Synthesis, Characterization, and Theoretical Study of Some New Organotellurium Compounds Derived from Camphor
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Abstract: The present work describes the synthesis of a variety of organotellurium compounds. The first part describes the synthesis of a new series of organotellurium compounds containing azomethine groups. Reaction of (E)-(4-((1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-ylidene)amino)phenyl)mercury(II)chloride and (E)-(5-methyl-2-((1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-ylidene)amino)phenyl)mercury(II)chloride with tellurium tetrabromide in 2:1 mole ratio yielded the tellurated Schiff bases Ar_2TeBr_2 (where Ar = 1-(C_9H_16C=N)C=N)C_6H_4 and 1-(C_9H_16C=N)C=N)-4-CH_3C_6H_3) respectively. Reduction of organyl tellurium dibromide Ar_2TeBr_2 by hydrazine hydrate obtained the corresponding tellurides (i.e., Ar_2Te) in good yields. Characterization of the prepared compounds was carried out using infrared spectrum (FT-IR), proton nuclear magnetic resonance spectrum (1H-NMR), and elemental analysis (CHN). The molecular structure of the organotellurium compounds was investigated using the density functional theory with hybrid functional (B3LYP), and the basis set 6-31G Geometrical structure, HOMO surfaces, LUMO surfaces, and energy gap have been produced throughout the geometry optimization. The molecular geometry and contours for the organotellurium compounds were investigated throughout the geometrical optimization. The donor and acceptor properties have been studied by comparing organotellurium compounds' highest occupied molecular orbital energies (HOMO). The present study aims to prepare organotellurium compounds derived from aniline, p-toluidine, and camphor and their derivatives using tellurated Schiff bases.
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INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been a great deal of interest in synthesizing organotellurium compounds containing amino [1-2], azomethine [3], pyridines, or acetamido group in 2-position of tellurium element [1]. The high stability of such compounds is due to the intramolecular interactions (N→Te). There are few examples of tellurated derivatives of azobenzenes in the literature, although the first example was prepared in 1979 by trans-metallation of mercurated azobenzenes with tellurium tetrachloride [4-6]. In the last ten years, the field of organic tellurium chemistry has witnessed a vast development, and several review articles and books on the subject have been published [3,7-11]. Organotellurium compounds have long proved to be valuable intermediate products in organic synthesis, are known to be convenient models for studying fundamental problems of theoretical chemistry, and are essential substances from the practical viewpoint [12-13]. Elemental tellurium provides a source of nucleophilic (chalcogenide and dichalcogenide ions) and electrophilic reagents, which may be generated in situ or prepared just before use [14-15]. Elemental tellurium can be brought into insertion reaction with organometallic compounds to afford the corresponding metal tellurolates, which are then involved in nucleophilic substitution and addition reactions [15]. Organotellurium compounds have been used as precursors for the preparative organic synthesis.
and semiconducting metal tellurides. Organotellurium chemistry has become a trending topic [5,7-9,16].

The quantum mechanical wave function contains all the information about the given system [17]. In the case of a simple 2-D square potential or even a hydrogen atom, the Schrödinger equation may be solved to get the system’s wave function, following which the allowed energy states of the system can be determined [11]. The simplest definition of density functional theory (DFT) is a technique used to approximate the Schrödinger equation of many-body systems [18]. Computational codes refer to DFT in the Gaussian 09 program. DFT is one of the most common methods of quantum mechanics. DFT exactly describes the rigid structure of the molecules throughout the geometrical optimization procedure. In application, it is used to investigate the structural, electronic, and physical properties of the molecules and materials, such as the binding energies of the molecules in chemistry, physics, and other areas [[19]]. For example, DFT aims to calculate the electronic ground state energy of a system of N electrons only through its density without prior well-known system wave function [11,17,18,20-23].

In the present work, attempts will be made to prepare several new organotellurium compounds containing group (–C=N). However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no method to prepare organotellurium compounds derived from camphor, aniline, and p-toluidine. Therefore, the current study aims at studying the biological activity of these new compounds.

**EXPERIMENTAL SECTION**

**Materials**

The chemicals used in this study included camphor, ethanol absolute, p-toluidine, glacial acetic acid, mercuric acetate, bromine, chloroform, dioxane, sodium metal, potassium hydroxide, hydrazine hydrate, aniline (Avantor), lithium chloride, tellurium powder, hydrochloric acid (HGB), and molecular sieves (ACS). All the chemicals in this study were used as obtained by the manufacturer with no further purification.

**Instrumentation**

The 1H-NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker 500 MHz spectrometers with TMS as an internal reference, utilizing soluble DMSO-d6. Elemental analysis for carbon, hydrogen, and nitrogen was performed using a Euro vector EA 3000A Elemental Analysis (Italy). Infrared spectra were recorded with KBr circles, utilizing an FTIR spectrophotometer Shimadzu model 8400 S in 4000–250 cm⁻¹. This study begins by optimizing A, B, C, and D compounds using the DFT method, implemented in the Gaussian 09W package with the 6-31G basis set in its ground state. Depending on the first principle of DFT computations, the energy gaps (Eₔ) and frontier orbital distributions (HOMO and LUMO) are computed for all these systems. DFT using Becke and Lee-Yang-Parr exchange-correlation functional, with the 6-31G mention basis set were applied in the quantum-chemical evaluation.

**Procedure**

**Synthesis of (2E,2′E)-N,N’-((dibromo-λ⁴-tellanediyi) bis(4,1-phenylene))bis(1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1] heptan-2-imine) (A)**

Firstly, (5.5 mmol, 2.54 g) of (E)-(4-((1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-ylidene)amino) phenyl) mercury(II) chloride was dissolved in 25 mL of dry dioxane. Then, (2.8 mmol, 1.25 g) of tellurium tetrabromide in 25 mL of dry dioxane was added to the mixture. The mixture was then refluxed for 14 h, the hot solution was filtered, and the filtrate was cooled to room temperature [1-2,11]. The filtrate was poured into 250 mL of cold distilled water to form reddish-brown crystals. Following recrystallization by ethanol, brown crystals were formed, yielding 63% and melting point 103–105 °C.

C.H.N.: theoretical % (practical %): C, 51.93 (51.64); H, 5.45 (5.33); N, 3.79 (3.47); FT-IR using KBr: ν(C–H) Aliphatic = 3100 cm⁻¹, ν(C–H) Aromatic = 3194 cm⁻¹, ν(C=N) Aliphatic = 1679 cm⁻¹, ν(C=N) Aromatic = 1325 cm⁻¹, ν(C–C) Aromatic = 1404 cm⁻¹.

1H-NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-d₆) δ 6.97 (s, 6H), 6.81 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 4H), 6.78–6.72 (m, 8H), 6.55 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 6H), 6.51 (s, 1H), 6.47 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 6H), 3.75 (dd,
$J = 10.6, 3.6 \text{ Hz, 8H}$, 2.74 (dd, $J = 16.0, 10.6 \text{ Hz, 8H}$), 2.47 (d, $J = 3.6 \text{ Hz, 6H}$), 2.11 (d, $J = 12.8 \text{ Hz, 24H}$), 2.07 (s, 7H). These data were shown in Scheme 1, Table 1 and 2, Fig. S1, S2 and S9.

**Synthesis of (2E,2'E)-N,N'-(tellurobis(4,1-phenylene))bis(1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-imine) (B)**

(2E,2'E)-N,N'-(dibromo-$\lambda^1$-tellanediyl)bis(4,1-phenylene)bis(1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-imine) (5 mmol, 3.7 g) was dissolved in 25 mL of ethanol. The solution was then refluxed for 2 h, and the mixture was cooled to room temperature. To the mixture, hydrazine hydrate (5 mmol., 0.16 g) in 25 mL of ethanol was added dropwise and heated in the water bath to 70 °C. The resulting solution was evaporated using a rotary evaporator. The brown solid that had formed was recrystallized by using chloroform to give brown crystals, with a yield of 55%, and melting point 88–90 °C.

C.H.N: theoretical % (practical %): C, 66.23 (66.45); H, 6.95 (6.83); N, 4.83 (4.11); FT-IR using KBr: $\nu$(C–H) Aliphatic = 2920 cm–1, $\nu$(C–H) Aromatic  = 3103 cm –1, $\nu$(C=N) Aliphatic = 1616 cm–1, $\nu$(C–N) Aromatic = 1333 cm–1, $\nu$(C=C) Aromatic = 1419 cm–1.

$^1$H-NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-d$_6$) $\delta$ 6.97 (s, 6H), 6.81 (d, $J = 7.9 \text{ Hz, 4H}$), 6.78–6.72 (m, 8H), 6.55 (d, $J = 8.0 \text{ Hz, 6H}$), 6.51 (s, 1H), 6.47 (d, $J = 8.0 \text{ Hz, 3H}$), 3.75 (dd, $J = 10.6, 3.6 \text{ Hz, 8H}$), 2.74 (dd, $J = 16.0, 10.6 \text{ Hz, 8H}$), 2.47 (d, $J = 3.6 \text{ Hz, 6H}$), 2.11 (d, $J = 12.8 \text{ Hz, 24H}$), 2.07 (s, 7H). These data were shown in Scheme 2, Table 1 and 2, Fig. S3, S4, and S10.

**Synthesis of (E)-N-(2-(dibromo-5-methyl-2-((E)-1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-ylidene)amino)phenyl)-$\lambda^4$-tellane)-4-methylphenyl)-1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[3.1.1]heptan-6-imine (C)**

(E)-5-methyl-2-((1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-ylidene)amino)phenyl)mercury(II) chloride (5.5 mmol., 2.62 g) was dissolved in 25 mL of dry dioxane. To the solution, (2.8 mmol., 1.25 g) of tellurium tetrabromide in 25 mL of dry dioxane was added and then refluxed for 14 h. Next, the hot solution was filtered, and the filtrate was cooled to room temperature [1-2,11]. The filtrate was poured into 250 mL of cold distilled water to form brown crystals, recrystallization by ethanol to give brown crystals, with a yield of 65%, and melting point 123–125 °C.

C.H.N: theoretical % (practical %): C, 53.16 (52.95); H, 5.77 (5.45); N, 3.79 (3.47); FT-IR using KBr: $\nu$(C–H) Aliphatic = 2951 cm–1, $\nu$(C–H) Aromatic = 2999 cm–1, $\nu$(C=N) Aliphatic = 1694 cm–1, $\nu$(C–N) Aromatic = 1396 cm–1, $\nu$(C=C) Aromatic = 1487 cm–1.

$^1$H-NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-d$_6$) $\delta$ 7.93 (d, $J = 7.8 \text{ Hz, 8H}$), 7.89 (s, 1H), 7.78 (dt, $J=26.1, 7.7 \text{ Hz, 7H}$), 7.64 (t, $J = 7.6 \text{ Hz, 10H}$), 7.60–7.44 (m, 3H), 7.02 (dd, $J = 24.2, 8.0 \text{ Hz, 2H}$), 6.67 (d, $J = 8.0 \text{ Hz, 1H}$), 2.16 (s, 1H). These data were shown in Scheme 3, Table 1 and 2, Fig. S5, S6, and S11.
CH₃NCH₃HgClCH₃\textsubscript{1/2 TeBr₄}

Scheme 3. Preparation of diorganyl tellurium dibromide of p-toluidine and a camphor derivative

**Synthesis of (E)-1,7,7-trimethyl-N-(4-methyl-2-((5-methyl-2-(((E)-1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-6-ylidene)amino)phenyl)tellanyl)phenyl)bicyclo[3.1.1]heptan-6-imine (D)**

(E)-N-(2-(dibromo(5-methyl-2-((E)-(1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[3.1.1]heptan-6-ylidene)methyl)phenyl)-4-methylphenyl)-1,7,7-trimethylbicyclo[2.2.1]heptan-2-imine

22.5, 7.6 Hz, 5H), 6.99 (d, \(J = 7.9\) Hz, 1H), 6.76 (d, \(J = 7.9\) Hz, 1H), 2.15 (s, 2H). These data were shown in Scheme 4, Table 1 and 2, Fig. S7, S8, and S12.

■ RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present work included the preparation of organotellurium compounds such as Ar₂TeBr₂ and Ar₂Te (where Ar = 1-(C₉H₁₆C=N)C=N)C₆H₄ and 1-(C₉H₁₆C=N)C=N)-4-CH₃C₆H₃, respectively) by tellurated Schiff base derived of camphor, aniline, and p-toluidine.

\(^1\)H-NMR spectra of compounds (A–D) showed all the expected peaks. All spectrum [16,24-28] in DMSO-d\textsubscript{6} are given in Table 1 and explained in Fig. S1–S8.

IR spectra of the compounds under study displayed standard features in specific regions and characteristic bands in the other areas [24-29] (explained in Table 2). In all the compounds under study, the aromatic (C–H) bond appeared at the range (2998–3194 cm\(^{-1}\)) [24-29], whereas the aliphatic (C–H) bond appeared at the range of (2920–3100 cm\(^{-1}\)). The clear band at the range of (1616–1696 cm\(^{-1}\)) was attributed to the aliphatic bond (C=N) [24-29]. On the
Table 1. $^1$H-NMR spectral data of selected compounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure for compound</th>
<th>$^1$H-NMR (DMSO-d$_6$); TMS = 0 ppm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.97 (s, 6H), 6.81 (d, $J = 7.9$ Hz, 4H), 6.78–6.72 (m, 8H), 6.55 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 6H), 6.51 (s, 1H), 6.47 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 3H), 3.75 (dd, $J = 10.6$, 3.6 Hz, 8H), 2.74 (dd, $J = 16.0$, 10.6 Hz, 8H), 2.47 (d, $J = 3.6$ Hz, 6H), 2.11 (d, $J = 12.8$ Hz, 24H), 2.07 (s, 7H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.97 (s, 6H), 6.81 (d, $J = 7.9$ Hz, 4H), 6.78–6.72 (m, 8H), 6.55 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 6H), 6.51 (s, 1H), 6.47 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 3H), 3.75 (dd, $J = 10.6$, 3.6 Hz, 8H), 2.74 (dd, $J = 16.0$, 10.6 Hz, 8H), 2.47 (d, $J = 3.6$ Hz, 6H), 2.11 (d, $J = 12.8$ Hz, 24H), 2.07 (s, 7H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.93 (d, $J = 7.8$ Hz, 8H), 7.89 (s, 1H), 7.78 (dt, $J = 26.1$, 7.7 Hz, 7H), 7.64 (t, $J = 7.6$ Hz, 10H), 7.60–7.44 (m, 3H), 7.02 (dd, $J = 24.2$, 8.0 Hz, 2H), 6.67 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 1H), 2.16 (s, 1H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.93 (d, $J = 7.7$ Hz, 1H), 7.78 (td, $J = 16.0$, 15.5, 7.6 Hz, 3H), 7.55 (ddt, $J = 54.8$, 22.5, 7.6 Hz, 5H), 6.99 (d, $J = 7.9$ Hz, 1H), 6.76 (d, $J = 7.9$ Hz, 1H), 2.15 (s, 2H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. FT-IR spectral data of selected compounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Aromatic C–H</th>
<th>Aliphatic C–H</th>
<th>Aliphatic C=N</th>
<th>Aromatic C–N</th>
<th>Aromatic C=C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3194</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3103</td>
<td>2920</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2999</td>
<td>2951</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>1487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2998</td>
<td>2951</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>1487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

other hand, the band at the range of 1325–1396 cm$^{-1}$ was attributed to the aromatic (C–N) bond for all the prepared compounds. The aromatic (C=C) bond appeared at the range of (1404-1487 cm$^{-1}$) [24-29], as shown in Table 2 and Fig. S9–S12.

**Computational Study**

The molecular structure for the organotellurium compounds was investigated using optimization plus frequency at the ground state level. In addition, density functional theory has been applied to optimize the...
organotellurium compounds with Gaussian 09 software program [17,29-30] (see Fig. S13–S28).

HOMO (Highest Occupied Molecular Orbital) and LUMO (Lowest Unoccupied Molecular Orbital) energies are the electronic states, referring to certain places of the existence of the electrons with quantized energies, where the molecular orbitals are in linear combination to the atomic orbitals [17,30-31] (see Fig. S21–S28). The difference between HOMO provides the energy bandgap (E_g). The energy gap is a crucial property in solids as it allows the prediction of the material (whether it is a conductor, insulator, or semiconductor). Furthermore, it represents the energy difference between the lower virtual energy and the higher total energy levels [32-34] (see Fig. S21–S28 and Table 3).

\[ E_g = E_{\text{LUMO}} - E_{\text{HOMO}} \]  

In the present work, a comparison between the HOMO and LUMO energies is explained in Table 3, to find out that HOMO energy of organyl tellurium dibromide A and C compound where is C a greater than D compound, as, for diorganyl telluride B and D, D is higher than C compound [32-34]. as follows:

D > B > A > C

Therefore, the highest energy gap was observed by compound D, while the lowest value was observed by compound C (see Table 3 and Fig. S21–S28).

Electronegativity and electrophilicity

Electronegativity and electrophilicity can be calculated from [30,32-36] the relations 2 and 3 (see Table 4).

\[ x = \frac{E_{\text{HOMO}} + E_{\text{LUMO}}}{2} \]  

\[ w = \frac{x^2}{2\eta} \]  

In Table 4, the electronegativity of D was higher than the electronegativity of C and A. On the other hand, the electronegativity of compound B was the lowest.

D > C > A > B

Among the prepared compounds, compound B had the greatest electrophilicity, whereas compound D had the least.

B > A > C > D

**Ionization potential and electron affinity**

According to Koopman’s theory, the following relations, 4 and 5 [29-30,37], can express the ionization potential and electron affinity, as shown in Table 5.

\[ \text{LP} = -E_{\text{HOMO}} \]  

\[ \text{E.A} = -E_{\text{LUMO}} \]  

Table 5 demonstrates the ionization potential, and electron affinity values in (eV) for compounds A, B, C, and D. According to Koopman’s theorem, the ionization potential, and electron affinity results depend on the energies in the valence band and the conduction band. The table demonstrates the arrangement of the prepared compounds according to the increase in their ionization potential [29,37]:

B > D > A > C

**Hardness softness acid base (HSAB Principle)**

The following equations 6 and 7 can express the hardness and softness [18,29,35,38]:

\[ \text{Hardness} = \frac{1}{2}(\text{LP} + \text{E.A}) \]  

\[ \text{Softness} = \frac{1}{2}(\text{LP} - \text{E.A}) \]  

**Electronegativity and electrophilicity of the organotellurium compounds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Electronegativity (eV)</th>
<th>Electrophilicity (eV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-2.87</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-6.47</td>
<td>21.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ionization potential and electron affinity of the organotellurium compounds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Ionization potential (eV) (LP)</th>
<th>Electron affinity (eV) (E.A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Chemical hardness and chemical softness of the organotellurium compounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Chemical hardness ((\eta))</th>
<th>Chemical softness ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\eta = \frac{I.P - E.A}{2}
\]
\[
\sigma = \frac{1}{2\eta}
\]

\(\eta\) refers to chemical hardness, and \(\sigma\) refers to chemical softness (see Table 6).

The comparison between A, B, C, and D shows that compound D was harder than compounds B, C, and A, respectively, indicating that compound D will behave as a hard base [29,35,38].

\(D > B > C > A\)

On the other hand, compound D was softer than compounds A, B, and D, indicating that compound C will behave as a soft base. Therefore, according to Table 6, the behavior of organotellurium compounds can be classified as donors or acceptors.

\(C > A > B > D\)

**CONCLUSION**

In the present study, compounds A, B, C, and D were obtained in a 51–65% yield. All the prepared compounds were characterized by the CHN elemental analysis, FTIR, and \(^1\)H-NMR. Findings from this study were in concordance with previous research findings, confirming the correctness of the proposed structures for all the prepared compounds. Additionally, it is evident that the density functional theory used in this study was a powerful method, and B3LYP functional is a suitable and efficient function for studying the electronic properties of these structures.
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