

# CHEMISTRY

## A European Journal

A Journal of



### Accepted Article

**Title:** Reductive Elimination Leading to C-C Bond Formation in Gold(III) Complexes: A Mechanistic and Computational Study

**Authors:** Manfred Bochmann, Luca Rocchigiani, Julio Fernandez-Cestau, and Peter Budzelaar

This manuscript has been accepted after peer review and appears as an Accepted Article online prior to editing, proofing, and formal publication of the final Version of Record (VoR). This work is currently citable by using the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) given below. The VoR will be published online in Early View as soon as possible and may be different to this Accepted Article as a result of editing. Readers should obtain the VoR from the journal website shown below when it is published to ensure accuracy of information. The authors are responsible for the content of this Accepted Article.

**To be cited as:** *Chem. Eur. J.* 10.1002/chem.201801277

**Link to VoR:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/chem.201801277>

Supported by  
**ACES**

WILEY-VCH

# Reductive Elimination Leading to C-C Bond Formation in Gold(III) Complexes: A Mechanistic and Computational Study


Luca Rocchigiani,<sup>\*[a]</sup> Julio-Fernandez-Cestau,<sup>[a]</sup> Peter H. M. Budzelaar<sup>\*[b]</sup> and Manfred Bochmann<sup>\*[a]</sup>

**Abstract:** The factors affecting the rates of reductive C-C cross-coupling reactions in gold(III) aryls were studied using complexes that allow easy access to a series of electronically modified aryl ligands, as well as to gold methyl and vinyl complexes, using the pincer compounds (C<sup>N</sup>^C)AuR (R = C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>, CH=CMe<sub>2</sub>, Me and *p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>X, where X = OMe, F, H, Bu<sup>t</sup>, Cl, CF<sub>3</sub>, or NO<sub>2</sub>) as starting materials (C<sup>N</sup>^C = 2,6-*q*-Bu<sup>t</sup>C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub><sub>2</sub>pyridine dianion). Protodeauration followed by addition of 1 equiv. SMe<sub>2</sub> leads to the quantitative generation of the thioether complexes [(C<sup>N</sup>-CH)-AuR(SMe<sub>2</sub>)]<sup>+</sup>. Upon addition of a second SMe<sub>2</sub> pyridine is displaced, which triggers reductive aryl-R elimination. The rates for these cross-couplings increase in the sequence  $k(\text{vinyl}) > k(\text{aryl}) \gg k(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5) > k(\text{Me})$ . Vinyl-aryl coupling is particularly fast,  $1.15 \times 10^{-3} \text{ L mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at 221 K, while both C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub> and Me couplings encountered higher barriers for the C-C bond forming step. Using P(*p*-tol)<sub>3</sub> in place of SMe<sub>2</sub> greatly accelerates C-C couplings. Computational modelling shows that in the C<sup>N</sup> bonded compounds displacement of N by a donor L is required before the aryl ligands can adopt a conformation suitable for C-C bond formation, so that elimination takes place from a four-coordinate intermediate. C-C bond formation is rate limiting. In the non-chelating case, reductive C(sp<sup>2</sup>)-C(sp<sup>2</sup>) elimination from three-coordinate cations [(Ar<sup>1</sup>)(Ar<sup>2</sup>)AuL]<sup>+</sup> is almost barrierless, particularly if L = phosphine.

## Introduction

Reductive elimination leading to C-C bond formation constitutes the product-generating step in many transition metal catalyzed reactions. Given that gold catalysts have in recent years become a major research focus,<sup>[1]</sup> reductive elimination and C-C bond forming reactions of gold(III) complexes have attracted particular attention.<sup>[2]</sup> Early pioneering work showed that the reductive elimination of ethane from neutral gold(III) methyl complexes is slow, which explains their thermal stability,<sup>[3]</sup> but in Me<sub>2</sub>Au(OTf)(H<sub>2</sub>O) is accelerated when the water ligand is displaced by PPh<sub>3</sub>.<sup>[4]</sup> Cationic dimethyl complexes [Me<sub>2</sub>AuL<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> were found to eliminate ethane faster

than neutral complexes, and the rate of reductive elimination was shown to depend on L in the sequence L = PMe<sub>3</sub> < PMe<sub>2</sub>Ph < PMePh<sub>2</sub> < PPh<sub>3</sub>.<sup>[5]</sup> Recent computational models showed that methyl-methyl elimination from Me<sub>2</sub>AuCl(PPh<sub>3</sub>) is kinetically inaccessible due to the directionality of the Au-C bond, which needs to weaken before a compensating C...C bond can develop.<sup>[6]</sup> On the other hand, Toste and co-workers found that the rate of ethane elimination from [Me<sub>2</sub>Au(PR<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> (R = Me, Et) was enhanced by a factor of up to 10<sup>7</sup> in the presence of catalytic quantities of a supramolecular cage, provided the cage cavity was spacious enough to accommodate the cation. This effect highlights the importance of steric factors in lowering the barrier of reductive eliminations.<sup>[7]</sup> However, C(sp<sup>3</sup>)-C(sp<sup>3</sup>) couplings remain generally challenging.



**Scheme 1.** Illustrations of reductive elimination reactions of gold(III) complexes.<sup>[8,9,13,16,17]</sup>

[a] Dr. L. Rocchigiani, Dr. J. Fernandez-Cestau, Prof. Dr. M. Bochmann  
 School of Chemistry, University of East Anglia  
 Norwich Research Park  
 NR47TJ, Norwich, UK  
 E-mail: l.rocchigiani@uea.ac.uk; m.bochmann@uea.ac.uk

[b] Prof. Dr. P. H. M. Budzelaar  
 Department of Chemistry  
 University of Naples Federico II  
 Via Cintia, 80126, Naples, Italy  
 E-mail: p.budzelaar@unina.it

The reductive elimination leading to aryl-aryl cross-coupling products in cyclometallated C<sup>N</sup> chelate gold(III) complexes was first shown by Vicente et al. to be induced by the addition of PPh<sub>3</sub>, which was thought to displace the nitrogen donor prior to the C(sp<sup>2</sup>)-C(sp<sup>2</sup>) bond forming step. This reaction proceeds at room temperature (Scheme 1A).<sup>[8]</sup> More recently, You et al. reported the catalytic *ortho*-arylation of cyclometallating 2-arylpiperidines with arylboronic acids using AuBr<sub>3</sub> or (C<sup>N</sup>)AuBr<sub>2</sub> as a catalysts in the presence of an oxidant; this phosphine-free system requires forcing conditions (130 °C, Scheme 1B).<sup>[9]</sup> On the other hand, *ortho*-substituted and electron-withdrawing aryls, such as mesityl and C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>, give thermally stable, isolable cations [L<sub>2</sub>AuAr<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> (L = N or P-donor ligand), which in spite of their conformational flexibility are resistant to reductive elimination.<sup>[10,11]</sup>


The nature of the species involved in catalysis is often speculative, while the range of studies on well-defined complexes is so far limited to specific alkyls or aryls and does not yet allow a general picture to be drawn of the factors that favour reductive elimination. For example, in mechanistic studies on the selective cross-coupling of arenes with arylsilanes to give Ar-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>-SiR<sub>3</sub> using AuCl<sub>3</sub> and AuCl<sub>2</sub> complexes, a phosphine-free gold(III) catalyst, [AuCl<sub>2</sub>(C<sup>N</sup>)Ar]<sup>+</sup> has been proposed but the nature of X (neutral or anionic ligand) remained undefined.<sup>[12]</sup>

More precise information about the structure of species involved in reductive elimination is available for phosphine complexes (R<sub>3</sub>P)AuCl(R<sup>1</sup>)(R<sup>2</sup>), where R<sup>1</sup> = aryl and R<sup>2</sup> = either fluoroaryl or CF<sub>3</sub>. Nevado showed that the aryl-aryl coupling reactions from neutral gold fluoroaryl complexes require high temperatures (150 °C) and, in the presence of sacrificial oxidants, can be extended to the catalytic direct coupling of *p*-xylene with C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>B(OH)<sub>2</sub> (Scheme 1C).<sup>[13,14]</sup> Variations of the phosphine ligand in similar cross-coupling reactions of perfluoroaryls at 85–150 °C showed that the steric requirements of the phosphines seem to play a larger role than their electronic properties.<sup>[15]</sup> In all these cases elimination was thought to proceed from a four-coordinate phosphine complex.

Much faster elimination rates were found in the otherwise challenging reductive C(sp<sup>2</sup>)-C(sp<sup>3</sup>) coupling of aryls with CF<sub>3</sub>, provided the halide ligand was removed with a silver salt, generating a three-coordinate species [(R<sub>3</sub>P)Au(aryl)(CF<sub>3</sub>)]<sup>+</sup>. Under these conditions the aryls *p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>X (X = H, F, Me, OMe) all undergo aryl-CF<sub>3</sub> coupling within less than a minute at or below room temperature (Scheme 1D).<sup>[16]</sup> The reductive aryl-aryl coupling of in-situ generated (and non-isolable) (Ph<sub>3</sub>P)AuClAr<sup>F</sup><sub>2</sub> (Ar<sup>F</sup> = *p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>F) proceeds exceptionally rapidly even at -52 °C and, far from being favoured by ligand dissociation and formation of a three-coordinate species, was found to be strongly *accelerated* by the addition of phosphine. It was proposed that under these conditions chloride displacement leads to the formation of [(Ph<sub>3</sub>P)<sub>2</sub>AuAr<sup>F</sup><sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> cations, which are too unstable to accumulate in detectable concentrations but give very rapid C-C coupling (Scheme 1E).<sup>[17]</sup> It is entirely possible that even the reductive elimination from the neutral (Ph<sub>3</sub>P)AuClAr<sup>F</sup><sub>2</sub> is preceded by ligand rearrangement to transient [(Ph<sub>3</sub>P)<sub>2</sub>AuAr<sup>F</sup><sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>, such that the measured rate refers to that

rearrangement and not to the actual C-C coupling step. However, C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>Ar<sup>F</sup> [Ar<sup>F</sup> = *p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>F] reaction was not extended to other aryls. Computational modelling of this reaction proposed a contribution of heavy-atom tunneling to the bond formation rates in the system (Ph<sub>3</sub>P)AuCl(R<sup>1</sup>)(R<sup>2</sup>) and suggested that the rate of aryl-aryl coupling in [(Ph<sub>3</sub>P)<sub>2</sub>AuAr<sup>F</sup><sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> should be 10<sup>4</sup> times faster than was actually observed.<sup>[6]</sup>

It is evident therefore that the rates of C-C coupling reactions in gold(III) complexes are subject to strong ligand effects, with both three-coordinate and four-coordinate transition states likely involved. Even isostructural cationic systems [L<sub>2</sub>AuR<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> show behavior ranging from high thermal stability to extremely rapid reductive elimination, with rates varying as a function of L and R by many orders of magnitude. In an effort to elucidate the factors governing reductive C-C bond forming reactions in gold(III) systems, we were looking for a system which gave easy access to a wide range of aryl, alkyl and alkenyl complexes and which would react at comparable rates for all types of C-ligands, in a range suitable for monitoring by NMR spectroscopy. We therefore concentrated on (C<sup>N</sup>C)Au-R pincer complexes,<sup>[18-22]</sup> since these compounds are synthetically readily accessible and reductive elimination can easily be induced by a protocol involving protolytic cleavage of one pincer Au-C bond,<sup>[22,23]</sup> followed by addition of a donor ligand L (Scheme 2). We report here the mechanism of reductive aryl-R coupling, where R = aryl, vinyl or methyl, together with the identification of the role of donor ligands and computational modelling of these reaction sequences.



**Scheme 2.** General pathway for reductive aryl-R elimination in gold(III) complexes.


## Results and Discussion

### Reductive Eliminations induced by SMe<sub>2</sub>


The complexes (C<sup>N</sup>C)AuAr<sup>x</sup> **1a**–**1g** (Ar<sup>x</sup> = *p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>X, where X = **a**, OMe; **b**, F; **c**, H; **d**, Bu<sup>t</sup>; **e**, Cl; **f**, CF<sub>3</sub>; **g**, NO<sub>2</sub>) were synthesized by heating (C<sup>N</sup>C)AuOH in toluene with the corresponding boronic acids in good yields (C<sup>N</sup>C = 2,6-*q*-Bu<sup>t</sup>C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>pyridine dianion). The electronic effect of the *para*-substituent X is evident from the <sup>13</sup>C NMR shifts of the Au. C(Ar<sup>x</sup>) atom in **1a**–**1g** & Δδ<sub>C</sub> (ppm) parameter of X = UT Δδ<sub>C</sub> = 138.2), H (147.8) and NO<sub>2</sub> (158.6 ppm).

*C(aryl)-C(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>X) Reductive Elimination.* Although reductive eliminations are most frequently induced by phosphine ligands, we found that SMe<sub>2</sub> plays the same role but is less subject to steric factors and gives reaction rates that can be conveniently followed by NMR spectroscopy. Preliminary tests showed that the reaction of (C<sup>N</sup>C)AuAr<sup>OMe</sup> with the strong solid Brønsted acid [H(OEt<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>][H<sub>2</sub>N{B(C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}<sub>2</sub>]<sup>[24]</sup> (HAB<sub>2</sub>) at room temperature leads to the quantitative generation of the protodeauration

product  $[(C^{\wedge}N-CH)Au(Ar^{OMe})(OEt_2)]^+$ , which is stable towards C-C coupling over a period of several hours. The addition of 1 molar equivalent of  $SMe_2$  displaced the ether ligand to give  $[(C^{\wedge}N-CH)Au(Ar^{OMe})(SMe_2)]^+$  (**2a**), which is thermally sufficiently stable in  $CD_2Cl_2$  solution to be characterized by NMR spectroscopy. Heating this solution to reflux for 5 minutes triggered reductive elimination and quantitative formation of the cross-coupling product **3a**. On the other hand, the addition of 5 equivalents of  $SMe_2$  to **2a** at the same temperature induced immediate reductive elimination, which was too fast at room temperature to follow the kinetics. It is evident that the addition of the first  $SMe_2$  molecule leads to a resting state, and a second  $SMe_2$  is required to trigger fast reductive elimination. This implies substitution of the pyridine donor, which enables the geometric flexibility required to reach the coupling transition state (Scheme 3). This scenario resembles that observed by Vicente *et al.* for the action of  $PPh_3$  on  $(C^{\wedge}N)$ gold chelates (Scheme 1A).<sup>[8]</sup> The high reactivity of gold(III) aryls  $[(Me_2S)_2Au(Ar^1)(Ar^2)]^+$  is in sharp contrast with the thermal stability of the platinum analogues  $(Me_2S)_2PtR_2$  ( $R = Ph, p\text{-tol}$ ), which undergo substitution of the  $SMe_2$  ligands but no reductive C-C coupling.<sup>[25]</sup>



**Scheme 3.**  $SMe_2$  induced  $C(sp^2)-C(sp^2)$  reductive elimination in bis(aryl)-gold(III) cations.



**Figure 1.** Left: Evolution of the aliphatic region of the  $^1H$  NMR spectrum of  $[(C^{\wedge}N-CH)Au(Ar^{OMe})(OEt_2)]^+$  (a), after addition of 4  $SMe_2$  at  $-50$  °C (b), and upon raising the temperature to  $-10$  °C (c, d) ( $CD_2Cl_2$ ). Right: Kinetics of the conversion of **2b** into **3b** at  $-10$  °C.

Protodeauration of the *p*-fluorophenyl complex **1b** at  $25$  °C, followed by addition of four molar equivalents of  $SMe_2$  at  $-50$  °C showed that at this temperature only the adduct  $[(C^{\wedge}N-CH)Au(Ar^F)(SMe_2)]^+$  (**2b**) was formed, in spite of the presence of excess  $SMe_2$ . On raising the temperature to  $-10$  °C reductive elimination was observed, and **2b** was converted into **3b** over a period of about 1 hour (Figure 1).

Reactant decay and product formation are monoexponential under these conditions. Given that coordination of the first  $SMe_2$  leads to a resting state and the second molecule of  $SMe_2$  triggers C-C coupling, a second-order rate law can be assumed,  $-d[Au]/dt = k[Au][SMe_2]$  (where  $Au = [(C^{\wedge}N-CH)Au-R(SMe_2)]^+$ ). Experiments at three different  $SMe_2$  concentrations gave an average  $k = 1.17 \times 10^{-2} \text{ L mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  ( $CD_2Cl_2, -10$  °C).


**Table 1.** Kinetic data for the reductive elimination from protodeaured pincer complexes in  $CD_2Cl_2$ .

[Au] <sub>0</sub> (mM)	T (K)	[SMe <sub>2</sub> ]	k <sub>2</sub> (L mol <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )	k <sub>2av</sub> (L mol <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )
<b>2a</b> (C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> OMe)				
12.5	263	70.2	4.32x10 <sup>-2</sup>	5.8±1.5 × 10 <sup>-2</sup>
14.2		80.3	7.34x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
12.1		75.6	5.64x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
<b>2b</b> (C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> F)				
13.5	263	57.1	1.23x10 <sup>-2</sup>	1.2±0.1 × 10 <sup>-2</sup>
13.3		53.2	1.12x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
16.1		89.6	1.14x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
<b>2c</b> (C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>5</sub> )				
19.1	263	91.6	2.37x10 <sup>-2</sup>	2.2±0.2 × 10 <sup>-2</sup>
14.6		100.2	2.02x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
15.0		105.2	2.33x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
<b>2d</b> (C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> Bu <sup>t</sup> )				
16.5	263	88.0	3.47x10 <sup>-2</sup>	3.5±0.1 × 10 <sup>-2</sup>
16.2		111.1	3.21x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
15.1		75.6	3.36x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
<b>2e</b> (C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> Cl)				
14.0	263	154.81	1.78x10 <sup>-2</sup>	1.9±0.1 × 10 <sup>-2</sup>
15.0		84.1	1.85x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
9.1		94.3	2.05x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
<b>2f</b> (C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> CF <sub>3</sub> )				
13.3	263	84.1	1.87x10 <sup>-2</sup>	1.6±0.2 × 10 <sup>-2</sup>
13.1		54.7	1.59x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
15.5		271.6	1.44x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
<b>2g</b> (C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> NO <sub>2</sub> )				
14.8	263	66.4	4.10x10 <sup>-2</sup>	3.5±0.6 × 10 <sup>-2</sup>
13.6		99.7	2.90x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
16.7		103.9	3.62x10 <sup>-2</sup>	
<b>2h</b> (C <sub>6</sub> F <sub>5</sub> )				
18.8	298	350.0	-	1.5 ± 0.1 × 10 <sup>-3</sup>
<b>2i</b> (CH=CM <sub>2</sub> )				
12.3	221	199.0	-	1.2 ± 0.1 × 10 <sup>-3</sup>
<b>2j</b> (Me)				
13.2	298	214.7	-	3.8 ± 0.3 × 10 <sup>-3</sup>

The complexes **1c** - **1g** react similarly to give intermediates and C-C coupling products that were characterized by  $^1H/^{13}C$  NMR (Experimental Section). The reaction rates were measured

at -10 °C in CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> and the results of the data interpolation are reported in Table 1. All the reactions show very similar second-order rate constants, of the order of 10<sup>-2</sup> L mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, which means that the electron donating or withdrawing character of X does not have a significant effect on the apparent rate of C-C coupling.

The Hammett plot of the Au-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>X derivatives as a function of the  $\sigma_p$  parameter (Figure 2) shows a V-shaped correlation with very moderate  $\rho$  values of -1.8 (left) and 0.5 (right). There is a linear decrease in rates going from electron-donating to electron-withdrawing substituents in the series from X = OMe to X = F, although rates increase again for X = NO<sub>2</sub>. The mechanistic reason for this variation has been explored by computational modelling (vide infra), although its origins proved difficult to pinpoint. In any case, the effect of aryl *p*-substituents is small compared to the differences in rates when the aryl ring is changed to C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>, vinyl or methyl.




**Figure 2.** Correlation of reductive elimination rates of *p*-substituted gold(III) aryls **2a**.

**Aryl-C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>, Aryl-Vinyl and Aryl-Methyl Reductive Eliminations.** In order to extend the study, the same HAB<sub>2</sub> / SME<sub>2</sub> elimination protocol was applied to (C<sup>N</sup>^C)AuC<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub> (**1h**). Contrary to what was observed with the other aryl species, the protodeauration complex [(C<sup>N</sup>-CH)Au(C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>)(SME<sub>2</sub>)]<sup>+</sup> (**2h**) is a rather stable product, even in the presence of 20 equivalents of SME<sub>2</sub>. Monitoring the reaction over the course of several days shows that slow reductive elimination does take place, to give **3g** (Scheme 4). At 25 °C the reaction is complete after 7 days, leading to a rate constant of 1.5 × 10<sup>-5</sup> L mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. Considering that the reaction of the other aryls are too fast to be followed at room temperature and extrapolation from -10 °C gives a minimum  $k > 1$  s<sup>-1</sup> for the formation of **3a**. **3g**, the reaction leading to **3h** is about five orders of magnitude slower.

The opposite rate trend was found for C(sp<sup>2</sup>)-C(sp<sup>2</sup>) cross-couplings where one coupling partner was a vinyl ligand. Gold vinyl species constitute an important class of C(sp<sup>2</sup>) groups; they are intermediates in nucleophilic activation of alkynes, and subsequent C-C bond formations of gold vinyls have been extensively incorporated into synthetic methodology.<sup>[19,1k]</sup> To investigate Au-vinyl reactivity, we targeted (C<sup>N</sup>^C)AuCH=CMe<sub>2</sub> (**1i**), which was obtained in good yield by reacting (C<sup>N</sup>^C)AuCl with BrMgCH=CMe<sub>2</sub> in THF. Protonation of **1i** with HAB<sub>2</sub> in CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> at -10 °C followed by addition of 12 equivalents of SME<sub>2</sub>

caused instantaneous reductive elimination of **3i**, an indication that vinyls react significantly faster than aryls.

At -52 °C the reaction is slow enough for the kinetics to be followed by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy. Assuming the same second-order rate law as for aryls, a rate constant  $k = 1.15 \times 10^{-3}$  L mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> (at 221 K) was obtained. This compares with the rate of reductive elimination of 4,4'-difluorobiphenyl from PPh<sub>3</sub>AuCl(Ph<sup>F</sup>)<sub>2</sub> plus PPh<sub>3</sub> (0.019 L mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>).<sup>[17]</sup> Most likely, our process is still slower than the latter because the pyridine displacement by SME<sub>2</sub> is slower than the chloride displacement in (Ph<sub>3</sub>P)AuCl(Ph<sup>F</sup>)<sub>2</sub> by PPh<sub>3</sub>.



**Scheme 4.** SME<sub>2</sub>-induced aryl-C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>, aryl-vinyl and aryl-methyl reductive elimination reactions.

Cross-coupling reactions involving sp<sup>3</sup>-carbon are most challenging. Protodeauration of (C<sup>N</sup>^C)AuMe<sup>[22]</sup> (**1j**) with HAB<sub>2</sub> in CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> gave [(C<sup>N</sup>-CH)AuMe(OEt<sub>2</sub>)]<sup>+</sup> which is stable in solution at room temperature for several days. As was the case with the Au-C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub> complex, adding an excess of SME<sub>2</sub> replaced the ether but did not induce further reaction. Reductive elimination occurred only very slowly over the course of weeks, to give the methyl-substituted arene **3j**, with an estimated rate constant of 3.8 × 10<sup>-6</sup> L mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, about one order of magnitude slower than the pentafluorophenyl complex. The rates of SME<sub>2</sub>-induced reductive C-C cross-coupling reactions in these gold(III) aryls therefore decrease in the order


$$k(\text{vinyl}) > k(\text{aryl}) \gg k(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5) > k(\text{Me})$$

**Reductive elimination in pyrazine-based C<sup>N</sup>^Pz^C complexes.** The results obtained so far with C<sup>N</sup>^C complexes of type **1** indicated that the barrier for C-C coupling likely involved pyridine displacement. Pyrazine is about five orders of magnitude less basic than pyridine.<sup>[26]</sup> It was therefore of interest to compare the reductive elimination process of C<sup>N</sup>^Pz^C complexes **1** with the analogous pyrazine compounds (C<sup>N</sup>^Pz^C)Au(aryl) **4**,<sup>[27]</sup> which could be expected to be substitutionally more labile.

(C<sup>N</sup>^Pz^C)Au(*p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>OMe) **4a** was obtained from the reaction of (C<sup>N</sup>^Pz^C)AuOAc<sup>F</sup> and *p*-MeOC<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>B(OH)<sub>2</sub> (OAc<sup>F</sup> = trifluoroacetate). Protonation of **4a** can occur on two sites, the Au-C bond and the uncoordinated pyrazine-N atom. Unfortunately, the reaction of **4a** with 1 equivalent of [H(OEt<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>][AB<sub>2</sub>] at room temperature gave a broad and

unresolved  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectrum, hampering the characterization of the reaction mixture. Nevertheless, addition of  $\text{SMe}_2$  to this solution produced very cleanly the reductive elimination product **6a**. Even at  $-10$  °C the formation of **6a** was too fast to be monitored by  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectroscopy, while at  $-52$  °C only the expected deep-red protonated species **5a** was seen (Scheme 5). On the other hand, if protonation is carried out at room temperature followed by cooling to  $-52$  °C and addition of  $\text{SMe}_2$  at that temperature, reductive elimination was observed immediately, without any induction period. Under these conditions the apparent rate of reductive elimination is significantly faster than with the pyridine system, and faster than the rate reported previously<sup>[17]</sup> for  $[(\text{Ph}_3\text{P})_2\text{Au}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{F})_2]^+$  complexes. Because of the broadness of the NMR signals, the possibility cannot be excluded that reductive elimination already takes place on protonation, even before  $\text{SMe}_2$  is added, with the non-coordinated N-atom of pyrazine acting as donor. Whatever the precise pathway, it is clear that under identical protocols the pyrazine complexes give substantially faster reductive C-C coupling than their pyridine analogues.

In order to get a better understanding of the protonation process, we investigated the reactivity of  $(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}^{\text{PZ}}\text{C})\text{AuCl}$  **7**, which cannot give reductive elimination. The  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectrum obtained upon mixing **7** with  $\text{HAB}_2$  (molar ratio 1:1) suggests the formation of the binuclear complex **8**, in which a neutral pyrazine complex stabilizes a cationic Au-C cleavage product by N-coordination (Scheme 5). As NMR diffusion measurements show, the two sets of signals diffuse together and show mutual NOE interactions. Complex **8** appears fairly stable and does not react with a second equivalent of  $\text{HAB}_2$ . The addition of  $\text{SMe}_2$  cleanly generates one single species, which on the basis of NMR studies (diffusion, NOE, VT) was identified as the bis- $\text{SMe}_2$  adduct **9**. Translating the formation of **9** to gold aryl complexes, it seems likely that **9** closely resembles the species that immediately precedes the C-C coupling reaction.




**Scheme 5.** Reactions of pyrazine-based gold complexes.

### Reductive Elimination induced by $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$ .

The results for complexes of type **1** discussed above serve to show that the rate of reductive C-C coupling is affected by the rate of displacement of the pyridine ligand by  $\text{SMe}_2$ . If the pyridine is not displaced, C-C reductive elimination does not take place. For comparison with  $\text{SMe}_2$ , and in order to relate these reactions to those reported previously for gold phosphine complexes (Scheme 1), experiments were carried out with tris(*p*-tolyl)phosphine as donor ligand.  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$  is not only more

coordinating than  $\text{SMe}_2$ , it is also sterically more demanding, and this has consequences for the types of reaction intermediates that are generated.


Unlike the reaction with  $\text{SMe}_2$ , adding 1 molar equivalent of  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$  to  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{Au}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{F})(\text{OEt}_2)]^+$  at room temperature generated not one species but a mixture, which contains no free phosphine. The composition of this mixture could not be determined but plausibly includes the species shown in Scheme 6. There was however no formation of the product of reductive elimination **3b**, which implies that, like  $\text{SMe}_2$ , adding one equivalent of phosphine does not trigger fast C-C bond formation. Eventually reductive elimination happens very slowly, consistent with a low equilibrium concentration of a bis-phosphine precursor species for C-C coupling.




**Scheme 6.** Possible equilibria on addition of 1.0 equivalents of  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$  to  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{Au}(p\text{-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{F})(\text{OEt}_2)]^+$ .

However, over a period of several days, this mixture converted into a single species. Analysis of the 2D NMR spectra showed that reductive elimination had finally occurred and that the product contained an  $[\text{AuP}(p\text{-tol})_3]^+$  cation bound to the pyridine. The py-bound gold(I) is released on addition of a second equivalent of phosphine.

On the other hand, treatment of  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{Au}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{F})(\text{OEt}_2)]^+$  with two equivalents of phosphine from the beginning gives instantaneous reductive elimination at room temperature; no intermediates were observed. The second equivalent of phosphine has the effect of speeding up the reductive elimination step from days to seconds. At  $-52$  °C, on the other hand, the addition of two equivalents of phosphine leads to quantitative formation of the mono-phosphine adduct  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{Au}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{F})(\text{Ptol}_3)]^+$  **10b** ( $\zeta_{\text{P}} = 31.3$ ), leaving 1 equivalent of free  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$ , with no trace of reductive elimination (Scheme 7). Evidently, at that temperature, coordination to pyridine is preferred to a second phosphine. The methyl groups of  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$  appear as two signals in 2:1 ratio, indicative of hindered rotation. Two isomers are possible for **10b**, with P either *cis* or *trans* to C. Calculations showed that both isomers are of almost equal energy, possibly due to competition between steric bulk and *trans* effect, with P *trans* to C being marginally more stable by 1.6 kcal/mol. Upon warming solutions of **10b** to temperatures above  $-20$  °C reductive elimination occurs very fast to give C-C coupling; intermediates such as  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{Au}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{F})(\text{Ptol}_3)_2]^+$  were not detected.



**Scheme 7.** Phosphine-initiated reductive C-C cross-coupling reactions, including proposed reaction intermediates ( $R = p\text{-tolyl}$ ).



**Scheme 8.** Pathways for  $SMe_2$ -triggered aryl-aryl coupling reactions ( $S = \text{solvent}$ ).

However, for Au-Me complexes bis-phosphine intermediates of type  $[(Ar_3P)_2AuR^1R^2]^+$  do become observable. Treating the methylgold complex  $[(C^*N-CH)AuMe(OEt_2)]^+$  with 2 equivalents

of  $P(p\text{-tol})_3$  at  $-52^\circ\text{C}$  gives the bis(phosphine) adduct **11** (Scheme 7), indicated by (i) the appearance of two  $^{31}\text{P}$  doublets at  $\delta_p 27.5$  and  $26.0$  ( $^2J_{PP} = 15.0$  Hz), (ii) diffusion NMR which

shows no free phosphine, (iii) a dipolar NOE interaction between the Au.Me resonance and only *one* set of phosphine-aryl signals, and (iv)  $^1\text{H}$  NMR signals around 8 ppm for free rather than coordinated pyridine. As was the case for **10b**, intermediate **11** is thermally unstable, and on warming to room temperature reductive elimination was observed within minutes. Evidently  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$  induces  $\text{C}(\text{sp}^2)\text{-C}(\text{sp}^3)$  reductive elimination orders of magnitude faster than  $\text{SMe}_2$ .


### Computational Modelling.

We turned to density functional calculations in order to (a) help understand the observed trends and (b) check to what extent the results for the  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}\text{-CH}$  ligand can be extrapolated to more general organogold(III) chemistry.

Computational studies were done for a model  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}\text{-C}$  ligand lacking the  $^t\text{Bu}$  substituents at the phenyl rings, using Gaussian 09.<sup>[28]</sup> Geometries were optimized at the B3LYP<sup>[29]</sup>/SVP<sup>[30]</sup> level (LANL2DZ with corresponding ECP at Au<sup>[31]</sup>) including a PCM(dichloromethane) solvent correction.<sup>[32]</sup> The nature of stationary points was checked by vibrational analyses. Improved single-point energies were obtained with the TPSSH<sup>[33]</sup> functional and the cc-pVTZ basis set<sup>[34]</sup> (and using the corresponding ECP at Au<sup>[35]</sup>), again including a PCM(dichloromethane) correction. These were combined with a DFT-D3 dispersion correction<sup>[36]</sup> (zero damping) and with the thermal corrections (enthalpy and entropy) at 298 K, obtained from the B3LYP/SVP vibrational analyses. All energies mentioned are Gibbs free energies.


**Reaction path.** Elimination paths involving zero, one or two  $\text{SMe}_2$  ligands per gold atom were studied for the parent system  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}\text{-CH})\text{Au}(\text{Ph})]^+$  (**A**), where the  $^t\text{Bu}$  groups of  $(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}\text{-C})\text{AuPh}$

(**1c**) were omitted from the model. The reactions are summarized in Scheme 8, and Scheme 9 shows the corresponding free energy profile. The structures of a few key transition states are presented in Figure 3.



**Scheme 9.** Free energy profile for  $\text{SMe}_2$  assisted reductive elimination from  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}\text{-CH})\text{AuPh}]^+$  (**A**). In red and *italics* the corresponding values for pyrazine analogue **A'**.

Unassisted reductive elimination from **A** via  $\text{TS}_{\text{Ae}}$ , i.e. pyridine substitution by solvent, has a prohibitively high calculated barrier of 34.1 kcal/mol, in line with the observation that **2c** is stable in solution. The main reason for this large barrier is that coordination of the pyridine donor cannot be maintained during the elimination; this is not a general feature of three-coordinate Au species as will become clear later on.



**Figure 3.** Structures of key transition states on the reductive elimination path (distances in Å, angles in *italics*).

Coordination of one  $\text{SMe}_2$  ligand in the empty "pocket" of **A** to give **B** is exergonic by 13.7 kcal/mol and presumably has a low barrier. There is some steric crowding caused by the dangling CH arm of the  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}\text{-CH}$  ligand, resulting in nonplanarity of the complex, but  $\text{SMe}_2$  is a small donor that fits fairly well into the

pocket. Reductive elimination from **B** via  $\text{TS}_{\text{BD}}$  (Figure 3) has a smaller but still sizeable barrier of 23.5 kcal/mol, corresponding to a reaction that is not very fast at room temperature, in agreement with the observation of **2c** by NMR.



The four-coordinate complex **B** is coordinatively saturated and does not bind a fifth ligand. A fully dissociative path for binding of the second  $\text{SMe}_2$  molecule is high in energy (via **C**, 28.1 kcal/mol) and not compatible with observed reactivity. However, we were able to locate transition state  $\text{TS}_{\text{BF}}$  (Figure 3) for concerted displacement of pyridine by an incoming  $\text{SMe}_2$  ligand. It features elongated Au-N (2.52 Å) and Au-S (2.97 Å) bonds as expected, and an N-Au-S angle of 85°, indicating an  $\text{S}_{\text{N}}2$ -retention type mechanism. The barrier for this displacement is low (11.1 kcal/mol), so this would be a fast pre-equilibrium at room temperature. However, the displacement is slightly endergonic (3.4 kcal/mol), so one would not expect the bis(thioether) complex **F** to be observable by NMR. From **F**, the barrier for C-C coupling via  $\text{TS}_{\text{FG}}$  is only 13.8 kcal/mol. Since **B** is the resting state for this thioether-induced coupling, the effective barrier (that would correspond to experimental kinetics<sup>[37]</sup>) is 17.2 kcal/mol, consisting of a contribution from py displacement (**B**  $\rightarrow$  **F**, 3.4 kcal/mol) and the subsequent elimination (**F**  $\rightarrow$   $\text{TS}_{\text{FG}}$ , 13.8 kcal/mol). Based on the energy profile, this would be the rate-limiting step for the preferred elimination path in the presence of excess  $\text{SMe}_2$ , and the calculated barrier is compatible with a reaction that can be "frozen out" by cooling.

The whole profile was recalculated for the pyrazine analogue **A'** of **A** (see Scheme 8). Differences are found to be modest. Pyrazine is more weakly coordinating, which results in more exergonic binding of the first  $\text{SMe}_2$  (**A'**  $\rightarrow$  **B'**, -15.3 vs -13.7 kcal/mol), less endergonic binding of the second one (**B'**  $\rightarrow$  **F'**, 1.0 vs 3.4 kcal/mol) and a slightly lower effective elimination barrier (**B'**  $\rightarrow$   $\text{TS}_{\text{FG}}$ , 15.4 vs 17.2 kcal/mol). Easier elimination is in qualitative agreement with experiment.

**Substituent effects.** To analyze substituent effects in more detail, we used simplified model systems that don't feature "dangling aryl arms":  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})\text{SMe}_2]^+$  to study pyridine displacement, and  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})(\text{SMe}_2)_n]^+$  ( $n = 1, 2$ ) to study reductive elimination. The ligand Ar was varied over the set of substituents studied experimentally: Ar = *p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>X (X = OMe, <sup>t</sup>Bu, H, F, Cl, CF<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>), C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>, Me and CH=CMe<sub>2</sub> ("Vin"). The results are summarized in Table 3.

Pyridine displacement in the  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}$  complexes has a higher barrier (by 5.5 kcal/mol for X = H) and is more endergonic (by 4.7 kcal/mol) than for the  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}$ -CH complex, presumably due to the crowding caused by the dangling -CH arm weakening the Au-py bond. The calculated displacement barriers for X = OMe to X = NO<sub>2</sub> do not vary by much (spread of 1.1 kcal/mol) but show an almost perfect *anti*-correlation with the experimental relative barriers, indicating that py displacement is unlikely to be rate-limiting. The methyl complex has a clearly lower barrier than all  $\text{C}(sp^2)$  type substituents.

Reductive elimination from three-coordinate  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})\text{SMe}_2]^+$  is remarkably facile, having a barrier <6 kcal/mol for all Ar groups studied. Inspection of the geometries (see SI, Figures S27 - S29) shows that these eliminations have very early transition states. Such complexes are expected to eliminate instantaneously and would not be isolable. There is hardly any variation in the OMe - NO<sub>2</sub> series (all ~ 3 kcal/mol); C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub> and Vin

couple more easily (~ 1.8 kcal/mol) while Me has the highest barrier (5.7 kcal/mol).


**Table 3.** Substituent effects on displacement and elimination barriers (L =  $\text{SMe}_2$ ).

Ar	py displacement <sup>a</sup>		Elimination <sup>b</sup>		Binding energy <sup>c</sup>
	G	G	(Ph)Au(Ar)L <sup>+</sup>	(Ph)Au(Ar)L <sub>2</sub> <sup>+</sup>	
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> OMe	17.70	10.66	2.72	11.88	-17.20
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> <sup>t</sup> Bu	16.94	9.57	3.16	12.31	-16.50
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	16.57	9.00	3.17	13.39	-17.08
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> F	16.73	8.12	3.19	13.26	-17.83
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> Cl	16.77	8.70	3.24	13.22	-18.08
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> CF <sub>3</sub>	17.00	8.41	3.13	13.27	-18.79
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>4</sub> NO <sub>2</sub>	16.81	8.74	3.50	12.36	-18.22
C <sub>6</sub> F <sub>5</sub>	16.00	10.19	1.85	16.27	-24.46
Me	14.39	9.83	5.73	21.67	-16.25
Vin	17.13	10.80	1.72	10.17	-15.52

<sup>a</sup> Displacement of the coordinated py group in  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})\text{SMe}_2]^+$  by  $\text{SMe}_2$ .

<sup>b</sup> Reductive elimination from  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})\text{SMe}_2]^+$  or  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})(\text{SMe}_2)_2]^+$ .

<sup>c</sup> Energy change for  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})\text{SMe}_2]^+ + \text{SMe}_2 \rightarrow [(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})(\text{SMe}_2)_2]^+$ .



**Figure 4.** Relative (vs H) free energy barriers  $\Delta\Delta G^\ddagger$  for reductive elimination vs  $\sigma_p$ : calculated  $\Delta\Delta G^\ddagger$  for  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})(\text{SMe}_2)_2]^+$  and  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})(\text{SMe}_2)]^+$  in the presence of  $\text{SMe}_2$ .

In the presence of an excess of  $\text{SMe}_2$ , formation of the bis(thioether) complex  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})(\text{SMe}_2)_2]^+$  would be essentially quantitative, with a binding energy of ~ -17 kcal/mol (more for C<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>, less for Me and Vin). The barriers for elimination from these four-coordinate complexes are ~ 13 kcal/mol, i.e. substantially higher than from the three-coordinate complexes, and the transition states are later (see the SI). Nevertheless, the non-dissociative path is preferred: the effective barrier for the dissociative path  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})(\text{SMe}_2)_2]^+ \rightarrow [(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ar})\text{SMe}_2]^+ + \text{SMe}_2$

$\text{SMe}_2$  is  $\sim 21$  kcal/mol, of which  $\sim 18$  kcal/mol comes from dissociation and 3 kcal/mol from the actual coupling barrier. Substituent effects for the *p*-substituted phenyl groups ( $X = \text{OMe}$  to  $\text{NO}_2$ ) are modest (11.9 - 13.4 kcal/mol), but the fair agreement between calculated and experimental relative barriers (Figure 4) supports the assignment of the actual C-C coupling step as the rate-limiting step also for the C<sup>^</sup>N-CH systems. Here, elimination of  $\text{C}_6\text{F}_5$  has a larger barrier than the *p*-substituted phenyls (16.3 kcal/mol) and methyl-aryl coupling is much more difficult still (21.7 kcal/mol). On the other hand, coupling to Vin is easier (10.2 kcal/mol) than to aryl groups. These results match well with the experimental observations.

The predicted extremely easy C-C coupling in three-coordinate  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ph})\text{SMe}_2]^+$  of 3.2 kcal/mol agrees with computational results by Datta<sup>[6]</sup> for neutral three-coordinate complexes, but contrasts sharply with the prohibitive coupling barrier in corresponding three-coordinate complex **A**  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{Au}(\text{Ph})]^+$ , 34.1 kcal/mol). This is not caused by the different nature of the third ligand (py vs  $\text{SMe}_2$ ) but rather by the geometric constraints imposed by the C<sup>^</sup>N-CH ligand backbone, which force a loss of most of the py coordination before C-C coupling can begin. To a somewhat smaller degree, the same applies to elimination from  $[(\text{Ph})\text{Au}(\text{Ph})\text{SMe}_2]^+$  (13.4 kcal/mol) vs  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{Au}(\text{Ph})\text{SMe}_2]^+$  (23.5 kcal/mol). It is only in the *bis*(thioether) complexes that these geometric effects are lost and  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{Au}(\text{Ph})(\text{SMe}_2)_2]^+$  starts behaving like a "normal" four-coordinate complex. Thus, the constraints imposed by the C<sup>^</sup>N-CH ligand backbone are essential in stabilizing the *bis*(aryl) complexes against reductive elimination: ligand addition here *facilitates* reductive elimination, in an inversion of the normal stability order.

**Phosphine ligands.** C-C coupling is more usually associated with phosphine ligands. Evaluation of the whole reaction path including one or two complete  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$  ligands was not feasible because of size and conformational issues, so we restricted ourselves to evaluation of the binding of  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$  in the "in-pocket" (IP, *cis* to py) and "out-of-pocket" (OP, *trans* to py) coordination sites of **A** (Scheme 8).  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$  does not fit comfortably in the limited space of the IP site, but coordination at the OP site requires the formation of an unfavourable *trans* Ar-Au-Ar arrangement. At the level of theory used here, for  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{Au}(p\text{-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{F})]^+$ , the two effects mostly cancel, leaving a 3.2 kcal/mol preference for the IP site (which reduces to 1.6 kcal/mol when the ligand <sup>t</sup>Bu groups are included in the modelling). We conclude that these isomers are close in energy and could both be components of the mixture of intermediates mentioned in Scheme 6.

Beyond this, we used  $\text{PMe}_3$  as a generic phosphine model. Since this has very different steric properties we did not attempt to model ligand displacement, and instead concentrated on Au-L bond strength and reductive elimination. Results are summarized in Table 4.  $\text{PMe}_3$  binds more strongly than  $\text{SMe}_2$  in comparable situations, by about 11-13 kcal/mol. The C-C coupling barriers are rather similar for corresponding  $\text{PMe}_3$  and  $\text{SMe}_2$  complexes. In particular, the extremely low barrier for elimination from a three-coordinate complex is also seen for this phosphine ligand.

**Table 4.** Comparison of  $\text{SMe}_2$  and  $\text{PMe}_3$  behaviour in Ph-Ph reductive elimination

Reaction	$\text{SMe}_2$	$\text{PMe}_3$
L-Au Binding <sup>a</sup>		
$\text{O} \text{ } \text{O}$	-13.71	-24.78
$\text{O} \text{ } \emptyset$	3.43	-9.51
$[\text{LAuPh}_2]^+ \text{ } \text{SMe}_2\text{AuPh}_2^+$	-17.08	-28.08
Elimination <sup>a</sup>		
$\text{O} \text{ } \text{V}_{\text{BD}}$	23.48	20.03
$\emptyset \text{ } \text{V}_{\text{FG}}$	13.79	15.27
G, $[\text{LAuPh}_2]^+$	3.17	1.01
G, $[\text{L}_2\text{AuPh}_2]^+$	13.39	14.67

<sup>a</sup> Free energies of  $\text{SMe}_2/\text{PMe}_3$  binding and free energy barriers for C-C reductive elimination, in kcal/mol.

## Conclusions

Reductive C-C cross-coupling reactions can be induced in  $(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{C})\text{AuR}$  pincer complexes by a protocol involving Au-C cleavage by  $\text{H}^+$  followed by the addition of a donor L. While no reaction takes place if  $\text{L} = \text{OEt}_2$ , C-C coupling is induced by stronger donors such as  $\text{L} = \text{SMe}_2$  and  $\text{P}(p\text{-tol})_3$ . The intermediates  $[(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N-CH})\text{ArR}(\text{L})]^+$  proved to be observable, thermally comparatively stable species. Within the series of *p*-substituted aryls  $\text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{X}$ , the rates of reductive elimination were remarkably little affected by the electron donating or withdrawing properties of X. Displacement of the pyridine donor of the C<sup>^</sup>N chelate ligand by a second equivalent of L proved essential in order to provide the conformational flexibility necessary for facile C-C bond formation; elimination here therefore takes place from a four-coordinate transition state  $[(\text{Ar}^1)(\text{Ar}^2)\text{AuL}_2]^+$ . C<sup>^</sup>N<sup>^</sup>^C pyrazine complexes reacted significantly faster than their pyridine analogues, likely reflecting the weaker coordination of pyrazine. Computational modelling showed that in gold(III)- $\text{C}_6\text{F}_5$  complexes pyridine displacement is comparatively facile but this is compensated by a higher barrier to C-C elimination, which explains the experimental finding of slow Ar- $\text{C}_6\text{F}_5$  coupling. By contrast, vinyl-aryl cross-coupling reactions proved to be fast even at -52 °C. The rates of aryl-R C-C cross-couplings decrease in the sequence  $k(\text{vinyl}) > k(\text{aryl}) \gg k(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5) > k(\text{Me})$ . Phosphines induce faster reductive elimination than  $\text{SMe}_2$ , for both energetic and steric reasons, although their action is complicated by *cis/trans* isomerization. Modelling also suggests that in non-chelating systems three-coordinate species,  $[(\text{Ar}^1)(\text{Ar}^2)\text{Au}(\text{L})]^+$ , if formed, would eliminate instantaneously, underlining the potential of gold(III) catalysts in smooth C-C bond forming reactions.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the European Research Council. M.B. is an ERC Advanced Investigator Award holder (grant no. 338944-GOCAT).

## Supporting Information

Supporting information including synthetic procedures, NMR spectra and computational details can be found under <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/chem.201801277>.


**Keywords:** gold ~ reaction mechanism ~ coupling reaction ~ reductive elimination ~ DFT calculations

- [1] For recent reviews see for example: (a) A. S. K. Hashmi, G. J. Hutchings, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2006**, *45*, 7896–7936. (b) L.-P. Liu, G. B. Hammond, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2012**, *41*, 3129–3139. (c) H. Schmidbaur, H. G. Raubenheimer, L. Dobrzanska, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2014**, *43*, 345–380. (d) R. Dorel, A. M. Echavarren, *Chem. Rev.* **2015**, *115*, 1543–1593. (e) J. C. Díaz-Rubio, J. Vicente, *Dalton Trans.* **2015**, *44*, 19432–19442. (f) D. O. Faustino, J. Vicente, *Dalton Trans.* **2015**, *44*, 20785–20807. (g) M. N. Hopkinson, A. Tlahuext-Aca, F. Glorius, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2016**, *49*, 2261–2272. (h) A. M. Asiria, A. Stephen K. Hashmi, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2016**, *45*, 4471–4503. (i) D. P. Day, P. W. H. Chan, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2016**, *358*, 1368–1384. (j) W.-W. Zi, F. D. Toste, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, **2016**, *45*, 4567–4589. (k) J. Miró, C. del Pozo, *Chem. Rev.* **2016**, *116*, 1161–1204. (l) S. K. Hashmi, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, **2016**, *45*, 1331–1367. (m) R. J. Harris, R. A. Widenhoefer, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2016**, *45*, 4533–4551.
- [2] M. Joost, A. Amgoune, D. Bourissou, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2015**, *54*, 15022–15045.
- [3] A. Tamaki, S. A. Magennis, J. K. Kochi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1974**, *96*, 6140–6148. (b) S. Komiya, T. A. Albright, R. Hoffmann, J. K. Kochi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1976**, *98*, 7255–7265.
- [4] S. Komiya, J. C. Huffman, J. K. Kochi, *Inorg. Chem.* **1977**, *16*, 2138–2140.
- [5] (a) C. F. Shaw III, J. W. Lundeen, R. S. Tobias, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1973**, *51*, 365–374. (b) P. L. Kuch, R. S. Tobias, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1976**, *122*, 429–446.
- [6] A. Nijamudheen, S. Karmakar, A. Datta, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2014**, *20*, 14650–14658.
- [7] D. M. Kaphan, M. D. Levin, R. G. Bergman, K. N. Raymond, F. D. Toste, *Science* **2015**, *350*, 1235–1238.
- [8] (a) J. Vicente, M. D. Bermúdez, J. Escribano, M. P. Carrillo, P. G. Jones, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1990**, 3083–3089. (b) J. Vicente, M. D. Bermúdez, J. Escribano, *Organometallics* **1991**, *10*, 3380–3384. (c) J. Vicente, M. D. Bermúdez, F. J. Carrion, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **1994**, *220*, 1.
- [9] Q. Wu, C. L. Du, Y. M. Huang, X. G. Liu, Z. Long, F. J. Song, J. S. You, *Chem. Sci.* **2015**, *6*, 288–293.
- [10] R. Usón, A. Laguna, M. L. Arrese, *Synth. React. Inorg. Met.-Org. Chem.* **1984**, *14*, 557–567.
- [11] M. Contel, A. J. Edwards, J. Garrido, M. B. Hursthouse, M. Laguna, R. Terroba, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **2000**, *607*, 129–136.
- [12] (a) L. T. Ball, G. C. Lloyd-Jones, C. A. Russell, *Science* **2012**, *337*, 1644–1648. (b) L. T. Ball, G. C. Lloyd-Jones, C. A. Russell, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 254–264.
- [13] M. Hofer, E. Gomez-Bengoa, C. Nevado, *Organometallics* **2014**, *33*, 1153–1155.
- [14] M. Hofer, A. Genoux, R. Kumar, C. Nevado, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2017**, *56*, 1021–1025.
- [15] K. Kang, S. S. Liu, T. Xu, D. Wang, X. B. Leng, R. P. Bai, Y. Lan, and Q. L. Shen, *Organometallics* **2017**, *36*, 111–113.
- [16] (a) Winston, M. S.; Wolf, W. J.; Toste, F. D. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 7777–7782. (b) M. S. Winston, W. J. Wolf, F. D. Toste, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**, *137*, 7921–7928.
- [17] W. J. Wolf, M. S. Winston, F. D. Toste, *Nat. Chem.* **2014**, *6*, 159–164.
- [18] K.-H. Wong, K.-K. Cheung, M. C.-W. Chan, C.-M. Che, *Organometallics* **1998**, *17*, 3505–3511.
- [19] Review: R. Kumar, C. Nevado, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2017**, *56*, 1994–2015.
- [20] D. O. Faustino, J. Vicente, *Chem. Commun.* **2012**, *48*, 7247–7249, and cited references.
- [21] J. Fernandez-Cestau, B. Bertrand, A. Pintus, M. Bochmann, *Organometallics*, **2017**, *36*, 3304–3312.
- [22] D. A. Smith, D. O. Faustino, J. Vicente, *Organometallics* **2012**, *31*, 5988–6000.
- [23] L. Rocchigiani, J. Fernandez-Cestau, P.H.M. Budzelaar, M. Bochmann, *Chem. Commun.*, **2017**, *53*, 4358–4361.
- [24] S. J. Lancaster, A. Rodriguez, A. Lara-Sanchez, M. D. Hannant, D. A. Walker, D. L. Hughes, M. Bochmann, *Organometallics* **2002**, *21*, 451–453.
- [25] (a) B. R. Steele, K. Vrieze, *Transition Metal Chem.* **1977**, *2*, 140–144. (b) G. Alibrandi, G. Bruno, S. Lanza, D. Minniti, R. Romeo, M. L. Tobe, *Inorg. Chem.* **1987**, *26*, 185–190.
- [26] H. J. Soscún Machado, A. Hincliffe, *J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem)* **1995**, *339*, 255–258.
- [27] J. Fernandez-Cestau, B. Bertrand, M. Blaya, G. A. Jones, T. J. Penfold, M. Bochmann, *Chem. Commun.* **2015**, *51*, 16629–16632.
- [28] M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, B. Mennucci, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, M. Caricato, X. Li, H. P. Hratchian, A. F. Izmaylov, J. Bloino, G. Zheng, J. L. Sonnenberg, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, T. Vreven, J. A. J. Montgomery, J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, J. Tomasi, M. Cossi, N. Rega, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, J. E. Knox, J. B. Cross, V. Bakken, C. Adamo, J. Jaramillo, R. Gomperts, R. E. Stratmann, O. Yazyev, A. J. Austin, R. Cammi, C. Pomelli, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K. Morukuma, V. G. Zakrzewski, G. A. Voth, P. Salvador, J. J. Dannenberg, S. Dapprich, A. D. Daniels, O. Farkas, J. B. Foresman, J. V. Ortiz, J. Ciolowski, D. J. Fox, B.01 ed., Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, **2009**.
- [29] (a) A. D. Becke, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 5648–5652; (b) A. D. Becke, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 1372–1377; (c) C. T. Lee, W. T. Yang, R. G. Parr, *Phys. Rev. B* **1988**, *37*, 785–789.
- [30] A. Schäfer, H. Horn, R. Ahlrichs, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *97*, 2571–2577.
- [31] P. J. Hay, W. R. Wadt, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1985**, *82*, 299–310.
- [32] (a) S. Miertus, J. Tomasi, *Chem. Phys.* **1982**, *65*, 239–245; (b) S. Miertus, E. Scrocco, J. Tomasi, *Chem. Phys.* **1981**, *55*, 117–129; (c) G. Scalmani, M. J. Frisch, *J. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *132*.
- [33] J. M. Tao, J. P. Perdew, V. N. Staroverov, G. E. Scuseria, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2003**, *91*, 146401.
- [34] (a) T. H. Dunning, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1989**, *90*, 1007–1023; (b) D. E. Woon, T. H. Dunning, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 1358–1371.
- [35] (a) Figgen, D.; Rauhut, G.; Dolg, M.; Stoll, H., *Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *311*, 227–244; (b) K. A. Peterson, C. Puzzarini, *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2005**, *114*, 283–296.
- [36] S. Grimme, J. Antony, S. Ehrlich, H. Krieg, *J. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *132*, 154104.
- [37] S. Kozuch, S. Shaik, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2011**, *44*, 101–110.

## Entry for the Table of Contents

## FULL PAPER

Protolytic Au-C bond cleavage of (C<sup>N</sup>C)AuR pincer complexes,  $k(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5) > k(\text{Me})$  of  $\text{SMe}_2$  leads to reductive aryl-R elimination, with rates decreasing in the sequence  $k(\text{vinyl}) > k(\text{aryl}) \gg k(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5) > k(\text{Me})$ . Vinyl-aryl coupling is very fast even at  $-52^\circ\text{C}$ .



Luca Rocchigiani,<sup>\*</sup> Julio-Fernandez-Cestau, Peter H. M. Budzelaar<sup>\*</sup> and Manfred Bochmann<sup>\*</sup>

**Page No. – Page No.**

**Reductive Elimination Leading to C-C Bond Formation in Gold(III) Complexes: A Mechanistic and Computational Study**