ChemComm



Mobility of Lewis Acids within the Secondary Coordination Sphere: Toward a Model for Cooperative Substrate Binding

Journal:	ChemComm
Manuscript ID	CC-COM-07-2020-005121.R1
Article Type:	Communication





199x73mm (300 x 300 DPI)

COMMUNICATION

Mobility of Lewis Acids within the Secondary Coordination Sphere: Toward a Model for Cooperative Substrate Binding

Received 00th January 20xx, Accepted 00th January 20xx John J. Kiernicki,^a Emily E. Norwine,^a Myles A. Lovasz,^a Matthias Zeller,^b and Nathaniel K. Szymczak^a*

cooperative model

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

Distance dependence of appended Lewis acids in N₂H₄ binding and deprotonation was evaluated within a series of zinc complexes. Variation of spacer-length to a tethered trialkylborane Lewis acid revealed distinct preferences for binding and stabilization of the resulting deprotonated N₂H₃⁻ unit.

Acidic/basic residues within the secondary coordination sphere of metalloenzyme active sites are often critical for structure regulation and/or reactive-intermediate stabilization.¹ These interactions occur in a dynamic protein environment where acidic residues are highly flexible and mobile. For example, in the active site of type II β -carbonic anhydrase, an aspartate residue (Asp44) gates reactivity to a Zn-OH: initially binding to Zn, then migrating 1.5 Å to hydrogen bond with Zn-OH₂.² Similarly, a recent report of Mo-nitrogenase revealed a dynamic multi-metallic cofactor, where the nitrogen reduction sequence is proposed to involve dynamic rotation and substrate/H-bonding interactions.³

Synthetic models containing pre-arranged secondary sphere groups can provide insight into the roles through which acidic groups facilitate substrate binding.⁴ While such models often use rigid molecular scaffolds to provide critical snapshots of donor/acceptor adducts, they do not capture mobilitydependent reactivity. Modelling mobility of an acidic residue within the secondary coordination sphere is synthetically challenging.⁵

Our group is working to evaluate how the precise structural, electronic, and cooperative modes in the secondary coordination sphere can be used to regulate reactivity.⁶ Recently, our lab investigated the role of ligand-appended acidic groups in homolytic bond scission of hydrazine by



platform to probe substrate specific cooperative binding modes

prior work

Fig. 1 Left: Conceptual design. Right: specific substrates investigated in this study and their potential binding modes.

transition metal complexes.⁷ A key design aspect in those studies was the flexibility of the tethered trialkylborane Lewis acid, which enabled acid/base interactions to occur in both the primary (cooperatively with the transition metal) and secondary (independent of metal) spheres. A first-generation ligand, 3-^{BBN}NN^{tBu}, containing a 3-carbon alkyl tether between the Lewis acid and the bidentate ligand was synthesized by hydroboration of 2-(1-allyl-5-(tert-butyl)-1H-pyrazol-3-yl)-6-methylpyridine with 9-borabicyclo[3.3.1]nonane (BBN).8 While this tether length stabilized monoatomic ligands (e.g. -NH₂) cooperatively with iron (Fig. 1), we obtained divergent results when attempting to sequester a diatomic substrate, cyanide.⁹ These disparate results highlight a Lewis acid dependence on substrate binding and illustrate a need to establish parameters (e.g. tether length) that maximize binding for a given substrate. Minimizing the energy requirement for cooperative acidsubstrate-metal interaction will provide design cues that will enable the use of less-acidic Lewis acids, and ultimately facilitate product release—a challenge for catalytic turnover.

To probe distance relationships between the Lewis acid and a given substrate, we evaluated a set of compounds where: 1) the Lewis acid is held constant (9-BBN), 2) the alkyl tether length is systematically varied from 2 to 4 methylene (-CH₂-) units, and 3) the substrate contained variable bonding modes (Fig. 1). Zn was selected to ensure a consistent coordination geometry, and hydrazine (N₂H₄) was selected as the substrate (Fig. 1). Cooperative binding of N₂H₄ between the two Lewis acids, Zn²⁺

^{a.} University of Michigan, 930 N. University, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA. E-mail: nszym@umich.edu.

^{b.} H. C. Brown Laboratory, Purdue University, 560 Oval Dr, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA.

^{*}Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: CCDC 2012063-2012075. For ESI and crystallographic data in CIF or another electronic format see DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

COMMUNICATION

and trialkylborane, must involve coordinating each of the two lone pairs (i.e. μ -1,2-N₂H₄).



Fig. 2 A) Synthesis of complexes A. B) Molecular structures (50% probability ellipsoids) of A-2 and A-4 as well as their vinyl and butenyl precursors, respectively. H-atoms not attached to alkenyl moieties are omitted for clarity.

The two- and four-carbon length precursor ligands, vinylNNtBu and ^{butenyl}NN^{tBu}, were prepared by adapted literature procedures (see SI). Initial metalation strategies of the new ligands mirrored our synthesis of (3-BBNNNtBu)ZnBr2 (A-3; 3 denotes tether length, A denotes compound series).8 Stirring a CH_2Cl_2 solution of vinylNN^{tBu} or ^{butenyl}NN^{tBu} with ZnBr₂ furnished (vinylNNtBu)ZnBr2 and (butenylNNtBu)ZnBr2 as white powders (Fig. 2). Whereas late-stage hydroboration of $(^{butenyl}NN^{tBu})ZnBr_2$ with 9-BBN proceeded (RT, THF, 18 hr) to afford (4-BBNNNtBu)ZnBr2 (A-4), (vinylNNtBu)ZnBr₂ was obstinate to hydroboration. The molecular structures of (vinylNNtBu)ZnBr2 and (butenylNNtBu)ZnBr2 (Fig. 2B) determined by single crystal X-ray diffraction (SC-XRD) revealed a potential origin of the difference in hydroboration reactivity. Although hydroboration of vinyl substituents is generally facile with 9-BBN,10 (vinylNNtBu)ZnBr2 possesses two large steric moieties, the -C(CH₃)₃ and ZnBr₂, that render the vinyl group inaccessible.¹¹ To overcome this challenge, we pursued an early-stage hydroboration. Treating vinyl NN^{tBu} with 9-BBN generated ^{2-BBN}NN^{tBu} in situ, which was metalated with ZnBr₂ in one-pot to afford (^{2-BBN}NN^{tBu})ZnBr₂ (A-2). Spectroscopically and structurally, A-2 and A-4 are similar to A-3. The distance between the two acidic centres, Zn and the trialkylborane, increases by ca. 1 Å for each additional –CH₂– unit added to the tether length (Zn-B: A-2 = 4.76_{ave}; A-3 = 5.82; A-4 = 6.57 Å).¹² This trend suggests the system is well-suited for a distance-dependent cooperativity study.

Our previous studies revealed the three-carbon tether was ideally suited for cooperative binding of a wide range of μ -1,1 substrates;⁸⁻⁹ however, we hypothesized a distinct tether length

would be needed for a μ -1,2 substrate. We used hydrazine (N₂H₄) to investigate this hypothesis. Previously, we demonstrated that the trialkylborane of **A-3** could capture a single equivalent to N₂H₄ to afford (^{3-BBN}NN^{tBu})ZnBr₂(N₂H₄) (**B-3**), where the terminal -NH₂ lone-pair is uncoordinated.¹³ The series of complexes **B** were synthesized by standard protocols and all share similar spectroscopic properties.⁸ Structurally, the coordination environment at Zn is unperturbed and the distances between the two acidic sites, Zn and boron, are variable and range from 4.80 (**B-2**) to 7.38 Å (**B-4**). All display weak intra- (**B-2** and **B-3**) or intermolecular (**B-4**) NH...Br hydrogen bonding interactions¹⁴ that result in the N₂H₄ moieties being nearly equidistant (ave = 4.36 +/- 0.17 Å) to a Zn atom of the same, or an adjacent molecule.

Halide abstraction from complexes **B** with TI⁺ afforded cationic complexes, [(^{n-BBN}NN^{tBu})ZnBr(N₂H₄)][X], (C-2-C-4; X = OTf, PF₆) and were subjected to SC-XRD studies (Fig. 3). Each complex displays a C_1 symmetric tetrahedral bromido-Zn (τ_4 = 0.83-0.85) chelated by the ^{n-BBN}NN^{tBu} ligand. The fourth coordination site is occupied by a hydrazine ligand bridging to the appended trialkylborane (i.e. Zn-NH₂NH₂-BR₃). Across the series of compounds, the Zn-N₂H₄ bond distance elongates from 2.0256(11) – 2.0892(15) Å (C-2 < C-3 < C-4) as the tether length to the trialkylborane increases ($\Delta = 0.055$ Å). This trend is also observed, though to a lesser degree, in the B-N₂H₄ distance where C-2 is shorter (1.6463(18) Å) in comparison to C-3 and C-**4** (1.675(2) and 1.668(2) Å, respectively). Both the $R_3B-N_2H_4^{15}$ and Zn-N₂H₄ distances¹⁶ are comparable to related species. The interactions of N_2H_4 with the two Lewis acids, Zn and boron, force a nearly fixed distance from one another with variation of only 0.33 Å across the C series (contrasting with the B series; Δ Zn-B = 2.58 Å), highlighting the accordion-like flexibility of the acidic trialkylborane.

The solid-state data of C-2 revealed both the shortest Zn-N and B-N contacts suggesting that this binding pocket is best suited for favourable host/guest interactions with N₂H₄. Variable temperature NMR spectra provided additional support. At 25 °C, complexes C display C_s symmetric spectra that suggest a dynamic process. Upon cooling, each undergo broadening with a coalescence temperature of T_c = 276, 260, and 240 K for C-2, C-3, and C-4, respectively. For each complex, we propose this dynamic process is the same. From the coalescence temperature of C-2 in CDCl₃, we obtained an activation energy barrier for this process of 12.8 +/- 0.1 kcal/mol (see SI). This value is similar to a previously reported on/off binding event between Zn and a ligand-tethered amine (13 kcal/mol).17 Across the series of compounds C, this energy varies by ~ 1.5 kcal/mol. Complex C-4 displays both the lowest barrier for activation (11.5 kcal/mol), as well as the longest Zn-N₂H₄ bond distance.

Two limiting dynamic acid/base interactions are possible in complexes **C**: 1) Zn-N₂H₄ bond scission, or 2) R₃B-N₂H₄ bond scission. The latter was probed by attempting to form a boranefree analogue of complexes **C**. Treating (^{butyl}NN^{tBu})ZnBr₂, a borane-free surrogate where the alkyl-BBN portion of the ligand was replaced with *n*-butyl, N₂H₄ caused immediate demetalation of the ligand. These results suggest that boron-



Fig.3 A) Reversible formation of C from B. B) Molecular structures (50% probability ellipsoids, only H-atoms attached to heteroatoms are displayed). B-3 is previously reported.8

nitrogen bond scission in complexes **C** may result in decomposition, and highlights the requirement of an appended Lewis acid for stability. To ascertain the differences in Lewis acid strengths, we measured solution Gutmann-Beckett acidities.¹⁸ These data show that the Zn in **C-2** is significantly more acidic than the appended borane (acceptor number = 66.3 vs. 25.0; see SI). The acceptor numbers suggest that a competitive base may promote dissociation of the weaker acid.¹⁹ Treating compounds **C** with 1.5 equiv. [Bu₄N][Br] rapidly regenerated compounds **B**, highlighting the lability of the Zn-N₂H₄ bond (Fig. 3A).²⁰ This result highlights the challenges of experimentally measuring and comparing Lewis acidities: due to hard/soft-acid/base mismatches and steric considerations, *measured acidities are substrate specific and do not always correspond to accessible acidities.*²¹

We propose the dynamic solution behaviour for complexes **C** is the result of dissociation of the $Zn-N_2H_4$ bond (Fig. 4, top). Thermodynamically, the tether length has minimal effect on the Zn-N₂H₄ bond dissociation energy.²² We computationally probed the electron density distribution of the Zn-N₂H₄ unit via density functional theory (DFT) methods. Complexes C were analysed at the B3LYP/6-311+G(2d,p) (CH₂Cl₂) level of theory for all atoms except Zn (6-311+G(2d) level). Natural bond orbital analyses are consistent with the extracted thermodynamic parameters from NMR spectroscopy: changing tether length results in minimal variation to the natural charges or bond indices. Kinetically, the tether length has a clear effect. Measured rates of Zn-N₂H₄ on/off binding at the coalescence temperature, k_c , for each complex follows the trend C-2 > C-3 > C-4.23 This trend can be rationalized in terms of the distances between the two acidic residues, Zn and boron, in complexes B and C. As the tether length is increased, the rate of on/off binding is slowed because the distance between the two acids increases.

The acidification of hydrazine by Lewis acids was probed through DFT assessment of **C-3**, N₂H₄, and its adduct with 9-methyl-9-borabicyclo[3.3.1]nonane (9-Me-9-BBN).²⁴ Upon coordination of N₂H₄ to 9-Me-9-BBN, the proximal N-*H* protons

are acidified by 20 pK_a units (Fig 4B). In **C-3**, the N-*H* protons are further acidified by *ca*. 10 pK_a units. Notably, the Lewis acidic Zn in **C-3** acidifies the N-*H* protons to a greater extent (pK_a = 24.9 vs. 26.9; Fig. 4B, right) than the trialkylborane, supporting the measured acceptor numbers.²⁵ Overall, these data indicate that the addition of both Zn and boron Lewis acids serve additive roles to increase the acidity of coordinated N₂H₄.



Fig. 4 A) Top: Dynamic solution behaviour of complexes C. Left: reversible deprotonation of C-3 to form D-3 and molecular structure of D-3 (50% probability ellipsoids, only H-atoms attached to heteroatoms displayed). B) Calculated pKa values.

We assessed the viability of deprotonating the cooperatively captured N₂H₄. Treating a THF solution of **C-3** with KN(SiMe₃)₂ at low temperature resulted in formation of HN(SiMe₃)₂ and a C_1 symmetric complex by ¹H NMR spectroscopy—consistent with formation of a [N₂H₃]¹⁻ moiety

COMMUNICATION

and production of $(^{3-BBN}NN^{tBu})ZnBr(N_2H_3)$ (**D-3**).²⁶ In contrast, when similar reactions were attempted for the other tether lengths to form **D-2** and **D-4**, we observed either demetalation or an intractable mixture (see SI), illustrating a unique stabilizing effect for the 3-carbon variant.

Due to the multiple bonding modes possible with $[N_2H_3]^{1-,27}$ the solid-state structure was determined by SC-XRD. **D-3** represents the first structurally characterized example of a Zn hydrazido¹⁻ complex. Both boron and Zn are attached to the same nitrogen of the hydrazido ligand (Fig. 4, bottom). Deprotonation results in a decrease in both the Zn-N (1.973(2); $\Delta = 0.074$ Å) and B-N (1.630(4); $\Delta = 0.027$ Å) bond lengths, compared to **C-3**. In **D-3**, the terminal -NH₂ does not interact with Lewis acidic residues and the N-N distance is identical to **C-3**. The tandem Lewis acid/metal stabilization of $[N_2H_3]^{1-}$ in **D-3**, is reminiscent of the vanadium Lewis acid/base triad that employed a weakly acidic, but rigid, tetramethyl-1,3,2dioxaborolane Lewis acid (B-N₂H₃ = 1.623(4) Å).²⁸

The structure of **D-3** is unique to the series because the 3carbon tether can accommodate both μ -1,1 and μ -1,2 ligands (N₂H₃ and N₂H₄). The ability to stabilize both types of substrates enables facile rearrangement upon deprotonation of **C-3** to form **D-3**. Importantly, this process is reversible; treating **D-3** with [Ph₂NH][OTf] quantitatively regenerates **C-3** (Fig. 4, left). The mobility of the Lewis acid is highlighted for complexes **B-3**, **C-3**, and **D-3**. While operating independently, the boron atom is located 5.41 Å away from Zn (**B-3**). Upon forming a cooperative interaction with Zn in **C-3** to capture a diatom, N₂H₄, the Zn-B distances decreases to 3.95 Å (Δ = 1.46 Å). Finally, following deprotonation, cooperative stabilization of the same N-atom in ⁻N₂H₃ decreases the Zn-B distance to 3.06 Å. Overall, the Lewis acid exhibits mobility of 2.35 Å, mirroring the distance traversed by amino acids in metalloenzymes during turnover.^{1a, 2}

We have described a system where it is possible to probe distant-dependent substrate-Lewis acid relationships. The trialkylborane in this system was tethered by $-(CH_2)_{n}$ - units at defined distances, from a substrate. Of note, the three-carbon tether affords the most versatility in terms of substrate accommodation. Our results suggest that while a certain tether length may provide an ideal fit for a given substrate, the versatility of the three-carbon tether may be the most useful for stabilizing a variety of high-energy reduction products of a single substrate (e.g. N_xH_y from N_2). Further work from our lab is investigating both of these aspects.

This work was supported by the NIH (1R01GM111486-01A1 and 1R35GM136360-01). N.K.S. is a Camille Dreyfus Teacher-Scholar. J.J.K. is supported by the NIH NIGMS (F32GM126635). M.A.L. was supported through the James E. Harris Scholarship through SURP at the Univ. Michigan. The X-ray diffractometers were funded by the NSF (CHE 1625543).

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Notes and references

- (a) Lipscomb, W. N.; Sträter, N., *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, *96*, 2375-2434; (b) Marshall, N. M.; Garner, D. K.; Wilson, T. D.; Gao, Y.-G.; Robinson, H.; Nilges, M. J.; Lu, Y., *Nature* **2009**, *462*, 113-116.
- 2 (a) Sawaya, M. R.; Cannon, G. C.; Heinhorst, S.; Tanaka, S.; Williams, E. B.; Yeates, T. O.; Kerfeld, C. A., *J. Biol. Chem.* 2006, 281, 7546-7555; (b) Ferraroni, M.; Del Prete, S.; Vullo, D.; Capasso, C.; Supuran, C. T., *Acta Cryst. D* 2015, *D71*, 2449-2456; (c) Aggarwal, M.; Chua, T. K.; Pinard, M. A.; Szebenyi, D. M.; McKenna, R., *Biochemistry* 2015, *54*, 6631-6638; (d) Cronk, J. D.; Endrizzi, J. A.; Cronk, M. R.; O'Neill, J. W.; Zhang, K. Y. J., *Protein Sci.* 2001, *10*, 911-922.
- 3 Kang, W.; Lee, C. C.; Jasniewski, A. J.; Ribbe, M. W.; Hu, Y., *Science* **2020**, *368*, 1381.
- 4 (a) Matson, E. M.; Park, Y. J.; Fout, A. R., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*2014, 136, 17398; (b) Ward, M. B.; Scheitler, A.; Yu, M.; Senft, L.; Zillmann, A. S.; Gorden, J. D.; Schwartz, D. D.; Ivanović-Burmazović, I.; Goldsmith, C. R., *Nat. Chem.* 2018, 10, 1207.
- 5 (a) Miller, A. J. M.; Labinger, J. A.; Bercaw, J. E., Organometallics 2010, 29, 4499-4516; (b) Meng, G.; Lam, N. Y. S.; Lucas, E. L.; Saint-Denis, T. G.; Verma, P.; Chekshin, N.; Yu, J.-Q., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2020, 142, 10571-10591; (c) Talukdar, K.; Sinha Roy, S.; Amatya, E.; Sleeper, E. A.; Le Magueres, P.; Jurss, J. W., Inorg. Chem. 2020, 59, 6087-6099; (d) González-Fernández, R.; Crochet, P.; Cadierno, V., Dalton Trans. 2020, 49, 210-222; (e) Nichols, Eva M.; Derrick, J. S.; Nistanaki, S. K.; Smith, P. T.; Chang, C. J., Chem. Sci. 2018, 9, 2952-2960.
- 6 Hale, L. V. A.; Szymczak, N. K., ACS Catal. 2018, 8, 6446-6461.
- 7 (a) Kiernicki, J. J.; Zeller, M.; Szymczak, N. K., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2017, 139, 18194-18197; (b) Kiernicki, J. J.; Zeller, M.;
 Szymczak, N. K., *Inorg. Chem.* 2019, 58, 1147-1154; (c)
 Kiernicki, J. J.; Zeller, M.; Szymczak, N. K., *Inorg. Chem.* 2020.
- 8 Kiernicki, J. J.; Norwine, E. E.; Zeller, M.; Szymczak, N. K., Chem. Commun. 2019, 55, 11896-11899.
- 9 Kiernicki, J. J.; Shanahan, J. P.; Zeller, M.; Szymczak, N. K., *Chem. Sci.* **2019**, *10*, 5539-5545.
- 10 Brown, H. C.; Scouten, C. G.; Liotta, R., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 96-99.
- 11 See SI for space filling model.
- 12 Two molecules per unit cell: Zn-B = 4.687 and 4.823 Å.
- 13 <1 equiv. N₂H₄ led to a dinuclear compound, see SI and Ref 8.
- 14 Steiner, T., Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2002, 41, 48-76.
- 15 Chen, C.-H.; Gabbaï, F. P., Chem. Sci. 2018, 9, 6210-6218.
- 16 (a) Yu, X.-Y.; Cui, X.-B.; Yang, J.-J.; Zhang, J.-P.; Luo, Y.-H.; Zhang, H.; Gao, W.-P., *CrystEngComm* **2012**, *14*, 4719-4727; (b) Wang, Y.-N.; Bai, F.-Q.; Yu, J.-H.; Xu, J.-Q., *Dalton Trans.* **2013**, *42*, 16547-16555.
- 17 17. He, Z.; Craig, D. C.; Colbran, S. B., J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans. **2002**, 4224-4235.
- 18 Beckett, M. A.; Strickland, G. C.; Holland, J. R.; Sukumar Varma, K., *Polymer* **1996**, *37*, 4629-4631.
- 19 Hard/soft mismatches complicate acidity comparisons.
- 20 Yield is quantitative for C-3/C-4 and 60% for C-2, see SI.
- 21 (a) Plumley, J. A.; Evanseck, J. D., J. Phys. Chem. A 2009, 113, 5985-5992; (b) Sivaev, I. B.; Bregadze, V. I., Coord. Chem. Rev. 2014, 270-271, 75-88.
- 22 BDE values from single point calc. derived from X-ray data.
- 23 There is error in measuring peak separation in the slowexchange limit and these values should be viewed as lower limits. NMR simulations have been unsuccessful.
- 24 Of C, only C-3 can be successfully deprotonated. See below.
- 25 Equilibrium conditions cannot be met to experimentally.
- 26 For bulk synthesis, deprotonation of **B-3** is preferred, see SI.
- 27 Li, Y.; Shi, Y.; Odom, A. L., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 1794-1803.
- 28 Tutusaus, O.; Ni, C.; Szymczak, N. K., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 3403-3406.