



Cite this: *Dalton Trans.*, 2015, **44**, 6740

## A theoretical study of the aromaticity in neutral and anionic borole compounds†‡

J. Oscar C. Jimenez-Halla,<sup>\*a</sup> Eduard Matito,<sup>\*b</sup> Miquel Solà,<sup>b</sup> Holger Braunschweig,<sup>\*c</sup> Christian Hörl,<sup>c</sup> Ivo Krummenacher<sup>c</sup> and Johannes Wahler<sup>c</sup>

In this contribution, we have evaluated the (anti)aromatic character of thirty-four different borole compounds in their neutral and reduced states based on two aromaticity indices, namely nucleus-independent chemical shift (NICS) and multicenter indices (MCI), calculated at the PBE0/6-31+G(d,p) level of theory. Both indices corroborate the notion that neutral borole compounds are antiaromatic and become increasingly aromatic upon addition of electrons. Effects of the ring substituents on the degree of (anti)aromaticity are discussed together with differences in the two theoretical methods, which are on the one hand based on magnetic (NICS) and on the other hand based on electronic criteria (MCI).

Received 10th November 2014,  
Accepted 2nd December 2014

DOI: 10.1039/c4dt03445g

www.rsc.org/dalton

### Introduction

Antiaromatic compounds that do not obey Hückel's rule of  $4n + 2$   $\pi$ -electrons have fascinated chemists for decades, over time becoming an important class of molecules with intriguing physical and chemical properties.<sup>1,2</sup> To this class of compounds belong the five-membered boroles, compounds that are isoelectronic to the cyclopentadienyl cation  $C_5H_5^+$  and comprise four  $\pi$  electrons. The unfavorable  $\pi$ -conjugation in these systems exerts a destabilizing effect and thus contributes to their high reactivity, which is the reason why stable borole derivatives can only be achieved by annulation<sup>3</sup> or employing bulky substituents around the reactive  $BC_4$  core. Since the first report of a stable borole by the group of Eisch in 1969, a penta-phenyl-substituted borole (1),<sup>4</sup> several other aryl<sup>5–7</sup> and hetero-aryl ring substituents<sup>8</sup> have been found to be effective in the stabilization of borole compounds, thereby enabling detailed investigations of their chemical and physical properties.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, isolable boroles are typically highly reactive species and follow various pathways to reduce their antiaromaticity, namely by activation of H–H and Si–H bonds,<sup>10–12</sup> [4 + 2] cycloaddition reactions,<sup>13,14</sup> adduct formation with Lewis bases,<sup>15,16</sup> ring expansion reactions,<sup>17</sup> or one- and two-electron

reductions to form the corresponding radical anions and di-anions, respectively.<sup>18,19</sup> Besides their rich reactivity profile, boroles display chromophoric properties, *i.e.* they absorb light strongly in the UV-vis region of the spectrum, and are highly Lewis acidic due to the presence of a vacant p-orbital on boron.<sup>9</sup> Notably, these features can readily be altered by modifying the exocyclic substituents. As illustrated in Fig. 1, changes in the boron substituent in a 2,3,4,5-tetraphenylborole framework result in characteristic shifts in the UV-vis absorptions, thereby giving rise to a large gamut of colors.

The intriguing electronic and optical properties of boroles, combined with their facile control through variation of the exocyclic substituents, make them also interesting for a broad range of applications in materials science such as sensors or




Fig. 1 Absorption behavior of 2,3,4,5-tetraphenylboroles as a function of the nature of the boron substituent (R).

<sup>a</sup>Department of Chemistry (DCNE), University of Guanajuato, Noria Alta s/n 36050 Guanajuato, Mexico. E-mail: jjimenez@ugto.mx

<sup>b</sup>Institut de Química Computacional i Catàlisi (IQCC) and Departament de Química, Universitat de Girona, Campus Montilivi, 17071 Girona (Catalonia), Spain. E-mail: ematito@gmail.com

<sup>c</sup>Institut für Anorganische Chemie, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Am Hubland, 97074 Würzburg, Germany. E-mail: h.braunschweig@uni-wuerzburg.de

†Dedicated to the memory of Professor Kenneth Wade.

‡Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Molecular coordinates and NICS profiles of all compounds. See DOI: 10.1039/c4dt03445g

optoelectronics.<sup>9b,20</sup> Given that these properties are closely linked to the extent of antiaromaticity in boroles, an understanding of the contributing factors to this elusive property is particularly important. We have thus set out to systematically study the substituent effects on the cyclic delocalization in borole compounds by density functional theory, *i.e.* the calculation of nucleus-independent chemical shifts (NICS) and multicenter indices (MCI), general theoretical methods to quantify (anti)aromaticity. In this contribution, we report our results for a series of mono-, bis- and tris(borole)s in their neutral and reduced states and discuss differences between the two aromaticity criteria.

## Computational details

All calculations were performed with the Gaussian03 computational package.<sup>21</sup> Geometries were optimized with the PBE0 hybrid functional,<sup>22,23</sup> which combines the pure non-local functional PBE<sup>24,25</sup> with 25% of exact HF exchange, and the 6-31+G(d,p) basis set. Harmonic frequency calculations were carried out to verify that the optimized structures are true minima on the potential energy surface (Hessian eigenvalues are all positive numbers). Moreover, we have tested the performance of our computational method [PBE0/6-31+G(d,p)] by performing calculations on the ferrocene-containing compounds with the OLYP functional<sup>26</sup> and the def2-SVPD basis set;<sup>27</sup> when comparing with experimental data, PBE0 gave better results than OLYP.

The nucleus-independent chemical shifts (NICS) have become the most popular aromaticity index since they are an easy option in computations and give direct information on the effects of an applied magnetic field on the ring current that is intrinsically related to the delocalized  $\pi$  electrons.<sup>28,29</sup> As a result, the various boroles can be classified according to this index as aromatic (diamagnetic) or antiaromatic (paramagnetic). Simply put, a system is more aromatic when the NICS value is more negative and more antiaromatic when that value is more positive. We have computed the NICS values at the PBE0/6-31+G(d,p) level of theory through the gauge-including atomic orbital (GIAO)<sup>30,31</sup> method implemented in Gaussian03. The magnetic shielding tensor was calculated as a single-point run for the ghost atoms located as a series of points from the geometric center of each ring (from the optimized geometry) – the so-called NICS(0) index – up to five angstroms above and below the ring plane with steps of 0.2 Å. By plotting NICS values as a function of the corresponding distance from the ring (expressed as NICS( $r$ )), we have generated NICS profiles (also known as NICS scans) that have been shown to be very useful in assessing the (anti)aromaticity in organic, inorganic, and organometallic species.<sup>32–34</sup>

On the other hand, electronic delocalization descriptors have gained an important role in the characterization of aromaticity. Among these tools, the multicenter indices are the most versatile and popular. Unlike other descriptors such as FLU<sup>35</sup> or PDI,<sup>36</sup> they can be applied to all sorts of molecules (including inorganic species) and do not rely on reference

values. Some of us have recently shown that multicenter descriptors perform the best in controversial molecular species like all-metal clusters.<sup>37</sup> The  $I_{\text{ring}}$  was the first of these descriptors and measures the electron delocalization along the molecular ring.<sup>38</sup> MCI was suggested as an improvement to  $I_{\text{ring}}$  that also includes the delocalization across the ring.<sup>38</sup> Recently, we have introduced a normalization for these indices that avoids the ring-size dependency of these quantities resulting in the  $I_{\text{NG}}$  and  $I_{\text{NB}}$  indices that are the normalized versions of  $I_{\text{ring}}$  and MCI, respectively.<sup>39</sup> The atomic partition used is Becke-rho, which performs close to Bader's quantum theory of atoms in molecules (QTAIM) but it is computationally less demanding.<sup>40–42</sup> Calculation of atomic overlap matrices (AOM) needed for the computation of  $I_{\text{NG}}$  and  $I_{\text{NB}}$  indices have been performed with the APOST-3D program.<sup>43</sup>  $I_{\text{NG}}$  and  $I_{\text{NB}}$  were obtained with the ESI-3D package.<sup>44</sup>

## Results and discussion

This section has been organized as follows. Firstly, neutral monoborole systems will be discussed, followed by a treatment of their corresponding anionic derivatives and lastly, we present a comparison of aromaticity between neutral and anionic mono-, bis- and tris(borole)s.

### Monoboroles

In this study, we have chosen the archetypical pentaphenylborole (**1**) by Eisch as reference system.<sup>4</sup> As has been previously reported in the literature and as expected from the Hückel  $4n + 2$  rule,<sup>45</sup> this compound is antiaromatic based on the magnetic aromaticity index (NICS(0) = 12.90).<sup>8</sup> Our calculated value of NICS(0) = 12.92 is in excellent agreement with the reported value. With the aim to determine the influence of the boron substituents on the degree of (anti)aromaticity, we have set out to calculate corresponding NICS values for borole systems containing the same tetraphenyl-substituted backbone but varying *B*-substituents (Fig. 2). The incorporation of electronegative halogen substituents (**2**, **3**) at boron, despite their electron-withdrawing inductive effect, has hardly any effect on the observed antiaromaticity (see Table 1). The change in antiaromaticity relative to **1** is also small for boroles with ferro-




Fig. 2 Neutral monoborole systems studied in this work.

**Table 1** Maximum or minimum values of NICS<sup>a</sup> along the z-axis direction perpendicular to the center of the borole ring and multicenter indices (multiplied by 10<sup>3</sup>) of the studied systems calculated at the PBE0/6-31+G(d,p) level

Molecule	r <sup>b</sup>	NICS	I <sub>NG</sub>	I <sub>NB</sub>
1	0.0	12.92	27.4	17.7
[1] <sup>-</sup>	0.0	3.74	29.7	29.8
[1] <sup>2-c</sup>	(0.8)	(-3.30)	32.7	31.6
2	0.0	12.99	28.1	20.3
[2] <sup>-</sup>	0.0	2.81	29.4	29.9
[2] <sup>2-</sup>	(0.0)	(-4.04)	32.5	31.6
3	0.0	13.52	28.3	21.1
[3] <sup>-</sup>	0.0	3.04	29.7	30.3
[3] <sup>2-</sup>	(0.0)	(-4.26)	32.9	32.1
4	0.0	11.75	27.3	18.7
[4] <sup>-</sup>	0.0	4.94	29.7	29.8
[4] <sup>2-c</sup>	(1.0)	(-3.51)	32.8	31.7
5	0.0	12.36	27.6	18.7
[5] <sup>2-c</sup>	(0.8)	(-4.27)	33.2	32.1
6	0.0	10.58	27.0	14.8
7	0.0	13.57	27.3	-12.2
[7] <sup>-</sup>	0.0	4.06	29.8	29.9
[7] <sup>2-c</sup>	(0.8)	(-2.58)	32.6	31.5
8	0.0	14.37	27.0	-14.9
9	0.0	14.28	27.0	-15.1
10	0.0	13.33	27.5	17.8
11	0.0	12.71	27.5	17.7
12	0.0	12.65	27.5	17.1
[12] <sup>6-c</sup>	(1.4)	(-1.55)	31.8	30.1
13	0.0	12.74	27.6	18.7
14	0.0	13.27	27.7	19.4
[14] <sup>2-</sup>	0.0	3.99	29.3	29.3
[14] <sup>4-c</sup>	(1.0)	(-2.37)	32.2	30.8
15 <sup>c</sup>	0.2	13.21	27.3	17.6
[15] <sup>2-</sup>	0.0	4.10	31.7	29.6
[15] <sup>4-c</sup>	(1.0)	(-2.90)	32.2	30.8
16	0.0	13.58	27.3	16.7
17 <sup>c</sup>	0.0, 0.2 <sup>d</sup>	12.37, 13.67 <sup>d</sup>	27.6, 27.6	18.4, 16.8
[17] <sup>4-c</sup>	(1.0, 0.8) <sup>d</sup>	(-3.56, -4.38) <sup>d</sup>	32.4, 32.5	31.1, 31.1


<sup>a</sup> Minimum values are shown in parenthesis. <sup>b</sup> Distance (in Å) from the geometric center for the NICS maximum or minimum. <sup>c</sup> NICS(0) values in these compounds are as follows: [1]<sup>2-</sup> = -2.74; [4]<sup>2-</sup> = -2.10; [5]<sup>2-</sup> = -3.44; [7]<sup>2-</sup> = -2.03; [12]<sup>6-</sup> = 0.07; [14]<sup>4-</sup> = -1.54; 15 = 13.07; [15]<sup>4-</sup> = -1.29; [17]<sup>4-</sup> = -2.53, -3.49. <sup>d</sup> Values are different for the individual borole rings.

cenyl (4)<sup>5</sup> or cymantrenyl ( $\sigma\text{-}\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{Mn}(\text{CO})_3$ ) substituents at the boron atom (5),<sup>46</sup> although Raman spectroscopic data indicates a significant decrease in the antiaromatic character due to electron donation of a filled metal d orbital to the vacant 2p orbital on boron.<sup>47</sup> This is further reflected in the bending of the borolyl unit toward the metal center in the molecular structures.<sup>48,49</sup> While the gas-phase optimized geometry matches the experimentally observed structure well (the dip angle  $\alpha^*$ , defined between the cyclopentadienyl ring plane and the borolyl unit, is 29.4° (exp.)<sup>5</sup> vs. 19.2° (calc.)), neither the two-center C-B and C-C delocalization indices nor the aromaticity indices are affected by the ferrocenyl substituent, thus indicating no increase in electron density at the boron atom. In contrast, borole 6 with an electron donating amino substituent was found to possess a decreased antiaromatic character based on the NICS value (NICS(0) = 10.58), in line with the experimental data.<sup>50</sup> However, according to the multicenter indices the antiaromatic character of 6 remains unaffected

(I<sub>NG</sub>) or is even slightly increased (I<sub>NB</sub>) compared to penta-phenylborole (see Table 1). This can be explained by a twisted arrangement of the NR<sub>2</sub> (R = SiMe<sub>3</sub>) group with respect to the borole plane (*ca.* 60°) which reduces the overlap of the lone pair on nitrogen with the empty p-orbital on boron, an effect that is better reflected by the multicenter indices.

A comparison between boroles with different aryl substituents (1: R = phenyl;<sup>7</sup> 7: R = 2,4,6-trimethylphenyl;<sup>18a</sup> 8: R = 2,3,5,6-tetramethylphenyl;<sup>51</sup> 9: R = 2,4,6-triisopropylphenyl)<sup>51</sup> reveals distinct changes in the NICS(0) values. Based on the NICS profiles for boroles 1, 7, 8 and 9 (Fig. 3), it is possible to establish an antiaromaticity scale: 8 (14.37)  $\approx$  9 (14.28) > 7 (13.52) > 1 (12.92), which is also in line with both multicenter indices (I<sub>NG</sub> and I<sub>NB</sub>). Pentaarylboroles 7, 8 and 9 show negative I<sub>NB</sub> values, which are indicative of a strongly antiaromatic character. The data also suggests that the antiaromaticity of the boroles correlates with the steric demand of the *B*-aryl substituent: the higher the steric bulk of the R substituent, the higher the antiaromaticity. This can be understood by an increasingly weaker  $\pi$ -overlap of the aryl group with the borole unit due to the steric crowding around the exocyclic B-C bond. It is worth mentioning, however, that on the basis of a resonance Raman investigation this  $\pi$ -interaction of the aryl moiety with the borole unit is rather weak.<sup>47</sup> More conclusive evidence for  $\pi$ -conjugation of an exocyclic substituent with the borole ring was found in 1-heteroaromatic-substituted tetraphenylboroles, in which the electron-rich heterocycles (furan, thiophene or pyrrole) are essentially coplanar with the borole ring plane. This interaction is further manifested in characteristic hypsochromic shifts in their UV-vis absorption maxima compared to borole 1, which correspond to a reduced antiaromaticity, as well as in the calculated NICS values for the contrasting ring systems.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, all the 1-aryl-substituted borole compounds display a common feature in their NICS profile, namely a maximum NICS value in the center of the ring and a monotonic decrease to zero when moving away from the ring center, a behavior typical of fully antiaromatic systems.

In addition, we have investigated corresponding NICS values for the negatively charged derivatives. As previously



**Fig. 3** NICS profiles for the series of monoborole compounds 1, 7, 8, and 9. The dots indicate the center of each borole ring.




Fig. 4 Mono- and dianionic borole systems studied in this work.

reported by the groups of Herberich,<sup>53</sup> Yamaguchi<sup>19</sup> and Braunschweig,<sup>15,18,54–56</sup> the synthesis and isolation of various dianionic and a monoanionic species has been successfully achieved (Fig. 4). The addition of one electron noticeably decreases the antiaromatic character of boroles, as judged by both the NICS and multicenter indices. The two different indices also agree that addition of a second electron transforms boroles into aromatic species, a notion which is supported by experimentally observed structural and spectroscopic changes.<sup>9b</sup> The subtle difference between the two aromaticity criteria is based on the fact that NICS values predict larger differences upon addition of electrons than multicenter indices do. Interestingly, the NICS profiles of this series (Fig. 5) show that, while neutral **1** and monoanionic compound [1]<sup>-</sup> behave the same way, the dianion [1]<sup>2-</sup> exhibits a shallow minimum at *ca.* 1 Å above/below the central ring. Moreover, according to Baird's rule,<sup>57</sup> the triplet state of **1** becomes more aromatic with a minimum at 1.0 Å above the borole plane (NICS(1) = -3.29, see Fig. 2), in agreement with the large  $I_{\text{NB}}$  value of 30.1. The same holds true for boroles **7** and **5**, whereas for the dianions of boroles **2** and **3**, the minimum NICS value is located at the borole ring center with the usual monotonic decrease of the curve. The NICS(1) minima found for the peraryl-substituted dianions can be understood by an interaction between the  $\pi$ -systems of the respective *B*-aryl substituent and the borole unit, an effect which is lacking in case of the halogen-substituted derivatives **2** and **3**.

The difference in the degree of (anti)aromaticity between anionic aryl- and halogen-substituted borole systems is subtle and varies between the different indices. According to the




Fig. 5 NICS profiles for the neutral pentaphenylborole **1** (singlet and triplet states) and its mono- and dianion.




Fig. 6 NICS profiles for **4** and its mono- and dianion. The left side of the graph corresponds to the calculations done above the borole plane (*syn* to the ferrocenyl unit), whereas the right side shows the results below the ring plane (*anti* to the ferrocenyl unit).

NICS values the chloro-substituted borole [2]<sup>-</sup> is less antiaromatic than its phenyl- ([1]<sup>-</sup>), bromo- ([3]<sup>-</sup>), and 2,4,6-trimethylphenyl-substituted ([7]<sup>-</sup>) counterparts, while  $I_{\text{NG}}$  reports the opposite, although differences are only minor in both cases. The dianions of haloboroles **2** and **3** show an increase in aromaticity compared to the parent borole **1** ([1]<sup>2-</sup>: NICS(0) = -2.74,  $I_{\text{NB}}$  = 31.6; [2]<sup>2-</sup>: NICS(0) = -4.04,  $I_{\text{NB}}$  = 31.6; [3]<sup>2-</sup>: NICS(0) = -4.26,  $I_{\text{NB}}$  = 32.1). On the other hand,  $I_{\text{NG}}$  suggests that the aromaticity in these series does not markedly change.

The series of negatively charged borolyferrocenes ([4]<sup>-</sup> and [4]<sup>2-</sup>)<sup>54</sup> follows the same trend. Addition of one or two electrons to the electron-deficient  $\pi$  system in **4** interrupts the existing metal-to-boron through-space interaction and causes the borole ring to lie in the same plane as the adjacent Cp ring (*i.e.* the dip angle  $\alpha^*$  becomes smaller, *ca.* 2.0°). While the NICS profile of the radical anion [4]<sup>-</sup> is analogous to the ones of the other anions ([1]<sup>-</sup>, [2]<sup>-</sup> and [3]<sup>-</sup>), the dianion [4]<sup>2-</sup> shows two minima around *ca.*  $\pm 1$  Å, which are slightly more pronounced than the one in [1]<sup>2-</sup> (see Fig. 5 and 6). The different NICS values for the two minima in [4]<sup>2-</sup> are an indication of the influence of the magnetic field from the iron atom. As a consequence, there is an apparent difference in the NICS profile when following a path above and below the borole ring plane (*i.e.* *syn* and *anti* to the ferrocenyl unit). The direction affected by the magnetic field of the ferrocenyl unit shows a slightly smaller NICS value.

### Bis- and tris(borole)s

The Braunschweig group has recently reported the successful synthesis of systems containing two and three boroly units.<sup>52,56,58–60</sup> Fig. 7 displays all derivatives used for this study. By comparing the 1,3- and 1,4-disubstituted bis(boroly)-benzenes **10** and **11**,<sup>58</sup> respectively, compound **11** was found to be 4.3 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> more stable than **10**. The reason for the decreased thermodynamic stability of **10** is likely due to the destabilizing  $\pi$ -conjugation of the two  $\pi$ -accepting boroly units through the phenylene bridge. In terms of antiaromaticity in




Fig. 7 Neutral bis- and tris(borole) systems studied in this work.

the borole rings, however, there is no noticeable difference between the two isomers. A comparison of the NICS profiles of monoborole **1**, bis(borole)s **10** and **11**, and tris(borole) **12** is shown in Fig. 8.

The longer *trans*-stilbenyl spacer in bis(borole) **13** does not significantly change the degree of antiaromaticity with respect to the bis(borole)s **10** or **11**.<sup>60</sup> However, replacing the phenylene linker with an electron-rich heterocycle, such as a thiofene in compound **14**,<sup>52</sup> has a more pronounced effect on the antiaromaticity. Bis(borole) **14** contains two borolyl moieties which are less antiaromatic than the parent borole **1** or other bis- and tris(borole)s (except for **11**) based on  $I_{NB}$ , whereas the  $I_{NG}$  and NICS values show no qualitative differences. The sulfur atom in the molecule allows for higher cross delocalizations in the borole ring, thus enhancing the value of  $I_{NB}$  in this compound. A conjugation between the aromatic




Fig. 8 Comparison of NICS profiles for mono-, bis- and tris(borole) compounds. The dot in the center of the borole ring indicates the starting point for the calculations. Note that in case of tris(borole) **12** the calculation was stopped at a certain point due to fluctuations with phenyl groups of the other boroles.

heterocycle and the vacant p-orbital on boron seems to be effective in these compounds leading to the observed coplanar arrangement of the contrasting ring systems.<sup>52</sup>

Other significant differences are found by comparison of transition-metal-containing mono- and bis(borole)s. For the borolyl-functionalized ferrocenes,<sup>59</sup> the differences in the NICS profiles are shown in Fig. 9. The bis(borole) systems **15** (NICS(0) = 13.07,  $I_{NB}$  = 17.6) and **16** (NICS(0) = 13.58,  $I_{NB}$  = 16.7) exhibit an increased antiaromaticity in comparison to their corresponding monoborole **4** (NICS(0) = 11.75,  $I_{NB}$  = 18.7). This result is in agreement with a mitigation of the stabilizing through-space boron-iron interaction, as seen by a decreased bending of the borolyl unit towards the iron atom in the molecular structures (**4** ( $\alpha^* = 19.2^\circ$ ) > **15** ( $\alpha^* = 14.7^\circ$ ) > **16** ( $\alpha^* = 8.1^\circ$ )).

The antiaromatic character of anionic derivatives of bis- and tris(borole)s seems to follow the same trend as for the




Fig. 9 NICS profiles for the borolyl-substituted ferrocene derivatives. The dots indicate the center of each borole ring where the calculations were done. The left side of the graph corresponds to the series of ghost atoms placed along the iron side (*syn*), whereas the right side shows the results in the opposite direction (*anti*). Note that on the left side some lines are cut off due to fluctuations when approaching the vicinity of other atoms.




Fig. 10 Anionic bis- and tris(borole) systems studied in this work.

above-discussed mono(borole)s (Fig. 10). In other words, the anionic  $[5]^{2-}$ ,  $[14]^{2-}$ , and  $[15]^{2-}$  (calculated as open-shell, triplet state molecules), which have one extra electron in each borolyl unit, are less antiaromatic than their neutral counterparts. In fact, it was found that  $[14]^{2-}$  is better described as a closed-shell singlet species with a bipolaron structure, in which the unpaired electrons on the borolyl units are paired across the thiophene bridge.<sup>61</sup> Again, when  $[14]^{2-}$  and  $[15]^{2-}$  are further reduced by two electrons resulting in tetraanionic borole derivatives, the aromatic character of each borole is




Fig. 11 NICS profiles for the cymentrenyl-containing mono- and bis(borole)s 5 and 17, respectively. Dots in the center of each borole ring show where the calculations were done. The left side of the graph corresponds to the series of points in *syn* position with respect to  $\text{Mn}(\text{CO})_3$ , whereas the right side shows the results in the opposite direction.

further increased, as was previously found for dianionic mono-borole species (*vide supra*).<sup>9b,62</sup> The same happens for the hexaanionic  $[12]^{6-}$  species. Fig. 11 shows the NICS profiles for the series of cymentrene-containing mono- and bis(borole) systems.<sup>56</sup> As the borole units in 1,3-bis(borolyl)cymentrene 17 are not equivalent in the geometry-optimized structure, each  $\text{BC}_4\text{Ph}_4$  group was treated separately. As one might expect from their different arrangement with respect to the metal fragment, the two borolyl substituents in 17 exhibit a slightly different degree of antiaromaticity. For the neutral species, the nearly coplanar borole group with respect to the Cp ring ( $\text{NICS}(0) = 12.37$ ,  $I_{\text{NB}} = 18.4$ ) shows an almost identical antiaromaticity compared to that of 5 ( $\text{NICS}(0) = 12.36$ ,  $I_{\text{NB}} = 18.7$ ), whereas the more twisted borolyl group in 17 ( $\text{NICS}(0) = 13.67$ ,  $I_{\text{NB}} = 16.8$ ) features a higher antiaromaticity.

Fig. 12 summarizes the main results obtained in this work. NICS and multicenter indices agree on classifying the set of compounds into three different groups. The first group contains the most aromatic species, which are the compounds with two additional electrons per borole unit, the second one includes molecules with one additional electron per borole ring, *i.e.* borole radical anions, and the third group contains neutral borole compounds. While the  $\text{NICS}(0)$  values make a clear distinction between these three groups, the multicenter indices draw a slightly less sharp line between the groups. Thus, in some cases, using multicenter indices as criteria for (anti)aromaticity, it can become difficult to assign the borole structures to a specific group. Nevertheless, there are very few exceptions to these general trends, which are associated with




Fig. 12 Multicenter indices ( $I_{\text{NG}}$  and  $I_{\text{NB}}$ ) against NICS values for the series of boroles studied. The illustration is subdivided into boxes that separate the three different aromatic characters of the studied species. Systems with negative  $I_{\text{NB}}$  values are not included.

the different charge states of the boroles. The most remarkable difference between the two multicenter indices is evident for the neutral borole systems, for which two separate groups of points are obtained, suggesting that  $I_{\text{NB}}$  better captures the increase in aromaticity upon reduction of the compounds than  $I_{\text{NG}}$  does. However, as seen in Fig. 12, the overall picture for the aromaticity in these compounds is qualitatively the same.

## Conclusions

In this manuscript we have surveyed the aromaticity of thirty-four borole compounds in their various reduction states through assessment of the NICS and MCI aromaticity indices, with the goal of getting an understanding of how the electron delocalization in the ring is affected by the substituents. As one might expect, the neutral borole structures with four  $\pi$  electrons are antiaromatic and become increasingly more aromatic by addition of one and two electrons, according to Hückel's rule. While the uptake of one electron to the borole leads to a nonaromatic system, addition of a second electron fully aromatizes the ring and relieves the system from its inherent electron deficiency. This finding is supported by MCI values and by the magnetic response seen in the NICS profiles as the maximum moves from the center of the borole ring (in neutral, antiaromatic species) to a local minimum at a certain distance up/above the ring (in dianionic, aromatic species). In addition, the theoretical results show that the exocyclic substituent at the boron atom has a considerable influence on the degree of antiaromaticity in the borole ring. Substituents with  $\pi$ -donating abilities, such as an amino or thiophene group, seem to mitigate the destabilizing electron delocalization in the ring, whereas  $\pi$ -accepting groups result in an enhanced antiaromatic destabilization. These findings are in good agreement with corresponding experimental studies aimed to assess the antiaromaticity in boroles by structural and spectroscopic analysis.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the following organizations for financial support: the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (MICINN, project number CTQ2011-23156/BQU), the DIUE of the Generalitat de Catalunya (projects number 2014SGR931, 2009SGR637, and XRQTC), the FEDER fund (European Fund for Regional Development) for the grant UNGI08-4E-003 and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. Excellent service by the Centre de Supercomputació de Catalunya (CESCA) is also gratefully acknowledged. Support for the research of M.S. was received through the ICREA Academia 2009 prize for excellence in research funded by the DIUE of the Generalitat de Catalunya. E. M. acknowledges financial support of the EU under Marie Curie Career Integration grant (PCI09-GA-2011-294240) and the Europa Excelencia project from Spanish Ministry (MINECO), CTQ2013-41236-ERC.

## Notes and references

- 1 A. D. Allen and T. T. Tidwell, *Chem. Rev.*, 2001, **101**, 1333.
- 2 R. Breslow, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 1973, **6**, 393.
- 3 See, for example: A. Iida, A. Sekioka and S. Yamaguchi, *Chem. Sci.*, 2012, **3**, 1461.
- 4 J. J. Eisch, N. K. Hota and S. Kozima, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1969, **91**, 4575.
- 5 H. Braunschweig, I. Fernández, G. Frenking and T. Kupfer, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2008, **47**, 1951.
- 6 C. Fan, W. E. Piers and M. Parvez, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2009, **48**, 2955.
- 7 J. J. Eisch, J. E. Galle and S. Kozima, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1986, **108**, 379.
- 8 T. Araki, A. Fukazawa and S. Yamaguchi, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2012, **51**, 5484.
- 9 (a) H. Braunschweig and T. Kupfer, *Chem. Commun.*, 2011, **47**, 10903; (b) H. Braunschweig, I. Krummenacher and J. Wahler, *Adv. Organomet. Chem.*, 2013, **61**, 1.
- 10 H. Braunschweig, A. Damme, C. Hörl, T. Kupfer and J. Wahler, *Organometallics*, 2013, **32**, 6800.
- 11 C. Fan, L. G. Mercier, W. E. Piers, H. M. Tuononen and M. Parvez, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2010, **132**, 9604.
- 12 A. Y. Houghton, V. A. Karttunen, C. Fan, W. E. Piers and H. M. Tuononen, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2013, **135**, 941.
- 13 J. J. Eisch, J. E. Galle, B. Shafii and A. L. Rheingold, *Organometallics*, 1990, **9**, 2342.
- 14 C. Fan, W. E. Piers, M. Parvez and R. McDonald, *Organometallics*, 2010, **29**, 5132.
- 15 H. Braunschweig, C.-W. Chiu, A. Damme, K. Ferkinghoff, K. Kraft, K. Radacki and J. Wahler, *Organometallics*, 2011, **30**, 3210.
- 16 H. Braunschweig, C.-W. Chiu, D. Gamon, K. Gruf, C. Hörl, T. Kupfer, K. Radacki and J. Wahler, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.*, 2013, 1525.
- 17 (a) H. Braunschweig, C. Hörl, L. Mailänder, K. Radacki and J. Wahler, *Chem. - Eur. J.*, 2014, **20**, 9858; (b) S. A. Couchman, T. K. Thompson, D. J. D. Wilson, J. L. Dutton and C. D. Martin, *Chem. Commun.*, 2014, **50**, 11724.
- 18 (a) H. Braunschweig, V. Dyakonov, J. O. C. Jimenez-Halla, K. Kraft, I. Krummenacher, K. Radacki, A. Sperlich and J. Wahler, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2012, **51**, 2977; (b) P. Bissinger, H. Braunschweig, A. Damme, C. Hörl, I. Krummenacher and T. Kupfer, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, DOI: 10.1002/anie.201409513.
- 19 C.-W. So, D. Watanabe, A. Wakamiya and S. Yamaguchi, *Organometallics*, 2008, **27**, 3496.
- 20 For selected reviews on boron-containing  $\pi$ -conjugated materials, see: (a) C. D. Entwistle and T. B. Marder, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2002, **114**, 3051; (b) C. D. Entwistle and T. B. Marder, *Chem. Mater.*, 2004, **16**, 4574; (c) S. Yamaguchi and A. Wakamiya, *Pure Appl. Chem.*, 2006, **78**, 1413; (d) N. Matsumi and Y. Chujo, *Polym. J.*, 2008, **40**, 77; (e) F. Jäkle, *Chem. Rev.*, 2010, **110**, 3985.

- 21 M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, J. A. Montgomery Jr., T. Vreven, K. N. Kudin, J. C. Burant, J. M. Millam, S. S. Iyengar, N. Rega, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, M. Klene, X. Li, J. E. Knox, H. P. Hratchian, J. B. Cross, V. Bakken, C. Adamo, J. Jaramillo, R. Gomperts, R. E. Stratmann, O. Yazyev, A. J. Austin, R. Cammi, C. Pomelli, J. Ochterski, P. Y. Ayala, K. Morokuma, G. A. Voth, P. Salvador, J. J. Dannenberg, V. G. Zakrzewski, S. Dapprich, A. D. Daniels, M. C. Strain, O. Farkas, D. K. Malick, A. D. Rabuck, K. Raghavachari, J. B. Foresman, J. V. Ortiz, Q. Cui, A. G. Baboul, S. Clifford, J. Cioslowski, B. B. Stefanov, G. Liu, A. Liashenko, P. Piskorz, I. Komaromi, R. L. Martin, D. J. Fox, T. Keith, M. Al-Laham, C. Y. Peng, A. Nanayakkara, M. Challacombe, P. M. W. Gill, B. G. Johnson, W. Chen, M. W. Wong, R. González and J. A. Pople, *Gaussian 03*, Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2004.
- 22 C. Adamo and V. Barone, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1999, **110**, 6158.
- 23 M. Ernzerhof and G. E. Scuseria, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1999, **110**, 5029.
- 24 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, **77**, 3865.
- 25 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1997, **78**, 1396.
- 26 (a) C. T. Lee, W. T. Yang and R. G. Parr, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter*, 1988, **37**, 785; (b) N. C. Handy and A. J. Cohen, *Mol. Phys.*, 2001, **99**, 403.
- 27 F. Weigend and R. Ahlrichs, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **7**, 3297.
- 28 Z. F. Chen, C. S. Wannere, C. Corminboeuf, R. Puchta and P. v. R. Schleyer, *Chem. Rev.*, 2005, **105**, 3842.
- 29 P. v. R. Schleyer, C. Maerker, A. Dransfeld, H. Jiao and N. J. R. van Eikema Hommes, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1996, **118**, 6317.
- 30 J. R. Cheeseman, G. W. Trucks, T. A. Keith and M. J. Frisch, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1996, **104**, 5497.
- 31 K. Wolinski, J. F. Hilton and P. Pulay, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1990, **112**, 8251.
- 32 J. O. C. Jimenez-Halla, E. Matito, J. Robles and M. Solà, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 2006, **691**, 4359.
- 33 A. Stanger, *J. Org. Chem.*, 2006, **71**, 883.
- 34 A. C. Tsipis, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2009, **11**, 8244.
- 35 E. Matito, M. Duran and M. Solà, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **122**, 014109. Erratum, E. Matito, M. Duran and M. Solà, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2006, **125**, 059901.
- 36 J. Poater, X. Fradera, M. Duran and M. Solà, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2003, **9**, 400.
- 37 F. Feixas, J. O. C. Jimenez-Halla, E. Matito, J. Poater and M. Solà, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2010, **6**, 1118.
- 38 P. Bultinck, R. Ponc and S. Van Damme, *J. Phys. Org. Chem.*, 2005, **18**, 706.
- 39 J. Cioslowski, E. Matito and M. Solà, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2007, **111**, 6521.
- 40 I. Mayer and P. Salvador, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 2004, **383**, 368.
- 41 P. Salvador and I. Mayer, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **120**, 5046.
- 42 E. Matito, M. Solà, P. Salvador and M. Duran, *Faraday Discuss.*, 2007, **135**, 325.
- 43 P. Salvador and E. Ramos-Cordoba, in *APOST-3D*, Institut de Química Computacional i Catàlisi, University of Girona, Catalonia, Spain, 2011.
- 44 E. Matito, in *ESI-3D: Electron Sharing Indexes Program for 3D Molecular Space Partition Girona*, IQC, 2006, Available at: <http://iqc.udg.edu/~eduard/ESI>.
- 45 E. Hückel, *Z. Elektrochemie*, 1937, **43**, 752.
- 46 H. Braunschweig, A. Damme, D. Gamon, T. Kupfer and K. Radacki, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2011, **50**, 4250.
- 47 J. Köhler, S. Lindenmeier, I. Fischer, H. Braunschweig, T. Kupfer, D. Gamon and C.-W. Chiu, *J. Raman Spectrosc.*, 2010, **41**, 636.
- 48 A. Appel, F. Jäkle, T. Priermeier, R. Schmid and M. Wagner, *Organometallics*, 1996, **15**, 1188.
- 49 M. Scheibitz, M. Bolte, J. W. Bats, H.-W. Lerner, I. Nowik, R. H. Herber, A. Krapp, M. Lein, M. C. Holthausen and M. Wagner, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2005, **11**, 584.
- 50 H. Braunschweig and T. Kupfer, *Chem. Commun.*, 2008, 4487.
- 51 J. Wahler, *Borole als Synthesebausteine für neue Organoborverbindungen*, Ph.D. Thesis, Universität Würzburg, Würzburg, 2013.
- 52 H. Braunschweig, A. Damme, J. O. C. Jimenez-Halla, C. Hörl, I. Krummenacher, T. Kupfer, L. Mailänder and K. Radacki, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, **134**, 20169.
- 53 G. E. Herberich, B. Buller, B. Hessner and W. Oschmann, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 1980, **195**, 253.
- 54 H. Braunschweig, F. Breher, C.-W. Chiu, D. Gamon, D. Nied and K. Radacki, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2010, **49**, 8975.
- 55 H. Braunschweig, C.-W. Chiu, J. Wahler, K. Radacki and T. Kupfer, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2010, **16**, 12229.
- 56 H. Braunschweig, A. Damme, D. Gamon, H. Kelch, I. Krummenacher, T. Kupfer and K. Radacki, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2012, **18**, 8430.
- 57 (a) N. C. Baird, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1972, **94**, 4941; (b) H. Ottosson, *Nat. Chem.*, 2012, **4**, 969; (c) M. Rosenberg, C. Dahlstrand, K. Kilså and H. Ottosson, *Chem. Rev.*, 2014, **114**, 5379.
- 58 H. Braunschweig, C.-W. Chiu, A. Damme, B. Engels, D. Gamon, C. Hörl, T. Kupfer, I. Krummenacher, K. Radacki and C. Walter, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2012, **18**, 14292.
- 59 H. Braunschweig, C.-W. Chiu, D. Gamon, M. Kaupp, I. Krummenacher, T. Kupfer, R. Müller and K. Radacki, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2012, **18**, 11732.
- 60 D. Gamon, *Borole, Synthese und Reaktivität neuartiger Borolverbindungen*, Ph.D. Thesis, Universität Würzburg, Würzburg, 2012.
- 61 H. Braunschweig, V. Dyakonov, B. Engels, Z. Falk, C. Hörl, J. H. Klein, T. Kramer, H. Kraus, I. Krummenacher, C. Lambert and C. Walter, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2013, **52**, 12852.
- 62 See, also: R. Ghiasi and H. Pasdar, *J. Mex. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, **56**, 426.