



Article

Subscriber access provided by United Arab Emirates University | Libraries Deanship

An Unexpected, Latent Radical Reaction of Methane Propagated by Trifluoromethyl Radicals

Nima Zargari, Pierre Winter, Yong Liang, Joo Ho Lee, Andrew Cooksy, Kendall N. Houk, and Kyung Woon Jung

J. Org. Chem., Just Accepted Manuscript • DOI: 10.1021/acs.joc.6b01903 • Publication Date (Web): 29 Sep 2016 Downloaded from http://pubs.acs.org on September 30, 2016

Just Accepted

"Just Accepted" manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides "Just Accepted" as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. "Just Accepted" manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. "Just Accepted" manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). "Just Accepted" is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the "Just Accepted" Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the "Just Accepted" Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these "Just Accepted" manuscripts.



The Journal of Organic Chemistry is published by the American Chemical Society. 1155 Sixteenth Street N.W., Washington, DC 20036

Published by American Chemical Society. Copyright © American Chemical Society. However, no copyright claim is made to original U.S. Government works, or works produced by employees of any Commonwealth realm Crown government in the course of their duties. 12345678

9 10

11 12

An Unexpected, Latent Radical Reaction of Methane Propagated by Trifluoromethyl Radicals

Nima Zargari,¹Pierre Winter,²Yong Liang,³Joo Ho Lee,¹Andrew Cooksy,^{*2}K. N. Houk,^{*3}and Kyung Woon Jung^{*1}

¹Loker Hydrocarbon Research Institute, Department of Chemistry, University of Southern California, 837 Bloom Walk, Los Angeles, CA 90089

²Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego CA 92182

³Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90095



ABSTRACT: Thorough mechanistic studies and DFT calculations revealed a background radical pathway latent in metal catalyzed oxidation reactions of methane at low temperatures. Use of hydrogen peroxide with TFAA generated a trifluoromethyl radical (\cdot CF₃), which in turn reacted with methane gas to selectively yield acetic acid. It was found that the methyl carbon of the product was derived from methane, while the carbonyl carbon was derived from TFAA. Computational studies also support these findings, revealing the reaction cycle to be energetically favorable.

INGRODUCTION

Methane, in the form of natural gas, is the most abundant hydrocarbon but the least reactive due to its high bond-dissociation energy.^[1] Because methane and its flared product, carbon dioxide, are major greenhouse gases,[2] it is of paramount importance to discover novel ways to functionalize methane. Various oxidants with transition metals or even main-group catalysts have been investigated in order to oxidize methane into chemical feedstock products with varying degrees of success.^[3] Seminally, Sen, Mizuno, and Ingrosso used hydrogen peroxide in trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) and trifluoroacetic anhydride (TFAA) to successfully convert methane gas to either methyl trifluoroacetate or acetic acid as major liquid products.^[4-6] Despite low yields based on methane, these methodologies were progressive and pioneering. These transformations required the use of transition metal catalysts; however, their mechanisms including the possible presence of nonmetallic background processes were not comprehensively studied. Herein, we report a background reaction which we have identified as a radical process.^[7] The purpose of this paper is to provide clarity to the mysterious and underdeveloped reaction of methane gas under radical conditions in TFA and TFAA solution.

Using various palladium catalysts including our NHCamidate complex,^[8] we examined the oxidation of methane under the conditions similar to the work done by Sen at 90 °C, and obtained methanol in similar yields as Sen reported. However, at lower temperatures (60 °C) we observed acetic acid as the primary product. To our surprise, the same amount of acetic acid was seen without the use of any palladium catalysts as well. As depicted in Scheme 1, acetic acid was selectively generated from methane at 60 °C while we also observed the presence of another critical product, fluoroform, which stemmed from TFA/TFAA (*vide infra*). Hence, we embarked on the study of this background reaction to better understand the mechanistic pathway.

Scheme 1. Background radical reaction at a low temperature

CH₄
$$\xrightarrow{\text{TFAA, TFA, H}_2O_2}$$
 CH₃CO₂H + CF₃H
60 °C, 16 h 3.8% 0.6%

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the absence of methane, no products were observed, indicating that methane was the actual carbon source for the intended reactions. When we employed ¹³C labeled methane, we observed acetic acid as the only meaningful ¹³C incorporating product (Figure 1). However, the acetyl protons in the ¹H NMR spectra exhibited a large one-bond ¹³C-H coupling ($\mathcal{J}_{C-H} = 130 \text{ Hz}$) but no two-bond coupling (i.e., ¹³C-¹³C-H), signaling only the methyl of the acetyl group came from methane. In addition, fluoroform was constantly detected in variable amounts, suggesting that the C-C bond of the trifluoroacetyl group was cleaved to offer the carbonyl moiety, which would be incorporated into the produced acetic acid (*vide infra*).



Figure 1. Wet1D ¹H NMR of ¹³C labeled methane reaction (DMSO was added as an internal NMR standard after the reaction)

In the proton-coupled ¹³C NMR spectra (Figure 2), similar patterns were demonstrated, where the methyl carbon of the acetyl group showed a quartet with a large coupling constant due to the aforementioned one-bond coupling ($\mathcal{J}_{C-H} = 130$ Hz). The carbonyl carbon peak was negligible due to low abundance of ¹³C, suggesting this carbon would be naturally abundant ¹²C. Both spectrum data confirmed that methane was a key reactant to form the methyl portion of acetic acid, and the carbonyl moiety would stem from another carbon source.

As a potential candidate of the extra carbon sources, we first decided to see if carbon dioxide would react since we usually detected carbon dioxide in small amounts (Figure 2). However, the addition of either carbon dioxide or carbon monoxide did not affect the yield of the reaction. Thus, it was concluded that TFAA/TFA would offer the carbonyl moiety to the produced acetic acid since they were the only carbon-containing compounds left in the reaction mixture.

We investigated the effect of TFA and TFAA in order to determine which reagent participated in the formation of acetic acid and fluoroform (Table 1). The reaction did not proceed when TFAA was excluded (entry 1). As the amount of TFAA increased, the reaction afforded higher yields of acetic acid and smaller quantities of methanol (entries 2 - 4). Use of pure TFAA resulted in a lower yield, suggesting acidic anhydrous conditions are required (entry 5). These results supported the role of TFAA rather than TFA as the carbonyl source of the observed acetic acid. The necessity of having an excess amount of TFAA has significant mechanistic implications, which include the trapping of acetic acid within a mixed anhydride (*vide infra*).



Figure 2.¹³C NMR of ¹³C labeled methane reaction (DMSO was added as an internal NMR standard after the reaction)

Entry	TFAA / TFA (mmol)	AcOH (µmol, yield)	MeOH (µmol)
1	0.0 / 11	-	-
2	1.4 / 8.1	33 (1.0%)	2.0
3	2.8 / 5.4	55 (1.7%)	0.7
4	4.3 / 2.7	121 (3.8%)	-
5	5.7 / 0.0	25 (0.77%)	-

Reaction conditions: Varying amounts of TFAA and TFA were added to 130 μ mol 30% H₂O₂ in a stainless steel reactor with a high pressure valve and charged with 3200 μ mol methane. The mixture was stirred at 60 °C for 16 hours. D₂O was added to the reaction mixture and a wet1D NMR was taken using DMSO as an internal standard. Yields were calculated based on methane as the limiting reagent.

Since CF₃H was observed in both ¹H and ¹⁹F NMR, we proposed that trifluoromethyl radical (CF_3) would be the chain carrier of this reaction. In conditions including hydrogen peroxide and TFAA, there are several ways in which ·CF₃ can be produced. As depicted in Scheme 2, the radical processes can be initiated by trifluoroperacetic acid 1 (TFPAA), which is in accordance with previous studies performed with TFAA and hydrogen peroxide at room temperature.^[9] Therefore, TFPAA (1) can react directly with methane to form intermediate 2.[10] Radical degradation of this complex would furnish methyl (CH_3) and TFA radicals (3) along with water. Decarboxylation of TFA radical 3 leads to the facile production of trifluoromethyl radical ($\cdot CF_3$), which plays a crucial role in the subsequent radical propagation processes. Previous studies also confirmed that trifluoroacetyl peroxides furnished fluoroform along with carbon dioxide when they were subject to thermal decomposition in hydrocarbon solvents.[11]

1

Scheme 2. Formation of trifluoroperacetic acid and subsequent reaction with methane

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_{3} \bigcirc H_{2} \odot H_$$

ш

Another source of $\[CF_3\]$ is bis(perfluoroacetyl) peroxide **4** (Scheme 3). When hydrogen peroxide is added to a solution of TFAA and trace amounts of base, **1** is no longer produced and the primary product is bis(perfluoroacetyl) peroxide **4**.^[9] Alternatively, when 30% hydrogen peroxide is introduced dropwise into a biphasic system of an aqueous alkaline media and Freon 113, **4** is also produced.^[12] At elevated temperatures, **4** readily undergoes homolysis, and the resulting TFA radical **3** rapidly dissociates to give rise to the formation of trifluoromethyl radical ($\[CF_3\]$).



Scheme 3. Formation of bis(perfluoroacetyl) peroxide and subsequent homolysis

Our standard reaction conditions were applied using all three different pathways of producing trifluoromethyl radical initiators and all produced acetic acid as the selective product. Most importantly, in the reaction which bis(perfluoroacetyl) peroxide in Freon 113 solution was used as the trifluoromethyl radical initiator, no additional hydrogen peroxide was introduced into the solution. This supports our belief that the radical chain carrier of this methane functionalization reaction is trifluoromethyl radical (\cdot CF₃).

The ¹⁹F NMR of the solutions prior to reacting them with methane clearly showed the selective formation of either 1 or 4 (Figure 3). Since our standard reaction conditions did not use any bases, trifluoroperacetic acid 1 (TFPAA) would be the trifluoromethyl radical source of the reactions, not bis(per-fluoroacetyl) peroxide 4.



-67.0 -67.5 -68.0 -68.5 -69.0 -69.5 -70.0 -70.5 -71.0 -71.5 -72.0 -72.5 -73.0 -73.5 -74.0 -74.5 -75.0 -75.5 f1 (opm)

Figure 3. ¹⁹F NMR of three methods of forming trifluoromethyl radical sources: A) addition of H_2O_2 to a TFA/TFAA solution at room temperature; B) addition of H_2O_2 to a TFA/TFAA solution with trace amounts of potassium hydroxide at room temperature; C) dropwise addition of H_2O_2 into a biphasic system of an aqueous alkaline media and Freon 113 at -4 °C.

As illustrated in Scheme 4, trifluoromethyl radical (CF₃) reacts with methane to form methyl radical ($\cdot CH_3$) and fluoroform (CF₃H) because of the favorable difference in the bond dissociation energies between fluroform (446.4 kJ/mol) and methane (439.7 kJ/mol).^[13] After the produced methyl radical $(\cdot CH_3)$ adds to TFAA, the resultant intermediate 5 undergoes radical dissociation to mixed anhydride 6, while trifluoromethyl radical ($\cdot CF_3$) is regenerated to propagate the radical cycle. Upon treatment with water during the work-up, mixed anhydride 6 is ultimately liberated into acetic acid and TFA. This mechanistic scheme is similar to the one proposed by Sen while investigating the radical-initiated oxidative functionalization of higher chain alkanes such as ethane and propane.^[4b] Interestingly, the trifluoromethyl radical might add to TFAA, however we did not observe other potential dissociation products such as hexafluoroacetone. The adduct would dissociate to $\cdot CF_3$ more rapidly via the reversible process of the addition than the dissociation of the anhydride C-O bond to hexafluoroacetone. Termination of this radical process may occur by the reaction of two trifluoromethyl radicals ($\cdot CF_3$), forming hexafluoroethane (C_2F_6) which was observed in ¹⁹F NMR. Hexafluoroethane is commonly seen as a decomposition product of reactions containing trifluoromethyl radicals (CF_3).^[14]

Scheme 4. Methane functionalization by proposed radical processes and termination of trifluoromethyl radical



•CF₃ + •CF₃ $\xrightarrow{}$ Termination C₂F₆



Figure 4. TFA Solvated relative free energy (kJ/mol) diagram for Scheme 4 reactions. Vibrational corrections were calculated at 333K and 27.0 atm.

This mechanistic approach takes into account several critical observations. Firstly, greater amounts of acetic acid were observed as the amount of TFAA increased because TFAA provided both CF₃ radical as the reagent and the carbonyl group as the substrate. Secondly, acetic acid was not detected until the aqueous work-up because the mixed anhydride **6** was stable during the reaction conditions. As a consequence, at low temperatures, the over-oxidation of acetic acid to carbon dioxide was inhibited, while higher temperatures may have degraded the mixed anhydride. The rare cases where trace methanol was observed, may be caused by the direct oxidation of methane via peroxide radicals. Lastly, since water could be formed as a by-product of the radical degradation of complex **2** (Scheme 2), excess amounts of TFAA were used to maintain anhydrous reaction conditions.

Seeking evidence to corroborate the proposed mechanism, we carefully analyzed products by using NMR and GC methods mainly to identify important product species such as fluoroform, hexafluoroethane, carbon dioxide, and mixed anhydride **6**. We confirmed the presence of fluoroform by both wet1D ¹H (Figure 1) and ¹⁹F NMR. Hexafluoroethane was observed as another fluorine containing product besides fluoroform by ¹⁹F NMR analysis. By employing wet1D ¹H and ¹³C NMR techniques, we detected the mixed anhydride at the end of the reaction as well as its rapid hydrolysis to acetic acid and TFA upon the addition of water. Under standard reaction conditions (Table 1, entry 4), proton-coupled ¹³C NMR studies (Figure 2) showed the production of carbon dioxide, while gas chromatography analysis quantified the amount to be 109 µmol. These results suggested that 130 µmol of hydrogen peroxide led to 109 µmol of CO₂ and the equimolar amount of trifluoromethyl radical (·CF₃). Acetic acid as the only liquid product was obtained in slightly larger amounts (i.e., 121 µmol), implying the radical cycle proposed in Scheme 4 would be in play.

Rigorous computational studies were also performed to support these experimental findings. The radical processes for methane functionalization in Scheme 4, with the exception of the hydrolysis of mixed anhydride **6** and the radical termination reaction, were analyzed computationally using Gaussian 09.^[15] The bimolecular reaction between the trifluoromethyl radical (CF_3) and methane will be referred to as reaction 1. The bimolecular addition reaction between the methyl radical (CH_3) and TFAA will be referred to as reaction 2. Finally, the unimolecular decomposition reaction of **5** into trifluoromethyl radical and **6** will be referred to as reaction 3. Each of these reactions proceeds through a single transition state which will be referred to as transition state 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

The COSMO model was used to estimate the solvent effects of TFA on the single-point energies of all reactants, transition states, and products. The COSMO results predict that the free energies of reaction for reactions 1 and 3 are both lowered by 7.7 kJ/mol when using TFA as a solvent, but increase by 1.8 kJ/mol for reaction 2. For reactions 2, the energy of activation did not change significantly when using the COSMO model. The free energies of activation for reaction 1 and 3, however, were each reduced by 3.0 kJ/mol when the COSMO model was employed. From these data we conclude that solvation plays an important role in the reaction thermodynamics of Scheme 4, if not the kinetics (Figure 4).

Frequency calculations were performed on the optimized geometries to obtain zero-point and thermal corrections at 333K and 27.0 atm. These calculations also confirm that our transition state geometries are first-order saddle points and that our reactant and product geometries are minima on the potential energy surface. The single imaginary frequency calculated for each transition state was verified to correspond to the reaction coordinate for that step.

The transfer of a hydrogen atom to proceed from CF_3 and CH_4 to CF_3H and CH_3 is found to occur through transition state 1 (Figure 5). The C-H bond length in this structure is 1.37 Å between CF_3 and the shared hydrogen atom and 1.33 Å between CH_3 and the shared hydrogen atom. The FCH bond angle is 109.8° and the HCH bond angle is 104.3°. The solvated free energy of activation for this transition state was found to be 62.2 kJ/mol.



Figure 5. Transition state structure of reaction between trifluoromethyl radical ($\cdot CF_3$) and methane; carbon: gray, hydrogen: white, and fluorine: blue (reaction 1).

Of the three reactions modeled, the transition state for reaction 2 has the highest solvated activation free energy of 67.2 kJ/mol, indicating that this is the slowest reaction in the mechanism. The C-C bond distance in this structure is 2.22Å between the carbonyl of TFAA and the $\,^{\circ}$ CH₃ carbon atom. The CCO bond angle between the previously mentioned carbon atoms and the respective carbonyl oxygen atom is 100.5° (Figure 6).

The structure of transition state 3 shows the removal of the \cdot CF₃ group from the reactant to form the mixed anhydride product (Figure 7). The C-C bond length in this structure is 2.07 Å between \cdot CF₃ and the carbonyl carbon of the mixed anhydride. The CCO bond angle between the \cdot CF₃ moiety and the carbonyl group is 99.0°. The solvated free energy of activation for this transition state was found to be 35.4 kJ/mol.



Figure 6. Transition state structure of reaction between the methyl radical (CH_3) and TFAA; carbon: gray, hydrogen: white, oxygen: red, and fluorine: blue (reaction 2).



Figure 7. Transition state structure of decomposition reaction of **5** into trifluoromethyl radical and **6**; carbon: gray, hydrogen: white, oxygen: red, and fluorine: blue (reaction 3).

In an effort to validate the radical process, we evaluated the feasibility of the methane functionalization by using various radical inhibitors and promoters (Table 2). When various radical inhibitors and initiators including butylated hydroxytoluene (BHT), TEMPO, and azobisisobutyronitrile (AIBN) were added (10 mole percent to hydrogen peroxide), yields of acetic acid were reduced by 75% (entries 2 - 4 vs entry 1). As expected, a stoichiometric amount of BHT shut down the reaction completely (entry 5). When radical initiators such as AIBN were solely utilized in the absence of hydrogen peroxide, no products were observed. These data support a radical mechanism through the necessity of TFPAA (1).

En-	H_2O_2	Additive	AcOH	MeOH
try	(μmol)		(μmol)	(μmol)
1	130	-	121	-
2	130	BHT^a	34	1.4
3	130	TEM-	22	2.1
4	130	PO^a	46	4.3
5	130	AIBN ^a	-	-
		BHT^b		

^{*a*}13 µmoles. ^{*b*}130 µmoles. Reaction conditions: 2.7 mmol TFA, 4.25 mmol TFAA, 130 µmol 30% H_2O_2 , and varying amounts of an radical inhibitor and initiator were added to a stainless steel reactor with a high pressure valve and charged with 3200 µmol methane. The mixture was stirred at 60 °C for 16 hours. D₂O was added to the reaction mixture and a wet1D NMR was taken using DMSO as an internal standard.

As represented in Table 3, we varied the amounts of hydrogen peroxide and compared the aforementioned results (shown again in Table 3, entry 2). Reducing the amount of hydrogen peroxide by half produced acetic acid in a lower yield as expected (entry 1). However, doubling the amount of hydrogen peroxide failed to furnish additional acetic acid (entry 3). Both of these modified amounts of hydrogen peroxide produced methanol in trace amounts. Therefore, there seemed to be an appropriate stoichiometry between hydrogen peroxide and TFAA for optimal radical processes (entry 2).

Table 3. Effect of hydrogen peroxide used

Entry	$\begin{array}{c} H_2O_2 \\ (\mu mol) \end{array}$	AcOH (µmol, yield)	MeOH (µmol)
1	65	75 (2.4%)	1.9
2	130	121 (3.8%)	-
3	260	109 (3.4%)	1.8

Reaction conditions: 2.7 mmol TFA, 4.25 mmol TFAA were added to varying amounts of 30% H₂O₂ and were added to a stainless steel reactor with a high pressure valve and charged with 3200 µmol methane. The mixture was stirred at 60 °C for 16 hours. D₂O was added to the reaction mixture and a wet1D NMR was taken using DMSO as an internal standard.

CONCLUSION

In summary, we found a background radical reaction latent in metal catalyzed oxidative functionalizations of methane. Hydrogen peroxide together with TFAA produced the trifluoromethyl radical (CF_3) by trifluoroperacetic acid **1**, though it was also shown that CF_3 can also be produced by the homolysis of bis(perfluoroacetyl) peroxide **4**. The CF_3 in turn reacted with methane in a favorable reaction forming fluroform and methyl radical. The resulting methyl radical reacted with TFAA to generate a mixed anhydride, which was subsequently hydrolyzed into acetic acid. NMR data indicated that the methyl group of acetic acid originated from methane while the carbonyl carbon originated from TFAA. Experimental results from the use of radical initiators and inhibitors along with careful analysis of products and intermediates supported our hypothesis on a radical mechanism. Though similar reaction conditions for methane oxidation have frequently been employed, a thorough study of this intriguing background reaction has not been performed. Thus, we hope that this report will bring some clarity to radical transformations and metal catalyzed oxidations of methane, the most abundant carbon source.

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Methods. All glassware and reactor components were oven-dried prior to use. All chemicals were purchased as reagent grade and used without further purification.. ¹H (400 or 500 MHz), ¹³C (126 MHz), and ¹⁹F (470 MHz) NMR spectra were referenced to DMSO or TFA.

A TCD detector for gas chromatography was set at 160 °C and the inlet temperature was set at 200 °C. Initial oven temperature was 40 °C for one minute and was then ramped to 50 °C at 10 °C/minute. The flow rate was set to 3 mL/minute by an argon high purity carrier. After the reaction was complete, the reactor was cooled at -20 °C for half an hour. The vessel was opened and the expelled gas was passed through potassium hydroxide and Drierite and collected in a screw cap vial with septum. Resulting gas was then injected into the GC column.

General Method for Methane Functionalization. To a 0.5 dram vial equipped with a stir bar, was added a solution of 0.2 mL (2.69 mmol) TFA, 0.6 mL (4.25 mmol) TFAA, and 13 μ L (130 μ mol) 30% H₂O₂. The solution was stirred at room temperature for one minute. The reaction was then placed in a stainless steel reactor with a high pressure valve and was subjected to eight purge cycles and charged with 27 psi (3200 μ mol) methane gas. The reactor was stirred at 60 °C for 16 hours. The reaction vessels were then held at -20 °C for half an hour. 0.5 mL D₂O was added to the reaction mixture and a wet1D NMR was taken using DMSO as an internal standard.

Synthesis of Bis(perfluoroacetyl) peroxide (4). 0.21 g (2.0 mmol) sodium carbonate and 0.11 g (2.0 mmol) sodium chloride were added to 1.9 mL of deionized water and the reaction was stirred at 0 °C for five minutes. 0.2 mL of 30% H_2O_2 (20 mmol) and 1.9 mL of Freon 113 were then added to the aqueous solution and stirred at -3 °C for five minutes. 0.35 mL (2.5 mmol) TFAA was added dropwise over 30 minutes. The organic layer was separated and ¹⁹F NMR was taken, using trifluorotoluene as an internal standard. ¹⁹F NMR; -72.76 ppm.

Gaussian Parameters. In all cases the reactant, product, and transition state geometries were optimized using the B3LYP hybrid functional,^[16] and Dunning's aug-cc-pVDZ basis set.^[17] Diffuse functions were included in the basis set in order to account for long-range interactions, particularly between the fluorine and carbon atoms.

COSMO Paramenrts. Energies were calculated for the gas-phase optimized geometries both with and without the conductor-like polarizable continuum solvent model (COSMO).^[18] Values for the dielectric constant and solute

1

> 59 60

radius were manually configured in Gaussian to most accurately represent TFA.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

Experimental procedures, computational data, spectroscopic data, copies of wet1D ¹H, ¹³C, and ¹⁹Fspectra, and gas chromatography data

This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*kwjung@usc.edu *houk@chem.ucla.edu *acooksy@mail.sdsu.edu

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We acknowledge Dr. Richard Giles for helpful discussion as well as the Hydrocarbon Research Foundation, the NIH (S10 RR025432), and the NSF (Grant CHE-1361104) for generous financial support.

REFERENCES

(1) Blanksby, S. J.; Ellison, G. B. Acc. Chem. Res. 2003, 36, 255-263.

(2) (a) Karacan, C. Ö.; Ruiz, F. A.; Cotè, M.; Phipps, S. Int. *J. Coal Geol.* 2011, 86, 121-156. (b) Jorgenson, A. K. Soc.
Forces. 2006, 84, 1779-1798. (c) Augenstein, D. Global Environ. Change. 1992, 2, 311-328. (d) Lashof, D. A.; Ahuja, D.
R. Nature 1990, 344, 529-531. (e) Parkyns, N. D. Chem. Br.
1990, 26, 841-844.

(3) (a) Fu, R.; O'Reilly, M. E.; Nielsen, R. J.; Goddard III, W. A.; Gunnoe, T. B. Chem. Eur. J. 2015, 21, 1286-1293.
(b) Guo, Z.; Liu, B.; Zhang Q.; Deng, W.; Wang, Y.; Yang, Y. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2014, 43, 3480-3524. (c) Hashiguchi, F. G.; Konnick, M. M.; Bischof, S. M.; Gustafson, S. J.; Devarajan, D.; Gunsalus, N.; Ess, D. H.; Periana, R. A. Science 2014, 343, 1232-1237. (d) Gupta, S.;Kirillova, M. V.;da Silva, M. F. C. G.;Pombeiro, A. J. L.;Kiri, A. M.Inorg. Chem. 2013, 52, 8601-8611. (e) Silva, T. F. S.; Mac Leod, T. C. O.; Martinsa, L. M. D. R. S.; da Silva, M. F. C. G.; Schiavon, M. A.; Pombeiro, A. J. L.J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem. 2013, 367, 52-60.

(4) (a) Kao, L. C.; Hutson, A. C.; Sen, A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1991**, *113*, 700-701. (b) Hogan, T.; Sen, A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 2642-2646.

(5) Seki, Y.; Min, J. S.; Misono, M.; Mizuno, N. *J. Phys. Chem. B.* **2000**, *104*, 5940-5944.

(6) Ingrosso, G.; Midollini, N. *J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem.* **2003**, 204-205, 425-431.

(7) Radical processes were reported using persulfate and peroxodisulfate: (a) Basickes, N.; Hogan, T. E.; Sen, A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1996, 118, 13111-13112. (b) Lin, M.; Sen, A. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1992, 892-893.

(8) Sakaguchi, S.; Yoo, K. S.; O'Neil, J.; Lee, J. H.; Stewart, T.; Jung, K. W. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. **2008**, 47, 9326-9329.

(9) Krasutsky, P. A.; Kolomitsyn, I. V.; Carlson, R. M. Org. Lett. **2001**, *3*, 2997-2999.

(10) Camaioni, D. M.; Bays, J. T.; Shaw, W. J.; Linehan J. C.; Birnbaum, J. C.; *J. Org. Chem.* **2001**, *66*, 789-795.

(11) Serov, S. I.; Zhurarlev, M. V.; Sass, V. P.; Sokolov, S. V. *7. Org. Chem. USSR (Engl. Transl.)* **1980**, *16*, 1360-1362.

(12) Sawada, H.; Nakayama, M. *J. Fluorine Chem.* **1990**, *46*, 423-431.

(13) McGivern, W. S.; Derecskei-Kovacs A.; North, S. W. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2000**, *104*, 436-442.

(14) Kopitzky, R.; Willner, H. Inorg. Chem. 2001, 40, 2693-2698.

(15) Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Petersson, G. A.; Nakatsuji, H.; Caricato, M.; Li, X.; Hratchian, H. P.; Izmaylov, A. F.; Bloino, J.; Zheng, G.; Sonnenberg, J. L.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Vreven, T.; Montgomery, J. A., Jr.; Peralta, J. E.; Ogliaro, F.; Bearpark, M.; Heyd, J. J.; Brothers, E.; Kudin, K. N.; Staroverov, V. N.; Kobayashi, R.; Normand, J.; Raghavachari, K.; Rendell, A.; Burant, J. C.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Cossi, M.; Rega, N.; Millam, J. M.; Klene, M.; Knox, J. E.; Cross, J. B.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, A. J.; Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, J. W.; Martin, R. L.; Morokuma, K.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, A. D.; Farkas, Ö.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.; Cioslowski, J.; Fox, D. J. Gaussian 09, revision D.01; Gaussian, Inc.: Wallingford, CT, 2013.

(16) (a) Becke, A. D. *J. Chem. Phys. Rev. B*, **1993**, *98*, 5648-5652. (b) Lee, C.; Yang, W.; Parr, R. G. *Phys. Rev. B*, **1988**, *37*, 785-789. (c)Vosko, S. H.; Wilk, L.; Nusair, M.*Can. J. Phys.* **1980**, *58*, 1200-1211. (d) Stephens, P. J.; Devlin, F. J.; Chabalowski, C. F.; Frisch, M. J. *J.Phys. Chem.* **1994**, *98*, 11623-11627.

(17) (a) Dunning T. H. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **1989**, *90*, 1007-1023.
(b) Kendall, R. A.; Dunning, T. H.; Harrison, R. J. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **1992**, *96*, 6796-6806. (c) Woon, D. E.; Dunning, T. H. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **1993**, *98*, 1358-1371.

(18) (a) Cossi, M.; Rega, N.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V.*J. Comp. Chem.*, **2003**, *24*, 669-681. (b) Barone, V.; Cossi, M. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, **1998**, *102*, 1995-2001.