Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2009 February 11; 131(5): 1931–1938. doi:10.1021/ja8078913.

Conformations of N-Heterocyclic Carbene Ligands in Ruthenium Complexes Relevant to Olefin Metathesis

Ian C. Stewart, Diego Benitez, Daniel J. O'Leary[†], Ekaterina Tkatchouk, Michael W. Day, William A. Goddard III, and Robert H. Grubbs*

The Arnold and Mabel Beckman Laboratory of Chemical Synthesis and the Materials and Process Simulation Center, Division of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125; Department of Chemistry, Pomona College, Claremont, California 91711

Abstract

The structure of ruthenium-based olefin metathesis catalyst **3** and model π -complex **5** in solution and in the solid state are reported. The N-tolyl ligands, due to their lower symmetry than the traditional N-mesityl substituents, complicate this analysis, but ultimately provide explanation for the enhanced reactivity of **3** relative to standard catalyst **2**. The tilt of the N-tolyl ring provides additional space near the ruthenium center, which is consistent with the enhanced reactivity of **3** towards sterically demanding substrates. Due to this tilt, the more sterically accessible face bears the two methyl substituents of the N-aryl rings. These experimental studies are supported by computational studies of these complexes by DFT. The experimental data provides a means to validate the accuracy of the B3LYP and M06 functionals. B3LYP provides geometries that match X-ray crystal structural data more closely, though it leads to slightly less (~ 0.5 kcal mol⁻¹) accuracy than M06 most likely because it underestimates attractive non-covalent interactions.

Olefin metathesis has become an indispensable tool for the construction of carbon-carbon bonds, and the development of catalysts for this reaction continues to drive development in this burgeoning field.¹ In particular, ruthenium-based catalysts (Figure 1) offer excellent levels of reactivity and selectivity, and their environmental robustness makes them simple to use. Ruthenium catalysts containing a N-heterocyclic carbene (NHC) ligand (e.g., **2**)² exhibit high levels of reactivity in a number of reactions that were challenging or impossible for diphosphine catalyst **1**.³ However, N-mesityl catalyst **2** exhibits low efficiency in the formation of sterically encumbered olefins by ring-closing metathesis (RCM) and cross metathesis (CM). These limitations can be circumvented, while preserving the robustness of this catalyst framework, by reducing the steric bulk of the NHC ligand.⁴ In particular, N-tolyl catalyst **3** has proved rather successful in this regard.⁵

In order to establish a basis for further catalyst development efforts, we investigated the source of this enhanced reactivity. In particular, we expected that the conformation of the N-aryl rings of **3** is likely to play a key role. We report here a detailed experimental study using solid- and solution-state investigations of **3** and a model π -bound olefin complex (**5**), as well as a quantum mechanical study using density functional theory (DFT).

Email: rhg@caltech.edu.

[†]Current address: Department of Chemistry, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, ME 04011.

Supporting Information Available. Details of NMR experiments and computational data. Complete reference 18a. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

The experimental data included in this study provide an excellent basis for validating the accuracy of density functional theory (DFT). DFT calculations with the popular B3LYP functional have become a valuable predictive tool. B3LYP has been shown to provide excellent accuracy on stable intermediates and transition states in main group and transition metal reaction mechanisms.⁶ However, there is increasing evidence that B3LYP errs significantly for attractive medium-range attractive interactions such as van der Waals and π - π stacking.⁷ Recently, Truhlar reported the M06-class of DFT functionals that were developed with the objective of improving the accuracy in describing medium range attractive interactions.⁸

It was previously shown⁹ that B3LYP predicts accurately the energy of intermediates in the isomerization of *cis* and *trans* dichloro Ru complexes relevant to olefin metathesis. In contrast, Truhlar and Zhao reported⁸ that medium-range non-covalent interactions (dispersion forces) can have a dramatic effect on the ruthenium tricyclohexylphosphine (PCy₃) bond dissociation energies for Ru-based olefin metathesis catalysts. Given this apparent discrepancy in the accuracy of B3LYP and M06, the accuracy of predicting the relative stability of *cis* and *trans* dichloro Ru complexes relevant to olefin metathesis with the new M06 functional is assessed herein.¹⁰

I. Solution State Structure of Isopropoxybenzylidene **3** via NMR Analysis

The room temperature ¹H NMR spectrum of catalyst **3** (Figure 2, top) shows evidence of an exchange process that produces a single resonance for the benzylidene proton (16.45 ppm) and a single shift for Me₆ and Me_{6'}. Most of the aromatic resonances are broadened and one resonance appears distinctively downfield at 8.57 ppm. The NHC backbone resonances split into two broad resonances at 4.37 and 4.09 ppm. The isopropyl methine resonance is sharp, while the isopropyl methyl resonances display separate broad and overlapping peaks.

Upon cooling to -48 °C, the ¹H spectrum sharpens and resonances corresponding to a major and minor form (6.7:1) can be identified (Figure 2, bottom). The benzylidene resonances (H_{BN}) of the major and minor forms appear at 16.37 and 16.40 ppm, respectively (See Figure 3 for naming scheme). The low field aromatic resonance sharpens into a one-proton doublet (*J* = 7.5 Hz). The NHC backbone resonances sharpen into a complex multiplet pattern consistent with four unique chemical shifts. For the major isomer, two resonances are observed for the Me₆ and Me_{6'}; a similar spectrum is observed for the minor form. Finally, the isopropyl methyl groups appear as a set of sharp doublets for the major and minor forms.

A 2D-NOESY spectrum recorded at -48 °C revealed that exchange processes were still operative at this temperature and served to interconvert resonances within a given isomer and among the major and minor forms. Analysis of the data provided an estimate of the magnetization transfer rate (*k*_{for}) between major and minor forms to be 3.9 s⁻¹.

A combination of NMR experiments was used to assign the *syn/anti* relationship of Me₆ and Me_{6'} in the major conformation (**3a**) observed in solution at low temperature. From the 2D-NOESY experiment,¹¹ it was apparent that Me₆ and Me_{6'} both showed through-space interactions with the low-field NHC resonances. The identity and spatial orientation of these two low-field NHC resonances is essential for making the *syn/anti* Me₆/Me_{6'} assignment. First, a 2D-HMQC experiment established that these two resonances arose from protons attached to different carbon atoms (Figure 4). Second, 1D homonuclear decoupling experiments established a *syn* orientation of H_β and H_{β'} on the basis of large H_β/H_{β'} and H_α/H_{α'} vicinal coupling constants (11 and 10.7 Hz, respectively). Analysis of models and a modified Karplus equation suggested that if the vicinal proton pairs in question were each *trans*, then the couplings would have been in the range of 2-8 Hz. Because Me₆ and Me_{6'} in the major isomer each show an Overhauser effect to a *syn* pair of NHC backbone protons (H_β and H_{β'}), their own relationship must likewise be *syn*.

Further analysis of Overhauser effects provided specific shift assignments. For example, the downfield Me₆/Me_{6'} resonance in **3a** was assigned to Me₆ on the basis of an Overhauser effect between it and H_{Bn}. Another set of conformation-defining Overhauser effects involves the downfield aromatic doublet at 8.54 ppm. This resonance is assigned as H_{2'} on the basis of interactions with the isopropyl methyl resonances, the upfield Me_{6'} resonance, and the upfield resonance of the high field set of NHC resonances (H_{α'}).

The minor isomer in solution was assigned to be the conformation with an *anti* relationship between Me₆ and Me_{6'} because it is the only other reasonable structure to consider. We were unable to obtain definitive proof of this assignment because of limitations in signal-to-noise and peak overlap issues, which were especially problematic in the NHC region.

To summarize this section, compound **3** was found to exist as a mixture of two conformations that interconvert rapidly in solution. The major conformation was found to be the *syn* conformation in which Me₆ and Me_{6'} are on the same side of the NHC ligand. The minor isomer was assumed to be the other reasonable conformation, in which the two methyl groups are disposed in an *anti* relationship.

II. Solid State Structure of Complex **3** via X-Ray Diffraction

Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction studies were obtained as dark green blocks by vapor diffusion of pentane into a benzene solution of **3**.¹² The NHC ligand is disordered between *syn*-conformation (**3a**) and *anti*-conformation (**3b**) with respect to the N-tolyl substituents, with the *syn*-isomer being the major component with approximately 91% occupancy (Figure 5). More specifically, the N2-tolyl ring is disordered between these two locations, while the N1-tolyl group is well refined in a single position. Excluding this disorder, the two conformations exhibit similar metric parameters to each other and to N-mesityl catalyst **2**. However, the N1-tolyl substituent is rotated approximately 35° away from being perpendicular with the NHC plane (as measured by relevant dihedral angles), while the N2-tolyl ring is within 5° of perpendicularity.

III. Solution State Structure of π -Complex **5** via NMR Analysis

Although the above solution- and solid-state conformational analysis of precatalyst **3** show that both the *syn*- and *anti*-conformations of the *N*-tolyl NHC ligand are accessible, additional models of olefin metathesis intermediates were sought to explain its enhanced reactivity. A number of stable olefin π -complexes of ruthenium complexes relevant to olefin metathesis have been reported in recent years.¹³ Conveniently, cross metathesis of 1,2-divinylbenzene with pyridine-adduct **4** afforded the desired complex (**5**) in good yield (eq 1).

(1)

The room temperature ^1H NMR spectrum of complex **5** shows four low field benzyldiene resonances with relative integration intensities of 1:10:4:2 (16.24 ppm, 16.08 ppm, 15.77 ppm, and 15.71 ppm), respectively.¹¹ The remainder of the spectrum is characterized by a mixture of sharp and broad peaks. 2D NOESY/EXSY experiments (600 ms mixing time) conducted at room temperature revealed no exchange occurring among the benzyldiene resonances, nor any among the olefin resonances. This contrasts with complex **6**, where exchange was observed to occur among the two principal olefin complexes in solution (a 2:3 mixture of **6a** and **6b** was observed).^{13a} It should be noted that exchange is also not observed in certain other Ru–olefin complexes.^{13d} Another difference in behavior of complexes **5** and **6** is that Ru–C_{NHC} bond rotation is observable only in the latter. Therefore, it appears that the observable conformers adopted by **5** at room temperature are less labile than those of complex **6**. Additionally, there is qualitative evidence for the enhanced chemical stability of complex **5** relative to complex **6**: when dissolved in dichloromethane and stored in a sealed NMR tube held at $-20\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, complex **5** appeared to be stable for months, whereas solutions of complex **6** typically would show signs of decomposition within a week.

On a 400 MHz ^1H spectrometer, it was necessary to cool the sample to $-82\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ in order to sharpen the spectral lines sufficiently to probe the geometry of the major complexes. Although a fast exchange process between major conformer **5a** and a fifth and minor conformer was likely active at room temperature, cooling to $-82\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ allowed a fifth minor benzyldiene resonance to be observed. The chemical shifts of all benzyldiene resonances were also found to be temperature-dependent. H_{Bn} resonances were observed in a 1:15:165:64:27 ratio (16.06, 16.01, 15.86, 15.4, and 15.32 ppm, respectively).

At $-82\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ the major conformer exhibited the following NMR parameters for the bound olefin resonances: H_a: 4.89 ppm (dd, $J = 12.0, 9.0\text{ Hz}$), H_b: 2.05 ppm (d, $J = 9.0\text{ Hz}$), and H_c: 2.83 ppm (d, $J = 12.0\text{ Hz}$). The chemical shifts of the geminally disposed H_a and H_b resonances (See Figure 6 for naming scheme) are shifted even further upfield than in complexes **6a/6b**, where these resonances ranged from 3.4–3.7 ppm. At $-82\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, a 2D-NOESY experiment revealed Overhauser interactions between H_a and the two ortho methyl resonances (Me_{6'} and Me₆) at 2.55 and 1.42 ppm. An NOE was also observed between H_{Bn} and the H₂ resonance at 7.91 ppm. These interactions are consistent with a side-bound olefin geometry in which the olefinic CH₂ group is oriented away from *syn*-disposed Me₆ and Me_{6'} (**5a**). A 2D-COSYLR experiment, which can detect very small scalar couplings ($< 1\text{ Hz}$) between protons, revealed a coupling between H_{Bn} and H_b at 2.05 ppm. Formally operating through six bonds, this type of coupling has been observed in other side-bound Ru-olefin complexes.¹³ The precise mechanism of this coupling remains unknown, but participation of the metal center may play a role.

The bound olefin resonances for the second-most populated conformer (H_{Bn} 15.40 ppm) exhibited NMR parameters of H_a: 5.71 ppm (dd, $J = 11.8, 10.0\text{ Hz}$), H_b: 2.98 ppm (d, $J = 10.0\text{ Hz}$), H_c: 2.92 ppm (dd, $J = 11.8\text{ Hz}$). At $-82\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$, Overhauser interactions were observed between H_c and two methyl resonances at 2.39 and 1.17 ppm. NOEs were also observed between H_b and the methyl resonance at 2.39 ppm and between H_{Bn} and the H₂ resonance at 8.1 ppm. These Overhauser effects would be expected to arise in a side-bound olefin geometry in which the olefinic CH₂ group is oriented toward *syn*-disposed ortho methyl groups Me₆ and Me_{6'} (**5b**). A long-range H_{Bn}/H_b coupling was also observed in this complex.

While the structural assignment of complexes **5a** and **5b** could be based upon the observation of several Overhauser effects, the remaining three complexes were more difficult to characterize with Overhauser effects because of low signal-to-noise ratios and peak overlap issues. Despite this difficulty, it is possible to use chemical shift arguments coupled with key NOE observations to provide evidence for the geometry of two of the remaining complexes.

In the third-most populated conformer (H_{Bn} : 15.32 ppm) and in complexes **5a** and **5b**, an NOE between H_{Bn} and H_g at 6.75 ppm is clearly evident. This NOE is to be expected, as the benzylidene proton is always proximal to the ortho-disposed H_g . In the cases of complexes **5a** and **5b**, however, there was additional and structure-determining NOE between H_{Bn} and one downfield aromatic resonance, assigned as H_2 . On the other hand, for structure **5c**, H_{Bn} does not have a discernible NOE to any other aromatic resonances but it does have an NOE between H_{Bn} and a methyl resonance at 2.92 ppm. Therefore, this signal was assigned as Me_6 . Whereas Me_6 in complexes **5a** and **5b** was oriented proximal to the bound olefin, in **5c** it appears to occupy the alternate position and lies over the benzylidene proton. An additional argument can be made in support of this orientation in complex **5c** and **5d**. In earlier studies of complexes **6** and **5a/b**,^{13a} methyl groups occupying the quadrant shown by Me_6 in **5a** and **5b** tended to be shielded relative to other NHC-derived methyl resonances. There are only two shielded Me resonances in the spectrum of the mixture and these have been assigned to **5a** and **5b**. All other methyl resonances are not shielded, which suggests that the methyl groups have changed their orientation in the two remaining complexes. This was confirmed for complex **5c** by the observation of an NOE between a reasonably shielded H_2 (6.0 ppm) and H_c of the olefin. The identity of the shielded doublet as H_2 was confirmed by establishing scalar and NOE connectivity between it and H_3 (6.713 ppm), H_4 (7.38 ppm), H_5 (7.52 ppm), and Me_6 (2.905 ppm). This shielding effect for the aromatic H_2 is likely to have an origin similar to that described earlier for Me_6 in complexes **5a** and **5b** providing a useful means for establishing structure. The olefin resonances were partially characterized with parameters: H_a : 5.76 ppm (dd, $J = 10, 12$ Hz), H_b : 2.83 ppm (d, $J = 10$ Hz), and H_c : 2.59 ppm (d, $J = 12$ Hz). The shifts for H_a and H_b are similar to those observed for the same nuclei in **5b**, and a long-range coupling is observed between H_b and H_{Bn} . These similarities suggest a side-bound olefin with the CH_2 group oriented towards the NHC ligand. Additional evidence is required to define the orientation of Me_6 . As was the case in complexes **5a** and **5b**, NOEs involving the olefin resonances and portions of the NHC ligand are useful for making this assignment. The H_a resonance, which is reasonably well isolated at 5.76 ppm, was not observed to have any interesting NOEs beyond that to the *cis*-disposed H_b resonance at 2.83 ppm. This would be expected for the olefin binding geometry as shown in **5c**. An NOE was observed between H_b and a methyl resonance at 2.37 ppm, which is consistent with Me_6 being proximal to the bound olefin.

The three olefin resonances in the fourth-most populated conformer (H_{Bn} : 16.01 ppm) were assigned as: H_c : 3.03 ppm (d, $J = 12$ Hz), H_b : 2.03 ppm (d, $J = 10$ Hz), H_a : (5.10 ppm, dd, $J = 10, 12$ Hz). An NOE between H_a and a strongly shielded aromatic doublet at 5.61 ppm provided evidence for a side-bound complex in which the olefinic CH_2 group is oriented away from the NHC ligand. The identity of the shielded doublet was confirmed as arising from H_2 by establishing scalar and NOE connectivity between it and H_3 (6.22 ppm), H_4 (7.08 ppm), H_5 (7.235 ppm), and Me_6 (2.546 ppm). An NOE was observed between H_{Bn} and Me_6 , which confirms the orientation of these two groups as shown in structure **5d**. Again a strong degree of correspondence was observed between the olefinic chemical shifts in **5d** and the structurally similar complex **5a**. The orientation of the 'left' NHC-derived aromatic residue in complex **5d** likely has Me_6 facing the olefin, although this assignment is based upon the observation of an NOE between H_a and a methyl resonance that overlaps with Me_6 at 2.546 ppm. No NOEs were observed between H_a and any other aromatic chemical shifts, which lends further support for the proposed geometry.

Summarizing this section, a variety of NMR experiments were employed to assign the structure of the four conformations of π -complex **5** observed at -82 °C. The structure of the fifth and most minor (ca. 0.4% of the sample) conformation, **5e**, could not be established because of low signal-to-noise NOE data. The two major conformations, **5a** and **5b**, accounting for ~84% of the sample, display *syn*-disposed methyl groups that are oriented towards the π -coordinated

olefin ligand. These results are counterintuitive given the increased reactivity of catalyst **3** (i.e., we expected the methyl groups to be oriented away from the coordinated olefin, which would explain the tolerance of **3** for sterically demanding substrates). To obtain the structural information needed to resolve this issue, we expanded our analysis of **5** to the solid state.

IV. Solid State Structure of π -Complex **5** via X-Ray Diffraction

Crystals suitable for X-Ray diffraction studies were obtained as olive green blocks by vapor diffusion of benzene into a dichloromethane solution of **5**.¹⁴ As with complex **3**, the conformational disorder for the *N*-tolyl substituents was observed in the solid state, and further complications arise because the space group (*Pca*2₁) can be problematic.¹⁵ There are two molecules in the asymmetric unit related by an apparent center of symmetry. A number of atoms are not related through this apparent center, which gives us a high degree of confidence in our assignment. Although evidence of the disorder is apparent for both molecules, it could only be modeled in one of the pair. This disorder corresponds to two of the five conformations observed in the solution state. The first, constituting 68% occupancy, is complex **5b** in which the methyl groups are displayed in a *syn*-orientation and the bound olefin is oriented up towards them (Figure 7, left). The remainder of this molecule is conformation **5d** wherein the methyl groups are in an *anti*-conformation and the olefin points downwards, away from the NHC (Figure 7, right).

Even though **5a**, the most stable conformation in solution, was not detected in the solid state, the X-Ray structural data does provide an important clue as to the source of the reactivity difference between the *N*-tolyl complex **5** and the *N*-mesityl analog **6**. Significant rotation (30°) around the N2a–C11a bond was observed by measuring appropriate dihedral angles in the structures of **5b** and **5d** (and **6a** for comparison, see Table 1). This twisting of the N1-tolyl ring provides additional space for the coordinated olefin, and methylene carbon C26a in particular.

Summarizing this section, X-Ray diffraction analysis revealed structural details of two of the five conformations of complex **5** in the solid state. In these structures the 'left' *N*-tolyl ring is tilted significantly away from the bound olefin, in contrast to complex **6**, for which the *N*-mesityl rings are within 10° of bisecting the NHC plane. This tilting of the *N*-aryl rings is likely due to the absence of a substituent on the face opposite to the bound olefin, as **5d** and **6a** present otherwise nearly identical steric environments to the bound olefin. However, without structural evidence for the major conformation in solution (**5a**), we turned our attention to quantum mechanical calculations.

V. Quantum Mechanical Calculations.¹⁶

Isopropoxybenzylidene catalyst (**3**)

For catalyst **3**, two relevant rotations that generate two sets of different *syn* and *anti* isomers were identified. The rotation about the NHC_{aryl}s generates **3a** and **3b**, while the rotation about the NHC–Ru bond leads to two new *syn* and *anti* isomers (**3c** and **3d**) where the *i*PrO group points to opposite sides of the catalyst (See Figure 8 for naming scheme).¹⁷ We believe that these structures contribute to the total population of *syn* and *anti* isomers, therefore relevant in our theoretical analysis.

Table 2 shows that B3LYP and M06 predict (CH₂Cl₂ at 225K) the *syn* configuration as most stable in agreement with our ¹H NMR interpretation. In the gas phase, M06 predicts that **3a** is more stable than **3b** by 0.56 kcal mol^{–1} (~75% of **3a**) which is consistent with **3a** the most abundant (91%) isomer present in the solid state. In solution, M06 predicts both *syn* isomers (**3a** and **3c**) to be the most stable complexes in a combined ratio of 7:1 in excellent agreement with experiment (6.7:1). Our results show that B3LYP is able to make good qualitative

predictions, and that M06 exhibits remarkably accurate quantitative predictions in the stability of transition metal containing organometallic complexes.

1,2-Divinylbenzene as chelating ligand (5)

The 2-methyl substitution of the NHC-aryls leads to 12 possible isomers when coordinated with 1,2-divinylbenzene. All 12 isomers were minimized with B3LYP and with M06-L with the LACVP+** basis set and computed energies with B3LYP and M06 functionals with the LACVP+** (2f) basis set. Figure 9 shows an overlay graphic comparison of the B3LYP and M06-L optimized structures (full color) over the X-Ray structure (orange) of complex **5b**. It is clear that B3LYP predicts a geometry in closer resemblance to experiment. The attractive dispersion forces in M06-L favor the stacking of the *o*-tolyl and the 1,2-divinyl aryls. Overestimation of the stacking tendency causes a distortion in the placement of the coordinated olefin. The olefin coordination distance in the X-Ray structure is 2.17 Å compared to 2.17 Å from B3LYP and 2.12 Å from M06-L. However, both methods predict the Ru-NHC distance 0.03 Å too long (2.03 Å X-Ray and 2.06 Å B3LYP and M06) while for the benzyldiene Ru=C distance, M06-L predicts 1.87 Å, B3LYP predicts 1.85 Å (1.84 Å X-Ray). The aryl-NHC dihedral angles in **5b** are relatively well predicted with unsigned mean errors of 4.25° and 2.89° for M06-L and B3LYP respectively.

The predicted geometry of **5d** shows similar peculiarities in the geometries optimized by B3LYP and M06-L (see Figure 10). B3LYP does a better job at predicting the solid-state geometry, while M06-L overemphasizes the aryl-aryl attractive medium-range interactions that distort the dihedral of the NHC-*o*-tolyl and 1,2-divinylbenzene ligand.¹⁸ In contrast, M06-L accurately predicts the solid-state geometry of complexes **3a** and **3b** (see Supporting Information) because the aryl ring of the benzyldiene ligand lies perpendicular to the aryl rings of the NHC ligand, thus eliminating the susceptibility to π - π stacking.

The predicted energy differences for the isomers of **5** are presented in Table 3 (See Figure 11 for naming scheme). Complex **5a** is predicted by B3LYP and M06 as the most stable isomer in CH₂Cl₂ at 298K. The differences arise in the relative energy of the rest of the isomers. M06 predicts that **5a** exists almost exclusively (>95%) while B3LYP predicts the coexistence of five major isomers (>1%) with similar relative abundances as experiment. B3LYP also predicts the coexistence of **5e** which was presumably not observed experimentally. Interestingly, the M06 functional with the B3LYP geometry predicts **5e** as the second most abundant isomer.

VI. Conclusions

Structural aspects of catalyst **3** and π -bound olefin complex **5** were studied by a combination of solution- and solid-state structural analysis, alongside computational studies. We were surprised by the prevalence of conformations in which the two N-tolyl rings were displayed in a *syn* orientation. Furthermore, for π -complex **5** the two most prevalent isomers (**5a** and **5b**) not only exhibit *syn*-disposed N-tolyl rings, but the methyl groups are oriented *towards* the bound olefin. In order to accommodate this congestion, the aryl rings of the NHC are rotated away from the bound olefin, which brings only a small hydrogen substituent closer to the metal center. In other words, the substituted side of the N-aryl rings appears “smaller” than the unsubstituted face due to rotation of these rings. This (initially counterintuitive) hypothesis was also proposed by Cavallo in regards to olefin binding to chiral ruthenium-based olefin metathesis catalysts.¹⁹ Thus we believe that in moving from N-mesityl catalyst **2** to N-tolyl catalyst **3**, the observed increase in reactivity is due to accessibility of conformations in which the N-aryl rings are rotated away from approaching and coordinated olefins.

We show that the B3LYP flavor of DFT predicts geometries for Ru metathesis relevant complexes in better agreement with experiment than M06-L. This suggests to us that the

attractive non-covalent interactions are overemphasized in M06-L. B3LYP and M06 both predict relative energies of isomers in very good agreement to ^1H NMR experimental observations, with M06 being remarkably accurate, $\sim 0.5 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ better than B3LYP.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The NIH (F32GM078734 and K99GM084302 to ICS, 5R01GM31332 to RHG), the NSF (NIRT(CTS-0608889) to DB, ET, WAG, CHE-0410425 to RHG) and Pomona College Chemistry Department (to DJO'L) for generous financial support. Larry Henling for X-Ray crystallography assistance. Computational facilities were funded by grants from ARO-DURIP and ONR-DURIP. DB and ET thank Dr. Vyacheslav Bryantsev for help with NWChem and Professor Donald G. Truhlar for helpful discussions. NWChem Version 5.1, as developed and distributed by Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, P.O.Box 999, Richland, Washington 99352 USA, and funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, was used to obtain some of these results.

References

1. a Chauvin Y. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2006;45:3740–3747. b Schrock RR. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2006;45:3748–3759. c Grubbs RH. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2006;45:3760–3765. d Nicolaou KC, Bulger PG, Sarlah D. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2005;44:4490–4527. e Grubbs RH. *Tetrahedron* 2004;60:7117–7140. Grubbs, RH., editor. *Handbook of Metathesis*. Wiley-VCH; Weinheim: 2003. g Schrock RR, Hoveyda AH. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2003;42:4592–4633. h Frenzel U, Nuyken O. *J. Polym. Sci. Part A: Polym. Chem* 2002;40:2895–2916. i Trnka TM, Grubbs RH. *Acc. Chem. Res* 2001;34:18–29. [PubMed: 11170353] j Fürstner A. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2000;39:3012–3043. k Buchmeiser MR. *Chem. Rev* 2000;100:1565–1604. [PubMed: 11749276]
2. Scholl M, Ding S, Lee CW, Grubbs RH. *Org. Lett* 1999;1:953–956. [PubMed: 10823227]
3. Schwab P, France MB, Ziller JW, Grubbs RH. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed* 1995;34:2039–2041.
4. Berlin JM, Campbell K, Ritter T, Funk TW, Chlenov A, Grubbs RH. *Org. Lett* 2007;9:1339–1342. [PubMed: 17343392]
5. a Stewart IC, Douglas CJ, Grubbs RH. *Org. Lett* 2008;10:441–444. [PubMed: 18177048] b Stewart IC, Ung T, Pletnev AA, Berlin JM, Grubbs RH, Schrodi Y. *Org. Lett* 2007;9:1589–1592. [PubMed: 17378575] c White DE, Stewart IC, Grubbs RH, Stoltz BM. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2008;130:810–811. [PubMed: 18163634] d Enquist JA, Stoltz BM. *Nature* 2008;453:1228–1231. [PubMed: 18580947] e Clark DA, Basile BS, Karnofel WS, Diver ST. *Org. Lett* 2008;10:4927–4929. [PubMed: 18842051]
6. Baker, J.; Muir, M.; Andzelm, J.; Scheiner, A. *Chemical Applications of Density-Functional Theory*. Laird, BB.; Ross, RB.; Ziegler, T., editors. American Chemical Society; Washington, DC: 1996. ACS Symposium Series 629 b Niu S, Hall BM. *Chem. Rev* 2000;100:353. [PubMed: 11749240] c Nielsen RJ, Keith JM, Stoltz BM, Goddard WA III. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004;126:7967–7974. [PubMed: 15212546] d Nielsen RJ, Goddard WA III. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2006;128:9651–9660. [PubMed: 16866517]
7. Benitez D, Tkatchouk E, Yoon I, Stoddart JF, Goddard WA III. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2008;130:14928–14929. [PubMed: 18937472]
8. Zhao Y, Truhlar DG. *Org. Lett* 2007;9:1967–1970. [PubMed: 17428063] b Zhao Y, Truhlar DG. *Acc. Chem. Res* 2008;41:157–167. [PubMed: 18186612]
9. Benitez D, Goddard WA III. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2005;127:12218–12219. [PubMed: 16131188]
10. Truhlar and Zhao performed single point calculations with the M06-L functional on B3LYP optimized structures. Their report suggested that the M06 functional might be much more accurate than B3LYP. Consequently, we performed calculations with the M06 functional on B3LYP and M06-L optimized structures.
11. See Supporting Information.

12. Crystallographic data have been deposited at the CCDC, 12 Union Road, Cambridge CB2 1EZ, UK and copies can be obtained on request, free of charge, by quoting the publication citation and the deposition number 635259.
13. a Anderson DR, Hickstein DD, O'Leary DJ, Grubbs RH. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2006;128:8386–8387. [PubMed: 16802789] b van der Eide EF, Romero PE, Piers WE. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2008;130:4485–4491. [PubMed: 18321104] c Tallarico JA, Bonitatebus PJ, Snapper ML. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1997;119:7157–7158. d Anderson DR, O'Leary DJ, Grubbs RH. *Chem. Eur. J* 2008;14:7536–7544.
14. Crystallographic data have been deposited at the CCDC, 12 Union Road, Cambridge CB2 1EZ, UK and copies can be obtained on request, free of charge, by quoting the publication citation and the deposition number 693207.
15. Marsh RE, Schomaker V, Herbstein FH. *Acta Cryst* 1998;B54:921–924.
16. Calculations were performed on all systems using density functional theory (DFT) with the B3LYP, M06 and M06-L functionals, as implemented in Jaguar 7.0 (release 207). Jaguar 7.0 Release 207, Schrodinger, LLC, New York, NY, 2006. See SI for more details on the methods.
17. This rotation can also be interpreted as a rotation along the (CH₃)₂HC–OAr bond.
18. We performed geometry optimizations of **5b** and **5d** using M06-L and a similar basis set with NWChem 5.1 software package and observed no differences in the equilibrium geometries. For NWChem see: a Straatsma TP. NWChem, A Computational Chemistry Package for Parallel Computers, Version 5.1. 2007 Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Richland, Washington 99352-0999, USA. See Supporting Information for complete reference. b Kendall RA, Aprà E, Bernholdt DE, Bylaska EJ, Dupuis M, Fann GI, Harrison RJ, Ju J, Nichols JA, Nieplocha J, Straatsma TP, Windus TL, Wong AT. High Performance Computational Chemistry: an Overview of NWChem a Distributed Parallel Application. *Computer Phys. Comm* 2000;128:260–283.
19. Costabile C, Cavallo L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2004;126:9592–9600. [PubMed: 15291563]

Figure 1.

Figure 2. 400 MHz ¹H spectrum of complex **3** dissolved in CD₂Cl₂. Top: spectrum recorded at 19 °C. Bottom: spectrum recorded at -48 °C.

Figure 3.

Figure 4.

(A) NHC region of 400 MHz ^1H 2D-HMQC experiment recorded at -48°C . The two-proton low field and high field NHC ^1H resonances each correlate to different carbon atoms. (B) 1D spectrum of NHC region with homonuclear decoupling applied at the high field resonance. The low field resonances collapse to a highly degenerate AB pattern with $J_{\text{AB}} = 11 \text{ Hz}$. (C) NHC region with homonuclear decoupling applied at the low field resonances. The high field resonances collapse to an AB pattern with $J_{\text{AB}} = 10.7 \text{ Hz}$.

Figure 5. ORTEP diagram of complex **3a**. Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (deg.): Ru1–C1, 1.9611(11); Ru1–C18, 1.8329(11); Ru1–Cl1, 2.3445(3); Ru1–Cl2, 2.3532(3); Ru1–O1, 2.2979(8); C18–Ru1–C1, 100.45(5); C18–Ru1–O1, 78.71(4); C1–Ru1–O1, 179.15(4); Cl1–Ru1–Cl2, 160.382(12). Thermal ellipsoids are shown at 50 % probability.

Figure 6.

Naming scheme for ^1H NMR resonances in complexes **5** and **6**. Selected observed NOEs are indicated with double-headed arrows. Color has been used to clarify the geometry of the bound olefin (blue: side-bound, CH_2 down; red: side-bound, CH_2 up). Chloride ligands are omitted for clarity.

Figure 7.
ORTEP diagram of complexes **5b** (left) and **5d** (right). Thermal ellipsoids are shown at 50 % probability.

Figure 8.
Isomers of **3** calculated with the B3LYP and M06 functionals.

Figure 9. Comparison of the geometries of the a) B3LYP and b) M06-L minimized structures of **5b** overlaid with the XRD structure in orange.

Figure 10. Comparison of the geometries of the a) B3LYP and b) M06-L minimized structures of **5d** overlaid with the XRD structure in orange.

Figure 11.
Isomers of **5** calculated with B3LYP and M06 functionals.

Table 1Comparison of relevant dihedral angles showing N-aryl twisting in **5d** and **6a**.

	5d	6a
C ₁ -N ₂ -C ₁₁ -C ₁₆	121.70	83.89
C ₁ -N ₂ -C ₁₁ -C ₁₂	-59.36	-100.86
C ₁ -N ₁ -C ₄ -C ₉	94.67	91.01
C ₁ -N ₁ -C ₄ -C ₅	-88.41	-94.59

Table 2
Comparison for M06 and B3LYP predicted relative free energies (ΔG_{225}) and abundances of isomers of **3** in CH_2Cl_2 at 225K.

Geometry	B3LYP	B3LYP	M06-L	B3LYP	B3LYP	M06-L	Experiment		
							M06-L	M06	
SP Energy	B3LYP	M06	M06	B3LYP	M06	M06			
Structure	Relative Energy (kcal mol ⁻¹)*						Relative Abundance		¹ H-NMR
3a	0.13	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	1.2	7.0	6.7 (<i>syn</i>)	
3c	0.0	0.37	0.45						
3b	0.75	0.66	1.15		1	1	1	1 (<i>anti</i>)	
3d	0.40	0.04	0.95						

* $G_{\text{TOT}} = E_{\text{SCF}} + E_{\text{SOLV}} + E_{\text{ZP}} + H_{\text{VIB}} - T_{\text{SVIB}}$

Table 3
Comparison for M06 and B3LYP predicted relative free energies (ΔG_{298}) and abundances of isomers of **5** in CH_2Cl_2 at 298K.

Geometry	B3LYP	B3LYP	M06-L	B3LYP	B3LYP	M06-L	Experiment
SP Energy	B3LYP	M06	M06	B3LYP	M06	M06	
Structure	Relative Energy (kcal mol ⁻¹)*						¹ H-NMR
	Relative Abundance						
5a	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	15.9	95.9	10
5b	0.36	0.44	2.21	5.4	7.6	2.3	4
5c	0.29	0.78	2.82	6.0	4.3	0.8	2
5d	1.35	1.64	2.70	1.0	1.0	1.0	1
5e	0.25	0.02	4.88	6.5	15.4	0.0	N.O.
5f	1.67	1.98	5.61	0.6	0.6	0.0	N.O.
5g	1.70	2.57	7.76	0.6	0.2	0.0	N.O.
5h	2.01	1.95	8.89	0.3	0.6	0.0	N.O.
5i	4.21	6.67	8.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	N.O.
5j	4.10	6.70	8.63	0.0	0.0	0.0	N.O.
5k	2.80	5.61	7.30	0.1	0.0	0.0	N.O.
5l	4.28	7.33	9.62	0.0	0.0	0.0	N.O.

* $G_{\text{TOT}} = E_{\text{SCF}} + E_{\text{SOLV}} + E_{\text{ZP}} + H_{\text{VIB}} - T_{\text{SVIB}}$