Accepted Manuscript

Ruthenium(II) complexes of Schiff base derived from cycloalkylamines as precatalysts for ROMP of norbornene and ATRP of methyl methacrylate

Maria Beatriz A. Afonso, Thais R. Cruz, Yan F. Silva, João Clécio A. Pereira, Antonio E.H. Machado, Beatriz E. Goi, Benedito S. Lima-Neto, Valdemiro P. Carvalho-Jr

PII: S0022-328X(17)30574-0

DOI: 10.1016/j.jorganchem.2017.09.043

Reference: JOM 20118

To appear in: Journal of Organometallic Chemistry

Received Date: 4 August 2017

Revised Date: 18 September 2017

Accepted Date: 28 September 2017

Please cite this article as: M.B.A. Afonso, T.R. Cruz, Y.F. Silva, Joã.Clé.A. Pereira, A.E.H. Machado, B.E. Goi, B.S. Lima-Neto, V.P. Carvalho-Jr, Ruthenium(II) complexes of Schiff base derived from cycloalkylamines as pre-catalysts for ROMP of norbornene and ATRP of methyl methacrylate, *Journal of Organometallic Chemistry* (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.jorganchem.2017.09.043.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



Ruthenium(II) complexes of Schiff base derived from cycloalkylamines as pre-

catalysts for ROMP of norbornene and ATRP of methyl methacrylate

Maria Beatriz A. Afonso^a, Thais R. Cruz^a, Yan F. Silva^a, João Clécio A. Pereira^b, Antonio E. H. Machado^c, Beatriz E. Goi^a, Benedito S. Lima-Neto^b, Valdemiro P. Carvalho-Jr^{a*}

^aFaculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, UNESP Univ Estadual Paulista, CEP 19060-900, Presidente Prudente, SP, Brazil ^bInstituto de Química de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo, CEP 13560-970, São

Carlos, SP, Brazil

^cInstituto de Química, UFU Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, CEP 38400-902, Uberlândia, MG, Brazil.

* Correspondence to: V. P. Carvalho Jr (e-mail: valdemiro@fct.unesp.br)

Abstract

Ruthenium(II) complexes of Schiff base derived from cycloalkylamines (cycloalkyl = cyclopentyl (1a), cyclohexyl (1b), cycloheptyl (1c), and cyclooctyl) (1d) were synthesized: $[RuCl(CyPen-Salen)(PPh_3)_2]$ (2a), $[RuCl(CyHex-Salen)(PPh_3)_2]$ (2b), [RuCl(CyHep-Salen)(PPh₃)₂] (2c), and [RuCl(CyOct-Salen)(PPh₃)₂] (2d). The Schiff base-Ru^{II} complexes 2a-d were characterized by elemental analysis, FTIR, UV-Vis, ¹H-, ¹³C- and ³¹P-NMR, and cyclic voltammetry. The complexes **2a-d** were evaluated as catalytic precursors for ROMP of norbornene (NBE) and for ATRP of methyl methacrylate (MMA). The syntheses of polynorbornene (polyNBE) via ROMP with complexes 2a-d as pre-catalysts were evaluated under different reaction conditions ([HCl]/[Ru], [EDA]/[Ru], [NBE]/[Ru], and temperature). The highest yields of polyNBE were obtained with [NBE]/[HC1]/[Ru] = 5000/25/1 molar ratio in the presence of 5 µL of EDA for 60 minutes at 50 °C. MMA polymerization via ATRP was conducted using the complexes 2a-d in the presence of ethyl- α -bromoisobutyrate (EB*i*B) as initiator. The catalytic tests were evaluated as a function of the reaction time using the initial molar ratio of [MMA]/[EBiB]/[Ru] = 1000/2/1 at 85 °C. The linear correlation of ln([MMA]₀/[MMA]) and time indicates that the concentration of radicals remains constant during the polymerization and that the ATRP of MMA mediated by 2a-d proceeds in a controlled manner. Molecular weights increased linearly with conversion, however, the experimental molecular weights were higher than the theoretical ones.

Keywords: Schiff base, ruthenium complexes, ROMP, ATRP; norbornene, methyl methacrylate

1. Introduction

Schiff bases have been playing an important part in the development of coordination chemistry. Schiff base metal complexes have been studied extensively because of their attractive chemical and physical properties and their wide range of applications in numerous scientific areas [1-4]. Concurrently, complexes bearing Schiff base ligands are recognized as homogeneous or heterogeneous catalysts in various organic reactions. Schiff base complexes play a central role in various homogeneous catalytic reactions and the activity of these complexes varies with the type of ligands, coordination sites and metal ions. Furthermore, such complexes have recently attracted much attention for oxidation, epoxidation, hydrogenation, miscellaneos, and polymerization reactions [5,6].

In particular, notable works were conducted in ethylene polymerization reactions catalyzed by various metal complexes containing Schiff bases ligands. Aluminum complexes of a series of tridentate Schiff base ligands were found to catalyze the polymerization of ethylene [7]. A number of pyridyl bis(imide) complexes and phenoxy imine complexes are used as catalysts in the polymerization of ethylene [8,9]. Pyridine bis(imine) complexes of iron(III) and cobalt(II) show significant activity in the polymerization of ethylene and copolymerization of ethylene with 1-hexene [10]. The salicylaldiminato complexes of zirconium were found to be effective catalysts in ethylene polymerization and promoted radical decomposition in certain cases [11]. Poly(methylmethacrylate) was prepared in presence of Cr(III) and Ni(II) salen complexes as catalysts for the controlled radical polymerization of methyl methacrylate (MMA) monomer [12]. Verpoort et al. reported a detailed discussion on catalytic activity in the atom transfer radical polymerization (ATRP) and ring opening metathesis polymerization (ROMP) of various substrates using Schiff bases Ru catalysts [13]. The critical points of these works showed that the efficiencies of catalysts

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

were directly affected by the steric and electronic properties of the ligands. Therefore, the efforts in the easy synthesis of new catalysts and investigation of their activity in ROMP and ATRP reactions are an ongoing interest for the catalysis community.

Herein, we report the facile preparation and evaluation of novel ruthenium(II) complexes of bidentade Schiff bases derived from cycloalkylamines, where the cycloalkyl is cyclopentyl (**2a**), cyclohexyl (**2b**), cycloheptyl (**2c**), and cyclooctyl (**2d**) (Fig. 1), as precatalysts for ROMP of norbornene (NBE) and ATRP of methyl methacrylate (MMA) under different conditions of temperature, reaction time, and monomer concentration. Ethyl diazoacetate (EDA) was used as carbene source for ROMP and ethyl 2-bromoisobutyrate (EB*i*B) was used as initiator for ATRP. The goal was to observe the ring size influence and its effects on catalytic activity of the studies complexes, discussing the σ -donor ability and steric hindrance, obtaining resources to understand the factors that influence the efficiency of both reactions. Moreover, base Schiff ligands bound to ruthenium impart good stability and tolerance towards various organic functionalities, air and moisture, widening thus the area of their applications.



Fig. 1. Illustration of the Schiff base ruthenium(II) complexes (2a-d).

2. Experimental

2.1. General remarks

All reactions and manipulations were performed under nitrogen atmosphere following standard Schlenk techniques. 1,2-dichloroethane (DCE) was dried with CaCl₂ overnight, filtered, distilled and degassed by three vacuum–nitrogen cycles under nitrogen before use. Methyl methacrylate (MMA) was washed with 5% NaOH solution, dried over anhydrous MgSO₄, vacuum distilled from CaH₂ and stored under nitrogen at -18 °C before use. RuCl₃.xH₂O, 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-1-piperidinoxyl (TEMPO), tetrabutylammonium hexafluorophosphate (*n*-Bu₄NPF₆), norbornene (NBE), ethyl diazoacetate (EDA), cyclopentylamine, cyclohexylamine, cycloheptylamine, cyclooctylamine, salicylaldehyde, and ethyl 2-bromoisobutyrate (EB*i*B) were used as acquired. The [RuCl₂(PPh₃)₃] complex was prepared following the literature and its purity was checked by satisfactory elemental analysis and spectroscopic examination (³¹P{¹H} and ¹H-NMR, FTIR and EPR) [14].

2.2. Analyses

Elemental analyses were performed with a Perkin-Elmer CHN 2400 at the Elemental Analysis Laboratory of Institute of Chemistry - USP. ESR measurements from solid sample were conducted at 77 K using a Bruker ESR 300C apparatus (X-band) equipped with a TE102 cavity and an HP 52152A frequency counter. The FTIR spectra in CsI pellets were obtained on a Bomem FTIR MB 102. Electronic spectra were recorded on a Varian model Cary 500 NIR spectrophotometer, using 1 cm path length quartz cells. The ¹H and ³¹P{¹H}NMR spectra were obtained in CDCl₃ at 298 K on a Bruker DRX-400 spectrometer operating at 400.13 and

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

161.98 MHz, respectively. The obtained chemical shifts were reported in ppm relative to TMS or 85% H₃PO₄. Conversion was determined from the concentration of residual monomer measured by gas chromatography (GC) using a Shimadzu GC-2010 gas chromatograph equipped with a flame ionization detector and a 30 m (0.53 mm I.D., 0.5 µm film thickness) SPB-1 Supelco fused silica capillary column. Anisole was added to polymerization and used as an internal standard. Analysis conditions: injector and detector temperature, 250 °C; temperature program, 40 °C (4 min), 20 °C min⁻¹ until 200 °C, 200 °C (2 min). The molecular weights and the molecular weight distribution of the polymers were determined by gel permeation chromatography using a Shimadzu Prominence LC system equipped with a LC-20AD pump, a DGU-20A5 degasser, a CBM-20A communication module, a CTO-20A oven at 40 °C and a RID-10A detector equipped with two Shimadzu column (GPC-805: 30 cm, \emptyset = 8.0 mm). The retention time was calibrated with standard monodispersed polystyrene using HPLC-grade THF as an eluent at 40 °C with a flow rate of 1.0 mL min⁻¹. Electrochemical measurements were performed using an Autolab PGSTAT204 potentiostat with a stationary platinum disk and a wire as working and auxiliary electrodes, respectively. The reference electrode was Ag/AgCl. The measurements were performed at 25 °C \pm 0.1 in CH₂Cl₂ with 0.1 mol L^{-1} of *n*-Bu₄NPF₆.

2.3. General Procedure for the Preparation of Schiff-Base Ligands (1a-d)

To prepare the Schiff base ligands **1a-d**, a solution of salicylaldehyde in methanol was slowly added over a solution of the respective cycloalkylamine in methanol. The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 16 h and the product was obtained as a yellowish orange oil. Any modifications are described below for each reaction.

Schiff-Base Ligand 1a: Salicylaldehyde (0.48 g, 4.0 mmol), cyclopentylamine (0.34 g,

4.0 mmol), and methanol (15 mL) afforded 0.60 g (80%) of the title compound as a yellow oil. Refractive index 1.5626; (a) UV–Vis: $\lambda_{max(n)}$ (nm), $\varepsilon_{max(n)}$ [M⁻¹ cm⁻¹]: $\lambda_{max(1)}$ (317), $\varepsilon_{max(1)}$ [9600]; (b) IR (KBr): v_x (cm⁻¹): vC=N (1629), vC–O (1277); (c) ¹H NMR: (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): 13.8 (s, 1H, OH), 8.32 (s, 1H, CH=N), 7.27-7.31 ((dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, dd, ³J_{H,H} = 0.8 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 7.22-7.24 (dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.93-6.96 (dt, ³J_{H,H} = 6 Hz, ³J_{H,H} = 0.4 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.85-6.88 (td, ³J_{H,H} = 0.8 Hz 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.75-3.82 (m, 1H, CH^{Pentyl}), 1.90-1.99 (m, 2H, CH₂^{Pentyl}), 1.81-1.88 (m, 2H, CH₂^{Pentyl}), 1.65-1.77 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Pentyl}), ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃) δ 162.3, 161.3, 131.8, 130.9, 118.4, 116.9, 70, 34.7, 24.5.

Schiff-Base Ligand **1b**: Salicylaldehyde (0.48 g, 4.0 mmol), cyclohexylamine (0.39 g, 4.0 mmol), and methanol (15 mL) afforded 0.68 g (85%) of the title compound as a yellow oil. Refractive index 1.5678; (a) UV–Vis: $\lambda_{max(n)}$ (nm), $\varepsilon_{max(n)}$ [M⁻¹ cm⁻¹]: $\lambda_{max(1)}$ (317), $\varepsilon_{max(1)}$ [9700]; (b) IR (KBr): v_x (cm⁻¹): vC=N (1629), vC–O (1274), (c) ¹H NMR: (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): 13.83 (s, 1H, OH), 8.37 (s, 1H, CH=N), 7.31-7.27 (dd, ³*J*_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, dd, ³*J*_{H,H} = 0.8 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 7.23-7.25 (dd, ³*J*_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.94-6.98 (dt, ³*J*_{H,H} = 6 Hz, ³*J*_{H,H} = 0.4 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.85-6.89 (td, ³*J*_{H,H} = 0.8 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.22-3.30 (m, 1H, CH^{Hexyl}), 1.80-1.87 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Hexyl}), 1.50-1.70 (m, 3H, CH₂^{Hexyl}), 1.27-1.45 (m, 3H, CH₂^{Hexyl}); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃) δ 162.1, 161.4, 131.9, 131.1, 118.9, 118.3, 117.04, 77.3, 77.02, 76.7, 67.4, 25.5, 24.3.

Schiff-Base Ligand **1c**: Salicylaldehyde (0.48 g, 4.0 mmol), cycloheptylamine (0.45 g, 4.0 mmol), and methanol (15 mL) afforded 0.69 g (80%) of the title compound as a yellow oil. Refractive index 1.5652; (a) UV–Vis: $\lambda_{max(n)}$ (nm), $\varepsilon_{max(n)}$ [M⁻¹ cm⁻¹]: $\lambda_{max(1)}$ (316), $\varepsilon_{max(1)}$ [9600]; (b) IR (KBr): v_x (cm⁻¹): vC=N (1621), vC–O (1270); (c) ¹H NMR: (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): 13.85 (s, 1H, OH), 8.3 (s, 1H, CH=N), 7.25-7.32 (dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, dd, ³J_{H,H} = 0.8 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 7.22-7.25 (dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.2 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.95-6.98 (dt,

7

 ${}^{3}J_{\rm H,H} = 6.4$ Hz, ${}^{3}J_{\rm H,H} = 0.4$ Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.85-6.89 (td, ${}^{3}J_{\rm H,H} = 0.8$ Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.37-3.46 (m, 1H, CH^{Heptyl}), 1.82-1.90 (m, 2H, CH₂^{Heptyl}), 1.72-1.82 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Heptyl}), 1.50-1.70 (m, 6H, CH₂^{Heptyl}); 13 C NMR (CDCl₃) δ 161.66, 161.39, 131.92, 131.02, 118.91, 118.29, 116.99, 77.34, 77.08, 76.83, 70.12, 36.40, 28.54, 24.24.

Schiff-Base Ligand 1d: Salicylaldehyde (0.48 g, 4.0 mmol), cyclooctylamine (0.51 g, 4.0 mmol), and methanol (15 mL) afforded 0.82 g (90%) of the title compound as a yellow oil. Refractive index 1.5631; (a) UV–Vis: $\lambda_{max(n)}$ (nm), $\varepsilon_{max(n)}$ [M⁻¹ cm⁻¹]: $\lambda_{max(1)}$ (318), $\varepsilon_{max(1)}$ [10000]; (b) IR (KBr): v_x (cm⁻¹): vC=N (1624), vC–O (1278); (c) ¹H NMR: (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): 13.85 (s, 1H, OH), 8.3 (s, 1H, CH=N), 7.27-7.32 (dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.2 Hz, dd, ³J_{H,H} = 0.8 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 7.22-7.25 (dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.2 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.93-6.97 (dt, ³J_{H,H} = 6.4 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.84-6.88 (td, ³J_{H,H} = 0.8 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.40-3.45 (m, 1H, CH^{Octyl}), 1.75-1.90 (m, 6H, CH₂^{Octyl}), 1.45-1.70 (m, 8H, CH₂^{Octyl}); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃) δ 161.7, 161.4, 131.9, 131, 118.9, 118.3, 117.04, 77.3, 77, 76.8, 70, 51.4, 35.6, 33.47, 27.54, 25.48, 23.6.

2.3. General Procedure for the Preparation of Schiff-Base Ru Complexes (2a-d)

Synthesis of the ruthenium(II) Schiff base complexes (**2a-d**) was accomplished according to the following procedure: To a solution of Schiff base **1a-d** in methanol was added dropwise a solution of NaOH in methanol and the reaction mixture was stirred for 2 h at room temperature. The deprotonated ligand mixture was transferred by cannula to a 50-mL three-necked flask fitted with a reflux condenser containing the [RuCl₂(PPh₃)₃] precursor, stirred mixture was refluxed for 4 h. A yellow precipitate was then filtered and washed with methanol and ethyl ether and then dried in a vacuum.

Complex **2a**: [RuCl₂(PPh₃)₃] complex (0.30 g, 0.31 mmol), Schiff base **1a** (0.070 g, 0.37 mmol), NaOH (0.18 g, 0.45 mmol), and methanol (20 mL) afforded 0.25 g (80%) of the title complex as a yellow solid: anal. calculated for C₄₉H₄₈ClNOP₂Ru was 68.01 C, 5.59 H and 1.62% N; found: 68.34 C, 5.55 H and 1.60% N. UV–Vis: $\lambda_{max(n)}$ (nm), $\varepsilon_{max(n)}$ [M⁻¹ cm⁻¹]: $\lambda_{max(1)}$ (252), $\varepsilon_{max(1)}$ [10020], $\lambda_{max(2)}$ (370), $\varepsilon_{max(2)}$ [625], $\lambda_{max(3)}$ (422), $\varepsilon_{max(3)}$ [240]; IR (KBr): v_x (cm⁻¹): vC=N (1618), vC–O (1355); ¹H NMR: (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): 7.30-7.70 (m, 12H: *metha*-PPh₃ and 1H: CH=N), 7.30-7.70 (m, 6H, *para*-PPh₃), 7.21-7.30 (m, 12H, *ortho*-PPh₃), 6.63-6.68 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.4-6.5 (dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.2 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.04-6.10 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.85-5.80 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.85-3.92 (m, 1H, CH^{Pentyl}), 1.60-1.80 (m, 3H, CH₂^{Pentyl}), 1.29-1.38 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Pentyl}), 1.07-1.15 (m, 1H, CH₂^{Pentyl}), 1.60-1.80 (m, 3H, CH₂^{Pentyl}), 1.29-1.38 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Pentyl}), 1.07-1.15 (m, 1H, CH₂^{Pentyl}), 13C NMR (CDCl₃) δ 166.12, 160.83, 135.16, 135, 134.84, 134.26, 134.21, 134.16, 132.12, 132.04, 131.93, 131.91, 129, 128.53, 128.44, 127.62, 127.59, 127.55, 123.36, 121.99, 111.80, 75.92, 32.39, 23.43; ³¹P{¹H} NMR (CDCl₃: δ , ppm): 43.15 (s). EPR: no signal was observed.

Complex **2b**: [RuCl₂(PPh₃)₃] complex (0.30 g, 0.31 mmol), Schiff base **1b** (0.075 g, 0.37 mmol), NaOH (0.18 g, 0.45 mmol), and methanol (20 mL) afforded 0.20 g (75%) of the title complex as a yellow solid: anal. calculated for C₅₀H₅₀ClNOP₂Ru was 68.29 C, 5.73 H and 1.59% N; found: 68.41 C, 5.64 H and 1.61% N. UV–Vis: $\lambda_{max(n)}$ (nm), $\varepsilon_{max(n)}$ [M⁻¹ cm⁻¹]: $\lambda_{max(1)}$ (252), $\varepsilon_{max(1)}$ [10050], $\lambda_{max(2)}$ (369), $\varepsilon_{max(2)}$ [1766], $\lambda_{max(3)}$ (420), $\varepsilon_{max(3)}$ [585]; IR (KBr): v_x (cm⁻¹): vC=N (1618), vC–O (1342); ¹H NMR: (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): 7.30-7.80 (m, 12H: *metha*-PPh₃ and 1H: CH=N), 7.30-7.80 (m, 6H, *para*-PPh₃), 7.08-7.30 (m, 12H, *ortho*-PPh₃), 6.57-6.67 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.38-6.51 (dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.2 Hz, dd, ³J_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.99-6.12 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.76-5.89 (dd, J = 0.8 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.18-3.33 (m, 1H, CH^{Hexyl}), 1.44-1.57 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Hexyl}), 0.78-1.05 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Hexyl}), 0.65-0.78 (m, 2H, CH₂^{Hexyl}); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃) δ 166.03, 160.74, 135.26, 135.10, 134.94,

9

134.22, 131.98, 128.99, 127.59, 123.40, 122.28, 111.68, 77.24, 76.99, 76.73, 73.17, 33.20, 26.03, 25.84; ³¹P{¹H} NMR (CDCl₃: δ, ppm): 43.37 (s). EPR: no signal was observed.

Complex **2c**: [RuCl₂(PPh₃)₃] complex (0.30 g, 0.31 mmol), Schiff base **1c** (0.080 g, 0.37 mmol), NaOH (0.18 g, 0.45 mmol), and methanol (20 mL) afforded 0.23 g (85%) of the title complex as a yellow solid: nal. calculated for C₅₁H₅₂ClNOP₂Ru was 68.56 C, 5.87 H and 1.57% N; found: 69.19 C, 5.64 H and 1.64% N; UV–Vis: $\lambda_{max(n)}$ (nm), $\varepsilon_{max(n)}$ [M⁻¹ cm⁻¹]: $\lambda_{max(1)}$ (246), $\varepsilon_{max(1)}$ [9500], $\lambda_{max(2)}$ (370), $\varepsilon_{max(2)}$ [1268], $\lambda_{max(3)}$ (423), $\varepsilon_{max(3)}$ [599]; IR (KBr): v_x (cm⁻¹): vC=N (1610), vC–O (1337); ¹H NMR: (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): 7.30-7.69 (m, 12H: *metha*-PPh₃ and 1H: CH=N), 7.30-7.69 (m, 6H, *para*-PPh₃), 6.92-7.30 (m, 12H, *ortho*-PPh₃), 6.60-6.73 (d, ³*J*_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.47-6.56 (d, ³*J*_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.09-6.20 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.73-5.85 (d, ³*J*_{H,H} = 0.8 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.63-3.77 (m, 1H, CH^{Heptyl}), 1.37-1.64 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Heptyl}), 1.27-1.36 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Heptyl}), 1.03-1.15 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Heptyl}); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃) δ 166.20, 161.6, 135.47, 135.30, 135.14, 134.24, 134.19, 134.14, 134.03, 132.13, 132.05, 131.96, 131.88, 128.97, 128.68, 128.52, 128.42, 127.64, 127.60, 127.56, 123.52, 122.78, 111.75, 75.0, 33.32, 26.6, 25.85, 25.02; ³¹P{¹H} NMR (CDCl₃: δ , ppm): 42.48 (s). EPR: no signal was observed.

Complex 2d: [RuCl₂(PPh₃)₃] complex (0.30 g, 0.31 mmol), Schiff base 1d (0.085 g, 0.37 mmol), NaOH (0.18 g, 0.45 mmol), and methanol (20 mL) afforded 0.21 g (75%) of the title complex as a yellow solid: anal. calculated for C₅₂H₅₄ClNOP₂Ru was 68.82 C, 6.00 H and 1.54% N; found 69.03 C, 6.21 H and 1.62% N. UV–Vis: $\lambda_{max(n)}$ (nm), $\varepsilon_{max(n)}$ [M⁻¹ cm⁻¹]: $\lambda_{max(1)}$ (262), $\varepsilon_{max(1)}$ [10000], $\lambda_{max(2)}$ (377), $\varepsilon_{max(2)}$ [1528], $\lambda_{max(3)}$ (426), $\varepsilon_{max(3)}$ [822]; IR (KBr): v_x (cm⁻¹): vC=N (1611), vC–O (1336); ¹H NMR: (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): 7.23-7.72 (m, 12H: *metha*-PPh₃ and 1H: CH=N), 7.23-7.72 (m, 6H, *para*-PPh₃), 6.95-7.23 (m, 12H, *ortho*-PPh₃), 6.60-6.67 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.52-6.58 (d, ³J_{H,H} = 1.6 Hz, 1H, salicyl-ring), 6.09-6.16 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.76-5.80 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.62-3.76 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 4.00 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.62-3.76 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.76-5.80 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.76-5.80 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.76-5.80 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.76-5.80 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.62-3.76 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.76-5.80 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 3.62-3.76 (m, 1H, salicyl-ring), 5.76-5.80 (m

10

CH^{Octyl}), 1.38-1.50 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Octyl}), 1.30-1.36 (m, 4H, CH₂^{Octyl}), 1.05-1.25 (m, 6H, CH₂^{Octyl}); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃) δ 166.13, 161.78, 135.12, 134.19, 134.03, 132.12, 132.04, 131.93, 128.99, 128.53, 128.44, 127.61, 123.50, 122.80, 111.81, 77.25, 77.00, 76.74, 74.85, 33.31, 26.57, 25.84, 25.01; ³¹P{¹H} NMR (CDCl₃: δ , ppm): 42.57 (s). EPR: no signal was observed.

4.3. ROMP procedure

In a typical ROMP experiment, 1.1 μ mol of complex was dissolved in CHCl₃ (2 mL) with an appropriate amount of monomer (NBE, 5.5 mmol) and additive (HCl, 27.5 μ mol), followed by addition of carbene source (EDA, 43 μ mol). Usually the solution gelled for 1-2 min, but the reaction mixture was stirred for 60 min at 25 or 50 °C in a silicon oil bath. At room temperature, 5 mL of methanol was added and the polymer was filtered, washed with methanol and dried in a vacuum oven at 40 °C up to constant weight. The reported yields are average values from catalytic runs performed at least three times with 10% error at the most. The isolated polyNBEs were dissolved in THF for GPC data.

4.4. ATRP procedure

In a typical ATRP experiment, 12.3 μ mol of complex was placed in a Schlenk tube containing a magnet bar and capped by a rubber septum. Air was expelled by three vacuumnitrogen cycles before appropriate amounts of monomer (MMA, 12.3 mmol), initiator (EB*i*B, 24.6 μ mol), and DCE (1 mL) were added. All liquids were handled with dried syringes under nitrogen. The tube was capped under N₂ atmosphere using Schlenk techniques, then the reaction mixture was immediately immersed in an oil bath previously heated to the desired

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

temperature. The polymerizations were conducted at 85 °C. The samples were removed from the tube after certain time intervals using degassed syringes. The polymerization was stopped when the reaction mixture became very viscous. The reported conversions are average values from catalytic runs performed at least twice.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Synthesis and characterization

The bidentate Schiff bases (**1a-d**) were readily prepared by condensation of salicylaldehyde with four different cycloalkylamines in methanol (Scheme 1). When 1 mol of salicylaldehyde and 1 mol of amine were reacted, the corresponding products were obtained under mild conditions; confirmation of these products was demonstrated by spectroscopic data. As the ligands predominantly exist in the keto tautomeric form in the solid state. Prior to the complexation step an equivalent amount of NaOH in methanol was added to the ligands to convert this keto form to enolate form. This renders the coordination of enolate oxygen. Equimolar reactions between [RuCl₂(PPh₃)₂] with the corresponding deprotonated Schiff bases (**1a-d**) led to the ruthenium(II) Schiff base complexes **2a-d** in high yields (Scheme 1).



Scheme 1. Synthesis protocol of Schiff base 1a-d and their ruthenium complexes 2a-d.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

In the ¹H NMR spectra in CDCl₃ for the synthesized ligands (1a-d) and their complexes (2a-d) are given in Section 2. The peaks in the range 1.0-2.0 ppm for ligands 1a-d and 0.65-2.0 ppm for complexes **2a-d**, as multiplets, are assignable to the CH_2 groups hydrogens from the *N*-cycloalkyl substituent. Additionally, the peaks at range 6.84-7.32 ppm for ligands **1a-d** and 5.73-6.73 for complexes **2a-d**, as multiplets, are assignable to the protons of aromatic -CH groups. In the ¹H NMR spectra of ligands **1a-d** and complexes **2a-d**, the chemical shifts observed around 8.3 ppm for free ligands and at 7.22-7.50 for complexes 2a-d as singlets are assigned to the proton of azomethine (-N=CH-) [15]. The peak due to the azomethine showed a high field shift compared to the free Schiff base after complexation with the metal ion indicating coordination through the azomethine nitrogen atom. A singlet for OH has a distinct down-field resonance at 13.8 ppm, characteristic for the acidic proton involved in a strong intramolecular hydrogen bond in the ligands **1a-d** [15]. These signals did not appear in the complexes **2a-d** as expected. The ¹H NMR spectra for the complexes **2a-d** were dominated by multiplets between 6.92-7.80 ppm due to the phenyl protons of two PPh₃ ligands coordinated in the Ru center which are upfield relative to the multiplets around 6.92-7.80 ppm from the aromatic signals for the Schiff base. In the ¹³C NMR spectra, the carbon peaks between 23.6-161.6 ppm for ligands **1a-d** and 23.4-166.2 ppm for complexes **2a-d** were observed. ³¹P NMR spectroscopy confirmed the presence of the PPh₃ ligands and their magnetic equivalence revealed that the two PPh₃ ligands are *trans*-positioned to each other in the complexes **2a-d** since only a singlet around 43 ppm was found for all complexes, thereby minimizing steric repulsion. This orientation is typical for ruthenium Schiff base complexes containing the *trans*- $[Ru(PPh_3)_2]$ core [16]. The FTIR spectra of the ligands **1a-d** were compared with that of the complexes 2a-d in order to confirm the coordination of ligand to the ruthenium metal. The infrared spectra of free ligands show the characteristic v(O-H)absorption bands around 2678 cm^{-1} which disappears after complexation, the absorption

corresponding to the v(C=N) vibration is around 1625 cm⁻¹ in the ligands, and it is shifted approximately 12 cm⁻¹ to a lower wavenumber in the spectra of the complexes **2a-d** confirming the coordination of azomethine nitrogen to the metal. The coordination of phenolic oxygen of the Schiff bases is supported by the appearance of new bands in 497-499 cm⁻¹ range due to v(Ru–O) stretching in the ruthenium complexes [17]. In addition, these complexes exhibit one strong band in the range 414-417 cm⁻¹, which may be due to v(Ru–N) stretching suggesting coordination of azomethine nitrogen atoms [17].

Electronic spectra of ligands 1a-d and their complexes 2a-d have been recorded in the 200–700 nm range in CHCl₃ and their corresponding data are given in Table 1. The formation of the complexes 2a-d was also confirmed by electronic spectra (Fig. 2). In the electronic spectra of the free ligands and their complexes, the wide range bands were observed due to either the $\pi \rightarrow \pi^*$ and $n \rightarrow \pi^*$ of C=N chromophore or charge-transfer transition arising from π electron interactions between the metal and ligand, which involves either a metal-to-ligand electron transfer [18]. The electronic spectra of the ligands **1a-d** in CHCl₃ (Fig. 3) showed strong absorption bands in the ultraviolet region (316-318 nm), that could be attributed respectively to the $\pi \rightarrow \pi^*$ and $n \rightarrow \pi^*$ transitions in the benzene ring or azomethine (-C=N) groups [19]. In the electronic spectra of the complexes **2a-d**, these bands show hypsochromic shifts relative to their free ligands, and they may be hidden under the electronic transition of the PPh₃ ligands. This displacement of the absorption bands of the complexes **2a-d** most likely originate from the metalation which increases the conjugation and delocalization of the whole electronic system and results in the energy change of the intra-ligand transitions of the conjugated chromophore. These results clearly indicate that the ligand coordinates to metal center, which are in accordance with the results of the other spectroscopic data. Furthermore, the absorption bands in the visible region are observed at between 360 and 426 nm as a low intensity bands These bands are considered to arise from the MLCT transition [20].



Fig. 2. Electronic spectra of the complexes 2a-d in degassed CH_2Cl_2 solution at room temperature ([Ru] =0.1 mmol L⁻¹).

The electrochemical activity of the complexes **2a-d** was studied by cyclic voltammetry in scan rate of 100 mV s⁻¹ in CH₂Cl₂ solution containing 0.1M *n*-Bu₄NPF₆ supporting electrolyte in the potential range 0 to 1.1 V. The cyclic voltammograms of **2a-d** are shown in Fig. 3 and the voltammetric data are summarized in Table 2. On scanning anodically and reversing the scan direction, similar anodic waves which may be attributed to the Ru^{II/III} redox couple and the redox-active phenolate moieties were observed between 0.41-0.60 V and 0.7-1.0, respectively, for all Schiff base Ru complexes (Fig. 3). Less intense corresponding cathodic peaks were observed; and this may be attributed to the instability and transient nature of the Ru^{III} ions in solution. Overall there is a clear shift in the redox potentials towards more negative values as the electron-donating ability of the cycloalkyl substituents is increased (Octyl > Heptyl > Hexyl > Pentyl). Modulation of the electron-donating ability, as well as the steric effect of the Schiff base ligands is subsequently shown to have an effect on the activity on ROMP and ATRP of the complexes **2a-d**.

 Table 1. Infrared and electronic absorption data for base Schiff ligands 1a-d and their ruthenium complexes 2a-d.

Commente	FTIR (cm ⁻¹)		UV-Vis (nm)		
Compounds -	Ligand	Complex	Ligand	Complex	
1a/2a	1277 v(C-O)	416 v(Ru-N)	317 (π → π *)	252 (π→π*)	
	1629 v(C=N)	499 v(Ru-O)		313 (n $\rightarrow\pi^*$)	
	2734 v(O-H)	1355 v(C-O)		370 (MLCT)	
	2952 v(C-H)	1618 v(C=N)		422 (MLCT)	
1b/2b	1274 v(C-O)	417 v(Ru-N)	317 (π→π*)	252 (π→π*)	
	1629 v(C=N)	497 v(Ru-O)		313 (n $\rightarrow \pi^*$)	
	2663 v(O-H)	1342 v(C-O)	7	369 (MLCT)	
	2925 v(C-H)	1618 v(C=N)		420 (MLCT)	
1c/2c	1270 v(C-O)	416 v(Ru-N)	316 (π→π*)	246 (π→π*)	
	1621 v(C=N)	497 v(Ru-O)		273 (n→π*)	
	2662 v(O-H)	1337 v(C-O)		370 (MLCT)	
	2910 v(C-H)	1610 v(C=N)		423 (MLCT)	
1d/2d	1278 v(C-O)	414 v(Ru-N)	318 (π→π*)	262 (π→π*)	
	1624 v(C=N)	498 v(Ru-O)		320 (n $\rightarrow \pi^*$)	
	2651 v(O-H)	1336 v(C-O)		377 (MLCT)	
	2904 v(C-H)	1611 v(C=N)		426 (MLCT)	



Fig. 3. Cyclics voltammograms of **2a-d** in CH₂Cl₂ at 25 °C. [Ru] = 10 mM; [*n*-Bu₄NPF₆] = 0.1 M. Scanning anodically from 0.0 up to 1.1 V at scan rates of 100 mV s⁻¹.

Compley		CV		
Complex	$E_{\rm pa}\left({\rm V}\right)$	$E_{\rm pc}\left({ m V} ight)$	$E_{1/2}\left(\mathbf{V}\right)$	$\Delta E_{\rm p}\left({\rm V}\right)$
2a	0.599	0.462	0.530	0.137
2b	0.568	0.483	0.525	0.085
2c	0.529	0.408	0.468	0.121
2d	0.515	0.433	0.474	0.082

Table 2. Cyclic voltammetry^a results for complexes 2a-d.

^{*a*} Conditions: CH₂Cl₂, *n*-Bu₄NPF₆ (supporting electrolyte, 0.1 mol L⁻¹), [Ru] = 5 mmol L⁻¹, scan rate = 100 mV s⁻¹), platinum disk and wire (working and auxiliary electrode), Ag/AgCl (reference electrode). $E_{1/2}$ is the half-potential for the complex; ΔE_p is the cathodic-anodic peak separation.

3.2. ROMP reactions

The reactivity of the complexes **2a-d** as catalytic precursors was tested on ROMP of NBE in CHCl₃ with [NBE]/[Ru] = 5000, volume of EDA = 5 μ L at 25 °C for 60 min (Fig. 4). In general, the complexes **2a-d** presented low yields of polyNBE, the complex **2a** with lower yield of 4% and **2d** with higher yield equal to 11% (Table 3). ROMP of NBE with complexes **2a-d** was also evaluated at 50 °C under the same conditions. The increase of temperature produced higher yields of polyNBE, with maximum yields of up to 25% and PDI values between 1.1 and 2.3. As the temperature increased to 50 °C, the yields practically doubled with a significant increase in M_n values of the order from 10³ to 10⁴ g mol⁻¹ in relation to 25 °C. When comparing the reactivity at 25 and 50 °C, the main difference was in the yields of polymer, which the catalytic activity at 50 °C was always higher than that observed at 25 °C for all complexes. Thus, the improvement in the catalytic activity of the complexes **2a-d** at 50 °C shows that the induction period was favored.



Fig. 4. Dependence of yield on the [HCl]/[Ru] molar ratio for ROMP of NBE with **2a-d**; [NBE]/[Ru] = 5000 and 5 μ L of EDA in CH₂Cl₂ at 25 and 50 °C for 60 min.

In order to optimize the induction period of the complexes **2a-d** in the ROMP mechanism, a chemical activation of the catalytic precursors was attempted with the use of HCl acid. This strategy has already been applied for the activation of ruthenium(II) Schiff bases catalysts, which the acid protonates the *N*-atom of the azomethine group [13c]. This causes the partial labilization of the Schiff base with generation of a vacancy at the ruthenium center, and the initiation step occurs as monomer is added. The ROMP of NBE catalyzed by the complexes **2a-d** in the presence of HCl is shown in Fig. 4, where the [HCl]/[Ru] ratio was investigated to find the optimal concentration of acid.

Complex	[HCl]/[Ru]	25 °C			50 °C		
		Yield (%)	$M_{n}(10^{3})$	PDI	Yield (%)	$M_{n}(10^{3})$	PDI
2a	0	4	4.1	1.2	8	98.8	2.3
	10	22	38.2	1.5	34	94.0	3.0
	25	29	49.2	1.2	43	87.3	1.3
	50	21	78.6	1.2	38	62.1	1.2
	150	16	60.2	1.4	24	97.0	3.7
	300	6	5.4	2.9	15	15.0	2.0
2b	0	4	8.7	1.1	10	86.0	1.1
	10	25	46.0	3.8	37	19.3	1.5
	25	28	68.0	3.8	43	49.2	3.2
	50	17	79.5	1.1	17	76.4	1.1
	150	18	56.4	3.2	18	54.4	1.2
	300	14	9.6	1.0	13	76.5	1.1
2c	0	8	2.4	2.0	15	68.0	1.3
	10	26	37.2	2.6	32	60.0	3.6
	25	31	64.5	2.3	43	32.5	1.6
	50	14	48.9	3.8	23	70.8	1.5
	150	11	61.2	3.1	18	71.0	1.1
	300	0	-	-	11	94.6	1.1
2d	0	11	54.0	1.1	25	96.1	1.1
	10	31	56.6	2.6	35	48.4	3.1
	25	34	10.8	3.0	44	72.6	1.1
	50	21	23.1	1.4	45	83.7	1.3
	150	13	34.5	2.7	36	90.1	2.8
	300	0	-	-	2	7.7	1.1

Table 3. Yield values and SEC data from the ROMP of NBE with **2a-d** at 25 and 50 °C; [NBE]/[Ru] = 5000 and 5 µL of EDA with 1.1 µmol of complex in CH₂Cl₂ for 60 min.

The catalytic activity of the complexes 2a-d was sensitive with variation of the [HCl]/[Ru] molar ratio at 25 and 50 °C (Table 3). At 25 °C, a considerable increase in the yields of polyNBE as increasing the [HCl]/[Ru] ratio up to 25 was observed, followed by a drop for $[HC1]/[Ru] \ge 50$. When polymerization was performed at 50 °C in the presence of acid, a similar profile was observed, although, higher values of polyNBE yields were achieved with M_n values near the order of 10^5 g mol⁻¹. It is rationalized that this increase in the catalytic activity of **2a-d** can be explained by the protonation of *N*-atom of the Schiff base azomethine group, it creates a vacant site at the ruthenium center to formation of active species. In addition, the steric hindrance in the different Schiff bases plays a decisive role in the reactivity in the complexes 2a-d. Besides that, the order of reactivity of the complexes in ROMP increases from 2a to 2d. The lability of the azomethine group becomes more favored as the steric hindrance increases, as cycloalkyl substituent is increased from cyclopentyl (2a) to cyclooctyl (2d). However, excess HCl acid ([HCl]/[Ru] \geq 50) in the mixture conducted a decreasing in the polyNBE yields. Perhaps, with a very excessive amount of HCl, the chlorides should compete for a coordination site and be able to coordinate to the ruthenium center, causing the degradation of the complex in solution by full release of the Schiff base of the coordinating sphere.

ROMP of NBE with the complexes **2a-d** was conducted varying the volume of EDA (Fig. 5), the polymerizations were carried out by keeping the optimal concentration of acid found ([HCI]/[Ru] = 25) at 25 ° C. No formation of polymer was observed in the absence of EDA. An increase in polyNBE yields is observed by increasing the volume of EDA up to 5 μ L. For higher volumes of EDA ($\geq 10 \mu$ L), a decreasing in yields is observed. In general, the M_n values also follow this trend with an increase of the molecular weights up to 5 μ L followed by decreases to higher volumes of EDA ($\geq 10 \mu$ L) with PDI values ranging from 1.1

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

to 3.0. (Table 4). The increase of polyNBE yields with increasing volume of EDA up to 5 μ L is indicative of the coordination of EDA with associative character. However, it should be noted that a very excessive amount of EDA ($\geq 10 \mu$ L) provokes a decreasing in the yields values, probably due to competition with the monomer for coordination onto the initiator active sites. Thus, it worth to mention that the optimum EDA amount used as a carbene source was of 5 μ L for the complexes **2a-d**. Considering that these complexes have the same profile when reacted with EDA, it is possible to affirm that the four complexes have the same pathway in the formation of Ru carbene in the induction period.



Fig. 5. Dependence of yield on the volume of EDA for ROMP of NBE with 2a-d; [NBE]/[HCl]/[Ru] = 5000/25/1 with 1.1 µmol of complex in CH₂Cl₂ at 25 °C for 60 min.

Complex	Volume of EDA	Yield (%)	$M_n (10^3)$	PDI
2a	1	2	5.6	1.1
	3	2	6.8	1.2
	5	22	49.2	1.2
	10	8	7.9	1.2
	15	3	6.8	1.3
	20	5	8.1	1.3
2b	1	4	6.8	1.2
	3	15	71.2	1.2
	5	28	68.0	1.8
	10	6	21.8	1.2
	15	3	7.0	1.5
	20	3	8.9	1.4
2c	1	3	7.2	1.3
	3	14	62.2	1.2
	5	31	64.5	2.3
	10	6	7.4	1.4
	15	4	7.7	1.2
	20	2	7.4	1.1
2d	1	4	5.9	1.1
	3	15	60.7	1.1
	5	36	10.8	3.0
	10	14	76.5	1.1
	15	8	19.6	1.2
	20	6	7.9	1.2

Table 4. Yield values and SEC data from the ROMP of NBE with **2a-d** at 25 °C; [NBE]/[HCl]/[Ru] = 5000/25/1 with 1.1 µmol of complex in CH₂Cl₂ for 60 min.

The yields increase when increasing the [NBE]/[Ru] molar ratio starting from 3000 with yields of 5, 8, 12, and 15% with **2a**, **2b**, **2c**, and **2d**, respectively, reaching yields at least twice higher at 5000 for all complexes (Table 5). ROMP is a process governed by thermodynamic equilibrium, where the increase of monomer concentration favors the thermodynamic of polymerization providing higher polymer production [21].

Complex	[NBE]/[Ru]	Yield (%)	$M_n (10^3)$	PDI
2a	3000	5	70.4	1.2
	5000	22	49.2	1.2
2b	3000	8	73.4	1.3
	5000	28	68.0	1.8
2c	3000	12	72.7	1.4
	5000	31	64.5	2.3
2d	3000	15	69.8	1.2
	5000	36	10.8	3.0

Table 5. Yield values and SEC data from the ROMP of NBE with **2a-d** at 25 °C; [HCl]/[Ru] = 25/1 and 5 µL of EDA with 1.1 µmol of complex in CH₂Cl₂ for 60 min.

When comparing the catalytic activity of the complexes in ROMP reactions, it is interesting to point out that the reactivity follows this order: 2a < 2b < 2c < 2d. The electronic and steric characteristics of the Schiff base ligands were able to tune the catalytic activity of complexes for ROMP of NBE, highlighting the importance of the Schiff base as ancillary ligand. However, it is reasonable to attribute that the steric effects on the Schiff base play a determinant role for the release of the azomethine group, rate-determining step for the formation of in-situ active species. Furthermore, this induction period can be faster as using acid (HCl).

From the UV-Vis experiments, the kinetic constants of the reaction of the complexes **2a-d** with HCl acid ([HCl]/[Ru] = 25) was calculated (Fig. 6). The deprotonation reaction of the azomethine group was pseudo-first order with apparent rate constants (k_{obs}) of 2.7 × 10⁻⁴, 4.5 × 10⁻⁴, 6.4 × 10⁻⁴, and 2.5 × 10⁻³ s⁻¹ to the complex **2a**, **2b**, **2c**, and **2d**, respectively. A decrease in the k_{obs} values with the increase of the cycloalkyl substituent is observed; it confirms that the reaction between the complexes **2a-d** with the HCl acid is kinetically favored as the steric hindrance is increased.



Fig. 6. Time-dependent UV-vis absorption spectra of **1**, **2**, and **3** in the presence of HCl in CH₂Cl₂ at 25 °C; [Ru] =0.1 mmol L⁻¹); [HCl]/[Ru] = 25. *Insert*: Dependence of $\ln(A_{inf}-A_t)$ on the reaction time at 365 nm.

Based on this, it is possible to infer that the difference in the reactivity of the studied complexes is directly related to the steric characteristics of the Schiff base ligands, which are modulated by their substituents. Upon metal-carbene formation, a PPh₃ leaves the complex, followed by the coordination of NBE to the carbene-Ru species. In order to confirm this proposal, experiments in the presence of excess PPh₃ (20 equiv.) at 25 °C for 60 min with [NBE]/[HCI]/[Ru] = 5000/25/1 and 5 μ L of EDA for the complexes **2a-d**, which no formation of polymer was observed. This procedure confirms that the ROMP reaction did not occur, although the carbene complex formation took place. The ROMP will only occur when the PPh₃ molecule undergoes discoordination from the metal center (Scheme 2).



Scheme 2. Illustration of possible reaction steps for ROMP of NBE with the complexes 2a-d.

3.3. ATRP reactions

The complexes **2a-d** have properties that make them promising reagents for use as ATRP catalysts. They provide reversible or quasi-reversible Ru^{II}/Ru^{III} couples at easily accessible potentials, as shown by the electrochemical data. They have either a vacant coordination site, which makes it possible for a halide ligand to enter the coordination sphere. Thus, MMA polymerization via ATRP with complexes **2a-d** were performed as a function of time using EB*i*B as initiator with [MMA]/[EBiB]/[Ru] = 1000/2/1 molar ratio at 85 ° C. The MMA conversion values increase exponentially as a function of time in all cases (Fig. 7). MMA polymerization with **2a** achieved a maximum conversion of 47% of polyMMA and, when catalyzed by **2b**, the conversion values was observed for the complexes **2c-d** under the same conditions.



Fig. 7. Dependence of conversion and $\ln([MMA]_0/[MMA])$ on the reaction time for ATRP of MMA with **2a** (**•**), **2b** (**•**), **2c** (**•**) and **2d** (**•**); [MMA]/[EB*i*B]/[Ru] = 1000/2/1 with 12.3 µmol of complex in CH₂Cl₂ at 85 °C.

Kinetics studies of MMA polymerization mediated by the complexes **2a-d** show a linear correlation of ln([MMA]₀/[MMA]) as a function of time (Fig. 7), with a pseudo-first order rate constant (k_{obs}) equal to 1.07×10^{-5} , 1.78×10^{-5} , 1.08×10^{-5} and 1.15×10^{-5} s⁻¹ for **2a**, **2b**, **2c** and **2d**, respectively. The linear semilogarithmic plot of ln[MMA]₀/[MMA]t versus time and the linear increase of molecular weight with conversion, in conjunction with moderate PDIs, illustrates a certain level of control imparted by the complexes **2a-b** (Fig. 7 and 8). However, in repeated kinetic experiments molecular weights were observed to be somewhat higher than the theoretical values. This can be attributed to the number of growing radical chains being lower than expected, resulting in an effective increase in the monomer concentration (f = 0.30-0.35). On the other hand, the molecular weight of polyMMA obtained with **2c-d** showed non-dependence of the molecular weight on the conversion, coupled with PDI of ca. 2.0 clearly illustrating the lack of control during the polymerization. As observed, MMA polymerization suggests that the level of control can be slightly tuned by the

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

substitution pattern of the ancillary ligand in the complexes **2a-d**, as more sterically hindered substituents were incorporated into the base Schiff ligand, polymerization control decreased.



Fig. 8. Dependence of M_n and PDI on the conversion for ATRP of MMA with $2a (\blacksquare)$, $2b (\bullet)$, $2c (\blacktriangle)$ and $2d (\triangledown)$, [MMA]/[EB*i*B]/[Ru] = 1000/2/1 with 12.3 µmol of complex in CH₂Cl₂ at 85 °C.

4. Conclusion

The Schiff bases ligands **1a-d** and their respective complexes **2a-d** were successfully synthesized. The Schiff base-Ru^{II} complexes **2a-d** were characterized by FTIR, UV-Vis, ¹H-, ¹³C- and ³¹P-NMR, and cyclic voltammetry. Complexes **2a-d** were moderately active as catalytic precursors in ROMP of NBE and their catalytic activity was improved in the presence of the HCl acid using [NBE]/[HCl]/[Ru] = 5000/25/1 ratio in the presence of 5 μ L of EDA for 60 minutes. The kinetic studies were determinate to explain the reactivity difference between the complexes **2a-d** against the ROMP reactions, it follows this order: **2a** < **2b** < **2c** < **2d**. The catalytic activity of the complexes **2a-d** suggests that the steric effects on the Schiff base play a determinate role for the release of the azomethine group, rate-determining step for

the formation of in-situ active species, and this induction period can be faster as using acid (HCl).

MMA polymerization mediated by complexes 2a-d was performed using [MMA]/[EBiB]/[Ru] = 1000/2/1 molar ratio at 85 °C. A linear correlation of ln([MMA]_0/[MMA]) as a function of time mediated by complexes 2a-d indicates some level of control in the polymerization as compared to conventional radical polymerization. However, better control levels were achieved with the complexes 2a-b, in which the molecular weights increased linearly with the conversion with narrow polydispersity. On the other hand, complexes 2c-d showed low efficiency in the control of MMA polymerization, evidenced by non-dependence of the molecular weight on the conversion and broad PDIs. It is believed that the steric hindrance of the Schiff base played a decisive role in the reactivity/efficiency against the controlled polymerization of MMA.

Acknowledgements

The authors are indebted to the financial support from FAPESP (Proc. 2013/10002-0).

References

1. A. M. Abu-Dief, I. M. A. Mohamed, Beni-Suef University Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 2015, 4, 119-133.

- 2. A. Prakash, D. Adhikari, International Journal of ChemTech Research, 3, 2011, 1891-1896
- 3. P. G. Cozzi, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2004, 33, 410-421.
- 4. R. M. Clarke, T. Storr, Dalton Transac. 2014, 43, 9380-9391.
- 5. K. C. Gupta, A. K. Sutar, Coordination Chemistry Reviews 252 (2008) 1420–1450.

 R. Drozdzak, B. Allaert, N. Ledoux, I. Dragutan, V. Dragutan, F. Verpoort, Adv. Synth. Catal. 2005, 347, 1721 – 1743.

7. R.G. Cavell, K. Aparna, R.P. Kamalesh Babu, Q. Wang. Journal of Molecular Catalysis A. Chemical, 189 (2002) 137-143.

8. S. Matsui, T. Fujita. Catalysis Today, 66 (2001) 63-73.

9. Y. Nakayama, H. Bando, Y. Sonobe, T. Fujita. Journal of Molecular Catalysis A. Chemical, 213 (2004) 141-150.

10. a) Marcus Seitz, Helmut G. Alt Journal of Molecular Catalysis A: Chemical 257 (2006)

73-77. b) R. Souane, F. Isel, F. Peruch, P.J. Lutz. Comptes Rendus Chimie, 5 (2002) 43-48.

 a) Jing Wang, Xinli Zhang, Lu Zhou, Yang Zhou, Qigu Huang, Wantai Yang, J. Appl. Polym. Sci. 2015, 132, 42225. b) LIU Kefeng, YAO Gang, WU Wenlei, GAO Bo Chem. Res. Chin. Univ., 2014, 30(5), 825-830, c) Mandal, M., Chakraborty, D., Ramkumar, V. RSC Advances 2015 5(36), pp. 28536-28553, d) Liu, K., Yao, G., Wu, W., Gao, B. Chemical Research in Chinese Universities 2014 30(5), pp. 825-830

12. M.A Mekewi. International Journal of Polymeric Materials, 55, (2006) 219-234.

13. a) R. Drozdzak, B. Allaert, N. Ledoux, I. Dragutan, V. Dragutan, F. Verpoort. Coordination Chemistry Reviews 249 (2005) 3055–3074. b) R. Drozdzak, B. Allaert, N. Ledoux, I. Dragutan, V. Dragutan, F. Verpoort. Adv. Synth. Catal. 2005, 347, 1721 – 1743. c) STIJN MONSAERT, NELE LEDOUX, RENATA DROZDZAK, FRANCIS VERPOORT Journal of Polymer Science: Part A: Polymer Chemistry, Vol. 48, 302–310 (2010), d) Nele Ledoux, Renata Drozdzak, Bart Allaert, Anthony Linden, Pascal Van Der Voort, Francis Verpoort Dalton Trans., 2007, 5201–5210. e) Renata Drozdzak, Naoki Nishioka, Gilles Recher, Francis Verpoort, Macromol. Symp. 2010, 293, 1–4. 14. a) P.W. Armit, A.S.F. Boyd, T.A. Stephenson, J. Chem. Soc. Dalton (1975) 1663. b) P.R.

Hoffman, K.G. Caulton, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 97 (1975) 4221. c) R.C.J. Vriends, G.V. Koten,

K. Vrieze, Inorg. Chim. Acta 26 (1978) L29.

15. M. S. Refat, M. Y. El-Sayed, A. Majid, A. Adam, J. Mol. Struc., 2013, 1038, 62-72.

16. Balasubramanian, K.P., Karvembu, K., Prabhakaran, R., Chinnusamy, V., Natarajan, K. *Spectrochim. Acta, Part A.*, 2007, 68, 50.

17. K. Nakamoto, Infrared and Raman Spectra of Inorganic and Coordination Compounds,4th Edn, John Wiely and Sons, Inc.: New York, 1986.

M.V. Kaveri, R. Prabhakaran, R. Karvembu, K. Natarajan, Spectrochim. Acta Part A 61 (2005) 2915.

19. A. Böttcher, T. Takeuchi, K. I. Hardcastle, T. J. Meade, H. B. Gray, D. C. Wikel, M.

Kapon, Z. Dori, Inorg. Chem. 1997, 36, 2498.

20. a) Natarajan, K., Poddar, R. K., Agarwala, C., Journal of Inorganic and Nuclear Chemistry, Oxford, v. 39, n. 3, p.431, 1997. b) Lever, A. B. P., Inorganic Electronic Spectroscopy, 2ed, Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier, 1984. c) Chichak, K., Jacquenard, U., Branda, N., R., European Journal Inorganic Chemistry, Weinheim, v. 2002, n.2, p. 357, 2002.

21. C. W. Bielawski and R. H. Grubbs, Prog. Polym. Sci., 2007, 32, 1-29.

Supplementary information for Ruthenium(II) complexes of Schiff base derived from cycloalkylamines as pre-catalysts for ROMP of norbornene and ATRP of methyl methacrylate

Maria Beatriz A. Afonso^a, Thais R. Cruz^a, Yan F. Silva^a, João Clécio A. Pereira^b, Antonio E. H. Machado^c, Beatriz E. Goi^a, Benedito S. Lima-Neto^b, Valdemiro P. Carvalho-Jr^{a*}

^aFaculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, UNESP Univ Estadual Paulista, CEP 19060-900, Presidente Prudente, SP, Brazil ^bInstituto de Química de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo, CEP 13560-970, São Carlos, SP, Brazil

^cInstituto de Química, UFU Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, CEP 38400-902, Uberlândia, MG, Brazil.

* Correspondence to: V. P. Carvalho Jr (e-mail: valdemiro@fct.unesp.br)

Fig S1. View of the optimized structure of complex 2a.



Fig S2. View of the optimized structure of complex 2b.





Fig S3. View of the optimized structure of complex 2c.

Fig S4. View of the optimized structure of complex 2d.



Highlights

- ☆ A series of phosphine ruthenium(II) complexes of Schiff base derived from cycloalkylamines (2a-2d) have been synthesized and characterized.
- ☆ All Schiff-base ligands and their ruthenium complexes (2a-2d) were fully characterized by ¹H and ¹³C NMR spectra, UV-vis, and infrared spectrometry.
- The molecular structures of ruthenium complexes (2a-2d) were further confirmed by computational methods.
- These ruthenium(II) complexes of Schiff base are active catalysts for ROMP of norbornene in the presence of HCl and for ATRP of methyl methacrylate in the presence of ethyl-α-bromoisobutyrate (EBiB) as initiator.

CER RANK