 ± 0.67
25415-77-4	-106.84	-106.28 ± 1.19
505-22-6	-80.88	-81.08 ± 1.07
611-14-3	0.29	-0.25 ± 0.43
109-87-5	-83.22	-84.21 ± 0.66
286-43-1	-4.06	-4.01 ± 0.97
540-67-0	-51.72	-50.89 ± 0.32
3806-59-5	20.1	19.57 ± 0.58
2465-56-7	92.35	91.87 ± 9.66
10514-79-1	11.81	10.83 ± 0.74
2040-96-2	-35.4	-36.16 ± 1.22
217-59-4	64.56	64.25 ± 0.99
79-29-8	-42.5	-41.75 ± 0.98
760-21-4	-13.4	-12.48 ± 0.55
108-30-5	-126.17	-126.21 ± 1.11
109-94-4	-95.12	-94.76 ± 1.13
565-80-0	-74.4	-73.92 ± 0.55
61886-71-3	23.45	22.9 ± 0.48
78-78-4	-36.93	-37.61 ± 0.54
6863-58-7	-86.28	-85.5 ± 0.89
2716-23-6	-52.1	-52.56 ± 0.42
589-34-4	-46.1	-46.84 ± 0.79
497-26-7	-83.65	-83.15 ± 1.61
107-18-6	-29.54	-29.04 ± 0.76
71032-66-1	-11.74	-11.65 ± 1.12
74-85-1	12.54	13.17 ± 0.58
137-32-6	-72.18	-72.12 ± 0.54
96-48-0	-90.27	-89.53 ± 0.99
3635-95-8	55.21	55.31 ± 0.83
5343-92-0	-111.16	-110.44 ± 0.24
75-21-8	-12.58	-13.39 ± 0.15
1942-45-6	14.36	14.49 ± 0.22
526-73-8	-2.29	-2.36 ± 0.43
108-83-8	-85.49	-86.35 ± 1.07
119-61-9	11.93	12.43 ± 2.81
622-76-4	59.42	59.13 ± 2.75
5597-89-7	-16.01	-16.67 ± 0.76
764-93-2	10.01	9.59 ± 0.06
278-74-0	-12.88	-12.27 ± 1.3
1955-45-9	-84.3	-85 ± 0.79
500-00-5	-26.58	-25.78 ± 0.73
2785-98-0	-138.29	-138.05 ± 2.01
28304-67-8	35.95	35.12 ± 0.45
1120-56-5	25.33	26.02 ± 0.62
592-42-7	20.32	20.89 ± 0.75
624-64-6	-2.58	-3.33 ± 0.26
56-81-5	-138.12	-138.06 ± 2.84
504-63-2	-97.61	-97.8 ± 1.43

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
1638-26-2	-33.05	-33.23 ± 1.06
106-44-5	-29.97	-30.5 ± 0.58
103-29-7	32.41	32.75 ± 1.09
123-54-6	-89.89	-89.18 ± 0
286-08-8	0.48	1.29 ± 0.87
3635-94-7	57.12	58 ± 1.09
108-68-9	-38.62	-38.63 ± 0.5
38795-15-2	34.89	34.01 ± 0.84
105-57-7	-108.41	-108.02 ± 0.82
1795-16-0	-80.52	-80.92 ± 2.49
275-51-4	66.92	66.83 ± 0.84
3451-55-6	85.11	84.88 ± 0.62
78-83-1	-67.61	-67.65 ± 0.49
19447-29-1	10.42	9.82 ± 0.41
2417-88-1	0.74	1.63 ± 0.87
31561-59-8	101.24	101.7 ± 1.87
157-33-5	51.86	52.58 ± 0.45
1453-24-3	-15.2	-15.01 ± 1.03
110-54-3	-39.96	-39.96 ± 0.87
563-45-1	-6.09	-5.46 ± 0.48
123-38-6	-45.55	-45.42 ± 0.5
13269-52-8	-12.31	-12.65 ± 0.41
827-52-1	-3.99	-4.55 ± 0.92
581-40-8	18.19	18.37 ± 0.86
141-79-7	-44.1	-44.73 ± 0.96
1634-04-4	-67.45	-66.96 ± 0.34
278-06-8	77.68	76.81 ± 0.33
928-49-4	25.19	25.29 ± 0.01
613-33-2	26.6	26.27 ± 1.01
121-98-2	-103.49	-103.54 ± 1.01
108-20-3	-76	-76.22 ± 0.73
2384-85-2	5.21	4.25 ± 0.02
123-51-3	-72.01	-72.15 ± 0.57
64-19-7	-103.49	-103.62 ± 1.44
2409-55-4	-49.47	-49.69 ± 0.91
574-00-5	-47.92	-48.05 ± 1.27
115-07-1	4.88	4.61 ± 0.52
107-83-5	-41.66	-41.92 ± 0.93
15892-23-6	-69.96	-68.98 ± 0.33
149-57-5	-133.72	-133.74 ± 1.03
700-56-1	-36.19	-36.04 ± 1.04
108-88-3	11.47	11.13 ± 0.55
74-82-8	-17.54	-17.64 ± 0.52
2566-57-6	28.44	28.87 ± 0.42
764-13-6	-4.59	-4.17 ± 0.68
107-31-3	-86.52	-85.93 ± 0.92
2004-70-8	18.11	18.7 ± 0.54
23057-35-4	11.9	12.16 ± 0.39
123-91-1	-76	-75.81 ± 0.83
96-41-3	-58.05	-58.02 ± 0.63
493-02-7	-43.55	-44.28 ± 1.21
554-61-0	5.98	6.74 ± 0.34
<i>Potentially unreliable (1.0 < ε ≤ 3.0 kcal mol⁻¹)</i>		
1981-80-2	40.87	39.69 ± 4.5
67-64-1	-52.22	-53.26 ± 0.5
124-13-0	-69.77	-70.9 ± 0.69
2532-58-3	-31.93	-34.52 ± 1.1
452-86-8	-71.32	-72.46 ± 1.24
83-32-9	37.28	34.95 ± 0.51
25093-48-5	37.52	39.9 ± 0.78
1105650	33.39	34.93 ± 0.55
100-09-4	-108.01	-109.22 ± 1.35

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
74-84-0	-20.24	-21.24 ± 0.33
462-95-3	-99.13	-100.38 ± 1.13
111-71-7	-63.1	-65.3 ± 0.53
592-27-8	-51.51	-53.33 ± 0.94
100-40-3	16.61	18.45 ± 0.77
941-60-6	-16.83	-15.78 ± 0.92
2529-36-4	-88.72	-87.08 ± 1.21
1068-87-7	-54.35	-51.65 ± 1.14
18362-64-6	-112.43	-109.63 ± 2.29
926-65-8	-41.59	-40.13 ± 0.51
111-65-9	-49.88	-51.12 ± 1.31
108-08-7	-48.3	-45.48 ± 1.13
132911-34-3	21.8	23.07 ± 0.72
279-19-6	19.12	16.26 ± 1.16
74-98-6	-25.02	-26.56 ± 0.48
94383-67-2	51.39	53.32 ± 1.97
110-63-4	-102.06	-104.12 ± 0.41
108-11-2	-82.24	-80.27 ± 0.49
10563-11-8	22.99	20.2 ± 0.19
7396-38-5	31.07	32.33 ± 0.93
822-50-4	-32.67	-33.97 ± 1
14926-88-6	-1.7	0.2 ± 0.46
55282-16-1	-140.39	-138.71 ± 2.84
611-73-4	-92.9	-95.88 ± 1.61
1192-18-3	-30.95	-32.29 ± 1
33930-87-9	37.62	34.88 ± 0.87
1795-15-9	-70.65	-68.07 ± 2.24
504-64-3	-23.37	-25.52 ± 1.99
598-53-8	-60.23	-58.63 ± 0.17
604-83-1	39.91	37.99 ± 1.49
589-81-1	-50.81	-52.64 ± 1.33
583-48-2	-50.91	-49.81 ± 1.26
257-55-6	131.81	132.82 ± 1.22
100-41-4	7.12	5.69 ± 0.56
140-88-5	-79.21	-80.3 ± 1.11
563-78-0	-14.58	-13.12 ± 0.54
25154-53-4	-93.14	-91 ± 0.53
98-01-1	-36.19	-37.44 ± 0.99
84-15-1	67.59	69.29 ± 1.4
135-70-6	91.3	88.52 ± 1.1
50874-24-3	102.75	100.54 ± 1.64
14296-80-1	48.76	47.53 ± 0.32
16526-90-2	-1.46	-3.85 ± 0.6
21218-11-1	-25.57	-23.62 ± 1
29415-95-0	-21.27	-19.49 ± 1.05
79-20-9	-97.99	-99.21 ± 1.22
30154-99-5	86.04	84.81 ± 0.62
1078-04-2	-14.94	-13.86 ± 1.12
122-51-0	-150.72	-148.14 ± 0.91
123-29-5	-141.01	-143.7 ± 0.43
3806-82-4	28.8	27.53 ± 0.86
103-65-1	1.87	0.76 ± 0.47
22704-38-7	20.2	18.48 ± 0.47
112-53-8	-104.33	-103.29 ± 1.31
590-19-2	38.77	37.44 ± 0.55
123-66-0	-126.2	-127.86 ± 1.72
5385-36-4	52.17	53.33 ± 0.39
109-92-2	-33.48	-31.99 ± 0.23
108-21-4	-117.04	-114.99 ± 0.84
10250-48-3	-122.3	-119.87 ± 0.22
124-18-5	-59.68	-60.97 ± 1.6
78-80-8	61.9	63.19 ± 0.57
629-05-0	19.29	20.64 ± 0.37

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
44917-51-3	-101.58	-103.51 ± 0.96
2422-86-8	63.1	61.67 ± 0.24
504-02-9	-80.21	-82.28 ± 0.78
7283-49-0	68.12	70.23 ± 1.26
108-64-5	-126	-123.84 ± 1.13
499-75-2	-46.41	-48.41 ± 0.76
821-55-6	-81.45	-84.45 ± 0.85
3126-95-2	-65.15	-66.24 ± 0.51
116316-76-8	115.85	113.37 ± 0.52
2717-39-7	19.5	21.28 ± 0.85
1191-95-3	-24.14	-25.5 ± 0.73
485106	-50.22	-48.85 ± 0.81
76089-59-3	19.91	18.52 ± 0.51
819-97-6	-130.31	-131.39 ± 1.56
503-30-0	-19.25	-21.26 ± 0.15
106-32-1	-136.23	-138.1 ± 1.07
622-96-8	-0.79	-2.01 ± 0.61
286-20-4	-30	-31.62 ± 0.55
589-43-5	-52.44	-50.9 ± 1.25
98-06-6	-5.43	-3.93 ± 0.86
1191-99-7	-17.27	-18.65 ± 0.21
57-57-8	-68.4	-69.74 ± 0.8
485076	-43.98	-45.89 ± 0.34
142-82-5	-45.24	-47.18 ± 1.02
3048-64-4	37.95	39.16 ± 0.38
2097503	-16.59	-17.63 ± 0.87
27905-65-3	61.9	64.1 ± 1.38
1013-08-7	22.06	20.85 ± 0.74
132-64-9	11.3	9.77 ± 0.9
692-70-6	-28.56	-26.11 ± 0.55
108-73-6	-108.25	-105.59 ± 1.01
693-86-7	30.35	28.94 ± 0.37
1740-97-2	-49.43	-48.21 ± 0.89
55320-06-4	-167.3	-165.76 ± 3.96
111869-19-3	81.26	80.16 ± 1.29
1067-08-9	-51.39	-49.29 ± 1.07
2604-45-7	-95.6	-94.18 ± 1.74
124-38-9	-94.05	-92.68 ± 1.82
623-30-3	-25.33	-26.99 ± 1.02
92-06-8	66.92	65.15 ± 1.44
17048-59-8	22.9	21.62 ± 1.53
100-52-7	-9.66	-11.24 ± 0.17
498-66-8	21.51	19.8 ± 0.48
215-58-7	79.11	80.9 ± 1.11
6006-95-7	-105.14	-107.56 ± 2.95
26886-05-5	-60.73	-57.97 ± 0.89
1000-63-1	-86.28	-85.17 ± 0.8
501-65-5	92.02	94.84 ± 1.83
693-02-7	29.23	30.25 ± 0
591-96-8	31.79	30.22 ± 0.49
1055-23-8	113.53	115.84 ± 1.71
176-63-6	-34.68	-37.25 ± 0.91
110-88-3	-110.9	-109.78 ± 1.89
1864-94-4	-51.55	-50.53 ± 0.47
2882-98-6	-64.84	-66.37 ± 2.44
5617-41-4	-65.73	-68.33 ± 1.89
934-00-9	-100.02	-98.95 ± 0.2
2566-48-5	-52.1	-50.97 ± 1.24
75-28-5	-32.41	-33.5 ± 0.76
628-32-0	-65.06	-67.06 ± 0.32
700-58-3	-55.21	-57.34 ± 0.9
150895-65-1	43.26	44.53 ± 0.76
1755-05-1	-22.23	-23.93 ± 1.05

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
562-49-2	-48.16	-46.46 ± 1.05
27829-70-5	-92.5	-91.45 ± 1.07
598-23-2	32.6	35.41 ± 0.78
557-75-5	-26.53	-27.81 ± 0.66
23890-32-6	37.52	39.66 ± 0.4
491-38-3	-35.49	-32.79 ± 0.8
644-08-6	33.03	34.4 ± 0.75
560-21-4	-51.72	-49.09 ± 1.24
16554-83-9	28.68	27.13 ± 0.36
33021-02-2	-88	-86.61 ± 0.87
563-79-1	-16.35	-14.97 ± 0.43
591-93-5	25.41	26.49 ± 0.69
95-47-6	4.54	3.3 ± 0.68
1071-26-7	-58.82	-57.37 ± 1.31
692-48-8	-39.56	-36.6 ± 0.67
110-71-4	-81.93	-83.03 ± 1.05
438389	58.32	56.23 ± 0.31
74-99-7	44.31	46.57 ± 0.56
120-92-3	-47.18	-49.11 ± 1.48
463-51-4	-11.47	-12.67 ± 0.7
104-76-7	-87.83	-85.13 ± 0.49
1630-94-0	-1.96	-4.18 ± 0.8
75-19-4	12.74	11.25 ± 0.44
53130-19-1	-20.53	-21.59 ± 0.78
7318-67-4	18.4	19.62 ± 0.76
1069-53-0	-57.98	-56.86 ± 1.16
120351	34.82	37.16 ± 2.09
768-91-2	-40.99	-39.18 ± 0.41
295-17-0	-57.17	-59.67 ± 2.44
582-16-1	19	17.62 ± 0.41
1660-04-4	-71.3	-69.64 ± 0.8
283-27-2	-53.2	-50.94 ± 1.14
637-88-7	-79.49	-78.32 ± 1.71
108-32-7	-134.73	-132.04 ± 1.4
129872-30-6	130.02	133.01 ± 1.96
103-79-7	-22.62	-24.34 ± 0.37
493-08-3	-19.69	-22.41 ± 1.38
106-30-9	-130.98	-132.06 ± 0.54
5187-81-5	118.09	120.63 ± 2.04
105-54-4	-115.92	-116.95 ± 0.67
71032-67-2	-10.66	-11.86 ± 1
121-46-0	57.36	59.67 ± 0.5
1685-82-1	-1.39	-3.06 ± 0.57
293-30-1	-148.24	-146.89 ± 2.76
6553-48-6	42.3	40.37 ± 0.58
930-26-7	27.49	25.61 ± 0.36
287-92-3	-18.46	-20.61 ± 0.73
565-59-3	-47.49	-45.39 ± 0.99
693-89-0	-1.05	-2.46 ± 0.73
108-55-4	-127.25	-128.79 ± 2.24
629-78-7	-94.14	-95.74 ± 1.57
120-80-9	-62.74	-61.23 ± 1.28
4551-51-3	-30.4	-28.77 ± 0.8
2143-68-2	4.06	2.25 ± 0.2
6812-39-1	-99.33	-97.86 ± 3.47
107-22-2	-50.67	-51.69 ± 0.03
542-10-9	-194.22	-195.34 ± 0.02
3296-50-2	-31.45	-32.67 ± 0.88
589-53-7	-50.69	-52.29 ± 1.22
110-82-7	-29.78	-31.28 ± 0.91
1678-91-7	-41.25	-42.34 ± 1.21
108-38-3	4.11	3 ± 0.79
765-43-5	-27.56	-30.07 ± 1.14

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
2004-69-5	61.9	63.34 ± 0.71
18060-77-0	-98.23	-96.24 ± 1.11
819-41-0	-1.6	-0.43 ± 1.38
33475-22-8	72.37	71.14 ± 1.02
627-19-0	34.49	36.04 ± 0.71
1640-89-7	-30.37	-32.36 ± 1.14
108-29-2	-97.16	-98.95 ± 1.32
112-41-4	-39.53	-42.23 ± 1.04
1120-62-3	1.76	-0.09 ± 0.52
586-38-9	-106.62	-107.65 ± 0.79
15869-85-9	-61.81	-59.84 ± 1.57
112-40-3	-69.53	-72.22 ± 1.16
4457-00-5	-50.07	-52.97 ± 1.75
90-12-0	27.94	26.74 ± 0.73
690-92-6	-23.09	-20.35 ± 0.41
2143-61-5	23.9	21.32 ± 0.83
2868-37-3	-72.83	-75.01 ± 1.1
464-06-2	-48.95	-46.59 ± 1.09
1540-36-9	-111.21	-108.45 ± 0.59
871-83-0	-62.19	-60.47 ± 1.44
10352-87-1	-94.41	-95.66 ± 1.18
19915-11-8	-54.97	-52.63 ± 0.76
28102-61-6	56.17	53.43 ± 1.11
98-51-1	-13.62	-11.37 ± 0.53
3522-94-9	-60.49	-57.99 ± 1.26
1968-40-7	-92.02	-89.77 ± 0.79
111-87-5	-85.09	-87.07 ± 0.32
493-05-0	-15.08	-17.23 ± 1.37
105-58-8	-152.46	-149.99 ± 1.69
10563-10-7	41.35	38.83 ± 0.5
1552-12-1	24.14	26.88 ± 0.37
591-95-7	33.6	32.08 ± 0.54
629-20-9	71.13	73.89 ± 0.87
206-44-0	69.26	66.89 ± 1.89
107-00-6	39.7	41.79 ± 0.05
111-96-6	-122.3	-119.85 ± 0.9
1576-69-8	34.18	31.75 ± 0.47
106-97-8	-30.38	-32.25 ± 0.69
377788	-60.73	-58.45 ± 0.58
283-50-1	-25.33	-26.89 ± 1.19
149-73-5	-127.1	-125.22 ± 0.79
629-11-8	-110.44	-111.5 ± 0.55
75-83-2	-44.36	-43.15 ± 0.8
110-87-2	-26.96	-29.11 ± 1.13
1075-38-3	-12.91	-10.89 ± 0.44
617-78-7	-45.34	-44.31 ± 1.05
4630-45-9	16.73	13.85 ± 3.19
122-79-2	-66.85	-65.17 ± 0.52
106-73-0	-123.57	-125.09 ± 1.27
16484-17-6	-59.56	-62.53 ± 1.73
132-86-5	-50.48	-48.67 ± 1.19
20734-29-6	-112.55	-110.09 ± 0.32
2040-95-1	-40.22	-42.47 ± 1.04
130-15-4	-23.3	-24.31 ± 2.15
3459-83-4	-104.25	-103.2 ± 0.24
1777-44-2	14.1	11.62 ± 1.55
123-19-3	-71.3	-72.92 ± 0.57
36402-73-0	-106.84	-103.96 ± 0.91
13466-78-9	4.54	5.88 ± 0.58
3605-31-0	-24.86	-22.97 ± 1.38
29817-09-2	69.79	68.78 ± 0.39
24410-84-2	-94.17	-95.26 ± 1.79
5685-46-1	31.07	29.87 ± 0.91

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
2919-23-5	-34.66	-36.87 ± 0.44
6682-71-9	-1.77	-2.97 ± 0.64
3374-41-2	-56.41	-58.96 ± 0.81
2025-56-1	28.44	25.75 ± 3.47
192337	-69.77	-71.92 ± 1.57
5617-42-5	-55	-57.97 ± 1.18
765-47-9	-9.89	-10.9 ± 0.67
106-70-7	-118.07	-119.62 ± 0.45
87-85-4	-18.5	-15.64 ± 0.65
95540-87-7	38	39.6 ± 0.74
218-01-9	64.22	63.19 ± 0.8
67-56-1	-49	-47.95 ± 0.87
141-97-9	-140.11	-141.39 ± 1.53
2809-69-0	90.2	87.51 ± 1.36
91-20-3	35.85	33.88 ± 0.77
92-52-4	43.02	41.86 ± 1.03
20669-04-9	-72.61	-71.35 ± 0.48
2050-00-2	-137.19	-135.4 ± 0.46
106623-86-3	-7.17	-4.42 ± 0.45
243-24-3	47.8	45.08 ± 1.13
598-25-4	30.85	29.34 ± 0.62
496-11-7	14.27	12.06 ± 0.51
21293-01-6	-0.91	1.16 ± 0.8
109-66-0	-35.16	-37.6 ± 0.86
112-30-1	-94.41	-96.78 ± 1.02
3463-79-4	56.88	55.22 ± 0.76
2523-37-7	35.37	37.57 ± 0.99
17684-73-0	32.46	35.29 ± 0.45
111-34-2	-42.83	-41.55 ± 0.2
590-35-2	-49.28	-47.89 ± 0.89
196594	-85.85	-84.44 ± 1.04
519-73-3	65.99	67.63 ± 0.86
119-64-2	6.21	4.65 ± 0.6
17348-59-3	-85.56	-82.73 ± 0.74
2146-37-4	-4.78	-5.87 ± 0.49
3724-65-0	-88.07	-86.56 ± 1
1528-30-9	2.44	1.26 ± 0.68
122-60-1	-23.83	-25.64 ± 0.62
28304-66-7	35.07	36.37 ± 0.75
106623-87-4	-12.09	-9.37 ± 0.99
1487-18-9	6.69	4.89 ± 0.89
629-92-5	-103.99	-106.45 ± 2.21
132911-35-4	22.11	23.53 ± 1.13
15269-16-6	-62.12	-63.71 ± 0.97
279-23-2	-13.12	-14.74 ± 0.71
564-02-3	-52.61	-50.46 ± 1.08
627-21-4	30.81	29.44 ± 1.04
14906-26-4	30.38	28.29 ± 6.71
262-12-4	-14.15	-12.62 ± 1.23
540-84-1	-53.56	-51.81 ± 1.02
96-37-7	-25.84	-27.44 ± 0.97
4045-44-7	-5.98	-7.32 ± 1.33
431-03-8	-78.11	-80.15 ± 0.29
502-97-6	-147.13	-149.1 ± 1.83
95-13-6	38.53	37.03 ± 0.49
1759-58-6	-32.48	-33.86 ± 1.05
<i>Unreliable ($\epsilon > 3.0$ kcal mol⁻¹)</i>		
536-74-3	73.28	76.71 ± 1.37
1120-21-4	-64.6	-67.92 ± 1.29
22341-17-9	6.45	-53.52 ± 0.92
143-08-8	-90.11	-85.89 ± 0.96
180-43-8	-45	-33.44 ± 1.08

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15\text{ K}}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
1120-97-4	-90.08	-84.04 ± 0.41
75245-21-5	-40.22	-30.84 ± 1.19
32038-79-2	9.94	23.7 ± 1.37
4016-14-2	-71.56	-67.87 ± 1.84
630-76-2	95.15	105.2 ± 2.53
259-79-0	99.71	96.26 ± 1.06
462-80-6	117.11	113.08 ± 1.06
13351-29-6	-68.59	-62.42 ± 0.66
14575-93-0	-35.61	-43.68 ± 1.45
41487-78-9	57.36	161.88 ± 1.5
2597-44-6	10.4	-49.83 ± 47.03
110-93-0	-59.99	-53.14 ± 0.66
79-92-5	-6.69	-2.25 ± 0.99
12075-35-3	196	165.22 ± 11.47
1530-12-7	78.9	95.66 ± 1.04
781-17-9	21.56	33.98 ± 1.42
83615-93-4	30.83	34.5 ± 0.49
690-93-7	-28.2	-24.71 ± 0.4
486-25-9	12.5	17.35 ± 1.16
1502-06-3	-72.92	-68.25 ± 1.09
35671-18-2	-23.42	-20.29 ± 1.51
707-35-7	-60.95	-54.81 ± 0.96
1445-45-0	-136.44	-131.1 ± 1.17
1551-44-6	-130.43	-126.52 ± 0.01
1540-35-8	-108.29	-104.51 ± 0.29
5471-63-6	48.52	56.49 ± 1.68
594-82-1	-53.99	-49.35 ± 1.03
19740-34-2	-43.74	-38.77 ± 1.01
4350-84-9	-94.79	-74.13 ± 1.99
629-50-5	-74.45	-78.24 ± 1.2
1759-81-5	3.59	0.2 ± 0.49
629-59-4	-79.37	-83.79 ± 0.61
15042-59-8	-101.63	-94.85 ± 0.94
6053-74-3	53.54	61.6 ± 1.27
66809-06-1	6.21	26.52 ± 2.6
3031-75-2	-47.11	-7.74 ± 53.1
92-24-0	81.88	73.95 ± 1.38
6074-99-3	62.38	71.79 ± 0.46
20237-34-7	12.91	16.69 ± 0.82
12184-80-4	232	255.48 ± 0.82
191-68-4	120.22	107.69 ± 2.33
2669-89-8	71.46	56.84 ± 11.09
706-14-9	-118.55	-124.58 ± 0.01
2243-32-5	-101.08	-95.7 ± 1
376325	-32.98	-27.69 ± 1.25
5181-34-0	90.42	87.06 ± 0.8
286-62-4	-39.46	-31.23 ± 0.56
2122-48-7	114	132.87 ± 7.38
1071-81-4	-68.12	-64.39 ± 1.27
116-11-0	-35.52	-30.7 ± 0.79
122-57-6	-11.5	-6.75 ± 1.51
630-08-0	-26.42	114.75 ± 0.03
34454-78-9	-57.6	-50.88 ± 0.65
72323-66-1	128.7	133.85 ± 1.34
69045-73-4	-50.43	-27.07 ± 2.24
26902-55-6	111.5	136.98 ± 3.42
10222-95-4	-24.69	-20.17 ± 0.62
1011-12-7	-51.1	-47.56 ± 1.3
111-13-7	-82.48	-79.48 ± 0.67
20013-73-4	-55.69	-51.52 ± 1.19
1633-22-3	58.48	63.94 ± 1.07
359071	-75.57	-67.99 ± 2.6
1540-34-7	-105.09	-99.6 ± 0.25

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
872-36-6	-100.05	-93.41 ± 1.77
19446-68-5	68.83	63.98 ± 0.96
2461-40-7	-119.91	-116.74 ± 2
1678-93-9	-50.96	-45.51 ± 1.5
334-48-5	-149.19	-142.21 ± 0.43
108-59-8	-176.34	-167.71 ± 1.42
3806-60-8	34.89	46.84 ± 0.76
4384-23-0	-18.4	-7.19 ± 1.66
59358-70-2	26.53	35.3 ± 1.53
30545-28-9	-43.52	-40.41 ± 1.61
117110-17-5	37.52	40.68 ± 0.64
14906-32-2	5.43	2.26 ± 1.23
1499-10-1	114.32	107.2 ± 1.71
1574-41-0	19.77	23.26 ± 0.36
103-30-0	53.63	57.25 ± 1.12
3249-47-6	-91.35	-87 ± 1.07
2154-56-5	49.47	40.42 ± 18.9
110-38-3	-146.27	-149.84 ± 0.98
1118-71-4	-126.29	-117.58 ± 0.73
632-46-2	-81.64	-76.91 ± 1.1
141-78-6	-106.07	-98.07 ± 0.84
32398-67-7	15.44	21.06 ± 0.45
815-57-6	-102.51	-94.44 ± 0.68
294-93-9	-150.84	-138.06 ± 0.62
60329-21-7	65.97	61.41 ± 0.55
2319-97-3	40.63	44.75 ± 0.91
22630-75-7	39.91	36.84 ± 0.45
280-65-9	-30.59	20.5 ± 0.99
108-93-0	-69.31	-62.87 ± 0.51
2892-51-5	-123.09	-109.8 ± 1.25
4292-75-5	-60.8	-56.75 ± 1.78
65754-71-4	95.6	92.11 ± 0.53
2294-94-2	87.24	100.37 ± 2.4
1678-92-8	-45.98	-41.06 ± 1.5
16225-26-6	-123.4	-115.91 ± 1.01
2597-43-5	-2.15	-9.83 ± 2.91
4806-61-5	-6.62	-10.04 ± 1.02
4292-92-6	-55.88	-52.46 ± 1.52
2025-55-0	21.51	16.61 ± 1.02
694-87-1	47.66	44.08 ± 0.25
1795-26-2	-49.38	-44.27 ± 1.17
931-89-5	4.78	11.02 ± 0.87
692-47-7	-30.35	-25.57 ± 0.92
10557-44-5	-26.6	-20.54 ± 0.64
187-78-0	97.66	104.24 ± 1.29
10036-09-6	-60.71	-55.29 ± 0.56
62678-54-0	-58.32	-27.02 ± 3.28
123-42-2	-116.2	-109.09 ± 0.32
3315-37-5	142	167.9 ± 4.58
502-49-8	-65.01	-57.87 ± 0.41
5259-71-2	38.72	44 ± 0.7
125379-19-3	-122.37	-107.17 ± 1.55
207-08-9	73.18	84 ± 2.52
544-85-4	-166.49	-173.96 ± 2.89
20532-03-0	87	104.47 ± 3.02
1795-17-1	-90.37	-87.21 ± 2.45
496-16-2	-11.11	-14.3 ± 0.12
20268-00-2	-115.77	-111.37 ± 1.15
17612-50-9	46.85	53.62 ± 0.36
477-75-8	76.96	81.2 ± 0.87
6006-34-4	-84.56	-90.31 ± 2.9
1850-14-2	-173.8	-169.32 ± 0.5
22339-21-5	-36.57	-46.14 ± 1.31

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
2040-73-5	66.92	138.22 ± 1.44
28994-41-4	11.88	-3.08 ± 0.68
157-40-4	44.24	40.88 ± 0.52
1129-65-3	54.02	50.15 ± 1.53
3002-24-2	-105.09	-94.91 ± 0.13
15844-05-0	0.72	-4.58 ± 0.95
316-51-8	45.2	50.7 ± 1.44
59358-71-3	10.52	24.69 ± 0.83
629-41-4	-116.47	-122.17 ± 0.68
185-94-4	37.76	34.45 ± 0.35
1725-03-7	-123.57	-120.45 ± 1.07
609-02-9	-183.69	-173.06 ± 2.63
62850-21-9	-59.99	-43.7 ± 2.67
277-10-1	142.71	136.16 ± 2.28
6812-38-0	-110.06	-105.31 ± 3.46
19889-94-2	-44.93	-50.89 ± 1.24
6004-38-2	-14.39	-18.78 ± 0.91
51322	-45.17	-41.48 ± 0.76
58208-49-4	130.02	138.39 ± 0.12
24041-60-9	-43.5	-50.71 ± 1.19
26460-76-4	-39.84	67.5 ± 1.92
10218-02-7	-32.03	-37.12 ± 0.45
3352-57-6	9.32	-39.28 ± 107.32
1070-87-7	-57.72	-54.16 ± 1.26
35117-21-6	97.92	101.21 ± 2.01
2203-73-8	-162.43	-157.48 ± 2.32
591-49-1	-19.42	-10.96 ± 0.69
3002-23-1	-109.11	-104.04 ± 1.83
14738-97-7	-101.1	-64.84 ± 2.04
6169-94-4	6.93	13.7 ± 2.7
565-75-3	-51.96	-48.24 ± 1.35
14090-87-0	-109.2	-105.49 ± 0.33
635-10-9	-323.14	-269.61 ± 3.4
625-16-1	-128.82	-123.67 ± 0.62
285-58-5	9.32	59.17 ± 0.41
36262-33-6	72.42	67.76 ± 0.19
39124-79-3	-4.49	-0.21 ± 0.72
1732-13-4	9.73	14.37 ± 0.63
2078-54-8	-58.41	-55.41 ± 0.2
14738-99-9	-91.54	-64.11 ± 0.89
1974927	-108.2	-98.63 ± 0.53
702-79-4	-52.34	-47.37 ± 0.76
20455-01-0	122.9	117.89 ± 0.79
126-81-8	-91.68	-94.72 ± 2.52
13027-75-3	50.43	46.18 ± 1.11
28636-10-4	56.17	52.43 ± 0.35
6142-73-0	48.04	44.15 ± 0.13
101-53-1	15.18	-2.67 ± 0.7
765-46-8	56.88	53.69 ± 0.39
18012-46-9	88.91	81.64 ± 0.51
111-78-4	13.62	24.25 ± 0.75
24599-57-3	-16.73	-5.74 ± 1.27
1499-02-1	-152.06	-135.97 ± 0.78
54429-93-5	-29.42	-21.79 ± 1.12
822-41-3	59.99	54.19 ± 0.22
110-05-4	-81.45	-75.59 ± 1.76
632-50-8	85.33	91.48 ± 2.24
4982-20-1	15.39	19.13 ± 0.48
41233-74-3	22.9	30.54 ± 0.9
85668-74-2	-40.63	-34.54 ± 3.14
123-86-4	-135.28	-116.2 ± 0.31
85668-72-0	-50.91	-45.82 ± 3.49
1667-01-2	-49	-38.25 ± 0.48

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15\text{ K}}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
1889-67-4	13.62	23.23 ± 0.81
20847-82-9	95.36	102.97 ± 0.54
107133-43-7	-52.1	-39.85 ± 1.93
2932-78-7	81.02	67.24 ± 10.98
79356-83-5	91.75	88.1 ± 0.51
1074-92-6	-7.89	-4.26 ± 0.47
78-79-5	18.09	22.19 ± 0.68
1121-20-6	-98.23	-88.68 ± 1.08
86301-94-2	91.85	95.83 ± 2.88
106-68-3	-80.93	-76.95 ± 0.65
475-38-7	-119.29	-109.41 ± 0.09
2734-31-8	-43.98	-48.79 ± 1.41
38765-94-5	111.4	99.67 ± 1.17
108-05-4	-73.85	-68.11 ± 1.33
62678-52-8	-71.7	-64.75 ± 2.3
29365-79-5	-49.47	-44.23 ± 0.28
1687-36-1	-67.42	-62.39 ± 1.66
1502-22-3	-52.46	-45.88 ± 0.93
23361-74-2	-136.95	-132.64 ± 0.73
56-55-3	69.38	65.35 ± 0.67
6785-23-5	-74.69	-79.4 ± 1.97
123-63-7	-152.01	-145.79 ± 0.58
1795-18-2	-100.22	-94.72 ± 2.98
6006-33-3	-95.29	-87.38 ± 2.9
85668-73-1	-53.54	-35.6 ± 3.66
38229-26-4	-1.29	3.96 ± 1.07
106-91-2	-94.22	-87.78 ± 1.16
594-60-5	-85.33	-81.71 ± 0.55
181163	81.02	51.72 ± 14.82
35660-96-9	-56.21	-41.71 ± 1.2
126-84-1	-121.1	-116.31 ± 1.26
1795-20-6	-59.92	-63.25 ± 2.07
85668-75-3	-60.71	-42.79 ± 3.73
2348-55-2	16.49	11.89 ± 1.12
917-92-0	25.57	29.3 ± 0.22
16177-46-1	44.93	41.71 ± 0.72
17760-91-7	-24.45	-6.05 ± 0.96
109-86-4	-90.08	-87.06 ± 0.8
59358-73-5	16.49	33.83 ± 1.14
1005-51-2	79.85	84.56 ± 1.43
82110-70-1	44.34	51.84 ± 1.87
1988175	38.24	34.84 ± 1.22
6671-66-5	-11.74	-6.1 ± 0.57
39239-93-5	-132.41	-122.38 ± 1.55
106562-31-6	-12.4	-8.52 ± 0.63
1540-38-1	-107.29	-99.33 ± 0.75
1540-80-3	75	69.3 ± 2.81
674-82-8	-17.54	-46.24 ± 0.42
493-01-6	-40.44	-32.91 ± 0.96
2568-90-3	-119.74	-115.51 ± 0.57
13475-76-8	-141.8	-136.74 ± 3.48
17931-55-4	-57.36	-9.91 ± 1.21
3350-30-9	-66.85	-62.18 ± 0.94
109-93-3	-3.04	1.85 ± 0.64
70415-58-6	-21.51	-13.7 ± 0.39
20666-86-8	-154.23	-143.23 ± 6.61
3674-77-9	-62.6	-58.98 ± 0.97
6065-54-9	-191.86	-188.45 ± 1.8
286-45-3	-36.4	-33.29 ± 1.65
96-33-3	-79.59	-71.72 ± 1.29
17227-17-7	-118.64	-113.07 ± 1.6
542-46-1	-97.51	-77.37 ± 0.97
5171-91-5	-33.22	-9.18 ± 2.38

Table 2 Continued:

CAS No.	$\Delta_f H_{298.15 K}^\circ$ [kcal mol ⁻¹]	
	NIST data [1]	Validation data
22272-48-6	11.68	-2.89 ± 0.7
3725-30-2	46.92	53.15 ± 0.71

References

- [1] NIST Chemistry WebBook, NIST Standard Reference Database Number 69, June 2005. URL <http://webbook.nist.gov/chemistry/>. Retrieved May 13, 2016.
- [2] NIST Computational Chemistry Comparison and Benchmark Database, NIST Standard Reference Database Number 101, Sept. 2015. URL <http://cccbdb.nist.gov/>. Retrieved May 13, 2016.
- [3] Active Thermochemical Tables, version 1.118, 2016. URL <http://atct.anl.gov/>. Retrieved July 03, 2016.
- [4] Cheméo, 2016. URL <https://www.chemeo.com/>. Retrieved June 29, 2016.
- [5] GNU Linear Programming Kit, Version 4.58, 2016. URL <http://www.gnu.org/software/glpk/glpk.html>.
- [6] MolHub, 2016. URL <http://como.cheng.cam.ac.uk/molhub/compchem/>. Retrieved July 07, 2016.
- [7] Nano, 2016. URL <http://nano.nature.com/>. Retrieved July 07, 2016.
- [8] PrIME: Process Informatics Model, 2016. URL http://www.primekinetics.org/prime_data_warehouse/. Retrieved June 29, 2016.
- [9] ReSpecTh, 2016. URL <http://respecth.hu/>. Retrieved July 07, 2016.
- [10] M. D. Allendorf and C. F. Melius. Theoretical Study of Thermochemistry of Molecules in the Silicon-Carbon-Chlorine-Hydrogen System. *J. Phys. Chem.*, 97(3):720–728, 1993. doi:10.1021/j100105a031.
- [11] S. W. Benson and J. H. Buss. Additivity Rules for the Estimation of Molecular Properties. Thermodynamic Properties. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 29(3):546–572, 1958. doi:10.1063/1.1744539.
- [12] G. Bertholon, M. Giray, R. Perrin, and M. Vincent-Falquet-Berny. No. 532.-Etude Physicochimique des Phenols. IX.-Enthalpies de Combustion et Energies de Resonance des Alcoyletaryphenols. *Bull. Soc. Chim. France*, 12:3180–3187, 1971.
- [13] G. Blanquart and H. Pitsch. Thermochemical Properties of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) from G3MP2B3 Calculations. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 111(28):6510–6520, 2007. doi:10.1021/jp068579w.
- [14] A. D. Boese, J. M. L. Martin, and N. C. Handy. The Role of the Basis Set: Assessing Density Functional Theory. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 119(6):3005–3014, 2003. doi:10.1063/1.1589004.

- [15] D. Bond. Computational Methods in Organic Thermochemistry. 1. Hydrocarbon Enthalpies and Free Energies of Formation. *J. Org. Chem.*, 72(15):5555–5566, 2007. doi:10.1021/jo070383k.
- [16] P. Buerger, D. Nurkowski, J. Akroyd, S. Mosbach, and M. Kraft. First-Principles Thermochemistry for the Thermal Decomposition of Titanium Tetraisopropoxide. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 119(30):8376–8387, 2015. doi:10.1021/acs.jpca.5b01721.
- [17] P. Buerger, D. Nurkowski, J. Akroyd, and M. Kraft. A Kinetic Mechanism for the Thermal Decomposition of Titanium Tetraisopropoxide. *Accepted for oral presentation at the 36th International Symposium on Combustion, Submitted for publication in Proc. Combust. Inst.*, 2016. URL <http://como.cheng.cam.ac.uk/index.php?Page=Preprints&No=163>. Retrieved July 07, 2016.
- [18] A. Burcat and B. Ruscic. *Third Millenium Ideal Gas and Condensed Phase Thermochemical Database for Combustion with Updates from Active Thermochemical Tables*. Anl [series]. Faculty of Aerospace Engineering, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology and Chemistry Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Sept. 2005.
- [19] J. Cioslowski, M. Schimeczek, G. Liu, and V. Stoyanov. A Set of Standard Enthalpies of Formation for Benchmarking, Calibration, and Parametrization of Electronic Structure Methods. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 113(21):9377–9389, 2000.
- [20] G. B. Dantzig. Linear Programming. *Oper. Res.*, 50(1):42–47, 2002. doi:10.1287/opre.50.1.42.17798.
- [21] D. F. DeTar. Experimental Formal Steric Enthalpy. 1. Alkanes and Cycloalkanes. *J. Org. Chem.*, 56(4):1463–1470, 1991. doi:10.1021/jo00004a023.
- [22] P. Duchowicz and E. Castro. Hydrocarbon Enthalpies of Formation from Ab Initio Calculations Improved Through Bond Parameters. *J. Korean Chem. Soc.*, 43(6):621–627, 1999.
- [23] 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, H. Nakatsuji, M. Caricato, X. Li, H. P. Hratchian, A. F. Izmaylov, J. Bloino, G. Zheng, J. L. Sonnenberg, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, T. Vreven, J. A. Montgomery, Jr., J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, J. Tomasi, M. Cossi, N. Rega, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, J. E. Knox, J. B. Cross, V. Bakken, C. Adamo, J. Jaramillo, R. Gomperts, R. E. Stratmann, O. Yazyev, A. J. Austin, R. Cammi, C. Pomelli, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K. Morokuma, V. G. Zakrzewski, G. A. Voth, P. Salvador, J. J. Dannenberg, S. Dapprich, A. D. Daniels, Ö. Farkas, J. B. Foresman, J. V. Ortiz, J. Cioslowski, and D. J. Fox. Gaussian 09 Revision D.01, 2009.

- [24] C. W. Gao, J. W. Allen, W. H. Green, and R. H. West. Reaction Mechanism Generator: Automatic Construction of Chemical Kinetic Mechanisms. *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 203:212–225, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2016.02.013.
- [25] J. L. Gearhart, K. L. Adair, R. J. Detry, J. D. Durfee, K. A. Jones, and N. Martin. Comparison of Open-Source Linear Programming Solvers. Technical report, Sandia National Laboratories (SNL-NM), Albuquerque, NM (United States), 2013.
- [26] P. George, M. Trachtman, C. W. Bock, and A. M. Brett. An Alternative Approach to the Problem of Assessing Stabilization Energies in Cyclic Conjugated Hydrocarbons. *Theor. Chim. Acta*, 38(2):121–129, 1975. doi:10.1007/BF00581469.
- [27] P. George, M. Trachtman, C. W. Bock, and A. M. Brett. Homodesmotic Reactions for the Assessment of Stabilization Energies in Benzenoid and other Conjugated Cyclic Hydrocarbons. *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2*, pages 1222–1227, 1976. doi:10.1039/P29760001222.
- [28] P. George, M. Trachtman, A. M. Brett, and C. W. Bock. Comparison of Various Isodesmotic and Homodesmotic Reaction Heats with Values Derived from Published Ab Initio Molecular Orbital Calculations. *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2*, pages 1036–1047, 1977. doi:10.1039/P29770001036.
- [29] P. E. Gill, W. Murray, M. A. Saunders, J. A. Tomlin, and M. H. Wright. George B. Dantzig and Systems Optimization. *Discrete Optimization*, 5(2):151 – 158, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.disopt.2007.01.002.
- [30] W. H. Green and R. H. West. Reaction Mechanism Generator: An Open-Source Software Package for Automatically Generating Chemical Kinetic Mechanisms, 2016. URL <http://reactionmechanismgenerator.github.io>. Retrieved July 07, 2016.
- [31] W. J. Hehre, R. Ditchfield, L. Radom, and J. A. Pople. Molecular Orbital Theory of the Electronic Structure of Organic Compounds. V. Molecular Theory of Bond Separation. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 92(16):4796–4801, 1970. doi:10.1021/ja00719a006.
- [32] P. Ho and C. F. Melius. Theoretical Study of the Thermochemistry of Fluorosilanes (SiF_n and SiH_nF_m) Compounds and Hexafluorodisilane. *J. Phys. Chem.*, 94(12): 5120–5127, 1990. doi:10.1021/j100375a066.
- [33] G. James, D. Witten, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. *An Introduction to Statistical Learning: With Applications in R*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2014. ISBN 1461471370, 9781461471370.
- [34] K. Joback and R. Reid. Estimation of Pure-Component Properties from Group-Contributions. *Chem. Eng. Commun.*, 57(1-6):233–243, 1987. doi:10.1080/00986448708960487.

- [35] A. Karton, P. R. Schreiner, and J. M. L. Martin. Heats of Formation of Platonic Hydrocarbon Cages by Means of High-Level Thermochemical Procedures. *J. Comput. Chem.*, 37(1):49–58, 2016. doi:10.1002/jcc.23963.
- [36] S. Lias and United States. National Bureau of Standards. *Gas-Phase Ion and Neutral Thermochemistry*. J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data: Supplement. Published by the American Chemical Society and the American Institute of Physics for the National Bureau of Standards, 1988. ISBN 9780883185629.
- [37] D. Lide. *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, 84th Edition*. CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics. Taylor & Francis, 2003. ISBN 9780849304842.
- [38] D. McQuarrie and J. Simon. *Molecular Thermodynamics*. University Science Books, Sausalito, CA, United States, 1999. ISBN 9781891389054.
- [39] C. F. Melius and M. D. Allendorf. Bond Additivity Corrections for Quantum Chemistry Methods. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 104(11):2168–2177, 2000. doi:10.1021/jp9914370.
- [40] C. F. Melius and P. Ho. Theoretical Study of the Thermochemistry of Molecules in the Silicon-Nitrogen-Hydrogen-Fluorine System. *J. Phys. Chem.*, 95(3):1410–1419, 1991. doi:10.1021/j100156a070.
- [41] J. P. Merrick, D. Moran, and L. Radom. An Evaluation of Harmonic Vibrational Frequency Scale Factors. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 111(45):11683–11700, 2007. doi:10.1021/jp073974n.
- [42] M. S. Miranda, J. C. E. da Silva, and J. F. Liebman. Gas-Phase Thermochemical Properties of some Tri-Substituted Phenols: A Density Functional Theory Study. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.*, 80:65 – 72, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.jct.2014.08.025.
- [43] D. Nurkowski, P. Buerger, J. Akroyd, and M. Kraft. A Detailed Kinetic Study of the Thermal Decomposition of Tetraethoxysilane. *Proc. Combust. Inst.*, 35(2):2291–2298, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.proci.2014.06.093.
- [44] D. Nurkowski, S. J. Klippenstein, Y. Georgievskii, M. Verdicchio, A. W. Jasper, J. Akroyd, S. Mosbach, and M. Kraft. Ab Initio Variational Transition State Theory and Master Equation Study of the Reaction $(\text{OH})_3\text{SiOCH}_2 + \text{CH}_3 \longleftrightarrow (\text{OH})_3\text{SiOC}_2\text{H}_5$. *Z. Phys. Chem.*, 229(5):691–708, 2015. doi:10.1515/zpch-2014-0640.
- [45] J. Pedley. *Thermochemical Data of Organic Compounds*. Springer Netherlands, 1986. ISBN 9780412271007.
- [46] W. Phadungsukanan, S. Shekar, R. Shirley, M. Sander, R. H. West, and M. Kraft. First-Principles Thermochemistry for Silicon Species in the Decomposition of Tetraethoxysilane. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 113(31):9041–9049, 2009. doi:10.1021/jp905494s.

- [47] W. Phadungsukanan, M. Kraft, J. A. Townsend, and P. Murray-Rust. The Semantics of Chemical Markup Language (CML) for Computational Chemistry: CompChem. *J. Cheminform.*, 4(15):1–16, 2012. doi:10.1186/1758-2946-4-15.
- [48] J. A. Pople, L. Radom, and W. J. Hehre. Molecular Orbital Theory of the Electronic Structure of Organic Compounds. VII. Systematic Study of Energies, Conformations, and Bond Interactions. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 93(2):289–300, 1971. doi:10.1021/ja00731a001.
- [49] J. A. Pople, M. J. Frisch, B. T. Luke, and J. S. Binkley. A Moller-Plesset Study of the Energies of AH_n Molecules ($A = Li$ to F). *Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, 24(S17):307–320, 1983. doi:10.1002/qua.560240835.
- [50] R. O. Ramabhadran and K. Raghavachari. Theoretical Thermochemistry for Organic Molecules: Development of the Generalized Connectivity-Based Hierarchy. *J. Chem. Theory. Comput.*, 7(7):2094–2103, 2011. doi:10.1021/ct200279q.
- [51] S. Rayne and K. Forest. Estimated Gas-Phase Standard State Enthalpies of Formation for Organic Compounds Using the Gaussian-4 (G4) and W1BD Theoretical Methods. *J. Chem. Eng. Data*, 55(11):5359–5364, 2010. doi:10.1021/je100768s.
- [52] P. Refaeilzadeh, L. Tang, and H. Liu. *Encyclopedia of Database Systems*, chapter Cross-Validation, pages 532–538. Springer US, Boston, MA, 2009. ISBN 978-0-387-39940-9.
- [53] M. P. Repasky, J. Chandrasekhar, and W. L. Jorgensen. Improved Semiempirical Heats of Formation Through the Use of Bond and Group Equivalents. *J. Comput. Chem.*, 23(4):498–510, 2002. doi:10.1002/jcc.10023.
- [54] M. Saeys, M.-F. Reyniers, G. B. Marin, V. V. Speybroeck, and M. Waroquier. Ab Initio Calculations for Hydrocarbons: Enthalpy of Formation, Transition State Geometry, and Activation Energy for Radical Reactions. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 107(43):9147–9159, 2003. doi:10.1021/jp021706d.
- [55] R. Shirley, Y. Liu, T. S. Totton, R. H. West, and M. Kraft. First-Principles Thermochemistry for the Combustion of a $TiCl_4$ and $AlCl_3$ Mixture. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 113(49):13790–13796, 2009. doi:10.1021/jp905244w.
- [56] K. P. Somers and J. M. Simmie. Benchmarking Compound Methods (CBS-QB3, CBS-APNO, G3, G4, W1BD) Against the Active Thermochemical Tables: Formation Enthalpies of Radicals. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 119(33):8922–8933, 2015. doi:10.1021/acs.jpca.5b05448.
- [57] A. Tajti, P. G. Szalay, A. G. Császár, M. Kállay, J. Gauss, E. F. Valeev, B. A. Flowers, J. Vázquez, and J. F. Stanton. HEAT: High Accuracy Extrapolated Ab Initio Thermochemistry. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 121(23):11599–11613, 2004. doi:10.1063/1.1811608.

- [58] E. Taskinen. Enthalpies of Formation and Isomerization of Aromatic Hydrocarbons and Ethers by G3(MP2)//B3LYP Calculations. *J. Phys. Org. Chem.*, 22(6):632–642, 2009. doi:10.1002/poc.1494.
- [59] T. S. Totton, R. Shirley, and M. Kraft. First-Principles Thermochemistry for the Combustion in a Methane Flame. *Proc. Combust. Inst.*, 33(1):493–500, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.proci.2010.05.011.
- [60] R. J. Vanderbei. *Linear Programming: Foundations and Extensions*. Department of Operations and Research and Financial Engineering, Princeton University, 2001. ISBN 978-1-4614-7630-6.
- [61] S. P. Verevkin. Thermochemistry of Phenols: Buttress Effects in Sterically Hindered Phenols. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.*, 31(11):1397 – 1416, 1999. doi:10.1006/jcht.1999.0466.
- [62] A. I. Vitvitskii. Calculation of Heats of Formation for Carbocyclic Compounds. *Theor. Exp. Chem.*, 3(1):44–47, 1969. doi:10.1007/BF00523731.
- [63] A. A. Voityuk. Accurate Treatment of Energetics and Geometry of Carbon and Hydrocarbon Compounds Within Tight-Binding Model. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2(4):1038–1044, 2006. doi:10.1021/ct600064m.
- [64] A. A. Voityuk. Thermochemistry of Hydrocarbons. Back to Extended Hückel Theory. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 4(11):1877–1885, 2008. doi:10.1021/ct8003222.
- [65] M. N. Weaver, J. Kenneth M. Merz, D. Ma, H. J. Kim, and L. Gagliardi. Calculation of Heats of Formation for Z_n Complexes: Comparison of Density Functional Theory, Second Order Perturbation Theory, Coupled-Cluster and Complete Active Space Methods. *J. Chem. Theory. Comput.*, 9(12):5277–5285, 2013. doi:10.1021/ct400856g.
- [66] R. Weber and A. K. Wilson. Do Composite Methods Achieve Their Target Accuracy? *Comp. Theor. Chem.*, 1072:58 – 62, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.comptc.2015.08.015.
- [67] R. H. West, G. J. O. Beran, W. H. Green, and M. Kraft. First-Principles Thermochemistry for the Production of TiO_2 from $TiCl_4$. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 111(18): 3560–3565, 2007. doi:10.1021/jp0661950.
- [68] S. E. Wheeler, K. N. Houk, P. v. R. Schleyer, and W. D. Allen. A Hierarchy of Homodesmotic Reactions for Thermochemistry. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 131(7):2547–2560, 2009. doi:10.1021/ja805843n.
- [69] S. E. Wheeler, A. Moran, S. N. Pieniazek, and K. N. Houk. Accurate Reaction Enthalpies and Sources of Error in DFT Thermochemistry for Aldol, Mannich, and α -Aminoxylation Reactions. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 113(38):10376–10384, 2009. doi:10.1021/jp9058565.

- [70] M. D. Wodrich, C. Corminboeuf, and S. E. Wheeler. Accurate Thermochemistry of Hydrocarbon Radicals Via an Extended Generalized Bond Separation Reaction Scheme. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 116(13):3436–3447, 2012. doi:10.1021/jp212209q.
- [71] Y. Zhou, J. Wu, and X. Xu. How Well Can B3LYP Heats of Formation be Improved by Dispersion Correction Models? *Theor. Chem. Acc.*, 135(2):1–15, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00214-015-1801-9.