

### Communication

# Electrochemically Controlled Hydrogen Bonding. Electrolyte Effects in an Oxidation-Based Arylurea#Amide System

Jessica E. Woods, Yu Ge, and Diane K. Smith

J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2008, 130 (31), 10070-10071 • DOI: 10.1021/ja803453e • Publication Date (Web): 10 July 2008

Downloaded from http://pubs.acs.org on February 8, 2009



## More About This Article

Additional resources and features associated with this article are available within the HTML version:

- Supporting Information
- Access to high resolution figures
- Links to articles and content related to this article
- Copyright permission to reproduce figures and/or text from this article

View the Full Text HTML





#### Electrochemically Controlled Hydrogen Bonding. Electrolyte Effects in an Oxidation-Based Arylurea-Amide System

Jessica E. Woods, Yu Ge, and Diane K. Smith\*

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, San Diego State University, San Diego, Califorinia 92182-1030

Received May 9, 2008; E-mail: dsmith@sciences.sdsu.edu

Over the past decade, it has been shown that it is possible to selectively and significantly perturb the strength of H-bonding between organic molecules using electrochemistry. However, although both reduction<sup>1</sup> and oxidation<sup>2</sup> reactions have been used, reductions have generally proven more successful.<sup>3</sup> In this paper, we show that the difficulty with oxidations can be due to an electrolyte effect resulting from competition between the guest and the electrolyte anion for H-bonding to the oxidized host. Furthermore, we show that, by switching to an electrolyte with a very large anion, significant changes in binding strength are observed upon oxidation of an electroactive urea in the presence of a diamide guest.

The basic idea behind redox-dependent hydrogen bonding is to use the change in charge accompanying e-transfer to perturb the strength of H-bonds between host and guest. One possibility is to use a reduction reaction to increase negative charge on H-accepting atoms in a host. Another possibility, which is explored in this study, is to use an oxidation reaction to increase the positive charge on H-donating groups in the host. H-accepting guests will then bind more strongly to the oxidized form, making it easier to oxidize the host. This results in a negative shift in the half-wave potential,  $E_{1/2}$ , of the host in the presence of the guest.

Since the perturbation of H-bond strength relies on a change in charge, ion—ion interactions may also play a role in these systems. They can be used to advantage when the guest itself is ionic,<sup>4</sup> but with neutral guests, they may pose a problem. This is particularly an issue in electrochemical studies, where an "inert" electrolyte will be present in excess. The most common electrolytes used in these studies are NBu<sub>4</sub>ClO<sub>4</sub> or NBu<sub>4</sub>PF<sub>6</sub>.<sup>2</sup> Use of NBu<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> is a good choice for reduction-based systems because it is a very large ion and is unlikely to significantly ion pair in the solvents commonly used for these studies.<sup>5</sup> However, the same cannot be said about  $ClO_4^-$  or  $PF_6^-$ . This has been particularly noted by Geiger in electrochemical studies of organometallic cations.<sup>6</sup>

In this work, we show that interaction with  $ClO_4^-$  or  $PF_6^-$  can also be an issue for oxidation-based, redox-dependent H-bonding. The system under investigation is based on the urea, U. This compound was chosen because diarylureas are known to be very good H-donors, and oxidation of the NMe<sub>2</sub>-phenyl ring should lead to a significant increase in positive charge on one of the urea NH's (eq 1). For comparison purposes, we also synthesized the methylated derivative, UMe.



Figure 1 shows cyclic voltammograms (CVs) of U in  $CH_2Cl_2$  with (a)  $NBu_4ClO_4$ , (b)  $NBu_4PF_6$ , and (c)  $NBu_4B(C_6F_5)_4$  as the



Figure 1.  $CVs (100 \text{ mV/s}) \text{ of } 1 \text{ mM U in } CH_2Cl_2 \text{ with } (a) 0.1 \text{ M NBu}_4ClO_4, (b) 0.1 \text{ M NBu}_4PF_6, \text{ and } (c) 0.1 \text{ M NBu}_4B(C_6F_5)_4.$ 

Scheme 1. Mechanism for U Oxidation with Guest, G, Present



electrolyte. Clearly, the electrolyte anion has a big effect on the electrochemistry. With  $ClO_4^-$ , reversible oxidation to the radical cation, U<sup>+</sup>, is observed at 1.47 V, with  $PF_6^-$ , the same process occurs at 1.51 V, and with  $B(C_6F_5)_4^-$ , it is at 1.60 V. In addition, the U<sup>0/+</sup> wave is considerably broader with  $B(C_6F_5)_4^-$  than  $ClO_4^-$  or  $PF_6^-$ . Close inspection of the U<sup>0/+</sup> wave in Figure 1c suggests that it actually represents two strongly overlapping waves of equal height. Interestingly, when the same set of CVs is run with UMe, the  $E_{1/2}$  values are much closer (within 0.03 V) and there is no significant difference in wave shape between the three electrolytes.<sup>7</sup> This strongly suggests that it is an ionic H-bonding interaction between the anions and the urea NH's that is mainly responsible for the differences between electrolytes seen in Figure 1.

A mechanism capable of explaining the differences observed in Figure 1 is given in Scheme 1. If a guest, G, is present that binds more strongly to U<sup>+</sup> than U, the observed  $E_{1/2}$  of U<sup>0/+</sup> will shift negative in the presence of G. This is what appears to happen in Figure 1a and b, with  $ClO_4^-$  or  $PF_6^-$  playing the role of G through strong interaction with the urea NH's. In contrast, if no G is present, as with  $B(C_6F_5)_4^-$ , then U<sup>+</sup> could interact with U to form the UU<sup>+</sup> dimer shown below. Since U would bind more strongly to U<sup>+</sup> than another U, the  $E_{1/2}$  shifts negative as  $UU^+$  is being formed. This continues until half of the U is oxidized to U<sup>+</sup>. Oxidation of the



**Figure 2.** Experimental (solid lines) and simulated (dots) CVs (500 mV/s) of 1 mM U in 0.1 M NBu<sub>4</sub>B( $C_6F_5$ )<sub>4</sub>/CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> + PZD: (a) 0 mM, (b) 0.5 mM, (c) 1 mM, (d) 5 mM, (e) 100 mM.

rest of U then occurs upon dissociation of  $UU^+$ . This would occur at a slightly more positive potential, producing the broad wave observed for  $U^{0/+}$  with B(C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>)<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup>.



The occurrence of U dimerization in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> is supported by <sup>1</sup>H NMR data for U in CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> that show the NH chemical shifts are concentration-dependent. Analysis of these data gives  $K_{UU} = 22$  M<sup>-1</sup>. Using this value, CVs of 0.5 and 1 mM U in NBu<sub>4</sub>B(C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>)<sub>4</sub>/ CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> were fit to a slightly modified version<sup>7</sup> of the mechanism shown in Scheme 1, giving  $K_{UU+} = 4600$  M<sup>-1</sup>.

The fact that  $U^+$  binds so strongly to another U suggests there must be other molecular guests that will strongly bind to  $U^+$  and produce large shifts in the observed  $E_{1/2}$  of  $U^{0/+}$ . Past experience<sup>1c,d</sup> suggests that this requires a guest with two strong H-acceptor atoms preorganized to H-bond with both urea NH's. 1,4-Dimethylpiperizine-2,3-dione, abbreviated PZD, nicely satisfies these criteria as shown above.

It turns out that PZD is a good enough guest for U that large  $E_{1/2}$  shifts are observed in all electrolytes. The difference is how much PZD needs to be added. With  $ClO_4^-$  or  $PF_6^-$ , addition of 1 mM PZD to 1 mM U in  $CH_2Cl_2$  produces a -2 or -16 mV shift, respectively, in the  $E_{1/2}$  of  $U^{0/+}$ , with little change in the shape or size of the CV wave.<sup>7</sup> As more PZD is added, the wave shifts further negative. By 400 mM PZD, the shift is significant, -60 mV with  $ClO_4^-$  and -114 mV with  $PF_6^-$ , but there is no evidence that the maximum shift is nearing.

Figure 2 shows experimental and simulated CVs for the same type of experiment done with NBu<sub>4</sub>B(C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>)<sub>4</sub>. Now addition of 1 mM PZD causes a -109 mV shift, almost as large as that observed with 400 mM in PF<sub>6</sub><sup>-</sup>. Along with the shift, there is a substantial sharpening of the wave, indicating that PZD binding is competing

successfully with U dimerization. By 5 mM PZD, the wave has reached full height, and by 100 mM, the system appears to be closing in on a maximum shift of about -200 mV. This corresponds to a >2000-fold increase in binding strength upon oxidation. To the best of our knowledge, this is by far the largest binding enhancement reported to date for an oxidation-based, redox-dependent H-bonding system with a neutral molecular guest. From the simulated CVs, we obtain reliable estimates of the actual binding constants in the two oxidation states:  $K_{\rm UG} = 62 \text{ M}^{-1}$  and  $K_{\rm UG+} = 1.6 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}$ .

In conclusion, we have demonstrated a simple redox-dependent H-bonding system in which oxidation leads to a substantial increase in binding strength to a molecular guest. Indeed, the magnitude of the effect is comparable to that observed for the better reduction-based systems. However, it is doubtful that this system is unique. The difference is the electrolyte. Binding to the commonly used electrolyte anions  $ClO_4^-$  and  $PF_6^-$  is strong enough to obscure the strength of binding to the guest. It is likely that other oxidation-based systems would also reveal much stronger binding if reexamined using less competitive electrolytes.

Acknowledgment. Acknowledgment is made to the Donors of the American Chemical Society Petroleum Research Fund for support of this research.

**Supporting Information Available:** Additional CVs, NMR titration data and analysis, general voltammetry and CV simulation procedures, synthesis and structural data for UMe. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

#### References

- (a) Kajiki, T.; Moriya, H.; Hoshino, K.; Kuroi, T.; Kondo, S. i.; Nabeshima, T.; Yano, Y. J. Org. Chem. 1999, 64, 9679–9689. (b) Legrand, Y.-M.; Gray, M.; Cooke, G.; Rotello, V. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 15789–15795.
   (c) Bu, J.; Lilienthal, N. D.; Woods, J. E.; Nohrden, C. E.; Hoang, K. T.; Truong, D.; Smith, D. K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 6423–6429. (d) Ge, Y.; Miller, L.; Ouimet, T.; Smith, D. K. J. Org. Chem. 2000, 65, 8831– 8838. (e) Gray, M.; Cuello, A. O.; Cooke, G.; Rotello, V. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 7882–7888. (f) Jordan, B. J.; Pollier, M. A.; Miller, L. A.; Tiernan, C.; Clavier, G.; Audebert, P.; Rotello, V. M. Org. Lett. 2007, 9, 2835–2838. (g) Kato, S. i.; Matsumoto, T.; Ideta, K.; Shimasaki, T.; Goto, K.; Shinmyozu, T. J. Org. Chem. 2006, 71, 4723–4733.
   (2) (a) Boyd, A. S. F.; Cooke, G.; Duclairoir, F. M. A.; Rotello, V. M. Tetrahedron Lett. 2003, 44, 303–306. (b) Cooke, G.; de Cremiers, H. A.;
- (2) (a) Boyd, A. S. F.; Cooke, G.; Duclairoir, F. M. A.; Rotello, V. M. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2003, *44*, 303–306. (b) Cooke, G.; de Cremiers, H. A.; Duclairoir, F. M. A.; Leonardi, J.; Rosair, G.; Rotello, V. M. *Tetrahedron* 2003, *59*, 3341–3347. (c) Goldenberg, L. M.; Neilands, O. J. Electroanal. *Chem.* 1999, *463*, 212–217. (d) Saweczko, P.; Enright, G. D.; Kraatz, H.-B. *Inorg. Chem.* 2001, *40*, 4409–4419. (e) Westwood, J.; Coles, S. J.; Collinson, S. R.; Gasser, G.; Green, S. J.; Hursthouse, M. B.; Light, M. E.; Tucker, J. H. R. *Organometallics* 2004, *23*, 946–951. (f) Carr, J. D.; Coles, S. J.; Hursthouse, M. B.; Light, M. E.; Tucker, *J. H. R. Organometallics* 2004, *23*, 946–951. (f) Carr, J. D.; Coles, S. J.; Hursthouse, *M. B.; Light, M. E.; 2009, 39*, 3296–3299.
- (3) There are a number of examples (see ref 1) where perturbation of H bonds through reduction results in a > 10-fold change in binding strength between an electroactive host and a neutral guest. In contrast, to our knowledge, the ferrocene diamides studied by Green, Tucker, and colleagues (ref 2e) remain, until now, the only reported examples where oxidation does the same.
- (4) Much greater success has been achieved with oxidation-based H-bonding receptors for anions. For a recent example, see Willener, Y.; Joly, K. M.; Moody, C. J.; Tucker, J. H. R. J. Org. Chem. 2008, 73, 1225–1233.
- (5) Macias-Ruvalcaba, N. A.; Evans, D. H. J. Phys. Chem. B 2005, 109, 14642– 14647.
- (6) (a) LeSuer, R. J.; Geiger, W. E. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2000, 39, 248–250.
  (b) Barriere, F.; Geiger, W. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006, 128, 3980–3989.

(7) See Supporting Information.

JA803453E