

ChemComm

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/c0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/xxxxxx

COMMUNICATION

Electrochemical Controlling and Monitoring of Halogen Bond Formation in Solution.

Sihem Groni, Tanguy Maby-Raud, Claire Fave, Mathieu Branca and Bernd Schöllhorn*

Received (in XXX, XXX) Xth XXXXXXXXXX 20XX, Accepted Xth XXXXXXXXXX 20XX

DOI: 10.1039/b000000x

Cyclic voltammetry has been used for the first time to probe and to control the formation of non-covalent halogen bonding (XB) via redox switching. These results strongly encourage the use of electrochemistry as an economical and precisely controllable tool for the investigation of XB in solution.


Halogen bonds¹ are non-covalent interactions in which covalently bound halogens act as electrophilic species in the presence of a Lewis base. The term “halogen bonding” (XB)² was introduced to stress its similarity with hydrogen bonding regarding geometry and strength (5-180 kJ mol⁻¹).¹ Halo-hydrocarbons (I, Br, Cl) are potential XB donors in the presence of a Lewis base. Halo-perfluorocarbons form particularly strong interactions owing to the electron-withdrawing fluoro substituents which are considerably increasing the so called sigma hole³ of the halogen atom and consequently its electrophilicity. The utility and importance of XB for controlling self-assembly in the solid state^{1,4} was proven in many applications in crystal engineering and materials science.⁵ Until recently, it has been less clear to what extent XB is capable to influence conformation, binding or reactivity in the solution phase.⁶ So far only few examples have been described and a first review⁷ summarizes solution-phase thermodynamic data for XB interactions and emerging applications in molecular recognition, anion sensing, medicinal chemistry and catalysis.⁸ The analytical methods⁹ applied are mostly based on spectroscopic techniques such as NMR, UV, IR, Raman and EPR. In this context we are not aware of any publications based upon electrochemical methods.

The goal of the present work was to prove the concept of electrochemical controlling of XB interactions in homogeneous solution. There are only few publications reporting on the influence of redox states on XB in the solid phase¹⁰ and so far no examples in solution. Tuning the strength of a redox active Lewis base via a reversible electrochemical reaction should change its affinity towards halogenated XB donors. Such type of redox switching is of great interest since the electrochemical probing and controlling of XB will assist to better understand supramolecular properties and reactivity of complex systems such as liquid electrolytes involving multiple competing non-covalent interactions. There is also an important potential for the development of electrochemical sensing devices and novel tools for the investigation of halogenated molecules in chemical biology and medicinal chemistry.¹¹

In non-aqueous solvents *p*-quinones can be reversibly reduced in two sequential one-electron transfer steps¹² generating the corresponding radical anion (semiquinone radical) and dianions, increasing considerably the respective Lewis base strength. The influence of hydrogen-bond donors and Lewis acids on the electrochemistry of quinones has been extensively studied.^{13,14} The observed potential shifts in the quinone reduction potentials were attributed to the stabilization of the corresponding anions due to their association with hydrogen bond donors¹³ (in the absence of proton transfer reactions) and Lewis acids¹⁵ (alkali and earth-alkali metal cations).

For the first time we have investigated the interactions of quinone anions with XB donors by cyclic voltammetry (CV) in homogeneous solution. The relatively weak Lewis acidity of organic halo-derivatives represents an intrinsic problem for probing such interactions in a conducting liquid electrolyte involving numerous competitive interactions with the solvent molecules and the supporting electrolyte salt present in relatively high concentrations. In this study the CV experiments were conducted in a 0.1 M solution of tetra-*n*-butylammonium hexafluorophosphate (TBAPF₆) in acetonitrile, a common electrolyte with a relatively large potential window. No significant ion-pairing has been observed so far during the reduction of *p*-quinones to the corresponding dianions in contrary to supporting electrolytes containing alkaline metal cations (MPF₆; M= Li, Na, K).^{13b,16} Furthermore Taylor and co-workers recently showed that acetonitrile is a weaker XB acceptor as it would have been expected on the basis of electrostatic interactions only.¹⁷ It is important to note that all voltammetric experiments have been conducted under anhydrous conditions in the absence of oxygen (see experimental section). Acetylferrocene and [Os(bpy)₃](PF₆)₂ were used as internal standards in control experiments confirming the accuracy of the saturated calomel electrode. The added XB donor solutions systematically contained the supporting electrolyte salt and the quinone in order to keep both concentrations constant during the entire period of each experiment.

For this work we have chosen tetrachloro-*p*-quinone (TCQ), a common oxidizing agent, also known as *p*-chloranil (Scheme 1). The interaction of its reduced species with various aliphatic and aromatic XB donors (Scheme 1) was investigated. Typical cyclic voltammograms of TCQ in the absence and the presence of 1-iodo-perfluorohexane (**1**) are illustrated in Figure 1.



Scheme 1. Electrochemically active Lewis bases (TCQ, DDQ, TCNQ) and perfluorinated aliphatic (X-R_f) and aromatic (X-Ar_f) XB donors used in this study (X = I, Br, Cl).




Figure 1. Cyclic voltammograms of TCQ (0.5 mM) on a glassy carbon electrode in a solution of TBAPF₆ (0.1 M) in acetonitrile in the absence and in the presence of increasing concentrations of iodo-perfluorohexane (**1**) (from left to right: 0, 0.5, 5, 25 and 50 mM). Scan rate 0.1 V/s.

In acetonitrile TCQ shows two mono-electronic cathodic waves which correspond to the formation of the anion radical TCQ^{•-} and the dianion TCQ²⁻, respectively. In these reductions the first step is fully reversible and the second step quasi-reversible at customary scan rates (compare Table S1 in Supplementary Information).





Figure 2. Dependence of the potential shift (ΔE°) corresponding to the second reduction step of TCQ (0.5 mM) on the concentration of the XB-donors **1** (red dots, including standard deviations) and **3** (black squares) at 298 K.

Upon the addition of **1** the formal standard potential of the second reduction wave was shifted significantly (up to 140 mV) to the positive direction towards more anodic potentials with no essential loss of reversibility whereas the position of the first wave remained unchanged. This observation is consistent with the previously observed weak binding of oxo anions such as nitrate or tosylate to XB donors¹⁸ suggesting that only the highly Lewis basic dianion is able to undergo strong XB in the presence of competing interactions with the electrolyte but not the radical anion. This behavior can be attributed to a substantial stabilization of TCQ²⁻ as it has been previously described for

hydrogen bond donors in the absence of proton transfer reactions.¹² Upon the addition of a 100 fold excess of iodo-perfluorohexane (**1**) or iodo-perfluorobenzene (**3**) potential shifts of around 140 mV and 108 mV, respectively, have been observed (Table S1 and Fig. 3). The dependence of the potential shifts on the concentration of both XB donors **1** and **3** is shown in the titration curves of Figure 2. The corresponding equilibria concerning the formation of XB complexes depending on the TCQ redox state are detailed in Scheme 2. The irreversible reduction of the XB donors was observed outside the applied potential window at more negative potentials around -1.50 V (compound **1**) and -1.65 V (compound **3**).

In order to discard any ion-pairing effects we also performed the same experiments at lower supporting electrolyte concentrations (0.02 M TBAPF₆) and different cations (0.1 M tetra-methyl ammonium hexafluorophosphate). In both cases the standard potential shifts upon the addition of 100 equivalents of XB-donor **1** were observed to be very similar (140 and 120 mV, respectively) confirming that ion-pairing effects can be neglected under these conditions (see Fig. S5 and S6).¹⁶ Besides TCQ two other electrochemically active Lewis bases dichloro-dicyano-*p*-quinone (DDQ) and tetracyanoquinodimethane (TCNQ) were studied (Scheme 1). Like TCQ both compounds can be reversibly reduced in two steps to the respective dianions. In TCQ²⁻ the negative charges are mainly localized on the two oxygen atoms.¹⁹ Due to the nitrile groups the charge of DDQ²⁻ is more delocalized leading to a weaker Lewis basicity (weaker XB acceptor) than TCQ²⁻ explaining the smaller potential shift of only 53 mV observed upon the addition of 100 equivalents of **1** under the same conditions as described above. This explanation was supported by the absence of significant potential shifts ($\Delta E^\circ = 8$ mV) for the even more delocalized TCNQ²⁻. In the latter case the corresponding di-anions can certainly not compete with the solvent molecules or the PF₆⁻ anions being present in much higher concentrations.



Scheme 2. Square scheme illustration the equilibria of electrochemical reactions and halogen bonding between TCQ and a XB donor (RX).

Figure 3 shows the measured formal potential shifts of the TCQ^{•-}/TCQ²⁻ couple after the addition of 100 equivalents of several aliphatic (X-R_f) and aromatic (X-Ar_f) halo-perfluorocarbons and their non-fluorinated homologues (X-R_h and X-Ar_h) (see also supporting information). The highest shift values of 100-141 mV have been recorded for all studied iodo-perfluorocarbons, the aliphatic derivatives I-R_f **1** and iodo-perfluorobutane **2** displaying higher values than the aromatic compounds I-Ar_f **3** and 1,4-diiodo-perfluorobenzene **4**. Compared to these strong XB donors the other halo-perfluorocarbons (X=Br, Cl, F) induce much smaller potential shifts of 32-43 mV which is consistent with their weaker XB-donor strength. There is a tendency of the shift values corresponding to the usually observed trend¹ in XB donor strength: I > Br > Cl. However the differences are too small for

being significant. The studied non-fluorinated halo-hydrocarbons are very weak XB donors and as it could be predicted they fairly shift the reduction potential of TCQ ($\Delta E^\circ = 11\text{--}20\text{ mV}$ for X-Ar_f and 19–26 mV for X-R_h). The similar shift values of pentafluorobenzene and benzene as well as the particularly high shifts for the aliphatic iodo-perfluorocarbons compared to their aromatic homologues exclude the hypothesis of a predominant contribution of $\pi\text{--}\pi$ or $\sigma\text{--}\pi$ interactions.




Figure 3. Formal potential shifts ΔE° of the redox couple $\text{TCQ}^\bullet/\text{TCQ}^{2-}$ ($[\text{TCQ}] = 0.5\text{ mM}$) in the presence of 100 equivalents (50 mM) of perfluorinated and non-fluorinated XB donors in 0.1 M TBAPF₆/acetonitrile: X-R_f (1-halo-perfluoro-*n*-hexane), X-R_h (1-halo-*n*-hexane), X-Ar_f (halo-pentafluoro-benzene), X-Ar_h (halo-benzene).

For the hydrogen bond donor ethanol (100 equiv.) a ΔE° of only 53 mV has been measured for the $\text{TCQ}^\bullet/\text{TCQ}^{2-}$ couple which is only 50% or less of the values determined for the strongest XB donors in this study. Although surprising this is not the first example of XB overcoming comparable hydrogen bonding.²⁰ A perturbation of the experiments by the presence of water traces could be excluded. In agreement with the literature²¹ the presence of water in low concentrations (<0.1 M) affected not only the second (ΔE° only 50 mV at 50 mM of water) but also the first reduction step significantly. Such behaviour was not observed in any of the above reported examples performed under anhydrous conditions.





Figure 4. Job's continuous variation plots ($|\chi \Delta E^\circ|$ vs χ , $\chi = [\text{TCQ}]/([\text{TCQ}] + [\text{XB donor}])$, $[\text{TCQ}] + [\text{XB donor}] = 1\text{ mM}$) for TCQ and the XB donors **1** (red dots) and **3** (black squares) based on the potential shifts of the $\text{TCQ}^\bullet/\text{TCQ}^{2-}$ redox couple in 0.1 M TBAPF₆ acetonitrile at 298 K.

The stoichiometry of XB-complexes was determined by Job's

continuous variation method²² based on the measured potential shifts (Figure 4). For both donors **1** and **3** symmetric curves with maxima at 0.5 molar ratio indicate the formation of 1:1 complexes. Consequently the simulations of the cyclic voltammograms were based on the square scheme represented above (Scheme 2) and did not take into account the formation of complexes with higher stoichiometries than 1:1. The ratios of formal affinity constants K_a^3/K_a^2 of the strong XB-donors corresponding to the binding enhancement during the reduction of TCQ^\bullet to the dianion TCQ^{2-} were estimated by fitting the simulated cyclic voltammograms to the experimental data (see supporting information). Since the first reduction potential was not influenced by the presence of XB donors the simulations could be limited to the second reduction step. K_a^3/K_a^2 ratios of 1000 (TCQ^{2-} , compound **1**) and 350 (TCQ^{2-} , compound **3**) were calculated. A significantly smaller value of 50 (DDQ^{2-} , compound **1**) was found for the weaker Lewis base DDQ. Previously published affinity constants of $[\text{Cl}^\bullet, \text{I-C}_8\text{F}_{17}]$ ($1.3 \times 10^2\text{ M}^{-1}$ in acetonitrile and $2.2 \times 10^3\text{ M}^{-1}$ in acetone)²³ and $[\text{Cl}^\bullet, \text{I-C}_6\text{F}_5]$ ($1.4 \times 10^2\text{ M}^{-1}$ in acetone)¹⁸ had been determined by ¹⁹F NMR titrations in pure solvents. One has to take into consideration the fact that solvent polarity and the concentration of supporting electrolyte salts strongly influence the measured affinity constants.

In order to demonstrate the reversible XB complex formation, the Lewis base competition between TCQ^{2-} and Cl⁻ anions has been investigated. A voltammetric titration curve of TCQ with successive and alternating additions of the XB donor **1** and tetra-*n*-butylammonium chloride (TBACl) has been recorded (Figure S4 in Supplementary Information). The potential shift of 65 mV reached after the XB donor addition (10 equiv.), decreased significantly to the value of 53 mV when TBACl (20 equiv.) was added. This procedure could be repeated several times proving the competition of a strong (TCQ^{2-}) and a weaker (Cl⁻) Lewis base in reversible XB:



In conclusion we have proven the concept of electrochemical XB switching in homogeneous solution. The XB acceptor strength of *p*-quinones such as TCQ or DDQ can be controlled by the modulation of their redox state. In the presence of iodo-perfluorocarbons, binding is “on” in the reduced dianionic state of the Lewis basic quinone and “off” in the anion radical and neutral states. An electrochemical technique, cyclic voltammetry, was used for the first time to monitor these dynamic interactions in solution. XB was found to prevail among the numerous competing intermolecular interactions between the XB donors as well as the quinone dianions with the polar solvent molecules and supporting electrolyte ions present in high concentrations. The main contribution to the observed potential shifts was attributed to the stabilization of the quinone dianion *via* XB. Reversible XB acceptor competition was demonstrated between TCQ^{2-} and chloride anions. Currently work is in progress to develop a redox switch based on a halogenated electrochemically active XB donor molecule. Beyond potential applications in molecular recognition (sensing devices, molecular redox switches), these results strongly encourage the use of electrochemistry as an economical and precisely controllable tool for the investigation of the impact of XB on chemical reactivity in solution.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the University Sorbonne Paris Cité (IDEX) and thank Dr. Elodie Anxolabéhère and Dr. Benoît Limoges for helpful discussions.

Notes and references

Laboratoire d'Electrochimie Moléculaire, UMR CNRS 7591, Univ Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Bâtiment Lavoisier, 15 rue Jean-Antoine de Baïf, 75205 Paris Cedex 13, France. Fax: (+33) 157278788; Tel: (+33) 157278784; E-mail: bernd.schollhorn@univ-paris-diderot.fr

Supplementary Information (ESI) available: See DOI: 10.1039/b000000x/

- (a) *Halogen Bonding: Fundamentals and Applications* (Structure and Bonding), Springer: Heidelberg, 2008; (b) P. Metrangolo, F. Meyer, T. Pilati, G. Resnati and G. Terraneo, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2008, **47**, 6114-6127; (c) A.C. Legon, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **12**, 7736-7747. (d) A. Priimagi, G. Cavallo, P. Metrangolo and G. Resnati, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2013, **46**, 2686-2695. (e) O. Hassel, *Science*, 1970, **170**, 497-502.
- G. R. Desiraju, P. S. Ho, L. Klöo, A. C. Legon, R. Marquardt, P. Metrangolo, P. A. Politzer, G. Resnati and K. Rissanen, *Pure Appl. Chem.*, 2013, **85**, 1711-1713.
- P. Politzer, J. S. Murray and T. Clark, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **12**, 7748-7757.
- (a) J.-L. Syssa-Magalé, K. Boubekour and B. Schöllhorn, *J. Mol. Str.*, 2005, **737**, 103-107; (b) J.-L. Syssa-Magalé, K. Boubekour, P. Palvadeau and B. Schöllhorn, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 2006, **47**, 149-1252; (c) M. Weingarth, N. Raouafi, B. Jouvelet, L. Duma, G. Bodenhausen, K. Boujlel, B. Schöllhorn and P. Tekely, *Chem. Comm.*, 2008, 5981-5983.
- (a) K. Rissanen, *CrystEngComm.*, 2008, **10**, 1107-1113; (b) L. Brammer, G. M. Espallargas and S. Libri, *CrystEngComm.*, 2008, **10**, 1712; (c) M. Fourmigué, *Curr. Opin. Solid State Mater. Sci.*, 2009, **13**, 36-45; (d) G. Cavallo, P. Metrangolo, T. Pilati, G. Resnati, M. Sansotera and G. Terraneo, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2010, **39**, 3772-3783.
- Y. Lu, H. Li, X. Zhu, W. Zhu and H. Liu, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2011, **115**, 4467-4475.
- T. M. Beale, M. G. Chudzinski, M. G. Sarwar and M. S. Taylor, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2013, **42**, 1667-1680.
- Recent article on Halogen bonding in catalysis : F. Kniep, S. H. Jungbauer, Q. Zhang, S. M. Walter, S. Schindler, I. Schnapperelle, E. Herdtweck and S. M. Huber, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2013, **52**, 7028-7032.
- M. Erdélyi, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2012, **41**, 3547-3557. b) S.M. Walter, F. Kniep, L. Rout, F.P. Schmidtchen, E. Herdtweck and S.M. Huber, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, **134**, 8507-8512. c) J.-M. Dumas, C. Geron, H. Peurichard, M. Gomel, *Bull. Soc. Chim. Fr.*, 1976, 720-728. d) J.-M. Dumas, M. Kern, J.-L. Janier-Dubry, *Bull. Soc. Chim. Fr.*, 1976, 1785-1790.
- a) M. Fourmigué, P. Batail, *Chem. Rev.*, 2004, **104**, 5379-5418; b) J. Lieffrig, O. Jeannin, A. Frackowiak, I. Olejniczak, R. Swietlik, S. Dahaoui, E. Aubert, E. Espinosa, P. Auban-Senzier and M. Fourmigué, *Chem. Eur. J.*, 2013, **19**, 14804-14813.
- a) P. Auffinger, F. A. Hays, E. Westhof and P. S. Ho, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2004, **101**, 16789-16794; b) P. Metrangolo and G. Resnati, *Nat. Chem.*, 2011, **3**, 260-260; c) R. Wilcken, M. O. Zimmermann, A. Lange, A. C. Joerger and F. M. Boeckler, *Medicinal Chem.*, 2013, **56**, 1363-1388; d) M. R. Scholfield, C. M. Vander Zanden, M. Carter and P. S. Ho, *Protein Sci.*, 2013, **22**, 139-147; e) J. H. R. Tucker, S. R. Collinson, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2002, **31**, 147-156.
- a) J.Q. Chambers, in *The Chemistry of the Quinoid Compounds*; (Eds: S. Patai, Z. Rappoport), WILEY: New York, 1974, Vol.1, Chapter 14, pp. 737-791; 1988, Vo. 2, Chapter 12, pp. 719-757. b) H. Lund, M. M. Baizer, *Organic Electrochemistry*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 3rd ed., 1991.
- a) Y. Ge, R. R. Lilienthal and D. K. Smith, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1996, **118**, 3976-3977; b) N. Gupta and H. Linschitz, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1997, **119**, 6384-6391; c) B. Uno, N. Okumura, M. Goto and K. Kano, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2000, **65**, 1448-1455; d) Y. Ge, L. Miller, T. Oiumet and D. K. Smith, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2000, **65**, 8831-8838; e) M. Gomez, C.Z. Gomez-Castro, I.I. Padilla-Martinez, F.J. Martinez-Martinez and F.J. Gonzalez, *J. Electroanal. Chem.*, 2004, **567**, 269-276; f) J. Katsumi, T. Nakayama, Y. Esaka and B. Uno, *Analytical Sciences*, 2012, **28**, 257-256; g) A. René and D. H. Evans, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2012, **116**, 14454-14460.
- C. Constantin, *Chem. Rev.*, 2008, **108**, 2145-2179.
- a) R. H. Philip Jr., T. Layoff and R.N. Adams, *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 1964, **111**, 1189-1190; b) A. Desbene-Monvernay, P. C. Lacaze, J.-E. Dubois and A. Cherigui, *J. Electroanal. Chem.*, 1987, **216**, 203-212.
- a) M.E. Peover and J. D. Davies, *J. Anal. Chem.*, 1963, **6**, 46-53; b) B. R. Eggins, *Chem. Commun.*, 1969, 1267-1268; c) P.S. Guin, S. Das and P. C. Mandal, *Int. J. Electrochem.*, 2011, 1-22.
- M. G. Sarwar, B. Dragisic, L. J. Salsberg, C. Gouliaras and M. S. Taylor, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2010, **132**, 1646-1653.
- M. G. Sarwar, B. Dragisic, S. Sagoo and M. S. Taylor, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2010, **49**, 1674-1677.
- D. Bao, S. Ramu, A. Contreras, S. Upadhyayula, J.M. Vasquez, G. Beran and V.I. Vullev, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2010, **114**, 14467-14479.
- a) E. Corradi, S. V. Meille, M ; T. Messina, P. Metrangolo and G. Resnati, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2000, **39**, 1782-1786; b) C. B. Aakeroy, M. Fasulo, N. Schultheiss, J. Desper and C. Moore, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2007, **129**, 6188-6193; c) A. R. Voth, F.A. Hays and P. S. Ho, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2007, **104**, 6188-6193.
- a) L. Zhang, H. Zhou, X. Li, Y. Lin, P. Yu, L. Su and L. Mao, *Electrochem. Commun.*, 2009, **11**, 808-811; b) Y. Hui, E.L.K. Chng, L.P.-L. Chua, W.Z. Liu and R.D. Webster, *Anal. Chem.*, 2010, **82**, 1928-1934.
- P. Job, *Ann. Chim. Phys.*, 1928, **9**, 113-203.
- M. G. Sarwar, B. Dragisic, E. Dimitrijevic and M. S. Taylor, *Chem. Eur. J.*, 2013, **19**, 2050-2058.