

## Substituent Effects and Excited State Reactivity<sup>1</sup>

By **Peter J. Baldry**, Department of Chemistry, Fourah Bay College, University of Sierra Leone, Freetown, Sierra Leone

Analysis of published data on excited singlet reactivity shows that a new set of substituent constants,  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$ , gives significantly better correlations than  $\sigma$ . Some properties and limitations of the new constants are discussed.

RECENTLY, we published calculations indicating differences in substituent effects in different singlet excited states of 1-arylbutadienes.<sup>2</sup> However, reported experimental reactivity data on excited states have generally been analysed in terms of ground-state substituent constants,  $\sigma$ ,  $\sigma^+$ , or  $\sigma^-$ , implying that substituent effects are not affected by changing the electronic state. Two reports<sup>3,4</sup> consider differences between ground-state and excited-state substituent constants, but in each case only a limited range of substituents was considered, and no evidence was given that the excited state constants have any general usefulness; indeed, the results of Sengupta and Lahiri,<sup>3</sup> applying their constants to phenol  $pK_a^*$ , suggest that they do not. The present study was carried out firstly to determine whether a sufficiently large amount of reliable reactivity data are available to set up a scale of excited-state substituent constants, and secondly to determine whether the resulting constants show any significant improvement over the ground-state constants previously used, when correlating excited state reactivity.

Reported data on excited-state reactivity are most readily available for singlet acidities,<sup>5</sup> and a particularly large number of results are available for the  $pK_a^*$  values of phenols. Three methods have been used for determining  $pK_a^*$ : Förster cycle<sup>6</sup> applied to absorption maxima of acidic and basic forms, Förster cycle applied to 0-0 frequencies (estimated as average of absorption maximum and fluorescence maximum) of acidic and basic forms, and analysis of the pH dependence of fluorescence intensity.<sup>7</sup> Of these, the first has been used most often (it is often the only method available when one or both forms do not fluoresce), but has no theoretical justification, and results of this method often differ by one or more  $pK_a$  units from results obtained by other methods.<sup>†,9</sup> The other two methods are generally in better agreement. For the  $pK_a^*$  of phenols, values obtained by Förster cycle on 0-0 bands or by pH dependence of fluorescence have been reported for a wide range of substituents, and these values were used to derive the excited-state substituent constants  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$ . In Table 1,  $pK_a^*$  values are given for 16 phenols; least-squares analysis of  $pK_a^*$  against  $\sigma$  gave  $\rho = -3.10$ . We define  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$  so as to have the same  $\rho$  value; this will result in substituent constants which can most readily be compared with ground-state constants:

$$\sigma_{\text{ex}} = (pK_a^* - 3.804)/-3.10$$

where  $pK_a^*$  refers to the corresponding phenol.

Two important substituents, cyano and nitro, were not

included, because fluorescence data are not available. Approximate  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$  values are given in Table 2, obtained from Förster cycle on absorption maxima. The other values in Table 2 refer to substituents for which  $pK_a^*$

TABLE 1  
 $pK_a^*$  of phenols and  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$

Substituent	Reported $pK_a^*$ <sup>a</sup>	avg. $pK_a^*$	$\sigma$ <sup>b</sup>	$\sigma_{\text{ex}}$ <sup>c</sup>
H	4.0, <sup>d</sup> 3.62, <sup>e</sup> 4.1, <sup>f</sup> 3.6, <sup>g</sup> 3.7 <sup>h</sup>	3.084	0	0
3-F	3.8 <sup>d</sup>	3.8	0.337	0
4-F	4.4, <sup>d</sup> 3.5 <sup>e</sup>	3.95	0.062	-0.05
3-Cl	3.0, <sup>d</sup> 4.0 <sup>e</sup>	3.5	0.373	0.10
4-Cl	3.2, <sup>d</sup> 3.5, <sup>e</sup> 2.6 <sup>h</sup>	3.1	0.227	0.23
3-Br	2.8 <sup>d</sup>	2.8	0.391	0.32
4-Br	3.1, <sup>d</sup> 2.9, <sup>e</sup> 2.9, <sup>f</sup> 3.0, <sup>i</sup> 3.1 <sup>j</sup>	3.0	0.232	0.26
3-OMe	4.6, <sup>d</sup> 2.7, <sup>e</sup> 4.6, <sup>f</sup> 3.4, <sup>h</sup> 4.8, <sup>i</sup> 4.6 <sup>j</sup>	4.12	0.115	-0.10
4-OMe	5.6, <sup>d</sup> 4.7, <sup>e</sup> 5.7, <sup>f</sup> 4.1 <sup>h</sup>	5.025	-0.268	-0.39
3-Me	4.0, <sup>d</sup> 4.2 <sup>e</sup>	4.1	-0.069	-0.10
4-Me	4.3, <sup>d</sup> 4.1, <sup>e</sup> 3.7, <sup>h</sup> 4.6, <sup>i</sup> 4.3 <sup>j</sup>	4.2	-0.170	-0.13
3-Et	4.1, <sup>d</sup> 4.5 <sup>e</sup>	4.3	-0.043 <sup>k</sup>	-0.16
4-Et	4.3, <sup>d</sup> 4.3 <sup>e</sup>	4.3	-0.151 <sup>k</sup>	-0.16
3-CF <sub>3</sub>	1.5 <sup>g</sup>	1.5	0.43	0.74
4-CF <sub>3</sub>	2 <sup>g</sup>	2	0.54	0.58
4-NMe <sub>3</sub> <sup>+</sup>	1.7, <sup>d</sup> 1.6, <sup>f</sup> 1.6, <sup>i</sup> 1.7 <sup>j</sup>	1.65	0.82	0.69

<sup>a</sup> Förster cycle on absorption maxima not included. In notes, FC = Förster cycle on 0-0 frequencies and fl = pH dependence of fluorescence. <sup>b</sup> C. Laurence and B. Wojtkowiak, *Ann. Chim. (14me Sér.)*, 1970, **5**, 163. <sup>c</sup> See text for definition. <sup>d</sup> FC from E. L. Wehry and L. B. Rogers, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1965, **87**, 4234. <sup>e</sup> FC from W. Bartok, R. B. Hartman, and P. J. Lucchesi, *Photochem. Photobiol.*, 1965, **4**, 499. <sup>f</sup> FC from E. L. Wehry and L. B. Rogers, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1966, **88**, 351. <sup>g</sup> FC ref. 11. <sup>h</sup> fl ref. 10. <sup>i</sup> fl ref. 9. <sup>j</sup> FC ref. 9. <sup>k</sup> H. C. Brown and Y. Okamoto, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1957, **79**, 1913.

of the phenol is available, but no other excited-state reactivity data have been reported, so these substituent constants were not used in any other correlations. Some substituents for which phenol  $pK_a^*$  data are available (for example CO<sub>2</sub>H, NH<sub>2</sub>) have been omitted because the measured  $pK_a^*$  probably does not correspond to proton removal from the phenolic OH in the excited state.

To determine the usefulness of the new constants,  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$ , other excited-state reactivity data were analysed as a function of  $\sigma$  and of  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$ . Table 3 shows the results of least-squares correlations. It is clear from the correlation coefficients that the constants  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$  generally give better linear correlation than  $\sigma$ , and, therefore, consistently give a better description of the transmission of

<sup>†</sup> Values of  $pK_a^*$  for phenols from Förster cycle on absorption maxima were taken from ref. 8.

TABLE 2  
 $pK_a^*$  of phenols and  $\sigma_{ex}$ 

Substituent	Reported $pK_a^*$ <sup>a</sup>	Avg. $pK_a^*$	$\sigma$ <sup>b</sup>	$\sigma_{ex}$ <sup>c</sup>
4-CN	-1.27 <sup>d</sup>	-1.27	0.660	1.6
3-NO <sub>2</sub>	-1.14, <sup>e</sup> -1.12, <sup>f</sup> -2.18, <sup>g</sup> -1.20 <sup>h</sup>	-1.41	0.710	1.7
4-NO <sub>2</sub>	-4.28, <sup>e</sup> -6.65, <sup>f</sup> -5.78, <sup>g</sup> -6.74 <sup>h</sup>	-5.86	0.778	3.1
3-OEt	4.4 <sup>i</sup>	4.4		-0.19
4-OEt	5.3 <sup>i</sup>	5.3		-0.48
4-SO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	2.4, <sup>j</sup> 2.3, <sup>j</sup> 2.6, <sup>k</sup> 2.4 <sup>l</sup>	2.43		0.44
3-CH <sub>2</sub> OH	3.0 <sup>m</sup>	3.0		0.26
4-CH <sub>2</sub> OH	3.0 <sup>m</sup>	3.0		0.26
3-OH	3.8 <sup>n</sup>	3.8		0
4-OH	3.1 <sup>n</sup>	3.1		0.23
3-SO <sub>2</sub> Me	2.6 <sup>o</sup>	2.6		0.39
4-SO <sub>2</sub> Me	2.3 <sup>o</sup>	2.3		0.49
4-SO <sub>2</sub> Ph	2.1 <sup>o</sup>	2.1		0.55
3-SOMe	2.8 <sup>o</sup>	2.8		0.32
4-SOMe	2.4 <sup>o</sup>	2.4		0.45
4-SOPh	2.3 <sup>o</sup>	2.3		0.49
3-SMe	4.4 <sup>o</sup>	4.4		-0.19
4-SMe	4.4 <sup>o</sup>	4.4		-0.19
3-SPh	4.4 <sup>o</sup>	4.4		-0.19
4-SPh	4.2 <sup>o</sup>	4.2		-0.13
3-SMe <sub>2</sub> <sup>+</sup> Cl <sup>-</sup>	2.2 <sup>o</sup>	2.2		0.52
4-SMe <sub>2</sub> <sup>+</sup> Cl <sup>-</sup>	2.0 <sup>o</sup>	2.0		0.58

<sup>a</sup> In notes, FC(abs) = Förster cycle on absorption maxima, FC(00) = Förster cycle on 0-0 frequencies, fl = pH dependence of fluorescence. <sup>b</sup> C. Laurence and B. Wojtkowiak, *Ann. Chim. (14me Sér.)*, 1970, **5**, 163. <sup>c</sup> See text for definition. <sup>d</sup> FC(abs) calc. from u.v. of G. P. Scheimenz, *Spectrochim. Acta*, 1968, **A24**, 465; and  $pK_a$  from J. P. Dupont, J. D'Hondt, and T. Zeegers-Huyskens, *Bull. Soc. Chim belges*, 1971, **80**, 369. <sup>e</sup> FC(abs) calc. from u.v. of S. D. Hamann, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1966, **70**, 2418. <sup>f</sup> FC(abs) from S. D. Hamann and M. Linton, *Austral. J. Chem.*, 1975, **28**, 701. <sup>g</sup> FC(abs) recalc. from S. G. Schulman, L. B. Sanders, and J. D. Winefordner, *Photochem. Photobiol.*, 1971, **13**, 381, using  $pK_a$  of E. L. Wehry and L. B. Rogers, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1966, **88**, 351. <sup>h</sup> FC(abs) calc. from u.v. of L. Doub and J. M. Vandenberg, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1947, **69**, 2714; 1949, **71**, 2414; 1955, **77**, 4535, and  $pK_a$  of E. L. Wehry and L. B. Rogers, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1966, **88**, 351. <sup>i</sup> FC(00) from E. L. Wehry and L. B. Rogers, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1965, **87**, 4234. <sup>j</sup> FC(00) from E. L. Wehry and L. B. Rogers, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1966, **88**, 351. <sup>k</sup> fl from ref. 9. <sup>l</sup> FC(00) from ref. 9. <sup>m</sup> FC(00) from W. Bartok, R. B. Hartman, and P. J. Lucchesi, *Photochem. Photobiol.*, 1965, **4**, 499. <sup>n</sup> fl from ref. 10. <sup>o</sup> FC(00) from ref. 4.

substituent effects through an excited-singlet benzene ring.<sup>†</sup>

The uncertainty in the new substituent constants is rather large. Errors are not generally quoted in the  $pK_a^*$  values used in this study, but they can be roughly estimated: 0.5 nm wavelength error in the absorption and fluorescence maxima results in an error in the Förster cycle calculations of  $pK_a^*$  of 0.1–0.15 units in the region of the spectrum appropriate to most phenols. Errors in the determination of  $pK_a^*$  by pH dependence of fluorescence are quoted as 0.1–0.2 units by Avigal *et al.*,<sup>10</sup> and there is a spread of values averaging 0.15  $pK_a$  units for different reports using the same method. Thus the average  $pK_a^*$  values may be accurate to only ca. 0.3 units, giving an uncertainty of ca. 0.1 in the values of  $\sigma_{ex}$ . Values for CN and NO<sub>2</sub> are rather less reliable, since values from the Förster cycle on absorption maxima may differ from values obtained by other

methods by about 1.5  $pK_a$  units,<sup>8,9</sup> and the probable error in these values of  $\sigma_{ex}$  is around 0.5. The  $pK_a^*$  of 4-trifluoromethylphenol is approximate,<sup>11</sup> and a larger error applies to  $\sigma_{ex}$  for this substituent. Similar uncertainties apply to the  $pK_a^*$  data in Table 3, in fact most of them are obtained by Förster cycle on absorption data, and in view of this the first five correlations with  $\sigma_{ex}$  are quite reasonable.

In comparing  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma_{ex}$  values in Tables 1 and 2, it is convenient to consider three types of substituent. (i) Purely inductive and hyperconjugative substituents (Me, Et, CF<sub>3</sub>, and NMe<sub>3</sub><sup>+</sup>) have similar values of  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma_{ex}$ . (ii) Mesomerically electron-donating substituents with lone pairs (halogens, OMe, and OEt) have similar  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma_{ex}$  in the 4-position, but  $\sigma_{ex}$  is more negative by 0.1 to 0.3 units than  $\sigma$  for the 3-position. This extra electron-donating effect of 3-substitution is largely responsible for the greater success of  $\sigma_{ex}$  in correlating data referring to both 3- and 4-substituents, and is in agreement with our calculated electron densities in 1-arylbutadienes.<sup>2</sup> (iii) Mesomerically electron-withdrawing substituents (CN and NO<sub>2</sub>) have very large values of  $\sigma_{ex}$ . This is particularly striking in all the  $pK_a^*$  data analysed, and is consistent with qualitative observations, for example on photosubstitution reactions.

 TABLE 3  
 Correlations of excited state reactivity <sup>a</sup>

Reaction	<i>n</i>	With $\sigma$		With $\sigma_{ex}$	
		$\rho$	<i>r</i>	$\rho$	<i>r</i>
$pK_a^*$ of 4-styrylpyridines <sup>b</sup>	8	-6.50	0.883	-2.15	0.982
$pK_a^*$ of 2-styrylpyridines <sup>b</sup>	8	-6.92	0.915	-2.16	0.959
$pK_a^*$ of ArCO <sub>2</sub> H <sup>c</sup>	9	-5.31	0.856	-1.82	0.971
$pK_a^*$ of ArCO <sub>2</sub> H <sup>d</sup>	8	-7.41	0.854	-1.93	0.967
$pK_a^*$ of 2-nitroanilines	11	-7.31	0.784	-3.02	0.941
$pK_a^*$ of 3-nitroanilines <sup>f</sup>	4	-5.84	0.801	-2.03	0.691
$pK_a^*$ of anilines <sup>d</sup>	11	-1.15	0.181	-2.91	0.438
$pK_a^*$ of acetophenones <sup>g</sup>	5	-3.02	0.554	-3.19	0.694
log <i>k</i> for Ar <sub>2</sub> C=CHCHR <sub>2</sub> photorearrangement <sup>h</sup>	5	3.47	0.856	1.59	0.733

<sup>a</sup> *n* = no. of substituents, including H; *r* is least-squares correlation coefficient. <sup>b</sup> J. C. Doty, J. L. R. Williams, and P. J. Grisdale, *Canad. J. Chem.*, 1969, **47**, 2355. <sup>c</sup> Calc. by Förster cycle from u.v. of L. Doub and J. M. Vandenberg, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1947, **69**, 2714; 1949, **71**, 2414; 1955, **77**, 4535; and  $pK_a$  of J. M. Vandenberg, C. Henrich, and S. G. Vandenberg, *Analyt. Chem.*, 1954, **26**, 726 (measured by u.v.). <sup>d</sup> Ref. 3. <sup>e</sup> J. P. Idoux and C. K. Hancock, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1968, **33**, 3498. <sup>f</sup> See ref. given in footnote *e*; substituents in 5-position only. <sup>g</sup> Ref. 5. <sup>h</sup> S. S. Hixson, *J.C.S. Chem. Comm.*, 1975, 515; 4-substituents only, and two of the five rate constants are order-of-magnitude estimates.

When these constants are used for mechanistic study, the low accuracy of  $\sigma_{ex}$  must be taken into account. Thus it may be necessary to use a fairly large number of substituents to obtain a significant difference between correlations using  $\sigma_{ex}$  and correlations using  $\sigma$  or other ground-state constants. Use of both 3- and 4-substituents is desirable, particularly F, Cl, OMe, or OEt, and the large effects of CN and NO<sub>2</sub> substituents may be useful, though with nitro-compounds particularly, changes in reaction type may occur. Provided these

<sup>†</sup> The two exceptions have only a small number of substituents, all in the same position. Correlation with  $\sigma$  in other cases improves if 3- and 4- substituents are considered separately.

points are borne in mind, the differences between  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$  should be useful in mechanistic studies.

Finally we consider some limitations of the constants  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$ . A major problem facing the correlation of excited-state reactivities is the low accuracy of the data. It is difficult to imagine any great improvement in Förster cycle accuracy while broad absorption and emission bands must be used, and in any case the assumption  $\Delta S = \Delta S^*$  may be a limitation on the accuracy of the results. Results based on equilibrium or kinetic measurements of protonation and deprotonation in the excited state can in principle be improved, but the assumption of the attainment of equilibrium during the lifetime of the excited state may limit the accuracy, although recent work<sup>12</sup> suggests that this assumption may be justified. Moreover, the effects of diffusion rates may introduce errors here, as they have been shown to do in exciplex kinetics.<sup>13</sup> Thus the values of  $\sigma_{\text{ex}}$ , and the data to be correlated, are likely to remain relatively inaccurate.

A second serious limitation of any substituent constants in excited states is that substitution also affects the rates of photophysical processes, in a manner depending more on available vibration modes than on any electron donating or withdrawing effects. There-

fore, it may not be possible in some cases to make any use of substituent constants.<sup>14</sup>

[8/1851 Received, 23rd October, 1978]

#### REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> Presented at the 4th IUPAC Conference on Physical Organic Chemistry at York, England, September 1978.
- <sup>2</sup> P. J. Baldry and J. A. Barltrop, *Chem. Phys. Letters*, 1977, **46**, 430.
- <sup>3</sup> D. Sengupta and S. C. Lahiri, *Z. phys. Chem. (Leipzig)*, 1977, **258**, 1097.
- <sup>4</sup> E. L. Wehry, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1967, **89**, 41.
- <sup>5</sup> For a recent, if incomplete, review, see J. F. Ireland and P. A. H. Wyatt, *Adv. Phys. Org. Chem.*, 1976, **12**, 131.
- <sup>6</sup> T. Förster, *Z. Elektrochem.*, 1950, **54**, 42; A. Weller, *ibid.*, 1956, **60**, 1144; *Progr. Reaction Kinetics*, 1961, **1**, 189.
- <sup>7</sup> T. Förster, *Z. Elektrochem.*, 1950, **54**, 531; A. Weller, *ibid.*, 1952, **56**, 662; *Z. phys. Chem. (Frankfurt)*, 1955, **3**, 238.
- <sup>8</sup> M. Tichý, R. Zahradník, J. A. Völmin, and W. Simon, *Coll. Czech. Chem. Comm.*, 1972, **37**, 962; G. Dobson and L. I. Grossweiner, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, 1965, **61**, 708; D. K. Hazra and S. C. Lahiri, *Indian J. Chem.*, 1972, **10**, 753, and ref. 9. These values may be compared with those in Table 1.
- <sup>9</sup> E. L. Wehry and L. B. Rogers, *Spectrochim. Acta*, 1965, **21**, 1976.
- <sup>10</sup> I. Avigal, J. Feitelson, and M. Ottolenghi, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1969, **50**, 2614.
- <sup>11</sup> P. Seiler and T. Wirz, *Helv. Chim. Acta*, 1972, **55**, 2693.
- <sup>12</sup> A. B. Demyashkevich, N. K. Zaitsev, and M. G. Kuzmin, *Chem. Phys. Letters*, 1978, **55**, 80.
- <sup>13</sup> M.-H. Hui and W. R. Ware, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1976, **98**, 4712.
- <sup>14</sup> For an example, see G. M. Coppinger, and E. R. Bell, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1966, **70**, 3479.