Photoredox catalysis is photoinduced electron transfer (PET) catalysis.

Photoinduced electron transfer is an excited state electron transfer process by which an excited electron is transferred from a donor to an acceptor. Since an excited state molecule has an electron in an antibonding orbital as well as a vacancy in its highest energy bonding orbital, the resultant excited state molecule is both a better oxidant and a stronger reductant than the ground state molecule. Consequently, intermolecular electron transfer is more facile. Photoredox catalysis leverages the intermediate radical species to promote novel chemical reactivity. "Visible light photoredox catalysis"... "relies on the ability of metal complexes and organic dyes to engage in single-electron transfer (SET) processes with organic substrates upon photoexcitation with light." - MacMillan and coworkers, 2013

This discussion is restricted to selected transition metal mediated reactions with applications to organic synthesis post 2006, with emphasis placed on the most recent work. See http://www.scripps.edu/baran/images/grpmtgpdf/Yan_2014.pdf for Ming Yan's discussion of PET prior to 2006.





where [P] = photoredox catalyst; D = electron donor; A = electron acceptor; S = redox neutral substrate

Common donors (**D**): amines, alcohols, thiols, ethers, E_{rich}Arenes Common acceptors (**A**): carbonyls, halides, E_{poor}Arenes

Photoredox catalysts promote SET processes via *intermolecular quenching* pathways. Graphical depiction of intermolecular quenching by PET: Consider this in the context of all possible electronic transitions:*



Key Reviews: Prier, C. K.; Rankic, D. A.; MacMillan, D.W.M. Chem. Rev. 2013, 113, 5322.; Tucker, J. W.; Stephenson, C. R. J. J. Org. Chem. 2012, 77, 1617. *Jablonski diagram taken from http://www.shsu.edu/chm_tgc/chemilumdir/JABLONSKI.html

Anslyn, E.V.; Dougherty, D.A. Modern Physical Organic Chemistry, University Science Books, 2006.

Photoelectronic properties of transition metal phototoredox catalysts. ex) The case of $[Ru(bpy)_3]^{2+}$:



 $\tau = 1.1 \ \mu S$

 $\lambda_{em} = 615 \text{ nm}$

 $\Phi_{\rm em} = 0.095$





Simplified molecular orbital diagram for [Ru(bpy)₃]⁺². L₆[Ru]⁺² is octahedral, d⁶, max CFSE ∴ substitutionally inert



Corresponding Jablonski Diagram



Some other common transition metal photoredox catalysts:





Θ PF₆

lr(III)(ppy) ₃	[Ir(III)(ppy) ₂ (dtbbpy)] ⁺ PF ₆ ⁻
$E(Ir^{IV}/Ir^{*III}) = -1.73 V$	$E(Ir^{IV}/Ir^{*III}) = -0.96 V$
$E(Ir^{*III}/Ir^{II}) = +0.31 \text{ V}$	$E(Ir^{*III}/Ir^{II}) = +0.66 V$
τ = 1.9 μs	$\tau = 0.56 \ \mu s$
λ_{abs} = 375 nm	$\lambda_{abs} = 410 \text{ nm}$
λ _{em} = 518 nm	λ _{em} = 581 nm
<u> </u>	

Ir(III)[dF(CF₃)ppy]₂(dtbbpy)+ $E(Ir^{IV}/Ir^{*III}) = -0.89 V$ $E(|r^{*|||}/|r^{||}) = +1.21 \text{ V}$ $\tau = 2.3 \,\mu s$ $\lambda_{abs} = 380 \text{ nm}$ $\lambda_{em} = 470 \text{ nm}$ $\Phi_{\rm em} = 0.68$

Some general trends should be noted:

- $[Ir]^{+3}$ is a better oxidant than $[Ru]^{+2}$ (higher OS to be d⁶ \therefore more electron poor) cf. $[Ru(bpy)]^{2+}$ with $[Ir(bpy)_3^{3+}]$ ($E(M^+/M^*) = -0.88$ V and $E(M^*/M^+) = +1.18$ V)
- [Ir]+3 has a larger LFSE and HOMO/LUMO gap than [Ru]+2 and therefore requires more photonic input (needs higher energy light for excitation. This leads to a larger difference between reduction and oxidation potentials)
- As electron density of the metal center increases, the oxidative power of the complex decreases.
- As electron density of the ligand increases, the reductive power of the complex increases
- [Ir]⁺³ can support a heteroleptic ligand set, while [Ru]⁺² is better with homoleptic ligand sets. Two reasons for this include the greater charge of [Ir]+3, allowing it to better stabilize anionic ligands, and improved spin-orbit coupling in larger elements, which improves MLCT efficiency. Since symmetric ligands make MLCT less efficient because of lower orbital degeneracy, use of metals with better spinorbit coupling can compensate for decreased MLCT efficiency resulting from use of heteroleptic ligand sets.

[Ir]+3 complexes therefore are generally more powerful and versatile than [Ru]+2 complexes.

MOT is very useful for predicting the relative behaviour of different complexes.

Tucker, J. W.; Stephenson, C. R. J. J. Org. Chem. 2012, 77, 1617.; Prier, C. K.; Rankic, D. A.; MacMillan, D.W.M. Chem. Rev. 2013, 113, 5322. see E. R. Welin's MacMillan Group Meeting' (02/12/15) (http://www.princeton.edu/chemistry/macmillan/group-meetings/ERW Behind the Scenes.pdf) for more details Kinetic Parameters of electron transfer.

A favorable potential difference is a thermodynamic factor. Favorable kinetics are also requisite to successfully close a photoredox catalytic cycle. For the cases of substitutionally inert d⁶ octahedral [Ru]²⁺ and [Ir]³⁺, two outer sphere electron transfer processes must occur to close a catalytic cycle:

1) an electron transfer to quench the excited state

2) a subsequent electron transfer to regenerate the ground-state catalyst

Marcus theory relates relevant thermodynamic factors to the rate of these ET processes:

 $k_{\rm et} = 4\pi^2 / h \left| {\sf H}_{{\sf A},{\sf B}} \right|^2 (4\pi\lambda k_{\rm b}T)^{-1/2} e \left[-(\lambda + \Delta {\sf G}^{\rm o})^2 (4\lambda k_{\rm b}T)^{-1/2} \right]$

where h = Plank's constant

|H_{AB}| represents the electronic coupling of the reaction partners

 λ = the reorganization energy. This represents the energy required for the reorganization of the precursor complex to the same configuration of the successor complex without the corresponding transfer of an electron.

 $k_{\rm b}$ = Boltzmann's constant

T = absolute temperature

 $\Delta G^{o} = Gibb's$ free energy

Basically, this equation says that the rate of electron transfer between A and B depends on how well A and B are electronically coupled, how easily A and B can reorganize their structures (including the solvent cage) following ET, the absolute temperature, and the degree of exergonicity of the reaction.

 $k_{\rm et}$ increases when A and B...are better coupled electronically

- ...require less structural reorganization leading up to and following ET
- ...as T decreases
- ...as ΔG^o increases (exergonicity increases), until the Marcus inverted region

The size k_{et} relative to the other rate constants k_{a} , k_{cr} , k_{esc} , etc. is also crucial to have a sufficient amount of the desired quenching products for a successful reaction.

Transition metal photoredox catalysts have relatively low reorganization energies, long triplet lifetimes (improves probability of intermolecular quenching) and are fairly stable to radicals (which means cat. decomposition is slow). These factors lead to favorable $k_{\rm et}$ values. Quenching by ET is ~ 10-20% efficient with these complexes.



Selected examples of other Visible Light Photocatalysts:



Tucker, J. W.; Stephenson, C. R. J. J. Org. Chem. 2012, 77, 1617.; Closs, G.L.; Miller, J.R. Science 1988, 240(4851), 440.

Table	1. Redox Potential	s and Select	ed Photoph	ysical Proj	perties of (Commonly Utilized	Visible Light Pl	hotocatalysts ^a	a) in Volts vs SCE; measured in MeCN at	
entry	photocatalyst	$E_{1/2}$ (M ⁺ /M*)	E _{1/2} (M*/M ⁻)	$E_{1/2}$ (M ⁺ /M)	E _{1/2} (M/M ⁻)	excited-state lifetime, $ au$ (ns)	excitation λ_{max} (nm)	emission λ_{max} (nm)	rt. b) determined in propylene carbonate	
1	Ru(bpm) ₃ ²⁺	-0.21	+0.99	+1.69	-0.91	131 ^b	454	639 ^b	c) determined in	
2	$\operatorname{Ru}(bpz)_{3}^{2+}$	-0.26	+1.45	+1.86	-0.80	740	443	591	d) determined in	
3	$\operatorname{Ru}(bpy)_{3}^{2+}$	-0.81	+0.77	+1.29	-1.33	1100	452	615	CH ₂ Cl ₂	
4	$\operatorname{Ru}(\operatorname{phen})_3^{2+}$	-0.87	+0.82	+1.26	-1.36	500	422	610 ^c	EtOH/MeOH glass at	
5	Ir[dF(CF ₃) ppy] ₂ (dtbbpy) ⁺	-0.89	+1.21	+1.69	-1.37	2300	380	470	77 K	
6	$Ir(ppy)_2(dtbbpy)^+$	-0.96	+0.66	+1.21	-1.51	557		581		
7	$Cu(dap)_2^+$	-1.43		+0.62		270		670 ^d	Talaan faana Ohaan	
8	fac-Ir(ppy) ₃	-1.73	+0.31	+0.77	-2.19	1900	375	494 ^e	<i>Rev.</i> 2013 , <i>113</i> , 5322.	
Selected reviews, perspectives and hightlights in reverse chronological order: Recent (2010-2014) advances in asymmetric C-C bond formation: Pena-Lopez, M.; Rosas-Hernandez, A.; Beller, M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2015, 54, 5006. Olefin difunctionalizations via photoredox catalysis: Beatty, J.W.; Stephenson, C.J. Acc. Chem. Res. 2015, 48, 1474. Recent (2010-2015) advances in photoredox catalysis: Angnes, R.A. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2015, 13, 9152 C-H functionalization via photoredox catalysis: Xie. J. et al. Tetrahedron Lett. 2014, 55, 36. Radical additions into iminium ions and cationic heterocycles: Tauber, J. et al. Molecules 2014, 19, 16190. Recent (2010-2013) advances in organic dye mediated photoredox catalysis: Nicewicz, D.A.; Nguyen, T.M. ACS Catal. 2014, 4, 355. [Ru] and [Ir] photoredox catalysis: Koike, T.; Akita, M. Inorg. Chem. Front. 2014, 57, 967. Oxidative photoredox activation of aliphatic nucleophiles for C(sp3)-C(sp2) cross coupling reactions (Pd, Ni, Au): Jahn, E.; Jahn, U. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2014, 53, 13326.										
Cumthes	an the signed and the									

Synthesis of α -alkyl substituted aldehydes (incl. photoredox): Hodgson, D. M.; Charlton, A. Tetrahedron 2014, 70, 2207.

Eosin Y in photoredox catalysis: Hari, D. P.; Koenig, B. Chem. Commun. 2014, 50, 6688.

Photoredox catalysis in flow: Garlets, Z. J.; Nguyen, J. D.; Stephenson, C. R. J. Isr. J. Chem. 2014, 54, 351.

Organic dyes as photoredox catalysts: Fukuzumi, S.; Ohkubo, K. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2014, 12, 6059.

Photocatalyst selection for desired reactivity: Douglas, J. J.; Nguyen, J. D.; Cole, K. P.; Stephenson, C. R. J. Aldrichimica Acta 2014, 47, 15.

Photoredox catalysis in carbocyclic and heterocyclic ring construction: Xuan, J.; Lu, L.-Q.; Chen, J.-R.; Xiao, W.-J. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2013, 2013, 6755.

Synthetic applications of photoredox catalysis (5): Xi, Y.; Yi, H.; Lei, A. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2013, 11, 2387; Reckenthaeler, M.; Griesbeck, A. G. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2013, 355, 2727.; Koike, T.; Akita, M. Synlett 2013, 24, 2492.; Narayanam, J. M. R.; Stephenson, C. R. J. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2011, 40, 102.; Zeitler, K. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2009, 48, 9785. Synthetic applications of transition metal photoredox catalysis: Prier, C. K.; Rankic, D. A.; MacMillan, D. W. C. Chem. Rev. 2013, 113, 5322.

Photoredox generated amine radical cation chemistry: Hu, J.; Wang, J.; Nguyen, T. H.; Zheng, N. Beilstein J. Org. Chem. 2013, 9, 1977.

Theory and applications of photoredox catalysis: Tucker, J. W.; Stephenson, C. R. J. J. Org. Chem. 2012, 77, 1617.

α-amino C-H functionalization via photoredox catalysis: Shi, L.; Xia, W. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2012, 41, 7687.

Historical roots of photoredox chemistry and chemistry of [Ru(bpy)₃]²⁺: Teply, F. Collect. Czech. Chem. Commun. 2011, 76, 859.

Asymmetric alkylation of aldehydes using photoredox catalysis: Melchiorre, P. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2009, 48, 1360.; Renaud, P.; Leong, P. Science (Washington, DC, U. S.) 2008, 322, 55.

Steven Crossley



Prier, C. K.; Rankic, D. A.; MacMillan, D.W.M. Chem. Rev. 2013, 113, 5322.







Yoon, T.P. & co. Chem. Sci. 2010, 3, 2807.

Yoon, T.P. & co. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 19350.

Ме





C-C bond formation



Asymmetric C-C bond formation

Photoredox plus chiral organocatalysis Asymmetric C-C bond formation Because photoredox catalysts are primarily involved in initiating and terminating [lr(dtbbpy)(ppy)₂]PF₆ reactions via outer-sphere SET (aka generating reactive radical species), they are not (0.5 mol%) usually closely associated with the reactive organic molecules and do not catalyze the A (20 mol%) bond forming step. For this reason, alongside the inherent challenge (early transition state in bond formation) of using radicals to form bonds, enantioselective bond -20 °C, visible light $R^1 = alkyl, aryl$ formation has been particularly challenging. The most successful strategies to date up to 89% yield & 99% ee have employed ancilliary chiral catalysts. $R^4 = F$, fluoroalkyl Oxidative biaryl coupling with a chiral photocatalyst MacMillan, D.W.C. & co. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 10875. Photoredox plus Stetter OH Δ -Ru(menbpy)₂²⁺ OH OH Co(acac)₃ (1.2 eq.) MeCN, visible light $[Ru(bpy)_3^{2+}]$ (1 mol%) X = H (16% ee)NHC (5 mol%) X = OMe (4% ee)*m*-dinitrobenzene via: up to 94% yield and 92% ee +2 CH₂Cl₂, visible light $R^1 = Me, Et, nPr, alkyl$ OH 0 Ru Me NHC Br Mechanism? R= Δ -Ru(menbpy)₃²⁺ Me Me Hamada, T. et al. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1993, 909.; Hamada, T. et al. J. Mol. Catal. 1994, 88, L1. Photoredox plus chiral organocatalysis $[Ru(bpy)_3]^{+2}$ or $lr(ppy)_{3}$ (0.5 mol%) A or B (20 mol%) visible light R¹ $R^1 = alkyl, aryl$ up to 93% yield & 99% ee $R^{2}, R^{3} = EWG, H$ via: $R^{2} = H; R^{3} = aryl$ NMe NMe **A**, X = Me, Y = tBu**B**, X = Bn, Y = Me

MacMillan & co. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 13600; Science 2008, 322, 77.

DiRocco, D.A.; Rovis, T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 8094.

Asymmetric C-C bond formation





C-C bond formation

Ph

Me



Photoredox catalysts have been used in concert with other transition metals in as least two general ways. One is through the generation of reactive intermediates for another metal's catalytic cycle. The second is as an an active participant in the redox cycle of the other transition metal.

Dual catalysis with nickel (Ni^{0/1/2/3} cycle)

R¹BF₃K or	+	ArX	[Ir] or [Ru] + [Ni]	Ar-R ^{1,2}	
R ² COOH				57-99%	
Molander & co.			R¹BF₃K	X = Bi	
MacMillan, D	oyle,	& co.	R ² COOH	X = CI, Br, I	

$$R^1 = \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{1}{2}} Ar}$$

R² =
$$K''$$
 NR'Boc

R' = alkyl R'' = alkyl or aryl

Molander, G. & co. Science 2014, 345, 433.; Doyle, A.G.; MacMillan, D.W.M. & co. Science, 2014, 345, 437

Decarboxylative Heck coupling with [Ni]

&

Ir[dF(CF₃)ppy]₂(dtbbpy)PF₆ \mathbb{R}^2 (1 mol%), NiCl₂(dtbbpy) (2 mol%) R¹COOH 1.2 equiv. Cs₂CO₃, 25 °C, blue LED, 18 h

 \mathbf{R}^4 60-96%



 $R^2 = alkvl$





MacMillan & co. J. Am.Chem. Soc, 2015, 137, 2195.

Merging Pd and photoredox catalysis for C-H arylations





Sanford & co. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 11234.

Photoredox and [Cu] for trifluoromethylation





 $Ru(bpy)_{3}Cl_{2}$ (1 mol%)

Ru(bpy)₃Cl₂ (2.5 mol%)

Pd(OAc)₂ (10 mol%)

0.1 equiv Ag₂CO₃, MeOH, 25 °C, visible light (76%))



Proposed mechanism:



Sanford & co. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 9034.

Toste, F. D. & co. J. Am. Chem. Soc, 2013, 136, 5844.

C-H Functionalization

C-H Functionalization

N-H BDE =

100 kcal/mol

-ОН

0

Ĥ

Ѓ∖он он

0

Jeffrey, J. L.; Terrett, J. A.; MacMillan, D. W. Science 2015, 349, 1523.

(+)-Gliocladin C

Furst, L.; Narayanam, J. M. R.; Stephenson, C. R. J. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 9655.

Zhang, J.; Chen, J.; Zhang, X.; Lei, X. J. Org. Chem. 2014, 79, 10682.