Electron paramagnetic resonance studies of electron attachment to thiophene, bi(thienyl) and some halogen-substituted thiophenes

Robert D. Farley,^a Bruce C. Gilbert,^{*,a} Peter Hanson,^a Allan W. Timms^b and

Martyn C. R. Symons †"

^a Department of Chemistry, University of York, Heslington, York, UK YO1 5DD

^b Great Lakes Fine Chemicals, Halebank, Cheshire, UK WA8 8NS

^c Department of Chemistry, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK LE1 7RH

Exposure of dilute solutions of 2,2'-bithienyl in 2-methyltetrahydrofuran glasses at 77 K to ionizing radiation gave the corresponding radical-anion, as indicated by the EPR spectra. Similar treatment of thiophene solutions failed to give the expected π radical-anion, although electron capture clearly occurred: for CD₃OH and CD₃OD solutions the primary products were identified as the H- and D-atom-addition products, formed by protonation of the anions.

Under similar conditions, 2-bromothiophene gave clear EPR signals with features characteristic of the $C_{(2)}$ -Br⁻ σ^* radical-anion (with a spin density of ~37% on bromine). A σ^* anion, with the unpaired electron localized in one of the C-Cl σ^* orbitals, was detected following electron-addition to 2,5-dichlorothiophene, whereas for 2-chlorothiophene the corresponding σ^* radical-anion, if formed, evidently decomposes rapidly to the 2-thienyl radical, whose EPR spectrum is reported. Only for 2,2'-bithienyl was the radical-anion's EPR spectrum detected in fluid solution following electron attachment.

These findings and the results of MO calculations are discussed in terms of the structures of the radicalanions and the alternative routes available for reaction following electron-addition.

Introduction

Many radical-anions of aromatic compounds, including, for example, $C_6H_6^{-}$ are relatively stable and have been thoroughly characterized by spectroscopic techniques, especially electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) spectroscopy.¹ Hence it might be expected that radical-anions from thiophene and its simple derivatives would be sufficiently stable for detection and characterization; however, as far as we are aware the thiophene radical-anion itself has never been successfully studied. One aim of the present work was to investigate whether by generation at 77 K in solid matrices these radical-anions would prove to be sufficiently stable for detection and characterization using EPR spectroscopy. We also intended to investigate related species with extended conjugation $(2,2'-bithienyl)^2$ and halogensubstituted analogues (in irradiated 2-chlorothiophene crystals it is believed that the appropriate C-Cl σ^* radical-anion, rather than the π^* structure, is formed).³ Attempts were also made to generate the appropriate radical-anions in fluid solution by one-electron reduction (with sodium or potassium) in an inert solvent [1,2-dimethoxyethane (DME)].

Experimental

EPR spectra were measured at 77 K using a Varian E109 Xband spectrometer. Samples, which were usually ~1 mol dm⁻³ in solute [methanol or 2-methyltetrahydrofuran (MTHF)] and frozen quickly in liquid nitrogen as small glassy beads, were exposed at 77 K to γ -rays from a ⁶⁰Co source, with doses between 10³ and 10⁴ Gy. Samples were annealed by decantation of the liquid nitrogen from the Dewar insert and allowing them to warm until significant changes were observed in the EPR spectra: they were then immediately recooled for measurement.

All substrates were commercially available, and used as

obtained. The solvents employed were a 9:2 mixture (by volume) of CD₃OD and D₂O, a 9:2 mixture of CD₃OH and water, and MTHF (Lancaster Chemicals): the deuteriated alcohols (Aldrich) and D₂O (Goss Scientific) were used as supplied, and MTHF was distilled prior to use.

Thiophene derivatives were also subjected to treatment with sodium or potassium (typically as a freshly deposited mirror) in deoxygenated DME (concentration of substrate typically 10^{-3} mol dm⁻³) at low temperature (~200 K) prior to recording of EPR spectra.

Simulations of anistropic EPR spectra were performed on a DEC VAX 3190 computer using programs written and provided by Professor P. H. Rieger and modified by Dr A. C. Whitwood to allow display and plotting of composite spectra from mixtures.

Results

Typical EPR spectra obtained from irradiated solid solutions of thiophene and its derivatives are shown in Figs. 1–4, and the data derived therefrom are shown in Table 1. For the CD_3OD spectra (see, e.g., Fig. 2) the central features are due to a mixture of $^{\circ}CD_2OD$ and $^{\circ}CD_3$ radicals,⁴ and free electrons trapped in the glass, and these conceal the central portion of the solute radical features. In some cases we were able to remove these signals by careful annealing (results not shown), but for some other systems where this was impossible we were nevertheless able to analyse the spectra satisfactorily on the basis of the outside lines. For the MTHF systems this was a greater problem because of the wide spread of solvent-derived radical signals but, again, careful annealing sometimes resulted in loss of these features prior to those from the solute radicals.

Discussion

Radical identification

(i) 2,2'-Bithienyl. Comparison of the quintet obtained from this substrate on electron-addition at 77 K (Fig. 1) with the

[†] Current address: Department of Chemistry, De Montfort University, Leicester, LE1 9BH, UK.

Fable 1	EPR parameters f	for radicals and radical-anion	s generated by electron-a	attachment to thiophene d	erivatives in solid matrices at 77 K ^a
----------------	------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

 Substrate	Solvent	Radical detecte	ed	EPR parameters (hfs/mT)	
2,2'-Bithienyl ^b	MTHF	1		0.4 (4 H)	g ~ 2.00
I mophene*	CD ₃ OH	2	A _{xx}	3.3 (1 H) 1.2 (2) 3.1 (1 H) 0.1 (1)	g _{xx} 2.003
			A_{yy}	$\begin{cases} 3.4 (1 \text{ H}) 1.6 (2) \\ 3.2 (1 \text{ H}) 0.1 (1) \end{cases}$	g _{yy} 2.009
			Azz	$\begin{cases} 3.2 (1 \text{ H}) 1.0 (2) \\ 3.0 (1 \text{ H}) 0.1 (1) \end{cases}$	g _{zz} 2.006
2-Bromothiophene	MTHF, CD ₃ OD	4	$A_{\parallel}(\mathbf{Br})$	42.0	g 2.00
			$A_{\perp}(\mathbf{Br})$	17.1	g 2.05
2,5-Dichlorothiophene	MTHF	5	$A_{\parallel}(^{35}\text{Cl})$	8.1	$g \sim 2.00$
		9 ^d	$A_{\parallel}^{(35)}$ Cl) \simeq A(3-H)	2.1	$g \sim 2.00$
2-Chlorothiophene	CD ₃ OD	6 ^{<i>d</i>}	A _∥ (2 H) ^e	2.0	$g \sim 2.00$

^a In some cases after annealing; see text. ^b For details of isotropic spectra from radical 1 see text and ref. 2. ^c The *g*-values used were those for the 2carboxy-5-hydro-4-thienyl radical (reported in ref. 4, p. 417. The *z*-axis (*g*-factor) was taken as perpendicular to the plane of the ring; the *y*-axis was taken as parallel to the plane of the ring in the direction of the bond between the carbon atoms in positions 3 and 4, with the *x*-axis mutually perpendicular to the *y*-axis. ^d On annealing. ^e Assigned to C3-H and C5-H, see text.



Fig. 1 EPR spectrum of the corresponding π^* radical-anion from γ -irradiated 2,2'-bithienyl in MTHF at 77 K. \blacklozenge Signals from the solvent. Signals from the substrate.

isotropic spectrum readily generated by one-electron reduction with sodium (e.g., in DME at 210 K) clearly establishes that the spectrum is that of the (π^*) radical-anion 1. In fluid solution the high-resolution spectrum is dominated by signals from the *S*-trans rotamer with splittings and g-value as indicated (*cf.* ref. 2); the minor isomer (*S*-*cis*) has *a*(H) 0.477, 0.397 and 0.071 (g 2.0043).



(ii) Thiophene. No feature that could reasonably be expected for the appropriate π^* radical-anion could be detected in either solvent (a spectrum with nine lines and a total width of up to 3 mT would have been expected). However, for the CD₃OD solutions the spectra exhibit fairly well defined outer features and a total width of ~ 8.5 mT [see Fig. 2(*a*)]; use of CD₃OH led to the detection of a considerably wider spectrum (total width ~ 11 mT) with a triplet pattern (~ 1.2 mT) visible in the wings especially at high field [Fig. 2(*b*)]. The splittings are more clearly resolved in the spectrum [Fig. 2(*c*)] obtained after twice annealing and refreezing this sample; in the triplet (3.3 mT) of triplets (1.2 mT) observed, one of the former splittings



Fig. 2 (a) EPR spectrum from γ -irradiated thiophene in CD₃OD/D₂O at 77 K (the peaks marked \blacklozenge are due to radicals obtained from HOD in the solvents. (b) EPR spectrum from γ -irradiated thiophene in CD₃OH-water at 77 K. (c) EPR spectrum from sample shown in Fig. 2(b) after annealing and refreezing twice. (d) Simulation of the spectra, shown in Figs. 2(b) and 2(c), attributed to 2-hydrothienyl (for parameters, see text and Table 1).

evidently derives from the solvent (CD_3OH). Signals from the MTHF glass obscured any substrate-derived signals in this solvent.

We believe that the spectra in CD_3OD and CD_3OH shown in Fig. 2 are from the 2-hydrothienyl radical and its deuteriated counterpart **2**, in which a dominant splitting will be expected from the C²-H(β) proton(s), with other splittings typical of an allyl radical moiety. The corresponding (protonated) radical has previously been detected ⁵ following irradiation both of a ,20 mT

+ ³/₂ " + ³/₂ " x 10 H 179 H 179 + ³/₂ L glass peaks

Fig. 3 EPR spectrum obtained from γ -irradiation of 2-bromothiophene in MTHF at 77 K, attributed to the σ^* radical-anion

single crystal of thiophene and of thiophene adsorbed on silica gel. Spectral simulation with the anisotropic parameters shown in Table 1, including the introduction of anisotropic g-values and slight non-equivalence between the two β -protons, gave reasonable agreement with the observed spectra. The spectrum of the deuteriated analogue was similarly simulated, with substitution of the calculated value for a(D), satisfactory agreement again being obtained.



The formation of C-3 radical 2, rather than C-2 radical 3, is consistent with the rapid protonation (deuteronation) of the π^* radical-anion by methanol at the site of highest negative charge density [as expected on the basis of molecular orbital (MO) calculations, using the PM3 Hamiltonian and restricted Hartree–Fock operator which leads to predicted values of $\rho(\pi)$ of 0.13 (positions 2, 5) and 0.12 (positions 3 and 4)].

No EPR signals could be obtained in fluid solution in DME using either Na or K as reductant.

(iii) 2-Bromothiophene. The EPR spectrum obtained from this substrate in MTHF is shown in Fig. 3. This spectrum exhibits parallel and perpendicular features which are characteristic ^{6,7} of hyperfine coupling to bromine (see Table 1): the values observed (A_{\parallel} 42.0 mT, A_{\perp} 17.1 mT, g_{\parallel} 2.00, g_{\perp} 2.05) are similar to those obtained ⁶ for C₆F₅Br^{*} and lead to an estimate ⁸ of 0.37 for the spin density on bromine in a σ^* radicalion 4. No other signals could be obtained on annealing and refreezing. No signals could be obtained by reduction of this or the other halogeno-substituted thiophene derivatives in fluid solution with sodium or potassium.



(iv) 2,5-Dichlorothiophene. Irradiation of this substrate in MTHF at 77 K gave weak but well defined outer lines (see Fig. 4) assigned to the parallel features of a spectrum with a substantial *single* chlorine hyperfine splittings $[A_{\parallel}]^{(3^5Cl)}$ 8.1 mT], which is characteristic of a σ^* species with the unpaired electron localized in a single C-Cl bond: ^{3,6} the results are close



Fig. 4 EPR spectrum obtained from the γ -irradiation of 2,5dichlorothiophene in MTHF at 77 K, attributed to the σ^* radical-anion

to those obtained by Nagai and Gillbro³ for the γ -irradiation of a single crystal of 2-chlorothiophene (A_{\parallel} 8.4 mT), which strongly supports this conclusion [*cf.* also the value⁶ of A_{\parallel} (³⁵Cl) 8.0 mT in C₆H₅Cl^{*-}]. These features were lost on annealing: the resulting (weak) spectra showed a 1:2:2:2:1 pattern [$A \sim 2.1$ mT] discussed below.

(v) 2-Chlorothiophene. We failed to observe the corresponding σ^* radical-ion in this case. Instead, at least in CD₃OD, a new species with large g-value variation and broad triplet splitting (~2.0 mT) was observed, these features being most easily distinguishable in spectra of samples which had been annealed and refrozen; no clear signals could be detected in MTHF. The spectrum was analysed in terms of the parameters given in Table 1 and was assigned to the 2-thienyl radical 6, formed by loss of halide ion.



Whilst a splitting of ~2 mT is anticipated from the adjacent (*ortho*) proton in this σ radical (*cf.* the value for the phenyl radical)⁹ the second splitting of this magnitude is unexpected: we believe that it derives from the hydrogen at C-5 in the thiophene ring and thus that significant spin density arises either *via* delocalization onto sulfur [*cf.* structure 7 or *via* interaction of the appropriate σ -orbitals across space (structure 8)]. It is notable that in the σ^* radical-anion from 2-chlorothiophene a substantial C⁵-H splitting (0.75 mT) is also observed,³ and that delocalization on to adjacent nitrogen in the related 2-pyridyl radical has also been reported.¹⁰ The quintet observed in the spectrum obtained from 2,5-dichlorothiophene after annealing is similarly assigned to radical 9, with $A(3-H) \approx A_{\parallel}(^{35}Cl) \approx 2.1$ mT.



MO calculations

A limited range of MO calculations have been performed using the PM3 Hamiltonian in the MOPAC package; the results shown (Table 2) were obtained from restricted Hartree–Fock calculations on the neutral molecules (to avoid spin-contamination problems encountered in calculations of the thiophene and halogeno radical-anions themselves).

Compound	Orbital type	Σc_i^2	Energy/eV	
2-Bromothiophene	$\begin{cases} \pi^* \\ \text{adjacent} \\ \sigma^* \\ \text{LUMO} \end{cases}$	0.11 0.14 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.14 0.01 0.14 0.01 0.14 0.01 0.14 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.009 0.06 0.009 0.06 0.009 0.040 0.034 Br 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18 0.40 0.18	- 1.86 - 2.05	
2-Chlorothiophene	$\begin{cases} \sigma^* \\ \text{adjacent} \\ \pi^* \\ \text{LUMO} \end{cases}$	0.002 0.01 0.11 0.45 0.12 0.02 0.01 0.11 0.45 0.11 0.29 0.12 0.12 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.13 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02	- 1.47 - 1.86	
2,5-Dichlorothiophene	$\begin{cases} \sigma^* \\ \text{adjacent} \\ \pi^* \\ \text{LUMO} \end{cases}$	$0.002 0.002 0.002 \\ 0.08 \\ 0.21 \\ 0.21 \\ 0.41 \\ 0.12 \\ 0.12 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.13 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.13 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.13 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.13 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.02$	-1.81 -2.10	

Table 2 Calculated energy levels and coefficient of LUMOs and adjacent higher energy orbitals of neutral halogenothiophenes

The calculated results for 2-bromothiophene are in good agreement with EPR findings: the calculated lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) is a σ^* orbital localized along the C-Br bond, with a small contribution from the sulfur atomic orbitals: the orbital of next higher energy is, as expected, the delocalized π^* orbital, with little contribution from bromine atomic orbitals.

For the chlorine-substituted compounds, our calculational approach suggests that the π^* , rather than the σ^* (as observed), radical-anion is of lower energy. We believe, however, that the simplified calculational approach fails to allow for the stabilization which would result from a localization of the unpaired electron in the *stretched* C-Cl bond. Similarly, and not surprisingly, it fails to show that in the dichloro example the extra electron in the σ^* orbital is located largely in a single σ^* bond (as observed).

Conclusions

We conclude that the thiophene π^* anion is a relatively strong base and that it is ring-protonated by methanol, even at 77 K. The parent anion is also probably formed in MTHF glasses, though the detection is prevented by the occurrence of intense solvent-radical features. In contrast, the σ^* (C-'Br⁻) radicalanion is favoured for the 2-bromo derivative. This is the precursor for dissociative electron capture which undoubtedly occurs readily in protic media. It is interesting that the 2,5dichloro derivative gives a localized σ^* radical-anion rather than a symmetrical delocalized centre. This illustrates well the concept that, on electron-capture, the C-Hal bond stretches because of the antibonding nature of the added electron; single bond stretch, rather than both simultaneously, is evidently preferred. Again, this σ^* radical-anion is the precursor for the loss of halide ion.

Acknowledgements

We thank the SERC (for a grant for the EPR spectrometer) and IBIS (formerly Ward-Blenkinsop, now Great Lakes Fine Chemicals) for their support of this work (through a studentship for R. D. F.) and Dr I. Podmore and Dr A. C. Whitwood, respectively, for experimental and computational assistance.

References

- 1 F. Gerson, *High Resolution ESR Spectroscopy*, Wiley/Verlag Chemie, Weinheim, 1970.
- 2 P. Cavalieri d'Oro, A. Mangini, G. F. Pedulli, P. Spagnolo and M. Tiecco, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1969, 4179; G. F. Pedulli, M. Tiecco, M. Guerra, G. Mortelli and P. Zanirato, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2, 1978, 212.
- 3 S. Nagai and T. Gillbro, J. Phys. Chem., 1977, 81, 1793.
- 4 Landolt-Börnstein, Numerical Data and Functional Relationships in Science and Technology, New Series. Vol. 9. Magnetic Properties of Free Radicals, Part B, Organic C-Centered Radicals, eds. A. Berndt, H. Fischer and H. Paul, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.
- 5 S. Nagai and T. Gillbro, J. Phys. Chem., 1979, 83, 402.
- 6 M. C. R. Symons, J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 1, 1981, 77, 783.
- 7 S. P. Mishra and M. C. R. Symons, *J. Chem. Soc.*, *Perkin Trans.* 2, 1981, 185.
- 8 M. C. R. Symons, Chemical and Biochemical Aspects of Electron Spin Resonance, Van Nostrand-Rheinhold, New York, 1978.
- 9 J. E. Bennett and B. Mile, J. Phys. Chem., 1971, 75, 3432.
- 10 T. Shida and T. Kato, Chem. Phys. Lett., 1979, 68, 106.

Paper 5/02199E Received 5th April 1995 Accepted 31st May 1995