Importance of π-Bonding in the 2*p* – Sublevel: Impact on Molecular Structure and Reactivity



Dr. Jaydip Gangopadhyay Associate Professor Department of Chemistry St. Paul's Cathedral Mission College, Kolkata – 700 009

Group	Oxides	Common Acids
14 (IVB)		
С	CO, CO_2, C_3O_2 etc.	H ₂ CO ₃
Si	(SiO ₂) _n	H ₄ SiO ₄ , H ₂ SiO ₃
Ge	(GeO ₂) _n	
	••••••	

Group	Oxides	Common Acids
15 (VB)		
Ν	$N_2O_1 NO_1 N_2O_3, NO_2, N_2O_4, N_2O_5$	HNO ₃ (monomeric (oxidizing), HNO ₂ (stronger oxidant but weaker reductant)
Ρ	(P ₂ O ₃) ₂ , (P ₂ O ₅) ₂	(HPO ₃) _n (non- oxidising), H ₃ PO ₄ , H ₃ PO ₃
As	$(As_2O_3)_2$, $(As_2O_5)_2$	H ₃ AsO ₄ (oxidizing), As(OH) ₃

Group	Oxides	Common Acids
16 (VIB)		
0	••••••	••••••
S	SO ₂ (mainly reducing in aqueous solution)	H ₂ SO ₃ (aqueous, reducing), H ₂ SO ₄ (feebly oxidizing)
Se	(SeO ₂) _n (oxidizing)	H ₂ SeO ₃ (oxidizing)
Те	(TeO ₂) _n	Te(OH) ₆

Group	Oxides	Common Acids
17 (VIIB)		
F	••••••	Practically no tendency to form oxyacids
Cl		HClO ₄ (non-oxidizing in aqueous solution but powerful oxidant at elevated temperature)
Br		HBrO ₄ (Strong oxidant)
Ι		H ₅ IO ₆ (moderately strong oxidant but kinetically labile)

2*p*-Orbital Involvement in Controlling Dimerization and Polymerization Reactions

unlike BX_3 , the halides of other congeners are dimeric: M_2X_6 (M = Al, Ga, In and X = Cl, Br, I)



separation of charge due to EN difference: INSTABILITY

<u>neutralization of charge occurs either by</u>: (a) suitable π-bond formation (b) heterocatenation leading to aggregation



2*p*-Orbital Involvement in Controlling Dimerization and Polymerization Reactions

equivalent resonance structures:





inefficient π bonding due to larger internuclear separation and more diffuse nature of 3p orbitals



B(CH₃)₃: MONOMERIC BMe₃ fails to dimerize due to: (i) loss in hyperconjugational stability (ii) steric congestion around the relatively small B atom by the CH₃ groups

for M₂(CH₃)₆ (M = Al(III), Ga(III), In(III)) dimers are available owing to lack of hyperconjugational stability and larger atomic volume of central atom to expand coordination number without facing severe steric congestion

2*p*-Orbital Involvement in Controlling Dimerization and Polymerization Reactions



high degree of π -nature in C–O linkages

C=O bond energy = 806 kJ mol⁻¹ C-O bond energy = 359 kJ mol⁻¹



Si-O bond energy 466 kJ mol⁻¹ Si=O bond energy 642 kJ mol⁻¹

polymerization: to satisfy Lewis acidity of Si^{δ+} and Lewis basicity of O^{δ-}



Effect on Lewis Acidity



for BX_3 (X = F, Cl, Br) the change of Gibbs free energy follows the order: $-\Delta G_1 < -\Delta G_2 < -\Delta G_3$ $\Delta G^0 = -RTInK_{eq}$ the trend for Lewis acidity: $\underline{BF_3 < BCl_3 < BBr_3}$

 BF_3 being enjoying high degree of π bonding stability, will have the maximum loss of stabilization due to loss of π bonding in course of exhibiting Lewis acidity

reverse order of acidity is found for SiX_4 (X = F, Cl, Br)

 p_{π} - d_{π} back bonding is feeble and the effect of EN difference between Si and X atoms governs the relative acid strengths, thus: SiF₄ > SiCl₄ > SiBr₄

Effect on Lewis Acidity

BPh_3 is a weaker acid than BMe_3



direct conjugation of the boron acceptor orbital into the phenyl aromatic π system in triphenyl boron lowers the acidity of BPh₃ relative to BMe₃ where only hyperconjugation is operative

> if σ effects were only operative, BPh₃ would have been a stronger acid than BMe₃

Effect on Lewis Basicity

dimethyl ether is a better Lewis base than disiloxane



absence of disiloxane adducts with BF_3 and BCl_3 : $(CH_3)_2O + BF_3 \rightarrow (CH_3)_2O \rightarrow BF_3$ $(SiH_3)_2O + BF_3 \rightarrow No$ adduct

H₃CNCS is a better Lewis base than H₃SiNCS



delocalization of the lone pair into a π orbital on the Si atom leads to insignificant Lewis basicity in H₃SiN=C=S

Stability of Ylids and Effect on Dipole Moments

$R_{2}P^{+} - CH_{2}$ vs. $R_{2}N^{+} - CH_{2}$

ammonium ylids are more basic and reactive than the phosphorus ylids

commercially available because of stability in air

$$R_{3}P^{+} - {}^{-}CH_{2} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad R_{3}P = CH_{2}$$

reasoni

but

both resonating structures contribute towards stability of the phosphorus ylids;

the second resonating structure arises from d orbital conjugation

$$R_3N^+ - CH_2 \quad \leftrightarrow \qquad \bigstar$$

dipole moment of $R_3N \rightarrow O(5.02 D) > R_3P \rightarrow O(4.37 D)$

the phosphine oxides can have contribution from dative $d\pi p$ bonding: $R_{2}P^{+}-O^{-} \leftrightarrow R_{2}P=O$

Effect on Structure of Oxyacids & Influence on Redox Properties

HNO₃ and its analog of phosphorus



extensive π bonding in NO₃⁻



HPO₃ (hypothetical):



heterocatenated P-O-P bond

 $HPO_3 \rightarrow H_3PO_4$

Effect on Structure of Oxyacids & Influence on Redox Properties



neutralization of charge separation through extensive π bonding



lower π character in Br–O linkages



similar behavior is expected for H₂SO₄, H₂SeO₄ and Te(OH)₆

Effect on Structure of Oxyacids & Influence on Redox Properties

 $ClO_4^- + 2H^+ + 2e \rightarrow ClO_3^- + H_2O$ ($E^0_{red} = +1.201 V$)

 $BrO_4^- + 2H^+ + 2e \rightarrow BrO_3^- + H_2O$ ($E^0_{red} = +1.853 V$)

 $H_{5}IO_{6} + H^{+} + 2e \rightarrow IO_{3}^{-} + 3H_{2}O$ $H_{5}IO_{6} + H^{+} + 2e \rightarrow IO_{3}^{-} + 3H_{2}O$ $H_{6}IO_{4} + H^{+} + 2e \rightarrow IO_{3}^{-} + 3H_{2}O$ $H_{6}IO_{4} + H^{+} + 2e \rightarrow IO_{3}^{-} + 3H_{2}O$ $H_{6}IO_{4} + H^{+} + 2e \rightarrow IO_{3}^{-} + 3H_{2}O$ $H_{6}IO_{4} + H^{+} + 2e \rightarrow IO_{3}^{-} + 3H_{2}O$ $H_{6}IO_{4} + H^{+} + 2e \rightarrow IO_{3}^{-} + 3H_{2}O$ $H_{6}IO_{4} + H^{+} + 2e \rightarrow IO_{3}^{-} + 3H_{2}O$

Reaction Coordinate

 $(E_{red}^{0} = +1.653 V)$ $BrO_{4}^{-} is thermodynamically less stable than either ClO_{4}^{-} or IO_{4}^{-}$ $\Delta G_{f}^{0} values :$ $KClO_{4}: -302 kJ mol^{-1}$ $KBrO_{4}: -174 kJ mol^{-1}$ $KIO_{4}: -349 kJ mol^{-1}$ $thus, -\Delta G_{1} < -\Delta G_{2} -\Delta G_{3}$ i.e. trend for oxidizing property: $ClO_{4}^{-} < H_{5}IO_{6} < BrO_{4}^{-}$

but, kinetic studies reveal the order of rate of oxidizing capacity: $ClO_4^- < BrO_4^- < H_5IO_6$

Effect on Disproportionation Reactions

the initially surprising non-existence of SF₂ is often rationalized in thermodynamic terms by a highly favorable energy for disproportionation reactions :

 $\frac{1}{8}S_8 + F_2 \rightarrow SF_2(g) \qquad \Delta E = -147 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$

 $3SF_2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{4}S_8(g) + SF_6$ $\Delta E = -546 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$

NOTE:

SF₄ does not disproportionate into S and SF₆ though the reaction should be thermodynamically spontaneous

disproportionation possible only at elevated temperatures

reaction is kinetically sluggish due to high potential barrier of the reaction involving S–F bond weakening for high π nature of the S^{$\delta+-F^{\delta-}$} linkage

Stability of Peroxo Compounds with Respect to H₂O₂

 $H_2S_2O_8$ has greater stability than H_2O_2 in spite of higher reduction potential for $S_2O_8^{2-}/SO_4^{2-}$ couple ($E^0 = +2.01$ V) its oxidizing action is very slow and can be enhanced in presence of a suitable catalyst like Ag^+



stabilization of the O–O linkage by the SO₃⁻ groups arising from their conjugation with oxygen lone pairs to confer double bond character to the lone pair via p_{π} -d_{π} bonding

Feasibility of Reactions Determined by Stability of Intermediates

feasibility of the conversion of an aldehyde to a ketone via cyclic acetal formation followed by alkylation of the carbanion depends on the stabilization of the latter as a reaction intermediate





Effect of π Bonding on Stereochemical Arrangement: A Controversy



instead:

 $(SiH_3)_3N + 4HCl \rightarrow NH_4Cl + 3SiH_3Cl$