ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VII, July 2026

Qualitative Prediction of Reaction Rates Using Transition State Theory, Solvent Effects and Activation Parameters: A Review

Anil Kumar Singh.

Department of chemistry, Teerthanke Mahaveer University. Moradabad. UP. India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150700114

Received: 02 August 2026; Accepted: 07 August 2026; Published: 20 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Transition State Theory (TST), also known as Activated Complex Theory, provides an important theoretical framework for understanding and qualitatively predicting the rates of chemical reactions. The theory proposes that reactant molecules undergo transformation through a high-energy transition state or activated complex before forming products. The rate of a reaction is strongly related to the Gibbs free energy of activation (ΔG‡), while the enthalpy of activation (ΔH‡) and entropy of activation (ΔS‡) provide additional information about the nature and organization of the transition state. The uploaded article emphasizes the application of these concepts to organic reactions and mixed aqueous–organic solvent systems. It also discusses the Hughes–Ingold approach, hydrogen bonding, ion-solvating power of solvents, and the role of activation parameters in interpreting reaction mechanisms. Solvent polarity, solvation, molecular structure, substituent effects, and temperature can significantly influence the stability of reactants, intermediates, and transition states, thereby modifying reaction rates. The review demonstrates that combining Transition State Theory with solvent effects and activation parameters provides a useful qualitative approach for understanding reaction mechanisms and comparing relative reaction rates.

Keywords: Transition State Theory Activated Complex, Reaction Rate, Gibbs Free Energy of Activation, Enthalpy of Activation, Entropy of Activation, Solvent Effect, Hughes–Ingold Theory, Solvation, Reaction Mechanism.

INTRODUCTION

Prediction and interpretation of reaction rates are fundamental objectives of chemical kinetics and physical organic chemistry. Although experimental kinetic measurements provide quantitative rate constants, theoretical approaches are essential for explaining why reaction rates change with molecular structure, solvent, temperature, and reaction mechanism. Transition State Theory occupies a central position in this area because it relates molecular-level changes at the transition state to the observed kinetic behavior.[1-3]

Transition State Theory was developed independently by Henry Eyring, Meredith Gwynne Evans, and Michael Polanyi during the 1930s. It considers the formation of a transient, high-energy activated complex along the reaction coordinate. The stability and free energy of this transition state determine the probability that reactant molecules will proceed toward products. Consequently, reactions having lower activation free energies generally proceed more rapidly than reactions requiring higher energy barriers.[4-6]

The theory is particularly valuable in physical organic chemistry because it provides a framework for interpreting nucleophilic substitution, elimination, addition, rearrangement, hydrolysis, catalysis, isotope effects, and solvent-dependent reactions. It can also be applied to mixed aqueous–organic systems, where changes in solvent polarity and solvation can alter activation parameters and reaction pathways. [7-10]

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VII, July 2026

Transition State Theory

According to Transition State Theory, reactant molecules must reach a high-energy configuration called the transition state or activated complex before conversion into products. The Gibbs free energy of activation, ΔG‡, represents the free-energy barrier between the reactants and the transition state.

The rate constant can be expressed as:

$$k = (k_B T/h)\, e^{(-\Delta G‡/RT)}$$

where k is the rate constant, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, T is the absolute temperature, h is Planck's constant, R is the gas constant, and ΔG‡ is the Gibbs free energy of activation.

A decrease in ΔG‡ generally results in an increase in the reaction rate, whereas an increase in ΔG‡ produces a slower reaction. Thus, comparison of activation free energies provides a useful qualitative method for predicting relative reaction rates.[11-12]

Hughes–Ingold Theory and Reaction Mechanism

The Hughes–Ingold approach provides an important framework for interpreting organic reaction mechanisms. It emphasizes electron movement, bond formation and bond cleavage, and the influence of electronic factors on chemical reactivity. The approach is particularly relevant to nucleophilic substitution, electrophilic substitution, addition, and elimination reactions.

Bond cleavage may occur through homolytic or heterolytic fission. Homolytic cleavage produces radicals, whereas heterolytic cleavage produces ionic species. The nature of the solvent can influence these processes, with polar solvents favoring ionic processes.

Electronic effects such as inductive effects, resonance effects, electromeric effects, and hyperconjugation influence the stability and reactivity of organic species. The article also discusses important reactive intermediates, including carbocations, carbanions, free radicals, carbenes, and nitrenes.

The Hughes–Ingold approach is useful for understanding SN1, SN2, E1, and E2 reactions, solvent effects, substituent effects, reaction intermediates, and transition states. However, the article notes that the approach is primarily qualitative and that highly complex systems may require molecular-orbital or computational approaches for complete interpretation.[13-14]

Hydrogen Bonding and Solvent Effects

Solvent effects play a major role in determining reaction rates because solvents interact with reactants, transition states, intermediates, and products. Hydrogen bonding and ion-solvating ability are two important solvent properties considered in the article.

Hydrogen-bonding solvents can stabilize polar functional groups and influence the relative energies of reactants and transition states. If the reactants are stabilized more strongly than the transition state, the activation energy may increase and the reaction may become slower. Conversely, preferential stabilization of a polar transition state can decrease the activation barrier and accelerate the reaction.

Polar protic solvents such as water, methanol, and ethanol can strongly solvate anionic nucleophiles. This reduces nucleophilic reactivity and can slow SN2 reactions. In contrast, polar aprotic solvents such as acetone, DMSO, DMF, and acetonitrile can solvate cations effectively while relatively weakly solvating anions, thereby enhancing nucleophilicity.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VII, July 2026

Ion-Solvating Power

Ion-solvating power describes the ability of a solvent to stabilize charged species through electrostatic interactions. Polar solvents with high dielectric constants can stabilize ions and reduce electrostatic attraction between oppositely charged species. This can promote ionization and reactions involving ionic intermediates.

The effect is particularly important for SN1 reactions because formation of a carbocation and leaving-group anion is involved. Strong ion-solvating solvents can stabilize these species and decrease the activation barrier. For SN2 reactions, however, strong solvation of anionic nucleophiles in polar protic solvents may decrease nucleophilic reactivity.[15-16]

Activation Parameters and Mechanistic Interpretation

Activation parameters provide important information concerning the nature of the transition state and the reaction mechanism. The principal parameters discussed are activation energy (Ea), enthalpy of activation (ΔH‡), entropy of activation (ΔS‡), and Gibbs free energy of activation (ΔG‡).

Enthalpy of Activation

ΔH‡ represents the energy required to convert reactants into the activated complex. A lower ΔH‡ indicates a comparatively accessible transition state, whereas a higher ΔH‡ suggests a greater energetic requirement. Changes in ΔH‡ caused by solvent or substituent variation may provide evidence for changes in the reaction pathway.

Entropy of Activation

ΔS‡ describes the change in molecular organization accompanying formation of the transition state. Positive ΔS‡ values are associated in the article with increased disorder and dissociative or unimolecular processes, whereas negative ΔS‡ values indicate increased ordering and are characteristic of associative or bimolecular processes.

Gibbs Free Energy of Activation

The relationship between activation enthalpy, activation entropy, and activation free energy is:

$$\Delta G‡ = \Delta H‡ - T\Delta S‡$$

Because the rate constant depends exponentially on ΔG‡, even relatively small changes in activation free energy can produce substantial changes in reaction rate.

Arrhenius Activation Energy

The Arrhenius relationship is:

$$k = A\, e^{(-Ea/RT)}$$

where *Ea* is the activation energy and *A* is the pre-exponential factor. Lower activation energy corresponds to an energetically easier reaction pathway. Significant changes in Ea can provide evidence for changes in the rate-determining step or reaction pathway.

Qualitative Prediction of Reaction Rates

The combined interpretation of activation parameters provides a useful qualitative method for predicting reaction rates. The article associates low ΔH‡ with easier transition-state formation, positive ΔS‡ with dissociative or

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VII, July 2026

unimolecular processes, negative ΔS‡ with associative or bimolecular processes, low ΔG‡ with faster reactions, and low Ea with a lower energy barrier.

Therefore, reaction-rate prediction can be approached by considering:

1. Stability of the transition state.
2. Gibbs free energy of activation.
3. Enthalpic requirements for bond breaking and formation.
4. Entropic changes during activation.
5. Solvent polarity and solvation.
6. Hydrogen-bonding interactions.
7. Ion-solvating ability.
8. Molecular structure and substituent effects.
9. Temperature.
10. Nature of the reaction mechanism.

This approach is particularly useful for comparing related reactions and interpreting changes in reaction behavior in aqueous and mixed-solvent systems.

Applications in Mechanistic Studies

Activation parameters and Transition State Theory can be used to differentiate SN1 and SN2 mechanisms, distinguish E1 and E2 pathways, investigate solvent effects, determine the nature of transition states, identify rate-determining steps, study substituent effects, and compare mechanisms in mixed aqueous and non-aqueous solvents.

The integration of solvent effects with transition-state concepts is especially relevant to aqueous–organic systems. Changes in solvent composition can modify solvation and the relative stabilization of reactants and activated complexes, thereby changing the observed kinetic behavior.

Review and Critical Perspective

The material reviewed demonstrates that reaction rates cannot always be interpreted solely through a single kinetic parameter. A more meaningful mechanistic interpretation emerges when ΔH‡, ΔS‡, ΔG‡, Ea, molecular structure, and solvent properties are considered together.

Transition State Theory provides the thermodynamic basis for understanding the activation barrier, while the Hughes–Ingold framework helps interpret electron movement and reaction pathways. Solvent effects provide an additional level of explanation by showing how hydrogen bonding and ion solvation modify the relative stability of reactants and transition states.

The major strength of this integrated approach is its ability to provide qualitative predictions even when extensive experimental kinetic information is unavailable. At the same time, the source recognizes limitations of qualitative mechanistic approaches, particularly for highly complex chemical and biological systems, where more advanced theoretical and computational methods may be necessary.

Future Perspectives

Future studies can extend this framework by combining experimental kinetic measurements with computational chemistry, molecular simulation, and quantitative solvent-effect parameters. Such approaches could provide a more detailed description of transition-state stabilization and solvent–solute interactions.

Particular attention may be given to mixed aqueous–organic solvent systems because relatively small changes in solvent composition can alter polarity, hydrogen bonding, ion solvation, and the organization of reacting

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VII, July 2026

species. Integration of experimental activation parameters with computational transition-state analysis may therefore improve qualitative and quantitative prediction of reaction rates.[17]

CONCLUSION

Transition State Theory provides a powerful theoretical basis for the qualitative prediction of reaction rates and mechanisms. The relationship between Gibbs free energy of activation and reaction rate explains why reactions having lower activation barriers generally proceed more rapidly. The combined use of ΔH‡, ΔS‡, ΔG‡, and Ea provides additional mechanistic information concerning transition-state formation, molecular organization, and energy requirements.

Solvent properties, particularly hydrogen-bonding ability and ion-solvating power, strongly influence the relative stabilization of reactants, transition states, intermediates, and products. The Hughes–Ingold approach further contributes to mechanistic interpretation by relating electron movement, bond cleavage, substituent effects, and solvent effects to organic reaction behavior.

Overall, the reviewed framework demonstrates that Transition State Theory, activation parameters, Hughes–Ingold concepts, and solvent effects should be considered together for a meaningful qualitative interpretation of reaction kinetics. This integrated approach is valuable in physical organic chemistry, catalysis, synthetic chemistry, and the study of reactions in aqueous and mixed-solvent systems.

REFERENCES

1. Seliverstova T S, Marina Kushner, Matusevich L G. (2020). Kinetics and mechanism of hydrolysis of Benzyl Ether bond in aqueous-organic media. Russian J of Physical Chemistry A. Vol-94: 310-316.
1. 2.*Magda F Fathalla,Yassir R. Elmarassi.(2019). The reaction of 2-chloroquinoxaline with piperidine in DMSO-H_2O and DMF- H_2O mixture. Kinetic and solvent effect. Journal of solution chemistry. Vol. 48:1287-1308,.*
2. Singh A K. (2026). Organic Reaction in Mixed Aqueous Solvents and their Kinetics. International journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI) ISSN No.2321-2705.DOI:10.51244/IJRSI. VOL VIII. Issue-VII. July 2026. PP1747-1753.
3. Keith J. Laidler, & John H. Meiser. (1999). *Physical Chemistry*. Houghton Mifflin.
4. Kenneth A. Connors. (1990). *Chemical Kinetics: The Study of Reaction Rates in Solution*. VCH Publishers.
5. F. A. Carey, & Richard J. Sundberg. (2007). *Advanced Organic Chemistry, Part A: Structure and Mechanisms* (5th ed.). Springer.
6. Jerry March. (1992). *Advanced Organic Chemistry: Reactions, Mechanisms, and Structure* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
7. Isaac Lowry, & K. S. Richardson. (1987). *Mechanism and Theory in Organic Chemistry* (3rd ed.). Harper & Row.
8. Christopher G. Swain, Christopher B. Scott, & Robert W. Taft. Studies on solvent effects and transition state stabilization in organic reactions. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*.
9. Henry Eyring. (1935). "The Activated Complex in Chemical Reactions." *Journal of Chemical Physics*, **3**, 107–115.
10. Meredith Gwynne Evans, & Michael Polanyi. (1935). "Some Applications of the Transition State Method to the Calculation of Reaction Velocities." *Transactions of the Faraday Society*, **31**, 875–894.
11. Cyril Norman Hinshelwood. (1940). *The Kinetics of Chemical Change*. Oxford University Press.
12. Kenneth B. Wiberg. (1964). *Physical Organic Chemistry*. John Wiley & Sons.
13. 14 John McMurry. (2021). *Organic Chemistry* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
14. Thomas H. Lowry, & Kathleen Schueller Richardson. (1987). *Mechanism and Theory in Organic Chemistry* (3rd ed.). Harper & Row.
15. 16. Singh AK & LK. TIWARI . (2020) “Study of Solvent effect of Protic solvent on Solvolysis of Hexanoate ester and Activation parameters.” Asian journal of Research in Chemistry, ISSN 0974-4150, 13(3), pp 216-218. DOI: 10.5958/0974-4150.2020.00041.3

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue VII, July 2026

16. Singh A K. (2019). Kinetics and solvent effect on activation parameter of aquo-propanol solvent system for acid catalyzed solvolysis of propyl formate. International Journal of Chemical Science ISSN:2523-2843 ,Vol-3, Issue-4, July, pp85-88