



Supramolecular Chemistry

International Edition: DOI: 10.1002/anie.201909540 German Edition: DOI: 10.1002/ange.201909540

Anion– π Catalysis on Carbon Nanotubes

Anna-Bea Bornhof⁺, Mikiko Vázquez-Nakagawa⁺, Laura Rodríguez-Pérez, María Ángeles Herranz, Naomi Sakai, Nazario Martín,* Stefan Matile,* and Javier López-Andarias*

Abstract: Induced π acidity from polarizability is emerging as the most effective way to stabilize anionic transition states on aromatic π surfaces, that is, anion- π catalysis. To access extreme polarizability, we propose a shift from homogeneous toward heterogeneous anion- π catalysis on higher carbon allotropes. According to benchmark enolate addition chemistry, multi-walled carbon nanotubes equipped with tertiary amine bases outperform single-walled carbon nanotubes. This is consistent with the polarizability of the former not only along but also between the tubes. Inactivation by π -basic aromatics and saturation with increasing catalyst concentration support that catalysis occurs on the π surface of the tubes. Increasing rate and selectivity of existing anion– π catalysts on the surface of unmodified nanotubes is consistent with transition-state stabilization by electron sharing into the tubes, i.e., induced anion– π interactions. On pristine tubes, anion– π catalysis is realized by non-covalent interfacing with π -basic pyrenes.

he term anion– π interaction refers to the binding of anions on the surface of extended π -conjugated systems, usually aromatic planes.^[1–3] Anion– π interactions have received little attention, presumably because they are counterintuitive and comparably rare in nature. Catalysis with anion– π interactions has been introduced explicitly six years ago.^[3] Since then, anion– π catalysis has been realized for asymmetric enolate, enamine and iminium chemistry, cascade reactions, cycloadditions and autocatalytic epoxide opening ether cyclizations.^[3,4]

In light of its importance in chemistry and biology, the addition of malonic half thioester 1 to enolate acceptor 2 has

[*]	AB. Bornhof, ^[+] Dr. N. Sakai, Prof. S. Matile, Dr. J. López-Andarias
	Department of Organic Chemistry, University of Geneva
	1211 Geneva (Switzerland)
	E-mail: stefan.matile@unige.ch
	javier.lopez@unige.ch
	Homepage: http://www.unige.ch/sciences/chiorg/matile/
	M. Vázquez-Nakagawa, ^[+] Dr. L. Rodríguez-Pérez,
	Dr. M. Ángeles Herranz, Prof. N. Martín
	Department of Organic Chemistry, Faculty of Chemistry
	Universidad Complutense de Madrid
	28040 Madrid (Spain)
	E-mail: nazmar@ucm.es
	Prof. N. Martín
	IMDEA-Nanociencia
	c/ Faraday 9, Campus Cantoblanco, 28049 Madrid (Spain)
[+]	These authors contributed equally to this work.
	Supporting information and the ORCID identification number(s) for

the author(s) of this article can be found under: https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201909540.

Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2019, 58, 1-5

© 2019 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

Weinheim Wiley Online Library These are not the final page numbers!

emerged as the reaction of choice to assess the activity of new anion– π catalysts. The formation of addition product **3** (or A) occurs in competition with the decarboxylation product **4** (or D, Figure 1 a).^[3,5] Recently confirmed by theory,^[6] the selective acceleration of enolate addition by anion– π catalysis has been attributed to the discrimination of flat and bent enol and keto tautomers **5** and **6**, respectively, on π -acidic surfaces (Figure 1, red arrow).

For catalyst development, the strength of anion– π interactions is of central importance. Removal of electron density from aromatic systems for this purpose is limited because of the onset of catalyst degradation, electron transfer, and nucleophilic aromatic substitution.^[2,3] Induced rather than intrinsic anion– π interactions could ultimately be more promising.^[3] Induced anion– π interactions originate from the polarization of the aromatic system in response to the presence of negative charges, repelling the nearby π electrons toward the other end of the π system, thus inducing oriented macrodipoles or rather multipoles that have their focal point on the inducer, enabling and strengthening anion binding on



Figure 1. a) Benchmark reaction for anion- π catalysis, reporting higher activity with increasing A/D values, that is the yield of enolate addition product A (**3**, red arrow) divided by the yield of decarboxylation product D (**4**). b) For anion- π catalysis on MWCNTs **7** m, anionic transition states **TS** are expected to stabilize themselves by repelling electron density (red) along as well as between the stacked tubes. c) **TS** stabilization on SWCNTs **7** s occurs only along this single tube. PMP=*para*-methoxyphenyl, S=substrates, P=products, C=catalysts.

the π surface (Figure 1 b,c). Anionic transition states emerging on π surfaces thus generate their own stabilization, create their own catalyst. This idea has been supported by anion- π catalysis on π -stacked foldamers^[6] and on [60]fullerene monomers^[7] and dimers.^[3] From there, a shift of attention toward heterogeneous anion- π catalysis on higher carbon allotropes was the obvious next step.

Since their discovery, carbon nanotubes have been explored extensively to understand their unique structures and properties.^[8] For their use in materials science, much emphasis has been conferred to their conducting properties, including many examples for photoinduced electron transfer processes.^[9] Consistent with extreme polarizability,^[10,11] carbon nanotubes can accept, donate, and conduct both electrons (e, n) and holes (h, p).^[12] Molecular recognition has attracted attention not only for sensing applications but also for controlled dispersion, purification, and functionalization.^[13] Most approaches focus on π - π stacking and dispersion forces, while an $n-\pi$ and also cation- π interactions with higher carbon allotropes have received little attention,^[14] although they are predicted to be strong.^[10,15] Contrary to fullerenes,^[3,4,16] carbon nanotubes have been explored quite extensively in catalysis, mostly as a scaffold to maximize effective concentrations, occasionally also to modulate redox processes, including the activation of metal catalysts.^[12,17] The stabilization of neither anionic nor cationic transitions states by induced π -system polarization, i.e., neither anion- π nor cation $-\pi$ catalysis, have been explored explicitly on carbon nanotubes.

For this purpose, carbon nanotubes **7** were firstly shortened and endowed with carboxylic acids by oxidative treatment (**8**) and afterwards covalently reacted with tertiary amine bases bearing different linkers to yield **9–11** (Figure 2 and Schemes S2–S5). The multi-walled carbon nanotubes (MWCNTs) **7m** used were composed of around 11 tubes with diameters between 6 nm and 13 nm and were functionalized with 0.64 μ mol base per milligram of material in **9m**.^[18] Single-walled carbon nanotubes (SWCNTs) **7s** were narrower (diameter between 0.8 and 1.4 nm) and conjugated to 1.19 μ mol base per milligram of material in **9s** (Table S1).

Tested in the above mentioned enolate addition reaction (Figure 1 a), suspensions of MWCNTs **7m** in [D₈]THF/CDCl₃ 1:1 activated triethylamine (TEA) to A/D = 4.3, a selectivity only slightly above the intrinsic A/D = 3.4 for TEA under these conditions (Figure 2, entries 1 and 4). With A/D = 25, the highest activity was found for MWCNTs 9m (blue, entry 5). With longer and turned spacers in 10m and 11m, activities dropped until A/D = 16 (blue, entries 9 and 12). A decreasing activity with longer spacers was as with the soluble fullerene models 9 f and 10 f (striped, entries 8 and 11),^[7] and well explained with increasing entropic losses for transitionstate recognition. Lower activity with rigid turns on mismatched 11m was, however, contrary to fullerene models 11 f (striped, entries 8 and 14). This contrast was meaningful because the absence of the cyclopropyl turns of Bingel fullerenes causes the amine base in 11m to end up fixed far from the π surface. Because of this, according to computational models,^[7] the unique topological matching in 11 f is ruined for 11m. The activities with the best MWCNT catalyst 9m, also exceeding the best fullerene catalyst 11f, were remarkable considering the shift from homogeneous to heterogeneous catalysis (entries 5 and 14). Indeed, the reactions stopped as soon as 9m MWCNTs were centrifuged away and restarted as soon as they were redispersed (Figure S3). Previous studies on heterogeneous anion $-\pi$ catalysis on ITO electrodes gave, without applied voltage, extremely favorable decarboxylation (A/D = 0.08).^[19]

Kinetics analysis for MWCNT catalyst 9 m confirmed that addition clearly exceeds decarboxylation (Figure 3a and Figure S1). The differences in activation energy of addition



Figure 2. A/D values for product 3 divided by 4 obtained with substrates 1 (200 mM) and 2 (10 equiv) in $[D_8]$ THF/CDCl₃ 1:1 (blue, black), 12 (pink) or 13 (red) for covalent MWCNT anion– π catalysts 9m–11m compared to SWCNT 9s and controls TEA (black), fullerenes 9f–11f (striped)^[7] with 20 mol% of catalyst (tertiary amine), with indication of differential transition-state stabilization $\Delta\Delta G_{TS}^+$ for A vs. D for 9m–11m vs. TEA (left), and $\Delta A/D$ values with or without the addition of 7m (9 w/w% of the reaction mixture) to 9p, 10p, 9n, 9f and TEA (5 mol%, blue) (right). The error of A/D values is estimated to be within ±10%. m=multi-walled, s=single-walled, n=naphthalenediimide, f=fullerene, p=pyrene, R=leucylhexylamide, *cat*=catalyst, *in-/act*=in-/activator.

www.angewandte.org

© 2019 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim





Figure 3. a) Product formation (A, 3, blue ■; D, 4, blue □) with 9m as a function of time (10 mol%, 200 mm 1, 10 equiv 2, [D₈]THF/CDCl₃ 1:1). b) Normalized A/D values with 9m as a function of the concentration of inactivators 12 (pink \triangledown) and 13 (red \checkmark). For calibration, A/D of TEA in 12 or 13 were used as A/D_{rel}=0. c) A/D with 9m (blue ●) and TEA (pink x) (40 mm of tertiary amine) as a function of the concentration of substrate 1. Equivalents of 2 were kept constant. d) A/D with 9m (blue ●) and TEA (pink x) as a function of their concentration (200 mm 1, 10 equiv 2). e) ΔA/D (A/D-A/D₀, blue +) and conversion after 4 days (turquoise ▲) with 9n (5 mol%) as a function of activator 7m (wt% of the reaction mixture). f) ΔA/D with 9f (blue △), 9p (red ▲), 10p (red △) and TEA (pink x) (5 mol%) as a function of the concentration of activator 7m (wt% of the reaction mixture).

and decarboxylation reactions $(\Delta G_{\rm TS}^{*})$ were compared to that observed with TEA to give differential transition-state stabilization^[3] $\Delta\Delta G_{\rm TS}^{*} = -3.1$ kJ mol⁻¹ (Figure 2). Decreasing $\Delta\Delta G_{\rm TS}^{*} = -2.3$ kJ mol⁻¹ for **10m** and $\Delta\Delta G_{\rm TS}^{*} = -2.2$ kJ mol⁻¹ for **11m** reproduced trends from A/D values very well (blue, entries 5, 9, and 12).

Comparing bi- against unimolecular transformations, A/D values increased with substrate concentration (Figure 3 c). They also increased with the concentration of catalyst **9 m** but not with TEA (Figure 3 d). Saturation behavior characterized by a formal $EC_{50} = 11 \text{ mM}$ supported the presence of active sites on MWCNTs, although the complex heterogeneous system complicates interpretations, a call for caution that naturally applies for all that follows.

In 1-chloronaphthalene **12**, activities of **9m–11m** decreased (Figure 2, pink, entries 7, 10, and 13). Hill analysis of the dose–response curve gave an $IC_{50} = 5.9 \text{ M}$ for the inactivation of catalyst **9m** by **12** (Figure 2, entry 7; Figure 3b, pink \bigtriangledown ; Table S2). Stronger inactivation was found for the more π -basic 1,7-dialkoxynaphthalene (DAN)^[20] **13**, also a liquid at room temperature ($IC_{50} = 2.6 \text{ M}$, Figure 2, entry 6; Figure 3b, red \checkmark). These results indicated that the π -basic **12** and **13** inactivate the catalysts by covering the π surfaces of

the tubes with a layer repulsive to the anions, and thus provided corroborative support for operational anion $-\pi$ interactions, i.e., the existence of anion $-\pi$ catalysis on MWCNTs (entries 5–7, 9–10, and 12–13).

SWCNTs **9s** were with A/D = 6.8 less active than MWCNTs **9m** with A/D = 25 (Figure 2, blue, entries 5, 17) but could be further inactivated by π -basic competitor **12** (Figure 2, pink, entries 17 and 18). This significant difference is interesting because it supports that transition states on the surface of MWCNTs could be stabilized by polarizability along the tubes but also between the layers, somehow combining previously explored through-bond contributions from very large π surfaces beyond fullerenes on the one hand and from through-space synergistic anion- $(\pi)_n$ - π interactions on π -stacked foldamers on the other hand (Figure 1b).^[3]

The binding of anion– π catalyst **9n** (Scheme S1)^[3] on the surface of unmodified MWCNTs **7m** increased their activity by maximal $\Delta A/D = +7.1$ (Figure 2, entry 22; Figure 3e, blue +). The coinciding increase in rate and selectivity with MWCNT concentrations supported that the central principles of catalysis also apply for these more complex systems, in this case increasing transition-state recognition on the naphthale-nediimide (NDI) surface in **9n** by electron sharing with the carbon nanotubes **7m** (Figure 3e, turquoise \blacktriangle). Activation of fullerene anion– π catalysts **9f** was, with up to $\Delta A/D = +1.4$, much weaker perhaps because the convex fullerenes prefer to hide in the concave interior of carbon nanotubes^[21] (Figure 2, entry 23; Figure 3 f, blue \triangle).

The binding of the newly synthesized π -basic pyrene^[17] **9p** (Scheme S1) by face-to-face π stacking on MWCNTs **7m** slightly increased activity (up to $\Delta A/D = +1.2$, Figure 2, entry 20; Figure 3 f, red \blacktriangle). Contrary to **9n**, however, catalysis with **9p** on **7m** is unlikely to take place on the more repulsive pyrene surface. This system thus documented the possibility of non-covalent interfacing for anion– π catalysis on unmodified nanotubes **7m**, although the obtained activities were rather weak compared to covalent interfacing in **9m** (Figure 2, entry 20). As with covalent interfacing in **10m**, activities decreased with spacer elongation in the complementary non-covalent pyrene interfacer **10p** on **7m** (Figure 2, entry 21; Figure 3 f, red \triangle). TEA, without π – π interfacer, was the least sensitive to the presence of MWCNTs **7m** (Figure 2, entry 19; Figure 3 f, pink x).

In summary, we provide experimental support for the existence and significance of an ion- π catalysis on carbon nanotubes. Highlights include MWCNTs outperforming SWCNTs owing to electron sharing within and between the tubes, thus driving induced anion- π interactions from polarizability to the extreme, or the activation of existing an $n-\pi$ catalysts on the surface of pristine MWCNTs. The amphoteric nature of MWCNTs^[12] suggests that, contrary to results from π -stacked foldamers,^[6] the above-mentioned insights should hold also for the more conventional stabilization of cationic intermediates on most polarizable π surfaces, i.e., induced cation- π rather than an ion- π catalysis.^[22] Additional contributions from the reduced dimensionality in 1D sliding kinetics to anion- π catalysis, obviously most inviting on carbon nanotubes, could deserve future attention.^[23] The heterogeneous nature of MWCNT anion- π catalysts is

www.angewandte.org

particularly appealing for applications toward films on conductive surfaces.^[19,24]

Acknowledgements

We thank the NMR and the MS platforms for services, and the University of Geneva, the Swiss National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) Molecular Systems Engineering, the NCCR Chemical Biology and the Swiss NSF for financial support. This work was also supported by the Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades (CIEN-CIA) of Spain (Projects CTQ2017-83531-R and CTQ2017-84327-P), and the CAM (QUIMTRONIC, Project Y2018/ NMT-4783). J.L.A. acknowledges a MSCA fellowship (project 740288).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Keywords: anion-macrodipole interactions \cdot anion- π catalysis \cdot carbon nanotubes \cdot induced π acidity \cdot polarizability

- a) A. Bauzá, T. J. Mooibroek, A. Frontera, *ChemPhysChem* 2015, *16*, 2496–2517; b) D.-H. Tuo, W. Liu, X.-Y. Wang, X.-D. Wang, Y.-F. Ao, Q.-Q. Wang, Z.-Y. Li, D.-X. Wang, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2019, *141*, 1118–1125; c) L. Li, Y.-J. Hong, D.-Y. Chen, W.-C. Xiao, M.-J. Lin, *Chem. Commun.* 2019, *55*, 2364–2367; d) M. Giese, M. Albrecht, K. Rissanen, *Chem. Commun.* 2016, *52*, 1778–1795; e) H. T. Chifotides, K. R. Dunbar, *Acc. Chem. Res.* 2013, *46*, 894–906.
- [2] a) Y. Kumar, S. Kumar, K. Mandal, P. Mukhopadhyay, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2018, 57, 16318–16322; Angew. Chem. 2018, 130, 16556–16560; b) G. Bélanger-Chabot, A. Ali, F. P. Gabbaï, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2017, 56, 9958–9961; Angew. Chem. 2017, 129, 10090–10093.
- [3] Y. Zhao, Y. Cotelle, L. Liu, J. López-Andarias, A.-B. Bornhof, M. Akamatsu, N. Sakai, S. Matile, Acc. Chem. Res. 2018, 51, 2255– 2263.
- [4] X. Zhang, X. Hao, L. Liu, A.-T. Pham, J. López-Andarias, A. Frontera, N. Sakai, S. Matile, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2018, 140, 17867–17871.
- [5] Y. Zhao, S. Benz, N. Sakai, S. Matile, *Chem. Sci.* 2015, 6, 6219–6223.
- [6] A.-B. Bornhof, A. Bauzà, A. Aster, E. Vauthey, A. Frontera, N. Sakai, S. Matile, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2018, 140, 4884–4892.
- [7] J. López-Andarias, A. Frontera, S. Matile, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2017, 139, 13296-13299.
- [8] a) D. Tasis, N. Tagmatarchis, A. Bianco, M. Prato, *Chem. Rev.* 2006, *106*, 1105–1136; b) V. Georgakilas, J. A. Perman, J. Tucek, R. Zboril, *Chem. Rev.* 2015, *115*, 4744–4822.
- [9] a) D. Jariwala, V. K. Sangwan, L. J. Lauhon, T. J. Marks, M. C. Hersam, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 2013, *42*, 2824–2860; b) S. Chaudhary, H. Lu, A. M. Müller, C. J. Bardeen, M. Ozkan, *Nano Lett.* 2007, 7, 1973–1979; c) J. M. Holt, A. J. Ferguson, N. Kopidakis, B. A. Larsen, J. Bult, G. Rumbles, J. L. Blackburn, *Nano Lett.* 2010, *10*, 4627–4633; d) A. Roth, C. Schierl, A. Ferrer-Ruiz, M. Minameyer, L. Rodríguez-Pérez, C. Villegas, M. A. Herranz, N. Martín, *Chem* 2017, *3*, 164–173.

[10] M. Novák, C. Foroutan-Nejad, R. Marek, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 2016, 12, 3788–3795.

Angewandte

I Edition Chemie

- [11] a) D. Sh. Sabirov, *RSC Adv.* 2014, *4*, 44996–45028; b) E. N. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, G. E. Scuseria, C. W. Bauschlicher, *Phys. Rev. B* 2005, *72*, 033402.
- [12] M. Blanco, B. Nieto-Ortega, A. de Juan, M. Vera-Hidalgo, A. López-Moreno, S. Casado, L. R. González, H. Sawada, J. M. González-Calbet, E. M. Pérez, *Nat. Commun.* 2018, 9, 2671.
- [13] a) F. G. Brunetti, C. Romero-Nieto, J. López-Andarias, C. Atienza, J. L. López, D. M. Guldi, N. Martín, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2013, 52, 2180-2184; Angew. Chem. 2013, 125, 2236-2240; b) A. de Juan, A. López-Moreno, J. Calbo, E. Ortí, E. M. Pérez, Chem. Sci. 2015, 6, 7008-7014; c) D. Fong, A. Adronov, Chem. Sci. 2017, 8, 7292-7305.
- [14] a) L. Mohammadzadeh, P. Quaino, W. Schmickler, *Faraday Discuss.* 2016, 193, 415–426; b) N. P. Pampaloni, M. Lottner, M. Giugliano, A. Matruglio, F. D'Amico, M. Prato, J. A. Garrido, L. Ballerini, D. Scaini, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* 2018, 13, 755–764.
- [15] a) T. A. Pham, S. M. G. Mortuza, B. C. Wood, E. Y. Lau, T. Ogitsu, S. F. Buchsbaum, Z. S. Siwy, F. Fornasiero, E. Schwegler, *J. Phys. Chem. C* 2016, *120*, 7332–7338; b) E. Farajpour, B. Sohrabi, J. Beheshtian, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 2016, *18*, 7293–7299; c) A. Frontera, D. Quiñonero, C. Garau, A. Costa, P. Ballester, P. M. Deyà, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2006, *110*, 9307–9309.
- [16] J. Marco-Martínez, S. Vidal, I. Fernández, S. Filippone, N. Martín, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2017, 56, 2136–2139; Angew. Chem. 2017, 129, 2168–2171.
- [17] a) V. Campisciano, M. Gruttadauria, F. Giacalone, Chem-CatChem 2019, 11, 90-133; b) A. Bahuguna, A. Kumar, T. Chhabra, A. Kumar, V. Krishnan, ACS Appl. Nano Mater. 2018, 1, 6711-6723; c) T. Kitanosono, P. Xu, S. Kobayashi, Science 2018, 362, 311-315; d) M. Zhou, H.-L. Wang, S. Guo, Chem. Soc. Rev. 2016, 45, 1273-1307; e) D. D. Chronopoulos, C. G. Kokotos, N. Karousis, G. Kokotos, N. Tagmatarchis, Nanoscale 2015, 7, 2750-2757; f) H. Hu, J. H. Xin, H. Hu, X. Wang, Y. Kong, Appl. Catal. A 2015, 492, 1-9; g) M. R. Acocella, M. Mauro, G. Guerra, ChemSusChem 2014, 7, 3279-3283; h) A. Schaetz, M. Zeltner, W. J. Stark, ACS Catal. 2012, 2, 1267-1284; i) F. Li, B. Zhang, X. Li, Y. Jiang, L. Chen, Y. Li, L. Sun, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 12276-12279; Angew. Chem. 2011, 123, 12484-12487; j) J. John, E. Gravel, A. Hagège, H. Li, T. Gacoin, E. Doris, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 7533-7536; Angew. Chem. 2011, 123, 7675-7678.
- [18] N. Chiodarelli, O. Richard, H. Bender, M. Heyns, S. De Gendt, G. Groeseneken, P. M. Vereecken, *Carbon* 2012, 50, 1748–1752.
- [19] M. Akamatsu, N. Sakai, S. Matile, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2017, 139, 6558–6561.
- [20] S. Hagihara, L. Gremaud, G. Bollot, J. Mareda, S. Matile, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 4347–4351.
- [21] A. N. Khlobystov, D. A. Britz, G. A. D. Briggs, Acc. Chem. Res. 2005, 38, 901–909.
- [22] a) C. R. Kennedy, S. Lin, E. N. Jacobsen, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.
 2016, 55, 12596-12624; Angew. Chem. 2016, 128, 12784-12814;
 b) C. M. Hong, R. G. Bergman, K. N. Raymond, F. D. Toste, Acc. Chem. Res. 2018, 51, 2447-2455; c) E. Pahima, Q. Zhang, K. Tiefenbacher, D. T. Major, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2019, 141, 6234-6246.
- [23] a) L. Zheng, H. Zhao, Y. Han, H. Qian, L. Vukovic, J. Mecinović, P. Král, W. T. S. Huck, *Nat. Chem.* **2019**, *11*, 359; b) V. Gorteau, G. Bollot, J. Mareda, A. Perez-Velasco, S. Matile, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 14788–14789.
- [24] S. Shaik, R. Ramanan, D. Danovich, D. Mandal, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 2018, 47, 5125–5145.

Manuscript received: July 29, 2019 Version of record online: ■■ ■■, ■■■■

© 2019 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2019, 58, 1-5

K These are not the final page numbers!



Communications

Communications

Supramolecular Chemistry

A.-B. Bornhof, M. Vázquez-Nakagawa, L. Rodríguez-Pérez, M. Ángeles Herranz, N. Sakai, N. Martín,* S. Matile,* J. López-Andarias* _____

Anion– π Catalysis on Carbon Nanotubes



Polarizability is driven to the extreme and harnessed for anion– π catalysis. Multiwalled carbon nanotubes i) outperform single-walled ones (polarizable beyond one tube), ii) are inactivated by π -basic competitors (active sites are on tube surface), iii) prefer covalent, linker-sensitive interfacing over non-covalent strategies (pyrene), and iv) activate existing anion- π catalysts by electron sharing (NDIs > fullerenes).

© 2019 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

einheim www.angewandte.org 5 These are not the final page numbers!