

Theoretical studies on the structural properties, aromaticity and reactivity of 1*H***-phosphole derivatives**

Mehdi Nabati^{a, *}, Mehdi Hasanvand Mofrad^b, Maliheh-alsadat Kermanian^c, Saman Sarshar^d

^aChemistry Department, Faculty of Science, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran ^bFaculty of Liberal arts, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran ^cEnglish language Department, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Pishva Branch, Islamic Azad University, Varamin, Iran ^dPhysics Department, Faculty of Science, Lorestan University, Khorramabad, Iran

Received: November 2016; Revised: December 2016; Accepted: January 2017

Abstract: In the present research work, we have done a comparative study of 1*H*-phosphole molecule and its derivatives substituted on C2 or C3 atoms with B3LYP/6-311++G(d,p) level of theory. Here, we have done an investigation of their structures, aromaticity, and global and local reactivity of 1*H*-phosphole molecule and its derivatives. The aromaticity property of all compounds was considered by NICS and BIRD indices. Also, we have used frontier orbital HOMO-LUMO energies and relative calculations (global hardness, electronic chemical potential, electronegativity, global softness, nucleophilicity index and electrophilicity index) to explain the stability and reactive nature of 1*H*-phosphole and its derivatives. The reactivity of different atoms in each molecule was studied by Fukui functions.

Keywords: DFT study, 1*H*-phosphole, Aromaticity, Global reactivity, Local reactivity.

Introduction

The 1*H*-phosphole ring is an organic molecule with the chemical formula C_4H_4PH . This heterocyclic compound is the phosphorus analog of the pyrrole molecule. Recently, the organic materials based on the phosphole ring received much attention due to their characteristic optical and electronic properties [1].The phosphole compound has a low-lying lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) and low aromaticity [2]. Pentaphenylphosphole is the first phosphole compound that was prepared in 1953 [3]. Hughes and Srivanavit worked on thermal and photochemical ring expansion of some phosphole derivatives. In another work, churchman et.al studied the site of protonation in phosphole derivatives. They found the 1*H*-phospholium salts stabilized by complex transition metal ions [4].

Laszlo Nyulaszi investigated on the substituents effect on the aromatization of phosphole ring in 1995 [5]. Klaus Eichele and his co-workers studied the phosphorus chemical shift tensors of phosphole derivatives by ${}^{31}P$ NMR spectroscopy technique of powder samples [6].In 2001, Eric Mattmann et.al.prepared the trivalent 7-phosphanobornenes by enhancing the dienic reactivity of the phosphole materials [7].The de-aromatizing of the phosphole compounds were investigated by Mattmann group. They used the quantum-chemical density functional theory (DFT) computations for study of this property [8]. Jeanne Crassous and Regis Reau synthesized the π-conjugated phosphole derivatives in 2008. They also studied the optoelectronic functions and coordination chemistry of those compounds [9].Some of the phosphole*P*-oxide molecules were reported by Arihiro Saito et.al. in 2009 [10]. The palladium-catalyzed

^{*}Corresponding author. Tel: +98 (413) 4327501, Fax: +98 (413) 4327501, E-mail: mnabati@ymail.com

direct synthesis of phosphole derivatives was first reported by the Katsuaki Baba group in 2013 [11].

Recently, the various materials based on this heterocyclic compound were synthesized and studied theoretically [12]. In the present research work, the main aim of my investigations is the study of structural properties, aromaticities and reactivities of various 1*H*-

phosphole derivatives containing different substituents on positions 2 or 3.

Results and discussion

The structure of the positions 2 and 3 substituted 1*H*phospholes is shown in Scheme **1**.

Scheme 1: The studied 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted at positions 2 and 3.

The present study is divided into three parts. The first part studies the structural properties of the studied molecules. In second part, aromaticity and stability of the compounds are investigated. Finally, the third part of this research work is related to the study of the global and local reactivity of all molecules.

Bond lengths, bond angles and dihedral angles of the 1*H***-phosphole derivatives**

The bond lengths data of the 1H-phosphole derivatives substituted on C2 are collected in Table **1**.

It can be seen from the data, the geometry of the molecules changes depending on the substituent. The P-C2 bond length of 1*H*-phosphole ring containing electron withdrawing substituents on position 2 varies between 1.72 and 1.74 Aº. Also, the electron donating groups cause longer distances. We can see the P-C2 distance of phosphole compound containing methyl and t-butyl substituents is 1.737 and 1.842 Aº, respectively. Hence, the more electron-donating substituent cause the longer distance of P-C2 bond. The distance of this bond for the molecules containing $-CH_2F$, $-CHF_2$ and $-CF_3$ substituents are 1.736, 1.828 and 1.731 Aº, respectively. Exceptionally, the P-C2 bond distance of $1H$ -phosphole substituted by $-CHF_2$ group is longer than the $-CH_2F$ and $-CF_3$ groups. Probably, the asymmetric steric bulk distribution of the F atoms of this substituent to hydrogen atom causes the longer distance of P-C2 bond. Also, the $-SO₃H$ substituent polarizes the P-C2 bond. For this reason, the distance of this bond in the molecule containing – $SO₃H$ substituent is 1.824 A $^{\circ}$. The P-C5 bond distance of the molecules with electron-withdrawing and

electron-donating substituents is in range 1.70-1.73 and 1.81-1.82 Aº, respectively. Exceptionally, this bond in 2-(difluoromethyl)-1*H*-phosphole and is 1.815 A° . Also, the P-C5 bond of 1*H*-phosphole-2-sulfonic acid polarized by –SO3H group and is 1.817 Aº. The data of the Table **1** shows the range of C2-C3, C3-C4 and C4-C5 bonds lengths of all compounds are 1.35-1.41, 1.40-1.46, 1.35-1.41 and 1.07-1.08 Aº, respectively. The P-H6 bond of molecules containing electrondonating substituents is longer than the electronwithdrawing groups.

Table **2** indicates the bond lengths data of the 1Hphosphole compounds substituted on position 3.

The electronegative substituents cause the shorter P-C2 and P-C5 bonds lengths than the electron-donation substituents. These bonds distances are in range 1.71- 1.73 and 1.81-1.82 Aº for molecules containing electronegative and electron-donating substituents, respectively.The C-C bonds distances vary from 1.35 to 1.45 Aº. The short P-H6 bonds are related to the 1*H*phospholes with electron-withdrawing substituents on position 3. The distance of C-H bonds of all molecules is about 1.08 Aº.

It can be seen from the data, the angles order is: C-C- $C > C-C-P > C-P-C$. The C-C-C angles vary from 113 degree to 117 degree. The range of C-C-P angles of molecules is 105-111 degree. The small and big C-C-P angles relate to the 1*H*-phosphole compounds containing electron-withdrawing and electron-donating substituents, respectively. Also, the C-P-C bond angles are in range 88-99 degree. The molecules with electron-withdrawing substituents on position 2 have bigger C-P-C bond angles than the electron-donating substituents.

Y	$P-C2$	$C2-C3$	C3-C4	$C4-C5$	$C5-P$	P-H ₆	$C2-Y$	$C3-H8$	$C4-H9$	$C5-H10$
H	1.725	1.390	1.420	1.390	1.725	1.391	1.078	1.082	1.082	1.078
CH ₃	1.737	1.390	1.422	1.386	1.730	1.392	1.501	1.084	1.083	1.078
CH_2F	1.736	1.388	1.422	1.385	1.729	1.392	1.498	1.081	1.082	1.078
CHF ₂	1.828	1.355	1.453	1.354	1.815	1.421	1.483	1.086	1.084	1.082
CF ₃	1.731	1.392	1.415	1.391	1.720	1.391	1.483	1.081	1.082	1.078
tBu	1.842	1.357	1.457	1.352	1.814	1.422	1.522	1.084	1.085	1.082
$\mathbf F$	1.739	1.375	1.425	1.385	1.733	1.390	1.344	1.081	1.082	1.077
Cl	1.733	1.384	1.421	1.388	1.727	1.391	1.736	1.082	1.082	1.078
Br	1.730	1.385	1.421	1.388	1.727	1.391	1.892	1.082	1.082	1.078
CN	1.736	1.402	1.410	1.394	1.717	1.391	1.409	1.081	1.082	1.078
COOH	1.733	1.400	1.409	1.398	1.715	1.390	1.456	1.081	1.082	1.078
CONH ₂	1.731	1.399	1.412	1.396	1.717	1.390	1.474	1.083	1.082	1.078
OH	1.834	1.354	1.456	1.353	1.820	1.423	1.358	1.085	1.085	1.081
OCH ₃	1.842	1.358	1.457	1.352	1.820	1.423	1.349	1.082	1.085	1.081
SH	1.834	1.356	1.456	1.353	1.820	1.421	1.771	1.084	1.085	1.082
SCH ₃	1.839	1.358	1.455	1.353	1.819	1.421	1.768	1.084	1.085	1.082
SO_3H	1.824	1.356	1.451	1.354	1.817	1.421	1.759	1.084	1.084	1.082
NO ₂	1.732	1.392	1.408	1.400	1.715	1.390	1.429	1.081	1.082	1.078
N _O	1.743	1.406	1.400	1.407	1.708	1.392	1.397	1.081	1.082	1.078
NH ₂	1.847	1.361	1.452	1.353	1.819	1.423	1.385	1.085	1.086	1.081
NCH ₃) ₂	1.855	1.370	1.449	1.354	1.814	1.425	1.378	1.082	1.086	1.081

Table 1: The bond lengths data of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C2 atom.

Table 2: The bond lengths data of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C3 atom.

Table **3** collects the bond angles data of the molecules containing various substitutions on position 2.

The bond angles data of the molecules containing different substitutions on position 3 is collected in Table **4**. The order of bond angles of the molecules is: C-C-C (112-117 degree) > C-C-P (105-111 degree) > C-P-C (89-99 degree). From the data, the C-C-P bond angles of 1*H*-phosphole compounds containing electron-donating substituents are bigger than the electron-withdrawing substituents. Also, we can see the molecules with electron-withdrawing and electrondonating substituents have big and small C-P-C bond angles, respectively.

Table 3: The bond angles data of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C2 atom.

Table **5** shows the dihedral angles of 1*H*-phosphole compounds substituted on position 2. It can be seen from the data, the molecules with substituents H , $CH₃$, CH_2F , F, Cl, Br, CN, COOH, CONH₂, NO and NO₂ on C2 atom are planar. In other hand, the 1*H*-phosphole compounds containing electron-donating substituents $(CHF₂, tBu, OH, OCH₃, SH, SCH₃, NH₂ and NMe₂)$ and SO3H group (with polarization of P-C bond) are

not planar. The torsion angle range inside the ring of these molecules is 4.5-6.5 degree. Also, the C-C-P-H dihedral angle of these compounds is about 70-77 degree.

The dihedral angles data of 1*H*-phosphole compounds substituted on position 3 is shown in Table **6**.

Table 5: The dihedral angles data of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C2 atom.

Table 6: The dihedral angles data of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C3 atom.

From the data, the substituents CH_3 , CH_2F , CHF_2 , CF_3 , tBu, OH, OCH₃, SCH₃, SO₃H, NO, NH₂ and $NMe₂$ on position 3 of 1H-phosphole heterocyclic compound destroy the planarity of ring. These substituents make the torsion angle in range 7-10 degree inside the ring and the C-C-P-H dihedral angle about 68-72 degree. On other hand, the molecules containing electron-withdrawing substituents on position 3 are plane and have not any torsional and dihedral angles.

Bond orders and aromaticity indices of the 1Hphosphole derivatives:

The aromaticity concept is virtually a tenet of faith to organic chemists yet its quantification is a good parameter to explore the structural properties of the molecules. There are several methods for study of the aromaticitiy property of molecules [13-15]. Here, nucleus independent chemical shift (NICS) and BIRD indices were used for discussion about the aromaticity of the studied compounds.

In 1996, P. Schleyer and his co-workers proposed the NICS index for study of stability and aromaticity in organic rings. They used the absolute magnetic shieldings, computed at ring centers with quantum mechanics computations, as a novel aromaticity/antiaromaticity criterion. The negative and positive NICSs state the aromaticity and

antiaromaticity properties, respectively. Also, small nucleus independent chemical shifts denote nonaromaticity [16].

In 1991, Clive Bird reported new index for aromaticity property of five-membered, six-membered, and fused five and six-membered heterocycles [17]. The variation coefficient for the bond orders of a heterocycle compound is given by the expression:

$$
V = \frac{100}{\overline{N}} \sqrt{\frac{\sum (N - \overline{N})^2}{n}}
$$

Where \overline{N} is the arithmetic mean of the various bond orders (N), and n is the number of bonds. The Bird aromaticity index is expressed by following formulas:

$$
BIRD\ Index = 100\big(1 - \frac{V}{V_K}\big)
$$

The non-delocalized Kekule variation coefficient (V_K) of bond orders is 35, 33.3 and 35 for a fivemembered ring heterocycle, a six-membered ring heterocycle and a five-membered ring fused to the sixmembered ring heterocycle, respectively.

Table **7** shows the Wibergbond orders data and aromaticity parameters (nucleus independent chemical shift NICS and BIRD indices) of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C2 atom.

Table 7: The bond orders data and aromaticity indices of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C2 atom.

Y	NICS(0)	BIRD Index	$n_{(P1-C2)}$	$n_{(C2-C3)}$	$n_{(C3-C4)}$	$n_{(C4-C5)}$	$n_{(C5-P1)}$
H	-16.227	74.789	1.264	1.534	1.347	1.534	1.264
CH ₃	-15.291	71.923	1.225	1.515	1.328	1.550	1.248
CH_2F	-15.411	71.358	1.214	1.514	1.327	1.553	1.251
CHF ₂	-4.936	28.019	0.990	1.714	1.162	1.771	1.045
CF ₃	-16.125	76.123	1.202	1.472	1.363	1.518	1.299
tBu	-4.186	25.820	1.000	1.744	1.150	1.783	1.031
$\mathbf F$	-16.979	68.373	1.212	1.531	1.305	1.568	1.227
Cl	-15.967	71.524	1.199	1.499	1.327	1.546	1.252
Br	-15.733	72.242	1.207	1.502	1.329	1.542	1.256
CN	-16.366	76.703	1.170	1.412	1.390	1.497	1.308
COOH	-15.202	79.130	1.190	1.420	1.401	1.480	1.327
COMH ₂	-15.333	79.316	1.208	1.439	1.386	1.491	1.314
OH	-4.447	25.940	0.981	1.690	1.147	1.785	1.018
OCH ₃	-4.115	26.276	0.981	1.674	1.145	1.787	1.017
SH	-3.944	25.380	0.975	1.704	1.149	1.784	1.021
SCH ₃	-3.710	25.456	0.971	1.709	1.152	1.780	1.025
SO_3H	-5.291	28.187	0.976	1.700	1.164	1.765	1.047
NO ₂	-15.239	78.360	1.176	1.416	1.400	1.476	1.329
N _O	-13.893	78.523	1.162	1.359	1.447	1.432	1.362
NH ₂	-3.566	27.682	0.973	1.650	1.161	1.774	1.015
NCH ₃) ₂	-3.684	29.900	0.974	1.614	1.173	1.761	1.015

From the data, we can see the NICS index of the molecules containing H, CH_3 , CH_2F , CF_3 , F, Cl, Br, CN, COOH, CONH₂, $NO₂$ and NO substituents on C2 is in minus 16-14 range. The compounds with H, F,

Cl, Br, CN, COOH, CONH₂, $NO₂$ and NO substituents indicate the range of 68-80 to BIRD parameter but the molecules containing CH_3 , CH_2F and CF_3 substituents show 25-30 range. Adversely, the molecules with CHF_2 , tBu, OH, OCH₃, SH, SCH₃, SO₃H, NH₂ and $NMe₂$ substituents show minus 3-5 and 25-30 ranges for NICS and BIRD parameters, respectively.In other hand, for all molecules the C2-C3 and C4-C5 bond orders are greater than the P1-C2, C3-C4 and C5-P1 bond orders. It can be seen from these data, the bonds in all compounds are not equivalent. Also, we can conclude that the NICS and BIRD parameters don't state the aromaticity of the 1*H*-phosphole compounds substituted on C2 atom with electron-withdrawing groups appropriately.

The Wibergbond orders data and aromaticity parameters (NICS and BIRD indices) of the 1*H*phosphole derivatives substituted on C3 atom are collected in Table **8**.

Table 8:The bond orders data and aromaticity indices of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C3 atom.

From the data, the molecules including H, F, Cl, Br, CN, COOH, CONH₂, SH and NO₂ substituents show minus 15.5-17.8 and 74.2-76.2 for NICS(0) and BIRD factors, respectively. Adversely, the NICS(0) and BIRD indices of the molecules containing CH_3 , CH_2F , $CHF₂, CF₃, tBu, OH, OCH₃, SCH₃, SO₃H, NO, NH₂$ and NMe₂ groups on C3 atom are in minus $4.8-6.7$ and 26-30.8 ranges. In other hand, the C2-C3 and C4-C5 bond orders of all molecules are greatest. We can see the bonds in structures are not equivalent. So, the aromaticity of the structures having electronwithdrawing substituents can't state by NICS and BIRD parameters appropriately. It can be concluded from the bonds order data of the molecules substituted on C2 and or C3 atoms are non-aromatic.

Global reactivity indices of the 1H-phosphole derivatives:

It is well known that global reactivity indices defined within conceptual DFT is a powerful tool to explain reactivity and the molecular properties [18, 19]. Consequently, we have calculated global hardness (η), electronic chemical potential (μ) , electronegativity (γ) , global softness (S), nucleophilicity index (N) and electrophilicity index (ω) for all compounds by following formulas [20-22]:

$$
\eta (eV) = \frac{(\varepsilon_{LUMO} - \varepsilon_{HOMO})}{2}
$$

$$
\mu (eV) = -\frac{(\varepsilon_{LUMO} + \varepsilon_{HOMO})}{2}
$$

$$
\chi (eV) = -\mu
$$

$$
S (eV) = \frac{1}{2\eta}
$$

 $N(eV) = E_{HOMO} - E_{HOMO(Tetracyanoethylene)}$

$$
\omega \text{ (eV)} = \frac{\mu^2}{2\eta}
$$

The data of global reactivity calculations for 1*H*phosphole derivatives are collected in Tables **9** and **10**. Stability of molecules is relative to the frontier orbitals (HOMO and LUMO) energies of them. The compounds with high HOMO-LUMO energies gap are more stable than the molecules with low HOMO-LUMO energies gap. From the global hardness data, the stability order of the molecules substituted on C2 atom is: $H > F > C l > Br > CH₃ > CH₂F > CF₃ > CHF₂ >$ $CN > tBu > SO₃H > CONH₂ > OH > OCH₃ > COOH >$ $SH > NH₂ > SCH₃ > N(CH₃)₂ > NO₂ > NO.$ The stability of the 1*H*-phosphole molecules substituted on C3 atom varies by following order: $H > F > CONH₂>CN$ $>CI > CF_3 > CH_2F > CHF_2 > tBu > CH_3 > SO_3H > COOH >$ $Br > SH > OH > OCH₃ > NH₂ > SH > SOH₃ > NO₂ >$ NO. These stability orders indicate the compounds containing SH, OH, OCH₃, NH₂, SCH₃, N(CH₃)₂, NO₂ and NOsubstituents on C2 or C3 atoms have less stability than other molecules. Also, the 1*H*-phosphole without any substituent is more stable among all studied molecules. In other hand, the global nucleophilicity and electrophilicity indices of the molecules substituted on C2 atom show the following orders: $N(CH_3)_{2} > NH_2 > CH_3 > OCH_3 > SCH_3 > H > OH$ >CH2F >SH >NO > F >Br >Cl>CONH2>tBu>COOH $>CF_3>CN > NO_2>CHF_2>SO_3H$ and NO $>NO_2>SO_3H$ $>CHF_2 > CN$ $>COOH$ $>SH$ $>SCH_3>CONH_2>CF_3>tBu>OH$ > $OCH_3>NH_2>Br$ $>Cl > N(CH_3)_2 > F > CH_2F > H > CH_3$, respectively. We can see from these orders that the molecules containing electron-donating groups have more nucleophilicity among all compounds. In contrast, the electronwithdrawing substituents cause high electrophilicity power of molecules. Figure **1** shows the relationship between global nucleophilicity and electrophilicity indices of the studied 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C2 atom. It can be deduced that the nucleuphilicity and electrophilicity powers are not related together in these molecules.

Figure 1: The relationship between global nucleophilicity and electrophilicity indices of the studied 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted at positions 2.

The global nucleophilicity of the molecules substituted on C3 atom varies with this order: SH $>N(CH_3)_2>NH_2>H > SCH_3 > OCH_3>F >Br >Cl >OH$ $>$ CONH₂ $>$ NO $>$ tBu $>$ CH₃ $>$ COOH $>$ CN $>$ CH₂F $>$ NO₂ $>$ $CHF₂>CF₃>SO₃H$. This order shows that the most nucleophilicity power is related to the compounds containing electron-donating substituents.In contrast, the global electrophilicity order of these compounds is: $NO > NO₂> SO₃H > CF₃> CHF₂> CH₂F > CN > tBu>OH$ $>SCH_3>COOH$ $>OCH_3$ = $CH_3>NH_2>CONH_2>Br$ $>N(CH_3)_2>CI>F > SH > H$. It can be seen from the electrophilicity order, the molecules having electronwithdrawing groups at position 3 are powerful electrophile compounds among all these derivatives.

Figure **2** indicates us the relationship between global nucleophilicity and electrophilicity indices of the studied 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted at position 3. It can be concluded that the nucleuphilicity and electrophilicity indices are not related together in these molecules.

Local reactivity descriptors of the 1*H***-phosphole derivatives**

Fukui function (FF) provides information on the local site reactivity within the molecule and as such it Provides a system for understanding of chemical reactions. These values correspond to the qualitative descriptors of reactivity of different atoms in the molecule.The condensed Fukui functions were computed by taking the finite difference

approximations from population analysis of atoms in molecules, depending on the direction of electron transfer, through the following formulas [23]:

[for radical attack] Where q_k is the gross charge of atom k in the molecule.

 $f_{\mathbf{k}}^{+} = q_{\mathbf{k}(N+1)} - q_{\mathbf{k}(N)}$ [for nucleophilic attack] $f_{\mathbf{k}} = q_{\mathbf{k}(N)} - q_{\mathbf{k}(N-1)}$ [for electrophilic attack] $f_{k}^{0} = \frac{[q_{k(N+1)} - q_{k(N-1)}]}{2}$ 0.6 $y = 0.1457x - 0.1056$ 0.5 $R^2 = 0.566$ $1/\omega$ 0.4
 0.3 0.2 $0.1\,$ 3.5 $1.5\,$ $\sqrt{2}$ 2.5 3 $\overline{4}$ $N(\mathrm{eV})$

Figure 2: The relationship between global nucleophilicity and electrophilicity indices of the studied 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted at positions 3.

Table 9: The global reactivity indices of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C2 atom.

Y	HOMO (a.u.)	LUMO (a.u.)	χ (eV)	μ (eV)	η (eV)	S(1/eV)	N(eV)	ω (eV)
H	-0.21792	-0.01413	3.157	-3.157	2.773	0.361	3.557	1.797
CH ₃	-0.21250	-0.01342	3.074	-3.074	2.709	0.369	3.705	1.744
CH ₂ F	-0.22215	-0.02329	3.339	-3.339	2.706	0.370	3.442	2.060
CHF ₂	-0.26118	-0.07407	4.561	-4.561	2.546	0.393	2.380	4.085
CF ₃	-0.24040	-0.04550	3.890	-3.890	2.652	0.377	2.945	2.853
tBu	-0.23072	-0.04655	3.772	-3.772	2.506	0.399	3.209	2.839
F	-0.22737	-0.02365	3.415	-3.415	2.772	0.361	3.300	2.104
Cl	-0.22783	-0.02657	3.461	-3.461	2.738	0.365	3.287	2.187
Br	-0.22752	-0.02762	3.471	-3.471	2.720	0.368	3.296	2.215
CN	-0.24794	-0.06291	4.229	-4.229	2.517	0.397	2.740	3.553
COOH	-0.23545	-0.06274	4.057	-4.057	2.350	0.426	3.080	3.502
CONH ₂	-0.22938	-0.05154	3.822	-3.822	2.420	0.413	3.245	3.018
OH	-0.21942	-0.04368	3.580	-3.580	2.391	0.418	3.516	2.680
OCH ₃	-0.21524	-0.04001	3.473	-3.473	2.384	0.419	3.630	2.530
SH	-0.22313	-0.05987	3.850	-3.850	2.221	0.450	3.415	3.337
SCH ₃	-0.21785	-0.05989	3.779	-3.779	2.149	0.465	3.559	3.323
SO_3H	-0.27646	-0.09397	5.040	-5.040	2.483	0.403	1.964	5.115
NO ₂	-0.25417	-0.10510	4.888	-4.888	2.028	0.493	2.571	5.891
N _O	-0.22538	-0.10594	4.508	-4.508	1.625	0.615	3.354	6.253
NH ₂	-0.19977	-0.03705	3.222	-3.222	2.214	0.452	4.051	2.344
$NCH_3)_2$	-0.18815	-0.03297	3.009	-3.009	2.111	0.474	4.367	2.145

Table 10: The global reactivity indices of the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C3 atom.

Fukui indices indicate the reactive regions as well as the nucleophilic (the site for nucleophilic attack would depend on the values of f_k^+ on the atoms with a positive charge density), electrophilic (the sites for electrophilic attack will be those atoms bearing a negative charge and where the Fukui function f_k is a maximum) and radical attack (f_k^0) in the molecule [24]. Table 11 collects the data of the fukui indices of the atoms in the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted on C2 atom. From the data, the compounds show the following affinity for attack in various reactions:

For nucleuphilic attack:

C3: CF3, F, Cl, $SO₃H$, NO and NH₂

C4: tBu, COOH, CONH₂, CH₃, CH₂F, Br, CN₂SH, $SCH₃$, NO₂ and N(CH₃)₂ C5:OH, $CHF₂$ and OCH₃ For electrophilic attack: C3: CF_3 , tBu, Cl, Br, CN, COOH, SH, SCH₃, SO₃H, $NO₂$, NO, NH₂ and N(CH₃)₂ C4: CHF₂, OCH₃, CH3, CH₂F, F and CONH₂ C5: OH

For radical attack: $C3:CHF₂,CF3, F, CONH₂, OH, SO₃H and OCH₃$ C4:CH2F, CH3,tBu,Cl,Br, COOH, CN,SH,SCH3,NO, $NH₂$ and $NCH₃)₂$

Table 11: Principal reactivity sitesof 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted at position 2 obtained by using Fukui indices.

 $C5: NO₂$

From the data of the Table **12**, the 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted at position 3 indicate the following affinity for attack in various reactions: For nucleuphilic attack: C2: OH C4: CHF₂,F, Cl, Br, COOH, CONH₂, SH, NO₂, NO and NCH_3 ₂ C5: $CH_3, CH_2F, CF3, tBu, CN, OCH_3, SCH_3, SO_3Hand$ $NH₂$ For electrophilic attack:

C2: CN, OH and $NO₂$

C4: CH₂F, CHF₂, CF3, ^{*t*}Bu, F, Cl, Br, COOH, CONH₂, $OCH₃, SH, SCH₃, NO$ and $N(CH₃)₂$

C5: CH₃, SO₃Hand NH₂

For radical attack:

 $C2$:CONH₂, OHand N(CH₃)₂

C4: F, Cl, Br, COOH, $NO₂$ and $NH₂$

C5:CH₃,CH₂F,CHF₂,CF3,tBu,CN,

OCH3,SH,SCH3,SO3HandNO

Presence of dehydrating agents was the most fascinating method over other reported methods [19- 32]. The dehydrating agents used so far for the synthesis of nitriles including *N*-methyl-2-

pyrrolidinone [23], MeSO₂Cl/alumina [19], silica chloride [21], sodium iodide [22], dichlorophosphate-DBU [24], propyl phosphonic anhydride (T3P) [25], $CuCl₂/NaOMe/O₂$ [26], $KF/Al₂O₃$ [27] I₂[28], NBS [29] graphite/MeSO₂Cl [30], choline chloride-urea [31] and transition metal catalysts [32]. However, these reported methods suffer from some disadvantages as requirement of drastic reaction conditions [19,22,23,30], limited substrate scope [33], use of expensive and hazardous metallic reagents [34-39]. In addition, some of these methods are not suitable for thermally unstable and enolizable aliphatic aldehydes [24]. Hence, there is still need to develop more efficient and direct methodology for the synthesis of nitrile from aldehyde.

During the past few decades, attention being focused on the development of ultrasound assisted reactions [40]. The application of 'cavitations' as energy source allows organic reactions faster with more selectivity and excellent product yields in shorter reaction time and [41-46]. The utility and applicability of ultrasound promoted reactions have been well documented in literature [47-50].

Table 12: Principal reactivity sitesof 1*H*-phosphole derivatives substituted at position 3 obtained by using Fukui indices.

H	$P(0.350), C2(-0.167), C3(0.023), C4$	$P(-0.303)$, C ₂ (-0.046) , C ₃ (-0.065) ,	$P(0.024), C2(-0.106), C3(-0.020), C4$
	(0.023) , C5 (-0.0167)	C ₄ (-0.065) , C ₅ (-0.046)	(-0.020) , C5 (-0.106)
	$P(0.535), C2(-0.689), C3(0.416), C4$	$P(-0.409)$, C ₂ (-0.084) , C ₃ (-0.010) ,	$P(0.063)$, C ₂ (-0.387) , C ₃ (0.203) , C ₄
CH ₃	(-0.784) , C5 (0.045)	$C4 (0.046), C5 (-0.091)$	(-0.369) , C5 (-0.023)
CH_2F	$P(0.093)$, C ₂ (-0.372) , C ₃ (0.398) , C ₄	P (-0.039), C ₂ (0.014), C ₃ (0.090), C ₄	$P(0.027), C2(-0.179), C3(0.244), C4$
	(-0.372) , C5 (-0.014)	(-0.359) , C5 (-0.081)	(-0.366) , C5 (-0.048)
CHF ₂	$P(0.050), C2(-0.451), C3(0.183), C4$	$P(-0.046)$, C ₂ (-0.064) , C ₃ (0.053) , C ₄	$P(0.002)$, C ₂ (-0.257), C ₃ (0.118), C ₄
	(0.026) , C5 (-0.054)	(-0.204) , C5 (-0.126)	(-0.089) , C5 (-0.090)
CF ₃	$P(0.034)$, C ₂ (-0.171) , C ₃ (0.479) , C ₄	P (-0.518), C ₂ (-0.141), C ₃ (0.038), C ₄	P (-0.242), C2 (-0.156), C3 (0.259), C4
	(-0.554) , C5 (-0.022)	(0.102) , C5 (-0.083)	(-0.226) , C5 (-0.053)
tBu	$P(0.439), C2(-0.320), C3(1.041), C4$	$P(-0.438), C2(-0.047), C3(-0.188),$	$P(0.001)$, C ₂ (-0.184), C ₃ (0.427), C ₄
	(-0.719) , C5 (-0.065)	$C4 (0.154), C5 (-0.087)$	(-0.283) , C5 (-0.076)
F	$P(-0.278)$, C ₂ (-0.069) , C ₃ (-0.066) ,	$P(-0.278)$, C ₂ (-0.046) , C ₃ (-0.077) ,	$P(-0.278)$, C ₂ (-0.058) , C ₃ (-0.072) ,

Computational method

The programs of Gaussian 03 suit [25] can be used in chemistry in order to determine the structural and reactivity properties of various molecules at the atomic level. All molecules were optimized by density functional theory (DFT) computations using the B3LYP exchange-correlation functional with the 6- $311++G(d,p)$ basis set. The computations were done in gas phase. The frequency calculations did not show any imaginary frequency for the molecules. These calculations indicate the accuracy of all computations on the molecules.

Conclusion

In the present study, the structural properties, aromaticity, global reactivity and local reactivity of 1H-phosphole derivatives substituted at positions 2 and 3 were investigated by density functional theory (DFT) method. All compounds were optimized at $B3LYP/6-311++G(d,p)$ level of theory. All computations were done without any structural restrictions at standard conditions (293.15 K and 1 atmosphere). In vibrational computations, no imaginary frequencies were shown for all considered molecules. So, it proves the accuracy of my calculations. The bonds order data and aromaticity

studies (NICS and BIRD indices) showed all molecules substituted on C2 and or C3 atoms are nonaromatic. Also, the global reactivity studies showed the molecules containing electron-donating and electron-withdrawing groups have more nucleophilicity and electrophilicity among all compounds, respectively.

Acknowledgement

The corresponding author is grateful to Doctor Mir Babak Bahadori for providing valuable suggestions.

References

[1] Mathey, F. *Chem. Rev.***1988,** *88,* 429-453.

[2] Baumgartner, T.; Wilk, W. *Org. Lett.* **2006,** *8,* 503-506.

[3] Chan, T. H.; Wong, L. T. L. *Can. J. Chem.* **1971,** *49,* 530-531.

[4] Hughes, A. N.; Srivanavit, C. *Can. J. Chem.* **1971,** *49,* 874-878.

[5] Tsuji, H.; Sato, K.; Iiies, L.; Itoh, Y.; Sato, Y.; Nakamura, E*. Org. Lett.* **2008,** *10,* 2263-2265.

[6] Hay, C.; Hissler, M.; Fischmeister, C.; Rault-Berthelot, J.; Toupet, L.; Nyulaszi, L.; Reau, R. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2001,** *7,* 4222-4236.

[7] Mattmann, E.; Simonutti, D.; Ricard, L.; Mercier, F.; Mathey, F. *J. Org. Chem.* **2001,** *66,* 755-758.

[8] Mattmann, E.; Mathey, F.; Sevin, A.; Frison, G. *J. Org. Chem.* **2002,** *67,* 1208-1213.

[9] Crassous, J.; Reau, R. *Dalton Trans.* **2008,** 6865- 6876.

- [10] Saito, A.; Miyajima, T.; Nakashima, M.; Fukushima, T.; Kaji, H.; Matano, H.; Matano, Y.;
- Imahori, H. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009,** *15,* 10000-10004.

[11] Baba, K.; Tobisu, M.; Chatani, N. *Bioorg. Angew. Chem.* **2013,** *125,* 12108-12111.

- [12] Delaere, D.; Dransfeld, A.; Nguyen, M. T.; Vanquickenborne, L. G. *J. Org. Chem.* **2000,** *65,* 2631-2636.
- [13] Nabati, M.; Mahkam, M. *J. Phys. Theor. Chem. IAU Iran* **2015,** *12,* 121-136.

[14] Nabati, M. *J. Phys. Theor. Chem. IAU Iran* **2015,** *12,* 325-338.

[15] Nabati, M.; Mahkam, M.; Atani, Y. G. *J. Phys. Theor. Chem. IAU Iran* **2016,** *13,* 35-59.

[16] Nabati, M.; Mahkam, M. *Org. Chem. Res.* **2016,** *2,* 70-80.

[17] Nabati, M. *Iran. J. Org. Chem.* **2016,** *8,* 1703- 1716.

[18] Nabati, M. *J. Phys. Theor. Chem. IAU Iran* **2016,** *13,* 133-146.

[19] Nabati, M.; Mahkam, M. *J. Phys. Theor. Chem. IAU Iran* **2015,** *12,* 33-43.

[20] Nabati, M.; Mahkam, M. *Silicon* **2016,** *8,* 461- 465.

[21] Nabati, M.; Hojjati, M. *Iran. J. Org. Chem.* **2016,** *8,* 1777-1787.

[22] Nabati, M.; Mahkam, M. *Iran. J. Org. Chem.* **2015,** *7,* 1463-1472.

[23] Nabati, M. *Iran. J. Org. Chem.* **2015,** *7,* 1631- 1640.

[24] Dwivedi, A.; Baboo, V.; Bajpai, A. *Iran. J. Theor. Chem.* **2015,** *Article ID 345234,*11 p., doi: 10.1155/2015/345234.

[25] Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Montgomery Jr., J. A.; Vreven, T.; Kudin, K. N.; Burant, J. C.; Millam, J. M.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Cossi, M.; Scalmani, G.; Rega, N.; Petersson, G. A.; Nakatsuji, H.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Klene, M.; Li, X.; Knox, J. E.; Hratchian, H. P.; Cross, J. B.; Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, A. J.; Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, J. W.; Ayala, P. Y.; Morokuma, K.; Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, A. D.; Strain, M. C.; Farkas, O.; Malick,

D. K.; Rabuck, A. D.; Raghavachari, K.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.; Cui, Q.; Baboul, A. G.; Clifford, S.; Cioslowski, J.; Stefanov, B. B.; Liu, G.; Liashenko, A; Piskorz, P.; Komaromi, I.; Martin, R. L.; Fox, D. J.; Keith, T.; Al- Laham, M. A.; Peng, C. Y.; Nanayakkara, A.; Challacombe, M.; Gill, P. M. W.; Johnson, B.; Chen, W.; Wong, M. W.; Gonzalez, C.; Pople, J. A. *Gaussian 03. Revision B.01.*Gaussian Inc. Wallingford. CT. **2004**.