The effect of solvent on the α-effect: the MeCN–H₂O solvent system†

Ik-Hwan Um,[a] **Young-Min Park**[a] **and Erwin Buncel**[*b]

[a] *Department of Chemistry, Ewha Womans University, Seoul 120-750, Korea*
[b] *Department of Chemistry, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario K7L 3N6, Canada.*
 *E-mail: buncele@chem.queensu.ca; Tel: 613-533-2635; Fax: 613-533-6669*

The increasing α-effect observed in MeCN–H₂O solvent mixtures, which contrasts with the previously found bell-shaped dependence on solvent composition in the DMSO–H₂O system, is attributed to the differential solvent effect on basicities of the α- and normal nucleophiles in the former case.

Among the possible causes of the α-effect, that is the enhanced reactivity of nucleophiles having an unshared pair of electrons adjacent to the nucleophilic centre,[1] the effect of solvent has been particularly controversial.[2–9] As one possible approach to the problem, in 1986 we examined the reactivities of an α-nucleophile, butane-2,3-dione monoxime (Ox⁻), and a normal nucleophile, *p*-chlorophenoxide (ClPhO⁻) with *p*-nitrophenyl acetate (PNPA) in dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO)–H₂O mixtures,[7a] due to the unique properties of this solvent system.[10] Unexpectedly, we observed a bell-shaped profile for the dependence of the α-effect on solvent composition, with a maximum at *ca.* 50 mol % DMSO.[7a] More recently, we observed a similar bell-shaped α-effect trend for the corresponding reactions of *p*-nitrophenyl diphenyl phosphinate (PNPDPP).[7b] However, a contrary result was reported for the reaction of PNPA with *O*-iodosylbenzoate (IBO⁻) and ClPhO⁻: the α-effect showed no maximum but decreased steadily as the DMSO content in the reaction medium increased.[9] Clearly, more work is called for in order to understand the effect of solvent on the α-effect.

We have now extended our study to a different solvent system, acetonitrile (MeCN)–H₂O mixtures, and have found a new type of solvent effect on the α-effect, namely an increasing α-effect. A plausible cause of this trend for the reaction of PNPA with Ox⁻ and ClPhO⁻ (eqn. 1) in MeCN–H₂O mixtures is herein presented.

$$CH_3C(O)OC_6H_4NO_2\text{-}p + Nu^- \rightarrow$$
$$CH_3C(O)\text{-}Nu + p\text{-}NO_2C_6H_4O^-$$
$$Nu^- = CH_3C(O)C(CH_3)=NO^- (Ox^-), \text{ an } \alpha\text{-nucleophile}$$
$$p\text{-}ClC_6H_4O^- (ClPhO^-), \text{ a normal nucleophile} \qquad (1)$$

Kinetic studies were performed spectrophotometrically under pseudo-first-order conditions with the nucleophile in excess. Pseudo-first-order rate constants (k_{obs}) were obtained from linear plots of ln ($A_\infty - A_t$) *vs. t.* Second-order rate constants (k^{Ox-} and k^{ClPhO-}) were calculated from the slope of the linear plot of k_{obs} *vs.* nucleophile concentration. As shown in Fig. 1, the magnitude of the α-effect (k^{Ox-}/k^{ClPhO-}) increases as the mol % MeCN in the medium increases, from *ca.* 100 in H₂O to 500 in 90 mol % MeCN. Recently, we found a decreasing α-effect trend for the reaction of PNPA with hydroxamates in MeCN–H₂O mixtures, and a shift in equilibrium from an OH acid to an NH acid upon addition of MeCN to H₂O was attributed as responsible for the observed α-effect trend.[8b]

Transition-state stabilization is one possible cause of the α-effect[11] and recently the bell-shaped α-effect trend observed for

the reaction of PNPA in DMSO–H₂O mixtures has been explained through a dissection of ground-state and transition-state contributions.[7c] In that system the basicities of the α-Nu (Ox⁻) and normal-Nu (ClPhO⁻) exhibit a parallel dependence on the DMSO–H₂O composition.[7]

The addition of MeCN to H₂O could influence not only the reaction rate but also the basicity of the anionic nucleophiles. Although the pK_a values for some phenols, carboxylic acids and amines in pure MeCN are available,[12a,b] very few pK_a data have been reported for MeCN–H₂O mixtures.[8b] Therefore, we have measured the relative basicity of Ox⁻ and ClPhO⁻ in MeCN–H₂O mixtures using piperazine as a reference base. One can define ΔpK_a as the pK_a difference between the conjugate acids of the nucleophile (Ox⁻ or ClPhO⁻) and piperazine, *i.e.* ΔpK_a = pK_a of the conjugate acid of the nucleophile (Ox⁻ or ClPhO⁻) − pK_a of the conjugate acid of the reference base (piperazine). Hence, the magnitude of ΔpK_a represents the relative basicities of these nucleophiles. We determined ΔpK_a values spectrophotometrically using the relationship: ΔpK_a = log $[HA]_{eq}[B]_{eq}/[A^-]_{eq}^2$, in which $[HA]_{eq}$ represents the equilibrium concentration of the conjugate acid of the nucleophile, and $[B]_{eq}$ and $[A^-]_{eq}$ represent the equilibrium concentration of the reference base (piperazine) and the nucleophile, respectively. The ΔpK_a values thus determined in MeCN–H₂O mixtures are summarized in Table 1. As shown in the table, the ΔpK_a values of Ox⁻ and ClPhO⁻ in H₂O are −0.38 and −0.44, respectively. The pK_a values of the conjugate acids of Ox⁻, ClPhO⁻ and piperazine in H₂O at 25 °C, have been reported to be 9.44,[7b] 9.38[12c] and 9.82,[12c] respectively, *i.e.* the ΔpK_a data determined in H₂O in the present study are identical to the literature values. It is also noted that Ox⁻ and ClPhO⁻ are less basic than piperazine in H₂O but appear to be more basic upon addition of MeCN. This is consistent with the report that the increase in pK_a values upon changing medium from H₂O to MeCN is more significant for phenols than for amines: the pK_a enhancements were reported to be 12–17 and 7–8 in pK_a units for phenols and for the conjugate acids of alicyclic secondary


Fig. 1 Plots showing the effect of solvent on the α-effect ($k^{\alpha-Nu}/k^{normal-Nu}$) for the reaction of PNPA at 25.0 °C: k^{Ox-}/k^{ClPhO-} in MeCN–H₂O (●); k^{Ox-}/k^{ClPhO-} in DMSO–H₂O (○);[7b] k^{IBO-}/k^{ClPhO-} in DMSO–H₂O (□).[9]

Table 1 Summary of the relative basicity of the nucleophile ($\Delta pK_a = pK_a$ of the conjugate acid of the nucleophile—pK_a of the conjugate acid of the reference base, piperazine) in MeCN–H_2O mixtures of varying compositions at 25.0 ± 0.1 °C[a]

Mol % MeCN	ΔpK_a (Ox$^-$)	ΔpK_a (ClPhO$^-$)	$\Delta\Delta pK_a$[b]
0	−0.38	−0.44	0.06
10	0.58	0.43	0.15
20	1.17	0.90	0.27
30	1.80	1.44	0.36
40	2.32	1.89	0.43
50	2.69	2.19	0.50
60	3.43	2.84	0.59
70	3.90	3.20	0.70
80	4.96	4.18	0.78
90	5.85	4.90	0.95

[a] The uncertainty in ΔpK_a values is estimated to be less than ± 0.03 pK_a units. [b] $\Delta\Delta pK_a = \Delta pK_a$ (Ox$^-$) − ΔpK_a (ClPhO$^-$).

amines (*e.g.* piperidine and morpholine), respectively, upon solvent change from H_2O to MeCN.[12a,b]

The difference in the relative basicity between Ox$^-$ and ClPhO$^-$ can be expressed as $\Delta\Delta pK_a$, *i.e.* $\Delta\Delta pK_a = \Delta pK_a$(Ox$^-$) − ΔpK_a (ClPhO$^-$). As shown in Table 1, $\Delta\Delta pK_a$ increases as the mol % MeCN in the medium increases, *i.e.* Ox$^-$ is more basic than ClPhO$^-$ by 0.06, 0.50 and 0.95 pK_a units in H_2O, 50 and 90 mol % MeCN, respectively, which contrasts with the situation, noted above, for DMSO–H_2O mixtures. We


Fig. 2 Plot of log $k^{\text{Ox}-}/k^{\text{ClPhO}-}$ *vs.* $\Delta\Delta pK_a$ for the reaction of PNPA with Ox$^-$ and ClPhO$^-$ in MeCN–H_2O mixtures at 25.0 ± 0.1 °C.

propose therefore, that the differential solvent effect on the basicity of these nucleophiles is the cause of the contrasting α-effect trends observed for the reaction of PNPA with Ox$^-$ and ClPhO$^-$ in DMSO–H_2O and in MeCN–H_2O mixtures.

Furthermore, it is found that a plot of log $k^{\text{Ox}-}/k^{\text{ClPhO}-}$ against $\Delta\Delta pK_a$ is linear with a slope of 0.85 (Fig. 2). This provides evidence that the increase in the $\Delta\Delta pK_a$ values is almost fully reflected in the increase in the α-effect for the reaction of PNPA with Ox$^-$ and ClPhO$^-$ upon addition of MeCN into the reaction medium.

Notes and references

1 J. O. Edwards and R. G. Pearson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1962, **84**, 16.
2 Reviews: (*a*) E. Buncel and S. Hoz, *Isr. J. Chem.*, 1985, **26**, 313; (*b*) A. P. Grekov and V. Y. Veselov, *Usp. Khim.*, 1978, **47**, 1200; (*c*) N. J. Fina and J. O. Edwards, *Int. Chem. Kinet.*, 1973, **5**, 1.
3 (*a*) C. F. Bernasconi and C. Murray, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1986, **108**, 5251; (*b*) D. J. Palling and W. P. Jencks, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1984, **106**, 4869.
4 (*a*) G. Moutiers, E. Guevel, L. Villien and F. Terrier, *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2*, 1997, 710; (*b*) F. Terrier, G. Moutiers, L. Xiao, E. Guevel and F. Guir, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1995, **60**, 1748.
5 (*a*) I. H. Um, J. S. Lee and S. M. Yuk, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1998, **63**, 9152; (*b*) K. R. Fountain, T. W. Dunkin and K. D. Patal, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1997, **62**, 2738; (*c*) E. Buncel, C. Chuaqui and H. Wilson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1982, **104**, 4896.
6 W. L. Jorgensen, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1987, **109**, 2349.
7 (*a*) E. Buncel and I. H. Um, *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.*, 1986, 595; (*b*) R. M. Tarkka and E. Buncel, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1995, **117**, 1503; (*c*) I. H. Um and E. Buncel, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2000, **65**, 577.
8 (*a*) I. H. Um, D. S. Kwon and G. J. Lee, *Bull. Korean Chem. Soc.*, 1989, **10**, 620; (*b*) I. H. Um, H. W. Yoon, J. S. Lee and H. J. Moon, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1997, **62**, 5939.
9 R. A. Moss, S. Swarup and S. Ganguli, *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.*, 1987, 860.
10 E. Buncel and H. Wilson, *Adv. Phys. Org. Chem.*, 1977, **14**, 133.
11 (*a*) E. Buncel and S. Hoz, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1983, **24**, 4777; (*b*) S. Hoz and E. Buncel, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1984, **25**, 3411; (*c*) K. R. Fountain, D. B. Tad-y, T. W. Paul and M. V. Golynskiy, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1999, **64**, 6547; (*d*) K. R. Fountain and K. D. Patel, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1997, **62**, 4795.
12 (*a*) M. K. Chantooni and I. M. Kolthoff, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1976, **80**, 1306; (*b*) J. F. Coetzee and G. R. Padmanabhan, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1965, **87**, 5005; (*c*) W. P. Jencks and J. Regenstein, in *Handbook of Biochemistry. Selected Data for Molecular Biology*, ed. H. A. Sober, The Chemical Rubber Co., Cleveland, OH, 1968.