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Abstract: Phosphole-substituted phosphaalkenes (PPAs) of the general formula Mes*P(--C(CH$_3$)$_3$)--(C$_2$H$_4$P(Ph))--R 5a-c (Mes* = 2,4,6-trBu,Ph; R = 2-pyridyl (a), 2-thienyl (b), phenyl (c)) have been prepared from octa-1,7-diyne-substituted phosphaalkenes by utilizing the Fagan–Nugent route. The presence of two differently hybridized phosphorus centers ($\sigma^2\lambda^1$ and $\sigma^3\lambda^3$) in 5 offers the possibility to selectively tune the HOMO–LUMO gap of the compounds by utilizing the different reactivity of the two phosphorus heteroatoms. Oxidation of 5a-c by sulfur proceeds exclusively at the $\sigma^3\lambda^3$-phosphorus atom, thus giving rise to the corresponding thioxophospholes 6a–c. Similarly, 5a is selectively coordinated by AuCl at the $\sigma^2\lambda^1$-phosphorus atom. Subsequent second AuCl coordination at the $\sigma^3\lambda^3$-phosphorus heteroatom results in a dimetallic species that is characterized by a gold–gold interaction that provokes a change in $\pi$ conjugation. Spectroscopic, electrochemical, and theoretical investigations show that the phosphaalkene and the phosphole both have a sizable impact on the electronic properties of the compounds. The presence of the phosphaalkene unit induces a decrease of the HOMO–LUMO gap relative to reference phosphe-containing $\pi$ systems that lack a P=–C substituent.

Introduction

The field of organic $\pi$-conjugated materials has matured tremendously over the last two decades.[1] More and more materials, which range from single molecules to oligomers and polymers, have found use in organic electronics devices, for example, and a plethora of organic compounds with potential applications within the field of molecular electronics have been synthesized.[2] Today, the art of organic synthesis is well developed, and both the chemical and electronic properties of synthesized organic compounds are easily modified.[3] In particular, the insertion of heteroatoms in the backbone of $\pi$ systems has attracted great interest owing to the impact of the heteroatom on the electronic properties of the molecules.[4] Furthermore, postsynthetic manipulations such as metal coordination or oxidation reactions can be performed to modify the physical properties of the $\pi$ system.[4c,5] Recently, it has been shown that the inclusion of phosphaalkenes (a $\sigma^2\lambda^1$-phosphorus center) into oligoacetylenes has a pronounced effect on the energies of the frontier molecular orbitals.[6] Similar effects have been described for oligomeric and polymeric $\pi$-conjugated systems in which $\sigma^2\lambda^1$-phosphorus centers feature in the form of phosphaalkenes or diphospholes.[7] A specific class of phosphorus-containing $\pi$-conjugated materials are phospholes, that is, phosphorus analogues to pyrroles.[5] The tricordinated phosphorus atom of phospholes possesses a pyramidal geometry with a lone pair of pronouned $\sigma$ character. These geometric and electronic features prevent an efficient endocyclic conjugation of the electron sextet. In fact, de-localization within the phosphole ring arises from a hyperconjugation that involves the exocyclic P–R $\sigma$ bond and the $\pi$ system of the diene moiety.[8] As a consequence, the phosphole ring exhibits a unique set of properties (low aromatic character, reactive P atom, $\sigma$–$\pi$ hyperconjugation) that has motivated the development of new conjugated $\pi$ systems that integrate the phosphole unit.[9] In particular, the intact reactivity of the phosphorus heteroatom has proven to provide a unique possibility for facile tuning of the optoelectronic properties of phospholes (e.g., through oxidation or metal coordination to the phosphole), thereby making them suitable for applications within optoelectronic devices.[8b,a,10] In an early study, Mathey and co-workers combined two differently hybridized P centers, namely, a phosphole and a phosphinine unit[11] or a phosphole decorated with an imine functionality,[12] and explored their coordination behavior. In the present work, we wish to chemically tune the electronic properties of a new...
class of compounds that contains two differently hybridized phosphorus centers in the form of phosphaalkenes and phospholes as integral parts of a conjugated system. Through the unique reactivity of two differently hybridized phosphorus atoms, chemical manipulations will offer possibilities to selectively alter the optical and electronic properties of the novel π-conjugated molecules. Herein, we present an unprecedented synthetic approach towards phosphole-phosphaalkenes (PPAs). Showcases for the differences in reactivity of the two phosphorus heteroatoms through metal coordination and oxidation are presented.

Results and Discussion

Synthesis and X-ray crystallography of phosphole-phosphaalkenes

Phosphole-substituted phosphaalkenes (PPAs) were targeted through a sequence of reactions in which the phosphole is formed in the last step from phosphaalkene-containing 1,7-octadiyne compounds 4a–c by using the Fagan–Nugent protocol (Scheme 1).[13] The strategy turned out to be a feasible synthetic route, as sterically protected phosphaalkenes are compatible with nBuLi and [Cp₂ZrCl₂] (Cp = cyclopentadienyl ligand), that is, the required reagents for the phosphole assembly. The synthetic sequence towards 4a–c starts from previously described C,C-dibromophosphaalkene 1 (Scheme 1).[14] For subsequent cross-coupling reactions, it is important to substitute one of the bromide atoms by other groups as palladium catalysts that are commonly used for cross-coupling reactions lead to a rearrangement of 1 and the formation of phospholeynes.[15] Using this strategy, Bickelhaupt et al. previously presented cross-coupling reactions on Mes*P–CBr (Mes* = 2,4,6-tri-tert-butylphenyl).[16] To increase the stabilities of the compounds, it was decided to introduce a methyl group instead of one bromide substituent in 1. Hence, Mes*P–CBr₂ (1) was treated with nBuLi at −120 °C in the Trapp mixture (THF/diethyl ether/pentane 4:4:1) for 30 min.[17] After quenching the reaction mixture with methyl iodide and subsequent workup, Mes*P–CCH₃Br (2) was obtained in good yields.[18] The 1,7-octadiyne motif can be introduced by using one of two procedures that basically differ in the alkyne source. In the first case, 2 is coupled with 1,7-octadiynemagnesium bromide in THF by using [Pd(dbac)₂] (dbac = dibenzylideneacetone) and PPh₃ under reflux conditions.[16]

This reaction gives octadiynephosphaalkene 3 in 98% yield and is suitable for medium to large scales, preferably less than or equal to one gram, mainly due to the fact that it is easier to handle Grignard reagents on these scales. In accordance to the cross-couplings presented by Bickelhaupt et al., an isomerization occurs during the palladium-mediated coupling step, and only the E isomer of 3 is obtained from (Z)-2 (see below).[16,19]

For smaller scales, 2 can be coupled directly with 1,7-octadiyne in Et₃NH with [Pd(PPh₃)₂Cl₂] and Cul as catalysts. The reaction time is crucial for this reaction, since longer reaction times result in homocoupling of the product. By using the standard Sonogashira coupling conditions, that is, amine as solvent and [Pd(PPh₃)₂Cl₂] and Cul as catalysts in the presence of 2-bromopyridine, 2-iodothiophene, or iodobenzene, compound 3 can be converted into 4a–c in medium to good yields. Higher overall yields of 4a can be obtained by coupling 2 directly with 1-(2-pyridyl)octa-1,7-diyne. The direct cross-coupling approach also provides a larger functional group tolerance and would allow the introduction of substituents that are reactive towards Grignard reagents. Compounds 3 and 4a–c are isomerically pure, as is evident from one single 31P{1H} NMR spectroscopic resonance in the typical region for P–C compounds between δ = 274.7 and 275.3 ppm. Figure 1 shows a depiction of the solid-state structures of 3 and 4b,c. The structures confirm the formation of E isomer 3 from Z isomer 2 during the preparation of the octadiynephosphaalkenes. In all cases, the bond lengths of the P–C double bonds and the C≡C triple bonds are in the usual range.

With phosphaalkene-substituted octadiynes in hand, PPAs were synthesized by utilizing the Fagan–Nugent route, which is a well-established method for the preparation of five-membered heterocycles.[11] Thus, treating phosphole precursors 4a–

Scheme 1. Synthesis of octadiyne-phosphaalkenes 4a–c. (i) nBuLi, −130 °C, Trapp mixture, 30 min; (ii) or (iii) MeI, −120 °C, 30 min then to RT, 2 h. Compound 2 93%, ii) 1,7-octadiynemagnesium bromide, [Pd(dbac)₂], PPh₃, THF, reflux, 4–5 h. Compound 3 98%, iii) 1,7-octadiyne, Cul, [Pd(PPh₃)₂Cl₂], Et₃NH, RT, 3 h. Compound 3 65%. iv) 1-(2-pyridyl)octa-1,7-diyne, Cul, [Pd(PPh₃)₂Cl₂], Et₃NH, RT, 14 h. Compound 4a 74%. v) 2-iodothiophene, Cul, [Pd(PPh₃)₂Cl₂], Et₃N, RT, 14 h. Compound 4b 96%. c) iodobenzene, Cul, [Pd(PPh₃)₂Cl₂], Et₃NH, RT, 14 h. Compound 4c 54%.
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with [Cp₂ZrCl₂] and nBuLi in THF results in the formation of zirconium metallacycle intermediates, which were subsequently treated with PhPBr₂ to afford PPAs 5a–c (Scheme 2). Noteworthy is a difference in stability between the three PPAs. PPA 5a is stable under ambient conditions and on silica, thereby allowing purification by column chromatography without visible decomposition. In contrast, 5b was found to be less stable, and new red bands appeared during chromatographic purification, even when a rapid flash procedure was applied. The appearance of the red bands is consistent with partial oxidation of 5b during chromatographic workup. Compound 5c was not isolated and was directly subjected to oxidation with elemental sulfur (S₈) (see below).

For a first indication of whether it would be possible to perform selective chemistry on either of the two phosphorus heteroatoms, PPAs 5a–c were subjected to oxidative conditions by using an excess amount of sulfur in CH₂Cl₂. Although such oxidation by sulfur is well established for phospholes [9, 10d,h] it has previously been shown that phosphaalkenes can also be oxidized by sulfur to thiaphosphiranes. [20] However, procedures for phosphaalkene oxidation usually suggest the addition of base to accelerate the reaction, although sulfurization is also described to proceed without a base but under extended reaction times. [20] It was thus an objective of this work to investigate whether selective oxidation of the phosphole in the series of PPAs is possible while maintaining the intactness of the phosphaalkene moiety. First indications of selective oxidation of the phospholes to a $s^4,l^5$ center can be anticipated from the $^{31}$P{¹H} NMR spectra of the reaction products (Table 1). For PPAs 6a–c, the $^{31}$P{¹H} NMR spectroscopic signals of the phosphole phosphorus centers are shifted downfield by approximately 5 ppm compared to the signals of the phosphaalkene phosphorus centers.

Table 1. $^{31}$P{¹H} NMR spectroscopic chemical shifts [ppm] of the PPAs (CD₂Cl₂) and $J$(P,P) coupling constants [Hz].

| Entry | Substituent | $^{31}$P{¹H} phosphole | $^{31}$P{¹H} phosphaalkene | $J$(P,P) |
|-------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| 5a    | pyridyl     | +10.4                   | +240.0                    | 89.7    |
| 5b    | thienyl     | +10.5                   | +249.4                    | 92.8    |
| 5c    | phenyl      | +12.2                   | +246.2                    | 90.3    |
| 6a    | pyridyl     | +52.3                   | +269.6                    | 35.8    |
| 6b    | thienyl     | +51.7                   | +268.6                    | 36.7    |
| 6c    | phenyl      | +53.4                   | +267.8                    | 35.7    |
| 7     | pyridyl*(AuCl) | +38.3               | +279.4                    | 75.6    |
| 8     | pyridyl*(AuCl₂) | +44.1              | +199.0                    | 45.0    |

Figure 1. ORTEP plots of phosphaalkenes 3 and 4b,c (ellipsoids are drawn at 50% probability level). Hydrogen atoms and disorder in the alkyl groups are omitted for clarity. Selected bond lengths [Å]: Compound 3: P1–C1 1.855(2), P1=C19 1.693(2), C21=C22 1.207(3), C27=C28 1.194(4); compound 4b: P1–C1 1.852(3), P1=C19 1.686(3), C21=C22 1.194(6), C27=C28 1.183(6); Compound 4c: P1–C1 1.8449(16), P1=C19 1.6834(18), C21=C22 1.198(11), C27=C28 1.185(10).

Scheme 2. Synthesis of phosphole-phosphaalkenes (PPAs) 5.6a–c. (i) [Cp₂ZrCl₂], nBuLi (2 equiv), THF, –78°C 1 h, then RT, 14 h; 2) PhPBr₂, –78°C, then for 5a: RT, 4 h, 5b,c: RT, 24 h. Compound 5a 42%, 5b 21%, 5c not isolated. (ii) sulfur, CH₂Cl₂, RT, 14 h. Compound 6a 40%, 6b 19% (over 2 steps), 5c 29% (over 2 steps).
mately 40 ppm to approximately 52 ppm, which is in good accordance with the chemical shifts of other $\sigma^s,\sigma^t$-thio phospholes.[20,20d] Interestingly, also the $^{31}\text{P}({^1}\text{H})$ NMR spectroscopic resonances of the phosphaalkene phosphorus atoms are significantly shifted downfield by approximately 20 ppm. Nevertheless, the observed chemical shifts are still in the typical region for phosphaalkenes, which indicates that the phosphaalkene is left intact. Comparison with typical chemical shifts of oxidation products of phosphaalkenes, that is, $\lambda^s$-phosphorane ($\delta_{\lambda^s} = 10.0$ ppm) and thiophosphorane ($\delta_{\lambda^s} = -34.9$ ppm) observed during oxidation of Mes$^+\text{P} = \text{CPh}_2$ with sulfur further supports our assignment.[20d] HRMS and X-ray crystallography (see below) further confirm that only the phosphorus phosphorus is oxidized, thus encouraging our strategy to utilize the different reactivity of the two phosphorus centers in PPAs for the tuning of their electronic properties. Despite their differences in oxygen sensitivity, it is also evident that the $^{31}\text{P}({^1}\text{H})$ NMR spectroscopic signal of the phosphaalkene phosphorus downfield (Table 1). The selective coordination of the phosphorus atom of the phosphole ring by sulfur, the coordination by [AuCl(tht)], shifts the $^{31}\text{P}({^1}\text{H})$ NMR spectroscopic signal of the phosphaalkene phosphorus downfield (Table 1). The selective coordination of the $\sigma^s,\sigma^t$-phosphorus is verified by X-ray crystallography as shown in Figure 3. The solid-state structure of 7 shows similar structural parameters to 5a with a typical P=C bond length (1.698(8) Å) and expected Au’ coordination. The P-Au-Cl fragment shows a linear arrangement (177.56(7)°) with typical bond lengths (Au1–P1: 2.234(2) Å and Au1–Cl1: 2.295(2) Å). Interestingly, the phosphaalkene, the phosphole moiety, and the pending pyridine fragment are almost coplanar (P1–C8–C9–P2 = 4.5(9)°) and calculated angles of the least-squares plane (l.s.pl.) between pyridine, phosphole, and phosphole are 13.3(4)° and 9.2(4)°, respectively. In contrast to the solid-state structures of 5a and 6a, the pyridine ring has an s-cis relationship with respect to the phosphole phosphorus in the solid state. Interestingly, treating 5a with two equivalents of [AuCl(tht)] results in an upfield shift of the $^{31}\text{P}({^1}\text{H})$ NMR spectroscopic signal of 8 to $\delta = 199$ ppm relative to $\delta = 249$ ppm for 5a of the phosphole phosphorus concomi-

---

**Figure 2.** ORTEP plots of PPAs 5a and 6a-c (ellipsoids are drawn at 50% probability level). Hydrogen atoms and disorder in the alky groups are omitted for clarity. Selected bond lengths [Å] and angles [°]: Compound 5a: P1–C1 1.7984(19), C1–C8 1.811(2), P1–C8 1.828(2), P2–C9 1.705(2), P2–C11 1.7582(19), C1–C2 1.372(3), C2–C7 1.463(3), C7–C8 1.378(3), C8–C9 1.467(3), C1–P1–C8 91.28(9), C9–P2–C11 104.23(9), P2–C9–C8 115.61(15), Compound 6a: P1–C1 1.802(4), P1–C8 1.823(4), P1–C9 1.821(3), P2–C9 1.706(4), P2–C11 1.839(4), C1–C2 1.367(5), C2–C7 1.482(5), C7–C8 1.377(5), C8–C9 1.455(5), P1–C11 1.9500(12), P2–C9–C11 110.0 ppm) and thiophosphorane ($\delta_{\lambda^s} = -34.9$ ppm) observed during oxidation of Mes$^+\text{P} = \text{CPh}_2$ with sulfur further supports our assignment.[20d] HRMS and X-ray crystallography (see below) further confirm that only the phosphorus phosphorus is oxidized, thus encouraging our strategy to utilize the different reactivity of the two phosphorus centers in PPAs for the tuning of their electronic properties. Despite their differences in oxygen sensitivity, it is also evident that the $^{31}\text{P}({^1}\text{H})$ NMR spectroscopic signal of the phosphaalkene phosphorus downfield (Table 1). The selective coordination of the phosphorus atom of the phosphole ring by sulfur, the coordination by [AuCl(tht)], shifts the $^{31}\text{P}({^1}\text{H})$ NMR spectroscopic signal of the phosphaalkene phosphorus downfield (Table 1). The selective coordination of the $\sigma^s,\sigma^t$-phosphorus is verified by X-ray crystallography as shown in Figure 3. The solid-state structure of 7 shows similar structural parameters to 5a with a typical P=C bond length (1.698(8) Å) and expected Au’ coordination. The P-Au-Cl fragment shows a linear arrangement (177.56(7)°) with typical bond lengths (Au1–P1: 2.234(2) Å and Au1–Cl1: 2.295(2) Å). Interestingly, the phosphaalkene, the phosphole moiety, and the pending pyridine fragment are almost coplanar (P1–C8–C9–P2 = 4.5(9)°) and calculated angles of the least-squares plane (l.s.pl.) between pyridine, phosphole, and phosphole are 13.3(4)° and 9.2(4)°, respectively. In contrast to the solid-state structures of 5a and 6a, the pyridine ring has an s-cis relationship with respect to the phosphole phosphorus in the solid state. Interestingly, treating 5a with two equivalents of [AuCl(tht)] results in an upfield shift of the $^{31}\text{P}({^1}\text{H})$ NMR spectroscopic signal of 8 to $\delta = 199$ ppm relative to $\delta = 249$ ppm for 5a of the phosphole phosphorus concomi-

---

**Figure 2.** ORTEP plots of PPAs 5a and 6a-c (ellipsoids are drawn at 50% probability level). Hydrogen atoms and disorder in the alky groups are omitted for clarity. Selected bond lengths [Å] and angles [°]: Compound 5a: P1–C1 1.7984(19), P1–C8 1.811(2), P1–C9 1.828(2), P2–C9 1.705(2), P2–C11 1.8582(19), C1–C2 1.372(3), C2–C7 1.463(3), C7–C8 1.378(3), C8–C9 1.467(3), C1–P1–C8 91.28(9), C9–P2–C11 104.23(9), P2–C9–C8 115.61(15), Compound 6a: P1–C1 1.802(4), P1–C8 1.823(4), P1–C9 1.821(3), P2–C9 1.706(4), P2–C11 1.839(4), C1–C2 1.367(5), C2–C7 1.482(5), C7–C8 1.377(5), C8–C9 1.455(5), P1–S1 1.9500(12), C1–P1–C8 94.17(17), C9–P2–C11 104.03(18), P2–C9–C8 114.67(3). Compound 6b: P1–C1 1.813(2), P1–C8 1.814(2), C1–C2 1.822(2), P1–S1 1.9493(11), P2–C13 1.697(2), P2–C15 1.846(2), S2–C12 1.707(3), S2–C9 1.741(2), C1–C2 1.364(3), C1–C3 1.471(3), C2–C7 1.487(3), C7–C8 1.362(3), C9–C10 1.377(3), C10–C11 1.412(3), C11–C12 1.355(4), C13–C14 1.509(3), C13–P2–C15 101.93(10), C1–C1 P1–C8 93.41(10), C1–C13–P2 115.99(16). Compound 6c: P1–C9 1.6889(12), P1–C11 1.8580(12), P2–C11 1.7999(12), P2–C8 1.8214(12), P2–C9 1.8150(13), C1–C2 1.3487(17), C1–C3 1.4782(16), C2–C7 1.4955(16), C7–C8 1.3571(17), C8–C9 1.4762(16), P2–S1 1.9482(4), C1–P1–C8 94.17(17), C9–P2–C11 104.03(18), P2–C9–C8 114.67(3).
The solid-state structure of 8 confirms the formation of a dimeric species and shows that one AuCl is coordinated to each gold–gold interaction (3.069 Å) (Scheme 3). This metallophilic interaction twists the P–C out of the phosphole plane (P9-C8-C7-P7 = 67.2°) and thereby breaks the effective conjugation between the phosphole moiety and the phospahaalkene in 8. Again, the pyridine fragment is almost coplanar to the phosphole unit (9.7°).

(Scheme 3)

**Electronic absorption spectroscopy and cyclic voltammetry**

The electronic absorption spectra of all PPAs are characterized by a strong absorption in the visible region, except for those of 6c and the Au2 complex 8, which feature additional absorptions at higher energy (Figure 3 and Table 2). The observed absorption maxima are attributed to $\pi \rightarrow \pi^*$ transitions of the conjugated system on the basis of quantum chemical calculations (see below). The nature of the 2,5-substituents and the phosphole–P oxidation state affect the optical properties of phospholes 5a,b and 6a–c. The presence of a thienyl group in 5b relative to a pyridyl group in 5a leads to a redshift of the lowest-energy absorption maximum by 20 nm. Sulfur oxidation of phospholes 5a,b to 6a,b induces a small blueshift of the absorption maximum and a redshift of the onsets absorption ($\Delta \lambda_{onset}$ (5a–6a) = 21 nm, $\Delta \lambda_{onset}$ (5b–6b) = 27 nm). The longest wavelength absorption maximum of phenyl-substituted 6c is the highest in energy of all the PPAs investigated.

Coordination of one AuCl to 5a results in a blueshift of $\lambda_{max}$ by 19 nm, and the $\lambda_{onset}$ shifts by 29 nm to lower energies. Interestingly, coordination of a second AuCl fragment as in 8 results in a further hypsochromic shift, both relative to 5a and 7 for $\lambda_{max}$. In contrast to the monoaurated complex 7, the $\lambda_{onset}$ is significantly shifted to higher energies upon complexation of a second AuCl fragment. As described above, the Au–Au interaction in 8 twists the P–C unit out of the phosphole plane and thereby breaks effective conjugation between the two chromophores, which explains the hypsochromic shift that is observed in the UV/Vis spectrum of 8. When comparing the UV/Vis data of 5a with a related phosphole, 1-phenyl-2,5-bis(2-pyridyl)phosphole (5a, $\lambda_{max} = 374$ nm), it is noticeable that the incorporation

**Figure 3.** UV/Vis spectra of PPAs 5a,b, 6a–c, and gold complexes 7 and 8 in CH2Cl2 at room temperature. Synthesis of phospahaalkenes (PPAs) 5.6a–c.

| Entry | Substituent | $\lambda_{max}$ [nm] | $\epsilon$ [m$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$] | $\lambda_{onset}$ [nm] |
|-------|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| 5a    | pyridyl     | 415                 | 14000                       | 485                 |
| 5b    | thiényl     | 435                 | 12000                       | 502                 |
| 5c    | phenyl      | 407                 | 7700                        | 506                 |
| 6a    | pyridyl     | 429                 | 14500                       | 529                 |
| 6b    | thiényl     | 397                 | 6400                        | 491                 |
| 6c    | phenyl      | 396                 | 6300                        | 514                 |
| 7     | pyridyli(\*AuCl) | 378 | 5900                        | 455                 |
| 8     | pyridyli(\*AuCl)$_2$ | 415 | 14000                       | 485                 |

**Table 2.** UV/Vis spectroscopic data of PPAs 5a,b and 6a–c and gold complexes 7 and 8 in CH2Cl2 at room temperature.
The potentials of gold complexes are almost identical (the difference is 20–40 mV) to those of 1-CH2Cl2 and given versus the ferrocene/ferrocenium (Fc/0) couple. In general, electron uptake by oxidized 6a occurs at very similar potential of −2.16 and −2.18 V, respectively, and is thus not influenced by the pyridyl or thienyl auxiliary substituent. The situation is somewhat different in the reduction potentials observed for oxidized 6a–c, which can be detected over a broader potential range of −1.90 to −2.05 V depending on the substituent (all potentials are measured in CH2Cl2 and given versus the ferrocene/ferrocenium (Fc/0) couple). In general, electron uptake by oxidized 6a–c occurs at milder potentials than those of 5a,b.

When comparing PPAs 5a,b to literature-known phospholes that contain an additional pyridyl or thienyl group instead of the phosphaalkene, a large difference in reduction potential can be observed. Whereas 5a displays a first reduction at −2.16 V, the equivalent process occurs at significantly more negative potential in 1-phenyl-2,5-bis(2-pyridyl)phosphole at −2.45 V.[21] The electronic effect of the phosphaalkene on the reduction potential of 6a,b is, however, negligible as they are almost identical (the difference is 20–40 mV) to those of 1-phenyl-2,5-bis(2-pyridyl)thiooxophosphole and 1-phenyl-2,5-bis(2-thienyl)thiooxophosphole, respectively. The first reduction potentials of gold complexes 7 and 8 are observed at more positive potentials than both 5a and 6a.

### Density functional theory (DFT) calculations

DFT calculations of the different PPAs were performed to gain further insight into the conformations of the PPA, delocalization through the π systems, and the influence of the phosphaalkene moiety. Computations were performed at the DFT B3LYP/6-311G** level of theory, which is known to perform well for main group systems.[19,23] As a first step, we decided to investigate the energy difference between the s-cis and s-trans conformations of PPAs 5c and 6c with respect to the torsion angle between the phosphole and the phosphaalkene moiety (Figure 4). Since both conformations were observed in solid-phase experiments, the expectation was that the energy difference between the two arrangements of the phosphorus heteroatoms would be very small. For both 5c and 6c, the s-trans arrangement is favored by 0.53 and 1.60 kJ mol−1, respectively, which is in good agreement with the observations from X-ray crystallography and also indicates that both conformers can be expected to be present in solution.

| Entry | Eox [V] | Ered [V] |
|-------|---------|---------|
| 5a    | −2.16   | −2.27   |
| 5b    | −2.18   | −2.29   |
| 6a    | −1.90   | −2.20   |
| 6b    | −1.99   | −2.28   |
| 6c    | −2.05   | −2.27   |
| 7     | −1.53   | −1.69   |
| 8     | −0.97   | −1.57   |

[Image: Figure 4]
As the pyridyl-phospholes in 5a and 6a are potential bidentate metal-binding sites, the conformational preference of these two subunits relative to each other was investigated. According to the X-ray crystallographic structures of the compounds, the s-cis conformations of the two phosphorus heteroatoms were kept, and the torsion angles between the phosphole phosphorus and the nitrogen were set either close to 0° in s-cis/s-trans and close to 180° in the s-cis/s-cis. The structures were then allowed to fully relax during geometry optimization (Figure 4). In both 5a and 6a, the s-cis/s-trans conformations were favored by 1.35 and 2.08 kJ mol⁻¹, respectively, values that correlate well with the X-ray crystallographic structures. However, we assume that the rotational barrier is very low, which might also explain the pyridine conformation found in gold complexes 7 and 8, both of which show the s-cis/s-cis conformation. Owing to the small energy difference found between the different conformers for 5a,c and 6a,c, it was decided that the geometries for geometry optimization 5b and 6b were based on the structures obtained from the X-ray crystallographic analysis.

Graphical representation of the calculated FMOs of compounds 5a-c and 6a-c are shown in Figure 5. The FMOs have almost exclusively a p character. In agreement with the electronic absorption spectra, both the phosphalkene moiety and the π-conjugated backbone of the phosphore are participating in both the HOMO and the LUMO. The lowest energy absorptions in the UV/Vis spectra can therefore be expected to result from π → π* transitions. The trends observed for the PPAs from the electronic absorption spectroscopy are also observed from the LUMO–HOMO energies of the DFT calculations. The longest-wavelength absorption maximum of phenyl-substituted 5c and 6c are highest, and thiényl-substituted 5b and 6b are the lowest in energy of all PPAs. The bathochromic shifts of the λmax upon oxidation by sulfur is also reflected in the values of the calculated LUMO–HOMO gaps. The calculated LUMO–HOMO gaps for 6a,b of 3.06 and 2.91 eV are in excellent agreement with the values obtained for the lowest energy absorption maxima of 3.05 (407) and 2.89 eV (429 nm), respectively, obtained from the UV/Vis absorption experiments.

The calculations also show that the phosphole-phosphorus does not participate in the HOMOs of 5 and 6, which are localized on the phosphalkene and the butadiene with contributions from the auxiliary substituents. These results are thus in excellent agreement with the conclusions from the electrochemical studies. In general, PPAs 6a,b are more difficult to oxidize than 5a,b; this is reflected well in the energies of the calculated HOMOs, which are higher in energy for 5a,b than for 6a,b, even though the quantitative agreement is not excellent.

As for the HOMOs, the LUMOs are located on the phosphalkene and the butadiene unit with contributions from the substituents. However, for PPAs 5, there is a contribution from the phosphorus lone pair of the phosphole, whereas the contribution of the P=S is smaller for the oxidized PPAs 6. The LUMO lies higher in energy for 5a,b relative to 6a,b, which reflects the experimentally obtained reduction potentials in which 6a,b are reduced at milder potentials than 5a,b.

Gold complexes 7 and 8 were calculated at the PBE1PBE/6-311G**/LANL2DZ level of theory. Similar to their precursor 5a, both the HOMOs and the LUMOs of 7 and 8 are localized on the phosphole and phosphalkene motifs with small contributions from the pyridyl substituent. The AuCl moiety connected to the phosphalkene of 8 contributes to the HOMO with a dₓ orbital localized on the Au and a p orbital localized on the chlorine atom. The contribution of the phosphalkene moiety in 8 is decreased owing to the twist between the phosphalkene and the phosphole ring (dihedral angle of 78.3°) relative to the situation in 5 and 6 in which the two moieties are generally more coplanar (dihedral angles of (150 ± 15°) both in the experimental and the theoretical data). This twist is also responsible for the relatively high-energy transition in the UV/Vis spectrum of 8. The HOMO and the LUMO are lower in energy for 7 and 8 than those of 5a and 6a, which is in good agreement with the electrochemical data in which both 7 and 8 are more difficult to oxidize than 5 and 6. Diurate complex 8 is the most difficult compound to be oxidized of the series (Figure 6).

**Conclusion**

In summary, we have established a synthetic versatile route to the first examples of phosphole-phosphalkenes that unite two differently hybridized (π,π,π) and π,π,π) phosphorus heteroatoms as integral parts of one fully π-conjugated framework. We have also demonstrated that selective modifications of
these compounds at the phosphole unit can be achieved by using oxidation (S₈) and metal coordination (AuCl). Ultimately, a diaurated species was obtained with intermetallic distances of 3.069(1) Å. The Au–Au interaction induces a twist in the molecular structure that is responsible for a significant decrease in the conjugation path. UV/Vis spectroscopic studies show that the phosphaalkene is part of the extended π system and thereby shifts the lowest-energy absorption maxima towards lower energies than similar phosphate reference compounds that lack the phosphaalkene unit. Cyclic voltammetry and ab initio calculations both indicate that the phosphaalkene moiety is mainly involved in the HOMO, whereas the phosphole phosphorus participates in the LUMO of PPAs 5. This result encourages further manipulations of the PPAs to tune the optical properties of this new class of π-conjugated materials and the use of such materials for organic electronics applications.

**Experimental Section**

**Materials and general methods**

Chemicals were purchased from Sigma–Aldrich, VWR, ABCR, and Fisher Scientific and were used as received. THF and Et₂O were distilled from sodium/benzophenone. CH₂Cl₂ was distilled from calcium hydride or freshly purified using MBraun SPS-800 drying columns. All reactions were performed under an inert atmosphere of N₂ or Ar using standard Schlenk techniques. Column chromatography was performed using Merck silica gel Si-60 (35–70 or 0.063–0.200 mm) or on basic alumina (Aldrich type 5016A, 150 mesh, 58 Å).

**NMR spectroscopy**

¹H NMR spectra were recorded at ambient temperature using a JEOL Eclipse 400 MHz spectrometer (operating at 399.8 MHz), a Varian Mercury Plus 300 MHz spectrometer (operating at 300.03 MHz) or Bruker AM300, AM400, or AM500 instruments. Chemical shifts are given in ppm and referenced internally to the residual solvent signal (CHCl₃, δₑ = 7.26 ppm or CH₂Cl₂, δₑ = 5.32 ppm). ³¹P{¹H} NMR spectra were recorded using a JEOL Eclipse 400 MHz spectrometer (operating at 161.8 MHz), referenced externally to 85% H₃PO₄ (aqueous).

**UV/Vis spectroscopy**

UV/Vis measurements were performed using a Varian Cary 50 instrument or a Varian Cary 5000 instrument at room temperature. The measurements were performed in 1 x 1 cm² optical quartz cells as solutions in CH₂Cl₂.

**Electrochemistry**

The electrochemical measurements were conducted in dry CH₂Cl₂ (distilled from calcium hydride). An Autolab potentiostat with a GPES electrochemical interface (Eco Chemie) was used for cyclic voltammetry measurements with a glassy carbon disc (diameter 3 mm, freshly polished) as the working electrode. The counter electrode was a glassy carbon rod and the reference electrode a nonaqueous Ag⁺/Ag electrode (a silver wire immersed into 10 mM AgNO₃ in acetonitrile) with a potential of −0.08 V versus the ferrocenium/ferrocene (Fc⁺/Fc) couple in CH₂Cl₂ as an external standard. The cyclic voltammograms were conducted at a scan rate (ν) of 100 mVs⁻¹. All solutions were conducted on 1 mM solutions of the phospholes in dry CH₂Cl₂ with 0.1 M tetrabutylammonium hexafluorophosphate (NBu₄PF₆) as supporting electrolyte. Before all measurements, oxygen was removed by bubbling with argon and during the measurement all samples were kept under argon.

**Mass spectrometry**

Low-resolution mass spectrometry was performed using a Thermo LCQ Deca XP Max with direct injection electrospray ionization (ESI). A small amount of the compounds were dissolved in a solution of approximately 2.5 mM AgBF₄ in MeOH. High-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS) were performed using a high-resolution and FTMS +pNSI mass spectrometer (orbitrapXL), using a MicroTOF spectrometer with ESI core at University of Muenster, or using a Varian MAT 311, Waters Q-TOF 2, or ZabSpec TOF Micromass instrument at CRMPO of Rennes 1. MALDI-MS spectra were obtained in a Ditranoil matrix using a nitrogen laser accumulating 50 laser shots and a Bruker Microflex LT MALDI-TOF mass spectrometer.

**Computational details**

Calculations were carried out with the Gaussian 09 program package (G09 rev. A.02). The PPAs were fully optimized at the B3LYP/6-311G** level of theory and were determined as true minima by inspection of their harmonic frequencies with no imaginary frequencies. Molecular orbitals were calculated at the same level of theory. Gold complexes were calculated at the PBE1PBE level of theory with a 6-311G** basis set for CHNPCI and a LANL2DZ with ECP for gold.[24]

**Synthesis**

Phosphaalkene 3: Mg turnings (350 mg, 14.4 mmol) were added to 25 mL three-necked round-bottomed flask equipped with a condenser, a stirring bar, and a dropping funnel. THF (5 mL) was added and the suspension was heated to reflux. EtBr (0.25 mL, 3.4 mmol) was added in one portion, and EtBr (0.75 mL, 10.2 mmol) dissolved in THF (20 mL) was added to the dropping funnel. The solution was added dropwise to the
Mg suspension that was heated to reflux, and the Mg turnings started to disappear. After stirring for 30 min, the solution was transferred to a 250 mL three-necked round-bottomed flask that contained THF (100 mL). The pale gray solution was brought to reflux, and 1,7-octadine (1.5 mL, 11.3 mmol) in THF (40 mL) was added dropwise to the solution that was heated to reflux. The pale gray solution became clear and a white precipitate was formed. Mes+P=CH2Br 2 (1.80 g, 4.70 mmol), [Pd(dba)2] (269 mg, 0.47 mmol), and PPh3 (123 mg, 0.47 mmol) were added to the white suspension. The reaction mixture turned dark green and was stirred at reflux for 4−5 h until all the starting material had disappeared by TLC (silica, pentane). If no change could be detected by TLC and there was still starting material left, additional [Pd(dba)2] was added to complete the reaction. The reaction mixture was cooled to room temperature and filtered through a plug of silica, which was rinsed with CH2Cl2. The solvent was removed under vacuum and subsequently subjected to column chromatography on silica with pentane as eluent to yield an off-white solid. Crystallization from CH2Cl2/CH3CN gave colorless crystals. Yield: 1.88 g, 4.60 mmol (98%).

**Alternative procedure:** Mes+P=CH2Br 2 (1.50 g, 3.90 mmol) was dissolved in Et3NH (30 mL), and the solution was deaerated by bubbling with argon. Cul (70 mg, 0.37 mmol), [Pd(PPh3)2Cl2] (223 mg, 0.32 mmol), and finally 1,7-octadine (1.0 mL, 8.0 mmol) were added. The reaction mixture was stirred for 3 h at room temperature until no Mes+P=CH2Br could be detected by TLC. The reaction mixture was concentrated and the solid extracted with pentane. Column chromatography as above. Yield: 1.04 g, 2.54 mmol (65%). 1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 1.28 (d, 3J(P,H) = 13.6 Hz, 3H, CH3), 1.33 (s, 9H, p-tert-But), 1.48 (s, 18H, o-tert-But), 1.69 (m, 4H, C≡CH2CH3), 1.93 (t, 3J(P,H) = 2.6 Hz, 1H, C≡CH3), 2.25 (m, 2H, C≡CH3), 2.47 (m, C≡CH3), 7.40 ppm (s, 2H, Ar); 31P{1H} NMR (161.8 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 275.3 ppm; 13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 18.0 (s, C≡CH2CH3), 19.9 (d, 3J(C,P) = 3.8 Hz, C≡CH2CH3), 25.4 (d, 3J(C,P) = 14.4 Hz, CH3), 27.7 (s, C≡CH2CH3), 27.8 (s, C≡CH2CH3), 31.3 (s, p-C(CH3)3), 32.5 (d, 3J(C,P) = 6.2 Hz, o-C(CH3)3), 35.0 (s, o-C(CH3)3), 37.9 (p-C(CH3)3), 68.4 (s, C≡CH2), 84.3 (s, C≡CH), 85.8 (d, 3J(P,C) = 29.1 Hz, P=C=C=C), 97.5 (d, 3J(C,P) = 18.6 Hz, P≡C=C≡C), 121.6 (s, meta-PH), 136.1 (d, 3J(C,P) = 60.3 Hz, P−C), 150.3 (s, para-PH), 153.7 (s, 13P{1H} NMR (161.8 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 275.3 ppm; 13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 18.0 (s, C≡CH2CH3), 19.9 (d, 3J(C,P) = 3.8 Hz, C≡CH2CH3), 25.4 (d, 3J(C,P) = 14.4 Hz, CH3), 27.7 (s, C≡CH2CH3), 27.8 (s, C≡CH2CH3), 31.3 (s, p-C(CH3)3), 32.5 (d, 3J(C,P) = 6.2 Hz, o-C(CH3)3), 35.0 (s, o-C(CH3)3), 37.9 (p-C(CH3)3), 68.4 (s, C≡CH2), 84.3 (s, C≡CH), 85.8 (d, 3J(P,C) = 29.1 Hz, P=C=C=C), 97.5 (d, 3J(C,P) = 18.6 Hz, P≡C=C≡C), 121.6 (s, meta-PH), 136.1 (d, 3J(C,P) = 60.3 Hz, P−C), 150.3 (s, para-PH), 153.7 (s, ortho-PH), 162.0 ppm (d, 3J(P,C) = 32.4 Hz, P=C); MS (ESI): z/m: 515.4 (100) [M+Ag]+; HRMS (ESI): m/z calc for C33H34NNaP: 508.3109; found: 508.3106 [M+Na]+; m/z calc for C31H32NiNaP: 486.3290; found: 486.3303 [M+H]+; elemental analysis calc (%) for C31H32NiNaP: C 81.61, H 9.13, found: C 81.59, H 8.92. The assignment was based on the assignment of 1-(2-pyridyl)octa-1,7-diene.210

**Phosphaalkene 4b and 4c** were prepared in a procedure analogous to that used for the preparation of 4a in 96 and 54% yield, respectively (see the Supporting Information).

**Phosphaalkene 5a:** Phosphaalkene 4a (250 mg, 0.51 mmol) and [Pz2Cl2] (149 mg, 0.51 mmol) were added to a 150 mL Schlenk flask, and the two compounds were dried for 2 h. THF (10 mL) was added, and the yellow solution was cooled to −78 °C. nBuLi (0.41 mL, 1.02 mmol, 2.5 in hexanes) was added, and the resulting green solution was stirred at this temperature for 1 h and then warmed to room temperature upon which it turned red and left overnight. The following morning the solution was cooled to −78 °C and PhPBr2 (0.11 mL, 0.56 mmol) was added. The red solution was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 4 h followed by a filtration through basic alumina. The alumina was rinsed with THF (3 ×15 mL) until the color of the eluent disappeared. The yellow-orange solution was concentrated to yield 5a as a yellow solid. In cases in which purification was needed, the phosphole was purified by column chromatography on silica with 10% Et2O in pentane or by recrystallization from either pentane or CH3Cl/CH2CN. Yield: 127 mg, 0.21 mmol (42%). 1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 1.23 (s, 9H, tert-Bu); 1.30 (s, 9H, tert-Bu); 1.37 (s, 9H, tert-Bu); 1.52 (d, 3J(P,H) = 13.5 Hz, 3H, CH3), 1.70 (m, 2H, CH2CH2CH3), 1.82 (m, 2H, C≡CH2CH3), 2.81 (m, 2H, C≡CH2CH3), 3.11 (m, 1H, C≡CH3), 3.33 (m, 1H, C≡CH3), 6.95 (dd, 3J(H,H) = 7.4 Hz, 4.8 Hz, 3J(H,H) = 1.1 Hz, 1J(H,H) = 1.0 Hz, pyridyl H6); 7.15−7.34 (m, 3H, Ph), 7.34−7.41 (m, 4H, Mes*, Ph), 7.41−7.43 (m, 1H, pyridyl H3), 7.52 (dd, 3J(H,H) = 7.9, 7.4 Hz, 1J(H,H) = 1.9 Hz, 1J(H,H) = 1.9 Hz, pyridyl H4), 8.47 ppm (dd, 3J(H,H) = 4.8 Hz, 3J(H,H) = 1.9 Hz, 1J(H,H) = 1.0 Hz, pyridyl H6); 13P NMR (161.8 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 10.4 (d, 3J(P,P) = 89.7 Hz), 249.0 ppm (d, 3J(P,P) = 89.7 Hz); 13C NMR (100 MHz, CDCl3): δ = 23.7 (s, C≡CH2C6H4), 24.0 (s, C≡CH2C6H4) (dd, 3J(C,P) = 14.4, 14.6 Hz, P−C≡C), 29.7 (s, C≡CH2C6H4), 30.6 (d, 3J(C,P) = 4.9 Hz, C≡CH2C6H4), 31.6 (s, CH3, para-tBu), 32.4 (d, 3J(C,P) = 6.4 Hz, CH3, ortho-tBu), 32.9 (d, 3J(C,P) = 7.4 Hz, CH3, ortho-tBu), 35.4 (s, para-C(CH3)), 38.2 (s, ortho-C(CH3)), 38.4 (s, ortho-C(CH3)), 120.7 (s, 5J, pyridyl), 122.2 (d, 3J(C,P) = 13.7 Hz, CH, phenyl), 123.8 (d, 3J(C,P) = 9.5 Hz, C3, pyridyl), 128.9 (d,
(Cp 2ZrCl2) (224 mg, 0.77 mmol) were added to a 100 mL Schlenk flask, and the two compounds were dried for 4 h. THF (20 mL) was added, and the yellow-orange solution was cooled to \(-78\) °C. nBuLi (0.50 mL, 1.25 mmol, 2.5 M in hexanes) was added, and the resulting red solution was stirred at this temperature for 1 h and then warmed to room temperature and left overnight. The following morning the solution was cooled to \(-78\) °C, and PhPBr1 (0.18 mL, 0.9 mmol) was added. The red solution was warmed to room temperature and stirred for 24 h followed by a filtration through basic alumina. The alumina was rinsed with THF (3\times20\) mL) until the color of the eluent disappeared. The yellow-orange solution was concentrated, redissolved in CH2Cl2, and an excess amount of sulfur was added. The solution was stirred overnight at room temperature, filtered, and the solvent was removed under vacuum. Column chromatography was performed on silica using pure pentane to elute the remaining starting material and byproducts, and then the polarity was increased to 5\% EtO in pentane. This gave 6b as an orange solid. Yield 74 mg, 0.12 mmol (19\%). 1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl3): \(\delta =1.24\) (s, 9 H; tert-Bu), 1.29 (s, 9 H; tert-Bu), 1.40 (d, \(\delta =1.7\) Hz, 3 H; CH3), 1.45 (s, 9 H; tert-Bu), 1.87 (m, 4 H; CH2), 2.92 (m, 2 H; CH2), 3.08 (m, 2 H; CH2) 6.96 (dd, \(\delta =1.7\) Hz, 1.5 Hz, 1 H; H4, thienyl H4), 7.24 (d, \(\delta =1.7\) Hz, 1 H; thienyl, H5), 7.33 (d, \(\delta =1.7\) Hz, 1 H; thienyl, H3), 7.34 (s, 1 H; Mes*) 7.38 (s, 1 H; Mes*), 7.41 (m, 3 H; m-/p-H Ph), 7.87 ppm (ddd, \(\delta =1.5, 8.0, 13.9\) Hz, 2 H; ortho-phenyl); 13P(1H) NMR (161.8 MHz, CDCl3): \(\delta =51.7\) (d, \(\delta =36.7\) Hz, 268.6 ppm (d, \(\delta =36.7\) Hz). 13C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl3): \(\delta =23.1\) (s; C8, CH3), 23.3 (s, d, \(\delta =23.7\) Hz, C8, CH3), 25.6 (dd, \(\delta =14.3, 4.6\) Hz; P-CH3), 29.6 (d, \(\delta =13.0\) Hz, C8, CH3), 30.5 (dd, \(\delta =9.1, 13.3\) Hz, C8, CH3), 31.6 (s; CH3, para-Br), 32.8 (d, \(\delta =7.0\) Hz, CH3, ortho-Br), 33.1 (d, \(\delta =6.9\) Hz, CH3, para-Br), 35.4 (s; para-C(CH3)2), 38.2 (s; ortho-C(CH3)2), 38.5 (s; ortho-C(CH3)2), 122.2 (s, C5, pyridyl), 122.4 (s, CH, phenyl), 124.6 (d, \(\delta =2.5\) Hz; C3, pyridyl), 129.2 (d, \(\delta =73.2\) Hz; ipso-C, phenyl), 129.2 (d, \(\delta =12.4\) Hz; CH, phenyl), 131.5 (s; CH, Mes*), 131.5 (s; CH, Mes*), 132.1 (d, \(\delta =3.0\) Hz; phenyl), 136.2 (s; C4, pyridyl), 136.9 (d, \(\delta =63.7\) Hz; ipso-C, Mes*), 141.4 (d, \(\delta =21.0\) Hz; C14/ C7), 142.2 (d, \(\delta =21.1\) Hz; C14/ C7), 147.8 (d, \(\delta =18.3\), 23.9 Hz; C13), 149.8 (s; pyridyl C6), 150.8 (s; Mes*), 152.9 (d, \(\delta =16.8\) Hz; C8), 153.7 (dd, \(\delta =20.9, 5.4\) Hz; pyridyl C2), 154.6 (s; Mes*), 174.0 ppm (dd, \(\delta =8.2, 46.5\) Hz; P-Cl); HRMS (ESI): \(m/z = 653.2567\) [M+Na]⁺; calculated for C39H28NaP2S2: 653.2564.

Phosphaalkene 6c was prepared from 4c in 29\% isolated yield analogously to the procedure described for 6b (see the Supporting Information).

Phosphaalkene 7: [AuCl(thtl)] (22 mg, 0.068 mmol) was added to PPA 5a (40 mg, 0.068 mmol) in CH2Cl2 (10 mL), and the reaction mixture turned immediately red. The mixture was stirred under argon for 1 h and the solvent was removed under vacuum. Recrystallization from CH2Cl2/CH3CN. Compound 7 was obtained as a red-orange solid. Yield: 55 mg, 0.067 mmol (98\%). 1H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl3): \(\delta =1.23\) (brs, 9 H; tert-Bu), 1.30 (s, 9 H; tert-Bu), 1.39 (s, 9 H; tert-Bu) 1.54 (d, \(\delta =14.9\) Hz, 3 H; CH3), 1.81 (m, 4 H; C8, CH3), 2.94 (m, 1 H; C8, CH3), 3.05 (m, 2 H; C8, CH3), 3.23 (m, 1 H; CH3, CH2), 7.09 ppm (1 H; pyridyl H5), 7.38 (s, 5 H; Mes*, Ph), 7.62 (m, 2 H; pyridyl H3 and/or H4 and/or phenyl), 7.75 ppm (m, 2 H; pyridyl H3 and/or H4 and/or phenyl), 8.45 ppm (m, 1 H; pyridyl H6); 13P(1H) NMR (161.8 MHz, CDCl3): \(\delta =38.3\) (d, \(\delta =75.6\) Hz, 279.4 ppm (d, \(\delta =75.6\) Hz). 13C NMR (101 MHz, CDCl3): \(\delta =22.3\) (s; C8, CH3), 22.8 (s; C8, CH3), 107.4 (brm; P-CH3), 29.7 (d, \(\delta =9.9\) Hz; C8, CH3), 30.6 (brm; C8, CH3), 31.4 (para-Br), 32.5 (brm; CH3, ortho-Br, both groups), 35.1 (s; para-C(CH3)2), 37.7 (s; ortho-C(CH3)2), 37.9 (s; ortho-C(CH3)2), 121.8 (s;
22 mg, 0.021 mmol (61%). 1H NMR (400 MHz, CD2Cl2):
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