


 Cite this: *RSC Adv.*, 2020, 10, 31316

## Correction: Toward realistic computer modeling of paraffin-based composite materials: critical assessment of atomic-scale models of paraffins


Igor V. Volgin, Artyom D. Glova, Victor M. Nazarychev, Sergey V. Larin, Sergey V. Lyulin and Andrey A. Gurtovenko \*

DOI: 10.1039/d0ra90087g

[rsc.li/rsc-advances](http://rsc.li/rsc-advances)

 Correction for 'Toward realistic computer modeling of paraffin-based composite materials: critical assessment of atomic-scale models of paraffins' by Artyom D. Glova *et al.*, *RSC Adv.*, 2019, 9, 38834–38847, DOI: 10.1039/C9RA07325F.

The authors regret that the 1–4 Lennard-Jones interactions were not accounted for in the molecular dynamics simulations of *n*-eicosane samples with the use of the united-atom GROMOS force field, as required by the original parametrization of this force field.<sup>1</sup> This led to the abnormal behavior of the corresponding systems, namely: the *n*-eicosane samples did not crystallize within the temperature range of 200–450 K. After the 1–4 interactions were turned on, the GROMOS force field allowed us to observe the crystallization of *n*-eicosane with the transition temperature of  $270 \pm 1$  K, see Fig. 1.



**Fig. 1** Mass density of *n*-eicosane samples as a function of temperature for the GROMOS force field, *cf.* Fig. 2(b) of the original publication. The open black squares show the original incorrect data, and the closed red squares correspond to the corrected results. For the sake of comparison, the experimental data<sup>2,3</sup> is also presented.

Most structural and dynamic characteristics also changed after the 1–4 interactions were properly accounted for. Below we present the updated versions of Tables 1 and 2 of the original publication.

Overall, the GROMOS force field does not show abnormal behavior for the *n*-eicosane sample anymore and performs rather similarly to other united-atom force fields such as *e.g.* PYS. The main conclusions of the original publication remain unchanged since the use of all-atom general-purpose force fields was shown to provide a more realistic description for *n*-eicosane as compared to their united-atom counterparts.



## Correction

**Table 1** The crystallization temperature ( $T_c$ ), the coefficient of volumetric thermal expansion (CTE) measured in the temperature interval 400–450 K, the radius of gyration ( $R_g$ ), and the end-to-end distance  $H$  of  $n$ -eicosane chains for different force fields. The corrected data for the GROMOS force field is highlighted in bold

Force field	$T_c$ , K	CTE, $10^{-4} \text{ K}^{-1}$	$R_g$ , nm ( $T = 250 \text{ K}$ )	$R_g$ , nm ( $T = 450 \text{ K}$ )	$H$ , nm ( $T = 250 \text{ K}$ )	$H$ , nm ( $T = 450 \text{ K}$ )
GAFF	330 ± 1	17.4 ± 0.1	0.75 ± 0.01	0.60 ± 0.01	2.43 ± 0.01	1.70 ± 0.01
GAFF2	365 ± 2	14.3 ± 0.1	0.75 ± 0.01	0.62 ± 0.01	2.43 ± 0.01	1.82 ± 0.01
OPLS-AA	365 ± 1	14.7 ± 0.1	0.74 ± 0.01	0.62 ± 0.01	2.42 ± 0.01	1.80 ± 0.01
L-OPLS-AA	265 ± 3	12.3 ± 0.1	0.72 ± 0.01	0.57 ± 0.01	2.29 ± 0.01	1.63 ± 0.01
CHARMM36	320 ± 1	12.4 ± 0.1	0.74 ± 0.01	0.59 ± 0.01	2.39 ± 0.01	1.69 ± 0.01
<b>GROMOS</b>	<b>270 ± 1</b>	<b>9.1 ± 0.1</b>	<b>0.72 ± 0.01</b>	<b>0.58 ± 0.01</b>	<b>2.34 ± 0.01</b>	<b>1.66 ± 0.01</b>
NERD	270 ± 1	11.6 ± 0.1	0.74 ± 0.01	0.58 ± 0.01	2.41 ± 0.01	1.64 ± 0.01
OPLS-UA	310 ± 1	7.6 ± 0.1	0.73 ± 0.01	0.57 ± 0.01	2.38 ± 0.01	1.63 ± 0.01
PYS	270 ± 10	9.0 ± 0.1	0.72 ± 0.01	0.55 ± 0.01	2.34 ± 0.01	1.57 ± 0.01
TraPPE	280 ± 1	9.6 ± 0.1	0.74 ± 0.01	0.58 ± 0.01	2.41 ± 0.01	1.65 ± 0.01
Experiment	310 (ref. 4)	8.8–8.9 (ref. 2 and 3)	—	—	2.43 (ref. 5)	—

**Table 2** The shear viscosity, the diffusion coefficient and the mass density for  $n$ -eicosane samples in the liquid state simulated with different force fields at  $T = 450 \text{ K}$ . The corrected data for the GROMOS force field is highlighted in bold

Force field	$\eta$ , mPa s	$D$ , $10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$	$\rho$ , $\text{kg m}^{-3}$
GAFF	0.42 ± 0.04	2.9 ± 0.2	592.3 ± 0.1
GAFF2	0.59 ± 0.01	2.1 ± 0.1	633.5 ± 0.1
OPLS-AA	0.83 ± 0.07	1.6 ± 0.1	668.2 ± 0.1
L-OPLS-AA	0.64 ± 0.08	2.2 ± 0.2	656.4 ± 0.1
CHARMM36	0.60 ± 0.04	2.1 ± 0.2	658.1 ± 0.1
<b>GROMOS</b>	<b>0.52 ± 0.01</b>	<b>2.7 ± 0.1</b>	<b>690.3 ± 0.1</b>
NERD	0.32 ± 0.01	3.6 ± 0.1	661.0 ± 0.1
OPLS-UA	0.79 ± 0.02	1.8 ± 0.1	753.1 ± 0.1
PYS	0.53 ± 0.01	2.6 ± 0.1	698.8 ± 0.1
TraPPE	0.45 ± 0.04	2.9 ± 0.1	693.7 ± 0.1
Experiment	0.594 ( $T = 453 \text{ K}$ ) <sup>6</sup>	2.2 ( $T = 443 \text{ K}$ ) <sup>7</sup>	696.0 ( $T = 440 \text{ K}$ ) <sup>3</sup>

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.

## References

- 1 L. D. Schuler, X. Daura and W. F. van Gunsteren, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 2001, **22**, 1205–1218.
- 2 A. P. Shlosinger and E. W. Bentilla, *Research and development study on thermal control by use of fusible materials, NASA Technical Report, NASA-CR-67695*, 1965.
- 3 W. F. Seyer, R. F. Patterson and J. L. Keays, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1944, **66**, 179–182.
- 4 A. Sharma, V. V. Tyagi, C. R. Chen and D. Buddhi, *Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev.*, 2009, **13**, 318–345.
- 5 M. Rubinstein and R. H. Colby, *Polymer physics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
- 6 P. H. Gross and H. K. Zimmerman, *Rheol. Acta*, 1964, **3**, 290–294.
- 7 E. von Meerwall, S. Beckman, J. Jang and W. L. Mattice, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1998, **108**, 4299–4304.

