

A MATHEMATICAL MODEL FOR THE DIRECT FIELD ELECTROSTATIC EFFECT  
IN ELECTROPHILIC AROMATIC SUBSTITUTION

K.C.C. Bancroft and G.R. Howe  
School of Chemistry, City of Leicester Polytechnic, LE1 9BH

(Received in UK 20 April 1970; accepted for publication 23 April 1970)

As part of a general investigation of various semi empirical methods for correlating substituent effects upon electrophilic aromatic substitution reaction rates,<sup>1</sup> we have developed a new model for the polar direct field effect<sup>2</sup> of a substituent upon the  $\pi$  electron systems in such reactions. This is an electrostatic interaction potential  $E_i$  defined as:-

$$E_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j \sum_{j \neq i} \zeta_i \zeta_j / r_{ij} \quad - - - (1)$$

where  $\zeta_i$  is the  $\pi$  charge density on the  $i^{\text{th}}$  atom, and  $r_{ij}$  is the distance between atom  $i$  and atom  $j$ .

In the case of hydrocarbons without substituents this is of course a rough approximation to an SCF calculation,  $E$  being some measure of electron-electron repulsion. In such systems differential  $\sigma$  bond energies between ground and transition states should be negligible, and we have therefore investigated the use of equation (1) for protodetrition rate data for unsubstituted hydrocarbons.<sup>3,4,5</sup> Defining  $E_i^+ = E_i$  WHELAND INTERMEDIATE  $-E_i$  GROUND STATE, table I lists values of  $E_i^+$  for various positions in these hydrocarbons calculated by Hückel<sup>6</sup> and Omega<sup>7</sup> techniques.

Correlations of experimental data (a) with  $\pi$  electron localisation energies<sup>7</sup>  $L^+$  and (b) with  $L^+$  and  $E^+$  values were examined using functions (2) and (3) respectively.

$$\text{Log } k = A + BL^+ \quad - - - (2)$$

$$\text{Log } k = A + BL^+ + CE^+ \quad - - - (3)$$

The data was examined in two groups: (i) all available data for alternant hydrocarbons<sup>3,4</sup> and (ii) our data for all five positions in the non-alternant fluoranthene system.<sup>5</sup> The ratios of the standard error of estimate<sup>8</sup> for functions (2) and (3) are listed in table II.

TABLE I

Electrostatic potentials as calculated by H.M.O. and Omega Theory

| Hydrocarbon  | Position | $E^+$<br>H.M.O. | $E^+$<br>Omega |
|--------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|
| Benzene      | -        | 0.013           | 0.024          |
| Naphthalene  | 1        | 0.000           | 0.000          |
|              | 2        | -0.005          | 0.001          |
| Phenanthrene | 1        | -0.002          | -0.012         |
|              | 2        | 0.001           | 0.006          |
|              | 3        | 0.000           | -0.010         |
|              | 4        | .002            | -0.009         |
|              | 9        | -0.017          | -0.012         |
| Triphenylene | 1        | 0.005           | -0.015         |
|              | 2        | 0.003           | -0.054         |
| Chrysene     | 6        | -0.012          | -0.023         |
| Pyrene       | 1        | -0.006          | -0.025         |
|              | 2        | 0.006           | -0.013         |
|              | 4        | -0.017          | -0.015         |
| Perylene     | 3        | -0.014          | -0.035         |
| Fluoranthene | 1        | -0.031          | -0.035         |
|              | 2        | -0.017          | -0.012         |
|              | 3        | -0.022          | -0.031         |
|              | 7        | -0.045          | -0.039         |
|              | 8        | -0.027          | -0.030         |

TABLE II

Ratio of standard errors of estimate using functions (2) and (3) respectively

| Hydrocarbon                    | Ratio H.M.O. | Ratio Omega |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| All protodetritionation data * | 1.02         | 1.03        |
| Fluoranthene data +            | 1.00         | 0.86        |

\* ref. 3,4 and references therein. + ref. 5

The results for the alternant hydrocarbons show little difference on including  $E^+$  values, as do the Hückel results for the non-alternant fluoranthene. However use of the more sophisticated Omega technique in conjunction with  $E^+$  values for fluoranthene gives a significant improvement in the correlation by some 14%.

Hückel calculations in non-alternant systems are particularly prone to error,<sup>9</sup> and it is for such systems as these that calculations of the Omega type, and those inherent in equation (1) may be expected to give improved results. Hetero-atom substituted hydrocarbons are of course also non-alternant. Subsequently we hope to examine the application of equation (1) (in conjunction with various mathematical models for  $\sigma$  bond electrostatic interaction) to substituent effects in such systems.

## References

- (1) K.C.C. Bancroft and G.R. Howe, Tetrahedron Letters, 1967, 4207.
- (2) J.G. Kirkwood and F.H. Westheimer, J. Chem. Phys., 1938, 6,506;  
F.H. Westheimer and J.G. Kirkwood, ibid., 1938, 6,513.
- (3) K.C.C. Bancroft, R.W. Bott, and C. Eaborn, Chem. and Ind., 1965, 1951.
- (4) A.Lewis, Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, 1967.
- (5) G.R. Howe, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leicester, 1969.
- (6) A. Streitwieser, 'Molecular Orbital Theory for Organic Chemists',  
Wiley, New York and London, 1961, Chap. 11.
- (7) A. Streitwieser, J.I. Brauman, and J.B. Bush, Tetrahedron, 1963, 19, Sup.2., 379.
- (8) K.W. Smillie, 'An Introduction to Regression and Correlation,' Academic Press,  
London, 1966.
- (9) M.J.S. Dewar, International Symposium on Aromaticity, 1966, Sheffield.  
(Chemical Society. Special Publication - No. 21).