

Phi -57	15	16	17	18	19
1	2.8165	2.7025	4.7646	4.2732	3.5145
2	2.9403	2.6976	4.4054	4.4471	3.6493
3	3.0279	2.7697	3.903	4.5903	3.8105
4	3.0104	2.8109	3.563	4.6102	4.0444
5	2.6997	2.7591	5.0645	4.1192	3.4006
6	2.6288	2.8404	5.2884	4.0231	3.2662
7	2.6206	2.9208	5.408	3.9743	3.1216

Psi -47	15	16	17	18	19
1	2.5429	2.3838	3.584	4.3108	3.46
2	2.5461	2.4834	4.0916	4.3372	3.49
3	2.655	2.5994	4.4567	4.3063	3.4967
4	3.0104	2.8109	3.563	4.6102	4.0444
5	3.0392	2.7474	5.0129	4.2501	3.5418
6	3.3458	2.7158	5.2123	4.2372	3.5723
7	3.6818	2.6291	5.3898	4.2335	3.6043

Diag	15	16	17	18	19
1	2.7586	1.9176	-0.4242	3.999	3.7119
2	2.8139	2.5206	2.7465	4.4879	3.7152
3	2.7706	2.6113	4.056	4.504	3.6292
4	2.8166	2.7026	4.7647	4.2732	3.5145
5	2.9088	2.8083	5.2805	4.1195	3.434
6	3.1201	2.8718	5.5681	4.0546	3.3375
7	3.4144	2.8982	5.6418	4.0213	3.2258

For the GLY-GLY as shown in Sheet-15, Phi and Psi angles are varied and the chemical shift values were calculated. When for each proton the Chemical shifts were plotted graphically, no clear trend emerged for systematizing the variations. Nor the numerical manipulation and averaging did yield any singular average structure in any simple way. Thus a need for knowing the functional dependence of the Chemical Shift with Phi-Psi angles became even more evident. For that matter if one tries to correlate the charge on the atom in a molecule with the chemical shift, no clear trends were immediately evident







