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**Abstract:** The TeII/TeIII-catalyzed dehydrogenative C–H phenothiazination of challenging phenols featuring electron-withdrawing substituents under mild aerobic conditions and with high yields is described. These unexpected TeII/TeIII radical catalytic properties were characterized by cyclic voltammetry, EPR spectroscopy, kinetic experiments, and DFT calculations.

Intermolecular cross-dehydrogenative[1] C–N bond formation still represents a relatively recent and underappreciated development in the field of amination coupling reactions,[2] in spite of pronounced step, atom, and redox economical advantages.[3] These are moreover of particular sustainable character if air, or O2, can be successfully activated and utilized as the terminal oxidant of the reaction.[4] Early examples are often metal catalyzed, copper being one of the most often utilized metal catalysts.[5] Metal-free halide catalysis has also been successfully applied.[6] Yet, the scope of such methods remains generally limited. In this context of narrow applicability, the development of new catalytic methods constitutes a strategic priority, especially through the exploration of unusual catalytic elements and their yet untapped properties. In view of our recent works focused on the cross-dehydrogenative phenothiazination of electron-rich phenols, affording access to valuable triarylamine materials (Scheme 1),[7] we envisioned the idea of chalcogen catalysis, and in particular tellurium catalysis,[8] in order to broaden the so far limited substrate scope.[7] As a metalloid, tellurium combines properties of both metal and non-metal elements.

Therefore, it possesses a low oxidation potential and various stable oxidation states, while forming relatively stable C–Te bonds.[9]

In this context, recent developments in metal catalysis highlight the use of ligands which actively take part in the reaction via electron transfer events. These ligands are so-called “redox non-innocent” ligands.[10] Non-innocent ligands act in several ways. For example, they can act as electron reservoir. This allows strategic metals to bypass unfavorable oxidation states while maintaining catalytic activity. They can also actively take part in bond breaking/forming events via hydrogen abstraction.[11,12] Thus, we propose herein an unprecedented TeII/TeIII catalysis approach containing a bidentate, nitrogen-bridged redox non-innocent ligand (Scheme 1), in the aim of unlocking new catalytic properties.

In order to proceed with this objective, selenium and tellurium azine derivatives were targeted as prospective catalysts. PSeZH (phenoselenazine, X = Se) was easily accessed with a simple two-step procedure from the literature (Scheme 2a).[13]

PTeZH (phenotellurazine, X = Te), however, proved slightly more challenging. After testing and optimizing various retrosynthetic approaches, we eventually estab-
This new method was found reliable and scalable, affording an easy and serviceable route to the target tellurium metalloid-based heterocyclic catalyst. Once with the PSeZH and PTeZH catalyst candidates in hand, we set out to optimize the tellurium-catalyzed cross-dehydrogenative phenothiazination of unprecedented and typically challenging phenols featuring electron-withdrawing substituents ($7 < pK_a < 10$). We finally selected and optimized a mild O$_2$-mediated basic oxidation method, for a limited reaction time of 3 hours. K$_2$HPO$_4$ was found to be an optimal base in comparison to K$_3$PO$_4$, NaHCO$_3$, or AcOK, although good results were also obtained with K$_2$CO$_3$. Importantly, the Te catalyst (PTeZH) was found significantly superior to the Se catalyst candidate (PSeZH). Moreover, while 5 mol% of PTeZH catalyst loading provided encouraging results, 10 mol% was found optimal. The optimized tellurium-catalyzed conditions are shown in Scheme 3 (product 3aa, 97% isolated).

This Te-catalyzed reaction was found to tolerate a number of unprecedentedly acidic phenols ($pK_a$ down to 7.5, 3ea, 73%), with high yields. Challenging functional groups such as...
ketones, a pyridine, and an aldehyde were moreover well tolerated (3Ha, 3hb, 3he, 3pa, 3oa, 3qa). Importantly, control experiments omitting the Te catalyst systematically led to very poor conversions, thus highlighting by contrast the strong catalytic role of the TeII organometalloid PTeZH complex (Scheme 3).

Moreover, the non-catalyzed reaction (absence of PTeZH catalyst) does not perform much better at longer reaction times.

For example, the uncatalyzed method afforded 3aa in only 66% yield after 24 h reaction time, versus 97% in 3 h for the optimized Te-catalyzed conditions. In some cases, the uncatalyzed reaction yielded only traces of the expected coupling product (3ab, 3bb, 3bf, 3hb < 5%). Thus, the use of these highly sustainable O2-based reaction conditions requires the presence of the PTeZH catalyst. Finally, this TeII-catalyzed method allowed the straightforward scale-up of the reaction without any loss of yield (3ia, pKα = 7.8, 86%), therefore demonstrating its robustness.

In order to understand this remarkable catalytic effect, the cyclic voltammetry (CV) plots of all four chalcogen congeners are presented in Figure 1. The first three congeners (X = O, S, Se) were found to have a similar oxidation potential (E8(1/2ox) = +0.24, +0.22, +0.24 V for POZH (red), PSZH (green), PSeZH (blue), and PTeZH (pink), respectively).

Figure 1. CV plots (r.t.) in CH2Cl2. E8(1/2ox) values are reported versus Fc/Fc⁺, utilizing Fc* as an internal standard. E8(1/2ox) = +0.24, +0.22, +0.24, +0.08 V for POZH (red), PSZH (green), PSeZH (blue), and PTeZH (pink), respectively.

Figure 2. Experimental and simulated EPR spectrum of N-centered neutral radical POZ⁻ (top left), PSZ⁻ (top right), PSeZ⁻ (bottom left), and the radical cation of PTeZH⁺ (bottom right), obtained by exposing the corresponding PXZH azine to air in [D6]benzene. Experimental parameters: see SI. The simulated spectra were obtained with EasySpin, via the cwEPR GUI plugin, using the simulation parameters listed in Table S3 (see SI).[16]
This oxidation potential difference for tellurium has important consequences for its reactivity, as will be discussed below. Next, the radical character of each oxidized chalcogenazine congener was investigated by electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) spectroscopy. The radical species were generated by bubbling air through a solution of POZ\(\text{H},\) PSZH, PSeZH, and PTeZH in [D\(_6\)]benzene at room temperature. The corresponding EPR profiles are shown in Figure 2. Interestingly, while we had expected similar N-centered neutral radicals\(^{[17]}\) for all four investigated chalcogens, only the first three (X = O, S, Se) showed an EPR signal that is compatible with an N-centered neutral radical species \(\text{P}X\text{ZH}^+\) (Figure 2). In contrast, phenotellurazine (PTeZH) delivered a very different EPR signal, which, according to simulations and supporting DFT property calculations, corresponds to a (protonated) radical cation species: \(\text{PTeZH}^+\). This difference between tellurium and the other chalcogens presumably arises from a lower oxidation potential (\(+0.08\) V) and subsequent weaker acidity of \(\text{PTeZH}^+\) compared to the other three chalcumers (X = O, S, Se, \(E^\circ\)\(_{\text{ox}}\) = +0.22–0.24 V). Indeed, one-electron oxidation of POZ\(\text{H},\) PSZH, and PSeZH apparently leads to strongly acidified PXZH\(^+\) radical cations, which spontaneously deprotonate at nitrogen to the corresponding persistent neutral radicals. In contrast, the (NPA) charge and spin density of \(\text{PTeZH}^+\) are significantly shifted from N to Te (see SI, Table S4).

Next, we measured the relative initial rates of conversion (5 min reaction time) of the various chalcogenazines as N-substrates, with common phenothiazine PSZH (X = S) as the reference \((k_{\text{rel}} = 1)\). In those four parallel experiments, POZ\(\text{H}\) was found to be the fastest azine \((k_{\text{rel}} = k_{\text{POZ}}/k_{\text{PSZH}} = 4.4)\), and PTeZH the slowest \((k_{\text{rel}} = 0.7, \text{Scheme 4a})\). In a competition set-up however (Scheme 2b), POZ\(\text{H}\) becomes 20 times faster, while PTeZH becomes circa 100 times—two orders of magnitude—slower than competing PSZH \((k_{\text{rel}} = 0.01)\). Moreover, in the latter case, the PSZH initial conversion rate has been multiplied by 4 in comparison to the non-catalyzed reaction (absence of PTeZH).

PTeZH is a good catalyst in this reaction because it combines a significantly lower oxidation potential compared to PSZH (+ 0.08 V versus + 0.22 V, respectively), such that it must oxidize first, with a very reactive neutral N-centered radical (PTeZ). Indeed, the H-atom transfer (HAT) process was calculated to be very favorable from PSZH to PTeZ: The latter species therefore serves as radical catalyst\(^{[18]}\) which is generated from the in situ deprotonation of \(\text{PTeZH}^+\), facilitated by the basic reaction conditions and/or peroxide anions resulting from O\(_2\) reduction (Scheme 5, see also SI). This process would thus increase the rate of formation as well as the concentration of the key persistent PSZH neutral radical species, which is a known intermediate in the dehydrogenative phenothiazination reaction.\(^{[17]}\) This favorable HAT process would therefore lead to a reaction acceleration. Oxidation of the PTeZH Te\(^{\text{II}}\) catalyst would then occur again towards the Te\(^{\text{III}}\) PTeZH\(^+\) intermediate, thus closing the catalytic cycle.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that a Te\(^{\text{II}}\) organometallic complex could catalyze the dehydrogenative C–H phenothiazination of challenging phenols bearing electron-withdrawing substituents, with acidities as low as p\(K_a\) = 7.5 (3ea, 73%). In all cases, the absence of Te\(^{\text{II}}\) catalyst leads to dramatically lower conversions. This unexpected catalytic effect essentially arises from a combination of two important
properties: a lower oxidation potential of the $\text{Pd}^+$ catalyst towards the $\text{Pd}^2+$ radical cation and a significantly higher spin density at the tellurium center compared to the sulfur-based substrates. It is thus probable that $\text{Pd}^2+$ will find further applications as radical catalyst$^{[18,19]}$ for the development of innovative (radical-catalyzed) cross-dehydrogenative couplings.

Acknowledgements

ERC project 716136: 2O2ACTIVATION as well as the DFG-funded transregional collaborative research center SFB/ TRR 88 “Cooperative effects in homo and heterometallic complexes” (http://3MET.de) are acknowledged for generous financial support. Heiko Schiefer (RWTH Aachen University) is acknowledged for a short internship in the group on this topic in 2019. Open access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Keywords: dehydrogenative C–N bond formation · radical catalyst · selenium heterocycle · tellurium heterocycle · tellurium catalysis.
Wang, N. Jiao, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2013, 135, 11692; c) T. Gunasekara, G. P. Abramo, A. Hansen, H. Neugebauer, M. Bursch, S. Grimme, J. R. Norton, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2019, 141, 1882.

[19] a) N. J. Treat, H. Sprafke, J. W. Kramer, P. G. Clark, B. E. Barton, J. Read de Alaniz, B. P. Fors, C. J. Hawker, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2014, 136, 16096; b) X. Pan, M. Lamson, J. Yan, K. Matyjaszewski, *ACS Macro Lett.* 2015, 4, 192; c) X. Pan, C. Fang, M. Fantin, N. Malhotra, W. Y. So, L. A. Peteanu, A. A. Isse, A. Gennaro, P. Liu, K. Matyjaszewski, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2016, 138, 2411; d) J. K. Salunke, F. L. Wong, K. Feron, S. Manzhos, M. F. Lo, D. Shinde, A. Patil, C. S. Lee, V. A. L. Roy, P. Sonar, P. P. Wadgaonkar, *J. Mater. Chem. C* 2016, 4, 1009; e) S. Kumar, M. Singh, J.-H. Jou, S. Ghosh, *J. Mater. Chem. C* 2016, 4, 6769; f) R. Grisorio, B. Roose, S. Colella, A. Listorti, G. P. Suranna, A. Abate, *ACS Energy Lett.* 2017, 2, 1029.

Manuscript received: November 15, 2020
Revised manuscript received: December 11, 2020
Accepted manuscript online: December 15, 2020
Version of record online: February 4, 2021