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#### Abstract

Hydralazine $\left(\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{4}\right)$ is an antihypertensive drug used as a vasodilator for the treatment of severe hypertension.In this work,computational methods were employed to determine the most stable conformer, optimized parameters, frontier molecular orbital energies (HOMO and LUMO), energy gap, chemical hardness, chemical softness, chemical potential, electrophilicity, polarizability, dipole moment and Natural Bond Orbital (NBO)of Hydralazine. Conformational search was performed usingwindow version ofConflex 7 based on molecular mechanics force field (MMFF) where four conformers with minimum energyare reportedand the most stable one was found to have sterric energy of $85.42 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. This value agreed with a previously reported work where $84.57 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. was obtained.Other calculations were carried out at two levels of theory, theabintio[Restricted Hatree-Fock]/ (RHF) and Density Functional Theory (DFT) [LSDA \& B3LYP] using windows version of Gaussian 03 software with different basis sets. The results obtained show thatat both levels of theory, the N1-H4 bond in Hydralazine is the strongest because it has the shortest bond length (Average $1.0124 \AA$ for DFT and $0.9921 \AA$ for RHF ) while C3-C6 is the weakest due to its longer bond lengths (Average 1.4399A for DFT and $1.4446 \AA$ for RHF). The HOMOLUMO energy gap was found to be4.11eV which was closer to4.52eV as previously reported. NBO analysis was carried out where the highest values ofstabilisation energy $\left(E^{(2)}\right)$ were obtained in the lone-pair N5 as $10.42 \mathrm{~kJ} / \mathrm{mol}$ for DFT and $13.18 \mathrm{~kJ} / \mathrm{mol}$ for RHF which implies more intense interaction between donors and acceptors. This work specifically contributed in the calculations of chemical hardness, chemical softness, chemical potential, electrophilicity, NBO analysis, average polarizability and first order hyper polarizability which have not been reported previously. In a nutshell, this work sheds more light into the molecular structure and electronic properties of hydralazine which will be useful in drug design.


### 1.0 Introduction

Hypertension (high blood pressure) is define as having a blood pressure higher than 140 over 90 mmHg with a consensus across a medical guidelines. Blood pressureis the force exerted by the blood against the walls of blood vessels, and the magnitude of this force depends on the cardiac output and the resistance of the blood vessels. Hydralazine is widely used in the long term treatment of hypertension The cellular response to hydralazine includes production of free radicals and induction of DNA damage [1]. Hydralazine is also known as Apresoline (HP) and is used in the treatment of hypertension because of its peripheral vasolidatoreffect[2].
The World Health Organisation (WHO) identified hypertension as the leading cause of cardio vascular mortality. As the momentum picks up every year, the WHO is confident that almost the estimated 1.5 billion people are affected by elevated
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blood pressure can be reached [3]. Hydralazine is a vasodilator used to treats severe hypertension, congestive heart failure, myocardial infarction and preeclampsia.Hydralazine thought to reduce peripheral resistance directly by relaxing the smooth muscle cell lyre in arterial vessels[4]. Hydralazine is a centrally acting anti-hypertensive agent, find use in the treatment of all grades of hypertension. It is also known to act peripherally, partly by blocking alpha-adrenegic receptors and partly by decreasing vascular reactivity [5-6]. The 3-dimentionalquantitative structure activity relationship provides the valuable information about the nature of the receptor helps to describe new drug candidates and to improve in vitro potency [7].An investigation of the relative stability, thermodynamic properties, HOMO-LUMO energy and dipole moment of hydralazine and its metabolites has been reported [1].Similarly, the anticorrosion potential of hydralazine was studied and reported by [8]. Hydralazine and nitrate when combined, reduces morbidity and in some trials of chronic heart failure (CHF) [9].


Figure 1.0: Chemical structure of Hydralazine
It is the purpose of this work to investigate some of the molecular, electronic and non-linear optical propeties of hydralazine and compare the results with previously reported works and also to compute chemical hardness, chemical softness, chemical potential, electrophilicity, NBO analysis, average polarizability and first order hyper polarizability which have not been reported previously.

### 2.0 Theoretical Background

## Geometry Optimization

Geometry optimization is a name for the procedure that attemptsto find the configuration of minimum energy of the molecule. Theprocedure calculates the wave function and the energy at a startinggeometry and then proceeds to search a new geometry of a lower energy.This is repeated until the lowest energy geometry is found. Theprocedure calculates the force on each atom by evaluating the gradient (first derivative) of the energy with respect to atomic positions [10].

## Conformational Analysis

All classical and quantum mechanics geometry optimization methods typically find a minimumenergy conformation near the starting geometry. This minimum is not necessarily the true globalminimum energy structure. Hence, there is often a need to compare all possible conformations ofa molecule to find the true global minimum, or several of the lowest minima. This process is known as conformational searching[10].
Conformational analysis of molecule is based on molecular mechanics, it is a method for the calculation of molecular structures,conformational energies and other molecular properties using concept from classical mechanics. A molecule is considered as a collection of atoms held together by classical forces. These forces are described by potential energy function of structural features like bond lengths,bond angles and torsion angles [5].
Furthermore, molecular mechanics deals with the changes in a molecule's electronic energy due to bond stretching ( $V_{\text {str }}$ ), bond-angle bending ( $V_{\text {bend }}$ ), out-of-plane bending ( $V_{\text {oop }}$ ), internal rotation (torsion) about bonds ( $V_{\text {tors }}$ ), interactions between these kinds of motion which produce cross terms ( $V_{\text {cross }}$ ), van der Waals attractions and repulsion between non-bonded atoms ( $V_{v d w}$ ) and electrostatic interactions between atoms ( $V_{e s}$ ). The sum of these contributions gives the molecular mechanics potential energy V (called the sterric energy) for motion of the atoms in the molecule (or molecules if the system being calculated has more than one molecule) [10].
$V=V_{\text {str }}+V_{\text {bend }}+V_{\text {oop }}+V_{\text {tors }}+V_{\text {cross }}+V_{\text {vdw }}+V_{\text {es }}$
Bond stretching: $V_{\text {str }}$
$V_{\text {str }}$, the first term of the equation, represents the potential energy of stretching a bond, like a spring, from its minimum energy equilibrium length.Itrepresents the energy required to stretch or compress a bond between two atoms. In the simplest force fields, the potential energy of stretching may be approximated by the harmonic oscillator potential.
$V_{s t r, i j}=\frac{1}{2} K_{I J}\left(r_{i j}-r_{I J}\right)^{2}$
Here, $\boldsymbol{r}_{i j}$ represents the distance between atoms $i$ and $j, \boldsymbol{K}_{I J}$ represents the force constant between the atoms, and $\boldsymbol{r}_{I J}$ represnts a reference bond length between the atoms.

## Angle bending: $\boldsymbol{V}_{\text {bend }}$

The second term of equation (1) $V_{\text {bend }}$ represents the potential energy associated with bending the angle between three atoms. Itis the energy required to bend a bond from its equilibrium angle $\theta_{j k l}$.
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This system can be modelled by a spring, and the energy is given by the Hookian potential with respect to angle. The simplest representation of this interaction is a quadratic [10].
$V_{\text {bend }, i j k}=\frac{1}{2} K_{I J K}\left(\theta_{i j k}-\theta_{I J K}\right)^{2}$
$\theta_{i j k}, K_{I J K}$ and $\theta_{I J K}$ each hold analogous definitions as in equation (2), except they representan interaction between three immediately adjacent bonded atoms and are referenced and measured by the angle formed by these atoms and not by any distances.

## Out-of-plane bending: $\boldsymbol{V}_{\text {oop }}$

$V_{\text {oop }}$ Is the energy required to deform a planar group of atoms from its equilibrium angle, usually equal to zero. An out-ofplane angle bending coordinate arises when the local molecular structure consists of four atoms with three valence bonds formed to one centre atom. Out-of-plane bending, sometimes called improper torsion, simply gives quantitative value to deviation from planarity, and may also, in simplest form, be written as a quadratic [10].
$V_{o o p, i j k}=\frac{1}{2} K_{I J K L} \chi_{i j k l}^{2}$
where $\chi_{i j k l}$ represents the angle by which an atom deviates from planar.

## Torsion angle: $\boldsymbol{V}_{\text {tors }}$

$V_{\text {tors }}$ is the energy of torsion needed to rotate about bonds. Torsionalenergies are usually important only for single bonds because double and triple bonds are too rigidto permit rotation. Potential energy changes due to torsional bending of fouratom groups bonded in a chain-like configuration are represented by the term $V_{\text {tors }}$ in equation (1) and is given by[10].
$V_{\text {tors }, i j k l}=\frac{1}{2}\left[V_{1}(1+\cos \phi)\right]+V_{2}(1-\cos 2 \phi)+V_{3}(1-\cos 2 \phi)$
where $\phi$ is the torsion angle $\left(\theta_{i j k l}\right)$ and $V_{1}, V_{2} a n d V_{3}$ are parameters whose values depend on the atom types $i, j, k$ and $l$.
Van der Waals interactions: $V_{v d w}$
Variations in the potential energy of the system due to van der Waals interactionsamong atoms are accounted for by the $V_{v d w}$ term of equation (1). Van der Waals forces, orLondon dispersion forces, exist between non-bonded atoms, and are typically regarded asinfluential among atoms separated by roughly three bond lengths or more. The Lennard-Jones 6-12 potential is particularly useful in this case [10].
$V_{v d W, i j}=\varepsilon_{I J}\left[\left(\frac{R_{I J}^{*}}{r_{i j}}\right)^{12}-2\left(\frac{R_{I J}^{*}}{r_{i j}}\right)^{6}\right]$
Here, $r_{i j}$ is the distance between atoms i $a$ nd $j, \varepsilon_{I J}$ is called the well-depth parameter, and $R^{*}{ }_{I J}$ is the distance between atoms $i$ and $j$ when the vander Waals potential energy is at a minimum.
Electrostatic interactions: $V_{e s}$
The $V_{e s t}$ term of equation (1) represents electrostatic interactions between atoms and, likevan der Waals forces; they are usually taken into account for non-bonded atoms. In its simplest incarnation, the electrostatic term appearsas Columbic [10].
$V_{e s, i j}=\frac{Q_{i} Q_{j}}{\varepsilon_{r} r_{i j}}$
Atoms are assigned partial charges in determining the values of $Q_{i}$ and $Q_{j} \cdot \varepsilon_{r}$ is adielectric constant, and $r_{i j}$ is the distance between atoms $i$ and $j$.
Interactions between different modes of conformations $V_{\text {cross }}$
$V_{\text {crossis }}$ a quantification of the interactions which may exist between different modes of conformation.For example, stretching bonds will change the van der Waals force between atoms, which in turn will change the force needed to bend an angle in question. The potential function that canmodel this interaction isgiven as [10].
$V_{\text {cross }, i j}=\frac{1}{2} K_{I J}\left(\Delta r_{1}-\Delta r_{2}\right) \Delta \theta$
where $\Delta \mathrm{r}$ 's and $\Delta \theta$ are deviations from bond lengths and angle, respectively.

## Density Functional Theory (DFT)

This is a very powerful method in computation and it has low cost as well as good accuracy for many problems [11]. DFT makes use of electron probability density instead of the electron positions, which reduces the computation cost. In DFT, the ground state energy can be determined by the relationship given as [12].
$\rho(r)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|\psi_{i(r)}\right|^{2}$
where $\rho(r)$ is the electron density and $\psi_{i(r)}$ is the wave function of the electrons.
Further description of DFT can be found in [13-16]
Global Quantities
Chemical hardness $(\eta)$ measures the resistance of an atom to charge transfer, it is estimated by using the equation [17].
$\eta=\frac{I-A}{2}$
Chemical softness $(S)$ is a property of molecules that measures the extent of chemical reactivity. It is estimated by using the equation [17].
$S=\frac{1}{\eta}$
Chemical potential $(\mu)$ measures the escaping tendency of an electronic cloud of the atoms, ions or molecules and can be calculated using the following relation[17].
$\mu=\frac{I+A}{2}$
where $\mathrm{I}=-\mathrm{E}_{\text {номо }}$ and $\mathrm{A}=-\mathrm{E}_{\text {Lumo }}$.
I and A are the ionization potential and electron affinity of the molecule.
Electrophilicity $(\omega)$ is a measure of energy lowering of the chemical species due to maximum electron flow between donor and acceptor. It is defined as [18].
$\omega=\frac{\mu^{2}}{2 \eta}$
Further, to define global descriptors for a given molecule one may use Koopmans' theorem within Hatree-Fock to get IP and EA in the form of molecular orbital energies and also define $\mu$, $\eta$ and $\chi$ as in the following equations [18].
I= - Еномо
EA $=-E_{\text {LUMO }}$
$\eta=\frac{1}{2}\left(E_{\text {LUMO }}-E_{\text {Номо }}\right) \approx \frac{1}{2}(I P-E A)$
$\chi=\frac{1}{2}(I P+E A)$
$\mu=\frac{1}{2}\left(E_{\text {LUмо }}+E_{\text {Номо }}\right) \approx \frac{1}{2}(I P+E A)$
In addition, according to Koopmans' theorem, the energy gap, Egap, defined as the difference between HOMO and LUMO energy is given by [18].
$\mathrm{E}_{\text {gap }}=\left(E_{\text {LUмо }}-E_{\text {Номо }}\right) \approx I P-E A$
Natural Bond Orbital (NBO) Analysis
The NBO analysis is already proved to be an effective tool for the chemical interpretation of hyperconjugative interaction and electron density transfer from the filled lone pair electron [19]. The hyperconjugative interaction energy can be calculated from the second-order perturbation approach as given by [20].
$E^{(2)}=-n_{\sigma} \frac{\langle\sigma| F|\sigma\rangle^{2}}{\varepsilon_{\sigma^{*}}-\varepsilon_{\sigma}}=-n_{\sigma} \frac{F_{i j}^{2}}{\Delta E}$
Where $\langle\sigma| F|\sigma\rangle^{2}$ or $F_{i j}{ }^{2}$ is the Fock matrix elements between i and j NBO orbitals, $\varepsilon_{\sigma^{*}}$ and $\varepsilon_{\sigma}$ are the energies of $\sigma^{*}$ and $\sigma$ NBOs and $n_{\sigma}$ is the population of the donor $\sigma$ orbital.

## Nonlinear optical properties

The study of nonlinear optical properties involves the calculation of dipole moment $(\mu)$, polarizability ( $\alpha_{\text {tol }}$ ) and first hyperpolarizability $\left(\beta_{t o l}\right)$ tensor. First hyperpolarizability is a third rank tensor which can be described by a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ matrix. Due to the Kleinman symmetry, the 27 components of the 3-D matrix can be reduced to 10 components. Using the $x, y$ and $z$ components and the magnitude of the total static dipole moment ( $\mu$ ), isotropic polarizability ( $\alpha_{\text {tol }}$ ) and first-order hyperpolarizability $\beta_{t o l}$ tensor can be calculated using the following equations [21] respectively,
$\mu_{t o l}=\left(\mu_{x}^{2}+\mu_{y}^{2}+\mu_{z}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$
$\alpha_{t o l}=\frac{1}{3}\left(\alpha_{x x}+\alpha_{y y}+\alpha_{z z}\right)$
$\beta_{t o l}=\left(\beta_{x}^{2}+\beta_{y}^{2}+\beta_{z}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$
where
$\beta_{x}=\beta_{x x x}+\beta_{x y y}+\beta_{x z z}$,
$\beta_{y}=\beta_{y y y}+\beta_{x x y}+\beta_{y z z}$
$\beta_{z}=\beta_{z z z}+\beta_{x x z}+\beta_{y y z}$

### 3.0 Methodology

The molecular structure ofthe title molecule was obtained from ligand Expo database and was used as obtained.Ligand expo (formerly Ligand Depot) is an online database which provides chemical and structural information about small molecules (so-called ligand) within the structure entries of the protein Data Bank (PDB). In order to obtain the most stable structure of the title molecule, conformational analysis was carried out using Complex 07 [22] based on molecular mechanics force field (MMFF).
This computation was performed using Newton Raphsonoptimization method. After the most stable conformer of the molecule was determined, geometry optimization of this molecule wasperformed using the window version of Gaussian 03 program package [23].Density functional theory (DFT) has been proved to be extremely useful intreating electronic structure of molecules[24]. Also DFT methods are now standard in virtually all of the most popular software packages[25]. The
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structure of the most stable conformer was used as the initial structure for quantum calculations. The entire quantum chemical calculations have been performed at DFT (B3LYP and LSDA) and ab initio methods [26] using the basis sets LSDA/3-21G*, LSDA/6-31G*, LSDA/6-311G*, B3LYP/3-21 G*, B3LYP/6-31 G*, B3LYP/6-311 G ${ }^{*}$, RHF/3-21G*, RHF/6$31 G^{*}$ and RHF/6-311G*. Finding a good geometry is called geometry optimization, so "OPT" was used as the keyword.The calculation generatedan output file called "filenameout". The output file (filename.out) contains a lot of information about the calculation and the results.The HOMO-LUMO analysishas been carried out to explain the charge transfer within the molecule. The energy gap which is the difference between HOMO and LUMO was calculated. The chemical hardness, chemical softnes, chemical potential and electrophilicity were also calculated using the HOMO and LUMO energy. NBO analysis stresses the role of intermolecular orbital interaction in the compounds, particularly charge transfer. This was carried out by considering all possible interaction between filled donor and empty acceptor NBOs and estimating their energetic importance by secondorder perturbation theory. For each donor NBO (i) and acceptor NBO (j), the stabilization energy associated with electron delocalization between donor and acceptor $E^{(2)}$ was calculated.

### 4.0 Results and Discussion

### 4.1 Conformational Stability

Since molecular geometry plays a very important role in determining the structure-activity relationship, conformational analysis of the molecule provides meaningful information, relevant to drug action [24]. To find the most stable conformer a conformational analysis was carried out for the title molecule usingConflex 07D. Table 1 shows the sterric energy of the four conformers with minimum energy. The conformer with ID number 0001 has the smallest value of sterric energy $(85.42 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol})$ which is in agreement with $84.57 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ reported by [1].

Table 1: Sterric Energy of Conformers

| S/N | ID | Sterric Energy (kcal/mol) | Conformer with <br> minimum energy | (Zaheed and Fazlul, 2006) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  | Kcal/mol |
| 1 | 00001 | 85.4208 |  | 84.57 |
| 2 | 00002 | 86.8449 |  |  |
| 3 | 00003 | 87.3493 |  |  |
| 4 | 00004 | 87.9595 |  |  |

### 4.2 Optimized Parameters of Hydralazine

Optimized Bond Lengths ( $\AA$ ) For Hydralazine Molecule
Bond length is the average distance between the canters of two atoms bonded together in any given molecule[25].Tables 2 and 3 show the calculated bond lengths at RHF and DFT levels of theory using different basis sets. The bond length in $R(1,4), R(2,7), R(2,8), R(11,15), R(13,19), R(14,18)$ and $R(15,20)$ respectively are found to be the least for both levels of theory. The strongest bond was formed at B3LYP/6-311G* level of theory for $\mathrm{R}(1,4)$ which was $1.002 \AA$ while the weakest bond existed at B3LYP/3-21G* level of theory which was calculated to be 1.4503 . On comparing the calculated values of bond length with experimental values, the bond lengthR $(5,9)$ at LSAD/3-21G* which was $(1.3915 \AA)$ was found to be in agreement with experimental value of $(1.392 \AA)$ in magnitude.
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Table 2: Optimized Bond Lengths of Hydralazine $(\AA)$ For RHF

| Bond <br> Lengths | RHF |  |  | $[27]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $3-21 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | $6-31 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | $6-311 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | Experimental |
| $\mathrm{R}(1,2)$ | 1.423 | 1.3927 | 1.3927 | 1.353 |
| $\mathrm{R}(1,3)$ | 1.4015 | 1.3629 | 1.3645 | 1.488 |
| $\mathrm{R}(1,4)$ | 1.006 | 0.9864 | 0.984 | 1.348 |
| $\mathrm{R}(2,7)$ | 0.9999 | 0.9986 | 0.9976 | 1.410 |
| $\mathrm{R}(2,8)$ | 1.0022 | 0.9986 | 0.9976 | 1.346 |
| $\mathrm{R}(3,5)$ | 1.2847 | 1.3058 | 1.306 | 1.393 |
| $\mathrm{R}(3,6)$ | 1.4416 | 1.4468 | 1.4454 | 1.486 |
| $\mathrm{R}(5,9)$ | 1.4015 | 1.3636 | 1.3643 | 1.392 |
| $\mathrm{R}(6,10)$ | 1.3903 | 1.3989 | 1.397 | 1.394 |
| $\mathrm{R}(6,11)$ | 1.4042 | 1.4099 | 1.4094 | 1.396 |
| $\mathrm{R}(9,14)$ | 1.2843 | 1.2902 | 1.2893 | 1.400 |
| $\mathrm{R}(10,12)$ | 1.4042 | 1.4091 | 1.4086 | 1.397 |
| $\mathrm{R}(10,14)$ | 1.4311 | 1.4321 | 1.4305 | 1.401 |
| $\mathrm{R}(11,13)$ | 1.365 | 1.3714 | 1.369 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(11,15)$ | 1.0693 | 1.0717 | 1.0696 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(12,16)$ | 1.3645 | 1.3698 | 1.3674 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(12,17)$ | 1.0723 | 1.0735 | 1.0712 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(13,16)$ | 1.4061 | 1.4078 | 1.4074 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(13,19)$ | 1.0716 | 1.0727 | 1.0704 | 1.000 |
| $\mathrm{R}(14,18)$ | 1.0715 | 1.0709 | 1.0691 | 1.000 |
| $\mathrm{R}(16,20)$ | 1.0716 | 1.0728 | 1.0705 | 1.000 |

Table 3: Optimized Bond Lengths of Hydralazine ( $\AA$ ) for DFT

| Bond <br> Lengths | LSDA |  |  | B3LYP |  | [27] |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $3-21 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | $6-31 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | $6-311 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | $3-21 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | $6-31 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | $6-311 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | Experimental |
| $\mathrm{R}(1,2)$ | 1.4278 | 1.3862 | 1.4007 | 1.4408 | 1.4107 | 1.4124 | 1.353 |
| $\mathrm{R}(1,3)$ | 1.3615 | 1.361 | 1.3587 | 1.3753 | 1.3742 | 1.3742 | 1.488 |
| $\mathrm{R}(1,4)$ | 1.0247 | 1.0169 | 1.017 | 1.009 | 1.0048 | 1.002 | 1.348 |
| $\mathrm{R}(2,7)$ | 1.0371 | 1.0278 | 1.0251 | 1.0288 | 1.0189 | 1.0165 | 1.410 |
| $\mathrm{R}(2,8)$ | 1.0512 | 1.0278 | 1.0363 | 1.0288 | 1.0189 | 1.0165 | 1.346 |
| $\mathrm{R}(3,5)$ | 1.3412 | 1.3419 | 1.3417 | 1.3373 | 1.341 | 1.34 | 1.393 |
| $\mathrm{R}(3,6)$ | 1.4318 | 1.4337 | 1.4289 | 1.4503 | 1.4483 | 1.4467 | 1.486 |
| $\mathrm{R}(5,9)$ | 1.3915 | 1.3655 | 1.3643 | 1.4214 | 1.385 | 1.3872 | 1.392 |
| $\mathrm{R}(6,10)$ | 1.4151 | 1.4189 | 1.4152 | 1.4177 | 1.423 | 1.4204 | 1.394 |
| $\mathrm{R}(6,11)$ | 1.4034 | 1.407 | 1.4024 | 1.4139 | 1.417 | 1.415 | 1.396 |
| $\mathrm{R}(9,14)$ | 1.3222 | 1.3235 | 1.3204 | 1.3195 | 1.3227 | 1.3202 | 1.400 |
| $\mathrm{R}(10,12)$ | 1.4066 | 1.4089 | 1.4052 | 1.4147 | 1.4177 | 1.4157 | 1.397 |
| $\mathrm{R}(10,14)$ | 1.4214 | 1.4188 | 1.4175 | 1.4326 | 1.4308 | 1.4287 | 1.401 |
| $\mathrm{R}(11,13)$ | 1.383 | 1.384 | 1.3798 | 1.3861 | 1.388 | 1.3841 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(11,15)$ | 1.097 | 1.0965 | 1.0937 | 1.0847 | 1.0851 | 1.0817 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(12,16)$ | 1.381 | 1.3816 | 1.3777 | 1.3837 | 1.3855 | 1.3817 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(12,17)$ | 1.0969 | 1.0964 | 1.0933 | 1.0859 | 1.0861 | 1.0826 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(13,16)$ | 1.4064 | 1.4084 | 1.4037 | 1.4132 | 1.4156 | 1.4127 | 1.080 |
| $\mathrm{R}(14,18)$ | 1.096 | 1.0953 | 1.0923 | 1.0853 | 1.0847 | 1.0816 | 1.000 |
| $\mathrm{R}(16,20)$ | 1.0954 | 1.095 | 1.0918 | 1.085 | 1.0853 | 1.0817 | 1.000 |

### 4.3 Optimized Bond Angles

Bond angle is defined as an angle formed between three atoms across at least two bonds. Molecular geometry is associated with the specific orientation of bonding of atom;whichcan be specified in terms of bond angles.The bond angles were calculated at RHF/3-21G*, RHF/6-31G*, RHF/6-311G*, LSDA/3-21G*, LSDA/6-31G*, LSDA/6-311G*, B3LYP/3-21G*, B3LYP/6-31G* and B3LYP/6-311G* levels of theoryas shown in Tables 4 and 5.The values obtained at both levels of theory
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are close with one another.It can be seen that the bond angleA ( $3,1,4$ ) at LSDA/6-31G* level which was $121.7865^{0}$ corresponds with experimental value $121.5^{\circ}$. AlsoA $(5,6,14)$ at B3LYP/6-31G* and B3LYP/6-311G* levels which were $119.7806^{\circ}$ and $119.757^{\circ}$ respectively closely agreed with experimental value of $119.7^{\circ}$. Similarly the bond angle A $(6,10,12)$ at LSDA/6-311G* which was $119.2695^{0}$ is similar with experimental value of $119.2^{0}$. In a nutshell, the calculated results are in agreement with experimental values.

Table 4: Optimized Bond Angles ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) for Hydralazine Molecule in RHF

| Bond Angles | RHF |  |  | [27] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $3-21 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | $6-31 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ | $6-311 \mathrm{G}^{+}$ | Experimental |
| $\mathrm{A}(2,1,3)$ | 115.9534 | 122.7097 | 122.7021 | 118.5 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(2,1,4)$ | 115.7658 | 114.8565 | 114.9385 | 120.5 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(3,1,4)$ | 114.1879 | 122.4336 | 122.3594 | 121.5 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(1,2,7)$ | 110.6805 | 111.5601 | 111.1548 | 121.0 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(1,2,8)$ | 114.024 | 111.5349 | 111.1568 | 117.4 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(7,2,8)$ | 115.3816 | 110.9296 | 110.4008 | 123.0 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(1,3,5)$ | 119.5463 | 116.8813 | 116.91 | 120.0 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(1,3,6)$ | 117.117 | 120.5744 | 120.534 | 106.1 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(5,3,6)$ | 123.3145 | 122.5443 | 122.556 | 122.9 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(3,5,9)$ | 120.019 | 120.7523 | 120.6794 | 120.6 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(3,6,10)$ | 116.4495 | 115.6958 | 115.7268 | 119.7 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(3,6,11)$ | 123.7376 | 124.9575 | 124.927 | 119.0 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(10,6,11)$ | 119.7985 | 119.3467 | 119.3462 | 121.9 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(5,9,14)$ | 119.529 | 120.6928 | 120.6437 | 119.7 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(6,10,12)$ | 119.9227 | 119.8655 | 119.8249 | 119.2 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(6,10,14)$ | 116.786 | 117.6014 | 117.6195 | 119.6 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(12,10,14)$ | 123.2709 | 122.5331 | 122.5556 | 119.4 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(6,11,13)$ | 119.6568 | 120.1002 | 120.1182 | 120.3 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(6,11,15)$ | 119.29 | 120.9339 | 120.9022 | 119.2 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(13,11,15)$ | 121.0341 | 118.9659 | 118.9796 | 120.4 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(10,12,16)$ | 119.7087 | 120.0559 | 120.0923 | 121.3 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(10,12,17)$ | 119.4118 | 119.257 | 119.2206 | 120.4 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(16,12,17)$ | 120.8786 | 120.6871 | 120.6871 | 119.3 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(11,13,16)$ | 120.5243 | 120.444 | 120.4375 | 121.4 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(11,13,19)$ | 120.0872 | 119.9368 | 119.9479 | 119.3 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(16,13,19)$ | 119.3839 | 119.6192 | 119.6146 | 119.3 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(9,14,10)$ | 123.8082 | 122.7134 | 122.7746 | 119.3 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(9,14,18)$ | 116.8859 | 116.7172 | 116.6919 | 120.3 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(10,14,18)$ | 119.302 | 120.5694 | 120.5335 | 106.1 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(12,16,13)$ | 120.3513 | 120.1877 | 120.181 | 109.5 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(12,16,20)$ | 120.2031 | 120.2302 | 120.2497 | 109.5 |
| $\mathrm{~A}(13,16,20)$ | 119.4396 | 119.5821 | 119.5693 | 109.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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Table 5: Optimized Bond Angles ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) for Hydralazine Molecule in DFT

| Bond Angles | LSDA |  |  | B3LYP |  |  | [27] <br> Experimental |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3-21G* | 6-31G* | 6-311G ${ }^{+}$ | 3-21G+ | 6-31G* | 6-311G+ |  |
| A $(2,1,3)$ | 117.6963 | 122.2429 | 118.7772 | 122.3634 | 123.0051 | 123.058 | 118.5 |
| A $(2,1,4)$ | 114.7816 | 115.9706 | 115.1139 | 114.4129 | 114.7199 | 114.6626 | 120.5 |
| A $(3,1,4)$ | 120.6775 | 121.7865 | 119.9868 | 123.2237 | 122.275 | 122.2793 | 121.5 |
| A(1,2,7) | 109.2395 | 111.4973 | 110.8915 | 108.3441 | 110.6392 | 110.2683 | 121.0 |
| $\mathrm{A}(1,2,8)$ | 104.3014 | 111.5024 | 106.6011 | 108.3333 | 110.6382 | 110.2692 | 117.4 |
| $\mathrm{A}(7,2,8)$ | 110.1862 | 109.9557 | 110.7753 | 108.0981 | 109.7113 | 109.2661 | 123.0 |
| A(1,3,5) | 115.0902 | 115.5355 | 115.1547 | 115.7916 | 115.8376 | 115.8859 | 120.0 |
| $\mathrm{A}(1,3,6)$ | 121.325 | 120.982 | 121.6452 | 120.4533 | 120.8335 | 120.8678 | 106.1 |
| $\mathrm{A}(5,3,6)$ | 123.5818 | 123.4825 | 123.1831 | 123.7551 | 123.3289 | 123.2462 | 122.9 |
| A (3,5,9) | 120.0548 | 119.891 | 120.2941 | 119.4915 | 119.9891 | 119.9385 | 120.6 |
| A(3,6,10) | 115.6634 | 115.492 | 115.5775 | 115.7816 | 115.576 | 115.6841 | 119.7 |
| A(3,6,11) | 124.5797 | 125.0358 | 124.7464 | 124.9376 | 125.2038 | 125.1171 | 119.0 |
| $\mathrm{A}(10,6,11)$ | 119.7516 | 119.4723 | 119.6693 | 119.2808 | 119.2202 | 119.1989 | 121.9 |
| A(5,9,14) | 118.6236 | 119.9129 | 119.5403 | 118.8183 | 119.7806 | 119.757 | 119.7 |
| A(6,10,12) | 119.4284 | 119.5133 | 119.2695 | 119.7482 | 119.6396 | 119.5616 | 119.2 |
| A(6,10,14) | 117.7255 | 117.6354 | 117.7492 | 117.7487 | 117.6406 | 117.6773 | 119.6 |
| A(12,10,14) | 122.8455 | 122.8513 | 122.9805 | 122.5032 | 122.7199 | 122.7611 | 119.4 |
| A(6,11,13) | 119.9791 | 120.1151 | 120.0779 | 120.1899 | 120.2383 | 120.2846 | 120.3 |
| A(6,11,15) | 120.5634 | 120.8118 | 120.461 | 120.8933 | 120.8735 | 120.8208 | 119.2 |
| $\mathrm{A}(13,11,15)$ | 119.4466 | 119.073 | 119.4518 | 118.9168 | 118.8882 | 118.8947 | 120.4 |
| A(10,12,16) | 120.1437 | 120.2271 | 120.3009 | 120.1515 | 120.2567 | 120.3109 | 121.3 |
| A(10,12,17) | 118.9747 | 118.8071 | 118.8492 | 119.1451 | 119.0372 | 119.0445 | 120.4 |
| $\mathrm{A}(16,12,17)$ | 120.8815 | 120.9658 | 120.8498 | 120.7034 | 120.7062 | 120.6446 | 119.3 |
| $\mathrm{A}(11,13,16)$ | 120.382 | 120.4465 | 120.3824 | 120.4604 | 120.4909 | 120.4731 | 121.4 |
| A(11,13,19) | 119.9927 | 119.8678 | 119.9233 | 119.9196 | 119.8356 | 119.8566 | 119.3 |
| $\mathrm{A}(16,13,19)$ | 119.624 | 119.6857 | 119.6932 | 119.62 | 119.6735 | 119.6704 | 119.3 |
| $\mathrm{A}(9,14,10)$ | 124.3388 | 123.5863 | 123.6431 | 124.4049 | 123.6848 | 123.697 | 119.3 |
| $\mathrm{A}(9,14,18)$ | 115.6524 | 115.7904 | 115.741 | 115.7169 | 115.7382 | 115.7184 | 120.3 |
| $\mathrm{A}(10,14,18)$ | 120.0088 | 120.6234 | 120.6159 | 119.8782 | 120.577 | 120.5847 | 106.1 |
| $\mathrm{A}(12,16,13)$ | 120.3024 | 120.2258 | 120.2901 | 120.1693 | 120.1545 | 120.171 | 109.5 |
| $\mathrm{A}(12,16,20)$ | 120.1189 | 120.1485 | 120.0992 | 120.2172 | 120.1981 | 120.1954 | 109.5 |
| $\mathrm{A}(13,16,20)$ | 119.5773 | 119.6257 | 119.6096 | 119.6135 | 119.6474 | 119.6336 | 109.5 |

### 4.4 Homo-Lumo Energy of Hydralazine

The word HOMO means Highest Occupied Molecular Orbital while LUMO stand for Lowest Unoccupied Molecular Orbital. The calculated values of HOMO and LUMO energy in atomic unit (a.u) of different basis set at different levels of theory are reported in Table 6.Both HOMO and LUMO are the main orbital taking part in chemical reaction. HOMO energy characterizes the capability of electron giving; LUMO characterizes the capability of electron accepting. The frontier orbital gap helps to characterize the chemical reactivity, optical polarizability, chemical hardness and softness of a molecule. The HOMO-LUMO gap is an important stability index. A large HOMO-LUMO gap implies high electronic stability for the molecule in chemical reaction and low reactivity, when low values imply that it will be easier to remove an electron from the HOMO orbital to LOMO one which can result in good reactivity.However for this work, there are some discrepancies in the results for both levels of theory. These discrepancies may be as a result of the theoretical approximation and probably the type of basis set used. Despite these discrepancies the results for RHF/6-31G* and DFT/6-31G* have been found to be the same value of 4.11 eV which is approaching a value of 4.52 eV as reported by [1].

Table 6: Homo-Lumo Energy Gap

| Method | Basis Sets |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { HOMO } \\ & \text { (a.u) } \end{aligned}$ | LUMO (a.u) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HOMO-LUMO } \\ & \text { Gap (a.u) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HOMO-LUMO Gap } \\ & (\mathrm{eV}) \end{aligned}$ | [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RHF | 6-31G+ |  | -0.20708 | -0.05620 | 0.15088 | 4.10574656 | 4.52 Ev |
|  | 6-311G+ |  | -0.21474 | -0.06553 | 0.14921 | 4.06030252 |  |
| DFT | LSDA | 6-31G+ | -0.18788 | -0.10531 | 0.08257 | 2.246894 |  |
|  |  | 6-311G+ | -0.19744 | -0.11585 | 0.08159 | 2.22022708 |  |
|  | B3LYP | 6-31G+ | -0.20708 | -0.05620 | 0.15088 | 4.10574656 |  |
|  |  | 6-311G+ | -0.21474 | -0.06553 | 0.14921 | 4.06030252 |  |

### 4.5 Global Quantities of Hydralazine

The chemical hardness of the molecule was determined by Equation (10). The calculated values are listed in Table 7.In addition, softness, $(S)$ accounts to measure the chemical reactivity of molecules, and it is the reciprocal of hardness as shown in Equation (11). The results are shown in Table 8. On the other hand, chemical potential of the title compound was determined from Equation (12)and the results calculated at different levels of theory are shown in Table 9. It can be observed that at LSDA/3-21G and LSDA/3-21G* the chemical potentials arethe same.Soft molecules are more reactive than hard ones because they can easily offer electrons.The electrophilicity was calculated using Equation (13) and the results is shown in Table 10.Electrophilicity index measures the propensity or capacity of a species to accept electrons. It is a measure of the stabilization in energy after a system accepts additional amount of electronic charge from the environment. More stable molecule corresponds to lesser electrophilicity.

Table 7: Chemical Hardness of Hydralazine

| Method |  | Basis Sets | I= - Еномо | EA = -Elumo | Chemical Hardness ( $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ ) [eV] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RHF |  | 6-31G+ | 0.20708 | 0.05620 | 0.07544 |
|  |  | 6-311G+ | 0.21474 | 0.06553 | 0.074605 |
| DFT | LSDA | 6-31G+ | 0.18788 | 0.10531 | 0.041285 |
|  |  | 6-311G+ | 0.19744 | 0.11585 | 0.040795 |
|  | B3LYP | 6-31G+ | 0.20708 | 0.05620 | 0.07544 |
|  |  | 6-311G+ | 0.21474 | 0.06553 | 0.074605 |

Table 8: Chemical Softness of Hydralazine

| Method |  | Basis Sets | I= - Еномо | EA = -Elumo | Chemical Softness ( $\mathrm{S}_{\text {) }}\left[\mathrm{eV}^{-1}\right]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RHF |  | 6-31G+ | 0.20708 | 0.05620 | 13.2556 |
|  |  | 6-311G+ | 0.21474 | 0.06553 | 13.4039 |
| DFT | LSDA | 6-31G+ | 0.18788 | 0.10531 | 24.2219 |
|  |  | 6-311G+ | 0.19744 | 0.11585 | 24.5128 |
|  | B3LYP | 6-31G+ | 0.20708 | 0.05620 | 13.2556 |
|  |  | 6-311G+ | 0.21474 | 0.06553 | 13.4039 |

Table 9: Chemical Potential of Hydralazine

| Method |  | I= - E $_{\text {номо }}$ |  | A =-E |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RHF | $6-31 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.20708 | 0.05620 | Chemical Potential $(\boldsymbol{\mu})[\mathbf{e V}]$ |
|  | $6-311 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.21474 | 0.06553 | 0.13164 |
|  | LSDA | $6-31 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.18788 | 0.10531 |
|  |  | $6-311 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.19744 | 0.11585 |

Table 10: Electrophilicity of Hydralazine

| Method |  | Basis Sets | $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{2 \boldsymbol { \eta }}$ | Electrophilicity $(\boldsymbol{\omega})[\mathbf{e V}]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RHF | $6-31 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.0173290896 | 0.15088 | 0.114853 |  |
|  | $6-311 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.01963781823 | 0.14921 | 0.131612 |  |
|  | LSDA | $6-31 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.02149009402 | 0.08257 | 0.260265 |
|  |  | $6-311 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.02453765603 | 0.08159 | 0.300743 |
|  | B3LYP | $6-31 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.0173290896 | 0.15088 | 0.114853 |
|  |  | $6-311 \mathrm{G}+$ | 0.01963781823 | 0.14921 | 0.131612 |

### 4.6 Natural Bond Orbital (NBO)Analysis

The NBO analysis is proved to be an effective tool for the chemical interpretation of hyperconjugative interaction and electron density transfer from the filled lone pair electro [19]. In order to investigate the various second - order interaction between the filled orbitals of one subsystem and vacant orbitals of another subsystem, the DFT/B3LYP/6-31G* and RHF/6$31 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ levels have been used to predict the hyperconjugation energy $E^{(2)}$. The hyperconjugative interaction energy was calculated from the second-order perturbation approach as shown in Equation (20). The results obtained for both DFT and RHF are shown in Tables11and 12. The larger $E^{(2)}$ value, the more intensive is the interaction between electron donors and acceptor. That is to say the more donation tendency from electron donors to electron acceptors, the greater the extent of conjugation of the whole system. From the results obtained at DFT, the highest values of $E^{(2)}$ was recorded in the lone-pairs N5 interacting with anti-bonding C3-C6 which was $10.42 \mathrm{~kJ} / \mathrm{mol}$ hence this give stronger stabilization of the structure. On the other hand for RHF the highest values was obtained inthe lone-pairs N5 interacting with anti-bonding C3-C6 with values of $13.18 \mathrm{~kJ} / \mathrm{mol}$ which shows larger delocalization in RHF method.Comparing DFT and ab initio, it can be seen that in RHF the interaction is more intense.

Table 11: Second-order Perturbation Theory Analysis of Fock Matrix in NBO basis Corresponding to the Intermolecular of the Title Compound at B3LYP/6-31G* Level of Theory.

| Donor NBO(i) | Acceptor NBO(j) | $\mathbf{E}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k J} / \mathbf{m o l})$ | $\mathbf{E ( j )} \mathbf{( \mathbf { E } ( \mathbf { i } ) ( \mathbf { a . u } )}$ | $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})(\mathbf{a . u})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{N} 1-\mathrm{N} 2)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | 0.59 | 1.26 | 0.025 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 2-\mathrm{H} 7)$ | 1.11 | 1.23 | 0.033 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{H} 4)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{N} 5)$ | 2.38 | 1.18 | 0.047 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{~N} 2-\mathrm{H} 7)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | 4.45 | 1.05 | 0.062 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{N} 5)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{H} 4)$ | 1.22 | 1.25 | 0.035 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 6)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{N} 2)$ | 2.55 | 1.09 | 0.047 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 6)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 11-\mathrm{C} 13)$ | 1.64 | 1.29 | 0.041 |
| LP (1) N1 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 2-\mathrm{H} 7)$ | 1.57 | 0.72 | 0.031 |
| LP (1) N1 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 2-\mathrm{H} 8)$ | 6.62 | 0.72 | 0.065 |
| LP (1) N1 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 6)$ | 0.93 | 0.84 | 0.026 |
| LP (1) N2 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | 0.83 | 0.75 | 0.022 |
| LP (1) N2 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{H} 4)$ | 8.27 | 0.77 | 0.071 |
| LP (1) N5 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | 3.08 | 0.77 | 0.044 |
| LP (1) N5 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 6)$ | 10.42 | 0.93 | 0.088 |
| LP (1) N9 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{N} 5)$ | 8.82 | 0.88 | 0.079 |

Table 12: Second-order Perturbation Theory Analysis of Fock Matrix in NBO Basis Corresponding to the Intermolecular of the Title Compound at RHF/6-31G* Level of Theory.

| Donor NBO(i) | Acceptor NBO(j) | $\mathbf{E}^{(\mathbf{2})}(\mathbf{k J / m o l})$ | $\mathbf{E ( j ) - E ( i ) ( \mathbf { a . u } )}$ | $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j})(\mathbf{a . u})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{N} 1-\mathrm{N} 2)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | 0.63 | 1.77 | 0.030 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 2-\mathrm{H} 7)$ | 1.43 | 1.76 | 0.045 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{H} 4)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{N} 5)$ | 3.10 | 1.66 | 0.064 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{~N} 2-\mathrm{H} 7)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | 6.00 | 1.53 | 0.086 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{N} 5)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{H} 4)$ | 1.53 | 1.80 | 0.047 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 6)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{N} 2)$ | 3.06 | 1.63 | 0.063 |
| $\sigma(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 6)$ | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 11-\mathrm{C} 13)$ | 1.80 | 1.80 | 0.051 |
| LP (1) N1 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 2-\mathrm{H} 7)$ | 2.13 | 1.15 | 0.046 |
| LP (1) N1 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 2-\mathrm{H} 8)$ | 9.45 | 1.15 | 0.096 |
| LP (1) N1 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 6)$ | 1.20 | 1.27 | 0.036 |
| LP (1) N2 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | 1.04 | 1.21 | 0.032 |
| LP (1) N2 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{H} 4)$ | 11.05 | 1.24 | 0.104 |
| LP (1) N5 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{~N} 1-\mathrm{C} 3)$ | 4.35 | 1.25 | 0.066 |
| LP (1) N5 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{C} 6)$ | 13.18 | 1.40 | 0.122 |
| LP (1) N9 | $\sigma^{*}(\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{N} 5)$ | 10.86 | 1.36 | 0.109 |
| N 9 2 |  |  |  |  |

## Nonlinear Optical Properties(The Average Polarizability ( $\alpha_{\text {tol }}$ ), first Order Hyperpolarizability ( $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\text {tol }}$ ) and Dipole Moment ( $\mu$ )) Values of Hydralazine Analysis

The calculated values of average polarizability ( $\alpha_{\text {tol }}$ ), first order hyperpolarizability $\left(\beta_{t o l}\right)$ and dipole moment ( $\mu$ ) calculated at DFT and RHF levels of theory are shown in Table 12. Higher value of dipole moment, molecular polarizability and first order hyperpolarizability are important for more active non-linear optical(NLO) properties. The large value of hyperpolarizability $(\beta)$ which is a function of the NLO activity of the molecular system is associated with the intra molecular charge transfer.The results at both levels of theory agreed with each other.For example the calculated average polarizability for DFT and RHF are $1.922 \times 10^{-23}$ and $1.759 \times 10^{-23}$ esu respectively. For the first order hyperpolarizability, the value obtained for DFT and RHF are $0.7971 \times 10^{-30}$ and $0.7066 \times 10^{-30}$ esu respectively and that of dipole moment for both levels were found to be 6.6579 and 6.2535 D respectively.
Table 13: The Average Polarizability ( $\alpha_{\text {tol }}$ ), First Order Hyperpolarizability ( $\beta_{t o l}$ ) and DipoleMoment ( $\mu$ ) Valuesof Hydralazine

| Parameters | LSDA/6-31G* | RHF/6-31G* |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\alpha_{x x}$ | 178.592 | 156.634 |
| $\alpha_{x y}$ | -0.107 | 5.132 |
| $\alpha_{y y}$ | 145.053 | 134.345 |
| $\alpha_{x z}$ | 1.416 | 1.314 |
| $\alpha_{y z}$ | -1.100 | -0.523 |
| $\alpha_{z z}$ | 65.428 | 65.156 |
| $\alpha_{\text {tol }(e s u)}$ | $1.922 \times 10^{-23}$ | $1.759 \times 10^{-23}$ |
| $\beta_{x x x}$ | 6.6316 | 5.1111 |
| $\beta_{x x y}$ | -43.4966 | -38.1152 |
| $\beta_{x y y}$ | -8.6786 | -8.0425 |
| $\beta_{y y y}$ | -45.5593 | -40.8244 |
| $\beta_{x x z}$ | 17.7682 | 15.4991 |
| $\beta_{x y z}$ | -2.2367 | -2.0303 |
| $\beta_{y y z}$ | 1.0836 | 1.4426 |
| $\beta_{x z z}$ | 9.0112 | 11.6747 |
| $\beta_{y z z}$ | -0.6330 | -0.8210 |
| $\beta_{z z z}$ | 1.6519 | 1.7817 |
| $\beta_{t o l}(e s u)$ | $0.7971 \times 10^{-30}$ | $0.7066 \times 10^{-30}$ |
| $\mu_{\mathrm{x}}$ | -2.8034 | -3.2152 |
| $\mu_{\mathrm{y}}$ | -5.7817 | -5.1285 |
| $\mu_{\mathrm{z}}$ | 1.7440 | 1.5709 |
| $\mu(\mathrm{D})$ | 6.6579 | 6.2535 |

### 5.0 Conclusion

In this work, the most stable structure of Hydralazine was found to have sterric energy of $85.42 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ by MMFF calculation which agreed with the value $84.57 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ as reported by[1]. The optimized parameters (bond lengths and bond angles) calculated using DFT and ab initio with different basis sets mostly agreed with experimental values. The HOMOLUMO energy gap calculated show that at both levels of theory, the basis sets 6-31G* and 6-311G* give closer results to the one reported by (Zaheed andFazlul, 2006). For example, RHF/6-31G* and DFT/6-31G* results show that a value of 4.11 eV was obtained as compared to 4.52 eV reported by [1]. Chemical hardness, chemical softness, chemical potential and electrophilicity have been calculated using the values of HOMO and LUMO energies and the results agreed with different basis sets. NBO analysis shows the calculated value of hyperconjugative energy $E^{(2)}$ in which the highest value of $10.42 \mathrm{~kJ} / \mathrm{mol}$ for DFT and $13.18 \mathrm{~kJ} / \mathrm{mol}$ for RHF which implies that the interaction will be more intense at these values. Values obtained for average polarizability, hyperpolarizability and dipole moment using different basis set strongly agreed.The results indicate that the DFT and RHF are valuable tools for predicting biological activity of hydralazine phytochemical. The HOMO-LUMO energy gap reveals the stability index of compounds.
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