


Quantitative Measure for the “Nakedness” of Fluoride Ion Sources

Karl O. Christe, and H. Donald Brooke Jenkins

J. Am. Chem. Soc., **2003**, 125 (31), 9457-9461 • DOI: 10.1021/ja035675r • Publication Date (Web): 08 July 2003

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on March 29, 2009



More About This Article

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

- Supporting Information
- Links to the 5 articles that cite this article, as of the time of this article download
- 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](#)

Quantitative Measure for the “Nakedness” of Fluoride Ion Sources

Karl O. Christe*[†] and H. Donald Brooke Jenkins[‡]

Contribution from the Loker Hydrocarbon Research Institute, University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles, California 90089, Air Force Research Laboratory, Edwards Air Force Base, California 93524, and Department of Chemistry, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, West Midlands, U.K.

Received April 16, 2003; E-mail: karl.christe@edwards.af.mil

Abstract: A quantitative measure for the donor strength or “nakedness” of fluoride ion donors is presented. It is based on the free energy change associated with the transfer of a fluoride ion from the donor to a given acceptor molecule. Born–Haber cycle calculations were used to calculate both the free energy and the enthalpy change for this process. The enthalpy change is given by the sum of the fluoride ion affinity of the acceptor (as defined in strict thermodynamic convention) and the lattice energy difference (ΔU_{POT}) between the fluoride ion donor and the salt formed with the acceptor. Because, for a given acceptor, the fluoride affinity has a constant value, the relative enthalpy (and also the corresponding free energy) changes are governed exclusively by the lattice energy differences. In this study, BF_3 , PF_5 , AsF_5 , and SbF_5 were used as the acceptors, and the following seven fluoride ion donors were evaluated: CsF , $\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4\text{F}$ (TMAF), *N*-methyltrotropinium fluoride (MUF), hexamethylguanidinium fluoride (HMGF), hexamethylpiperidinium fluoride (HMPF), *N,N,N*-trimethyl-1-adamantylammonium fluoride (TMAAF), and hexakis(dimethylamino)-phosphazanium fluoride (HDMAPF). Smooth relationships between the enthalpy changes and the molar volumes of the donor cations were found which asymptotically approach constant values for infinitely large cations. Whereas CsF is a relatively poor F^- donor [$(U_{\text{POT}}(\text{CsF}) - U_{\text{POT}}(\text{CsSbF}_6)) = 213 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$], when compared to $\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4\text{F}$ [$(U_{\text{POT}}(\text{TMAF}) - U_{\text{POT}}(\text{TMAAF})) = 69 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$], a 4 times larger cation (phosphazanium salt) and an infinitely large cation are required to decrease ΔU_{POT} to 17 and 0 kJ mol^{-1} , respectively. These results clearly demonstrate that very little is gained by increasing the cation size past a certain level and that secondary factors, such as chemical and physical properties, become overriding considerations.

Introduction

Although a truly naked fluoride ion cannot exist in either the solid state or in solution, the term “naked fluoride” is frequently applied to fluoride ion sources that exhibit significant solubility in organic solvents.^{1–3} Because soluble fluoride ions have given rise to a renaissance in high coordination number chemistry^{4,5} and play an important role in many fields, such as halogen exchange⁶ and fluorocarbon polymerization reactions,⁷ claims for the best or “most naked” fluoride ion source are commonly made. To judge the validity of such claims, a quantitative

measure for the “nakedness” is required. Schwesinger¹ and, more recently, Mews and co-workers⁸ have proposed the use of the anion–cation distance or the closest anion–cation contacts in fluoride crystal structures as a measure for the “nakedness”. While this approach is reasonable for monatomic ions, a better method is needed for measuring the “nakedness” of fluoride ions that involve complex cations. In this paper, a quantitative measure based on thermodynamics is proposed and was tested for seven common fluoride ion donors.

General Description of the Method

The donor ability or “nakedness” of a fluoride ion source can be defined as the ease with which it can transfer a fluoride ion to a given acceptor, A. Because the free energy change,


[†] Loker Hydrocarbon Research Institute and Air Force Research Laboratory.

[‡] University of Warwick.

- (1) Schwesinger, R.; Link, R.; Thiele, G.; Rotter, H.; Honert, D.; Limbach, H.; Männle, F. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.* **1991**, *30*, 1372.
- (2) Christe, K. O.; Wilson, W. W.; Wilson, R. D.; Bau, R.; Feng, J.-a. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1990**, *112*, 7619.
- (3) Seppelt, K. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.* **1992**, *31*, 292.
- (4) Christe, K. O.; Curtis, E. C.; Dixon, D. A.; Mercier, H. P. A.; Sanders, J. C. P.; Schrobilgen, G. J.; Wilson, W. W. In *Inorganic Fluorine Chemistry Toward the 21st Century*; Thrasher, J. S., Strauss, S. H., Eds.; ACS Symposium Series 555; American Chemical Society: Washington, DC, 1994; Chapter 5, pp 66–89.
- (5) Seppelt, K. In *Inorganic Fluorine Chemistry Toward the 21st Century*; Thrasher, J. S., Strauss, S. H., Eds.; ACS Symposium Series 555; American Chemical Society: Washington, DC, 1994; Chapter 5, pp 56–65.


- (6) Subramanian, L. R.; Siegemund, G. In *Houben-Weyl, Methods of Organic Chemistry, Vol. E 10 a, Organo-Fluorine Compounds*; Baasner, B., Hagemann, H., Tatlow, C. J., Eds.; Thieme Stuttgart: New York, 1999; Chapter 14, pp 548–587.
- (7) Chambers, R. D. In *Synthetic Fluorine Chemistry*; Olah, G. A., Chambers, R. D., Surya Prakash, G. K., Eds.; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1992; Chapter 16, pp 359–380.
- (8) Mews, R.; Lork, E.; Borrmann, T.; Stohrer, W.-D. Paper 93, presented at the 16th ACS Winter Fluorine Conference, St. Pete Beach, FL, January 12–17, 2003.

ΔG , is a quantitative measure for the tendency of a reaction to occur,⁹ the calculation of ΔG for process 1



provides a quantitative measure for the fluoride donor ability of C^+F^- and hence the “nakedness” of F^- in C^+F^- .

The corresponding enthalpy change, ΔH , of reaction 1 can be determined from the following Born–Haber cycle:




The temperature corrections for the lattice energy, U_{POT} , shown in the above cycle are for polyatomic cations. For a monatomic cation, such as Cs^+ , they become $-RT$ and $1/2RT$ for $U_{\text{POT}}(\text{CF})$ and $U_{\text{POT}}(\text{CAF})$, respectively, but their sum remains unchanged. The reaction enthalpies for (1) are then given for both polyatomic and monatomic cations by eq 2.

$$\Delta H = U_{\text{POT}}(\text{C}^+\text{F}^-) - U_{\text{POT}}(\text{C}^+\text{AF}^-) - \frac{3}{2}RT + \text{FIA}(\text{A}, \text{g}) \quad (2)$$

Equation 2 shows that, for a given acceptor molecule, the relative fluoride ion donor strength depends solely on the difference between the two lattice energies. Although the absolute ΔH values depend on the fluoride ion affinity, FIA , values,¹⁰ the relative ΔH values should be similar for different acceptors. This was verified by calculating ΔH for four different Lewis acids, that is, BF_3 , PF_5 , AsF_5 , and SbF_5 . In this study, the following seven fluoride ion donors were evaluated: CsF (I), $\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4\text{F}$ (TMAF) (II),² *N*-methylurotropinium fluoride (MUF) (III),¹¹ hexamethylguanidinium fluoride (HMGF) (IV),¹² hexamethylpiperidinium fluoride (HMPF) (V),¹³ *N,N,N*-trimethyl-1-adamantylammonium fluoride (TMAAF) (VI),¹⁴ and hexakis(dimethylamino)phosphazene fluoride (HDMAPF) (VII).¹

- (9) Pimentel, G. C.; Spratley, R. D. *Understanding Chemical Thermodynamics*; Holden-Day, Inc.: San Francisco, 1970; p 126.
 (10) The process $\text{FIA}(\text{A}, \text{g})$ depicted in Figure 1 is exothermic and thermodynamically represented by a negative number, that is, $\text{FIA}(\text{A}, \text{g}) < 0$. A convention exists in the literature whereby FIA values are cited as positive values. Because, in this paper, we will employ our values always in the thermodynamic context, we shall follow the strict thermodynamic convention to avoid confusion. Thus, all FIA values cited in this paper are less than zero and defined in accordance with an analogous process: $\text{A}(\text{g}) + \text{F}^-(\text{g}) \rightarrow \text{AF}^-(\text{g})$.
 (11) Gnann, R. Z.; Wagner, R. I.; Christe, K. O.; Bau, R.; Olah, G. A.; Wilson, W. W. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 112.
 (12) (a) Igumnov, S. M.; Delyagina, N. I.; Knunyants, I. L. *Izv. Akad. Nauk, Ser. Khim.* **1986**, 1315. (b) Zhang, X.; Bau, R.; Sheehy, J. A.; Christe, K. O. *J. Fluorine Chem.* **1999**, *98*, 121.
 (13) Mahjoub, A. R.; Zhang, X.; Seppelt, K. *Chem.-Eur. J.* **1995**, *1*, 261.
 (14) Harmon, K. M.; Southwork, B. A.; Wilson, K. E.; Keefer, P. K. *J. Org. Chem.* **1993**, *58*, 7294.



Estimation of Lattice Energies

The lattice energies¹⁵ of the fluoride salts are estimated using eq 3,

$$U_{\text{POT}} = 2I(\alpha V^{-1/3} + \beta) \quad (3)$$

where I is the ionic strength of the lattice ($=1$, in the case of the C^+AF^- and C^+F^- salts considered in this paper) and $\alpha = 117.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \text{ nm}$ and $\beta = 51.9 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$. For this, an estimate of the volume of the cations $V(\text{C}^+)$ is required for combination with the anion volumes:¹⁶ $V(\text{F}^-) = 0.025 \pm 0.010 \text{ nm}^3$, $V(\text{SbF}_6^-) = 0.181 \pm 0.112 \text{ nm}^3$, $V(\text{BF}_4^-) = 0.073 \pm 0.009 \text{ nm}^3$, $V(\text{PF}_6^-) = 0.109 \pm 0.008 \text{ nm}^3$, and the similar sized $V(\text{AsF}_6^-) = 0.110 \pm 0.007$ to estimate V in eq 1, taking $V(\text{CAF}$ or $\text{CF}) = V(\text{C}^+) + V(\text{AF}^- \text{ or } \text{F}^-)$. The following data were used to estimate the volumes of each cation and the lattice energies of the corresponding fluoride salts.

TMAF – $\text{N}(\text{CH}_3)_4^+\text{F}^-$ (II). The X-ray powder data² for tetramethylammonium fluoride, $(\text{CH}_3)_4\text{N}^+\text{F}^-$ (hexagonal, bimolecular cell with $V_{\text{cell}}(\text{Me}_4\text{NF}) = 0.2919 \text{ nm}^3$), give¹⁷ values of 0.1460 and 0.121 nm^3 for the molecular (formula unit) volumes of Me_4NF and Me_4N^+ , respectively. Using eq 3, one obtains¹⁶ $U_{\text{POT}}(\text{Me}_4\text{N}^+\text{F}^-) = 549 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$.

MUF – *N*-Methylurotropinium Fluoride, $(\text{CH}_2)_6\text{N}_4\text{CH}_3^+\text{F}^-$ (III). The crystal structure data¹⁸ for the iodide salt, 1-methyl-1,3,5,7-tetrazatricyclo[3.3.1.1]decan-1-ium iodide, give $V(\text{C}_6\text{H}_{15}\text{N}_4\text{I})$


- (15) Jenkins, H. D. B.; Roobottom, H. K.; Passmore, J.; Glasser, L. *Inorg. Chem.* **1999**, *38*, 3609.
 (16) Taken from our single ion volume database Table 5 in ref 15.

= 0.2527 nm³. Subtraction of $V(I^-) = 0.072 \pm 0.016$ nm³ from this value gives $V(C_6H_{15}N_4^+) = 0.1807 \pm 0.016$ nm³. Addition of $V(F^-) = 0.025 \pm 0.010$ nm³ then leads to $V(C_6H_{15}N_4F) = 0.2057 \pm 0.0189$ nm³ and $U_{POT}(C_6H_{15}N_4F) = U(MU^+F^-) = 501 \pm 11$ kJ mol⁻¹.

HMGF – Hexamethylguanidinium Fluoride, (Me₂N)₃C⁺F⁻, C₁₄H₃₆N₆⁺F⁻ (IV). The crystal structure of the hexahydrate of the hexafluorosilicate salt, [(Me₂N)₃C⁺]₂SiF₆²⁻·6H₂O, has been reported.¹² Subtraction of $V = 0.0245$ nm³ for hydrated water¹⁹ and $V(SiF_6^{2-}) = 0.112 \pm 0.028$ nm³ yields $V((Me_2N)_3C^+) = 1/2[V([(Me_2N)_3C^+]_2SiF_6^{2-} \cdot 6H_2O) - 6V(H_2O) - V(SiF_6^{2-})] = 0.2021$ nm³. Addition of $V(F^-)$ leads to $V((Me_2N)_3CF) = 0.2271$ nm³ and to $U_{POT}((Me_2N)_3CF) = U(HMG^+F^-) = 488$ kJ mol⁻¹.

HMPF – 1,1,3,3,5,5-Hexamethylpiperidinium Fluoride, C₁₄H₂₄N⁺F⁻ (V). The crystal structure of the fluoride salt has been directly established¹³ and leads to $V(C_{14}H_{24}NF) = 0.2874$ nm³ and $U_{POT}(C_{14}H_{24}NF) = U(HMP^+F^-) = 459$ kJ mol⁻¹.

TMAAF – N,N,N-Trimethyl-1-adamantylammonium Fluoride, C₁₃H₂₄N⁺F⁻ (VI). No crystal structure data were given for any salt of this cation.¹⁴ To ascertain the likely cation volume and hence estimate a molecular (formula unit) volume for the fluoride salt C₁₃H₂₄NF (VI), the following strategy was used. A search was made of Landolt-Börnstein²⁰ to find compounds containing ions whose elemental composition and overall structural features were close to those of the N,N,N-trimethyl-1-adamantylammonium cation. The closest one found was the 3-N-dimethylaminomethyl-2(10)pinene cation (VI') whose molecular formula is identical (C₁₃H₂₄N⁺) and for which the crystal structure of its bromine salt has been established.²¹



(17) Using our single ion volume database, the tabulated volume of Me₄N⁺ is $V(Me_4N^+) = 0.113 \pm 0.015$ nm³, which when added to $V(F^-)$ leads to a value $V(Me_4NF) = 0.138 \pm 0.016$ nm³. Tudela and co-workers (Tudela, D.; Diaz, M.; Alvaro, D. A.; Ignacio, J.; Seijo, L.; Belsky, V. K. *Organometallics* **2001**, *20*, 654) concluded that a value of 0.126 nm³ for $V(Me_4N^+)$ was more acceptable, which leads to $V(Me_4NF) = 0.151$ nm³. Taking the average of the two values for $V(Me_4NF)$ then leads to 0.1445 nm³, which is close to the value found by Christie et al.² It is interesting to consider volumes derived from other tetramethylammonium halide salts for which structural data are available: Me₄NCl (phase III, tetragonal: Pistorius, C. W. F. T.; Gibson, A. A. V. *J. Solid State Chem.* **1973**, *8*, 126) leads to $V(Me_4NCl) = 0.1565$ nm³ and $V(Me_4N^+) = 0.1095$ nm³; Me₄NBr (Duforcq, J.; Haget-Bouillard, Y.; Chanh, N. B.; Lemanceau, B. *Acta Crystallogr.* **1972**, *B28*, 1305) leads to $V(Me_4NBr) = 0.1644$ nm³ and $V(Me_4N^+) = 0.1084$ nm³; Me₄NI (Christe, K. O.; Wilson, W. W.; Bau, R.; Bunte, S. W. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, *114*, 3411) leads to $V(Me_4NI) = 0.1824$ nm³ and $V(Me_4N^+) = 0.1104$ nm³; Me₄NN₃ (Wilson, W. W.; Christe, K. O.; Feng, J.-A.; Bau, R. *Can. J. Chem.* **1989**, *67*, 1898) leads to $V(Me_4NN_3) = 0.1669$ nm³ and $V(Me_4N^+) = 0.1089$ nm³; Me₄NHF₂ (Wilson, W. W.; Christe, K. O.; Feng, J.-A.; Bau, R. *Can. J. Chem.* **1989**, *67*, 1898) leads to $V(Me_4NHF_2) = 0.1558$ nm³ and $V(Me_4N^+) = 0.1088$ nm³. The value of $V(Me_4N^+)$ obtained from the fluoride salt is therefore slightly anomalous, and the overall (averaged) value of $V(Me_4N^+) = 0.1112$ nm³ is close to the value cited in our database.^{15,16} This cation is reported to be many orders of magnitude more stable than conventional organic cations towards nucleophiles.³

(18) Ribár, B.; Mészáros, C.; Vladimirov, S.; Živanov-Stakić, D.; Golič, L. *Acta Crystallogr.* **1991**, *C47*, 1987.
 (19) Jenkins, H. D. B.; Glasser, L. *Inorg. Chem.* **2002**, *41*, 4378.
 (20) Landolt-Börnstein, New Series; Group III, Crystal and Solid State Phys., Vol. 10, Structure Data of Organic Crystals; Hellwege, K.-H., Madelung, O., Eds.; Springer-Verlag: Berlin, 1985.
 (21) (a) Kutschabsky, L. Z. *Chem.* **1969**, *9*, 31. (b) Kutschabsky, L. Z.; Reck, G. S. *J. Prakt. Chem.* **1971**, *312*, 896.

While not identical in structural detail to VI, it does contain a bridged CH₂ and the nitrogen moiety outside the pinene ring. The reported structure results in $V(C_{13}H_{24}NBr) = 0.3634$ nm³. Subtraction of $V(Br^-) = 0.056 \pm 0.014$ nm³ gives $V(C_{13}H_{24}N^+) = 0.3074 \pm 0.014$ nm³ which we equate to the volume of the target cation (VI). Adding $V(F^-) = 0.025 \pm 0.010$ nm³, $V(C_{13}H_{24}NF)$ becomes 0.3324 nm³ and $U_{POT}(C_{13}H_{24}NF) = U(TMAA^+F^-) = 442$ kJ mol⁻¹.

HDMAPF – Hexakis(dimethylamino)phosphazanium Fluoride, C₁₂H₃₆N₇P₂⁺F⁻ (VII). The known crystal structure¹ gives $V(C_{12}H_{36}N_7P_2^+) = 0.4755$ nm³ and $U_{POT}(C_{12}H_{36}N_7P_2F) = U(HDMAP^+F^-) = 399$ kJ mol⁻¹.

Estimation of Reaction Enthalpies and Free Energies from the Born–Haber Cycles

The reaction enthalpies for reaction 1 were estimated for the above seven fluoride ion donors and four Lewis acids using eq 2. Substitution of the *FIA* values in (2) by the Christie/Dixon pF^- , Lewis acidity, values which are defined by (4)

$$pF^-(A, g) = [-FIA(A, g)/kcal mol^{-1}]/10 \quad (4)$$

and their conversion to SI units (5)

$$FIA(A, g)/kJ mol^{-1} = -41.84pF^- \quad (5)$$

result in (6).

$$\Delta H = U_{POT}(C^+F^-) - U_{POT}(C^+AF^-) - \frac{3}{2}RT - 41.84pF^- \quad (6)$$

Using the published, MP2 based, pF^- values,^{22,23} we calculated the reaction enthalpies for (1), and the results are summarized in Table 1. Conversion of enthalpy, ΔH , to free energy, ΔG , values is achieved by estimation of the corresponding entropy terms $T\Delta S$ using eqs 7 and 8,

$$\Delta S = \Delta_r S^0(C^+AF^-, s) - \Delta_r S^0(A, g) - \Delta_r S^0(C^+F^-, s) \quad (7)$$

$$\Delta S = S_{298}^0(C^+AF^-, s) - S_{298}^0(A, g) - S_{298}^0(C^+F^-, s) \quad (8)$$

if the standard entropies of formation of the reactants and products are available or if the standard entropies were known or could be estimated. Neither standard entropies nor standard entropies of formation are available for the salts we have considered, although $S_{298}^0(A, g)$ values are. For ionic solids, however, the recently reported^{24–25} relationship (9) between standard entropy and volume can be used to obtain estimates for $S_{298}^0(C^+AF^-)$ and $S_{298}^0(C^+F^-)$,

$$S_{298}^0 = kV \quad (9)$$

(22) Christe, K. O.; Dixon, D. A.; McLemore, D.; Wilson, W. W.; Sheehy, J. A.; Boatz, J. A. *J. Fluorine Chem.* **2000**, *101*, 151.
 (23) Recently, the value of the fluoride ion affinity, *FIA*, of SbF₅ has also been estimated from lattice energies.²⁴ The value, -506 ± 63 kJ mol⁻¹, corresponding to a pF^- value of 12.09 ± 1.5 agrees well with the pF^- value of 12.03 given in ref 22.
 (24) Jenkins, H. D. B.; Roobottom, H. K.; Passmore, J. *Inorg. Chem.* **2003**, *42*, 2886.
 (25) (a) Jenkins, H. D. B.; Glasser, L. Paper 104, presented at the 16th ACS Winter Fluorine Conference, St. Pete Beach, FL, January 12–17, 2003. (b) Glasser, L.; Jenkins, H. D. B., submitted for publication.

Table 1. Estimation of $\Delta G/\text{kJ mol}^{-1}$ from the Born–Haber Cycle and Eq 2^a

cation	$V(\text{C}^+)$ nm^3	$V(\text{CF})$ nm^3	$V(\text{AF}^-)$ nm^3	$V(\text{CAF})$ nm^3	$U(\text{CAF})$ kJ mol^{-1}	$U(\text{CF})$ kJ mol^{-1}	$p\text{F}^-$ kcal $\text{mol}^{-1} 10^{-1}$	FIA kJ mol^{-1}	ΔH kJ mol^{-1}	$k(\Delta V)^b$ $\text{J K}^{-1} \text{mol}^{-1}$	$S(\text{A}, \text{g})$ J K^{-1} mol^{-1}	$T\Delta S$ kJ mol^{-1}	ΔG kJ mol^{-1}	$[\Delta H - FIA + 3/2RT]^c$ kJ mol^{-1}
A = SbF₅														
Cs	0.0188	0.0438	0.121	0.1398	556	769	12.03	-503	-294	-130.6	180.27	14.81	-279	240
TMA	0.121	0.146	0.121	0.242	480	549	12.03	-503	-438	-130.6	180.27	14.81	-423	69
MU	0.1807	0.2057	0.121	0.3017	454	501	12.03	-503	-460	-130.6	180.27	14.81	-445	47
HMG	0.2021	0.2271	0.121	0.3231	446	488	12.03	-503	-465	-130.6	180.27	14.81	-450	42
HMP	0.2624	0.2874	0.121	0.3834	427	459	12.03	-503	-475	-130.6	180.27	14.81	-460	32
TMAA	0.3074	0.3324	0.121	0.4284	415	442	12.03	-503	-480	-130.6	180.27	14.81	-465	27
HDMAP	0.4755	0.5005	0.121	0.5965	382	399	12.03	-503	-491	-130.6	180.27	14.81	-476	17
1.3	1.325	0.121	1.421	312	317	12.03	-503	-502	-130.6	180.27	14.81	-487	5	
A = BF₃														
Cs	0.0188	0.0438	0.073	0.0918	623	769	8.31	-348	-207	-65.3	153.45	26.27	-181	145
TMA	0.121	0.146	0.073	0.194	509	549	8.31	-348	-311	-65.3	153.45	26.27	-285	41
MU	0.1807	0.2057	0.073	0.2537	474	501	8.31	-348	-325	-65.3	153.45	26.27	-299	27
HMG	0.2021	0.2271	0.073	0.2751	465	488	8.31	-348	-328	-65.3	153.45	26.27	-302	24
HMP	0.2624	0.2874	0.073	0.3354	441	459	8.31	-348	-334	-65.3	153.45	26.27	-308	18
TMAA	0.3074	0.3324	0.073	0.3804	428	442	8.31	-348	-337	-65.3	153.45	26.27	-311	15
HDMAP	0.4755	0.5005	0.073	0.5485	390	399	8.31	-348	-343	-65.3	153.45	26.27	-317	9
1.3	1.325	0.073	1.373	314	317	8.31	-348	-349	-65.3	153.45	26.27	-323	3	
A = PF₅														
Cs	0.0188	0.0438	0.109	0.1278	569	769	9.49	-397	-201	-114.2	163.2	14.59	-187	200
TMA	0.121	0.146	0.109	0.23	487	549	9.49	-397	-338	-114.2	163.2	14.59	-324	63
MU	0.1807	0.2057	0.109	0.2897	458	501	9.49	-397	-358	-114.2	163.2	14.59	-344	43
HMG	0.2021	0.2271	0.109	0.3111	450	488	9.49	-397	-363	-114.2	163.2	14.59	-348	38
HMP	0.2624	0.2874	0.109	0.3714	430	459	9.49	-397	-372	-114.2	163.2	14.59	-357	29
TMAA	0.3074	0.3324	0.109	0.4164	418	442	9.49	-397	-377	-114.2	163.2	14.59	-362	24
HDMAP	0.4755	0.5005	0.109	0.5845	384	399	9.49	-397	-386	-114.2	163.2	14.59	-372	15
1.3	1.325	0.109	1.409	313	317	9.49	-397	-397	-114.2	163.2	14.59	-383	4	
A = AsF₅														
Cs	0.0188	0.0438	0.11	0.1288	568	769	10.59	-443	-246	-115.6	174.21	17.47	-228	201
TMA	0.121	0.146	0.11	0.231	486	549	10.59	-443	-384	-115.6	174.21	17.47	-366	63
MU	0.1807	0.2057	0.11	0.2907	458	501	10.59	-443	-404	-115.6	174.21	17.47	-386	43
HMG	0.2021	0.2271	0.11	0.3121	450	488	10.59	-443	-408	-115.6	174.21	17.47	-391	39
HMP	0.2624	0.2874	0.11	0.3724	430	459	10.59	-443	-418	-115.6	174.21	17.47	-400	29
TMAA	0.3074	0.3324	0.11	0.4174	418	442	10.59	-443	-422	-115.6	174.21	17.47	-405	25
HDMAP	0.4755	0.5005	0.11	0.5855	384	399	10.59	-443	-432	-115.6	174.21	17.47	-415	15
1.3	1.325	0.11	1.41	313	317	10.59	-443	-443	-115.6	174.21	17.47	-426	4	

^a For all rows, $3/2RT = 4 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$. ^b $\Delta V = V(\text{C}^+\text{AF}^-) - V(\text{C}^+\text{F}^-)$. ^c Quantitative parameter to measure “nakedness” of fluoride ion sources or donor strength.

where k equals $1360 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ nm}^{-3}$. This leads to eq 10:

$$\Delta S = k[V(\text{C}^+\text{AF}^-, \text{s}) - V(\text{C}^+\text{F}^-, \text{s})] - S_{298}^0(\text{A}, \text{g}) = k\Delta V - S_{298}^0(\text{A}, \text{g}) \quad (10)$$

where ΔV represents the difference between the C^+AF^- and C^+F^- molecular volumes. Because of the additivity¹⁵ of ion volumes, it can also be expressed as

$$\Delta V = V(\text{AF}^-) - V(\text{F}^-) \quad (11)$$

The function $[k\Delta V - S_{298}^0(\text{A}, \text{g})]$ on the right-hand side of eq 10 and equal to the entropy change for process (1) can thus be seen to be independent of the actual choice made for the cation C^+ , and hence the quantitative measure of the “nakedness” of the fluoride ion sources is vested in the enthalpy (rather than the free energy) change for reaction 1. Thus, while $\Delta G(\text{kJ mol}^{-1})$ at 298 K for reaction 1 is given by eq 12,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta G &= \Delta H - T\Delta S \\ &= U_{\text{POT}}(\text{C}^+\text{F}^-) - U_{\text{POT}}(\text{C}^+\text{AF}^-) - 3/2RT + \\ &FIA(\text{A}, \text{g}) - 0.298\{k[V(\text{C}^+\text{AF}^-, \text{s}) - V(\text{C}^+\text{F}^-, \text{s})] - \\ &S_{298}^0(\text{A}, \text{g})\} \\ &= U_{\text{POT}}(\text{C}^+\text{F}^-) - U_{\text{POT}}(\text{C}^+\text{AF}^-) - 3/2RT + \\ &FIA(\text{A}, \text{g}) - 0.298\{k[\Delta V] - S_{298}^0(\text{A}, \text{g})\} \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1. Plots of the free energy changes of reaction 1 against the molar volumes of cations **I–VII** and one hypothetical point with a molar volume of 1.3 nm^3 , using SbF_5 (blue), AsF_5 (red), PF_5 (green), and BF_3 (black) as the acceptor molecules. For infinitely large molar volumes of the cation, the curves asymptotically approach the fluoride ion affinity values ($+RT$ terms) of the acceptors.

separation of terms which are independent of the choice of cation on the right-hand side leads to

$$[\Delta G - FIA(\text{A}, \text{g}) + 3/2RT + 0.298\{k[\Delta V] - S_{298}^0(\text{A}, \text{g})\}] = U_{\text{POT}}(\text{C}^+\text{F}^-) - U_{\text{POT}}(\text{C}^+\text{AF}^-) \quad (13)$$

The values of ΔG , obtained in this manner, are given in Table

1 and Figure 1. The function $[\Delta G - FIA(A, g) + 3/2RT + 0.298\{k[\Delta V] - S_{298}^0(A, g)\}]$ would serve as a suitable quantitative measure of our "nakedness" criteria. However, it can be simplified. Because the two terms $[\Delta G + 0.298\{k[\Delta V] - S_{298}^0(A, g)\}]$ within the above function correspond to $[\Delta G + T\Delta S]$ which equals ΔH , the parameter $[\Delta H - FIA(A, g) + 3/2RT]$ (Table 1) can be taken as our quantitative measure for the "nakedness".

These results show that, independent of the choice of the acceptor molecules, the relative fluoride ion donor strength decreases in the following order of cations, HDMAP > TMAA > HMP > HMG > MU > TMA > Cs, and is given by the lattice energy difference between C^+F^- and C^+AF^- . This difference is, in turn, proportional to the difference of the inverse cube roots of the molecular (formula unit) volumes of the two salts, so that our "nakedness" parameter (14)

$$[\Delta H - FIA(A, g) + 3/2RT]/kJ\ mol^{-1} = U_{POT}(C^+F^-) - U_{POT}(C^+AF^-) = 2\alpha[V(C^+F^-)^{-1/3} - V(C^+AF^-)^{-1/3}] \quad (14)$$

where $\alpha = 117.3\ kJ\ mol^{-1}\ nm$, is governed by the size (volume/nm³) of the cations and becomes zero for infinitely large cations (i.e., as $V(C^+) \rightarrow$ large, then $V(C^+AF^-) \rightarrow V(C^+F^-)$, $U_{POT}(C^+AF^-) \rightarrow U_{POT}(C^+F^-)$, and so $\Delta H \rightarrow FIA(A, g) - 3/2RT$).

Using our density-based equation,²⁶ the difference in lattice energies $[U_{POT}(C^+F^-) - U_{POT}(C^+AF^-)]$ can also be equated to (15),

$$[\Delta H - FIA(A, g) + 3/2RT]/kJ\ mol^{-1} = U_{POT}(C^+F^-) - U_{POT}(C^+AF^-) = \gamma\{[\rho(C^+F^-)/M(C^+F^-)]^{1/3} - [\rho(C^+AF^-)/M(C^+AF^-)]^{1/3}\} \quad (15)$$

where $\gamma = 1981.2\ mol^{-1}\ cm$, and $\rho(C^+F^-)$ and $\rho(C^+AF^-)$ are the densities (in g cm⁻³), and $M(C^+F^-)$ and $M(C^+AF^-)$ are the chemical formula masses of the respective salts, C^+F^- and C^+AF^- .

The absolute values of the free energy (and enthalpy) change show, as expected, a strong dependence on the fluoride ion affinities of the given acceptor molecules (see Figure 1) and, for infinitely large cations, asymptotically approach these fluoride ion affinity values (adjusted by the RT terms). When the enthalpy values are corrected for the fluoride affinity and RT values of the corresponding acceptors, the individual curves for $[\Delta H - FIA(A, g) + 3/2RT]$ versus $V(C^+)$ collapse into a single line that asymptotically approaches zero for infinitely large cations (see Figure 2). Because the sign of the lattice energy difference is opposite to that of the fluoride affinity, the salts with the largest cations exhibit the largest (negative) free energy and corresponding enthalpy changes which approach the FIA values, and are the best F^- donors. Therefore, the cation size is a suitable measure for the fluoride ion donor strength of a salt. Figures 1 and 2 furthermore show that for the hexakis-(dimethylamino)phosphazanium cation the free energy change already approximates its maximum value (or that the enthalpy




Figure 2. Plots of the "nakedness" parameters, $\{\Delta H - FIA + 3/2RT\}$, of the cations **I–VII** against their molar volumes and one hypothetical point with a molar volume of $1.3\ nm^3$. It can be seen that after correction of ΔH for $3/2RT$ and the F^- affinities of the corresponding F^- acceptors, the four curves of Figure 1 collapse into a single line, that asymptotically approaches zero for infinitely large molar volumes of the cation.

change, ΔH , is close to the corresponding FIA value) and that a further increase in cation size²⁷ will only minimally increase the fluoride ion donor strength. Therefore, further synthetic efforts in this direction are hardly warranted, and the potential usefulness of different fluoride ion donor sources will be largely determined by their chemical and physical properties. For example, the tetramethylammonium cation, despite its relatively small size, has proven to be extremely useful because of its excellent chemical inertness and oxidation resistance.^{2,4} A drawback of this cation, however, is its high symmetry which results in a tendency to enforce disorder on lesser symmetric anions that can interfere with crystal structure determinations.¹³ The approach described in this paper should be generally applicable for the evaluation of the "nakedness" of other small ions, such as chloride or pseudohalides.

Conclusion

The above analysis shows that for a given acceptor molecule the temperature corrected enthalpy change of reaction 1, or the differences in either the lattice energies, $[U_{POT}(C^+F^-) - U_{POT}(C^+AF^-)]$, or the inverse cube roots of the volumes, $[V(C^+F^-)^{-1/3} - V(C^+AF^-)^{-1/3}]$, or the cube roots of the (ρ/M) terms, $\{[\rho(C^+F^-)/M(C^+F^-)]^{1/3} - [\rho(C^+AF^-)/M(C^+AF^-)]^{1/3}\}$, all can serve as a reliable measure for the fluoride ion donor strength and hence the "nakedness" of a fluoride ion source. Because, for a given acceptor, the enthalpy change depends solely on the molar volume of the cation of the fluoride ion source, the donor strength can easily be predicted.

Acknowledgment. We thank the National Science Foundation, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the EPSRC for financial support, and Dr. W. Larson for his help with the graphics.

JA035675R

(27) It should be noted that for salts with very large cations and small anions, the latter can fit into the holes in the cation–cation packing. Therefore, in these cases, the additivity rule might no longer be valid. These considerations, however, in no way affect the conclusions in this paper.

(26) Jenkins, H. D. B.; Tudela, D.; Glasser, L. *Inorg. Chem.* **2002**, *41*, 2364.