


Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer in the Reduction of Arenes by SmI₂–Water Complexes

Tesia V. Chciuk and Robert A. Flowers, II*

Department of Chemistry, Lehigh University, 6 E. Packer Ave. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015, United States

S Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: The presence of water has a significant impact on the reduction of substrates by SmI₂. The reactivity of the Sm(II)-water reducing system and the relationship between sequential or concerted electron-transfer, proton-transfer is not well understood. In this work, we demonstrate that the reduction of an arene by SmI₂-water proceeds through an initial proton-coupled electron transfer. The use of thermochemical data available in the literature shows that upon coordination of water to Sm(II) in THF, significant weakening of the O–H bond occurs. The derived value of nearly 73 kcal/mol for the decrease in the bond dissociation energy of the O–H bond in the Sm(II)–water complex is the largest reported to date for low-valent reductants containing bound water.



INTRODUCTION

The addition of water and alcohols to samarium diiodide (SmI₂) in THF has a significant impact on the selectivity and reactivity of the reagent.¹ A wide range of highly selective reductions and reductive coupling reactions can be carried out with high efficiency.² In each case, the effectiveness of the approach is dependent on proton donor concentration, competition for Sm(II) coordination between substrate and proton donor, and other reaction components. Functional group reductions and bond-forming reactions initiated by SmI₂-proton donor systems are complicated by the interplay between proton donor coordination to Sm(II) and their ability to donate a proton through cleavage of the O–H bond. Given this, proton donors employed in reactions of SmI₂ are distinguished by those which have a high affinity for Sm(II) (water, methanol, glycols) and those that do not (phenol, 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol, *t*-butanol, etc.).³

Among Sm(II)-proton donor systems, those that employ water or coordinating proton donors are the most effective at reducing substrates typically recalcitrant to reduction through electron transfer.⁴ The seminal work of Curran and Hasegawa demonstrated that water addition to SmI₂ accelerated the rate of functional group reduction, and they proposed that the effectiveness of the reducing system was a consequence of water coordination to Sm(II).⁵ This hypothesis was later confirmed by the groups of Hoz and Flowers.^{3,6,7} Since these earlier studies, a number of reductions and bond-forming reactions initiated by the reduction of lactones and other carboxylic acid derivatives by SmI₂-water have been developed predominantly through the work of Procter.^{8,9} The interesting feature of these reductions is that substrates are being reduced that have significantly higher reduction potentials than SmI₂-water.⁷ Since this process and others are endergonic (based on redox potentials), it raises the question: Are these events stepwise or does the initial reduction of substrates occur through a proton-coupled electron transfer (PCET)? The

reactivity of the Sm(II)-water reducing system and the relationship between the sequential (or concerted) electron-transfer proton-transfer (ET-PT) process is not well understood. Herein we present a detailed mechanistic study on the reduction of noncoordinating substrates by SmI₂-water. This work demonstrates that in the case of arenes, the reduction by Sm(II)-water occurs through a PCET.


RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Given the complexity of Sm(II)-water systems and possible multiple coordination of substrate, water, and other reaction components to Sm, we sought out substrates that would simplify a mechanistic study and enable us to examine the interplay between the impact of water on the reducing power of the complex (thermodynamic) and the rate of reaction (kinetic). To this end, we chose two classes of substrates, an arene (anthracene) and a primary alkyl iodide (1-iodododecane). These substrates were chosen since they are known to be reduced by Sm-water systems,⁴ and studies would not be complicated by competition with water for coordination sites on Sm(II) since both are reduced through predominantly an outer-sphere process.^{10,11} In addition, the choice of these substrates enables us to examine the impact of water on the rate of reduction by SmI₂. Alkyl halides are reduced through a dissociative ET mechanism where initial ET is rate limiting.^{12,13} Conversely arenes may be reduced by a rate-limiting ET, a rate-limiting second PT in the second step or a PCET.

To examine the systems in detail, a series of rate experiments were performed on SmI₂-mediated reductions of anthracene and 1-iodododecane using water and methanol (MeOH) over a wide range of concentrations in THF as shown in eqs 1 and 2. Reactions without proton donors led to the recovery of starting material in the case of anthracene, whereas partial reduction of

Received: July 18, 2015

Published: August 14, 2015



the alkyl halide occurred. The rate of reduction of anthracene was relatively fast using water, whereas reduction by MeOH was too slow to be measured by stopped-flow spectrophotometry. Reduction of the alkyl iodide occurred in the presence of water and MeOH, but was considerably slower than the reduction of anthracene.

These studies show that water is critical for the reduction of anthracene. Rate studies were performed under pseudo-first-order conditions with anthracene and 1-iodododecane in a 10-fold excess (100 mM) with respect to $[\text{SmI}_2]$ which was maintained at 10 mM. The reaction was monitored using stopped-flow spectrophotometry to observe $[\text{SmI}_2]$ (see Supporting Information (SI)). Water concentrations were monitored under pseudo-first-order conditions over a range of 75 mM to 12 M in the case of anthracene and 70 mM to 5 M in the case of 1-iodododecane. Each rate measurement was repeated thrice with freshly prepared samples. To verify that the rate of substrate reduction was not influenced by the instability of the SmI_2 -water complexes at high concentrations of proton donor, the natural decay of the complex was acquired and found to be <5% of the value obtained for the decay of $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ in the presence of substrate. A plot of k_{obs} vs proton donor concentration up to 5 M for the reduction of anthracene and 1-iodododecane is contained in Figure 1.





Figure 1. Plot of k_{obs} vs water concentration for the reduction of anthracene (◆, blue) and 1-iodododecane (■, red) by SmI_2 (10 mM).

Examination of the data shows that water has a significantly greater impact on the reduction of anthracene by SmI_2 than it does on the reduction of 1-iodododecane. At low concentrations of water, there is a rapid increase in the rate of reduction of anthracene until saturation occurs at approximately 3 M water. At higher concentrations of water above 4.5 M, the rate decreases and displays an inverse order in water (see SI). Although the impact of water on the reduction of 1-iodododecane by SmI_2 is modest in comparison to anthracene, there is a 40-fold rate increase at 2 M water (200 equiv based on $[\text{SmI}_2]$) in comparison to reduction in the absence of water.¹³

The fascinating feature of this data is the relative impact of water on reduction of anthracene by SmI_2 in comparison to 1-iodododecane. The redox potentials of SmI_2 , anthracene, and a primary alkyl iodide vs SCE are known.^{14–16} As a consequence, the ΔG of the initial ET to each substrate can be determined as shown in Scheme 1. The data below clearly show that reduction

Scheme 1



of anthracene is a significantly more endergonic process. The caveat of this analysis is the fact that as water is added to SmI_2 , a more powerful reductant is formed.¹⁷ However, the reduction of anthracene initiates at concentrations of water below the level where it impacts the reducing power of $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$, and the full impact of water on the reducing power of water is not realized until nearly 1000 equiv of water.⁷ Additionally, if the only role of water in the reduction was to produce a more powerful reductant, a similar rate enhancement should be observed in both cases given that a primary alkyl iodide is thermodynamically easier to reduce through single ET.

To further examine the unusual impact of water on anthracene reduction, rate orders were determined. We focused on water concentrations below 2 M (200 equiv based on $[\text{SmI}_2]$) since this is the range of water typically employed in reactions carried out by synthetic chemists.^{1,2} Rate orders for SmI_2 , water, and anthracene were determined for each of the components and are shown in Table 1. The rate order of water

Table 1. Rate Orders for Reduction of Anthracene by SmI_2 -Water

reaction component	rate order
SmI_2	1 ^a
anthracene	0.9 ± 0.1 ^b
water	2.0 ± 0.1 (0–1.75 M) ^c

^aConditions: Fractional times method. 10 mM SmI_2 , 100 mM anthracene, 0.75–2 M H_2O . ^b5 mM SmI_2 , 60–100 mM anthracene, 625 mM H_2O . ^c10 mM SmI_2 , 100 mM anthracene, 0–1.75 M H_2O . The rate orders are the average of three independent experiments.

was obtained from the nonlinear region of the plot of k_{obs} vs $[\text{water}]$ up to 2 M as shown in Figure 2. The rate orders of anthracene and SmI_2 are near unity, whereas water displays a rate order of 2 in the initial nonlinear regions displayed in Figures 1 and 2.

The empirical rate law for the reduction of anthracene at modest concentrations of water typically employed in reductions (50 mM to 2 M) is shown in eq 3:

$$-d[\text{Sm}^{\text{II}}]/dt = k'[\text{Sm}^{\text{II}}][\text{anthracene}][\text{water}]^2 = k_{\text{obs}}[\text{Sm}^{\text{II}}] \quad (3)$$




Figure 2. Plot of average k_{obs} vs water concentration for the reduction of anthracene (100 mM) by SmI_2 (10 mM). Inset displays a plot of k_{obs} vs $[\text{H}_2\text{O}]^2$ with a linear least-squares fit ($R^2 = 0.997$).

The high molecularity of the empirical rate law and the rate order of 2 for water are consistent with a complex mechanism and a role for water beyond serving as a proton donor.

Water has a high affinity for $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ even in bulk THF, and as a consequence, at least one water is likely coordinated to $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ at lower concentrations of the proton donor. Given this, it is probable that the initial ET-PT to anthracene occurs through two possible pathways: (1) ET from $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ -water followed by protonation from donors in bulk solvent, or (2) ET from a $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ -intermediate requiring 2 equiv of bound water. To evaluate if proton donation from the bulk solution was occurring, trifluoroethanol (TFE) was examined since it does not coordinate to $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$, but is significantly more acidic than water and has been shown to donate protons to anionic intermediates from bulk solution.⁶ The rate of reduction of anthracene by SmI_2 containing equimolar amounts of water and TFE was measured over a range of 1–3 M proton donor. It was our supposition that if protonation from the bulk was important, then the more acidic TFE would lead to a faster reduction. Despite the presence of a substantial amount of TFE, the rate of reduction decreased slightly. This finding is consistent with bulk proton not playing a role in the PT and suggests that two waters associated with $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ are responsible for the rate order of 2.

To obtain further insight into the mechanistic role of water in the $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ -mediated reduction of anthracene, the rate was measured using D_2O . Data were determined from individual rate experiments for the reduction of anthracene using either water or D_2O . A plot of the $k_{\text{H}}/k_{\text{D}}$ vs water concentration is shown in Figure 3. At low concentrations of water (50 mM), the $k_{\text{H}}/k_{\text{D}}$ is 2.1 ± 0.1 and as additional water is added, the isotope effect gradually drops to 1.7 ± 0.1 at 1 M water (100 equiv vs $[\text{SmI}_2]$). The $k_{\text{H}}/k_{\text{D}} = 1.7 \pm 0.1$ across concentrations up to 10 M water. The results are somewhat larger in magnitude than those reported by Procter for the reduction of anthracene by $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ reductants where a value of 1.3 was obtained.¹⁴ It should be noted that the KIE experiments described by Procter and colleagues were carried out as competition experiments using equimolar amounts of H_2O and D_2O in the reaction to determine the degree of deuterium incorporation in the final reduced product to determine $k_{\text{H}}/k_{\text{D}}$.




Figure 3. Plot of $k_{\text{H}}/k_{\text{D}}$ vs $[\text{water}]$ for the reduction of anthracene by SmI_2 , $[\text{SmI}_2] = 10 \text{ mM}$; $[\text{anthracene}] = 100 \text{ mM}$.

Regardless of this difference, it is our supposition that the data is clearly consistent with a primary isotope effect whose magnitude is a consequence of PCET. The relationship between PCET and the observed deuterium isotope effect will be discussed *vide infra*.

To acquire further detail about the reduction of anthracene by SmI_2 , and water, rates were measured over a 30° temperature range to obtain activation parameters from the linear form of the Eyring equation. The data are contained in Table 2. The concentration of water was maintained at 1.25 M

Table 2. Activation Parameters for the Reduction of Anthracene by SmI_2 and Water

[proton donor] ^a	$\Delta H^{\ddagger b}$ (kcal/mol)	$\Delta S^{\ddagger b}$ (cal/mol·K)	$\Delta G^{\ddagger c}$ (kcal/mol)
1.25 M H_2O	0.1 ± 0.1	-64 ± 4	19 ± 1

^aConditions: 10 mM SmI_2 and 100 mM anthracene in THF. The activation parameters are the average of three independent experiments from 20 to 40 °C and are reported as $\pm \sigma$. ^bObtained from $\ln(k_{\text{obs,H}}/k_{\text{obs,D}}) - \Delta H^{\ddagger}/RT + \Delta S^{\ddagger}/R$. ^cCalculated from $\Delta G^{\ddagger} = \Delta H^{\ddagger} - T\Delta S^{\ddagger}$.

(125 equiv) which is in the region where water exhibits a rate order of 2. Examination of the data in Table 2 shows that the reduction has a small degree of bond reorganization and that the reduction is entropy controlled.

It is important to consider the present results in the context of earlier studies of the $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ -water system and classic studies on PT to arene radical anions. Previous studies have demonstrated that water has a high affinity for $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$.^{3,18} Coordination of water to the Lewis acidic Sm increases the acidity of the O–H bond.¹⁹ Concomitant with this process, the ease of oxidation of $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ is enhanced by producing a more powerful reductant.⁷ In other words, as water coordinates to $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$, a more powerful reductant is formed in concert with a better proton donor. In addition to work on $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ -water complexes, there is a great deal of classic work on the protonation of anthracene radical anions by water and other proton donors.²⁰ The work of Bank is quite useful in this regard.^{20a} In this report, he found that protonation of the sodium generated anthracene radical anion by water in THF occurred through water bound to the sodium counterion.^{20a}

In light of the data and framework from previous studies, the question that arises is: What is the procession of events that leads to the initial ET and PT in the reduction of anthracene by $\text{Sm}(\text{II})$ -water? To answer this question, it is useful to keep a number of points in mind: (1) SmI_2 is incapable of reducing anthracene in the absence of water. (2) Addition of successive


amounts of water to SmI_2 in THF likely drives coordination to result in the formation of a Sm(II) –water complex. (3) Reduction of anthracene initiates with amounts of water well below that required to influence the reducing power of SmI_2 . (4) The rate order of water is 2 and has a $k_{\text{H}}/k_{\text{D}}$ of 1.7. (5) The rate law describing the reduction provides the stoichiometry of the activated complex relative to reactants, but only the transition state for the rate-limiting step can be probed with any certainty.²¹

Given the points above, there are several possible events that can occur in the initial electron–proton transfer from the Sm(II) –water complex to anthracene: (1) A rate-limiting ET followed by a PT;¹⁴ (2) an ET followed by a rate-limiting PT; or (3) a PCET. The key difference between 1 or 2 and 3 is whether the electron and proton are transferred sequentially or in one kinetic step.

In a classic review by Mayer, he notes that it is a common supposition that stepwise transfers of a proton and electron are favored over the concerted PCET, but this intuition is incorrect in most cases since ΔG is always lower for PCET than ΔG for the initial PT or ET.²² Although sequential ET–PT is the accepted process in the chemistry of Sm(II) reductions and reductive couplings, bond-weakening processes are extremely common in the PCET literature for a wide range of complexes that lead to significant weakening of N–H and O–H bonds.²³ In the present case, concerted transfer of a proton and electron from Sm(II) –water to anthracene is thermodynamically equivalent to hydrogen atom transfer between the same reactants. As a consequence, an alternative way to view the process is one where water complexation to Sm(II) lowers the homolytic bond dissociation energy (BDE) of the O–H of the bound water enabling it to donate an H atom to the anthracene acceptor.

A consequence of the line of reasoning described above is that it enables us to make quantitative conclusions about the ability of the Sm(II) –water complex to function as a PCET donor as exemplified in Scheme 2. The BDE of the O–H bond

Scheme 2



of water is 117.6 kcal/mol.²⁴ However, the BDE of the initial radical formed via hydrogen atom transfer to anthracene is comparably weak with a value of 44.9 kcal/mol.²⁵ This analysis demonstrates that the BDE of the O–H bond in the Sm(II) –water complex is decreased by at least 72.7 kcal/mol.


Bond weakening of water is well preceded in the literature. Pioneering work of Wood and Renaud showed that borane–water or borane–alcohol complexes could be used as H atom donors to radicals.²⁶ In 1997, Stack demonstrated that coordination of alcohols to nonheme iron models of lip-oxygenases significantly reduces the O–H bond strength of the bound ligand.²⁷ More recently, experiments by Cuerva and co-

workers revealed that water bound to $\text{Cp}_2\text{Ti}^{\text{III}}\text{Cl}$ decreased the O–H BDE by approximately 60 kcal/mol.²⁸ As a consequence, Ti^{III} –water complexes serve as efficient H atom donors for alkyl radicals. These findings were exploited in elegant work by Knowles for the development of a catalytic bond-weakening protocol for the conjugate amination.²⁹ In each of the examples cited above, bond weakening is significant but the decrease in the O–H bond of the Sm(II) –water complex of at least 72.7 kcal/mol derived from the analysis shown in Scheme 2 is the largest reported to date.

The thermochemical analysis described above is consistent with PCET, but do the mechanistic studies support a concerted process? The inclusion of water in the empirical rate law is consistent with a role in the rate-limiting step, but the low magnitude of the deuterium isotope has previously been interpreted as a secondary effect.¹⁴ It is our supposition that the $k_{\text{H}}/k_{\text{D}}$ determined for the reduction of anthracene is clearly a primary isotope effect. From a classical perspective, the activation parameters displayed in Table 2 are consistent with a highly ordered early transition state where very little O–H(D) bond cleavage has occurred and very little C–H(D) bond formation has taken place in the activated complex. In this case, the isotope effect is predicted to be small since the zero point vibrational energy differences for H and D are small between the reactant and transition state.³⁰ In systems where PCET is operating, isotope effects are significantly more complex than classical systems. Proton vibrational wave function overlap plays an important role in determining deuterium isotope effects, but the KIE is complicated due to differing length and time scales for electron proton exchange, dynamic effects, and differing contributions from excited vibronic states.³¹ As a consequence, reactions occurring through PCET can have isotope effects that vary a great deal, and many well-characterized examples occur with primary isotope effect only slightly above unity.³² It is our supposition that the observed deuterium KIE is consistent with PCET.

On the basis of the points described above, the remaining question is: Does the kinetic study support sequential ET–PT or PCET? If the ET and PT were successive processes, an expression cannot be derived that fits the experimentally determined data. However, application of a steady-state approximation to the concentration of the Sm(II) –water complex followed by a concerted, rate-limiting PCET as shown in Scheme 3 provides eq 4, which matches the empirical rate-law eq 3 obtained from experimental data.


Scheme 3



$$\frac{-d[\text{Sm(II)}]}{dt} = K_1 k_2 [\text{Sm(II)}][\text{H}_2\text{O}]^2 [\text{A}] \quad (4)$$

The high molecularity of the empirical rate law which is second order in water and the large degree of order in the activated complex are consistent with the transition state shown below in Scheme 4. In this scenario, the coordination of water to Sm(II)

Scheme 4



increases the acidity of the O–H bond and also enhances its ability to hydrogen bond to another water facilitating the rate-limiting PCET to anthracene. Alternatively, the activated complex could have both waters bound to Sm(II).

Overall, it is our supposition that the collection of studies and experimental work described above support a PCET for the reduction of anthracene by SmI₂ containing modest concentrations of water typically employed in reductions. Although the majority of the work described above is focused on concentrations of water typically employed in reductions by SmI₂, we believe it is useful to consider why higher concentrations of water lead to saturation and eventual inverse order of the proton donor. As higher concentrations of water are added, THF and iodide are displaced from the coordination sphere of Sm(II) and replaced by water.^{18b} Once Sm(II) is saturated, additional water is likely to hydrogen bond in the second coordination sphere. Second sphere interactions are recognized to be important in rare earth-mediated reactions.³³ In the present case, anthracene would have to displace water in the second coordination sphere leading to a change in the mechanism where water displacement is likely rate-limiting. A caveat with this hypothesis is the fact that as high amounts of water are added to THF, the solvent polarity changes significantly, and as a consequence may impact the mechanism of ET.³⁴

One final point to consider is whether arenes are a suitable measure of the redox potential of Sm(II)-water or other coordinating proton donor systems. Classic studies on the reduction of arenes by rare-earth reductants in the absence of any additive showed that arene dimerization occurred through radical–radical coupling.³⁵ The present study shows that SmI₂ alone is incapable of reducing anthracene and that the reduction initiates at concentrations of water below the level where it impacts the reducing power of Sm(II) and is inhibited at higher concentrations where the proton donor has a maximal impact on the redox potential of the metal. Additionally, the concerted nature of the ET-PT makes estimation of the redox potential tenuous at best. Given this, we recommend that caution is employed in the use of arenes as a measure of redox potential of SmI₂-water systems given the mechanistic complexity of the reaction.

CONCLUSIONS

The results described herein show that the reduction of an arene by SmI₂ containing modest concentrations of water proceeds through a highly ordered transition state where the initial transfer of an electron and proton proceeds through PCET. The complexity of the reduction resulting from PCET shows that care should be employed when interpreting

deuterium isotope effects or mechanisms deduced from empirical models based on knowledge of ground-state reductants and reaction products alone. Although the studies presented herein reveal the complexity of arene reduction by Sm(II)-water, these results may have an important impact for the reduction of other functional groups. This is especially important for carbonyls and related functional groups that are likely to compete with water for coordination to Sm(II). We are currently examining these systems, and the results of these studies will be reported in due course.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/jacs.5b07518.

Experimental procedures, kinetic and spectral data (PDF)

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*rof2@lehigh.edu

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Drs. James Devery, Lawrence Courtney, Niki Patel, and Rebecca Miller for insightful discussions. We also thank reviewers for constructive evaluation and feedback. R.A.F. thanks Professor R. Stan Brown for insightful discussions on rare earth–water complexes. R.A.F. is grateful to the National Science Foundation (CHE 1266333) for support of this work.

REFERENCES

- (1) (a) Szostak, M.; Spain, M.; Parmar, D.; Procter, D. J. *Chem. Commun.* **2012**, 48, 330–346. (b) Flowers, R. A., II *Synlett* **2008**, 2008, 1427–1439. (c) Dahlen, A.; Hilmersson, G. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2004**, 2004, 3393–3403.
- (2) (a) Choquette, K. A.; Flowers, R. A. Sm and Yb Reagents. In *Comprehensive Organic Synthesis*, 2nd ed.; Molander, G. A., Knochel, P., Eds.; Elsevier: Oxford, 2014; Vol. 1, pp 279–343. (b) Szostak, M.; Fazakerley, N. J.; Parmar, D.; Procter, D. J. *Chem. Rev.* **2014**, 114, 5959–6039. (c) Szostak, M.; Spain, M.; Procter, D. J. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2013**, 42, 9155–9183. (d) Procter, D. J.; Flowers, R. A., II; Skrydstrup, T. *Organic Synthesis using Samarium Diiiodide: A Practical Guide*; RSC Publishing: Cambridge, 2010. (e) Nicolaou, K. C.; Ellery, S. P.; Chen, J. S. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2009**, 48, 7140–7165. (f) Edmonds, D. J.; Johnston, D.; Procter, D. J. *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, 104, 3371–3404. (g) Kagan, H. B. *Tetrahedron* **2003**, 59, 10351–10372. (h) Steel, P. G. *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 1* **2001**, 2727–2884. (i) Molander, G. A.; Harris, C. R. *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, 96, 307–338. (j) Molander, G. A. *Chem. Rev.* **1992**, 92, 29–68.
- (3) (a) Hoz, S.; Yacovan, A.; Bilkis, I. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1996**, 118, 261–262. (b) Chopade, P. R.; Prasad, E.; Flowers, R. A., II. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, 126, 44–45.
- (4) Sautier, B.; Procter, D. J. *Chimia* **2012**, 66, 399–403.
- (5) Hasegawa, E.; Curran, D. P. *J. Org. Chem.* **1993**, 58, 5008–5010.
- (6) (a) Tarnopolsky, A.; Hoz, S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, 129, 3402–3407. (b) Tarnopolsky, A.; Hoz, S. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2007**, 5, 3801–3804. (c) Amiel-Levy, M.; Hoz, S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, 131, 8280–8284.
- (7) Prasad, E.; Flowers, R. A., II. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, 127, 18093–18099.
- (8) Seminal studies on the reduction of carboxylic acid derivatives by SmI₂ were carried out by Kamochi and Kudo: (a) Kamochi, Y.; Kudo, T. *Chem. Lett.* **1991**, 893–896. (b) Kamochi, Y.; Kudo, T. *Bull. Chem.*

- Soc. Jpn. **1992**, *65*, 3049–3054. (c) Kamochi, Y.; Kudo, T. *Chem. Lett.* **1993**, 1495–1498.
- (9) (a) Duffy, L. A.; Matsubara, H.; Procter, D. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 1136–1137. (b) Guazzelli, G.; De Grazia, S.; Collins, K. D.; Matsubara, H.; Spain, M.; Procter, D. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 7214–7215. (c) Parmar, D.; Duffy, L. A.; Sadasivam, D. V.; Matsubara, H.; Bradley, P. A.; Flowers, R. A., II; Procter, D. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 15467–15473. (d) Szostak, M.; Spain, M.; Procter, D. J. *Chem. Commun.* **2011**, *47*, 10254–10256. (e) Szostak, M.; Spain, M.; Procter, D. J. *Org. Lett.* **2012**, *14*, 840–843. (f) Szostak, M.; Collins, K. D.; Fazakerley, N. J.; Spain, M.; Procter, D. J. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2012**, *10*, 5820–5824. (g) Szostak, M.; Sautier, B.; Spain, M.; Behlendorf, M.; Procter, D. J. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2013**, *52*, 12559–12563. (h) Szostak, M.; Spain, M.; Choquette, K. A.; Flowers, R. A., II; Procter, D. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 15702–15705. (i) Szostak, M.; Spain, M.; Eberhart, A. J.; Procter, D. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 2268–2271. (j) Szostak, M.; Spain, M.; Procter, D. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 8459–8466. (k) Szostak, M.; Spain, M.; Eberhart, A. J.; Procter, D. J. *J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *79*, 11988–12003. (l) Just-Baringo, X.; Procter, D. J. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2015**, *48*, 1263–1275.
- (10) Enemaerke, R. J.; Daasbjerg, K.; Skrydstrup, T. *Chem. Commun.* **1999**, 343–344.
- (11) Miller, R. S.; Sealy, J. M.; Fuchs, J. R.; Shabangi, M.; Flowers, R. A., II *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 7718–7722.
- (12) (a) Andrieux, C. P.; Gallardo, I.; Saveant, J.-M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1989**, *111*, 1620–1626. (b) Saveant, J.-M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, *114*, 10595–10602.
- (13) Prasad, E.; Flowers, R. A., II *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 6895–6899.
- (14) Szostak, M.; Spain, M.; Procter, D. J. *J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *79*, 2522–2537.
- (15) Vanýsek, P. *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, 85th ed.; Lide, D. R., Ed.; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, 2004–2005; pp 1264–1266.
- (16) Isse, A. A.; Lin, C. Y.; Coote, M. L.; Gennaro, A. J. *Phys. Chem. B* **2011**, *115*, 678–684.
- (17) Shabangi, M.; Sealy, J. M.; Fuchs, J. R.; Flowers, R. A., II *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1998**, *39*, 4429–4432.
- (18) (a) Teprovich, J. A., Jr.; Balili, M. N.; Pintauer, T.; Flowers, R. A., II *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2007**, *46*, 8160–8163. (b) Sadasivam, D. V.; Teprovich, J. A., Jr.; Procter, D. J.; Flowers, R. A., II *Org. Lett.* **2010**, *12*, 4140–4143.
- (19) Neverov, A. A.; Gibson, G.; Brown, R. S. *Inorg. Chem.* **2003**, *42*, 228–234.
- (20) (a) Bank, S.; Bockrath, B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1972**, *94*, 6076–6083. (b) Minnich, E. R.; Long, L. D.; Ceraso, J. M.; Dye, J. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1973**, *95*, 1061–1070. (c) Papadakis, N.; Dye, J. L. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1978**, *82*, 1111–1114. (d) Nielsen, M. F.; Ingold, K. U. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 1172–1182.
- (21) Plata, R. E.; Singleton, D. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**, *137*, 3811–3826.
- (22) Mayer, J. M. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **2004**, *55*, 363–390.
- (23) (a) Roth, J. P.; Mayer, J. M. *Inorg. Chem.* **1999**, *38*, 2760–2761. (b) Manner, V. W.; Mayer, J. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 9874–9875. (c) Fang, H.; Ling, Z.; Lang, K.; Brothers, P. J.; Bruin, B.; Fu, X. *Chem. Sci.* **2014**, *5*, 916–921. (d) Wu, A.; Mayer, J. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 14745. (e) Wu, A.; Masland, J.; Swartz, R. D.; Kaminsky, W.; Mayer, J. M. *Inorg. Chem.* **2007**, *46*, 11190–11201. (f) Milsmann, C.; Semproni, S. P.; Chirik, P. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 12099–12107. (g) Estes, D. P.; Grills, D. C.; Norton, J. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 17362–17365.
- (24) Ruscic, B.; Wagner, A. F.; Harding, L. B.; Asher, R. L.; Feller, D.; Dixon, D. a.; Peterson, K. a.; Song, Y.; Qian, X.; Ng, C. Y.; Liu, J.; Chen, W.; Schwenke, D. W. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2002**, *106*, 2727–2747.
- (25) Stein, S. E.; Brown, R. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1991**, *113*, 787–793.
- (26) Spiegel, D. A.; Wiberg, K. B.; Schacherer, L. N.; Medeiros, M. R.; Wood, J. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 12513–12515. (3) Pozzi, D.; Scanlan, E. M.; Renaud, P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 14204–14205.
- (27) Jonas, R. T.; Stack, T. D. P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 8566–8567.
- (28) (a) Cuerva, J. M.; Campana, A. G.; Justicia, J.; Rosales, A.; Oller-Lopez, J. L.; Robles, R.; Cardenas, D. J.; Bunuel, E.; Oltra, J. E. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2006**, *45*, 5522–5526. (b) Paradas, M.; Campaña, A. G.; Jiménez, T.; Robles, R.; Oltra, J. E.; Buñuel, E.; Justicia, J.; Cárdenas, D. J.; Cuerva, J. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 12748–12756.
- (29) Tarantino, K. T.; Miller, D. C.; Callon, T. A.; Knowles, R. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**, *137*, 6440–6443.
- (30) (a) Melander, L.; Saunders, W. J., Jr. *Reaction Rates of Isotopic Molecules*; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1980. (b) Anslyn, E. V.; Dougherty, D. A. *Modern Physical Organic Chemistry*; University Science Books: Sausalito, CA, 2006.
- (31) (a) Edwards, S. J.; Soudackov, A. V.; Hammes-Schiffer, S. J. *Phys. Chem. A* **2009**, *113*, 2117–2126. (b) Hammes-Schiffer, S. J. *Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**, *137*, 8860–8871.
- (32) (a) Warren, J. J.; Menzeleev, A. R.; Kretchmer, J. S.; Miller, T. F., III; Gray, H. B.; Mayer, J. M. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2013**, *4*, 519–523. (b) Megiatto, J. D., Jr.; Méndez-Hernández, D. D.; Tejada-Ferrari, M. E.; Teillout, A.-L.; Llansola-Portolés, M. J.; Kodis, G.; Poluektov, O. G.; Rajh, T.; Mujica, V.; Groy, T. L.; Gust, D.; Moore, T. A.; Moore, A. L. *Nat. Chem.* **2014**, *6*, 423–428. (c) Warren, J. J.; Mayer, J. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 8544–8551. (d) Schrauben, J. N.; Cattaneo, M.; Day, T. C.; Tenderholt, A. L.; Mayer, J. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 16635–16645. (e) Tarantino, K. T.; Liu, P.; Knowles, R. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 10022–10025.
- (33) Robinson, J. R.; Gordon, Z.; Booth, C. H.; Carroll, P. J.; Walsh, P. J.; Schelter, E. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 19016–19024.
- (34) (a) Chciuk, T. V.; Hilmersson, G.; Flowers, R. A., II *J. Org. Chem.* **2014**, *79*, 9441–9443. (b) Chopad, P.; Davis, T. A.; Prasad, E.; Flowers, R. A., II *Org. Lett.* **2004**, *6*, 2685–2688.
- (35) (a) Evans, W. J.; Gonzales, S. L.; Ziller, J. W. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 2600–2608. (b) Fedushkin, I. L.; Bochkarev, M. N.; Dechert, S.; Schumann, H. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2001**, *7*, 3558–3563.