248-nm Laser Flash Photoprotonation of Mesitylene, Hexamethylbenzene, and 1,3,5-Trimethoxybenzene in 1,1,1,3,3,3-Hexafluoroisopropyl Alcohol. Formation and Electrophilic Reactivities of the Cyclohexadienyl Cations

Steen Steenken*,1a and Robert A. McClelland*,1b

Max-Planck-Institut für Strahlenchemie D-4330 Mülheim, Germany Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto Toronto, Canada M5S 1A1 Received August 14, 1990 Revised Manuscript Received October 11, 1990

Proton exchange upon photolysis of aromatic compounds in acidic solutions suggests that the excited aromatic species is protonated to form an intermediate cyclohexadienyl cation.² Quenching of the fluorescence of aromatic compounds by acids²⁻⁴ and ipso photosubstitution^{3c} have been interpreted in terms of the same mechanism. Photoreactions proceeding by way of carbocations are well established,⁵ and there have been a number of recent reports using flash photolysis to detect the intermediates and to study directly the kinetics of their reactions.⁶ This. however, has not been done for photoprotonation of aromatics (eq 1). In fact, although cyclohexadienyl cations are well established



in strong acids,⁷ there is no information regarding their lifetime under solvolytic conditions (in the presence of nucleophiles), except for some highly stabilized examples.⁸ We have recently found that the solvent 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoroisopropyl alcohol (HFIP) has a dramatic kinetic stabilizing effect for the 9-fluorenyl cation.⁶⁶ In this paper we report that this solvent has the additional property of being sufficiently acidic to effect protonation of electronically excited aromatic compounds without the need for added stronger acids. It is thus possible to produce, characterize spectroscopically, and kinetically study cyclohexadienyl cations. As examples, data

(1) (a) Max-Planck-Institut. (b) University of Toronto.

(1) (a) Max-Planck-Institut. (b) University of Toronto.
(2) (a) Smith, B. E. J. Chem. Soc. A 1969, 2673. (b) Lodder, G.; Havinga, E. Tetrahedron 1972, 28, 5583. (c) Stevens, C. G.; Strickler, S. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1973, 95, 3922. (d) Shikuza, H.; Tobita, S. Ibid. 1982, 104, 6919. (e) Shizuka, H. Acc. Chem. Res. 1985, 18, 141.
(3) (a) Brandon, W.; Pincock, A. L.; Pincock, J. A.; Redden, P.; Sehmbey, C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1987, 109, 2181. (b) Pincock, J. A.; Redden, P. R. Can. J. Chem. 1989, 67, 2181. (c) Wan, P.; Wu, P. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1990, 822

mun. 1990, 822

(4) For an alternative interpretation for compounds with reactive side chains, see: (a) Wan, P.; Culshaw, S.; Yates, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 2509. (b) Wan, P.; Yates, K. J. Org. Chem. 1983, 48, 869. (c) Turro, N. J.; Wan, P. J. Photochem. 1985, 28, 93. (d) Wan, P.; Chak, B. J. Chem. Perkin Trans. 2 1986, 1751 Soc.

(5) (a) Cristol, S. J.; Bindel, T. H. In Organic Photochemistry; Padwa, A Ed.; Marcel Dekker: New York, 1983; Vol. 6, pp 327-415. (b) Kropp, P. J. Acc. Chem. Res. 1984, 17, 131-137. (c) Wan, P.; Yates, K. Rev. Chem. Intermed. 1984, 5, 157

(6) (a) McClelland, R. A.; Banait, N.; Steenken, S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1986, 108, 7023; (b) 1989, 1/1, 2935. (c) McClelland, R. A.; Kanagasabapathy, V. M.; Steenken, S. *Ibid.* 1988, 1/0, 6913. (d) McClelland, R. A.; Kanagasabapathy, V. M.; Banait, N.; Steenken, S. *Ibid.* 1989, 1/1, 3966. (e) Steenken, S.; McClelland, R. A. *Ibid.* 1989, 1/1, 4967. (f) McClelland, R. A.; Mathivanan, N.; Steenken, S. *Ibid.* 1989, 1/1, 4967. (g) Schnabel, W.; A.; Mathivanan, N.; Steenken, S. *Ibid.* 1990, *112*, 4857. (g) Schnabel, W.; Naito, I.; Kitamura, T.; Kobayashi, S.; Taniguchi, H. *Tetrahedron* 1980, 36, 3229-3231. (h) Kobayashi, S.; Kitamura, T.; Taniguchi, H.; Schnabel, W. Chem. Lett. 1983, 1117-1120. (i) Van Ginkel, F. I. M.; Visser, R. J.; Varma, C. A. G. O.; Lodder, G. J. Photochem. 1985, 30, 453-473. (j) Kobayashi, S.; Zhu, Q. Q.; Schnabel, W. Z. Naturforsch. 1988, 43b, 825-829. (k) Minto, R. E.; Das, P. K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1989, 111, 8858. (l) Johnston, L. J.; Lobaugh, J.; Wintgens, V. J. Phys. Chem. 1989, 93, 7370. (m) Alonso, E. O.; Johnston, L. J.; Scaiano, J. C.; Toscano, V. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1990, 112, 1270. 112, 1270.

(7) Brouwer, D. M.; Mackor, E. L.; MacLean, C. In Carbonium Ions; Olah, G. A., Schleyer, P. v. R., Eds.; Wiley-Interscience: New York, 1970; Vol. II, Chapter 20.

(8) Effenberger, F. Acc. Chem. Res. 1989, 22, 27.



Figure 1. Absorption spectrum of MESH⁺ produced by 248-nm photolysis of 10 mM MES in HFIP at 20 ± 1 °C and measured at 100 ns after the laser pulse. The inserts show the decay of MESH⁺ at (a) 258 nm and (b) 355 nm and (c) the dependence on [MeOH] of k_{obsd} for decay monitored at 355 nm. The arrows show the position of the laser pulse.

on those derived from mesitylene (MES), hexamethylbenzene (HMB), and 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene (TMB) are reported.

The result obtained on photolysis of MES is shown in Figure 1: A transient with two absorption peaks appears within the 20-ns laser pulse and decays exponentially, with the same rates at the two wavelengths (inserts a and b). There is no difference between oxygen- and argon-saturated solutions while added bases accelerate the decay (insert c). That this transient is the cyclohexadienyl cation MESH⁺ is seen by comparison with literature spectra obtained for MES in highly acidic solutions where the cation is stable. As shown in Table I, the peaks of the species match closely with respect to both position and relative intensity.⁹ This table also shows that HMB and TMB behave in a similar manner upon photolysis in HFIP, giving the corresponding cyclohexadienyl cations HMBH⁺ and TMBH⁺.

Table II lists the quantum yields for the formation of the cyclohexadienyl cations and rate constants for their decay. The former were determined as previously described,^{6b} with the photoionization of iodide in water as actinometer, and using values reported in highly acidic media for the extinction coefficients of the cations.⁹ Quantum yields measured at the two maxima are in good agreement in each case. Rate constants for decay of cation for replicate measurements with the same solution were reproducible to $\pm 3\%$. However, for MESH⁺ and HMBH⁺, decay rates for different solutions showed larger deviations $(\pm 30\%)$, and there was an effect of dose, rate constants being slightly higher at very high laser intensities with a poorer obeyance to first-order decay. Both these observations were made previously with 9-fluorenyl cation.66 The former can be attributed to varying amounts of trace water in HFIP (see rate constants in Table III), the latter to reaction with the hexafluoroisopropoxide ion which must also form in the photoprotonation so that its initial concentration increases with laser dose. TMBH⁺ is extremely long-lived in the solvent HFIP, with little decay in 10 ms. This cation is also observed in trifluoroethanol (TFE) and even water (with 20% acetonitrile (AN)), although the quantum yields for its formation are an order of magnitude lower. The amount formed was increased by adding HClO₄, although even 3 M acid did not give as much cation as in HFIP. There was no cation signal for MES in any of these other solvents, including 5 M HClO₄ in 20% AN.

As expected, added bases/nucleophiles accelerate the decay of the cyclohexadienyl cations. Table III lists some preliminary

⁽⁹⁾ With both MESH⁺ and TMBH⁺, the optical density does not decay to zero at either λ_{max} (see inserts a and b to Figure 1), due to the presence of other, as yet unidentified, photoproducts. The optical densities employed in the comparisons at the two wavelengths and in the quantum yield mea-surements were calculated from differences between the initial value and the value after decay of the cation, using the ϵ values at λ_1 and λ_2 for MESH⁺ and HMBH⁺ and that at λ_1 for TMBH⁺. Due to the assumptions involved in the ϵ values of the cations in HFIP, the error in the quantum yields for cation formation is estimated as ±20%.

Table I. UV Spectra of Cyclohexadienyl Cations

cation	solvent	λ ₁ (max)	$\epsilon_1, M^{-1}, cm^{-1}$	$\lambda_2(\max)$	$\epsilon_2, M^{-1}, cm^{-1}$	$OD(\lambda_1)/OD(\lambda_2)$
MESH+	HFIP ^e	355		260		1.27
	HF/BF₃ ^c	355	11 000	254	8700	1.26
	HC1/AIC1 ₃ /lmCl ^d	360	10 700	262	10 200	1.05
	CF ₃ SO ₃ H ^e	358				
HMBH+	HFÌ₽°	390		275		1.51*
	HCl/AlCl ₃ /lmCl ^d	396	9880	285	6700	1.47
	98% [′] H₂SÓ₄ [∫]	395	≈10000	283	7240	1.38
тмвн⁺	HFIP ⁴	345		250		0.58
	65% HClO4 ⁸	346	10 000	251	15 000	0.65

^a This work. ^b See footnote 9. ^c Dallinga, G.; Mackor, E. L.; Verrijn Stuart, A. A. Mol. Phys. **1958**, 1, 123. ^d Smith, G. P.; Dworkin, A. S.; Pagni, R. M.; Zingg, S. P. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1989**, 111, 525. ImCl is 1-ethyl-3-methylimidazolium chloride. ^e Bokoss, H. J.; Ransom, R. J.; Roberts, R. M. G.; Sadri, A. R. Tetrahedron 1982, 38, 623. ⁷Deno, N. C.; Groves, P. J.; Jaruzelski, J. J.; Lugasch, M. N.; J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1960, 82, 4719. ⁸ Kresge, A. J.; Chiang, Y.; Kakke, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1971, 93, 6167.

Table II. Quantum Yields for Formation of Cyclohexadienyl Cations and Rate Constants for Decay at 20 ± 1 °C

cation	solvent	Φ^a	$k(\text{decay}), s^{-1}$
MESH ⁺	HFIP	0.08	1 × 10 ⁵
НМВН+	HFIP	0.04	7×10^{3}
TMBH+	HFIP	0.06	$<1 \times 10^{2}$
тмвн+	TFE	~0.006	7×10^{2}
тмвн+	1:4 AN:H ₂ O	~0.003	5.8×10^{5}
тмвн+	0.4 M HCĪO₄ (20% AN)	0.01	3.2×10^{5}
TMBH ⁺	3 M HClO ₄ (20% AN)	0.03	6.3×10^{4}

"See footnote 9.

Table III. Rate Constants, k_{Nu} for the Reaction of Bases/Nucleophiles Nu with MESH⁺, HMBH⁺, and TMBH⁺ in HFIP at 20 ± 1 °C

		k _{Nu} , ^a M ⁻¹ s ⁻¹	
Nu	MESH+*	HMBH+¢	TMBH ⁺
H ₂ O	8.8×10^{6}	2.7×10^{5}	<10
MeOH	2.4×10^{7}	1.5×10^{6}	<10 ²
EtOH	1.7×10^{7}	8.2×10^{5}	<10 ²
i-PrOH	2.0×10^{7}	8.1 × 10 ⁵	<10 ²
t-BuOH	1.2×10^{7}	8.7×10^{5}	<10 ²
tetrahydrofuran	2.0×10^{7}	2.1×10^{6}	34
1,4-dioxane	5.4×10^{6}	1.3×10^{5}	
$C_2H_5OCH=CH_2$	$\approx 2.2 \times 10^6$	$\approx 1.6 \times 10^5$	
ĊH ₂ (CH ₂) ₂ CH _ CHÒ	5.6×10^{6}	3.0×10^{5}	
$CH_2(CH_2)_3CH = C(Me)$	≈9 × 10 ⁶	≈9 × 10 ⁵	
CIT	2.4×10^{9}	4.3×10^{8}	$\leq 5 \times 10^{2f}$
Br⁻ '	3.7 × 10 ⁹	$6.3 \times 10^{8 f}$	≤10 ³ ∫
]- <i>e</i>	3.8×10^{9}	1.1 × 10 ⁹⁷	
NO ₃ -•	1.4×10^{9}	$1.7 \times 10^{8 f}$	

^aError limits typically ±10%. ^bMonitored at 355 nm. ^cMonitored at 390 nm. ^dMonitored at 345 nm. ^cCounterion is (*n*-Bu)₄N⁺. ¹Reaction is possibly reversible. If this is the case, the measured k_{Nu} is not identical with the rate constant for ion combination.

results, e.g., the second-order rate constants for the reaction of MESH⁺ and HMBH⁺ in HFIP with alcohols, ethers, and halides. With the series of alcohols there is obviously very little steric effect, even for t-BuOH. Since the basicities of these compounds are similar, it is this factor that determines reactivity. This also explains why tetrahydrofuran, which has similar basicity, reacts at a rate similar to the alcohols, while 1,4-dioxane, which is less basic due to the inductive (-I) effect of the additional oxygen, is less reactive. In comparison, the very high reactivity of the three halides and of NO3⁻ suggests that these do not react as bases, but rather by nucleophilic combination with the cyclohexadienyl cations.¹⁰ With all the bases/nucleophiles, HMBH⁺ reacts With all the bases/nucleophiles, HMBH⁺ reacts considerably slower than does MESH+, which is obviously due to the higher degree of stabilization and steric demand of HMBH+. As seen from column 4 of Table III, TMBH⁺ has an astounding lack of reactivity in HFIP toward bases/nucleophiles.

Detailed studies of the reactivities with additional reagents, as well as extensions to other aromatic systems, are currently in

(10) See note f in Table III.

progress. The present study demonstrates that the solvent HFIP has the remarkable properties of a very weak basicity/nucleophilicity combined with good photoprotonating capabilities. Thus the photolysis of aromatic compounds in this solvent provides an excellent method for generating and observing unstable cyclohexadienyl cations. Moreover the reactivities of the so-formed cations with the solvent and with added bases/nucleophiles can be directly examined.

Acknowledgment. R.A.M. thanks the donors of the Petroleum Research Fund, administered by the American Chemical Society, and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada for support.

Picosecond Flash Photolysis of Carboxy Horseradish Peroxidase: Rapid Geminate Recombination in the Presence of Benzohydroxamic Acid

Alain B. Berinstain, Ann M. English,* Bruce C. Hill,[†] and Devendra Sharma

Canadian Centre for Picosecond Laser Spectroscopy and Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry Concordia University 1455 de Maisonneuve Boulevard West Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3G 1M8 Received June 26, 1990

Revised Manuscript Received August 26, 1990

Photolysis of heme-CO bonds occurs on the femtosecond time scale.¹ Photolysis quantum yields (Φ) of less than 1, as measured on micro- or millisecond time scales, have been ascribed to fast geminate recombination of CO with the heme.² In sperm whale myoglobin (Mb), most of the CO molecules pass through the protein matrix into the solvent at room temperature³ and Φ is very near unity,^{4,5} but for ferrohorseradish peroxidase (HRP), a Φ of less than 1 has been reported.⁵ A smaller Φ for HRP compared to Mb is consistent with the proposed lower barrier for CO binding to the heme in the peroxidase,⁶ since this would allow rapid

(1) Fetrich, J. W.; Poyart, C.; Martin, J. L. Biochemistry 1988, 27, 4049.
(2) Jongeward, K. A.; Magde, D.; Taube, D. J.; Marsters, J. C.; Traylor, T. C.; Sharma, V. S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1988, 110, 380. Chatfield, M. D.; Walda, K. N.; Magde, D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1990, 112, 4680.
(3) Henry et al. reported ~4% geminate recombination with a rate constant of 5.6 × 10⁶ s⁻¹ in sperm whale Mb at room temperature (Henry, E. R.; Sommer, J. H.; Hofrichter, J.; Eaton, W. A. J. Mol. Biol. 1983, 166, 443). Boster et al. reported that most of the CO molecules migrate from Mb to the solvent above 270 K (Doster, W.; Beece, D.; Bowne, S. F.; Dilorio, E. E.; Eisenstein, L.; Frauenfelder, H.; Reinisch, L.; Shyamsunder, E.; Winterhalter, K. H.; Yue, K. T. Biochemistry 1982, 21, 4831).
(4) Brunori, M.; Giacometti, G. M. Methods Enzymol. 1981, 76, 582 and former therein.

references therein

(5) Brunori, M.; Giacometti, G. M.; Antonini, E.; Wyman, J. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 1973, 70, 3141.
(6) Doster, W.; Bowne, S. F.; Frauenfelder, H.; Reinisch, L.; Shyamsunder, E. J. Mol. Biol. 1987, 194, 299.

^{*}Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

[†] Present address: Division of Biochemistry, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4. (1) Petrich, J. W.; Poyart, C.; Martin, J. L. *Biochemistry* 1988, 27, 4049.